U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 89—PART 10

MARCH 27, 1943, TO JUNE 9, 1943

(PAGES A1457 TO A2894)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1943

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AUG 2 '44

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Appendix

Bishop Noll Replies to Drew Pearson

REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 25, Mr. Drew Pearson, author of the widely read Washington Merry-Go-Round column, discussed at some length the actior of the Post Office Department in withholding the second-class mailing privilege from several magazines of national circulation charged with disseminating lewd and indecent literature.

Mr. Pearson charged, in effect, that there has been collusion between Postmaster General Walker and the National Organization for Decent Literature in the censoring of the mails, and that the National Organization for Decent Literature has set itself up as the unofficial censor of United States magazines.

He also asserted that—

The situation has gone so far that scores of American magazines before going to press send their manuscripts to the representative of Bishop John F. Noll, of the Catholic National Organization for Decent Literature, where they are examined. * * *

Postmaster General Walker, when questioned by the Washington Merry-Go-Round, indignantly denied that members of his own religious faith were influencing his policy in barring magazines from the mails.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with consent granted, I wish to include herewith a copy of Bishop Noll's reply to these charges, contained in a letter to Mr. Pearson:

MR DREW PEARSON,
Author of the Daily Washington
Merry-Go-Round, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PEARSON: My attention has been called to the observations made in the March 25 installment of the Washington Merry-Go-Round. That installment deals with the National Organization for Decent Literature, with which, you imply, Postmaster General Frank Walker is cooperating by design.

I can assure you, and I hope that you will accept this assurance, that there is no collusion between the National Organization for Decent Literature and the United States Post Office Department.

If anything, the standards of the Post Office Department are more severe than those of the National Organization for Decent Literature, because it has banned from the mail magazines which were not on the National Organization for Decent Literature disapproved list. It is not likely that, in his censorship, the Postmaster General thinks in terms of morals as much as he does in terms of the unfairness on the part of publishers to expect the Federal Government to pay most of the cost of carrying through the mails periodicals which, to say the least, are calculated to do more harm than good. Kindly read carefully the statute governing the grant of the second-class mail privilege to periodicals.

Those who examine magazines for the National Organization for Decent Literature do not pass arbitrary judgment on them, nor permit their own personal standards to influence their judgment. They relate the magazines to the five-point code of the National Organization for Decent Literature, which nearly all publishers of magazines have recognized as most fair and sane. There is no prudishness in that code. In fact warm commendations of our policy have come from publishers, from national, regional and local distributors, from thousands of retail dealers.

SAYS CODE SANE AND SOUND

We should like to ask you, Mr. Pearson, to examine objectively the code of the National Organization for Decent Literature in order to satisfy yourself whether it is not eminently sane and sound.

If Frank Walker, as you say, "indignantly denied that members of his own religious faith were influencing his policy in barring magazines from the mails," he told the plain truth. Personally, I have refrained from approaching him lest he might become embarrassed. But since Mr. Walker's office likely receives every week hundreds of marked copies of magazines, leaflets, and circular letters advertising wares which may not lawfully be carried by mail, he has ample reason for independent and wholly objective action. You, I am sure, are too good a philosopher to fall for the fallacy, "post hoc, ergo propter hoc."

You leave the impression on the readers of your column that the Washington office of the National Organization for Decent Literature requires publishers to send dummies of forthcoming issues for examination, while the fact is that those publishers who submit dummies have themselves requested the privilege of doing so, because they claim they actually want stories containing incidents of illicit love to be inspected before going to press with them.

As far as the National Organization for Decent Literature is Catholic I should like to declare that the bishops of every country have the right and duty to give directions to their flocks in matters relating to morals. If the clergy and laity of other organizations, if mayors of cities and juvenile court judges, believe in the National Organization for Decent Literature standards, they have an equal right to get behind the effort to make magazine literature safer for youth.

It may not be out of place to remind you that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is just as sympathetic toward the National Organization for Decent Literature as is the United States Post Office Department. If it has not suppressed many very lewd periodicals it is only because it is not within its province to prosecute. It must leave that to the Federal courts.

And it may not be out of place to remind you of the figures on the increase of sex crimes among minors during the year 1942 as compared to 1941. Figures released on March 20—only 5 days ago—disclose that arrests of girls under 21 for sex offenses increased 104.7 percent; that rape was committed every 52 minutes of the day and night during that year—an increase of 11.2 percent over the previous year. J. Edgar Hoover believes that the salacious publications are largely responsible for the increasing tide of sex offenses.

I feel, dear Mr. Pearson, that even if you are not inclined to make corrections, you will, in the interest of what is fair, send a copy of this to the papers which use your syndicated column.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. NOLL,
Bishop of Fort Wayne.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Have these Pearson articles been barred as obscene or indecent?

Mr. GILLIE. No; not in this particular case, but they should have been.

Horse Meat in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we are not a brutal people. We are a kindly, generous race of folks whose hearts have always been deeply touched by suffering.

When this Nation is at peace there are no people on the face of the earth who are more solicitous in their efforts to avoid harming their fellow men or causing unnecessary pain to dumb animals. But, Mr. Speaker, when this Nation goes to war we send into battle fighting men whose ferocity and grim determination in conflicts where no quarter is asked and none is given are terrifying things.

Our enemies have learned before—and they are learning again—that the gentle and humane precepts we follow in times of peace are not signs of weakness. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, they are signs of our greatest strength. When a nation is at war its people must become hard and tough. War is a brutal, uncivilized, unnatural thing in which the weak and faint of heart cannot survive.

But people must not become callous while they are at war, for if they do they will find when victory comes that they have not gained the better world for which they fought. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am calling attention of this House to a despicable situation on our home front which is growing increasingly more intolerable. I speak of the brutally inhumane conditions which precede the slaughter of horses by packers who process their meat. Although I am fully aware that a great many of our people are filled with revulsion by the knowledge that such a noble, intelligent, and faithful animal as the horse is put to death so that his flesh can be sold for human consumption, I do not intend to debate that phase of the situation today.

If our country has reached such a low ebb in its food resources that our people must turn to horse meat to maintain their health and vigor because meat of other animals customarily raised solely for human consumption is not available then, perhaps, it is right and proper that they should do so. I am fully aware, also, that many of the horses which reach the slaughterhouses have outlived their usefulness to man or because of injury or illness are no longer able to work. There are a few—and only a few—horse-slaughtering plants, I am informed, where the operators earnestly attempt to observe humane conditions in every step of their operations.

But there are many more of these plants, Mr. Speaker, where every step of the operation attending the slaughter of these unfortunate horses is attended by barbarism and cruelty which outrages the soul of every decent American.

Large trailer trucks are employed to transport horses to a number of these slaughterhouses. No unloading ramps are provided at the slaughterhouse. The trucks are backed up to large manure piles and the back gate is removed. Men jump on the truck yelling and striking at the heads of the horses. In their panic the poor animals fight to escape from the truck. Those nearest the gate are knocked down by the stampede and the following horses jump and step on the prostrate beasts. Next, the animals are herded into filthy pens and kept there massed tightly together to await their death. The operators of these abominable places seem to proceed on the theory that since the horses are due to die anyway, it would be a waste of money to show them any humane consideration. Other cases have been called to my attention, Mr. Speaker, in which horses packed into cattle cars have frozen to death while they were being shipped.

I have photographs of horses standing knee deep in water in muddy corrals waiting to be driven into the slaughtering house. Mr. Speaker, the National Humane Review, monthly publication of the American Humane Association, has an article in its current issue entitled "The Last Round-up" which describes some of the brutality surrounding the handling of horses sold for horse meat before they are slaughtered.

The writer says and I quote:

> Usually at these place horses are killed with a bullet. That is the best way. But sometimes they are first stunned with a hammer, as at cattle slaughtering plants, then bled on the floor to which they have fallen. Ammunition is very hard to get now, due to war.
>
> Stunning horses with a hammer is much more difficult than stunning a steer. The horse sees the blow coming, moves his head to dodge the blows. A young fellow was trying to stun a horse. The head moved as the blows were struck. Crash, crash, more crashes, aim bad, head dodging the swinging hammer, head bones smashed, six blows in all and the horse still on its feet, conscious, terrible pain. Then came another man. He took the hammer and with his one heavy and well-directed blow the horse fell, and that was the end of his pain. Will anyone challenge my presumption that this could have been the only case of its kind?

Not all of the horses which are killed under such unspeakable conditions, Mr. Speaker, are old and worn-out beasts whose working usefulness to man has ended. In the last quarter of 1942 many hundreds of good working horses were sold to the slaughterhouses because drought dried up pastures and farmers could not afford the high prices demanded for hay and other feeds.

We know that the critical shortage of farm machinery has created a demand for work horses on many farms which the market cannot supply. It is only sensible that we should not permit a single one of our existing inadequate supply of work horses to be slaughtered.

The Farm Security Administration belatedly launched a program to buy up all dairy cows which seemed headed for the slaughterhouse at farm auctions. It would be good sense for the Farm Security Administration to start buying all work horses which can be used on farms instead of letting them fall into the hands of horse-meat packers at auction sales. The Federal Government now inspects horse meat intended for human consumption, but its interest does not extend to the inhumane conditions under which the horses are handled before they are killed.

We cannot afford to be callous about conditions now. War has a deadening effect upon the finer sensibilities of a people. Now, more urgently than ever before, the American people who remain here at home must strive to maintain the decent way of life our boys in uniform are fighting to protect.

More Criminal Activities of the Surplus Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have several times on previous occasions referred to some of the activities of the Surplus Commodity Credit Corporation in my district which I hold under the dire food situation to be nothing less than outright criminal.

This morning I have another letter from an authentic source telling me about this bureaucratic agency having loaded every school in one of my counties with butter, English walnuts, prunes, dried beans, and several other rationed commodities. Further, that every rural school had cheese piled up so far ahead of their possibility to use it that it was being discarded because of spoiling. Further, that in one of the communities oranges and tangerines piled up so much more rapidly than they could be given away that almost a truckload were taken out and dumped on the dump because they spoiled before being used.

The situation has become so serious that citizens are petitioning that the Surplus Commodity Credit Corporation be abolished as the following will show:

KIWANIS CLUB OF MOUNT GILEAD,
Mount Gilead, Ohio.

Whereas the shortage of food in the United States is so serious that the Government has instituted a rationing system to prevent hoarding and insure more equitable distribution; and

Whereas there is such a shortage of manpower that the Congress has instituted studies to determine its causes; and

Whereas despite these shortages, the Surplus Commodities Corporation has continued distributing, as surplus foods, commodities that are rationed because of scarcity and without any co sideration whatsoever of actual need, thereby causing criminal waste of valuable food supplies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Mount Gilead Kiwanis Club officially approve the abolishing of the Surplus Comodities Corporation thereby stopping criminal waste of food and freeing thousands of job holders for productive em-

ployment, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, to Senator HAROLD BURTON, and to Congressman FREDERICK C. SMITH.

Passed by unanimous vote at the regular meeting March 24, 1943.

L. E. WILCOX, *President.*
I. B. WHITE, *Secretary.*

We Must Eat To Shoot To Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter to me from Mr. W. H. Badeaux, secretary of the Iowa Retail Lumbermen's Association, along with short statements from 45 Iowa farmers, poultry, dairy, and stockmen, setting out needs for more building material in order that farmers may meet the food-production goal required to win their part of the war, besides the giving of their sons to fight the war.

Now, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, anyone who knows the least bit about farming should know that unless the farmer of America has proper housing for poultry and stock, and sufficient farm machinery and labor, the farmer is whipped before he starts, and the much-needed food for our own soldiers and our allies, and for our civilian population will be seriously curtailed, which might mean the difference between defeat and victory. We dare not take that chance. Since Mr. Badeaux wrote this letter, Chester Davis, has, as you all know, taken over the food-production job. I sincerely hope that he will give full and serious consideration to the importance of making available every bit of farm-building material, equipment, farm machinery and repair parts that can possibly be had without detriment to our shooting force; bearing in mind always that we must continue to eat so we will continue to shoot to win, especially in a war such as this one, which may take years to prosecute to final victory.

The letter follows:

IOWA RETAIL LUMBERMENS ASSOCIATION,
Des Moines, Iowa, March 22, 1943.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND JENSEN: Knowing that greater food production is, and will be, one of the greatest factors in the winning of the war, we are taking the liberty of presenting to you facts, information, and data which we have gathered and tabulated pertaining to this important subject.

The important factors necessary for increased production are, as you know, farm labor, machinery, feeding, breeding, and housing. A great deal of emphasis has been placed on all of these factors, except housing, and it is on this subject we wish to present the information we have acquired.

This association, and several others in the States of Minnesota, North and South Dakota, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Nebraska, has just completed a survey among thousands of farmers located in these States. I will report on the results of farmers located in Iowa only as we do not have the figures for the other States, but they are available if you would want them.

A questionnaire was sent to the 1,166 lumber yards in Iowa, 10 to each yard. The lumber dealers were asked to contact 10 farmers in their respective communities, asking the farmer to fill out the questionnaire and sign it, and not state what he would like to build but what he actually needed in the way of lumber for repairs for his present buildings, and for new buildings in order to increase his production of livestock, hogs, and poultry.

Over 3,000 farmers filled out this questionnaire, and the results of our tabulation are as follows:

Absolute minimum of lumber for repair of present farm buildings, 373,617,837 board feet, comprising of boards, shiplap, siding, and dimension lumber.

Total new buildings needed for increased production, such as hog houses (all types), poultry houses (all types), milk houses, cattle sheds and feed racks, sheep sheds and feed racks, grain bins, corncribs and hopper feeders, 554,773 new buildings. Minimum lumber needed for construction of these buildings, 501,990,126 board feet, comprising of boards, siding, shiplap, and dimension lumber.

Enclosed are only a very few of the remarks made by the farmers when they filled out their questionnaires. These will give you a slight idea of the thoughts of hundreds of Iowa farmers, who so badly need lumber for their program of increased food production.

The survey also included information on the new equipment the farmer needs for increased food production and repair for his present equipment, and the following are the results of that part of the survey:

One hundred and thirty-four need new barn equipment, 57 new milking machines, 74 new cream separators, 506 pails and cans, 109 new pumps, 1,052 new fence and gates, 226 hog equipment, 309 poultry equipment, 382 farm machinery, 230 hay tools. Repairs for present equipment: 142 barn equipment, 16 milking machines, 52 separators, 40 pumps, 722 fence and gates, 174 hog equipment, 97 poultry equipment, 325 farm machinery, 137 hay tools. These figures are for only 3,000 of the Iowa farmers.

We then made a survey of lumber-dealers' stocks of dimension, common boards, shiplap, drop siding, and car siding—the kind of lumber necessary in the construction of hog houses (all types), poultry houses (all types), grain bins, corncribs, feeders, etc.

In a great many yards the dealer is completely out of these items. Over the State as a whole—and we received a return of over 700 replies to our questionnaires on dealer inventories—our dealers' stocks on the items mentioned in the previous paragraphs are 20 percent of the required amount of lumber needed for the present necessary repairs and new buildings required by the farmers of Iowa, and because of the lumber restrictions not only our members go without the lumber but the farmers as well, who have so definite a need for the lumber.

Many farmers have told our dealers that if they could not supply the necessary lumber for repairs, or the new buildings they needed, they would have to ship their livestock and hogs to market, and give up any idea of not only increasing their production, let alone retaining their past performance.

The information contained in this letter is not based on the ideas, wishes, or desires of the retail lumbermen of Iowa. These are the facts on what the farmers' needs are in Iowa for repair and new buildings in order to meet increased food production. The farmers have spoken on the subject in their own words.

A great deal has been said about farm labor and machinery—and these of course, are most essential—but very little has been said about farm building repairs and new buildings needed to do the big job of producing more food to help win the war and peace.

Our group has appointed a committee who will take to Washington all of the facts, figures, and information pertaining to this survey in an effort to present to Mr. Wickard and the powers that be the plight of the farmers in America's greatest food-producing area. It is hoped that those in Washington will see the necessity and make it possible for lumber to be produced and shipped into this food-producing area to the lumber dealers for their farm trade, and without a lot of red tape attached to getting it out on the farms.

You will be told that the recent amendments to the lumber-conservation order M-208 should give considerable relief to the lumber dealers of the Nation in securing lumber for their farm trade. For your definite information the preference ratings that can be used under amended M-208 and used in accordance with priorities regulation No. 3 are not high enough—same being AA-3 and AA-4—for the lumber dealers of the Nation to secure shipments from the mills as the mills are loaded with orders of AA-1 or better and will not ship on ratings less than AA-1 or better, so don't let anybody mislead you to the extent that the amended M-208 is any definite relief to the dealer and farmer in the securing of lumber for farm purposes.

Our dealers have been building literally thousands of portable hog houses, poultry houses, feeders, and so forth, and the lumber that they used before January 12, 1943, for this purpose can only be replaced on regulation Form PD-1X and when our dealers submit these forms to Washington, and if the forms are approved, the preference rating assigned is not high enough for our dealers to purchase lumber for the farmer. On the materials used for this purpose after January 12 the dealer has to secure the customer's signature and determine use before he can assign preference ratings of AA-4 to his orders to replace his stocks and that rating isn't high enough to get lumber. To be very definite, the present M-208 and the use of PD-1X forms are about the "rankest" types of regimentation and procedure necessary for our dealers to comply with in their sincere effort to secure lumber for their farm trade, who in turn as you have heard before, are big factors in the food production program.

Unless the repair to present farm buildings and the new farm buildings problem is taken care of, and at once, improper housing and inadequate housing of livestock, poultry, etc., will cause a serious shortage and make a more acute food situation, which, as you know, is most acute now.

Iowa is one of the Nation's greatest food producing States, and unless the farmers of Iowa, and in the Middle West can have the necessary labor, machinery, feed, and housing required to do the job Wickard wants done, we fear to predict the future of the Nation's food supply.

Isn't there anything possible you can do to make those in charge of the lumber situation "see the light"?

Most cordially yours,
W. H. BADEAUX,
Secretary.

FARMER REMARKS

Am in need of new fencing and lumber to provide more room to handle livestock. (Charles Widner, Richland, Iowa.)

Lumber and wire fences and barb wire and posts are absolutely necessary if we are to

meet production on even keel. For to lose out on proper repairs means waste and later want. (P. C. Heninger, Martinsburg, Iowa.)

With all the limitations and shortages of materials have been able to do nothing to raise my produce production. (Albert Voss, Luverne, Iowa.)

I have no brooder houses and it is absolutely necessary that I have some before I raise any chickens. (George Ellsworth, Coggon, Iowa.)

Need stanchions very bad. Must have them. (Roy Biereck, Larchwood, Iowa.)

I got to have lumber for cattle and sheep sheds. I feed a hundred head of cattle every year. Need lumber for poultry houses. (John G. Hinrich, George, Iowa.)

Lumber is badly wanted to build a new poultry house. (Landman Bros., Doon, Iowa.)

Lumber needed at once for re-siding barn for cattle. (John Mulder, Doon, Iowa.)

We can't increase hog production 15 percent without a place to house these additional sows and without feeders to feed the additional number of pigs, and the same for poultry. (George H. Hitch, Liscomb, Iowa.)

In order to sell milk to Sioux City, Iowa Cooperative Milk Association, new barn must be built. Have secured permits from Washington to build. However, lumber is not available. (Perry M. Miller, Whiting, Iowa.)

I buy $500 worth of lumber per year, but this year it cannot be done because the yards are out of lumber. I intended to have some A hog houses this spring but lumberman said he was out of all kinds of boards. (George Wittrock, Sutherland, Iowa.)

I want to make an increase but help will not let me and you cannot get lumber for housing if you could get help. (S. F. Steele, Sutherland, Iowa.)

I would like to make increases in hog, cattle, and chickens. Talked with lumberman and he is out of all boards. He cannot furnish hog houses or poultry houses. (Mrs. Elias Nelson, Sutherland, Iowa.)

I intended to increase hogs 200. I need 20 new A hog houses to make this increase but lumberyard cannot furnish them. Also need two new brooder houses. Lumberyard cannot furnish them. Need repairs of my large hog house and chicken house. Lumberyard cannot furnish material. (Carl Weiss, Sutherland, Iowa.)

How can we increase production without housing? I cannot make increase without lumber. (J. C. Innes, Sutherland, Iowa.)

Need several hog troughs and feeders. (Rudolph Jales, Sutherland, Iowa.)

I am raising 8,000 turkeys and require all new sheds. (Bill Sommerville, Le Mars, Iowa.)

Due to increase of production requirements it will be necessary to provide more housing. (Mrs. Grace Schow, Palmer, Iowa.)

I am going to keep more brood sows and will need material for additional room. (Lewis Reeder, Palmer, Iowa.)

Need lumber to increase production of livestock. (David Lang, Palmer, Iowa.)

Need lumber to increase production of chickens. (Just Wahlgren, Palmer, Iowa.)

Need lumber to increase production of hogs, cattle, and chickens. (Orrin Fredrick, Pocahontas, Iowa.)

Need woven wire fence and barb wire. Windows in chicken house need replacing. Badly in need of portable hog sheds. (W. A. Schofield, Griswold, Iowa.)

I think the Wilder Grain & Lumber Co. should have at least lumber to give the farmers what we need for repairs, being that this is in the heart of the food-production country. Without hog houses and dairy barns it can't be done. If the Government wants more food produced they will have to help us get the necessary equipment. (W. A. Cordes, Guernsey, Iowa.)

In order to raise more hogs I must have a hog house. I'm willing to do my part but I must have barns and hog houses to work with. Some provision should be made whereby the farmers can obtain the necessary buildings to take care of the increased production. (Homer Hall, Guernsey, Iowa.)

Guernsey is here in the heart of the agricultural and livestock community. Our buildings and fences are in need of repair and many buildings need it, and lumber is needed here at all times. Time is essential to us now. (M. H. Brothersen, Victor, Iowa.)

We need repairs for our old poultry house and also need another one. The lumber situation is acute in this section, and I think some provision should be made for the farmers to have lumber for necessary housing facilities. How can we produce more if we can't get the necessary buildings? (E. J. Taylor, Guernsey, Iowa.)

I am a farmer taking care of 149 acres. I want to raise more hogs and poultry in line with the Government's plea for more. We need lumber here in Guernsey and provisions should be made whereby our lumberyards can secure lumber for our requirements. (Kasper Johnstern, Deep River, Iowa.)

Have had an order in for 6 months for hog houses and have been unable to get them. (Jessie Cartwright, Kellerton, Iowa.)

Need a new cattle shed. I am feeding 60 head now and don't have room enough. Also need a lot of repairs on corncrib and grain bin. (Huga Lensib, New Liberty, Iowa.)

Need a new hog house as I am keeping more sows this year. Repairs on poultry house badly needed. (Willie Hiem, New Liberty, Iowa.)

I need a new hog house as I have 30 sows this year. Also need a new chicken house and repairs on corncrib. (William Gaizer, New Liberty, Iowa.)

Badly need hog houses and chicken wire. (Ora M. Ball, Duncombe, Iowa.)

Badly need hog waterers and feeders. (Frank A. Schuster, Lehigh, Iowa.)

Need lumber badly for necessary repairs and also because of the increased production program needed in the successful war effort. (Clarence Hanna, Woden, Iowa.)

Lumber badly needed to comply with increased production program. (George Schmidt, Woden, Iowa.)

Need lumber for new hog house to replace old obsolete house. (A. A. Buhr, Sumner, Iowa.)

Need shingles badly, also several hog troughs and feeders as I raised 2,500 head of hogs in 1942. (E. E. Beck, Sutherland, Iowa.)

It is essential that I have a new barn and cattle shed to house my cattle as present facilities are inadequate to shelter the increased herds brought about by the demand for more war food. (J. E. Hansen, Dedham, Iowa.)

Lumber and material badly needed to carry on production goal set by the Government. (C. N. Loope, Vaile, Iowa.)

Lumber badly needed for repair work for increase in production of livestock and crops. (Ford Hawley, Vaile, Iowa.)

Need material for new barn and repairs to meet Government food production. (Tracy North, Vaile, Iowa.)

I have three farms to keep up and need materials for repairs and would like to buy the lumber as needed. (John Supple, Coggon, Iowa.)

Poultry house too small and need more hog houses. (Arthur J. Truman, Ryan, Iowa.)

I need some hog houses but local lumber dealer does not have any material on hand to make them up. Have a large number of sows to farrow and not enough room for them. (Russell Seymour, Des Moines County, Iowa.)

Limit the Term of Any President of the United States Not To Exceed Two Terms of 4 Years Each

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, this month the General Assembly of the State of Illinois passed a resolution petitioning the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting any President of the United States from serving more than two terms of 4 years each. This resolution was adopted by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois on the 10th day of March, and concurred therein by the house of representatives of said assembly on the 17th day of March 1943.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I submit for the consideration of the Congress this resolution:

Senate Joint Resolution 8

Whereas article V of the Constitution of the United States provides as follows:

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress; provided that no amendment which may be made prior to the year 1808 shall in any manner affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article; and that no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate"; and

Whereas from the foregoing it is obvious that State legislatures may apply to the Congress of the United States for the calling of a convention to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States, subject to ratification by the legislatures or conventions of three-fourths of the States, as provided; and

Whereas an elective term of office of the President of the United States is limited to 4 years by the Constitution of the United States, without any present restrictions of provisions as to the number of terms, successive or otherwise, for which a President may be elected; and

Whereas, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and other great American statesmen of immortal memory held inviolate the sanctity of American tradition that no President of the United States ought to serve in that high office longer than two terms of 4 years each; and

Whereas, the office of the Presidency embodies and personifies an immense, growing, and encompassing authority, as exercised by the executive branch of the National Government, and for that reason ought to reflect American opportunity of attainment, without restricting high favor to the few, yet admit of such wholesome modifications of national policy as the American people, in

their rightful progress, shall be entitled to, in perpetuity of the American order of life; and

Whereas, in the years to come, the necessity for strong and undissipated American perspectives, traditions, and practices, exemplified by such leaders as Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, will transcend personal and partisan interests, if the Republic of the United States of America is to continue to live and function as a leader of world civilization; and

Whereas, 44 State legislatures are in session this year, and 8 additional State legislatures, including those that convene annually, will be in session in 1944: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the House of Representatives concurring herein), do hereby apply to, and petition, the Congress of the United States to call a convention, in pursuance of the provisions of article V of the Constitution of the United States for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the said Constitution, prohibiting any President of the United States from serving more than two terms of 4 years each, unless, in lieu thereof, the Congress, in its wisdom, shall elect to submit to the several States a proposed amendment to the said Constitution, providing for the said limitation of the tenure of office of any President of the United States to two terms of 4 years each, subject to ratification by three-fourths of the States, in manner provided; and be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be transmitted to the legislatures of all other States of the Union, inviting those of like mind to pursue the course herein provided, to the end that a determination of this vital issue may be had, and, if consummated, incorporated as the twenty-second amendment to the Constitution of the United States, at as early a date as State ratification and constitutional procedures shall make possible.

Gasoline Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter addressed to Hon. James F. Byrnes, Chairman, Economic Stabilization Board, Washington, D. C., March 25, 1943, by Mr. Thomas P. Henry, president of the American Automobile Association:

MARCH 25, 1943.

Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES,
Chairman, Economic Stabilization Board,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BYRNES: Not long ago you were called upon to resolve the bitter controversy that had developed between various agencies of the Government as to the priority position that should be accorded to critical production programs, including synthetic rubber, high-octane gasoline, and escort vessels in the allocation of limited supplies of component parts. The decision you rendered may not have been pleasing to all parties, but it was final, it restored harmony, and it is very generally understood that all of the programs are now making satisfactory progress.

I am writing you in regard to a problem which I believe urgently calls for your intervention. I refer to the chaotic situation in which some 8,500,000 operators of automobiles in the 16 Eastern States and the District of Columbia find themselves because of constantly changing rules and regulations, abrupt fluctuations of motor fuel allotments, and uncertainty and apprehension as to the future. As the special Senate Oil Shortage Committee recently concluded: "The public has not known from week to week and sometimes from day to day how much gasoline it could count on." If this situation is permitted to continue, it cannot fail to have unfortunate effects on civilian efficiency, civilian economy, and the war effort itself.

We appreciate, of course, the underlying factors in the situation—the petroleum shortage, the virtual disappearance from their old routes of the tanker fleet that formerly served the eastern seaboard, the problem of building up a new transportation system, the tremendous demands of war industry and the home for fuel oil and the onshore and offshore requirements of the armed forces. Granting all of this, it is our opinion that the conclusion is inescapable that passenger-car operation in the Eastern States could have been stabilized within the limits of the mileage rationing program, except for blunders in the domain of major policy, the division of control and responsibility as regards policy, and the interagency feuds that make cooperation impossible.

For months, at a time when tankers were going to the bottom of the ocean, laid up, or transferred to new routes, the War Production Board withheld priority for the necessary steel for a large pipe line. For months the oil companies and the railroads backed and filled in the matter of mobilizing tank cars for the transportation of petroleum products. For months the consideration of petroleum costs and trade advantages hampered the effort to bring relief to the eastern seaboard. All this is history. More important, from the standpoint of this communication, the division of responsibility as between Government agencies, the constant squabbling and maneuvering as to what agency did this or that, what agency shall take credit for liberality or blame for restriction, have reached an all-time high.

The War Production Board is fully conversant with the disharmony of the division of counsel that pertains, but it is either unwilling to do anything about it and is unable to bypass the rampart of "directives" with which the agencies are surrounded. It is because of this and because the Government has fully recognized the importance of the passenger car in the transportation scheme of the Nation that we call the matter to your attention.

As to where responsibility rests, the answer is that it rests in different places for different purposes. The Office of Defense Transportation has the over-all responsibility for the maintenance of an adequate transportation system. Yet this Office exercises little more than the role of another consultant when it comes to actually determining the amount of gasoline to be allotted to various classes of automobiles. It was the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, however, who recently stated that we must depend more and more on the passenger car to meet the demands of the increasing transportation load. The Office of the Petroleum Administrator for War is responsible for bringing petroleum supplies into the shortage area and for breaking up the supplies into various categories of products, including the fuel to be made available to the armed services. Thus it determined the other day, for instance, that 333,000 barrels of motor fuel a day would be the quota for April and it is so certified to the Office of Price Administration. Acting upon this certification, the Office of Petroleum Administration for War was through for all practical purposes. And the Office of Price Administrator had the responsibility for the distribution of this supply, including what policy was to be followed in regard to the ban on pleasure driving, maintenance or the cutting of coupon values, and what have you. The Office of the Petroleum Administrator for War had no more to say about these latter actions than the Office of Price Administration had to say about how much of the over-all petroleum supply should be converted into motor fuel for civilian use. And so goes the division of jurisdiction, with the Office of the Rubber Director standing by to protect the prerogatives of its Executive order, while the Office of Civilian Supply seems wholly powerless to do anything to protect the civilian.

One agency knows little about what the other is doing or why. It took all the tact and diplomacy of the Office of War Information to secure an agreement between the Office of Price Administration and the Office of the Petroleum Administrator for War on the explanation to the public on the recent cut in coupon values. And even then, the explanation was a meaningless statement to the effect that we cannot have "unlimited motoring now," something all of us have known and fully realize, but which at this juncture was handed out with all the solemnity of a great revelation. The people are still wondering at the why and how of it all. This is not surprising. The simultaneous announcement of the lifting of the ban on pleasure driving and the cut in coupon values came at a time when the general impression prevailed that the petroleum situation on the eastern seaboard was easier, that with the coming of spring there would be less demand for heating oil, speedier movement of rail shipments and the opening of barge movements on the Great Lakes, all of which would naturally be expected to have the effect of easing the drastic restrictions on civilian car use. The knowledge that car owners in the Dominion of Canada are permitted 2,160 miles a year, while car owners in adjacent sections of the United States are allowed only 1,080 miles a year did not help the situation. So, the fact that hundreds of thousands of car owners are now contemplating getting rid of their cars or storing them for the duration of the war is not to be wondered at.

Reference has been made to the harassment and uncertainty to which the car owners in the 16 Eastern States and the District of Columbia have been subjected as a result of the division of authority and policy fluctuations. On March 19, 1942, the oil companies were asked to curtail deliveries to service stations by 20 percent. On April 15, the curtailment was placed at 33⅓ percent, and later to 50 percent. Card rationing of gasoline was put into effect on March 15. Coupon rationing became effective on July 22. A moratorium on gasoline sales was put into effect from noon December 18 to midnight December 20. A cut in coupon values from 4 gallons to 3 gallons was made effective for A book holders on November 22 and a similar cut for B and C book holders on December 21. On January 7 came the ban on pleasure driving with enforcement sanctions. On March 3 enforcement was eliminated and an honor system installed. (Incidentally, on March 2 the Petroleum Industry War Council reported that we were "over the hump" insofar as petroleum shortage in the East is concerned.) And, finally, although nothing is final in such a state of flux, came the announcement that the pleasure ban would end on March 22, but that A coupons would be drastically devalued. That is the record.

I think you will agree with me that it is difficult to find in it any semblance of a reasoned pattern or any approach to a stabilized policy. The various agencies referred to above

are doing much effective work in the areas in which they have clear-cut jurisdiction. But when it comes to formulating broad policies for car operation, authority conflicts and overlaps, the end result being bickering and complete lack of teamwork, with the car owners confused and confounded amidst the cross-currents of the conflict in Washington. And as regards this conflict, the situation is definitely deteriorating. For example, it could well turn out that the recent devaluation of A coupons will prove a boomerang since the granting of supplementary rations for work purposes to many present holders of A coupon books, as well as B and C books, may absorb any theoretical saving. So with the ceiling on motor-fuel supply for April fixed and without any guaranty that there is or there will be a continuing relationship from day to day between the supply and the coupons outstanding, it would not be at all surprising if before April is over another moratorium on sales overtakes the eastern seaboard. At the same time there is growing concern over the possibility that the depression of coupon values may lead to a new and large-scale outbreak of black-market operation. That is the picture today.

It is needless for me to say that the public has great confidence in your fairness, in your objectivity, and in your common-sense approach to national and regional problems. We feel that the issue we are submitting to you has reached a critical state; that it has a large potential of trouble for the civilian economy; and that it is sufficiently important to merit the consideration of your office.

Yours very truly,

THOS. P. HENRY,
President, American Automobile Association.

Does Liberty Consist in $2 a Day Extra?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, my attention has recently been called to a class-day address by Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University of Providence, R. I.

I do not necessarily agree with all of President Wriston's conclusions and neither do I know that all the background of facts are included in his address, but he has in his speech touched upon some powerful and thought-provoking conditions involving human rights and constitutional rights which should merit the best thought of this country. I am most seriously and forever concerned with the rights of the individual and it is my earnest belief that Mr. Wriston's address deserves the immediate and considerate attention of the Congress of the United States.

Certainly the comments of all concerned should be welcomed so that a full discussion might be had.

President Wriston's speech follows:

This is a war in which public education in the grand features of strategy has been pursued upon a scale never before attempted. The newspapers fight every battle in prospect, they record every battle in detail, and they review every battle in retrospect. They employ not only reporters but experts; they supply maps and diagrams, explanations, and explications. It is a poorly oriented person indeed who does not have some grasp upon the strategic concepts which are so vital to victory.

The most familiar of all the strategic concepts and of all the tactical maneuvers is the so-called pincers movement. I will not insult your intelligence by further developing an idea with which you are already familiar through reading and in which most of you are shortly to gain a direct experience of the first importance.

I want to speak this afternoon of another pincers movement by which a little band of men were encircled, cut off, and brought to surrender, defeated and discredited, and in a manner and by a method which seems to me an assault upon freedom everywhere in the world. The battle was fought without maps, without glamour, and, I am afraid, without hope.

By the law of the United States there has been "set up an order in that (bituminous coal) industry which is not without its resemblance to the Fascist order." That is a terrible thing to say. Being, as you know, a cautious man, I would not venture to say it upon my own responsibility. That is a quotation from an official document of the United States Government issued at the close of an inquiry launched by the President of the United States, participated in by both branches of Congress and by the administration, richly supported with public funds and ardently pursued for many months. The statement was signed by men known as conservatives and as radicals, by exponents and opponents of the so-called New Deal. So far as I know, it has never been challenged, nor do I see how it is open to challenge.

The entire coal industry is organized under a closed-shop union known as the United Mine Workers of America. No man may work either in the anthracite industry or in the bituminous-coal industry without being a member of this union. That situation was promoted by the Government of the United States; it was sealed by contract between the union and the mine operators; it was recognized, sanctioned, and enforced by the power and authority of the United States Government.

That situation, I submit, gave enormous power into the hands of the union, but there was no requirement, either in law or in practice, that the union should have any democratic process; there was no requirement on the part of the Government which conferred those powers that there should be the slightest attention to individual liberties. Competent testimony, if angry, is supplied upon that fact.

One who was for many years a vice president of the United Mine Workers made this comment: "These are the things that are going on, organized despotism, the devices used by Hitler in occupied countries are resorted to in the 20 puppet districts over which John Lewis has complete domination." Let us assume that because of anger the point is overstated. It presumably has a core of truth.

Now let us see what happened. The anthracite mine workers are a minority within the union. They had a tax laid upon them by the union. It was called dues, but we ought not to let names confuse us. It was a tax to which they had not consented. It was a tax which was withdrawn from their wages. It was a tax which they could not avoid without giving up their living, for failure to pay the tax destroyed their union status. The loss of union status under the closed-shop agreement involved their discharge and they could not be hired by any other coal mine in the United States until readmitted to the union.

They protested payment of that tax. They claimed that there was some $7,000,000 in the treasury, a claim which I did not see denied. They claimed that the tax was to be used not for their benefit, but to organize other people outside the mine industry in which they did not have a lively interest. I am not at this moment concerned either with the truth of those allegations or with their merits. I am concerned for the moment only with the fact that in a democratic society they were held as convictions by a substantial body of citizens.

These men felt that they had been taxed without representation and they sought redress of grievances. Those grievances may have been real or they may have been partly imaginary. A historical school in recent years has insisted that our forefathers were not fair to the British Government in saying that they were taxed without representation. It has been rather the fashion to imply that John Hancock was nothing but an old smuggler, Sam Adams a ne'er-do-well, and Tom Paine a rabble rouser; it has become stylish to insist that the monumental grievances of which they complained were grossly exaggerated. But I think that the verdict of history is that those grievances were deeply and passionately held; beliefs about them became the moving force by which liberty was advanced everywhere in the world.

Whether, therefore, the grievances of the anthracite miners were as real or as significant as they thought is an important matter but not the central issue. The central issue is that nowhere in all the vast and involved bureaucracy which constitutes the executive Government of the United States was there anyone whom the miners could petition for the redress of grievances. Their quarrel was not with the employer. They could not appeal to the Conciliation Service, to the Department of Labor, to the National Labor Relations Board. They thought they could appeal to the War Labor Board, but that body, which has not been timid in the acceptance of jurisdiction, though sometimes feeble in the discharge of its responsibility, having gravely listened, gravely determined that they had no power to redress those grievances.

If there are grievances and no machinery exists to hear them and to redress them, revolution is the inevitable consequence. That was learned to the cost of the British Empire in 1776 and thereafter, to the cost of the French monarchy in 1789 and thereafter, and so it was in the mine fields of Pennsylvania. The men struck.

Now I come to the pincers movement. The strikers were proceeded against by two powerful instrumentalities. The first was the Army of the United States. Let us not be confused because there were neither soldiers present nor firing. The Army was there just the same. For the President of the United States did not claim, when he ordered the miners to go back to work, that he was obeying his constitutional oath to take care that the laws be faithfully executed. He did not claim to be acting in any civil capacity whatever; he did not act in accordance with any law passed by Congress, or any rule adopted by any administrative agency, or any civil procedure sanctioned by a court.

His order was addressed to the miners as the Commander in Chief. It was a military directive and had implicit in it military sanctions, including the use of force. It was a confession that the civil Government of the United States did not have at its disposal any instrumentality for the redress of the strikers' grievances. That was a pretty powerful pincer point to pinch men without funds, without national leadership, without avenues of publicity, and without resources.

But there was another element in the tactics of this situation equally powerful, perhaps even more potent. It is difficult to conceive an agency more powerful than the Army. But the strikers said, "Let the soldiers come; you cannot mine coal with bayonets." The other jaw of the pincers was, in their minds, I conclude, more potent. The union, operating under the sanction of law, threat-

ened those men with expulsion. Technically it was expulsion from the union. Really it was expulsion from their living. They could not work in any mine in America. In many another strike—against employers—the strikers have been promised food and relief that they might not starve. No one promised these men so much as a crust of bread. They were left without hope. How much option remained to the miners?

That power to take away not only a man's job but his occupation, to blacklist him from his livelihood, to exile him from his skill—that power is so vast that it should never be committed to one man, or any group of men, or any voluntary association of men. Such dominance over human life ought never to be controlled by a contract between industrial managers and union managers who may be in competition, but who may act in collusion. I am making no charge, but I am calling your attention to a very real possibility. That power is so controlling that it should not be exercised even by government itself except under careful restriction of law, with full judicial consideration and review. In this instance there were neither legislative restrictions nor any judicial process whatever; the whole matter was committed to the uncontrolled discretion of a small group of men—or, conceivably, an individual. That is the precise and explicit program of tyranny, and should have no place whatever in American life.

Let me remind you once again that I am not discussing the merits of the tax or the accuracy of the men's judgment as to the dimensions of their grievance. I am not saying that their action did not bring hardship upon the householder. All those things are important in other connections: they are quite irrelevant to the point at issue.

I am saying that we cannot talk about freedom everywhere in the world until we find means through legal processes and not by military measures and the threat of starvation to hear and redress grievances on the part of free-born citizens of the United States. And I am saying, with all the passion I can summon, that the Government of the United States has no right to protect the property rights of the union in the dues of its members while neglecting, as it conspicuously did neglect, the human rights of those miners to the protection of the democratic process.

Since the passage of the Wagner Act, the moral basis for an industry-wide closed shop has disappeared, unless there is a rigorous regulation of the internal affairs of the union. To treat a union which covers a whole industry as though it were still a mere voluntary association without great powers is an anachronism. It has great powers; it must also have great responsibilities, and those responsibilities must be reflected in the law. There must be opportunity to review and redress the grievances of its members against its management just as there must be redress of grievances against industrial management.

When you get outside, you will hear it said that this is just an attack upon labor and unions. I do not believe you will be deceived. Unions long ago became an essential element in American life, and if they had not gained in strength and vigor, we should be worse off and not better. It is no service to the cause of labor or of unionism, however, to give them privileges without responsibilities or to assign them vast powers free of all regulation.

When you get outside, it will be emphasized that those miners had no substantial complaint; it will be argued that John L. Lewis is going to demand $2 a day extra for them when next he bargains on their behalf. He stood right up to the War Labor Board and said he would demand this wholesome increase—without reference to the so-called Little Steel formula. If a man gets $2 a day extra, what difference does it make whether he has this fantasy called liberty? It is the cash that counts, and if Lewis delivers the cash on the barrelhead, the miners have no kick coming.

You are going out into a world which will tell you that if you have food and clothing and housing, and particularly if there is a separate bathroom for each member of the family, moral integrity and political liberty and freedom of thought and expression are not so important.

I am not suggesting that you should be careless of human want and human suffering and human need. I do not have much worry upon that point, for America has set a standard of philanthropy, a standard of hospital care unique in the world's history. You inherit, and I am sure will fulfill, that tradition. I am saying that if you got from this university what it had to give, a philanthropic attitude will not fulfill your obligation; humanitarianism is but the prelude.

The substance of your obligation is to develop within your own life and to exhibit in your speech and in your action a supreme devotion to the rights of men, to justice, to freedom for others to speak, to freedom for them to exercise their God-given rights as citizens. You will be concerned first of all to eschew hypocrisy and purge from our own national life the vices which we deplore in others.

The Forand-Robertson Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the information of my colleagues who have asked me how my bill, H. R. 2277, would work, the script used in a radio interview over the N. B. C. network last evening by Radio Commentator Richard Harkness and myself.

I believe that these questions and answers, all in plain everyday English, make very clear what in technical terms appears complex and difficult to understand.

The interview follows:

Mr. HARKNESS. Mr. FORAND, it's a pleasure to have you here this evening before our N. B. C. microphone. Tell us, first, what do you think of the idea of putting our taxes on a pay-as-we-go basis?

Mr. FORAND. Well Mr. Harkness, everyone is for a pay-as-we-go system of taxation. This fight arises from one fact only. There's a difference of opinion as to how we should put the system into effect. For example: You remember President Roosevelt's Budget message to Congress last January. In his section on taxes the President said we should simplify our whole tax system. And, so far as is possible, Mr. Roosevelt said we should put tax collections on a pay-as-we-go basis. But the President is opposed to the Ruml plan. He endorses its objective. But he feels the Treasury can't afford to be so big-hearted.

Mr. HARKNESS. That seems to be where your bill fits in.

Mr. FORAND. Exactly. My plan—that is, the Forand-Robertson plan—is a compromise measure aimed at getting part of our taxes on a pay-as-we-go basis. First, it establishes the principle of collecting taxes currently. Secondly, it does it in such a way that there will be no impairment of the Treasury's revenue.

Mr. HARKNESS. Tell us then, how does your compromise plan work?

Mr. FORAND. It's really simple. The House Ways and Means Committee reported a bill featuring a 20 percent withholding of salaries and wages beginning next July 1. The Forand-Robertson bill has the same withholding feature.

But the committee bill—the bill that's being debated on the House floor now—carries no provision for paying our taxes as we go. That's where my bill differs.

As you know, the Government now collects a 19-percent tax on the first taxable dollar of any person's income. That figure includes the 6-percent normal tax, and a surtax of 13 percent in the lowest bracket. Under my bill the Government will forgive that 19 percent now being charged on our 1942 incomes.

That means that if my bill is adopted, the Government will forgive all last year's taxes owed by almost all persons in the lower tax brackets. That group takes in some 90 percent of our taxpayers.

Mr. HARKNESS. I want to get that straight, Mr. FORAND. On 1942 incomes some 44,000,000 persons had to file returns with the Treasury. If your plan is approved by Congress, how many of those 44,000,000 taxpayers will have their 1942 taxes entirely forgiven?

Mr. FORAND. I'd estimate about 33,000,000 persons will have their 1942 taxes wiped out under the Forand-Robertson bill.

Mr. HARKNESS. There's one more question right at this point. The balance of the Nation's taxpayers—some ten or eleven million—have to pay more than 19 percent on their 1942 incomes. How will your proposal affect this group?

Mr. FORAND. These persons will have to pay the Government everything they owe on last year's taxes above 19 percent. That's where the compromise comes in. A big portion of the taxpayers will be put on a pay-as-they-go basis. But, still, the Government will collect taxes from incomes in the upper brackets.

Mr. HARKNESS. That's plain so far. Now let's get down to cases. Let's assume your plan is adopted. Here's one question. How would we shift over from the present tax collection plan—the one which keeps us paying our taxes 1 year behind—to your system of pay as you go?

Mr. FORAND. It's simple. We all made out our income-tax returns and paid the first installment on March 15. That payment would stand. In addition, we'd pay the second installment coming due on June 15. Then the Government would figure it this way. The basic part of our March and June payments—that is, the 19 percent—would be counted by the Treasury as advance payments on our 1943 income taxes. Anything in excess of that 19 percent would be counted as payments of 1942 taxes. In other words, the Treasury would be forgiving us our basic liability for last year's taxes.

Mr. HARKNESS. That's plain enough, all right. But what would happen after June 15 under your plan?

Mr FORAND. Beginning July 1, the Government would withhold 20 percent from our pay checks. This tax would be figured as all, or as part of what we owe the Government on our 1943 incomes. When we achieve that position, approximately 33,000,000 of the country's 44,000,000 taxpayers will be on a pay-as-they-go basis.

But under our present system, there will be income-tax installments for 1942 due on September 15, and again on December 15. Here's the way those two installments would work out.

If the tax on your 1942 income was no more than 19 percent, you'll owe the Government nothing in September and December. But if your tax was more than the basic liability of 19 percent, you'll have to pay the Treasury the difference between 19 percent and whatever your tax may have been. The same would be true in the years to come.

There's one more important point. We shouldn't fool ourselves. Before this war is over, the Government will have to collect still higher taxes from the American public. That's where the Forand-Robertson plan comes in again. If the Government forgives that 19 percent basic liability for 1942, individual income taxpayers will be able to shoulder the additional burden. They'll be able to do it because they won't have the weight of previous taxes still hanging over their heads. That's one of the chief benefits of this pay-as-we-go plan.

Mr. HARKNESS. Mr. FORAND, the administration—that is, the President and the Treasury Department—are against the Ruml plan as embodied in the so-called Carlson bill. How does the administration stand on your measure?

Mr. FORAND. Last year, the plan I now offer was approved by the Treasury Department. And certainly, the plan seems to meet the President's recommendation for a feasible way of putting our taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Mr. HARKNESS. There's one more point. I was reading your plan this afternoon. I notice you provide special exemptions for men in the Army and Navy.

Mr. FORAND. That's right. Members of our armed forces would automatically get exemptions up to $3,500, less personal exemptions, on compensation received for military service. Then, if any man in uniform should die while in active service, the Government would abate all of his tax debts.

Mr. HARKNESS. Now, for one last question. If the Forand-Robertson plan is adopted, when will the people feel its benefits?

Mr. FORAND. Not this year, nor perhaps next year. But when they lose their jobs, or when they retire, or if they die. In other words, when they cease receiving income. For example, at the end of the war, millions of people may be out of work, temporarily at least, during the period of transition from our war economy to peacetime. Under our present law, even though they would have no income at all, they still would have to pay a year's back taxes. Whereas, under the Forand-Robertson plan, at least 90 percent of the people having been made current, will owe no back taxes. The other 10 percent would owe but a little. So, as a matter of fact, the people will get the relief, when they need it most.

Mr. HARKNESS. Thank you, Representative FORAND for being with us this evening. I'm sure that your explanation of the Forand-Robertson plan of tax forgiveness will aid us all in understanding the issue at stake in the consideration of this tax bill on Capitol Hill.

Absenteeism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial appearing in the March 26, 1943, issue of the Mobile Labor Journal, Mobile, Ala.:

MORE ABOUT ABSENTEEISM: ITS CAUSE AND THE CURE

There has been more loose talk about absenteeism than there was about the so-called 40-hour week. Like most insincere dishonest persons the labor baiters attempt to lay all the blame at the door of organized labor. The Peglers and their like say such-and-such is so and the cure lies in one positive action: Destroy the unions—invoke a work-or-fight order. If the cure were that simple I think we could all support it. But the facts belie the statements and the premises so glibly enunciated by the smart guys. What are the facts?

Labor organizations are doing their dead-level best to curb all absenteeism.

What are they up against?

1. Housing projects are planned, built, and filled with war workers. Those who designed the projects forgot that 2,000 or 3,000 families all dumped in one restricted area must have certain services such as food, barber shops, pressing shops, and all those myriads of things that go to make something akin to living. No provision at all is made for recreational activity. So what happens: Precious hours are wasted while the head of the household tries to find food at already overtaxed groceries in already established areas. He waits endless hours at downtown barber shops because some theorist didn't figure a war worker ever gets a haircut or ever eats a meal.

2. Such essential services as visiting the bank brings up a major problem for the war worker. The banks are working under normal peacetime procedures. They have not taken into consideration the needs of the war worker and as a result unless the head of the family makes his time fit the bank's time he's just out of luck. The same thing applies in visiting the already overloaded limited number of doctors in the community or the dentist. Insofar as shopping in the city is concerned up until now there is no possibility of this, unless the worker deliberately takes a day off.

3. A large part of our war-worker population lives at distances from their work of from 10 to 40 miles. At week's end after the monotony of driving to work and back home of 80 miles daily, plus putting in a good day's work, many of the workers just plain take off. Maybe they do a little farming. No matter what they do, it all goes into the record as absenteeism.

4. Older men have been recalled into the plants. Their physical stamina is just not up to hitting the ball over long stretches of time. Irrespective of the reasons, in the minds of those who are intellectually dishonest and who distort the facts just to distort them, it is absenteeism.

5. Then there's just the plain ne'er-do well—the parasite—who after he makes a couple of days will lay off till he's used up his earnings and his appetite or thirst forces him back to work. This is the guy I'm going to talk about now. When our Government and industrial management gets wise to the fact that the maintenance of worker morale is just as important to the war effort as the maintaining of soldier morale the other problems will be solved. But about this matter of malingerers and just plain ignorant cussedness on the part of war-production slackers, here's a plan that would work:

This plan needs but one thing—the wholehearted cooperation of the labor leaders in every community. We must accept the challenge.

The War Manpower Commission should issue a directive making it mandatory to set up in every war-connected industry a joint management-labor review committee. The sole purpose of this committee would be to review the attendance records of all absentees. Put the absentees through a screening test: Weed out those who are absent for good cause from those who have or can show no good reason. Bring these men or women before the committee of labor and management, get his version of the reasons for his continued and consistent periods of being absent. Investigate among his associates. If it is established that he just does not give a damn, then treat this worker just as we treat a slacker or alien sympathizer, put him in a reservation closely adjacent to his former associates. The stigma attached to such a procedure once it was established and the shirking workers realized that their associates on the committee were not kidding, would soon definitely halt practically all irresponsible absenteeism. The effectiveness of this plan lies in the fact that a jury of the worker's close associates inflicted the punishment. Very few men could stand the ridicule and the stigma that would be attached to them if through their own dereliction of duty they found themselves in such a predicament and in bad grace with their fellow workers.

Loose-thinking, well-meaning Congressmen and others have the silly notion that the threat of induction would halt irresponsible absenteeism. The idea is silly. Half the guys guilty are involuntarily held in civilian life by home ties. To that type of person induction into the Army would come to them as a release from responsibility. Many of them are in a 4–F, others are over 38 years of age and not subject to a work-or-fight order. Surely they are not good material for our Army. Our officers are not wonderworkers and this man's Army is made up of the best human material ever brought into an Army. Remember well that old axiom about one rotten apple spoiling the whole barrel—that's exactly what would occasion if we tried to make soldiers of these malingerers.

The cure for irresponsible absenteeism is: The social ostracism of workers that are guilty of it After all a production slacker merits no more consideration than an Army slacker.

We can stop it cold if we will have courage to do the job. It's up to labor to take the ball and offer constructive ideas on this matter of irresponsible absenteeism.

If we adopt the idea propounded herein or something similar to it, then we have answered our critics in an honest and positive way. We prove our right to continued public support.

If we fail to heed the storm warnings, then we but let down the bars for continued criticism from the labor baiter and skepticism from those who read or listen to the comments of those same labor baiters.

What is organized labor's answer? Will we take up the challenge, or will we duck the issue?

Compton Current Tax Premium Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest since Thursday to the expositions, explanations, and debate on the several bills. As far as I can determine in my own mind nothing has been proposed as yet that is as simple and as fair and as logical, as the Carlson bill. However, there seems to be some criticism from both sides of the aisle that I believe I can meet. This plan is so simple and so fair and treats everyone alike and should, I believe, satisfy the millionaire

as well as the demagog and class-baiters who fear the rich will be favored.

Let us first face facts and be realistic. Let us stop trying to be complicated and talking about discounts and forgiveness and all of the intricate computations and tables, for a moment, and say to ourselves, "After all, we, the people of the United States as a whole, must pay for this war, not this year but over the years to come as quickly as we can." Then ask ourselves this question: "How much can we pay this year; in other words, how much will the economy of the United States as represented by our individual incomes stand in this year 1943?"

In answer to this question I ask, Mr. Speaker, that you consider my plan not as a partisan matter, but as a solution and a compromise against those who wish to differentiate in the treatment of the taxpayer and favor one group against another. As I said in the beginning, my plan is a very simple one; perhaps so simple that it has no place in these days of complicated and multitudinous directives, but at least there will be no difficulty on the part of the public in understanding what I propose.

My plan will void 75 percent of the 1942 taxes for 100 percent of the taxpayers; not 100 percent of the taxes for 75 percent of the taxpayers.

I shall vote for the Carlson bill with the very great hope that a majority will do likewise. But I have been both saddened and cheered by the debate here since Thursday. There have been distinctions made that strike a terrible blow at democracy as we have grown to know it in America. Is it possible that any large number of Members of this Congress are going to consider seriously any legislation that will result in the abandonment of one of our most cherished principles and set class against class merely as a sop to the unreasonable whims of the New Deal?

I realize that the very life of the New Deal depends upon its ability to spend, to create unnecessary jobs for the faithful. But does not the New Deal realize that the old fable of the goose that laid the golden egg still holds true?

For 10 long years the taxpayers of this country have poured an ever-increasing stream of dollars into the bottomless pit of the New Deal well. The taxpayers have made it possible for this administration to keep all of its varied and sundry pumps well primed. Now it is time to do a little pump priming for the taxpayer, and to do it on a basis of equality.

If we are going to kill a fatted calf, let all of the taxpayers sit at the prodigals' table and share equally.

My plan is as simple as the Ruml plan. It is equally equitable in that it draws no distinction between the low-income and the high-income groups, but still accomplishes the prime purpose—for we are seeking a solution, by making all taxpayers current with a genuine minimum of hardship.

More than that, however, it adds three very vital factors which we do not find in the Carlson bill or the Ruml plan. Besides adding $2,000,000,000 to the estimated 1943 tax income by making taxpayers current, as those plans do, it gives the Treasury an additional $2,500,000,000 by requiring that all taxpayers pay the same percentage of their 1942 taxes without distinction between them.

Thus, under the plan I propose, the 1943 tax revenue of the Treasury Department will be $14,500,000,000 instead of the $10,000,000,000 estimated on 1942 incomes.

Its second outstanding accomplishment is that it will curb inflationary tendencies throughout 1943 by requiring a larger tax payment from all taxpayers, big and small.

A third accomplishment, not to be overlooked, is one that is of great concern to all of us. It will make everybody just a little bit more aware that we are fighting a terrible and costly war, and that sacrifices must be equal among all of us—not just shared by a few.

My plan is simply this:

All of our taxpayers who earned a taxable income in 1942 have paid the first installment on that tax on March 15. That installment represented 25 percent or more, at least, of their indebtedness for 1942 and it is now money gone over the dam.

Accept that first installment—that 25-percent payment—as full payment of all 1942 income-tax obligations. The Treasury Department is thus assured of collecting 25 percent of the 1942 levy or approximately $2,500,000,000.

I am very confident that the vast majority of our taxpayers are willing to pay that extra 25 percent this year as a premium or share-the-war thanks offering to the Treasury Department and to an intelligent Congress for the privilege of getting themselves out of debt, or sharing equitably the cost of the war and preserving the fundamental principle that all men are created equal—and are treated as such in these United States.

So far, then, the plan has accomplished the task of paying off the 1942 income-tax debts of all of our taxpayers on an equal, share-and-share-alike basis.

But, while Congress has been considering this legislation the tax clock has kept moving inexorably forward, and we now find that our 44,000,000 taxpayers are already in debt for the first 3 months of 1943. We do not intend to go on a pay-as-you-go basis until July 1, so by that time our taxpayers will be in debt for the first 6 months' taxes of 1943. How best to liquidate those taxes?

Under my plan the taxpayers with a taxable income in 1942 would make their second installment payment on June 15 as already planned and arranged for by a great majority of our taxpayers. But as the first installment paid off the 1942 debt in full, the second installment will be credited to the taxes owed for the first 3 months of 1943.

Thus on July 1, when the withholding tax goes into effect—that is when the pay-as-you-earn deductions begin—our taxpayers will then be in debt only for the preceding 3 months or second quarter of 1943.

Meanwhile, of course, beginning July 1, the pay-roll deduction plan is accounting for the third and fourth quarterly payments for 1943.

The unpaid taxes for that second quarter representing 25 percent of a full year's taxes, may be paid at the taxpayers' convenience during the period from June 15, 1943, to March 15, 1944, when they must have been paid in full. Provisions could be made for extensions of time in cases of undue hardships. No interest would be charged.

The taxpayers thus have a minimum of 9 months to accumulate enough cash in addition to that currently deducted from wages and salaries, to liquidate an extra one-fourth of a year's taxes.

The "share-the-war" premium the American people will pay to become current and which the Treasury Department will receive is one-fourth of their 1942 income tax. It may well be that for some people this added burden will be something in the nature of a hardship, but these are hard times and the hardship or sacrifice will be no greater, relatively, on any one class or group.

The "white collar" worker who today is generally believed to be the greatest sufferer under a heavy tax burden will bear the least brunt under this plan because his taxes are smaller and a 25 percent addition to them is thus very small.

None of us can read the future. None of us knows what next year will bring. At this moment our national income is at its highest peak. I am convinced that the people can and will shoulder this added burden just so long as it is placed upon their shoulders on a share-and-share-alike basis. Certainly it is only a percentage of a burden that we all must share some day soon—why not at a time when incomes are at a peak.

It is better to awaken the people to the costliness of war and the need for sacrifices now, than to abandon for all time an ideal and a principle of democracy that has made this country great and strong.

Here, then, Mr. Speaker, is an opportunity for this Victory Congress to achieve a maximum of results with a minimum of hardships. In the order of their importance the prime results are:

First. Place all 44,000,000 of our taxpayers on a current, pay-as-you-go basis and continue the accepted schedules set up on ability to pay.

Second. Treat all taxpayers alike without regard to class, group, or income.

Third. Increase the tax revenue of the Treasury Department in 1943 from an estimated $10,000,000,000 to $14,500,000,000.

Fourth. Curb inflationary tendencies.

Fifth. Collect high taxes during a high income period.

Sixth. Acquaint the American people now with the tremendous costs of war.

Seventh. Quiet the objections of the administration to a suspected too great a loss of income from 1942 taxes.

Eighth. Silence the demagogs and the class-baiters who fear the wealthy will benefit out of proper proportion.

There is no other plan now before this Congress which will equitably accomplish all of these much-to-be-desired results.

An Aviation Committee—It Will Come Up Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to reopen at this time the arguments for a standing Committee on Aviation. I do, however, desire to state that the matter is not dead—it will be considered, I hope favorably, at a date not too far distant. We are to live in an air age in the years just over the horizon. This new world is graphically set forth in the following advertisement appearing in newspapers of recent date. It is quoted herewith:

NO SPOT ON EARTH IS MORE THAN 60 HOURS FROM YOUR LOCAL AIRPORT

Along with all that's being said and written about the kind of world we'll be living in after the war, here's one fact you cannot ignore: No spot on earth, however distant, is more than 60 hours' flying time from your local airport. That's how small the world is today, because of the plane.

If you doubt it, ask the pilots and crews who are flying today's big long-range planes, ferrying military personnel and supplies to our far-flung battle fronts. They'll tell you that the Atlantic is only 400 minutes wide—that Australia and San Francisco are a mere 35 hours' flying time apart—that you can hop from the United States, touch Brazil's hump, and come down in Africa, all in 27 hours' flying time.

Or look at one of the new "aviation geography" maps, like those our children are studying in school. These maps make obsolete the maps we have always known. They show us the world as it really is. In this world, because of the plane, Main Street runs from your home town to London, Moscow, and Chungking. Nations and people we once thought remote are now merely hours and minutes away.

Air-age timetable

From—	To—	Air-line miles	Hours
New York	Berlin	3,960	20
Chicago	Singapore	9,365	47
New York	Capetown	7,801	39
San Francisco	Wellington	6,759	34
Washington	Moscow	4,883	24
London	Rome	887	4½
New York	London	3,460	17
London	Berlin	574	3

Today, of course, the global skyways are reserved for war. But after the war, when freedom of the air returns, trade and travel by plane will become as much a part of everyday life as the use of cars, trucks, busses, railroads, and ocean liners. It is no dream of the future to count on global transportation in giant planes which fly almost with the speed of sound itself. Even today such planes are being designed and are undergoing their wind-tunnel tests.

The air age has come sooner than we thought. Already we have had to learn that wars must be won with the aid of the new air-age geography—not in spite of it—and we are beginning to see that the peace we win must be built on a clear understanding of this new global geography and how it can work for us.

The tens of thousands of men and women who make up the United States aircraft industry believe that America must be supreme in the air—to win the war today, to win the peace tomorrow.

They know that air power alone will not win the war. But they find it difficult to imagine a nation which possesses the finest planes and the most planes going down to defeat.

CONSOLIDATED VULTEE AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,
San Diego, Calif.; Vultee Field, Calif.; Fort Worth, Tex.; New Orleans, La.; Nashville, Tenn.; Wayne, Mich.; Allentown, Pa.; Tucson, Ariz.; Elizabeth City, N. C.; Louisville, Ky.; Miami, Fla.; member, Aircraft War Production Council.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that the airplane will be a paramount factor in winning and keeping the peace. The editorial of March 5 from the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star is correct, in my opinion, in stating aviation is to hold the spotlight in future days. It says:

IT WILL COME UP AGAIN

The fight over the Nichols resolution, creating a special House Committee on Civil Aviation was complicated by the administration's own desires to retain control over planning for post-war aviation and by jurisdictional jealousies on the part of the members of other standing committees now having a voice in aviation development. Defeat of the resolution was hardly a fair test of the separate committee principle itself.

Supporters of the Nichols resolution argued that the time has come when Congress must be alert to the possibilities of commercial aviation after the war, and its importance justifies creation of a committee giving its attention exclusively to the subject. In the past, House legislation relating to civil aviation has been handled by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with military aviation divided between the Appropriations Committee and the Committees on Naval and Military Affairs. Representative RANDOLPH told the House, during debate, that the combined domestic aviation companies of America owned only 265 aircraft at the beginning of the war, operating less than 37,000 miles of air lines. The Government's dominant philosophy, in civil aviation, has been regulation, not promotion.

There must be a change in this philosophy after the war if this Nation is to compete successfully with other air-minded nations of the world, and civil aviation must be encouraged by every means within the power of a sympathetic Government. It is unfortunate that the creation of a special House committee was regarded as infringing on existing committee territories, for one important purpose of the resolution was to end the division of authority which has existed in the past. While the vote in defeat of the resolution was not a party vote, it was influenced by Speaker RAYBURN'S and Majority Leader MCCORMACK'S active leadership of the opposition, and the circulation of reports that the administration opposed too much emphasis on post-war international aviation at this time. A standing committee on aviation, however, would cause no more interference with the Executive in the conduct of foreign relations (involving aviation) than does the House Committee on Foreign Relations.

In one form or another the proposal will be revived, for regardless of the ability of other standing committees, aviation development in the future is going to demand and hold the spotlight, undivided.

Mr. Speaker, as I close this further chapter on the subject of our recent setback to establish a standing committee, I am mindful of the poetic expression of Miriam Tiechner when she said:

I call no fight a losing fight if, fighting,
I have gained some straight new strength.

Socializing the Use of Public Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, we are being constantly confronted with plans to socialize the trend of development in America.

Many people, including those in responsible positions in our Government, advocate the abridgment of individual opportunity in this country apparently overlooking the effect of the application of broad and liberal principles of government that has fostered individual enterprise, Government policies that have contributed in such a large measure to the superiority of American citizenship and the advance of our Nation to its preeminent position among world powers.

As an illustration of this social trend there is inserted correspondence concerning the proposed program:

LOS ANGELES, *March 19, 1943.*

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

FRIEND: The bill H. R. 6522 I watched with considerable interest, and was sorry, indeed, to learn its fate. It is surely in the right direction, and very much to be commended. You will note that I say "is," for the good cannot be crushed by refusal to accept, especially in times like these. Every step in the right direction is a stone in the building of true democracy and a more responsive, satisfied home environment.

I have a thought in mind that may take much time and explanation to bring to legislators' mentality, and especially to the loosening of their heartstrings toward the life more abundant that we so glibly harp on.

The responsibility for a better world, and the American way, of which we talk so glibly, rests squarely upon the shoulders of that portion of humanity that has the vision, or the dream itself. Now, please do not confuse me with the impractical, visionary dreamers, poets, and philosophers who, while they are necessary, find themselves quite unable to face the problems as they are and work their way out of them.

We have a problem. Democracy itself is in danger, with the large floating population of homeless, unanchored people, with the hand-to-mouth method of living, little family culture, and the futile effort of juvenile courts, probation officers, and reform schools to substitute for character-building homes in our American progress, of which we boast. We must also prepare for our returning boys from overseas, potential home builders.

I have for years believed in and fostered the importance of developing lands, improved sections, obtaining absolute justice for government, and return for every effort that the Government has put forth in fostering public works, but my vision has been enlarged, and I am quite sure the importance of individual home building is so far ahead of all forms of

physical prosperity that I have become imbued with the hope that a truly parental government rather than a lawmaking body and its dictatorial possibilities toward all its citizens, as well as the world, shall come into being.

A thorough perusal of the necessary requirements brings me to the understanding that the first step in true home building is absolute security of the environment into which that home is builded. Let us not for one moment lose sight of the facts, for houses are not homes. Lawns, gardens, and fences, successful crops, and great agricultural advancement have little to do with home, for the home is that which people in their great love and unfoldment with one another build into these environments. The home reaches to the corner store, to the schoolhouse, to the playground, to the wild woods, and swimming hole. In fact, the home has no boundary, and it is this real home that is of paramount importance to humanities' well-being, to the progress of our beloved America, and to the actual preservation of democracy itself.

Why should we take so much worry over financial successes, and thorough care of the agricultural and business successes, or even the returns to government? America must build for the future, and in so doing let us first lay the foundation—true homes—a foundation that will extend even to the seat of government when it is well laid in the high chair and the lullaby of the mother's song.

I have no word of criticism for any part of your bill, and I am very anxious to give it opportunities for expansion—opportunities for adaptation to the great need of the hour, instead of tying ourselves too rigidly to prestige, past activities, and to the status quo of humanity's thinking. As I say, I am willing that all precautions be written into the bill, but with the perfect understanding that long-time leases are the one real security to the home builder, for the weaknesses of humanity have always proven that possession is futile, and a condition such as we have now is always the result. Never is possession as powerful as unlimited use. No man owns the air, and we all partake of it freely and benefit equally from its natural distribution

I am working at present on a bill, and realizing what a novice I am, must ask much help from many, and I hope you will let me consider you one of the closest to the ideals which I hope will be liberated through our efforts.

Sincerely yours,

DR. H. GALE ATWATER.

P. S.—In my effort to stir public thinking and to arouse keymen, I have placed in the hands of each of the 28 committees and a number of other men a copy of my letter to Secretary Ickes (a copy of which is herewith enclosed) and have had many responses, and I propose to get them into the hands of each Senator and Representative when the proper time comes for the next bill. JERRY VOORHIS has talked with me, and you may appreciate a copy of his letter.

LOS ANGELES, *October 2, 1940.*

Mr. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The New Deal is shaping events in American history which overreach the hopes of even the most optimistic progressives. The progress of Work Projects Administration works, the establishment of Civilian Conservation Corps camps, reforestation, restoration of the soil, development and increase of transportation facilities, and other such efforts of the present administration to stabilize industry and farming make us eager and confident of advancing even yet further. Let us move on. We must work toward some plan looking toward the security of human beings as well as industries.

We still have the problem of 13,000,000 unemployed and the resulting problems of an ever-diminishing number of real American units—American homes. I value the home as a real unit of democracy. For years I have fought against taxing the home when it is lived in by the owner and his family. As the body of the family, the home should no more be subject to mortgage foreclosure, tax sale, or any other encroachment on its security, than the body of the individual. We must work toward home solidity, with less of aimless transiency and scattered families. A purposeful, home-loving citizen is never an empty vessel for alien philosophies to fill.

An unusual opportunity has presented itself which, I believe, only a man in your position can effectually unfold, develop, and give life to the undertaking. Some 2,000,000 acres of land will be reclaimed by the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam and irrigation project. This immense tract must never be allowed to serve the purposes of land-grabbing, money-making speculation. It must be used sanely and scientifically in a planned effort to rebuild and increase American home units, the real security of American citizens. There are 1,200,000 acres under the ditches of Grand Coulee proper. I went over all this property last year and it seems to me most appropriate for the experiment which I propose. It is now chiefly owned in large holdings. An uninviting waste, with no water, no verdure, no improvements, its present value is very little. The Government, of course, has surveyed and appraised all this land and has passed laws to prevent speculation for a time.

In the interest of American families, I urge that the Government of the United States should take over this property, hold the title in fee simple, and place it in the hands of a federally established authority This authority would then grant long-term leases of small tracts, 20 to 80 acres. By the conditions of the lease the lessee would obligate himself to use and cultivate his tract, to fertilize the land, rotate crops, prevent erosion, etc. Lease rates must not exceed the necessary amount for amortization of construction cost and administration; no purchase price, no interest, no profit, would be included in this sum. When leases are relinquished they revert to the Government always, though provision might be made for heirs, relatives, or specially recommended persons to be accorded preference in re-leasing.

Since the purpose of this project is to create a settlement of American home units, its very conception suggests an environment of advantage and opportunity. The necessities, conveniences, and recreations of an agricultural community of American families should be provided for under the administration of the Government authority and written into the terms of the lease.

Within 300 miles of Grand Coulee Dam, in north Idaho, are large beds of nitrates, nearly 80 percent of the nitrates in the United States. At no great expense the farmer could be furnished with this material for fertilization, just as he would be furnished with water and electricity at nominal rates, inclusive in the lease cost.

The Grand Coulee properties are now held in about equal proportions by five entities, the Federal Government, the State of Washington, the two local railroads, the local banks, individual property owners.

As a tentative procedure, let us suggest that the holdings of the Federal Government and the State of Washington be placed in the hands of an established authority—America's Home Experiment Authority. This Authority would then negotiate for the balance of the property. The acquisition of the tract would not, I believe, offer any great difficulties. The railroads, for example, would no doubt be willing to relinquish their present worthless holdings (originally a gift from the Government) in view of the increase in transportation which development of the tract would unquestionably bring them. Contracts for work might be another inducement to gain their cooperation.

That portion of the property held by local banks and loan companies could be purchased for the face value of mortgages or at a discount, as it has been proven that many of the properties were overvalued when loans were made upon them.

Private owners, I am convinced, could be dealt with upon the basis of a clear explanation of the advantage of the project and a possible opportunity of first choice of the lands to be leased. Surely the exchange of a title to worthless land for the privileges of a lifetime lease, including all the advantages such a lease will carry, should prove a very tempting offer.

The experiment in building American home units, as I have outlined it, will, I hope, appeal to your vision at this time when we are in such need of relief for the problems of home and family. The idea is not in itself wholly without precedent, for I understand that under Coolidge Dam in Arizona large tracts are leased to cooperative farmers by the Government.

In recognition of the New Deal I am impressed with the fact that less talk and more action has accompanied its procedure. I should like to base a question upon that rule: By what active procedure can the ideal of an American home unit best be attained? I feel sure that you will know, and I am ready to serve in accordance with your advice.

Respectfully yours,

DR. H. GALE ATWATER.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., November 12, 1940.

Dr. H. GALE ATWATER,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR DR. ATWATER: I want to thank you for your fine letter of October 26 and the splendid spirit which it reveals.

I have read your letter to Secretary Ickes and am 100 percent in favor of the plan you suggest for the Government to continue to hold title to the land in the reclamation projects and leasing them out on long-term leases. I believe the tenure of the people would, as a matter of fact, be much more secure that way and it would make certain that the land would be continuously held by people who are actual farmers.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY VOORHIS.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 27, 1943.

Dr. H. GALE ATWATER,
Los Angeles, Calif.

MY DEAR DR. ATWATER: Your letter of March 19 enclosing a copy of letter to Secretary Ickes advocating a lease-hold system in the utilization of public lands, together with a photostatic copy of a letter from my good colleague, JERRY VOORHIS, of California, has been received.

The plan you propose goes to the very fundamentals of citizenship and property rights of the American people. It has been my observation that American ideals as to property rights have somewhat reversed in recent years.

I can well recall the western movement previous to the last World War when American people, inspired by the desire to obtain land and independence, left land tenancy in the Eastern States to go west and reclaim a home and a competency on the land of our Western States.

After the war this ideal seems to have changed to a purpose of being relieved from the responsibility of ownership of anything, land or homes, or personal property. A good

job, a good pay check, a rented apartment, and the freedom to enjoy the things of life became the accepted American standard of living.

Your letter brings to mind some pathetic instances where people were content to occupy land without the security of ownership. I can cite you a case that came under my observation where an industrious couple occupied the premises on a railway right of way and built up a nice home with a large garden as a means of subsistence supplemental to the earnings of the head of the family. They were completely dispossessed in their declining years, due to the fact that the land was needed for a civic improvement and their lease was revocable on 30 days' notice, whereas the people who owned their homes who were dispossessed for this public improvement, were fully compensated and were able to transfer this ownership to property of equal value and usefulness.

I am of the opinion your plan does not take in the fundamental principles of security and the upbuilding of American family life.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Statement on Taxation Submitted by the Committee on Taxation, National Lawyers Guild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a statement on taxation submitted by the committee on taxation, National Lawyers Guild:

AN EQUITABLE PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAX PLAN

Although the ink is hardly dry on the Revenue Act of 1942, Congress and the Treasury Department are already at work on a new revenue act for 1943. The Treasury may seek $16,000,000,000 in new revenues,[1] which with the estimated receipts from current levies, would yield total annual revenues of approximately $51,000,000,000.[2]

The first 1943 tax problem being tackled is the enactment of a plan to put individual taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis. This is a highly laudable objective, particularly in view of the wide broadening of the income tax base during the past 3 years; whereas in 1940 less than 4,000,000 individuals filed income tax returns, in 1943 it is estimated that approximately 27,000,000 individuals will file returns[3] (exclusive of the Victory tax).

At present, because a taxpayer ordinarily pays his previous year's tax bill in the current year there are frequent hardships when incomes decrease or the taxpayer dies. Most individuals, unlike substantial businesses, do not set aside out of each week's or each month's receipts a tax accrual; instead we rely on next year's earnings to pay this year's income tax. With the current basic income tax rate of 19 percent[4] a sharp general drop in incomes in any year would leave many taxpayers burdened with a tax liability they could not meet. It is to remedy this difficulty that pay-as-you-go tax plans are being advocated.

THE RUML PLAN

The most widely discussed proposal to put individuals on a pay-as-you-go basis is the Ruml plan.[5] A bill embodying the provisions of the Ruml plan has already been introduced in Congress.[6] This plan on its face offers an extremely simple solution to the problem; it proposes that we skip 1 year's income taxes. By forgiving, for example, the entire 1942 income tax liability of all taxpayers, the payments to be made in 1943 would be treated as payments on account of the 1943 liability. As a result it is stated that we would be on a current basis.

If the Ruml plan were to go into effect in 1943, on March 15, 1943, we would file our returns, as usual, but we would be paying our 1943 tax bills, instead of our 1942 tax bills. Inasmuch as the taxpayer cannot ordinarily know the amount of his 1943 gross income or his deductions, on March 15, 1943, he would file a tentative return, in which he would assume that his 1943 net income would be the same as his 1942 net income. If, in fact, his 1943 net income should exceed his 1942 income, he would pay an additional tax for 1943 on March 15, 1944, when he files his 1944 return. If his net income should decrease in 1943 below his 1942 income, he would be entitled in 1944 to a refund or credit of a part of the tax paid in 1943.[7] This same process of filing a tentative return and making adjustments in the succeeding year's return, would be repeated for each year's tax.[8]

1. The forgiveness of $10,000,000,000 of income taxes

If the Ruml plan should be adopted in 1943, a tax debt of approximately $10,000,000,000 owed to the Federal Government would be canceled.[9] This is a very startling proposal to make at a time when the national debt is soaring. When the proposal is examined more closely, it becomes apparent why the advocates of a soak-the-poor tax policy—through general Federal sales taxes, increased "victory" tax rates, further lowering of exemptions, and so forth—are so vociferous in their support of the Ruml plan. For, under the Ruml plan, the higher the income, the bigger the tax canceled. The Ruml plan would grant a colossal tax subsidy, graduated according to incomes.

In response to this objection, the advocates of the Ruml plan complain that the use of the term "forgiveness" of the 1942 tax is unfortunate. They point out that in 1943 there would be no loss of revenue to the Treasury; that we would merely "move the tax clock ahead 1 year" and that the "receipts will not be diminished by this plan."[10]

An example of the way the Ruml plan would work will illustrate the effects of the scheme on the revenues. Suppose a taxpayer had a $10,000 income in 1942, a $5,000 income in 1943 and a $5,000 income in 1944. In 1943, he would in the first instance, pay a tax based on his 1942 income; so far, the Treasury and the taxpayer would be in exactly the same position as they are under the present system. But in 1944, in adjusting his 1943 tax, the taxpayer, under the Ruml plan, would be entitled to a refund or credit of the tax on $5,000 of income, since he had overpaid his 1943 tax by that amount. He would be entitled to no such credit under the present law. In 1944, under the Ruml plan, he would pay a tax based on his 1943 income of $5,000 and would be entitled to no readjustment in 1945, since his tentative 1944 income turned out to be the same as his actual 1944 income; thus, in 1944, he would pay the same tax as under the present law. In short, over the 2-year period, 1943–44, the taxpayer would have received his total tax payments by the tax on $5,000 of income through the adoption of the Ruml plan and the Treasury's receipts would have been reduced by that amount.

Speaking more generally, as the incomes of individual taxpayers decline for any particular year, or as deaths occur, the Treasury will suffer the loss of the $10,000,000,000 to be forgiven under the Ruml plan.[11] Someone

---

[1] See President Roosevelt's budget message, New York Times, January 12, 1943; see speech by Stanley Surrey, legislative counsel to the Treasury, idem, January 14, 1943.

[2] See note 1, supra.

[3] See hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance on the Revenue Act of 1942, H. R. 7378 (77th Cong., 2d sess.), p. 19.

[4] The normal tax of 6 percent and the surtax of 13 percent apply to the first $2,000 of net income, after exemptions and credits.

[5] The Ruml plan was presented in detail by its author, Beardsley Ruml, to the Senate Finance Committee last year, as a plan which was "the result of much consultation and the working of many minds." See hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance on the Revenue Act of 1942, note 3, supra, at p. 175, et seq.

[6] House Joint Resolution 17 (78th Cong., 1st sess.), introduced by Representative CARLSON of Kansas, who has declared that his bill is "the Ruml plan put into bill form. It is not my own plan." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (78th Cong., 1st sess.), January 12, 1943, p. 128. Cf. S. 280 (78th Cong., 1st sess.), introduced by Senator CLARK of Missouri, which combines the Ruml plan with provisions for deducting taxes at the source from salaries and wages. Mr. Ruml has recently indicated his willingness to modify his plan by providing for withholding deductions. See PM, January 26, 1943.

[7] The Ruml plan provides a relief provision whereby taxpayers whose incomes have definitely decreased below the previous year's levels would be permitted to file their tentative returns by estimating actual 1943 incomes. See the plan, note 5, supra, at page 185. This is designed to cover only income from personal services and is limited to situations where the decrease is clearly established. As embodied in the Carlson bill, the relief would be allowed to a taxpayer: (1) Who has become a member of the Nation's armed forces, or (2) whose status with respect to personal exemption or credit for dependents has changed, or (3) who can establish to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that other changes have taken place. The Carlson bill does not limit the relief to personal-service income.

[8] The additional burden which the duty of filing a tentative return in 1 year and correcting it in the succeeding year would impose on taxpayers is a serious objection to the Ruml plan. With 27,000,000 taxpayers filing returns, it is extremely important that the task of computing the income tax and filing the return be simplified and made easier, instead of being complicated and made more difficult by tentative and adjusting returns, as would be the case under the Ruml plan.

[9] See President's Budget message, note 1, supra, and more recent Treasury estimates.

[10] See Representative CARLSON'S statement, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (78th Cong., 1st sess.), January 12, 1943, p. 128.

[11] Mr. Ruml recently wrote to Representative CARLSON, the Congressional sponsor of his plan, as follows (see PM, January 26, 1943):

"How can the present taxpayers over the generation gain 1 year's income taxes and at the same time the Treasury gain revenue and no taxpayer pay more than he otherwise would be called on to pay?

"The answer is to be found by examining the position of the Treasury on Judgment Day, when the books finally are closed. Un-

will have to make up the $10,000,000,000 of revenues thus lost. And it is not without significance, in weighing the tax windfall proposed, that Ruml and his followers have suggested forgiving the tax in the two highest income years and the two highest tax years in American history—first 1941 and now 1942.

2. The failure to put us on a pay-as-you-go basis

Perhaps the most serious objection to the Ruml plan is that it does not accomplish the objective of putting us on a pay-as-you-go basis. As already indicated, the previous year's income is used to measure the current year's tax. The day of reckoning for the increase or decrease in the current year's income in relation to the past year's income does not arrive until another year has passed. Thus, with respect to the major objective of pay-as-you-go proposals, to provide for paying this year's taxes out of this year's income as we receive it, the Ruml plan leaves us in the same situation as under the present law.

What the Ruml plan does accomplish is to forgive the difference in taxes if 1943 income falls below 1942 and for the year of the taxpayer's death. Under existing law, if a taxpayer, for example, had a net income of $10,000 in 1942 and has his income cut to $5,000 in 1943, he must pay his 1942 tax on a $10,000 income in 1943 without any prospect of a refund in 1944, whereas under the Ruml plan, the blow may be lightened by the refund or credit in 1944. Or if the taxpayer in question dies on January 1, 1944, under the Ruml plan his estate would have no income tax to pay in 1944, whereas under the present Internal Revenue Code, the estate would have to pay a tax on the $5,000 income of 1943 in 1944. This relief is achieved by the Ruml plan at the price of the cancelation of a full year's income taxes.

THE TREASURY'S PLAN

The only satisfactory method of which we know to put the Nation's 27,000,000 individual income taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go basis is to deduct payments at the source week by week and month by month out of pay envelopes and pay checks and if administratively practicable, out of interest and dividend checks.[12] The Treasury recommended such a withholding plan last year, which was adopted by the House but was killed by the Senate Finance Committee.[13] This year the Treasury has renewed its support of a withholding plan.[14] Through the withholding plan, after allowance for personal exemptions and credits for dependents, the basic 19-percent income-tax rate can be paid over to the Government week by week and month by month as incomes are received, and this plan would be a useful check on inflation, for it would prevent the funds deducted for taxes from reaching the market place.

The difficulty with the withholding plan is in getting it started. If, for example, a plan of withholding income taxes at the rate of 19 percent from wages, salaries, dividends, and interest were to commence on March 1, 1943, the sums withheld would be applied to the 1943 tax liability. But on March 15 we would still be obliged to file our 1942 returns and pay the first quarterly instalment of the 1942 tax. To pay both 1942 and 1943 taxes in full in the same year would impose severe hardships on a great many people.

To meet this difficulty the Treasury has indicated that a limited amount of forgiveness may be desirable and that the remaining 1942 tax be spread over a period of years.[15] By limiting the tax cancelation to the liability on the first $2,000 of income, the amount forgiven would be very sharply reduced in comparison to the reduction proposed under the Ruml plan. Moreover, the striking discrepancies in the amounts of taxes to be cancelled for particular taxpayers under the Ruml plan, from a few dollars to the lowest bracket taxpayer to millions of dollars to the highest bracket taxpayer, would be eliminated. No taxpayer would receive a tax reduction in excess of $380. This cancelation would wipe out entirely the 1942 taxes of married persons without dependents, whose net incomes do not exceed approximately $3,500, and of single persons, without dependents, whose net income does not exceed approximately $2,750.[16] For the higher income groups, who would receive partial cancelations of their 1942 taxes, the necessity of meeting the remainder of their 1942 taxes, in installments spread over several years, would in general result in no real hardship. Indeed, such a doubling up of tax payments for the higher income levels has much to commend it as an anti-inflationary measure.

CONCLUSION

Leading proponents of the Ruml plan have recently indicated their willingness to support a withholding plan,[17] the sine qua non of pay-as-you-go taxes. The chances of the adoption of a withholding plan for income taxes in 1943 are therefore bright. Unless business groups succeed in stopping the withholding plan by reason of the work and expense it would entail to them,[18] the real problem before Congress will probably center on the issue of forgiveness of the entire 1942 tax, or forgiveness of the tax in the lowest bracket only, coupled with the amortization of the remaining 1942 tax liability over a period of years. As between the two alternatives, sound fiscal policy and an effective anti-inflationary program require the adoption of a withholding plan with a cancelation of the tax on the first $2,000 of taxable net income.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON TAXATION
OF NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD.

---

der our present system, the Treasury would have billions owing from the taxpayers. These would be bad debts in any case. Since the Government is not concerned about any final loss on Judgment Day, the Government is able to turn the tax clock ahead, make all taxpayers current, eliminate income-tax debt, and do it without loss of revenue and with no additional burden on any taxpayer."

PM then points out that "Ruml said he submitted this argument to a group of members of the American Institute of Accountants and they agreed he was right."

The PM editorial comment on this letter, written by Nathan Robertson, was as follows:

"Beardsley Ruml is arguing that the Treasury won't lose anything in the long run through canceling the $8,000,000,000 of taxes due on 1942 income, because, when Judgment Day arrives, the Treasury won't care whether any taxes are due or not.

"You ought to try that one on your landlord. It's very simple. Just tell him you will cancel that month's rent you owe, but you will pay him regularly every month from now on, and, when Judgment Day comes, he won't care whether you owe him for that other month.

"If your landlord hesitates, tell him you can get the American Institute of Accountants to prove it won't cost him anything."

Advocates of a progressive and democratic wartime tax policy owe a debt of gratitude to Nathan Robertson and to PM for their consistent and intelligent advocacy of such a tax program and for their recognition of the vital importance of wartime revenue measures.

---

[12] It is to be noted that Senator CLARK's bill embodying the Ruml plan contains a withholding provision. (See note 6.) Representative CARLSON's plan calls for nine monthly payments to be made directly by the taxpayer each month beginning with March (ibid.). This is hardly a satisfactory method, in the light of the great difficulty involved in collecting taxes monthly from 27,000,000 taxpayers, as compared with utilizing the existing machinery for pay-roll deductions. In addition, the plan allows 2½ months to pass without any tax payments.

It should be noted that none of these plans puts the owner of an unincorporated business, the professional man, the recipient of rents, etc., on a pay-as-you-go basis. If the 1942 tax is partly forgiven and partly amortized over succeeding years, such taxpayers should be required to pay their current year's taxes on an estimated basis, in the same way as is provided by the Ruml plan, with a provision for adjusting the estimated tax to the final tax in the succeeding year. Otherwise the Treasury would lose substantial revenues in 1943 and the taxpayers would still be paying their entire income-tax bills for each year in the succeeding year. Perhaps as to such taxpayers a provision for permissive monthly payments would also be desirable.

[13] See H. R. 7378 (77th Cong., 2d sess.) as passed by the House. It provided for withholding at the rate of 5 percent in 1942 and 10 percent thereafter on wages, dividends, and bond interest, allowing as to wages, personal exemptions and a credit for dependents. Representatives of some business interests opposed the plan as burdensome on the employer. See, e. g., the statement of M. L. Seidman, on behalf of the New York Board of Trade in Hearings Before the Senate Committee on Finance on the Revenue Act of 1942, note 5, supra, at p. 147.

[14] See New York Times, January 14 and 24, 1943.

[15] See note 14, supra.

[16] The approximate figures used allow for personal exemptions of $1,200 and $500 for married persons and single persons, respectively, and earned-income credits, plus the first $2,000 bracket subject to tax at 19 percent.

[17] See note 6, supra.

[18] See note 13, supra.

My Opposition to the Ruml Plan Expressed Over Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, on January 24 this year four Congressmen, including myself; Congressman CARLSON of Kansas, author of the alternative bill now before the House; Congressman DISNEY; and Congressman VOORHIS of California, discussed the Ruml plan at great length in a Nation-wide radio hook-up on the American Forum of the Air. In the prepared portion of my speech I presented the following:

As I see it, there are three ways by which a people may pay for the dollar cost of a war; first, by current taxation; second, by borrowing the money; and, third, through inflated prices. Today we are trying to minimize inflation and we are reliably informed that one way to do it is for such amounts as are borrowed by the Government to be borrowed from individuals rather than from commercial banks.

Since this tax burden must be the heaviest we have ever known, it should be as equitably distributed as possible and it should

be collected in such a way as to be most effective and least harmful. The whole problem of taxation is a very intricate economic matter. The Government's view is not merely how much revenue may be obtained, but the Government must also be concerned with the effects of the tax system on the political economy. If we put oil in the delicate rotating parts of a machine it will be much better than if we put sand or emery dust in those bearings—the one facilitating and other destroying. To my mind, taxes may be made to serve some such very diverse effects upon business and upon national economy. John Marshall said, "The power to tax is the power to destroy," and it is certainly true that some taxes can affect the economic machine very much like "sand in the gear box." On the other hand, I believe that some taxes may facilitate business in beneficial respects as well as affording the protection for business which taxes are supposed to afford.

In addition to other taxes and tax methods, I favor a pay-as-you-go plan of taxation, started now, to finance this war. I do not favor the Ruml plan exclusively, but I do feel that the enormous increase in taxation makes imperative a shift from a "year-behind scheme" to the "current-year plan," so that the taxes should be collected at short intervals on current earnings. We are greatly increasing the number of individuals who must pay income taxes in 1943 over the number who paid incomes taxes in 1942. A large proportion of these new taxpayers will probably find themselves owing taxes on money earned last year and spent with nothing saved in advance to make such payments.

While agreeing with the shift in time, I do not agree with the Ruml plan to forgive or cancel all 1942 income taxes of individuals. I certainly recognize the injustice of trying to collect the 1942 income taxes and the 1943 income taxes both this year. We should not do this, nor attempt to do it. While I recognize that relatively few individuals would entirely escape the 1942 tax burden if we should follow the Ruml plan and forgive all individual income taxes for 1942, I do believe the Treasury would suffer by such a move and that it should not be done. A citizen's tax debt to the public treasury is just as binding and sacred an obligation as is the Treasury's obligation to a bondholder or other public creditor. There shouldn't be any forgiveness of debt either way, whether by the Government or by the individual, without more sufficient justification. I fear many favor the Ruml plan hoping to pay no taxes for 1942.

My proposal would be to assess the 1942 individual income taxes as before, amortize this part of each citizen's tax obligation over a definite period of several years, add a fractional part of this year's taxes and collect it in the most feasible and justifiable way possible. By that way there would be fewer losses, less hardship on individuals and more money brought into the Treasury than by any other scheme I have heard suggested.

During the round-table panel discussion, when one Congressman suggested that we were apparently agreed, I said:

Not altogether. I can't agree on this Ruml plan for 1942, if I understand it correctly. He talks about forgiveness——

Congressman CARLSON (interposing). When he talks about forgiveness, he doesn't mean abatement or cancelation.

Congressman VOORHIS. I think he does.

In reply to this I quickly and emphatically declared:

He certainly does, and I can't stand for that a moment. I might say to the power company whose electricity I use in Washington, "Please forgive my bill for 1942 because I can't pay for 1942, but suppose I pay for each month in 1943?" Could I get away with that? I certainly could not. I would have to pay for what I have used in 1942. Uncle Sam has given the American people protection and all that has cost the Government money, and I wouldn't forgive that for a moment. I think that the people ought to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, my views on the Ruml plan have changed but little since that evening on the American Forum of the Air, but if anything I have come more to abhor this idea with all of its implications. My friend, the author of the Ruml plan bill, is a Christian gentleman, actuated by the highest motives, and anxious to do the right thing by the white-collared workers, the great middle class on fixed salaries, caught in the rising cost of living, the distressed small businessmen, and especially the men in our armed forces—but I cannot believe he understands the full implications of the idea he is sponsoring.

I, too, have a deep feeling and understanding for the various classes whom the gentleman from Kansas would no doubt like to serve. I do not think his bill will serve them. Of course, I do not want to force anybody to pay 2 years' taxes in one, nor do I believe that that is absolutely essential and necessary to get those taxpayers who should be on a pay-as-you-go plan. I am sure there is another alternative, which is not furnished by the committee bill. Let it be noted that the committee bill does not force or require anyone to pay 2 years' taxes in 1 year, but makes it possible to do so. I shall vote for the committee bill.

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce Field and Regional Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters, protesting against the elimination of the appropriation for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce field and regional offices:

CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS,
Chicago, Ill., March 9, 1943.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: Without going into the critical plight in which small business throughout America finds itself today through no fault of its own, and of which you are fully aware, may we point out the fact of which you may not be aware, which is that the only direct and personal contact the small businessman has ever had with any Government agency is now in danger of being taken away from him.

This contact is the field office of the Department of Commerce, of which there are 29 scattered conveniently throughout the country, and which for the past 25 years have done a splendid job in giving the kind of service businessmen need and perhaps cannot get in any other way. These offices render services to businessmen in their own communities which cannot be measured in dollars and cents. But now, under the guise of economy, the comparatively small appropriation of $430,000 required to maintain these offices has been omitted from the Budget.

When many millions are being appropriated for other civilian purposes, the sum of $430,000 required for the maintenance of these 29 field offices is fully justified because these field offices have fully demonstrated their value.

May we not respectfully urge you to cooperate in behalf of continuing these very important contacts with business throughout the country? By doing so you will earn the appreciation of small business generally.

Cordially and sincerely,

FRED A. VIRKUS,
Chairman.

SHOE AND LEATHER REPORTER,
Boston, Mass., February 19, 1943.

To Senators BREWSTER, WALSH, LODGE, and Representatives MCCORMACK, HALE, TREADWAY, ROGERS, CURLEY, MARTIN:

Members of our industry are concerned over the possibility of closing regional offices of the Department of Commerce, numbering some 30 throughout the country for want of appropriations with which to continue their operation after June 30, 1943.

In view of the plight of small business which needs all the Government assistance it can obtain to survive the present trying period, and in view of the fact that world markets must be kept open for our industry if it is to compete successfully with other nations during the post-war period, this would seem to be a penny wise and pound foolish policy to adopt at this critical time.

We do not believe that even a war period justifies scrapping the regional offices manned by experts who have aided industry materially over a period of more than 30 years, including the period of World War No. 1, as well as many major business disturbances.

Today more than ever before the services of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce through regional offices in the principal shoe and leather centers are needed for guidance of industry in foreign and domestic business channels. It would be regrettable if for want of an appropriation of less than $500,000 this aid should be withdrawn from an industry at this critical period in our history.

We are submitting the above for your general information and trust that you will look into the situation more closely as to its effect on industry generally and our own industry in particular.

Thanking you for your interest in the matter and trusting that the Bureau will be able to continue its effective functioning as in the past, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

F. J. MOYNIHAN, *Editor.*

SHOULD CONTINUE COMMERCE REGIONAL OFFICES

Members of our industry in all sections of the country are alarmed and vitally concerned over the probable suspension of operations of one of the most business-like, efficient, and constant of the many Government branches of service. The Department of Commerce faces severe crippling of its activities should the House Appropriations Committee fail to appropriate the necessary funds with which to carry on this service after the end of the fiscal year which terminates June 30, 1943.

For some as yet unexplainable reason a penny wise and pound foolish policy seems to dominate some quarters who want to economize by eliminating operations of some

30 regional offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. These offices, or at least a considerable number of them, have served as a clearinghouse for information and have aided materially in the guidance of exporters and importers of shoe and leather products of all descriptions.

Failure of the House Appropriations Committee to approve the sum of $430,000 with which to operate these regional offices for the fiscal year anticipated in some quarters may be due to a lack of understanding of the principles and purposes of these branches. In trade quarters it is pretty generally recognized that many of these regional offices have demonstrated their worth over a period of many years and they have performed a high degree of service to our industry in particular.

There appears to be no justification for the belief that during a period of war these offices should be dispensed with. To do so would not only handicap industry seriously but would nullify much of the good work which has been accomplished in the field of commerce over a period of many years including the period of World War No. 1.

These regional offices have provided an effective vehicle for the promotion of industry in a world-wide scope. If ever there was a time for the maintenance of offices of this nature in the principal shoe and leather centers of the country in particular, it is now when industry is hungry for authentic and speedy information of foreign and domestic markets.

Established for the primary purpose of aiding business, these district offices have over a period of nearly 30 years provided industry with a wide variety of valuable services relating to export and import trade as well as domestic business.

Among the services rendered industry by these regional offices is that of distributing trade surveys, furnishing reports on the business standing of foreign concerns, supplying lists of exporters, importers, and agents in foreign countries, handling complaints for American concerns and assisting in the settling of differences between the American exporter and the foreign importer.

In providing American business concerns promptly with figures on the extent of foreign trade these regional offices in the past and directed from the Washington headquarters of the Bureau, have aided small and large concerns alike in the planning of sales campaigns in foreign markets. This type of service valuable in ordinary times will unquestionaly prove more so during the post-war or reconstruction period when world markets must be obtained.

On the domestic side of the picture the dissemination of Bureau of Census releases, maintenance of statistical references on many important subjects, including interstate trade barriers, sales analysis of United States markets, market research, etc., have been at the disposal of the industry from such offices.

Continuance of these offices will aid immeasurably in lessening the volume of correspondence in already crowded and overtaxed Washington and aid industry greatly in obtaining promptly such information as is required to expand domestic and foreign business alike.

From the standpoint of past accomplishments and in view of industry's need for the aid and counsel of practical industry consultants who are associated with the larger offices throughout the country and who have been trained in foreign and domestic commerce, many of these offices should be maintained regardless of war conditions.

The aid, counsel, and assistance of such offices is needed now and will be needed still more if business and industry is to participate successfully in the post-war era. Failure to appropriate sufficient funds for the maintenance of such offices would be a distinct loss to the country and industry alike.

SHOE AND LEATHER REPORTER.

ASSOCIATED INDUSTRIES OF MASSACHUSETTS,
Boston, February 12, 1943.

To All Members, Associated Industries of Massachusetts:

IMPORTANT NOTICE—ATTENTION AND ACTION NECESSARY TO ASSURE CONTINUED SERVICE BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE REGIONAL OFFICES

There is a strong possibility that the New England office of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, located at the customhouse in Boston, will be discontinued.

The failure to include an appropriation in the 1943-44 Federal Budget to provide funds for the continuation of 300 field offices of the Department of Commerce will apparently mean the closing of these offices. The annual amount necessary for the service is $430,000 for these 30 field offices.

In spite of the small economy possible in this move, we know that many members frequently call on us and the Boston office for information and advice with respect to foreign trade and shipments; also for other trade information both foreign and domestic, and that there is no other source of such information on which we can rely. These concerns will also recognize the inestimable value of the services rendered by the competent personnel of the Boston office—only 6 people—and that loss of time and confusion would result if requests for such information had to be sent to Washington.

If you agree with us that the Boston office should be continued, we urge you to write immediately to your Massachusetts Senators and Congressmen and request their efforts to restore a sufficient amount in the Budget for continued maintenance of this office or offices on an economical basis.

Following is the personnel of the House Subcommittee on Commerce Appropriations to whom you may also present your request: Chairman LOUIS C. RABAUT, Michigan; JAMES M. FITZPATRICK, New York; JOHN H. KERR, North Carolina; KARL STEFAN, Nebraska; ALBERT E. CARTER, California; and BUTLER B. HARE, South Carolina, care of House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Very truly yours,

ROY F. WILLIAMS,
General Manager.

Stirring Race Trouble

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to use the word "Jew" in any speech in this House, for whenever I do a little group of communistic Jews in this country howl to high heaven. They seem to think it is all right for them to abuse gentiles and stir up race trouble all over the country; but when you refer to one of them, they cry "anti-Semitism," or accuse you of being pro-Nazi.

A short time ago Stalin caught a couple of these troublemakers named Ehrlich and Alter, tried and convicted them of treason, and executed both of them.

I see that a certain element of the Communist press is now ringing with denunciations of Russia's action in the matter; and I suppose some of them will now be denouncing me as pro-Russian.

But I am going to take the risk and insert in the RECORD, as a part of these remarks, one of the most unusual indictments ever returned by a grand jury in an English-speaking country. I want every Member of Congress to read it and note the number of times it uses the word "Jew" or "Jewry" or "anti-Semitism."

All patriotic Americans are for prosecuting all violators of the law. If the individuals mentioned in this indictment are guilty they should be punished. But why attempt to smear patriotic organizations, intimidate law-abiding men and women, or frighten a free press, all over the country, in this way?

As was pointed out by a leading Member of the Senate some time ago, one of the organizations mentioned in this indictment includes the Daughters of the American Revolution. Another one includes all, or practically all, the veterans' organizations, such as the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Why should this element be permitted to use the courts of the land to stir up race trouble throughout the country?

As I pointed out the other day, the Department of Justice has gone down into Mississippi and perpetrated an inquisition against the white people of that State that is not only alarming to the entire South but it threatens the integrity of every State in this Union. It strikes at the very heart of constitutional government.

Read this indictment, and then read it again, and ask yourself if the white gentiles of this country have no rights left that the Department of Justice is bound to respect.

The indictment referred to reads as follows:

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, *v.* GERALD B. WINROD ET AL., DEFENDANTS

INDICTMENT

The grand jurors for the United States of America, duly empanelled and sworn in the District of Columbia for the July 1941 term, by order of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, having been duly authorized and directed to sit and inquire for the October 1941, January 1942, April 1942, and July 1942 terms to complete inquiries begun but not finished at the original terms, and inquiring for that district, upon their oaths present:

1. Heretofore, to wit: On or about the 28th day of June 1940, and continuously thereafter, up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment, Gerald B. Winrod, Wichita, Kans.; Herman Max Schwinn, Los Angeles, Calif.; George Sylvester Viereck, alias J. B. Hamilton, New York City and Washington, D. C.; William Griffin, New York City; Hans Diebel, Los Angeles, Calif.; H. Victor Broenstrupp, alias the Duke of St. Saba, Count Victor Cherep-Spiridovich, Lieutenant General Cherep-Spiridovich, Colonel Bennett, J. G. Francis, New York City and Noblesville,

Ind.; William Dudley Pelley, Noblesville, Ind.; Prescott Freese Dennett, Washington, D. C.; Elizabeth Dilling, alias Rev. Frank Woodruff Johnson, Chicago, Ill.; Charles B. Hudson, alias Rev. Frank Woodruff Johnson, Omaha, Nebr.; Elmer J. Garner, Wichita, Kans.; James F. Garner, Wichita, Kans.; David J. Baxter, alias the Chancelor, alias John Pepper, alias John H. Rand, Colton and San Bernardino, Calif.; Hudson de Priest, Wichita, Kans. and New York City; William Kullgren, Atascadero, Calif.; C. Leon De Aryan, San Diego, Calif.; Court Asher, Muncie, Ind.; Eugene Nelson Sanctuary, New York City; Robert Edward Edmondson, also known as R. E. Edmondson, New York City and Santa Barbara, Calif.; Ellis O. Jones, Los Angeles, Calif.; Robert Noble, Los Angeles, Calif.; James C. True, Arlington, Va., and Washington, D. C.; Edward James Smythe, New York City; Oscar Brumback, Washington, D. C., and Luray, Va.; Ralph Townsend, San Francisco, Calif., Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, and Washington, D. C.; William Robert Lyman, Jr., alias Robert Lanham, Detroit, Mich.; Donald McDaniel, Chicago, Ill.; Otto Brennermann, also known as Otto Brennemann, Chicago, Ill., hereinafter called the defendants, and divers other persons whose names are to be grand jurors unknown, at the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court, unlawfully, willfully, feloniously, and knowingly, conspired, combined, confederated, and agreed together and with each other to commit acts prohibited by section 9 of title 18, United States Code, in that they, the said defendants and divers other persons to the grand jurors unknown, with intent to interfere with, impair and influence the loyalty, morale, and discipline of the military and naval forces of the United States, would—

(i) Advise, counsel, urge and cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, and refusal of duty by members of the military and naval forces of the United States; and

(ii) Distribute and cause to be distributed written and printed matter, advising, counseling, and urging insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, and refusal of duty by members of the military and naval forces of the United States.

2. It was a part of the aforesaid conspiracy that the said defendants, and divers other persons to the grand jurors unknown, would print, publish, distribute, and circulate widely at New York City; Chicago, Ill.; Washington, D. C.; Noblesville and Muncie, Ind.; Wichita and Newton, Kans.; Los Angeles, San Diego, San Bernardino, Colton, Santa Barbara, Atascadero, and San Francisco, Calif.; Omaha, Nebr.; Arlington, Va.; Lake Geneva, Wis.; New Haven, Conn.; Stuttgart and Erfurt, Germany, and divers other places within and without the United States of America to the grand jurors unknown, and cause so to be done, newspapers, magazines, books, leaflets, circulars, pamphlets, and documents; cartoons, drawings, and photographs under the following names, among others: The New York Enquirer; The Defender; The Octopus; The Galilean; X-Ray; Publicity; Beacon Light; The Roll Call; Weckruf Und Beobachter, also known as The Free American; Industrial Control Reports; World Service, also known as Welt Dienst, published at Erfurt, Germany; Social Republics Society Bulletin; America in Danger; The Broom; Patriotic Research Bureau News Letter; Road to Victory; Women Investors in America Bulletin; Constitutional Educational League Bulletin; Scribner's Commentator; War Guilt and War Mongers; Revolution and the Fifth Column; Edmondson's Economic Research Service; American Vigilante; Citizens' No Foreign War Coalition Manual; America Awake; Lord Lothian *v.* Lord Lothian; War, War, War; The Cross and the Flag, Detroit, Mich.; Cease Firing; and Purdy Publishing Co.

3. And it was further a part of the aforesaid conspiracy that the said defendants, and divers other persons to the grand jurors unknown, would organize and cause to be organized, support, use, control, contribute to financially, and otherwise aid, at divers places within and without the United States of America, committees, groups and organizations, under the following names, among others: Silver Shirts; Black Legion; Ku Klux Klan; German-American Bund, also known as American-German Bund; National Workers' League of America, Detroit, Mich.; America First Committee; National Committee to Keep America Out of Foreign Wars; Citizens Committee to Keep America Out of War; Make Europe Pay War Debts Committee; Islands for War Debts Committee; War Debts Defense Committee; Coalition of Patriotic Societies; Crusading Mothers of America; Citizens' No Foreign War Coalition; American Guards; Social Republic Society, also known as S. O. C. I. S.; Committee of Patriotic Organizations; Protestant Gentile League; Pioneer News Service; Crusaders White Shirts; James True Associates; Women Investors in America; Constitutional Educational League; We, the Mothers, United; Flanders Hall, Incorporated; United Mothers of America; We, the Mothers, Mobilize for America, Inc.; and American Mothers.

4. It was further a part of the aforesaid conspiracy that the said defendants, and divers other persons to the grand jurors unknown, would use and make use of the publications, groups, organizations, and committees, hereinbefore in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this indictment referred to and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to publish, convey to, and urge upon members of the military and naval forces of the United States of America and the people of the United States of America, for the purpose of obstructing, and designed and intended to impede, obstruct, and defeat the preparation of our national defenses against aggression and invasion and the national war effort, among other things in substance, that—

(i) The war now raging in all parts of the world, commonly known as the War for Survival, is a dishonest war waged at the expense and measured in blood and dollars of the people of the United States solely for the benefit of and to insure the continuance of world domination by international Jewry-organized finance, British-American capitalists, British imperialists, international bankers, international capitalists, Mongolian Jews, Communists, and other persons and groups opposed to our republican form of government;

(ii) The duly elected holders of public office and the Government of the United States are controlled by Communists and members of the Communist Internationale who are seeking to destroy the Constitution of the United States and our republican form of government, and substitute therefor a Communist form of government under the rule of a dictatorship;

(iii) The people of the United States are being forced by dishonest, corrupt, and traitorous public officials to finance a war against nations and people who are friendly to the United States, and who have no aggressive designs upon the United States;

(iv) By supplying arms and munitions and other implements of war to the Government of Soviet Russia the Government of the United States is giving aid and comfort to a foreign power whose agents have already filtered into high public offices in the Government seeking to destroy the republican form of government of the United States and to prepare the way for the said foreign power to take possession of the United States;

(v) Germany and Italy have committed no aggressive act against any nation and are fighting a solely defensive war against British imperialism, American capitalists, and the desire of American public officials to rule the world, hence any act of war against them or either of them is unjust and immoral on the part of the United States;

(vi) The Japanese war against China is morally right and just and constitutes an effort by the Japanese to establish right and justice in territory formerly ruled by anarchists, brigands, and Communists lying within the Japanese sphere of influence;

(vii) The Axis Powers are fighting to free the world from domination by communism and international Jewry, hence the United States should give no aid and comfort to the enemies of the Axis;

(viii) An honorable and just peace could be brought about speedily were it not for the opposition of Communists and international Jewry;

(ix) The peoples of nations opposed to the Axis Powers are politically and morally decadent, corrupt, and degenerate;

(x) The cause of the Axis Powers is the cause of justice and morality;

(xi) To give aid to any of the nations and peoples opposed to the Axis Powers is to encourage the growth and spread of communism;

(xii) If the Axis Powers are defeated all of Europe and Asia will be ruled by a communistic form of government;

(xiii) The nations opposed to the Axis Powers are not in fact friendly to the United States but are seeking under the guise of friendship and community of interest and ideals to obtain from the United States money, materials, and men with which to fight an unjust war;

(xiv) The only interest the nations opposed to the Axis Powers have in the United States is how much in money and materials of war they can get from the United States free;

(xv) Great Britain is planning to destroy the independence of the United States and force the United States into a national union with the British Empire;

(xvi) As a result of sending and giving American arms, equipment, and materials of war to foreign nations which are opposed to and seeking to destroy American ideals and our republican form of government, United States military and naval forces, inadequately armed, equipped, and led, are being exposed to terrible physical hardships, diseases, and death and are being "slaughtered like sheep";

(xvii) No real danger exists anywhere in the world to the United States, its possessions, or its republican form of government;

(xviii) The Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor was instigated by Great Britain.

5. It was further a part of the said conspiracy and one of the ends to the accomplishment thereof that said defendants, and divers other persons to the grand jurors unknown, would carry on a systematic campaign of personal vilification and defamation of the public officials of the United States Government and to that end would advise, counsel, urge, persuade, and convince members of the military and naval forces of the United States and the people of the United States that such public officials are traitorous, corrupt, dishonest, incompetent, un-American, and mentally unbalanced, among other things in substance, that;

(i) The holders of public office duly elected by the people to administer the affairs of the Government of the United States and other officials of the Federal Government are traitorous, dishonest, and corrupt and are dominated and controlled by foreign and domestic persons, groups and organizations, and foreign governments seeking the overthrow of the Constitution of the United States and utterly opposed to American ideals of freedom and liberty;

(ii) The United States is governed, not by the duly elected representatives of the people, but by a secret foreign group of persons and organizations opposed to American principles and ideals and seeking to overthrow the Constitution of the United States;

(iii) The duly elected representatives of the people of the United States deliberately have violated their oath of office to support the Constitution and are planning to involve the United States in war as a means of enabling them to overthrow the Constitution and substitute government by a dictator for our republican form of government;

(iv) The war with Japan was provoked deliberately by officials of the United States Government as a means of enabling them to seize permanent control of the Government of the United States under the guise of military necessity;

(v) The officials of the United States Government are bent on conquering the whole world and to that end have provoked war with Germany, Italy, and Japan in order to have an excuse for sending American troops to far corners of the world in order to carry out their plan of world conquest;

(vi) "The war for survival" was plotted deliberately by public officials of the United States who are in league with and members of the Communist Internationale;

(vii) The public officials of the United States, in violation of their oath to support and defend the Constitution, are plotting and planning to force the United States into a permanent political union with Great Britain and thus destroy our independence;

(viii) The public officials of the United States are atheistic and antireligious;

(ix) The acts, proclamations, and orders of the public officials of the United States are dishonest, illegal, corrupt, and in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States;

(x) As a result of illegal and corrupt orders given by public officials members of the military and naval forces of the United States needlessly have lost their lives;

(xi) The public officials of the United States are insane murderers bent on ruling the whole world;

(xii) The public officials of the United States are squandering the wealth of the Nation in order to carry out their plan for world dominion;

(xiii) The public officials of the United States are anti-Christian, Marxian dictators;

(xiv) The public officials of the United States are sacrificing deliberately the defense of the United States of America to rush to the defense of godless, corrupt, and degenerate nations;

(xv) The public officials of the United States are Judas-like betrayers of their country;

(xvi) The public officials of the United States are planning to mingle the blood of Negroes, criminals, and Jews with that of Christian-American soldiers and sailors by means of transfusions and so-called blood banks with the deliberate intent and purpose of corrupting the blood of the said Christian-American soldiers and sailors.

It being the plan and purpose of said defendants, and divers other persons to the grand jurors unknown, to destroy the morale and faith and confidence of the members of the military and naval forces of the United States and the people of the United States in their public officials and republican form of government, the said defendants, and divers other persons to the grand jurors unknown, planning and intending to seize upon and use and misuse the right of freedom of speech and of the press to spread their disloyal doctrines, intending and believing that any nation allowing to its people the right of freedom of speech and of the press is powerless to defend itself against enemies masquerading as patriots and seeking to obstruct, impede, break down, and destroy the proper functioning of its republican form of government under the guise of honest criticism, the said defendants, and divers other persons to the grand jurors unknown, knowing full well and intending that a government bereft of the faith and confidence of the members of the military and naval forces and of the people is powerless to defend the nation or the people against armed attack from without or treachery from within and cannot long survive.

6. It was further a part of the aforesaid conspiracy and a means to the accomplishment of the end and purpose thereof that the said defendants, and divers other persons to the grand jurors unknown, would use and make use of the instrumentalities hereinbefore described in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this indictment, in a continuous and systematic campaign of written and printed opposition and sabotage against any and all efforts of public officials of the United States to arouse the members of the military and naval forces of the United States and the American people to a realization of the grave and imminent danger threatening the national existence of the United States, and to this end would, by means of the instrumentalities hereinbefore described in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this indictment, advise, counsel, urge, persuade, and convince members of the military and naval forces and the American people in substance, among other things, that—

(i) The activities and territorial acquisitions and plans of the Axis Powers constitute no real danger to the national existence and security of the United States or any of its Territorial possessions;

(ii) None of the Axis Powers has any intention of threatening the United States, nor any designs upon or plans for the destruction of, or the conquest of the United States or any of its Territorial possessions;

(iii) Any expansion, strengthening, or modernization of our armed forces, either by compulsory military training or otherwise, not only is unnecessary but is part of a deliberate plot and scheme designed by our public officials to involve the United States in a war in which the United States has no interest, either of self-defense or otherwise;

(iv) The public officials of the United States of America are trying deliberately to provoke war with peaceful nations, such as Germany, Italy, and Japan, which are seeking only to live at peace with the world in general and the United States in particular;

(v) It is impossible from a military standpoint for any of the Axis Powers to wage war successfully against the United States or any of its possessions or to seize and occupy any United States territory;

(vi) The plan of the public officials of the United States Government to keep war away from America by giving aid and support to the nations at war against the Axis Powers is in reality part of a scheme deliberately to involve America in a foreign war;

(vii) The United States should refrain from interference in the "war for survival" in any manner whatever and should keep its military and naval forces at home until such time as any nation actually attacks the United States;

(viii) The policy of hemispheric solidarity and pan-American cooperation for defense sponsored by the United States is doomed to failure because the people of Latin America are physically degenerate and politically corrupt;

(ix) The actions taken by Germany, Italy, and Japan are justified in the eyes of God and far from being acts of aggression against, or a threat to the existence of any nation, constituting merely an attempt to throw off the yoke of harsh and unjust restrictions imposed upon the so-called Axis Powers by the Monroe Doctrine and by Great Britain and her allies of the First World War;

(x) Statements by public officials of the United States of America to the effect that it is in the best interests of the United States to aid nations opposed to the Axis Powers are false and designed to conceal from the people the true fact that such public officials are under the control and domination of British Imperialists and international Jews seeking only to serve their own interests at the expense of the people of the United States of America;

(xi) The public officials of the United States are guilty of murdering American soldiers and sailors killed while carrying out the illegal orders of such public officials.

7. It was further a part of the said conspiracy and one of the means to the accomplishment of the end and purpose thereof that the said defendants, and divers other persons to the grand jurors unknown, for the purposes hereinabove set forth, would print and publish and cause to be printed and published in the said publications, newspapers, periodicals, magazines, pamphlets, leaflets, documents, and other writings, articles and writings to the following effect, among others:

(i) "Roosevelt should be impeached."

(ii) "No longer can it be claimed that this is a war to preserve democracy or one fought in behalf of any other government than the British Empire."

(iii) "There is no hope for America or England unless they repudiate their present leaders."

(iv) "And all this Jewish, Negro, and now—penitentiary criminals donating to 'blood bank' holds terrible consequences for our white race. Mixing blood strains through 'transfusions' easily done with so many Jewish doctors and interns in hospitals and armed forces."

(v) "A man may be ever so good at home, but once he goes to take office the many powers now ruling the country are waiting for him and will either buy him away from those who elected him or break him if he proves recalcitrant. There is absolutely no use placing men in office until first we have removed the system and traitorous people at the top who corrupt our Representatives as fast as we put them in office."

(vi) "Do not neglect your arsenals. Buy arms and keep them in a place where they are readily accessible. No immediate emergency foreseen, but there is no time to prepare like now. Also keep a plentiful supply of ammunition and do not let it become over a year old or it will deteriorate."

(vii) "Back in February 1912 Miss Troy reported that the official mouthpiece of the Duke of Connaught claimed that England's alliance with Japan was made to offer the tempting bait of the Philippines as a reward of the services which Japan must be ever prepared and ready to offer if necessary * * * Was the attack on Pearl Harbor that 'service,' seeing as the United States of America was slow entering the war, and the giving of Singapore another part of that bargain."

(viii) "The lesson to be learned from all this is that the second American revolution is due before very long (when national bankruptcy and starvation have forced the people into it) and only the Communists are prepared for it."

(ix) "On many occasions and in many wars Britain has shown that she would rather see half the population of Europe murdered than to give up her 'balance of power' and cease being the 'policeman of Europe.'"

(x) "If other nations allow the British to use them, that is not Britain's shame, but the shame of the other nations. These other nations are so many prostitutes who do the master's bidding whenever he beckons."

(xi) "Thus the present war is a struggle for survival between the European peoples and the British Empire."

(xii) "Britain and France, preparing feverishly to make war on Germany to save their international bankers, suffered the effects of their own system. Money first, men second. Labor disputes and strikes, public discontent, political favoritism, and money squandered on useless war preparations,

graft, corruption, antagonistic groups fighting one another, battles between capitalists over the awarding of fat contracts, etc. The Germans, placing men first and money far in the background, utilizing every resource without endless disputes and political tangles, working on a barter basis, held the advantage."

(xiii) "The Japs did Sunday just what Secretary of State Hull and his warmongering pal, Lord Halifax of London, have been longing for. They attacked Honolulu and the Philippines. Now the United States has a war on its hands. So then what?"

(xiv) "The British and French (not the people, but their Jewish overlords) opened the war by declaring it against Germany in September 1939."

(xv) "The set-to between the United States and Japan is now taking the lives of hordes of fine, upstanding American boys and chiefly to protect possessions that we are none too proud of. Are they worth the sacrifice?"

(xvi) "Germany has no designs on America or any other country. She wants no war, but she is determined to defend the new order against the old gold loan order."

(xvii) "End the war quickly."

(xviii) "For over 2 years we have been 'blitzing' Japan. Embargoes, giving arms, airplanes and men to the Chinese puppet government to kill Japs with. Small wonder the Japanese felt they were fighting America and Britain, not China. Chiang-Kai-shek was a Chinese bandit. He took power by force, not election, and he is merely the Chinese stooge for British-American capitalism."

(xix) "While being fed pledges of peace we were led deliberately into the European slaughterhouse. And now we wave flags and applaud public scoundrels and knaves who did the job."

(xx) "We are in the war. We must fight it out. We must fight for 'national defense,' which is a trick word employed by our leaders to cover an aggressive war to enable American capitalists to hold on to their ill-gotten gains in other countries."

(xxi) "But, fear not! At the height of his career the occupant of the White House will suddenly pass on to his reward. A man-of-the-hour will arise and save your Nation from the destruction which has been 'planned that way.'"

(xxii) "If we lose, the common people will lose; if we win, the common people will lose. Only supercapitalism will emerge the winner, not the people. It is to protect and defend the exploitation and ownership of vast property in all parts of the world of supercapitalism that the common people are being called upon to fight for, not 'national defense.' We are to send troops all over the world to fight, which could hardly be called a 'defensive' war."

(xxiii) "We propose that all Americans unite in denouncing domination of other peoples by any nation whatsoever. That they unite in urging the earliest possible ending of the present profitless conflict."

(xxiv) "The unpatriotic, international leaders of the New Deal, who think of all others first and America last, who have lied to and deceived the American people who trusted them with great power and who have plunged the Nation into foreign wars in which we stand to lose much and gain nothing, and who control the propaganda in America—these traitors are raising a great hue and cry against fascism in America, falsely leading the people to believe that an American Fascist is a fifth columnist."

(xxv) "The false leaders do not like patriotic societies opposed to communism and lying, deceiving, traitorous public officials."

(xxvi) "Any professed servant of Christ who could aid the church-burning, clergy-murdering, God-hating Soviet regime belongs either in the ranks of blind leaders of the blind or in the ancient and dishonorable order of Judas."

(xxvii) "That boy said to me, in substance, 'How come that the fighting planes and the bombers and the ships were not provided to aid my brother in making his fight for his country? How come they were over in the other—the Eastern Hemisphere?' And did I have an answer? No. There was no answer, except the one that we had sent the fighting planes, the bombers, the destroyers to aid Britain."

(xxviii) "Of course great numbers of Americans hate Hitler. Why shouldn't they when all the sinister forces in our country have done everything in their power to lie about him, to withhold the truth about him, to malign, vilify, and misrepresent him?"

(xxix) "Yes; of course, millions of Americans hate Hitler, but the amazing thing is that probably many millions more have seen through this hate hysteria and greatly admire the fine work he is doing for his people."

(xxx) "Ever since the President had his conference with Churchill on the high seas, we have been hearing from editorial writers, radio commentators, and New Deal spokesmen of the United Nations. Now comes a member of the President's Cabinet, Ickes; a member of the United States Supreme Court, Roberts; both of whom have sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution, and add their endorsement to the Judaslike betrayal of our people into and as one of a united states of the world."

(xxxi) "Is not Franklin Delano Roosevelt satisfied with being a third-time President of the United States, an honor which the patriotism of Washington forbade him to accept? Is he not satisfied with his opportunity of conquering the whole world—far greater than in Alexander's day? Are his spokesmen behind this move to surrender our independence—our national existence—become a part of a united states of the world, and make Franklin Delano Roosevelt the president of that world nation?"

(xxxii) "And yet these men, like Judas, who betrayed his Master, would, before we are fairly in this war, betray our people; surrender our independence; connive to destroy our liberty and our freedom. They would surrender that for which the war is being fought—our national existence—before the war is fairly begun."

(xxxiii) "Meanwhile, there is increasing advocacy of fascism. It is mainly from young college men and women who now realize that they have been exploited by bribed professors and universities, and Jewish control of foundations and endowments. They declare that Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco must be right,' and that they will repudiate the New Deal national indebtedness. This reaction is spontaneous, following a revelation of a small part of the truth."

(xxxiv) "The aim of the international financiers (Jewish) is world control by the creation of inextinguishable debt."

(xxxv) "Before making up his mind on the subject of a negotiated peace, Churchill ordered American Ambassador John G. Winant to Washington, to learn from Roosevelt whether or not the United States would promise to go all the way, in a war on the side of England. Winant flew from London to Washington. For a few hours, Franklin Delano Roosevelt held the destiny of the world in his hands—and had power to determine whether the war should continue. Being spokesman and representative for international Jewry * * * having inaugurated a system of Semitic control at Washington, his natural aversion to that phase of the Nazi philosophy which professes to be a reaction against Jewry is understandable. The scales were tipped on the side of continued warfare."

(xxxvi) "We have by every act and deed performable aggressively solicited war with the Axis."

(xxxvii) "The mighty empire 'on which the sun never sets' is just sitting back waiting patiently for the good old United States of America to come to her rescue again."

(xxxviii) "Movies of the President, speaking on the war issue, give me the idea that he fairly smacks his lips about war to police the world to enforce the 'four freedoms,' so-called."

(xxxix) "Radio gives the idea he relishes the proposed conflict, so bloody."

(xl) "Says death awaits United States boys in Africa."

(xli) "There is unspeakable chagrin in Washington because our boys are not blazing away on the firing line."

(xlii) "True national defense does not, never did, and never will mean that America's first line of defense is in Europe, Asia, Africa, or anywhere but in the United States of America."

(xliii) "Aid Russia an insult to God. What American Christian mother will want her son to fight and die in Soviet Red Russia or anywhere else in the world for the rotten red flag, for communism and world revolution?"

(xliv) "We prepare for Germany, but if Britain wins, a war with Britain is probable—most likely—if we are unprepared."

(xlv) "Britain is a potential post-war enemy and making her stronger than the United States at American taxpayers' expense is not national defense, but will split our country, and is pure treason."

(xlvi) "The price of every article and commodity will be fixed by the Government, solely for benefit of Jewish speculators."

(xlvii) "In short, your white-livered and yellow-striped Members of Congress gave and surrendered to the Mongolian Jew-controlled administration the right to take the shirt from your back and the gold from your teeth; and further permitting your wife and daughter to be regimented, enslaved, and forced into prostitution."

(xlviii) "One must not be deceived by the pacific humanitarianism of the vocabulary of the White House. Mr. Roosevelt has perfectly understood that war is the one opportunity of allowing the Hebrew comrades of his brain trust to revenge themselves and to reconquer central Europe. Another war in which America would take the initiatve or even active participation * * * seeing that the French and English were weakening he took the trouble to telephone personally to Sir John Simon and said to him: 'Go ahead, we will support you.'"

(xlix) "But the British are not far behind in this talent for publicity reversals. With a fifth of the earth's people kept under their rule by force, they bleat of fighting to liberate subject populations. Fighting now for the triumph of the bloodiest dictatorship ever known—Soviet Russia—they microphone to listening Americans their pious horror of dictatorships."

(l) "We propose: That all Americans unite in denouncing domination of other peoples by any nation whatsoever. That they unite in urging the earliest possible ending of the present profitless conflict."

OVERT ACTS

1. In pursuance of said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, heretofore and during the period between June 1, 1941, and September 1, 1941, in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court, the defendant, Prescott Freese Dennett, conferred with one George Hill.

2. And further, in pursuance of the said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, on or about the 4th day of April 1942, in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court the defendant Charles B. Hudson caused to be delivered by the Post Office establishment of the United States to the addressee thereof an envelope addressed to Jefferson Breem, 3917 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

3. And further, in pursuance of the said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, on or about the 2d day of April 1942, in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court the defendant Charles B. Hudson caused to be delivered by the Post Office establishment of the United States an envelope addressed to Jefferson Breem, 3917 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

4. And further in pursuance of the said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, on or about the 2d day of April 1942, in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court, the defendants Elmer J. Garner and James F. Garner caused to be delivered by the Post Office establishment of the United States a copy of Publicity dated March 5, 1942, enclosed in a wrapper addressed to Jefferson Breem, 3917 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

5. And further in pursuance of the said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, during the month of June 1942, in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court the defendant C. Leon de Aryan caused to be delivered by the Post Office establishment of the United States copies of the Broom, dated June 15 and 22, 1942, respectively, enclosed in a wrapper addressed to Quigley Adams, Box 919, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D. C.

6. And further in pursuance of the said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, during the months of June, July, August, and September 1941, the defendants George Sylvester Viereck and Prescott Freese Dennett met and conferred in the city of Washington in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court.

7. And further in pursuance of the said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, during the month of April 1942, in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court, the defendant, William Kullgren, caused to be delivered by the Post Office establishment of the United States to the addressee thereof the February and March 1942 issues of the Beacon Light enclosed in an envelope addressed to: Jefferson Breem, 3917 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

8. And further in pursuance of the said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, on or about the 1st day of April 1942, in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court, the defendant, Elizabeth Dilling, caused to be delivered by the Post Office establishment of the United States to the addressee thereof a post-paid envelope enclosing documents entitled "They Have Struck" addressed to: Mr. Jefferson Breem, 3917 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

9. And further in pursuance of the said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, on or about the 2d day of April 1942, in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court, the defendants, Elizabeth Dilling and Charles B. Hudson, caused to be delivered by the Post Office establishment of the United States to the addressee thereof a post-paid envelope enclosing a copy of the Octopus and other material addressed to: Jefferson Breem, 3917 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

Count two

And the grand jurors aforesaid upon their oaths aforesaid do further present that:

1. Heretofore, to wit: on or about the 8th day of December 1941, and continuously thereafter up to and including the date of the filing of this indictment Gerald B. Winrod, Wichita, Kans.; Herman Max Schwinn, Los Angeles, Calif.; George Sylvester Viereck, alias J. B. Hamilton, New York City and Washington, D. C.; William Griffin, New York City; Hans Diebel, Los Angeles, Calif.; H. Victor Broenstrupp, alias the Duke of St. Saba, alias Count Victor Cherep-Spiridovich, alias Lieutenant General Cherep-Spiridovich, alias Colonel Bennett, alias J. G. Francis, New York City and Noblesville, Ind.; William Dudley Pelley, Noblesville, Ind.; Prescott Freese Dennett, Washington, D. C.; Elizabeth Dilling, alias Rev. Frank Woodruff Johnson, Chicago, Ill.; Charles B. Hudson, alias Rev. Frank Woodruff Johnson, Omaha, Nebr.; Elmer J. Garner, Wichita, Kans.; James F. Garner, Wichita, Kans.; David J. Baxter, alias the Chancellor, alias John Pepper, alias John H. Rand, San Bernardino and Colton, Calif.; Hudson de Priest, Wichita, Kans., and New York City; William Kullgren, Atsacadero, Calif.; C. Leon de Aryan, San Diego, Calif.; Court Asher, Muncie, Ind.; Eugene Nelson Sanctuary, New York City; Robert Edward Edmondson, also known as R. E. Edmonson, New York City and Santa Barbara, Calif.; Ellis O. Jones, Los Angeles, Calif.; Robert Noble, Los Angeles, Calif.; James C. True, Arlington, Va., and Washington, D. C.; Edward James Smythe, New York City; Oscar Brumback, Washington, D. C., and Luray, Va.; Ralph Townsend, San Francisco, Calif., Lake Geneva, Wis., and Washington, D. C.; William Robert Lyman, Jr., alias Robert Lanham, Detroit, Mich.; Donald McDaniel, Chicago, Ill.; Otto Brennermann, also known as Otto Brennemann, Chicago, Ill.; hereinafter called the defendants, and divers other persons whose names are to the grand jurors unknown, at the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court, unlawfully, willfully, feloniously, and knowingly conspired, combined, confederated, and agreed together and with each other to violate the provisions of section 33 of title 50 of the United States Code, in that they, the said defendants, and divers other persons to the grand jurors unknown, the United States being at war would willfully cause and attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, and refusal of duty in the military and naval forces of the United States, and would willfully obstruct the recruiting and enlistment services of the United States to the injury of the service of the United States.

2. And the grand jurors aforesaid upon their oaths aforesaid do hereby reaffirm, reallege and incorporate as if herein set out in full each and every allegation of the first count of this indictment except those allegations contained in paragraph 1 thereof.

OVERT ACTS

1. In pursuance of said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, on or about the 4th day of April 1942 in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court the defendant Charles B. Hudson caused to be delivered by the Post Office establishment of the United States to the addressee thereof an envelope addressed to: Jefferson Breem, 3917 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

2. And further, in pursuance of the said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, on or about the 2d day of April 1942 in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court the defendant Charles B. Hudson caused to be delivered by the Post Office establishment of the United States an envelope addressed to: Jefferson Breem, 3917 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

3. And further, in pursuance of the said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, on or about the 2d day of April 1942 in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court the defendants Elmer J. Garner and James F. Garner caused to be delivered by the Post Office establishment of the United States a copy of Publicity, dated March 5, 1942, enclosed in a wrapper addressed to: Jefferson Breem, 3917 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

4. And further in pursuance of the said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, during the month of June 1942, in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court the defendant C. Leon de Aryan caused to be delivered by the Post Office establishment of the United States copies of The Broom, dated June 15 and 22, 1942, respectively, enclosed in a wrapper addressed to Quigley Adams, box 219, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D. C.

5. And further in pursuance of the said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, during the month of April 1942, in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court, the defendant William Kullgren caused to be delivered by the Post Office establishment of the United States to the addressee thereof the February and March 1942 issues of The Beacon Light enclosed in an envelope addressed to: Jefferson Breem, 3917 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

6. And further in pursuance of the said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, on or about the 1st day of April 1942, in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court the defendant Elizabeth Dilling caused to be delivered by the Post Office establishment of the United States to the addressee thereof a post-paid envelope enclosing documents entitled "They Have Struck," addressed to: Mr. Jefferson Breem, 3917 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

7. And further in pursuance of the said conspiracy and to effect the objects thereof, on or about the 2d day of April 1942, in the District of Columbia and within the jurisdiction of this court the defendants Elizabeth Dilling and Charles B. Hudson caused to be delivered by the Post Office establishment of the United States to the addressee thereof a post-paid envelope enclosing a copy of The Octopus and other material addressed to: Jefferson Breem, 3917 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

Contrary to the form of the statutes in such case made and provided (sec. 11 of title 18, U. S. Code, and sec. 34 of title 50, U. S. Code), and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

EDWARD M. CURRAN,
United States Attorney for the District of Columbia.
WENDELL BERGE,
Assistant Attorney General.
WILLIAM POWER MALONEY,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General.
JOHN T. M. REDDAN,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General.

Booth Tarkington on Civilian Morale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a perfect literary cameo of pertinent philosophy and profound patriotism written by my distinguished constituent, Booth Tarkington:

CIVILIAN MORALE

(By Booth Tarkington)

Recently I had a letter from a young relative who had been with the Marines during the whole fearful triumph on Guadalcanal. He said that Guadalcanal was beautiful but the life there rather monotonous; then he asked me solicitously how civilians at home were getting along.

His word monotonous struck me the more after I learned (not from him) that part of

his particular monotony had consisted of having the rear sight on his rifle shot off by a Jap bullet and being blown 15 feet in the air by a Jap shell; but I believe that under the circumstances his interest in current civilian life is even more remarkable than his talent for understatement. Perhaps, however, this concern is characteristic of more soldiers than we think. Perhaps indeed (and oughtn't it to make us feel humble if not actually humiliated?) most of America's fighting men are generous enough in the midst of their dangers to worry about us. Maybe they are wise, too, to give a thought to our morale. Possibly they are instinctively aware that in all grim truth our morale is as important to their futures as theirs is to ours.

I wrote a V-letter to this young Marine "somewhere in the Pacific" and told him that everyone at home was working hard and with but the one eager purpose, that all of us of all ages (except for a scant few congenital squeakers) were not merely adapting ourselves to rationing but were welcoming it—and wanting more of it—because we knew it was our chance to contribute in concert to the fueling and feeding of those whom it were indeed better for our most selfish selves that we do heapingly fuel and feed. I said that we'd had to endure no deprivations of any but trifling importance so far and that we'd be better pleased if we did have a hardship or two worthy of the name because then we'd have the satisfaction of knowing, ourselves, more of the company of our fellow countrymen upon the fronts.

I wrote this believing it to be in the main true; but I would have written it to him anyhow because if not yet altogether true it must be made so. At work daily all over our land are splendid men and women upon the rationing boards whose patience, tact, and firmness are already visibly accomplishing the realization of this truth. Soon the most nervous, the timidest, and even the most stupidly piggish of us will have it gladly in his heart—and then none but enemies will be in our marching way.

Ruml-Carlson Pay-As-You-Earn Plan of Tax Collection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the tax-collection bill now before this House and the proposed amendments to it create an issue in which the people of this country are intensely interested. Everyone admits the desirability of having income-tax collections placed on a current, or, as it has been aptly called, pay-as-you-earn basis. The advantages to be gained by the Federal Treasury, as well as the convenience to taxpayers, by such a plan are likewise admitted. The demand for legislation of this character is almost unanimous.

In response to this universal demand, upon the part of all classes of our citizenship, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House reported this bill, now before the House, ostensibly to effect this purpose, but which, unfortunately, does not accomplish the purpose desired by the great mass of taxpayers.

A study of the plan submitted by the committee, known as the Doughton bill, reveals that while the bill provides a method to collect taxes at the source, yet, there is no way under that bill by which a taxpayer could become current in payment of tax liability except by paying 1942 and 1943 taxes in 1 year. As an inducement to pay 2 years' taxes in one a discount of 6 percent is allowed. It can be readily seen that such a plan precludes all possibility of the average taxpayer being able to take advantage of its terms. Only a wealthy person would be able to pay 2 years' taxes in one. The heavy taxes now levied makes it absolutely impossible, for any other than the wealthy, to pay 2 years' taxes in one. Thus, from a practical standpoint, the 44,000,000 taxpayers of the Nation would continue to be 1 year behind in the payment of their Federal taxes. They would never be able to be current. They would always, as long as they lived, be paying out of the present year's income the taxes based upon the earnings of the preceding year. This would continue until they died and the tax collector would then close in and demand payment of the tax, or the unpaid portion thereof, due on the income of the preceding year. And this would have first claim on the assets of the estate. It would have to be paid in full before the wife, children, or any other beneficiary of decedent's estate would have the right to one single dollar of said estate.

Furthermore, the average taxpayer would rather be current in his tax payments than be faced with the possibility of being required to pay the tax out of a decreased income the following year. The possibility of such a contingency is very likely the year following the conclusion of this war. We can all visualize the possibility of such a contingency. If it does happen, then the taxpayer would be required to pay the tax out of what may be meager earnings the year following the war. This would mean a real hardship to all classes of income-tax payers, except the wealthy, who would, as I have shown, be able to pay 2 years' taxes in one and obtain a discount of 6 percent for so doing.

Thus, it is easy to understand why the great mass of income-tax payers are anxious to have a plan adopted that will enable them to face each year clear of any tax liability to the Government.

In an endeavor to meet the public demand for the collection of taxes on a current basis, Beardsley Ruml, chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, proposed a plan that has become known as the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan. It immediately met with enthusiastic support throughout the entire country. Under close scrutiny and study it was found advisable to make some slight changes in order that no one could take advantage of its terms and escape taxation on what has been termed "windfalls," or, in other words, large profits received in 1942, and no comparable amount received in 1943 when the shift would be made to the current basis of collection. These amendments have been made and are known as the Carlson bill. This latter bill, which is offered as a substitute for the Ruml plan, contains the same general policy as the Ruml plan but with adequate guards against any of the inequities that opponents of the Ruml plan alleged were possible under its terms.

Thus, a highly satisfactory solution has been reached to the perplexing problem of placing the Government on a current, pay-as-you-earn basis. And, this under the terms of the Carlson bill can be accomplished without loss of revenue to the Government. It is not strange that this plan has the support of 90 percent of the people and at least 95 percent of the newspapers of the country.

As evidence of the support given to the Ruml-Carlson plan of tax collection under the unanimous consent granted, I insert as part of my remarks two editorials of the Courier-Post newspapers of Camden, N. J. The first of the editorials to which I have referred appeared in the issue of March 13, 1943, and reads as follows:

WHY LET THE GRAND OLD PARTY ADOPT THE RUML PLAN?

Will the Democratic Party permit the Republicans in Congress to capitalize the popularity of the Ruml pay-as-you-earn tax plan and make it a partisan issue?

The test will come next week when the Carlson bill, embodying the principle of the Ruml plan, and the botched bill of the Ways and Means Committee come to a show-down on the floor of the House of Representatives.

So far this session Republican opposition in Congress has been strictly negative. Grand Old Party fulfillment of what it calls a mandate from the voters last November has consisted chiefly of saying "No" to one after another administration proposal.

At last, we are glad to say, the Grand Old Party minority moves to exercise its responsibility in a constructive way. That responsibility is the greater because the Grand Old Party minority is greater—209 votes against 222 for the Democrats.

The Grand Old Party steering committee has called a caucus Monday to line up House Republicans behind the Carlson bill for pay-as-you-earn taxes.

We hope House Democrats—and administration leaders—will be wise enough to prevent this popular issue from becoming partisan property, by also backing the Carlson bill and ending the confusion which promises to reach a climax Monday when all tax returns are due.

Chairman DOUGHTON and the bookkeeper-minded majority of the Ways and Means Committee ought to be ashamed of the flabby imitation of a pay-as-you-earn plan submitted in the committee's bill.

True, they followed the Treasury's wishes. But the wishes of the public are equally clear. A recent Gallup survey showed 90 percent of the public in favor of Ruml's idea of applying current taxes to current income.

We regret that President Roosevelt yesterday chose to enter the controversy against the Ruml plan.

His comments in press conference showed plainly that he had taken the Treasury's figures and the Treasury's word as the basis of his views. And how badly the Treasury had misinformed the President was evident when he observed that tax collections would be less this year under the Ruml plan.

The Carlson bill specifically provides that 1942 income taxes be based upon either 1942 income or 1943 income—whichever is higher.

Thus the Government would collect more taxes in 1943, not less, under the new plan.

The Treasury ignores prospective losses to the Government through default by taxpayers who simply didn't save the money to pay all their 1942 taxes. As we have observed before, it is futile to argue that people ought to have saved up. The answer is they didn't.

And, last year, they could not have estimated their 1942 taxes and saved up for them in full—because the vastly higher tax rates were not enacted by Congress until October 20.

It is true that under the Ruml plan, when a taxpayer dies, 1 year's taxes would be lost. But when those taxes are of any size, the Government can be safeguarded against any loss by a slight boost in the inheritance levy.

With the Carlson bill, the Government is insured against any loss in current taxes through change to the new system—

At the same time millions of taxpayers are brought up-to-date in their payments—with the chance of defaults rendered negligible.

We hope Congress will override the Treasury and give the people the security they want—security against double taxation that would ruin many of them.

The Democratic Party will make a regrettable mistake if it deals with this issue on partisan lines. The taxpayers do not look at it in any such light.

The second editorial to which I have referred appears in the issue of the Courier-Post of March 16, 1943. It reads as follows:

STRAIGHT—OR WITH SIRUP?

We wonder whether Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau has taken any castor oil lately.

If he has, he knows it can be taken straight, which makes it quite a dose. It can be seasoned with asafetida, which makes it even worse. Or it can be taken with orange juice, sarsaparilla, or some other drink which makes the swallowing pleasanter.

The important thing in administering any medicine is getting the patient to swallow it. The same principle applies in taxation.

By the Treasury's die-hard attitude on the Ruml plan, as modified in the Carlson bill, it demonstrates that while it may be long on arithmetic, it is woefully short on psychology.

The argument over the Ruml plan really is an argument over bookkeeping methods. We'll admit there is something to be said on both sides. But we also know that Uncle Sam will not lose any revenue under the Carlson bill, just as we know that the taxpayer will not escape any payments.

The Ruml program is to the present heavy tax burden what the orange juice is to the castor oil.

Since the main idea is to collect taxes—and heavy taxes—the Treasury would be wise in plumping for whatever method will collect those taxes with the least hardship to the taxpayer.

Few Americans want to duck their tax obligations. They're not griping or groaning. All they ask is that the Treasury not go out of its way to make it tough to pay Uncle Sam the money.

Without the Ruml plan, as modified in the Carlson bill, the taxpayer is faced with paying 2 years' taxes in 1 year to get on a current basis. With the Ruml plan he will pay 1 year's taxes in 1 year.

It is as simple as that. Castor oil straight, or with a sweetener?

And we think it will be a grievous mistake if Chairman DOUGHTON or any other Democratic Congressman tries to commit the party to forcing the public to pay its taxes the hardest way.

Victory Pledge of Labor Groups at the Puget Sound Navy Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the labor groups in the vital Puget Sound Navy Yard have adopted a patriotic war work plan which I submit for the consideration of the country. It is as follows:

WAR DANGERS CITED—LABOR UNIONS IN YARD ADOPT VICTORY PLEDGE—HIGHER PRODUCTION URGED

Pledges of union labor groups in the Puget Sound Navy Yard, in which union members agree to subordinate their own interests toward increased contributions to the war effort, was released for publication today.

The pledge, drafted by the Technical Engineers and Draftsmen's Union, Local 12, has been adopted by the Bremerton Metal Trades Council and 10 union locals, according to S. W. Oliver, Metal Trades secretary.

Unions adopting the pledge were the following locals:

Sheet Metal Workers, No. 274; Teamsters, No. 672; Carpenters, No. 2317; Blacksmiths, No. 48; Coppersmiths, No. 147; Ordnancemen, No. 17000; Machinists, No. 282; Plumbers, No. 631; Welders, No. 671; Painters, No. 1208.

TEXT OF PLEDGE

Complete text of the pledge follows:

"It is apparent that our union membership, together with all labor in the yard, has not been aroused fully to the danger facing our country, to the trials and tribulations confronting us, to the great struggle and the heavy sacrifices that must be made before ultimate victory can be achieved. We have not yet fully realized the grim truth that the Axis intends the conquest of the United States as their greatest prize; that without the full and complete mobilization of all our resources, Hitler's and Tojo's dreams of dictating peace from the White House steps can become a stark reality. Our country is in the most deadly peril of its 166 years of existence.

"It is because of that danger that we, as representatives of American labor, the most powerful anti-Axis force in the country, recognize our responsibility as such and restate our position toward the war and call upon all like-minded organizations within the yard to take a similar position.

"The creation of the offensive that will win this war and which will provide that offensive with the means necessary for its success is the central task of organized labor and the American people. As the war unfolds it will become increasingly clear that the labor organizations that fulfill this obligation strengthen themselves thereby. There is not room in this country for any organization that cannot subordinate its interests to this task.

HEAVY DEMANDS

"The fulfilling of this task demands real and positive contributions. Lip service is not enough. Our Nation's position, the weight that it carries with management, the prestige that it enjoys, and in the last analysis its ability to protect and advance our own economic interests depend on our arriving at a position where we are giving our maximum service to our country—delivering this service not in words, but in fact.

"In view of the foregoing, we, the members of organized labor, state that the central task facing our body is the same as that facing all patriotic Americans; that is, crushing the Axis and winning the war. Therefore, until such time as victory has been won, we pledge ourselves to subordinate our interests to that task and take our rightful place as leaders in mobilizing the forces we represent toward increased contributions to the war effort as a whole, and toward increased production within Puget Sound Navy Yard in particular."

Korean—Not Japanese—Cherry Trees

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in line with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] concerning the brutal attacks made on our men by the ruthless Japanese, I call attention to the fact that spring is approaching and the cherry trees are blooming. I have learned that they are not Japanese cherry trees but Korean cherry trees. They were stolen by the Japanese from Korea, just as she is now stealing everything that China has. So, instead of chopping them down, as a great many indignant Americans want to do, I suggest to the press, to the Congress, to the people of Washington, and to the people of the whole country that from now on we call these trees by their right name, "Korean cherry trees."

Fairforest Finishing Co., Fairforest, S. C., Awarded Distinguished Army-Navy E Banner and Pins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from my district, where I had the privilege, on Saturday, March 27, of attending an unusual ceremony for the conferring of the Army-Navy E award upon one of the many of our industries.

At this ceremony President John M. Reeves, of the Fairforest Finishing Co., Fairforest, S. C., delivered the following inspiring speech, which was appropriately responded to by Mr. C. F. Dobbins, one of the oldest employees of the plant.

It was indeed an impressive occasion, especially to learn of this company's fine accomplishments in the past and of its renewed determination to carry on in the war program.

The speeches follow:

SPEECH OF JOHN M. REEVES

Mr. Chairman, Colonel Gregory, distinguished guests, war workers of the Fairforest Finishing Co., this is indeed a great day for us all—a red-letter day in your lives and mine—a day that brings you recognition from our fighting forces in the form of the Army and Navy E award for the outstanding war work you are doing, particularly in the finishing of uniform fabrics for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

I can well remember when shortly before the war Fairforest was one of very few plants in the United States which could satisfactorily finish the difficult 8.2 ounce, type I, Army twill for the Army and Navy. With this head start in the service of your country, you have since been finishing this fabric in great volume along with a substantial yardage of Marine Corps suiting and reverse twist herringbone twill. You have found time also to master the difficult finishing of water-repellent and wind-resistant poplins and flameproof duck for the Army.

Fairforest, together with Mills Mill, pioneered in the creation and development of some of the more vital wartime fabrics. For example, your organization served as a sort of clearing house on the 6-ounce shirting used by the Army, furnishing information on yarns, cotton type, and construction to other interested mills. You also pioneered the Marine Corps suiting, both as to construction and finish.

On this cloth, the herringbone twill, and the 8.2-ounce army twill, you are keeping well ahead of your tremendous schedule. It is, therefore, fitting and right that you, the employees and management of Fairforest Finishing Co., should be given this recognition by the award of the Army-Navy E for your wholehearted efforts toward improving the quality of finishing and of increasing production.

On behalf of the men and women of Fairforest Finishing Co. I accept this signal honor which our Government has seen fit to bestow upon this company and its employees. It is a great privilege to represent you and receive for you officially from our fighting forces this coveted award for exceptional performance. It is not an award that is easily won nor lightly given. It is the highest honor our Government can bestow upon an industrial organization. There is only one regret I have on this, the most memorable occasion of my life, namely, that my brother, M. R. Reeves, could not have been spared to witness and participate in this ceremony.

Now that the award has been won, it must be accepted and regarded as a trust. With its acceptance go responsibilities—not only that the same high standard of performance be maintained, but that our energies shall be directed toward even greater achievement in the days to come. Let us so regard this our faithful trust and let us pledge now to keep the Army and Navy E flag proudly flying with a service star added for each new 6 months of continued high production.

SPEECH OF C. F. DOBBINS

Mr. Chairman, Colonel Manderbach, we, the employees of Fairforest Finishing Co., want you to know that we are proud of this honor you are bestowing on us for the small part we are doing for our country in its great need. We know that we must sacrifice and work to help support our boys who are doing so much for their country and the high ideals for which it stands.

We want you to know that we are in this fight and we are in it to stay. If it takes more sacrifice, if it takes more work, if it takes more buying bonds, we are ready to go the limit. We shall ever strive to live up to this confidence you have in us, and will never allow the least stain or taint to mar the sacredness of this honor. We shall all continue to pull together for victory in this fight for everything that is worth living for. To this end we shall ever strive and give, and yes, suffer if it need be to do our part.

Sugar for Home Canning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1943.

The Honorable CLARENCE J. BROWN,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am in receipt of your letter dated March 19, 1943, requesting information as to the amount of sugar that will be allotted for home-canning purposes.

The Office of Price Administration is now working on a program which will govern the issuance of sugar for home canning in 1943. While the details of this program are not ready for release at this time, I can assure you that reasonable amounts of sugar will be made available for the required home canning of fresh fruits and vegetables.

We are fully aware of the importance of home canning in relation to our over-all food supply, and everything possible will be done to encourage not only maximum production of farm products but also for their effective utilization.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator.

Mills Mill, Greenville, S. C., Given High Award of Army-Navy E

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker on Saturday last I had the privilege of visiting Mills Mill at Greenville, S. C., where I was formerly employed. It is always a privilege to meet those whom I have known so long but on this special occasion we had gathered for the awarding of the Army-Navy E for outstanding production of war materials.

Mr. John M. Reeves, the president of Mills Mill, delivered an impressive address to which Mr. M. E. Bishop, one of the company's oldest employees, promptly and properly responded. I insert herewith the remarks by Mr. Reeves and Mr. Bishop.

So long as we have the cooperation between our people and the Government as exemplified in this instance there can be no doubt about the successful termination of this war. My heartiest congratulations go out to those who have thus attained these distinct rewards.

The speeches follow:

SPEECH OF JOHN M. REEVES

Mr. Chairman, Colonel Gloeckner, distinguished guests, war workers of the Mills Mill organization of Greenville, it is with a deep sense of pride that I accept this Army and Navy E pennant on behalf of the men and women of Mills Mill No. 1. Your all-out efforts in converting this plant in its entirety to war fabrics in record time, your constant attention to quality, your greatly increased production, make you particularly worthy of this high production award from our fighting forces.

Your vast contribution to the Marine Corps clothing procurement program has I am sure been a source of satisfaction to Colonel Gregory, Colonel Gloeckner and their associates in the Marine Quartermaster Corps. It was through your prompt conversion of this mill from commercial to wartime fabrics that we were able to keep pace with their increasing demands for more and more yardage.

Somehow I feel that this mill which has been running largely on herringbone twills for the marines has a kinship with the corps. I am sure that everyone of you here has followed the fortunes of the men who were first to fight at Guadalcanal, the Solomons, and elsewhere with a keener personal interest knowing that you have helped to clothe them and keep them in good fighting trim.

As the Marine Corps is the oldest armed service in the United States, so Mills Mill at Greenville is the oldest mill under Reeves' management—the cornerstone of our present organization. There are some among you today who remember when Mills Mill No. 1 first began operations in 1895. Right here on the platform, of the three workers you have chosen to represent you, Mrs. Abbott has served the mill 48 years, Mrs. Porter 47 years, and Mr. Bishop also 47 years. What a glorious milestone this ceremony today is in such a long life of service. That the Government has paid our organization such high tribute for a job well done brings to each of us a thrill of pride and satisfaction. This is truly a memorable occasion—the most outstanding event in the long history of this mill.

But we must not forget that with this great honor comes an even greater responsibility. As the Army and Navy E flag is raised, let us pledge ourselves to renewed effort in our fight to defeat those who would destroy all that we cherish and hold dear in American life. Let us make our pledge now that this flag will continue to proudly fly with a service star added for each additional 6 months' record of continued high production.

SPEECH OF M. E. BISHOP

Colonel Manderbach, thank you.

I accept the E pins on behalf of the employees of Mills Mill No. 1. We are proud that we have won the E award. We are also happy that we have the opportunity to help those boys who are fighting for us on the battle fronts of the world.

The best way that we can help win this war is by cooperation; so let's continue to work together to help win the war.

This E pin should be an inspiration to us that we may be on our jobs daily, work harder, and produce better materials so that we can keep this E. If we do this, a star will be added to our flag every 6 months.

Release of Radio Supplies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution from the unicameral Legislature of Nebraska dealing with the serious shortage of B batteries for radio-receiving sets.

The farmers and ranchmen in my district rely heavily upon the radio for news in reference to the various programs of government and the price of livestock and feed. For many of them it is their only means of keeping in touch with the news of the world.

A copy of the resolution and a letter is being sent to Donald Nelson, Director of the War Production Board, urging that he recognize the seriousness of the situation and that he make as much critical material available as is possible in order that these ranchers and farmers may continue to receive the news and programs sent out by radio stations.

The resolution follows:

Legislative Resolution 12

Resolution relating to release of radio supplies

Whereas it is vitally necessary in the rural areas of this State that farmers and ranchers be informed of weather conditions for the protection of crops and livestock; and

Whereas the rural residents of the State of Nebraska are at the present time suffering a serious shortage of B batteries for radio receiving sets, and nearly all of the radio receiving sets on the farms and ranches of Nebraska are dependent upon B batteries; and

Whereas the United States Government is urging farmers and ranches to increase production of food and relies heavily upon radio to disseminate news and programs with reference to measures and steps to be taken to aid in carrying on the present World War: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of Nebraska:

1. That we earnestly commend to the War Production Board of the United States that it release a sufficient supply of B batteries and other farm radio receiving set supplies to permit farmers and ranchers in this State to maintain existing radio receiving sets.

2. That a copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted to the War Production Board of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States.

A False Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wheeling Intelligencer, Wheeling, W. Va., dated March 23, 1943.

A FALSE ISSUE

In its report rejecting the Ruml tax plan, the House Ways and Means Committee said this:

"To forgive any taxpayer 1 year's taxes means that the debt which he has already incurred and owes to the Government must be borne by some other taxpayer, who may be in some instances less able to pay than the taxpayer whose debt is forgiven."

Here is the basic fallacy on which practically all of the opposition to the Ruml plan or any equivalent rests. For the truth is, there is no forgiveness of taxes whatever involved. The plan is merely to shift the payment of taxes from a year-end to a current basis.

Those who filed income-tax returns on March 15 and who paid part of the tax bill indicated in the return, were not paying 1942 taxes. They were paying 1943 taxes, measured by their 1942 earnings. Go back to the beginnings of the Union. The Federal Government has collected taxes every year. So as long as it keeps on collecting taxes every year, it has not skipped a year's taxes. Get this idea of a measuring stick of Federal tax obligations clearly in mind, and it is easy to understand that no forgiveness whatever is contemplated. We merely change the measuring stick from last year's income to this year's income, and pay taxes as we earn because it is easier to pay them that way.

The Government is entitled to whatever money is necessary to carry on its legitimate activities—no more. The measuring rod used to determine these taxes is immaterial, so long as the proper amount is arrived at and the distribution among taxpayers is just. Therefore, all the Government has to do is to fix rates on a current collection basis sufficient to bring in the required yield. That is the only procedure necessary in a shift to current collection, whether the change had been made at the beginning of this year, whether it is made in the middle of the year, or whether it is made the first of next year. In no circumstances is there justification for doubling up on the taxpayer by requiring him to pay 2 years' taxes or any part of 2 years' taxes in 1 year.

Almost Persuaded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the editorial, U. S. A. and U. S. S. R., in the April 3 Collier's, one gets the idea that while that publication does not yet see the virtue of America first, it is almost persuaded that those who prior to Pearl Harbor thought it might be well to prepare for national defense and for war before getting ourselves in a position where war was inevitable were thinking and acting constructively, as well as with good sense.

The editorial is as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

More and more important, as Hitler's propaganda strives to split us from our Russian semially, grows the question: What is the sensible American attitude toward Russia, regarding both the war and the peace?

We think the correct answer can be worked out from these facts:

Stalin always acts for Russia's interests; anybody who expects him to act otherwise is deluded. Stalin signed a nonaggression pact with Hitler just before this war broke out, and it was Hitler, not Stalin, who tore up that pact and forced Stalin into the Allied camp.

The Red army has put up a historic and effective fight against Germany. Hence, it is to our interest to send Russia all the lend-lease help we can, without short-changing our other lend-lease clients or weakening ourselves beyond the safety point.

Orthodox communism—the Marx-Lenin-Trotsky brand, whose apostles expected to communize the world—appears to have faded out in the Russia of Josef Stalin.

"This Cripps is all right," Stalin is reported, perhaps apocryphally, to have said, when Sir Stafford Cripps visited Moscow; "but why does he talk all this communism?"

Stalin appears far more determined to make some kind of communism, fascism, state capitalism—call it what you like—work in Russia than to force any kind of totalitarian philosophy on the rest of the world.

Yet Stalin, to this writing, has not publicly cut adrift any of the Communist parties active in other countries, including the United States and Great Britain. Those organizations remain notoriously in touch with Moscow and loyal to Russia rather than to nations which tolerate them. Stalin, too, is helping the Partisan guerrillas in Yugoslavia, who are fighting Gen. Draja Mikhailovitch's anti-Axis Chetniks as well as the Germans, Italians, and the Yugoslav quislings.

Stalin, ignoring the Atlantic Charter on self-determination for small nations, has let it be publicly known that he intends to keep the Baltic states (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania) in the event of an Allied victory.

Shutting our ears to our domestic Russia-lovers and Russia-haters alike, and fixing our eyes and minds on the facts listed above, we should be able to reach a common-sense American attitude toward Russia. That attitude, we believe, is this: Look at Russia as we look at any other nation fighting on our side. Expect Russia to think of itself first and last, and to get any added power and territory out of this war that it can. Don't idealize Russia, don't consider it a devil-nation, either; just view it as a huge collection of human beings who will act in any situation as other human beings will act.

As for Mr. Stalin, well, in case he is at all interested in breaking down the perhaps unjustified suspicion many Americans and Britons feel about his aims and motives, he could best do that by publicly cutting off all connections between the Moscow Government and the communist parties now making nuisances of themselves throughout the non-Russian part of the world.

It concisely states a policy which might have been followed by Russia with profit to herself and with almost immeasurable good to the United States of America.

One more progressive, logical step further along the line of the thinking of this editorial and Collier's will find itself suggesting that, while we continue our efforts to aid our allies, we keep as our guiding star the thought that this is our country and her interests come first. That, in this boiling caldron of world politics, Americans keep their minds attuned to the thought that we should above all else remember that self-preservation is the first law of nations and that, if we do not look out for our own interests, no other Nation will.

William Power Maloney, Attorney General Biddle, take notice: The popularity of the policy of persecuting, of smear-purging, patriotic American citizens who place their loyalty to their country above their adherence to the New Deal is steadily going out of fashion. Watch your step or you will find yourselves out on a limb.

The Atlantic Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 12 my colleague, CHESTER E. MERROW, of New Hampshire, introduced a concurrent resolution the adoption of which would place the Congress on record as accepting the principles so clearly stated in the Atlantic Charter.

On March 21, Adolf Hitler, the greatest criminal the world has ever known, made a speech in Berlin. Commenting on this address, the New York Times of Monday, March 22, used these words in an editorial:

There are two passages, however, worth noticing. One is Hitler's admission that the German homeland has itself become a theater of war, which is a tribute to the Allied air power that is getting under Hitler's toughened skin. The other is his reference to the Atlantic Charter, which Hitler compares with Wilson's fourteen points. And, though he denounces the charter as equally treacherous, it is obvious that he is trying to take prophylactic measures against the infection of the European nations by its hopeful principles.

But this again emphasizes that the Atlantic Charter is still the best hope, not only for the United Nations but also for all the enslaved European peoples, and that any word or act which compromises that charter is grist to Hitler's mill. It is presumably with this in mind that Churchill pointedly stressed the rights of small nations, and while urging unity among the United Nations also warned that no power is likely to see all its hopes fulfilled.

I am inserting the above statement in the RECORD to emphasize the high respect with which the Atlantic Charter is held by one of the Nation's leading newspapers.

Frustration on the Food and Fighting Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday of last week the administration appointed Chester A. Davis, Food Administrator. Just what his duties will be is not clear. Whether it means any more than a similar appointment of Secretary Wickard a few months ago, or whether the purpose is to secure adequate food and fiber production is another question. The people are asking whether it means any more for the necessary production of food than the appointment of William M. Jeffers was intended to mean for the production of rubber.

Mr. Jeffers was appointed Rubber Administrator in September of 1942. In that same week I made a couple of speeches in the Well of the House in the course of which I said:

For instance, they—the people—realize that the rubber situation is desperate. They realize that except for the synthetic rubber bill passed by the Congress in July, the administration would still be in chaos, with no intelligent, unified effort toward the solution of this vital problem. They hope that the appointment of William M. Jeffers will solve it.

Everybody remembers that William M. Jeffers disappointed the administration. He wanted to make rubber for our military and essential civilian needs. It was very apparent that the bureaucrats did not want him to make rubber, and he had to get hardboiled and kick the traces before the bureaucrats realized that he meant business and was working with the people and the country and not with them. That there was a deliberate program on the part of the opportunists and Utopians not to supply our people with rubber during the war, whether it lasts 1 year or 5 years, is apparent among other considerations from an article appearing under the name of Vice President WALLACE in the New York Times Magazine for July 12, 1942, and reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 13:

Well, the simple fact is that if the rubber question is handled as certain people would handle it, we would fly in the face of the clear lesson of this war. We would tear down our chance to cement the firm and friendly ties that can give us national safety. We would be embracing a new isolationism which would smash any further attempt at collective security for the world, cause a resurgence of the law of the jungle in human affairs, and lead to another terrible world war. And next time, if we were without friends, such a war might easily end in our encirclement and defeat.

This new isolationism is beginning to show its head for the first time in a very human and plausible way, using rubber as its cloak. From the long-run point of view, it is more dangerous than the old isolationism. Under the plea that the United States must produce everything at home in order to be prepared in time of war, this new isolationism would not only destroy the export market of the United States but would cause great hardship among the producing populace of countries which normally export to the United States. The new isolationism would of necessity develop many points of economic likeness with the Germany of 1933 to 1939.

These facts would make it appear that the catastrophic failure and famine in rubber was not the result of mere inefficiency and bungling, but a prearranged plan to create chaos through a rubber famine, for the mutual advantage of the opportunists and Utopians seeking to change the American way of living.

In the course of those same speeches, I made the further statement:

In the rubber situation the policy was clearly, first, national rationing of gasoline and rubber to conserve rubber; and second, to get the required production of necessary rubber.

I went on to say:

And yet the administration formula and policy on the food problem is just as tenuous and flimsy as it was on the rubber problem. * * * President Roosevelt, in his Labor Day message on inflation and parity prices to the Senate, said: "Our policy with respect to farm products should be guided by three principles: First, to hold the line against inflationary price increases. Second, to get the required production of necessary farm products. Third, to maintain the principle of parity for agriculture."

And I further said:

Why put first things second and second things first? * * * Unless we make "getting the required production of necessary farm production" our first consideration with due regard for such elements as price control and anti-inflation measures, we may be in danger of a food famine. * * * The President, after 9 months of war, and nearly 10 years as Chief Executive of this great Nation, has utterly failed to recognize the fundamental truism acted upon for decades by all competent and successful executives: that the best way to get a difficult job done well and quickly is to assign it, with power and responsibility, to a single competent administrator, with an efficient organization, reserving only the right to fire him if he doesn't deliver. * * * I make these observations with the consciousness that some of them may be founded on overcautiousness, but with Mr. Baruch I will say, "Better be safe than sorry," and I would like to see a competent administrator with a proper organization invested with over-all power and responsibility, to insure that our food problem does not meet with the same negligent disaster that overtook our rubber problem.

A week later, after calling attention to the muddled draft board situation with reference to farm help, the drastically restricted farm machinery and fertilizer allotments in conjunction with the President's avowed policy of giving first attention to price and inflation and being secondarily interested in getting the necessary production, I emphasized and strengthened the last aforementioned quotation by saying:

If we are going to win the war, we must put first things first, and under such a policy to get the required production of necessary farm products will be considered of far greater importance than to decide whether 100 or 110 percent of parity shall be paid for farm products, and we can do it only by placing this problem in the hands of a competent administrator with power to act.

As I said, that was in September 1942, over 6 months ago, and with reference to our food problem, we are now in the critical situation with which it was apparent at that time we were threatened. It was as apparent then as it is now that the policy of the administration of putting the cart before the horse, of applying the grossest inefficiency, could only result in the same disaster that had overtaken us in our rubber supply.

Very shortly after making these speeches, and this is over 6 months ago,

information came from reliable and apparently well-informed sources, that these palpably bungling programs for rubber and food were not the product of mere inefficiency, but the result of a deliberate five-point program to bring our economy under the absolute domination of the bureaucratic opportunists and Utopian dreamers after the war. That five-point program was stated to be as follows:

First. Point system of rationing.
Second. Centralization of plants.
Third. Regionalization of business.
Fourth. Inventory and sales control.
Fifth. Victory labels and grade labeling.

This revelation was so amazing that I have hesitated until the present time to disclose it, but I do think that in the intervening months there has been sufficient confirmation of such a plan, and I feel it my duty to give it to the Congress, if they are not already cognizant of it. I at first took the position that such a program would be just as consistent with a well-planned and determined effort to concentrate on the all-out winning of the war as with a post-war planning program. If the former were the fact its publication as a post-war planned economy could only interfere with the war effort, and this I wish to avoid, as every true American would have me do under the circumstances. With the failure of the administration to take action in the appointment of a food administrator with power to act, I was about to call attention to the above alleged five-point program on Monday, December 5, 1942, when coincidentally the President did appoint Secretary Wickard as Food Administrator, and I deferred giving these facts, with every hope that such appointment would bring about the desired results, namely making the "getting of the required production of necessary farm products" the first consideration, and thereby implementing this program as a war schedule.

It is obvious that this ingredient of getting the necessary production would be an essential element in the five-point program if it were in reality a war program. On the other hand it is equally obvious that if the five-point program is a plan to control the post-war economy, then a necessary element is the scarcity of food products and civilian supplies in order that the planners have a situation to which their program could apply; and it seems to me that this element is deliberately being created. If this is a fact, restriction of production stigmatizes the above-named five-point program principally as a scheme for a post-war planning of our economy.

In other words the bureaucrats in the administration assume that the war will be won and are more interested in building their post-war planned economy, than to concentrate all their efforts on the war with the objective of winning it as quickly as possible. Nevertheless it is obvious that these planners, under the guise of furthering the war effort, are in fact presenting a detriment to the war effort, and insofar as rubber and food are essentials of the war program just as much as ammunition is essential to guns and cannon, they are creating an impediment to the successful prosecution of the war.

We have only to consider the tremendous powers involved for individual bureaus and bureaucrats in such a controlled economy to understand the tremendous conflict and struggle for power between such agencies as Office of Civilian Supply, the Department of Agriculture, Office of Price Administration, particularly the Henderson school, the War Production Board, and others. Their failure to cooperate in the common effort is better understood when we realize this quest for power in the proposed future economy. It also clarifies why no one man is invested with the power and authority needed for his job. He might freeze out others so they gang up against him every time.

Naturally this five-point program is not being broadcast to the people of the United States; its successful establishment and development depends on secrecy, so they keep the program from the public. At the time that this plan was disclosed to me I, of course, did not know what point rationing meant. The same is true of some of the other planks in the program. But in the intervening months the existence of the elements of such a program has become more or less articulate.

The American people now have some idea as to what point rationing is, although they have only had the first taste of it. They are not only willing to put up with it but are anxious to embrace it if it is essential to give our fighting men plenty of the best of everything. It is all right with them even for the purpose of sharing with the starving people among our allies. But they are not going to like it if after a year or two we are down to bread and molasses with potatoes—and that is where we will be under the present program—if they find their plight deliberately planned by a bunch of opportunists and crackpots with selfish or Utopian schemes.

The asininity of this crowd and their planning was aptly illustrated by the recent bread-slicing episode. Bakers told me that it costs 7$^{9}/_{10}$ cents to slice a thousand loaves of bread. They recaptured 6$^{1}/_{2}$ cents by selling the crumbs. This left a cost of 1$^{1}/_{10}$ cents for slicing a thousand loaves, which covered cost of knives, repairing and sharpening, as well as all labor. Assuming that the average housewife slices a loaf a day, imagine how these loyal, patriotic housewives would have felt after slicing bread for about 3 years to find that with all this effort each had contributed a cent—1 penny—to the war effort. Senator Brown saw this and changed the order almost as quickly as he took office. But his staff is still honeycombed with the Henderson complex and is wedded to this program, as I will show later.

The bread-slicing episode not only shows the asininity but also the organized, determined scheming to the minutest detail of the bureaucrats for their five-point program, while plans for production are totally ignored, if not sabotaged.

The artificial creation of scarcity as a basis for the five-point program apparently is not confined to stifling of production by failure to provide necessary farm labor, machinery, fertilizer, and so forth. Recent reports of hoarding by the Government lend force to the bureaucrats in their program. It would be naive to assume that there are no Brass Hats in our high military command cooperating with the bureaucrats. Recent reports that the Government is holding 40 to 75 percent of the entire pack of canned fruits and vegetables, while 12 to 15 percent will last them until next fall pack; that on January 1, 1943, it held 816,000,000 cans of evaporated milk, with other supplies comparable, much of which is spoiling, should receive attention. Mr. Davis as the most recent Food Administrator must not only have power to act in the matter of farm labor, farm machinery, fertilizer, and so forth, but he will have to get hard-boiled with the "brass hats" in the Army just as Mr. Jeffers had to get hard-boiled with them in the rubber situation, to prevent a break-down on the home front in our war effort.

I could go on but the restrictive influence of point rationing as the first step in the elimination of private enterprise is too obvious.

As to the second point—centralization of plants—this is being accomplished in various ways. The Office of Price Administration, through its ceiling prices, has forced hundreds of thousands of small businessmen to the wall. Other measures of discrimination, among them priorities, conversion from civilian to war economy, renegotiation of contracts, failure to give deferment to the same labor status in small business to that in large industries, and numerous other elements, are slowly but surely liquidating small business.

Of course, it would be impossible to take over a half million small businesses under the new order. But the centralization of plants will largely facilitate the process. The danger to private enterprise of this point in the program is well recognized, and has been the concern of the Small Business Committee of Congress.

The third point of the program—regionalization of business—has not yet attracted general public attention. Ostensibly its aim is to prevent transportation cross hauling in business. In other words, why should an industry on the west coast have customers on the Atlantic seaboard and vice versa. If the commodity is similar or nearly so, why should not these industries trade customers to prevent cross hauling or transportation across the country. That this is being forced on business on the plea of war necessity to conserve transportation facilities we know. That the argument is specious we must admit. But its effectiveness in the strangling of private enterprise is only too obvious.

The fourth point—inventory and sales control—is functioning, of course, through the Office of Price Administration. Sales control is obvious and has already been discussed. Inventory control through arbitrary restrictions of inventories to a certain percentage, say of 50 to 75 percent of annual sales is already being enforced, and is being gradually extended. As a collar on free

enterprise this control needs no comment.

Point 5. Victory labels and grade labeling is a process to restrict and prohibit the manufacture and marketing of commodities under established brands and trade names; to eliminate all of these and make everything conform to a few standard grades for each of the various commodities, which, together with concentration of plants, will be one of the surest methods of killing private enterprise. Commentators on the radio last Thursday night spoke of the struggle in the O. P. A. between the Henderson crowd for hard-boiled regimentation and Senator Brown's goal of cooperation, and commented especially on this grade-labeling scheme in the O. P. A. with the statement that the Henderson school of thought was still working hard for the accomplishment of this objective, but that it was meeting with opposition from Senator Brown, the new head of the O. P. A., who was alleged to be fighting the Henderson crowd for the retention of trade names and brands as necessary for the survival of free enterprise.

To just what extent the tentacles of this octopus in the administration have fastened themselves on the various bureaus, and through them on our economy, would be a matter of speculation. It must not be overlooked that this five-point program is only the framework and is constantly being implemented with moves and measures to strengthen it.

If such a five-point program and plan has the strangle hold on our economy and war effort that it seems to have, there can be no question but that it constitutes a menace to an early victory, not to mention the general welfare of the American people; and the people know, as they were told by the Baruch committee, that a serious rubber shortage may lose the war, and certainly will cause its protraction at a fearful cost of American lives and property. They know this is doubly true of a food shortage.

The American people know that the President alone and single-handed cannot win the war, but they also know that he is the only person in the United States who, through failure and negligence to take cognizance of such situations, could, single-handed and alone, lose the war or prolong it, with the result of that fearful cost of American lives and property.

The American people, much to the surprise and chagrin of the bureaucrats, found in William M. Jeffers, as Rubber Administrator, a champion for the whole Nation, civil as well as military, in the matter of rubber supply. In the final analysis, this is the only sound policy, for the military make all sacrifice for the preservation of the Nation while the civilians make any sacrifice needed by the military in this objective. It is the hope of the American people that Mr. Davis will be just such a hard-boiled champion in the matter of food supply and that the President will not only clothe him with the necessary powers for the job, but synchronize and correlate his needs and demands in and with the entire war production effort. Then the President should give the Office of Civilian Supply the same going over.

In the meantime Congress, through its Small Business Committee or some other committee, should make a searching investigation of this bureaucratic program to control and regiment our economy with its consequent destruction of the American way of living.

Conservation Farming Is a War Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief editorial from the Oklahoma Banker for January 1943:

CONSERVATION FARMING IS A WAR WEAPON

A summary of information furnished us by farmers reveals that the establishment of conservation practices upon their farms increased the value of the land 44 percent. The acre yield of corn was increased 37 percent, oats 27 percent, and cotton production showed an increase of 25 percent per acre.

Eroded cultivated land planted to Bermuda showed a profit increase of 64 percent, and the use of conservation practices, such as mowing, controlled grazing, protecting from fire, and overseeding with clovers, increased income from old pastures 80 percent.

This information indicates that the soil-conservation-district program is doing far more than conserving the soil. Such programs help to increase land values and are aiding the war effort by helping farmers establish conservation practices that increase production.

St. Patrick's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, at Hotel Casey, Scranton, Pa., on March 17, 1943:

Mr. Chairman and fellow Americans, you have extended to me the great honor of joining with the members of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in observance of the feast of St. Patrick. It is our good fortune in this country to be privileged to continue traditional celebrations even in time of war.

It is a particular pleasure for me to share in a St. Patrick Day celebration in the great State of Pennsylvania, a State where I have so many friends—the State of my distinguished friend and your Congressman JOHN W. MURPHY.

Your club may well be proud of the name it bears. That name echoes and reechoes courage, loyalty, and devotion to God and country.

Through the ages we Irish have always fought for freedom. Yes; I am proud to say that some of the blood of old Erin flows through my veins. The history of America—its fight for freedom, its growth to the country that we know and love—and the history of the Irish in America are one and the same.

The Irish have always answered the call to arms in defense of our country, from the five O'Briens of the Revolution to the five Sullivans of the present struggle. And now the names of Colin Kelly, Butch O'Hare, and only the other day Lt. Col. Brian O'Neill, who led the fight against the Japs at Bismarck Bay, take their places alongside the immortal Celts whose undying deeds of bravery enshrined their names in the hearts of all Americans.

Today the freedom that we have so long cherished is in peril. America is being attacked on every side—in the Atlantic, the Pacific, the Caribbean. American lives are being lost and American ships are being sunk. Through it all, Americans of Irish ancestry are fighting—as they have always fought in the past, with honor and with glory.

This world-wide war will determine for generations to come whether we will live in a world of democracy and individual liberty, or in a world enslaved, brutalized, and terrorized by barbarous aggressors. The pattern is clear, the enemy has embarked on a path of world-wide conquest—the ultimate goal, the complete and utter subjugation of all nations of the world. This is his challenge to the United Nations. We have accepted that challenge.

To take the offensive and win this war—and we must take the offensive, because wars are not won on the defensive—we must produce vast amounts of instruments of war. We must equip the forces of the United Nations to carry the war to the enemy wherever he may be—and carry it successfully. On the battlefronts of the world our fighting men need planes, tanks, ships, and guns, and they need them now. We have already suffered serious reverses because our forces have not been adequately equipped. We shall not allow this to continue. I have said before, I say now, and I will say again, that American lives must not be lost because of inadequate equipment.

However, when the savage blow fell which brought the United States fully into the war—the dastardly attack of the Japanese on Pearl Harbor—we were not completely unprepared. When it became apparent that the Nazis had embarked on a course to crush and conquer their friendly neighbors, our Nation began to prepare for defense against the aggressor. Our President early determined that adequate defense of this Nation against our enemies compelled us to institute a program of armament greater than the world had ever seen before. The construction of our two-ocean fleet was well on its way when the Nazis swept through France. While the Battle of Britain raged, large plants were manufacturing planes and guns and tanks and all the supplies of war. It could be seen then that America's lines of defense were not our shores bordered by the Atlantic and the Pacific, but were in Britain and China and wherever freemen were fighting the Nazi savages and their allies. Hence, by lend-lease aid we made it possible to furnish sinews of war and foodstuffs to the gallant warriors who were then fighting against Nazi aggression.

Great as was the program for the defense of this country, immediately after Pearl Harbor the Nation embarked upon the greatest undertaking for war the world has ever

known. This calls for the construction of planes—swarms of planes—more planes than any other country in the world has ever constructed. It calls for the construction of ships—ships that would be necessary to carry men and supplies to the battle fronts of the world—wherever they may be. This Nation has to be the arsenal of the world, with tanks and guns and all the supplies of war, so that through the assembled might of this Nation, and our allies, the ravagers of the peace of this world will be subdued—and subdued quickly.

America's 1942 production record is one of which we may all be proud. War material of almost every description is now rolling off production lines at rates which we can be confident have not been and cannot be equaled by our enemies. This production has been achieved without sacrificing quality. Today our armed forces have the best equipment in the world. With every additional day the impact of this production on our enemies will be greater.

Despite this admirable progress, it is not as much as we could have done. The weaknesses and mistakes which have slowed our war effort during the past year could have been recognized and corrected earlier. The mistakes of the past are the problems of the present.

We all know that it would be absolutely impossible to spend $100,000,000, let alone several hundred billion dollars, without some mistakes and without some dishonesty. We also know that only too often in past wars indecision and inaction on the part of important Government officials impaired the effectiveness of the program. No such factor must be allowed to impede this war program. This administration is determined that the billions of dollars being spent on the armament program shall be effectively and economically expended so as to insure a maximum of production with a minimum of expense and as little dislocation as possible.

In furtherance of this end, the United States Senate created early in 1941 a Special Committee to Investigate the War Program, of which I had the honor of being named chairman. The purpose for which that committee was created was to search out the obstacles that were hampering the war program and to see that they were removed without fear or favor. What is more, the investigation was to be a continuing one. The committee was determined to do the job assigned to it without resorting either to a whitewash or a smear.

None of us on the committee started out with any preconceived ideas that we desired to prove. We have all tried to the best of our abilities to make the committee's actions purely constructive.

Each individual in our land has a grave responsibility in this war. To fulfill it, all the facts must be known.

When we ask Government officials to explain their activities we are asking on behalf of the whole country. The information which the committee gets is for every American citizen. The recommendations which it makes are made in the interests of the whole country.

During the past year, the committee has reported on light metals and aircraft, rubber, conversion to war production, manpower, shipbuilding, gasoline and fuel-oil rationing, lumber, barges, farm machinery, and steel. Many of its recommendations have been adopted. There has, however, frequently been unnecessary delay before attempting to make corrections.

Almost from its inception the committee stressed the need to expand facilities for the production of the basic raw materials such as steel, copper, and aluminum. There was a long delay in the expansion program, but as noted in the committee's second annual report made last week to the Congress, rapid progress toward alleviating the shortages has been made during the past year.

Competing demands for productive facilities and products are tremendous. Too much of one thing at the wrong time is almost as bad as not enough at the time needed. Excess and unusable production means that vital materials have been improperly diverted either from military or essential civilian needs. In effect what we must have above everything else is the delicate balance of production and use. We must plan to make the raw materials available as required, and then we must allocate them to the production of the items that we can use as produced.

While we could use more strategic materials than we will have available, there will be available many materials which could be manufactured into useful and necessary civilian goods, except for the lack of manpower.

This constitutes the biggest bottleneck in the war program. Full and effective utilization of our available manpower resources is one of the biggest jobs on the home front this year. It will become more and more urgent as induction of men into the armed forces continues. Strong, firm policies of government, backed by the cooperation of labor, industry, and agriculture, are vital.

The greatest contribution which can be made to alleviate the manpower shortage is by increasing the productivity of our present labor force. The chief source of increased productivity must come from increased efficiency. To obtain that efficiency, we must perfect our system of allocating raw materials and of scheduling production so that all of the necessary materials will flow into the factories at such times and in such quantities as to enable them to operate to the maximum extent possible for their men and machines. In addition to providing materials at the right times, less efficient plants must be raised to the standard of those doing the job properly.

When materials flow smoothly onto and through production lines in adequate quantities in an efficiently operated plant, the men can constantly see the finished results of their work. This gives them inspiration to stay at their jobs and even increase their individual efforts.

Today, however, absenteeism still continues at a very high level. Workers in industry must regard themselves as part of our great army defending America. Every time a worker stays away from his job unnecessarily, he should consider himself as much a deserter from the home front as a soldier who leaves his post of duty in face of the enemy. We know that the production hours lost because of absenteeism in industry are lost forever. A real contribution can be made to the country by the workers of the Nation in devoting every possible hour to their jobs. Tapping the reservoir of production wasted by absenteeism will give tremendous impetus to our over-all war effort.

Similarly, all companies engaged in production must realize that it is absolutely essential to get the greatest production with the least possible use of manpower. Companies hoarding manpower which they do not absolutely need are just as guilty as workers who by absenteeism or otherwise desert their posts. Moreover, when the workers can be kept busy turning out war materials, absenteeism without cause will decrease.

One point, too, must be made clear. The War Investigating Committee was not organized to tell the war agencies what to do or how to do it. The purpose of the committee is not to substitute its judgment for theirs. Its function is to insure that intelligent consideration is given to the important and difficult problems presented by the war program, so as to make certain that our victory is won with the least cost in human lives and property.

Of paramount importance in achieving that victory is for the American people—every one of us—to keep faith with each other and with our leaders and with united strength and firm confidence in the righteousness of our cause, with God's help we will attain complete victory and lasting peace.

Additional Aid for General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, Representatives in Congress from west coast States have been repeatedly urging that a Pacific war council be established. We are constantly stressing the importance of this council for the safety of the Republic. On March 22, 1943, the board of the city and county of San Francisco adopted a resolution asking additional aid to Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas numerous military authorities are constantly stressing the fact that the Japanese menace in the Pacific area is growing more acute and is a constant threat to the Pacific coast and particularly to the people of the State of California; and

Whereas San Francisco has often been designated as the No. 1 enemy military target of the Pacific coast and is therefore in great immediate danger from enemy attack; and

Whereas Gen. Douglas MacArthur is continually pleading with the authorities of our Nation for a greater number of aircraft and more of the implements of war to defend the vast territory under his command and to win from the Japanese hordes the "Battle of the Pacific"; and

Whereas numerous civic leaders and men and women of national prominence in our city have requested again and again that our Government authorities heed General MacArthur's request for additional supplies of war and realize the danger of delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco does hereby recommend to the Congress of the United States of America that General MacArthur's request for immediate aid for pursuing the war in the Pacific be granted; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of the board is hereby instructed to send a copy of this resolution to His Excellency Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States of America and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, Hon. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy; Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War; Hon. Hiram Johnson, Senator from California; Hon. Sheridan Downey, Senator from California; Hon. Richard J. Welch, Member of Congress from San Francisco, and Hon. Thomas Rolph, Member of Congress from San Francisco, and respectfully suggest to them that they give every possible assistance in furthering any effort required to grant immediate military aid to General MacArthur to the extent required by him.

Mills Mill, Woodruff, S. C., Receives Army-Navy E Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 27, it was my privilege to attend the ceremonies at Mills Mill, Woodruff, S. C., at the conferring of the Army-Navy E award for excellent production of war materials.

This was, indeed, an inspiring occasion, especially in view of the fact that of all industries engaged in the production of war goods less than 2 percent have received this outstanding award.

In addition to the faithful and cooperative employers and employees who are giving so unstintingly of their skills and knowledge to the production of essential war materials from this community, 145 men and women have gone into actual combat service.

The awarding of this distinct honor to Mills Mill, Woodruff, was attended by prominent representatives of the municipal, county, State, and Federal governments, as well as by high-ranking officers from the several branches of the armed service.

It was an inspiration to observe the friendly relationship existing between the highest officials of this mill and the humblest employees. President John M. Reeves delivered an impressive address responded to by Mr. Hobart Hunter on behalf of the employees, which I herewith enclose.

Of course, I add my own personal congratulations to the fine people of this community.

The speeches follow:

SPEECH OF JOHN M. REEVES

Mr. Chairman, Colonel Gregory, distinguished guests, war workers of the Mills Mill organization of Woodruff, all battles are not fought on fighting fronts. Many are being waged and won right here at home. In your daily war work, you men and women are helping to provide our armed forces with clothing and fighting equipment, and as you improve the quality and increase the quantity of the fabrics you produce, you increase the effectiveness of those engaged in fighting the enemy. You thus take part in the great conflict yourselves and at all times may take pride in the fact that you are helping to speed the return of peace, freedom, and decency to a war-torn world.

Now recognition has come to you in the award of the Army and Navy E for the splendid work you are doing. May I state here flatly that no cotton textile plant in the United States has even approached your performance in all-out war effort. You were "going to town" on vital war fabrics long before many ever knew there were such places as Bataan, Corregidor, or Guadalcanal.

One of the fabrics you produce is the RR basket weave which goes into the blimps which perform so well on convoy duty. Undoubtedly, they are responsible for the destruction of many a German submarine—submarines which you men and women can take justifiable pride in having helped sink.

Another fabric you make is the famous type I wind-resistant twill, known as Byrd cloth. In speaking before the Southern Yarn Spinners Association, Quartermaster General Gregory of the Army praised this vital war fabric as the best substitute for fur. He urged the mills which wanted to do something really worth while for the war effort to make this cloth; yet to date you folks here at Mills Mill No. 2 are the only ones in the United States who have been able to produce this cloth satisfactorily and in quantity. An indication of the importance of this fabric is its adoption for use in Army field jackets, Navy summer flight clothing such as suits, jackets, and helmets, and Navy sleeping bags. In fact, we understand that 22 Byrd cloth sleeping bags were part of the equipment on President Roosevelt's plane to Casablanca.

You are helping save lives, too, for one fabric you make goes into life rafts. The cloth you fashioned with such care and patience may well have enabled Dixon and his 2 companions to withstand wind and wave for 34 days and Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker and his crew to survive for 21 days—until rescued from their tiny yet dependable life rafts floating in the middle of a storm-tossed sea. Still another life-saving fabric is your heavy satin which goes into inflatable life vests for military fliers.

You have made a further outstanding contribution in your tremendous production of airplane cloth and heavy 2-ply balloon cloth. This latter fabric is going into enormous quantities of Navy foul-weather clothing which is protecting our sailors day in and day out from wind, rain, and cold.

Some of you may have thought your particular tasks humble and unimportant, yet truly every man and woman among you is making a mighty contribution toward winning the war.

I am sure this is one of the proudest days of your lives, as it is of mine—to witness this raising of the Army-Navy E flag. Let us make our pledge now that it will continue to proudly fly with a service star added for each new 6 months' record of continued high production.

SPEECH OF HOBART HUNTER

We, the employees of Mills Mill, deeply appreciate the honor which has been bestowed upon us. We feel like we have achieved this goal only to set a higher one for larger and better production.

From our midst have gone 150 boys into the services of our country. We pay tribute to these boys who not only have helped to win this production award, but have sacrificed even more than we have for this great cause.

We realize this honor is given us because of the obstacles we have overcome in getting out the production for our armed forces and we realize that without the help of every person at home, our armed forces could not carry on, as they are doing so well, in this struggle for freedom.

In behalf of the employees of Mills Mill No. 2, we accept this honor and its accompanying challenge to continue in our achievements.

Pay-As-You-Earn Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D. WINTER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, in response to the demand of the people of this Nation for pay-as-you-earn tax legislation, the Ways and Means Committee of the House over 2 months ago began working on legislation presumably to place the individual income taxpayers of this Nation on a pay-as-you-earn basis. We, as the representatives of the people, are now considering whether we are going to accept the fruits of their labor as the answer to the demands of our constituents.

The Democratic majority of the committee has brought forth a bill, H. R. 2218, which is entitled "A bill to provide a method for the payment currently of individual income taxes and for other purposes" Briefly, this bill provides for a withholding tax at the source of 20 percent on salaries and wages beginning next July 1. The funds so withheld are to be applied either in payment of the tax due on 1942 income or to the payment of the 1943 tax assessment. However, in order to have the funds so withheld apply on the 1943 tax assessment the taxpayer must first pay his 1942 tax in full. If the taxpayer is fortunate enough to have sufficient cash to pay his entire 1942 tax assessment in addition to the 20 percent withheld from his salary or wages during 1943, plus the first and second quarterly payments which he has been required to make under existing law, he then becomes current. Or, if the taxpayer's income is other than salaries he must, in order to become current, under the committee bill, pay his 1942 tax assessment in full and by June 15, 1943, pay the estimated amount of his tax for 1943 if he desires to take the 6-percent discount provided by the terms of the bill.

The bill provides that a taxpayer who has paid his tax for the calendar year of 1942 is entitled to a discount of 6 percent if he pays the estimated tax he owes on his 1943 income tax by June 15, 1943. This discount does not apply if all or a part of the taxpayer's income consists of salaries or wages. Such a taxpayer will be entitled to only a 3-percent discount on the amounts withheld during the calendar year 1943 which is applied against his 1943 tax.

The bill also provides in the case of voluntary advance payments made in 1944 or subsequent years, after the tax reported by the taxpayer on his return for the past year has been paid in full, that the taxpayer is entitled to a discount of 4 percent if he pays the estimated amount of his taxes for such year in full by March 15. This discount, however, does not apply to payments withheld at the source in 1944 or subsequent years. Such a taxpayer will be entitled to only a 2-percent discount on the amounts withheld at the source in 1944 and subsequent years.

In other words, the committee bill makes a distinction between the taxpayer whose taxes are withheld at the source and the taxpayer with an independent income other than salaries or wages. Under this bill the taxpayer whose tax is withheld at the source is precluded from taking advantage of the 6-percent discount for 1943 or the 4-percent discount for 1944 and subsequent years,

even though such taxpayer has the cash to pay his estimated tax in full for such year or years. The taxpayer who has an income other than from salaries or wages is allowed a greater discount under the provisions of the bill than the taxpayer whose taxes are withheld at the source. As I read this committee bill, this, in brief, is the committee's solution to the demand for a pay-as-you-earn current system for collecting income taxes.

This bill does not provide a genuine pay-as-you-earn tax system for a majority of the taxpayers and it does not place a majority of the taxpayers on a current basis. It actually will place only that small minority on a current basis who are financially able to pay 2 years' tax assessment in one. The taxpayer with plenty of money—the rich man—or the well-to-do—will take advantage of the discount provisions of this bill and take his 6 percent discount in 1943 and his 4 percent in all subsequent years and in 25 years he will have received a discount of 1 full year's tax which will be a fairly good investment when you consider the fact that the interest on Government bonds is only around 2 to 2½ percent.

Every Member of this House should ask himself: How many people in my district of moderate means and small incomes will be in a position to take advantage of such an investment? And remember this, 90 percent of the people of the average congressional district are people of small incomes and moderate means, whose average yearly incomes fluctuate but very little from year to year.

The salaried people and the wage earners of your district, by the provisions of this committee bill, are precluded from taking advantage of this investment even though some of them are capable of doing so. How many farmers in your district can pay 2 years' taxes in 1? How many laboring men can? How many small businessmen can? Most of them are broke now and hanging on by the skin of their teeth. How many professional men can, such as school teachers, doctors, lawyers, insurance men, and salesmen? How about the people who have not received a raise in pay who are receiving the same pay they did a year ago, or 2 years ago, the clerks and bookkeepers in the many small business places throughout your district? With taxes at an all-time high it is going to be all the taxpayers in this category can do to get together enough money to pay 1 year's tax and the result will be that only about 10 percent—the rich and those in the high income brackets—will become current and thereby entitled to receive a reduction in their income tax, while the other 90 percent, an overwhelming majority of the taxpayers, will continue to pay their taxes in full and still be 1 year behind in the payment of their tax assessments.

It is perfectly clear to me that the discount provisions and the method provided for the taxpayer to become current in this committee bill will benefit only a small minority rather than the overwhelming majority of the taxpayers whose present tax obligation is a serious financial problem and who are most in need of having their tax payments placed on a current basis, not only for protection to themselves but also to assure the Government that the tax will be paid.

The advocates of the committee bill charge that the Carlson bill, which will be offered as a substitute for the committee bill, is a rich man's bill; that it works a hardship on the poor while conferring special favors to the well-to-do; that it will create new war millionaires; that it will shift a part of the tax burden from the few at the upper end of the income scale to the many in the middle and lower end; that it will shift tax burdens from old taxpayers to new taxpayers; and that the Federal Government will lose $10,000,000,000 in revenue.

These charges are fantastic and ridiculous. The enactment of the Carlson bill into law would actually increase current Government revenue rather than reduce it, for the simple reason that it would substitute 1943 incomes for 1942 incomes as a base for paying income taxes in 1943. And it is agreed by the Treasury experts that the anticipated income tax received for 1943 will be at least $3,000,000,000 more than 1942.

The Carlson bill would not shift the tax burden from the old taxpayers to new taxpayers. New taxpayers becoming subject to income tax for the first time in 1943 will be required to pay exactly the same tax under either the Carlson bill or the committee bill.

The Carlson bill will not shift the tax burden from the few in the upper end of the tax scale to the majority at the middle and lower end. There is positively no shift in the tax burden from one group to another under the provisions of the Carlson bill. The few in the upper tax brackets will pay only 1 year's tax each year under existing law and that is exactly what they will be required to do under the Carlson bill right along with the medium and small taxpayers, and it will not reduce or increase the amount of taxes of the middle or lower brackets one cent.

The Carlson bill will not confer special favors on the well-to-do nor will it create new war millionaires. Under existing law, all well-to-do taxpayers and those in the upper income brackets will pay only 1 year's tax each year and that is precisely what they will do under the provisions of the Carlson bill. For example, under the Carlson bill, a person who had a net taxable income of $100,000 in 1941 and by reason of a war contract had a net taxable income of a million dollars in 1942 and $750,000 in 1943, will pay into the Federal Treasury for his 1943 tax payment $1,029,000, under the Carlson bill, instead of $854,000 under existing law. And if such person made another million dollars in 1942, under the Carlson bill, he would pay $854,000 into the Federal Treasury and he will continue to pay in 1945 and all succeeding years unless he dies or loses his income.

All this talk about the rich escaping tax liability just does not make sense to me because in the transition from the 1942 tax base to the 1943 tax base under the Carlson bill, as it will be presented to the committee, those in the upper tax brackets will pay a much higher rate in making the transition than those in the middle and lower brackets and they do not have any choice about it and do not get a 4-percent deduction in their tax liability for the rest of their lives.

I was very much interested in the statement made by the very able and distinguished statesman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], that under the Carlson bill we would skip a year's taxes. And also his statement that under the committee bill we would not pay 2 years' taxes in 1 to become current. I trust you will pardon the personal reference but I spent quite some time last evening trying to figure out how I would skip a year's taxes. For example, let us go back to 1940. I paid income tax in 1940, 1941, and 1942 and the first quarter of 1943. Now, suppose the Carlson bill is adopted. It so happens that my income for 1943 will be somewhat higher than it was in 1942 and my tax liability for 1943 will be increased and I will pay that increase in 1943. I will again pay income tax in 1944. But suppose my income falls off in 1944 to what it was in 1942. I would then pay in 1944 the same amount I would have paid on my 1942 income under existing law before the Carlson bill was adopted. Up to this point the Government has not lost a dime on the transaction. In 1945 I fall below my 1942 income and, of course, I will pay the Government less income tax on that particular year but the next year, 1946, my income rises to the 1943 level, I again pay more. In 1947 my income is still higher and I again pay more tax and this procedure will go on, up and down, until my income falls below the tax level or I die. And then, and only then, will the Government fail to receive a tax payment from me.

I just cannot figure out how I could get current under the committee bill without paying 2 years' tax in 1. Going back again to 1940 I paid income tax for 1940, 1941, and 1942, and the first quarter of 1943. Now let us suppose the committee bill becomes law and on June 15, 1943, I decide that I want to become current in my taxes under the bill. What do I have to do? I would have to pay the remaining three quarter payments that I still owe and another full year's tax payment by December 15, 1943. I would then be current. Thereafter, I pay income tax in 1944 and 1945 and on January 1, 1946, I die. That is 6 tax years and I have paid 7 full tax-year assessments and you cannot make anything else out of it. And it will take something more than a fireside chat to convince the people of my district that they do not have to pay 2 years' tax assessments in one to become current under the committee bill.

The advocates of the committee bill charge that those of us who are supporting the Carlson bill are favoring 60 millionaires. That is absolutely untrue insofar as I am concerned. None of those 60 millionaires live in my district. If there is a millionaire in my district I am not acquainted with him.

I am trying to favor the 300,000 people of my district who are overwhelmingly in

favor of the Carlson bill. They are coal miners, lead and zinc miners, oilfield workers, farmers, laborers, small businessmen, and professional men—not millionaires—who, by reason of the New Deal having wasted billions of the taxpayers' dollars during the past 10 or 11 years know that they must have their tax obligations placed on a current basis if they are to escape a serious postwar catastrophe. I hope that the Carlson bill will be adopted.

Government Hoarding of Food

REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have already called the attention of the House to charges that New Deal agencies are depriving millions of people of the privilege of securing essential foodstuffs while hoarding in warehouses millions of pounds of food to be later given away.

Surely at a time when the country is faced with the heaviest tax bill in its history due in a great part to the necessity of paying for the war effort and in great part also to the misuse and bungling of the taxpayer's moneys by New Deal bureaucrats, the money appropriated by the Congress should not be used to permit some Federal theorists to engage in hoarding the very foodstuffs which millions of people need and are improperly deprived of.

Additional evidence has been presented to me by the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers Association which indicates that the New Deal has hoarded in the warehouses of Massachusetts alone sufficient food to feed fully 563,000 people for a month with food calling for more than 27,000,000 ration points.

Among the hoarded foods I note 2,400,000 cans of milk, 555,317 pounds of beans, 113,652 pounds of peanut butter, 176,266 pounds of cheese, 71,000 cans of grapefruit, 572,592 cans of evaporated milk, and 274,330 pounds of pork and beans.

When the people of Massachusetts complained to the Secretary of Agriculture a few days ago and demanded that the hoarded foodstuffs be placed in the normal channels of trade, they were apparently punished by the administration by notice that the foodstuffs would be transferred out of the State.

I have urged an immediate investigation into the storage by the administration of food claimed to be surplus. I again urge this course of action.

Congress and the people are entitled to full particulars in respect to the storage of foodstuffs, including meats, claimed to be surplus with a view to making them available to the normal channels of trade for use in these difficult times by all the people.

I quote in this connection from a leading editorial appearing in yesterday's Washington Post, in part, as follows:

NO. 1 HOARDER

Charges are made from time to time that the Government is the Nation's chief hoarder.

When leading representatives of the food industries make such charges the time has certainly come for a searching inquiry to determine whether such allegations are well founded. Certainly the war effort will be hampered instead of being aided by hoarding supplies that are needed to maintain the health and strength of the working civilian population.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point a letter and two releases received from the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers Associations:

MASSACHUSETTS FEDERATION OF TAXPAYERS' ASSOCIATIONS, INC.,
Boston, March 25, 1943.

Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIGGLESWORTH: We are very grateful that you were willing to get our telegrams concerning Government hoarding of rationed foods into the RECORD. We hope the situation will shock Congress as it has shocked the people of Massachusetts

You will be interested to know that repeated efforts on our part to find out from the Department of Agriculture the total quantity of rationed foods now held as "surplus" by the Federal Government have been futile. Our confidential information is that the amount is enormous, perhaps enough to permit reduction of high ration point values if turned into normal trade channels. While rationed food is not involved in this case, you will be interested to know that in the warehouse in Quincy is stored enough wheat flour to give every family on relief in the area served nearly a half ton.

For your information, I enclose our releases on the subject. We sincerely trust that you will see fit to proceed further.

Very cordially yours,

NORMAN MACDONALD,
Executive Director.

While weary and discouraged housewives are trudging from store to store in often fruitless search for foodstuffs for their families, the Federal Government has in storage in a score of warehouses in Massachusetts as surplus food to be given away hundreds of thousands of cans, packages and bags of the very eatables that long ago disappeared from the shelves of the corner grocery, or which require high ration-point payment if they can be found at all.

The situation was revealed today by the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers Associations following an investigation of statements made at current hearings before the legislative ways and means committee when the State department of public welfare asked for an appropriation of $285,000 a year for 2 years to pay the salaries and other costs involved in carrying on the distribution of food which is surplus when the Government owns it, but severely rationed because of scarcity when the family tries to buy it.

"We have here uncovered an example of bureaucracy gone hog-wild," Norman MacDonald, executive director of the taxpayers federation, declared in disclosing the results of the federation's investigation.

"On the one hand, Office of Price Administration scourges our people as hoarders. On the other hand, an Office of Price Administration sister bureau, dealing with so-called surplus commodities, proves itself to be the greatest hoarder in history and then has the colossal gall to ask us as taxpayers to put up $570,000 to help to finance the Government's own 'black market'.

"Perhaps someone in the Government will try to laugh it off. But every citizen will be shocked and resentful to learn that on March 1 there were stored in this State, to be given away, rationed foods having a value of 27,087,000 ration points, or a full month's ration of 48 points for 563,000 people. And those in charge say they have been handling a surplus of 3,000,000 pounds a month, or a minimum of 24,000,000 points—enough for a half million people; according to the O. P. A. doctrine of scarcity.

"The people of this State have cooperated without complaint in a program of self-denial and hardship because they were told it was necessary. Now who can they believe? If Massachusetts has these millions of pounds of rationed food to give away, how many millions or billions of pounds must be hidden elsewhere in the country? Who is being kidded, Secretary Wickard, the Washington bedlam of bureaus, or plain John Citizen again?

"For instance, Massachusetts women have been able to buy little or no lard for their pies for many weeks. Yet the Government, on its own figures, has more than a ton of it in the State labeled 'surplus,' which it wants to give away.

"The traditional Saturday bean pot hasn't been going into ovens here for more than 2 months. The reason—no beans at the grocers. But Uncle Sam's bureaucrats have 555,317 pounds of 'surplus' white beans stored here to be given away at the first opportunity.

"While the situation has not been quite as acute so far as canned milk is concerned, housewives who have felt lucky if they could pick up an occasional can or two will be at least interested to know that a 'surplus' of some 2,400 000 cans has been in storage here, requiring a force of men to turn the cases over from time to time so that the milk will not spoil.

"Butter was declared frozen by Office of Price Administration officials this week and housewives have been scurrying here and there trying to find some suitable substitute. Peanut butter would be acceptable, and hardly any is available. But in warehouses in Massachusetts 113,652 pounds are carefully stored.

"Yesterday we had a cheese panic according to the papers and today a grocer with a pound of cheese on his shelf would be mobbed. Yet there are 176,226 pounds of 'surplus' cheese on the Government list in this State.

"Most residents in this area have practically forgotten the taste of grapefruit juice because of scarcity or lack of ration points with which to buy it. But 71,000 cans were awaiting distribution from the Government store here—and we might add, try and get one. It might be pertinent to state at this point that 16 cars—and that is cars and not cans—have been canceled.

"Tomatoes, soups, pears, peaches, prunes, and various other vegetables and fruits are also stored here in abundance.

"Here is another feature of the picture that undoubtedly will make a hit with food-worried wives and mothers. Because the State Department of Public Welfare could not use these commodities, 572,592 cans of evaporated milk, 29,000 pounds of dried milk, and 274,330 pounds of canned pork and beans have been returned to the Federal Government for distribution elsewhere.

"Can this be how our domestic heroes plan to win the war on the home front?"

Following is a table of foods and quantities on hand in the State on March 1, and the ration-coupon value of the various items:

Federal commodities in storage in Massachusetts, Mar. 1, 1943

Commodity	Total available		Ration per pound	Points total
	Pounds	*Cans*		
Apples	89,207			
Dried beans	555,317		8	4,442,536
Wheat cereal	148,339			
Corn meal	153,055			
Graham flour	137,705			
Wheat flour	336,327			
Lard	2,440			
Rolled oats	116,470			
Dried prunes	16,949		20	338,980
Tangerines	2,300			
Evaporated milk	2,241,842	2,473,757		
Blackeyed beans	3,349		8	26,792
Cheese	176,226			
Dehydrated eggs	44,695			
Dehydrated milk	178,090			
Dehydrated soup	21,323		16	341,168
Peanut butter	113,652			
Shelled walnuts	48,402			
Canned apples	1,930	965	8	15,440
Canned applesauce	142,888	71,444	8	1,143,104
Canned beets	59,852	29,926	8	478,816
Canned carrots	3,272	1,636	11	35,992
Cane sirup	2,251	536		
Grapefruit juice:				
18-ounce	8,901	7,877	8	71,208
46-ounce	69,224	24,036	8	553,792
Grapefruit segments (processed)	2,016	1,008	8	16,128
Grapefruit segments	252	202	8	2,016
Canned peaches	133,501	73,656	11	1,468,511
Canned pears	67,287	37,124	11	740,157
Canned pork and beans	1,038,794	552,550	8	8,310,352
Canned tomatoes:				
20-ounce	512,256	409,805	13	6,659,328
28-ounce	187,488	107,136	13	2,437,344
Tomatoes, process canned	1,236	618	13	16,068
Total	6,616,836	3,791,976		27,097,732
Value	$875,823.65			

Following is a list of warehouses in Massachusetts where the commodities are stored: Athol, 574 South Street, Jessie McRea, supervisor; Brockton, South Skinner Street, Harold F. Minnock, supervisor; Charlestown, Medford and Terminal Streets, Ivers J. Rutherford, supervisor; Fall River, Alden Street, William E. O'Donnell, supervisor; Fitchburg, Fire Alarm Building, Elm Street, Philip F. Watson, supervisor; Greenfield, Old County Courthouse, Julia F. Powers, supervisor; Gloucester, 10 Pearce Street, Norman S. Hannibal, supervisor; Haverhill, 69 Essex Street, Arthur J. Bourneuf, supervisor; Hyannis, 257 Main Street, Emily F. Lawrence, supervisor; Lawrence, Everett Mills, 15 Union Street, Stephen McNaughton, supervisor; Lee, 51 Housatonic Street, Stephen J. Dohoney, supervisor; Lowell, 324 Jackson Street, John J. Keefe, supervisor; Marlboro, Weade and Court Streets, Mary G. Manning, supervisor; Milford, 161 Central Street, Frederick V. Casey, supervisor; New Bedford, Potter Building, Homer P. Welch, supervisor; Newburyport, Hannah Building, Prince Place, Eleanor S. Steele, supervisor; Northampton, 196 Pleasant Street, John J. Griffin, supervisor; Pittsfield, 100 Columbus Avenue, Samuel J. Reynolds, supervisor; Plymouth, Old High School, Lincoln Street, Frank E. Butts, supervisor; Quincy, 166 Washington Street, John J. Riley, supervisor; Salem, 19 Endicott Street, Frank T. Oldson, supervisor; Springfield, 54 Waltham Avenue, Edward T. Crimmins, supervisor; Taunton, Eastern Ice Co., Edwin A. Dunn, supervisor; Worcester, 53 Hermon Street, Joseph F. Quinn, supervisor; and West Roxbury State warehouse.

Reports from Washington yesterday afternoon that in view of disclosure by the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers Associations that huge quantities of rationed foods were being hoarded in Federal warehouses in the Commonwealth, stocks would be removed from the State last night brought from Norman MacDonald, executive director of the taxpayers federation, fresh attacks upon the Government's food policy.

"The arbitrary and resentful action of the Department of Agriculture in ordering the removal of so-called surplus stocks of rationed food from Massachusetts is typical of the shocking mishandling of the whole food situation and of the arrogant disregard with which appeals from citizens are met," MacDonald declared.

"Today we asked in a formal telegram to the Secretary of Agriculture that so-called surplus stocks, wherever they exist in the country, be released into the regular channels of trade or turned over to the military services. The result has been, as might be expected, no direct reply from the Department but a general pronunciamento that stocks in Massachusetts were to be removed. Thus the Department, which has been fostering an intolerable situation, shows no interest in righting a wrong; it merely wants to punish Massachusetts because someone has had courage enough to bring to light the strange and unhappy shenanigans in which a major Federal agency has been engaged.

"There is not one word about taking the vast stocks of rationed foods held in other parts of the country. Apparently those are going to be held to prove the impossible point that surplus and scarcity can exist in the same place at the same time. Only in Massachusetts is the whip to be cracked by our putative political masters. Well, that has been tried before, and the voice of the Commonwealth has never been stilled, as Washington ought to know by this time.

"There is no reason why citizens should back-water in the face of such an occurrence as this, duly attested by reputable witnesses.

"Last summer the Federal Government ordered from Massachusetts farmers great quantities of surplus apples which were to be given to school lunch projects. The specifications were that the minimum size of the apples was to be 2¼ inches. The summer of 1942 was unusually good for apples, and they grew much larger than usual. The farmers packed their crates with these large apples at the same price and sent them to Ayer for shipment. One day an interpretation of the specifications was received to the effect that at least one of the apples had to be exactly 2¼ inches in diameter; the rest could be larger.

"When this interpretation was received at Ayer, 3 cars were on the tracks there and already loaded with 540 cases each. The farmers had to get some sixteen-hundred-odd apples exactly 2¼ inches in diameter, break into each of the sixteen-hundred-odd cases already loaded in the cars, to say nothing of cases they had already packed on their farms, and insert one of these 2¼-inch apples in each case. Now don't disbelieve this. It is true.

"During the day State officials have been making explanations. We desire to point out that no criticism has been made by us, and none has been intended, of any State department or official, or of any municipal agency for accepting gifts of Federal food. Neither do we object to the use that has been made of the food received. That is not the point.

"The point is that today a starvation diet of meat and butter has been announced close on the heels of a tight ration of canned goods, and with every householder in the country deeply concerned about feeding his family, his Government can find and give away millions of pounds of the things the citizen cannot buy. There simply cannot be a shortage of beans and lard and tomatoes in Boston or Springfield and a surplus of the same commodities in the same places at the same time. But this is what we are asked to believe. The result is that we don't know what to believe.

"We can only believe what our eyes and ears tell us—that just as rationing restrictions tighten desperately about us, 27,000,000 ration points' worth of foods that are scarce or unobtainable on the open market are available as a 'surplus free of charge to those who can attain the status of relief client. These foods aren't for defense workers, the 'men behind the men behind the guns,' or their families. They are for those whose nutritional needs are far lower—for those who do not work at all.

"The issue will not be settled by taking out of Massachusetts what has been uncovered here and hurrying it off to some other place of concealment. It will be settled only when sanity returns (if that's not too much to ask) to the Department of Agriculture, and every single pound of rationed food now held as 'surplus' is turned over to the military services or into the regular channels of trade. No shrugging of official shoulders and no laughter from official throats will stop us in our determination to get this result so that everyone in America may have an equal chance at whatever food there is.

"If the Department of Agriculture will not listen and will not act, we are confident that we can turn to Congress and get immediate action, if that is necessary, to restore reason and sense to food distribution. We will not support a Federal black market."

The federation today sent the following telegram to Claude A. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, and Prentiss Brown, Office of Price Administration Administrator:

"Investigation here shows more than 6,000,000 pounds of rationed foods with a value of more than 27,000,000 ration points were held in Federal warehouses in Massachusetts on March 1 as 'surplus' to be given away while same food items are either nonexistent in local markets or have high ration point value. This must be but small fraction of quantity of rationed foods held as 'surplus' in all parts of country while serious shortages of same products exist in open market. Urge steps at once to get release of this food either to military services or to regular channels of trade so that civilian supply may rise. Sure you will recognize that it is unconscionable that American householders should be unable to buy necessary food from local merchants while a Federal agency hoards vast quantities on shockingly false ground that it is 'surplus.'"

Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest being manifested and in view of the problem of air transportation which the Congress will be called upon to analyze and attempt to solve, under unanimous consent to extend my

remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an opinion of the attorney general of South Carolina in response to a request of the director of the South Carolina Aeronautics Commission:

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Columbia, March 18, 1943.

Hon. DEXTER C. MARTIN,
Director, South Carolina Aeronautics Commission, Columbia, S. C.

MY DEAR MR. MARTIN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 22 with reference to House bill 1012, which has been introduced in the United States House of Representatives; and a companion bill in the United States Senate. You are apprehensive that this bill violates States' rights, and ask my opinion as to its general effect.

In reply, I advise that section 3 proposes to amend section 1 (3) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by defining "air commerce" to mean "the operation or navigation of aircraft (a) upon any landing area in the United States or in the air space overlying the United States and any other space in the United States," etc. The above wording seems to make every place on the earth, over the earth, and any other place in the United States subject to the Aeronautics Commission, without regard to whether the commerce referred to is intrastate or interstate.

Section 4 proposes to amend section 1 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by adding a new section (4) which defines the words "air contractor" to mean "any person who undertakes, whether directly or indirectly, or by a lease or any other arrangement, and whether as a forwarder or otherwise, to engage in interstate air commerce."

If the meaning assigned to air commerce by the proposed amendment to section (3) is adopted then air contractors who undertake directly or indirectly under any arrangement to engage in air commerce would be entitled to use air-landing areas, air space overlying the United States as well as any other place in the United States. The United States Supreme Court has held that when the United States agencies go into a field, such as interstate commerce, under authority granted—its occupancy thereof may at the will of such agency become exclusive. The Interstate Commerce Commission is now stopping intrastate railroads and ordering their abandonment—without regard to the recommendation or wish of the State authorities or State law.

Air contractors whether directly or indirectly engaged in interstate commerce, as defined above, I presume would have the right to conduct same in accordance with the above definition of air commerce.

In addition to the above definitions of air commerce by section 6, section 1 (20) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended, is proposed to mean as follows:

(20) "Interstate air commerce" shall mean "the carriage by aircraft of persons or property for compensation or hire in commerce" between (a) "a place in any State of the United States * * * and any other place in any State of the United States * * * of the United States."

SEC. 7. Section 1 (21) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, shall read as follows:

(21) "Interstate air transportation" means "the carriage by aircraft of persons or property as a common carrier for compensation or hire or the carriage of mail by aircraft, in commerce between: (a) "a place in any State of the United States and any other place in any State of the United States."

Under "Findings and declaration of policy" we see "for the reasons hereinafter enumerated * * * development of civil aeronautics as a vital national asset for the national defense, the national commerce, the Postal Service, and the general welfare, require the national regulation and promotion of the operation and navigation of all civil aircraft using the air space of the United States * * * and the national regulation and promotion of all civil aeronautical enterprises involving transportation by aircraft in such air space or commerce." In other words no civil aeronautical enterprise—even though intrastate—would be allowed to function without fully complying with any and all regulations of the United States governing "transportation by aircraft."

Section 2 (a) (3) seeks to reserve the air space, referred to in preceding sections—primarily to be used as an instrumentality of military and postal operations and of commerce among the several States—and that the air cannot be "confined to defined and limited airways."

Section 2 (a–1), (3b), (1) declares the development and regulation of civil aeronautics both for commerce and for pleasure shall be subject to unified national planning and control.

Section 16 proposes to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 as amended by a declaration of policy:

Section 3100 (a) states it to be "essential to the proper development and protection of military aeronautics, air commerce * * * and o the protection of the value of the investment of funds of the United States in landing areas and other air navigation facilities that there be carried out a unified program of regulating the height and location of structures and of objects of natural growth in the vicinity of landing areas and in other places where the safety or freedom of aerial navigation may otherwise be impaired." It speaks of funds invested by the United States needing safeguarding and protection, but makes no reference to either individuals or corporations who may have made similar investments. The proposal not only tells the height and the location to give ear; but it goes on and even calls upon the "objects of natural growth in the vicinity of landing fields and in other places" to trim their wings and grow their leaves subject to regulations from Washington. It says to be sure that none of these objects transgress the bounds decided upon in Washington—developments contemplated are to be under an agency of the United States. It does consent that the States may cooperate but the power to do is in the Washington agency.

Section 3100 (c) declares an easement to exist throughout the air space of the United States for the purpose of aerial navigation.

It has heretofore been declared to be the law that the owner of the fee in real estate owns the space over his real estate to the sky. No thought is given to compensating such owner of property for the taking of his property right in the said space over his possessions. He must keep quiet while all kinds of airplanes roar and carry on navigation for profit over his home.

Section 3102 gives the Administrator the power to formulate a Nation-wide program for zoning for the purposes of aerial navigation in the vicinity of landing areas and in such other places as may be appropriate.

Section 3103 does direct the Administrator to invite the cooperation of States in the formulation of these zoning programs. It even directs him to encourage the administration of such programs by local agencies in order to decentralize such administration to the greatest possible degree. After what has gone before in the way of centralizing, few would be bold enough to attempt to decentralize. It would be far better to outline a program forbidding centralization except for purposes of Army and Navy forces.

Section 3104 says—in case the local agencies do not cooperate, as the Administrator thinks they should—he may then establish air safety areas about any landing area. The only check is that he must notify the Governor of the State. It is clear if the Administrator speaks—opposition will be useless—under the language—which contains such unlimited power and discretion.

Safeguards to the rights of property owners should be specific in the law. After the Administrator files, in the office where deeds are recorded, the boundary lines of the safety area—the landowner is apparently helpless—if the method of getting rid of his hard-earned interests is as dogmatic as it seems.

By section 3105 (d) "smokestacks," "radio towers," "chimney", or "similar structures" which exceed 150 feet in height above the ground, etc., are to be changed or cleared or "altered" as may be ordered by the Administrator. By subsection (e) in what the Administrator considers an emergency, he may issue order to owners to do certain things without notice and hearing.

After all is set, in accordance with orders of Administrators, a trembling landowner or other person affected, on petition, may go to court and have an order reviewed by the United States District Court in the district where structure or object is located or in which such person resides. Usually persons sue where they reside.

Section 3107 (a) deals with compensation, but limits the amount and justice of such compensation to be determined by the Administrator by order, after notice and opportunity for hearing. After the Administrator has acted and ordered the chance of getting a fair additional price is difficult. (This procedure is that, however, which is generally followed in condemnation actions.) The burden is placed upon the person seeking review of compensation order to show inadequacy of amount—as it is provided such sum fixed by the Administrator's order is presumed adequate. No jury trial or review is made mandatory or is such referred to. Compliance with order of Administrator is required whether or not a review proceeding is instituted. The Administrator and public must be notified by all persons—form of notice to be fixed by Administrator, of construction or alterations of structures contemplated by them—if in safety aerial zone.

Section 417 (b) allows the Government authority to utilize private person, or its own members or employees or those of other Government agencies as arbiters. This is not, in my opinion, a proper provision. No "member" whose act is under question should be eligible to review a matter in which he is interested—as a member of a department. No employee who wishes to retain his job would feel free to decide against his department or boss. Arbitrators should be independent of the question or organization up for arbitration.

Section 4100 (b) comes close to delegating legislative power when it confers upon the authority the right to "make such classifications of air contractors, according to geographical sections, types, or otherwise, as it may deem to be in the public interest" and to "make any provision of this title inapplicable to any or all air contractors or classes of air contractors for such periods, or until such time, as it may deem to be in the public interest." Why go to such detail in legislation and then place it in discretion of an agency to chop it up to suit its ideas? Who would know what the law is to be? He would have to await the decision of the agency.

Section 4101 (e) seems to only allow a person who is operating as an air contractor who is operating at the time section (a) becomes applicable to continue to operate until the authority has passed upon his or its application for a license, if it or he makes application within a certain number of days.

Section 802 (a) makes air commerce a matter of special national interest. It pro-

hibits any State, Territory, or subdivision to regulate air commerce or to impose or enforce any regulation in a manner which hinders, burdens, or interferes with the free flow of such commerce or substantially impairs uniformity in the conditions pursuant to which such commerce is conducted throughout the United States. We know how similar provisions in regard to other interstate commerce have been construed. The rights of the States have practically been destroyed. State railroads have been ordered abandoned over the protest of State commissions and over the earnest plea of the State.

Section 802 (b) forbids to the State the right to tax, assess, or levy upon any air carrier, except perhaps to a very limited extent.

Section 48 adds a new section to section 1005 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, giving to any person, within a time fixed by the Authority the right to make application for reconsideration of any order made by the Authority. But such application is not to excuse any person from complying with or obeying any order of the Authority or operate in any manner to stay or postpone the enforcement thereof—without special order of the Authority. This arrangement makes it reasonable to expect that the Authority will find few occasions where it feels its order is wrong to the extent of granting the application for review, and if it does grant it the order under review will be carried out in the meantime. No real good will come from such provision to the party aggrieved.

Section 211 seems to omit some words between the words "shall be" on line 1 and "of inquiry" on line 2.

I have endeavored to point out some of the features which appear to intend to turn over to air travel all air spaces in the United States—regardless of who owns the fee in the land beneath. It is time for the Congress to determine whether or not the States and the people in them should have their rights protected or is the United States Government so far superior in its functioning as to justify treading the rights of the States and the people thereof under foot, as being of not much concern.

Yours very truly,

JOHN M. DANIEL,
Attorney General.

Oregon's Outstanding Contributions in Our War Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the people in my State of Oregon are making a great contribution to our war effort. In the production of aluminum, the construction of ships, the furnishing of lumber products, and the supplying of foods, fiber, and other agricultural products, they are helping to feed, clothe, and supply our fighting forces with munitions, ships, and fighting tools on the battle fronts of every continent. It is true that the hardships of rationing and other war measures are causing much suffering, distress, and sacrifice among our people, but they are taking it in their stride and are willing to make every sacrifice necessary to bring success to our efforts.

Pursuant to authority heretofore given, I include as a part of my remarks a factual study written by Agnes E. Meyer, and appearing in the Washington Post, in its issue of March 28, 1943, being a discussion of some of the problems faced by our people in Oregon and the way they are meeting and solving these problems. The article follows:

THERE'S NO SECRET ABOUT KAISER PRODUCTION—HEALTH AND WELFARE OF WORKERS EMPHASIZED

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

PORTLAND, OREG.—The Portland Oregonian on March 12 carried the headline "Meat to go on ration by April 1." The article says: "Food Administrator Wickard estimates that the amount of meat available would average in the neighborhood of 2 pounds, more or less, per week, per person."

That sounds like enough meat for the average civilian, but the shipyard workers, both men and women, who do an 8-hour shift, rain or shine, in the open, say that it is not enough for them. What is more alarming, these workers are now in danger of having no meat at all for several weeks.

Here are the facts concerning this crisis as outlined by Mr. John H. Luihn, whose job it is to feed a large proportion of the workers in the Kaiser Vancouver shipyard and dormitory, right around the clock.

THEORY FALLS THROUGH

He showed me his kitchens and food supply. The quality is very high—special extra eggs, the best butter and meat. "We feel our men must have the best food in order to do the best work," said Mr. Luihn, "but it is a job to feed our people under the rationing system and meat is our most serious problem. We must have meat for people who work hard during the night in the cold.

"Our women welders eat just as heavy as the men. They don't want salads. They have to have meat."

"Now, our proposition is this: The Office of Price Administration meat-slaughtering quota is a fixed percentage of what was sold here last year. But, in the meantime, the population in Vancouver has more than doubled. Also, people have more money and buy more meat. In the Vancouver shipyard alone, for example, in December we supplied 98,000 meals, but in February it had mounted to 160,000.

"The Office of Price Administration's argument is that the areas from which our additional population has come will ship to the crowded industrial centers. That is a fallacy because those areas are also using more meat. Besides, the price ceiling on meat is the same all over the country. The freight rate allowed from Chicago is $1.75 a hundred, whereas it actually costs $2.68 to get to Portland.

"How can the packers from the Middle West afford to ship it to us?

"Yesterday the Chamber of Commerce of Vancouver telephoned us that Vancouver would be out of meat the end of this week and can get no more until the next quota comes in April. Where are we going to get meat for our workers during the next 3 weeks, and where are they going to get their own meat? Those are the kind of regulations that force people into the "black market." At the yards we shall have to appeal to Washington if we are going to be able to feed our men, but appeals to Washington take too much time in an emergency situation.

SMALL ITEMS VITAL

"Then there is the rationing of canned goods. If we go on the point system we have only 2½ points of fruit and vegetables for each man per meal. When the Government reimburses us it give us three-fifths of 1 point. At that rate we could give each man only a teaspoonful of vegetables.

"In addition, there are small items that are important food in a shipyard, such as chewing gum and candy bars. If a man chews gum on the job it satisfies the desire for drink. Sugar is also an important substitute for alcohol. For people exposed to the elements this is a natural craving. We are already refusing gum to the clerical staff. Nevertheless, it is hard to get it for the men in the yards. Satisfaction and health of the worker depend on such little things.

"However, it is meat that is our most critical problem now. Either we feed the war workers properly or we slow up production."

I brought up a talk I had had with Lord Woolton, British Minister of Food, in which he told me that he had to release supplementary rations for workers in heavy industry if production was to be maintained. The weekly British meat ration is lower than ours. But every factory and shipyard over there employing more than 250 workers is compelled by law to establish a canteen for every shift, at which the workers can get nourishing meals at British restaurant prices, 12 cents for the daily meat course and 5 cents each for a thick soup and a dessert. These factory meals are extra and do not come out of the workers' ration cards.

CONTRAST IN ENGLAND

Another factor which Mr. Luihn brought out is that the American working man is accustomed to a nourishing diet. Whereas the British worker's food has been improved and his health built up to get a maximum production, our workers are taking a decrease in their normal rations. In Great Britain the worker's diet is given as much consideration as that of the soldier.

Not only the worker's food, but the whole background of his daily life is a major interest in the Kaiser shipyards.

Michael Miller, manager of the Vancouver yards, told me that such problems as housing, transportation, health, schools, and recreation programs have taken more of Mr. Edgar Kaiser's time and that of his executive staff for the past 6 months, than shipbuilding, because the management realizes that such problems are at the root of absenteeism and turnover. "We think we have the problem of transportation licked," he remarked, "but housing and the establishment of adequate facilities for these new communities are still on our minds."

The people and officials at Portland told me that there would never have been so much new housing in Portland if the Kaiser Co. had not begun construction of its own accord.

STANDARDS HIGH

On their recommendation I went to see Hudson House, which the Kaiser architect had planned on the basis of the company's experience at former engineering camps. It is the most attractive housing scheme I have seen, made of plywood with a cement finish, in a pleasant gray tone. It is a dormitory layout of 5,000 units divided amongst 13 separate buildings, one of which is for women. It has a fine recreation hall with gymnasium, game rooms, and library, a solid-looking theater built of brick which is fireproof.

The beauty of this building has psychological value bacause of its attractive appearance. Psychological values receive great consideration from the Kaiser Co. The bedrooms were large and pleasant. The women's toilet facilities contained two tubs, if they wished to do their own washing. There is an infirmary and a mess hall for 1,500 people. The dormitories are full, because life there is pleasant. Now that the Kaisers have finished these dormitories, the F. P. H. A. operates them.

A MAGIC CITY

Whether it is due to standards set by this dormitory project or to the drive that one feels in all the Kaiser executives, the volume, the design, and even the quality of the Federal housing projects in this Portland-Vancouver area are superior to any I have seen in my travels.

In Vancouver there are 21,000 units, in Portland 27,000 units, finished or under construction. Vanport, popularly known as Kaiserville, has to be seen to be believed. It reminds me of the magic cities that sprang up in the Arabian Nights. It is a mirage. If it were not so necessary, it would be a nightmare. The second largest city in Oregon, it harbors 40,000 people.

To mold this stiff mass of new habitations into the semblance of a live American community is the task which the Kaiser company has now set itself. They are daunted by nothing. They are planning more schools—there are five now—recreation programs, children's playgrounds, baseball fields. They were indignant when I saw them because the F. P. H. A. had called a halt on the planting of shrubbery. "How can anybody live there without some green trees?" Edgar Kaiser asked me.

How, indeed, said I, and wondered at this country of ours which produces executive geniuses who are just as much concerned about the comfort of the crew's quarters on the new tankers, about the parks in which the children of the workers can play with satisfaction, as they are about the production figures.

"From the outset," said Mr. Miller, "we recognized the relationship of proper housing and adequate community facilities to production because we have had much experience on engineering jobs in remote places.

KNOW THE PROBLEMS

"The way people live and the way their families are cared for is bound to be reflected in production. If members of the family are sick, the worker worries on the job or stays home to take care of them. If the single men have no recreation, they get morose. You have to treat workers like human beings, not like machines. I learned this because I grew up on the other side of the fence. I have been one of these people and lived under the same conditions. I know their problems."

Because of their realization of the close tie between welfare, health, and production, Henry Kaiser and his son, Edgar, founded the Permanent Hospital Foundation at Vancouver, to supplement the overcrowded hospital facilities of Portland. It is now on a 70-bed basis, but has 91 patients. However, the operating and X-ray rooms, the laboratory, offices, out-patient department, and kitchen were built to take care of 125 more beds. An addition is now being constructed that will be ready for occupancy on April 1.

The hospital is privately endowed by the family. The profits go back into the foundation. Its use is not confined to the employees, although they get preference. The hospital has a staff of 24 doctors, 80 nurses, and total personnel of 386. The building has charm. Equipment is the best.

PLAN PAYS FOR SELF

The company has also organized a health plan which gives the workers complete medical and hospital service for 60 cents per week. The preventive work is heavy, as the worker does not hesitate to consult the doctors frequently when he has medical insurance. The plan pays for itself. Unfortunately, it does not include the families of the workers. The American Medical Association would not allow it.

The Kaiser company is looking for additional manpower. Production, they say, is limited only by that. They need "a few more men—say 25,000—" and the leveling-off point will be at hand.

Much credit for the gathering of their army of workers is given by Mr. Jack Murray, the Kaiser personnel manager, to Mr. L. C. Stoll, State manpower commissioner. "He digs in and works hard. He also has excellent staffmen, familiar with the work. He was careful not to give a clearance for workers until we had enough housing. And before the houses were ready, he checked again to see if the furnishings had arrived. He combed the nonessential industries and put some 19,000 local men on the labor market in a month."

SENIORITY QUESTION

That last sentence reminded me that all through the country, even in Portland, there is a hitch in transferring people from nonessential to war industries. It is the question of seniority. We could tap an enormous source of labor supply were it not for the fact that the small employer, hard pressed as he is, tells his men that he won't take them back if they leave to do war work. With a position it has taken a lifetime of faithful effort to achieve, these workers in many a nonessential industry dare not leave for a temporary war job.

Who can blame them? Something like congressional action will be necessary, fixing the seniority status, before the Manpower Commission can pry these people loose from their quiet moorings and bring them into the maelstrom of war production.

No sooner had I arrived in Portland, than I received telephone messages from shipyard employees who asked to see me. Most of them were women who had never worked before. One of them, a merchant's wife, told me that she had become a welder in order to feel that she was making a war contribution.

"My son who died would have been 22 now and would have been in the Army. I am trying to do his bit for him."

These women wanted especially to register their indignation about the constant emphasis on absenteeism. "Of course, there are a few slackers, women who cannot stand the work and drop out, and some youngsters who want to have a good time; some drinking that makes Monday absentees. But most of us work whether we are sick or not."

This woman was coughing heavily, and yet she was bound for the graveyard shift that night. "As long as the women can stand, they go on working," she continued. "I'd like to see some of the Washington softies who talk about absenteeism do our jobs, night after night, regardless of snow and rain and wind. After all, there is a Liberty ship launched every other day. How can you put a ship in the water every other day unless the people are working?"

VIEWS ON UNIONS

When the women had finished what they had to say I brought up the question of labor unions. As everyone knows, the Kaiser shipyards have a closed-shop contract with the American Federation of Labor. The largest union is that of the Boilermakers, Shipbuilders, Welders and Helpers, Local 72, under the leadership of Mr. Tom Ray. This local, with a membership of 110 before the shipyards began, now has more than 60,000 on the rolls. The Congress of Industrial Organizations has appealed to the National Labor Relations Board to hold an election and allow the workers to choose their own union.

The rivalry between the unions has been discussed from one end of our country to the other, but as no one has asked the workers to make a statement of their point of view, I was curious to hear what this group of intelligent women thought about the matter.

"We are sick and tired of the unions," they replied without hesitation. "We have to pay them a lot of money and what do we get for it? If we ever get a chance to vote, most of the shipyard workers will vote for no union. But if we have to take a union, we'll just take the one that's cheapest, and that's the C. I. O."

This resentment was leveled at the boilermakers union because it charges an initiation fee of $50 and dues of $2.50 a month. The palatial marble headquarters which this union built at a cost of $270,000, and which has had so much publicity, seems to be the least important of Mr. Tom Ray's mistakes. The workers resent the lavish use of their funds for this handsome, modern structure, but they resent even more the fact that they are not welcome in the building above the first floor, where initiation fees and dues are handed across the counter. My group of women resented especially the fact that they have to pay the dues without being eligible for membership. Negroes also are excluded from this white man's union.

MR. RAY EXPLAINS

In order to be certain that these excited women were not exaggerating, I called upon Mr. Ray and watched the long line of workers who were that day contributing to the millions of dollars he has collected in the last 2 years.

Mr. Ray was out, but he very kindly called me on the telephone later in the day. He informed me that his local could not alter the regulations of the International Boilermakers Union concerning Negro membership. It would take a convention vote to do that. "At Portland and Vancouver auxiliary unions have been set up for the Negroes," he added. "But many of them have refused to join." As a result, numbers of skilled workers were lost to the Portland area.

Mr. Henry Kaiser cleared his position on this important question by a letter of transmission on the Negro question. The company hires and upgrades Negro workers whenever possible. His attitude toward the problem was summed up for me by a local man, to whom he said:

"Come one, come all, black or white; it's all the same to me."

But the worst situation that has been created for the city of Portland is a clause in Mr. Ray's contract which prohibits preemployment medical examinations. I called up Dr. C. R. Fargher, director of the Portland County-City Department of Health, and asked what effect this was having in the community.

"The fact that we cannot give preemployment medical examinations is creating our most important and our most permanent health problem," said Dr. Fargher. "It is going to cost us a lot of money. We already know that the tuberculosis and venereal-disease rate is going up. We see many active cases of tuberculosis who come to us for treatment. We know these men and try to do what we can for them.

CAN'T STAND EXPOSURE

"People with active cases of tuberculosis are coming here, get sick because they cannot stand the exposure, and come to the hospital. We know also that there is an increase of syphilis. But tuberculosis makes a long-term problem. It is an expensive disease to treat and as many of those who break down will remain here, there will be a great financial drain on our community. In addition, they will infect our own people."

The Kaiser Co. succeeded in negotiating an agreement with the Boilermakers' Union by which workers who are to be transported to the Portland area are given a medical examination at the point of embarkation. I asked Dr. Fargher whether this was helpful. "Not in the least," he relied emphatically. "Most States haven't laws with teeth that can keep these people at home. They see the big money here and, sick or not sick, they come to make the money. Besides, most of them come under their own steam and avoid the check-up at home. I do not

know what can be done about it, but it certainly puts Portland in a bad spot."

UNION'S JUSTIFICATION

The shipyards are also handicapped by this clause in their contract. Many of the workers leave because they cannot stand the exposure and contribute to the rapid turn-over. If the company knew their condition, it would not refuse to employ them, but would place them in less exacting jobs.

When I asked Mr. Ray how he justified his position, he replied:

"The preemployment medical examination would brand the worker and, although it might not keep him out of a job now, it would make it difficult for him to get one in peacetimes when work is slack."

I asked him about the turn-over in his union. "We have 3,000 to 5,000 members going out every month," he replied. The townspeople asserted that this turn-over does not bother Mr. Ray since he gets the initiation fee and the dues before they go.

NOT UNION MINDED

There are many members of the Boilermakers' Union who object to the way in which Mr. Tom Ray is running their affairs. They called a meeting of the union in December and elected Mr. A. E. Jordon as president. Mr. Ray says this rump election was illegal. He refuses to recognize it and surrender his books.

These are some of the facts which the Congress of Industrial Organizations has used as campaign material. It has been conservative in its tactics and is, on the whole, more popular with the townspeople than the present regime. The natives argue that, from their point of view, any change in union leadership could only be for the better

Portland people who are in touch with large groups of the shipyard workers are convinced that the majority of these war workers are not union-minded; the treatment they have had under the present union leadership has made them, if anything, anti-union. The Kaiser Co. has kept itself aloof from the battle.

As for the famous Kaiser production, its stupendous figures look even more impressive when one sees ship after ship lying in the ways in their three great yards—Oregon, Vancouver, and Swan Island. Especially at night, when the sprays of light from the welding machines fall like inverted skyrockets from the scaffoldings, and the floodlights illumine the scene of activity, the vast expanse of glittering structures look like Venice at carnival time.

From a Farmer's Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a very interesting and worth-while editorial from The Farmer's Exchange written by a well-known newspaper man from the district I have the honor to represent who has had first-hand experience with the farm problem of which he writes:

FROM A FARMER'S VIEWPOINT

(By Frank Jefferies)

Although the motive may be commendable, an organized army of two or three millions of people to help the farmers when and where help is needed may have its weak points.

It takes as long to train a man so he will be a good farm hand as it does to train one for the average job in a factory or store or shop. And to train a man to be an all-around proficient and efficient farm worker would take as long as to learn a skilled trade.

It may be interesting to try to visualize a situation like harvesting a crop of wheat or hay with helpers who know little or nothing about farming. They might be willing, but they would be like the Irishman who was asked whether he could play a fiddle and replied, "I don't know, I never tried."

To continue in business, a farmer must be able to sell his products at prices which will pay cost of production, including labor, plus a profit for his investment and taxes, etc. The farmer should not, as a rule, be paid a subsidy He should be on a par with other business and industry so his business will be self-supporting.

Thousands of farmers all over the country have been quitting business and selling their livestock and equipment because of scarcity of needed help and because they cannot compete with wages paid in defense plants.

We need on our boards which are intended to look after the welfare of agriculture men who have a practical knowledge of farming and who understand the farmers' many problems. Theorists who want to do the impossible are a menace when placed in a position of authority.

Agriculture should demand a ceiling to wages. To try to prevent inflation by price fixing and not include wages will be a futile effort. And the public should call a halt to the cost-plus system of letting Government contracts, whereby the higher the cost of production the larger the plus.

If the farmer could use such a system, cost of production plus 10 percent, the more he could make it cost to produce food the bigger would be his pay. There would be an inducement to pay very high wages and to work 6 or 8 hours and call it a full day. Such a system is contrary to common sense.

Of course, we must make sacrifices. That is part of the price we must pay for defense and by reason for our folly. But no one group should be granted increases to enable them to live up to peacetime standards, thus forcing other groups to make heavier sacrifices. Labor should be willing to work 48 hours per week to produce what our country urgently needs, and should do so without demanding 50 percent more pay for the 8 hours.

And our Government should divert to agriculture for tools and machinery some of the materials now used by the liquor interests to make and transport alcoholic beverages. Liquor is not a necessity. It is more important to have milk and bread and meat than it is to have beer and wine or whisky.

To be able to do his part, the farmer must have a fair chance. He must have the necessary machinery and tools; and he must be able to hire the necessary help at wages he can afford to pay. He must be liberated from regimentation by a group of visionary and impractical theorists.

The writer had an experience. He hired a man who did not understand trucking and gardening to weed and hoe a tomato patch. The man was shown what was to be done and how, by pulling the weeds around one tomato plant and using the hoe to loosen the soil. He pulled up all the tomato plants and left a few ladyfinger plants standing here and there. Wouldn't an army of such workers be a big help on a farm.

The writer of this article believes he knows at least a little about farming and the farmers' problems. He has plowed and sowed and reaped, husked two big shocks of corn before daylight came, bound wheat by hand, worked all the places around a thresher except feeding, cut and hauled a supply of firewood for the year, picked cider apples, taught calves to drink, hauled manure, and plowed new ground with a jumping shovel plow. For several months he milked eight cows twice each day.

Notwithstanding all these experiences, he knows he would need careful training for 2 years to manage a farm; and at that, under present conditions, he would be apprehensive.

H. R. 2087 Holds Threats to Personal Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George Rothwell Brown, recognized as one of the foremost news analysts in Washington, ably discussed H. R. 2087 in his column, Political Parade, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald Sunday, March 28. To enable all Members of this House to appreciate the dangers in this legislation as it is now written, I ask permission to include Mr. Brown's comments as a part of these remarks.

When H. R. 2087, which has become well known as the "Gestapo" bill, was being considered in the House last week, there was barely a handful of Members on the floor. I demanded a quorum to prevent its immediate passage. I understand that this legislation is to be recalled for further consideration soon after the present tax bill is disposed of.

Mr. Speaker, this bill—H. R. 2087—as it is now written, holds a definite threat to the personal liberties of the people of America. While, no doubt, all of us are in sympathy with its objectives, it should not be passed in its present form. It should be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary, and rewritten, if we are to protect the rights of the citizens of our Nation and safeguard the press under the Bill of Rights. I hope the Members of this House will throw off that strangely indifferent attitude that they exhibited a week ago when this bill was before the House. I hope they will read the comments of Mr. Brown and wake up that they may take intelligent action when this "Gestapo" bill is again brought before this body.

Mr. Brown's comments follow:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

The people of this country would do well to fasten their attention for a moment upon a remarkable bill now in a state of suspended animation, as it were, in the House of Representatives.

It has been debated for 1 day, and then laid aside. In its present form it ought to be laid aside permanently. It should not be passed without amendments that would draw some of its rather vicious-looking teeth.

It is called the War Security Act. It was drawn at the Department of Justice and sent to the Capitol, to be rubber-stamped, by Attorney General Biddle.

I have had occasion to write about an identical bill before, when it was hastily, and without due consideration, reported to the Senate by the Judiciary Committee of that body.

Subsequently, and most fortunately, the favorable report was reconsidered and the bill sent back to the committee for further study.

This measure is designed to give to the Government powers to cope with saboteurs and traitors and to deal with such cases as those of the German spies, who landed on Long Island and Florida and were tried by military courts.

Nobody objects to such a purpose. But the bill contains language so loosely drawn that there is reasonable ground for belief that it could be used for the persecution of innocent American citizens and for the abridgement of the press.

The bill is known as H. R. 2087. There is no space here to describe the paragraphs which might be abused to the detriment of the freedom of the press and of the individual. The measure has been termed at the Capitol the "American Gestapo bill."

It has been charged that it would force American citizens to snoop and inform on their neighbors, on the mere suspicion that they were indulging in acts or thoughts helpful to the enemy.

It is not the purpose here to repeat the criticism of this bill heretofore printed in this place. Those who are interested should ask their Congressmen for copies of the measure.

The purpose here is to comment upon the remarkable psychology of the House of Representatives, as it prepares to pass this bill.

Within the past few days the House—and the Senate, also—has gone to extreme length to rebuke the President, by taking back from him powers allegedly usurped by him under loosely drawn provisions of the Stabilization Act, in the matter of the $25,000 salary limitation.

That language was accepted at the time of its passage, both by the House and the Rules Committee, as carrying no authorization for a Presidential order limiting salaries. This assurance was given by spokesmen for the administration, as quoted by responsible Democratic leaders of the House.

The assurance subsequently proved to be valueless. The President acted precisely contrary to the way the House was told he would act. One would think that the burnt child would dread the fire.

Yet here is the House of Representatives prepared to accept one of the most drastic bills in our history, affecting the personal liberties of the people, on assurances given to the Rules Committee that the unusual powers requested in the bill by the Department of Justice "would not be abused."

Representative EUGENE COX, of Georgia, told the House there were apprehensions entertained at first by some members of the Rules Committee as to this bill in the matter of powers conferred and how they would be used.

The committee was reassured, "upon the basis of the statements made to the Rules Committee," by representatives of the Department of Justice and others.

Representative HATTON SUMNERS, of Texas, the usually astute and cautious chairman of the Judiciary Committee, told the House that representatives of the Department of Justice had given definite assurances which were apparently satisfactory to him.

It would seem that Congress had learned its bitter lesson, that bureaucracy has been guilty of violating the intent of Congress and exceeding the letter of the law.

Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, bluntly warned bureaucracy against this vicious practice in the able speech he made this week in the Senate on the bill to repeal the President's $25,000 salary directive.

In view of the past abuses, the House should think well before it passes a law containing language unusual in our statutes upon the mere say so of some official of the Government that the power granted by the language would not be abused.

It is difficult to applaud the House for its firm stand against Executive encroachment in the face of its readiness to enact a law under these conditions.

Before this bill is passed to deal drastically with enemies of the Government, all ambiguity should be removed for the full protection of the innocent and the safeguarding of the press under the Bill of Rights.

Bureaucracy Is Not a Pipe Dream—It's a Nightmare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been sending a number of victory garden books to chambers of commerce, newspapers, and so forth, throughout my district, hoping they would be of value in increasing food production and so help protect our country against the serious threat of food shortages.

However, complications have arisen which are discouraging many of our people who otherwise are willing and anxious to help.

As an example, I am inserting an editorial from the Daily Olympian, of Olympia, Wash., a paper published by Mr. Fred Chitty, and edited by Mr. Marshall Hunt. Both of these gentlemen are intimately familiar with conditions in their circulation area.

The editorial follows:

NOT A PIPE DREAM BUT A PIPE NIGHTMARE

You don't have to venture beyond the confines of Olympia to discover ludicrous examples of how the war effort is being handicapped by the inability or unwillingness of the President to effect efficient coordination among the numerous bureaus he has established—to learn, first-hand, how the domestic economy in a country the size of the United States can be weakened when an inept, bungling, confused Central Government attempts to assume too much authority.

Here's one case and, brothers, it's a ringtailed lulu:

The administration is taking hundreds of thousands of dollars from the Public Treasury to print pamphlets and booklets and issue bulletins which point out why it is highly necessary for American families to raise victory gardens this summer, and to explain the best way to plant, cultivate, and harvest crops. So far, fine and dandy. This country, having made lavish promises to all its United Nations friends, must produce vegetables and fruits in abundance if it is to abide by its pledges and raise enough food for home consumption. Several Federal bureaus are charged with the task of encouraging the planting of victory gardens.

So—

Three upstanding Olympians, realizing that their labors will help fill the family larder, thus releasing food to the armed forces, obtained permission to engage in a bit of amateur gardening on a lot near their homes. They had the lot plowed and fertilized. They assembled an impressive and practical collection of tools, bean poles, string, seeds, hose, and other equipment needed to carry out their Government-blessed project.

They wanted water, of course. The trio of tyro agriculturists appointed one of their group to visit Olympia City Hall and arrange for water service. Their requirements consisted of about 3 feet of pipe to connect the city main with some secondhand pipe they had acquired for a sprinkling system. The material they sought probably isn't worth more than 30 cents. But the gardeners' delegate was informed by the water commissioner that all such connections have been frozen by the War Production Board, which has headquarters away back there in the National Capital. The delegate, his eyebrows elevated but still undaunted, requested that the problem be taken up with the alleged branch office of the War Production Board in Seattle, which was done. That agency politely informed the Olympia water commissioner that such important matters would have to be attended to by the Power Branch of the War Production Board in Washington, D. C.

Yes, esteemed readers, with the Government spending billions of dollars on a vast number of major-league schemes, a request for a yard of pipe would have to be approved by a bureau 3,000 miles away before a threesome of Olympia patriots, following the suggestion of other bureaus, could dampen their victory patch.

The three men who hope to become gardeners got pretty hot under their collars, a condition for which they can't be blamed but which in no way will contribute to the growth of a mess of turnips. They next wrote not to the Power Branch of the War Production Board, but to a United States Senator elected to represent this State in the Halls of Congress. The Senator replied that their complaint would be brought to the attention of War Production Board (which, incidentally, also is trying to speed the output of colossal tank foundries, giant plane factories, and sprawling shipyards). The Senator also notified the annoyed Olympia gardeners that a copy of their letter had been sent to the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture and concluded his epistle by expressing the hope that Mr. Wickard (who is trying to feed the world and therefore unquestionably will be intensely interested in a problem involving two bits' worth of metal) can "be of assistance."

The time to plant victory gardens has arrived. But the three Olympia men, having consulted almanacs and having arrived at the conclusion the coming summer will be dry, are not opening their packets of seed and sowing same—simply because a Federal agency has decreed that a city can't unfreeze a short length of pipe without inviting the possibility of some municipal official being clapped in jail, paying a stiff fine, or suffering both penalties.

How can this Nation keep from starving, how can it expect to win a war without going bankrupt and needlessly sending regiments of young men to their doom if it is smothered to death by red tape—if one bureau jealously or stupidly cripples the efforts of another by insisting on controlling a million and one little items necessary to sustain life?

For the sake of a country that has been good to its citizens for a century and a half, may this war not only bring about the extinction of some stinkers in Asia and Europe, but also teach all Americans an unforgettable lesson, to wit: That woe is inevitable when plutocracy, autocracy, or bureaucracy replaces democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, have been trying to help these Olympia gentlemen get their victory garden water pipe.

I believe I have ridden a bit farther on the bureaucratic merry-go-round with them than did the Senator to whom the editorial referred.

First they rode to Seattle to see the W. P. B., and were referred to the War Utilities Branch in Washington, D. C. Then they rode to Washington, D. C., to the Senator's office. From there they rode to the Department of Agriculture, with a side trip to the W. P. B. office in the Nation's Capital. And then they rode home to await developments. None came, which certainly was not the Senator's fault, nor the gardeners' fault. So they rode back to Washington, D. C., where I joined the cavalcade. We traveled to W. P. B. again, and won a free ticket back to Olympia, with the advice of the Office of War Utilities that the Olympia Water Department, which serves the homes of these gardeners, should apply to the W. P. B. for permission to make a 3-foot extension to their gardens.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, our trip has ended, for the time being. One ticket has expired. And now another ticket is being issued to the water department. The water department will travel the same route we did; it will see the same scenery and, like us, no doubt, will find that this scenery soon palls upon the weary observer.

And when the second trip is completed, I very much doubt that the water department, either, will have gained much except experience with red tape.

Meantime, it might be these Olympia gentlemen will persuade themselves to do what their patriotic feelings would not let them do in the first place—that is to hunt up the black market in their home town and buy their water pipe there, or perhaps steal it some night—all 30 cents worth—in the dark of the moon. And if the water gurgles cheerily through the ranks of their parched planting, I trust these friends of mine will reflect very deeply on the blessings of modern-day travel, as exemplified by their recent and nonlamented voyage of discovery.

Elmer's Other Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, Frank C. Waldrop, of the Washington Times-Herald, is an outstanding reporter. His writings always contain valuable information. His recent article entitled "Elmer's Other Hand," should be of unusual interest to the Nation. I therefore include it in the Appendix as an extension of my remarks:

ELMER'S OTHER HAND

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Is the Office of War Information supposed by law to be a secret Washington bureau for Marshall Field's printing curiosity, PM? On the one hand, pure and noble Office of War Information Director Elmer Davis is giving the Nation and the world undefiled droplets of information and advice by way of front-office radio addresses. On the other hand, PM has the run of the Office of War Information's back stairs and private files.

While newspaper reporters wait in the anteroom for Office of War Information handouts, PM employees call long distance from New York, instructing Office of War Information officials here to hand over the handouts' information in advance of release date. Here's an example: One night recently, while reporters, as aforesaid, were waiting in the Office of War Information press room, a high Office of War Information official got a call from PM's New York office to give out with certain facts.

"Oh," said the Office of War Information official, "I can't discuss that. It's confidential in the present stage, and the date of publication has not been set. Sorry."

"Yes, you can discuss it," PM told him. "We have a working arrangement with the Office of War Information on these things. So give."

There followed a heated exchange of calls between numerous other persons—but in the end the Office of War Information gave.

Now, such matters might in another city and in another time be shrugged off as mere newspaper occupational difficulties of no interest to the general public.

But this is Washington in wartime, and the Office of War Information is the official news bottleneck.

News is a tremendous local industry in Washington, employing hundreds of reporters who dispatch the news to all parts of the world. Office of War Information is helping PM to the injury of all those hundreds.

Such is the performance of Elmer's other hand that manipulates behind the front office in which Elmer pontificates. That other hand, by the way, holds not less than 24—some authorities say more than that—of PM's own ex-staff members, now on the Office of War Information.

You can see how the other hand works when you know that.

And, by the way, just in case any of the Office of War Information's fluttering help feel particularly soothed by Director Elmer's definition of present comments on the Office of War Information, they have a lot to learn.

Director Elmer gave out an opinion yesterday to the effect that after the election criticism of the Office of War Information would go away. The election is in 1944.

But everything in Washington, D. C., is related to politics—every day.

It is true there is an election scheduled for 1944. Let's hope and pray it is held, according to schedule. If the ancient schedule holds, there will also be another election in 1946. And another in 1948. Let's hope and pray.

And as long as such are in prospect, there will be politicians around to point out what other politicians are doing and not doing.

Inexperienced members of Office of War Information just down from New York may not realize it, but Director Elmer himself is a politician. He was, until he took his present job, not only a radio commentator but also a very vocal member of the American Labor Party of New York, which has a working arrangement with PM, with the New York Post, and whatever politicians are chased by fate into that general zone of affairs.

As an old American Labor Party operative, therefore, Director Elmer knows something about politics and the arts of giving a partisan cause a push in the right direction without letting anything show in public.

Just what, for instance, 'ed Director Elmer to confer recently with the Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives?

Amateurs of Washington performance just down from PM may think Director Elmer is getting away with his story that Office of War Information is untouched from within by politics.

But just hang on a few days, dear visitors, and you will see. For when Director Elmer went up to the Capitol to talk with the above-mentioned Democratic leadership it was on the subject of how to head off the investigation of Office of War Information now coming down the track with headlights gleaming and whistle wide open.

In which respect there develops an unemployment or manpower note. Director Elmer was advised by the House leadership that the only way he can save the Office of War Information is to toss overboard the burden that is symbolized by the 24 PM staff members who have transferred their affections to Washington and the Office of War Information.

The fact is, friends, that Director Elmer knows very well there will be politics from now until 1944, and he is not going to be out of it. But you are.

Because the House leadership has told him that's the only way to keep Mr. MARTIN DIES from reading all your names into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with certain other interesting data.

And that, at this time, would interfere with the political plans of the House leadership. His experience in the American Labor Party has taught Director Elmer how to see the realities in your case. That's how it is—on the one hand and on the other, too.

Problem of Canned-Food Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently many letters have come to my desk from the canning companies in the State of Indiana, and I am confident all Members of Congress have received similar communications from this industry, by which communications the canners are protesting the rules and price regulations which have been announced by the O. P. A.

The justifiable complaint which is made by those engaged in the canning business is that the prices announced are less than the 1943 production costs. This same complaint is made by practically every canner in the district which I represent, and it is likewise expressed by the Indiana Canners Association, Inc., of which Mr. Arthur Noble is president and Mr. H. E. Coddington is secretary.

Mr. Speaker, our canners are facing the manpower problem, which is very critical. It is almost impossible to obtain help in canning factories at the

wage scale which those so engaged can afford to pay. The price ceilings fixed by the O. P. A. for the product, makes it entirely impossible for the canners to compete with defense plants and war industries in the payment of wages to their employees. The result has been that the manpower available for the canning industry has migrated to defense plants and war industries, and there is no available help for them at the wage scale they will be able to pay under the ceilings fixed by the O. P. A. Other labor, which was available in 1942, has been inducted into the Army or has entered the Navy and that supply of labor is unavailable to them. This manpower situation has created a very critical situation in this industry.

Mr. Speaker, those engaged in the canning industry have made complaint to the O. P. A., but the O. P. A. has failed to do anything about this problem. Because of the great scarcity of canned goods they are now rationed, and the people are greatly limited in the amount they can purchase. If, and when, the canners are forced to quit their businesses, and close their doors, this scarcity will be greatly augmented. This will increase the food shortage in this country. With the farm labor shortage, and with the labor shortage in the canning factories—both of which are engaged in producing and canning essential food commodities—we will face a tragic situation in this country unless the O. P. A., the Food Administrator, and the Manpower Commissioner take immediate steps to solve this problem.

Mr. Speaker, those engaged in the canning industry have expressed themselves, by letters, and I desire to set forth some extracts from those letters in order that the Members of the House may know more about this serious situation which is confronting them.

In one letter from the Morristown Canning Co., of Morristown, Ind., it is stated:

> Prices as announced are less than 1943 production costs. We had started planting peas. We have stopped, and will not plant any more unless there is an adjustment in those ceiling prices that will allow us to recover the costs of production and processing and canning.

Another letter from the Indiana Canners Association, Inc., states the following:

> Our canners are very much incensed over the delay, inaction, and inattention from which the problems of the canned-food industry are suffering at this time. There is going to be a tremendous shortage of canned vegetables in the United States unless these ills are remedied.

Another letter from the Mays Packing Co., of Mays, Ind., contains the following statement:

> We have sent a committee to Washington, to contact those agencies, but our committee was shunted from one place to another and to this date we do not even know the price we are to get for our canned goods. At the present time only 55 percent of the acreage is contracted for, while all acreage is usually contracted before the month of March.

The letter received by me from the Loudon Packing Co., of Terre Haute, Ind., contains the following statement:

> We now find that because of the restrictions promulgated by the Office of Price Administration, wage stabilization, and the Department of Agriculture that we are so hampered that we cannot attain our goal of production unless immediate and adequate relief is furnished to the canning industry.

Mr. Speaker, I have received many other letters on this subject from those engaged in the canning industry. These letters especially refer to the repeal of section 204 of the original act, and to the fixing of a price ceiling sufficiently high to give the canners at least the cost of production for their goods. The canners cannot continue to operate their plants at a financial loss, and our Government cannot afford to have the canners close their doors and discontinue their businesses. We must win this war. We must have sufficient food with which to properly feed our Army, our Navy, and our people, and those engaged in the canning industry have contributed much to the solution of our food problem. When our canners are forced to cease their operation, by reason of a price ceiling which destroys their ability to break even, then that great contribution to our food supply will have been entirely lost. We will then face a greatly augmented shortage, which may cause great hunger to exist in our country.

Mr. Speaker, the O. P. A. should take immediate steps in this matter. Price ceilings should be reestablished at such a level as to assure to the canners at least an even break, and so that their production will not be disposed of at a loss, which is the present result. Many of the canners cannot continue to exist for any great length of time under the present regulations, and, unless relief is granted, they will be forced to close their plants in 1943.

It is my hope that the O. P. A. will take immediate action on this very serious problem.

Joseph B. Shannon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON U. S. GUYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, it is with real sorrow that we learn of the death of our former colleague and neighbor across the State line in Missouri, Hon. Joseph B. Shannon, who for a dozen years represented the Fifth Missouri District in the House. While for over 30 years he was a neighbor in Kansas City, Mo., I never met him until he came to Congress as a Member of the Seventy-second Congress, but our close friendship in spite of our differing political alinement grew stronger with all the years of our service in the House.

Joseph B. Shannon was a man of granite character, of strong personality and unswerving fidelity and devotion to what he held to be the right. To his ideals of political integrity he clung with celebrated tenacity. He not only talked Jefferson, his political patron saint, but he voted Jefferson. There were few men in public life who had made such a long and constant study of the life and ideals of Thomas Jefferson, and he always expressed contempt for those followers of Jefferson who only gave lip service to the exalted ideals of Jefferson but who in their political conduct disregarded the fundamental principles for which Jefferson stood, not only as expressed in the Declaration of Independence but also in his first inaugural address and policies Jefferson inaugurated as the third President of the United States.

Mr. Shannon will be longest remembered as a true Jeffersonian Democrat, and he would, I am sure, ask no higher encomium.

Absenteeism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, during the past 3 months various newspapers and various governmental officials have used absenteeism as just another method of smearing labor. Labor baiters and those who would destroy unions have jumped on absenteeism as a method by which they could put labor in a bad light.

Many of these officials have even gone so far as to use the term "slacker." In my judgment, those who talk the most about absenteeism have done little, if any, investigating. In my study of labor absenteeism I have found that very little absenteeism takes place willfully on the part of labor. I find that absenteeism for the largest part is due to circumstances beyond the control of labor.

Labor has performed admirably in the war effort. In fact, figures show that labor has performed more admirably in this war than in the last World War. From all absentee figures available, absenteeism today is half of what it was during the last World War.

A study of figures also shows that the absenteeism today is no more than absenteeism during normal times. This is proof enough that absenteeism cannot be used to smear labor during this present war. Those who try to use it to smear labor are barking up the wrong tree.

To give an idea of how little voluntary absenteeism there really is, I am going to insert in the RECORD an article appearing in the Globe Trotter, which is a monthly sheet put out by the Globe Ship-

building Co. at Superior, Wis. The reading of their editorial and the figures in it will show the grand job that this company is doing in cutting down absenteeism. Labor and management in this company are cutting down absenteeism to almost nil.

I might mention that the figures in this editorial are for a period when they had the largest snowstorms in northern Wisconsin and when the thermometer averaged 20° below zero. Let those who could condemn labor and labor unions study those figures carefully.

The editorial follows:

WHAT IS ABSENTEEISM?

The increasing agitation concerning absenteeism as a serious menace to war production is reflected in the press, on the radio, and in the councils of war production officials. Some confusion exists. A study of press comments, various surveys, and articles prepared by industrial experts indicate that the term "absenteeism" is very loosely used.

Absenteeism is not synonymous with voluntary loafing, but it does include this category. It also includes the category of low worker morale, which frequently means that men are lacking in war consciousness and enthusiasm for winning the war, are generally lazy and indifferent, are dissipated, homesick, sore at the boss, and voluntarily stay away. It may include not only illness and accidents, but such factors as transportation, housing, fatigue, rationing, and draft board problems, inadequate shopping and service facilities.

Calling all absentees slackers is a mistake frequently made. Obviously not all absentees are slackers. To call a man who is confined to his bed by influenza a slacker would be most unfair

To those who have made a study of the subject as a whole absenteeism may mean all absences from the job, for whatever reason, or it may exclude some absences which have reasonable causes, such as accidents, sickness, authorized leave, etc. In the Maritime yard, which represents the minimum in absenteeism, it is noted that 58 percent of the absences are due to accidents and sickness, and that in this particular yard there is a minimum of what might be called slackerism, loafing, or unexplained absence.

The absenteeism record of the Globeship is printed below. Of course, the personnel department has been on top of this problem for some time, and judging by the report for the period it appears that they have been getting results. Even if we do say so, it's not the worst record, and the thing that we know is that it is going to get better. There is no fooling about that as we are in a serious business—the winning of the war—and every person at the yard knows it, and the most and the best we can do it help win it is the least we can do.

Next issue we will have a comparison for you if figures are available. There has been some difference in the methods of issuing the reports, but it will be standardized so all yards will know just where they stand. However, Bill Olson and his entire personnel crew will see that it improves—they want to lead and they will or know the reason why.

Absenteeism record, period, Feb. 1 to Feb. 24, 1943, inclusive

Reason	Number workers absent	Hours lost	Percent of scheduled time lost
Authorized	20	185	0.1
Voluntary	83	1,277	.6
Illness	179	5,488	2.8
Injured	8	405	.2
Total	290	7,355	3.7

Scheduled hours	186
Employment	1,033
Total hours scheduled	192,138

Reasons for voluntary absence were illness in family, moving, driver did not show up, personal business.

Three Great California Newspapers Condemn Ruml Plan Steal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to me, indeed, to be able to offer for inclusion in the RECORD an able and most timely editorial which appeared simultaneously in the Sacramento Bee, the Fresno Bee, and the Modesto Bee of March 23, 1943—an editorial in which the tax-gypping features of the so-called Ruml plan are fearlessly exposed and bitterly condemned.

Because of the high influence of these California newspapers and their wide circulation in central California, I am sure that this editorial expression will contribute much to the promotion of a better understanding of this sinister conspiracy to mulct the Treasury of its much-needed revenue—money which the country needs now more than it ever needed it before.

The editorial referred to follows:

GEARHART VOICES SOUND CRITICISM OF RUML PLAN

The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has been trying to make up its mind on a tax bill ever since Congress met in January.

Last week a majority of its members agreed on a measure concerning which even its friends are apologetic, and which they frankly expect to be modified.

A Republican caucus has announced its decision to go all out for the so-called Ruml plan which would cancel last year's income taxes and put future payments on a pay-as-you-go basis.

But Representative B. W. GEARHART, of Fresno, takes issue with his Grand Old Party colleagues. He declares the Ruml plan is wonderful—for the profiteers and war millionaires who would be relieved of paying anything on their 1942 incomes. And that was a year of swollen profits if there ever was one.

GEARHART, in a speech in the House last Friday, warned his colleagues:

"As the martyred Lincoln admonished, you can, perhaps, fool the people a part of the time, but, Mr. Speaker, sooner or later the people will see this crafty, tax-gypping scheme in all of its ug'y nakedness—Wall Street boondoggling at its worst. It is nothing but an ill-disguised maneuver to get away with paying but 1 year's taxes on 2 years' income. Nothing could be plainer.

"If we grant the forgiveness that Banker Ruml demands, we will have surrendered to war profiteering, consented to a repetition of the scandals of the first World War, when we stood idly by while new marble mansions were built by 43,000 newly made war profiteering millionaires, one for every white cross that was raised to mark the grave of an American soldier, sailor and marine who remained to sleep in Flanders Field."

GEARHART, in the parlance of the street, has something there. And his statement goes far to disclose the powerful influences which have been thrown behind the Ruml plan.

Yet they have been carefully camouflaged.

The Ruml plan has been urged most loudly as a method by which Uncle Sam would be relieved of the embarrassment of going after thousands of smaller taxpayers, who had not saved sufficient sums from their weekly pay envelopes to keep that financial rendezvous with their Government on March 15.

True, for wage- and salary-earning Americans a pay-as-you-go plan would be more convenient.

But there should be a way to put such a plan into effect without the Treasury losing billions of dollars as it must if the Ruml plan is adopted.

And those who would get the lion's share of this juicy rebate would be those enjoying excessive war profits. Most Americans will agree with GEARHART that this should not be allowed to happen.

Texas A. & M.'s Part in Winning the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, located at College Station, in the district which I have the honor to represent, is Texas A. & M. College, an institution of which Texas is proud and which is playing a major part in the winning of this war by contributing thousands of young men who are today officers in the Army of the United States and who received their military training at this great college. It has furnished more officers to the Army of the United States than even West Point or any other college in the Nation.

Here in Washington many of its alumni are now stationed, and these have organized a club known as the National Capital Texas A. & M. club, which meets monthly.

On the night of March 18, 1943, upon invitation, I addressed the membership of this club, and in my remarks told something of the history of this great college and its achievements, and more especially the part that it is playing in winning the war in which we are now engaged.

Under leave granted, I submit herewith the speech which I delivered upon that occasion:

I am glad to be here tonight, and consider it an honor to have the privilege of speaking to the National Capital Texas A. & M. Club.

Unfortunately for me, I did not attend Texas A. & M. and am therefore not eligible for membership in your club, but the president of your club, Carlton Speed, comes from my home town of Corsicana and I have known him from boyhood, and when he extended me an invitation to address you I could not resist, since he has been my lifelong friend and I also wanted the opportunity of mingling with you and paying tribute to your Alma Mater.

The district which I have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States has within its boundaries this great institution, an institution which is not only a credit to our congressional district but to the State of Texas, and in view of the part that it is playing in this war is likewise a credit to our Nation.

I think it most appropriate that here in the Nation's Capital, more than fifteen hundred miles from this seat of learning, that you who are graduates of this great school and where so many of you are now stationed in Washington, carrying on war activities, that you should have an A. & M. Club here, where you can get together and live again your college days and recount the glories of Texas A. & M.

Beset as we all are by so many problems, problems which at times are confusing and bewildering, and which affect the destiny of our country and the democracies of the world, it is good, once in a while, to forget these baffling problems and relax and think again of those pre-war days and of those happy days when peace reigned on earth, and there is no better way to do this than for your club to have its monthly meetings, and I count it a rare privilege to be with you on such an occasion as this.

Here we can forget for the moment taxes and the Ruml plan, rationing and priorities, the Office of Price Administration, War Production Board, Office of Defense Transportation, Office of War Information, Lend-Lease, Alien Property, National Resources Planning, whether we shall have a second front, and if so, where, post-war planning, fourth-term problems, farm labor, parity prices, inflation, furloughs, commissions in the Army and Navy, transfers to different posts, and a thousand and one problems such as these which consume our thoughts and time by day, and about which we dream at night.

It is tranquil and peaceful here tonight, since we have no problems to solve, and we can let our minds rest and refresh our spirits by thinking of a great school that has had a great history, and that has contributed so much to the welfare of the Nation, both in peace and in war.

I was told that I could talk about anything, but I can think of but one topic that would be appropriate, and that is the topic about which you have first-hand information and know more about than I. But I am going to take a chance, nevertheless, of talking to you about your alma mater.

If I tell you what you already know, which I shall certainly do, please forgive me, but as a Texan and as a Congressman who represents the district in which this school is located, I am so proud of it, I hope you will bear with me while I pay tribute to it.

On April 20 of last year I made a speech in Congress and had for my subject, Texas A. & M., at which time I told the Members of the House of the history and achievements of this institution, and I shall cull from that speech some of the facts and figures which I then used, most of the factual data having been furnished me by Mr. G. Byron Winstead, director of information at Texas A. & M.

It is one of the oldest schools in Texas, having first opened its doors on October 4, 1876, more than 66 years ago.

Jefferson Davis, president of the Confederate States of America, was tendered the first presidency and accepted, but was prevailed upon by his family to decline the presidency. Asked to recommend a good man Davis suggested Thomas S. Gathright, State superintendent of public instruction of the State of Mississippi, who accepted, and the school opened with an enrollment of students, which increased to 106 by the end of the year.

Last year, when I was visiting for the week end down in Virginia, I met a gentleman by the name of Gathright, and he proudly told me that he was related to Thomas S. Gathright, the first president of Texas A. & M.

The first commandant was a Confederate soldier, R. P. W. Morris, who combined military tactics with courses in mathematics and mechanics. Military instruction has been continuous, except in 1898–99, when the professional officers and most of the student body went into active duty with the American troops in the War with Spain. Texas Aggies rode with Teddy Roosevelt at San Juan Hill and with Pershing on the Mexican border.

When World War No. 1 came Texas A. & M. alumni promptly contributed 2,200 well-trained officers to the colors, almost in a body. The senior class of 1916 received their diplomas of graduation under the shade of a spreading oak tree adjacent to the officers' training camp at Leon Springs.

The military aspect of this institution, while basic and vital, is by no means its principal claim to distinction. For more than 8 years it has been the largest agricultural school in the world. It is likewise the largest school of veterinary medicine, and it has the second largest school of engineering. Its schools of art and sciences and the graduate school are making significant contributions.

The attack on Pearl Harbor was the signal for Texas A. & M. to immediately launch a series of drastic reforms in college education. The institution went on a year around basis, and today enjoys the distinction of being the trail blazer among major American colleges and universities in speeding up educational machinery in order to produce at the request of the Government more trained technicians for industry, more agricultural leaders for production of livestock, and farm commodities, and more commissioned officers for the armed forces.

Collegiate instructional facilities are on a year around schedule, shops and laboratories are on a 24-hour-a-day basis, and the military science and tactics department is training Reserve officers for Infantry, Field Artillery, Coast Artillery, Ordnance, Cavalry, Chemical Warfare, Signal Corps, Engineers, and Quartermaster Corps.

Brig. Gen. Frank E. Lowe, executive officer for Reserve Officers' Training Corps affairs, is authority for the statement that Texas A. & M. is the only school in the United States having all nine branches of the service represented in its military program.

Between establishment of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program in 1920 to date, Texas A. & M. College has commissioned a total of 6,382 Reserve officers, and today the living among those men are on active duty either as officers or in positions deemed equally as vital to the prosecution of the war effort. And as I speak to you tonight, 1,306 members of the junior and senior classes who hold advanced military contracts in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps are on the way to induction centers to be activated in the Army and returned to their alma mater for further study and training as privates for the current semester, and then to officer candidate schools for their commissions. Thus will Texas A. & M. College have trained, graduated, and commissioned 7,688 men in a generation of peace plus 2 years of war.

This is indeed a fitting finale to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps program which is being discontinued, and the record testifies for itself. As a matter of economy, and saving of cost to the Government, I would observe that it costs the Federal Government $20,000 to get an officer from West Point, $30,000 for Army Air Corps officer, and $40,000 for Navy Air Force officer. At Texas A. & M. it costs Uncle Sam $400 in rations, a 6-week camp, the use of $1,000,000 in military equipment, and the staff of tactical officers. At $400 per head we've saved some important money for the taxpayers on our 7,688 officers.

Today 4 major generals and 14 brigadier generals in the Army and Marine Corps received their first taste of military training at Texas A. & M. College. The major generals are: George Fleming Moore, 1908, who commanded coast artillery defenses at Corregidor Island, P. I., and is now a prisoner of war on the island of Formosa; Maj. Gen. Andrew D. Bruce, 1916, commander of the Tank Destroyer Command, Camp Hood, Tex.; Maj. Gen. P. W. Clarkson, 1915, commanding 87th Infantry Division, Camp McCain, Miss.; Maj. Gen. Harry H. Johnson, 1917, commanding 2d Cavalry Division, Fort Clark, Tex.

Brigadiers: Ralph H. Wooten, 1916, Air Corps; Douglas B. Netherwood, 1908, Air Corps; John A. Warden, 1908, Quartermaster Corps; Howard C. Davidson, 1911, Air Corps; Jerome C. Waters, 1913, Field Artillery, Roderick R. Allen, 1915, Armored Forces; C. M. Easley, 1916, General Staff; W. E. Farthing, 1914, Air Corps; Nat S. Perrine, 1917, Puerto Rican Mobile Forces; Robert B. Williams, 1923, Air Force; E. A. Eversberg, 1913, Quartermaster; William D. Old, 1924, Air Corps; William C. Crane, 1910, Southern Defense Command; and Bennett Puryear, 1906, Marine Corps.

For years Texas Aggies flew with the Flying Tigers of Gen. Claire Chennault and with the Royal Air Force. These now have been transferred back to American forces. In the meantime, Texas Aggies who had not won commissions through Reserve Officers' Training Corps channels joined the air arms of the Army and Navy and marines. It is conservatively estimated that at least 1,500 have won commissions in this manner as pilots, navigators, and bombardiers, and ground officers.

When Tokyo was bombed, second in command to Gen. Jimmy Doolittle was Lt. Col. John A. Hilger, who graduated in 1932. High valor awards have been presented in this war to more than a hundred Texas Aggies, among them Lt. Col. James T. Connally, first cousin of Senator TOM CONNALLY, who received the Distinguished Service Cross for leading a bomber squadron from Java to Mindanao in the Philippines, sinking a Japanese tanker, and rescuing 23 stranded American pilots on the island. Among those pilots rescued was Lt. Col. K. R. Kreps, now stationed in Washington, who tells me that he and the other 22 pilots owe their lives to Col. James Connally's heroism. Connally's younger brother, Clem Connally, also an Aggie, is a Navy flyer and has been decorated for his exploits.

Lt. Col. Henry C. Dittman, former Aggie football star, received the Distinguished Flying (not Service) Cross for leading a squadron over an uncharted air route to the Philippines via India.

Capt. E. J. Crane, United States Marine Corps, was the first officer to set foot on the Solomons when the American forces recaptured that area.

Maj. Louis Hobbs was cited for valor in leading an air mission in the Philippines.

First Lt. Tom Dooley, now Major Dooley, to whom I shall again refer shortly, was aide to Maj. Gen. Jonathan Wainwright, who succeeded Gen. Douglas MacArthur as commander of our Army in the Philippines when he went to Australia.

General Moore, before leaving A. & M. to take command at Corregidor Fortress, selected 35 graduating Aggies out of the 1940 class to precede him to the Philippines while he was serving as commandant at Texas A. & M., and all of these Aggies were line officers at Corregidor when it fell.

The next day after I made that speech last year in the House about Texas A. & M. was April 21—San Jacinto Day, and my telephone rang on that day, and it was an official in the War Department, who said that he wished to advise me that they had just received a radiogram from the Philippines, advising that the Texas soldiers at Corregidor were celebrating San Jacinto Day, and that Corregidor Chapter of Texas A. & M. Alumni was participating in the celebration, and that

Maj. Tom Dooley was the president of the Corregidor Chapter, and among those present were General Moore, Maj. John King, and Capt. Roy Vick, and I immediately sent a telegram to Dr. Walton, the president of Texas A. & M., and I have a copy of that telegram, which I shall read to you.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 21, 1942.*

Dr. T. O. WALTON,
President, A. & M. College,
College Station, Tex.:

War Department today received radiogram advising Texas soldiers at Corregidor celebrating San Jacinto Day. Corregidor Chapter of Alumni Texas A. & M. of which Maj. Tom Dooley is president, participating. Among those present, General Moore, Maj. John King, and Capt. Roy Vick; last two of Bryan, Tex. Please notify their relatives and friends.

LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
Member of Congress.

That was doubtless the last meeting of the Corregidor chapter of Texas A. & M. alumni, for within 15 days thereafter, on May 6, 1942, Corregidor fell. After heroic fighting for many weeks and months, against overwhelming odds, these brave and heroic Texans, together with the other Americans who were fighting under the Stars and Stripes, weakened by illness and sheer exhaustion, were compelled to surrender, and the curtain fell upon that drama where Americans had once more proved to the world their supreme courage, and had written a chapter of heroism and deathless devotion that will live for all time.

Many battles have been fought on land and sea since Corregidor fell; many victories have been achieved by our military and naval forces since that dark day in the Philippines and Pearl Harbor, and doubtless in a major portion of these engagements, if not all, fighting Aggies have participated, and I doubt not that as they have entered into mortal combat with the enemy, they have not only remembered Pearl Harbor, but they have remembered also those brave Aggies who fought and died at Corregidor, and inspired by such memories they have fought with that same unconquerable spirit which has characterized the Aggies on the gridiron and their brothers at Corregidor.

Tonight, fighting Aggies are on all battle fronts, in Guadalcanal, in New Guinea, in China, in Burma, in England, and in North Africa, and they are playing a conspicuous part in all of these fields and living up to the traditions of the great school from whence they came.

When this awful war is over and victory is ours, which it must be and will be, I am sure that we will be able to say, as in the last World War, that no college in America will have produced more officers, not even excepting West Point, and that the men from no college in America will have fought more valiantly and more bravely for the cause of freedom than the sons of old Texas A. & M.

Salary Increase for Postal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, in common with a preponderant majority of the Members of the House, I was most gratified at the emphatic vote approving the temporary $300 increase for postal employees. This was a striking example of the speed and dispatch with which this body can act once it sets its mind upon the desirability of reaching a specific objective. It serves notice on carping critics that the machinery of the House is flexible enough to permit the elimination of dilatory red tape and long-drawn-out debate. I hope that this instance will serve as a stimulus to our membership not to hesitate in time to come when vital matters are pending to invoke the powers which reside here to pass legislation in a straightforward, effective, and expeditious manner.

I feel, too, that as to the merits of this particular legislation no one can truthfully or honestly deny the right of these faithful Government employees to this well-deserved consideration at the hands of Congress. I am prepared to go further and say that I hope Congress will not cease to be interested in the postal workers. Reference has been properly made in general debate to the long-continued fidelity, industry, and patriotism of the postal workers who have perhaps more than any other group of Government employees been called upon to bear the marked increases in living costs and substantial changes in working hours and conditions without obtaining material benefits by way of enhanced compensation, hours, and favorable conditions extended to many other classes of our working population.

In recognition of the enduring patience and loyalty of the postal workers and the forbearance and sense of justice exhibited by their leadership, I think it is not too much to express the hope that the House will soon give consideration to the question of making these recently granted increases permanent.

For my part, I will look forward expectantly to any opportunity in this Chamber or elsewhere to indicate my approval of the policy of permanent increases for postal workers and trust that appropriate committees will see to it in the near future that legislation is presented here enabling me to speak and vote in behalf of permanent salary and wage adjustments for the thousands of faithful postal workers.

Eighty-eight and One-Tenth Percent of Indiana Republican Committee Members Opposed to Wendell Willkie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the News-Sentinel of Fort Wayne, Ind., which goes into details regarding the accuracy of a recent Presidential poll taken by that paper, which shows that 88.1 percent of the Indiana Republican precinct committeemen and committeewomen who were polled were against the renomination of Wendell Willkie for President in his own State of Indiana.

This poll should make interesting and useful reading for all Republican leaders throughout the Nation. The Republican precinct committee members are closest to the people and represent the sentiments of the rank and file of the Republican Party better than any other group. The result of the vote speaks for itself in no uncertain terms.

The article follows:

Four days after the date originally set for its completion, and 1 week after the last ballots had been delivered to some 8,000 Republican precinct committeemen and committeewomen throughout Indiana's 92 counties, the News-Sentinel's "grass roots" Presidential preference poll was formally concluded today, when returns received since noon Tuesday were added to totals previously announced.

A total of 1,493, or 88.1 percent, of the 1,693 "grass roots" Republican leaders sending back their poll cards, declared their opposition to the 1944 nomination of Wendell L. Willkie, of New York, for President on the Republican ticket.

Only 200, or 11.9 percent, favored Willkie's nomination.

Tally of the 1,693 ballots, representing more than 21 percent of the total number sent out from March 13 to March 16—a percentage of returns twice as large as is ordinarily anticipated from such a canvass—showed results in line with previous day-to-day tabulations of responses to the 5 questions directed to Grand Old Party leaders in all sorts and sizes of Hoosier communities in all parts of the State.

OTHER QUESTIONS ASKED

While the pro- or anti-Willkie sentiments of the committeemen and committeewomen have attracted the most Nation-wide interest, receiving primary emphasis of everybody from Congressmen to columnists and radio commentators, there were 4 other questions on the poll cards, which also evoked a display of lively interest on the part of recipients.

In one question, the precinct leaders were asked to indicate their own personal preference for President in 1944; in another, to state their opinion as to the strongest candidate for the office; in another, to designate their Vice Presidential preferences; and in yet another, to express their views as to whether the United States should mix extensively in foreign politics after the war.

VOTE ON FOREIGN POLICY

The question of whether the United States should hereafter mix extensively in foreign politics brought in the following replies:

"Yes," 203; "No," 1,490.

Forty-two percent of the "grass roots" Republican leaders indicating Presidential preferences named Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, as their idea of the strongest candidate; 39.2 percent stated that he was their personal preference; and 23.4 percent favored him for Vice President.

Thirty-nine percent like Bricker best; 38 percent think he would make the strongest Presidential candidate; and 25 percent would nominate him for Vice President.

Willkie is the personal preference of 10 percent, while 11 percent designate him as the strongest candidate, and 2 percent would run him for Vice President.

In Allen County only 2 percent of the Republican precinct committeemen and committeewomen believe Willkie should be nominated for President next year. In this county,

Bricker is top man for the Presidency, with nearly 40 percent of the total votes, while the remaining 60 percent are divided among Dewey, Taft, and half a dozen others.

The opposition to Willkie in De Kalb County constitutes 91.5 percent of the total; in Adams County, 96 percent; in Randolph County, 94.5 percent. Among the 100 percent anti-Willkie counties are Whitley (home of Republican State Chairman Ralph F. Gates); Steuben (home of United States Senator RAYMOND E. WILLIS); Lagrange, Union, Dearborn and Switzerland.

INDUSTRIAL AREAS OPPOSE WILLKIE

Governor Bricker's strength in the dozen counties ranged along the Ohio line is, as perhaps might naturally be expected, somewhat greater than that shown for the State as a whole.

Of particular interest is the fact that anti-Willkie sentiment is strong in large populous industrial counties whose votes frequently determine the outcome of elections.

In Lake and St. Joseph Counties, for example, anti-Willkie committeemen cast 92 percent of the ballots sent in from those areas; in Vanderburgh County (Evansville), 90 percent; in Vigo (Terre Haute), 89 percent; in Allen (Fort Wayne), 98 percent; in Marion (Indianapolis), 53 percent.

From all parts of the country have come expressions of interest in the poll, which was initiated on March 15, when the first ballots were sent out accompanied by the following letter:

"To Precinct Committeemen and Precinct Vice Committeemen:

"In the interests of obtaining an honest, accurate appraisal of the composite judgment of Republican leaders in the State of Indiana, we are taking a poll of the real grass-roots leadership of this important key State on what is probably, at this time, one of the most vital of political questions.

"That is to say, we are inquiring of all the Republican committeemen and committeewomen in Indiana as to their preferences for President and Vice President in 1944.

NATION-WIDE INTEREST SEEN

"The results of this poll will be given publicity in the press in this and other States, and over the radios of the country.

"If you do not care to sign your name to the enclosed postal card, or otherwise to identify yourself, that will be perfectly all right. Just send us the card, so marked as to indicate your reaction to one or more of the questions listed.

"We believe that the completion of this poll will be of tremendous interest to people throughout the United States, and very probably it will exercise a distinctly helpful influence.

"We sincerely thank you for all your numerous efforts in behalf of good government in general and of the Republican Party in particular, and would welcome an expression of your opinions and ideas at the point marked 'Remarks.' Will you please return this card at your earliest convenience? It is desired to complete the poll by March 20.

"Very truly yours,

"THE NEWS-SENTINEL,
"Fort Wayne, Ind."

MAJORITY MAKE "REMARKS"

It is considered quite remarkable that about five out of every six cards returned carried the sender's name, county, and precinct or township; and about two-thirds made "remarks," of which the following, taken from the last batch of returns today, are typical:

From Anderson, in Madison County: "Stop mixing in foreign politics. I say let's be free of England again, and run our own country in our own way."

From Dubois, in Dubois County: "The people of this county do not care for any more 'campaign oratory' from Windy Willkie."

From Vevay, in Switzerland County: "Keep out of foreign politics, and nominate Dewey for President."

From North Vernon, in Jennings County: "If Willkie runs against Roosevelt, he will be defeated. Let's have an honest and wholehearted Republican!"

From Evansville, in Vanderburg County: "Willkie would not get 10 votes in my precinct."

From Dubois, in Dubois County: "If Willkie is nominated, I would favor a third-party candidate."

From Scottsburg, in Scott County: "We need a man who can carry New York, and I believe Dewey can do that."

From Napoleon, in Ripley County: "We need a man from the Midle West. We've had a New Yorker in the White House too long already. I'll pick Taft, of Ohio. He's had the most experience and is the most level-headed."

From Evansville: "Willkie has changed sides too much; people around here have no confidence in him."

From Goshen, in Elkhart County: "If Willkie is our candidate we will still have a Democrat in the presidency after 1945—whether he is elected or defeated."

From Bloomington, in Monroe County: "Willkie might be all right for Vice President; but I prefer Dewey to head the ticket."

From Summitville, in Madison County: "We need no Willkies. He concurs with this administration's internationalist and interventionist program too much. What we need is a President who will first minister unto his own household, for he that does not, the Scriptures tell us, is worse than an infidel. Sweep Washington of so-called social planners—sweep it as clean as a windswept desert."

PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCE POLL

THE NEWS-SENTINEL, FORT WAYNE, IND.

1. Do you think that Wendell L. Willkie should be nominated for President on the Republican ticket in 1944? Yes ------- No -- No ---.

2. Who do you think would be the strongest Presidential candidate on the Republican ticket in 1944? Governor Bricker, of Ohio.

3. Who is your first choice for next year's—1944—Republican Presidential nomination? Bricker, of Ohio.

4. Who do you think would be the strongest candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket? Dewey.

5. Do you favor the United States mixing extensively in foreign politics after this war? Yes ------- No -- No ---.

Remarks: The people of Dubois County do not care for any more "campaign oratory" from Willkie.

Name ——— ———
County --Dubose. Precinct ———

(Above is reproduced a typical "grass roots" poll card, with Government seal mutilated to conform to wartime postal regulations, which was received today from a precinct committeeman in Dubois County, in the southwest part of Indiana. It was one of 1,693 such cards returned to the News-Sentinel from all parts of the State during the past week, making possible a sampling of rank-and-file Republican sentiment which has attracted Nation-wide attention, interest, and comment.)

Florida Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HENDRICKS
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker and Members, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the Appendix a brief item from the Boston Traveler of March 26 on the Florida Canal, and also an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of March 29 on the same subject:

[From the Boston Traveler of March 26, 1943]

INLAND WATERWAYS

(By S. Willson Richards, Editor, the Marine News)

Striking events are making manifest the real value of the inland waterways. Now, owing to their safety and to the burden on the railroads, their worth to the Nation is incalculable.

The public knows practically nothing about one of the Nation's greatest assets, the Federal waterways system.

Now, with the fate of the democratic world depending so much upon America for supplies, equipment, and military and naval aid, how futile the situation would be but for these waterways.

Every shipyard in America is located on a waterway improved by the Federal Government.

Without improved harbors, improved channels from the sea and lakes, our Navy and merchant marine could not exist; our railroads would not have the tremendous tonnage brought to or taken from them by ships; water terminals would be nonexistent. The coastal terminal cities of today were made possible through the interchange of waterborne and rail commerce.

Without the Cape Cod Canal, water transportation between New York and Boston would be more perilous, take longer, and be more expensive. Right now, without the canal, all this shipping would face probable submarine attack.

Without improvements made on the Hudson River and the New York State Barge Canal system, the economical movement of sufficient grain, oil, lumber, pulpwood and other bulk products between the Great Lakes and the seaboard would be a problem. These waterways serve another purpose; they help keep railway rates where they should be. The improved Hudson enables the Port of Albany to handle ocean shipping.

Without the improved Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, it would not be possible for deep draft vessels to move between Delaware and Chesapeake Bays, again safe from submarine attack.

What a blessing it would be today if the Atlantic and Gulf Intracoastal Waterways were deep and wide; if the proposed canals across New Jersey and Florida were complete. Then, this protected waterway system would extend from Boston to close to the Mexican border. Through it, tankers and barges, destroyers and other light draft naval vessels could navigate safely.

Without the improved Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, much of the vast movement of bulk commodities from the gulf coast would have to move at costs many times that on

waterways and, now, on the dangerous open sea.

Without the development of the Houston ship channel the world port of Houston, as the great city of the Southwest, would not exist. Railways handled, either before or after water shipment, a large part of the tremendous tonnage of this port.

Without the great locks at the Soo, the improved St. Marys, St. Clair, and Detroit Rivers, the improved harbors at Great Lakes ports, the facilities for moving 90,000,000 tons annually of vitally needed iron ore from upper Lake Superior to ports on Lakes Michigan and Erie would not exist, except at a transportation cost of from 8 to 10 times the water rates. Our commanding position in the steel world would be lost.

When initiated, many projects so vital to us now were criticized or condemned by selfish or sectional interests. "Pork barrel," they shouted to an uninformed public. And today, these same interests continue to combat the expansion of our unparalleled natural waterways; expansion necessary for defense and for the growth of the Nation.

At this solemn moment, our outlook would be dark but for the existence of the facilities for naval mobility and water-borne commerce.

America has the greatest potential inland and intracoastal waterway system on earth; development is making it a priceless national asset, assuring the safety of the Nation and benefits for all the people.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 29, 1943]

FINISH THAT BARGE CANAL

This week may see some definite action taken in Congress toward either granting or denying to the Atlantic Seaboard States an inland-waterway, submarineproof route, for barge transport of oil from the Gulf oil ports.

The House Appropriations Committee is scheduled to act some time this week on the $44,000,000 appropriation needed to complete the Florida barge canal and thus complete this oil-barge waterway. A subcommittee of this committee has already voted in favor of the appropriation.

What with Secretary Ickes and other bureaucrats continually (and gleefully, as a rule) assuring us that we'll be worse off for fuel oil next winter than last, we hope Congress will push this appropriation through as fast as may be and let the work go ahead.

The canal referred to runs along the Jacksonville-Port Inglis route, across northern Florida, which was originally laid out by Lt. Col. (now Lt. Gen.) Brehon B. Somervell in 1935. Somervell got the work well under way on what was originally planned as a full-size ship canal, but then Congress decided it was a boondoggle and cut off the money to finish the job.

PLENTY OIL, PLENTY GAS

The canal never did look like a boondoggle to us. When Pearl Harbor happened the canal shucked off any traces of boondoggiery that it may once have had.

The reason for that is summarized in the argument Gen. Charles P. Summerall puts up for completion of the project as a barge canal only.

General Summerall is chairman of the Florida Ship Canal Authority, and a former United States Army Chief of Staff who shone particularly during his military career as an engineering and construction expert.

He insists that if we will only finish this canal the Atlantic seaboard thereafter can have all the fuel oil and gasoline it needs without rationing either commodity. The necessary hauling equipment would be an appropriate number of large, cheaply constructed barges using no critical materials plus a few powerful Diesel-engined tugs.

Nor would completion of the canal, says General Summerall, call for any substantial amounts of critical materials for steam shovels, dredges, etc. This equipment is now in existence and available for the work. Since these machines turn out huge amounts of work per man needed to operate them, the labor problem would be similarly small.

The work could be finished in about 10 months, according to the Summerall-and-associates estimates—which would be about the end of next January if it could be begun now. It got pretty cold about the end of last January in these parts, if you remember.

MYSTERIOUS MR. ICKES

Why, then, doesn't Congress give the Florida barge canal job the green light, in the form of that $44,000,000 appropriation?

We gather from reliable sources that Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes is the main stumbling block, with some assistance from a few railroads and large oil companies.

The railroads want to carry as much oil by tank car as may be; the oil companies fear the inland waterway may undercut their post-war coastwise tanker business. You can understand the railroad and oil company opposition, though we think it is misguided.

The oil companies seem to us to be unduly alarmed, since admittedly the proposed barge transportation will be more expensive than tanker transportation is in peacetime. After the war, the cheaper tankers would naturally get back most if not all of the business. And the inland waterway route would be a great help in direct oil and gas delivery to waterway towns where large tankers can't put in.

Mr. Ickes' opposition remains mysterious to us.

It seems that Honest Harold, as he is sometimes called, just does not like water-borne oil transport. When Harold doesn't like a thing, his not to reason why; he just doesn't like it, and he fights it to the last ditch. He also appears to enjoy making people more miserable in wartime than they need be. We surmise, too, that Harold is a trifle jealous because somebody else besides himself thought up this possible solution of the Atlantic seaboard oil and gas problems.

None of these Ickesian objections seems sufficient reason for Congress to deny this relief to the people of the Eastern States.

The Chicago Tribune Has Kind Words for the Ways and Means Committee and Criticism for the Ruml Skip-a-Year-of-Taxes Plan

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, because I am quite sure that that which is contained therein will be helpful to the membership in arriving at a correct decision in respect to the so-called Ruml skip-a-year-of-taxes plan, I offer for inclusion in the RECORD as a part of my instant remarks an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune just a few days ago, an editorial which the headline writer has entitled "The Ruml Plan and Some Alternatives."

The editorial follows:

THE RUML PLAN AND SOME ALTERNATIVES

There are some things about the Ruml plan that we think deserve more attention than they have received.

It is said that almost nobody in this country set aside money in 1942 to pay the taxes on 1942 income that are now coming due. That can't be true, because the Treasury sold to individual taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars worth of tax notes in 1942. They were bought precisely for the purpose of paying 1942 income taxes in 1943. Moreover, the savings of the country were never larger than they were in 1942. There may be a lot of improvident citizens, but it is a libel on the people of this country to pretend that almost nobody set aside money to meet the taxes he knew were coming due on March 15, 1943. A lot of people have their payments in hand and have kissed the money good-bye. The Ruml plan, if adopted, will give it back to them.

The people who argue that the Ruml plan presents no threat of inflation because citizens will go on paying about the same amount to the Government, year by year, either way, will be right if the money reserved for taxes is kept in the savings banks or invested in Government bonds.

If any considerable amount of the savings gets into the already swollen current of trade, the effect will be noticeable and it may be very damaging. It's hard enough now to keep prices from ballooning out of sight and, if the rate of spending goes up, the problem may become insoluble.

We think the Ways and Means Committee of the House has been showing good sense in examining the Ruml plan with care before adopting it or any modification of it. Certainly the committee has been wise in rejecting the Treasury's scheme to combine the worst features of both the present plan and the Ruml plan. The Treasury says it will indorse a scheme to bring the taxpayer up to date if the taxpayer is required to pay something like 18 months' taxes in 12 months. Everybody above the poverty line is now obliged to pay a substantial part of his income in taxes and the rates are already so high that a 50-percent increase will be unbearable. About all that can be said of the Treasury's compromise plan is that it would ruin all but the most provident of the citizens.

Debate Starts on Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, from the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune:

DEBATE STARTS ON RUML PLAN

Debate on the Ruml tax plan started yesterday in the lower House of Congress and

will last for 4 days. When the vote is taken we will know whether Congress is looking at the facts of taxation or the politics of it. But with taxation having become a very serious problem facing almost every adult person we can no longer afford to let it be booted around by politics.

Fortunately at this time the most sensible tax proposal anyone has thought up for years is getting the attention of Congress and the support of the country. Of course, we are speaking of the Ruml plan. In the most recent Gallup poll (announced Monday) the plan was supported by 85 percent of the American people.

Why this unheard of majority in favor of a tax plan? Because it takes the big unknown out of income taxation. It provides for the collection of 1943 taxes in 1943. That is the central feature of the Ruml plan. People won't have to wonder whether they will have enough income next year to pay income tax on what they receive this year.

In everyone's mind a second feature is connected with the Ruml plan; that is collection at the source. With the tax year moved up to coincide with the payment of the tax and the tax collected at the source most of the uncertainty and fear of taxation will have been removed.

Both of these features are so sensible and so popular we doubt if Congress will dare to vote the Ruml plan down. But why should any Congressman want to do so? He will not be helping himself, his constituents, or his country.

We have no doubt that more money will be collected under the Ruml plan than under any other that has been suggested. Is not that the most important factor in war taxation?

The Treasury is opposed to the Ruml plan, probably because it did not suggest it or because the President is interested in the political phase of the question. He still insists that it will not be fair to treat rich taxpayers the same as others.

This is about the poorest argument anyone could put up for a tax bill, and it is our belief Mr. Roosevelt is making a serious blunder in injecting prejudice into this problem. When 85 percent of the people favor a measure there is good reason to think they don't have much faith in the arguments against it.

Just remember that the Ruml plan proposes that every taxpayer shall be treated exactly alike. Does anyone know any reason why any other criterion should be used?

An Official of W. P. A. in Arizona Makes Final Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I want to insert a letter which I received today concerning the "folding up" of the W. P. A. in Arizona. I have read and reread this report, not only because it is written by a friend of mine, but it is the final word of a public servant announcing that the function for which his agency was created has finished its work and it is proper to give an accounting.

He is reporting to me, not because he is required by law to do so but because he thinks that other public servants should know of a record of which he is not ashamed. It is a good accounting of a stewardship.

During the years of the great depression while I have been in Congress I have had a knowledge of, and sympathetic understanding toward, the work of the W. P. A. in Arizona. I know that a true accounting may ignore the oft-heard, sarcastic reference to "leaf raking," but must include a story of salvaging of human values and the constructions of public works to serve our community through many years.

The letter is as follows:

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION,
STATE OF ARIZONA,
Phoenix, Ariz.

Now that the Works Projects Administration programs is in the process of liquidation, we feel the obligation of briefly reporting to the sponsors of Works Projects Administration projects some of the accomplishments.

The physical accomplishments under the program included such major items as concrete, oil, or grade surfacing of 2,100 miles of highways, 278 miles of streets and alleys, and 200 miles of other roads; construction or reconstruction of 5,768 bridges and viaducts, and 463 miles of concrete sidewalks, curb, and gutter. The building program involved the construction and improvement of 284 structures for educational purposes, 103 for recreational, and 170 for other public functions; 2 new airports were constructed and 5 enlarged and improved; 120 miles of water mains, storm and sewerage lines were laid.

The major activities in the professional and service division centered around the nursery school, vocational training, Americanization classes for aliens, child health and welfare, and school lunch projects. Results of these are well known throughout the State.

We have been informed that the operation in Arizona was one of the outstanding programs in the Nation. There were several reasons for this record. First, the program in Arizona was devoid of politics and patronage, thanks to our Senators and Representatives standing solidly back of the President's request that there be no politics in the administration of work relief. Second, Arizona being a pioneer State, the need for public improvements had never been fully satisfied. Third, our sponsors' cooperation in the furnishing of project proposals and the necessary financing for the higher types of public improvements for the employment of needy persons in their immediate communities, which resulted in probably the highest average sponsors' contribution among the States.

We feel that the most important result is what the program has meant to our fellow citizens who were forced by adverse conditions to seek this employment. By your presentation of sound work projects (not leaf raking), these persons not only were able to sustain their families through an earned wage but had the opportunity to train the hand and mind and regain their confidence by honest labor which, supplemented by sufficient material and equipment, produced many fine public improvements in which the workers felt a justifiable pride.

This training on the project and the additional training furnished through our vocational night schools, and later the assistance given by the Arizona vocational schools, placed our workmen in the position that when the increase in outside employment offered the opportunity they were able to competently fill needed positions.

We are pleased to report that, with the closing of our projects on February 1, 1943, and with the fine cooperation of the employees in the States and the able assistance of the United States Employment Service, all but 100 of the former maximum load of 15,000 persons had been able to find jobs in private or war production employment.

We believe that the Works Progress Administration program, as a temporary palliative to relieve unemployment, has served the purpose and justified its existence during the depression through physical and humanitarian accomplishments.

It is, indeed, encouraging that private industry is now engaged in a planning program designed to take care of a maximum employment after the war and that this is being supplemented by thinking at national, State, and local levels in planning necessary public works. It is sincerely hoped that by this combined planning we will never again be faced with an unemployment condition such as was experienced during the last decade, in which there was no precedent to guide us, no time for long-range planning, but the immediate necessity of providing employment. Under those conditions some confusion and waste were inevitable.

Whatever success was accomplished in Arizona, we realize that it would have been impossible without adequate sponsors' planning and cooperation, and we wish to express the gratitude of this administration and the workers who were employed by these projects, for your valued assistance.

Yours very truly,

RAY VYNE,
Acting State Administrator.

Location of Alcohol Manufacturing Plants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. U. S. GUYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the United States War Production Board to change their policy in regard to the location of alcohol manufacturing plants:

House Concurrent Resolution 11

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the United States War Production Board to change their policy in regard to the location of alcohol manufacturing plants

Whereas this Nation's economy and its successful war program are so fundamentally based on rubber that any break-down which may occur might seriously endanger or postpone victory for the United Nations; and

Whereas it is generally agreed that the only solution to the Nation's rubber problem is in volume production of synthetic rubber, and from the reports of the press, this volume must be between 200,000 and 300,000 tons during 1943 to produce the over-all tonnage from all sources, including natural rubber and synthetics, of more than 775,000 tons; and

Whereas this total requirement includes the working stock and natural rubber backlog which rubber companies must maintain, and the present Government program for synthetic rubber, again relying on the reports of the Nation's press, is overwhelmingly dependent on the production of butadiene, which is produced from either petroleum or alcohol; and

Whereas the recommendations of the Baruch report are for 40 percent of the butadiene to be made from alcohol processes,

and present War Production Board tabulations show that this process is now used in about 30 percent of the production, and to the end of January 1943, only 5 percent of the butadiene program was in production; and

Whereas the Baruch report points out needs for aviation gasoline, fuel for merchant vessels and ships of the Navy conflict with the needs of butadiene for synthetic rubber; and

Whereas agricultural alcohol has been proved superior both in terms of speed of production and in availability of raw materials, and the Gillette committee findings of last year established the fact that plants for making rubber out of agricultural products can be built with one-third of the amount of critical materials required by the petroleum plants and one-third of the cost in about one-half of the time; and

Whereas the United States War Production Board has recently designated certain locations for alcohol plants, three in Iowa, one in Nebraska, one in Missouri, two in Illinois, one in Wisconsin, and none in the State of Kansas; and

Whereas the State of Kansas, being one of the greatest grain-producing States of the Nation, has, and will have, an adequate supply of grain and other raw materials necessary in the manufacture of alcohol; and

Whereas the War Production Board has adopted the policy contained in the so-called Baruch committee report of locating alcohol plants on navigable streams and, as a result, has precluded the placing of such a plant in the State of Kansas; and

Whereas the State of Kansas has the largest gas field in the world, the gas from which could be utilized in the manufacture of alcohol: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the senate concurring therein), That we respectfully urge and request Congress and the United States War Production Board to consider the factors mentioned in the preamble of this resolution, namely, the abundance of grain, the abundance of gas, and the abundance of water as offsetting the advantage of a navigable stream and change their policy so that the State of Kansas would be eligible to be designated as a place where an alcohol plant, or any of the related plants required in the production of synthetic rubber should be located; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each Member of Congress from Kansas, including both Senators and Representatives; the President of the Senate; the Speaker of the House; the President of the United States; the Vice President of the United States; the Chairman of the War Production Board; Mr. William M. Jeffers, Rubber Director; and Mr. James F. Byrnes, Economic Stabilizer; and Mr. Bernard Baruch.

Pennsylvania Grade Crude Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, permit me at this time to call the attention of Members of Congress to a very interesting speech appearing in the columns of the Oil City Derrick, Oil City, Pa., by P. J. Noon, secretary of the Bradford District Oil Producers Association on Pennsylvania grade crude oil, the finest lubricating oil found anywhere throughout the world today.

Mr. Noon's speech follows:

I assume that you men present this afternoon represent various types of businesses and professions in and surrounding the city of Bradford. Every progressive businessman likes to know a little about other businesses or industries in his particular locality. The vast economic changes which have occurred during the past years have made us realize that while each particular industry is vital to the welfare of the community, we are, as a group, interested in the prosperity of one another whether we be businessmen, professional men, manufacturers, or oil producers.

INDUSTRY IS ESSENTIAL ONE

I happen to be associated with the petroleum industry. Some of us, perhaps some of you, call it the oil business. Under whichever name you choose to call it—if we study this business seriously—we shall find it to be a basic essential undertaking. It is so fundamental that, without it, few other industrial enterprises would have reached the advanced stages of progress they enjoy today. The services of the oil industry are so widespread that every civilized person, either directly or indirectly, uses petroleum products or services.

All crude oil is not the same quality. Just as we have different grades and qualities of coal, lumber, cattle, and metals, we also have different grades of crude oil. Generally speaking, price is indicative of quality and the present price of $3 per barrel for crude oil produced in McKean County is the highest price paid in the United States. Some grades of western oils sell for as low as 70 cents per barrel.

According to the Federal Trade Commission, "Pennsylvania oil, which is a kind and grade of oil produced in the Appalachian field, is a high-grade lubricating oil, and is regarded by the public as a superior grade of oil, by reason of which it commands a higher price than other oils produced in the Mid-Continent field and the California field, and is also regarded as a higher grade and more desirable oil than any blend or combination of Pennsylvania oil with the oils produced in said other fields, and commands a higher price in the market than such blend with inferior oils."

COVERS 1,750,000 ACRES

The Pennsylvania grade area covers approximately 1,750,000 productive acres in western New York State, western Pennsylvania, western West Virginia, and southeastern Ohio. The Bradford field consists of approximately 85,000 acres, and that part of the Bradford field which lies entirely within the county of McKean comprises about 75,000 acres of productive territory. It is the most important oil producing erritory in the Pennsylvania grade area. The daily average production of the entire Pennsylvania grade area last year was 78,032 (1942) barrels. The production of the Bradford field averaged 42,555 (1942) barrels daily last year or 54.53 (1942) percent of the total production of the entire Penn grade area. McKean County's production averaged 38,745 (1942) barrels daily last year or 49.65 (1942) percent of the total production of the entire Penn grade area.

As to how oil was formed is a disputed question, but geologists are of the opinion that the Bradford oil sand which ranges from 1,200 to 2,000 feet below the surface of the earth was at one time covered by water, and the animal and vegetable life on the earth at that time have, through millions of years, been changed into crude oil.

WATER FLOODING USED

During the early years in the development of the McKean County field, the force which removed the oil from the sand was the dissolved natural gas in the oil. As this gas became depleted, oil ceased to flow to the oil wells, production dropped considerably, yet only about one-third of the original oil content had been removed from the sand. Water is now used to remove part of the remaining oil content by what is called the water-flooding process. The arrangement of oil and water wells is principally the five-spot set-up where four water wells are drilled on the corners of a square, water is admitted to these water wells, and the oil is forced to the center of the square where an oil well is drilled. It is advantageous not to drill the oil well until all the oil possible has been forced into the center area. Water wells are drilled and water admitted from 6 to 9 months before the oil wells are drilled.

Pennsylvania grade oil has the natural qualities which makes it possible to manufacture the highest grade lubricating oil. If we were to take a barrel of crude oil produced in this county and determine its by-products, some of the most important would be as follows: Gasoline, naphtha, kerosene, cylinder stock, and bright stock. Bright stock is a natural base for aviation lubricants. If military experts are correct in their assumption that the present worldwide conflict must be won in the air, McKean County crude oil, by reason of its by-products, is contributing substantially toward that victory. Highest quality oils are necessary for the lubrication of an engine operating under the severe temperature changes encountered in the operation of an airplane motor.

STUDY RECOVERY PROBLEM

I have already stated that this county is the most important oil-producing territory in the Pennsylvania grade area. The production of oil is of paramount importance to the continued economic welfare of the citizens of the county. It has been estimated that approximately 120,000,000 barrels of oil can still be recovered in this county by present methods. Our present yearly production approximates 12,000,000 barrels. Notwithstanding the increased production brought about by the innovation of water flooding, authorities are of the opinion that from 30 to 40 percent of the original oil content still remains in the ground. Any industry, in order to progress in these highly competitive times, must of necessity resort to a program of scientific research in order to develop ways and means of discovering new products or improving its existing product. The producers of McKean County have not been found to be dilatory in this regard. In conjunction with the school of mineral industries at State College, a Bradford district research group was organized about 8 years ago in order to study the existing problems of the producing industry in McKean County and to successfully solve the future problems of the field. The recovery of every barrel of crude oil which nature has bountifully stored in these beautiful hills and valleys of McKean County is of paramount importance to the producer, farmer, merchant, and home owner.

VALUATIONS ARE CITED

The total valuation in McKean County on which taxes were paid for the year 1941 was $36,065,740 (1942) exclusive of personal property valuation. The oil valuation of the county for the year 1942 was $19,372,500. The total oil taxes for the year 1942 for county and township road and school amounted to approximately $600,000. The principal oil production of McKean County lies within the confines of seven townships: Bradford, Eldred, Foster, Hamlin, Keating, Lafayette, and Otto. In these seven townships, oil-production valuation equaled 82 percent of the total real estate and occupational valuation. Over the entire county, oil-production valuation equaled approximately 50 percent of

the total real estate and occupational valuation. These figures are significant with relation to the maintenance of county government, roads, and schools. They are also significant to the farmer, merchant, and real-estate owner.

Thousands of men are employed in the production of crude oil in the county. There are 2 modern and well-equipped refineries located in McKean County which take the crude produced in this county and in addition our crude is shipped to the eastern seaboard. The refineries located in the county employ hundreds of men. At McKean County's present production rate of approximately 35,000 barrels per day and at the present price of $3 per barrel at the wells, the gross monthly income amounts to about $3,150,000. It is estimated that about 60 percent of this total remains in our banking institutions subject to check.

PETROLEUM AGE

In conclusion, let me say that petroleum products have penetrated into our lives and into the American way of doing things. Automotive and air transportation are entirely dependent on them. Diesel locomotives are the pride of our railroads, just as oil-burning steamers are the pride of our fleet. Manufacturers lubricate the wheels of practically every machine with petroleum oils, and fuel oils furnish a great deal of the power. We provide sprays for fighting insects, paraffin for preserving farm products, and an economical fuel for transportation over roads improved with asphalt. Human history has been divided into ages such as the iron age. Truly, we are living in what might be called the petroleum age, and I assure you that McKean County is a dominant factor in that petroleum age.

The Pace Bill

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it was only after an experimental period following the passage of the original price-control bill, that this country decided to make price control really effective by putting ceilings on farm products, as well as on all otner items which are used in everyday life.

When the original price-control bill was passed the farmer was given a preferential and unique status. The over-all price-control bill did not control his products, and even after a ceiling was placed on farm products, it was still over and above parity prices, which other consumer's items have received.

A farmer, as a matter of fact, is not only a producer, but also a consumer and any substantial increase in farm prices must necessarily result in the increase of other prices.

It was the very fact that it was necessary to establish price ceilings on everything a person buys, that made it necessary to establish price ceilings on farm products as well. We saw fit, under the latest set-up to establish price ceilings on items of food, clothing, and the like, simply because without such ceilings we would have had a runaway market and everything that one uses would skyrocket in price and ultimately you and I, and the man in the street, would be wholly unable to buy anything because one's income could never keep pace with the rising prices of goods. A typical instance of this is well known to us from recent history. Those of us who are old enough to remember 1922 and 1923, know how inflation in Germany resulted in everybody becoming a millionaire overnight. There was a million marks in prices paid for everything one desired to purchase. A humble postage stamp cost a couple of million marks and prices of goods and the cost of production increased accordingly. A million marks could not even purchase a cup of coffee.

Do we desire inflation to come to us the same way? Do we desire an uncontrolled market, where everyday prices of things would go up by 1, 2, or 10 points, and eventually nothing would be reasonable enough to enable a person of ordinary means to make a purchase? Do we want a situation where the average person toiling for his daily wage will be obliged to ask for increases because no matter how much his wages would be increased, he would still be unable to go to the corner grocery and buy a tin of rice.

You see, we have so definitely determined that an uncontrolled market is impossible in time of war, that only after long deliberation and a thorough consideration of all factors we passed a Price Control Act, which, in my opinion, is fair, honorable, and conducive to the happiness of millions, in that it freezes wages and prices, and makes it possible to earn a living and enjoy the blessings of our democracy.

The proposed bill, H. R. 1408, is definitely an inflationary measure. It seeks to include into the cost of farm products the cost of farm labor and thereby increase the cost of all farm products, but I do not know how much. Some people estimate that that increase would be as much as 32 percent. Others estimated it at other figures. But there is no question that no matter how the increase is estimated there will be a definite increase in the cost of production of farm products, and, of course, a definite increase in the cost of living of the average man, woman, and child in this country.

The Members of the House are of course familiar with the fact that whatever ceilings were imposed on other products, the products of farms have had a higher ceiling than everything else which goes into the budget of the average consumer. In fact, the farmer is the pet child of this body, and whatever benefits can be given to any portion of our population, it is the farmer who gets most of it.

I have before me a very interesting publication, prepared by the Division of Research of the O. P. A., and dealing with farm prices, farm costs, and farm production.

I find from this analysis that between 1939 and 1942 the prices received by farmers for their products were far in excess of the prices received prior to that date. In fact the prices between 1939 and 1942 increased two and one-half times as much as the costs of wages paid by the farmer per unit of output and four times as much as the total costs per unit per output. This situation was brought about by the fact that while the farmer's costs, that is the prices the farmer paid has been controlled, the prices the farmer received have been permitted to rise very rapidly. In fact it is estimated that the farmer received as much as 114 percent of so-called parity prices, although their demand right along has been for what they called parity which already meant a substantial increase in the farmer's income for many years past.

It is true that farm-wage rates have risen and risen sharply since the outbreak of the war, but this rise in farm wages did not check farm production. As a matter of fact there has been a considerable increase in the output. This is due to the fact that while farm prices have risen 71 percent, farm-wage rates have only risen 58 percent. There is, therefore, a differential of 23 percent in favor of the farmer, and as a result he has nothing to complain about.

I challenge any other person who is obliged to employ labor or who is engaged in business, to show that since 1939 he had obtained an increase in his real earnings of 23 percent. Why, most people are glad enough to break even.

It is important, however, to observe that it is not only the rates of wages paid which determine the price of farm production. It is important, in order to determine a proper price, to analyze the amount of farm production as well as the output per individual. In this respect it is important to observe that in 1942, the output per farm worker was 78 percent higher than during the period of 1910 to 1914.

Productivity increased 23 percent between 1939 and 1942. A day's labor will now produce more bushels of corn. All these figures have been taken by me from the publication I quoted, and I have no doubt that these figures are accurate and reliable.

The booklet estimates that between 1939 and 1942 wage rates on Illinois and Nebraska corn farms increased 58 percent, while the total wage bill increased 61 percent. But it is estimated that the output per worker increased to such an extent that hired-labor costs per unit of output increased only 18 percent, so that the total costs per unit declined 9 percent while prices increased 53 percent. This is a very substantial increase in the farmers' income.

I do not wish to burden the House with more figures, and as a matter of fact a study of the publication mentioned will be of great benefit to the Members of the House and will show to every unprejudiced person that it would be very detrimental and destructive to our whole price-control set-up, if we are to allow a break in our present price-control system by adding increased cost of farm labor to the basis upon which prices for agricultural products are fixed.

As I said before, you cannot establish a price structure which is as fair as our Price Administration seeks to establish

if we deliberately add something which seeks to increase farm prices.

An increase of farm prices can only result in a further increase in the cost of living, and by doing so our entire stabilization program will fall to pieces.

I warn the Members of the House against such a break-down, and I feel that it will be in the interests of the country if this bill is voted down.

The Farm Problem—Equipment—Manpower—Transportation

REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTON J. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the farm problem—the problem of supplying food for our Nation and its allies. We all know how badly the farm-equipment problem was bungled by bureaucrats when they placed drastic limitations on production of such equipment last year. The manpower problem is still manhandled.

What I want to bring to the attention of Congress today is a problem that seems to have been overlooked, one akin to the farm-equipment problem. Failure to take action now may result in a frustration of our efforts in solving the other two problems. Unless the cattle and hogs our farmers raise on their farms, and unless the fresh fruits and vegetables they raise are moved to markets where they are distributed to the masses of the peoples, the farmer might better have let his help go off to the Army and saved his seed.

As my colleagues know, the manufacture of highway-transport equipment—trucks and trailers—has, except for very special purposes, been discontinued for about a year. I have before me a press release of the War Production Board dated March 24, 1943, and I am amazed at the small number of trucks remaining in the so-called reserve pool. Available for civilian rationing, are listed the following: Light trucks, 13,045; medium trucks, 36,062; heavy trucks, 3,071.

The farmer has been asked to increase his plantings by 10,000,000 acres. He has likewise been asked to increase his production of cattle, hogs, and livestock to supply the meat requirements of the Nation and its allies. If the highway-transport equipment available in previous years was enough to handle the farm produce, then what will be the situation when you consider an expanded production, plus the fact that practically every truck and trailer on the highways is now at least over a year old.

Commercial growers of vegetables, beans, peas, potatoes, and sweetpotatoes will increase their acreage by 18 percent over 1942. Livestock for meats will be increased 17 percent over 1942 and poultry 28 percent over 1942. Just how will that increased production get to market without an increase in highway-transport equipment? The old equipment now in use could hardly be expected, after an additional year's use, to move the same amount of produce as in 1942—much less this added 17 percent to 28 percent.

Of course the farmer is busy with his plantings and with his labor problem. He has not raised this highway transport question because it has not hurt him as yet. But the farmer has a right to expect that we here in Washington do not bring his valient efforts to naught, for lack of proper transportation to market when his crop is harvested or his livestock ready for the slaughter.

It is a problem that faces the War Production Board squarely, but if that body will not act, then it becomes the duty of Congress to take steps. Previous actions of the War Production Board in not solving the rubber problem, and in not solving the farm-equipment problem, before much damage was done, and then not until an aroused Congress forced the issue, leads me to believe that little can be expected from that Board.

Rather than wait for the War Production Board to miss the signals on this all important subject of highway transportation I propose that the Congress make a thorough-going investigation promptly—and then act before it is too late. We cannot afford to wait until our highway transport system starts to go to pieces, nor until our crops and livestock are ready for market. It takes time to manufacture trucks and trailers, even in a going shop, but much more in one that has been converted to other work because of the shut-down on civilian truck manufacture.

A disillusioned farmer and a hungry citizenry awaits us at home next fall if, in this instance, we provide too little—too late.

Recruiting of Farm Labor From Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under the guise of an amendment to the appropriation bill and in a manner which rides roughshod over the rules of the House of Representatives, this resolution seeks to appropriate $26,100,000 for a purpose which I cannot possibly approve.

The resolution seeks to make an appropriation to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate a program to develop an adequate supply and distribution of labor "for the production of agricultural commodities essential for the prosecution of the war." But the resolution goes further than that. It appropriates a substantial sum of money for the recruiting, transporting, and distributing of labor to be used in agriculture. And here is the greatest objection to the bill: It seeks to bring farm labor from such neighboring countries as Mexico and Central America without the present-day restrictions of our immigration laws.

It is clear that any amendment to the immigration laws should originate in the Committee on Immigration, and it is this committee which can provide the machinery for the successful enforcement of immigration laws, and it is through this committee that any amendments to immigration laws should originate.

The wording of the resolution makes it possible to be interpreted in such a manner that labor could be imported into the United States without restrictions and without any supervision by the Immigration Service or the Attorney General.

Under the existing law since 1875 alien contract labor was continually under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Labor and the Attorney General, and this attempt seems to be a complete break from existing procedure.

At the present time, if any type of labor is to be brought in from another country, the Attorney General would be required to make sure that labor of like kind imported into the United States cannot be found here.

As a practical solution the Attorney General has been cooperating with the Manpower Commission and the United States Employment Service and other organizations of the Government, as well as representatives of the Department of Agriculture, in meeting the needs of employment insofar as importation of labor is concerned. Arrangements have been made for the importation of large groups of farm employees from Mexico and conferences are being held in relation to bringing in additional railway and mining employees from Mexico, as well as agricultural workers from the Bahama Islands.

But all these importations have been made under the existing contract-labor laws which specifically call for an investigation by the Attorney General in each case, and for a finding by the Attorney General that like labor cannot be found in the United States.

Under the resolution all the safeguards with reference to contract labor have been wiped out, and there is a great danger that this resolution will practically wipe out all the existing restrictions with reference to contract labor.

As a matter of fact, there are a number of immigration inspectors in many countries who examine prospective laborers at the source and who determine for themselves as to whether or not certain persons should be fitted out and allowed to cross the border and weed out those who will get to the border only to be rejected under our immigration laws. There should be some provision enacted to the effect that any

such appropriation should not be construed as authorizing a repeal of any portion of our immigration laws or any regulations adopted by the Attorney General under the immigration law.

Charles O. Falkenwald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 25, Charles O. Falkenwald, of the Rural Electrification Administration, and one of the best friends rural electrification ever had, passed away at his home in St. Louis, Mo. He was laid to rest at Baltimore, Md., this morning.

Charlie Falkenwald will long be remembered by the farmers of this Nation whose cause he so faithfully served. Wherever an electric light is seen in a farmhouse, from Maine to Mexico, his name is known.

The cause of rural electrification was nearest his heart. He lived it day and night. He appreciated the happiness, the efficiency, the comforts, conveniences, and the relief from drudgery it brought to the farm home.

He literally killed himself at work. He was a martyr to the great cause of rural electrification. The doctors say he "outran his heart."

He gave his life in the service of his country.

Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plan

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, today Congress has the option of either giving the people a current pay-as-you-go system of taxation or of refusing to do so. If the bill before us, H. R. 2218, known as the committee taxation bill, should become a law, the taxpayer could do either of two things. He could continue on a year-behind-always-in-debt basis, or he could squeeze out of 1 year's pay envelopes enough to pay the total taxes of 2 years. Only a very small percent of the people from my district could live and pay 2 years' taxes from 1 year's income. If the committee plan is adopted, thousands of people in our military units will be forced to pay, when they return to civilian life, a tax based on their 1942 income. What about our War bonds, if we have to pay 2 years' taxes in 1? Those patriotic workers who are buying War bonds out of each pay check will find it practically impossible to buy bonds, pay 2 years' taxes in 1, and still keep the "home fires burning."

In my district the result of a poll initiated through my office shows that better than 95 percent want a pay-as-you-go-tax plan. Why is the administration so strong for the committee bill? They know well that 85 to 90 percent of the American taxpayers want a pay-as-you-go-tax plan. Is the administration mad at Congress because Congress now insists on writing its own laws and exercising its rights as set forth in our Constitution, or is it for purely political reasons? In the past taxes have too often been levied with an eye to political consideration. If we contemplate taking nearly a third of the national income in taxation, it is most important that our tax program be studied carefully to make sure that: First, it is directed to cut down excessive spending power where it exists; and, second, that it does not cut so deeply into the spending power of any group as to endanger health and wartime efficiency. An ideal program would be to cut out all the excessive spending, reduce all Federal personnel about one-half, which would include a reduction of our Federal bureaus, and then submit a pay-as-you-earn-tax program that treats the rich and poor alike.

I hope that Congress today will assume its rightful duties and write a law that will give equal chance to all the people, a law that a vast majority of the people think fair, and a law which does not carry with it political aroma.

Opinion Invalidating Rent-Control Provisions of Price Control Act

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for printing in the RECORD, copy of an opinion by Judge Thomas W. Slick, judge of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Indiana, in which he declared invalid the rent-control provisions of the Price Control Act. An appeal has been taken from this opinion directed to the Supreme Court under the provisions of this act.

In holding that the act fails to set up any standards by which the Administrator should be governed in the fixing of rentals, the court had this to say:

The Administrator possesses here not only a figurative roving commission but one in patent literalness. He may move from State to State, from county to county, and, according as the spirit moves or in the measure of his last nocturnal sojourn, whether restful or restless, his morning meal palatable or inedible, find or decline to find, as for that territorial locality where each morning sun discovered him, that it was "an area where defense activities have resulted or threaten to result in an increase in the rents for housing accommodations which will bring about speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in rents, which tend to defeat or obstruct the effective prosecution of the war." He becomes the general agent of the Congress, first to choose the area for legislation, then to choose the character of the legislation that he believes suits the areas selected for action, and there to enforce it in the manner he sees fit.

As Mr. Justice Cardozo once said:

Here in effect is a roving commission to inquire into evils, and, upon discovery, correct them. It is "delegation running riot."

The opinion of Judge Slick follows:

Plaintiff brings this suit against defendant asking for judgment in treble the amount he has been required by defendant to pay on a lease of property in the city of South Bend, Ind., in excess of that permitted under an order issued by the Administrator of the Emergency Price Control Act. He alleges that both he and the defendant are residents of the city of South Bend, and invokes the jurisdiction of this court under section 205 of the Emergency Price Control Act enacted by Congress and approved January 30, 1942. Plaintiff alleges that he is a tenant of the defendant under a written lease providing for the payment of rent in the sum of $45 per month; that in March 1942 the Administrator of the Emergency Price Control Act created and proclaimed as a defense rental area the territory embodying the county of St. Joseph, including South Bend, to become effective June 1, 1942. That the pertinent provisions of the regulation as created by the Administrator of the Emergency Price Control Act are, that regardless of any contract or lease, no person shall demand or receive rent within the defense rental area higher than the maximum rent provided by the regulation; that disregarding such regulation the defendant, his landlord, has exacted $10 per month more than the regulation permits and plaintiff has been required to pay $45 per month when under said regulation the maximum he could be required to pay is $35 per month. He brings this suit for treble damages amounting in all to $120, in addition to $50 attorneys' fees.

Defendant challenges the specifications of this complaint with a motion to dismiss accompanied by a very exhaustive brief in support of such motion.

We have not been favored with a brief on behalf of the plaintiff. Intervenor, the Price Administrator, filed an answering brief which has been answered by way of reply by the defendant who specifically affirms that the Congress, under its war powers, has authority to regulate prices limitedy only by the constitutional inhibition against failure to provide standards. Defendants, as I understand his brief, contends that the Administrator cannot use his own discretion without a hearing, to arbitrarily fix prices in any rental area; that there must be some standards to guide him, which the act fails to provide. Otherwise the delegation of authority is contrary to the constitutional provisions.

I realize the seriousness of the question and the necessity of delegating authority to stabilize prices in these troublous times; nevertheless, the Constitution is intended to be enforced and complied with in times of war as well as in times of peace. This principle has been particularly accented and runs through all the decisions handed down by the Supreme Court—*United States* v. *Cohen Grocery Company* (255 U. S. 81; ex parte *Milligan*, 4 Wall. 121), and many other illuminating decisions.

In *Panama Refining Company* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388), the Court said "Congress has declared no policy, has established no stand-

ard, had laid down no rule," thus inferentially requiring that a policy and standards must be set up to give the act of Congress constitutionality. The order in this case, as in the Panama case, contains no finding of facts, no statement of the grounds of the Administrator's action. Again in the case at bar, as was held in the Panama case, if it could be inferred that Congress intended certain circumstances or conditions to govern the exercise of the authority conferred, the Administrator could not act validly without complying with the circumstances and conditions and findings by the Administrator that these conditions existed and were necessary, else it is left entirely to the unfettered discretion of the Administrator.

As was said by Chief Justice Hughes in the Panama case, supra, "We are concerned with the question of delegation of legislative power. If the citizen is to be punished for the crime of violating a legislative order of an executive officer, or of a board or commission, due process of law requires that it shall appear that the order is within the authority of the officer, board, or commission, and, if that authority depends on the determination of facts these determinations must be shown." No determinations of facts are shown in the case at bar. The only provision in the Emergency Price Control Act that even hints at the necessity for determination of facts is found in section 202 where it is provided that "The Administrator is authorized to make such studies and investigations and to obtain such information as he deems necessary or proper to assist him in prescribing any regulation or order under this act or in the administration and enforcement of this act and regulations, orders, and price schedules thereunder." Here the Administrator is authorized, but not required to act. In *Wichita Railroad & Light Company* v. *Public Utilities, etc* (260 U. S. 48), the Court said, "In creating such an administrative agency the legislature, to prevent its being a pure delegation of legislative power, must enjoin upon it a certain course or procedure and certain rules of decision in the performance of its function." What course of procedure or rules of decision were laid down or complied with in this case?

As defendant very well says on page 16 of his brief, "He (the Administrator) possesses here not only a figurative 'roving commission,' but one in patent literalness. He may move from State to State, from county to county, and, according as 'the spirit moves' or in the measure of his last nocturnal sojourn, whether restful or restless, his morning meal palatable or inedible, find or decline to find, as for that territorial locality where each morning sun discovered him, that it was 'an area where defense activities have resulted or threaten to result in an increase in the rents for housing accommodations which will bring about speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in rents which tend to defeat or obstruct the effective prosecution of the war.' He (the Administrator) becomes the general agent of the Congress—first to choose the area for legislation, then to choose the character of the legislation that he believes suits the area selected for action, and there to enforce it in the manner he sees fit."

As Mr. Justice Cardoza once said, "Here in effect is a roving commission to inquire into evils, and, upon discovery, correct them." It "is delegation running riot." In my opinion Congress never intended to delegate this omnipotent power to the Administrator of the Emergency Price Control Act, and if it was so intended, the act, under such construction, is unconstitutional.

For the above reasons the motion to dismiss should be sustained.

THOS W. SLICK,
Judge, United States District Court.

At South Bend, Ind.
FEBURARY 25, 1943.

A Soldier's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago there was published in the Decatur (Ala.) Daily a letter from a soldier somewhere in New Guinea. Believing that this letter and the editorial in the same paper of the same date may be of interest to many, I am including them as follows:

STATION HOSPITAL,
San Francisco, Calif., March 9, 1943.

THE EDITOR,
Decatur Daily, Decatur, Ala.

DEAR MR. BLOODWORTH: I wrote a letter to you sometime ago to be placed in the Voice of the People, and you very graciously published it. I am writing another one and I desire to have it published in that column also, and I assure you that it will be highly appreciated.

SOMEWHERE IN NEW GUINEA.

DEAR PEOPLE OF ALABAMA: From the very scarce news we soldiers get over here I see where they are still pulling strike after strike in the industrial plants throughout America. It sorely grieves me to see this. If the workers throughout our land would only stop for just one moment and think and say to himself: "What am I doing for the defense of my country?" I believe there would be an end of all this. I believe their consciences would urge them on.

I wonder if these people know that their jobs, no matter where they are or what they are doing, are just as vital in the defense of their Nation as ours are over here in these Jap-infested jungles. If they could come over here and live with mosquitoes, flies, snakes, lizards, and every vermin on earth and watching men die, they would change their minds. It is in no sense a beautiful and pleasant sight. Perhaps that same man has a son right along beside me. We've got to do ours. The same rule should apply to them.

Do they know, I wonder, that every day they lose from that plant is another star in the tiara of Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo? Do they know, I wonder, that they are just as guilty of sabotage as any Axis spy, just the same as though they had placed a ton of TNT under that nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals? Well, people, they are. They should be drafted and just as soon as was utterly possible they should put them on a ship and send them to some foreign fighting front and let them face death. Let them dodge dive bombers, shrapnel, and machine-gun bullets, and every time you raise your head have a sniper cut it off with a rifle or a hand grenade. People, if that were to happen they would go back to America, if given the opportunity, and work free of charge for the rest of their lives.

I was born and raised in Morgan County, Ala., and I love it with all the love in the world. My father and my mother were raised there. If I love it enough to fight for it, you people should love it enough to work for it. If I had the same opportunity I would work and never cease until we had driven every Axis nation off the face of the earth.

I wish that some good man or woman who reads this will cut it out and send it to the Birmingham News and to any other paper they so desire. It's a cinch, buddy, we can't win without your help. But if you will place your shoulder to the wheel we will win, and no power this side of heaven nor hell will keep us from it.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN R. ALDRIDGE.

ALDRIDGE WRITES

Corp. John R. Aldridge writes from a hospital somewhere overseas to the Daily that if the industrial workers in war plants who are so much concerned with wages, hours, union representation, and various other matters, could get a glimpse of what the soldier at the front is undergoing, the workers would be less inclined to strike on the slight provocations which inspire so many walk-outs.

The reasoning of Corporal Aldridge is sound and logical. He does not berate, but he does appeal to reason.

In order that the appeal might have the widest possible circulation, he suggests that copies of the letter be clipped and sent to other newspapers. That looks like a splendid idea.

If there are readers of the Daily who feel as Corporal Aldridge does (and we feel sure there must be many of them) then why not cut out the letter and send it with an explanation of your own to the voice of the people column of some other newspaper?

It is entirely possible that a new form of chain letter could be created capable of reaching the majority of the workers of the entire Nation.

War Manpower Recognition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. TOLAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting herewith the following article from the National Chiropractic Journal of April 1943. The chiropractic profession is seeking to be placed upon the essential list of the Manpower Commission and this article is very interesting and persuasive as to what part the chiropractic profession is playing in the manpower problem of this country.

WAR MANPOWER RECOGNITION

(A brief in support of a proposal to include chiropractic as an occupation essential to the conduct of the war, and necessary to the maintenance of the health of the civilian population)

Chiropractic is a health system that employs a distinctive method of therapeutics. The chiropractic physician manipulates the structures of the body, especially those of the spinal column, to restore normal nerve function. Supplementary measures of light, heat, air, water, diet, and exercise are also used. (The chiropractic profession owns more physiotherapy equipment in proportion to its numbers than any other profession.)

Though the distinctive therapeutic procedure of the chiropractor may be manipulation its effectiveness and rightful application in the whole realm of disease is recognized. This claim is made with due consideration for its limitations in many disease conditions.

The chiropractor is a physician—a particular kind of physician, just as is the osteopath or homeopath, and as such is a person of

recognized experience, with educational and legal qualifications, engaged in the cure and prevention of disease and in the promotion of public health and welfare. He uses all of the conventional methods of diagnosis. He is licensed and regulated as a physician in 42 States, in the District of Columbia, and in Hawaii and Alaska. In Canada he is recognized in the Provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Ontario.

State and Federal courts in many decisions have declared chiropractic physicians to be subject to the same liabilities and responsibilities a the medical or oseopathic physicians in the exercise of their practice.

The course in accredited colleges of chiropractic consists of 4 years, of not less than 3,600 hours, and includes all of the basic sciences of anatomy, physiology, chemistry, pathology, and bacteriology, as well as diagnosis, hygiene, sanitation, and public health, as taught in medical and osteopathic colleges.

Thus the chiropractic profession has legal scientific, and educational qualifications giving it the right and competency to work in the entire domain of disease.

Chiropractic is the largest nonmedical or drugless profession in the United States. Approximately 20,000 chiropractic physicians serve an estimated clientele of 20,000,000 people. The estimated annual income of the profession is $80,000,000.

ESSENTIALITY OF ACTIVITY

The chiropractic profession has an increasing responsibility for the health and welfare of an increasingly large part of the civilian population. This is indicated (1) by the fact that a recent poll in 29 States showed a public demand for 78.5 percent increase in the number of chiropractic physicians, and (2) by the fact that, according to statistics recently compiled in 25 States, 11,878 chiropractic physicians treat daily 160,479 patients engaged in industries necessary to the war effort and distributed as follows:

Agriculture	31,472
Railroading	17,597
Aviation	14,004
Machine operation	16,137
Woodwork	13,568
Public utilities	20,377
Miscellaneous	19,419
Unclassified	27,905
Total	160,479

Clinical experience has proven chiropractic to be particularly efficacious in the treatment of certain physical disabilities induced by the rigors of modern industrial life.

The human spine and adjacent structures constitute the special province of chiropractic care. The chief concern of the chiropractic physician is the integrity of the human back. His immediate function is to correct such conditions as vertebral subluxations, pelvic distortions, sacro-iliac sprains, and related nervous and muscular dysfunctions—ailments which patiently impair the efficiency of men and women who operate the new war machinery. Clinical experience, extending over many years and including thousands of cases, has conclusively demonstrated the merit of chiropractic in effecting complete recovery from these disabilities, with recovery time reduced to minimum.

The effective treatment of these ailments—the special sphere of application of chiropractic science—is essential not only to the present efficiency but also to the future health of our workers; for such abnormalities, if not corrected, produce nervous disorders and lay the foundation for spinal arthritis and various internal functional disturbances.

Statistics compiled by the Chiropractic Bureau of Research and Review are here presented to indicate the effectiveness of chiropractic treatment in certain typical industrial ailments:

Type of case	Reported	Complete recovery or decided improvement	Percentage of recovery
			Percent
Coccygodynia	413	383	92.5
Lumbago	7,298	6,821	93.4
Neuritis	3,783	3,306	87.4
Rheumatism	3,040	2,428	79.9
Sacroiliac sprain	57,360	53,492	93.4
Sciatica	2,495	2,206	88.4
Torticollis	2,534	2,439	96.2

Certain governmental agencies, such as the Office of Price Administration and the War Production Board, have by regulation recognized Chiropractic physicians as being on an equality with medical physicians as necessary to the public welfare in relation to tire, fuel-oil, and gasoline rationing, and in relation to the installation of telephones and the purchase of X-ray apparatus and similar office equipment.

Approximately 200 of the leading insurance companies in the United States have recognized the proven merit of chiropractic treatment and have paid claims based upon the diagnoses and opinions of chiropractic physicians.

Chiropractors are qualified to perform vital services in activities essential to war production and to support the war effort.

ISSUES INVOLVED

There is impending a serious Nation-wide shortage of properly trained and qualified chiropractors. The exclusion of chiropractic from the list of essential occupations and the refusal to postpone induction of its students will, in the course of a few years, result in the extinction of the profession.

The annual loss through death and retirement is estimated at 603 practitioners. In previous years this loss was compensated for by the acquisition of new graduates. As a result of Selective-Service induction chiropractic colleges are now being depleted of both faculty and students. The annual enrollment in 12 approved colleges (of which 6 are now closed) for the past 3 years has been as follows:

	Students
September 1940	840
September 1941	774
September 1942	404

This represents a decrease in enrollment of over 50 percent. Of the 404 students now enrolled 348 are eligible for induction. This will leave exactly 56 students and inevitably means the closing of all accredited colleges.

Registrants in training and preparation as prechiropractic or chiropractic students, pursuing courses in recognized schools, should be considered for occupational classification during the period they are full-time students in such course of study, and provided they are in good standing, give promise of the successful completion of such course of study and of acquiring the necessary degree of training, qualification, or skill to become recognized chiropractic doctors.

AGE DISTRIBUTION

A census of the profession reveals the following age groups:

	Male	Female	Total
18 to 37 years	1,775	333	2,108
38 to 45 years	2,359	398	2,757
46 years and over	11,205	3,790	14,995
Total	15,339	4,521	19,860

Of the first age group approximately 25 percent have been inducted and it is impossible to say how many more will be called.

The new Selective-Service classification of men above 38 years of age will make further inroads upon the most effective age group. If chiropractic is definitely designated as "unessential" then the residual group will have to abandon the work for which they have been trained and qualified by education and experience and transfer to an activity where their effectiveness is practically nil and their contribution to the war effort immeasurably reduced.

EFFORTS FOR UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER

The efforts of the profession to make maximum utilization of its facilities and manpower have been of necessity restricted to increasing the hours which each practitioner has worked. Practitioners throughout the country report a tremendous increase in the number of patients treated. In order to care for this increased practice they are working 12 to 15 hours per day. The increase is due not only to "boom-town" conditions but to the necessity of taking on the additional burden of the patients of chiropractors and of medical practitioners called into military service.

ABILITY TO MEET CURRENT DEMANDS

The ability of the profession to keep up with the current demand for services is taxing the ingenuity and stamina of the individual practitioner. Unless new graduates can be provided and its present numerical strength maintained it will be impossible for the profession to perform its vital service in activities essential to war production and to the support of the war effort.

The chiropractic profession has a responsibility for the health and welfare of a large part of the civilian population of this country and since chiropractic physicians are not being used in their professional capacity in the Army or Navy, it seems reasonable that they would be more useful in their civilian and professional capacity. Therefore, we believe that chiropractic physicians should be declared by your committee to be essential to the health and welfare of the civilian population.

Respectfully submitted for the National Chiropractic Association,

J. J. NUGENT,
Director of Education.
EMMETT J. MURPHY,
National Representative.

This brief was filed with the War Manpower Commission on March 10, 1943.

Care of Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, within the past few days the Congress has passed, and the President has signed two measures of most far-reaching importance to the men now serving in the armed forces of our country. One of these measures provides hospitalization and domiciliary care for these veterans, and the other provides for their rehabilitation and vocational training following the termination of their services.

In my opinion this is the very least a grateful nation can do for the men who offer their all that our sacred institutions, our way of life, and our form of government may be preserved.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert at this point an article written by a veteran who had been hospitalized at United States Veterans' Hospital, Coatesville, Pa.

Tnis young man died last September, just a week before the publication of his article.

Because this veteran's own story serves as reassurance to the future veterans of the present conflict and to their loved ones, I ask that it be made a part of these remarks:

PERSONAL EXPERIENCES OF MAN WHO UNDERWENT TREATMENT IN GOVERNMENT FACILITY SHOW EXTENT OF NATION'S EFFORTS TO REHABILITATE THOSE IMPAIRED BY SERVICE

(By Cryil Tozier)

When the first casualty lists came through from Hawaii and the Philippines, comparatively few American families were directly affected. But all over the country older people almost certainly remembered the longer lists of World War No. 1, not only of the dead and the maimed, but also of the shell-shocked and the psychically hurt. What, many people may have asked themselves, would become of the mentally broken men, the psychically disoriented veterans, of World War No. 2?

To this question America has already given an answer. It is a good answer, for it consists of a promise based on sound past performance. The mentally injured men of World War No. 2, the nervously shattered heroes of the Philippines of the Malay jungles, of East Indian beachheads, and the desert of north Africa, will be cared for, and in many cases entirely rehabilitated, by a hospital system that has already proved its worth in taking care of the veterans of World War No. 1. The United States, great and grateful Nation that it is, is now spending nine times more money than any other country in the world on its armed force veterans. And the young men of today, who may be giving up good jobs or quitting college to fight in Asia or in Mesopotamia or around Dakar, will find their discharge papers an open sesame to a world of security, and the best care that medical science can provide, if they incur disability in their services. Under its acts of October 8 and 17, 1940, Congress made all the older veterans' services, including mental hospitals, available to the new draftees, who incur disability while in service.

MANY CARED FOR YEARLY

As one of the veterans of the First World War who has had the benefits of United States hospitalization, I know whereof I write when I reassure the families of young men who are busy in training. To some it may sound like an unfavorable admission when I say I was one of the 13,750 veterans of 1917–18 who last year entered one of the 29 hospitals for mental, nervous, and seemingly incurable diseases maintained by the United States Veterans Administration for former servicemen. Life in these hospitals, however, is not sinister or awesome. It has its pleasantries and compensations. To me, the 4-month period I spent there, was the most purifying and mellowing experience in my life. I lived with men who were morose and sullen, gay and light-hearted, and those to whom life was complete and full as it was.

Without the slightest exaggeration I can truthfully say that I consider my honorable discharge from the United States Army of greater value than any gilt-edge bond, regardless of its denomination. That yellowing sheet of paper is a guaranty of security and the best of care as long as I live.

HOSPITAL ATMOSPHERE FRIENDLY

Many people associate a so-called mental hospital with uncontrollable men obsessed with hallucinations and delusions, with men who need solitary confinement and strait jackets. Yet I found life in a veterans' mental hospital helpful and beneficial, its routine a great aid to emotional stability and a thorough conditioning to meet and surmount disappointments and set-backs of whatever kind.

Not so long ago mental hospitals were called asylums; today they are called neuropsychiatric institutions, and their methods have improved and advanced to the same degree that the designation has been softened. Only one who has lived within the walls of one of these institutions, or facilities, can tell of its life, a mystery to all outsiders except the especially instructed workers of the Red Cross, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars and their auxiliaries, who are the only ones to get beyond the visitors' rooms.

Routine in a neuropsychiatrix, or neuropsychiatric facility is entirely different from that in any other hospital. I was admitted to one of the largest in the East, having a total capacity of 1,536 beds, each of which was occupied all of the time. We had on our reservation 473 acres and 45 buildings, most of which were connected by ground-level enclosed corridors.

In my new surroundings of 15 wards and few private rooms, I learned more of a stratum of American life and a better lesson in the fundamentals of a useful existence than I had in my 4 years of college.

CAREFULLY EXAMINED

Upon admission to the hospital I was pared down to my birthday suit. The young physician who happened to be officer of the day told me quite plainly I was in a mental hospital. All my luggage, with the exception of underwear, socks, shirts, shoes, and suit was taken away from the ward. It was evening when I arrived, and after a thorough going-over to see that I had no skin abrasions, and no opiates or possible means of self-destruction hidden in my ears, between my toes, or in any other conceivable place on my body, I was given pajamas, sandals, and a bathrobe and sent to bed.

At 6 the next morning I was transferred to another ward. I followed a white-clad attendant, who was pleasant and helpful enough, through what seemed an endless series of doors, which he unlocked and locked, very painstakingly, and on through the corridors to another building. Still in pajamas and bathrobe, I went into the ward dining room and had breakfast.

After breakfast we all (there were about 40 of us) went back to the dayroom. The nurse, accompaned by an attendant, brought in a basket of cigarettes, tobacco, candy, and a few cigars.

About 9, a psychiatrist, or ward surgeon, as he was called, made his rounds, asked a few perfunctory questions, and was gone, not to be seen until the next morning. About 10 o'clock, I was told I was going to "staff." This proved to be an introduction to the entire medical staff of the hospital. The members of the staff sat around a long directors' table, at which I occupied the head chair.

Questions covering all my history, health, and general outlook on life were asked. Every word was recorded and transcribed, and I saw my file, taken out on each visit for reference when I was interviewed, grow larger and larger. By the time I was discharged, 4 months later, all my answers and remarks had become a volume of permanent record; this volume gave the 15 staff members an opportunity to study my case between meetings, and left me no chance to deny anything I had said.

ALL CLASSES AMONG PATIENTS

My fellow patients were mostly men of middle age and from every walk of life; they were both rich and poor, but here was a hospital into which no man could buy his way, neither could he bribe his way out. The doctors are carefully chosen psychiatrists, and there is no possibility of "inside" conniving with families to keep a well man hospitalized or to let a sick man out prematurely. The Government had as complete control over a legally committed patient as it does over your income-tax return. The Veterans' Administration sees and protects both itself and the community by requiring court commitments when necessary, but a hospital cannot hold a veteran who has voluntarily applied for treatment unless he would be a menace to himself and others if released. Once he is committed the hospital is then responsible for him.

Naturally, the Administration does not want men to leave a facility until they have progressed to a point of being able to resume a normal routine in the outside world, with some guaranty of security. And while the officials will not discharge a veteran who has no home nor anyone to accept responsibility for him, the Government neuropsychiatric facilities are no dumping grounds for veterans unwanted by members of their families. There is no such a person in a neuropsychiatric veterans' hospital as the forgotten man. The Administration sees to that, too, and provides a social worker to place veterans able to take their useful places in a community.

During the first days our every move was watched and checked. The chart provided for designations of noisy, quiet, laughing, whistling, singing and crying, delusions or hallucinations, and almost every conceivable state of emotion or mental reaction.

DIETS REGULATED

Those requiring special diets were grouped together in the ward dining rooms. Their food was specially weighed, selected, and balanced. All contraindicated foods were eliminated. A nurse stood watch to see there was no snitching of bread, sweets, or other forbidden items from the men eating the general menu.

As for the rest of us, those who were permitted a full, normal diet, the food was excellent—wide in variety, and unimpeachable as to quality and cleanliness in serving.

The same exactitude found in the food was also identified with the cleanliness of the men and their surroundings. All the cleaning was done by the patients. In the wards, to which the newcomers were assigned, a group was designated for bed making, another for floor cleaning and polishing, one for window washing, and one for kitchen detail. After rising, the beds were aired, then carefully and methodically made, each with its white counterpane. Bed linen was changed weekly, and more often if necessary.

CLEANLINESS STRESSED

After shaving, every veteran was checked in at the shower. It was not optional, either. This was a frolic for some of the boys, who had to be literally chased from under the water. The water temperature was controlled by thermostat, so that scalding was impossible. There was a big, clean bath towel for every man. A freshly laundered shirt, underwear, and socks. Each veteran's fresh clothes were in a bundle. The facility laundry, with its force of 65, including 44 patients, handled 5,000 shirts a week, all hand finished. The work would be a credit to any metropolitan laundry. All told, the laundry

handled some 200,000 pieces of laundry a month and used 1 ton of soap. Regardless of his condition or habits, every veteran was helped to retain his self-respect.

After 6 weeks of careful scrutiny by the staff I was transferred to another building and ward. There we had knives and forks, although we still ate in a ward dining room.

Here practically everyone went to occupational therapy, both morning and afternoon in the occupational therapy building. We were called by name, counted and checked out, counted again as we passed through each of the seven locked doors in the corridors. The same procedure was followed on our return.

ACTIVITIES ENCOURAGED

It is really remarkable the part occupational therapy plays in the rehabilitation of the mentally ill. Basket making, carpentry, painting, weaving, embroidery, and type setting all help to establish and create a mental focus on something that is creative. The satisfaction of achievement and accomplishment, besides occupying his time, has, in itself, salvaged many a man who had no interest or desire to be useful. The instructors were highly trained, competent, understanding, and patient. One, a charming, refined woman of middle age, showed me a handbag one day. She had spent 4 months trying to get the veteran who had made it, started at something. I understood her when she said, "That's more than just a handbag to me." To her it was the symbol of the reclamation of a man, and a long stride for him on the road to recovery.

I was fortunate in being assigned to the print shop. All type was set by hand. A 10-page paper was published weekly, giving all the news and activities of patients and personnel, program for the coming week, and reviews of pictures and accounts of entertainments and social events at the facility. I helped to write and edit the news items, all of which were contributed by patients whose names or initials appeared by regulations above the items as contributors. The job of editing called for a good deal of tact and diplomacy, for even in a facility writers are egotists. Our weekly circulation was 1,200, including more than 100 nonresident subscribers.

GOOD CONDUCT REWARDED

Giving 100-percent cooperation, and doing what you were told when you were told, paid good dividends. After about another 6 weeks in a second ward I was transferred to one of the largest on the reservation. Its daily census was 174 men, some of them ready to graduate and others so far along the road to complete recovery as to be trusted with either partial or full parole.

We ate cafeteria style in the main dining room, seating about 600. The patient's orchestra of about 15 pieces played during the midday meal. The food was uniform throughout the facility for patients, the 55 nurses, and the 400 attendants. Our sleeping quarters were now on the second floor with smaller dormitories and rooms, but still no bedside chairs. The heavy oak furniture of the previous day rooms was replaced by wicker-cushioned chairs and divans and bridge lamps. Each man had his own locker, without key, where he kept all his possessions. Now everything was available except razors, matches, nail files, and knives.

Every veteran had something useful to do every day. There were the ward workers, the grounds and farm details, the occupational therapy classes, kitchen and dining-room workers, orchestra rehearsals, and the hothouse caretakers, as well as the laundry, butcher shop, and bakery details.

"ELOPERS" ARE PROBLEM

The two greatest problems in neuropsychiatric facilities were the "elopers," those who leave without permission, and the smuggling out of uncensored mail. Partial parole, allowed from 1 of 2 wards also granting full parole, gave the veterans freedom of the reservation from 8 a. m. until 5 p. m. Full parole extended to 9 p. m. Impatient to await the day of regular discharge, with transportation home, veterans run away in surprisingly large numbers. Despite the 5 daily checks made on every ward, and the thorough accounting for every man on every detail, the latest Veterans' Administration records available show about 600 elopements in 1 year from all facilities. Most of the men, practically indigent, generally head for home and are usually returned by State police or attendants sent from the hospitals.

Every outgoing letter is read by the ward surgeon and every incoming envelope must be opened in the presence of a nurse to guard against a veteran being sent money or stamps, both of which must be deposited at the office.

The attendants, all having civil-service status, are picked with the same care you would exercise in choosing a companion for your invalid uncle. In 4 months at the facility I never saw or heard of a hand being raised to a patient no matter how combative he might have become.

Semiweekly movie shows with a feature, short subject and news reel, are given both afternoon and evening, the afternoon shows being for locked-ward patients, and the evening for all partial and full parole men. But there is never a war picture. Very seldom is there any disturbance at the movies, except perhaps the openly declared condemnation of a dirty trick.

LEGION ENTERTAINS

The American Legion, with its membership of 1,070,000, has made entertainment for comrades in all the facilities a vital part of its program of activities. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled War Veterans, and their ladies' auxiliaries, with total memberships of almost 2,000,000, provide ward parties for those men without parole and furnish Sunday afternoon entertainments, card parties, picnics in summer, and bus trips for the others. Proceeds from poppy and forget-me-not sales on the streets are used to help pay for these entertainments and parties.

Ladies of these organizations come to the weekly dances. There is no cigarette smoking or gum chewing on the part of the visitors. These affairs are of the type that you'd attend in any respectable community—always with fine refreshments and prizes. Three barbers, continuously circulating through the facility, assure every veteran of a haircut at least once every 2 weeks. Prospective dancers and card players have an appearance standard to meet before meeting the ladies, who are all hand-picked and well instructed by their post officers.

Apart from the wards in which I spent time there was a specially desirable one which I never reached. It was the largest in the facility and was frequently referred to as "the Old Soldiers Home." Here all the veterans who were to be hospitalized for prolonged periods, and who had progressed sufficiently to be trusted with full parole, were eventually assigned. The doors were never locked from 8 a. m. to 9 p. m. but there was still a census check four times a day. The large recreation room was furnished with chromium and leather upholstered chairs and divans, smoking stands, bridge lamps, and pool and ping-pong tables. There was also a natural science museum, and a trophy room for prizes won by the facility athletic teams. Veterans had the use of their own razors and had combination full length lockers, where they kept all their clothing and other possessions. The recreation room had all the comforts and appointments of a country club. The card parties were held here; the movies and entertainments in the auditorium, seating 800. There was also a fine new bowling alley donated by the American Legion Auxiliary.

In the winter season, the American Legion pays every veteran a cent a piece for every poppy he makes out of furnished materials. But earnings are limited by the facility officials to $10, which is considered enough for personal purposes.

Nowhere is there a greater effort made to bring home the true spirit of Christmas. It's the biggest time of the year. Turkey to mince pie and ice cream, trees, colored lights—everything, including carol singing and Santa Claus. The possession of a big silver loving cup for a year goes to the best decorated ward, all arranged by the patients. Strangely enough, the prize last year at the facility was won by a locked ward, with an open or parole ward having a professional decorator for a patient, receiving honorable mention.

The young man who is inducted into service today and the veteran who may go to these neuropsychiatric facilities may be secure in the thought that, regardless of the nature of his illness in later life, the finest hospital care in the world will be his, absolutely free, not for a month or two, but just as long as he needs it.

Address by Senator Wiley Before Wisconsin Society of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Three-Point Blueprint for Congress," delivered by the Senator from Wisconsin before the Wisconsin Society of Chicago at the Union League Club, Chicago, Ill., on March 26, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A THREE-POINT BLUEPRINT FOR CONGRESS

Fellow citizens, it is a great pleasure for me to meet here in the city of Chicago with men and women from the State of Wisconsin. Those of us who are gathered here today have as a common heritage the great forward-looking principles which have always characterized our native State.

Because we share this common heritage, it is perhaps well for us today to consider a problem which is basic for today and basic for the future.

The problem is a simple one. It is this: How can we best preserve and strengthen the institutions and the ideals for which we fight today?

This is a broad subject, and I shall discuss only one phase of it—the preservation and the strengthening of our form of representative government—a democracy in a republic. How can we best preserve and strengthen our system of checks and balances through a reassertion of congressional authority and through a reimplementing of the checks and balances in government and through a modernization of Congress?

I propose to discuss this reassertion of congressional authority as it relates to three specific subjects:

(1) A mechanism for the future peace.
(2) Future fiscal planning.
(3) Future planning for social security.

(1) The conduct of the future peace

In the last few weeks it has suddenly become very fashionable to talk about the commitments and the plans of the future peace. Congressional authorities hold forth on this subject at great length and interesting new words are coined. Commentators, columnists, and forums all over America are concerned—and rightly so—with the subject of the future peace.

It is well for us to think these subjects through now. It is true that our first job is obviously to win the war, but it is equally true that without a victorious peace the winning of the war can be a hollow mockery, and the shambles of this war can be a breeding place for future wars.

However, it is not my purpose today to discuss the various peace plans and policies which have been suggested. My purpose today is to discuss what I believe to be an absolutely essential mechanical prerequisite to the consideration of any peace.

In other words, we cannot plan all of the details of a trip to California from Chicago without some assurance of a vehicle of transportation. The type of vehicle and the capabilities of the vehicle will determine whether we can ever make the trip and how rapidly we can make it.

While we talk glibly of peace plans—many of them commendable and even vital—we are, nevertheless, overlooking the need for a vehicle to carry us to these peace objectives.

Under our system, there are two peace-making authorities. Under our Constitution the authority to make peace is properly divided between the Congress and the Executive as represented by the Secrtary of State.

Now it is elementary that before there can be any effective peace between this Nation and other nations, there must be peace between our own American peace-making authorities.

Throughout American history and in the pattern of American governmental machinery, there has always been one weak thread. That thread has been the ineffective collaboration of the Executive and the Congress in the conduct of a peace.

Let me make it clear at the outset that I am not criticizing this constitutional balance of power. All thinking students of government regard some balance of power in this connection as desirable. My criticism is that throughout American history we have failed to implement this balance—that we have failed to establish the mechanics of a working arrangement between the Executive and the Congress in the conduct of the peace.

It has often been said that the soldiers won the last war but the statesmen lost the peace. That must never happen again.

American history is studded with examples of the failure of the Executive branch and the Congress to collaborate successfully in the establishment of a peace.

We know what the reaction of the American people was to the Senate action on the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty years ago. We can recall how the Senate then exercised its deadly power without much opposition from the amiable McKinley. There is no evidence that the Chief Executive then interviewed a single Senator or raised his hand on behalf of the treaty. There was then no effective working relationship between the Executive and the Congress and certainly there was no successful working arrangement between the irritable Hay and the United States Senate.

The Hay arbitration treaties are another example of friction between the Senate and the Executive branch. When the treaties were discussed, Hay made his famous statement: "A treaty entering the Senate is like a bull going into the arena: no one can say just how or when the final blow will fall, but one thing is certain—it will never leave the arena alive".

The Taft treaties of 1911 were blocked by the Senate as those of Taft's predecessors had been, and again there was discussion about the need for a more effective working arrangement between the Executive branch and the Senate in the conduct of treaties.

Every schoolboy in the land knows of the scathing indictment which many contemporary historians lodged against our statesmen in the conduct of the Treaty of Versailles, and we can still recall the tremendous tidal wave of public indignation over the death of that treaty in the Senate.

Almost every comment made on the Versailles Treaty and on the various treaty battles between the Executive and Congress which have studded our history, indicates the need for a plan to integrate our two peace-making authorities more adequately.

After the rejection of the Treaty of Versailles, the United States Senate was subjected to a blistering broadside of criticism. At that time there were demands for sharply restricting the arbitrary power of the Senate in connection with the making of treaties. At that time there was criticism of the constitutional provision which made it possible for a minority of the Senate to block the desires of the President with respect to foreign policy.

Section 2 of article II of the Constitution provides that the President shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, providing two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

When a peace or an armistice comes, the American people, the Senate, and the President will have to face the demands of the hour. It is undoubtedly necessary for us to have a change in governmental mechanics to effect a domestic unity between the executive and legislative branches in connection with any treaty which may be written.

It serves no purpose to rake over the ashes of past deficiencies in connection with the treaty-making power. It is imperative, however, that we now consider the establishment of machinery which will enable us to overcome the shortcomings which have beset our path in the past.

Probably a basic difficulty in writing a peace treaty has been the deep-rooted belief of the executive branch that its function is simply that of negotiating and producing a treaty, whereas the Constitution provides that the Executive shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties.

The word which has been overlooked and which should be stressed emphatically at this time, when we are fighting to preserve a democratic government, is the word "advice." In planning for the peace which will follow this war, we will deal in global matters. We will think in terms of world-wide obligations for the American people.

We will contemplate calling on the American people to extend the police power of government over all the seas and lands of the earth.

This period, more than any other period in world history, calls for something more than the routine work of producing and submitting a treaty to the Senate. It calls for advice, which means cooperation in the inception steps of the treaty.

It is apparent from all of this that it serves little purpose for us to talk of peace objectives and peace between nations when there is no assurance that there will be peace between the Executive and the Congress in the conduct of a treaty. It is apparent that no final purpose can be served by an era of "high resolving" unless there is some assurance that these resolutions can successfully be implemented by an effective joint action between the Executive and the Congress.

Talk of world peace organizations is desirable and perhaps valuable as a part of our wartime psychological warfare, but it will not insure an effective peace.

Back in 1916 there was a great deal of individual resolution-making but long before the war was over men of both parties had shifted their political views and made a turnabout on their earlier statements.

There are a great many questions involved in a future peace: The question of an international police force; the kind of police force which is intended; who will control the force; what factors would compel war if such a force were in action; and could such a police force be created under our Constitution.

I am not attempting to answer these questions today. I am merely pointing out that these are all tremendously important decisions which cannot be made unless we have taken the preliminary step of securing the endorsement and weight of both the executive and the legislative branch of the American government. That joint action cannot be secured unless there has been a formal working arrangement.

On September 17, 1942, and subsequently on January 7, 1943, I presented a resolution in the Senate inviting the Chief Executive to join with the Senate in the creation of a Foreign Relations Advisory Council.

There is nothing spectacular about this proposal. It would merely establish a council embracing the minority and majority membership of both the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs along with the representatives from the State Department.

This Advisory Council would in no way encroach on either the power of the Chief Executive or the Senate, and would in no way destroy the constitutional balance of power. It would, however, implement that balance of power by providing a fulcrum by which the peace-making powers of the Executive and the Senate could be balanced. Such council would provide a liaison committee between the Executive and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Senate itself. It would serve as a clearing house of ideas relating to the peace.

The Constitution has laid the groundwork for such a plan. It has made provision for such a balance of power but thus far the provision has been implemented only by an admittedly faulty arrangement.

This council would, of course, be concerned with the definite formulation of the foreign policy of the United States. The council would have the force of a working liaison committee between the legislative branch and the Executive in the formulation of our foreign policy.

This committee, embracing both the Executive and the ranking minority and majority members of our committees dealing with foreign affairs, could properly handle proposals such as have recently been made. It could properly handle them because it would have the authority of joint action. It would have the machinery to effect compromises, if necessary, before these proposals were brought to the Senate for action.

All of this means that there would be less need for defeating or amending peace treaties on the floor of the Senate. It would mean that there would be fewer possibilities for political friction. All the compromises between the Executive and the Senate could be considered long before the treaty was presented to the Senate. The creation of such a council could be a splendid example of democratic government at work because

it would embrace the Executive and the representatives of the people working together on the establishment of a policy instead of separately as has been done in the past.

This war involves the most momentous issues in the history of mankind.

The treaty which will be written at the close of this war could definitely determine the part which the United States will play in world affairs. A deadlock between the Chief Executive and the Senate on a treaty involving such momentous problems could end in disaster. That is why the creation of such a liaison group must be immediately considered. Without it, peace proposals are futile because without it there is no assurance that these peace proposals can become the effective expression of a joint Executive and Congressional commitment.

(2) *Future fiscal planning*

Thus far we have considered a working arrangement by which a just and enduring peace is possible. The plan I have presented contemplates definite collaboration between the Executive and the Congress.

I believe it is equally imperative that we have such a collaboration in our future economic planning. What is even more imperative if we are to avoid economic chaos and economic revolutions in the years up ahead, is that Congress itself must rebuild its machinery so that it is adequate to face the economic problems of the future.

In the past 6 months there have been a great many newspaper accounts dealing with the gradual erosion of congressional authority. There has been a great deal of discussion of the various pressure groups which presumably have affected the legislative branch.

I can wholeheartedly concur that the only yardstick by which any legislation can be measured is its effect on the general public welfare which, of course, at the present time means its general effect on winning the war and the peace.

I feel, however, that the discussion about pressure groups has made one serious omission. That omission has been a neglect to comment on the pressure which is exerted on Congress by the executive branch.

My purpose is not to indict the executive branch for the influence which it has exerted on Congress, although I am not certain that this influence has always been a healthy one. Nevertheless, if there is an indictment for the gradual erosion of legislative powers and legislative initiative, that indictment rests with the Congress for its failure to modernize its structure so that it could be competent to handle present-day problems of a magnitude never before encountered. In other words, in recent years there has been an unfortunate tendency in Congress to rely more and more on the expert counsel, research, and recommendations of the executive branch and, as a consequence, the stature of Congress has perhaps dwindled in public estimation.

In restoring Congress to its legitimate stature, we can perform a vital and badly needed service and can make an outstanding contribution to the continuance of a strong representative government.

Early this year Congress was given a $109,000,000,000 Budget. That Budget represents more than one-half of all the expenditures of the Nation from 1789 to the outbreak of the war.

Our machinery for considering such a tremendous Budget is obviously inadequate. Any business whose budget had increased on such a fabulous scale would long since have changed the mechanics of its budget consideration to more nearly approximate the magnitude of the present day job.

At the outset then it is apparent that Congress today needs an adequately staffed single joint budget committee empowered to call before it experts not only from within Government but from within the ranks of industry and business throughout the country. The Budget problem is one which should be considered at one table around which are seated representatives from both Houses of Congress acting in concert on the best advice obtainable.

Moreover, there is at the present time no collaboration between the spending and revenue-raising committees. That just doesn't make sense and it is high time that a joint Budget committee of both Houses is set up to embrace the Appropriations Committees and also representatives from the Finance and Ways and Means Committees—all acting in unison on one logical coordinated plan.

Accordingly, I have introduced a measure calling for the creation of an adequate single joint budget committee of both Houses which can supply competent machinery to enable Congress to regain its legitimate stature in the consideration of this momentous Budget. Please let me emphasize that this proposal would correlate the revenue-raising activities of government with the spending activities of government. In an individual family we know the financial suicide which would result if wives spent indiscriminately without any reference to their husbands' incomes. It is equally necessary for government if it is to survive financially, to correlate its revenue raising and spending activities.

(3) *Future planning for social security*

In the past few weeks Congress has been given far-reaching proposals for social-security legislation. Those proposals may be considered at this session of Congress and here again there is a definite need for a joint social security committee of both Houses to consider this problem which will probably assume incredible proportions at the close of the war and, accordingly, I have introduced a measure providing for the creation of one single joint committee to function effectively on this problem.

I think this is imperative because I do not believe that the executive department alone can present any ready-to-wear proposals which the Congress can adopt without an adequate independent study and survey of its own.

To do this we need a joint unified effort between the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Senate Finance Committee of the Senate to get one coordinated plan and to eliminate any bickering and controversy.

And now in conclusion, let me say that all of these proposals are designed with only one purpose in mind—not only to retain all that is good and fine in our system of government but also to make our system of government workable in a new era so that we will not lose our way of life and our form of government.

The present war is a large-scale laboratory of big government. This war is a testing ground to determine whether permanently big government can go hand in hand with our democratic procedures. This war has provided a laboratory experiment to determine whether big government brings along with it the inherent weaknesses of confusion, duplication, bungling, and chaos. This war can determine for all time that it is possible to retain a democracy in a republic—that it is not necessary to surrender our beliefs, our ideals, and our system for any hand-me-down eclectic European system.

To that end it is necessary that we adopt every measure which will insure the effective working and perpetuation of our kind of government.

Our War Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on Friday, March 26, 1943, before the Commonwealth Club of Cincinnati.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends of the Commonwealth Club, the time has come to try to analyze the underlying ideas and motives which guide the conduct of those men and women who determine the policies of the country. Up to this point we have had to be concerned almost exclusively with winning the war. That must still be the first essential, and it must have priority over every other consideration. Post-war planning itself must stop if and when it interferes with the unity and military success of the United Nations. But the time has come when men and women throughout the country want to analyze the causes of this war, and discuss the manner in which we can prevent the repetition of such a catastrophe.

My own belief is that the United States went to war in order that this country and its people might enjoy peace now, and in the days to come; in order that they might be left free to work out the destiny of the American Republic. We did not go to war to establish liberty throughout the world, except as such a world condition might affect our own liberty. We did not go to war against Japan when they attacked China. We did not go to war with Germany when they attacked Poland or Czechoslovakia. War came only when our people came to believe that aggression was so dangerous and so likely to be successful that our own safety was threatened. That led first to aid to Britain, and finally it led to war itself. I was opposed to entering the war because I did not believe that aggression in Europe was so dangerous as to threaten our own safety, even if it attempted an attack upon us. As I analyze the public opinion which led us gradually to war, it was an opinion which disagreed with this view. Perhaps it was correct. When Japan attacked Hawaii, there was no course except to enter the war against aggression all over the world. Now that war has been undertaken, our people are determined to carry it through to a severe punishment of the aggressor, not only for our present safety but to discourage aggression for all time to come. They are determined further to attempt again an organization of the world which will prevent aggression in the future and insure peace for the people of this country by insuring peace throughout the world.

If I am right in my analysis of our reason for going to war, how should that affect our conduct of the war? I believe first that everything must be sacrificed to win the war. That is the only way aggression can be punished, and it is a prerequisite to any future planning in which we participate. I do not understand those who criticize our policy in Africa or in Spain. It was estimated

by the War Department that the capture of Dakar by attack might cost 50,000 casualties and many months of delay. Surely it was well worth our while to make a deal with Darlan, whether we liked his politics or didn't like his politics. We are shipping gasoline to Spain in order to obtain more chrome and other minerals from Spain and prevent their going to Germany. What difference does it make if Franco is a Fascist or a Communist so long as the net result of the transaction is a direct aid to our military effort? There is a school of Russian sympathizers who object to our short-wave broadcast policy of trying to separate Italy from Germany because it slants in the direction of a separate peace with Italy. If we could take Italy out of the war on reasonable terms, I believe we should do so tomorrow. Italy and its opera bouffe Mussolini have never been a real menace, and they have suffered a severe penalty now and for their future. Such a peace might well shorten the war against Germany by a year in time and half a million casualties. Surely the military considerations outweigh every political consideration.

I regret the attitude of those who insist on interfering with the British handling of the situation in India. That handling may be right or it may be wrong. But in the first place, the British are in control of India, and we cannot interfere with that control without dissension and disunity. In the second place, they have been in control of India for several hundred years, and they probably know a good deal more about the proper way to handle the situation in the present emergency that any American novelist or American professor. The important thing is to prevent any Japanese entrance into India, and make India a solid base for operations in China and against Burma.

On the other hand, I have just as little sympathy with those who hesitate to send aid to Russia simply because the Russian Government is a Communist dictatorship. That Communist army has done more to bring about a German defeat than any other army in the world, and for that Russian aid we shall be eternally grateful.

The theory of those who criticize our course in Africa, Spain, and India is that we are not merely interested in winning the war, but that we are engaged in a crusade to spread the ideals of the New Deal throughout the world; that we are battling to establish everywhere the principles of the Atlantic Charter; that as our armies proceed they must carry the "four freedoms" on their banners to every continent and island in the world. I do not believe that any war can be justified as a crusade. If we prevail in the war, it is undoubtedly true that the principles for which we stand will be stronger, and that we will have an opportunity by example to show that they should be adhered to by all free people. But if we admit that the United States can properly go to war to impose our ideas of freedom on the rest of the world, then it seems we must admit that the Soviets have a right to crusade to impose communism on the rest of the world because they believe communism to be the final solution of the world's problems. We would even have to admit that Hitler, however, deluded he might be, had a right to crusade to impose his ideas of national socialism on the rest of the world. A crusade is by its very nature an aggressive act. Our purpose in this war is to punish and abolish aggression. Even if a crusade could be successful, its success would be far outbalanced by the terrific horror, the terrific sacrifices, the terrific destruction of war. If war can be justified as a crusade, the world will face perpetual war. The whole crusade idea is absolutely inconsistent with the purposes for which this war is being fought.

What are the "four freedoms?" The first two, freedom of speech and freedom of religion, have to do with the internal government of the country in which the individual lives. Freedom from fear and freedom from want have also been construed as rights we are fighting to guarantee to every individual throughout the world, no matter what his government may be. I believe the last two freedoms are reasonable goals as applied to the situation of entire nations in relation to other nations; but if the "four freedoms" are construed as freedoms for individuals everywhere in the world, we would certainly be engaged in war from now till doomsday before those goals could be obtained. We would not only have to defeat our enemies and establish governments in those countries with American Constitutions and New Deal administrations, but we would have to interfere with the governments of our allies. This is no war of democracies against dictatorships. There is no freedom of religion or freedom of speech in Russia. There are benevolent dictators in Brazil, in Cuba, and in China. There was a dictator in Poland. In Greece, which made one of the most magnificent defenses against Mussolini that has been seen in this war, the people fought under a dictator, Metaxas, who was so benighted as to prohibit the reading of the Republic of Plato.

Surely we are not going to interfere with the internal governments of Russia and China and other nations in order to insist upon all of their citizens enjoying freedom of speech and freedom of religion. If so, we will have to have a permanent army a good deal larger than 11,000,000 men, and we will have to suspend for all time any renewal of freedom in the United States. It is absolutely impossible for one country to dictate the internal organization of another country.

When we come to freedom from want, it is even more impossible to give any assurance to the peoples of many countries throughout the world. I was recently in Puerto Rico, and saw a condition of abject poverty among thousands of people after 45 years of American rule. Under New Deal auspices, in 1935 and 1936 the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration spent $100,000,000 to make a new world out of Puerto Rico and assure them perpetual freedom from want. In spite of that expenditure and $200,000,000 more poured in since 1932, there is little result apparent to the casual visitor, with the exception of a few public works which don't do the slum dweller the slightest good. There are 2,000,000 people in Puerto Rico on an island which cannot possibly support that number at any reasonable standard of living. But if we can't solve freedom from want in Puerto Rico, how could we expect to solve the problem in China and in India with twice as many people as the resources of the country can support on a decent standard of living? In fact, we haven't solved the problem of freedom from want in the United States, and as yet we cannot even furnish an example to the world as to how poverty and unemployment can be abolished. Let us devote ourselves to that problem in the United States before we distribute milk to every Hottentot.

If freedom from want is construed to mean merely a fair treatment of every nation in the world by other nations from an economic standpoint, then it is a conceivable goal. It can be brought about without any crusade, by the winning of the war and an intelligent agreement between nations after the war.

As a matter of fact, the Atlantic Charter itself contradicts the idea of any crusade for the "four freedoms." The third paragraph of that very sensible document, signed by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, states that "they respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live." That means that the Russians can have a dictatorship of the proletariat if they wish to have it. It means that China can be run by a generalissimo and avoid elections of every kind. It means that some other governments with a democratic form may permit the subjection of the rights of freedom of speech and freedom of religion to the will of the man whom they choose to elect.

The only effective way in which we can spread the "four freedoms" throughout the world, the only way in which we can lead people back to democratic government, which is so much less inclined to military aggression, is by the force of our example. It was the American example set in 1776 and 1788 which led to the spread of democratic government throughout the world for more than a hundred years. It was the World War, a war frankly stated to be a war to preserve democracy, which led to the rise of the dictators. If again we can show that under a republic in time of peace the people can be more free and more happy and more prosperous than the people of any other nation, then we can hope to see established the "four freedoms" of democracy throughout the world.

We are fighting the war to punish and prevent aggression. Half of that task is accomplished by the mere winning of the war, and to that we must devote our present energies. But there is another half which in time will become equally important. That is the assurance of future peace and the prevention of future aggression. It is not an easy task. For centuries men have yearned for such a result. One Council of Nations after another has been set up, and after every war the treaty-makers have stated their purpose of assuring perpetual peace. Perhaps the ideal is unattainable by form of organization. No matter what organization of the world we set up in our generation, that league is only likely to succeed 30 years from now if the next generation is determined to make it succeed.

Nevertheless certain forms of organization are more likely to check aggression than others. It seems to me largely a practical question, and I should certainly be glad to support any plan if success is probable. I supported the League of Nations in 1920, and if we had joined it, and its ideals had been supported by its members, the aggression of recent years might perhaps have been checked in its beginning. I am inclined to think at the present moment that the best plan would be a League of Nations in which every nation covenants to use its national forces against that nation which engages in territorial aggression, but it should not interfere with any internal affairs except possibly questions of armament. The modification suggested by Mr. Churchill last Sunday that we have regional councils to act within their respective regions is a very reasonable modification. It seems to me that the United States should be only a secondary guarantor of the peace of Europe, to be called in only when the problem seems to be beyond the resources of the European council.

It is said that such a league as I have proposed lacks sanction, and that it depends on the will to act of the member nations. Certainly that is so, but without that will could any form of international organization have a hope of success? In the ultimate analysis, is it not the peace-loving nations themselves which must restrain the aggressor?

The idealists insist upon a peace to be enforced by an international police force, or even a union of all nations into a single federal union. Their claim is that the nations can be united into one nation just exactly as our Thirteen Colonies were united in 1788. Frankly, I think such a plan is impossible. I think it will destroy democracy

in the long run, because I don't believe that a nation of such a size can be run on democratic principles. Washington is much too far away from the people today. In Geneva or Panama the cranks would be on hand, but the common man would never have a chance. I believe we have already reached about the limit of size in the United States for successful democratic government. More and more we find it necessary to centralize power if that power is to be effective, and the same thing would be true of union now. I believe the differences in language, in customs, in methods of thought, in living standards, would cause a federal union of the world to fall apart even before it started.

Governor Stassen has proposed a kind of superstate with an international police force, and this is the basis of the plan to which the Ball resolution proposes to commit the Senate. In my opinion that plan is not practical and would not insure peace. Most people think of an international police force as one which will keep the Germans, Italians, and Japanese in order after the war. It is necessary, however, to separate clearly the handling of the immediate post-war situation and the permanent plan to insure future peace. Everyone recognizes that for some years there must be a policing of all the Axis countries Whether this is to be done by the national armies or by an international police is certainly a question to be discussed.

But the Ball proposal has no relation to the immediate post-war period. It looks to a permanent form of organization, of which all of the Axis countries shall gradually become members. If such a military force is to be of any value, it must be able to suppress military aggression by any nation, as the resolution states, and it must therefore be considerably larger than the forces of any nation. This necessarily implies a practical disarmament of the United States, of England, and of Russia, as well as of the Axis nations. It must be just as easy for such a force to bomb New York as it will be to bomb Berlin as a punishment for what is found to be aggression. Of course it is said that we will never be aggressors, but aggerssion is an indefinite term, and the body which decides on what is aggression will be a body in which the United States will have a very small minority representation. In short, the world will be at the mercy of the only military force in existence, and we cannot tell who will control that military force. Certainly an international police force implies an international executive to direct it, and probably an international legislature. I do not believe in the present state of the world or its state after the war we can afford to subject the United States to such a superior force.

Furthermore, I do not believe the people of the United States would be willing for a moment to disband their Army and Navy at the conclusion of the war. I feel equally confident that England has no such intention, and that Stalin has no such intention. In fact, if I read correctly the recent statements of the leaders of those countries, they intend as far as they can see ahead to control the continent of Europe by superior military force. That is the meaning of the 20-year treaty. That is the direct statement of English policy which appeared last week in the London Times. That, it seems to me, is the practical implication of Mr. Churchill's Council of Europe, however he may talk of the principles of a League of Nations. The time may come far in the future when England, Russia, and the United States can agree to lay down their arms and create a super military police force to police the world, but I believe it will only be considered many years from now.

A good many editors, and others, apparently assume that the Ball resolution merely asks the Senate to advise the President to call meetings of the United Nations for the purpose of discussing and working out post-war plans to be submitted to the Senate for consideration. Certainly I am strongly in favor of making post-war plans in the domestic and foreign economic field, and I am a member of the George committee which proposes to make such plans. Equally, I believe that the United Nations should confer together, discuss every type of post-war political organization with a view to agreement whenever agreement is possible. It is vitally important, in my opinion, that the United Nations know exactly the course they are going to pursue when the armistice occurs, including particularly the temporary military control of the world to prevent a rash of minor wars, and relief and rehabilitation measures. The actual working out of permanent settlements may take many years.

But the Ball resolution does far more than that. It authorizes the President to set up an organization of nations, with definite powers, but without specifying the details of that organization. It grants the President a blank check to determine such important questions as the representation of the United States in the organization; what type of disputes and disagreements are to be settled by the international body; whether questions relating to the treatment of minorities within nations are to be dealt with; whether questions relating to the internal form of government are to be dealt with; whether guaranties of freedom of the press and of religion within nations are to be included. These matters are not matters of detail; they are matters which go to the very substance of the organization. Certainly the Senate cannot be asked to grant such a blank check even if it approved the proposals in principle. That is the very thing for which the people have blamed Congress in the domestic field for the past 8 years.

Furthermore, there is another doubt which must arise at the present time. The President is already conferring constantly with England and occasionally with Russia. Should we insist upon a formal conference in which the differences between the United Nations will be dragged out and exposed to public discussion? Mr. Stalin has indicated his intention of annexing to Russia the Baltic states and eastern Poland. Apparently the British are now engaged in a strenuous effort to persuade us to agree to this claim. Possibly it is justified, although hardly consistent with the declaration of the Atlantic Charter in favor of the self-determination of peoples. But there will certainly be a violent difference of opinion in this country as to what our course should be. There is a suggestion that the English may desire a more permanent status in North Africa than they now have. Shall a public discussion of that question and of the freedom of India be encouraged at this time, or would it seriously interfere with the war effort?

Furthermore, can we pass now on the fundamental question of joining a League of Nations, and perhaps guaranteeing boundaries in Europe of which we disapprove and which we believe will make further war probable? Does future peace not depend very largely on a satisfactory economic settlement which will assure raw materials and sufficient trade to give every country a square deal? Can we afford to commit ourselves until these problems are dealt with? I am in favor of a full discussion of post-war plans, debates by private citizens and studies by every possible planning body, but I have serious doubt whether we should drag into the open in official debate problems which it is absolutely impossible to decide at the present moment and which may seriously interfere with our success in the present war.

I wish to emphasize the fact that one of the first and most important steps toward peace after the war is the making of an economic set-up which will lay the ground work for satisfied peoples and eliminate the causes of war. In the Versailles Treaty economic conditions were completely disrupted and disregarded. States were set up which were wholly unable to support themselves. Europe was broken up into a large number of unstable units. After this war we must try to establish customs unions between nations whose economies are complementary, so that they can be reasonably self-sufficient. We must assure to each one of these nations and groups of nations the raw materials which they require to keep their industrial development. We must assure to each an outlet for sufficient products at least to pay for these raw materials. If we interpret freedom from want to mean this fair and equitable economic treatment, then I think it is a reasonable goal and one absolutely essential to future peace. Further, our efforts should be to make the different regions or groups as self-sufficient as possible, and eliminate the tremendous competition for foreign trade which itself has been one of the causes of war. If each of these countries or groups of countries can be made prosperous within itself, the foreign trade which will result to all will be infinitely greater than that which existed before the war. I believe reasonable tariffs are essential to protect this country against the low wages in many other countries throughout the world, but I certainly am in favor of assisting those countries to raise their standards of living. On a sound economic basis, there is a reasonable chance that a league of nations can succeed. Without it there can be no success with or without a superstate or an international police force.

I have tried to make clear my own views here this evening. I shall work toward an organization of nations banded together to prevent by military, naval, and air action any aggression determined to be aggression by some international decision. I should prefer that our obligation to use our armed forces in any continent but our own and perhaps the Far East be only a secondary obligation after the region itself declares its inability to keep the peace. But I would condition our membership on three conditions—

First, the territorial settlement and the other terms of the peace treaty must be fair to all nations, so that we can agree wholeheartedly to stand behind them.

Second, the economic arrangement must be such as to assure every country a fair deal and a chance to improve the condition of its people.

Third, it must have a reasonable chance of practical success in assuring world peace.

On these conditions I have no doubt that the American people would approve an organization of nations.

High Caliber of T. V. A. Employees Is Tribute to Its Merit System

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Nashville Tennesseean by J. Lacey Reynolds, one of the most able and industrious newspaper writers in the Nation's Capital, is deserving of

careful attention. It is interesting and informative as to the T. V. A.'s contribution to Government in the training and placing of personnel. This has been possible under the T. V. A.'s system of selecting personnel under its merit system without political intervention.

The article follows:

HIGH CALIBER OF T. V. A. EMPLOYEES IS TRIBUTE TO ITS MERIT SYSTEM—OTHER AGENCIES COMPETE FOR EXECUTIVES; MCKELLAR FINDS LITTLE BASIS FOR CRITICISM

(By J. Lacey Reynolds)

WASHINGTON, March 27.—In 10 short years the Tennessee Valley Authority has built up an unparalleled reputation for the high caliber of employees it has brought into the Government under its merit system.

This is reflected, of course, in the efficiency and speed records the Authority has set in building dams and carrying out its other varied programs. But you are more impressed when you see how many former Tennessee Valley Authority employees have gone on to higher jobs in the Government.

ALWAYS IN DEMAND

Washington is full of ex-Tennessee Valley Authority people. They are scattered all over the globe. They are in constant demand. They are wanted not only by other agencies of our Government, but by Allied governments everywhere.

This is high tribute not only to the special form of civil service which the Tennessee Valley Authority has devised and by which its employees were originally selected, but it is the unassailable answer to those who want to change the system.

Senator KENNETH D. MCKELLAR and others who want to turn the Tennessee Valley Authority into a political bureaucracy cannot cloud Tennessee Valley Authority's personnel record by the smokescreen contention that the Constitution requires Tennessee Valley Authority employees to be confirmed by the Senate. It is up to them to prove that the patronage system turns out better Government employees than a nonpolitical merit system such as the Tennessee Valley Authority's.

It would be difficult for MCKELLAR to do this. While the Senator has given his political endorsement to many deserving Government workers over the years, the fact remains that Tennessee Valley Authority has turned out far more top-notchers in much less time.

TOP-NOTCHER LIST

Let's look at Tennessee Valley Authority's record:

Pride of all Tennessee Valley Authority people is J. A. Krug, former Tennessee Valley Authority power director, who was recently promoted to program vice chairman of the War Production Board. He came to Washington on loan from Tennessee Valley Authority as director of War Production Board's power program, and because of his ability has risen to one of the key positions in the entire war program. This is the same Krug whom MCKELLAR berates and whose resignation he once demanded.

Another top-notcher here is J. Haden Alldredge, once head of Tennessee Valley Authority's commerce department, who is today chairman of the powerful Interstate Commerce Commission. He is the author of Tennessee Valley Authority's first two freight rate studies—studies which marked the real beginning of the South's fight to remove freight-rate discriminations.

BUILDER OF NORRIS

Right in the forefront of the war-housing program are two Tennessee Valley Authority alumni: John B. Blandford, Jr., administrator of the National Housing Agency, who was Tennessee Valley Authority's former general manager, and Earle S. Draper, deputy commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration. Draper is the man who built the model town of Norris as director of Tennessee Valley Authority's department of regional studies.

James Lawrence Fly, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, is directing the Government's war communications control. He is a former Tennessee Valley Authority chief counsel.

Only this week, Dr. James A. Crabtree, former deputy medical director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, was made chief medical officer of the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation, headed by former Governor Herbert H. Lehman, New York. Since leaving Tennessee Valley Authority, he has stood high in the Public Health Service, and was medical consultant to the Lease-Lend Administration. In his new job he will stand as this Nation's foremost medical officer in the crucial postwar relief and rehabilitation period.

Girard Davidson, another TVA-er, is acting general counsel of the Bonneville Power Administration. Robert Sessions, on Tennessee Valley Authority's administrative staff, has been on loan to the Office of Price Administration since it was created. Another Tennessee Valley Authority lawyer, Melvin Segal, is in Brazil for the Board of Economic Warfare.

BARTON JONES IN CHILE

The State Department asked Tennessee Valley Authority to release Barton Jones, an engineer, to go to Chile at the request of that Government to survey some water development sites. Chileans liked him so much they have kept him there.

Tracey Augur, a Tennessee Valley Authority housing expert, has been loaned to the National Housing Agency to tackle two knotty jobs—the Puerto Rican housing situation and the Willow Run bomber plant mess.

Several of Tennessee Valley Authority's malaria experts were transferred to Public Health Service and sent to China to aid the Government there in disinfecting the Burma Road. The road was closed while they were en route, but they are still somewhere in China today fighting the mosquito.

Aside from the direct transfer of Tennessee Valley Authority employees to other agencies and governments, there are countless other ways that the efficiency of Tennessee Valley Authority personnel has been acclaimed.

For instance, the Army has been sending to the valley members of the Medical Corps for training in mosquito control. The importance of this may be seen by the fact that malaria disabled more soldiers in the Solomons than the Japs.

Of all the agencies and corporations experimenting in extraction of aluminum from clay, the War Production Board recently chose Tennessee Valley Authority technicians to conduct experiments in a new clay-extraction process.

Bonneville officials have borrowed Tennessee Valley Authority land-acquisition officers to purchase land, and so has the Army. (MCKELLAR wants to change Tennessee Valley Authority's land-condemnation procedures, incidentally.)

So great is the fame of Tennessee Valley Authority in water-control problems that foreign nations are constantly sending engineers and technicians into the valley to study its system. Eleven countries have had representatives in the valley for that purpose within the last 6 months. About 20 are now training on Tennessee Valley Authority dam projects.

Senator MCKELLAR has been frank to say that he has never been consulted in the selection of a single Tennessee Valley Authority employee. If Tennessee Valley Authority personnel has gained this sort of reputation without him, he will have to do some tall talking to convince people that he should be consulted in the future.

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech delivered by me over Station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on March 27, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, I greet you this week from a white Capital. Just as we all determined that spring had really come, a mighty blizzard descended upon Washington and buried it in a canopy of snow. If it were not for the overwhelming feeling I have entertained several weeks now that Americans are going hungry before they have plenty, I would have forgot to mention tonight that I still have a goodly supply of Victory garden booklets and handbooks, although several thousand have already been sent from my office to the Triple Cities and all over my district. Let me urge upon you, those of you who find any available plot of ground, to put yourselves in a garden this spring no matter how insignificant it may be. At least, with a little extra effort, you will be able to find something to nibble on next winter. This is said in all seriousness in spite of the belated steps which Congress recently took to provide for farm labor and Government cooperation to a greater degree with the American farmer.

Yes, I have been concerned, chagrined, and frankly worried over the reports I hear from day to day about food shortages and curtailments. Therefore, if I seem to be too persistent in my urging you people to plant Victory gardens, I know you will forgive me in view of my fears.

Since we are back to the familiar subject of agriculture, let me remind you of the numerous items, books, and pamphlets I have at my disposal with which I will gladly provide you. I am sending out several thousand bulletin lists in the course of the next 2 or 3 weeks. These will be sent to farmers and to city residents both. On the back of each list the following letter from your Congressman will appear. It reads as follows:

"DEAR FRIEND: While I serve as your Representative in wartime Washington, I like to keep in touch with you folks back home. I welcome your advice and encouragement during these dark days.

"Then, too, perhaps I can help you. Does your boy in the service need assistance? Do you know if he is well?

"Have you received your allotment money yet? Has your soldier husband, sailor son, or marine father provided for his wife, parents, and children?

"Remember, Uncle Sam owes this to you. If you have difficulty, I will make the arrangements for you with the War Department.

"Maybe you need information on different subjects, agricultural or general. Are you planning a Victory garden?

"Write me. I am your hired man. Let me know what I can do to lift the heavy burdens you carry on your shoulders and in your hearts.

"With my very best wishes for a victorious future, I remain

"Your Congressman,

"EDWIN ARTHUR HALL."

Folks, it is necessary for me once more to get out the old scissors and pastepot about which some of our mutual friends have been talking and snip a few remarks of my own from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I addressed the House last week and I quote:

"Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and satisfaction to support the gentleman from North Carolina on his resolution in committee, and I take this opportunity to support him on the floor and assure him of my support and vote for this resolution. I think such an action has been forthcoming for a long time and that it is absolutely necessary.

"My vote for a resolution of this kind is simply in line with a policy which I have determined to set out upon and to put into practice throughout this session of Congress; namely, to keep the Congress entirely informed and familiar with the actions of the various bureaucratic agencies of our Government. Many of you recall a few years ago a book entitled 'The Specialist'. You will also recall the various functions of the hero of that book and some of the attempts he made at specializing on certain parts of the rural environment. Today we have to listen to a lot of these so-called specialists running up and down the country describing what America should do in a post-war world and what action they should take. I submit to you that if some of these specialists would insist on concentrating on what we are going to do with our soldiers and sailors when they come back from the war and from the front, when they are to be assimilated once more into our community life we would be a lot further ahead. What are we going to do to rehabilitate millions of men when they come back and are released and are mustered out of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps and seek their places in American life once more? I insist that it is the function of the Committee on Agriculture and of the House of Representatives to plan a post-war program for the men in the service who will sooner or later be released from our armed forces and who will once more desire to take up a normal family life, a normal community life, and will find it necessary to be given the chance by their Government with a definite program of rehabilitation."

The next day I addressed the following remarks to the House:

"Mr. Speaker, I care not what political considerations would dictate to me to do otherwise, I expect to support this bill in its entirety. I hope we can pass this today because it provides at last for the cost of farm labor to be included in the farmer's cost of production.

"Last fall I, for one, was very much incensed when the farmer, who has recently been picked on and blamed for a lot of economic ills, was pointed to as the profiteer, as the gouger, as the one who was taking advantage of the war effort and demanding a higher price for his commodities and goods. I for one intend to stick with the farmer, because I feel he is sincerely trying to produce food for freedom.

"As far as inflation goes, you can say that has been here for a long time. For the life of me, I cannot understand why the farmer has been blamed by various other groups in the country as being the tool and the agent of inflation. I insist, Mr. Speaker, that simply because he has been inarticulate, because he has been unable to defend himself, he has been blamed for the bugbear of inflation. You will recall that last fall, just before the heated campaign into which many of us were plunged, all through the newspapers of the country the farmer was accused of being responsible for the terrible economic situation in which the consumer found himself. As a matter of fact, inflation had been here for sometime before. The farmer was simply singled out and blamed for something for which he had no responsibility at all.

"The farmer has been the scapegoat of the American public. He has been accused of every sin on the calendar because he did not have the articulate expression to answer his accusers.

"I submit that this Congress must take the power into its own hands and give justice to the last vestige of strength of the American public, namely, the farmer, to save the food-for-production program, which you and I must have if we are to win this war. The farmer has just as much right to consider the cost of labor and to include that in his production cost as any other group in our economic body."

The other day I received a message which I quote:

"DEAR MR. HALL: We listen to your program every Saturday and would you please explain on one of your coming programs how we are supposed to have Victory gardens that are in the country with no gas to get to and from them on a gallon and a half of gas.

"A VESTAL FRIEND."

Frankly, that's a hard one for me to answer. My vestal friend asks a difficult question. Her letter is similar to a great many others from patriotic citizens who feel the war effort will be hindered by the sudden cutting in two of gasoline ration coupons. Personally, I feel that the Office of Price Administration should do everything in its power to keep the public on the road. Farmers ought to be able to get enough gas to get to town, city folks should be supplied with enough to get to their war jobs and necessary destinations. The public is in dead earnest with the prosecution of this war. Their patriotism should not be questioned.

What greater evidence of loyalty and interest in this struggle can there be than sending one's flesh and blood to the service. Go up and down the streets of the Triple Cities if you will and see the little flags with one, two, three, and four stars in the windows. You need not tell me how much the owners of those flags have contributed to the war. I know. You know. You know how those parents' hearts are aching, how that mother lies awake at night thinking, longing for her boys 5,000 miles away in New Guinea, or North Africa, or in some other corner of this earth. No, I don't know of any of these folks that are going to take advantage of extra gas or extra anything for that matter which is not absolutely necessary in the part they are playing in winning the war. So I'll say to my vestal friend, I think you ought to have the gas if it is available to transport you to the place you have available for your victory garden.

Under the title "G. O. P. Handed an Issue," in a recent editorial, the editor of the Binghamton Press made an able defense of the pay-as-you-go income-tax plan with the following: "Without the Ruml plan, many billions desperately needed by the Treasury may be lost." He is right.

I am highly amused when I read of frantic statements on the part of Treasury officials and others to the effect that the pay-as-you-go plan is a rich man's paradise. I can't see it.

Unless a plan of this kind is adopted, 40,000,000 small-income people will be unable to meet their tax obligations. Make no mistake, rich man, poor man, beggar man alike will be paying 2 years' taxes in 1. Unless the Ruml plan or some modification is adopted, you will pay 1942 and 1943 taxes in 1943. How many of you can do it? Not very many.

True, a handful of people have been able to plan their lives so frugally and wisely that they budgeted their needs, bought bonds, beat the high cost of living, and were able to save enough to pay their taxes on March 15. But the majority of folks couldn't do this. They pledged themselves patriotically to buy bonds, and did their best to meet the increased food and clothing bill, tried to get caught up on debts they had incurred during lean financial years before the war, and found they could not meet the tremendous increase in taxes which Congress placed on them at the end of 1942. It was not fair anyway, to enact a tax bill for 1942 at the very end of that year.

To me, this question goes even further. If you saddle an impossible tax debt on the people, you are going to scrap the capitalistic system and put in its place a socialistic or communistic one. You will do this because nobody will be able to live under the present system if you make it financially impossible to do so. That is the issue. I don't think Americans are ready to scrap the capitalistic system. But it is dangerous to put such a heavy yoke around the people's necks. Let us make things as easy as possible for the great majority of taxpayers so they will have a fighting chance to meet their debts. Remember more folks than ever before are tax conscious this year. They are ready and willing to pay these taxes for the war effort but they can't do the impossible. They can't pay 2 years' taxes in 1 as the Treasury would have them do. I refuse to try to make them do it. They have enough burdens to shoulder nowadays without giving them a blow to break the camel's back.

No, you can put me down as favoring a pay-as-you-go tax system, and I'm not going to vote to saddle you with the 1942 taxes now either. Why not start with a clean slate? I say we owe it to ourselves.

Last week, I had the temerity to talk to you a little about post-war planning for our soldiers and sailors. I listed five steps which I thought should be taken by Congress before the war is over in order to insure economic security for those millions of the Nation's manhood. I emphasized the absolute necessity of doing everything we can for the future of the men in service in order to avoid any repetition of events in Germany after the first World War, when their armies returned and found nothing but unemployment and starvation.

I want to see Congress set up a program of post-war planning for our armed forces so that no veteran will be deprived of a chance to make an honest living when he comes home. This can be done if we give it close study and proper action before peace is declared.

In my conversation with hundreds of service men from our district, I find one point which is uppermost in their minds. They want to get the war won just as quickly as possible so they can return to their families. They want to see the country back to normalcy. They want to go back, get married and raise children. To do these things, they've got to have security. They've got to have jobs. They've got to be able to make their own way without Government overseers cracking down on them. This they will never stand.

Therefore, every man in the service has the right to expect an opportunity from Uncle Sam after the war. I'm sure we all recognize this fact and want to help our boys. I urge Congress and the people to give this plenty of thought in the days to come, in order to have a definite plan worked out for our men by the time the certain victory is brought about.

Thank you.

Ruml Plan Helps 44,000,000 Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of March 29, 1943:

RUML PLAN HELPS 44,000,000 TAXPAYERS

More man-hours of demagoguery have been wasted in Congress in the last few days than the people should be asked to tolerate—especially in an off year. In an election year, the people have come to expect politicians to take political license with the facts, beat their breasts, wave the flag, proclaim themselves faithful friends of the poor and undying foes of the "blood millionaires." But in off year, with no election in sight, the people expect their elected representatives to hew more closely to truth and issues.

The debate in the House is over the Ruml plan to put income taxation on a pay-as-you-go basis.

On this question there are only two bona fide considerations. One is the welfare of the Government, as represented in revenue for the Treasury. The other is the welfare of the 44,000,000 income-tax payers.

The evidence clearly shows that if the Ruml plan, as embodied in the Carlson bill, were adopted, the Treasury would collect $3,000,000,000 more revenue this year than under the present law—and would continue to get more revenue in the years ahead by collecting taxes at the source of income before the taxpayer has a chance to spend it.

As for the welfare of the 44,000,000 income-tax payers, the evidence is equally clear that they would gain a great advantage by adoption of the Carlson bill. It would rid taxpayers of overhanging income-tax debt and enable them to pay their taxes as they earn, while they are able to pay.

The breast beaters have tried to brand the Ruml-Carlson measure as a rich man's tax bill. That demagogic lie is fooling nobody. The truth is that no rich man would pay less under the Ruml-Carlson proposal than under the present law—and many rich men would pay a whole lot more. The crux of this plan is to shift the basis of tax assessment from 1942 to 1943 incomes and put everybody on a pay-as-you-go basis. All whose incomes are above $20,000 would pay a tax on whichever year's income is the higher. In addition, in this group special super taxes are levied against so-called windfall incomes, such as big incomes that may be derived from war contracts.

Taxpayers whose incomes are below $20,000 would pay a higher tax if 1943 incomes were larger than 1942 incomes, and a lower tax if 1943 incomes were lower than 1942 incomes. For instance, a taxpayer who earned three or four or five thousand dollars in 1942, and joined the Army at $50 a month in 1943, would pay a smaller tax. And that is only right and fair.

In considering the Ruml-Carlson measure, the future is even more important than the present. Forty-four million taxpayers are involved. Most of them never paid income taxes before. Most of them never earned as much money as they are earning in these war-boom years. Most of them will earn a lot less in the year or two following the end of the war. Millions will be unemployed. They will face the greatest economic crisis of their lives, unless meanwhile a pay-as-you-go reckoning on taxation is adopted. These millions of rank-and-file taxpayers are quite willing to pay taxes to their Government, according to their ability to pay, while they are able to pay But they won't want to be burdened with income-tax debts on incomes already earned and spent.

And there are 11,000,000 others to consider—those to be in the armed forces. Some of them will not come back, and it is not just nor fair that their widows be compelled to pay their income-tax debts. The Ruml-Carlson bill should be passed.

Absenteeism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial written by Floyd E. Matteson, editor and publisher of the Potwin (Kans.) Ledger, on the subject of Absenteeism.

Editor Matteson, who lives and publishes his newspaper in the small town of Potwin, in Butler County, near Wichita, Kans., last year worked in a Wichita airplane factory for 8 months, and has a first-hand knowledge of working conditions in a war-industry plant. The gist of his editorial is that absenteeism is due, not to the caprice of workmen, but to the fact that these plants are 25-percent overmanned. Plant management has been hoarding workers, that is, the management has more workmen on the rolls than are needed to handle the materials available.

I commend the editorial to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABSENTEEISM—SMOKE SCREEN

A great stir has been made about absenteeism the past few weeks. Bureaucrats, manufacturers, politicians, commentators, all have raised a hue and cry about this great evil—but the unfunny part of it is that absenteeism is nothing more or less than a smoke screen raised to direct the public gaze from more important inefficiencies of our war production.

Our guess is that this smoke screen has been raised by the War Department as a means of enlisting public approval for their plan of drafting labor, and by manufacturers who desire to keep the public eye turned from the real cause of the labor shortage—their hoarding of labor.

All those who have decried absenteeism have told how many million man-hours have been lost, but they have never told just how many less airplanes, ships, guns, etc., have been built because of this absenteeism. They have stated that so many planes, ships, etc., could have been built with the wasted manhours but they have never mentioned the fact that actually they would not have built one more unit even if there had been no absenteeism. They have not mentioned that the man-hours lost by absenteeism would have been wasted in their factories if they hadn't been wasted at home, the only difference being that they would have cost the Government upwards of a dollar an hour being wasted at the factory whereas they cost the Government nothing being wasted at home.

The factories prepare, weeks in advance, a schedule of units to be built, so many a day, a week, or during a certain period. This schedule is based on the orders they have received.

The fact that practically every plant having war contracts floats an Army and Navy efficiency flag shows that most of them have completed their schedules, and if they have not completed them it is because of material shortage. They prepare their schedules ahead of time and they base them on the orders on hand and not on the number of employees they expect will be absent, and no matter how many are absent or how many are present they complete their schedule and build no more than was planned.

If the factories would cut their personnel by 25 percent they would still have enough employees left to meet all schedules and to keep up with the material. The other 25 percent could go to work on farms or wherever needed thus alleviating the labor shortage. In doing this, this so-called absenteeism evil would be cured, because after all these people working in the factories are just as good Americans as anyone else and when it gets to the place that they are holding up production—actually instead of theoretically—they will no longer be absent. They do not want to hold up the war effort any more than anyone else but as it is there is so much wasted manpower in the war plants that these employees feel they are doing more to help the war effort by going fishing instead of getting in some other workers way as would be the case if they all were present on the job.

Our River of Power Flowing to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "Our River of Power Flowing to War," written by R. L. Duffus and published in the New York Times Magazine of Sunday, March 28, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR RIVER OF POWER FLOWING TO WAR—THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY EMPIRE HAS GROWN PRODIGIOUSLY IN 10 YEARS AND IS NOW THE HEART OF A GREAT ARSENAL

(By R. L. Duffus)

KNOXVILLE, TENN.—The eve of the Tennessee Valley Authority's tenth anniversary finds this region, from the rugged peaks of the Southern Appalachians to the Mississippi levees, deep in war. It is an amazing spectacle. For an observer who followed the course of the river, almost 10 years ago, from the site of Norris Dam on the Clinch, down past Knoxville to Paducah, before Tennessee Valley Authority had done more than a little brush cutting, it takes the breath away.

During that decade I have visited the river from time to time, always drawn by an irresistible fascination, seeing dams in all stages of construction, watching the water back up behind them, feeling the throb of power in the great transmission towers that began to stride across the country, and aware, also, that this majestic enterprise was stirring towns, cities, and people to a new and vigorous activity.

Now a change has come. Tennessee Valley Authority was established to improve navigation, control floods, restore forests, develop

farming and industry. These things have not been forgotten. But now its prodigious energy is turned toward the additional clause in its instructions: "To provide for the national defense." It has become, in the words of Chairman David E. Lilienthal, "the largest producer of power for war in the Western Hemisphere."

Tennessee Valley Authority is producing half as much power for battle as all the electric generators in the United States were turning out during the First World War. It operates 20 dams on the Tennessee and its tributaries; one, the great Wilson Dam, at Muscle Shoals, taken over from the Army as a heritage of World War No. 1; 4 bought from private owners; the others constructed by Tennessee Valley Authority itself, 8 of them completed since the fall of France in 1940. All but 2 storage dams in this great system carry, or will soon carry, electric generators, and these 2 store water that supplies generators. Two more dams and powerhouses, each among the world's mightiest, are being built. More than 70 percent of the developed power is going into war. Soon it will be 80 percent—maybe by Tennessee Valley Authority's birthday, May 18.

As the river flows, so flows the current from the great machines. It flows far beyond the valley. It flows into a network of power lines extending from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, from the Mississippi to the Appalachians. Soon, through connections made or improved since Pearl Harbor, it will be furnishing 20 percent of that power. The mills of Gary, the war plants of Baton Rouge and Mobile, would falter if a single one of Tennessee Valley Authority's dams went out of operation. In all this region, this heartland of America, the generators are so carefully synchronized that even Arlington time is not precise enough for them. Within the narrow limits of one-thousandth of a second, and no more, do they ever vary; one can look at an indicator in Chattanooga and see for one's self.

Into this vast system the river feeds, saving coal and oil directly, saving indirectly as power is switched here and there to meet peak demands.

The building operations which have produced and are producing these effects are astounding. Let me cite two examples.

In September 1941, I witnessed the controlled fury of the final weeks of construction on the Cherokee Dam on the Holston above Knoxville. It almost seemed that the work was being done on the run. Now I have seen the completion of Cherokee's twin, Douglas, on the French Broad. A world's record was broken at Cherokee, finished in 16 months. It was broken again at Douglas, finished in 12 months and 19 days. What men couldn't do was done, and in the case of Douglas in the face of two floods, in December and February last, which threatened to sweep away the cofferdams.

You can't see power, though you can sense it when you stand before the quivering indicators in a great powerhouse, or in front of the board in the dispatcher's office in Chattanooga. But there it is, quiet water behind dams, raring to go, and, to receive it, the great turbines. On the morning of Pearl Harbor, Tennessee Valley Authority had 1,000,000 kilowatts of installed power. This morning it has more than 1,500,000. On New Year's Day, 1944, or earlier, it will have 2,000,000.

The great pools, the inland lakes set in the lovely land of the mid-South, the myriads of little running streams that feed tributaries and main river, the rain that falls gently in the mountains: these things are not water; they are high explosives, tanks, airplanes, guns. When the little automatic radio stream gages, far in the remote highlands, tap out in Morse code, as they miraculously do, the news of rising water, they whisper death.

It is the terror and majesty of what the river can do in war that was, for me, the new element in a 1,300-mile trip up and down and across this familiar landscape. Hardly second to that impression was a new sense of the determination, the courage and the skill of the men who have made and are making this awful and necessary thing possible; the engineers over their blueprints or walking the frightening heights of the dams; the workmen, skilled and unskilled, white, Negro, and occasionally Indian, driving huge machines, handling cranes, doing their work in cold, in rain, in steaming heat, in darkness, in winds that often sweep the dam crests with hurricane force, in rock-bound tunnels, on the verges of roaring currents, in vaulted chambers where massive generators are being put together, in recesses where intricate wiring is assembled; the handful of technicians, in powerhouses and control rooms, who in the quiet hum that is almost a whisper after the roar of construction, direct this violent energy toward its appointed ends.

One does not think this is public power. One thinks, private or public, this is American power. These are Americans and one is proud of them.

Let me draw some pictures; of dams in construction, of dams at work, of the deadly operations into which this quiet and violent strength of the river is poured. They will be snapshots of a camera swung here and there. There could be hundreds of others if there were time and space.

Look at the Douglas Dam. It is almost closing day. The river has been rising. The weather forecasters predict that it will rise more. The boiling waves are splashing over the wall of the cofferdam. Then the sky clears. The crest has passed. The work has never stopped. Men are swarming all over the structure from powerhouse and cofferdam to the lofty deck. There is a hammering, banging, and chugging. The great cranes swing, handling 8 tons of concrete at a time as though the big bucket were a bag of gumdrops. A man jumps to the bucket and turns a wheel. The soft mass discharges. Up goes the bucket again. This is dangerous work. Half way down the lower face of the dam is the first-aid station, someone always in attendance. Men can be hurt. Men can break under the strain. But the work goes on. It will be going forward on the night of this visit so that the dam can be closed on the appointed day. Later one learns that it has been closed ahead of the appointed day.

Look at Fontana, high up where the Little Tennessee breaks out of the Smokies—a tremendous site where the rock has been blasted from awful cliffs and the river diverted through two monster tunnels to make America's fourth greatest dam. It is all raw now. Here you can see the tracks of the caterpillar trucks—the "cat wagons"—going down slopes almost too steep to follow on foot. A truck has gone off one of those high trails; you see where the driver jumped to safety. Some pieces of the truck were salvaged.

Fontana is so big and so remote it called for a new town to house the 3,600 men who will be needed at the peak. And their families. Here it is, half mining camp, half Main Street, with neat two-sectional houses hauled up by trucks, with many trailers, with cabins and tents, with a great cafeteria, a chapel, a school, a recreation center, a bank, a drug store, a beauty parlor, children in rompers and young girls in short swagger coats; all in the heart of the Carolina mountains, once known only to the occupants of scattered cabins, some hunters, and occasional tourists. Fontana is power in reserve, to fight the battles of 1944. It is like the Russian Army that waited behind Stalingrad for the hour to attack.

Down on the main river, not far below Knoxville, is Fort Loudoun—scene of a winter-long siege of white settlers by Indians long ago. It will be closed in May, a year ahead of schedule. I scrambled all over it during a breathing space between shifts, seeing the deep corridors through which the cables will run, the generators in process of assembly, the high deck above the gathering thrust of the pool, the ferocity of smoothly passing water, the turbulence below, from which no small craft and no swimmer can escape. My bolder companion walked to the edge of the 80-foot lock, the highest single-lift lock in the world. He leaned casually on the seemingly rickety wooden guardrail. To one who crawled the last few feet to the verge the chasm had its thrills. Sizable ships will go up to Knoxville by that route, through a channel 11 feet deep before very long. They will go through while the generators whirl to produce cargo for them to carry back.

Now let us look at some finished dams. Norris, strong and quiet as the former Senator, father of Tennessee Valley Authority, after whom it was named, deserves a pilgrimage. Ten years ago this site was marked only by a slash in the brush down one steep bank, up the other. The spot where we had our picnic in 1933 looks down now on majesty. The wires in the transformer yard are singing. The river, having finished its work here, swings downstream, green because its mud has been left in the upper reservoir.

Watts Bar Dam, below Loudoun on the main river, has huge steam generators to supplement the water-driven dynamos. You see the pulverized coal in a vast storage yard, but after that you don't see it. The place is as clean as a sanitary lunch room. You don't even like to drop cigarette ashes on the floor. The boilers run up to the height of a 10-story building, the engines are finished off in brass-trimmed, cream-colored spotlessness, and you can balance a nickel on its edge on the turbine casing, so quietly, yet with such inconceivable speed, do the engines turn.

Go down river again. It is twilight now, at Chickamauga Dam, near Chattanooga. I saw Chickamauga when the first cofferdam was going in—a hopeless, confusing welter for any layman to understand. Now the tumult has died down, the last chips have been swept up, and this is power and vigorous architecture. It is lovely and quiet here, near an old battleground, with a moon coming up and an evening star going down. The plain, majestic structure softens in gathering darkness. In the control room, with tamed thousands of horsepower at their bidding for the turn of a switch, the two attendants are eating their supper.

Down river once more, in the morning. This is Guntersville, Ala., and here is Guntersville Dam, backing up a winding river lake for many miles, with water and wind enough to require a breakwater. Guntersville a few years ago was a sleepy river town. It is waking now. It is a port, indeed. To its docks have been brought thousands of Army jeeps, trucks, and ambulances, upstream from the Ohio. There they are, in orderly ranks, deep around the old cotton warehouse.

Again down the river. Pass by the busy generators of Wheeler Dam and we come to Wilson Dam, built at the close of World War No. 1. Its turbines, for many years almost idle, are all working now. I looked along a line of 14 dynamos, in what must be one of the world's most impressive rooms. They even dwindle a little in the distance. Again there is the same sense of a majestic surge of power. Ten years ago I saw two of them in operation, the others that were in position at that time standing sadly idle.

Farther downstream is Pickwick Dam, which I remember in the throes of construction, now in full operation. Near the mouth of the river, at the gateway to the Ohio, the great Kentucky Dam is taking shape. This river is man's river now. He says how it shall flow.

The river flows to war. It flows into the great aluminum plants at Alcoa and Muscle Shoals, without which our airplane program would be crippled. It flows into lesser plants, too. It flows into Tennessee Valley Authority's experimental and demonstration plants at Muscle Shoals, where miracles are part of the day's work. There are the blazing phosphate furnaces. From them comes elemental phosphorus, to go into chemical warfare and tracer bullets; to go also by shiploads to Britain, there to be made into fertilizers and so to save the cargo space that food might take.

Out of the Muscle Shoals plant come ammonium nitrate, a basic material in today's high explosives; calcium carbide, now being sent to Louisville as an ingredient in the synthetic rubber known as neoprene; fertilizers potent to help feed the world.

Tennessee Valley Authority power makes delicate instruments at Knoxville, in the Fulton Sylphon Co.'s plant. You see little or medium-sized brass contrivances, often deftly processed by young girls. They control temperature and do other things, some so delicate and vital that they had better not be mentioned Sylphons from this plant go into jeeps, airplanes, tanks, warships.

Tennessee Valley Authority power makes boilers, amid an ear-splitting din, in the Combustion Engineering Co.'s plant at Chattanooga. It flows into the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation's yards at Decatur, Ala. The great red hulks of 3,000-ton Diesel-motor cargo ships sit on the bank and about every 2 weeks one of them goes broadside into the river. Ingalls makes floating machine shops for the Navy, too, for use off unnamed shores where there are no port facilities.

Tennessee Valley Authority power goes north with the speed of lightning into the huge Vultee factory at Nashville, where the A-31 bomber, known to British flyers as the Vengeance, is being produced. I saw this bomber growing under my eyes, sections taking shape separately and being bolted together, the engine hung in place by four bolts only for quick replacement, the planes wheeled out for testing. Overhead the test pilots were putting machines through their paces, profiting by the wing brake that one sees but does not describe—or even wholly understand.

At the Redstone Arsenal, near Huntsville, Ala., the Federal Government has spent $100,000,000 to create a vast industry in a once-quiet valley. The plant was built with fantastic speed, between October, 1941, and the end of January 1942. It is a chemical shell assembly plant, making both gas and smoke shells and bombs. The gas shells and bombs will not be used unless the Axis powers use some first. Then they will be ready in adequate quantities. One watches these operations with attention, and one does not carry matches or cigarette lighters while doing so.

Redstone is a quiet, cheerful sort of place, with what might be called cells so arranged that if a part of the plant goes up the rest may not follow. Girls load powder into cartridges, ready for the gunners. Other girls handle aluminum tubes filled with TNT, inserting them carefully into a projectile already packed with phosphorus. It is well to be careful, for if the energy of the Tennessee, expressed in phosphorus, came into direct contact with the energy of the Tennessee, expressed in TNT, the result would be unhappy for all concerned.

This is just a little of what Tennessee Valley Authority power does. It is going into a mysterious Army construction job, not on view when my visit was made, on 56,000 acres of land on the Clinch River, below Norris Dam. It is making kaolin clay into spark plugs and radio equipment; it is processing copper, manganese and zinc; it is manufacturing electrodes, metal dies, ferro-alloys, sulfuric acid, methyl alcohol, acetic acid, and uniforms. This is a valley, as Chairman Lilienthal says, of electrochemistry and electro-metallurgy, of light metals and heavy chemicals. It is a valley getting wartime power and crying out for more.

In peacetime its finished product is happier and more efficient people. In wartime the armed combatant is the end result. I saw him at Camp Forrest, near Tullahoma, Tenn., where a part of Gen. Ben Lear's Second Army was in training. General Lear is said to be bent on making every man in the Second Army a Ranger. I saw some of them covering an obstacle course, falling on barbed wire, exposing booby traps, and otherwise demonstrating how a Ranger operates. And there were grinning boys just in from a 25-mile tramp under field equipment. A young officer stood in the headquarters room, still working his feet up and down. Not a man fell out, he said—not one. He grinned more widely than anyone else.

This was the very doorstep of war. But it was all war. The whole valley is enlisted for the duration. Like the Coast Guardsmen I had seen patrolling these inland fresh-water reaches of Uncle Sam's coast line, all those who plan, design, build, supervise, control, and use the Tennessee Valley Authority's power are in this war.

I went back to see Chairman Lilienthal. What about all this electricity after the war? He saw no more limit to the market for electricity than to the market for happiness. "You can't get too much energy," he declared. "Use it and you create a demand for more. Energy isn't a commodity. It's an ever-recurring cycle. The power of the dams flows into mens lives. It flows out again in the form of creative work. There's no end to it that I can see."

I went out and took another look at the muddy stream. There it flowed, in parts almost as the pioneers saw it—the river of man's earthly hell, the river of his dreams of heaven on earth; the river of death and of life.

Verendrye and the Rebirth of France Today—Addresses Broadcast for the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Planting of the Verendrye Plate in What Is Now South Dakota

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, Saturday evening, under the auspices of the Verendrye Memorial Commission of the State of South Dakota, there was broadcast here in Washington a program commemorating the two hundredth anniversary of the planting of the Verendrye Plate. Mr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Associate Director of the Office of War Information, participated in the program and gave a remarkable address on the part that new France is playing in the war today. It was based on his personal observations during a recent trip to North Africa and upon information in the hands of the O. W. I.

The program was broadcast to this country by the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co. and rebroadcast to Europe and Africa by short wave. Both because of the historical meaning to this country of the Verendrye explorations that were being commemorated and because a special significance for the cause of the United Nations at this time, I have asked that the program be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and under permission granted, I offer it at this time.

VERENDRYE ANNIVERSARY PROGRAM

ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Co. presents a program arranged by the Verendrye Memorial Commission of South Dakota commemorating the two hundredth anniversary of the planting of the Verendrye Plate which marked French exploration in the upper Missouri Valley and staked the claim of France to a vast area that later became a part of the United States in the Louisiana Purchase. The speakers will be the Honorable FRANCIS CASE, Representative in Congress from the Second District of South Dakota, and the Honorable Milton S. Eisenhower, Associate Director of the Office of War Information, who has lately returned from French North Africa.

REMARKS BY MR. CASE

Mr. CASE. Thank you, Mr. Douglas. The people of South Dakota appreciate this opportunity of bringing to the great audience of the National Broadcasting Co. the story of the Verendrye Plate.

Around the turn of the eighteenth century, 240 years ago, rumors of a great western sea drifted into Three Rivers, New France, a military post west of Montreal. In 1707, young Captain Verendrye, son of the French Governor, went to Europe to fight in the War of the Spanish Succession. Wounded on the battlefield of Maplaquet, he was left for dead. Recovering, however, he met important people. He told them the story of a great fur country and a western sea, somewhere beyond Three Rivers. If financed, he would find it and claim the lands for France.

In 1711, Pierre Verendrye returned, married, and engaged in the fur trade. For 25 years, family responsibilities and financial troubles limited his travels but did not dim his dream. As his boys grew up, he traded farther and farther west. He reached and explored the Lake of the Woods, but did not find the sea. Finally, in 1738, with two sons, Francois and Louis-Joseph, he built Fort La Reine on the Assiniboine, well west of the Red River of the North. There, worn by battle and travel, Pierre commissioned his sons to go on, looking for a river that flowed west.

One winter they found the Mandans on the Missouri in what is now North Dakota. The Mandans said they might reach the western sea by going farther south and west. The winter of 1742 was spent with the Bows, who were preparing for war with the Snake Indians. In January, they moved with the Bows to the west, but came to mountains across which waters could not flow to a western sea, and which, in winter, they could not cross. Then the Verendryes turned east and reached a camp of the Little Cherry Indians on the Missouri River, about the middle of March 1743. They did not

know it, but they were within 10 miles of the geographical center of North America. There they planted what is, aside from LaSalle's monument on the banks of the Mississippi, the only known marker planted by French explorers west of the great river.

From the Journal of the elder Verendrye boys, we get the story:

"On a mound near the camp, on behalf of our general, I placed a plate of lead with the arms and the name of the King, and raised a pyramid of stones. I told the savages, who had no knowledge of the plate of lead which I had buried in the earth, that I placed those stones as a memorial of our having come to their lands."

Whether the pyramid of stones was later destroyed by the Indians, or whether it fell down as the butte crumbled, or whether carried away when white men needed building stone, is not known. For 170 years no one knew the spot. The planting was known from Verendrye's published journal and cited by such historians as Parkman. In 1908 Bishop Thomas O'Gorman, one-time professor of history in Catholic University here in Washington, in an address on Verendrye's travels predicted that "some day or other, the exact spot may be found."

No trace of it was found, however, until February 1913, when some Fort Pierre school children unexpectedly kicked the plate out of the crumbling shale soil of the river bluffs, within sight of Pierre, our South Dakota State capital. The strange words in French caught their attention. One side was carefully engraved; the other was crudely scratched with some names and a date, "le 30 de Mars, 1743."

The discovery was called to the attention of the French Ambassador Jusserand by the Honorable Charles H. Burke, then Representative in Congress. After consulting French sources, Jusserand wrote: "Everything about the plate tallies with everything in the journal; its authenticity cannot be doubted."

Charles de Land, western historian, pronounced the planting "the climax of a daring dream, one of the most notable chapters of bravery, privation, and indomitable energy ever experienced by any family of discoverers and explorers."

Our State historian, Doane Robinson, quoted Bishop O'Gorman in declaring that "the most historic event in South Dakota, was the claiming of the great region west of the Mississippi for France by the tablet on which was briefly inscribed the story of the great enterprise."

Two years ago South Dakota authorized a commission to arrange a suitable commemoration for this 200th anniversary in 1943. Governor, now Senator BUSHFIELD, appointed Anton Fischer, Dr. T. F. Riggs, and Cyril Van Hise. They planned to have a great international pageant in South Dakota this spring. But, once again fate entwined the destiny of the French people with those of the United States. War came.

Our pageant is in Africa. Some may have thought that the great freedom-loving spirit of France was dead, that the courage and vision which inspire men had gone from the French people. Those who knew this story of the Verendryes have known that the real spirit of the French people could not die.

And so, we are particularly glad, that in the commemoration of the 200th anniversary of an act that signalized the workings of the French spirit in the new world, we can have a first-hand report on the rebirth of the French nation in North Africa. It is my very great privilege at this time to present Mr. Milton Eisenhower, Associate Director of the Office of War Information, recently returned from North Africa, where he collaborated with his brother, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, commander of the troops of the United Nations. Mr. Eisenhower.

ADDRESS BY MR. EISENHOWER

Thank you, Mr. CASE, I am happy to pay tribute, with you and the people of South Dakota, to the spirit which animated the Verendrye brothers. Those gallant young men, who claimed the Dakotas for France 200 years ago, were part of a great tradition. Theirs was the tradition of Cartier, Champlain, LaSalle, and other explorers and colonizers of the North American continent; it was the tradition of Caillié, de Brazza, Marchand, Lyautey—explorers and colonizers of Africa. The Verendryes belong to a long line of Frenchmen who have carried the French spirit around the world, establishing outposts of French civilization from Africa to India, from the Americas to the islands of the South Pacific.

The French overseas territories today make up the world's second largest colonial empire in area, the third largest in population. Most of that empire now fights with the United Nations.

Indeed, after the fall of France in 1940, the French nation was born again in the colonies. In a sense it can be said that the republic had its rebirth on the other side of the world on July 18, 1940. On that date the citizens of the New Hebrides, responding to an appeal from General DeGaulle in London, voted to go on fighting the Axis. Those small South Pacific islands were the first French territory to join the liberty-loving peoples of the world in the war for freedom. They were quickly followed by other French islands in the Pacific, on some of which we now have vital airplane bases. They were joined also by the French settlements in India; by French Equatorial Africa and the Cameroons; by the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, off the coast of Newfoundland. And finally, just since last November, not only North Africa itself, but French West Africa, Somaliland in East Africa, and French Guiana in South America have rallied to the United Nations' cause.

Thus, for nearly 3 years, free Frenchmen have fought the Axis from England or from the French colonies. But when, a few months ago, French troops from Algeria under the leadership of General Giraud appeared on the Tunisian front, France itself was back in the war. For Algeria is not a colony, but an integral part of metropolitan France. Up to the fall of the Republic, Algeria sent senators and deputies to the French Parliament.

Sections of the North African cities of Algers, Oran, and Bone—with their European architecture and tree-shaded squares—have the characteristic calm and order of French towns. Much of the Algerian countryside—the neat orange groves, vineyards, olive plantations, truck farms, and wheat fields—seems transplanted from southern France.

Those fertile fields and groves will now become a major supply base for the United States. The people of North Africa are anxious to see to that. But they cannot do it immediately. For by the time American troops landed in North Africa, the Axis had stripped the country bare. The Nazis had taken not only all they could from continental France, directly or indirectly they had also taken from North Africa everything they could lay their hands on—food and clothing, pharmaceuticals, even pipe, cement, and anything else that was movable.

Food, clothing, and other commodities were so scarce that money was practically worthless. Many of the stores were closed. You couldn't buy a basket o' tangerines from a farmer because he couldn't use the money to buy the things he needed. But with a bolt of cloth you could buy just about anything he had. People would no longer work for money. But men and women would work all hours for a little wheat, or meat, or sugar, or salt.

And so, bled white by the Axis, with a short crop last year, and a population swollen by refugees from a Nazi-dominated Europe, North Africa was faced with actual starvation. But soon after our landings ships of the United Nations began carrying food and clothing from Great Britain and America. A great deal has already arrived. More is on the way. You can see hope once more in the eyes of men, women, and children.

The food we send now will tide the population over until the new crop is produced in North Africa. So, as a second step, we are doing all we can to make it possible for the people there to produce the maximum amount of food themselves. This, in turn, will help shorten the war because maximum production in North Africa will help support our forces and thus reduce the drain on our shipping.

Today in French North Africa, after 2 years of Nazi oppression, the free and democratic spirit is being revived. While waiting for the day when the French people as a whole can express themselves, General Giraud has abrogated the decrees imposed by a Nazi-dominated government. The municipal assemblies and general councils, local expressions of French democracy, are to be restored. The unity of all Frenchmen fighting the Axis is now being forged.

That unity had already found a concrete symbol 2 months ago on the Tunisian border. A column of Free French soldiers under young General Leclerc marched 1,300 miles from Lake Chad in Equatorial Africa to join one of General Giraud's battalions at a Sahara oasis. Together they attacked and won a common victory over a strong Italian garrison. In men like those, who are conquering jungles and deserts as well as enemy forces, the spirit of the Verendryes lives on.

That spirit, that passionate French love of freedom, lives on within the borders of continental Frances as well. It lives on in underground organizations whose members risk death every day. It lives on in the biting wit of secret newspapers. It lives on in the stubborn defiance of workers who would rather starve than go to work in Germany; in the unyielding individualism of the peasants; and in the open revolt of the youths who have recently opened their own "second front" in the mountains of Savoy.

When the armies of the United Nations enter France, they know they will find that the great majority of the French people have been in the war all along. They know that French soldiers everywhere will join in the war of liberation. They know that France will sit as one of the conquering nations at the peace table. The motto of the Republic—Liberty, Equality, Fraternity—is still in every Frenchman's heart. The spirit of the Verendryes still lives. As one Frenchman has recently written, "France will renounce neither her past nor her future."

A Lot of Little Things

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I seldom ask permission to place speeches in the RECORD made by persons who are not Members or former Members of this body unless the speeches have been

made at an occasion of outstanding national interest. There has come to my attention, however, an address that was made at a joint American Legion and Legion Auxiliary meeting, so outstanding in its fine spirit of patriotism that I believe it should be placed in the RECORD. Accordingly, I offer at this time, an address by Tom Eastman of Custer, S. Dak., delivered at a local joint meeting of the Legion organizations under the title:

"A LOT OF LITTLE THINGS"

Currently there is running through the more prominent of our national magazines a series of advertisements, sponsored, I believe, by the brewing industry, which uses as its keynote the phrase: "Morale is a lot of little things"—little things like a posy in your lapel, or a friendly wave from the traffic cop, or a haircut down at Tony's, or a permanent over at Mabel's. Small, pleasant, everyday things that all add up to what we call "morale." And it occurs to me that to a greater or lesser degree the same thing may be said of Americanism. That in reality Americanism, too, is a "lot of little things"—a lot of the everyday things which we have come to accept as a part of the American scene, for surely Americanism as we know it is nothing more and is nothing less than our way of life and the institutions of our Government as we have learned to accept them.

It is a condition of the mind and of the heart which has been brought about through natural processes in each of us, and that bespeaks love and respect and honor for the many little things which go to make up our America. Little things, yes, but vastly important ones nonetheless.

Now, while basically Americanism is something that is solid and unyielding, and as fixed and as permanent in its principles as are the stars in the firmament of the heavens, the fact yet remains that in the application of its doctrines it varies with changing times. For, you see, Americanism is not a one-way street, even though many of us have inadvertently come to look upon it as such, but it is something that not only gives to us but likewise demands from us—and it is these demands which will vary as national and world conditions alter.

Throughout the entire lifetime of everyone within the sound of my voice tonight we have enjoyed the protected right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We have been privileged, within reasonable limitations, to say the things we wanted to say and write the things we wanted to write; we could go to the church of our choice, or not go to church at all if that pleased us better. We were free to engage in any business or any vocation that our fancy dictated, just so it didn't bring harm upon others. We could establish our homes, over whose threshhold none could pass save with our consent, and we could raise our families and plan for and with them a protected future surrounded by all of these same blessings.

Now these, and many more like them, were the things which our Government—our American Government—gave to us, and about the only demands which that Government made from us was that we fully respect those same rights in all other persons, and that we contribute, each according to his or her financial ability, a comparatively trivial sum for the preservation of those rights. That was "yesterday"—a short yesterday ago.

But a crazy house painter from Berchtesgaden, and an ambitious puppet of a modern Caesar from one of the seven hills of Rome, and a group of treacherous slant-eyed sun-worshipers from the foot of Mount Fujiyama have now changed all that for us. Not that we have lost any of the basic privileges or the rights which were ours on yesterday—those in principle we still keep, and, God willing, we will always keep—but today has come into being that changed national and world condition that compels the full realization, as never before, that this thing we call "Americanism" is, in truth, more than just a one-way street. And we who have always been on the receiving end and whose contributions, spiritually and materially, have been but slight toward the maintenance of our Government—and that means nearly all of us—we now find ourselves in a position where, if we are to survive at all, we must pass from the receiving to the giving end.

And I don't mean by that that we must rest content on the fact that we may have bought a few bonds or stamps, or have donated a dollar or two for the support of the Red Cross or the United Service Organizations, or that we may have sent an old worn-out tire over to the school house salvage drive with junior or Mary—it goes much deeper and it goes much further than that.

Those little things were and are important, of course, and must never be neglected for they mean much in the over-all defense and victory picture. But our real contribution, yes, our necessary contribution, is and must be the state of mind and state of heart we place ourselves in.

It is that voluntary willingness on our part—on the part of every single one of us—to cheerfully do and perform in a spirit of helpful cooperation each and every one of those single little duties which our Government calls on us now to perform. When we are asked to register and abide by the rules of rationing let's do it with the absolute minimum of complaining—let's do it with the conviction that it is helping in the war effort, and helping in that, is thereby helping each one of us. As we look about us we can readily see that there are so many things for each of us to do—yes, "little things" but things which are so vitally necessary in the maintenance and preserving of our American way of life, and all of which bespeaks true Americanism.

Then let us continue to believe in our Constitution; let's continue to have faith in our American institutions; let's consider it a true badge of patriotism to obey constituted authority; and let's away with all personal and political bickering and sniping at men in high places. Let's open our hearts and our minds to true Americanism, for just as surely as we do we will find ourselves swept along with all the other loyal patriots with each then contributing his and her bit toward national unity and glorious victory.

Yes, "Americanism is a lot of little things," but how massive and how tremendous those "little things" are and can be. And we of the American Legion and of the American Legion Auxiliary can and should render the high service of leadership in keeping that spirit alive and the flame burning brighter. For we who have served and sacrificed cannot now rest on past laurels. We have a duty still to perform. Our sons and daughters must carry on. We cannot lose faith, for they must not. We must sell America, its Constitution and its Declaration of Independence so completely to them that they will be real zealots of the principles of freedom, peace, and democracy, eager to sell these ideas to all with whom they come in contact. We must have faith in their generation, for in their veins runs the blood of patriots, our own blood. We must make them understand that we know they are true Americans, ready to die, if need be, in the defense of our beloved country. To them Old Glory must ever be a symbol of a Government that is a real democracy and that each year of its existence must be a step nearer to perfection.

Yes; let us teach our sons and our daughters that they must love America, they must live in America, and most of all, they must improve America. If we do this then fascism, nazi-ism, or any other ism except Americanism cannot survive on these shores. And how better can we pass this lesson on to them than by the living example of our own personal conduct before them if in our own everyday life we exhibit that cheerful willingness to give something in payment for all of those many material benefits we and they have always received from a generous government.

"It is for us the living that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall have a new birth of earth."

America and Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me on the subject of America and Lasting Peace, at the Pan-European Conference, held in New York City, March 27 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gen. Douglas MacArthur in response to his welcome to Australia last year said: "I have come as a soldier in a great crusade of personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. * * * There can be no compromise. We shall win or we shall die, and to this end, I pledge you the full resources of all the mighty power of my country and all the blood of my countrymen." This pledge also places a deep responsibility upon each of us civilians to live up to its high standard of devotion. We must do our full share to win the war. We must also do our full share to establish lasting peace or the war will not stay won.

The United States of America is proud to be a member of the United Nations of the world fighting this war. The United Nations are bound together by a brotherhood in arms and by the brotherhood of man defending his home. The government of each United Nation is pledged by its declaration of January 1, 1942, to employ its full resources, military or economic, against those members of the Tripartite Pact and its adherents with which such government is at war. Each United Nation is pledged by that declaration to cooperate with the other governments signatory to it and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies.

Already closely united in this war against our enemies, let us be no less united in the constructive work of the peace toward which we fight. There can be no lasting peace without complete victory for the United Nations in both hemispheres. We must plan

each effort toward lasting peace so that it will strengthen our attack or weaken the resistance of our enemies. Personal meetings can add much to our mutual understanding and these meetings must never be permitted to divide us. Our constant effort must be to unite the people of the United States with one another, the people of the Americas with one another, and the people of the world with one another in an orderly but flexible program both to fight the war and build the peace.

We well know that the first step toward lasting peace is to fight our way across the one-way bridge to victory, yet someone must also plan our advance beyond that bridge. We citizen-civilians owe it to our citizen-soldiers to be ready to render constructive civilian service worthy of their military service at the moment when their primary responsibilities for winning the war end and ours for winning the peace begin. As a matter of fact, these responsibilities overlap each other and ours call for planning as well as for action.

In our civilian sector we must be as realistic, thorough, determined, loyal, far-sighted, and bold as are our generals and their men in their military sectors. We must be as thoughtful, helpful, and sympathetic toward our people, our allies, and the civilian victims of this war as a good general is toward his soldiers, his allies, and the wounded men of both sides. Our standards on the military front are high. Our standards on the civilian front must be equally high. Those who win the war have the right to ask us to secure a peace worthy of that full measure of devotion that they and their comrades will have given to our cause.

Under the Constitution of the United States the President and the Congress share the responsibility for declaring war. The President and the Senate share the responsibiliy for making peace. In accepting the treaty of peace, other nations may act through their executives alone. We must act through our Chief Executive and Senate jointly. Neither can speak for the other. If this joint procedure generates delay, friction, or indecision, it is a serious handicap. Yet if it be used promptly, cordially, and vigorously, this very sharing of the responsibility should contribute to the wisdom of the action taken. It also brings that action closer to the hearts of the people and it thus can become a substantial asset. It is the joint responsibility of the President and the Senate to make the system work successfully. They owe it to the soldiers, to the people of the United States, and to the world to do so.

There are at least five roads to lasting peace in the building of which the United States must take a vital part. The first is the road to our own internal stability. This we must build upon continued faith in the individual citizen and so as to preserve his freedom of initiative and the incentive of private enterprise. The second is the road to regional stability in the Western Hemisphere. This must draw together the raw materials, fertile fields, productive factories, and diverse cultures of the many good neighbors in our Pan American Union.

The third is the road to the immediate post-war emergencies that will follow the war almost as closely as though they were a part of it. Among them will be the emergencies of demobilization, feeding the hungry, rehabilitating the farms, factories, and homes, and reestablishing the family as the foundation of society. Another will be the need to maintain law and order in recovered territories pending establishment of local governments deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. These emergencies will call for joint civilian and military action and will benefit from preliminary planning and agreement among representatives of those directly concerned.

Next come the world-wide problems of a more permanent nature. Of these, military stability comes first. When the fighting ends, the United Nations will have demonstrated beyond doubt their capacity to insure military stability for the time being in the face of the most powerful aggression in history. We must not lose that stability, and yet we must not continue to carry longer than necessary the crushing burden of wartime armaments. Our enemies must be disarmed. Then, in proportion to the lessened danger of aggression and in proportion to the faith of the United Nations in each other there can begin a gradual demobilization. It should keep step with the absorption of the armed forces into the productive forces of the world. There should remain available enough military forces of the respective United Nations and of their combined commands to leave no doubt as to the effectiveness of the determination of the United Nations that no military aggression shall be permitted.

The domination of the air by the victors in this war provides a more feasible means of enforcing world-wide military stability than ever before has been possible. This also calls for advance planning and for agreements as to use of planes, pilots, air routes, and landing fields for military and even civilian purposes.

If there were no agreements made to preserve such military stability and if there were no effective agency to enforce it, this would compel each nation to maintain far greater military forces than otherwise would be needed. The way to justify demobilization is to reduce all reasonable need for the forces demobilized. The existence of relatively strong agencies ready to enforce the peace on behalf of those who have won the war will be the best guaranty against the need for their actual use.

Finally we come to the long-term programs for the economic, social, and political stability of the world. Here we cannot be sure of the premises to the same degree that we can in connection with the other problems. We cannot even obtain authoritative representation of all of the parties who will be concerned with the solutions.

In these areas we will do well to build the foundations rather than to specify the details of the superstructure of the temple of lasting peace. We should plan the foundations with care. This will call also for an outline and general sketch of the structure to come later. It will not call for detailed "blueprints" and specifications now.

We can and should, however, agree upon the plan of procedure to be followed later. If this can be agreed upon before the end of the fighting it will be an important contribution to world-wide stability. It will eliminate confusion and friction at a most critical time. To this end, our representatives in these fields soon should be assigned to their responsibilities and they should, as far as possible, become personally acquainted with the corresponding representatives of other nations.

Those economic and social problems that can be considered immediately should be studied ahead of the others. To do so may develop not only early solutions but also patterns of action contributing to our progress in related fields.

To the extent that world-wide economic, social, or political problems involve regional issues with which certain groups of nations will be especially well fitted to deal, it will be helpful for the United Nations to foster studies of them on regional bases. This decentralization of the work not only should contribute to the relief of the larger group but also should add to the correctness and speed with which sound regional recommendations are reached.

We must approach our difficult post-war issues with the same indomitable determination and fixed faith in our joint capacity to overcome them that inspires us in fighting the war. With a firm reliance upon the protection and help of Divine Providence, we must set ourselves to the solution of our new problems much as did our American forefathers when they overcame their new problems.

The building of foundations for lasting peace rises above partisanship. It is for the sake of all humanity. In doing it we need the confidence of all men and the help of God, our Common Father.

I congratulate those who have arranged this conference for thus bringing those attending it closer to the great responsibilities of today and tomorrow.

We owe it to those millions who have given their lives in this tragic war to take up their crusade and press it forward to a just, a lasting, and a living peace. For that they died. For that we live.

Senator Ball's Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I place in the RECORD the following letter from the editor of the Baltimore Sun and my reply:

THE SUN,
Baltimore, Md., March 48, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am sending you, with this note, a clipping of an article which appeared on page one of the Baltimore Sun on March 18. If you have not already seen it, I believe you will be interested in reading it.

If Senator BALL is correct in his judgment concerning the practical politics of post-war international collaboration and collective security, it indicates a major change in public sentiment in that influential region—a change which may be of great significance.

Your comment on Senator BALL's opinion as expressed in the enclosed article, and also your own views, would be most interesting and useful.

Do you agree with his judgment as to public sentiment and the practical politics of the matter?

Do you feel that the Senate, rather than merely consenting to or rejecting treaties, should exercise the other half of its constitutional function by setting up machinery for advising the Executive on policies and objectives of international engagements and settlements?

The Sun would like to publish your comments.

Sincerely yours,

NEIL H. SWANSON,
Executive Editor.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1943.

Mr. NEIL H. SWANSON,
Executive Editor, the Baltimore Sun,
Baltimore, Md.

MY DEAR MR. SWANSON: Thank you for sending me the very interesting article about

Senator BALL and his constructive work. Replying to your questions, I would say:

I have not tried to measure public sentiment in any formal way, nor tried to determine "the practical politics of the matter," but my opinion is that the people of South Dakota do not have and never have had a desire to remain aloof from a constructive and practical method of international cooperation. Certainly, they are not now in any mood to accept world wars as the only method.

It has been a mistake, I think, to assume that because people of the Middle West or Northwest did not want to get into the war that they were opposed to international cooperation. I should say that it was precisely because they believed there was a better way than war that they have been so much opposed to steps that they thought led to war. It is inconceivable that they would hesitate now to take the steps toward "international living together" that they wanted in the first place.

As a method of practical international politics, it has seemed to me that one of mankind's difficulties has been that some leaders have not been willing to do something unless they could do everything. This thought I have illustrated over a period of years by pointing out that the United States of America did not burst full-blown upon the world as the beginning of things in the New World.

Before we had the Constitution, we had the Articles of Confederation. And before the Articles of Confederation, we had Committees of Correspondence. Before we had the Congress of the United States, we had a Continental Congress. The history of living in the New World runs back longer before we had the Constitution than since. The Constitution came, in the fullness of time, "to form a more perfect Union."

So, it has seemed to me that a logical approach to international relations of a better sort would be through international conferences in advance of which the nations would merely agree to send delegates and to share the expenses of the gathering pro rata, with an understanding that agreements or covenants developed should be binding only upon the powers that became signatory thereto. From the casual treaty stage of international relations, a step forward would be taken by an agreement merely to hold international conferences regularly. Meetings would lead to resolutions, resolutions to covenants, covenants to codes, codes to courts, courts to decisions, decisions to enforcement.

It should have been possible for the United States to adhere to those portions of the League of Nations covenant to which there was no objection. Had we done that much, we could have supported many measures without involvement in international actions which we did not approve, and the history of the world might have been different. In some current discussions of post-war proposals, I regret to see the same intolerance of the middle-roaders that was fatal 20 years ago.

Progress is made by taking one step at a time. In the ordinary affairs of life, successful cooperation of people is achieved by concentrating on the points of unity rather than the points of disagreement. It is impossible and not desirable to expect that all nations will see all problems alike. We shall progress, however, to the extent that we can find points of agreement and go ahead with them.

In answer to your final question, I would say that I think the finest thing about the proposal advanced by Senator BALL and his associates is that they are endeavoring to forestall another deadlock. They are attempting to develop a public thinking that will yield common ground on which the President can stand with confidence in his negotiations.

If the venture of this generation into world politics can be marked by proposals developed by the advice of the Senate and not merely offered to the Senate to take or leave, there will be a real chance that the boys of this day will not offer their lives in vain.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE,
Member of Congress,
Second District, South Dakota.

Filipino Defenders of Bataan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "We're Going Back to Bataan," published in the September 1942 issue of the Filipino Reporter of Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WE'RE GOING BACK TO BATAAN

The cold shadowy moon which shines over us in security in the United States is the same tropical moon which also casts its lurid blood-red luster over the graves of many brave and courageous Americans and Filipinos now sleeping peacefully under the fragrant incense of the hibiscus, dama de noche, azucena, orchid, and ginger flowers o the verdant green slopes of Bataar reposing in confidence awaiting the response of the great day of the return of America to the Philippines.

The heart-breaking tears shed for these dead heroes is the morning dew which falls delicately upon the green grass and their funeral dirge requiem is the melancholy wind which mourns through the Nipa palm trees.

Strike with hands of fire, oh, wierd musician thy harp strung with Apollo's golden hair but know there is not music comparable to these Filipino dead who cry aloud in song—"We Filipinos who died on Bataan that you may live, salute you, America! (MaBuhay!)"

As Cato in the forum of the Roman Senate pronounced the death sentence upon Carthage when he uttered the immortal words "Carthage est Delende" so shall we say "Japano est Delende" to the end that we shall again restore the natural beauty and independence of the Philippines to its former grandeur, charm and magnificance of true simplicity and eastern culture so that the traditions of the Philippines may endure.

Shall the Filipinos who died to defend a principle of honor so that we may live have died in vain? "Have pity on us," cry those who fought so desperately in the fox holes of Bataan and Corregidor, "for the hands of the Japs hath toughed us. Send us succor and aid—lest we perish and our national ideals vanish."

Yes, brave defenders of Bataan, your cry shall be heard and a mighty, tumultuous riot of voices increasing in volume echoes over the length and breadth of these great United States in response to patriotic Americans and Filipinos in America.

Yes, we are going back to Bataan.

Food and Oil Production Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 23, 1943, I had the opportunity to visit the great Sun Shipbuilding Co. of Philadelphia at their yards in Chester, Pa., to observe the launching of three great oil tankers for the war effort. It is the largest single shipyard in the world and was only established in the early part of 1916, and launched its first ship in October 1917, a little more than 6 months after America entered into World War No. 1.

Today this gigantic industry extends almost 2 miles along the Delaware River and has now some 28 ways for ship building with the necessary shops and outfitting basins and 2 drydocks. Approximately 20 ships are now under construction. Currently it has more than 33,000 workers employed in the yard and on 3 shifts around the clock and is under the supervision of 2 outstanding Americans, John Pew and Joseph N. Pew, Jr. The number of workers will be greatly increased before the year ends.

In 1942 Sun Ship launched a total of 46 ships. Twenty-one ocean-going tankers, 19 ocean-going vessels for private owners, and 6 cargo ships. In addition, Sun Ship turned out a number of extensive repair jobs on torpedoed ships.

Now, since Pearl Harbor—15 months—this great industrial organization has turned out nearly one-half the production in this short space of time that they turned out in 23 years between Armistice Day 1918 and Pearl Harbor; and before the year is over they will increase their production 100 percent over last year. A remarkable record, and Sun Ship deserves the heartiest commendation of the people of the United States for their great contribution in this all-out effort of America to win the war. Contrast this private effort with the situation existing today in governmentally operated enterprises. Let us compare these results of private enterprise with the Office of Price Administration, for instance, where confusion and confliction of opinion and chaos exists—instead of a well-organized, coordinated, smoothly operating organization to produce the foodstuffs and materials to win the war.

I wonder what would happen at the Sun Ship if some of the economic czars, economists, and day-dreaming theorists had been permitted to operate this great industrial shipbuilding institution as they have been permitted to operate the Office of Price Administration—these visionary, impractical theorists, power-drunk bureaucrats, byproducts of the depression days, who are determined to force down the throats of the American people their crack-pot ideas, even in the face of an all-out war going on.

It is almost unbelievable that the American people would tolerate the conditions that exist, when our American boys are sacrificing daily their lives at Guadalcanal, in North Africa, on the high seas, under the seas, and in the air; that social reforms, byproducts of the N. R. A. days; the Donald Richberg, Tugwellian stuff must be insisted upon, even though it hampers our war effort, cuts down our food supply and our materials, so necessary to meet the demands to carry on this great war effort.

I desire to call to your attention today a resolution recently adopted by the Retail Food Dealers' Association of California, which reads as follows:

When, in the course of our relations with Government agencies, it becomes necessary to discontinue private enterprise and the citizens of a Nation long established are threatened with a complete change in their economy, without their knowledge or consent, a decent respect to their duly constituted and accepted authorities requires that they should present to their governing body a statement of the events which causes them to suffer and fear the future.

We are engaged in a great war, the largest and most destructive the world has ever known. Right or wrong, we and our allies must and will win, if we, of the United States of America are permitted to follow our natural and proven way of accomplishing our purpose.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, the Congress of the United States of America is the creator of all our agencies and bureaus by whatever name they may be known, or for what purpose they were established; that these agencies have fallen into the hands of our enemies who are using them for their own purpose, or into the hands of our allies who are using them to force their own economy onto us that we may fall into their power upon the termination of war, if not before; that many of these agencies have presumed themselves to be creatures greater than their creator; that orders and regulations issued by them are a hindrance to progress and will seriously reduce vital food production, that most of their program is not indicated by conditions or supported by facts, that their orders and regulations alone create the serious conditions which develop, that they array the resources of the Government and the power of their positions to produce evidence favorable to their program and use the same resources and power to suppress all evidence not favorable, that the orders of the Office of Price Administration immobilizes production, wholesale and retail distribution; that point rationing is causing food to spoil in storage, causing consumers to pilfer rationed goods from retail stores, creating all the so-called black markets, and destroying all desire on the part of the public to cooperate in any manner; that the Office of War Information is going far beyond its functions in radio programs, news releases, and even motion pictures to mold public opinion to the will of the bureaucrats and no private opinions can possibly be expressed in opposition through the same channels; that employees on some of the congressional committees are suppressing and preventing testimony and evidence unfavorable to the bureaucrats, from reaching the committee, that the bureaucrats have combined with others to subject American business and the people to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution and unacknowledged by our laws

In every State of these oppressions, we have petitioned and pleaded, in most humble terms, for relief and offered our services in an honest attempt to assist, our repeated petitions and offers of assistance, have been answered only by rebukes and added injury which further jeopardizes our future security and war effort.

Now here is a situation that calls for immediate action on the part of Congress. It is a deplorable situation that this great country has degenerated into a socialized bureaucracy from which it appears the individual, farmer and businessman, has no recourse. There is one man in particular who is responsible to a great degree for the situation existing. This one man in particular, who seems to be determined to impede this program of food and material production is the Deputy Price Administrator by the name of Dr. J. K. Galbraith. This gentleman insists on his socialistic reforms on grade labeling and many other cockeyed reforms that would revolutionize our American way of life with the result that the farmers and canners cannot come to an agreement with the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture on the canning program for 1943 because of his determination to force through those ideas which he knows would regiment and socialize the farmers and canners and food packagers of America.

Who is this Dr. J. K. Galbraith and what qualifications does he have to qualify him to be placed in charge of billions of dollars of agricultural and industrial enterprises? The gentleman is on leave from Princeton University. He has never had any business experience or farming experience or any other experience. He never had any other work except professor in several universities, and now this gentleman is the head of the whole Price Control Division of the Office of Price Administration.

Price Administrator Prentiss M. Brown ought to clean house on this element which is determined to sabotage the agricultural and business life of America. Now the food problem alone is a very difficult one to handle and I am of the opinion that it would take the time and effort of one man to concern himself with the many problems of the food administration during this critical period, when the cry is, "Food, more food, more food."

However, I come from a district in northwestern Pennsylvania that is interested in the producing and refining of oil, and they are leaving nothing undone to produce more oil as their contribution to the war effort, and lo and behold, I find that this same Deputy Price Administrator Dr. Galbraith is the bottleneck not alone in foodstuffs but in the efforts to increase the production of oil.

I heard Dr. Galbraith, appearing before the Agriculture Committee of the House, talk about being a farmer and now he turns up as the price czar on oil. Why the O. P. A. would place an inexperienced, impractical man such as Dr. Galbraith without knowledge of the producing and refining of oil to determine the problems of price structure of oil in a time of war when he no doubt has never in his life seen an oil well is beyond my powers of comprehension.

This gentleman seems to cover a wide field of agriculture and business and his dictatorial policy making has been one to remake and revolutionize the economic life, all contributing to the destruction of our American system of free enterprise. Now, the sooner they clean house on the men of this caliber and the sooner the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown eliminates this group of theorists out of the O. P. A., the quicker we will be on our way to win this war.

It is evident today that one of the serious problems confronting America is the need for more oil. To secure more oil it is necessary to increase the price of oil to stimulate production because it becomes increasingly evident that we may wake up one of these days with the ships, tanks, submarines, planes, and so forth, to fight the war and not have the oil with which to operate the same.

If you think that the food program is a headache, the oil problem will be a far more serious one because it will impede our efforts to win the war and drag it out, with a cost of thousands of American lives.

The price on oil has been static since October 1941. We all know that labor costs have spiraled several hundred percent over the average paid the oil-lease worker. We, too, know that material costs have advanced from 25 to 50 percent, but the Office of Price Administration arbitrarily sets a price and refuses to do anything about it, even though preponderous evidence has been submitted to prove the necessity for a price increase, with the result that no exploration is being carried on, no new reserves are being found, because of the inability of the producer to secure at least lifting costs on the crude oil. Our reserves and stocks are rapidly being depleted; the increased demand because of the war will be 100 percent greater for crude products in 1943, and the result will be a terrific headache before 1943 is over when this Nation wakes up to the fact that we are without the necessary oil to fight this war. However, no doubt, the Office of Price Administration will then act. and it will be too late, and the public will then ask the Congress as to why something was not done about it, and I am going to be recorded today requesting action.

On March 5, in the New York Journal of Commerce, Mr. Galbraith, the great food and oil administrator, who has brought about chaos in the food production, and will also bring chaos to crude-oil production, has this to say about oil:

Price control has not kept down production.

And:

Production has risen so sharply that materials, facilities, and finally manpower have become definite bottlenecks. Higher prices would not lead to greater over-all production.

And:

Physical volume of production failed to rise after the middle of 1916 when the serious price rise of World War No. 1 got under way. This time, in contrast, prices have been reasonably stable while production has soared.

Now this is a typical crackpot theorists statement and it is ridiculous because this gentleman making such a statement in the face of actual facts and conditions makes him appear foolish. Now understand this from a professor that I do not believe knows anything more about the oil business than anyone driving up to a filling station and asking the attendant to give him a quart of oil for his car and I doubt if Dr. Galbraith knows what grade of oil his car requires.

Price control has kept down production, production has declined and is declining because labor and material costs have increased and the producer is not securing lifting costs for his oil.

It is further pointed out to Hon. Prentiss Brown, O. P. A. Administrator, by Russell B. Brown of the Independent Petroleum Association of America that—

The first price schedule, fixing crude petroleum prices, was announced February 2, 1942, freezing crude petroleum prices as of the first half of October 1941. In the face of insistent and urgent demands for more petroleum, production has gone down consistently from that time until the average daily production for the week ending February 24, 1943, was 3,860,075 barrels, a decline of 6 percent. This reflects a constant decline in production until we now suffer a loss in current daily average production of 250,000 barrels of oil per day compared with the average daily production at the time of the announcement of this crude price freeze. In the meantime new discoveries have fallen off so greatly that the Chairman of the Petroleum Industry War Council on March 5 issued the following statement, in part:

"The petroleum industry did not find nearly enough oil last year," and "the decline in discoveries of new oil fields shows that the present high rate of exploratory efforts of the industry must be still further accelerated as is being strongly urged by the Petroleum Administrator for War in order to maintain the country's productive capacity." That same statement further shows that only 260,051,000 barrels of oil in new fields were discovered in 1942. Further, the statement says, "This is substantially smaller than the volume of discoveries from new fields in any recent year and compares with the average estimate of 559,243,000 barrels for each of the past 5 years."

As above pointed out by Mr. Galbraith the serious rise in prices for World War No. 1 got under way in the middle of 1916. He further stated that physical volume of production failed to rise during that period. The facts are that in the period from 1916 to 1920 while prices were rising crude production increased 47.28 percent. At the same time 40,163 additional wells went into operation in the United States. A reference to the figures will show how inapplicable is the statement of Mr Galbraith that "this time, in contrast, prices have been reasonably stable while production has soared." The petroleum producers are not now asking for the prices of 1920 but they are urging reasonable increases.

"Well aware of the need for using high-cost producers if maximum output is to be obtained," says Mr. Galbraith, "Office of Price Administration has employed three methods to obtain this goal, with the choice between the three dependent upon the characteristics of the industry involved.

"1. For many lines it has frozen ceilings so high that all needed producers could operate under them.

"2. It has inaugurated premium payments for marginal output, notably in the nonferrous metal-mining industry.

"3. It has permitted high-cost producers upon appeal to raise their ceilings if they could show that they otherwise could not operate and that their products were essential."

The above three methods have not been applied to the petroleum-producing industry. The ceilings for petroleum were frozen below reasonable average base for crude prices; in fact, at 59 percent of parity. No premiums have been paid for marginal output and only in very rare and minor instances have increases in the ceilings been permitted and then to a very limited degree.

Mr. Galbraith vigorously denied, according to the published interview, that any rise in petroleum prices would increase the volume of drilling, contending that drilling volume now is controlled by the amount of steel made available for the purpose and that none of that steel had remained unused. This statement ignores the fact that no restrictions for wildcat drilling have been imposed at any time and plenty of material has been available for this purpose, but in spite of this lack of restriction fewer wildcat wells have been drilled since the imposition of the price ceilings than for the previous 12-month period and far less new oil was discovered. This is true at a time when the Petroleum Administrator is urging greater wildcat drilling activity to discover sufficient supplies of new petroleum to maintain the country's productive capacity.

I hope you understand the discouragement and near impatience such statements create. Mr Galbraith is the Deputy Administrator in Charge of Price. He says that "materials, facilities, and finally manpower have become definite bottlenecks."

The producers' hands have been tied with inadequate price for their products. Their employees are confronted with increasing living costs. They are skilled men, highly adaptable to the use of any machinery. They were offered employment with industries not so restricted by price ceilings as to prevent increased wages. These producers could not prevent their employees seeking a living wage elsewhere. Yet they are now told that they do not need increased prices because their labor is not available. This is a defeatist attitude unacceptable to American industry Give the petroleum producers reasonable ceilings under which to work and they will be helping in the solution of this difficulty.

Mr. Galbraith's dismissal of this subject with the statement that there is no reason to believe any moderate price increase would lead to greater activity is a smug ex parte statement. It is an empiricism, unsupported by any historical review of the industry's operation and is disproved by all available facts as well as the expressed opinion of the entire petroleum industry.

Now I say to Members of Congress this oil situation is a very serious one and until a price increase of 50 cents a barrel is granted the producer, no new discoveries of oil are going to be found. I am of the opinion that the Congress of the United States should take immediate action to see that these bottlenecks should be removed from the Office of Price Administration and men placed in the positions now occupied by these dictating theorists of the Henderson regime who have the brains and qualifications to do the kind of a job that must be done to secure the oil to bring this war to an early and final conclusion.

The American people, I believe, are unaware of what is going on here in Washington or you would have open rebellion. If this Congress of the United States sits complacently by and does nothing to stop existing practices that may cost the lives of thousands of American youth, then there is something wrong with the Congress and we are ready to submit to bureaucracy and forget democracy and our constitutional form of government.

I am calling this to your attention so that some consideration can be given this very serious situation and suggest that the Congress demand that Hon. Prentiss Brown eliminate from the Office of Price Administration those men who are not qualified by experience to intelligently handle the many problems now confronting this war effort. Why visionary intellectuals like this Dr. Galbraith would be placed in such a responsible position is almost beyond belief, but, nevertheless, he is there. Prentiss Brown had better clean house on all of the Henderson carry-overs if he wants results.

I ask the Members of this House, if you were going to run a business, would you get a man who knew something about the business or the job, or would you get a college professor that never had any experience with oil in his life, and yet, mind you, he is permitted to act as economic czar to sit in judgment on matters in which billions of dollars are invested, and hundreds of thousands of people are dependent upon this great petroleum enterprise for their livelihood, and this great nation of ours is looking to this petroleum industry to make the necessary contribution to win this war?

This is a very serious situation, and some action should be taken immediately to eliminate from the various departments of the Government those responsible for impeding our war effort.

The Eagle Magazine's Appeal to the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday March 23, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the House and the country to the little poem on the front cover of the Eagle Magazine for the month of April. I think that, as a patriotic appeal to the "home front," that verse is the most effective from the standpoint of phrasing and thought that I have yet read, condensed into so few lines.

It is as follows:

And if our lines should form and break
Because of things you failed to make—
The extra tank, or ship, or plane,
For which we waited all in vain,
And the supplies that never came.
Will you then come and take the blame?
For we, not you, will pay the cost
Of battles you, not we, have lost.

—By a United States Marine
in the South Pacific.

Children on the Loose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the Boston Globe of March 19 1943, relating to a problem that exists at the present time, and which will grow in its seriousness as the war continues.

As the editorial well says—

The call for women in war industry has been clear and becomes insistent—but what about their small children?

This is a far-reaching problem affecting the family life which must be met to the fullest extent possible, and in a manner that wil" rotect the family life of those families where the mother is or becomes employed in a war activity.

The editorial included in my remarks brings this serious problem to the forefront and comes at an opportune time.

Its contents are worthy of the consideration of all interested and public-spirited persons, and of public officials charged with the responsibility of establishing a program that will adequately—and in a satisfactory manner—meet this problem which has such far-reaching results.

CHILDREN ON THE LOOSE

When mother goes into the munitions factory, what about the brood she leaves behind? As the Army increases and the Navy requires more men for new fighting ships there are vacant places in the assembly lines. And there are going to be more, for the tempo of the conflict speeds up, requiring more tanks, planes, cannons and shells, and all the other tools needed to fight the Axis.

The call for women in war industry has been clear and becomes insistent—but what about their small children? Many of the women now being sought to speed industrial production have children, usually small children. Leaving them to their own devices for many hours each working day sounds dangerous and is. There is a shortage of teen-age girls available to look after younger boys and girls while mother is away. The situation is serious and yet the Nation needs the women on factory jobs.

Fortunately this has not burst upon us unforeseen. Back in 1940 Congress passed the Lanham Act for the purpose of extending relief to communities that should be hard pressed by reason of unusual situations created by the emergency. This legislation has now been interpreted as calling for assistance in maintaining physical, mental, and moral health among the people. This has been taken to mean establishment of nursery (that is pre-school) schools, and also looking after regular school children from the early morning until a parent returns at night.

Already two school districts in New Hampshire, those of Keene and of Hudson, have been given allotments of Federal funds for nursery schools and child-care centers for the children of mothers in war work. Communities in Connecticut have also had allotments. The work of giving these children the care they need, which includes food as well as proper activities, is beginning in New England. Because of the alertness of the department of education in this commonwealth the possibility of extending such aid where it is needed has been under consideration for a whole year. An enormous amount of exploratory work has been done already.

Here in Massachusetts there are at least four centers, at Springfield, Pittsfield, Lynn, and New Bedford, where the labor situation is such that child care of this sort is giving concern.

It may all sound very simple, but the problem has many angles, just as most other matters connected with our war economy. There is a very natural reluctance to take any steps which will seem to be in the direction of removing children from home guidance. But it is true that when mother marches off in slacks for a long and arduous day, the attention she used to give her children is distinctly lacking. Whatever is done must be with a clear understanding that this is a war measure, to be discontinued promptly when the guns cease their roar.

But there is no denying the present situation. The places vacated by the men must be filled and more. Only the women can provide the human power necessary to maintain and improve industrial production rates. The children cannot be neglected.

It is necessary that care should be given them. But there should be an absence of compulsion. It is when the working mothers of a community want it that the aid should be asked. And there should be a division of the burden. The Federal Government properly may be expected to furnish some of the necessary money, but a share of it should also come from the mothers who are earning. There should also be local contributions from State or municipal treasuries.

Giving proper consideration to these diverse factors is not easy. Yet the situation must be faced. There are thousands of children needing care which cannot come to them unless extraordinary measures are taken soon.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Depression Remedies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following timely and illuminating comment on taxation and the depression, with certain economic suggestions, originally submitted in a letter to the Senate Finance Committee, at its request, by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, the eminent publisher and economist, on February 21, 1933.

This communication, again of peculiar interest at this time, is as follows:

W. R. HEARST GIVES HIS VIEWS TO SENATE ON DEPRESSION REMEDIES

(In response to a request from the United States Senate Finance Committee, Mr. William Randolph Hearst sent the following letter, setting forth his views on measures to alleviate the economic depression. The letter, proposing six Federal measures, was read at today's session of the committee.)

WASHINGTON, *February 21, 1933.*

HON. REED SMOOT,

Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As it seems impossible for me to be in Washington during the lifetime of the present Congress, I am mailing my views on cures for the depression. Briefness in this statement, I imagine, is the first essential.

The cause of the crash seems to have been due to a speculative fever on the part of the public, accompanied by general overexpansion and overcapitalization on the part of industry, and aggravated by the promotion and sale of securities which were more or less obviously worthless, and probably known by the promoters to be worthless.

In the full flood of prosperity there was a continually growing demand for products. Industries, meeting and anticipating this demand, expanded to the danger point, and expanded largely on borrowed capital.

The capitalization of businesses also increased unwarrantably.

It is observable from the records that business rises to the crest of a wave of prosperity and then sinks to the trough of depression, and repeats this process with singular certainty and regularity, but not with the same degree of intensity.

It must be expected, however, by those who are mindful of the records, that business will first rise to a certain degree of prosperity and then sink to a corresponding degree of adversity.

Therefore, prosperity should not be capitalized at its face value.

To illustrate—If a business is making a comfortable 8 or 10 percent on the investment in ordinary times and a period of prosperity raises that income to 25 or 30 percent, the customary process is to capitalize the business on the basis of this higher income and to issue securities and sell them to the public, until the business which is paying 30 percent on its original capitalization is reduced to 8 or 10 percent on its excess and excessive capitalization.

This additional stock is easy to dispose of in times of prosperity, because everything in those times is on a boom market and the public is in a buying mood.

This process, however, leaves out of consideration the fact that periods of high prosperity are not permanent. Not only is a return to normalcy inevitable but, as the records show, these periods of high prosperity are generally followed by periods of low depression.

As a consequence, when the period of low depression is reached, these businesses are no longer able to pay dividends on securities based on a period of high prosperity.

So the water is squeezed out of the capitalization, which means that the public is squeezed out, and the public's money is lost.

The investing public generally, in prosperous periods, have been estimating their wealth and their income on a false basis and have been spending accordingly, and, consequently, when the crash comes and their securities depreciate to little or nothing and their incomes disappear, they are compelled to adopt an ultra-economical system of living and to stop buying.

Production and consequent prosperity depend fundamentally upon the ability of the public to buy, and the willingness of the public to buy.

When the people cut down drastically their expenditure at the shops, the shops, of course, suffer proportionately in their volume of business and in their volume of profits.

The shops discharge help and this creates an unemployment problem.

The shops drastically reduce their orders from the factories.

The factories reduce production and profits and discharge help and add to the unemployment problem.

Then the factories drastically cut down their consumption of the products of the mines and the farms, thus reducing the use and price of raw materials and further reducing employment.

And so the vicious circle rotates, each revolution adding to the severity of the depression.

The essential question in the cure of the depression, then, seems to be how to overcome this tendency downward.

And the crucial point seems to be how to restore the purchasing power of the community and to make the people not only able but willing to spend money and buy products, and so stimulate production and employment.

I have continually urged that one very important way to accomplish this is for the Government, during periods of depression, to make exceptional expenditure in public works, and not only give direct employment to some millions of unemployed, but indirectly to give employment to laborers in those industries which create the products in construction, and to salesmen and accountants; and also indirectly to give employment, through the increased consuming power of the public, to the workers employed generally in the shops and the factories, etc.

Of course this proposal has been entertained and propounded by many, and by none more convincingly than Mr. Hoover and the President's conference on unemployment, of which he was chairman during the Harding Administration.

Unfortunately, merely proposing the plan is not sufficient. In order to be effective, the plan naturally has to be carried into effect.

This has not yet been done to any adequate degree at any period of the present depression.

It would seem that the plan should be comprehensive enough to include a system, as was proposed by the Hoover conference, greatly to increase public works during periods of depression and to decrease them to a minimum during periods of prosperity; since in prosperous times not only is employment generally obtainable in private enterprise, but the cost of public construction is excessive; while in periods of depression, Government work takes up the slack of unemployment and also has the advantage to the Government of being performed at lower cost.

A well-balanced system, therefore, of public construction would not mean, over any considerable period of years, any more public construction than would ordinarily take place in that period.

But the public construction would be, according to this system, increased in bad times and decreased in good times.

In order to provide for this increased construction in bad times a reserve fund could be accumulated in good times; but since no such reserve fund has been accumulated, the only practicable plan is to issue bonds sufficient to pay for this extraordinary Government construction in bad times and redeem the bonds in good times.

The unfortunate part of the situation is that the Government not only does not proceed according to this comprehensive plan but it proceeds to the contrary.

It spends its money freely for public works in good times and cuts down on public works in bad times, thus aggravating, instead of relieving, the depression.

This is the record not only of the National Government but of the various State governments, and the reverse of the record would be the proper policy.

So much for the program of public construction.

Another question of very serious importance in times of depression is the question of taxation.

In times of depression there is, of course, business dullness. Profits are less, incomes are less, business is less.

Consequently the government income from taxation is less, and consequently the Government proceeds to pile upon income and industry (already staggering under the burdens of adversity) additional burdens of taxation.

This naturally aggravates and intensifies the difficulties of every industry and every investor.

It also drastically reduces the general expenditure which, as I have said, is the fundamental basis of prosperity.

If well-to-do people with incomes have to reserve a great part of their incomes to turn over to the Government, they naturally have less for the purchase of products and less for investment in enterprise and industry.

Consequently, through diminished expenditure, the shops suffer, the factories suffer, and the producers of raw material suffer.

And consequently, through diminished funds for investment, the development of enterprise is retarded and employment is proportionately diminished.

Taxation, like construction, should be accommodated to good times and to bad times.

There should in bad times be more help to the community through construction and less burden to the community in taxation.

As a matter of fact, let me make the radical, and doubtless unacceptable, statement that taxation should be diminished in bad times; but if taxation cannot be diminished, it should at least not be increased.

High taxation is as much responsible for bankruptcies in business, and foreclosures on properties, as the high interest rates of the usurers or the relentless liquidating processes of the bankers.

In fact, the Government, the mortgage holders and the money lenders have been cooperating in perfect harmony to deflate and liquidate America.

In this combination for extortion, the Government is the worst offender, because, without any consideration of the obvious fact that dollars have doubled in value and are doubly difficult to secure, it is extorting more dollars from a communit, prostrated by adversity than it demanded in times of prosperity.

The income tax especially has degenerated into a racket. It is a racket on the part of the Government, which positively plunders the public under coercion to the point of confiscation.

It is a racket on the part of the rich, who disloyally evade taxation and take refuge in tax-exempt securities.

It is a definite damage to the community and the country, because it takes money out of investment and out of the everyday expenditure, which is the basis of prosperity, and hands it over to an extravagant Government to be dissipated in bureaucracy.

It is an inequitable tax, an injurious tax, an undemocratic tax, creating class distinctions; an un-American tax, creating class antagonisms, dangerous to the peace and harmony of the Nation. The sales tax should be substituted for it, not added to it.

With the sales tax, a citizen pays in proportion to what he buys.

If he buys little, he pays little; but those who buy a lot will not only increase the prosperity of the country by liberal purchasing of products, but they will increase the income of the Government.

An income tax decreases purchasing power. It decreases investment in industry and consequently decreases employment.

It transfers money from active business into inactive tax-exempt securities. The shrewd evade it. The sincere pay doubly in consequence.

It is in every phase a vicious measure, and shares with prohibition the odium of the two great wartime mistakes.

These two evils, prohibition and income taxation, have been chiefly responsible for demoralizing our people and disheartening the Nation.

I repeat that excess expenditures of Government, over and above income, should be met by bond issues, the proceeds of which to be expended in times of depression and the bonds themselves to be redeemed in times of prosperity.

The money-lending element of the community will oppose these considerable bond issues with the statement that this means inflation of the circulating medium, and that inflation is dangerous.

On the contrary, these bond issues mean stabilization of the circulating medium and reduction of the dollar's present $2 value to its legitimate $1 value.

Inflation is dangerous in good times, when the community is in a period of overcapitalization, overexpansion, and overspeculation; and when there is a great amount of natural inflation of bank-deposit currency; that is to say of the checks, drafts, and personal notes, which are actually employed as money in business transactions, and are regarded scientifically as an essential part of the circulating medium.

In fact, this bank-deposit currency is by far the greater part of the circulating medium.

Indeed, reliable figures seem to indicate that about four-fifths of the circulating medium employed in the transaction of business is this bank-deposit currency, and one-fifth actual currency; that is to say, metallic money and banknotes.

When a financial crash comes, such as precipitated the present depression, business transactions decrease enormously and bank-deposit currency—the checks and drafts and personal notes which constitute the major part of the circulating medium—decreases proportionately; it is estimated by experts that in this depression they have decreased one-half.

This means, obviously, that if the whole circulating medium is five-fifths during times of high prosperity, and the four-fifths of it which is bank-deposit currency decreases one-half, the total circulating medium in times of adversity is decreased to three-fifths of what it was in times of prosperity.

The total circulating medium, therefore, has been deflated to the extent of two-fifths of the whole.

We cannot reflate at the moment the bank-deposit currency, but we can increase the actual currency by increasing the bond issues and the Federal Reserve notes based upon the issue of bonds.

Such inflation, or rather reasonable reflation, is in no sense dangerous, but, on the contrary, natural, salutary and, indeed, necessary to the restoration of prosperity.

In fact, the issue of bonds and Federal Reserve notes is the conservative method of procedure.

It would be possible to increase the currency by a direct issue of Government notes and by increased coinage, but this, it is believed, would be disturbing to confidence, and possibly detrimental to the Nation's credit. However, if the Federal banks should hesitate to absorb reasonable bond issues, the Government could have the direct issue of Government notes to fall back upon.

I am assuming here again that these Government notes, like the bonds, would be retired in times of prosperity, to prevent inflation in periods when inflation is not needed and when it actually would be dangerous as a stimulus to speculation, overexpansion and over-capitalization, and all such evils attendant upon peaks of prosperity.

To sum up! I think the main cures for depression and stimuli to the return of prosperity are liberal Government expenditure in construction, reduced or at least restrained taxation, and reasonable reflation.

As prosperity returns, we can diminish the public works, secure more income from taxation and retire the bonds and banknotes

which might in good times constitute undue inflation.

Let me say in conclusion, however, that no plan to increase employment and distribute wealth in wages, no plan to diminish taxation and leave intact the purchasing power of the community, no plan of reasonable inflation to make money easier and commodity prices higher, will be of value in stimulating industry and employment if American home markets are to be left open to an influx of cheap foreign products, made by war-pauperized labor under a system of depreciated currency which proportionately decreases the manufacturing cost of the goods.

Such an invasion of American markets by cheap foreign products will create unemployment here faster than any appropriations for public works can create employment.

Such an invasion of cheap foreign goods will put American industries out of commission faster than any favoring governmental legislation or any reduction of taxation can build them up.

Such an invasion of American markets by cheap foreign goods, paid for in their production by depreciated currencies, can only be competed with by an excessive inflation, which would reduce our currency to the basis of depreciated foreign currencies, and by a reduction of the standards of living of our citizens, which would completely debase, as it has already partly debased, our American wage standards and living standards.

I believe that all citizens, regardless of politics, should unite in this emergency to save the American market for American industry and protect American labor and American standards of living.

The people of this country flatter themselves that they are alert and informed and progressive. Apparently we are not as much so as we think.

France, a great and rich country, like the United States, and like the United States on a gold standard, has recognized the danger to her industries and her people in this influx of cheaply made foreign goods from countries which have depreciated currencies and has established compensatory duties, which, as we all know, are duties in addition to the regular tariff duties upon goods manufactured in foreign countries and imposed in proportion to the depreciation of the currencies in those countries.

France has, furthermore, created quotas in imports, as we in our country have created quotas in immigration.

Thus, France will not allow her industry and her employment to be disturbed by the importation of cheap goods from foreign countries beyond a certain definite limitation and allotment well within the amount likely to inflict injury on her people and her prosperity.

Our country was not alert enough, not informed enough, and not progressive enough to originate such measures, but it should be at least intelligent enough to duplicate them when the need for such protection is so obvious, and the condition of our industries and our working people so critical.

The condition of our country demands action by our Government.

We have had, in my humble judgment, ample discussion and ample theorization.

We should reach conclusions, and those conclusions should be followed by prompt and vigorous action.

I forward this message, however inadequate, because I believe the high purpose of your committee is to promote action of exactly this kind.

I have discussed four general propositions only, and have not gone into the details of farm relief and industrial relief on account of the length to which discussion would extend.

After all, the farmer is mainly a producer like the manufacturer and the important thing to each is a satisfactory market for his products.

The greater the consuming power of the public, the better the market for farm products, as well as manufactured products.

The more that wealth is distributed in wages, the greater the consuming power of the public and the greater the compensation of the producer.

High standards of living mean high prices. The chief duty of government is, in my opinion, to stimulate high wages and high purchasing power.

Beyond creating, as far as remunerative, American markets for American production, the Government should finance the farmer at a low rate of interest and insure him in the possession of his farm over a sufficient stretch of years to nullify the destructive effects of periodic unfavorable climatic and economic conditions.

When the Government has gone that far in farm protection, it should certainly have some further function with respect to the regulation and the transportation and the sale and distribution of crops in order to protect its own investment and insure the objective of its paternalism.

Reduced cost of transportation is just as important to the farmers as reduced cost of financing and of marketing.

The welfare of the consumer, as well as the farmer, demands cheap transportation.

The railroads, under the present system, or lack of system, are in no condition to supply cheap transportation.

Railroad freight rates are extremely high when compared with the rates of motor transportation, and the railroads are continually asking for higher rates, in the hope of being able thus to meet their obligations, while they should be establishing lower rates, not only for the benefit of the community, but in order to be able to meet the lower rates and more modern methods of competing transportation.

To come immediately to the point, it seems impossible that the railroads of the United States can pay a high rate for borrowed money, meet their fixed charges, and lower their rates to the point where they will be able to compete with modern methods of transportation, while operating under their present policy of ragged individualism.

Apparently the only way that the necessarily complete reorganization and unification of the railroads can be accomplished is through Government ownership.

Government ownership will administer the railroads economically in one coordinated system.

Government ownership would secure money to the railroads at half the rate of interest which the railroads now pay, and railroad securities could be retired with a 3-percent Government bond, to the advantage and satisfaction of the security holders.

Under a unified railroad system, reorganized and refinanced by the Government, the railroads could economically transport freight of that character of weight and bulk which naturally belongs to them.

Farm products are of this weighty and bulky character, and consequently farm products would greatly benefit by the economical railroad transportation which Government ownership would secure.

Consumers would also benefit; and as the alternative to Government ownership seems to be nothing less than general railroad insolvency and bankruptcy, the whole country would be relieved by Government ownership from this impending disaster.

If the Government is to attempt to rescue the railroads through the Federal Reconstruction Finance Corporation, it must pay out vast sums of money to save them from bankruptcy; yet, after it has done this, and practically paid for the railroads, it will not possess them, nor be able to systematize them, unless we adopt a policy of Government ownership.

If the people's money is being paid out in sufficient quantities to buy the railroads, then the people should own the railroads and secure the full benefit that would accrue from Government refinancing, Government reorganization, Government unification, and Government operation.

Therefore, I beg to recommend Government ownership of the railroads as an important aid to general economic recovery and general economic stability.

And in this operation, benefit could be conferred upon the farmer without imposing burdens upon the consumer.

However, I am writing interminably. In fact, I must apologize for the length of this letter, which I promised in the beginning to make brief.

Perhaps I should also apologize for the vehemence with which I have expressed my opinions.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST.

Furlough From Military Service for Farm Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Gen. J. A. Ulio, Adjutant General of the War Department, which may help to clarify the method by which a man in service may proceed to be considered for an opportunity to work on his farm.

The letter follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 26, 1943.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Further reference is made to your letter of March 19, 1943, concerning the release of military personnel to do farm work.

This Nation faces an emergency of such magnitude that it has been necessary to raise, equip, and train a large Army. Units of this new Army are now engaged with the enemy in many theaters of war. Nothing short of another emergency of greater danger must be permitted to retard the development of this Army.

The War Department does not contemplate authorized individual furloughs or releases from military service to enable soldiers to return to farming. This method was tried during World War No. 1, which experience demonstrated individual furloughs as an ineffective means of assistance to farmers and disruptive to the organization and training of an army. However, a procedure has been established whereby individual soldiers may be discharged in cases of extreme emergency. The soldier himself initiates this procedure by submitting written application to his immediate commanding officer, who will advise him as to the necessary evidence to support his request. In cases where an individual soldier 38 years of age and over is needed on his farm, a statement as to the necessity for his return to his farm must be obtained from the local farm agent. When a soldier under 38 desires to return to his farm the necessity for his return is investigated by

his local draft board, which reports its findings to the War Department through the National Director of Selective Service System, but such soldiers will be discharged only in cases of gravest emergency.

Procedures have also been established affording relief to the agricultural industry, but these involve the use of entire units remaining under military control rather than the broad dispersion of soldiers under the furlough procedure. However, the War Department will furnish units for this purpose only when advised by the War Manpower Commission and the Department of Agriculture as to the necessity for providing troops.

Very respectfully,

J. A. ULIO,
Major General,
The Adjutant General.

Loss of Mail Addressed to Members of the Military Forces Serving Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL A. HATCH
OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, from time to time I have received communications from relatives of our men in the service regarding the nonreceipt of mail sent overseas. Upon inquiry from responsible officials in the War Department I find that too often the fact that large quantities of mail are lost through ship sinkings on the high seas is overlooked.

Recently the War Department issued an official announcement with respect to mail losses on the high seas as a result of enemy action during recent weeks. I think it particularly timely that Members of Congress and others be apprised of our mail losses in order that they may be better informed as to the chief reason why soldiers sometimes do not receive mail sent to them by their families, relatives, and friends. I think it would be helpful to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release of the War Department dated March 26, 1943, showing that more than 2,000 sacks of Army mail have been lost through enemy action at sea. I ask unanimous consent that the release be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO THOUSAND SACKS OF ARMY MAIL LOST THROUGH ENEMY ACTION AT SEA

The loss through enemy action of more than 2,000 sacks of United States mails carried on United Nations ships and destined for American soldiers overseas in recent weeks was reported today by the Army Postal Service, the War Department announced.

The mailing public, the War Department said, should be guided accordingly in cases involving the nonreceipt of mail by American troops abroad. These mails lost on the high seas represent a great many individual pieces. They originated in various parts of the country for the most part during the month of February, it was stated. The mails thus lost, it was revealed, were destined for points in the United Kingdom, Iceland, North Africa, Egypt, and India. A very considerable portion of this mail was first-class letter mail.

In making this announcement, the War Department said that the loss of the aforementioned mails was a striking illustration of why V-mail should be more fully utilized in communicating with soldiers overseas since 30,000,000 pieces of such mail have been handled thus far without the loss of a single letter. This is made possible by holding the originals at the ports of embarkation until the duplicate copies arrive safely at their overseas destinations.

Loan Sharks Prey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Buffalo Evening News:

LOAN SHARKS PREY

Perhaps the most unsavory aspect of the present income-tax collection-system was disclosed by Representative DANIEL A. REED of Dunkirk in the current House debate on pay-as-you-go tax legislation. This is the fact that war workers and others in the middle and lower income brackets are being victimized by loan sharks who are taking advantage of their need for cash to pay income taxes and charging enormous interest rates to furnish the money. Mr. Reed said a report would soon be made public showing that "$100,000,000 has been loaned, under cover, at interest rates from 120 to 240 percent and $500,000,000 at from 30 to 36 percent." This is over and above the legal borrowings from legitimate banking institutions to meet income-tax payments that in most cases were many times the amount due in previous years.

"Wait until the delinquent taxpayers are called into the collectors' office and watch the mounting figures when the second installment comes due," Representative REED remarked. "The lending agencies estimate there will be 5,000,000 borrowers for income-tax payments on the next installment, June 15. Instead of making the taxpayers current, you majority Members are putting him in hock for the rest of his life."

This last reference was to the bill reported by the majority members of the House Ways and Means Committee, which calls for a 20-percent withholding tax but which would make only those few taxpayers current who could afford to pay 2 years' taxes in 1. Mr. REED and most of the Republican minority favor the Carlson bill embodying the Ruml plan, which would make all of the Nation's 40,000,000 income taxpayers current at one stroke by using 1943 instead of 1942 income as the base for current tax collections. Another argument in favor of the Ruml-Carlson plan is that the Treasury, far from losing revenue, would gain several billion dollars more than it had expected this year because the existing tax rates would apply to the estimated $140,000,000,000 national income in 1943, rather than to the 1942 income of $120,000,000,000.

Assuming the Treasury allows the real figures on borrowings and cashing in of War bonds by individuals, on tax delinquencies and related matters in connection with the March 15 payments to be made public, the country is certain to suffer a shock. The fact is that regardless of voluminous advance warnings by the Treasury and in the press, few taxpayers were aware of the size of their obligations and fewer still made advance provisions against the March 15 deadline. This is because, with tax rates relatively low in pre-war years for the income groups earning less than $5,000, the tendency had been to make tax payments out of current income or normal savings. The result of this readily explained laxity was that millions of taxpayers were forced to borrow or liquidate assets in order to meet payments which were several times larger than anticipated. Hence the opportunity of the loan sharks.

The only equitable measure to retrieve this situation is the Carlson bill which embodies the Ruml plan in modified form to prevent "windfalls" for wealthy taxpayers. It would put the majority of taxpayers on a current, pay-as-you-go basis without the necessity for double taxation or an overhanging tax debt based on income that has already been spent. The attempt of some administration leaders to sell the idea that the Ruml plan is a rich man's boon falls of its own weight, since it is only the rich who could possibly afford to pay 2 years' taxes in 1 in order to become current.

Beardsley Ruml, author of the plan, is a distinguished economist and a successful businessman who has often been called into New Deal counsels. He is an adviser to the National Resources Planning Board which recently submitted to Congress the most sweeping proposals for post-war social and economic reform that have ever been advanced by a responsible governmental agency in any capitalist country. He is chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, a position he owes to administration appointment. He is a doctor of philosophy, a director of the National Bureau of Economic Research, a former dean of the social science division and professor of education at the University of Chicago, and the treasurer of R. H. Macy & Co., one of the Nation's largest retail establishments. With such a background, he is not likely to be behind a movement to benefit the rich in order to get Republican campaign funds for 1944, as irresponsibly charged by Representative DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan.

No, the only answer to the administration's opposition to the Ruml plan appears to be that it didn't think of it first. More than four-fifths of the American people want it, according to the Gallup poll; an increasing number of independent Democrats are joining with Republicans in Congress in its support, the discouraging facts of the March 15 income-tax collection and the equally discouraging prospects for the June 15 collection—all recommend the passage of the Carlson bill.

Elimination of War Profiteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID I. WALSH
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Saturday Evening Post of March 27, 1943, contains a valuable editorial entitled "How We Take the Profiteer Out of War."

The editorial discusses the operations incident to the renegotiation of contracts. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HOW WE TAKE THE PROFITS OUT OF WAR

The phrase "renegotiation of contracts" gives most businessmen and manufacturers the creeps. It suggests welshing by act of Congress, and a swarm of bureaucrats in every war plant holding up production while they try to prove that the owner is a crook. A year ago, when Congress passed section 403 of the Sixth Supplemental Defense Appropriation Act, which requires that all contracts involving more than $100,000 with the Army and Navy, the Treasury or the Maritime Commission be renegotiated whenever "the profits can be determined with reasonable certainty," there were practically no cheers. Even a man who has no intention of "profiteering" feels better with a firm contract in the drawer of his desk.

The act has been in force almost a year, and the Army and Navy between them have recaptured "excessive profits," or renegotiated them out of war contracts, to the tune of $1,500,000,000. How is renegotiation working? What are the justifications for it? Is the producer allowed enough profit to stimulate increased production? Does the efficient producer suffer at the expense of his slovenly competitor? Why aren't excess-profits taxes adequate to curb profiteering? These and some hundreds of other questions are being asked whenever producers who are supplying the Government—and that means most producers—get together.

Nobody has stated the origins and causes of contract renegotiation more clearly than Senator DAVID I. WALSH, chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee. "It became apparent," said Senator WALSH, "that many negotiated contracts were awarded before either of the contracting parties had any accurate idea as to the actual cost of producing the article on a mass-production basis. When the actual cost of manufacturing the article became known, it was apparent that some firms were making an excess profit, and both the Government and the manufacturer desired to renegotiate the contract in order to reduce the cost to the Government." That was one reason for renegotiation. The Army asks an automobile manufacturer to make tanks in a hurry. The manufacturer has never made a tank and has no idea what the costs will be. A contract is signed at some price just to get things started. When manufacturing experience has established the actual cost, a new contract can be written.

Equally important, however, has been the feeling that this time there should be no scandalously exorbitant profits from war orders. Both political parties and almost every organization big enough to afford a national convention have passed resolutions demanding that profit be taken out of war. Nobody likes to contemplate the difference between the hardships endured by a soldier on Guadalcanal and a manufacturer at home cashing in on war business. Since it is impracticable to equip the manufacturer's office with fox holes and cooties, the most obvious means of narrowing the gap between his lot and that of the soldier is to see to it that the manufacturer does not make so much money as to create a scandal and give a bad name to the free-enterprise system. In the last war the so-called profiteers represented an infinitesimal fraction of American industry, but there were enough of them to supply every pinko and crackpot with enough ammunition against capitalism to last 25 years. As Under Secretary of War Patterson puts it: "If inordinate profits were reaped by a few under a $22,000,000,000 war program, what will be the consequences under $240,000,000,000 of current appropriations and authorizations?"

Nobody, least of all the men on the price-adjustment boards, would claim that the record of renegotiation has been perfect up to now or that perfection is likely to distinguish it in the future. But from the character of the men who are in charge of contract renegotiation, as well as from the experiences of various suppliers, we think it fair to say that the intent of Congress and the American people that there shall be no profiteers is being carried out with the minimum of injustice to individuals. The personnel of the various regional boards is kept down to the minimum consistent with efficiency and the convenience of the producers. Of course, some producers complain; everybody would like to go on getting $5,000 a unit, even when the cost of production has dropped to $1,500. But when the producer stops to think that he has a customer who will take everything he can make, that he has no competition, sales expense, or risk of saturating the market, he is likely to conclude that renegotiation of a contract with the Army or Navy leaves him with substantially as much profit as he derived from his peacetime efforts to sell in a market shared by a dozen eager competitors. The War and Navy Departments, with an act of Congress behind them, are not much tougher than normal peacetime competitive practice.

Probably the chief reason why one hears so many contradictory stories on contract renegotiation is the flexibility with which it is administered. There is no arbitrary maximum or minimum profit margin permitted by the price adjusters. Many factors are considered. The low-cost producer is favored as against his inefficient competitor by receiving a higher unit profit for his article. The man who is operating on his own capital will come off better than the man who has been set up in business with Government money in a Government plant, and who is, in reality, less an owner than a manager. Indeed, believers in capitalism and free enterprise ought not to withhold approval from section 403 on at least one ground—namely, that it is almost unique among Government activities in that it actually exerts pressure to reduce costs and increase production, instead of freezing costs and restricting production as so much New Deal legislation has done. The renegotiators have also shown a disposition to be generous toward suppliers whose contracts with the Army or Navy have been preceded by years of experimental work on which no profit was possible. There are several instances in which the boards took into account losses incurred before the supplier had any contract at all with the Government.

Granted that the country wants no profiteers and that nobody wants very much to be a profiteer, is this the best way to control excessive profits? Why not leave this job to the excess-profits tax, which takes 90 percent of the top-bracket incomes anyway? Why not fix a definite margin of profit over cost, as was done in the last war? The answer to the last question is, of course, that cost-plus is out precisely because it worked so badly in the last war. The higher the costs, the bigger the profit. Sound industrial practice should work just the other way. The effort to control inflation becomes all but impossible if industry is encouraged to add to production costs. Nor can the excess-profits tax, unaided, capture undue profits. As Bernard M Baruch has pointed out: "Twenty percent of $500,000 is $100,000 and 20 percent of $1,000,000 is $200,000. One way to increase a $500,000 profit to $1,000,000 without increased risk or effort is to double the price. For this reason there is more incentive to increase prices—and therefore profits—under an 80 percent excess-profits tax than there is without it." If we are serious about curbing war profits the job has to be done before, rather than after, taxes.

It would be foolish to pretend that renegotiation of a contract, which looked pretty good in the first place, is invariably a pleasant experience. The question which those who are renegotiated ought to ask themselves is: "Is this better or worse than being gone over by a senatorial investigating committee after the war, perhaps lampooned and misrepresented, and certainly pilloried by opponents of our competitive business system?" One answer certainly is that when the great day comes and disillusioned politicians are looking about for fat cats and scapegoats, the war contractor will be in a preferred position if he can say, "I was put under the microscope by some of the hardest boiled bug detectors you ever saw, and they gave me a clean bill of health."

After all, total war demands a total effort by all classes. We cannot conscript soldiers, draft labor, and ration civilians, yet fail to restrain profits to a reasonable level. In war, when we cannot even guarantee a man the right to his own life, no war contractor can be assured the last dollar of profit from business which was made for him by the war emergency. Furthermore, we know that few American producers want any such advantage. Now that he has assurance that his excessive profits will be sheared off without endless bureaucratic interference with his operations, and that the result will be fair as between him and other producers, the American businessman will accept renegotiation of his war contracts with good grace. From all reports, he is doing so already.

The Small Plant Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of March 25, 1943, containing a very important statement recently made by Col. Robert W. Johnson, Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, at a meeting of the Advertising Club of New York, in which he discussed some phases of the small businessmen's problems.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AD DRIVE TO HELP SMALL FIRMS HERE—JOHNSON SAYS SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION WILL ASSIST IN MAINTAINING ESSENTIAL CIVILIAN OUTPUT—TO LIST DISTRESS CASES—CONGRESS TO GET FIRST OF 60-DAY REPORTS FOR ENTIRE COUNTRY BY FIRST OF JUNE

Apparently coming to the conclusion that maintained manufacture of essential civilian goods can be as much a solution for the small plant problem as conversion to war output, the Smaller War Plants Corporation will soon launch in this area an advertising and merchandising campaign designed to bring together "businessmen who need products with businessmen who need production," Col. Robert W. Johnson, chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, declared yesterday at the weekly luncheon meeting of the Advertising Club of New York.

This activity will be headed here by a prominent merchant with "ingenious merchandising ability" who will be named in a few days. If the plan is successful in New York, it will be extended to Chicago, San Francisco, Atlanta, Dallas, and other important national buying centers.

"New York is the greatest buying center in the world and we expect it to assume the initiative in banding together to use the open and distress facilities of small business to help fill its needs," Colonel Johnson said. "There is no greater ingenuity in the world than that demonstrated by our merchant buyers, and ingenuity reaches its highest point when both the buyer and the seller are in need, which happens to be the case right now."

During the course of his speech Colonel Johnson made these points:

1. For administrative purposes the Smaller War Plants Corporation has been divorced from the War Production Board, but for all purposes it is still part of the same organization, and Colonel Johnson reports only to Donald Nelson.

2 Starting on May 1, the number of distressed plants existing throughout the country will be tabulated and figures submitted to Congress by June 1. Every 60 days thereafter such plants will be reported.

3. The volume of business going through the Smaller War Plants Corporation has increased from $10,000,000 to $60,000,000 a week in the past 7 weeks.

Colonel Johnson defined a distressed plant as one that is operating at less than 66⅔ percent of its normal production, averaged over the 5 years prior to the war.

He asserted that the present Smaller War Plants Corporation has been set up under the guidance of five objectives: Define the problem, get a measuring device, lay out forms of attack, get in touch with the men who are buyers in the every-day important commercial life of the Nation, and get the War Production Board to allocate critical materials to distressed plants by name where necessary.

The procurement services are offering varying degrees of cooperation in switching war work to small plants, Colonel Johnson said, but today the prime contractors have more business to distribute than the Government, because the latter has laid out and contracted for most of its 1943 program.

"We will take all prime contractors and bring them into all our regional offices, where they will be exposed not only to the actual list of distressed plants and regions but to the men who understand these plants," he said. "The prime contractors will be brought face to face with the problem of small business, particularly in the environments in which they operate."

In addition, all the civic governments of the country ranging from States to communities, which are purchasers of numerous products, will be brought within the plan.

In discussing the five objectives, Colonel Johnson declared that if they are properly executed, they "should attract the interest of the greatest collection of buying power ever generated in the history of the United States toward a problem that has been specified, simplified, defined, and described."

"We are 80 percent down the road in definition and plans but only about 20 percent in building an organization capable of execution," he added. "The problem of execution is extremely difficult. We are late and have no time to get good men to do tough jobs at this date."

Neither business nor government separately can do the job of helping small business, Colonel Johnson said, adding:

"Business and government can do it together but it takes self-starting leadership to get country-wide realization of this problem."

He declared that a serious mistake was made in the erection of new large plants while "across the street facilities existed to do the same job."

"We did not save money, time, or improve quality," Colonel Johnson asserted. "We lost all three. We added to the backlog of machine tools and delayed the job 6 months because we did not use the machine tools we had. There were too many instances of duplication of facilities and it is still happening this afternoon."

In answer to a question from the floor, the colonel said that he had the assurance of major labor leaders that if a prime contractor operating a closed shop wanted to send part of a war contract to a nonunion shop in a nonunion community, labor would give its consent.

John A. Zellers, president of the Advertising Club, presided.

Organization and Collaboration of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. BURTON
OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Ernest Lindley, entitled "Post War Influence—What Will Our Role Be," published in the Washington Post on March 17, 1943, and an editorial entitled "The Four Senators' Plan" published in the Cleveland Press of March 16, 1043.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of March 17, 1943]

POST-WAR INFLUENCE

(By Ernest Lindley)

WHAT WILL OUR ROLE BE?

If passed promptly by an overwhelming vote, a resolution in the vein of that drafted by a bipartisan Senate group would be invaluable. It would diminish, perhaps remove, one of the great uncertainties about the post-war world. That uncertainty is the role of the United States. It is not only an impediment to other nations in considering their plans, but a detriment to the interests of the United States.

The weight of American views in the settlements which follow the defeat of Germany and Japan should be at least as great as our power. This means that they should carry more weight than those of any other nation. But to apply this weight we must not only have the power at the conclusion of the war but must show that we intend to preserve and exercise indefinitely an influence relative to our strength. As long as there is any doubt about this our influence will be less than it should be. Every indication that we may retire after the war subtracts from our influence. No one need pay much attention to our views if we are not going to stand behind them.

Although we were the last great power to enter the war, the grand alliance, known as the United Nations, was formalized in Washington and signed first by the President of the United States. Because of our strength, we should be the ranking partner. We can remain the ranking partner unless we resign.

But there are reasons why our influence, if shown that we mean to exert it indefinitely, can carry even more weight than power alone would entitle us to. Our national interests do not seriously interfere with those of other United Nations. Our ideals are subscribed to by free peoples everywhere. For historical and other reasons, our ideals and our interests march close together. Many of the United Nations will accept our leadership, and most are eager for it. For if we don't lead, other nations will. The small nations must always mold their policies with reference to those of the stronger powers.

Likewise the great powers must always mold their policies with reference to each other. When the fighting stops there will be, in all probability, only three great powers: The United States, Russia, and Britain. By the usual tests, China will not be a great power. But for sound reasons, it is being treated as a great power, at least by the United States and Great Britain, and will be in the organization of the post-war world if we make our views and interests prevail.

Of the three great powers, Britain (including the Empire and dominions) is the least secure, because it is scattered all over the world. But it lacks the strength to preserve peace around the world. Britain must ally or concert its strength with other nations. Britain's future orientation depends mostly on the United States. An Anglo-American concert of power would be strong enough to stabilize most of the world. A concert of the Big Four would be better. But Russia also is still an uncertainty. If Russia prefers to remain in seclusion, an Anglo-American-Chinese combination can provide the cornerstones for a stable world order. Or if we withdraw into our shell, a British-Russian combination might do part of the job. Such a combination might make arrangements disadvantageous to us.

As long as Britain and the smaller United Nations think we may withdraw after the war, we cannot expect to obtain any agreements most advantageous to our interests. They must always keep in mind what they may have to do if we suddenly or gradually resign. Likewise, the policy of Russia itself is likely to be influenced by our own role.

A suitable resolution passed overwhelmingly by the Senate would be of immense value in strengthening the hand of the United States Government in its conferences with its Allies. But to be effective it would have to be passed by a majority of the Senators of both parties without protracted debate. The resolution drafted by Senators HATCH, BALL, BURTON, and HILL probably is a little too specific to have a chance of easy passage. Possibly no resolution strong enough to serve the purpose can be passed now without a damaging debate. This is distinctly the type of action to which at least two-thirds, preferably more, of the Senators should subscribe before it is brought forward for formal debate. If such an agreement could be reached it would go down in history as one of the most constructive actions ever taken by the United States Senate.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press of March 16, 1943]

THE FOUR SENATORS' PLAN

Senators HATCH, BALL, HILL, and BURTON, by proposing that the United States call meetings of the United Nations for better war and post-war organization, have acted on the principle that the Senate is constitutionally concerned in this business. The President, by consulting with them and other Senate leaders, has recognized this principle.

Doubtless the Senators and the President have in mind the tragedy of the Wilson peace, when lack of such cooperation proved so costly. Anything the President and the Senate can do to prevent a repetition of that blunder will be enthusiastically welcomed.

As to the nature and limits of the post-war international organization, there is naturally disagreement. Those differences will be debated as they should be; for there is no easy answer, no black-and-white solution. That fact, however, should restrain bitter partisanship. The contribution needed by the Senate, in this joint responsibility with the Executive, is light rather than heat.

Apart from their service in bringing the Senate into the picture, these Senators have stressed the need of a United Nations conference or council. That, too, is essential.

St. Patrick's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, at annual dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, Philadelphia, Pa., Wednesday, March 17, 1943:

For us Americans, St. Patrick's birthday is a national holiday—not legally, it is true, but what Irishman ever cared whether the law was with him on a holiday? So far as I know, I have no Irish blood in my veins. But the Irish—God bless them—claim me occasionally, as when in news articles I am referred to, not infrequently as Francis X. Biddle, and you will find plenty of Irish in the Department of Justice. The names of Charles Fahy, the Solicitor General, speaks for itself, and the Assistant to the Attorney General, next in command, James Rowe, has the vigor and imagination that his Irish blood guarantees.

Today all of us wear a bit of shamrock in our hearts in memory of the good Saint who 1,500 years ago brought Ireland in touch with western Europe, and particularly with the young religion of Christ that was flowering in Rome. The Irish had not yet discovered America, but it did not take them long to make themselves at home in the new land of freedom when they found how congenial to their spirit was this wide country of opportunity, for men who have lived under a tyranny that has taught them only to resist do not take long to flower and expand when a new environment draws them into its free heart.

And how the Irish loved freedom.

Do you remember Wendell Phillips' account of Daniel O'Connell's fight in the British Parliament for emancipation of Negro slaves in the West Indies? The West Indian block in Parliament, pledged to maintain slavery, had promised to throw their 27 votes to him on every Irish question if only he would oppose Negro emancipation. "It was," Phillips wrote, "a terrible temptation. How many a so-called statesmen would have yielded! O'Connell said, 'Gentlemen, God knows I speak for the saddest nation the sun ever sees, but may my right hand forget its cunning and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if to serve Ireland, even Ireland, I forget the Negro one single hour!' "

Always the Irish have cared about freedom, not only for themselves but for others who were making the same fight. "I have seen a white crow and heard of black swans," said John Randolph of Roanoke, "but an Irish opponent of American liberty I have never either seen or heard of." And in the Civil War a slaveholder lamented: "The mistake with us has been that it was not made a felony to bring in an Irishman when it was made piracy to bring in an African."

They would never forget that dream of nationhood and freedom to which O'Connell gave such strong substance; for, as T. C. Irwin said in the Potato Digger's Song:

"As the great sun sets in glory furled,
Faith, it's grand to think, as I watch his face,
If he never sets on the English world,
He never, lad, sets on the Irish race."

And how they took to the land of the free. Between 1650 and 1659 60,000 emigrated from Ireland to the American Colonies, about half the estimated population for the latter year. In 1789 David Ramsay, the historian of South Carolina, recorded that "the Colonies which now form the United States may be considered as Europe transplanted. Ireland, England, Scotland, France, Germany, Holland, Switzerland, Sweden, Poland, Italy furnished the original stock of the present population and are generally supposed to have contributed to it in the order named. For the last 70 or 80 years no nation has contributed so much to the population of America as Ireland."

And small wonder, for the new country was a land of opportunity, as evidenced by a letter that James Murray, a resident of New York City, wrote on November 7, 1737, to his friend the Reverend Baptist Boyd, of County Tyrone, Ireland. "Rev. Baptist Boyd," it ran, "read this letter, and look, and tell aw the poor folk of your place that God has open'd a door for their deliverance; for here is no scant of bread, and if your sons wad but come here, they wad get more money teechin a Letin skulle in ane year nor ye yer sell wad get for three years preechin whar ye are. Rev. Baptist Boyd, there came one with me in the ship that now gets ane hundred punds for ane year for teechin a Letin skule, and God kens, little he is skilled in learning, and yet they think him a high learned man. Ye ken I had but sma learning when I left ye, and now wad ye think it, I hea 20 pund a year for being a clark to the York meeting-house, and I keep a skulle for wee weans * * * My love to ye aw."

A Description of the Territory (District) of Columbia, published in Paris in 1816, notes that one-half of the population of Washington were of Irish origin, many of whom had no acquaintance with the English language. A street sign was observed to read: "Peter Rodgers, saddler, from the green fields of tyranny to the green streets of Washington and liberty." The saddler was a native of Cork, who had been banished at the age of 75, for no other reason (as he alleged) than that of having worn a green colored coat and vented sighs for his dear native country. I wonder. * * *

But, if the Irish left Ireland to come to America, they were not minded to have the new country forget whence they had come; and today in the United States we have 24 Dublins, 21 Waterfords, 18 Belfasts, 16 Tyrones, 10 Limericks, 9 Antrims, 8 Sligos 7 Derrys, 6 Corks, 5 Kildares. * * *

Fighters, dreamers, poets—they brought with them memories of that green island of druids and leprechauns; inconsistencies; an expansive, lyrical humor; and courage. The Celtic state of mind has been described as "a vehement reaction against the despotism of fact." They liked the form of humor commonly known as a bull, but the Irish bull, as an Irish writer has said, is always pregnant. An Irish alderman, speaking on the duty of patriotism at a forefathers dinner in Boston, said: "Every man should love his native land—whether he was born there or not. He should be willing to die for it. People are dying today who never died before."

And they brought courage and the Irish love of battle, and the memory of their heroic ancestors who had died in battle after deeds of valor. Descendants of Catholic Irish who had settled in Maryland and Pennsylvania, and of Protestants from Ulster in New England, Virginia, and the Carolinas joined the Revolutionary Army in 1775, and made up nearly a third of its personnel. Washington's Irish aides included Adj. Gen. Edward Hand, rifles; Brig. Gen. Stephen Moylan, dragoons; Maj. Gen. Henry Knox, artillery; Col. Ephraim Blaine, quartermaster; and John Dunlop, bodyguard.

In 1776 John Barry, first commodore of the new United States Navy, was appointed to command the *Lexington*, which captured the tender *Edward* after a sharp action. The *Lexington* is today a glorious name in the great American Navy * * * The first blow struck at the British on the water after war began was the capture of the British armed schooner *Margaretta* in Machias Bay, Maine, by the American schooner *Liberty*, in command of Capt. Jeremiah O'Brien, native of Cork. On orders of General Washington, "St. Patrick" was made the watchword on the night before the evacuation of Boston by the British, 167 years ago tonight, March 17, 1776.

Nor is the Irish tradition forgotten in the Navy, as witness the fact that in 1863 the U. S. Navy cruiser *Shamrock* was christened with a bottle of Irish whisky.

Perhaps as typical an Irishman as any of his time was Gen. John Sullivan, who began his stormy career in the Revolutionary War by rallying a band of New Hampshire men to capture Fort William and Mary at the entrance of Portsmouth Harbor. He served at Boston, at Quebec, Long Island, Jersey, Staten Island, Germantown, Valley Forge, Brandywine, Newport. To quote from the Dictionary of American Biography: "He was brave, hotheaded, oversensitive, fond of display, generous to a fault, usually out of money, and a born political organizer."

A New Hampshire tradition has it that when Margery Browne, of Cork, was on her way to America, someone asked her what she planned to do when she reached the Colonies. "Raise governors for thim, to be sure," was her ready reply. She married John Sullivan, a schoolmaster, formerly of Limerick. Reminiscing in her old age, Margery Browne Sullivan used to say she had known what it was to work hard in the fields, "carrying in my arms the Governor of Massachusetts, with the Governor of New Hampshire tagging at my skirts." Her son John, the fighting general who was such a good political organizer, became Governor of New Hampshire in 1786; and his brother James, Governor of Massachusetts in 1807.

In the Civil War it was estimated that 40 percent of the Federals were Irish or of Irish descent. New York alone furnished over 51,000 Irishmen and 80,000 of Irish descent. Gen. Philip H. Sheridan was born in Albany the year after his parents arrived from County Cavan. Gen. Thomas Francis Meagher commanded the Irish Brigade at Fredericksburg; Gen. Michael Corcoran, the Irish Sixty-ninth Regiment; Maj. Gen. Alexander McDowell McCook was at Shiloh and Corinth, Perryville, Stone River, and Chickamauga.

Tonight, answering to the toast to our dear country, tonight, as we remember the Irish, on this their saint's day, let us remember some of the heroes of this war, Americans, whose Irish ancestors must stir tonight in pride over their heroism as we now record it:

Capt. Colin P. Kelly, Jr., who on December 9, 1941, near Cagayan, Philippine Islands, with his plane a focal point of fire from strong enemy forces, placed three direct hits on an enemy battleship; en route to his home field was set afire by two enemy fighters; ordered his crew to bail out; last to leave the ship,

from which six men were saved, was killed in the crash.

Corp. Philip N. Murphy, under direct fire from numerous enemy tanks at Lyautey, in north Africa, who went into action with an assault gun and routed six tanks out of the woods into the open, where the Air Forces and observers for naval gunfire could locate them—and did.

Sgt. John D. Sullivan, who participated in a daylight attack on an airdrome at Courtais, in France; and, after his plane had bombed its target, was attacked by from 20 to 30 enemy fighters, and destroyed a Messerschmit 109.

Lt. Comdr. Edward Henry O'Hare, of the Navy, who as section leader and pilot of fighting squadron 3 on February 20, 1942, having lost the assistance of his team mates, interposed his plane between his ship and an advancing enemy formation of nine attacking twin-engine heavy bombers. Attacking alone he shot down five enemy bombers and severely damaged a sixth before they reached the bomb-release point.

Lt. Comdr. Robert B. Kelly, of the Navy, who was awarded the Army Distinguished Service Cross and the Silver Star and the Navy Cross with the following citation: For distinguished conduct in the line of his profession and for extraordinary courage in combat as commanding officer of the U. S. S. *PT-34*, when that vessel in company with the U. S. S. *PT-41* made an attack on the Japanese light cruiser *Kuma* on the night of April 8-9, 1942. Despite extremely heavy shell fire opposition and the fact that the cruiser was screened by four enemy destroyers, the *PT-34* closed to 300-yard range and made successful torpedo hits on the enemy cruiser, finally sinking her. Then, on the following morning, in a narrow channel of Cebu Harbor, with three guns of the *PT-34* out of action and a hole 6 feet across blown through her, Commander Kelly maneuvering to save his boat from further direct hits from four attacking enemy dive bombers, maintained fire against the enemy until all of his remaining guns were out of action and with five of his crew of six killed or wounded, beached his boat, and, under continual strafing from the enemy directed the removal of the wounded to a place of safety.

Rear Admiral Daniel Judson Callaghan, to whom the President, on December 9, 1942, awarded the Medal of Honor posthumously, presenting it to his son, Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Daniel J. Callaghan, Jr., "for extraordinary heroism and conspicuous intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty, during action against enemy Japanese forces during the battle of Guadalcanal on the night of November 12-13, 1942. Although outbalanced in strength and numbers by a desperate and armed enemy, Rear Admiral Callaghan, with ingenious tactical skill and superb coordination of units under his command, led his forces into battle against tremendous odds, thereby contributing decisively to the routing of a powerful invasion fleet and to the consequent frustration of a formidable Japanese offensive. While fighting during close range operations in the face of furious bombardment by superior enemy fire power, he was killed on the bridge of his flagship."

And then there were the five Sullivan brothers, all lost in a single action when the cruiser *Juneau* went down fighting last November in the battle of Guadalcanal. These boys, of a Waterloo, Iowa, family, had enlisted together and had asked that they be allowed to serve together. And that is the way they did serve—to the last. For them the Navy has named a new destroyer—the U. S. S. *Sullivans*.

It is good to recall these American heroes, of Irish descent, tonight, on March 17, 1943. And it is good to know that there are so many Americans who share, by an ancient heritage, the love of a clean fight as only an Irishman can love it, the abhorrence of oppression as only an Irishman can abhor it. But through this heritage, too, runs a loyalty to true friends and protectors, equally strong, equally constant. Today that loyalty transcends all that has gone before. We have seen the attempts of enemy propagandists in our country to revive ancient grudges. And one by one, we have seen them fail. In America they will always fail. Here nothing in the past can divide us or hold us back from this fight which aims to rid the world of a kind of vermin hated by the Irish as wholeheartedly as by any people on earth.

Planning for the Post-War World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on last Saturday the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] delivered a very excellent address over the National Broadcasting Co. on the subject Planning for the Post-War World. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every American should realize by now that America must plan for the peace and for the post-war world.

Unless America does plan to fight for something more than mere survival in this total war, the only peace democracy will know may be the peace of the grave and the only post-war planning that will be done may be done for us by the victorious Axis.

To win the war, we must plan for the peace; we must know what we are fighting for; we must win the peace; we must play our part in the post-war world.

For that reason, as a devoted supporter of Woodrow Wilson, of the League of Nations and the World Court, I have been deeply interested in the recent Win the Peace Resolution proposed by Senators HATCH, of New Mexico, HILL, of Alabama, BALL, of Minnesota, and BURTON, of Ohio.

My experience in American politics goes pretty far back and I cannot help remembering how during the first World War, the late William Howard Taft, Wilson's predecessor in the White House, joined with other Republicans in touring America on behalf of what was called a League to Enforce Peace. It sounded grand.

In order to make a show of performance for the public, a conference was held by representatives of both parties on Pacific and Far Eastern matters right here in Washington, a conference which saved the Japanese the trouble of sinking our battleships by doing it for them, while they, with the utmost courtesy, smilingly tore up some blueprints.

Babies who were born that fatal winter when this conference destroyed the only solid advantage we had gained in the first World War—the naval power which Woodrow Wilson had wisely fostered in the Pacific—were old enough to die under Japanese bombs at Pearl Harbor or to be bayoneted by Japanese troops at Wake Island and Bataan.

The consequences were as fatally direct as exactly that.

We threw away the peace which American valor and President Wilson had won for us and condemned the present generation of Americans to pass through the fire once again in a greater and more desperate struggle, which today has cost the lives of at least 25,000,000 people and will cost our boys at least 1,000,000 lives to say nothing of the $300,000,000,000 we will have to expend from our Treasury and our natural resources.

We may not be able to gain even a temporary military victory, as in 1918, unless we are fighting for something rather than simply struggling against something, to save our skins.

As the late William Howard Taft once said, "Even a cornered rat will fight." Unless we know what we are fighting for, we are a Nation of cornered rats, human animals actuated by the blind instinct of self-preservation, and any victory won under such terms would be no more permanent than the victory in World War No. 1.

No one who has watched the events of the past 25 years can have any doubts that another and greater third world war will come, if we miss our chance today.

In 1920, Germany was down and out, bled white, ruined economically, under foreign military occupation; in 1920 Soviet Russia was in virtual chaos—war and revolution, foreign intervention, German invasion, famine, disease had reduced the Russian people the Dark Ages.

In less than a single generation these two beaten, ruined, crushed, distracted nations had not only recovered but had generated gigantic economic and military power until the whole world watched with awe and anxiety as the Nazi hordes wrestled the Red Army at Stalingrad.

I warn you now in all sincerity that no matter how completely we may crush the Axis no matter how harmless and exhausted any nation may seem to be unless we win the peace within another 20 years there will be again a great recovery and a flood of new aggression and new conquest which will once more ravage the entire planet.

We have seen it happen once. It can happen again. It will happen again unless we act now to make sure that it need not happen again.

I warn you that we owe it to ourselves and to our allies to let them know now where we stand on post-war plans and post-war responsibilities for world peace.

Take just one example—North Africa. We have all watched with much disgust and some dismay the squabbling which broke out right after General Eisenhower landed his army and had to choose between fighting the French forces in North Africa, or dealing with them.

Even the Casablanca conference of Roosevelt and Churchill did not end this dispute between rival French factions backed by conflicting diplomatic policies.

This squabble was made inevitable by the plain, brutal fact that our other allies among the United Nations did not and could not know what our foreign policy would be after 1944.

Like the cat that once sat down on a red-hot stove, they weren't taking any chances with isolationism, and after the minority party's gains in the 1942 elections, they were doubly on their guard against the possibility of future reversion of the United States to a policy of isolation.

How, for example, could the British Government take a chance on a regime in French North Africa—the region which assures air

control of the vital Straits of Gibraltar—if America was going to walk out on her allies again, get back into bed, pull the blanket over her face, and leave England holding the bag the way we left France holding the bag after the last war?

Naturally, under these conditions the far-sighted gentlemen who control British foreign policy tried to make sure that their man, General DeGaulle, would get control, if America could not guarantee that American foreign policy after 1944 would still shoulder her responsibilities in a post-war world.

The terrible thing about this situation, however, is that we weaken the spirit of our own people and the morale of our soldiers by failing to plan our post-war policy now.

For if our invasion of North Africa and our coming invasion of the European Continent are simply designed to enable our other associates, England and Russia, to set up regimes suitable to their respective governments, then we are reducing ourselves to an infamous position in which we let other people do our thinking for us and use our wealth and forces for their own particular ends.

How long do you think the American people will continue to sacrifice their children and their wealth under such conditions?

If we are not fighting for a decent, peaceful post-war world, why are we fighting at all?

If we aren't willing to take the time and trouble now to figure out how we can keep the sort of peace we want, why bother to go to war in the first place?

I warn you now that in this refusal to consider post-war planning lies the seed of terrible, crippling defeatism.

President Roosevelt, less than 7 short years ago, told us that this generation of Americans had a rendezvous with destiny. Today we are keeping that rendezvous.

It came upon us because a generation ago we listened to the voices of men who told us that the time had come to go back to normalcy, let the isolationists run the country, make money hand over fist, and talk about the beauties of peace and disarmament instead of doing anything to maintain the peace or to make armament unnecessary.

Today we are paying in blood and in treasure, in agony and sacrifice, for having listened to those voices which told us that a vote for Harding was a vote for the League of Nations and that sinking our Navy was a guaranty of our peaceful possession of Pearl Harbor, Guam, Wake Island, Midway, and the Philippines, a guaranty of China's independence and integrity, not to mention those statesmen who said that we—10 years before Neville Chamberlain returned from Munich with what he called "Peace in our time"—had assured abiding peace because M. Briand of France and Secretary of State Kellogg had negotiated the Multilateral Pact for the abolition of war. Remember?

And now, even now, while Hitler gathers the energies of his Axis forces for a last desperate gamble, while Eisenhower's army stands poised in North Africa and the Japanese behind their screen of island bases are with equal desperation to that of Hitler preparing to strike again, even now I hear men in public life rise and say that we must not discuss what we are fighting for because we might disagree about it and stir up a lot of dangerous discussion.

What else, I ask you, is our Congress for if we are not to discuss the real problems which face the country, the real choice which we must make?

This speech of mine is, I know, undiplomatic. Perhaps it is impolitic. I don't know whether it is. But the time has come to speak the truth about these things, to stand up and be counted for what we believe in, what we want with the victory our men are winning for us.

As a practical politician, I agree that it is not wise to discuss details of the peace before we know the exact post-war problems with which we will have to deal.

But I do know that the time has come when we must make the great fundamental decisions which will clear up, once and for all, in our minds as well as in that of our allies, the question of whether we are to continue Wilson's and Roosevelt's wise and practical world policies or whether we are going to doom ourselves and the world—as well as condemn the next generation of Americans to a fresh war—to a return to normalcy, to phoney isolation, to ignorance, greed, and cowardice, because we haven't the courage to stand up now and chart our own future course in dignity and in honor and in truth.

Restrictions on Planting Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Oklahoma:

House Concurrent Resolution 14

Resolution memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture to release the restrictions on planting cotton in Oklahoma for the crop year 1943

Whereas Oklahoma is one of the largest livestock producing States in the entire United States.

During the past 40 years Oklahoma has produced the majority of the feed with which to fatten and finish its own livestock, and has been able to buy such additional supplies as might be necessary from nearby States; and

Whereas under the restrictions of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, the feed we have been producing has been so reduced that we have been called on to buy more of our necessary livestock feed from other States, such as Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi; and

Whereas those States have also been reduced in the amount of feed they can produce. Texas is now only able to produce protein feeds to the extent of one-half its requirements, and is now competing with Oklahoma for feed in other States. At the same time the States that have been furnishing part of the feed for our livestock have increased their own livestock and are using a greater proportion of their own production. It is now practically impossible to buy this protein feed from other States; and

Whereas the program of crop restrictions has now resulted in a large percentage of our livestock going without the necessary protein feeds to produce the greatest amount of meat and dairy products and has caused a large percentage of the livestock being marketed in a light and unfinished condition, and a considerable amount being held off the market on account of not being fattened. This is one of the largest contributing factors in the shortage of meat; and

Whereas the Agricultural Marketing Administration has recently removed the restrictions on planting wheat and peanuts for 1943 crop and in the case of peanuts are offering to pay subsidies equivalent to $50 per ton for the production of peanuts in addition to other payments as an incentive to plant peanuts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Nineteenth Oklahoma Legislature (the senate concurring therein), That we earnestly request the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to remove the restrictions on the planting of cotton acreage in Oklahoma for the purpose of permitting a larger production of protein feeds, cottonseed oil, and cotton linters. All of which is important in reaching production goals for meat and dairy products; be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully submit to the Agricultural Marketing Administration that more than three-fourths of the Cotton Belt in Oklahoma will produce more pounds of essential food, feed, and materials necessary for the national defense than any other crop, and that in those sections where the annual rainfall is insufficient and on those types of soil where the clean harvesting of peanuts is not possible, that every effort be made to plant and raise all of the cotton possible, not only for the fiber but for the feed and food that cotton will produce.

We also call to their attention that with the present consumption of cotton in the United States, and with the prospects of a large demand from other countries as soon as the war is over, that the present stocks of cotton will be insufficient to meet the demand.

We further call to the attention of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency and the people of Oklahoma that unless restrictions on the planting of cotton are relaxed to allow the planting of a larger acreage Oklahoma will not be able to produce the livestock that it has been producing, and in all probability Oklahoma livestock will be reduced in the same percentage as our protein feeds have been reduced. The State of Oklahoma will not only have lost the income from cotton but from livestock as well.

Therefore, we urge that each farmer in Oklahoma be allowed to produce without penalty those crops which, in his judgment, can be produced, taking into consideration the type of soil on his farm, the farming equipment now owned by him, the size of his family, and the needs for producing the greatest volume of necessary products; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, duly authenticated by the respective signatures of the presiding officer of each house of the legislative, be forthwith sent to Claude Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.; to I. W. Dugan, director of the southern division of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, New Orleans, La., and to H. P. Moffitt, State administrator, Stillwater, Okla.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 3d day of March 1943.

Adopted by the senate the 8th day of March 1943.

HAROLD FREEMAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
CLINT BRADEN,
Acting President of the Senate.

New Mexico National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the New Mexico National Guard was in the Philippine Islands at the time of the fall of Bataan. Recently General MacArthur sent to Dr. V. H. Spensley, chairman of

the Bataan relief organization at Albuquerque, the following message:

If I live, I shall return to save them.

General MacArthur referred to the New Mexico National Guard men. I ask that a news article under the date line of Albuquerque, N. Mex., giving the circumstances under which the message was sent, be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACARTHUR SAYS HE'LL FREE MEMBERS OF NEW MEXICO GUARD

Albuquerque, N. Mex., March 4.—In a dramatic personal message, Gen. Douglas MacArthur tonight pledged to return to the Philippines and rescue the surviving members of the New Mexico National Guard who were taken prisoner with the fall of Bataan.

"If I live, I shall return to save them," said General MacArthur in a message to Dr. V. H. Spensley, chairman of the Bataan relief organization at Albuquerque.

The relief group is composed of relatives and friends of the soldiers from New Mexico. Of the 2,000 soldiers from the State on Bataan, 340 have been reported as prisoners of war.

Automobile Tires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter from a constituent of mine, which is representative of the many complaints I have heard relative to the plan for redistribution of automobile tires. I cannot understand why a matter so important to the war as well as the home front has not been handled in a more expeditious manner.

The letter follows:

ROCK HILL, S. C., *March 25, 1943.*

Hon. JAMES P. RICHARDS,
Member of Congress,
Fifth District, South Carolina,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RICHARDS: Last fall, at the request of the President, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch made a study of the national rubber situation after which he outlined a very practical and workable plan for distributing the available tires to the motorists of the Nation; which plan, if worked as intended, would keep all cars available for essential driving.

Under this plan the idle tires of the Nation were to be gathered together and redistributed to those car owners who need them most. This stock of idle tires was to be used for the bulk of the motorists, the A gas-ration group. These tires were bought by the Defense Supplies Corporation from the individual owners, and were supposed to have been inspected by experienced tire appraisers and sorted into groups according to their usefulness. If properly marked and sorted they could have been very easily reshipped to tire dealers to be rationed to the public.

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of, and to voice our protest against, these so-called appraisers, who have thrown a monkey wrench into this whole program by their willful neglect of their job. Warehouses scattered through the Carolinas are stacked full of these tires; the necessary procedure is worked out for shipping them to the dealers; but, at the last minute, it has been discovered that the tires are not appraised. Each tire has an appraisal value pasted on it, it is true, but they have been marked at random with absolutely no regard for their true value. Due to this, and possibly other inefficiencies, the people's tires have been unnecessarily tied up now for at least 6 weeks, with still no sign of improvement in the situation.

Many motorists need these tires seriously, and their number is growing daily as others have tire failures. It is very discouraging when a person goes through all the necessary rationing procedure to get a certificate for tires which he needs to get to his work, only to find that all the tires are tied up in a bunch of Government red tape, and that very little, if anything at all, is being done to get them where he can buy them. This situation is affecting the public confidence in the whole rationing program; and not only this, but it is seriously affecting the war effort, by making it harder for many workers to get to their jobs.

We respectfully ask that you do what you can to get this condition clarified, and get these tires back to the public quickly.

Very truly yours,
YORKE'S EASY PAY TIRE STORE,
Per N. F. YORKE.

Are We on Our Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a short editorial appearing in the Blissfield (Mich.) Advance. It is concise and comments on a subject in which we are all vitally interested at this particular time.

The editorial is as follows:

ARE WE ON OUR WAY?

After advocating full public ownership of land as well as control of the issue of credit, the Archbishop of Canterbury, according to a London cable in the New York Times, says: "If I view the situation rightly, the question of ownership is becoming steadily less important compared with that of direction and management."

When considering socialization of basic industries "for the common good" there is nothing more basic than farming. Federal socialization of the electric-power industry in the United States is now well advanced and is being steadily pushed forward by a small, powerful group of public officials. Electric power, however, is but a minor issue compared to food. It is merely an entering wedge which is being driven into a private enterprise economy before the people are aware of the dangers involved. It builds up to the archbishop's suggestion.

We in America have felt that the individual ownership of land and business, resting in the hands of the people, developed responsibility and pride in accomplishment which was the strength of the Nation. Children in school have been taught that private opportunity in America offered any man or woman with incentive and ambition a chance to rise from the poorest beginnings to the highest places in industry or government. Saving was fostered; the acquisition of property was something to be proud of; the average man strove by hard work and sound management to accumulate some form of inheritance to leave to his family.

We believe that the sole reason for the existence of government in a democracy was to protect the weak, to see that justice was based on equality, and that the needy, the incompetent, and the helpless were properly cared for. It has never been our idea that government should compete with its own people in business.

A new world trend toward socialism and the leveling of opportunity is reaching out to engulf us. Hatred for the thrifty is being promoted, and accumulated savings are for redistribution to others. These are hard, cold facts stripped of glamorous words.

The Archbishop of Canterbury proposes the only logical step that can follow socialization of basic industry. Conditions may be somewhat different in England, but the principle and the effect on the people remain the same. He can be thanked by the people of this country for warning them of things to come.

Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. D. McWILLIAMS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, debate on income-tax measures has now been going on for 4 days. I have listened with rapt attention to the remarks of my various distinguished colleagues. I have tried to reconcile the well presented remarks of those who have spoken against the Carlson-Ruml bill with my own views. But each day, as the debate ended, I have found that all the oratory we have heard during these 4 days has not changed my conviction one iota. As at the outset, I still feel that the Carlson-Ruml tax plan is not only what the people want but what they should have.

To me the whole problem is very simple. Either we are going to put the taxpayers on a pay-as-you-earn basis and not require them to pay more than 1 year's taxes in 1 year or we are not. I do not believe the taxpayers are prepared to pay 2 years' taxes this year and I certainly do not believe they should be called upon to do so.

To place the great mass of taxpayers on a current basis requires that we either abate 1 full year of taxes or make the taxpayers pay more than 1 year's taxes at the present high rate.

Ultimately, the taxpayers will have to pay the amount of taxes which in one sense would be abated by the Carlson-Ruml bill. But the money will then come from those who are earning a sufficient amount to be taxed at a time when they will be better able to pay and not in a year when their income-tax load, to say nothing of all the other taxes they are called upon to pay today, would be unreasonable.

To my mind the Carlson-Ruml plan is a simple and a direct solution of the problem. It abates the smaller tax of the 2 years, contains provisions which prevents the comparatively small group of persons with extremely high incomes from getting windfalls and put the whole group of taxpayers on a pay-as-you-earn basis at one and the same time.

I realize that the people of this Nation are not yet cognizant of the terrific amount they are going to have to pay to defray the cost of this war. But the least the Government can do in wringing this money from the taxpayers is to let them know in advance what they must pay and to permit them to pay within reasonable bounds of their ability to meet these obligations.

I appreciate the lengthy consideration which has been given this matter by the House Ways and Means Committee and on the floor of the House has been necessary to permit a complete expression of opinion. But now that all have had their opportunity to be heard I sincerely hope that we will not disappoint the great mass of American taxpayers by further delay and that favorable action on the Carlson-Ruml bill will be taken forthwith.

Potato Ceiling Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK FELLOWS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, addressed to the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture; Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director, Office of Economic Stabilization; Hon. Prentiss Brown, Director, Office of Price Administration:

To the Honorable CLAUDE R. WICKARD, Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture; Hon. JAMES F. BYRNES, Director, Office of Economic Stabilization; Hon. PRENTISS BROWN, Director, Office of Price Administration:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, in ninety-first legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition you as follows:

Whereas amendment No. 5 to Maximum Price Regulation No. 271 froze the price of certified white-seed potatoes and established a differential for selected white-seed potatoes at 75 cents above table stock prices; and

Whereas it is impossible to define selected seed potatoes so as to distinguish them from table stock, it would be necessary to classify all potatoes which were not eligible for State certification as table stock; and

Whereas if the present ceiling price on selected seed potatoes is reduced to the present ceiling price of table stock, the price on potatoes to the grower would drop from 75 cents to $1 per barrel and discourage the farmer from planting the maximum acreage in 1943; and

Whereas if the price of table-stock potatoes was raised to the present ceiling price of selected seed, thereby placing both table stock and selected seed potatoes in the same category, and the ceiling on certified seed abolished, the farmers would be encouraged to plant more potatoes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the price of table-stock potatoes be raised to the present ceiling on selected seed and that the ceiling on certified seed potatoes be immediately abolished; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.; Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director, Office of Economic Stabilization, White House, Washington, D. C.; Hon. Prentiss Brown, Director, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.; and a copy sent to each of the Senators and Representatives representing the State of Maine in the United States Congress.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

Problems Affecting Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa:

House Concurrent Resolution 18

Whereas apparently there has been no determination made by responsible officers of the Government of the total required production of essential food and fiber for the duration of the war and for the reconstruction period following the war; and

Whereas food and fiber goals have thus far been established only on a short-time basis; and

Whereas the War Manpower Commission was created for the purpose of analyzing and giving proper weight to the minimum manpower requirements of all war industries including agriculture, the armed forces, and the necessary civilian economy, and

Whereas although several months have elapsed since the creation of said Manpower Commission, the drain of agriculture's trained manpower into industry and the armed forces through the Selective Service System, continues at substantially the previous rate, notwithstanding the fact that thousands of auction sales have been held and that breeding herds of sheep, hogs, and both beef and dairy cattle continue to be reduced through shipment to market as a result of the manpower shortage already existing throughout this area, and

Whereas notwithstanding the fact that agriculture in the Great Plains area normally renews completely its mechanized equipment every 10 years, and the further fact that the whole Middle West has just come through a 10-year period of depressed times which made normal replacement difficult, thus multiplying the minimum requirements for both new machinery and repair parts, and

Whereas notwithstanding the recent increase over previous allocations of iron and steel for farm equipment granted by the War Production Board, there may reasonably be reduced acreage as compared to 1942 for the combined reasons of manpower shortage and inadequate machinery and repair parts, and

Whereas Iowa now has thousands of its young men serving in the armed forces and, being almost wholly an agricultural State, it is self-evident that a very large percentage of any subsequent drains on our manpower have and must come from our farms, and

Whereas if Iowa is to contribute her best in this prosecution of this total war, it can only be done through maximum utilization of its one great resource, namely, agriculture, and,

Whereas this can be done only if immediate and realistic consideration, followed by positive action, be given to the minimum requirements of our farmers in the fields. Manpower, machinery, repair parts, tires, gasoline, credit availability, credit cost, nonrecourse production, loans, equitable relationship between price floors and ceiling to production costs to the added risks incident to the efforts to meet expanding production goals under wartime conditions, the apparent necessity for lifting all acreage restrictions on wheat and other commodities as has been done for corn: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring): That we earnestly recommend and ask that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry make an immediate and thorough investigation of all the agricultural "musts" to the end that the requirements of sufficient manpower, sufficient current credit, proper price relationship between production costs, ceilings and floors, sufficient farm machinery and repair parts, gasoline, rubber, fertilizer, and other necessary supplies be definitely determined on a long-time basis, not only for the war years, but for the reconstruction period following the war, and allotted to agriculture so that sufficient food and fiber may be forthcoming to meet increasingly expanding goals and to supply the requirements of our armed forces, the civilian population, the lend-lease commitments to the allied nations, and food for occupied countries and that such investigation include the careful weighing and consideration of the interrelationship and division of authority and responsibility among the following agencies in connection with such determination: United States Department of Agriculture, Office of Price Administration, War Production Board, War Manpower Commission, Office of Petroleum Coordinator; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each Member of Congress from Iowa, presiding officer of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, Office of Price Administration, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HARRY E. WEICHMAN,
HAROLD FELTON,
On the part of the house.
PAUL P. STEWART,
On the part of the senate.

Gas and Tire Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following resolution of the county farm bureau, of Craighead County, Ark.:

"Resolution regarding the rationing of gas, tires, and tractor fuel to farmers of Craighead County, Ark.

"Whereas the present method used by the ration board in rationing farmers in the use of gas, tires, and tractor fuel has resulted in increased use of these products rather than a decrease as intended and requires a great loss of time by farmers, many thousands of extra miles of driving, great quantities of extra gas, and more fuel for tractors than would have been used otherwise; and

"Whereas the average farmer lives about 15 miles from the office of the local ration board As set up now he is required to make an average of at least four trips per quarter, necessitating a total of 120 miles of extra driving for each farmer; and

"Whereas on each trip it is necessary to wait in line at the ration office an average of at least 2 hours and since the ration board is not open at night and will not answer telephone calls at night, such trips must be made at a time that takes the farmer away from his work. Some farmers have reported as much as 10 days lost the first quarter of rationing, which time is sorely needed on the farm or food production will be reduced.

"Whereas there is no conceivable good whatever that can possibly come from rationing tractor fuel. It has been said that the reason for rationing it is that farmers might use the fuel in their cars in lieu of gas. No farmers think that would be done and if it has been done rationing fuel would in no way stop it, as rationed fuel would work in a car as well as fuel not rationed.

"Whereas according to the records of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration office there are approximately 3,000 farmers in Craighead County who have either tractors, cars, or trucks, or both, who must get rationing stamps at the county seat ration board, necessitating an extra burden on farmers of a total of 120,000 hours of time lost, a consumption of 24,000 gallons of extra gas, and extra wear on tires of 360,000 extra miles of driving.

"Whereas the method used in rationing tires forces farm necessity trucks to be without a spare tire from 3 to 8 days each time a tire blows out. Tires are getting thin and during that period it often happens that another tire blows out, which necessitates untold trouble. Loads of livestock in most cases have to be unloaded at nearby farms and fed, a man hired to stay with the truck, a car hired to make a trip to the ration board, from 1 to 5 days lost, cattle and hogs in bad condition reloaded to continue on to market, still without a spare. All of which is ruinous to his success and extremely disheartening to the farmer.

"Whereas, trained and experienced under grim necessity, farmers are already experts in saving tires and gas. They can show ration board officials tricks about saving they never before thought of. Beyond the amount required by bare necessity, farmers simply do not buy gas or tires. Now above all times they would not pleasure drive when they are bending every possible effort to overcome labor shortages. Under the present rationing system, it is economy to avoid as many trips to the ration board as possible, therefore, they get stamps for what they think will be the maximum used. They then fear that if not used they might be cut next time and then run out. As a result, aside from the extra amount used in this endless trek to ration boards, there are actually more gas and tires used than would be used without the present system.

"Whereas farmers do not object to being rationed, they want only the least amount of tires, gas, and fuel absolutely necessary to carry out their pledged production; they do object to the wasteful and extravagant method used in rationing farmers for the reasons herein set out: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That tractor-fuel rationing be immediately eliminated. That if it is desired to continue to ration gas and tires to farmers, that it be done at community meetings at night to avoid loss of time. That a representative of the ration board be present at the meeting, or that it be handled by the county agent. That each farmer be given a pledge card to sign, stating that he will not use gas or tires for any purpose whatever except when necessary to further the operation of his farming, except 2 gallons per week, which be used to drive to church, funerals, school in rainy weather, etc. That he will not buy tires unless both he and the local garage man agree that the old tire cannot be repaired. State on the pledge card the penalty to follow in case he is found guilty of violating his pledge.

"When the pledge is properly signed, then give the farmer a certificate that will entitle him to get gas or tires from his local service station. Do away with stamps. It is far better for one rationing official to go to 3,000 farmers at night meetings assembled, than for 3,000 farmers to go to rationing officials in the daytime, thereby losing 3,000 work days in this county.

"This resolution has no reference to rationing anyone other than actual farmers and their assistants. This resolution is not intended in any way to criticize or reflect on the local board. It is directed to the higher-ups in charge of the plan."

The above resolution was unanimously adopted by the directors of the Craighead County (Ark.) Farm Bureau Federation, assembled in regular session, this 23d day of March 1943.

CRAIGHEAD COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
E. L. DEAN, *President.*
ERIC ROGERS, *Secretary.*

Payment of 1942 and 1943 Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 30 (legislative day of Tuesday, March 23), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the subject of the payment of the 1942 and 1943 income taxes entitled "Forget 'Forgive' ", written by Mr. E. D. Lambright, one of the able editors of the Nation, published in the Tampa Sunday Tribune of March 21, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORGET "FORGIVE"

To Senators ANDREWS and PEPPER and Congressman PETERSON.

GENTLEMEN: From time to time throughout the year we are urged by zealots of one cause or another to send you telegrams or write you letters for or against those measures which are to have the privilege of your distinguished consideration. This, as you know, we have not done. We believe that if a measure has the support or opposition of our newspaper, the place for our sentiments is in the paper and not in private communication.

Currently, in common with some 99 percent of your constituents, we find ourselves deeply concerned over the tax measures which are soon to be the subject of debate in the House and Senate.

In an Associated Press dispatch received Friday we are informed that "Congressional cloakrooms buzzed today with discussion of possible compromises that would abate a part but not all of 1 year's income taxes in arriving at a pay-as-you-go basis." A California Representative announces that there will be "very substantial opposition among Republican Representatives to any plan which completely forgives the year's taxes."

Minority Leader MARTIN terms as a "monstrosity" the bill reported out by the Ways and Means Committee of the House which would make pay as you go optional for any taxpayer who elected to double up by paying off 2 years' taxes within 1 year.

In our observation we have found no single voter among your constituents opposed to a pay-as-you-go tax. The only question discussed it: How we are to get on that happy basis. No doubt you have already been pondering that problem yourselves, and we write this letter to suggest that statesmanship, and your own political considerations alike point the wisdom of finding the right answer.

WHENCE THE WORD "FORGIVE"?

There is one word used in all the reams of tax copy that come to us over the wires from Washington that we would like to warn you against. That is the word forgive. We have only the dictionary to help us when we try to get the meaning of your discussions on the floor of Congress; and when we turn to the word "forgive" in our Webster we find that it means to give up claim to requital.

As we understand it you are now working on the 1943 Federal tax laws. Until those laws are passed by Congress and signed by the President our Government hasn't any claim for requital from us in the year 1943. Until the 1943 tax law is passed our Government therefore can't "forgive" our taxes for that year.

So let us suggest first that if you will do your best to expunge the word "forgive" from the forthcoming debates you will be rendering a service to clear thinking on the floors of your respective houses not to mention the service to ourselves as your constituents who are not asking to be forgiven anything.

On this same subject, we will expect to go on paying at regular quarterly intervals the highest taxes we can pay till we have this war won and a sound peace established. As we see it, what you are about to debate is the name to be given to the label on what we pay. Shall the payment that we make next September 15 be labeled "1942 taxes" or "1943 taxes," or half and half? We'd all prefer to pay as we go, and inasmuch as this is true, why not put a current label on our payments? The money comes into the Government just the same.

It'll be argued that some of us may not make as much money in 1943 as we did in 1942 and the Government will lose a percentage of the difference if you labeled our remaining 1943 payments as current taxes. All right, fix your law so that our taxes will be based on 1942 income, if it is the higher.

IT'S ALL IN THE "LABEL"

No doubt a certain percentage of us will pass on to our just rewards in the last half of the year. As we do, we presume our widows and orphans would have to pay all the present 1942 tax and a percentage of 1943. If our tax payments are labeled "1943," they'd only have to dig into the insurance for a few months' taxes. The Government might lose a little on this for a year, but certainly not much.

We believe you know we don't suffer under the illusion that a newspaper is likely to know more about taxes than Secretary Morgenthau, or more about war than General Marshall. But it's quite possible that our contacts with your constituents are more

continuous, and possibly closer, than yours. We believe they feel about this tax debate just as we do. Of one thing we are absolutely confident. We are all of us fed up with the uncertainties and confusion that we're faced with when you gentlemen in Congress don't pass the tax law until 9 months of the year have passed. So please get busy and do the best you can to pass the tax law and let us know where we stand. And please do your best to persuade yourselves and your associates that whatever you call the tax payments that we make four times every year, you aren't forgiving us anything.

In Time of War, Prepare for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to include as my remarks, the splendid address delivered by Philip M. Klutznick, president of the supreme advisory council of the A. Z. A. Junior Order of the B'nai B'rith, at the memorial service for the A. Z. A. war dead, Hotel New Yorker, on February 21, 1943, entitled "In Time of War, Prepare for Peace." Mr. Klutznick is also the Administrator of the Homes Use Service, National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.

The address follows:

This is a solemn moment. Here in the metropolis of the world, symbolically darkened each night by the overhanging and awesome fear of destruction, we gather to pay tribute to the memories of our brothers whose earthly remains have been consumed by the ravages of war. We know, as we speak here, that each tick of the pendulum may yet add another name to the roster. We are not provincial, we know that our losses are but an infinitesimal portion of those suffered in this universal catastrophe. In singling out our own for memorial we record, as well, our innermost feelings for the countless thousands already occupying seats in the Olympus reserved for those who perish in this struggle.

We speak of our own because we knew them best—because we were tied to one another by a taut and unyielding bond of brotherhood. Few of these individuals were known to all of us personally—doubtless no one present ever saw the physical likeness of each of our brothers—but all of them were known to us spiritually. Did we not labor together for a better world? Did we not strive as one to achieve the idealism that we learned together? Did we not vow at the altar of the seven-armed candelabra graced by the eternal Mogen Dovid that we would love God and Country as well as to perform those acts which distinguish right from wrong even in the innermost recesses of the darkest and most ignoble corners of the world? Didn't we together pledge our sacred honor to preserve our countries—we, of the United States, others of Canada, with our lives, if need be? It was a pledge which has been kept to the everlasting glory of each person we remember today.

With all due reverence for the departed, we do not gather for the purpose of recalling the personal traits of each. These were boys—they had not yet achieved their just position in a peacetime society—they were but reaching for their places in the sun of normal affairs when the grim reaper, who works overtime in these chaotic days, cut them down. They were fine young men, sturdy and strong as the timeless oak—they were promising young men, whose futures were cushioned in the reservoirs of sound spiritual values. Yet, as our hearts ache at the memory of their sacrifices, and as tears well up in the recollection of the violence of their departures, at the base of our emotions is the thought of the one common denominator which took these brothers from us—war. In all candor, it is not so much the intrinsic value of each young man as the incident of his valorous participation in this ghastly blood bath that moves us to pause and pay hallowed tribute.

There are some people who war for the sake of war. There are those who have breached the peace of the world too many times in the century past. These are men without souls, who believe with Spengler, that war is essential to the full development of man—that no people can achieve true greatness except as they boil in the flaming cauldron of physical and mortal combat. These are the people who strut in their uniforms; these are the people who desecrate the holiness of mankind and eternity of the Almighty by claiming to be a master race. To such we do not pay tribute even though the incident of their passing may have been a thousand wars.

We honor our heroes today because they were raised in the tradition that hates war—abhors the concept that man must evolve from murder and destruction. These young men fought valiantly and died nobly, not for the sake of war, but for the sacred cause of humanity. I do not recall nor would time permit the recitation of the intimate circumstances surrounding the supreme sacrifice of each of our buddies. Geographically, their earthly remains are so scattered as even the forces of righteousness are scattered over the devastated battle fronts of this global conflict. From the sandy deserts of Libya, to the foxholes of Bataan, from the once-shattered defenses of Pearl Harbor, to the bombed but firm British isles. Really, it matters very little where their earthly remains rest. It matters much what they sought to achieve. From a knowledge of the young men we call ours, I form the firm belief that in their innermost consciences, to a greater or lesser degree they sought the same objectives as one of their number who is singled out as an example of the manner of men we honor.

He was a slight youngster from my home town. When I saw him last, nearly 2 years ago, he was full of the vitality of youth. His was a pungent and active existence. He loved people and he adored life. He was a medical aide forbidden by the Geneva convention to bear arms. Hymie Epstein was one of a small force sent out on the New Guinea front to carry rations to a unit which had been cut off in a forest. The mission had to creep from mudhole to mudhole between two converging lines of intense Jap fire. Nightfall compelled the unit to stop—it was impossible to see where to go. Then the Jap snipers and machine gunners went to work in earnest.

Hymie was lying at the side of the Major when a man ahead was hit. Both of them saw it. In the Major's words, "I would not order anyone to go out in that fire to get that man. I could not. It was just throwing one life after another." But, our Hymie, without orders crawled right through the mud to the side of the wounded man and applied the life saving remedies he carried with him. He got back! Again, during the darkness of the night he performed a similar feat without hesitation. When dawn began to brighten the skies over Buna a third man was hit. Our boy went forth again driven by a sense of duty. The Japs put on all that they had on that little bit of hallowed ground where a mere slip of a lad was trying to tie together a broken thread of life. This time he did not come back.

His Major has since said, "You never know who is going to be a good soldier, and who isn't. But when they are handing honors around, you can give mine to that little Hymie and that goes for all of us." It is reported that his comrades within his company, hard-bitten warriors living in water-filled mud holes and fighting off creeping fever as well as Jap sharpshooters, can only tighten their lips and look far away when they mention those who have gone and they hear recounted the feats of this little A. Z. A. boy. All they can say as they beat away the tears is, "He was one swell little guy, that Hymie."

These battlers of New Guinea did not stop to philosophize on Hymie's accomplishments. It is quite possible that the Major will have his way and the deeds of that "swell little guy" will be recognized posthumously by a piece of pretty metal and that there will be recorded in the archives of our tomorrows a special tribute to one of our boys, but even this will not adequately record what motivated Hymie and certainly inspired the other boys whom we reverently recall today.

I will never believe that the mere flesh and bone of a wounded man was the compelling force. Here was a boy born in a faith, which we seek to stimulate, to which one man's life was most important. I believe that his reflexes responded to that age-old concept that man is created in the image of God and that to destroy one man is to destroy the world. He and other heroes gave their lives to preserve that thought—to save humanity from the barbarous and medieval notion that an intangible thing called a state is greater than the images of the Almighty. They fought and they died to establish the dignity of man against the aggressor who would stultify the soul of man by making him the tool and plaything of other men. They fought those who would create Golden Calves—whether you call them that or Duce or Fuehrer—to supplant Him, who from the lightning-lit mount, delivered a code that forcefully negates slavery and goose-stepping by whatever name you may call it.

So we honor our heroes. They gave everything they had to save the right, the precious right of humans to live with dignity and without fear. Can we stop by merely uttering words of praise? Have they, by their passing already selflessly achieved for us who live that rich right or have they merely qualified us for the finals, as it were, when the real battle will be won or lost? If we stop here we desecrate their memories. If we will pay real tribute let us think and act clearly in the immediate days ahead. This war is not yet won. It will be, although the date may be sooner or later. By the combined might on the battlefronts and in the less glorious, but equally vital, production line the United Nations have and are forging the weapons of destruction that today and tomorrow will prove invincible.

Before me are men who have already distinguished themselves in a record of home-front activity which is the marvel of seasoned veterans. Before me are men who before long will leave their civilian days to do battle, all of whom I know will serve with distinction and all of whom I pray God shall return to us safe and sound. Our determination to see this physical struggle through to a victorious end knows no limitation and will brook no bounds.

Is that the whole answer? Emphatically no. It is unfortunate, but true, that the disagreeable conflict attending the question of preparation which led up to the war is repeating itself in a far-reaching and equally important conflict as to whether or not we shall prepare for the peace. The shocking

demonstrations of some of our self-styled leaders of national thought shelving all concern for the world after the war under the smoke screen of "Let's win the war first" is equaled only by the abominable ignorance which sought to stymie our great President and Commander in Chief in his determination to prepare our Nation for an inevitable war. If the loss of our boys is not to be a mockery, if the countless thousands of lives which will be offered in the days ahead to destroy every vestige of aggression is not to be a prelude to World War No. 3, then our memories must be sharpened to avoid a debacle in the days after the war which could well be humanity's count of 10. Remember, my friends, that it was on September 3, 1939, that the President of the United States declared the existence of a state of limited national emergency. Weighted down by isolationism, slowed by the softness of "it can't happen here" philosophizers, when war finally came on December 7, 1941, we suffered a national humiliation at Pearl Harbor. For months we inched our participation into this life-and-death struggle, ever on the defensive, never quite summoning the tremendous strength that was needed to offset the vicious power of a foe prepared for total war. I shudder to think of what might have been our fate had our great leader lacked the foresight or the courage to start us on a slow and laborious road to rearmament more than 2 years before the nightmare of that Hawaiian Sunday.

Now we are a Nation of warriors. Yesterday we built automobiles, refrigerators, toys, and radios. Today we make planes, guns, ships, and tanks Yesterday, we thought only of peace. Except for the grace of clear visioned leadership, today there are those who basked in that illusive peace who would reject that we should think of peace now. I have seen with my own eyes the conversion of great parts of our industrial machine from peace to war I have lived with the problem, as have you, of converting the national mind from its comfort to a realization of its danger unwittingly aided and abetted by the Jap himself in a sneaky and atrocious and unprovoked attack. I say confidently that the miraculous metamorphosis which in little more than a year finds us on the offensive in virtually every theater of war was but a simple transformation when compared to the stupendous tasks that lie ahead of us when the bombs have ceased their singing descents and when cannons no longer roar over most of the world's geography. When we view realistically the problems of economic and social reconstruction, the tasks of reclaiming bodies and souls, the reestablishment of peace and order, the conflicting claim and historic hatreds—all of which must find imaginative and creative thinking and action for solution I submit that we invite a disaster at the cessation of hostilities that will reduce Pearl Harbor to an insignificant incident—unless we undertake now to create some order out of our chaotic thinking as to the world of tomorrow. This we owe to ourselves no less than we owe to those whom we honor today.

Maybe the thoughts of some of our leaders are not acceptable—maybe their idealism is too far in advance of the parade—maybe we can only prepare for the century of the common man, not live in it—maybe we can secure only a pittance of milk for each infant and not a quart or a pint, but whatever it be, this is the time to think about it and to start creating it.

The vast and disturbing problems that affect our people, who have been shattered and scattered, declassed and denationalized in so much of the world, will never be solved by the dangerous postponement of frank decisions of what the Jew should justly expect and secure from the next peace table. We must acknowledge with gratification the leadership of the president of the B'nai B'rith in the avoidance of such a catastrophe.

And let this be said now. You and I, the young men of today, who may live to garner some of the fruits of tomorrow's peace, will never be content with a cold, materialistic and antisocial world in which youth's energy is wasted in the preparation for careers which never materialize—in which depressions come like clockwork to relegate young people into the depths of despair and in which world diplomacy is a game of checkers to see who can get to the king row of war first and best equipped. We recognize with some of our eminent economists that tomorrow will rise on an America and a world hungry for things, for autos, for refrigerators, tires, radios, and plenty of clothes; but, we demand of world leadership and of our own leaders that they keep alive the sparks of a hunger for the needs of the spirit—a hunger for faith, dignity, and a sense of sound human values.

There are those who say that we should not divide our energies at this time—that everything and everyone should concentrate their all on the winning of the war. That's fine—that we must do and that we shall do. But champions are made from the stuff that has an extra ounce of energy, that catches a second breath, and to whom an extra job if it must be done is taken in stride. America and its Allies are champions—shall we say less of them as nations than we do of the people who make them nations? This is a job that must and can be done as we go about winning the war—this is as important to the preservation of freedom as the mighty weapons that flow off our production lines or the bronzed, well-equipped army that enters the field of battle. Let those who scoff or who declare it impossible remember the brain and the brawn, the strength and the courage that built America and reckon with the fact that they are still here.

Yes; this is a solemn moment. In word and by demeanor we have expressed our respect for the memory of our brothers. To do less would be to tarnish the sacred memories of our fighting men, our boys, who rest and will rest on the far-flung battle fronts of the world, and those whose bodies will never rise from the blood-soaked pits of our bottomless oceans. To seal our bond with them and to keep our rendezvous with tomorrow we pledge on our sacred honor that their sacrifices will not have been in vain. We say to them as they look down upon us this afternoon—we shall go on and win the war—yes, we shall and will win the peace—we shall and will strive for a tomorrow in which mothers and fathers will not be torn from their children by the beastly deprivations of war, in which man may walk across this globe with dignity and with honor, in which Jews and kindred minorities will not be the scapegoat of some fool's fancy and in which youth, vibrant and idealistic, will find itself and help the world find itself.

Amen.

Restrictions on Sale of Dry Cell Batteries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Iowa:

House Concurrent Resolution 25

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to lift the priorities and restrictions on dry-cell batteries

Whereas telephones and radios in rural and farm communities are of great convenience and of practical necessity in securing information relative to farm work, livestock marketing, and community affairs necessary in the war effort and conserving rubber; and

Whereas the restrictions and priorities placed on these commodities by the Federal Government have resulted in great inconveniences to farmers and residents of rural communities, thereby retarding the war effort: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa (the senate concurring), That we respectfully urge and memorialize Congress to lift the priorities and restrictions on batteries used for rural telephones, radios, and electric fences, to the end that a sufficient supply of such commodities may be made available to rural communities.

That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the War Production Board, and to the Iowa Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind but that if we pass the Ruml plan we are placing on our people the greatest fraud of all time. I remember the first time I heard of the Ruml plan it was called the skip-a-year plan. Then a little while later it was changed to the forgiveness plan. Then still later it was labeled the "abatement plan." Then it was labeled the "put-the-clock-a-year-ahead plan." All of these names were not catchy enough and did not attract very many supporters. Most recently the Ruml plan has been referred to as the pay-as-you-go plan.

Immediately this struck public fancy. Some of our people had already heard that the Ruml plan contained 1 year of forgiveness of taxes. So these people caught onto the idea of "pay as you go" and started a million-dollar publicity campaign to put the Ruml plan into operation.

Stripped of all these artificialities, the Ruml plan is nothing but a joker and a scheme. The Ruml plan is nothing but a method of forgiving $10,000,000,000 now due the Government by the taxpayers. If the Ruml plan is put into operation, by the mere passage of that bill, we will have created thousands of new war millionaires. The Ruml plan is nothing but an underhanded scheme, coated with a little sugar, to give the war profiteers,

whose income last year was the highest in history, forgiveness of 1 year's taxes.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I cannot see why anyone should be thinking of forgiveness of taxes at this time. Our Federal Government needs money today like it never needed it before. Our national debt is mounting by leaps and bounds. With this condition staring us in the face, how can anyone conscientiously ask that 1 year's taxes be forgiven? If we pass this Ruml plan and forgive 1 year's taxes we shall commit a wrong that this Congress will never be able to live down.

Now here is another angle that we must consider. If we forgive $10,000,000,000 in taxes now due the Government it means that we will have to make up this $10,000,000,000 some place else. Where can we get this $10,000,000,000 that we will lose by forgiveness? There is only one place we can get it, and that is from the lower incomes. This Ruml plan, ladies and gentlemen of the House, is nothing but a scheme to shift the tax burden from the war profiteers to the lower income groups. Pass the Ruml plan and we will have to more than double the income tax on the lower income groups to make up for it. Pass the Ruml plan and you will have a sales tax before this session is over, just as sure as I am speaking here today. Make no bones about this, the active supporters of the Ruml plan have already in their minds a sales tax—a sales-tax plan to introduce to this Congress. Who then is going to make up the $10,000,000,000 in taxes lost under the Ruml plan? The poor people will make it up with higher income taxes and with a vicious sales tax.

Very shortly you and I are going to see the launching of another bond drive to raise $13,000,000,000 from our people. You know and I know of men and women who go begging, who go ringing doorbells, who pound our street pavements soliciting people to buy a measly $18.75 bond. You know and I know of school children who are giving up their candy money and their lunch money with which to buy a dime stamp. These conditions actually exist where patriotism prevails. Under such conditions, ladies and gentlemen, I cannot understand how any of us could face these people and look them in the eye if we pass this Ruml plan and forgive $10,000,000,000 in taxes. If we pass the Ruml plan we are virtually telling these people who are begging us to buy bonds that they are foolish to work their heads off because our Federal Government has got so much money that we forgave $10,000,000,000 in taxes. No, ladies and gentlemen, let us keep our feet on the ground. Let us not be misled by these jokers and these schemes that are every day coming before this House to give the war profiteers a break. Let us examine all of these schemes for what they really are. The Ruml plan is nothing but a slick vicious scheme to create blood millionaires and to pass the tax load on to the poor. The Ruml plan is nothing but an introduction to a sales-tax plan that is already in the offing in this Congress. It behooves each and every Member of this House to see that the Ruml plan is so badly defeated that none would dare think of it again.

Wartime Baseball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SPOKANE, WASH., *March 26, 1943.*

MR. WALT HORAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our club recently took a public poll on wartime baseball. We wanted to find out how the servicemen felt about it too. We have already received close to 140,000 votes. The short wave helped us collect votes from our armed forces in all parts of the globe. The response was large and the results a surprise to us.

Ninety-nine percent of the Navy votes of about 38,000 favor it. Over 90,000 men in the Army favor it. The whole poll shows better than 90 percent favoring a continuance of our American sport. Votes are still coming in from overseas.

Fifty individual War-bond prize-winning letters will be announced by April 15.

We trust you will recognize our effort in the public interest, all from your district. Besides the incidential costs we are passing out $2,200 in War-bond prizes.

We are expressing no collective opinion ourselves.

ATHLETIC ROUND TABLE,
JOSEPH A. ALBI, *President.*

Pay-As-You-Go Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Johnstown Tribune, Johnstown, Pa.

A vast majority of our people want a pay-as-you-go tax plan. Their reasoning is based upon a real and genuine American philosophy that everyone is to pay his or her just share of taxes, which is within the means of all taxpayers, to be assessed equitably and without class distinction.

The Ruml plan or one similar to it appeals to me as a reasonable solution to our income-tax problem. Its principles are based on an equally essential method of collection at the source. It is a guaranty that all should be treated alike. The load of taxes would be distributed equitably. The average taxpayer will know his tax liability now, rather than to wait several months or a year hence. By its adoption there will be less uncertainty and confusion in the minds of honest and sincere people who want to fulfill their duty to the Government. The recent sale of Government bonds by some taxpayers to meet their tax obligations is further evidence in support of a pay-as-you-go plan.

The editorial follows:

COLLECT FROM PAY ENVELOPES

As Congress continues to wrestle with the tax question, it seems certain that the pay-as-you-go plan, in one form or another, will emerge from the discussion. The Ruml plan is favored by many of the National Legislators, as it is by a majority of the American people, but it may be necessary to make some concession to the so-called experts of the Treasury Department to secure the enactment of a bill embodying the pay-as-you-go or pay-as-you-earn feature.

This concession may be in any one of a variety of forms. For example, it may deny cancelation of 1942 taxes on very heavy incomes while allowing it on smaller incomes, although that would be clearly discriminatory. Or it may allow cancelation of 50 to 75 percent of the taxes on 1942 incomes.

The Tribune has favored the Ruml plan for the reason that so many wage earners, particularly those in the lower-income bracket who have no reserves to fall back on, are experiencing great difficulty in meeting their obligations to the Federal Treasury. Most of them are paying income taxes for the first time and had insufficient notice of the lowering of exemption schedules. Consequently they lacked opportunity to set aside funds for the purpose. To meet the contingency they have been selling their War bonds and imposing an unexpected burden upon the Treasury.

There is the ease of collecting from pay envelopes as a further inducement to adopt the Ruml plan or some reasonable substitute, with rates so fixed as to aid the fight against inflation. We appreciate the difficulties of the task before Congress, but it is a job that must be done if the financial equilibrium of the Nation is to be maintained.

Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK FELLOWS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I do not feel I can make any great contribution to this discussion of taxes, but there are a few things, it may be, that will stand—if they do not require—emphasis. This is not a party question. I am not charging that members of any group are playing politics, because I do not think they are. This question affects vitally the present and future of our country as a whole.

The House has before it a bill reported out by the Ways and Means Committee.

The debate revolves around the question of so-called pay-as-you-earn income taxes. After reading the committee hearings and the reports there is but one conclusion one can reach, and that is that the purpose of the hearings of the committee was to see if some basis of pay-as-you-earn taxation could not be arrived at. The title page of the book which I have before me says this:

Hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means—a proposal to place income tax on individuals on a pay-as-you-go basis.

The distinguished chairman of this committee, on page 1, said this:

We are opening hearings today on the proposal to place the income tax of individuals on the pay-as-you-go basis. Therefore, we shall consider all possible methods to accomplish this purpose.

Hon. Randolph E. Paul, general counsel for the Treasury Department, submitted a very carefully prepared statement in which he said, under the title "Conclusion":

In this discussion of current income-tax collection, or pay as you go. I have endeavored to indicate the principal problems in designing a satisfactory system.

Mr. Paul also stated the problem of putting income taxes on pay-as-you-go basis was emphasized by President Roosevelt in his recent Budget Message in his request for an additional $16,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944. Our President can see the necessity for such a plan—and the people want it.

I do not understand that anybody disagrees with the fundamental proposition that there is vital need for a change in our system of collecting income taxes.

The objection seems to be that some people are allergic to the name "Ruml." It is said that the Ruml-Carlson plan has defects in it. So has every tax bill that ever was passed by any legislative body anywhere, any time. This is true of our present income-tax law.

The first and important thing is that we are here for the purpose of arriving at some plan that will collect the taxes the year the income is received and as it is received. How is this to be accomplished?

I take Mr. Paul's analysis, found in the volume entitled "Hearings Before Committee on Ways and Means," page 9 to 24, inclusive. He gives three methods of achieving transition, and they appear on page 17:

One method of achieving transition that has been widely discussed is to forgive a year's liability. * * * A second method of achieving transition is to require individuals to pay their 1942 taxes at the same time they are paying their 1943 taxes. * * * And, third, to postpone or defer the payment of part of the 1942 liabilities.

Let me speak of the third method first—a method proposed by him to permit postponement under a plan to amortize the payments over a period longer than a year. This method has received little attention. I assume, therefore, it is not acceptable.

This leaves two methods suggested by him.

One is to forgive part or all of a year's tax liability.

The other is to require individuals to continue to pay their 1942 taxes as at present and at the same time begin current collection of 1943 taxes. This second method calls for payment of two years' in one. It is obvious this cannot be done by the rank and file of the American income-tax payers.

This leaves only the first method offered by Mr. Paul—a method that is described as forgiveness of a year's tax.

So I stand here before the House, with Mr. Paul's analysis before me, with only one method to vote for, namely, the proposed Ruml-Carlson bill.

To whom would I go for advice if not to the general counsel of the Treasury Department?

The committee bill answers no one of Mr. Paul's suggestions. The committee bill gives a few favored ones—favored in finances—the option to go on a pay-as-you-go basis and take advantage of a substantial discount system through the years. This obviously does not answer the demand for a pay-as-you-earn system. It is neither one thing nor the other.

The demand for a pay-as-you-earn system of collecting taxes arises because it is recognized even by the Treasury experts that if you are to collect taxes from a large majority of our earners in this country these taxes must be collected promptly, before wages and salaries have been expended. If this is the reason for the demand for such a system, and, as I have indicated above, the demand seems to be universal, it is our plain duty to support some plan which will accomplish this purpose.

To listen to the debate one might get the impression that the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Henry Morgenthau, was paying out of his own pocket the expenses of this war.

The Secretary of the Treasury is our bookkeeper.

Mr. Paul uses this expression:

The Government in forgiving a year's tax liabilities would be discarding assets as a business would that canceled its accounts receivable from customers.

Forgive whom?

What is the Government?

Is it not the servant of the people?

The people are paying for this war with blood and treasure.

I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 25, the words of Mr. DOUGHTON, the distinguished chairman of the committee:

Let us not forgive the taxpayer who is able now to pay the tax—

And so forth. Who is "us"?

Instead of talking about forgiving the people, we should ask the people to forgive us our trespasses.

This is a people's war, and they are going to pay for it whether it takes 2 years or 200. These people are asking and demanding that our bookkeeper in the Treasury Department keep his books in a manner suggested and demanded by his employer—the people.

To hear Members debate this question and to read the RECORD is to hear of a government that is willing to "forgive" the people something or anything. We have been brought up to believe that the Government is the servant of the people, and not the master.

The people of this country demand a pay-as-you-earn system of collecting income taxes and we, their Representatives, have a duty and privilege to vote for such a plan. The committee measure is no improvement over our present system. The proposed Ruml-Carlson bill is essentially sound and equitable, and accomplishes the desired change, and I shall support the latter until something better has been evolved.

One Solution to Absenteeism in Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following report prepared by J. W. Youtz, personnel director, and N. W. Couch, supervisor of employee relations, of the Waterbury Tool Co., a division of Vickers, Inc. This company employs more than 3,000 employees, and is doing 100 percent work for the Navy.

It is my hope that all the Members of Congress will read this report, because it is the belief of this company that by individual instruction, and not by legislation, can absenteeism be solved as a problem of industry. The report follows:

The most pressing problem facing American war industries today is absenteeism. It is not necessary to quote the amazing statistics proving the appalling loss of productive time due to inexcusable absences. They have been given the widest possible publicity in all types of publications. The space which the press is devoting to the subject is indicative of the trend of public opinion. The attention of Congress is being directed toward corrective legislation.

It is our opinion that you cannot legislate successfully against absenteeism. Even if it were possible to assure the presence of the worker by this method, it would not necessarily mean that he would produce to his full capabilities. After all, our objective is to attain maximum production, and the worker who has been induced to appear at the plant through fear of some legal penalty might better remain at home. Many companies have instituted practices designed to attract employees to work. These have generally followed the pattern of (1) offering money in the form of cash or bonds as an incentive for workers not to lose time, and (2) attempts to discredit workers who have lost time by publicly listing their names, paying them in sample German currency, or other similar methods. The objection to the first plan is that war workers today are earning such high wages that the possibility of receiving extra compensation is no incentive for them to appear for work on a day they feel they can afford to take off.

The second plan is not only ineffective but may be dangerous. In attempting to cure one bad situation, they are contributing to another that could develop into a problem as serious as absenteeism and even more difficult to control, namely, criticism of an employee by his fellow worker (which may sometimes be unjustified) and a general lack

of harmonious relations among all the employees.

Parents are told in bringing up their children not to reward them with money or candy for doing things they should do and not to ridicule them in public for things they do wrong. The worker who has received a prize for being on the job will be as difficult to handle as a child rewarded with candy. The worker who has been publicly condemned for being absent will sulk as much as a ridiculed child.

Practically all of the vast amount of publicity given this subject up to the present time has dealt with the contributing factors, and very little, if any, to a constructive approach to the cure. Industry itself has had very little voice in the matter either from the angle of cause or cure. Many are doing a great deal of wishful thinking while others are waiting for Federal legislation to be passed. A few are making a thorough study in hopes of finding the real answer.

In October 1942, when our absentee problem began to be serious, we set out to develop a technique that would enable us to reduce our inexcusable lost time to a minimum. After 4 months we are able to report definite progress toward this goal. It should be pointed out that in our company we have two factors that ordinarily contribute to a high percentage of absenteeism—a 60-hour workweek and a swing shift in which every employee works 5 out of 6 Sundays. In addition, 20 percent of our employees are women, and we operate 24 hours per day 7 days per week. In the last 14 months we have experienced an increase of over 200 percent in our working force.

We decided in the beginning that in dealing with such a complex problem there was no panacea that would assist us with the solution. We discarded early all thoughts of rewards for attendance. We realized that this was entirely an individual problem; therefore our approach has always been to the individual.

We decided that the most important single factor in decreasing absenteeism was a proper induction program for new employees. We realized that many persons being hired by us today are not accustomed to factory work and do not realize the seriousness of being absent. Many of them came from civilian occupations that permitted them to do today's work tomorrow if they felt so inclined. Some of our new employees were persons who had been released from previous employers because of irregular attendance.

Our induction program consists of acquainting the new employees with the company's policies, its products, and the part they play in the war effort. Most of all, we stress the vital part the new employees play in their jobs. This is done by reviewing an attractive employee's manual, after which a representative of the personnel department talks with them very seriously about absenteeism. They are told of how absenteeism is handled at the company, what records are kept, and the action taken in the case of frequent violations. We point out the result of the "they won't miss me 1 day" attitude when multiplied by 50 or 100 workers. The cumulative effect of lost time is explained by telling them how a delay in shipping, a seemingly unimportant part, can hold up deliveries all along the line and finally be the deciding factor in an important engagement. We emphasize the necessity of not only winning the war but of hastening the time of final victory by even a day or an hour. This provides a great opportunity for a personal appeal to the individual's patriotism.

After this, the new employee is then taken and introduced to his supervisor by the person conducting the induction program. This procedure takes about 45 minutes and the importance of the personal contact cannot be emphasized too strongly. Daily contact with the new employee is maintained for the first few days to insure the fact that he has not been miscast. Sometimes services of the Personnel Department which seem very small and unimportant have a direct bearing upon reducing absenteeism. For example, employees out sick are sent a get-well card followed by flowers, cigarettes, or fruit. The purpose of this is to let the employee know that the management has noted his absence and is interested in his welfare. The response to this policy has been one of great appreciation. Telephone calls, and home visits by company nurses are not infrequent in questionable cases.

Figures compiled from our attendance records are conclusive proof that the program as outlined will materially reduce absenteeism among this group of employees. The following figures for the past 3 months show the percentage of lost time of employees hired since starting our induction program, as compared with our entire plant personnel:

December:	
All employees	5.4
New employees	3.3
January:	
All employees	4.9
New employees	3.0
February:	
All employees	5.1
New employees	3.8

We have not attempted in this article to outline a complete plan for the control of absenteeism. We have dealt specifically with employees entering our service during the past few months, realizing that as time goes on employees properly inducted will represent a steadily higher percentage of our total personnel. The results of our study indicate that our total absenteeism will decrease accordingly.

We believe that absenteeism is the responsibility of industry alone. Good working conditions coupled with proper handling of new employees will pay dividends in increased production hours.

The Ruml Plan

REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to make a few observations upon the so-called revenue bill, which I did not have the opportunity of doing while the bill and the Ruml plan were being discussed.

Mr. Speaker, many of us recall the 1892–93 panic and most of us remember going through the money and bankers' panic of 1907, followed by the hoarders and speculators' commodity crash of 1920 and 1921, and, surely, no one can forget the devastating crash of 1929 brought about by the bankers and stock manipulators. Notwithstanding that millions upon millions lost their all, the bankers did not have the audacity to ask that they be forgiven the 1929 income tax. Consequently, it is amazing to me that in view of the fact that 1942 was the most prosperous year in the history of our country, everyone making more money than ever before, that those who have gained and profited the most instead of sacrificing a little should now advocate that they be forgiven the taxes of 1942. This is a time when the country needs revenue more than ever before to supply our armed forces with war needs to expedite the prosecution of the war to an early and successful conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that if anyone is to be forgiven the payment of taxes, it should be the twenty million or more men and women whose salaries have not been increased and who are still working for $20 and $25 weekly, or $125 or $150 a month and who are finding it extremely difficult to live on their pay, due to the increased cost of living, instead of the few thousand who have and are continuing to make millions. It is my sincere belief that we should act in relieving from taxation that group of wage and salary workers whose net income is not over $2,500 annually.

I appreciate that the Committee on Ways and Means had a tremendously hard and unpleasant task before them, particularly in their effort to extend some relief, and included a provision in the bill allowing a discount of 6 percent should the full amount of the tax be paid in advance. I realize that is the usual practice in commercial dealings and is taken advantage of, but I know how the small fellow who has not the cash cannot obtain the benefit of this privilege. We have granted exemption up to $3,500 to those serving in our armed forces and I feel that we can justly and properly allow an abatement to the extent of 50 percent of the 1942 tax to relieve all taxpayers up to $2,500 of their income.

I wonder how the Republicans and the handful of misled Democrats will be able to explain to the people at home their vote in favor of the banker's Ruml plan. I presume that the Republicans will justify their vote on the theory that Willkie, former candidate of the Republican Party for President advocated it. I was not surprised that he did so as I have always been satisfied that he was the mouthpiece of Wall Street and the special interests.

I regret that we could not obtain the opportunity of votes on the several proposed amendments and on the compromise Forand bill, to which I was ready to offer an amendment to reduce the abatement, as I have already stated, up to and including $2,500 of all taxpayers' income.

I feel that the Ways and Means Committee's bill, had the committee agreed to such an amendment for such small forgiveness, would have passed, but in view of the fact that the bill has been referred back to the committee, I hope that the majority of the committee who desire to relieve the situation will on reconsideration agree to the proposal which I have advocated and I firmly believe that with such a provision included in the bill it will pass the House.

Government by Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1943

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, today I am talking to America—not to any foreign nation or foreign element. America, watch your step! There are some things going on here in Washington that are not healthy for democracy. We are just beginning to realize that as a people we have been sleeping at the switch. We have allowed our form of government to slip away from us. We asked our Uncle Sam for donations, relief, and aid for all kinds of projects. These he has given us, but the price he exacted—government by bureaucracy—has come too high. In our desire to get something for nothing we forgot that the "price of liberty is eternal vigilance."

Now we realize that there are men in key positions here in Washington that are stifling the Nation's war activities. These have arrogantly made themselves the bottlenecks through which the Nation's energy must flow. They have substituted their own egotistical ignorance for law. In recent years they not only dictated, but actually wrote some of the laws that Congress passed. An aggressive Executive demanded this, an unalert public opinion approved it, a spineless Congress submitted to it.

But now Members of Congress of all parties are aware of this. They have awakened to the danger. They sense something that is un-American, that is foreign. There is a suspicion that bureaucracy has interfered with the conduct of the war. This could not be otherwise. There have been too many blunders, too much waste of public funds, too much favoritism, too many secret sessions, too much the-public-be-damned attitude.

Congress now realizes its responsibility to the Nation. It knows that for the conduct of this war it should create a board of strategy consisting of real generals and admirals. War is the business of admirals and generals—not of bureaucrats. There is danger ahead. We must become more united, more determined, and more serious about this war, and still more determined that there shall be a just and lasting peace. This must be the last time that American youth will be called upon to give their lives on foreign battlefields.

Bureaucracy must not be permitted to juggle and fumble the peace. No nation must be allowed to grab everything in sight at the expense of the smaller nations. Secret diplomacy must cease. In a democracy the best way to settle all public questions is to throw open the blinds and let in the white light of publicity. America is furnishing the material, the finances, and the men with which to win this war. But for us it would have been lost long ago. America must demand a just peace and an end to all aggression.

There has been altogether too much censorship for the good of the Nation. The American people can take it. They can be trusted with the truth. We are at war. This war does not belong to a little clique. It belongs to all of us. It is not a social event for the international 400. It is a war in which our sons are doing the fighting and dying, so that, the form of government established by Washington, Jefferson, and Madison, and preserved by Abraham Lincoln, may survive.

Mr. Jeffers says that there are too many loafers and expediters. He might have added that this administration is top heavy with book-educated specialists from Harvard, Cornell, and Columbia. It is overloaded with book knowledge—but woefully lacking in experience and common horse sense. Unfortunately these specialists occupy positions that require actual experience and real knowledge—not merely empty thinking and incoherent planning.

These bureaucrats do not assist the prosecution of the war—they hamper it. They lay awake nights, figuring out new rules and regulations, with which to harass, hinder, and delay the farmer, the laborer, and the businessman. For example, from January 3 to February 12 the Federal Register, which contains the bureaucratic-made laws, consisted of 1,870 pages, while the proceedings of the DAILY CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which contain speeches made in Congress, for the same period, contained only 935 pages—just one-half. How long can we function under such confusion, contradiction, and conglomeration of Executive and administrative orders?

Some of these specialists are even of foreign origin. One of these brought with him the point system of food rationing. He was kept, and still is kept, under cover in the O. P. A. May I ask, have we not enough intelligence to set up our own system and would we not do a better job? Is this, too, a part of the good-neighbor policy?

The achievement of these bureaucrats consists largely of bluff, bluster, blunder, and deception. They constantly threaten to get tough and crack down on the people. Laughable if it were not so tragic. In order to carry out their scheme of regimentation, they have loaded upon the taxpayer's back 2,000,000 too many Federal pay rollers. Among them some draft dodgers, the rest are honest men and women who want to, could be, and should be utilized in doing useful work—in creating wealth in place of consuming it—but who now render no useful service. These, in fact, are a detriment to themselves and to the Nation.

If these were allowed to go back to the farms, to industrial plants, or into the Army, rather, than to be permitted to continue to hound the civilian population—then there would be plenty of manpower. But, as it is, they hamper, harrass, and hamstring with red tape those who do the Nation's work. It takes about one-third of our time to comply with their rules and regulations, to undo the mischief that they cause.

These book-educated specialists have all but wrecked agriculture, small business, and enterprise. They have endangered the Nation's food supply. For example, I am informed that one of these of foreign origin, a New Yorker, in the W. P. B. department conceived the foolish idea that six-tenths of 1 percent of the steel manufactured in this country was enough for all the farm-implement manufacturers. Mr. Nelson, head of the W. P. B., apparently accepted the theory of this specialist in the face of the protest of the manufacturers of farm implements. This without consulting the farm leaders or the farmers of the Nation.

I have written to and received replies from some 50 farm-implement manufacturers. I asked them whether, if they were given sufficient steel and material now, they could supply the agricultural needs for the year 1943. With one or two exceptions, the answer is "no." I asked them whether farm machinery was still frozen. With one or two exceptions, those who answered that question answered "yes." A manufacturer of peanut weeders wrote that he was not allowed to sell a single peanut weeder to a dealer without clearance through the bottleneck, the Department of Agriculture. Practically everyone of these farm-implement manufacturers complain bitterly of the treatment they have received at the hands of the bureaucracy here in Washington. I shall here give excerpts from three of these letters. Time does not permit me to give more. Here is one dated March 11:

> You wrote us on February 25, in reference to the crisis caused by the shortage of farm help and farm implements. A good deal of this shortage could have been avoided if the Department of Agriculture had issued the quotas to the manufacturers in time to get farm implements out for spring use.
>
> Many times it requires 2 to 3 months to get the steel and, sometimes another month or so to process this steel and the assembly of the implements takes another 2 months, then the distribution takes from 3 to 6 weeks. All of this means that we should have our manufacturing quotas for 1944 not later than April of this year. * * * All of which means that we will be in exactly the same fix next year and thousands of farm machines will not be manufactured in time for 1944 requirements. To us this seems about the silliest program one could devise.

Here is one dated March 13:

> Mr. LEMKE, if your group will reach an agreement with Mr. Nelson or Mr. Wilson of the War Production Board where they will turn over to us two official material expediters and will give us one red-tape cutter, we will show you the most magnificent job of producing equipment you ever saw in the history of this country.
>
> As to your second question of how much farm machinery is frozen, the main farm machinery that is frozen is where the administrative orders of rationing have not funneled through the Department of Agriculture due to the magnitude of the job and trying to handle it in Washington rather than through the State boards. * * *
>
> We attach two wires we sent to Mr. Claude Wickard and Mr. Donald Nelson some time

ago. We have done everything but pray with them to let us use our specialized machinery, and the facilities of more than 100 small manufacturers who can do no regular war work, and let us turn loose and save the American farmer and this food crisis.

To date we have been hammering on a blank wall, and if your committee can get us loose, we think you will be proud of the results.

Here is another one dated March 10:

In reply to your first question, as far as our company is concerned, the answer is "No." * * * If we were immediately granted permission by the War Production Board to purchase the necessary materials for a quantity of spraying machines and dusters, it would be approximately January 1944 before these completed machines would be available. * * *

It is absolutely true that a great deal of farm machinery is still frozen in the hands of the manufacturers and a great loss in the 1943 production of food will result. Dusters are still frozen and there is absolutely no reason why they should be. * * * We have orders for many of these dusters from fruit and vegetable growers in the 11 Western States. Fruit and vegetable crops are going to ruin because the War Production Board has not released these machines from the freeze order and has not given us a distribution plan.

The writer suggests that you ask a third question. This question should be, How much loss of food production will there be because of the impractical rationing system of farm machinery? Our answer to this question would be that this loss is tremendous.

These book-educated specialists now talk of training city school boys and girls to operate the farms. Is this the first step to their pet scheme of collective farming? Will the farmers' sons when they return from the war find their places taken by pretty maidens? It sounds like a fairy tale—like Alice in Wonderland. The whole thing is absurd, but, it is also dangerous.

Government by bureaucracy must be abolished. This is not so easily done. It did not spring up overnight. It gradually fastened itself upon us. It is deep-rooted. The older it gets the more malignant it gets and the more malicious it becomes. Let no one doubt but that it is powerful—it is a dangerous disease. It is an entrenched enemy in a democracy. It is a cancer that will have to be cut out by a skillful surgeon. Congress must act. The time for investigating is passed. Too long has Congress submitted.

In the past Congress accepted the bureaucrat's philosophy of "the abundant life by scarcity." It accepted the plowing under of crops and the slaughter and destruction of thousands and millions of hogs, sheep, and cattle. It went with the bureaucracy all the way from curtailment and destruction of agricultural wealth to the advice of how to eat horse meat and muskrats, but, its patience is now exhausted. We are not going to permit bureaucracy to endanger the Nation's food supply.

We all agree with the President that we are going to win this war. We will never submit to any foreign nation or combination of nations. The only question is how to win quickly. I speak for all of the fathers and mothers, whose sons are in the armed forces, as well as for myself, when I say we will make any and all sacrifices to win at the earliest possible moment. Our sons are in the formative period of life. The sooner we win the sooner they will be able to go on with their life's work.

However, dumb submission to dictatorial, to bureaucratic power, will not win—but may prolong—the war. Blind appropriation of billions, unless honestly and intelligently spent, will not win the war, but prolong it. We cannot win by wrecking the industrial life of our Nation first. The people back home must travel just as fast, and be just as alert, as our armed forces. This is not a Democratic, a Republican, or a bureaucratic war. It is we, the people's, war. We are going to win on both, the home and the foreign front.

Congress, in the past, was censurable for permitting all the able-bodied men to be taken from our farms. This could have been stopped by exempting sufficient farm help from the draft. Congress should have safeguarded agriculture. Because of this stupidity valuable crops have been lost—crops needed to win the war.

Because of this neglect, hundreds and thousands of farm auction sales are taking place in this Nation. To take all the farm boys is just as foolish as to take all the skilled labor out of war-production plants.

Congress, in the past, was censurable, because it permitted the destruction of small business. Everywhere small businessmen are forced to close their doors. It is the same story in every city, town, and village. Is it possible that the bureaucrats in Washington have planned it that way? Is it their aim to regiment the small businessman and the farmer? Why does Congress sit idly by and permit a few bureaucrats to wreck the industrial life of this Nation?

In the name of the American people, in the name of democracy, we demand that you bureaucrats stop bottlenecking the Nation's food production. We demand that you stop wasting our time by silly edicts, orders, directives, rationing, and priorities. We insist that you stop insulting our intelligence. The time has arrived that you either make good or quit hampering the Nation's activities—the Nation's energy. You are responsible for this situation. Your mistakes may have been honest, but, that is no excuse when the Nation's life is at stake. That is our ultimatum to you from we, the people.

Carlson Pay-As-You-Earn Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee seems to be satisfied with the defeat of the Carlson pay-as-you-earn tax plan. I gather from the press that Chairman DOUGHTON is abundantly satisfied with the defeat of the bill, although the American taxpayers are bitterly disappointed. I quote from the Times-Herald of March 31, 1943:

DOUGHTON SATISFIED

Such action is usually tantamount to killing the legislation recommitted, and most committee members took that view of it in this case. Said 79-year-old Representative DOUGHTON, Democrat of South Carolina, committee chairman:

"I was abundantly satisfied with the present system of collecting taxes before this question of the Ruml plan ever came up, and I still am. I like it 10 times better. I don't know whether we will ever take up the matter again."

Is this the voice of Ulysses saying to one raising his voice against the authority of the king:

Be still, thou slave, and to thy betters yield. Be silent, wretch, and think not here allowed that worst of tyrants, an usurping crowd.

This fight for the people is one of many contests that will have to be fought against the tyranny of usurpation, but I venture the prediction that the people will recapture their legislative rights.

Production of Strategic Metals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a large part of the iron and copper used in the production of war armaments comes from the Twelfth District of Michigan. This district covers the western half of northern Michigan. And while billions have been spent by the Federal Government in war plants and arsenals which are utilizing these raw materials, not 1 cent has been spent by the Government to increase the production of iron and copper in northern Michigan. There are thousands of tons of low-grade iron ore lying in stock piles all through this area which could be put to work in the war effort if the Government would spend some of its money to build additional facilities in our iron-mining area.

The same thing applies to copper. In Ontonagon County there lies the largest potential source of new copper production on North American soil. This source is contained in what is known as the White Pine property. Various plans for putting this property into production have been submitted to the War Production Board over the last year, but up to this moment nothing has happened except a series of postponements and delays. If the W. P. B. would approve this project, they would be getting new copper at the rate of 3,600 tons per year within the next 10 months.

The ironical thing about the whole business is that while copper is so scarce that the Government cannot any longer make copper pennies, delays are countenanced on vital and strategic projects similar to this one.

In connection with this situation the following is Senate Concurrent Resolution 20, proposed by Senator Burritt, recently adopted by the Michigan Legislature:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 20

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to effect a substantial increase in the price of copper, iron, and other strategic metals

Whereas the prosecution of the war has resulted in a great and constantly increasing demand for copper, iron, and other strategic metals; and

Whereas with underground mining it is imperative to stock-pile some strategic metals while navigation is closed on the Great Lakes, thus making it necessary to keep men employed and the mines in operation during the winter months; and

Whereas the ceiling prices currently effective for these metals may have been adequate when set, but since these prices have been fixed everything entering into the cost of mining has increased and the small operators, particularly, are finding themselves with inadequate loans and unable to realize full production; and

Whereas the mining industry should be enabled to operate on a fair and equitable basis, equal to that enjoyed by other war industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to take the necessary steps to insure a substantial increase in the price of strategic metals; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

The Forand Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, after giving vent to their feelings for 4 days, the House on yesterday took about 4 hours to dispose of a very important matter. I refer to the tax-collection bill, H. R. 2218, and all amendments that were offered and proposed to be offered to it. The disposition of the bill was to recommit it to the Committee on Ways and Means. In other words, we spent 5 days discussing the subject of a pay-as-you-go plan of taxation and then discarded it.

I had hoped to offer my bill, H. R. 2277, as a substitute to the committee bill, but under the Rules of the House this could not be done until the Carlson-Ruml substitute was disposed of. Not more than one substitute for a bill can be pending at the same time.

To have offered my bill as an amendment to the Carlson-Ruml bill would have been merely a publicity stunt because I was aware that a clear-cut vote on that bill was demanded by a majority of the House. Had my bill come up as an amendment it would have received the same treatment that the many other amendments offered did receive—that was defeat.

I was sincere in my proposal, and refused to be inveigled into a trap to kill my bill, so I advised the House that if we voted down the Carlson-Ruml bill I would then immediately offer my bill as a substitute. It could have been considered then because the other substitute would have been out of the way.

However, when the Carlson-Ruml bill was adopted in the Committee of the Whole, there was no opportunity for a vote on my bill.

The people of this country are, I am sure, disappointed at our action. They want, and are demanding legislation that will make it possible for them to become current in the payment of their taxes. They want collection at the source. They do not want doubling up of their taxes because they could not pay them.

As my bill has not been considered by the House but is still pending before the Ways and Means Committee, I shall ask the committee to report it to the House at an early date so that we may have another opportunity to consider the subject and, I hope, enact legislation which is demanded by the people.

Restoration of Central Standard Time in Midwestern States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK B. KEEFE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication sent to me by the Committee on Military Affairs of the Wisconsin Senate.

WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE,
SENATE CHAMBER,
Madison, March 26, 1943.

Hon. FRANK B. KEEFE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KEEFE: The undersigned members of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Wisconsin Senate respectfully request you and the other Representatives in Congress from Wisconsin to promptly take such action as may be necessary to restore central standard time in Wisconsin and the other Midwest States embraced in the central standard time zone.

To this end we urge you and the other Members of Congress from Wisconsin, to each of whom this letter is sent, to contact immediately the Congressmen and United States Senators from the various States embraced in the central standard time zone with the view to enacting an amendment of Public Law 403, approved January 20, 1942, restoring central standard time in this time zone.

The Wisconsin Legislature recently adopted Joint Resolution No. 16 A, urging the Congress to restore central standard time in Wisconsin. Copies of this resolution have already been sent to each House of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof. It is the feeling of this committee, however, that the restoration of central standard time should not be made applicable only to Wisconsin but to all of the Midwest States in the central standard time zone. We understand that a number of Midwest States have taken action similar to that expressed in Joint Resolution No. 16 A.

It is the feeling of the Military Affairs Committee that the restoration of central standard time in Wisconsin and the Midwest States will greatly benefit the farmers in this area and will be a distinct aid to the farmers in equaling or exceeding the 1942 farm production which is so vital in our war effort.

A bill (222, A) providing for the restoration of central standard time in Wisconsin has passed the assembly and is now before this committee in the senate. The members of the committee deem it advisable to hold this bill for the time being to await your advice as to what action may be expected on this matter in Washington.

We feel confident that under your leadership the support of representatives in Congress from the Midwest States can be enlisted to accomplish congressional action in securing the suggested amendment.

This committee will appreciate your earliest advice as to the progress of this matter and we trust that you and your colleagues will do all in your power to attain the desired result.

Yours very truly,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
WISCONSIN STATE SENATE,
BERNHARD GETTELMAN, *Milwaukee.*
TAYLOR G. BROWN, *Oshkosh.*
EDWARD F. HILKER, *Racine.*
ROBERT P. ROBINSON, *Beloit.*
J. EARL LEVERICH, *Sparta.*

Training of Nurses for the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill which I introduced on March 29:

H. R. 2326

A bill to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of assuring a supply of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for each fiscal year thereafter, sums sufficient to carry out the purposes of this act. Such sums shall be used for making payments to schools of nursing or other institutions which have submitted, and had approved by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service (hereinafter referred to as the Surgeon General),

plans for nurses' training, and for all necessary expenses of the Public Health Service in administering the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. A plan for training of nurses may be limited to student-nurse training, or to postgraduate or refresher-nursing courses, or may include both. A plan submitted by any institution may be approved only if it provides—

(a) That no student or graduate nurse will be included under the plan unless in the judgment of the head of the institution such nurse will be available for military or essential civilian services for the duration of the present war, and such nurse so states in her application for inclusion under the plan;

(b) That nurses under the plan will be provided courses of study and training meeting standards prescribed by the Surgeon General;

(c) That the institution will furnish student nurses under the plan (without charge for tuition, fees, or other expenses) courses of study and training, uniforms, including street uniforms, and maintenance in accordance with regulations of the Surgeon General;

(d) That the institution will pay student nurses under the plan a stipend at not less than the following monthly rates: $15 for the first 9 months of study; $20 for the following 15 to 21 months of combined study and practice, depending upon the curriculum of such institution; and

(e) That the institution will either afford student nurses under the plan an opportunity to complete their course of training until graduation at such institution and will pay such student nurse a stipend at a monthly rate not less than $30 for the period following the period of combined study and practice and prior to graduation, or will transfer such student, after completion of the period of combined study and practice and prior to graduation, for training in some other institution, but only if such training may be credited toward graduation, and the institution to which the nurse is transferred agrees to pay her a stipend at a monthly rate of not less than $30 until graduation.

SEC. 3. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay each institution, with a plan approved under section 2—

(1) with respect to items furnished student nurses thereunder, amounts determined by the Surgeon General to compensate such institution for—

(A) reasonable tuition and fees for the courses of study and training;

(B) reasonable maintenance provided pursuant to section 2 for the first 9 months of their course of study and training;

(C) uniforms and insignia, provided in accordance with section 2; and

(D) the minimum rate of stipend specified in section 2 for periods prior to completion of the course of combined study and training referred to in such section; and

(2) with respect to items furnished graduate nurses thereunder, amounts determined by the Surgeon General to compensate such institution for reasonable tuition and fees for postgraduate and refresher course of study, and reasonable maintenance for graduate nurses undertaking postgraduate courses, or such portion of such amounts as may be determined in accordance with regulations of the Surgeon General.

(b) Determinations by the Surgeon General under this section of amounts which any institution shall receive shall be conclusive upon such institution and upon the General Accounting Office.

SEC. 4. The method of computing and paying the amounts referred to in section 3 shall be as follows:

(a) The Surgeon General shall from time to time, on a prepayment or reimbursement basis, estimate or make determination of the amount for each institution, which amount shall be reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which he finds that unadjusted payments with respect to any prior period were greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such institution pursuant to section 3 for such prior period, and shall certify the amount so estimated or determined and so reduced or increased to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office pay the institution at the time or times fixed by the Surgeon General the amounts so certified.

SEC. 5. In lieu of payment therefor under section 3 (a), the Surgeon General is authorized to procure and provide insignia for student nurses under a plan approved under section 2.

SEC. 6. The Surgeon General with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator is hereby authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Program To Salvage Fiscal and Monetary Solvency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics, New York University, and executive secretary, Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy:

The trend of events makes it reasonably certain that by the time we reach the end of this war our fiscal and monetary affairs will be sad to contemplate. The important things to do are (1) to minimize the evils and dangers we shall face, and (2) to adopt the best possible solutions to the problems we cannot escape. Efforts to prevent unnecessary fiscal and monetary evils and to provide the proper way out in the end can be made successful if all of us, to the best of our ability, will pursue the following four-point program:

1. Give all possible aid to those who are trying to reduce and eliminate nonessential governmental expenditures.

2. Fight all those sponsors of bigger and better programs of Government expenditures, deficits, and debts, as we have seen them during the last decade, and all those who argue the virtues of such policies.

3. Fight greenbackism and currency depreciation in all its forms.

4. Urge a permanent national debt as the ultimate solution to the debt problem which we shall face at the close of this war.

The alternatives to this four-point program are things to be feared and fought. One of these alternatives is a radical devaluation of our dollar. It seems reasonably clear that a drive will be made for such a devaluation, and it is possible that such a program may be slipped over on the American people so quickly that they will not be able to understand its terrible implications before it is too late. A very large proportion of the American people has not yet learned the nature and significance of the devaluation of 1934, and we can be almost certain that they would not be able to see how the effects of this devaluation would differ from those following a radical devaluation of the dollar such as the one that probably will be urged upon us at the end of this war. Although a radical devaluation of the dollar could be urged upon the American people only through ignorance of the economic destruction that such a program would bring, it will be easy for the devaluationists to capitalize the public's lack of understanding of the nature of this device and the consequences that would follow its use unless public education on this serious matter begins now. Moves to put over such a ruinous program on the American people have already begun. On July 14, 1941, a group of silver Senators, headed by Senator ELMER THOMAS of Oklahoma, issued a statement in which they said that if our national debt should reach the sum then prophesied by some of our citizens the size and weight of our dollar may have to be reduced to enable our people to meet their taxes, interest, and debts, and to liquidate our national obligations. In a radio address, November 15, 1942, Senator THOMAS repeated this prediction.

On February 21, 1943, the New York Herald Tribune carried a column with a headline which read, "Need to revalue dollar seen by some experts." It would not be monetary experts in this country—quite the contrary—that would advance the views set forth in that heading and column. If there are any monetary experts involved, it would have to be those of foreign countries who are willing to aid us in fleecing ourselves so that their countries might profit at our expense. Both the heading and column of that article may well be taken as a sample of the type of dangerous alternative to which the public is already being subjected and which needs to be analyzed and exposed in terms that the American people can understand. That job needs to be done immediately and repeated over and over until the average citizen knows what the quick and sharp answer is to this ruinous program.

Other very objectionable alternatives to the suggested four-point program are the recommendations for irredeemable paper money and currency dilution in various forms. Since early 1933 this Nation has been subjected to programs of this sort, supported by various groups with differing excuses, and up to date neither the Treasury nor the Reserve authorities has made one important move to arrest this unhealthy trend of events. As greater fiscal pressures develop, it may be expected that the advocates of these unwise alternatives to an honest and sound method of meeting our debt problems will become more active because they probably will claim that necessity now demands the use of their solution.

Since outright greenbackism is apparently best understood by the mass of people, it is probable that more subtle devices will be the ones urged or utilized. Devaluation is a slick, though devastating, sleight-of-hand method of debt payment. Recently we have been treated to a new brand of manipulation in the issuance of $660,000,000 of Federal Reserve bank notes, called national currency. By a maneuver, in which a so-called retirement preceded issuance, the Treasury and Reserve authorities pumped this national currency into circulation. These notes are the same in nature as unsecured greenbacks; the differences in effect probably lie in the psychological reactions of the people. They do not understand this transaction; they probably would have understood the significance of a straightforward issuance of unsecured United States notes or greenbacks.

The employment of this piece of currency manipulation is symptomatic of the thinking and attitude in administration circles

with respect to the handling of the people's fiscal and monetary affairs. It comes while this Nation is barely getting into this war and after 10 years of recommending and of writing into our monetary statutes provision for about every species of currency expansion and dilution that mankind has ever seen.

Let us be specific about this 10-year record: (1) On May 12, 1933, we got the Thomas greenback law. (2) On December 21, 1933, the President launched us on a silver purchase and silver subsidy program. (3) On January 31, 1934, our dollar was devalued 41 percent. (4) On June 19, 1934, the notorious Silver Purchase Act was passed. (5) On July 6, 1939, the Domestic Silver Subs'dy and Silver Purchase Act became law. (6) February 5, 1942, Chairman Eccles of the Reserve Board recommended that the Federal Reserve banks be permitted to purchase Government securities direct from the Treasury in unlimited amounts—the German road to disastrous inflation in the 1920's—and 5 billion dollars of such purchases were authorized. (7) On October 14, 1942, the Reserve Board and Treasury endorsed a program to convert silver certificates into inconvertible paper money. (8) On December 13, 1942, we got out $660,000,000 of greenback "National currency." (9) As a consistent Government policy since 1933, we have had a fairly constant monetization of the Federal debt by the Reserve and commercial banks of this country—first under the "socially beneficial" pump-priming-and-large-Government-deficit program in peacetime, and now under the necessities of war financing.

Since neither the Treasury nor the Reserve authorities nor other policy makers of this administration have done anything of importance to arrest this trend of events during the past 10 years, and are not now showing any marked improvement in thinking or attitude where fiscal and monetary matters are concerned, the hope of the public would seem to lie chiefly in the newly constituted Congress. For a change, the majority of Congress seems inclined to stop, look, listen, and investigate. Some wholesome repeal measures have already been introduced.

The signs in these respects are more encouraging than they have been for a decade. But now that we are in this war, the monetization of much of the Federal debt must of necessity continue until the end of the war and perhaps for a time thereafter. There is no wise or defensible tax program which can be devised that can prevent this monetization of a large portion of the national debt, despite the current popularity of that untenable, oversimplified concept of the inflation gap and the related contention that taxes should be made to take all this inflation gap.

The best that can be done now is to eliminate all unnecessary Government expenses and then consolidate and fund our huge debt into a permanent one at a low rate of interest. With an interest charge of perhaps $4,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000 per year, and a Federal budget of other items of approximately $7,000,000,000 per year, we should be able, as a Nation, to recover from our present distressing condition in a reasonably good manner and without a back-breaking tax burden on our people.

This solution is simple and prudent, and it can be employed if we begin now to make the public aware of it, and at the same time warn them against the evil and ruinous alternatives being prepared for them by the currency manipulators—the greenbackers, devaluationists, and every other variety of currency expansionist, dilutionist, "managers," and what not. Now is the time for responsible leaders to pitch in. The currency manipulators have been on the job for 10 years. They have their tools ready, and they have learned new tricks. The unprepared and largely unprotected public simply cannot be aided too soon.

Point Values on Food Items

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK C. SMITH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement taken from a news item by Anton J. Carlson, one of the greatest living authorities on physiology, in which he indicates that the present method of increasing the point values on food items is harmful to the bodily economy.

The following is taken from a news article in the March 29, 1943, Chicago Tribune:

"Increasing the point values on these items is harmful," said the University of Chicago's famed nutritionist, Anton J. Carlson, professor emeritus in the department of physiology.

"MUST LEARN TO EAT WEOLE GRAINS

"It may not be serious at present for the public as a whole, but people must learn to eat a variety of foods which they may not have been accustomed to eating, and they must eat whole grains, as well as all the fresh vegetables and fruits they can get.

"The Government has promulgated a very foolish nutrition program in the last 2 years by telling the people that 75 percent of them have been on bad diets. How can the Government turn around now and say they can work harder in war on less food than they had in peace? If we are going to feed the world, and make it 'free from want,' we will have rationing the next 50 years."

Coming from so high an authority on physiology and nutrition as Professor Carlson, the country should not fail to take due cognizance of what he says. Here we have a warning of the dangers the country is facing in respect to the growing food shortage, one we had better heed before it is too late.

Thomas Jefferson, the Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and following up the little speech I made today, I include the following column by George Rothwell Brown, noted commentator, which appeared in many papers throughout the country on March 29, in which he points out that Thomas Jefferson, whose bicentennial we celebrate on April 13, belonged to the Republican Party, and the administration in power does not belong to Jefferson's party:

JEFFERSON'S PRINCIPLES

(By George Rothwell Brown)

WASHINGTON, March 29.—The dedication of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial on April 13, in its magnificent setting on the Tidal Basin, just south of the White House, is going to bring the immortal author of the Declaration of Independence, and our third President, very definitely into today's thrilling political situation.

It may be safely assumed that the Democratic orators on this occasion will drape themselves in the mantle of the great statesman-philosopher and claim him as the patron saint of their party

This will be pure bunk and lip service to Jefferson, virtually every one of whose political precepts has been derided and discarded by the party which falsely claims inheritance from him.

Eulogies of Jefferson in Washington by democratic leaders at this time, where the very atmosphere is electrical with the undercover machinations to bring about a fourth nomination for President Roosevelt, doubtless will meet with the scoffing smiles they will deserve.

An advocate of a fourth term must be lacking in all sense of humor or have a poker face under complete control who can stand up before a sophisticated audience and pay tribute to the Sage of Monticello.

Jefferson's letters and writings contain the severest indictment of that ambition which would lead a President to seek to perpetuate himself in office beyond a second term, which our archives can show.

Jefferson was scarcely second to Benjamin Franklin in preaching the virtues of thrift and economy, especially in the administration of government. The wasteful extravagance of the New Deal, masquerading as the Democratic Party, would have appalled him.

Jefferson believed and taught that that government is best which governs least. But the whole philosophy of the Roosevelt New Deal is predicated upon the socialistic and communistic doctrine that that government is best which governs most.

Jefferson was the father of the great principle in our government—the very keystone of the arch which makes it strong—the principle of State rights.

The Roosevelt New Deal has scorned this theory, and under it there has been so great a concentration of power in Washington as to undermine and weaken the powers of the States.

Indeed, there was an early New Deal scheme for virtually wiping out the States and dividing the country into a few arbitrary regional divisions laid out without regard to State lines.

In the pre-Civil War era there was a great shifting of political philosophies in the United States. The South abandoned protection and embraced free trade, New England abandoned free trade and embraced the American system of the protective tariff.

There has been in recent years another great shifting of political creeds in this country.

The Republican Party today is the heir of Jefferson.

It is the champion of State rights, a principle abandoned by the Democrats.

It is the party of economy in government.

It is the party which clings to the old tradition that, if two terms were enough for Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Cleveland, and Wilson, two terms should have been enough for any man.

Jefferson was never a member of the Democratic Party, which was born until Jackson's time. He was a member of the original old Republican Party and was twice elected President as a Republican.

The Republican Party today should claim Jefferson, as it does Lincoln, as its own. Jefferson was no new dealer. The New Deal should not be permitted to steal his garments.

If the Republican Party had the wisdom here and now to change its name to the Jeffersonian-Republican Party, going back to the ancient Republican Party of Jefferson, from which it borrowed its name, and if this reborn party should nominate an outstanding American for President, that candidate would split the Solid South on a fourth-term issue.

The South today is clearly in a receptive mood for such a recognition of the realinement of political opinion in this country.

A Bold Blow at Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Herald American of March 19, 1943:

A BOLD BLOW AT FREE ENTERPRISE

An incredibly destructive program is being developed by Federal price and rationing agencies under the economic device of "grade labeling."

By way of testing the temperature of the hot water it knew it was getting into, the Office of Price Administration launched this program of destruction against the American system of free enterprise last January by applying it to the single item of canned grapefruit juice.

Now it has been extended to the entire 1943 pack of canned vegetables and fruits.

Eventually, if the American people are not aroused by their great danger to protest, it will apply to all consumer goods.

The purpose is to standardize all manufactured products by eliminating established ranges of price and quality and by rendering ineffective and meaningless the familiar brand names by which the products are identified to the consumer.

The Office of Price Administration says this is necessary in order to make the rationing system work.

The truth of the matter is that it will make it impossible for the traditional and beneficial American competitive system of production to exist.

It will destroy many, and probably most, of the great producing industries of the country, and virtually all of the small industries.

It will obliterate the small merchandising establishments of the country, the neighborhood groceries and markets, of which there are hundreds of thousands and in which millions of people either have investments or rely upon for vital services or depend upon for their livelihood.

Abolition of the brand name in American production and merchandising is a senseless and frightening prospect, so utterly injurious and ruinous to the American way of life as to be incomprehensible and almost unbelievable.

To put consumer goods under a system of blanket and compulsory anonymity would be like substituting numbers instead of names for the people themselves.

The American scene would not be recognizable.

American habits of shopping and buying would be revolutionized.

American standards of living would diminish and ultimately fall to the level of the very worst of the regimented and totalitarian states.

Such a program could not be worse if there were criminal intent behind it.

Indeed, it is to be wondered if the intent behind it—if not criminal—is not the outgrowth of something worse.

Impairment and destruction of American free enterprise and of the competitive system of production and merchandising are easily recognizable as the objectives of criminal communism.

It is well known that scores of hundreds of Communists and their fellow travelers and sympathizers are on the pay rolls of Federal agencies and bureaus, and have key positions in many of them.

It is to be suspected, therefore, that it is by neither accident nor coincidence, but by deliberate design and covert conspiracy, that a completely communistic enterprise is dominating the whole rationing system.

The Congress has been "looking into" this matter of grade labeling for many weeks, but is unfortunately doing nothing about it as yet.

The business and industrial interests of the country understand the dangers inherent in the situation, but have been too busy with the war to offer effective challenge.

The American people as a whole, who have the most to lose, are also occupied with the war.

So the Office of Price Administration, mistaking the occupation of Congress, of business and industry, and of the people with the war for acquiescence in the initial application of grade labeling, has gained the courage to broaden the iniquitous system.

Congress and business and industry, and especially the American people, if they wish to preserve free enterprise and democratic institutions, will do well to bestir themselves before communistic bureaucracy has accomplished irreparable injury to the American way of life on the home front of this war.

Post-War International Settlements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from the Baltimore Sun, and my reply thereto:

THE SUN,
Baltimore, Md., March 18, 1943.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am sending you with this note a clipping of an article which appeared on page 1 of the Baltimore Sun on March 18. If you have not already seen it, I believe you will be interested in reading it.

If Senator BALL is correct in his judgment concerning the practical politics of post-war international collaboration and collective security, it indicates a major change in public sentiment in that influential region—a change which may be of great significance.

Your comment on Senator BALL'S opinion as expressed in the enclosed article, and also your own views, would be most interesting and useful.

Do you agree with his judgment as to public sentiment and the practical politics of the matter?

Do you feel that the Senate, rather than merely consenting to or rejecting treaties, should exercise the other half of its constitutional function by setting up machinery for advising the Executive on policies and objectives of international engagements and settlements?

The Sun would like to publish your comments.

Sincerely yours,

NEIL H. SWANSON,
Executive Editor.

MARCH 25, 1943.

NEIL H. SWANSON,
Executive Editor, the Baltimore Sun,
Baltimore, Md.

MY DEAR MR. SWANSON: I have been so extremely busy that I have not had time until today to comply with your request of March 18 relative to the article appearing in the Baltimore Sun of the same date, concerning Senator BALL'S proposal for a United Nations organization with world police power.

Senator BALL, doubtless, has devoted a great deal of time and study to this all-important question. I feel that while every constructive suggestion should be thoroughly considered, I am also convinced that we must proceed with the utmost caution. For myself, I have always advocated a strong and effective organization of peaceful nations. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee during the last World War I strenuously urged that the United States join the League of Nations, and it is my firm conviction that had our Nation added its voice and its power to the League, this second world catastrophe would not have occurred.

For your information, I am enclosing a speech made just 5 years ago—March 18, 1938—on the floor of the House which will in some measure explain my viewpoint and which will disclose why I will naturally favor the establishment of an international organization.

We must not permit the country to be again misled by the so-called isolationists as it was in 1920 by Senators Lodge, Borah, Johnson, McCormick, La Follette, and others, some of whom, I believe, were influenced by the Hearst papers and other periodicals which were mistakenly believed at the time to carry a popular appeal.

Advocacy of Senator BALL'S plan or any other plan contemplating the military enforcement of the decrees of a congress of the world must not be allowed to become a political issue at this time when the earth is aflame with war. Your valuable newspaper and other fair and thoughtful newspapers can do much to prevent premature debate along political lines of this delicate subject. It is easy to see how fathers and mothers and wives with sons and husbands in the armed forces can be persuaded to cast thoughtless votes in favor of any half-baked plan which is urged as a perpetual war disinfectant. Please believe that I am not so characterizing Senator BALL'S suggestion. I am merely attempting to say that we cannot at this time design and cast the mold into which a pattern for world affairs must be poured when the war is over and won.

A world organization with a massive, world-wide military police necessitates, of course, a full underlying agreement. The minds of the high contracting parties must meet in all essential particulars. This means that there will occur demands, counterdemands, concessions, compromises, give, and take. Is it possible for nations engaged in a death struggle, with raw open wounds, calmly, dispassionately, and fairly to come to a present workable agreement even with those who fight with them? I do not think so. I do not think, moreover, that the subject should be pressed to the point where it will create discord and disunity among ourselves, distract our attention from the major problem

of winning the war, and also cause dangerous friction among the Allies.

Heretofore I have not been in favor of any oversize international military force. I still am inclined to feel that by actually disarming and keeping disarmed the aggressor nations, Germany, Italy, and Japan, and by punishing the evil heads of those nations and by isolating and insulating Prussia from the lesser German states, we shall effectively eliminate the Junkers, white and yellow.

But in all of these matters I am convinced that we must receive and consider the reports of our State, military, diplomatic, and intelligence experts when the war is won before we can build the structure which is thereafter to house, permanently, international affairs.

You ask, do I feel "that the Senate, rather than merely consenting to or rejecting treaties, should exercise the other half of its constitutional function by setting up machinery for advising the Executive on policies and objectives of international engagements and settlements?"

I think my foregoing remarks answer that question. I do not believe that this is the time for the Senate to attempt to set up advisory machinery as to policies and objectives. If a law should be framed in general language, it would be meaningless. If it attempt to be specific and designate particular policies and particular objectives, then I think it would unwisely assume the quality of clairvoyance. No one at this time can forecast the pattern of things to come.

Sincerely yours,

ADOLPH J. SABATH.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bay City (Mich.) Times:

SOME AMAZING REASONING

No more amazing reasoning has been heard in our National Legislature within living memory than that of Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, in opposing the Ruml income-tax plan. His chief objection to the legislation was embodied in his charge that it is "tax heresy." Evidently the North Carolina statesman is convinced that that constitutes a fatal fault and condemns the new idea to be the hell of things anathema.

Of course he is mistaken. Every enlightened piece of tax legislation in the last two generations was heresy when first advanced. Heresy, according to the dictionary maker, leaving its religious application out of the question, is "an opinion held in opposition to commonly received doctrine." Meaning any suggestion for changing old practices and beliefs, erroneous or not.

Of course Ruml is guilty of heresy on that basis. So were those who put forward the income-tax idea itself years ago. Mr. DOUGHTON doubtless is aware that the Supreme Court of the United States outlawed the first peacetime bill, passed in Grover Cleveland's day, on some such score. All except the original Christian church were heresies at their inception; democracy was a heresy in the time of George III; freedom of the slave was a heresy in Wendell Phillips' day; labor unionism when Frick and Carnegie dominated the industrial world.

Heresy, Mr. DOUGHTON, is not something vicious in itself. If the Ruml plan is heresy, it is in good company.

DOUGHTON, with just as little good sense, called it a bonus at the expense of men on the fighting front. Of course, its enactment would not mean a bonus for anybody or cost anybody or any interest a red cent. It is simply a plan to put the income taxpayers of the United States on a cash basis and collect the money in most instances as it is earned. The allegation that it is an attempt to skip a year of taxpaying is simple nonsense. Taxes would continue to be handed over just as at present. The only new thing is that we would be paid up from week to week instead of being a year behind. Mr. DOUGHTON knows, or should know, that income taxation cannot be halted or abated, and that there is intention of halting or abating it until the war is paid for.

"Let us not be slackers on the home front," he intoned. "We must help win the war by contributing our share of the tax burden, not by forgiving taxes."

Considering the facts, that is as arrant a piece of balderdash as has come out of the prolific House of Representatives in many a month. Can it be that the head of the Ways and Means Committee knows no better?

It is timely to say that no more convincing argument has been advanced by any enemy of the Ruml plan. Perhaps because no better is available.

Argentine Beef

REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have made an investigation of the possibility of bringing into this country Argentine beef. I find that there is a vast supply of Argentine meat which could be readily transferred to this country by either three or, at most, five refrigerated ships which the Argentine Government is most anxious to use in trade between Buenos Aires and New Orleans. If that beef could be brought in and the tariff provisions could be changed, it would relieve, to a vast extent, the meat shortage of this country, and the meat could be distributed in the various industrial areas where it is greatly needed, because the war workers require the protein and the vitamins contained in meat.

In the Province of Patagonia, in Argentina, I am informed by reliable authority, the cattle are not afflicted with the hoof-and-mouth disease. A convention was entered into between the United States and Argentina providing that Patagonian beef might be brought in. Some of the Senators coming from certain States so confused the situation as to preclude ratification of that treaty, but a remedy is now at hand and we should avail ourselves of it.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I append a letter which I sent to Chester C. Davis and Prentiss M. Brown expounding my views on Argentine beef:

Hon. CHESTER C. DAVIS,
National Food Administrator,
Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
National Administrator, Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Throughout the Nation, we have food, and especially meat shortages. News reports register meat shortage riots in various parts of the country. War workers especially need the vitamins and proteins contained in meat, but many must do without. Efficiency of these workers is thus impaired.

There is plenty of meat "down yonder." Argentine has vast quantities of chilled, frozen, salted, and canned or corned beef. A good deal of it might be imported into this country if our tariff laws were altered or repealed.

If I can get the green light from both you gentlemen, I shall offer bills to pull down the barriers for the duration. Assuredly, this is no time to feel squeamish about the tariff. We need meat. We should get it wherever we can find it.

Argentina is a great cattle- and meat-producing country. The United States has purchased in the past vast quantities of canned beef, but refuses absolutely to buy Argentine fresh beef ostensibly on the ground that the cattle are subject to hoof-and-mouth disease. This has enraged and even humiliated the Argentineans. They consider this a national affront. They are wounded in pocketbook and patriotic pride. If England buys it, why can't we? It is pointed out that humans rarely, if ever, get hoof-and-mouth disease. Assuredly there is reason for the protection of domestic cattle and livestock, but there is a great area in south Argentina known as Patagonia which is free of this disease. In 1935 we signed with Argentina a sanitary convention whereby Patagonia meat could enter the United States, but the United States Senate has refused to ratify it because of opposition from the so-called cattle Senators.

England buys vast quantities of Argentine beef, but even at the present time England does not buy all the available beef at Argentina. There is still much beef left. Let no tariff or unreasonable sanitary barriers stand in the way, the Middle West meat packers notwithstanding.

We are starving in the midst of plenty. We must lay our hands on the surplus Argentine beef as soon as possible. We must scrap the meat tariff and quotas against Argentina.

That would serve a twofold purpose:

1. Satisfy our hunger for meat.

2. Reestablish ourselves in the estimation of the Argentineans.

At present, thanks to fifth-column intrigues and conniving of the Axis, we Americans are not in good odor in Argentina. The Nazis and Fascists are in the ascendancy. They are the favored people. We are in the doghouse. Englishmen who are the prime customers of Argentina are in no way proscribed as we are.

Scrapping tariff laws against Argentine meat would, like lightning, clear the atmosphere, dispel the antipathy and make us again personae gratae. Such action would be far more beneficial than all the pan-American conferences put together. It would clearly and unmistakably indicate to the Argentinians that we want to be helpful and cooperative. Good will would be created overnight. Such action would be worth billions of dollars of propaganda.

With regard to the quality of Argentine meat, be advised that England has been eating it for more than a generation and, at present, is taking all available supply that can be loaded on English boats.

Furthermore, I incline to the belief that this Argentine meat is being fed to our own

troops located in north Ireland and in England.

Some in authority state that Argentine beef is not available since England purchases it all. It is true that we may have given England a monopoly of purchasing the meat, but, frankly, I am informed from reliable sources that there is more beef in Argentina than England can use. That monopoly should be cracked open. The Argentineans wish to sell their meat surplus to us. Furthermore, they wish to guarantee all freedom from hoof-and-mouth disease. It is definitely agreed that hoof-and-mouth disease can only be conveyed by diseased bones and the Argentine government would agree to bone any beef or mutton permitted entry into the United States.

Despite information erroneously advanced in Washington, there is at the present time available enormous quantities of mutton and considerable quantities of beef which the British are unable to load and ship. This the Argentineans would be glad to ship to the United States.

Furthermore, there is sufficient refrigerator steamer space to convey this beef to the United States. There is at present an agreement between the Flota Mercante (Argentine Government-owned steamship line) and the War Shipping Administration which provides an allotment of 75 percent of the tonnage of the Flota Mercante to be used to carry cargo to the United States. There are three fine refrigerator steamers, the steamship *Rio Mendoza*, the steamship *Rio Gallegos*, and the steamship *Rio San Juan* which are now immediately available to carry Argentine meat to New Orleans. These three ships are available in addition to the 75 percent of the tonnage of the Flota Mercante. These three refrigerator steamers formerly belonged to the Lauritzen Line, a European steamship company. I am informed that line is now owned by an Argentine company.

The refrigerator space and dead-weight tonnage of these steamers is as follows:

Rio Gallegos: 184,800 cubic feet, of which 10,300 are not insulated, and 3,400 tons dead weight.

Rio Mendoza: 127,630 cubic feet, and 2,350 tons dead weight.

Rio San Juan: 187,300 cubic feet, and 2,600 tons dead weight.

They are practically 100-percent refrigerated boats, and they are specially equipped to load and unload refrigerator cargo with the least amount of lost effort and time.

The general manager of the Flota Mercante, Mr. Jose Bares, told my informant in early January of this year that he would like to send these three boats constantly to the United States, but unfortunately not enough refrigerator cargo had received permits from the War Production Board and Board of Economic Warfare to warrant keeping these boats in the United States trade.

These ships are now engaged in shipment of fresh fruits, but fresh fruit can be shipped in nonrefrigerator ships to a great degree. Within 60 days, even fresh fruit will not be shipped by Argentine and these boats could be exclusively used for meat shipments.

We can, therefore, bring great quantities of fresh Argentine frozen boned beef, mutton, and probably pork products reasonably to supply civilian needs in the vicinity of New Orleans, New York, Baltimore, and other eastern points of the United States. It can be conveyed especially to places where meat is impossible to obtain and this without the slightest risk of any introduction of hoof-and-mouth disease.

Argentine would welcome any kind of inspection the United States Department of Agriculture would require.

Frankly, to sum up, we could have landed in this country every month at least 2,000 tons of fresh frozen Argentine meats and in some months there would be two arrivals, or a minimum of 4,000 tons.

This tonnage could even be increased by the conversion of other steamers into refrigerator steamers of which there are two available. I am informed that 70 to 80 percent of the necessary refrigerator equipment may now be had in Argentina, while the balance, 20 to 30 percent, might have to be supplied by the United States.

Lastly, a suitable arrangement for the shipment of the beef to the United States in these three or probably five steamers would be a body blow to the Axis. It would go a long way toward bringing Argentina within the orbit of the United Nations.

Under the trade agreement of November 15, 1941, the duty on canned beef was lowered from 6 cents a pound to 3 cents a pound, but not less than 20 percent ad valorem. For the duration this 3-cent tariff should be canceled. As to the fresh beef, the duty is still 6 cents a pound. That likewise should be canceled. Furthermore, most of the imaginary and ridiculous quotas and hoof-and-mouth disease barriers might well be surmounted by rigid but nevertheless "fair and equitable" inspection by the United States Department of Agriculture. I emphasize use of the words "fair and equitable."

I would appreciate word from you on this matter with all convenient speed. I shall hold up action until I hear from you both.

Yours sincerely,

EMANUEL CELLER.

A New Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House, after 5 days of debate, having failed to agree upon any method of tax collection which would make the taxpayer approximately current, permit me to call attention to the methods used for the collection of initiation fees and dues by William Green, Philip Murray, and John L. Lewis.

These gentlemen, during the past few years and especially during the emergency created by the war, have collected millions of dollars. No one knows just how much. They have had the aid of the administration, which, in many instances, has required those seeking to work in defense industries in support of the sons and the brothers who have been sent to fight across to contribute to the treasuries of the organizations of which these gentlemen are chief executives.

The methods of collection have been direct and forceful. There has been no forgiveness and no discount for cash or advance payments. Nor have the millions—the billions, it might be said—collected by these gentlemen's representatives been subject to either a normal or a surtax. Nor has there been any limitation upon the use of the funds so collected. It seems more than probable that considerable sums have been used to hire goon squads. Some must have been used to purchase blackjacks and other offensive weapons.

Moreover, neither Green, Murray, nor Lewis seems to have been excessively choosy about his revenue collectors.

Green's A. F. L. teamsters are using the plan at present in the city of Port Huron, Mich. There, drivers of milk wagons do not want to contribute to Green's union, so the A. F. L. teamsters from Detroit, using gasoline ration book C and rationed rubber tires, drive each day from Detroit to Port Huron, follow the milkmen around on their routes and intimidate their customers.

The collectors used by Green's teamsters are not revenue agents; they are men with criminal records, and their procedure, while not successful to date, has been effective enough so that Paul S. Lunt has been sent by the administration from Washington to Port Huron to see if he cannot settle the dispute.

Two things have so far prevented the success of the intimidation program carried on by these racketeers. One is the independence and the determination of the milk drivers, who cling to the old-fashioned idea that they have the right to earn a livelihood without paying for the privilege of exercising that right. The other is the courage, the fearlessness of the editor of the Port Huron Times-Herald, Mr. Louis A. Weil, who has kept the people of Port Huron advised of what the racketeers are trying to do and of their methods.

A recent editorial entitled "Apologies to Captain Kidd," from the pen of Mr. Weil, is well worth reading. That editorial is, in part, as follows:

When the Times-Herald started off with the first of this series of page 1 editorials we said that "the people of Port Huron are being made the victims of as fine a bunch of pirates as ever scuttled a ship."

Now we desire to correct that and we feel that perhaps we should offer our sincere apologies to the late and lamented Captain Kidd and all of his crew.

It may be that we have grossly libeled every pirate that ever sailed the seven seas.

The fact of the matter seems to be that the pirates were just a set of pretty parlor pinks as compared with some of our distinguished C car visitors of the past week.

Pirating was a Sunday-school picnic alongside of the job of racketeering that is being done right now in this glorious country of ours in these modern days, if what has happened here in Port Huron is any criterion, and we have reason to believe it is.

You may not know it was the Times-Herald which first advised of the situation here with reference to the use of C cards, etc.

So we sent a telegram as follows:

"How can five or six carloads of racketeers get C ration books to come from Detroit to Port Huron daily and follow milkmen around their routes threatening the customers of these men because the latter will not permit themselves to be forced into a union by their employers? Does the Government issue C cards for this purpose; and if so, upon whose authority? This is what happened in Port Huron. You have the courage of your convictions and we shall appreciate a reply from you."

At the same time we sent this message to Senator Prentiss M. Brown, now head of the Office of Price Administration, in charge of gasoline rationing:

"Labor racketeers from Detroit following honest milkmen over their routes in this city and all equipped with big Buick cars and C ration cards. We protest sincerely against this sort of thing. Sorry to bother you with

it, but know you are fair and that you will not permit this outrageous procedure if you know about it. Would like to have you investigate."

This brought on the investigation which is now going on in this connection as a result of Representative HOFFMAN'S clear and courageous presentation of the facts on the floor of the House of Representatives in Washington.

Now, what about the men who came here? Who were they? Were they here to settle or prevent a labor dispute in essential industries? That's the only Office of Price Administration regulation which entitles union representatives to preferred gasoline mileage.

If the way to settle or prevent a labor dispute is to permit a lot of Detroit "goons" to trail honest hard-working milkmen around their routes, annoy them and threaten their customers, then we're the sultan of Turkey or the maharajah of Timbuktu.

Now then, let's see who were these nice men Coleman tells us about who came to Port Huron last Monday from Detroit in big cars with preferred gasoline mileage cards from the United States Government?

Were they fine, legitimate union men and organizers, who really wanted to be helpful in settling the milk dispute here?

They were not!

We haven't the space here to give all of their names and all of their police records, but we have them all—every one of them.

They are a matter of public record in our local police department.

Their police records—practically every single one of them has a police record—show charges of everything from breaking and entering in the nighttime, to just plain burglary and larceny.

Some of them have served long prison sentences.

Others were arrested at strike scenes and found carrying pick handles, pieces of gas pipe and bloody baseball bats.

Others were arrested for shooting, beating up workingmen, malicious destruction of property, felonious assault, intimidating truck drivers, and so forth, and so forth.

In many instances, they managed to get themselves discharged and escape punishment.

Yes, readers of the Times Herald, a thousand apologies to Captain Kidd and every member of his pirate crew!

Perhaps the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. DOUGHTON] his capable right-arm, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], and the Republicans on that committee and citizens throughout the country might be interested in the background of some of those referred to in the foregoing editorial. Here is at least a partial record of five of those so-called organizers. It makes interesting reading:

JAMES CASSILY ALIAS JAMES CASSIDY, ORGANIZER FOR UNDERTAKERS AND FLORISTS UNION; DETROIT POLICE DEPARTMENT FILE NO. 58188; FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION FILE NO. 519164; MICHIGAN STATE POLICE FILE NO. 91825

February 15, 1918: Providence, R. I., police: Breaking and entering; disposition, probation.

April 14, 1918: Providence, R. I., police: Larceny; disposition, paid $20 fine and court costs.

July 3, 1918: Providence, R. I., police: Breaking and entering in nighttime; disposition, probation.

November 1, 1918: Providence, R. I., police: Larceny from a person; disposition, probation

January 10, 1919: Providence Police Department: Breaking and entering in nighttime; disposition, probation.

April 2, 1919: Providence Police Department: Breaking and entering in nighttime; disposition, 8 months in county jail.

October 29, 1920: Providence Police Department: Receiving stolen property; disposition, sentenced to 10 months in county jail.

October 21, 1923: Cleveland, Ohio, Police Department: No. 23985, larceny.

October 14, 1923: Mansfield, Ohio, Police Department: No. 16115; grand larceny; disposition, indefinite term.

April 1, 1925: Paroled.

October 5, 1925: Dropped from rolls.

December 13, 1927: Providence, R. I., Police Department: No. 7203: Breaking and entering, safe job.

December 14, 1927: Spen. disposition, Providence, R. I., No. 4226, 4 years in prison.

December 8, 1930: Paroled.

August 12, 1931: State Police, Providence, R. I.: Receiving stolen property; disposition, sentenced to 10 months' imprisonment.

September 22, 1931: Released on bail.

December 22, 1931: Cleveland, Ohio, Police Department No. 23985: Burglary and larceny; disposition, to State prison, Columbus, Ohio.

March 5, 1932: Columbus, Ohio, SPR: Burglary and larceny; disposition, 1 to 15 years' imprisonment.

October 5, 1935: Cleveland, Ohio, Police Department No. 23985: Petty larceny.

June 20, 1938: Detroit Police Department No. 58188: Investigation robbery, armed.

August 12, 1938: Disposition, discharged by superintendent.

September 29, 1939: Detroit Police Department No. 58188: Investigation for assault.

THOMAS J. BRIGLIA, DETROIT POLICE DEPARTMENT FILE NO. J-18158

August 13, 1923: Arrested on charge of breaking and entering; discharged.

April 29, 1939: Arrested for investigation. Discharged Section 352-504, 328 of 1931. Precinct Office No. 13—Officers Fred Gillam and Walter Doerr made arrest at 5200 Brush Street, Detroit, Shell gas station, after he intimidated driver of a gasoline truck: Place picketed.

July 8, 1941: At 11:55 a. m. arrested by detective bureau; arrested at 1300 Beaubien. Subject's residence: 7763 Whipple Street; charge, felonious assault.

ALFRED SQUIRES, DETROIT POLICE DEPARTMENT FILE NO. 59497; FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION FILE NO. 1700870

March 5, 1934: Malicious destruction of property; disposition, not guilty.

July 20, 1937: Investigation of assault; disposition, discharged.

December 30, 1937: SO, Detroit: Applicant.

February 11, 1939: Molesting men working.

February 15, 1939: Disposition, discharged by superintendent.

September 30, 1939: Molesting men working.

October 9, 1939: Disposition, not guilty. Judge Gillis, recorders court.

December 2, 1939: Molesting men working, truck drivers; disposition, discharged by superintendent.

February 10, 1940: Investigation, shooting.

February 13, 1940: Disposition, discharged by superintendent.

ROBERT HOLMES, DETROIT POLICE DEPARTMENT FILE NO. 61040

June 25, 1938: Investigation; disposition, discharged by superintendent.

July 29, 1938: Assault and battery; disposition, discharged by superintendent.

September 30, 1939: Investigation for carrying concealed weapons.

October 2, 1939: Discharged by superintendent.

(NOTE.—At 7:35 a. m. on September 30, 1939, in Buick sedan (Y-80-453) at Orleans and Franklin, baseball bat found in luggage compartment of car. Intimidating Crowley and Milner, truck drivers. (Patrolman Frank Ponke.)

EDWARD F. GARLAND, DETROIT POLICE DEPARTMENT FILE NO. 35712

October 14, 1941: At 10:50 a. m. precinct No. 5, Inspector Heidt, Sergeant Converse, etc. Subject arrested by Parker and Moffatt. Subject's address: 2000 Elmhurst. Associates: Isaac Litrvak, Saul Freedman, and Bernard Cooper. (NOTE.—Three baseball bats and one pick handle, a piece of pipe in car at Sears, Roebuck strike.) Subject born New Haven, Conn.

February 10, 1940: Investigation shooting of William Hoffa at Fourteenth and Howard, February 9, 1940.

MARTIN HAGGERTY, DETROIT POLICE DEPARTMENT FILE NO. 61039

January 9, 1936: Traffic warrant; January 10, 1936, paid $2 fine. Judge Mahar.

September 22, 1937: Traffic violation; September 23, 1937, paid $3 fine. Judge Mahar.

April 8, 1938, reckless driving; April 8, 1938, disposition: Sentenced $25 or 10 days in Detroit House of Correction and 6 months probation and driver's license revoked.

July 9, 1938, malicious destruction of property; July 11, 1938, disposition: Discharged.

July 18, 1938, felonious assault; May 3, 1939, disposition: 1 year probation. Judge Mahar.

September 30, 1939, carrying concealed weapons; December 2, 1939, discharged by superintendent.

(NOTE.—At 7:35 a. m. on September 30, 1939, Martin Haggerty and two men in a Buick coach (Y-80-453) picked up. Baseball bat in trunk of car. Intimidating Crowley-Milner truck drivers on strike—Patrolman Oscar Friedlund, badge No. 2441.

One of the speechifiers for the union, who went into Port Huron in a Buick sedan with a C-card sticker, was Morris Coleman, international representative for the teamsters' union. Coleman apparently had little respect for traffic laws, for seven violation tickets, according to report, were pasted on the car. They were as follows:

January 29: Overtime parking on Water Street, near Sixth Street.

February 5: Overtime parking on Water Street, near Seventh Street.

February 11: Overtime parking on Military Street, near Pine Street.

February 23: Overtime parking on Huron Avenue, near Park Street.

February 26: Overtime parking on Water Street, near Sixth Street.

March 5: Overtime parking on Huron Avenue, near Broad Street.

March 6: Overtime parking on Military Street, near Seventh Street.

March 20: Prohibitive parking on Huron Avenue.

If the negotiations at Port Huron follow the usual administration procedure, it will end by law-abiding citizens being forced to pay tribute to these racketeers.

More strenuous methods are sometimes used. An illustration of these is called to our attention by the letter of Sidney Hillman, not so long ago high in administration favor. He now complains that members of his union are being blackjacked and pistol-whipped by Lewis' United Mine Workers, who seek to compel them to leave the Hillman union and join up with Local 50 of the C. I. O.

While Congress debates ways and means of wringing from the taxpayers every possible dollar which can be collected, the money to be used to equip our forces which are supposed to be carrying freedom from fear to all the world, here

at home—in America, the land of freedom—organized goon-squads, carrying deadly weapons, are permitted by this administration to beat up honest citizens and to collect from them money which might be used to purchase rationed food or War bonds or be donated to the Red Cross.

It is a strange, strange world.

Army Pharmacy Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years many Members of Congress have clearly expressed themselves as favoring the creation of a pharmacy corps in the United States Army. A great majority of the American public likewise favor an Army pharmacy corps. Certainly the services of these professional men in the Army are not only necessary, but as one military leader said:

The need for pharmacists in our great Army and Navy is indispensable.

With our armed forces soon to reach the amazing figure of 11,000,000 men, certain leaders in the Army and Navy must forget their policies of the past and wholeheartedly agree to support the Army Pharmacy Corps bills represented by House bill 997 and Senate bill 216. Support of these measures would seem to be pursuing a policy of wisdom and justice, and their enactment would undoubtedly help in this great war effort.

The legislatures of many States have passed concurrent resolutions memorializing Congress to act, and I make this plea to our military leadership—in whom I have utmost confidence—to get behind the overwhelming public sentiment and support these measures. I feel certain Congress will meet its responsibility in promptly enacting into law the meritorious Pharmacy Corps bill.

Tax Forgiveness in Wisconsin

REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD H. McLEAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the discussion on the Carlson amendment to H. R. 2218, to provide a method for the payment currently of individual income taxes, I stated that the State of Wisconsin in making a shift of income taxes to a more current collection basis forgave the tax on 1 year's income.

The remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI], who followed me, leave the inference that there was no forgiveness.

In support of my own statement, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a memorandum submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means by the Treasury Department on February 27, 1943:

WISCONSIN SHIFT OF INCOME TAX TO MORE CURRENT COLLECTION BASIS

For many years under the Wisconsin income tax there was roughly a 2-year spread between the time income was received and the time tax on it was paid. Income earned in 1911, for example, was reported and assessed in 1912 and the tax paid in 1913. This system was employed through the tax paid in 1927 on income of 1925.

The legislature of 1927 substituted an averaging device. Under this, the tax paid in 1928 was based on an average of 1926 and 1927 incomes in which two-thirds weight was given to 1926 and one-third weight to 1927 income. The tax paid in 1929 was based on a straight average of 1926, 1927, and 1928 income. The same type of average was employed in subsequent years.

The averaging provision proved unpopular and was repealed. The legislature then faced the problem of dropping tax on 1 year's income or of doubling up. Because of the averaging provision, in any 1 year there was some income of prior years that had not been fully taxed. Therefore, if some tax was to be canceled, the legislature had the choice of canceling the tax on prior years' income that remained untaxed or the tax on 1 full year's income on which tax had not yet begun to be collected.

To meet the problem it was provided that the tax payable in 1933 was to be based upon the larger of (a) one-third of the 1930 income plus two-thirds of the 1931 income or (b) the income of 1932. Thus, in effect, 1 full year's income was freed from tax. The act was passed in 1931.

Farm Labor

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, in the Daily Oklahoman of March 29 is a story by Tom Rucker with reference to the Farm Security Agency in deporting 422 citizens from the valleys of the Red River, Washita, Blue, Kiamichi, Little River, Poteau, Arkansas and many other smaller valleys to do farm labor in the States of Washington and Oregon. My district contributed the greater part of the people that are leaving Oklahoma now. Last year we released the inmates from the penitentiary to gather our peanuts. A great many acres were never gathered. Many of them have not been gathered until this good hour, due to the shortage of manpower. Yet Washington and Oregon come into these fertile valleys, where the land is as fertile as the Valley of the Nile, and pick up 422 farmers where they are badly needed and ship them out to Washington and Oregon at great expense to the Government.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma, but one of your troubles is that they have reasonable electric light and power rates in Washington and Oregon. The Power Trust controls both Oklahoma and Arkansas and literally robs those people, so that your farmers cannot even afford to pay the rates, if they could get the power. If you will get those legislatures down there to wake up and give the people of Arkansas and Oklahoma a square deal and treat them decently in this matter of electric rates you might get more of those people to stay in Arkansas and Oklahoma.

Mr. STEWART. But this is the first information I have ever received that the Farm Security Administration and the Power Trust in Oklahoma were in partnership.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thought you had a shortage of farm labor in the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. STEWART. Oklahoma is one of the four States in the Nation that has been losing population to the congested centers of the country. We have enough empty houses down there and enough fertile soil to increase our production possibly 100 percent if we could secure farm labor.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As a matter of fact, you are short right now in your own State, are you not?

Mr. STEWART. We are short right now.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Oklahoma has a member on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Oklahoma is paying double freight rates. You cannot compete with other States and pay those high freight rates. Wake the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce up, and let us get some relief from these exorbitant freight rates.

Mr. STEWART. We well appreciate we pay greater freight rates than many of the other States—this we have known for many, many years, and it is difficult for Oklahomans to understand States to our south and west that move their trains through Oklahoma enjoy a less freight rate than do we, and freight rate discriminations is not all; with all of our oil, coal, and grain—first in the production of coal, third in oil, we did not get a single synthetic rubber plant out of all the 17 the Baruch report recommended which, according to Mr. Jeffers, were located and surveyed by the Baruch committee before he was appointed Rubber Administrator.

The article referred to follows:

STATE FARMERS START SECOND COAST EXODUS—ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTEEN FAMILIES HEED CALL OF EMPLOYMENT IN PROMISED LAND

(By Tom Rucker)

POTEAU, March 28.—One hundred and thirteen eastern Oklahoma farm families Sun-

day said "Goodbye" to Soonerland, and "Washington and Oregon, you asked for us, here we come."

This new migration of 422 men, women, and children—biggest organized exodus in the State's history, and a controversial subject—will be no new trail of tears.

This time Oklahomans are not highwaying westward in broken-down bailing-wire jalopies and falling-apart $50 turkeys.

They are riding the railroad plush, guests of the Federal Government, which is on the dotted line to see they are not shoved around.

GREENER FIELDS CALL

The attitude of the Oklahomans, who remembered the jeering "Okie" days, appeared to be—

"We can't be hurt much. We can find work for a dollar to a dollar and a half a day, but that's not enough to live on, so we'll just go out and see what we shall see because the Government is in on this deal."

They all are looking for greener fields. It is highly doubtful they would be making the trip without the Government guaranteeing the work, living conditions, and pay.

The Oklahomans are going to work on dairy, truck food and truck farms in Washington and Oregon, where owners asked expressly for Oklahoma workers.

RECRUITMENT PROTESTED HERE

Heads of families have been guaranteed by the Farm Security Administration there will be work paying at least $60 a month for 10 months out of the year, well more than double what they earn now in a year's time.

The families also have been promised a house, a cow, chickens, and a garden plot, with fruits to be sold to them at low prices.

Fifty of the families are going to Dayton, Oreg., 50 to Granger, Wash., and the other 13 to Wenatchee, Wash., in the Apple Belt.

Recruitment of the families has created strong protest in the State where single men are being deferred for farm work while married men, who are not farmers, are being drafted.

LEAVE SHORTAGE IN ADAIR

Seventeen of the families come from Adair County, which will have a peak worker shortage of 3,000, the shortage beginning in late May and continuing until frost. The work there is seasonal.

A substantial percentage of the heads of families, beginning the trip from Poteau were in the fighting draft age. About one-third of those questioned replied that they had been rejected. Most of the men, however, were 38 years old or older.

A Tulsan, member of a draft board, who saw the trippers leave Poteau, observed that in Tulsa County alone he could find jobs for half the men leaving.

FOOD PRODUCTION STRESSED

Farm Security Administration officials stressed the importance of producing food for the war as prime reason for the movement and placed resettlement of subsistance families in a secondary position. Their attitude is:

"We have taken only the unemployed and the underemployed, and out in their new homes, they will work at least 10 months a year; more than double the work they could get around here. In other words, they will be put to producing and they'll make better wages doing it."

The migration was viewed by townspeople in Poteau, seat of LeFlore County, which furnished 21 families containing 87 people, with mixed feelings.

Some said the idea seemed to them to be a good one, while others were against it because of the impending worker shortage in eastern Oklahoma, where even in the Work Projects Administration's most lush days made work was all but shut down to release men for harvesting seasonal crops and for other reasons.

TRIPPERS HAVE PICNIC

The trippers themselves appeared to be in festive mood while they waited at Poteau for their special train to arrive from Hugo and Antlers with the others.

As the crowd gathered in the sunshine outside the station, the inevitable guitar twanged nasally and a squatting young boy sang to his appreciative listeners about how the memory of his mother cured him of gambling. The guitar twanged until the train pulled in.

Children played in the gravel near the station while groups of mothers, holding the lap fry and letting the creepers crawl, talked about their prospective new homes. The men stood and talked and "spelled" the women in holding the small ones.

Many of the workers wore new work clothes, bought at Government expense. Several stores here stayed open Sunday for their benefit. Most of the women wore crisp prints and ginghams. Two wore slacks.

LOW WAGES CITED

Horace Gibson, 54-year-old Pushmataha County farmer, headed the largest contingent of families going west. His wife, their 3 sons and their families, totaling 18 persons in all, are making the trip. His comments were typical of those questioned.

"You can find work all right at home," he said, "but they don't pay but $1, $1.25, and $1.50 a day and food, and the land is just too poor to make a living."

Some of the contingents which began the trip from Poteau said they were railroad "tie-hackers"—unemployed day laborers and farm workers getting seasonal employment.

Farm Security Administration officials said the average family making the trip has been able to find only day labor totaling not more than 4 months a year, and had not earned more than $200 a year.

FIRST TRIP FOR MANY

Most of the trippers are making "the trip of their lives" and a few said they had not been out of Oklahoma, though the Arkansas line is only 35 miles distant. One man said he had not been out of his home county in his life. Many of the families come from hill country several miles from town.

The trippers come from LeFlore, Adair, Latimer, Sequoyah, Choctaw, Pontotoc, and McCurtain Counties. From here, they will go to Kansas City, then northwest to Billings, Mont., and on to Washington and Oregon where they will work for individual farmers.

The trip will be made in day coaches, and the trippers will be required to sleep in their seats. There will be no Pullman.

Special menus have been prepared for children. There will be medical attention.

HONEYMOON TRIP FOR HUBERT

Five boxcars of household furniture are going along. Each family was permitted to take along all the furniture it wanted to, particularly those items which are hard to buy because of the war.

The most carefully packed furniture at the Poteau concentration point was that of 17-year-old Hubert Jackson, Sallisaw, and his 18-year-old wife. It will be their honeymoon.

They were married a week ago Saturday. Jackson said he was unemployed.

The trip was the biggest thing in Poteau Sunday. It attracted a large crowd of curious ones who came down to see the train off. As it pulled off, one man said:

"It sure does get cold up there, they tell me. They'll come back to Oklahoma all right. The others did."

Clean Plate Club

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago when one of our distinguished colleagues, probably one of the greatest agriculturists in America, the Honorable CHESTER H. GROSS, of Pennsylvania, made some remarks on this floor about cleaning our plates clean.

It has never been my pleasure to visit the domicile in the Pennsylvania hills of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS], but I am reliably informed that he operates one of the best farms in Pennsylvania. It goes without saying that all of us, when we get hungry, will know where to go.

This movement of his to "lick your platter clean" is an old-fashioned country custom, and we are mighty proud of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] for calling the attention of the people to this problem in connection with the food shortage and the way that he intends to handle it. The Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune of Minneapolis, Minn., is just a little bit ahead of him. It has organized the Clean Plate Club. I just want to call your attention to the fact that Minnesota, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS], does not believe in food waste.

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, a movement has been started in my home State of Minnesota which Members of Congress and those in the executive branch of the Government should know about. I refer to the organization, on a Nation-wide scale, of the Clean Plate Club. Perhaps some may have read about it in advertisements appearing in Washington and other eastern newspapers this week. Its purpose is to awaken the people of the United States to the fact that 15 percent of the food placed on the table ends up in the garbage can, or, in other words, three meals a week never get to victory's production line. The project was started by the Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune, and deserves every commendation.

I quote the following from the message appearing in Washington newspapers this week and draw special attention to the facts given about Minnesota's contribution to producing food for the United States and for the world:

Would it shock you to know that 15 percent of the food placed on your table ends up in the garbage can?

That's the food-waste figure for the Nation.

It's the worst kind of "absenteeism" in America-at-war.

It means that every member of your household—if yours is an average family—is throwing away three meals a week.

Three meals a week—that never get to victory's production line.

Three meals a week—that might be going to our armed forces, our allies, and our friends.

There's something you and your family can do about it—right now:

Enlist in the Clean Plate Club of the Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune.

The Clean Plate Club was started in Minnesota for a reason.

The reason is that Minnesota is one of the great food-producing regions of the world. Last year more than half a dollar out of every hundred dollars of national income went to Minnesota farmers for the crops they raised.

Today the farms of Minnesota are one great, vital war industry, producing food for a free world.

Minnesota turns out yearly more than 575,000,000 pounds of dried or dehydrated milk for shipment abroad; more than 5,000,000 pounds of canned chicken for the armed forces; more butter and processed sweet corn than any other State; more turkeys than any State except Texas and California.

Minnesota grows garden seed for shipment to Russia, Britain, north Africa, India, South America, and Australia. One recent 17,000-pound shipment alone will yield 160,000 tons of food in gardens nearer the battle fronts.

And so Minnesota, which produces food for victory, challenges you not to waste it.

The Clean Plate Club invites you to join with its members in the upper Mississippi Valley, school children, war workers, farmers, housewives, enlisted men and women, civic club members, business leaders, office workers, to do your part to end food waste.

In food-producing Minnesota the Clean Plate Club was started by the Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune, because they are the favorite newspapers of the upper Mississippi Valley, read in more than 300,000 homes every weekday, more than 350,000 every Sunday * * * newspapers relied on not only for accurate, complete news coverage, and sound editorial thinking, but also as good neighbors and dependable friends.

In the name of food-producing Minnesota—in the name of victory-bound America—in the name of a free and well-fed world—the Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune invite you and your family to enlist in the Clean Plate Club—today.

Adjustment of Freight Rates in United States

REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the South and West have for many years been retarded in industrial development by a regionalized system of freight rates. This system of freight rates gives the eastern territory a lower level of rates on manufactured goods than is available to the southern and western regions of the United States.

The southwest territory, of which Texas is a part, is particularly handicapped because in that territory the highest level of freight rates on finished goods prevails.

Congress wisely provided in the Transportation Act of 1940 that undue prejudice in freight rates against region, district, and territory be made unlawful, and directed that the Interstate Commerce Commission make an investigation of such rates and eliminate discriminations where they exist.

The Interstate Commerce Commission in response to this congressional action initiated this proceeding and it has been my pleasure this week to attend the final hearings in the case known as the Class Rate Investigation, I. C. C. Docket 28300. It would seem that the long fight which the South and West have waged, to rid themselves of the freight-rate handicap, is nearing a climax.

Among other evidence introduced in the proceeding is the valuable and interesting information made by scientific and impartial members of the Interstate Commerce Commission staff that, while there is a wide divergence of rates in the manufactured goods in the regions of the country, the cost of rendering rail transportation service varies but slightly between the regions. This affords a sound basis upon which to formulate a national rather than a regionalized freight-rate structure with a single level of rates for manufactured products.

Another important event that has taken place within the last few days is the release of a study by the Board of Investigation and Research, an independent board created by the Transportation Act of 1940 to study 300 transport problems. This study was made under the supervision of an unbiased transportation economist, Dr. D. Philip Locklin, of the University of Illinois, who ranks as one of the great students of transportation in the country. The study concludes that the existing regional differences in the levels of rates on manufactured goods are not justified by differences in costs and that the artificial rate handicaps present in the United States should be eliminated.

As one who has fought diligently to have this injustice imposed on the South and West removed, I feel that the report of the Board is definitely conclusive that the injustice should be remedied.

I sincerely hope that in the proceeding now being conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission, the errors of the past will be rectified as the evidence presented to the Commission fully justifies this action.

Sermon of Rev. Gerald F. Dillon to Air Cadets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Providence (R. I.) Visitor of March 11, 1943:

FATHER DILLON HIGHLY LAUDED FOR SERMON TO AIR CADETS—ADDRESS OF FORMER PROVIDENCE PRIEST AND DEAN OF MEN AT CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, NOW NAVY CHAPLAIN, GREATLY PRAISED AT PENSACOLA

Rev. Gerald F. Dillon, priest of the Providence Diocese and formerly dean of men at Catholic University, Washington, recently enjoyed the distinction of having had one of his sermons read to every member of the United States naval air training center at Pensacola, Fla. The same sermon attracted wide attention and received high commendation and reproduction in full in the regular editorial columns of the Pensacola Journal, a daily paper.

Its reading before trainees, some of whom had heard it preached or read it in the publication of Our Lady of Loretto Chapel, where Father Dillon, a chaplain, is stationed, was ordered by the station commander, Rear Admiral G. D. Murray, United States Navy.

After citing steps taken by naval officials to counteract prostitution and related evils to which men at the station are exposed, the Pensacola paper declares "no better statement on the subject has been made than that of Chaplain G. F. Dillon in his program for Our Lady of Loretto Chapel." Like the commandant, the paper presents the sermon in full because its weight is best felt when the entire message is read in the complete context.

The sermon follows:

"If anyone wants to run the risk of a smack in the nose, let him tell me that I am not a man. That's a very healthy attitude for anyone in the Navy. The Navy is particular about those whom it takes in and has ways of getting rid of those who do not measure up to its standard of manhood.

"But what is a man? There are some rather fancy notions right here on this station about the answer to that—if we can believe the newspapers.

"Let's get the matter squared away once and for all. The perfect answer to the question is the one we learned in the catechism. Man is a creature composed of body and soul, made to the image and likeness of God. That makes man look like a pretty rugged sort of individual. Nothing weak or fancy about that definition.

"We have a body. Any dope can see that.

"We have a soul. We can't see it, but anyone who can tell the difference between a living, energetic body and a lifeless corpse knows that there has to be something to make us tick whether he calls it soul or something else.

"We have intelligence. We can know what's right and wrong.

"We have will. We can freely choose right or wrong.

"Because we have a soul that sparks our intelligence and will, we bear a very limited resemblance to God. That's why we can truthfully say we are made by God to His own image and likeness.

"Very definitely the body is the lesser portion of our being. Just as definitely it is not unimportant. It is the instrument with which we achieve our perfection, our happiness. God willed it so.

"But the appetites of the body very definitely can run wild. It takes a real man to bring them into subjection to the higher portion of his nature—his reason and his will.

"The appetite for food and drink can and often does succeed in softening and eventually blotting out all traces of real manhood. The appetite for sleep and ease can and often does sap vitality and make us sad examples of men.

"The appetite of sex is strong, often with the strength of a raging lion. Unleashed, unopposed, that appetite destroys the dignity of man quicker and more surely than all the others. Don't take my word for it. Look at the pages of history. Ask any physician. Walk through the venereal-disease ward of any hospital. Tour any insane asylum. Take a long look at any human derelict who didn't say no to a 'pick-up.'

"God—the God who made us—says in thundering tones: 'Thou shalt not commit adultery.' Nature—God's Nature—says: "Disregard that law and you pay and pay and pay.' It may sound smart to say there is an eleventh commandment: 'Thou shalt

not get caught.' But we can't fool Nature. We can't fool God. We can only fool ourselves. We can't beat the rap. The man who disregards the sixth commandment is a sucker. He is selling his chances for happy, normal, married family life down the river for a song. He is tossing his chances for eternal happiness out the window.

"This is very serious business. And it's our business—yours and mine. This is our station. Its reputation is our reputation. Let's get it through our skulls that sex immorality is not the characteristic of a he-man but the mark of a weakling. Let's pass the word that the first one who insinuates that purity is a sign of weakness gets a smack in the nose. When that attitude is general, the front-page story of our station will be different. We'll be able to clip the record and send it home to mother, wife, or sweetheart with a little pride in our station."

PROVIDENCE NATIVE

Father Dillon, son of the late James F. and Katharine (O'Rourke) Dillon, of 301 Oxford Street, Providence, was born in Providence on January 22, 1905. He is a graduate of Lexington Avenue school, Classical High, and Louvain University. He spent 2 years at Providence College before entering Louvain. Ordained on July 13, 1930, he served as an assistant at St. Mary's, Pawtucket, and St. John's, Providence, before becoming a chaplain.

He has taught in many diocesan schools, having been instructor in religion and spiritual director at St. Xavier's Academy, a professor at Catholic Teachers' College, and an instructor at La Salle Academy. He also served as director of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in Apponaug, and as president of the Catholic Teachers' Institute.

The Idea Still Lives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune for April 1, 1943:

THE IDEA STILL LIVES

The Carlson bill, embodying the principles of the Rumi plan for collecting individual income taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis, lost in the House Tuesday by the close vote of 215 to 198. It was defeated under the lash of the administration, which has chosen to make a political issue of one which should be debated on its economic merits, and has conducted one of the most outrageous campaigns of misrepresentation ever witnessed in an American Congress.

But it is one thing to kill a bill and quite another thing to kill an idea. That is especially true when the idea is logically unassailable and when it has the support of an overwhelming majority of the voting public. If one requires any evidence of this, let him recall the fight which began about 2 years ago over price control. Mr. Bernard M. Baruch took the position at that time that, if price control was to be effective, it must embrace all prices, including that of labor (wages). But this was too obvious and too nonpolitical for the administration, so the bill introduced by Representative ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, embodying Mr. Baruch's views, was badly defeated. In its place Congress passed the ridiculous administration measure, which put ceilings over half the prices of the Nation but left wages and farm prices free to rise at will.

But it was inevitable that, with its customary common sense, the American public would see through the political hypocrisy of that legislation and would demand a ceiling on all prices in the economy. Because the public did insist upon such a program, and because he knew that the public was right and he was wrong, the President finally found himself forced to demand over-all inflation control. Reluctantly, and with not very good grace, he finally embraced the principles of the Gore bill, but only after a great deal of damage had been done, particularly among the less articulate segments of the population.

In the case of the Carlson bill the President is facing the same irresistible combination of sound logic and public sentiment that he faced in his fight against the Gore bill. For this reason we predict that history will repeat itself and that he will ultimately be compelled to accept the principles of that legislation. But the victory for common sense and public opinion over partisan politics in this case may be a hollow one if "ultimately" proves to mean a year, or 2 years, in the future. The time to have adopted the Gore bill was in 1941; the time for adopting the Carlson bill is in 1943—early in 1943.

Farm-Labor Shortage

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I received a wire this morning from our State director of the Agricultural Extension Service inquiring when he might be able to know what we were going to do about this farm-labor shortage. What are we going to do about it, I ask you?

On March 17 this House passed Joint Resolution 96, and 2 weeks afterward we learn that it will be at least another 2 weeks before this resolution will be passed by the other body, and then, Mr. Speaker, it will be another 2 weeks before our farm people will know what our plans are for the organization we are preparing to assist them in solving their critical manpower shortage. Planting season is here now; it is time for immediate action. A serious situation faces us; time is of the essence and not a single day should elapse without a serious effort being made by our leaders to solve this farm-labor shortage. The time for talk is passed, and action is absolutely necessary. The labor is needed now—today. Unplanted crops can never be harvested or used to supply starving people.

If Chester Davis is to be Food Administrator, and if he is to prepare plans to solve our food shortages, let us give him all the power necessary and tell him to begin now on this most vital and critical problem.

I include as part of my remarks an article from Time magazine, dated April 5, 1943, showing, in part, how serious the farm-labor shortage is in Colorado:

DELTA'S 22

Colorado's mile-high Delta County should have been a good place to live and farm last week. Through the warm days ranchers sheared their sheep, branded their new calves. Lambs tried out their wobbly legs in the meadows; over the broad fields men and women planted potatoes and beets. The big irrigation pipes spilled cold mountain water into the ditches to course slowly through pear and peach orchards. Even after the sunset had flared red over Uncompahgre Plateau and the chill night wind swept down from the peaks, plowmen worked in the dark by searchlights.

They had to work late in Delta County. There was scarcely a farmer who had not lost to the Army a son, a hired man, or both. Some had lost a third of their help; some had lost half. Delta's farmers and the three solid citizens on its draft board knew the law—essential farm workers should be deferred—but their boys were too proud to ask for deferment. Anyway, the board had almost no one else to call.

One evening last week, as the sun sank, the Denver & Rio Grande Western's Mountaineer chuffed out of the county-seat depot. Aboard were 44 men bound for the Army—22 of them born and reared on Delta's farms. There was no one to replace them. Delta was steeped in gloom. Around the corrals the talk was of draft boards, of furloughs, and missing men: "A green man is helpless on a ranch. * * * My crops are shot to hell." In town bespectacled King L. Banks, manager of the potato growers' co-op, was busy helping worried farmers fill out affidavits—deferment forms.

In Denver, some 175 miles to the east, tall, affable Gov. John C. Vivian heard about Delta County's train, lost his affability, finally lost his temper. In 4 years as Lieutenant Governor, 3 months as Governor, quiet John Vivian had made little ripple in his own State. Now he made a splash that reached all the way to Washington. In the draft laws he found a neglected phrase: "The Governor of each State shall have charge of the administration of the selective-service law in his State." Governor Vivian's fist hit his desk top. Off went an order to Colorado's Selective Service chief—notify all draft boards immediately to stop taking farmers.

In startled Washington everybody knew that Governor Vivian had brought the farmer's manpower problem to a dramatic crisis that the administration could no longer ignore. One day later President Roosevelt promised that 3,000,000 farm helpers would be deferred this year.

Farm Security Administration Program in Seventh District of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call to your attention the fact that the F. S. A. has done an excellent job, as indicated by the following table:

Rural rehabilitation loans as of Feb. 28, 1943

District and county	Advances	Repayments		Matured principal	Ratio of principal repayments to matured principal
		Principal	Interest		
					Percent
District VII	$7,008,733	$4,015,512	$463,483	$4,273,193	94.0
Beckham	532,465	354,989	33,793	369,911	96.0
Custer	946,882	468,954	68,648	501,906	93.4
Dewey	481,897	303,856	32,521	293,871	100.0
Ellis	274,427	142,532	18,144	141,713	100.0
Greer	514,695	335,618	36,022	341,925	98.2
Harmon	550,108	314,474	29,034	336,057	93.6
Jackson	691,897	376,401	45,263	425,818	88.4
Kiowa	1,088,904	698,120	81,710	724,249	96.4
Roger Mills	752,458	353,389	51,451	399,172	88.5
Tillman	698,202	389,473	34,896	404,543	96.3
Washita	476,738	277,706	32,001	298,028	93.2

Tenant purchase loans as of Jan. 31, 1943

District and county	Advances	Repayments		Maturities principal and interest	Extra payments	Ratio of repayments to maturities
		Principal	Interest			
						Percent
District VII	$1,624,444	$141,977	$66,779	$209,066	$54,137	99.9
Beckham	110,762	13,747	3,436	17,183	7,429	100.0
Custer	110,367	15,895	3,398	19,293	12,744	100.0
Dewey	82,190	4,236	3,109	7,345	952	100.0
Ellis	102,485	5,840	2,923	8,763	1,078	100.0
Greer	95,153	7,926	3,401	11,327	2,758	100.0
Harmon	171,952	15,720	4,335	20,365	5,394	98.5
Jackson	98,676	7,603	6,681	14,284	6,120	100.0
Kiowa	277,712	35,253	13,186	48,439	5,092	100.0
Roger Mills	61,677	4,677	1,101	5,778	3,750	100.0
Tillman	159,216	9,634	4,739	14,373	4,272	100.0
Washita	354,254	21,446	20,470	41,916	4,548	100.0

The increased production by 3,609 active Farm Security Administration borrowers between 1941 and 1942 and the planned increased production in 1943 over 1942

Product	Actual increase, 1942 over 1941		Planned increases, 1943 over 1942 (amount)
	Amount	Percent	
Milk.....gallons	3,020,938	31	1,021,000
Eggs.....dozen	617,930	41	408,100
Pork...pounds live weight	2,723,111	108	1,974,000
Beef...pounds live weight	2,990,393	58	1,538,900
Peanuts.....bushels	730,434	[1]	162,000

[1]No production in 1941.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, after a lot of talk about "windfalls," it turned out to be a "dogfall."

The passing of Judge Ben B. Lindsey reminds me that he advocated "trial marriage" 20 years before the "Mudeal" came along.

"Labor has now come of age, and it is my concept that it is now strong enough to accept equal responsibility with management."—Gov. Andrew Schoeppel, Kansas.

Gross, a Pennsylvania farmer, is becoming known nationally for his frequent 1-minute speeches in the House on the importance of "licking your platter clean."

One of the best-known Jersey cattle auctioneers of our country is our new Democratic colleague from Tennessee, JIM NANCE MCCORD. Think of the irony of his coming here and bringing butter rationing.

Walter Winchell, the fightless wonder of the Navy, appears to be trying to crucify me in the middle of Lent, as one of the two thieves, accusing me of pilfering a membership in the American Legion.

Draftee Bob Potter, from my home town, 44 years old, married, and a World War No. 1 volunteer, spent the week end with me. While here, he brushed shoulders with a few of the thousands of unclassified youths of the Capital City.

Cattlemen's associations, in the days following the other war, spent money in ads urging the eating of meat. I would like to see the color of the lost steer that could make his way through the streets of Washington today.

Retail milk in New York and two or three other large cities is 5 cents a quart. The Federal Treasury makes up the other 10 cents occasioned by the highest labor distribution costs in the world. How do you like that, Mr. Taxpayer?

The breaks, good and bad, make up an interesting proportion of public life. On a Saturday 26 new Republicans announced for the Ball resolution for afterwar planning, and the next night Churchill knocked the props out from under them.

"For some unknown reason there has been a great infiltration of Socialist-Communist-minded individuals into the various governmental bureaus and agencies, whose evident purpose seems to be the destruction of the Jeffersonian philosophy, and substitute therefor a controlled subsidized credit system."

"Judging from Captain Rickenbacker and Colonel Lindbergh, some of these ace flyers not only have convictions but also have the courage to stand up for them. Of course, as air pilots they were self-reliant, which tends to individualism. They neither fal' for mob madness nor do they fear the mob."—Clif Stratton, Topeka Daily Capital.

War Department Policy for Releasing Soldiers Under 38 for Farm Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, with the farm manpower shortage growing more critical by the day and with the War Manpower Commission shifting its policy, the people in the farm sections of the country, as well as many of us here in Congress, have had difficulty in getting a clear-cut statement relative to the actual situation that prevails at the moment.

Many elderly farm people have written me about the release of their sons from the armed forces in order that they could return to the farms to plant and harvest the 1943 crops. In most of these instances the soldier is under 38 years old.

In order to furnish these people with an answer that could be based on official information I have attempted to compile data which would be authentic as of this date and which have been checked for that purpose with the War Department today.

Briefly the War Department states that soldiers under 38 years "will be discharged only in cases of gravest emergency."

Under permission granted me, I desire to first submit a letter written to a Member of the House by Col. W. F. Pearson, War Department liaison officer. It reads as follows:

OFFICE, WAR DEPARTMENT LIAISON OFFICER,
The House of Representatives,
House Office Building:

Reference is made to your inquiry of yesterday as to the possibility of a man under 38 years of age being discharged from the Army, to engage in essential industry.

There follows a statement as to the only means known to this office, whereby a soldier may be discharged as indicated.

A soldier under 38 years may be discharged from the service to engage in essential industry, including agriculture, by applying for discharge for the maintenance of national health, safety, or interest.

If a soldier under 38 years of age makes application for discharge for the maintenance of national health, safety, or interest, he should forward with his application a statement setting forth the position offered him in civil life in essential war industry, with all

the supporting and duly attested data that he is able to obtain to prove his case.

I am forced to state that a discharge under the method mentioned is a cumbersome procedure and must not only be approved by the local military authorities but by the headquarters of Selective Service in Washington, D. C. Discharges such as indicated are provided for in the Selective Service Act of 1940, section 5–E.

I trust that the above is the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,

WM. F. PEARSON,
Colonel, Adjutant General's Department, Liaison.

Under the heading "War Department restates position on farm labor shortage problems" recently, the War Department also revealed its policy relative to the release of men under 38 years old, and I have today checked with them and find this statement of policy is still in effect.

The pertinent sections of the statement follow:

It was also announced by the War Department that the discharge of any appreciable number of soldiers under 38 years of age is not contemplated. However, a procedure is available whereby individual soldiers in this age group may be discharged in cases of extreme emergency. The soldier himself initiates this procedure by submitting written application to his immediate commanding officer who will advise him as to the necessary evidence to support his request. The application proceeds through military channels to Washington, thence to the Selective Service System which obtains for War Department consideration the viewpoint of the local Selective Service Board which initially selected the soldier for military service. Each case is decided on its own merits, and the decision to discharge is based upon the conclusion that the services of the individual are more important to agriculture than to the Army. Since these findings are based largely upon the decisions of prominent citizens in the soldier's home community, the War Department is enabled to give proper weight to the need for his return to his farm as substantiated by neighbors familiar with local conditions.

* * * * *

When a soldier under 38 desires to return to his farm, the necessity for his return is investigated by his local draft board, which reports its findings to the War Department through the National Director of the Selective Service System, War Manpower Commission, but such soldiers will be discharged only in cases of gravest emergency.

The Clean Plate Club—America's Most Unexclusive Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star-Journal and Tribune, one of the West's great newspapers, has begun a food preservation and conservation campaign that is most commendable. It appeals primarily to the boys and girls of America, but it is also equally applicable to the adults.

The name of the club is the Clean Plate Club.

A full-page advertisement appeared in the March 30 issue of the Washington (D. C.) Post explaining the Clean Plate Club and showing pictures of children proudly displaying clean plates as their badge of membership.

When we realize that 15 percent of the food we buy ends up in the garbage can, the new organization takes on real importance.

Because of the drastic food situation, this plan sponsored by the Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune is of unusual significance and of great importance. We must not only grow more food but we must also save what food we have produced.

I hope that this organization grows to such an extent that it covers the entire Nation.

After seeing the full page advertisement in the Washington Post, I sent the following telegram:

STAR-JOURNAL,
Minneapolis, Minn.
(Attention Mr. Basil L. Walters, Editor.)

Have just read your full page advertisement about the "Clean Plate Club" in the Washington Post. Let me congratulate your organization on inaugurating a campaign that is both unique and effective. Know that it will catch on and be responsible for conserving a great deal of our food supply. If I can do so, is your permission granted to place copy in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

HAROLD C. HAGEN,
Member of Congress.

His reply was:

Thanks for wire. Would be delighted if you saw fit to place in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Regards.

BASIL L. WALTERS.

The following paragraphs are taken from the advertisement that appeared in the Washington Post of March 30:

Join America's most unexclusive club—Dues: A clean plate at every meal.

Would it shock you to know that 15 percent of the food placed on your table ends up in the garbage can?

That's the food waste figure for the nation.

It's the worst kind of "absenteeism" in America-at-war!

It means that every member of your household—if yours is an "average family"—is throwing away three meals a week.

Three meals a week—that never get to Victory's production line.

Three meals a week—that might be going to our armed forces, our allies, and our friends.

There's something you and your family can do about it—right now:

Enlist in the Clean Plate Club of the Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune.

The Clean Plate Club was started in Minnesota for a reason.

The reason is that Minnesota is one of the great food-producing regions of the world. Last year more than half a dollar out of every hundred dollars of national income went to Minnesota farmers for the crops they raised.

Today the farms of Minnesota are one great, vital war industry, producing food for a free world.

Minnesota turns out yearly more than 575,000,000 pounds of dried or dehydrated milk for shipment abroad * * * more than 5,000,000 pounds of canned chicken for the armed forces * * * more butter and processed sweet corn than any other State * * * more turkeys than any state except Texas and California.

Minnesota grows garden seed for shipment to Russia, Britain, North Africa, India, South America, Australia. One recent 17,000-pound shipment alone will yield 160,000 tons of food in gardens nearer the battle fronts.

And so Minnesota, which produces food for victory, challenges you not to waste it.

The Clean Plate Club invites you to join with its members in the upper Mississippi Valley—school children, war workers, farmers, housewives, enlisted men and women, civic club members, business leaders, office workers—to do your part to end food waste.

In food-producing Minnesota the Clean Plate Club was started by the Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune because they are the favorite newspapers of the upper Mississippi Valley, read in more than 300,000 homes every weekday, more than 350,000 every Sunday—newspapers relied on not only for accurate, complete news coverage and sound editorial thinking, but also as good neighbors and dependable friends.

In the name of food-producing Minnesota, in the name of victory-bound America, in the name of a free and well-fed world, the Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune invite you and your family to enlist in the Clean Plate Club today.

The membership blank follows:

CLEAN PLATE CLUB

(Care of Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune, Minneapolis, Minn.)

Please enroll us as members of the Clean Plate Club. We pledge to do everything possible to avoid waste of food during the war. We agree to "clean our plates" at every meal.

Name_____

Address_____

How you can join the Clean Plate Club: This is the membership card signed, pasted on a penny post card and sent in by readers of the Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune. You'll be most welcome as a member, or you may want to use this or some other idea for food conservation in your own city or community.

T. V. A. and Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago Congress received from the President the third report made by the Tennessee Valley Authority since 1933 on the question of interregional freight rates. One of those reports usually called the Alldredge Report and compiled after long study by Mr. J. Haden Alldredge, now a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, is perhaps the most complete study yet made on that important subject.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include some correspondence on this subject between Chairman David Lilienthal, of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and Gov. Sam Jones, of Louisiana:

MARCH 12, 1943.

HON. SAM H. JONES,
Governor, State of Louisiana,
Baton Rouge, La.

DEAR GOVERNOR JONES: In your article in the current Saturday Evening Post you have, inadvertently, I trust, done a considerable

injustice to the Tennessee Valley Authority, one I hope you will wish to correct. I refer to your comments on freight-rate discrimination against the South.

On page 45 you write: "I say the new dealers, sitting in office by grace of the southern ballot, have been blind and deaf when the South pleaded with them to begin correction of the No. 1 cause of the Nation's No. 1 economic problem," namely, the interterritorial freight-rate situation.

In August of 1933 the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors, as one of its very first acts, authorized and directed me to have a study made of the freight-rate situation in this region. This resulted in the setting up of a division in the Tennessee Valley Authority, headed by Mr. J. Haden Alldredge, of Alabama. The Tennessee Valley Authority's report, usually referred to as the Alldredge report, submitted by this agency to the President in May 1937, and by him to Congress, was the beginning of the correction of this injustice. It was this Tennessee Valley Authority report that 6 years ago called official attention to the essential facts, and was the direct precursor of congressional and Interstate Commerce Commission action that is the only reasonable way open to a correction of the evil.

I feel sure that inadvertence rather than any wish to confuse the record prompted you in neglecting to refer to these facts. I have before me your letter to me of December 19, 1941, in which you comment most generously on the part of the Tennessee Valley Authority's leadership played in this very matter. (For your convenience I enclose this correspondence.) As a member of the Southern Governor's Conference, I am sure you will recall that the Tennessee Valley Authority, in accordance with the wishes of the States themselves, has been acting as coordinator for the economic side of the class rate case before the Interstate Commerce Commission for the various States of the South and West, and further that Mr. A. D. Spottswood of Tennessee Valley Authority's staff, was a principal witness before the Interstate Commerce Commission in this very proceeding.

As to the political matters raised by your article I have no comment. But on the facts the Tennessee Valley Authority's record in respect to the freight-rate discrimination against the South and West is of such a character that you can see why I feel that your condemnation seems wrong, and in fairness ought to be corrected publicly.

Within a very few days now the Tennessee Valley Authority will complete a third report on this interregional freight-rate issue. This report fortifies some of the more general statements included in my speech upon which you commented in your letter of December 19. This latest report will, I believe, have a good effect in further clarifying in the public mind the evil consequences to the Nation of the interregional freight-rate structure.

Since the publication of your article we have had so many inquiries and comments respecting the Tennessee Valley Authority's participation in the regional freight-rate matter that I trust you will have no objection if I should make available our correspondence on this subject for the purpose of clarifying our own record.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL,
Chairman.

STATE OF LOUISIANA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Baton Rouge, December 19, 1941.

Hon. DAVID E. LILIENTHAL,
Chairman, Tennessee Valley Authority,
Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR MR. LILIENTHAL: This is to acknowledge receipt of and thank you for your letter of December 8, enclosing copy of speech delivered by you before a recent transportation conference at the University of Texas on the subject of freight rates and southwestern industry. I have found your paper both interesting and beneficial.

While, as you are aware, the Southern Governors' Conference was organized primarily for the purpose of and has been devoting practically its entire attention to the correction of the unconscionable inequities existing in the freight-rate structure prevailing in this country, the exact extent of such inequalities have never appeared to me so clearly and to the extent as manifested from the statistics demonstrated on the charts appearing in your paper.

You have rendered a great service in my opinion in indisputably disapproving what you term the classic argument that the greater density of traffic in the Northeastern States makes lower rates in that region possible when compared with similar distance service in the southern and western regions. This argument has always presented a question of economics which has been difficult to answer. Evidence accumulated by expert accountants and statisticians of the Interstate Commerce Commission, from which you prepared the data showing true average costs of moving traffic to be less in the southern and western regions, provides that section of the country which is being discriminated against with the most effective weapon since commencement of efforts to obtain freight-rate equality.

A favorable termination of this problem appears to me as the most vital and important domestic goal of the Southern and Western States at this time. I have and shall continue to exert every effort and influence as chief executive of this State to bring about an early correction of this undemocratic rate structure.

I would feel deeply indebted to you if you will continue to provide me with statistics and data prepared by your staff in future studies of this question, which work is indicated in your paper.

If not incompatible with your office as Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, I, for one, would like to enlist your active support, assistance, and cooperation in the fight which we are making to bring about a correction of the evils so clearly indicated in your paper.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate you on the fine work being done by the Tennessee Valley Authority. I am somewhat familiar with your program in forestry, housing, fertilizers, soil conservation, education of farmers in proper practices, etc., and know that you have done one of the outstanding jobs in the country.

With every good wish for Christmas and the New Year, I am,

Cordially yours,

SAM H. JONES,
Governor of Louisiana.

The Glorious Greeks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a speech I delivered at Worcester, Mass., March 28, 1943, before the Mu Lambda Pi Society and entitled "The Glorious Greeks":

The Mu Lambda Pi Society has greatly honored me by the invitation to attend its first annual dinner dance this evening. It is most significant and fitting that this should be held on the occasion of the commemoration of the one hundred and twenty-second anniversary of the declaration of Greek independence.

Most of you are natives of the United States but the rich blood of your Grecian ancestors which flows in your veins must bring you feelings of justifiable pride when you look back and contemplate the glories of the ancient race from which you have sprung. Most of you are or will be faithful, true, and loyal American citizens, yet it is only natural that on occasions like this you should pay well-deserved homage and tribute to the achievements, the accomplishments, the virtues, and the outstanding characteristics of the Greek race to which you owe your noble heritage and birthright.

The grandeur of ancient Greece has in many respects never been equaled in the whole history of mankind. The spirit of freedom, the passion for democracy, the love of beauty, art, music, and all the fine impulses of the human heart which flourished and blossomed with such rich fertility during the age of Pericles have certainly never been exceeded by any civilization that man has established on this earth.

There was a reason why the Greeks were able to mold such remarkable institutions of culture, freedom, and justice. These institutions grew out of the innermost impulses and instincts of the Grecian character, out of the love of liberty, out of the respect for the dignity of the individual, out of reverence for the power of the Almighty, out of a burning passion for righteousness and justice, and out of an invincible determination to fight against all odds to establish, maintain, and preserve high ideals and high principles of life and government.

Down through the unbroken, sometimes uncharted, channels of history these noble impulses of Greek antiquity have descended to confer untold benefits upon the whole human race. Like Aristotle and Plato, the Greeks have kept their feet on the ground and their eyes fixed upon the stars and have never surrendered their convictions or their ideals even when the yoke of oppression was fastened upon them.

Just as the glories and the grandeur of ancient Greece have thus influenced the whole course of civilization, the example of the modern Greeks who have given to the world such an inspiring lesson in sacrifice, courage, and the willingness to give of themselves in order to fight off oppression, hatred, and injustice has produced among us a spirit of admiration and inspiration which enables us to move against the common enemy with renewed enthusiasm, determination, and confidence.

Greek Independence Day marks but one of very many glorious exploits of the Greek people. Almost entirely unarmed, for almost 400 years cruelly oppressed, in the face of overwhelming odds, the Greeks l idly hoisted the blue-and-white flag of independence and started the 7-year war of liberation from Turkish domination. This was another memorable chapter in the struggle for human freedom. What was said then by a great American seems just as timely and appropriate today, when Greek Independence Day finds the Greek people again united in an epochal battle for liberty, this time side by side with our own great American Nation. President Monroe once said, "The name of Greece fills the mind and heart with the highest and noblest sentiments. Superior skill and refinements in arts, heroic gallantry in action, disinterested patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to liberty are connected with our memories of old Greece. The disappearance of this country for a long time under an aggressive dark yoke has profoundly grieved the generous spirits of the past; it was therefore natural for the reappearance

of these people in its original character, fighting for its liberty, to arouse the enthusiasm and sympathy everywhere in the United States."

Those stirring words are as true today as when they were first spoken. There stands glorious Greece sacked, pillaged, starved, and deprived of food, invaded, imprisoned, overrun by nefarious barbarians, the people slaughtered, innocent children butchered, the whole nation torn and ravaged, yet invincible and unconquered.

Like the heroes of old, these great modern heroes and warriors know no surrender. They will not lay down their arms until they have made their country safe from the barbaric aggressors who have invaded its sacred precincts, until they have avenged the horrible wrongs perpetrated upon their people, until they have regained their beloved liberties and their cherished peace, security, and happiness.

Whether it be the spirit of the late Premier who refused, at pistol point, to surrender his country, with the stirring words, "I will not give up the Greek Nation for the sake of one man's life," or whether it be that of the starving, emaciated Greek child, stamping in defiance on the piece of candy offered him as a bribe by an officer of the enemy, or the dry, tearless eyes of the Greek women as they send their sons into battle, we have on every hand striking evidence of the unyielding determination and stanch invicibility of the Greek Nation. Just as she has overcame tyranny, ignorance, and oppression in the past, she is destined to rise again to a glorious triumph over the dark and evil forces that would torture and suppress her citizens and deprive her of freedom. Greece is immortal.

We in America have a solemn duty imposed upon us in these unparalled days to keep alive the burning love of freedom and liberty which has animated the Greek people throughout its long, magnificent history. Today we are fighting side by side with this great ancient nation. We are fighting to preserve for ourselves and our posterity certain self-evident truths and principles of righteousness and decency upon which the whole future of our country depends.

While our brave and gallant boys are waging relentless battle on the war-torn, far-flung battlefields of the world giving their all that our Nation may be preserved, and that the cause of human liberty may triumph, let us be mindful of our own obligations as citizens of this great country; let us determine to take example and inspiration from the brave struggle and invincible spirit of Greek people who have not been and will not be crushed but who will rise to greater glory when, God willing, the yoke of oppression is finally lifted. Let us catch some of their willingness to sacrifice, some of their willingness to bear and endure hardship and privation in order to keep inviolate our own citadel of freedom. Let us fight abroad and at home against the threatening dangers to our own institutions by waging unyielding war against ruthless, cruel, foreign foes. As we begin the important work of this vigorous young group and commemorate the heroism of modern Greek independence, let us constantly be reminded of the enemies here at home in America who seek the destruction of our form of government and our system of free enterprise. Let us disavow regimentation and bureaucracy and all efforts to smother the free impulses of our people.

If we strive for these ends, we will be keeping our faith with those great and exalted principles of human conduct, decency, and idealism which have been at once not only the source of the strength of the great achievements of the Greek Nation but also the virtue and happiness of our own noble heritage.

Greece will live again, the luster of its ancient glory will never be dimmed. With our own United States of America standing solidly with her in this darkest hour of tribulation and despair, the Greek nation will enjoy a new birth of freedom this time, let us hope and pray, an enduring freedom from exploitation by cruel aggressors who seek to extinguish the light of liberty throughout the world.

In the words of Pericles, "Nay, rather, you must fix your gaze upon the power of Athens and become lovers of her, and when the vision of her greatness has inspired you, reflect that all this has been acquired by men of courage who knew their duty and in the hour of conflict were moved by a high sense of honor, who were resolved that their country should not find herself deserted by their valor, but freely sacrificed to her the fairest offering it was in their power to give. For they gave their lives for the commonweal, and in doing so won for themselves the praise that grows not old and the most distinguished of all sepulchers—not that in which they lie buried but that in which their glory survives in everlasting remembrance."

A Soldier's Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE B. BATES

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Garrett M. Wright, a relative of mine, to his father Dr. J. F. Wright, of Russell, Ky. I am inserting this letter because I think it gives information that will be helpful to other Members of Congress. This boy has been on foreign soil for several months, and his letter tells us what the boys over there are thinking:

FEBRUARY 2, 1943.

DEAR POP AND MOM: I wrote you a letter last night but will try to write a few lines again tonight as I think that the mail may be going out in the next few days and I hate to pass up a chance to write to you when there is any possibility that my letter might reach you a little sooner.

It has been some time since I have heard from you, with the exception of the cable that I received a few days ago. I am always glad to receive a cable from you because then I know that you are all well but a cable does not give me very much to write about.

There is just one thing that I am going to mention: In one of the news flashes that we receive, I see where the coal miners in Pennsylvania are striking again. I realize that situated as we are there is nothing that I can do about it. But, I just thought that you might mention to Joe that the attitude of the soldiers is very much against that kind of business at the present time and that any steps that they might take to remedy the situation, will be appreciated by the folks at home and the soldiers away from home.

Pop, I can assure you that the above statement expresses the sentiments of myself and of the majority of the soldiers who are away from home.

There is no doubt in any of our minds but what the worst conditions that they might have to contend with is nothing compared to what a lot of soldiers, sailors, and other units of our fighting forces have to contend with.

Well, so much for that. I feel better having unloaded it from my mind.

This leaves me well. I hope that you are all getting along all right. Do not worry because you cannot send me any more packages as it does not work any hardship on me as I can obtain practically everything I need at the canteen. Just continue to write long letters as often as you can and I will be satisfied. Take good care of each other, do not worry, and always remember, I am,

Your loving son,

GARRETT.

Plight of Dairymen in Rhode Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include several letters written by the Local Dairymen's Association, of Rhode Island, to the State's milk consumers. I also wish to include an item of news published in the Providence Evening Bulletin, of March 24, which is on the same subject.

I ask that my colleagues read these items so that it may not be said at some future date, as has been said all too often, "Oh, if I had only known in time":

LETTER NO. 1

To the Milk Consumers of Rhode Island:

The time has come when the dairy farmers believe the consumers of Rhode Island should have brought to their attention facts relative to the fluid-milk situation in this market.

The fluid-milk producers in this State are faced with very critical and unsatisfactory production and price problems which require immediate attention. We wish to point out that a ceiling, ordered by Office of Price Administration, should not be placed upon producer prices at the present time because of a lack of adequate control over the prices of the principal items entering into the cost of production.

The freezing of producer prices upon the basis of January levels means the freezing of prices below the cost of production. By cost of production we do not refer either to the average costs or the highest costs of any producer. We mean the necessary costs of enough reasonably efficient producers whose fluid-milk production is required to provide a reasonably adequate supply to consumers. Thus such a price-freezing order will have, and has had, a disastrous effect upon both the fluid-milk producers affected and also upon the available supplies of milk and upon the consumers.

You may doubt that the imposition of the ceiling upon producer prices will cause such serious consequences. We who are closely in touch with the producers are convinced that the result may even be more serious than we have expressed.

We ask you in all sincerity whether it is necessary for the Federal Government to cause such conditions.

We ask you, furthermore, whether you are prepared to accept the consequences.

THE LOCAL DAIRYMEN'S CO-OP ASSOCIATION, INC.,

ELMER A. HAVENS, *President.*

LETTER NO. 2

To the Milk Consumers of Rhode Island:

The farm labor situation in this state is definitely acute. The number of farm workers has declined 25 to 30 percent, and there has been very little replacement. Two-thirds of those leaving our farms have been attracted to our shipyards and war industries because of high wages paid and the other third have joined the armed forces.

Farmers of the State are hesitating, even at this late date, to make plans for the raising of crops and livestock which would involve more than their own individual family labor. Milking cows are going to be butchered in record numbers, principally because their owners feel they cannot get labor to keep them in production. The potato raisers and vegetable growers are delaying the ordering of seed and fertilizer. They had the sad experience last fall of not being able to get all their crops out of the ground. As a result of the gloomy outlook for production, quite a number of farms are being sold and their operations discontinued.

There are many things about farming which city people do not understand. One of them is that just anybody cannot be a farmer and a food producer. A dairy herd can be ruined in 6 weeks by a green hand. Expensive and complicated machinery of the kind now in use on farms cannot be entrusted to unskilled workers, especially at a time when it is difficult or impossible to obtain repair parts.

How can we be expected to meet our Nation's food-production goals with no skilled farm labor available? How can we hold our workers on the farm when you compare the 48 hours, with time and a half for overtime in other industries, with the 70 hours of work required on the farm, plus the low wages the farmer can afford to pay?

It is necessary that immediate attention be given to this important and vital problem.

THE LOCAL DAIRYMEN'S CO-OP ASSOCIATION, INC.,
ELMER A. HAVENS, *President.*

LETTER NO. 3

To the Milk Consumers of Rhode Island:

Do you realize that while wages and income are about double what they were in the First World War, farm prices are still under 60 percent as high as they were then? Do you realize in the First World War, 58 percent of the worker's dollar went for food, yet in this war only 28 percent of that dollar goes for food? Just think, the farm group, representing about 22 percent of the total population, is receiving only about 12 percent of a total annual income of over $100,000,000,000, most of which is used in debt paying.

Some of the newspapers are calling farmers and their leaders unpatriotic because farm organizations have stood up for farmers' rights in demanding fair prices for farm products. The great majority of farmers would be willing to have a ceiling put on the prices of farm products, providing there also was a ceiling put on everything else, including wages. But it is grossly unfair and not good for the country itself to demand that farmers keep their prices down, in our case, below the cost of production, while wages, the chief cost in everything the farmer buys, are not restricted in any way.

The volume of farm production is always influenced by prices. When the price of farm products is higher relatively than costs of production, farmers tend to increase production. Increased production of food is essential if we are to care for the needs of our home people, provide abundant supplies for our armed forces, and aid in furnishing food for the people of Britain and Russia.

A sure way to create a food shortage will be to continue forcing farmers to work longer hours and for lower comparative income than those engaged in other lines of industry. Fair prices to food producers will stimulate adequate production, be a safeguard against inflation, and furnish protection to consumers.

THE LOCAL DAIRYMEN'S CO-OP ASSOCIATION, INC.,
ELMER A. HAVENS, *President.*

LETTER NO. 4

To the Milk Consumers of Rhode Island:

We are certain you agree that the production of food is as necessary for the successful prosecution of the war as is the production of any other implements of war. If this is so, why is it approved by Government agencies as being entirely satisfactory to pay workmen $10, $15, and $20 a day to produce those implements, but as being all wrong to pay those who produce the food a living wage for their services and certainly not a wage comparable with those paid in the war industries?

Back in 1910 the average factory worker's wage was 20 cents an hour. In July 1942 it was 85 cents. That is an increase to 401.7 percent of the 1910 index. For the same period the average farm wage rate was 13 cents per hour, without board. In July 1942 it was 30 cents. That is an increase of 132 percent.

The average weekly wages of Rhode Island manufacturing and industrial workers are as follows:

1939	$22
1940	24
1941	31
1942 (December)	36

The average weekly wages paid farmers in Rhode Island are:

1939	$16.25
1940	16.25
1941	16.25
1942	23.50

Construction workers in our State are averaging $60 per week. A laborer can average $50 per week by working 48 hours. Is it any wonder that farmers are leaving the farms and going into war plants?

Only with a fair price can farmers continue to produce. We cannot understand why a farmer is not entitled to a commensurate increase in the price of his milk to take care of the increase in wages he must pay those who work for him. Yet industrial wages are allowed to soar.

THE LOCAL DAIRYMEN'S CO-OP ASSOCIATION, INC.,
ELMER A. HAVENS, *President.*

LETTER 5

To the Milk Consumers of Rhode Island:

The Department of Agriculture has proposed a subsidy program under which a bonus is to be paid to farmers in the form of incentive payments. Such a policy would mean appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars and adding that amount to our national debt.

We believe such a program is unsound because subsidies are inflationary. They increase spending power either by increasing the price of commodities to producers or reducing the cost to consumers. A subsidy which is paid from loans is unfair to future generations. Someone must pay in the future in order to give someone greater spending power at the present time. Subsidies which are paid from current receipts are unfair because they make everybody pay for the benefits enjoyed by a few. Subsidies which are paid to reduce living costs are certainly unjustified during a period when more people are employed than at any preceding time and wage scales are at the highest levels ever reached.

The farmers do not want this. They want a fair price for their products. They are entitled to it, and the Office of Price Administration should obey the law which Congress passed so that they can get it.

Our way would be to pay the men who work on the farms more money and let ceilings go up correspondingly, just as we have paid the men in the manufacturing plants more money, and the prices of all manufactured products have gone up and have been increased to farmers and all other consumers. Our way would be to pay the farm worker a decent wage, to add that wage to the cost of production, and to give justice to the farmer whose son is in the armed forces, just as we give justice to others in America whose sons are in the armed forces.

We firmly insist the Office of Price Administration reconsider ceilings established upon prices of fluid milk paid to producers in Rhode Island and give them at least cost of production plus enough to provide a moderate standard of living.

THE LOCAL DAIRYMEN'S CO-OP ASSOCIATION, INC.,
ELMER A. HAVENS, *President.*

LETTER NO. 6

To the Milk Consumers of Rhode Island:

With farm help fast disappearing, farm machinery becomes more important than ever. The employment of labor-saving machinery is next to impossible, due to the fact that allotments for farm machinery are only about 20 percent of normal farm purchases. On October 20, 1942, the War Production Board issued an order limiting the manufacture of farm equipment to one-fifth of the amount of new equipment that was manufactured in 1940.

The State of Rhode Island has had a very small percentage allotted to it. We list the number of units allotted of the more essential: 1 Ensilage cutter, 1 corn binder, 3 manure spreaders, 3 side-delivery rakes, 3 dump rakes, 6 milk coolers, 7 hay loaders, 16 wheel-type tractors.

In order to purchase new equipment a farmer must fill in an application which must be presented to his county farm-rationing committee. The application contains the following clause: "I also agree to rent, or do custom work with, or let others use, such new farm machinery and equipment as I shall purchase, on such terms and conditions as the county farm-rationing committee may deem necessary." In simple language this means he agrees to pool his machinery. He agrees he will work for his neighbors. If he refuses to do this, he agrees he will rent or sell the new farm machinery to such person or persons as the county farm-rationing committee may designate. Many farmers would hesitate to sign such a contract.

How can you expect a farmer to share his tools and equipment with his neighbors when all need the same implements at virtually the same time? Naturally he is reluctant to lend or rent a machine that cost from $200 to $1,000, which is indispensable in his own work and which is practically impossible to replace, unless he is very sure of the skill of the man who wishes to use it.

A reasonable amount of labor-saving machinery without so much red tape attached to it would be helpful in meeting the labor shortage. We urge that a greater proportion of necessary material be released for the manufacturing of farm machinery in order that we may go about our task of producing this vital food which is so essential in the war program.

THE LOCAL DAIRYMEN'S CO-OP ASSOCIATION, INC.,
ELMER A. HAVENS, *President.*

LETTER NO. 7

To the Milk Consumers of Rhode Island:

The farmer knows that his costs—labor and materials—are up. He knows he cannot produce at wartime costs and sell for peacetime prices (the ceilings set by the Office of Price

Administration) any more than can the manufacturer. The dairy farmer's costs have advanced more rapidly in the past year than in any previous year, yet he is asked to produce at prices established at the beginning of the war.

Many of our farmers keep complete sets of books, and the following figures are taken from their records:

Farmer A produced 708,795 pounds of milk in 1942. His cost of production per hundredweight was $3.882. He averaged $3.693 per hundredweight for this milk, showing a net loss of 0.189 per hundredweight, or a total of $1,339.62 for the year.

Farmer B, who shipped 323,453 pounds during the year, found his cost of production was $4.6225 per hundredweight. He averaged $4.32 per hundredweight, showing a loss of 0.3025 per hundredweight, or a total of $978.45 for the year.

Farmer C produced 137,938 pounds during January, February, and March 1942. His cost of production per hundredweight was $4.076. He averaged $3.48 per hundredweight, showing a loss of 0.593 per hundredweight, or $817.97 for the 3 months. During October, November, and December 1942 he produced 156,998 pounds of milk. His cost of production per hundredweight was $4.374. He averaged $3.804 per hundredweight, showing a loss of 0.57 per hundredweight, or $894.89 for the 3 months.

This farmer found it impractical to continue operating under such heavy losses and sold his herd the early part of this year.

Farmer E's records show his cost of production for January 1943 to be $4.56. How much longer can this farmer be expected to produce milk in a $4.10 market?

According to figures prepared by J. L. Tennant, agricultural economist, extension service, Rhode Island State College, it is estimated that the cost of producing milk in Rhode Island, using March price levels, is $4.56 per 100 pounds at the farm.

With the thought always in mind that what the farmer gets above the actual cost of producion must be considered his profit or wage—for he is a businessman as well as a workingman—one need not be a prophet to foretell his future.

Price ceilings on farm products have seriously interfered with the flow of food to market and have discouraged plans to increase production. If farmers cannot meet these increased costs, they cannot produce the food to win the war.

We believe a sound price policy for the dairy industry must be established to permit adequate prices to producers to call forth the necessary production.

THE LOCAL DAIRYMEN'S CO-OP ASSOCIATION, INC.,
ELMER A. HAVENS, *President*.

SUMMARY

To the Milk Consumers of Rhode Island:

We believe we have proved conclusively in our previous letters the plight of the dairy farmer in this State. We have presented a few of the facts pertaining to the high cost of producing milk, and that unless farmers are given half a chance to at least break even, they cannot keep on producing. In this, our final letter, we would like to point out that—

1. Farm labor has been reduced by about 30 percent—one-third by draft and the other thirds by the lure of huge wages in war industries. The farm industry must be very sick if the skilled worker is to be replaced by women and children because the farmer cannot compete with wages paid in the war plants.

2. An alarming number of farmers have sold their cows for slaughter and have discontinued production.

3. Farmers never make a real profit, just a meager living. The farm group, constituting 22 percent of the total population, received only 12 percent of the national income.

4. Statistics show that while the farmer's income last year was 149 percent of parity, labor's income has increased to 397 percent. Yet the Office of Price Administration has frozen the farmer's selling price below his cost of production. We believe that before the Office of Price Administration sets ceilings on commodities it be authorized to request actual costs of production in order to arrive at a fair average price and in this way will prevent serious losses. The only way this can be accomplished is to amend the Price Administration Act. We also believe when ceilings are set on commodities, profits as well as losses are frozen, and this is not the intent of Congress.

5. The Department of Agriculture has talked of subsidies. Such a program is inflationary and will defeat the very purpose of the Office of Price Administration by adding hundreds of millions to an already mounting public debt and will make everyone pay in taxes for the benefit of a certain few.

6. The farmer is faced not only with the labor shortage but with a cut of 80 percent in new machinery. As all farms today are highly mechanized, you may well imagine where this leaves him in the production line.

7. As a cooperative milk producer association, we have costs of production from a large number of milk producers for 1942, proving conclusively that the farmer cannot remain in business at the present fluid-milk prices. This fact is substantiated by figures from the Extension Service, Rhode Island State College (another Federal bureau).

In conclusion, we believe the most effective way of encouraging larger production is higher prices. Common sense tells us that if the farmer cannot receive the cost of production, he simply cannot produce. When he does not produce, there is a scarcity, and scarcity always increases the price of any commodity. The best cure for this is abundant production, but abundant production cannot be achieved by placing a low ceiling on farm prices.

By lifting repressive ceilings, farmers will produce enough food to meet requirements. Give the dairy farmer a 2-cent-per-quart increase, which is only an increase of 12 percent, and even with today's shortages and high production costs he will produce the food. Unless the Office of Price Administration raises the ceiling price 2 cents per quart, the milk consumer of Rhode Island will be faced with milk rationing before too many months. If the Office of Price Administration will let the farmer operate on at least a break-even basis, then this and our previous letters have served their purpose.

THE LOCAL DAIRYMEN'S CO-OP ASSOCIATION, INC.,
ELMER A. HAVENS, *President*.

[From the Providence (R. I.) Evening Bulletin of March 24, 1943]

FOUR RHODE ISLAND FARMERS TO SELL HERDS; BLAME LABOR SCARCITY, LOW PRICES—REPORT INABILITY TO GET ADEQUATE HELP TO PLANT, CULTIVATE, AND HARVEST CROPS FOR CATTLE; TO AUCTION 209 HEAD WITHIN FEW DAYS

(By Leonard O. Warner)

Four Rhode Island dairy farmers, faced with the immediate prospect of planting, cultivating, and harvesting crops for their cattle without adequate help, will sell out their herds within the next few days.

Three of the herds are large, by Rhode Island standards, numbering as high as 80 head, while the fourth is of average size—15 cows. A total of 209 cattle will change hands in the four sales.

Auction notices advertising the four sales first appeared yesterday morning and later in the day the four farmers told stories that were almost as one. They could not remain in business, they said, in the face of labor shortages and low prices.

On Friday two auctions will be conducted. At 1 o'clock Auctioneers Carl and Al Witter, of Danielson, will take the stump to sell the 80 cows of Vito A. Macera, of Middle Road, Frenchtown, while at 1:30 o'clock on Skunk Hill Road in Hope Valley, Auctioneer Fred A. Bailey will "knock down" 15 head of cattle for George V. Crandall.

The Witter brothers, hoarse from overwork these days, will jump to Bowen Hill Road in remote Summit, Coventry, Saturday to sell 61 cattle on the farm of Byron E. Hazard, producer representative on the State board of milk control. That auction will open at 10 a. m.

Monday they will preside at an auction at 1 o'clock at the Everett Carr farm, corner of Seven Mile Road and Scituate Avenue, Cranston, where Horace L. Greene, of Washington, Coventry, will put up his 80 head of cattle for sale. Greene purchased the cattle several months ago from Carr, he said, and is being forced to sell because his lease on Carr's barn runs out April 1.

Hazard, a sharp-eyed farmer who chews a cigar continually, was vitriolic yesterday in his attack on the price and labor situation.

"The minute the Office of Price Administration told the farmers they could not have the price rise the State board of milk control allowed them," he said, "I decided to sell the whole. And I did."

Hazard sold his 250-acre farm to Cecil Ferguson, Frenchtown resident who was forced to move when the Navy condemned his property under a leasehold agreement. Ferguson bought the cows, too, but then sold them to A. Spungin of East Greenwich, who in turn will offer them at auction.

SAYS DEALERS "MILK" FARMERS

"This is a damned bad situation," Hazard said as he stood on the whitewashed barn floor. "The farmers milk the cows and then the dealers milk the farmers."

His reference, he said, was to the Office of Price Administration's action in nullifying the 25-cent price rise allowed by the State board of milk control. The State board told Rhode Island farmers they would be paid $4.35 per hundredweight for 3.7 milk as of February 1, an increase from the $4.10 price. Along came Office of Price Administration to freeze the milk price at the January level, which automatically sent the Rhode Island price back down to $4.10.

"And none of that increase came out of the consumer," Hazard said. "It came from the dealer spread. In other words, the farmers were getting more money and the consumers were still paying 16 cents a quart. But Office of Price Administration stepped in and that's that."

Hazard, a native Rhode Islander, has been on his Coventry farm for 22 years and for 4 years he has been a member of the State board of milk control. "I imagine," he said, "that a lot of dealers will be glad to see me leave the State board, if I do."

REACHES POINT OF IMPOSSIBILITY

Hazard isn't the kind of a fellow who gives up easily, but he said he has reached the point of impossibility. "A lot of days I don't have my breakfast until 2 p. m. and then I have supper at midnight," he said.

He should have from three to four helpers, but he has only one. He had to leave more than $1,000 worth of crops in the fields, he said, because he could not find any labor last fall. "I can't do that again," he said. As a result of his failure, he explained that he has been forced to buy a lot of feed. "And prices are high."

Hazard doesn't know what he is going to do, but he recalled that he once operated a steam shovel and "I guess I can do that again and make a lot more money than I did here working 22 hours a day."

Farmer Vito Macera, prominent in agricultural activities in southern Rhode Island, has been on his Frenchtown dairy farm for 11 years, but labor conditions, he said, have made it impossible for him to continue. "I used to have five men but now I have only one," he said. He expects to continue living on his 107-acre farm, but added, "I'm still in a fog about what I am going to do."

PRODUCTION CUT UNCERTAIN

It was a moot question last night how many of the 209 head of cattle to be offered for sale at the 4 auctions will remain in production. The consensus was that all of the cows to be put on the auction block are in good condition, but it remains to be seen whether there are farmers in the vicinity who can absorb the extra load. The alternative is that the cows go to the butcher block.

In any event, the State's agricultural picture will be materially affected because some of the farms involved in the four sales will probably not produce crops.

Greene—the farmer who will hold an auction Monday in Cranston—has been the victim of all sorts of tangles he said. He sold his farm in Coventry not long ago because he was about to be drafted. He failed to pass the physical requirements, however, and as a result was left without a job.

Then he bought the 80 head of cattle owned by Carr and has been milking those in the leased barn on the Carr farm. Carr, Greene said, was influenced in his decision to sell by the labor shortage.

COURAGE STILL GOOD

Greene said yesterday "He will attempt soon to lease part of the farm he once owned in Coventry so that he can continue in the milk business." His courage is good in the face of many difficulties. "Labor is hard to get," he said, "and when you do get some it isn't too good. You can't depend on it. I'm supposed to have four men, but all I have is myself and one other man."

Crandall is selling out his Hope Valley herd because he has accepted a position in the Wakefield office of the Federal Conservation Bureau. He said he would have kept his herd, however, had he been able to obtain reliable help to care for the cattle.

Elmer A. Havens, president of the Local Dairymen's Cooperative Association, had this to say about the situation: "It's a damned shame. You can't expect people to make milk if you don't pay them for it. This is only the beginning and by and by it's going to hurt like the devil."

Our Forgotten Peace Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the widespread discussion now taking place throughout the country with respect to the part which this Nation should take in post-war international affairs, I feel that the following article by Clarence K. Streit, which was published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 6 and 13, 1943, makes a valuable contribution to this discussion:

OUR FORGOTTEN PEACE POLICY

(By Clarence K. Streit)

I

(While The Christian Science Monitor has expressed a position on post-war world organization which does not specifically indorse Mr. Streit's well-known Federal Union proposals, this newspaper feels that this article, which is to be printed in two parts, will serve a very useful purpose in any general discussion of ways to build a free world—Editor's note.)

Men and women of many States, Nations, races, and religions have learned to live peacefully through Federal Union since 1787, when the framers of the American Constitution invented this solution of the problem of international government.

Yet the astonishing fact remains that none of the peoples who have benefited from Federal Union have ever tried to turn their experience with it to the benefit of world peace. This is the more astonishing when one considers that since 1787—and particularly since the United States proved that a Federal Union could withstand the shock of civil war—this system has been tried successfully on every continent.

In 1867 Canada, encouraged by far-sighted British statesmen, turned to Federal Union for solution of its Franco-British problem. In 1874 the German, French, and Italian cantons of Switzerland completed their transition from a league to a Federal Union. In 1900 Australia adopted the federal system. Then the British and the Boers ended their war in an enduring peace, thanks to another variation of Federal Union, the Union of South Africa.

Scrapping the Czar's highly centralized system for still another adaptation of the federal principle, the Soviets have carried it into Asia. They have proved in this war that it can do more than merely hold together Russia's vast territory and 49 recognized nationalities. Meanwhile from Argentina through Brazil to Mexico the federal system has long been governing great areas in Latin America.

The world has gained a great and varied wealth of experience with the federal answer to the international problem—but not one federal union has yet proposed officially that the possibility of applying federal principles to the world be so much as studied. And no people has neglected the federal union answer so much as the people of the oldest federal union, the United States of America.

President Wilson forgot America's federal principles when he organized the world as a league. The Senate, when it rejected his League, also failed to remember federal union. The Republicans were not thinking of a federal system when they proposed an "international association" in their 1920 platform. Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover made no effort to apply federal principles beyond our borders. Nor have the Democrats done so since they returned to power with President Roosevelt. In the 20 years that led from war to war, colleges, churches, great peace foundations, and other American institutions specializing in foreign affairs were busy studying and popularizing all kinds of solutions to the problem of world organization—all, that is, except the principles of the United States Constitution itself.

Now high officials at Washington tell us that we must begin in wartime if we are to work out the effective world organization that peace requires. But neither the White House nor the State Department has yet intimated that our public might begin this work at home, by examining the possibilities offered by our own federal principles. Is it not high time that we began to explore at least, how far we can apply these principles beyond our borders?

The American membership association that has nailed these principles to its masthead—Federal Union, Inc.—answers more than "Yes." Assembled in St. Louis at its second annual convention, it adopted as a program for action the following resolution:

"1. That the people of the United States, acting through their Government set up machinery for urgent consideration of how the principles of federal union, as exemplified in the Constitution and in other federal governments, might best be applied internationally now to win the war and secure enduring peace, a better standard of living, greater justice, and more individual freedom.

"2. That such consideration should comprehend—

"(a) The full application of federal principles to a nucleus composed of such nations as are found ready and able to undertake this step with greater hope of success.

"(b) The partial application of federal principles to an all-inclusive world organization, beginning with all the United Nations as a nucleus.

"(c) The preparation of draft constitutions designed to achieve both these objectives.

"3. That the machinery for this action might be provided, for example, in some such ways as either or both of the following suggestions:

"(a) That the United States Government invite both its neighbors, Canada and the United States of Mexico—both of which are federal unions—to form with it a New World Committee of Three for the purpose of organizing a broader Expert Commission on International Federal Union. To make the most of the world's available experience in this field, the members of this commission should be drawn from the peoples that have actually governed themselves by federal union. All the members of this commission would sit as private citizens, and none could represent any government. The commission would submit its report and its draft constitutions to the New World Committee for transmission to all concerned with a view to action.

"(b) That the United States Government invite the members of the existing Inter-Parliamentary Union to hold an emergency session in the United States to consider this whole problem, and particularly its bearing on the maintenance of the institutions of free, representative government."

This program was adopted after considerable discussion in a committee presided over by Chester C. Davis, president of the St. Louis Federal Reserve Bank and former Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. The discussion brought out the breadth and practical character of this program.

Some have contended that since it is impossible to apply the federal principles fully to all nations we should concentrate on applying them to the small nucleus of nations that are capable of taking this step now. Others have contended that since it is necessary to have some organization to which all nations equally belong, and since it is possible to apply some federal principles to all of them, we should concentrate on spreading federalism thinly to all, instead of thickly to some. Still others have contended that the two preceding policies are not mutually exclusive, that they complete each other, and that the best solution is to adopt them both. The program of Federal Union, Inc., calls for machinery broad enough to consider all these views, and competent to convert academic argument into concrete proposals for action.

Again, some argue that the union question should be left till after the war, and others contend, as I do, that we must establish it, at least provisionally, during the war

if we are to make sure of securing durable peace. Here, too, the program of Federal Union allows action without prejudicing either view. It calls for machinery—which might or might not be called a convention—not merely to study principles but to draft constitutions, one for a close union limited to the few democracies who are ready for this step; the other for a loose general federation of all the United Nations. To accept this program binds no one to accept any draft constitutions that result.

These drafts may have no more importance than the Virginia plan. It served as a basis for discussion when the Philadelphia Convention met in 1787, but can hardly be recognized in the Constitution of the United States finally adopted. The proposed machinery may serve, indeed, no greater purpose than was served by the meeting at Annapolis which failed to draft a constitution but did prepare the way for the Philadelphia Convention.

If, of course, we should again suffer disaster in war, then one of these draft constitutions might be given an immediate trial. Since we must always face the possibility of disaster, surely it is wise to be better prepared for an emergency union than the British and French were.

The concrete problem we face at present, however, is not that of drafting a constitution, but of providing the machinery for studying federal principles with this end in view. Someone has to be the host and set it up, or take the initiative in giving the problem to some existing machinery. The United States Government could do this alone in a variety of ways, or it could join with others to do this. The Federal Union program suggests two different ways but stresses they are meant only as examples.

II

One of the program's suggestions is that we ask our two neighbors, Canada and Mexico, to join us in playing host and setting up the machinery, that we form with them a "New World committee of three" for this limited purpose. Some have jumped to the conclusion that this means a union limited to North America, but to read the proposal is to see that this is not the aim. For the function of this new world committee would simply be that of setting up a commission of experts drawn not only from the three North American federal unions but from all the other federal unions, too. The aim is to let mankind pool all its experience with the federal principle.

The commission would presumably include experts from Australia, the Union of South Africa, the British Commonwealth, the Soviet Union, and Brazil, and other federal unions, such as Switzerland, which are outside the United Nations. This method would also allow the inclusion of refugee statesmen familiar with the working of federalism in Austria and Germany before the Nazis destroyed those democratic federations. Their participation would have obvious advantages from the viewpoint of winning the war as well as the peace. Whatever proposals this commission of experts made would go to the New World committee for transmission to the interested nations for action.

This method of organizing the machinery avoids both the extremes of making this initiative a purely United States move, and also the opposite extreme of leaving the initiative to so large a group of nations as to encumber action. It allows us to pay a compliment to both our neighbors and build up a spirit of North American solidarity. It manages to keep the host committee small by a process of selection so natural that no nation can be offended by it. Yet at the same time it includes in this committee representatives of the two groups of nations with which we have the closest ties—the British Commonwealth and the Latin-American republics.

Moreover, this method leaves the real problem not to the governments and diplomats but to experts who are best qualified to study and apply the principles of federalism to the international field, and who can act with all the freedom of private citizens. It allows the problem to be tackled objectively and on a high plane, instead of leaving it the football of power politics.

The other method that Federal Union, Inc., suggests would use the existing machinery of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. This body, which was organized in 1889, and has headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland, is composed of members of Parliaments in some 30 countries. By act of Congress all the members of the United States House of Representatives and Senate are ipso facto members of the American section of this Union. Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, the majority leader, is now chairman of the executive committee of the American group, which is bipartisan. The Inter-Parliamentary Union normally meets once a year, but has not met since the war began. The voting in it is roughly proportioned to the population of the various countries included. Its decisions, of course, have no binding power on governments, but it does allow the members of national legislatures a good opportunity to meet together, get acquainted personally, and discuss their common problems.

Attention was first called to the possibilities that the Inter-Parliamentary Union offers in the present crisis by JOHN M. VORYS, of Ohio, Republican member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and hitherto rated as isolationist. Speaking in the House on June 25, 1942, he suggested that the American group of this union call an international meeting of it "promptly in Washington to consider and discuss the preservation of representative government." Without referring directly to federal union, he explained:

"What is needed now is open formal discussion between elected representatives of the people in the democracies, in addition to the necessarily secret diplomatic and military conferences. * * * What is needed now is a broad public consideration by elected representatives of the warring peoples of our basic war aims and peace aims."

Stressing that "the important point is that this machinery for interchange of ideas betives, must assume their responsibility in the democracies already exists," Congressman VORYS concluded:

"The immediate conduct of the war should, of course, be left as it is, but we know from past experience that there is danger that war aims and peace plans dictated solely by military and diplomatic forces will not be effective. In the long run, any international organization, formal or informal, temporary or permanent, must have the support of the people in the democracies. This means that the people, through their elected representatives, must assume their responsibility in formulating and discussing such plans. The Inter-Parliamentary Union is a mechanism for doing this which is now in existence. Why not put it to work?"

The suggestion of Mr. VORYS is the more notable, since it is the first constructive proposal in this field to come from the so-called isolationist side. It is difficult to see what harm it could do for our Senators and Congressmen to get acquainted with their opposites in other democracies. It is easy to see that great good might come from such a meeting just now when the institutions of representative government are so endangered.

Another suggestion is that President Roosevelt or Congress begin at home by naming a bipartisan committee, composed equally of Democrats and Republicans, to consider how our Federal principles might best be applied internationally. This would aim at securing more agreement within the United States, a better understanding of the problem, and some measure of agreement on the broad lines of the solution before meeting with the representatives of other countries.

Still other suggestions would eliminate these preliminary moves; they would jump over the Annapolis stage in our own history and start now with the Philadelphia stage—an actual federal convention. Such a short cut was suggested in 1939 in Union Now when it called for the convocation of a constituent assembly of the free.

Another convention proposal, sponsored by Robert Lee Humber, has been adopted by the legislatures of North Carolina (1941) and New Jersey (1942). It asks for a congressional resolution "committing the United States to the acceptance of the principle of the Federation of the World and requesting the President of the United States to call an international convention to formulate a constitution for the Federation of the World, which shall be submitted to each nation for its ratification."

Among the other suggestions in this field must be mentioned the one sponsored by the Massachusetts Committee of Federal Union. It is the only one on which the voters themselves have voted. The Bay State has a unique provision whereby, on petition of 200 voters in a State representative district, a question on public policy can be put on the ballot in that district.

Thanks to it, the voters in 42 of the 164 districts in Massachusetts were asked to instruct their representatives in the legislature "to request the President and Congress to call at the earliest possible moment a convention of representatives of all free peoples, to frame a Federal constitution under which they may unite in a democratic world government." About two-thirds of the voters who had an opportunity to vote on this expressed themselves. Of these, about three to one in every district, Republican or Democrat, favored the proposal. The total vote was 202,503 for and 67,691 against. The districts concerned were urban, suburban, and rural, and scattered from the Berkshires to Boston.

Any of the various procedures mentioned or further variations of them could be used. Indeed, the National Board of Federal Union recently recommended both the Massachusetts and North Carolina formulas to other States, and the Massachusetts committee, in preparing its proposal for submission to the legislature, worked out with Mr. Humber a combination of the two texts which some consider better than either. Any procedure would seem better than continued neglect of the underlying problem, how to unite the free effectively to win the war sooner and keep it won longer.

What objections can there be to exploring now how we can unite the nations as our 48 States are united and enjoy the substance of union and not just an empty word?

Would it hurt our war effort? No. It would greatly aid it. The mere possibility of a World United States would bring hope everywhere, would reassure our people that their sacrifices could bring far greater good than they now believe possible; would encourage all our friends and weaken the resistance of our deluded foes.

But would not such work distract from our war effort? No. Those best fitted for working out international federal constitutions are rarely fitted for waging war—other than by thus uniting allies strongly enough to win and to prevent such catastrophes as a separate peace.

Would it take money needed for the war? It costs hardly anything.

Would it harm our country? To bring to humanity the boon of a World United States

would be the crowning glory of the United States of America.

Is it not too hard, impractical, Utopian? Some day a World United States will be created. It will be the work of men, just as was the United States of America. We are not so feeble that we ourselves cannot do what our fathers have already done, and what we expect our children to do. We have nothing to lose and everything to gain, even militarily, from asking competent men to begin at least exploring what can be done now, in this airplane age, to bring humanity nearer to this ancient dream. That step is not hard to take. Then why not take it, now?

Repeal of the Federal Use Tax on Motor Vehicles Is a Step in the Right Direction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since introducing H. R. 2010 to repeal the Federal use tax of $5 on motor vehicles some interesting facts have been revealed concerning the many taxes levied against the family automobile. As pointed out in my remarks on March 22 urging repeal of the Federal use tax on motor vehicles, in the great majority of States there are 18 direct taxes on automobiles or automobile operation, exclusive of the Federal use tax.

A recent survey by the Boston Automobile Club, an affiliate of the American Automobile Association, discloses that since gasoline rationing has become effective the cost of operating an automobile by an A card holder is prohibitive and beyond the bounds of reason.

It is pointed out that the A card holder is given an annual mileage of 1,000 miles a year in exchange for which he must pay taxes and cost of upkeep for his car that reaches an absolute minimum of approximately $195. To this minimum cost is added storage charges if he uses a public garage and also repairs which every motorist is subjected to in keeping his car fit for the road.

The survey conducted by the Boston Automobile Club further asserts that an A-card holder will be forced to pay from $200 to $300 yearly in driving his 1,000 miles—a cost of from 20 to 30 cents for each mile.

The following article from the March 25 issue of the Christian Science Monitor clearly explains the difficulties that have befallen A-card holders and the heavy burden of taxation that is levied against the family automobile. The article follows:

A-CARDERS PAYING HIGH FOR DRIVING—BOSTON CLUB FINDS THEY'RE SPENDING FROM 20 TO 30 CENTS A MILE TO OPERATE UNDER PRESENT RATION

BOSTON, March 25.—Thumbing over the records of what it costs the automobile owner in taxes, garaging, insurance, upkeep, and special fees to get his car on the road, the Boston Automobile Club today estimated that A-card holders were paying from 20 to 30 cents a mile to operate their cars under rationing restrictions of 1½ gallons of gasoline per week.

On this promise, the club announced that it had called a mass meeting of all affiliated agencies of the American Automobile Association in New England to be held in the Hotel Statler, April 5, to help avoid what the club declared might very well prove "a serious crisis in transportation on the home front."

The meeting will concentrate on the plight of A-card holders said to be paying more than $200 a year to travel a little over 1,000 miles under rationing allotments. At the same time the club will attempt to force the issue of linking New England in with projected fuel pipe lines now under construction to Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

Between now and the meeting, the club is watching local rationing boards to see whether they are basing supplemental gas allotments to B- and C-card holders solely upon occupational needs for automobile transportation, or whether they are taking into consideration the essential needs of average families.

As for the A-card holder, he is being given tickets by the Government to cover some 1,000 miles a year, in exchange for which he will pay an average of $10 in excise taxes, $2 for driving license, $3 to $4.50 for registration, $46.60 for adequate insurance coverage, $5 for Federal use stamp, $3 to $5 for battery recharging, $0.75 for tire checkings, $100 for depreciation, $3 to $4 for antifreezes, about $15 for gasoline, and $2.50 to $4 for oil changes and greasings.

These figures represent a flat minimum of $188.85 to $194.85 that the A-card holder must spend on his car. If he keeps his car in a public garage, these costs increase from $90 to $144 a year. Repairs are all extra, and who doesn't have repairs? To the Boston driver, the insurance costs are higher than the minimum figures. Washing, polishing, towings, and all incidentals are added costs.

Everybody Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 23, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a splendid editorial from the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer-News and commend it to the Members of Congress:

EVERYBODY PAYS

In a denunciation of the Hoover administration's increase of Federal income tax rates to meet the Federal deficit as revenue fell off after 1930, Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Governor of New York, and the 1932 Democratic nominee for President, declared that the country was headed for bankruptcy and that the burden of taxes would crush the people. In his oft-quoted speech at Pittsburgh, October 19, 1932, he said: "Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors because they are a burden on production and can be paid only by production."

The statement was commended for its truth. But what Mr. Roosevelt meant was that the taxes paid by people of substantial income are passed on until the burden falls in part on the people of small income and they cannot pass it on. They can only sweat it out. It was then hard to trace the tax payment of the well-to-do to the sweat of the man working for day wages. But under 10 years of Mr. Roosevelt's administration, all that has been changed. There is no step-by-step descent of the load on the people of small income. The load has fallen on them first hand. The Government has bled the rich white, ridden the people of medium income until they are staggering under a destructive peace debt to which has been added the cost of war, and now finds that it must go directly into the pockets of people of lower income. This was inevitable. The war only hastened the day.

The hint of things to come arrived with the withholding tax the first of the year. The reality arrived with March 15. The millions had to begin to pay. Many had to cash their War bonds, many declared they would not pay. But most paid because they want to support their Government in every way possible during the war, and they raised the money some way. Their thoughts about what they might have done will be long and searching. And they will center on Washington. Congress should listen closely, for the reaction will be a roaring demand for the firing of at least half of the Federal pay-roll riders and restoration of the Government to the people.

Typical American Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM I. TROUTMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. TROUTMAN. Mr. Speaker, in these perilous times, it is an inspiration to all of us to see how nobly the people of our country are responding. Day after day, we read of great sacrifices being made by our youth and their families in order that our American way of life might be preserved.

As an example, in my home paper, the Shamokin (Pa.) News-Dispatch, there appeared under the date line of March 25, 1943, this item:

Lee Edward Kistner yesterday became the seventh son of Mr. and Mrs. George F. Kistner, Northumberland, to be accepted for service in the armed forces of the Nation.

One of Kistner's brothers, Corp. Leonard Kistner, was the first Northumberland youth drafted for service. The other brothers are scattered over a wide area of service units.

An eighth son of the family, John Kistner, is employed as a bus operator between Sunbury and Northumberland, and unless he is deferred because of occupational employment, will be called for examination and induction in April or May.

Mr. and Mrs. George Kistner are typical American parents and their eight sons are typical American boys, hale and hearty with all the vigor and enthusiasm of young manhood. Seven are now in the service of their country and the eighth awaiting call to the colors.

This, Mr. Speaker, is what is happening all over our broad land. Whether it be one son or multiplied by 8, that goes forth from our American homes, we must never forget that there follows each and every soldier the prayers, heartaches, and anxieties of the parents left behind. "They, too, serve who only stand and wait."

Into the rearing of those sons have gone countless sacrifices of the parents, as well as their dreams and hopes for the future. As in every other war in which America has participated, these parents have patriotically laid aside those dreams and hopes at the call of country and are sending forth their sons in defense of American liberty and the American way of life.

The noble contribution of this family is not only an inspiration to us but also should be a challenge, a challenge to faithfully preserve and protect the liberty and freedom enjoyed by us under our American form of government.

Hogs Hard To Raise—Farmers Fight Cholera and Disease To Supply Us Pork

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, March 27, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully the other day to a speaker giving the figures of hogs we should raise in order to produce the pork and fats needed. He indicated that it would not be a difficult task. I had the impression that people here little knew of the great risks; the great obstacles and the hard work confronting the farmer who raises hogs. Those of you who complain now about the high price of that pork chop; those who complain that they cannot even buy a pork chop when they want it must remember two things, first, that the price you pay for that pork chop is not the price the farmer receives for it. Second, that before the farmer finally brings his finished hog to market he has worked unlimited hours; fought cholera and other diseases and in reality saved only a portion of the original number of hogs he expected to raise. The life of a farmer may look good in a story book or it may sound good from the lips of a city member who complains that the farmer is receiving too much for his products. But in reality, it is a far different story. I have here a letter of a typical case in my district. It comes from a real dirt farmer who is raising hogs. I include it with my remarks for your information:

PLATTE COUNTY, NEBR., *March 11, 1943.*

Hon. KARL STEFAN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR KARL: As you know, the Government has asked all of us farmers and stock raisers to produce more pork, beef, eggs, and cream for our Army and for all our people in this good old United States of America, the best country in the world. Well, last spring we had 12 brood sows; they farrowed 104 pigs. With good care and hard work we saved them all until about weaning time—then along came the big flood, the creek overflowed and the water came up to our yards. Well, everything went well until a few days later when we smelled a horrible stink. Upon investigating we found two dead hogs laying in our oats field that ran right to our feed lots. Some poor codger up the creek had the cholera and dumped the dead carcasses in a ditch; the flood washed them out and down the stream they came.

Well, a few days later our hogs commenced to look droopy—went off their feed. We guessed right away what was wrong so we had the veterinary come out. He looked them over and said: "Well, this looks bad; let's catch one and kill it and examine it." Here we were—cholera—No. 1. The best we could do then was to just give them a shot to check the fever and a few days later the vet gave them the cholera serum vaccine. I asked the doc what chance we had to save them and he said we would be lucky if we saved half of them.

We worked hard with them. We took gunny sacks, soaked them in water and put them on the pigs to try and check the high fever. This we kept up from early in the morning until late at night. Well with all the good care we could give them, we only lost 28 but some of the best ones. Well we babied them along—got many different kinds of feed and minerals to pep up their appetites—and now for this coming spring we breed 24 sows to increase our production. This we were more than willing to do.

And now, to top all of this, they go and put a ceiling on our hogs and about half our herd is ready for the market. Now do you think this is right for the farmers? Why do we always have to get it in the neck? Is there any other group of people that has to face as many ups and downs as the farmer? But there is one advantage we have—we can raise our own potatoes, meat, and bread, if the good Lord gives us the right kind of weather to do it. We have come through 6 years of drought and hardship, but we have kept our chins up and are willing to again and again.

With shortage of good farm labor and the very high prices, you are lucky if you get a man that will work to your interest. We cannot get along with most of the high-school kids. They want to quit early; they will want you to take them to the city so they can get their cold drinks, a beer or two, and go to the movies; the chances are they would like to shoot a few games of pool—why not? "I earn big money." Some are willing to work but don't know beans about the farm problems. First of all, what would they do with a big team of horses? They could soon learn to harness them and hitch them, but to go out in the field and plow and cultivate corn—well, they could do you more damage in a cornfield than a bunch of gophers. And tractor machinery, they would not know the first thing about it, and could do more damage in a few days than your season's crop would bring you.

As I was going to say, this hog ceiling is going to throw many, many brood sows on the market. If the ceiling price is too low to allow us a fair margin, what can we do? We cannot produce at a loss. We are more than willing to work 18 hours a day—7 days a week—so that we can give our boys the food they need and to help end this war so that our boys will soon be back home again.

Martin's Leadership of House Minority Proves Ability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House is devoted to the distinguished Republican, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., of Massachusetts. He is an outstanding leader. All Members, irrespective of party affiliation, know him affectionately as "Joe." His entire public career is one of tireless service to State and Nation. We deem it a distinct privilege to be in Congress with JOE MARTIN, and each of us appreciates his willingness at all times to help with our legislative problems.

On Saturday, March 27, 1943, the San Francisco Examiner published an editorial commending Mr. MARTIN, and I know the Congress and the country will be interested in reading this article:

MARTIN'S LEADERSHIP OF HOUSE MINORITY PROVES ABILITY

Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, of Massachusetts, leader of the Republican minority in the lower House of Congress, has a position of great power and responsibility under the American democratic system of government.

He organizes and directs the opposition to an administration which has a majority in Congress, and which is in practical effect "the Government."

When he opposes a proffered program or policy of the Government, and succeeds in mustering a majority of the House against it, he defeats the Government on a particular issue.

This is the very essence of the democratic system. It constitutes an effective check on the Government and is often a brake on the Government—and thus makes it possible for the Government to be rebuked and for its mistakes to be rectified and its excesses restrained.

Very much depends on the wisdom and patriotism of the opposition under the democratic system, whether the end gained is good or bad.

This is a chance the American people have always believed worth taking, although it is accounted the fatal weakness of democracy by advocates of other systems of government. Totalitarian governments never take it.

To those in government, even a democratic government, any opposition is an annoyance and an obstruction. Our present New Deal Government is not an exception. In peacetime, it thought its programs and policies for alleviating depression were essential to the best interests of the country and should not be questioned or obstructed. In wartime, it thinks everything it does is for the best and should be accepted without question.

Naturally, therefore, the New Deal administration had a bad opinion about the opposition.

It has complained that national unity is required to combat depressions and to win wars, and that unity of the people and opposition to government are incompatible.

Since the American people obviously have an entirely different opinion, and in the last congressional election—held in wartime—increased the minority controlled by Mr. MARTIN to a near majority, it must be concluded that the people regard national unity and constructive opposition as inseparable.

It is especially obvious that the American people have a wholesome respect for Mr. MARTIN, and great confidence in his leadership.

To account for this popular respect and confidence, an appraisal of Mr. MARTIN's views and philosophy about democratic government is suggested.

In 1939, when the administration accused him of obstruction for opposing excessive Federal expenditures, he said:

"I never thought it reactionary to protect the finances of the Government, if you could. I always thought it was both progressive and constructive to keep any concern healthy

and functioning. If the Government is not safe, then there is chaos and collapse * * * the people are against spending which wastes public funds without providing jobs."

In 1941, when the administration was asking for suppression of political opposition in the interest of national unity, Mr. MARTIN said:

"A political bureaucracy always begins to build and continues to build its functions and its powers until, if given enough time, it becomes arrogant and unresponsive to Congressional regulation or limitation * * * any political party too long continued in overwhelmingly dominant power becomes corrupt and fails to respond to the will of the people."

In 1942, when the administration had rejected all propositions to halt excessive Federal expenditures not related to the war, Mr. MARTIN warned:

"The fact that we are dealing in billions of dollars tends to cause us to lose our sense of perspective. It tends to make us careless of the hundreds of thousands and the millions and the hundreds of millions.

"We must remember that every dollar wasted or inefficiently spent must be paid back in the sweat and toil of our people over the years just as every dollar wisely and efficiently spent must be repaid."

And as recently as January of this year, when the administration was resisting the determination of a courageous and patriotic Congress to rescind excessive war powers utilized by the Executive against the will of Congress and to impose socialistic philosophies and restrictions upon the people, Mr. MARTIN said:

"Promiscuous granting of blank checks and blanket powers leads to arrogant bureaucracy, inflation, higher taxes, and eventual destruction of our American system of Government."

It attests the sound judgment and great patriotism of the American people that the prevailing national opinion of Mr. MARTIN is that his able conduct of "the opposition" is not obstructive, but is constructive and beneficial in the most vital sense. He is giving the people true American leadership, and is properly becoming recognized as one of the great Americans of our time.

St. Lawrence County Milk Production Falling as Farmers Sell Cows

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith an interesting article from the New York Herald Tribune of Wednesday, March 31, 1943, by John Watson, covering a situation which is typical of the dairy industry in New York State:

ST. LAWRENCE MILK PRODUCTION FALLING AS FARMERS SELL COWS—SURVEY OF COUNTY DISCLOSES DAIRYMEN ARE BITTER OVER LACK OF LABOR, COMPETITION OF WAR-PLANT PAY, AND WASHINGTON BUNGLING

(By John Watson)

CANTON, N. Y., March 30.—Riding out into the country past the dairy farms of St. Lawrence County, the largest dairy area in the State, Otis F. Dandy, a farmer who is a human Who's Who of the countryside, kept pointing out various places. "Now take this one," he would say, "there was 35 head of stock there; now it's down to about 16. This one over here isn't being worked at all. This man is doing all right, that house over there on the hill, provided the draft doesn't take his son."

Presently the car turned into the farm of Byron Healy, a small man about 65 years old, with intense blue eyes and a face as weathered as the side of an old barn. The blue eyes were savage and troubled. Mr. Healy had just sold his 47 head of Ayrshires, big, fat-looking cows for the most part, and he felt like a man whose life's work has suddenly been cut from under him. Of course, he got a good price for them—purebred cattle are selling as high as $200 each—but that wasn't the point.

The point was that this farm, which his father had worked before him and into which Mr. Healy estimated he had invested $50,000 in stock, machinery, buildings, feed, and fertilizer over a period of years, had become nonproductive. He was forced to sell because he couldn't get labor to help him. Mr. Healy is getting along in years. He and his wife and his son managed to muddle along last year, but the task has become too great. The only prospect he has to look forward to now is buying poor, young stock throughout the county, turning them out to graze and selling them when they have fattened up a little. But that isn't dairy farming, and dairy farming has been Mr. Healy's life.

BITTER ABOUT LABOR DEARTH

"About the only help a man can get nowadays," he said, speaking from the depths of his bitterness, "is old men, who talk about the things they used to do, or young men who are too lazy or not good enough to work over to Massena." The big Aluminum Co. of America plant is situated in Massena. Many men have left the farms to work there, including not only hired hands but some farmers who find it more profitable to work in the plant than to try to maintain dairy production. Mr. Healy spat in disgust. "The Government," he said, "the Government is trying to do something now, when it's too late. As always, the Government is trying to lock the barn after the horse has been stolen."

Fortunately for St. Lawrence County, Mr. Healy has a conscience and likes his cows. He said he refused an offer to sell them for slaughter. They will remain in production within the county. This is not the case in other such sales that are taking place throughout the county. Mr. Healy's crisis cannot be called general, or even typical, but it is a fact that hundreds of cattle are being sold by farmers in the county. Some are reducing their herds, some are selling lock, stock, and barrel.

It was estimated by George R. Johnson, assistant county agent, and by Ralph E. King, county assistant in conservation of the local association of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, that about 5,000 cows have been sold in the county in recent months. Not many of them, a comparatively few, perhaps, are being sold for beef. Most of the stock that is being sold, according to the belief of such authorities as Mr. Johnson and Mr. King, is being bought by farmers in other counties, who, in turn, may be selling their old stock for slaughter. Culling their cows is the phrase.

One thing on which there is general agreement is that there will be a reduction of millions of pounds in the amount of milk that flows from St. Lawrence County this coming year. Estimates vary from 1 percent to 10 percent and even to 25 percent, but even taking the lowest estimate the reduction runs into millions of pounds.

DECLINE IN MILK PRODUCTION

On the 4,500 commercial dairy farms in the county there are 95,000 to 100,000 producing cows, according to Mr. Johnson's estimates. Take as a base an estimated 5,000 pounds of milk for each cow a year. That is an extremely low estimate. For the State as a whole the average milk production a cow in 1942 was 6,200 pounds, according to figures of the State College of Agriculture, at Ithaca, and the goal set hopefully by the Government for 1943 is 6,353 pounds. If 3,000 cows are taken out of production in the county—and this is an arbitrary figure which may be considerably greater or less than the actual figure, which must wait for the test of time—the milk production of St. Lawrence County would be reduced 15,000,000 pounds or more.

Mr. Johnson and Mr. King are inclined to believe that the over-all production, including not only fluid milk but the various subsidiary products such as dried milk, butter, and cheese, will be 1 percent under normal and perhaps 5 percent under last year, a peak production year. Mr. Dandy feels the decrease will be nearer 25 percent. He believes that 10 percent of the land in the county will not be operated under any conditions this year.

C. Milton Clark, who owns 5 farms operated by tenants, and J. Leslie Craig, who also owns tenant-operated farms, set the estimated decrease in milk at about 10 percent.

The picture is not all bleak. Mr. Dandy, for example, expects to increase his milk production this year. He will be milking 40 cows this year, where last year only 29 of his stock were producing.

Similarly, Robert M. Thompson, of Heuvelton, who has 75 head of Holsteins, big producers of milk, expects to produce more milk this year. Mr. Thompson, county representative of the State Grange organization is fortunate in having for assistant his son, who is a graduate of the New York State Agricultural and Technical Institute at Canton, and one man, who, although 67 years old, is a good and experienced worker. Therefore, Mr. Thompson is not troubled by lack of labor. "I wouldn't want any more help," he said, "even if I could get it."

He thinks many farmers can get by on the present prices being paid for fluid milk. The current price was $3.14 a hundredweight (46.51 quarts) for blended milk, that is milk in all classifications, but he agreed with Mr. Dandy that there would be much more incentive to produce if farmers received more. Mr. Dandy believed they should receive $3 a hundredweight in the peak summer season, and $4 or even $4.50 a hundredweight in the winter season.

SEES LACK OF INCENTIVE

Also on the bright side is Mr. Johnson's belief that, although farmers are selling their poorer cows, many of them will step up the production of their best cows. This depends on such considerations as the price farmers receive for their milk, the price and shortage of feed and labor.

"At present," Mr. Thompson said, "there is not enough incentive for farmers to work for full production. A man works hard if he expects to get a reasonable profit out of his labor."

"Feed is now selling at about $50 a ton, as compared with $30 a ton a year or 2 ago. The protein content of the grain feed has dropped from 22 to 18 percent," Mr. Dandy said, "and added to this is the expectation that the supply of grain from the Midwest will be sharply decreased this year, because farmers out there are finding it more profitable to feed to their own stock than to sell it."

For these compelling reasons the Farm Bureau here held a meeting of dairymen a

few weeks ago, to plan for the expected shortage. Farmers were urged to grow more oats and corn this year, and to get their hay in as early as possible. Hay that remains in the fields late loses much of its nutritive value. This is all very well, but where, farmers ask, are they going to get their extra help for this harvesting? So far there has been no answer to this question any more than there has to the problem of where the vastly more important permanent help is coming from.

FARM WAGES UP SHARPLY

Farm wages here have risen greatly, as they have in other farming areas of the State, but they do not, of course, approach the wages that a man can get in the Alcoa plant. A real good farmhand can get as much as $100 a month with privileges, which always include a house and such other variable consideration as firewood, milk, electricity, and a place to grow a few vegetables if he wishes. The average pay for a married man is nearer $75 a month with privileges, and a single man receives about $55 or $60 a month.

There is nothing much a farmer can do to compete with wages in industry, except to hope for some kind of stabilization, in which farm wages and prices of production could be so balanced against chance for profit so as to provide an incentive for all-out work. Several blistering letters on this subject have been received and printed by the St. Lawrence Plaindealer, a weekly newspaper published here by Williston Manley and his son, G. Atwood Manley. An excerpt from one such letter read: "The average mill or factory worker today earns more clear money in 1 hour than is cleared by the average farmer in 10 or 12 hours of the hardest kind of work. * * * Now comes the plea for more food. They say millions will starve if we don't work longer and harder, although no longer ago than January milk prices were cut to the farmer because of a milk surplus—or so said the dealers. * * * But in every way our Government is hampering our endeavor so that even the most hardy are beginning to wonder and doubt."

One farmer, in answer to a Government questionnaire, put the complaint a little more succinctly. "Too many men in Washington," he wrote, "are trying to spread manure with a fountain pen."

The Pay-As-You-Go Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 1, 1943:

WHAT MR. DOUGHTON SAYS GOES

Something went seriously wrong with our democratic processes on Tuesday. It is of the first importance that we understand clearly just what it was. Under our multiagency form of government it is often difficult to know where or how to fix responsibility when an obvious failure of this sort occurs. Responsibility in this case must be distributed. It belongs in the first place with the administration, and particularly with the Treasury. It belongs in the next place with the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and particularly with Chairman DOUGHTON. It belongs, finally, with the House itself. Not least disturbing about the whole episode is how lightly those who were responsible for it take their responsibility and how little they seem to recognize the extent of the harm they have done.

It was not merely the pay-as-you-earn plan—any pay-as-you-earn plan—that was defeated on Tuesday. It was the whole collection-at-the-source system that was scheduled to go into effect on July 1. Entirely apart from the controversial Ruml plan, it is imperative that a withholding tax go into effect without a day's unnecessary delay. Such a tax would be the Treasury's greatest single source of revenue. It would be our greatest single weapon against inflation. Yet it has been killed along with the Ruml plan.

Passing over the responsibility of the Treasury and of the full House for this situation, it may be most instructive at the moment to center our attention on the middle link in the chain of irresponsibility—that is to say, on the Ways and Means Committee, and particularly on its chairman, Mr. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina.

Here is the political situation that confronts us: The Senate cannot act now on a tax bill until the House has acted. The House cannot act until the Ways and Means Committee has acted. The Ways and Means Committee cannot act until its chairman, Mr. DOUGHTON, acts. The country depends on Mr. DOUGHTON. And Mr. DOUGHTON is in no hurry. Now that he has defeated the Ruml plan, in fact, he has pronounced himself "gloriously satisfied."

How did Mr. DOUGHTON come to occupy this position of tremendous power? Was he put there by Congress on the ground that he knew more about taxation than any other Member of the House? Not at all. He got there by seniority. He got there because he was elected 33 years ago to the Sixty-second Congress and has been reelected ever since. He has by virtue of this long tenure been chairman of the Ways and Means Committee ever since the beginning of the first Roosevelt administration in 1933. He has now reached the ripe age of 79 years. His mind is not distinguished for grasp or flexibility. The tax bills for which he has been responsible have not been brilliantly conceived. It is no accident that nearly all of them have had to be largely rewritten when they got to the Senate.

There is no way in which the country can now hold Mr. DOUGHTON responsible for what has just happened. He is responsible only to the Ninth District of North Carolina, with a population of 310,000. He is responsible to less than three-tenths of 1 percent of the American electorate.

In the vital matter of financing the war the country now finds itself to a large extent at the mercy of the multiple-committee system of Congress, and particularly at the mercy of the rule of selecting powerful committee chairmen by seniority, and not for ability, or for any correspondence of their views with those of the majority in Congress. The Treasury now depends on Mr. DOUGHTON for getting a withholding tax by July 1, and some sort of pay-as-you-earn system to go with it. But Mr. DOUGHTON is angry because Congress has rejected his hodge-podge bill. He will take his royal time. He has not said when he will call the next meeting of the committee. As for pay-as-you-go legislation, "we are going to let it rest a while." He doesn't even know, in fact, whether the question "ever will come up again."

And if that attitude is satisfactory to the inhabitants of Cabarrus, Iredell, and Watauga Counties in North Carolina—and if Congress is wedded to its seniority system—what has the country got to say about it?

Pay-As-You-Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I frequently advocated to this Congress the adoption of a pay-as-you-go system of income-tax collection. I submitted a bill in this session, House Joint Resolution 30, advocating a pay-as-you-go system in line with the so-called Ruml plan. Further, I also submitted to the Ways and Means Committee a plan recommended by John A. Krut, of McKeesport, Pa., which suggested a very sensible pay-as-you-go plan.

After 4 days of debate in the House, I adduced from the logic of statesmen like Congressmen DISNEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma; GEARHART, Republican, of California; COOPER, Democrat, of Tennessee; BURDICK, Republican, of North Dakota; MARTIN, Republican, of Iowa; and MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, that the Ruml plan as advocated by Representative CARLSON, of Kansas, was not in the best interests of the American people. As admitted by Representative CARLSON in debate, the plan would relieve approximately 2,000,000 taxpayers in the Nation from paying 1942 tax obligations ranging in individual amounts from $10,000 to $3,500,000, while it would forgive approximately 40,000,000 taxpayers individual amounts ranging from $6.50 to $850. There were too many windfalls in the Carlson bill and I voted against it.

I likewise voted to send the bill submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means back to committee as it was not a sensible pay-as-you-go plan. It clearly provided for the payment of 2 years' taxes in 1—a burdensome imposition upon the American people. It offered inducements to those wealthy taxpayers who are best able to take advantage of cash discounts. The bill was returned to committee, where it belongs.

I hope the committee will follow the recommendations submitted by Mr. Krut. The advantages of the Krut proposal are worthy of the consideration of this Congress, and I list them:

First. Ease of adoption of the pay-as-you-go plan.

Second. No double taxation in 1 year.

Third. No loss to the Treasury.

Fourth. No windfall wealth to an estate in case of an individual's death.

I hope also that the Committee on Ways and Means will consider seriously the Robertson-Forand plan.

The American people in the midst of the greatest prosperity in our history want to pay their just share of taxes for the cost of this war now. They want pay-as-you-go taxation with collection at the source. They want no gold bricks as represented by the Carlson-Ruml plan.

Disloyalty Costs 654 Federal Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN DIES

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of March 25, 1943, with reference to a statement by Civil Service Commissioner Arthur S. Flemming before the Ramspeck Civil Service Committee:

DISLOYALTY COSTS 654 FEDERAL JOBS—FLEMMING TELLS HOUSE PROBE ABOUT FIRINGS

Since the war effort was initiated, 654 Federal workers have been dismissed because of suspected disloyalty to the Nation, Civil Service Commissioner Arthur S. Flemming declared today. He said the group was among almost 27,000 employees let go for various reasons after investigation by the Civil Service Commission.

Testifying before the Ramspeck civil service committee probing Federal personnel practices, Flemming added that the individual's loyalty was "undoubtedly in the picture" in many of the other dismissals but that other factors also were considered in these, "particularly where they played fast and loose with the truth."

AID TO DIES AND FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Flemming gave the committee figures from the fiscal year 1940–41 through the first 8 months of the present fiscal year, the latter period producing 10,130 persons hired for various reasons, of whom 239 were considered disloyal or their tendencies too dangerous for continued tenure.

The Civil Service Commissioner said the Commission closely cooperates with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Dies committee of the House in tracking down disloyal and subversive employees or candidates for office.

The Dies group, he said, "makes accessible to us all its information on persons who have been discharged for subversive tendencies." Flemming gave the committee examples of three cases which the Commission probed, identifying the persons involved only as "X."

X–1 and X–2 were described as an arsenal machinist and a port of entry radio applicant who, after close questioning by investigators admitted Communist affiliations and leanings and then decided, because of the close questioning, they didn't want the jobs after all.

X–3 was described as a "difficult problem" holding "a big professional job" in a war agency who appealed and opposed all civil service actions in attempting to probe his background. When it was finally proven that, despite his denials, the man had been arrested for participating in a mass picketing riot and had registered as a Communist voter in 1934, he was ruled ineligible and discharged.

The Commission institutes investigations usually when positions are filled subject to an inquiry into the character of the person appointed. Flemming disclosed there have been more than 126,000 of this type of inquiry during the war, and there is currently an arrearage of some 20,000 cases.

He said he knew of no instance of any employee actually attempting to give aid to the enemy.

Flemming said the Commission is now cooperating in the probe ordered by the House Appropriations Committee into cases of suspected disloyalty by persons now on Government pay rolls.

Let Us Do Our Part To Help Win the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding journalists of the State of Washington is C. B. LaFromboise, editor of the Enumclaw Courier Herald, of Enumclaw, Wash. Recently he wrote an editorial which contains much sound and practical advice. I include it as a part of my remarks. I think we might all heed its salutary injunctions.

WHAT WE CAN ALL DO TO HELP WIN THE WAR

War changes the pattern of our lives. It cannot change our way of life, unless we are beaten. The kids still play marbles in the corner lot—but they stop playing earlier to help prepare the victory garden—carry home groceries that used to be delivered, or run some other errand that used to be given as a part of our system of business. There are activities in many homes at odd hours of the day and night, because men are working three shifts in mill, war plants and mines instead of one. The daily papers still carry comics, but it's the front page that carries the answers to urgent question "how are we doing?" All over America there's a new tempo, a new purpose, a new spirit.

Hard work isn't hard—it's a badge of courage. That "old clothes look" doesn't matter. It's smart to be mended. "Sorry, ma'am, we can't get any more of those." Good. That means materials are going where they belong—into war weapons.

Only one thing worries a lot of us.

"I'm too old to fight. I'm too young to fight."

"I'm busy all day cooking and cleaning and mending."

"How can I get into this war?"

To these questions there are many answers. Here are a few: Buy War bonds and stamps, as many and as often as you can. Plant and tend a victory garden. Conserve and preserve everything you can. Save waste kitchen fats and turn them in at your local meat markets. Join one of the civilian defense units. Volunteer your services as an aircraft spotter at your neighborhood observation post. Volunteer some time to work at the local ration board office. Sign up to work some on neighborhood farms this season.

This is your war—and your part is clear. You have imagination to see how tasks which seem small and unimportant can help win the war. You have resourcefulness, self-discipline, determination, and love of America.

No matter how close you have to stay to the stove, Mrs. Jones, or how late you get home, Mr. Smith, you can make an individual contribution to the winning of this war.

Washington State Legislature Endorses Coffee Resolution to Establish a Commission on Tax Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I recently reintroduced a resolution to establish a commission on tax integration. The increasing confusion in the tax situation, as it affects the Federal, State, and local governments, seems to me to necessitate the investigation by Congress of the entire national tax procedure, and to call for the creation of a commission on tax integration, to make prompt recommendations seeking to clarify the situation.

I include herewith house joint memorial 11, adopted by the Washington State Legislature, which gives expression of the people of the State of Washington, through its elected members of the State legislature, on my proposed resolution:

House Joint Memorial 11

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition your honorable bodies as follows:

Whereas the national emergency has brought about the necessity for new and additional tax levies; and

Whereas the formation of new Federal tax policies is in many instances threatening the very existence of local governmental units whose continued functioning is essential in this national emergency and in the return to normal economic conditions thereafter; and

Whereas no real satisfactory tax reform can be achieved without readjusting the Federal, State, and local fiscal relationships; and

Whereas an agency created by Congress would be best fitted to study tax structures and make recommendations; and

Whereas in the Seventy-eighth Congress, the Honorable JOHN M. COFFEE, Congressman from the Sixth Washington Congressional District, introduced House Joint Resolution 56, by the terms of which there is proposed a Federal Commission on tax integration, for the purpose hereinbefore set forth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to cause to be enacted proper legislation, creating a Federal agency to study tax structures to the end that inequitable burdens be avoided and the financial stability of the various local governmental units assured; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington.

Death of Cardinal Hinsley Great Loss for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in K. A. P., a weekly publication of London, as of March 20, 1943, and which pays tribute to the late Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Hinsley:

The death of Cardinal Hinsley, Primate of Britain and Archbishop of Westminster, has caused profound grief to the British public and the Allied Nations, especially to the Poles.

Leon Cauchois, a French speaker over the London radio, recalling the great virtues and enduring merits of the late Prince of the Church, said that "Cardinal Hinsley, as no other foreign cardinal, stood by martyred Poland and took every occasion to assert and defend her rights."

Cardinal Hinsley's personality brings to mind another great dignitary of the church in the last war—Cardinal Mercier of Belgium. There is a great similarity between the characters of these two spiritual leaders, both of whom embodied the highest moral values. This gives particular weight to the fact that Cardinal Hinsley always looked upon justice to Poland as a test of the moral principles for which this war is being fought. This is why the messages of sympathy and condolence sent to the Archepiscopal Chapter at Westminster by the Polish president and Government are not mere acts of international courtesy, but express the genuine feelings of the Polish nation, mourning the loss of a true friend.

The Polish Government and the Poles in Great Britain participated in the funeral rites, not only as members of a Catholic nation but also as genuine admirers and spiritual disciples of the late Archbishop of Westminster.

Momentous Journey of One Little Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of March 28, 1943:

MOMENTOUS JOURNEY OF ONE LITTLE WOMAN

(By Carl Sandburg)

Not in the history of this country has there been a tour by a visitor from another country so peculiarly dramatic, so darkly momentous, as what we have seen in recent weeks in the journey of one lone, little woman from China.

What she has been saying is not quite up to what she has been trying to say.

After reading President Lincoln's message to Congress December of 1862, a London Spectator commentator wrote of "the mystical dreaminess" to be found in Lincoln's picture of an American Union of States becoming a light to the world, and "The thoughts of the man are too big for his mouth."

Lincoln couldn't get it said fully and adequately because great hopes and dreams are immeasurable.

So now we have been listening to a little woman whose thoughts are too big for her mouth in this hour of chaos.

A later time will come, however, and events will justify her words and frame her sentences in fresh lights and make some of her declarations and predictions carry the sound of terrible warnings.

EARS ALONE DON'T GIVE US HER MESSAGE

As some of us heard her at the Chicago Stadium last week, she seemed to be trying to make herself the voice of the many millions of Chinese who have died for their hope of an independent republic of free people, joined in cooperation and humility with other free peoples.

By merely hearing Mme. Chiang speak we don't get her message. She is vastly implicative. Reading one of her speeches carries us on into meanings we didn't get from her spoken words. These speeches, soon to be published in collected form, will constitute one of the classics of the literature of democracy and free peoples.

If it should happen that after this war the guidance and leadership are such that again in another generation or sooner there comes another global war, her book will read like an infinitely sad music of dreams lost in a welter of personal follies, personal ambitions, and personal greeds.

WANTS TO BE THOUGHT OF AS TOUGH-MINDED

She has heard of soft soap and moonshine, of dreamers blamed for idle dreaming, of hopers and rainbow chasers. And she wishes that some of those who don't see eye to eye with her at all times might get her picture of herself as she would like to be, her words running:

"Invariably the great spirits in human relationships have honesty and imagination—honesty in appraising themselves, first, as they see themselves; second, as they think others see them; and third, the imagination to place themselves in others' positions while appraising themselves. The first two, being subjective, cannot be all-sufficing; the third, an objective approach is needed to complete the picture."

She would like those Americans she seeks to convince to think of her and her fellow believers as tough-minded, telling it in these words:

"To translate faith into reality, you and I must recapture faith in our fellow men in the spirit of your pioneer fathers who forged in the van of the movement westward and forward in cutting across the wilderness and endless forests. We should march onward with stanch hearts and steadfast wills in the cultivation of what William James calls tough-mindedness—tough-mindedness while searching for rectitude and truth in the triumph of a just and permanent peace."

And, naturally enough, she knows for sure that some, who pride themselves on precisely this quality they term "tough-mindedness," refuse to string along with her in her last words in Chicago. Those last words read like a little psalm:

"Let us then together resolve to keep on fighting in the faith that our vision is worth preserving and can be preserved. For is it not true that faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen?"

Seattle Lawyer Expresses His Views on the Power and Irrigation Potentialities of the Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the eminent and honored lawyers of the State of Washington, is the Honorable John P. Hartman, of Seattle. Though Mr. Hartman is in his eighties, his mind and physique continue virile and active. He is a splendid citizen, who inspires all of us younger citizens. I had the pleasure of a visit with him, at his law offices recently, and found him to be keen and alert as ever, possessed of charm and an engaging personality which endears him to all who come in contact with him. Though Mr. Hartman is a Republican of long standing, he has never been an intolerant partisan. He is a warm friend of the leading Democratic and Republican public officials of our State.

Mr. Hartman has had a colorful life, and his activities are indelibly linked with the development of the Territory of Alaska and of the Evergreen State of Washington. He is thoroughly conversant with the natural resources of the State of Washington and their potentialities.

Attorney Hartman recently wrote an article discussing power and irrigation on the Columbia, which contains so much worthy material, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and of the country.

The article is as follows:

NEW POWER AND IRRIGATION ON THE COLUMBIA

Twenty-four years ago a few hundred determined and wide-awake citizens met in convention and unanimously decided that they would put a great dam across the Columbia and irrigate 2,600,000 acres of otherwise worthless land. They knew it was a hard job and sentiment would have to be developed therefor.

Notwithstanding discouragements and the oft-repeated statement that the promoters were idle dreamers and even crazy, the bunch persevered, but it took 12 years to get a favorable response from the citizens. The result is really beyond the dream of those pioneers and the people generally.

The minimum flow of the Columbia River is greater than that of any other stream in the world save the Amazon. True, the run-off of the Mississippi with its affluents is 5 times that of the Columbia, but the minimum flow of the Columbia is 14 times that of the Mississippi at Cairo, Ill.

The reason for the large amount of water is that the Columbia's watershed is all high mountain area in Montana, Idaho, and British Columbia, where there are many glaciers and snow lies almost continuously so that the river is highest in June, July, and August, which is the period of maximum irrigation demands.

The citizens behind the movement knew that it was a Federal instead of a State job because of the immensity and great cost. On his trip to view the area, not long after his first election, President Roosevelt declared for the construction and later the necessary legislation was enacted by Congress.

Before this, because of the splendid work of Senator McNary, of Oregon, Bonneville Dam was being erected, which was primarily in the interest of navigation and secondarily for power.

Noted engineers had declared in favor of the Grand Coulee Dam, but the State commission was not entirely satisfied and asked Gen. George W. Goethals to make a survey and report, who declared in favor of the proposition as now completed.

Fortunately, as nature left it, the dam foundation is on eternal granite. Usually these dams have all been built upon softer and seismically disturbed rock, and not, therefore, so satisfactory as granite.

The foundation penetrates 182 feet below the river's surface, while the top of the dam is about 525 feet above, with a total length of 4,400 feet and about 500 feet wide at the bottom. The structure is steel reinforced, with cooling galvanized iron pipes all through, never more than 3 feet apart in any part of the structure, where cold water may be kept flowing to prevent heat. After the foundation was brought some 30 feet above the surface of the river, a steel structure, equivalent to a bridge, was made the entire length, 225 feet high, on which cantilever cranes moved back and forth on wheels to carry the products for the structure. The largest cantilever was 375 feet long and the other two about 50 feet less in length.

This structure was imbedded in reinforced concrete and then another structure placed on top, 125 feet high, finally reaching the crest of the dam, on top of which is a roadway.

As indicated, the dam is for joint electric and irrigation purposes, it being expected that the minimum flow of the stream will be used exclusively for electric generation and the flood waters for irrigation.

The largest turbine water wheels ever built were installed with the accompanying electric generation appliances and run over 125,000 horsepower per unit, so that there is now, for constant daily use, 1,200,000 horsepower generated, which can be raised, when needed, to about 2,600,000.

The crest of the dam is about 200 feet lower than the highest point in the Grand Coulee to the south, down which the water will flow finally to the 2,600,000 acres ultimately to be irrigated in the lower areas. Therefore the water has to be lifted over this ridge and for that purpose centrifugal pumps are placed in the 12 reinforced concrete cylinders, 10 being sufficient to supply the ultimate needs, with the other two for stand-bys in case of breaks.

It is interesting to contemplate the amount of water which will be lifted over this ridge and used ultimately for growing crops where now is the barren dry ground.

In a 24-hour period each pump will lift 1,031,000,000 gallons of water, and I put this in gallons because the mass of people measure water by gallons and not so many cubic feet flowing per second of time.

To get a clear understanding I will use an actual comparison. Greater New York now gets its domestic water supply from the east, south, and west slopes of the Catskill Mountains. Its population of 10,500,000 use 960,000,000 gallons per 24 hours. Therefore, one pump will deliver enough water to supply that entire great city; 10 can supply with domestic water the entire people of the United States. It is difficult to vision this gargantuan sum, but the figures given are those worked out by one of the engineers under Mr. Banks, the chief engineer of construction.

I have spoken of but one water-power place. Bonneville is developed practically to the ultimate and now gives 750,000 horsepower and it is all contracted and being used. At the seven other places on the Columbia between Grand Coulee and Bonneville, enough more power may be developed when needed to make a total amount of electrical development on the Columbia of more than 10,000,000 horsepower, or about 10 times more than Niagara. These figures are very large, but they are not guesses for the report made by Major Butler when he surveyed the Columbia several years ago proves all these facts.

One asks, naturally, "What will we do with all this?" The answer is easy—manufacturing. In making aluminum and magnesium metals, electric heat for treating the base product is almost indispensable because a smelting furnace furnished with electric heat may keep the range within 100 degrees of variance, while with coke it may be as much as 500 degrees and that means, if it gets too low there may be freezing in the furnace and if too high, the light metals may be lost in voltil.

All the base metals are at hand. North of Spokane is one of the largest almost pure dolomite deposits in this country, and in quantities so great that it is practically inexhaustible, and the magnesite mountain north of Spokane, now operated with about 5,000 workers, is one of the largest in the world. To the east of Spokane is the clay ridge on the boundary between Washington and Idaho, about 30 miles wide and 100 miles long, carrying raw aluminum from 13 percent to 15 percent—the richest of any we know of. Two large plants will be completed by the middle of July at Spokane, one for producing aluminum metal and the other magnesium, which will be constantly operated with electric heat.

Most of the aluminum produced in this country is from bauxite, which means only oxidized raw aluminum. The owners of this process have earnestly claimed that the metal cannot be manufactured from raw aluminum clays, but the answer is that for more than 10 years Germany has had no other source than the raw clays. She is producing, and will continue to produce, all the aluminum needed for her purposes, so that the argument falls for naught and, with the cheap electric power, these metals in large quantities will be produced at Spokane.

There are many sources from which we may get the magnesium base. One of the first was salt water, but we now find, which has been proved by the Henry Ford organizations, that dolomite is the best and cheapest source and the easiest manufactured for the magnesium metals. The Ford people are using dolomite, but not of such purity as that found north of Spokane.

West of Spokane are alunite, diatomaceous earth, and the gold-silver-copper deposit reaching from a point on Railroad Creek, shortly west of Lake Chelan, and running over the Cascades to the Sultan Basin in Snohomish County, a distance of about 30 miles in length, and 5 miles in width, a little larger than the ores which made Butte famous, of which I have known personally since 1880, and will ultimately be a copper source equal to the best in the United States.

Respectfully submitted,

John P. Hartman.

The Nye Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact into law S. 207, known as the Nye bill, providing for waiver of second-class postal fees upon resumption of publication by newspapers that were compelled to suspend publication because of war conditions:

Resolution 6

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact into law S. 207, known as the Nye bill, providing for waiver of second-class postal fees upon resumption of publication by newspapers that were compelled to suspend publication because of war conditions

Whereas numerous newspapers throughout the Nation and particularly those in towns in smaller communities have been and in the future will be compelled to suspend publication because of the economic conditions and the loss of manpower brought about by the war emergency; and

Whereas the country newspaper is a valuable economic and social asset in the community life of the Nation and should therefore be encouraged; and

Whereas newspapers of Minnesota, as those in the Nation, have made great contributions to the war effort through the medium of news articles and advertisements bearing upon the successful prosecution of the war, said contributions in the aggregate being many millions of dollars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring), That we memorialize, petition, and urge Congress to take such steps as are necessary to enact into law S. 207, known as the Nye bill, which provides for the waiver of second-class postal fees upon resumption of publication by newspapers which were compelled to suspend publication during the war and because of war conditions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Edward J. Thye,
President of the Senate.
Lawrence M. Hall,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 19th day of March, 1943.

H. Y. Torrey,
Secretary of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 24th day of March, 1943.

Harry L. Allen,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Approved March 26, 1943:

Harold E. Stassen,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Rationing of Alcoholic Liquors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Jacob Simpson Payton appearing in the March issue of the Christian Advocate and the Christian Evangelist:

CAPITOL COMMENT

(By Jacob Simpson Payton)

It's about time for Uncle Sam to turn off the spigots of the beer kegs and to post a guard at the warehouses of all distillers to insure that their flasks and jugs shall remain undelivered during these perilous times. The most outrageous inconsistency now being practiced by the Government is the favoritism being shown these liquor producers in being allowed to market their reserve stocks.

THE PURCHASING PUBLIC

At a time when only a pound of coffee per person for 5 weeks is permissible, and when worried mothers are obliged to measure the points in their ration books over against the appetities of their children, with meat, cheese, and butter limited beginning April 1, it is simply inexplicable that the Federal Government should still permit licensed venders to supply the purchasing public with quantities of intoxicating beverages.

Of course, certain States have begun rationing liquor, but the question will not down as to why Washington should exempt intoxicants when certain individuals have been given dictatorial power over consumption of food, rubber, gasoline, and oil.

With commendable acquiescence, residents of the Nation's Capital accept whatever denial is deemed necessary for the transfer from their own tables to mess halls and field kitchens whatever food is necessary for the Nation's warriors. Many wonder, however, how the Government can justify permission to distillers and brewers to use trucks, oil, tires, gasoline, and manpower to deliver their befuddling wares which are not respectable enough to be classified as luxuries or nonessentials, but rather belong to the deterrents of our victory effort.

Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, has introduced a resolution in the House calling for investigation of the curb of 10 percent placed on newsprint by the War Production Board. Certain others of the United Nations have acted to conserve paper and protect the public against the avaricious liquor interests by banning their advertisements from all publications. And yet in a day of increasing scarcity of meat, dairy products, and canned goods, these same distillers and brewers who have transformed to destructive uses the very grain that would nourish multitudes are allowed to employ the occasion of their country's peril by advertising their gin and beer bargains in space that would better serve anxious families eager for news of the battles in which their kinsmen are offering their lives.

The hour is long overdue for the war planners who cry aloud that food will win the war to withhold from consumption the debauching goods that, for all their producers care, may lose it. Were not the long and sordid record of these merchants of death known, it might be expected that their consciences would bleed at every pore.

It's about time that the same Government that demands of housewives that they take inventory of their larders, should ask also that distillers take inventory of the space needed for the prosecution of the war which they are using in merchandising their wares. Not many months have passed since respectable citizens were evicted from a Washington apartment house by Federal action in order that office space might be obtained. At the same time, there were hundreds of buildings in this same city occupied wholly or in part as salesrooms for alcoholic beverages; yet these undesirable tenants have been allowed to carry on their nefarious business as usual.

There is something ominous in the comeback staged by these enemies of sobriety who only a few years ago were driven back under the vicious cover of gangland, but now in a time of grave national danger are so firmly established in political, financial, and popular favor that even the Government declines to curb their rapacity.

LIQUOR RATIONING REFUSED

From reliable sources has come the report that the Economic Stabilization Board has recently declined the recommendation of the War Production Board, Office of Civilian Supply, that a liquor ration of 1 percent of the 1941 consumption be ordered. The refusal was made on the ground that the Government needs the taxes on alcoholic beverages, and that a reduction of sales will not be necessary until the present stock, sufficient for 3½ years, is exhausted.

And so the consciences of men in power instead of moving like a clear, swift stream unimpeded by blood money, come gurgling forth like the bonded contents of the distillers' keg. Many will interpret the position of our administrators as placing more value on those shekels that will flow from the smelly tills of the barrooms into Uncle Sam's pockets than upon the hundreds of heartaches and headaches that will follow those sales. They point out that liquor now on hand would last 300 years for snake bites and other alleged medicinal purposes, but are silent about how many snakes it would send squirming through the inflamed brains of excessive consumers during 3½ years. Really, some of the mental processes of men in high position in Washington who prate from dawn to dusk about doing everything possible to win this war are rather difficult for even a sober man to follow.

ARMY CHIEFS' COMMENT

It's about time that certain civilian chiefs caught up with our commanders. It is encouraging to be able to cite the order of the Army Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall, that after January 25, 1943, sales of anything stronger than 3.2 beer will be forbidden at United States Army officers' clubs, and of Lt. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower from the Allied headquarters in North Africa that he would not tolerate excessive drinking on the ground that "we are fighting a tough war, and everything we do must be directed toward winning that war."

In the manuals on officers' training issued by the War Department, much serious admonition is given on how imperative it is in order to maintain the morale of the men of his command that an officer should set an example in bravery, self-control, courtesy, dignity, sympathy, and sobriety. Apparently General Marshall, who is an experienced soldier and a Christian gentleman, issued his order banning spirituous liquors from officers' clubs on the ground that if their possession and use were officially condoned among men with commissions, by no stretch of consistency could much be said against such practices by soldiers in the ranks.

Gradually but surely the "traffickers" in strong drink are coming up against the might of the American commanders who, regardless of personal practices and convictions during peacetime, realize that a victorious army must consist of fighters with brains unaddled by distillers' products.

There are many adversaries to be overcome on the home front—the submarine along our coasts, fifth columnists and saboteurs, and the shortage of critical materials. And let no one overlook the enemy lurking in liquor warehouses. In such a day as this, whenever a whisky truck appears on the street, it might be well to sound the sirens just as when an enemy plane approaches.

A Letter From a Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, dated March 26, 1943, from Mr. W. A. Elliott, a farmer, living in Brickeys, Ark.:

BRICKEYS, ARK., *March 26, 1943.*

Hon. "TOOK" GATHINGS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I hear a great deal about how high the farmers products have risen since 1940, possibly this is true with the hog raiser and the vegetable grower, but not with the cotton farmer, which takes in about 11 States.

We find from our gin records that the 1942 crop of seed sold for about $10 per ton less than the crop of 1941, with about 50 percent advance in labor costs. Cotton-picking in the harvesting of the 1941 crop ran from $1 to $1.50 hundredweight, while this same service for the 1942 crop was from $2 to as high as $2.35 per hundredweight. Probably the trouble can be found in the contract the mills had with the Commodity Credit Corporation. It seems this agreement set a price which the mills were not to go under, or a floor for seed; this was used by the mills as a ceiling price and was used as such throughout the season.

I sold my 1941 crop of cotton for 22 cents average. I have my 1942 crop on hand and have some doubts that should I put it on the market today, that it would bring any more than the 1941 crop.

I find in checking back over my record that I paid $1 per day for labor in 1941, and $1.50 for the same in the making of the 1942 crop. Day work is costing $2 at present for ordinary field hands. So where is all of this so-called riches the farmers are gathering in?

I'm in the merchandising business. If some of the wiseheads would come down and check my invoices against those of 2 years ago, and compare qualities of goods, they would be able to more intelligently discuss the price situation.

I understand that the price was fixed on dry goods, based on 21.45 for Middling ⅞-inch cotton. This is from $10 to $15 per bale more than we have been able to get for this grade of cotton. A neighbor of mine was

offered 17 cents for 1⅛-inch cotton 2 weeks ago.

I believe 90 percent of the cotton farmers want no subsidies. They have found out that this means cheap clothing and food and that, after all, they are not the beneficiaries. It seems that the whole idea from the start is regimentation, and I believe the people have a fill of this.

Permit me to congratulate you on your splendid work.

Yours truly,

W. A. ELLIOTT.

Post-War Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK NICHOLS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to have printed an address which I delivered on March 29, 1943, before the joint assembly of the House and Senate of the State of Oklahoma, on the subject of post-war aviation:

To say that I am happy and delighted with the privilege of being here; to say that this affords me great pleasure; to say that I deem it a great privilege and honor to be permitted to address this body today, is to state my reactions in too mild a form. This occasion means very much more to me than these phrases would indicate.

To be permitted to stand here today and talk to you, my friends, my colleagues, the men and women who shape the destiny of this, my State, is the realization of a dream long cherished by me.

As a young man I spent much time in the corridors and the chambers of this building. This capitol represented to me everything big, everything great. The people who worked here in responsible positions, and particularly those in both branches of the legislature, stirred my envy and became my idols. They were the chosen few. They were the privileged group.

Because my brother, Clark, was a member of the senate, and because I had a minor position with Governor Trapp, I enjoyed the privileges of the floor in both houses.

For long hours every day the Legislature was in session, from my lowly station, I watched the proceedings—looked with hungry eyes on the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, even as I held in awe every Member as he rose in his place to address the assembly. Those days I spent in dreaming of the almost hopeless time when maybe I would be permitted to address this body as a person in equal station and upon a subject vital to the best interests of the people of this State. Thus the privilege afforded me today is the realization of a long-cherished dream come true.

In these, the most perilous times that ever confronted the American people, there is so much to talk about—so much to be done—that it was difficult for me to select a theme for this address. One could discuss rationing, or the inequities practiced in the Office of Price Administration. One might talk of the deplorable condition existing on the farms of this country because there are so few left to plant and harvest the crops which must feed and clothe half the people on the face of the earth—soldiers and civilians alike. The farmer's condition is a pitiful one. With the services taking his boys on the one hand and high wages luring them away from the soil on the other, the farmer doesn't have much chance.

My friends, I shudder to think what the conditions may be if cold and hunger is required to show Mr. Laboring Man, Mr. Capitalist, yes, and Mr. Government, that they all depend upon the produce from the farms to feed and clothe them. I shake with fear when I contemplate the situation which may prevail if these people are too slow in realizing that the Army and Navy cannot fight, that industry cannot produce the implements of war, that life in every form must suffer and finally perish, unless the farmer's ability to produce is protected and his right to legitimate profit is guaranteed. Remember he asks only the privilege of working from daylight till dark if we will only leave him someone to work.

I could use much time in discussing labor conditions in the country and their effect on productive capacity. To cover this field one would have, first, to take time to pay just tribute to that vast majority of labor who are as fine as mortals can be. Those who would, if permitted, work with their heart and soul without regard to the ticking of a clock. Even as soldier and sailor works and fights, with no thought of time.

Then I would want a great deal of time to deal with the labor racketeers. Those parasites who live on the very lifeblood of those whom they represent. Those who have no love for God, for country, or for man, except that each serves a selfish desire beneficial to the racketeer.

I could discuss absenteeism, which caused 26 percent of the employees of the Boeing plant to absent themselves from work the day after Christmas, and 11,000 employees of the Douglas plant to stay at home on the same day, when our aviators in the hell holes were crying their hearts out for a few more Flying Fortresses. On the basis of an 8-hour day at the Douglas plant alone this represents 88,000 work hours. Precious work hours that are lost forever.

I wish I might have time to discuss with you the proposition of whether we are keeping the faith with our sons, brothers, fathers, sweethearts, and neighbors who suffer and die for us in the far-flung corners of the earth—in England, Ireland, Scotland, Iceland, Greenland, Newfoundland, Australia, New Zealand, New Guinea, India, China, Egypt, Africa, Hawaii, the Solomon Islands, Samoan Islands, Caribbean Islands, Panama, Brazil, the Aleutians. In all of these places you will find our soldiers, sailors, and marines at work. Their feelings are best described by a Minnesota boy in an article he wrote in 1917. He said:

"I am a mother's son. I am the pride of a family and part of a home. I love my life as you love yours. I am a youth in years and experience in life, yet I am a gambler, betting the highest stakes a man can wager—my life. If I win, you win; if I lose, I have lost all. The loss is mine, not yours; and there is a grieved mother, a saddened family, and a broken home to which I can never return.

"I ask only for Godspeed and support of my Nation in return for laying upon the altar of my country my all. For bravery and blood, will you furnish bullets and bread? Will you pawn your shekels if I pawn myself? Will you bet your gold while I bet my blood? Will you hazard your wealth while I risk my life?

"I am the flower of a nation's manhood, the glory of a noble race. I am the American soldier. I am the boy in the trenches."

Today millions of boys like him are in the armed forces, each with a smile on his face and a song on his lips, offering himself as a sacrifice that you and I may be safe here at home.

I wonder if each one of them is not asking the question which that boy asked in 1917, "What are the folks back home doing to back us up?"

I wonder if we, the farmer, the laborer, the banker, merchant, and all the rest, are keeping the faith?

Only time will answer these questions. But in the meantime let me sound this warning to you all, and particularly to organized labor. You had better get your house in order because those millions of boys, or at least most of them, are coming home some day, coming back from the jungles and the deserts, the foxholes of Bataan and Guadalcanal, the hellholes of the battlefields all over the world, and from the submarine-infested oceans, where there was no 40-hour week, no time and a half for overtime, no right to strike when displeased. Heed ye well this warning, weigh well the cost of your deeds, lest upon their return you lose all the good things that Government has given you, and by the same token could take away.

Each of these subjects might well consume all of my time and maybe it would have been better that I chose one of them. However, I can think of no reason for our being in this war; I can see no reason for the extravagant waste of life and material, unless it be that we are fighting for something in the future. I conceive those things for which we fight and struggle to be: Protection of the rights of free people, including free enterprise; the right to trade peaceably in the markets of the world; guaranty of a lasting peace which can only be realized by our being able, with the help of other democratic nations, to see to it that no more will countries like Germany and Japan be permitted to expend 10 years of effort in preparation for war. This means that in the future we must prevent wars and not win them. Thus, today, I choose a subject that I think there is being too little done about, and one on which the future of America will depend more than any other single thing: Post-war aviation.

The problems of today and tomorrow confronting aviation involve and are a part of the future of our Nation and the progress of civilization. These problems require specialized and individual attention in the interest of every American citizen and the destiny of free people all over the world.

Aviation is suddenly growing up in all of its categories as a result of the pressure of technical development due to the war.

The airplane, for the next 50 years, will have a greater capacity for good or evil than any other material tool. It is not difficult to imagine in a very short time after the close of the war the development of a single commercial aircraft which, when converted to military use, could carry as much destruction as 1,000 of our present bombers.

It is vital and important to our national security and well-being that we develop and maintain a Nation-wide—yes; a world-wide, self-supporting commercial air-transport industry, so that we continue at all times to lead the world in aviation, research, engineering, manufacturing, and operations.

The magnitude of our world-aviation problem from the standpoint of our national economy, as well as our national security, is such that immediate attention must be given to it by the people themselves, and certainly by legislative and executive branches of the Government. It took the battle of Crete to prove to our Army Air Corps that the trans-

port plane would play an important part in the winning of a modern war.

Likewise, it took Pearl Harbor, and finally war itself, to shock the Congress and the people into the realization of the important part that commercial aviation would play in the post-war period. Even now there are those in the Congress who say, "We have nothing to do but win this war." Thus, we cannot devote the attention of any part of the Congress to any other problems.

Of course, every effort within the power of our people to exert must be directed to the winning of this war. But upon that person who would stop America's planning there must be laid the charge of short-sightedness or ignorance, because, once more, our only excuse for being in this war is to protect the rights of the free people in the United States and all over the world, to enjoy free enterprise, and the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience, and the right to freely compete as private institutions and as governments in trade and commerce.

If the above be true, then when this terrible war has ended the people of this Nation must direct their thoughts once more to economics. Particularly the people of the United States must direct their thoughts to the problem of in some way getting back a portion of the money that our Government has taken from our taxpayers and spent with lavish extravagance on our allies all over the world.

Thus, we must not only win the war, but we must prepare ourselves to enter into world competition with the other world powers, many of whom are now our allies and who, now being the beneficiaries of our lend-lease and other programs, will in the post-war period be our bitter contenders for the control of world markets.

Believe me that the nation which is first ready with heavy cargo-carrying fast airplanes will be the nation that will first recover from the war effort.

In order to be specific, let's see what some of these problems are. To get a proper perspective of the problems we must know that the United States leads all the nations of the world in the development of aviation. I would divide them basically into three groups:

First. The question is, How far will the United States press its advantages and how far will it be willing to share world air-trade with other nations?

Second. Government operation against private enterprise. The questions are, Whether, and how soon, and under what conditions, the Government will turn the nonmilitary air-transportation business back to private air lines? And,

Third. Freedom of the air. The problem is whether the air is to be free to world transport lines, as in peacetimes the seas are free to shipping.

Each of these questions bristle with its separate set of problems. And as to all three there are signs of growing division and outlook between an interested group of liberals in the administration, on the one hand, and businessmen and conservative officials, on the other hand.

I do not want here to take up the argument as to what should be done in order to answer these three all-important questions. But I do want executive and legislative branches of the Government to devote attention to the study of these questions, with the purpose in mind of arriving, ultimately, at the proper answer, in light of the best interests of the most of the people of the United States.

With American dollars, modern airports, airways, and air-navigational facilities have been built in Canada, South America, and on the continent of Africa.

What is to become of these air facilities after the war is over?

Are we to follow the pattern of the agreement that our Government has now made Canada, to wit, that 1 year after the end of the war all present airport facilities built there with our money are to be turned over to Canada?

Is this to be the policy of our Government in South America, Africa, and the other places throughout the world where American dollars have been spent?

Are we going to do in the post-war period what we already have done in Africa, where the Pan American Airways System built a modernized airway for the United States Government, from the African West Coast to Cairo? The operation of which has now been taken away from Pan American and turned over to the British Overseas Airways, or are we going to be as zealous in the protection of the rights of our citizens in the post-war period as Britain and Canada are zealous of the protection of the rights of their citizens?

Up to this point I have been discussing aviation as though you had had as much opportunity as I have had to become familiar with its potentialities. Of course, you have not. So let us divert here and look at some of the possibilities of this great modern achievement.

If this industry is permitted to go forward, it will do for the United States, in my opinion, at the end of this war, what the automobile did for us at the end of the last war. In this connection you might be surprised to know that when we sent our expedition across the Mexican border in 1916 to run down the bandit Villa, the United States Army owned not a single motortruck. And there were those who argued then that the motortruck would never displace the mule as a means of transportation in warfare.

In this same connection, it will be interesting to note that although we in the United States had more commercial airplanes in operation at the outbreak of World War No. 2 than any other nation in the world, at the peak this number of airplanes in commercial operation in the United States was only slightly in excess of 300, although every community in the United States was hungry for air service.

Will this great air industry, in both the field of production and transportation, grow in the post-war period, or, will it be stifled by selfish interests within our own country who have their money invested in other fields of transportation?

Unless the development of commercial aviation in every aspect is permitted to go forward, hundreds of thousands of people now employed in both the production and operation of airplanes will find themselves out of employment and forced to seek other fields of endeavor at the end of this war.

As I said before, let us now canvass some of the potentialities of post-war commercial aviation, in order to ascertain what possibly aviation might mean to our post-war economy and international policies.

Our planet earth is the center of a larger air globe. It is like a small spherical kernel within a large spherical shell. Both globes as one unit follow the same orbit. We take our air with us and always have. The new factor that changes our world is the use of air as the only universal realm for transportation. In ratio, as we do use it, we change the proximity and accessibility of all places and effectively we make the world smaller. With this conception as the basis for our war thinking, the world could make peace permanently. Not that human nature will change that much, that quickly, but because after centuries of recurring war the human race now does possess the physical means of enforcing peace.

Consider the protective possibility of air. Since air is everywhere, it is not possible for any person or clique or nation to hide anywhere upon the earth from air surveillance. If we have mastery of the air we can reach the spawning ground of the war plotters and prevent their preparation.

Consider the productive possibilities of air. Today all world markets are much closer neighbors than cities of the United States used to be. In this connection we must forget mileage, for stating global distance in miles in relation to flight is like giving highway distances in feet. At 300 miles per hour speed, and this speed will certainly be universally attained shortly after the close of this war, making allowance for take-off and refueling stops, Chicago and Detroit are only 30 hours from Bombay and Calcutta, 21 hours from Ankara, and 19 hours from Moscow. Tokyo and Shanghai are only 23 and 27 hours, respectively, from Minneapolis. Washington, D. C. is less than 55 hours from any spot on the world's surface. Thus you can readily see that air transportation makes possible a quicker post-war rehabilitation and a better world economic system.

World War No. 1 was a localized war. It was won by surface strategy. World War No. 2 is a universal war where there are no safety zones because every inch of the earth's surface is a potential target for bombs from the air. The world geography of 1918 is as obsolete as that of the ancient flat world. That is why the post-war world will present problems equally as great as does this war world, and why we will need aviation more after this war than during it.

After the peace conference we will have a much more vulnerable Nation because it is no longer an isolated piece of land but an integral, inseparable, and indivisible part of today's air world. The water of our two oceans could no more prevent air attack than did the cement of the Maginot line.

The pre-air conception of the world was one of nations protected by vast oceans. All world economic, political, and military thinking was predicated upon the surface conception. Aviation has turned the page on that era.

Of course, nations will continue to have boundary lines and will use land and water methods of transportation. But aviation changes all relative values. It nullifies the buffer nations and makes possible that which have for all man's prior history been impossible.

Since it is primarily the use of air that makes this a global war it must follow inevitably that a dominant use of air can maintain global peace. The United States has the beginning of the aviation machinery necessary to implement its democratic ideals and prevent a repetition of the war crime by any nation; attain the most powerful position in the air; and automatically we will become the greatest power for peace. Control the air and you control mankind. The United States does not want to control the air or to control mankind. We want no domination over the skies any more than we want domination over the earth. But we must expand, evolve, and grow as an air power, or we will be dominated by someone else, and will shrivel into a third-rate power quickly.

Glenn L. Martin says his firm can build a 250,000-pound flying ship, able to carry 80 tons of bombs or cargo to Europe, or any place else, at a speed of more than 300 miles per hour. Eight thousand three hundred of such planes could move tonnage in the course of a year equivalent to the yearly freight capacity of the entire merchant marine of the world; 45,000 would be the equivalent in carrying capacity of this country's 1,900,000 freight cars. These figures, my

friends, are not the result of fanciful idle dreaming, the proof of which is that we already have built the Lockheed *Constellation*, which weighs 87,000 pounds, has a top speed in excess of 300 miles per hour, has a range of approximately 7,000 miles, and a ceiling of approximately 30,000 feet.

In the air world of tomorrow this *Constellation* will be compared as a jeep we know today, to a tank we know today. And if you think this is fanciful dreaming, listen to the poem of Tennyson, written in 1842.

With great vision that poet a hundred years ago foresaw the possibilities of the air transport in freight movements, and put it down in these words:

"For I dipt into the future,
Far as human eye could see,
Saw the vision of the world,
And all the wonder that would be;

"Saw the heavens fill with commerce,
Argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight,
Dropping down with costly bales."

Isn't it amazing that Tennyson saw more clearly 100 years ago the future of the flying machine (which to him could have been only a dream) than many people now are able to see it?

Further proof of the fact that this is not fanciful dreaming is the fact that at the outbreak of this war we had only a little over 300 commercial transport planes, and although it remains a military secret, believe me we didn't have too many more than this number of serviceable planes in our Army. Despite this, however, we now are turning out a hundred thousand planes a year. They could transport 2,000,000 men at one time. The immensity of the change we are facing staggers the imagination.

On January 7, 1943, the Nichols Committee to Investigate Air Accidents filed its final report with the Congress. I want to read to you a few paragraphs from that report. I quote:

"While the committee can at this time say but little concerning new designs in the field of transport aircraft, it can at least hint, from its observations in the leading aircraft plants of the country, that this whole industry will be revolutionized after the present war and that it will become one of the great industries of this country.

Your committee has been permitted to view the airplanes now under construction and to see the designs of other aircraft which are in the blueprint stage. Some of these are so revolutionary and of such military significance that we cannot divulge the full facts, even to the Congress. We can only hope that you will believe us when we say that the future security and economic prosperity of the United States may depend upon your willingness to give wholehearted and constructive cooperation to civil aviation now. Very seriously we say to you that that nation which is best prepared to enter world air commerce on a large and effective scale at the end of this war may be the first nation to recover its economic stability.

Now is the time to prepare for the post-war period and to advance the interests of the United States in international air commerce. The foundation stones are many. For example, may we venture to say that the day is not far distant when Fairbanks, Alaska, will be one of the great aviation centers of North America. Through this gateway the air commerce of the United States, India, Asia, and Russia will pass over the Arctic Circle comparable to the manner in which air traffic now passes through Miami, Fla., to and from the West Indies, Central and South America, and Africa. Other points not now regarded as important will become air traffic centers. It is highly important that careful preparation be made for the great air commerce of the future.

Recent history proves the absolute necessity for a going aircraft industry in constant operation, in order that the productive capacity may be available at all times, that can be turned quickly into mass production of combat and transport aircraft to meet the exigencies and requirements of an adequate national defense. It is the considered opinion of your committee that this can best be accomplished by our Government fostering a strong and ever-expanding civil and commercial aviation program.

Those air experts who have given long study to the matter feel sure that the possibilities of air transportation are practically unlimited. After the war there will be millions of persons who will purchase things they have never bought before. No people and no markets will be inaccessible. Air traffic will affect what they eat in China and India, their living conditions, the hours they work. It will industrialize small and remote places with wealth that have not been successfully developed because of travel difficulties. In turn, all of this air activity the world over will have the effect of increasing the intensity of air travel over the United States. For example, let us look at an air route from Chicago to Calcutta, by way of New York, the Azores, Casablanca, Cairo, Basra, and Karachi. This route would become rich territory and would consume but 40 hours in its completion. It would be fed by lines running down from Spain, France, Italy, the Balkans, and Asia Minor and running up the length of Africa, as well as from South America.

Once more, is this fanciful dreaming? No; it is not. Proof is available. Several months ago our Air Transport Command under Gen. Harold L. George was already operating 60,000 miles of route. This mileage is being greatly increased this year while the number of trips is being increased by several hundred percent. The Air Transport Command flies the North Atlantic to the United Kingdom by alternative routes: It flies from the United States to Chungking, via Brazil, Africa, Arabia, and India, with spurs running up to French North Africa, Cairo, and Iran. It has developed and expanded routes to the southwest Pacific, and through Canada to Alaska.

The time is not far removed when you will see overnight sleeper service between New York and London, and between Chicago and Berlin. This will be comparable to the present overnight rail sleeper service between Chicago and New York. All of these things are possible, but not without overcoming some handicaps. So let us look for a moment at only one phase of the competitive situation.

When the British Empire is restored, British planes will be able to fly around the world without ever landing outside the British Empire or Commonwealth. They would have circumnavigated the globe before the war if we had not denied all foreign planes permission to land in the Hawaiian Islands. Hawaii is our trump card in commercial aviation in the Pacific. But it would be possible, if extremely expensive, for the British to skip Hawaii by one long jump from Vancouver, British Columbia, to Christmas Island.

On the other hand, almost everywhere we go we must obtain permission. To fly the short polar routes we must have the consent of Canada and, in most instances, of Russia. To fly the great circle from Chicago to Calcutta or Bombay, we would require permission to land in the Soviet Union, to fly its full length, to traverse Kinkiang and Tibet, and finally to land in Calcutta.

Will the Russians permit the commercial planes of other nations to fly across Russian territory? And would the British, so long as they have any influence in India, permit a polar route from the United States through Russia to develop to the immediate disadvantage of an empire route from Great Britain through the Mediterranean and Middle East?

The above offers only a few of the problems to be solved before we can expect to get an even break with our now allies who, tomorrow, will be our competitors. It should be ample proof to all thinking Americans that now is the time to start laying plans for the settlement of these aggravating problems. And unless they are solved at the peace table, God pity us. And you may kiss good-bye any return that you expected from the money that we have given away, and loaned, to our world-power allies.

Who Is To Blame for Inaction on Pay-As-You-Go Taxation?

REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, now that both the Ways and Means Committee bill and the Ruml pay-as-we-earn plan have been rejected by the House, an attempt is being made to blame Republicans for the failure of the House to take any positive action on the subject. But what are the facts?

The committee bill came up for consideration in Committee of the Whole. The Ruml-Carlson bill was offered as a substitute for the committee bill. It would have been possible to have offered the Robertson-Forand plan or any other compromise measure as an amendment to the Carlson substitute, but the sponsors of these compromise measures deliberately chose not to do so, preferring to wait until the Ruml-Carlson bill was out of the way. The only choice, then, was between the Ruml-Carlson plan and the committee bill. The House, in Committee of the Whole, adopted the Carlson substitute. The Committee of the Whole then rose and reported the bill back to the House with the Carlson amendment. On a roll-call vote, the Carlson amendment was rejected.

At that point, it would have been possible for the House to have gone back into Committee of the Whole and considered various substitute measures for the committee bill. But what happened? The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], moved the previous question on the committee bill, and thus any possibility of offering any compromise measures was cut off. The Democratic leadership on the Ways and Means Committee apparently felt they had the votes to pass the committee bill and therefore did not want to give supporters of the Robertson-Forand substitute or any other compromise measure a chance to offer their proposals.

When the time came to vote the committee bill up or down, the Republican minority offered a motion to recommit the entire subject to the Ways and Means Committee. This had the effect of killing the hopelessly unsatisfactory com-

mittee bill and at the same time paved the way for reconsideration of the whole question by the Ways and Means Committee. Such reconsideration is now blocked by the unyielding attitude of the chairman, who has refused to call the committee together to take up the matter anew.

The Republican members of the committee will continue their efforts to bring out a real pay-as-we-earn tax bill as desired by the overwhelming majority of the American people, and will resist the effort of the Democratic majority to postpone or ignore this pressing issue.

Wage and Price Stabilization

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak a word of commendation of Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. It is reported in this morning's papers that, instead of asking the President to raise wages, they have asked him to lower prices.

Their request is a just one. They have, in effect, asked that the principles embodied in the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, for the stabilization of wages and prices, be adhered to and rigidly enforced.

Mr. Green is quoted in the Washington Post as saying:

> If wage stabilization is to be a part of this program, price stabilization must be parallel.

In those words he expressed the very essence and purpose of the Price Control Act.

Some of you may recall that when I was privileged to address the House on September 22 of last year, at which time we were considering the price-control bill, I stated that the bill set up two hitching posts: parity for farm prices, and existing wage levels for wage earners or real wages. If I may, I would like to read the remarks I made at that time:

> It can be readily understood that it is just as much to the disadvantage of the wage earner as to the farmer if parity gets out of adjustment. True, one or the other may profit for a period, but it is inevitable that there will be a readjustment. If farm prices advance over parity, the wage earner's dollar will buy less, hence his real wages are lower. If, on the other hand, wages increase too rapidly, parity gets "out of kilter" as far as the farmer is concerned because manufactured articles increase in price to cover wage raises.
>
> What usually occurs, particularly in times of intense business activity, is that a rise in wages causes farm prices to advance in their turn, and this is followed by another increase in wages. The process continues, one ratcheting the other up, with the recipient, either the farmer or the wage earner, really gaining nothing at all. Each may have more dollars in his pocket, but they will not purchase any more needed articles.

By their request that prices be lowered instead of wages being increased, Mr. Green and Mr. Murray recognize the intimate interrelationship between prices and wages. They are looking at our economy as a closely knit unit and not solely at wages in terms of dollars.

I have vigorously opposed the repeated attempts that have been made to rewrite the established definition of parity prices for agricultural products, and I have vigorously opposed attempts of agricultural interests to raise farm prices. It is my hope that the President will veto, and I feel confident he will, the so-called Bankhead bill. I wish that the farming interests would follow the lead of the two great labor leaders and recognize that stabilization, the prevention of inflation chaos, requires that we keep the hitching posts of parity prices and real wages, set up in the Price Control Act of October 2, 1942, firm and unyielding.

Fuel Rationing

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, according to an article that appeared in last evening's Washington Star, Mr. Wilson, before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, in his colloquy with Mr. POWERS, said that fuel rationing could be terminated if we have normal conditions, if the second and last length of the 20-inch line from the Middle West to the east coast is finished, and if the program of conversion of oil to coal is carried out.

Mr. Speaker, we were promised last summer that we would have enough fuel oil this year on the east coast, but that promise was not fulfilled. Promises do not keep people warm. I shall not be satisfied unless we have a third pipe line to the east coast. We do not know whether or not conditions will be normal. Certainly in wartime conditions are not normal. We have had very great suffering because of shortage of oil in New England and all over the east coast. That must not occur again. It is incredible to me that action is not taken to insure a full supply of oil in order to keep us warm and to keep industries in operation. Mr. Wilson also stated that there must be more conversion from oil to coal in order to have an adequate supply of oil. In many instances that cannot be done. I hope you all will unite in helping us secure another pipe line.

The news article referred to is as follows:

FUEL-OIL RATIONING CAN BE TERMINATED, HEARING IS TOLD—REQUIREMENTS MUST REMAIN NORMAL TO ALLOW LIFTING OF BAN, WILSON SAYS

Testimony of a high Petroleum Administration official that fuel-oil rationing in the East would be unnecessary next winter—provided requirements remain "normal"—has been made public by a House Appropriations Subcommittee.

The witness, George A. Wilson, of the Office of Director of Transportation, Petroleum Administration for War, told the committee in reply to questioning by Representative POWERS, Republican, of New Jersey, that fuel-oil requirements could be met without rationing, unless unforeseen demands developed. The testimony was disclosed yesterday.

Mr. POWERS, in order clearly to establish Mr. Wilson's meaning, asked:

"Mr. Wilson, we are at liberty to state on the floor or publicly that with the completion of your two pipe lines from Texas to the east coast, plus existing tank-car facilities, that the present gasoline rationing system in the East will be definitely taken care of and enough oil will be delivered to the east coast next winter without fuel-oil rationing?"

"In answer to that, Mr. POWERS," Mr. Wilson replied, "I would say that on the completion of the 2 new large-diameter pipe lines, the 24-inch and the 20-inch, all of the way from Texas through to the east coast, which would provide approximately 535,000 barrels delivery per day by those 2 lines, plus continued use of tank cars, existing pipe lines, and existing or under-construction inland waterways equipment, that we will be able to meet the full east-coast petroleum requirements on a basis of continuing gasoline rationing, substantially as it now is (March 16, before the A coupons were devaluated 50 percent), and supply normal requirements of fuel oil and other petroleum requirements for domestic and offshore use."

"Without rationing of fuel oil?" Mr. POWERS asked.

"That is what I mean by normal requirements," replied Mr. Wilson. "If the requirements, due to some presently unforeseen condition, increased, of course, our estimate would be out of balance by that much.

"And my answer also takes into consideration the program of conversion from petroleum to coal, which is now under way and which already has been accomplished to the amount of approximately a hundred thousand barrels of oil per day."

Later it was disclosed that the 24-inch pipe line is to be completed by July 4, this year, and the 20-inch line by December, if the extension to the East is approved by the War Production Board and materials made available.

Discriminatory Freight Rates

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to address the House for 1 minute and to extend and revise my remarks.

Ever since the beginning of rail transportation in this country there has been a marked discrimination in freight rates

against the South and Midwest in favor of the East. This discrimination has been forcibly brought to our attention by the Board of Investigation and Research provided for in the Transportation Act of 1940, in its report of March 30, 1943. A majority of the Board in its recommendations state that it is in the interests of the proper development of the country as a whole that there should be established a uniform classification of freight and a uniform scale of class rates for application in interstate commerce throughout the United States. They recommend that Congress amend the Interstate Commerce Act by declaring this to be a fact and directing the Commission to administer and enforce the provisions of the act with a view of carrying out the declaration.

The existing discrimination of freight rates has made it impossible for Nebraska and the other Midwestern States beyond the Mississippi, and the Southern States to develop small manufacturing plants for processing their raw materials and shipping the finished products into the Eastern and far Western States. In Nebraska we have the raw materials for processing food, for making alcohol from which to make synthetic rubber, for making plastics and leather goods. We have ample power from our newly developed hydroelectric plants. We have ample transportation facilities, both rail and highway, and when the war is over will have a great new network of airports. Thousands of men and women are being trained in factory techniques in the many war plants that now dot the State. The one great thing we lack is fair freight rates. To me this is a grave condition and should be speedily corrected. I expect to introduce legislation which will compel the Interstate Commerce Commission to wipe out these discriminations.

Board of Legal Examiners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication and resolution from the American Bar Association:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, Ill., March 31, 1943.

To the honorable Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

Because of the vital interest which the American Bar Association has in the selection of adequately trained, able, and experienced lawyers in the Government service, the matter of the passage of H. R. 1025 has been considered by the house of delegates of the association at a meeting held in Chicago on March 29 and 30, which adopted the enclosed resolution.

In view of the immediate importance of the matter, we take the liberty of sending you a copy for your consideration and express the hope that this bill may have your support and receive the approval of Congress when it is considered on April 5, next.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. KNIGHT,
Secretary.

Whereas there has been created within the United States Civil Service Commission a board of legal examiners which, acting in consultation with the Commission, is charged with the duty of developing and administering the merit system for lawyers in the employ of the United States Government; and

Whereas this board received an appropriation for the fiscal year 1943 and has thereby been enabled to develop its program to the point of demonstrating fully its value to the Government and its significance to the legal profession; and

Whereas the Congress is now considering legislation to give specific statutory authorization to the board, the passage of which has been made a condition of further appropriations for the work of the board: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress be and it is hereby petitioned to adopt the legislation above mentioned (H. R. 1025) and to make necessary appropriations for the continuance of the work of said board.

The Labor Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William H. O'Brien, former president, Boston Central Labor Union, and oldest member in Boston of the labor movement in point of membership:

It is not so very long ago that the factory windows were whitewashed, the factory bell tolled at 5:30 and at 6:30 the workers trekked into the mill and trekked out at 6:30 at night. Eight months of the year (if they worked) they trekked in in darkness and trekked out in darkness.

All over the industrial and mining centers the employer owned the tenement houses adjacent to the mine, or the mill, and owned the stores where the worker traded. Into those factories and mills trekked women and children of tender age to work long hours under unsanitary conditions. Child labor, the sweatshops, low wages, long hours, unsanitary working and housing conditions began to be recognized as outstanding social evils that must be wiped out, but little progress was made until the organization of the knights of labor and then the fight was on. Progress was slow, but there was a gradual awakening to the fact that instead of two parties at interest, the employer and employee, there was a third party whose interest was as great, if not greater, than both employer and employees, and that third party was the general public in every community, where these conditions existed.

The American Federation of Labor succeeded the Knights of Labor, and took up the fight under craft organization. It has been a long, hard fight to establish decent working conditions in shop, factory, and mine, and in the white-collar establishments. But when one visualizes, as only we old-timers can, and recalls the struggle for a few more hours of God's sunshine and the home for all, but particularly for the women and children, and a more equitable division of the fruits of their toil, the wiping out of the sweatshop, child labor, the company stores, and tenements, decent working and sanitary conditions, the right to join their fellow-workers in organized effort to bring about these results, we wonder just what would be the condition of this country today if these fights had not been made and won. I have always believed that no strike for these conditions was ever lost.

But the fight will never be over so long as there is an employer of labor who still regards labor as a chattel, or who still says, there is nothing to arbitrate.

There is plenty of loose criticism aimed at organized labor today with the very evident purpose of creating a backfire against unions because of strikes by both big labor groups in defense work. Every effort should be made to settle labor requests for a fair division of the increased profits that have come to employers through defense contracts without a strike and the employers should be even more anxious than the employee to do the right thing. It does seem that with so many conciliation boards—local, State, and Federal—there should be few, if any, strikes. Of course, it must be agreed that if labor doesn't get its fair share of increased profits while the going is good it will never get it when the rush is over. While I hold no brief for any party or individual and with no ax to grind, I think I can state, and within the bounds of reason, that labor, as a whole, unskilled, skilled, and white collar, has made greater progress under President Roosevelt in the past 10 years, than in the fifty-odd years preceding. But labor divided can never hold those gains and if they are still split when this bloody thing is over they will take an awful licking. Not we of this generation but generations yet unborn, will be able to understand and appreciate what has been done since the President closed the banks after 4,617 banks had shut their doors, involving nearly $2,000,000,000, preventing bloody days in our great industrial centers, and inaugurating the greatest humanitarian scheme the world has ever known which brought hope and comfort into the homes of millions of unemployed workers and their families who had gone through 4 long years of suffering, almost to despair.

But thank God and the relief program we have come through the crisis and we would be unworthy of our lineage and our great heritage if for one moment we doubted our ability to carry on to even a greater moral victory and a greater material success than we have ever enjoyed as a Nation, and to continue as the abiding place only of those who believe in a government of law, where all the problems that affect the welfare of all the people will continue to be settled by the ballot and not the bullet, and those who believe there are better countries in which to live should pack up and get out of this country that has fed them and sheltered them from the bloody mess of Europe.

Confiscation of Firearms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I am reliably informed that there is a movement

on foot to collect all firearms and ammunition from the civilian population on the plea that the Coast Guard and merchant marine need them. This is not compatible with the editorials we read, stating that we have enough guns and ammunition to last an army of 11,000,000 for 10 years' combat duty.

I am also informed that the Government is sending a representative throughout the country canceling governmental contracts for such material.

This impresses me as being another step in the disarmament of civilians as occurred in Germany, France, and other occupied countries.

I am not a pessimist, nor a calamity howler, nor has my imagination run wild. But I cannot help but wonder if this proposed program of confiscation and the bill now before us might not eventually lock step and prove to be country cousins, which we might unwittingly and innocently accept into our household, only to later regret it, as did the man in Aesop's Fables who warmed the cold rattlesnake because of sympathy and was later bitten as his reward.

Churchill on Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of March 31, 1943:

CHURCHILL ON INFLATION

Premier Churchill's address of Sunday, May 21, should be read and pondered by Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Morgenthau, and every Member of Congress. Said Churchill:

"Britain holds unswervingly to the principle of a sound and strong currency, to a steady and fair continuity of values for the guarantee of faith between man and man and between the individual and the state:

"Britain discards as false any theory that pounds, shilling, and pence are meaningless symbols.

"Britain holds that the savings of the nation arising from the thrift, skill, or devotion of individuals are sacred;

"Britain's very national life is built around them, and it is the duty of the state to redeem its faith in an equal degree of value."

Britain is doing a much better job of managing her finances than the United States. To begin with she is spending only $1 to our $5 She is paying a large share of the cost of the war as she goes along. She is holding down her national debt through high tax levies. Churchill is well aware of the perils of inflation. Winning the war is not enough. The integrity of British money is of superlative importance.

Our national debt is now soaring to two hundred and ten billions. That will be $1,615 for every American. During the first World War it went no higher than thirty billions. We were reducing that war debt at the rate o a billion dollars a year until the stock panic hit us with full force in 1929 and 1930. From that day to this we have never balanced our budget.

We have never balanced it because we went in for paternalism on a gigantic scale. During the decade from 1930 to 1940 our national debt climbed at an average rate of three billions a year. We went into the first World War with a debt of only one billion. We went into this one with a debt of over fifty billions. And all this in a time of profound peace.

The saddest thing which could happen to any country is to cheapen its money. This reduces or wipes out the savings of the masses. Every life-insurance policy calls for the payment of a number of dollars regardless of their value. The face value of the policies now in force is one hundred and thirty-five billions. Prudent men and women have for years been investing their savings in life insurance. In the years gone by those were hard-earned, sound dollars, and sound dollars are what the beneficiaries should get when the policies become due and payable. Britain and the United States should remember what inflation did to Germany following the first war.

"Britain holds that the savings of the nation arising from the thrift, skill, or devotion of individuals are sacred," said Churchill. Most of the American savings are going into War bonds. The American people want those bonds redeemed in dollars of equal value to those they bought their bonds with.

We cannot call a halt now on spending. We have to see this war through. But we can call a halt on waste. We can stop Treasury raiding. We can stop subsidizing this group or that group. We must explode the fallacy that there is no limit to the Government's purse.

As a hedge against inflation we have been hoarding gold until we now have some $20,000,000,000 worth of it. But when we increased this gold from its former price of $21 an ounce to $35 an ounce we marked up its value 60 percent. When we did this the rest of the world went off the gold standard and until the gold standard is restored as a medium of international exchange our gold hoard is only a useless pile of yellow metal.

The New Deal does business on the principle that the size of the national debt means nothing—that we owe the money to ourselves. This is what the President has said. Please get this. It means that when we lend the money to ourselves we will have to pay it back to ourselves. This is pure casuistry.

Economically speaking, there is nothing more desirable to any nation than what Mr. Churchill calls "a sound and strong currency," "a steady and fair continuity of values," "a guaranty of faith between man and man and between the individual and the state."

We hope those words were heard in the White House and in the Halls of Congress.

Indiana Legislature Urges Congress To Pass Anti-Poll-Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave extended me by the House, I am inserting in the RECORD herewith the text of a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana memorializing Congress to enact anti-poll tax legislation:

Senate Enrolled Concurrent Resolution 3

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to pass legislation abolishing the poll tax as a qualification for voting

Whereas the people of the United States are engaged in a war to determine whether or not democracy as a principle of government shall continue to exist; and

Whereas in the heart of democracy one of the basic fights of this war is the right of the people to cast the ballot and vote for a government of their own choosing; and

Whereas there are certain States of the United States which have laws, commonly called "poll tax laws," whereby a portion of their citizens, because of their financial condition, are prevented from casting their ballot; and

Whereas a bill was introduced in the National Congress making such laws inoperative; and

Whereas Indiana's representatives in the National Congress voted in favor of such measure: Therefore

SECTION 1. *Be it resolved by the Senate of the eighty-third General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the house of representatives concurring)*, That Congress be and is hereby petitioned and urged to pass the necessary legislation abolishing the payment of poll tax as a qualification for voting.

SEC. 2. That the secretary of the senate is hereby instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each of the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from Indiana.

Additional Aid for General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL ELLISON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to insert my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Resolution No. 1454, adopted by the City Council of Baltimore, Md., as of March 22, 1943, urging the United States Congress to give General MacArthur the immediate aid he asks to pursue war in the Pacific:

Resolution 1454

Resolution urging the United States Congress to give General MacArthur the immediate aid he asks to pursue war in the Pacific

Whereas numerous military authorities are constantly stressing the fact that the Japanese menace in the Pacific area is growing more acute and is a constant threat to the United States, and particularly to the people of the State of California; and

Whereas Baltimore has often been designated as an enemy military target of the greatest importance and would, therefore, be in great immediate danger from enemy attack in the event of invasion; and

Whereas Gen. Douglas MacArthur, a former Baltimorean, has pleaded with the authorities of our Nation for a greater number of aircraft and more of the implements of war to defend the vast territory under his command and to win from the Japanese hordes the Battle of the Pacific; and

Whereas, numerous civic leaders and men and women of national prominence have requested again and again that our Government authorities heed General MacArthur's

request for additional supplies of war and realize the danger of delay: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of Baltimore, That we hereby recommend to the Congress of the United States of America that General MacArthur's request for immediate aid for pursuing the war in the Pacific be granted; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the city council be and he is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to His Excellency, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States of America and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy; to Hon. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy; to Hon. L. Stimson, Secretary of War; to Hon. George L. Radcliffe and Hon. Millard E. Tydings, Senators from Maryland; and to Hon. Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., and Hon. Daniel Ellison, Members of Congress from Baltimore, and respectfully suggest that they give every possible assistance in furthering any effort required to grant immediate military aid to General MacArthur to the extent required by him.

We Are Proud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, because it will give all who read the sort of inspiration regarding our country which all of us need today, under unanimous consent, I include herewith a poem entitled "We Are Proud," which was read on the radio program One Man's Family in 1941. The National Broadcasting Co. has been good enough to grant permission for this to be done:

WE ARE PROUD [1]

I am filled with courage and determination.
I am filled with pride.
Not the vain pride of possession but the greater pride of doing and accomplishment.
For in these United States there are great doing and great accomplishments and there are mighty reservoirs of courage and determination.
I stand on a high place and I say this is America.
I say this is my America, and I turn my face to the east,
And I see many peoples.
I see a mixture of peoples in great cities,
And I see a vast network of transportation facilities knitting these cities.
Two ribbons of steel, innumerable bands of concrete, giant birds of commerce with their fierce wingspread of shellacked metal gleaming against the eastern blue.
I see the frothy wakes of coastwise shipping;
The smudge of oil and coal smoke against the horizon;
Hear distant hum of turbines, the faint reverberations of whistles.
And all these are but part of the network linking this city with that city and these peoples with those peoples.
Strangers to one another, and yet not strangers, but each a citizen of this commonwealth and each with the deep and unutterable desire to make America a living, human force for the greater good of her citizens and the never-ending envy of her neighbors.
And to the east I see industry and the halls of science and learning and the higher expression of the arts.
And my heart swells with pride for there in the East is much of doing and accomplishment.
And I am proud, for this same East is part of America, and I, too, am part of America.
And I turn my face to the South.
I turn my face south to the beauty of the magnolia trees and the scent of honeysuckle and the soft rhythmic lullaby of a Negro woman.
I turn my face to the gospel shouting and the sweating bodies and the chanting voices of the field hands.
I see cotton in the field and cotton in the bale.
I see tobacco in the field and tobacco in the cask.
And there are the piney woods and the river boats on the Mississippi and the lusciousness of a Georgia peach and that certain blue of Kentucky bluegrass.
And I turn my face to the cabin where Lincoln was reared, and the estate where Washington was.
I see the oil and rice fields of Louisiana and the vast expanse of Texas, and I feel a rising emotion in my throat.
And I am proud, for this same South is part of America, and I, too, am part of America.
And from my pinnacle, I turn my face north.
I turn my face to the north and there are lakes and forests and green rolling farms and a labyrinth of mines,
And all the natural wealth to keep a dozen great nations are here.
Barley and rye and flax and oats and corn and wheat and clover;
Rich beds of iron ore and salt mines and silver mines and copper and coal.
And I see butterfat and good wheat flour and milk and cream and fresh-killed meat.
And I smell the violets of Wisconsin and the wild prairie rose of North Dakota and the apple blossoms of Michigan.
And I am proud, for this same North is a part of America, and I, too, am part of America.
And finally I turned to the west.
I turn to the west and I see Washington.
I see the hunter's green of her forests and the icy blue of her lakes.
And I see the rivers and valleys of Oregon and thousands of cattle and millions of sheep and a gray coyote whipping across the eastern badlands * * *
And frantic horses and men showing gray and sweaty in the corral dust.
And in the West I see California.
I see the redwoods of California and I see a coast line washed by the Pacific and I see the grim beauty of Death Valley burned by the sun and gleaming with the salt of a long-forgotten sea, and orange blossoms and bougainvillea and the sky filled with test pilots and the highways filled with the rush of engines, and the beaches and the mountains and the deserts teeming with visitors of every color, creed, and ideology.
And I see Nevada.
I see Reno, the biggest little city in the world, and I see Nevada justice grinding out divorces, and I see Carson City.
And there is Montana smudged with smoke and tinted by her copper mines, and Utah, and the painted desert of Arizona, and the clean, dry air of New Mexico.
And I look at the West so full of people and places and things and strangeness and beauty.
And I am proud, for this same West is a part of America, and I, too, am part of America.
And with deep convictions and great dignity and no hysteria, we consider what must be done.
For there is much to do.
Much to be done which needs doing quickly, earnestly, passionately.
But without hysteria.
If there is any among us who is not of us, talk to him and persuade him.
That is one thing we must do.
Unite and knit more closely all traditions so that though there may be many traditions, there will be no factions.
And there is another thing we must do.
We must accept our duties as citizens with better grace than ever before.
We must poll our vote with greater thought and rear our children with diligence, so they will be more intelligent citizens, and we must not turn our backs on our neighbor's distress or close our eyes to chicanery among those whom we have clothed with the dignity of public office.
For we must be a united force, with courage, with dignity, with humility, but with the wrath of a vengeful heaven for anyone within or without our borders who would tamper for one instant with our fine heritage.
For this is America, and you and I are a part of America.
And we are proud.

[1] Copyright 1940 by the National Broadcasting Co., Inc.

Organization and Collaboration of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a discussion between the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] of Senate resolution 114 having to do with post-war adjustments between the United Nations. The discussion took place on the National Radio Forum arranged by the Washington Evening Star on the Blue Network on March 31, 1943.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator HATCH. Thank you, Mr. Stodard. May Senator BALL and I express our gratitude to you and the Evening Star for this opportunity to discuss the resolution to win the peace, which Senators BALL, HILL, BURTON, and I recently introduced in the Senate.

Under our Constitution, the Senate must advise and consent to all treaties. Heretofore, as a rule, the Senate has acted negatively, waiting until after the treaty has been

formulated and then ratifying or rejecting the proposal.

We believe the word "advise" in the Constitution means that the Senate has the duty to advise with the Executive in the first instance, to act positively. Therefore, in taking this step we only ask the Senate to perform its constitutional duty.

There are other more important reasons. A great number of people in this country, of whom I was one, began to feel that we were drifting, perhaps unconsciously, back to where we were at the close of the last war. That meant defeat to me. Why let our gallant sons of today die with no move made to secure some organization or to form some plan to save the sons of tomorrow from the same tragedy and disaster our sons face today?

We who support this resolution want to begin building barriers against future wars now before it is too late. We are utterly convinced that unless we begin now taking steps which will give complete victory in war and also in peace, we of this generation will have failed in our obligations to our brave fighting men and to future generations. What do you have to add, Senator BALL?

Senator BALL. I am in complete accord, Senator HATCH, and I would add only this thought. Thinking realistically, we know that our great allies are now developing the foreign policies which they will follow in the post-war period. No government of a great nation can afford to wait until the actual cessation of hostilities to formulate plans for that very difficult, immediate post-war period. They would not be fulfilling their obligations to their own people if they waited.

The United States is going to play a very important role in that post-war world. Our wealth, our economic and political influence, and the military power we will possess at the end of this war are going to make us a tremendously important factor in that post-war world regardless of what we do now. We cannot avoid it.

So the real question is whether the United States Government will join with the governments of our allies in planning a decent, democratic, and unified post-war program cooperatively, or whether we will hold back and let them go ahead and make their post-war programs without us. Then we are likely to find ourselves forced to help maintain a peace we had little voice in developing. It is in that connection that Senate Resolution 114 is so very important. Our allies remember very clearly what happened 23 years ago when an American President fathered the League of Nations and a minority of the United States Senate prevented American participation in that effort to achieve lasting world peace. There is a real question in the minds of our allies as to whether the United States people and the Senate will agree to full participation of our Government in these post-war plans when the time comes for that agreement. That is why some positive expression from the Senate is so important at this time.

Senator HATCH. It would strengthen tremendously the role which our Government can play in the preliminary planning for the immediate post-war period, and I think that our Government's role would be all in the direction of making that post-war pattern more democratic, more just, and with more emphasis on the dignity and the freedom of individual men and women.

I am glad you used the word, "realistically" in your opening statement, JOE. It is so easy to characterize any effort such as we make now as idealistic or Utopian. As a matter of fact, we are the ones who are being realistic and facing the conditions of the world as they exactly exist.

Senator BALL. Right, CARL. Events of the last 25 years have proven that it was Woodrow Wilson who was the realist at Versailles, and it was his colleagues who dictated some of the oppressive terms of that treaty who were the fuzzy thinkers.

Senator HATCH. This resolution was introduced in the Senate by two Republicans and two Democrats. It is supported by a much larger group of both Democrats and Republicans, and it is the conviction of every one of these Senators that it would be the greatest accomplishment for our country if we could take our basic foreign policy out of partisan politics. It should never be there because it strikes too closely to the very lives of all of our people. I can say for my Democratic colleagues who are supporting us that we are very happy to join with you and your Republican colleagues in trying to take this tremendous issue out of any partisan consideration whatsoever.

Senator BALL. Now, CARL, let's go over the resolution clause by clause. The first paragraph reads: "*Resolved*, That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority"——

Senator HATCH. The Senate merely advises our Government to take the initiative in calling meetings of the United Nations to form an organization with specific and limited authority.

Senator BALL. I think everyone feels that the sooner we can get a close and effective organization of the United Nations, and particularly of the four great powers—China, the British Commonwealth, Russia, and the United States—the better it will be for all concerned.

Senator HATCH. Now, the next clause: "To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis."

Senator BALL. I think the key word there is "assist," and the General Staff, of course, will run the war. But it is our thought that a political organization of the United Nations could render effective assistance to the general staffs when called upon. Further, the experience gained in cooperating and working together in actually winning the war would be extremely valuable to the organization in handling the problems of peace.

Senator HATCH. Now on to the second function of the United Nations, namely: "To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established." Regardless of whether or not the resolution passes that will have to be done.

Senator BALL. Correct. The only question is whether the government of one nation should establish a temporary administration in a particular area or whether it should be done through a United Nations organization. I think everyone in America would agree that the cause of permanent peace would be advanced tremendously if the latter method were used. The chances of any nation trying to gain some territorial or other advantage out of this war would be lessened if these temporary administrations are set up by a United Nations organization rather than by individual nations.

The third immediate war task which would be delegated to the United Nations organization is: "To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces."

Senator HATCH. That, of course, is a tremendous and immediate job we are already running into in North Africa, and we are engaged now in trying to set up a joint organization headed by Governor Lehmann to do it in all war theaters. There's one question: Is the United States going to take the responsibility for feeding the whole world? Of course, I have no such thought. Neither do you nor the other sponsors.

Senator BALL. As I recall, New Zealand and Australia already have furnished more beef for our troops over there than we have furnished under lend-lease to all our allies.

Senator HATCH. We are going to accept our responsibility in administering relief, and we had better do it through a United Nations organization as is proposed here, rather than by ourselves.

Senator BALL. I have another angle on this, CARL. I think one reason the people of America were a little disgusted with our venture in foreign affairs following World War No. 1 was because we played Santa Claus in that period. Our food, wealth, machine tools, and other implements helped rehabilitate Europe after that war, but we got no assurance of a decent and stable peace for ourselves and the rest of the world out of that relief job.

Senator HATCH. It is my conviction that this time before we pour out our wealth to help rehabilitate the devasted areas of the world, let's ask the governments of those areas to join with us in setting up a decent, democratic, and durable peace organization. Again, this is a realistic approach to foreign policy.

Senator BALL. Now we come to the fourth and fifth specific and limited functions which we would delegate to this United Nations organization. I read from the resolution: "4. To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations 5. To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation."

Those two clauses, of course, are the very heart of the machinery to assure a stable and permanent peace after this war. We have seen the peace of the world destroyed in the last 20 years because, even though 98 percent of the people of the world hated war, when some aggressor power decided to throw civilization overboard and launch on a career of aggression, there was no agency to step in and say, "No; you cannot do this, and we will stop you."

Senator HATCH. The last few years have proved conclusively that this machinery is necessary if aggression is to be stopped and if the world is to have any chance for peace in the future.

Looking back we can see clearly that if the combined force of all the nations now fighting the Axis had been mobilized to resist its aggressions at any time up to and including Munich, they would have had a preponderance of power. That force was never mobilized, however, because no nation wanted to fight alone, and before even an attempt to reach agreement on a course of action had been made, the aggressor had grabbed what he wanted and the peace-loving nations faced an accomplished fact. They would have had to fight to undo what had been done instead of stopping it from being done.

Senator BALL. That is absolutely true. It would have been easy for the combined power of the peace-loving nations to have stopped aggression—in Manchuria in 1931, in Ethiopia, when Hitler marched into the Rhineland, or when he seized Austria. But action was paralyzed. That's why we need a joint military force that can act immediately to stop aggression. Its mere existence would do more than any other thing to prevent war.

It is in the best interest of the United States, or for any single nation, to have this job of maintaining peace and stability done through a cooperative organization of nations. It is the least costly in lives and materials. Possibly we could maintain our safety after this war by ourselves, but you know and I know it would mean placing on our people a tremendous burden of maintaining huge

air, land, and sea forces. Even then there would always be a very great danger of war. Compared to that the cost of maintaining peace through a cooperative organization shrinks into comparative insignificance.

Senator HATCH. While we are not unmindful of our obligation to the rest of the world, the primary thing which moves all of us is the safety and welfare of the United States of America. That is the main purpose of our resolution.

Our task here in the Senate, and the task of the American people, is to battle now for a program to prevent further wars as bravely as the young men of this country are fighting and dying today.

Senator BALL. The final paragraph of the resolution reads as follows: "That the Senate further advise that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement." That is all of the resolution. The final paragraph simply provides that this organization shall contain within itself the seeds of growth and change. It is essential to plant those seeds in any organization set up because we do not live in a static world. It is a changing world and any organization attempting to settle its problems peacefully must be able to adapt itself to changing conditions, able to adjust as they arise the stresses and strains of international relations which have bred war in the past.

Senator HATCH. Then there is the final clause that member nations should seek no territorial aggrandizement. That is traditional American policy. We have never recognized territory seized by military force, and I think that policy is recognized by the other United Nations who signed the Atlantic Charter. If we proclaim that purpose of the organization, it will aid tremendously in drawing support to our cause and weakening the morale of our enemies.

There is no country better fitted to announce that doctrine and stand for it than our own, and there is no place in the world where that policy should be more voiced than in the Senate of the United States in order to bring about complete agreement. We have not attempted to write in this resolution a blueprint for the government of the world. We have tried to state broad objectives because we realize that is all we can do now. The details will have to be worked out later around the conference table, and some will have to wait until after the war.

Senator BALL. Our Government alone cannot draw blueprints. Details of this post-war pattern must be worked out by agreement of the United States with its allies. We can assume a degree of leadership. The basic issue placed before the Senate by our resolution is simply this: Shall the United States commit itself now to participation in a strong and effective world organization to maintain peace and stability in this world on a decent, democratic basis when the shooting and bloodshed in this war finally ends?

Senator HATCH. I think that is well stated, Joe, and is the basic issue of what we are trying to do at this time.

Senator BALL. I think it is very significant that no individual has taken issue with that basic objective. The few opposing our resolution always agree the United States must collaborate to maintain peace once we have won it, but then they go on to oppose any and all specific proposals to do that job.

Senator HATCH. There has been quite a "yes, but" attitude, hasn't there?

Senator BALL. Of course, some of the opposition is to the idea of backing up a world organization with military force. But what other effective way is there to do the job? That is the real question, and when you consider it that way nobody contends that you can maintain peace without having force in the picture somewhere.

Senator HATCH. Practically everyone admits that. Our correspondence has been running about 20 to 1 in favor of a world organization backed by force. The people have not hesitated to speak on the subject.

Senator BALL. That is right. And the people must speak if this is to be a people's peace. The only way they can speak effectively, under our Constitution, is through the United States Senate.

There has been some question as to whether consideration of this resolution now might not provoke controversy and some bitter debate.

Senator HATCH. Well, I am not afraid of a free and frank open discussion of any subject. In fact, that is the way democracy works and the way it should work. If there is anything wrong with our resolution which can be developed in debate, let it be developed. That is the way we should legislate.

Senator BALL. There is one other very good reason for action on this resolution now. That is the volume of rumors and gossip concerning the war and peace aims of our allies—the British Commonwealth, Russia, and China. I know you have had the question asked of you. How can we decide our post-war aims unless we know what the post-war plans of our allies are?

China has made her position in favor of a world organization very clear. Likewise, Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Minister Eden have emphasized the British Commonwealth's interest in post-war collaboration. As for Russia, we know that Stalin never talks unless it is necessary.

Senator HATCH. Perhaps one reason he hasn't spoken out on Russia's aims is because he doesn't know what they will be until he knows what America's position is. One sure way of finding out whether Russia wants to participate in this kind of machinery to maintain peace is to sit down around the conference table and ask Russia. But we cannot ask effectively until we have a reasonable assurance from the Senate that the people of the United States favor this kind of a program. If we hold back, can we blame Russia or any other country for holding back? If we want to know their views why not sit down with them and discuss them? Isn't that the way to find out?

Senator BALL. This present atmosphere of suspicion and distrust is actually hurting collaboration to win the war. If we and our allies thrash out the fundamentals and reach an agreement on broad post-war objectives soon, it will not only increase our chances of winning a stable peace, but it will help tremendously to win the war.

The Global War and American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The Global War and American Business, delivered by me on February 15, 1943, before the National Paper Trade Association at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, it is not very easy these days for Members of Congress to tear away from their multitudinous duties to accept speaking engagements. As the work of the Nation multiplies under the impact of the war, the days seem to grow shorter and shorter in the world's Capital—Washington. Yet even under these circumstances, we must recognize the eagerness of our citizens to meet and counsel with their Representatives and learn at first hand of the plans and operations of their Government. I was therefore very glad to accept your invitation, extended to me through your able Mr. Chamberlain, to address you this afternoon.

I am particularly happy to meet with the representatives of the paper distributing industry because you have always shown yourselves to be public-spirited and progressive. I recall that in the early days of the National Recovery Administration, your industry was one of the first to be given the go-ahead signal. You had your facts and figures ready. Many of you had been operating under the main principles of the National Recovery Administration long before Washington began to advocate its universal application.

The paper distributing industry performs an essential service in the national war effort and in civilian life. It contributes much more to the health, happiness and welfare of the nation than is generally appreciated. Paper has been in such common and widespread use, and is so plentifully supplied, that we have failed to give much thought to its real importance in modern life. The paper distributor, regardless of the apparent simplicity of the commodity he deals in, performs a vital economic service. He is more than a mere middle man. He possesses important technical knowledge in regard to the paper business and is called upon to give advice and counsel to his customers of definite value in the conduct of business. He occupies a place in our system of business just as important as the banker who takes your money and mine and lends it to others where it becomes the basis of important commercial and business operations. People little realize that the paper distributor represents the greatest service organization in America today. No factory, office, store nor even our Government, could efficiently operate without the extensive utilization of paper. The distributor's salesmen contact every commercial, professional and governmental outlet in our entire country and holds a very unique position in our economy. He furnishes the necessary paper in all educational activities and in the maintenance of the national morale so important in time of war. He furnishes paper used for all sorts of forms, questionaires, advertising, mimeographing and a score of other purposes in government and in business. He must keep the press and the printer supplied for it is an accepted maxim in American business that "printing gets things done." All in all, both the winning of the war, and business in general, would be seriously jeopardized if the paper distributors of the country failed to fulfill their obligations, or if the opportunity to so serve should in any way be crippled or impaired.

The problems besetting your industry today are generally characteristic of the problem affecting all others. There are some variations, to be sure, but all our woes spring from the same source—the war which a German maniac in Berlin and a clique of bloodthirsty bandits in Tokyo have forced upon this and other peace-loving nations of the world.

We are today organized on the basis of fighting a global war. No nation in history has ever assumed such gigantic tasks or been

confronted with such weighty problems as the United States of America in this war.

The implications of a global war are so great that it would be impossible to describe them in the brief time I have been allotted. The last war, for example, took about 19 percent of the national income. It is estimated that the year 1943 will consume over 60 percent of our national income. During the last war we were faced with the problem of supplying raw materials, food, and certain manufactured products. This was done largely by means of industrial expansion, with business continuing as usual. The question of conversion even on a limited scale did not come to the fore until the war was nearly over. Today, because of the global nature of this war, our allies are counting heavily on us for vast supplies of war matériel, food, etc. To accomplish this gigantic program, we have found it necessary to convert the major portion of our economy to war production.

Few of us realize what this word, "conversion," implies, what devastating effects it is having upon many important industries and what perplexing problems it will present when the war is over. Some of the converted industries will never again be part of our economy. New ideas and inventions will render many of them obsolete and new industries will rise in their stead. Many will again become adjusted to peacetime economy and will emerge more powerful than ever before, while others will hardly be able to continue in business.

The war has cut us off from many sources of raw materials coming from overseas. For the first time in our history, we have really come to realize how dependent we are upon the freedom of the seas for the uninterrupted functioning of our internal economic machine.

This interdependence of nations brings to the fore the old Biblical question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" In the international arena, an affirmative answer is now being given by the men of the United Nations who are fighting shoulder to shoulder against the would-be enslavers of the world—the Nazis, the Japs, the Italians, and their lesser satellites. There were, of course, people here and in other countries who had felt that the problem of quarantining the aggressor nations was the concern only of those immediately affected, and that the nations isolated by broad oceans and immense distances had no cause to be disturbed by threats of conquest of the aggressors. Now we all know how fallacious this line of reasoning was and how narrowly we have escaped its disastrous consequences.

There is not the slightest doubt but that our isolationist policy played into the hands of Hitler and helped to precipitate this war. If wiser counsels had prevailed in this country long before 1939, the present world catastrophe might have been averted, and we would not be enduring today the economic and social dislocations which have come to plague us.

Let us hope that this bitter lesson will be fully mastered by our people—that in the future, they will refuse to follow the blind leadership of men who permit personal animosities and ambitions to influence their political and economic thinking and conduct.

When one looks back on the pre-Pearl Harbor period and recalls the desperate efforts which were made in this country to induce our Government to ignore its obligations to the world we cannot help but feel deep remorse. That is why in the international arena, we have at last come to accept the truism that we are our brother's keeper—that when a nation goes mad and attempts to enslave a defenseless neighbor, liberty everywhere is threatened. Military aggression and conquest anywhere disturbs the freedom of the whole world. No nation can possibly escape it. It is my belief that both our economic security at home and our safety and security in the world-at-large are attainable only through international cooperation and the defeat of all isolationist tendencies. Our country must join with the other peace-loving nations of the world in establishing a world organization with ample power to enforce its judgment against war-like nations who seek to resort to force. When peace comes, we must, through such a world organization, undertake the reconstruction and rehabilitation of world economy to benefit all nations. Such a program is indispensable to a lasting peace.

It is becoming more and more apparent, also, that businessmen, like nations, must stand together for mutual protection or suffer ruin separately.

No segment of our business life can hope to enjoy permanent prosperity at the expense of injustice or unfair dealings toward other segments. They are all links in one mighty chain constituting our American economy, and the weakest link determines the strength of the whole chain. The war has created many strange paradoxes. Today we find many industrial organizations in the country enjoying unprecedented prosperity while others are faced with bankruptcy and ruin. The great basic corporations of the country seem to have had a monopoly of war orders. They have hoarded raw materials. They have squeezed out the little contractor. They have entered into combinations, cartels, and schemes to secure the lion's share of war work. They have expanded their manufacturing facilities with the aid of the Government. Lack of proper planning prevented a more widespread distribution of war work. Such procedure would have served the ends of efficiency and the national well being. Instead of expanding the larger plants, the existing small plants should have been utilized in war production to a much greater extent. When 100 big corporations are able to garner—as they did between June 1940 and November 1942—70.1 percent of the total of the prime contracts awarded by the various procurement agencies of the Government, and with 10 of the larger of those corporations able to grab off 33.4 percent of that total, it is evident that our economic system is not operating in the interest and welfare of the Nation. It is evident that many thousands of small industrial units must suffer extinction.

This offers a problem for the Congress. I do not claim any distinction because I had foreseen this situation before it actually assumed serious proportions. It was inevitable that the outbreak of the war in Europe would affect our country. Every great war creates dislocations which spread over the whole world, and small business is usually the greatest sufferer. Long before war actually came, we were already feeling the effect of our national defense program. Shortages of raw materials soon began to play havoc with small business.

In the fall of 1940, 14 months prior to Pearl Harbor, I brought about the adoption of a Senate resolution creating a special committee to study the problems of small business.

What we commonly call small business is in reality the largest part of business in our country, comprising about 95 percent of the total. It is made up of hundreds of thousands of small concerns scattered among the cities and hamlets of the Nation. At a time when so much criticism is being leveled at the National Congress and its Members, it is only fair to note the fact that my resolution to aid small business enterprise was adopted without a dissenting vote and that ever since Republicans and Democrats alike have been working harmoniously in the Congress to help preserve small business economy.

No one in the United States wants to see the institution of free enterprise destroyed or even injured by this war. The thwarting of private enterprise, the crippling of individual initiative would drive our great middle class into the ranks of the proletarians. It would bar the laborer of today from becoming the industrial leader of tomorrow. It would bring us all down to the state where our very existence would be at the mercy of some monopolistic personnel director. A weakened or destroyed middle class would open the floodgates of totalitarianism of one sort or another. The consequences of monopolistic power are well known to you all. They have brought in their wake corruption in politics and government. They have brought the destruction of business ethics, and in some States, like Montana, they have made a mockery of the constitutional provisions of freedom of the press and freedom of speech. Obviously, there can be no happiness in America when our livelihood must depend exclusively upon the personnel director of an absentee owner of an industry. Furthermore, I maintain that the destruction of small business is bound to decrease the national wealth. Since we all know that monopolistic philosophy means lowered output, poorer quality, and higher prices, which spells less consumption and lower standards of living. The absence of a strong middle class has helped lay the foundation of totalitarianism in other countries. The destruction of small business by international cartels ushered in the type of leaders in European countries who eventually plunged the whole world into its present misery.

I hope you will not take my remarks as indicating that I harbor any general opposition to big business per se. Big business has its useful place in the scheme of our economy. Many of our industries must necessarily be conducted on a large scale, but if we are to maintain our democratic system of life, we must begin to block any further concentration of business in this country. I repeat, I do not condemn big business merely because it is big. Their laboratories have produced some of the miracles of our modern civilization, but I agree with the former president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Mr. George H. Davis, who said: "There is not much doubt that the development of business organization has outrun the public understanding of it. It is like a giant locomotive that has become too heavy for the roadbed on which it runs."

The point I am trying to make is that the preservation of small business in this country is essential to our democratic way of life. American business was founded upon the principle of free competition maintained through free markets. If the growing concentration of economic control of business, which I have mentioned, is permitted to continue, small business will eventually be wiped out and we will find in its place a totalitarian system of one kind or another. We all complain bitterly about bureaucracy in government, but how can it be avoided if we permit the growth of business monopoly to continue unchecked?

The more American business becomes concentrated in the hands of gigantic corporations, the more imperative it becomes for the Government to protect the weaker units of business and the consuming public. Thus bureaucracy is born. Bureaucracy did not see its beginnings under this administration. It began to grow many years ago. If centralization of business continues, the march of bureaucracy is bound to proceed unabated. To arrest this trend, the Senate Committee on Small Business has resolved to attain the following goals:

1. Small business must not be unnecessarily oppressed or discriminated against by competitors possessed of greater financial power; they must not be victimized by unfair business practices.

2. Small business shall not be financially hamstrung by a credit system which caters only to large-scale enterprise and neglects the interests of small business.

3. To preserve free competition, antimonopoly laws must be vigorously and effectively enforced, and every effort must be made to thwart the growth of collectivism.

4. In all Government programs of rationing, price control, and the like the industries to be affected must be consulted first and given an opportunity to present objections against unwise or unnecessary Government action.

5. The expansion of large plants must be stopped and the smaller plants must be used to the fullest possible extent in war work and in essential civilian industry.

Our committee has been in existence for a little over 2 years. What have we accomplished to date?

One of the most significant achievements of our committee is the fact that we have helped make Congress and the country small-business minded. This has awakened many of the Federal procurement agencies to the realization that in the placing of orders more and more attention must be given to the utilization of the smaller units of our economy. Thousands of such units have already benefited therefrom. Hearings before our committee have time and again exposed the unwarranted concentration of orders in the hands of a few firms. Public and congressional pressure has brought about the desirable change in attitude.

The Senate Committee on Small Business has sponsored and helped enact a number of measures designed to bring justice as well as relief to the hard-pressed smaller industries and distribution units. Time will not permit going into great detail about the specific legislation enacted or which is still in the process of enactment or consideration. However, you have no doubt heard about the law creating the Smaller War Plants Corporation with a capital of $150,000,000. After three futile attempts by the war agencies to distribute contracts, Congress took the matter in hand and unanimously passed the Murray-Patman Act. The Corporation has been given ample powers to bring about a wider distribution of orders and there is good reason to believe it will soon begin to show results.

When the production of motorcars was stopped and rationing regulations threatened the existence of thousands of dealers and distributors, our committee lost no time in enacting Public Law 549. It made it possible for dealers with rationed products on hand to borrow on such stock from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or to dispose of their stock to that Corporation. Dealers were stabilized and enabled to continue in business on a reduced basis.

One of our measures, the Federal Reports Act, has brought relief to every business enterprise in the United States, small and big. There was universal objection to the avalanche of questionnaires and forms emanating from governmental agencies. An unprecedented number of doctors, fresh from the campus, had invaded the Government offices and brought about much of this unnecessary paper work upon the businessmen of America. They were made to spend millions of hours of labor in filling out forms and questionnaires which often looked more like Chinese puzzles. Much of it was duplication. Our committee, therefore, took drastic action and we believe that if efficiently administered this law should be of great help both to business and the Government.

Our committee has published many studies on important phases of small business problems. The press has followed our publications with keen interest and has spread our findings to the remotest corners of the land.

I am sure you will agree with me that it is not always possible nor feasible to solve economic or administrative problems by means of legislation alone. At times it is too slow a process. There are occasions when our work must take the nature of a rescue squad. This is an almost daily occurrence. Firms from all over the country appeal to us direct or through their associations. We intercede in their behalf with the respective Federal agencies. If the case is justified, we leave no stone unturned to see that they are treated fairly, that their needs are met. It is impossible, however, to give this the time and attention it calls for. The Senators on the committee neither have the time nor the staff available. Hence, I have been urging the Federal agencies to take the public more and more into their confidence before promulgating measures affecting the various industries in our economy. It is my contention that the public must always know what the Government is doing and the basis of the action it takes. This, after all, is a people's government. Failure to do that in the past has already done considerable injury to our business firms and the general public.

Take the case of my State of Montana, for example. With the population scattered far and wide, with the distances vast and gasoline rationing in force, their trips to the market must of necessity be restricted. It is obvious that what might suit the people of a more densely populated State would not suit us. The consumption of canned vegetables and fruit by our people who live on the ranches is three to four times as great as that of citizens living in other sections of the country where an abundance of fresh fruits and vegetables is at hand. A rationing system devised for the whole country, which might suit the people in California or Texas or Florida, would be disastrous to our people in Montana.

I therefore contend that it is utterly impossible for a group of men, who are unfamiliar with the widely varying conditions of American life, to sit behind closed doors in Washington and determine an over-all program to fit the economy of the entire country.

Government Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I had prepared for delivery on Tuesday. Time did not then permit its delivery, although it was released at that time for use by the press. For that reason I shall not take up the Senate's time with those remarks at this time, but ask that they be made a part of the RECORD. I desire to say in this connection that I have, of course, always found the day-to-day services of the Legislative Reference Service, responding to specific requests, to be of the highest order and most satisfactory.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The almost countless bales of paper which continue to be fed into the maw of this administration's huge propaganda monster—despite new warnings of additional curtailment of newsprint for private use—are in many cases not merely wasted, but actually expended for what seems to be the crudest and most insidious purposes.

In a self-righteous attitude which seems little more than an attitude of naive conceit, the chief purveyors of official New Deal ideology have now decided to reach out even into the Legislative Reference Service of our own Library of Congress.

It is interesting to note that many of the more fanciful instances of New Deal propaganda dissemination seem to have coincided with the development of the Office of so-called War Information—which, in turn, happened to coincide with amazing precision with the resignation of Charles Michelson, from the publicity directorship of the Democratic National Committee. Mr. Michelson's resignation was officially attributed to a lack of party funds. The Office of War Information, however, is not hampered, yet, by lack of funds; and surely even Mr. Michelson himself would not deny that the Office of so-called War Information is doing a job which Mr. Michelson could not help but envy.

It is no less than a tragically depraved and decadent philosophy of government which will permit public officials to pervert the people's agencies of factual information. But they are being perverted into dangerous instrumentalities for indoctrinating the entire populace with one political party's own presumptuous interpretations of factual information. Such an agency of propaganda spreads paralysis through minds seeking objective truth, whether the propaganda be true or false.

In recent days, new threats have been hurled against the ability of an unbridled press to express the conclusions of its own thought. And so I call the Senate's attention to the most recent instance of Government propaganda:

Funds appropriated for two agencies of the executive department of the Federal Government have found their way to the Library of Congress—where they are being used, in effect, to propagandize the Congress which appropriated them.

On March 12, Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress, wrote to Senators and Representatives that "the Legislative Reference Service (of the Library of Congress) has been given a small grant by the State Department and the Office for Emergency Management to provide abstracts of books and articles containing significant information on problems likely to face our Government at the conclusion of the war."

Upon investigation, I was advised that the State Department and the Office for Emergency Management, which formerly prepared such abstracts in their own offices, concluded that they were unable to continue that work. Whereupon they requested the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to assume that responsibility in view of the fact that Legislative Reference possessed adequate facilities and trained personnel to carry on that sort of work. And the State Department and the Office for Emergency Management transferred $8,750 of their funds to bear part of the cost for 6 months. Another $8,750 is reported earmarked for the following 6 months.

I am advised that at present Legislative Reference, with the assistance of 50 employees of the Library, is examining some 3,000 new books, magazine articles, and Government publications a day, and abstracting those selected from that 3,000 under the direction of a supervisor transferred for that purpose from the Office of Strategic Services.

Mr. MacLeish adds in his letter that the books, articles, and Government handouts abstracted include not only the best that is being written in our own country but also many items reflecting the experience and opinions of other nations. Problems of the

peace settlement and of the absorption of demobilized soldiers into civilian life are among the subjects most frequently treated.

In his letter of March 12, Mr. MacLeish informed the Congress that, inasmuch as these abstracts were being prepared, they might just as well be made available to Members of Congress. So he added that "most aspects of the (post-war) question are included"—and he has sent a check list of 55 such aspects to each Congressman. But it would be a mistake to conclude, as Mr. MacLeish seems nevertheless to wish Members of Congress to infer, that "most aspects of the question" is synonymous with most sides of the question.

Any Member of Congress, of course, is still free to request whatever material he desires from the Library of Congress. But the importance of this new development is this: That any Member of Congress who now requests abstracts from the Library of Congress, and who indicates his choice according to subject, receives abstracts of books, magazine articles, and Government publications, in every instance, which have been selected by agents of the State Department and the Office of Emergency Management.

Six such abstracts were attached, as "samples," to Mr. MacLeish's letter.

Number 1 was an abstract of a pamphlet stating flatfootedly that, after the war, only those troops would be demobilized which were not required for policing the world. It defends most of the paternalistic contentions of the recent National Resources Planning Board report and it argues in behalf of maintaining, after the war, price-fixing and other economic controls.

Number 2 was an abstract of a book advocating no revival of European economy except under sponsorship of the United States and Great Britain. It advocates an increase of economic internationalism, and world-wide transfer of minorities from one part of the world to another.

Number 3 advocated price control after the war, Government subsidy of industry, and National Resources Planning Board objectives.

Number 4 was a State Department bulletin—which it surely did not have to abstract for itself—advocating continuing lease-lend policies after the war, and creation of a vast world-wide free-trade area.

Number 5 was an abstract of a pamphlet by Harold Laski and nine others.

Number 6 was an abstract of a pamphlet by the California State Planning Board.

Feeling that perhaps these six samples enclosed by Mr. MacLeish might not be representative of the group as a whole, my office requested all the abstracts yet prepared under this new arrangement on the subjects of (1) international trade, and (2) peace aims.

1. Of the 16 abstracts of treatises on international trade which were sent to me, all 16 presented the views of the Roosevelt administration. Six of these gave special emphasis to the necessity of a world bank to prevent internal planning by individual nations, as one of them so frankly worded it. The majority expressed awareness that most of the world's nations, including the United States, were, as a result of scientific progress, advancing toward an increased measure of self-sufficiency, but advocated (as one of them worded it) that "care must be taken that domestic measures not interfere with the expansion of the international economy." That is rather like arguing that the erection of buildings not be permitted to interfere with the erection of a city.

2. Of the 40 abstracts of treatises on peace aims which were sent to me, not a single one was based on any of the current straightforward statements which are in opposition to the objectives of the Roosevelt administration. Thirty-six were strongly proadministration. Three were predominantly proadministration, voicing comparatively minor criticism. One was an abstract of an anti-administration magazine article. But the abstract itself was prepared in such a way as to leave any reader with the mistaken but inescapable conclusion that it was, in fact, proadministration.

If these abstracts were really prepared primarily for the State Department or the Office for Emergency Management, I wish someone would explain why a great percentage of the items abstracted are themselves State Department publications. For surely the State Department does not need to be advised of the essences of its own publications.

This is only another example of the administration's determination to continue a tendency fraught with the most dangerous social dynamite—a tendency to indoctrinate the entire populace with internationalist conclusions in the guise of facts. Perhaps a variety of internationalism is the best doctrine. Perhaps a kind of nationalism or regionalism is the best doctrine. How do we decide? Certainly not by shutting off access to all the facts required by the people to reach their own conclusions. Certainly not by paying for internationalist propaganda out of the income taxes of the nationalists and internationalists alike.

America is no mere committee to defend itself by aiding ignorance. America is a nation—a nation of more than one individual, a nation of more than one group, a nation of more than one idea—a nation of people whose very form of government depends for its success upon the people's freedom to think and upon their freedom of access to the unvarnished and untarnished facts which are the only raw materials of sound conclusions.

A conclusion which comes to the people canned in vacuum—without explanation of how it was prepared—is no more intellectually or spiritually honest than the forging of a check. It is, indeed, nothing less than moral and intellectual extortion.

Cecil Calvert, Founder of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a lecture delivered before the Maryland Society of the Colonial Dames of America and their guests, in the lecture hall of the Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore, Tuesday afternoon, February 23, 1943, by Dr. Beverley W. Bond, Jr., professor of history in the University of Cincinnati, and president of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio. The lecture on the subject, Cecil Calvert, founder of Maryland, was sponsored by the (Emilie) McKim Reed Memorial Foundation established by the Maryland Chapter of the Colonial Dames of America in memory of one of its founders and its late president, Emilie McKim Reed, who was for many years an outstanding woman in the civic, social, and patriotic life of Baltimore. After the War between the States was over, she founded, organized, and directed as president, a unique organization of inestimable value in that it created much-needed, far-reaching opportunities by which many women of the Southern States, impoverished by the War between the States, could earn, working in their own homes, substantial amounts of money. Emilie McKim Reed was the granddaughter of John McKim, Jr., born in Londonderry of Irish nobility, who became an outstanding industrialist, financier, and public-spirited citizen of Baltimore. The Maryland Historical Society has in its large collection many portraits, records, and other valuable historical material regarding both Emilie McKim Reed and John McKim, Jr.

At the conclusion of the lecture by Dr. Bond, Dr. Hugh Hampton Young, of Johns Hopkins University, presented his valuable collection of Calvert documents to the Enoch Pratt Free Library, thus rounding out his generous gifts to that well-equipped library.

In these days, when liberty of conscience and tolerance are being assailed so violently and so viciously, this lecture on the subject of the Maryland Doctrine of Toleration is exceedingly timely.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ADDRESS BY DR. BOND

Even in the very thick of our bitter fight to preserve democracy, it is essential to remember how deeply rooted in the American past are the "four freedoms" which President Roosevelt so aptly summarized in his speech of January 6, 1941. Here in the Enoch Pratt Free Library a notable work has been carried out in preserving the visible memorials of the past. Through the munificent aid of Dr. Hugh Hampton Young, the original portraits of the six Lords Baltimore have been brought together in the central hall. Also, Dr. Young has loaned the library, for exhibition, his collection of Calvert Documents, of the utmost importance for the early history of colonial Maryland. It is fitting then, in this house of such priceless portraits and documents, to commemorate the work of Cecil Calvert, the founder of Maryland, a man in the foremost ranks of those men of vision who laid the foundations of the United States. In his own beloved Maryland he established ideals of a broad-minded and generous citizenship which Dr. Young has so notably carried out in our own day.

Maryland has been termed the "Free State." From the early days of settlement its people have been distinguished by an unusual spirit of independence and liberality, qualities which have been shown especially in a broad-minded toleration toward religious and intellectual views, and a strikingly independent attitude with regard to political issues. These characteristics may be traced directly to the policies of the founder, Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore, who from the first landing at St. Clements Island in March 1634 until his death, November 30, 1675, directed the affairs of his province of Maryland.

The initial step in the founding of Maryland came from Cecil Calvert's father, George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore. After a distinguished public career, George Calvert adopted the Roman Catholic faith and turned to colonization in America as an outlet for his abounding energy. Moreover, he hoped to find a refuge in America for his Catholic brethren who were beginning to be persecuted in England. Again, like William Penn, who was later to found a refuge for Quakers in Pennsylvania, the first Lord Baltimore expected to make of his colonial venture a

financial success. First he founded the colony of Avalon in southeastern Newfoundland. Coming personally to the colony, George Calvert quickly recognized the almost insuperable obstacles—the bleak climate and the scanty natural resources of Newfoundland. Finally he sailed with his colonists for Virginia. But the Virginia Anglicans turned a cold shoulder to proposals for a colony under Catholic auspices in their midst. Incidentally, this attitude on the part of the Virginians was the beginning of a persistent prejudice against the more liberal-minded inhabitant of Maryland. George Calvert was resourceful, and he enjoyed the royal favor. He now secured a grant for land that lay north of Virginia, and the charter of Maryland was confirmed June 20, 1632, 2 months after his death. Thus the charter itself had the benefit of the first Lord Baltimore's practical experience in colonization and in public administration.

Cecil Calvert, the second Lord Baltimore, barely 26, now took up the work of founding Maryland where his father had left off. His was the role to translate into actual settlement the general conditions that had been written down in a charter which was so strikingly the result of practical experience. Personally, Cecil Calvert was quite different from his father, George Calvert, who was preeminently a practical man of affairs. In decided contrast Gerard Soest's portrait of Cecil Calvert in the central hall of this library, from which the one in this room was copied, is that of a man, shy and unassuming, yet with a firm mouth and an exceptionally intelligent face. In his hand is a map of Maryland, and to the work of founding and building up his province he devoted more than two-score years.

In establishing Maryland, Cecil Calvert faced many problems. At the very first, in England the struggle had already broken out between Charles I and the Puritan element in Parliament, which was to end in the complete triumph of the latter. There was, too, a growing hostility on the part of these same Puritans to the Roman Catholic Church to which Lord Baltimore adhered. In America he faced the persistent hostility of Virginia, while the trading station, which William Claiborne had established on Kent Island in 1673, was to become another source of trouble. There were, also, practical problems of colonization, such as the necessity to meet the large initial expenses. Equally important was the very practical problem of offering inducements which would bring colonists to Maryland, in competition with the existing colonies of Virginia, and Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay in New England. These varied problems might well have cooled the ardor of an inexperienced colonizer. But Cecil Calvert was persistent. With quiet determination he met each issue as it arose with tact; a patient tolerance, and a broadminded recognition of practical needs which was unusual in that age.

As proprietary of Maryland, Lord Baltimore enjoyed extensive powers under the charter. Annually, on Tuesday of Easter week, he was required to pay two Indian arrows at Windsor Castle in token of fealty to the King. Otherwise his powers over Maryland were much similar to those of the King over England, executive, military, and judicial. Especially did he possess full powers to determine the conditions for holding land. But there were decided checks upon too arbitrary use of these powers. The charter required Lord Baltimore to rule his province in accordance with the laws and customs of England. Likewise, any grave abuse of power would drive settlers into the other American colonies. A more practical check George Calvert had wisely inserted in the Charter. Following the example of Virginia, the experimental colony, he had guaranteed the inhabitants of Maryland, all their privileges, franchises, and liberties of England. The proprietary was to "Ordaine, make, and enact" laws, with the "Advice, assent, and approbation of the freemen." This recognition of popular rights, coupled with the extensive proprietary powers, gave a firm foundation upon which Cecil, the second Lord Baltimore, could base a particularly enlightened administration.

In his policies, Cecil Calvert was both practical and liberal. A striking example was the appeal he made, in seeking colonists, to the discontented elements in England (M. P. Andrews, History of Maryland, p. 136); "such as for some reason or other could not live with ease in other places, and of these a greater part were such as could not conform in all particulars to the several laws of England relating to religion." Many were willing to go if they had "general toleration" in Maryland established by law, and "without complying with these conditions, in all probability, this Province had never been planted."

The care with which the second Lord Baltimore provided for the early settlement of Maryland, is evident in his instructions to the first Governor, his brother Leonard Calvert, and the two commissioners who sailed in November 1633, with the earliest settlers (Narratives of Early Maryland, pp. 16–23). Recognizing one of the chief incentives for colonization, Cecil Calvert required that every precaution should be taken to avoid religious controversies during the voyage in order "to preserve unity and peace."

Doubtless profiting by the experience of the settlers at Jamestown, Lord Baltimore directed that a site should be picked out for the first settlement, which would be, "healthful and fruitful, next that it may be easily fortified, and thirdly that it may be convenient for trade, both with the English and savages."

Good relations with Virginia, Lord Baltimore felt, were highly desirable, and he directed that the Governor of that colony be assured of his own desire for a mutually friendly attitude. With consummate tact Calvert stipulated that the messenger must be "conformable to the Church of England," and that he should take along a "Butt of sacke" as a present to the Governor of Virginia.

To Captain Claiborne, the instructions directed, a letter should be written, offering an opportunity to state his point of view, so that the troublesome problem of his trading post could be satisfactorily adjusted.

Other very practical instructions dealt with the trade with the Virginians, the laying out of the new settlement, the training of the militia, the search for necessary supplies of salt, and similarly pressing problems. Lastly, the Governor and the commissioners were, "to do justice to every man without partiality."

In Instructions and Advertisements for intending settlers (Narratives, pp. 92–101), there was much information with regard to the quantity and the prices of such necessary supplies as "victualls", "apparrell", "bedding," "armes," "tooles," "household implements," and the like. The total cost of transporting one servant, and providing him with "all necessities" for 1 year, was estimated at £20 15s. 4d.

Furthermore, the Instructions and Advertisements advised the colonist to take along servants who were skilled in the "usefull and necessary Arts." * * * "A carpenter, of all others the most necessary; a millwright, ship-wright, boate-wright, wheelewright, brick-maker, brick-layer, potter; one that can cleave lath and pole, and make pipe-staves, etc. A joyner, cooper, turner, sawyer, smith, cutler, leatherdresser, miller, fisherman, and gardiner. These will be of most use; but any lusty young able man, that is willing to labour and take paines, although he have no particular trade, will be beneficiall enough to his master." This very practical advice is quite reminiscent of Captain John Smith's famous plea for more workingmen and less gentlemen in Virginia. It illustrated, too, the lessons which Cecil Calvert had learned from the "experimental" colony of Virginia, and from his father's unhappy experience at Avalon.

It is possible to cite only a few striking instances of the tactful and liberal point of view from which the second Lord Baltimore administered the affairs of Maryland for 41 years. Of especial importance was his attitude when the question arose, at the first session of the assembly in 1635, whether the right to initiate legislation rested with the freemen or the proprietary. The former passed several laws which local conditions made necessary. Lord Baltimore, objecting to a popular initiative, rejected them and substituted a code of his own. The assembly, equally obdurate, refused to accept the proprietary's laws, and again they passed a much-needed code. This time Lord Baltimore yielded the point, conceding to the assembly the right to initiate laws as one which the Burgesses in Virginia and the Commons in England already exercised.

The second Lord Baltimore's policy of religious freedom has been the center of much controversy, and especially as to his motives. It will be possible here merely to state the facts and to give a personal interpretation. The situation was a difficult one. Customarily a system of state religion prevailed in the Old World, and in England the Anglican Church was established, although the Puritans were rapidly gaining the ascendancy. Both Anglicans and Puritans were bitterly hostile to the Catholics. Consequently, Cecil Calvert was obliged to steer an exceedingly careful course to reach his goal of an asylum in Maryland for Catholics. Also, he must reckon with the unrelenting hostility of the Virginia Anglicans.

From the earliest settlement the second Lord Baltimore upheld freedom of religion, and it became an actual fact in early Maryland, in strong contrast to the intolerance in Puritan New England. The climax came with the "act concerning religion," commonly known as the Toleration Act, which was passed in 1649 and was probably drawn up by Lord Baltimore himself. This famous act (M. P. Andrews, History of Maryland, pp. 697–699) provided that no person "professing to believe in Jesus Christ shall from henceforth be any waies troubled, molested, or discountenanced for or in his or her religion, nor in the free exercise thereof." Also, the act imposed a penalty upon anyone who reproached another with being an "Heretick, Schismatick, Idolator, Puritan, Presbyterean, Independant, Popish Priest, Jesuit, Jesuited Papist, Lutheran, Calvinist, Anabaptist, Brownist, Antinomian, Barrowist, Roundhead, Separatist, or other name or terme in a reproachful manner, relating to a matter of religion."

Yet this "act concerning religion" did not grant full religious toleration, and it was not Cecil Calvert's fault. The combined Puritan and Anglican vote in the assembly added a clause which imposed the death penalty, or the confiscation of property, upon any person who denied the Trinity or the divine origin of Christ. Lord Baltimore accepted this rather drastic provision, which, incidentally, was not enforced, even though it denied religious freedom to all nontrinitarians, notably to Jews, Unitarians, and Freethinkers. Doubtless the proprietary did not wish at this particular time to antagonize the powerful Puritan element.

Cecil Calvert also fought for and upheld the separation of the church and the state in Maryland, a policy which was far in advance of the age in which he lived. The issue was stirred up by the Jesuit representatives in Maryland. Especially did they advance the claim that land, which they had purchased from the Indians, was not subject to the civil authority, thus asserting ecclesiastical supremacy. Lord Baltimore settled the dispute

in 1641 in favor of the civil power, when he declared void any grants of land which the Jesuits had acquired from the Indians. For the future he prohibited gifts of land to corporations and societies without official consent. This sturdy stand against ecclesiastical usurpation has had lasting results. The late William Hand Browne, writing in 1890, pointed out the permanent influence of Lord Baltimore's vigorous stand for the separation of church and state (W. H. Browne, George and Cecilius Calvert, p. 116). "In Maryland alone, of all the States, no land can be held by an ecclesiastical body or for religious use without special enabling legislation; no priest, clergyman, or minister of the gospel, can sit, or ever has sat, in the legislature; and—what seems singular—no marriage is valid without a religious sanction."

Like William Penn in Pennsylvania, Cecil Calvert showed his enlightened point of view when he offered an asylum in Maryland to persons who were persecuted in other colonies for religious beliefs. A notable instance was the outcome of the settlement of a considerable body of Puritans in Virginia. They had suffered many petty annoyances under the Anglican governor, Sir William Berkeley, and in 1650 they accepted an invitation from Lord Baltimore to migrate to Maryland. Some three hundred strong, they settled at Providence (Annapolis), and there they enjoyed local government, full civil rights, and freedom of religion. Attempting to develop their settlement in imitation of Puritan Massachusetts Bay, they soon proved a veritable "thorn in the flesh." Lord Baltimore gave an asylum, too, to Quakers, although in some instances their refusal to take the oath of allegiance caused difficulty.

Other illustrations of Cecil Calvert's tactful and liberal policies may be cited. Thus, in contrast to the usual penalty at this time of imprisonment for debt, he agreed that where there was not sufficient property to meet the obligation, the debtor or his servant must work it out. Another very practical policy which was included in the instructions to the first settlers, required each planter to put in a "sufficient quantity of corne and other provision of victuall" annually. This same determination to insure a varied agriculture was continued by an act of the Assembly in 1639 which required each tobacco planter to put in two acres of corn Still another instance of Calvert's broad-minded policies was the encouragement he gave to aliens to settle in Maryland. In 1649 he offered the same terms and privileges to French, Dutch, and German immigrants as to those from the British Isles. A number of these alien settlers were naturalized, and, but for opposition in the Assembly, Lord Baltimore would have secured a general naturalization act. In still another fashion Calvert showed his intense interest in Maryland by collecting specimens of the native birds, animals, and plants. At Wardour Castle he planted Virginia creeper and an iron beam, or lion beam tree.

One of the most distinguishing characteristics of Cecil Calvert was his persistence. This quality tided him over the early days of settlement when expenses were large and income was meager. This same persistence, aided by his very practical point of view and notable tact, carried him successfully through the struggle to retain his province of Maryland, even after the complete triumph of the hostile Puritan element in England. It is possible to note only a few of the outstanding actors and incidents in this drama so important to Lord Baltimore and the settlers in Maryland. The first important move was a typically conciliatory one when in 1648 Lord Baltimore appointed as Governor of Maryland William Stone, who was acceptable to the Puritans. In 1651 Parliament gave orders for the reduction of "all plantations within the Bay of Chesapeake," and this was interpreted by the two commissioners to apply to Maryland as well as Virginia. Both of them were bitterly opposed to Lord Baltimore. William Claiborne felt he had been unfairly treated in the matter of Kent Island, while Richard Bennett was an ardent Puritan, naturally opposed to a Catholic proprietary. In Maryland public opinion was divided. Both Catholics and Anglicans rather favored Lord Baltimore. But the strong Puritan Colony at Providence (Annapolis), now the most influential element politically, was strongly opposed to him.

In this crisis Cecil Calvert was tactful, resourceful, and persistent. He represented to Cromwell that he had been ousted from his rights in Maryland and asked for redress. His petition was finally referred to the board of trade, which gave a favorable report. Lord Baltimore greatly helped matters by a typically conciliatory attitude and soon came to an agreement with the troublesome Puritan element. Quoting the masterly summary by Prof. Charles M. Andrews (Colonial Period of American History, II, p. 321), "He was restored to the full control of his government, and all the inhabitants were required to take the oath of fidelity and to give due obedience and submission to his authority in matters of administration and the exercise of justice. He in turn promised to forget the past, to grant land to all applicants without discrimination as if nothing had happened, and to let anyone who wanted to remove from the province. He promised also to stand firm for the 'act concerning religion.' As an aftermath came the attempt under Governor Fendall to establish a Puritan commonwealth in Maryland. This move Lord Baltimore easily put down, again showing his usual leniency toward his late opponents."

George Alsop, in his Character of the Province of Maryland, 1666 (Narratives of Early Maryland, pp. 340 ff.), has given an illuminating insight into the achievements of the thirty-odd years of Cecil Calvert's administration of Maryland. "Of the government and natural disposition of the people," he wrote, "Mary-Land, not from the remoteness of her situation, but from the regularity of her well-ordered government may * * * be called singular, and though she is not supported with such large revenues as some of her neighbors are, yet such is her wisdom, in a reserved silence, and not in pomp, to shew her well-conditioned estate." Beggars, according to Alsop, were unknown. "I am certainly confident there is none within the province that would lower themselves so much below the dignity of men to beg as long as limbs and life keep house together; so much is a vigilant, industrious care esteem'd." To an Englishman of the last half of the seventeenth century this last statement must have seemed almost incredible.

Equally astounding was Alsop's testimony regarding the liberal policies of the proprietary government of Maryland, and this in a notably intolerant age. "He that desires to see the real Platform of a quiet and sober Government extant, Superiority with a meek and yet commanding power sitting at the Helme, steering the actions of State quietly, through the multitude and diversity of Opinionous waves that diversely meet, let him look on Mary-Land with eyes admiring, and he'll then judge her, the miracle of this Age." * * * "Here the Roman Catholick and the Protestant Episcopal, (whom the world would perswade have proclaimed open Wars against each other) contrarywise concur in an unanimous parallel of friendship, and inseparable love intayled into one another: All Inquisitions, Martyrdom, and Banishments are not so much as named, but unexpressably adhorr'd by each other." * * * "The severall Opinions and Sects that lodge within this Government, meet not together in mutinous contempts to disquiet the power that bears Rules but with a reverend quietness obeys the legal commands of Authority."

Such was Maryland in 1666, conservative, well situated economically, ruled quietly, tactfully, and effectively. This happy situation was chiefly due to the wise policies of Cecil Calvert who had never personally visited Maryland. But from his English home he had directed the lieutenants who had translated into a prosperous colony the provisions of the charter which his father, George Calvert, had drawn up. Here in an intolerant world the second Lord Baltimore had established freedom of religion and freedom of speech. Here too was freedom from want, almost three centuries before President Roosevelt advanced the "four freedoms" as the very core of American aims in this world struggle. The achievements of Cecil Calvert in Maryland are to be ranked alongside those of William Penn, and he began his work a full half century in advance of the much vaunted founder of Pennsylvania.

Education in Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, recently, while riding on the train toward the great State of California, I happened to read a copy of the Atlantic Monthly. I found in the February issue of the Atlantic Monthly an article by Archibald MacLeish headed "Education in Uniform—the Dilemma." It is a most instructive article, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION IN UNIFORM

THE DILEMMA

(By Archibald MacLeish)

I suppose there is no public role more completely fatuous than that of Job's comforter. You may evoke from Job passages of the most moving verse, but only at the cost of making a fool of yourself. The worst you can say he already knows, and the best he would rather not hear.

The role of the man who attempts to talk to teachers about education in this second winter of the war is precisely the role of Job's comforter. Your colleges are being turned into military academies and technical institutions. Your schools are being stripped of masters and sixth-form boys. Your endowments are draining off into bonds and taxes. And there is no hope anywhere. To some of you it must seem that your life's work is being destroyed before your eyes. To others, the whole fabric of liberal education comes clattering down and you wonder whether, when the war ends, its structure will be restored. To speak words of superficial comfort to men and women afflicted with these anxieties would be a fool's errand indeed.

It is no use asking you to accept with gratitude the cold comfort of the common lot. Your bones are no easier because other

men's bones are racked as well. You know perfectly well that what you face others face with you. It is the fundamental nature of the Fascist wars to present the free societies with a hard, a brutal choice. Indeed, it was precisely because the free societies would be presented with a brutal choice that the Fascists felt safe to wage these wars, for it was the Fascist conviction that the choice would be too hard for the free and self-governing communities to make—or at least to make in time. The choice was the choice between the surrender of the rich attributes of freedom for good, but by soft and easy stages, and their surrender with harshness for the months and years necessary to their defense.

The surrender for good was to be a surrender as seductive as the descent into Avernus—as seductive and as shameful. The surrender for the months and years necessary to a defense by fighting was a surrender, in the Fascist view, so difficult and so painful that no self-governing people would be able to agree to make it until the making of it was too late.

History has proved that the Fascist view was sound but not, thanks to the courage of two living men, quite sound enough. Hitler's strategy rested upon a contempt for his enemies and a confidence in their incapacity to act which seemed—but only seemed—reckless and maniacal. The reoccupation of the Rhineland, the rearming of Germany, the seizure of Austria, the seizure of Czechoslovakia were foolhardy ventures. Hitler could have been destroyed at a trifling cost at any step in his presumptuous and insolent rise to power. But he was not destroyed. And Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France were to add, to the proof which went before, their heartbreaking proof that freemen could apparently not make in time the decisions necessary to defend their freedom. Not until that lesson had been spelled out, and not until Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill had interpreted that lesson to their people, and had reinforced their people's understanding with their own personal and moral courage, their own will to action was the creeping of the democratic paralysis overcome and halted.

When Britain fought back against the Nazi bombers and regained, as Mr. Churchill superbly put it, the mastery of the daylight air; when the United States placed its resources of men and iron at the disposition of the freedom-loving world, and rearmed Britain with its ships and rifles, the free peoples found the leadership and the courageous voice they had earlier lacked, and the strategy of contempt and bluff met its first and therefore fatal defeat.

II

The free people of England and of the United States made, in the following months, the tremendous decision the misled Fascists had believed they could never make. In England first and in America later, the great divisions into which a free economy naturally falls—labor, industry, agriculture, the learned professions, the people as consumers, the people as members of households, as owners of businesses, the people as young men, as young women—handed over to the common labor of defense, handed over to themselves as citizens and therefore as trustees for all the people, increasing measures of their personal and professional and economic freedom. Organized labor handed over its basic right to strike. Industry handed over a great part of its freedom to manage its factories and its plants. Farmers handed over a measure of determination as to the crops they would plant and harvest. The people as consumers handed over to an increasing extent their freedom to buy and use as they pleased. Young men and young women handed over their freedom to dispose of themselves, even of their lives.

There were some, of course, who refused to contribute. There were unauthorized strikes not countenanced by the responsible leaders of labor. There was business as usual in occasional factories, occasional enterprises. There were consumers who revolted against any interference with their peacetime habits—hoarders of coffee and sugar, wasters of the Nation's rubber and the Nation's oil. But these were the minority, and even this minority gradually fell away as the young men, who had not complained, who had not asked questions, who had accepted for themselves and for their future, who had given far more than the greatest corporation or the most powerful union or the richest and most delicate woman, began on far-off and dangerous islands to make the meaning of their contributions real.

It heartens you, of course, to feel yourselves surrounded by others who have made the same sacrifices you have made—the same in substance however they may differ in degree. It heartens you to feel that you, as members of a free society, have joined with other members of that society in the most difficult choice freemen were ever called upon to make. Indeed, this sense of decision, of ability to decide, is more heartening to you than it is, perhaps, to any others, for you, whose whole life work depends upon the maintenance of free institutions, welcome, more than most men, visible and tangible proof that the free institutions of wartime democracy are vigorous and strong. But you will hardly feel, nevertheless, that these assurances of common effort supply the answer to your deepest question. For the question which moves your minds, if I may undertake to speak thus far on your behalf, is a question touching not your privileges but your duties.

III

What troubles you most is not the conversion of the liberal arts colleges of New England to military and technical institutions, or the drafting and enlistment of your boys, or the loss of trained and skillful teachers, painful as all these things may be. Above all, what troubles you is not the shrinkage of endowments or the loss of tuitions. What deeply and searchingly troubles your minds is the question how you are to perform, under the conditions of this time, the necessary duties which this time imposes upon your profession—the most solemn, perhaps, the most urgent certainly, of all the duties your profession has been called upon to bear.

Specifically and precisely, what you ask yourselves is this: How and by what means are you, whose profession is the teaching of the young men and the young women of a free society, to reach these young men and these young women with the instruction they, more than any generation of their predecessors in this country, will shortly and desperately require? How are you to give them the understanding of the common past, the sense of the common future, the mastery of the tools and implements of the common life, which they must necessarily have, which they, more than any who preceded them, must surely have, if they are to turn the military winning of this war into a human victory for the things for which this war is fought?

You agree, as all men and women who love their country, who love freedom and who hate fascism must agree, that the military winning of the war comes first. But you ask yourselves as teachers, as servants of the truth and of the spirit, what it means truly to win the war. Does it mean something that young men trained to handle guns and tanks and planes and ships and signal apparatus and the machinery of factories can do? Or does it mean something else, something requiring a different kind of training? Does the winning of this war mean the defeat of our enemies only, or does it mean the gaining of something beyond the defeat of our enemies—the gaining of a positive and created thing which shall justify all this anguish, all this death? What is the image of our victory and what soldiers are required to gain it for us; how trained, how taught?

This, I take it, is the central question of your deep concern. For you believe, as many who have not the privilege to share your holy calling also believe, that the gaining of a positive victory in this war is only second in profound necessity to the avoidance of defeat; and that, once the terrible danger of defeat has been removed, the gaining of a positive victory becomes the dedicated, the essential purpose of our lives.

You believe—as most, I think, of your contemporaries believe—that we must not fall again, we must not fall back again into the slothful self-indulgence, the intellectual cowardice, and the moral degeneration of the years which followed the other war. There must be no public Hardings, no private post-war generations, no resignation to the so-called course of history, no "return"—what word was ever sadder or more shameful than the word "return"?—to "normalcy," to the world as it was, to the evils which begat this evil, to the old surrender, the old indifference, the old cynicism, the irresponsibility of men as citizens and men, which prepared, as surely as the past prepares the future, the slaughter of our sons.

And believing all this, you believe also, in your capacity as teachers whose duty it is to prepare new generations for new lives, that you have an obligation in this matter—an obligation which, however willingly you may surrender anything else, you cannot possibly surrender. The labor of creating victory is a labor, you believe—and many believe with you—which only the generation of the young can possibly accomplish, for only the young men and the young women can have the inward hope and courage to conceive the image of our victory and make it real. Only the young men and the young women can feel in their bodies and their lives what the world, made whole at last and single by the mastery of the daylight air, can be.

But believing this you believe also and necessarily that the generation which is to accomplish this tremendous labor—this labor no other generation has ever yet succeeded in accomplishing—must be prepared for its immeasurable work even more carefully, even more meticulously, even more laboriously than this same generation must be prepared for the task of bearing arms. For you see clearly that those who are to attempt to construct, in the brief moment of opportunity at the war's end, the world for which the war is fought, will require for this labor a range of knowledge, a degree of understanding of their past and of themselves, a clarity of perception, which only the greatest, the most devoted, and the most passionate teaching can supply.

The heart of your anxiety, in other words, is this: That the time imposes upon you obligations which the time prevents you from performing; that the war imposes duties toward the generation of young men which cannot be fulfilled because the war will not allow you to fulfill them—because the generation of young men, by a necessity you cannot question and do not question, has been devoted to a more urgently, a more immediately required education in arts far different from the arts you teach.

It would be frivolous and worse to suggest to you that you comfort yourselves in that anxiety by looking around you at the sacrifices of the manufacturers and the labor unions and the housewives. You cannot comfort yourselves and, indeed, you should not. For the unanswerable question which you ask yourselves and us is a question which must have an answer. In this one matter we cannot accept impossibility. Too much de-

pends on it. The whole future depends on it. The survival of this democracy depends on it. The realization of the millions of sacrifices already made—the slaughtered armies, the murdered hostages, the children and women starved, the cold, the fire, the hunger—depends on it. For unless the military winning of this war is followed by the accomplishment in victory of the cause for which the war is fought, even the military winning will not be secure. And unless the generation of the young, the generation which will fight this war and win it, is prepared to carry on beyond the winning to the victory, no victory will be gained.

No layman can or should attempt to tell you how this irresolvable issue may be resolved. The problem belongs to all of us, but the instructed answer can be only yours. Laymen remember from their own experience of schools that education is not a question of hours of instruction but of moments of learning. They remember that a boy who is ready to be taught can receive much in a small time while a boy who is not prepared to learn can be obdurate and impenetrable for years. They remember, too, that teaching is not altogether a question of number of hours lectured but of rare and unforgettable moments of communication—that a teacher who, like the lovers in Donne's poem, can gather all he is and all he knows up into a momentary ball of expression, can cast it far and deep.

They believe, therefore, that a generation of young men and young women, who are profoundly prepared by the sudden fracture of their lives to accept and to know, will perceive in a brief time what might otherwise have required years of teaching; and that teachers who feel, as American teachers must now feel, the terrible need to speak and to be understood—who speak, as American teachers must now speak, with the tongues of a profound and sober passion and an earnest knowledge—will be heard as they were never heard before. How these two, speakers and hearers, can be brought together—whether in camps or technical schools or ships; whether by word of mouth, or print, or radio, or record—no layman, certainly not I, can tell you. But this we do know, that unless the means are found the ultimate victory may elude our hands.

Address of Hon. Sumner Welles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERE COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, before the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, April 1, 1943. The address was broadcast over the facilities of station WEAF:

I am glad to have been afforded the privilege at this particular time of addressing a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York.

We are passing through the gravest period in our national history. And while I am convinced that we and the other peoples of the United Nations, have now reached that high plateau from which we can see in the distance the goal for which we fight, you and I know that the struggle in which we are engaged will still demand the utmost of which we are capable, and may still be far longer in duration than some of the more optimistic of our fellow citizens sometimes believe.

The American people are bravely and resolutely facing the great crisis of war. They are confident that the United Nations will obtain the unconditional surrender of the Axis forces to which we are pledged. They are eager to do all they can, to make any sacrifice, to hasten that victory. But I want to speak to you briefly about another crisis that lies ahead, a crisis which no less than that on the many fighting fronts will determine the fate of the future generations of the people of the United States.

The greatest single interest, the greatest single objective, of the American people is to prevent the recurrence of war, to create a reliable and permanent peace. The thing that lies nearest the hearts of all of us is to avoid again sacrificing our young men on the field of battle, to avoid the untold suffering, heartache and bereavement of war, and to avoid the huge economic cost of war and the social chaos that inevitably follows in the wake of all wars.

I have no illusions whatever as to the difficulty of this task. In attempting to put an end to war we face a problem that the human race has never yet been able to solve. But of one thing I am perfectly sure: the greatest obstacle to success is defeatism—the assumption that nations are by nature so antagonistic, that foreign peoples are so untrustworthy, or that the technical problems of constructing peace machinery are so great that the task is a hopeless one. For my part I do not consider it hopeless. I believe that from the moment its hopelessness is generally denied, from the moment people abandon a defeatist attitude and begin searching for ways to solve the problems presented, rather than for reasons why they can't be solved, from that moment we will be well on the way to success in this greatest of all human undertakings.

And I am even more convinced that unless the American people are willing to assume their fair share of responsibility for the maintenance of peace in the world of the future, by joining in the exercise of police powers when that may be determined by international agreement to be necessary, and by participating in such other forms of international cooperation as may effectively prevent the rise of economic or political dangers, the peace of the world cannot be maintained.

When the war is over we shall be faced with domestic problems of the utmost difficulty. We have enormously expanded our productive facilities in many lines of industry and agriculture. We shall be faced with the problem of maintaining the present level of employment and at the same time reabsorbing millions of demobilized soldiers. As a result of the war we shall have incurred an enormous debt, and our people must bear the heaviest burden of taxation in their history.

In the field of our international relations it will be necessary, in order to preserve the peace in which we have so much at stake, to supply our fair share of immediate relief for the millions of people left destitute in the wake of war. We must do this not only for humanitarian reasons, but for reasons of purest self-interest. If we want the world in which we are to live to be a peaceful one, we must prevent international anarchy. There are no more disrupting forces than starvation and pestilence.

The provision of our fair share of relief will help to keep our productive facilities employed, but this will be at the expense of the already burdened taxpayer. In his interest, the relief period must be made as short as possible, which means that peoples in the devastated countries must be placed upon a self-reliant and a self-sustaining basis as rapidly as possible. From this standpoint, wise trade policies are essential. Foreign countries can attain a self-sustaining basis only if there are markets for their products. Full employment of our men and resources can be maintained only if there are markets for our products. In a larger sense, also, sound international trade policies are essential in relation to our vital interests. They are essential, above all, from the standpoint of constructing a durable peace.

Any organization whereby the nations who want peace will cooperate to enforce it would fall apart if the economic underpinning were unsound. Unemployment, poverty, and declining living standards will not be tolerated for long. Shortsighted measures will be resorted to. Peoples will in desperation take any action which promises momentary relief even if it means the destruction of world order and world peace.

From whatever standpoint our domestic or our international problems are approached, it becomes apparent that in the post-war world an expansion of international trade is indispensable. Consider for a moment in elementary terms why this must be so.

What would happen to the living standards of any of our States if their trade with the other States were shut off? The answer is obvious. Cut off any of our States from commercial intercourse with the other States, or seriously interfere with it, and you would create so grave a political issue as to threaten the destruction of the Union. Under such conditions, would these United States continue to act as a unit?

Is it stretching the point in the least to ask similar questions about international trade? Suppose the trade of any one of the United Nations with the others were cut off or seriously disrupted. Would that nation, with unemployment lines growing, and living standards sinking, cooperate wholeheartedly with the other United Nations in any common objective? It is highly significant that the tragic period between the wars was characterized by widespread trade warfare and by the fact that the spirit of cooperation among peace-loving nations was so weak that they did not unite against the Axis until war was actually upon them and their very existence was at stake.

My purpose in mentioning these considerations is to focus your attention on a question which must be acted upon by the present Congress of the United States. I refer to the fact that the Trade Agreements Act, which provides an effective means for international trade cooperation by the United States with other countries, in our own national interest, will expire in June unless the Congress shall meanwhile have renewed it. I doubt whether the vital importance of this legislation in relation to the crisis which lies ahead is fully realized by our people. Its importance goes beyond trade and employment; it is the first concrete test of whether we really intend to cooperate with the rest of the world in a matter that is essential, not only to the full solution of our domestic problems, but to the construction of a durable peace.

Let me recall to your minds the nature and significance of this piece of legislation. It was adopted in 1934 following the disastrous effects of successive tariff acts which closed this market to many foreign products without regard to the interests of other countries, and without regard to the interests of American producers for export, of American consumers, and of the Nation as a whole. It was adopted at a time when our own policy and that of other countries consisted of cut-throat trade warfare, each country seeking by acts of economic desperation to benefit itself at the expense of others. It was enacted in a period of stark international trade anarchy which was part of a developing state of general anarchy in international affairs out of which grew the catastrophe of another world

war. That was a period characterized by high and rising tariffs, quotas, exchange controls, depreciated currencies, clearing agreements, discriminations, and every conceivable device for waging trade warfare that the ingenuity of man could devise. Our trade-agreements program represented one spark of sanity in a world outlook that seemed wholly and hopelessly dark.

We, as well as other countries, had seen our export industries all but destroyed, our surpluses backed up on the domestic market with ruinous effects on prices. Our export industries were sick and the buying power of the large and important interests dependent on foreign trade was rapidly shrinking. We saw the sickness spread throughout our economy. The decline of our foreign trade had contributed materially to creating the worst depression in our history.

It was in these circumstances that the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was passed. It authorized the Executive to enter into agreements reducing our tariffs, within specified limits, in return for corresponding reductions in the barriers erected against our trade by foreign countries. In brief, it sought to substitute commercial peace for trade war.

Under this act we have negotiated some 30 agreements during the last 9 years. In doing so we have approached the problem with the extreme care which circumstances so obviously required. We have been well aware of the fact that the tariff protection which an industry enjoys may have a very real relation to the welfare of the industry and the people employed in it. We have proceeded cautiously, realizing that drastic action might cause serious dislocations and affect the livelihood of thousands of Americans. In the administration of the act we have sought to deal with conditions as they are, not to apply any theoretical conception of the way things should be if we were able to go back a hundred years and start our economic policies from scratch.

An effective interdepartmental organization has been developed with a view to bringing to bear upon each detailed question presented all the facts available. These facts are obtained from the Tariff Commission, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and other interested agencies of the Government, and interested private individuals. The approach is a highly-selective, practical approach, not a broad theoretical one. The Government experts who pool their knowledge in this work do not, as some thoughtless critics seem to imply, spend their time discussing the philosophy of Adam Smith, or any other philosophy. They study the facts and considerations bearing on the question of what can be done to promote our foreign trade without creating serious dislocations in the process. The formulation of the provisions of any trade agreement concluded pursuant to the act is based on a minute examination of the problem in detail, industry by industry, product by product.

I shall not burden you with the detailed procedural steps whereby recommendations as to the precise terms of these agreements are formulated for submission by the Secretary of State to the President, with a description of the great care that is taken to obtain and examine information and views submitted by business interests, or with the system of balances and checks whereby anything in the nature of arbitrary or capricious action is absolutely precluded.

If you examine the agreements for yourselves you will find in them the evidence of the truth of what I have just said. For example, you will find evidence that the approach is detailed and selective, rather than sweeping and academic. You will find great variation in the extent of the reductions made in our tariff within the 50-percent limitation provided for in the law. You will find that the concessions made will vary from no reduction at all; that is to say, a mere binding of the present duty or duty-free treatment, to 5, 10, 15, down to the full 50 percent, not a sweeping uniform reduction to the full extent permitted by the law such as might result from the nonselective application of any general formula or theory.

You will note also the changes made in classifications. Ask yourself why these have been made. You will find that the purpose is to segregate for duty reduction those types or classes of a product the importation of which is of special importance to the particular foreign country concerned and of less importance to American production. In this way we have been able, where need arose, to promote our foreign trade while reducing to a minimum the competitive impact that would result if the break-down in the classification had not been made. Ideas regarding such reclassifications have sometimes been obtained from the business interests concerned who have indicated categories of a product with the importation of which they would not be seriously concerned. In other cases the main reason for reclassification has been the common-sense desire to retain bargaining power for use in later agreements.

In examining the agreements you will also note that some of the duty reductions apply only to specified seasons, or to specified quantities (so-called customs quotas). While such reductions are designed to increase our foreign trade, they at the same time take into account, as the act says, "the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production." These words of the act have real meaning and importance. The particular situation in each industry concerned is carefully examined and fully taken into account in the negotiation of these agreements.

In connection with the administration of the act, let me refer to one point on which there is a good deal of misconception. People often speak of the trade agreements made by the State Department. Failure to recognize the part played by the Tariff Commission and the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture and Treasury in the formulation of these agreements does serious injustice to those agencies and to the numerous highly qualified and devoted experts whose work has made this program the success it has been. Indeed the factual material, the expert analysis of it, and the recommendations as to what action should be taken are predominantly the work of these other agencies, rather than that of the State Department. The role of the Department of State is to mobilize and coordinate the resources and effort of all the other agencies of the Government that may be concerned and, with the assistance of these agencies, to perform its function of carrying on the international negotiations involved. The terms of the agreement which are the subject of the negotiations are not by any means solely of the State Department's making. Any offer to a foreign government with respect to a reduction in our tariff or any request to a foreign government for a reduction in a trade barrier against American exports, or any other provision of these agreements, no matter how detailed, are referred for recommendation to the Trade Agreements Committee, upon which all of the agencies concerned are represented. The negotiations take place on the basis of a detailed draft prepared by this committee and approved by the Secretary of State and by the President. The State Department in the course of the negotiations does not deviate in the least from that draft without referring any proposed deviation to the Trade Agreements Committee and getting its decision upon it.

When agreement has been reached and the new rates are put into effect, the act provides that they "shall apply to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of all foreign countries," with, of course, appropriate provision for suspension in the case of any country which discriminates against our products. Under this provision we extend to all friendly foreign countries the concessions that we grant to anyone, and we expect and ask them each to do the same for us. The only exception on our side is for our special preferential arrangement with Cuba. This provision constitutes the so-called unconditional most-favored-nation clause, which could better be described as the clause against discrimination. It has been somewhat criticized, as a result of what I can only think of as a misunderstanding of its purpose and effect.

That purpose and effect is simply to prevent discrimination. The policy against discrimination in international trade was not invented at the time the Trade Agreements Act was passed. It goes back to our first commercial legislation, in the time of President Washington, and has been followed, with some vacillation, ever since. The recent occasion on which the policy was most thoroughly discussed was in the administration of President Harding, when Mr. Hughes was Secretary of State. The correspondence of 1923 and 1924 between Secretary Hughes, President Harding, Chairman Culbertson of the Tariff Commission, and Senator Lodge, then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, has been published and is most illuminating. Mr. Hughes summed the whole matter up accurately in one of his incisive sentences: "Either we are to have a policy of discrimination or a policy of obtaining immunity from discrimination." Needless to say, the second alternative was the course which was adopted. The Trade Agreements Act embodies the same view. I cannot believe that any businessman would prefer the other policy. For if we applied two tariff rates, depending on the place of origin of goods, we would discriminate against every country whose goods took the higher rate, and we could properly expect them to do the same toward us. I know of nothing so calculated to disrupt the orderly conduct of private trade as such a system of reciprocal discriminations.

There is one further general aspect of the Trade Agreements Act and of the agreements concluded under it to which I wish to invite your particular attention. This is a matter of first and fundamental importance to every American businessman. You will look in vain for any provision whereby the Government of the United States, as a government, undertakes to buy or to sell anything. You will look in vain for any provision whereby this Government or any agency of it participates in the conduct of business. The Trade Agreements Act is based upon the philosophy that it is the function of private enterprise to develop our foreign trade. It is based on the idea that the profit motive, coupled with American efficiency, ingenuity, and enterprise, will create for us the largest and best foreign commerce, from which the whole Nation will benefit. You will find from a thoughtful examination of the agreements concluded under this authority that all the Government has done has been to reduce insofar as practicable governmental obstacles to private trade, to create opportunities for American businessmen who may want to take advantage of such opportunities.

I may add that even during the unsettled period during which these agreements were negotiated, American businessmen did take advantage extensively of the opportunities created for them, with benefit to themselves, to our whole economy, and to the foreign countries with which the agreements were concluded.

There is no question whatsoever that both in the interest of American prosperity and living standards, and in the interest of creating conditions conducive to peace, we must foster trade with other countries. These are vital interests, for reasons which I have indicated. They are compelling and overriding considerations. Any person or party in a

position of responsibility must face them. There has been vigorous but misguided opposition to these agreements by special interests who insist on a virtually complete monopoly of the domestic market and who object to facing any foreign competition at all.

If the effort to develop a thriving foreign trade in the traditional American way, as contemplated in the Trade Agreements Act, should be thwarted by such opposition, other ways inevitably will have to be found to meet the overriding requirements I have mentioned. Doubtless there are some who would favor actual Government trading. If private interests will not let private enterprise do what is essential in the national interest, then pressure of necessity will force the adoption of other methods. For my part I consider it of vital importance to the continued functioning of this democracy that American foreign trade, as well as other economic activities, be handled in the American way.

I am revealing no state secret when I say to you that one of the gravest doubts which exists in the minds of our partners of the United Nations today is the doubt as to what the policy of the United States will be when the victory is won. They remember that when the victory of 1918 had been achieved, this great country of ours withdrew from almost every form of practical cooperation with its former allies in the great task of constructing that kind of world in which we and all other peace-loving and liberty-loving peoples could securely and profitably live. In very truth, we won the war, and made no effort to win the peace.

Our allies are asking themselves now whether we will again follow that same course. In a very real sense the decision that will be made with regard to the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act will be regarded by peoples throughout the world as an acid test of our future intentions. They will see in that decision a clear indication as to whether the people of the United States have determined upon a policy of international cooperation for the future, or whether they will once more turn back to that road of isolation which leads to inevitable disaster.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Air Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, pursuant to the permission granted me today, I present for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD data which have been compiled for me by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] relative to the debate which occurred in the Senate at about the time of the inauguration of the air mail service in the United States.

There being no objection, the data was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I saw in the paper, and I think I got an invitation to attend some sort of celebration given by the Bureau of Civil Aeronautics on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the beginning of air mail.

In the year 1918 the Post Office appropriations were in the hands of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee. Appropriations were not then all made by the Appropriations Committee as they are now. In the Post Office and Post Roads Committee there had been inserted a proviso reading as follows:

"Provided further, that out of this appropriation the Postmaster General is authorized to expend not exceeding $100,000 for the purchase, operation, and maintenance of airplanes for an experimental airplane mail service between such points as he may determine."

Senator King of Utah moved to strike out the above language. Senator Bankhead, the elder, Chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, had this to say:

"Mr. President, as I stated awhile ago, for 2 or 3 years we have been appropriating $100,000 for this experimental service. The principal purpose of this is to experiment in Alaska and to use airplanes in Alaska if they find they are practicable, where the cost of carrying the mails by boat or by overland transportation is simply out of the question. You have got to substitute something for it, or you cannot afford to pay the cost of carrying the mails." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 56, pt. 6, p. 6207.)

It will be seen from the RECORD, and it is in accordance with my recollection, that we had in 1917 made a similar appropriation but which had not been used because we could not get the airplanes. However, in 1918 we were in the war and a number of war planes had to be discarded because they were not the kind we needed any more and it was expected that the Postmaster General could use these discarded planes in the air-mail service as an experiment.

I took quite an interest in the matter in the Post Office and Post Roads Committee where we had a contest about it and the provision was put in the bill, or retained in the bill and reported to the Senate.

When Senator King offered his amendment, it will be seen from the same RECORD on page 6208 and following pages, that Senator King made the principal argument for his motion to strike out and I had the laboring oar in opposing his motion to strike out. I take great pride in the fact that I did some prophesying at that time concerning the development of transportation by air. The debate between Senator King and myself follows:

"Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will not be adopted.

"I just want to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. King], who is the author of the amendment to strike out the airplane provision, to the fact that obections of this kind have uniformly been made, and frequently by our ablest and most distinguished men, to new discoveries and inventions of this kind and to progressive measures generally. I think it was no less a person than Mr. Webster who, on the floor of this Senate, about 1830, said that he would vote against any appropriation to be used for any purpose for the improvement of anything beyond the Mississippi River, on the ground that the great West was a desert waste and never could be used by this country. Now, we read the statements of the men who opposed those things in those days and we wonder how it was that with their great reputations they were men who did not have more perspective or insight into the future, to say the least; and in the years to come I have no doubt that the distinguished Senator from Utah will be referred to by others, just as I am referring to Mr. Webster now, in the very same way. I can say to the Senator that I believe that he is just standing across the path of progress.

"Why, as young a man as I am, I remember distinctly when it was considered that the telephone was a toy and that it had no real use or advantage, and later on the automobile was considered a toy that would never be of any practical benefit; and yet the world could hardly get along today without telephones and automobiles. The telegraph, the ocean cable, the electric light, the electric motor, the moving picture, the numberless other improvements had the same history. And so it is with airships. I have no doubt that the time will come when we will use them for a hundred different purposes and that the world will feel that it could hardly get along without them.

"I hope the Senator will not interpose an objection to this very worthy measure, as it seems to me. It may be that the money may not bring full results the first year or the second year or even the third year, but the time will come when results will be shown by reason of these experiments. Why, the time will come when we will use airplanes just as frequently as we now use automobiles, in my judgment, and there may be inventions in the future that will far surpass them. We cannot afford to take chances on it if we want to help develop things of this kind and make them the best for our country; and I hope the Senator will withdraw his amendment.

"Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee is assuming the role of a prophet today. It was stated by the great prophet of old that 'without vision the people perish.' Prophecy did not cease when Malachi, the last of the prophets of the Old Testament, gave his words to an unwilling world.

"Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator does not refer to me as a contemporary of the prophet Malachi. [Laughter.]

"Mr. KING. No, Mr. President; the amiable and able Senator has the flower of youth upon his brow; I was assigning to him a distinguished position in associating his name with the prophets of old. We all know the great service rendered by those who have spoken with the voice of prophetic inspiration. Prophets have been those who saw into the future, pointed the path of duty, and indicated impending dangers. All great leaders have been prophets. Humanity has advanced in proportion to the broad vision and prophetc power of men upon whom the mantle of Providence rested. Great political leaders have with prophetic vision looked into the future, and the great statesman is the one who glimpses the mighty events which the future holds within her grasp. Poets, too, have been prophets, and they, like Tennyson—

"Dipped into the future far as human eye could see,
Saw the visions of the world and all the wonders that would be,
Saw the heavens filled with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight dropping down their golden bales.

"So the great poet of England, more than half a century ago, foretold that above the clouds the commerce of the world, in part, would be carried upon ships not baptized in oceans deep.

"I am glad to know that my distinguished friend looks beyond the present hour and seeks to read the future and to meet its mighty problems. There is need of prophets and of vision here in this Chamber, in the activities of the Government. We need prophets here to challenge attention to the staggering expenditures which are being made and to the inevitable consequences that will flow therefrom. We need voices to cry out against improvident expenditures, against unwarranted appropriations that are often made. The task of the economist in legislative bodies is always a difficult and an undesirable one. It is so easy to pass laws appropriating money; there are always a multitude of people willing to receive in every quarter gifts and bounties and gratuities and appropriations. Even in times of peace the man who seeks to protect the public treasury

becomes unpopular, and in times of war, where public attention is riveted upon great struggles upon land and sea, and all eyes are looking to great issues which perhaps involve the life of nations, and the cause of civilization itself, any plea for economy and providence in expenditures falls upon deaf ears.

"In this World War figures have become meaningless. We cease to speak of thousands, or hundreds of thousands, even. The man upon the street as well as the one in public service speaks of hundreds of millions and billions. So a hundred thousand dollars for an experiment for some fad or some Utopian plan causes no comment; indeed, attracts no attention. And if objection is interposed to an appropriation for $100,000 or a million dollars or a hundred million dollars it excites derision, and the objector is denominated a 'mossback.'

"However, the criticism of my distinguished friend loses something of its sting because he tempers it with the asseveration that I remind him of Daniel Webster. So in the years that are to come it is possible I may live in history, because in this august body my name has been coupled with the great and immortal statesman, Daniel Webster, and that standing with Webster I opposed things essential to progress and conducive to the cause of civilization.

"Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

"Mr. KING. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

"Mr. McKELLAR. There are many points of similarity between the distinguished Senator from Utah and Daniel Webster; but I really think that on the occasion referred to, when he voted against the appropriation for Government improvements beyond the Mississippi River, that was one of Mr. Webster's signal failures to diagnose the future.

"But that was not what I rose to say to the Senator. He speaks of this airplane mail service as being a fad. I happened to be acquainted with a lawsuit some time ago in my home town of Memphis, Tenn., involving a question with a telephone company, and that company dated back for its charter to a resolution on the minutes of the council meeting which referred to the telephone as 'Carnes toy.' A far-visioned and progressive man by the name of Carnes had adopted this toy—this fad, if the Senator pleases to call it that—and received a contract from the city to operate it, and even the city fathers laughed at his fad; but Mr. Carnes was right, and the Senator sees and the whole world sees what we have in the telephone; and I say to the Senator that it does not take a prophet to see that something of real worth and of real merit is coming from airplane service in the future, just as it has already come from the telephone service.

"Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would be the last man in the world to depreciate the marvelous discoveries and inventions of our age. When we behold the achievements of the past century, and particularly the scientific discoveries of the past quarter of a century, it would seem that the very secrets of nature must be yielded up to men. The application of the principles of the physical sciences have almost revolutionized society and transformed the face of the globe. Our civilization must pay tribute to the mighty men of genius who have opened the rich pages of nature's volume and read to a wondering world of the mysteries and truths that have advanced humanity and builded our civilization. Our Nation has become great not alone because of the moral standards of our people, but because they have been foremost in discoveries and inventions and in applying in a utilitarian way the principles which have been comprehended

"But some great discovery or invention may be profitable and advantageous in one field of endeavor, and to seek to utilize it in another would be attended with failure. The use of steam has revolutionized the world, but it would be a fad to seek to apply its use to certain activities. I have no doubt that when the science of aeronautics has been further developed aircraft will be used for many purposes. It is possible airplanes may be constructed for carrying a limited number of persons or for use commercially in a limited way, but I repeat that it is more or less of a fad to talk of carrying the mails by means of airplanes at the present time. We have, or at least we had before the Government took possession of the railroads, a splendid transportation system. Our railroads were among the best in the world. Our mail system was most excellent, and the transportation facilities afforded by the railroads and other carrying agencies linked our Nation together and served the people commercially, socially, and otherwise in a most effective and superior manenr. There was no cry for more rapid mail service between Washington and New York, or between Washington and Chicago, or between the Atlantic and the Pacific. At any rate, there is no demand, while this great war is on, for appropriations for experimental purposes along these lines. The War Department is spending hundreds of millions of dollars experimentally to develop suitable aircraft. It seems ridiculous to me that the Post Office Department should be engaged in like experiments, but upon a scale so pitiably small that no results except failures are possible.

"But, Mr. President, recurring to the statement of the Senator concerning Daniel Webster's allusion to the West, as I recall, Mr. Webster did not declaim against all of the territory west of the Mississippi River, and did not, as I remember his speech, object to making appropriations for some purposes to be expended beyond the Mississippi. What he referred to were the arid wastes, the desolate lands of alkali and sand, the rugged mountains, supposed to be devoid of wealth or value, lying far beyond the Mississippi River. That part of our great domain was almost terra incognita; it was 'the great American desert.' Webster did speak disparagingly of it.

"His great mind was occupied in construing the Federal Constitution, in forging those mighty arguments which he so powerfully employed to prove that this was an indestructible union of indestructible States. His vision failed him when he looked into the great West. He did not see its possibilities. He did not appreciate its limitless wealth and its future contribution to the greatness of this Republic.

"Years after Webster delivered the speech referred to by the Senator it was a perilous journey to go from the Mississippi River across the continent to the Pacific coast, and until the construction of the transcontinental railroad weeks and months were consumed in making such a journey. It was a trackless waste, dreary and dismal, and the bones of thousands of adventuresome and hardy pioneers bleached on the bleak and whitened plains. But the situation of that day is not paralleled by the conditions of this hour. To attempt to justify this legislation by a reference to the conditions in the time of Mr. Webster seems to me, with all due respect to my friend, a rather slender thread upon which to hang an argument.

"Mr. President, the question of airplanes is not a new one, and yet everybody admits that airships and aircraft are just in the beginning of their development. We are now engaged in a great war. We are taxing the industries of the people. We are calling for every dollar that can be raised. We are spending not hundreds of millions but billions of dollars, and every dollar which we spend has to be raised by taxation or by bond issues. We will need perhaps more than eighteen to twenty billions of dollars to meet the obligations and to extend credit to our allies for the fiscal year of 1919. Where is this vast sum of money coming from? From taxation and by the issue of more bonds.

"The policy which we are pursuing necessarily tends to expansion or to inflation, whatever term may be preferred, and as a result of that expansion and inflation prices are augmented until the burden of carrying on the war becomes staggering.

"I submit, Mr. President, that not one dollar ought to be expended in this great crisis that is not imperatively demanded by the Government for some important purpose.

"Mr. President, we are not now able to manufacture the aircraft that we require We have boys who for months have been waiting in the various encampments for the purpose of receiving their instruction in flying, to the end that they might go beyond the sea and do something to preserve the liberties of this country and the civilization of the world. We have been unable to furnish them sufficient aeroplanes in order that they might be properly taught how to fly. We have hundreds of patriotic young men, eagerly waiting to serve their country, but they are helpless, and impatiently cry out for opportunity to uphold their country's cause.

"Why should we now expend any amount whatever for this experiment? We know that with the progress of the war the airplanes of today and tomorrow will soon be obsolete within the next few months or the next year or two. Indeed, it has been stated here by distinguished members of the Military Affairs Committee that the changes in aircraft are so many and occur so frequently that the machine of today is useless tomorrow. It is superseded by something superior and some new invention or device compels the construction of planes of a different character or type.

"Now it is proposed, when we cannot build planes enough for military purposes and when their use is so essential to our country's safety, to engage in the foolish experiment of carrying mails from Washington to New York City with airplanes and to go into the frozen fields of Alaska and fly from icebergs to ice peaks. Mr. President, we have one of the best transportation systems in the world. We can carry mail from here to New York in 4 to 6 hours. What is the necessity for this scheme? Who is demanding it? Why dissipate our energies, squander our money in this experiment at this time, when all our resources ought to be devoted to the prosecution of the war?

"I have no doubt that in years to come, and perhaps in the near future, we will be using airships for many purposes, perhaps carrying the mails; but certainly no reason appears now to justify the expenditure of $1 for the purposes suggested by the gentlemen who are sponsors for this proposition."

It will be seen that Senator KING had the last say, but the Senate, after delaying the matter for about a week, finally decided in my favor. The vote came on the motion to strike out the two provisos as follows:

"That out of this appropriation the Postmaster General is authorized to expend not exceeding $100,000 for the purchase, operation, and maintenance of airplanes for an experimental airplane mail service between such points as he may determine: *Provided further*, That the Postmaster General, in his discretion, may fix the amount of postage on mail carried by airplane at not exceeding 24 cents an ounce or fraction thereof."

The Vice President made a ruling in the matter favorable to us previously and his ruling was attacked and his decision was overruled. But on the motion to strike out the yeas and nays were called for and the result in rejecting Mr. King's amendment to strike out and the provisos stayed in the bill.

On Senator KING's motion to strike out the vote was as follows:

Yeas, 24: Baird, Brandegee, Chamberlain, Cummins, Curtis, Gallinger, Gronna, Guion, Hale, Kellogg, Kenyon, King, Lenroot, Lodge, McNary, Nelson, New, Page, Phelan, Sherman, Smith, Georgia, Smoot, Sutherland, Wadsworth.

Nays, 32: Bankhead, Beckham, Culberson, Fletcher, France, Hardwick, Henderson, Hitchcock, Hollis, Johnson, Calif., Kirby, Knox, McKellar, Martin, Norris, Nugent, Poindexter, Pomerene, Ransdell, Robinson, Saulsbury, Shafroth, Sheppard, Shields, Simmons, Thomas, Thompson, Townsend, Trammel, Vardaman, Walsh, Wilfley.

Postmaster General Burleson, acting under this authority, soon afterward inaugurated the experimental service between Washington and New York. The next year, or a year or two later, a like experimental service was established between New York and San Francisco via Chicago and Cheyenne, Wyo., as I recall.

When the Harding administration came in these Government lines were sold or transferred to private operators and the Government went out of the aeronautics business.

Mr. President, I hope I may be pardoned for recalling this debate I had with Senator King, who served 24 years in the Senate, and who, I am glad to say, is still alive and living in Washington, and for whom I always had the greatest respect and esteem, because this debate was about one of the most important mechanical developments of our day and time.

This debate between Senator King and myself was partially reprinted in parallel columns by some of the newspapers, and if I can find such a copy in my scrapbook, I will insert it in the RECORD.

Airplane transportation, of course, was in its infancy then, but I felt that it would become a great method of transportation and I gave it my enthusiastic support, as can be seen from my remarks made 25 years ago.

Six Pillars of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by John Foster Dulles, chairman of the commission to study the bases of a just and durable peace, of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, in which he outlines the six pillars of peace sponsored by that commission. The address was delivered at a luncheon meeting in New York City on March 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I deeply appreciate your being here. By your coming you are making an essential contribution to the sound working of democracy. Significant proposals, such as those our commission is making, need to be tested by the judgment of experienced and thoughtful citizens, representative of different viewpoints. Only if men and women such as you support what we propose, can we be assured of the success of our program.

In 1940, the Federal Council of Churches voted to set up a commission to study the bases of a just and durable peace. For over 2 years we have been at work. Until now we have primarily emphasized spiritual factors. We have urged upon the churches that they inculcate in men the qualities that Christ taught. We have pointed out that Christ's way was not to tell men what to do in relation to worldly matters, but to give them qualities of vision, of mind, and of soul so that they would be enlightened and filled with a righteous faith. We have not sought, indeed we have opposed, the preaching from the pulpits of politics and economics. We have said to the churches, give us men and women possessed of Christian qualities, and then our citizenry can be counted on to take enlightened action.

Our commission is now entering upon a second phase of our task. We are about to address ourselves to the citizens of this country and say to them that, in our judgment, considerations of morality and enlightened self-interest combine to require this Nation now to commit itself to a future of organized international collaboration.

Why do we do this, and why do we do it now? There are several answers to that question.

In the first place, our commission feels under a duty to respond to a tremendous demand upon us from citizens who seek guidance as to how to translate their faith into their acts as citizens. We cannot ignore that demand, nor do we want to do so. For faith will shrivel unless it is made manifest by works. We must try to help those many who turn to us and say, "What shall we do?"

In the second place, our commission feels under a duty to do for itself what it has urged upon others, namely, to seek to bring the Christian approach into our life as citizens. We do not pretend to speak with divine sanction; nor is there anything exclusively Christian about our proposals. We do not want them preached from our pulpits. We are, to be sure, availing of church organizations as a way to reach millions of laymen. But we make clear that what we say is merely the practical proposal of a group which has some competence and which has tried to bring to the problem the spiritual approach Christ taught.

Our timing is due to the fact that we are deeply impressed by the critical nature of this hour. There are, of course, those who say: Let us get on with the war; when that is won it will be time enough to talk about the peace. To an extent, I agree with that viewpoint. It would be folly to divert our effort and imperil our unity by forcing debate on the details of hypothetical future problems.

But there is a decision which must be made now, both from the standpoint of winning the war and winning the peace. That decision is: Will the American people now commit themselves to a future of organized international collaboration within the areas of demonstrated world interdependence? It is that decision which our proposals are designed to force, and it must be made now or the opportunity for such collaboration will inevitably disappear and the world will be doomed to continuance of the war system. Indeed, unless it is made now, this war may be greatly prolonged and its outcome thrown into doubt.

The last war was fought to victory, and the peace was made on the assumption that this Nation was committed to organized international collaboration. It was a profound and unforgettable shock when we rejected that collaboration and decided to go it alone. Will history repeat itself? That question raises a fundamental doubt, and until we conclusively resolve it, it will plague us at every turn. Let me illustrate:

To produce military aircraft most efficiently involves specialization between Britain and ourselves. Actually, we are concentrating on long-range craft and Britain on short-range craft. The latter have little peacetime value, and Britain is thus faced with a serious post-war disadvantage. So much is this so that the British Government is now being pressed to undertake immediate work to design civil aircraft for post-war use. Lord Cranborne said last week that while Britain preferred international collaboration, "if other nations insist upon cutthroat competition, we are quite ready to enter the fray against them." Is this helping to win the war? If not, where lies the responsibility?

Let us look at France. De Gaulle is one of the French leaders who is friendly to Britain. Darlan was violently anti-British. If the post-war system is to be one of power politics, it is important to Britain that French leadership pass into friendly hands. We cannot, under such circumstances, expect French affairs to be dealt with with a single eye to winning the war.

Our greatest problems will arise with the Soviet Union. Decisions may have to be made during the war in relation to Finland, the Baltic states, and Poland. I see no hope that such decisions will be generally acceptable if they crush human beings and human aspirations between the millstones of power politics. The only hope lies in building a world order under which such treatment may not seem a permanent harsh necessity.

Let us look to the East. In China there lies the unresolved conflict between the so-called Red Army, faction and the Kuomingtang faction with which the Soongs are primarily identified. As Japan weakens, that struggle may reemerge and, if power politics are to be the order of the day, Russia and the United States each may seek to secure the supremacy of their particular friends. China may again be the victim of Western politics and peace in the Far East may be indefinitely postponed.

What will be the position of Britain as between Russia and the United States? I was in Britain last summer and clearly sensed the dilemma in which she is placed. She would, I am sure, prefer a post-war system permitting close collaboration with the United States. But she does not and cannot know whether the United States will elect that role. Thus she must keep open the possibility of seeking, through Russian alliance, a balance of power in Europe and the Far East. Such a policy may lead to a deterioration in Anglo-American relations. That would be a calamity. But Britain has no practicable alternative so long as our future policy is unpredictable and so long as important elements in this country seem attracted toward going it alone with a seven-ocean Navy and strategic bases throughout the world.

I attended, and was close to the center of, the Paris Peace Conference. Then the principal powers were nations with similar outlooks and similar standards. We belonged, as it were, to the same "club." Furthermore, solutions were eased by the fact that it was universally assumed that there would be an international organization with the United States a member. Even so, there developed many violent clashes which several times nearly broke up the conference.

Today the problems we face are infinitely more serious and, as between the four principal allies, there exist great gulfs formed by differences in outlook, ideology and material standards. Tremendously difficult and controversial problems will require decision while the war is still on and while we are still faced by formidable and resourceful enemies. Only the ignorant or the sentimentalists can believe that the United Nations will automatically remain friends. It is sobering to recall that the Treaty of Versailles named five nations as the "principal allied and associated powers." Of these, two—Great Britain and the United States—are now fighting two—Japan and Italy—with

the fifth—France—divided in its collaboration.

If the United Nations of this war are to continue to be united, the time to cement that unity is now and the only cement that may work is organized world collaboration. The United States cannot safely postpone showing its hand in that matter. It is basic to the solution of all the grave problems that will increasingly be thrust upon us. If the United Nations must deal with each other on the assumption that the future is to be a repetition of the past, with a world of anarchy and of power politics, then I doubt that even a unity of expediency can be preserved until victory and I know that any "peace" that ensues will be no more than a time for recuperating strength for another war.

Our Commission has therefore determined to seek that the American people make clear their intention to work for organized international collaboration within the critical areas of national interdependence. We have tried to state our proposals in a way which is both simple and significant. We say—

1. There must be organized political collaboration, in the first instance as between the United Nations, with others to be subsequently included. We point out that within an over-all framework there can also be regional collaboration. This might, for example, apply to Europe and the Americas.

2. Wherever, in the economic and financial field, interdependence is such that the acts of one nation may have acute international consequences, then, we say, such acts must be brought within the scope of international agreement and not left to purely unilateral decision. We make clear that we do not advocate free trade as now practicable.

3. There must be a standing international body to study the need for change. Initial decisions will not be perfect and may inevitably be influenced by short-range expediency. This will not be fatal if, in the international field, as in the domestic field, change is taken for granted and organization is set up to promote it. We do not, however, propose that any international body now be given power to dictate or impose change.

4. There should be some form of international organization to promote the ultimate autonomy of subject peoples. But we expressly recognize that in many cases such self-rule is now neither practicable nor desired by the people themselves.

5. We propose international control of armament, both to insure effective disarmament and limitation of armament and also to facilitate mobilizing such armament as remains in support of international order.

6. And finally, we assert that the right of spiritual and intellectual liberty must be both recognized and made a matter of international concern. Only if the peoples of the world move toward common standards of knowledge and morality can international organization achieve the broad popular support needed for its effective development.

Our "six pillars of peace" deal, I think, with the areas within which world organization is indispensable. We do not attempt to go into details. This might, I think, be premature and certainly it is not within the competence of our Commission. But what we propose is sufficient to force an intelligent and significant decision on the part of the American people. If they are firmly resolved to move in the direction, and on the fronts, proposed by our statement, then it will be the duty and the right of government to implement that mandate. Under such conditions it may be possible to solve, in amity with our allies, the grave issues which, from now on, will increasingly be forced upon us. If so, we will have made a momentous advance toward victory and done that which will give us a reasonable chance for a durable peace.

Mindful of Wilson Slip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column written by Raymond Clapper, appearing in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, April 1, 1943.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Word filters out that President Roosevelt hopes to bring the Senate and Members of the House, into closer play regarding preparations for after the war.

We may see some rather marked changes in practice in that respect, as the United Nations' discussions become more frequent.

It would not be surprising to see the President make it a habit to place Members of the Senate, or House, or both, on American delegations to future United Nations' conferences. There will be many such conferences. Already in mind, as President Roosevelt has indicated, is the food conference—to be followed, he hopes, by a conference on relief, another on finances, and perhaps still another on minerals, metals, and oil.

He has discussed with his close friends the desirability of finding Senators and Representatives who would be willing to serve in such conferences, and who would feel free to devote the time that would be required by the complicated nature of these meetings.

First of all, Mr. Roosevelt is sharply conscious of the failure of Woodrow Wilson. He recognizes that the failure of President Wilson was primarily in his relations with the Senate.

Woodrow Wilson was an exceptionally astute student of the American congressional system. He wrote one of the standard works on it in his earlier days. Yet as President he seemed to overlook completely the Senate's role in foreign relations.

Woodrow Wilson had sufficient popular support in the country to have sustained him through the League of Nations controversy under normal conditions. Public pressure in the beginning was preponderantly on the side of the League. Even Senator Lodge, the Republican chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and later the bitter foe of Wilson, had advocated a League of Nations with police powers 2 years before Versailles. In 1916 he was for the League to Enforce Peace.

But Wilson ignored the Senate. He forgot to take any Senators to Paris with him. He had recognized the Republicans only by placing one diplomat on the delegation, Henry White, who had only a faint Republican Party tradition behind him. White was not an active Republican. He was not considered by Republican Senators to represent their viewpoint in any sense, but rather to be only a nominal captive Republican. The appointment only incensed them, for they regarded it as a trick at their expense.

That deadly opposition of a frustrated and offended Senate, and nothing else, beat Woodrow Wilson. After a year's battle, the treaty lost by only seven votes short of the necessary two-thirds.

All of that President Roosevelt has thought about a great deal. It has been so much in his mind that it may have deterred him from moving as directly as he otherwise might have moved. He has wished to use extreme care to avoid any misstep that might bring similar disaster from the Senate.

He was nervous about the Ball resolution chiefly because of the damage that would result if the Senate failed to cast a two-thirds vote for it or for some strong substitute.

In other words, it is recognized around the White House that America's future place in the world will be determined, not only by what this Government and other governments can agree upon, but by what two-thirds of the American Senate will agree to.

In practical terms, that means that the Administration must have a program that will have the support of Senators like GEORGE, of Georgia; TYDINGS, of Maryland, and VANDENBERG, of Michigan—to suggest types that I have heard mentioned by some friends of the Administration. You have to find something that will carry them along.

The great value of the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution is that it brings that fundamental question to a head. We had been getting the cart somewhat before the horse. What will two-thirds of the Senate vote for, in the way of recommendations now? That is the important thing for everybody to know, both here and abroad.

The Administration will have difficulty in "talking turkey" with foreign governments unless it can show that Senate sentiment supports its general position.

William Tyler Page

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the official adoption of The American's Creed, written by the late William Tyler Page. I call attention to House Document 654 of the Seventy-seventh Congress which is available to Members. This document contains the picture of William Tyler Page, with the full proceedings in the House of Representatives in commemoration of the sixtieth anniversary of the services of Mr. Page, together with the ceremony, under the auspices of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, commemorating the last birthday during the life of this great American.

By leave granted me I include in my remarks a brief speech I made on that occasion:

Fellow Americans, it is very rarely an occasion arises where we can at the same time eulogize a man whom we respect and love, and pay tribute to a symbol of pure Americanism, and to an institution of the legislative branch of the Government.

William Tyler Page carries in his veins the blood of many great Americans. He carries in his philosophy of life and of government the finest traditions and ideals of his progenitors.

William Tyler Page has served his country longer than any living man, in functions both humble and distinguished, in the House of Representatives. For threescore years he has served as earnestly in his humble capaci-

ties when they were humble as he has in his distinguished capacities, which were many. He has endowed every office and every function he has ever filled or performed with dignity and distinction because he has given to every office, and has put into every duty, the best of a brilliant mind, a tremendous capacity, and an earnest soul. He has achieved a universal respect and friendship among the Members of a great parliamentary body.

William Tyler Page's influence on the House of Representatives has been benign and uplifting because he gives it honest, unflagging energy, untiring devotion, and great capacity.

It would have been strange if William Tyler Page had not written The American's Creed. That creed was the welling up from the soul of this man of all the devotion to liberty, all of the ideals, all the love of country that caused his progenitors to be who they were and what they were, when they were.

The first ancestor of his family on this continent was John Page, who settled in Williamsburg, Va., in 1650. His son, Col. Matthew Page, was one of the founders of that great and honorable institution, the College of William and Mary. Mann Page and Mann Page, Jr., were members of the Continental Congress. A son of Mann Page, named John, was Governor of Virginia, and served in the First and Second Congresses under the Constitution.

Carter Braxton, William Tyler Page's great-great-great grandfather, was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. He was a member of the House of Burgesses of Virginia which adopted the resolutions of Patrick Henry. Our distinguished friend is both a lineal and collateral descendant of President John Tyler. He is also a grandson of Dr. William Tyler, of Frederick, Md., for whom he was named, and who was renowned for his professional and humanitarian activities.

William Tyler Page stands today in a changing world as an unchanged descendant of the cavaliers of Virginia.

It is remarkable, yet natural, that the mixed strains of the early colonists should have produced such a man as he. The ideals, those early American pioneers cherished, all conspired to produce a great American such as the author of the American's Creed.

From every country in the world have come men and women seeking the loveliness, the joy, the peace, the opportunity of free government, and personal liberty. From every country in the world have come men and women who were willing to dare the perils of uncharted seas, to land on the strange shores of an unexplored continent, and to carve out from the trackless forests and the arid plains for their posterity the great legacy of the rich, free, enlightened Nation which is ours today.

From that blend of blood, that coalescence of courage, that fusing of hardship and struggle, the synthesis of ideals, came the man to whom we pay this tribute today.

William Tyler Page has been the valued friend of many of the greatest men of his time. He has been, too, the valued friend of many of the humblest workers in the corridors of the Capitol under whose dome he has so long served his country. He is a great man because he has always been a simple and kindly man. Great men are always simple and kindly.

The time will be—and God grant that it may still be far off—when William Tyler Page will join his fathers. The time will never come when the history of his country will cease to bear the stamp of his fine, strong, rugged, honest, American personality.

So, then, William Tyler Page, descendant of those who helped to establish the foundations of this free Republic, your associates in the House of Representatives, voicing the sentiments of those millions who know of you through your American's Creed, and your long services to your Nation, all pay you tribute on this, the seventy-third anniversary of your birth. May you, for many, many years, be spared in vigor and activity to continue to serve your country.

May you, for many more years, be the friend, the confidant, and the counselor of legislators trying to serve their country well in these days when human liberty trembles in the balance, and when the finest impulses of which humanity is capable seem to be trampled under the heel of brutality.

May you live, good friend, good citizen, good American, to see the reign of peace again, and your country once more embarked upon the highway of her destiny—a permanent spiritual, cultural, and material security.

William Tyler Page, your country salutes you.

Proposed Visit to Fighting Fronts by Subcommittee of Truman Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, entitled "A Worth-While Proposal."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WORTH-WHILE PROPOSAL

The War Department will do well to grant the request of the Truman committee of the United States Senate that it be allowed to send small subcommittees to both the African and Pacific fighting fronts to find out how American war equipment is standing the test of battle.

The Truman committee, by refraining from politics and by the objective reports which have followed its investigations into various aspects of the domestic war program, has become one of the most valuable sources of accurate information for the American public. It has called attention to administrative mistakes which otherwise might have gone uncorrected for lack of publicity, but it has conscientiously avoided sensationalizing its findings, and it has scrupulously bestowed praise where praise was due.

As a result, the public has come to accept its findings with the utmost faith in their validity. The Truman committee has become the recognized public watchdog in the field of war production. It has probably done more than any other agency to give the American people confidence in their Government.

A Truman committee investigation of experience with American-made materials on the fighting fronts should be welcomed by both the armed services and the public. If, as it did on a similar expedition to Alaska, the committee should find the need for improvements, it would almost certainly bring about the necessary corrections. If it should find that everything is satisfactory, a report to that effect would be welcome and morale-sustaining news.

Landmarks of War and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before a luncheon group at Beloit, Wis., on March 27.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, it is a privilege and a pleasure to be with you today. It was a gracious thing to ask me to be your guest speaker. I am grateful for the opportunity of talking with you and visiting with you.

People all over the world, and certainly this group, are aware of certain powerful world trends which even in these momentaus years of world conflict provide an outlook of optimism and challenge for the future of the peoples of earth.

These movements, or trends, are the results of mankind's experience through the centuries and the peoples' yearning for an elimination of the causes of war.

Masses of people during the past years put their trust in scientific and political remedies, but these remedies were inadequate to the demands of the hour and may in part have contributed to the present world debacle.

There are hopeful signs for the future—signs that adequate means may be found. More people are turning to spiritual foundations as a basis for individual life and for the direction and guidance of the future life of our Nation and the world.

It is to be hoped that the world of the future will be governed by a desire for the common good of humanity, a world which will more nearly approximate our spiritual ideals.

However, as we approach the discussion of this subject Landmarks of War and Peace, let us bear in mind that only a level-headed America can be a secure America, and only a level-headed world will be a peaceful world. By level-headedeness we mean thinking straight, using judgment based on realism, not emotionalism, and acting as God's people should act. Everywhere people are thinking about the kind of a world that will follow the war. Let us recognize that wars are man-made and that the conditions that precipitate wars are also man-made. Therefore, man should, if he will exercise this level-headedness, be able to correct those conditions which make for war.

But you know man is a peculiar animal. Races of men are not alike. They are in different stages of economic, political, moral, social, and religious development.

Right now all America is discussing this matter of peace, assuming that we are going to win the war. Now, let us be realistic about that. We have not won the war—I believe we shall, and while it is a good thing to have foresight we must not forget that we have a job on our hands which requires all our attention—winning the war.

When the war is over we should totally disarm our enemies, and repatriate the prisoners and the civilians who have been driven from their homes in the occupied countries. America will have to be the good Samaritan to look after the starved and famished people enslaved by the Axis. This will be our first job in aiding world reconstruction so that

these countries can then begin to think straight on terms of peace.

People, especially the democratic peoples of the earth, are thinking in terms of seeking to get an international organization into operation which will (it is hoped) make for peace. There are many plans being considered. I enumerate some: a British-American alliance; a British-American union; a federation of the democracies; an association of United Nations; regional arrangements; the league of nations; a new balance of power with America as the balancing power; American leadership and mastery in the post-war period.

Of course, today we cannot discuss any of these plans, but we must realize that plans alone are not sufficient. The plans which have been suggested call for international contractual relationships. A contract to be worth while must be mutually beneficial and made between responsible parties who will live up to their obligations. We all know that a great deal must take place in the rebirth of the human race before wars will cease, before international compacts will be held inviolate. We know that great nations like Russia and China are now feeling the impulse of a great new nationalism; whither will that take them? We know that a changing world is all about us. All this means that America must be realistic in facing the world of tomorrow—there must be no more Pearl Harbors.

Many folks feel that had America been realistic from 1918 on, the whole world picture might be different. In other words, if America remains on guard, preaching by example the principles of the republic and remaining strong and able to protect her own—this indeed may be a great factor in the maintenance of peace.

I believe that out of this holocaust will come some form of association of some governments which will try to antidote those forces which make for war. But let us realize that until the race is reborn in the things of the spirit there will be those forces continually arising, and unless we are alert and willing to take the steps that are necessary, wars will follow. All of us have a great responsibility in this period, and in the period which will follow victory, of keeping our feet on the ground and thinking the situation through—thinking straight. Never has there been a period in world history when straight thinking is more needed.

Until the race has learned to be Christian in fact instead of in theory, we have to admit that the problem is primarily one of power—power in the hands of some government, or group of nations, used justly for the purpose of maintaining world order. Mere generalities, or phrases, or fine-sounding clauses will not do the job, neither will wishful thinking or impractical, unrealistic ideas help.

Britain has done a pretty good job, as is shown by the freedom and the loyalty of her dominions. America has likewise done a good job with people like the Filipinos. We have extended liberty to them and we have supervised their training and growth. The future will require that fit nations shall act as guardians of nations who need guardianship.

When this war is over we will still have to combat the ideas that would make one people economic and political slaves of another.

Russia is a nation of a hundred tongues. She is just coming into her own. I believe that the course of the world for a long time to come, in war or in peace, could be vitally affected by the spirit of this great Russian people. Will they collaborate for peace? Will they cooperate? It seems to me they should. They have everything to gain to develop their great country.

We have had wartime declarations, but it must be admitted there is no definite outline yet of what we hope will be an ordered free world. Public opinion in this country is in flux, and rightly so. We know that besides international guideposts there have to be certain national guideposts erected and maintained. We know that before we can effectively speak of good will and brotherhood and fellowship for the world, we must reassert good will and brotherhood and fellowship in our own Nation. We must have understanding on the home front. We know that before we can effectively talk of peace arrangements and plans with other nations, we must win the war, and we must have peace on every phase of the domestic front.

I have contended that before peace negotiations can be undertaken abroad there must be a working domestic arrangement between the Senate and the Executive for the consideration of the peace. Accordingly, I have introduced in the Senate, Senate Resolution No. 22, which would provide for a working liaison committee between the Executive and the Congress. Hundreds of newspapers and magazines have commented favorably on this proposition, and it is hoped that in the near future the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will take steps to see that the resolution is brought before the Senate for action.

I believe that every American will agree that some form of an association should be attempted between kindred-thinking nations with the object of seeking a way to global peace and the maintenance thereof, providing that the way is practical and feasible. That calls for the ascertainment of the basis on which the nations can collaborate for a post-war security system.

This means that the form and basis of such association must be studied and planned by the contracting parties (probably Russia, China, Britain, and the United States). This presents a great problem, not unsolvable, however, if the solvents of good will, understanding, and moral responsibility are in the picture.

If my resolution is passed, we have then for the first time in the history of the Republic a liaison committee between the Executive and the Senate, which committee can act as a clearing house of ideas from every source. This committee can, if it is thought feasible and practical, present to the Foreign Relations Committee its conclusions on foreign policy, and such committee can then present the same to the Senate for Senate action, if it so determines.

In recent months we have seen clearly demonstrated the fact that no program of rationing or self-discipline of any sort can be effective unless it is accompanied by a strong sense of spiritual responsibility. Similarly, on an international scale no agreements or treaties can be worth any more than the paper they are written on if they do not have behind them the backing of a morally responsible and a spiritually conscious people.

Any peace plan in order to be practical and working and lasting (as far as the people of this country are concerned) must be shaped the constitutional way and must follow the convictions of our people. Therefore, it is imperative that we not only discuss in every forum in America the various plans that have been suggested but that we get the over-all picture and realize that we are engaged in an international undertaking now, somewhat as we were in 1787 engaged in an interstate undertaking. In those days the people saw and felt the need of coming together "in a more perfect union" for the security of their lives and their property and the inherent rights of man.

Let me repeat the idea heretofore made, and which I think is basic. We must erect guideposts on our domestic front—get our national house in order—in order that we may better provide right thinking and right action on the international front. We must chart a sound economic course here in America; establish a workable, equitable system of social security. Labor and management and government must have a common objective, a common goal. Then we will be ready for the larger task—the prevention of war and the establishment of a system of international justice and law.

There are those who say that wars have always been and that wars will ever continue as long as man is man. They call our attention to the fact that nations are in various stages of development, that great nations like Russia and China are feeling the new impulse of national power; that the boiling pot of Europe, the Balkans, will continue to boil; that Russia will want a nataural barrier of defense against Germany, which will mean taking in part of Poland; that the submerged races of the earth, the various races in Africa and the people of the South Seas and their territory, will have to be ruled and managed and occupied by the strong races, and that all of this will provide centers of friction; that commercial rivalries and the control and domination of markets, and age-old antagonisms between nations will still continue. All this we admit, and add to this grand total, jealousy and hate and selfishness and the lust for power, individual and national.

Then, over against these war factors, with the courage born of the spirit, we remember as we enter this contest, a little shepherd boy, David by name, who went up against the Goliath of his day—representing power-drunk dictators of his day who knew no kindness, no tolerance, no understanding, who were out to enslave their neighbors, and whose entire philosophy repudiates the idea of the God of Israel. We remember also an American called George Washington, who on bended knee at Valley Forge, when the odds were a hundred to one against victory, found strength and guidance to go forward to liberate a little group of farmers and merchants on this continent.

We remember also a rail splitter, Lincoln by name, who came into power as the head of this Nation, and who looked through the mist of hate and prejudice and lack of vision in his day and carried on that this land might be one people, undivided, with liberty and freedom for all—not a hodge-podge of nations There was no hate or intolerance, or bigotry, in the mind of this great soul who came out from the backwoods of Kentucky and Indiana and Illinois. That is why he could see straight. We remember Moses, he to whom it was said, "My Presence shall go with thee." Desire is prayer which brings "His Presence"—meaning adequacy to meet any challenge—to the seeker.

Over against these war factors, also, we see the great hunger of the common people of earth who sense the imperative need of some kind of an organization. Yes; an organization with teeth in it that can enforce peace. We know that the world has been contracted through science and discovery. This very contraction compels a cooperation and collaboration as never before. There is a leaven working—working in all the peoples of earth.

We can set up machinery to control nations in an effort to prevent war. We can establish treaties. We can write peace pacts. We can make agreements. We can do all of these things in an effort to achieve a lasting peace, but none of these things will have eliminated the causes of war.

Any completely effective program to eliminate future war must go beyond the treaties and the agreements and the understandings, and must seek to eliminate the basic and fundamental causes of war.

What are these basic causes for conflict? Some of them originate in jealousies, in rivalries, in traditional hatreds, and some of them in conflicting ideologies. For the most part, however, they originate in economic or political maladjustments, in lust for power

and territory, and these are war diseases. It is imperative for us to control these diseases and if possible eliminate the causes.

No program for world peace will ever be successful unless it makes a sincere attempt to eliminate the basic causes for armed conflict. That means, very simply, that in any peace program it is imperative that we seek to give at least guidance to the elimination of the economic and political difficulties and maladjustments which have been basic factors in causing war.

All of this means in time that if and when the United States assumes a good Samaritan role—that role is not entirely inconsistent with our own selfish best interests—if we can avert a contagious disease for our neighbor's home we may be sparing ourselves from that same contagious ailment. If we can in our post-war program aid in the reconstruction of the world to such a degree that economic maladjustments—according to the particular geographical location and needs—are eliminated, we not only create a better world for ourselves but we will have insured to a certain degree at least healthy neighbors from whom there is less danger of contagion. If we can succeed in forestalling the world-wide political maladjustments which create militaristic governments, then, too, we will have prevented a possible source of military and war infection.

I don't mean by all of the foregoing that we can neglect our domestic problems, or our domestic best interests in any utopian program of world reform—economic and political. I do mean, however, that we must be keenly conscious of economic and political maladjustments wherever they may occur to the extent that they might create a war which would ultimately involve us.

If we are to build for lasting peace, we must have two ideas in mind. First, we must restore order and recovery to the world by dealing justly with the problems that involve the political, economic, territorial, and ideological phases. Second, we must create some sort of instrumentality with power to preserve the peace. To accomplish this our leaders will need faith and vision and tolerance—a Christian statesmanship of the highest order.

This is the greatest age in the world's history—and think of it, you and I are a part of it. Not to loaf in it, not to sit by the side of the road and watch events go by, but to be actors, doers of the work, to be ready when the opportunity arrives to do our part. You are the molders of destiny of your country. Keep the fire burning, and dedicate your services to your God and your country. Life then will not be a shabby, drab, but a thing of light and flame—and you will aid in solving many of mankind's problems.

Information Versus Intuition in the Imposition of Sentence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very instructive article entitled "Information Versus Intuition in the Imposition of Sentence," written by a former colleague of ours, Hon. Lewis B. Schwellenbach, judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington. I especially invite the attention of members of the Judiciary Committee to this article. It is of interest, of course, to all judges, but it is also interesting to lawmakers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMATION VERSUS INTUITION IN THE IMPOSITION OF SENTENCE

(By Judge Lewis B. Schwellenbach, United States District Court, Eastern District of Washington)

The pilot of an airplane who failed to make full use of his instruments during a period of blind flying would be deemed reckless in his disregard of his duty to protect the lives of his passengers. While a sentencing judge very seldom wields the power of life or death over the individual before him, his control over the future of the lives of the defendants facing him often is of even greater importance than the infliction of death itself. The sentencing judge does have a duty not only to defendants facing him but also to the society which entrusts him with his responsibility to make use of all the instruments provided for him.

SIGNIFICANCE OF PRESENTENCE INVESTIGATIONS AND POWER TO APPOINT COUNSEL

The two most important instruments provided for the judge are the power to use the presentence investigation device and the power to appoint attorneys for indigent defendants. No judge should neglect to make full and complete use of these powers. I am inclined to think that the failure to make full use of them is primarily due to the belief which most of us have that we are peculiarly possessed of the ability to "size up" our fellow men and reach conclusions concerning them by the mere process of looking at them and talking to them. Even though we may recognize in some cases the necessity for the use of a psychiatrist or a psychologist, we each have the inborn feeling that our broad experience and our varied contacts have given to us the gift of piercing into the minds of those who stand before us and divining what treatment will best fit the particular individual with whom we are dealing. The fact is that conclusions thus reached are mere guesses. None of us is possessed of such intuition as will enable us correctly so to conclude.

The knowledge of the life of a man, his background and has family, is the only proper basis for the determination as to his treatment. There is no substitute for information. The sentencing judge in the Federal court has the tools with which to acquire that information. Failure to make full use of those tools cannot be justified.

SOME DIFFICULTIES INCLUDED IN IMPOSING SENTENCES

I was fortunate in that shortly after I assumed my present position 2 years ago I made two unfortunate but striking mistakes. In the first I granted probation to a young man after I had sized him up without the benefit of a presentence investigation. He had no previous criminal record. He was fine looking, upstanding, and straight talking. He appeared to be to be an ideal probationer. Within the next month he proceeded to hold up six service stations. The investigation which I had made at the time of the revocation of his probation revealed what a presentence investigation would have revealed—that is, that, although he had never been convicted of any offenses, he had been involved in many. The phase of the case which was particularly striking to me was the realization that if any of the service-station operators had been valorous rather than discreet I would have carried on my conscience the responsibility for a murder.

The other case involved a young man, the charge against whom was minor. I struggled with him for fully a half hour attempting to get him to explain why he had committed the crime and to show some degree of penitence so that I could place him on probation. He declined to answer any questions and I finally concluded that he was sullen and stubborn and gave him a short sentence in a road camp. I found out later that, instead of being sullen and stubborn, he was simply bashful and embarrassed. As a result of these two experiences, I cast around to develop a plan whereby I could use more effectively the tools provided for men in reaching a correct conclusion as to the treatment to be accorded to the defendants appearing before me.

The situation in this district was not unlike that in many of the districts in the United States. At the beginning of each term a grand jury was impaneled; it was called into session two or three times during the term. This meant about five sessions a year. The calling of the grand jury usually depended upon the amount of business which had piled up for them to consider. On the average indictments were returned against some 25 to 40 individual defendants. Within a day or two after the return of the indictments, all of the defendants were called in for arraignment. A large percentage of the individuals indicted were without legal representation. Those requesting the appointment of lawyers had such requests granted. The representation by the lawyers, however, usually consisted of a short visit with the defendant while the court was still in session and the return to the court room of the defendant and his lawyer with the entry of a plea of guilty. In those cases where there was any possibility of probation, the court requested a presentence investigation by the probation officer and then continued the case for a few days while such investigation was being made. The whole atmosphere of the proceeding was one of the need for speed. Everyone, including the defendants themselves, was anxious that the matters be disposed of rapidly. The net result was that the defendant's day in court consisted of the acceptance of his plea, a brief statement concerning the crime charged, a review of the defendant's criminal record, a brief explanation by the defendant and his counsel, and then imposition of sentence.

Even in those cases where presentence investigations were made, they were not adequate. The time allowed was not sufficient. All of the presentence investigations were crowded into a short space of time not exceeding 1 week. Actually, they usually consisted only of an interview by the probation officer with the defendant himself.

INITIATING THE INVESTIGATION IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE COMMISSIONER'S HEARING

I was convinced that the system used nullified the effectiveness of the presentence investigation power. I could see no reason why these investigations should not be spaced out during the time between the defendant's arrest and the date of his arraignment. This brought about the necessity of someone making a decision as to which defendants should be selected for the privilege of a presentence investigation. The probation officer does not have time to make a complete investigation of all individuals arrested. There are many cases in which probation would not be considered. I concluded that the United States commissioners should have the responsibility of determining that question. I prepared for them complete instructions as to their procedure. I provided them with a form

of statement to be read to the defendant at the time of his appearance before the United States commissioner. In this statement, the defendant is assured that a request on his part for a presentence investigation would not be considered an admission of guilt. He is told that such an investigation will not prevent a plea of not guilty. He is assured that all information revealed by him will be confidential as between the probation officer and the judge and none of the information will be made available to the prosecuting officers. He is also assured that the probation officer will make no effort to investigate the particular crime with which he is charged but will limit his investigation to the past life and history of the defendant. After this explanation, the defendant is given an opportunity to sign a request for a presentence investigation which is transmitted by the United States commissioner to the court. The fact that the commissioner may not decide in favor of a presentence investigation in any case does not preclude the defendant, when he is arraigned, from asking for an investigation; nor does it preclude me from ordering one.

The advantages of this system are apparent. It gives the probation officer ample time to make a complete investigation. The statements made by the defendant may be checked and verified. Instead of having to make 15 or 20 presentence investigations in a week, the probation officer has them spaced out over a period of 2 to 3 months. The reports of the investigation are available for a considerable period prior to the date of arraignment. I have an opportunity to study them and to make suggestions to the probation officer concerning information which he may have overlooked. Oftentimes, I will suggest individuals whom I think should be interviewed.

The plan has increased materially the number of presentence investigations and also the number of cases granted probation. Unfortunately, I do not have a record of a full year's experience prior to September 1, 1941, when this plan was inaugurated. Consequently, there is no basis for tabulated comparison. However, I do know that the information I have received under this system is much more complete and accurate than that which I received prior to its use.

"BLIND-FLYING" JUSTICE

In opening my discussion I referred to a pilot flying blind. This analogy occurred to me last week when I visited another district and handled an arraignment calendar where, in 5 days, the probation officer was compelled to make 12 presentence investigations. He labored valiantly and splendidly, yet he knew, and I knew, that we did not have the information which was essential for me to pass properly upon the individuals involved. After 14 months' experience with a system under which I am able, by the time of arraignment, to have complete knowledge of the life history of each individual defendant and an opportunity to study and consider that life history, the thought ran through my mind, as I was sentencing the individuals last week, that I was simply flying blind and was not using the instruments which the law provided for me.

PREARRAIGNMENT APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

Of equal importance, and synchronizing perfectly with the presentence investigation technique, is the prearraignment appointment of attorneys. This matter is handled in the same way. Each defendant who appears before the United States commissioner is informed of his right to have an attorney appointed. Those who take advantage of the appointment opportunity receive the services of the attorney. The attorney has an opportunity, in his own time, to confer with his client on as many occasions as are necessary. He can study the facts of the case. He is furnished a copy of the indictment when it is returned. The constitutional guaranty of right to counsel is changed from a mere formality to an actual effective instrument by which the defendant's right to his day in court is fully protected.

I find that the attitude of the attorneys has completely changed with the advent of this system. Where, prior to that time, they considered the appointment a mere nuisance to the formality of which they had to conform, they now think of the appointment as a responsibility and duty which they are glad to take seriously. In addition to that, the system permits me to make some selection of attorneys according to the seriousness of the offense charged. It is a decided advance over the old system of sitting on the bench with a lawyers' directory before me and picking out names in alphabetical order.

SOME OBJECTIONS USUALLY RAISED TO THE PROCEDURES OUTLINED

Certain objections to this procedure have been raised on legal and even constitutional grounds. I can see no such questions involved.

The first objection raised was that offering an attorney by the United States commissioner would not satisfy the constitutional requirement as to intelligent and competent waiver by the defendants who did not accept the offer. The answer to this is that the offer by the commissioner is not a substitute for the offer by the court. In each case in which a defendant, when before the commissioner, did not request an attorney, I fully explain his rights to counsel at the time of arraignment.

The suggestion has been made that the system results in a waiver of the constitutional guaranty against self-incrimination. The answer to that objection is that the probation officer does not discuss with the defendant the crime of which he is now accused. It is explained carefully to the defendant that he does not need to discuss that particular charge. The probation officer is not a prosecuting officer. The information that he secures is not available to the prosecuting officers. It is not admissible for use against the defendant in the event of trial. If we had a Federal habitual-criminal statute, there might then be some basis for this objection. I can see no reason why anyone can complain when this opportunity is afforded to the defendant simply for the purpose of enabling the court to acquire such information concerning his background as will assist him in pronouncing the most effective sentence.

The third objection which has been raised is that the judge might be prejudiced against a man in the event of a trial because of information which he had received prior to the trial. Once again, I contend that the exclusion from the investigation and report of any information concerning the instant charge is a complete answer to this objection. I doubt very much if any judge would be willing to admit that there was an actual prejudice created because of knowledge of a defendant's background which would influence him in presiding over a trial where the sole question was the guilt or innocence of the defendant of the particular crime of which he was then charged. Of course, any judge who believes that he would be prejudiced, or even might be prejudiced, should not adopt this presentence investigation technique.

The stress of the problems of these times brings increasingly serious tasks to the members of the Federal judiciary. We would not be fully responsive to our obligation and would be prodigal with our opportunities if we failed to make full use of all facilities available to us, and relied on intuition rather than information.

The Will of the American People Was Defeated—the Policy of the Bureaucrats, "The Public Be Damned," Won

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1943

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, in my speech on the floor of the House yesterday, I attempted to point out that H. R. 2218, the Doughton-Morgenthau bill, was against the best interests of the 44,000,000 income-tax payers of the Nation, and would bring three billion less in revenues to the Treasury than the Carlson bill, embodying the pay-as-you-earn Ruml plan. We also pointed out that the Doughton-Morgenthau bill, backed by the administration, would benefit the very rich men of the country. The administration threw all of its great power, patronage, and control against the Carlson bill, which was backed almost solidly by the Republicans, and in favor of the Doughton-Morgenthau bill. On a record vote, the Carlson bill was defeated 215 to 198. Although the administration backed to the limit the Doughton-Morgenthau bill, and they have a majority in the House, the House adopted a motion to recommit the Doughton-Morgenthau bill to the Ways and Means Committee by a vote of 248 to 160—80 majority. The administration showed their great delight over the defeat of the bill backed by about 90 percent of the American people. Let them make the most of that hollow but temporary victory. The House repudiated the administration plan by 80 majority.

The Republicans, in backing the Carlson bill, offered to the country a constructive, fair, equitable solution of this important problem. The American people are behind this plan, and it will win in the end. It was insisted by the administration that the American people did not know what they wanted, or what they were doing in urging the adoption of the pay-as-you-earn and according-to-your-earnings plan. The bureaucrats show in every act by their rules and regulations their contempt for the constitutional rights of the people, a policy of "the public be damned." They are so drunk with power they cannot see the unmistakable implications of the House, the people's representatives action, in the 80 majority for the motion to recommit, to kill the administration bill.

The Carlson bill embodying the Ruml pay-as-you-earn plan, according to the recent Gallup poll, is favored by 83 percent of the Democrats and 87 percent of the Republicans of the Nation and 86 percent of the income-tax payers in the lower brackets, and 83 percent in the higher brackets. It was endorsed by the American Legion, the two great national farm organizations, the National

Grange, and the American Farm Bureau Federation. It was likewise endorsed by the American Federation of Labor, and practically every newspaper, Democrat and Republican, great and small, in the Nation, and by practically every radio commentator.

I have not yet received a single letter from the people of my district expressing opposition to the Carlson bill, but have received many letters and telegrams from persons in all walks of life favoring the plan, and this has been true of the daily and weekly newspapers in my district, as far as I have been able to observe. The two largest daily newspapers in Kentucky, both Democrat, the Louisville Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times, have endorsed the pay-as-you-go or pay-as-you-earn plan and have expressed opposition to the Doughton-Morgenthau plan. I know of no organization, great or small, that has endorsed the Doughton-Morgenthau-administration bill. I have never yet known of a tax measure having such universal approval as the Carlson bill, embodying the pay-as-you-earn plan. This is the plan that should be adopted and, in my opinion, it will yet be adopted. The American people will demand, while our President is giving away sixty-three billion to any nations he might desire, and our Nation has not only become the arsenal of democracy but the breadbasket, the bank, and the manpower in fighting and winning the war, that the American people be given some consideration. This is the wise, constructive, sensible, and just solution of this problem. The American people want it, and they should have it.

THE DOUGHTON-MORGENTHAU PLAN

There is no way to get on a pay-as-you-go or pay-as-you-earn basis under the Doughton-Morgenthau plan except and unless the income-tax payer pays 2 years' taxes in 1 year. This cannot be done, as a rule, except by the very wealthy people.

The Doughton-Morgenthau administration plan offers to the rich this year a discount of 6 percent if they will pay 2 years' taxes in 1. The Treasury admits this discount the rich people would receive will amount to five hundred millions this year, and, under the 4-percent discount for subsequent years, the rich people would receive two hundred and fifty millions annually in discounts. This measure would offer no relief to the nearly 44,000,000 of other income-tax payers, but it would also withhold from its source 20 percent from the salaries and wages of perhaps 40,000,000 income-tax payers, and it would force these wage earners and salaried persons to pay at least 1½ years' taxes in 1 year. In other words, they would have to pay their income taxes on 1942 and would have taken out of their wages and salaries 20 percent beginning July 1, 1943. This would be too heavy a burden on an overwhelming majority of these 40,000,000 income-tax payers, and we can clearly see the reason for the very able editorial of the Honorable C. H. Arundel, of the Daily News, of Middlesboro, Ky., and why he heads his editorial "Rich man's tax." This editorial is as follows:

RICH MAN'S TAX

The administration in Washington—President Roosevelt, Speaker Rayburn, General Counsel Paul of the Treasury—is on record in favor of a pay-as-you-earn tax. It objected to the Ruml plan on the ground that if 1942 tax liabilities were excused, rich men might profit from windfalls.

Now Treasury Secretary Morgenthau says that the administration is 100 percent behind the Ways and Means Committee tax measure. This is not a pay-as-you-earn bill, and it is notoriously a rich man's windfall.

Mr. Ruml and the vast majority of Americans who favor his plan have accepted the administration argument against permitting even a few wealthy persons to benefit from reform of the taxing system. The Carlson bill, embodying the Ruml plan, provides against this possibility.

The Ways and Means monstrosity, on the other hand, invites those who have money to "come and get it." Yet the administration is behind the committee bill 100 percent.

If the committee bill should become law the average taxpayer could do either of two things. He could continue on a year-behind, always-in-debt basis—and most would do so, and we should have no pay-as-you-earn tax system. Or he could squeeze out of 1 year's pay envelopes enough to pay the heaviest 2 years' taxes in American history. Few would do that.

How about the rich man, the fellow with savings in the bank or a good sheaf of War bonds in the safe-deposit box?

He could withdraw the savings or sell the bonds—Has Mr. Morgenthau considered that possibility?—and earn 6 percent on his money by paying up 1943 taxes before June 15.

That is a better return than is available from War bonds or any other moderately safe investment.

If the administration really is 100 percent behind the committee bill, what becomes of its lip service to a pay-as-you-earn plan? How should we evaluate its talk about opposing the Ruml plan out of consideration for the poor and out of dislike for giving any prosperous taxpayer a break?

Why is the administration against the Ruml plan? Isn't it for purely political reasons—because alert Republicans were smart enough to climb first onto the most popular tax bandwagon that has rolled down the pike in many a generation?

THE CARLSON BILL PAY-AS-YOU-EARN RUML PLAN

Mr. Speaker, the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and everybody else who has given this subject any consideration admits our present plan of paying income taxes is archaic. We pay out income taxes the year following the year in which they are earned. Our income-tax payers are always a year behind. They all agree we should adopt a pay-as-you-go or pay-as-you-earn plan. The Carlson bill, or Ruml plan, provides that all income-tax payers pay their income taxes currently, that is, we pay the income taxes on our earnings each year and out of the same year's earnings, and our taxpayers will be current, so that at the end of the year the income-tax payers will not owe the Government, and we agree that wherever it is practicable these income taxes should be paid at their source. This plan will make all income-tax payers current in their payments and will benefit all of them. If an income-tax payer has a fat year of earning he will pay taxes that year on his earning accordingly, while on the other hand if the taxpayer has a lean year he will pay taxes in that year accordingly, and if he should lose his health and not be able to work, or lose his job, and have no earnings, he will not have a last year's income-tax debt hanging over him, and if he should die the income-tax collector would not be standing over his coffin trying to collect income taxes for the year before, and his family would not have that burden hanging over them.

Under the Carlson-Ruml plan the 44,000,000 income-tax payers will pay their 1943 taxes on and out of their 1943 incomes, and because of the larger number of persons who would pay income taxes by reason of the collection of the taxes at the source and the increased income in 1943, the Government would actually receive at least three billion more in income taxes in 1943 under the Carlson-Ruml plan than under the present law, but it is insisted by the opponents of the Carlson-Ruml plan that some 60 persons, and perhaps a few others, in 1942 had a larger income than they will have in 1943, or that they had a special windfall income. The Carlson bill takes care of that situation. It provides that if the taxable income of any person for 1942 was more than twenty thousand and greater than 1943 then the 1942 income will be used as the basis on which to pay the income taxes, and it further provides a tax on windfalls, and so forth. The revenue acts, already on the statute books, give further protection to the Government in situations like these. The taxes on these high incomes run above 90 percent, and furthermore, under the renegotiation contract law, any Government contractor who has made big profits on war contracts the Government can renegotiate and readjust his contract, and, in effect, take everything by way of profits away from him. The Carlson bill also provides that the Government may take away from any income-tax payer any profits acquired by reason of fraud against the Government.

Therefore this very small group of very large income-tax payers in 1942 or 1943 can be and will be reached under the Carlson bill and other revenue laws, and these having been taken care of, why deny the nearly 44,000,000 other income-tax payers the benefits of this pay-as-you-earn plan?

We have pointed out above, and it is also pointed out in the editorial of Mr. Arundel, how the administration's Doughton-Morgenthau bill will benefit a few of the very rich and those who have the money to pay 2 years' taxes in 1. Let us bear in mind all the time this bill does not fix any tax rates. That was done in the Revenue Act of October 1942, and neither does this measure have anything to do with the income or taxes of corporations. This measure deals solely and only with the collection of individual income taxes under existing rates.

The administration is now urging new taxes and increased rates be voted by Congress that will bring in sixteen billion more in taxes. If such a measure is adopted by the Congress, under the pay-as-you-go or pay-as-you-earn plan the taxpayers will pay these increased taxes

this year on this year's earnings. Only a few of the 44,000,000 individual income-tax payers could pay 2 years' taxes in 1 year under the present rates. How could they do this with the increased taxes? We could not possibly put these millions on a pay-as-you-go basis except under the Carlson-Ruml pay-as-you-go and pay-as-you-earn and according as you earn.

WILL THE GOVERNMENT LOSE REVENUE?

It has been urged that the Carlson-Ruml plan would cause great loss of revenue to the Government and that many income-tax payers would escape the payment of their taxes, and that this plan would create a lot of millionaires. These statements are not borne out by the facts. If any millionaires are made by this war it will be laid directly at the door of the administration, and this is true if any person makes exorbitant profits on war contracts. The Congress some years ago passed a law compelling competitive bidding for Government contracts. This administration forced through the Congress a law repealing this salutary act and set out to let Government contracts on a cost-plus basis. The Republicans generally, and myself, voted against that measure.

Some contracts were let and some persons made big profits, but this was the fault of the administration and its agencies. To correct this we passed an act authorizing the renegotiation of these war contracts and many of these contracts have been renegotiated, and in all about one and a half billion have been recovered. Under that act the Government can take practically every dollar that any contractor made, if it desires to do so.

To further prevent swollen profits being made out of this war, last year the Congress passed an act increasing the tax rates on individual incomes of those in the higher brackets at more than 90 percent of the taxable income, and even a higher percentage for corporations, and the Carlson-Ruml plan now steps in and permits the Government to take further sums from those who have made exorbitant profits and had windfalls out of war contracts.

If Mr. Morgenthau and his assistants will do their duty, no man can make a million dollars out of this war and keep it. If any person becomes a millionaire out of this war it can be laid directly at the door of the administration.

The Carlson-Ruml plan merely moves the tax clock forward 1 year. Will anyone escape paying taxes yearly? Last year I paid an income tax, as did millions of other individuals, and, under the Carlson-Ruml plan, millions and myself would pay income taxes in 1943, but they will be paid on the 1943 income. In 1944 millions, and myself, will pay income taxes on our incomes in 1944, and this will be true of 1945, and on through the years, and no year will be skipped; and these taxes will be paid at the high rates fixed by the Revenue Act of 1942, or at such increased rates as the Congress may impose. No one will miss a single year's taxes, unless such person dies, or loses his job, or becomes unable to work and has no income above his or her exemptions.

As we have heretofore pointed out, the Government under the Carlson-Ruml plan will collect taxes from millions of income-tax payers in 1943 who have not heretofore paid income taxes, and these taxes will be collected from 30,000,000 of these wage earners and salaried workers at the source, and the Government on the whole will receive three billion more this year under the Carlson-Ruml plan than under the old plan, and the income-tax payers at the end of the year will be out of debt to the Government.

Of course, we pay more under this plan during the fat years and pay less or nothing during the lean years, and this plan also applies to the farmers. If they have a good season, good crops, and good prices, and a splendid income, they will be better able to pay taxes out of that income for that year, and when they have droughts, a poor season, poor crops, and small income, their taxes will be cut down accordingly.

Under this plan we pay as we earn and according to our earnings. At the end of the year we have no tax debt. But for this plan, if the salaried people or wage earners and the farmers had a bad year, then they would still owe their taxes for the income of the good year, and the Government would have a lien on their personal property and their homes and many of them would be sold. This plan will be helpful to the Government and to the individual income-tax payers. It is a sane, sound, constructive, just plan. The people want it and why should the administration deny them this relief?

Since this plan was defeated by the administration I have received a great many letters and telegrams urging the Congress to continue until such relief is obtained, and I for one shall continue the fight. This is right, it should win, and I believe it will finally win, notwithstanding the opposition of the administration and the bureaucrats here in Washington.

Respect for and Confidence of the People in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Western Hills Press of Cheviot, Ohio, March 19, 1943, entitled "Congress Begins Job of Regaining Public's Respect and Confidence."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS BEGINS JOB OF REGAINING PUBLIC'S RESPECT AND CONFIDENCE

It was not so long ago that certain of the more thin-skinned gentlemen in Congress were rising up in wrath to defend their personal honor and the integrity of the august body which they felt was dignified by their membership. The attacks on Congress were being motivated by subversive elements, they contended, and they showed great concern lest the American people would forever lose the respect to which Congress as a fundamental American institution is entitled.

In some instances, of course, the shoe (of public censure) probably fit certain little men who were in big jobs and they assumed that it had been patterned for them. They were probably right, and so was the public, except that they failed to make the charges specific enough to eliminate the majority of honest, patriotic, and sincere Congressmen who were unjustly damned for the frailties of their lesser brethren.

However, in most cases, those unjustly defamed suffered in silence with the realization that when Congress achieved substantially enough in the form of the leadership and constructive policy making that the public has a right to expect from it, the complaints would be overshadowed and forgotten. They were right. Even today, Congress is beginning to regain some of the respect it formerly claimed—a respect which the American people are anxious to accord it.

The Truman committee offers an instance in point. Not only is this able and patriotic bipartisan group of Senators winning high public regard for themselves as the public is informed of their accomplishments, but they are reestablishing public confidence in the Congress.

We were afforded an interesting insight into this process recently when we had the good fortune of seeing the Truman committee at a newspaper meeting in Columbus and hearing from the gentleman from Missouri whose name the committee bears and the junior Senator from Ohio, Senator BURTON, who is a member of the committee. Your correspondent was very favorably impressed with the group and the work they are doing, as briefly outlined. But that fact was not significant—the reaction of a friend sitting next to us was.

To this individual the word "politician" was no longer a simple noun. It had become a compound word incomplete without expletives. His quick revaluation of this particular group of politicians following the briefest exposure to their apparent sincere and honest patriotism was startling. These men seemed to stand for what he would like to have his Congressmen represent and he was more than ready to think well of them, given the slightest basis on which to establish his revised estimate. There are many other Americans equally ready and anxious to admire and respect their leadership if given a chance.

Another example of how the Congress can rise above the political pettiness of some of its Members is now being afforded by the activity of another bipartisan group of Senators who have drafted a resolution which can be made the basis of United States post-war policy. We quote from this resolution:

"It is our deep conviction that the basic foreign policy of the United States should not become an issue in partisan politics, that it should be decided as soon as possible so that post-war planning may be effective, and that our policy should be determined, not on the basis of past debates based on conditions then existing, but on the basis of world conditions as they are today and are likely to develop in the future."

Such a declaration reflects statesmanship—the type of statesmanship the American people have long sought in their Congress and have failed to find. Now that it is offered, it is our prediction that the people will grasp

it hungrily and support with pride the Congressmen who speak for them as Americans. The people are tired of being viewed as constituents more interested in party and class than in America. As Congressmen realize this truth and act accordingly, they will be reestablishing the integrity of their body and the respect to which it is entitled as a basic American institution.—(A. H. H.)

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Our Air Mail Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE F. LEA
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, 1918, 25 years ago the United States Post Office Department inaugurated the first air-mail service. This service was between Washington, Philadelphia, and New York. On the afternoon of that day the first airplane took off from Washington and, at about the same time, another took off from New York. The plane from New York successfully reached Philadelphia and then Washington, a distance of about 226 miles, only 3 hours and 20 minutes after its departure from Long Island.

The aircraft which took off from Washington failed to reach Philadelphia. However, by the end of the first fortnight, the operation had established a regular schedule.

Thus our Air Mail Service, now the greatest in the world, had its humble beginning.

On the 31st of March, I introduced House Joint Resolution 108 to commemorate on May 15, 1943, the twenty-fifth anniversary of that notable day when our air-mail system was instituted. This resolution directs that the Secretary of the Treasury shall on that day present to the Postmaster General a suitable plaque to mark the occasion.

I Am Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday mornings at 11 o'clock, eastern wartime, there can be heard over the Columbia Broadcasting System's net work, a program called "God's Country". Fortunately, I happened the other day to tune in on this program and heard a most beautiful tribute paid to music. Since music is the universal language of mankind and is a tongue we all can hear and understand, I think it can contribute much to promote understanding and to the building of a new and better world following in the wake of the present world's cataclysm that threatens not only to engulf, but to destroy mankind.

The voice of the narrator sounded very natural to me and as if the speaker might have come from my own "neck of the woods." Somewhat to my surprise and much to my delight, I learned after writing the Columbia Broadcasting System in New York that the narrator was Milton Bacon, who was born and reared 30 miles west of St. Louis and who lived for a number of years in Kansas City, in my good old State of Missouri. The beautiful tribute he has given to music is almost equal to Senator Vest's Tribute to the Dog, and these men will long be remembered with Mark Twain, Eugene Field, Harold Bell Wright, Sarah Teasdale, Dale Carnegie, Rose Wilder Lane, Rose O'Neal, Vance Randolph, John G. Niehardt, and Mae Kennedy McCord.

I AM MUSIC

(By Milton Bacon)

I am music. I am the servant and the master; servant of the dead and master of the living. Through me immortal spirits speak the message that makes the world weep, and laugh, and wonder, and worship. I tell the story of love, the story of hate, the story that saves, and the story that debases. I am incense on which prayers float to Heaven. I am the smoke which palls over the field of battle where men lie dying with me on their lips. I am close to the marriage altar, and when graves open I stand nearby. I call the wanderer home, I rescue the soul from the depths, I open the lips of lovers, and through me the dead whisper to the living. I serve all alike. The king is my slave as much as his subject. I speak through the birds of the air, the insects of the field, the crash of waters on rock-ribbed shores, the sighing of winds in the trees. And I am even heard by the soul that knows me in the clatter of wheels on city streets. I know no brother, yet all men are my brothers; I am the father of the best that is in them, and they are the fathers of the best that is in me; I am of them, and they are of me. For I am the instrument of God. I am music.

Super War Council Proposed by Congressman Morrison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill, which I introduced yesterday, together with a statement in connection with same:

A bill providing for the creation of a Supreme War Council to consist of four members, two to be elected and appointed by the Senate and two to be elected and appointed by the House of Representatives to approve the actions of the President in the conduct of the war

Be it enacted, etc., That Congress shall create and establish a Supreme War Council. Such Council shall be created by electing by a majority vote, one Member from the Republican or minority party in the House and one Member from the Democratic or majority party in the House, which two Members shall be named by the Speaker; and one Member from the Republican or minority party in the Senate and one Member from the Democratic or majority party in the Senate, which two Members shall be named by the President of the Senate. "By electing by a majority vote," is meant the election in party caucus, both in the House and Senate, in the selection of each Member.

The duties of this War Council shall be to meet with the President of the United States daily, or at such times as the successful prosecution of the war demands.

The President shall submit to this War Council for its approval all agreements made with foreign powers, all moves of strategy by the Army, Navy or Marine Corps, all deals or agreements of any nature whatsoever that may affect the conduct of the war with foreign countries, including all lend-lease agreements. The President shall submit for approval to said War Council all State Department negotiations or agreements that in any way affect the conduct of the war or this Nation's relations with neutral or allied countries. The President shall report and get the approval of the War Council on all domestic matters involving transportation, communication, food, manufacturer's supplies, armaments, ammunition and any and all goods, equipment or products necessary to the war effort.

This War Council shall be in effect for the duration of the war. Should any Member die or fail to be reelected, then his successor shall be elected as above set forth.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN MORRISON OF LOUISIANA ON THE PROPOSED WAR COUNCIL

In introducing this bill in the House, providing for a war council, I feel that we are supplying a most necessary aid to President Roosevelt at this time.

Here in America, President Roosevelt has the whole load on his shoulders. He is responsible for the entire war front and the entire home front. This load and responsibility is too great for any one human. If it continues, bad mistakes will be unavoidable. As they have occurred in the past, they will occur in the future. Our President is accountable to no group or individual. At present he is shouldering the whole responsibility. It is too great a load, and even Mr. Roosevelt cannot hold up under such a gigantic responsibility.

In England there is a supreme war council of eight members. The Prime Minister, whose duties and responsibilities are similar to President Roosevelt's, is accountable to England's war council for all of his actions. He discusses every major move with them, and they give him their approval whenever a major move is made, either on the war front or on the home front.

In America I feel that four members would work to a better advantage in a super war council (similar to England's) than eight members, and that is the reason for the smaller number. Eight members would probably be too unwieldy.

The method of selecting these four members was based on the fact that those men who were elected by the people, and therefore who would be accountable to the people, could serve the people's interest best. In order that partisan politics should be omitted, both parties in America are to select a Member in the House and in the Senate according to the bill. In this way the people are assured that the Republicans will pick out two outstanding Members, while the Democrats are bound to do likewise.

By all rhyme or reason it would be almost impossible to select a more able war council

by any other means. The fact that all four members are selected by their respective parties, and the further fact that the responsibility of their actions shall rest squarely on the shoulders of the Democratic and Republican Parties, guarantees that men of the greatest amount of responsibility, courage, ability, and patriotism will be selected. That, coupled with the fact that each member must take his actions as a member of this war council and face his constituents in an election at a comparatively early future date, further insures the guaranty that the ablest and most patriotic men will be selected and that their actions will be according to the desires of the vast majority of the people.

I feel confident that President Roosevelt will welcome such a war council and, that through its cooperative counsel, advice, and aid, many serious mistakes of the future will never happen I know that our President well realizes that he owes it to himself and to the Nation to support this bill in order that an able, loyal, unbiased, patriotic super war council can be created with the one objective in mind—and that is to work unceasingly and untiringly to the end that this horrible war shall be won and won in the shortest possible time.

The Saguenay River and Shipshaw

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, no more important resolution has come before Congress at this session than Concurrent Resolution No. 16, introduced by Congressman COFFEE of Washington for investigation of the transactions involved in what is known as the Shipshaw Power Development in northern Quebec, in the Dominion of Canada.

I have not had an opportunity to go into this matter as carefully as I like but if I am correctly advised, since 1941 the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which is an agency of the Government of the United States, has been involved in a series of negotiations with the Aluminum Corporation Ltd., a Canadian corporation, in connection with a large power development which involves the building of a series of dams in the saguenay River in the Province of Quebec. The Aluminum Corporation Ltd., is, as I am advised, a private corporation and its stockholders are probably the same men who own and control the Aluminum Corporation of America, with which most Members of Congress are somewhat familiar. This United States corporation, known as the Aluminum Corporation of America has had a monopoly on the production of aluminum in the United States up until December 7, 1941, which promises to be a rather prominent date in the history of the world.

Statements have been made that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, beginning in 1941, made payments in anticipation of the delivery of aluminum by the Canadian company and up to date those payments approximate $68,500,000. In connection with these payments, the Aluminum Corporation in Canada was furnished with strategic war materials such as iron and steel products, copper, manufactured generating machinery in the United States and utilized as many as 10,000 men during the period of construction of these dams. There is some slight information as to the amount of war materials that were diverted for this company but definite figures are not available because this information was divulged in connection with an executive session of the committee.

My information, which is incomplete, indicates that the financing arrangements in connection with this project were illuminated and of the natural-gas type. While it has been stated that the funds furnished by the United States for this project were advance payments for aluminum, nevertheless the Aluminum Corporation in Canada was left free to use these funds without restriction, and it is perfectly evident that these United States funds were used to finance a large part, if not all, of the power development. To talk very simply, all of these advances are to be repaid in terms of pounds of aluminum. I am informed that the price is to be 15 cents per pound.

Without making these remarks so extended that no one will read them, the gist of the whole matter is this: That a foreign corporation was financed by an administrative agency of the Government of the United States and used as an instrumentality to pull the private power company's chestnuts out of the fire. In other words, we took the necessary money and materials and constructed a power plant up in Canada for a private corporation to provide aluminum for this country, while at the same time denying the development of the Shasta power project, Grand Coulee power project, and T. V. A. in the United States. During all this time the project known as the St. Lawrence seaway-power development project has been delayed, ostensibly because of the lack of the same material that was used for the benefit of a private foreign corporation and individual stockholders.

There are some of us in the House who would like to have an explanation. I am sure that Members of Congress who live in California would like to know something about the effect of this program on the Shasta power project in California. In effect, instead of putting any electric generators in the Shasta project in California, such generators were placed in northern Quebec. These same remarks apply to the Grand Coulee in the State of Washington, and I am sure Members of Congress in the northwestern section of the United States join with me in trying to find out why generators were not used in their section of the United States but were made available somewhere else.

Most of us are familiar with the St. Lawrence seaway—power development which, in a few words, involves the deepening of a few connecting river channels in the Great Lakes to a depth of 27 feet—many of them are already 14 feet in depth, or more, now—so as to permit oceangoing vessels to navigate the Great Lakes and reach the inland-located empire of the Midwest. In connection with this project, the building of a power dam in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, on the boundary between the State of New York and the Province of Ontario, producing 2,200,000 horsepower of low-cost hydroelectricity, is also involved. No person who has studied this power development near Massena, N. Y., has ever been able to figure out why the Government of the United States has not taken action many years ago. This power development would make possible, on the United States side, the production of aluminum, and, incidentally, is the same size as the Shipshaw project in the Saguenay River, and also furnish electricity to the northeastern United States. Testimony was given before the Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941 to the effect that $1,000 worth of electric power is going to waste every hour in the St. Lawrence River near Massena.

These facts are discussed here because on March 23 the Honorable FRANCIS D. CULKIN, of New York State; the Honorable THAD F. WASIELEWSKI, of Milwaukee, Wis., and myself introduced identical bills which would permit an authorization for the St. Lawrence seaway power development.

Now, I would like to ask my colleagues a rather serious question: Do not you think somebody is doing something rather foolish or perhaps worse, in our Government administration in refusing an authorization for the St. Lawrence development and at the same time building a power plant in another country for the benefit of a private corporation? I cannot reconcile this situation with common sense or good financial judgment or on any other basis. There is a sinister basis. I say to you frankly that we hope the powerful corporations that are involved have not reached the point where they dominate the welfare of the American people for the benefit of their own selfish financial advantage. It is well known among informed people that the 1941 legislation which was before the Rivers and Harbors Committee and which included the St. Lawrence Seaway power development was opposed by a powerful railway lobby, by the utilities, and by other selfish sectional interests which I do not here enumerate. Some day the American people will realize what a real injury these groups caused them.

In conclusion, I want to repeat that this resolution introduced by Congressman COFFEE is one of the matters on the legislative program that ought to have immediate attention and the proper committee of this House should make a thorough investigation and if necessary, legislation should be passed which will make a repetition of this fiasco impossible for all time to come.

Good Will—Like Charity—Should Begin at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, today we have practically stopped the development of our electrical projects within the United States. The excuse is the lack of copper and materials; the preoccupation of our electrical manufacturers with war orders.

And yet we hear of the Shipshaw project in Canada and the open-handed treatment of that development at the same time we are denying ours at home.

Weakening the United States will certainly not strengthen the world, promote the post-war peace nor contribute to our spiritual or material well-being.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. MILLER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 31, 1943:

DON'T QUIT FIGHT—PUSH RUML PLAN

Notwithstanding yesterday's dizzy maneuvers in the House, the Carlson bill for income-tax collection, embodying the genuine pay-as-you-go principles of the Ruml plan and supported by a great army of American citizens is still alive.

Its essentials must be kept alive until enacted into law.

If this constructive measure, sent back to the inept Ways and Means Committee after a weird orgy of partisan politics, can't be forced out by any available parliamentary procedure, its sound Ruml plan provisions should be incorporated in a new bill and pushed through Congress by expressed order of the people.

Every citizen should now tell his Congressman to back the Ruml plan, until final adoption and accept no phony substitutes.

Certainly the Ways and Means Committee's own atrocious bill hashed up with the connivance of the Treasury Department, must be rejected if brought to a vote. All substitutes for the Ways and Means measure that do not offer the Ruml plan must be rejected.

Congressional opponents of the Ruml plan like to talk of compromise. What do they mean, compromise? Do they dare compromise the interests of 44,000,000 income-tax payers?

The people of this country have every right to roaring indignation over the income-tax run-around they have been given by Ways and Means and Treasury. It's time now that they got up and shouted a peremptory demand for justice—and passage of the Ruml plan.

A Nation-wide poll indicates that at least 86 percent of the income-tax payers want the Ruml plan. But the Ways and Means Committee and the Treasury have had the unmitigated gall to chide, "No, no. Mustn't. Your old fuddy-duddies know best."

Why? Because the Secretary of the Treasury or Chairman DOUGHTON didn't think of Beardsley Ruml's sound, simple, fair plan first?

Let there be no mistake about this: The Ways and Means tax-collection bill, with its invitation to double taxation and its bonus for paying 2 years' income taxes in 1 year—a bonus only the wealthy could hope to collect—would not give one iota of relief to anybody now paying income taxes.

In more or less the same class are the other makeshifts for true pay as you go, including the Forand-Robertson plan bill, which proposes unjust discrimination as to whose tax burdens shall be lightened.

Lest there be any misunderstanding, it should be reiterated that the Carlson-Ruml plan bill would not forgive 1942 taxes. It would not make possible skipping a year, either in the imposition or the payment of taxes.

It would simply move the tax clock ahead 1 year so that income taxes in 1943 would be paid on 1943 income, instead of on income earned and spent in 1942. It would provide a check against windfalls by those, with incomes of more than $20,000 a year, who made more in 1942 than they will in 1943. It would put everybody on an authentic pay-as-you-go basis and safeguard the families of those who may die, lose their jobs, or suffer serious cut in income.

The Ruml plan's equitable tax-collection principles must be made into law. No substitutes will do. No compromise will do.

The House majority yesterday muffed a shining opportunity to live up to its responsibilities. The people of America want the Ruml plan. Congress must be made to obey the will of the people.

Get in touch with your Congressman at once and tell him to reject all substitutes and stand firm for the one and only Ruml plan.

Award to Charles B. Voorhis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, each year the city of Pasadena awards a medal known as the Arthur Noble Award to that citizen who has been judged the city's most useful citizen in the year previous.

For the year 1942 this medal was given to the man whom I have looked up to, loved, and admired through the years, my father. The award was made for his service as chairman of the war price and ration board.

I know the House will understand my request to include in the RECORD herewith the following article from the Pasadena Post for March 31, 1943:

NOBLE AWARD FOR SERVICE TO CITY PRESENTED TO CHARLES B. VOORHIS

While 350 friends and admirers rose to their feet to give hearty applause, Charles Brown Voorhis, Pasadena's distinguished citizen who executed rationing of gasoline, tires, sugar, and other commodities in this community in a painless but efficient manner, received the Arthur Noble gold medal last night which marks him as Pasadena's most useful citizen of 1942.

PRESENTS MEDAL

The medal was presented by Dr. John A. Sexson, who succeeded Mr. Voorhis as chairman of the war ration board and the fifty-fifth annual banquet of the chamber of commerce at Masonic Temple.

"This has never happened to me before and I can assure you that I am embarrassed," Mr. Voorhis said in reply to a glowing tribute by Dr. Sexson.

"I wish I could believe the things I have just heard but I fear my friend, Dr. Sexson, has exceeded the speed limit of truth.

"The committee had an impossible job to select a recipient of this medal in a community where there are so many hundreds of individuals who are devoting such unselfish service to the community and Nation and persons who are more worthy," Mr. Voorhis said modestly.

HAPPY TO ACCEPT

"I am happy, however, to accept the medal as a representative of the hundreds who are deserving of praise for their civic contributions."

In making the presentation, Dr. Sexson pointed to Mr. Voorhis' war service and how he organized the largest consumer group handled by any one ration board in this State. Mr. Voorhis did his job without injury to any person and gained the cooperation and support of the public without threats or any unpleasant incidents.

Dr. Sexson pointed to Mr. Voorhis' long and useful public record and also paid tribute to all the previous winners of the medal who by their acts have enriched the community.

A. I. Stewart, chairman of the board of city directors, recalled the aims of Arthur Noble, who left a trust in 1924 with the city government to be used to buy a medal and select each year a worthy recipient.

THEY CHOSE RECIPIENT

Mr. Stewart said that the recipient is always chosen by a committee of citizens appointed by the city directors. This year the committee was composed of Cyril Bennett, chairman, Mrs. William Hansen, Milton S. Grier, Dr. J. Tyler Parker, Jr., and Seth Miller.

Music for the occasion was provided by musicians and singers from the Pasadena Junior College directed by Miss Lulu Parmley. The invocation was spoken by Rev. Eugene Carson Blake.

Washington Will Have 2,000,000 Population in 10 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SOL BLOOM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of Friday,

March 26, 1943, by Frank C. Waldrop, with reference to prediction of Mr. Morris Cafritz on the future of the city of Washington:

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Morris Cafritz, the real-estate man and builder, says Washington will have 2,000,000 population within 10 years. That's important news to every home owner, every worker in business, and everybody else.

For Cafritz qualifies as an expert on the subject of Washington. He has lived here all his extremely successful life which has been successful only because he uses the brains God gave him. Nobody gave Cafritz a free ride to the top and nobody but Cafritz keeps him there. His business depends on his own judgment. And Cafritz says he doesn't care how many people clip out this forecast of his and save it to check with in 1953. Here it is again for the "I-told-you-so" society's files.

Washington today—that is the District of Columbia and its immediate suburbs—has a population close to 1,500,000, according to Cafritz's estimate. Washington of 1953—including the same geographical area—will be 2,000,000. So Cafritz predicts.

Here's how he arrives at that conclusion: Washington before 1917 was a slowly growing, peaceable small city of leisurely habits, graceful living, beautiful homes, and unobtrusive public buildings.

The first World War brought thousands upon thousands of new citizens to Washington and jammed them into every crack and cranny of the downtown area, worked them dizzy, and then turned some of them loose at the first sign of peace.

But the people loved it. And they wouldn't go home when their war jobs closed down.

Of course, a great many of them were kept on by the Government because the war gave a tremendous impetus toward permanent expansion of the State, War, and Navy Departments.

And, of course, the growth of the population in the country as a whole called for expansion of Government personnel in other old-line departments that had previously been able to execute services with a few clerks and record keepers.

Just to keep the census record, for instance, there had to be more people every 10 years than there had been before.

But neither of those factors was the main one in Washington's growth.

Says Cafritz: "Between 1922 and 1931 our company sold more than 6,000 homes to people in and around Washington. I talked personally with most of those people.

"Over and over again I heard the same story—they came here in the war as emergency workers, expecting to 'go back home' as soon as peace came.

"But they got to like Washington.

"Many of them had married here during the war emergency. Or they had babies born here or their kids got started in school here.

"One way or another, they began to be tied to Washington stronger than they ever intended. And they lost the pull to 'go home.' If they couldn't find one thing to do here they found another."

Many people, he said, left the Government service not just because their jobs had dried up but because they were smart enough to dig up some line of business Washington needed.

"Thousands of little stores and sales companies opened up right after the last war," he said, "with savings some man and his wife had put aside during the war years on the Government pay roll. Those people today are solid in this town for keeps.

"You'd never guess how many ways those Government clerks found to make a good living after the big emergency Federal bureaus closed down."

Add to all this the fact that Washington is a beautiful place to live and that the people who live here are on the average the best educated, best paid, best read, and most stable class of citizens in the country—and you understand why people resist the idea of leaving.

History, he contends, is now repeating itself on a far greater scale. Washington is growing, and will continue to grow, because of the new population tidal wave swept in by this war.

But it is not all just one big balloon of pink. Washington is a best on many counts. On others it is a worst. Washington is one of the worst governed cities in the world.

Congress and a Board of Commissioners appointed by the President have the duty of governing Washington. The people who live here have no say in their government. None whatsoever.

Result: Government irresponsible to the people naturally becomes sloppy, ineffectual misgovernment.

That sort of slipshod makeshift could be tolerated back when Washington had a population of 150,000.

But not now with a population of 1,500,000. And with a population of 2,000,000 it will be worse.

Now is the time to change. It is a job for Congress. But the people of Washington—if they expect to get what they need and want—will have to keep Congress' attention to the problem.

Votes for Washington. Now.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa:

House Concurrent Resolution 21

Be it resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That—

Whereas the application of arbitrary rules and regulations by the Rent Control Division of the Office of Price Administration promulgated under the authority of Federal legislation, has resulted in an unfair and inequitable imposition against landlords; and

Whereas by virtue thereof substandard rentals cannot be brought to a fair parity with other rentals and undesirable tenants may not be ejected from property; and

Whereas as a result property owners in many instances are compelled to accept rentals insufficient to maintain their properties and make a fair return on their investment; and

Whereas landlords are compelled to retain renters who are destructive to property and in some instances the health and welfare of other occupants of the premises; and

Whereas the rent ceilings in Iowa are far below the parity of labor and commodities as a consequence of which an unjust burden is imposed against a landlord; and

Whereas this situation is the result of national policy and not local administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fiftieth General Assembly of the State of Iowa (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to forthwith take such action as may be necessary and appropriate to make more flexible the arbitrary rules of the Rent Control Division of the Office of Price Administration and provide the means through which unfair and inequitable impositions against landlords may be heard by an impartial tribunal on the merits of the case.

SAM ORBAUGH,
On the part of the House.
GEORGE FAUL,
On the part of the Senate.

Lt. William I. Martin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, several years ago it was my privilege and my honor to deliver the commencement address at the graduating exercises of the senior class of the Ava, Mo., High School. Among the many fine graduates on that occasion was young Billy Martin, son of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Martin of that small county-seat town, and whose prominent father is now collector of revenue of Douglas County.

As I looked into the bright and eager faces of those young people that night I could see all of life's aspirations, ambitions, and hopes gleaming from their eyes. One did not have to be a prophet to predict with accuracy that some of the members of that class would accomplish great things in the future.

Young Martin was not satisfied on graduation from high school but attended the Universities of Missouri and Oklahoma the following 2 years. It was then my privilege and my pleasure to appoint him to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, from which he graduated in 1934, and went into the Navy as an ensign. In 1938 he took up aviation training at Pensacola, Fla., and was later transferred to Corpus Christi, Tex., where he was an instructor in instrument flying for a year and a half before going overseas as a flyer in July 1942.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much pleased but not greatly surprised to just learn that Lieutenant Martin has received the Distinguished Flying Cross for heroic service as set forth in the following citation:

The southern Pacific force of headquarters of the commander, in the name of the President of the United States, takes pleasure in awarding Lt. William I. Martin the Distinguished Flying Cross for heroic and extraordinary achievement in action off Guadalcanal on November 13–14. Lieutenant Martin, as pilot of a scout bomber, conducted highly satisfactory search and returned safely from three operations. He personally led three attack groups against the enemy and obtained two direct heavy bomb hits on enemy ships.

This major performance of duty under heavy antiaircraft fire and an umbrella of

enemy fighters was unquestionably a major factor in the glorious victory achieved. With unswerving devotion to duty and with untiring energy he conducted his operations in a highly skillful, courageous, and aggressive manner in accord with the highest tradition of the Navy service.

Mr. Speaker, this well-deserved citation was signed by Admiral Halsey, commander of the south Pacific force. With Lieutenant Martin's fine family and many patriotic friends I take great pride in his accomplishments. We all hope and pray that he shall continue to dish it out in real Ozark style and that this Douglas County boy from the hills of southwest Missouri will safely return to his wife and two small sons, Billy and Dickey, who reside at San Gabriel, Calif.

Adjournment of Politics for the Duration

REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas a while ago complained that Mr. Michelson smeared Hoover. I think the gentleman from Kansas should be the very last man in this House to talk about smearing, because if any one was taken to task for smearing it was the gentleman himself just a short time ago, for which he was properly excoriated on the floor as well as in the press throughout the country. It would appear, therefore, that after such rebuke he would have been hesitant to complain of smearing in charging Mr. Michelson of the same practice.

Of course, there are other Members who from time to time are misled by press articles and without inquiring and ascertaining the truth or falsity of the statements contained therein, rush to the floor to express themselves on unfounded accusations and to insert the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Unlike the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], upon ascertainment of the true facts, they are not big enough or honest enough to take the floor to correct them. The gentleman from Wisconsin a few days ago referred to an article appearing in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer in which it was stated that a great deal of excess food stuffs had been shipped to Alaska, some of which had been destroyed. When he later learned that these charges were not borne out, he rose on the floor and stated that the article was not based on truth or fact. I therefore compliment the gentleman on his straightforwardness in clarifying or disclosing the actual circumstances and conditions. I further express the hope that the gentleman from Kansas and others will follow the lead of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, hardly a day passes without at least one and sometimes several gentlemen arising and assailing and attacking the President and the administration, frequently quoting from newspapers without first taking the caution to verify the truth of the assertions, damaging as they frequently are because of their inaccuracy.

A few weeks ago much publicity was given to a false newspaper report with the evident purpose of creating unfair resentment and prejudice against labor. That report was to the effect that the seamen's organization refused to load ships and thereby delayed passage of war matériel to our fighting forces at the front. An investigation developed that the report was wholly without foundation in fact, and the publisher of the newspaper could not even give the name of the man from whom he had previously claimed to have received the report. Much irreparable damage is done by such unfair and false statements before an investigation and correction can be made, and the careless making of such false statements is nothing short of reprehensible.

Some days thereafter the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] charged in effect that the President had withdrawn two of his sons from active combat service on the fighting front. It develops that that statement was made without a scintilla of evidence to support it. A copy of a newspaper bearing this inaccurate statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was handed to Elliott Roosevelt in Africa who immediately wrote his Congressman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], giving the facts concerning the active combat service of his three brothers and himself which emphatically refuted the remarks of gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]. I might add that these inaccurate and unfair statements uttered in a moment of apparent carelessness of speech have brought many protests and expressions of resentment.

And again, some days ago a letter purporting to come from Private William Smith was given out by Mr. Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and given a great deal of publicity in connection with conditions on Guadalcanal. An investigation disclosed there was no such man as William Smith on Guadalcanal and that the letter was purely a fabrication with no foundation in truth.

The continuous unfair, untrue charges and accusations in the majority of instances, as I said from the beginning, were evidently intended to create resentment and prejudice against labor.

The members of the press and others who originally opposed the defense program were known as isolationists and some insist that we should forget all that has transpired before the sneaky and cowardly Pearl Harbor attack. I hoped and wished we all could forget and forgive all that these misguided and misled people did, but unfortunately they continue indirectly and connivingly in their effort to snipe, assail, and attack so as to weaken the hands of the President. It seems to me that an effort is being made to distract the President and even our military leaders from the extraordinary and extremely important matters that confront him and them daily.

Some are charging that China is not receiving the aid and assistance to which it is entitled and that our first duty is and should be to defeat Japan. And they find fault with anything and everything that Stalin or his representatives may say, so as to create a rift and discord on the home front in our own country.

I feel that more than 98 percent of the American people are heart and soul in doing their part and their share in aiding the country to bring about early victory.

And many claim that these attacks and sniping do not affect the morale of the American people. I disagree. The best way to engender the highest morale is to be 100-percent loyal behind our President. In fact, there should be no one amongst us who in any way is permitted to give aid and comfort to our enemies. Therefore, those few who hate Roosevelt and the New Deal should be made to realize that it is not a question of Roosevelt; it is not a question of the New Deal; it is a question of our country, the saving of our freedom and independence and liberties, and the only way that it can be done is by the defeat of those who are trying to destroy us.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Scranton (Pa.) Times:

BACK WHERE IT STARTED

Rejection by the House of the Ruml plan and throwing the majority committee's report back into the lap of the House Ways and Means Committee some say mean that the whole tax proposition is back where it started. On its face that would seem to be the case. However, there is a clarification. To begin with, the Ruml plan, which has caused so much agitation, would appear to be dead. Secondly, the voting showed greater Democratic solidarity than has been in evidence during the present session.

Return of the committee's proposal for a 20-percent withholding plan means that the committee has been mandated to work out a new scheme which, from the temper of the House, ought to include some sort of compromise exoneration as well as pay-as-you-go plan. Incidentally, in our opinion there is an obligation on the part of the Treasury Department to recognize conditions, to get away from its stubborn attitude of "our plan or nothing," and to cooperate in the developing of a scheme which can be quickly presented to Congress and adopted. Any prolonged delay in working out a new plan will jeopardize its passage before the next income-tax-paying date in June.

It is observable in the voting that while the Democrats showed a greater strength than heretofore in the session, there were some

defections. Fifteen Democrats voted with 182 Republicans in favor of the Ruml plan, while 23 Republicans joined with the 189 Democrats in opposition to the plan. Yesterday's balloting in a large sense was a parliamentary maneuver, with votes to substitute, reject, and recommit coming in order.

Not in years has public interest in a tax bill been so keen as at present. Maybe the fact that more people are directly concerned with the outcome than ever before is the explanation for this great show of interest.

Which of Two Worlds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Morgan from the Boston Sunday Globe of March 7, 1943:

WHICH OF THE TWO WORLDS?—THAT IS THE CHOICE WE ARE MAKING NOW AS WE APPROACH THE FOURTH GREAT DECISION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

(By James Morgan)

We Americans are now in the confusing process of making up our minds for the fourth great decision in our history as a people. The first of those crucial decisions was registered by the Declaration of Independence. The second by our adoption of the Constitution for a more perfect union. The third by the resolution in the Civil War that a nation so conceived and so dedicated could endure and should not be permitted to perish from the earth. Now, in our day-by-day thinking and exchange of ideas, we are groping for an answer to a question that may be as fundamental as any one of those three historic judgments by public opinion.

We are facing nothing less than a choice between two worlds. First, we can abandon ourselves in despair to the acceptance of the militaristic, imperialistic world of unrestrained nationalistic competition, which has twice in a generation resulted in enveloping the globe in the flames of war. Or, secondly, we can offer a leadership toward an experiment with a world of peaceable cooperation in administering an age of abundance such as mankind never before has known.

A GLORIOUS RISK

It would be a bold and uncertain adventure. But would it be bolder or more doubtful than the chance the fathers dared to take in setting up on the fringe of a wilderness continent the first nation in this new hemisphere and the first great republican government? In an unforgettable phrase of her brilliant speech in the House of Representatives at Washington, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek sounded a challenge to the courage we need in this crisis: "It is the better part of wisdom not to accept failure ignominiously but to risk it gloriously."

SHALL WE REENACT THE FOLLIES OF THE TWENTIES

No doubt there are among us a few who still hug the primitive American delusion that we can keep out of both those worlds and isolate ourselves from the world as a whole. Those who sincerely cherish that view are entitled to our respect for their sincerity. But most of us who hold on to that wish even after there was little hope left—this writer among them—that we might escape the war and its settlement are not like the Bourbons who learned among nothing and forgot nothing.

Lloyd George said that when Stanley Baldwin did stumble on an idea, he picked himself up and went on just as if nothing had happened. We Americans cannot pick ourselves up after falling into a Second World War in a lifetime and resume our walk backward to normalcy. We cannot image ourselves reenacting the follies of the 1920's.

After the Senate in 1919 had decided for us to "let the world stew in its own juice," that most honest and devoted nationalist, Senator Borah, soon was calling in trumpet tones for an international agreement to stop the nationalistic race in armaments. But it is unbelievable that we shall again stage a Washington arms conference, scrap our warships, and pledge ourselves to leave our Pacific bases unfortified—just long enough for other powers to catch their breath before starting the next round. The inescapable logic of ultra-nationalism is an international competition in armaments.

Horace Greeley owned up that he made a lot of mistakes, but he boasted that they were always original; he never made the same mistake twice. Shall we follow this war by building an isolationist tariff wall, and then passing huge loans over it to save our international trade from ruin? Shall we so soon repeat the simian economics of the Fordney-McCumber, Smoot-Hawley tariffs? We shall presently see. The initial test of our economic sanity will come in the present session of Congress on the question of renewing the Hull Trade Agreements Act.

ANARCHY OR LAW AND ORDER?

The two main bodies in the coming collision of opinions will be the all-out, go-it-alone nationalists, who are without any faith in international cooperation, and those who believe that the nations can be saved from self destruction, if at all, only by cooperating with one another. The first argue that nations are incurably selfish. And they are. That is their duty.

But the other side contends that since individuals are capable of an enlightened selfishness, nations also may be. If they are, they must see that the self interest of every nation now is in peace and the profits of commerce, that war no longer pays dividends to anyone.

After this most destructive of all wars, there will be the biggest outburst of construction the world ever saw This will be so even in our country, although it has escaped harm from an invader. As quickly as our industrial plant can be reconverted to production for peace, it will have to fill the empty shelves of the stores, repair the run-down equipment of factories, transportation and homes, replace out-dated houses, offices, hotels, which have all been neglected ever since 1929. Plastics and air-conditioning are among big, new industries waiting for the green light.

War-wrecked Europe and Asia will be reconstructed. The merchant marine of the world will be rebuilt. Vast areas of the earth will emerge into the industrial age and be clamorous for machinery.

A SUICIDAL MARATHON

If it is to be every nation for itself and the devil take the hindmost in that international race for the recapture of markets, all alike will lose in the certain collapse of the boom and in World War No. 3, which would be as much worse than World War No. 2 as that is worse than World War No. 1 was. That suicidal marathon would be run in the air as well as on the land and the sea. Already jealous and suspicious voices are raised in Congress and Parliament as to whether we or the British are to rule the commerce of the skies.

In that new form of competition our country would be at an intolerable disadvantage, unless it joined in an imperialistic grab for landing fields on the continents and in the islands of all the seas. Once we got into that game, the American way would go glimmering among the things that were. We should have to throw overboard all our hampering traditions. For the alternative to international cooperation is the competition of nationalistic imperialisms.

AFTER THE WAR WOULD BE TOO LATE

Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, is not in the habit of overstatement or of dealing with barren idealities. Mr. Welles warns us that "there could be no surer road to disaster, no surer means of bringing about unmitigated havoc in the future than for the United Nations to enter the post-war period as rivals and opponents in their commercial and financial policies, rather than as collaborators in a common task of seeking and achieving international economic stability and general well being."

Yet, that is the mad world we shall find ourselves in when the sun goes down on the last day of the war, if we follow a policy of unrestrained nationalistic competition and unless we begin right now to shape a cooperative world. This could not hastily be improvised as a postscript to the war; over night the war of arms would run into a trade war. No league on paper could prevent that catastrophe.

WHICH OF TWO WORLDS?

Which of two worlds? That is the choice we must make now. We have no choice between isolation and internationalism. Isolation proved to be impossible in the twenties. Internationalism in one or the other of two forms is inescapable. We have only to choose whether it shall be an armed, imperialistic scramble or a great new adventure toward the waiting world, in which, for the first time, there is plenty for all.

Of course the decision is not for us to make alone. But the peoples everywhere, east and west, are waiting for America to decide her course and offer them the leadership of the one great detached power, whose only selfish interest abroad is peace, peace for her commerce and the peace that is indispensable for the preservation of her free institutions.

Creation of a Pharmacy Corps, United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread interest in legislation introduced in both branches of Congress for the commissioning of duly qualified pharmacists now on duty with the United States Army.

In civilian life the individual States have rigid laws governing the licensing of pharmacists because of their important position in the field of medicine. Pharmacists are members of an age-old profession and act as guardians of the public health. They must comply with high college standards in receiving their

degree as pharmacist, and are therefore entitled to proper recognition to their profession when called to such an assignment in military life.

I am inserting at this point the following resolution on the subject, adopted by the Blair County, Pa., Pharmaceutical Association, Altoona, Pa.

It is my hope that Congress may give favorable consideration at an early date to the legislation establishing a pharmacy corps for the United States Army.

Whereas the pharmacy corps bill (S. 216, H. R. 997) is now pending in Congress, providing for the creation of a pharmacy corps in the United States Army, to be organized under graduate pharmacists skilled and learned in the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines; and

Whereas in the treatment of disease and care of the sick or injured, the services of skilled, reliable, and experienced graduate pharmacists are essential and such services are second only to the services of skilled physicians and surgeons; and

Whereas the civilian is safeguarded by State and Federal statutes, limiting the handling of such dangerous drugs and poisons as morphine, strychnine, barbiturates, bichloride of mercury, the various serums and vaccines, sulfa drugs, et al., to professionally trained and licensed graduate pharmacists, the soldier in the armed services at the present time has no comparable safeguards; and

Whereas many men in the Army are now handling potent and dangerous drugs after only 90 days' emergency training and no previous pharmaceutical experience at all, the minimum of protection possible under present war conditions can best be obtained by the establishment of a separate pharmacy corps, whose personnel is properly trained and experienced in the science and art of materia medica, the purchase, selection, manufacture, analysis, standardization, storage, and dispensing of pharmaceuticals and biologicals; and

Whereas the health, safety, and preservation of life of every member of the armed forces of the United States is of primary and paramount importance to the safety of the Nation; and

Whereas members of the armed forces of the United States, and especially those who are overseas at various fighting fronts, are entitled to receive, and it is the policy and desire of the people of the United States to furnish to them the best treatment and the most proficient services within the power and capacity of the people, and especially the services of proficient and skilled graduate pharmacists to safeguard the health and lives of its fighting men; and

Whereas the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines is essentially a professional service requiring great skill and intimate knowledge and experience with drugs and medicines: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Blair County Pharmaceutical Association unanimously endorse the pharmacy corps bills, S. 216 and H. R. 997, and request the Members of Congress to enact the same into law; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania, and that the Senators and Representatives from Pennsylvania are hereby respectfully urged and requested to support the said pharmacy corps bill.

Madame Chiang Kai-shek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek at the civic auditorium, San Francisco, Calif., March 27, 1943:

Because China and San Francisco are only separated by an expanse of water, in speaking to you today I feel very close to my homeland; and because amongst you there live so many of my people, I am particularly touched and gratified at the warm welcome which you have accorded me. I need not tell you how greatly I appreciate and treasure the pledges of friendship which you have given by act and words to China.

While flying from Chungking to New York, and again while traversing your great country, I reflected on the changing climate and topography which I experienced and surveyed. I marvelled at the varied surface of your beautiful land modeled by the gargantuan hand of plentiful Providence. Your Great Lakes, clustering in the North and covering some 60,000 square miles, shimmer like gems studded over a vast continent. Through the great center valley flows your Mississippi, a river system of a thousand miles. From a thousand and more miles of rolling prairies and fertile plains; from the cold of the North to the warmth of the great gulf, the whole valley gently slopes from east to west like a tilted floor, with the Colorado River tearing its way down to the Gulf of California, west of the Mississippi River.

America and China are both blessed with large areas of lands in the temperate zone, and yet we have the extremes of cold and heat. Our great Manchurian plains in the northeast, our deserts with their snow-capped mountains rising sheer and straight from the plains of Mongolia, and our rich countryside stretching to the subtropic emerald isles dotted around Canton and i's vicinity, present as colorful and as varied a topography as your America. The Yangtze River with its turbulent gorges, and the Yellow River which meanders its way from the west to the east, cover territories as diverse and rich in resources and underground minerals as your vast plains and prairies. The bluffs of the Yangtze gorges, towering in somber majesty, find their parallel in the austerity of your Rockies, and the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys have their counterpart in the rolling hills of Hangchow and Fenghua. Spacious skies, spacious earth; thus I found myself comparing your country with mine.

Today we both are threatened by the lowering clouds of evil forces which, if they could, would deprive us not only of our beloved lands, but would uproot from our hearts the traditions we treasure, and erase from our minds the principles we cherish.

But far be it from being necessary that to defend and preserve what we love we must all literally shoulder arms. This would be neither practical nor practicable, for those of us who are holding the home front have a task which is just as important and vital as any being performed by our armed forces on the battlefields. Our task is to insure that the ideals of justice and freedom for which we are fighting find actuation in deeds now and in the halcyon days of peace.

In this we are not alone. History gives pertinent examples of what we have in mind. I recall that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the powers of absolutism not only gained ascendancy in Europe but were vested with the legal mantle, deriving the authorities of kings from the Godhead. Men, however, like the great Spanish Jesuit, Suarez, and John Pym in England, were not intimidated by the overwhelming forces arrayed against them. They fought for their convictions; they paid the price of unpopularity with the ruling class of the time, but in the end, as we look back, we know that they helped toward achieving the goal.

This is as true of an individual in his unremitting efforts to conquer inertness as it is true of a people. After the defeat of Napoleon III at Sedan, when the Prussian forces were in control of the forts of Paris to the north and east of the city, the French Nation, facing stupendous difficulties, pursued with unquenchable courage the quest for her rightful place in subscribing her effort to the betterment of the world.

You and I realize that the days for financial and territorial conquistadores are over, and that in their place international understanding and goodwill must be exercised as the lodestar for the future of mankind.

We are aware, too, that genius and creative thought are not delimited by race or creed. Goethe asserted that we are never in a position to draw a line of demarcation between what we have created by our own powers and what we have acquired from others. The impact of truth contained in these words derives greater impetus when we consider how distances are now so abridged by air traffic that the world has shrunk in space and size.

Another German philosopher, Schopenhauer, emphasized and reiterated the importance of the individual, and Lessing advanced the thought that the universal attitude could be the only attitude taken for man's progress and advancement.

These philosophers were Germans, and the lasting contributions they made to man's quickened perception were confined not merely to their own culture but extended to that of universal thought and civilization.

How, then, do we reconcile the profound and humanitarian ideals of certain German philosophers to the oppression and degradation now being perpetrated by the present-day Germans as personified in the Nazis? My answer is that there is no possible reconciliation, for nazi-ism has become a perverted form of national consciousness. This is true of Shintoism, and equally true of all other forms of narrow nationalism.

The present Nazi and Shintoistic indoctrinations of mendacity and deceit I attribute to the disjunctive reasoning of warped minds and they cannot endure; for only the truth and the convictions of the truth of human postulates can withstand the onslaughts of time and violence.

Some people maintain that falsity with repeated asseverations acquires that sancity beyond inquiry and analysis, but you and I would maintain that only truth can stand the test of reality whether in the past, the present, or the future.

There is at present prevailing confusion of thought which must and can be dispelled only by clear, intensive, and analytic thinking, for judgment must be predicated on ideas, and ideas preceded by meaning. This method for the clarification of the mind, reinforced with honesty of purpose and intention, would bring forth an antiphonal concord. Judicious solitude for a thinking mind forms also an essential adjunct in evolving and developing ideas and in the implementation thereof.

During my recent illness in the hospital, I had again what was, for the moment, infinite time to reassess my emotions and convictions in relation to ideas. I asked myself why must the riches of the mind be cultivated only in

quietness, solitude, and serenity? Why does the unhurried pace of ripe thinking lend harmony and creative originality to man's endeavors? Could it be that in unremitting action the achievements of human progress and richness of spirit are thereby battened; or is action oftentimes the substitute for purposeful thinking? For him who reflects, inner beliefs reached through tribulations and soul-searing experiences become profound convictions clarified and integrated.

China has been able to withstand the vicissitudes of ages because her thinking people have learned the wisdom of storing up valuable truths which are to be had if one will take the time and trouble to cultivate the inner self. You, too, realize the importance of the cultivation of the mind and the spirit through harnessing to your bidding the mechanical devices of the age. Industrial development and material comfort need not necessarily imply spiritual bankruptcy; nor leisure for thinking incongruent with vim and vigor for action. It is only when we place the emphasis solely on the material and neglect the development of the mind and the heart that decadence corrodes our being.

Oftentimes we hear learned discourses on the belief that the business of the Nation should not be relegated to the responsibility of a chosen few or, in that sense, the elite; for the elite theory, like the mythical theory of racial superiority, should be challenged by the common man. And the tenet of the common man should be the greatest possible good to the greatest possible number.

While we all agree with this thesis, have we ever thought how we should proceed to put into effect this program so that while casting overboard the elite theory we should, at the same time, offer a novation which would be competent to combat the gale of fallen ideologies?

Washington, on remarking upon the Constitution, wrote: "The warmest friends and the best supporters the Constitution has do not contend that it is free from imperfections but they found them unavoidable and are sensible if evil is likely to arise therefrom. The remedy must come hereafter. I do not think we are more inspired, have more wisdom, or possess more virtues than those that will come after us."

Granting that panaceas and foolproof blueprints of a post-war world do not exist any more than a perfect Constitution, we should not blind ourselves to the peril that confronts us today. This peril is not the winning of the war, but the winning of the peace after this war.

In the fifteenth century, John Huss, who had been promised safe conduct for his return to his people, was burnt on a pyre. The Hussites, of Bohemia, a part of present-day Czechoslovakia, inflamed by the dastardly breach of faith, rose against the German Emperor, Sigismund. Under their able and experienced leader, Ziska, they defeated the army that was sent against them by the German Emperor to compel them to return to orthodoxy against their will. Their aim was realized in the Compact of Prague. But unfortunately, factional differences developed anew amongst themselves—the Calixtines and Taborites—and were allowed to grow to such proportions that internal strife flamed up and culminated in the murderous self-destruction in the battle of Lipan.

When these two factions had a common enemy, they united and were strong against him. When they had defeated the enemy, they flew at each other's throats. Will we avert similar disaster and gain wisdom from this object lesson?

Let me relate to you a Chinese anecdote commonly known as the Peach Garden Oath. In the Han dynasty, some 2,000 years ago, there lived three men: Liu-Pei, Kuan-Yu, and Chang-Fei. Liu-Pei was of ingenuous birth; the other two of humble origin. They all were motivated nevertheless by a common ambition: To save their country from the corrupt officialdom and lawless elements then rampant.

They met together in a peach garden and took the following oath: Though we three are of different surnames, today we swear brotherhood. We will work as one man for our common cause: To save our nation. For this we are willing to die. If any breaks this pledge, may he suffer eternal perdition. Heaven be our witness.

These three men portray the spirit of service to their country. We of the United Nations have a greater aim before us—the advancement of mankind—toward which voluntary service should be our deepest pride and vicarious pain our highest decoration.

Drive Slowly—Soft Shoulders Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial written by Mr. Merle Thorpe, which appeared in the April issue of Nation's Business. There is food for thought in this statement:

DRIVE SLOWLY—SOFT SHOULDERS AHEAD!

The Delano report on security from cradle to the grave, sent to Congress by the President, recommends a permanent change in the social and economic structure of the United States. It proposes increased Government control and ownership of business, widespread insurance coverage, and a greatly expanded National Youth Administration-Work Projects Administration make work program.

The goal to be obtained is the dream and prayer of all Americans. Unfortunately, like so many short cuts, the ways and means to reach a destination so desirable are unpleasant details to be worked out later.

One thing is certain: The burden of proof is upon those who advocate such a radical change in the American way of life. Lest we forget, that way of life has made us, based upon any test, the envy of all peoples everywhere. Our well-being is the result of individual effort, with Government acting as umpire. Any plan to substitute for this a pseudo-partnership with Government "experts" must be argued for, must be defended against the known experience of America, where governmental restraints have been at a minimum, and where man has been most free.

In point of time, aside from the political expediency of the moment, the announcement of the Delano plan is unfortunate. It comes when men and women, high and low, are skeptical of the omniscience of Government planners, and of their capacity to administer their plans. Too recent is the Blue Eagle which failed to increase purchasing power; of buying and selling gold at a price fixed each morning which failed to restore commodity prices; of the annual promise to balance the Budget; of stabilizing gold, of a deficit spending policy the result of which the war has temporarily postponed; of planning in the field of labor, and of agriculture.

Still more recent are the effects of Washington planning in rubber, sugar, gasoline, fuel oil, and food, and on down to the simplest of plans, bread-slicing, tire-recapping, and pleasure driving. And there is scarcely a citizen who has not had an eye-opening personal experience with some phase of the administration of war planning in the economic field.

So, the country will await more details. Particularly will it watch for one omission in the plan—the cost. Not only the cost to those who must work, and produce, and save to provide the money, but also the cost of the additional millions of citizens who must be taken from the Nation's production line to administer as Government employees the wide range of new duties the Government proposes to take on.

While waiting for this information, we may beguile ourselves with a similar situation which confronted Alfalfa Bill Murray of Oklahoma. He was campaigning for Governor on a platform of increasing the old-age pension. When a roving correspondent, John T. Flynn, reminded him that the present payment had set the State back $25,000,000, impairing its credit, and asked the Governor how he expected to get the wherewithal for the larger pension, the Governor replied, "That, sir, is a detail to be worked out after the election."

MERLE THORPE.

Letter of Thanks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

NEW YORK, *April 1, 1943.*

Congressman PAUL W. SHAFER,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I guess the other day was about the first time in a generation that somebody in Washington decided to quit pilin' penalties on energy, ambition an' brains.

What I mean is when you voted to cancel the $25,000 limitation on salaries. You would think it affected my pocketbook, I'm that proud of you. But it doesn't an' I don't if it ever will. It only affected my soul.

You see, I was born poor. Poor in money but born rich in opportunities.

If I had been smart an' energetic enough I could have been a millionaire—or President. That was what made the whole difference, accordin' to my history books, between the United States an' the rest of the world. It might be hard—or unlikely—for a barefooted country boy to rise to the top, but it wasn't impossible. Not in the United States of America.

I've stood, shiny eyed, in front of the speaker's stand on the 4th of July a lot of times. I've heard candidates for the Senate and Congress, or big, rich, successful men, or maybe movie stars talk to the rest of us.

They always, somewhere along in their speech, got to the place where they said: "In this great land of ours the humblest man can aspire to fame, high office, riches, and great wisdom. Sickness, misfortune, or fate may bar your way—but never, my friends," the speaker would say, "never will this door

of opportunity be closed by law in this great land of the free."

Well, sir, I believed that. An' then I began to doubt. Now I believe it all over again an' I wanted to thank you for restorin' my faith.

Respectfully yours,

WALLY BOREN,

Sometimes Proprietor of Wally's Wagon.

P. S.—They tell me about 10,000,000 people a week read my pieces in This Week magazine. Me an' the Dog Wagon customers don't talk religion or politics therein, but I'd be willin' to bet that nearly all the 10,000,000 would like to join me in this little note of thanks.

Fees of Agents for Services in Securing Government Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, in the discussion on the floor last Monday there was disclosed statistical data about how much of the Government's money is being paid to persons who are acting as agents for individuals, partnerships, firms, and corporations in obtaining contracts and orders from the different Government agencies.

It may be illuminating to cite some of those figures and totals for the RECORD.

In 1939 the sum of $357,067.92 was paid to such agents as retainer fees, reimbursements of expenses, salaries, and commissions.

In 1940 the amount had risen to $587,524.51. In 1941 it was $1,936,799.55. In 1942 it will be in excess of $4,407,370. These totals account only for those who came within the purview of an investigation conducted by a committee of this body. If others who are being paid in one form or another and who did not come to public light were added to the cost of our war contracts, I believe the totals could be multiplied many times.

It is not an uncommon experience to hear of ex-Government officials, both elective and appointive, of attaching themselves to companies, or individuals, and sometimes acting as unattached agents, waxing fat, receiving fabulous sums just to use their influence in directing war contracts and obtaining favors from our agencies of Government. This Capital is overcrowded with lobbyists seeking privilege as a quality for someone interested in getting their hands into the illimitable treasuries of our Government that spring from oppressive taxes and public debt, or interested in having legislation passed to effect the same privilege.

We have the very ludicrous, paradoxical situation wherein our Government through laws enacted by this body and by orders and directives from governmental agencies can delve into the acts and affairs of a businessman or corporation to see if excessive profits were taken, and then we renegotiate his contract. This is proper, I believe, but what about the unnumbered millions of dollars that were paid to agents for their influence to obtain the original contracts with the excessive profits?

No one will ever know how much money has been paid by our taxpayers in the form of expense accounts to these agents to entertain in grandiose fashion those in authority to influence them in awarding these fat contracts.

A Senator, speaking within my hearing, said that within one proposed appropriation measure there was provided an additional $100,000,000 for waste and expedition for the contracts for which this money was to be appropriated.

We well remember the case of Ohio's famous Charlie West. It was told publicly that he enjoyed appointment to a powerful place of authority, set up bureaus, influenced the appointment of these bureaus' heads, then resigned his job, became the agent for some corporation, did business with the Government through some of these men he had helped appoint, and then sued the concern for an unpaid balance of several hundred thousand dollars for his efforts in obtaining a huge contract.

In today's Washington papers, a news item reveals testimony of a man who admits that knowledge and contact with our Government, where he was employed as a Treasury Procurement official, was useful in his receiving $112,371 in 1942 as a war broker, another name for a lobbyist. He also admits spending $25 every weekday of the year as entertainment and business gratuities expense. He said he bought smoked turkeys and presents for purchasing agents. This, gentlemen, is our taxpayers' money.

Another man testified the money he was receiving as a lobbyist or broker rose to such proportions that his conscience caused him to tell two of his clients, in substance, that they would have to find someone else to give their money to, as he was getting too much of it. This, gentlemen, is our taxpayers' money. He said that if he had not fired two of his clients, he probably would have made several hundred thousand dollars in 1942. This is our taxpayers' money, gentlemen.

I am not against a lobbyist, because he is just a salesman; or an attorney following the pursuit for which he was trained. He should be entitled to lobby and work and to receive the benefits therefrom. When we hear, however, of millions of dollars being paid to these agents on only a partial accounting, I think it is time we learned about who they are and how this money is being paid and for what purpose. It is about time a little renegotiation was put into effect on some of these commissions, fees, and retainers that are being paid to men whose only qualification is knowing someone in Government circles too well. I am introducing a bill today that will take the lid off a lot of under-cover manipulations and bring all of these lobbyists out into the open.

If the Members of this body are interested in learning some names of people who in my opinion are just as dangerous to honest American government as some of those indicted by the Dies committee, I suggest the passage of this bill.

I have heard of a concern that moved into my district, bought an unused manufacturing plant after receiving a contract from a Government agency, began to manufacture the item for which their contract called; failed by reason of ignorance, incompetency, and inexperience, in their effort to do this job; lost their contract by reason of that failure, and these same men have been back in Washington in the last month using the same lobbyist to obtain that same or another contract.

It is common talk of the street that men leaving Government employment receive large retainer fees to use their influence with the Government.

The passage of this bill will prove or disprove these statements.

If there must be lobbyists, then let them register and identify themselves. I want to know who they are and what they are doing. This House should want to know who they are and what they are doing, and our people want to know who they are and what they are doing. Let us help insure an honest Government.

Program of Ford Local No. 50 for the Willow Run Bomber Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter with enclosure giving a program for the Willow Run bomber plant:

YPSILANTI, MICH., *March 31, 1943.*

Representative JOHN LESINSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LESINSKI: I am enclosing a copy of a plan for Willow Run, which has been drafted by myself and the officers of Local 50. Naturally I do not expect you can accept every point in the program, but I think you will agree with many of them which are outlined.

I am firmly convinced that the reason for the failure to get production at Willow Run can be attributed to social conditions: Housing, health, transportation, recreation, etc. However, friction in labor relations also plays a prominent part. If these questions can be tackled courageously, I have no hesitation in saying that I am convinced that the Willow Run bomber plant can live up to the expectations which were forecast when it was first built.

At the present moment, the whole social program is muddled in governmental red tape, both at city, township, State, and Federal levels. Something must be done, either through the Truman committee, or by congressional action to alleviate this situation immediately, or the unsatisfactory production results, which we are now experiencing will continue.

Can labor expect your cooperation in helping to solve this most pressing problem? I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM MCAULEY,
Local No. 50, United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

A PROGRAM FOR WILLOW RUN

Recently the Government has announced that the number of people employed at the Willow Run bomber plant will be substantially increased. Some figures are as high as 88,000, while others are more conservative.

Whatever may be the final figure, there is little doubt that the plant will increase its present number of employees. This means that social planning must be started immediately and the friction which now exists within the plant minimized if production is to flow in any quantity from the Willow Run bomber plant.

The union, therefore, recommends the following plan for Willow Run:

1. The United Automotive Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, calls on the citizens of Ypsilanti, Ann Arbor, and those in the Willow Run area to join with them in protesting the hiring at this time of any more people at the bomber plant unless safe health standards are observed, housing and recreational facilities provided, and sufficient schools and child-care facilities are forthcoming.

2. In order to eliminate the red tape which now exists, the establishment by the Federal Government, either by congressional action or through the War Production Board, of an authority to immediately coordinate the activities of all agencies—city, township, county, State, and Federal—which are working in the field of health, child care, education, recreation, etc.

3. The War Production Board to be instructed to relax its ruling on priorities so that materials can be obtained for housing, schools, recreation, restaurants, and other social services necessary where large numbers of people are congregated.

4. Elimination, by action of the State legislature or the Office of Defense Transportation, of that section of the D. S. R. franchise which forbids them to pick up passengers outside the city of Detroit.

5. Establishment of a shuttle line on the New York Central Railroad between Detroit and the plant, with ample parking space provided at the starting points. This will allow workers to drive their cars to the station, park them, and then take the train to the plant.

6. Freezing of shifts so the share-the-ride clubs will not be disturbed.

7. Better bus service from the plant to outlying towns in Washtenaw and Wayne Counties.

8. Relaxing of the 35-mile speed limit for the workers at the plant, each car to carry a bomber plant emblem.

9. The enlargement to 10,000 of the Government's present plan to build 2,500 family units in the Willow Run area alone, these units to be built as near the plant as possible to minimize transportation difficulty.

10. The use of the State normal college for school facilities for children in the Willow Run area. This would lighten the present school load and reduce the necessity of new schools, which are needed today and will be desperately needed in the near future.

11. The planning of the proposed Willow Run trailer park to accommodate 2,000 trailers if necessary, instead of the 500 as now proposed.

12. In order to counteract the rise of juvenile delinquency, the Government to study the advisability of renting the hundreds of summer camps in the State of Michigan, and making it possible for children to be sent to these camps during the summer months.

13. In order to encourage workers to seek employment at Willow Run, and because of added transportation time and cost to the worker, the Government and the company to agree to give 1 hour's extra pay to each worker for every day worked. (Actual wages netted by Willow Run workers after the payment of daily transportation expenses average less than the prevailing rates for the Detroit area. This minimizes the inducement to work at Willow Run.)

14. The recruiting of new employees to be the responsibility of the United States Employment Service, who shall give prospective employees an aptitude and physical test before they are hired; and, upon acceptance, the employees shall be guaranteed housing and transportation in the Willow Run area before they move from their present location.

15. Competent Government engineers to study with the company and the union the possibility of decentralizing some of the work done in the plant, particularly in the manufacturing division. Expansion can come to Willow Run output through the utilization of idle facilities shortly to become available to the Detroit area.

16. The company and the union to work out a morale-building program in order to facilitate the war-production effort.

17. Liberalization of hiring standards.

18. The speeding up of grievance procedure by giving secondary supervision more authority to dispose of grievances.

19. Establishment of a labor-management committee.

Where is Dictatorship?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, so that all may have an opportunity to read it, I offer for the RECORD an article entitled "Ten Years of Roosevelt—Where Is Dictatorship?" written by Jay Franklin, and published in the Boston Daily Globe of March 4, 1943. The article follows:

TEN YEARS OF ROOSEVELT—WHERE IS DICTATORSHIP?

(By Jay Franklin)

March 4, 1943, marks the end of 10 years of Roosevelt in the White House. More than 2 years of that period have been third term. There are, of course, many angles from which such an anniversary could be discussed. There is one angle, however, which may escape detection among the pointers-with-pride and viewers-with-alarm. That is the angle of dictatorship. From time to time, over the past 10 years, it has suited the convenience of Roosevelt's opponents to charge Caesarism, to represent him as a would-be dictator.

Now there is one great example before our eyes. Adolf Hitler came to power just about the same time as Roosevelt. Since then, the German Reichsfuehrer has liquidated all internal opposition. Almost every day over the past 10 years we have read of this man, that group, and other organization going on a one-way ride for the greater power of Hitler. Today, in embattled Germany, the quickest way to qualify for a firing squad is to make a noise like a post-Hitler political movement.

The contrast is self-evident. As this column is written, reliable news reports show Wendell L. Willkie actively engaged in seeking delegates for the Republican Presidential nomination in 1944. Dr. George Gallup finds that, as of today, 51 percent of American people want Franklin D. Roosevelt to serve a fourth term if the war is still raging in 1944. Fifty-one percent. It's a poor election in Germany which does not give Hitler 99$^{99}/_{100}$ percent.

The same current news shows Congress in "revolt" against the President and his policies, trying to hold down the size of the Army, trying to scrap the administration's farm-price program, trying to seize from the President the power of appointment, and generally sabotaging the home front. The unanswerable record of the Nazi Reichstag—as a rubber-stamp organization—supplies the best criticism here.

And then of course there are the newspapers, most of which are politically opposed to Roosevelt and some of whom stop little short of treason in their effort to discredit him.

Here one need only point to the goosestep journalism of the Third Reich, as drilled by Joseph Goebbels, to demonstrate that Franklin Delano Roosevelt spoke the truth when he said that he did not have a drop of dictatorial blood in his veins.

As a matter of fact, some of the opposition to Roosevelt—particularly that expessed by the Henry Luce publications—has been based on the charge that he has not been dictatorial enough, that where Hitler has made Germany militarily formidable, Roosevelt neglected our defenses. Judging by the course of military events in recent months, Roosevelt showed that a great democracy under freedom is capable of military action on a scale which makes the totalitarian system pale with envy. And it has yet to be shown that the soldiers of a decadent democracy—in North Africa and the Solomons—are inferior in courage and ability to those of the dictatorships.

In this connection it is worth noting that the diplomacy of democracy, as represented by Churchill and Roosevelt, is capable of building and maintaining a great coalition, where the diplomacy of dictatorship has yet to knit to the Axis a single European nation except on terms of abject fear.

This is the most impressive tribute to the effectiveness of the methods of freedom in the struggle for existence. Roosevelt's war leadership has a sunny, Olympian quality which is in marked contrast to the Wagnerian thunder and gnomelike cruelty of the Nazi Valhalla. Even Roosevelt's political opponents are helping him in his task of defending America and expanding the frontiers of freedom. Hitler's political opponents are in prison, in exile, or in their graves.

No; taken by and large, Roosevelt's 10 years of free democracy stand in comparison with Hitler's 10 years of dictatorship. The only really dictatorial tendency in the United States today is that which would forbid the American people the right to decide whether they want to reelect Roosevelt next year.

We Cannot Beat Hitler by Sniping at Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial appearing in yesterday's

Philadelphia Record entitled "We Can't Beat Hitler by Sniping at Russia," and it is not an April fool's story either. I hope the Members and those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will read it. It has to do with the folly and the danger of the apathy and distrust which many Americans are displaying toward our allies. It ends up—and I have said the same thing on the floor of this House many times:

If we don't get together now, and stay together, it won't be the United States, Russia, and Britain at the peace table. It might be Germany and Italy.

The editorial follows:

WE CAN'T BEAT HITLER BY SNIPING AT RUSSIA

The headline over this editorial might have been:

"We can't beat Hitler by sniping at Britain."

Or it might have been:

"We can't beat Hitler by sniping at China."

All three statements are equally true.

But the great danger right now to unity among the United Nations is distrust of Russia on the part of her allies, particularly by Americans.

That's the line Hitler's propaganda is taking. He knows that a split between Russia and her allies to the west—United States and Britain—would enable him to snatch victory from the defeat now facing him from the Donets to Tunisia.

The Hitler line hasn't worked too well in Britain, which now has a 20-year mutual assistance treaty with Russia.

But there are some in this country who fear Stalin more than they fear Hitler—just as there were some in France who hated the Popular Front Leader Blum more than they hated Hitler.

The Record is proud to add a bit to the cause of unity by printing today an article by Joseph E. Davies, American lawyer, capitalist and former United States Ambassador to Moscow.

We asked Mr. Davies: "What will be the political effect upon Europe and the world if Russia wins a complete victory over Germany?"

We urge all our readers to study his answer.

Mr. Davies reminds us that Russia has subscribed to the Atlantic Charter, that Russia has an excellent record for keeping obligations, that we are playing Hitler's game when we find fault with an ally against a common enemy because he doesn't belong to our club.

Mr. Davies, too, voices a profound American faith in the strength of our democratic institutions against the attacks of communism or any other "ism." We heartily endorse his confidence in our way of life.

We of the United Nations have a tremendous job ahead of us before we can impose on Hitler our terms of unconditional surrender. Russia is just as anxious to see those terms in effect as we are.

We must not let Hitler use against us the old rule of divide and conquer. We must unite and conquer.

President Roosevelt's announcement that a Russian-American conference will soon be held is encouraging news.

So is his expressed hope of meeting Stalin personally.

There is much misunderstanding to clear up on both sides. There are those in Moscow who still believe that Hitler can line up Britain and the United States in his anti-Bolshevik campaign.

Let's get together with Moscow now to win the war. Let's stop worrying so much about what Russia will do at the peace table.

If we don't get together now, and stay together, it won't be the United States, Russia, and Britain at the peace table. It might be Germany and Italy.

Limitation of Tenure of Office of the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Michigan:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 24

Concurrent resolution applying to the Congress of the United States under the provisions of article V of the Constitution of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution to limit the term of office of the President of the United States by prohibiting any one person from serving for more than two terms of 4 years each

Whereas the Constitution of the United States now contains no limitation on the number of terms which may be served by one person as President; and

Whereas the sound traditional limitation of two terms for any one person, first suggested and subscribed to by George Washington, has been adhered to by all Presidents from the creation of the United States until the year 1940; and

Whereas the wisdom of the traditional limitation has been amply demonstrated to the people of the United States by the first breach thereof; and

Whereas the tradition should be translated into a positive mandate of the people by action by the States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Michigan Legislature, for the State of Michigan, invokes its power, granted under article V of the Constitution of the United States, to apply to the Congress of the United States to call a convention of the States for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution to limit the holding of the office of President of the United States by any one person to two terms of 4 years each; and be it further

Resolved, That this action of the legislature on behalf of the State of Michigan is a continuing application for the call of a convention for the purpose named herein, and the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to provide by resolution that this application be presented to each succeeding Congress until two-thirds of the States have made similar application; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and all members of the Michigan delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Drones and Slackers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Paterson Evening News, Paterson, N. J., of March 31, 1943:

A TREND IS DEVELOPING FOR A SOCIETY IN WHICH NO ONE WILL COUNT BUT THE POLITICIAN

Americans, as well as many other peoples, are hoping that after this war a new economy will afford individuals a larger measure of social security. That is a vital objective. Yet in seeking it we must beware of selling our liberties for a mess of pottage.

Eric A. Johnston, young and forward-looking president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, has warned against letting the pursuit of social security lead us into totalitarianism. When the Government subsidizes an individual, Johnston said, the Government becomes more authoritative and the individual gives up some right. "Continue the process and the state becomes total and absolute." The ballot box becomes meaningless.

The alternative to the gradual socialization of this country is for business and labor to provide their own social security within the private enterprise system. As Johnston put it:

"Trade-unionism has become an integral part of our economic life and the problem from this time forward will be to make unionism more efficient, more democratic, more socially minded. The epoch of dog-eat-dog is past for labor and management alike."

A measure of Government supervision is necessary in our complex industrial life, but business can be handicapped and thwarted in its efforts to clean house by too much Government interference.

Winston Churchill declared in respect to the Beveridge plan, that in the England he hoped to build there would be no room for "drones and shirkers" at either end of the social ladder. Sir William himself, when he laid his proposals before Parliament, stressed that they preserved the incentive motive.

An impression, for which Vice President WALLACE seems responsible, appears to be prevalent that if the administration has its way our own "drones and shirkers" will be as well fed, as well clothed, as well housed after the war as those who work for what they get. Certainly the emphasis placed in Uncle Frederic Delano's plan on Government partnership in business indicates a trend toward a society in which no one will count but the politician.

The ignoring of the National Resources Planning Board's report by Congress, the repeal of the anti-incentive limitation on salaries, the House revolt against using taxation as an instrument of social reform in favor of a real pay-as-you-go income-tax plan, the attention congressional committees are giving domestic post-war matters—all show an awareness on Capitol Hill of the danger to which Mr. Johnston referred.

Americans now in the armed forces will demand, when the war is over, a chance to earn an honest living. They don't expect

"to be wrapped in cotton wool and spoonfed by a patronizing Government." As little do they want to come home to a country that has gone totalitarian while they have been fighting totalitarianism abroad.

The only social security they need is an opportunity for the free play of the abilities God has given them.

That's the American way.

Paul Porter's Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald of March 26, 1943:

PAUL PORTER'S TAX PLAN

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Congress has been debating the Rumi plan, the Treasury plan, and numerous other plans of taxation, and so it may be of interest to unveil still another plan, which may be called the Paul Porter plan.

Paul Porter is head of the shipping division of the War Labor Board. On February 1, 1943, he was Chief of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Branch of the War Production Board.

But on February 1, 1943, Representative MARTIN DIES, of Texas, made a speech on the floor of the House in which he touched lightly upon Mr. Porter's public record. Whereupon Porter was transported, but not out of the Government. Only over to the War Labor Board.

The taxpayers of the United States were paying him $8,000 a year to look after their interests while he was with the War Production Board. They are doing the same while he does what he does over at the War Labor Board.

And so, in order that the taxpayers who support Mr. Porter may have a little idea what kind of gent he is and what he believes in, we present the Porter tax plan.

It was issued by the Socialist Party of the United States from its office at No. 549 Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill., in 1934, which was prior to Mr. Porter's landing on the United States Government's pay roll at $8,000 a year.

Anybody who wanted to know his aims and objects and what could be expected of him as a public servant of the present system of American life could easily have found out, as his tax plan was signed by him and his name was bold on its front cover.

The Porter plan is best stated by three direct quotations from its text, and these are:

"1. All natural resources (of the United States) such as minerals, forests, and waterpower sites, all banks, insurance companies, and public utilities, and all basic industries such as mining and the manufacture of steel, automobiles, and textiles, shall be public property.

"Other industries and services, and all city land and buildings which are not used or occupied by their owners, shall also be taken over by the Government as rapidly as possible and in the order of their importance to society.

"All owners of stocks, bonds, mortgages, land, buildings, or equipment affected shall be required to surrender them in return for Commonwealth bonds.

"2. Land worked by its owners shall remain in their possession. All other farm land, all farm mortgages, and all marketing and processing agencies, such as stockyards, elevators, packing houses, mills, dairies, canneries, and gins, shall be declared public property and shall be taken over by the Government in exchange for Commonwealth bonds. * * *

"3. A National Assessment Board shall be established to set a fair valuation on the property to be taken over by the Government. The valuation shall be based upon the present cost of production or the present prudent investment value, whichever is the lower.

"In exchange for all such property there shall be issued Commonwealth bonds of like value. These bonds shall not bear interest, but shall entitle the holder to 20 annual payments, each of 5 percent of their face value. The payments may be considered as income for purposes of taxation * * *.

"The income of all persons shall be limited to $10,400 a year ($200 a week) by a tax of 100 percent upon all income exceeding that amount."

And that's the killer. Confiscate all property of any importance whatsoever except subsistence farms and dwelling houses, limit incomes—drive everybody to working for the Government. State socialism, brother, or communism and fascism.

Paul Porter, supported by the taxpayers of the United States and under an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, turns out to be a man who has prepared a detailed plan for destroying the system of living that has made the United States worth while.

WHY?

The soldiers, sailors, and marines of the United States are fighting all around the world to secure the way of life under which this Nation grew. The rest of the people are pouring out their sweat and their treasure for the same purposes.

Nobody begrudges the blood, sweat, tears, and wealth necessary to save what we have and what we are.

But can the same be said about financing Porter and plans? Not at the expense of the taxpayers, surely. Not on the Government pay roll while he gnaws at the base of our security and happiness.

Who put this Porter on the public pay roll? Who keeps him there? Questions for Congress to answer.

Jim Farley Popular in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, recently Hon. James A. Farley visited Texas and at the time of his visit there appeared in the Dallas Times-Herald an editorial entitled "Welcome to Jim Farley," which expresses the feeling of many Texans toward this outstanding American, and under leave granted, same is submitted herewith:

WELCOME TO JIM FARLEY

Here in Texas we are always glad when James A. Farley pays us a visit. He is an easterner and New Yorker whom we find remarkably congenial. In fact, he seems like a native Texan only temporarily sojourning in New York.

Jim Farley is not in politics at this time, yet the vast circle of friends that he made during his years of political activity is still intact. In making friends, Mr. Farley was not merely trying to win votes, but was seeking to know and understand, personally, his fellow countrymen.

Mr. Farley once confessed to being a politician, and his skill in political activity has been amply demonstrated. Nevertheless, he has proved that he is not the sort of politician who is willing to trim his sails to every wind.

Perhaps the outstanding thing about Jim Farley is his profound devotion to the American way of life and his ability to realize that one part of the Nation is as important as another. We like to think of him as being Texan in his characteristics, but we must admit that he seems to be at home wherever he is on American soil. No matter which way the political winds blow, we shall welcome him to Texas as a man that it is a pleasure to know.

Defeating the Axis on the Home Front

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include an outstanding address delivered by Mr. W. E. Mallalieu, general manager, National Board of Fire Underwriters, at the twentieth annual meeting of the National Fire Waste Council, held in Washington April 2, 1943. This address, on the subject of defeating the Axis on the home front, is an illuminating and inspiring presentation of the character and extent of the splendid cooperation in the war effort being made by private enterprise in the essential field of fire protection and the prevention of production interruption by fire waste:

American industry has always considered it important to reduce fires and accidents to a minimum. Now it is imperative. The challenge of the Axis makes safety measures in war plants not only a moral but a patriotic obligation as well. Today not a single hour should be lost in the battle of production.

Fighting on the home front may not have the violence or drama of a front-line battle but it is just as vital. For the war front is an extension of the home front—a literal reflection of ability to organize machines, materials, and manpower for combat service and keep them producing.

America's production miracles, amazing not only to our enemies but to our allies as well, prove the quality of our home front. The Army and Navy E for excellence, doubtless awarded to many industries represented on this council besides numerous industrial members of our national chamber, demonstrates the determination of free men to cooperate and work exhaustingly until the business of defeating the Axis is triumphantly finished.

In developing a victorious home front no group has contributed more loyally than the fire- and casualty-insurance companies. Theirs has been the job of action, education, of anticipating trouble, of being ready with the right measure to eliminate potential danger and thus maintain production schedules. They have done it conscientiously and

modestly and their work continues to grow in importance.

Its real importance can be revealed most vividly by asking a grim yet necessary question. How can our bombers, protecting American interests amid the south Pacific area, or the jeeps and tanks now traversing the desert wastes of Africa, be supplemented by additional machines but for the safeguards which the insurance companies have developed? Without knowledge of fire hazards and how to cope with them munitions of war would be delayed—they might arrive too late. These materials can be produced only if our war plants continue to operate without interruption.

How has the insurance industry helped to develop the Nation's productive abilities? How has their vast fund of technical information been organized so that it can be used to the utmost advantage in speeding war materials?

The story is another example of voluntary cooperation, of democracy in action. Through the creation of a National Bureau for Industrial Protection, the fire, casualty, and steam boiler insurance industries were able to offer the services of their trained engineers for immediate action. Companies of every type contributed their specialists. A total of several thousand war plants are now protected by this service, plants which otherwise would be exposed to the crippling loss of time and waste from fires and accidents. No legislation was necessary for this.

These engineers are trained to look for possible trouble so there won't be any. Their efforts increase production by seeking out the causes of fires and accidents, and then eliminating them. Their work is unrelaxing, continuous, 24 hours a day.

Progress has been fast and efficient and refinements in organization have moved forward steadily. The various State insurance-inspection bureaus, as far as possible, and other fire and casualty companies and their associations have assumed the responsibility for determining which conditions should be reported to the National Bureau. A standardized system has been developed for making inspections and making reports. Reinspections are frequently necessary, not only of the manufacturing plants but of every storage facility of any importance.

The National Fire Waste Council and every friend of the council knows that, in a large measure, victory will depend on whether enough war materials reach our fighting forces and whether they arrive in time. That is why the engineering knowledge of staff members of the National Bureau for Industrial Protection was made available immediately to the appropriate branches of the Army, the Navy, the Defense Plants Corporation and to the War Production Board thus providing a still greater degree of fire protection and safety measures in war plants. Furthermore, the same service was given to the Government agencies charged with the responsibility of safeguarding the storage of critical materials.

These services add up to an amazing total. The country has actually been experiencing an almost complete freedom from effective sabatoge in our war plants and a relative immunity from serious fires or other casualties adversely affecting production.

Speed has been a decisive factor in the battle of production. New factories costing millions of dollars had to be built, and vast new communities mushroomed into existence almost overnight. Yet, most of the new plants have been constructed in accordance with recognized standards of safety devised by the fire insurance industry in cooperation with the construction industry. Practically all of the plants include such protective features as standpipe and hose systems, sprinkler equipment, yard water-main systems and other fire-extinguishing appliances. These, too, were developed by the fire-insurance business.

So unspectacular are the services provided by the fire and casualty companies that probably many persons do not clearly visualize how important the various prevention and safety measures are to every citizen, particularly in these hard-pressed days of war production. But the record shows that there is hardly a safety feature in the modern war plant whose original perfection is not connected with the research work of the Nation's fire insurance and casualty companies. Often these features contribute to efficiency in production as well as to the reduction of accidents and fire hazards. Typical examples are modern ventilating and exhaust systems; paint spraying and dip tanks; the widespread use of acetylene equipment; and gas systems for welding and cutting.

Research conducted by the fire-insurance industry also has a constructive influence upon civilian wartime problems. Almost every person along the eastern seaboard has been affected by the oil shortage during the past winter and many of us are hopeful that the new oil pipe line from Texas to the East will be completed soon. When this is accomplished, the experience of the fire-insurance industry will be utilized to assure safe delivery of the fuel, because standards for the safe discharge of flammable liquids from tank cars and petroleum pipe lines were developed years ago by the insurance companies and the petroleum industry.

Although the Nation's fire loss has been cut approximately 40 percent from the half-billion dollars wasted annually during the period following the First World War, today even more intensive work is necessary. An extra effort is being made by the National Board of Fire Underwriters. Since September 1940 we have maintained in the War Department in Washington an Advisory Bureau on Fire Protection to which engineers have been assigned on a full-time basis. Augmented by nearly 100 engineers from other insurance organizations, they form a corps of highly qualified fire-inspection specialists, immediately available for Government projects.

This War Department Advisory Bureau is thorough. It has collaborated in the preparation of the best possible fire protection standards for each individual type of project—such projects as cantonments, training centers, hospitals, ordnance plants and depots, chemical warfare plants, and storage depots. The standards apply to fire-protection devices, fire department and fire alarm apparatus, water-supply distribution systems, and heating installations. To date, these engineers have inspected and advised on approximately 600 Army and affiliated projects and have made a total of more than 2,000 inspections and reinspections.

One of the most vital links of the victory chain which America is forging is the shipyard. Fighting equipment cannot reach foreign shores promptly if fires retard building schedules. Therefore, an advisory group for fire protection was set up by the National Board of Fire Underwriters in the Bureau of Yards and Docks of the Navy Department, which provides consultative services for both Navy shore establishments and private shipyards working on Government orders. Since October 1940, when the work was undertaken, a total of 120 naval establishments and 161 private shipyards have been inspected. Subsequent visits were frequently made to check whether engineers' suggestions were being followed.

All this has been accomplished voluntarily by the fire-insurance companies, a result of their deeply rooted instinct for service. Last year the Coast Guard was made part of the expanding program. Specifically, the captains of the port of the Coast Guard in more than 100 ports throughout the country are now charged with these fire-prevention duties: To see that piers and wharves are not damaged or destroyed by fire; that auxiliary fireboats are available to fight any fires that do occur; that these boats are manned by trained personnel; and that unauthorized persons do not gain access to the piers.

Our engineers assigned to this work were consulted on the design of fireboats which have been provided, and on the allocation of these boats to ports along all coasts of the United States. They also have advised on the adequacy of fire-protection facilities at a number of Coast Guard establishments, and devote much time to the important work of analyzing the port-security plans submitted by captains of the port. Miscellaneous activities include discussion of training facilities, distribution of fireboats, and recommendations for equipment carried on these boats and trailer pumpers.

Practically all of these diverse activities are unspectacular. Little is known of them publicly. Yet without this specialized knowledge of fire prevention and fire protection, and its utilization, the country's gigantic war program would be exposed to frequent stoppage from various controllable hazards. The fire-insurance industry, equipped by years of experience, is in a position to do this particular job, and it is a happy privilege for us to do it.

Some may think that the average individual has no place in the fire-prevention phase of the war program. I want to stress most emphatically, however, that there is a job for every man, woman, and child in the struggle to preserve the country's resources against damage by fire. Fires and industrial casualties are friends of the Axis—whether caused by carelessness or saboteurs. They are among the first-line enemies of increased production.

Defense workers as well as businessmen, schoolchildren, and housewives, farmers and office workers all owe our country this pledge: "I will not be responsible for a preventable fire or industrial accident." Each one can help prevent crippling delays by simply being careful.

I think you will agree that the fire- and casualty-insurance companies have made a brilliant blueprint for practical cooperation between Government and business. This formidable job is being carried out by using the machinery created by private enterprise, and it is concrete proof of the flexibility of our national economy. We feel that it is an obligation to contribute to the preservation of that enterprise and we believe the industry is meeting this obligation.

Hitler may rant and rave, and threaten our destruction. He may even try to bomb our factories to rubble or burn them to the ground. But we know and you know that this war will be won by American production. Every fire and accident which you can prevent is another defeat for the Axis. The insurance industry must continue to sound the alert for the American way of life it has helped to build.

Difficulties of Dairy Farmers Under the O. P. A.

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 I brought to the attention of the Members of Congress the difficulties of dairy farmers under present Office of Price Administration regulations. On

that date I wrote to the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, concerning the possibility of a shortage of milk in western Massachusetts during the coming months. I also brought to their attention the sale and disposal of one of the finest dairy herds in the Connecticut Valley, that of Mr. Arthur L. Donnellan at South Hadley. Since that time I have talked with another producer of milk whose family has been in the dairy business for at least 40 years.

At present this producer has a herd of about 60 head of cattle of which 40 to 45 are producers of milk. A year and a half ago he had 100 head, but due to the inability to secure farm labor he has reduced the number to 60. Today he finds himself in two predicaments. First, he has only one man to take care of all 60 cows, as he is unable to do heavy work himself. Second, the cost of feed for his cows and the general expenses of running his plant have increased to such an extent that it is not possible for him to carry on profitably. He serves about 200 families in the city of Springfield. He believes that unless some relief is given to producers of milk it will be necessary for him to sell his herd also. While he believes that there will be sufficient milk for local consumption from now until July, this man, who has been in the milk business all his life, feels equally certain that unless some steps are taken to change the present situation there will be a serious shortage of milk in western Massachusetts after July, and particularly if there is a dry spell. Since we had an unusually rainy season last summer, such a dry spell is likely.

Some months before the United States entered the War, I am told that the Administration placed an absolute embargo upon shipments of wheat from Canada to the United States. In these days, when transportation facilities to the east coast are difficult to secure, I believe that this embargo should be lifted and that wheat supplies should be permitted to enter the Northeast from Canada. Such supplies would provide feed for both milk and poultry producers at lower prices than at present if the prices were fixed at reasonable figures either by the Department of Agriculture or the Office of Price Administration. The labor shortage on farms must be taken care of and presumably every effort is being made to solve that critical situation in our war effort. In order that the members of Congress may be advised of the views of outstanding leaders in western Massachusetts on this subject, I am adding to this statement two news articles from the Springfield Union of March 26 and April 1, 1943, and the reply which I have received to my letter from Hon. Prentiss M. Brown.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union of March 26, 1943]

ACUTE MILK SHORTAGE AHEAD—CORT BASES PREDICTIONS ON GROUND 4,000 COWS HAVE BEEN DISPOSED OF BY PRODUCERS DURING YEAR

Fear of an acute milk shortage in this area in July and August, when the surplus season ends, is seen by J. C. Cort, State director of the milk control board, who was in Springfield yesterday to impress 93 milk dealers, producer dealers, and intermediate dealers with the necessity of supplying the board with information on the amount of milk purchased, the amount of milk sold, and the amount of milk produced, from month to month.

Mr. Cort made it plain that at the present time there is a surplus of milk in this area, but that in the summer there is bound to be a shortage of milk because, during the last year, 4,000 cows were disposed of by producers, and indications are that this year there is another 10-percent reduction in heads of cattle in this State.

Reasons for this decrease in cows as given by Mr. Cort are that, during the last year and a half, there has been but one one-half cent increase per quart paid to producers because of the Office of Price Administration ceiling on the price of milk, while no ceiling has been placed on the price of grains, on labor, and on living expenses, and because the Government has drafted experienced farm hands while deferring men in defense factories. Some producers have become discouraged and have sold out their herds and gone to work in defense plants, attracted by the wages. Others have reduced the size of their herds because of inability to pay laborers due to the reducing incomes.

RAISE OWN FOODSTUFFS

Many of the milk producers would not be able to live except that they had raised their own foodstuffs, Mr. Cort said.

The three classes of dealers are the milk dealers, who have their own pasteurizing plants; producers, who pasteurize their own milk; and intermediary dealers, who buy their milk from others already pasteurized and bottled. They have been negligent in many cases in reporting to the State board on the amount bought, sold, or produced.

Because the State board realizes, from its surveys and its own observations, that the Nation faces a milk shortage, which will be felt particularly by the parents of infants, and because it fears that, due to discouragement and lack of interest, the producers may become careless in the pasteurization and handling of milk, a dangerous situation may be created, the State board insists that the dealers report regularly on the supply of milk bought, sold, and produced.

INFORMATION SOUGHT

Washington officials are asking for information on the milk situation because of the probability of a national shortage, and the milk control board wants to be in a position to provide the latest information to the Federal Government, to insure the people of Massachusetts of their fair share of milk.

The Federal Office of Price Administration ceiling on the price of milk has resulted in past increases in the price being held in escrow by some of the large producers, and naturally this has failed to benefit the producers, who have become alarmed at the increases they have had to pay for grain, labor, and living costs, which they charge have not been effectively controlled by price ceilings.

There is to be a conference of New England Governors soon to discuss the milk situation, which is viewed by officials with alarm, and they intend to appeal to Washington to do something to encourage the milk producers to continue in business so that babies and children may be able to get milk during the summer.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union of April 1, 1943]

FEARS UNITED STATES ACTS TOO LATE TO BE SAVIOR TO MILK—DISTRIBUTOR SAYS LONG VIEW IS NEEDED TO OFFSET PRESENT INGROWING TREND

Any steps which the Government may take upon advisement of President Roosevelt or the new Agricultural Administrator, Chester C. Davis, to relieve the farm-labor shortage will come too late to mend the damage which has already been done to the milk production of this country, Malcolm K. Skipton, president of the Skipton Co. and a leading distributor, declared last night.

NEEDS LONG-RANGE VIEW

Referring to an announcement by President Roosevelt Tuesday that relief measures are being considered through the releasing from the Army of farm workers over 38, assigning of conscientious objectors to farms, and encouraging farmers now in industry to return to the land, Skipton said that long-range planning is necessary in the milk business. Dairy cows do not freshen overnight.

Dealers are not asking for anything for themselves, he said, in backing the producers in seeking an added one-half cent per quart raise in the present consumer price. The producers must get more money from the consumer to keep on producing, and it is to the advantage of the dealers to see that the producers keep the milk flowing, Skipton said.

If anything is to be done to relieve the situation it must be done immediately, said Skipton. Although he felt that any drafting of volunteer workers, including students, or the importing of agricultural workers from the Bahamas, Jamaica, and Mexico would have little effect upon saving local producers, he noted that the return of Army men and those in industries back to the farm in cases where that has been their occupation is necessary to guarantee a future supply of milk.

"We are just about meeting requirements now when there should be a surplus of milk. Now is usually the flush or high-production season. I think there will be a very bad situation in the late summer and fall," said Skipton, predicting a milk shortage after August. "Milk is something which should flow freely and ought not to have to be rationed."

The milk situation, which has been growing steadily worse, was not seen as a temporary bad condition. In fact, according to Skipton and Harry J. Talmage of the New England Milk Producers Association, milk will be scarce from late August on for some years after the war unless immediate steps are taken. Already the dearth of young heifers presents a shadow over the milk-production prospects for the future, it was said, and unless more active interest is taken in breeding and producing for next year the shortage will grow so acute as to cause panic, it was forecast.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1943.

The Honorable CHARLES R. CLASON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CLASON: This is in reply to your letter of March 23, together with attached clippings from the Springfield (Mass.) Union, which describes the sale of a dairy herd in the area which supplies the Springfield market with milk.

For some time the Massachusetts Milk Control Board and groups of producers in certain parts of Massachusetts have sought from this Office permission to increase milk prices, both to producers and at retail, above current price levels in these particular areas. The highest retail price for standard milk in any part of New England today is 16 cents per quart. This price level exists in most of the thickly settled portions of the States of Rhode Island and Connecticut and in portions of Massachusetts. The areas within the State of Massachusetts which exhibit a 16-cent retail price today consist mainly of the Boston metropolitan area, southeastern Massachusetts, Worcester, Pittsfield, and Haverhill. The current 16-cent price in the Boston metropolitan area will be reduced to 15½ cents per quart within 60 days. The retail price in the Springfield market is now 15½ cents per

quart at retail and any action taken by this Office to increase that price above its current level could not be confined to the Springfield area but would have to be extended to many other parts of the State.

In this connection I should like to point out that there exists today in the entire New England area a generally sound pattern of milk prices, both at retail and to producers. Our regional office in Boston has been guided in its determination as to maximum prices for milk, both to producers and at retail, by the level of producer prices established for milk producers who ship milk into the Boston metropolitan area. These prices are established by the Secretary of Agriculture, Claude R. Wickard, under the authority granted him by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. Producer prices in areas between Boston and the major sources of milk supply are graduated downward from the level of producer prices in the Boston market in accordance with established freight rates.

It is a well-established principle that secondary markets in the milkshed of a large primary market can secure their milk supplies at prices lower than the f. o. b. city prices for milk in the primary market because of the lesser cost of transporting milk to secondary markets from the point at which it is produced. On this basis, which we believe to be sound, the present class I price in the Springfield market of $4.02 per hundredweight compares very favorably with the class I price of $4.10 per hundredweight in the Boston market. The difference in transportation cost from the point of production to market, as described above, operates to give the milk producer who ships milk into the Springfield market approximately the same price at his farm which is received by producers shipping milk to the Boston market. The general conditions of production for dairy farmers who produce milk sold in the Springfield market are closely similar to those experienced by dairy farmers producing milk for sale in the Boston market. We believe that so long as this condition exists we can justly claim that we are according equal treatment to milk producers, not only in the Springfield market, but elsewhere in Massachusetts.

It is our considered opinion that the Massachusetts Milk Control Board does not have a sound foundation on which to base its claim that the price of milk should be raised in the Springfield market 1 cent per quart. We believe that the foregoing description of the milk-price situation in Massachusetts fully justifies our reluctance to permit further increase in milk prices in the Springfield market at this time. We are, however, anxious that proper price relationships should be maintained among all the New England milk markets and are prepared to make necessary upward adjustments in milk prices both to producers and at retail if the general level of milk prices in New England should be raised.

With regard to your request for information as to whether prices cannot be raised for milk in Massachusets at the present time owing to regulations of this office, I should like to point out that prices for milk received by producers who ship milk into the Boston, Lowell-Lawrence, and Fall River markets are exclusively under the jurisdiction of the United States Secretary of Agriculture.

Prices of milk sold at wholesale and retail in the above-mentioned markets, together with prices for milk both to producers and at retail and wholesale elsewhere in Massachusetts, are controlled by regulations issued by this office.

In response to your request for a survey of the Springfield area, I should like to point out that our Boston office is well informed as to the price relationship and other relevant information concerning the Springfield and other Massachusetts milk markets. I should like to add that our regulations contain provisions for price adjustments where it can be demonstrated that price action must be taken to prevent or correct local shortages of milk. I am confident that our Boston office will take any action with respect to milk prices which should be taken in accordance with the adjustment provisions contained in our regulations I shall be glad to forward our Boston office a copy of your request and I shall ask them to inform me of the current milk price situation in Springfield. If it should develop that price action is necessary in the Springfield market, I shall be glad to inform you promptly both as to the nature and the reasons for whatever price action is taken.

I wish to thank you for bringing this matter to my attention and I trust that the foregoing explanation of our price policy for milk in the New England area will be satisfactory.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator.

Lest We Forget

REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, 26 years ago on the legislative day of April 5, 1917, but actually about 3 o'clock a. m. of the calendar day of April 6, 1917, this House, by a vote of 373 yeas, 50 nays, and 9 not voting, adopted the declaration of war with Germany in World War No. 1.

Woodrow Wilson was then President of the United States. He was a great statesman, a great idealist, a great humanitarian, a great leader, and a great President. We know now as never before that had we followed that great leader, the present catastrophe might possibly have never come. However others may feel as to the truth of that statement, I am willing to appear before my Maker with an abiding conviction in its everlasting truth.

What Mr. Wilson said in his immortal war message of April 2, 1917, applies with equal force today.

I quote:

It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free.

To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other.

Woodrow Wilson was a prophet. History will record him as an immortal prophet, and I insert here as a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared yesterday in the Washington Star under the heading "Immortal prophet":

IMMORTAL PROPHET

When Woodrow Wilson died on February 3, 1924, there were more than a few of his countrymen who frankly thought that his influence was at an end. He had stood for ideals which no longer were fashionable; and now that his final breath was spent, he would have his rest and the world would go on very much as it had before his life had started. What was wanted was a more realistic philosophy than his. Practical leaders, it was expected, would follow one another through the discernible future.

And the anticipation so set forth was justified by the sequence of events. The Nation prospered, and its people were happy in the enjoyment of their accumulating wealth. News of trouble abroad reached them only as though it came from another planet. They were at peace with all their neighbors, and there seemed no reason why they ever again should be involved in armed conflict with any foreign government.

Meanwhile the twenty-eighth President of the United States passed beyond the concern of the masses he had sought to serve. If he were not altogether forgotten, he was taken for granted. A few faithful adherents made pilgrimage to his tomb in Washington Cathedral on successive Armistice Days. His portrait adorned a 17-cent postage stamp.

But Mr. Wilson was not born to be lost in obscurity. There was in him a light which still burns with undiminished power. His sympathy and his intelligence continue to affect the destiny of the world. A single illustration of his strength as an immortal prophet is to be found in these words, written by him December 30, 1918, and now repeated for their application to present times and current conditions among men: "Friendship must have machinery. If I cannot correspond with you, if I cannot learn your mind, if I cannot cooperate with you, I cannot be your friend, and if the world is to remain a body of friends it must have the means of friendship, the means of constant friendly intercourse, the means of constant watchfulness over the common interest * * *. I never thought that I had a big difference with a man that I did not find when I came into conference with him that, after all, it was rather a little difference and that if we were frank with one another and did not too much stand upon that great enemy of mankind, which is called pride, we could come together. It is the wish to come together that is more than half of the process."

That's Where the Money Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following table I shows the number of payees receiving checks for $1,000 or more in connection with the agricultural program. Since in the past these big checks have been justified as needed to get the big producer to reduce

his production, why should they get these checks for restricting their production when we are spending millions for increasing production? We hear of much legislative opposition to the family sized farm operator:

TABLE I.—*Payments to payees who received $1,000 or more under the 1941 agricultural conservation and parity payment programs*

State	Number of payees	Payments			
		Agricultural conservation program	Parity	Naval stores	Total
Alabama	531	$546,334.78	$344,739.19	$138,114.60	$1,029,188.57
Arizona	784	1,399,467.78	1,032,716.60		2,432,184.38
Arkansas	2,153	2,898,579.27	2,526,621.47		5,425,200.74
California	2,332	3,637,953.54	3,047,630.94		6,685,584.48
Colorado	380	499,661.05	153,271.86		652,932.91
Connecticut	32	74,260.91	138,341.56		212,602.47
Delaware	15	17,078.14	5,006.18		22,084.32
Florida	316	369,812.69	2,198.94	420,967.97	792,979.60
Georgia	1,019	879,139.14	581,035.43	448,988.85	1,909,163.42
Idaho	409	369,661.77	341,275.61		710,937.38
Illinois	2,021	2,156,349.65	1,043,816.02		3,200,165.67
Indiana	522	572,786.79	286,161.48		858,948.27
Iowa	1,799	1,887,815.84	837,409.57		2,725,225.51
Kansas	2,660	2,582,123.90	1,846,086.98		4,428,210.88
Kentucky	111	138,771.28	48,064.58		186,835.86
Louisiana	716	861,213.00	802,261.72		1,663,474.72
Maine	66	131,603.03			131,603.03
Maryland	52	49,154.16	21,935.14		71,089.30
Massachusetts	9	21,259.17	74,821.54		96,080.71
Michigan	14	16,299.39	6,286.55		22,585.94
Minnesota	432	592,847.61	285,003.15		877,850.76
Mississippi	1,940	3,168,483.16	2,587,412.14	36,921.84	5,792,817.14
Missouri	851	967,429.55	755,299.46		1,722,729.01
Montana	1,262	1,341,744.07	684,257.49		2,026,001.56
Nebraska	882	959,439.87	565,894.48		1,525,334.35
Nevada	19	36,532.06	3,430.54		39,962.60
New Hampshire	1	1,063.75	747.69		1,811.44
New Jersey	11	43,122.44	143,606.80		186,729.24
New Mexico	599	943,435.18	416,468.11		1,359,903.29
New York	30	66,186.78	137,933.20		204,119.98
North Carolina	313	332,645.86	221,035.67		553,681.53
North Dakota	1,072	1,111,150.28	627,448.53		1,738,598.81
Ohio	347	380,499.09	245,054.93		625,554.02
Oklahoma	889	862,548.13	518,755.71		1,381,303.84
Oregon	710	829,449.09	661,412.54		1,490,861.63
Pennsylvania	39	68,507.76	19,374.27		87,882.03
Rhode Island	3	3,276.02			3,276.02
South Carolina	873	888,238.74	640,329.54	24,436.87	1,553,005.15
South Dakota	627	790,705.98	208,318.60		999,024.58
Tennessee	269	299,237.92	220,140.03		519,377.95
Texas	6,428	8,119,233.40	4,401,257.26		12,520,490.66
Utah	88	103,290.46	52,134.10		155,424.56
Vermont	8	19,657.52	21,350.68		41,008.20
Virginia	25	40,198.15	3,995.08		44,193.23
Washington	1,195	1,158,764.92	1,168,118.30		2,326,883.22
West Virginia	1	1,060.85	133.94		1,194.79
Wisconsin	39	61,242.07	55,563.28		116,805.35
Wyoming	254	466,716.49	31,577.24		498,293.73
Alaska					
Hawaii	26	72,092.91			72,092.91
Puerto Rico	32	50,699.15	4,460.89		55,160.04
Total	35,206	42,888,824.64	27,820,195.01	1,069,430.13	71,778,449.78

The following table II shows that 53 percent of the farmers get less than $20 per farm subsidy and 81 to 94 percent of the farmers receive less than $100:

TABLE II.—*Estimated number of payees and percentage distribution by size groups, 1941 conservation and parity payment programs*

Size of payment	Agricultural conservation program			Parity payment program		
	Number	Percent	Cumulative (percent)	Number	Percent	Cumulative (percent)
$0.00 to $20	1,607,203	27.39	27.39	3,029,372	53.38	53.38
$20.01 to $40	1,452,190	24.75	52.14	1,419,505	25.01	78.39
$40.01 to $60	830,017	14.14	66.28	520,917	9.18	87.57
$60.01 to $100	864,060	14.73	81.01	390,500	6.88	94.45
$100.01 to $150	473,245	8.07	89.08	161,460	2.85	97.30
$150.01 to $200	274,726	4.68	93.76	63,128	1.11	98.41
$200.01 to $300	196,008	3.34	97.10	45,912	.81	99.22
$300.01 to $400	78,669	1.34	89.44	17,627	.31	99.53
$400.01 to $500	36,336	.62	99.06	8,566	.15	99.68
$500.01 to $1,000	42,189	.719	99.779	11,998	.21	99.89
$1,001.01 to $2,000	9,772	.166	99.945	4,415	.08	99.97
$2,000.01 to $3,000	1,868	.032	99.977	906	.02	99.99
$3,000.01 to $4,000	664	.011	99.988	263	.005	99.995
$4,000.01 to $5,000	288	.005	99.993	130	.002	99.997
$5,000.01 to $10,000	392	.007	100.000	173	.003	100.000
$10,000.01 and above				10	(1)	
Total	5,867,627	100.000		5,674,882	100.000	

[1] Less than $0.0005.

A Challenge to Private Enterprise

REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the revolutionary report of the National Resources Planning Board is a challenge to private enterprise. It is a sugar-coated proposal to be directed by bureaucrats in Washington. The social planners propose to build this program on a foundation of debt. They seek to make this a nation of "goose-steppers." A system of this kind will lead to regimentation, seizure of farms, industries, and labor unions. In the past few years the New Deal has substituted bureaucracy for the hard-won experience of tried Americanism. They want to take over the transportation systems, public utilities, banks, insurance companies, our schools, and continue controls over production.

It is fair to point out, however, that millions of our people are in substantial agreement with certain social objectives as roughly outlined in the Resources Planning Board's report. It is my belief, as a whole, the individualistic American, as well as the individualistic Britisher, will not in a post-war or any other period ever subject himself to the totalitarian doctrines of central Europe, which we are now practicing to a great degree. I do not believe we should give up our freedom and submit to dictatorship in order to establish a post-war economic program. Our people will have to make a choice between private enterprise and Government bureaucracy. There is no question as to how real Americans will decide. We need emphasis on good management and persuasion rather than regimentation and compulsion. We have had too little leadership of a kind to which free-born Americans best respond. American people want leaders they can trust. The best ones are those who lead, not those who dictate and compel.

An abundant production is the best guaranty against inflation. In order for all of us to have more, we must produce more. We can get nowhere by starving labor, agriculture, and industry. Business is entitled to a fair profit, labor is entitled to fair wages, and the farmers are entitled to fair prices.

TEAMWORK

America is made up of individuals where every man is an independent unit, who works from choice with all other Americans for the good of all. We will get the job done with teamwork. We learned the value of teamwork from our pioneer ancestors. They worked together in their corn-husking bees and threshing rings. Our armed forces are demonstrating American teamwork on the fighting fronts to the highest degree. Thousands of war plants are participating in teamwork production. Americans,

using their heritage and experience in teamwork, can outproduce any economy devised by dictators or bureaucrats.

The American people, knowing the power and efficiency of the American way, fully realize that this approach will be needed after the military victory is won and when the time comes to write the peace. After this war is over we want an orderly program of demobilization and reconstruction. We cannot disband the Army and Navy, close down war plants, and remove all economic controls all within a few weeks. We will have all that it takes in natural resources, trained labor, trained managers, and productive resources to carry on. Private industry must act to maintain and increase output and income to insure full employment. Our purchasing power must be maintained at the highest possible levels in order for our farmers, retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers to supply the American public. We must have the American way of opportunity when our boys return from the fighting fronts.

The American system of free competition and private enterprise is the only one that has stood the test of time with suitable and proper reward to individual initiative, ability, and ambition. It may be that the system is not perfect, but it is responsive to the demands of progress and the requirements of the common welfare. We will perfect it whenever all groups accept the solemn responsibility of trying to build the economic phases of our Republic. We must stand united for the future, and all can benefit if all will serve.

INDUSTRY AND LABOR RESPONSIBILITIES

We will continue to correct our problems with a live-and-let-live policy. Industry must win the confidence of its working organization. Mutual confidence and good will will be created when carefully-thought-out policies bring about a spirit of sympathy and real cooperation between the members of its working organization, its stockholders, and the citizens of the communities in which its plants are located. Industry can win the confidence of its employees when it stands for those things which makes for better homes, better educational facilities, better health, happiness, and all that goes to make up a healthful and contented community life. Industry should support every constructive agency in the community to help make it as strong and as great an influence for good as is humanly possible.

Every industry should have a plan that provides a proper contact between management and the employees. This will give the rank and file of labor an understanding of the problems of business as they relate to financing, producing, and marketing. It will also give business first-hand information about the problems of labor.

Workers also have a responsibility. Too many workers consider a union as merely a grievance committee to secure all the wages it can squeeze out of the company. A union must be a constructive organization designed to promote the mutual best interests of the employer and employees. Those unions that have adopted a policy to help management to improve production and reduce costs are to be commended. American labor is smart enough to know it must produce the products, goods, and services upon which profits and taxes must be had and levied to pay the cost of social security. There must be mutual confidence and understanding between labor and capital.

Private enterprise or Government bureaucracy will have to provide full-time employment when the war is over. I am certain that labor will prefer the present system. We must look today, as in the past, to the creative impulses of free men and women, born of the most enterprising and self-reliant stock in the world, for the productive genius, for expansion of industry, new enterprises, for economic recovery, for restoration of normal jobs, and for increased standards of living. America is still the hope of the free people of the world. We have just begun to climb the ladder.

POST-WAR PROGRAM

The hope of the world lies in free men and women for only they can establish lasting peace and security. In order to have independence and social security we must have a workable post-war program. At present there is much confusion in America about post-war planning. Some would create a commission of domestic economic planning, while others want international planning and still others want both domestic and international planning. However, nothing should be done that will interfere with the war effort. There is divided opinion as to whether it is good judgment to meddle in international post-war affairs at the present time. A dispute over post-war boundaries, trade treaties, and air lanes may lead to disunity among our allies. After all, we probably will not have much to say about making over Europe after the war. We may be interested in a plan to prevent future wars, but the decision of how far we should go must be made by the American people.

We must concentrate on winning the war and prepare a post-war program that will furnish full employment to our disbanded armed forces and civilian population. This program must be wisely and carefully planned. It must be built on the system of free competition and private enterprise. Every American citizen must be given an opportunity to present his or her post-war views or plans to a planning commission. After all of the data is collected, this commission should be directed to study the economic problems and formulate a comprehensive program for the full utilization of the world's resources of men and machines in maintaining and improving the economic well-being of all peoples. This commission would make recommendations to parliaments of the world with respect to legislation necessary to effect the elimination of unemployment and to adjust the economic life and financial structure of all nations.

The Government does not owe anyone a living. However, it is incumbent on governments to remove the fear of want for our disabled veterans, our elders, and all other people who are unable to work. It is the duty of private enterprise to give full opportunities to all able Americans who want to work. If business cannot employ the workers, they will have to be employed by the Government. On the other hand, business must be allowed to keep enough savings in order to expand and make new investments. Free enterprise must lead the way, unfettered by senseless Government restrictions.

Some suggestions that have been made to insure post-war prosperity are: extensive program for private investments; immediate conversion of war industries to peacetime operation; construction of a million new homes; manufacture of automobiles, radios, planes, and other products; extensive research for the creation of new products; modernization and expansion of our transportation system; construction and improvement of highways and public roads; airport construction; and encourage back-to-the-farm movement.

FREE ENTERPRISE WILL DO THE JOB

The big question, at the moment, is the method to be used by enterprise to furnish full-time employment to the American people in the post-war period. Business will have to plan on a Nation-wide basis in order to accomplish the task. The miracle of American war production is proof that the job can be done in peacetime. Security will be obtained by the most efficient use toward production of capital and labor. Business will have to produce more and better goods for less money or with less effort. We must have a better method of distributing these goods. Business must reward the able, according to merit, in order to stimulate effort. A labor force between the ages of 21 and 60 can produce enough to clothe, house, and feed all of our people. Private industry must organize and operate in a manner which will make unnecessary another W. P. A. Only through the processes of private enterprise will the American people enjoy a higher standard of living. I do not believe we want the bureaucrats to take over business, farms, and labor unions. Let us serve notice to the world that we do not have to surrender our freedom for a mess of pottage labeled "social security." We certainly do not want to go totalitarian under any circumstances or under any assumed label.

Big and little business both have a stake in saving the American way of life. Little business is a giant force equally as great as big business, and it knows the danger in the concentration of the Nation's business in fewer and fewer hands. This concentration is a stepping stone to other and more dangerous and destructive forms of regimentation. If the little businessmen are wiped out, America will be compelled to accept a lower standard of living, making it easier for the bureaucrats to take over. Big and little business must unite and work together in harmony if we are to have post-war prosperity and save the American way of life.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE VERSUS FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY

Fellow Americans, this is the challenge to free competition and private enterprise. You will have to make your choice between Government bureaucracy and free enterprise. Our armed forces are fighting for the American way—a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. When this war is over our boys will return from the fox holes in the jungles and the desert sands of Africa as rugged individualists. Rugged individualism will save America. Our boys will realize that the New Deal has spent billions of dollars to destroy individual initiative and regiment and plan the lives of 132,000,000 people. These Americans will take an active part on the home front after the war. But in the meantime let us protect and preserve the American way of life for our fighting forces when they return and their posterity.

Treat All Alike—It Can Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, old Mother Nature down through the ages is fairly consistent. Crops grow when the soil is fertile, the sun shines, and there is sufficient moisture. Human nature does not change a great deal. History, as well as the Bible, informs us that people are greedy, selfish, and quarrelsome; that they are kind, charitable, and helpful.

Men may plan and legislate, but neither produces food nor prevents some individuals taking advantage of others. Rules governing conduct are helpful to those who must deal with nature, live with others, if those rules are fair, reasonable, and apply to all alike.

INFLATION

Inflation comes when the volume of money outstrips production; when individuals have so much money that, by competitive bidding, they rapidly raise above the former level the price of the things they buy, either services or merchandise. Once started, the rising price spiral often continues until money is of little or no value.

Our forefathers had it when continental money became of so little value that in one instance it was pasted on a dog. That period gave rise to the expression, "not worth a continental."

Because of the billions heretofore appropriated by rubber-stamp Congresses and because of the immense quantities of practically everything which are being shipped abroad and the resulting scarcity here, the danger of inflation some time ago became apparent.

The President pointed to the danger. Members of Congress knew it. So it passed what it was pleased to term an anti-inflation or price-fixing law. That law created a department authorized to fix the price of many articles of merchandise, including food, but it did not regulate wages. The obvious result was that wages skyrocketed.

Then the futility of defying the laws of nature—of supply and demand—became apparent. High wages brought higher food prices. Then, when O. P. A. pegged the point value of prunes and raisins where people thought it excessive, they ceased to buy. Prunes and raisins were on the point of spoiling on the merchant's shelves—O. P. A. rescinded the order. The same result is occurring with reference to other articles.

Labor, when the price of food went up, as it did because of scarcity and the increased demand, asked another increase in wages. The result is somewhat similar to that we used to get when we put a plank across a barrel and got a playmate on the other end of the plank. First, he went up and we went down. Then we went up and he went down. So the price of food goes up until labor's wage does not buy what it did before. Then wages go up and, for a short time, the worker's dollar buys as much as it did before. But only for a short time. Competitive bidding and plenty of money in the wage earner's pocket force the price of food up and the game starts all over again.

The President, through his agencies, authorized wage increases. Now he is confronted by farmer demands for an increase in the price of their products. Lewis' united coal miners threaten to shut off the production of coal if they do not get a $2-a-day increase in their wages by May 1. So the President vetoed the bill which would have given the farmer a higher price for his food, because, he said, it would cause further inflation, result in another demand by workers for an increase in wages to meet the increase in the cost of living. That is probably correct. But there has always been a remedy.

THE REMEDY

It is a little late, but the legislation I proposed in November 1940, and subsequently reintroduced, would have prevented the present crisis, had it been adopted and enforced. That was to fix, to stabilize, the price of all materials—merchandise—and the wage for services. The proposal was to ascertain the fair, average price for the production of merchandise in common use at any stated period and freeze it there; to, at the same time, fix the fair, average wage received by labor and freeze it there. The law to be enforced by the law-enforcing officials of cities, counties, States, and the Federal Government, without any new snoopers, persecutors, or prosecutors.

The result would have been that the factory worker's dollar would have continued to buy the same amount of food, clothing—whatever he bought; the farmer's bushel of wheat would have continued to have procured for him the same amount of merchandise and service. None except the chiselers and the bootleggers could have profited, and the public would have dealt with them.

Canada used the system, has it today, and it is working. It was too simple, too easy of enforcement, to be adopted by the new dealers; hence received no consideration. Perhaps Congress will get around to it before it is too late. I hope so.

Connecticut Public School Teachers Volunteer Vacation Period To Help Win the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, there are times, when we read our daily mail, when we wonder if the American people really have a will to win this war. Too often we receive letters containing petty complaints. We are told of a large number of cases of absenteeism, and we are told about alleged slow-downs in defense industries.

In the morning's mail, however, I received a letter which really helped restore my faith in the American people's desire to win this war. This letter came from the Connecticut State Teachers Association, representing 10,500 public-school teachers in our State. Many of these teachers are already engaged in part-time volunteer war work. Most of us are familiar with the work done by school teachers from one end of the country to the other in setting up the rationing machinery and in registering men for selective service. The school teachers in America have set an example that all of us would do well to follow but now our Connecticut teachers wish to offer their services to the war effort during their summer vacation. It is my sincere hope that the United States Employment Service will place these teachers in full-time defense industries wherever labor shortages exist in Connecticut during the months they ordinarily would spend in vacation.

So that all may know just what our Connecticut teachers wish to do, I am quoting their letter herewith, and I commend their action to similar associations throughout the country:

CONNECTICUT STATE
TEACHERS ASSOCIATION,
Hartford, Conn., April 1, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM J. MILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: The Connecticut State Teachers Association is hoping to make available to the victory effort a million vacation-man-hours of the time of Connecticut teachers during the summer.

Working in collaboration with the United States Employment Service, a voluntary plan of enlistment is being developed whereby teachers who qualify can be placed on full-time jobs for the vacation period wherever labor shortages in Connecticut exist.

An advisory council is being formed representing education, Federal and State governments, labor, business, and industry. The active management of the enrollment will be in the hands of the executive secretary of the Connecticut State Teachers Association, an officer of the Connecticut United States Employment Service, and representatives of the teachers.

Of the 10,500 Connecticut public-school teachers, many are already engaged in part-time war work. Thousands more are acting as unpaid volunteers in defense activities. Nearly all have been serving the State and the Nation in the several rationing programs throughout the year. All have been devoting themselves to the herculean task of preparing the children and youth of Connecticut to play their parts in a nation at war. And yet many teachers are still unsatisfied with the importance of their total contribution to the victory effort. It would take only 2,000 teachers working six 48-hour weeks during the summer to bring to bear a force of more than a million man-hours against the Axis.

Sincerely yours,

LYNDON U. PRATT,
Executive Secretary.

The Idea Is Not Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL C. MICHENER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the reaction of the country to the recent defeat in the House of pay-as-you-go income-tax legislation is clear and definite. The Gallup poll and other public-sentiment measuring agencies reported before the vote in the House that our people overwhelmingly favored a pay-as-you-go plan. All of these polls considered the fundamentals of the Ruml plan. Now that the Congress has had a clean-cut vote between the general principles of pay-as-you-go, as advocated by the Ruml plan and the opposition of the administration, which found expression in the Doughton bill, it is most interesting to again appraise public sentiment. In the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, one of the leading dailies in Michigan, there appeared an editorial which I think is indicative of the general sentiment of our people. Pursuant to the permission granted to me, I include that editorial, which is as follows:

THE IDEA IS NOT DEAD

The pleasure expressed by Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., over the failure of the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan to pass the House on its first test may be a bit premature. True, the badly battered and bleeding bill was shunted back to the House Ways and Means Committee with instructions to make an entirely new start, but that is not the end of the idea. The convenience and efficiency of a current payment plan for income tax are too obvious to have the plan killed permanently by one political foray.

The basic idea of the Ruml plan is not dead. It has met defeat on one front, in which partisan political prejudice played too important a part for consideration of a wartime measure.

The opposition's strength was based on the fear that some of the big fellows would escape a year's income tax. That fear overshadowed and outweighed the truth that at the same time many people are now enjoying the largest incomes of their lives at this time and would welcome a system that would take their income-tax payments as they are earned and not be called upon to settle after the present boom has passed and payment of any tax at all will be a real problem. Its very convenience and common sense will bring the basic features of the Ruml plan back again.

Too much importance can be given the recent defeat in the House, because any bill the House passes must also be passed by the Senate. Senate Members will rewrite the tax bill, even though all revenue bills must, by provision of the Constitution, originate in the House. The Senate has many tax experts, and any bill that becomes law must pass their scrutiny.

The pay-as-you-go plan has too many advantages, both to the Government and to those who pay, to be permanently defeated or even forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, the convenience and welfare of the tax-paying public makes the enactment of a pay-as-you-earn tax plan advisable now. The necessity and requirements of the Federal Treasury demand like action. The people of the country are justly impatient and indignant at the fiddling of the Ways and Means Committee and the lack of decision on the part of the House in placing upon the statute books adequate tax legislation now.

The time for excuses and promises is long since past. We all know that there is to be an additional tax-raising bill passed in 1943. If this is the case, then why not do the job now? The people are entitled to know what their taxes are to be at the earliest possible moment and they are entitled to be permitted to pay those taxes as they go along and not be worried, bothered, and harassed all the time because they still owe a year's taxes.

I am confident as to the general feeling throughout the country. John Q. Public wants prospective 1943 tax legislation now. He wants to know.

Mr. Speaker, I have stressed the word "now," and this is exactly what I mean. That is exactly what the American people are demanding now.

Down to Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer and News of April 1, 1943:

DOWN TO BUSINESS

The defeat of the Ruml plan is probably due to the fact that too much politics was mixed with economics. The adverse vote of the House in reaffirming the fact that the two don't mix deprived the American people of a tax-collection system which enjoyed wide public support.

Now that the political jousts are ended, it may be that the House can get down to the practical matter of figuring a common-sense way in which the taxpayer can meet his heavy obligation. Since it is apparent that the name "Ruml" has become a red flag to the House Way and Means Committee, efforts should be made to find a solution along lines on which there is common agreement.

There is common agreement that a withholding system is the most practical answer to the collection of high taxes. The March 15 experience has shown that many were unprepared to meet their quarterly payment, and borrowed as a result. Many have unwisely borrowed at excessively high interest rates. It stands to reason that their preparedness for the June 15 payment will be handicapped by their efforts to pay off the loan previously made.

Should the withholding levy be adopted, Congress will have taken at least one step toward the relief of the taxpayer. There will then be time for consideration of abatement. But there remains no doubt that some method of getting on a current basis must be found.

The House vote, a political matter, didn't settle the economic problem. When present high war earnings end, the majority of taxpayers will not be in a position to make belated payments upon them. Political fireworks and Treasury charts can't alter this fact.

Federal Prisons and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad once more to call your attention to the program of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, whose appropriation for the next fiscal year is now under consideration. Some years ago I went into quite a few details regarding this particular Bureau. At that time I pointed out the great development which this Bureau had undergone in the 10 years, 1931 to 1941, and how the increase in criminal jurisdiction in the Federal Government from concern over a few crimes like counterfeiting, treason, and those connected with the delivery of the mail, to one which includes the whole battery of interstate offenses, liquor and drug violations, had greatly enlarged the work of that Bureau. To these may now be added those offenses which arise out of the prosecution of the war, including violations of the Selective Service Act, the tax laws, the May Act, and other new wartime statutes.

During the past 2 years the Federal prison system, like all other functions of the Government, has been forced to suspend its normal routine and to gear its program to the war effort. To many people a prison program is a remote cry from the battlefield, and this has been true in most conflicts. However, in a situation such as the present one, described by some as total war, even the

prisons of the United States, and especially the Federal prisons, have found a part to play which is most significant.

It has aptly been said that the prisons of a country reflect the culture of that country, and so with our totalitarian enemies we find concentration camps, prison idle houses, brutality, sadism, "mercy" killings, and bastilles, where men deteriorate in body, mind, and soul. In Nazi systems of justice, those who offend against the state are considered candidates for liquidation rather than readjustment. In this great democracy where those who offend against the law are looked upon as men in need of adjustment rather than elimination, our prisoners have become a factor in the program of defense and national service, and in so doing have a chance for finding new inspiration, new self-respect, and a possible stake in the future with promise of permanent values. The part which the Federal Bureau of Prisons and its thousands of prisoners are taking in the production of war materials, in the purchase of War bonds, and in contributions to the blood bank makes a notable record in the history of prisons in this or in any country.

I do not want to burden you with a great mass of statistics, but I must call your attention to a few to give you some idea of the scope and character of these contributions. We are faced during the coming year with the necessity of rationing the consumption of food among our people. It should, therefore, interest us that during the past year the total production of farm products on Federal prison farms were valued at approximately three quarters of a million dollars. This consisted of vegetables, root crops, forage, pork products, and other foods needed in the prison diet.

The Federal prison system at the present time is producing not only sufficient milk to allow each inmate a reasonable dairy ration, but an excess of over 1,000 pounds of milk per day is shipped to other Federal agencies for consumption. The growth in average milk production per cow per year from 9,110 pounds in 1934 to 12,762 pounds per cow per year in 1942 is indicative of the healthy development of this branch of the service. Incidentally, all Federal prisons have for some time been rationed on all foods where shortages exist. The cost of feeding a Federal prisoner is now about 32 cents per man per day. For this he gets a good, healthy, well-balanced diet.

On this diet Federal prisoners have worked well and effectively. A report recently issued by Federal Prison Industries, Inc., shows that inmates of Federal institutions are carrying their end of the load in the production of essential commodities. During the past 2 years Federal prison industries have produced a variety of articles for use in the war effort equal in quality to similar shops on the outside. Over a million and a half pounds of gray iron castings, over 2,000,000 canvas bags, tarpaulins, tents, and similar products, nearly 10,000,000 pounds of metal shelving, over 1,000,000 pairs of Army shoes, nearly 17,000,000 yards of heavy cotton fabrics, over one-half million metal food trays are among some of the products which have been turned out by prisoners in Federal prisons for the use of the armed forces. A carload of war materials has been produced every 50 minutes in the prison shops. Nor have officers and prisoners been reluctant to give generously when it came to working hours. The maintenance of working hours of 48, 56, and 60 hours in prison shops, the operation of some shops on two and three shifts daily, and the contribution of a considerable amount of overtime work on the part of both civilians and prisoners have helped to produce these unusual totals.

Such a program engenders and at the same time has also given an outlet to the very sincere desire and enthusiasm of thousands of prisoners for active participation in the war effort of the country. Indeed, the great majority of inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions have volunteered to work extra hours in the industries after completing their regular prison assignments and advantage has been taken of many of these offers so that production might be maintained and greatly increased. Some indications of this increase in production is shown by the fact that whereas in 1940 an annual production of $1,500 for each prisoner employed in Federal prison industries was considered an excellent record, in 1942 this figure had reached nearly $4,000 per inmate employed.

Nor have the contributions of our prison system to the war effort been confined solely to the production of farm products and manufactured goods. In one of the older institutions, which houses men serving their second, third, or fourth term, it is reported that nearly 90 percent of such prisoners volunteered an average of about 200 pints a day for the blood bank during a 2-week period. Blood donations are being regularly made by a large number of the inmates of our Federal institutions; also, in one of the Federal prisons the prisoners have purchased through January of this year a total of $74,325 in War bonds. Although deprived of their freedom for some infraction of the law, these men so highly prize the democratic tradition of freedom that they are doing their part to help preserve it throughout the world.

I give you this information, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, not simply to let you know how far reaching has been the effect of this war but also to give due credit to the men who, though locked behind walls, are willing and anxious to do their part in preserving the country we love so dearly. These men who have lost their freedom appreciate better than most of us the preciousness of that freedom. Better it is to toil as a prisoner in America than be the richly outfitted sycophant of Hitler.

This same spirit has also pervaded many of the State institutions. The Federal Bureau of Prisons has cooperated in the establishment of a program under the War Production Board, whereby State prisoners may also produce for war needs, and already a score of State prisons are working on articles sorely needed by the armed services. In this way the contributions being made by Federal prisoners may be extended many times throughout the 48 States. The possibilities of harnessing a potential manpower of over 100,000 State prisoners in the production of textiles, metal and wood products, and other articles needed to maintain our gigantic Army cannot be overlooked.

The Bureau has, however, not merely confined itself to activities connected with industries, farms, and other programs within the confines of institutions. It has been definitely a philosophy of the Federal Bureau of Prisons for 10 years that one of its main objectives was to prepare men and women for release into society, trained to meet the needs of society. To this end, a program of vocational training and employment placement has been developed in Federal prisons with special reference to war industries. Training in essential skills such as machine shop practice, welding, foundry work, aviation engine mechanics, and other practical lines has been established and many hundreds of inmates are now enrolled in such training. During the past year over 200 of these trained inmates have been placed in jobs on release from Federal institutions, where they are becoming useful, self-supporting, and productive members of society.

One of the interesting phenomena which has grown out of the constructive handling of men in our prisons has been the enthusiasm which prisoners have displayed for enlistment in the armed forces. Here again the Federal Bureau of Prisons has been alert to the possibilities inherent in potential recruits for the land and naval forces. For 2 years every violator of the Selective Service Act who has been sent to prison has been carefully examined to determine whether he might be more useful as a member of the armed forces than as a prisoner. To date approximately 150 such violators have been released for induction into the Army, and an additional 50 or 60 have been sent into some form of public service under the provisions of a special order permitting the parole of such prisoners if they are found to be eligible and qualified for either military or public service.

Similarly, with men who have been convicted of other crimes which do not disqualify them for military service, under a program approved by the Director of Selective Service all Federal prisoners are now being examined as to their eligibility for military service. Special selective-service boards attached to Federal institutions are being established to classify such eligibles as are found worthy to see that they are inducted into the Army. The order setting up these boards, which has just been issued by the Director of Selective Service, applies not only to Federal institutions but may be extended to any of the State penal or correctional institutions. Again, the Federal Bureau of Prisons has not retained for itself alone the advantages of a broad and far-seeing policy but has been instrumental in seeing that the fruits may be extended to the States as well.

The things which I have mentioned are in the nature of service over and above the usual routine of caring for criminals convicted of the violations of the law. There have been times when the maintenance and custody of nearly 20,000 such prisoners have seemed sufficient to justify the expenditure of appropriations for personnel and maintenance.

At the present time, while ordinary crimes naturally decline, crimes which arise out of the present emergency furnish a host of unusual problems which tax the ability and ingenuity of officials out of the ordinary. While State penal and correctional institutions may be enjoying a period of comparative relaxation due to the decline in ordinary offenses, Federal institutions are faced with whole new sets of problems due to wartime offenders.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons is the custodian of all those convicted of espionage, sabotage, treason, violation of the Selective Service Act, and other wartime legislation. While fortunately we have not had a large number of persons convicted of espionage or sabotage, those few who have been convicted furnish a peculiarly difficult problem because of the extraordinary nature of their cases. Violations of the Selective Service Act, while few in comparison to the total number of men inducted, far less than 1 percent, have nevertheless included several thousand prisoners, some of whom present a very nice problem peculiar to wartimes.

While the law has provided for the great majority of those who for conscientious or religious reasons will not participate in military service, there are always a few extremists who even these provisions of the Selective Service will not satisfy. Such extremists ordinarily land in prison, and we have had approximately 1,500 such convictions of whom approximately 1,000 are still in prison. These persons are people of extreme individualistic points of view. They do not easily adapt themselves to institutional routine. Many of them are highly educated and ordinarily useful members of society, quite different from the usual run of prisoners. To handle these men with patience and understanding and to avoid the unfortunate effects of intolerance and prejudice in such cases requires a high type of personnel and program. To date, the Department of Justice under the able and understanding leadership of Attorney General Biddle has met this problem to the satisfaction not only of the general public but also of that small portion of our citizenry who is in sympathy with these violators. This is no mean achievement and is one which I believe deserves the commendation of all of us who know how difficult such extremists may prove in public affairs.

In a world where prisons in certain countries are a synonym for brutality, suppression, and even annihilation, it is a notable mark of faith in democracy that Federal prisons offer to their inmates opportunity for self-development, a chance to participate in the needs of the outside world, training to meet that world on a self-respecting basis, and hope for the future. To most of us, a prison is a strange and remote place. Let us hope that none of us will ever experience what it means to be confined in one. Although I and other members of our subcommittee have made it our business to inspect these institutions and see for ourselves how the money we appropriate has been expended, few others visit them. Yet, if it be true that prisons reflect the culture of a people by mirroring the manner in which a people care for the least of its citizens and indicate what it is prepared to do and is doing in far greater measure for the bulk of its people, we can, though they may never affect our lives personally, be glad that we have here in America an institution such as the Federal Bureau of Prisons, which represents the true principles of democracy.

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek's Speech at Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek at the Chicago Stadium, Chicago, Ill., Monday, March 22, 1943:

On my way to this great and populous city, one of the thoughts which occurred to my mind and kept tune to the rhythm of the rolling wheels of my train was the modern miracle of what is now known as the United States of America.

I recollected, too, chronicles in American history that I learned in my school days. When your Pilgrim Fathers landed from the *Mayflower*, America was one vast continent of wilderness. As long ago as when Germantown, Pa., was first settled, Pastorious wrote that the settlers' cry was, "Nothing but endless forests." Today all those areas are amongst the most highly developed and industrialized centers of this country.

Most of your forbears, in coming to America, sought freedom from the irritating restrictions of an irresponsible government of a despot. They agreed that they would govern themselves in accordance with a compact which they signed to "submit to such government and governors as they should by common consent agree to make and choose."

Such was the unostentatious and unpretentious start of this country. These men, I venture to say, scarce dared to dream that they were laying the foundations of a great democracy which inevitably came into being because of the sound common-sense fundamentals they had incorporated in their compact. Nor, in all probability, had they any conception then of the influence that America would one day wield on the destiny of mankind in all parts of the world. They confined themselves to the simple and outright pledge to abide by the common will combined with the firm faith that right is might. Thus, the unmitigated strength of the Mayflower Compact lies in the fact that it was not a theory, but a practical instrument evolved for a practical purpose. In the words of the Reverend Hooker, in his famous sermon on the fundamentals of government, "the foundation of authority is law firstly in the free consent of the people." Later John Wise, also a minister, but son of an indentured slave, writing in Massachusetts, stated that "government is based on human free compacts."

But the compacts did not go beyond the immediate physical realm of the settlements. History substantiates our view that the first settlers in America did not think of themselves as a nation.

They called themselves New Englanders, Virginians, or Pennsylvanians. They were merely groups of people with steadfast wills, indomitable energy, and unconquerable spirit scattered under 13 different governments.

As time rolled on, such limited instruments as the Mayflower Compact, the Fundamental Order of Connecticut, and innumerable church covenants and frontier agreements, which various groups had contributed as practicable and workable, found their crystallization in the Declaration of Independence. So long as the torch of liberty shines with effulgence, mankind will cherish Jefferson's immortal words, vibrant with vigor, that "we hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal." Yet difficulty upon difficulty accumulated and challenged the young fledgling Republic even after Cornwallis met his defeat at Yorktown.

The many different groups widely scattered and with varied local interests in these States could easily have fallen into such serious dissension amongst themselves that anarchy would have resulted had it not been that a common denominator fused them together into one great whole—a common denominator which I would call the wholesome American national fiber. For, aside from the souls mute from timorousness, the diversification of minds was truly sincere and honest. If memory serves me right, Hamilton held to the theory that the exercise of the power of the nation should be the duty and occupation of the comparative few, whereas Jefferson believed that all men are created equal and should be given equal initial opportunities.

To those obsessed by hard and fast rules of logic, these seemed two diametrical convictions which, at the time, appeared irreconcilable. Yet, as I see it, the present American society is actually the very evolvement of a happy culmination of Hamilton's and Jefferson's ideals forged into one. The seemingly repellant opposites have produced an epochal synthesis, for the fundaments of supreme reason in man, for the most part, enjoin the must and forbid the contrary.

Some of your Presidents, like Jackson and Lincoln, came from the backwoods—products of the people. Some of the greatest Emperors of China also came from peasant stock. Both our peoples have been fortunate enough not to decry poverty. Though our two countries have widely varied backgrounds, histories, cultures, and traditions, both recognize the inherent ability of the individual as an individual with powers to sway, to contribute to, and to help mold, the destiny of a nation.

China's civil-service system and the opportunities thereby offered to those who strive for achievement are not wanting. The land where "the barefoot boy with cheeks of tan" may become the highest executive also declaims that here indeed a man may become what he wills himself to be.

With firmness and perseverance, I stress again, that to insure future peace and prosperity for all peoples, war, that acme of human folly, should not be permitted to recur. Only with concerted vigilance and action by the United Nations, and, later, by others who will have gained the wisdom of adhering to the principles of live and let live, would this world be rendered perdurable for peace.

We are all aware that organized effort is nothing new. In ancient Greece there was the confederacy of Delos. Coming nearer to the modern age, there was the Congress of Vienna. Then, in our own time, emerged the League of Nations. The reasons for the failures of these efforts are not far to seek. The Greek confederacy sought to combine the Hellenic States against Persia, but they soon forgot the purpose of their aim and fell to bickering amongst themselves. The Congress of Vienna meant no more than the hegemony of the Austria that Metternich conceived. The main cause for the failure of the League of Nations had its root in the narrowness of vision of those by whom it was created, and, being recent, will be adjudged by posterity.

Inherently, the weakness in each of the defunct united efforts was that it played an old game—the game of jealously, self-seeking, and petty distrust, often euphemistically misinterpreted as the balance of power. Assuredly, the League of Nations proved to be an improvement on the others, but the chink in its armor became apparent because it concerned itself mainly with the inconsonant policies of a few nations. The fissures and flaws in the League Covenant revealed themselves only under stress, for the inadequacies did not appear in times of peace and calm. But, under the gathering momentum of the tempest, the structure could not withstand the tension of the impact.

That no alinement of nations in the past had been found successful does not invalidate the possibility and the necessity for concerted effort. Nor, for that matter, do they preclude the wisdom of our continued cooperation when victory is won in the active maintenance of peace against future collusion of rapacious powers.

In this connection we must take heed from China's painful experience. Manchuria in 1931 portrays a lesson which should be indelibly imprinted on our minds, that documents in themselves affixed with imposing-looking and important seals are mere foolscaps; just as a robot in itself without the breath of life remains inanimate. The good faith and responsibilities of the signatories of a pact must extend beyond mere compliance with the letter of the text. Neither can peace be pursued by warping the truth and finding comfort in the fact that the infeasibility of joint duty in chastisement means no chastisement at all. Had wise counsel prevailed in the Manchurian incident, and had aggression been cauterized at its source, today the whole world would not be travailed by the holocaust of war.

But the self-righteous, perhaps, would seek to justify their lethargy by the reply that hindsight is easy, foresight difficult. What higher tribute than this could be paid to the wisdom of those who foresaw the inevitable implications from the shadows cast before the tragic events? What more conclusive proof is needed than that theirs were warning voices which echoed small and still across the vast wilderness of indifference and nescience? Should we in the future allow ourselves to sink again into the morass of realization only by hindsight, and place foresight beyond the pale of man's rationale? This we must ultimately, nay, immediately, ask ourselves.

Some minds reveal their claim to intellectual capacities by erecting barriers to the closer cooperation of peoples after this war. It is, notwithstanding, true that the culture of a nation is peculiarly its own and that unless what is borrowed becomes part of the skein of pattern of our daily life, it will bear the harsh lines of foreign matters. Six years of war and suffering in China speak more eloquently than words that we deem the preservation of our own culture subservient to the maintenance of world civilization. Precisely because we refuse to be content with our culture as a separate entity, we in China are fighting to help build the mosaic of world civilization, the perpetuation of mankind's common and pledged principles which cannot be subverted or surrendered—no matter how painful they may seem for a time.

We in China stand firm in the belief that those principles are inborn, and that, so long as men live and progress, those principles cannot be compromised.

We should support the four freedoms which epitomize all that we want. We should also support the men who fathered the Atlantic Charter, for we believe that their purpose was not to tantalize the sorely tried and stanch peoples fighting against violence nor was it prompted by the necessity to meet the dire needs of the moment, but because they were convinced that a better world based on those universal principles must come into being.

It is the easier thing to court popular approbation of one's countrymen; it is the harder thing to act and speak according to the dictates of one's conscience, especially when conscience tells one that to prevent future destruction and carnage, one must think not only in terms of the good of one's own country, but in terms of the good of other people's.

China realizes that her building a great wall to isolate herself from the rest of the world, in the nineteenth century was a mistake, and today those men who were responsible for erecting this barrier are pointed out to every Chinese school child as examples of mental myopics who saw only the expediency of temporary solutions. Their names will go down in infamy.

How may we find a true basis for coexistence and cooperation to cement better understanding between nations and between peoples? Good will and desire for cooperation will do as a starting point, but left to themselves, they will make little headway.

Your sense of the aesthetic in appreciating the artistry of Chinese craftsmanship, your praise of the fragility of eggshell porcelain, and our admiration for your intricate machinery and our approbation of your suspension bridges should not be construed to mean that complete understanding of the nature of our two peoples or their greatness is the logical deduction

Perhaps I may pause here to give you an illustration of what I mean. To understand music in the true sense of appreciation, one must know the rudiments of theory and harmony, the sequence of concord, the atonality of discord, the characteristics differing major from minor melodies, and something about the life and motives of the composer when he set down the composition.

All these tend to convey a true understanding of music, for much as cognoscence is all-desirable, yet intelligent appreciation, too, has its unerring merits. Were it otherwise, a symphony would merely be a mass of sounds devoid of cadence and beauty.

I may go a little further and tell you something of my own experience. As you probably know, I came to America when I was a child and returned to my native land after I had finished college 10 years later. Upon my return home, the élan of youth made me eager to contribute my service in the interests of my country. To my surprise, my parents insisted that as I had been away for so long, I should spend my time studying Chinese history and literature. They pointed out that until I learned more of the history and culture of my people, I could not understand the intricacies of China's problems, and that in whatever field I wished to direct my efforts and whatever contributions I hoped to make, would be consistently nullified by lack of comprehension of the basic structure and needs of Chinese society In subsequent years, and especially during these war years when I have worked so closely with every section of our people, I have realized to the full the wisdom and foresight of this counsel.

I have attempted to illustrate to you the importance of fostering better understanding between our two peoples through knowledge of each other's history and culture. Integrity and imagination, however, must also play their part. Invariably the great spirits in human relationships have honesty and imagination—honesty in appraising themselves, first, as they see themselves; second, as they think others see them; and third, the imagination to place themselves in others' positions while appraising themselves. The first two, being subjective, cannot be all-sufficing; the third, an objective approach is needed to complete the picture.

I mentioned that your forebears clung to the faith that their experiment of abiding by the common will would work, and that their ideals of a government for the people, of the people, and by the people, would finally prevail. Let us remember, however, that before America grew to be the present great democracy, dissensions, secessions, and civil war cleaved the Nation and almost rent asunder the national fabric beyond repair.

But today there are peoples and nations who are yet bent on trampling underfoot the inalienable rights and dignity of men. They have not the eyes to see that over the blue horizon, beyond the smoky ruins following in the wake of bursting bombs, there is a vision of a new world—a world founded on practiced justice and equality for all mankind. The following anecdote may help us to understand the power of faith:

When Confucius was on his way to return to the kingdom of Lu from the kingdom of Wei, he and his party rested on the bank of a river. Below was a waterfall of several hundred feet. On the opposite bank a man started to swim across the river. Confucius sent a disciple to stop him: "Cannot you see that here is a waterfall of several hundred feet with miles of whirlpools beneath it where not even fish or turtles can live?" The man replied, "Do not mind me"; and quickly swam across. In astonishment Confucius asked him, "What skill or magic do you possess so that you can jump into this whirlpool and come out safe?" The man replied, "When I plunge into the river, I have faith in myself. When I swim in the current, I keep my faith in the water. My faith protects me in the current and I do not think about myself."

Turning to his disciples, Confucius said, "If a man can swim across such a river through faith, what cannot be accomplished by having faith in man?"

To translate, however, faith into reality, you and I must recapture faith in our fellow men in the spirit of your pioneer fathers who forged in the van of the movement westward and forward in cutting across the wilderness and endless forests. We should march onward with stanch hearts and steadfast will in the cultivation of what William James calls tough-mindedness—tough-mindedness while searching for rectitude and truth in the triumph of a just and permanent peace.

Let us then together resolve to keep on fighting in the faith that our vision is worth preserving and can be preserved. For is it not true that faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen?

Army Air Corps Crashes, Lives at Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the fol-

lowing letter and article by Joseph Leib:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 4, 1943.*

Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing herewith a statement which I have drawn up in connection with the Army Air Corps crashes which I believe will be of material benefit to the war effort if same is placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I have noted from your actions up here that you are independent in thought and seem to be doing everything possible to aid in the war effort. I therefore think it will be helping the war effort immensely if you will have this placed in the RECORD.

Please let me hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH LEIB.

ARMY AIR CORPS CRASHES—LIVES AT STAKE

Could it be possible that some United States Army officials are attempting to deceive the American people in the sole hope of protecting themselves from public indignation?

This question is asked, regretfully. We are at war. We must weigh our words. Yet, can we afford to sit by idly and allow incompetent, plundering, and careless officials to humbug and deprive the American people of the true facts?

This criticism is made relative to the appalling number of crashes by Army and Navy flyers in this country.

Many of our finest youths have responded to the call to arms and are willing to make any sacrifice to preserve the ideals this Republic embodies. But they should not be killed in airplane crashes caused by mechanical deficiencies, and poor equipment, and so forth. Generally these accidents happen to men who are already commissioned pilots and are extremely valuable. Physically speaking they cannot be replaced in less than a year nor at a cost of less than $10,000. More than this their lives can never be replaced in the hearts of every American.

For more than a year and a half there has been a demand for a sincere Congressional investigation of these numerous crashes. The history of Army attempts to prevent such an investigation is revolting. What have they to cover up? Why have they resorted to every conceivable device in their attempt to obviate such a congressional study? Are these Army officials of the opinion that Congress does not know its responsibility in time of war?

On March 23, 1943, the Senate War Investigating Committee announced that they hold reports that 30 percent of war-plane crashes were due to defective engines, and that they were fearful that defective engines were being passed through assembly lines. This startling declaration came on the heels of Senate disclosure that defective steel plates were being furnished to shipbuilding concerns which have caused a number of vessels to crack in two.

But on April 1, Army air officials rushes into print to declare that material failure caused only 14 percent of plane crashes.

There is a great discrepancy in these figures. Why should the Truman Committee publish statistics that are contradictory to those of the War Department? Who is telling the truth? Incidentally, these almost identical War Department figures were used more than a year ago by the Army in their then attempt to kill off the pending investigation.

It seems, according to the War Department, that these crash figures never change. Why?

Here is the complete story of the accident investigation to date:

Early in 1942, I began pleading for a congressional study of these numerous crashes. I appeared before the Senate Military Affairs Committee and presented some startling documentary evidence. Some months later (March 30) Chairman ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, ordered the introduction of Senate Resolution 234, to authorize a thorough investigation of plane crashes. This decision had been previously announced in the press as follows:

[From New York PM of February 15, 1942]

"SERVICE AIR CRASHES TO BE INVESTIGATED

"WASHINGTON, D. C., February 14.—The Senate Military Affairs Committee has ordered an investigation of reports of an alarming increase in the number of military plane crashes.

"Chairman ROBERT REYNOLDS (Democrat, of North Carolina) appointed Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE (Democrat, of West Virginia) to make the investigation after the committee's attention had been called to scattered press reports on individual crashes indicating more than 100 planes and 300 lives were lost between September 9 and January 25.

"The compilation of press reports was submitted to the committee by Joseph Leib, an independent Washington researcher, who told the committee that 'there is a strong belief that sabotage is the cause of many of these crashes.'

"Leib's compilation, which, he emphasized, was not complete, included crashes of all types of planes—trainers, pursuit planes, and bombers. Most of the crashes apparently involved big ships. Types of planes were not given in every case, but 49 were listed as bombers.

"Leib also called the committee's attention to testimony by Rear Admiral John H. Towers before the House Appropriations Committee that the Navy lost an average of 25 planes a month in crashes during 1941."

Five weeks later the Army Air Corps got busy and made public the fact that it was setting up an accident-prevention bureau. Story follows:

[From the Chicago Sun of April 23, 1942]

"ARMY ADOPTS PLAN TO REDUCE PLANE TOLLS

"WASHINGTON, D. C., April 23.—To safeguard inexperienced flying personnel the Army Air Corps today initiated a broad program of safety measures designed to reduce to a minimum the number of air accidents arising from human failure. Lt. Col. Samuel R. Harris, of the Air Corps, was appointed by Secretary of War Stimson to the post of Director of Flying Safety to execute the program, which calls for immediate establishment of 20 field area headquarters to examine causes of all flying accidents and coordinate the findings."

(Note that the above announcement stated that a "broad program of safety measures" were being "designed to reduce to a minimum the number of air accidents arising from human failure."

Now, around the same period the Air Corps Safety Section stated (the story appearing in the Washington Post April 17, 1942, Associated Press) that 79.9 percent of Army aircraft accidents were caused by human errors and that 13.9 percent were caused by failure of materials.

A year later the same Air Corps agency revealed (article appearing in the Washington Daily News April 1, 1943, United Press) that 78.7 percent of accidents were caused by personnel error and 14.5 percent by material failure.

In other words, over a period of 1 year the Air Corps Safety Section has been able to reduce these accidents due to human errors only 1 percent and that material failure came up 1 percent.

There is something ominous about these War Department figures.)

In the meantime the War Department used political pressure in the hope of killing the Senate resolution. Precious months passed, nothing was done, and the resolution gathered dust.

On September 25, 1942, Senator STYLES BRIDGES placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a petition from me reurging an investigation of the matter and demanded that Congress act on the resolution.

But the War Department refused to allow the Military Committee to budge. Finally, Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, on October 13, took the floor to present a Military Committee statement whitewashing the entire matter. The closing sentence of that exoneration read:

"We were further convinced on evidence presented that in no accidents has there been proven evidence of sabotage."

That statement was preposterous. Sabotage is extremely difficult to prove after the act has been committed. When a plane crashes there is little or nothing left to a ship whereby acts of sabotage can be studied or detected.

In this connection it is worthy to note that, as of today, there are over 50 cases where persons have been seized while sabotaging airships in plane factories. Together with this, German spies have been caught with confidential information concerning our bombing planes, etc. How did these enemies get hold of this data?

Likewise worthy of consideration is the fact that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is forbidden to look into these plane crashes. The following letter speaks for itself:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., September 16, 1942.

Mr. JOSEPH LEIB,
National Press Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEIB: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of September 5, 1942.

Please be advised that under existing agreements between the Army, Navy, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, sabotage investigations involving Army and Navy personnel, equipment, or facilities are not conducted by this Bureau. Such investigations come within the investigative jurisdiction of the Army and the Navy. In view of this agreement, I regret that I cannot give you any advice concerning sabotage investigations involving military airplanes or other Army or Navy equipment.

Forwarded herewith are the three enclosures sent with your letter which you requested to be returned to you.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER,
Director.

Why is such a procedure tolerated? Why is there so much jealousy and divided authority in the Government departments?

Some months ago, the proadministration Chicago Sun, on October 30, 1942, criticized the War Department, in an editorial entitled "A Belated Admission," relative to the collision of an Army bomber and an American Airlines transport plane, at which time the Army Air Forces hesitated to disclose the cause of the wreck. Said the editorial:

"We can all imagine the embarrassment officers experienced when they learned the facts. We submit, however, that embarrassment and pride of service never warrant suppression of facts. * * * We cannot avoid wondering whether the public ever would have learned the cause of the crash had the Congress not investigated. * * * 'Military security,' as we understand it, is not to be confused with security of the military from feelings of embarrassment."

The Washington Merry-Go-Round had this to say on February 14, 1943:

"Interesting question: Why is it that Army air crashes during training and operations right here in the U. S. A. are military secrets? Could it be that some persons are

trying to protect themselves from public indignation?"

Yes, what are the true facts? The War Department may be successful in stopping the Truman committee from making a complete investigation, but, if it does it would be doing the Republic a great disservice. Two clippings from the Washington Star show the difficulty Congress has been undergoing to get the complete story. Why is this pampering necessary?

[From the Washington Star of March 4, 1943]

PROBE OF ALL CRASHES OF ARMY, NAVY PLANES BEGUN BY SENATORS—CONGRESS TO GET REPORT OF PRINCIPAL CAUSES OF ACCIDENTS

A quiet but thoroughgoing inquiry into the causes of all Army and Navy plane accidents since the start of the defense program was disclosed today to have been initiated by the Senate War Investigating Committee.

Chairman TRUMAN refused to discuss the inquiry, which was given impetus last week when Army officials agreed to give committee investigators full access to their records.

Other Members said they planned to give Congress a report on the principal causes of all accidents, particularly in this country, separated as to bomber, pursuit, and other types of craft, as well as to their manufacture.

PLANE COMPARISON SOUGHT

"We want an analysis of all the records, so we will be able to say where mechanism was at fault, in order to compare records of one make of plane against another," one committee member told reporters. "If other accidents indicate a need for changes in the pilot-training program, we want Congress to know it."

The investigation is expected to get under way in full force within a week, the Senator said, "and one investigator already is at work."

RECORDS MADE AVAILABLE

Senator TRUMAN is known to have had frequent conferences with War Department officials recently in an effort to get what Members say is "the complete picture." Much information has been supplied. However, it was only last week that free access to all records finally was agreed to.

When the investigators have completed their studies in Washington and elsewhere, hearings may follow, with top-ranking aviation officers called before the committee, probably in executive session.

[From the Washington Star of March 23, 1943]

WAR PLANE CRASHES LAID TO BAD MOTORS—TRUMAN SAYS 30 PERCENT ARE DUE TO INSPECTION

The Senate War Investigating Committee is probing reports that defective engines have caused 30 percent of war plane crashes with nearly 100-percent fatality in such accidents, Chairman TRUMAN said today.

Senator TRUMAN said the committee's inquiry into war production methods, scheduled to bring representatives of steel manufacturers before it today for testimony, would be broadened later to look into inspection methods under which aircraft engines are accepted for the armed forces.

"Our staff has been looking into reports that some defective engines are being passed, and that engine failures are responsible for 30 percent of airplane accidents," Senator TRUMAN told reporters. "If the reports are true, there must be something the matter with the inspections and we intend to find out what it is."

The committee took preliminary testimony behind closed doors yesterday on an investigation into reports that defective steel plates were being furnished for shipbuilding in some instances.

The Embarrassing Freshman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, appearing in the April 3 issue of the Washington Times-Herald:

THE EMBARRASSING FRESHMAN

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Here's one you didn't see in yesterday's papers: A freshman in the House of Representatives has introduced a bill to create a congressional war council with power to control all the President's strategic, diplomatic, political, and economic planning.

In so doing, he has touched off a red-hot private cussing session between House Majority Leader MCCORMACK and White House Secretary Early.

Worse than that, he has "embarrassed the President," quite a trick on the part of any freshman, seeing as how the President is supposed always to eat these little mice alive. Charmingly, of course. Except in this case.

The freshman is Representative JAMES HOBSON MORRISON, of the Sixth District of Louisiana, in which he says everybody is "pore but independent." Mr. MORRISON was never in Washington until this very year. He came here a loyal party man, and was one of the young Democratic faithful who voted as a bloc to reelect SAM RAYBURN Speaker of the House.

Had MORRISON and friends not stuck by the New Deal that time, the Speaker of the House today would be MARTIN DIES, of Texas, and not RAYBURN.

All of which makes the more interesting what he has become after staying here a while.

Shortly after he had signed up with the New Deal to help win the world to "four freedoms," etc., etc., Freshman MORRISON got from his great leader, SAM RAYBURN, the news as to Freshman MORRISON's committee assignments.

These committee assignments, of course, are the principal guideposts of any new Member's career.

Since MORRISON was from a constituency of farmers, he wanted on the Agriculture Committee. He got Civil Service.

MORRISON drove around to Speaker Sam and explained that he didn't have many civil servants in his district but he sure did have plenty of farmers. So he would still like to get on Agriculture.

RAYBURN explained to him the seniority system, the benefits of being a good boy, the wisdom of "getting along," and the virtue of letting older heads think for him.

But MORRISON had the gall to respond that "Yawl up heah don't realize I'm representin' my own district. I got farmers to think of. Whuttim I gonna do?"

Upshot: He got nowhere with the Speaker, and in a rush of independence to the head, said that if he couldn't get on the Agriculture Committee he would not take any committees. He would spend all his time "workin' for my district" wherever and however he thought best. So he's a Congressman without a committee. And loves it, apparently.

Now this sort of revolt among freshmen from the solid South is new. It is also a sign in the heavens, considering 1944. For, of course, one revolt breeds another.

Which leads us up to what happened Thursday and was not printed in the Friday papers.

Thursday, shortly after the House of Representatives convened, Freshman MORRISON sidled up to the Clerk's desk and dropped into the hopper a bill—

"Providing for the creation of a supreme war council to consist of four members, two to be elected and appointed by the Senate, and two to be elected and appointed by the House of Representatives, to approve the actions of the President in the conduct of the war."

Wow! Read that again. A congressional war council "to approve the actions of the President in the conduct of the war." That covers it all. Morrison issued a statement of explanation at the same time, but it wasn't necessary. That crack, "to approve the actions of the President in the conduct of the war," is the volume speaker.

Well, that proposition to have a congressional war council control all the President's strategic, diplomatic, political, and economic propositions had hardly been recorded by the House clerk before the fireworks began to go off.

RAYBURN notified the White House. Presidential Secretary Early called JOHN MCCORMACK, the House majority leader, to know what the heck MCCORMACK meant letting a fresh egg like MORRISON introduce a bill like that.

"Let him?" MCCORMACK yelled into the phone.

"What do you mean, 'let him'? I didn't know he was going to do it. The President is upset about it? You say he was going to announce a war council of his own? So he's embarrassed, is he? What about me?"

And MCCORMACK proceeded to burn Early's ears with an analysis in detail of the state of morale among House Democrats.

The situation is this, as MCCORMACK explained it to Early: The freshmen are off the reservation and riding hard in every direction.

If MORRISON had known he was introducing a bill that would embarrass the President—why what did Early think he introduced the bill for, anyhow?

MCCORMACK said he does the best he can with these wild Indians and Yahoos, but the President will just have to realize this is not 1935.

There are strange revolts and fierce fires burning below the Democratic surface.

MORRISON's proposal to have a congressional war council checkmate the President's global thinking not only is an embarrassment, it is distinctly probable law.

Loyalty of Residents of the United States of Italian Origin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Assembly of the State of New York:

Whereas the demonstration of loyalty to the Government of the United States by the residents of the United States of Italian origin has been noteworthy; and

Whereas this exemplary conduct on those numbers of our population of Italian origin,

on the part of those who had not become citizens as well as those who had perfected United States citizenship has been deemed worthy of praise by the Attorney General of the United States; and

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the legislature that notwithstanding the recent expressions of the Attorney General of the United States, considerable obstacles and delay appear to prevent these worthy residents of our country from finally perfecting their United States citizenship during the existence of a state of war between the United States and Italy; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully memorialized to take appropriate action to eliminate any delay in the final attainment of citizenship on the part of applicants of Italian origin who have demonstrated themselves to be loyal and worthy, notwithstanding the existence of a state of war between the United States and Italy and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of Labor of the United States, and to each Member of the United States Senate and each Member of the House of Representatives elected from the State of New York.

Spread in Freight Rates on Livestock and Meats and Packing-House Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

OREGON STATE GRANGE,
Portland, March 31, 1943.

LOWELL STOCKMAN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STOCKMAN: I have read the statement from the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4340, made by the Honorable Harry B. Coffee, then Congressman from Nebraska and now president of the Omaha Union Stock Yards.

I believe that there should be an answer in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to Mr. Coffee's claims as to need of narrowing the spread between freight rates upon livestock and freight rates upon meat and packing-house products from Omaha to the Mountain Pacific area. Accordingly, I would appreciate very much if you would place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copy of the letter of Arthur M. Geary addressed to the War Production Board on behalf of western farm and livestock interests, along with this letter of transmittal.

I consider that the contentions of the Omaha Stock Yards and affiliated interests are not well founded and have no part in sound planning for the livestock producers, meat consumers, and the general public.

In all events now is no time to attempt a readjustment of the long-established freight-rate relationships on meat, packing-house products, and livestock from the Corn Belt to the Pacific coast. Farmers and stockmen cannot take time off from war production now to again defend before the Interstate Commerce Commission against litigation such as Omaha Stock Yards interests have been trying to stir up.

Yours truly,

MORTON TOMPKINS,
Master, Oregon State Grange.

PORTLAND, OREG., *March 22, 1943.*

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention Mr. Donald R. Longman, Civilian Distribution Division.)

GENTLEMEN: In compliance with your oral suggestion to me when in Washington, I am now presenting to the War Production Board a short written statement in opposition to the proposed narrowing of the spread between freight rates on meat and packing-house products and freight rates on livestock to the Pacific slope, publicized by Harry B. Coffee, ex-Congressman, now president of Omaha Union Stock Yards.

Freight-rate relationships that encourage movement of livestock eastward to Missouri River markets for slaughtering and processing, then movement westward as meat and packing-house products, are wasteful. Nevertheless, the plea of this executive of the Omaha Stock Yards to half a dozen Government departments and agencies, reported in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A4340, and over the radio and through the press to the public, is in favor of just that kind of freight rates.

Omaha Stock Yards interests do not seek a general lowering of freight rates from Missouri River to Pacific coast. What they are advocating is lower freight rates on meat and meat products and relatively higher freight rates on livestock; in short, they want the kind of freight rates that would draw more livestock from the West to their stockyards.

As a matter of fact, the exceptional meat shortage in industrial areas of the Pacific coast—despite Mr. Coffee's claims—has no connection with freight rates; but instead, this exceptional meat shortage has been properly attributed to undue restriction upon slaughtering. Furthermore, one at least of the Corn Belt packers in whose interest Mr. Coffee pleads, strongly supported the retention of the quota slaughtering system. A public relations executive of this big packer—with a plant at Omaha—explained to me personally that his firm favored the quota system, and he pointed out that the quota system prevented small packers from enlarging their civilian trade while his firm was so largely occupied in filling Government orders. Rationing without slaughtering quotas would not give the big packer the same protection.

The viewpoint of the big packer may not be in accord with the civilian war worker going without his fair share of meat, but it is easily understood.

Likewise, the viewpoint of the new president of the Omaha Union Stock Yards in seeking to divert more livestock to his stockyards is understandable.

Nevertheless, should not the livestock that is available in territory west of Missouri River markets and that is to be consumed there also be slaughtered there?

Take, for example, the Army camps near Great Falls, Mont. Should they not be supplied as far as practicable, first by slaughter, at Great Falls, of livestock produced in the vicinity of Great Falls; and, secondly, by slaughter, at Great Falls, of livestock produced in Montana and adjacent area, including the western Dakotas and Nebraska? Even hogs produced around Alliance or Sidney in western Nebraska can be more economically shipped directly to Great Falls or other western points of consumption than "around Robin Hood's barn" to Omaha, over 400 miles eastward, for slaughter and processing.

The local packing plants which dot the far West are needed in furtherance of the war effort. To stay in business, these packing plants must be afforded steady and constant flows of livestock. At different seasons they must be able to supplement local supplies of livestock with those shipped in from more distant points, all according to the seasons.

How much more economical of transportation is it to have freight-rate relationships between meat and livestock that permit long hauls of supplementing supplies of livestock than to have rate relationships that promote Omaha packing plants at expense of weakening local killing and processing throughout the far West?

To conserve transportation—and this letter is in approval of such a program—Office of Price Administration restrictions that govern price ceilings on meat are intended to encourage far-western plants to use livestock of the area west of Omaha in much the same manner that Office of Price Administration restrictions discourage Omaha plants from back hauling livestock to Omaha and shipping meat therefrom to the Pacific coast. A wholesale price ceiling on beef $1.75 higher per hundred pounds on the Pacific coast, available to coast packers, is more than offset by the $1.10 freight rate which they must pay on livestock from Omaha to the coast, even when cattle are good enough to dress out 60 percent.

In every portion of the Mountain-Pacific territory there is a surplus of livestock during part of the year.

To illustrate: In the early spring, even California, with population of approximately 7,000,000, has more fat lambs than California can consume. But, in June and July, California has a deficit of lambs, and then California draws upon the surplus of lambs produced in western Oregon. Later in the year California seeks supplies of lambs from the range territory, and at still other seasons obtains lambs from feeding areas including those around Yakima, Wash., and in Idaho and Colorado.

Availability of cattle for immediate slaughter west of the Missouri River also varies according to the season, but, all told, this western area produces far more cattle than it consumes. Accordingly, shipping into the Mountain-Pacific area of either dressed beef or cattle from Omaha is "carrying coals to Newcastle."

Furthermore, when the several million hogs of western Nebraska and the Dakotas are added to the million hogs on farms in the Pacific Northwest, one again observes the waste in transportation caused by freight rates that encourage movement of livestock eastward for slaughter at Missouri River packing plants and then movement of the products westward.

In the use of railroads there is economy even in shipping supplementary livestock long distances at certain seasons of certain years when, by doing this, packing plants are kept in operation and available the year around for the slaughtering and processing of much livestock produced close at hand.

Ordinarily a livestock producer of the Corn Belt profits, and his interests are protected, by being able to escape west from conditions prevailing at Omaha, and for that matter, from any point where so-called big meat packers have so strong an influence. Also, the meat-consuming public of the Pacific Slope in the long run profits from continuation of freight rates which make it possible for numerous independent meat packing plants of the far West to stay in business. Their competition both in buying of livestock and selling of meat and products is decidedly in the public interest.

When meat and meat-product freight rates from midwestern points, including Omaha, to the Pacific coast were investigated in 1935, the Interstate Commerce Commission found

that there were vital differences between the conditions governing movement westbound and movement eastbound from the Midwest. Inter alia, the Commission found that "Mountain-Pacific territory produces both sheep and cattle in excess of its requirements and this excess is shipped east" and also the Commission found that "most of the hogs moving from the Midwest to California are purchased in the country 200 or 300 miles west of the Missouri River, so that movement of live animals to river markets and movement of dressed carcasses to the west coast would constitute a back haul of some 400 to 600 miles" (*Westbound Rates on Meats*, 210 I. C. C. 13, p. 25). This peacetime decision of the Commission approved the kind of freight rates which are economical of transportation facilities, and decidedly in furtherance of the war effort.

Respectfully submitted.

ARTHUR M. GEARY,
Attorney for Farm Rate Council (Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana), Northwestern Livestock Shippers, Traffic League.

P. S.—In this letter we have not endeavored to present the drastic need that we feel exists for general reduction in freight rates. In February we joined with the Office of Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture in submitting evidence and arguments on this subject to the Interstate Commerce Commission in the rehearing of Ex parte 148. However, lowering of livestock rates would be particularly helpful throughout the Mountain-Pacific area, where so much of the slaughtering and meat processing is done at the consuming centers.

A. M. G.

Tribute to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a tribute to youth written by Mr. Hubert M. Harrison, Longview. I commend the statement to all of you:

TRIBUTE TO YOUTH

(By Hubert M. Harrison)

In our recent peaceful yesterdays, when our boys and girls enjoyed the privileges of a carefree life, it was said that we were rearing a race of "softies" and that the breed was running out. They took their fun where they found it and responsibility slipped easily from their shoulders. Then came Pearl Harbor and war. How magnificently have our boys and girls responded. When the crisis came they showed the courage and stamina of pioneer ancestors, long dormant in the gaily singing heart of youth.

That beaming boy, who mortgaged his soul and months of his allowance to buy a jalopy is now driving a tank against the Germans in North Africa. The small-town "drug-store cowboy" who ran his parents and his teachers wild with his antics, is now a foreman in an airplane factory. Boys who made cheerful idiots of themselves at football games a few years ago marched into the teeth of death in the jungles of Java singing The Eyes of Texas Are Upon You. That lovely laughing girl who thought only of high-school dances and wouldn't learn to cook, now manages a household, rears babies, and carries on as her husband goes to war and they give up their new little home. She who used to have her breakfast in bed now works in a war factory or sews for the Red Cross or has joined the WAAC's.

A sweet, pretty girl of the peaceful thirties who was chided for her lack of interest in home chores used to say, "Daddy, I'll do that when I have to." And now she has to and she does—splendidly.

This is the mysterious spirit that has made America. This is the magic of soul the dictators cannot understand. Rich, resourceful, pleasure-loving America enjoyed the fruits of its industry and was friendly to all mankind. Our enemies mistook kindliness for weakness.

East Texas boys and girls who are in this war are the descendants of the men and women who fought Indians, wild animals, and tyrants to establish a new nation in Texas. They are the great grandsons and daughters of those men and women of the old South who turned from the dining and dancing of the luxury and ease of that glorious civilization to the blood and sweat and dirt of battlefields. There is still iron in the American soul.

Hats off to our boys and girls. They are meeting their crisis bravely. They can do it when they "have to." We need have no fear of the future of America and east Texas. Our boys and girls will meet the new problems of war and victory and peace—and solve them when they have to. And "when the lights go on again all over the world," our east Texas boys and girls will laugh and love and live again in this dear land that they have saved.

A Million Men for the Army From Federal Bureaus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the question of manpower is one of the vital problems before our Nation today. In a specially prepared pamphlet the Chamber of Commerce of Columbus, Ohio, has made some suggestions in regard to this matter that deserve a good deal of consideration.

It points out that in streamlining for victory 1,000,000 Federal employees should be transferred immediately to military service or directly to war and agricultural production. Congress is urged to act at once.

It is contended that there are more than one-half as many Federal employees sitting at desks in Washington and elsewhere as there are enrolled in the Army and that the number is steadily increasing. If it is possible to transfer 1,000,000 men and women from Federal pay rolls, it is quite obvious that this would be an answer to part of the manpower problem.

In support of its position the chamber of commerce continues:

Canada has done it. The ratio of total Federal civilian employees to the total armed forces of the United States is 1 to 2.

On the same basis, in Canada the ratio is 1 to 6.

The ratio of civilian employees in war agencies to the armed-force personnel of the United States is 1 to 3.

On the same basis, in Canada the ratio is 1 to 8.

Civilian personnel increase outstrips armed forces.

From June 30, 1940, to August 31, 1942, civilian personnel in Federal war agencies increased at a rate more rapid than in the armed forces. Civilian increase was 530 percent; armed forces, 507 percent.

On June 30, 1940, the Federal war agencies employed 256,569; on August 31, 1942, 1,620,972.

Other Federal agencies also increased civilian personnel approximately 11 percent. These include the Federal Security Agency, the National Labor Relations Board, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Power Commission, etc.

On June 30, 1940, these agencies employed 746,251, with the number increasing to 829,786, approximately 11 percent, on August 31, 1942.

Employment system encourages abuse. One reason for the increase in employees is due to the Federal Classification Act of 1923, which in normal times makes an executive's salary dependent upon the number of persons under his supervision. Under this system it frequently happens that to obtain a useful executive at a salary commensurate with his skill and ability he is obliged to supervise a force of employees in greater number than necessary.

Another cause for the increase in employees lies at the door of personnel officers for many various Government agencies who feel their reputation and pay depend upon the number of persons on their pay rolls.

In many instances, additional employees have been so numerous they have handicapped the war effort by getting in each other's way. To relieve this situation, some agencies have created make-work programs, including establishment of new questionnaires for business and the public.

Canada's policy: The Canadian policy is simple but effective in holding government employees in nonwar agencies to a minimum.

Before a position can be created, or a vacated position filled in a nonwar agency, proof of necessity must be made to the Canadian Civil Service Commission which has strict requirements.

Cut personnel of nonwar agencies: Nonwar agencies of the Federal Government are huge reservoirs of manpower which can be utilized to help relieve the shortage.

Only a few of many instances where a drastic slash in personnel would be useful without impairing any essential services are cited in the following:

The Federal Security Agency: On October 31, 1942, this Agency employed 66,449 persons, of whom 20,832 were formerly members of State employment agencies. Deducting the latter figure, this Agency employed 45,617 persons as of October 31, 1942, as compared to 27,065 on June 30, 1940, an increase of 68.5 percent.

This Agency primarily was established to assist needy and unemployed. Obviously, expansion was unjustified under existing conditions.

The Federal Power Commission: This agency also has expanded personnel during the past 2 years.

And additional thousands of employees will be added to the pay rolls if a recent ruling of the agency, changing the basic policy in public-utility rate-making procedure, is enforced.

These prospective employees would be principally accountants and engineers who are sorely needed in war production.

Preventive as well as corrective measures should be employed here.

Labor relations administration: The administrative agencies in this complete setup could readily be pruned in personnel.

Also, it should be adjusted to a more efficient and economic system that would expedite matters in this vitally important field.

Here is the picture: Wages and salaries are controlled and administered in some phases by the following agencies. Wage and Hour Division, Bureau of Internal Revenue, National War Labor Board, and Office of Price Administration.

Labor disputes are handled by the United States Conciliation Service, the National Labor Relations Board, and the National War Labor Board.

In addition, the Labor Standards Division, Children's Bureau, and the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor also have a part in administrative affairs for labor.

These are only a few examples of the "business as usual" attitude of Washington bureaucracy.

The Jefferson Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Will P. Kennedy from the Washington Sunday Star of April 4, 1943:

CAPITAL SIDELIGHTS

(By Will P. Kennedy)

The approaching celebration of the bicentennial of Thomas Jefferson, with the dedication of the classic Jefferson Memorial scheduled for April 13, suggests a joint tribute to two men prominent in Washington, who, above all others, made possible the erection of the memorial—the late Representative John J. Boylan, of New York, who labored zealously for years to get the authorizing legislation approved by Congress and who was the first chairman of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, which selected the design, and Joseph P. Tumulty, most closely associated with Representative Boylan in this patriotic service.

Both Mr Boylan and Mr. Tumulty, close personal and political friends for more than three decades, were men of broad human sympathies and patriotic devotion, who reverenced the leadership of Jefferson in the formative days of this Nation. They both were idealists, both determined that Jefferson should have the tardy justice of a fitting memorial marking the fifth most important commemorative site in the Capital City.

Memorial services for Representative Boylan were held in the House on May 30, 1939, when a resolution of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission was presented, stating that "The fine concept which brought this Commission into being came from Mr. Boylan, a true lover of Thomas Jefferson and of the principles he espoused in life. Mr. Boylan brought to the deliberations of this Commission not only the knowledge and ripe experience acquired in many years of public service but also those qualities of integrity and sound judgment so necessary to the faithful discharge of his duties as a member of the Commission. He did what was characteristic of the man—he gave to its noble work the rare gift of life, love, and affection, and though ill and suffering, he carried on in splendid fashion the important work committed to his care with fine poise and patience and with never a boast on his lips."

Mr. Tumulty, former confidential secretary to Governor and later President Woodrow Wilson, who for many years had supported and counseled Mr. Boylan in his Jefferson Memorial objective, spoke feelingly in part as follows: "This plain man, born in an unpretentious part of the city of New York, wearing upon his good face the smudge of honest poverty, dreamed a beautiful dream of a memorial in Washington to Thomas Jefferson. Quietly, unostentatiously, he went about his work, scorning vulgar display, happy in the thought that after he had departed there would be left behind those who would not mock the thing that his vision built to an unmeasured monument.

"It was a pleasure to work with him, to sit by his side as I was accustomed to do, while quietly, humbly he expressed his views regarding every phase of our commission's activities. Always he gained his fine objective by openness and honorable action, his fine nature making it impossible for him ever to use unworthy arguments to accomplish his humane objectives.

"When the Jefferson Memorial is completed, there will be one name, like that of Abou ben Adhem, which will lead the list and that name will be our altogether lovely friend, John Boylan. As we behold that name, the words of John Drinkwater will flash into our minds:

"'Shall a man understand
He shall know bitterness because his kind,
Being perplexed of mind,
Hold issues even that are nothing mated.
And he shall give
Counsel out of his wisdom that none shall hear,
And steadfast in vain persuasion must he live,
And unabated
Shall his temptation be.'

"As a personality he had about him the grandeur of the old-fashioned man, with a noble vision directed into the far reaches of the future.

"John Galsworthy must have had this type of man in mind when he drew a portrait of an old friend in the story, A Portrait, an excerpt from which is as follows:

"'I know how big and sane and sweet he was. His breed is dying now; it has nearly gone. But as I remember him with that great, quiet forehead, with his tenderness and his glance which traveled to the heart of what it rested on, I despair of seeing his kind again. For, with him there seems to me to have passed away a principle, a golden rule of life, nay, more, a spirit—the soul of balance. It has stolen away, as in the early morning the stars steal out of the sky. He knew its tranquil secret, and where he is there must it still be hovering.'

"To him God was more than a nodding star atop a windy hill. Dear John Boylan, the tired heart, beloved friend in all seasons, turned home and thus the end of his brooding came."

Meat Situation May Get Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the following Associated Press story illustrates the depth of thought of some of our bureaucrats:

SEATTLE.—Guy R. Kinsley, food-rationing representative for the Pacific region, said the Pacific Northwest meat situation may be worse before it is better. He said Saturday that black markets and the reluctance of slaughterers to provide meat at what they say is a loss to themselves causes the shortage. "Personally, I think the packers and slaughterers can afford to take a loss for a time," he said. "It's like paying income tax, another way of helping the war effort."

It is about time that such men as this are taught that income comes from continuous production with reasonable rewards, and that no one has ever found a way to gain revenue from idleness or overdone and arbitrary regulations that ignore the principle of reasonable rewards.

Post-War Roads Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Senate Concurrent Resolution 24, adopted by the Fiftieth General Assembly of Iowa, urging that Congress take immediate action on the post-war highway program proposal as submitted by the American Association of State Highway Officials to the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and the House Committee on Roads of the National Congress on March 4, 1943:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 24

Whereas our Nation is engaged in the greatest war effort of our history and the President has announced that 11,200,000 men will be in the armed forces of our country by December of this year; and

Whereas our national economy has been converted from peace to war with several tens of millions of our citizens now engaged in producing the implements of war; and

Whereas it has been stated by high Government authority that 65,000,000 of our citizens (both in and out of the armed forces) will be engaged in the war effort by the end of this year; and

Whereas after the war is over the transformation of our country from a total war economy to a civilian peacetime economy, including the complete disruption of employment of fifty to sixty million people, is a problem of which the consequences can be almost as fateful as the result of the war itself unless proper steps are taken now; and

Whereas it is inevitable that our National Government will of necessity spend many billions of dollars in the post-war period, to cushion the transformation of the Nation's economy from war to peace; and

Whereas it is of the utmost importance that the funds so expended shall be spent on useful work and in an efficient, economical, and businesslike manner so that the Nation will have something of value to show for the money spent after the unemployment problem of the post-war period shall have passed

and to the end that the principle of self-help rather than public bounty shall be uppermost; and

Whereas highway construction is useful work and will be vitally necessary and is one of the best means of providing employment for idle men, and produces a durable necessary public improvement for the convenience and welfare of all our people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Fiftieth General Assembly of the State of Iowa (the house concurring):

1. That we hereby endorse the proposal submitted to the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and the House Committee on Roads of the National Congress on March 4, 1943, by the American Association of State Highway Officials, for the immediate authorization of $3,000,000,000 to be expended on highway construction over a period of 3 years following the close of the war.

2. That these funds be controlled and expended through the regular highway agencies of the States and the Federal Government, and that no new Federal agencies be created or empowered to handle such work.

3. That the funds so authorized be allotted among all the States on some equitable fixed formula to the end that each State will know as soon as the act is passed the approximate amount of such funds it will receive, and plan accordingly.

4. That the funds so authorized be available for expenditure in the improvement of State primary roads, secondary roads, and municipal streets.

5. That the work be done under contracts let at open, advertised, competitive, public bidding to the lowest responsible bidder, and based on fixed, definite plans and specifications, thus avoiding and preventing the confusion, delay, waste, and extravagance of work done without adequate plans and specifications, or with no plans and specifications.

6. That the Congress take immediate action on this matter to the end that time may be had to make surveys, prepare plans, secure rights-of-way, and get ready to let contracts and start construction promptly when the war is over and unemployment becomes acute.

7. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Iowa and to Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and Hon. J. W. ROBINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Roads, of the National Congress.

Pay As You Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of April 1, 1943:

CONGRESS FLOPS

The administration and the Democratic House have done a disservice to the Nation in defeating the modified Ruml pay-as-you-go tax plan. They have gone counter to public opinion, which has been strongly in favor of such a measure. They have nullified 2 months of study, hearings, and debate. They have made all but impossible the enactment of much-needed tax reform at this session. They have deferred the solution of a problem which will eventually impoverish many taxpayers and harass most of them. The White House, the Treasury, and the Democratic majority have won, but at the expense of the country as a whole, and Congress itself, floundering around in its excitement, has given us an exhibition which is certainly not reassuring in a critical period.

There was a consistently creditable showing in one group—those Republicans who supported the Ruml plan from first to last and refused to be influenced by political appeals. If any other satisfaction is to be derived from the mess, it is the defeat of the Doughton plan, which the Treasury urged. A preliminary vote showed that a majority preferred the Ruml-Carlson proposal to that of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. The Republicans did not, unfortunately, have their way, but at least they stood to their guns and blocked the enactment of a sorry substitute for either the Ruml-Carlson pay-as-you-go bill or the existing law.

For the time being there is little probability of a change in our procedure, as the Ways and Means Committee has shown itself incapable of drafting an acceptable bill and the Senate is powerless to act, for such measures must originate in the House. We shall continue, unless the Republicans manage to revive the discussion, to pay in arrears and to face the prospect of a large number of defaults. And the people will wonder, meanwhile, what is wrong with a Democratic House which labors for 2 months and accomplishes nothing.

Political Activities of the Office of Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, in a speech in this House, I leveled certain accusations at the Office of Civilian Defense and especially at its participation in the past in political activities, for which it was definitely not so organized by the act of Congress setting up the O. C. D.

During the course of my speech, I was requested to yield, and on frequent occasions gladly did so, to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who sought to defend the O. C. D. activities. Possibly it was because of this fact that when Dean James M. Landis, director of the Office of Civilian Defense, wrote me on Friday, he sent a copy of that letter to the gentleman from Washington.

As would be expected, Dean Landis objected to some of my statements. In my office yesterday afternoon, I dictated a reply in some detail to Mr. Landis' objections to my remarks of last Thursday.

I had not intended to place this correspondence in the RECORD. However, this morning the gentleman from Washington informed me by telephone that it was his intention to place in the Appendix of the RECORD today the copy of the letter addressed to me which he had received from Dean Landis, and asked if I had any objection. Of course, he is at liberty to put any such official communication that he cares to into the RECORD, and I did not feel called upon to object; but I did inform him, however, that if that was his intention, and in order that there be no misunderstanding in his mind or in the minds of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that I was in any sense of the word assuming a defensive attitude in this matter, I would at the same time—and for that reason only—likewise today put into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of my reply to Dean Landis, which I dictated yesterday, Sunday, April 4; and under permission previously granted by unanimous consent, I herewith include a copy of my letter to Dean Landis, which I think is completely self-explanatory:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. April 4, 1943.

Hon. JAMES M. LANDIS,
Director, Office of Civilian Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DEAN LANDIS: Your letter of April 2 is acknowledged with interest and carefully noted.

I appreciate your natural interest in my speech recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 1, beginning on page 2818. Of course, I made certain charges in that speech which I considered well founded, based not only on research but also on personal observations in my home State, in my own district, and elsewhere in the country. May I assure you, however, that I intended to confine myself to charges rather than insinuations. I usually like to hit straight out from the shoulder and let the chips fall where they may. Therefore, if you regard some of my statements as insinuations, it must be because I was unable to express myself perfectly clear.

Illustrative of this statement and illustrative of my general attitude toward the civilian war effort, and those who are patriotically participating therein, let me repeat this—taken from the third column on page 2821

"And in my criticism of the present Office of Civilian Defense set-up, let me make this perfectly clear. I am not denying the need for proper semimilitary anti-air raid or other war organizations in definite target areas, such as, for instance, our Nation's Capital here and in war-production areas as Detroit, Pittsburgh, Los Angeles, and so forth. Secondly, I am not critical in any sense of the word of the intense patriotic desire of millions of American citizens who have volunteered their services in seeking to bring about a perfect organization—all honor to them. What I am critical of is that now a potential political machine is definitely in the making, and I am warning in advance those millions of patriotic Americans to be wary that they differentiate between purely patriotic motives and activities in truth aimed at civilian defense as distinguished from sinister political activities. And in saying this, I am mindful of many complaints which I received long, long ago from patriotic people in my State, who said they had become thoroughly disgusted with local and regional, and even State-wide, civilian-defense meetings because of the fact that 10 percent of their time in meetings was spent in intelligent discussion of defense matters and the balance turned over to a super-glorification of the attainments of the New Deal. This has been going on for a long time to such a nauseating extent that many of these loyal, patriotic citizens felt their efforts were going for naught and who, therefore, resigned outright or failed to attend future meetings.

"Listen, my colleagues, this House ought to pass a bill that will absolutely prohibit

any use whatsoever of the Office of Civilian Defense for any political purposes whatsoever. Instead of this 'gestapo' bill we debated so long yesterday, we ought to pass an act making it punishable by a fine, or imprisonment, or both, for anyone to utilize the facilities of the Office of Civilian Defense in any way for any political purposes. No mere statement by Dean Landis is going to satisfy the American people. It is up to Congress to act on this matter and clearly legislate the Office of Civilian Defense and the Office of War Information out of all political activities."

I repeat, Dean Landis, civilian defense is one thing. Nauseating political activity is another. The two must not be allowed to be combined or screened under the guise of a patriotic civilian war effort.

Too often have I been in attendance at Office of Civilian Defense functions in my own State and district, especially within the few months prior to the campaign of last fall, when no one could deny but that the Office of Civilian Defense platform was decidedly serving as the sounding board for the political activities of the New Deal candidates in my State. Their very utterances on those occasions could not possibly be misinterpreted as being confined solely to the activities of civilian defense.

Now in your list of specific complaints as to misstatements, you say: First, "the most important of these misstatements is that all the persons in the civilian defense organization are subject to removal by me." I find no such statement in the RECORD. Then you go on quoting me as saying: "Block leaders will become fanatic followers of the New Deal—or they will lose their jobs." I stand on that statement and it can be proven in many instances in my own State, while under the administration of our recent Governor Van Wagoner.

In substantiation of the point I had in mind, namely, that the unfaithful would be promptly removed, let me cite the instance, prior to the last election, in the Third Illinois District which was won by present Congressman FRED E. BUSBEY. Congressman BUSBEY for the past 22 years had been actively identified with the Americanism division of the American Legion, Department of Illinois, having served in the capacity of District Americanism director, Americanism director of Cook County and also for the State of Illinois for the American Legion. Notwithstanding these facts, the Office of Civilian Defense attempted to prevent him from dedicating American flags in honor of the men serving in the armed forces of our country. In fact, the community commander of civilian defense went so far as to issue a directive stating that any block captain permitting Mr BUSBEY to appear on a patriotic program dedicating a flag would be fired. In a subsequent bulletin, he even stated that he had fired two block captains for having permitted Mr. BUSBEY to appear at a flag dedication. The point, Mr. Landis, that I am trying to bring out is this: Notwithstanding the fact that the Office of Civilian Defense had no jurisdiction whatsoever over these flag dedications, it even went outside of its sphere of activities of civilian defense to attempt to prevent Congressman BUSBEY from appearing at any flag dedications, because he was a Republican candidate for office; and while doing so, nevertheless, turned its back on the fact that incumbent New Deal officeholders, avowed candidates for reelection, were invited and permitted to appear promiscuously

Your second point. I care not where the block plan originated. I care not who got the idea originally. What I am talking about is the way it is operating at the present time and its political potentialities, and I care not whether those be directed toward Republican or Democratic candidates. We have no right in this country to permit politics to be mingled with the war effort, and I shall continue to fight it at every opportunity. And, I repeat, I can prove that it was used against me in the past campaign and used against other Republican candidates. I would suggest that you not deny that, because I have plenty of proof, and I say it is about time to stop that sort of stuff if we are to win this war.

Your third objection to my speech seems to fall into the above category and needs no further comment at this time.

As to your fourth objection, may I say that I made it perfectly clear in my speech—if you read it clearly—I raised no objection to that ad, and I clearly stated so.

Very truly yours,

FRED BRADLEY,
Member of Congress.

A Country Doctor Philosophizes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, some years ago a book entitled "The Country Doctor" became a best seller because it was such an intensely human document. In my home town we also have a man of medicine to whom I refer affectionately as our country doctor. I use the term in the sense that for a lifetime his practice has been confined to a city of modest size.

In his quiet, unselfish way he has done much good, experienced many things, lived intimately with people, shared their joys and sorrows, and developed a humble yet rich philosophy of living. I refer to Dr. W. A. Balcke, of Pekin, Ill.

Now and then he finds time to set his thoughts on paper for a very modest weekly newspaper. They contain sufficient enrichment to warrant wider circulation, and I am therefore expressing them in the official RECORD of the Congress:

DR. BILL'S COLUMN—HOW WE GET ALONG

While I was a "horse and buggy" doctor, an incident occurred which left an impression on me. I was often called to the family of a farm hand. His wife and four children were often sick or injured. During the time I was called there the four children were born. In due time all my bills were paid. Forty-five years ago a farm hand's wages were small. In addition to wages, he was allowed a good garden spot and pasture for his cow; he also kept chickens and a pig from his employer's crib.

After some years, he said he had rented 80 acres and the next year would farm for himself. My curiosity got the best of me and I asked him how he could borrow enough money to buy equipment and run on his own.

His answer was, "I have come to pay you the $20 I owe you. This $20 is all I have had to borrow. I have saved all the rest." I promptly told him to repay the loan and sign a 2-year note to me. He did this and paid the note before the due date, so the interest was stricken.

Without exposing too much curiosity, I have followed the financial state of many of my patients. The conclusions were simply astonishing.

Some families got along so well on so little and had no financial worries. Others with more wages were always hopelessly in debt. Bill collectors were a constant nightmare. Only a few were real dead beats and dishonest. Most of them did not keep a single brain cell working in a financial line.

Some years ago a man earned good wages but let his bills go unpaid until he owed me in excess of $500. I tried in many ways to show him the error of his ways. He lost both homes his wife's father had left her.

I finally called him and his wife to my office and gave them the works, holding no punches. I found that he cashed his check and was to pay bills. I told him I would tie up his wages until kingdom come, if he did not pay me, unless he complied with my one request. This was to let the wife handle all the money and pay all the bills, as his way had failed.

I showed them a 10-cent book which I had prepared, in which to list all their debts and payments. I also ruled off a place where expenses were to be budgeted and debts slowly liquidated. They both agreed after some arguments.

In 14 years their debts were paid, they went on a cash basis, they repurchased one of the lost homes, remodeled it and paid for it entirely and furnished it with lovely furniture.

This has often been done with some failures, but with many successes. Sometimes the husband's and wife's position reversed. I sometimes got my nose burnt sticking it into other people's business, but I considered it my own business when my interests were involved. I might say that in 45 years of practice I have not directly sued anyone or tied up their wages. That hurts friendships.

One old man earned only $12 a week. He said he could not pay me because his grocer managed to charge him exactly $12 per week right along. I asked about his rent and other bills. He said he simply did not pay them because he could not. Death finally settled his bills. That was before our Government rewarded men for being no good all their lives.

The above statement, however, does not apply to many old people whose misfortunes in life left them destitute in their old age. We are glad to see them cared for.

The Government's recent pronouncement to care for all from the cradle to the grave will knock all the self-respect and self-reliance out of a proud, free people and will some day make them slaves to some ambitious government in return for their votes. That will be the end of our democracy. "Help a man to help himself," is a good motto for America.

Here are some tabulated thoughts for consideration:

1. American wages should be so as to preserve our high standard of American life.

2. Young couples starting out should be able to equip their home on deferred payments with 25 percent paid down.

3. Families buying a home should be able to finance it on deferred payments.

4. Men driving a car in their own business or to work should be able to buy a car on deferred payments.

5. Families desiring to add more comforts in their home, or things for better living, as radios, pianos, etc., should be able to buy them on deferred payments, if there are no other deferred payments except on a home.

6. Church donations and anticipated medical expense should be budgeted and kept for that purpose.

7. Every American family should so live to preserve its self-respect and independence and live with their chins up and be able to look

all men in the face. How wonderful it would be if most retail buying would be for cash.

The above are my own thoughts. No one needs to agree with me. I do not love bill collectors and try not to have any ring my door bell. Physicians are notoriously bad financial men. As soon as they get a practice they are placed on a sucker list and are often taken in. As for me, I do not want to live a life in financial misery, nor barter my independence for my vote.

Farm Owners Protest President's Veto of Bankhead Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the following telegram of protest against the President's veto of the Bankhead bill, which furnishes a very complete up-to-the-minute picture of the operating difficulties of the farmers of my district under existing conditions:

CENTRALIA, MO., *April 4, 1943.*

Hon. MAX SCHWABE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The undersigned farmers owning 5,000 and feeding over 6,000 head hogs, cattle, and sheep for market annually, wish to protest against the grossly unfair argument that what the farmer sells is up over 100 percent and what he buys is up only about 30 percent since 1939, and that, therefore, farmers should be getting along better. This is most unfair because what the farmer buys is only a small percentage of his operating costs. Labor, taxes, and numerous items of our expenses necessarily incurred in producing crops and livestock for market are over 250 percent of what they were in 1939. Our actual operating expenses are up considerably more than prices we get for our products, leaving us in same or worse position than in recent years. We call attention to the following: Fat cattle were selling 2½ cents per pound higher in Chicago in 1937 than now, yet the city consumer paid 4 cents less per pound for the leading beef cuts than now. Most meat animals are now bringing the farmer 14 to 16 cents per pound, while the city consumer is mostly paying 50 to 65 cents per pound. The spread is much too great. He should be able to get 5 or 6 cents per pound more without any increase in the cost to the consumer. We think that what union labor is getting, rather than what the farmer is getting, is by long odds the biggest factor in the determining what the city consumer pays. Union labor now gets nearly twice as much as in First World War, while we are getting only 55 percent of what we got then. Likewise union labor is getting four and one-half times as much as it got in our parity base period 1910 to 1914, while farm products are not bringing quite twice as much as then. Compared to any previous base period in our memory, union labor is getting two to four times as much as we farmers for our products. We insist on passage of the Pace bill and repassage over the veto of the Bankhead bill. Why should the Government push union labor so high and hold their workweek to 40 hours plus time and one-half or double pay for overtime, while we have to work 90 hours per week? And the Government insists not only on no overtime but in completely ignoring our labor cost in calculating the prices we get. This is most unfair. Is union labor entitled to something that farm labor is not? A fair price will enable us farmers to greatly increase our production, which, in turn, will help win the war, better feed our people, who are certainly able to pay, and our allies. We believe a bountiful supply is the best protection against wild inflation, while the unfair prices we are getting and will continue to get if the Bankhead and Pace bills are defeated, will not only make angrier farmers and hungrier city people, but the decreased supply resulting will most surely and inevitably bring on the inflation we all seek to avoid. A great many farmers are going broke, and farm sales are very numerous, which means that farm production will materially decrease until the farmer gets a better price for his products. The Government gives industry contracts running into hundreds of billions of dollars on the basis of cost, plus substantial profits. In order to get increased production of all goods needed to win the war except farm products, getting rid of theoretical and impractical crackpots in the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration is vital to not only agriculture but the Nation.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN D. SCHINDLER.
A. B. CHANCE.
PAUL EVERHART.
E. B. WILSON.
E. K. COLE.
ALBERT W. SCHINDLER.

Pay-As-You-Go Continues To Be a Live Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present for the consideration of my colleagues an editorial published in the Buffalo Evening News, of Buffalo, N. Y., on April 1, 1943:

RUML PLAN NOT DEAD

The most significant feature of the House's action in sending all pay-as-you-go tax proposals back to committee was the fact that the entire debate and subsequent voting centered about the Ruml plan, as embodied in the Carlson bill It is true that the Ruml plan went down to defeat by a vote of 215 to 198 which held very strongly to party lines, but the House action left no doubt that Members on both sides realized that no compromise was possible on the issue of double taxation for the great majority of the Nation's 44,000,000 income taxpayers. The fact that the Ways and Means Committee bill, providing for a 20-percent withholding tax starting July 1 but requiring the payment of double taxes for 1 year before the taxpayer could get on a current basis, received virtually no consideration is proof of this. Other proposals that would have involved a greater or less measure of tax payments above the amount prescribed by existing revenue legislation received equally scant consideration.

The Carlson bill embodying the Ruml plan in somewhat modified form was the only measure before the House that would have made all taxpayers current in their obligations without the payment of extra, unlegislated taxes. It also included a 20-percent withholding levy, but the latter could be justified only as a means of collecting taxes currently. Under the committee bill the withholding tax would be an anomaly—a "monstrosity," as Republican supporters of the Ruml plan put it—because even after paying it the taxpayer would still be in debt to the Government for a year's taxes and his only alternative would be to pay 2 years' taxes in 1 to get on a current basis. None but the very rich could afford to do that at a time when unprecedented wartime tax rates have cut deeply into the average family budget for essentials.

But the Ruml-Carlson plan is not dead, as Chairman DOUGHTON of the Ways and Means Committee implied when he said the committee would pass on to "other important things." The public, more than four-fifths of whom, according to the Gallup poll, favor the Ruml plan, will not let it die. From the standpoint of taxpayers and the Treasury alike, it is absolutely essential that a system of current tax collections from wages, salaries, and other income sources be placed in effect at the earliest possible moment. The confusion and uncertainty caused by congressional delay in the enactment of a pay-as-you-go tax-collection plan has already been reflected in the excessive borrowing and cashing in of assets, including War bonds, which took place in order that taxpayers might meet their March 15 payments. The dislocations may be even greater when the next payment falls due on June 15. Every day of delay in enacting a current pay-as-you-go plan piles an Ossa of demoralizing uncertainty on the Pelion of existing doubt with respect to the Government's tax intentions.

No more heated congressional debate has taken place in many years than the House debate on pay-as-you-go legislation. The charges of "demagoguery" hurled by both sides had best be forgotten, for there should be no question of the sincerity of both the pro- and anti-Ruml plan adherents. But the main argument, furnished by the Treasury, of the Democratic opponents of the Carlson bill—namely, that the Government would be throwing away assets of $10,000,000,000 by technically forgiving a year's taxes in order to make all taxpaying current—falls of its own weight. The Treasury has never carried taxes collectible as assets on its books—and for a very good reason. This is because Congress provides each year by legislation for the imposition of taxes needed and feasible in that year. The Ruml plan would not stop tax collections for one moment; in fact, it would regularize and speed them up. Under it revenues this year would be anywhere from $2,000,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 greater than anticipated because the tax base would be the estimated 1943 national income of $140,000,000,000 instead of the $120,000,000,000 income of 1942.

There are various possibilities for compromise on certain features of the Ruml plan, though not on the essential point of current collections without double taxation for the vast majority of taxpayers in the lower and middle-income groups. The Ways and Means Committee should go to work immediately on the draft of a satisfactory bill combining a withholding tax and the principle of pay-as-you-go. There are no more "important things" before it, because delay in solving the tax-collection problem affects the whole financing of the war, the economic controls against inflation and morale on the home front. As disappointing as the House action, or inaction, was, at least it shows that the underlying principle of the Ruml plan must be the point of departure for any solution to the problem of current income-tax collections.

Is the Administration Buying the Press of the Nation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAX SCHWABE
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to call the attention of the House to a letter from one of my highly respected and alert constituents, Dr. James Stewart, of Jefferson City, Mo., protesting against the proposed expenditure by the Treasury Department of from twenty-five to thirty million dollars for advertisements in the small newspapers throughout our Nation for the purpose of selling Government bonds, as follows:

Hon MAX SCHWABE,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: There is being prepared by the Treasury of the United States a bill which will probably be introduced by Senator BANKHEAD, which calls for the expenditure by the Treasury Department of some twenty-five to thirty million dollars to be used in advertising in small rural newspapers throughout the Nation for the purpose of selling Government bonds.

Although I feel sure that you will catch the significance of this, I thought it well, since I know you are very busy, to point out this fact. This is a deliberate move on the part of the Treasury to buy the press of this Nation. For God's sake, Mr. SCHWABE, we expect the Republicans to stop this atrocious practice. This, as I see it, would be the end of democracy.

Very truly yours,
JAMES STEWART, M. D.,
Jefferson City, Mo.

The Labor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication received by me from a constituent setting forth a plan to help solve the labor shortage situation:

Too much publicity on what to do when the war is over is bound to weaken the immediate drive, so essential to final victory.

Our people must realize that each of them must make an "all out" effort each and every day. The proposed plan will help the war effort. It will be of as much value after the war though it definitely is a program for now. It may appear too simple, yet it, with teeth, will work and could be put into operation in a week's time. As it is radical, it will require courage to be made a law. Yet it will enable the Nation to better meet both the present and the future.

Price regulation as it has been handled is as hard to solve as a jigsaw puzzle, where the parts of several sets are badly mixed and partially lost. When one item is corrected in our present system, we bulge out on another and the price keeps on rising just the same.

The public has been sold on the fact that the panic of 1929 was due to overproduction, yet it was fear and inflation that produced the overproduction by curtailing purchasing power. Had our excess been shipped to needy nations, our way of life could have been maintained and we might still have been reducing the public debt. Even the present war might have been deferred. Today we are on the other side of the cycle. Our shortage is real, yet it has been made far more acute by the fact that our buying power exceeds our production.

Today we have a multitude of regulations, and these regulations are consuming manpower which is already insufficient to meet the demands of those who set our program. Any move today must correct inequalities which have come with regulation.

The only fault with the proposed plan is that it may be too simple for the bureaucrats to comprehend. Yet here is the plan.

Pay every worker for all the hours he works up to 40 per week, the total the unions have accepted as a standard. Then base living and wage standards on this 40-hour pay check. Impound all wages over the 40-hour amount in a fund from which income tax would be paid and the rest invested in bonds which would be frozen for the duration, after which they would be released to be used as the worker saw fit. At the end of the war we would have a nation with a purchasing power without which we must either drop to the standard of our neighbors and find ourselves a nation stripped of raw material, our principal asset being the largest public debt in the world on which we would pay ourselves interest.

Absenteeism would be curtailed as time lost would come out of the 40-hour base pay rather than from the surplus. This 40-hour check would provide greater equality among workers. Today we have handicapped groups who do not happen to be in war work trying to match on 40 hours, and their industry has been slack so their pay rates have not advanced, with a neighbor who happens to be in war work. He gets from 60 hours a week up, with time and a half for all over 40 hours, and if he is any good at all his base pay has already been boosted at least one-third. Yet today we ask the 40-hour people, teachers, clerks, public employees, and other service people to meet living costs which Washington admits are up 15 percent, put 10 percent of their pay in bonds, pay sharply increased income taxes, and try to keep up with their neighbors. We are missing one of the four freedoms right here at home.

If the money available or paid out in wages and salaries be limited to that earned in a 40-hour week with a deduction for absenteeism and the balance invested in bonds to the employee's credit and impounded with interest for the duration, all will be more nearly on the same scale, all will have nearer the same purchasing power and 90 percent of our present inflation and shortage will disappear almost over night. In other words, we will stop inflation at the source rather than try to clean up the mess which it creates.

This program will stop the need for all bond drives so far as the general public goes. There will be no longer any excuse for the firm with no reason to create public opinion on a large scale to use radio and billboards to tell people to buy bonds. Of course, the officials might not loom as large in their community, though the tax money used for advertising purposes will go to the Government as taxes as was intended.

Another item that can be seriously considered is the subsidizing of our colleges. The cry first went up that the war and draft were wrecking the seats of higher learning. The draft succeeded, and today we have a mad rush in the furniture plants to double the number of beds so that double the number of boys can be put in each college room. The boys sent to college have all expenses paid and receive the same pay as men on call in the service. A large percentage will fail to pass the speed-up program, and very few will be of anything like as much value to the armed effort as if they went direct to the armed forces or industry, both of whom need men of this age more than ever before. There is no reason why our colleges should not be on a very restricted basis for the duration. Let their teachers get out and gain experience which will better fit them for the period after the war when there will be a real reason to boost the number of boys who will be in college, boys who will require teachers with experiences equal to what experience these boys have had. You might even use Army camps as industrial schools in an effort to absorb men and build better for the problems we then face. The home of the future needs much which is not available today. Lack of craftsmen here make the tile floors in the common home in Cuba a luxury enjoyed in only a few of our most expensive homes, but college can absorb our youth after the war rather than shelter them now. A year of Army life will mean as much to a boy as any year in his life.

Nothing can be more simple than an enforced saving of all we earn beyond the first 40 hours. Social Security already has most of the figures. The first pay-roll deduction will hit the black markets like a wintry blast, liquor lines where men pay almost any price, stand for hours, and forget values, will dwindle. There will be no need for all the fanfare and advertising of our bond drives. What absenteeism continued would be the result of calls more serious than a hang-over or not feeling fit when we ask our soldiers to fight 24 hours a day, to fight with heat, drought, and vermin, with loss of life thrown in for good measure to protect the soft life at home. The program will improve our manpower situation. People will be satisfied, the dollar spent will bring home more bacon, and the final bill which the American people must settle will be a lot less. And finally, we will solve the post-war problem without any excitement. An act of Congress with Presidential approval can adopt this plan as an emergency. When this is done we will be on a direct road to ultimate victory and a shorter war.

Stupid Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News:

STUPID SECRECY

That conference of 38 nations on post-war food problems, which is to be held in this country this month, is all very hush-hush. At least, our Government has decided that the press must not even talk with the delegates. The only information given the public—which is so vitally involved—was to be of the canned variety, doled out if, as, and when

the Government saw fit. Now the Government appears to be retreating from that untenable position.

The reaction to this contemplated suppression of nonmilitary news is obvious. The plain citizen, or the Congressman, asks what the administration is trying to put over that must be covered up. Newspapermen wonder whether freedom of the press is going out and a semidictatorship coming in.

Our disposition is to give the administration the benefit of the doubt. It is hard to believe that a plot is cooking to injure the democracy, which can function only through informed public opinion and a free press.

The remarkably fine record of the Office of Censorship, improvement in Navy Department communiques, and courageously honest reports by Secretary of War Stimson are evidence that responsible officials want to give the public the facts—except information useful to the enemy, and, of course, there is no challenge of that exception.

Unfortunately, this proposed conference secrecy was a departure from that responsible policy. It would be a bad precedent and a stupid one. Negotiating delicate issues outside the glare of publicity may seem a surer and safer way, and is for a little while. But not in the long run. "Open covenants openly arrived at" may be harder to get, but they last longer.

Secret diplomacy is suspect by the American electorate. Therefore it is not worth the paper it is written on. Any official who forgets that is so busy with details he has forgotten the first lesson in American foreign policy and in the neglected art of treaty ratification.

Just because the success of this and related international conferences is so important to American and world welfare, we hope the President will invite necessary public support for any constructive agreements by congressional representation and normal press coverage.

Like it or not, an informed and approving American public opinion is the price of any American foreign commitments. Along with most Americans, we happen to like it that way.

The Income-Tax Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an editorial by John S. Knight, publisher of the Akron Beacon-Journal, Miami Herald, and Detroit Free Press, and appearing in the Akron Beacon-Journal.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to avoid catastrophic results, this tax problem on incomes must be solved soon.

The time has passed for any politics to be a part of this issue.

If we expect our people to respect this body and the laws we enact, then we must enact the kind of laws that a large majority of our people are asking for from us. I cannot feel that my election to this honorable body removed me from the will of the people whom I represent. If this House goes forward with an indifferent attitude in the face of public demands about a pay-as-you-go tax plan, then we deserve whatever may befall us from a hostile people.

The editorial is as follows:

NO TIME FOR POLITICS—LITTLE GEMS OF STATESMANSHIP

"I am satisfied," DOUGHTON declared. "We have beaten the Ruml plan. The present tax-collection system has existed since 1913 and I suppose we can get along with it another year." (International News Service.)

"The final action of the House spelled zero for 2 months of work on the part of the Ways and Means Committee to produce an acceptable plan for collecting income taxes out of pay checks and envelopes, and for placing taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go basis." (International News Service.)

"ROBERTSON then gave the death stroke to the Luce amendment by telling the House that, under it, a man making a million dollars a year would have to pay the Government, during the next 5 years, an annual tax of $1,023,100, or $23,100 a year more than his income. 'That shows the undesirability of having tax amendments presented by persons (Mrs. LUCE) inexperienced in such matters,' he remarked wryly." (International News Service.)

"A lull settled upon the House in the wake of a week-long scrap, and Republicans and Democrats alike shook hands, and said it was a good fight." (Associated Press.)

"While a demand arose immediately for a new try at getting out some sort of pay-as-you-go legislation, it appeared likely the battle would not be renewed until the House has taken a brief rest during the Easter holiday." (Associated Press.)

"President Roosevelt told congressional leaders Wednesday that he was pleased over defeat of the Ruml plan and House spokesmen declared that further efforts to pass pay-as-you-go tax legislation would be postponed until work is started later this year on a bill increasing taxes." (International News Service.)

Well, there you have it.

Another shocking example of legislative irresponsibility, largely inspired by administrative irresponsibility, at the very moment when the Secretary of the Treasury frantically is scurrying about trying to whip up enthusiasm for the Second War Loan drive which is to start April 12.

A few days ago, a bill authorizing the raising of our national debt limit to $210,000,000,000 was placed on President Roosevelt's desk. That limit will ultimately have to go as high as $400,000,000,000 if we intend to put Hitler and Hirohito out of business for all time to come and help get the world back on its feet.

But the little men at Washington, the Doughtons and the Morgenthaus and dozens of other two-bit economists, would rather dawdle along and play politics with the Nation's tax structure than adopt a workable pay-as-you-go plan that would place everybody on a current basis.

Even while assailing the Ruml plan as a device permitting the rich to have their 1942 taxes forgiven, the confused Ways and Means Committee of the House produced a monstrosity of its own under the guise of a current tax plan which imposed 2 years' taxes in one and offered a discount feature for paying in advance which could benefit no one except the men with money in the bank. The Committee's bill was a kick in the teeth to every man, woman, and child who has tried to help the Government by buying War bonds with every extra available dollar.

When he saw that his colleagues in the House of Representatives intended to turn thumbs down on the committee's work, Chairman DOUGHTON devoted his efforts to sabotaging the Ruml plan, even though his opposition had the net effect of sending all tax schemes back to the committee for "more study."

As was noted above in an Associated Press paragraph, the "more study" phase will be resumed after "a brief rest during the Easter holiday."

By that time Mr. Morgenthau's second war-loan program may be limping very badly.

It is regrettable indeed that the President has not only permitted but actually encouraged his leaders in Congress to play politics with the tax bill.

But, then, Mr. Roosevelt enjoys needling his fellow millionaires, and this time he thinks the Ruml plan has a sharp and irritating point.

What happens to the 44,000,000 lower-income taxpayers is something for Secretary Morgenthau to worry about.

The Beacon Journal has been for the Ruml plan because it is the only feasible method we have seen proposed for making the American taxpayer current in his obligations to the United States Government.

As Beardsley Ruml, author of the plan, said in his recent address at Detroit, "The Ruml plan is as simple as daylight-saving time. Let us turn our tax clocks ahead 1 year Our Government finances would be no more affected than time is by a change in clock hands. Out-of-date income taxes make all of us live a life of modern peonage—we can't afford to get sick, have an accident, or even to die. If we turn the tax clock ahead, all taxpayers can be made current, income-tax debt will be eliminated, the Government will obtain increased revenue, and there will be no additional tax burden on any taxpayer."

That statement, we submit, makes a pretty good case for the Ruml plan, particularly since the plan's author believes that a special windfall tax should be employed to catch large incomes swollen by war profits in the year to be skipped.

As opposed to the administration's claim that the Ruml plan is a device to let the millionaires escape without paying taxes for last year, Mr. Ruml maintains, first, that the upper-bracket taxpayers, like everyone else, must continue to pay income taxes so long as they have incomes and that, when they die, "what otherwise would have been payable as income tax on the taxpayer's previous year's income is subject to estate taxes."

If you think Mr. Ruml is covering up on this point, lend an ear to Samuel Grafton, a sincere, able, and intelligent liberal, who wouldn't be caught dead at a National Association of Manufacturers' or chamber of commerce dinner:

"The administration calls the Ruml plan (which is a plan to collect this year's income taxes on this year's income, not last year's income) a plan to let the millionaires escape without paying taxes for last year. But millionaires would pay just as much money out-of-pocket, or more, this year with the Ruml plan, as without it; and, in any case, Mr. Ruml's own quiet acceptance of the principle of a windfall tax to make up inequalities has gone almost unnoticed.

"Only in the case of a millionaire who cunningly decides to die early in the current fiscal year would the estate save a year's income taxes, and a special inheritance tax could take care of that."

There are many other irrefutable arguments which would seem to call for immediate adoption of the Ruml plan if we intend to get the Government's finances in order and prevent at least a partial break-down in the income tax system.

But such a completely logical course of procedure is too much to expect. The President has reiterated his opposition to the Ruml plan and that alone is enough to kill it in Congress.

Probably the most we can hope for is the adoption of a compromise measure embody-

ing diluted portions of the Ruml plan which will mean only a partial solution of the problem.

In the cloakrooms of Congress, our $10,000-a-year public servants like their whisky straight, but when it comes to legislation, they prefer a little water on the side.

Settlement of the all-important tax question will stimulate the war effort by eliminating doubt and uncertainty in the minds of our citizens.

It will assist materially in the sale of War bonds because people just aren't going to subscribe to the amounts desired until they know exactly what they are expected to pay in taxes.

It will eliminate much futile bickering and partisan drum beating in Congress.

It will promote national unity by removing an unnecessary point of controversy.

President Roosevelt should immediately call together leaders of both parties in Congress and insist that a workable, equitable compromise tax bill be enacted at once.

Mr. Morgenthau has a lot of bonds to sell in April.

Controlled Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Clapper from the Washington Daily News of April 2, 1943:

CONTROLLED PRESS

(By Raymond Clapper)

This Government is playing with the dangerous idea of carrying the technique of a controlled press far beyond anything we have experienced before in this country.

A United Nations food conference is being arranged to take place within a few weeks. The President has desired to hold it at an isolated location some distance from Washington where the meeting could be easily protected from the public view.

Newspapers have been requested not to attempt to send reporters to cover this conference or to try to talk to the delegates representing the United Nations.

Such arrangements go far beyond the sphere of military censorship. They reach very frankly into political censorship.

Obviously the reasons that prompt the White House to feel that a United Nations conference should be thus isolated from the normal operations of newspaper correspondents will be the same reasons that will be found persuasive by Administration officials when subsequent United Nations conferences are held.

Newspaper editors have been requested to accept this policy. What else will they be asked to accept if this precedent is established?

There could have been no objection if the Government had called in the press, explained some of the considerations, and emphasized that international relations might be done serious injury by irresponsible handling of news or comment.

But the press is being given no opportunity to be either responsible or irresponsible. It is proposed to shut it out flatly.

Anyone will recognize that the United Nations are still in the formative period, that their first meetings may thrive or wither, depending upon how they are carried off. An irresponsible press can do fateful damage to international relations, particularly in a time like this.

But a free press is not necessarily an irresponsible press.

For evidence in behalf of a free press as against the type of control now proposed for the United Nations conference, I go directly to our own Government propaganda service itself.

The Office of War Information is an enormous organization. It employs dozens of excellent newspapermen and magazine writers, men who have made their reputations in competitive private life.

Yet, the skillful propaganda prepared by these expert craftsmen falls short. It doesn't ring true enough. So Office of War Information sends out, for the information of the people in foreign countries, the actual daily columns and editorials of well-known American writers and newspapers.

The Government prefers to send abroad the regular work of these writers, and to give newspapers abroad the opportunity to print current columns of many of the American columnists, because this is the genuine propaganda of truth, the genuine discussion that goes on in America.

Abroad they don't want special propaganda written particularly for them. They don't have confidence in it.

But when they read what Americans themselves are reading in American newspapers, when they are, so to speak, listening in on discussions taking place in the free press here in America, then they believe it.

Hand-tailored propaganda is discounted abroad as it is here at home. Everybody abroad has been propagandized by experts for years. All the tricks are known.

What concerns me about this proposed exclusion of the press from such a nonmilitary affair as an international food conference is that the same reasons will be used to impose a similar blockade on the press after the war. If we are afraid a free press will damage the United Nations now, won't we still be afraid of it after the war?

Oil and Explosives From Lignite Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, Francis Stacy, formerly of the U. S. Census Bureau, in charge of smelting and refining industries, and for some 2 years in the Geological Survey of the State of Minnesota, has prepared an article of great interest to the people in those States having lignite coal, and of tremendous interest to our war efforts. Coming as it does from one who has given the subject wide and critical study, I desire to present the article in full:

Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes tells us in a recent magazine article on the Hard Cold Facts, that Germany since 1938, when the German war machine started on its European raid, has increased by 400 percent in the brief period of 5 years its production of synthetic oil and explosives by the process of hydrogenation of coal—chiefly brown coal or lignite—into gasoline, Diesel oil, and explosives for the Axis war machine.

An increase of 400 percent since 1938 means that Germany in its 5 years of raiding the coal reserves of Europe—Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, France, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Greece, Ukraine, and most of European Russia—is five times as strong in synthetic oil and explosives as when it started on its career of conquest. And that, our Secretary of the Interior and "czar" of oil and coal informs us, is the hard cold fact.

In 1922, at the close of the last World War, German lignite production was only 80,000,000 tons, which was used mainly for electric energy in the Berlin industrial district.

In 1933, when Hitler came into power, German lignite production was around 120,000,000 tons, which now is used not only for industrial electric energy, but for war purposes—gasoline and Diesel oil for tanks and aircraft, explosives for bombs and submarines.

Four years later, 1937, German lignite production had risen over 50 percent to 188,000,000 tons, electric production had doubled, coal tar distillates for explosives increased 150 percent, and gasoline and other light oils quadrupled. And now, our oil administration chief announces that since 1938 Germany by the coal hydrogenation process has jumped synthetic oil production by a further expansion of 400 percent.

Undoubtedly this last 5-year expansion is in large part due to German conquest of the lignite and other coal reserves of the 14 European countries above listed. Instead of holding one-third of Europe's lignite, as in 1922, or one-half as in 1933, Germany today holds 90 percent of the lignite power of Europe. What is the answer?

Here is the answer: The United States has more than double the lignite reserves of both Europe and Asia thus far surveyed. North Dakota alone has more than double all the lignite reserves possessed by Germany or conquered during the past 5 years. North Dakota's lignite reserve of 600,000,000,000 tons is not only, as stated by Chambers of the United States Geological Survey in 1928, approximately equal to the entire bituminous deposits of the Appalachian coal region, but greater than the coal reserves of Europe. Add to these lignite reserves the vast subbituminous deposits of Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana—which likewise may be mined by machines at high speed and low cost in manpower—and we have the complete answer to the Axis power and its conquest through hydrogenation of lignite reserves.

Strangely enough, the mass-production methods of Germany in mining lignite by power shovels was borrowed by Germany from the United States. It is the same method which the United States employed during the last World War in mining the iron ore of Minnesota's Mesabi Iron Range—the source of the American steel production for Allied supply.

Moreover, the power-shovel method of lignite production, which has given Germany superiority over the deep-shaft mining countries of Europe, is the very method employed in North Dakota lignite production during the past 15 years. Indeed, American lignite production in North Dakota, Montana, and Texas by power shovels and draglines may exceed the German speed. Both North Dakota and Texas in recent years have produced lignite in open-strip mines at a speed of 20 to 50 tons per man per day, compared with a deep-shaft average of 6 tons per man per day in the bituminous mines of Pennsylvania, 3 tons per man per day in anthracite mines, and only 2 tons per man daily in the deep mines of Wales and France.

In 1942, as reported by the North Dakota Coal Mine Inspection Department, the State lignite production was 2,474,000 tons, or two and one-half times that of 1924. Of this tonnage, there were shipped by the four railroads—the Soo, the Great Northern, the

Northern Pacific, and the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul—1,707,841 tons, while 652,874 tons were consumed locally. The valuation of the 2,474,000 tons was reported at $3,195,847, or $1.30 per ton. With an adequate Government demand and mass production by power shovels at three shifts per day instead of the present one-shift production and an unfavorable priority rating in obtaining power shovels, the production cost of lignite may readily be reduced to 50 cents per ton or one-fifth of the cost of Pittsburgh coking coal.

Only 35 steam and electric power shovels are reported available to our lignite mines today, or less than the number of shovels that may be used in 1 large iron mining open-pit on the Mesabi Iron Range of Minnesota. Given a priority rating and 500 shovels to mine North Dakota's 600,000,000,000-ton lignite reserve, North Dakota alone would be able during the present year to expand its production tenfold. If all the lignite States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Texas, and the Gulf and lower Mississippi were placed on a mass-production basis of 3 shifts daily with power shovels to meet Government demands, the year 1944 would see the lignite production of the United States second only to that of Germany.

The power-shovel average for North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Texas in 1938, as reported by United States Minerals Year Book 1940, was 16 tons per man per day, or eight times the production speed in the deep mines of England and France. But the famous Velva mine of the Truax-Traer Coal Co., North Dakota, average over 33 tons per man per day in 1941, and on Government demand could well exceed that average.

The first hydrogenation plant for processing lignite into oil and tar distillates for explosives is now 80 percent complete and will be ready for operation by July 1, 1943. The Government program, which well may include the entire lignite and sub-bituminous regions of a dozen States, is, naturally, not at this time available. Logically, it may well be assumed that the program will be developed into an effective stop-Hitler and stop-Japan campaign—an all-out war production of synthetic oil and explosives to supplement our depleted oil reserves. That may mean a score of lignite hydrogenation plants in full operation in 1944, and the turn of the tide against Axis aggression. And, when lignite turns the tide of the war, when synthetic oil is added to our present oil production, World War No. 2 is won.

The United States Bureau of Mines 2 years ago found that lignite of North Dakota's Velva mine ran 35 tons of oil per 100 tons of coal as mined, 55 tons of oil per 100 tons of dry coal, and 60 tons of oil per 100 tons of moisture-and-ash-free coal. (NOTE.—Even at 35 tons of oil per 100 tons of coal, the 1942 lignite production of North Dakota when hydrogenated into oil would yield over 800,000 tons of oil, or double the oil product of Sakhalin, Japan.)

American Flying Fortresses, going from North Dakota via Alaska, would be able within 24 hours to be dropping bombs on Tokyo. Even in 1943 our synthetic production of oil would be able to drive the Japs from the Aleutian Isles and make trouble for Sakhalin. By 1944 General MacArthur would be able to take from Japan the control of the oil supplies of the Dutch East Indies, recover Singapore, Malaya, the oil refineries of Hong Kong and Singapore, and enable China to recover the coal of Manchuria—and Japan's rule of the Pacific would be ended. The Philippines would be set free, MacArthur would recover Bataan, Guam and Wake Islands would return to the United States, and Japan would be praying for peace.

In short, the battle of the Pacific hangs upon the speed of our 1943 program in hydrogenation of our 600,000,000,000-ton lignite reserve. And this production speed is readily attainable. It is within our hands. First, grant favorable priority ratings whereby our present 35 power shoveis may be multiplied as in open-pit iron mines. Let our lignite industry be free to operate, if need be, 500 power shovels to supply the fuel needs of the hydrogenation plants.

Second, expand the coal hydrogenation program, as Germany and Japan have done, until our oil production is adequate to meet the demands for an all-out production of aircraft, ships, and tank machines. Let the hydrogenation plant, now 80 percent complete in the Minot region of North Dakota, be followed by a score of such plants in the dozen lignite and subbituminous States. If by hydrogenation of lignite and subbituminous coal, we by 1944 add even 5 percent to our present oil production we shall have added to the available oil supply of the United Nations as much oil as that of Iran, the present objective of the Hitler campaign in Russia.

And the costs of this hydrogenation program will be the lowest of any now undertaken in winning the war. For lease-lend abroad we are now spending $1,000,000,000 a month, and our taxes are doubled. Ten percent of that lease-lend expenditure, if wisely expended in our hydrogenation program of American development, would throw the fear of God even into the souls of Hitler and Hirohito—if they have any.

Free Czechoslovakia in a Free Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a republic which modeled its national government closely after our own following World War No. 1, and which at all times has maintained the most cordial relations with our own is Czechoslovakia.

In these days, when the point of view of each of the United Nations is of especial value in considering the future policies of the world, I believe it will be of value to have before us the viewpoint of our sister Republic of Czechoslovakia as expressed in a lecture before the Federation of Women's Clubs of Greater Cleveland, Ohio, on February 19, 1943, by Dr. Antonin Obrdlik, who has served recently as a professor of sociology and political science at Ohio Wesleyan University, which is located in my district, and is now an attaché of the Czechoslovak Legation in Washington. I therefore have that lecture published in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of the Congress and the Nation:

My homeland, Czechoslovakia, does not stand alone, her fate being dependent on what will be the fate of the whole of Europe and on what is going to happen to the rest of the world. Before President Benes left his mutilated country, in October 1938, he said to his friends these memorable words: "A free Europe is unthinkable without a free Czechoslovakia." Hence the title of my address: Free Czechoslovakia in a Free Europe.

Freedom, as you will agree, will be both at the beginning as well as at the end of the United Nations' endeavor for the attainment of all they are striving for. That means that certain prerequisites must be fulfilled before freedom can be reached and that, at the same time, freedom will become in its turn a starting point for the attainment of other cultural and moral values.

To begin with, what are we fighting for? First, we are fighting for the victory of moral principles, such as truth, honesty, liberty, decency, and human dignity; that involves a just punishment of all those—whether individuals or nations—who are responsible for this war and the unspeakable suffering brought upon the whole world. Second, we are fighting for a better future, with a new social and economic order; having accepted democratic principles in the political sphere, we wish to apply them also in the field of social and economic processes. Third, we are fighting for the preservation of the future peace by creating a system of collective security, as it is manifested already today by the collective action of more than 30 members of the United Nations front. Finally, we are fighting for the political reorganization of Europe and the rest of the world.

Although a distinction is usually being drawn between the sphere of domestic and international politics there can be little doubt that a direct connection exists between the internal political set-up of states and their external policies. Today we do not believe any more that fascism and nazi-ism are peculiar domestic regimes of Italy and Germany, with no importance for other nations and states. Therefore, one of the most necessary steps that must be taken, in order to create a better and a more secure world, is that an end should be put to the hypocritical belief that it is no concern of ours what happens on the other side of frontiers, or of the ocean, for that matter.

Here is another step leading toward a new freedom: Narrow-minded, overheated nationalism, known under the name of chauvinism, must be done away with for good. All nations, small or great, must willingly give up part of their sovereignty so that they all can breathe more freely and live in a greater security.

There will most certainly be an attempt to solve the problem of raw materials and colonies. It will not be possible to maintain permanently agricultural countries on a low standard of living, and industrial countries on a high one. And, above all: Political democracy must be completed by economic and social democracy. Of course, this will limit private property in various respects, but it will not abolish it. We might expect that in most of the states there will be a deliberate limitation of large private properties. A certain degree of collectivization of property, under the surveillance of public authorities, is to be expected. Districts, towns, states, public-utility corporations, etc., will own properly to a much greater extent than it has been the case until now. Evidently, all this will require far-reaching changes in those states where the survivals of medieval social and economic conditions are still very much alive, as for instance in Hungary. For the sake of freedom, it is of utmost importance that this new system remains democratic and does not become totalitarian, and that the new collectivistic tendencies are properly counterbalanced by a new form of vigorous, socially minded, and responsible individualism. The inalienable right should be secured for every individual to remain unmolested and undisturbed in the exercise of his human privileges.

One word about the new European solidarity. The present war has definitely proved how untenable and unsound was the concept of national isolation. We have a global war which is indivisible; so the peace and freedom are indivisible. The freedom and security in post-war Europe will be based on solidarity and cooperation—or there shall be

no freedom and no security anywhere. Speaking concretely, this would mean: (a) The political liberation of all occupied European countries and that, of course, will involve the complete destruction of the Nazi system; (b) the establishment of new federal or confederate units in different parts of Europe; (c) the creation of a new system of collective security corresponding better to the post-war situation and being more effective than has been the League of Nations as we knew it before. An international police force should be organized in order to prevent all possible future acts of aggression and to bring about at least a relative limitation of armaments, together with a special control of Germany for the necessary period of years; (d) a new system of European economic collaboration should preclude the conflicts for economic reasons by avoiding the creation of autarchic totalitarian states.

With respect to the so-called "small" nations, I wish to emphasize that their security is a precondition of the security of the great powers. The geographically and numerically smaller nations will again live—must live—in the future Europe as free nations in their own free states. They can and surely will combine in confederate blocs, and these blocs will perhaps be later united in still larger units under a new European or world organization like the one we had in the League of Nations. Democratic regional decentralization in these free states will be necessary. I dare hope that there will be no return to the pre-war habit of placating a strong aggressor at the expense of a smaller nation; such a danger is, in fact, the strongest argument for the creation of larger confederations, capable of holding their own against any aggressor, especially with an internationally organized armed force at their disposal and for their protection. These confederations could easily have the necessary financial, economic, and industrial strength, which most definitely would make for a greater collective security and freedom. However—and let me be very emphatic on this point—it would be inconsiderate to expect that there could be a United States of Europe immediately after this war is over. Such a grandiose scheme will necessarily require a longer period of time—several decades, to say the least—in which, by a process of gradual evolution, that ultimate object of European unification would be achieved. For it would be a mistake to force the existing states of the Old World into purely mechanical units which again would disintegrate on the first occation of an unexpected international conflict. Much sacrifice, much work, and especially much patience will be required before something like the United States of Europe will be created.

Then, there will be serious political problems in post-war Europe. In the first place, an effective cooperation in the west of Europe must be established, especially between France and Great Britain I have no doubts any more that the British are going to hold their own, because they proved and are proving themselves to be able to make the necessary adjustments in this changing world, and I for one look with sincere admiration at what has already been achieved there, at what is being done or planned at present, and with still greater expectation of things to come. This, i. e., the ability to make the necessary adjustments, and to make them in time, more than anything else will prove to be the safest guaranty of the survival of that magnificent political structure called the British Commonwealth of Peoples. I think, ladies and gentlemen, it is only fair to mention this, because, being a Czech, I shall not be suspected of blind pro-British sympathies [Munich!]. It seems to me that some of my American friends do not realize that many profound changes are taking place in present-day Britain.

France will certainly pass through a period of internal changes. Her democracy was utterly rotten and corrupt, thanks to some of her criminal leaders like Laval, Bonnet, and Daladier. But I am confident that at the end of her suffering there will be a new reborn France, worthy of her splendid name and record. Also an agreement regarding Belgium and Holland, the two weak spots in case of a new German aggression, will have to be reached in a joint collaboration of France and England.

Below France, in the southwest of Europe, Spain and Portugal will decide their future status for themselves. Let us hope that the reactionary forces which have been operating in Spain to the detriment of the brave Spanish people, forces which are to be held responsible for the terrible civil war as well as for more than 40 percent of illiteracy among the Spanish population, will soon pass into oblivion.

Then, there is and always will be an Italy, the country of Mazzini, that great democrat and patriot, the birthplace of Dante and Petrarca, of Raphaël, Michelangelo, and Leonardo da Vinci, of Puccini, Verdi, and of so many others. Yes; there will be again Italy, perhaps a democratic republic, weakened territorially in Africa, where she lost her empire for good, but strengthened internally and restored to her former dignity, as her people so much deserve.

Central Europe will be reorganized economically as well as politically. It appears that its core will be a Czechoslovak-Polish confederation, which, of course, could be freely joined by any other state of Central Europe, such as Austria, Hungary, or Rumania, on the condition that their inner social strueture will become truly democratic after this war. Naturally, Hungary cannot be allowed to get away with the territories that Germany gave her as a reward for participation in this war on the side of the Axis.

The so-called Balkan bloc could consist of a confederated Yugoslavia, Greece, Albania, Bulgaria, and possibly also Rumania. Turkey, which still remains "neutral," must decide what she will do. As a European power, partly at least, she must assume her obligations and responsibility for what will happen to Europe during and after this war.

A larger Scandinavian unit is desirable in the north of Europe. Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Denmark ought to pull together, in agreement with the two major powers interested in that area: Great Britain and Russia. It should be feasible, now that the British finally came to working terms with the Soviet.

I do not agree with those who claim that post-war Europe will either be dominated by Germany or by Russia. I see in such a statement Nazi propaganda in disguise. One thing is certain, however. Should the Soviet Union again be excluded from the participation in the affairs of the European community, the proposed collaboration of post-war European political units would lose its equilibrium through the fact that the German influence would again be unduly strengthened in the east of the European Continent. True enough, the Russian people fight today for their own and their country's salvation, but by doing so they are making, at the same time, a tremendous contribution toward the preservation of what still remains from the European culture under the Nazi yoke and toward the upbuilding of a new, better world. Therefore, a real cooperation with Russia must emerge out of this struggle. Russia is our ally and the flower of Russian youth which is giving her life for our common good cannot be disregarded or forgotten. This being so, who could ever dare to argue whether Russia should be included within the sphere of post-war European interests? Czechoslovakia has always had a very special interest in the proper balance of the relationship and relative influence of all the chief European countries. For this reason we felt the damaging effects of Russia's lengthy withdrawal from the European political scene, and since there are people who are afraid of Soviet Russia let me remind them that it certainly will be safer for us to have relations with Russia in order to influence her and, if need be, to help her in solving her political, economic, and social problems than to wait for what she might plan to do against us in her forced isolation. On the other hand, I hasten to add that the Russian influence in Europe in general, and in central Europe in particular, would become intolerable if it meant interference in the internal affairs of individual European states. Speaking of Czechoslovakia for instance, I cannot imagine that our people would passively participate in such an attempt simply because we stand at a different evolutionary stage than where are the Russians, and especially because we wish to manage our own affairs in our own way, with full responsibility, of course, toward the international order. I fully agree with what has been recently said in this respect by one of the foremost American columnists, Mr. Walter Lippmann. I quote:

[From the Washington Post of February 6, 1943]

"THE WISDOM OF THE STRONG

"(By Walter Lippmann)

"Nothing could conceivably be more dangerously wrong-headed than a policy which would alienate the western powers from Russia. For it is as certain as anything could be that the British and the Americans will not and could not exert military power in eastern Europe to enforce an anti-Russian diplomacy. Never will they repeat the monstrous policy of 1919.

"And as for the idea that the small nations of eastern Europe could combine against Russia, and then bring Germany into their combination, the very suggestion of such a thing is suicidal. For it is obvious that the Russians are capable of a devastating reaction. They can checkmate the project by making their own combination with a defeated Germany which will be looking for a powerful friend, and that would be the end of any prospect of independence and even of existence for the small states lying between Germany and Russia.

"The small states are quite incapable of playing power politics. Their future will be as unhappy as their past has been tragic if their statesmen do not withdraw from power politics—as pawns and as principals—and rely upon an enlightened diplomacy. In the relations between small states and great powers enlightened diplomacy consists in promoting what the American republics call the good-neighbor policy.

"Viewed from the standpoint of the small neighbor, what does this policy mean? It means that the small neighbor coordinates its foreign policy with that of its big neighbor. It does this so that the menace can never arise of its becoming the pawn of another great power, or a base for intrigue and enemy action, or a hole in the defenses of its great neighbor through which an enemy can pass. This makes the small state a good neighbor of a big one.

"From the standpoint of the big state the good-neighbor policy means that in order to consolidate these great benefits, it is to its interest to maintain and foster the liberties, the national traditions, and the material welfare of its smaller neighbors. For since they are its dependable allies, the greater and stronger and happier they are, the better."

Mr. Lippmann's words betray objectivity of mind and real statesmanship.

Finally, there is and will be the German problem. If we do make a program this time we must stick to it in the interest of all of us, including Germany. The Prussian militaristic spirit has to be eliminated. The last time the Germans believed that they had not been beaten. It should be of a very serious concern to all of us to see to it that a complete lack of political education in Germany does not express itself again in the future by a new war every 20 years. After unconditional surrender of Germany there should be a period of transition during which the internal affairs of post-war Germany should be regulated by a joint committee of the Allies directly from Berlin. This may take months or even years. The Germans of today and of tomorrow must be convinced that force does not pay. That means that Germany must return to her pre-Munich frontiers, giving up every inch of territory she got either by blackmail or conquest. For, if we do not succeed in causing Germany to pass through a period of the profoundest internal change which would purify the German people from all the evil into which their country has been plunged not only by nazi-ism but by Germany's whole national education since 1870, and even since Frederick the Great, then we shall have a third world war as certainly as the day comes after night. To reeducate Germany will prove to be a tremendous job. It will require two or three generations for, however hard my words may sound, as far as I can see, the present Nazi generation is lost beyond any hope.

The foregoing picture is based to a great degree on what has been said, in the course of the last 2 years or so, by official Czechoslovak spokesmen, mainly by President Beneš himself. I used freely many direct or indirect quotations. I did so for the two following reasons: First, because it seemed to me that you should hear what is more or less the official Czechoslovak viewpoint; and, second, because Dr. Beneš is not only the undisputed representative and leader of the Czechoslovak nation but also one of the best, if not the best, amongst European statesmen of our present era. He qualifies himself as such by his vast erudition, long political experience, keen insight, and foresight, as well as by the seriousness of his endeavor to serve the common good for the restoration of spiritual and moral values of our common cultural heritage. To us, the Czechs and the Slovaks, President Beneš is almost a symbol; symbol of what we stand for together with him—freedom, truth, justice, democracy, human decency. At the moment when Hitler raged against the head of the Czechoslovak Republic, calling him "dieser Beneš" (this Beneš), and thus, as we felt it, insulting the whole of our nation, millions of the Czechoslovak people were firmly resolved to see the day when Hitler will go down and Dr. Beneš will come back, thus visibly testifying that justice has been restored.

The "Best Brains" Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a significant editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of March 21, 1943:

THE "BEST BRAINS" AGAIN

Before the war is over, before we have hardly begun to fight, voices are raised calling for the old privileges. Senator TAFT said recently that we must return to "the old method of restoring prosperity." What he seemed to believe the chief item in the "old method" was a "reasonable tariff barrier."

The formula doesn't sound so much like restoring prosperity as restoring depression. We would not put Mr. TAFT in the same class, but his words are strangely like those of Harrison E. Spangler, the old party hack recently put in as a compromise chairman of the Republican National Committee. Mr. Spangler says that the cure for present confusion is the calling up of "the best brains of the Nation."

The "best brains of the Nation" has an appealing sound. We think of Adams and Jefferson, Hamilton and Madison, the men who saw the Revolution through, and then, amid existing confusion, made a plan for the government of a new Nation.

The "best brains of the Nation" also recalls a more recent slogan. That was the formula on which Harding came into office after the World War. It is not pleasant to recall that the best brains then included Albert B. Fall, Harry M. Daugherty, and others not now mentioned with praise.

The "old method" of restoring prosperity turned out to be a high tariff to foster monopolies, returning billions which had been collected in taxes to those who had profited most from war industry, the robbery of millions of dollars from savers through manipulated stocks and bonds called "securities," the boom, and then the panic of 1929.

Out of the failure of this old method grew many expedients, some of which we do not like any more than Mr. TAFT does. The "old method" did not work for President Hoover, who inherited an impossible task. The country turned him out and adopted another "old method," old although euphoniously labeled a "new deal." Then came national relief, subsidies, borrowing, and a whole flock of experiments. Still no prosperity, but a people had learned that the "best brains" did not mean to them the fattest pockets.

Yet Mr. TAFT comes back with the old recipe—a "reasonable tariff barrier." The tariff of 1922 was the highest ever. And in 1930, when the bubble had burst, the best thing the old-timers could think of was a still higher tariff, put out by Hawley and Smoot, championed by Grundy, signed by Hoover. Then 29 other nations put on tariffs, quotas, other restrictions, and we had bread lines.

Mr. TAFT was living in the days when these things went on. Yet he seems not to recognize that it was these things which endangered "our American way of life." Anyone can condemn the laxity and confusion and experiment and borrowing which have come to us since. Only a man who has missed the lesson of his own times will try to crystallize American thinking on some dead and ruinous formula of the past.

No one today thinks that a high tariff, a low tariff, or no tariff is the sole answer to our problems. Mr. TAFT says a free-trade policy, "apparently advocated" by Vice President WALLACE, would improve the Chinese standard of living but drag down our own. He forgets that WALLACE said: "The spirit of competition must continue to be one of our main driving forces"; "men must work for what they have," and "governments can and must accept the major responsibilities for filling in whatever gaps business leaves."

The country is getting tired of confusion, uncertainty, and endless borrowing. But it also has learned something about the concealed subsidy, the manipulation of securities, the public laws designed for private gain, which were sold to it a generation ago as the old method of restoring prosperity.

Cotton Is Great Foe of Axis and Facts Aplenty Prove It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., March 30, 1943:

COTTON IS GREAT FOE OF AXIS, AND FACTS APLENTY PROVE IT

Speaking of cotton, did you know that:

Cotton, second only to steel as America's major weapon of war, is meeting more vital needs of war than any other crop?

One bale of cotton linters will provide smokeless powder for 20,440 rounds of machine-gun ammunition, 2,737 rounds of pompom ammunition, 100,000 rounds of rifle ammunition, or 85 rounds of heavy tank ammunition?

Cotton fabrics are fighting equipment, as priority demands for 1943 will take more cotton than the total average American consumption prior to the war?

STAPLE PACKS A PUNCH

With each 500-pound bale of cotton there is produced 900 pounds of seed, yielding 140 pounds of high-grade vegetable oil for human feed; 200 pounds of protein meal and cake for livestock; 240 pounds of hulls for livestock roughage and chemical uses; 81 pounds of linters for smokeless powder, plastics, and numerous other essential products?

Forty-eight percent of the total United States production of edible vegetable oils in 1942 came from cottonseed?

The 1942 crop supplied enough oil to furnish every man, woman, and child in the United States with 10 pounds of food fat?

The 1942 production of cottonseed oil equaled the total fat requirements of the Army and Navy, plus 18,000,000 civilians?

As a shortening, cottonseed oil can supply all cooking fat for an Army of 7,500,000 men and a Navy of 1,500,000 men, plus 42,000,000 civilians?

As a margarine, cottonseed oil can supply all table fats for the same sized Army and Navy, plus 72,000,000 civilians?

Thirty-two percent of the total United States production of protein feed meals for livestock in 1942 came from cottonseed?

DON'T FORGET FILMS

From cotton linters come plastics for warplane windows and noses, cockpit enclosures, cargo and flare chutes, high-tenacity rayon, X-ray and photograyhic films, fabric coatings, plastic replacements for metal parts, and many other war products?

All this information about cotton, and much more, is contained in a booklet entitle "America's No. 1 War Crop," issued yesterday by the National Cotton Council, with headquarters here. Approximately 10,000 copies will be distributed.

Office of Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following copy of a letter from James M. Landis, Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, in reply to certain charges made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] against the Office of Civilian Defense:

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1943.

Hon. FRED BRADLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRADLEY: I have just had the opportunity of reading your speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 1.

It is not my purpose in writing to you to deal with the personal charges and insinuations that are contained in that speech. These things do not matter, for neither you nor I as individuals matter today except insofar as we can make our contributions to the winning of this war.

But there are many statements in your speech which are just wrong as a matter of fact and reflect on an effort that is neither mine nor yours, not even the President's or the Congress', but an effort of the people of this whole country to make themselves count in the war as effectively as they can.

First. The most important of these misstatements is that all the persons in the Civilian Defense organization are subject to removal by me. This statement is reiterated several times by you, for at one point you go so far as to say that "block leaders will become fanatic followers of the New Deal—or they will lose their jobs." This is completely untrue. There are no persons in State, city, county, or town organizations that are subject to removal by me. Nor do I have any power to order any of these organizations or any individual in them to pursue any course of conduct. The State directors of civilian defense derive appointment from the governors of the States and not from me. The local directors usually derive their appointment from mayors or other appropriate authority. We do not finance their operations, beyond loaning them protective equipment as specifically authorized by Congress.

Second. The so-called block plan is not the invention of this office. It sprang up of its own accord in many communities. Governor Stassen of Minnesota had the plan well developed in that State long ago. Cities like Bridgeport, Syracuse, and Chicago also antedated us. Your own State of Michigan under very capable leadership developed the plan in advance of our general sponsorship of it. What we did was recognize the merits of the plan and bring it to the attention of the other communities of the United States.

Third. As indicated above, we have no control over block plans, speakers, or other State or local organizations. We do point out to them war tasks that they can perform. There is only one objective to which every act of this Office is attuned, and that is the waging of war on the home front. That, I submit, gives common cause between us, and little occasion at this time for factious dispute.

Fourth. The magazine advertisement to which you refer was a complete contribution of the magazine publishing business, thought up by that business and created by it. The magazines included embraced those of every political color and I am sure they would not have contributed the paper had they felt that the advertisement was to be construed as political in implication.

It is in this spirit that I am writing, because these are facts that I want you to know, so that if another occasion arises to discuss this question, you will not be misinformed on these matters.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES M. LANDIS,
Director.

The Valor of Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, covering the confession of faith by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, reprinted from the United States News of April 9, 1943:

THE VALOR OF TRUTH

MME. CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S CONFESSION OF FAITH IS A SIGNIFICANT EXPRESSION OF THE NEED FOR A GREATER SENSE OF SPIRITUAL RESPONSIBILITY AMONG INDIVIDUALS AS WELL AS NATIONS

(America has reason to be proud of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek. Not only was she educated in the United States but she derived her Christian philosophy from an American background. Her father came to this country as a cabin boy on a United States revenue cutter in 1880 and, after attending Trinity College (now Duke University) and the theological department of Vanderbilt University, he returned to China as a Methodist preacher and married a devoted Christian. All of their six children were reared and trained as Christians. They have become prominent in the life and government of the Chinese Republic. It is an excellent example of the results of American missionary enterprise, and it would be a fitting recompense to this country if the Confession of Faith, written during recent years by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, which is reproduced in full here, were to be found helpful by many of us in America today.—David Lawrence.)

(By Mme. Chiang Kai-shek)

By nature I am not a religious person. At least not in the common acceptance of that term. I am not by nature a mystic. I am practical minded. Mundane things have meant much to me, perhaps too much.

Mundane, not material things. I care more for a beautiful celadon vase than for costly jewels.

I am more disturbed as I traverse the crowded, dirty streets of an interior city than I am by the hazards of flying with poor visibility, which my husband and I experienced the other day. Personal danger means nothing to me. But I am concerned that my schools for the children of the revolutionary heroes shall raise for them, and perhaps for the communities to which they return, the standard of living and the quality of life.

Also, I am more or less skeptical. I used to think faith, belief, immortality were more or less imaginary. I believed in the world seen, not the world unseen. I could not accept things just because they had always been accepted. In other words, a religion good enough for my fathers did not necessarily appeal to me. I do not yet believe in predigested religion in palatable, sugar-coated doses.

I knew my mother lived very close to God. I recognized something great in her. And I believe that my childhood training influenced me greatly, even though I was more or less rebellious at the time. It must often have grieved my beloved mother that I found family prayers tiresome and frequently found myself conveniently thirsty at the moment, so that I had to slip out of the room.

Like my brothers and sisters, I always had to go to church and I hated the long sermons. But today I feel that this church-going habit established something, a kind of stability, for which I am grateful to my parents.

My mother was not a sentimental parent. In many ways she was a Spartan. But one of my strongest childhood impressions is of mother going to a room she kept for the purpose on the third floor to pray. She spent hours in prayer, often beginning before dawn. When we asked her advice about anything, she would say, "I must ask God first."

And we could not hurry her. Asking God was not a matter of spending 5 minutes to ask Him to bless her child and grant the request. It meant waiting upon God until she felt his leading. And I must say that whenever mother prayed and trusted God for her decision, the undertaking invariably turned out well.

As long as mother lived I had a feeling that whatever I did, or failed to do, mother would pray me through. Though she insisted that she was not our intercessor, that we must pray ourselves, yet I know for a certainty that many of her long hours of prayer were spent interceding for us. Perhaps it is because religion in my mind is associated with such a mother that I have never been able to turn from it entirely.

One day I was talking with her about the imminent Japanese menace, and I suddenly cried out in irritable intensity of feeling:

"Mother, you're so powerful in prayer. Why don't you pray that God will annihilate Japan—by an earthquake or something?"

She turned her face away for a time. Then looking gravely at me she said: "When you pray, or expect me to pray, don't insult God's intelligence by asking Him to do something which would be unworthy even of you, a mortal."

That made a deep impression on me. And today I can pray for the Japanese people, knowing that there must be many who, like Kagawa, suffer because of what their country is doing to China.

During the last 7 years I have suffered much. I have gone through deep waters because of the chaotic conditions in China; the lopping off of our richest provinces, the death of my saintly mother, flood, famine, and the intrigues of those who should have been helping to unify the country.

All these things have made me see my own inadequacy. More than that, all human insufficiency. To try to do anything for the country seemed like trying to put out a great conflagration with a cup of water.

During these years of my married life, I have gone through three phases as related to my religion. First, there was a tremendous enthusiasm and patriotism—a passionate desire to do something for my country. Here was my opportunity. With my husband, I would work ceaselessly to make China strong. I had the best of intentions. But something was lacking. There was no staying power. I was depending on self.

Then came the second phase. These things that I have referred to happened, and I was

plunged into dark despair. A terrible depression settled on me—spiritual despair, bleakness, desolation. At the time of my mother's death, the blackness was greatest. A foreign foe was on our soil in the north. A discontented political faction in the south. Famine in the northwest. Floods threatening the millions who dwell in the Yangtze Valley. And my beloved mother taken from me. What was left?

And then I realized that spiritually I was failing my husband. My mother's influence on the general had been tremendous. His own mother was a devout Buddhist. It was my mother's influence and personal example that led him to become a Christian.

Too honest to promise to be one just to win her consent to our marriage, he had promised my mother that he would study Christianity and read the Bible. And I suddenly realized that he was sticking to his promise, even after she was gone, but losing because there were so many things he did not understand.

I began to see that what I was doing to help, for the sake of the country, was only a substitute for what he needed. I was letting him head toward a mirage when I knew of the oasis. Life was all confusion. I had been in the depths of despair. Out of that, and the feeling of human inadequacy, I was driven back to my mother's God. I knew there was a power greater than myself. I knew God was there. But Mother was no longer there to do my interceding for me. It seemed to be up to me to help the General spiritually, and in helping him I grew spiritually myself.

Thus I entered into the third period, where I wanted to do, not my will, but God's. Life is really simple, and yet how confused we make it. In old Chinese art, there is just one outstanding object, perhaps a flower, on a scroll. Everything else in the picture is subordinate to that one beautiful thing.

An integrated life is like that. What is that one flower? As I see it now, it is the will of God. But to know His will, and do it, calls for absolute sincerity, absolute honesty with one's self, and it means using one's mind to the best of one's ability.

I used to pray that God would do this or that. Now I pray only that God will make His will known to me.

God speaks to me in prayer. Prayer is not self-hypnotism. It is more than meditation. The Buddhist priests spend days in meditating. In meditation the source of strength is one's self. But when one prays he goes to a source of strength greater than his own. I wait to feel His leading, and His guidance means certainty.

In the feudal time of the Three Kingdoms there was an old general called Ts'ao Ts'ao. Once upon a time he was going on a long march. His soldiers were weary, thirsty, discouraged. He said to them, "From my horse I can see a beautiful garden, full of luscious plums!" Their mouths watered, new strength and courage came to them. But for how long? The plum garden did not materialize, and the soldiers were more weary than before.

That, to me, is like meditation. There is a buoyancy of spirit for a time. It may help when there is no oasis in sight. But when I am spiritually thirsty, I do not think of plum gardens—I go to the fountain of living water.

Prayer is our source of guidance and balance. God is able to enlighten the understanding. I am often bewildered, because my mind is only finite. I question and doubt my own judgments. Then I seek guidance, and when I am sure, I go ahead, leaving the results with Him.

Our finite minds beside His infinite mind seems to me like this: I go walking, and the hills loom above me, range upon range, one against the other. I cannot tell where one begins and another leaves off. But from the air (I seldom have time to travel any other way now) everything has a distinct contour and form. I can see things so much more clearly. Perhaps that is like my mind and God's. And when I talk with Him, He lifts me up where I can see clearly.

I do not think it is possible to make this understandable to one who has not tried it. To explain to one who has had no experience of getting guidance what it means would be like trying to make a stone-deaf person understand the beauty of a Chopin sonata.

What I do want to make clear is that whether we get guidance or not, it's there. It's like tuning in on the radio. There's music in the air, whether we tune in or not. By learning to tune in one can understand. How is it done? As Brother Lawrence told us long ago, "by practicing the presence of God." By daily communion with Him. One cannot expect to be conscious of God's presence when one has only a bowing acquaintance with Him.

In conclusion, with me religion is a very simple thing. It means to try with all my heart and soul and strength and mind to do the will of God.

I feel that God has given me a work to do for China. In this province of Kiangsi thousands of li of fertile rice fields are now devastated ruins; hundreds of thousands of families have been rendered homeless. Rural rehabilitation must follow, helping the farmers back to their land and to better conditions of life. This is no small task. In fact, China's problems in some ways are greater today than ever before.

But despondency and despair are not mine today. I look to Him who is able to do all things, even more than we ask or think. At this time of writing I am with my husband in the heart of the bandit area. Constantly exposed to dangers, I am unafraid. I know that nothing can happen either to the general or to me till our work is done.

Congress, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 4, 1943:

CONGRESS, TOO

Two very important conferences with representatives of other nations are to be held this month in the United States. One has been called to discuss post-war food problems and the other to explore plans for post-war stabilization of currencies. Any agreements that may eventually result from conferences of this type will unquestionably require legislative action to make them effective. If they take the form of treaties, Senate approval will have to be secured. And even if the commitments are of a less formal nature, Congress will undoubtedly be called upon to appropriate funds for carrying out the approved plans.

Leading Members of Congress are, therefore, well advised to insist upon representation at the food conference, either in the role of observers or participants. An equally strong case can be made out for congressional representation at the conference called to discuss monetary problems. Secretary Morgenthau has, in fact, announced his intention to disclose details of the Treasury's post-war currency plan to interested House and Senate committees in secret session. His propitiatory move was probably encouraged by the fact that congressional approval is required to extend the provisions of the Gold Reserve Act, expiring June 30.

It is not enough, however, merely to acquaint congressional committees with the plans of the administration. Nor would it be satisfactory for the President simply to select certain Members of the Senate and the House to participate in international conferences. That has been done before, notably in case of the ill-fated London Economic Conference of 1933. President Roosevelt dominated that conference from Washington. The American delegation, regardless of its composition, could not have functioned effectively, handicapped by such interference. To make legislative participation in international conferences really worth while, Congress itself must have a voice in selecting representatives from its own membership and there must be a disposition on the part of the White House to let the delegates do the negotiating within the broad outlines of national policy.

This question of participation in international conferences is closely allied with the question of post-war peace terms. The failure of President Wilson to secure legislative support for his peace program was a tragedy for which we are today paying a heavy price. To prevent repetition of that catastrophe, it is essential that the administration work hand in hand with the Senate in formulating post-war peace terms. That could be done through creation of a Foreign Relations Advisory Council as proposed in the Wiley resolution. Representatives of the Department of State and the Senate as well as the chairman and ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs would be members of the proposed council. If such a group were in existence today, it could bring both Senate and House into closer contacts with the administration and influence the selection of qualified colleagues to participate in numerous special conferences such as those to be held within the next few weeks.

Pay-As-You-Go Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I have been constrained during the recent discussion of taxation from making any statement to the membership of the House by two reasons: First, since I have found it impossible to go along with the leadership of my party in supporting the Carlson bill, and furthermore, because I did not have the expert accounting knowledge with which to support my observations, I felt it improper for me to speak until the issue had been decided; second, I am well aware of the prevalent, unwritten rules of the House that it would be well for new Members to learn their way through the tunnels without getting lost before they attempt to belabor the atmosphere with their opinions. As a lawyer, I always believed that before a young man out of law school sought to reform judicial procedure, it might be well for him to try at least one case.

However, the debate has ceased and perhaps the atmosphere is such that my intruding certain observations and experiences in connection with the pay-as-you-go taxation question might at this time be proper and possibly beneficial. I am driven to this conclusion by the fact that the public press indicates that the majority leader and the Republican members on the Ways and Means Committee, uniquely as it may seem, are somewhat in accord in their belief that the public wants some form of pay-as-you-go tax legislation now, and that it is important that legislation be presented which would not only help to preserve the financial stability of the Government, but equally important, treat the individual taxpayers as equitably as it is possible to do so.

On January 28, 1943, our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY], under a special order, discussed pay-as-you-go taxation on the floor of the House. Being present at that time, I was impressed by the necessarily rough draft of a proposal which he then advanced as offering a principle and a rough draft of the mechanics to effectuate the principle which, it seemed to me, also embodied both of the prerequisites of sound tax legislation as I am able to see them from an inexpert layman's point of view.

Since the speech itself is available to the membership, it does not seem to me that it is necessary or proper for me to discuss it now or attempt to paraphrase that which is available to the membership in its original form. However, I think it is proper to say that through the courtesy of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY], I was able to send out his speech and distribute it in a rather desultory and incomplete manner among three groups in the Eighth District of Indiana: First, bankers; second, veterans' groups; and, third, labor unions. Between 150 and 200 copies were distributed. The replies were hardly numerous enough to furnish a factual basis of judging the opinion of the three groups, but it can be said factually that no reply was received which was critical and that some replies were received from all of the groups which were favorable. Eliminating names, I shall quote from several of the replies in the groups from which they came.

A banker in a small town wrote on March 22 as follows:

I received yours of the 2d and also the speech of Hon. CHARLES S. DEWEY, and seriously I must apologize for delaying to answer however, I felt unable to answer until after I had reviewed the speech.

I am heartily in accord with you as to that being a fair and intelligent plan of getting on a pay-as-you-go basis.

On March 6 another banker in a small town in a purely agricultural county wrote as follows:

Received your statement as to the tax proposition.

I have studied this tax business from every angle that I can think of. It is too big for me to even offer a suggestion, however, I want to say that everyone, practically everyone, is making more money than he ever made in his life. He is making more than he will ever make again. He can pay this double tax better now than any other time. He has known for a year that this tax was coming. If he did not prepare for it, he will not prepare to pay it in the future. He can pay it in four installments which seems to me is plenty lenient. He can carry the pay-as-you-go along with it. This may seem a bit hard, however, it is the thing to do.

Uncle Sam has been playing Santa Claus for 10 years but not with us who pay the taxes. Now is not the time to extend us any presents.

Another way to look at the proposition is that if this is not paid now while the laborer is getting more than ever before, he will begin to want to be released from the debt after the war is over and is working for far less wages. Some of our politicians will want to gain votes by asking that the debt be canceled.

I am in favor of paying this current tax now and taking out the tax, pay-as-you-go tax, along with it. If we are going to make a sacrifice, let's do it and not just make a pretense. This is my way to handle the situation.

A labor union with a rather small membership wrote as follows on March 23:

Our local wish to extend their appreciation for the information furnished by you concerning the pay-as-you-go tax plan, and your opinion about it.

After receiving your letter of March 2 explaining the Dewey plan, we, too, think that it is a very good solution for the tax question, and are writing Mr. DEWEY about same.

Only one reply was received from a veteran's group and other than acknowledging the receipt of the literature was noncommittal.

However, as the voting date was approached and even during the progress of the debate, I had correspondence with two other people which I think is sufficiently revealing to be included in this statement.

The correspondence immediately following, I think, is particularly revealing because it sustains an opinion which I formed with reference to the value to be placed on the Gallup poll and confirms my belief that the public associated pay-as-you-go with the Ruml plan more than it did remission of taxes. On March 24 a president of a corporation in my district with a salary of between ten and twenty thousand dollars wrote as follows:

I've been reading all the comment about the fight in the Congress on the pay-as-you-go plan. I'm very much in favor of the Ruml plan; however, I don't believe that we should release everyone from the taxes on their 1942 income.

Some graduated scale could be worked out on this. Perhaps it could be on the following basis: Everyone with an income of $5,000 or less to pay one-quarter of their taxes; everyone with an income of between $5,000 and $12,000 to pay half of their taxes; everyone with an income of between $12,000 and $20,000 to pay three-fourths of their taxes; all persons whose incomes are in excess of these figures to pay all their taxes. Then after that, make the total tax deduction about 25 percent of their pay. That would go a long way toward preventing inflation.

As a matter of fact, I am not sure but what everyone could pay all of their 1942 taxes and at least half of their taxes they will owe on their 1943 income from the pay-roll deduction plan, without hurting them too much, and then in 1944, they might make it on some basis where they might eventually catch up with their taxes.

I am passing this on to you for what it is worth.

On March 26 I replied to this letter as follows:

Thank you for your letter of March 24. Your letter is very interesting to me because it evidences the same kind of mixed-up thinking, or rather, misuse of terms which I think many people are using today. Let me illustrate what I mean by the following quotation from your letter:

"I'm very much in favor of the Ruml plan; however, I don't believe that we should release everyone from the taxes on their 1942 income."

I think what you mean to say is what everyone wants to say, that they want to get on a pay-as-you-go basis, but that they are not sure about remitting or abating 1942 taxes. Yet, the Ruml plan strictly carries with it the absolute idea of abatement of everyone's 1942 taxes. Therefore, you actually are not in favor of the Ruml plan as such, although you say "I'm very much in favor of the Ruml plan."

Please believe me, I do not point this out in order to belittle you or to make fun of you, but this illustrates that you, a very clear thinker, are falling into the same error that I think many people are falling into by using the term "Ruml plan" which includes complete abatement of taxes, when actually the only thing they are really in favor of is a pay-as-you-go basis, they are not in favor of the remission of 1942 taxes.

I illustrate again what I mean by the following quotation from your letter:

"As a matter of fact, I am not sure but what everyone could pay all of their 1942 taxes and at least half of their taxes they will owe on their 1943 income from the pay-roll deduction plan, without hurting them too much, and then in 1944, they might make it on some basis where they might eventually catch up with their taxes."

I have taken the trouble to analyze your letter because my thinking is very much like yours, and at present I think I am going to vote against every tax plan presented because I cannot go along with the idea of abating anybody's 1942 taxes.

I am still in favor of a plan originally presented by Mr. DEWEY of Illinois which provided for the payment of 1942 taxes over 10 years on the installment plan of either 10, 40, or 120 equal annual, quarterly or monthly payments, coupled with an insurance feature, the insurance to be issued by the War Risk Insurance Corporation and added to the deferred payments as a carrying charge to insure collection by the Government in the event of death and at the same time to keep these taxes from being an unnecessary burden on a man's estate."

And now, it is interesting to note that on March 29 this same man wrote me confirming the deductions contained in my letter of March 26, as follows:

Your letter of the 26th received. You are correct, the people are confusing the pay-as-you-go with the Ruml plan, for he was the originator of the idea. What I meant to say to you was this:

First. I distinctly favor pay-as-you-go plan.

Second. I am opposed to the complete abatement of the 1942 taxes.

I am of the firm opinion almost everyone could pay all or the greater part of their 1942 taxes, at the same time go along on the cash basis and eventually get on a paid-up basis of their taxes. I am not much sold on the 10-year plan. I think that is too long. Frankly, I believe half or three-quarters of

the 1942 taxes ought to be paid in 1943; the balance of it to be paid in the years 1944 and 1945. Get this money now while it is in circulation.

* * * Make everybody pay their taxes. They are going to have to provide this money and they might just as well start it now.

Also during the debate on this bill I received the following letter from an officer of one of the five largest banks in my district on March 25:

There has been a good deal of general as well as loose talk about placing this country's income-tax collections on what has become popularly known as the pay-as-you-go basis. I thought you would be interested to know how the situation will affect the average citizen. By average citizen I mean all of those middle-class Americans, which for my purpose would exclude the following:

1. Those people who have accumulated a capital backlog of securities or cash, which carries with it the implication that they are also without debts.

2. Those people who are gainfully employed at salaries several times their average earnings, wholly as a result of conditions brought about by the war.

In other words, my average citizen is the head of a family who works for a salary, and, in the majority of instances, has as his obligations the education of children, the payment for his home, or the purchase of a share in his business.

I do not pretend to know the advantages and disadvantages of the so-called Ruml plan. I do know, however, that payment of these vastly increased taxes 1 year at a time is about all that the average citizen is prepared to absorb now.

I replied in part as follows:

About a month ago I sent you from this office a proposed method of getting on a current basis advanced by Mr. DEWEY, of Illinois, which proposed, in substance, to amortize the 1942 taxes over a period of 10 years in such a form as not to be unduly burdensome to anyone. I am still in favor of this plan, and, frankly, I shall find it very difficult to support any of the bills now pending.

On March 31, after the vote had been taken, I received the following letter from this same man:

I see by the morning paper that a majority of your fellow Congressmen agreed with you that no plan which has been submitted is satisfactory.

I agree with you that Mr. DEWEY's 10-year plan was the most logical approach to the problem submitted thus far. I think, however, that careful consideration should be given as to the real purpose of pay-as-you-go tax collections. As I understand it, the main objective is to collect taxes from those people who are presently making big wages, which same people will be difficult to reach and in many cases impossible to collect from a year after the wages are earned. The objection to most plans is that some large taxpayers will forever escape liability if all or a portion of 1 year's taxes are waived.

The solution is a practical matter of what plan will produce the greatest revenue for the Treasury without overburdening the regular year-after-year taxpayer.

Because of the fact that taxes not paid by present large wage earners will eventually have to be paid by we people who have always paid income taxes, I hope some method is arrived at to make these collections. However, I would strongly object to trying to pay 2 years' taxes in 1 since the increased tax is as much as can be managed at the present time.

In order that my position may be made clear and that some intelligence may be thrown upon the correspondence last shown, I also am taking the liberty of inserting here a statement which I sent out to my district the day before the vote was taken on the legislation, which reads as follows:

I am of the opinion that a pay-as-you-go basis of paying income tax out of current earnings is desirable. But, I am also of the opinion that any forgiveness at this time, except possibly to very low income people, $1,200 gross income or less, when we have a mounting war debt, which the next generation must pay, is not financially sound or morally honest. It follows that I can only support a plan which can combine pay-as-you-go of 1943 taxes with a collection of 1942 taxes on a basis which will not be too burdensome.

A few months ago a proposal was suggested which accomplished this wholly desirable idea. It proposed to amortize 1942 tax liability over 10 years in 120, 40 or 10 monthly, quarterly, or annual instalments with a slight carrying charge for life insurance issued by the existing War Risk Insurance Corporation which would guarantee collection by the Government in event of death and freedom of the taxpayer's estate from the liability at the same time. These payments, along with 1943 and subsequent taxes, would not be too burdensome upon civilians—after all men are dying in this war. The proposal was a rough draft, it could even now be modified as to length of amortization, rates, other inequalities, or detail as to mechanics of collection. For reasons not clear to me, it has been abandoned and no effort made to perfect the idea by the committee or the President's Treasury Department.

Since I cannot vote for any of the existing plans, I intend to vote against all of them. I admit that this is a negative, protest vote, but I ask my constituents to understand that a 3-month-old freshman Congressman has as much chance to have a tax plan presented for passage or passed as three-legged hound at a fox hunt.

In addition, just before the vote was taken letters were written to me in support of the Robertson plan, but which did not reach me until after the vote was taken without the Robertson plan ever having been presented for our vote. However, I felt that I should state my position on that plan also to the people who had written these letters and I replied as follows on March 31:

I am answering your letter of March 29. By now you probably know that I voted against the Ruml plan.

You will also know from my statement published in the Evansville Courier on March 30 that I am opposed to any form of forgiveness to anyone with a gross income in excess of $1,200. This would include the Robertson plan.

Since I have already demonstrated to you that I am opposed to the complete forgiveness of all or any part of 1942 taxes, including the taxes of the very wealthy, you will respect my decision that I cannot support forgiveness of 1942 taxes for anyone except the very poor.

I have presented this full record for no other reason than to establish the fact that I have attempted to be forthright in my approach on this question to date. I am also presenting it for the reason that I think it throws some light upon the actual wishes of the public with reference to getting on a pay-as-you-go basis. I am aware that the experiences of one Member of the Congress and rather meager responses thereto of his constituency, of course, do not establish public-thinking, but I do think that the fact that my correspondence covered people of very diverse financial status and from distinctly different classes of our society that it does show some evidence of uniformity of public thinking.

As the result of this experience, and the facts are all set out for any Member to draw different conclusions, I am driven to the conclusion: first, that the people of the United States are again dence of uniformity of public thinking, and their willingness to make reasonable sacrifice designed to operate along accepted democratic principles, and I am driven to the conclusion that they want to do 2 things: first, to get on a pay-as-you-go basis with a withholding tax in 1943, and, second, to pay their 1942 taxes with remission only to the very unfortunate or to those who have not benefited in any way from this war inflation, and to make these payments over such period of time as will not be too burdensome and under a plan which will not cause the Treasury to fail to receive the 1942 taxes.

The Tribune Purge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Chicago Sun of Friday, March 13, 1943:

THE TRIBUNE PURGE

Our morning contemporary, which has moaned much in the past about "purges," i. e., all who campaign for the defeat at the polls of candidates favored by the Tribune, has now gone overboard for a purge of the Grand Old Party "Roosevelt Republicans," it stated yesterday, and "fourth-term Republicans" and "other kinds of fake Republicans," must not be permitted to "bore from within." They must be "thrown out of the party in disgrace as deserters if not as spies."

(That concern over spies is a growing phenomenon at Tribune tower. "Snoopers" and "spies" are after Mr. McCormick, after the Tribune, and now, it seems, they're running as wild through the Grand Old Party as the Japs used to think spies did through Tokyo before Pearl Harbor.)

The Tribune's specific list yesterday of Republicans to be purged was only partial, but considerable. It named Messrs. Stimson and Knox, of course, and Mr. Willkie, and Messrs. Ball and Stassen, of Minnesota. Also to be "smoked out with a view to excluding them from the party councils" are "all the financiers and social climbers" who, as the Tribune phrases it, propose to "subordinate" America to another country or a coalition. In other words, if a Republican isn't a Tribune America Firster, he's to be purged.

All this may be funny to level-headed Republicans when viewed simply as a phenomenon of Tribune psychology, but the isolationist versus cooperation conflict in the party is irrepressible enough in all reality. We note the words of the Wisconsin State Journal of

Madison, for example, in a front-page editorial on "Our Kind of Republicanism": "If supporting the Robert McCormick Chicago Tribune brand of isolationist, defeatist politics is required before one can be a Republican, we'd rather not belong. If we can be a Republican newspaper and support a broad international policy necessary for winning the war and the peace * * * we will be proud to help carry the banner. If we must feel that we'd rather have Russia lose than America win, in order to be Republicans, please count the State Journal out."

The Republican National Convention of 1944 is still more than a year hence, but the fight for supremacy in it is well under way. We presume that the party will retain much strength when the fight is over—but not if victory goes to the faction of national and international defeat and sabotage.

William Henry Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me yesterday at the dedicatory exercises held in Arlington for William Henry Jackson.

William Henry Jackson, to whom we pay affectionate tribute here today, was a true American. His forebears were among those who colonized the eastern shores of this land. They played the helpful part of solid citizens in building our Nation. They gave to it a goodly number of sturdy children, who grew to manhood and womanhood clean and upright, helpful and neighborly. They were self-reliant, cooperative, peace-loving folk. They lived useful and beautiful lives.

When William Jackson was born—100 years ago today—our country, even along the Atlantic seaboard, was largely in the pioneering stage. Over New York, his birth State, were scattered frontier settlements, where Indians just a few years before had held sway. It was a close-to-nature life those pioneers lived, dependent on the soil, on ingenuity, and on courage. Common problems brought neighbors together to solve them. An inborn love of learning brought the common school into being. Love of God brought churches and worship. And with it all, a love of the beautiful developed the spirit of art.

Responsive to these surroundings, William H. Jackson grew up. He loved nature in all its forms. He had the inborn spirit of the artist; and this, fostered by his own mother, who was, herself, an artist, determined the course of his life. His father, experimenting in early day photography, helped to turn the current of his boy's interest into that specific form of art. From his childhood on through nearly a full century, this son was to be a maker of pictures.

Even the vicissitudes of civil war did not thwart this major interest. True American that he was, he volunteered to help save the Union. Yet while in camp he spent leisure hours sketching the scenes around him. An officer, observing this talent, set the young solder to the work of sketching for the information of his leaders. Some of his pictures, sent in letters to the home folk, and treasured by his appreciative mother, give revealing glimpses not only of soldier camp life during Civil War days but also of the developing artist. The sketches done with sincerity portray with something of photographic accuracy scenes and experiences a home-loving soldier boy would share with his loved ones.

After the war struggle was over, a broken engagement with the girl he had left behind him, set young William Jackson's feet on the historic trails of the far West. In 1866 he found himself with pals playing the role of an oxteamster in a covered wagon train heading for the gold fields of Montana. What few moments he could garner out of these strenuous days, he filled with sketching pictures and keeping a dairy record of the new scenes and adventures on this westward trip. Letters written to his parents, added to his sketches and day-by-day notes, preserve with fidelity a stirring phase of our Nation-building story.

William H. Jackson's pictures and his faithful record tell the truth about the old West. He went through man-testing experiences and dangers with quiet courage. To him, as with every other real hero, these were just in the day's work. He never boasted or posed. He seemed ever to be able to go through exciting adventures without losing his head. He observed keenly, appraised wisely, and, through pictures and written record, preserved truthfully what seemed worth preserving. In this he not only shared the riches of his new life with his home folks, but also kept something precious for all time.

After his experiences on the old Oregon, Mormon, and California trails in the 1860's, driving oxteams and muleteams, working at a stage station, and helping bring a band of mustangs eastward from old Los Angeles to Omaha, young Jackson was to settle into his life's work as a photographer. It was not, however, the confining work of a gallery that challenged his interest. His bent was for picture making in the great out-of-doors. Omaha, where he set up shop, was at that time booming with activities connected with building the Union Pacific. A photographic record must be made of that history-shaping event. Besides, there were the Indians—Pawnee and other tribes—still within reach.

With a portable "dark room" mounted on a horse-drawn buggy, the youthful photographer visited Indian villages for pictures of the vanishing red men. Freight crews took him along the developing railroad across the plains and into the mountains to photograph the scenic spots on the line. Finally, this field work with the old "wet plate" camera opened a new and important service for America.

Dr. Ferdinand V. Hayden, pioneer leader of the United States Geological Survey, found in William H. Jackson a man who could give invaluable help to the Survey. No appropriation was then available in the service for photography, but Mr. Jackson was glad to accompany Dr. Hayden as a volunteer for the first expedition. Reports that year were brightened with revealing photographs.

As a result, the photographic division became a part of the Survey, with William H. Jackson officially its leader.

Through nearly a decade following, this adventurous cameraman devoted himself to revealing through fine photographs the wonderlands of the West. In 1871 he followed Dr. Hayden into the Yellowstone and came forth with photographic proof that the "tall tales" of John Colter and Jim Bridger fell short of the marvels of that region. He cut a trail across snowbanks to photograph the Grand Teton. He scaled the heights of the Rockies to get a picture of the mystical Holy Cross. He followed an old prospector, John Moss, into southwestern Colorado to take the first photographs of the cliff dwellings. He made pictures of the Shoshones, Utes, the Navajos, and the Pueblos. With him, photography was a passion; to get good pictures of new scenes and interesting people he spared no pains.

With the close of his service in the Survey, this pioneer photographer carried on into new fields. One of his photographic ventures took him 10,000 miles across Siberia. On another, he photographed most of the old missions in our own land and in Mexico. Later, he settled down, somewhat, by making his headquarters in Denver, at the foot of the Rockies. From here he continued his work of portraying the places of challenging interest along the new railroad lines. As a last business venture, he organized the Detroit Publishing Co., devoted largely to the creation and distribution of pictures and picture post cards.

Past fourscore years, yet still youthful in spirit and in good health, William H. Jackson laid down these business cares, but not his life's work.

It was early in 1930, the year of the Covered Wagon Centennial, proclaimed by President Hoover, that he appeared at the office of the Oregon Trail Memorial Association. He had learned of the movement fostered by Ezra Meeker and his successors to save our precious pioneer heritage.

Introduced to the president of this patriotic organization and asked what he desired, William H. Jackson modestly responded, "I just came to see whether I might not do something to help in your work."

That sentence gives a flash view of the spirit of this pioneer.

A few questions by the executive brought forth some of his rich background. Then the president said, "Mr. Jackson, we are trying to save some of the great trails closely linked with the making of America. Frankly, we do not know just where certain of those trails ran. Do you think you could make a map to help us get a clearer picture of the old trails?"

"I believe I could," was his reply.

With that he was given a place in the association at a modest compensation. How he has magnified that calling is attested, not only by the many accurate maps he drew, but by a series of pictures he painted that bring back the Old West with fidelity and artistry that has challenged admiration.

What the patriotic association he had joined did was to open an opportunity for a great American artist to perform a distinctive final service for all America. Like the famed century plant, William H. Jackson was to come to his blossoming years as he neared the close of nearly a century of a rich and beautiful life.

The joy he found in this splendid expression through art was enhanced when he was engaged by the National Park Service to portray through pictures the story of the development of our national parks. Impressive murals and other paintings came into being through his artistic touch through these years.

Friendships made through the Explorers' Club, the Cosmos Club, and other organizations were cheering and helpful. Annual trips made with officers and members of the Oregon Trail Memorial Association along historic trails revived rich memories and extended his opportunity to help make pioneer America live again for young Americans.

He came to the close of his long life of service with a wealth of friendship and honors.

Today his friends by thousands join us on this, the hundredth anniversary of his birth, in paying heartfelt tribute to a rare artist, a dauntless pioneer, a beloved man, a great American.

Payment of Overtime Compensation to Government Employees

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it is high time that the Federal Government did something for the employees affected by this bill, H. R. 1860.

Some of us seem to forget that these employees, too, have families depending upon them for support. They, too, have a patriotic urge, which would lead them to the purchase of War bonds, contribute to war charities, and so forth. They, too, must pay all taxes, irrespective of how high the taxes may be. Certainly, when prices go up they affect all purchasers and no exception is made of these Federal employees.

Private industry has recognized, and justly so, the need for the adjustment of salaries to its employees. It is obvious to all that the cost of living has gone far above the purchase level of the old salaries. How can we justify one standard for employees in private industry and a different one for Federal employees?

It is no argument against the enactment of this bill to say that it will cost over $550,000,000. This cost must be accepted as another of the abnormal expenditures brought about by the conditions of all-out warfare. We certainly would not refuse to increase our hitting or defensive power merely because of the cost. And, by the same token, we cannot withhold justice from those who serve the people, because it means some more money is to be spent by the Government.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is fair, just, and necessary. It should be enacted into law.

Our Harvard Farm Experts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press, March 31, 1943, wrote a satiric piece on our bureaucratic agricultural experts, some of whom have their feet in their wastebaskets and their heads in the clouds. The editorial is as follows:

THE NEW FARM EXPERT

"I am Mr. Brown, the new agricultural expert for this Division. Here are my credentials."

"Ah, yes, Mr. Brown. Harvard man, I see. Splendid. Now, which department do you——"

"I think I would prefer the publicity angle. I have some new ideas I should like to give the farmers. Take, for example, our most delicious berries, the potato and the onion. I think we should plant the trees closer and prune the branches in the spring just after the molting season. That would give us more branches to produce more burrs. This same plan would help the peanut tree."

"But, Mr. Brown——"

"However, my chief interest is bovines or cows. It has been our practice to produce numbers of useless male cows, and this must be discouraged. Such as are produced should be butchered and made into sausage and ham to relieve the pork and mutton shortage.

"We have also followed the wasteful practice of feeding our young female cows a year or more before breaking them to give milk. I think these fillies should be trained to produce milk within 6 or 8 weeks after hatching.

"The whole dairy business needs efficient reorganization. We must teach our dairymen to specialize. The cows in one region should give nothing but milk, those in another nothing but cream, those in a third section nothing but butter, and those in a fourth section nothing but cheese. It will not be necessary to specialize in buttermilk, for we can use ordinary milk and add the butter at a processing plant.

"We have been very wasteful. No doubt you have read about the breakage of milk bottles. This can be corrected by using larger containers with rubber cushions around the top. We should not blame the cows, for it must be very difficult to sit on those small bottles.

"Cows are nervous animals, easily disturbed by noise. I think we should disconnect or plug up the horns they use in making that mooing sound, and—"

"Yes, yes, Mr. Brown. That is splendid. But excuse me a moment. I need a little air."

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on April 3, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, before I start my discussion tonight, I want to take a moment to thank everybody for their kind and encouraging letters. As you know, I average 50 of these a day from my district. They have a range of subjects as wide as the world and a thousand different requests. But in each letter, whether its writer is asking me to obtain a soldier's allotment or to send a victory garden handbook there is a sincerity and a friendliness which makes me pleased indeed that you have taken the time to write me.

Ordinarily, I am a poor correspondent and I know the average person is. It's hard to get the chance to sit down and write a letter when one has worked hard all day in a war factory, or on a farm, or at the end of a hard grueling day in the service. It's a lot easier to relax and enjoy yourself. Therefore, I can doubly appreciate the interest which prompts so many of you to sit down in the evening when you're tired and fretful and make the effort which letter writing requires. So I wish to thank you for your trouble and to assure you that your letters are always welcome, no matter what you choose to write about. It is just great to hear from you.

My supply of victory garden books and handbooks has been supplemented by a large number of city garden books. These are similar to the others and are most informative. They are especially helpful to you in the Triple Cities who are going to plant gardens this spring. And the way the weather has been lately, I guess we can look for spring anytime now. So, I suggest to you folks who have organized victory garden clubs and groups or you who are doing it on your own to get in touch with me. I will send you at least one victory garden or city garden booklet. In the case of a victory garden group, I will be pleased to supply you with as many as you need. Don't be afraid to write me and ask me for these or any five of a thousand other subjects connected with agriculture. Bear in mind we are in the same economic position this year as was Egypt during the first of its 7 lean years, with one big difference: we don't have a wise Joseph, who warned Pharaoh to fill the storehouses with wheat and corn through the 7 years of plenty. I only wish we could say we were in half as good a position as ancient Egypt was.

Therefore, the American people must fight a food shortage on the home front while our boys are fighting our battles all over the world. Every victory garden under cultivation means just that much more food to supply our people at home for a whole year. I urge you, I implore you for this reason to plant and produce, plant and produce even if you only have the corner of your back lot. Let's not have the specter of famine raise its awful head on top of all the other troubles and sorrows we are bearing.

Congress has proposed a great many different ways to solve the farm-labor problem in the past few weeks. Although I voted for the bill which finally passed, I am not satisfied with it. The measure provides for many millions to be spent to hire and transport farm labor from any part of the country or even from Mexico and Puerto Rico. Personally I am not too strong for this imported farm labor. I don't think it will be worth a hoot on the dairy farms of my district.

My solution for this whole shortage of farm labor in our section is to send home the boys who have been drafted off our farms and let them remain home on furlough as long as there is any important farm work to be done this summer and fall.

Dozens of farmers have written in asking me to intervene with their boys' commanding officers for releases from the Army in order to help them on the farm this year. In many cases I have carried this appeal to their commander because I have long been deeply concerned over the dismal prospects of maintaining agriculture with everybody gone.

Of one thing I am sure: That one hired farm hand who knows his dairy and has worked around farms in the Southern Tier all his life is equal to a dozen Mexican laborers that Mr. Wickard says he is going to bring across the border and place on American farms to help the American farmer. I hope we don't get any up this way. I'm afraid there won't be much work done. Not that I doubt their good intentions. But can't you imagine how much time it would take a Broome County farmer who hasn't enough hours in the day, anyway, to try to make a Mexican farm hand understand what he wanted? This would take most of the time of both the farmer and his farm hand.

We've all heard a lot lately about absenteeism in war industry and among defense workers. A few weeks ago the cry was raised that we were losing the war on the assembly line because the people engaged in war production were becoming lax and

delinquent in their attendance to duty. Figures were quoted by certain authorities that showed a large percentage of men and women were staying away from their jobs.

It is easy to understand how greatly concerned the country could be over a condition of this kind if it were really as flagrant as it has been made out to be. It is obvious that millions of man-hours would be lost to the war effort if absenteeism were as widespread as it was pictured. There is no denying that such a loss of work would let the boys down at the front in a most disheartening way.

Whatever the extent of absenteeism, and I am not prepared to say because I do not know its extent, the fact remains that full publicity has been given this shameful practice. The newspapers filled their columns with headlined articles and indignant editorials about it.

So one thing is obvious, the absentees have been exposed and punished in the American way, namely, by the heat of publicity. It is no fun to be pointed at during these times—wherever you happen to be—whether you are engaged in war production or just folding bandages in a volunteer capacity and told you are not backing up the armed forces. Yes, the heat of adverse publicity has worked as far as absenteeism goes. According to further estimates since the exposure of this malpractice, the decrease of absent cases in war plants has actually been unbelievable.

This shows that defense workers never intended to overindulge in absenteeism. I am convinced that in the vast majority of cases this was caused by the failure to see anything wrong with occasionally staying off the job, not realizing what this failure multiplied by millions could mean.

All of which prompts me to take a little time out to utter a word or two of praise for the jobs our people in defense work have already done. I'm not talking now about what they have not done or have been unable to do because they were away from the job. I am talking about what they have done and are doing.

In the first place, I think everybody will agree that our soldiers, sailors, and marines can have the greatest courage, the highest degree of determination, and the stoutest hearts in the world, and I know they have all these; but these fine qualities can't win the war alone. The boys can't go into a Jap-infested jungle in New Guinea, they can't run against a Nazi-held base in Tunisia and expect to win barehanded. Somebody has to work to produce the weapons they're fighting with. Somebody has to use a lot of energy to plan, design, fashion, and assemble all the tanks, guns, and planes they've been using to make the progress we've seen them make thus far. Somebody had to do a little work to manufacture the ships bearing more and more men to the scenes of conflict. In fact, quite a crowd of somebodies had to sweat and toil in the heat and bustle of America's thousands of war factories in order to assemble enough of what it takes to back up our fighters. Quite a crowd of somebodies had to go the limit to produce enough so the boys could hold the enemy back and to give them the wherewithal to go forward to victory.

So let's look at what our men and women in defense work have done instead of what they haven't done. They certainly have produced enough to enable our armed forces to hold their ground and to advance. This is a matter of record, and it is a glorious record, indeed.

Therefore I have only the warmest praise for you thousands of Triple Cities folks who are patriotically striving to do your parts in the war industries of our valley. I have only the highest tribute to pay all of you in this congressional district. You have kept the enemy from the entire Western Hemisphere by your ceaseless efforts. You have developed the sinews of war which have been loosed upon the other continents of this world. Your performance thus far is fair assurance that you will do a faster, bigger, and better job from now on. By your work, America and her allies have held the savage onslaughts of the Nazi hordes in Russia and thrust them back from Moscow. By your work the yellow-bellied Japanese has been halted in his rampage of bloodthirsty plunder until now he is being turned back to the Son of Heaven, who will soon feel the real weight of your growing strength even from the skies above Tokyo.

No, dear friends, workers in a hundred busy plants in our valley of opportunity, I cannot join with those who would condemn you for what you have not done. I see only the great good in what you have done. I see only the Herculean might of a people strong enough to match blow for blow the industrial might of Nazi Germany with her countless millions of slave laborers groaning under the yoke of oppression. I see only the love, loyalty, and patriotic fervor which have prompted you men and women in our war factories to carry on your arduous tasks as free Americans. I see only the devotion to duty which spurs you on to save enough money out of your weekly pay checks, in spite of increased living costs, to buy bonds, give to the Red Cross, public and private charities, and contribute to your own church.

To me, this is something of which those in authority in our Government should be proud. I will say to them you cannot drive Americans like these. You do not need to. You must first convince them that you are right. Once this is done, they will cooperate. They have already cooperated to the tune of the greatest feat of mass production in war weapons and material the world has ever known. They have accomplished this without Nazi pressure or threats. They have accomplished this because they knew their country's fate was in their hands.

Thus far, I believe the splendid spirit of cooperation between management and the folks who produce is responsible for America's favorable position today on the war front of the world. It was only a short year ago that we were all feeling the discouragement of Allied reverses. Our production had not started to show results. Yet through all those discouraging days, you men and women stayed at your jobs turning out with ever-increasing precision the necessary weapons with which to bring us victory.

You have done a monumental task and you have saved America from defeat. The tables have been turned unquestionably toward certain victory. I think this victory is coming sooner than anyone of us expects.

Restore the Rank of Brigadier General to "Billy" Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, that air power is playing a dominant part in the present war is recognized daily by all of us. Every issue of the daily newspapers, every radio commentator, and every newsreel in the theaters of America confirm the fact that the airplane has revolutionized the mode of carrying on war.

Modern methods of warfare clearly portray that Gen. William "Billy" Mitchell, back in 1929, knew whereof he spoke when he uttered these prophetic words:

The coming of air power has made a greater difference in war than anything in history. Armies are mere holders of land. During the war armies only moved back and forth for 60 miles and killed hundreds of thousands. That isn't war—war is getting at the vital centers of the enemy—where they live, their food, their communications. Air power can go straight to them now—3,000 miles away—and destroy.

Mr. Speaker, on January 24, 1941, I introduced a bill to restore the rank of brigadier general to the late William Mitchell. The House failed to take action on the bill during the 77th Congress and I have reintroduced it at this session. It is known as H. R. 106. The legislation referred to was introduced at the request of the American Legion, an organization composed of veterans of the first World War.

The American people are deeply indebted to General "Billy" Mitchell for his timely advice. If we had followed his admonitions we would have been better prepared from an air standpoint for participation in the present war.

Congress represents the American people and is expected to carry out their wishes. Americans everywhere recognize the injustice imposed upon General "Billy" Mitchell and demand that his name and reputation be vincidated by restoring him to the rank of brigadier general. The time is ripe to give redress for a wrong committed, and it is my hope that Congress will take favorable action on this legislation designed to correct an injury to the good name and reputation of a distinguished American.

The following is a copy of H. R. 106:

H. R. 106

A bill to restore the rank of brigadier general to William Mitchell, deceased

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby regards the late William Mitchell as having been exonerated of all the charges on account of which a judgment of court martial was on January 26, 1926, entered against him, and the causes which he espoused and by reason of which such court martial was instituted to have been vindicated by the passage of time; and the Congress further regards his resignation from the Army to have been under honorable circumstances and that his rank in War Department records should appear as that of brigadier general.

Unjust Criticism of Senator Moore of Oklahoma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, when a man lives for half a lifetime in a community and establishes among his neighbors a reputation for honesty, integrity, and square dealing which is unimpeachable, he needs no defense against attempts of a bunch of political satellites

who have used the agencies of Government—and thus the taxpayers' money—to build and keep in power a ruthless political machine.

It could, of course, be expected that the machine-politicians would become terribly irked when the people commence the overthrow of the political oligarchy, as was the case in Oklahoma last November.

Senator E. H. MOORE lived in Okmulgee, Okla., for many years. I include as a part of my remarks a recent editorial from the Okmulgee Times-Democrat, which speaks for itself. Also included is an editorial from the Enid Morning News published at Enid, Okla., under date of Friday, April 2, 1943:

[From the Okmulgee Times-Democrat]

THIS WAS NO OFF-COLOR DEAL

As far as we are concerned, Senator E. H. MOORE has completely an satisfactorily explained that $5,000 about which the legislature investigating committee asked ex-Gov. Leon C. Phillips Monday.

Senator MOORE said in Washington yesterday that the check for $5,000 "was in appreciation of the services he has rendered to the State as Governor and of the check he had imposed on the political oligarchy of Oklahoma that has all but bankrupted the State."

Ex-Governor Phillips told the investigating committee that the $5,000 was "in payment for the work yet to be done." He said Mr. MOORE called him on the telephone and told him: "You've played the game on the square and are going out of office broke and sick, and I want to do something for you."

There isn't necessarily any conflict between the explanation offered by ex-Governor Phillips and Senator MOORE. Mr. Phillips does perhaps intend to make repayment in service, though Mr. MOORE says he intended the check as an outright gift.

We know Senator MOORE too well to believe for an instant that the $5,000 was a part of any shady deal. Senator MOORE would not be a party to one and, frankly, we don't believe Mr. Phillips would, either.

Of course, there are many, many Oklahomans, include the Times, who lack a lot of approving the acts of the Phillips regime as thoroughly as Senator MOORE did.

Mr. Phillips, then Governor, did bolt his party to support Senator MOORE, the Republican nominee, in his race for the Senate. Equally true is it that Mr. MOORE gave Mr. Phillips his full support in the Democratic primary 4 years ago when the Okemahan narrowly won the gubernatorial nomination from Gen. W. S. Key.

However, that's all in the realm of politics and nothing that either of these two men did reflects anything dishonorable.

On the other hand, there certainly is nothing strange or out of keeping with Senator MOORE's character and reputation in his giving the ex-Governor $5,000 as a token of appreciation and friendship. In fact, it is strictly in keeping. We've heard of too many other generous acts by Senator MOORE to find anything strange in this instance. He has repeatedly done like things for other friends and employees in the past.

We recall, among other things, that when Senator MOORE was operating in the California oil fields he made a point of giving most, if not all, of the employes of his Tulsa headquarters, opportunity to work in California at least 3 months at large expense to himself. That reflects the same spirit that, we feel sure, actuated him in sending $5,000 to ex-Governor Phillips.

Other similar kindly acts on the part of Senator MOORE are known by us and others but he never has cared about the public knowing of them and for us to enumerate many of them now would no doubt be distasteful to him.

We're all for any investigation the legislature wants to make. In fact, we feel quite sure that some things should be probed to the very bottom, but we'd gamble that this $5,000 deal between Senator MOORE and ex-Governor Phillips is strictly on the up and up.

[From the Enid (Okla.) Morning News of April 2, 1943]

THE SMEAR THAT FAILED

It is typically democratic New Deal stuff to make wild charges against the political opposition—charges often without any foundation, in fact, and so known to be, but put forward in the hope of befuddling the people and smearing men on the opposite side of the political fence. Sometimes this is done in order to defeat an opposition candidate, but under the New Deal and its famous exponent of the practice, Charley Michelson, smearing has become a fine art, and the smear is used for political revenge, for distracting public attention from the smearers' wrongdoing, or just for the pure cussedness of it. It has filtered down to the States, especially such machine-ridden Democratic States as Oklahoma. As witness the effort in the late legislaitve session of State Senator Bill Logan to smear United States Senator ED MOORE, who overwhelmingly defeated Rubberstamp Josh Lee in the November election.

Senator Logan introduced a resolution in the upper house of the legislature blithely charging that Senator MOORE had spent $400,000 in his senatorial campaign, and loudly calling for an investigation, charging violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, etc. And the senate, Democratic by a 10-to-1 majority, flatly refused to consider the proposal, only 10 senators arising to favor the smear resolution, designed only to discredit MOORE and the Republican Party, which had sponsored his candidacy.

In the meantime, Senator MOORE promptly replied to the Democratic charges by supplying to the newspapers a copy of his sworn and detailed statement of his expenditures during the campaign, a statement showing election costs of $11,772.92, as compared to the Logan smear charge of $400,000, and the charge of Governor Kerr that the Senator had bought his seat in the Senate. Moreover, MOORE showed in his statement that there were no contributors to his campaign fund; that he paid his own way and was therefore obligated to no individual, group, or commercial interest through acceptance of campaign funds

Weird smear charges had been made by State Democrats from the Governor on down. Yet upon the presentation of the opportunity to proceed with an inquiry into the truth of such charges, in an overwhelmingly Democratic State senate, less than one-fourth the members were willing to publicly attach their names to an effort to establish the truth of such charges. It is the cowardly way of the smear-mongers, from Washington on down to the Oklahoma statehouse.

Flashes From News and Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include bulletin issued March 13, 1943, by the Church League of America, edited by George Washington Robnett, entitled "Flashes From News and Views, an Open Letter to the New York Times and Other Newspapers":

FLASHES FROM NEWS AND VIEWS

An open letter to the New York Times, the Chicago Sun, the San Francisco Chronicle, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, the Washington (D. C.) Star, the Birmingham News Age-Herald, the S. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Detroit News, the Philadelphia Record, the Newark Star-Ledger, the Boston Herald Traveler, the Baltimore Sun, the Milwaukee Journal

GENTLEMEN: Only a few days ago you carried in your paper a full page propaganda advertisement sponsored by the Communist Party (U. S. A.) according to the Daily Worker. The cost for this would be $17,876.72.

We challenge not only your good judgment but also your moral right to allow your publication (supported by free enterprise) to be used as a vehicle for carrying the propaganda of an organization that is the avowed enemy of the American free enterprise system of which your paper is a major symbol.

Let it be clear at once that our reference here is to the so-called Communist Party (U. S. A.) and not to communism in any other country. What we say here is in no sense a reflection upon our war relationship with any nation. In this letter our reference is to the same organization to which Attorney General Biddle referred in April of 1942 when he ruled that Harry Bridges should be deported. He said: "The Communist Party of the United States, a section of the so-called Third International, was founded in 1919; and after its name was changed several times, finally became the Communist Party of the United States of America in 1929 * * *. The Communist Party teaches the violent overthrow of existing governments, including that of the United States.

"This concept reaches back to the famous manifesto of Marx and Engels of 1848, which declares: 'The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be obtained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions.'"

THIS CHALLENGE IS BASED UPON THREE COUNTS

1. That the so-called Communist Party (U. S. A.) is spiritually atheistic. It is built around the dialectical-materialism teachings of Karl Marx and this calls for a godless society. In the Fish congressional investigation (1930), when Communists were called before the committee to be sworn, they refused to take an oath giving the reason that they did not accept the Christian theory of God.

2. That the so-called Communist Party (U. S. A.) advocates and propagandizes for a socialistic economy which is diametrically opposed to the capitalistic economy of free enterprise, which is our established order in this country. They believe in federalized collectivism—everything to be owned and operated by the state. We believe in the principle of individual freedom and private ownership.

3. That the so-called Communist Party (U. S. A.) is congenitally and fundamentally anti-American in its basic purpose and aims—and that it is not entitled to recognition in this country as a political party in the sense that the Republican and Democratic Parties function. The Communist apparatus is an international political octopus, and the members of its various branches are notorious for their international allegiance. The Communist organism in this country is prima facie a collusive prevarication in that its predominant expressions and actions show homage, loyalty, and devotion to another land and another form of government, while its functionaries refuse to register as foreign agents.

Twelve years ago we would not have dignified this "party" or "movement" (or whatever type of organism it may be) with any attention because at that time it was but little more than a backroom nuisance, but under highly favorable conditions it has, in these few tragic years, grown to the proportions of a major threat. A movement mechanism that can blanket the Nation with full-page newspaper advertisements is no longer an inconsequential force.

WHAT WAS THE PURPOSE OF THIS NEWSPAPER MESSAGE?

If you read this advertisement you will recall that its headline was "Hitler's Secret Weapon: The Bogey of Communism." The message then undertook to smear all in this country who are opposed to communism with the implication that they are allies of Hitler. The fraudulency and absurdity of this part of the appeal is too obvious to require attention.

Under this deception Browder proceeded to indict several hundred Members of Congress who recently voted to continue the Dies committee by employing these libelous words: "To our shame we must confess that Herr Schickelgruber's single victory was won in the United States, in Washington, in Congress."

People all over this country were astounded when you allowed a Communist ex-convict to use your paper at space rates to smear our constitutional Congress by linking it (in its performance of an act) to the unthinkable beast of Berlin.

He, this same Earl Browder, who has served time in two of our Federal penitentiaries, goes on to say that "Those who wish to cement that friendship (between America and the Soviet Union) are put on notice that they must defeat the majority of Congress on this question * * * No more can we have MARTIN DIES as the symbol of our policy, and also have our friendship with the Soviet Union." By what authority does this man speak thusly? Does he mean that he is speaking for the Soviet Union? Does he mean that the Communists (United States of America) are a legal branch of the Comintern—and in that way are spokesmen for the Soviet Government? If so, then why has our Government not required the Communist Party (United States of America) to register as a foreign agent? Browder, as an official of the Communist Party (United States of America), here makes a charge with serious implications. Our Government should investigate its meaning.

Browder then proceeds to smear others who have earned his hatred. He says: "For this Congress has the power, and a reactionary, defeatist coalition of Hoover Republicans and Wheeler Democrats is influencing a majority of Congress to use this power, under our Constitution, to throw confusion into the war effort." Strange words from a man who served in Fort Leavenworth as a slacker in World War No. 1 and who was head of a party that fought our entry into this war up to the day Hitler attacked Stalin.

BROWDER AND HIS "RED" PALS WERE YELLING "IMPERIALIST WAR"

In a speech at town hall, Philadelphia (September 29, 1939) Earl Browder said: "The Communist Party has issued as the slogan of the day: 'Keep America out of the imperialist war.' In this slogan are implicit, what we consider, the only correct answers to all those pressing questions about this war. First, it is correct to describe this as an imperialist war; that is, a war in which both sides are directed by imperialist aims, by rival and irreconcilable ambitions of world domination to which all other considerations are subordinated."

Speaking at Symphony Hall, Boston (November 5, 1939), Browder entitled his speech "Stop the War" and railed at "the Republican Party, which now demands and obtains my indictment from a Democratic administration. My real crime therefore, is denouncing equally both sides in the present criminal and predatory war, in advocating a real neutrality in thought as well as in deed, and calling for the quickest possible ending of the war."

In this same speech he went on to say: "When we search for the explanation of why the United States, together with most of the world, is slipping backward economically, while the Soviet Union forges ahead so magnificently, and emerges a giant of strength and progress, we are finally forced to find the answer in the difference between two systems of social organization, the difference between capitalism and socialism."

Continuing, he said: "The guilt for this war lies upon the ruling classes, the bourgeoisie, of all the capitalist countries and most especially upon those of the belligerents. But at this moment the responsibility for continuing this war lies, before all, upon the British and French imperialists who have rejected the very thought of a halt to hostilities, and who feverishly work to involve all other countries in the slaughter."

At the close of his speech, Browder said: "Out of the struggle against the present imperialistic war, new defeats will be administered to the decaying system of capitalism and all its agents, additional lands will be won for socialism. 'Only the people are immortal,' said Comrade Stalin."

In this report Browder derided President Roosevelt by saying: "'Fifty thousand airplanes' is the slogan which opened the 1940 Presidential campaign. For what?" Further in this report he says: "The Communist Party's first task is to crystallize the mass determination to keep our country out of the European war." But now this same Browder and his same Communist Party are the most vociferous of the "side-line quarterbacks" calling all the plays and demanding a second front in reckless defiance of all military judgment and decision.

BROWDER MAKES NO BONES ABOUT HIS JOB IN AMERICA

His report went on to say that it was the task of the Communist Party in 1940 to "introduce America into the higher school of political education, on the basis of its own experience, to introduce the millions to the problems of socialism as the first stage of communism."

Do you, Mr. Publishers, think that the tiger has changed its spots? Do you think that it has dropped its purpose to introduce us to socialism as the first stage of communism?

In 1940 Browder came out with a Communist propaganda booklet called The Second Imperialist War, in which he said: "The American people are overwhelmingly against this imperialistic war and want no part in it whatever. * * * The war party, of which Roosevelt has assumed the leadership, holds in its hands * * *. The Government, with the war party in full possession, step by step moves into the second imperialistic war and sets up its instruments of repression of the masses. * * *"

All of this is repeated merely for the purpose of showing the perfidious role that the Communist Party and its leaders have been playing in this country—for the purpose of showing that their eternal theme song is one of disunity and rabble rousing—and for the purpose of showing that underlying all their high-sounding prattle is the one revolutionary objective of changing our form of government to a dictatorship of socialism or communism—whichever term suits their pleasure at the moment.

WHAT IS THIS COMMUNIST PARTY OF WHICH BROWDER IS SPOKESMAN?

We have already quoted Attorney General Biddle's recent definition of American communism. Now we quote from Government Report No. 2290 of the Seventy-first Congress:

"The following is a definition of communism, a world-wide political organization advocating: (1) Hatred of God and all forms of religion; (2) destruction of private property and inheritance; (3) absolute social and racial equality; promotion of class hatred; (4) revolutionary propaganda through the Communist International, stirring up Communist activities in foreign countries in order to cause strikes, riots, bloodshed, and civil war; (5) destruction of all forms of representative governments, including civil liberties, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and trial by jury; (6) the ultimate and final objective is by means of world revolution to establish the dictatorship of the so-called proletariat into one world union of soviet socialist republics with the capitol at Moscow."

WHAT KIND OF AN AMERICAN IS THIS COMMUNIST BROWDER? HERE ARE HIS WORDS

From his book, Fighting for Peace (1939), page 232: "It was Lenin's direct influence, continued and deepened by Stalin, which brought the American working-class vanguard, organized in the Communist Party, to its present degree of maturity in which it is able to be the staunchest and most clear-headed builder of the democratic front of the people against reaction, fascism, and war, and at the same time, the most effective pathfinder to the socialist future. It is Leninism, organically growing on American soil, which has begun to realize in some degree for the American people the heroic perspective opened up for the world by Dimitroff at the Seventh World Congress." (Dimitroff is head of the Comintern (Communist International) which is dedicated to the job of spreading communism throughout the world.)

Page 234: "Since the rise of the modern Communist or Socialist movement dating from the Communist Manifesto, written by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in 1848, which proposed that the national economy of each country should be taken over by its people, acting through its government, abolishing private ownership in the means of production and distribution, the issues thus raised have been the very center of all economic and political thought and controversy." He then proceeds with several pages of statistics, to eulogize the Soviet regime of Communism as the ideal economic system and berates our own American way by saying: "Under our economic system of capitalism, the national economy is under the private ownership and operation of a relatively small section of the population, the incentive to production being entirely dominated by the search for private profit on the part of these private owners. The result is anarchy in economic life."

In his booklet The Communist Party of the United States of America, Earl Browder said (pages 18 and 22): "The Communist Party is the party of the working class. The party is the most advanced section of the working class, its vanguard uniting its immediate interests with its ultimate and broadest historical goal. When we proclaim our party as the vanguard, and our program as scientific, we must remember always that our party is not fully the master, but is only in the process of mastering, the theoretical inheritance which is the source of our power, the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin."

In a book called The Democratic Front, published in 1938, Browder said (page 63): "We are learning, but we must learn better and more quickly, how to organize and extend the independent mass agitation of the party, together with the deeper education of the masses in the teachings of our great guides, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. We have begun seriously to popularize among

the masses our rich inheritance of American revolutionary and democratic traditions, linking it up fundamentally with our full party program." Now Mr. Newspaper Publishers, just what do you understand that to mean? Is it a program in which you are proud to collaborate?

From a booklet "Social and National Security," written by Earl Browder in 1938 (pages 24–25): "We cannot afford to forget for a moment that the Communist Party is itself our first and most effective instrument in the struggle for the most immediate and the most far-reaching demands of the people. Our party, together with the Young Communist League, uniting itself with the broadest masses in their daily struggles, must learn better than ever how to build itself stronger and stronger within the democratic front * * * Our great brother party, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which gave to the world the supreme example of the communist program translated into life, has now provided us with a great instrument for our ideological rearmament. It is a new book, 'A Short Course in the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union,' prepared under the direction of its central committee, with the personal participation and leadership of Comrade Stalin." After quoting a few paragraphs from the book, which Browder said had a first edition of 6,000,000 copies in Russia, he continued: "Will such a book be of special value also to us here in America, a book written and edited under the personal direction of our great teacher Stalin? Of course, it will be of the most inestimable value." Browder then explained how the "party" proposed to make copies of this book available for every Communist and every sympathizer in the United States of America. Does this, Mr. Newspaper Publisher, give you any inkling as to the purpose of the Communst Party (U. S. A.)?

Communist "labor" schools and "democracy" schools are now increasing. We have just seen how Browder and his "party" proposed to supply America with a textbook. The Communist workers schools and their other adult schools now flourishing in this country use just such textbooks. All emphasis is laid upon the teachings and philosophy of Marx, Engel, Lenin, and Stalin. The founding fathers of America are ignored by these schools as so much poison.

Communism encourages atheism. It was a shock to those Christian people in this Nation who are acquainted with the atheistic nature of communism to discover that you were opening your advertising pages to Communist propaganda. These church people have something very definitely at stake in this matter. The Communist movement is notoriously an atheistic program. Karl Marx, to whom Browder continuously refers as communism's leading apostle, said: "Religion is opium for the people." William Z. Foster, who is associated with Browder as the fronting heads of the Communist Party (U. S. A.) has written: "Religion is the sworn enemy of liberty, education, science * * * Such a monstrous system of dupery * * * is foreign to a socialist society." Again he has written: "God will be banished from the laboratories as well as the schools."

In his book The 1940 Elections, Communist Browder states: "These people, in growing hundreds of thousands, belong to us—the moment we show them, by the work of every branch and committee and leader of the party, that we have the party for which they have been looking, a party worthy of our great principles and aims, a party worthy of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin." Now, what do you make of that, Mr. Publishers?

The Communist ad which you carried offered Browder's new book, Victory—and After. In that he says: "It is the policy of the Communist Party to aid in every way possible, in collaboration with all like-minded persons and groups, to secure the fullest integration of the United Nations for the war and equally for the post-war period." "If this is achieved," says Browder, "it will be an unprecedented step forward in history. And it is clear that the unprecedented cannot be achieved by following old doctrines based upon precedent." (Does that sound anything like what we've been experiencing? Twenty-five-thousand-dollar salary limit first appeared as a Communist Party platform plank.) Decrying precedent and tradition, Browder continues: "The Communist understanding of history, which is the school of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, presents no obstacle to setting such an aim as that of the United Nations in war and peace." (Note absence of reference to Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, and other Americans.)

Why was your collaboration in spreading this Communist propaganda before millions a matter of major importance to our people? Communism (in its various forms) in this country is now a highly organized and powerful force. The Communist spirit is spreading widely in labor unioninsm. It has infiltrated our educational system to an almost unbelievable degree. It has gained adherents from radical minds in the ministry. Communistic "youth movements" are invading schools and social groups. Over 600 publications are being published to spread socialistic ideologies. "Tainted" text books used in thousands of schools have been exposed by the American Legion. Thirteen million Negroes are now being angled for by Communist workers and the Communist press. Communist inspired strikes swept the Nation before June 1941. Does anyone believe those agitators will be less active during our coming readjustment period? Although there has been less trouble since June 1941 (when Hitler attacked Stalin), the Communist influence in labor is there at work—and waiting its chance.

These are crucial days in America and revolutionary radicalism is pressing us hard. We know that we can win victory over the Axis—but can we also win on the home front by preserving the American traditions for which our boys believe they are fighting? Your responsibility as a newspaper in this crisis is tremendous.

Production for Victory Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a letter received from the Production for Victory Committee, of Weirton, W. Va., signed by Mr. J. S. Williamson, cochairman, management; and L. S. Lafferty, cochairman, labor. This record has been consistently maintained and it is something of which the employees and the management can be justly proud. The letter follows:

PRODUCTION FOR VICTORY COMMITTEE,
Weirton, W. Va., April 1, 1943.

Mr. DONALD NELSON,
Chairman, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NELSON: Weirton Steel employees are thrilled to inform you that they have reached another all-time high not only for the production of open-hearth steel ingots, but also for the processing of these ingots into finished steel products and in the actual shipment of these products from our mills.

During the month of March our tonnage record of steel produced from 12 stationary open-hearth furnaces was 158,229 net tons. This figure beats the best previous monthly record established in December 1942 by 1,400 tons.

Weirton Steel men and women point with pride to the fact that Weirton has established new world's records in the production of steel for the fifth time. Months ago, when the first record was broken, Weirton's war workers declared that it was no freak but was the basis on which they expected to maintain or improve on. Five times they have made good on their promise to produce for victory.

Twelve thousand Weirton Steel employees are keeping faith with the 3,000 Weirton Steel men who today are with the armed forces by their determination that this rate of production will be maintained or improved.

PRODUCTION FOR VICTORY COMMITTEE,
WEIRTON STEEL CO.,
J. S. WILLIAMSON,
Co-Chairman, Management.
L. S. LAFFERTY, *Co-Chairman, Labor.*

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek's Speech at Wellesley College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 2, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek at Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass., Sunday, March 7, 1943:

Strong emotions often tend to render one inarticulate. It is not easy for me, therefore, adequately to express my feelings today as I stand in your midst. During the years of absence from Wellesley I have often thought and wished for the moment when I would be able to return to these once familiar surroundings. The deep attachment that I have for my alma mater is not grounded solely on the 4 years of association with her. It is immeasurably strengthened by the many manifestations of fellowship and sympathy which Wellesley's daughters all over the world have shown for China.

You will doubtless understand me when I say that, as I look at your faces and gaze into your eyes, I am seeing not only you, the present generation of Wellesley students; I am conscious also of all the preceding generations and all the future generations in the years to come, as Wellesley goes onward and forward. I hope, however, that what I shall tell you will be heard by college women elsewhere, for what I am saying to you is what I should also like to tell them.

But you have come here today not to listen to me indulge in sentiment—least of all in sentimentalities. What you want to hear is how you can best do your part in creating a saner world. When I was a student here the world was then weltering in rivers of blood. Today these rivers have swelled into oceans, for the advance of science makes this war more deadly, more expensive in its toll of lives and human misery than the previous Great War. What can you do to help bring

about a state which would uphold peace and maintain world fellowship among all nations?

History tells us that human achievement is proportional to the variety and quality of the material contributed by the past and the present and that we women, too, have had a share in building the ever-ascending pyramid of civilization It is natural that the development of women's increasingly high status differs in every continent. But in one point we find a striking similarity. Invariably whatever power and influence for good women have been able to exert anywhere in the world, whatever gains they have made in their respective countries as political and economic factors, sprang from a very unpretentious start. In fact, I may say that because women were content to start in a modest way and expand their work as they went along, they have gained whatever success they have been able to achieve.

When Mr. and Mrs. Durant founded our college there were few institutions of higher learning for women and fewer still coeducational colleges. Michigan in 1870, if I remember rightly, finally admitted girls after having refused to do so for nearly three decades. We smile when we remember that the president of Michigan at that time solemnly assured a visiting foreigner that none of the ladies had found the curriculum too heavy for their physical endurance.

At the turn of the century, however, 70 percent of American colleges and universities became coeducational. By 1900, two out of every three school teachers were women, and there were 1,000 women lawyers, nearly as many dentists, more than 3,000 ministers, and almost 8,000 doctors and surgeons.

Look back a moment into the lives of your grandmothers. The first seeds of social consciousness of women in America germinated during the heyday of the temperance cause. That movement was instrumental in pointing out the evils of overindulgence, and the result was a growing realization of the need for social betterment.

Again, during the economic revolution, women found their way from their homes into the factories. Inevitably there followed the sweatshop system with all its attendant evils. Nevertheless, between 1870 and 1900 the total number of women workers over 16 years of age increased from around 2,000,000 to over 5,000,000. Since that time the number has waxed, and because certain women foresaw the evils and fought against them, each succeeding generation has benefited from more humane legislation.

Kansas and Montana in 1887 soon followed by Iowa and Louisiana, permitted women to vote on bond issues, taxation questions, and other local matters. This, to be sure, was a humble start, but the cherished goal of the feminists was attained when Wyoming in entering the Union in 1890, Colorado 3 years later, Utah and Idaho in 1896 allowed women the vote.

The names of Elizabeth Stanton, Susan Anthony, Anna Howard Shaw, and Carrie Chapman Catt will stand forever as pioneer women leaders endowed with courage and vision. They fought for recognition that each sex had a distinctive contribution to make to public affairs and society and that failure to accept the logic of women's altered status was an effort to "put the bird back into the egg." Discouragements, prejudices, and cheap epithets of "blue stockings" left them undismayed.

About the same time, on the other side of the Atlantic, we find that women's education, such as it was, tended to be dreary and superficial. Classics and mathematics were generally excluded from the curriculum. The girls were allowed no games and whatever physical exercise they had took the form of an hour's walk in a "crocodile." Fortunately for England, Dorothy Beal and Frances Buss, the English prototypes of pioneers of woman's suffrage, made their contribution through reforms of education by establishing advanced institutions of learning for women. With persistence, good humor, and wisdom they succeeded in overcoming much prejudice and ridicule.

The status of British women took another step forward when the Married Women's Property Act of 1882, later amended in 1893, placed a wife in regard to her property upon the same footing as the unmarried woman. Perhaps you will recall that in the leading case of *Regina* v. *Jackson*, the British Court of Appeal set aside earlier decisions and ruled that a husband cannot legally detain his wife in his house.

In passing let me mention that the two oldest and most enduring institutions the world has ever known are the Chinese Examination Academy and the Catholic Church. The latter has had immense and lasting influence in the Occident and its contiguous lands, in the realm of that most potent weapon, ideas—ideas of both government and social progress. It is particularly interesting, therefore, to note the influence that women have exerted on catholicism and its development. The noxious practices indulged in the church during some periods of its long history were particularly menacing, including that baneful theory of probabilism by which directors were trained to transform all major sins as murder and other iniquities into venial offenses by employing casuistry. Such a step indubitably led to hypocrisy and deceit.

It was during those darkest days that light began to penetrate the ominous shroud. Catharine Cybo, the niece of Pope Clement, recognized the dangers of this depraved lassitude and sought to counteract its effects by forming a circle of highly intellectual and deeply pious women to inspire responsible men to work for the resurrection of the church. Marguerite of Navarre, Vittoria Colona, and others all worked for the reformation of the Roman Curia and the elevation of social ideals far beyond the limits of the Italian Peninsula. It may be added that it was a woman, Isabella Roser, who made it possible for Loyola, the founder of the Jesuit Order, to continue his studies. The group of Meaux in France, amongst whom was the famous William Farel, a friend and mentor of Calvin, largely received its impetus from women like Marguerite of Navarre.

Now let us go on to China. In my native land, throughout her long chronicle of human endeavor, we see illuminating flashes in the pages where women made lasting contributions to the epistemological advancement of our civilization. Pan-chao, the sister of the court historian of the Han dynasty, some 2,000 years ago became the continuator after the death of her brother, and completed his works. She acted as the tutoress of the Empress and her ladies-in-waiting. It was also she who wrote Precepts for Women. To us of this generation they make quaint reading but for her time, I suppose, they were suitable.

Coming nearer to the modern age, we find Chiu-chin (Autumn Lute), the woman revolutionist who was an educator as well. She was killed by the Manchu Government because she took an active part in helping to overthrow the decadent Ching dynasty and advocated the rights and responsibilities of women and inspired others to do likewise.

Cloistered and sheltered up to the time of our Revolution, Chinese women have stepped out in a new world—a stark world—stripped of the amenities and comforts which generally surrounded the inner court (the women's apartments). From the highest to the lowliest the change has been marked although among the farmer and laboring classes Chinese women have always had more freedom than their more affluent sisters.

When the first Parliament convened in 1912 following the success of the revolution, a woman's suffrage group stormed the Parliament to demand "votes for women," on the ground that since women had proven their willingness to risk their lives for the liberation of the country they should be given equal franchise with men. It was not until the First National Congress convened in 1924, nevertheless, that the Kuomintang took cognizance of woman suffrage by recording that: "Universal suffrage should be carried out. Class suffrage based on property qualification should be abolished."

Chinese women entered civil service for the first time in 1927, and 2 years later in the postal service they received equal treatment with men. More astounding yet, the National Government promulgated a law entitling daughters and sons to equal inheritance.

In 1936 in the draft constitution also promulgated by the National Government, article 6 reads as follows:

"Among the citizens of the Republic of China there is no distinction as to sex, race, religion, or class; they are equal before the law."

You as students will be particularly interested to hear that article 48 reads:

"Men and women shall have equal opportunity in education."

Chinese women during the past 5½ years of war have made even more rapid strides toward true equality. In every province of China—occupied China included—there is a women's advisory council usually headed by the wife of the provincial governor. All these branch councils come under the supreme direction of the national council. The work extends throughout each province and comprises relief for refugees, care of the wounded whether military or civilian, and of war orphans, and stimulation of production—which is so necessary since China is now in toto cut off from the rest of the world except through air transport—training of women sent to various areas to bring home to the local women the meaning of the war, the importance of continued resistance, the consciousness of our great responsibility toward other peoples of the world. The noteworthy point is that whereas a woman's position of yore was gaged by the social, economic, and political position of her husband, the Chinese woman of today stands on her own feet and is acknowledged for what she is.

You doubtless are wondering why I have picked out as examples the women I have referred to above rather than other women who probably were more prominent and better known. I answer that, whilst it is necessary to have prominent individuals, it is not necessarily the prominent individuals who apply themselves with results of great beneficence to their country and society. The women I have selected exemplify what can be done not by the individual but by individuals working as a group having power to project their personalities, enthusiasm, and spirit into the lives of others. Whatever an individual can do is picayune as compared with what a group can accomplish.

We of Wellesley know and realize that our tradition and all that it stands for is the summation not of one factor but of divers factors integrated: The spirit of the founders of our college, the idealism of the trustees and presidents, the devotion of the faculty, the loyalty of the alumnae, combined with the rich intellectual, spiritual, and emotional possibilities of the student body in perpetuating Wellesley's watchword, "Non ministrari sed ministrare."

To you who are assembled in this hall, I should like to give you my exegesis of this motto in accordance to the light which has guided me in my work. First comes cooperation, that common and much-used word which seems to convey so little and yet should mean so much. For is it not true that human progress is but a mighty growing pattern woven together by the tenuous single

threads, united in a common effort? Brilliant generalship may be all paramount, yet no army would be an army were the individual soldiers who compose it to follow the whims which happen to dictate their momentary fancy.

Second stands the spirit of humility. Loyola, whom I have mentioned, was not chagrined to learn Latin at the age of 30 from mere boys although that language in his day was as universal as English is today. One of the greatest essayists China produced, Su Hsin, oftentimes known as Old Su, did not learn to read or write until after he had passed his twenty-seventh birthday. Confucius said: "Amongst any trio I find a teacher."

Last but not least ranks probity in thought and in action. It is transcendent thinking and the translating of these thoughts into deeds worthy of the name of human progress which differentiates men from beasts. Always have we frowned on moral turpitude, yet intellectual and mental dissipation are no less culpable of disdain. The Tartufes and the mentally lackadaisical have had more than their share in nurturing the evils of our day.

With the riches of the ages within your grasp, with the wide field of specialized branches of knowledge to be had at your will, with the maturity of mind to be gained in your contacts with your professors and advisers, you should beware of machine-made processes of thinking. Do not be afraid to strike out and explore the fertile realm of your own minds and let them lead you in your conclusions to what they will so long as you are true and honest to yourselves. Nor do I counsel you to concur to shallow and supercilious omniscience.

This present world struggle is a battle of light against darkness, of justice and right dealing against selfishness and greed. Indehiscence and mawkish maunder will not equip us for our battle through life. Stern days are still ahead. Yet within these very portals is the cenote of learning. It is here where your strength could be reinforced.

Veterans' Relief

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to make a study of the needs, in the matter of medical, tuberculosis, and mental hospitals likely to arise from the present war. The resolution also directs the committee to formulate a program for meeting those needs.

The purpose of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is to enable the Congress to be forehanded in meeting a situation which will inevitably arise within the next few months or at most within the next few years.

It is unpleasant to contemplate but it is our duty to realize that thousands of men, and many women, will shortly be returning to this country from our far flung and myriad battle fronts broken in mind and body.

To these men and women the people of the United States owe a sacred duty. That duty is to see that they are afforded every opportunity for a complete recovery of their wounded and sick bodies and their shattered minds. This duty devolves upon the Congress as the agent of the people.

We can postpone this duty until a hospital emergency develops; or we can proceed now to envision the needs and thus avoid the acute emergency which otherwise will confront us.

I can recall, and I know many of my colleagues can too, that it was several years after the World War before we were able to offer adequate and proper hospitalization to the veterans of that struggle. Men came back from the battlefields of that war and suffered untold hardship because of failure of the Government to prepare medical, tuberculosis, and mental hospitals to receive the wounded.

That deplorable condition must not come into existence again.

We can avoid it. We can move now in an efficient and effective manner to meet the need which will arise. Fortunately, we have in the Veterans' Bureau an organization trained to provide such facilities. This Congress should move at once to set this organization into motion on a full scale.

Provision of hospital facilities for veterans of the war is a real war task. It cannot be delayed until the peace comes. By the time peace comes we should—we must—be already meeting the problem, for the problem is already in embryo.

This Congress has already recognized that by its recent adoption of legislation which makes hospital facilities created for the veterans of the World War available to the veterans of this war. But the great danger is, and the great fear I have is, that these facilities now in existence will be totally inadequate.

It is our duty to find out if they will be. Under my resolution the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation would make a survey and prepare a hospital program.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the veterans of the World War are alert to this problem as it will exist in relation to the veterans of the present war It is, I think, commendable that these earlier veterans should express their fundamental sympathy with those who will be veterans by insisting that the mistakes of the last war in regard to hospitalization be avoided.

I have received a letter from three officials of three leading organizations of veterans in my State: Horace C. Parrish, State service officer of the American Legion; Sydney J. Allen, national service officer, Disabled American Veterans; and Fred Beard, State welfare officer of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

That letter touches upon this matter in a very forthright, sympathetic, and intelligent manner and I shall quote a few paragraphs from it.

We feel since Congress passed legislation authorizing hospitalization for veterans of World War No. 2 they should take the lead in securing new construction so that the men and women serving in War No. 2 may receive medical attention. This would require several more hundred beds than recommended by General Hines. At present, new veterans may be admitted only by denying hospitalization to veterans of World War No. 1.

Several years ago, Veterans' Administration general hospitals were erected in most States of the Union largely on the recommendation of Senators and Congressmen throughout the several States. Michigan did not have a general hospital until April 1939. All the veterans from this State had to be hospitalized in Wisconsin, Illinois, or Ohio This condition still exists for veterans suffering from active tuberculosis except for 25 beds which are available at the United States Marine Hospital in Detroit. It is true, for several years, we have had a mental institution at Fort Custer but that was no answer to the thousands of medical patients that had to be hospitalized in other States.

The present authority insofar as erecting new facilities, or additions to existing facilities, has been delegated by Congress to the Federal Hospital Board and only such facilities or additions as they recommend are constructed. We have had no quarrel with that policy in the past. However, we doubt very much if the Hospital Board will request Congress for the funds necessary to build sufficient general and tubercular hospital beds to take care of World War veterans No. 1 and No. 2.

My resolution follows:

Whereas at the close of the World War and for several years thereafter, there developed and existed an acute shortage of hospital facilities to care for the wounded and sick veterans of that war; and

Whereas there are now in the armed services a greater number of men and women than were in those services during the World War with the resultant likelihood that the close of this war will find a greater number of wounded and sick veterans; and

Whereas it is considered likely that existing hospitals for veterans of the World War will be inadequate to meet the needs created by the present war; and

Whereas adequate and proper hospital facilities for all wounded and sick veterans of the present war should be established and made available in time to care for these sick and wounded immediately upon their needing hospitalization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation be authorized and directed to make a study and survey of existing veterans' and military hospital facilities, and a study and survey of the needs arising, and likely to arise, from the existing emergency for medical, tuberculosis, and mental hospitals for veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation be directed to submit to the House a report covering a general program, with estimates of the cost, for the provision of hospital facilities likely to be needed.

The Alaskan Highway

REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, this House has long been interested in the Alaskan Highway. The military portion of this highway has been completed connecting up certain vital airfields. However, we of the Pacific Northwest and parts of Canada believe that the real commercial possibilities of this means

of ingress and egress to our great territory in the north have not been completed. The Delegate from Alaska and I have long contended that there should be a connection from a certain area in British Columbia known as Prince George to the present military highway. The Secretary of the Interior feels the same way, but we have met with some opposition from the Secretary of War.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman is entitled to great credit for the construction of this highway. I recall that he pioneered some years ago in originating the legislation which brought it about.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With the aid of the gentleman from Texas, also. I thank him.

I point out to the House the necessity for this construction, both from a military standpoint and otherwise. In this connection, I include in my remarks a statement compiled by the Alaska committee of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce giving some of the reasons why this should be done. It is a well-thought-out brief on the subject:

CONSTRUCTION OF MILITARY SUPPLY HIGHWAY TO ALASKA

It is urged that the United States Government in conjunction with the Canadian Government construct 673 miles of highway from Prince George, in central British Columbia, to connect with the Alcan Highway at Tagish, in southern Yukon Territory. This highway would follow a segment of the so-called A route, which was studied and recommended by the Alaskan International Highway Commission.

This highway would be on the interior side of the great barrier Coast Range and would pass through an area of light snowfall, would avoid high mountain passes, and would traverse an area where road-building materials would be close at hand. The cost per mile of this new construction should not exceed the average cost per mile of the Alcan Highway, and authorities state that it would be considerably less.

The reason advanced by Government authorities for extending the highway to Alaska from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, was that it would immediately link up and service an important chain of airports between Edmonton and Whitehorse, which are used jointly by the Canadian and United States air forces. The construction to date on the Alcan Highway has accomplished this original objective. It is our understanding that the United States Bureau of Public Roads has been directed to convert this pioneer road into a three-lane highway with curves and grades comparable to superhighway construction standards of the United States. To accomplish this will require that much of the present pioneer highway be abandoned and relocated. We believe that the A route is the superior route for permanent construction and urge that it be given the consideration which it deserves. The useful purpose of the Alcan Highway, between Dawson Creek and Tagish, Yukon Territory, is as a service road connecting the airfields at Fort St. John, Fort Nelson, and Watson Lake. To connect Dawson Creek, the southern terminus of the Alcan Highway, with the Canadian highway system requires the rebuilding of the road from Dawson Creek to Edmonton. The cost of this improvement would go a long way toward building the A segment from Prince George north.

Some of the advantages of the alternate route from Prince George to Tagish, Yukon Territory, are the following:

MILITARY CONSIDERATIONS

1. It would shorten the highway distance to Alaska by 180 miles.

The distance from Dawson Creek to Tagish over the Alcan Highway is 974 miles. The distance from Prince George to Tagish over the A route would be 787 miles or a saving of 180 miles. There now exists a gravel road from Prince George to Fort St. James, British Columbia, a distance of 114 miles. This is on the A segment, so there is actually 673 miles of new construction necessary to complete this link.

2. It would reduce the expense of truck operation to Alaska very materially.

It is our understanding that approximately 3,000 trucks will be used on the Alcan Highway during the summer of 1943. If the northern theater of war flared up suddenly, movements over this highway would be doubled. Economic factors are given scant consideration in wartimes, yet—if the truck haul can be reduced by 180 miles—time, equipment, and money is saved. Using the ultra-conservative figure of 30 cents per truck-mile as bare operating cost, and assuming that 3,000 trucks make a one-way trip from Prince George to Fairbanks every 4 days, the reduction of 180 miles distance will bring an over-all saving of 540,000 miles one way, and 1,080,000 miles one round trip. Five hundred and forty thousand miles at 30 cents per mile would show a monetary saving of $324,000 for one trip of the 3,000 trucks. Assuming that each truck would make 50 round trips a year, the saving would be 50,000,000 traveling miles—$16,100,000 operating cost. The saving alone in truck mileage would, in 1 year, pay the cost of building a good gravel truck road between Prince George and Tagish.

The present rate for contract truck hauling on the Alcan Highway, from Dawson Creek is 25 cents per ton-mile. Reducing this to a figure of 20 cents per ton-mile—on an average load of 5 tons—the cost is $1 per truck-mile. The cost for 3,000 trucks is $3,000 per mile. If 180 miles distance could be saved, the monetary saving for 1 round trip of the fleet would be $540,000. Assuming the trucks return empty as there is no return cargo, and assuming that the trucks make 50 round trips in a year, the annual saving would be $27,000,000.

Regardless of which basis is used, it is apparent that a very considerable saving in money could be realized.

3. It would reduce the actual time required to transport military supplies to Alaska from midwestern and eastern production centers.

Prince George is the local, natural, and economic railhead in western Canada for traffic moving to Whitehorse, Fairbanks and westward to Nome. It is in central British Columbia and on the main line of the transcontinental Canadian National Railway. This railway passes through Edmonton, and at Red Pass Junction, one branch of the road extends to Vancouver, British Columbia, and the other to Prince Rupert, British Columbia. It is only 489 miles by the Canadian National Railway from Edmonton to Prince George. This is actually 6 miles shorter than the rail distance from Edmonton to the southern terminus of the Alcan Highway at Dawson Creek over the Northern Alberta Railway. This latter line is a branch line into the Peace River wheat belt—it is poorly built and difficult to maintain because of the nature of the country through which it passes. It has already been demonstrated that this railroad is not equipped to handle the flood of traffic brought on by the Alcan Highway, and at the present moment there is a heavy congestion over this line, and we are advised that freight is now arriving at Edmonton much faster than this branch railroad can move it. Therefore, adequately to serve as a connection with the Alcan Highway, it would have to be considerably rebuilt and rehabilitated, and this cost would go far toward construction of the A segment of the road from Prince George north.

According to the published passenger schedules, the running time from Edmonton to Dawson Creek on the Canadian National is 21 hours and 15 minutes, as compared to 16 hours over the Canadian National from Edmonton to Prince George. Based on these schedules, there would be an actual saving in operating time of 5 hours and 15 minutes if Prince George were used as the rail connection with the highway to Alaska.

In addition to this, freight movements from the Pacific coast could be handled by direct routes to the southern terminus of the highway, either by the Canadian National Railway from Vancouver to Red Pass Junction, and thence to Prince George or the alternate route of the Pacific Great Eastern Railway, which extends from Squamish, near Vancouver, British Columbia, to Quesnel, 80 miles south of Prince George.

4. The alternate railheads—Dawson Creek and Prince George—would afford the Army two access routes to Alaska.

Extensive military activities in the Alaska theater, or heavy movements to Nome, for transport to Russia and China, would quickly demonstrate the advantage of two railheads.

5. It would link the Pacific coast war-production centers and war-supply depots of the United States and Canada with the highway system.

The southern terminus of the Alcan Highway at Dawson Creek can be reached from the Pacific Coast States by rail and by highway only by very circuitous routes. The rail distance from Seattle to Dawson Creek, for instance, is 1,415 miles. The highway distance is 1,477 miles, as compared to 592 miles from Seattle to Prince George. The entire Pacific coast is heavily engaged in the production of war materials and yet it is practically cut off from using land transportation to Alaska. It would seem reasonable that an alternate land route to supplement the water route would be logical.

POST-WAR CONSIDERATIONS

1. It will make possible the building of airfields to serve both the air route to Alaska from the States, and the air route to the Orient through Alaska.

It is unquestioned that, following the war, there will be tremendous air travel over the great circle route between points in the United States and Canada to Russia, China, and other countries of Asia. American air lines should have post-war access to Canadian airfields along this highway, which is being built with United States funds. At present our Government has an agreement with Canada to use the Canadian airfields for military purposes only. There is no agreement as to peacetime use of these fields.

The Pan American Airways' planes, which pioneered commercial aviation between Alaska and the Pacific Northwest, generally follow the A route. It is sheltered from the Pacific by the Coast Range, and is regarded as a favorable air route. If a chain of air bases were built along this proposed highway and made available to American aviation companies, then these bases would provide a vital link in the northern air commerce—both present and future. In the event of enemy attacks on shipping to Alaska, or our military bases along the coast of southeastern Alaska, then these fields, located behind the Coast Range, would become vital, protected rear bases. The Alcan Highway is so

distant from the coast of southeastern Alaska as to make it unusable as a base for fighter planes.

A year ago some held that a distant, interior highway was better from a military standpoint, considering the possibility of Japanese invasion. Alaska is now primarily regarded as an offensive base and defensive only against hit-and-run attacks.

We believe that if the A route is built from Prince George to Tagish, an arrangement should be made with Canada, so that intermediate airfields along this route can be constructed for the use of American aviation companies.

2. It will help in the development of the important metal and timber resources in the area traversed by the highway.

(a) Mineral: The A link between Prince George and Tagish would follow close to the interior flank of the Coast Range batholith. This highway would open up one of the potentially richest mineral-bearing areas on the continent. As an example, consider the mercury deposit recently opened near Fort St. James by the Consolidated Mining & Smelting Co. of Canada. The mercury production today from this new deposit exceeds that of any other mercury mine in the Western Hemisphere. This new production has had a great deal to do with removing the critical shortage of mercury for our war needs.

(b) Timber: The principal timber resources in Alaska are located in the southeastern section. In the future, the pulp, paper, plywood, and lumber industries will utilize these resources on a large scale. While the production will probably not be hauled over the highway because of the cost of such transportation, yet the development will mean an expansion of the population and business of this section, which makes it desirable that southeastern Alaska be linked up with the highway.

3. It will serve the populous section of southeastern Alaska.

The A route extends close enough to the coast line so that it is feasible to build access roads to the cities located in southeastern Alaska. It is not practical to do this with the Alcan Highway, as it is so far inland.

4. It will continue the natural and long-standing trade relationships existing between Alaska and the Pacific coast.

After the close of the war it is likely that the bulk of the trade of Alaska will continue to be with the Pacific coast cities, as it has always been. Therefore, if the road is to be of any service in this direction, there must be a direct highway or rail connection with these centers.

5. This route has distinct advantages in the development of tourist travel to the north.

While the A link is on the interior side of the coast range, hence has no high summits to cross, yet it trends roughly parallel to the axis of the coast range and will present the tourist with panoramas of rugged mountain scenery.

DETAILS OF A ROUTE

The first 114 miles out of Prince George would be over the existing gravel road from Prince George to Fort St. James. If desired later, this road could be shortened to 90 miles by relocation along a more direct route. After leaving Fort St. James, the route would follow a chain of lake (Stuart, Trembleur, and Takla) for a distance of 120 miles. Barges could be used on these lakes for setting up adjacent and parallel transportation for moving road-building supplies and equipment. From the chain of lakes the route follows up Driftwood River to cross a very easy divide and then follows the Sustut River to a junction with the Skeena River. The Skeena River is then followed to its headwaters at the Skeena Little Klappan Pass (elevation 4,400 feet). This is the highest point on the route. From the pass, the road would follow water grade down to the Stikine River. Road-building supplies could be moved up the Stikine River by boat and road construction started both directions from that point. After crossing the Stikine River, the route intercepts and follows in a general direction the old Telegraph Trail into the Atlin country, where it makes a junction with the Alcan Highway at Tagish.

Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, since January 8 I have appeared before you and my colleagues on numerous occasions and have protested and argued against the selective service taking into the armed forces essential, necessary, and experienced farm labor in my district and State, and have pointed out the fact that Louisiana is one of the most important agricultural States in the Union producing so many and so much of the agricultural products that contribute to the food supply, both for our armed forces and the civilian population, and notwithstanding all of my protests addressed to the Selective Service Director, the War Manpower Commission, the Department of Agriculture here at Washington, and also in the State of Louisiana, and notwithstanding all of the protests of my colleagues from all of the other agricultural States, in my State especially, selective service officials have paid very little attention to the seriousness of this situation, but on the contrary continue to induct necessary, essential, and skilled farm labor and dairy workers into the armed forces regardless of the consequences. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of this continued practice in my State, I am submitting a letter from one of my constituents with respect to this situation in my district, this being one of the many letters of complaint which I am daily receiving, but I have selected this letter because it covers the attitude of the selective service so graphically, and I beg leave to have the same printed in the RECORD together with these remarks:

APRIL 3, 1943.

The Honorable HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LARCADE: Thanks for your letter of March 31.

I am very much concerned about the apparent arranged delay in the House Military Affairs Committee handling and scheduling a hearing on the Bankhead bill. It is very much apparent that politics are being used to bring about this delay. The President has been holding conferences during the past 2 weeks with department heads and farm organization leaders in regard to the farm and food problems. The President recently made the statement to the effect that the food situation is in a most serious condition, and has suggested a large army of workers be recruited from public schools, and to also consist of women and nonessential office workers. This plan may be practical in some few instances, but I am sure you will agree this will not answer to the handling of rice farms. All this delay and these recommendations, from all indications, are being used to build up public opinion to help kill the Bankhead bill.

The situation in respect to farm operations and farm labor in this State is not improving any, and to the contrary is daily getting worse. Whereas selective service regulations and directives, and some of them promulgated just recently, provide classifications for farm operators and farm workers, the average selective service board throughout the State and State general headquarters is paying very little attention, if any, to these regulations and directives. I had an experience this past week that proves this statement. A high-ranking official from our State headquarters of selective service stated he had told the local selective service boards to get men for the armed forces, and if necessary close the farms, and we will eat grass. Now, this is a terrible line of thought and reasoning, and certainly does not work to the end of winning of the war and lasting peace.

Many war agencies are given special jobs to do, then stung by criticism over inaction, have become so aggressive, each in its own special sphere, that they push and shove each other around, fight each other openly, grab each other's functions, and make an awful mess. Each department or agency is special-cause minded—its own special cause. Each is sincere, honest, zealous, but single-visioned for its own phase. The military is given the job to put men on the battle fronts—they are single-visioned; they think only in terms of men in uniforms; they grab all the men they can; they know nothing; think nothing of the problems of producing food to feed these men. The matter of food is the problem for someone else to handle; they say again—get men—if necessary close the farms and we will eat grass.

I note you have asked the selective service headquarters in Washington to investigate the draft of farmers in Louisiana. You are to be commended on this move. But, in my opinion, it is going to take legislative action to correct this whole food production and farm problem. Too much time is being wasted in this matter. The condition: Too little, too late, in the food problem, is fast approaching. Immediate action must be had.

Please keep me advised about the progress of the Bankhead bill, and any other developments in regard to this serious problem.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from my district on the Ruml plan:

[From the Oregonian of April 1, 1943]

A DEAF EAR TO THE GROUND

There is a news report that after debate and voting resulted in sending the pay-as-you-go-income-tax proposal back to the uncertain ministrations of the Ways and Means Committee, many House Members who had been on opposing sides shook hands and declared it was a jolly good fight. Yet the failure to act favorably upon this issue is not the outcome of an abstract test of party

leadership and administration dominance. In essence it is an exhibition of unresponsiveness in the lower House of Congress to a widespread popular desire shared without predilection toward other policies of government, or party, or administration supremacy.

The Ruml plan has the approval of the multitude because it will serve the interests of the multitude. It is, as has been often said before, a proposal only to change the method of measuring current tax liability. It would measure the taxpaying obligation in the taxpaying year by the amount of income derived in that year, instead of by the amount of income derived in the preceding year. And by making the yardstick and the liability coincide it would identify tax payments with ability to pay. Persons struck by unexpected misfortune in one year would be relieved of a debt that had accrued before misfortune struck. Persons upon whom fortune currently smiled would pay more during the time that fortune was kind.

And because in a population of 130,000,000 those who are confronted by sudden financial distress are counterbalanced in number by those whose income rises, and by the number of persons newly brought into the tax fold, the Treasury would not conceivably suffer a loss of revenue.

It is true that hypothetical instances, and some concrete ones, may be cited wherein large incomes derived in 1942 have fallen in 1943, and that consequent windfalls would ensue in such cases. But the simple expedient has been proposed in the Ruml-Carlson bill that the tax on incomes in excess of $20,000 be measured by 1942 or by 1943 income, whichever is larger. This device hits squarely and inescapably at the big windfall, one of the main objections to the plan.

The national income is on the upgrade. Unless there be better control of inflation, it will continue to rise. In a period of upward-moving national income the pay-as-you-go plan would accelerate revenue collections by the Treasury. If general income be higher this year than last, the Ruml plan would bring in an increase in tax collections this year instead of next year. And that the Government imperatively needs more money now is revealed by Treasury plans for a popular War bond selling campaign this month in which everybody who is now buying regularly will be urged to buy extra bonds. This campaign would be fortified if the income possessor were assured that whatever dire hazard of life descended next year upon his resources he would not have piled up a debt against this year's income that he could not pay.

The pay-as-you-go plan again rests within the House Ways and Means Committee. Public demand is not yet satisfied. If not wholly rebuffed, it still must endure the rebuff of delay—committee internal controversy, followed, if compromise emerges, by renewed controversy in Congress.

If this handshaking and mutual congratulation by House opponents and supporters of the plan implies only a return engagement of a forensic spectacle, it may be a good thing before the steps are determined upon for Congress to adopt the current proposal of an Easter vacation. A brief return to the home front should provide an eye opener as to how many people are interested in and want the Ruml plan in principle and are puzzled why they do not have representative government in fact as well as theory.

[From the Oregon Journal of April 1, 1943]

NOR MOUSE NOR PLAN

Four long months the mountain which is Congress labored and brought forth neither mouse nor Ruml plan.

We don't care much. A plan that "forgave" the tax due on some of last year's swollen incomes would allow certain enterprises that earned in a year almost the equivalent of their capital, to escape the payment of millions due to the Government and to the war program.

But, dear Mr. Congressman, each of you and all of you, the people, and we mean the people, want a pay-as-you-go income-tax plan. They don't want to escape paying what is due on last year's income. They don't want to dodge. They want to pay as they earn, and take first from their paychecks their cash contributions to war that take the form of taxes, and their investments in America that take the form of War bond purchases.

The vast number of plain Americans have spent or given away last year's income. They actually pay last year's income taxes with this year's income. They want a plan that takes, weekly or monthly, their share of war's costs—that is, the part of war's costs that is also on a pay-as-you-go basis rather than on a credit basis.

And, please, Mr. Congressman, each of you and all of you, don't make pay-as-you-go April fool.

Memorials and Resolutions of the Montana Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of 11 memorials and resolutions just received from the Montana Legislature, just recently adjourned. Under unanimous consent, I am submitting a brief summary of the memorials and resolutions for printing in the RECORD:

No. 1

Senate Joint Memorial 14

Joint memorial requesting the enactment of legislation directing the annual payment of grants by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to the State of Montana for the use and benefit of the several counties of Montana in lieu of taxes on lands owned by the United States Government in the State of Montana.

In Montana between 38 and 50 percent of landed area is held by Government in proprietory or trustee capacity for Indian reservations, forest reserves, wild-life refuge, grazing lands, military reservations, and other governmental uses.

None of these lands contribute much in form of taxation to school districts, county, or State government.

Legislature, therefore, recommends that S. 1201, by Senator MCNARY (77th Cong.) be again introduced. Under it Government would pay to the States, for the benefit of counties wherein Government-held lands are located, grants in lieu of taxes upon these lands.

No. 2

House Joint Resolution 4

Memorializing Congress to enact House Resolution 38, authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to make a study and investigation of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products.

No. 3

House Joint Memorial 6

Requests the Government to grant to the State of Montana that part of the Federal reservation located south of Havre known as the "Beaver Creek Park" for use as a State park in perpetuity and that appropriate legislation be introduced.

(This reservation is a portion of the original Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation.)

No. 4

Senate Joint Resolution 2

To enact legislation to transfer the Fort Peck project to the Bureau of Reclamation of the Interior Department for operation and maintenance and that adequate funds be made available enabling completion of plans and estimates to completely utilize the irrigation and power possibilities.

No. 5

Senate Joint Memorial 7

Requests that the so-called "cost plus" plan of letting Government contracts be discontinued.

No. 6

Senate Joint Memorial 10

Deplores the hasty and ill-advised action that has led to the proposed separation of the Meat Inspection Division from the United States Bureau of Animal Industry and requests that all division of animal industry remain under direct administration of a man especially trained in the prevention of diseases of livestock.

No. 7

Senate Joint Memorial 12

Urges the immediate institution of extensive research for the development of new crops for all such needed commodities, foods, and drugs.

Urges development of new crops for food for man and beast, of fibers for burlap and cordage, and for medicinal plants and roots and herbs for drugs and medicine.

No. 8

Senate Joint Memorial 13

That whereas extensive deposits of chrome are suitable for reduction or milling exist on the Boulder Plateau in Sweetgrass County, but that suitable roads do not exist for hauling the ore out over this rough, timbered country, now, therefore, a road or some suitable alternate route should be constructed that will permit access to the Boulder Plateau.

No. 9

Senate Joint Memorial 16

Asks that the War Department recognize an already existing all-season highway extending from Edmonton through Great Falls to both Wyoming and Idaho points as the official Alaskan Highway (and assist in its maintenance) instead of the present highway.

No. 10

Senate Joint Memorial 17

Requests legislation and administrative regulation fixing the allotment of acreage for sugar beets on the basis of 1942, and years previous, as a minimum, removing any and all penalties for seeding or planting less than 90 percent of the war crops.

No. 11

Senate Joint Memorial 19

Requests that immediate steps be taken to increase the price of strategic metals.

German Morale Will Crack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Charles A. Merrill, from the Boston Sunday Globe of April 4, 1943:

GERMAN MORALE WILL CRACK—OUR SIDE HAS EDGE IN THIS WAR BECAUSE FAITH IN DEMOCRATIC PROGRESS HAS SURVIVED SET-BACKS FATAL TO MASTER RACE

(By Charles A. Merrill)

General Patton's American troops, helping to clear Tunisia of Germans and Italians, have been using a new weapon called the bazooka. From time to time Berlin hints that Hitler has a secret weapon such as warriors have never hitherto faced. Though the enemy has failed to unveil any startling innovation, hundreds of new devices are, of course, being developed and put to use in this war.

Here is a terrifying thought: Out of some ingenious mind, cloistered within laboratory walls, may there not emerge an instrument so revolutionary and deadly that it will end the war in a week? Suppose the inventor happens to be working, not on our side but on the enemy's.

The antidote for this form of spine chiller is supplied by a shrewd observer who remarked, "Weapons will not win the war; morale will do it. The side whose morale holds up will be the victor."

CAUSE AND EFFECT

We are inclined to shy away from generalities like this. We are compelled in a hard, factual era to avoid daydreaming and to keep our eye on the ball. We warn ourselves not to be diverted by mere talk. In education the liberal arts are being sacrificed to the practical needs of the hour—mathematics, physics, chemistry. There may be a danger in climbing too far out on that limb. Perhaps it is time to reflect that every miracle of applied science is a branch stream flowing out of the great river of abstract thinking.

What, then, did our philosopher mean when he said that morale is all-important in war?

Everybody will concede that there is a connection between physical facts and morale, but it is not always easy to distinguish cause from effect. The sick man's morale may sag to an irretrievable low, but a man may fall ill because he is spiritually depressed. Nor is it always true that a sick person's morale is bad. A bedridden individual, with no prospects of ever getting up, is sometimes a model of serenity and good spirits.

GUNS AND MORALE

If there is a relation between guns, tanks, and planes, and morale, the question is, Which comes first?

Almost every newspaper contains speculation about the enemy's morale. A commentator tries to estimate Nazi Germany's strength as of today. He starts with the assumption that in the beginning Germany had a maximum of 10,000,000 men available for military service. He figures losses plus reserves; youth arriving at military age, males released by the drafting of women for industry. He arrives at the conclusion that German reserves, if great in number, may be deficient in quality and fighting morale.

A specialist writes a financial column. His job is to keep investors informed. He decides that the bombing of German cities has two results: It hampers the production and distribution of war supplies in Germany, and it also lowers morale. As to the former, the financial writer suggests, generals know more than the laymen, but when it comes to morale, nonmilitary persons can perhaps judge better than the military leader.

Are guns more important than morale? Why, then, did France fall, France with her big army, mobilized behind the bristling Maginot line? Conversely, why did Britain survive Dunkerque, Britain with her little, untrained army, her war production hardly under way, her air forces outnumbered, her cities scourged from the skies; why did Britain emerge confident and strong?

COMING BACK AFTER DEFEAT

Today every competent observer believes Hitler is doomed. Why?

True, entrance of the United States into the war has tipped the balance of potential military strength against Hitler. But some of our strength is being diverted to the war against Japan. If the Nazis can put 8,000,000 in the field, the numbers are large enough, according to experts, to fight on both eastern and western fronts. If Germany cannot keep up in the production race, what is the reason? She has organized production across a whole continent, and our tremendous capacity is partly offset by the interior lines and shorter hauls.

To be sure, we have had air superiority in Tunisia. But do not forget that, prior to its victorious advance from the Egyptian border, the British African forces had been defeated, despite air superiority. What causes an army to come back after defeat?

Civilians in Germany may anticipate nightmares of increasing violence. But the people of England stood up under terrific punishment and dive bombers could not drive the Russians out of the shambles of Stalingrad. Is it the degree of violence showered on a populace which fixes the limit of human endurance or something less tangible?

NOT DISCOURAGED BY DEFEATS

The assumption is that there is a difference between our morale and Axis morale. This calls for diagnosis.

First, consider Russia. The Russians are fighting for their homes. Though the Soviet Government does not guarantee the people of Russia our prized civil liberties, it has freed them from serfdom and illiteracy and promises the masses of people economic security. They have something to fight for, something that belongs to them, something to protect.

Morale in the British Commonwealth and the United States, and in China, which models her future on our experience, derives from the belief that the Fascist attack on our way of life is an interruption in the long march toward the goal of a democratic civilization in which every man will have the opportunity to develop to the full measure of his capacity.

One or two defeats in war do not discourage us because, in progressing toward our goal, we have become used to frustration. Those who really believe in democracy do not lose faith because of failure to reach our objectives overnight.

NO LONGER A MASTER RACE

Imperialism and class snobbery are hardly consistent with democratic pretensions. But we are not blind to our shortcomings. Thus, the Atlantic Charter proposes giving to all countries, vanquished as well as victor, free access to the trade of the world. And a Tory Prime Minister in caste-ridden Britain outlines a reconstruction program calling for vast social changes—material security and education for all, a purge of snobbery. Here is a good American creed, sometimes resisted in high places.

This is the food which our morale feeds on. We are not drugged by delusions of racial superiority. It is the democratic method to learn from mistakes from defeat. But a master race must never admit defeat; the minute it does so, it is stripped naked. It is no longer a master race.

Confident hope keeps our side going; fear is the motive force in Germany, desperation in Japan.

The Nazis have propagated the doctrine of fear, fear of the Jews, fear of "capitalistic democracy," fear of Russia. Now, when their hierarchy preaches fear of retribution, it is a sign of cracking morale.

OVER-ALL PICTURE GOOD

The morale of America's fighting forces has been tested—on Bataan, on Guadalcanal, in the south Pacific, in North Africa, on the route to Murmansk. On the home front, bureaucratic blundering troubles us. People ask themselves: Do mistakes like this occur on the fighting front? But our morale holds up, and officialdom generally gets back on the track. We were negligent about rubber, but we are now speeding toward an adequate rubber supply. We are getting oil. The manpower problem seems on the way to solution. We are learning how to ration food. As the saying goes, "The over-all picture looks good."

Need we worry about the production front? A writer in the Scientific American relates how battered warships emerge from our navy yards in a week's time repaired and made more formidable than ever by young engineers with Navy commissions, working 16 hours a day and using original methods acquired not from textbooks but from their own experience and ingenuity. Cited for National honors are 157 blue-shirt workers, whose suggestions have saved thousands of man-hours and tons of critical materials.

Thus does our system justify itself. It produces bazookas.

We cannot win the war without weapons, but we could lose it with an abundance of weapons. New defense devices cancel out new instruments of warfare. High morale cannot be canceled out. It will win the war.

Is the Nation Facing a Food Crisis?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois on the 18th day of March and concurred therein by the senate of the said assembly on the 24th day of March 1943:

House Joint Resolution 21

Whereas it is a matter of the most extreme urgency that our agricultural production resources be maintained at a level which will insure a food supply adequate to meet the extraordinary demands of our armed forces and our civilian population; and

Whereas the imminent food crisis with which this Nation is faced constitutes a grave threat to the successful prosecution of the national war effort; and

Whereas an important contributing factor to this emergency has been the short-sighted

selective service policy which permitted the indiscriminate drafting of essential farm labor; and

Whereas unless this policy is altered immediately to defer or exempt farm labor from military service, we are faced with a complete break-down of our internal stability and a consequent impairment of our war effort: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the senate concurring herein), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact such measures as will immediately defer or exempt from military service all essential farm labor and services for the reasons enumerated in the preamble hereto: and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois, and to the War Manpower Commission and the National Selective Service Headquarters at Washington, D. C.

The President's Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Atlanta Journal of April 4, 1943:

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

In vetoing the Bankhead bill, which orders that the hundreds of millions of dollars, paid from the Federal Treasury annually in farm benefits, shall be excluded from any computation of parity prices, President Roosevelt has appealed over the heads of the farm bloc to the people of the Nation. He has bulwarked his appeal with forceful argument.

The President declares the Bankhead bill will be in itself a powerful influence for inflation, in that it will add more than $1,000,000,000 to the country's food bill by direct increase of prices. But, more than that, he points out, it will start an inflationary spiral, by making it impossible to retain the Little Steel wage formula. He says in his veto message:

"If by this bill you force an increase in the cost of the basic foodstuffs (* * * an increase which might swell the cost of living more than 5 percent, add more than a billion dollars to the consumers' food bill * * *) and as a result the National War Labor Board increases wages, no one can tell where increases will stop or what those increased wages will ultimately cost the farmers and all the people of the Nation."

And the President adds, in all solemnity, "It (this bill) will make the winning of the war more difficult and gravely imperil our chances of winning the peace."

In January President Roosevelt recommended to the Congress in his annual budget message that $837,000,000 in agricultural aid funds be appropriated for use in the next fiscal year to facilitate the program calling for a record output of farm products. This figure was about the average for recent years. At the time the message was sent, the farm bloc was endeavoring to force through the Congress a new definition of parity which would raise the Government guaranty of prices for cotton, wheat, tobacco, corn, peanuts, and other staple crops. The Bankhead bill is a directive that the great sum being paid to the farmers in special benefits shall not be given any weight in the computation of the new parity prices.

A few figures will give the layman an idea of the financial betterment that has been effected for our agriculture in the 10 years of Mr. Roosevelt and his administrations.

On March 4, 1933, these prices prevailed in the market place:

March cotton	6 cents
May corn	23 cents
May wheat	47 cents
Hogs at Chicago	$3.75

Three years ago, on March 4, 1940, these were the prices being paid:

March cotton	10½ cents
May corn	56 cents
May wheat	$1.00
Hogs at Chicago	5.75

On Friday, April 2, 1943, these prices were being paid:

May cotton	20½ cents
May corn	$1.01
May wheat	1.45
Hogs at Chicago	16.00

The prices reveal an amazing increase in income to the farmer for his crops. They bespeak a tremendous rise in the cost of living to all Americans who are not farmers, and an expansion in the cost of the war to the Government which all of us must support. They do not tell of the billions which have gone from the taxpayers in the last 10 years in the form of payments to the farmer for the improvement of his lands and the preservation of his property.

What action the Congress will take concerning this veto, the next week will probably disclose. The bill was passed by very large majorities. In the Senate, the tally was 78 to 2, in the House it was, without a roll call, 149 to 40.

Senator BANKHEAD'S argument for his bill is that parity prices are one thing and farm benefits are quite another, and that, since they are independent propositions, neither should be considered in relation to the other. It is a plausible argument in the realm of disputative logic.

The President resorts not to the refinements of dialectics but to the brutal facts of our war for existence. If we fail through greed on the home front, if we permit inflation to destroy our national economy, we shall lose a battle that no defeat of Germany and Japan can make good. It might even be we shall lose our national existence as a democracy.

Cooperation Versus Compulsion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in trying to understand the complicated and annoying food shortage in which we find ourselves one thing strikes me as peculiar and discouraging. The Government seems to be trying to solve this thing by rules and directives from Washington. Very little regard seems to be paid to the agencies, State and local, whose experience and knowledge might be used to help solve this problem.

The problem in the last war was handled largely by cooperation of the local governments and of the people. Why not utilize the State and local governments to handle this situation? They could actually handle the administrative set-up, such as is done in administering the Selective Service Act.

Our great new Governor in California, Earl Warren, recently made some mighty wise and convincing comments on that situation. I am asking permission to include, as part of my remarks, an article in the Washington Post yesterday quoting our Governor and I endorse, and make part hereof, everything Governor Warren said. The article follows:

WARREN, OF CALIFORNIA, WHOSE ABILITIES AND ENERGIES ARE EQUAL TO A TOUGH JOB

(By Agnes E. Meyer)

SAN FRANCISCO.—San Francisco is in more of a turmoil than any other area I have visited. Before the war the city was primarily a port, and such industry as it had consisted of small units. A few of its industries had as many as 1,000 employees, but most of them had less than 100. Now it is not only the busiest center on the west coast for the coming and going of troops, but it is surrounded by some of our largest shipyards, employing hundreds of thousands of people.

Its manpower problem is as acute as any I have encountered, because the shipyards have become a magnet for farm labor throughout the entire State, and even last year the agricultural manpower shortage led to large crop losses.

As a result of congestion, inadequate housing and the confusion occasioned by the sudden embarkation and debarkation of military forces, the police are struggling with a crime wave whose details are emblazoned on the front pages every day.

THE GOVERNOR IS O. K.

In the midst of discussions of these many-sided problems, of the uncertainty, the disorder and the need for immediate action on various fronts, my attention was caught by the fact that many citizens would heave a deep sigh of relief and remark with satisfaction:

"Well, at any rate, we have a good Governor now."

Some of them were reassured because he had just called a special session to tackle the farm-labor shortage. Some thought that his greatest contribution consisted in a courageous attitude toward the problem of old-age pensions, which has haunted California ever since Mr. Townsend and the Ham-and-Eggers got underway. Most of the people who mentioned him put their trust in the fact that he is honest, able, and unafraid.

These tributes, coming from many different types of citizens at a moment of such real distress, aroused my curiosity. It seemed eminently worth while to study a man who could gain such general confidence at a moment when our governmental leadership is being severely criticized.

VISITS THE GOVERNOR

Through the intercession of a mutual friend, I arranged to visit the Governor in his offices at the Capitol the following day. Earl Warren is well known, not only in California but throughout the West. But being an easterner, it was necessary for me to review his history while taking the 3-hour ferry and train ride from San Francisco to Sacramento.

* * * * *

Perhaps because of his experience in the last World War, he had a vivid awareness of the coming world conflict. He appreciated California's dangerous position, in case of a sudden outbreak of hostilities with Japan, and as early as August 1940 he went to Washington to help draft recommendations for State and local councils of defense.

STATE WAS READY

His analysis of the war situation resulted in a meeting of the peace officers of the State in January 1941 to complete the State-wide framework for safeguarding the lives and property of the people on the west coast in the event of an emergency.

As a result, California set up a broad civilian defense system long before Pearl Harbor, upon which the State could build when the declaration of war placed the whole west coast in jeopardy.

The reputation which this achievement gave him as a farsighted, practical and capable public servant, his excellent record as attorney general, and his personal popularity made him an obvious candidate for the governorship in opposition to an incumbent who seemed at the time fairly certain of reelection.

* * * * *

Later on, when I was talking to him about his campaign, he said of this State-wide effort:

"I took the position that I didn't want to be Governor and represent any class or group. I wanted to be Governor of all California. I covered the shipyards as well as the country districts. Of course, you can't really cover California. It's too big. But I covered a lot of it and I enjoyed every moment of it. It was a fine experience. I don't like campaigning, but when I'm in it, I go like hell. When you're in a race, you'd better run. I had to get Democratic votes to win. I conducted a nonpartisan campaign and I am determined to give the State a nonpartisan administration. A lot of my Republican friends thought it shouldn't be done that way, and others thought it was a pose, but I was sincerely convinced that this was no time for petty partisanship."

* * * * *

His nonpartisan bent has been demonstrated since his election by the fact that his cabinet was appointed for merit, regardless of politics, and has a large Democratic representation.

* * * * *

A LIKING FOR PEOPLE

When I entered the Governor's office I saw a square-shouldered, gray-haired man, somewhat Scandinavian in type, apparently of great physical strength and good health, with friendly gray eyes that betray an interest in people and a real liking for them.

Food is a problem that is uppermost in every Californian's mind, and as I knew that the Governor had called a special session to pass a bill to create a farm labor council to make plans to meet the agricultural labor shortage, we plunged at once into a discussion of this all-important problem.

"The food situation in California is very, very critical," said the Governor.

"We believe that unless the situation is remedied, and remedied quickly, we shall not only not be able to make our contribution to the war effort but we shall have a food shortage in California itself. This is due mostly to Federal bureaucratic misunderstanding of our farming needs in California and total disregard of the farm-labor problem in the administration of the selective service.

"COSTS IGNORED

"The price control we have had here has in some respects totally ignored the cost of production and has also been unsympathetic to the welfare of the farmer.

"For instance, the authorities put a maximum price on a commodity, but put no controls whatsoever on the elements that make up the cost of that commodity. As a result, the farmer is going bankrupt.

"But that is only half the story, for the farmer's bankruptcy means that land goes out of production and supply is curtailed. There is danger that hundreds and thousands of acres will not be planted this year because the Government is giving the farmer no assurance that he can get adequate manpower to take care of his crops, nor that any attempt will be made by price fixing to prevent him from going bankrupt.

"As things are now, the farmer is a lot better off not to plant. The farmer is patriotic and hates to see his land unproductive. He wants to produce as much as he can, but he has absolutely no feeling of security."

The Governor then explained to me that a special session had been called for the passage of the California Food and Fiber Production Act because any new department of government set up at the regular session can go into effect only after 90 days, whereas in a special session it becomes law immediately; and speed in this case is essential. The act provides $1,500,000 to procure labor, housing and supplies needed to save the crops of California through the cooperation of Federal, State and private agencies.

It is an emergency measure designed to make full use of all farm labor and farm production facilities and to mobilize additional workers.

It sets up a farm labor council of seven men, to be appointed by the Governor, from each of the main branches of the State's agricultural industry. There is an advisory council of nine nonvoting members.

* * * * *

The Governor said to me that the act was conceived because of a lack of coordinated planning in Washington.

"If the Federal Government wants to help," he added, "we will go along 100 percent. But if not, we must help ourselves. We are not going to die on the vine if we can help it."

The Governor then explained in some detail California's agricultural importance to the Nation and summed it up with the words: "We are probably the greatest single employer of agricultural labor in the whole country."

GOES ON ITS OWN

Last year at this time California had a shortage of 50,000 men, but by August of this year the shortage is estimated at 125,000. Last fall California had already thought out a plan for harvesting its crops and sent Charles C. Teague to Washington to explain it to Manpower Commissioner McNutt.

After weeks of discussion, California's plan to handle its manpower shortage was declared satisfactory, but before Mr. Teague could get home, the problem was turned over to the Secretary of Agriculture, who had no machinery for the job.

It was then that California started on its own program, realizing that it could not depend on Washington. Although it is late in the season, California is determined to do its best through the help of town clubs, local volunteers, and the efficient movement of workers to meet the increased Government production quotas.

"I want California to be just as helpful to this administration in the war effort as it can be," said Governor Warren. "There is nothing in life just now except winning the war, and food is a very fundamental part of the battle. We have to take every problem by its four corners and decide it on its merits, regardless of politics. As far as the wartime administration of our State is concerned, there is no such thing as a partisan issue.

DANGER TO STATES

"At the same time, I believe that the Federal Government can get the most efficient support from States that have pride in their own situations, States that have not only the power, but the will to take care of their own problems.

"There is great danger at present of subordinating the State and local governments to the Federal Government to such an extent that there won't be sufficient virility left in local governments to give the Federal Government the support that it must have to win the war.

"I believe that every State jurisdiction should have an independent program, not in opposition to the Federal program, but in order to remain self-reliant and in a position to do its best for its own people and the country as a whole.

LITTLE ENTHUSIASM

"There have been many instances of bureaucratic decisions that ignore the conditions of our agricultural, industrial, and manpower problems. In this war and in all crises that our country has been through, there has been better compliance with the policy of the Federal Government when the people were informed of the true facts of their situation and asked to develop a solution from the grass roots, than when they have had a program imposed upon them. The country must become conscious of that fact and act accordingly if we are to have the enthusiastic response of the people from all over the country that is needed to win the war.

"There isn't that enthusiastic response now, because we have not given full recognition to that principle. The people want to do far more than they have been permitted to do. There is a willingness to sacrifice whenever the people are made to see and accept a necessity and are given a part in working out the problems.

"There is danger in this national crisis of making a fetish of centralized power.

"If we succumb to this temptation, it will be because we have lost sight of the fact that there are but two ways of getting the compliance of people with governmental necessity. One is through the compulsion of totalitarianism. The other is through the voluntarism of democracy. There is no half way about it. There can't be any mixture of the two things because they are diametrically opposed, one to the other. In one, power flows from the top, in the other, it springs from the bottom. The war effort must be organized to bring out the best there is in us on a voluntary basis or we must be ruled by compulsion.

"I think most Americans are firmly convinced that true efficiency in democracy, war or no war, stems from the contributions made voluntarily by individuals in their home communities. Whenever centralization gets beyond an outline of guidance and infringes too much on local initiative, you are bound to get a reaction.

WILSON'S APPEAL

"I am not speaking only of the trends in our Federal Government, because we find the same thing in State government. There, too, we have to look out for the tendency to take responsibility away from the people.

"I think it's a good thing to remember that during the last war Woodrow Wilson asked for 'the spontaneous cooperation of a free people.' He made this call at a time when he was being besieged to back measures calling for regimentation. He knew that men in every community would make greater and more willing sacrifices if called upon to cooperate in something which they understood and in which they had confidence; he wanted the kind of civilian morale which comes only from men and women working

together in their local communities for the common good.

"The challenge today is whether we shall be permitted to do things voluntarily under national policy and guidance, or whether our leadership for reasons of expediency will use ever-increasing compulsion to obtain compliance with the war program.

"It seems to me that nothing would do more to increase people's faith in democracy than to achieve victory in this war through voluntary methods."

* * * * *

HIS POST-WAR IDEAS

I asked the Governor * * * what his thoughts are about our post-war reconstruction, and especially what plans he has in mind for the difficult period that the country must face immediately after the war.

He plunged into the subject without hesitation. Evidently he had already given it much of his attention.

"Our war industry at the present time is artificial. A very large percentage of it has come to us not because we have successfully competed for it with other industrial centers but because the Federal Government has placed it here.

"When the war is over and the old factors of competition work again, we shall have to stand on our own feet to retain these great industries. Above all things, we shall have to expand the use of our own raw materials, of which we have an abundance. We are now manufacturing steel and also have aluminum plants. Also we can make plastics from our forests to take the place of metals. We have potential resources of hydroelectric power that are still waiting for development. In fact, we could almost make ourselves independent as a State. In the past we have never properly exploited these resources, but if we are going to continue our industries, we shall have to develop every one of them.

CONSIDER THE SHOCK

"We must also face the fact that California will be the demobilization point for many men from the Pacific war area. Many will want to stay here, and if industry is temporarily curtailed, we must find means to take up the slack without using the dole. I want to set aside funds to build highways and necessary public buildings and also for the development of our natural resources. By these means we will take up much of that slack.

"The State will have approximately $90,000,000 of surplus by July 1, and our estimates of income show that by July 1945 we shall have an estimated surplus of $228,000,000. This money comes from the sales tax, the use tax, the income tax, and the franchise tax. Every sale of every article in industry except food has a 3 percent sales tax. The use tax is levied on things brought into the State. In addition to the income tax, we have a bank and corporate franchise tax. From these various proceeds it is anticipated that we shall be able to save the sum I mentioned.

* * * * *

"INCOME WILL DROP

"The time will come when income drops and we shall be obliged to meet a loss of revenue. If we permit ourselves to be extravagant now we should then be doubly cursed by the extravagant habits we have built up. Anyone who has experience with government knows that if you commit yourself to a spending policy, this habit is the most difficult thing to overcome. For when you try to get rid of new agencies, you find you have to set up three additional ones to take their place.

"We must consolidate our gains in California and go forward to build a great peacetime industrial empire to supplement our agricultural assets.

"The same natural advantages which attracted the war industries—raw materials close at hand in abundance, a huge oil and hydroelectric power supply, ideal climatic conditions, rail-, truck-, and water-transportation facilities—will build a new California when the war is over that will transcend anything we have ever known, if we are alert to the opportunity.

"Industrial expansion can be a major factor in solving our post-war work problems. This transition, however, can only be accomplished if labor, management, and government all cooperate wholeheartedly in bringing it about. During recent months we have responded to President Roosevelt's appeal for uninterrupted production—and relations between workers and employers have been vastly improved. We have brushed aside old animosities and misunderstandings, we have begun to put America first and personal advantage second. With the realities of war crowding upon us, I believe we have all begun to have a new appreciation of the comradeship of our American democracy."

Proposed Amendments to the Alien Registration Act To Conform to the Bill of Rights

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a bill I have introduced in the House to amend title I, sections 1, 3, and 5, of the Alien Registration Act of June 28, 1940—sections 9 and 11, title 18, United States Code—and outlining the objectives sought through such amendments:

H. R. 2352

A bill to amend title I, sections 1, 3, and 5, of the Alien Registration Act, 1940 (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 9 and 11)

Be it enacted, etc., That title I, sections 1, 3, and 5 of the Alien Registration Act, 1940 (U. S. C., title 18, secs. 9 and 11) be amended to read as follows:

"TITLE I

"SECTION 1. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, with intent to undermine and impair the loyalty, morale, or discipline of the military or naval forces of the United States—

"(1) to make direct personal contact with and advise, counsel, and urge said armed forces to become rebellious, mutinous, or disloyal to the United States, or insubordinate to their officers; or

"(2) to distribute among the armed forces any written or printed matter which advises, counsels, or urges disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty by members of the military or naval forces of the United States.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, the term 'military or naval forces of the United States' includes the Army of the United States, as defined in section 1 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended (48 Stat. 153; U. S. C., title 10, sec. 2), the Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps Reserve of the United States; and, when any merchant vessel is commissioned in the Navy or is in the service of the Army or the Navy, includes the master, officers, and crew of such vessel.

"SEC. 3. (a) No person shall be convicted for conspiracy to violate the provisions of this act unless the indictment alleges and describes every essential fact connected with the alleged crime as to time, place, participants, and circumstances, and alleges and describes a criminal overt act on the part of each of the alleged conspirators, showing direct contact with the military or naval forces.

"(b) No person shall be convicted under the provisions of this act except after proof in court both of the conspiracy and of the criminality of the particular overt act alleged to have been committed by said defendant.

"(c) No person may be tried under the provisions of this Act in any State or district other than where the criminal overt act is alleged to have been committed, as provided in amendment VI of the Bill of Rights, and in article III, section 2, of the United States Constitution.

"SEC. 5. (a) Any person who violates any of the provisions of this title shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(b) If said violation or violations shall have resulted in the desertion or rebellion of two or more persons, the offender shall be imprisoned not to exceed 10 years or be fined not to exceed $5,000, or both. Intent of the alleged offender is to be determined not by inference but by direct words and action.

"(c) Nothing in the provisions of this title shall be construed to deny or abridge to any editor, writer, or public speaker the right of free political discourse and discussion, guaranteed to all American citizens by article I of the Bill of Rights.

"(d) No person convicted of violation of any of the provisions of this title shall, during the 5 years next following his conviction, be eligible for employment by the United States, or by any department or agency thereof (including any corporation the stock of which is wholly owned by the United States).

"(e) *Purpose and basic principle.* The purpose of the provisions of this title is solely to protect the armed forces from unpatriotic and subversive agitation, and to guard free speech. It is not meant to deprive soldiers and sailors in the armed forces of the United States from a free exercise of speech, or from hearing and reading legitimate political discussions and criticisms of men and measures, which is the only way a republic has of eliminating evils in administration and thus of surviving internally. One may speak freely to soldiers and sailors, but they must not be advised to mutiny.

"(f) The provisions of this title are retroactive to December 8, 1941."

Mr. Speaker, the provisions covered under the Alien Registration Act of 1940 were suggested by the War and Navy Departments as far back as 1935, and were considered by previous Congresses. The Seventy-fourth Congress rejected the bill, holding that it was not necessary during peacetime and that perhaps the wording suggested might interfere with the freedom of speech and be held to be unconstitutional.

In 1939, the Navy Department urged the passage of some such legislation, contending that the need had "grown to the acute stage" during the intervening years. The arguments advanced by Lieutenant Nunn, representing the Navy, were that additional authority was required to deal with Communist activities among the enlisted personnel of the Navy, basing his case largely on quotations showing that Communist agitators had been caught distributing circulars describing in part an alleged mutiny in the British Navy and characterized as suggesting that members of the United

States Navy do likewise. This was in 1936, prior to the German invasion of the Soviet Union.

Thus the evidence submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary in behalf of the passage of this bill, which is typified by the arguments advanced by the Navy, shows clearly that the intent and necessity for such legislation was due to Communist activities inciting to mutiny and leading to the Communist plan of revolution, advocated by the Communist International and carried out by the Communist Party of the United States and its affiliated groups.

In a report I submitted to the House of Representatives, on January 17, 1931, as chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Communist Activities in the United States—Report No. 2290, Seventy-first Congress—it was pointed out that there was no effective method of dealing with such activities, and the committee then recommended:

1. Enlarging the authority of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice for the purpose of investigating and keeping in constant touch with the revolutionary propaganda and activities of the Communists in the United States, and to provide for additional appropriations for skilled agents to devote their entire time to investigating and preparing reports on the personnel of all entities, groups, individuals, who teach or advocate the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence.

The committee also recommended the strengthening of our immigration laws against the admission and naturalization of aliens known to be affiliated with international communism, and the adoption of legislation to bar all newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, circulars, and so forth, advocating revolutionary communism from the United States mails and from shipment in interstate commerce.

In section 2 of the Alien Registration Act of 1940, which is left intact under the bill I have just introduced, the Congress takes cognizance of the fact that this legislation was intended to carry out the recommendations made by the Army and Navy and other witnesses appearing at the hearings on this bill, holding that—

It shall be unlawful for any person (1) to knowingly or willfully advocate, abet, advise, or teach the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying any government in the United States by force or violence, or by the assassination of any officer of any such government; (2) with the intent to cause the overthrow or destruction of any government in the United States, to print, publish, edit, issue, circulate, sell, distribute, or publicly display any written or printed matter advocating, advising, or teaching the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying any government in the United States by force or violence.

And so forth. Thus the intent of the Congress is clearly set forth, based on the evidence brought before the Committee on the Judiciary, and I am convinced that there would be few, if any, Members of Congress who would not favor legislation advanced for this specific purpose. On that basis I am sure there was much support gained for the bill, and the necessity for such legislation was readily admitted.

However, the bill as finally passed by the House, particularly the sections herein suggested for amendment, was so loosely drawn that it has provided a basis for prosecution of anyone who in any way has criticized or differed with any official of the administration or department of the Government. The act has been utilized by various United States attorneys throughout the country, particularly in the city of Washington, as their sole prerogative of determining who shall and who shall not be prosecuted.

In addition some of the Federal judges, at least prior to the famous statement made recently by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, have apparently gained the idea that they have merely become a part of the Department of Justice instead of being a part of the judiciary of the United States, in all probability due to the loose wording and implied powers deduced by the assistants to the Attorney General under the Alien Registration Act. As long as such conditions exist, no American citizen will have full protection of the law and the courts in obtaining a fair and impartial trial.

Prof. Zechariah Chafee, Jr., Langdell professor at law at Harvard University, in his famous book, Free Speech in the United States, declared:

Not for the sake of the radicals, but for our own sake, should we oppose this unprecedented legislation, whose enforcement let loose a horde of spies and informers, official and unofficial, swarming into our private life, stirring up suspicion without end, making all attacks on government either impotent or unsafe.

There is a grave danger—

Continued Professor Chafee—

that section 1, although enacted to protect soldiers and sailors, will be used in times of excitement to suppress the discussion of public affairs among civilians. (P. 440 to 467 of Free Speech in the United States.)

The District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia has upheld the Department of Justice in its blanket indictments against certain citizens and organizations for the mere printing and distribution of literature criticizing the New Deal administration, and/or advocating that America stay out of foreign wars. No attempt was made to show that there was ever any intent to influence the members of the armed forces to sedition or insurrection, nor was there any direct evidence to show that such attempts were made.

These indictments—without in any way coming within the intent and provision of the Alien Registration Act adopted by the Congress—do, in effect, deprive each and every person so indicted of the right of freedom of speech guaranteed under the Constitution.

To correct these abuses, the amendments referred to above have been introduced. Under title I, section 1, if these amendments are adopted, it will be necessary to prove definite contact with the armed forces, with the intent to undermine and impair the loyalty, morale or discipline of the military or naval forces of the United States, instead of permitting the Department of Justice to infer that such was the intent without producing any evidence to show that an unpatriotic act was committed. Also, it is provided that any literature distributed to the armed forces must, in fact, encourage mutiny or insubordination.

Under section 3 the act is amended so that in conspiracy charges the Department of Justice must show "every essential detail of the alleged crime as to time, place, participants, and circumstances," and show conclusively a criminal overt act on the part of each of the alleged conspirators, and contact with the military and naval forces. Under the existing indictments only general charges were made, with no specific instances of criminality and no evidence of individual violations being alleged. In spite of the fact that the courts have previously held that details must be submitted in the indictments, no particulars were set forth, and this section would make it mandatory that the prosecution must comply with the constitutional provision that the defendant should be "informed of the nature and cause of the accusation" in specific detail.

This section would also make operative article III, section 2, of the Constitution, which guarantees that "such trial shall be held in the State where the said crimes shall have been committed," and amendment VI of the Bill of Rights, providing that "the accused shall be tried by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed." The indictments clearly show that the Department of Justice was fully aware of these guaranties to American citizens, and deliberately attempted to evade the constitutional provisions above cited, by its entrapment of certain of the defendants included and its efforts to deprive them of a trial by an impartial jury in a district or State where they were known, lived, and operated. This entrapment proceeding appears to be a conspiracy on the part of the prosecution against the defendants, and to deprive them of their constitutional rights.

As to the penalty, provided under section 5, unless it is shown that the actions of the accused have brought about the desertion or rebellion of two or more persons, the maximum punishment is fixed at $500 or imprisonment not to exceed 1 year, or both. Professor Chafee states, in his book above referred to, that Sir Frederick Pollock, the great British authority, was astounded at the severity of the punishment provided in the Alien Registration Act of 1940, and asserted that a similar offense in England would result in a sentence of not exceeding 6 months or a fine of £100. However, if an actual conspiracy is proven and a rebellion results, a penalty as high as 10 years and a fine of $5,000, or both, is provided.

Following the Civil War, the United States Supreme Court held in *Ex parte Milligan* (4 Wall. 1), that—

The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and

in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine involving more pernicious consequences was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government. Such a doctrine leads directly to anarchy or despotism. The theory of necessity on which it is based is false.

The provisions of the Alien Registration Act of 1940 were patently unconstitutional, as its application has shown that it violates every principle of freedom of speech, as cited by the United States Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Cohen Grocery Co.* (255 U. S. 81), requiring a penal statute to be definite and certain in its terms and to provide an immutable standard of guilt:

Therefore, because the law is vague, indefinite, and uncertain, and because it fixes no immutable standard of guilt, but leaves such standard to the variant views of the different courts and juries which may be called on to enforce it, and because it does not inform defendant of the nature and cause of the accusation against it, I think it is constitutionally invalid, and that the demurrer offered by the defendant ought to be sustained.

The House itself was aware of the ambiguity of the language contained in this act. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] one of its sponsors, stated:

I am not wedded to the language of this bill.

And Lieutenant Nunn, of the Navy Department, stated at the hearings:

The statute, if enacted, may be involved in an unconstitutional way. It may be involved in a manner so as to be unconstitutional, as Mr. Justice Holmes felt it was in the Abrams case. That will be for the Court in each particular case that comes before it to decide. * * * It might be applied to a set of facts which would be unconstitutional, and, of course, it can easily be applied to many sets of facts where it would be unconstitutional.

I am convinced that events have shown Lieutenant Nunn's observations to have been prophetic; that is exactly what has happened in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the so-called sedition indictments.

Professor Chafee covers this point clearly in his book, when he states:

The truth is that the precise language of a sedition law is like the inscription on a sword. What matters is the existence of the weapon. Once the sword is placed in the hands of the people in power, then, whatever it says, they will be able to reach and slash at almost any unpopular person who is speaking or writing anything that they consider objectionable criticism of their policies.

The peacetime sedition law of 1940 was aimed specifically at preventing the distribution of handbills and propaganda to cause disaffection and mutiny on board warships and disobedience and desertion in our armed forces; and should not, by any stretch of interpretation by the Department of Justice, be applied to editorials or to statements and speeches by American citizens exercising their constitutional right and ancient fireside privilege of commenting on or criticizing the administration, the President, the New Deal, the foreign policies of the President and of Congress prior to Pearl Harbor, or racial or religious issues, or the conduct of the war.

The intent and purpose of the House of Representatives in adopting the Alien Registration Act of June 28, 1940, known as the peacetime sedition law, is very clear, and there can be no misunderstanding by any fair-minded person who has read the testimony of the witnesses before the House committee or the debates in the House. The House at no time ever conceived of the law being used except to prevent Communist, Nazi, or subversive elements from distributing revolutionary propaganda and leaflets among our armed forces to cause mutiny, disobedience, desertion, or to seriously undermine their morale.

It is utterly preposterous to attempt to twist and distort the 1940 act into indicting and bringing to trial opponents of the administration's foreign policies or of President Roosevelt, or anti-New Dealers, anti-Communists, or anti-Semites.

Such a distortion of the obvious and declared purpose of the bill, and interference with the rights of American citizens to free speech and to a free press, revives the discredited and infamous Sedition Act of 1798, under which Jeffersonian writers, speakers, and editors were jailed for opposition to the Federalists then in power.

The Sedition Act of 1798 died within 3 years and was the main factor in destroying the Federalist Party, which sponsored it, and any attempt to revive it by the New Deal, thereby abridging freedom of speech in America, against critics of the administration will develop an issue that will destroy the New Deal just as surely and quickly as the first Sedition Act undermined and virtually wiped out the Federalist Party 144 years ago.

In a letter to Mrs. John Adams, written at the end of his first term in the Presidency, Thomas Jefferson stated:

I discharged every person under punishment or prosecution under the sedition law because I considered and now consider that law to be a nullity, as absolute and as palpable as if Congress had ordered us to fall down and worship a golden image; and that it was as much my duty to arrest its execution in every stage as it would have been to rescue from the fiery furnace those who should have been cast into it for refusing to worship the image. (Thomas Jefferson, by Albert Jay Nock, p. 230.)

The golden calf in the present instance is the foreign policy of the New Deal administration prior to Pearl Harbor, and those who failed to fall down and worship it before Pearl Harbor are being charged and in some instances indicted under the provisions of the present-day Sedition Act—1940.

Fair-minded Americans, regardless of party affiliations, will never remain silent and permit freedom of speech or a free press—without which free America ceases to exist—to be curbed and gagged, or opponents of the foreign policies of President Roosevelt prior to Pearl Harbor—who numbered 100,000,000—sent to jail through bold distortion of the peacetime sedition law and the intent of the Congress.

If American citizens, clergymen, editors, writers, and crackpots or cranks from all parts of the Nation can be brought to Washington and tried for expressing their noninterventionist and anti-New Deal views prior to Pearl Harbor, half of Congress and 80 percent of the American people could be sent to prison under such a Gestapo procedure.

I have met and know only a few of the 34 persons now under indictment under what I consider to be a gross misconstruction and interpretation of a congressional statute. No witness or Member of Congress who advocated section 1 of the Alien Registration Act ever imagined that the law could be used to punish individuals who uttered or wrote criticisms considered objectionable by the administration, particularly when they do not constitute a clear or present danger of mutiny, disobedience, or desertion in our armed forces.

I am informed that there is a group of anti-Semites among the 34 Americans indicted. I do not approve of their words or actions, as I believe there should be no religious test under the Constitution, and that all American citizens, regardless of race or color, have a right to their own religious convictions. But, while anti-Semitism is un-American, I know of no Federal law or constitutional provision that prohibits freedom of discussion of racial and religious issues, as much as I deplore them. It certainly was not the intent of the Congress to write any such restriction or limitation into the Alien Registration and Sedition Act.

I am convinced the Department of Justice is in error in attempting to abridge freedom of speech and of the press in violation of the Constitution of the United States and contrary to the intent of Congress. If it succeeds in establishing such an unfortunate and unhappy precedent, carried to its natural and logical conclusion it would mean the setting up of a Gestapo in America that would rival that of Hitler's Reich and destroy freedom of speech and of the press and endanger the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness of every American citizen.

This issue is so important that it far exceeds all party lines. It is a great American issue, involving the most fundamental and precious of all American rights and liberties—that of freedom of speech. No sacrifice is too great to safeguard freedom of speech and of the press, symbols of freedom in America. We are fighting a war all over the world for these very principles and must not permit them to be destroyed here at home.

Paraphrasing the words of Voltaire, I say of these 34 defendants under indictment through a distorted and tortured construction of the Alien Registration Act of 1940, "I do not believe in what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it in time of peace."

The Port of New Orleans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Lester F. Alexander, president of the Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans, is one of New Orleans' outstanding and leading citizens. Only recently he was signally honored by his townspeople for his splendid work in connection with the development of the port of New Orleans.

As head of the dock board in New Orleans he receives no salary or remuneration. His is essentially a post of civic duty and performance in every sense of the word.

Recently before the members' council of the New Orleans Association of Commerce, Mr. Alexander discussed the future of the port of New Orleans and proposed a new deep-sea route to the Gulf of Mexico.

His observations are of importance not only to New Orleans and the South but to the entire United States and particularly to the Mississippi Valley.

I should like every Member of this House to be acquainted with Mr. Alexander's proposal and for that reason have asked permission to include his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Here is Mr. Alexander's address. It speaks for itself:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and members of the council, in talking to you about the port of New Orleans I fully appreciate the magnitude of the subject, also my limitations as well as the limitation of time. This subject is of the utmost importance to you and to me; our business and our livelihood depend on the port. New Orleans is a port before anything else; in normal times 75 cents of every dollar comes directly or indirectly from port business, and don't forget that peace will come again, and when the lights are turned on again all over the world I hope that we will not be left in the dark. I am not going to attempt to tell you nice things, but will deal strictly in hard, cold facts and will divide my talk into three parts—the port of yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

THE PORT OF YESTERDAY

The founders who selected the site for the city of New Orleans undoubtedly had in mind its strategic location as a port—a port of import and of export. Those men evidently visualized the future possibilities of the great Mississippi River and its tributaries for transportation purposes, and the fertile lands along the banks to furnish the cargoes. The history of the development of these waterways is well worth studying; it is a history of adventure, hardship, endurance, as well as romance. The improvement and utilization of these waterways for commercial purposes was accomplished, in the main, by those rough-and-ready settlers residing on the upper reaches of the rivers. It would appear that the citizens of New Orleans, even at that early date, sipped their black coffee and cocktails and placed their principal reliance for trade and their own prosperity upon the geographical location of their port, believing that this advantage would, of necessity, force commerce to them.

About the time of the War of 1812, steamboating on the Mississippi River was in its infancy and while the war, to some extent, retarded the work of improvement of the rivers and the development of the steamboat, it did, however, emphasize the need of both improved rivers and better steamboats.

In 1835, the value of our exports, principally cotton, was in excess of $36,000,000, and for the next 3 years exceeded those of New York. However, New York's imports were much greater than those of New Orleans. In 1836 one of the foremost commercial journals of the day published this statement: "No city in the world has ever advanced as a mart of commerce with such gigantic and rapid strides as New Orleans."

With the development of the rivers, the necessity for deeper water to the sea became a problem—bars choked the Mississippi River at its entrance. Various and sundry were the methods used to better this condition, the most successful one consisting of agitating the soft mud and silt on the bars by dragging harrows or rakes and permitting the current to carry the soft material, thus agitated and set in motion, into the Gulf of Mexico. By this method a navigable depth of approximately 18 feet was obtained.

Time came when these crude methods were inadequate. Numerous examinations, surveys, and reports were made by Government engineers, and finally in 1875, a "no-cure no-pay" contract was entered into with Capt. James B. Eads. This contract provided for a channel through South Pass 26 feet deep and 200 feet wide, and also for a 20-year period of maintenance by Captain Eads.

The commerce of the port has ever kept pace with the improvements of its waterways and even before the expiration of the Eads maintenance contract it was apparent that greater depth across the bar was necessary to accommodate the growing business. More examinations, studies, and reports were being made in an effort to obtain a better outlet channel to the sea, and in 1898 a board of engineers recommended that Southwest Pass be improved to a depth of 35 feet with a minimum width of 1,000 feet, and the river-and-harbor bill of 1902 authorized the improvement.

During the preceding years the facilities of the port consisted of an indiscriminate system of wharves and docks operated under various controls and ownerships and which had proven very unsatisfactory and inefficient. Therefore, in 1896, the Louisiana Legislature passed Act No. 70, with a view of improving these conditions, this act providing for the establishment of a board of port commissioners, defining its powers, duties, and ways and means of obtaining revenue. Due to litigation and other obstacles the commission did not take over until May 1901. The legislature, in creating the board of port commissioners, and the act of Congress of 1902 authorizing the improvement of Southwest Pass, furnished the foundation for the port of today.

THE PORT OF TODAY

In the fall of 1903 the authorized improvement of Southwest Pass was started. (Incidentally, I was the first Government man on the job.) Work progressed from year to year by the construction of jetties and by dredging. The approved project called for a navigable depth of 35 feet, with a minimum width of 1,000 feet; however, this was slow of accomplishment and the date of attainment uncertain, so the channel was officially declared open to navigation on December 26, 1911 with 31 feet at mean low tide; even that was of short duration and the depth varied from 20 to 27 feet until September 1, 1924, when the project depth of 35 feet was obtained. To obtain this depth it had become necessary to modify the original project, which contemplated 35 feet on the axis of the jetty channel. The modification consisted of utilizing a sharp angle or elbow beginning near the end of the east jetty and veering sharply to the eastward to deep water in the Gulf; this channel provides 35 feet of water, but it should not, in any sense, be considered sufficiently safe, dependable, or adequate for the present or for the future development of the port.

No other port in the world possesses natural advantages equal to those of New Orleans, some of which are the Mississippi River with its numerous tributaries providing transportation at the lowest possible cost to the richest producing area of the United States. An empty bottle thrown into the waters of any of these rivers will be furnished free transportation to New Orleans—the intracoastal canal from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Appalachee Bay, Fla., with a depth of 9 feet and a bottom width of 100 feet, presently being deepened to 12 feet and widened to 125 feet. The authority for this improvement also provides for the extension of this canal from Corpus Christi to Brownsville, Tex. Funds are now available for this improvement. This authorization also includes the bypassing of the open waters of Lake Pontchartrain by dredging an inland canal from the industrial canal at New Orleans to the Rigolets, and this part of the work is now in progress and will probably be completed within the next 100 days.

I shall not take up your time to review the various dock boards which have come and gone. Some have been good, some better, some dictatorial, some political, and some both dictatorial and political in policy, and the progress of the port, no doubt, has been greatly influenced by the policies of the various boards, coupled with the interest manifested by the community in its port affairs.

The present Board is neither dictatorial nor political; it construes its duties to be those of salesmanship and service, selling our facilities to shippers and ship operators, be they near or far, and after having sold them to so service their requirements that they will remain sold. We believe it to be our duty to encourage and facilitate the commerce of the port in every manner possible, and do not feel that we have performed our full duty in merely providing an honest and efficient operation but, in addition, we should busy ourselves studying ways and means for port improvement. We do not believe that its aims should be primarily one of profit. We are opposed to the assessment of tolls against commerce on our inland waterways, and for this reason we sponsored that portion of Public Law 675 which provides for the leasing of a portion of the industrial canal to the United States Government. When this lease is concluded the Government will then operate the St. Claude Street locks and bridge and the Florida Avenue bridge, and no tollage or lock fees will be assessed against commerce using these facilities.

A few figures of the Board's surplus from time to time may be interesting:

In 1911 the surplus was $610,000.
On June 30, 1920, $1,700,000.
On June 30, 1930, $6,362,000.
On June 30, 1940, $5,700,000.
On February 28, 1943, it was $8,100,000.

The improvement during the past 3 years was made during war conditions with its consequent loss of tonnage and other forms of revenue.

THE PORT OF TOMORROW

In describing the hit-or-miss haphazard condition and operation of the wharves and docks, the lack of improved inland waterways, and the inadequate channels across the bar during the days of the port of yesterday—and the improvement of these various facilities during the period of the port of

today, I believe you will agree that the commerce of the port has increased in direct proportion to the improvements made to our inland waterway system, dock facilities, and channels to the sea.

Please look at this map and see the vast system of inland waterways, approximately 7,600 miles—the Intracoastal Canal from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Appalachee Bay, Fla., soon to be deepened, widened, and extended to Brownsville, Tex.

This little red dot on the map represents New Orleans, the hub or heart of this great inland waterway system. Are we taking advantage of our geographical location, or do we still sit and sip our black coffee and cocktails?

I know statistics are dull, but sometimes a few are necessary to obtain the proper perspective. In 1860 the value of our foreign commerce, both export and import, was $126,801,000. Philadelphia, $20,139,000; Baltimore, $18,721,000; New York, $311,358,000; and in 1940 the comparable values were:

New Orleans, $334,613,000, a gain of less than three times that of 1860.

Philadelphia, $240,862,000, a gain of 12 times.

Baltimore, $262,279,000, a gain of 14 times.

New York, $3,186,713,000, a gain of 10 times.

A port's growth and prosperity can only be measured by comparison with competing ports.

Houston has a canal to deep water in the Gulf approximately 50 miles long and all tidewater—Mobile, 35 miles of tidewater to the Gulf. Mobile's development during the past 5 years is comparable to the preceding 100 years; Mobile district has a Congressman, live, alert, and on his toes for the port of Mobile.

This line on the map represents a proposed canal connecting the Tennessee River with the Tombigbee River. Sixty-six million dollars for the construction of this canal, approved by the President in 1939, was included in the river and harbor bill of 1940; this bill passed both Houses of Congress, but the entire bill, not the canal alone, was vetoed by the President in January 1941.

This canal will be built, and as soon as peace comes; when it is constructed, points on the Mississippi River above Cairo will be 100 miles nearer Mobile than New Orleans, and on the Ohio River above Paducah will be 200 miles nearer Mobile than New Orleans, and all points on the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers will be nearer Mobile—Mobile only 35 miles of tidewater to the sea—New Orleans 115 miles of river current to the sea. I congratulate Mobile for helping herself, but what are we going to do to help ourselves to meet this situation—sip our black coffee and cocktails?

Gentlemen, I tell you without fear of contradiction that, North, East, and West, New Orleans has the finest system of inland waterways of any city in the world. These waterways serve the most productive area in the United States. The port of New Orleans, if it will extend itself, can assemble on its docks diversified cargoes at less cost than any other port in the world.

I have not emphasized the railroads serving the port of New Orleans because I am primarily talking about waterways today. We have the railroads—from the North, from the East, and from the West they serve us well. I know these railroads, and I know many of their officials, and I know they are willing to expand their services if, as, and when we need expansion

As previously stated, North, East, and West, we possess the greatest system of inland waterways in the world. Now I tell you, expecting criticism and comment, that from New Orleans south to deep water in the Gulf we have the most inadequate and hazardous channel to be found anywhere—115 miles of up-bound navigation in swift currents, innumerable bends, and often through heavy fogs, with an elbow channel across the bar at both the south and southwest pass, and even these channels subject to shoaling from bottom-carried sand waves, mud lumps, and at times stranded or sunken ships. The commerce that we now enjoy comes to us in spite of this river entrance to the sea.

I have always believed that the entrance to a salesroom should be easy of approach and good to look at. It matters not how well selected, plentiful, and attractive is your stock of goods if the would-be purchaser is not received through a front door easy of approach.

This line on the map from the Industrial Canal to deep water in the Gulf, terminating at or near Chandeleur Island, represents a proposed 40-foot canal approximately 75 miles long, with no bends or elbow entrances. Its exact location is immaterial, however, in selecting Chandeleur Island as a terminus for the canal, I have in mind that a straight line is the shortest distance between two given points, and as a ship channel would ultimately be the most economical. Also, a highway to Chandeleur Island would be built on the fill created by the canal excavation and Chandeleur Island would soon become a second Miami Beach.

I have been an active proponent of this canal for 25 years. However, last week in reading the annual report of the Chief of Engineers for the year 1899, I found these words referring to the Mississippi River: "The peculiar formation of the land between Lake Borgne and Chandeleur Island might lead to the inference that at some time the mouth was not far from the Chandeleur Island, and that the present channel was created through the action of some earthquake which forced the stream to the westward." Gentlemen, even the Mississippi River had to be forced to its present location.

Along the banks of this proposed canal is an unlimited area for slips and lateral canals on which could be constructed wharves and docks of concrete at tidewater level, the floor of these wharves to be at least 12 feet below those now on the river front; these new wharves and docks served, both front and back, by a well-laid-out system of railroads; shipside warehouses where cargo may be received and stored for reshipment by rail or barge to interior points, eliminating much of the present costs of trucking and storing in city warehouses, with the consequent rehandling when shipment is made to final destination. Too much cost and so unnecessary.

A shipside foreign trade zone, a foreign trade zone in reality and not in name only, a zone performing its functions as the law intended and on a profitable basis.

Terminals to fit all requirements, constructed at minimum cost. Location for a United States navy yard, second to none in the United States, and perhaps, most important of all, a great naval graving dock, so urgently needed today. It is impossible to construct these facilities on the banks of the river with over 20-foot variation in water level.

There are many other physical advantages too numerous to mention in the time allotted me today. However, it is my well-considered opinion that the construction of this canal, as outlined, would result in a saving of 50 percent of present-day costs in bringing a ship from the Gulf of Mexico to New Orleans, discharging its cargo, reloading, and returning to deep water in the Gulf.

The construction of this port of tomorrow would provide employment for 7,000 or 8,000 men for a period of 10 years, or a greater number of men for a lesser number of years. You may think these figures large—not today, my friends. Mobile is going to get her $66,000,000 canal from the Tennessee to the Tombigbee River, and last week the River and Harbor Committee of the House approved an item of $199,000,000 for the construction of the "missing link" in the Atlantic Intracoastal Canal, a canal from the Delaware to the Raritan River in New Jersey. This amount is approximately what we require to provide a tidewater canal to the sea and proper port facilities.

I do not deal in visions or dreams—only in realities, sometimes cold and blunt, but always realities.

Once upon a time New Orleans described itself as "the city that care forgot"; later changed to "America's most interesting city."

Shall we build this port of tomorrow and again change to "America's most progressive city?"

I thank you.

Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of April 3, 1943:

TRADE AGREEMENTS

There have been disturbing rumors of late that when the Trade Agreements Act of 1940 expires next June, Congress will either allow it to lapse or renew it in a form that will destroy its usefulness. It is pointed out in this connection that the recurrent votes on this legislation, first approved in 1934 and reapproved in 1937 and 1940, showed a steady decline in the affirmative majority, and that there is now a large element in Congress which wants a return to the old system of tariff making. If these rumors are correct, we may lose the peace even before we win the war Certainly the failure by Congress to renew the Trade Agreements Act will be regarded everywhere as a clear indication that we propose to return to economic isolation That means political isolation as well.

In his speech before the New York State Chamber of Commerce Thursday, Sumner Welles Under Secretary of State, made clear what this would mean in terms of the common welfare As he points out, "Any organization whereby the nations who want peace will cooperate to enforce it would fall apart if the economic underpinning were unsound." For an international order to exist and prosper, there must be a steady expansion of world commerce. To bring that about in an orderly fashion, with due concern shown for long-established domestic interests, was the aim of the trade-agreements program which Secretary Hull has for so long sponsored. Each of the 30 such agreements that have been concluded represented months of the most careful examination by competent experts from various governmental bodies. Each, as Mr Welles says "sought to deal with conditions as they are, not to apply any theoretical conception of the way things should be if we were to go back a hundred years and start our economic policies from scratch." And in line with historic American policy each embodied a most-favored-nation clause so as to make it as little discriminatory as possible.

In the period before the war, to quote Mr. Welles again, the trade-agreements program was one spark of sanity in a world outlook that seemed wholly and hopelessly dark. For us to abandon it at a time when its usefulness can now really begin would be a blunder worse than a crime.

After War—Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the Woman's Home Companion in its April issue published the results of a poll of sentiment of women on planning for peace now. The results of that poll show that 84 percent believe we should be planning now; 92 percent believe there should be a permanent world organization; and 95 percent believe such a world organization should have force to carry out its decisions.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary of the poll be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Woman's Home Companion opinion poll, April 1943—After war—peace?

PERCENTAGE, BY SECTIONS, OF THE COUNTRY

	East	North	South	West	Total
QUESTION 1					
Which do you believe?					
We should be devoting thought now to after-war problems	82	85	81	87	84
We should not (such discussions tend to lessen our war effort)	18	15	19	13	16
QUESTION 2					
Should there be a permanent world congress to act upon international disputes?					
Yes	92	91	93	96	92
No	8	9	7	4	8
QUESTION 3					
If yes, should we grant such a body the power and means to enforce its decisions?					
Yes	95	95	91	98	95
No	5	5	9	2	5

American-Russian-British Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT B. CHANDLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] over the telephone wires from Washington, D. C., to a mass meeting dedicated to the consolidation of American, Russian, and British friendship, held at Carnegie Hall, New York City, Sunday, April 4, at 9:30 p. m.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Those of us who read history have learned that in times past when nations with the aggressor attitude have made war, they always used the technique of attempting to divide their enemies. Germany and the other Axis Powers have of course done this from the very beginning. The strength of the Allies is now expressing itself in pressure which actually causes the Axis to shout for some rest. That pressure will continue to be great and the circle around the Axis Powers will be narrowed as time goes on and our armies advance. German diplomacy, which of course has controlled the diplomacy of Italy and Japan, uses the neutrals and the radio for a dissemination of imagined information. The Axis is trying to show now that the Allies, especially the big four—China, Britain, Russia, and America—have such diverse aims in this war that they are beginning to quarrel among themselves, not only in war objectives, but also in peace objectives. If the Axis Powers should succeed in causing this spirit to become part of the spirit of the Allies, we would start to distrust one another. If the individual members of the United Nations begin feeling that they are being ignored, improperly treated, that their importance is not recognized, it will not be long before the unity of our war effort is destroyed.

We are fundamentally united because we are fighting wickedness in the world. I use that word advisedly. This war is actually a war between right and wrong. Every element of that democracy which has become part of our political and national endeavor, every ideal which we recognize as the American national cult, has been challenged by Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese. They want to drag the flag of liberty through the dust. They want to destroy freedom in the earth. They want individual man to cease to count as the entity around which and for which governments are created and established. They hate all Jeffersonian doctrines because no dictator can thrive if the people that he is supposed to rule insist upon rights and stand for law and the processes of law. Thus we see if that for which we stand in the world is good, then that for which Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese stand is bad.

It seems that it has always been harder to unite men in good endeavors than it has been to unite men in evil design. Back in the days of the Greek dramatists, the wail went forth, "Why, oh why, do men unite for war, but divide for peace?" Now, after 150 years' experience in the United States with the processes of democracy, with government by law, with the rights of the individual maintained and with governments serving the people established, we have found that there is a unifying element in all this that is good.

But, say our opponents, China is not ready for democracy in our sense, Russia is still a single-will state, and Britain is more interested in preserving the inequalities of an empire than developing the cooperative theories of a commonwealth of nations. A semblance of truth in all these statements makes them very effective and causes us to have suspicion in our hearts. But they are not whole truths, and there is no cause for suspicion.

China, since the beginning, has known what it meant for a man to have rights. The Chinaman could always own and dispose of his property, which is the very essence of economic democracy. He could always go where he wanted to go, to live as he wanted. He was free to eat what he wanted. There were no marrying taboos. He could be what he wanted professionally and serve in highest positions if he could pass the examinations. In the whole history of that country no dictator has ever interfered with the right of the Chinaman to exert these fundamental individualistic characteristics of everyday democracy.

The communistic endeavor in Russia has been achieved by a spirit of unity. Forced unity, let us admit, but what has it brought? It has brought education to all the people; it has brought equality between the sexes in economic, political, and social endeavor; it has furnished the world with the greatest achievements of women soldiers, women doctors, women ships' officers, that the world has ever seen. The power of the Russian revolution is expressed in the energy of the youth of that great nation. A great nation's women and children ever furnish untold energy when properly directed. Russia's youth has tasted freedom and called it good. Today Russia's youth is fighting and dying for freedom. While all Russia fights, it is the spirit of freed youth that directs the victories.

As to Great Britain, every thoughtful person in England knows that the strength of the commonwealth nations, together with the natural allies which they have attracted because they are free, makes Great Britain today much stronger than she ever was under her imperialistic notions. No Englishman dares stand up in his Parliament and say that he does not like the Act of Westminster which liberated Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. There is no Britisher on earth who does not realize that the educational and social laws of the last 20 years in Britain have made it possible for the British people to exert themselves in a way that Dunkerque, though a defeat, becomes a monument of glory and ultimately, like our own Bunker Hill, will be celebrated throughout the ages.

The Axis Powers fail to realize that when they made the state the important entity, they just naturally turned people against them. The strength of the Allies and the United Nations today is this: A union of peoples has been brought about—a mighty brotherhood of endeavor. Peoples fighting for their rights, peoples who feel themselves destined to initiate and inaugurate a better world, peoples who are not afraid to take a stand for freedom everywhere. Peoples who know that there can be by united action a development of resources, a remaking of nature, an overcoming of famines. Maldistribution, and even physical characteristics which hold men back will, when we have overcome them, cause want to be banished from this earth. When men, women, and children no longer have to worry about their next meal, when they realize that there is food for all, homes for all, and a place for all, it will be inevitable that man can become free from fear.

Do not assume that the ideals of our great war endeavor are too visionary. They are very practical, and the history of our country shows that they are practical. In my lifetime I have seen the desert blossom as the rose, I have seen water brought from one mountainside to another, I have seen people so poor that they were utterly without food, not made rich, but made happy and contented, living—comparatively speaking—a life of abundance. These things can be done. They are not merely great dreams. We have Boulder Dam, we have the Bonneville Dam, and the desert has been conquered. Distances have been overcome. The earth in her abundance can be made to yield. This is not vain hope, it is an accomplished fact. America is the living witness of what liberty can do for a people.

I wonder if the people of the world realize that our flyers from their great heights today see a complete circle when they see a rainbow. Think of it. We are living in a day when the old mythical end of the rainbow the children sought to find, that grown people wanted to attain—the rainbow with its pot of gold at the end—is no more. We have discovered that the rainbow has no end. It is a circle, typifying eternity. Surely, if the broken rainbow was given as a sign and promise to our ancestors back in Biblical days, the unbroken, never-ending rainbow of today should be both a sign and a promise to us. A rainbow which has no end; we must make that a sign which will lead us on to an understanding of what victory may mean to us and to the world.

You remember the old story about Benjamin Franklin, who looked at the chair in which George Washington sat at the Constitutional Convention. Franklin noticed the design on the back of that chair. It was a sun. He remarked, after the Constitution had been signed, that he had always wondered about that sun, whether it was a rising or a setting sun. We know today that it was a rising sun, and the nations of the earth know today that it was the dawning of the new day of freedom for the world. That rising sun was potential America. It has grown and developed to such a place that this great Nation of ours can establish a theory of governmental action the like of which the world has never seen, the theory behind our lend-lease endeavors. We have learned that that which is choice to us may be shared by others. We have learned the great rule of liberty, which is the fundamental rule of love, that the more you give the more you get

As an American, I am firmly convinced that our allies and our associates in the United Nations have recognized our spirit, have made that spirit theirs, and the unity which is theirs in this great war will be continued in the making of the peace. America must see to it that the spirit of dividing us from our allies shall die where it had its origin—among the Nazis, the Fascists, and the Japanese. We will not let suspicion enter our souls and our hearts. We will fight as we have sacrificed; we will fight for our friends as we fight for ourselves; and we will find and continue to have unity as a result of that endeavor and that objective. America was destined to lead the political world into a better way for men, women, and children. We have that leadership today, and we have the support of our allies. We are going to see to it that they have our support We learned the strength of the words "United States" long ago. We now know the strength of the words "United Nations." Unity is our aim; unity is our objective. In unity will come the destruction of the enemy and the establishment of peace. United in war we will unite for the peace. Mankind will call that nation blessed which accepts leadership in such a cause. This is the mission of America. Our people will not be found wanting. Under heaven Columbus sailed and found a new world. Under heaven the land that Columbus found will lead the people of the whole earth to newly discovered blessings.

Under the American constitutional scheme the President of the United States from time to time makes a report to the people on the state of the Union. This practice the allied world has now adopted. Our President, Britain's premier, Russia's commander-in-chief, China's generalissimo and his gracious lady along with the representatives of the other United Nations have all spoken. Each time the burden of their theme has been the state of the Union of the United Nations. Each has presented a striving toward that unity which bespeaks victory and success. The way of peace is indeed in the earth. That we may all walk in its path when once the enemy of mankind is crushed is today not only the prayer but also the desire of nations. This prayer has been put into prophetic words by the great poet Rabindranath Tagore. These words portray the aspirations of the United Nations:

"Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;
"Where knowledge is free;
"Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;
"Where words come out from the depth of truth;
"Where tireless striving stretches its arms toward perfection;
"Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sand of dead habit;
"Where the mind is led forward by Thee into ever-widening thought and action—
"Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let my country awake."

The Obligation of Every American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a talk on the subject of the obligation of every American which I delivered before the annual meeting of the Rock County Bar Association at Janesville, Wis., on March 27, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, as a practicing attorney in Wisconsin for more than three decades, I feel a special kinship with the members of the bar who are here today—and as a Senator and taxpayer with a great many problems in Washington, I feel an equally strong kinship with the lawyers' clients who are here today and those who pay me the honor to listen to me over the radio.

It is a privilege to be with you, and I am grateful to the Rock County Bar Association for their courtesy in extending this invitation to me.

At the outset, let me say that each of us, and particularly the lawyers, have a tremendous stake in one very fundamental issue involved in the present war.

That issue is absolutely basic, because it involves a conflict between government by freemen through democratic processes and government, as exemplified by the Axis by dictatorship. The issue is between a government of freemen and justice, and a government of slaves and men. The issue is between law and men. The issue is between right and wrong. The issue is between justice and injustice. The issue is between the rights of men and the rights of despots. The issue is between freedom and tyranny.

Throughout the ages, there have always been wars between governments of law and governments of men and tyranny.

America didn't want war. War was thrust upon us. Now we fight for our lives. The pre-Pearl Harbor issue of intervention by a divided nation, or nonintervention, should be laid aside forever, or at least until the war is over. We have too much to attend to, requiring the efforts of a united people, without getting into an argument between ourselves about what is past. The eternal present is too full of problems to spend time discussing that past now. Oh, yes, we can learn from our mistakes (and we all make them), but we cannot take time to dwell on them. If we do, we are sabotaging the great needs of the present.

The tides of change throughout the world are in full flow. Like the days of the Renaissance, the industrial revolution, the political revolution of the latter part of the eighteenth century, the floodgates are open and you and I are privileged to be alive and play our little parts. Civilization is not in its death throes but in the birth pains of a new life. Are we aware of the privilege? In these days life cannot be stagnant and complacent. It is for you and me to see that these tides are confined so they do not overflow and destroy the landmarks that should be preserved. Let us harness such tides of change to the Nation's advantage. That is our job. Each of us has an individual responsibility in building the world of tomorrow.

The prophet, Joel, said, "Your old men shall dream dreams; your young men shall see visions." Here we have the directive that fits the present. We need very much in the world today, practical men—men with their feet on the ground who know the ways of men and nations. But we need something more. We need men and women with vision who see more than the ways of men and nations; men and women who see the possibility of better days ahead; who can plan and execute for the improvement of the Nation economically, socially, and politically.

In these confusing, troublesome but challenging days, we need a liaison between these two classes of men in order that we may appraise rightly the course that this Nation should take.

The needs of humanity are many. How to meet those needs is the problem. So we do need a combination of the man of vision and the man of realism.

The possibilities are here for a great forward step for humanity. We must have the courage and daring our fathers had in 1787 as well as their wisdom. Yes; we need the vision of youth with unbleared eyes to venture forth unawed by condition and circumstance toward a better tomorrow, and the judgment of maturity, eyes open to facts but still dreaming of life as growth and development and unafraid of it. Here we see the obligation of each of us.

I am not going to have much to say about the far-flung strategy of the present war. Instead, I am going to talk about certain domestic trends which I feel are a part of the ideals for which we fight—trends which are rightly the special concern of the lawyer and the concern of every true American.

INCIDENT OF UNPOISED CALLER

1. The American lawyer and the American citizen must never lose sight of the basic question of a government by law versus a government by men and minions. That means, at the outset, that even in wartime we must fight to the last ditch to preserve the civil liberties which are so basically a part of this conflict. That does not mean that we should tolerate any kind of fifth-column activities.

That does not mean that we should quibble about fifth columnists, nor does it mean that we should endanger our war effort by a too-scrupulous regard for the hair-splitting distinctions which might permit intellectual saboteurs of American opinion to escape punishment. We must be realistic, but we must also adhere rigidly to every conceivable safeguard against witch-hunting.

There must be no "burning at the stake" of those who properly make constructive comments on the war effort even though these comments may be at variance with the thinking of the administration. The ultimate test of where the line should be drawn must perhaps be found in the question of motive or intent.

2. Aside from this basic issue, lawyers particularly, and laymen also, must be keenly conscious of the divided powers which our Constitution has established for each of the branches of government. It is not the function of the legislative branch to carry out the administration of its laws.

It is not the function of the executive branch to write those laws.

The last decade has seen a gradual insidious erosion of congressional authority and responsibility as the Nation's law-making body. That erosion of legislative authority has grown throughout the war period, though, since the last election, Congress is standing considerably more on its own legs.

Now, it is perfectly apparent that the tremendous problems of the war have made it necessary for Government to administer laws relating to many new problems. It is equally apparent that the executive branch must, however, limit its activities to the administration of these laws.

The tendency of the executive branch to write legislation is a dangerous menace to our form of government. It is dangerous not only because it represents an abuse of our constitutional provisions, but also because it invites reprisals by Congress, and because it creates a friction which is particularly hazardous in wartime.

It was not so many years ago when a small select group designated as "brain trusters" habitually brought legislation already written to Congress for a rubber-stamp approval. That inner circle of "palace guards" was perhaps disappearing at the outbreak of this war. At the present time, however, a new group has assumed the function of writing laws—and this group does not even bring them to Congress for approval. I refer to that peculiar species of American Government employee known as the bureaucrat.

Let me make it clear that I do not indict the legitimate hardworking Government employee—and there are countless thousands of them. I am indicting the self-glorified nonelected bureaucrat who presumes to act as a legislator.

The most charitable designation which I can apply to this group—as a substitute for a stronger and more understandable term—is the term "illegitimate lawmakers."

The war brought tremendous new problems to the Executive. I do not minimize those problems nor do I minimize the responsibilities which have been laid on the Executive doorstep.

I do not minimize the fact that the representatives of the people—the Congress—are not always speedy in their conclusions or their action, but I still contend that this is no reason to sabotage the orderly processes of government and the established and constitutional procedure for lawmaking.

I still contend that this is no reason for any long-haired theorist, working in a Government bureau, to arrogate to himself the right to create new laws far beyond the expressed intent of Congress in the legislation which originally created the authority which is now claimed by the Bureau.

The last 2 years have seen an incredible floodtide of regulations, having the force of law, and emanating from the facile pens of a vast virtually unregulated horde of bureaucrats running riot.

It is inevitable that out of a war there should emerge a strengthening of the executive branch It is inevitable that there should be some concentration of power. It is inevitable that in our necessity for speedy action, there should be more power to make decisions vested in the executive branch.

These things are inevitable, but they are no explanation for the myriad muddled regulations, spawned by a bureaucracy acting hastily and ill-advisedly.

It is not the intent of Congress to sabotage the constructive work of any phase of the executive branch. It must not be the intent of Congress to scrutinize the activities of the executive branch in any partisan sense, but it must be the function of Congress to r tain a bulwark of our constitutional system as far as it can be conceivably maintained during a war period.

The shocking drift of legislative authority to the executive branch must be scrutinized sharply and must be rigidly limited to a proper exercise of delegated authority. There can be no thief-in-the-night usurpation of the lawmaking power vested by a sovereign people in its representatives. We are fighting for a government by law, rather than men and minions. We are fighting for a system of justice, and we will not see that justice listed as an unnecessary casualty in the war.

We are willing to make every sacrifice—but they must be essential sacrifices. We are willing to follow every regulation—but they must be intelligent, workable regulations, written on the basis of clearly defined plans and on the basis of well-established facts.

Thus far, a major portion of our regulations have been written in the shifting sands of day-to-day expediency. They have not resulted from any clearly defined over-all plan and frequently they have not resulted from well-established facts.

I make this criticism, not in any sense of partisanship but in a fervent conviction that this constructive criticism is a duty and an obligation to the war effort. We cannot win a war—except at far greater costs than necessary—with a muddled manpower policy. We cannot win a war with production throttled by red tape and strangled by conflicting purposes and a confusion of authority.

It has been said that no American citizen in the year 1943 will survive without having violated some Federal regulation which has the force of law, and I might add that even the First Lady of the Land had admittedly violated some of these regulations.

Think of what this means—no American surviving in 1943 without violating a Federal regulation or law. Now, there is something fundamentally wrong when that statement can be made. The wrong isn't inherent in the American people, for the American people are the most law-abiding race on the face of the earth, and the American people are sold heart and soul on winning this war and want to do everything they can to win it quickly and subsequently to establish a just peace.

No, my friends, the fault results with the multiplicity of regulations, with the floodtide of bureaucratic rules, and with the hopeless confusion, duplication, and cross-purposes of our civilian planning on the home front.

I frankly believe that it is imperative for the Executive to create a real honest-to-God War Cabinet. It is time that conflicts in government end. We need a real War Cabinet, one which holds weekly meetings.

At the present time there are about fifteen "czars" and "subczars." They include the Director of War Production, Donald Nelson, Byrnes as Economic Stabilizer, McNutt as Manpower and draft boss, Brown on prices and rationing, Davis on food and farm labor, Jeffers on rubber, Davis on wages and war labor, Morgenthau on money, Jones on loans, Stettinius on lease-lend, Wallace on Economic Warfare, Ickes on fuel, Eastman on transportation, Land on shipping, and Davis on war information.

The experience of these directors shows that almost any action they take conflicts with one of their fellow directors or in some cases conflicts with the military and civilian leadership of the Army and Navy.

Out of the 15 leaders, only four are members of the President's regular Cabinet. This group rarely meets in a body, if it ever has. Their jurisdictional squabbles usually do not get attention until public discussion brings them to the President's consideration The synthetic rubber program is an example.

We still have not permanently settled the dispute between the War and Navy Departments and the civilian War Production Board. We still have no completely coordinated program to prevent serious rises in the cost of living. We still have no one agency with sole jurisdiction over all the factors involved in gasoline rationing. We still do not have one agency with complete jurisdiction over all the factors involved in food rationing. We still do not have one unified direction between economic warfare and loaning activities.

What we need is a genuine war cabinet which would cover all of the fields of war activity and which would meet regularly and promptly. This cabinet would include the principal executive officers. Each one would have definite powers, each one would be held accountable for results and the Chief Executive would have the final authority on resolving any conflicts. This could be a businesslike organization.

3. Along with all of these things, the lawyers here tonight will recognize that we cannot completely neglect the problem of law reform. Law reform has been abruptly arrested by the course of the war and throughout the war Federal procedural reform will probably be relegated to the post-war period.

We can understand that, if the military effort will be aided; otherwise, we cannot understand it.

Our fight is for international justice and our domestic justice must be the basis of that effort. Consequently, we cannot permit the domestic justice to take a holiday throughout the war. Our courts must continue to function. As a matter of fact, we need a more efficient court organization throughout the war.

It is difficult to secure law reform, through legislation, in a war period. The attention of Congress is rightly concentrated on war problems, and there is little time left for technical procedural law reform. Nevertheless, it is possible to have such procedural reform through nonlegislative means.

The lawyers here know that there has been created a Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Federal Rules. This committee can continue to function to promote Federal procedural reform in the civil field, and lawyers throughout the Nation should feel free to consult with this committee.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I am interested in a revision of the judicial code which can definitely stand improvement. Improvement and revision in the judicial code has been impeded by questions of jurisdiction involving two committees of the House of Representatives. Here is a case where Congress must clean its own house. I believe that Congress needs a small but adequate technical staff to work on the problems of revision.

Despite the fact that we are in a war period, the judiciary committees of both Houses are daily considering legislation of far-reaching import relating to procedure and our judiciary system. These reforms, insofar as they do not conflict with the war effort, must continue.

4. Another reform which must continue—and must continue particularly during the war period—is the problem of juvenile delinquency. This problem, likewise, should be the special concern of attorneys who are

peculiarly equipped by the nature of their profession to make recommendations.

The war has brought many hardships to us as individuals and as a people, but it has also brought some great benefits. One shadow which it has left—one scar which it is creating, one casualty which has resulted, however, need not be. I am speaking now of the alarming growth of juvenile delinquency. This problem must be met immediately. The Children's Bureau Commission on Children in Wartime recently met at the White House and surveyed the extent of the problems of juvenile delinquency and the resources available for its prevention and treatment. The results of that conference have not yet been completely assembled, but it is apparent that Federal, State, and local agencies must correlate their efforts in a program to meet the special wartime problems and hazards affecting children.

The health, welfare, and educational problems for young people must be safeguarded through measures such as guidance services, placement services, and a law-enforcement program. We are fighting for human freedom and especially for the future of children in a free world.

We must establish the safeguards for children in the midst of this total war. Children must be protected from exploitation in war-production areas. Their home life must be strengthened even though parents have been mobilized for war production. This calls for a program which includes adequate health education and welfare services, recreation activities, school opportunities, and adequate housing programs, a nutritional program for children, and a program of control for wartime employment of boys and girls under 18.

The increases in juvenile delinquency in wartime are common to all nations at war. It is important that this trend be halted not only for the present but to avert an outbreak of lawlessness after the war. This creates a tremendous need for a strong child-welfare program to supplement home care and supervision.

We need a sound and inclusive welfare program. This is a major problem, and it must be faced immediately, and there is no better group to give guidance and direction to a program to combat juvenile delinquency than the bar associations of this land. That can be a great contribution to the war effort and to the Nation.

5. The lawyers of our Nation should also be concerned with the growing tendency to shift power from the States and cities to the Federal Government. The lawyers of this Nation must be concerned with the tendency which may carry over into the post-war period to move the Government further away from the people. The lawyers of the Nation must be concerned with any possible move in the post-war period to black out the tenth amendment in the Bill of Rights which reserves to the States all powers not delegated to the United States.

Now, in wartime, when we must have a concentration of Federal power, it is well for us to think of an abandonment of that concentrated power in a post-war period. In the post-war era we do not want to see a gradual extension of Federal power at the expense of local self-government. That has been the tendency ever since the Civil War. We do not want to see unwarranted Federal encroachments into the field of State authority in the post-war era. We do not want to break down the covenants of the Constitution.

Lawyers understand this threat because they understand the Constitution. This means also that in the post-war period, we cannot make the Federal Government supreme in the taxing field by an insidious process of infiltration. It is the problem of lawyers to insure the kind of a government that our soldiers will return to after the war.

6. It is the concern of lawyers in wartime to consider the problem of administrative law, and to make recommendations which will make administrative law workable. I don't mean that in this grave hour, we should quibble over the niceties of administrative law, but I do mean that lawyers particularly must fight for the rights of person and property—rights which our soldiers have a right to expect will be intact when they return. We need an administrative law which will protect the public interests.

In this group today there are a number of men who are not lawyers. They know, perhaps better than anyone else, how frequently their problems involve the legal profession and the Government. All of this means that the lawyer and the client have a mutual interest in a revision of administrative law so that the relations between the citizens of our land and Government will be workable. Government agencies today exercise legislative, judicial, and executive functions, and they affect almost every person and almost every economic interest in the land.

There is no evidence that the number of administrative agencies nor the scope of their activities will be materially decreased in the day up ahead. It is the function of the lawyers to see that there is no confusion of judicial and prosecuting functions in government.

It is the function of lawyers to see that administrative agencies do not go beyond policies laid down by the Congress. It is the function of lawyers to see that administrative agencies do not determine facts on the basis of policy rather than on evidence. It is the function of lawyers to see that administrative agencies do not make their determinations on the basis of star-chamber back-room hearings with undivulged reports.

It may not be possible to do so during the war period, but sooner or later, Congress must legislate on this subject to eliminate the defects of administrative procedure which needs reform badly. We need a clearly defined set of agency rules and regulations which are available to all of the people, and we need a system of independent hearing commissioners, and a system of rules subject to appropriate review.

These things are fundamental. Some of them must be postponed until after the war, and some of them must be the subject of immediate action if we are to win the war with the least possible number of casualties in manpower, both on the fighting front and on the production front.

Our job is to win the war, and our job is to so firmly enshrine justice in this land that it will be a powerful force not only for victory but for order in a post-war world.

Now let me conclude with a few words in relation to the world situation and America's responsibility in the post-war period.

The years since September 1939 have seen many of our old concepts die. Life individually and nationally has new meaning. Geographically we in America are only a few hours away from any place on the globe.

The war is not won. It will be won by the United Nations. How soon we cannot tell. With what cost we cannot tell. After the war is won, you ask, what then, what part is America to play?

The answer is not now complete. The cloth will have to be cut to fit the international pattern and the pattern is not now complete. But this we know: America will accept her responsibility, whatever that is, in the post-war period for establishing and safeguarding an enduring peace, thus making our liberties safe.

Two factors have brought America to this conclusion. First, the contracted globe, due to invention and the mechanical genius of man, demanding an end to war.

Second, the realization that we cannot live unto ourselves alone and that America's destiny is wrapped up in the destiny of earth, and the further fact that America owes to the people of earth and to herself the obligation to bring light throughout the earth, showing mankind the way through the republican channel of life—showing the way to justice, peace, economic health, and brotherhood.

Our problems at present are mainly those of production, military strategy, transportation, and keeping our home economy as healthy as possible. The other problem—greater still—comes later—building a better world. We cannot pass up that responsibility and duty. It is up to us after victory to fulfill our destiny. It is America's opportunity and obligation.

America has never been confounded or appalled by any job. It is not by this one. With a prayer in our hearts, knowing that God-directed leadership will be ours, we shall proceed realistically to perform the task before us—equal to every demand and alert to every challenge.

Army Day Dinner Address of Hon. Jesse H. Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, at the Army Day dinner of the Military Order of the World War, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, on April 3, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am honored by your invitation to meet with you, who through the years, have sought support for the United States Army. The Army has too often been neglected in time of peace, and too freely criticized in time of war. When this war is won, there will still be need for Army Day, work for you to do, if we are to prevent another relapse to indifference to preparedness.

It will always be difficult to maintain sufficient national interest in preparedness for our people to tax themselves enough to support the Army properly in time of peace and to keep abreast of changing military science. As a people we abhor war, and are always hopeful that we will not be drawn into another. We forget that the best and cheapest insurance against war is adequate preparedness.

Without the foresight and determination of the President and his military advisers, our Army today would not be able to meet the enemy on battle fronts stretching around the world. Even after this war started in September 1939 few of us thought it would be brought to us, that it would be necessary to send our boys to fight and die in foreign lands and seas; nor did any of us dream we would be required to spend every ounce of our stores and energy and every dollar of our financial strength to prevent the war lords from overrunning the world.

Britain had her Dunkerque and we Pearl Harbor. It took these two catastrophes, Dunkerque and Pearl Harbor, to arouse us to the dangers confronting us and to the fact that we would have to fight for self-preservation, if indeed not for civilization. So we are at it with all our armed strength, our manpower, our stores, and our credit.

What we have already been able to do on many battlefields—which is only a foretaste of victory—is a tribute to our fighting men, who have no superiors, and to the loyal men and women throughout the Nation who are wholeheartedly behind them, ready and willing to make any sacrifice necessary to victory.

The transformation of our peaceful people into an army millions strong, backed by a home front of men and women in factory and field, in the mine, the forest, in transportation, land, sea, and air, in science and invention, and in the home, assures ultimate victory, however dear the price. Our obligation—every one of us who is not at the front—is that complete support, day and night, Sundays and holidays, that will speed the day of victory so that not a single life may be lost and not a body maimed that can be avoided.

Military science, however, is not my specialty, and I will not attempt to tell you how or when or where the war will be won. Suffice it to say that it will be won. It must be won before there can be freedom in the world, before man is his own master. My job has been to assist in converting our civilian economy to that of war and to give some thought to what our problems will be after the war.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other agencies directly under my supervision have authorized the expenditure of more than $20,000,000,000 in the war effort. These operations began as a defense measure under an act of Congress approved by the President June 25, 1940.

Our activities in that period have reached to every corner of the earth where we might obtain the critical materials necessary for fighting a world war and where we might buy things in competition with the Axis Powers necessary and vital to them.

We have at the same time greatly increased our domestic production of many important metals through loans, premium payments, and the construction of mining and smelting facilities.

We now have facilities, completed or nearing completion, sufficient for the production of such basic materials as steel, aluminum, magnesium, synthetic rubber, etc. We have also provided facilities for increasing the flow of guns, tanks, planes, and ships to the levels set by those who need them. We have financed business and industry, large and small, that needed capital to play their part in war production.

Much that has been done in expanding plant facilities and productive capacity will constitute a post-war problem. In addition to plants built directly by the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission, Defense Plant Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has built and equipped 1,479 plants and other facilities costing approximately $7,000,000,000, all of which are owned by Defense Plant Corporation. These include 51 plants for the manufacture of airplanes of all types; 344 plants for making airplane parts; 64 air school plants for training cadets in primary flying; 70 plants for the production of ordnance; 54 for radios and radio equipment, 161 for the manufacture of machine tools; 57 for steel and pig iron; 43 for the manufacture and fabrication of aluminum; 54 for the manufacture of synthetic rubber and its basic materials, butadiene, styrene, alcohol, etc.; 44 plants for the manufacture of 100 octane aviation gasoline; 42 for the production of ships, engines, and parts; building pipe lines, barges, etc. The manufacturing capacity of the country has been increased many times, and much of this increase must be fitted into our post-war program in such a way as to continue in substantial measure the increased employment that has been brought about by the war effort.

Aluminum and magnesium metals, for the manufacture of which we will have a tremendous capacity, are destined to play a very important role in our future economy, as is also synthetic rubber. We will have an annual productive capacity of 2,150,000,000 pounds of aluminum (enough to produce 238,000 transport planes), more than one-half of which will be owned by the Government, as against 327,000,000 pounds privately owned in 1939. We will have an annual productive capacity of 600,000,000 pounds of magnesium, of which the Government will own almost 90 percent, as against 6,700,000 pounds privately owned in 1939.

We will have a capacity for manufacturing more rubber than we have ever used, and that fact alone will need to be considered in readjusting world trade and world economy after the war.

The Government's investment in facilities for the production and manufacture of aluminum and aluminum products will be in excess of $725,000,000, of magnesium $410,000,000, and of synthetic rubber $650,000,000. Some experts estimate that we will be able to produce synthetic rubber for less than 15 cents a pound, as durable as natural rubber, and less than we normally paid for natural rubber.

We will have invested in plants and facilities for the production and manufacture of airplanes, airplane engines, parts, instruments, and accessories $2,640,000,000—this is in addition to all such privately owned plants and facilities; alcohol and chemicals more than $100,000,000; aviation gasoline, $125,000,000; plants for the manufacture of machine tools, $80,000,000; plants for the mining and manufacture of copper, lead, zinc, and other minerals, $160,000,000; plants for the manufacture of guns, ammunition, tanks, and armor, $440,000,000; radio equipment and scientific instruments, $60,000,000; shipbuilding, $150,000,000; and steel and pig iron, $710,000,000. The Government-owned steel-producing facilities will be only about 10 percent of the total in the United States.

All these vast expansions in so short a period of time could only have been accomplished in a country of great resources and by a people equal to any task and any emergency, and under such courageous leadership as that of President Roosevelt. They were necessary because, as you know, we must supply billions in materials of every imaginable character to our allies, as well as transport and service our own armed forces.

To recruit, train, and supply an Army of 8,200,000 men and officers, which, I am advised by the office of the Chief of Staff, General George C. Marshall, will be accomplished by the end of this year, is of itself a very great undertaking, particularly when we must draw so heavily on our manpower for all other purposes in connection with the war.

For the information of those who might feel that an Army of 8,200,000 is large, 2,500,000 of these men will be in the Army Air Forces and many others in the Engineers and Signal Corps, etc., so that we should not visualize the 8,200,000 as massed infantry. And even at this figure we and our allies will have only 321 divisions, while I am informed the Axis Powers can muster 483 divisions in the European theater. It should also be remembered that many of these men will need at least a year's training.

In the 17 months of this war our Army officers have shown outstanding leadership wherever they have engaged the enemy. The days when high-ranking officers directed the attack from a position well behind the lines are gone. Today they fight at the head of their men, leading them onward, setting an example for the men to follow. Our military leaders have imparted inspiration to our troops and given them a spirit seldom demonstrated by enemy forces. Generally, enemy forces are driven rather than led, and lack that confidence in their officers that only fearless leadership can inspire.

We must, however, look beyond the days of conflict. There will be peace on earth again. It will then be our job to make the readjustments which step on the heels of war. We will be treading new paths, for it seems certain that we will not be able to relax our watchfulness as we did after World War No. 1.

We have more than a dim outline of the conditions we will have to meet. First of all, we must do what is within our power to preserve the peace we will have won. This cannot help but mean that we will have to retain a substantial portion of our armed forces until world conditions have become adjusted and permanent peace assured.

We should so order our affairs that our own economy and that of other nations do not provide a breeding ground for another uncontrolled post-war boom which inevitably would be followed by another depression and then probably another war. We in our day have lived through that vicious cycle and want no more of it.

We must remember that what we have done in expanding productivity has been matched in a relative sense by other nations who will have their problems. By the end of the war, productive capacity properly used can save the world, and improperly applied, could become an economic menace.

We must therefore find a sound and sensible solution. This will mean a meeting of minds of all peoples for self-preservation and for the preservation of civilization. A big question for us to decide will be what to do with our Government-owned manufacturing facilities. We will need to maintain a high level of employment to prevent idleness, suffering, and want. But this does not mean that the Government must retain the ownership or the operation of the facilities it has built. Nor does it mean that they should be sacrificed. It means that government and private business must work together to utilize in peace much of the machinery we have created for war.

It is my belief that to a very large extent this can be done if government and business give intelligent consideration to working together in confidence for the common good. This statement may be oversimplified, but it is fundamental. I also believe it can be done without losing the gains we have made for the common good. The strong must not be allowed to exploit the weak. There must be cooperation in post-war thinking and planning, and it must be practical. Even then there will be many tough nuts to crack. The war has forced us into manufacturing fields which we have never occupied before. We are producing many synthetic materials through necessity which with the peace will compete with the natural article.

Practical judgment may, however, tell us that we must maintain such industries at least on a scale which will prevent our ever again being cut off from necessary supplies without which we cannot in a short time become self-sufficient.

Such questions cannot be answered on a narrow, selfish, or sectional basis. They must be faced both as national and international problems. In my judgment, Congress will have no greater task, and it will require statesmanship of the highest degree. It will be easy to act rashly. It may be popular to give away national advantage. There may be great insistence for keeping government in business. There may be extreme pressure to sell to private industry at bargain prices. Congress must decide and with great deliberation.

International aviation will be one of our big problems. It was a new-born child of commerce when the war began, taking its first firm steps. When peace comes, it may well have come to man's estate. In the field of economics and in the even more touchy relationship between nations, post-war aviation will be something we must face frankly

and wisely. It is certain to be a most powerful agency for the development of commerce and good will.

We shall also need to know what to do with the immediate commercial problems of the peace; how to utilize or liquidate the billions of dollars' worth of manufactured goods and foods which will need to find a market as armies are demobilized.

These all too few instances of what peace will mean have brought me to the conviction that if we are not to dodge responsibility, every segment of our economy—government, capital, business, labor, and agriculture—must be ready with blueprints for the future.

There is no need to fear the task. The ravages of war alone will make work for a period. The pent-up demands of civilian consumers will cry for the products of mass production. A gaunt world, undernourished after years of hunger, will need to be fed. Private capital will have the opportunity of replacing Government financing, and private initiative should take up where Government leaves off.

Leaders from all walks of life will be required. They will come from the factory, the farm, from business, and from politics, but the leaders who prevail will be those who, despite the fact that war takes vast amounts of energy and strength from us, have given some thought to the future.

They will be those who have applied practical consideration to man's complete desire for a peaceful world of opportunity.

It has been my privilege to live in a world of opportunity. It is my hope, and I am sure the hope of every patriotic citizen, that the boys who are fighting our war shall have the same privilege. There is no doubt in my mind that they will if we exercise the same practical judgment that we have as a Nation shown in the past; if we maintain for future generations all the rights and liberties that have made our country great.

These remarks may have been addressed too much to the future. There is, after all, a present. The war must still be won.

What we need to do daily is to search our conscience and make certain that we have done nothing to let down our men in uniform.

How many of us can do that and be satisfied with the verdict?

How many of us can say we are doing everything we can in the war effort without the thought of selfishness?

I wonder if we as individuals have yet achieved the degree of patriotism which the hour and the day demand. No one should make excuses for himself or think himself the exception.

And so, to paraphrase the words of Winston Churchill, never has it been possible for so many to do so much with so little effort, if we will only try. All that is needed is for each one of us at home to live up to what our heart tells us is the patriotic thing to do each day.

Those who have died and those who may die have a right to ask us to do that much.

Proposed National War Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Witness of March 25, 1943, published in Dubuque, Iowa, on the subject of the proposed National War Service Act.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ABOMINABLE AUSTIN-WADSWORTH BILL

Now is the time to wage war and win it. Now, right now, American forces and resources should be mobilized to the fullest extent to establish American rights and liberties against their assailants. Every means and every energy should be enlisted and used in the war in defense of American freedom against its dastardly and formidable opponents. No sinister influence should be permitted to impede the national all-out effort in defense of the great American heritage of God-given and Christ-created rights and liberties. Every energy of every man, woman, and child should be concentrated in the crusade for the maintenance of American liberty. American energies are by no means completely mobilized as yet in the defense and assertion of American rights and liberties.

Only freemen can win, defend, and maintain liberty.

Professing to defend liberty, the Austin-Wadsworth bill would lose it by regimenting and enslaving the whole adult manhood and womanhood of the United States.

Regimented labor is sullen, weak, feeble, and ineffective labor. Forced workers are feeble and fumbling and sabotaging; their heart is not in their work. Free labor accomplished the miracle of American mass production. Freemen are the best soldiers of freedom. Slaves are not going to fight to keep their chains. The Austin-Wadsworth bill would maintain freedom by the methods of slavery.

"Enforced and involuntary service for a private master is and has been clearly and repeatedly defined by our Supreme Court as slavery," points out Bernard Baruch. According to the Austin-Wadsworth bill, the draftees are compelled to work for an employer who is in a business to make a profit, and that, according to the law of the land, is slavery. There are adequate laws for the mobilization of American manhood to work or to fight. There is no need nor call for the regimentation of the Austin-Wadsworth bill.

Its regimentation puts the whole war effort into a strait jacket.

Don't hamstring American manhood by regimenting and enslaving it. Release its gigantic energies by freeing and organizing them. Call in the Carnots, the great organizers of victory, and forge American forces and American resources into a destroying thunderbolt, into a mighty, invincible, conquering, Excalibur sword.

The Austin-Wadsworth bill is bad, vicious, blundering, bungling. It is no defense of it to say its intentions are good. "Hell," as Dr. Johnson said, "is paved with good intentions." Liberty is always lost in the name of liberty; democracy undone in the name of democracy; freedom destroyed in the name of freedom. The vast natural forces and resources of the great country are by no means organized and utilized in the war effort. In that effort they are not completely organized and utilized. Negro labor is neglected. Farm labor is dissipated. The vast natural powers of the great country should and can be organized to promote the war effort. No country has such great organizers as the United States.

Call them in and organize American manpower and American resources.

Everybody is trying to do his best. Utilize our forces; utilize the prodigious American energies; don't destroy them by stupidity and hysteria; by running hog wild and abdicating reason.

The Austin-Wadsworth bill is another prohibition measure that defeats its very purpose and entails a whole train of evils besides. A short cut is frequently calamitous. Of itself, passing a law doesn't solve a situation. There is a tremendous difference between drafting a man into the Army and drafting a man into work for a private employer. In the Army a man is under a discipline and serving his country and defending his right and liberties. Drafted to work for General Motors say, he is slaving for the profit of a private employer. The Austin-Wadsworth bill simply won't work; it won't do.

The President of the United States opposes the Austin-Wadsworth bill, and the Archbishop of Dubuque, in the interest of the great American heritage of God-given and Christ-created rights and liberties has to denounce the Austin-Wadsworth bill.

It has nothing to do with politics. It is a bomb aimed at the heart of free America. As an outrage on free America, the Austin-Wadsworth bill ought to be defeated.

Churches Can End War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, at the request of the author I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed by Mr. Tom Burns, of Portland, Oreg., to the editor of the Portland Oregonian, and published in the Oregonian, under date of April 3, 1943.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCHES CAN END WAR

To the EDITOR:

To his everlasting credit, Cardinal Daugherty, head of the Catholic Church in the United States, asked every American to pray for the defeat of the Axis armies.

Therefore, I beg every church, labor, fraternal, and business organization to pass resolutions congratulating his excellency and also appeal to him to request the correct German and Italian authorities to excommunicate Hitler and Mussolini.

It is the studied opinion of the writer (a member of one of Ireland's oldest Catholic families) that both request and appeal would be promptly granted.

This done (since no Catholic will ever obey orders from an excommunicate), millions of liberty-loving Catholics, having been bayoneted into the Axis armies, would revolt and sabotage the military machines of Hitler and Mussolini, thus ending the world's most horrible war, to the eternal glory of their church.

TOM BURNS.

Proposed National War Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD an article from the Witness of March 25, 1943, published in Dubuque, Iowa, giving the views of Archbishop Beckman on the proposed National War Service Act.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPULSORY LABOR BILL OPPOSED BY ARCHBISHOP—AGREES WITH VIEW OF PRESIDENT

"If the proposed National War Service Act of 1943 now pending before Congress is enacted it will mean potentially, if not in fact, the total regimentation of the American people," the Most Reverend Francis J. L. Beckman, archbishop of Dubuque, declared in a statement to the editors of The Witness, archdiocesan weekly, here this week.

The archbishop, obviously indignant, stated that even at the risk of being falsely accused of impeding the war effort, in conscience he had no alternative but to condemn unequivocally "such a totalitarian blueprint for forced labor in the land of the "four freedoms." If the American people permit their representatives in Congress to enact a law the sinister soul of which (no matter how camouflaged) is slavery, that freedom for which our boys are fighting may well fall a dead and empty cause."

The archbishop's statement follows:

"In recent weeks I have had occasion to study the present bill, S. 666, entitled 'A National War Service Act of 1943,' now pending on the congressional calendar. The proposed bill, while democratic enough in appearance, I fear contains more than meets the eye. It is the logical result, certainly, of our present military-manpower goals.

"LARGE ARMY NEEDED

"Of course no one questions the wisdom of the military and other interested authorities in projecting an army of 10,000,000 or more men; but there are so many questions which a thinking American must ask himself as he surveys the vast, virtually untapped, or unused, manpower reservoirs of some of our allies. These millions of soldiers and potential soldiers (who incidentally do not need to be transported to the war theaters) lack food and military equipment which our Government has pledged, in order to enable them to press the battle to an early and successful conclusion. But perhaps American boys in foreign lands are more readily to be trusted with the implements of war when victory comes. All this we leave to the military and other interested authorities for it is not our province.

FORCED LABOR

"But with the end product of their military planning we are indeed concerned, for compulsory labor is something else again; it is the final totalitarian blow to freedom both at home and abroad, a blow from which, despite military victory, we cannot expect to fully recover for many years to come. For once the idea of forced labor has been accepted by our civilian populace we shall all be on a totalitarian toboggan with no brakes to hold it back. No; there is no purely temporary exchange of freedom for slavery. Slavery, involuntary or otherwise, once imposed will be long and lasting as far as the American people are concerned; make no mistake about that.

"On the other hand, our people who have been pledged to this fight for freedom will certainly not be found lacking in patriotic fervor when it comes to voluntary servitude. How could it be otherwise? The American people, once convinced of the need, have never lacked the will to sacrifice. The Civil War cry, 'We are coming, Father Abraham, 300,000 strong,' is not dead, but it still rings in the hearts of our countrymen; they will still respond as free men struggling to maintain their God-given rights.

SLAVERY

"But take these rights away, make slaves of our people, and we have forfeited the very cause for which we fight. Of course, there are always those few in Government, in labor and capital, who would place their own selfish purpose above the welfare of the Nation, but these can and should be dealt with by separate legislation in keeping with the American way, the way of freemen. It was for the ideals of freemen that our ancestors fought, bled, and died; and while, this hour, our boys at the front make once again the supreme sacrifice for freedom, let not that freedom be taken from those loved ones at home for whose security and rights they die.

"Therefore, reviewing this threat to the American way of life which is S. 666, National Service Act of 1943, and even at the risk of being falsely accused of impeding the war effort, in conscience I have had no alternative but to condemn unequivocally such a totalitarian blueprint for forced labor in the land of the 'four freedoms.' I solemnly warn my people that if they permit their Representatives in Congress to enact a law, the sinister soul of which—no matter how camouflaged—is slavery, then that freedom for which even now our boys are fighting may well fall a dead and empty cause."

In connection with the archbishop's statement, it was pointed out here that President Roosevelt told his press conference last Friday he wanted to avoid national service legislation.

Use of Electricity on the Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK VAN NUYS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, on January 19, 1943, Mr. Vincent D. Nicholson delivered a very important address before the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, at St. Louis. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President has recently made the following public statements. I quote:

"Food is no less a weapon than tanks and guns and planes. As the power of our enemies decreases, the importance of the food resources of the United Nations increases. With this thought in mind, we must further mobilize our resources for the production of food."

"Food is a weapon of total war—fully as important in its way as guns or tanks or planes. So are other products of the farm. We of the United Nations are also using food as a weapon to keep our fighting men fit and to maintain the health of all our civilian families. We are using food to earn the friendship of people in liberated areas and to serve as a promise and an encouragement to people who are not yet free. * * * So this year, as never before, the entire Nation is looking to its farmers. Many quarters of the free world are looking to them, too. American farmers are a small group with a great task. Although 60 percent of the world's population are farm people, only 2 percent of that population are American farmers. But that 2 percent have the skill and the energy to make this country the United Nations' greatest arsenal for food and fiber."

Secretary Wickard has said: "In this war, food is as necessary as bullets. * * * Farm production is war production."

This convention is dedicated to the proposition that electricity on the farm is an important instrument in helping to win the war and creating the kind of post-war America for which we are fighting this war.

When I was preparing my remarks for this occasion, I thought to myself, "Why should it be necessary to hold a convention for such a purpose?" It seems to be one of those elementary, self-evident propositions upon which everyone should agree and which requires no discussion.

Suppose I should propose that a convention be called to discuss the proposition that every new industrial plant for war production be supplied with electricity for power and for lighting. People would say, "The man is crazy." Suppose I should propose that a convention be called to discuss the proposition that electricity is vitally essential to our civilian economy in cities in wartime. Again, people would say, "The man is crazy."

We can manage to get along without many accustomed things in wartime. I can easily imagine a complete abolition of the use of automobiles for civilian purposes without a complete break-down of the economy necessary for the war effort. But let us try to imagine what would happen in St. Louis if electricity for lighting and for power were shut off for just 24 hours. There would be unimaginable confusion and chaos. It would be worse than a major air raid. Everyone takes for granted the absolute necessity of electricity in factories and in cities.

The need of the farmer for electricity—the right of the farmer to satisfy this need by his own efforts—should be taken for granted just as readily. The fact is, however, that we have had to fight for a recognition of this need and this right for the past 7 years. We in the Rural Electrification Administration, you in the cooperative movement, have been confronted with the ideology that it is presumptuous for a group of farmers to dare to venture into the light and power business. This week I have read a brief prepared on behalf of most of the utility companies of this State, challenging the right of a group of electric cooperatives to purchase an electric property that is essential to the adequate completion of a rural-electrification program in southeastern Missouri. It contains a hundred pages of sneering sarcasm, making fun of the presumption of a group of farmers in seeking to consummate a perfectly normal transaction in the electric-power field.

During the past 7 years I have fought and bled with many persons in this room, in many States, as we sought to establish the right of farmers to do business in the traditional American spirit of free enterprise. We have suffered some wounds; we have shed some blood; we have lost some battles. But the fact of this impressive convention is proof that we have gone a long way in winning the fight to establish the right of the American farmer to rise in his dignity and go into big business if he wants to, providing for himself a service that others had denied to him.

It is said, however, even by many persons who are sympathetic with rural electrification by cooperatives, that the farmer must now wait until after the war. Recently, in talking with an important man, I was attempting to justify the use of a few hundred tons of copper to connect a few thousand farms located along existing lines. He

said to me, "The farmer got along all right in the last war without electricity; he has got along up to date; he should have replacements of farm machinery to which he has been accustomed; but he should not have any new service or equipment to which he has not been accustomed." This was an honest opinion; it was not influenced by ulterior motives; it deserved an honest answer. What answer would you have given?

This is what I said: The farmer is fighting this war—not the last. He is fighting against great obstacles of labor shortage and the need for increased production. He should not be forced to fight on the production front of 1943 with the tools of 1918. The Army got along all right in 1918 without General Grant tanks; it got along all right without Flying Fortresses. But our armed forces must fight the war of 1943 with the weapons of 1943. The farmers must be denied many things, but the decisions should not be made on the ground that he must do without an essential service merely because he never had it before.

Recently, I talked with another important man with respect to the farmer's needs in wartime. He agreed that arrangements should be made to bring electric power to a much larger number of farmers—power to run motors. But he expressed the opinion that copper should not be used to provide wiring for lights. How would you answer such an opinion?

This is what I said. I told him of a trip I had just made through the great industrial section between St. Louis and Washington. My train passed factory after factory, many of them new. They were brilliantly lighted. Try to imagine, if you can, those factories equipped with electric motors, wired for electric power, but lighted with kerosene lamps. You say that I am fantastic; that the idea is beyond your imagination. Well, what about the idea of the farmer, engaged in critical war production in 1943, forced to work under lighting conditions that are medieval.

Unfortunately, most farmers of America have got to do that—those who live in areas where high lines have not yet been extended. But there are tens of thousands of farms within a few hundred feet of modern lights and power. Civilization has almost reached them—just a few hundred feet away. These farmers, and their hard-working wives and children, must look out of the seventeenth century into the twentieth century—only a few feet away. It is my opinion—and I yield to no one in the honesty of my patriotism as I say it—that there can be no better use for the small quantities of copper and steel necessary to bridge this last little gap of the centuries and give these farmers the equipment of 1943 with which to help win the war of 1943.

At the time of Pearl Harbor, Rural Electrification Administration was at the peak of its activity—in the middle of a year's program of $100,000,000 of loans authorized by Congress. Immediate curtailment was necessary. We were allocated a greatly restricted amount of copper per month. Rural Electrification Administration-financed systems had been using copper at the rate of over 6,000 tons a month. We were first allocated 4,500 tons a month. This was almost immediately reduced to 1,500 tons a month. Within 3 months we were limited to the completion of the projects that were 40 percent complete as of Pearl Harbor. Almost all of these were completed. By midsummer there were only 16 such projects remaining uncompleted. In July the War Production Board issued an order preventing the completion of these 16.

Since then the wartime task of Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives has been threefold. First, providing electric service to certain military establishments and war production industries located in their areas. Yesterday my chief, Mr. Slattery, in his magnificent address told you of the several hundred loads of this kind that are being served.

Second, employing the cooperative organization in certain community activities. Mr. Slattery discussed this important contribution of electric cooperatives to the war effort on the home front. In some of these activities—particularly in the rural scrap campaign—your cooperatives have been the spearhead. You know more than I about these matters, and I shall not attempt to do more than make recognition of this service in which you have used the high esprit de corps, the experienced community spirit, and the efficient organization of your cooperatives.

The third activity of the past 6 months has been the connection of a limited number of farms located along existing lines. Such connections have been governed by a War Production Board order known as P-46. There were two aspects of this order that were important. It set up certain conditions under which connections could be made without special application to the Board. These conditions were so narrow that very few farms could qualify and the number of connections under it has been insignificant compared with the need and the latent demand.

There was another aspect of the order which I should like to mention. It provided that special application could be made for approval of an extension even though the conditions did not conform to the narrow limitations under which service could be extended without special approval.

A large number of such special applications was made. Some were approved, the majority were denied. It has been my opinion that the policy which has been followed with respect to electric extensions has been greatly out of balance with the policy with respect to every other farm need involving critical material. I am informed that for the last quarter of 1942 more than 26,000 tons of steel was allocated for farm fence. I am informed that 2 percent of this amount would have been sufficient to take care of every application to War Production Board during the past 6 months for short extensions from existing electric lines. Copper, of course, has been more critical than steel, but little new copper was required. The cooperatives have had sufficient copper on hand for most of these applications. Ten percent of the allocation for farm fence for the last quarter of 1942 would provide enough steel conductor for nearly 20,000 farm connections.

I should like to give you two typical stories, telling much more vividly than any statistical statement, the human problem involved. An old farmer in Pennsylvania went to the cooperative superintendent, Mr. Jakway, the one and only "Jake," and told him that he needed electricity because his son had gone into the Army and he had no other way to milk his cows. The old man's hands were gnarled and twisted with arthritis. He had a herd of blooded cows. He had a milking machine and had wired his premises. But he was 400 feet from the high line—too far to qualify under the 250-foot rule of Order P-46. With tears in his eyes he told Mr. Jakway that he would have to give up his herd. This one situation was saved by "Jake's" ingenuity in using some old barbed-wire fence for conductor.

A farmer in North Carolina was feeding 4,000 hogs near a military camp. He was using two trucks and four men to haul water. He had installed an electric pump. He was only 70 feet from a cooperative high line. But the application to War Production Board was denied because the premises were not wired before July 1, 1942.

Order P-46 has just been amended and its criteria for electric connections to farms have been greatly liberalized. I do not know how many can qualify under these new rules, and I do not know the extent to which materials on hand can be used. You will receive from Rural Electrification Administration in the near future full information concerning this new order.

The Department of Agriculture, in its new capacity as one of the so-called claimant agencies, has made request to War Production Board for an allocation of enough new conductor, including both steel and copper, to connect about 10,000 farms during the second quarter of 1943. I read and hear about the curtailment of various equipment needed by the farmer and involving critical materials. Compared with normal requirements, some items are cut 50 percent, some 30 percent, some 20 percent, etc. This request for electric service connections for the second quarter of 1943 involves only 2 percent of the copper that was used by electric cooperatives alone in the similar period of 1941. We have asked for 125 tons a month, just about one-half the amount that was formerly used in a single day at the time of peak construction. I am hoping for a program of significant proportions this year, compared with the past 6 months; a program that will help many thousand farmers engaged in critical food production to solve otherwise unsolvable problems of labor shortage and maintenance of production goals. At the most, however, the task of further rural electrification must await the ending of the war.

Your biggest job, during the war period, will be to preserve the strength of this cooperative movement. I believe in Government ownership in many fields. I believe in private business for profit in certain fields. Each of these traditional forms of enterprise has its advantages, each has its disadvantages. You have discovered that the electric cooperative, within its unique field, combines the advantages of both.

What is the secret of the vigor of this movement, epitomized in this great convention? I think I have discovered the secret as I have ridden your cooperative lines in many States. I arrive at a railroad station, I am met by a member of the local cooperative. When we are out of town a mile or two, he points and says, "That is where our line begins." He does not say "the new line" or "the Rural Electrification Administration line." He says "our line." I note in his voice the thrill of a new interest and a new dignity as he points here and there and describes the line and the problems they have met and solved. Farm boys are not going to go to the city in such numbers to take a factory job if they can be directors or active members of a fascinating business operating a property worth a half million dollars or more. It is not only the thrill of this intriguing thing called electricity that has inspired these cooperatives. It is not only the satisfaction of a great want and a great need. It is partly the opportunity to broaden the horizon of men and women who have been too closely tied to the soil.

These cooperatives are business necessities to their members, but they are also a lot of fun as they give their members the chance to go into big business. It is a business that has a unique relation to rural community life; it is a business that is unusually adapted to successful cooperative enterprise. The poles of these electric cooperators are set in ground which their fathers or grandfathers settled. The teeming wires do more than tie together an electric system. They symbolize a tying together of the common interests of the rural community.

A man accustomed to public speaking acquires a certain sixth sense in apprehending a "feel" of his audience. I think every speaker at this convention has felt a surge of life and power in this room this week that

is unusual. There is enthusiasm but no artificial or superficial emotion. It is the quiet, determined, purposeful enthusiasm of a group that is making history in America.

As I conclude my remarks, I want to congratulate you upon your choice of an executive manager. And, Clyde, I want to congratulate you also. You have represented a constituency which I am sure you would describe as the best congressional district in the country. But you have moved on to a wider constituency. You now represent not only the hundreds of thousands of members of the local cooperatives which compose your national association, but also the more than 3,000,000 farmers who do not have electricity and who, when this war is over, will demand the conditions of life and work which inhere in the kind of civilization for which this war is being fought.

Rehabilitation of the Physically Handicapped

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, since the introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 43, a resolution which I sponsored, calling for the establishment of a Division for the Physically Handicapped within the United States Employment Service—I have received a vast number of letters from all sections of the country enthusiastically endorsing both the purposes which will be served by the enactment of the joint resolution and the methods designed to attain these purposes.

These letters have come from all fields and from all walks of life, from outstanding business leaders, from prominent educators, from charitable organizations, from cripples and invalids, and from homes and institutions of all types. These many letters are indicative of the fact that there is indeed a keen and widespread public interest in the matter of rehabilitating America's physically handicapped and raising them once again to the status of self-dependent, productive, and efficient citizens. Indeed, these letters indicate the need for early and effective action in this regard, for they universally voice the hope that the committee concerned and the Senate itself, as well as the other House, will see fit to act upon and approve the joint resolution at the earliest possible date.

As an indication of the widespread and sympathetic public interest which attends this problem, I bring to this floor a tremendously significant and frankly informative letter written on March 16, by Mr. Paul A. Strachan, president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc. Mr. Strachan, though deaf himself, has long championed the cause of the physically handicapped in America, and he has, moreover, put forth a number of valuable suggestions for the effective solution of this particular problem.

Mr. President, because this letter is typical of the hundreds of letters which I have received on this subject, and because it contains certain information and sets forth certain suggestions which might well be of considerable interest and value to the Members of this body in their study of Senate Joint Resolution 43, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. Strachan's letter, together with a copy of the resolution itself, be included in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information and guidance of all those who have a sincere interest in this timely and important question, the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped in America.

There being no objection, the letter and Senate Joint Resolution 43 were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE
PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, INC.,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
1365 NATIONAL PRESS BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1943.

Hon. JAMES JOHN DAVIS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DAVIS: In the present instance, I am addressing you because as former Secretary of Labor, you are, perhaps, more intimately acquainted with the situation outlined hereinafter than any other man in Congress, and are thus in position to see the necessity for and advantages of, the suggestions incorporated in Senate Joint Resolution 43 designed to establish a Division for the Physically Handicapped within the United States Employment Service, which you recently introduced into the Senate, and which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

I need not tell you, Senator, that the problems of the handicapped are very special problems which can be met effectively only through specialized treatment. We have observed the trend for many months past: The rapidly increasing need for more and more manpower; the fumbling and buck-passing; the waiting for something to turn up so that a program for the handicapped could really get under way. But we regret to state that at this moment, despite the fact that industry has made great strides in this direction, the Federal Government is still just about at the same point it was in 1941, when first we brought to public attention our own concept of just what proper rehabilitation program for the physically handicapped should entail. In short, for various reasons, very little progress has been made on the part of the Federal Government toward the development of a sound program for the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped.

So, while the experts were wrangling among themselves, over procedures, etc., much valuable time was lost, and we are therefore gratified to learn that you have introduced Senate Joint Resolution 43, in an effort to bring about some immediate and effective action on this particular problem. And we are further gratified to note that the recommendations contained therein are in direct accord with a number of recommendations which have from time to time been made by this organization.

I shall not attempt to discuss with you, who are undoubtedly far more familiar with the employment service than I, the past or present conditions in the United States Employment Service. We have witnessed, under the impelling urge of war, a virtual convulsion in that service, due to the induction of the thousands of its hitherto State employees. At this moment, it could hardly be forecast whether or not this change is permanent, or whether these State offices will revert to the States after the war. But that is not particular in point here. The questions are these: "Is it necessary to deal with the handicapped as specialized groups—and in a specialized way?" "And is this the time—when our Nation most needs the services of all people who are capable of performing any kind of work—to inject into the employment service a hitherto 'acking element, which, we are convinced, will go a long way toward meeting the problems of the physically handicapped?"

We believe that your resolution effectively answers both these questions. This is the time to move—while there is opportunity and need for such service—so that, whatever may be the aftermath, the germ of the idea—developed and tried under heavy pressure—will carry over into the post-war days as a permanent part of the establishment of all employment offices, whether they be administered by the Federal Government or by the States.

I am familiar with and appreciative of your long and humanitarian service to our country. I know that you have an understanding of the psychology of the less fortuate because of a wealth of personal experience not given to most men. I know that you are in agreement with us in our contention that the problems of the 23,000,000 physically handicapped American citizens are of sufficient importance to demand the sincere attention and careful consideration of all those who have the interest of our people's welfare at heart.

I know, too, that the great Keystone State of Pennsylvania has taken official cognizance of the problems of its physically handicapped citizens, and has, in their behalf, put into effective operation one of the best rehabilitation services to be found among the several States of the Union. So, knowing that we are on familiar ground here, I do not hesitate, in these premises, to commend you upon your service to all those who are physically handicapped and to the Nation, as well, in introducing your resolution.

We are properly convinced—in scanning the recently released information from the Bureau of Placements of the War Manpower Commission, which information shows that only about 92,000 or slightly more than 1 percent of the total of all handicapped registrants have been placed—that the reservoir of manpower which this handicapped group represents has scarcely been tapped, and that further action is necessary if this group is to be permitted to perform its proper function, in behalf of the war effort, and in behalf of its own well-being. We are further convinced that this problem should be dealt with in the most direct way possible. The employment offices of the United States Employment Service—all 1,500 of them—offer the short cut to decisive action and justify, in our opinion, the establishment therein of adequately equipped divisions and subdivisions, dealing directly and exclusively with this particular problem.

We trust, therefore, that the resolution which you have sponsored will be speedily adopted by the Congress and approved by the President—not only as a means of winning the war, but of stabilizing the peace to follow.

Were it not for my deafness, which sometimes leads to misunderstandings, I would very much like to discuss this problem with you in person. But since that is impossible, I am writing you to let you know that your service in behalf of the physically handicapped is deeply appreciated by all of us, and to express the hope that your very commendable resolution will be speedily adopted and placed into effective operation.

With best personal regards to you, I am

PAUL A. STRACHAN,
President.

Senate Joint Resolution 43

Joint resolution establishing a Division for the Physically Handicapped in the United States Employment Service

Resolved, etc., That in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war by utilizing to the fullest practicable extent the services of persons who are physically handicapped, and in order to formulate a comprehensive and effective program for recruiting, registering, and employing such persons, there is hereby established in the United States Employment Service a division to be known as the Division for the Physically Handicapped (hereinafter referred to as the "Division").

SEC. 2. The Director of the United States Employment Service is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to employ and fix the compensation of such persons as may be necessary for the efficient administration of the Division, to establish such number of subdivisions thereof as in his judgment may be necessary to carry out the functions of such Division, and to provide for an accredited representative of such Division in each of the offices of the United States Employment Service throughout the United States. So far as practicable, the personnel of such Division shall be selected from physically handicapped persons, and the Division shall cooperate to the fullest practicable extent with public and private agencies and organizations which are actively engaged in providing employment for physically handicapped persons.

SEC. 3. (a) The Division shall make public monthly the number of physically handicapped persons who have been registered with and provided with employment by the Division, and the number and types of positions to which such physically handicapped persons may be appointed.

(b) The Division shall also report to the Congress every 3 months the number of physically handicapped persons who have been appointed to positions through the United States Employment Service, the types of disabilities of the persons so appointed, and the positions held by them, and such report shall also contain a general statement with respect to the services performed by the persons so appointed and whether or not such services have proved satisfactory.

(c) Each annual report of the United States Employment Service shall contain a full and complete statement with respect to the activities of the Division for the period covered by such report.

SEC. 4. The Director of the United States Employment Service is authorized to make such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Production of Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to the production of rubber, entitled "How About a Recount?", written by Frank C. Waldrop, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 2 last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW ABOUT A RECOUNT?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The high planners within the Government now foresee so much synthetic rubber in 1944 that they have started a circular asking for—believe it or not—new ways to use more rubber in civilian life.

When you consider that this country has always been the world's greatest consumer of rubber for articles ranging from automobile tires to hair combs, and when you consider that the civilian supply of all these is rapidly approaching zero, the composed mind is easily jarred by news that somebody is hunting new uses for a threatened surplus in rubber.

But it is a fact and the idea men all through the War Production Board are at work on it.

Unless new uses are found, the report goes, the country may be flooded with surplus synthetic rubber before it knows what has happened, even though every military need will have been supplied to excess and civilian shortages of normal rubber products ended.

Considering all of which, maybe you would be interested in a brief review of the rubber-production program.

This time in 1940 the United States was buying all the natural crude rubber it could get from the British and Dutch growers, and President Roosevelt had authorized a pilot operation in synthetic rubber of 25,000 tons a year.

This time in 1941, the United States was scared stiff—the Japs had all the British-Dutch rubber plantations and we had a world war coming at us from two directions. And we had no source of crude rubber.

This time in 1942, a really gigantic project for the production of synthetic rubber was laid out for installation over and above the ordinary program of war production.

The rubber program was drawn up under direction of Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones, who financed both the crude natural rubber purchases and, later, synthetic production.

And this time in 1942, Jones' program was being shot at from every direction.

All kinds of scandalizing filled the air. It came from committees of Congress, from lobbyists, from newspaper and radio yippers, from factions within the Government.

The Truman and Gillette committees of the Senate were particularly outstanding as sounding boards.

And the result was that by midsummer, 1942, the President was on the edge of his chair waiting for a report by a special committee of investigators headed by B. M. Baruch.

Well, the Baruch report was pretty rough on the whole governmental rubber record. It was not specifically harsh with anybody, but it was harsh with the end product of everybody's work.

On the whole, the Baruch report conceded that the program of work laid out under Jones' direction would have to be carried ahead, but called for a really powerful single boss for all aspects of the rubber enterprise.

William Jeffers, the hard-fisted and red-hot railroad president, took over.

Day before yesterday, Jeffers announced that there will be plenty of rubber for all civilian automobile tire needs. A few weeks ago he issued progress report No. 2, which was equally optimistic in a quiet way.

This writer has been doing a little cross-checking of the facts and has found out something very interesting.

The rubber production program coming into operation so strongly under Director Jeffers is more than 90 percent the exact, original program laid out by Jesse Jones' staff.

Just about this time a year ago, William J. Madigan, who had been loaned to Jones by the War Department to plan and build the rubber factories, gave an elaborate analysis of his project to the Gillette committee of the Senate.

It told what each plant would produce, and when it would be ready to do so.

The latest figures in Jeffers' forecast of plant completion and production are almost identical with those Madigan gave the Senate a year ago.

In other words, the original rubber-production program is going through not only unchanged in plan, but unchanged in schedule. The only change is in detail, and to cut back volume production.

All adding up to what? Why was rubber production taken away from Jones and given to Jeffers, who has followed Jones' plan and schedule?

Well, one report is that Jesse Jones wanted the synthetic rubber program to be a permanent asset to the United States that would stay in operation after this war.

In so doing he fouled his relationship with the globaloney planners.

Vice President WALLACE publicly advocates tearing down our rubber plants as soon as the British-Dutch plantations in Asia are producing again.

So Jones is out of the rubber business, though his work has proved sound.

The appropriate committees of Congress may some day wish they had straightened out the record on rubber.

Now is the time to do that. Get Jones, Jefferson, Wallace & Co., up there on the witness stand now and let's see what the administration's rubber policy is and is to be.

The Manpower Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "All Must Join in To Win War," written by Robert L. Norton, and appearing in the Boston Sunday Post of April 4 last. It contains a discussion of the manpower question.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL MUST JOIN IN TO WIN WAR—MANPOWER QUESTION DEPENDENT ON MILITARY NEEDS IN DESPERATE CRISIS—NO TIME FOR TEMPORIZING

(By Robert L. Norton)

If compulsory mobilization of manpower and womanpower does finally become necessary, the blame will rest with the administration and the war agencies which have temporized with the problem from the beginning. The fact of the matter is that manpower has been and still is being badly manhandled from Washington.

For months the administration has put off a show-down, relying on indirect measures of compulsion, mainly effective only as regards men of draft age.

Today the country is suffering from a scare over the prospects of a food shortage

due to the belated introduction of the rationing system. Actually, however, people are more scared than hurt.

The highly unfortunate result of the failure to balance our resources and our economy to the desperate requirements of an all-out war is the open insistence of some groups in Congress that first, we do not need armed forces totaling 11,000,000 by 1944, and second, that in any event, the induction of so many millions of fighting men would damage our home front and thus our effectiveness in ultimate victory.

PROLONG WAR IF ARMY'S SIZE IS CUT

This is an admission of the lack of determination to make any dislocation necessary to support and equip the number of men in our armed forces which are judged necessary for victory by our military leaders.

It may further indicate a lack of disposition to make the necessary sacrifices, or a weakening of confidence in our resources and power as a nation.

It does not seem reasonable to assume that the United States with a population of more than 135,000,000 persons, fighting a war for its very existence, cannot mobilize 11,000,000, or only 8 percent of our population, for this purpose, when Germany has mobilized 12 percent and Great Britain 10 percent.

Those who now propose to reduce the size of the Army miss these vital points: That we are engaged in a total war of survival; that total war by its very nature strains the civilian economy to its limits; and that our strategic plans call for an early and conclusive termination of this war by doing all that we can as soon as we can.

If we are not willing to mobilize our manpower this year so as to build the essential army while producing the essential materials and food, if we sacrifice one essential of early victory to another, we inevitably prolong the war. This means additional hardships and sacrifices for all of us, and above all unnecessary bloodshed for our troops.

MUST DO OUR FULL FIGHTING DUTY

There are some publicists and Members of Congress who calmly affirm that time is on our side, but this is not the fact. The war might well end in a stalemate if we were satisfied to make it a war of attrition. This would give the two greatest military powers the world has ever seen, Germany and Japan, the opportunity to consolidate and utilize their vast conquests. We must take the offensive.

Certainly we must retain the confidence of our allies if victory is to be accomplished, and above all we must keep the faith with our own fighting men who are battling all over the globe today.

There are critics of the army program who ask "Why should we fight? Why not give more supplies to the British, the Chinese, and the Russians and let them fight for us?"

Surely this country has not come to the pass where it expects our allies to do our fighting for us.

Subjected to savage aerial assaults, the British have approached the full time war employment of every man, woman, and child in their country. For over 5 years the Chinese have made a heroic resistance and the Russians have fought with indomitable courage and skill. And during this period we have been given time to prepare.

CAN'T AVOID GRIM REALITIES

We would be facing an extremely tough outlook if Russia and Britain had succumbed. This is our war just as much as it is the war of the British, the Russians, and the Chinese. We are sending supplies to the utmost of our ability to these and the other United Nations, and will continue to do so.

But it should never be forgotten that, in the final show-down, victory can only be won by our superior striking power in the air, and with the aid of our ground forces.

"Elemental truths are often the most difficult to grasp," says Under Secretary of War Patterson. "Throughout all ages people have tried to avoid facing up the reality that war is a grim business; have longed for an easy war and have hoped that, somehow, some way, victory could be gained without risking too much or without experiencing the stark unpleasantness of the conflict. But all the wishing in the world does not change the nature of war and its impacts upon all people engaged in it, whether in battle lines or at home.

FIGURE OF 11,000,000 BASICALLY SOUND

"The hour for realism has arrived for every American. We must brace ourselves for mounting casualty lists and reverses on the battle fronts, and for more arduous labors and sacrifices on the home front.

"Realism must extend from fox holes and the pill boxes on the firing lines to the factories and homes of America. When our country is at war, none of us can escape the responsibility of viewing the routine, as well as the emergency duties of life, in the light of their bearing on the final result—unconditional surrender by our enemies.

"We cannot solve our manpower problems by whittling down the size of our armed forces, by permitting one special group after another to obtain blanket deferment. The problem must be tackled at its source. Everyone wants to do his or her share to help win the war and must serve where he or she can render the best service. The decision cannot be based upon personal desire."

Secretary Patterson points out that the figure of 11,000,000 for our armed forces is not something that was pulled out of a hat. It is the requirement determined by those charged with the heavy responsibility of winning this war.

DIFFICULT AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

No reasonable American would question the judgment of General Marshall when he says that we need so many planes and so many tanks to win the war. And neither would any American question the judgment of Admiral King that we need so many escort ships and destroyers to beat the Axis. And this being the case, why should anyone question their judgment as to the number of men that they need to use these weapons and man these ships?

There is, of course, no doubt but that we are faced with a very difficult agricultural situation. Last year agriculture lost approximately 694,000 men to the armed forces, while the lure of high wages drew 1,000,000 workers to the industries.

Practical farm leaders are not very optimistic that the situation can be alleviated by the President's proposal for a land army. They say that what is needed most are men who know something about farming.

Mr. Roosevelt states that by the end of 1943, in addition to the 550,000 farm workers between the ages of 18 and 37, who have already been deferred, some 3,000,000 more agricultural laborers will have been excused from military service.

FARM LABOR MUST BE SKILLED

It is to be doubted, however, if the flow of farm workers to industry can be stopped by such indirect methods. But the implication is that farm workers will not be released from military service except under agreement to return to their employment, and that there will be supervision and checks upon their activities by local Selective Service Boards.

The advocates of the Universal Selective Service Act, or compulsory direction of manpower, for the most part believe irreparable harm has already been done. There is certain to be a serious shortage of farm machinery this year, which will be reflected in the 1943 food production.

It is pointed out that farm labor in these times is skilled labor and anyone not trained in the handling of modern farm equipment and lacking a knowledge of scientific food production is of not much value to the farm owner. It is regarded as more or less absurd to think that we can get maximum food production by taking men from the cities, inexperienced in agriculture, or that women and children can qualify as farm labor except in helping to harvest certain crops.

The doubt is therefore expressed that a further drain of labor from the farms can be stopped unless through the adoption of some such law as adopted in England and Canada, mobilizing manpower so that its maximum efficient utilization is made available to winning the war.

Many agree with Paul V. McNutt, head of the Manpower Commission, who has repeatedly said compulsory national service was ultimately inevitable. Mr. McNutt should know what he is talking about, since a large group in Congress blame him for the failure adequately to meet the manpower problem. Although the inconsistency of this attitude lies in the fact, that while criticizing Mr. McNutt, Congress has denied him any real authority in handling the situation, either in agriculture or industry.

Except as a last resort, Congress has not been disposed to act favorably upon a compulsory manpower bill such as that introduced jointly by Senator AUSTIN of Vermont and Representative WADSWORTH of New York.

The labor unions are opposed to this measure because they know that compulsory selective service would weaken their position. If drafted workers are not forced to join the unions that would create serious internal union difficulties. It would undoubtedly also bring increased public pressure for effective Federal regulations of unions.

LIMIT TO RESOURCES OF UNITED STATES

However, if anything like a complete breakdown in food production does take place, Congress will be called upon to face a decision in both the matter of enforced industrial and agricultural employment. And the outlook is none too favorable in any case.

Those Members who would hold down the size of the Army are greatly influenced by the views of former President Hoover. "We urgently need to determine what we can do within our strength of manpower, materials, shops, and agriculture, and the bottlenecks with which we must contend. We need to determine which of our tasks comes first.

"And, if we determine rightly, we will place agriculture in the first rank of the war effort, alongside of planes and ships. Our imperative necessity is the maximum food production. The American farmer will do it if he is given a chance. And the fate of the world may depend upon it."

Mr. Hoover contends that time runs in our favor. We have undertaken a far larger task than Germany. "But there is a limit even to the resources of America. We have undertaken a job far greater than any other nation in history."

CALLS HOOVER'S VIEWPOINT DEFEATIST

"Germany does not have to build merchant ships to transport much of her armies overseas. She is not building much of a navy except submarines. We must fight a war at 3,000 to 8,000 miles from our shores. We must furnish vast quantities of food and munitions to our allies. We must finance our allies. We must build a host of merchant ships and a larger navy. But we may run so fast that we get out of breath. Trying to do too much too fast may delay the inevitable Axis defeat."

Sharply disagreeing with the ex-President, Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, says: "These proponents who favor drastically cutting down the size of the Army and following Mr. Hoover take a defeatist viewpoint. They

say that no way can be found to mobilize the country's resources of men, food, and other materials to support an army of the size determined necessary by our military leaders. They mean that no way can be found without reorganizing agriculture as we are reorganizing industry, without men and women on the farms and in the towns working harder and sweating more, and without the people generally tightening their belts and submitting to the rationing of many more things.

FIVE IMPORTANT POINTS

"And so these critics propose to take the easiest way out now, no matter what the future risks may be. This is the easiest way to solve the problem. It is also the easiest way to lose the war.

"I appreciate the fact that we are face to face with a very difficult agricultural situation, resulting from men leaving the farms at an alarming rate. But the proposed plan of cutting down the Army ignores five important points:

"1. This problem will not be solved by reducing the size of the Army. More men have left the farms to go into industry than to join the Army. High-paid war industry will still draw labor from the farms.

"2. Reducing the Army will lengthen the war.

"3. Lengthening the war will mean more bloodshed for our sons, brothers, and husbands and more sacrifices for us all in the long run.

"4. We can produce the necessary food and build the necessary Army at the same time, if we do the job of mobilizing our manpower and rationing our food comparable with what our allies are doing.

"5. Until everything else has first been done to make the most efficient use of all available labor, the whole conduct of the war and the safety of the country must not be jeopardized by cutting the size of the Army."

And so runs this great controversy which finally must be settled by Congress.

Probably nothing would give the enemy greater aid and comfort at this juncture of the war than a reduction in our Army.

Policies for the Post-War Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. BURTON Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article discussing policies for the post-war period, by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, as printed in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR ELIOT ON THE PEACE—WRITER IS IMPATIENT WITH ANY WHO WOULD SLOW WAR COUNCIL AIMS OF UNITED STATES

(By Maj. George Fielding Eliot)

It should be obvious that we cannot make a beginning in the planning of United Nations policies for the post-war period, until our allies have assurance that the people of the United States mean to accept their measure of responsibility for those policies. To give our allies such assurance is the purpose of the resolution to be introduced in the Senate by Senators BALL, BURTON, HATCH, and HILL.

Purposes of the organization, which this resolution foresees, are clearly stated.

Better coordination of military and economic resources in prosecution of the war.

Plans for temporary administration of occupied areas.

Plans for relief and assistance.

Procedures and machinery for peaceful settlements of international disputes.

It is the fifth provision around which opposition may center. This calls for assembling and maintenance of military forces to deal with future threat to peace of the world.

"LET'S LOOK CLOSER"

Let us examine this. When the war is over, there will be in many parts of the world American, British, French, Russian, Chinese, and other military forces under combined command.

Cessation of hostilities will not bring these arrangements to an immediate end or cause these military forces to disappear. There will still be occasion for their employment to deal with pressing responsibilities as to disarmament of enemy forces, maintenance of order and security, and carrying out of armistice terms. It does not seem a far cry from this state of affairs to one in which certain of these forces might be employed for the maintenance of peace.

WHEELER RAISES VOICE

It seems incredible that there could be opposition to so reasonable a definition of American policy. Yet Senator Burton K. Wheeler of Montana has raised his voice to oppose it. How can we commit ourselves, he asks, until we know what Russia and Britain want? It is difficult to be patient with such an attitude—how can Russia and Britain come to any decisions until they know that the United States is not going to run out on them as we did the last time?

For the sake of all our futures, this resolution must not fail. Write your Senators today.

Blow to Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix an editorial entitled "Blow to Isolationism," from the Lorain Journal, of Lorain, Ohio, of March 17, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOW TO ISOLATIONISM

All America now knows how we won the war in 1918 and then lost the peace in the United States Senate in 1919 and 1920.

And even as we fight that First World War all over again, there is fear that a revival of isolationist emotion may cause another Senate to throw out the fruits of a second victory. Experience of the last 25 years has demonstrated that all America can get or wants out of victory in these world conflicts is the security of world peace—a world peace that can be attained and preserved only if America takes a leading role in preserving the peace once war has been ended.

But as the world is well aware this time, a President can wage war or end war but only the Senate can ratify peace pacts or approve treaties.

For that reason the resolution put before the Senate yesterday calling for an Allied council to win the war and to preserve the peace by rehabilitating and policing the post-war world has tremendous significance.

Ohio can be proud that one of the four sponsors of this program is Senator HAROLD H. BURTON. The others are the youthful Republican Senator from Minnesota, JOSEPH H. BALL; Senator LISTER HILL of Alabama, one of the Democratic leaders, and Senator CARL A. HATCH, New Mexico, the Democratic author of the clean politics law.

The nonpartisan nature of the proposal is emphasized by the fact that it had the approval of both party leaders.

Furthermore, its sponsors have been at pains to determine probable acceptance before exposing the resolution to debate.

As Raymond Clapper, one of the more experienced and respected Washington columnists, put it:

"This resolution has evolved and grown gradually in the minds of plain American Senators who think that world wars are too frequent, and too costly in lives and treasures and that the United States ought to try to do something to prevent any more of them. The whole move springs out of that simple, grassroots common sense.

"This is not a bloc move of any kind. It is a Senate move. It is contemplated as an impressive act in which the full dignity and power of the Senate is thrown into the development of our foreign policy, to make clear to the world which fork of the road the United States intends to travel."

Farm Labor and Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLAN BUSHFIELD

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Farmers Out in Fields for First Time on Thursday." The article, which is from the Miller Gazette, of Miller, S. Dak., contains a discussion of the manpower and food situation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS OUT IN FIELDS FOR FIRST TIME ON THURSDAY—CONFIDENT OF MAKING WAR GOALS, DESPITE SHORTAGES

Hand County's big battle of World War No 2 began on Thursday.

That battle is, of course, the battle for increased production of food in 1943—probably the most crucial year of the war. Tractors were seen out in the fields in Hand County Thursday for the first time. Farmers were encouraged to begin work in the 1943 crop season by a couple of days of fine weather.

Since much is heard about the manpower and machinery shortages, the Gazette today asked people in Miller who deal with and talk to farmers every day and several farmers themselves just how these shortages will affect Hand County production this year. Their answers would make warranted these generalizations:

(1) Despite manpower and machinery shortages, Hand County farmers will get the

job done and will increase production, given favorable weather conditions.

(2) However, relief from these shortages, especially of machinery would make possible considerably greater production.

(3) The real manpower pinch will come at harvest time if we have anywhere near the favorable weather of last year and the consequent large-sized crop.

Here is what these men have to say about the situation:

"Of course, labor is a problem this year," says R C. Waring, who is a livestock farmer of Glendale Township, "it couldn't be otherwise But the worst feature is machinery. Most of us have been skimping along the past few years with what we had and a lot of it is no good."

Hay tools are most badly needed, Mr. Waring believes. The job would be simplified if most farmers had good machinery.

"Still," Mr. Waring avers, "I don't know of any cultivated land used the last few years which won't be farmed this year. Probably even some that wasn't farmed last year will be farmed this year just because the job must be done and it will be done."

Although the local war board had been discouraged by the production prospects earlier in the year, the outlook is good now, says Clifton R. Winn, farmer and chairman of the board.

"The local war board thought 2 months ago that a reduction in acreage from last year of as much as 25 percent might result from inability to get labor and machinery. As we go into the fields now it begins to look much as if the extra hard work and patriotic effort of Hand County farms will offset that estimated decrease and we may get in as much as a year ago."

The real pinch will come at harvest time, Mr. Winn says, if we have as much as an average crop.

"Then our deficiencies will show up, both labor and machinery, especially machinery." But the willingness to do the job is here, Mr. Winn states, and we are justified in the hope that Hand County will come through.

A. B. Cahalan, president of the First National Bank of Miller, brings up a significant fact about livestock production:

"I think there is no question but what we'll get the job done; everybody is in motion. We are set to produce more weight and numbers of cattle, sheep, and hogs, and poultry, too. There will be a tremendous increase in the pig farrow.

"I see that in North Dakota they estimate a 40-percent increase in hog production. I haven't any doubt but that ours will be several hundred percent."

Here is an example of a farmer hit by the draft and whose production may be cut down thereby.

Art Hartman, farmer of St. Lawrence, and member of the Hand County Board of Commissioners, says, "Generally speaking, we'll get the crop in this year, but the pinch will come around harvest time.

"We can't go to town and get a man when we want him because they just aren't there. Wages are high and that will hurt the small operator who can't afford to pay help."

But Mr. Hartman makes this point for the other side:

"Of course, a lot of us farmers have been taking it easy these last few years. We worked all right, but when something was going on in town we always managed to get in. It looks like we won't be able to do that this year."

Mr. Hartman's son is in the Army and has been in for 2 years and has not been shipped overseas. He has taken training as a paratrooper and is now training with ski troops in Montana.

Mr. Hartman's leg will prevent him from doing farm work this year. If his son is going to be shipped overseas, Mr. Hartman wants him to go. But if he is going to stay on this side this year, he would like to have him back. Provided the boy can come back, Mr. Hartman can put all his 320 acres into production. If not, Mr. Hartman can have a neighbor farm about half of it with the help of a neighbor who by way of exchange will get the use of Mr. Hartman's tractor.

"I remember when in the last war," says C. W. Gardner, secretary-treasurer of National Farm Loan Associations in Hand and Hyde Counties, "we were worrying about our county's share of food production to win the war; my father closed the argument this way: 'Don't lose any sleep about that. When all the people of Hand County start in to do something it will get done. You don't know how much we can produce if we have to because it's never been tried."

If our ranches and farms don't equal last year's record, it will be for the reason that Nature isn't good to us and not for any other reason, Mr. Gardner says. "That will be in spite of the absence of the boys and the tragic need for some machinery. Better not sell your county short on food production, or War bonds, or Red Cross either."

County Agent N. E. Beers sizes up the situation this way:

"Hand County farmers are going to make a determined effort to plant all of the feed grains and cash crop possible, even with some handicap coming from shortages of labor and machines.

"With favorable seeding conditions," Mr. Beers conservatively states, "the amount of unseeded cropland may not exceed that of last year. During the past few years there has been from 30,000 to 50,000 acres of idle land, but this is not the same land each year.

"There are few, if any, farms for rent with suitable buildings, water, and other facilities for crops and livestock," and this answers to a great degree whether a bigger part of Hand County land this year will be devoted to production.

Hand County people are getting down to essentials as far as the manpower situation is concerned. "Farmers' wives and daughters are already making plans to take up part of the burden of field work and the handling of livestock," Mr. Beers says. Girls as young as 12 years and plenty of farm wives are looking forward to driving tractors this year, and it is amazing what these ladies can do in addition to their regular home duties.

"It is quite apparent that every effort will be made to produce all the feed and all of the livestock that is humanly possible to produce under the existing limitations of labor and machines," Mr. Beers concludes. "Good prices and a partiotic desire to do their best are contributing to this effort on the part of farm families."

About the only thing that can hold Hand County down this year is Old Mother Nature. It certainly won't be any lack of patriotism. Stories in this newspaper about exceeding War bond quotas and exceeding Red Cross quotas show that Hand County is in this war to win it. They will carry that patriotism right out into the fields this year.

On the Ruml Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Indianola Record, Indianola, Iowa:

ONE EATS ON TICK—THE OTHER PAYS

Just what is this Ruml tax plan and why did it go up so quickly and come down with such a bang?

As we see it, the secret of the whole argument is that the supporters of the plan didn't want to say it was a plan to prevent war industry workers from getting out of their taxes; and the opponents didn't want to say it was a plan to keep the middle-class people, like most of us folks here in Warren County, from paying more than their share.

A lot of hullabaloo was made over the fact the Ruml plan would let a horde of rich people out of their 1942 income tax; but not much was said about the fact that without it we ordinary folks with moderate incomes will pay double, along with the rich.

A lot of the money made in this war is made by people who have not heretofore had any or much income tax to pay. Now they have incomes equal to the fairly well-to-do. A good many of these suddenly increased incomes go to young people who have perhaps had practically no incomes before. They are spending their money as fast as they get it.

Now the man who spends his money as fast as he makes it has nothing with which to pay income tax. Not even the Government can get blood out of a turnip.

That means the fellow at perhaps the next bench, who has saved his money, pays his income tax, while the profligate, earning the same wages, gets off with none.

When we start on the new year on a pay-as-you-go plan, the saver will pay along with the spendthrift after having also paid for last year.

The New Deal crowd, running true to form, hold up the old bogey man, the rich, in order to cover up the fact that the spendthrifts and the ne'er-do-wells, the backbone of the New Deal, are getting off without any taxes.

Congressman FRANK CARLSON, the Centralia, Kans., farmer, knew when he introduced the Ruml plan that his farmer constituents were the fellows who were being caught for double taxation.

It is as if John Doe and Richard Roe go into a restaurant, get their dinners and tell the proprietor they will pay him the next day. When the next day comes John Doe pays for yesterday's meal. But Richard Roe says he has no money. The food is eaten and Dick has nothing to show for it, so the restaurant man holds the bag.

But the cafe adopts a new rule, you pay before you eat. So both John and Richard pay their money and go in to dinner. John is paying two prices for two dinners, but Richard eats two dinners for one price.

It is against having to pay for both meals while the new dealer eats free that FRANK CARLSON is trying to protect his Kansas farmers.

Religion and the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include a letter written by one of my constituents, Mr. William Montgomery Bennett, of Woodbury,

which appeared in the Churchman for April 1, 1943, and also an editorial written by the editor of the Churchman in the same issue.

The letter follows:

RELIGION AND THE PEACE

To the EDITOR OF THE CHURCHMAN:

If, as is generally agreed, civilization flows out of and is based upon fundamental religion and the spirit of Christianity, then, to save and perpetuate that civilization must not Christian principle underlie the thinking, acts, and decisions of the peace conference which will follow this war?

Can there be found a definite plan of action whereby the spirit and ethics of Jesus can be brought to bear directly on the hearts and minds of the delegates to that conference so that, for the first time in human history, a lasting and just peace under God may be established for all the nations of the world?

I believe that such a means exists. At every peace conference the accredited delegates are armed with a corps of experts, consultants, and specialists on every subject—except religion. Apparently only political and material considerations heretofore have guided such delegations in their deliberations and decisions, notwithstanding that the civilization they have sought to sustain springs from spiritual rather than from material ideals. Can civilization do anything but suffer if the very laws of its being are violated or ignored?

I therefore suggest that, in connection with constituting the personnel of the peace conference, all governments at issue shall agree to set up a religious committee composed of clerical and lay delegates appointed by each major faith of every country—such religious group to function as an international religious advisory committee to the peace conference. Designated spokesmen of this group would have seats at the peace table. The religious committee would study all proposals submitted by the delegates at the peace table, make known to the peace conference through its spokesmen its views thereon and, further, formulate and submit to the general conference for consideration its own views and recommendations bearing on the peace treaty. This religious committee would be an integral part of the conference, sponsored by each government, and would act in an advisory capacity only.

Would not the development and adoption of such a plan implement the universal desire of men of good will all over the world that Christian principles may actually and effectively enter into the making of peace? That general desire is now finding expression through over one hundred committees in these United States alone. Unfortunately, those committees, aspiring to approximately the same aims, fall short of the mark through failing to propose some realistic means for realizing their aspirations at the one place that will count—the very peace table itself.

From a purely practical standpoint a peace made not alone by the political representatives of the nations but also under the eye and with the aid of the outstanding religious leaders of those nations will have readier and more whole hearted acceptance throughout the world. Further, a common religion—brought actively to bear—among many of the delegates might develop as a most important influence for harmony and unity.

As Christopher Dawson says: "The hope of the world rests in the last resort in the existence of a spiritual nucleus of believers who are the bearers of the seed of unity."

Would not an outstanding religious group at or near the peace table carry and plant that "seed of unity"?

WM. MONTGOMERY BENNETT.

WOODBURY, CONN.

The editorial follows:

RELIGION IN THE PEACE

The recent statement by the Federal Council of Churches on plans for the post-war world—they appear in full in this issue—gives stress to the responsibility of the churches for the kind of world we are to have for future generations. In this connection we call attention to the suggestions made in a letter by William Montgomery Bennett in The Open Forum. Mr. Bennett, who is a communicant of the Episcopal Church and a consultant on economics and public relations, outlines a definite plan for the participation of church leaders in the setting up of peace. He points out that at every peace conference there are experts representing all sorts of interests, except religion. He therefore calls for the setting up of a religious committee composed of delegates from all churches in every country, to function as an international religious advisory committee, and, though only advisory, to be an integral part of the peace conference. We can see many politicians throwing up their hands in horror at this suggestion. They are always convinced that religion is dangerous. We are happy to agree that it is—whenever it gets outside the churches and into human relationships. But it represents the kind of danger of which the world stands in dire need—and particularly the world of tomorrow.

Cultural Relations With Latin-American Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution introduced by me today:

House Resolution 203

Resolved, That the President is hereby authorized and directed to transmit to the House information so fully as possible, from the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs showing the actual status of the functions, duties, operation, and administration of cultural relations thereof of and in relation to the State Department of cultural relations.

SEC. 2. *Resolved further*, That the President is hereby authorized and directed to transmit to the House information so fully as possible defining and distinguishing the information service duties of the following agencies: Office of War Information, Board of Economic Warfare, Lend-Lease, and Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.

Address of Protest by James B. Carey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the address made by James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the C. I. O., at New York City on March 30, protesting against the execution by the Soviet Government of two Polish labor leaders, Alter and Ehrlich. Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, addressed this same meeting to voice his protest against these executions.

The address follows:

All of us assembled here tonight regret the necessity for this meeting. All of us must wish that we could devote our full and undivided energies to the war against Hitlerism and its allies, and all of us wish that the two men whose memory we are honoring might still be with us, serving in the legions of international labor. At this moment, when so much of man's hope rests upon the incomparable heroism of the Russian people, one can only feel a sense of tragedy about the words we are called upon to speak.

But the tragedy would be even greater if we remained silent. To us in the labor movement, this war is not merely a negative crusade against the evils of fascism. It is a struggle to affirm those principles of justice, and the dignity of individual human life, which have been symbols of the labor movement in all times in the past. We have spoken out against the continued enslavement of the people of India. We have raised our voices against the humiliating and continuing persecution of Negroes in our own country. We have been aware that some of our words will be parroted and broadcast by our enemies; but we have not remained silent. We spoke because we knew that the ultimate strength of our cause would be increased, not lessened, by our open determination to face and wipe out injustice behind our own lines, as well as in the lands that nazi-ism has conquered.

I know of no men of independent thought who have been persuaded that Alter and Ehrlich were guilty. I have read and reread the "explanation" submitted by Ambassador Litvinov, and each time the explanation appears less convincing. These men were leaders of labor. They were antifascists. They were Socialists. They were Jews. Their lives were a record of uncompromising resistance to the intellectual and physical barbarism which reached its climax under Hitler. All that they stood for was endangered by the Nazi advance. Are we to believe that they urged the Russian armies to cease fighting against Hitlerism? Those who seek to defend these executions are reduced to the grim self-deception practiced recently by one columnist in the Daily Worker, who wrote:

"These men were guilty or they would not have been executed."

No apologist for any tyranny ever spoke more frankly. But international labor cannot ignore the clamor of conscience and accept this twentieth century version of an old jingo line—"my country, right or wrong."

I say that I know of no men willing to confront the issue who accept the guilt of Alter and Ehrlich. But I know others who believe that we should not openly state the questions that are flooding our minds. They say, "Now is not the time," or "we can't afford to argue among ourselves." I have said and I repeat that we cannot accept this timid council without slowly abandoning that sense of justice and devotion to truth that distinguish the antifascist world from the black fascist hemisphere.

Others say: "Yes; the executions were a great injustice, but we must not allow them to distort our perspective. We have a new world to build; we have enemies on every side; we must lay the foundation now for lasting collaboration among the United Nations, or else the world is doomed to a new era of war."

I strongly agree. The organization which I represent agrees. And tonight, since we

have pledged ourselves to speak frankly, I intend to confront that problem with utmost candor. We of the Congress of Industrial Organizations mourn the memory of Alter and Ehrlich; but we believe they would have hoped that their martyrdom would strengthen, not destroy, the solidarity of the working people of the world. Their sacrifice will have been in vain if the hope of a better world is lost. We believe that the shaping of a new world is the fundamental responsibility of labor in all countries; and we of the Congress of Industrial Organizations are dedicated to that goal.

That is why the Congress of Industrial Organizations has sought the creation of an international labor committee representing American, British, and Soviet workers. We have criticized the refusal of the American Federation of Labor to join in such a committee. In the spirit of free and frank discussion which prevails here tonight, I say that we do not retreat from that stand; we do not abandon hope that such a world labor body may yet be formed. And I believe that the protests being voiced here tonight would be stronger, if all sections of the labor movement in the United States had been willing, despite the real difficulties which exist, to undertake common action with the trade union of Russia as well as other countries.

Having made this clear, let me make equally plain that we do not view this program for common action as a 1-day partnership. We recognize that the execution of Alter and Ehrlich has been a grave blow to our vision of world labor unity. While recognizing the debt all people owe to the Soviet workers for their heroic resistance against nazi-ism, there can be no true unity achieved unless the Soviet Government acknowledges its responsibility to the workers of other countries. There can be no true unity without recognition that we are equals; that American workers and Polish workers and workers everywhere have a right to choose their own leaders; that any attempt by anyone to dictate their choice can only shatter the unity we seek. There can be no real unity if only those labor leaders who have blindly worshipped the emissaries of the Communist International are welcomed by the Soviet Government at the international council tables. And when two great leaders of labor are executed, we have the right to demand the truth about the execution and to air the case in the court of international conscience.

I know that there are forces within our country and abroad which still dream of an anti-Soviet front in Europe. We in the Congress of Industrial Organizations have challenged these forces and resisted their actions. It is perhaps inevitable that the Soviet Government should still look with suspicion at the continued presence of some of these men in high places. But these men are not Americans any more than Alter and Ehrlich can be confused with the pro-Fascist landlords of Poland. The Soviet Government can dismiss the crocodile tears spilled by the Hearst press and other traditional foes of labor over the execution of these two men. But it cannot dismiss the questions and the fears stirring in the minds of millions of workers all over the world who knew the record of Alter and Ehrlich. Their questions, their fears, must be answered if world labor unity is to be won.

In asking that the Soviet Government respond to these questions, I am not presenting issues of "internal" Russian politics. I note here for the record—whatever my private opinions—that I did not publicly discuss the Moscow trials, or other acts of the Russian Government which created widespread controversy here. But the Alter-Ehrlich case extends far beyond national boundaries. It cuts deep into the whole future of world labor. The victims were Poles, not Russians; many people looked to them as the leaders of a great democratic reconstruction in Poland; their fate carries an implied threat to the integrity of labor leaders in other countries; I might also add, as other speakers will undoubtedly note, that the Russian workers in the past have often joined with us in protesting injustices and persecutions in our own country. We have welcomed such demonstrations—in the case of Mooney and Billings, and of Sacco and Vanzetti. We ask them to see our protest tonight in a similar light—as a gesture, not of hostility to Soviet labor, but of concern for the future of world labor organizations.

In no sense am I suggesting any program of political uniformity for the social structure of all countries. In the long run, such decisions must be made by the people of each nation. I believe in our democratic traditions, in the slow but free processes of debate and action which we have developed as a way of life. I am not seeking to impose this tradition on anyone else. But we are fighting a war so that the people everywhere shall have a chance to make their own choice; so that the organizations of workers shall be free to organize and act. And any challenge to that freedom, from any source, must be met.

Out of the darkness and suffering of the present era, I believe that we shall yet win a new day of common understanding and world solidarity. I have said earlier that we of the Congress of Industrial Organizations do not despair of world-labor unity; we shall continue to fight for it. In that fight we must seek a common language through which the workers of all countries can speak to each other. It is a tragic fact of our time that American workers have had little chance to know and understand the workers of the Soviet Union; and I believe the reason is twofold. The first is that for two decades, most of the American press has deliberately endeavored to widen the gap between us; to prevent us from knowing the real achievements won by the Russian workers in their quest for economic security.

We have been fully told one side of the story—the story of political rigidity and suppression—but we have been told little of the other side—of economic change and enlarged opportunity. But it would be foolish to believe that this is the sole reason for our misunderstanding. The other key fact is that the Communist Parties operating in this and other countries have proclaimed themselves the only true representatives of the Russian workers. It is my considered opinion that the activities of the Communist Party in this country, with its savage vilification of all who refuse to follow the party line, with its sudden reversals of policy and its ideological twists and turns, with its totalitarian habits of mind and ways of action, remains a major barrier to true American-Russian understanding. As long as the Soviet Government lives in the delusion that the Communist Party represents American workers, it cannot conceivably appreciate the problems that divide the workers of our countries.

This is a time that requires frankness, and I have spoken in that spirit. I have spoken in the belief that we fight a war not only for survival but for the liberation of the human spirit; and that the workers of all countries must make common cause now to lay the foundation for a bright new era in human history.

Florida Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMORY H. PRICE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of April 6, 1943:

ICKES DUPED CONGRESS ON OIL, HENDRICKS CHARGES—FLORIDA CANAL SNAG BLAMED ON ICKES—HENDRICKS, OTHERS ASSAIL OIL CHIEF

(By George Dixon)

Representative JOE HENDRICKS, Democrat, of Florida, declared yesterday that the House Appropriations Committee had been duped into voting down the Florida barge canal. A sort of Tinker-to-Evers-to-Chance play by the Office of Petroleum Administrator Harold L. Ickes, he added, did the trick.

The $44,000,000 canal project was defeated in the committee 21 to 19. HENDRICKS declared that at least four members—enough to have reversed the picture completely—had admitted to him they had been bamboozled.

The duping was accomplished, according to HENDRICKS, by the testimony before the committee of George A. Wilson, of Ickes' office, that the fuel oil situation was now well in hand and requirements could be met next winter without rationing.

Inasmuch as the major argument for the canal is that it will help assure an adequate supply of petroleum for the East, the Wilson testimony proved deadly, HENDRICKS said. He added that members who had come in with an open mind were convinced the canal wasn't necessary.

After Wilson gave his testimony, the committee voted. That was last Wednesday. Then, on Saturday, Ickes himself came out with a statement that his subordinate, Wilson, had given the wrong impression about the oil situation.

Ickes said it was unfortunate that Wilson had made any such statement, because the fuel business was far from solved. It is impossible to say now whether there will have to be rationing next winter or not, he added.

"That gives you an idea how it was done," said HENDRICKS. "Wilson came in and virtually said the barge canal wouldn't be necessary because the new pipe lines would give the East all the oil it needed. So the barge canal was voted down. Then, after it was killed, Ickes came back and says that Wilson was wrong."

Representative JOE STARNES, Democrat, of Alabama, also criticized the Ickes office. Members of the committee, he declared, undoubtedly were swayed by the testimony of the Petroleum Administrator's representative. Representative ALBERT J. ENGEL, Republican, of Michigan, said he knew Wilson's testimony had carried great weight.

Two other members of the committee, who refused to be quoted, said they would have voted differently if Ickes had corrected his subordinate's testimony in time. They said they couldn't understand why Ickes waited so long before announcing that Wilson was in error.

PLENTY MORE TO SAY

"Ickes can't say he didn't know all about it," said Representative HENDRICKS, "because

it was in the papers. Furthermore, Wilson wasn't the only man from his office there. Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator, was before us, too."

HENDRICKS said he would have plenty more to say later.

"I am not saying right now that I think Ickes instructed Wilson to give the testimony he did," the Floridian declared. "But if he didn't he is to blame anyway for having such incompetent men in his employ."

HENDRICKS said he was convinced Ickes' main objection to the barge canal was that it would tend to take complete control of oil distribution out of his hands. Ickes, he said, is all for the pipelines because he can exercise direct and complete control over them.

H. H. Buckman, engineering counsel for the Florida Ship Canal Authority, had this to add:

"It may be pertinent that, at the time Wilson testified, the War Production Board had not granted materials for Ickes' new 20-inch pipe-line, and approval of the barge canal appropriation by Congress was a threat to the granting of such materials. Now, the War Production Board having granted the new pipe-line materials, Ickes states, in effect, that his deputy misled the committee. This is an amazing admission."

Proponents of the barge canal, however, are not finished. They have carried it to the Senate where they hope to override the House action and have the item rewritten into the War Department's civil functions appropriations bill.

The Senate fight will be led by Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, once a bitter opponent of the canal. Senator BRIDGES said he had changed his mind after a survey had convinced him it was the only way in which an adequate supply of oil for the East could be obtained.

Distribution of Surplus Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concurrent resolution calling the attention of the Government of the United States to certain facts with reference to food rationing and distribution of surplus commodities:

Whereas Nation-wide food rationing has been instituted by the Federal Government and its agencies, and every person in the Nation will receive only a limited amount of certain commodities under the point system of food rationing; and

Whereas prunes and tomatoes are two of the foods included in this system of food rationing, and both have a high point value; and

Whereas it takes 20 points, or almost one-half of 1 person's points for 1 month to purchase 1 pound of prunes; and

Whereas men in the armed forces complain of having no milk and of having to drink black coffee; and

Whereas at the same time these conditions exist the Federal Government through its agencies is distributing free to schools in this State, as a part of a so-called surplus commodity, prunes, tomatoes, and canned milk; and

Whereas much of the milk distributed is going into rural schools for children who have plenty of fresh milk at home and who do not want and will not use canned milk; and

Whereas such distribution under these conditions and at this time denotes inefficiency, waste, extravagance, and lack of coordination and lack of understanding by the various Federal Government agencies, bureaus, departments, commissions, boards, and officials, and constitutes unwarranted waste and extravagance in Federal expenditures creating confusion and doubts in the public mind as to the ability of the various Federal governmental agencies in charge of such activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the senate concurring), That this matter be called to the attention of the Government of the United States to the end that some steps may be taken to remedy the situation; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota is hereby instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States, and to the Senator from the State of Virginia, the Honorable HARRY BYRD.

International Stabilization of Currencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the statement issued yesterday by the Secretary of the Treasury concerning post-war monetary problems.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST-WAR MONETARY PROBLEMS UNDER STUDY TO HALT THREAT OF INTERNATIONAL CHAOS

For some time we in the Treasury have been deeply concerned with the threat of international monetary chaos at the end of this war.

We feel that international currency stability is essential to reconstruction in the post-war period and to the resumption of private trade and finance. It is generally held that this formidable task can be successfully handled only through international cooperation.

I think further that most of us would agree that the establishment of a program adequate to deal with the inevitable post-war monetary problems should not be postponed until the end of hostilities. It would be ill-advised, if not dangerous, to be unprepared for the difficult task of international cooperation when the war ends. No one knows how long or how short the war will be. We therefore believe it is desirable to begin now to devise an international monetary agency adequate to cope with the problems with which we shall be confronted when the war does end.

TO TAKE MANY MONTHS

The completion of such a task is certain to take many months at the least. Specific and practical proposals must be formulated and must be carefully considered by the policy-shaping officials of the various countries. In each country acceptance of a definite plan can follow only upon legislation or executive action. And even when a plan is finally adopted much time will be consumed in establishing an organization capable of beginning effective work.

There is another important reason for dealing with this problem now. A plan for international monetary cooperation can be a factor in winning the war. It has been suggested, and with much cogency, that the task of assuring the defeat of the Axis Powers would be made easier if the victims of aggression, actual and potential, could have greater assurance that a victory of the United Nations will not mean in the economic sphere a repetition of the exchange instability and monetary collapse that followed the last war.

The assurance should be given now. The people in all of the United Nations must be encouraged to feel themselves on solid ground. They must be given to understand that a victory of the United Nations will not usher in another two decades of widespread economic disruption. The people must know that we at least recognize the fundamental truth that prosperity, like peace, is indivisible.

METHODS UNDER STUDY

With these points in mind, the technical experts of the Treasury and other agencies of the Government for some time have been studying methods by which post-war monetary stability can be achieved. No specific plan has yet been considered by this Government, but preliminary suggestions of our technical experts have been formulated and have been made available for exploratory study of the experts of other interested governments.

The technical men of other governments have likewise been studying the problem.

Our own thinking along the lines of currency stability has not been addressed to concocting some panacea that will automatically cure all the economic ailments of a postwar world. Rather we have attempted to address ourselves to the specific problem of foreign exchange stability and the common-sense way of achieving this end.

Our views are based on the rich experience that this country has had in cooperating with other governments in our attempts to maintain exchange stability. We have tried to adapt that experience to the broader and more difficult currency problems confronting the world during the post-war years.

We have also kept in mind the pattern laid down by the tripartite agreement and our own stabilization agreements.

TENTATIVE PROPOSAL

Our tentative proposal is to establish an international stabilization fund in which all the United Nations and those nations which are associated with them in this war would participate. This fund would constitute an international agency, with powers and resources adequate to promote the maintenance of currency stability.

The cooperating governments who would participate in the program would, among other things, undertake not to engage in competitive depreciation of their currencies. This stability would be in large measure secured by fixing the value of currencies in terms of gold, and by providing that changes could not be made without consultation with other members.

The resources of the fund that we have in mind would be provided by the participating governments in an amount and form suited to each nation. Participation would be in the form of gold and local currency and public obligations of the member countries. The operations of the fund would include buying and selling of foreign exchange under adequate safeguards.

The fund would deal only with treasuries and central banks. It would not compete with private banks or existing agencies. Its operations would be maintained only to supplement the efforts made by each member government to maintain monetary stability.

ESTABLISHED CHANNELS

The established channels of international trade and international banking would be retained in full for all international transactions.

We have given special attention to the solution of certain troublesome monetary problems growing out of the war and have included suggestions for handling of such problems. In particular, the fund would facilitate the restoration of free exchange markets and liberate the abnormal balances which have accumulated in some of the countries as a consequence of war conditions.

The control of the operations of the fund would be in the hands of an international board appointed by the governments of the member countries and the voting power on that board would be related to the contribution which each country makes to the required fund.

The creation of an international agency of the character that we are contemplating is a logical development of the various tentative steps which have been made in the direction of stabilization of currencies during the immediate pre-war years.

I have been anxious to discuss this matter with you and to keep you informed of developments. Obviously we are still in the early stages of our thinking and discussions. However, I did want you to know what we are doing, and I do want to feel free to come back from time to time and discuss the subject with you and obtain your views and advice.

The Work of the Committee to Investigate the War Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] before the Chamber of Commerce of Cleveland, Ohio, on April 6, 1943, on the subject of the work of the committee to investigate the war program.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to be with the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce today. I am doubly happy to be here because this is the home city of my friend and very able colleague, Honorable HAROLD H. BURTON, who is a Member of the Senate special committee of which I am the chairman. He is a credit to this great State of Ohio and this city should be proud of him. All of us, who represent the United States of America in the Congress, stand for certain great principles of government as outlined in the Constitution. We all believe in these principles regardless of our political affiliations.

Today these principles are endangered by foreign enemies. The freedom that we have so long cherished is in peril. America is being attacked on every side—in the Atlantic, the Pacific, the Caribbean. American lives are being lost and American ships are being sunk, but Americans are fighting—as they have always fought in the past, with honor and with glory.

This world-wide war will determine for generations to come whether we will live in a world of democracy and individual liberty, or in a world enslaved, brutalized, and terrorized by barbarous aggressors. The pattern is clear, the enemy has embarked on a path of world-wide conquest—the ultimate goal the complete and utter subjugation of all nations of the world. This is his challenge to the United Nations. We have accepted that challenge.

To take the offensive and win this war—and we must take the offensive, because wars are not won on the defensive—we must produce vast amounts of instruments of war. We must equip the forces of the United Nations to carry the war to the enemy wherever he may be—and carry it successfully. On the battlefronts of the world our fighting men need planes, tanks, ships, and guns, and they need them now. We have already suffered serious reverses because our forces have not been adequately equipped. We shall not allow this to continue. I have said before, I say now, and I will say again, that American lives must not be lost because of inadequate equipment.

However, when the savage blow fell which brought the United States fully into the war—the dastardly attack of the Japanese on Pearl Harbor—we were not completely unprepared. When it became apparent that the Nazis had embarked on a course to crush and conquer their friendly neighbors, our Nation began to prepare for defense against the aggressor. Our President early determined that adequate defense of this Nation against our enemies compelled us to institute a program of armament greater than the world had ever seen before. The construction of our two-ocean fleet was well on its way when the Nazis swept through France. While the battle of Britain raged, large plants were manufacturing planes and guns and tanks and all the supplies of war. It could be seen then that America's lines of defense were not our shores bordered by the Atlantic and the Pacific, but were in Britain and China and wherever free men were fighting the Nazi savages and their allies. Hence, by lend-lease aid we made it possible to furnish sinews of war and foodstuffs to the gallant warriors who were then fighting against Nazi aggression.

We can be proud, indeed, that through these efforts Britain was saved from the blitzkrieg and today stands undaunted against our common foe. Our valiant allies, the Chinese, have not as yet been supplied with all the guns and ammunition and planes that we would wish. We may be thankful, however, that with the aid of the supplies we have furnished they have succeeded in holding off the treacherous Nipponese.

When Russia was overrun by the Nazi hordes, munitions of war were already flowing from our factories into the hands of that brave ally of America.

Great as was the program for the defense of this country, immediately after Pearl Harbor the Nation embarked upon the greatest undertaking for war the world has ever known. This calls for the construction of planes—swarms of planes—more planes than any other country in the world has ever constructed. It calls for the construction of ships—ships that would be necessary to carry men and supplies to the battle fronts of the world—wherever they may be. This Nation has to be the arsenal of the world with tanks and guns and all the supplies of war so that through the assembled might of this Nation, and our allies, the ravagers of the peace of this world will be subdued—and subdued quickly.

America's 1942 war production record is one of which we may all be proud. War material of almost every description is now rolling off production lines at rates which we can be confident have not been and cannot be equaled by our enemies. This production has been achieved without sacrificing quality. Today, our armed forces have the best equipment in the world. With every additional day the impact of this production on our enemies will be greater.

Despite this admirable progress, it is not as much as we could have done. The weaknesses and mistakes which have slowed our war effort during the past year could have been recognized and corrected earlier. The mistakes of the past are the problems of the present.

When a great peace-loving Nation changes its way of life for war—when industry and agriculture turn from usual peacetime production to that of war—when Government necessarily expands its functions, some confusion will ensue and some mistakes will be made. Indeed, some of our problems can be solved only through trial and error.

We all know that it would be absolutely impossible to spend $100,000,000, let alone several hundred billion dollars, without some mistakes and without some dishonesty. We also know that only too often in past wars indecision and inaction on the part of important Government officials impaired the effectiveness of the program. No such factor must be allowed to impede this war program. This administration is determined that the billions of dollars being spent on the armament program shall be effectively and economically expended so as to insure a maximum of production with a minimum of expense and as little dislocation as possible. In furtherance of this end the United States Senate created early in 1941 a Special Committee to Investigate the War Program, of which I had the honor of being named chairman. The purpose for which that committee was created was to search out the obstacles that were hampering the war program and to see that they were removed without fear or favor. What is more, the investigation was to be a continuing one. The committee was determined to do the job assigned to it without resorting either to a whitewash or a smear. It originally consisted of five Democrats and two Republicans, and at present consists of six Democrats and four Republicans.

It gives me great pleasure, as chairman of that committee, to say to you that the members of the committee from both parties have cooperated harmoniously. We have never had, and I hope we never will have, a minority report.

None of us started out with any preconceived ideas that we desired to prove. We have all tried to the best of our abilities to make the committee's actions purely constructive.

Each individual in our land has a grave responsibility in this war. To fulfill it all the facts must be known.

When we ask Government officials to explain their activities we are asking on behalf of the whole country. The information which the committee gets is for every American citizen. The recommendations which it makes are made in the interests of the whole country.

During the past year the committee has reported on light metals and aircraft, rubber, conversion to war production, manpower, shipbuilding, gasoline and fuel-oil rationing, lumber, barges, farm machinery, and steel. It has investigated and studied many other subjects and specific complaints on which no public reports have been made. It has inspected numerous defense plants and military installations located in nearly every section of the country, including Alaska and the Caribbean area. Whenever possible, without in any way endangering the war program, the committee has held public hearings. In many other cases its hearings have been private. Many of its recommendations during the past year have been adopted. There has, however, frequently been unnecessary delay before attempting to make corrections.

A short time ago the committee made its second annual report to the Congress. In that report the committee has pointed out three basic weaknesses in our war program.

1. Inadequate over-all planning by Government agencies and delay in working out their basic policies

2. Conflicting authority over various phases of the war program, resulting in delays and buck passing

3. Hesitancy of the Government to adopt unpopular or unpleasant policies long after the facts clearly indicated the necessity.

As to the latter, what is needed is more of such firm actions as the inflation-control policies of Stabilization Director James F. Byrnes, which have been maintained so far in the face of opposition from powerful groups. The committee believes that successful operation by the War Production Board also calls for a strong directing head. Mr. Donald Nelson has wide authority vested in him by the President and should exercise the powers delegated to him.

For instance, though we are producing airplanes in very large quantity, far exceeding anything our enemies can produce, we are not producing to capacity because there are: First, frequent changes of Army and Navy specifications; second, difficulties in getting materials at the right times in the right amounts; third, lack of trained foremen, supervisors, and skilled workmen. In the future, the Army and Navy must keep changes in specifications to a minimum, or accept responsibility for smaller airplane production.

Turning to our building of merchant vessels, we have produced them at a rate that our friends and enemies thought impossible. Our shipyards should be well able to meet the goal for 1943—18,000,000 tons. But merchant ships alone are not enough. We must have escort vessels to protect them. For a long time, the Navy paid too much attention to larger and more complicated naval vessels. However, progress is now being made.

Almost from its inception, the committee stressed the need to expand facilities for the production of the basic raw materials such as steel, copper, and aluminum. There was a long delay in the expansion program, but the committee is glad to report that rapid progress toward alleviating the shortages has been made during the past year.

We still do not have enough of all the critical materials to supply all the needs under the specifications scheduled by the various claimant agencies. Consequently if we are to obtain the number of airplanes, escort vessels, synthetic rubber plants, merchant ships, 100-octane gasoline and other products, that the high command has determined are necessary, there must be a coordinated effort not only to allocate fairly the scarce materials but to organize the production of all these competing articles.

These competing demands for productive facilities and products are tremendous. Too much of one thing at the wrong time is almost as bad as not enough at the time needed. Excess and unusable production means that vital materials have been improperly diverted either from military or essential civilian needs. In effect, what we must have above everything else is the delicate balance of production and use. We must plan to make the raw materials available as required, and then we must allocate them to the production of the items that we can use as produced.

We could use more strategic materials than we will have available, but we will have available many materials which could be manufactured into useful and necessary civilian goods, except for the lack of manpower.

This constitutes the biggest bottleneck in the war program. Full and effective utilization of our available manpower resources is one of the biggest jobs on the home front this year. It will become more and more urgent as induction of men into the armed forces continues. Strong, firm policies of Government, backed by the cooperation of labor, industry, and agriculture, are vital.

The greatest contribution which can be made to alleviate the manpower shortage is by increasing the productivity of our present labor force. The chief source of increased productivit must come from increased efficiency. To obtain that efficiency, we must perfect our system of allocating raw materials and of scheduling production so that all of the necessary materials will flow into the factories at such times and in such quantities as to enable them to operate to the maximum extent possible for their men and machines. In addition to providing materials at the right times, less efficient plants must be raised to the standard of those doing the job properly.

When materials flow smoothly onto and through production lines in adequate quantities in an efficiently operated plant, the men can constantly see the finished results of their work. This gives them inspiration to stay at their jobs and even increase their individual efforts.

Today, however, absenteeism still continues at a very high level. Workers in industry must regard themselves as part of our great army defending America. Every time a worker stays away from his job unnecessarily, he should consider himself as much a deserter from the homefront as a soldier who leaves his post of duty in face of the enemy. We know that the production hours lost because of absenteeism in industry are lost forever. A real contribution can still be made to the country by the workers of the Nation in devoting every possible hour to their jobs. Tapping the reservoir of production wasted by absenteeism will give tremendous impetus to our over-all war effort.

Similarly, all companies engaged in production must realize that it is absolutely essential to get the greatest production with the least possible use of manpower. Companies hoarding manpower which they do not absolutely need are just as guilty as workers who by absenteeism or otherwise desert their posts. Moreover, when the workers can be kept busy turning out war materials, absenteeism without cause will decrease.

It is regrettable that one of the least encouraging pictures on the home front is food. At the same time that our farmers are being urged to increase their production enormously, they are seriously hindered by the drafting of their skilled labor, by the loss of their helpers to high-paying construction and war industries, and by insufficient supplies of necessary farm machinery.

Sufficient provision for food must be made and it must be regarded as vital to our war effort. We must produce more food of all kinds than we have ever produced in our history.

At the same time we must learn to live on less. This requires material adjustments in our usual way of living. Some persons might call these adjustments sacrifices. But we civilians are not really sacrificing; we are fighting. The adjustments are our weapons. We will make them willingly and cheerfully, since they mean more food, more tanks and guns, more ships and planes and bombs for the boys out there.

That is why we have rationing, in order that what we have may be divided fairly among all of us. Rationing isn't taking away; it is giving. It is making sure that everyone gets an equal share of things that the war makes scarce.

Let's see what rationing is. First, it is not starvation, long bread lines, shoddy goods. Rather, it is a community plan for dividing fairly the supplies we have among all who need them.

Second, it is American. The earliest settlers of this country, facing scarcities of food and clothing, pooled their precious supplies and apportioned them out to everyone on an equal basis. It was an American idea then, and it is an American idea now, to share and share alike; to sacrifice when necessary, but to sacrifice together, because the country's welfare demands it.

We Americans fighting on the home front in a total war have adopted a policy of first things first. We no longer have in this country an abundance of raw materials to make automobiles and refrigerators and radios for our own civilian use. These are also the raw materials that must go into weapons for our armed forces. We have made our decision. We are determined to beat the Axis. To accomplish that end, we can do without a lot of things we had learned to take for granted, had grown to consider necessities rather than luxuries. Having made our decision, we must divide fairly what is left after the needs of our fighting men have been met.

At the same time, I believe that such rationing should be administered locally by local boards who are familiar with local problems and have authority to make decisions based on them. We should not attempt to administer rationing programs from Washington through complicated formulas which cannot be easily understood. Bureaucrats should have more confidence in the ability of the American people to handle such matters locally through persons familiar with the local problems, who have obtained the facts from the persons whose lives are being rationed.

We must also be mindful not to impose unnecessary burdens on industry. Regulation merely for the sake of regulation is nonsense. The imposition of complicated rules by people who know nothing of the industry they are running cannot be tolerated. Complex regulations must give way to simple, fair, and easily understood rules.

One point, too, must be made clear. The War Investigating Committee was not organized to tell the war agencies what to do or how to do it. The purpose of the committee is not to substitute its judgment for theirs. Its function is to insure that intelligent consideration is given to the important and difficult problems presented by the war program, so as to make certain that our victory is won with the least cost in human lives and property.

Of paramount importance in achieving that victory is for the American people—every one of us—to keep faith with each other and with our leaders—and with united strength and firm confidence in the righteousness of our cause, with God's help we will attain complete victory and lasting peace.

When Peace Comes, What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at Appleton, Wis., on March 28, at a public forum on post-war problems, held at the Appleton vocational schools.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, the years since September 1939 have seen many of our old concepts die. Life individually and nationally has new meaning. Geographically we in America are only a few hours away from any place on the globe.

The war is not won. It will be won by the United Nations. How soon we cannot tell. With what cost we cannot tell. After the war is won you ask, What then; what part is America to play? What will the nations do about war? Will they get together for peace?

The answer is not now complete. The cloth will have to be cut to fit the international pattern and the pattern is not now complete. But this we know: America will accept her responsibility, whatever that is, in the post-war period for establishing and safeguarding an enduring peace, thus making our liberties safe.

Two factors have brought America to this conclusion. First, the contracted globe, due to invention and the mechanical genius of man, demanding an end to war.

Second, the realization that we as a nation cannot live unto ourselves alone and that America's destiny is wrapped up in the destiny of earth, and the further fact that America owes to the people of the earth and to herself the obligation to bring light throughout the earth, showing mankind the way through the republican channel of life—showing the way to justice, peace, economic health, and brotherhood.

Our problems at present are mainly those of production, military strategy, transportation, and keeping our home economy as healthy as possible. The other problem—greater still—comes later—building a better world. We cannot pass up that responsibility and duty. It is up to us after victory to fulfill our destiny. It is America's opportunity and obligation.

America has never been confounded or appalled by any job. It is not by this one. We shall proceed realistically to perform the task before us, equal to every demand and alert to every challenge—with a prayer in our hearts, knowing that God-directed leadership will be ours.

The best guaranty that America has for a workable peace is the fact that there are groups, such as this forum, meeting all over America—including leaders from trade groups, labor groups, commerce groups, women's clubs, church groups, and service and school organizations.

Any peace in order to be effective must have its roots deep in the hearts and minds of the people themselves. No treaties, no agreements, no pledges, no conferences between nations can be effective unless they are backed up by the convictions of the peoples involved.

There have been a number of unofficial proposals which are being discussed in Washington and throughout the Nation. A great many of these proposals have been based on some kind of world associations, either those based on common ideals and common problems, or those based on regional arrangements.

There has been discussion of an alliance between the United States and Great Britain. There has been discussion of a federation of the United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations. There has been talk of a federation of democracies, and there has been talk of a close but possibly informal cooperation of United Nations.

The proposals for regional arrangements have called for either regional federations or some other type of regional combination which would include alliances, leagues, security pacts, or some kind of customs union. These proposals usually contemplate the region of the Western Hemisphere, the European region, and the Asiatic region.

We know that the kind of a world which will be established will depend to a large degree on the leadership and policy established in the United States. We know, also, that if we are going to have any kind of a workable, lasting, practical peace plan that plan must be grounded in the convictions of a great majority of our people and grounded in the convictions of other nations that are to become our associates in the plan.

That prompts me to say that long before we can consider any peace plan we must establish the mechanics for the consideration of a peace.

Our Constitution provides for two peacemaking authorities, and, unfortunately, there has frequently been lack of agreement between the two peacemakers established under our Constitution. That has given rise to the familiar saying that soldiers win the war but statesmen lose the peace.

Throughout our history there has been one very grave shortcoming in the conduct of any peace. The Constitution provides for the negotiation of treaties by and with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate. Actually, however, there has never been any formal arrangement by which the Executive sought the advice of the Members of the Senate. Usually the Executive proceeded through his Secretary of State to negotiate a treaty, and when the treaty was completed it was tied up with a little bit of blue ribbon and brought over to the Senate for approval.

Since the Senate hadn't been consulted in the negotiation or the consideration of the treaty, the Senate usually rebelled and then there would be trouble.

The last example was found in the Treaty of Versailles, which died in the United States Senate.

I have proposed the creation of a Foreign Relations Advisory Council, which would serve as a liaison between the Executive and the Senate and the House, so that the representatives of the people would have a voice in the formulation of the treaty and would be consulted during the negotiations.

That would enable the people's representatives to serve as a channel for the expression of the conclusions of groups such as this. It would also mean this council would have ironed out the differences between the Executive and Congress; that compromises would have been worked out; and that chances for the passage of such a treaty would have been immeasurably increased. In other words, the first prerequisite for any kind of a just and lasting peace—the first prerequisite for any kind of treaty—is a working arrangement between the Executive and the representatives of the people so that the people's ideas may be incorporated in the treaty. This would mean that the treaty would have the support of the representatives of the people and the people themselves.

We know that in the world of tomorrow the United States will play a great part, but there will be other great leaders—Russia, Great Britain, and China.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to predict what role these great nations will play in planning an ordered free world. It is difficult to predict the degree of their collaboration.

It is difficult to anticipate the extent and the character of the requirements of each of these nations. They are all in various stages of development and in addition to certain common problems, they also have problems peculiar to themselves alone. Russia and China feel a new impulse of national power. Russia will want a natural barrier of defense against Germany and that may mean taking a part of Poland. Some of the weaker races may have to be ruled and managed. There will be commercial rivalries. There will be battles for the control and domination of markets. There will be age-old antagonisms between countries which may continue.

All of these factors and many more will make it extremely difficult to secure a lasting peace, but over and against these factors we can see a great hunger of the common people of the earth who sense an imperative need for some kind of an organization for peace—an organization with teeth in it to insure peace.

The world has been contracted through science and discovery and this very contraction makes it vital to have a cooperation and collaboration which it has never experienced before.

We can set up machinery to control nations in an effort to prevent war. We can establish treaties. We can write peace pacts. We can make agreements. We can do all of these things in an effort to achieve a lasting peace, but none of these things will have eliminated the causes of war.

Any completely effective program to eliminate future war must go beyond the treaties and the agreements and the understandings, and must seek to eliminate the basic and fundamental causes of war.

What are these basic causes for conflict? Some of them originate in jealousies, in rivalries, in traditional hatreds, and some of them in conflicting ideologies. For the most part, however, they originate in economic or political maladjustments, in lust for power and territory—and these are diseases. It is imperative for us to control these diseases and, if possible, eliminate the causes.

No program for world peace will ever be successful unless it makes a sincere attempt to eliminate the basic causes for armed conflict. That means, very simply, that in any peace program, it is imperative that we seek to give at least guidance to the elimination of the economic and political difficulties and maladjustments which have been basic factors in causing war.

All of this means in time that if and when the United States assumes a Good Samaritan role—that role is not entirely inconsistent with our own selfish best interests—if we can avert a contagious disease for our neighbor's home we may be sparing ourselves from that same contagious ailment. If we can in our post-war program aid in the reconstruction of the world to such a degree that economic maladjustments—according to the particular geographical location and needs—are eliminated, we not only create a better world for ourselves but we will have insured to a certain degree at least healthy neighbors from whom there is less danger of contagion. If we can succeed in forestalling the world-wide political maladjustments which create militaristic governments, then, too, we will have prevented a possible source of military infection.

I don't mean by all of the foregoing that we can neglect our domestic problems, or our domestic best interests in any Utopian program of world reform—economic and political. I do mean, however, that we must be keenly conscious of economic and political

maladjustments wherever they may occur to the extent that they might create a war which would ultimately involve us.

If we are to build for lasting peace we must have two ideas in mind. First, we must restore order and recovery to the world by dealing justly with the problems that involve the political, economic, territorial, and ideological phases. Second, we must create some sort of instrumentality with power to preserve the peace. To accomplish this our leaders will need faith and vision and tolerance.

The treaty which will be written or the plan which will be developed when the war ends will determine the course of history for decades and perhaps centuries to come. Because we as a Nation have grown so big and powerful, the new situation has created new responsibilities and new duties for us.

We must make sure that we as a people are adequate to meet those responsibilities. This is the Sabbath and we might well ask what constitutes adequacy. The Good Samaritan of whom the Master spoke was adequate for the occasion. He had the proper concept as to his responsibility—which the Priest and the Levite did not have—but he also had the wine and the oil and the cash, making him the Good Neighbor. He made the wounded man whole so he could take care of himself.

The greatest act of charity is that which enables the recipient to become self-sufficient, to stand on his own feet. That is the first job that we will have to undertake in an international sense We will have to feed the world when the war is over, becoming the Good Samaritan among the Nations, making the occupied nations competent mentally and physically to stand on their own feet.

This does not mean that America should be a Santa Claus for the whole world. It does mean that we must realistically approach this problem of making the enslaved peoples free in mind so that they can also meet the responsibility which will be theirs.

It is a battle—which will probably continue until the end of time—between the forces of good and the powers of darkness. We should constantly bear this in mind, so that we will never again be apathetic, careless, unalert. The fight between right and wrong, liberty and slavery, greed and selfishness, tolerance and intolerance, justice and injustice, goes on within and without the Nation, and the ending of the war will not bring that fight to a close.

We do not have the time today to go into this matter of difference in races. It is sufficient to say that we—the people of earth—are groping our way toward a solution of the war problem. The situation calls for men of action possessing the qualities of the realist and the idealist. We have had the expression of President Hoover, suggesting that when the war ceases, there must be a breathing spell before we attempt to work out a final plan.

Governor Stassen of Minnesota suggested a plan, the nucleus of which would be a single-house parliament to be composed of the representatives of the United Nations of the world. The Governor's plan presupposes that these nations are ready and willing to cooperate to that end and that they will keep faith. In other words, there must be between the contracting parties not only a thorough understanding but a moral responsibility and a physical ability to live up to the obligations of the compact.

We are told that the peace must be planned and folks are upset because the cloth cannot immediately be cut to fit a pattern. There are certain steps that can be foreseen with reasonable certainty.

(a) The enemy must be totally disarmed.

(b) Prisoners must be repatriated and civilians who have been driven from their homes must be looked after.

(c) The people must be fed and the agricultural and economic life of these people built up.

(d) At least temporary boundaries between nations must be set up and governments organized.

(e) The channels of trade between nations must be opened.

(f) America must see to it that she has control of the pivotal air bases in the Western Hemisphere and the United Nations must retain control of the pivotal bases on the sea lanes of the world.

(g) In our own economy we must gradually slough off the Government controls which are not necessary and make sure that our peacetime economic life is healthy and make doubly sure that we remain alert in a growing world.

When these things will have been accomplished, we hope and pray that at least the great powers of earth will be ready for some association of governments which will be able to build for permanent peace and order.

This great desire for peace—which is prayer—among the common people of earth, may operate to channel the efforts of statesmen so that at least people of similar mind, as our Colonies were back in 1786, will get together in some form of international association or union.

The problem, of course, is tremendous. What has been going on in Africa between the various groups of Frenchmen, Royalists, De Gaulleists, Vichy French, exemplifies in a small way what the larger problem will be.

In the letter I received from Mr. Bertram, your chairman, he inquired as to America's attitude in relation to an international police force? That, of course, is also a matter which is in the making. Until an international organization is formed, it will be necessary for governments to enter into some tentative arrangement. That is why it is imperative that the pivotal air bases and pivotal sea-lane bases should be in control of the nations which want a peaceful world. When the war is over, we will have the largest navy in the world and the largest air force. The extent to which a world will have to be policed will depend upon the peoples of the world. There will have to be mandates.

I was talking the other day with Bishop Lee of the Methodist Church, who spent 18 years in the East, who, I understand, is going to talk to the students of Lawrence College some time in May. He is a realist. He feels that a great mass of humanity living in the islands of the South Seas should live under a mandate of the United Nations. In Java there are more people in that one island than there are in Great Britain. They haven't come very far up the ladder socially, economically, spiritually, or politically. They need guardianship. The question of to what extent we should enter into a policing of the world will have to await its answer when we see how badly the world wants to be policed and to what extent the spirit of collaboration and cooperation will come into being among the nations.

I was asked also, "What about tariffs?" That subject calls for a long discussion, for which we haven't time here today. There has been a great deal of loose thinking about tariffs. One thing is sure—that if the big and powerful nations of earth will play ball together, there will be treaty arrangements which will make for a greater flow of international commerce. On the other hand, we must ever bear in mind that our standard of living in America—the lighthouse of the world—must not be thrown to the winds because of some economic theory.

If all the peoples of earth had the same standard of living, and justice and fair dealing prevailed, that would be one thing. But we have ever to bear in mind that the American market is the best market for American produce (about 95 percent of our total) and that a prosperous, healthy America, economically, socially, and politically, is the greatest blessing we could give to the world. It is our obligation to be the economic, political, and social way-shower among the nations of the earth.

In my humble opinion, for a long period after the war is over, American goods will be flowing out of America and very little European or Asiatic goods which compete with our own will flow into America—hence the tariff issue may not be important immediately.

Out of all our endeavors, it is hoped that we will learn much which will be useful in the post-war period. When the war is over, there will be commercial rivalries, attempts to dominate and control certain markets, and many national antagonisms will continue. We can also add to this, jealousy and hate and selfishness and the lust for power, individual and national.

But over against these war factors, with the courage born of the spirit, we remember as we enter this contest for a better world, a little shepherd boy, David by name, who went up against the Goliath of his day—representing power-drunk dictators of his day who knew no kindness, no tolerance, no understanding, who were out to enslave their neighbors, and whose entire philosophy repudiates the idea of the God of Israel. We remember also an American called George Washington, who on bended knee at Valley Forge, when the odds were a hundred to one against victory, found strength and guidance to go forward to liberate a little group of farmers and merchants on this continent.

We remember also a rail splitter, Lincoln by name, who came into power as the head of this Nation, and who looked through the mist of hate and prejudice and lack of vision in his day and carried on, that this land might be one people, undivided, with liberty and freedom for all—not a hodgepodge of nations. There was no hate or intolerance, or bigotry, in the mind of this great soul who came out from the backwoods of Kentucky and Indiana and Illinois. That is why he could see straight.

We also remember Moses, fearful, living in the desert. He was told by God to go down and free his people in Egypt and he replied, "Who am I?" Then something happened to Moses. He was told, "My presence shall go with thee," and he did the job.

If we are to do this job we must recognize also that His presence is with us. This is the greatest age in the world's history. We are a part of it—not to loaf in it, not to sit by the side of the road and watch events go by, but to be actors, doers of the word, to be ready when the opportunity comes to do our part.

In this auditorium tonight there are many young people. You possess sentiment, dreams, vision, conscience, and enthusiasm—the fire of the gods. Keep the fire burning and dedicate your services to your God and your country. Life then will not be shabby, drab, but a thing of light and flame, and we will brush aside the mists that keep us from the solution and find the answer. What a glorious job we all have in front of us.

Juvenile Delinquency

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, for some time past the newspapers of the

country and the radio have been carrying stories of the great increase in juvenile delinquency since war was declared. A few days ago there appeared in the Jersey Journal, Jersey City—a leading newspaper in my district—an article by Helen Manning, secretary of the New Jersey Juvenile Delinquency Commission, explaining how Jersey City met this problem 12 years ago and conquered it. I am very proud of the Jersey City record. I hope this article will answer many of the questions on how to curb this menace. I ask unanimous consent to include the article in my remarks:

YOUTHFUL DELINQUENCY RISES DURING WAR, BUT NOT IN JERSEY CITY

(By Helen L. Manning, secretary to New Jersey Juvenile Delinquency Commission)

Statistics all over America reporting an increase of juvenile and adolescent crime are not reflected in the police records in Jersey City, which show a decrease since Pearl Harbor.

In his recent report to Mayor Frank Hague, Dr. Thomas W. Hopkins, director of the Bureau of Special Service of the Jersey City Board of Education, reported that police complaints in Jersey City had dropped and that there was no increase in juvenile delinquency.

There is no increase in adolescent crime in Jersey City for two reasons. The first is because of the sound program of handling juvenile offenders who are straightened out in their formative years and who grow up to be law-abiding citizens.

The second reason is because Mayor Frank Hague, who organized the bureau of special service more than 12 years ago, has kept his interest in the work and has constantly supervised the activities of the bureau.

More than 3 years ago, when World War No. 2 was in progress overseas, Mayor Hague enlarged the facilities of the bureau of special service to take care of the adolescent boy or girl who gets into trouble for the first time and whose offense is of such a nature that there is hope of restitution and reclamation. Mayor Hague did this because he knew if America should enter the war there would be an increase in crime.

Because of Mayor Hague's program letters come daily to the bureau of special service from boys who 3 years ago got into minor difficulties and who are now taking part in the battle for democracy.

Excerpts from 2 letters received by Inspector William V. McLaughlin, in charge of the police unit at the bureau, follow:

"Here I am away out in the Far East," writes one boy, "and only for Mayor Hague I would be in jail without the opportunity to be a real man.

"I never realized, until now, what Mayor Hague has accomplished in giving boys and girls who get into trouble, an opportunity to do better. I got a letter yesterday from an old pal of mine who lives outside Jersey City. He is now in a reformatory. That might have been me, had it not been for Mayor Hague."

Another letter, from a marine in California, says:

"NOW I REALIZE HOW DUMB I WAS

"Well, Inspector, the real reason for this letter is to thank you and Mayor Hague for all you did to help me. I know I was a pretty smart guy and now I realize how dumb I was.

"The principal of my former school has my name on the honor roll, and am I proud of it. You know, I get letters from the principal of the school and from my school teacher."

The cause for the increase of adolescent crime in many American cities might be traced back to the time the offender was a juvenile.

Many cities make mistakes in handling juvenile offenders and make the same mistakes in handling the adolescent. In altogether too many cities juvenile offenders are brought into courts and given records, thus paving the way for further misdeeds.

Oftentimes the adolescent offender only needs a helping hand over some seeming insurmountable barrier. Other times only a referee is needed in the troubles and misunderstanding at home.

If, however, the offense is so flagrant it cannot be overlooked, legal action must be taken, but in most cases of adolescent offenders in Jersey City the complainant is satisfied, restitution is made, and the public security is protected by an alert and firm police department under Commissioner Daniel Casey.

The Jersey City Bureau of Special Service, which handles the juvenile and adolescent boy and girl, might well be compared to supplemental parental supervision.

HEADACHE

Mayor Hague has preached to police officials and school authorities that the work of the Special Service Bureau is oftentimes a headache. He has counseled the officials of the bureau never to lose confidence in a boy or girl and to follow every problem through even though sometimes it might not seem worth while.

"A good parent loves his child, but if necessity arises he will adopt a rigid discipline to create respect for parental authority," says the mayor.

The special service bureau works with every agency interested in the child, the parent, the church, and the school. Clergymen of all faiths work with the director of the bureau in an effort to help. The clergymen do an effective job by drawing the boys and girls into the activities of their churches.

A program continued day after day, week after week, with friendly interest, brings the boy or girl to the realization of the error of their ways.

Judge Thomas H. Brown, of the Hudson County Court of Common Pleas, in a recent news release, points out the rise in crime as reported by J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Both men quote striking figures.

Judge Brown says, "Public security comes first, and the public is entitled to protection."

WRIGHT BILL

The jurist referred to a bill in the New Jersey Legislature introduced by Senator Ray Wright, of Essex County, increasing the age in which boys and girls could be handled in juvenile court from 16 to 18. There is a Federal law, passed in June 1938, which defines as a juvenile a "person 17 years of age or under."

NOT JERSEY CITY FIGURES

Judge Brown is right. The public is entitled to protection, and in Jersey City the public is protected. However, the figures quoted by Judge Brown and J. Edgar Hoover do not refer to Jersey City.

Several months ago Judge Brown had standing before him in court one morning a diminutive little miss of 19.

The girl had been placed in jail for failure to support her baby born out of wedlock. Judge Thomas J. Fleming, in one of his first days on the bench, had dismissed the charges against the girl and she was before Judge Brown to see if the alleged father of her child could be apprehended and brought to justice.

Judge Brown's face became livid with anger as the story unfolded and he immediately set the machinery in motion with Prosecutor Daniel T. O'Regan to have the young man brought to trial.

Subsequently the case was settled, everyone working together in the interest of the girl and her baby. Today—8 months later—the girl is married to a schoolboy sweetheart, the baby's father pays its board and is serving his country overseas, and in her new home, happy and contented, a grateful young woman appreciates the work of Judge Brown, Prosecutor Regan, Poormaster Martin Faber, and the bureau of special service, whose kindly help straightened out her difficulties.

The program of an intelligent approach to the handling of juvenile and adolescent delinquency has more than justified the faith and confidence Mayor Hague has in the youth of his city.

Pay-As-You-Go Tax Bill

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] and I have prepared a letter which we intend to transmit to the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, asking that income-tax legislation will not be further delayed in an effort to put this country on a pay-as-you-go basis. That letter we intend to have signed by a number of Democratic Members of the House, and we hope that it will result in a speedy bringing back to this assembly of income-tax legislation.

I will insert the letter at this point for the information of the Members of the House.

The letter is as follows:

APRIL 7, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: The undersigned Democratic Members of the House of Representatives respectfully urge you as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee not to delay action on income-tax legislation.

The President of the United States in submitting his budget message to Congress on January 6, 1943, said:

"It is more important than ever before to simplify taxation both for taxpayers and for those collecting the tax, and to put our taxes, as far as feasible, on a pay-as-you-go basis."

As matters now stand, of course nothing has been accomplished to put this country on a pay-as-you-go basis. There were before the House last week and before your committee during its hearings, many suggestions to promote currentness in income-tax payments. Because of the peculiar parliamentary situation which would permit consideration of all plans which were developed by the approval of the Carlson bill in the Committee of the Whole and its subsequent rejection as an amendment in the whole House, no opportunity was given to vote directly or indirectly on those other proposals and suggestions, such as the Forand-Robertson substitute.

We feel that adequate hearings have already been held by your committee and that the early resubmission to the House of measures designed to promote currentness in tax payments under a parliamentary rule that permits consideration of all plans would be a contribution to the war effort at this time.

The desire of many citizens to put this country on a pay-as-you-go income-tax basis has become perhaps the foremost domestic

issue. It is the duty of the Congress to meet this desire of the people as best it can. This can only be done by submission to the House of fair and equitable measures designed to bring it about. One of these will eventually be adopted and sent to the Senate, but the sooner it becomes effective the better it will suit the American public and the financial requirements of the Government. It is for this reason that we ask your committee to act now.

Respectfully yours.

David Ginsburg

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in time of war, high civilian morale, like high soldier morale, is all important. Yet, hardly a day goes by that some Government official does not "kick over the bucket" by a stupid act. The present crop of new dealers is the greatest aggregation of morale busters the world has ever known.

The 400-word citation of David Ginsburg, the 31-year-old paragon of wisdom, is a typical example of what I mean. The President felt that he was called upon to use 400 words in the citation of Little David, yet in his letter to the parents of the 5 Sullivan boys, who gave their lives for their country, the President used 81 words. In the award of a Congressional Medal to General MacArthur, 93 words were used. In the award of the medal to General Doolittle, the President used 66 words, and for the valor of one of America's bravest heroes, Colin Kelly, the President used only 109 words.

From the above records it would appear that in the eyes of the President of the United States the services rendered by David Ginsburg have been relatively more important to the United States than the lives of the heroes who have sacrificed their all for their country.

David Ginsburg, by the records of the draft board introduced by Mr. FLANNAGAN, a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from Virginia, had sought to avoid military service under the draft law on two occasions by claiming dependency. The records show that Leon Henderson had filed three affidavits with the draft board to assist David Ginsburg in avoiding military service. In the second affidavit filed by Leon Henderson and quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 24, 1943, Leon Henderson said of David Ginsburg, "He cannot be successfully replaced," and asked for the deferment of David Ginsburg for the duration. In his third affidavit to the draft board, Mr. Henderson said that it would be a serious blow to the O. P. A. if David Ginsburg should be inducted into the service. But after all of the claims of dependency and usefulness to the Government, David Ginsburg evidenced a full willingness to serve his country in a military way, provided he could be commissioned and be in a safe spot.

The Bible says, "Saul has slain his thousands, and David his tens of thousands." Now, little David Ginsburg, the draft dodger, goes the first David one better, and as a reward for his part in bringing about New Deal confusion and chaos is awarded a citation in 400 words.

Ceiling Prices on Beef

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. COLE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press of April 3, 1943:

INDEPENDENT PACKERS MAY HAVE TO QUIT

Forced under the Office of Price Administration ceiling prices to sell beef at an estimated average loss of $20 for every head slaughtered, the Dugdale Packing Co. of St. Joseph has joined with other independent packers in making a protest to Washington. Harold Dugdale declared today that unless some changes in present regulations are made at once the company probably would be forced to shut down operations. Butchering at the plant already has been greatly curtailed, with many of the butchers given part-time employment the past week.

Strong complaints have been made to Congressman WILLIAM C. COLE, Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN, and to the Office of Price Administration.

Increased prices in live cattle are blamed for the present condition. The Office of Price Administration ceiling and Government regulations keep the packer from increasing his price for slaughtered cattle to match the price of live cattle.

Independent packers are hit the hardest, Mr. Dugdale said, for the larger packers have other processed foods for use in making up some of the loss.

Good cattle cost the packer about $15.50 on the hoof, Mr. Dugdale said. Slaughtering costs increase this to a net cost of from $24 to $24.50 per hundredweight. The ceiling price is $21 for public sales. The Government, at the same time, takes 40 percent of the slaughtered animals and pays 75 cents per hundred under the ceiling price.

The only remedy, the small packers say, is either to hike the ceiling prices or hold down the price of live cattle. This latter would be difficult because of the high prices paid recently for feeder stock.

Distribution of F. D. A.-Owned Commodities to School-Lunch Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received from Mr. Roy F. Hendrickson, Director of the Food Distribution Administration, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., concerning the school-lunch activities carried on by the Food Distribution Administration:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOOD DISTRIBUTION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 3, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Our attention has been called to your remarks in the March 16 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning the school lunch activities carried on by the Food Distribution Administration. Since the charges your constituents make vitally concern any policy of continuing the many school-lunch programs throughout the country, we would like to take this opportunity to clarify the situations they describe and to explain our role in this type of community undertaking.

In the course of your remarks you included copies of two letters and one newspaper article criticizing the free distribution of rationed foods to school lunches. Apparently the writers of this material were not aware of the fact that schools are classified as institutions and, as such, must surrender points for all rationed foods, whether or not received free. Their quota of points is based on previous amounts of food used, and all school-lunch programs are treated in the same manner under rationing as are all other institutions.

As discussed in your recent telephone conversation with Mr. Kunkel, Chief of the Civilian Programs Branch, the rationed commodities now being distributed to school-lunch programs were in most cases purchased some 12 to 18 months ago and have been in State warehouses for a number of months. Wherever possible, we are endeavoring to return such foods to the normal channels of trade, but this is difficult because many of them are labeled "not to be sold," and much of this supply is widely scattered in local warehouses throughout the country. To arrange for the assembling and repackaging of these foods would entail a substantial and perhaps unjustifiable cost in terms of labor and transportation.

Some of your constituents seem to question the need for a school-lunch program at the present time when surpluses no longer exist and economic conditions are generally very good. However, our program has never sought to limit its benefits to low-income children. It has been found that malnourishment is by no means solely a result of low incomes; ignorance of the principles of nutrition is also widespread among higher income families. Furthermore, it is fundamentally true that hot lunches served at school are far more nourishing than cold meals brought from home. In addition, many parents are now neglecting the preparation of the midday meal for their children because of war work or other unusual employment. It also seems to us that the provision of meals at school would permit many nonworking mothers to enter war employment and thus alleviate to some degree the present labor shortage.

In the past we have followed a policy of encouraging and supplementing efforts by schools to establish lunch-feeding programs by making surplus commodities available once all necessary operating facilities have been established. In no instance was the variety of commodities available sufficient to provide a complete lunch, but in most cases the knowledge that our commodities could be obtained was directly instrumental in inducing the establishment of lunch programs, particularly in rural communities—the very schools least able to provide adequate lunches

without outside aid. Thus, our contribution to such programs was essentially supplementary in nature. The continued distribution of commodities to schools arranging for them was by no means automatic. Each school was required to submit monthly inventories of commodities on hand and specific requests for further needed supplies. However, the continued operation of any particular lunch program and receipt of free commodities is primarily the responsibility of the local sponsors who have agreed to assume the major responsibility for operating the program. We have, therefore, written to the Blue Earth County Welfare Department suggesting that it contact the sponsor of the lunch program in that county to determine if its cancelation is desired.

Because of food shortages in many parts of the country and because of current wartime conditions in the field of food warehousing and transportation, it has been found necessary to discontinue distribution of all Food and Drug Administration owned commodities to school lunch programs as of April 30. Similarly, distribution of commodities to recipients of public welfare will be discontinued June 30. However, since we do believe that wartime conditions make vital the continuance and extension of school feeding programs and that many schools will find it difficult to operate without some outside assistance, we have evolved a new method of operation. This program operates so that schools requiring financial assistance in providing lunches will purchase food in the open market and will later be indemnified for a major part of their expense up to certain amounts by the Food and Drug Administration. We are taking great care to sanction this program only in schools where assistance is definitely needed, and we are also gearing the amount of the subsidy closely to that absolutely necessary to maintain successful programs.

We trust that this information fully clarifies the points raised in the correspondence you have received from constituents. If you have any further questions, please feel free to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

ROY F. HENDRICKSON,
Director.

Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

BLUFFTON, S. C., *April 2, 1943.*

MY DEAR MR. BROWN: In Wednesday's New York paper I read a news story having to do with a letter you received from Prentiss Brown in which it said he would veto the idea of subtracting canned goods ration points if one got sugar for canning. It also said certain Office of Price Administration "technicians" (whatever that means and if you ask me I don't think it means much) insisted on taking from 8 to 12 points for every pound of canning sugar.

I am writing to you to thank you for taking up the cudgels for those of us at home. For up to now these typical "technicians" have been fighting not three enemies but four—with the American people making the fourth.

Some time ago I read in McCall's magazine that points would be taken for canning sugar. That the "technicians" wanted to is proof that their motive is to make it just as hard as possible for the people. It is proof that they subscribe wholeheartedly to Harry Hopkins' theory that strict rationing, more than is necessary to win this war, will have great spiritual benefits. The American people consider that theory not only unhealthy and unwholesome, but utter damned nonsense—but quite typical of the way Harry Hopkins' mind works—also the minds of those like him. And that goes for these so-called technicians who could offer more constructive service at this time if they got into uniform or behind a plow.

My two sisters live on Indiana farms. Last year hogs were turned in the orchards to eat fallen fruit because there was not enough sugar to save it. On this place we raked it up and dumped it in the river so a jungle of seedlings would not spring up. Of course our huge fig, strawberry, and wild orange crops were a total loss last year, for they could not be saved at all under the ridiculous Office of Price Administration "technicians' " formula of 1 pound of sugar to 1 gallon of fruit. Such fruit as was put up that way was inedible when it was opened, because there was no extra sugar to make it edible. Yet Mr. Wickard had the nerve to say that our fruit shortage was due to the fact that "we have only a certain number of fruit trees." Not a single voice has been raised to say that millions of bushels of fruit rotted on the ground in this country last year because these make-the-people-starve birds in Washington would not give us the sugar to save it. Moreover, no one, to date, has had the nerve to call these officials on the excuse they have given the public, namely, there is no shipping to bring sugar in from Cuba—and the West Indies—only a few miles from our mainland.

That is a lie on the face of it. It is a lie, or they mean that there is no shipping to bring in sugar for Americans. But there is shipping to bring it into America and to transship it to England under Harry Hopkins' lend-lease program. We rural women have definite proof of that. We got it from two sources. Not long ago an American commentator put on a program from an English village in which he described the homemade products exhibited. Among them were hundreds of jars of home-made jam. Proof No. 2 was, and is, to be found in the March Country Gentleman. It is a letter from Minnie Gowring, of Berkshire, England. She is thanking American farm women who gave a canning unit to Englishwomen. I quote from this letter: "The canning unit was a wonderful gift, and was most useful this year as the fruit crop was excellent and thousands of cans and thousands of pounds of jam were made at the canning center of the surplus fruit which it would have been hard to use otherwise."

Boiled down this story means this:

Americans give a canning unit to the British women. American farm women. American taxpayers give the sugar under lend-lease. (If Mr. Stettinius told the truth the British Government sells this sugar to the people and puts the money in the British Exchequer * * * and I have no complaints to offer on that score.) There is "no shipping" to bring in adequate sugar to save all of our fruit crops—our American fruit crops—so there is a $10,000 fine and 10 years in the hoosegow if an American woman uses a pound of canning sugar for jam, preserves, jelly, or marmalade, the very backbone of rural farm diets, and the only way under rationing that farm families can bring up their sugar diet to that of city dwellers who alone share in the millions of pounds released for city sweets such as cakes, pies, tarts, sweet rolls, ice cream, cookies, and soft drinks. There is "no shipping" for sugar for American jam and jelly and preserves. But, curiously and mysteriously, there is shipping to take sugar all the way across the Atlantic so the British can make jam. And we are giving the sugar. Now, if you can tie that for an asinine situation I give up.

Well, last year we had an excellent fruit crop, too. But ours rotted. The only way you can use this surplus fruit that Mrs. Gowring is talking about is to make it up into concentrated jams, jellies, preserves and marmalades. You can only can a certain amount and store a certain number of bulky quart jars. The rest, if it is to be saved, has to be put up in concentrated form. It is the only way figs, wild oranges, strawberries, and such can be saved at all.

And if you think farm women are not hot under the collar over this news leaking out you are mistaken. Both of my sisters in Indiana take the Country Gentleman and both have mentioned it in letters. One said: "It's a pretty kettle of fish, isn't it, that we have to feed our fruit to the hogs so the British can have the jam we can't have. It is very funny there is shipping to move sugar across the Atlantic for jam, and none to bring in sugar for jam at home."

Mr. Brown we want to help our allies. But we also want an even break on the stuff we are giving away. We want to save our own fruit crops. It is the only way we can help win this war, we rural women. There are over 57,000,000 of rural population. And if the Office of Price Administration technicians had their way we would not even be self-supporting. We aren't now in the matter of jams, jellies, and preserves. We have to go into an urban market and buy them. All due to an inflexible rule that doesn't even make sense.

Please bring this matter up before Congress. It will please the home canners of this country to force an explanation from the Office of Price Administration and Harry Hopkins' lend-lease. We want to know why we are being discriminated against in this matter of concentrated jams. We want to know why it is more imperative to save British surplus fruit than American surplus fruit. We want to know why there is shipping for one and not for the other.

The thing that burns us up is that we all have husbands and sons in this war. And they aren't sitting in Washington making silly rules on subjects they know nothing about. We have a big stake in this war. Added to our worries over those who are away is the added burden of having to deal with the technicians' arbitrary, bureaucratic rulings. They yell at us, "Waste helps the enemy." They yell, "Food is a weapon." And then they proceed to make us waste our fruit crops. According to their own propaganda, they are the enemies' best friends for they are forcing the waste.

Another thing the women of this community wrote to the Office of Price Administration about was soup bones. We wanted big bones like knuckles and shanks to be stripped of meat and sold at a flat rate per pound—not under rationing. Then we wanted to buy that meat stripped off under rationing. If it was a pound or a pound and half, to give coupons for the meat—the lean meat itself. As a knuckle or shank will weigh from 4 to 5½ pounds no one, even before they double-crossed us on the 2-pounds-of-meat-a-week-per-person affair, could afford to give an entire week's ration, or two rations, for a soup bone. This simple method would have meant that millions, and perhaps billions, of shanks and knuckles and big bones would have been used for pots of thick, nutritious home-made soup. This suggestion was not followed. All the bones for soup are 4 points a pound—including bone, fat, and marrow. Which means no one can buy a soup bone—especially not when what was to be the

meat ration now includes such essentials as butter, oil, lard, margarine, cheese, and two other products. It also means the Office of Price Administration is deliberately wasting an important and enormous supply of food because the technicians would rather see near-starvation than make it possible for Americans to eat. This is very obvious now.

Mr. Brown, it is things like these that are making people all over this land say, "They don't want you to have it." That is the majority opinion, and nothing is going to change it except a clean sweep in the Office of Price Administration. Prentiss Brown seems to be on our side. At least he isn't against us. But the technicians under him are the boys who are really making this war a hell right here at home for those of us whose men are at the front.

They lied to us on the meat ration. It was to be in the neighborhood of 2 pounds a week. Last night Canada announced their people would get 2 pounds a week per person beginning May 1. And Canadians will get 2 pounds a week—2 pounds of meat. Canada will not ring in butter, lard, shortening, oil, cheese, and several other products on that ration. Our officials even have the gall to pretend that we still get 2 pounds a week—in their propaganda. Then they say: "But, of course, you won't want to use all that for meat. You will want to buy some of the other meat substitutes with part of your points, such as butter and shortening." I have been keeping house for many years, but I have never seen butter, lard, margarine, shortening, or oil used as a substitute for meat. They aren't, in any man's language, if English still means what it says. There isn't an ounce of protein in most of these products they call substitutes for meat, and what it means is that most of us will go entirely meatless. We are raising big gardens. We will have wonderful vegetables, although that is nothing new in this community. But we can't eat them just out of boiling salt water. They have to have butter or seasoning of some kind. This, I think, has disillusioned people more than any other one atrocity committed by the Office of Price Administration. We are all Democrats down here, but believe me we are going to have something to say about this at the ballot box. We think one way to win this war is to get rid of some of those technicians who seem to be fixtures in the Democratic Party. If we have to shelve the party to get rid of them, well and good. We just happen to believe that the military and strategic angles are not the only ones that will win this war. We think it can be lost on the home front, too. And we think the easy way to lose it here is to keep these bunglers on the pay roll. We think you cannot put a hard-working man on a Chinese coolie diet. We think you cannot place Americans, who have eaten meat for generations, on a cereal and soybean diet and keep production of war materials at their peak. We think you cannot suddenly put meat-eating Americans on what will be about an ounce and a half of meat a day without wrecking the national health. It boils down to that. You can figure on each ration going for a pound of meat, a half pound of butter, a half pound of shortening or a half pound of margarine and oil, and a few ounces of cheese or bacon.

The consensus of opinion around here is: "No one can live and work on it." Nor can they. And in spite of the good work Prentiss Brown is doing to clear up the intolerable mess * * * and in spite of Mr. Roosevelt * * * I do not give my party a 2-cent chance in 1944 unless some realism and common horse sense are applied to problems that Washington is not solving.

Here are some more answers the people want: Elmer Davis, the new Mr. Davis, Harry Hopkins, and Mr. Prentiss Brown can answer these:

Australia furnishes the meat for our men in that area.

The papers have printed the fact that Great Britain is buying huge quantities of meat in Argentina and furnishing most of the meat to our men in the European area.

No matter how much more meat our Army and Navy men eat * * * over and above what they ate as civilians * * * it can't be more than 10 percent of our normal production. This is not new population, as Elmer Davis and other spokesmen seem to infer. They talk as if this is new population that has suddenly sprung from the blue. These men ate meat at home. They will eat only a certain percentage more in the service. I'll give them 10 percent over what they ate at home * * * which is high. Stomachs are only so big. They hold only so much.

Elmer Davis and other spokesmen have said over and over again that lend-lease requires less than 5 percent of our total production.

Added together this makes 15 percent * * * let us say 20 percent to be generous. Then where is the rest going? What does the Government want with it? One answer may have occurred in Savannah about a month ago when 25,000 cans from Army stores spoiled in the warehouse, and not even the public works in Savannah knew what to do with 25,000 cans of spoiled tomatoes, some 400,000 points' worth of tomatoes as people wistfully remarked.

These figures, we are asked to swallow, do not total up. There is a bad discrepancy, and officials seem to have forgotten that we Americans can still count and add a column. Certainly we expect to be rationed, but we also expect a fair deal. We expect figures to check, to make sense. We expect the truth, and to date we haven't got it.

Sincerely yours,

EDITH DICKEY MOSES
(Mrs. C. C. Moses).

The Coast Guard in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish our people knew more about the Coast Guard, its patriotic, unselfish service, fighting the elements, enforcing the laws on the sea, policing flooded areas, relieving the sick and distressed wherever in suffering, peril, disaster, or affliction, defending humanity and the Nation at all times in time of war or peace. To the record of that splendid service in time of peace, unsurpassed on land or sea, there must be added now its war on submarines, its work of keeping sea lanes open, convoying men, munitions, and supplies, hunting the seas for the derelicts, the rafts, the torpedoes, rescuing the wrecked, and comforting the dying.

By the organic act of January 1915, uniting the Reserve Cutter Service and the Life Saving Service into the United States Coast Guard, it was affirmatively declared that the Coast Guard shall constitute a part of the military forces of the United States and shall operate under the Treasury Department in time of peace, and operate as a part of the Navy, subject to the orders of the Secretary of the Navy in time of war or when the President shall so direct.

While the Coast Guard, in these days of heroic deeds, of outstanding achievements, of splendid service, and of daring adventure, is operating as a part of the Navy, it still operates by the law of its creation as a distinctive unit. This important armed service deserves proper recognition. The glorious heroic services and noble traditions of the Coast Guard must be recorded and preserved. Much glory is justly due the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Service, but the Coast Guard shines with no less a resplendent luster.

Before the United States Navy was created, the Coast Guard existed as the Revenue Cutter Service. After the freedom of the American Colonies had been won, the Continental Navy was disbanded. There existed no sea force available for the protection of the coasts and the maritime interests of the United States until the Revenue Cutter Service was authorized by the act of August 4, 1790.

Until the Navy was authorized a few years later, the cutters formed the only armed force afloat belonging to the young Republic. The officers of the first cutters were appointed largely from the officers who had served in the old Continental Navy. The first commission granted by President Washington to any officer afloat was issued to Capt. Hopely Yeaton, of New Hampshire, in the Revenue Cutter Service.

By act of July 1, 1797, the President was authorized to employ the cutters to defend the seacoasts and to repel any hostility to the vessels and commerce of the United States.

Vessels of the Coast Guard have been armed, their crews have been drilled, and they have had strict naval discipline since 1790. The service has fought in every war in which this Nation has been engaged, with the exception only of the War with Tripoli, and it has always rendered eminent service.

When we fought the quasi war with France in 1799, revenue cutters proved to be our greatest assets. In the War of 1812 it was a cutter that made the first capture during that war. In each war thereafter the revenue cutters served.

In the World War the Coast Guard, in the loss of the *Tampa*, incurred the largest loss of life incurred by any United States naval unit during the war, with the exception of the *Cyclops*. The *Tampa* was sunk by a German submarine and every officer and man on board perished, 115 in all, of whom 111 were Coast Guard personnel. This vessel had escorted no less than 18 convoys from Gibraltar, comprising 350 vessels, with a loss of only 2 ships through enemy action. The British Admiralty, in appreciation of the *Tampa's* good work, wrote Admiral Sims:

Those enlisted men of the Coast Guard who went down with the *Tampa* did not go into the war zone through the process of enlisting in the Navy or in the Naval Reserve Force, or by volunteering for naval

duty. They went because they were enlisted men of the Coast Guard and therefore subject to the military duty of the Coast Guard, for which they had enlisted, and for which they had been trained.

In each of these periods the other normal, peacetime functions of the Coast Guard have continued with unabated vigor.

The work of the Coast Guard is true in the most minute detail to its motto, "Semper paratus" (always ready). With a record of glory unsurpassed, the men of the former Revenue Cutter Service, the men of the former Life Saving Service, and the men of the Coast Guard have been always prepared and always ready. That motto is the personal motto of each individual in the Coast Guard. The public does not realize how truly it lives its motto and maintains its traditions whether in calm or storm, in peace or war, for the Coast Guard has no special publicists or expensive public-relations staff to proclaim its virtues and advertise its achievements.

We are taught in Holy Writ that the tree is known by its fruit: "Wherefore, by their fruits ye shall know them" applies to the Coast Guard as truly as to all other fields of human endeavor, and by that rule the Coast Guard is willing to be measured.

Rear Admiral John Downes, United States Navy, Commandant of the Ninth Naval District, speaking over the radio on WLS, Chicago program, January 23, 1943, from the Great Lakes Training Station, said in part:

It seems appropriate to tell you something about the United States Coast Guard. With the possible exception of the silent service (the sailors on our submarines), I doubt if there exists a greater group of unsung heroes than the men of our Coast Guard. During peacetimes the Coast Guard is under the Treasury Department, but at the first sign of national emergency it becomes a part of our Navy. Long before Pearl Harbor, in fact, as early as November 1, 1941, the Coast Guard and the Navy joined forces. We men of the Navy feel that this reunion is really the return of a brother, for we belong to the same family.

In addition to protecting the 40,000 miles of shore line and American waterways, the Coast Guard is doing a fighting job wherever our Navy sails. Many of the deeds of the Coast Guard cannot now be told, but in the final reckoning, when the last score is tallied, theirs will be a glorious tale. What a fine job they are doing.

Manning our troop transports, landing the marines at Guadalcanal, handling the assault transports in North Africa, and, in their 83-foot "sub busters," driving the enemy submarines farther and farther from our shores. Fighting on the four corners of the earth side by side with the men of the Navy and the Marine Corps you can always find the sailors of the Coast Guard. Theirs is a valiant tradition. Their motto is "Semper paratus" (always ready), and every day, every hour, they are proving that it is no idle phrase. Men of the Coast Guard, a salute to you, and (to make certain no one feels that we have overlooked the ladies), a salute to those new recruits of yours, the Spars.

I should add here the words of Admiral Nimitz about the air raid on Wake Island:

To me this operation epitomizes the complete unity with which all the fighting forces in the Pacific—the Army and Navy, the Marine Corps, and Coast Guard—are coordinating their strength and skill against the enemy.

The officers and men of the Coast Guard serve as maritime policemen, who are always prepared for all the eventualities of life. They must be ready always not only for human offenders and human conspiracies but also for the unpredictable assaults of nature, the violence of storms, and the caprices of calms. Fighting icebergs, rescuing from floods, saving from earthquakes, the transition from guardian to warrior is easy, for the training of every officer, enlisted man, and surfman is so complete, his experiences so varied, his duties so vast, and his preparation so complete that he readily turns from missions of mercy to deeds of daring.

On November 1, 1941, the entire Coast Guard Service was transferred officially from the jurisdiction of the Treasury to that of the Navy. However, Coast Guard vessels continue to function according to regular Coast Guard procedure. At present the duties of the Coast Guard may be divided into three general categories—regular, combat, and post security.

REGULAR DUTIES OF COAST GUARD

The Coast Guard installs and maintains lighthouses, lightships, radiobeacons, buoys, and all the other aids to navigation that prevent disaster at sea. War measures and dim-outs have curtailed some of these responsibilities, but additional duties are substituted in connection with the new overseas bases.

Coast Guard cutters on weather patrol continuously man the two Atlantic weather stations and collect and forward meteorological data for the benefit of ocean shipping and the transatlantic clippers. When each year the great icebergs from the Greenland ice cap start south to melt later in the Gulf Stream, Coast Guard cutters on ice patrol search the area, chart the bergs, and destroy those that make dangerous the shipping lanes. No repetition of the *Titanic* disaster is permitted if humanly possible to prevent.

The Greenland and Alaska patrols carry justice and medical care to the peoples of those remote regions. In the tour of Alaskan waters in 1939, when a subcommittee of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries was investigating Alaskan fisheries, the humanitarian work was seen by me personally and other members of the subcommittee when a fishing craft hailed the cutter which carried us, to obtain, for a native suffering from a fractured jaw, first-aid relief and transportation to the nearest hospital. The flag of the Coast Guard in many remote places of the earth is symbolic of Red Cross service.

Vice Admiral—then Rear Admiral—R. R. Waesche, Commandant of the Coast Guard, after an analysis of motorboat-assistance reports made by the Coast Guard, said, "We found that from 80 to 90 percent of those disasters were avoidable. They were either due to faulty equipment, or lack of equipment, or incompetence of the operators." As a result of reports made by Coast Guard officials, the Coast Guard Reserve Act of 1939 provided for this relief by checking safety equipment and educating the motorboatmen. In 1941 that act was amended so as to provide for a military reserve to augment the civilian auxiliary.

The regular duties of the Coast Guard have been enlarged, expanded, and somewhat altered for the war. The Greenland patrol has assumed tremendous importance since the service has undertaken the protection of that strategic area with its potential value as an air base and its rich cryolite mines at Ivigut. In fact, the present commander of the Greenland patrol was in command of the Coast Guard cutter *Northland* that made the first naval capture of the war in this hemisphere when she seized a vessel off the shores of Greenland and destroyed the pro-Nazi radio station it had established. The Bering Sea is still patrolled, but to the protection of seals in that area from the encroachments of Japanese poachers there are added heavier responsibilities. More than ever now accurate information of weather and the position of the ice floes and bergs is necessary for the success of escort operations. The responsibility for these services still rests in part with the Coast Guard, even though the former ice patrol and weather patrol no longer function in the same way or at the same locations as in peace.

The opportunities to continue regular lifesaving traditions are increased now that the torpedo has been added to the normal hazards of the sea. Beach patrols are still maintained, but the surfmen are armed in readiness for saboteurs who might attempt to land upon our shores. The Nation will long remember that it was Coast Guardman J. C. Cullen whose keen eyes and presence of mind led to the capture of four Nazis on a Long Island beach last summer. The use of dogs and horses along the coast line has increased the scope of individual patrols. Dogs are now on patrol in every naval district and mounted Coast Guard men are being used along the Pacific coast and up the Atlantic as far north as the Jersey shore.

COMBAT DUTIES OF THE COAST GUARD

The combat duties of the Coast Guard usually imply direct participation by Coast Guard vessels and personnel in Navy task units. In the last war the Coast Guard suffered the greatest proportionate loss of life among commissioned officers of the various services when 3.14 percent were killed. Considering all officers and enlisted men, the percentage of battle losses in the Coast Guard was 1.74 percent in comparison with that of 1.42 percent in the Army.

In this war the cutter *Alexander Hamilton* was torpedoed off Iceland, the *Acacia* was sunk in the Caribbean, and the *Muskeget* and *Natsek* disappeared without a trace somewhere in the North Atlantic. Coast Guard men have been killed in the Solomons engagements, both in landing operations and on board the destroyers *Little*, *Gregory*, and *McCauley*. The casualty list of the Coast Guard is at no time and at no season a closed book. That list grows from month to month.

A number of Navy troop transports are now completely Coast Guard manned

and officered. One of these is the *Wakefield*, which was damaged by bombs near Singapore and later swept by fire in the Atlantic. There are others—others which have landed men in the South Pacific atolls in one ocean, on the Moroccan shores of another, and on the Algerian beaches of the Mediterranean. A skill that has stood the Coast Guard in good stead in this connection is its proficiency with small boats, backed by its fidelity to the surfman's motto at all surf stations, "You have to go out, but you don't have to come back." The experience and unwavering courage of those Coast Guard men qualifies them peculiarly for one of the latest wartime assignments given our Coast Guard—the manning of many of the barges that land our soldiers and marines on hostile beaches. Transports under the jurisdiction of other branches of the service often have Coast Guard men as coxswains and crews on their landing barges.

But the usefulness of those men in the Coast Guard is not restricted to landing operations alone. Technical Sergeant Hurlburt, a marine combat correspondent, wrote:

> There is not a marine in the Solomon Islands who will not pay tribute to the gallantry of the Navy and Coast Guard units that took part in the attack. During the torpedo bombing that occurred Saturday morning, August 8, Navy and Coast Guard gunners manipulated their pieces with devastating effect, scoring hit after hit on the low-flying Nipponese. Few, if any, of the bombers lived to report back to Tokyo.

All the larger Coast Guard cutters of the 327-foot class are now assigned to trans-Atlantic or Pacific escort operations. These seaworthy vessels are useful in heavy weather and when taking on a tow. They are especially useful on long convoy routes, when destroyers and corvettes may become unable to patrol their stations because of lack of fuel capacity. The smaller seagoing cutters of the 165- and 125-foot classes are all engaged with the Navy on coastal and antisubmarine patrol. Coast Guard aircraft, together with Navy and Army planes, are helping to cover our offshore convoy routes. Although the aviation branch of the service is limited, with just enough pilots to man them, it is an integral unit of the service. Just how successful these operations have been against the submarine menace must remain undisclosed for the present. One thing is certain and that is that of the bombs dropped by Coast Guard aircraft, depth-charge patterns laid by Coast Guard cutters, and the shells fired from Coast Guard guns, many have found their mark.

The Coast Guard "picket fence" has played a most important part in forcing the submarine menace away from our shores. It was found from the experience of our own submarine officers in the Pacific that the presence of innumerable Japanese sampans forced them to stay submerged and proved to be one of their greatest inconveniences. The Coast Guard "picket fence," composed of many hundreds of small vessels that lie offshore upon our continental shelf, have exactly the same effect upon German U-boats. The most perfect example of the success of these and other Navy measures is the very small number of sinkings that have occurred since their initiation.

Another duty was undertaken by the Coast Guard when the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation was consolidated with it by an Executive order of February 28, 1942. This Bureau, headed by Capt. R. S. Field, is responsible for the general safety and protection of all our merchant vessels and their crews. In addition, the War Department has asked the Coast Guard to inspect all transports before they leave the ports of embarkation.

PORT SECURITY

Port security is the third function of the Coast Guard. Moreover, it is its most important single duty, since the Coast Guard, under the Secretary of the Navy, is responsible for the safety from fire, sabotage, or negligence of every water front in the United States. This includes inland waterways and the Great Lakes as well as the sea coasts. Coast Guard responsibility for port security began on June 27, 1940, when the Espionage Act of 1917 was invoked, whereby certain powers controlling the anchoring and berthing of ships was vested in the Secretary of the Treasury. By subsequent amendment these powers have been transferred to the Secretary of the Navy when the Coast Guard is operating under the Navy. Since June 27, 1940, the anchorage regulations have been issued by the Coast Guard. In addition, the President on February 25, 1942, issued Executive Order 9074, which gave to the Navy primary responsibility for water-front security. The Secretary of the Navy, by his letter of April 29, 1942, placed that responsibility in Vice Admiral Waesche, Commandant of the Coast Guard.

The Port Security Section at Coast Guard headquarters was created to carry out this responsibility. Capt. W. N. Derby was its first chief, and it now is administered by Capt. N. B. Hall. There is a rear admiral on each coast who coordinates port-security activities in the districts. The district Coast Guard officer is the supervisory agency, while the captain of the port is the actual enforcing agent. These new requirements have made tremendous demands upon the Coast Guard's available manpower. This demand is not only for the guarding of the water front from the land side, but the manning of the hundreds of Coast Guard picket and reserve boats that patrol the harbors and of the 250 fireboats for which the Coast Guard has contracted. The training school at Fort McHenry, Baltimore, has helped in training men for this specialized work.

These new duties have necessitated a great increase in the size of the Coast Guard. Its growth has been so rapid that before the close of voluntary enlistment, as many men were being shipped in 1 month as were enrolled in the whole service less than 2 years earlier.

COAST GUARD CUTTER "CAMPBELL"

Possibly the most outstanding achievement of the present war was the series of engagements of the Coast Guard cutter *Campbell* in the Atlantic recently in which the cutter rammed and sank one submarine and depth-charged four others. This series of engagements covered 5 hours. Only one man, Commander James A. Hirshfield, born in Cincinnati, Ohio, and who lived most of his youth in San Antonio, Tex., was wounded. Commander Hirshfield was injured when struck by a piece of ricocheting metal.

The record of the *Campbell* is so full of daring and so typical of the work the Coast Guard is doing everywhere that I shall deal with it in a separate extension which I have inserted today.

The Coast Guard takes pride in itself. But it takes an even greater pride in the tasks assigned it and the tasks performed. Whatever the call, whether to sink a submarine, or land a force on a beachhead, or to rescue a shipwrecked crew, the work has been done quietly and well. They have not sought applause but achievements. The awards have been few, and in my personal opinion far below the number for proper recognition of the Coast Guard. Of the thousands of decorations that have so far been awarded the services, only seven have gone to the Coast Guard. Sailors in peacetime, the Coast Guard is always ready for war. Theirs is a life of courage, of fortitude, and of unselfish service.

The work of the Coast Guard never ends. For a century and a half along the coast its men have been fighting the forces of nature to make safer the lives of sailors and of all who go down to the sea in ships. There is no peace in this everlasting conflict and there are only few and treacherous truces. Storms, icebergs, smugglers are constantly recurring dangers. Against these the Coast Guard always fights. War adds only another human foe to the unrelenting enemies of normal times.

I have omitted reference to the splendid work that is being done by the women reserves known as the SPARS. That work will form another chapter in the glorious annals of Coast Guard Service, but I omit it now in order to discuss it later in greater detail. Sufficient to say now the SPARS are making a record in keeping with the best Coast Guard traditions of the present and the past.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include

a brief article of Mr. C. F. Byrns appearing in the Times-Record of Fort Smith, Ark., under date of March 31, 1943, as follows:

OFF THE RECORD

(By C. F. Byrns)

The bitter tax debate in the House was a draw.

The irresistible force met the immovable body. The House would not approve the Ruml plan nor the Ways and Means Committee plan, so the whole matter goes back to the committee for further study. That may easily mean that nothing will be done now to change the present system of paying income taxes.

All the various proposals provide for withholding money from every pay check roughly sufficient to pay the Federal income taxes on that income. There the similarity ends.

The Ruml plan would make the withholding tax collections apply to the present year's income, and wipe out all liability for taxes on last year's income. The Republicans supported that. The Democrats, following some strange reasoning which I am unable to approve, opposed it almost as solidly.

The House Ways and Means Committee plan proposes to continue the present system of collecting taxes this year on last year's income, which is usually all spent when the year is ended. It provides a withholding tax, but the yield of it would be applied to last year's income, just as quarterly payments are under the present system.

A small majority turned down the Ruml plan. But the Ways and Means Committee plan couldn't muster a majority either. Obviously, something has to give before any change can be made in the present law.

I think the Ruml plan is sensible, and something very much like it will finally be enacted. It may not be this year.

The arguments which have been used in the House debate on this thing rise to the height of absurdity. It has been charged that the skip-a-year proposal would cost the Government $10,000,000,000 or some other figure, representing 1 year's income taxes. Of course, it would do nothing of the sort.

If the Ruml plan should be adopted, nearly all people would pay more income taxes between March 15, 1943, and March 15, 1944, than they would pay under the existing law. The reason is that the tax payments in 1943, and the final settlement on March 15, 1944, would apply to an income in 1943 which will be materially larger than the income in 1942. The Department of Commerce recently gave the official income figures for 1942 at one hundred and nineteen and nine-tenths billions, and the estimate for 1943 at one hundred and forty billions. The tax on one hundred and forty billions will be more than the tax on one hundred and nineteen and nine-tenths billions. Under existing law, the paymets up to next March 15 will be on one hundred and nineteen and nine-tenths billions. Under the Ruml plan the payments would be on one hundred and forty billions. If you can figure out how that would cost the Government money, you're pretty good.

There are two ways the Government could possibly lose money on the Ruml plan. One is this: When a taxpayer dies, under the Ruml plan he would not still owe the Government income tax on his last year's income, as he does under existing law. From the big taxpayer, the Government takes its large and juicy bite out of his estate through inheritances taxes. For the little taxpayer, death would leave his income tax accounts with the Government balanced, and the inheritance tax would not reach him because he doesn't leave enough.

The other situation in which the Government might lose is this: If a taxpayer suddenly ceases to have any taxable income, he would owe no more tax under the Ruml plan. He would owe tax on his last year's income under the present law or the committee plan. When income stops the great majority of taxpayers have nothing left with which to pay. The big taxpayer about whom the Democrats have talked so much in the debate, does not suddenly cease to have income, except in the rarest cases. The benefit of the Ruml plan goes to the little fellow, not to the big one.

Finally, the Government will never collect a great deal of the taxes owed by many smaller taxpayers unless some method is provided to collect it out of current income.

It is my opinion the Government will make money by the Ruml plan, both for the immediate future and for the long pull.

The notion that anybody will pay his taxes in advance, 2 years at a time, has no foundation. There is too much probability that some future Congress will get down to reality and enact some plan for bringing tax payments up to date and making them out of current income.

Coast Guard Cutter "Campbell"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the record of the Coast Guard in this war is well illustrated by the splendid service of the Coast Guard cutter *Campbell*, under the command of Commander James A. Hirshfield.

The release issued by the Navy tells the story so graphically that it should be preserved upon the records of the Congress.

In another extension which I am inserting today, I am dealing with the Coast Guard in war.

The *Campbell* was named in honor of Secretary of the Treasury George W. Campbell, of Tennessee, who served under President Madison in 1814. She was launched June 3, 1936, at the Philadelphia Navy Yard and is one of the most modern Coast Guard cutters.

The *Campbell* has a standard displacement of 2,000 tons and measures 327 feet in length.

The release of the Navy with reference to the Coast Guard cutter *Campbell* is as follows:

COAST GUARD CUTTER ENGAGES SIX U-BOATS IN 12 HOURS; SINKS ONE

The United States Coast Guard cutter *Campbell* rammed and sank one submarine and depth charged five others in a series of engagements, which took place during a period of 12 hours while the *Campbell* was on convoy escort duty in the Atlantic recently.

The *Campbell* was commanded by Commander James A. Hirshfield, United States Coast Guard, San Antonio, Tex., the only man wounded in the operation. He was injured when struck by a piece of ricocheting metal.

The cutter's running fight with the pack began when the cutter was separated from the main convoy to carry out a special assignment. She had gone some 25 miles distant, on orders to investigate the suspected presence of a submarine pack. After the investigation, she headed back to the convoy. On the way, the *Campbell* encountered an enemy sub on the surface. Hurrying to the spot, she saw the sub submerge, and immediately dropped a pattern of depth charges

Scarcely had the cutter driven this first sub down when it responded to the signals of a corvette that it was engaging another submarine. The cutter immediately rushed to the corvette's assistance.

The next morning, a third submarine was sighted on the surface. As the submarine dove for protection, the *Campbell* dropped a pattern of depth charges.

As the cutter proceeded to rejoin the convoy, she sighted her fourth submarine. Once more the enemy sub found it expedient to submerge. As the cutter bore down on it, the U-boat dove desperately, but the cutter dropped another pattern of depth charges. Shortly after this engagement, the *Campbell* sighted the fifth sub and forced it to submerge.

The sixth engagement of the day came as the cutter was about to resume her station in the convoy. The enemy submarine's presence in the vicinity was observed by the Coast Guard officers. They immediately established its position and rushed to the attack. This was the twelfth general quarters call to be sounded in 24 hours, and the *Campbell's* men once more opened their ready boxes. Steering a collision course for the Nazi sub, the cutter bore down upon it and continued on its path until the U-boat was so close that the *Campbell's* gunfire had to be discontinued. The enemy sub was dealt a glancing blow by the cutter. As the sub drifted free of the cutter following the collision, the cutter's guns resumed firing, and got off several rounds at point-blank range. The *Campbell's* officers could see the sub shudder from the impact of the exploding shells

A Coast Guard officer said the sub was constructed with a huge conning tower and possessed heavy armament. During this engagement, however, she was never given the slightest opportunity by the cutter to put up a fight.

The *Campbell*, however, had been damaged by the ramming. Her side below the water line had a 12-foot slit, from which the engine room was quickly flooded. Not only were the cutter's engines powerless but her electrical system was dead. Although there was no list, she was adrift several miles from the convoy. Four of the men went over the side and into the icy water to inspect the damage. An attempt was made to rig a collision mat, but it was ineffective. The captain ordered the ship lightened as much as possible and all available extra weight was jettisoned.

Then a Polish destroyer, the *Burza*, Lt. Comdr. Franciszek Pitulko in command, came to the scene. The skipper of the *Campbell*, Commander Hirshfield, remained in active command in spite of his wounds.

The next day 4 officers and 100 nonrated men of the crew were transferred from the *Campbell* to the Polish destroyer, which continued screening all that day and into the next night. The *Campbell's* officers had nothing but high praise for the *Burza*. She had been at Dunkerque, where her bow had been blown off, and minus a bow she had crossed back to England. When she arrived at the *Campbell's* scene, she had only one boiler working because of a fuel shortage. The gallant Polish vessel was already crowded and had virtually no food left and little fuel. Nevertheless, she stood by and took aboard the men from the *Campbell*.

The comment of the *Campbell's* men when they left their Polish host was "that she was the fightingest ship we have ever seen." One story that was told that the *Burza* had chased a German U-boat into a mine field and then had proceeded to depth charge her.

This fighting spirit was noticeable on the journey home. One morning, it was noticed that one of the *Burza's* holds was flooded. Her officers did not show the slightest concern or change her course, but merely pumped her out and went along as usual. She stayed with the *Campbell* until a British corvette arrived to help the latter.

On the day after the ramming of the sub, a British corvette arrived, and the *Burza* shoved off. The next afternoon a British destroyer arrived, she and the corvette screening all that night. The next day, a tug arrived and took the *Campbell* in tow. The little tug had churned its way through 800 miles of open sea without an escort.

With the destroyer as escort, the *Campbell* was towed to port. Her officers and men were all topside, all on the alert. Without air support and at a greatly reduced speed, the destroyer, which was short of fuel, was replaced as escort by a corvette the third day of the towing. Ten days after the collision with the sub, the *Campbell* reached an east coast port.

COMDR. JAMES A. HIRSHFIELD, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Comdr. James A. Hirshfield, United States Coast Guard, was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, July 30, 1902, but spent most of his youth in San Antonio, Tex. He entered the United States Coast Guard Academy in 1922 and was commissioned an ensign October 17, 1924. For the next 10 years Commander Hirshfield was on active sea duty in both Atlantic and Pacific waters. He was promoted to lieutenant, junior grade, 1926, and to a lieutenant, senior grade, in 1928. Commander Hirshfield served in Alaskan waters in 1931. He was promoted to lieutenant commander in March 1933 and served as an instructor in Spanish at the academy in New London during the years 1934–37. He married Miss Marjorie Prentis of New London, Conn., in 1935. Commander Hirshfield, in addition to his interest in Spanish, is an authority on law, having taken special training in the general subject at the University of Chicago and Texas University. In 1937 he entered the George Washington University law school in Washington, D. C., and was graduated with the degree of bachelor of laws in June 1939. During the period of his studies he served as a duty officer at Coast Guard Headquarters. Promoted to commander August 1942, Commander Hirshfield has been on sea duty throughout the war.

Commander Hirshfield has two children, Katherine, 7 years old, and James A., Jr., 4. They and Mrs. Hirshfield are making their home at 33 Wesley Street, Newton, Mass.

LT. COMDR. FRANCISZEK PITULKO

Lt. Comdr. Franciszek Pitulko, skipper of the Polish destroyer *Burza*, has been in the Polish Naval Service most of his life. He was graduated from the Polish Naval Academy at Torun, Poland, in 1923, and subsequently served in various capacities on torpedo boats and destroyers. His specialty is gunnery.

He escaped from Poland at the outbreak of war aboard a naval vessel and took part in action at Dunkerque and Calais and in Norway. He was executive officer on the destroyer *Biorun* when that ship engaged the German pocket battleship *Bismarck*, which was sunk after a spectacular North Atlantic battle.

Lieutenant Commander Pitulko was born in central Poland 34 years ago.

Tenth Anniversary of the Return of Beer as a Legal Beverage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. CULLEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, to millions of Americans April 7 is just another day of work in the great job of winning the war. But this date has a significance in American history which should not be permitted to pass without notice.

Ten years ago tomorrow, by vote of Congress, light beer was brought back to the people of this Nation as the first great move of the citizens to sweep the bootlegger, the racketeer, and the gunman out of our national life.

The end of the unforgettable 13 years of murder and hijacking, corruption of government, speakeasies, and general disrespect for law and order came swiftly after the return of legal beer.

As one thinks back to April 7, 1933, one remembers the crowded bread lines and park benches of the terrible economic depression. With the legalization of light beer came the breath of new life for more than a score of stagnating industries, the creation of new cereal markets for farmers and the opening of thousands of new jobs.

The legalizing of beer, with a Federal tax of $5 a barrel and varying State taxes, brought new revenues to government at a time when these revenues were sorely needed. In 10 years this tax, which has been increased as an emergency measure from time to time has brought to the Federal Government alone a total of $2,728,188,578. These figures are the official Treasury figures up to March 1, 1943. Millions of dollars have been added as well to the treasuries of States, counties, and municipalities.

It is to be deplored that at this time well-meaning persons have forgotten the lessons of the prohibition era, and opportunists who know but ignore those lessons should try again to tamper with the present enforceable statutes which have the wholehearted support of the majority of people.

To raise the dead issue of prohibition today when millions of our men in the armed forces abroad and at home have little opportunity to make their desires felt in civil life, is to create disunity at a time when unity of purpose and effort is needed.

To spread the fiction that these men who are protecting the Nation should be protected from themselves by any sort of prohibition is directly in opposition to the educational systems which constantly emphasize to youth the blessings of moderation and the true meaning of temperance and tolerance.

We can look at the record of legal beer during the last 10 years and we will find it a good record. We can give a word of commendation to the socially reputable and responsible brewing industry for its cooperation at all times with local, State, and Federal government.

We can take satisfaction from a recent report of the Office of War Information which recounted a Nation-wide survey and found that sale of 3.2 beer at Army camps is conducive to high morale and the maintenance of sobriety in the best behaved Army in history.

I am proud to have had a small part in the action which brought about a return to law and order and the restoration of a small privilege to millions of my countrymen who had been deprived of a moderate beverage by immoderate legislation.

Congressional action in restoring beer to its legal status came about through adoption of H. R. 3341 of which I was the sponsor in the House. The bill was introduced in the Senate by the late Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, then chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

One of my treasured possessions is a copy of that bill signed by President Roosevelt, John N. Garner as Vice President, and the late Henry Rainey as Speaker of the House. Framed with it is one of the four pens used to give that bill effect as a law of the United States, a law which for 10 years has proved its worth.

Eighty-five Alphabetical Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, it is not uncommon for a Member of Congress to receive inquiries from constituents asking advice as to the full name of some alphabetical agency operating in behalf of the Government. The April issue of the American Press furnishes the answer so far as 85 branches referred to by their initials are concerned. Pursuant to the permission granted to me, I include the article from the American Press, which is as follows:

EIGHTY-FIVE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT REFERRED TO BY THEIR INITIALS

There are now 85 departments and agencies in the Government which are commonly referred to by their initials. For the information of editors who may be forced to use these initials in their headlines, we print below a complete alphabetical list of the abbreviations:

A. A. A.—Agricultural Adjustment Agency.

A. C. A. A.—Agricultural Conservation and Adjustment Administration.

A. M. A.—Agricultural Marketing Administration.

A. R. A.—Agricultural Research Administration.

B. A. E.—Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

B. E. W.—Board of Economic Warfare.

B. F. D. C.—Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.
B. L. S.—Bureau of Labor Statistics.
B. P. I.—Bureau of Public Inquiries.
B. W. C.—Board of War Communications.
C. A. A.—Civil Aeronautics Administration.
C. A. B.—Civil Aeronautics Board.
C. C. C.—Civilian Conservation Corps; also Commodity Credit Corporation.
C. C. S.—Combined Chiefs of Staff.
C. I. A. A.—Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.
D. H. W. S.—Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services.
D. P. C.—Defense Plant Corporation.
D. S. C.—Defense Supplies Corporation.
E. S. B.—Economic Stabilization Board or Byrnes board.
F. B. I.—Federal Bureau of Investigation.
F. C. A.—Farm Credit Administration.
F. C. C.—Federal Communications Commission.
F. C. I. C.—Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.
F. D. A.—Food and Drug Administration.
F. D. I. C.—Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
F. H. A.—Federal Housing Administration.
F. H. L. B. A.—Federal Home Loan Bank Administration
F. P C.—Federal Power Commission.
F. P. H. A.—Federal Public Housing Authority.
F. S. A.—Farm Security Administration; also Federal Security Agency.
F. T. C.—Federal Trade Commission.
F. W. A.—Federal Works Agency.
G. A. O.—General Accounting Office.
G. P. O.—Government Printing Office.
H. O. L. C.—Home Owners' Loan Corporation.
I. A. D. B.—Inter-American Defense Board.
I. C. C.—Interstate Commerce Commission.
M. R. C.—Metals Reserve Company.
N. A. C. A.—National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
N. H. A.—National Housing Agency.
N. L. R. B.—National Labor Relations Board.
N. R. P. B.—National Resources Planning Board.
N. W. L. B.—National War Labor Board.
N. Y. A.—National Youth Administration.
O. A. P. C.—Office of Alien Property Custodian.
O. A. W. R.—Office of Agricultural War Relations.
O. C. D.—Office of Civilian Defense.
O. D. T.—Office of Defense Transportation.
O. E. M.—Office for Emergency Management.
O. L. L. A.—Office of Lend-Lease Administration.
O. C.—Office of Censorship.
O. P. A.—Office of Price Administration.
O. P. C. W.—Office of Petroleum Coordinator for War.
O. S. F. C. W.—Office of Solid Fuels Coordinator for War.
O. S. R. D.—Office of Scientific Research and Development.
O. S. S.—Office of Strategic Services.
O. W. I.—Office of War Information.
P. B. A.—Public Buildings Administration.
P. R. A.—Public Roads Administration.
P. W. A.—Public Works Administration.
P. W. C.—Pacific War Council.
P. W. R. C. B.—President's War Relief Control Board.
R. E. A.—Rural Electrification Administration.
R. F. C.—Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
R. R. B.—Railroad Retirement Board.
R. R. C.—Rubber Reserve Company.
S. C. S.—Soil Conservation Service.
S. E. C.—Securities and Exchange Commission.
S. S. B.—Social Security Board.
S. S. S.—Selective Service System.
T. V. A.—Tennessee Valley Authority.
U. S. C. G.—United States Coast Guard.
U. S. D. A.—United States Department of Agriculture.
U. S. E. C. C.—United States Employees' Compensation Commission.
U. S. E. S.—United States Employment Service.
U. S. M. C.—United States Marine Corps; also U. S. Maritime Commission.
WAAC—Women's Army Auxiliary Corps.
WAVES—Women's Auxiliary Volunteer Emergency Service (Women's Reserve—U. S. Naval Reserve).
W. D. C.—War Damage Corporation.
W. M. C.—War Manpower Commission.
W. P. A.—Work Projects Administration.
W. P. B.—War Production Board.
W. R. A.—War Relocation Authority.
W. S. A.—War Shipping Administration.

Some Straight Thinking From the "Grass Roots"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a column from the Nebraska City News-Press written by a former member of this body, Mr. J. Hyde Sweet:

THE KICK KOLUMN

Last night's aerial Tub Thumper said he was quite sure the American people will go down to the very depths of deprivation in order to feed the Army and Navy, provide adequately for lend-lease and—here's the disquieting thought—care of the rest of the world.

Insofar as our troops are concerned, we'll surely go hungry in order to prevent their malnutrition. We'll go the limit on lease-lend, too—as we already are doing. But when it comes to wet-nursing the rest of the world—an estimated 1,500,000,000 supplied by a mere 8 percent of that total—this reporter wants the statement made more definite and certain.

Speaking only for himself but suspecting he may win a few seconds to the motion, The Kick declares once more that this country has no responsibility, humanitarian or otherwise, for supplying radio sets to Kamchatkans, doughnuts to Patagonians, and nursing bottles filled with cows' milk to any others who live outside our boundaries.

A lot has been said about the unselfishness of our people, and such praise is well earned. Always we have been Lady Bountiful, not Uncle Shylock as the never-to-be-forgotten British editor once denominated us. We gave millions even to the Nips when Tokyo was shaken all to hell, more's the pity. We always have been the Fall Guy when it came to financing the other fellow's enterprises, questionable and otherwise. We still are in the hole to the extent of 11 billions lent on Mr. McAdoo's IOU's, and only one nation—the smallest debtor of them all—paid a dollar on the principal.

At this writing, the No. 2 man of the administration is sojourning in South America. He makes quite a hit, they say, by speaking Spanish to the Latins. That's a noble gesture, but what I would like to know—and mebbe you have a similiar yen—is what sort of commitments he is making to those folks on behalf of this Government?

Knowing Mr. WALLACE's propensity for spending other people's money, it is enough to give a body chills to meditate over the promises he may be making in a moment of enthusiasm and without any letters-patent of authority from the people's representatives in Washington.

I'm in favor of going down to the depths for the sake of those who are fighting our battles in 30 some scattered spots on this no longer far-flung globe, but, to use scriptural language, I'm damned if I favor sending mouth-harps to moujiks, peanuts to Parsees, or crapshooters' dice to Dahomey, unless they're sent cash on delivery with return postage guaranteed.

If that's an unpatriotic thought, chum, make the most of it and remember what happened the last time.

It is of little value to cry over spilled milk, but you have a right to remember your tears of the former occasion, unless you're a complete ninny. Also you should recall that in this country, at this moment, locally and nationally, are thousands upon thousands of persons, well-intentioned and otherwise, who have a perfect mania for blowing in your money for their own aggrandizement.

Every time you institute a reform it costs you your money, and don't forget. And when you try to collect you get either the icy stare or a charge that you are a selfish wight who ought to be liquidated.

When it comes to charity, this reporter is willing to go the limit to those folks who really need help but, after getting it, are willing to show a tiny bit of appreciative cooperation and coordination and, if able to do so, pay it back.

When it comes to playing the role of Lady Bountiful—and risking again the appellation of Uncle Shylock—your Uncle Pete wants to be shown. Certainly, he is eternally ferninst giving away everything in the pantry merely to augment the delusions of grandeur which already have darned near "ruint" us.

We have a war to fight, let's fight it and win it and forget about the poor benighted Hindu at least for the time being. (J. H. S.)

Baltic Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following review from the Washington Evening Star of a new book by Dr. Alfred Bilmanis, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Latvia.

BALTIC INDEPENDENCE DEFENDED BY ENVOY—DR. BILMANIS DISCUSSES HISTORY AND CULTURE OF STATES WHICH RUSSIA WOULD ABSORB

THREE STARS BETWEEN THE ANVIL AND THE HAMMER; LATVIA AND HER BALTIC NEIGHBORS

(By Dr. Alfred Bilmanis)

From now until the war's end the United States will hear much about the Baltic states—Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania. Occupied by German troops, the Baltic countries' post-war status is a question at issue between two of the strongest United Nations. Soviet Russia claims they are a part of the

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The United States recognizes their theoretic independence.

Dr. Bilmanis, the author of this work on the Baltic states, is Latvian Minister to the United States. He has no government to speak for. He represents a concept—Latvian independence. His book, privately published, argues the validity of Latvian claims to continue in the liberty which became hers during the break-up of the old Russia of the czars during the late years of the World War.

The Baltic people are racially unrelated to the Russians and ideologically unsympathetic to sovietism, Dr. Bilmanis reports. "They do not speak the Russian or German language, nor are they Slavic or Teutonic by race. The Estonians and Finns speak their own Finno-Ugric languages, which are akin to Hungarian, and the Latvians and Lithuanians speak languages classified as belonging to the Baltic branch of the Indo-European family of languages, derived directly from Sanskrit."

The Soviet Union, however, is not a racially or linguistically homogenous state. It is a vast association of different peoples, from the advanced Ukrainian farmers to the primitive Uzbek nomads. Dr. Bilmanis writes that there are more important barriers to successful membership for the Baltic states in the Soviet Union:

"The Balts and the Russians differ from each other practically in every way. They have different laws and different judicial systems. In their political and economic structure the former are democracies with private property, the latter a dictatorship with collective property. In their intellectual aspects they are also entirely separate entities—the Balts are individualists, the Russians Communists. The Balts are idealistic, religious, and believe in an eternal life after death. The Soviet Russians are materialistic, atheistic, and consider religion an opiate for the people."

Russian culture is young, while the Baltic peoples "since the twelfth century, thanks to the intense influence of the Roman Catholic Church and the Reformation of the sixteenth century, have developed along the lines of western European civilization." And "Baltic culture, owing to its affinity with Scandinavian culture, has always been determined by a composite of Scandinavian western European influence. Those acquainted with Baltic literature, architecture, art, and music are aware that they are not in the least influenced by Russians, but rather by Swedes, Italians, French, and English."

The Baltic peoples have been independent only since 1918, but they have nurtured nationalistic sentiments for many centuries. The Vikings overran their territories. The Swedish descendants of the Vikings controlled them. Russia possessed them, and the France of Napoleon dominated them. The Romans of the days of Tacitus knew about them, for Tacitus reports on the Aistii tribes which lived along the Baltic shores and collected the amber that brought rich rewards to traders from Rome, Greece, and Egypt.

The three Baltic republics were born of the political volcanoes of 1916, 1917, and 1918—the Russian revolution, the termination of the war between Russia and Germany, and the elevation of Bolshevism and its spokesmen to supreme authority in the new Russia. In those 3 years, three regimes rose in Russia, republics created on the fringes of Russia, rose and fell. But the Baltic countries which won freedom in that time of chaos kept it when most of the states that split off from Russia were too weak to resist incorporation in the Soviet state.

Dr. Bilmanis makes the point that the Baltic republics have a revolutionary origin. They were not conceived by the treaty-makers at Versailles. An attempted Communist coup in Estonia in 1924 was quickly overwhelmed. For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Baltic republics disappeared only in 1940, when fears and apprehensions about security had prodded Moscow into seizing a number of lands along her western frontier. From the American point of view, the three countries never have embraced either Russia or the Soviet system willingly.

The problem of the Baltics synthesizes the problem of the small state and the limited principle of self-determination set forth in the Atlantic Charter. It is commonly said in Washington today that one result of the conversations of Anthony Eden here has been to lay the groundwork for reconciling the official Soviet and American views about the Baltic states. The one thing certain about the future of those three countries, whose population totals about 5,000,000, is that they will disappear into Russia unless the United States decides to play a role in world political affairs in order to insure the security of peace in the world.

Veterans' Administration Represents a Vast Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, we are prone to forget that the United States Veterans' Administration furnishes a number of services to veterans and their dependents which has made it one of the most important and useful Government agencies.

The following editorial from the April 8 issue of the National Tribune is a tribute to the Veterans' Administration and contains useful information on the many fine services being rendered:

A VAST ENTERPRISE

For the past 2 years the National Tribune has published weekly illustrated feature stories of the more than a hundred facilities of the Veterans' Administration. We have presented to our readers, the managers of the hospitals, homes, and regional offices. Those articles were enthusiastically received. Beginning with our March 4 issue we started a new series covering the activities of the central office and its key personnel, and on page 2 of this paper will be found the sixth of a series that will run 27 in number. In the preparation of these features, we have enjoyed the close cooperation of Administrator of Veterans Affairs, Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, and his Director of Public Relations, Capt. Edward McE. Lewis, and, although we initiated them, the burden of preparation was assumed by the Administration.

We had a definite purpose in making this most valuable information available to our veteran readers. The vast majority of veterans of all wars and of the regular services and their dependents have only the most meager knowledge of the rights available to them. The general public knows even less about the magnitude of the machinery that grinds out administration of veterans' laws, or about how they came into being. Therefore, as a public service to veterans and the public alike, we sought a response from the Veterans' Administration so that we could sell a bill of goods through generously illustrated articles to the end that there might be less careless criticism of a permanent agency which is by far the largest in our country today, one that has already been a going concern for many years and one that will increase in size and usefulness as time goes on.

When it is realized that this establishment is the product of the effort of veterans, is manned at the top by veterans cognizant of the problems and needs of servicemen and their dependents, and that those who administer the vast maze of veterans' laws are but the keepers of the keys, their jobs subject to good behavior and honest endeavor, veterans as a whole and the Nation's entire citizenry can well be proud of the magnificent memorial that has here been wrought by organized veterandom to their departed comrades, their disabled buddies and to the loved ones of those who have passed away.

With the coming of World War No. 1, this country was ill prepared to cope with the aftermath of war. There were in being a Pensions Bureau, a National Homes Administration, and a Department of Public Health, all under separate management with histories of excellent service. The new war brought added needs and the Congress passed much legislation. War-risk insurance became a thriving national business. Insurance was extended to men and women in uniform. Compensation laws superseded outmoded acts on the statute books. Need for hospitalization increased, and existing facilities could not carry the domiciliary load. Then came the Veterans' Bureau and other services. With the war's end came vocational training, expanded medical services, and many other provisions for servicemen and dependents.

Organized veterans went to the Congress for more laws and in 1930 had passed the Consolidation Act that brought all agencies relating to veterans under one head—the Veterans' Administration as it is now constituted. Today, operating out of Washington, there are 103 suboffices in 45 States, all under the management of responsible, experienced, and understanding supervisors. Ninety-three hospitals with 63,000 beds and all modern equipment now serve veterans; some are being expanded and new ones are building. Twelve homes render care to domiciliary patients and provision is made for financial aid to State homes. During the fiscal year 1941–42, there were 242,000 hospital admissions of veterans of all wars. All told, 934,000 veterans were physically examined in that time and 33,000 received dental care. Special clinics with the best available physicians render modern treatment for the control and cure of cancer, tuberculosis, and other diseases taking their toll of veterans.

Space permits only sketchy analysis, but here are more statistics. As of March 1, this year, 764,184 veterans of all categories were receiving pension or compensation grants, and 414,659 widows and other dependents were on the rolls, a total of 1,178,843, and all paid through the veterans' agency. Exclusive of insurance benefits, more than $430,000,000 a year are expended in direct benefits. Insurance claims through death awards, total disability, matured endowments, and cash surrenders amounted to $38,000,000 during the last fiscal year. These contracts were faithfully met by one of the largest insurance businesses of all time, owned and operated by the veterans of this Nation.

Nor is this all. The insurance division has handled 4,500,000 accounts of World War No. 1 veterans with a coverage of $40,000,000,000, and of them, 588,000 are still active with a coverage of $2,500,000,000. Over 8,000,000 service men of World War No. 2 have applied for $55,000,000,000 in insurance. The Administration also operates portions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act and it is giving premium payment protection to 40,000 holders of $100,000,000 of insurance held by private companies. Other millions of dollars purchase subsistence and supplies annually for

the hospitals, the homes, the central and regional offices and go also to new construction; these accounts all go through the finance section. A pay roll of $75,000,000 represents a personnel of 45,000 men and women, and 1,250,000 checks go out monthly for interadministration activities.

Just now, while the sons and daughters of America are again protecting the country from its enemies, this review is believed to be in order. It must be a source of great comfort to them and to the parents of those who serve, or will serve, to know that through the years a structure of laws and their means of operation are insuring the future security of those who survive, and of their dependents. By congressional action benefits already theirs include pensions and compensation, domiciliary care, hospitalization, retired pay for officers, insurance, care of dependents, vocational training, prosthetic appliances, medical treatment, and assurance that in the end none will lie in a pauper's grave.

The responsibility involved in the operation of this vast enterprise covering security from the donning of the uniform to the sounding of taps over a hero's grave is of great magnitude. From time to time there have been criticisms of administration and some have been warranted. Most have been local in character and have been quickly eliminated; only once or twice in the long history of veterans' care has there been any scandal attached to the agencies, and there has been none at all for more than 20 years. As these vast services are expanded to meet the requirements of the veterans of previous wars and of the 12,000,000 men and women who are expected to be in this one, there will be further additions of personnel and the Veterans' Administration will be the largest institution of its kind in all history. That growth must be in safe hands.

Bureaucracy and its attendant evils must not be allowed to creep in. It must continue to employ veterans in all key positions. If abuses come, the veterans' organizations will demand immediate and absolute correction. The good done and doing must not be undone. Those who operate the Bureau are and will continue to be the agents of the veterans themselves. They are the custodians only of the rights of veterans; their hands must be free from taint or those veterans' leaders who are responsive to the will of their followings will rise up in righteous wrath to strike down and purge the offenders.

We do not anticipate such a contingency. The entire country has every reason to be proud of the structure the veterans have builded. We look ahead confidently to an enduring future of honest, understanding, and competent service to the men and women who have given and will always give unselfishly to their country in order that all citizens may enjoy the rights they have had preserved to them.

What Follows This War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the present session of Congress, I introduced House Joint Resolution 28, for the purpose of creating a 32-member post-war planning commission, including representatives of the executive branch of government, of the legislative branch of government, and of the general public. It is my conviction that post-war planning both on foreign and domestic policy must be conducted with a clear-cut realization of the impact of the one upon the other, and by a group representing all elements of our governmental structure and the public, if it is to be successful in developing patterns for the post-war world which will be accepted without partisan argument, sectional disputes, jurisdictional obstacles, or popular suspicion. Such a commission as I have proposed will lift post-war planning out of the realm of political bickering and partisan jockeying for position.

Under leave granted me by the House, I herewith append the radio script of an address I delivered last night on a program emanating from radio station WHN of New York City:

ANNOUNCER. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the air. From Washington, D. C., ladies and gentlemen, we bring you the twentieth weekly program in a public-service series, featuring outstanding leaders of the United States Congress. We are privileged to have as our speaker tonight, the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, a member of the important House Foreign Affairs Committee, and author of a far-reaching resolution, introduced on the opening day of the Seventy-eighth Congress, calling for the establishment of a post-war planning commission. And now we present Congressman MUNDT, who will discuss with you the question "What follows this war?" Congressman MUNDT:

Mr. MUNDT. As old as war itself is the ancient military maxim, "In time of peace, prepare for war." Unfortunately, almost equally old is the failure of the human race to follow a course of action which might in time make wars impossible—this otherwise but neglected course of action might be summarized in the words, "In time of war, prepare for peace." On the opening day of the present Congress I introduced House Joint Resolution 28, with the hope that the post-war planning commission, for which it provides, might help develop a program for the post-war world, both at home and abroad, which would assure the fact that out of the sacrifices and heartaches of this conflict there might come a world free from war and vastly richer in the qualities of human relationships which make for civilized and Christian living. If we are this time to win the peace, the time to begin planning for that sacred victory is now. It seems to me that tonight—the twenty-sixth anniversary of our entrance into World War No. 1—is an especially appropriate time to consider this matter.

It is my proposal that Congress provide for the establishment of a 32-member post-war planning commission, to be representative of various points of view, to be strictly nonpartisan in its approaches to the post-war problems, and to bring together the executive and legislative branches of Government with a like number of representatives from the general populace. This commission would give serious, dispassionate, practical, and impartial consideration to the development of post-war plans which will protect and preserve the blessings of the American way of life here at home while projecting to as many people as possible throughout the world an opportunity to enjoy and develop systems of self-government in a family of nations, from which war will be banned as an instrument for settling international disputes or internal disagreements. The foregoing seems to me to be the objectives for which right-minded people in every land are hoping and praying in these troubled days. That being true, it is doubly tragic that in this country, after more than a year of active participation in the war, we have failed to create any representative, official group charged with devoting its attention to the sifting and sorting of propcsals and the development of ideas aimed at implementing these objectives into tangible post-war realities. In short, we are failing to prepare for peace, and if the war were to end tomorrow we would be much more seriously unprepared for the peace table than we were for the fields of battle after Pearl Harbor.

Every well-read American realizes today that a large variety of post-war proposals are being developed and discussed by individuals and by groups without official status. Some are the dreams of private citizens, some the creation of individual members of the executive department or the Congress, some the proposals of groups and organizations. Each plan has its proponents and its opponents but none has the support of any considerable group of the public officials who in the final analysis will approve or disapprove what is to follow this war.

Mechanical inventions for the war are tested by practical, nonprejudiced, realistic men and women whose sole criteria for determining the value of a new proposal are such questions as "Will it do the job?" and, "Is it practical?" No questions are ever raised about politics, position, or popularity of the person who fathered the invention. A similar "testing laboratory" or "proving ground" is needed to examine and test and study and analyze the various proposals now being discussed on the air and in the press for rebuilding the world and for defining America's position and policies after the war. A commission such as I propose could do this job and unless it is done by some official group we shall once again find partisanship and prejudice seated at the peace table and encamped in the councils of the mighty as we consider our post-war attitudes on both foreign and domestic policy.

A brief examination of the many post-war proposals now being discussed indicates the need of a single post-war planning commission to analyze and harmonize post-war proposals both from the standpoint of our domestic affairs and our foreign attitudes. Neither can operate in a vacuum. Domestic policy must be shaped as a part of the warp and woof of wise foreign policy. Foreign policy must be geared into the mesh of our domestic economic and political affairs. To attempt to forecast either an efficacious domestic or foreign post-war program for America without analyzing the impact of the one upon the other, is to doom the program to failure at the start since when the two are competitive rather than complementary the one will eventually bring disaster to the other. Some there are who say, "What is good for America is good for the world." Others say, "Whatever is good for the world is good for America." Both or neither of these groups may be correct. So much depends upon what is incorporated under the heading of good that wise prudence suggests the best manner in which to develop patterns which will be really good for both America and the world is to study them together and to fashion them simultaneously in an atmosphere of serious, nonpolitical, nonsensational, realistic solemnity and to do this now so that our long national record of winning wars and losing peace treaties will this time be brightened by a victory of equal magnitude both in the theaters of war and in the temples of peace.

Before Pearl Harbor, America had two foreign policies whose disciples for want of better terms, were defined as "interventionists" and "isolationists." Today, America has no clear-cut foreign policy, because in the extreme of what the terms imply we have no "interventionists" and no "isolationists." That is to say, there are virtually no "isolationists" in our midst if by that term is implied a desire for holding back in the war, to settle for less

than victory, or to deprive our fighting forces throughout the world with everything they need to finish the job. By the same token, there are no "interventionists" of consequence in America today, if that term implies a desire to commit this country to a program of being permanently or perpetually involved in foreign wars, or to maintain armies of mercenary soldiers forever fighting in support of expanding American interests, whether they be territorial ambitions to create an imperialistic empire, or financial interests to force our trade or political philosophies upon reluctant people by the bayonet and the sword. Americans, all, want to see war banned from this earth, they want to do what we can to make sure that this time "these sacrifices shall not be made in vain," and they desire to see the blessings of a fair chance for a free people expanded to people everywhere who have the desire and the ability to develop systems of self-government which will protect the weak against the wicked.

Since neither pure "isolationism" nor permanent "interventionism" has the enduring substance and practical value to define a realistic foreign policy for America, a less sterile attitude must in some way be defined and developed. Someone has said that the most dangerous thing in the world is the void left by a lost religion. I think there is a lot of truth in that. I think, however, that a second and only slightly less-dangerous hazard is the void created by the absence of an accepted and acknowledged foreign policy. This American void and its resultant hazard to world betterment must be erased. I know of no better way to approach the development of a post-war program than to bring together around one table a group of men and women motivated by both idealism and realism for the purpose of outlining the factors of an acceptable American foreign policy following the war, for crystallizing in increasingly less general terms our peace objectives, and for considering our domestic post-war problems in their relationship with the type of world for which we hope and pray.

My resolution provides that a post-war planning commission for these purposes be created. Its 32 members shall be selected as follows: 8 by Secretary of State Hull and 8 by ex-President Herbert Hoover, these 16 to be chosen from the best brains in America, in or out of government, with at least two each chosen from the fields of agriculture, labor, business, and the professions. The remaining 16 will be selected from the legislative branches of government as follows: Four chosen by the majority and 4 by the minority leaders of the Senate, and 4 by the Speaker of the House and 4 by the minority leader of the House of Representatives. Thus, 32 leaders in representative fields of activity would be gathered together from the general public, from the executive departments, and from Congress; their selection would be on a strictly bipartisan basis so that both great political parties (and none can say just when this war will end and which political party will be in control when peace comes) can join in developing its recommendations with a happy freedom from partisanship in a field of activity in which partyism and political prejudice must always hamper more than they can help.

We are already tardy in making a practical, nonpartisan approach to the problems of peace, and there is little more time that we can safely lose in setting up the machinery for winning the peace if the terrible agonies and sacrifices of this war are to bring us a victory for statesmanship which will be anything near as great and as impressive as the victory for military valor which our fighting forces are now beginning to write into the records of all our far-flung battle lines. Just as unity is essential to a military victory, a unified approach to the problems of peace is essential to the translation of such victory into terms which will produce the type of post-war world for which we prayerfully hope.

To secure such a unified approach it is imperative that no department or individual in Government seek to monopolize our national planning on what is to follow this war. The future of America and of the world is too important to be simply a matter of individual concern or of concern to a single branch of government. We should have learned the folly of such a myoptic policy from our experiences following the last war. The people of this Republic want no international rabbit drawn out of a global hat as a "take it or leave it" symbol for the post-war world. This is a people's war and the people have a right to help evolve and determine the type of world which is to follow it. Having failed to preserve the peace of the world in the past, statesmen of the present have little to recommend them as sole claimants to authority as to what is best for the world of the future. Let us, therefore, have a post-war planning commission which will be truly representative of the people of America and let us have it established at an early date.

By bringing the executive departments, the Congress, and representative members of the general public around one table for constructive conferences we can best provide a wise and unified approach to a just and peaceful world after the war.

ANNOUNCER. Thank you, Congressman MUNDT. From Washington, D. C., ladies and gentlemen, you have just heard CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the Air, a public-service program presenting each week an outstanding leader of the United States Congress. We were honored tonight to have as our speaker Congressman KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, who addressed you on the question, "What follows this war?" CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the Air is arranged by Leo J. Paulin. Be sure to listen at this same time next Tuesday night for another highly informative talk by another outstanding Congressman.

The Manpower Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Star of Friday, April 2, 1943, written by Frank R. Kent, in which, speaking of the manpower situation, he says:

The result, of course, has been a mess—so bad a mess, indeed, that, recognizing it himself, the President nearly 2 months ago appointed a committee composed of James F. Byrnes, Bernard M. Baruch, Admiral William Leahy, Harry Hopkins, and Judge Samuel Rosenman to investigate and report with recommendations.

Considering the personnel of the committee and recalling the rubber report, which first gave the country the facts of a bad situation and then laid down the formula by which it could be straightened out, there was justification for the hope that similarly satisfactory results would flow from this report. All of which makes it pertinent to inquire why this report has not been made public.

I do not know, and, so far as I know, no one else knows, what is in the report. I might be opposed to the ideas expressed in the report, but certainly it does seem to me that when this special investigation has been made, the public and the Senate should know what is in the report.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—PUBLIC, SO FAR, IS DENIED GLIMPSE AT FINDINGS FOR SOLVING PROBLEMS OF MANPOWER

(By Frank R. Kent)

Notwithstanding the President's press conference talk of a great "land army" in which high school boys are to figure and Mrs. Roosevelt's advocacy of a "land army" composed of women to ameliorate the food production and distribution crisis, it is clear that the administration is still without coherent ideas on the vital problem of manpower.

For many months we drifted without even the machinery for handling it. When, finally, the President set up a manpower commission and named Paul V. McNutt manpower commissioner, there was some expectation that definite action would follow. But all that followed were pompous statements couched in general terms.

It wasn't really the fault of Mr. McNutt. He was neither in position to make policy himself nor was he handed a policy from higher quarters. The only manpower policy the administration has is the negative one expressed in its opposition to the Austin-Wadsworth bill, which is the only affirmative policy that has been offered.

REPORT COMPLETED

The result, of course, has been a mess—so bad a mess, indeed, that recognizing it himself, the President nearly 2 months ago appointed a committee composed of James F. Byrnes, Bernard M. Baruch, Admiral William Leahy, Harry Hopkins, and Judge Samuel Rosenman to investigate and report with recommendations.

Considering the personnel of the committee and recalling the rubber report, which first gave the country the facts of a bad situation and then laid down the formula by which it could be straightened out, there was justification for the hope that similarly satisfactory results would flow from this report. All of which makes it pertinent to inquire why this report has not been made public.

The investigation was completed some time ago and the report with recommendations was given to the President. Moreover, it was a unanimous report.

All this was several weeks ago, but neither press-conference questions nor editorial demands have succeeded in plucking the report out of its present Presidential pigeonhole.

When asked about the report the other day, Mr. Roosevelt said, in surprise as though he had never heard of it, "What report?" And when the facts were recalled to him he dismissed the whole business by saying that he had received some memoranda from the Byrnes Committee, and leaving the definite impression that the memoranda were confidential and would not be made public.

Now to suggest that the report was confidential and that it was in the form of memoranda is hardly an accurate description of it. But if he wants to minimize or bottle it up, the President is under no compulsion to be accurate in his press-conference descriptions.

Nevertheless, considering the character of the committee, the unanimity of its members, and the importance of the problem, it is a little difficult for any reasonably logical person to believe that the committee contented itself with doing anything less than a thorough job for the President.

No one who knows the members of the committee and recalls what they were asked to do can come to any other conclusion.

INVITES SPECULATION

Its suppression is equivalent to saying that, though he asked this group of men to find out the truth, Mr. Roosevelt does not consider the truth should be given to Congress or to the people.

It is inevitable that the President's attitude in this matter should invite speculation as to the content of the report. The most reasonable explanation is that it contains an even stronger indictment of the incompetency with which the whole manpower question has been handled than did the rubber report on the incompetency in the matter of rubber—and that, it will be recalled, was no weak indictment.

There is a suspicion that the incompetency as outlined by the committee is of such a character that it would be impossible, after publication for the President to retain Mr. McNutt and the present machinery. He would, it is said, have to scrap the present set-up and start all over.

This would be a rather public confession that he had been wrong at the start—and clear through.

EVENTUAL RELEASE EXPECTED

Anyone who knows the President will appreciate how reluc ant he would be to make such an admission, even indirectly. It is also easy to understand his reluctance to humiliate Mr McNutt by taking things out of his hands. Yet, if the surmises as to the report are correct, he could do nothing else.

Soon or late it is believed, Mr. Roosevelt will release the report. Certainly he would be forced to do so if Congress began to clamor for it—and he would not like that. Of course, the longer he delays the worse for the national interests. It does seem that the people are entitled to candor from the President on so important an issue. And, no matter from what angle it is viewed, there seems little sense—and no point—in publicly announcing the appointment of a committee to investigate and report and then refusing to make public its report.

The War Security Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Defeat 'Gestapo Bill'" from the Boston Evening American of April 5 last.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFEAT "GESTAPO BILL"

In the so-called war-security bill, devised by the Department of Justice and pushed through the House of Representatives by administration pressure, the New Deal makes the most open and outrageous assault on individual liberty in its long history of attempts to transform the American people into a race of obedient robots.

This measure has been widely and very justly described as the "Gestapo bill."

Should it become law, it actually would clothe the Department of Justice with powers over the rights, the liberties, and the very lives of Americans virtually equal to those exercised over the German people by the Nazi sadist Himmler.

The bill provides the death penalty for "hostile acts" against the United States.

It will be readily agreed that anyone in America who commits actual hostile acts against the Nation in wartime is deserving of the heaviest penalties. But before such penalties are exacted, it should be clearly and specifically understood what constitutes a hostile act.

Under the provisions of this dangerous measure, the determination of that fateful question is very largely left to the Department of Justice.

And the conduct of the Department of Justice under the New Deal certainly has not been of a kind to justify its being entrusted with fresh power over the lives of Americans.

Further, this disgraceful Gestapo bill includes a shameful requirement that Americans snoop and spy upon each other under penalty of 10 years in prison and a $10,000 fine.

It provides that every citizen must report anyone he might suspect of planning a hostile act against the Government.

True, an amendment tacked on at the insistence of alarmed but timid critics, makes the reservation that before a citizen can be convicted and imprisoned for failing to spy upon his neighbor, it must be proved that his failure was knowing, willful, and malicious.

But with or without the amendment, that is a law to transform the decent, friendly, tolerant people of America into a nation of despicable snoops and spies.

It is a measure to poison the wells of American unity with suspicion and hate and terror.

It is a measure to divide the people of the United States neighbor against neighbor, friend against friend, brother against brother, child against parent, in the same hideous way that the people of Germany and Russia were divided so that they might be enslaved.

As originally drafted by the Department of Justice, the bill would have clothed the Government with absolute power to suppress free speech and a free press. It would have made it a crime punishable by death, to acquire, compile, obtain access to, or transmit facts that might give information to the enemy.

Under that provision, every routine act involved in the gathering and dissemination of news could have been perverted into a "crime" at the whim of the Department of Justice. It would have been necessary only to pretend that the news might give information to the enemy.

Thus the New Deal would have been provided with a perfect weapon to suppress the honest and useful newspaper criticism which it so bitterly resents and to prevent its critics from speaking their criticisms in public, over the radio, or otherwise.

In order to get the bill through the House, the New Deal was compelled to accept an amendment designed to remove that danger.

The amendment provides that nothing in the bill shall prevent open criticism of the administration or the Government by newspapers and other publications or by individual citizens, but it by no means removes all danger to freedom of expression from the measure, and, of course, it does not cancel out the obvious desire of the Department of Justice to gain control over the sacred rights to publish and to speak.

In urging the passage of its drastic and dangerous Gestapo bill, the Justice Department represented that such a law is necessary to prevent sabotage.

That simply is not true.

Enough legislation has been passed already to put anybody in jail that expresses an honest and independent opinion.

The Attorney General's office already has been criticized for abuse of powers that already exist.

The incumbent administration does not need any additional powers to oppress the people.

To create such powers, as the House has voted to do, would certainly not further the prosecution of the war. It would only endanger the liberties of the American people.

If Americans are to retain the liberties guaranteed them in the Bill of Rights, if they are to continue to be free, self-governing, self-respecting citizens and not gagged and terrified slaves, the Senate must defeat this oppressive, dangerous, and utterly disastrous Gestapo bill which the House has cravenly enacted under the New Deal whip.

Organization and Collaboration of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 7 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Senate Resolution," published in the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of March 15, 1943, and an article by Russell Weisman, published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 25, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Youngstown Vindicator of March 15, 1943]

THE SENATE RESOLUTION

In regard to the possibility of making a better peace this time than last time there are two important factors, one pessimistic, the other optimistic. The depressing consideration is that human nature changes little if any, and so blind selfishness and apathy may be expected after this war as after the last. The encouraging element is that a great many people still active in public life went through the 1919 experience, know the mistakes that were made, and so will strive to guard against them now.

The element that works against a permanent peace has been uppermost recently, as suspicion and disagreement rose between America and Russia, and in regard to French Africa, Yugoslavia, Poland, and the Baltic States. It has appeared in Congress in a Senate committee's warning that lend-lease did not bind either House in regard to post-war agreements, and in the rumblings of opposition to renewal of reciprocal trade agreements.

This week emphasis shifts strongly to the encouraging factor as a bipartisan Senate group offers a resolution which would authorize the administration to undertake certain post-war commitments, including "procedures and machinery for peaceful settlements of disputes and disagreements between nations," and even an international police force.

This is the most heartening development that has appeared in all the peace discussions. The administration obviously is willing to join in post-war international arrangements, but the willingness of the Senate, which blocked the last attempt at collective security, has been in doubt.

Without an expression from the Senate, nothing concrete could be undertaken. All the plans and aims of all the nations depend on knowing that America will join in a world settlement. No stable peace can be built without the participation of all three of the great powers, the United States, Britain, and Russia. Prime Minister Churchill can make a commitment for Britain, Premier Stalin for Russia, but President Roosevelt cannot commit the United States.

The Senate development is particularly opportune as Anthony Eden arrives in this country for conferences which will inevitably include post-war subjects. The Senators' proposal shows the trend of American thought, in both political parties, away from isolation and toward cooperation It provides a greatly improved atmosphere for the conferences and enhances the possibility of success.

The resolution need not be adopted in exactly its present form. Its sponsors, indeed, give notice that they are seeking counsel as to its final substance. But the existing form is a good statement of broad war aims, and in the main it should stand.

The resolution puts first things first by advising that the United States promote an organization of the United Nations to use all resources in the prosecution of the war. The organization would also establish temporary governments in areas occupied by United Nations forces. It would administer relief in both member nations and "Axis territories occupied by United Nations forces," thus using food as a weapon in enemy countries as well as in such areas as North Africa. Finally, it would establish "procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes," setting up a United Nations military force which would immediately suppress "any future attempt at military aggression by any nation."

This proposal of an international police force will arouse the strongest opposition. It has an aspect of surrendering national sovereignty, for the United States, like the other nations, would be subject to suppression by the police force in case of aggression. Of course, this country does not expect to become an aggressor; yet it might hesitate at promoting a world force which would be able to sit in judgment over it.

This and other points will become the subject of sharp debate in the Senate. Mildly dissenting voices already have come from members of both parties, notably Senator CONNALLY, Democrat, and Senator TAFT, Republican. But arguments are unavoidable, and this is the time to have them, while the unifying force of the war efforts exists, rather than after the war when political and economic interests will again become dominant.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 25, 1943]

AN ECONOMIST'S POINT OF VIEW—MORE UNITY ON IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF POST-WAR PLANNING IS URGED BY COLUMNIST

(By Russell Weisman)

It seems to me we ought to be able to get together better on the more important aspects of post-war planning. There is, to be sure, room for reasonable difference of opinion as to how far it is desirable to go at this time, but I am more than a little disconcerted when I receive letters which so well reflect the point of view of Henry Cabot Lodge in the League of Nations controversy.

Whether the League of Nations as it was set up would have been able to preserve the peace, had we joined, is a question about which reasonable minds may well differ. My own point of view is that the post-war settlements were so unsound and indefensible on economic grounds (I am not thinking about reparations) that, League or no League, the European peoples who had been accustomed to fight when they were hungry probably would have fought again. But all that is beside the point of this discussion.

The thought that runs through my mind when I read criticism and objection to the Ball resolution is that here we have at least the beginning of what should prove a sound approach to one aspect of the post-war situation. Senator JOSEPH H. BALL and his associates proceeded on the thesis that this Nation failed to see the job through in 1919; that a majority of us were so anxious to get back to normalcy, as President Harding expressed it, that we were quite content to let Europe stew in the juice of post-war reconstruction.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLE

Now, the Ball resolution, as I read it, is merely a declaration of principle that this unfortunate bit of history must not be repeated; that this Nation would be blameworthy in a high degree and foolhardy also if it decided again, when the shooting ends, to return to its normal peacetime pursuits and accept no responsibility for settlements, both political and economic, that hold out the promise of at least fair employment of the energies of all the people of the world, and thus of a long period of peace as well.

At this juncture it is not necessary to work out the details of a superstate. But it is not too early, it seems to me, to be thinking and planning in terms of some form of world organization that will be charged with the responsibility of using force to preserve the peace when and if it becomes necessary to use force.

It would be utterly silly for us to do what we did in the 1920's and 1930's, assume that Europe's quarrels are not our quarrels and believe that in the event of another war we would manage to stay out Since it has been demonstrated beyond a reasonable doubt that we cannot stay out, the logic of joining with our neighbors in a broad program designed to keep all the nations in line seems so clear that I find myself unable to comprehend the opposite opinion.

ONLY COMMON SENSE TO ACT

Certainly now that it is clear that the world's wars are our wars and that it costs billions to fight them, it is only common sense and enlightened selfishness to assert that we should be willing to make a reasonable investment in preventing the outbreak of wars in the future.

If it were possible to start now with that premise, it seems to me we might be well on our way to a plan for implementing such a policy by the time the fighting ends, and certainly without impeding in any sense the conduct of the war itself.

To do nothing now on the theory that it is impossible to work out a complete plan and in the fear, also, that any planning for the peace would prolong the fighting, seems to me illogical and untenable. But those who take exception to my position will dismiss what I have written on the ground that I am an internationalist.

The O. W. I. Tells the Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement made by me over station WRC and the Red Network of N. B. C., Tuesday evening, April 6, 1943:

Let us suppose you had a product to sell. Let us suppose that years of toil and loving sacrifice to bring it into being had convinced you of its practical value, of its real service to humankind, of its indestructibility. Now, let us suppose further that along comes a cunning salesman; he, too, has a product to sell. You are aware of its viciousness, of its noisome quality, of the evil it will visit upon every man, woman, and child, darkening the world's vision and beating it into slavery. You have a name for yours—Democracy—life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. He calls his, the new order. Then, through every radio, newspaper, and magazine at his disposal, he sings his wares, yes; through 2,500 daily newspapers, through 18,000 periodicals, through motion pictures, literature, and the arts, through travel agencies, tourist bureaus, cultural organizations, through scores of elaborate exhibits and pamphlets, he extols its virtues, its superiority over any known brand. He, Hitler, spends from $250,000,000 to $500,000,000 a year to tell Mr. and Mrs. Everyman that his is the best, the finest, the truest, the noblest. Would you sit complacently back and murmur to yourself, "I know mine is better," and do nothing? Or would you fight it with the truth?

You will believe as I do, as does your neighbor, as does the Office of War Information, in fighting for the truth with the truth.

We must remember that the conflagration raging in all corners of the earth today was not a result of spontaneous combustion. Man did not rise against man merely upon sight of each other Since 1933, seeds of hatred had been carefully planted and skillfully nurtured until bigotry, lust and greed joined forces in a fiendish march of destruction. How potent the word when in its wake come the gun, the tank, the death-dealing airplane.

Herr Goebbels is not niggardly. He spends, as I stated before, $250,000,000 annually—the London Economist estimates $45,000,000 a month, $545,000,000 a year—spreading his poisonous lies through South America, Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and the Orient, paying most particular attention to Spain, Turkey, Portugal, and other neutral countries.

Before going into the work of our own Office of War Information, I should like to point out just a few examples of the work of the German Ministry of Propaganda.

An excellent example is the book, Germany. It is very ambitious There are 120 photographs of German art and industry, of youth training, of armed might. It has the most expensive type of binding, much of the work has been done carefully by hand. It portrays in glorious photography Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, and all the personalities of the Nazi regime. It costs $4 a copy to publish in English alone, and that does not include the transportation. It was published in many languages at even greater cost per unit. It was estimated that the Germans spent $1,200,000 on its publication alone; that is, for 300,000 English copies which were sent out by the German propaganda machine.

Another example is the publication called Signal. It is published by the Reich in German, French, Italian, Swedish, Norwegian, Spanish, Finnish, Hungarian, Portuguese, English, Green, Arabic, and Dutch, and two additional Balkan languages. It is one of the most widely circulated of the Axis picture magazines. Copies are on all newsstands and kiosks in Ankara, Stockholm, Berne, Madeira, Madrid, and Lisbon.

Typical of the resourcefulness and ingenuity of the Axis propaganda machine which grinds out tons and tons of this type of literature is the Story of King George and His Prime Minister. This is written in Arabic and is a sort of cartoon affair. Millions were

sent out to Asia depicting British imperialism and the ineffectuality of American intervention, showing at the end that the only salvation of the Arab nation depends on a final victory won by almighty Germany and her allies.

There are torrents of such dribble published in German, French, English, Dutch, Spanish, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, and Arabic, magazines like the Freude and Arbeit, News from Germany, the Italian magazine Tempo, and the Japanese Nippon Today and Tomorrow. With all the bombast of a never-ceasing political campaign, the little man with the Napoleonic urge plasters his pictures throughout—not as Adolf Schickelgruber, house painter, but as Hitler, savior of the world; Hitler, lover of babies, patting their innocent cheeks; Hitler, military genius reviewing troops; Hitler, screaming the glories of "youth through joy" movements; Hitler, addressing the youth of Germany as if conferring everlasting life upon them, rather than the death he sends them to. Pictures whirl off the German presses, destined for all parts of the world, picture of Hitler posturing, cajoling, defiant, the toothbrush mustache bristling with heroism and gallantry. While we may be inclined to view them in the comic light, there is no humor in the cumulative effect upon peoples who waver in their choice of loyalties.

This mental sabotage must not go unanswered. The Office of War Information, headed by Elmer Davis and most able assistants, has used the most unassailable weapon, the one weapon that cannot boomerang, the truth. In going through the work of the overseas branch of the Office of War Information, I was repeatedly reminded of what Tom Paine said in the Rights of Man: "Such is the irresistible nature of truth all it asks and all it wants is the liberty of appearing."

For this gigantic task—and I ask you to keep in mind all I have pointed out previously of the outpourings of the Axis-controlled press and radio in its battle to reach the minds of men—the Office of War Information will spend less than $40,000,000 for its over-all work, both domestic and foreign. Several of our American corporations consider it good business to spend as much if not more than forty millions annually to make known their brands. The overseas branch has 33 outposts in various parts of the world, 28 of them in Allied and neutral lands exclusive of South America. The most important of these listening and distributing posts are in places like Stockholm, Cairo, Chunking, London, Beirut, and Leopoldville. They short-wave 2,688 radio shows a week in 20 languages, cable spot news, features, and texts of official speeches in 20 countries. They have 21 radio transmitters to the Nazi's 100. The Office of War Information now sends news to Algiers, Casablanca, Accrá, Brazzaville, Leopoldville, Johannesburg, Asmára, and Cairo.

Let it be noted that from June 1942 to February 1943 the Overseas Branch has published 17 one-issue publications—booklets, pamphlets, and leaflets and distributed 5,673,000 copies in all. From January 1, 1942, to March 10, 1943, this Nation spent just a little over $300,000 in all types of printed material to reach 2 billions of people in other hemispheres, peoples speaking over 60 different languages with the widest possible range of education and culture, sympathies and race.

There has been some objection of the use of articles featuring President Roosevelt and others high in authority. Studies of printed material issued by the Axis press have convinced me as it did the Office of War Information that you cannot strike a telling note without regard to personalities. To peoples accustomed to excessive Axis personalized propaganda, inured to reading, hearing, and seeing messages of, by, and for persons—dictators like Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Antonescu, Horthy—it is essential to counter impressions along personal lines: Roosevelt against Hitler; Churchill against Mussolini; Chiang Kai-shek against Hirohito; otherwise the effort is meaningless and the money is wasted.

Let me emphasize, the Bureau seeks to assemble the best facts available and to tell the simple truth. Its publications for overseas distribution are not at all intended for domestic distribution, nor are they meant to be circulated among soldiers abroad. To speak of these publications as Roosevelt propaganda is to imply that we have suddenly conferred the voting privilege upon Hans in the Reich, Luigi in Italy, Pedro in Portugal, Olaf in Sweden, Erik in Norway, Batista in Spain, and Ali Baba in Turkey, and that they will swoop down upon us and crowd into our voting booths in 1944. That's more than just a little silly.

The functions of the Overseas Branch are to demonstrate to the peoples of other countries that this really is a peoples' war, to present a true and rounded picture of the United States and its people so that sympathy, trust, and friendliness will inevitably follow, to summarize the Nation's war effort by reporting the facts at regular intervals to the peoples of the world, and lastly, to project the national picture of America and its way of life to meet the world-wide thirst for authentic knowledge of the United States.

The Office of War Information explains and interprets the war, gives information on the home front and the battle front. It explains the war aims. Elmer Davis demands that he be permitted to tell the truth about battles fought; he does not seek to minimize losses nor to exaggerate victories. He rightfully believes that the people can take it

Also, as to the foreign peoples, the people of the Axis and all Allied and neutral powers, the watchword must be, again, the truth For these, the Office of War Information dramatizes our war aims, our prowess, our invincibility, our tremendous ingenuity and resourcefulness in making and streamlining trains, ships, tanks, and guns. It has seen to it that the Axis lies have come home to roost.

Important, too, is the job the Office of War Information is doing in interpreting our allies to us, giving us the facts of their contribution toward total victory. The need for so doing grows daily more apparent when we hear little groups here and there voicing a distrust of our powerful ally, Russia. When the Office of War Information sets forth the facts that Russian casualties run to at least 5,000,000 dead, wounded, and missing and reach perhaps 6,000,000 and 7,000,000 and that an estimated 25 percent of the entire Russian population is living in territory overrun by Germany, we must realize that we are all in this war together. We must realize that the fighting Russians have done nobly their share in turning back the German tide. The Office of War Information has shown us the give and take of unified action. What a Russian defeat would have meant is obvious to all. International cooperation by no means signifies that we must adopt our collaborator's political ideology, any more than sharing our neighbor's car means wearing the kind of tie he does. We can fight and plan together for world security fully within the framework of our American way of free enterprise and private initiative. While this bit may seem a bit parenthetical in a discussion of the Office of War Information, it is not entirely so, for this is part of the Office of War Information's job—to bring us the news of our neighbors and our neighbors the news and views of America.

Be it remembered that Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Portugal, and other neutral countries have for years been subjected to nazism and fascism. These countries know little of our advancements in culture, the arts, the sciences, and economics. They know little of our habits, customs, history, and traditions. They know nothing, for example, of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Grand Coulee Dam, the Boulder Dam, our network of national highways, our agricultural set-up, our legal strides in welfare, housing, and social security programs. What knowledge have they of the silently effective work we have done in reforestation, electrification of farm communities? Who is to bring word to them of our present mammoth war production, the almost torrential flow of guns, tanks, planes, and ships, our skill and science dedicated to the winning of the war? Who will tell them of our schools, of our war against disease, of our youth, so finely trained and equipped, going forth into battle? Who is to tell them all this and tell them this is done by a democratic people. They know us only through Nazi-fascist eyes. What we can do under democratic institutions is undisclosed to them; nay, more, democracy is distorted by Axis radio and pamphlets. Neutrals must finally choose, and Axis controlled countries must eventually choose between democracy and totalitarianism. How can they select intelligently unless they understand democracy, understand our Government, our aims, our freedoms. We have a story to tell—let it be told.

You can still recall the enthusiasm that greeted the choice of Elmer Davis to head the Office of War Information. The applause was spontaneous and the favorable verdict unanimous. I cannot remember a single dissenting voice. Many a puzzled newspaper reader must have shaken his head and said, "Nobody can be that good." Well, nobody can. True, some mistakes have been made, but the wonder of it is that there have been so few.

The confusing and ofttimes contradictory releases issuing forth from the multitude of governmental agencies have been coordinated and we have been blessed with consistent, fact-telling and fact-facing news, consistent, of course, with military necessity. We have learned to rely upon the veracity of our war news. Daily reports, good news and bad, confirm our judgment that the Office of War Information tells the truth.

Most suddenly, we find a furious scratching and digging in the sand designed to discredit the performance of the Office of War Information. I hesitate to venture a guess, but can it be that the political mill needs fodder and thus seizes upon the Office of War Information because of the dramatic nature of its activities?

I can only say this. We are fighting a war, fighting it 24 hours a day, giving our sons and our labor and our comforts, working to produce more and better than the enemy. Dare we take away one weapon, be it gun, tank, plane, picture, pamphlet, or poster that brings us one step nearer to victory and place it at the altar of politics? I say for every Axis weapon, a better American one; for every Axis lie, the truth.

Right of Members of the Armed Forces To Be Candidates for Public Office

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I read with interest the statement of the Secretary of War that no member of the armed

forces may aspire to public office unless it is one he has held previously.

Since when has the Executive Department of the Government assumed powers that nullify the Constitution of the United States? Under the Constitution every citizen is guaranteed the right to hold any public office to which the people may elect him. It is the inherent right of every American whether in the Army or out, or in time of peace or war. This is a most arbitrary order disqualifying patriotic Americans in our armed forces from the lowest rank to the highest from being a candidate for public office. It is playing into the hands of the bureaucrats. Service in the Army or Navy has never before been used to prohibit anyone in our armed forces from being a candidate or accepting an elective office.

I do not know whether General Douglas MacArthur would even consider the nomination for the Presidency on the Republican ticket if offered to him, but I am quite sure that the Executive Department of the Government has no power whatever to dictate to the free people of America whom they should nominate and elect as President of the United States. I anticipate there will be a reverse reaction to Secretary Stimson's directive, as the people in America resent executive dictation and reserve for themselves the right to select their own candidates.

Mr. Speaker, I include extracts from an article from today's Washington Times-Herald:

SECRETARY STIMSON FORBIDS SOLDIERS TO SEEK NEW POLITICAL OFFICES—ORDER BELIEVED AIMED AT RISING DEMAND FOR GENERAL MACARTHUR FOR PRESIDENT

(By Walter Trohan)

Stringent revision of Army regulations, which would bar any officer or enlisted man from running for public office unless he had held the same office before entering the Army, were recently promulgated by Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, it was learned yesterday.

Disclosure of the new order raised the immediate suspicion in the Capital that it was directed at Gen. Douglas MacArthur, whose enthusiastic admirers have raised a "MacArthur for President" cry. This suspicion was denied by War Department spokesmen, who asserted that the Secretary's order of February 25 had merely clarified the Army position against political activity.

SEES ULTERIOR PURPOSE

At his press conference, President Roosevelt denied knowledge of the new ruling, but voiced the belief that its motivation was due to some ulterior purpose. Who is it directed against, he asked?

At the War Department it was acknowledged that had the same regulation been in force in the past Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, hero of the Civil War, and Gen. Zachary Taylor, hero of the Mexican War, would not have been elected to the Presidency and Gen. George Brinton McClellan could not have run against President Lincoln in 1864.

MacArthur reaches retirement age, which is 64, next January and could enter politics, if he chose to retire. The general has declared that he has no political ambitions, but his denial is not taken seriously by new dealers worried over their drive for a fourth term for President Roosevelt.

The new order reads:

"No person on active duty shall become a candidate for, seek, or accept, election to any public office not held by him when he entered active duty."

Says British Deal Bars United States Traders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

SAY BRITISH DEAL BARS UNITED STATES TRADERS—EXPORTERS CHARGE SECRET PACT SHUTS OUT OUR CHEMICALS FROM INDIAN MARKETS—NEW SYSTEM EXPLAINED—DECENTRALIZATION PLAN ON LATIN EXPORTS TO BE FUNCTIONING IN 60–90 DAYS, KNOX SAYS

Charges of a secret agreement between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain by which American chemical exporters are prevented from competing with British products in certain Empire colonies were made yesterday at a meeting of foreign traders held under the auspices of the New York Board of Trade in the Hotel Pennsylvania.

Most of the informal discussion was devoted to clarification of the new decentralization policy governing exports to Latin-American countries, with Charles F. Knox, assistant chief of the division of exports and requirements of the State Department, replying to specific questions. He revealed that the acceptance by the Chilean Government of this program had been received officially and would be announced shortly.

William Fleischman, head of the export and import division of the Office of Price Administration, in response to a question as to whether the export premium would be increased in accordance with higher overhead expenses now existing, declared that the agency is "contemplating" some relief for exporters. The reason for delay in this matter, he added, is that the Office of Price Administration "does not want to flood the trade with too many amendments," and intends to bring out a general revision of the regulation as soon as possible which will contain adjustments regarded as necessary and timely.

SECRET AGREEMENT REPORTED

The reference to an alleged secret agreement which "shuts out" purchases of American chemicals by importers in India came during a general discussion of American Government policy concerning export trade.

One trader asserted he had inquired of the Lend-Lease Administration in Washington as to whether it could confirm private advices he had received from India to the effect that a recent decision arrived at between the United States and British Governments stipulates that India's copper sulfate requirements are to be supplied solely from the United Kingdom.

He declared that he had been advised subsequently by lend-lease that "in the interest of conservation of shipping and for various other reasons a decision has been made by the Combined Export Materials Committee that Indian copper sulfate requirements are to be supplied from the United Kingdom."

This has resulted in a situation, he continued, "whereby American exporters of copper sulfate have sought to divert their product to South American countries, only to find that in order to compete there with British copper sulfate they would have to quote prices at around three-quarters of our present world prices.

PRICE TWICE AS HIGH IN INDIA

"On the other hand," he added, "when we quoted on copper sulfate to India we were advised of this secret agreement between our Government and the British, and also learned that the price charged for British copper sulfate in India was nearly double the price of our product, which has been 'shut out' by the agreement."

With regard to the mechanics of the new decentralization plan covering American exports to Latin America, which takes effect April 1, Mr. Knox admitted there would be an "awkward" interim period between the current system and the new program. He gave it as his opinion that it would take from 60 to 90 days before the decentralization program is functioning so that no licenses are issued without a recommendation from the country of import.

In answer to a specific question as to probable future policy of the American Government with regard to exports to Argentina, Mr. Knox declared "there is some additional administrative scrutiny necessary because their Government has not put into legislative effect any of those control measures that the other Latin-American countries which have severed relations with the Axis have put into effect."

During a discussion of the joint-area agreements between England and the United States, which will direct all exports to British colonies through lend-lease, several of the traders expressed the fear that this new policy will disrupt present negotiations between American producers of highly technical wartime machinery and the colonial governments. They referred specifically to dealings with New Zealand, but Mr. Knox said he had come to the meeting for the express purpose of clarifying Latin-American problems and was not sufficiently conversant with the details of the new joint-area agreements with England to provide clarification.

Mr. Knox was warmly applauded when he declared that "in general" the sentiment of the State Department and of the Board of Economic Warfare, as well as other Government agencies, is that "the private export trader has been in the past and again in the future will be our first line of commercial frontier."

Palmer, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from

the Christian Science Monitor dated March 27, 1943:

LITTLE TOWN OF PALMER CALLED TOWN THAT WOULDN'T BE LICKED

(By W. Clifford Harvey)

PALMER, MASS., March 27.—Cooperative enterprise of the good old-fashioned New England type having its roots in back-country "barn-raisings" has lifted this community of nearly 10,000 people out of the shadow of industrial decline "into the clear again."

Four years ago (it seems like only weeks to local families who have lived here all their lives) hundreds of mill workers were walking Palmer's streets, following the collapse of the local cotton textile industry, wondering where their next pay envelopes were coming from.

Today, four industries have replaced the low-waged cotton business, welfare rolls have been unloaded, the town will pay off its last bonded indebtedness this year, and a man out of work here has no one to blame but himself.

That is the climax of an interesting story in civic organization, banking leadership, Yankee fortitude, and cooperation by the Massachusetts State Industrial Commission. It could be termed typical of the wartime resurgence of industry in small towns throughout New England, only the industrial revival started in Palmer before the war with a wholesome display of civic ingenuity and foresight.

In Palmer Center, where community life revolves around its First National Bank, there is less tendency to talk about the gloomy days of 1938 to 1940 than in Three Rivers, Thorndike, and Bondsville, other industrial centers of the town of Palmer which were left high and dry by the exodus of the textile business operated by the Otis Co. Palmer Center still clung to its Wickwire Spencer Steel Co., whose workers helped to support retail business in the Center.

VALUES FLATTENED

But property values flattened in the other three centers, retail business went into a tailspin, and hundreds of idle workers sought jobs in towns 30 to 50 miles away. In its best days, the chain of Otis textile mills in Three Rivers, Thorndike, and Bondsville employed some 2,000 workers. Hence the loss of this, the town's biggest taxpayer, was a shattering blow to the entire township.

Those were desperate days for a small town in which most of the present-day residents were born and raised. And, to make matters worse, the hurricane of 1938 hit Palmer hard at its vulnerable location in the fork of three rivers, Ware, Swift, and Quabaug. The floodwaters seriously damaged local mills. Emergency action was needed not only to salvage the mill property for future use but to save the town from possible industrial ruin.

The action came in the organization of Palmer Industries, Inc., a group of 2,000 stock-owning citizens dedicated to the job of raising enough funds from savings and recreation activities to take over the Otis properties and put them in repair for new tenants. Working without pay, sometimes long hours in the night, the civic group finally got the funds together, repaired the mills with their own labor, and induced three new industries to take over the Otis plant at Three Rivers: The Cleveland Container Co., Tampax Corporation, and the White Aircraft Co. In addition, the Bondsville plant of the one-time Otis mills is being utilized by two box companies. And nearly $100,000 in tax titles taken over by the town will be off the treasurer's hands this year.

GLOWING EXAMPLE

Palmer was described today by the State industrial commission as its most glowing example of a New England town that simply "would not be licked by the depression or the hurricane or by political factions entering the town from outside to try and capitalize on local properties during the construction of the nearby Quabbin Reservoir."

As a cooperative community venture, no one in Palmer will take personal credit for the town's recaptured prosperity. President Louis Brainerd, of the National City Bank, said Everett B. French, agent of the State industrial commission, did as much as anyone to bring new business to the town. Mr. French, on the other hand, said nothing could have been done without the full cooperation of the citizens' organization in which Horace Stearns is a leading light. Mr. Stearns pointed to Mr. Brainerd as leading the way back to prosperity.

On the other hand, hundreds of citizens gave unstintingly of their time and labor to keep Palmer industrially "in the running."

Today there are some 1,200 persons employed in plants where no more than 1,800 were working at the peak of Otis mill production. During the business depression that 1,800 had dropped to only several hundred. So the 1,200 present-day job holders, plus the steady employment provided by the Wickwire Co. and several small industries, make Palmer's business streets seem more crowded today than at any other time in the town's history.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fitchburg Sentinel of Fitchburg Mass., April 1, 1943:

MR. PHILBIN'S VOTE

Democratic Congressman PHILBIN of this, the Third Congressional District, made an excellent beginning as a freshman in the House when on Tuesday, casting his first major recorded vote of the session, he joined with 10 Republican Massachusetts Members in approving the Ruml plan tax bill.

With the exception of three Democrats (including Mr. CURLEY) the Massachusetts delegation was for the measure that would turn the tax clock ahead and put the millions of new taxpayers on a current basis.

However, the plan was defeated, to the shame of the House majority, who ignored common sense and the wishes of the American people.

The lower House of Congress has suffered a disappointing reverse in popular esteem. Not long ago it joined the Senate in nullifying President Roosevelt's Executive order limiting salaries to $25,000 net. By that vote, Congress reasserted its constitutional powers, which had been long ago abdicated to the President.

Now the House majority truckles once more to the voice of the White House, which opposes the Ruml plan because it thinks someone somewhere who possesses a little money may gain at the expense of the United States Treasury. However, under the Ruml plan the taxpayer continues to pay on the basis of the previous year's income. There is no gain for anyone—until possibly when a person dies.

Under the bill taxes would be paid for 1943, for example, in 1943 on a basis of 1942 income.

What's wrong with that?

Here's what's right with it: The plan would prevent the default of taxes by millions of taxpayers after the close of the war when there will be economic changes and vast shifts in employment.

The Third District should let Mr. PHILBIN know that his vote is praiseworthy and appreciated.

The Ruml Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the reasons back of the Ruml tax plan are gradually coming to light. The following article—if it had been printed in time—would have thrown some light on this plan, but the article, written and checked by the Washington Merry-Go-Round, was not permitted to get into print. The story itself, however, still lives and, although denied publication, I present it here in full. The story is:

FRANK DR. RUML

Beardsley Ruml, author of the famous tax-forgiveness plan, is delightfully frank. As tax adviser to the Macy department store millions, he makes no secret of the fact that he was trying to find a formula to help some of his tax clients when he hit upon his idea of forgiving all taxes for 1942, then collecting taxes at the source for 1943.

Macy's has one or two older members of the firm who would like to retire, but after they finish paying taxes each year they have no appreciable nest-egg left to live on. So, if they could be forgiven last year's taxes, they would save on the scale of $840,000 taxes if they had $1,000,000 income. And this saving would be enough to live on comfortably the rest of their lives.

That was the origin of the Ruml plan. When a Treasury official proposed to Ruml that lower bracket taxes be forgiven, but higher bracket taxes be paid, Ruml's frank come-back was:

"But where does that leave me with my Macy clients?"

GHOST OF ANDY MELLON

Andrew W. Mellon was not quite so frank. As Secretary of the Treasury under Coolidge he started a campaign to lower taxes on higher bracket incomes, arguing that this would release more money for individual enterprise. In a way it did. It released millions for stock-market speculation and the Coolidge bull market.

The Mellon theory later was called the trickle-down system, whereby a large amount of money released at the top gradually trickled down to the wage earner at the bottom. However, the trickle was so meager by the time it reached the bottom, that the inequalities of that system led to the too-well-remembered economic holocaust.

Today some Republicans, once sold on the Ruml plan, gradually are realizing that, if taxes are forgiven, it is the man in the higher brackets who really benefits, not the low-wage earner whose taxes are small anyway. That is why Democrats call the plan robbing Peter to pay a bonus to Paul.

The foregoing story regarding Dr. Beardsley Ruml and his efforts to bring about tax forgiveness to aid Macy's, of which he is treasurer, was distributed to newspapers, including the New York Mirror, on March 30. Within a few minutes executives of Macy's department store had demanded of the New York Mirror that the story be killed. The Mirror obliged immediately. Thereafter a kill was sent to all editors and the story never saw the light of day. I find further that the Macy department store is a heavy advertiser in the New York Mirror. The people yelling themselves hoarse for the Ruml plan did not know these facts, but why should not the public know?

Income-Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 7, 1943:

IT'S DOUGHTON AGAINST 40,000,000

The latest plan for breaking the House deadlock on income-tax relief may run into difficulties, but the situation has become so desperate that it is well worth trying.

Today more than 40,000,000 persons are being kept in anxious suspense regarding the way their income taxes are to be collected after July 1.

They are also wondering whether their payments are to be applied to this year's earnings or merely to paying off what the Treasury calls a debt on last year's, while a new and much larger debt is steadily accumulating.

There's no doubt that the House is overwhelmingly favorable to a withholding tax on pay envelopes and salary checks which would make payments easier.

This provision was contained in both the Ways and Means Committee's bill and the Carlson pay-as-you-go measure which were rejected by the House.

The new plan would have the House instruct its committee to present a simple bill containing nothing except the withholding tax. For this the House would have to give unanimous consent.

But so far as the new bill was concerned, the only controversial sticking point, real pay-as-you-go with the old debt thrown out of the window, would be eliminated.

Surely no Representative worthy of the name would dare to block a reform in tax-collection methods on which both supporters and opponents of the real Ruml pay-as-you-go are agreed.

This procedure would have great strategic advantages for those champions of the people who are resolved to fight to the finish for the Ruml plan.

They could then concentrate on a pay-as-you-go amendment to the withholding tax bill. Should this effort fail, they could join in passing the measure as it stood and send it to the Senate.

It would require only nine recruits from the House opponents of the Ruml plan to put it across. But if they could not be obtained, the people could still look to the Senate to restore genuine pay-as-you-go and set an example which, there are increasing reasons for believing, the House might accept.

The uselessness of trying to persuade Chairman DOUGHTON to cease his obstruction of tax relief is now apparent to all. The arrogant attitude of this old man has been made doubly irritating and insulting by his action in going off for a vacation with the most pressing domestic issue now before Congress still in the balance.

His own bank account bulging with money to pay his income taxes, no matter what happens, as he has so blatantly boasted, DOUGHTON doesn't give a hang for the millions of his less fortunate citizens who seek freedom from fear of what will happen should they lose their jobs, or die, and the Treasury continued to demand its pound of flesh.

Since he has already shown his contempt for the more than 40,000,000 anxious taxpayers, it may be too much to expect Chairman DOUGHTON to let even a withholding-tax bill see the light of day.

Even so, the House need not be helpless to do the people's bidding. By mustering a simple majority—and it has already given DOUGHTON a signal rebuke by a majority of 80—the House can take tax legislation and relief into its own hands and defy the chairman's dictatorship and the machinations of the Treasury.

The battle can still be won. It will be won if the people tell their Representatives to cease denying them this sorely needed relief—or else pay the penalty at the polls.

A Blow for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 6, 1943:

A BLOW TO DEMOCRACY

The bad taste left in the mouths of most Americans last year by the appointment of Boss Hague's man, Thomas F. Meaney, to the Federal District Court for New Jersey is now at least partially removed by a laudable opinion handed down by Judge Meaney. The Federal jurist has refused the request of a Federal Wage and Hour Bureau official in New Jersey that he compel the Paterson Evening News to open its records so that the Bureau could determine whether the newspaper was violating the wage-and-hour law.

The News had refused to recognize the Bureau's subpena on the contention that the Federal statute involved does not apply to newspapers or its employees, an issue which Judge Meaney did not pass upon. Instead, the judge upheld a much broader principle, beneficial to all citizens, namely, that enforcement officials may not invade the sanctity of private affairs "simply in quest of information * * * which might or might not disclose a violation."

Judge Meaney went further and gave it as his opinion that, "desirable as the contribution of experts to the Government is, there is no indication that Congress has as yet determined to substitute a Government of mere expert opinion for a Government of law. * * * The functions of the courts remain."

Thus, by an ironical and happy turn of events, a judge whose appointment was opposed because of his political support by a little dictator now comes boldly to the defense of the democratic system. If his decision in this case is allowed to stand by the higher courts, Judge Meaney will have helped to reverse the trend toward dictatorial administration of American government.

People Versus New Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Intelligencer of Doylestown, Pa., for March 23, 1943:

PEOPLE VERSUS NEW DEAL

The inevitable cycle of public sentiment is going strongly against the New Deal philosophy of government. This is a conclusion far removed from the elements of war and the necessity for a complete victory over the Axis.

The New Deal issue is one of domestic concern. It has an inescapable bearing on the future tranquillity and security of post-war America. Possibly the most clear-cut indictment of the New Deal is its failure to account for very definite deficiencies in the management of Federal Government. When the war burst upon us, drawing our attention from the domestic to foreign front, the New Deal was in the position of a fighter who has just been saved by the bell.

But the delinquencies of the New Deal were not erased by war. They are still apparent in every turn of the administrative machinery by which the New Deal has slowly and insidiously built up a bureaucratic kingdom bordering dangerously on dictatorial impulses. One might even say that the extraordinary powers already usurped by the New Deal have been magnified and compounded under cover of war.

If this cankerous mushrooming of power and extreme authority is to be halted it is up to the people. They alone can nip this ominous threat to our constitutional processes.

The New Deal's silence on a multitude of domestic subjects close to the public heart shows an amazing boldness and indifference never intended by the fathers of constitutional government.

Before the war provided the New Deal with a convenient smoke screen to hide its domestic shortcomings, there were numerous excuses for its failure to balance the Budget and put the 10,000,000 jobless back to work.

Had the New Deal's unprecedented spending succeeded in bringing about the oft-promised recovery or even visibly started it on its way, there would have been some excuse for the outlay of some $50,000,000,000 which is now, by silence, conceded to have been squandered in vain. Actually it has been considered worse than wasted.

It cost millions of Americans the virtue of self-respect, self-reliance, and initiative. It taught them to believe that the Government should support them instead of they the Government. It created the incredibly vicious system of professional unemployment, politically organized to perpetuate itself at public expense. Getting and staying on relief became a vocation; leechlike idleness a career.

How long, even with the tremendous artificial stimulus of the war program, it will

take this country to recover from the morale-sapping effects of the New Deal's mistaken paternalism, only time can tell. Augmenting the staggering public debt piled up indiscriminately before our entry into the war will be added billions in the actual cost of winning the war. The post-war tax burden will be a nightmare of worry and responsibility for generations of Americans.

The time has passed for equivocations. The facts must be faced.

While we, as a Nation, are concerned with the paramount job of winning the war, we cannot afford to be ostrichlike in our attitude toward the New Deal and what it has done to undermine and destroy the Constitutional bulwarks which have sustained the United States of America for more than 150 years.

Why the New Deal reemployment and recovery program failed was clear from the beginning. At the very outset, normal channels of employment were blocked by systematic restriction and regimentation of business and industry. Under Government shackles and facing suspicion and hostility at every turn, these agencies did well to maintain even a precarious existence; to grow and expand sufficiently to absorb millions of unemployed was an impossibility.

As the only substitute for normal employment which it could think of, the administration embarked on a multi-billion-dollar program of "made work," ranging from leaf-raking boondoggles to ambitious public works which, while measurably useful, cost from one-half to three times more than they should and were eventually unnecessary.

The vast sums poured on these and upon various forms of Federal relief were reflected in doubled taxes on productive enterprise, driving it to greater economies and mandatorily forcing thousands of workers into the ranks of the unemployed. In such a vicious spiral, it is not surprising that the ratio of men and women without jobs soared to dizzy heights.

Not even the New Deal's wild-eyed spending on visionary and completely hopeless projects could curb the dismaying rise in idle manpower. Somewhere in the flurry of their synthetic attempt to create an uncertain prosperity, the New Deal's long-haired theorists lost sight of the age-old fundamentals and economic estimates by which trade and commerce had harnessed their progress with that of productive manpower.

Which leads us to ask:

In view of its utter failure to solve the domestic problems of peace, can we afford to entrust the future of post-war America to the peculiarly unbalanced political and economic philosophy of the New Deal? What would be the outlook for the millions of returning soldiers who will naturally expect to find jobs awaiting them?

Can industry provide those jobs if continually harassed and hamstrung by an arrogant political order?

The disturbing lessons and sad experiences of the last 10 years should provide the American people with the right answers.

McBride's Bring Honor to McKeesport

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the city of McKeesport, Pa., was signally honored on April 3, 1943, when Mrs. George McBride, of 2205 Grandview Avenue, was selected by the United States Navy Department to christen the U. S. S. *Scott*, a new, modern-type escort destroyer, at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. The *Scott* was named for a Pearl Harbor hero, the late Robert Raymond Scott, of Massillon, Ohio, who received the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously for exceptional gallantry in action. Mrs. McBride, a proud and charming little mother, has five sons in the United States Navy and a daughter-in-law, Ann Nevel McBride, in the service of the SPARS—auxiliary of the Coast Guard—now stationed at Hunter College, Bronx, N. Y. The five gallant sons, namely, George, 33; Emmett, 24; Terry, 22; Eugene, 20; and Francis, 18, all reiterate that Uncle Sam's Navy is the world's best. Three of the sons—George, Eugene, and Francis—and Ann Nevel McBride, wife of Terry, were present at the launching, as was Mr. George McBride, proud father and husband. Emmett and Terry are on sea duty.

Mrs. McBride paid glowing tribute to Rear Admiral M. F. Draemel, commandant at the navy yard, Philadelphia, for courtesies extended to her and her sailor sons while in Philadelphia to attend the launching. Mrs. McBride had nothing but praise for the employees at the navy yard who built the U. S. S. *Scott*, and she was grateful in her appreciation for the beautiful wrist watch which these employees presented to her as the sponsor of the U. S. S. *Scott*.

I also want to add my commendation to Commander Joseph Tinney, of the Public Relations Division at the Philadelphia Navy Yard, for his many courtesies extended to myself and the McBride family. McKeesport and Pennsylvania were indeed honored. The McBrides—splendid American family—will always remember April 3, 1943, the launching date of the U. S. S. *Scott*.

And I am certain that many an Axis submarine will also remember the U. S. S. *Scott*.

Infamous Gestapo Bill Must Not Pass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, this House last Friday adopted what has become known in America as the Gestapo bill. I was personally responsible for the parliamentary procedure which delayed the enactment of this bill when it was first brought before this body for consideration.

I felt that far more consideration should be given a measure conferring such broad powers on the Attorney General over the life and death and personal liberty of the people of America, than had been afforded by the House leadership.

General debate, under the rule which was granted, was eliminated, preventing the proper discussion of this legislation which was finally adopted by a voice vote, and is now before the other body.

Mr. Speaker, although certain amendments designed to protect the press and free speech were adopted by the House, I feel that this bill remains one of the most dangerous pieces of legislation we have ever considered here.

It is not only dangerous legislation—it is utterly unnecessary. We already have ample legislation to deal properly with any person committing hostile acts against our Government or any of our Allied Nations, or in any way aiding the enemy.

If proof of that is needed, it may be found in the fact that six of the eight Nazi saboteurs captured on our Atlantic coast were put to death in the electric chair here in Washington, while the other two will spend the rest of their lives in prison. Proof may be found in the fact that three men, convicted of aiding those saboteurs are awaiting execution in Chicago; and in the fact that the Supreme Court yesterday refused to review the case of Max Stephan, now awaiting the hangman's noose in the Federal prison at Milan, Mich., convicted of harboring an escaped Nazi officer.

I am in full accord with editorials published in newspapers throughout the Nation within the past day or so, to the effect that the other body should give far more consideration to this measure than was afforded it in the House.

Let me especially commend to the Members of Congress an editorial appearing in the New York Journal-American and other Hearst newspapers entitled "Infamous 'Gestapo Bill' Must Not Pass the Senate!" Editorials such as this are performing a valuable service in awakening America to the grave peril to the Nation's freedom. Under permission to extend my remarks I include the editorial at this point:

INFAMOUS "GESTAPO BILL" MUST NOT PASS THE SENATE

In the so-called war security bill, devised by the Department of Justice and pushed through the House of Representatives by administration pressure, the New Deal makes the most open and outrageous assault on individual liberty in its long history of attempts to transform the American people into a race of obedient robots.

This measure has been widely and very justly described as the Gestapo bill.

Should it become law, it actually would clothe the Department of Justice with powers over the rights, the liberties, and the very lives of Americans virtually equal to those exercised over the German people by the Nazi sadist Himmler.

The bill provides the death penalty for hostile acts against the United States.

It will be readily agreed that anyone in America who commits actual hostile acts against the Nation in wartime is deserving of the heaviest penalties. But before such penalties are exacted, it should be clearly and specifically understood what constitutes a hostile act.

Under the provisions of this dangerous measure, the determination of that fateful question is very largely left to the Department of Justice.

And the conduct of the Department of Justice under the New Deal certainly has not been of a kind to justify its being entrusted with fresh power over the lives of Americans.

Further, this disgraceful Gestapo bill includes a shameful requirement that Americans snoop and spy upon each other under penalty of 10 years in prison and a $10,000 fine.

It provides that every citizen must report anyone he might suspect of planning a hostile act against the Government.

True, an amendment tacked on at the insistence of alarmed but timid critics makes the reservation that before a citizen can be convicted and imprisoned for failing to spy upon his neighbor, it must be proved that his failure was knowing, willful, and malicious.

But with or without the amendment, that is a law to transform the decent, friendly, tolerant people of America into a nation of despicable snoops and spies.

It is a measure to poison the wells of American unity with suspicion and hate and terror.

It is a measure to divide the people of the United States, neighbor against neighbor, friend against friend, brother against brother, child against parent, in the same hideous way that the people of Germany and Russia were divided so that they might be enslaved.

As originally drafted by the Department of Justice, the bill would have clothed the Government with absolute power to suppress free speech and a free press. It would have made it a crime punishable by death to acquire, compile, obtain access to, or transmit facts that might give information to the enemy.

Under that provision, every routine act involved in the gathering and dissemination of news could have been perverted into a "crime" at the whim of the Department of Justice. It would have been necessary only to pretend that the news might give information to the enemy.

Thus the New Deal would have been provided with a perfect weapon to suppress the honest and useful newspaper criticism which it so bitterly resents and to prevent its critics from speaking their criticisms in public, over the radio or otherwise.

In order to get the bill through the House the New Deal was compelled to accept an amendment designed to remove that danger.

The amendment provides that nothing in the bill shall prevent open criticism of the administration or the Government by newspapers and other publications or by individual citizens, but it by no means removes all danger to freedom of expression from the measure, and, of course, it does not cancel out the obvious desire of the Department of Justice to gain control over the sacred rights to publish and to speak.

In urging the passage of its drastic and dangerous Gestapo bill, the Justice Department represented that such a law is necessary to prevent sabotage.

That simply is not true.

Enough legislation has been passed already to put anybody in jail that expresses an honest and indepedent opinion.

The Attorney General's office already has been criticized for abuse of powers that already exist.

The incumbent administration does not need any additional powers to oppress the people.

To create such powers, as the House has voted to do, would certainly not further the prosecution of the war. It would only endanger the liberties of the American people.

If Americans are to retain the liberties guaranteed them in the Bill of Rights, if they are to continue to be free, self-governing, self-respecting citizens and not gagged and terrified slaves, the Senate must defeat this oppressive, dangerous, and utterly disastrous Gestapo bill which the House has cravenly enacted under the New Deal whip.

Independent Reporting of Food Talks at Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock:

INDEPENDENT REPORTING OF FOOD TALKS AT ISSUE—OFFICIAL PLANNING FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE IS WATCHED CLOSELY BY PRESS AND PUBLIC—PRECEDENT SEEN IN DECISION

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 3.—When the subject of reporting the forthcoming international food meeting arose at a recent White House press conference the President, in answer to a question, said he "hoped" no newspaper correspondents would have access to the delegates. He smiled as he said it. But subsequent developments confirmed the apprehension of many of his hearers that the President expressed himself with complete candor.

This apprehension arose from the fact that if free and independent reporting of one international conference can be prevented, there is no reason why all that follow cannot be similarly conducted. In such circumstances delegates would be constrained by their governments to amplify nothing which was conveyed to the public through the medium of official hand-outs. This would be total mockery of the oft-repeated Presidential promise that the press is to remain free and, except in matters of military information, subjected to no unusual restraints nor confined to official versions of proceedings that affect the lives and conditions of present and future generations. It would channel vital, nonmilitary news through the European method of an official gazette.

But after certain developments appeared to indicate that the President was seeking to make a reality of his "hope," there were signs of back-tracking from the plan completely to bar the press (and through it the public) from the food conference and thus establish an evil precedent. Once again these indications of retreat and modification followed a torrent of reportorial questioning of officials primarily concerned, notably White House Secretary Early and Office of War Information Director Davis. They also followed the appearance of a number of Washington dispatches to the country protesting what seemed to be the official plan.

OUTCOME IN ABEYANCE

If these questions and protests have defeated an attempt which could close to the public the international conferences of the United Nations as tightly as they would be if Fascist nations were holding them, it is another victory which can be marked up to the vigilance of the representatives of the press in Washington. But the proof of the pudding, as always, will be in the eating. Until the conference is held, and the nature of the permitted reporting is made clear, those who are familiar with the trend of the President's mind in such matters will keep their fingers crossed.

They will keep them crossed because, under his guidance, this administration has been more assiduous in attempts to suppress unwelcome news than any other this correspondent has observed in action. A colleague who did not accept this opinion when it was written in peacetime many years ago, but who has meanwhile changed his mind, made the following statement in discussing the official plans to report the food conference:

"The President's notion of a free press is quite different from our own. We talk of freedom of information really, whereas he talks of how to get his point across. His interest is in how a free press can best be used."

It is obvious that if the delegates to the food conference are officially instructed to have no contact with reporters, or only the most formal relations, news of their proceedings will be confined to whatever the United States Government chooses to give out through its paid employees in Office of War Information, the State Department, and so forth. It is also obvious that if severe limitations are put on the number of reporters who may sit at the gate of the conference, official plans of news suppression will be more easily attainable. And since one part of the plan is to hold the meeting in a place where accommodations and facilities are meager and the delegates can be kept inaccessible, that choice of site can be employed to explain a limitation on numbers.

FORMULA FOR COVERAGE

A few days ago the press was advised that the President felt it was essential to the harmony and effectiveness of the conference that it be held where the delegates would not be subject to interruptions by a large number of reporters. It was informed that the conference agenda included subjects of such delicacy—the distribution of food, now and postwar, in all needful countries—that independent reporting might upset unity and affect the present cooperation of the United Nations in the prosecution of the war. To get a story, the press was told, one nation might be ranged against another by reportorial enterprise, and the delegates of one might be tempted to take the opportunity thus presented to do that very thing. Mr. Davis and Mr. Early, the press was told, would arrange to see that everything that should be revealed to the public was revealed promptly.

"Please do not assume," ran these advices, "that there is any official wish to keep the press and public from knowing what is going on. Far from it. The sole purpose is to permit the delegates to work in quiet, conclude their work and come to decisions without being rent asunder by irresponsible stories and to prevent the Axis from using premature information to stir up feelings in Europe against the food arsenal—the United States."

CONFLICTING ATTITUDES

This is the whole case for the news suppression and canalizing plan, whether all or a part of it shall finally be put in operation at the conference. Those who are willing wholly to trust official judgment in these r atters will agree to forego the responsible, balanced and vital information that can come only through independent press reporting. But those who fear the precedent that would be established, stronger because the food conference will not deal with military matters, will encourage the press to make every effort to evaluate the government hand-outs if it is denied opportunity to ascertain the facts at first hand. They will, and rightly, hold the press accountable for whatever it may seek out and publish in an effort to maintain its duty to the public and what remains in wartime of its freedom. They will and should insist it must demonstrate again that a free press can be responsible, for this is the implication in its constitutional grant of freedom.

But the press has always met and generally satisfied this challenge. And it should not be forgotten that, through an existing agency

of general censorship, the American press is already bound by a code that precludes the publication of certain kinds of news. Also, the Government has ample means in its hands to punish those newspapers which transgress the censorship code.

MODEL IMPENDING

These general restrictions, the standing and responsibility of the delegates to the food conference and the character of the American press as a whole should be sufficient to assure that independent reporting of the conference would hold none of the threats listed above as reasons for the projected limitations. In other administrations it is more likely they would be. But Mr. Roosevelt's is not friendly to the free flow of public information, independently acquired, and it has given many proofs over the course of its 10 years that this is so.

That is another reason why official preparations for reporting the food conference are being closely watched in fear that they will be unduly repressive and serve as a model hereafter.

World Peace Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday evening, April 4, 1943, over the Mutual Broadcasting network, Mr. Upton Close gave a very interesting and enlightening discussion on the cooperation of our Government with other nations of the world in the formation of a world peace organization.

Under unanimous consent, I include as part of my remarks this address:

CLOSE-UPS OF THE NEWS

(By Upton Close)

Mr. Sumner Welles, the diplomat who took the "under" out of Under Secretary of State, indulged in another pedagogical lecture to the people of the United States on Thursday, April 1. It was the unusual spectacle of an official of their own foreign office with more social contact than historical wisdom presuming to speak the mind, not of his own Nation, as is traditional, but the minds of other nations about us.

Mr. Welles had let go a few days previously with a statement less reproachful, asking if there were any better time than now to reach an agreement on practical measures for carrying out the great principles of the Atlantic Charter. Most Americans agreed that this is the time. Yet they noted a few days later that Britain's Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, in a lengthy address broadcast to the American people, did not mention the Atlantic Charter, but did mention some policies which they are unable to reconcile with that document's great principles.

Our most elegant monthly magazine, Fortune, envisions Mr. Welles as Hans Christian Andersen's naked emperor—you remember, the one who thought he was parading in a mystic robe someone had sold him until a child broke the spell by calling out in childlike frankness—"why, he hasn't anything on." Both emperor and people were shocked back into trusting their own eyes and reasons.

But talk is important, coming from the man who presumably would be the administration's most active representative in peace councils, should the war end during his tenure. It deserves note from the young Senators who think our Senate should represent the Nation in framing peace. He said, "the United States after the victory of 1918 withdrew from almost every form of practical cooperation with friendly nations in the reconstruction tasks, and made no effort to win the peace."

This is a shocker. Does Mr. Welles really believe it? Can Americans who remember how they supplied food and personnel to administer it, how they poured out money in gifts, how they made loans when told these were needed in reconstruction, how they agreed to write down loans when told they were too burdensome, Americans who hold souvenirs in the form of worthless bonds, agree to this? Can Stuart J. Fuller and his fellow Americans who with the backing of the State Department fought valiantly but vainly for the clean ending of the narcotic menace in the post-war world agree that America withdrew from almost every form of practical cooperation with friendly nations?

Can the faithful leaguers on the International Labor Council and the International Agricultural Board and the International Bank and the World Court and a dozen other international enterprises of health, crime-suppression, freeing of trades, currency adjustment, white-slave traffic, communication, and education—which were very largely supported from America—agree that they made no effort to win the peace? Can they feel that Mr. Welles is representing America rightly to the younger generation in other countries and in our own who cannot remember these efforts of 1918 to 1938 but will read the Under Secretary's words?

Can the shade of Mr. Kellogg of the Kellogg-Briand Pact agree? Can Secretary of War Stimson agree, who as Secretary of State in 1931 made a bid for joint measures against the first flagrant violation of the League—by Japan in Manchuria—only to find himself out on a limb? I came out of Asia to the League's session at Geneva at the invitation of its president, Mr. Briand, with the first eyewitness story of Japan's unholy leap, and I can testify that the record terribly needs setting straight on America's share in losing the peace after the last war. Otherwise the whole gamut of disillusionment will be run again, making Uncle Sam the international savior to Uncle, the international goat.

America's President, Woodrow Wilson, an idealist of greater scholarly historical background than we have with us today, coined the thought that through war could come the end of war. He tied in this idea with the ancient concept of a world federation, or League of Nations, which had been proposed by Plato of Greece, Hugo Grotius of the early seventeenth century, the Abbe de St. Pierre of the early eighteenth, Immanuel Kant and Jeremy Bentham of the late eighteenth, the Americans, William Ladd and Elihu Burritt of the early nineteenth century, the poets Shelley and Tennyson, and Andrew Carnegie's foundations of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Woodrow Wilson went into war on a distinctly idealistic platform and his 14 points were used to persuade the German people to cease fighting. The Germans claimed to have surrendered on that basis and the Treaty of Versailles was presumed to have embodied the 14 points. The fourteenth point called for a League of Nations, the covenant of which was adopted some 6 months after the armistice. Yet 9 months later, in January 1920, the Treaty of Versailles, which made the covenant binding, was ratified by the treaty negotiators excepting the United States.

When Wilson took this Nation into the war he was expressly assured that no secret treaties had been made shaping the peace. After the Nation was in, he learned that the Allied Nations nevertheless had given pledges to Japan, which threatened China's freedom, in order to bring Japan into the war against Germany. The effect was most harmful to the American policy of preserving national freedoms and prohibiting empire building in the Pacific. Wilson persuaded China to join the Allied Nations in the war so that China might have an equal voice at the peace conference, and Japan might be constrained to relinquish advantages pledged her at China's expense.

This was part of the background of the American Senate's rejection of the Versailles Treaty. Not that our so-called isolationist Senators understood our coming Pacific crisis. Wilson was far ahead of them; in fact, he was far more aware than any Executive since, of the hell's brew that was a-preparing for us in east Asia. I think I know, because I was one of the youngsters reporting to him from the field at the time. But Japan's encroachment on China, blinked at by our European allies and only partly modified to save the American President's face—it was called the Shantung question—was one point on which Wilson could never answer his critics. Then there was the Korean question. Koreans, brutally treated by the Japanese, demanded their share of Wilson's self-determination, and got let down as they had been let down before, in Theodore Roosevelt's day, and bid fair to be let down again in our day. So much for the Asiatic picture after the last war, the picture which is going to be dominant again for America as soon as Hitler is dealt with.

Now for the European picture in January 1920. The hypocrisies and greeds of the treaty makers and the compromises of his Fourteen Points which President Wilson had to accept to get the League Compact included in the treaty of peace had caused dismay in many an American heart, and very particularly in those of the returning young veterans. Mr. Sumner Welles implies that we caused European nations to doubt our desire for sincere cooperation and says our allies are now asking themselves if we will again follow that course.

A fair historian would point out that European statesmen gave the American people much ground for doubting their desire for sincere cooperation. When President Wilson stubbornly demanded that America guarantee, through article X of the Covenant, every doubtful frontier set up by the Treaty of Versailles, the American people backed their Senate in refusing to ratify it. History since has shown how impossible were those frontiers—how right was American feeling about them. The League Council and Assembly, like our Congress today, was plagued by a bloc of votes controlled by its largest constituent commonwealth—perhaps for the good of all, but inevitably to the suspicion of all.

By that time, an Italian novelist with a rag-tag of adventurers had proved that the big European nations of the League would not act in something that did not concern their own interests, despite Wilson's indignation. D'Annunzio was the advance announcement of Mussolini. By that time, Gandhi was on the way to jail, the promise of self-government for India given by Lloyd George rescinded; by that time Lawrence of Arabia was saying privately that his Arab friends were being betrayed. Already, those in the know regretfully talked about what must happen to the Jewish national home. Already, allied forces were fighting Lenin and Trotsky, while the diplomats who called themselves the League demonstrated that each regarded himself still a representative of his own state, out to get what he could at the expense of others, not a representative

of a superstate out to give something for the benefit of all.

At this distance, looked at through the welter of war, the League of Nations appears like the good old times, the golden age, the old gray mare who isn't what she used to be—but she never was. The league of Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau, and Orlando turned out to be more the creation of the three provincial Europeans than of the one internationalist American. American diplomats today might better hold it up before our allies as the horrible example to be avoided, rather than before Americans as the great lost chance. It was a still-born monstrosity. The hearts of well-meaning people of the world wanted to give it a chance to grow straight and strong. But we today know that only something much better bred can survive, and as a preliminary to its breeding the European parent needs as much purification of the bloodstream as the American condemned facilely for callowness.

It was all very tragic, but the logic of Bill Bullitt and the pedagogy of Sumner Welles in attempting to pin the tragedy wholly or even primarily on their own America is almost comic.

Whether or not the league might have kept world peace if the United States had joined—whether we as members could have overcome both the fears and intrigues that shook it down will always remain a good question for high school debaters. As nonmembers we did much to bolster it—more by the record, I think, than some of its preeminent members.

The question now is not whether we or our European allies did the more to abandon the virgin League to ravishment. The question is very practically what are our allies determined upon now and what do we demand and how forcefully. The far-from-isolationist Walter Lippmann, who was at Versailles, writes that the last mistaken effort to carry the United States into every disputed European question could only force us to withdraw from the organization of the general peace of the world. It is time for the responsible diplomats of our State Department to get out of our allies just what they are going to claim as guiding principles and working programs and to present these principles and programs to the American people for their cooperation or rejection. This would be much more in keeping with the traditional and constitutional status of diplomats than lecturing American voters on peculiar conceptions of international moral turpitude.

We have the hard advantage, this time, that heads of Allied Governments are men who do not shrink from declaring themselves nor do they mask their iron hands in the velvet gloves of hypocrisy. Stalin says he will brook no advice regarding Russia's borders and will keep what he chooses of Poland and the mid-European states. He will obviously decide his own policy affecting China, Japan, and the United States in accord with Russia's interests as he sees them, not in accord with our interests or China's hopes. Churchill says Britain will hold her own. Mme. Chiang Kai-shek stated in Los Angeles Friday that China will demand back her own. Chiang has said that includes Indochina. Suppose, then, it also includes Hong Kong, as many Chinese believe. Suppose Moscow continues to express contempt for Dutch claims to empire in the South Pacific.

Can Mr. Sumner Welles find some formula to resolve these conflicting views and purposes? Can the paying and fighting American who no longer expects war to end war, and who can now sense more war in the offing, be presented with a blueprint for a peacetime world that deals with cases as they exist—that has logic and a working degree of fairness? It is time I think for Americans to draw together not to waste time and give misleading impressions to the world by scolding. Mr. Welles says the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act for which he is lobbying is an acid test of our future intentions. Has he procured as corollary the renunciation of British Empire trade preferences? Is world cooperation entirely one-sided, is it only America who must give and give?

A listener writes me "the post-war world presented to us common Americans so far is business as usual, empire as usual, war as usual." It is now up to the statesmen of the United Nations to offer the antidote to this cynicism, and it must be potent, and something that will stay down.

Problems of the Shoe Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a copy of the program of the United Shoe Workers of America, C. I. O., to meet the problems of the shoe industry which have been presented to the War Production Board and the Office of Price Administration and which also appeared in the C. I. O. News, Shoe Workers Edition, on March 29, 1943.

The immediate and vital seriousness of the problems besetting the shoe industry demands attention. The program presented hereafter is a concrete and practicable proposal, one which is presented with full recognition of the complexity of the problem. The plan, however, is essentially simple and direct both in theory and operation.

The United Shoe Workers' proposal recognizes the necessity for a reduction in civilian consumption of shoe leather; it urges, consequently, the more effective utilization of available resources by the production of sturdy and durable footwear. Both of these desired objectives can be achieved by the upgrading of cheap shoes through the use of better materials and more labor without, however, consuming more material than is presently contemplated under existing shoe-rationing plans. And finally the union proposal clarifies the need for an over-all planning and administrative council consisting of equal representation of labor, management, and government to be entrusted with the responsibility of placing the industry as rapidly and as effectively as possible on a war footing.

The urgency and acuteness of the difficulties confronting the shoe industry and the simple effectiveness of the proposal stated here cause me to recommend its careful study by the O. P. A. and W. P. B. authorities to whom it was presented, and to Members of Congress, particularly those among us who share my recognition of the needs of the shoe industry.

The matter referred to follows:

UNION TO PRESS FOR CONCRETE WAR PROGRAM—MCGRATH

WASHINGTON, D. C.—"The United Shoe Workers of America will continue its fight for a concrete war program for the shoe industry," stated President Frank R. McGrath, when he announced the union presented a program to the War Production Board and Office of Price Administration Officials which would help meet the immediate needs of the shoe industry.

"We must realistically recognize that the consumer is not purchasing the cheap or lower grade shoe; it does not meet his requirements under the ration program, due to the fact that it is lacking in quality. Therefore, the Government and shoe industry must meet these problems without dislocating and destroying important shoe centers and maintaining the necessary standards and quality of production."

A committee consisting of General Secretary-Treasurer James J. Mitchell, Vice President Isidore Rosenberg, General Counsel Harry Sacher, and Washington Representative James S. Zucker presented this program to the following Government officials: Henry W. Boyd, Chief, Women's Shoe Unit, Shoe Section, Textile, Clothing, and Leather Division; Nathan Buchalter, consultant, Industry Consultant Branch, Labor Production Division, War Production Board; Morris Chandross, Sr., consumer standards expert, Standards Division, Office of Price Administration; Harold Connett, Chief, Leather and Shoe Branch, Textile, Clothing, and Leather Division, War Production Board; George Laemmle, leather consultant, Conservation Division War Production Board; William A. Neiswanger, special assistant to Deputy Administrator, Price Department, Office of Price Administration; Eli Kriger, special assistant to associate director, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Labor Production Division, War Production Board; Edgar E. Rand, Chief, Shoe Section, Price Division, Office of Price Administration; Oscar W. Ross, labor consultant to the Textile Division, Industry Consultant Branch, Labor Production Division; and Irving Reubenstein, labor consultant, Labor Office, Office of Price Administration.

TEXT OF PROGRAM

The text of the program presented to the War Production Board and Office of Price Administration is as follows:

"The needs of our military forces and shrinking leather supplies dictate that, consistent with the requirements of civilian morale and productivity, civilian consumption of shoe leather should be reduced to a minimum. To this end, it is not only desirable, but necessary that so far as possible the civilian population should be supplied with sturdy and durable footwear. For if our people are provided with such footwear, the demand for replacements will be reduced and leather consumption correspondingly diminished.

"The United Shoe Workers of America therefore proposes an amendment of Conservation Order M-217 as amended Feb. 19, 1943, which will permit the upgrading of cheap shoes through the use of better materials and more labor, without, however, consuming more material than is presently contemplated under existing shoe rationing plans.

"Specifically, the United Shoe Workers of America proposed the following:

URGE REGRADING

"(a) Manufacturers who produce civilian utility footwear that retail for less than $5 shall be permitted to regrade their product up to $5, provided that they comply with the conditions and standards hereinafter set forth.

"(b) Manufacturers who produce children's shoes that retail for less than $2 shall be permitted to regrade their product up to $2, provided that they comply with the conditions and standards hereinafter set forth.

"(c) Manufacturers who produce play-shoes, beach sandals, and other slipper types in which critical materials are used and which retail for less than $3 shall be permitted to regrade their product up to $3 provided that they comply with the conditions and standards hereinafter set forth.

LIST CONDITIONS

"The conditions on which permission for regrading of the afore-mentioned shoes shall be granted shall be as follows:

"(a) The dollar volume of shoes manufactured in 1943 by each manufacturer shall not exceed the dollar volume of the shoes produced by him in the base period designated by the War Production Board. With an increase in the unit price, the observance of this requirement will reduce the number of units produced, with the result that there will be no increase in the quantity of critical materials consumed in the manufacture of the regraded shoe and future saving of material will be effected because of reduced need and demand for replacements.

"(b) The Office of Price Administration shall prescribe standards of material and labor which must be met by the manufacturer as a condition of upgrading the price on any of the above-mentioned shoes. Enforcement of such standards by the Office of Price Administration will insure the fulfillment of the objectives which this plan is designed to achieve.

ESSENTIAL MEASURES

"From an over-all view of the shoe manufacturing industry, it is essential that the following measures be adopted:

"1. So far as possible, production should be contracted and materials allocated to those areas in which there are no manpower shortages and in which there is no competition by other war industries for manpower. To this end an immediate study should be made of the productive facilities and manpower situation in the various shoe centers of the Nation.

"2. Concentration of production and allocation of materials on the basis above stated will not only serve the national interest by releasing available labor supply in manpower-shortage areas to other war industry, but will avoid the dislocation and increase in unemployment in historically and presently vital shoe centers

"3. The product of the shoe is so closely related to civilian moral and productivity, as well as to the direct successful prosecution of the war, that it ought to be classified as an industry essential to the war effort. We urge the establishment of an industry council consisting of equal representation of labor, management, and Government, to be entrusted with the responsibility of placing the industry as rapidly and as effectively as possible on this war footing."

Address by Senator Wiley Before Eau Claire (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a talk on the subject Small Business Must Not Be an Unnecessary War Casualty, which I made before the Eau Claire Chamber of Commerce at Eau Claire, Wis., on March 29, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS MUST NOT BE AN UNNECESSARY WAR CASUALTY

Fellow Americans, I am very grateful to Mr. Van Every and to the Eau Claire Chamber of Commerce for their courtesy in inviting me to address this annual meeting this evening.

It is a genuine pleasure to appear before this group, not only because it gives me an opportunity to visit with so many old friends and neighbors but also because it gives me an opportunity to talk with men who are leaders in this part of the country and men who are conversant with the problems which the war has brought to our people and to small business and small industry in northern Wisconsin.

Your able secretary, Mr. Van Every, has suggested that this talk deal with the problems of small business.

At the outset let me say that I think you gentleman could probably make a better speech on this subject than I can. I think you know more about the problem than a great many of our so-called leaders in Washington, and my regret has been that leaders in Washington have not seen fit to enact the recommendations made by groups such as this throughout the country with respect to small business.

I don't need to say that all of our resources, all of our business, all of our manpower, and all of our efforts are completely and wholeheartedly dedicated to winning this war. I don't have to say that all of us are eager and willing to make any sacrifice which will aid the war.

I cannot agree with those who say that the folks in the Middle West aren't aware of the urgency of war problems. Every middle western mother, every middle western father who has contributed a son to the armed forces realizes what this war means more clearly than any swivel-chair bureaucrat who writes about the lack of war consciousness in the Middle West.

There are men from Wisconsin serving in every branch of the armed forces in every theater of war. American planes, American ships, American tanks, American guns have all borne the imprint of Wisconsin thinking and Wisconsin labor.

That brings me back to the subject of my discussion this evening. There is no more patriotic section in all America than the Middle West. Because the Middle West is so vitally interested in winning this war, it is also interested in winning this war as rapidly as possible and with as few casualties as possible.

It is not my purpose this evening to discuss the military problems of the war. Instead, I propose to discuss the problem of casualties on the home front because that is a problem with which you and I are thoroughly familiar.

Let me emphasize again so that there can be no misinterpretation that none of us would object to casualties on the home front if they would save a single life on the battle-front, or if they would save a single hour or a single minute of the conflict abroad.

We do object, however, to any unnecessary war casualties on the home front—casualties which are not only unnecessary, but casualties which may actually impede the war effort:

1. Through a curtailment of revenue for the Government to keep the machine going;

2. Through a loss of essential civilian services which enable the production front to function;

3. Through the loss of facilities which could be utilized directly for production in the war effort and which have remained unconverted as a result of either Government indifference or Government inability to "do the job";

4. Through the displacement of thousands of trained workers in various industries and businesses who may be unable as individuals to secure war work and who may consequently become individual economic casualties on the home front along with their businesses.

In other words, I want to make is crystal-clear that I am not pleading the case of small business as a special segment of our economy which must be protected for selfish reasons. I am pleading for small business as a vital portion of our economy which must be safeguarded as far as is humanly possible in the interests of the general economy and in the interests of a more effective prosecution of the war.

I might remark in passing that I have never believed in pleading for any segment of our economy as a special group or a special class I have always believed that the yardstick for Government policies and national legislation must be the yardstick of the general benefit to the Nation as a whole—and at the present time that means the war effort.

I can conscientiously state that in my judgmen the continued annihilation of small business would materially impede the war effort, and in the post-war period would mean the destruction of our economy as we know it and would create a period of mass unemployment. The crucifixion of small business would create in the post-war period an era of roving migratory unemployment.

At the outset of this war it was apparent that in our procurement policies we needed decentralization and a better system of priorities for small business. It is apparent today that there can be no favoritism for big business—no special allocations—no "fat calf" preference for big business—no prodigal son—no fair-haired boy special treatment for big business.

Small business today and in the post-war period will begin to wonder whether big business and big government don't go hand-in-hand as the "gold dust twins" of bureaucracy. It is apparent that over-all big business planning and over-all big government planning too frequently go together. It is equally plain that a decentralized government is more likely to go with decentralized small business.

Washington must realize that political formulas or devices won't do the job. Washington must realize that in the post-war period the malignant tumorous growth of collectivism must be destroyed. Washington must realize that the issue in the post-war period will be whether the state will provide the money and work, or whether private enterprise will survive to do the job, or a utilization of both.

I should like tonight to briefly analyze some of the problems which have confronted small business. I want to make it clear that I am not commenting on the war effort as a whole, because I frankly feel that this Nation has accomplished miracles in production. I do feel, however, that along with these miracles there have been and there are still some serious shortcomings in our program. Perhaps the most obvious shortcoming is the lack of a genuine war cabinet geared to the demands of the day. Another obvious shortcoming has been the Government's lack of a clearly defined policy toward small business, and I am glad to report that I think such a policy is finally emerging from Washington.

At the outset of this war, it was apparent that many manufacturers could convert to war production. It was equally apparent that very few retailers were able to convert. As the war progressed there were increasing curtailments on civilian goods. Inventories ran

out. Retailers faced extinction. Goods became increasingly scarce. Commodities could not be sold at prices above certain ceilings. There were grave labor shortages, and the mortality rate of small business went up alarmingly.

The first job of the Nation's industrial economy in wartime is to provide all of the war goods needed for the successful prosecution of the war. It is also essential, however, that the basic civilian needs of the production front be maintained as far as possible. In other words, maximum production for war plus a maintenance of essential civilian economy constituted the twin economic problems of production.

All of these problems were aggravated by transportation and shipping difficulties, plus the loss of some of our sources of supply in other lands.

The retailers faced a particular problem. About four-fifths of all independent retail stores consists of small stores. Over two-fifths of these are in lines of trades which have declined consistently.

In 1939 all of our Government expenditures, including Federal, State, and local, for goods and services amounted to about $15,000,000,000. That was about 17 percent of the total gross national expenditures of $88,000,000,000 that year.

In the first half of 1943 Government expenditures for goods and services will probably be very close to $90,000,000,000. That is more than 50 percent of the total gross national expenditures. I mention these figures because it shows the degree to which Government war purchases have invaded civilian endeavor.

There has been a shift or a concentration of civilian production. There are some industries, and lumber and manufactured dairy products are included, where more than the entire civilian output for the fiscal year of 1943 can be produced in small plants employing less than 50 wage earners. The entire civilian output of the machinery, cement, and chemical industries can be produced in plants employing less than 100 wage earners. About 90 percent of all consumer purchasing goods are made at retail stores and their sales are declining rapidly. The dollar sales of durable goods stores for the first half of 1943 will probably decline by about 45 percent. Nondurable goods stores will probably decline about 12 percent. The small retailer is at a particular disadvantage when supplies are tight because he does not have sufficient credit facilities and he may not be able to cut his costs in the same proportion as the large retailer.

In other words, there are a great many pressures and squeezes which have developed in retailing. In order to obtain relief from the price squeeze, it will probably be necessary to continue to reduce services, deliveries, packaging, and so forth. It may be necessary to alter the General Maximum Price Regulations to provide for limited legitimate price increases. Subsidies may have to be considered, though I sincerely hope that this will not be necessary.

A basic problem which has confronted the small retailers is the problem of stock shortages. We haven't had a systematic plan for the distribution of stock. We have had no assurance that short stocks will be spread evenly for all distributors. Because we haven't had an orderly program of distribution, a great many small retailers were forced to close their business because of a lack of goods. No rationing system will ever be completely workable unless there is an even distribution of stocks. That will mean that Government will have to go increasingly into the problems of inventory control and the allocation of stocks.

The major problem confronting the Government with respect to production is to integrate all of our productive sources of business and industry into one total war pattern. The integration of small business into that pattern has been woefully neglected. Many small industries have already perished and more will perish unless they can be given a part in the pattern of production of a nation at war.

Our Washington planners must accept the doctrine of production by "bits and pieces." If all of the procurement agencies of government, Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, Treasury and others, will accept that principle, we will achieve maximum production in the shortest possible time and we will avert the crucifixion of small business.

The integration of small business in total production cannot be accomplished by government alone. The engineering and managerial initiative of small business will have to play its part. We need a mutual cooperation and understanding which can carry over into the post-war period. There are hundreds of thousands of small business and industrial establishments in the country.

I have conferred at some length with Col. Robert W. Johnson, former chief of the New York Ordnance District and at the present time vice-chairman of the War Production Board and chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and he has assured me that when a specific order can be divided into component parts of subassemblies, that action will be taken instead of letting one prime contract for one entirely completed item. He has also assured me the decentralization of Government procurement will result in a decentralization of contracts and he has further assured me that we will have a more workable priority system for small business.

I believe that if we can increasingly adopt our procurement policies to small industries, we will not only save these industries but we will accelerate the war production effort without a displacement of manpower and machinery.

I believe, moreover, that a coordination between our price policies and our civilian supply policies can salvage small retail businesses so that they can survive. We must handle our economy so that there will be opportunity for millions of young men who return from the war to be absorbed in retailing which is the natural stronghold of individual enterprise.

The Office of Price Administration must stand by to help the injured retailer. There will be many adjustments for retail industries—some concerns will have to shift from the sale of household appliances to services and repair work. Some automobile and repair shops will have to convert to machine shops in war work. I believe that the Federal Government has an obligation to insure the survival of small industry and small retail businesses.

There isn't any magic formula to accomplish these objectives. Congress has already written legislation giving ample opportunity for the administration to insure the survival of small business. Frankly, the administration hasn't followed through effectively. It is the job of Congress to see that its orders are carried out, and I think since the beginning of this year, there has been an increasing tendency to insist that the administration carry out the congressional authority relative to small business.

Now, in conclusion, let me speak briefly of Eau Claire, Wis. As a neighbor from Chippewa Falls I naturally feel an intensely personal interest not only in this city but in this area.

Col. Robert W. Johnson, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, at my request, has given particular consideration to the problem of small business in this community. Eau Claire is, of course, a responsibility of the district office at Eau Claire, which is attached to the regional office at Chicago. Under the new plans of the War Production Board, all distressed plants are listed by regions.

A distressed plant has been defined as one operating at less than 66⅔ percent of its normal production. A normal plant has been defined as the 1941 business volume adjusted to the Department of Commerce Index figures.

Within a very short time there will have been meetings in the regional office where every single plant with the name of every distressed plant and its description will be brought before a representative of every procurement agency.

In other words, the Air Corps, the Signal Corps, the Quartermaster Department, the Army Engineers, the Ordnance Department, the Surgeon General's Department, the Navy, and all of its bureaus, the Maritime Commission, the Treasury, and the Defense Plant Corporation will collectively take the assignments of plants most appropriate for their particular procurement service.

This approach sounds like good plain Wisconsin horse sense. It contemplates that the representatives of all of the procurement agencies will sit around a round table and have before them all of the distressed plants and their capacities. This should go a long way toward solving the problems of small concerns.

It is undeniable that essential civilian production will soon become a matter of great importance to the country, and at the present time plans are being established to deal specifically with essential civilian production.

In addition to this, the War Production Board is now contemplating an appeal to all prime contractors. It is more than an appeal. It will be a direct series of regulations which will directly result in more awards for small contractors.

Finally, the War Production Board will establish a plan to secure the cooperation of private business purchasing departments toward the end that they, too, will try to use the unused small plant capacity of the Nation.

All of these policies are hopeful signs for the future. They will not correct all of our problems, but they may serve to avert a wholesale annihilation of small business.

I believe that small business, both retail and industrial, in the Eau Claire area—and, in fact, throughout the State of Wisconsin—will verify my efforts on their behalf. As I indicated at the beginning of this speech, these efforts were made not solely in the interests of small business but in the genuine and sincere belief that the preservation and the strengthening of small business is essential to the survival of our economy as we know it.

To insure the winning of this war and the winning of this peace and the preservation of our kind of economy and our kind of government, the shortcomings of bungling bureaucracy must be corrected in an efficient workmanlike manner.

I believe these shortcomings can be corrected, and I believe it is our patriotic duty as good citizens to do the job.

The very last development on the small business front in Government is the virtual separation of the Government's machinery to help distressed small business.

In other words, the Smaller War Plants Corporation and the Smaller War Plants Division are now practically separated from the War Production Board. These organizations have now been converted to quasi-independent agencies and are only technically attached to the War Production Board.

I will tell you very frankly that the reason for this separation was that a good many

people on Capitol Hill felt that the War Production Board was led very largely by big businessmen, and consequently did not fully appreciate the plight of small business.

The order last week of the War Production Board gave joint agencies complete authority over their activities. Colonel Johnson has requested more authority over his personnel and over policies and is now working out details of a reorganization. I feel that this is a constructive change and one more hopeful sign in a picture which has many discouraging aspects.

On the 16th of March 1943 I introduced in the Senate of the United States a resolution which would provide for an assistant secretary of commerce for small business. It is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress hereby finds that (1) the existence of American small business as an integral part of the American economic system is essential for the preservation of the system of free competitive enterprise in the Nation, (2) that the continued existence of American small business as a potent factor in the American economy is now challenged and threatened with extinction, and (3) that destruction of American small business burdens and obstructs the free flow of goods in commerce and interferes with the orderly and fair marketing of goods in commerce.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act, through the exercise by Congress of its power to regulate commerce between the several States and to create executive offices, to preserve American small business as an integral and essential part of the American economic system, and to preserve the system of free private competitive enterprise in the Nation.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

SEC. 2. There shall be in the Department of Commerce an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business. It shall be the province and duty of said Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business to foster, promote, and develop the conduct of commerce, manufacturing, transportation, distribution, and other business facilities and activities in the United States by small business with the end in view of the preservation of small business as an integral component part of the American system of free private competitive enterprise of the Nation. He shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. He shall be charged with the supervision and coordination of governmental activities dealing with the small business and small-business problems, and such other duties as shall be assigned to him by the Secretary of Commerce and as may be required by law. There shall be detailed to his office such number of employees of the Department of Commerce as may be authorized by the Secretary of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce shall make a report to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each 6 months of the operation of the office of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business, including such other information and such comments and recommendations with respect to American small business and small-business problems as he may deem appropriate.

On that occasion I said:

"The last census taken of business concerns indicates there were over 3,100,000 in this country. Of course, since that time, because of the impact of the war, large numbers have fallen by the wayside. In 1939 small business produced 70 percent of all manufactured goods and employed about 60 percent of the wage earners in this country. These small business concerns were owned by about 6,500,000 men and women.

"Approximately only 40 percent of the small business manufacturers can possibly be harnessed into war production. The remaining 60 percent must be kept alive by civilian production. It is plain that if the manufacturer cannot produce, then the wholesaler, the jobber, and finally the retailer will go out of business for lack of merchandise to sell, and that is what is happening throughout the country. It has been said that last year there were fatalities of about 25 percent.

"This resolution I have introduced has something more in mind than simply protecting a group. Small business in this war has been the neglected and the forgotten man—the farmer, the misunderstood and maligned man. If we include many farmers who should be classified as small businessmen with this group of 3,100,000, then we will probably have a group of 4,500,000. These two segments of our society, small business and the farmers, constitute the backbone of America. We must maintain their economic health. Why? Because if we permit a great percentage of this segment to become paralyzed—remember it affects probably 10,000,000 adults—we will seriously damage the morale of this country.

"The war has brought out this fact, that small business must have a voice in the councils of the Nation. Therefore we are suggesting by this resolution that an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business be constituted.

"This Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business could take hold of this problem right now and do a great job now and in the post-war period in rehabilitating and integrating small business with the life of the Nation. He should have been appointed years ago, but this is like many other things that should have been attended to but haven't.

"But let us delay no longer. Small business, with its millions of the finest Americans, must have a pilot in Washington, one who knows the channels and who will look after its interests.

"The Assistant Secretary of Commerce in the post-war period can see to it that there is the right kind of cooperation between small business, big business, the farmer, and labor. Without this cooperation among these four segments of our society, the post-war period will bring only tragedy in the national and international economic field.

"We must demonstrate the 'four freedoms' at home before we can effectively become a 'world preacher' of the 'four freedoms.' I refer especially to freedom from want' and 'freedom from fear.' The small businessmen by the tens of thousands have become acquainted with these two 'wants.'"

Winning the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address on the subject of Winning the Peace delivered over the radio by the very able Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] on April 7.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My friends, for the American people on the home front, this is a time of grave anxiety for the safety of loved ones already in action, or training for combat overseas. It is a time of growing inconvenience in the everyday life of the average civilian. It is a time for increasing sacrifice of economic wealth to the pressing demands of total war.

Most of us face these trials with hearts full of pride that we, too, can do something, however small, to speed the day when the Axis runs up the white flag of unconditional surrender. But it is typical of a democracy that our minds remain free to question and discuss, to express hopes and fears, about the outcome of all this sacrifice, in the years and generations that lie ahead. Thoughtful people are talking about the post-war aims of our allies, the post-war plans of our own Government, and the views of the United States Senate which will have to pass upon the treaty of peace. And all this is not idle discussion; underlying it is the example, the debacle, of the Versailles Treaty and its aftermath.

In a real sense, none of the United Nations is in this war to save others from destruction. The United States, Britain, China, Russia, and the rest are at war because each of them was immediately and directly threatened with the loss of its power, its freedom, and its sovereignty. In that real sense, the United Nations are already an association for self-defense. When you look back over the years since the last World War, you see one fundamental mistake made by all the great powers, including ourselves: We failed to recognize that self-defense could only be achieved through a common defense, backed by armed force. Throughout that period, while each great power pursued inconsistent and isolated policies, Hitler, like the Kaiser before him, followed the rule that might makes right.

Today it is the common hope of mankind that now and in the future might shall be used to defend and enforce right. We cannot expect, at one stroke of the pen, to create a Utopian world of all-inclusive justice—a world from which all the causes of dissension have been removed—a world in which even the aggressors of today will be satisfied instead of have-not nations. Freedom from the fear of aggression must come first; it is the only foundation upon which individual progress and social security can be developed for a lasting future. If the peace treaty does nothing more than to build an enduring framework against military aggression, it will be the greatest advance in centuries of human relations.

This drive for collective security is the basis of the resolution introduced by four United States Senators, representing both major political parties. This resolution is bad news for any future Hitlers in the world It calls for American leadership in forming a closer association of the United Nations—to cooperate more effectively in winning the war and the peace. It looks toward a world family of all nations for common defense and mutual welfare. Its most important clause calls for an international military force ready at all times to prevent aggression by any nation. For the first time in history it would put real power behind the force of international law and order.

That is the fundamental idea; the exact language will doubtless be changed and improved in committee and on the floor. We in the Senate voted unanimously to declare war against the Axis. We bear that responsibility for your boys and our own in the uniform of our country. We bear an equal responsibility to our children's children to shape a future world without war or the threat of war.

In my support of the broad principle of this plan I have been heartened by the great volume of mail crossing my desk. These letters come mainly from those whose stake in peace is greatest—from the wives, mothers, or fathers of men overseas, from the armed forces, from veterans of the last war, from boys about to enter military service; and all through this mail runs the simple, fervent plea: "This horror of war must not come again. We must not fail the next generation as the last one failed us."

These views have also found expression in recent meetings of plain citizens throughout the country. A mass meeting will be held in my own city of New York one week from tonight.

As a practical matter, where is the alternative to a plan of collective security? Are we to try isolation again, in a world where isolation is impossible, and one Maginot line after another has come crashing down in ruins? Can we embrace the old system of power politics, which has failed time and again to keep the peace? Dare we put our faith in another League of Nations, set up as a debating society without real force or power to stop aggression in its tracks?

Few remember now that back in 1919, Marshal Foch argued that the League machinery would be too slow; that the Versailles Treaty should provide for permanent occupation of the bridgeheads on the left bank of the Rhine by an international military force, ready at all times to advance into the heart of Germany when aggression threatened. This plan was rejected by the peacemakers, but time has proved its soundness. I do not imply that the same plan should be accepted now in every detail, for air power will shape the methods of keeping the peace hereafter. I mean simply that an international force, maintained at vital points in Europe, and the exercise of a firm policy against aggression, could have prevented this war, or else it could have insured victory for the democracies with a minimum of bloodshed.

In the discussion of the Senate plan to win the peace, a few die-hard isolationists have rallied to a new version of their old slogan—"Cooperation without commitments." In our own history, that slogan takes us back to the Articles of Confederation, before a binding Union was formed under the Constitution of the United States.

In the international sphere that slogan means the same old policy that failed so badly in the years between two World Wars; the policy of polite conversations and good intentions without the effective united force to stop aggression. Of course, this resolution, or an amended form of it, would not commit any future Senate, nor would it commit us now to the detail of any plan for collective security. The details must be worked out by our Chief Executive and the other United Nations at the proper time in patient conferences and discussions, and ultimately written into a treaty of peace. That treaty would have to be approved by two-thirds of the Senate before it could bind the American people. But in the broad view we and our allies are already committed in this struggle to a common sacrifice of blood and treasure. In death and destruction they are paying, as we will have to pay, for the mistakes of the past. We cannot say now what they will ask at the peace table to assure their future security. But we do know that their views will depend on where the United States Senate stands. A resolution, such as I have described, would simply commit the Senate to reject isolation as a policy for America in the post-war settlement. By so doing, we would give up no more of our sovereignty or freedom of action than you and I yield to the policeman on the street corner who protects our lives and property. We would be committing ourselves only to this extent, as one brave Army wife has written me: "No matter what kind of a world emerges from this war, we will still have to live in it and should accept the responsibility of trying to make it a good one."

Such a declaration would strengthen morale all along the line of the United Nations. It would strengthen the hand of our own President in advancing the goals of the Atlantic Charter in a practical world, free from the fear of war.

We cannot afford a policy of "wait and see." This is no time for any public official or any political party to sit on the fence and wait for favorable political winds to blow. Politics has no proper place in a decision affecting the lives of our children and the future security of our country.

A Senate resolution alone will not win the peace or maintain it against future forces of evil. We cannot rely upon this alone to relax our military defenses even after victory is won. Peace, like liberty, requires the constant work and sacrifice of each generation of freemen. At this time, however, we have the opportunity to say to the whole world—"America intends to go through with the fight for future peace as well as the fight for present victory." I believe that a great majority of the Senate and the American people are ready to embrace that opportunity now.

Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Will P. Kennedy dealing with the activities of the late Representative John J. Boylan, of New York, in connection with the bicentennial celebration of the birth of Thomas Jefferson. The article was published in the Washington, D. C., Star of April 4, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL SIDELIGHTS

(By Will P. Kennedy)

The approaching celebration of the bicentennial of Thomas Jefferson, with the dedication of the classic Jefferson Memorial scheduled for April 13, suggests a joint tribute to two men prominent in Washington who, above all others, made possible the erection of the memorial—the late Representative John J. Boylan, of New York, who labored zealously for years to get the authorizing legislation approved by Congress and who was the first Chairman of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission which selected the design, and Joseph P. Tumulty, most closely associated with Representative Boylan in this patriotic service.

Both Mr. Boylan and Mr. Tumulty, close personal and political friends for more than three decades, were men of broad human sympathies and patriotic devotion, who reverenced the leadership of Jefferson in the formative days of this Nation. They both were idealists, both determined that Jefferson should have the tardy justice of a fitting memorial marking the fifth most important commemorative site in the Capital City.

Memorial services for Representative Boylan were held in the House on May 30, 1939, when a resolution of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission was presented, stating that "The fine concept which brought this Commission into being came from Mr. Boylan, a true lover of Thomas Jefferson and of the principles he espoused in life. Mr. Boylan brought to the deliberations of this Commission not only the knowledge and ripe experience acquired in many years of public service, but also those qualities of integrity and sound judgment so necessary to the faithful discharge of his duties as a member of the Commission. He did what was characteristic of the man—he gave to its noble work the rare gift of life, love, and affection, and though ill and suffering he carried on in splendid fashion the important work committed to his care with fine poise and patience and with never a boast on his lips."

Mr. Tumulty, former confidential secretary to Governor, and later President, Woodrow Wilson, who for many years had supported and counseled Mr. Boylan in his Jefferson Memorial objective, spoke feelingly in part as follows: "This plain man, born in an unpretentious part of the city of New York, wearing upon his good face the smudge of honest poverty, dreamed a beautiful dream of a memorial in Washington to Thomas Jefferson. Quietly, unostentatiously, he went about his work, scorning vulgar display, happy in the thought that after he had departed there would be left behind those who would not mock the thing that his vision built to an unmeasured monument.

"It was a pleasure to work with him, to sit by his side as I was accustomed to do, while quietly, humbly he expressed his views regarding every phase of our Commission's activities. Always he gained his fine objective by openness and honorable action; his fine nature making it impossible for him ever to use unworthy arguments to accomplish his humane objectives.

"When the Jefferson Memorial is completed, there will be one name, like that of Abou ben Adhem, which will lead the list and that name will be our altogether lovely friend, John Boylan. As we behold that name, the words of John Drinkwater will flash into our minds:

" 'Shall a man understand,
He shall know bitterness because his kind,
Being perplexed of mind,
Hold issues even that are nothing mated.
And he shall give
Counsel out of his wisdom that none shall hear,
And steadfast in vain persuasion must he live,
And unabated
Shall his temptation be.'

"As a personality, he had about him the grandeur of the old-fashioned man, with a noble vision directed into the far reaches of the future.

"John Galsworthy must have had this type of man in mind when he drew a portrait of an old friend in the story, A Portrait, an excerpt from which is as follows:

" 'I know how big and sane and sweet he was. His breed is dying now; it has nearly gone. But as I remember him with that great quiet forehead, with his tenderness and his glance which traveled to the heart of what it rested on, I despair of seeing his kind again. For with him there seems to me to have passed away a principle, a golden rule of life, nay, more, a spirit—the soul of balance. It has stolen away, as in the early

morning the stars steal out of the sky. He knew its tranquil secret, and where he is there must it still be hovering.'

"To him God was more than a nodding star atop a windy hill. Dear John Boylan, the tired heart, beloved friend in all seasons, turned home, and thus the end of his brooding came."

Organization and Collaboration of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "Give It a Hearing," from the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer of March 30, 1943, and another entitled "The Senate Answers the Challenge," from the Norwalk (Ohio) Experiment of April 1, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 30, 1943]

GIVE IT A HEARING

It is to be hoped that the resolution sponsored by Senators BALL, BURTON, HILL, and HATCH will receive thoughtful consideration in the subcommittee of the Senate to which it has been referred.

In the 2 weeks that have elapsed since the resolution was introduced it has been the subject of much public discussion, but of little objective thinking. The isolationists have condemned it out of hand, while some who profess to be sympathetic with the principle involved—President Roosevelt among them—warn of the danger of preparing for the peace until the war is won.

It seems to the Plain Dealer that the objections of both these groups are ill-advised and unfortunate. We suspect that the details of the plan provided by the Ball resolution are unimportant in the minds of its author and sponsors. But to them and to the country and, in fact, to the entire United Nations' cause, acceptance of the spirit of the plan is a consideration second only to military success.

Whether at the end of the war the United Nations organization for preserving the peace is patterned after the Stassen proposal, or that of Ely Culbertson, or takes a form quite different from either, is relatively unimportant. No one nation can dictate the details of the world organization. Of necessity it will be arrived at after long consultations among representatives of all the nations and its acceptance will require concessions probably by all.

But the Ball resolution reflects the desire of at least four Members of the Senate first to commit that body to some program of American participation in world affairs after the war is over. They would avoid such a conflict as developed between the President and the Senate over the League of Nations and which would make it possible again for this Nation to withdraw itself into its old isolationist shell and leave the people of Europe and Asia and Africa to work out their own salvation as best they can.

The resolution has the further advantage of creating wide public interest at home in the post-war situation and of educating the public to the importance, the imperative necessity, of avoiding the errors of omission and commission made by this Nation after the armistice was signed in 1918.

Certainly the resolution should not be used either in the committee or on the outside as a text for stressing differences between ourselves and the Allies or for arguing, as W. C. Bullitt does, for the letter of the Atlantic Charter.

The Ball resolution will have served an invaluable service if it brings the Senate to a realization of its responsibility in the matter of post-war settlements and at the same time brings home to the Nation as a whole adequate appreciation of the role this Nation must play if the end of this war is to usher in a period of unbroken peace instead of another truce.

In the resolution we have an excellent illustration of the kind of post-war planning that can be done and should be done while the war is still in progress. For if we plan wisely we shall come to the problems of peace not only with a better knowledge of their character but with a broad understanding, at least, of the kind of solution that is necessary.

Our effective participation in the war was retarded by many months because we failed to resolve when we should have resolved such issues as those raised by the Neutrality and Johnson Acts and pursued a policy of noninterference for months after it became apparent that sooner or later we would be involved in the war.

If the Ball resolution is nothing more, it is a convenient proposal whereby we may be educated up to the nature of our peacetime responsibilities. If it leads to American acceptance in Congress and out of the principle that the United Nations are a reality and that the nations now comprising them, with some others, probably, will unite after the war to preserve the fruits of victory, this proposal will have served a useful purpose, however little of its original provisions may find expression in an act of Congress or in the treaties of peace.

[From the Norwalk (Ohio) Experiment of April 1, 1943]

THE SENATE ANSWERS THE CHALLENGE

For more than 10 years now the executive branch of the Government has been dominant in national affairs, and the conviction was steadily growing that the sole function of the legislative branch was to provide funds for whatever an expanding bureaucracy desired.

March 16, 1943, may go down in history as the day on which the Senate of the United States decided to act positively in national affairs and to state before it is too late on what terms it will undertake to share in a world organization for the maintenance of peace.

Senator BALL (Republican, Minnesota), Senator HATCH (Democrat, New Mexico), Senator BURTON (Republican, Ohio), and Senator HILL (Democrat, Alabama) were delegated several weeks before that date to draft a resolution toward that end, and March 16 the resolution was presented to the Senate advising that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority.

We have so much faith in the combined intelligence of the citizens of the world that we are sure this resolution offers the only workable plan.

We never have believed that God ever bestowed enough wisdom on one or two or three men to decide the destinies of billions of fellowmen.

Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. DANAHER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, last evening, over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co., the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] discussed the subject of post-war problems. Since the address is so timely and the views of the Senator from Ohio are always of deep interest to his colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In opposing the resolution introduced by Senators BALL, BURTON, HATCH, and HILL in its present form, I wish to make it clear that I favor a discussion of post-war problems at every opportunity.

A good many editors and commentators give the impression that the Senate is being asked in the Ball resolution merely to advise the President to call meetings of the United Nations for the purpose of discussing and working out post-war plans to be submitted to the Senate for consideration. If that were the effect of the resolution, there would be little opposition. Certainly I am strongly in favor of making post-war plans in the domestic and foreign economic field, and I am a member of the George committee, which proposes to make such plans. Equally I believe that the United Nations should confer together from time to time, and discuss every type of post-war political and economic organization, with a view to agreement whenever agreement is possible. It is vitally important, in my opinion, that the United Nations know exactly the course they are going to pursue when the armistice occurs, including particularly the temporary military control of the world to prevent a rash of minor wars, and relief and rehabilitation measures.

The first objection to this resolution is the danger to our success in the war arising out of a formal international conference at this time. It is one thing for private individuals and organizations, or even the Congress, to develop post-war plans, but very different to call an international convention. It is probable that a formal meeting would develop serious differences within the ranks of the United Nations. For instance, how can we discuss post-war settlements without getting into the dangerous problem of boundaries? How can we avoid the discussion of Stalin's claims to all the Baltic States and Eastern Poland? How can we escape a controversy with the British regarding the status of India and North Africa? Differences are almost certain to develop which would seriously disturb our unity in the war. If the Senate provides for the calling of an international conference, therefore, complete discretion regarding the calling of that conference and the time of calling it should be left to the Secretary of State.

Furthermore, the resolution proposes the immediate forming of a League of Nations. I am in favor of the formation of a League of Nations, under certain conditions, after the war, to insure future peace, but undoubtedly there will be serious disagreement on the details of organization and power. Vio-

lent differences are likely to develop on the proportion of representation given to each nation and dominion. Disputes between the United Nations would be dragged into the open. Quiet discussions may well proceed, and no doubt are proceeding at the present time. But the actual formation of a League of Nations now with specific powers cannot be completed except by public debate. Is it wise to promote that at the present time?

The resolution, furthermore, proposes to give this league certain powers immediately, notably to establish temporary administrations for occupied areas and actually administer all relief and assistance. I doubt if the appointment of governors of occupied territory should be taken away from the military authorities and from the nation immediately concerned with military operations and turned over to some international body.

While plans should be made as to how relief and economic assistance shall be rendered, and by whom, I would not favor turning over the actual administration of such relief to an international group. We may wish to use the giving of such assistance as a weapon to secure compliance in peace plans. Also I believe America is entitled to the credit for their generosity from the people who receive this relief and assistance, and there will be little such credit if the administration is by an international staff, even if it were composed of Russians or Englishmen. Furthermore, I believe that the administration of relief in one place by one nation will be quicker and more efficient than operation through a league.

The most serious objection to the resolution in its present form is the tremendous power given the President. These meetings are to be called "for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific" powers. It is not at all clear that any question will ever again have to be referred back to Congress. The State Department today claims that we can assume any obligation by executive agreement, without authority of any kind from Congress or the Senate. In the United Nations agreement itself they have agreed not to make a separate peace, for instance, and they have never submitted that agreement to the Senate for ratification. If this Ball resolution is adopted in its present form, it will undoubtedly be claimed that it confers authority on the President to carry out the specified powers by Executive agreement. I have little doubt that he would exercise that power. If there is one thing for which Congress has been criticized in the last 10 years, and properly criticized, it is the delegation of unlimited power to the President by blank-check appropriations and otherwise. Now it is proposed that we give him carte blanche to enter any kind of league of nations and write the terms himself.

Even if it is made clear by amendment that our adherence to an organization of nations is subject to confirmation by the Senate, the resolution intends to commit the Senate in advance to the principle of an organization of nations, without any knowledge as to what the details of that organization may be. If the President commits the Nation to such an organization, falling within the broad specifications of the resolution, it will be difficult to reject that commitment, regardless of its specific terms, without charges of double-crossing being leveled against us both by foreign nations and our own officials. Certainly I would not commit myself to any league of nations without knowing what our commitments are, and I believe the decision of the people of the United States depends largely on the nature of the league obligations.

For instance, what proportion of the voting power is the United States to have in this new organization of the United Nations? What type of disputes and disagreements are to be settled by an international court? Are we to include, for instance, questions relating to the treatment of minorities within nations? Are we to include questions as to the form of government within nations? Are we to include a guaranty by this international body of freedom of the press and of religion within nations? These matters are not matters of detail—they are matters which go to the very substance of the proposed organization.

Furthermore, although I believe the American people desire to set up a league of nations to prevent the recurrence of war, there are certain conditions which they certainly would desire to impose. In order that this league may have a reasonable chance of assuring world peace, it must certainly be based on a sound economic settlement, assuring a fair economic opportunity for every country. Furthermore, it must be based on a fair political division of territory, with proper regard to the self-determination of peoples required by the Atlantic Charter. We certainly don't want to guarantee any boundaries against aggression which we regard as unfair. I don't believe the Senate should commit itself in principle to any league of nations which may be negotiated.

Finally, the fifth clause of the Ball resolution is intended to commit us to an international police force able "to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation." This is not proposed as a temporary post-war measure, but as a permanent plan, to which all the Allied and Axis nations will be invited to adhere. Such a permanent plan with an international police force is the most extreme form of international cooperation, except "union now," and it implies almost as complete an international government as "union now." There are many other plans for insuring peace, with a League of Nations, without such a police force. If such a military force is to be able to suppress "military aggresison by any nation," as provided in the Ball resolution, it must be considerably larger than the forces of any nation. This necessarily implies a practical disarmament of the United States, of England, and of Russia, as well as of the Axis nations. The police force designed by the Ball resolution must be one which it is just as possible to use against the United States as against Germany. It must be just as easy for such a force to bomb New York as it will be to bomb Berlin as a punishment for what is found to be aggression. Of course, it is said that we will never be aggressors, but aggression is an indefinite term, and the body which decides on what is aggression will be a body in which the United States will presumably have a very small minority representation. In short, the world will be at the mercy of the only military force in existence, and we cannot tell who will control that military force.

If there is to be a military force, it implies someone to control that force, certainly an international executive, and probably an international legislature. Before agreeing even to the principle of a military force, everyone would like to know what the method of choosing that executive and legislature is going to be.

In short, I am in favor of full discussion in this country of post-war plans. I am in favor of quiet discussions by our State Department with foreign nations of proposed organizations which can be effective in maintaining the peace of the world in the future. But I believe the formal convention necessary to set up immediately a league of nations would seriously interfere with the unity so necessary for success in the war. I do not see how we can commit ourselves, legally, or morally, to definite post-war obligations until we know just what those obligations are. I believe the suggestion of an international state with an international police force is not a practical solution of the world's difficulties.

An Additional Weapon for Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "An Additional Weapon for Japan," appearing in the Monday, April 5, 1943, issue of The Progressive.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

AN ADDITIONAL WEAPON FOR JAPAN

(By Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.)

Mr. Churchill made a difficult situation worse when he failed to mention China as one of the nations that would take the lead and confer now on future world organization. This glaring omission was especially unfortunate because of the fact that Britain's and China's relations leave great room for improvement.

Mr. Churchill's previous statement that he did not intend "to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire" undoubtedly had an adverse reaction on China. The slight to China in his recent broadcast comes at a time when the United Nations' aid to her is at a very low ebb.

In the present preoccupation with the European theater of operations, there is a dangerous tendency to put off vital questions affecting the war against Japan. The British Prime Minister's recent prospectus on the future of the war was too clear an indication of this unfortunate state of mind in high official councils of the United Nations, or at least the Anglo-American branch of the United Nations.

Time is running against us in the Pacific. Every month given Japan to consolidate her gains will make the ultimate job of winning the war that much tougher.

NEEDLESS NEGLECT OF PACIFIC

There are compelling reasons for not depriving the African campaign and the expected European invasion of essential men and supplies, but there is some reason to believe that there is unnecessary neglect of the Pacific theater of war. Unless this situation is remedied, it may have unfortunate consequences on our military position as well as our relations with heroic China. In any case this is no time to neglect the diplomatic and psychological aspects of the Asiatic front.

Great barriers must be broken down before we can hope for complete understanding between the Asiatic and the Occidental peoples. The record of exploitation and imperialism must be overcome.

Japan is exploiting this basic weakness of our position to the fullest possible extent, and unless American and British policy can convince the victims of Japanese aggression of our genuine and respectful concern and sympathy for them, untainted by imperialistic motives, the task of whipping Japan will prove to be even more difficult than is generally believed.

JAPAN'S DIPLOMATIC GESTURES

Too little attention has been given to the possible significance of Japan's recent diplomatic gestures toward the puppet Nanking government in China. At Japan's prompting

the Nanking government in China has declared war on the United States and Great Britain. Japan has hailed with great acclaim the fact that Chinese troops are fighting to suppress the forces of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek.

With great pomp and ceremony Premier Tojo paid a personal visit to the Nanking government, advertised as the first official visit ever to be made by a Japanese premier to a foreign country.

To emphasize its good intentions toward the Asiatic peoples it has chosen as its unwilling partners in the alleged Asiatic coprosperity scheme, the Japanese Government has pretended to turn over to the Nanking government control over captured allied property, renounce its extraterritorial rights in China, persuaded the Vichy government to do likewise, and admitted the puppet Nanking government to partial control over traffic in the lower Yangtze Valley.

PLAY ON THE OLD THEME

The propaganda implications of all this are obvious. It is a play on the old theme of "Asia for Asiatics" and a threat to the psychological and diplomatic position of the United Nations so far as Asia is concerned.

To those who understand the temper of America, here can be no doubt of the deep and wholehearted sympathy and admiration of the American people for Free China The heroic struggle of the Chungking government under Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and his gallant wife for their people appeals to the instinctive sympathies of Americans for what is right and just.

The American people have no self-seeking motives in our fight on China's side except to free her from the brutal clutches of Japan in the course of our march to complete victory.

The American people look to Free China as a friend, and a great nation in the making. It is the task of our diplomacy to get that idea across to the Chinese and to all the people of Asia.

I believe the time is long past due for some plain speech on the question of exploitation and imperialism which have marked the course of empire during the past two centuries. In my opinion, the day of empire based upon subjugation is past. The sooner responsible heads of government make this plain, the sooner will this war be won.

The dominations of the strong nations have assumed various forms—commercial, political, and, in the extreme, military. Each contains the ingredients from which hatreds and wars are made. All are odious in varying degree and have no place in a modern world where the best interests of all are served by a tolerance and understanding of the problems of the weaker.

True freedom and self-determination must be a goal among nations as well as individuals. This war will have been fought in vain unless exploitation, subjugation, and imperialism are abolished from the earth. The world of tomorrow will attain this objective only if the present governments have the courage and vision to abstain from exercising domineering influences which exist as vestiges of empires in the past.

The relinquishment of our extraterritorial rights in China was a significant step in the right direction, but many more great issues must be met in Asia frankly and freely before the barriers between East and West can be broken down and the full cooperation of the Asiatic peoples enlisted in the war against Japanese aggression.

To sidestep those issues, as Mr. Churchill seems inclined to do, gives Japan an added weapon that will make the ultimate task in the Pacific that much harder and the day of final victory more remote.

Poetic Tribute to Father Duffy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. McNARY. Mr President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem forwarded to the Senator from New Jersey by Mr. Martin M. Clifford, past State chairman of the Knights of Columbus of Jersey City, N. J., which he composed as a tribute to the late chaplain of the Fighting Irish Sixty-ninth, Rev. Francis P. Duffy, who served with distinction in Gen. Douglas MacArthur's Rainbow Division in World War No. 1.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jersey Journal of March 6, 1943]

FATHER DUFFY

(A tribute to the late chaplain of the Fighting Irish Sixty-ninth, Rev. Francis P. Duffy, who served with distinction in Gen. Douglas MacArthur's Rainbow Division in World War No. 1.)

There is a statue in the heart of Broadway,
At which old friends and I oft' stop to pray;
It's the one of the chaplain who justly won fame
As a soldier and shepherd,
Father Duffy's his name.

Oh, well we remember the hours he spent
In the thick of battle with the Sixty-ninth Regiment;
He carried no gun but the cross instead
As he cared for the wounded and buried the dead.

In peace, too, he labored for the souls of men,
And struck hard at hatreds with his voice and pen:
In uniform or cassock, he always did strive
To keep justice and love and freedom alive.

And St. Patrick, we're certain, named him his aide,
For the record on earth he so gloriously made;
He proved that the cross and the shamrock, too,
Set well in the land of the red, white, and blue.

Sure, from above, no doubt, he has blessed
Our own "Doug" MacArthur and the "boys" we love best,
Who fight for Old Glory and do all they can
To safeguard the rights that God gives to man.

Yes, often we stop and are glad to be seen
At our favorite statue wearin' the green;
We salute Father Duffy in the heart of Broadway
As the heaven-made chaplain of the U. S. A.

L'ENVOI

There's a rainbow for MacArthur
In the war-clouded sky,
And from it Father Duffy
We're sure keeps an eye
Upon the great commander
With whom he prayed and planned
For the "doughboys of the Rainbow"
In a shell-holed "No-Man's Land."

Yes, the Sixty-ninth's famed chaplain,
Though he can't be seen,
Is standing by his "buddy,"
As he did in "Eighteen."

And we know God's blessings go
To "our boys" everywhere,
From the rainbow for MacArthur
In Father Duffy's care.

—*Martin M. Clifford.*

Phoney War on Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Merlo Pusey entitled "Phoney War on Inflation," published in the Washington Post of April 6, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHONEY WAR ON INFLATION

(By Merlo Pusey)

Thousands of words have gone out from Washington recently on the so-called war against inflation. If there is such a war, it is one of the strangest contests ever fought. For most of the firing is done with blank cartridges and skyrockets that create a spectacle and raise a din without scathing the enemy. It is as if General Eisenhower launched an offensive by staging a Fourth of July display and dropping lollypops behind the enemy lines.

The President, of course, is making a sharp attack in one sector of the inflation front, and this limited sortie against exorbitant farm prices has been widely interpreted as a war against inflation. But in other sectors the forces of inflation are overrunning the country with nothing more than word camouflages to stop them. In some instances they have the actual aid and support of the administration. If the country is not yet alarmed over this dangerous situation, it is only because we have taken comfort from a deceptive barrage of words instead of looking at the facts.

What are the facts? As long ago as last September President Roosevelt saw catastrophe swooping down upon the United States. Agricultural prices were skyrocketing. The country's annual wage and salary bill was rising at the rate of more than a billion dollars a month. The President was so worried by these inflationary trends that he pledged himself to stabilize wages and threatened to set aside an act of Congress in order to hold farm prices down if Congress did not bestir itself within 3 weeks. Congress responded by ordering the President to stabilize prices, wages, and salaries at the levels of September 15, 1942, so far as practicable.

Since September we have been going on the assumption that wages have been stabilized. In his message vetoing the Bankhead bill, the President pictured his War Labor Board as "resolutely adhering to the Little Steel formula which compensates labor, in its wage rates, for the increase in the cost of

living which occurred between January 1, 1941, and May 1, 1942." Does this mean that labor is making a sacrifice? Certainly the President leaves the impression that the War Labor Board is holding wage rates down and not even taking into consideration the price increases of recent months. Even so well-informed a commentator as David Lawrence recently said that the upward spiral of wage increases "didn't stop until the October 3, 1942, law was passed."

But the ugly fact is that it didn't stop at all. The wage inflation spiral continued to go up and up regardless of the Stabilization Act, the subsequent Executive order and the Little Steel formula. The only difference is that it has gone up faster since September 15 (the stabilization date) than it did before.

Department of Labor records show that in the 4 months preceding this stabilization date average weekly earnings increased more than 5 percent. That must have been a prime cause of the President's alarm when he sent his now memorable threat to Congress. But in the 4 months following the stabilization date (the last for which data are available) weekly earnings went up more than 7 percent. Average hourly earnings also soared above all previous levels. Indeed, the gain in hourly earnings in January was at the rate of nearly 15 percent a year.

There is no evidence here that inflation is being held in check. On the contrary, it is roaring along at a faster pace than it could attain in the days before we achieved "stabilization." President Roosevelt vehemently declares that "we cannot improve our living standards in a period of total war." But members of the War Labor Board point out that the worker's take-home earnings have gone up 50 percent since January 1941, compared to a 20 percent increase in the cost of living. The 30 percent inflationary differential will not be wiped out by a barrage of words in April 1943, any more than it was in September 1942.

As if these increases were not enough fuel for the fires of inflation, the War Manpower Commissioner recently ordered a 48-hour week in crowded centers of war industry. Under the present law most of the workers affected will have to be paid time and a half for all hours worked over 40. Here is another staggering load of fuel for the fires of inflation. The additional earnings can't be spent for consumers goods because our industry is concentrating on war supplies. Such earnings will go into the flames of inflation. And so long as the present law remains unchanged every effort to overcome our shortage of manpower by lengthening hours will build the inflationary conflagration higher.

This reckness policy is doubly dangerous because inflation is being fostered in the name of anti-inflation. Even some labor leaders are now beginning to see its perils. Standing on their towering pedestal of a 50 percent increase, they look down at the lesser gains in living costs and feel dizzy. So they cry for more effective price control. On that point the great majority of the American people, except the farm bloc, will agree with them. But no control of any sort is likely to be attained so long as wage earnings continue to spurt upward with such perilous regularity.

The President warned the other day against setting loose an inflationary tornado. Well, let's change the metaphor and think of it as a tornado. All the President has asked is that Congress refrain from knocking down a windbreak. Apparently he hasn't even thought of turning off the White House blowers that are really whipping up this tornado. Until he is willing to do that, we can't hope for much more than a fight for positions of advantage before the full fury of the storm breaks.

Execution of Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks made by David Dubinsky, president, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, at a protest meeting held in Mecca Temple, New York City, March 30, 1943.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends, fellow trade-unionists, 6 years ago, in 1937, Henryk Ehrlich spoke from this platform, in Mecca Temple, at a meeting at which I was the chairman Ehrlich spoke about the great menace of nazi-ism and called upon us in America to help combat that menace.

Tonight we meet in Mecca Temple again. We meet to honor the memory of two fallen leaders, two of the noblest souls in the ranks of world-wide labor—Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter.

The lives of Ehrlich and Alter were as full of high human endeavor as their death was violent and tragic. To honor their memory is to protest at the same time the brutality and inhumanity of those who are responsible for their execution.

These two emotions are inseparable. The voice that is full of tears and mourning registers fiery indignation and bitter anger over the unpardonable act of their murder.

Ehrlich and Alter are no strangers to us in America. They were close to our labor movement, we worked with them, we cooperated with them, and we loved them for their idealism and for their high integrity.

Ehrlich and Alter were revolutionists, they were true children of the working class of Poland. Revolutionists, fighters for liberty, have frequently paid with their lives for their idealism. Human history is full of examples of such martyrdom. Ehrlich and Alter, who suffered imprisonment in the days when the Czars ruled Poland with an iron hand and by the whips of the Cossacks, knew well the taste of sacrifice and the bitterness of persecution.

Yes; Ehrlich and Alter, like true revolutionists, were not afraid of the hangman or the firing squad. But the great tragedy of this historic case lies in the fact that Ehrlich and Alter were struck down from behind by the treacherous hand of the Communist Party, at a time when they sought have in Russia from the bloody Nazi Gestapo.

They were executed in defiance of appeals for their release from President William Green, of the American Federation of Labor, President Philip Murray, of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Wendell Willkie, Dr. Albert Einstein, and many other outstanding representatives of democratic and labor opinion here and in England, including the British Labor Party and Sir Stafford Cripps. Both the State Department and the British Foreign Office, as well as the Polish Government-in-Exile have taken a deep interest in the case.

They were executed because they were democratic socialists, champions of trade-unionism, and opponents of all dictatorship, including the Communist dictatorship. They were executed because the Comintern could not afford to permit them to remain alive and return to Poland after the war. They were condemned by political opponents, who squared up old political accounts with them in secret chamber proceedings on trumped-up charges without a chance of a fair, honest trial.

But the Communist dictators were not satisfied with the mere taking of the lives of Ehrlich and Alter. The same hand that decreed their death also decreed the destruction of their characters. Those two lifelong fighters for liberty and democracy were to be blackened forever as Hitler allies and as Nazi supporters. Communist stooges and Comintern Quislings everywhere began to defame and besmirch their characters. Moreover, anyone who would dare raise his voice in protest against the murder of Ehrlich and Alter was to be blackjacked into silence by the charge that he was destroying Allied unity, that he was hindering the war effort.

But the hundreds of thousands of workers, liberals, and democrats who worked side by side with Ehrlich and Alter in the international labor movement will throw these vile charges back into the teeth of their executioners. The Comintern stooges who have the brazen effrontery to excuse the killing of Ehrlich and Alter on the ground that they were Nazi spies or tried to incite the Red Army to force a separate peace with Hitler have no respect for the intelligence or regard for the feelings of any decent human being. Just imagine for yourselves—Ehrlich and Alter fleeing from devastated Poland where their conationals, the entire Jewish population, was literally slaughtered by the Nazi fiends—imagine that Ehrlich and Alter would be working for Hitler, that they would be trying to break down the morale of the Red Army for Hitler's benefit.

Nor can we, American labor men and Democrats, accept the cold-blooded alibi that the execution of Ehrlich and Alter was a matter of Soviet domestic policy and does not concern us. If the Soviet Government expects to be taken seriously as a collaborator with the democratic countries in the establishment of a new world order based upon justice, decency, and respect for human rights it should show respect for these principles in its own policies and actions at home.

Ehrlich and Alter were Polish refugees in Russia who fled from the Nazi invaders, seeking safety from certain death at the hands of the Gestapo. But instead of an asylum they found a Soviet prison and a firing squad. The Comintern would not forget that Ehrlich and Alter were its ideological opponents while they lived and worked in Poland, and the Comintern achieved their destruction.

But we, too, shall not forget nor forgive this black crime.

War is brutal, and war demands a terrific price in lives and sacrifices. Some may be inclined to say, why, the killing of Ehrlich and Alter is but the loss of two more lives among millions of others, why get excited about it? Is now the time to protest against the act of an ally, be it ever so ugly and brutal?

To these we say: Our appreciation of the valiant struggle of the Russian armed forces to drive the Hitler hordes from the Russian homeland will not, should not, lead us to condone acts of brutal injustice committed by the Communist dictators such as the execution of trusted leaders of democracy and democratic labor organizations.

And let me remind those who raise the point that this is no time to protest against the act of an ally. In 1918 we had, in California, the famous case of Tom Mooney and Warren Billings. They had been condemned

to death on charges of having been responsible for the explosion of a bomb in San Francisco during the Preparedness Day parade in 1916. Well, in 1918 several big protest demonstrations were held in the city of Leningrad in favor of Mooney and Billings, and that was at a time when we were in the midst of a war and Russia, though it was forced into the Brest-Litovsk treaty, was in fact our ally. Under the pressure of that protest President Woodrow Wilson intervened in behalf of Mooney and Billings with the Governor of California and their sentences were commuted and they were ultimately vindicated. It was those protests that saved their lives. We have a right and a great moral duty to voice our protest, to shout out against a crime, even if committed by an ally. The murder of Ehrlich and Alter, we declare, is an act which cheapens life, degrades the very ideals for which we are fighting in this battle to preserve civilization, and, in the long run, is injuring the prestige of Soviet Russia, who is our ally in the struggle against Hitler.

Friends and comrades, no power on earth can bring Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter back to life; how well we recognize this in this moment of great sorrow. But no power on earth, we declare, shall succeed in besmirching the nobility of their lives, their reputations, or their characters. As free American citizens, as workers, and as democrats, in registering our fiery protest against their execution, we shall assert and reassert to the end of time our unshakable belief in their innocence and their stainless idealism. Ehrlich and Alter died as martyrs. They died because even at the price of life itself they would not renounce their convictions, the principles of a free democratic world. This is our tragedy, this is our loss, this is their undying glory.

Program for Permanent Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter and an answer to it which I think should be read by every citizen of the United States of America:

MARCH 22, 1943.

GEORGE MAURICE MORRIS, Esq.,
President, American Bar Association,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A friendly form letter from the junior bar conference to colleagues in the service invites suggestions or words of greeting. The thought occurs to me that our brethren in the law not yet in the service and therefore still more or less articulate can render all of us a service by actively campaigning in behalf of a program for permanent peace. The time to inaugurate that program is now.

It must be understood that my comments here are merely an expression of my own opinions, and do not state the attitude of the War Department or even of my brother lawyers in the service.

This is the second World War in the lifetime of many of us. Surely most thinking men have been asking themselves, and still do ask, Are we really going to solve the problem of lasting peace this time? Must the horrible tragedies of war continue to engulf the world in their consuming fires?

I note in passing a commentary or two on war. The Mussolinis tell us that "War alone brings up to their highest tension all human energies and puts the stamp of nobility upon the peoples who have the courage to meet it." [1] The answer to that was eloquently expressed long ago, by James Russell Lowell,[2] when he said:

"Ez fer war, I call it murder,
There you hev it plain an' flat;
I don't want to go no furder
Than my Testyment fer that;
God hez sed so plump an' fairly,
It's ez long ez it is broad,
An' you've gut to git up airly
Ef you want to take in God.
Ef you take a sword an' dror it
An' go stick a feller thru,
Guvment ain't to answer for it,
God'll send the bill to you."

Recently I have done considerable reading, talking, and thinking about war. To get down to fundamentals, it strikes me that war is a result of conflicting interests—religious, racial, economic, territorial, ideological, to name a few—where those conflicts arise in a field in which there exists no political or governmental machinery for their peaceful solution. We have all heard the time-honored arguments that war is inevitable because of man's greedy nature, because of capitalism, because of a few devils like Hitler and Mussolini. These arguments all overlook the fact that greed, capitalism, and devils all exist even in isolated peaceful areas of the world. But in those areas men have devised means for the peaceful solution of problems involving conflicting interests. In international relations, however, there still exists no legal machinery to which resort must be had for the solution of international problems.

Being a citizen of the United States, I quite naturally feel that ours is the most wonderful and best country on earth. Aside, however, from personal, understandable prejudice, there are objective reasons for the unique position of the United States. Our United States constitute the first successful attempt to tie together politically a large number of separate political units. This great wonder of the world is our Federal union, in which the member sovereign States have delegated certain powers to the Federal Government. A Federal Constitution limits the powers of that Government, denies the member States the right to engage in war (except in extreme emergency), and establishes a legal and political machinery for the peaceful solution of interstate problems. These things are enumerated here, not for the edification of my colleagues of the bar but to emphasize their novelty in international government and to point out that they are not appreciated for what they are by the layman.

Why should not the basic principles of Federal union be adopted internationally to substitute government for violence? No professional body is better equipped to inform the public on federalism than the bar. At this time it should accept the opportunity to spread information about federalism to the public.

It should here be noted briefly that isolationism is impossible for us. International intercourse—trade, commerce, travel—brings us into contact with others and creates problems involving conflicting interests. Those problems must be solved. It should also be pointed out that, because of such intercourse, political isolationism cannot keep us out of war. It may be pointed out here, moreover, that attempted political isolationism only aids the aggressor. It does not prevent war. Nor is war prevented by every nation arming to the teeth; nor by confederations, such as the League; nor by world courts without compulsory jurisdiction; nor by unilateral pacifism.

If the proposal for international federation sounds like an idle dream, impossible of attainment, consider the comments of the dean of Gloucester, Josiah Tucker, 1 year before our own Federal Constitution was drafted, as follows: [3]

"As to the future grandeur of America, and its being a rising empire under one head, whether republican or monarchical in its form, it is one of the idlest and most visionary notions that ever was conceived even by writers of romance. The mutual antipathies and clashing interests of the Americans, their differences of governments, habitudes, and manners, indicate that they will have no center of union and no common interest. They never can be united into one compact empire under any species of government whatever; a disunited people till the end of time, suspicious and distrustful of each other, they will be divided and subdivided into little commonwealths or principalities, according to natural boundaries, by great bays of the sea, and by vast rivers, lakes, and ridges of mountains."

The mistakes of World War No. 1 and subsequent years must not be repeated. Let us keep in mind the words of Abraham Lincoln in his speech at Gettysburg. We must resolve that the dead of this war "shall not have died in vain; that this [world],[4] under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

If it be said that I have here oversimplified the entire problem, I want to say simply that I cannot expound at great length in a letter. If I do not fully appreciate the problem, at least I know its solution will not be easy. I should like, moreover, to suggest a short bibliography,[5] to which I am indebted for my interest and for most of my ideas. I am deeply indebted to Mr. Streit for the tremendous inspiration his two books have given me, and for being the first to introduce to me the proposal of world union.

Let the members of the bar assert their leadership, and literally broadcast information about federal union. But I warn my colleagues that they must first well acquaint themselves with the subject. In my opinion, no person genuinely interested in this matter should fail to read Streit's books.

Having informed ourselves, let us then proceed to work for lasting peace through

[1] From the British publication The Case for Federal Union, by W. B. Curry, p. 19.

[2] According to p. 266 of Clement Wood's A Complete History of the United States.

[3] From a printed copy of a speech by the Honorable Governor Harold E. Stassen, January 7, 1943, at Coffman Memorial Union, University of Minnesota; copies obtainable from the St. Paul Branch, Foreign Policy Association, 827 Linwood Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.

[4] This word is, of course, "nation" in Lincoln's speech.

[5] The Constitution of the United States; W. B. Curry, The Case for Federal Union, Penguin Books, Inc., 800 Fourth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.; Jackson H. Ralston, A Quest for International Order, John Byrne & Co., Washington, D. C. Harold E. Stassen, see note 3. Clarence K. Streit, Union Now, and Union Now With Britain, Harper & Brothers, publishers, New York. Clement Wood, A Complete History of the United States, The World Publishing Co., New York. Other sources include: The organization; Federal Union, Inc., 1728 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.; and current articles in periodicals, such as Mr. Culbertson's article in the February 1943 issue of the Reader's Digest.

government. In the words of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow:[6]

"Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O union, strong and great.
Humanity with all its fears,
With all its hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate."

Sincerely,

JOHN F. SCHMIDT,
Captain, United States Army,
Arlington, Va.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
Chicago, Ill., April 3, 1943.

Capt. JOHN F. SCHMIDT,
Arlington, Va.

MY DEAR CAPTAIN SCHMIDT: Acknowledgment of your letter of March 22 addressed to me at the headquarters of the American Bar Association in Chicago has been delayed owing to my absence from the city

As you will learn in detail when the American Bar Association Journal for May sets forth the action of the house of delegates at its meeting last Monday and Tuesday at Chicago, the policy-making body of the association appears to be thinking in the same general direction that you are. That is to say, the association has determined that the agencies for the purpose shall inform themselves respecting the post-war problems and come forward with suggestions for meeting them.

Thanking you for your letter, I am

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. MORRIS.

---

[6] Ibid., note 2.

The History of the Rubber Situation and Its Prospects

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. FOLGER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I have lamented a disposition on the part of Members of the House to be somewhat unmindful of our serious situation in the world and to give of themselves what I have considered to be very ill-considered criticisms of everything and everybody. Among these, my good friend and yours, Jesse Jones has been one of those criticized for his action or nonaction on the rubber situation. It has developed now through the activities of Mr. Jeffers that Mr Jones was right in the beginning and is thoroughly vindicated.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a short article on the subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER]?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

HOW ABOUT A RECOUNT?

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

The high planners within the Government now foresee so much synthetic rubber in 1944 that they have started a circular asking for—believe it or not—new ways to use more rubber in civilian life.

When you consider that this country has always been the world's greatest consumer of rubber for articles ranging from automobile tires to hair combs, and when you consider that the civilian supply of all these is rapidly approaching zero, the composed mind is easily jarred by news that somebody is hunting new uses for a threatened surplus in rubber

But it is a fact, and the idea men all through the War Production Board are at work on it.

Unless new uses are found, the report goes, the country may be flooded with surplus synthetic rubber before it knows what has happened, even though every military need will have been supplied to excess and civilian shortages of normal rubber products ended.

Considering all of which, maybe you would be interested in a brief review of the rubber-production program.

This time in 1940 the United States was buying all the natural crude rubber it could get from the British and Dutch growers, and President Roosevelt had authorized a pilot operation in synthetic rubber of 25,000 tons a year.

This time in 1942, the United States was scared stiff—the Japs had all the British-Dutch rubber plantations and we had a world war coming at us from two directions. And we had no source of crude rubber.

This time in 1942, also, a really gigantic project for the production of synthetic rubber was laid out for installation over and above the ordinary program of war production.

The rubber program was drawn up under direction of Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones, who financed both the crude natural rubber purchases and, later, synthetic production.

And this time in 1942, Jones' program was being shot at from every direction.

All kinds of scandalizing filled the air. It came from committees of Congress, from lobbyists, from newspaper and radio yippers, from factions within the Government.

The Truman and Gillette committees of the Senate were particularly outstanding as sounding boards.

And the result was that by midsummer, 1942, the President was on the edge of his chair waiting for a report by a special committee of investigators headed by B. M. Baruch.

Well, the Baruch report was pretty rough on the whole governmental rubber record. It was no specifically harsh with anybody, but it was harsh with the end product of everybody's work.

On the whole, the Baruch report conceded that the program of work laid out under Jones' direction would have to be carried ahead, but called for a really powerful single boss or all aspects of the rubber enterprise.

William Jeffers, the hard-fisted and red-hot railroad president, took over.

Day before yesterday Jeffers announced that there will be plenty of rubber for all civilian automobile tire needs. A few weeks ago he issued Progress Report No. 2, which was equally optimistic in a quiet way.

This writer has been doing a little cross-checking of the facts and has found out something very interesting.

The rubber-production program coming into operation so strongly under Director Jeffers is more than 90 percent the exact, original program laid out by Jesse Jones' staff.

Just about this time a year ago William J. Madigan, who had been loaned to Jones by the War Department to plan and build the rubber factories, gave an elaborate analysis of his project to the Gillette committee of the Senate.

It told what each plant would produce and when it would be ready to do so.

The latest figures in Jeffers' forecast of plant completion and production are almost identical with those Madigan gave the Senate a year ago.

In other words, the original rubber-production program is going through, not only unchanged in plan, but unchanged in schedule. The only change is in detail, and to cut back volume production.

More About the Indefensible Cost-Plus-a-Fixed-Fee Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS LUDLOW
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore attacked the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts as being generally indefensible and contrary to public policy, and today I bring to you some startling additional evidence to corroborate that contention. This evidence has been furnished to me by the office of the Comptroller General of the United States and comes to me over the signature of Richard Nash Elliott, the Acting Comptroller General.

The evidence which I submit consists of a compilation of specific instances where, under the operation of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts, salaries have been boosted beyond all proportions compared with salaries paid to the same employees before they came in contact with the Government's pay roll. The very minute they tapped the Government's till, the services of these employees suddenly and miraculously assumed a value beyond all imagination, amounting in many instances to double the salary they were happy to receive before "lady luck" did them the fine turn of bringing them beneath the spreading canopy of Uncle Sam's umbrella. The imagination part of their swollen new salaries, of course, comes out of the pockets of the hard-earned taxpayers of the United States.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, we might as well let the truth be known about these unspeakable cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts. I do not know everything they cover; I do not know the complete extent of the wrongs they commit against our long-suffering taxpayers, but I do know that for one thing, they cover a salary grab that is as glaring as the midday sun. I challenge anybody to tell me how it happens that when an employee is happily and contentedly working for a certain salary in private employment and he is

transferred to work on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract, his services in the twinkling of an eye become worth 50 percent, 100 percent, or 150 percent more than he had been receiving. Let some one explain that. I think it is true that in a vast number of cases the men themselves would be content to work for less and that they are not asking for these increases. Please understand that I am not blaming the employees for these salary increases. It is my firm belief that the increases were thrust upon them, in most instances, at least. That makes the increases all the more mysterious. I am not holding any individual to blame, but I am attacking the system which permits such things to be done. There should be a thorough investigation of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts. Salary rolls have to be set forth separately and that brings them into the limelight, but the inflation of salary rolls also raises the question as to how many other inflated factors of various kinds there may be included in the cost of the contract which is charged up to the taxpayers of our country.

By unanimous consent, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the letter I have received from the Comptroller General and the list of salary increases furnished by him from the official records of these contracts.

Some of the increases on this list, it will be noted, are as follows:

A chief timekeeper, from $1,740 to $4,160 a year.

A chief warehouseman, from $2,100 to $4,160 a year.

An office superintendent, from $185 to $450 a month.

A chief engineer, from $4,000 to $7,500 a year.

A construction superintendent, from $4,800 to $7,500 a year.

A director of personnel, from $2,900 to $4,680 a year.

A foreman, from $30 to $50 a week.

An assistant accountant, from $900 a year to $3,000 a year.

An office manager, from $1,400 a year to $2,600 a year.

A guard, from $130 a month to $325 a month.

The documents submitted by the Acting Comptroller General are as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 19, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: With further reference to your letter of November 26, 1942, requesting any available information supplemental to the reports theretofore furnished to you relating to increases in salaries paid to employees of contractors engaged in the performance of war contracts on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis, I am enclosing an additional list of such cases which have come to the attention of this Office since the letter of December 14, 1942, to you.

Sincerely yours,

R. N. ELLIOTT,
Acting Comptroller General
of the United States.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractor's employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year—supplemental list

RADFORD ORDNANCE WORKS, RADFORD, VA.: CONTRACTOR, HERCULES POWDER CO., W-ORD-462

Name of employee	Title	Previous salary	Present salary
Clark, Geo. H.	Office superintendent	$300 per month	$500 per month.
Goodyear, Geo. E.	do	$185 per month	$450 per month.
Campbell, Andrew B.	Traffic superintendent	$175 per month	$300 per month.
McCausland, Alex	Plant doctor	$250 per month	$550 per month.
Mathes, Ben K.	Fire chief	$192 per month	$325 per month.
Payne, Van J.	Guard	$130 per month	Do.
Maddox, Chas. E.	Division clerk	$176 per month	$350 per month.
Kline, Dennis H.	do	$150 per month	$325 per month.
Platt, Harold W.	Construction engineer	$321 per month	$575 per month.
Carlin, Harold E.	Assistant project engineer	$250 per month	$450 per month.
Morrison, Wm. H.	Nitrate cotton superintendent	$350 per month	$525 per month.
Grossman, Martin L.	Power house chief	$200 per month	$375 per month.
Ruth, John L.	Smokeless assistant superintendent	$275 per month	$400 per month.
Copeland, Jack C., Jr.	Acid assistant superintendent	$200 per month	$325 per month.
Beehtel, Robt. J.	Purification supervisor	$150 per month	$265 per month.
Carroll, Eades	do	do	Do.
Kiessling, Wm. T.	Nitrating supervisor	do	Do.
Voneiff, John M.	do	do	Do.
Copps, Michael J.	Acid shift supervisor	do	$250 per month.
Thackston, Carl M.	do	$108 per month	Do.
Woodruff, Norris V.	Maintenance superintendent	$394 per month	$550 per month.

DENVER ORDNANCE PLANT, DENVER, COLO.: CONTRACTOR, FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF DENVER, ASSIGNEE; BRODERICK & GORDON, ASSIGNOR, W-7019-QM-2

Johnson, Ralph	Assistant purchasing agent	$5,000 per year	$6,500 per year.

CAMP GORDON, AUGUSTA, GA.: CONTRACTOR, JONES-MACDOUGALD-SMITH-FEW, W-7100-QM-6

Bryant, E. H.	Warehouse superintendent	$42 per week	$60 per week.

PINE BLUFF ARSENAL, PINE BLUFF, ARK.: CONTRACTOR, SANDERSON & PORTER, DA-W-7256-QM-1

Van Doren, Herbert	Chief engineer	$4,000 per year	$7,500 per year.
Hixon, Arthur G.	Construction superintendent	$4,800 per year	$7,500 per year.
Osterhoudt, Lawrence A.	Chief field engineer	$4,160 per year	$5,720 per year.
Osborn, William W.	Director of personnel	$2,900 per year	$4,680 per year.
Weaver, Windsor J.	Concrete and brick superintendent	$224 per month	$125 per week.
Ison, Fred L.	Accountant	$45 per week	$100 per week.

J. J. NOLAN & CO., SUBCONTRACT NO. 13

Braun, Otho N.	Purchasing agent	$75 per week	$100 per week.

RED RIVER ORDNANCE DEPOT, TEXARKANA, TEX.: CONTRACTOR, BROWN & ROOT, INC., W-7115-QM-2

Rogers, Sam	Chief liaison clerk	$216.66 per month	$350 per month.

MARIETTA REGULATING STATION, MARIETTA, PA.: CONTRACTOR, BRANN & STUART CO., W-7187-QM-2

Lawrence, Benjamin F.	Foreman	$30 per week	$50 per week.

NEW WAR DEPARTMENT OFFICE BUILDING, ARLINGTON, VA.: CONTRACTOR, JOHN M'SHAIN, INC., DOYLE & RUSSELL & WISE CONTRACTING CO., INC., W-7185-QM-3. SUBCONTRACT NO 5, FRED BRUTSCHY CO., INC.

Shea, Mary	Office manager	$1,400 per year	$2,600 per year.
Vojik, Charles	Superintendent	$4,160 per year	$6,240 per year.

PLUM BROOK ORDNANCE WORKS, PLUM BROOK (SANDUSKY, OHIO): CONTRACTOR, E. B. BADGER & SONS CO., W-7007-QM-1

Carlson, R. W.	Comptroller	$86.54 per week	$125 per week.
Curtis, H. E.	Purchasing agent	$80.77 per week	$130 per week.
Anderson, J. M.	General construction superintendent	$90 per week	$150 per week.
Rothermund, K. L.	Supervisor of construction, highways	$86.50 per week	$125 per week.
Roberts, F. R.	Assistant division superintendent	$70 per week	$100 per week.
Davis, C. G.	Personnel manager	$65 per week	$110 per week.
Dunseth, D. F.	Supervisor of railroad construction	do	$115 per week.
Wiese, H. E.	Construction engineer	$55 per week	$85 per week.
Meister, E. M.	Junior construction superintendent	$45 per week	$100 per week.
Morrison, N. E.	Pipe erection supervisor	$60 per week	$110 per week.
Richter, R. S.	Mechanical equipment supervisor	$75 per week	$100 per week.
Saunders, G. W.	Office engineer	do	$115 per week.
Schwearingen, F. L.	Senior engineer	do	$110 per week.
Chapman, H. A.	Estimator	$55.80 per week	$95 per week.
Randall, G. A.	Senior engineer	$57.69 per week	$92.69 per week.
Ward, John, Jr.	Engineer	$50 per week	$95 per week.
Robeson, D. H.	Division superintendent	$77 per week	$125 per week.
Formel, A. G.	Chief field engineer	$60 per week	$115 per week.
Spooner, H. D., Jr.	Assistant computer	$65 per week	$90 per week.
Woods, C. D.	Senior engineer	do	$100 per week.
Rehn, J. H.	Construction engineer	$85 per week	$115 per week.

Cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contractor's employees whose present salaries are 30 percent or more in excess of those of the prior year—supplemental list—Continued

TOPEKA AIR BASE, NEAR PAULINE, KANS.: CONTRACTOR, GENTRY & VOSKAMP & JOS. W. RADOTINSKY, THE RIVERVIEW STATE BANK, ASSIGNEE, W-461-ENG-10068

Name of employee	Title	Previous salary	Present salary
Brooks, Raymond U	Assistant office engineer	$2,600 per year	$4,160 per year.

ELWOOD ORDNANCE PLANT, ELWOOD, ILL.: CONTRACTOR, SANDERSON & PORTER, W-ORD-476

O'Connell, John	Chief timekeeper	$1,740 per year	$4,160 per year.
Herbig, Charles	Chief warehouseman	$2,100 per year	Do.
Butler, Wilfred	Section head	$3,600 per year	$5,408 per year.
James, Joseph L	Excavation foreman	$3,000 per year	$5,720 per year.

*MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE INSTALLATION, ST. LUCIA, BRITISH WEST INDIES: CONTRACTOR, MINDER CONSTRUCTION CORPORATION, W-958-ENG-52

McCaughey, John F	Chief accountant	$4,200 per year	$6,500 per year.
Cox, Kenneth A	Materialman	$100 to $140 per month.	$200 per month.
Feiring, Lester J	do	$150 per month	Do.
Haugland, John Thurman	Timekeeper	$105 per month	$250 per month.
Kelly, Elizabeth	Stenographer	$93 to $120 per month.	$200 per month.
Sears, Richard	Assistant accountant	$850 to $900 per year.	$250 per month.
Walhood, Alvin G	do	$125 per month	$200 per month.
Boll, Karl W	Transportation manager	$150 per month	Do
Boyle, Charles Thornton	Watchman	$30 per week	Do.

* Increases of 30 percent or more in British West Indies base.

Farm Security Administration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee, as well as this House, has been doing a splendid job so far this session in trying to cut out nonessential expenditures. Sometime ago I pointed out the maladministration, or shall I confine it merely to the unwise administration, of the Farm Security Administration program in my congressional district.. At that time I referred specifically to a program started by the Farm Security Administration in Cheboygan County to form a farmers' cooperative ostensibly for the storage and distribution and sale of our principal farm products — potatoes, chickens, eggs, and so forth. In effect, however, this organization was set up to do all manner of wholesale and retail business to the grave detriment of long established merchandising houses. Of course, the principal financing of this program would be carried by the Federal Government. I am glad to say that late information from the district indicates that this program seems to have bogged down for the time being at least.

Now, I received another very enlightening letter today on this subject of the Farm Security Administration program in our district, again indicating a further wanton waste of the public's money. The writer, Mr. Edwin G. Pailthorp of Petoskey, Mich., is a thoroughly substantial and leading citizen of his home city. He is an attorney as well as a farmer, and I think his information of the actual conditions in his district should be of interest to every Member of this body—and especially of interest to the Appropriations Committee, and under unanimous consent previously granted I extend his letter at this point in the RECORD:

PETOSKEY, MICH., *April 5, 1943.*

Hon. FRED BRADLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRED: I may not have told you, but I have been operating a rather large farm for several years, raising both beef and dairy cattle. After going over the farm yesterday, business in connection with the farm took me to several other farms in the county.

For a couple of weeks I heard from many sources that dairy cows were selling at $175 to $225 and was at a loss to understand it. Well, I got the answer yesterday. It seems that the representative of the Farm Security Administration is attending all farm sales where dairy cattle are being sold and also the public weekly auctions at Wolverine and Gaylord. He is there for the purpose of buying up all the dairy cows and is performing his mission nobly. The nigger in the woodpile is that the cattle dealers apparently have ganged up on him and every time a dairy cow comes along, they bid the hell our of it, and spending Uncle Sam's money, the sky is the limit with him, so he has raised the prices on dairy cows sky high around here. Let's follow this picture through. By raising the price of dairy cows out of sight, when a farmer does buy one, he then starts hollering for a higher price for his milk and cream based upon the nonsensical price he paid for the cow. In other words, the Government by creating an artificial market and a ficticious price for the cattle, is in fact bringing about the worst kind of inflation in the industry. Now, I know something about this farming game and I don't believe there are very many grade cows a farmer can pay $200 for and come out even, assuming the prices he receives for his product are kept within reason. You probably are aware that at public auctions, most of the cows for sale are cows which the farmer does not want himself or he would not be selling; in other words, most of them that go there are only fit for beef, so the net result is that the Farm Security has in fact been paying a terrific price for a damn poor critter. They, of course, place them with a farmer who only has to give a chattel mortgage back for the cow he buys; however, I can't see how the Farm Security will ever get its money back.

One farmer yesterday had made a deal 2 months ago for some "deacons" which are bull calves sold from dairy herds. I well remember when many of them were hit in the head as there was no demand for them. This farmer thought he was going to buy them for $5 each which is very high, however, when he went to get them, the owner wanted $12 each for them and will probably get it from some darn fool who has borrowed money from the Government and doesn't care how he spends it. He won't get it from any farmer who has to finance himself.

Fred, for several years now I have watched this Farm Security Administration operate. I have tried to find something good about it but it is very difficult to do. They have no doubt helped a few farmers but so few that it is but a drop in the bucket to the large number they have loaned to who can never repay. For years this outfit has created an artificial market for old farm machinery and horses. The farmer who makes a loan when he goes out to buy machinery instead of looking for quality, looks for quantity and gets a lot of broken down junk at a high price, in other words, he doesn't have a chance to succeed from the start. Now they are raising the devil with the cattle market and bringing about the worst sort of inflation because the borrower doesn't care what he pays for what he buys. He is not spending his own money.

Frankly, I am very much upset about the whole set-up. I am not worrying about myself because if I am not smart enough to take care of my wife and family, why, that is my hard luck, however, this whole country is headed for something and whatever it is, it is not good. Here is McNutt hollering about manpower. I know dozens of men working in the plants down below and I have yet to find even one who will say he is turning out an honest day's work simply because he can't. Their reasons fall into three general classifications:

1. Limitations placed on their productive capacity by the union.

2. Many material shortages.

3. Employers and particularly contractors hiring about three men to do the work of one man to boost their costs as they are operating on a cost-plus basis.

Now, in the face of all that, McNutt wants to force the rest of us into industry. I certainly expect to make any sacrifices necessary to win the war, but I certainly am not gleeful about the prospect of working in some factory when I know my services would not be needed if they would use the manpower they have now instead of just monkeying around. I believe I would much rather be a buck private in the Army as I was in the last war rather than work in a factory and stand around about two-thirds of the time.

I suppose the farmers have writtten you about being unable to get any concentrates for their dairy feed. Great stuff, more milk production but nothing to get it with. The War Board allotted me a new double disk. At considerable long-distance expense I find I have no chance to get it until too late for this year. Reason? The manufacturer down in Ohio did not get his steel until March 1 last when he should have had it last September. No plows available for the Ford-Ferguson tractors sold this year—same reason. The War Production Board should be

very proud of the way it had handled the farm machinery set-up.

Well, Fred, I don't know how much of the foregoing will be an old story to you but feel you should know what I learn from time to time and there may be something in the foregoing which will help you know what is going on back here at home.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN G. PAULTHORP.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, thousands of Americans' only claim to fame is that they, like the versatile Jefferson, died broke.

The Senate's threat to override the Bankhead bill veto will be the most effective means to hold down labor advances.

While 1,700 deaths have occurred to Army flyers in camps in this country in 6 months, it is better understood when one knows that there are 65,000 men flying here every day.

While we are all dedicating the beautiful Jefferson Memorial Tuesday, Republicans with equal sincerity with real Democrats will love to extol the things the third President stood for.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN, who looks like the real Will Rogers did look and whom Winchell has determined to keep in Congress for HOFFMAN'S life, wears no pockets in his coat. He is as trim as CLARE B., who has pockets in her skirt.

"I believe the President ought to appoint Gen. Douglas MacArthur as supreme commander in the far Pacific and give him control over all our armed forces there including our Air Forces and the Navy."—HAM FISH.

Recently a captain was found sitting above a major at a military conference. Proceedings were stopped until everyone was in his right seat. The Lord's Last Supper was recalled there as where rank was observed.

Has secondary education fallen down on teaching American history? A survey of 7,000 freshmen in 36 colleges reveals that only 16 percent knew of any contributions of Jefferson to this country, even though it is his bicentennial.

The O. P. A., to save lumber, has ruled with few quarterly exceptions, that coffins shall not be more than 6 feet 3 inches long nor wider than 22 inches. KEEFE, STOCKMAN, WOLCOTT, and others are sure it would be "O. P. U." if any of them should have to be held over.

The order from Secretary Stimson prohibiting soldiers from running for office for first terms is getting varied reactions. Personally we hope no professional soldier is nominated for President. Someone like Bricker will do the job "bester."

Monopoly and Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a brief editorial from America, a Catholic journal of public opinion, published in New York City. The editorial, entitled "Monopoly and Bureaucracy," touches importantly on a subject recently discussed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who is chairman of the Special Committee on Small Business.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONOPOLY AND BUREAUCRACY

Speaking at the annual convention of the National Paper Trade Association, held last month in New York City, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, made a significant remark that ought to be long and seriously pondered by business groups which are currently fighting bureaucracy in the name of free enterprise. He said that "if centralization of business continues, the march of bureaucracy is bound to proceed unabated." A moment's reflection will show how true that is. As business becomes increasingly centralized and subject to quasi-monopolistic controls, its influence over the national economy grows correspondingly. A few men sitting around a directors' table can make decisions which affect the economic well-being of millions of American people. Now, the American people, or any democratic people, cannot permit such a concentration of power to exist without correlative responsibility, since power, divorced from responsibility, is a threat to freedom and democracy. But in the present order they can check and discipline such power only by calling upon the Government to police big business for the common good, and that means bureaucracy. Thus, we have the anomalous situation today in which many of those who are most vocal in their opposition to the growth of bureaucracy are the very ones who by their business philosophy and practice are making bureaucracy inevitable.

President Goes Tory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of April 6, 1943:

PRESIDENT GOES TORY

The American people have some reason to congratulate themselves on the changed attitude of their President. Probably he is sensing a trend, and, politically wise, he may be keeping a step or two ahead of it. Realizing that a pressure group greater than those of the farmers and organized labor is growing fast, he is not only falling in line with it but showing a disposition to lead it. Indeed it would not surprise us if before his third term ends he becomes a full-fledged tory.

Increasing years conduce to conservatism, and Mr. Roosevelt is, of course, older than he was 5 or 10 years ago. At any rate he seems to be losing his enthusiasm for the New Deal. He is no longer a rubber stamp for the farm and the labor blocs. The pressure group which now commands his consideration is made up of the fathers and mothers, wives, sisters, and brothers of the men in the service. To this group may be added the millions of people who have savings accounts or who carry life insurance. Add to these the millions of consumers who are groaning over the high cost of foodstuffs. Combined, these form a pressure group which makes those of farm and labor look rather insignificant.

Whether or not the President has had an honest change of heart or a change dictated by the politics of the situation, there is a decided change in his attitude. Perhaps fear has something to do with it. Mr. Roosevelt is genuinely afraid of inflation. Last week for this reason he vetoed the Bankhead farm parity bill.

Parity in farm prices was established originally for the benefit of the farmer. To insure him adequate prices the Government bought up his surpluses of wheat, corn, cotton, etc. The Bankhead bill would deny the Government the right to deduct subsidy and incentive payments to farmers in computing the parity formula. This would change the parity ratio in favor of the farmer and thus raise prices further, although at present prices for the most part are 115 percent of parity. In his veto the President said: "The farmer, far from being worse off than he was in the last war, is substantially better off. But he will not remain better off if we let loose an inflationary tornado."

Mr. Roosevelt has adopted the same attitude with regard to wage and salary increases, to prices, and to everything calculated to elevate the general price structure. His War Labor Board has actually reduced the wage increases awarded by arbitrators. No longer is he awed by the labor bosses. He has forced John L. Lewis to back down on his threatened coal strike.

A year ago the President sounded the tocsin against inflation. He then proposed heavier taxes, price ceilings, wage stabilization, greater War bond purchases, rationing of scarce commodities, steps to discourage credit buying and to encourage the payment of debts. What must be annoying to him is that the two groups which have benefited most by the New Deal—farm and labor—are now the most ardent in demanding the very things which would invite inflation.

Men like Lewis, Philip Murray, and William Green should know—and probably do know—that the higher the wages paid the higher the cost of living. The farm leaders should know—and probably do know—that any rise in the cost of foods invites inflation. These men put the interests of their groups before the interest of the country.

That the farm group is still powerful in Congress is indicated by the fact that the Bankhead bill passed the Senate by a vote of 97 to 2 and the House of Representatives by a voice vote. Indeed, we have no assurance Congress by a two-thirds vote of both Houses will not override his veto of the Bankhead bill. We will sit back and watch.

Plea To Rescue Polish Children Imprisoned by Soviet Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Tablet, a Catholic weekly, Brooklyn, N. Y., of April 3, 1943, about the plight of the Polish children imprisoned by the Soviet Government, based upon the personal observations of the Most Reverend Josef Gawlina, military ordinary for the Polish troops:

PLEA TO RESCUE POLISH CHILDREN IMPRISONED BY SOVIET GOVERNMENT—BISHOP GAWLINA, IN VISIT HERE, TELLS OF PLIGHT OF ORPHANS TAKEN FROM HOMES IN 1939—22,000 ALREADY SAVED—EFFORTS TO OBTAIN RELIGIOUS FREEDOM FOR EXPATRIATED CIVILIANS UNSUCCESSFUL

The aid of the American people to save more than half a million Polish children from starvation and death in Russia and Siberia has been sought by Most Rev Josef Gawlina, military ordinary for the Polish troops, in his current visit to the United States. The fate of the infants, boys and girls, is sealed unless they can be released from the Soviets.

Accompanying Bishop Gawlina is Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas Reginek, Vicar General of the Diocese of Katowice, Poland, who escaped from Nazi-occupied Poland after learning that Hitler's Gestapo was seeking to arrest him.

Approximately 1,000,000 Polish children were taken captive by the Soviet Government following the invasion of eastern Poland in 1939. An estimated 40 percent have died from starvation, disease, and neglect. Bishop Gawlina believes about 600,000 are still alive in Russia, of whom not more than 175,000 are still with their parents. The rest have been orphaned or separated from their mothers and fathers

Among the Polish civilians evacuated from Soviet territory as members of the families of 60,000 Polish troops now in Iran there were 22,213 children under 14 years of age. The largest group of 9,251 children is in Iran, 4,962 are in east Africa, 4,000 in Palestine, 3,000 in India, and some in Egypt. A total of more than 2,250,000 Poles are still in Russia, either in prison camps or in forced labor.

Of the thousands of priests deported by the Soviets, only 223 could be located following the signing of the Russian-Polish pact in July 1941. When Bishop Gawlina visited Russia last year he appointed 73 of these as chaplains of the Polish Army. He was unable to make contact with the others, whose present fate is unknown. Of the 73, 22 died before leaving Russia and the remaining priests are with the army in Iran and India.

MAKES APPEAL FOR CHILDREN

Bishop Gawlina, in a recent address to members of the clergy in Manhattan, urged that American children be asked to pray for the Polish boys and girls who are in slavery in Russia. Referring to his recent visit to Russia and Iran, His Excellency said, in part:

"The sight of these children at the stations on the Iran borders moved even the hardest of us to tears. Death appeared on their faces. "I arrived at a certain village surrounded by miles of prairies. Houses were of clay. The children were exposed to the scorching rays of the sun. Snakes, scorpions, and mosquitoes spread infection and disease among the children, who went barefooted and half-naked.

"It was a village of the dying. Clay barracks serve as a hospital to the children. In the nursery there are only 20 healthy youngsters, all more than 10 years of age, but they looked like children of 6 years. When they gathered round my table to greet me and began to sing 'From our troubles and sufferings Poland will arise to live,' I could not withhold my tears.

"My problem today is these children. Who will intercede for them? These children are truly saints. I heard their confessions, gave them holy communion, and when I confirmed more than 1,200 of them in Teheran they addressed me in the following words:

" 'We offer all our experiences and hardships for those Polish children who are still suffering in exile.' They forgot that they themselves were suffering just a short time ago.

LESSON IN GEOGRAPHY

"When in Washington I visited the National Catholic Welfare Conference. There I noticed a very practical geography textbook in preparation. When asked about the textbook our Polish children use, I had but one answer: 'My children study geography in a much harder and more practical way, at the cost of great suffering. They traveled from Lwow, Vilno, Bialystok, Zaleszczki for weeks in cattle cars through Kijow, Charkow on the Kirgese Steppes and icy fields of Archangelsk, their route marked by the corpses of their companions. One learned how to float logs on the White Sea, another how to seek food for himself and his 5-year-old sister on the ice fields of Archangelsk. From their own experiences they learn that a "burant" is a terrific snowstorm, so thick that one cannot see 6 feet ahead and so strong that one caught in it is helpless. That is the way my children study geography.'

"My dear fellow priests, our children must be returned. They are God's and Poland's. I come to ask you for a crusade of prayer by your children and for our children. Your motto must be: 'American children pray for the liberation of Polish children.'

"Let your children, who are intelligent, healthy, well dressed, and nourished, pray for my children who sleep in stables, covered with sores, half-naked, and dying by the thousands."

CONDITION OF REFUGEES

The picture presented at the arrival of the first group of children from Russia into Iran in March of last year was described by Monsignor Reginek in a recent interview with the Polish Catholic Press Agency in Manhattan.

"My heart breaks with emotion and grief at the memory of the first arrival of Polish children from Russia," he said. "They were in rags, skeletons covered from head to foot with sores. We could not refrain from tears when these children began to sing the Polish national anthem, stretching their arms out in joy at the sight of a Catholic priest. They seemed unusually mature, mentally and in character. Their suffering had developed their will power, which was uncommonly strong for children of such a tender age.

"The health of these children has greatly improved. They study eagerly, are very obedient and make rapid progress. Seventy percent of them are orphans. Their parents died or disappeared in Russia, leaving them to fight their way alone. Many perished, many remained. Many are still fighting from day to day and hour to hour for life. • • • Bishop Gawlina is deeply concerned about these children, scattered all over the Far and Near East as well as in Russia. He is their father and faithful guardian."

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

In another talk here recently, Bishop Gawlina said that the Poles in Russia and Siberia were without the assistance of priests and the consolations of religion. Religious articles sent by the Catholics of this country have been confiscated by the Soviet Government. On his mission to Moscow he was able to secure freedom of religion for the Polish troops, but not for the civilian population.

Bishop Gawlina was appointed military chaplain in 1929. He escaped from Poland after the Nazi-Soviet invasion in 1939 through Rumania. He eventually reached Rome and later London, where he was put in charge of the Polish armed forces of the entire world by Pope Pius XII.

Monsignor Reginek came to this country shortly after fleeing occupied Poland. He accompanied Bishop Gawlina on his mission in the Far East. During his stay in India he spoke with national leaders, particularly among the Hindus. One of the latter told him that many Hindus have become Communists in order to overthrow the British rule as well as the caste system and the government of the maharajas. They even tried to stir up riots among the Polish refugees, he said, but found that the latter had been cured of communism after 2 years in the Soviet Union.

No Fairy-Tale Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely editorial entitled "No Fairy-Tale Promises," printed on March 28, 1943, by the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, and prompted by the address of Mr. Raymond Moley made before the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce.

This editorial is particularly interesting to me in view of the address that I made before this House on March 8, 1943, on the subject of the coming plans of the National Resources Planning Board and other agencies which are spending the Government's money and time in the hope to remake America into a paternalistic pattern resembling the Fascist states of Europe. I recall to the membership of the House that immediately following my address on March 8 the President sent to the Congress the National Resources Planning Board's program on March 10.

The resolution which I introduced, House Joint Resolution 90, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. To date there has been no action by that committee nor any indication whatever when the proponents of the measure might expect a hearing on the subject. I have no doubt

but what the vast majority of the Members of this House agree with my position. Likewise, I have no doubt but what the administration will do everything in its power to attempt to prevent the Congress from making any kind of an adequate analysis or study of post-war planning.

I extend this editorial in the RECORD principally for the purpose of emphasis of the need of the prompt passage of House Joint Resolution 90:

NO FAIRY-TALE PROMISES

Raymond Moley made some thought-provoking observations on America in the post-war era in his address last Friday before the chamber of commerce. Mr. Moley, it will be remembered, was a close adviser of the President in the early days of his administration, but no longer is in that position because he could not accept the fantastic vagaries of the New Deal. So, he spoke with the authority of an original "brain truster" when he pointed out the danger of America making post-war promises today which we may not be able to make good, and thus sow the "dragon's teeth of hatred" for the United States in fields where we should reap a generous harvest of gratitude.

New dealers, paced by Vice President WALLACE and the President's uncle, F. A. Delano, have some pretty plans for the post-war world. Pretty, but not practical. If they have their way, the world will be made over in the New Deal image. There will be no want or poverty; everybody will have a job; illiteracy will be taboo; government will exercise a benign but paternal guardianship over the peoples in whatever land they live. These fanciful planners only a few days ago projected a program of social security for all Americans, which takes care of them from the "cradle to the grave."

It's all very fine, but practical men will ask just how all this high-falutin' security is to be financed. And this refers not only to America, but to peoples everywhere who after the war will be the virtual wards of the democratic nations, at least for a time. Said Mr. Moley:

"One of the conditions of post-war stability is that it cannot be based upon perpetual almsgiving. Nations must support themselves. We must not, as a prelude to peace, indulge in rash promises. Persons in public office have no right to promise publicly the property of citizens of this country in the future beyond the war to anyone, either here or abroad. They have promised Americans much they cannot fulfill over the years. Now they are compounding their offense by practicing deceit upon the friendly peoples of the world. We have undermined the integrity of our common life at home by teaching people that the promises of the Government are not always kept. In heaven's name, let us not help spread that contagion through the world."

It is quite easy to make promises, especially political promises. They are presented as glittering pledges, obligations which a trusting people accept because they offer relief from their present difficulties. Mr. Moley might have enumerated some of the New Deal promises which have not been kept. He could have recalled the pledges to eliminate waste in government, to balance the Budget, to decrease Federal expenditures, to fight the encroachment of Federal Government on local powers, to revere the Constitution in its every paragraph. These, and others, Mr. Moley might have mentioned as the broken promises of the new dealers.

So it is pertinent to warn against pledges made now, however attractive they may be, when circumstances may be such at the war's end as to render them incapable of fulfillment. It is cruel to hold out false hopes, only to have them dashed on the rocks of the expediency of the moment.

Mr. Churchill astutely warned against that very thing last Sunday. "I am firmly resolved," he said, "not to give or make all kinds of promises and tell all kinds of fairy tales to you who have trusted me and gone with me so far. * * * I am absolutely determined not to falsify or mock that confidence by making promises without regard to whether they can be performed or not."

We have assumed leadership in world affairs, and rightfully so. Ours will be a tremendous burden after the war. Nations and peoples will look to us. It is mandatory that we plan now against that day. But it is also mandatory that we know where we are going and how we are going to get there, and that there be no side excursions into Utopia. Our duty is to help as we can, but primarily to assist other nations to attain that proud position where they can stand on their own feet.

Our cornucopia is already badly battered. It cannot stand the strain indefinitely.

Ignorance of American History Shown by College Students

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I suggested the other day that our military bands should alternately play Dixie and Yankee Doodle, in order to arouse and keep alive some real American spirit.

I now suggest that our educational institutions follow a similar policy. They have about quit teaching United States history. An article in last Sunday's New York Times says that 82 percent of our colleges do not teach American history, and of 7,000 students questioned, an overwhelming majority of them knew practically nothing about Lincoln, Jefferson, Washington, or any of the great leaders of America. Some of them did not know from their study of history whether Abraham Lincoln was killed by John Wilkes Booth, drowned in the Johnstown flood, or shot by Buffalo Bill at the Battle of Tupelo. Some of them thought John Burroughs was a cartoonist, that Chief Justice Taney was a gangster, that Jay Gould was a musician, and that Roger Williams was a movie star. Only 16 percent of them could tell even two things Thomas Jefferson ever did; while only 22 percent could tell two things that Abraham Lincoln did.

Now many of our law schools have quit teaching Blackstone, that great treatise on the common law, on which our institutions are based.

I say that it is time to drive these subversive influences out of our colleges and get back to making them real American institutions, teaching real American history and inculcating the American way of life.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Power Development Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 I joined with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI] in introducing companion bills for the authorization of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

These bills are identical in form with the bill fathered by the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], and favorably reported to the House by the committee on November 21, 1941. I know that the chairman of the committee will agree with me that never in his long experience in this House has any project been the subject of more extensive and exhaustive hearings than were held on this project. Never has any project been approved by the committee with its value and benefit more completely demonstrated by the testimony of the responsible war agencies and engineering authorities of our Government.

Since the hearings were closed, and since the United States entered the war, the authorization of this project has been recommended anew by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the War Production Board, as well as by the President and the Governors of leading States, regardless of party. I am, therefore, confident that the bill will receive the prompt and favorable consideration it deserves, as a measure which comes here under nonpartisan sponsorship, already approved by a committee of the House, acting upon the recommendations of the appropriate departments and war agencies of our Government.

BILL CONFIRMS AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA TO IMPROVE GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SYSTEM

The bill confirms an agreement signed by the United States and Canada on March 19, 1941. In this agreement the two neighboring nations undertook by cooperative action to complete the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, to remove the few remaining barriers necessary to provide a 27-foot channel throughout the Great Lakes to the Atlantic, and to develop 2,200,000 horsepower of low-cost hydroelectricity in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River.

When this agreement was signed 2 years ago Canada had been at war against Germany for more than 18 months. The United States was at that time in the midst of a national defense emergency. By the express terms of the agreement, both nations reserved the

right to expedite or defer the construction of certain of the works needed to complete the improvement, according to actual needs arising out of the war as they developed. Nevertheless, the two countries, now allied at war against the Axis, undertook to authorize the completion of the project and expressly provided for the utilization of the navigation and power resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system to serve needs which have become even more acute and apparent in the 2 years since this agreement was signed.

Had this project been undertaken promptly in the spring of 1941, it is the testimony of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, that in three construction seasons, or by the close of 1943, the great public power plants in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence would have been ready to commence operations. Moreover, the connecting channels of the upper Great Lakes could already have been deepened by the few extra feet required to provide a 27-foot depth, just as the Soo lock between Lake Superior and Lake Huron is now approaching completion, less than a year after Congress appropriated funds for this purpose to increase iron ore shipments on the Great Lakes.

COMPLETION OF UNITED STATES BASES AT THE MOUTH OF THE ST. LAWRENCE AND THE 1,500-MILE ALASKAN HIGHWAY

Since the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence agreement of 1941 was signed, the United States has completed two other great projects of vital importance to the success of this country and Canada in the present war; projects which, like the St. Lawrence development, will also contribute to the well-being of both countries after the war.

Our Army Engineers have now erected a series of great military, naval, and air bases near the mouth of the St. Lawrence, from which the United States and Canada will forever command the approaches to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, in war and in peace. Meanwhile across 1,500 miles of Canadian forests and mountains the Army Engineers completed in December 1942 a pioneer road started only in March 1942. This road is now being expanded to a broad highway to connect the interior producing areas of the United States and Canada in the region of the Great Lakes with Alaska.

These great projects, the construction of which has been expedited during the war, completely explode the arguments heretofore most often advanced against the St. Lawrence improvement. The time has now gone by when it can be claimed that we should not develop and use the immense resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system to the full, simply because a part of the system traverses the soil of a friendly neighboring nation. Today the mouth of the St. Lawrence River is protected by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Forces of the United States. The defenses recently erected there are equal, if not superior to, the defenses at the mouth of the Hudson, the Delaware, the Mississippi, or any other river wholly within our national boundaries. Nor can it be successfully argued, after the completion of these bases, and after the construction of a highway through Canada extending hundreds of miles from our borders, that we have no precedent for improving the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. While this section borders the two countries, most of the works to be erected, including the main dam, both sets of locks, and both side canals, will be built on United States soil.

COST OF THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT COMPARED WITH COST OF OTHER PROJECTS RECENTLY COMPLETED OR NOW PENDING

The cost in new funds for completing the St. Lawrence project is relatively so small, in comparison with the cost of other projects recently completed or now pending, that the arguments of railroad and utility propagandists against this improvement, on the score of economy, reduce themselves to absurdity.

For example, a few railroads with lines running from the southwest oil fields to the eastern seaboard received in the winter of 1942–43 payments averaging about $23,000,000 a month from the United States Treasury, as a differential between the cost of transporting the oil by water and the cost of transporting it by rail. In addition, the railroads have secured priorities to build thousands of new steel drums to carry this oil from the Gulf to the Atlantic, thereby absorbing thousands of tons of critical material and greatly increasing the enormous drain of this uneconomic transportation upon the Federal Treasury. In paying this oil differential, we have thus been subsidizing at a rate of more than $276,000,000 a year the very railroads which opposed the building of oil pipe lines and the Florida ship canal right up to Pearl Harbor. It is now estimated that when the steel drums have been provided and are used to haul oil on flat cars this subsidy will be increased to about $400,000,000 a year.

In an effort to help prevent the indefinite continuance and future recurrence of such a transportation hold-up, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has reported a bill, introduced by the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], providing for the construction of a shipway 27 feet in depth across the State of New Jersey from New York Harbor to the Delaware River. This project is described by the committee in its report filed March 23, 1942, as follows:

> The construction of this ship canal only 32 miles long along the Sayreville-Bordentown route would provide the one missing link needed to secure a continuous inland deep water route extending from Norfolk, Va., to Philadelphia, Pa., and thence to New York City, Albany, N. Y., New London, Conn., and to Boston, Mass.

In his testimony before the committee on March 10, 1943, the majority leader said:

> It is axiomatic that water transportation is the cheapest mode of transportation. Large tonnages can be accommodated by a waterway when all other methods prove inadequate for bulk transportation. Deep-draft ships are the most economical transportation vehicles for large tonnages and barges of less draft are the next best for heavy traffic. The necessities of the New England States can never be supplied by railroads and motortrucks alone. These methods of hauling freight are too limited in the amount of tonnage they can carry. The only practical way to solve the problem is to provide for a complete barge channel into the New England States * * *.
>
> There will be all sorts of relatively inconsequential details brought up to support opposition by those who spend their lives advocating doing nothing and saying things cannot be done. I admit that the Delaware-New York Bay canal can never be built if it is never started. I do not base my advocacy of this canal solely on the predicted time of completion. No man can predict what is going to happen in the future. We need the canal now. We will need it after the war. It is an uncompleted link in a great useful and needed public improvement already planned and almost completed by the National Government.

There is not an argument contained in the report of the committee and the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts in favor of the immediate authorization of the New Jersey canal that cannot be applied, with even greater force, to the completion of the St. Lawrence project.

The committee adopted the estimates of the Corps of Engineers that the New Jersey canal can be built at a cost of $199,000,000. The committee concluded that this improvement will further enhance the value of the $40,000,000 invested by the Federal Government in the acquisition and improvement of the Cape Cod Canal, the $25,000,000 invested by the Federal Government in the Delaware-Chesapeake canal, and other sections of the intracoastal waterway along the Atlantic. If it will also help to remove the future possibility of oil shortages and the payment of ruinous subsidies of from $275,000,000 to $400,000,000 a year to the railroads for uneconomic transportation of oil and other commodities, certainly the expenditure of $199,000,000 to accomplish these permanent benefits will promote very substantial savings and its obstruction on spurious claims of economy cannot be justified.

The authorization of the St. Lawrence project also involves the provision of a "missing link" in a great waterway system already largely completed. Canada has already provided a channel more than 30 feet deep from the mouth of the St. Lawrence 1,000 miles up the river. The United States meanwhile has already provided connecting channels of a minimum depth of 27 feet between the upper Great Lakes. At a cost of $130,000,000 Canada has built the Welland Canal around the Niagara Falls between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario to carry the deep channel through the last connection required to link the five Great Lakes. But between Lake Ontario on the west and the Canadian section of the St. Lawrence on the east, a series of rapids occurring at intervals over the 48 miles of the international rapids section must be harnessed before the seaway can be utilized over a distance of more than 2,600 miles from Duluth-Superior and Chicago on the west to the Atlantic on

the east. Two-thirds of all the works required to complete this great improvement will be constructed in the boundary waters of the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence River, on the border between the Province of Ontario and the State of New York. It is this section which is the missing link in the St. Lawrence development.

To offset Canada's expenditures on the Welland Canal, now open on equal terms to United States and Canadian commerce, the United States has undertaken in the agreement of 1941 to build locks and side canals on the American side of the river and to erect a main dam from which 2,200,000 horsepower of low-cost hydroelectricity can be developed. The net cost to the United States for this new construction, deducting $93,375,000 to be borne by the self-liquidating power project in New York, will be $134,242,000. If we add to this the cost of further enlargement of the existing connection near Detroit to provide greater depth on the up-bound channel from Lake Erie to Lake Huron, estimated at less than $50,000,000, we have a total cost in new funds to be assumed by the United States under the pending agreement of less than $184,000,000.

This investment of new funds is substantially less than the cost of the New Jersey ship canal of the same project depth. It will give the great interior section of this country access by ocean freighters to the sea. It will, moreover, utilize 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectricity now running to waste in the heart of the most populous sections of the United States and Canada.

PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS COMPLETED FOR INTERNATIONAL RAPIDS SECTION

When the St. Lawrence project was under consideration at the hearings conducted by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, it was recommended in the strongest terms, as a defense measure as well as because of its post-war value, by Secretary of War Stimson, Secretary of the Navy Knox, Lieutenant General Knudsen, Secretary of State Hull, Admiral Land, the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and more than a score of other witnesses.

Plans and specifications for the International Rapids section have been completed by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, since the agreement was signed in 1941. After the bill was favorably reported to the House by the committee and after our entrance into the war, the War Production Board approved the immediate authorization of the project. In a statement made public March 26, 1942, Chairman Donald M. Nelson outlined a procedure, based upon the completed plans and specifications of the Corps of Engineers, whereby this project could be undertaken without any substantial diversion whatever of critical materials.

In this statement, responding to inquiries regarding the worth of the St. Lawrence project. Chairman Nelson said:

> It appears that it will be possible to organize the construction program in such a way that during the first 2 years a minimum of critical materials would be required; thus most of the requirements for steel plates and all of the requirements for hydroelectric machinery would not come until 1944. In this way the drain on our supply of critical materials would be very low during the next 2 years, and if at the conclusion of that period the war is still on, we would still be in a position to make such changes in the program as the war situation might require.

On April 1, 1942, the President renewed his previous recommendations for authorizing the St. Lawrence project in a letter in which he said:

> As I have repeatedly pointed out * * * the completion of this development will not only supplement our transportation and power facilities, needed in the increased war production of aluminum, steel, ships, planes, tanks, and guns, but will also contribute to the welfare of all our people after the war is won. It is my hope that the agreement with Canada will be promptly confirmed so that completion of the project may proceed during the present construction season without further delay.

On July 31, 1942, the Navy Department again urged that the St. Lawrence project be expedited as a needed wartime development.

In the light of these and other recommendations from the highest officials of the war agencies of our Government, why has this project been held up? We know the reason assigned by the spokesmen for railroad and utility interests who appeared before the committee in opposition to the project, and who have maintained a continuous propaganda against this improvement. The main argument advanced by the opposition has been that the St. Lawrence project should not be undertaken because it would absorb large quantities of critical materials needed for other purposes in the prosecution of the war.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE SHIPSHAW POWER PROJECT FOR THE ALUMINUM CO.

We now find that in the 2 years since the St. Lawrence agreement was signed in 1941, a power development larger than Boulder Dam, capable of developing more than 1,000,000 horsepower, has been under construction on the Saguenay River in the Province of Quebec.

This project, known as the Shipshaw, is not a public power development, such as proposed in the International Rapids section. It is not owned or controlled by the Government of Canada or by the Province of Quebec. On the contrary, it is the creature of a private corporation, the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd., the Canadian affiliate of the Aluminum Co. of America.

During the past two years, while the St. Lawrence project has been held up on the claim of an alleged lack of critical materials, the Shipshaw development of the Aluminum Co. has been rushed toward completion. We all know that the United States and Canada draw freely upon each other as allies in the war for critical materials.

There can be no question, therefore, that materials used on the Shipshaw have been diverted to this private power project from the expansion of public power projects in the United States or Canada, including Grand Coulee and Bonneville, T. V. A., and the proposed New York-Ontario public power developments in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River. Steel, copper, generating machinery, and construction equipment were thus found available to build a great private power development for the Aluminum Co. in the midst of the war at the very time when we were being told that our projects could not go forward, for lack of materials, even on staggered schedules of construction.

Over the past 2 years a total of $68,500,000 in funds voted by Congress has been advanced to the Aluminum Co. of Canada and has been used to finance the completion of the Shipshaw power development on rush schedules. It has recently been stated by Minister Howe, of Canada, that these United States funds have been turned over to the Aluminum Co. as advance payments for aluminum to be delivered to the United States. But it remains the fact that a private corporation has thus been enabled to build a great power development which will be free of fixed charges after the war, in a favored position to compete with public power plants serving other industries in the United States.

THE ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT SHOULD BE AUTHORIZED WITHOUT FURTHER DELAY

The diversion of United States materials and the use of United States funds to construct the Shipshaw project of the Aluminum Co. in the Province of Quebec cannot be defended if we are to couple that policy with continued obstruction of the water resources of the United States.

The St. Lawrence project should, therefore, be authorized without further delay. If the projects of private corporations have been given precedence in the use of materials so that our own river developments have been held up, we nevertheless face the necessity of utilizing these resources in the event of a long war and in the period which will follow the war. Certainly the United States cannot hope to compete successfully in the post-war world and maintain American standards of living if we are to saddle our industry, labor, and agriculture with excessive transportation and power costs. We cannot do this while other nations proceed with the development of their water resources to reduce the charges on their production through low-cost navigation and low-cost hydroelectricity.

Indianapolis Association of Credit Men Raises Danger Cry of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men, an organization whose membership comprises more than 2,000 outstanding business men, is taking the lead in bringing

to the attention of the country what it regards as highly inflationary possibilities in the issuance of so-called Federal Reserve bank notes in the amount of $660,000,000.

A bulletin recently issued by Mr. Merritt Fields, the capable and brilliant executive manager of that association, is being circulated widely and is attracting much comment, not only in Indiana but throughout the United States. In view of the importance of the question involved I ask unanimous consent to insert this bulletin in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am sure that all of us are agreed that unbridled inflation would be one of the worst calamities that could befall our country. Notwithstanding the unanimity of opinion on that subject the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men contends with vigor that the effect of the issuance of this block of notes unquestionably will be inflationary. The bulletin referred to is an interesting contribution to the discussion of timely topics. It is as follows:

THEY DID IT—THEY WATERED THE MILK

We never did have any faith in the financial management of certain politicians, because even in peacetime they spent your tax money recklessly, frivolously. As long as they have been in control of your Government not theirs, they have run it in the hole. Now they have watered the milk. They just put in relatively a little water—put in only $660,000,000 of water. You don't notice it now, the milk looks the same and tastes the same. They have done it this time apparently without a ripple and may be expected to dilute the milk some more. If they do, after a while you won't want that milk and there may a flight from the dollar into things the same as the Germans and French fled from their currency into things.

PRINTING-PRESS MONEY?

We have before us a $5 bill. At the top over Mr. Lincoln's picture it says "National Currency" This bill is part of the $660,000,000 recently put into our currency stream by the Treasury. There is not one thing behind this bill under present laws except the cash assets of the Treasury. We are looking at another $5 bill Over Mr. Lincoln's picture it says "Silver Certificate" and at the bottom "Five Dollars in Silver Payable to the Bearer on Demand" The second $5 bill is lawful money. It is whole milk, not watered milk. It is amazing to us that the New Deal would do this thing to our credit—that it would take this chance of causing a loss of confidence in our money Look for these bills, they are in five's ten's and twenty's. Each one has the same thing at the top "National Currency". Printing-press money is what broke the German people The German Government printed just a little of it and the people didn't notice the water, so they poured in a little more and then a little more. Relating to this thing that has been done to our currency, Dr Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics, New York University and secretary, Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, says the following facts cannot be denied:

"1. There is no law authorizing the Treasury's action in issuing Federal Reserve bank notes up to $660,000,000 or in any amount whatever.

"2. Such notes can be issued legally only by Federal Reserve banks and only in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Reserve Act.

"3. The new so-called Federal Reserve bank notes are not being issued by the Federal Reserve banks and are not liabilities of these banks.

"4. The statement on the face of these notes to the effect that they are 'secured by United States bonds deposited with the Treasurer of the United States of America or by like deposit of other securities' is a falsehood."

NATIONAL CURRENCY

This particular transaction of introducing $660,000,000 of questionable money into our currency smells bad right from the start. We should be able to believe a press release from the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System which says that the Board has authorized the Federal Reserve banks to utilize at this time "the existing stock of currency smells bad right from the start. We as 'Federal Reserve Bank notes'." This Five Dollar bill before us is not called a Federal Reserve Bank note; it is called "National Currency." Ask your banker what "National Currency" is. Ask him what law authorized it. Ask him who can issue "National Currency" and whose liability it is.

All he can tell you, if he is an informed banker, is that this $660,000,000 in currency has been issued in violation of existing laws. This "National Currency" is not the same as the money issued by the Federal Reserve banks in accordance with existing laws. When money is issued by the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Reserve bank notes are obtained from the Comptroller of the Currency only after deposit, by the banks, of Government securities equal to 100 per cent of the notes received, or the deposit of approximately 111 per cent of other specified notes, drafts, bills of exchange, or bankers' acceptances, with the Treasurer of the United States or with the Federal Reserve agents acting for the Treasurer. When Federal Reserve banks issue money legally under the law, the Reserve banks would, in addition, be required to deposit a redemption fund in lawful money equal to not less than 5 per cent of the Federal Reserve bank notes received. These bank notes would not be assets or reserves in the Federal Reserve banks; they would be liabilities.

ISSUED AGAINST NOTHING DEPOSITED

The bonds and redemption fund deposited by the banks with the Treasurer of the United States or Federal Reserve agents would be the banks' assets against the notes. But the Treasury under the control of New Deal politicians has not followed existing law when it put out these so-called Federal Reserve bank notes—this "National Currency." The Treasury illegally issued this "National Currency" against no assets deposited anywhere by anyone. When currency is lawfully issued, $1 of Federal Reserve bank notes can support $5 of deposit credit, but when issued by the Treasury, $1 of Federal Reserve bank notes can support over $14 of deposit credit. This transaction is rank currency inflation in violation of the existing law It is reported the General Counsel of the Treasury has said when asked how the Treasury could legally issue Federal Reserve bank notes that "it is merely a matter of technicality." His reported remark pretty well sums up the New Deal attitude toward the Nation's fiscal affairs. "We only owe it to ourselves."

TREASURY SHOULD NOT BE INVOLVED

What a spectacle! The politicians lecture the American people about inflation while they dilute the milk with this $660,000,000. We repeat again, this money is in circulation in violation of existing law. Before any reader writes us a nasty letter about this credit transaction, let him inform himself of what has happened, then he will write to someone else. Look for this "National Currency." The Treasury gave itself a purchasing power of $660,000,000 to which it was not entitled; it neither taxed nor borrowed to get it. This "National Currency" is similar to the so-called greenbacks issued during the Civil War. We predict if Congress does not recover its authority and its powers to protect the people, the milk will be watered some more. The United States Treasury should not be taking a chance with the people's confidence in our money. Note: A more detailed discussion of this money issued in violation of existing laws may be obtained by writing Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, Educational Building, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Ask for Dr Walter E. Spahr's analysis of January 20, 1943.

It may be your Congressman and two Senators do not know what has happened. Already the issuing of this "National Currency" has started up demands of inflationists for further currency dilution. We are thinking ahead, of course, to what the politicians intend to do about retiring the national debt. Everybody who buys a Government bond holds part of that national debt. We want this national debt, this credit transaction, paid out—not watered out. If it is watered out, it ruins you.

When I learned of the bulletin of the Indianapolis Association of Credit Men I asked Hon. FRANK B. KEEFE, our colleague from Wisconsin, to furnish for the association his opinion of the quality of the money represented by this block of notes labeled "National Currency." Mr. KEEFE is a banker and lawyer and has given this matter his particular attention and close study. His reply was as follows:

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR LOUIS: Confirming the talk which we had this morning, it is my belief that the $660,000,000 worth of Federal Reserve Notes referred to in your letter are pure and simple "Greenbacks." As you are aware, the law provides for the issuance of Federal Reserve bank notes which are supposed to be the direct obligation of the Federal Reserve System. They are supposed to be issued only after deposit of the permitted collateral specified in the law. The transaction in the instant case, however, while the law was technically complied with, the net result was the issuance of unsecured circulating medium and the acquisition by the Treasury Department of a $660,000,000 deposit credit in the Federal Reserve banks which permits the Treasury to use this money in payment of its obligations withou payment of interest. It also results in the increase of the circulating medium by the amount of issue.

These notes can clearly be called printing-press money and the tremendous volume of circulating medium indicates that if it is persisted in in the future, we will eventually be face to face with the real threat of currency inflation, which can only spell disaster for our country.

It should be noted, however, that these notes do have behind them the full faith and credit of the United States Government because they are in fact obligations of the Treasury Department and are carried as such in the Daily Treasury Statement, as you can readily observe by turning to page 4 thereof.

While Federal Reserve notes and silver certificates in theory have some collateral behind them, in reality the greatest security is the same as that behind this issue of

Federal Reserve bank notes, to wit: "The full faith and credit of the United States Government."

In our thinking on this subject we must wherever possible maintain confidence in our circulating medium. If this confidence is destroyed and the billions of dollars of hoarded currency now outstanding begins to compete for the purchase of land and consumer goods, we will have a real inflationary spiral that can only end in financial chaos and disaster.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANK B. KEEFE, M. C.

The Trade Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of April 3, 1943:

THE TRADE TREATIES

The address of Mr. Sumner Welles before the chamber of commerce here yesterday was a serious and persuasive appeal for the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, which will expire in June unless Congress takes action to maintain it. The trade treaties always shone as one of the few sane spots in the fantastic world of pre-1939 economic and political relations, and as the Under Secretary rehearsed all the old arguments in their favor, he gave them an only greater cogency by applying them to the problems of the future. Of proved value in the past, the Trade Agreements Act is even more valuable today as an assurance to our allies that the United States will not relapse into a narrow isolation after the war, and it will be more valuable still tomorrow, when the restoration of a vigorous international trade will be imperative if demobilization is to be safely achieved, unemployment averted, and the conditions established for some political stability in the world.

But there is a special aspect of the matter at which Mr. Welles hardly more than hinted. There is no provision in the act, he observed, "whereby this Government or any agency of it participates in business. The Trade Agreements Act is based on the philosophy that it is the function of private enterprise to develop our foreign trade." This philosophy is not shared by everyone. The war has put all the governments into foreign trade on a gigantic scale, and the peace will find them wielding powers of control, of regulation, of direct governmental trading which many will be reluctant to abandon. Most British economic thinking, in particular, is now looking, not toward the old ideal of free trade but toward systems of cartelization, intergovernmental agreements, and close controls. The tendency came out plainly in Mr. Churchill's recent address, as it has in the thoughts of many lesser British spokesmen.

Just as the United States, as a result of the change in our economic position, is abandoning the old-fashioned high protection gospel in favor of freer international enterprise, the British are undergoing a change in somewhat the opposite direction. And where all the rest of the world economy is already under such close governmental controls, the United States is unlikely to be able to resist the trend unless we can offer some practicable machinery for promoting international commerce through private enterprise. The Trade Agreements Act represents a minimum beginning of the kind; we should certainly keep it ready for the future.

War Profits and Starvation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the House of Representatives who have had a constant interest in the social and economic welfare of elderly American citizens during our years of service in the House have been hesitant about voicing our hopes for better pensions since Pearl Harbor, because it was felt that every effort should be turned toward winning the war. We have seen every group in the Nation benefit, except those elderly Americans, from increased wages and better profits.

The situation has grown more serious each week, as far as 3,000,000 old-age pensioners are concerned, until today, Mr. Speaker, the spread between the income of these people and the cost of food, clothing, and shelter, has made it almost impossible for them to exist.

I, for one, and I know that many of my colleagues agree, feel that some definite action must now be taken. As you all know, old-age assistance payments under the social-security law are just the same or lower today than they were before the cost of everything we eat and wear began an upward climb.

For example, Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the average payments under old-age assistance were approximately $21 per month, with a low average of $6.18 in Mississippi, and a high average of $35 in California.

Despite the fact that the cost of food has risen over 42 percent and the cost of clothing 25 percent since Pearl Harbor, pensions have not gone up one dime. The national average is still about $21 per month.

A pension of that minor proportion before the war meant privation and poverty. Now it means starvation in many instances. This great commonwealth which has the high hope of being able to bring "freedom from want" to the entire world had better start now by thinking of the poverty and starvation of millions of its own people.

The war has not helped elderly citizens, as is evidenced by the recent annual report of the Social Security Board. Actually there were more persons receiving old-age assistance in 1942 than in 1941, we are informed in the Social Security Board report on page 53.

The Social Security Board, in spite of the fact that it is cognizant of the fact that living costs have skyrocketted and that these people so dependent upon it are in dire need, has not come to Congress asking for an amendment to law to allow these people more money for living expenses. It has not, apparently, recognized fully the importance of the great changes in the problems of the elderly citizens, rapidly becoming worse.

Now, gentlemen, with nearly two and a half million old folks living upon the crumbs of the Nation's table, I think it is about time we jolt the Social Security Board out of its complacency. I think we should have an investigation of its neglect.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, a special pensions committee of the House should be appointed immediately to undertake such an investigation, and at the same time to study revision of the whole pension old-age system. We all know it is antiquated. The Federal Government should pay uniform payments, for the present State-Federal matching system has been a hardship upon the most needy areas, and a great many of us now realize that a fixed pension such as we now have works intense hardships on our own citizens during such an inflationary period as we are now passing through. A great many of us also are of the opinion that the taxing system to pay for pensions should be on a month-to-month pay-as-you-go basis.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Townsend was the first to come forward with all these suggested changes. He was ridiculed 7 or 8 years ago, and then we began to see that the reforms he advocated were sound and feasible, and time has shown the wisdom of his suggestions.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say that I am anxious to join with all of my colleagues, who are interested, to press for the appointment of such a committee as I have suggested. This committee can make a careful study of the situation as it is today, then can study pension legislation before this Congress and, finally, give us a comprehensive report on the whole matter.

Let us win a major victory on the home front by freeing our own citizens from fear and want.

Americanism Versus Internationalism in the Post-War Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a talk which I delivered last evening on the Washington Evening Star Forum over the Blue Network.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends of the radio audience, in the brief time at my disposal, I should like to point out some other aspects of this post-war problem.

The Ball resolution for an agreement now—in the middle of the war—on post-war plans is the culmination of a long and persistent campaign carried on in this country.

An extraordinary number of books, magazine articles, and radio addresses have been released insisting on post-war agreements now. The general theme of these books, articles, and addresses is stated by Dr. Ranshofen-Wertheimer in his recent book Victory is Not Enough. He says:

"There must be a cooling-off period between the end of the war and the actual establishment of the peace terms. * * * This does not mean, however, that major decisions governing the peace settlement should be postponed until some years after the war. On the contrary, some of the more constructive and daring decisions must be made while the psychological emergency engendered by the war prevails. Preferably they should be made during the war" (p 97).

I have yet to read a better explanation of the reasons motivating these international planners like Dr. Wertheimer than that of the nationally known writer—John T. Flynn. He says:

"The theory is obvious. During the war our people are being worked up to a state of high emotional voltage. When the war ends—when the war propaganda ends—when the war emotionalism ends—when the people once more begin to think—the job of drawing this country into complex commitments for long and costly and dangerous activities all over the globe will be very difficult. Then the appeals will have to be made to the minds—not the passions. The subject will have to be thought out, argued, reasoned. Therefore, the people must be rushed into commitments before reason gets back on her throne. We have in this country, now, representatives of all the Allied Nations. They have written a number of books; they appear constantly on the radio and find their way into the magazines and newspapers with their views. Whatever one may think, this much is certain—these men and women are thinking in terms of their own countries, not ours. They are all eager to get the United States into commitments for the post-war world, commitments involving vast billions, military obligations, enterprises for the policing of their enemies, alterations in our own laws, our fiscal and other policies that will aid them in their plans for their countries. We should remember that they are talking for the interests of their nations and not for ours."

We all want permanent peace when the war is won. We all pray and hope that this will be the last World War. We all believe that the acme of civilization is to reach a place where war will be unnecessary to settle our differences. Therefore, the question is not who wants peace, the question is, what is the best way to keep the world at peace?

But, as Professor Borchard, a leading authority on international law, points out:

"International relations are a product of history, and reflect the changing needs, ambitions, capacities, philosophy, ideals, and accidents of circumstance, and leadership, which mark the progress of man through the ages."

Obviously, each nation adopts those tariffs, armies, navies, air fleets, immigration, or commercial policies it regards as best suited to its own particular needs. And the bulk of these national policies which so deeply disturb international relations are not affected or touched by international law as we know it. If the world desires to bring these policies within the scope of international law, a whole new atmosphere of cooperation, of congeniality, of willingness to voluntarily surrender national sovereignty must be created. Such an atmosphere of cooperation is entirely inconsistent with the demand for group force, for "sanctions against aggressors," or disturbers of the status quo. Yet we hear these very planners of this international post-war world argue the desirability of enforcing the status quo ante, of combining in sanctions against aggressors. How inconsistent is such reasoning in the light of all the facts!

Any attempt to create coercive machinery out of the materials of international relations, by which some states would be judges, mentors, or controllers of other nations, whether it is called "collective security" or by any other name, is a technique of war and potential war, which in itself impedes the possibility of any useful cooperation.

Do you suppose the boys who are doing the fighting want a new kind of government to tell them where and when they shall fight? Not long ago I had the opportunity to read a letter from an American boy who is with the fighting forces. I want to read parts of it to you. He says:

"You have got to get out here, I think, to get a true perspective. You have got to get out here to realize what it is you are fighting for. You hear these pontifical asses drool over the radio at you across the seas: 'This is what we are fighting for.' They don't—any of them—have anywhere in their frozen souls the slightest conception of what they are talking about. Never mind their high-sounding phrases, here is what we are really fighting for, we are fighting for the right to come back home and find the folks well and happy, sitting on the same old front porch. We're fighting for the right to stroll down Main Street past the corner drug store, hand in hand with the wife or the girl friend, on Saturday night on the way to the movies. We are fighting for the right to see the town, green in the moonlight, with the white church standing there, and the crowd laughing and kidding on its way to John's and Polly's for some bridge or some music. It's things like that and just as simple as that. Don't let them touch that land that we out here never knew before how much we loved. Don't let anybody prostitute it, cheapen it, enslave it, or appropriate our stake in it. Millions of us are going to be coming back some day and we want our country as it was."

Those are the thoughts of our fighting men.

You can't send 8,000,000 boys away from home to fight on foreign soil without their developing a new and almost exaggerated appreciation for their own threshold, and their own hearthstones.

These men will be back some day. They and their families will be the most powerful group, politically and psychologically, in this Nation. Depending upon the type of leadership they get, their force and their influence will be immeasurable.

What right have we to make these boys a part of an international police force—controlled and ordered around by a new super-international government made up of Russians, Turks, Chinese, British, and Americans?

I will be accused of provincialism by putting America first in my considerations. But it is my theory that what we cannot do in America we cannot do in the world. I believe that there should be no legislative, judicial, or executive authority on earth above our Government in Washington. That Government is responsible to the people of the United States and to them alone. I take it for granted that we shall have world trade, world missions, that we shall encourage and stimulate world-wide humanitarian enterprises.

But I am of the opinion that the American people will insist that at no time shall we delegate to some international super government the authority to carry on these activities, to define them, to develop them, or to repeal them.

Those who have authority over our destiny as a people must always be within reach of our power to recall, impeach, or remove by popular election.

Men speak glibly today of enforcing peace. Enforced peace is the antithesis of democracy. The graveyards of history are milestones of that program. The victors tried it in our own time. Renewed efforts to enforce peace can only result in another debacle.

1. The nature of nations and their relation to other nations is such that the competition between them for place, power, and prosperity demands a high degree of conciliation of conflicting interests; 2, only by persuading nations of their mutual self-interest, and not by force, can these nations be induced to create international economic and social agencies which might help temper or reconcile or adjust unfair competition between them; 3, indispensable to such progress is an atmosphere of harmony, trust, and mutual self-respect; 4, the threat of group force, the idea of forced peace stifles such an atmosphere, prevents and destroys the very objective sought.

If politics are to be institutionally controlled by a supergovernment—the goal should be instruments of ordered change; not for the enforcement of the status quo. That has been tried and found wanting. It has been well said that the enforcement of peace is a contradiction in terms—it rests on unsound premises; it manifests a confusion of mind; it will continue to end in a morass of failure.

Palestine a Place of Refuge for the Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an important article by James G. McDonald, former League of Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The article, appearing in the March 19 issue of the New Palestine, is entitled "The Time for Discussion Is Past."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The plight of the Jews of Europe is now clearly seen as constituting a problem beyond the scope of private relief enterprise. They live in an abyss of misery, human and economic and social, which only prompt international effort on the largest and most generously conceived scale will even partially alleviate.

Early in March, Ernest S. Pisko, writing for the Christian Science Monitor, estimated that already 2,000,000 of the 7,000,000 Jews in Germany and the Nazi-controlled territories had perished. No pretense of humanity or legality any longer hides the savage slaughter by mass killings, starvation, forced overwork, and overcrowding, with the resultant toll of disease and epidemic, whereby the Nazis are making large portions of Europe Jewless.

THE TOLL THUS FAR

Some idea of the relentless nature of this mass deportation and murder in zones of death may be gained from the decreases in what were once areas of prosperous Jewish minority existence:

In Austria a decline from 190,000 to twelve to fifteen thousand.

In Belgium from 85,000 to 8,000.

In Germany from 600,000 to thirty to forty thousand.

In Poland a campaign of total extermination is in progress.

In France more than 65,000 have been deported and the full blood hunt is now on.

In Bohemia and Moravia a decline from 90,000 to not more than 11,000.

As the extermination of the Jews of Europe has been integral to the Nazi assault on the world of humane tradition and everything that is known as culture, so it is obvious that the salvage of the Jews who survive constitutes a primary task of the United Nations. The responsibility has been recognized by the United States Government, whose Under Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles, early in March revealed that he had sent a note to the British Government offering the cooperation of the United States to save the Jews of Europe from extermination.

The British Government, in its reply, expressed willingness to explore the situation, stressing that the problem should be dealt with internationally instead of as hitherto by private charity or by individual governments in isolation. The British Government also stated that the British Minister, Sir Ronald Campbell, on January 20, 1943, had handed to the United States Department of State an aide memoire which pointed out that there might be an unlimited demand for accommodation by refugees fleeing from the German threat of extermination.

The procedure suggested in the American note to Britain included an Ottawa conference which should consider not merely Jewish but all other refugees; should explore temporary havens as near as possible to the present residence areas of the refugees, with a view to repatriating them at the conclusion of hostilities; and should consider the possibility of maintaining refugees temporarily in neutral and even in nonneutral countries.

PROMPT ACTION NECESSARY

To the nonpolitical and the nongovernmental observer, it is quite clear that the time for lengthy discussion of this problem is long past. The destruction of human lives and the sapping of human health and resistance to disease and hunger, which is now going on under the Nazis, is rapidly progressive. Action too long delayed will exact a frightful penalty. Success of the Nazi campaign of extermination will, in itself, constitute a partial victory for the Nazis. And therefore promptness and energy are of the essence in the campaign to save the Jewish remnants in Europe.

Planning may well be considered from two aspects: First, are immediate and emergency measures. Second, a program is needed which will continue and be extended into the post-war period. In the field of emergency planning, and from the point of view of those unhappy people who are now, at this moment, threatened with being brutally done to death, it is idle to think of long-range projects which contemplate the taking over of large uninhabited tracts in northwestern Australia. Such a project may or may not, in the long run, be feasible. It has a number of prominent advocates.

PALLIATIVES

As I write, early in March, the Associated Press reports from Perth, in Australia, that the Primate of Australia, the moderator general of the Presbyterian Church, and the president general of the Methodist Church, have jointly written to Prime Minister Curtin in support of the project. At the very least, that joint communication shows how world-wide is realization of the desperate nature of the condition which demands the most far-sighted and large-scale relief action.

In the same category with the Australian proposals belong the suggestions that Jewish refugees be placed in Madagascar, Guiana, Africa, the West Indies, and South America. The distances are such, climatic and transportation difficulties are so great, that from the point of view of immediate action, whatever may be the long-range possibilities, these palliatives hardly stand critical examination.

PALESTINE OR DEATH

The obvious first step lies close at hand. It is offered by Palestine. In saying this, I am quite well aware of the administrative, military, social, and economic difficulties attendant on the moving and reception of large numbers of human beings in wartime. Certainly there is no disposition on the part of anyone seriously wishing to see this problem adequately dealt with, to minimize the gigantic difficulties it presents. But in seeking an immediate haven to relieve a life-and-death emergency, one must choose the path which at the very least offers no absolutely insuperable obstacles. That path, for many of the Jews of Europe, points inexorably to Palestine. For them, the alternative is death by many horrible means.

The reasons for this are obvious. The distances to Palestine from the European concentration points, or from the ports in Rumania and Bulgaria, are relatively small, as compared with the route to any other conceivable reception point. Furthermore, some one-half million of the fellows of the refugees are already established in Palestine, on the land and in well organized cities and urban communities where emergency reception centers could without undue strain be rapidly established. Third, Palestine offers an environment to which the refugees can adjust themselves with least suffering and danger. The people there speak their language. The climate is one to which anyone from the temperate zone can accommodate himself. And existing social services, industrial and farm enterprises could take care of newcomers on a far different basis than would be offered by the effort to build new communities from the ground up in a distant wilderness.

WHITE PAPERS NOT IMMUTABLE

The proposal to use the facilities of Palestine involves sharp revision of the British attitude promulgated in a series of white papers. But inasmuch as the white papers themselves have at various times sharply revised prior conceptions of the possible and the desirable, and the war crisis itself makes drastic changes in planning everywhere inevitable, this should offer no hindrance to consideration of Palestinian possibilities.

From the British point of view, the chief obstacle to greatly and suddenly enlarged immigration to Palestine may be summed up in the political fear of its effect on the Arab population. To this objection there are two answers.

First, in view of the economic advantages which have accrued to considerable numbers of Arabs through Jewish reclamation, health, and industrial projects in Palestine, it would seem the part of statesmanship to work toward mutual understanding between the two groups. Moreover, the war emergency has tended to lessen to some degree the points of acutest friction. The great overshadowing danger to Palestine threatens all alike in such a way as to dwarf the lesser points of internal difference.

A second point that should be stressed is that the Arabs have large adjacent territories which belong to them exclusively. The Jews have no other land to which to go. In the case of the Jews in the Nazi-dominated lands of Europe, it is not a question of their preference for this or that point of refuge. Quite simply and literally, the question remains the life-and-death query as to whether the one place to which they can go will receive them.

So far as the irreconcilably pro-Axis Arabs go, their choice was made long ago and that choice cannot now be affected by any form of appeasement or bribery. It would seem hardly necessary for the British Empire to take their views into consideration.

ABSORPTIVE CAPACITY

One further objection which has been offered concerns the absorptive potential of Palestine itself. It has often been pointed out that the density of population there is considerably less than that of many of the well-populated European countries. Eventually, as southern Asia awakens industrially, the importance of the lands near the Suez Canal will no doubt be immensely enhanced. And the capacity of those lands to support populations will depend not on agriculture merely, but on their industrial productiveness, their facilities as transshipment centers, on oil supply, on their suitability for airplane landing fields, and on many other circumstances now only dimly, if at all, foreshadowed.

Whatever the difficulties involved in receiving large numbers of Jewish refugees in Palestine, none of them are insuperable. And it is the one place now immediately available. The fact may be recognized and acted upon in such a way as to minimize the immediate political stresses incidental thereunto.

The status of refugees may be made a provisional one, so that the bitterly contested question of population preponderance and of political supremacy as between Jews and Arabs need not be exacerbated. It would be the part of wisdom for Jewish leaders, intent on saving the threatened millions of Jews in Europe, to meet this problem in the spirit of statesmanship. For at best only a fraction of Europe's Jews can be moved to safety in this moment of crisis.

AFTER THE WAR

As for the problem at longer range, it offers a supreme challenge to human statesmanship and wisdom. For to those who with anxious eyes scan the growing demoralization and wreckage of Europe, it is clear that there will be little immediate opportunity for repatriating large numbers of people when hostilities end. At best there will be hunger, unemployment, lawlessness, and pestilence throughout immense areas. The problems of giving relief with food, clothing, and medical supplies will be urgent. This quite apart from the political disorders which may be expected with the break-down of such de facto organization as the Nazis have maintained by force and terror.

Far from offering the possibility of repatriation, it seems to me probable that large parts of Europe will, for a considerable period of time, remain uninhabitable by Jewish populations. One cannot blame people for shrinking from the prospect of living as a 1 or less than 1 percent minority among a 99 percent majority which has been trained for generations to abhor, insult, and rob them. We have the warning lesson of the guaranties to minorities written into the treaties after the first World War. In the case of Poland, for example, those guaranties did not prevent a steady deterioration in the status of the Jewish minority in that unhappy land. Since then the Nazi poison has been sown widely. And the economic causes predisposing to group rivalry and hostility will have become immeasurably worse as a result of the war. Despite pronouncements in favor of equality of treatment, therefore, by the governments in exile, internal conditions on the European continent may well be such that questions of abstract right will be submerged for a time in the desperate struggle for food, clothing, and shelter.

THE GREAT PROBLEM

Immediate resolution of this problem of trying to save at least some of the human lives threatened with extinction, need not prejudice exploration of wider and longer-range possibilities. There are always the north African littoral, northwestern Australia, South America, Alaska, the West Indies, and whatever other territories may be found in which numbers of immigrants might be fitted into existing agricultural or industrial societies. Given the numbers of those in Europe who cry in desperation for some means of escape, no possibility, however slight, ought to be rejected summarily. After all, the problem of the Jews whom the Nazis would destroy is part of the still greater problem of the perhaps 20,000,000 men, women, and children, uprooted and shunted about in the greatest series of tragic forced migrations in human history. From one end of Europe to the other, from Norway to Bessarabia, from Holland and Belgium to the Ukraine, multitudes of human beings have been brutally thrust from their homes, transported to concentration camps and places of forced labor, being moved hundreds and even thousands of miles.

No niggling approach to their problems will suffice. These are beyond the vision of old-time diplomacy with its dilatory commissions, white papers, endless discussions, and committees, and unwillingness to face the peremptory need for bold planning and prompt action. If we are to meet the global promise of joint action to assure decency in living conditions for the peoples of the world, then it is high time a beginning be made. It is evident that all nations must yield something of their prerogatives and sovereignty if the general peace is to be affirmed and maintained. The plight of the Jewish victims of Nazi hatred and brutality offers an outstanding challenge to immediate and joint action. The Jews of Europe were the first and most grievous sufferers from the savage campaign to subject the world to a reign of unbridled force and terror. Theirs is the first claim upon the decency of the civilized world. In this situation the immediate availability of Palestine is plain. The claims of Jewish refugees to haven there ought to transcend all narrowly political considerations. For these Jewish victims of Nazi barbarism are a first test of mankind's will to save and reestablish decency on earth.

Resolutions of the Legislature of the State of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions of the Legislature of the State of New York:

Whereas the demonstration of loyalty to the Government of the United States by the residents of the United States of Italian origin has been noteworthy; and

Whereas this exemplary conduct of those numbers of our population of Italian origin, on the part of those who had not become citizens as well as those who had perfected United States citizenship, has been deemed worthy of praise by the Attorney General of the United States; and

Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the legislature that notwithstanding the recent expressions of the Attorney General of the United States, considerable obstacles and delay appear to prevent these worthy residents of our country from finally perfecting their United States citizenship during the existence of a state of war between the United States and Italy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully memorialized to take appropriate action to eliminate any delay in the final attainment of citizenship on the part of applicants of Italian origin who have demonstrated themselves to be loyal and worthy, notwithstanding the existence of a state of war between the United States and Italy; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the Unites States, the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of Labor of the United States, and to each Member of the United States Senate and each Member of the House of Representatives elected from the State of New York.

Senate Resolution 33

Whereas the pharmacy corps bill, S. 216, H. R. 997, is now pending in Congress, providing for the creation of a pharmacy corps in the United States Army, to be organized under graduate pharmacists skilled and learned in the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines; and

Whereas, in the treatment of disease and the care of the sick or injured, the services of skilled, reliable and experienced graduate pharmacists are essential and such services are second only to the services of skilled physicians and surgeons; and

Whereas it is the well-established public policy of the United States and of every State thereof to require all persons engaged in the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines to be graduate pharmacists; and

Whereas such public policy is vital and necessary to the safety, health, and life of its people; and

Whereas the health, safety, and preservation of life of every member of the armed forces of the United States is of primary and paramount importance for the safety of the Nation; and

Whereas members of the armed forces of the United States and especially those of them who are overseas at various fighting fronts, are entitled to receive, and it is the policy and desire of the people of the United States to furnish to them, the best treatment and most proficient services within the power and capacity of the people and especially to furnish proficient and skillful graduate pharmacists to safeguard the health and lives of its fighting men; and

Whereas the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines is essentially a professional service requiring great skill, intimate knowledge, and experience with drugs and medicines: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of New York (*jointly*), That the legislature of this State unanimously endorse the pharmacy corps bill, S. 216, H. R. 997, and request the Members of Congress to enact the same into law; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Surgeon General of the United States Army, and to the New York State Members of Congress.

Senate Resolution 11

Whereas passage of persons and movement of commodities across the border between this country and Canada are hampered and affected by many governmental restrictions and regulations; and

Whereas during this time of perilous conflict in which both nations are allied and mutually engaged for the preservation of freedom and the defeat of dangerous enemy nations, it becomes particularly urgent that all unnecessary barriers which tend to injuriously affect the common war effort shall be eliminated; and

Whereas continental solidarity and friendly exchange are not only desirable but extremely essential to successful prosecution of the war, and irritating and distressing border conditions are not only undesirable but harmfully inimical to those essentials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby respectfully request the Congress of the United States to speedily bring about and put into effect any necessary changes in our laws and regulations affecting the border between this country and Canada to the end that unnecessary restrictions may be removed and that travel of persons and movement of products may be facilitated for the purpose of promoting a harmonious, an efficient, and a victorious prosecution of the existing war; and be it further

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress of the United States from the State of New York.

Miners' Wage Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the United Automobile Worker of April 1, 1943:

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

(By R. J. Thomas, president, United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations)

The crisis that confronts the Nation as a result of the deadlock (at this writing) in the miners' wage dispute is the fruit of several seeds.

Primarily it is the result of the War Labor Board's attempt to keep wage rates static while living costs, particularly the cost of food, have risen. Tied up with this is the fact that the basis for wage stabilization promised by Byrnes has not been forthcoming. The so-called Little Steel formula was based on the promise that living costs would be controlled; that is not the fact.

We cannot, however, ignore another factor. I refer to John L. Lewis. It is unfortunate for the miners' case that Lewis has chosen to use the miners' demands for a wage increase as a political instrument against President

Roosevelt; it is unfortunate that Lewis, at a time when his miners should have all his attention, cannot keep from meddling in the affairs of other unions in an effort to undermine those organizations and their leaders who will not accept dictation from John L.

A NEW POLICY IS NEEDED

Both the United Automobile Workers and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and of late the American Federation of Labor, have made it clear that they do not approve of the current position taken by management and most of public members of the War Labor Board. Together with President Philip Murray I, only last Saturday, conveyed to President Roosevelt our dissatisfaction with the Board's rulings against wage increases beyond 15 percent since January 1941, despite the fact that living costs have gone up at least 21 percent.

The last meeting of the United Automobile Workers-Congress of Industrial Organizations international executive board reiterated our previously announced position that we consider arbitrary application of the Little Steel formula unjust and destructive of labor morale in the war industries.

The War Labor Board would do well to heed the objections of labor The plain fact is that the farm bloc is getting away with economic murder that consumers are taking it on the nose, and that labor is being told to bear the full burden of increased living costs. In face of these facts we need immediate revision of the War Labor Board's policies. The miners and all other workers whose wages have not kept pace with living costs are entitled to a raise.

LEWIS' MEDDLING

The miners' case would be much further advanced if it were not for Lewis' tactics. Perhaps because he is still an isolationist, with no enthusiasm for the war in which our country is involved, Lewis has taken a defiant position which is untenable in wartime. The American people, of whom the workers are the majority, do not like the statement of James Mark, one of Lewis' district presidents, that the miners must get their full demands "regardless of the consequences."

That is not merely the rash statement of a subordinate officer of the miners' union. In that type of union no subordinate opens his mouth publicly unless he has the high-sign from Lewis to go ahead, or unless he knows with certainty what Lewis wants him to say. "Regardless of the consequences" is a tough pill for any American to swallow; if Lewis was thinking more of his miners and less of throwing hand grenades at the President and the war effort, he would not have permitted Mark to make that statement.

If Lewis were not out to make political capital in the labor movement from the miners' needs he would not at this time be attempting to stir up dissension in other unions.

His particular target of late has been the United Automobile Workers-Congress of Industrial Organizations. It was Lewis who instigated the lie that the United Automobile Workers executive board by one vote defeated a motion to disaffiliate from the Congress of Industrial Organizations. It was Lewis who started reports that our international officers have squads of "spies" working against each other in Washington. Both these statements are wholly and completely lies.

WHERE WE STAND

The position of the United Automobile Workers-Congress of Industrial Organizations is clear:

We are opposed to the Little Steel formula; we are in favor of wage adjustments in keeping with living costs; and we demand that price-control promises be kept. We are determined to strive for these objectives while at the same time furthering the war effort in every possible way.

Proposed Ship Canal Across New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. EATON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD today a letter from Governor Edison, of New Jersey, addressed to Mr. MANSFIELD, chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, in opposition to the proposed ship canal across New Jersey.

Also a resolution of the board of freeholders of my home county of Somerset in opposition to this project.

These two communications represent the practically unanimous opposition of all the governing bodies, State and county, and the entire citizenship of New Jersey against this unnecessary and chimerical project which would, if constructed, rob the State of its vitally needed potable water supply and work incalculable economic damage to the whole State.

The matter referred to follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
April 6, 1943.

Hon. CHARLES A. EATON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE EATON: There is enclosed herewith a copy of a letter which I have addressed to Representative JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, in opposition to House bill H. R. 2208, and its companion Senate bill, S. 7782 authorizing the construction and operation of the New York Bay-Delaware River section of the Intracoastal Waterway.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES EDISON,
Governor.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
April 1, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, *Chairman,*
Committee on Rivers and Harbors,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This communication is addressed to you in opposition to H. R. 2208, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session (and its companion Senate bill) authorizing the construction and operation of the New York Bay-Delaware River section of the Intracoastal Waterway. I understand that the House bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors on March 23, 1942, and committed to the Commitee of the Whole House.

About a month ago the senior Senator from New Jersey, the Honorable W. WARREN BARBOUR, wrote to me concerning this proposed project. I advised Senator BARBOUR that the Governor's war emergency cabinet had discussed the proposal and that it had been determined unanimously that if this project were deemed by the appropriate Federal agencies to be an urgent war necessity, and that if the project could be completed within a reasonable time (say 9 months or a year) it should be constructed and paid for entirely with Federal funds so that the State of New Jersey would assume no obligation either for the acquisition of rights-of-way, the construction of bridges, overpasses, and approach highways, nor for the maintenance and upkeep of any such structures. I also advised Senator BARBOUR that if it had been determined this project could not be completed for 2 or 3 years, then it should be postponed and carefully considered as a post-war project.

Since writing to Senator BARBOUR, I have had investigated further the project contemplated by these bills.

I find that the following State agencies are definitely opposed to the construction of this project at this time:

1. The New Jersey State Water Policy Commission.

2. The North Jersey District Water Supply Commission.

3. The New Jersey State Board of Commerce and Navigation.

Although the report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 14, 1942, concerning this proposed project, is not available, it is understood from testimony adduced before your committee that the project proposes a ship canal across the State of New Jersey from the vicinity of Bordentown to the vicinity of Sayreville, and is to have a bottom width of 250 feet and a depth of 27 feet, and that it is to be equipped with locks at its terminals. It is estimated that more than 600,000,000 gallons of fresh water daily would be required for the operation of this canal. This water could only be obtained from the Raritan and Delaware Rivers. To obtain the water from the Raritan River would involve the construction of a tremendous storage reservoir in northern New Jersey in the Raritan River watershed and to dam the Raritan River somewhere above the northeasterly terminal of the canal in the vicinity of Sayreville. The utilization of the water from the Raritan River would consume the entire future potential potable water supply from the Raritan River watershed, the only one entirely within the State of New Jersey, which is available to the people of the State. The construction of the dam across the Raritan River in the vicinity of Sayreville would naturally close the Raritan River to navigation from the point of the dam site to New Brunswick, N. J. As you know, perhaps the largest concentration of war industries in the United States is located in northern New Jersey. The tremendous expansion of these industries, together with the influx of thousands of additional war workers into this area, caused a tremendous increase in water consumption, which, in turn, created a most serious water shortage for a considerable time; the problem of an adequate water supply for this area has not yet been solved.

The Senate and the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey have adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 9, memorializing the Congress against the construction of this proposed ship canal. A copy of this resolution is enclosed herewith for your information

I am informed by representatives of several agencies of the State of New Jersey, who attended the hearings before your committee, that testimony indicated that this project could not be completed in less than 4 years and would require a minimum of some 5,000 men for its construction. With a serious manpower shortage already existent in New Jersey, such a number of men is not available It is estimated also that some 15 bridges would have to be constructed across this canal, which most certainly would involve a tremendous amount of critical and essential materials. In view of the years required for construction and the impossibility of obtaining the necessary materials, I cannot see by what stretch of the imagination this project could be considered as one of urgent war necessity.

The New Jersey Water Policy Commission has filed a brief with your committee in opposition to this project. The representatives of the North Jersey District Water Supply

Commission appeared before your committee in opposition to this project. The New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce is also opposed to the project and filed a memorandum with your committee in opposition.

In view of all of the above, I believe I am correct in saying to you that the State of New Jersey is definitely and completely in opposition to the enactment of this legislation at this time.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES EDISON,
Governor.

Resolution in opposition to the New Jersey ship canal

Whereas there is pending in the House of Representatives of the United States, legislation authorizing the construction of a ship canal 27 feet deep and 250 feet wide, across New Jersey, from Bordentown, on the Delaware River, to Sayreville, on the Raritan, at an estimated cost of $199,000,000, but which may ultimately reach $500,000,000; and

Whereas it is self-evident that the construction of the canal would seriously affect the water supply of New Jersey, its industries, transportation facilities, its dairy and agricultural production, would take thousands of fertile acres, and would cause serious damage to the property of the great number of adjoining owners; and

Whereas under the construction, as planned, Somerset County would suffer special damages through the proposed creation of an enormous storage base at the confluence of the north and south branches of the Raritan River covering a large and valuable portions of our county; and

Whereas this project has many times heretofore been carefully examined and disapproved, and nothing new is now being urged in support thereof, save and except the benefits which might or could come to the war effort upon the completion of the proposed canal; and

Whereas due to the size of the undertaking and the time necessary for its completion, this board is of the opinion that whatever military benefit this canal would have when constructed, would not be realized in the present war, and the tragic contribution of the State of New Jersey and its people would be in vain; and

Whereas this board believes that the military benefits sought could be realized from a project or projects, facility or facilities lesser in scope and which could be completed within a few months, at a cost negligible in comparison with the present proposal. For example, the existing State-owned Delaware and Raritan Canal can be rehabilitated and converted into a barge canal equal in depth to the New York State barge canal, at a cost of only one-tenth of the proposed ship canal and requiring no new construction except a bypass at Trenton: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Somerset for the reasons set forth in the preamble hereof be and it is hereby recorded as opposed to the passage of legislation providing for the building of the said ship canal from Bordentown to Sayreville; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of the Congress of the United States.

I, Chester Van Tine, clerk of the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Somerset, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the said board at its regular meeting held on Friday, April 2, 1943.

CHESTER VAN TINE,
Clerk.

An Unjustified Criticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pilot, Boston, Mass., of April 3, 1943:

AN UNJUSTIFIED CRITICISM

A recent article by the columnist, Drew Pearson, is certainly not calculated to promote mutual trust and good feeling. In substance Pearson says that a Catholic organization in this country has largely taken over the censorship of American magazines. These people were not elected to office. No one appointed them. Yet, unelected and unappointed, they exercise a vast power. Pearson dislikes the situation.

He begins his article: "Efficient Postmaster General Frank Walker has got himself into a situation whereby certain persons of the church to which he belongs have become unofficial censors of American magazines * * * the situation has gone so far that scores of American magazines, before going to press, send their material to the representatives of Bishop John F. Noll, of the Catholic National Organization for Decent Literature, where it is examined."

Pearson manages to suggest that about all this there is a sinister flavor. He doesn't mention the bogey word, "fascism." But he does try to convey that we have here a dangerous, un-American situation.

Closely examined, studied without prejudice, the matter appears so lucid, legitimate, and ordinary that one wonders why the columnist became excited Apparently this Catholic organization has made a point of reporting salacious magazines to the post-office inspectors. There is nothing wrong, nothing un-American in this act.

But this is an organization, not merely an individual. It is vigilant, not dormant. And apparently we now have a Postmaster General who really means to keep dirty literature out of the United States mails in fulfillment, as Pearson should know, of the law.

The Catholic National Organization for Decent Literature has scored some tangible hits. It has been so effective that "border line" magazines find it wise to consult with the National Organization for Decent Literature office before going to press. Obviously this is the politic thing to do. If they satisfy the National Organization for Decent Literature that their publication meets reasonable standards of decency, they go to press with minds at ease. They know no protest will be registered, no risk incurred of losing their prized second-class mailing privilege.

Now Pearson should be aware that there is nothing even faintly un-American or extra-legal about this whole proceeding. There is no coercion practiced. No publication has the slightest obligation to report to the Catholic National Organization for Decent Literature. And if publishers do consult this committee, they are perfectly free to flout its suggestions. This is a voluntary, advisory, noncoercing organization. It works in the clear, unafraid light of open day. In method, it is completely within both the letter and the spirit of the law.

And we suggest that the widely read Pearson should have had all these facts in his possession before he wrote darkly: "Postmaster General Frank Walker has got himself into a situation whereby certain persons of the church to which he belongs have become unofficial censors of American magazines."

Pay As You Go? Or a Nation of Debt Slaves?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Herald-News, Passaic, N. J., of Friday, April 2, 1943:

PAY AS YOU GO? OR A NATION OF DEBT SLAVES?

The war on the home front is being fought on an eat-what's-left and go-where-you're-sent basis, which is as it should be, but just mention a pay-as-you-go plan and every down-south demagog in Congress and every New Deal "yes man" in Washington yells bloody murder and goes into a fit.

Most of the people who can add, subtract, and divide seem to be able to understand Beardsley Ruml's pay-as-you-go plan and they're for it.

Congressmen CANFIELD, TOWE, THOMAS of New Jersey, and HARTLEY, who represent in Washington the South Bergen, North Essex, and Passaic County people who read this newspaper, voted for it Tuesday, when the Carlson bill came within 18 votes of passing in the House of Representatives.

Most of the people seem to be for the Ruml plan and our own Congressmen have voted for it, but who's against it, and why?

Except for the utterly fallacious assertion that it favors the very rich, you don't hear a sensible argument against it.

Treasury Secretary Morgenthau dismisses it as a petulant school teacher might order a child to go back to her seat in class

The White House backs up its Secretary.

Party wheelhorses who look to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue for their cues are against it, as you might suppose.

But why? Maybe because the Treasury didn't think of it first.

It's the most amazing thing that has happened in Washington since the war began, this unwillingness to admit that 2 and 2 make 4.

Who is this Beardsley Ruml and what is his pay-as-you-go plan?

He is chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, but that isn't his principle business. He is treasurer of R. H. Macy & Co. The Straus brothers, who operate Macy's and Bamberger's, are pretty smart boys, and they aren't hiring any crackpot theorists to run their business.

Beardsley Ruml has a horror of debt. He believes that the American people will tighten their belts, willingly, to pay for this war. But he also knows that the kind of tax legislation which the Treasury and the House Ways and Means Committee are proposing will make millions of Americans slaves of debt, in hock, in desperation, and in trouble. You can't keep your eye on the ball when you're worrying about paying tax bills with money you've spent already and wondering how you'll get the money to pay your next bill.

The Ruml plan boils down to this:

The Government can always demand of us whatever it costs the Government to run the war.

You can escape other debts by going through bankruptcy but you can never escape the debt you owe your Government. It stands.

In wartime, since nobody can predict how hard it's going to be next year, why not levy the income tax on this year's incomes, while people can still pay out of earnings?

All of us who are buying War bonds on the pay-roll allotment plan know how easy it is to pay as you go. There's less money in the pay check but everyone gets along. And regularly as pay day come the bonds.

But what about those who are making big profits out of the war, somebody asks? That's a fair question.

The Ruml plan, as modified and embodied in the Carlson bill, which came so close to passing, would raise $3,000,000,000 more revenue in 1943 than the tax law under which we are operating.

Nobody who makes $20,000 or more a year would pay less tax, and most persons in those brackets would pay more.

Truth is that the man whose gross income was very large last year may be grossing more this year—not from salary but from profits on his invested capital.

At the same time his net income will be less due to surtaxes.

The more you make, the more you must give back.

Congress fixes the rates on which all of us pay.

The Ruml plan is the poor man's way—the pay-as-you-go way. Some of the wealthy have reserves upon which they can draw to pay taxes, but what about the war worker, who has been earning and spending more than ever before; and what about the man who has chucked a good income job to go into service?

The Ruml plan will get the whole country out of income-tax debt and in effect Uncle Sam will say to all of us:

"You'll have to do without a lot of things you've gotten accustomed to because we're in a fight to the finish. From now on you'll have to give up part of what you make when you earn it. But you won't have to worry about it afterward."

The Ruml plan was voted down Tuesday, but it is not dead. You can't stop tomorrow's sunrise. You can't hold back the tides that run up the Passaic River from Newark Bay. You can't stifle a logical argument by refusing to listen to it.

The City of Chicago Urges Members of the House to Sign Discharge Petitions No. 3 and No. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave extended me by the House, I am inserting into the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, Ill., respectfully urging Members of the House to sign House Discharge Petitions No. 3 and No. 5 in order to secure early passage of anti-poll-tax and antilynching legislation:

Whereas there are now pending in the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives H. R. 7, a bill to outlaw the poll tax, and H. R. 51, a bill to curb lynching; and

Whereas it is necessary to obtain 218 signatures on each bill in order to have them discharged from the Judiciary Committee and brought to the floor for a vote; and

Whereas such action is the only way to safeguard these bills from defeat by the filibuster as they have been in the past; and

Whereas the failure of this Congress to pass antipoll tax and antilynch bills to protect the freedom and welfare of all American citizens, without regard to race or color, is a repudiation of our professed belief in democracy and a disappointment to our colored allies; and

Whereas we are now engaged in a fight to save democracy throughout the world; and

Whereas the menace of lynching and the poll tax are glaring evidences of a discrepancy in our democracy at home; and

Whereas the trend of world events has shown us that the denial of freedom and equality to one group jeopardizes the welfare of all groups and sets a dangerous precedent for the establishment of fascism and oppression: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of the City of Chicago go on record as endorsing the passage of the antipoll tax bill (H. R. 7) and the antilynch bill (H. R. 51) by the Seventy-eighth Congress, and that this body urge the Members of the Congress of the United States to sign the aforementioned petitions and have said bills brought to the floor for a vote; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and the sponsors of the two bills.

A Withholding Tax Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the membership of the House to an editorial in the New York Times of April 8, 1943, entitled "A Withholding Tax Now." This criticism of the failure to enact a pay-as-you-earn tax-collection system comes from a publication which is ordinarily friendly to the present administration. I hope that the New Deal members of the Ways and Means Committee have not become so saturated with the bureaucratic philosophy of the New Deal that they will ignore their real responsibility, which, after all, is to their constituents, and not to the Executive or to his departmental spokesmen. The situation so clearly presented in the editorial, which I am inserting under leave to extend, could not have occurred had the fundamental principles of true representation been followed. It was one of the most distinguished members of the Federal Constitutional Convention who pointed out that—

To the legitimate energy and weight of true representation, two things are essentially necessary:

1. That the representative should express the same sentiments which the represented, if possessed of equal information, would express.

2. That the sentiments of the representative, thus expressed, should have the same weight and influence as the sentiments of the constituents would have if expressed personally.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to meet the financial burden of this war, there should be no delay on the part of the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee in reporting back to the House a current pay-as-you-earn tax bill in accordance with the overwhelming sentiment of those who will have to bear the burden of Federal, State, and local taxes aggregating in 1944 about sixty thousand million dollars, if the $16,000,000,000 request of the President is enacted, or approximately one-half the national income. The 44,000,000 taxpayers who have to shoulder this load must not be crushed because of inept leadership or because of stubborn resistance to the public demand for a modern system of tax collection.

The editorial referred to follows:

A WITHHOLDING TAX NOW

It is imperative that a drastic withholding tax should be put into effect without a day's unnecessary delay. Such a tax would be the Treasury's greatest single source of revenue. It is an absolutely essential measure if we hope to combat inflation. It is the only form of income tax that will siphon off excessive purchasing power from the great mass of those who have it. It will take this purchasing power before it has had an opportunity to exert inflationary pressure, and divert it to the war effort. There could not possibly be a more vital measure before Congress and the administration at this time.

Yet we have a spectacle of shocking governmental irresponsibility in this matter on the part of almost everyone concerned—on the part of the Treasury, of the Ways and Means Committee, of Chairman DOUGHTON, of the House Democratic majority, of the Republican minority, and of the President. The subject is being treated as if it were of minor importance. At his press conference on Tuesday the President indicated that he agrees with the decision of Mr. DOUGHTON to sidetrack action on pay-as-you-go tax legislation at this time. Though the President has declared himself in favor of a pay-as-you-earn plan, he has also expressed his pleasure at the defeat of the Ruml plan. Asked whether he favored early application of a withholding tax, the President replied, according to our news dispatch, that he regarded that "as the same question, that both issues were all wrapped up in the same handkerchief."

On February 2 Randolph E. Paul, general counsel for the Treasury, appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and professed to speak for the Treasury. He recommended a partial pay-as-you-go plan and a withholding tax. Yet when Mr. DOUGHTON'S committee majority refused to accept even the pay-as-you-go plan outlined by the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau declared that "the administration is behind the committee bill 100 percent." Mr. Morgenthau later expressed delight that "We have had two battles and two 'R-o-u-m-m-e-l-s' and we've got them both on the run." He talked as if the defeat at the same time of the Treasury's own proposal for a withholding tax were of minor importance compared with this glorious domestic victory.

The Treasury seems willing to cut off its own nose to spite Mr. Ruml's face. It has got itself in the incredible position of treating lightly the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes, compared with the satisfaction of having defeated a proposal that someone else thought of first.

How is the withholding tax to be saved? How are we to get it before the Senate without a further enormously expensive loss of time? Every day's delay in acting means the loss of millions of dollars to the Treasury. Every day's delay increases the dangers of inflation. Where is responsibility to come from in this matter?

Address by William Green, President of American Federation of Labor

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD, the speech of William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor, protesting execution by the Soviet Government of the Polish labor leaders, Alter and Ehrlich:

The principles of justice are deeply rooted in the hearts of the American people. We believe in according justice under our laws to friend and foe alike, both in war and in peace. The founders of our country fully understood that free government would crumble and disintegrate unless it was built upon a foundation of equal treatment for all under law. They exercised great care in providing explicit safeguards for the fair administration of the law. Our Constitution was amended so as to guarantee that no person shall be deprived of life, limb, or property without due process of law. Our forefathers did this because experience had taught them that there can be no freedom without justice and no justice without freedom. The two were then, are now, and always will be inseparable.

America is now engaged in a desperate war for the survival and preservation of freedom and justice throughout the world. In this war, our country is associated with others in the family of the United Nations. Among our allies, fighting gallantly on our side and in our cause, is Soviet Russia.

The circumstances through which Soviet Russia became involved in this war against nazi-ism and fascism are not material to this discussion. The big thing for us to remember is that the Russian armies and the Russian people have thus far borne the main brunt of the Nazi attack, that they have successfully resisted Hitler's mighty war machine and that they have on their own account dealt such damaging blows to our enemies as to make the prospects for complete annihilation of Hitlerism brighter.

Therefore we do not hesitate to acknowledge our everlasting debt to the Russian armies and the Russian people. Nor do we hesitate to urge that our own Government extend the fullest aid possible to Russia's gallant defenders, both through the shipment of war material and through armed invasion of Europe, the moment such a military offensive is feasible. Our admiration for the courage of the Russian people is matched only by our determination to join with them to the fullest extent of our powers in the fight to crush our common enemy.

Because of our dependence upon Russia's aid in this war and because of our natural reluctance to arouse division and friction among the United Nations, there is a disposition in some quarters to accept all the acts of the Soviet Government as sacred and beyond the sphere of debate. We in the American labor movement recognize no such compulsion. We, who reserve the right to criticize the leaders of our own Government when our views differ, will not relinquish that right with respect to the leaders of other governments. We do not believe it is wise or healthy to suppress freedom of thought or freedom of expression even in the midst of a war. These fundamental rights must be preserved at any cost. When we are confronted with an act which we consider unjust, we cannot stop our ears, blind our eyes, or silence our protests. In America, now and forevermore, we can and we will speak out against injustice anywhere.

In this spirit we meet here tonight to consider the case of two men who were executed by the Soviet Government last December. Their names were Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter. The news of their death has just reached us and we are immeasurably shocked by it. Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter were our friends. We knew and loved them and respected them, as did many thousands of our fellow trade-unionists in this country, in Great Britain, and in every other nation where freedom is revered.

Ehrlich and Alter were not young men. Each of them had spent a lifetime in fighting for freedom and progress for the masses of humanity. They were men of high principle, not scheming politicians. Their principles were forged in the fires of suffering and sacrifice for ideals which meant more to them than life itself. No force or persuasion, no motives of expediency or personal advantage could prevail upon them to depart from or compromise with their principles and ideals.

Before war broke out in Europe Ehrlich and Alter were prominent in the labor movement of Poland. They were vigorously and consistently anti-Nazi. They warned the Polish Government of the Hitler menace and opposed any deal with him. Instead they advocated a united front with Soviet Russia to resist any threats from Germany.

Then Hitler struck at Poland with the full force of the blitzkrieg. Ehrlich and Alter appealed to the workers of Poland to give their lives in defense of their country. They joined in the fight for the protection of their homes and their homeland. When it became apparent that Polish resistance was about to collapse, they organized the workers of that country into an underground movement to continue the struggle against Hitler. Step by step they were forced back by the advancing Nazis and then Ehrlich and Alter were trapped from behind and captured by the Russians, at that time allied with Germany.

For long months thereafter we could learn nothing of the fate of these two Polish labor leaders except that they were being held in a Russian jail. Then, suddenly, the entire picture in Europe changed with the invasion of Russia by Hitler. Immediately, the Polish Government-in-exile took up the cause of Ehrlich and Alter and they were released by the Russian Government.

Happy at the opportunity to renew their fight against Hitlerism, Ehrlich and Alter set to work organizing the Poles in Russia into battalions to serve beside the Soviet troops. But before very long they were again arrested on orders of the Russian Government and again imprisoned.

When news of this mystifying occurrence reached me, I immediately took steps to correct what I considered an injustice. Through various channels I sought first to find out why Ehrlich and Alter had been rearrested and what the charges against them were. Here I was confronted with an unsurmountable obstacle for although the Russian Government in the past has evidenced a lively interest in the internal affairs of other nations, it does not recognize the right of another government to intercede or seek information concerning aliens held in Russia. Since Ehrlich and Alter were not American citizens, the authorities in Russia firmly declined to give us any information about them.

Further alarmed by this development, I joined with the friends of Ehrlich and Alter in this country and in Great Britain in appealing to the Russian Government for the release of the two Polish labor leaders so that they might be brought to America. These efforts continued for some time with no definite results until we received formal notification from representatives of the Russian Government only a few weeks ago that Ehrlich and Alter had been executed by that Government.

This notification gave us, for the first time, even the faintest inkling of the official charges against Ehrlich and Alter. It declared that they had been found guilty of hostile activities against the Soviet Government, including appeals to the Soviet troops to stop bloodshed and to conclude peace with Germany.

These were the charges. What facts and what evidence were produced in support of these charges we do not know. We do know this—that the lives and records and characters of Ehrlich and Alter thoroughly belie these charges.

Ehrlich and Alter were Jews. Is it possible for us to believe that they could sink so low as to traffic with the greatest enemy of the Jews in history, the vicious dictator who wantonly murdered hundreds of thousands of their fellow Jews in Poland?

Ehrlich and Alter were sincere trade-unionists. Is it possible for us to believe that they conspired with the world's arch-enemy of organized labor, the tyrant who subjected millions of free European workers to slavery and degradation?

Ehrlich and Alter devoted their entire lives to the cause of freedom and progress, sacrificing personal advancement and willingly undergoing constant hardships. Is it possible for us to believe that they could ever betray that noble cause to Hitler, the most hateful reactionary of all time?

We ask these questions as free American citizens who insist upon knowing the truth. Why were Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter executed? Upon what evidence were they convicted? As their friends, we have a right to know the truth. For in our hearts and minds we are convinced that if the two men executed by the Soviet Government were guilty of the crimes charged against them they were not the Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter whom we knew and trusted and cherished.

In the absence of direct and irrefutable evidence, we can no more believe in the truth of the charges against Ehrlich and Alter than we can believe the insults and the tirades that will be heaped upon each of us gathered in this hall by Communist publications in this country. One of these publications already has dared to condemn my friend and fellow-American, David Dubinsky, as a pro-Hitlerite, because he had the courage to protest against what he considered injustice. If that constitutes a crime in the eyes of the Soviet leaders, then perhaps Erhlich and Alter were also guilty; then, assuredly, all of us in this hall are guilty.

Let us calmly and dispassionately face the stern facts. Ehrlich and Alter are dead. They cannot be recalled to testify in their own behalf. We, who mourn their loss, are emotionally aroused by the fact that they were condemned to a death of shame, that their memory has been stained by accusations to which we cannot give credence. Yet we must not permit our emotions to cloud our judgment and lead us into actions that will interfere with what is and must be our supreme objective—victory in this war. Victory must take precedence now above all other considerations.

Therefore, let us discipline our grief and check our emotions. Circumstances beyond our control compel us to refrain at this time from sitting in judgment on the motives of the accusers and executioners of Ehrlich and Alter. But we will not and must not forget them nor the duty which we owe them. We must be patient. We must wait. But when the time comes, when Victory is won, we will move Heaven and earth to expose the hidden facts, to clear their names, and to give them their rightful place in history as heroic martyrs in the cause of progress.

A Land of Superlatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks, I include the following editorial from the Oakwood (Ohio) Press, which I believe so well evaluates present conditions as to be worthy of reading and study by every Member of Congress and by our Government officials:

A LAND OF SUPERLATIVES

The United States is a land of superlative adjectives.

It is the richest Nation in the world.

It is the biggest industrial Nation in the world.

It has the biggest motion-picture and steel and automobile and appliance industries, and for that matter excels in just about every branch and arm of industry and wealth.

It has the biggest national debt in history.

And if we're not careful we're going to have, if not the biggest, at least the most critical famine in the history of the world.

Let us not forget that even though this is a land of miracles our farmers are not magicians. They are, rather, simple folk, tillers of the soil, breeders of livestock, tenders of the bread basket of the world.

But, again, they are not magicians. They cannot wave a magic wand and cause the crops to spring from the ground, full grown and mature. That isn't the way farming is done. To produce a crop of corn they must prepare the soil and plant the grain and nurture the delicate plants; they must protect them from pests and weather and when the season is ripe they must harvest the crop. All this requires the hard work of men and machines through long, arduous days when the sun beats on aching backs and even the machines groan under the weight of their labors.

Today the farmer faces an almost impossible task—heading off the famine that is threatening the world. He cannot hope to do the job without the men and machines such a gigantic task requires.

Somehow the Government must provide the things he needs, must safeguard his men from the Army and industry, must grant the priorities for the steel and other materials to go into his farm machinery. This is a must that ranks with the highest—the winning of the war and the preservation of freedom. In fact, all else depends upon this one thing, for industry cannot turn out the implements of war without food, armies cannot fight without food, and the peoples of conquered nations cannot gain strength to turn on their masters without food.

The fate of the world rests in the hands of the farmers of the United States.

Hon. Hiram Johnson, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the home of California's senior Senator, Hon. HIRAM W. JOHNSON, is in my congressional district in San Francisco. The Golden State has shown unbounded confidence in HIRAM JOHNSON, first electing him as Governor and later United States Senator. His career of public service, dating from 1910, is one continuous record of untiring and unequivocal devotion to the people. He has always kept the faith. Few men in our national life wield a more potent influence than does my distinguished friend and constituent. Under date of April 3, 1943, the San Francisco Examiner gave expression to the high regard California holds for our illustrious native son:

HIRAM JOHNSON ONE OF GREAT AMERICANS OF ALL TIME

Senator HIRAM JOHNSON, of California, has been and is one of the great Americans of all time.

It is to the great credit of the people of California that they have always recognized the political and patriotic qualities and virtues of Senator JOHNSON and have never been diverted from their approval and appreciation of him by any stress of national or partisan emergency.

California loves HIRAM JOHNSON, and for abundant reasons.

He has been a political figure in California since 1910, when he was elected to the first of two terms as Governor.

He was responsible for the initiative, referendum, and recall provisions in the California Constitution, for the direct primary, for the elimination of party lines in municipal and county elections, and for woman suffrage.

He was responsible, too, for workmen's compensation laws, for limitations on hours of work for women, for protective laws for investors, for railroad regulation, and for prison reforms.

So when HIRAM JOHNSON went to the United States Senate in 1916 for the first of his five consecutive terms, it might have been accounted a loss for California but for the fact that his broader services thereafter in behalf of the whole Nation earned the appreciation and gratitude of the American people and reflected credit upon the State which made him available to all his countrymen.

There is so much that is instructive and inspiring in the life and philosophy of Senator JOHNSON that any brief appraisal is inadequate.

There has never been greater love for America nor greater faith in the American democratic heritage than he has shown throughout his life.

On a certain occasion in 1925, for example, when the American Government was resuming the policy of entangling foreign alliances which involved the United States in the First World War and laid the foundations of the present war, Senator JOHNSON said:

"A few Senators in 1919 raised their voices against entangling alliances, and I can speak for only one of them. But so long as he stays here, and so long as God gives him power to voice his sentiments, the same views he expressed here 5 long years ago he shall express today, and he shall continue to express as long as he lives.

"This is my creed: Let living America live her own life in her own free way, free of all political entanglements with Europe."

When naval disarmament and a scuttled merchant marine weakened the United States after the last war he protested:

"Sea power and the rise and fall of nations are closely linked. We are all pacifists, in that we all believe in peace. But I do not believe in disarmament for the United States alone, or a disarmament program which would leave us inferior and ineffective and unable to protect the trade supremacy we have won."

In a Navy Day address in San Francisco in 1931, opposing the program for a 5-year "naval holiday" which he said would make the United States inferior to every world power, including Japan, and which he described as a plan "for the perpetuation of the naval inferiority of the United States," Senator JOHNSON declared:

"Those who would take away from this Nation her defense against war are as wicked and as cruel as any men can be within the confines of their own country."

In the same speech he referred to previous naval disarmament programs which had left Japan dominant in the Pacific, saying:

"We yielded our right to naval bases and fortifications in the Pacific. We destroyed the naval superiority we then had, and we sunk in the ocean hundreds of millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. * * * We found ourselves transmuted from a position of superiority into one of inferiority."

In terms of things accomplished, Senator JOHNSON is compelled to regard his lifelong crusade to keep his country out of war, to keep it strong, and to ward off the grave perils in the Pacific with a sense of futility—as is so often the lot of great statesmen and patriots.

But in terms of great ideals and of patriotic devotion to the country he loves and serves so well, he rests secure and respected and honored in the affections of the American people. No man has earned the name of Great American more than HIRAM JOHNSON, and no man is called by that name with better right or with higher understanding and appreciation.

Canadian Border Restrictions and Pharmacy Corps Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present to the House two resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the State of New York.

The one is Senate Resolution No. 11, by Mr. Young, adopted by the senate January 19, 1943, and concurred in by the assembly March 17, 1943, which requests Congress to remove unnecessary restrictions interfering with travel of persons and movement of products between the United States and Canada, to the end that an efficient and victorious prosecution of the war may be promoted.

The second is Senate Resolution No. 33, by Mr. Twomey, adopted in the senate March 2, 1943, and concurred in by

the assembly March 17, 1943, which unanimously endorses the pharmacy corps bill, S. 216, H. R. 997, and requests Congress to enact the same into law.

In text the resolutions read as follows:

CANADIAN BORDER RESTRICTIONS

Senate Resolution 11

STATE OF NEW YORK, IN SENATE,
Albany, January 19, 1943.

(By Mr. Young)

Whereas passage of persons and movement of commodities across the border between this country and Canada are hampered and affected by many governmental restrictions and regulations; and

Whereas during this time of perilous conflict in which both nations are allied and mutually engaged for the preservation of freedom and the defeat of dangerous enemy nations, it becomes particularly urgent that all unnecessary barriers which tend to injuriously affect the common war effort shall be eliminated; and

Whereas continental solidarity and friendly exchange are not only desirable but extremely essential to successful prosecution of the war, and irritating and distressing border conditions are not only undesirable but harmfully inimical to those essentials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby respectfully request the Congress of the United States to speedily bring about and put into effect any necessary changes in our laws and regulations affecting the border between this country and Canada to the end that unnecessary restrictions may be removed and that travel of persons and movement of products may be facilitated for the purpose of promoting a harmonious, an efficient, and a victorious prosecution of the existing war; and be it further

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress of the United States from the State of New York.

By order of the senate,
WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

In assembly March 17, 1943.
Concurred in without amendment.
By order of the assembly,
ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

PHARMACY CORPS BILL

Senate Resolution 33

STATE OF NEW YORK, IN SENATE,
Albany, March 2, 1943.

(By Mr. Twomey)

Whereas the pharmacy corps bill, S. 216, H. R. 997, is now pending in Congress, providing for the creation of a pharmacy corps in the United States Army, to be organized under graduate pharmacists skilled and learned in the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines; and

Whereas in the treatment of disease and the care of the sick or injured, the services of skilled, reliable, and experienced graduate pharmacists are essential and such services are second only to the services of skilled physicians and surgeons; and

Whereas it is the well-established public policy of the United States and of every State thereof to require all persons engaged in the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines to be graduate pharmacists; and

Whereas such public policy is vital and necessary to the safety, health, and life of its people; and

Whereas the health, safety, and preservation of life of every member of the armed forces of the United States is of primary and paramount importance for the safety of the Nation; and

Whereas members of the armed forces of the United States and especially those of them who are overseas at various fighting fronts, are entitled to receive, and it is the policy and desire of the people of the United States to furnish to them, the best treatment and most proficient services within the power and capacity of the people and especially to furnish proficient and skillful graduate pharmacists to safeguard the health and lives of its fighting men; and

Whereas the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines is essentially a professional service requiring great skill, intimate knowledge, and experience with drugs and medicines: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of New York (*jointly*), That the legislature of this State unanimously endorse the pharmacy corps bill, S. 216, H. R. 997, and request the Members of Congress to enact the same into law; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Surgeon General of the United States Army, and to the New York State Members of Congress.

By order of the Senate.
WILLIAM S. KING, *Clerk.*

In assembly, March 17, 1943.
Concurred in without amendment.
By order of the assembly.
ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI, *Clerk.*

Message to the Netherlands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1943

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that I represent a constituency containing many thousands of Holland-Americans and I am myself of Holland descent, the Office of War Information invited me to make a statement by shortwave to the conquered nations of Europe. This message, translated into the Holland language, was sent to both the Netherlands and the Netherlands East Indies on April 3. In addition, the statement was cabled to London for use in both English and foreign languages in England and beamed from England to the occupied countries. Considerable play was given the statement in the Scandinavian languages. It will be used again on April 9 as background for the Invasion of Norway Anniversary.

The statement is as follows:

The open letter from Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, to Vidkun Quisling, Hitler's puppet in Norway—which will appear in a forthcoming publication of the Norwegian Government—is a scathing denunciation of that traitor who has forfeited all claim to the proud name of Norwegian.

Mr. Biddle said, in part, and I quote, "You are ruling, Vidkun Quisling, past the hour. You are living, Vidkun Quisling, on borrowed time. You have spent, Vidkun Quisling, the last of the 30 pieces of silver."

The words of the American Attorney General apply with equal force to the condemnation of Anton Mussert, despised betrayer of the Netherlands.

Many of the people whom I represent in the United States House of Representatives are Americans of Dutch descent. They share with me—for I am also of Dutch ancestry—and, with Attorney General Biddle, the deep loathing which Judases who sell their countrymen to shameful crucifixion inspire in the hearts of freemen. My constituents of Dutch origin—and every American—join with me in the steadfast determination to give all our strength to the winning of this war. Through the efforts of Americans—combined with the efforts of the people of the other United Nations—Quisling, betrayer of Norway; Laval, betrayer of France; Wang Ching Wei, betrayer of China; Pavelitch, betrayer of Yugoslavia; and Mussert, betrayer of the Netherlands, will be forever destroyed.

Through a complete victory by the United Nations over the forces of evil, all Axis-subjugated nations shall again see the light of freedom in a world of universal security and peace.

Wage and Price Order and Statement by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the wage and price order issued yesterday by the President, and also the statement released by the President at the same time.

There being no objection, the order and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, and particularly by the First War Powers Act, 1941, and the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and in order to safeguard the stabilization of prices, wages, and salaries, affecting the cost of living on the basis of levels existing on September 15, 1942, as authorized and directed by said act of Congress of October 2, 1942, and Executive Order No. 9250 of October 3, 1942, and to prevent increases in wages, salaries, prices, and profits, which, however justifiable if viewed apart from their effect upon the economy, tend to undermine the basis of stabilization, and to provide such regulations with respect to the control of price, wage, and salary increases as are necessary to maintain stabilization, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. In the case of agricultural commodities the Price Administrator and the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution (hereinafter referred to as the Food Administrator) are directed, and in the case of other commodities the Price Administrator is directed, to take immediate steps to place ceiling prices on all commodities affecting the

cost of living. Each of them is directed to authorize no further increases in ceiling prices except to the minimum extent required by law. Each of them is further directed immediately to use all discretionary powers vested in them by law to prevent further price increases, direct or indirect, to prevent profiteering, and to reduce prices which are excessively high, unfair, or inequitable. Nothing herein, however, shall be construed to prevent the Food Administrator and the Price Administrator, subject to the general policy directives of the Economic Stabilization Director, from making such readjustments in price relationships appropriate for various commodities, or classes, qualities, or grades thereof, or for seasonal variations, or for various marketing areas, or from authorizing such support prices, subsidies, or other inducements as may be authorized by law and deemed necessary to maintain or increase production, provided that such action does not increase the cost of living. The power, functions, and duties conferred on the Secretary of Agriculture under section 3 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (Public Law 421, 77th Cong.) and under section 3 of the act of October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.) are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercised by, the Food Administrator.

2. The National War Labor Board, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and other agencies exercising authority conferred by Executive Order No. 9250 or Executive Order No. 9299 and the regulations issued pursuant thereto over wage or salary increases are directed to authorize no further increase in wages or salaries except such as are clearly necessary to correct substandards of living, provided that nothing herein shall be construed to prevent such agencies from making such wage or salary readjustments as may be deemed appropriate and may not have heretofore been made to compensate, in accordance with the Little Steel formula as heretofore defined by the National War Labor Board, for the rise in the cost of living between January 1, 1941 and May 1, 1942. Nor shall anything herein be construed to prevent such agencies, subject to the general policies and directives of the Economic Stabilization Director, from authorizing reasonable adjustments of wages and salaries in case of promotions, reclassifications, merit increases, incentive wages or the like, provided that such adjustments do not increase the level of production costs appreciably or furnish the basis either to increase prices or to resist otherwise justifiable reductions in prices.

3. The chairman of the War Manpower Commission is authorized to forbid the employment by any employer of any new employee or the acceptance of employment by a new employee except as authorized in accordance with regulations which may be issued by the chairman of the War Manpower Commission, with the approval of the Economic Stabilization Director, for the purpose of preventing such employment at a wage or salary higher than that received by such new employee in his last employment unless the change of employment would aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

4. The attention of all agencies of the Federal Government, and of all State and municipal authorities, concerned with the rates of common carriers or other public utilities, is directed to the stabilization program of which this order is a part so that rate increases will be disapproved and rate reductions effected, consistently with the act of October 2, 1942, and other applicable Federal, State, or municipal law, in order to keep down the cost of living and effectuate the purposes of the stabilization program.

5. To provide for the consistent administration of this order and Executive Order No. 9250, and other orders and regulations of similar import and for the effectuation of the purposes of the act of October 2, 1942, the Economic Stabilization Director is authorized to exercise all powers and duties conferred upon the President by that act, and the Economic Stabilization Director is authorized and directed to take such action and to issue such directives under the authority of that act as he deems necessary to stabilize the national economy, to maintain and increase production, and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war. Except insofar as they are inconsistent with this order or except insofar as the Director shall otherwise direct, powers and duties conferred upon the President by the said act and heretofore devolved upon agencies or persons other than the Director shall continue to be exercised and performed by such agencies and persons.

6. Except insofar as they are inconsistent with this order, Executive Order 9250 and the regulations issued pursuant thereto shall remain in full force and effect.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 8, 1943.*

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The Executive order I have signed today is a hold-the-line order.

To hold the line, we cannot tolerate further increases in prices affecting the cost of living or further increases in general wage or salary rates except where clearly necessary to correct substandard living conditions. The only way to hold the line is to stop trying to find justifications for not holding it here or not holding it there.

No one straw may break a camel's back, but there is always a last straw. We cannot afford to take further chances in relaxing the line. We already have taken too many.

On the price front, the directions in the order are clear and specific.

All items affecting the cost of living are to be brought under control. No further price increases are to be sanctioned unless imperatively required by law. Adjustments in the price relationships between different commodities will be permitted if such adjustments can be made without increasing the general cost of living. But any further inducements to maintain or increase production must not be allowed to disturb the present price levels; such further inducements, whether they take the form of support prices or subsidies, must not be allowed to increase prices to consumers. Of course, the extent to which subsidies and other payments may be used to help keep down the cost of living will depend on congressional authorization.

Some prices affecting the cost of living are already above the levels of September 15, 1942. All of these cannot be rolled back. But some of these can and should be rolled back. The order directs the reduction of all prices which are excessively high, inequitable, or unfair. The Stabilization Act was not intended to be used as a shield to protect prices which were excessively high on September 15, 1942.

On the wage front the directions in the order are equally clear and specific.

There are to be no further increases in wage rates or salaries' scales beyond the Little Steel formula, except where clearly necessary to correct substandards of living. Reclassifications and promotions must not be permitted to affect the general level of production costs or to justify price increases or to forestall price reductions.

The order also makes clear the authority of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to forbid the employment by an employer of any new employee except in accordance with regulations of the Chairman, the purpose being to prevent such employment at a higher wage or salary than that received by the employee in his last employment unless the change of employment will aid in the prosecution of the war.

It further calls the attention of all agencies of the Federal Government and of State and municipal authorities concerned with the rates of common carriers and public utilities to the stabilization program in the hope that rate increases will be disapproved and rate reductions ordered so far as may be consistent with Federal and State laws.

For some time it has been apparent that this action must be taken because of the continued pressure for increased wages and increased prices. I have heretofore refrained from acting because of the contention of the supporters of the Bankhead bill that under the act of October 2, 1942, I had no authority to place ceiling prices on certain commodities at existing levels. My views on that question were set forth in my message of April 2, vetoing the Bankhead bill.

The Senate did not vote upon the question of passing the bill over the veto. Its author moved to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture, stating that there were not sufficient votes to override the veto.

I am advised that weeks or months from this date the bill may be reported for consideration. I am also advised that in the history of the Congress no bill vetoed by a President and recommitted to a committee has ever become law.

I cannot wait to see whether the committee at some future date will again report the bill to the Senate. I cannot permit a continuance of the upward spiral of prices.

Some groups have been urging increased prices for farmers on the ground that wage earners have unduly profited. Other groups have been urging increased wages on the ground that farmers have unduly profited. A continuance of this conflict will not only cause inflation but will breed disunity at a time when unity is essential.

Under the act of October 2, 1942, Congress directed that so far as is practicable, wages, salaries, and prices should be stabilized as of the level of September 15. Under that direction inflation has been slowed up. Now we must stop it.

We cannot stop inflation solely by wage and price ceilings. We cannot stop it solely by rationing. To complete the job Congress must act to reduce and hold in check the excess purchasing power. We must be prepared to tax ourselves more, to spend less and save more. The details of new fiscal legislation must be worked out by the appropriate committees of the House and the Senate. The executive departments stand ready to submit suggestions whenever the committees desire.

I am exerting every power I possess to preserve our stabilization program.

I am sure the Congress will cooperate.

Harry Slattery of the Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials by William Allen White in his Emporia (Kans.) Gazette, commenting very favorably upon the record of Harry Slattery as head of the Rural Electrification Administration and upon the excellent work done by R. E. A. in the public service.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette of August 13, 1942]

ABOUT HARRY SLATTERY

Harry Slattery is the head of the Rural Electrification Administration—a fine upstanding fighter for the public interest. He came into public life 40 years ago under Gifford Pinchot in the Roosevelt administration. He is now under fire. He always has been in some bloody angle of the old battle against what T. R. called predatory wealth.

The Government's big war aluminum plant in Arkansas west of Little Rock began operating last week. It will use electric power generated at Grand River Dam in Oklahoma and delivered over a 197-mile high line built by the Arkansas-Louisiana cooperative owned by some 30,000 farmers and financed by Rural Electrification Administration; also the aluminum plant will use current from a power pool of private companies.

With that accomplished after a year of controversy enough to have fought a small war, it is to be hoped that the constant stream of charges and innuendo by certain utility interests and their friends in Congress and elsewhere against Rural Electrification Administration and its Administrator, Harry Slattery, will now cease.

The Gazette for one is fed up on this row. The Rural Electrification Administration boys should continue their good work without being classed by Members of Congress and others with Benedict Arnold, Communists, and incompetents.

This widespread propaganda against Rural Electrification Administration, the hostile House speeches of WINTER, and the report of the Faddis subcommittee which investigated them, all boil down to utility power politics which has no place in this time of national danger.

Harry Slattery, head of the Rural Electrification Administration, for example, was accused of hoarding copper needed for defense and a photograph of a cache of copper wire in Texas was sent to newspapers to prove it. It turns out that this copper was purchased by a private contractor, before priorities were established, for a Rural Electrification Administration transmission cooperative he was constructing.

Faddis reported the Arkansas-Louisiana line unnecessary, a duplication and a waste of copper. This in the face of testimony of J. A. Krug, power chief of War Production Board, that the line was needed and was an actual conservation of copper, and the fact that Krug was backed by engineers and heads of Rural Electrification Administration, of Defense Plant Corporation, and the Federal Power Commission, and Federal Works Agency, Colonel Damon of the War Department alone dissenting.

Congressman ELLIS testified that when he and others were trying to bring a defense aluminum plant to Arkansas the power companies refused to cooperate, and he turned to Rural Electrification Administration as the only hope. Later, when Defense Plant decided to build its own power plant, President Husbands asked Slattery to furnish 32,500 kilowatts of the interim power and the companies 65,000 kilowatts. The companies then tried to hog the whole business for themselves. Hence the charge that Slattery sabotaged the defense effort and held up the plant for several months by butting in where he was not needed and like claims become absurd.

The real trouble is that Harry Slattery is too good an administrator and too loyal to the people to suit the power interests and politicians. The editor of the Gazette has known Harry Slattery since the days of "T. R.," when he entered the lists as a young knight errant of conservation. Since then he has held important private and public posts. He has administered the Rural Electrification Administration Act as its author, Senator George Norris, wrote and intended it—a genuine aid to dirt farmers and rural dwellers and industries; not as a side show to private utilities.

Mr. Slattery has kept the faith, proven himself clean and courageous. The efforts to smear him and hamstring Rural Electrification Administration must not succeed.

[From the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette of March 6, 1943]

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

One of the New Deal projects which is doing a splendid job is the administration of rural electrification. Harry Slattery, the administrator, is plenty smart. When the war came he realized that "so long as war exists, the Rural Electrification Administration must devote its entire effort to the Nation's conduct of the war." That's the way he put it.

In his recent report, Mr. Slattery declares that "the electrification of rural areas has given way to line extension for essential war work." Which is fine and shows the right spirit. Further in his report, he continues: "Rural educational and informational activities have been displaced by organized programs aimed at making sure that each Rural Electrification Administration borrower and its members use every kilowatt hour of energy to take the place of manpower, to produce increasing amounts of needed dairy and poultry products, meats, and other foods that will, in the end, spell victory and help in the reconstruction of a world without war."

That's the stuff. There is a New Deal administrator who is doing a grand job. He should be singled out for the praises of his fellow Americans.

Affairs in Thailand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Former Minister to Thailand Not Surprised at Recent Developments," published in the Savannah Morning News of February 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMER MINISTER TO THAILAND NOT SURPRISED AT RECENT DEVELOPMENTS—"RESIGNATION" OF PRIME MINISTER SONGGRAM EXPECTED RESULT OF APPEASEMENT POLICY, SAYS DR. HUGH GRANT

The "resignation" of Prime Minister Songgram and his Cabinet in Thailand as announced several days ago is not surprising at all but rather the natural result of trusting nations and officials trying to play the Axis game of appeasement.

That is the conclusion of Dr. Hugh Grant, American Minister to Thailand until shortly before Pearl Harbor and who is now visiting his parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. C. Grant, at Isle of Hope.

The former Minister has been on a lecture tour throughout the United States for the past few months. Rotarians will recall his interesting and informative speech before the local club while he was spending Christmas here. He goes on to New York in a few days for an engagement there.

In commenting on the so-called resignation of Field Marshal Songgram from the leadership of the "gateway to Burma and to Malaya," Dr. Grant declared that from his knowledge of the situation it was most obvious that he was "kicked out" by the Japanese militarists who through fifth-column activities had influenced the country away from the Allies before the Japs entered the war.

"It was to be expected from the time the Thai political leaders began their collaboration with the Japanese militarists long before the outbreak of the Pacific war," he declared.

As Minister to Albania from 1935 to 1940, he had seen a somewhat similar situation develop there. Although King Zog opposed the Italian invasion, many of his high officials had collaborated with Italy. For this they were given high posts under the Italian occupation and then "kicked out" when no longer needed.

"The Japanese, following the well-known Axis technique, used certain Thai leaders as 'stool pigeons' in the furtherance of their own designs for the military conquest of the whole of southeast Asia.

"And as American Minister in Thailand, I repeatedly warned the Thai Prime Minister against the Japanese methods and treachery. In line with Secretary Cordell Hull's strong advocacy of the policy of status quo and under instructions from the State Department, I urged the Prime Minister to stop the agitation for acquiring French territory in Indochina following the collapse of France in 1940. I told him it seemed a Jap trap to involve Thailand in the Japanese program for the conquest of Indochina and urged that he follow our policy of maintaining the status quo."

But the Thais went into war against Indochina, and the Japs stepped in as "mediators," awarding a large slice of the French territory to Thailand. This, of course, resulted in much "kowtowing" to the Japanese by Thai political leaders, who never seemed to realize they were completely in the Jap trap.

"Unfortunately, certain career 'appeasers' in the State Department applied the soft pedal to our policy of status quo, and even went so far as to agree to consider the advance of a large money loan from the American Government to the Thai Government.

"I cabled a warning to the State Department against making the loan, since it appeared obvious that the Thais were collaborators with the Japanese and we would never get it back. Shortly thereafter, my 'resignation,' which I had not tendered, was accepted by the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles, during the absence of Secretary Hull."

It was only a few weeks after this that the Japs started their war, marched into Thailand without a fight, and had the Thai troops fighting for them. The Thai army was described by Dr. Grant as a highly efficient and well-trained force of 100,000 men and 500 airplanes.

"I shall always believe that if the American and British Governments had adopted a strong joint policy in connection with the maintenance of the status quo and had followed through consistently and vigorously, especially following the collapse of France in June, 1940, and at the beginning of the Jap campaigns in southeast Asia, there is a good possibility that there would have been a different story, not only in Thailand but throughout the Far East," he concluded.

"The results of the fatal appeasement policies and lack of coordination among the governments in the Far East affairs prior to Pearl Harbor continues to unfold. The 'resignation' of the Thai prime minister and his cabinet is only the latest example."

Organization and Collaboration of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] at the Town Meeting of the Air program over the National Broadcasting Company's system at Chapel Hill, N. C., on April 8, 1943.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The peace-loving people of the world, here and in China and England and Australia and Russia, yes, even in Germany and Italy and Japan, watched with growing horror during the thirties as inexorably, step by step, nation after nation was swept into this Second World War. The governments serving those people, all their diplomacy, all their statecraft, failed to stem the tide. Once again all over the world millions of our youth are pouring out their lives because of that failure.

A bolder approach, a stronger mechanism, is required to meet this need of humanity, to control this age-old plague of war now grown into a Frankenstein monster that threatens to destroy our civilization.

The United Nations are paying heavily today for their failure to foresee and plan for total war against the Axis. Building a durable peace is an even tougher and longer job than mobilizing for total war, and already it is far past the time when a start should have been made on the foundations of that peace.

There is one vital difference between preparing for war and preparing for peace. One nation alone can prepare for and precipitate war, but only many nations working and planning together can prepare and maintain a durable peace.

On March 16 two Republican and two Democratic Senators, representing a larger bipartisan group, introduced in the Senate a resolution setting forth briefly and clearly the minimum essentials on which we believe United Nations agreement should be sought before the war ends if we are to have a fair chance of maintaining the peace after it ends. Senate Resolution 114 is short, and I read its text:

"*Resolved*, That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority—

"(1) To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis.

"(2) To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations' forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.

"(3) To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations' forces.

"(4) To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

"(5) To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

"That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement."

That is the full text of our win-the-peace-now resolution. It proposes that the United States declare now that it would prefer as its foreign policy to collaborate with the other United Nations in a strong and effective organization to maintain world peace and stability when we have won this war.

We need a strong commitment to this basic objective now by the Senate for four reasons. First, our allies are going to decide their basic post-war policies during the war and long before it ends. No responsible government can afford to wait until the fighting stops to develop such policies. They did not do so in World War No. 1 and they are not doing so in World War No. 2.

Second, the tremendous political, economic, and military power of the United States inevitably will force us to play a major role in world affairs after the war. We will help maintain world stability. The question is whether we shall have a strong voice in shaping that post-war pattern now, or whether we shall be forced by circumstances to help maintain a world order which we had little or no part in determining.

That leads to the third reason for action now. The United States is the only great power in which two-thirds of the Senate must ratify executive commitments on foreign affairs before they are binding. In view of Senate action on the Versailles Treaty 23 years ago, our allies can scarcely be blamed for questioning whether the United States will collaborate as effectively in maintaining peace as it is in fighting the war. Positive action now by the Senate would eliminate that question and strengthen tremendously our Government's influence in international post-war planning. We believe that influence will be all in the direction of a more just and durable peace.

The fourth reason is perhaps most important of all. The forces pulling the United Nations together and making for cooperation—our common cause, common enemies, and the necessity of working together to win the war—are dominant now and will continue so as long as the war lasts. But these cohesive forces will lose much of their strength the moment victory is won. Unless some agreements on basic principles are reached now, the forces tending to drive the allies apart—economic rivalries, jealousies, nationalism, and urgent domestic problems—will become dominant when the war ends and may block effective collaboration to maintain peace. That is why formation of a strong and effective United Nations organization now is essential.

All plans for future progress in the world, and in our own country, hinge on the maintenance of peace. We are experiencing daily the impact of war on our own economic and social progress, to say nothing of our individual freedoms. And no one disputes seriously the fact that, at least in the immediate postwar period, the presence of force ranged against any would-be aggressor is essential to maintain peace. The question is whether the force should reside in a United Nations organization or in individual nations.

At the heart of our resolution is the proposal that there be assembled a United Nations military force, capable of being ordered into immediate action to suppress any attempt at military aggression.

History shows clearly that individual nations devoted to peace will not go to war simply to stop aggression and save the peace of the world. They will go to war only to stop a direct and vital threat to their own security.

At any time up to 1937, the military force of the overwhelming majority of nations wanting peace would have been sufficient to crush any aggressor. But that force never was mobilized effectively because during the time it took for peaceful nations even to attempt to agree on a joint course of action, the aggressors had seized what they wanted and presented the world with an accomplished fact. And the world would not fight to undo what had been done. Would-be aggressors are not deterred by world opinion, diplomatic protests or discussion of sanctions. Like the gangsters of our prohibition era, they recognize only force.

Recent developments in warfare, which make a durable peace more imperative than ever, also make possible a realistic solution to this problem. The impact of air power, the tremendous striking force of comparatively small land and sea units, and the great mobility of air, sea, and land weapons make it possible to assemble at strategic bases throughout the world a military force which, even though relatively small in numbers, would still be strong enough to stop by itself any attempt at military aggression except by the three great powers—Britain, the United States, and Russia. And we may as well be realistic and recognize that any attempt to maintain peace cooperatively must rest on the good faith and nonaggressive intentions of these three great powers.

Undoubtedly these three nations will continue to maintain large military establishments in the immediate post-war period. None will put all its eggs of national safety in the international collaboration basket. But as world machinery to maintain peace gradually proves its effectiveness, we can look forward to gradually reducing our national armaments and taking from the backs of our people this crushing burden. It is the least costly method for us to assure our national safety.

But a far more powerful argument for collective security is that the only sure way to keep the United States out of future wars is not to have future wars. Our Nation alone cannot police the world or prevent wars. It is to our own interest to support the strongest possible world machinery to maintain peace. Furthermore, it is our obligation to the millions of our young men who are risking and giving their lives, not alone to defend this Nation, but to save future generations from the same fate.

Thank you.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in today's Baltimore Sun

written by Mr. C. P. Ives, on the trade agreements and their necessity for post-war trade revival.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRADE AGREEMENTS—THEIR NECESSITY FOR POST-WAR TRADE REVIVAL

(By C. P. Ives)

Meeting at sea in August of 1941, the President and the Prime Minister worked up the first formal outline of the post-war order for which they felt their peoples and the anti-Axis nations in general to be contending. Their countries, they said, "will endeavor * * * to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

These phrases of the Atlantic Charter were expanded upon and made explicit in the several lease-lend agreements. Take, for instance, article VII of the lease-lend agreement with the Soviet:

"In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of America by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in return for aid furnished * * * the terms and conditions thereof * * * shall include provision for agreed action (by the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) open to participation by all other countries of like mind, (and) directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods * * * (and) to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers."

It is against that background that Mr. Hull moves now for a third extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which amends the Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1930 so as to free world trade in some degree from the paralysis imposed upon it by that unhappy measure. Having made the solemn commitments cited above, can the United States take any other course?

Consider for a moment the larger and ultimate war aims of the United Nations. Here again we must turn to the Atlantic Charter, which, be it remembered, was subscribed to by all of the United Nations in the declaration of January 2, 1943. The aim of all, says the Charter, is "a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries."

Now, it would be wrong to suppose that Hitler could not appreciate the appeal of such a vision. All that Hitler has ever wanted was a world in which Germany could dwell in safety within her own boundaries. The difference between Hitler and the United Nations was one of definition; Hitler did not think Germany could ever be safe while some of the economic resources of the world were outside German boundaries. He proposed, then, to secure Germany's safety by expanding Germany's boundaries or the boundaries of her influence until they were roughly coterminous with the limits of the world itself. His war is as simple as that.

For Hitler had the wit to see that no fraction of the world, no matter how rich, was wholly self-contained in the economic sense. The pre-war United States was one of the great economic dominions of the world, much nearer self-sufficiency than Hitler's Germany; yet Americans have learned since Pearl Harbor how much they are dependent on the trans-Pacific areas, say, for one material, rubber, basic to their most characteristic industry, the automobile industry.

In contrast to Hitler's dream, then, the vision of the United Nations is to attain safety without the ruthless expansion of boundaries. For the unimpeded will of the conqueror, ministering to his own needs alone, the United Nations aim to substitute some form of joint control which will make all nations collectively secure. That world control will be an assurance that the nations of the world may have access to the economic resources of the world in proportion to their need and to the enterprise with which they turn that need into effective demand in purchasing-power terms.

Thus the concept of a wisely controlled free trade is at the very core of the post-war order on which the whole United Nations' war effort is bent. To slight it is to slight the fundamentals. For want of a nail the shoe was lost, for want of the shoe the horse was lost, for want of the horse the victory was lost, for want of the victory the kingdom was lost. But if we neglect world trade we neglect not merely the nail but the shoe and the horse besides. We doom ourselves, before we have won one war, to fight another still more terrible.

Now, is it conceivable that the great arsenal of democracy, the Nation which armed the British and the Russians in their time of peril—is that Nation, now fully armed itself, to obstruct at the very outset the building of the very peace at which all its efforts have been aimed?

Having agreed to lease and lend without fixed cash return, is that Nation to sabotage the only possible alternative compensation, namely, a rich revival of world trade, in which its producers and its workers would have their abundant share and its farm-boy soldiers could dare to turn their tanks back into tractors for the spring plowing?

Such sabotage is inconceivable. Even the old enemies of the trade agreements cannot really expect to block their extension. They know that the country will not let isolationism in this form threaten the new peace just as our armies are beginning to hammer it out. They know that, with motives a thousand times more vivid than in 1937 and 1940, we will move as we did in 1937 and 1940 to extend the Trade Agreements Act.

Trends of the Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal of April 6, 1943:

TRENDS OF THE TIMES

Scene: A meeting of the committee of the National House of Pepresentatives on the problem of absence from work and the bill to abolish it. The absence of workers from their jobs is deprecated and denounced. Workers who lay off from their jobs were to be cited to the draft boards for transfer to the battle fronts.

The committee to frown on absenteeism consists of 29 Congressmen. All but 13 of the 29 Congressmen to consider absenteeism are absent from the meeting on this particular day. None of them expects to be cited to the draft board for his absence.

An ancient adage, "Physician, heal thyself."

Another ancient saying, "Why do you keep looking at the speck in your brother's eye and pay no attention to the beam that is in your own?"

The paranoiac proclaims one law for himself and another for the rest of us. Example: It is wrong for anybody but a Congressman to be an absentee.

To the totalitarian, men are bees in hives, or peas in pods, or grains of wheat in sacks. All Russians together are trash, all Jews public enemies, all Americans fat and lazy, all non-Germans worthy only to be slaves. Even his own Germans are but blood for the state to drink. The man is nought, the state is everything.

Beware of lumping men together as we lump our cattle or our grains of corn.

Labor is unpatriotic, hence these absentees.

Capitalists are unpatriotic, hence these stallings over contracts, these frauds.

The farmers are greedy. Else how this furor from the farm bloc, these threats to quit the farm, to go on strike, if prices are not raised?

Democrats are unpatriotic. See their Senator, though it is wartime, scramble for his patronage.

Republicans are unpatriotic. See them shooting 10 times at Roosevelt and at Hitler only once.

Totalitarian ideas, every one.

No two leaves on a tree are just alike, nor any two men on the earth. No two fingerprints, no two faces, no two minds alike.

Great German Goethe told the Germans: "Germany is nothing. Every individual German is a great deal."

The Germans rejected their Goethe, who would have saved them. They believed, instead, a fanatic Hitler telling them: "You are nothing; the state is everything." They believed the psychotic Hitler, not the sane Goethe. For that they are on the road to ruin now. For the man is not the instrument, but the end, and who acts otherwise is doomed, in the end, to fail.

The laborer is not labor. He is John Smith, Hans Schmidt, or Peter Vrbsky, each unlike the rest.

The capitalist is not capital. He is Morgan the banker, Jones the storekeeper, Jenkins the industrialist, no two the same.

The farmer is not farming. He is Scott the dairyman, Brown the drover, Hughes the gardener, and each one just himself.

The Democrat is not a party. He is one of a wrangling, jangling host, no two alike; some good, some bad, some rich, some poor, some dumb as doorknobs, and some Solomons.

The Republican is not a party of ants in hills, each one a number on a card. They range from the meek and lowly Lincoln to John D. Rockefeller. He may be a Senator Norris, or a Secretary Fall, a Benedict Arnold, or a Nathan Hale.

Edmund Burke, the English statesman, would not denounce the American Revolution. He knew no way, he said, to indict a people as a whole.

Burke was no totalitarian. There was no such thing, he knew, as a people. There were only the infinite individuals of which a people is composed.

You cannot indict labor as labor for its absentees. Some Congressmen have tried it. They only betray their own totalitarian turn of mind. Men being men, whatever their place or rank, just men, the patriotism of labor will be about the same as that of Congressmen, farmers, capitalists. Who counts a people into classes counts amiss and wrongs the nation which his error would divide.

There is no such thing as "labor." There are only the persons, some patriots, some recreants, who work as laborers. There is no such thing as Congressmen, but only men in Congress—men as far apart as Senator WAGNER and Representative HAM FISH. The 13 were present; the 16 not there. Not all Congressmen were absentees.

Men, totalitarian style, are driven cattle, rubber stamps. Men, the democratic way, are royal freemen, every one a king. The line is drawn around the world, the totalitarian against the democrat. Men in Germany and in Japan are drops of water in a sea. In lands of freedom men are living souls. The house of humanity is thus divided against itself. The war is on.

The line is drawn, but never clearly drawn. Free souls there are in totalitarian Germany. And in America there still are those who lump men in other groups than their own (unpatriotic "labor"; greedy capital) into masses, the totalitarian way.

WALTER LOCKE.

Remember Bataan

REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, today is the first anniversary of the fall of Bataan and Corregidor. As Gen. Douglas MacArthur said, "no army has ever done so much with so little." The American people are proud of the gallant record made by our armed forces at Bataan, which were finally overwhelmed only by hunger, numbers, and lack of munitions.

Let us remember Bataan as we did the Alamo in the Mexican War, the *Maine* in the Spanish War, the attacks without warning on our ships in World War No. 1.

Let us supply General MacArthur with adequate forces, airplanes, and ships, and place him in supreme command in the far Pacific, and he will reconquer Bataan and the Philippines, defeat the Japanese Armies, sink her ships, and drive her airplanes out of the skies.

Let us, on this anniversary of the fall of Bataan, determine to provide General MacArthur with men and equipment to bomb Japanese cities and conduct an all-out offensive against her on the sea, in the air, and on the land.

That is the best way to remember Bataan. Every day's delay affords Japan more time to become entrenched and to develop the vast resources she has conquered and to strengthen her military and naval forces. Further delay will mean a fearful price in American blood and tears. Let us get on with the war now.

I trust there is nothing to the statement carried in the press that President Roosevelt called off the proposed Nation-wide commemoration of the Battle of Bataan. Such action would be incredible in view of the heroism and sacrifice of our troops there against terrific odds.

The following newspaper article by John O'Donnell, of the Washington Times-Herald, speaks for itself:

Orders issued by President Roosevelt have canceled official plans to commemorate General MacArthur's defense of Bataan.

The White House directives have gone to the Office of War Information, the Treasury, and War Department, and, though unofficially, even to the Philippine Commonwealth Government-in-exile here in Washington.

Plans had been made for a "Remember Bataan" appeal to the Nation on April 9—the anniversary which marks the end of the gallant resistance of MacArthur's men in the fox holes of the jungle peninsula.

By posters, radio addresses, and newspaper publicity, various department heads had prepared to put the Remember Bataan battle cry of vengeance in the historic lists with Remember the Maine and Remember Pearl Harbor.

White House directives have halted all this. Even the Filipino News, published in distant Honolulu, has been privately told that it probably will get nothing in the way of an official statement for its memorial edition to be published as a part of its bond-selling drive among the Filipino residents of the islands.

"After all, Bataan was a defeat for American arms—not a victory"—the President is quoted as instructing his administration's publicity men when he learned of the proposed commemoration.

I am also including the statement issued by General MacArthur on April 9, according to the Associated Press, from somewhere in Australia, which likewise speaks for itself:

BATAAN HAILED BY M'ARTHUR ON ANNIVERSARY—GENERAL PRAYS THAT DAY OF REDEMPTION MAY NOT BE "TOO LONG DELAYED"

SOMEWHERE IN AUSTRALIA, April 9.—In a statement commemorating the first anniversary of the surrender of American and Filipino forces on Bataan Peninsula, Gen. Douglas MacArthur said today:

"A year ago today the dimming light of Bataan's forlorn hope fluttered and died. Its prayers by that time, and it prayed as well as fought, were reduced to a simple formula rendered by hungry men through cracked and parching lips: 'Give us this day our daily bread.' The light failed. Bataan starved into collapse.

"Our flag lies crumpled, its proud pinions spat upon in the gutter; the wrecks of what were once our men and women groan and sweat in prison toil; our faithful Filipino wards—16,000,000 souls—gasp in the slavery of a conquering soldiery devoid of those ideals of chivalry which have so dignified many armies.

"I was the leader of that lost cause, and from the bottom of a seared and stricken heart I pray that a merciful God may not delay too long their redemption, that the day of salvation be not so far removed that they perish, that it be not again too late."

Food for Defense Workers

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, we have heard repeated many times the phrase that the United States has to be the arsenal of democracy in order to win this war. I firmly believe that the men who labor in the defense plants of this country are willing and anxious to do everything they possibly can to further production in connection with our war effort. However, in order to do their part, these men must have proper food.

I received a letter this morning from an official of a steel company in my district that bears upon this subject. It reads as follows:

It is a pleasure to write to you even though I have to pass on something for you to worry about. The trouble of the moment is with the food rationing.

The men in the steel mill are rapidly discovering that the 2 pounds total of real meat, butter, and cheese a week is not enough to sustain them, and they do not know what they can do. The men referred to do both the hot and heavy work on the furnaces, steam hammers, and rolling mills. They eat all of their meals at home and carry their lunch. They are heavy eaters, probably normally consuming an average of between 6 and 8 pounds of rationed meat, butter, and cheese per week. These men are big fellows, mostly weighing 180 pounds and up, and their reaction is that they need something they can get their teeth into, and I am inclined to agree with them.

For example, they eat a good breakfast of eggs and bacon, a representative lunch consists of four or five sandwiches and a quart of milk with a piece of fruit, and they eat a man-sized dinner. Their activities require the handling and manipulating with tongs and levers of many tons of hot or cold product per day. The men that do the hot work perspire heavily, with considerable evident loss of salt and minerals in their perspiration as shown by the encrusting deposit on their garments. My own impression is that the physical work done by the average of these men is considerably greater than an average man in the Army, and that the hardest work is harder than anything normally required of the Army. These facts can undoubtedly be confirmed by doctors familiar with these industrial practices.

The first question is whether or not anything can be done about this before we encounter difficulty, which is clearly ahead. We do not mean to be alarming, but this seems to be a point that has been overlooked and needs consideration.

If I can give you more specific facts, please advise or if this takes a turn for the worst, I will let you know.

Comparative Tables of Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable JOHN RANKIN, and other colleagues have frequently addressed this House on the subject of public power. Recently the eminent engineer, Mr. R. E. McDonnell, of Kansas City, Mo., who specializes in public power engineering, prepared a table which I think would be of great interest to the Members of this House.

I am inserting it here.

Residential electric rates compared—municipal systems in all cities over 50,000 population—rates as of Jan. 1, 1942, by Federal Power Commission

City	Cost in dollars					Rank of cities				
	Minimum	Kilowatt-hours				Minimum	Kilowatt-hours			
		25	40	100	250		25	40	100	250
1. Austin, Tex	0.50	1.25	1.85	3.65	6.65	2	13	11	17	17
2. Chattanooga, Tenn	.75	75	1.20	2.50	5.00	5	1	3	2	4
3. Cleveland, Ohio	.60	.80	1.19	2.65	5.40	4	2	2	3	8
4. Columbus, Ohio	.50	.98	1.50	3.40	6.28	2	7	5	14	16
5. Fort Wayne, Ind	.50	.87	1.40	3.50	5.90	2	3	4	15	13
6. Glendale, Calif	.60	1.08	1.59	2.91	5.04	4	9	6	6	5
7. Hamilton, Ohio	.50	.94	1.50	3.13	6.13	2	5	5	12	14
8. Holyoke Mass	.50	1.00	1.60	3.75	8.00	2	8	7	18	19
9. Jacksonville, Fla	.50	1.50	2.35	4.60	7.60	2	15	13	19	18
10. Kalamazoo, Mich	1.00	1.00	1.60	3.00	5.75	6	8	7	9	12
11. Kansas City, Kans	.75	1.30	1.60	2.80	4.95	5	14	7	5	3
12. Knoxville, Tenn	.75	.75	1.20	2.50	5.60	5	1	3	2	4
13. Lansing, Mich	.40	.95	1.40	2.70	5.45	1	6	4	4	9
14. Lincoln, Nebr	.60	1.20	1.72	3.03	5.48	4	12	9	11	10
15. Los Angeles, Calif	.55	1.10	1.65	2.97	5.16	3	10	8	8	6
16. Memphis, Tenn	.75	.75	1.20	2.50	5.00	5	1	3	2	4
17. Nashville, Tenn	.75	.75	1.20	2.50	5.00	5	1	3	2	4
18. Pasadena, Calif	.50	1.13	1.80	3.30	5.55	2	11	10	13	11
19. San Antonio, Tex	.50	1.25	1.90	3.64	6.26	2	13	12	16	15
20. Seattle, Wash	.75	.88	1.40	2.95	5.20	5	4	4	7	7
21. Springfield, Ill	.50	1.25	1.90	3.02	4.80	2	13	12	10	2
22. Tacoma, Wash	.50	.95	1.10	1.70	3.20	2	6	1	1	1
Municipal average of the 22 cities	.60	1.02	1.54	3.02	5.58					

Tax Bill

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. NEWSOME

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, the rain descends upon both the just and the unjust. Likewise, taxes fall upon both Democrats and Republicans.

The dangerous times in which we live, together with the public welfare, demand immediate action by this body on taxes.

Taxation in time of war should be nonpartisan and not the means for seeking political advantage.

Believing this, the gentleman from Connecticut, Major COMPTON, and I are today introducing identical bills to provide for the payment currently of individual income taxes—H. R. 2443 and H. R. 2444.

We believe this bill to be a fair compromise between the conflicting views expressed in this House.

We believe the bill would not have the opposition of the Treasury.

We trust that the Ways and Means Committee may find some merit in it.

EXPLANATION OF PLAN TO PROVIDE FOR THE CURRENT PAYMENT OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAXES

This plan meets the problem of transition to a system of current collection of individual income tax by taxing the 1942 income on the basis of 1941 rates and exemptions, and 1943 incomes on the basis of rates and exemptions of 1942 as they are now existing.

This is accomplished by cancelation of the liability for the difference between the tax on 1942 income computed at the lower 1941 rates and higher 1941 exemptions.

The unabated 1942 tax liabilities are then made payable over a period of 5 years beginning with 1944.

It is estimated that the total amount of tax which would be abated under the plan would be $4,400,000,000 out of a total of $9,800,000,000 of 1942 tax liabilities.

The attached table 1 compares the individual normal and surtax rate schedules under the Revenue Act of 1941 and the Revenue Act of 1942.

Table 2 shows the personal exemptions and credit for dependents allowed under the two acts.

Table 3, which assumes the case of a married person having no dependents, shows the amount of individual net income tax and effective rate of tax which would be canceled for 1942 at selected levels of net income, under this proposal.

Briefly, the plan provides as follows:

The March 15 and June 15, 1943, installments will be paid in the usual manner and will be treated as payments of 1943 tax on 1943 income.

The tax on 1942 income is to be computed on the basis of 1941 rates and exemptions, and the balance of the 1942 liability is to be abated.

The amount of the 1942 tax which is not abated will be paid in five equal annual installments beginning not later than December 31, 1944.

Apart from the liquidation of 1942 liabilities, the proposal contemplates that to the fullest practicable extent each individual will pay his tax out of the current year's income.

This is accomplished by two means.

The first is the same system of withholding at source on wages and salaries as that embodied in the bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee. But unlike the committee bill, the amounts withheld at source under the present plan are to be credited only against the tax liability of the current year.

The second device is current payment by the individual of so much of the taxes as will not be collected by withholding at source.

Withholding at source applies only to wages and salaries, and the rate of withholding is limited to 20 percent, which approximates the net Victory tax and the basic income-tax liability of the 6-percent normal tax and the 13-percent first-bracket surtax.

In order to provide for current payment of tax on other kinds of income and at the higher-bracket surtax rates, the plan requires that the taxpayer shall, on or before March 15 in each year, file a declaration of his estimated tax for the year in excess of the amount which he estimates will be withheld at source from his wages or salary during the year.

A comparable date is provided for individuals who report taxable income on a fiscal year basis.

If the taxpayer anticipates no income from wages or salary during the year his declaration will, of course, show no reduction for estimated taxes to be withheld.

If he estimates that his gross income for the year from sources not subject to withholding will be no more than $100, he is not required to file a declaration.

The proposal allows the taxpayer to amend his declaration from time to time if subsequent developments should indicate that his original estimate was too high or too low.

In view of the provision for amendment, and in order to insure a full declaration, an addition to tax is provided if the taxpayer should underdeclare and underpay his tax by more than 20 percent of his actual liability for the year.

The declared tax is to be paid in five installments. In the case of the calendar year taxpayer, the first four installments are to be paid on the 15th of March, June, September, and December respectively.

The provision for the fifth installment, payable on March 15 of the following year, is intended to meet the case where the actual liability exceeds the aggregate of the four installments plus the amounts withheld at source.

Comparable provision is made for the fiscal year taxpayer.

Special provision is made for the farmer.

He may elect to file his declaration in the last month of his taxable year. If he does so, he is to pay his tax in two installments, the first at the time of filing the declaration, and the second on the 15th day of the third month following the close of his taxable year. This is done because farm money is available usually only after the crops have been sold.

The first installment is the equivalent of the first four installments paid by other taxpayers.

The second installment is the equivalent of the fifth installment paid by other taxpayers.

An addition to tax is provided in the case of farmers who underdeclare and underpay their taxes by more than 33⅓ percent.

For the individual on a calendar-year basis, the first declaration under the plan will be due on September 15, 1943.

Thus, the 1943 tax liability will be met by the regular March 15 and June 15, 1943, installment payments and by the September 15 and December 15, 1943, declared installment payments, plus the last installment payment on March 15, 1944. This is done in case the current installment payments and withholding

at source have not met the entire 1943 liability.

Comparable provision is made for the taxpayer who is on a fiscal-year basis.

A 2-percent credit per annum is provided for the prepayment on the unpaid balance left after abatement of 1942 tax liability.

Special provisions are made for the members of the armed forces and for the payment of declared taxes as well as amended declarations by them.

The tables referred to follow:

TABLE 1.—*Individual normal and surtax rate schedules under Revenue Act of 1941 and Revenue Act of 1942*

Surtax net income (thousands of dollars)	Bracket rate		Cumulated surtax	
	Revenue Act of 1941	Revenue Act of 1942	Revenue Act of 1941	Revenue Act of 1942
	Percent	*Percent*		
Not over 2	6	13	$120	$260
Over 2 not over 4	9	16	300	580
Over 4 not over 6	13	20	560	980
Over 6 not over 8	17	24	900	1,460
Over 8 not over 10	21	28	1,320	2,020
Over 10 not over 12	25	32	1,820	2,660
Over 12 not over 14	29	36	2,400	3,380
Over 14 not over 16	32	40	3,040	4,180
Over 16 not over 18	35	43	3,740	5,040
Over 18 not over 20	38	46	4,500	5,960
Over 20 not over 22	41	49	5,320	6,940
Over 22 not over 26	44	52	7,080	9,020
Over 26 not over 32	47	55	9,900	12,320
Over 32 not over 38	50	58	12,900	15,800
Over 38 not over 44	53	61	16,080	19,460
Over 44 not over 50	55	63	19,380	23,240
Over 50 not over 60	57	66	25,080	29,840
Over 60 not over 70	59	69	30,980	36,740
Over 70 not over 80	61	72	37,080	43,940
Over 80 not over 90	63	75	43,380	51,440
Over 90 not over 100	64	77	49,780	59,140
Over 100 not over 150	65	79	82,280	98,640
Over 150 not over 200	66	81	115,280	139,140
Over 200 not over 250	67	82	148,780	180,140
Over 250 not over 300	69	82	183,280	221,140
Over 300 not over 400	71	82	254,280	330,140
Over 400 not over 500	72	82	326,280	385,140
Over 500 not over 750	73	82	508,780	590,140
Over 750 not over 1,000	74	82	693,780	795,140
Over 1,000 not over 2,000	75	82	1,443,780	1,615,140
Over 2,000 not over 5,000	76	82	3,723,780	4,075,140
Over 5,000	77	82		
Normal tax rate	4	6		

TABLE 2.—*Personal exemptions and credit for dependents under Revenue Act of 1941 and Revenue Act of 1942*

	Revenue Act of 1941	Revenue Act of 1942
Single person's exemption	$750	$500
Married person's exemption	1,500	1,200
Credit for dependents	400	350

TABLE 3.—*Amount of individual net income tax[1] and effective rate of tax which would be canceled for 1942 at selected levels of net income, if 1942 tax were computed at 1941 rates and exemptions*

Married person—no dependents.
Personal exemption: 1942 act: $1,200; 1943 act: $1,500.

Net income before personal exemption[2]	Tax on 1942 income		Amount of tax canceled	Effective rate		Effective rate of tax canceled
	Present law rates and exemption	1941 rates and exemption		Present tax rates and exemption	1941 rates and exemption	
				Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
$1,200						
$1,500	$48		$48	3.2		3.2
$1,800	103	$23	80	5.7	1.3	4.4
$2,000	140	42	98	7.0	2.1	4.9
$2,500	232	90	142	9.3	3.6	5.7
$3,000	324	138	186	10.8	4.6	6.2
$4,000	532	249	283	13.3	6.2	7.1
$5,000	746	375	371	14.9	7.5	7.4
$6,000	992	521	471	16.5	8.7	7.9
$8,000	1,532	873	659	19.2	10.9	8.2
$10,000	2,152	1,305	847	21.5	13.1	8.5
$15,000	4,052	2,739	1,313	27.0	18.3	8.8
$20,000	6,452	4,614	1,838	32.3	23.1	9.2
$25,000	9,220	6,864	2,356	36.9	27.5	9.4
$50,000	25,328	20,439	4,889	50.7	40.9	9.8
$100,000	64,060	52,704	11,356	64.1	52.7	11.4
$500,000	414,000	345,084	68,916	82.8	69.0	13.8
$1,000,000	854,000	732,554	121,446	85.4	73.3	12.1
$5,000,000	4,374,000	3,922,524	451,476	87.5	78.5	9.0

[1] Exclusive of Victory tax.
[2] Maximum earned net income assumed.

Army Day Address of Hon. James M. Tunnell, of Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MON C. WALLGREN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an Army Day address delivered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] under the auspices of the Jewish War Veterans, over the facilities of the Mutual Broadcasting System, April 6, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In Hitler's war of hate he has selected as the special object of his hatred the people of the Jewish faith. His particular reason for this hatred is not apparent from anything he says or from any known event in his career. But whatever its cause may have been, its effect has been to earn the hearty reciprocation of that feeling by the Jewish people. Undoubtedly his attitude has had much to do with the determination of the Jews of Palestine that they shall have their own separate army to aid in the struggle to eliminate Hitler as a world factor. The Jewish people, though they are without a separate national government, are entitled to real consideration in this great struggle because of the proportionate sacrifice in casualties suffered by the people of this faith. The casualties, as in most modern wars, have been more largely in the destruction of women and children in civilian life. The result of this situation is that interest on the part of the Jewish war veterans is perhaps greater than ever before in the history of the organization. Almost 3,000,000 of casualties from a race originally comprising perhaps 15,000,000 of people is a tremendous proportion. When we think that a very large part of those casualties represent helpless and harmless civilian populations, largely of women and children, we can understand the aroused anger and determination of the people of this faith. We can understand their eagerness to participate in the national Army Day exercises. This broadcast is given by the Jewish War Veterans of America. It is the hope of this organization that it may through this broadcast bring to America a greater realization of what is being accomplished by America at war.

Many persons, because of unfair criticisms of the war effort, believe that little or no progress has been made in our effort to assure the success of Allied Armies. Discouraging criticisms of America's efforts can have no beneficial effect upon the morale of our men in the service. It is particularly discouraging to the mothers and fathers, wives, brothers, and sisters of men in the service to be told that America is not functioning in its war effort. It is peculiarly appropriate on Army Day to consider for a few moments the origin, growth, and development of the United States Army. For this is a day when America honors its Army. From Bunker Hill to Tunisia is a long road. Our Army which immortalized itself in Revolutionary days was poorly clad and fought from behind fences, trees, stumps, and houses, usually with little or no military equipment and small amount of ammunition. But it was Andrew Jackson in the War of 1812 who showed the world how to fight behind bales of cotton. Grant and Lee displayed their military leadership, which was of the highest order, behind embankments of earth. The American Army in World War No. 1 fought its immortal battles behind concrete embankments. America's military history was sufficiently outstanding to call to America Germany's military leaders, who in the hills and valleys of Virginia studied American strategy as it was practiced in our own War Between the States.

Our Army has made a tremendous growth. At the end of 1943, it will contain 8,200,000 men and officers. It is estimated that the Axis Powers have a total armed force of 17,000,000 men in Europe, Asia, and Africa. The United Nations must meet and defeat this tremendous Axis army. We are preparing to do so. We are training the finest army that the world has ever seen. It will be the best equipped, the best fed, and the Army

with the best morale in the world's history. We are told that it will require 20,000,000 workers in war industries to supply the armed forces of the United States by December 1943. The President called for a production of 8,000,000 tons of merchant ships in 1942. The same program calls for the construction of 14,000,000 tons of shipping in 1943. The President asked for the production of 60,000 planes in 1942 and 125,000 planes in 1943. He asked for the production of 75,000 tanks in 1943 and the production of 35,000 antiaircraft guns in 1943. The exact number of the different defense implements constructed in 1942, for military reasons, cannot be published. However, our military authorities seem to be delighted over our progress in the furnishing of such supplies. Our output of munitions this year will equal all of German-dominated Europe. In 1942 America produced 86,000,000 tons of steel, practically all of which went into the war effort. The total funds available for the war effort by the United States in September 1942 reached the tremendous total of $230,000,000,000. This figure is approximately 10 times the total cost of America's participation in the First World War. In such a war as this every article necessary to civilian life is necessary in the war effort. There are thousands of items from pepper and salt to battleships that must be in readiness for use. In September 1942 the materials which we shipped to our allies under the lend-lease program amounted to $643,000,000.

But our Army must not only be armed. It must be fed. In the feeding and equipment of this Army, America must not and will not fail. Our food production is tremendous. We are producing enough food to feed America under ordinary circumstances, and have a large surplus. America in 1942 grew the enormous amount of 3,175,000,000 bushels of corn, or a total of 24 bushels to the person in the United States. It grew 981,000,000 bushels of wheat, or 7½ bushels of wheat to the person in the United States. It grew 371,000,000 bushels of potatoes, or approximately 3 bushels to the person. It grew 209,000,000 bushels of soy beans, or 1 bushel and 3 pecks for each person in the United States. It grew 2,504,000,000 pounds of peanuts, or a total of 19 pounds to the person in the United States. It grew 9,980,000,000 pounds of beef and veal, or 76 pounds of beef and veal to the person in the United States. It produced nearly 3,000,000,000 pounds of dressed chicken last year, or a total of 23 pounds of dressed chicken to the person. The corn produced in 1942 was 500,000,000 bushels more than in 1941. The wheat produced was 38,000,000 bushels in excess of that produced in 1941. America produced 16,000,000 bushels of potatoes in excess of what it produced in 1941. It produced double the quantity of soy beans that it produced in 1941. There were 1,000,000,000 pounds of peanuts produced in 1942 in excess of the amount produced in 1941. There were 850,000,000 pounds of beef and cattle produced in 1942 in excess of that produced in 1941. There were 350,000,000 pounds of dressed chicken produced in excess of the amount produced in 1941. This was done although there were 200,000 more workers on the farms of the United States in 1941 than there were in 1942. Can America produce its goal of food in 1943? America will produce its goal. America will feed its Army, its civilian population, and will furnish its allies the necessary food in 1943. You may tell the American farmer that he cannot produce the amount required. The American farmer will produce and furnish to the world the answer to that challenge. The American farmer is a patriot, he is a parent of the boys in the service, and again he is determined to do his part in winning the world fight. These figures and facts indicate a wonderful improvement in America's situation with reference to the war.

But the greatest improvement in America has been the improvement in the morale of the civilian population. It would be a hopeless and useless task for the American Army to be placed in the field to fight for something which the American people did not approve. Americans are peace lovers. The great body of our people were determined that we were not again to become involved in a European war unless flagrant grounds made it necessary. Millions of patriotic Americans were anxious to use every possible means of preventing the United States from entry into the European struggle until it was necessary. In this determination they felt themselves justified unless an attack should be made upon us. Pearl Harbor was the answer. A Nation of peace-loving citizens could not believe that the Axis Powers had actually partitioned the western continent into spheres of influence, South America to be subjugated by and allocated to Germany, and North America to be subjugated by the Japanese, our women and children to be left to the tender and solicitous treatment of Japanese hordes. Our people had been born and had grown to maturity in a land where freedom is taken for granted. Not being directly in touch with the terrible conditions of the eastern continent, we could not and did not realize that this was not just another European war. There were those who believed it to be a struggle for greater trade. There were those who believed it to be a struggle for territorial aggrandizement. They did not and could not realize that this was a struggle to erase from the governments of the world all recognition of weaker powers, and to separate the individuals and minorities of the world from all civil and religious rights. America now realizes that this war is against it, the rights of its citizens, against its posterity, against its liberty, and its future. But the transition of American economy from the pursuit of civil activities to a war basis was a severe one. Our manufacturing plants had to be transformed from the production of the necessities and conveniences of civil life to war requirements.

Millions of American citizens, prosperous as never before, richer than any nation had ever been in the history of the world, could not willingly surrender the necessaries, and even the luxuries which this kind of a war made necessary, until convinced that such a struggle was inevitable. Then there were those who believed that only a few months' fighting on the part of the United States would be necessary to win the war. These people resented any lessening of their pleasures and comforts. We hesitated to lessen the use of gasoline, of tires, of fuel oil, of coal, of foods of all sorts. However, as the result in the Philippines, the Dutch East Indies, Solomon Islands, and finally north Africa, gave us a realization that American property was being destroyed, American blood was being spilled, American boys slaughtered, our people opened their eyes to the real situation. Today America is at war. Her armies are on the march on every continent. Her manufacturing plants are producing the necessities of war. Her farmers are producing the food necessary to feed the world. In production America has overtaken and passed her enemies. From Maine to California, from Canada to Mexico, smoke is coming from every manufacturing plant. The father has sent his son to the far corners of the earth to help in this struggle, and he is going to help to produce on the farms, in the factories, and in every activity the things that may be necessary to win this war. From every community in the land, additions to the swelling tide of power are in evidence. Sleeping, peaceful America is now aroused. Everywhere evidence of transformation of a peaceful nation to a war giant can be observed. This is known to our friends and is being felt by our enemies. There is no overconfidence in America. There is now a recognition of the tremendous task ahead of us, the tremendous sacrifices necessary. America now sees that there is no alternative to success but slavery and that slavery extending to untold generations of our children. Americans no longer say they can win. In every home in this virile Nation there is a realization that we must, that we shall win.

College War-Training and Work Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the proposal of the National College Work Council of the National Youth Administration to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission on the college war-training and work program for 1943–44. This proposal was submitted on January 26, last.

There being no objection, the proposal was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 26, 1943.*

PROPOSAL OF THE NATIONAL COLLEGE WORK COUNCIL OF THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION ON THE COLLEGE WAR-TRAINING AND WORK PROGRAM FOR 1943–44

INTRODUCTION

The Nation is engaged in a total all-out war effort. Colleges and universities have offered their facilities and faculties to aid in the training of necessary personnel in technical and scientific fields through a year-around, accelerated program of studies. Students in training in these fields have been urged by national leaders in the war program to continue their studies to earliest possible completion on a 12-month basis, in order to contribute their specialized services in medicine, dentistry, engineering chemistry, physics, teaching in certain fields, and similar occupations in critical need of additional personnel to expedite the total war effort.

Of the youth attending college, a considerable group will be unable to finance their education particularly because of increased living costs and economic dislocations resulting from the war. Youth enrolled in college accelerated programs on a 12-month basis are thereby deprived of normal opportunities for earning funds during vacation periods to finance their college training.

In order that the Nation may avail itself of the potential abilities of capable youth developed by specialized college training for responsibilities in the total war effort and in the ensuing period of reconstruction, it seems imperative that assistance be provided to superior young men and women unable adequately to finance such training.

Based, therefore, upon these needs and the recommendations of State and regional college work councils, the following changes in the National Youth Administration college work program are proposed by the National College Work Council.

1. PURPOSES OF THE WAR-TRAINING AND COLLEGE WORK PROGRAM

The jobs on which it is proposed to employ National Youth Administration students in college would serve a threefold purpose essential to the war manpower program, namely:

(a) To insure that students of ability, who are unable adequately to finance attendance at college, receive the training necessary to prepare them for their maximum contribution to the war effort and the post-war period.

(b) To alleviate professional and technical manpower shortages in the training institutions and in public agencies by providing student services necessary to the acceleration of the institutional war effort.

(c) To provide students with work-training essential to their total preparation for professional and technical jobs.

2. WAR-TRAINING AND WORK PROGRAM FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS, 1943–44

It is proposed that financial assistance to college students of ability under the National Youth Administration for the fiscal year 1943–44 be available on the following bases:

(a) The college war-training program: In view of the increased training load in accelerated war-training programs in colleges, it is proposed that students of ability, unable adequately to finance attendance in college, enrolled in fields declared critical by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, including students in fields of teaching determined critical by the Chairman, be eligible for National Youth Administration employment up to $40 per month; provided that when the need of a student totals more than a wage earning of $20, additional amounts up to an aggregate of $40 may be earned for pursuing college war-related training in those fields defined as critical.

(b) The college work program: This phase of the program would be a continuation of the present college work program and would provide employment to students of ability regardless of the type of courses they are pursuing. The wage payment for such work would not exceed $25 per month per student.

(NOTE.—For these programs an appropriation of $30,000,000 for the fiscal year 1943–44 is necessary.)

3. PLAN OF OPERATION

In view of the inclusion of the National Youth Administration within the structure of the War Manpower Commission, the operation of the college war-trainin, and work program will be subject to the coordinating review of the Director of the Bureau of Training and the Chief, Division of Professional and Technical Training of the War Manpower Commission. The actual operation of the college war-training and work program shall be the responsibility of the National Youth Administration and the college authorities at the participating institutions.

4. AGE LIMITATION

It is proposed to eliminate the upper age limit of 25 years as a limiting factor to employment on the college war-training and work program in the case of any person having served in the armed forces in this war.

5. TWELVE-MONTH BASIS

The college war-training and work program shall be established to operate on a 12-month basis.

6. ELIGIBILITY OF STUDENTS

Only those students who meet the requirements for entrance into college and who, in the opinion of the appropriate college authorities based upon high-school records in the case of entering freshmen, give promise of superior performance in college training, shall be eligible for consideration to participate in the National Youth Administration college war-training and work program upon entrance into college. Advanced freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, and graduate students who have established a satisfactory standing in their scholastic work at the institution will be eligible for consideration to participate in this program.

Respectfully submitted.

Lewis Jackson, City College of New York, New York, N. Y., regions I and II; Dr. Levering Tyson, president, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa., region III; Dr. Joseph Rosier, president, Fairmont State Teachers College, Fairmont, W. Va., region IV; Dr. B. L. Stradley, dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, region V; Dr. C. E. Ragsdale, School of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., region VI; Dr. Cyril W. Grace, president, Mayville State Teachers College, Mayville, N. Dak., region VIII; Dr. M. L. Wardell, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla., region IX; Dr. Louis H. Hubbard, president, Texas State College for Women, Denton, Tex., region X; Dr. Harl R. Douglass, head, Department of Education, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., region XI; Dr. Roben J. Maaske, president, Eastern Oregon College of Education, La Grande, Oreg., region XII; Dean R. C. Beaty, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., chairman, region VII; Dr. James H. Richmond, president, Murray State Teachers College, Murray, Ky., region V; Dr. George S. Miller, vice president, Tufts College, Medford, Mass., region I.

Planned Parenthood and National Birth Rate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Planned Parenthood," written by Nathaniel W. Hicks and published in "America" on April 3, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY "PLANNED PARENTHOOD" THE PEOPLE MAY PERISH

(Nathaniel W. Hicks)

Facing the greatest crisis in its history, this Nation finds itself straining every resource to solve the gigantic problem of man shortage without serious upset to family life and the whole pattern of American living. While the vacuum of need in our armed forces and in essential war occupations must now siphon millions of husbands and fathers, and may draw up to 6,000,000 women from their present jobs or their homes into war industries, there thrives in our midst a well-organized, strongly entrenched, and shrewdly guided movement which, under the guise of science, patriotism, and social welfare, will—if left unchecked—depopulate and destroy our country—unwittingly, we grant, but more surely than any war against us from sky and sea and land.

The planned-parenthood movement for birth prevention and birth spacing, which can only lead to birth-rate depression, may clothe a very old evil in the habiliments of sociology, but it must stand condemned as furthering not a wisely planned, high-quality population but the ultimate destruction of this Nation—to preserve which the parents of today are offering the lives of their sons.

In establishing a case for our Nation against the Planned Parenthood Federation and its affiliates, let us return to the problem of manpower, not for the present emergency but for like ones which may arise in the future. Strong as may be our faith and hopes in the Atlantic Charter, it is a demand of intelligent patriotism and practical foresight that even the most optimistic give due regard to the worst propensities of human nature, the fallibility of the best-inclined nations and races, and to the strife-filled history of mankind.

The month the Japs struck Pearl Harbor, the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., then less deceptively named the Birth Control Federation of America, published in its pseudo-scientific bimonthly organ the following statement:

"The United States is overpopulated rather than underpopulated, in the sense that her resources will permit a higher standard of living in the future for a somewhat smaller population than for a larger one, regardless of the technological progress which may occur.

"It appeared in an article in Human Fertility (formerly the Journal of Contraception).

An obvious comment on this unfounded and unprovable assertion, which indicates the position of the birth controllers on the matter of population, is to recall that this vast, rich country's population density is only 44.2 persons for each square mile. Germany proper has a density of 381.5, or, if we include Austria and the Sudetenland, of 352.3. England's average square-mile inhabitation is 742.2 persons. We still find in these United States tremendous possibilities for growth without sacrifice either of our self-sufficiency or our constantly rising peacetime standard of living. Since 1880 our density has increased by only 27.3 persons. Meanwhile, our living standard has ascended with giant strides. In no way is it our problem to provide a higher standard for a lower number of people, but rather to raise the lower half of our Nation to a just participation in what we now can offer and to raise the standard, as national progress requires, for all the people and for more people.

However improbable another great war in our times may be, we may well ask ourselves, nevertheless, how much better would our manpower status be for a World War No. 3 in, say, 1960? Assuming a selective service pool confined to the ages 20 to 34, inclusive, we can compute some significant figures from future population estimates used by the National Resources Planning Committee and based upon statistics of the United States Bureau of the Census. Such a pool, in 1940, would have numbered 16,303,000 men, married and single, native-and-foreign-born, out of a total population of 131,669,275. For comparison, 16,316,908 men between the ages of 21 and 36 did register under selective service on October 16, 1940.

By 1960, our total population will, according to estimates, have increased by more than 15,000,000. This figure is attained with the assumption of medium birth and death rates and no net immigration; incidentally, it marks a 33⅓-percent drop in population gains by birth, as compared with the 20 years, 1920–40. The 20-34-year-old pool of men for the armed forces would be a mere 163,000 men more than in 1940.

A war in 1980 would find the same age-group pool totaling 562,000 fewer men than in 1960. Besides an alarming decrease for a 20-year period, this shows a frightening trend. The entire estimated population of 153,022,000 means a tremendous drop of 9,000,000 in over-all population growth in comparison with the 1940–60 period with its own startling depression in child-bearing. These decreases are reminiscent of the 8,100,000 drop in growth for 1930–40, when birth control notably came into its own in the first great inroads against our national population. Speaking then of the sharp decline for the youngest age groups, the usually calm, measured tone of the statistician broke, and his pithy warning was—The same trend is shown in France.

Estimates for 1980, based on medium birth and death rates, predict only 14,897,000 male children under 15 years. Mortality during the next 2 decades would cut this group to about 14,682,000. Thus, any possible war in the year 2,000, but 57 years from now, may find our country with its source of fighting men and war-industry workers in the considered manpower pool cut by more than 1,200,000 since 1980, or by approximately 1,784,000 since 1960.

And yet, this study in future manpower is only a partial prognosis of the national malady creeping—yes, hurtling itself—upon us. Since women are from 1 to 2 percent fewer than men in our population, we need but double the 40-year decrease indicated above and we roughly have the entire male and female group in the ages from 20 to 35 years. There alone we will have lost an approximate 1,750,000 potential mothers.

Despite the significance of the population estimates on which these figures are based, they were made before the 1940 census and were in that year proven to be underestimates. With their assumption of medium fertility (birth production) and medium mortality, our 1940 population should have been about 132,600,000. It was really almost a million less. In fact, it was well below the estimate of 131,902,000 (Scripps Foundation for Research in Population Problems) made on the basis of a possible low fertility and medium mortality. The net immigration gains in the 1930's were negligible.

The low fertility thereby indicated will continue and certainly go lower if birth control makes advances in the future comparable with those of the past 20 years, as evidenced by our vital statistics. The 1980 population is, therefore, not truly indicated by the previously cited and generally accepted estimate of 153,022,000. According to the Scripps Foundation's low fertility estimate (one of many estimates it prepared), the actual census figures in that year may be merely about 134,381,000—not even 3,000,000 more than in 1940. The ratio of growth would, of course, have continued to drop until we hit our population peak of 140,000,000 in 1960. From then on, the downward trend would no longer be one in ratio of growth, but in the real numerical decrease of population that must eventually lead to national disaster. The decline and fall of every great nation in history was heralded by a falling birth rate, such as we already have in the United States, and by the steady decrease of population we shall most certainly have unless we start to do something about the decline in childbearing.

Calculations of my own, carried forward from the officially accepted estimates up to 1980, provide a picture of what the following years will bring even with stationary birth and mortality rates. Not to take any advantage of the probable low fertility and the now practically assured downward movement in birth rates, I have used the same medium fertility rates which gave the National Resources Committee the population estimate of 153,022,000 for 1980, and showed a gain of slightly less than 9,000,000 over the 1955 estimate. I also assume the same medium mortality and no net immigration.

Going 5 years past the turn of the next century, we find that in 2005 the total population of the United States will be about 145,540,000, nearly a million and a half less than the prediction for 1960. In other words, assuming medium stationary rates and figuring for 25-year periods, this would be the first great numerical decrease of our population—a drop of 7,482,000 from the 1980 estimate. The ever-receding gains of the previous intracoastal periods will have given way to the inevitable era of repeated loss. The United States will be treading much the same road the great Roman nation trod toward oblivion and absorption nearly 2,000 years earlier. By 2030, our people will number 134,581,000—only about 3,000,000 more than in 1940. By 2055 our Nation will be 130,408,000—more than a million drop below our 1940 census total. Twenty-five years later we will have dwindled to an approximate 124,780,000, which is roughly but 2,000,000 more than we were in 1930. In the year 2105 our population will have fallen to more than 6,000,000 below the 1930 level. The ebb tide of our Nation (unless we are preserved or rescued by immigration) will be falling fast. It will be our national penalty for the original sin against nature.

Lest any of the foregoing considerations be branded as statistical sleight of hand, I cite some findings by an outspoken advocate of birth control. My authority is P. K. Whelpton, of the Scripps Foundation, who favors a gradually slowing-up decline in the birth-rate until we can maintain a stationary population. Writing in the Planned Parenthood Federation's publication, Human Fertility, in December 1941, he admitted that even if the continually falling birth rates of white women (particular subject of his article) in the United States should remain at the 1935–39 level "the white population will gradually cease to grow, and begin to decrease, perhaps within 30 or 40 years."

This he ascribed to the fact that each 100 women of one generation would be contributing only 95 daughters to the child-bearing period of the next generation. This would mean a constant drop of 5 percent from the number of women necessary to keep the population stationary. Mr. Whelpton further admitted that the birth rate for white women "during the next 20 or 30 years" must produce an increase of more than 15 percent, or a total of 110 girl babies for every 100 white women, in order to "achieve" the "gradual slowing up of population growth followed by the maintenance of a stationary population." Even in that estimate he generously allows the possibility of a death rate 20 percent lower than the average for 1930–39.

"In my opinion, however," he wrote, "it is unrealistic to expect the birth rate to continue dropping at the rapid pace of 1923–33 [from 22.2 to 16.5 per 1,000 population]; much more probable is a slowing up of the declines which will result in the population peak occurring sometime between 1950 and 1970. [Reaching the peak in those years would mean not medium but low fertility.] Whether we will then have a stationary population [or one diminishing in numbers] (unless maintained by immigration [will depend on how soon the decline in fertility is arrested and whether or not some increase from the low point can be obtained]."

It is sincerely regrettable, and rather difficult to understand, that one of America's most capable students of population problems should, despite the powerful arguments of his statistical data against the contraceptionists, remain in their camp. He could render inestimable service to the cause of national morality and secure a future for our country. Unfortunately, the facts cited from his article in the official organ of the birth controllers were followed by his suggestion that the "population program" should provide more "fertility" clinics for birth-control information and services. "This will tend to depress the birth rate, it is true," he wrote, in a weak attempt to explain what must be for him a scarcely tenable position:

"But to attempt to raise fertility to the maintenance level by withholding from the poorer and less educated classes the contraceptive information which is readily available to the well-to-do and more educated classes is highly undemocratic, extremely selfish * * * and perhaps even dangerous from the standpoint of the quality of tomorrow's children, and hence of our future population."

The latest efforts of the contraceptionists are strongly pronounced attempts to lower the already dangerous fertility rate by false appeals to the patriotism of women in war plants and by dire propaganda for general consumption that child-bearing is unhealthy and unsocial in these "emotional" and unstable times.

We can only increase an intelligent opposition, through every possible medium, and hope that, with the recognition of the manpower shortage now dislocating our national life, those who are formulating plans for our Nation's future will wake up to the need for an all-out effort against the birth-control propagandists and the suicidal birth rate which are internally decimating our population.

Eradication of the nationally destructive evil on the family front is not less a patriotic duty to the future of our country than is that solemn duty to the present which our people face so well and bravely today with "blood, toil, sweat, and tears" on the industrial and fighting fronts of this arsenal and defender of democracy and civilization. We Catholics and all right-thinking Americans must be well organized, vociferous, and ceaseless in action, both privately and jointly, in unmasking to the entire public and to our representative official bodies the threat of the "planned parenthood" forces and the already serious inroads upon the potential human resources of our Nation for the future.

Organization of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials relating to Senate Resolution 114, one entitled "Let's Tell the World Now," from the Raleigh News and Observer of March 28, 1943, and the second entitled "For Unified Action," from the Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette of March 28, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of March 28, 1943]

LET'S TELL THE WORLD NOW

(By Nell Battle Lewis)

The nonpartisan Ball-Hill-Hatch-Burton congressional resolution for immediate creation of an Allied council to deal with post-war problems, has the heartiest support of this column. Its passage would give welcome

assurance to the world that American isolation, with all its tragic consequences during the past 25 years, has ended at last, and that the other nations may now confidently expect our cooperation in the reordering of world affairs after this war.

That there should be much uncertainty and distrust abroad now as to what our part, if any, in post-war reorganization will be is inevitable in view of the shameful way we shirked our responsibility after 1918. Passage of this resolution by Congress which, after the First World War prevented our participation in an association of nations, would allay much of the general justified distrust of us and would be of the greatest value to Allied morale. It should come at the earliest possible moment.

"Why wait," asks one of the resolution's sponsors, LISTER HILL, Democrat, Alabama, "for war weariness and disillusionment, economic rivalry, nationalistic feeling and pressing domestic problems to make more difficult, if not impossible, the building of a family of nations, the building of an enduring peace?"

He's right. We can't extend the hand of fellowship too soon. Let's tell the world now that finally we are willing to assume our share of responsibility for the welfare of all.

[From the Kalamazoo (Mich.) Gazette of March 28, 1943]

FOR UNIFIED ACTION

Minnesota's Senator BALL says that it will be quite all right with him if reasonable modifications are made in the nonpartisan "win-the-peace" resolution submitted by himself and three other Senators—Messrs. BURTON, of Ohio; HILL, of Alabama, and HATCH, of New Mexico. "Our main objective is to commit the United States to joining with other nations in a strong and effective attempt to maintain the peace, once we have got peace," Mr. BALL declares. "We don't care so much about the details."

Undoubtedly the details are the things which will cause the most trouble in formulating a plan to assure full American cooperation in safeguarding the peace and security of the post-war world. There are some critics, indeed, who seem convinced that no plan adopted now should have any real details at all—that the Senate and the administration should be contented, at the most, with an extremely vague resolution promising some undefined degree of American aid in promoting international harmony. The big fear of these critics seems to be that if we try to make anything like a specific program for post-war cooperation now, we may find ourselves running squarely up against certain practical problems which will jeopardize the war effort of our country and its allies.

It may as well be admitted that the difficult question is just how far we can safely try to go in preparing a "blueprint" for international cooperation in the future. Probably no one supposes that all of the United Nations are in full agreement regarding such issues as sovereignties and national boundaries in the post-war world, and it is conceivable that an attempt to deal frankly with such issues now might lead to unfortunate misunderstandings and disagreements. Yet it should be possible to avoid these pitfalls and still make it clear to the world that this country of ours fully intends to participate in a definite post-war program for the enforcement of peace. Other nations, remembering what happened to Woodrow Wilson's comprehensive peace program after the last great war, may well be wondering right now whether the United States can be counted upon to cooperate in unified international action after the present conflict is over.

The very fact that the current move to put our Government on record in favor of cooperation has originated in the Senate is both significant and encouraging. It strongly suggests the possibility that the danger of another unfortunate clash between the treaty-making and the treaty-ratifying branches of our Government may be ruled out by the previous establishment of harmony on this important issue. It should be realized, however, that any resolution which is to be effective cannot consist solely of beautiful generalities. We may be sure that a resolution which impresses us as too vague to mean much of anything will impress the rest of the world in exactly the same way.

The World of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very brief statement entitled "The World of Tomorrow" by R. S. Reynolds, president of the Reynolds Metals Co., of Richmond, Va.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The frightful consequences of failure to prepare for war should be warning sufficient to convince every one of the United Nations that we must prepare now for militant peace and sane world reconstruction. Peace is being discussed as though we will still have the option of the antiquated peace, with its victory parade and disarmament. Such a choice must be denied to this and all other nations. A new and startling condition has arisen that changes the whole fabric of civilization. Our dreamers and inventors, in the past few years, have brought about an astounding age of miracles. These startling inventions have been seized and used to make war international in scope, titanic in destruction, prodigal of human life and nonreplaceable resources. This power of destruction will be multiplied. Militant peace, assuring the economy of abundance, must and will be global in scope.

The stone which our peace-loving nations rejected has become the capstone of the temple of peace. The airplane is now the avenging angel. It shall be the harbinger of peace—the great protector of the flock. The whole world is now a community. Its teeming millions are our neighbors. We can, and must, live together in peace and prosperity.

When danger threatens, it is always easy to give abundantly. Even men of the jungle united to save themselves. Our whole Nation became patriotic after Pearl Harbor, but when peace comes and the siren sings it is not so easy. Noncreative minds are already crying out, "America cannot afford to do this. We shall bankrupt ourselves." This same philosophy of greed caused us to crucify Woodrow Wilson and make a mockery of the League of Nations and his World Court. After we had scuttled the League of Nations, other nations repudiated international debts, scrapped sacred pledges of peace, and international law and morals in government slumped to the stupid standards of the ape man. This was followed by a decade of pillage and plunder, with its boom and panic. Soldiers of freedom were driven from the parks in Washington, D. C., and were feeding at bread lines throughout the Nation. In the jargon of the jungle, civilized nations once again broadcasted to high heaven the philosophy of the beasts, "Might makes right."

For this criminal stupidity the young and the strong once again are purchasing the peace and the freedom of the world with an ocean of blood and an ocean of tears. The present war will cost in blood, in tears, and in wealth more than the combined cost of all wars of all the centuries. For a fraction of this staggering cost we could have brought about the economy of abundance to the teeming millions still enslaved and made of war a relic of the jungle. From purely a matter of self-preservation this must never happen again.

In this magic land we have proven that to give abundantly is the only way in which to reap abundantly. Our trade-marks and trade names are today worth billions of dollars because the Yankee discovered and proved that big value brings big business. A few decades ago Mr. Henry Ford determined that 95 percent of our people should own and drive an automobile. Negative minds scoffed, but the dreamer went right ahead with his dream. Ford invented the magic of mass production which enabled him to give so abundantly. It took 15 years for his richest competitor to match his value and his volume. This country was the first to tear down the old sign, "buyers beware." It was the first to hang up the new sign, "customers are always right." The secret price tag vanished and our Nation set up the one-price system, with prices marked in plain figures. American business has proven to the world that honesty is the best policy.

All nations will gladly follow a philosophy that made this the greatest nation on earth. With cooperation all nations can, and will, learn the secret of our magic and our miracles that lifts from the back of labor the drudgery of the centuries and multiplies scarcity into abundance.

The pilgrim of progress knocked unheeded for centuries at every door of the Old World. He preached that it is more profitable to give than to get. Today he stands knocking at the door of the New World. America faces a transcendent challenge. With our new inventions we hold in our hand the power to solve the tri-riddle of the ages—poverty, pestilence, and war. The cry of all the ages rings in our ears today. We must decide now whether the beast in man or the God in man shall rule this war-weary world. We have the free choice of heaven or hell on earth. Our decision will be final.

Organization and Collaboration of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Post-War Plans Now," published in the Trades-Unionist of April 3, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST-WAR PLANS NOW

President Roosevelt, Vice President WALLACE, and many other forward-looking officials and citizens have been planning for world security after this war, in the hope not only that every citizen of every country in the world will have some measure of security but that another and more devastating war can be avoided.

Some of our politicians and manufacturers have decried this idea; newspapers have ridiculed it. Anthony Eden and now Winston Churchill insist we should wait until this war is won before we think about what is to come.

Somehow this reminds us of what has gone before. We followed their system 25 years ago, won the war—and lost the peace. We left it to the experts, and they were stumped. We even relied on their ability and their knowledge to guarantee us against a repetition of World War No. 1. In fact, we were assured by our so-called leaders and Army officials that it could never happen again.

And now they tell us to leave it to them; wait till we tell you to commence thinking about the peace that is to come. Don't bother your little minds about it; leave it to us, and everything will be hunky-dory.

Well, with a knowledge of what has gone before, with the conviction firmly in our minds that warriors are more skilled in war than in preventing conflict, we believe that plans for a lasting peace should be pushed right now. Let's decide now what kind of a world we want when this global struggle is over. The old cry of "in time of peace prepare for war" has been superseded by "in time of war prepare for peace."

Senate bill 114, by Senators BALL, HILL, HATCH, and BURTON, should have serious consideration on the Hill. The United States should take the lead and let no other nation take the ball away from us. We know we want peace and justice for everyone.

Collection of Income Taxes

REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been the custom, I am told, by Members who have been here many years, to treat tax bills in a nonpartisan manner. Unfortunately there was a division on a partisan basis on the income-tax bill lately presented to the House. However, it is now evident to all of us that the adoption of some method of collecting taxes on a pay-as-you-go or a pay-as-you-earn basis is imperative. My mail, and I am sure the official mail of most of us, has told us that the public is fully alive to the necessity for a pay-as-you-earn tax bill and they are demanding that this House take action toward that end. As my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NEWSOME] has told you, he and I have introduced as a nonpartisan measure identical bills for collecting income taxes in 1943. This bill has the two important features, pay-as-you-earn and immediately making 44,000,000 taxpayers current, and has been studied and prepared with full consideration of ability to pay.

While this bill, I am sure, will not please everyone, it is our hope it will satisfy on both sides of the House all of those who realize the importance of beginning collections at once on pay-as-you-go basis, with its benefit and convenience to the taxpayers, and the immense value to the Treasury Department by the increase in collections and by the simplicity of its administration.

For those thrifty ones who desire to pay their total 1942 tax at once or sooner than the due date, a further deduction of 2 percent per annum, the usual business rate for cash, is provided. The bill provides the usual quarterly payments for those whose incomes are not made up of wages or salary. Provision is also made for farmers and professional people and, of course, for members of the armed forces.

The plan provided by the Newsome-Compton bill will make 44,000,000 taxpayers current on or before July 1 of this year because the payments made on March 15 and to be made on June 15 and the deduction-at-the-source payments provided from July 1 will all be credited to 1943 taxes, which are based on 1942 rates and exemptions. For the 1942 tax we apply the rates and exemptions used in 1941, which will eliminate 7,000,000 first-time taxpayers but will produce for the Treasury $4,500,000,000. This 1942 tax to be paid—approximately 55 percent of the total—may be paid over a period of 5 years in equal annual installments. The plan also has the advantage of easy transition from the old method to the new, as well as simple administrative problems for the collection of all the taxes. The 1942 taxes collected on the basis of rates and exemptions of 1941, will collect about 55 percent and therefore provides an over-all abatement equal to 45 percent of their 1942 taxes. The remaining 55 percent to be paid over a period of 5 years will make the total annual payments approximately 110 percent. There is no taxpayer who cannot provide making an additional payment of 10 percent in order to provide a total of fifteen or sixteen billion dollars for the Treasury this year and, at the same time, bring the whole country on the much-to-be-desired pay-as-you-earn basis.

It has been the endeavor of my distinguished friend from Alabama [Mr. NEWSOME], and myself, to avoid favoring any particular individual or group both here in the House and among the taxpayers themselves.

In the preparation of the bill we have not been unmindful of the administrative difficulties which any change of the nature contemplated will entail. However, we believe our bill offers the simplest administrative requirements for the transition to the desired plan. In fact, so simple that it is our belief that the deduction at the source feature can begin promptly on July 1.

We offer the bill for only one purpose, to encourage early consideration of an all-important subject, not as tax experts but as humble new Members, with all the ardor of freshmen, we earnestly solicit your consideration for the bill on its merit. Since the full details of the plan will be found in the Appendix under the extended remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. NEWSOME], to save space and labor I shall not include them in my remarks.

Food for Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, the Prairie Farmer and its radio station WLS in Chicago, Ill., recognizing the possibility of a shortage of food production, so essential to the winning of the war, have just promulgated and announced a program entitled "Food for Humanity," to be carried on through this publication and its radio station. The facilities of both this great farm newspaper and this great radio station, which reach more farmers on purely agricultural subjects than any other newspaper or radio station in our State, are rendering a great service to our country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the editorial entitled "Food for Humanity," as it appeared in the most recent issue of the Prairie Farmer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAIRIE FARMER SAYS

FOOD FOR HUMANITY

We are at the beginning of the most important planting season in the history of mankind. The crops that grow on these farms this year will shape the future of the world. Hundreds of millions of people will read their fate in the 1943 harvest from American farms. We deal with the life or death of whole nations.

This is not something theoretical or far away. Behind the statistics are millions of men, women, and children facing death by starvation. Creation of famine is part of Axis strategy. Food supplies of conquered peoples have been stolen, hauled away in trucks, and those who tried to keep back enough to feed their hungry children have been shot. When liberated by the advance of Allied armies, these people must be fed, not only for humanitarian reasons, but also because it is vital to the winning of the war.

Our boys on the battle fronts must be fed, and in that task we must not slacken even for a moment. They are a long way from home. They are valiant boys, and we love them. They depend on us to keep the food coming over.

There are a hundred obstacles to food production this year. No use evading that fact. But no obstacle, no shortage of manpower or equipment, can be allowed to interfere with this job.

We will share what we produce. It will feed our men in the armed forces, our workers in industrial plants, and weary and despairing people in other countries. Never can we sit back after a full meal of rich

food and find contentment when we know that babies whimper and grow weak from hunger in the arms of haggard mothers, that men and women stagger and fall from lack of nourishment.

The bread and meat and milk and cheese and eggs we place in the outstretched hands of these neighbors on the brink of despair, becomes truly a part of the Holy Sacrament. From these whose grief is so great they can no longer weep comes a murmur: "Still there is a God in Heaven!"

Do not be ashamed to utter a prayer as you plant the seed, and thank God for the rich soil of the prairies, and the right to protect its freedom.

This year we produce food for humanity.

Stabilization of Farm Wages

REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure every Member is interested in the stabilization order issued last night by the President, but the significant thing to the producers of this Nation is the fact that it does not cover any stabilization of farm wages. As we all know, the President and Mr. Byrnes have vigorously opposed the inclusion of farm wages in the price the farmer receives for his commodity. It seems to me it would be eminently unfair to the producer, and I do not see how the producer can continue to operate if he is not permitted to include farm wages in his price and if there is no limitation placed upon farm wages.

As many of you know, farm wages have risen rapidly during the last several months. In some sections they are now entirely out of reason. I am quite sure that every Member of the House will appreciate the importance of this omission and join me in the hope that something will be promptly done either to permit the producer to include the increased farm wage in his price or else stabilize farm wages. It would be most unfair to freeze prices and not freeze the cost of production.

I invite your consideration of the President's statement and order, which are as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER ON INFLATION

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, and particularly by the First War Powers Act, 1941, and the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes," as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and in order to safeguard the stabilization of prices, wages, and salaries, affecting the cost of living on the basis of levels existing on September 15, 1942, as authorized and directed by said act of Congress of October 2, 1942, and Executive Order No. 9250 of October 3, 1942, and to prevent increases in wages, salaries, prices, and profits, which, however justifiable if viewed apart from their effect upon the economy, tend to undermine the basis of stabilization, and to provide such regulations with respect to the control of price, wage, and salary increases as are necessary to maintain stabilization, it is hereby ordered as follows:

1. In the case of agricultural commodities the Price Administrator and the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution (hereinafter referred to as the Food Administrator) are directed, and in the case of other commodities the Price Administrator is directed, to take immediate steps to place ceiling prices on all commodities affecting the cost of living.

Each of them is directed to authorize no further increases in ceiling prices except to the minimum extent required by law. Each of them is further directed immediately to use all discretionary powers vested in them by law to prevent further price increases direct or indirect, to prevent profiteering and to reduce prices which are excessively high, unfair or inequitable.

Nothing herein, however, shall be construed to prevent the Food Administrator and the Price Administrator, subject to the general policy directives of the Economic Stabilization Director, from making such readjustments in price relationships appropriate for various commodities, or classes, qualities, or grades thereof, or for seasonal variations or for various marketing areas, or from authorizing such support prices, subsidies or other inducements as may be authorized by law and deemed necessary to maintain or increase production, provided that such actions do not increase the cost of living.

The power, functions, and duties conferred on the Secretary of Agriculture under section 3 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (Public Law 421, 77th Cong.) and under section 3 of the act of October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.) are hereby transferred to, and shall be exercised by the Food Administrator.

SOME EXCEPTIONS ARE MADE

2. The National War Labor Board, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and other agencies exercising authority conferred by Executive Order No. 9250 or Executive Order 9299 and the regulations issued pursuant thereto over wage or salary increases, are directed to authorize no further increase in wages or salaries except such as are clearly necessary to correct substandards of living, provided that nothing herein shall be construed to prevent such agencies from making such wage or salary readjustments as may be deemed appropriate and may not have heretofore been made to compensate, in accordance with the Little Steel formula as heretofore defined by the National War Labor Board, for the rise in the cost of living between January 1, 1941, and May 1, 1942.

Nor shall anything herein be construed to prevent such agencies, subject to the general policies and directives of the Economic Stabilization Director, from authorizing reasonable adjustments of wages and salaries in case of promotions, reclassifications, merit increases, incentive wages, or the like, provided that such adjustments do not increase the level of production costs appreciably or furnish the basis either to increase prices or to resist otherwise justifiable reductions in prices.

3. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is authorized to forbid the employment by any employer of any new employee or the acceptance of employment by a new employee except as authorized in accordance with regulations which may be issued by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, with the approval of the Economic Stabilization Director, for the purpose of preventing such employment at a wage or salary higher than that received by such new employee in his last employment unless the change of employment would aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

4. The attention of all agencies of the Federal Government, and of all State and municipal authorities, concerned with the rates of common carriers or other public utilities, is directed to the stabilization program of which this order is a part so that rate increases will be disapproved and rate reductions effected, consistently with the act of October 2, 1942, and other applicable Federal, State, or municipal law, in order to keep down the cost of living and effectuate the purposes of the stabilization program.

5. To provide for the consistent administration of this order and Executive Order No. 9250, and other orders and regulations of similar import and for the effectuation of the purposes of the act of October 2, 1942, the Economic Stabilization Director is authorized to exercise all powers and duties conferred upon the President by that act, and the Economic Stabilization Director is authorized and directed to take such action and to issue such directives under the authority of that act as he deems necessary to stablize the national economy, to maintain and increase production, and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

Except insofar as they are inconsistent with this order or except insofar as the Director shall otherwise direct, powers and duties conferred upon the President by the said act and heretofore devolved upon agencies or persons other than the Director shall continue to be exercised and performed by such agencies and persons.

6. Except insofar as they are inconsistent with this order, Executive Order No. 9250 and the regulations issued pursuant thereto shall remain in full force and effect. Some prices affecting the cost of living are already above the levels of September 15, 1942. All of these cannot be rolled back. But some of these can and should be rolled back. The order directs the reduction of all prices which are excessively high, inequitable, or unfair. The Stabilization Act was not intended to be used as a shield to protect prices which were excessively high on September 15, 1942.

On the wage front the directions in the order are equally clear and specific.

There are to be no further increases in wage rates or salary scales beyond the Little Steel formula, except where clearly necessary to correct substandards of living. Reclassifications and promotions must not be permitted to affect the general level of production costs or to justify price increases or to forestall price reductions.

The order also makes clear the authority of the chairman of the War Manpower Commission to forbid the employment by an employer of any new employee except in accordance with regulations of the chairman, the purpose being to prevent such employment at a higher wage or salary than that received by the employee in his last employment unless the change of employment will aid in the prosecution of the war.

It further calls the attention of all agencies of the Federal Government and of State and municipal authorities concerned with the rates of common carriers and public utilities to the stabilization program in the hope that rate increases will be disapproved and rate reductions ordered so far as may be consistent with Federal and State laws.

For some time it has been apparent that this action must be taken because of the continued pressure for increased wages and increased prices. I have heretofore refrained from acting because of the contention of the supporters of the Bankhead bill that under the act of October 2, 1942, I had no authority to place ceiling prices on certain commodities at existing levels. My views on that question were set forth in my message of April 2 vetoing the Bankhead bill.

The Senate did not vote upon the question of passing the bill over the veto. Its author moved to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture, stating that there were not sufficient votes to override the veto.

HISTORY OF CONGRESS IS CITED

I am advised that weeks or months from this date the bill may be reported for consideration. I am also advised that in the history of Congress no bill vetoed by a President and recommitted to a committee has ever become law.

I cannot wait to see whether the committee at some future date will again report the bill to the Senate. I cannot permit a continuance of the upward spiral of prices.

TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S ANTI-INFLATION STATEMENT

The Executive order I have signed today is a hold-the-line order.

To hold the line we cannot tolerate further increases in prices affecting the cost of living or further increases in general wage or salary rates except where clearly necessary to correct substandard living conditions. The only way to hold the line is to stop trying to find justifications for not holding it here or not holding it there.

CAN'T TAKE CHANCES

No one straw may break a camel's back, but there is always a last straw. We cannot afford to take further chances in relaxing the line. We already have taken too many.

On the price front the directions in the order are clear and specific.

All items affecting the cost of living are to be brought under control. No further price increases are to be sanctioned unless imperatively required by law Adjustments in the price relationships between different commodities will be permitted if such adjustments can be made without increasing the general cost of living. But any further inducements to maintain or increase production must not be allowed to disturb the present price levels; such further inducements, whether they take the form of support prices or subsidies, must not be allowed to increase prices to consumers. Of course, the extent to which subsidies and other payments may be used to help keep down the cost of living will depend on congressional authorization.

WILL CUT SOME PRICES

Some prices affecting the cost of living are already above the levels of September 15, 1942. All of these cannot be rolled back. But some of these can and should be rolled back. The order directs the reduction of all prices which are excessively high, inequitable, or unfair. The Stabilization Act was not intended to be used as a shield to protect prices which were excessively high on September 15, 1942.

On the wage front the directions in the order are equally clear and specific.

There are to be no further increases in wage rates or salaries scales beyond the Little Steel formula, except where clearly necessary to correct substandards of living. Reclassifications and promotions must not be permitted to affect the general level of production costs or to justify price increases or to forestall price reductions.

The order also makes clear the authority of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to forbid the employment by any employer of any new employee except in accordance with regulations of the Chairman, the purpose being to prevent such employment at a higher wage or salary than that received by the employee in his last employment unless the change of employment will aid in the prosecution of the war.

It further calls the attention of all agencies of the Federal Government and of State and municipal authorities concerned with the rates of common carriers and public utilities to the stabilization program in the hope that rate increases will be disapproved and rate reductions ordered so far as may be consistent with Federal and State laws.

For some time it has been apparent that this action must be taken because of the continued pressure for increased wages and increased prices. I have heretofore refrained from acting because of the contention of the supporters of the Bankhead bill that under the act of October 2, 1942, I had no authority to place ceiling prices on certain commodities at existing levels. My views on that question were set forth in my message of April 2, vetoing the Bankhead bill.

CANNOT WAIT

The Senate did not vote upon the question of passing the bill over the veto. Its author moved to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture, stating that there were not sufficient votes to override the veto.

I am advised that weeks or months from this date the bill may be reported for consideration. I am also advised that in the history of Congress no bill vetoed by a President and recommitted to a committee has ever become law.

I cannot wait to see whether the committee at some future date will again report the bill to the Senate. I cannot permit a continuance of the upward spiral of prices.

Some groups have been urging increased prices for farmers on the ground that wage earners have unduly profited. Other groups have been urging increased prices on the ground that farmers have unduly profited. A continuance of this conflict will not only cause inflation but will breed disunity at a time when unity is essential.

Under the act of October 2, 1942, Congress directed that, so far as is practical, wages, salaries, and prices should be stabilized as of the level of September 15. Under that direction inflation has been slowed up. Now we must stop it.

MUST STOP INFLATION

We cannot stop inflation solely by wage and price ceilings. We cannot stop it solely by rationing. To complete the job Congress must act to reduce and hold in check the excess purchasing power We must be prepared to tax ourselves more—to spend less and save more. The details of new fiscal legislation must be worked out by the appropriate committees of the House and of the Senate. The executive departments stand ready to submit suggestions whenever the committees desire.

I am exerting every power I possess to preserve our stabilization program.

I am sure the Congress will cooperate.

War Correspondents' Medal

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I beg your indulgence for this brief minute in order that I may solicit special interest in a bill I have introduced today to provide for the awarding of a medal to war correspondents who, while serving with our armed forces, are wounded, or physically injured, or distinguish themselves by conspicuous service involving actual combat with an enemy of the United States.

In many respects these men who file their dispatches from battle fronts, giving us the daily news of the progress of our armed forces, are unsung and unheralded heroes. I hardly need speak of their courage and perseverance, oftimes their gallantry, which makes it possible for us to learn from day to day and week to week, in words and in pictures, the revealing details of the fighting of our boys on land, on ships at sea and in the air. While I cannot attest to the completeness of the figures, it is my information that 3 war correspondents have been killed, 13 have been disabled, and 30 are reported missing.

The average war correspondent does not sit comfortably in a bombproof shelter during an air raid; he does not stand at a safe distance on a hillside overlooking a battlefield; he does not wait in port for a naval task force to return; he does not loaf at the air field until the bombers land from a raid. On the contrary, he allows himself to experience bombings, artillery barrages, and machine-gun fire. He makes trips with the aircraft carriers, on the cruisers, and on the destroyers. He flies from time to time in the bombers on raids over France and Germany. While not a component part of the armed forces, he experiences and suffers what our fighting men experience and suffer. These experiences he translates into words and pictures that we here at home may better understand that which is taking place with our armed forces in all parts of this war-torn world.

Great stories of battles on land, at sea, and in the air have already been written. I need not speak of the contribution these stories—actual experiences and eye-witness accounts—have made to the morale of the American people, to the will and determination of the American people to sacrifice and to see this thing through to complete victory, whatever the costs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the war correspondents are entitled to national recognition for the sacrifices they make, the hardships they endure, and the risks they take. To this end I have today introduced this bill for a medal award. I hope it will receive early action.

Two New Jersey Families Send Sixth Sons Off to the War

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PARNELL THOMAS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I take this time of the House of Representatives to offer our congratulations to two families of Allendale, N. J., each of which has just given its sixth son to the service of the United States. My home town of Allendale is very proud

of the Fitzpatrick and Caputi families, and their many brave sons. We are a small town but a typical American community and today, as never before, Allendale typifies America's resolve to crush the Axis enemies with the most powerful military force in the world's history. Mr. and Mrs. Louis Caputi and Mr. and Mrs. Thomas A. Fitzpatrick, of Allendale, are in the vanguard of America's might.

I can best describe the pride which we in Allendale have for these two families, by inserting at this point in the RECORD an article which appeared in today's New York Herald Tribune, entitled "Two New Jersey Families Send Sixth Sons Off to the War":

TWO NEW JERSEY FAMILIES SEND SIXTH SONS OFF TO THE WAR—ALLENDALE COUPLES SEE LAST AVAILABLE BOYS INDUCTED WITH SPECIAL CEREMONY

RAMSEY, N. J., April 8.—Edward P. Fitzpatrick, 19 years old, and Alfred P. Caputi, 18 years old, the sixth and last available sons of their families, today were inducted into the fighting forces at a special ceremony held by Selective Service Board No. 1, in East Main Street.

It left Thomas A. Fitzpatrick, a 58-year-old house painter, of 157 Park Avenue, Allendale, and his wife, Mrs. Mary Callaghan Fitzpatrick, without any family in civilian life.

Louis Caputi, a 56-year-old yard conductor for the Erie Railroad, and his wife, Mrs. Rose Marie Laviano Caputi, of West Crescent Avenue, Allendale, were a little better off. They still have two daughters, and an 8-year-old son, Robert V. Caputi, to comfort them about their hearth. Charlotte Caputi, a third daughter, now in training at North Adams Hospital, North Adams, Mass., however, is talking about joining the Navy Nurse Corps.

"TWIN-SIX INDUCTION"

Maj. Charles V. Bacon, of Mahwah, chairman of Board No. 1, called the ceremony a "twin-six induction." A World War veteran, he praised the families for contributing 12 men to the fighting forces.

"These families, in doing this," he said to a crowd of 300 persons who gathered before the board's headquarters, "illustrate to us, not only the necessity of men for the armed forces, but how necessary it is for each and everyone to make an individual sacrifice for the winning of the war."

Mrs. Fitzpatrick said later she was too wrought up to speak and merely acknowledged Major Bacon's introduction to the crowd. Her husband rose and wished the group of 27 recruits well. Mr. Caputi expressed the same sentiments.

The Fitzpatricks have made some radical changes in their living. Most prominent was a six-point service star which Mrs. Fitzpatrick hung in the window. She first bought one with five stars, but had to order a special one, in the shape of a double "V" with Edward's leaving. The Fitzpatrick dining table, large enough for eight, has been taken to the cellar and replaced by one ample enough for two.

"THEY ALL WANTED TO GO"

"I feel bad about their going, but I never would have stood in their way," Mrs. Fitzpatrick said. "They all wanted to go and all tried hard to go. All the boys lived at home and contributed to keeping up the house." The modest home is almost surrounded by hemlock trees and rhododendron bushes.

Mrs. Caputi wondered yesterday whether she could get a job at the Wright Aeronautical Corporation plant in Paterson. She just returned from there after arriving too late to apply for a job.

"I'm undecided about what to do," she said. "I went to Wright's, but the application window was closed. Do you think I could do war work? I am only 54 years old. I wonder if they would take me."

Both mothers said they heard frequently from their sons, none of whom has yet left America. Both said they have learned a good deal about the regions of North America by perusing the mail of their sons. Each also has one son in the Navy.

MOTHER CALLS THE ROLL

Mrs. Fitzpatrick listed her sons in the order of their induction as Lt. John P. Fitzpatrick, 30 years old; Pvt. (1st cl.) James A., 27; Pvt. Michael F., 25; Corp. Thomas A., Jr., 23; Mark J., naval fireman first class, 21; and, today, Edward.

The Caputi sons, besides Alfred, are Joseph V. Caputi, 27; Technical Sgt. Thomas, 33; Louis, Jr., 26, Navy yeoman, first class; Pvt. Eugene, 19 and Pvt. (1st cl.) Cito, 31.

Louis Caputi, Jr., had the most education of the dozen men, having graduated from Rider College, Trenton, N. J., in 1939. Pvt. James Fitzpatrick, on the other hand, has traveled farthest. He is stationed in Canada at work on the Alcan Highway. The others are in camps from California to Florida.

After the war, there will be a hot time in Allendale when the Fitzpatricks and the Caputis come home.

Speech by Anthony Eden in House of Commons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6), 1943

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, pursuant to the permission granted me today, I present for publication in the RECORD the speech delivered yesterday in the House of Commons by Mr. Anthony Eden, British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

The speech is as follows:

I take this opportunity to make to the House a brief report of the visit I have recently made to the United States at the invitation of the United States Government and to Canada on the invitation of the Canadian Government.

I need hardly tell the House I was most glad to accept both these invitations. More than a year ago it fell to my lot to pay a visit to Moscow, where I had conversations on political questions, both present and future, with Mr. Stalin and Mr. Molotov. I, therefore, welcomed all the more cordially this opportunity for similar discussions with the United States.

The House may have noticed that terms of the communique issued on my arrival here were very wide. I can assure the House the discussions were equally wide in scope. And I can assure them of the cordiality shown by every one in the United States and Canada to their British visitors. The President himself was very liberal in the time he gave to me. I had repeated conferences with him, both alone and in company with his advisers.

I was during the latter part of my stay in Washington the guest of the White House. Mr. Cordell Hull equally extended me the most generous welcome and instructed his department to place itself entirely at the disposal of myself and my colleagues at the Foreign Office—a gesture which we deeply appreciated and of which we made the fullest use.

I think perhaps it would be appropriate if I were to tell the House at this point that, with the full approval of the Prime Minister, I extended while I was in Washington an invitation to Mr. Cordell Hull to come pay us a visit in this country any time it is convenient to him during the course of this summer. I am sure the House will indorse me when I say that if he does find it possible to come, he will be given the most cordial welcome, both on his own account and on account of the great country he represents.

I also had the advantage of meeting Vice President WALLACE and, I think, every member of the Cabinet of the United States.

TALKS ON FOREIGN POLICY

But there was one particular opportunity I had of which I must give a special account to this House because it was of parliamentary character. Thanks to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, Mr. CONNALLY, and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives, Mr. SOL BLOOM, I was able to have informal discussions with members of two committees drawn from both parties in the two Houses of Congress. The House is aware of the important part these committees play in the national life and politics in the United States. That, for me, was a most valuable experience. We exchanged views very freely, off the record. It was to me a very great advantage and, I hope, it was perhaps just a little bit to theirs, too. The exchanges were frank and ranged over every topic and every view.

During a brief interval at the week end I spent a little time in New York, where I was able to meet other prominent political figures, such as Mr. Hoover, Mr. LaGuardia, and Mr. Willkie, and also many writers of the press and commentators on the air, for whose courtesy to me I must express my thanks. Thus, I think the House will see I had a pretty wide opportunity of gaging and trying to understand the trend of opinion in the United States at this time.

The conversations upon which I was engaged fall primarily under three chapter headings. First, what I may call operational matters—that is to say, immediate questions concerned with the conduct of the war of a type of character which normally do not fall under the aegis of the Foreign Office.

Those were type questions which arise always in time of war among allies engaged in a common struggle. A visit by a member of the war cabinet provides the opportunity to regulate or to make progress with them. These questions, quite evidently, are not such as I can discuss at the present time. I can only say on these subjects that both of us—and I think the Prime Minister—were satisfied with the progress made.

COOPERATION IN POLITICAL SPHERE

The second chapter heading was the question of political cooperation between us in connection with actual military operations that have taken place or will take place. It is obvious that as the war progresses it becomes more and more important that there should be close coordination in the political sphere as in the military sphere, and in some respects may I say that this is more difficult to obtain, because you may be faced with political developments as a result of military action which no man can foresee. It remains too, that, if we can get this close political coordination and if we have close understanding, at least we are better able to stand the strain and stresses that will in-

evitably arise as military campaigns progress. That is what we sought to do.

I would like to give the House just one example of difficulties. I take north Africa. There is no doubt it is felt in the United States that there has been some misunderstanding in this country of the purpose the United States administration had in mind in maintaining relations with Vichy. I can assure the House that their motives for doing that were not special tenderness for Vichy, but because they thought, and we agreed with them, that by maintaining relations with Vichy it was possible to keep open a useful window on Europe which must otherwise have been shut, and I have no doubt that we were right and they were right. It was only through maintenance of those relations that the American Government was able to place a considerable number of agents in north Africa, who were quite valuable in opening a way for allied troops. Otherwise, that would have been impossible.

It was quite clear to me that many in the United States felt we have not understood the motives for their action and that we attributed them to tenderness for Vichy, Petain, and Laval or the rest of them, which they had not felt. I mentioned that just to show it is a kind of topic which should be talked out between two countries.

AGREEMENT ON FRANCE

At any rate, we did talk it out and I am satisfied as regards the future policy toward France that there is complete agreement between us. We and the United States have only one desire—to see all sectors of France prepared to fight the common enemy united together.

We examined our common policy in respect of Spain, Portugal, Turkey and other remaining neutrals in Europe and agreed on our policy in all respects in regard to those countries.

We examined conditions in other parts of Europe, both in enemy Europe and in enemy-occupied countries. We agreed that our common policy would be strengthened by the freest exchange of our knowledge of what was going on in those countries and our interpretation of the information that came to us, and we have certain plans which are being elaborated in form in trying to improve the exchange of information between us on those heads.

As regards the occupied countries there is only one policy which we and the United States are pursuing: To do all in our power to restore them their full liberty at the earliest possible moment.

I come to the third chapter. It covers a wide range of questions, including practical problems which will arise on the surrender of the enemy, a task that will face the United States Government, and other governments of the United Nations, to safeguard the world against further aggression.

As the President made plain in his public statement on all these topics, we found a very close similiarity in outlook. Admittedly, these exchanges were exploratory in character and committed neither the American Government nor ourselves, nor could they do so because other governments have to be consulted and exchanges take place. The last thing we wanted was to bind our allies to hard and fast rules. That was never in our minds

I do come back greatly encouraged by the large measure of general agreement which we found and I am certain it will be of great value to us in further exchanges we will have both with the United States and with other governments who are our allies.

SOLIDARITY TO PRESERVE PEACE

Perhaps I may be allowed here one observation on the nature of our relations generally with the Government and people of the United States. I think it is a mistake to try to base these relations mainly upon sentiment. We may not always like each other very much, I think it is a mistake to try to base them on common origins, common parentage, even common language, because there will be occasions when we differ from one another and I think it is desirable to base them on their true foundation, which is a common interest in the maintenance of world peace and in preventing a repetition of these catastrophic world conflicts every 20 years.

If we keep to that foundation we shall be less in danger of the ups and downs that we have sometimes seen in Anglo-American relations. I believe that definition to be true, profoundly true, and well understood on both sides of the Atlantic at the present time. We here recognize the need of some authority to insure by force that neither Germany, Italy, nor Japan shall be able to repeat their aggression. I believe the American people to share that view, and if it is to be effective then all peace-loving nations have to contribute their part, too.

In the last 30 years we have spent 8 of them in this country at war with Germany, and no one can yet say when will be the end of the present struggle. Therefore, I reported to the United States that if I could judge the temper of the people here aright, there was no disposition when war is over to trust luck and hope best. I have found exactly the same in the United States, and therefore I say that while it would be the height of unwisdom to cease to concentrate our thought and effort on the main task of winning the war, and that while it would be a mistake to distract ourselves with many prolonged public debates of post-war problems, at the same time it is necessary that the governments of countries concerned shall begin now to make certain preparation so they will not be completely unready when the moment comes.

It seems to me that aim was well expressed by Mr. Sumner Welles a little time ago when he said: "We cannot afford to permit basic issues by which destiny and humanity will be determined to be resolved without prior agreement by a group of harassed statesmen working against time." Our conversations in Washington were intended to guard against just that tendency. They constitute a beginning. A start has been made in the best tradition and I claim no more for them than that they will be followed up.

CITES MARYLAND RESOLUTION

The chief public occasion which it fell my lot to attend in the United States was a joint session of the two Houses of the Legislature of Maryland. After my speech that historic senate and house of the legislature were good enough to pass a resolution in the most generous terms to the people of this country. The resolution states:

"Be it resolved by the House and Delegates of Maryland in solemn assembly gathered, That it hereby formally registers for itself and for the citizens of Maryland it represents its deep respect for the impressive battle given by our valiant Britannic ally in its mortal conflict—a respect formally based on the known qualities of the British people, their incomparable resolution in the cause which they and we deem to be right, their refusal to admit defeat even in their darkest hour, their phenomenal energy, their astonishing self-discipline, their noble effort to cling to the path of honor—in a word, on all those traits by which a people comes to be known and is greatly admired accordingly."

I think this is a very generous message. I wish the time were allowed me to read others.

For 2 or 3 days I was fortunate enough to go down into the deep South in the company of General Marshall, much esteemed Chief of Staff of the American forces, and there I saw a very large number of camps, containing most of them tens of thousands of airmen and soldiers.

I was deeply impressed by what I saw and with the spirit of these young men. Their equipment and accommodation, of course, was first class—that one expects of the United States—and it was a pleasing experience to see Sherman tanks firing even if it was only at bits of wood.

What was remarkable was the spirit of these men. I am convinced that nowhere in the world is there a finer reservoir of first-class material than among those troops and airmen of the United States.

One final experience. For a day I was able to see something of the American naval forces, and also their bases, in company of an old valued friend of Anglo-American relations, Mr. Knox, and there I had an experience which was especially stimulating, which was to see one of our greatest battleships which was being repaired in American yards now almost completed; to see her crew and learn from them at first hand how splendid during their many months had their relations and friendship been with their comrades in the United States, which should be of immense value in the future, both here and in America in promoting understanding between our two services.

SEES UNITED STATES AS STAUNCH ALLY

My closing impression of the United States was one of a young and vigorous people wholeheartedly in the struggle and determined to work together with the other United Nations in war and in peace.

Now I want to travel to Canada, where I spent 3 days in Ottawa at the invitation of the Prime Minister. They were very crowded days. I had the opportunity of meeting those responsible for Canada's truly amazing war effort. I had two meetings with the war committee, which corresponds roughly to our Cabinet here at home. I told them of my talks in Washington and we exchanged views on many matters of common interest between us.

Then I addressed a joint session of the Canadian Parliament, members of the senate and members of the house of commons, and there, I regret, I have to report that unwittingly I committed a gross breach of censorship rules. I informed the Canadian Parliament that we now are meeting at another place, but I did go on to assure them we were doing so in excellent spirits, despite action of the enemy and the august nature of our new surroundings.

I would like once again here to say that we should pay our tribute to Canada's record of achievement. I came away with the impression of a great people, steadfast and loyal in struggle, proud to be a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations and proud, too, of its splendid loyalty in our darkest hour.

MESSAGE FROM CANADA

I am the bearer of a message of good will from the Canadian Parliament which I would like to read to the House. It was voiced in the concluding words of the Prime Minister.

"In conclusion, Mr. Eden," said Mr. Mackenzie King, "may I ask you on your return to Britain if you will take with you the most loyal greetings and expressions of devotion of His Majesty's Canadian subjects to the King and Queen?

"Will you also take with you the warmest best wishes to the Prime Minister of Great Britain? Tell Mr. Churchill how relieved we all are at his splendid recovery after the unfortunate indisposition suffered on his return from north Africa. Tell him we all hope he will continue to the end to enjoy the vision, wisdom, and endurance he has manifested from the beginning of his conduct of affairs in this war, and tell him and tell all the people of Britain that Canada's heart and soul are with them in this struggle and will

continue so to remain until the fight itself is ended and victory and peace are achieved."

In my time it has fallen my lot to visit many foreign capitals on a variety of missions. It always is difficult to assess the value of such meeting. There always are imponderable and incalculable factors which it is difficult to estimate at the time. I can only say sincerely to the House that I feel convinced myself that no mission with which I have ever been charged has been so fundamentally worth while as this. I have come back, I say frankly, with a different view of the sentiments of the United States toward both this struggle and the post-war period. I believe the opportunities that are opening for us, great as the difficulties, are wider in scope than I thought possible.

If as a result of these conversations to a small extent I have been able to make a contribution to Anglo-American relations, I will feel that nothing could have been more worth while.

The Old King Does Its Part

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial carried in the Columbia State paper, Columbia, S. C., entitled "The Old King Does Its Part."

Cotton is the major crop in the South, has been for many years, and I hope will continue to hold the position of importance, not only because our people love to produce this white, fleecy staple, but because it has meant so much in the past to our people as a whole as well as to other countries that we have been furnishing, from year to year, millions of bales.

This article sets forth the importance of cotton in connection with our war efforts, and I am sure will be read with a great deal of interest by Congressmen and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE OLD KING DOES ITS PART

America's No. 1 war crop.

That is the title of a pamphlet that has just reached the office of the State.

What is the No. 1 war crop?

The answer is cotton.

Cotton is food.

Cotton is feed.

Cotton is fighting equipment.

The three "f's" combating for freedom.

Peacetime thinking, it is pointed out, is still being applied to a commodity which is second only to steel as the most vital material of war.

Cotton to most Americans is synonymous with cotton fiber, says the National Cotton Council in its presentation of the case of the fleecy staple. Few realize that with each 500-pound bale of fiber there are produced 900 pounds of cottonseed, from which are secured:

One hundred and forty pounds of high grade vegetable oil for food.

Four hundred pounds of protein meal and cake for livestock.

Two hundred and forty pounds of hulls for livestock roughage and chemical uses.

Eighty-one pounds of linters for smokeless powder, plastics, and numerous other essential products.

Let's break those 1,400 pounds down in a different way.

The booklet illustrates the point by a horse drawing a wagon filled with the unginned product. Supporting it on one side is the 500-pound bale; on the other the cottonseed pile of 900 pounds.

What war necessities, we then ask, come from the fiber?

Fabrics for land, sea, and air forces; industrial fabrics for war plants; fabrics for Allies for lend-lease; bags, work clothes, hospital goods and civilian fabrics.

And from the seed?

Oil for food, meal for feed, hulls for feed, linters for ammunition and chemical products.

Let's produce some pertinent facts as set forth in this booklet.

Of the total United States output of edible vegetable oils in 1942 almost half, or 48 percent, came from cottonseed. The cotton oil production last year was equal to the total fat requirements of the Army, Navy, and 18,000,000 civilians. As shortening, cottonseed oil can supply all cooking fats for an Army of 7,500,000, a Navy of 1,500,000, and civilians up to 42,000,000. As margarine, cottonseed can supply all table fats for an Army of 7,500,000, a Navy of 1,500,000, and civilians up to 72,000,000.

Thirty-two percent of the total United States production of protein feed meals last year came from cottonseed. The crop yielded essential protein for 6,829,000 dairy cows producing 14,000,000,000 quarts of milk or essential protein for fattening 11,000,000 beef cattle producing 2,000,000,000 pounds of beef and 1,000,000 tons of cottonseed hulls for roughage.

Cotton linters are fighting equipment.

One hundred percent of the total United States production of linters is under priority orders. Cottonseed linters are the only acceptable raw material for many of war's essential chemical products. The largest of all war uses for them is smokeless powder. They protect infantrymen and artillery positions by leaving no tell-tale target of smoke to draw and direct enemy fire; they remain the preferred source of cellulose for munitions.

One bale of linters provides smokeless powder for 20,440 rounds of machine-gun ammunition, 2,737 rounds of pom pom ammunition, 100,000 rounds of rifle ammunition, 85 rounds of heavy tank ammunition.

And far from being confined largely to powder manufacture as in World War No. 1, cotton linters today are an integral part of war equipment which varies from nonbreakable glass to the pyroxylin coating for raincoats, from bomber noses to synthetic yarns and fabrics.

From cotton linters come plastics for war plane windows and noses, cockpit enclosures, cargo and flare chutes, high-tenacity rayon, X-ray and photographic films, fabric coatings, plastic replacements for metal and many other war products.

Cotton fabrics are fighting equipment. More than 80 percent of them are under priority restrictions.

As the very convincing argument of the Cotton Council says "no tank runs, no ship sails, no plane flies without cotton as a part of its equipment or structure." More than 11,000 cotton items appear on the procurements lists of the United States Quartermaster Corps, from shorts to ski suits, from mosquito bars to heaviest tarpaulins."

To our mind facts about cotton substantiate the claim that it is America's No. 1 war crop—that it meets more vital needs than any other.

And yet sometimes we of the South get restless and scorn the old king.

These Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by George E. Sokolsky from the New York Sun of April 1, 1943:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

THROWN TO THE DOGS

Apparently the smart boys of the New Deal have become a liability to Mr. Roosevelt. Hitherto they have been a liability only to the American people, but as long as Mr. Roosevelt covered up their deficiencies by the charm of his personality and the exaltation of his promise, the little lawyers from Harvard were free to make the Government of the United States their playground. They romped through statistics with song and dance; unfortunately their curves and dots and dashes do not provide the cities with food or the farmers with the means of producing food. They may have known how many cattle there ought to be in the United States, but few of them ever saw any other cow than Elsie. And when an American sees his wife battling to get a couple of points but no chow, he sees red—and I am not referring to Communists—but the kind of red that flows from somebody's nose after contact with an irate citizen.

So the hepcats of the New Deal are no longer indispensable. They are to be drafted into the Army. They are to be allowed to do K. P. so that they might know that a spud is not a cooked concoction that goes along with a sirloin but is something that grows in the ground and requires the attention of someone who knows how.

There seems to be great rejoicing on the Rialto that these youthful minds are being thrown to the dogs. I do not rejoice. I see in it the usual folly of the human heart.

"Had I but served my God with half the zeal
I served my king, he would not in mine age
Have left me naked to mine enemies."

And they were so young. Fresh out of college, they were projected into positions of tremendous importance. All the pet ideas and ancient foibles repeated endlessly by professors, who often read so much that they can only think a little, were the things with which these young votaries of perfection played as though with toys—and now we are short of the essentials of life. Are they to blame? No more than my little girl who, not having yet reached 3, must learn to walk sturdily and straight before she becomes a ballerina.

For 10 long years the American people have seen these boys take apart what they could not learn to put together again. They nearly wrecked industry to see how it works and they might have succeeded—not in learning but in wrecking—but for the natural resistance of those who, having builded great structures of production, fought to save them. They impaired industrial relations almost beyond repair. They wrecked our agriculture so that we are short of food.

They have piled upon us a staggering debt and a burdensome tax to implement the aberrations of John Maynard Keynes and his followers, which may be summarized in the single phrase that the more a Government spends the better off a people is. If that fellow Keynes had been around these

parts on March 15 he might have discovered in what language an American thinks of that kind of twisted logic. And now he has a scheme for taking our money away from us and turning it into something called "bancor." Maybe that is a new kind of bingo.

No; don't blame the nice little boys who got jobs in Washington through the employment committees of Harvard and Yale. They needed the jobs. The pay was good. The atmosphere congenial. The opportunities for fun unlimited. Who would not become the master of the destinies of millions of people in his middle twenties? At 60, of course, a man is careful, but at 25 the sky is the limit, particularly for the bright boys who knew exactly those answers that the professors wanted to hear.

Don't blame them. Blame those who employed these little fellows. Blame him who lets such men as Bernard Baruch and Herbert Hoover sit about and occasionally point the way, while David Ginsburg and Stacy May rule a nation. Blame him who constitutionally is responsible for all that has happened in his administration.

Whose Crimes Are Greater?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the past year there have been many mistakes made by the great industrialists, as well as the members of organized labor. At this time when we are considering the so-called Anti-Racketeering Act, H. R. 653, and when we are having isolated instances of labor's mistakes magnified a thousand times beyond their true proportion, in order to justify punitive legislation against all the members of American labor unions, I believe it wise to spread upon the RECORD some of the tremendous mistakes of the members of the National Association of Manufacturers.

The great industrialists whose crimes against society far exceed the petty-larceny acts of dues extortion, by union men, and so forth.

The effects of these crimes against society in terms of the extortion of American dollars and of American lives lost, far exceed the petty acts of union men, that are given as the excuse for this legislation.

These crimes against the American people are well authenticated. They are based on investigations by the senatorial committees of Senator O'MAHONEY of Wyoming, Senator TRUMAN of Missouri, and actual prosecutions by the Department of Justice. They are taken from sworn testimony and admissions wrung from the unwilling lips of the perpetrators of these gigantic and fraudulent acts.

The Attorney General's Department challenged the monopolistic production of synthetic quinine by the Winthrop Chemical Co., of Delaware, 50 percent of whose stock was controlled by the I. G. Farbenindustrie, of Germany.

The Department of Justice was not satisfied with the production of synthetic quinine because of monopolistic, price-maintaining procedures of the companies involved. If you remember, there were 20,000 cases of malaria on Bataan and Corregidor because of the quinine shortage.

On September 8, 1942, Lindsay Morrison, Chief of the Refrigerator Section of the War Production Board and former executive of the great General Electric Co., announced the release of 100,000 refrigerators to the public. These refrigerators, containing 150,000,000 pounds of high-grade steel, aluminum, and other critical materials, were manufactured during the time this company was supposed to be converting their plant to the manufacture of war supplies.

How many American soldiers died because of this diversion of war material?

On March 9, 1942, Senator Bunker, of Nevada, exposed the Basic Magnesium Co., of Cleveland. With an original investment of $50,000 and a loan of $63,000,000 from the Treasury of the United States, with amortization privileges, of course, they stand to make a profit of 4,280 percent on their investment.

Would that come under the heading of legitimate profit or legalized extortion?

Senator Bunker said:

> The fraud that is being perpetrated is a betrayal of the President and the American people.

On April 16, 1942, General Electric, by virtue of a patent-pooling arrangement with Krupp, of Germany, exercised a monopolistic restriction and control of American use and production of tungsten carbide. These practices contributed to the unpreparedness of American machine-tool industry in the production of war materials. Machine tools make the weapons of war; therefore, any restriction of tungsten carbide was a brake on the war effort.

On April 20, 1942, the War Production Board charged the Carnegie-Illinois Steel and the Jones-Laughlin Steel Corporation with repeated, deliberate violations of priorities regulations, including diversion of iron and steel to private customers at the "expense of and the needs of the armed forces and the Maritime Commission." These offenses extended until 4 months after Pearl Harbor. Profits again were more sacred than patriotism.

On April 2, 1942, the great Standard Oil-I. G. Farbenindustrie exposure hit the press of the Nation, and again Senator TRUMAN'S committee exposed in all its ugly nakedness the greed for profits on synthetic rubber and high-octane gasoline patent rights that was superior to the officers of these companies, to the needs of American civilians and the members of the armed forces. A page could be written on this abominable marriage of convenience with the great Nazi chemical cartel by one of America's greatest corporations. The fact that they signed a consent decree and paid a tremendous fine is enough to condemn them in the eyes of true Americans.

January 14, 1943, the great Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. was indicted by a Federal grand jury for installing special equipment to circumvent Government tests, resulting in the sale of over $1,000,000 worth of defective military wire to the United States Army and our ally the British Army.

Maximum penalties for this fraudulent practice which endangered the lives of American and British soldiers and robbed the American people of a million dollars, are 10 years in jail or a $10,000 fine or both. Compare this penalty with the penalty contained in the Hobbs bill and you can readily see the extreme cruel and unusual punishment intended for laboring American citizens.

On March 23, 1943, just 17 days ago, the most damning fraud of recent days was exposed. I speak of the Carnegie-Illinois faked reports on 28,000 tons of steel plate which had been delivered to the Navy-Maritime Commission and lend-lease. On the previous January 16, the tanker *Schenectady* broke apart and sank at Portland, Oreg. The plates of that ship came from the Carnegie-Illinois plant at Homestead, Pa.

How many lives were lost? I do not know. How many more lives will be lost because of inferior material of war, the responsibility of which lies at the door of the profit-hungry minority of our great industrialists? I do not know.

There has been no legislation introduced to penalize all of business because of the sins of a few.

If we show the proper perspective, if we are consistent, we will not pass punitive legislation against labor because of the mistakes of a few.

Article 8 of the Constitution says that excessive fines shall not be imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted. I submit to you that a fine of $10,000 or 20 years' imprisonment or both, for a fist fight in a picket line or threatened force, clearly comes under this prohibition. I oppose the Hobbs bill on the following grounds: Its terminology is too broad and therefore susceptible to unpredictable interpretation. The penalties and fines are excessive, cruel, and unusual. It is an undeserved slap at all of American labor, and it will tend to bring disunity to the war effort.

Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include certain statistics with reference to the outstanding services rendered by the Farm Security Administration in the Fourth South Carolina Congressional District, as

well as an editorial from the Greenville News of March 24, 1943:

Report on the Farm Security Administration program in the Fourth Congressional District, State of South Carolina

1. Total number of low-income farm families that have received rural rehabilitation loans, as of June 30, 1942		1,965
2. Total amount of money that has been loaned to these families. Include project occupants, as of June 30, 1942		$1,781,590
3. Total amount of matured principal and accrued interest on these loans, as of Dec. 31, 1942		$1,095,433
4. Total amount of collections on these loans, as of Feb. 28, 1943:		
Principal	$808,315	
Interest	127,568	
		$935,883
5. Collections as a percent of matured principal and accrued interest—percent		85.4
6. Total number of farm tenants that have received farm-ownership loans to buy family type farms, as of June 30, 1942		213
7. Total amount of money that has been loaned to these families to purchase and improve farms, as of June 30, 1942		$807,103
8. Total amount of matured principal and accrued interest on these loans, as of June 30, 1942		$38,162
9. Total amount of collections on these loans, as of Feb. 28, 1943:		
Principal	$46,369	
Interest	38,939	
		$85,308
10. Collections as a percent of matured principal and accrued interest—percent		223.5
11. Total number of farms in district according to the 1940 census		17,568
12. Total farms with products in 1939 valued at less than $600:		
Number		10,314
Percent of all farms		58.7
13. Total farmers who were tenants in 1940:		
Number		10,318
Percent of all farmers		58.7
14. Number of community and cooperative services established by low-income farmers with Farm Security Administration assistance, as of June 30, 1942:		
Purebred sires		1
Heavy farm machinery		36
Others		31
Total		68
15. Total number of participants in these services		2,945
16. Number of families receiving rural rehabilitation loans during the fiscal year 1942		1,258
17. Amount of money lent to farmers for rehabilitation purposes during the fiscal year 1942		$379,158
18. Approximate average size of original rehabilitation loan in the fiscal year 1942		$610
19. Approximate average size of original rehabilitation loan in the fiscal year 1941		$215

Standard rural rehabilitation case load as of Nov. 30, 1942, Congressional District No. 4, South Carolina

Name of county	Active standard borrowers	Total number of standard borrowers
Greenville	356	635
Laurens	262	355
Spartanburg	318	430
Union	363	425
Total	1,299	1,845

[From the Greenville (S. C.) News of March 24, 1943]

THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AND FOOD

There has been much critical discussion in recent months of various phases of the Farm Security Administration, which provides loans to farmers to aid them to become farm owners.

A congressional investigation of the Farm Security Administration is now to be made by a House committee. This should be welcomed, for it should result in providing the general citizenship and Congress as well with all the facts necessary for an intelligent judgment as to the value of this organization and with respect to any faults or weaknesses in the program.

But meanwhile there is much evidence that under this agency a substantial contribution is being made to the present national objective of increasing food production.

South Carolinians will note with great interest a statement from the offices of the regional Farm Security Administration director at Montgomery that Farm Security Administration borrowers in South Carolina last year so increased their production of war-essential crops and livestock that their output totaled the equivalent of 67 trainloads, averaging 60 cars to a train. There were 15,143 Farm Security Administration borrowers in South Carolina. They increased their milk production 26 percent; pork 43 percent; eggs 35 percent; chickens 48 percent; soybeans 96 percent; dry beans 62 percent; and peanuts 251 percent.

Farm Security Administration borrowers are schooled by this agency in diversified farming with livestock and poultry to provide a year-round income and a live-at-home menu. That clearly seems a most valuable contribution to southern agricultural progress and particularly so at this time, when the emphasis is so heavily upon increased food production as an integral part of the war effort.

The State of Washington Speaks Through Its Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein certain memorials adopted by the Washington State Legislature at the session recently concluded.

These memorials represent the thoughtful and considered views of the elected representatives of the people of the Evergreen State of Washington. I include them for the benefit of my colleagues and of the country, as deserving of sympathetic and careful consideration.

The memorials are as follows:

House Joint Memorial 16

To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition Your Excellency and honorable bodies as follows:

Whereas the War Production Board is a body of far-reaching importance; and

Whereas there are located in the industrial centers of the Pacific Northwest many war activities employing thousands of workers engaged in such war activity; and

Whereas there is great need that the War Production Board establish a regional board in the Pacific Northwest for the transaction of such business as might arise in said territory; and

Whereas the city of Seattle is the metropolis of the State of Washington and is the center of large war activities totaling more than $2,000,000,000 of contracts and is the logical place at which a regional office of the War Production Board should be established; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Washington do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to cause to be established a regional office of the War Production Board in the city of Seattle, Wash., as speedily as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington.

Passed the House March 3, 1943.

EDWARD J. REILLY,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the Senate March 9, 1943.

VICTOR A. MEYERS,
President of the Senate.

House Joint Resolution 25

Be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled:

Whereas the State of Washington from the year 1933 to date has received the benefits from the expenditure of large amounts of Federal funds through the Work Projects Administration, Civilian Conservation Corps, National Youth Administration, and the development of the Coulee and Bonneville dams and many other Federal programs; and

Whereas all of these programs have contributed immensely to the welfare, happiness, and well-being of the citizens of this State; and

Whereas these programs have done much to add to the peace and security of the State during this period of war by providing forest protection, airports, improvements to schools, Army and Navy improvements, and many other worth-while and beneficial programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the citizens of this Commonwealth do hereby commend the efforts of our President and Members of Congress for their foresight in sponsoring these programs; and be it further

Resolved, That we take this means of acknowledging and thanking the President of the United States and the Members of Congress for the fair and liberal consideration given the State of Washington from the year 1933 to date; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be immediately sent to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to all Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Washington.

Passed the house March 1, 1943.

EDWARD J. REILLY,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate March 2, 1943.

VICTOR A. MEYERS,
President of the Senate.

House Joint Resolution 11

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled:

Whereas it is the established policy of the State of Washington, since statehood, supported by law and custom, that the waters within the State belong to the public under the control and jurisdiction of the State, and

Whereas in the State of Washington rights to the use of water of immense importance have been acquired under this policy and in accordance with State laws; and

Whereas differences of opinion recently have arisen regarding the respective rights and powers of the Federal and State governments to control and administer the use of waters within the several States, with the result that doubt is cast upon the authority of this State to exercise control over such use, and the stability of existing property rights and the future development of the water resources of this State are threatened; and

Whereas in order to remove all causes, present and future, which might lead to litigation, the welfare of this State requires full cooperation among the States in the use of water, and the promotion of joint action by the States and the United States in the efficient use of water and the control of flood waters to the end that litigation be avoided and the use and control of water be continued in the manner and under the laws as heretofore exercised: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in session assembled, That it is the policy of the State of Washington to maintain its jurisdiction and control over the rights to the use of the waters in this State, and to protect such rights as have been established under the laws thereof, and that constituted authorities of this State take such action as may be necessary to resist attempts to invade the rights of this State in the control of the waters of the State; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Washington.

Passed the house February 25, 1943.

EDWARD J. REILLY,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate March 10, 1943.

VICTOR A. MEYERS,
President of the Senate.

House Joint Memorial 15

To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled.

We, your memoralists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition your Excellency and honorable bodies as follows:

Whereas the production of an adequate supply of synthetic rubber to meet military and civilian needs is vital to the successful prosecution of the war and to the people of the United States and of the State of Washington; and

Whereas the production of synthetic rubber has been greatly delayed by concentration on petroleum base methods of production, which concentration has been fostered by agents of the oil industry who are desirous of establishing a monopoly in the synthetic rubber industry in post-war years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington do hereby respectfully memorialize and petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to do all in their power to facilitate the immediate construction of plants designed to produce butadiene from farm and forest products; and be it further

Resolved, That we express our approbation of the efforts of Rubber Coordinator William M. Jeffers to break the bottlenecks in our synthetic rubber program, and urge that all Government agencies extend to him their full support; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington.

Passed the house March 1, 1943.

EDWARD J. REILLY,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate March 2, 1943.

VICTOR A. MEYERS,
President of the Senate.

Prepare To Pay the Price of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by Commodore Sheldon Clark, president of the Navy League of the United States, which appears in the March issue of Seapower. This editorial is entitled "Prepare To Pay the Price of Peace," and looking ahead to possible future impairment of United States naval strength, is highly pertinent and awareful at this time:

PREPARE TO PAY THE PRICE OF PEACE

Another battleship, said to be "the mightiest afloat," is announced in commission. If this were a Nazi battleship, or a Jap, what a whirl of anxiety its coming would have caused us to feel. Fortunately, this one is ours, and the anxiety will be felt in Berlin and in Tokyo, not here.

This is but one of a group being delivered to the United States Navy. Some sister ships already are in service, others will follow soon—all reasons for increased anxiety in the hearts of our enemies, for increased satisfaction in ours.

The cost of battleships is high, but is there anyone who will say it is too much? Is any price too high to pay for the sense of security their presence gives to our strategists, for the substantial and solid advantage they give our sons afloat?

There is no price too high to pay for this when we are actually facing the enemy. It is not so easy to comprehend, but just as true, that had we had them earlier we might not have had an enemy at all. If this great group of modern battleships had been afloat, it is most likely that Pearl Harbor would not have been attacked and Hitler would not have dared to challenge us. For power wins victories in peacetime as real as are its victories in final combat. The nation which is ready to defend itself is likely not to be challenged. A people moving like an irresistible force does not have to move often.

POWER WINS

We are moving today like an irresistible force. No doubt, we have developed our magnificent, but latent, powers with a swiftness which surprised our enemies, who obviously estimated that they could beat us before we got well started. Ambassador Grew says in his book, Report From Tokyo, that the Japanese started war against us because they believed they could defeat us.

If the nations standing for peace and decency between peoples had been armed enough to be an irresistible force, it can be said with truth that the aggressors would not have started the war But they examined France and England and challenged them by invading their partner, Poland, in the expectation that the other two would not be too hard to defeat. They were right about France, nearly right about England. Likewise, Japan viewed American defenses and dared the assault on Pearl Harbor. No one of the United Nations looked strong enough to deter the aggressors. The strength they had was an inward strength, invisible, one which the military calculators behind Hitler and Hirohito do not understand. By reason of enormous sacrifice and superhuman exertion and at great risk, this inward strength was made to tip the scale at last. But what a narrow escape England had at Dunkerque and in the bombings of her cities, what a narrow escape our country had, too, in the weeks after Pearl Harbor.

THE EASY WAY

These facts must be viewed now when they are plain, lest they be overlooked when the fighting ends. It will be senseless on our part to disarm ourselves again, as we did after World War No. 1 ended—a disarmament which led inevitably to the second thrust against us. It will be senseless, yet it will be an easy thing to accept.

It will be easy because the thought will spring forth in many minds fathered by the wish that war is done forever. We will be anxious to believe the best: Now there will come an era of peace and of international understanding. Now common sense will replace greed and hate. Now bad rulers having been dethroned, a period of good rulers begins. Let our great Nation, loving peace, lead the way into peace everlasting. Almost one can hear already the earnest, well-meaning speakers saying such things—which we know now defy the truth but which will sound persuasive then. Will we remember then how wrong they are?

Such were the things they said after World War No. 1 and in the period of peace between the two wars. And they sounded all right then. Millions of people, wishing to believe them, did believe them—good-hearted people, not fools or knaves. So many millions of people believed them that the contrary advice of our professional military advisers was overridden and our Nation disarmed.

LESSONS OF THE PAST

Our fleet fell so low in personnel and ships that it could no longer assure us protection. Our air force was held to toy size. Our merchant fleet, the third partner in the total of sea power, was laid up in creeks and rivers. Our industries, the fourth partner in sea power, devoted themselves exclusively to manufacturing for peace as if they would never again manufacture for war. Then war

returned. War came again when we were thoroughly and completely weak and unprepared. Was it coincidence that war returned just then and not sooner? Who can believe so now?

Let us not forget this melancholy recital of facts. Let us not forget this chapter of history again. Let us realize now and not forget that, though it is costly to stay prepared for defense, it is less costly than having to prepare in fearful haste. Let us resolve now to challenge our own hope and wish when this war is ended. It will take more courage and stamina then, when we have won this one and are tired of war and the future looks tranquil, than it takes now of strength and courage to question the siren voices we shall hear.

THE WRONG LEADERS

Those were the voices, well-meaning as they were, which led us wrong before. Those were the voices which lulled England and led her to the edge of disappearance, which overthrew France. Those were the reassuring voices which promised what millions of us wanted, while the men who knew, the military and the naval men, could promise only what we did not want to hear. But they were right, and the reassuring ones were wrong. We followed the wrong leaders.

Not to follow them again will be difficult. But not to follow them is the task to which the Navy League of the United States rededicates itself, as it has done steadily in the past. That will be the time, as it was before, when the Navy League will confront its hardest task. Hard though it be, it will be a necessary task. Those who believe so now are called to give their support to the Navy League today and to continue that support when peace returns There is no better form of service than to keep the people informed as to these truths today and awake to them when, later, they will not want to hear them.

SHELDON CLARK,
President, Navy League of the United States.

What Rickenbacker Means To Say

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a brief editorial from the New Republic, which I respectfully call to the attention of my colleagues:

WHAT RICKENBACKER MEANS TO SAY

Let us pause to reflect on two statements that Captain Rickenbacker made in a single public interview. First statement: "In times like these I do not approve of overtime pay except for the men in the fox holes, the swamps, the desert—those making the supreme sacrifice." Second statement: "I am opposed to limiting salaries to $25,000 a year, because to limit salary you limit incentive." These are not contradictory statements, if you grasp the captain's real meaning. He is saying in effect that American civilians are divided into two great classes: those who work at machines and those who work at big glass-covered desks with two secretaries and a dictaphone. The first class should not be paid for working overtime; it needs no incentive but pure patriotism. The second class is so mercenary and so indifferent to the life or death of the country that its members will go on strike if they are paid less than $25,000 a year, free of income tax.

Perhaps the truth is that Captain Rickenbacker tends to idealize the American workingman and presents too bleak a picture of the big executives. He ought to be told that there are good and bad men in both these classes, and that now is the time for all classes to be given equal treatment. In one of his early speeches he suggested that idle workmen might be shipped to the South Pacific and that their place at the lathes might be taken by soldiers in uniform. That would be a good idea if only he carried it to its logical conclusion. What about sending idle or dishonest executives to the fox holes of New Guinea, and what about assigning marines from Guadalcanal to sit at their big glass-topped desks?

The Steel Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include three editorials of the Inglewood Daily News, of Inglewood, Calif., dealing with the attempts of a newly established steel plant to relieve the present shortage of steel with which this country is now confronted.

California is doing its part to relieve the present steel shortage that is so vitally affecting our war effort. Recently there has been established a sponge steel plant in the city of Inglewood, Calif., that is capable of treating 40 tons of ore every 24 hours. Despite this fact, the potential services of this necessary plant have not been recognized by any governmental war agency. Several reasons have been suggested as the basis for this lack of recognition; all are based, I am informed, upon the intense dislike of certain steel interests of the development of any project that will tend to create possible future competition. I shrink from the thought that any group of American citizens, whether they be a part of this or any other industry, would participate in anything that would in anywise retard our war effort and in so doing sacrifice the lives of American youths in the battle for the preservation of democracy.

The editorials referred to follow:

[From the Inglewood (Calif.) Daily News of March 8, 1943]

STORM SIGNALS FOR BIG STEEL

It may be that Centinela Valley is overlooking one of the greatest opportunities ever to visit itself upon a community—the operation here of a so-called sponge-steel plant which would become a great permanent industry.

Such an establishment, built piecemeal without priorities from scrap material, is now in operation in Inglewood. It is contended that soft steel can be produced from ore at a cost approximating what is now being paid for fuel alone at the Fontana plant, subsidized by the United States Government. Owners of patented processes being used at the Inglewood experimental plant believe they can deliver steel castings from iron ore at 10 cents a pound, using electric power and natural gas without the necessity of installing blast furnaces.

The process would be so revolutionary as to virtually threaten the great steel industry, and, of course, steel is the most powerful monopoly ever to visit itself upon a nation.

The Inglewood plant can treat 40 tons of ore every 24 hours. The fluid hydrocarbon furnaces are inexpensive to construct, and if the required materials cannot be obtained for lack of priority, these can be purchased from junk dealers, as was the case locally. The process is commercially profitable where iron and manganese ores are available close to cheap electric energy and natural gas or crude petroleum; all of these are available in Centinela Valley districts.

There is now a long-smoldering row over whether the Nation should build quick new sponge-iron mills and also develop its isolated and far-western iron deposits. It is expected to flare into the open in Congress this month.

The stake for Centinela Valley and the entire west coast is so great that nothing, it seems to us, is more important for the Inglewood Chamber of Commerce and public officials to concern themselves with. It will be a terrific uphill fight to gain recognition But if the process is, as its owners contend, workable, the development would mean more to this community than would the establishment here of either a synthetic rubber plant or an aluminum plant.

With the Nation desperately short of iron and steel it is now revealed that as early as last June, Secretary Ickes pleaded with Donald Nelson not to accept the sponge-iron veto of the experts in the National Academy of Sciences.

Should the chamber of commerce, the realty board, and public officials decide to take up this fight, they ought to be prepared to be battered at every turn in the road—because their opposition will be Big Steel, and there is no more powerful opposition in America.

But certainly even the opposition of Steel cannot withstand the force of public opinion, and facts, the great leveler.

[From the Inglewood (Calif.) Daily News, of March 16, 1943]

INGLEWOOD'S GOLDEN CHANCE

If we had an adequate water supply, we could cause to be established here, at this time, a synthetic rubber plant. Even now, overtures ought to be made to the defense command for the establishment of such a plant locally, since the insurance of an adequate water supply is a question of time, in any event.

In the meantime, we are in an unusual situation to assist in the development of a sponge or soft steel plant in Inglewood, if we can break the bureaucratic indifference toward such an enterprise in Washington.

At 327 North Inglewood Avenue there is in existence—built from scrap because the Government would not issue priorities—a sponge steel plant prepared to produce steel at one-fourth the cost of its production at Fontana—and the United States of America, if you please, will not permit anybody to buy the products of this plant on a commercial basis.

Iron sponge is iron ore that has been exposed to or in contact with reducing gases at the right temperatures, thereby losing the largest part of its oxygen content. This product is an ideal melting stock for an electric furnace, for the production of steel castings or steel ingots, and has the great advantage that the steel does not contain nitrogen.

The construction of the Inglewood plant was started without priority and completed and the furnaces tested in August 1942.

Since then the operators have been trying to get an order for castings, and after several weeks found that they had to sublet from someone who has a contract from the Government, and such a contractor requires a cut; the local contractor has been unable to get any information as to how to get an order direct from a Government agency, without having to pay tribute to some subcontractor.

The Inglewood plant is ready to treat 40 tons of ore each 24 hours. Yet, every day the American public is told that there is an acute shortage of steel, rubber plants cannot be built for lack of steel, there is no more steel for mining operations, farmers are badly in need of equipment fabricated from steel.

If this is true, why does the Government not protect and encourage small business—such as the Inglewood plant—to produce the steel required? It can be done, but little business men must have the help and cooperation of the Government to offset the opposition of Big Steel.

[From the Inglewood (Calif.) Daily News of March 29, 1943]

LIQUIDATING SMALL BUSINESS

If you visit the sponge-steel plant—built out of scrap because the War Production Board would not grant priority for the material—you will find a monument to the determination of Government bureaus to stifle small business in this country, probably at the behest of Big Steel, which has been exposed only recently as having falsified records which resulted in the delivery of imperfect steel for use in United States armaments.

Out at the Inglewood plant at 327 North Inglewood Avenue you will find a watchman on duty, and a plant capable of processing 40 tons of manganese ore daily very idle. There isn't a workman around, because Uncle Sam—desperately short of steel—won't permit the company to produce steel which it can produce at a cost of approximately one-fourth that now being paid to produce steel at Fontana, Calif.

Consider what Congressman KNUTE HILL said last December about this situation:

"The Kaiser plant, the only new and recent construction of this kind located west of the Missouri will produce 1,200 tons of pig iron daily when it gets in operation. But when the plant was almost completed the engineers found themselves short some 58 tons of steel. To get the insignificant quantity of steel required released from the steel warehouses no less than 60 transactions with the War Production Board were necessary—telephone calls, telegrams, and conferences. Finally, Donald Nelson had to step in personally and order the necessary steel priority for the Kaiser plant—after 60,000 tons of potential production had been held up by such obstruction and wholly wasteful bickering."

Congressman HILL then had this to say about the Steel Trust: "It is my sincere belief that the Steel Trust considers itself to be absolutely secure in its ability to throttle any comprehensive program for the further establishment of sponge iron or blast furnaces or any other form of steel-making construction, anywhere in this country. * * * I believe they feel that their high-pressure lobby and their staff of highly paid public-relations men, who operate under the very dome of the Capitol, can handle any threatening or adverse legislation that might offer hindrance to their selfish interests."

Sponge iron, such as can be produced cheaply and efficiently in Inglewood, can lick the critical steel shortage. But somebody has got to lick the Steel Trust first.

This is bigger than any individual, or than Inglewood or California. It is one of the major problems of America. It may be that we are fortunate it is developing here, because Big Steel cannot lick us.

A Faithful Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I had a very distinct pleasure this morning, in that one of my constituents, an outstanding South Carolinian, called on me, not requesting anything but just in a social and friendly way.

The reason I am so proud of the visit of this distinguished South Carolinian is because he has had the privilege and honor of serving as a member of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen for 50 years.

On account of his long and faithful service as a member of Lodge 312, with continuous membership since September 25, 1892, he was awarded a 50-year veterans' gold emblem, which he is now wearing on the lapel of his coat with dignity and gratitude.

I refer to Mr. James H. Gaillard, 1808 Hampton Avenue, Columbia, S. C.

Although he is a man of 70 years, because of the type of life he has lived and because of his deep interest in humanity, in that he is in splendid physical condition, I feel sure, and I am hoping that he may live many more years so that he may be able to continue his splendid service for that great group of people who earn their living by the sweat of their brow, and in the interest of his country.

St. Patrick's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Father Edmund Walsh, S. J., before the members of the Charitable Irish Society, as published in the Pilot, of Boston, Mass.:

The total acceptance of Christianity by the Irish people and their integral loyalty to its credo ranks as the outstanding characteristic of Patrick's achievement. Whereas other pagan lands had brutally martyred the first missionaries of Christianity or submitted slowly and painfully to the yoke of Christ, as the Teutonic tribes did, the Irish Nation looked upon the Cross and recognized the face of Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Light of the World. In that integral acceptance of the supernatural we find the key of her long history and a powerful answer to many of the vicissitudes she has suffered. She was sealed from the beginning to two loyalties—love of the ancient faith and love of the soil which Patrick consecrated by his labors, his mysticism, his miracles, and his vision of the role of pain in the Christan economy of salvation.

When his days were done, at the age of 76, he saw a whole land evangelized and he alone of all his great contemporaries of the Christian West had the unique privilege of finding a people predominantly pagan on his arrival and leaving them wholly Christian at his death. This amazing transformation was accomplished in 30 years. If, as the Emperor Augustine could say of Rome: "I found it a city of brick and left it a city of marble," Patrick could say before the judgment seat of God: "I found them bound to idolatry and superstition; I left them consecrated forever to Thy Divine Son made Man of Mary and crucified for our salvation."

DEEP-ROOTED FAITH

The explanation of that extraordinary tenacity in adhering to the supernatural and to native soil derives, I submit, from the quality of Ireland's intellectual conceptions regarding religion and patriotism. For both these fundamental anchors of national existence her people consistently professed not convictions or opinions or vague persuasions, but deep-rooted faith, and rightly so. Love of native land is included among the moral virtues reducible to justice. Though her poets, like all seers in every tongue, have rhapsodized passionately over their native land, the basic patriotism of the Irish people reposes on the Catholic teaching respecting patriotism as distinguished from the exaggerated, self-centered, and egotistic nationalism which has done such grievous injury to the peace, the solidarity, and well-being of humanity. Patriotism so defined is implanted by nature in the breast of man and elevated to merit by the same Creator who decreed that "thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother." As they, in the physical order, are the agents and sources of our bodily existence to whom filial reverence is forever due, so one's native land is the progenitor of our social, our economic, and our political life.

After the family, it is one's native land that furnishes the social organization, the environment, and the guaranty of collective happiness that are manifestly impossible for individuals to create and assemble by their private and unaided efforts. The resulting obligations are not onerous but are a mandate of right reason—to obey the laws justly and legally enacted; to pay the taxes necessary to maintain national welfare; and in the hour of peril or emergency to defend her against foreign aggression or domestic anarchy. Patriotism, therefore, is not only a civic duty but a moral virtue. When to this argument were added the concrete measures of oppression, now happily ended, we can understand the fierce attachment to the old land which the Irishman carried with him in the great dispersion of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

INTELLECTUAL ASSENT

His acceptance of the supernatural was of similar origin. It came from his mind and judgment and not from his emotions only. The act of faith, contrary to the common misunderstanding of it, is an intellectual assent to propositions not immediately evident but accepted because of the authority of him who reveals and asserts.

If the truths concerned were capable of direct, mathematical demonstration, you would have scientific knowledge, not faith. Now, life on this earth is made possible by faith and confidence in the integrity of others as much as by cold evidence of the senses. And when the revealing agency is a divine voice, the Irishman logically puts no limit to his faith even in the seemingly impossible. That, of course, is the only logic open to intelligence. Hence when he accepted the Catholic faith he signed a blank check and left it to the divinely appointed trustee of his salvation to fill in the amount,

the date, and the terms of payment. This procedure is unquestioned in human transactions and legal relationships. The only instance when it is now ignored occurs when there is question of the most important issue of all time or eternity—the salvation of man's immortal soul.

I have raised this particular point not to indulge in controversy but to explain the totality and the depths of the loyalty to religion manifested by the Irish people. They accepted the faith brought by Patrick as a supernatural heritage and made it the constant among the variables of their history. They have resisted that subtle temptation which lies as a snare in the path of every church which seeks to construct a social program adapted to the needs of a highly industrialized and material-minded civilization.

The basic message of the Christian church is directed to the individual, not to any abstract collectivity called conscience, humanity, or civil society or democracy. The prime reason for her existence is the sanctification and salvation of the individual soul and the moment she dilutes the wine of that vintage she is preaching a pale and watery Christ, not Him who died bloodstained on a cross and who made that symbol the test and measure of apostolicity. The church which subordinates this primary supernatural mission to overemphasis on the mere mechanics of economic, social, or political organizations—necessary and important though they are—will be sacrificing religion as such and entering into a losing competition with social-welfare agencies, Hollywood, Broadway, and the Red Cross. Such a church will have defaulted on its first mortgage and will be obliged to advertise for worshippers or degrade its sanctuary into a forum for lectures on current events, rhythmic dancing, oratorios, and moving pictures.

IRISH CHARACTERISTICS

We have considered thus far the genius of the Irish people viewed collectively as a nation. What of them as individuals? Not all are saints but all know what sanctity is and revere it humbly, which is the difference between a contrite sinner and a scoffing sceptic. Always, everywhere an Irishman knows the eye of God is upon him. His religious faith at home, on his native soil, is incorruptible, for it has been tried in fire. It is usually under the seduction of complete freedom abroad, by alien enticement or prosperity that he loses his faith—and even that paradox is comparatively rare. That is why Ireland's saints have sometimes prayed to keep her poor, if riches are to lead to that sin of pride by which the angels fall. Irish womanhood has sanctified the purity of maidens and ennobled the chastity of wedlock. Your Irishman is not a stranger to violence but is quick to forgive and forget. In that respect he is a paradoxical reservoir of vehemence and humility.

He does not hate his adversary though he will battle him to that hell or Connaught which Cromwell once decreed for all nonconforming Celts. I verily do not believe that Irishmen in Ireland hate the English as violently as second or third generation Irishmen do from the safe distance of America.

The Irish immigrant to America has easily adapted himself to her institutions, her laws, her culture, and traditions. He is assimilated into the American democracy without difficulty and has rendered loyal service in its defense. He is rarely found among the radical elements of the left wing, though he will gladly lead a revolt against injustice wherever found, and has been known to engage in a brawl with the policeman on his rounds. His rebellion is against injustice and oppressive government, not against the principle of authority. No figure wields more authority over him than his priest in whom he recognizes a representative, however human, of Him who is the source of all the law and order by which creation moves.

It is sometimes alleged that Irish politicians and prominent Americans of Irish extraction have sinned against the public welfare with much facility and special grossness. Doubtless Irishmen have gone to jail for high crimes and low misdemeanors and it is entirely possible that some are still at large who should be jailed. But it is wholly unreasonable to indict the vast unpublicized majority for the sins of the notorious few.

When an Irishman succumbs to an unholy greed for gold or goes wrong in other ways, I concede you he can become as offensive and criminal as any of those eminent persons with non-Celtic names who have graced the apartments at Sing Sing, or smoothly plundered and wrecked an important railroad in New England or pauperized innocent widows and orphans by unctuous manipulation of worthless securities. It is an ancient but ever odious device of bigotry to attribute and transfer individual wrongdoing to an entire racial, religious, or political collectivity rather than lay it to the common weaknesses of human nature persisting in all the sons of Adam, be they Catholic, Protestant, Jew, or atheist. For every unworthy Roland discovered by the scavengers, someone will quickly dredge up an Oliver of different faith until dangerous hatreds infect the entire body politic where unity and mutual respect are so desperately needed. The shallows of a river are the points of babbling noises and friction; the deep volume of water flows majectically and silently to meet the sea. So it is with the river of life, and so let it be with our judgments on the currents of our neighbors' conduct as they empty into the ocean of eternity.

IRELAND'S NEUTRALITY

There remains but one further consideration. Much uneasiness has been felt and severe criticism voiced in certain quarters of this country respecting the neutrality of Ireland in the present global warfare. If so sensitive to the supernatural and if a passionate lover of human freedom to the degree asserted here tonight, why stands she apparently unconcerned when both liberty and religion are being so wantonly and brutally assailed by the hordes of Nazi Germany? Why is she not a belligerent on the side of the United Nations? And since she is not there, how shall she escape a sort of moral isolation as one who deliberately averts her eyes from the spiritual as well as the democratic issues in the greatest world tragedy that ever afflicted the human race?

Discussion of this international problem can easily degenerate into bitterness and sterile recrimination, with the ancient feud betweer the Orange North and the Catholic South lurking even in the background—or more accurately—just around the corner. Hence it must be viewed strictly in the light of the realities and the truths of record.

Belligerency or nonbelligerency is determined by the sovereign will of the nation concerned. The only powers following a different policy are Germany and Japan who assert the monstrous right of master races to decide the destiny of weaker states by unilateral action. The policy of Eire in the event of Eurcpean wars had been defined, by anticipation, as early as 1932 when the present government came into power, and that same government has been returned three times with neutrality as one of the main planks in its platform. When the present war broke out in 1939, Eire again proclaimed and maintained its neutrality in company with the United States and numerous other reputable governments. The special geographic position of Ireland and its defenseless condition, in terms of modern warfare, made her declaration as reasonable as that of Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Portugal, those typical smaller states of Europe. Their decision was respected by the Allied Powers and their neutrality understood without the slightest intimation of moral degeneracy.

The decision of the present Irish Government has received the overwhelming approbation of the Irish people to an extent which amazes those familiar with domestic politics in that land. Anti-British and pro-British, Catholic and Protestant alike, have demanded neutrality with a unanimity unparalleled in Irish history. Even the Irish Times, the traditional pro-British newspaper, strongly supports the Government's present attitude. Neither Daniel O'Connell nor Charles Stewart Parnell ever received such a clear mandate from their people as was recorded in the bill of the 95 to 99 percent of the population now requiring neutrality.

The other European governments which still maintain neutrality—Switzerland, Portugal, and Sweden—are not charged with the spiritual blindness and moral isolation which Professor Comminger of Columbia University applied to Ireland in the New York Times of Sunday, March 7. Why this curious segregation of sheep and goats? Other among the smaller powers, such as Belgium, Holland, and Norway, have lost their neutrality, and their governments in exile have become belligerents, to be sure—but only because and when they were attacked. The monarch of the House of Orange kept Holland neutral for the very same reasons which now actuate the Irish Government, and the Netherlands defended themselves honorably and heroically when that right was ignored by a brutal invader. When did the Government of the United States become a belligerent and discard its proclaimed neutrality? Only when a treacherous attack was made on its sovereign territory in mid-Pacific and the Far East—not because of the moral issues involved in a European conflict 15 months old, during which the spiritual values were clearly visible. When did the British Government itself take the sword? Only when the counter sword of Nazi domination was levelled at its very existence by the march of Hitler's juggernaut into Poland.

There were moral issues involved indeed, as Mr. Winston Churchill pointed out persistently and eloquently in the House of Commons and elsewhere during the blindness of men from 1931 to 1939. There was a hideous crime committed by Hitler against decency and international morality in 1938 when he invaded and absorbed Austria with never a bayonet being raised by Paris or London. There was a still greater moral default at Munich when Czechoslovakia was sacrificed on the altar of expediency, doubtless because Mr. Chamberlain and M. Daladier honestly believed themselves in no position to resist Berlin. The principle of security prevailed over indignation, at least until a stronger defense could be mobilized. And Mr. Chamberlain was applauded, not condemned.

BEST POLICY

That is precisely the position of Eire today. Consider the legistics of the situation confronting 4,500,000 people set on the fringe of the maelstrom. Here you have a nation but recently emerged from the weariness of a 700-years conflict for freedom and now bare-

ly started on the uphill road to economic and military recovery. She knew that any other policy save neutrality would have meant swift annihilation from the air after the pattern of Warsaw, Rotterdam, and Coventry. Article 5 of the Irish Constitution declares her an independent and sovereign state, a contention of fact and of law sustained for centuries past and now finally admitted an international law. Nevertheless out of her sparse population and slender resources she has contributed approximately 100,000 men to the allied cause and raised a domestic army of 300,000 to meet whatever contingencies the uncertain future may hold in store. If we in the United States follow a proportional mobilization, we shall require an army of 13,000,000 men.

Her coastal guard patrols her waters and mans her defenses, resolved, as Hitler knows, to die to the last man should the Nazis attempt to reduce Ireland to the slavery imposed on the conquered peoples of the continent. In view of these realities and particularly because of the domestic situation, many Irish leaders are convinced that voluntary abandonment of neutrality at this time could plunge the land into another civil war as disastrous to the Allied cause as the disunion in North Africa.

We cannot, then, deny to Eire the same principle of self-determination of peace or war which the powerful United States of America maintained for so long, while vigorously preparing for the war. A different policy by the United Nations would be the negation of the very fundamentals of democracy for which we are fighting. The decision taken at Dublin, be it right or wrong, belongs to the elected government. Wisely and logically Washington has refused to bring pressure to bear on an independent European state under the hateful and cynical doctrine that the end justifies the means. Leave that to Machiavelli and the Prussian geopoliticians. If a contrary policy were to be adopted as a measure of self-defense, the United Nations, by the cold logic of reason, would have to ask themselves how such aggression differs from Hitler's "preventive occupation" of Austria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Luxembourg—Japan's advance into Manchuria and Italy's invasion of Ethopia.

Agony lies in either balance of the scales whereon Ireland's future is being determined. Geography and the undisciplined passions of a ruthless conqueror have confronted her with another heart-rending alternative at the very inception of her long-delayed and dearly bought freedom. May the Lord of Hosts still keep her within the shadow of His outstretched hands, even though their juncture form a cross, and grant her Patrick's shield of sanctity, wisdom, fortitude, and clearness of vision in the darkness of the present hour. She will preserve the integrity of her soul and make a new Tara so long as she builds it of the rock from which she has been hewn.

Freedom for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 9, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from The Tablet, a Catholic weekly of Brooklyn, N. Y., entitled "Freedom for All":

FREEDOM FOR ALL

Bishop Gawlina, a refugee from his native Poland, tears the mask off much of the hypocrisy surrounding Soviet Russia's apologists in this country. The patriotic prelate, who, with millions of his people, has suffered at the violent hands of both Hitler and Stalin has stated that over half a million Polish children who were taken as captives into Russia following the Soviet-Nazi agreement are either dead or starving and their parents' whereabouts are unknown.

At the same time that His Excellency is revealing to the world this shocking tragedy, a mass meeting held in Manhattan protests the political assassination of two Jewish-Polish labor leaders in Russia—and condemns the Soviet crimes for destroying better relations with the United States and the hope of the four freedoms for the world.

The American public is not so stupid or biased, so inhuman or hypocritical, to overlook these national misdeeds. The people know the Soviet Government, by its agreement with Hitler, unleashed this war and the people know our republic is in the fighting field to endeavor to restore to the world freedom, and to destroy just such crimes as Russia has committed against the people and property of other nations.

The American people also know that murder is murder and persecution is persecution, no matter who commits it, and that starving children and oppressed grown-ups suffer just as much, no matter who are the aggressors. The "four freedoms" are not copyrighted for certain nations or peoples; they were given for the world by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill.

In the midst of the rule of criminality it is nauseating to read the current issue of Life—note our article on page 4—glorifying Stalin and suppressing the persecution there, as well as the denial of all essential freedoms. It would be just as logical for Life to get a picture case for Hitler. It is equally ridiculous to read that Warner Bros. are about to spend $250,000 publicizing the film Mission to Moscow, a seeming propaganda piece, based on the book of the former Ambassador Davies, who recently asserted Hitler was dead. Both Life and Warner Bros. would do a genuine work for the "four freedoms" if they included some of the current crimes as revealed by Bishop Gawlina and the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations protesting groups, or some of the past crimes like the liquidating of millions of kulaks.

The United States is great because her ideals are great. She is the champion of liberty and democracy everywhere. The cries of the oppressed have found a willing ear and an open purse among our people and international iniquity has always been condemned. That is the reason today we oppose all dictatorships, all totalitarian rulers The man has not been created, the propaganda trick has not been invented, that can make persecution bad when done by one and good when done by another. Starvation is not to be overlooked when some hold a brief for those who cause the starving. The human being whose heart truly beats for humanity will demand freedom for all people and oppose persecution of any, no matter what their religion, race, or class.

For Americans there is no need of a choice of international villainy. We do not have to adopt a policy of appeasement of either Stalin or Hitler, or throw to the winds the rights of Poland, the Baltic Nations, or any people. As the New York Times stated in its leading editorial on March 21:

"American opinion will not look favorably on any proposal to put the small nations of Europe on the auction block in order to purchase Russian confidence and cooperation. This policy carries an echo of the Chamberlain idea of appeasement, and is based, we believe, on a misunderstanding of recent history and European and world realities. The European nations did not go to war against Hitler to submit to Russian domination. On the contrary, the threat that 'the Bolsheviks will get them' if they don't support Hitler is Goebbels' last persuasive talking point. * * *

"For let there be no illusions on this point: The Communist Trojan horse is no stronger in Europe than the Nazi fifth column, and the European nations are tired of both of them. But if they are forced to choose, they may choose Hitler rather than Stalin. And the only way to rouse their whole-hearted resistance to the Nazis is to assure them that there is no need for such a desperate choice—which there isn't if the United Nations remain loyal to the Atlantic Charter."

Bataan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. BURCH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Dr. D. M. Yap at Averett College, Danville, Va., April 7, 1943:

A year ago we lost Bataan, and with it one of America's major battles. The men who struggled there made the Japanese pay dearly. They gave their lives that others might live.

Despite overwhelming odds, they fought without adequate ammunition, and were exhausted by hunger. At the farthest outpost of America, they were surrounded by the enemy in the sea, in the air, and from the nearest land bases. There was no supply line to them. They kept the faith.

General MacArthur said, "Nothing became them more than their last hour of trial and agony." Their conduct was becoming to men; it was becoming to both Americans and Filipinos. We Filipinos in America can share in the dignity which their suffering courage sheds upon us as a people by our realization of it, in all our thoughts and instincts and deeds. "It is for us living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced"—these tremendous words of the Gettysburg address suddenly become alive. For by them at Bataan we are ennobled.

The fight at Bataan was an act of redemption—redemption for America and the Philippines, redemption for mankind. MacArthur dared to say this: "The sacrifice and halo of Jesus of Nazareth has descended upon them and God will take them unto Himself." And our debt can only be paid in "increased devotion to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of their devotion." That our people and the world,

"under God shall have a new birth of freedom."

The extent to which we comprehend to the fullest the glory of the fight at Bataan is the exact extent to which the fight will prove to have been justified. Nothing less than our soldiers' obedience and their devotion is demanded of each of us. Who can grumble at discomfort, remembering them; or have fear for the future, remembering them; or care greatly for his own life, remembering them; or worry about his profits or his wages, remembering them? We must be worthy of them who suffered, died, and endured captivity so that our pride and faith and love might live. They redeemed our humiliation at Pearl Harbor. They washed it out in their own sweat and blood and hunger. They made themselves immortal, that our cause might take on immortality.

Frederick S. Marquardt, formerly a Manila newspaperman, in writing about the balance sheet of Bataan, said:

"From a strictly military standpoint their achievements more than justified their losses. In war, as in checkers, you can trade your enemy on even terms so long as you have greater resources to start with. On Bataan, the United States did far better than trade on even terms. The real significance of Bataan, however, lay in its moral effect on the American people, not in the ledger books of profit and loss. A whole generation of Americans had been drugged by false security of peace which could not endure. Even after it was obvious war couldn't be avoided, most Americans refused to face the facts. It required Bataan, with all its horrors, to prove to this country and the world that Americans had not, like many other people before them, grown too soft to stand up to rigors of modern warfare, no matter how great the odds. If the defenses of Bataan had wilted under the first direct onslaught of the foe, as did those of Hongkong, Singapore, and Java, the United States could never have achieved its present high state of morale. Nor would the rest of the world have had any reason to doubt that Axis victory was an absolute certainty.

"There was one other great gain for this Nation in the suffering on Bataan, less tangible perhaps than the heavy blows struck the enemy and less important than the positive proof that American soldiers were still able to hold their own in any part of the world. That was the heroic example of the Filipino troops, who not only established the right of the Philippines to a place in the concert of free nations but who vindicated once and for all the basic soundness of United States policy—Philippines for the Filipinos. We held the Philippines, not to exploit and not for our own profit, but to develop and educate and prepare for their long-awaited self-government. For 40 years foreigners declared the United States was entirely wrong in its avowed intention of preparing the Filipino people to govern themselves. And when the Philippine independence date was set for July 4, 1946, every colonial power believed Americans utterly insane. Yet when it came to war—the ultimate pay-off in all international relations—our Philippine investment in fair dealing paid some very handsome dividends. Three out of every four soldiers on Bataan were Filipinos and we have General MacArthur's word that 'no army has ever done so much with so little.'

"They came from every section and from every stratum of Philippine society and they never wavered in their determination to fight through to the end. Christians, pagans, and Mohammedans fought side by side through an ordeal which proved that our experiment in nation building had not failed. The first Filipino to get a Distinguished Service Cross was the son of a Filipino who fought against American troops during the Philippine Insurrection. The way Filipinos fought and died on Bataan is proof that a sovereign country can treat a dependency fairly. The fact should never be lost sight of in post-war settlements. It should become a guiding principle in the great task which will one day face the United Nations, the task of creating a just order throughout all of Asia. Bataan did not serve its original purpose in the United States grand strategy. It will never afford an opening wedge for troops to reenter the Philippines. But Bataan was not fought in vain. The men who bled and died on Bataan were not sacrificed on the altar of militarism. The greatest single military defeat of our history has already proved well worth the tears and blood and sense of frustration that it left in its wake. The Americans now know they can lose still another Bataan, if need be, but they cannot under any circumstances lose the war and that they need not under any false apprehensions fumble the peace."

Establishment of an Iron and Steel Industry in the State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a resolution recently adopted by the Senate of the State of Washington relative to my State's ores, coals, and other raw materials, and the necessity for, and the timeliness of, a new iron and steel industry which should be established in Washington. I have been working assiduously with various groups and individuals in my State toward creation of such an industry in our State. It is high time the Federal agencies concerned with war production should give their attention to the manifest and manifold benefits a Washington State steel and iron industry would have for the war effort. Efforts to start this industry on any material scale in the Pacific Northwest have hitherto been blocked in the interests of similar industries already established in other sections of the Nation. They fear our competition, and rightly so, for I assure you that the State of Washington, with its vast amounts of cheap power and its incalculably rich other resources, could and would, if given a fair chance by the Federal agencies concerned, soon give the entrenched industries of other sections plenty to worry about.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the State of Washington, richly endowed with the ores, coals, and other raw materials essential to the establishment and maintenance of an iron and steel industry and presently handicapped by lack of development of these resources, should take steps at this time to bring these resources to bear in the war effort, and should provide for its post-war development and prosperity through the establishment of such an industry on a sound basis; and

Whereas the Senate of the State of Washington recognizes that at many times in the past efforts have been made to establish such an industry in the State and that these efforts have been thwarted and blocked in the interest of industries already existing in other sections of the country; and

Whereas it is the declared conviction of the senate that the time is now ripe to add to the industrial resources of our State an iron and steel industry which will be able to contribute to our general industrial growth in the future and to make an important contribution to the winning of the war in which our country is now engaged; and

Whereas the senate recognizes the fact that Washington industries, basing their operations upon the use of iron and steel, are now and have been in the past at all times in an unfair competitive position because of the so-called Pittsburgh-plus basis upon which steel and iron are sold in this area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That we hereby urge the Governor of the State of Washington, the members of the Washington delegation in the Congress of the United States, and the agencies of the Federal Government concerned with war production to support and to give favorable consideration to any feasible proposal for the establishment of such an industry in the State of Washington at this time; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; to the Governor of the State of Washington; and to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Washington; and that copies shall be sent to Mr. Donald Nelson, Director of the War Production Board; to the Steel Investigation Subcommittee of the House of Representatives; and to the United States Senate Committee for the Investigation of the War Effort.

Why Pay for Controlling Food Production When We Appropriate Millions for Production?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, the following official table should be conclusive evidence of the fallacy of the New Deal agricultural program:

Payments under Agricultural Adjustment, agricultural commodity, and parity programs, by program years, 1933–42

Commodity	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941
Cotton:									
Adjustment or conservation	$181,025,000	$115,226,000	$120,451,000	$86,884,000	$68,742,000	$142,595,000	$118,817,000	$102,564,000	$97,251,000
Parity				39,771,000		123,000,000	96,195,000	95,752,000	87,706,000
Total	181,025,000	115,226,000	120,451,000	126,655,000	68,742,000	265,595,000	215,012,000	198,316,000	184,957,000
Wheat:									
Adjustment or conservation [1]	93,806,000	105,554,000	114,988,000	43,389,000		50,126,000	83,941,000	47,754,000	49,127,000
Parity							53,614,000	55,884,000	58,226,000
Total	93,806,000	105,554,000	114,988,000	43,389,000		50,126,000	137,555,000	103,638,000	107,353,000
Corn hogs: Adjustment		311,852,000	176,886,000						
Corn:									
Conservation [1 2]						61,048,000	89,791,000	85,956,000	86,271,000
Parity							60,131,000	43,826,000	43,915,000
Total		311,852,000	176,886,000			61,048,000	149,922,000	129,782,000	130,186,000
Rice:									
Adjustment or conservation			9,642,000	2,593,000	2,763,000	1,966,000	1,539,000	916,000	806,000
Parity							1,802,000	1,299,000	2,481,000
Total			9,642,000	2,593,000	2,763,000	1,966,000	3,341,000	2,215,000	3,287,000
Tobacco:									
Adjustment or conservation	2,059,000	43,930,000	16,020,000	15,380,000	11,471,000	10,622,000	7,476,000	12,573,000	11,687,000
Parity									4,580,000
Total	2,059,000	43,930,000	16,020,000	15,380,000	11,471,000	10,622,000	7,476,000	12,573,000	16,267,000
Peanuts: Adjustment or conservation			3,713,000	1,251,000	871,000	1,217,000	625,000	464,000	1,084,000
Rye: Adjustment				203,000					
Sugar: Adjustment or conservation		59,961,000	25,288,000	5,275,000	3,629,000				
Flax: Conservation				2,039,000					
Vegetables, commercial: Conservation							1,910,000	2,584,000	2,317,000
Potatoes, commercial: Conservation						6,095,000	5,632,000	5,491,000	4,697,000
General depleting: Conservation				202,342,000	129,926,000	77,057,000	70,502,000	68,401,000	79,254,000
Soil building				58,456,000	81,666,000	80,734,000	103,221,000	114,830,000	122,220,000
Range				1,810,000	8,765,000	12,188,000	12,218,000		
Naval stores				466,000	360,000	997,000	1,639,000	1,178,000	1,740,000
Total agricultural-commodity program				420,088,000	308,193,000	444,645,000	497,311,000	442,711,000	456,454,000
Total parity				39,771,000		123,000,000	211,742,000	196,761,000	196,908,000
Grand total	276,890,000	636,523,000	466,988,000	459,859,000	308,193,000	567,645,000	709,053,000	639,472,000	653,362,000

[1] Wheat and corn included in general soil-depleting acreage under 1936 and 1937 agricultural conservation programs.
[2] Commercial corn area only.

Analyze this table. Show it to the housewife. Explain it to the taxpayers, who are being so heavily taxed.

You will note that wheat received over a quarter of a billion dollars in subsidies during 1934, 1935, and 1936, while we were importing wheat during the entire time. In August 1939 the farmer received but 54.5 cents per bushel for his wheat, while the administration was paying an export bounty of 27 cents per bushel to get rid of it.

You will also note that cotton has been subsidized for about a billion and one-half dollars during these years, and we ended up without any foreign market for the product. In fact, over $40,000,000 was spent as an export bounty in 1 year, after we had appropriated millions of dollars not to produce it in the first place. Of course, everyone knows cotton has received, by other means, many other subsidies amounting to millions of dollars.

Can you explain to the American taxpayers why $184,947,000 was spent to control the 1941 cotton crop when there was a 2-year supply in storage and when millions of dollars were being spent in promoting food production?

We have a war on our hands. Should we not discontinue during wartime these schemes which did not even make sense during peacetime?

Picayunes in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post-Tribune, Saturday, April 3, 1943:

PICAYUNES IN WASHINGTON

The picayune used to be a copper coin worth a fraction of a cent. It has long been obsolete, but its name still is used to describe what is petty, paltry, mean.

Picayunish does not describe with complete accuracy the petty, mean activities of some Members of Congress, because the picayune was not vicious.

Such episodes as Representative LAMBERTSON'S attack upon the Roosevelt boys' military records, Representative TABER'S criticism of the Office of War Information's Roosevelt cartoon book, Representative COOLEY'S alarm about wooden guns atop the House Office Building, are both petty and vicious.

However questionable the method by which the Roosevelts originally acquired their military titles, the President's sons have made good officers, and deserve that respect which we pay to all good fighting men. Congressman LAMBERTSON was out of bounds when he permitted his dislike for the President's policies to slop over as stab-in-the-back criticism of the four boys.

Congressman TABER has been around a long time, and knows that the President of the United States symbolizes to the whole world the might and the will of American democracy. About half of the American electorate, be it more or less, disagrees with the Roosevelt philosophy of domestic government.

That is no reason why we should refrain from capitalizing upon the fact that Franklin Roosevelt personifies—to our allies, to neutrals, to the conquered peoples of Europe—militant democracy about to become triumphant.

If Congressman COOLEY really was worried about wooden guns and wooden men defending his person, why didn't he take the matter up quietly with the War Department? If he had been in north Africa and discovered that wooden guns and tanks were deceiving Rommel while the genuine weapons were being sneaked around to smite the Nazis unexpectedly from elsewhere, would he have felt impelled to get onto the radio and tell Rommel?

The most charitable explanation for such petty, harmful actions is that these Congressmen are victims of headlineitis—a far from rare disease that becomes virulent when politicians have not seen their names in headlines for a few days.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Capt. J. D. Carter, chairman of the North Carolina legislative committee of the Order of Railroad Conductors:

NORTH CAROLINA LEGISLATIVE
COMMITTEE OF THE ORDER
OF RAILWAY CONDUCTORS,
Spencer, N. C., April 7, 1943.

Hon. R. L. DOUGHTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: Please allow me the privilege of congratulating you upon your recent successful fight against the Ruml plan in the House. As usual you were making a stand for the masses of people who are willing to bear their share of the burden of taxes which may be adequate to defray the expenses of our country at war, but do not choose to have shifted to our shoulders, the load of those who would like to "get out from under" all that they can. Yes, I truly believe that the people generally throughout North Carolina are gladly doing the part of true Americans by investing in bonds and stamps, and paying income taxes as fast as they become due, but consider it a crime to put off or forgive the taxes on income that were higher during 1942 than for many years past. Labor, because of the permanent steady employment, and in many cases at increased pay; business, because of volume of same, and in a great many instances greater profit per item.

We can well imagine the temptation of the argument put forth by the powerful press and the agents of the privilege hunter who would have us believe that they are the spokesmen for democracy in government, but we take pride in men like yourself who never can be persuaded to go against the masses of the Nation to the advantage of the few who forget all for the sake of accumulating a few more dollars.

Mr. DOUGHTON, I have taken this opportunity to express to you what the opinion of the Railway Conductors is, and I feel sure that opinion is shared by a very great majority of the common people, throughout the Nation.

With kindest personal regards,
Yours truly,

J. D. CARTER.

What Is Oleo Made of?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, the following official table from the United States Department of Agriculture shows what oleomargarine is made from:

TABLE 1.—*Oleomargarine: Production of materials used in manufacture, United States, specified years*

Item	Year beginning July—			Calendar year—				
	1913	1917	1918	1922	1927	1932	1937	1942[1] Jan.-Nov.
	Mil. lb.	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*
Tota production	144.0	326.5	359.2	184.8	277.5	203.2	397.4	383.6
Materials used:								
Oleo oil	57.5	96.4	97.5	41.5	49.5	12.5	12.3	21.3
Oleostearine	1.7	3.4	2.5	4.6	5.4	3.7	3.4	2.7
Lard, neutral	23.3	45.7	45.8	27.0	25.0	9.4	1.7	7.5
Oleo stock		7.5	6.3	2.0	2.1	.5	1.3	3.7
Monostearine								.2
Tallow					.2			.1
Butter	6.1	4.5	5.7	1.2	2.3	(2)		(2)
Cream	3.4							
Tallow oil	.3							
Total, animal	92.3	157.6	157.7	76.3	84.5	26.1	18.7	35.4
Cottonseed oil	23.2	36.5	37.8	14.9	24.6	15.1	173.6	145.4
Soybean oil	.7					(2)	31.8	122.7
Peanut oil	4.2	21.6	38.8	8.2	4.7	2.5	2.9	.9
Corn oil	(2)	(2)	(2)		.1	.1	1.8	1.6
Mustard oil	.5				(2)			
Other vegetable oils [3]				.9		(2)		.2
Total, domestic vegetable	28.6	58.1	76.6	23.9	29.4	17.7	210.1	270.8
Coconut oil	.3	61.8	69.6	53.8	122.6	123.2	73.8	3.5
Babassu oil							14.6	.3
Palm oil					.6	.3	1.1	1.4
Palm-kernel oil					.1		7.9	
Sesame oil	.7				.1		(2)	
Sunflower oil								6.7
Total, foreign vegetable	1.1	61.8	69.6	53.8	123.3	123.5	97.4	6.0
Total, fats and oils	122.0	277.5	304.0	153.9	237.2	167.2	326.2	312.2
Milk	37.8	61.1	68.0	[4] 52.5	76.2	49.0	72.8	67.6
Salt and other miscellaneous	11.9	18.3	21.4	[4] 19.6	23.6	13.0	19.1	13.9
Total, other materials	49.7	79.4	89.4	[4] 72.1	99.9	62.0	91.9	81.5
Total, all materials	171.6	356.9	393.4	[4] 226.0	337.1	229.2	418.1	393.7

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Less than 50,000 pounds.
[3] Includes cottonseed stearine, soybean stearine, and miscellaneous vegetable oils.
[4] Partly estimated.

Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Compiled from records of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, except 1917 and 1918, from the Institute of Margarine Manufacturers.

You will note the gradual reduction in the use of animal fats and the large use of coconut oil up until 1942. You will also note that soybean oil is evidently replacing cottonseed oil.

The following official table from the United States Department of Agriculture shows the domestic production and imports of fats and oils in millions of pounds:

TABLE 2.—*Supply and disappearance of primary fats and oils, United States, specified calendar years*

Item	1912	1917	1922	1927	1932	1937	1942[1]
Production from domestic materials:							
Animal fats and oils:							
Butter:	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*
Creamery	722	838	1,227	1,564	1,694	1,624	1,779
Farm					581	472	380
Total, butter	1,592	1,648	1,870	2,171	2,276	2,096	2,159
Lard, including rendered pork fat:							
Federally inspected	959	738	1,575	1,557	1,573	780	1,724
Other	699	713	727	706	807	672	780
Total, lard	1,658	1,451	2,302	2,263	2,380	1,451	2,504
Neat's-foot oil	5	8	9	9	4	5	5
Oleo oil	[2] 122	143	165	128	75	75	107
Oleo stock [3]	(4)	[2] 8	18	14	8	4	5
Stearine, animal, edible	[2] 60	[2] 70	75	67	36	44	55
Tallow:							
Edible	[2] 22	[2] 30	49	49	53	78	114
Inedible and greases, excluding wool grease	[2] 338	[2] 456	745	856	847	855	1,763
Wool grease	[2] 5	[2] 7	4	8	6	8	15
Fish-liver oil	(5)	(5)	1	2	1	3	7
Fish oil	36	23	63	69	85	196	142
Marine mamma' oil	7	8	17	11	6	71	(5)
Total, animal	3,845	3,852	5,318	5,648	5,776	4,866	6,876

[1] Partly estimated; data for December not available.
[2] Estimate.
[3] Exports plus quantity reported as used in the manufacture of oleomargarine.
[4] Not available.
[5] Less than 500,000 pounds.

TABLE 2.—*Supply and disappearance of primary fats and oils, United States, specified calendar years*—Continued

Item	1912	1917	1922	1927	1932	1937	1942
Production—Continued							
Vegetable oils:	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*	*Mil. lb.*
Corn oil	73	118	112	117	106	127	249
Cottonseed oil	1,435	1,344	935	1,807	1,571	1,626	1,396
Linseed oil [6]	317	309	181	373	180	131	722
Olive oil			1	1	1	2	7
Peanut oil	(5)	50	23	11	13	51	76
Soybean oil			1	3	39	194	760
Tung oil							3
Total, vegetable	1,826	1,821	1,251	2,312	1,911	2,133	3,203
Total, domestic production	5,671	5,673	6,569	7,960	7,687	6,998	10,079
Imports, including oil in seed	537	1,104	1,199	1,666	1,285	2,695	892
Factory and warehouse stocks, Jan. 1	(4)	[7] 435	1,033	1,195	1,733	1,846	2,237
Total supply	6,209	7,213	8,802	10,820	10,705	11,539	13,208
Domestic disappearance	5,108	6,111	6,821	8,308	8,030	9,228	10,380
Exports [8]	1,100	654	1,158	1,032	801	230	828
Total disappearance	6,209	6,764	7,979	9,339	8,831	9,458	11,208
Factory and warehouse stocks, Dec. 31	(4)	[7] 449	822	1,481	1,874	2,081	2,000

[5] Less than 500,000 pounds.
[6] Total reported factory production minus oil equivalent of imported flaxseed.
[7] Includes butter, lard, and cottonseed oil only.
[8] Includes shipments of butter and lard to United States Territories, and reexports of items imported free of duty or tax.

Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Production, trade, and stocks compiled from reports of the Bureau of the Census, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Bureau of Animal Industry, Food Distribution Administration, and Fish and Wildlife Service. Disappearance computed from data on production, trade, and stocks. Totals computed from unrounded numbers.

You will note that although, in 1912, we imported less than 3 percent of the fats and oils consumed in the United States, by 1937 we were importing over 20 percent of our national consumption. It might have been wiser to have had more concern as to our domestic production.

Everyone conversant with the subject knows that by September 1939 the whole A. A. A. program of the New Deal was a colossal failure, the prices lowest in history. In the spring of 1940, leaf lard sold in Chicago at $4.40 per 100 pounds, and that when the imported vegetable oils paid 2 cents per pound duty, this now removed as a war measure. The whole corn-hog structure, the real backbone of agriculture faces this competition freed of tariff just as soon as transportation is resumed. Friends of agriculture who hoped to see the farmers freed from the vicious subsidy schemes and the farmer once more getting his reward at the market place have noted with despair and disgust the action taken by the O. P. A. They seem destined to further slavery under the starry-eyed do-gooders of the New Deal. It looks like a cut of $5 a head on hogs, with higher prices and less pork chops for the people. The farmers just "don't get it."

Corp. Anthony Casamento—a Hero at Guadalcanal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the Members of the House and of future generations the story of the heroism of a gallant young marine at Guadalcanal. The marine is an American of Italian extraction, and I am proud to say comes from my congressional district. His name is Anthony Casamento, and this is his story in his own words:

I can't figure out why I'm alive now, except that maybe God set aside a day for me to die and that day wasn't it. But I'm alive, I'm breathing, I can walk and see, and the doctors say it's a miracle.

You see here we were. I was in charge of a gun crew. We'd just set up our machine gun across the Tenaru River on Guadalcanal. I can't remember now what day it was; the days are pretty well mixed up.

It was awful. We set up this machine gun and the place just became alive with Japs. They had their guns all over and the bullets and shells were whizzing around us like bees. I got a sting in my right leg; it was a piece of shrapnel, but it didn't bother me much I was so excited.

And when the Japs cut loose they just mowed down every single one of my guys except me. You figure it out.

The first fellow hit was my squad leader. He died. I felt his pulse, but there wasn't any beat. Some of the guys were just moaning there; others were yelling "Help, help," but I had to work that gun. I took it over.

I didn't have anybody to help feed the gun because they were all shot and wounded. I threw the ammunition into it and fired it, and it was pretty hard. The gun was getting hot and getting stuck.

Hell, I was mad then. I didn't give a damn. I lost my head, I guess. All my friends were shot and I was out to take revenge.

Then I finally spotted them—a Jap machine gun right ahead of me and another one to the right, both about 50 yards away. So I got hold of my gun and fired at the Jap gun in front of me and just let the whole belt go on it, and I can see the Japs suddenly pop up—I could see the bullets hitting them—and then saw them falling over dead on their faces.

O. K. I try traversing the gun to the right to get that second Jap gun and just as I am about to let the round go I get hit.

It was like a bunch of hammers hitting me all over the body at the same time. I looked at my legs, the blood was soaking out. My ear was beginning to bleed. Blood was coming from my neck, my arms, my chest, my shoulders.

That machine gun got me right in its sights and they just started from my feet up to my head and stitched a design of bullet holes in me. They got me from my right ankle right straight up my whole side to my right ear. I even got one through my neck.

I stopped for a minute, tore off my shirt so I could wind it round my neck for a bandage to stop the blood. Then I got to feeling dizzy. I grabbed my canteen in both hands and splashed all the water into my face so I wouldn't pass out.

I knew if I passed out those Japs would rush up on me, grab my gun, and turn it around and start mowing down our own men about 100 yards behind me.

I drank some of the water. I couldn't breathe. God, it was hot and sticky that day. I took off my belt and my helmet so my breathing would be easier. The blood was coming out of me all over.

I was on the ground, not standing up, and I tried to crawl to the gun to get it back into action. Then they started throwing hand grenades at me. I was reaching out my hand to get ammunition on the ground when one of them landed near me and broke all the fingers on my right hand. It just got me right across the knuckles in a straight line. I looked at my hand. It was dripping blood. I couldn't move the fingers.

The Japs were yelling in English, "Retreat, marine; Tojo says you must die."

I was mad all the way through. I stood up there and kept yelling back, "Go to hell, you ——— ———; you come and get me."

But I wasn't making a sound. Just wind whistling through the hole in my neck. I was dancing around there like a madman.

I couldn't use my right hand. I tried to get the corporal's gun off his body with my left hand, but it had a short lanyard on it, and I couldn't loosen it.

So the Japs kept on throwing hand grenades at me. I felt the concussion of one of them, like somebody punched me in the chest. They told me later it smashed one of my ribs.

I was lying there and the bullets came by and my left side was burning bad. All the bullets that missed my right side, I guess, whipped off pieces of the skin on my left side. I had those bullet burns all up and down my left leg.

I waited to die, but I didn't want to die. I kept thinking of my father and mother and how close it was to Christmas, and all the other fellows coming back for Christmas, and I wouldn't be there, and they'd have to be told I was killed.

Any moment I figured the Japs would be on me with their bayonets, but then our own men starting catching up with us, and a lieutenant I knew saved me. He saved me from being killed by our own men.

At first they thought I was a Jap because I had my shirt off and my helmet off and you couldn't tell, I was all bloody.

Our own men came at me with fixed bayonets and I kept waving at the Jap gun I knew was still on the right. I was sore. "Get them," I tried to yell, but I didn't hear a sound.

Well, they picked me up to take me back and I passed out. The doctors at the base hospital said it was the worst case they ever had. I hardly had any blood left. I had more than a dozen bullets on my right side. I don't know how much shrapnel—it's still in my fingers, my shoulders, my chest—well, I guess I'm lucky. The Red Cross plasma and blood banks saved me.

It's a funny thing. Where I grew up you had to be on your toes, you had to work all the angles, you had to get the other guy first or he'd get you.

Well, I don't want to be sharp any more. I just want to be an ordinary guy. I'm plain happy I'm alive.

Right Decisions Rightly Made

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 5, 1943:

RIGHT DECISIONS RIGHTLY MADE

In a recent private conversation the head of an important war agency made a statement substantially as follows:

"If Congress would let us alone and cease its interference, we would have this whole thing straightened out and settled very soon."

Probably hundreds of administrators wrestling with difficult problems have made similar statements. And there is probably not one of them, once his fit of impatience had passed, who failed to recognize the absurdity of what he had said.

Granted a Government administrator of utmost sagacity and knowledge of his job coupled with unselfishness to a degree almost saintly; let a man so equipped produce a program as good as human ingenuity is likely to produce, and it will all be of no avail until the people who must carry out that program consent to it.

No dictator was ever so absolute that he could continuously impose unwelcome decisions. Dictators know that quite well. They become dictators in the first place because they have an uncanny intuition as to what a people will accept and reject. They have most elaborate systems of keeping track of what people are thinking. Almost their chief weapon is propaganda to prepare a favorable reception for decisions they hope to make.

A distinguishing mark of democracy is that the people have more than the right to demand that decisions be agreeable to them. They also have the right to demand that they be consulted during the formation of the decisions. Not only must these decisions accord with their idea of what is right, but the process of reaching a decision must conform to their idea of what is right. A good decision made in the wrong way can be fully as harmful as a wrong decision.

The "Congressional intereference" which impatient executives deplore is merely the vehicle by which a free people contributes its "5 cents' worth" to the consideration of public problems.

Foreign Trade Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press:

FOREIGN TRADE TOMORROW

Vice President WALLACE and his fellow Utopians in Washington are not alone in planning for a new and better post-war world. The British are also giving thought to the morrow. Where the war will leave their export trade, aviation, and merchant shipping is already engaging attention in and out of Government circles.

A recent speech by Herbert Morrison, a Laborite member of Mr. Churchill's war cabinet, affords a clue to British official thinking. Very frankly Mr. Morrison stated that he approached questions affecting industry in "the light of genuine national interest." The British are not guilty of sentimental internationalism. What is good for England is good for the world, they argue. A nation that does not look out for itself will not long endure.

The Home Secretary then proceeded to say that British export industries, which had been created by private enterprise, would need, after the war, to be "supported and guided by the state." A much closer partnership between government and industry would have to be concluded. "I was very glad to hear the president of the board of trade," said Mr. Morrison, "tell Parliament last week how the export industries and the state are beginning to get together now to plan efficiency."

Americans should not miss the significance of Mr. MORRISON'S remarks. We could get along without our foreign trade, which amounts to only a small fraction of our total business. Great Britain's position as a first-class power depends on its foreign trade. That is why it is prepared to accept government control of import and export industry as a desperate measure to recover its markets after the war.

The United States and Great Britain, although scarred, will probably emerge from the war the two nations best equipped for economic recovery—and competition. We shall have a much larger merchant marine than Britain, and, if our maritime laws and regulations do not make the cost of operation such that we can't compete with foreign bottoms, we have a right to look for a larger share of the world's carrying trade. We shall also be in position to outbuild Britain in commercial aircraft. We should be able to command markets in Latin America and elsewhere, which heretofore Britain has regarded as lying in its proper sphere.

All the situation requires is that in their commercial rivalry, Great Britain and the United States keep matters on a plane of friendly candor.

American and British views are likely to diverge on more than trade rights. The only thing they have in common now regarding the post-war world is a general acceptance of the indefinite pledges contained in the Atlantic Charter. All the specific promises of freedom and self-determination for all peoples, for feeding and financing the world, which have been made by President Roosevelt, Vice President Wallace, Secretary Hull, and Under Secretary Welles, have fallen on deaf ears in Great Britain. The British have given no indication of intention to live indefinitely on a lowered standard of living in order to raise the calories in the daily diet of the Burmese or Malayans.

Americans who pledge to other peoples what they can't deliver are storing up bitterness and wrath for their country. A strong sentiment exists for taking our proper share of responsibility for maintaining peace, when it is won. The American people can't and, we venture to say, will not attempt to feed the world after the war, although they will willingly contribute toward helping others to help themselves.

We do not believe that our young men overseas, who will run this country in years to come, are planning in their trenches and fox holes to spend the rest of their lives slaving to raise the standard of living among the head hunters of Borneo.

And neither do we believe that the people of this country generally will long submit, after the war is over, to the tax load that would be necessary to make good all the promises now being made in their name by Washington star-gazers.

We should begin now to approach the post-war world with hard-boiled idealism. That is what England is already doing.

Right Back of Rickenbacker

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, while certain alien-minded radicals, pretending to represent various labor groups, are attacking and attempting to smear Eddie Rickenbacker, one of America's greatest herces, I am glad to note that they are not joined by the railroad workers of this country, as you will see from a full-page editorial in the Railroad Workers Journal for March 1943, which reads as follows:

The participation of the United States in the present war is mainly to safeguard the principles for which our democracy stands. One of these principles is freedom of speech; the right of every citizen to voice his opinion on any subject whether he be right or wrong.

Our armed forces at this very moment are risking their lives and shedding their blood as a protest against those who would destroy our American birthrights were we to lose this war. Defeat means the end of democracy in the United States and the beginning of dictatorship such as exists in the Axis nations. In those countries, citizens are not allowed the right of free speech. To voice one's opinion contrary to that of the dictators means severe punishment, or even death.

It is surprising, with all the evidence before us on dictatorships, that we have individuals who are laying the ground work for this system in our country. Proof of this statement is borne out by the fact that when Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker told the American public of the tragedy lying ahead in case we lose this war, he immediately became an open target for the American would-be dictators. Having analyzed the statements of Captain Rickenbacker, I am convinced he is not only a patriot but a very courageous man to come out openly and make such statements of facts at this time.

Captain Rickenbacker, being a war veteran, realizes we cannot loaf our way to victory, nor work haphazardly while our enemies work diligently. He knows our armed forces are giving their all with no thought of hours, working conditions, or monetary compensation, and giving it with only one thought in mind; to beat the Axis and safeguard democracy, a system where people live their lives as human beings without domination of political racketeers.

This global war is one of production. The victor must produce more rapidly than the vanquished. This objective will never be accomplished by petty bickering of labor leaders who are placing the dollar beyond the lives and security of this Nation.

Strikes, slowdowns, absenteeism, short working weeks with unnecessary overtime pay will never win this war. We, on the home front must be willing to sacrifice many concersions during this war period if we are to enjoy our American way of life after the war. Selfish gains of labor now may be the means of us losing this war and, if we do, these

gains will have been for naught because with the coming of dictatorship there would be no unions in these United States. Labor leaders who are taking advantage of "grinding an ax" during this war, whether they realize it or not, are grinding an ax for the Axis.

Captain Rickenbacker is doing a major job for his country and organized labor as a whole. He is telling us all facts we should know, and some labor leaders facts they haven't the courage to tell their followers.

The men in the armed services are naturally looking forward to the day when they will return to this country of freedom where men have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Imagine their surprise and dismay if they find their freedom taken away from them by union leaders claiming to be Americans. This is exactly what they will find if we allow the system of the closed shop to continue after this war. Our war heroes will be told in no uncertain terms they must join a union for the right to earn a living; told that the very thing they have been fighting for has been taken away from them through the dictatorial system of the closed shop or its partner in crime, the union-maintenance plan.

The only actual opposition to Captain Rickenbacker's educational campaign seems to be coming from the big-headed labor leaders who are using this war as a means of attaining their selfish and mercenary objectives at the expense of our present form of government if necessary. Therefore, it is not surprising that the captain, who is trying to put the American industrial ship on its right course, is being attacked.

All fair-minded people who have taken time to analyze the purposes of Captain Rickenbacker's program are right back of Rickenbacker.

Frankly yours,

MAURICE R. FRANKS, *Editor.*

Range Finder for Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Toledo Blade of April 6, 1943:

RANGE FINDER FOR WASTE

An Ohio Congressman, ROBERT F. JONES, of Lima, uses the Research Branch of the Congressional Reference Service as a range finder for shots at costly and unnecessary duplication of research work by Government offices.

This has been the subject of much congressional and editorial comment, but criticisms have fallen short of the mark for lack of such authentic and specific information as that now disclosed in detail from official nonpartisan sources.

It is not surprising that weeds of extravagance and folly take root and flourish in wartime. This was so in the Revolutionary period. Lincoln was harassed by job seekers, profiteers, and bread-and-butter politicians during the Civil War. The short Spanish-American War lasted long enough to develop graft and scandal. Dishonesty, inefficiency, and waste constituted a trio which cost American taxpayers millions and billions of dollars during the First World War.

Now that the emergency period of the Second World War lengthens into a way of life for the duration, the Washington administration should consider that it is being helped, and not hurt, by the disclosure that 75 percent of the Federal probing and snooping is unnecessary.

When 16 separate agencies investigate Latin-American affairs, 16 more study labor relations, 13 put in full time on foreign commerce when most of the trade routes are closed, and 7 putter about ceilings and price fixing, the time is at hand for drastic action in furtherance of partial solution of the problems of manpower and money.

Congressman JONES shows the President exactly where to use pruning knife effectively.

Danger in Delay

REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, why should a few obstinate men defy the American people by preventing prompt action on a current pay-as-you-go tax-collection system? I agree with the press on this important issue, and, under leave to extend my remarks, include as a part of my remarks the following editorial in the News under date of April 10, 1943, as follows:

DANGER IN DELAY

The most urgent duty confronting Congress is to enact a pay-as-you-go, collect-at-the-source income-tax plan.

Each day of delay deprives the Government of needed revenue and increases the menace of inflation. As President Roosevelt said yesterday, control of wages, control of food prices, and rationing—all of which he has ordered enforced with added vigor—are not enough to hold the anti-inflation line. Purchasing power must be decreased through taxation and savings.

Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator, points out that war spending is putting into the hands of American consumers this year $35,000,000,000 more than the value, at present prices, of the limited supply of goods and services they can buy. He urges pay-as-you-go taxation, to take money directly out of salary checks and pay envelopes before it can be used to bid up the present prices.

Republicans in the House of Representatives, with few exceptions, are eager to vote pay-as-you-go. They voted for the Ruml-Carlson bill last week. Their leader, Representative MARTIN of Massachusetts, announces he will oppose an Easter recess of Congress until the House is given another opportunity to act.

Democrats, who defeated the Ruml-Carlson bill and then sent all tax matters back to the Ways and Means Committee, are hearing from the folks at home and repenting in haste. More than 70 of them have signed a letter asking the committee to report out another bill. The leader, Representative MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, also is demanding action before the Easter recess.

Ways and Means is the bottleneck. Its chairman, Representative DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, apparently wants to preserve his committee's perfect record for bungling and obstruction. But a little more pressure from the House for a chance to redeem its own blunders will break down Ways and Means resistance and jar loose a bill for action.

Let it come quickly. After the House has acted, the Senate must act, and time is precious. For until pay-as-you-go becomes law Congress cannot proceed sensibly on other tax legislation, and 44,000,000 taxpayers will be left in uncertainty about the future. People uncertain about the taxes they will have to pay, and how the Government is going to collect those taxes, can't be expected to respond with full enthusiasm to appeals to put cash into War bonds.

Fair Employment Practice Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York:

STATE OF NEW YORK IN SENATE,
Albany, March 1, 1943.

Senate Resolution 30

Whereas our country is now engaged at war, and pledged to decisively and speedily defeat the forces of aggression and tyranny; and

Whereas to achieve victory over the enemy all the available man and woman power of our country, at home, must be mobilized in a production effort to furnish and supply our glorious armed forces and our gallant and courageous allies with supplies, equipment, and war materials; and

Whereas certain employers engaged in businesses, industries and occupations, and engaged in the production of supplies, equipment and war materials, are not fully contributing to the limits of their ability and capacity, the reason among others therefor, being that even at this late date and advanced stage of our production efforts for victory, they are still practicing discrimination, by refusing to engage, employ, and hire certain of our people because of race, color, creed, or national origin, which discriminatory practices are imperiling and endangering the unity, morale, and social welfare of our people; and

Whereas the vital effects of this practice and situation has been recognized by the New York State War Council and accordingly a committee on discrimination was established, vested with full power and authorization, under our State laws, to investigate, prosecute, and penalize employers engaged in discriminatory practices; and

Whereas this vital situation was recognized by the President of the United States and the Congress and in June 1941 the Fair Employment Practice Committee was created; and

Whereas the Committee on Discrimination of the New York State War Council has been doing effective work and achieving favorable results, but however, many employers remain out of its jurisdictional sphere; and

Whereas the Fair Employment Practice Committee in attempting to do effective work and achieve favorable results finds it has limited power, scope, and authority, and it is otherwise handicapped: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact suitable legislation vesting the Fair Employment Practice Committee with autonomy and full power of investigation, subpena, prosecution and enforcement,

together with adequate funds to operate; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of New York and that the latter be urged to use their best efforts to accomplish the purposes of this resolution with all convenient speed.

By order of the senate,

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

In assembly, March 22, 1943. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the assembly,

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

Compromise Plan Avoids Double Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star:

COMPROMISE PLAN AVOIDS DOUBLE TAX—WOULD DEFER 1943 LEVY TO ACCOMPLISH PAY-AS-YOU-GO GOAL

(By David Lawrence)

A simple compromise plan to put all taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go basis without the loss of a cent to the United States Treasury and without the hardship of a doubling of any tax payments in the current year can be put into effect if there is a genuine willingness to accomplish the pay-as-you-go idea.

Here, for instance, is a plan:

First. Designate January 1 next as the date on which withholding payments at the source will begin. This gives everybody ample opportunity to adjust his or her affairs to the pay-as-you-go principle.

Second. Consider 1943 taxes as deferred but not forgiven. A tax return for 1943 would be made by everybody as heretofore but only one-twentieth of the tax would be due on March 15, 1944, when the return for 1943 normally would have been made.

Third. Payment of 1943 taxes would be put on a basis of 20 annual installments and a discount could be given to all taxpayers who anticipate the future payments—a discount designed to bring into the Treasury a large amount that would otherwise be deferred. The discounts could vary according to the amounts involved and according to the number of payments that are made ahead of due date.

Fourth. On the death of the taxpayer, the back taxes would be due and payable in full by his estate but would be subject to the same discount that would be given the taxpayer if he had anticipated future payments.

MIGHT START JULY 1

Thus the Treasury eventually would collect all of the preceding year's taxes and yet would get the taxpayers on a current basis without the hardships of heavy double payments. A vast number of taxpayers would take advantage of the discounts for anticipating payments and in this way the Treasury would collect a much larger sum than it could under the existing system of taxation.

If the plan is approved for January 1 next then it could be put into effect on July 1, too, depending on whether the Treasury could handle the administrative task of establishing a withholding tax as early as July 1. Assuming that July 1 would be the effective date, then the payments already made in the current year could be treated as part payment on 1943 taxes and the withholding tax could apply for the second half of 1943, adjustments of differences being worked out in a final payment at the end of the year in the return made perhaps on December 31.

In that event the 1942 taxes could be treated as a deferred item. A special place might be inserted in the income-tax return for the computation of one-twentieth of the 1942 taxes. So when the one-twentieth, or 5 percent, of 1942 is added to the 1943 taxes, which would be paid in full by the end of 1943, the taxpayer would be on a pay-as-you-go basis in every instance where the income deductions for 1942 and 1943 were the same.

COULD EQUALIZE DISCREPANCIES

As for those taxpayers who have a discrepancy in income received and taxes due, so that 1942 is larger than 1943, the new law could provide for equalization. In other words, the receipts by the Treasury during 1943 need not be less than that which was due for 1942.

Assuming that a man's taxes based on 1942 were $7,000 and the taxes for 1943 are $5,000, the Treasury would require current payments during 1943 to be $7,000 just the same, but would credit the taxpayer with $2,000 toward the 1942 tax bill, and, instead of paying 5 percent per year on $7,000, the taxpayer would pay 5 percent per year on $5,000 for the 20 years thereafter.

In this way there would be no windfalls due to lower taxes in 1943 as compared with 1942, and the pay-as-you-go plan would be realized without loss to the Treasury. The incentive or discount plan, however, would give the taxpayer a chance to reduce his obligation, but this, in turn, is in line with established theories with respect to 20-year debt. The present value of a debt due in 20 years is always less than what it is at maturity, and multiplication tables have been worked out giving the present value for each year before maturity date.

The importance of collecting taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis is recognized by all parties and all factions. The only controversy has been as between those who want to forgive all or part of the preceding year's taxes and those who want to double up a whole year or a half year or a quarter year. The above plan avoids both difficulties.

Intrastate Transportation by Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Public Service Commission of South Carolina:

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,
Columbia, S. C.

At a regular session of the Public Service Commission of South Carolina held at Columbia, S. C., on this 7th day of April A. D. 1943.

In the matter of H. R. 1012 now pending before the Congress of the United States of America.

The commission, having under consideration the provisions of H. R. 1012 now pending before the Congress of the United States of America, and it appearing—

That the said H. R. 1012, if enacted, would altogether destroy the power of the State of South Carolina to regulate intrastate transportation by aircraft; and it appearing further

That the reservation of such power to the several States is necessary in the interest of obtaining adequate and efficient service of such character: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this commission, by adopting this resolution, hereby records its opposition to the passage of said H. R. 1012 and any and all attempts to limit and deprive the State of South Carolina of its right to regulate intrastate commerce within the said State; it is further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forthwith dispatched to each Senator and each Member of the Congress from the State of South Carolina.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION,
RUFUS M. NEWTON, *Chairman.*

Skin Shortage Threatens Leather-Glove Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I desire to call to the attention of the House existing conditions which seriously affect the glove industry of my district. Fulton County, Montgomery County, and a part of Schenectady County, N. Y., are known throughout the Nation as glove-making centers where thousands of American men and women earn their living making gloves. Due to a growing shortage of skins there is a grave danger that the industry may be forced to curtail its production. Enemy activity is responsible in a great measure for this shortage in leather skins due to numerous losses in shipping, but poor planning, especially in shipments from the South American countries, is also responsible for this shortage. In this connection I am inserting here a very fine article from the Fashion Accessories, April 1943, New York, N. Y., on this matter:

SKIN SHORTAGE THREATENS LEATHER-GLOVE INDUSTRY—SOME IMPORTERS SEE CHANCE OF AVERTING SHUT-DOWN

A new threat to civilian glove business has crystallized in the past few weeks. Importations of raw skins, on which the glove industry depends, have fallen off so drastically, at a time when more leather is being used for Government gloves, that the greatest danger threatening production within the next few months has shifted from manpower to materials.

This situation is unexpected, and is due to several factors. When the amount of haired sheep allocated to the glove industry for importation was fixed by the Government, the figures were based entirely on civilian needs, since at that time the Government was using

mainly horsehide and goatskin for gloves for the war effort. In the past few months, specifications for huge Government orders for men's leather-palm wool gloves have permitted the use of cape and cabretta leather, and this demand, added to the constantly increasing quantities of leather gloves needed for the Navy, Army, Air Corps, the WAAC's and other women's organizations, and gloves for industrial uses, has helped drain off existing supplies from the backlog in this country.

It has been suggested that the quota of haired sheepskins allowed the glove industry should be raised to provide leather for these additional Government needs.

In the meantime, the arrival of raw skins in this country has been critically reduced. Principal sources for glovers skins are South Africa for capeskins, west Africa for Nigerians, northeast Africa and Arabia for soudans and mochas, and South America for cabrettas and pigskins. From the South African area the shortages can be traced to shipping losses, while lack of shipping space has handicapped the South American supply.

Shipments of glovers capes and soudans have suffered losses due to enemy action during the past few months, and no replacement permits are granted. If an importer loses his whole year's allotment of raw skins on one boat, there is no possibility of him importing any more skins for that period. Therefore, all skins lost through sinkings decrease the volume that had been allotted to the glove industry. Up to the present, shipping space from South Africa has been comparatively easy, since all war supplies for the Middle East and India have to be shipped around the cape. As soon as the Axis is driven out of Tunisia, and the Mediterranean becomes safe for Allied shipping, it is expected that the shorter route will be used almost exclusively, and shipping from the cape will become as scarce as it was in the last war when only one or two boats got through.

If any additional skins are to be obtained from South Africa, they would have to be brought over while shipping space is available.

The second big source of glovers skins is South America, and there the problem is not one of loss through sinkings, but one of coordinating Government permits for shipping with the actual shipping space available from the ports where the skins are located. Pigskins have not had any preferential allotments, so a falling off has to be expected. For cabretta skins there is a definite quota which the Government will allow to be imported, and at present it is felt that this quota is not being fully utilized.

The total allotment is divided among the regular importers according to their usual volume of raw skin imports, and shipping permits are granted for each 2-month period to cover each man's allotment. Some importers have facilities for buying up skins and transporting them from the small towns in the north of Brazil where they are grown, to big shipping centers where they are stored in warehouses to be ready for any shipping space that may be available. Naturally, the permits of these importers are soon exhausted, and no matter how much shipping space is offered them, they can do nothing until the next period arrives.

Other importers deal direct with the growers in the small northern Brazil seaports, who have to ship their skins by direct boat to New York. Few of such boats stop at those ports these days, and many times the permit period elapses before any shipping opportunity is open. In that case, renewal of the permit is requested and sometimes such renewals are granted repeatedly in the expectation or hope that enough space would be available during the succeeding periods to utilize the total allotments.

It is believed that more skins could be available for the glove industry, if these unused shipping permits were not renewed, but were released at expiration date for use by those importers who have skins stored at the ports where shipping space is open more frequently.

This does not mean that raw skins would supplant more essential cargo. It means filling up chinks in boats that would otherwise sail without being loaded to capacity. Importers claim that because of irregular shipping schedules, boats come into port unexpectedly, and have to be loaded almost overnight with the cargo at hand. Sometimes a boatload of mineral ore has space available for bulk goods that would not add materially to the weight. At the last minute the boat loader calls the warehouse to see if any raw skins are available for shipping to fill that space. When permits are exhausted, such space has to be passed up and the glove industry is the loser.

In other words, the glove industry with an increased need for raw skins, is not getting even the shipping space allocated to it on the old basis. Meanwhile, the backlog of glovers' skins in this country is steadily getting lower. It would seem too bad if ships were coming to this country without being loaded to the gunwale, because of poor planning.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
In Assembly, Albany.

Whereas 10,000,000 citizens of the United States are presently deprived of their right of free suffrage by poll-tax laws in 8 States which impose upon the exercise of the elective franchise limitations neither contemplated nor condoned by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas taking advantage of the inability of these 10,000,000 citizens, both Negro and white, to express themselves politically by participating in the choice of their representatives in Government, both State and Federal, the forces of disuntiy and reaction have entrenched themselves in power and, thus protected, struggle ceaselessly against the consummation of the domestic and foreign policies of our Government and seek to disrupt the mobilization of all our forces for the successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas at a time when the morale and strength of the people of this Nation are needed increasingly if it is to survive, it is a dangerous inconsistency to continue to deprive any section of them of the democratic rights, to preserve which this war is being fought, but rather is it necessary to draw all men and women, no matter what their race, creed, color, or economic position, into full participation in the struggle for victory; and

Whereas the abolition of the poll tax will enable these 10,000,000 citizens to enter fully into their rights and duties as American citizens and will, at the same time, weaken those forces who place petty self-interest and personal power above the need for complete mobilization for victory as it will defeat those elements of reaction who depend upon the poll tax for their power, while it will strengthen national unity and morale: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Legislature of the State of New York respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to speedily enact H. R. 7, or any other similar or suitable legislation which effectively abolishes the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting for candidates for office in the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved (if the senate concur), That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

By order of the assembly,
ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate, March 26, 1943. Concurred in, without amendment.

By order of the senate,
WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

Resolutions of the South Carolina Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Carolina:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Columbia, S. C., April 8, 1943.

Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to consider the feasibility of a plan to require military training of all schoolboys in the United States

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), that the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to consider the feasibility of providing that all boys now enrolled, and hereafter to be enrolled, in the high schools throughout this Nation be required, as part of their school course, to take military training;

That in the consideration of this matter, it is requested that plans be worked out whereby all expenses incident to such training shall be borne by the United States Government; and

That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the National Congress from South Carolina.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Columbia, S. C., April 8, 1943.

Concurrent resolution endorsing the passage of House Resolution No. 38, in the United States Congress relative to the marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products

Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina does hereby endorse the passage of House Resolution 38, in the United States Congress, relative to marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products from rural areas through the various marketing agencies to the ultimate consumer, as it affects farmers, the various types of middlemen, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers with a view to ascertaining the facts that will be helpful to farmers and the marketing of their produce.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Columbia, S. C., April 1, 1943.

Resolution to petition the Congress of the United States of America to speedily enact legislation to make it unlawful to transmit through the United States mails or interstate commerce any written or printed matter advertising intoxicating beverages or any statements, pictures, or drawings for the purpose of stimulating the increase in consumption of intoxicants

Whereas the excessive drinking of intoxicating beverages is injurious to the health and general welfare of the people of this Nation, and especially so in time of war, in that it increases crime, causes absenteeism in plants engaged in producing materials for the war effort, increases expenditures necessary for law enforcement, and leads to other evil results; and

Whereas Nation-wide advertising is creating an increase in the consumption of intoxicating beverages; and

Whereas due to its Nation-wide scope and its connection with interstate commerce the separate States cannot effectively legislate against such advertising: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, That we do hereby petition the Congress of the United States of America to speedily enact legislation making it unlawful for anyone to transmit through the United States mails or in interstate commerce any magazine, newspaper, picture, poster, or any other written or printed matter which contains or includes any advertising of intoxicating beverages or any statement or picture or drawing, the purpose of which is to stimulate or increase the consumption of intoxicating beverages; and

That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Members of Congress representing the State of South Carolina in the National Government with the request that they work to promote such legislation.

Senate Resolution 424

Resolution asking Congress to prevent the sending through the United States mails of magazines and newspapers containing advertisements of intoxicating liquors

Whereas it is contrary to the public interest to encourage the use of intoxicating liquors: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Carolina:

1. That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, requested to take such action as may be adequate to prevent the sending of magazines and newspapers through the mails and other channels of interstate commerce which contain any advertising of intoxicating liquors.

2. That copies of this resolution be furnished to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Members thereof from the State of South Carolina.

Meat Prices of Processors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we take drastic action to compel the Office of Price Administration to comply with the statutory mandate assuring fair and equitable margins to processors of meat. For more than 8 months the Office of Price Administration has required meat packers to operate at a loss. They have flagrantly violated the statute. I have before me a telegram, dated April 6, in which a typical packer says that he is forced to sell 13 carloads of beef to the United States Army at about the same level as the cost of livestock, and the Army will not pay him because he will not agree to the unfair O. P. A. prices. He says, "$65,000 of our working capital is frozen. Unless payment can be made by the Army prior to permanent settlement it may be necessary for us to cease operations because of a shortage of working capital."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is bad enough to require meat processors to operate at a loss, but I think that it is adding insult to injury to force them to sell the Army at these unfair prices, and then tie up the money because they will not voluntarily agree to prices which do not comply with the statutory mandate. Why, in the name of fairness, should meat packers voluntarily sell to the Army at less than the prices which Congress has said are fair and reasonable?

We have been fooling with this matter long enough. The Office of Price Administration made pork prices based on 13.7 hogs, but the current price of hogs is 15.85. The Office of Price Administration will neither fix the price of hogs, nor raise the ceiling on the products. It is so patently unfair that I do not understand why the Government continues its squeeze policy. Our Government cannot afford at this crucial time in our history to be unfair. The meat-packing industry is an essential industry, and its morale should be kept at high level, and its plants permitted to operate at maximum capacity.

A. Park Dibler, a Real American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 27, 1943, Mr. A. Park Dibler, owner and publisher of the Braddock Free Press and the Turtle Creek Independent, died suddenly at the Mount Park Hospital, St. Petersburg, Fla. Mr. Dibler died on his sixty-ninth birthday. His newspapers are institutions in the Tri-Boro and Turtle Creek districts in Allegheny County, Pa. Although Mr. Dibler was a Republican by registration, his news and editorial policies were absolutely nonpartisan, and his newspapers were staunch supporters of the President's foreign policy. Mr. Dibler was all out for winning the war, and he vigorously supported War bond rallies, steel-salvage drives, and Red Cross blood-plasma banks in our great steel industrial area. He was a member of the Calvary Reformed Church, Turtle Creek; past master of Valley Lodge No. 613, F. & A. M.; Odd Fellows; past president of Turtle Creek Rotary; and a member of the Braddock (Pa.) Board of Trade. Mr. Dibler was admired, respected, and loved by all who knew him. He was a gentleman, an understanding employer, and a real American. I am happy to include in my remarks an editorial by his employees which appeared in the April 1, 1943, issue of the Braddock Free Press:

A TRIBUTE TO A. PARK DIBLER FROM THE WORKERS OF HIS PLANT

We of the Braddock Free Press and the Independent grievously mourn the loss of our chief—and our hearts are heavy.

We were associated and lived our working hours with him. We learned to know him; and, as we did, there developed a natural affection for him.

A. Park Dibler was above all else a gentleman, embodying all the fine instincts the designation connotes. He was ever courteous, considerate, and generous. He was a printer by apprenticeship, by trade, and by business. He always evinced a deep understanding of and friendliness for his fellow worker, indicated in part by his maintenance throughout life of a membership in the printers' union.

His character had the fineness of sterling. He was a man of honor and unswerving integrity. He never quibbled or sought advantage. He was in the truest sense religious, and his faith was boundless. His trust of others inspired confidence in him.

We, his associates, have lost a dear friend. The community has lost an outstanding citizen who exerted his powerful influence for its good. All will benefit by his having lived.

Although he has passed on, he will continue to live in our memories and be an inspiration to us.

Losing Beef Unnecessarily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to the Christian Science Monitor:

LOSING BEEF UNNECESSARILY

To the Christian Science Monitor:

Your editorial, The United States Needs Argentine Beef, has been sent to me at the request of the head of the department of animal husbandry of a Western State university. It is suggested that I write you because of my first-hand knowledge of foot-and-mouth disease. In 1941 I visited Brazil, Uruguay, and the Argentine. I gave special attention to foot-and-mouth disease and talked with the leading scientists on animal diseases in all three countries. I saw many thousands of cattle, and almost without exception they either had the disease in the active stage or showed they had been afflicted, though the disease might then be dormant.

I went clear down into the Province of Santa Cruz, which joins the Strait of Magellan. I feel I can say advisedly there is no area in any of the three countries I visited

that is not infected with hoof-and-mouth disease or exposed to recurrent outbreaks.

Argentine beef is mostly all fattened on alfalfa pasture and is soft and flabby. It does not even compare favorably with our own domestic beef from cattle fattened on the range in the shortgrass country, much less our grain-finished beef.

We are today losing billions of potential pounds of beef unnecessarily. First, the industry is hampered by conflicting and vacillating administrative regulations; second, while housewives are urged to save every spoonful of fat and carry it to the butcher shop for the production of explosives, neither the military nor the lend-lease want fat beef. As a result, large numbers of grass yearlings were sent to the shambles last year at six to seven hundred pounds that should have been finished on grain and have weighed 1,500 pounds.

J. ELMER BROCK.

KAYCEE, WYO.

International Stabilization of Currencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

THE CONGRESS SHALL HAVE POWER

Secretary Morgenthau has unveiled what purports to be an American plan for an international stabilization of currencies. Before the argument gets too heated, attention had better be focused on article 1, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States, which provides that "the Congress shall have power * * * to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin."

The power to issue money and, insofar as it is possible to do so, to fix its value nationally and internationally, is a sovereign power which in this country cannot be alienated without a constitutional amendment. Further than that, the power resides in Congress and only in Congress. Neither Mr. Roosevelt nor Mr. Morgenthau can take this authority from Congress. So far as the United States is concerned, those are the controlling circumstances. Congress has the first word and the last. Its jurisdiction over currency and exchange cannot be challenged. The people expect Congress to protect their interests in these matters.

When this has been said we may go on to examine Mr. Morgenthau's program to see what there may be in it to recommend it to Congress or to arouse congressional opposition. The plan is vague, but it does contain the intimation that our Government will put up something like 60 percent of the gold reserve of an international stabilization fund or bank, and that in return for our contribution we shall have no more than a 25-percent voice in the management.

It would be difficult to imagine a proposal which would go further to persuade the American people that this is not an American plan in origin. Americans have long suspected that this administration takes its guidance from London, and here we have additional evidence to sustain the thesis.

The plan is advertised as a reestablishment, with minor modifications, of the international gold standard as we used to know it, but Mr. Morgenthau's outline seems to avoid any solution of the two most difficult problems which have arisen in connection with the operations of the system in our time. How are the gold values of the national currencies to be determined, and how are they to be made to stick, once determined? To the first question, Mr. Morgenthau's outline offers no answer, and to the second, he suggests merely an agreement not to enter into competitive depreciation. Is there reason to believe that such an agreement will be kept? He doesn't say.

The question is by no means academic. If this is a serious attempt to return to the gold standard, it means that every nation in the world must accept the discipline that the gold standard imposes. It means that a nation suffering economic distress cannot meet its problem by engaging in unlimited deficit spending, for to do that is to promote inflation and therefore disequilibrium in the international exchanges. Are the new dealers prepared to accept this limitation on their spending? Has Mr. Morgenthau shown the plan to Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Wallace, and Mr. Hopkins?

What the Nation's Editors Say About Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 12 the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act will expire unless further extended by act of Congress.

This act has been renewed twice since its inception in 1934, and each time there has been opposition from certain influential business quarters against its extension.

The welfare of the entire country, rather than selfish business interests, would seem to require its extension, and the press of the country have expressed so well the reasons for its extension, and coming as they do from every section of the country, under leave granted I am attaching hereto as a part of these remarks editorials from different newspapers throughout the country:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass.]

Another early test of independence will come when Congress takes up the renewal of authority to the President to carry on with lend-lease and the reciprocal trade agreements. Some closer scrutiny by Congress is desirable. But if independence is taken to means that the legislature will refuse authority to the Executive and seek itself to administer these instruments of international cooperation—and there are Members who would try it—then Congress will run grave risks not only of hampering the war but of wrecking the peace.

[From the New York World-Telegram]

That a Republican majority will challenge the renewal of these treaties—and thus raise the charge of isolationism at a moment when there is virtually no commercial foreign trade anyway—seems improbable.

[From the Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald-Journal]

The Governor's (Stassen's) emphasis on reestablishment of world trade deserves to be underlined. It is the exchange of goods and services that has made our modern life possible. Only in this way can resources be developed and all peoples given a stake in maintaining stable conditions.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin]

Good members of the Republican Party who are as much for a decent world order as anyone else, are going to be * * * invited to refuse to renew the Hull reciprocal trade treaties on the ground that tariffs should be determined in detail (and raised) by the people's independent legislature.

If they fall for these maneuvers, they might just as well, once and for all, proclaim the Republican Party as having repudiated the Atlantic Charter, line up solidly behind the isolationist doctrine, and come out into the open as opposed to any cooperation of any sort.

[From the Philadelphia Record]

The fight on the Reciprocal Trade Agreements is largely a fight on the tariff issue. Although those trade agreements have worked well; although they have helped our domestic economy instead of harming it, some still think the President should go back to the old Coolidge-Hoover program—of trying to sell to other nations without buying from them in return.

If we haven't learned the impossibility of one-sided trade—then we haven't learned one of the basic causes of the last world slump and the present World War.

[From the Pittsburgh Press]

The administration's authority to make reciprocal trade agreements with foreign nations will expire next June, and President Roosevelt is expected to ask the new Congress to renew it for another 3 years.

We think that the Hull trade agreements—the 25 now in effect, the 3 now being negotiated, and the others that should be negotiated—will be essential to enable the United States to play its proper post-war role as a force for world peace and domestic prosperity. If the Republican Party hopes to live up to its present responsibility, let alone to realize on its future opportunities, it cannot afford to follow the advocates of economic isolation.

[From the Newark (N. J.) Evening News]

It is not even now too early for American business to realize that the days of high tariff walls are over and that in the post-war era it will have to be internationally minded.

When the Hawley-Smoot tariff, the highest in our history, was in the making in 1930 the most ardent champions of soaring duties were American manufacturers. They wanted no competition from abroad. They were not receptive to the argument that only through furnishing goods and services to us could our debtor nations raise the wherewithal to pay the interest, much less principal. Or if it were so, they did not care, so long as the tariff assured them high prices for their output. They preached the doctrine that a nation could be substantially self-sufficient.

What if a foreign country did produce something better than we could—we could use substitutes, couldn't we? Advocacy of this principle of substitution flowed over into other than manufacturing fields. Orchardists told the country we ought actually to bar bananas by a duty that would make them too costly to import. If we didn't have bananas on our tables, their argument ran, we could eat oranges and apples the year around and more melons in their season. The idea of penalizing the people to make profits

for group interests ran riot through the Congress.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun]

When the present war is ended, we shall again face the question of political isolation or political cooperation; but the question of economic isolation will come up, at least in a preliminary way, * * * in connection with the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, for which the administration is expected to ask.

The attitude of Congress toward this proposal will be one of the important tests of congressional opinion about the post-war world.

[From the Washington (D. C.) News]

(By Raymond Clapper)

His (Cordell Hull's) reciprocal trade program has been one of the few beacons in a bleak decade. To repudiate the program now would undermine every effort to make this victory stick.

[From the Washington Star]

Though the New Dealers do not list them as such, these reciprocal trade agreements rank as the most wholesome and far-reaching achievement of the Roosevelt regime. They constitute the one expression of international cooperation during the years when the administration was as isolationist in its color as any we have had.

If, now, these agreements should be repudiated, it would be a disastrous backward step toward the old high-tariff protection system for which there would be neither defense nor excuse.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch]

There is every reason to believe that the general level of living in many countries of the world can be raised after the war, by means of an intelligent program of international collaboration and freer trade. The approach of President Roosevelt and Vice President WALLACE to the problems of the post-war world impresses us as the right one, insofar as it places emphasis on the lowering of trade barriers, the establishment of an international organization to enforce peace, and the development of backward areas with the aid of America's wealth and productive capacity.

[From the Atlanta Journal]

Reports that President Roosevelt would ask Congress soon to renew his authority to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements with foreign countries brought predictions from Republicans that the request would touch off one of the bitterest fights in the Seventy-eighth Congress.

So here emerges that bloc of most unsavory ancient memory, the tariff bloc. With its higher tariffs levied in the 1920's these had great influence in bringing on the economic collapse of 1929. Our own and the tariffs of Europe helped greatly to bring on this war. Now the tariff bloc, having learned nothing, is to rally again against the Nation's prosperity and the world's peace.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal]

The time has come when we can no longer afford to jeopardize international understanding, necessarily based upon sound trade policies, because special interests demand inordinate tariff protection for their products. * * *

The greed of special interests which have become accustomed to preferential treatment does not recognize the necessities of war or of anything else.

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune]

If the Republicans intend to make the reciprocal trade treaty program a party football, their choice may not be a happy one. They can hardly refuse to permit renewal of the President's authority to make the treaties without waging a fight that will antagonize some of our war allies and expose themselves to the charge of impairing our relations abroad. * * *

High tariff protectionist groups would be glad to see the reciprocal trade program killed. Some isolationists would give their help to beat it. But if the Republican leaders decide to oppose the bill, they will have to make a real fight to have a chance of success. * * * The defeat of Mr. Hull's program would tend to negate everything that his speeches have led other nations to hope for in the way of American cooperation to maintain economic stability and to make materials available to all nations which need them.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

Congressman KNUTSON, of Minnesota has introduced a bill to terminate our 25 reciprocal trade treaties, and Secretary of State Hull has paused long enough to remark that he will have plenty to say, about the proposal in due time. This sounds to us as if the Secretary plans to let his Tennessee fightin' spirit get up good and plenty before he wades in. And that is all right too.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer]

A near new low for all time in specious tariff discussion was made recently in the address of Elvin H. Killheffer, chairman of the executive committee of the American Tariff League, at the annual meeting of that organization.

Taking cognizance of the growing demand for a liberal trade and tariff policy at the end of the war, the speaker told what was doubtless an appreciative audience a number of things about the tariff that should not pass unchallenged. It is particularly important that we begin to educate our public as to the facts of our tariff policy as a part of the planning that must be done for the post-war era. * * *

This column has assumed there would be no difficulty in the matter of extending the Hull reciprocal trade treaties, but with the tariff league displaying animosity toward them and, in effect, advocating more extreme tariffs than we have ever imposed, there can be no certainty even as to them.

Certainly we should involve ourselves in a terrible mess if in the midst of a war designed to promote the exchange of goods and services and to open economic opportunities to all people we allowed the Trade Treaty Act to run out.

Irrespective of that, the signs are multiplying that important groups are still unregenerate on the tariff, which is to say that winning a sound peace may prove quite as difficult as it was at the end of the other war.

[From the Cleveland News]

The League of Women Voters has dedicated February to arousing support for an extension of this program, which fact should be proof enough, if any were needed, that the reciprocal trade agreement is a weapon for national security, not a partisan issue.

To extend the program is simply to take out a minimum of insurance against one kind of destructive post-war chaos. All the arguments for this technique in time of peace are of double or triple potency in time of war.

The authority for reciprocal trade agreements should be extended without alteration in any way. If post-war conditions require changes, they can be made when the need is shown. Meantime, we can't afford to lose during the fighting any ground already gained.

Oil Pipe Line to New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
April 8, 1943.

Hon. EDITH N. ROGERS,
Congresswoman from Massachusetts.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Today's Boston Post mentioned your name as prominent in trying to get the oil pipe line to New England before next winter. Well, I know of nothing that could be accomplished that would give the relief and eliminate suffering as would sufficient fuel oil to relieve suffering and retard sickness. Nothing ever printed or reported covered 10 percent of the suffering up here last winter. Hundreds of thousands suffered in silence and had sickness, doctors' bills, with mental anguish in families as did the loss of sufficient fuel oil last winter in New England. As you can realize it is easy to say convert to hundreds of thousands who have not the means to meet today all the calls on their meager earnings or in thousands of cases no earnings or income. To find ways and means to keep the homes warm during the cold season is one of God's greatest blessings. Thanking you for past favors, I am,

Truly yours,

CHARLES J. LENNON.

Why Do the Executive Agencies Thwart the Will of Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following brief showing the strategic and economic importance of the port of Charleston, S. C., on the coastal terminus of a crude-oil pipe line from Tinsley, Miss., for the refining, distribution, and transshipment of petroleum and its products:

A BRIEF SHOWING THE STRATEGIC AND ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE OF THE PORT OF CHARLESTON, S. C., AS THE COASTAL TERMINUS OF A CRUDE-OIL PIPE LINE FROM TINSLEY, MISS., FOR THE REFINING, DISTRIBUTION, AND TRANSSHIPMENT OF PETROLEUM AND ITS PRODUCTS

FOREWORD

Long aware of the vital need of the South Atlantic ports in general, and the port of Charleston, S. C., in particular, for a more

convenient and dependable supply of crude oil to meet the growing military and economic demands of this strategic coast line, the city of Charleston gives its unqualified endorsement to the efforts being made to connect by pipe line this important military, shipbuilding, and industrial center, and world seaport with the prolific and easily accessible oil fields in Mississippi, northern Louisiana, east Texas, and Arkansas.

It is logical that, with the Tinsley field, of Mississippi, as the trunk line terminus, and the focal point of a great gathering system to fields westward, crude oil may be transported with economy and dispatch, over a comparatively short pipe-line, direct from these fields to refineries on the southeastern seaboard, to serve not only the great military and industrial needs of the South Atlantic States, but to augment the supplies of crude oil and products at like centers north of Hatteras, lending to that latter purpose the economic advantages of transshipment from the coastal terminals of the line over relatively short routes by tank cars, barges on the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, and off-shore shuttle tankers.

In close proximity to the Caribbean area and the Panama Canal, and possessing a shorter average sailing distance to the key points of the world than any other Atlantic or Gulf port, Charleston is in strategic position to serve as a major oil-bunkering port for our ships of the line, or those of our allies; and as a lifting point for our tankers engaged in serving our far-flung battle fronts.

This favored seaward position, coupled with the advantage of being the nearest Atlantic port to the most convenient and cheapest of the Nation's oil reserves, makes evident the fact that, from the standpoints of military and economic needs, the connecting of the Port of Charleston and this vast oil reservoir, by pipe line, is a project vital to the economic development of this long-neglected coastal region; and one so urgently necessary to the national welfare, with special reference to our war effort, that, to further retard its completion through indifference, sectional prejudice, or selfish interest gives question to the patriotism of those who would deliberately stand in its way.

Believing the military and economic value of this project to be of such outstanding importance as to warrant its approval by Presidential proclamation, this survey has been prepared in an effort to present concisely and fairly the immediate need for such action, and is herewith respectfully submitted:

NEED FOR A SOUTH ATLANTIC COASTAL PIPE LINE TERMINUS

In a letter dated May 16, 1941, and addressed to Congressman SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, endorsing the draft of the bill which later became the Cole Pipe Line Act of 1941 (Public Law 197, 77th Cong.), President Franklin D. Roosevelt, in the following excerpt, concisely outlined the serious fuel problem of the Atlantic coast, and stressed the immediate need for the construction of pipe lines to augment the supply to this area:

"This measure is concerned with one of the vital phases of our national defense program.

"The vast concentration of industry, population, and military bases on the Atlantic coast is now dependent for petroleum upon tankers plying between the Gulf coast and the middle Atlantic ports. Not only is this water route long and potentially perilous, but even present demands upon these transportation facilities make restriction of oil consumption to essential uses a distinct possibility within a few months. The immediate construction of pipe lines, to augment the supply to the Atlantic coast, is the one means available to relieve this situation.

"The bill which is proposed by Mr. COLE seems to me adequate to accomplish its objectives, and, in my opinion, it is a measure of first rank in importance. The situation which the bill is designed to correct must be remedied. I therefore take this means to call the measure directly to your attention and to urge that it be given early and earnest consideration by the Congress."

Unlike the coasts of Texas and California, which have available, at tidewater and in their immediate hinterlands, prolific oil fields easily accessible by short pipe lines to their refineries, to meet the military, industrial, and domestic demands of the Gulf and the Pacific coasts, respectively, the Atlantic coastal areas, although having the greatest consumption needs, have no such reserves; and, lacking pipe lines to transport crude oil from the nearer midcontinental fields to strategic coastal terminals for refining, have been compelled, in the past, to resort to the use of tankers to supply the bulk of their crude oil from Texas or contiguous foreign fields to the centralized refineries and storage points on the northeastern seaboard, which in turn have used tank cars, for the most part, to distribute to the Middle Atlantic and South Atlantic sections, and at resultant high freight rates, the petroleum fuels and products for which these sections are dependent in large measure upon the northeastern points.

As was predicted by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Secretary of Navy Frank Knox, Acting Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, and others, in endorsing the legislation which subsequently became the Cole Pipe Line Act of 1941, our limited tanker fleet proved inadequate in wartime emergency; and, as result, the already difficult and expensive problem of supplying the petroleum demands of the Atlantic coast has been greatly aggravated, through the necessity for replacing the former tanker hauls by the use of already overburdened tank car and other railroad equipment, at greatly increased rates over the normal tanker tariffs, and which rates are being met by a Federal subsidy, or cost to the taxpayers, of $1 per barrel on tank-car hauls from Texas points to the Bayonne and Marcus Hook refineries.

CONCLUSION

From the acute oil shortage on the Atlantic coast two facts are apparent:

1. The inadequacy of tanker service, in coastwise hauls from the Gulf oil ports to the northeastern refineries and storage points, during wartime emergency.

2. The fundamental error, from both the military and economic standpoints, of concentrating said refineries and storage bases so far north, that, now deprived of the relatively low transportation costs of tanker long-haul service from the Gulf, dependence upon tank-car transportation is made mandatory, and at such excessive rates that Federal subsidy has become necessary, lest the oil refining and distribution facilities congested into that area break down entirely.

It is to be hoped that the Federal Government will derive from this lesson the equally important fact that it is false and impracticable economy to spend vast amounts of public funds on costly long-haul pipe lines, over mountainous terrain, to connect with these far northern concentration points, for subsequent distribution of petroleum products to important areas, which would be more promptly and economically served by a relatively short pipe line from the nearby midcontinental fields to centrally located Charleston.

AUTHORITY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A PIPE LINE TO CHARLESTON

Section 2, Public Law 197, Seventy-seventh Congress, "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, and completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, reads as follows:

"Whenever the President finds that the construction of any pipe line for the transportation and/or distribution of petroleum or petroleum products moving in interstate commerce, or the extension or completion of any such pipe line already wholly or partly constructed, is or may be necessary for national defense, he shall by proclamation declare such finding."

In Public Law 675, Seventy-seventh Congress, "An act to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and navigable barge channel across Florida, and by deepening and enlarging the Intracoastal Waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border," Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, South Carolina, secured the enactment of an amendment (modified in passage) which provides for a "crude-oil pipe line from the Tinsley oil field in the vicinity of Yazoo, Miss., to Charleston, S. C., and/or Savannah, Ga." Through the efforts of Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK, South Carolina, the Rivers amendment, with modifications, was retained in the bill as was enacted by the Senate.

The act authorizes the appropriation of funds, including $13,000,000 to cover the cost of construction of the pipe line proposed by Representative RIVERS.

The project was left subject to the provisions of Public Law 197, which requires the President to issue a proclamation declaring that the proposed pipe line is or may be necessary for national defense, with the necessary directives as to its financing and construction.

However, the appropriation of funds in the amount of $13,000,000, as set forth in Public Law 675, is not necessary in order to finance this pipe line. Under the provisions of the Defense Plant Corporation, of which 100 percent is owned by the Treasury of the United States, ample funds for this purpose are available and precedent has already been set for the financing of such utilities and the Federal machinery is extant and functioning.

PROPOSED PIPE-LINE PROJECT AND ITS CHARACTERISTICS

Planned as a common carrier the proposed trunk line will find terminus in the Tinsley oil field of Mississippi, and then by laterals gather from the adjacent fields of Mississippi, Arkansas, northern Louisiana, and east Texas, to serve the port of Charleston, S. C., where the crude oil carried will be available for refining, spot military and commercial use, and for transshipment, coastwise or foreign.

Approximately 600 miles in length, the trunk line will be 12¾ O. D. pipe with a wall thickness of 0.250 inch and weighing approximately 83 tons per mile.

Fifteen pumping stations, with 1,200 connected horsepower, will be located at intervals of approximately 40 miles, and the carrying capacity of the line is estimated at 70,000 barrels of 42 gallons each, per day of 24 hours.

To be built over easy terrain, in a mild climate permitting of maximum working days in construction, the cost is estimated at $13,000,000, including storage and terminals.

Refining facilities are not included in the estimated cost for the line, but it is anticipated that with the delivery of the proposed volume of crude oil at the port of Charleston, several small refineries will immediately locate thereat.

In this connection it should be noted that priorities on specialized equipment, such as

stills, will not be a problem to refineries locating at Charleston. Corrected as of January 13, 1943, the Operations Section, O. P. C., lists upward of 220 refineries throughout the United States which have closed down because of lack of transportation facilities to move in crude oil and to distribute the products.

The quick amortization of this project is illustrated in the following estimates:

1. Being free of the $1 per barrel in Federal subsidy on tank-car movements of crude oil from Texas to North Atlantic refineries, the daily volume of 70,000 barrels through the Charleston-Tinsley pipeline will save $12,600,000 in 6 months, or nearly the estimated cost of the project.

2. It will release 12 tankers for other than coastwise service, effecting a saving of $21,600,000 in construction costs, or approximately one and three-quarters times the estimated cost of the project.

AVAILABILITY OF FULL LOAD FOR PIPELINE

Since a pipe line from Tinsley, Miss., to Charleston, S. C., was approved in Public Law 675, July 23, 1942, considerable controversy has been had as to available reserves to supply a full and continuous capacity load over this carrier.

Seemingly predicated on the erroneous impression of certain Government officials that the proposed line will depend solely upon the output of the Tinsley field, rather than upon that site as a trunk line terminus, and gathering point from other adjacent fields in Mississippi, Arkansas, northern Louisiana, and east Texas, such disputation has resulted in great delay in the construction of this important national defense adjunct and economic utility. Commenting on this and other bureaucratic failures to achieve coordination in the oil problem, Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys of the Senate, made the following statement in a progress report, released October 22, 1942:

"The lack of coordination is well-illustrated by the situation where the Office of Defense Transportation has declined to permit the building of a 600-mile crude-oil pipeline to a known proven reserve (Tinsley, Miss.), of 80,000,000 to 100,000,000 barrels, because the use of the 50,000 tons of steel was not deemed advisable. The Office of Petroleum Coordinator reports an erroneous reserve of 28,000,000 barrels, while the Navy Department desires the line to supply oil for east coast storage, now empty. As a result, the independent producers—holding 95 percent of the reserve in Mississippi—rely on inadequate tank-car rail movements to southern Illinois refineries. Similarly, the Mississippi State Oil and Gas Board found that lack of adequate shipping facilities was responsible for a 15-percent decrease in production in the summer of 1942."

(NOTE.—Attached as addenda are letters from: (1) Ralph K. Davies, Acting Petroleum Coordinator, to Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina, under date of September 1, 1942, setting forth certain adverse statements concerning the characteristics of the Tinsley field. (2) H. M. Morse, supervisor, State gas and oil board, Mississippi, to Representative RIVERS, under date of September 14, 1942, refuting the statements of the Acting Petroleum Coordinator referred to.)

The following tables show the proven petroleum reserves and the prorated daily production in the fields from which the proposed pipe line would take its load:

Reserves (as of Jan. 1, 1943):	*Barrels*
Mississippi	59,734,000
North Louisiana	300,056,000
Arkansas	415,061,000
East Texas	3,454,469,000
Total	[1] 4,229,320,000

[1] 20.4 percent of the total proven oil reserves of the United States.

[From the Oil and Gas Journal of January 28, 1943]

Production (as of Mar. 6, 1943):	*Barrels*
East Texas	423,150
North Louisiana	89,900
Arkansas	75,250
Mississippi	54,950
Total daily	643,250

[From the Oil Weekly of March 15, 1943]

The Tinsley field has seven different sands which vary in total thickness from 157 to 290 feet. Concerning this, H. M. Morse, supervisor, State oil and gas board, has estimated that the total remaining recoverable oil in the Woodruff sand alone is over 300,000,000 barrels.

It is significant that, despite the various adverse findings against the Tinsley field as a source of supply to Charleston, as set forth by the Office of Petroleum Coordinator (see letter referred to as addendum), of the approximately 49,000,000 undeveloped acres of oil land leased by the major companies, upward of 5,500,000 or about 11 percent, was estimated as being in Mississippi, as of January 1, 1943.

ADDENDA

OFFICE OF PETROLEUM
COORDINATOR FOR WAR,
Washington, September 1, 1942.

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RIVERS: This will acknowledge your letter of August 13, addressed to the Petroleum Coordinator for War.

Upon the enactment of H. R. 6999, the Trans-American Pipeline Corporation submitted its consulting engineer's preliminary plan and proposal for the construction of a crude oil pipe line from Savannah, Ga., and Charleston, S. C., to and through the Tinsley oil field in Yazoo County, Miss., together with a letter of transmittal to the Petroleum Coordinator for War. The company advised that it was bringing a similar application to the attention of the Honorable Joseph B. Eastman, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation.

The proposed pipe line has a rated daily pumping capacity of 70,000 barrels and would originate in the Tinsley oil fields. The best available engineering data indicates that the Tinsley field would not be able to furnish a sustained adequate supply of oil for the operation of the proposed pipe line. The field is now producing at substantially full capacity. Its productive capacity is declining, and further rather rapid decline may be expected to occur in a manner characteristic of the behavior of numerous fields operated under conditions similar to those prevailing at Tinsley. The estimated total remaining recoverable oil from the Tinsley field is 28,000,000 barrels, which would provide only slightly more than 1 year's supply for the proposed line.

Because of the excessive rates at which the field has been produced, the reservoir pressure has declined from an original value of a little over 2,000 pounds per square inch to approximately 500 pounds per square inch, a drop of 75 percent. Furthermore, gas-oil ratios have increased from the original value of about 100 cubic feet per barrel to as high as 1,300 cubic feet per barrel for some wells, and there has occurred a pronounced and rapid encroachment of salt water into the field over a comparatively short period of time. With the virtual completion of the development of the field early this year, oil production of the Tinsley Field reached a peak of 95,000 barrels daily in April. Since that time, production has declined to 80,000 barrels daily for August. Based upon the operating behavior of the field to date, it is estimated that production will have declined at least to 60,000 and possibly to as low as 45,000 barrels daily by the first of 1943, and to 25,000–30,000 barrels daily by 1944. On the basis of these conditions, it seems clear that the Tinsley field does not constitute an adequate source of supply for the proposed pipe line.

The termini of this line are named as Savannah, Ga., and Charleston, S. C. Since this is a crude-oil line and since there are no refineries located at these points, this crude oil would have to be transshipped by tank car or barge to the eastern refining areas. These transportation facilities are limited and due to the acute shortage of steel plate further construction programs are not being considered. It is estimated that, if the steel were available, it would require approximately 58,180 tons to build enough barges and tugs to transport 66,000 barrels per day from Savannah to Philadelphia.

Thus, if we add the 58,180 tons of steel for barges to the 55,521 tons of steel required for the pipe line, we have 113,701 tons of steel consumed. In addition, it is self-evident from the above production figures for the Tinsley field that this pipe line would have to extend quite a distance westward for additional crude supply. No estimate of the additional steel tonnage has been made by this office for such an extension since it is not known whether such supplies would be available.

As the report and proposal of the Trans-American Pipeline Corporation provided for only one link of a transportation chain, we could not approve this project. To complete this transportation system would require a prohibitive and inefficient use of steel, which is, as you know, a critical material. For this reason, the Petroleum Coordinator undoubtedly was of the opinion, at the time of writing his article which appeared in the August 8 issue of Collier's, that it would be preferable to omit reference to this project.

Analysis of the provisions of H. R. 6999, as passed and signed by the President, does not support your conclusion that the Congress has directed the construction of the pipe line in question. H. R. 6999 expressly provides that its provisions relating to the construction of the pipe lines referred to therein are subject to the provisions of Public Law No. 197, Seventy-seventh Congress—the Cole Act. Section 2 of the Cole Act provides that petroleum pipe lines shall be constructed, extended, or completed in accordance with its provisions whenever the President finds and proclaims that such action is or may be necessary for national defense purposes. No such finding has been made or proclaimed by the President.

Thank you for affording this office the benefit of your view concerning this project, and an opportunity to inform you of our analysis of its merits. If you believe that I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

R. K. DAVIES,
Acting Petroleum Coordinator.

Answer by H. M. Morse, supervisor, State oil and gas board, Mississippi, to foregoing objections, follows:

DEPARTMENT OF
STATE OIL AND GAS BOARD,
Jackson, Miss., September 14, 1942.

The Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS,
The House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RIVERS: This is a reply to your letter of September 9 and answers the objections contained in the letter of Mr. Ralph K. Davies, Acting Petroleum Coordinator, directed to you, paragraphs 2 and 3:

Engineering data on fields the like of Tinsley is very limited. In fact there is only one other similar field.

The Tinsley field is not producing to capacity as we have only one well to 40 acres except for a limited area where the wells are on 10 and 20 acres.

My estimate of the total remaining recoverable oil in the Woodruff sand alone is over

300,000,000 barrels. We have seven different sands which vary in total thickness from 157 to 290 feet.

My estimate may seem high, but you must remember that the experts have had to revise their figures on recoverable oil in the east Texas field ever upward until now they are afraid to make any predictions.

Dr. E. De Golyer, of the Coordinator's office, stated before the joint session of the Mississippi Legislature that in his opinion the Tinsley oil field had a total recoverable production of 100,000,000 barrels of oil, but that due to the method of producing we could only expect 40,000,000 total production. To July 31 of this year we had produced 37,557,883 barrels of oil.

The Tinsley oil field is not flush production and never has been. The decline in production of oil is not due to drop in pressure, bottom hole, or any other hole. The level of the oil still stands at the top of the well and, as long as the oil migrates into the pipe at this rate, it can be produced without injury to the well.

The decline from the high of 95,000 barrels in April to 80,000 barrels in August is due to shipping conditions. Tinsley is dependent upon tank car, and it is easier to keep the storage in the ground rather than in steel tanks on the surface.

The old cry of salt water is used in every case of buying and selling. If we did not have salt water, then we would be in a bad fix. No major oil field fails to have salt water. When a field fails to continue to produce salt water, as in the case of East Texas and other oil fields, salt water is returned to the producing sand.

The wells producing salt water in the Tinsley field were expected to do so as most of them are edge wells. A number of wells were completed by drilling through the sand into the salt water. Casing was set through the sand and cemented. The casing was perforated. Salt water came in, showing a bad cement job. Squeezing cement out into the sand was tried in effort to shut off the salt water. I would say that 9 out of 10 wells completed in this manner and making salt water were due to cementing jobs. One company alone spent over $100,000 to overcome a bad cementing job. This well has never been completed successfully.

The increase of gas-oil ratio does not mean anything, unless it does mean that due to pressure drop, the gas from lower strata is migrating into this sand. Very seldom, if ever, do you get an increase in gas-oil ratio as a field declines from flush production to pumping. As to the estimated production in 1944, when this time comes and the field is producing two to three times this much daily, all that can be said of this estimate is that it was wrong. The damage has been done and the east coast has been deprived of this oil and of the pipe line.

Mississippi has three other fields within a 25-mile radius of the Tinsley field. A new well in the Cary field, Sharkey County, seems to be moving up on the structure. The Vaughan-Pickens field, Yazoo County, has two producing oil wells. The Sharpsburg-Pickens field, Madison County, has four wells.

In Clarke County, in the eastern part of the State, a saturated oil sand was cored. The thickness is not known, the top 4 feet having been cored and a drill stem test made, insuring a producer of approximately 20-gravity oil.

All of the above-named fields are in almost direct line east and west across the State.

I hope that these facts and figures will be of some benefit to you in this matter and I remain,

Yours very truly,

H. M. MORSE,
Supervisor, State Oil and Gas Board.

IMPORTANCE OF CHARLESTON TO WARTIME STRATEGY AND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Strategic location

Centrally located on the thousand-mile stretch of the South Atlantic seaboard, and well connected therewith by rail, air, water, and highway, Charleston, possessing the finest deep-water harbor south of Hampton Roads, and immediately on the Atlantic, is not only in strategic position to serve the great military, industrial, and shipping centers of this important coastal region; but, because of its close proximity to the Caribbean area and the Panama Canal, and its short average ocean hauls to the principal ports of the world, is well suited to function as a major fuel transshipment point to our armed forces contiguously located and abroad.

If connected by the proposed 600-mile pipe line from the Tinsley and adjoining fields, Charleston, as a coastal pipe-line terminus and refining and distribution point, would be in key position to provide the following invaluable services to the Nation's present war efforts and its post-war plans and requirements.

Service to the South Atlantic area

Throughout the South Atlantic States great military camps and shore stations have sprung up; naval bases and shipbuilding plants have increased their personnel by many thousands; and other war industries have brought an unprecedented influx of workers, taxing to capacity transportation facilities dependent upon petroleum fuels for operation Fuel for the aerial and surface patrols covering our coast line; bunker requirements for vessels engaged in the overseas shipment of men, armaments, and supplies, and for their naval convoys; cargoes for tankers in the direct overseas service of our troops and those of our allies; and the volume of fuel needed for our great network of naval bases and air bases in the Caribbean area, have developed a vital need which justifies this direct pipe line to the central port of Charleston.

Government estimates of light, heavy, and motor fuels consumed in North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, during 1941, show a total of 73,120,000 barrels of 42 gallons each, including 15,000,000 barrels estimated as used by the Navy in its pre-war activities While exact figures are not available for public use, this normal consumption of more than 200,000 barrels daily (approximately three times the estimated daily volume of 70,000 barrels proposed for the pipe line in question) has been tremendously increased in this area since our entry into the war.

A pipe line direct to Charleston would help to relieve the present serious shortage of petroleum and its products now being experienced in this area, and correct the unbalanced economy which at present makes it necessary for these States, at resultant high freight rates, to draw the bulk of their commercial gasoline from pipe lines at less strategic locations; and their military, industrial, and domestic fuel oil, gas oil, Diesel oil, lubricants, and other products, from distant refining centers, already overburdened by the stepped-up demands of the congested areas to which these refineries are adjacent.

Service to points north of Hatteras

A pipe-line terminus at Charleston, with the attendant convenience of short-haul transshipment by tank cars, inside water route barges, and off-shore shuttle tankers, would in time of emergency, prove of great help to those areas north of Hatteras, now dependent upon the gasoline refineries and storage reserves on the northeastern seaboard, with special reference to those in the Bayonne, N. J., Marcus Hook, Pa., and Baltimore, Md., areas.

In the event of hostile action against these congested facilities and supplies, Charleston, as a decentralized point for distribution, would be of invaluable aid to its northerly neighbors.

Service to the Caribbean area and overseas stations

Although Charleston possesses a shorter average ocean haul for tankers to the key points of the world than does any of its competitor ports on the Atlantic or Gulf coasts, and is in close and favorable proximity to the Panama Canal and our numerous naval bases and air bases in the Caribbean, these tankers are forced to sail hundreds of additional miles, through waters infested with enemy submarines, to lift cargoes at certain North Atlantic and Gulf ports, when, with greater economy and dispatch, and with less risk, these cargoes might be taken on direct at Charleston, were it made a pipeline terminus.

The following table shows the saving, in nautical miles, for tankers sailing from Charleston to the Greater Antilles ports, and to and beyond the Panama Canal, compared with distances from the oil ports of Texas City, Baltimore, and New York:

	Charleston	Texas City	Baltimore	New York
St. Thomas, V. I.	1,192	1,796	1,417	1,434
Habana, Cuba	646	779	1,107	1,227
San Juan, P. R.	1,138	1,726	1,374	1,399
Port-au-Prince, Haiti	961	1,410	1,301	1,372
Colon, C. Z.	1,564	1,503	1,901	1,971

In the following table it will be noted that sailing distances from Charleston, in direct service to meet the military requirements of the Mediterranean and northern Africa areas, compare favorably with the North Atlantic ports, and show great savings over competitor ports in the Gulf.

In this latter connection it will be noted that Charleston is nearer Liverpool by 1,243 nautical miles, or a round-trip distance of 2,486 miles than is Texas City; and that Charleston is nearer Gibraltar Strait by 1,144 miles or a round-trip distance of 2,288 miles than is Texas City. Based on an average speed of 10 knots, and including time for loading and discharging, a saving of 13 days and 12 days per round trip or voyage to Liverpool and Gibraltar Strait, respectively, is had by vessels using Charleston over those using Texas City.

	Charleston	Texas City	Baltimore	New York
Liverpool (winter eastbound)	3,540	4,783	3,393	3,107
Gibraltar Strait (winter eastbound)	3,595	4,739	3,466	3,183

NOTE.—Data from Tables of Distances Between Ports, Hydrographic Office, U. S. Navy Department.

The port of Charleston as a military adjunct

In its own right a great military base, Charleston has the only first-class navy yard, for naval construction and repairs, between Norfolk and San Francisco, and is the location of a major port of embarkation, and other important components of the Military Establishment. Within its deep, landlocked harbor the entire Atlantic Fleet can find safe anchorage; and, in the past, it has served as the home port for the Atlantic contingent of the destroyer forces.

Located here are the tank farms of a number of major oil companies and distributors, with great storage capacity for both fuel oil and gasoline. Shipside bunkering and cargo

facilities are operated by Sinclair Refining Co., Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, The Texas Co., and Gulf Oil Corporation.

Located here also is the former refinery of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, with a daily capacity of 6,000 barrels, but now given over to the manufacture of asphalt.

Ample waterfront industrial properties are available on deep water, on the Ashley River and Cooper River, and several refining companies now closed in other sections have expressed interest in Charleston as an operating point should this port secure pipe-line connections.

Four railroads, with 15,000 miles of track, connect Charleston with important producing and consuming territories. Nine steamship companies, in normal times, serve more than 30 ports in foreign, coastwise, and intercoastal trade, and there is regular freight service via Intracoastal Waterway. Passenger-bus and truck-line service is had over three national highways. Delta Air Lines give daily service to and from the Pacific coast, and Eastern Air Lines give north and south service.

Conclusion

As set forth in the foregoing items, the importance of Charleston's natural and acquired advantages to wartime strategy and the national defense is well established. The addition of the practical utility of a crude-oil pipe line will better serve to meet the present and future needs of the Military Establishment on this range, to bolster the industrial output of the southeastern seaboard, and substitute for much-needed tankers.

Even in normal times limited tanker facilities were not more than adequate to meet the needs of the Atlantic seaboard. Based on 1941 figures, tanker hauls between Gulf coast and Atlantic coast ports delivered an average of 81 percent of the Atlantic coast oil supplies, and, operated at full capacity, it was estimated that the tanker fleet engaged in this haul could transport 436,000,000 barrels during 1941, the minimum requirements for shipments in this service during that year.

Inversely to the present enormous increase in wartime needs for oil has been the drastic falling off of such deliveries to the refining and storage areas due to diversions of coasting tankers to overseas service; the necessity for convoys, and the reduced speed and the delays connected therewith; and the heavy losses from enemy underseas craft.

One of the most important contributions which the proposed pipe line to Charleston, with a capacity of 70,000 barrels daily, would make to the national war effort would be the release of an estimated 12 tankers to other than coastwise duties.

ECONOMIC ASPECT OF A PIPE LINE FROM THE TINSLEY FIELD TO CHARLESTON

Economy effected

In transporting crude oil from the oil fields to refineries well removed, in normal times, the following carriers are available in the order of economy: Oceangoing tankers, inland tank barges, pipe lines, oceangoing tank barges, railroad tank cars, and automotive tank vehicles; but various economic factors militate against certain of these facilities during time of serious emergency.

Tankers, in time of war, because of diversion to overseas hauls, the need of expensive convoys, and potential loss by enemy attack, are inadequate in this coastwise movement; inland tank barges are dependent upon careful maintenance of depths in the waterways they ply; oceangoing barges experience many of the handicaps applicable to the off-shore tankers; the efficiency of railroad tank cars may be impaired by easily disrupted railroad operations and jammed yards; and the profitable range of automotive tank vehicles is limited. All are adversely affected by the perils of war, fuel and labor shortages, unfavorable weather, and the so-called acts of God. Only is the buried pipe line dependable and reasonably secure against harm in peace or war.

While the oceangoing tanker is cheaper than the pipe line in long hauls, the situation is reversed in relatively short hauls, such as the proposed 600-mile pipe line from the Tinsley field to Charleston, as compared with the distance of 1,354 nautical miles from Texas City, around the Florida Peninsula to Charleston.

The savings in original investment, operating costs, and delivery time over such a short pipe line, is reflected in most favorable tariffs. For example, the present tariff on crude oil, 30 API and lighter, as given in Rate Order 101, United States Maritime Commission, is 43 cents per barrel, while it is estimated that the tariff for the pipe line should not exceed 30 cents per barrel.

Other savings are indicated. For example, whereas the posted field price in Texas fields, is $1.25 per barrel, for 38 gravity oil, the open market price in the Tinsley field is 92½ cents per barrel for 32/34 gravity oil. Thus it will be seen that, as far as the oil derived from this latter field is concerned even with the addition of the 30 cents estimated pipe-line tariff it may be laid down in Charleston at a saving of 2½ cents per barrel below the actual field price in Texas.

From the standpoint of dispatch the pipe line, compared with the tanker as a carrier, is like a modern high-powered fire engine versus an old-fashioned "bucket line." Like the latter, the tanker, as a container, must be returned repeatedly to its source for a new supply; while the flow of the pipe line is constant.

Government estimates show that for the normal year, 1941, approximately 260 tankers plied between Gulf coast and Atlantic coast ports, with an average speed of 10.5 knots, and an average load of 83,900 barrels. An average of 18 days was required for a round trip.

From Texas City to Charleston is 1,354 nautical miles, or a round-trip distance of 2,708 miles Based on the foregoing averages it is conservatively estimated that, with time out for bunkering and discharge, and for usual delays, a tanker can make the round trip in 14 days, to lay down, as a result of a complete voyage, the accepted average of 83,900 barrels, as compared with the daily delivery of 70,000 barrels through the pipe line; thus releasing approximately 12 tankers for other than coastwise service.

Based on total contracts let by the United States Maritime Commission, as of October 1, 1941, amounting to $395,000,000 for a total tanker capacity of 827,000,000 gallons, it is estimated that the average sea-ready cost of a tanker of 85,000 barrels would be $1,800,000. Twelve such tankers, released from the haul between the Texas coast ports and the northeastern coast refineries and storage points, would mean a saving in construction costs of $21,600,000, or approximately one and three-quarters times the construction cost of the pipe line.

Compared with the costly subsidy of $1 per barrel being paid by the Government in connection with crude oil moved by tank car from Texas to the refineries of the North Atlantic, the total lack of subsidy on the volume of crude oil moved through the Charleston-Tinsley pipe line, in the amount of 70,000 barrels daily, would provide a saving to the taxpayers of $70,000 daily, or a total of $12,600,000 in 6 months; almost sufficient to offset the entire estimated cost of the project.

Crude oil as a power source

Although the basic purpose of this line is to provide cheap, quick, and dependable transportation for a substantial amount of crude oil from the prolific fields of Mississippi, Arkansas, east Texas, and northern Louisiana, through a trunk line from Tinsley down to the Port of Charleston, for refining, distribution, and transshipment incidental to the military, industrial, and domestic needs of the southeastern seaboard; such a line offers great possibilities as a power source to industries and utilities along its route, through the States of Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina.

According to the type used, crude oil may be reduced to a residuum or bottom fraction suitable for the generation of power, representing from 20 to 30 percent of the original oil. At any point on the line, convenient to an industry, the necessary volume of oil may be drawn off and run through a pipe still to obtain the heavy ends; and the lighter portion then returned to the line for subsequent refining at the costal terminus

The vast potential power which might be derived from this pipe line is shown by comparison with the recently built Santee-Cooper power and navigation project, 40 miles north of Charleston.

Constructed at a cost of $40,795,000, this hydroelectric power project is planned for an ultimate annual generating capacity of 700,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or an estimated daily average of 1,917,808 kilowatt-hours

Based on an assumed daily reduction of 25 percent of the bottom fraction from the 70,000 barrels of crude oil in transit there would be available 17,500 barrels of heavy ends for power generation.

For Diesel engine performance it is estimated that 0.5 pound of bottom fraction will produce 1 kilowatt-hour, or 672 kilowatt-hours per barrel of 336 pounds, giving a total yield of 11,760,000 kilowatt-hours from 17,500 barrels. This would be 6.13 times the rated output of the Santee-Cooper project.

Allowing 500 kilowatt-hours per barrel as a reasonable estimate for steam-engine performance, 17,500 barrels of heavy ends would generate 8,750,000 kilowatt-hours, or 4.56 times the rated output of the Santee-Cooper project.

Other potentialities of a crude-oil pipe line include the production of a great variety of synthetics, plastics, rubber, etc.

Growing importance of South Atlantic area

Indicative of the military importance of the South Atlantic States which would be served by a pipe line from the Tinsley area to Charleston, and of the intervening States traversed by the line, which could draw upon this carrier, are the following major war facility and supply contracts and allocations—exclusive of foodstuffs and items of a value of less than $50,000—awarded for the Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, Treasury Department, and foreign purchasing mission from June 1940 through November 1942:

North Carolina	$692,129,000
South Carolina	359,525,000
George	731,151,000
Florida	889,961,000
Total	2,672,766,000
Mississippi	555,978,000
Alabama	1,176,957,000
Total	1,732,935,000

Great as are the military needs of the south Atlantic area, for petroleum and its products, its economic needs are equally as important, as a suddenly doubled population creates new demands for these essential fuels, and a long isolated and disfavored region hits its stride; and it is reasonable to assume that, with its vast natural resources and raw materials, and the profitable byproducts to be derived therefrom; this south Atlantic seaboard will continue to forge ahead, seeking new power sources and encouraging new in-

dustries, to which end the practical utility of a convenient pipe line terminus at Charleston is most essential.

Natural resources and industries

South Carolina, as typical of its sister States, is rich in minerals, timber, agriculture, and fisheries, possesses a climate characterized by long summers and mild winters; has an abundance of intelligent native-born labor; is well supplied with transportation by rail, water, air, and highway, and is steadily advancing in manufactures and finance. Outstanding in its natural resources are the following:

Approximately 10,732,000 acres, or about 65 percent of South Carolina's total land area is in forest lands. More than 80 types of forest trees make up the merchantable stands including commercial hardwoods and softwoods and the slash pine, gum, and yellow poplar used in the manufacture of pulp and paper.

Among its metallic and nonmetallic minerals are the following: Sand; gravel; granite, both crushed and slab; clay, in commercial quantities suitable for brick and tile, and for the manufacture of paper and pulp; gold, both placer and lode production, with some silver and copper recovered; pyrites, for making sulphuric acid; barite, used in the manufacture of lithopone and barium chemicals; rock phosphate; marl and limestone, suitable for agricultural lime, building lime, and that used in the refining of sugar, the manufacture of paper, and of artificial rubber, and in the textile industry; and some spodumene and kyanite. Kaolin, or white clay, of a fine quality, perhaps suitable to the production of aluminum by the Hixon-Miller process, is mined.

Aside from its importance as a military center and naval construction base, Charleston, sought as the coastal terminus for the pipe line from the Tinsley area, is the metropolis and State port of South Carolina. Its industrial structure embraces 86 manufacturing plants, with 40 classifications; and shipbuilding is a major industry. Metallurgical products, fertilizers, lumber, and creosoted woods, asphalt, pulp, and paper, asbestos, foodstuffs, and beverages are produced in large quantities. It is a major distribution point for heavy and light fuel oils. Four railroads, two major air lines, three national highways, and, in normal times, nine steamship companies make up its transportation system, and regular service is had over its intracoastal waterway.

PIPE LINES APPROVED BY PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR

(1) *Pipe lines constructed under provisions of Cole Pipe Line Act*

Portland Pipe Line Co.: Completed November 1941. Extends from Portland, Maine, to the United States-Canadian border, 166 miles. This line extends an additional 70 miles to Montreal, Quebec. Constructed and owned by Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. Cost approximately $7,600,000.

Southeastern Pipe Line Co.: Completed January 1942. Extends from Port St. Joe to Chattanooga, Tenn., 462 miles. Constructed and owned jointly by Gulf Refining Co. and the Pure Oil Co. Cost approximately $5,000,000.

Plantation Pipe Line Co.: Completed January 1942. Extends from Baton Rouge, La., to Greensboro, N. C., with laterals to Montgomery and Birmingham, Ala.; Columbus and Macon, Ga.; Chattanooga and Knoxville, Tenn. Aggregates 1,230 miles. Constructed and owned jointly by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, Standard Oil Co. of Kentucky, and Shell Oil Co. Cost approximately $15,000,000.

Project Five Pipe Line: Completed for partial operation December 1942. Extends from El Dorado to Helena, Ark., 158 miles. Products are delivered to the new line through reversed pipe lines extending from the Fort Arthur, Tex., area to El Dorado, Ark. Barge and tank car loading facilities are installed at Helena for transshipping products north and east. Constructed and owned by Gulf Refining Co., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., Premier Oil Refining Co. of Texas, Lion Oil Refining Co., and the Texas Co. Cost approximately $3,700,000.

(2) *Pipe lines under construction through Defense Plant Corporation, without invoking provisions of Cole Pipe Line Act*

A 24-inch line from Longview, Tex., to Philadelphia, Pa., and New York, N. Y., approximately 1,400 miles. Being constructed under the supervision of War Emergency Pipelines, Inc. Estimated cost, $95,000,000.

A 16-inch and 20-inch line from Baytown, Tex., to Seymour, Ind., approximately 850 miles. Being constructed under the supervision of War Emergency Pipelines, Inc. Estimated cost, $44,000,000.

An 8-inch line from Carrabella, Fla., to Jacksonville, Fla., approximately 198 miles. Constructed under the supervision of Trans-Florida Pipeline Co. Estimated cost, $3,360,000.

An 8-inch line from Fostoria, Ohio, to Akron, Ohio, approximately 82 miles. Being constructed under the supervision of Ohio Emergency Pipelines, Inc. Estimated cost, $1,250,000.

An 8-inch line from Greensboro, N. C., to Richmond, Va., approximately 175 miles. Being constructed under the supervision of Plantation Pipe Line Co. Estimated cost, $3,600,000.

A 14-inch and 16-inch line from Refugio, Tex., to Houston, Tex., approximately 157 miles. Being constructed under the supervision of Humble Pipe Line Co. Estimated cost, $4,625,000.

Ranging from an estimated cost of $67,857 per mile for the 24-inch line from Longview, Tex., to Philadelphia and New York, via mountainous terrain, to an estimated cost of $29,458 per mile for the 14-inch and 16-inch line from Refugio, Tex., to Houston, Tex., through flat country, no truly comparable figures can be arrived at because of the varying diameter of the pipe employed. However, the approximate cost of $21,667 per mile figured for the Charleston-Tinsley 12¾-inch line, also to traverse easy terrain, bespeaks great economy in both time and money in its construction.

Due to the tremendous transportation burden which has been placed on the railroad tank cars through the failure of ocean-tanker deliveries, and the delay in constructing direct coastal pipe lines, it will be necessary, in addition to the critical materials needed for the upkeep of rolling stock now engaged in delivering around 800,000 barrels of oil daily in the Atlantic Coastal States, to build 5,000 new tank cars, at a total of 130,000 tons of steel, or approximately 2½ times the amount of steel to be used in the proposed Tinsley-Charleston pipe line.

RÉSUMÉ

1. The military and economic needs for pipe lines, to augment the supply of oil to the Atlantic coast, were clearly set forth by the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the Acting Secretary of War, and others, in endorsing the legislation which later became the Cole Pipe Line Act of 1941.

2. Authority for the construction of such pipe lines to the Atlantic coast was given in general under Public Law 197, Seventy-seventh Congress; and specifically from Tinsley, Miss., to Charleston, S. C., and/or Savannah, Ga., under Public Law 675, Seventy-seventh Congress, subject to the provisions of Public Law 197, with $13,000,000 approved for the construction of said line. Funds are also available and precedent has been established through the Defense Plant Corporation for financing such utilities.

3. Within approximately 600 miles of Charleston lies the Tinsley field of Mississippi, proposed as the inland terminus of a 12¾-inch trunk line, with immediately adjacent, as a gathering area, other prolific fields in Mississippi, Arkansas, northern Louisiana, and east Texas.

4. Availability of proven petroleum reserves for a full and dependable load, of a rated daily pumping capacity of 70,000 barrels, for the proposed pipe line is claimed by competent oil experts.

5. Traversing an easy terrain, it is estimated this trunk line can be built at a cost of approximately $21,667 per mile, including storage and terminals, with minimum use of critical materials (about 88 tons of pipe per mile).

6. From the standpoint of strategic location, it is submitted that the use of the port of Charleston as a coastal pipe-line terminus for the refining, distribution, and transshipment of petroleum and its products will result in the following advantages to the Military Establishment:

(a) Decentralization of refining and storage facilities for petroleum and its products, now dangerously congested on the Middle and North Atlantic seaboards.

(b) Convenient and dependable supply of oil for the many military posts and stations, and war industries, in the important South Atlantic area.

(c) Immediate bunkering and cargo supply of oil for naval and merchant marine vessels basing on this range, or using the deep-water terminals of the harbor of Charleston, which has a shorter average sailing distance to the key points of the world than has any other Atlantic or Gulf port.

(d) Quick dispatch to the important bases of the Caribbean area, and to the Panama Canal, and beyond to Pacific ports.

(e) A saving of from 12 to 13 days per round trip, or voyage, for tankers out of Charleston and destined for the United Kingdom, Mediterranean and north African ports, compared with tankers from the Texas gulf ports.

7. From the standpoint of economy it is estimated that the Tinsley-Charleston pipe line will result in the following savings:

(a) Release for other than coastwise service approximately 12 tankers with an average capacity of 83,900 barrels each, and an estimated construction cost of $1,800,000 each, with a total saving of $21,600,000, or approximately one and three-quarters times the cost of the pipe line.

(b) Free of the Federal subsidy of approximately $1 per barrel paid on crude oil moved by railroad tank cars from Texas to middle and north Atlantic seaboard refineries, the daily movement of 70,000 barrels over the Tinsley-Charleston pipe line during 6 months would save the taxpayers $12,600,000, or nearly enough to offset the entire cost of the pipe line.

(c) Substantial savings in construction and operating cost of this relatively short route will be reflected in most favorable tariffs over both tanker and tank-car hauls, while the cheaper open-market price in the Tinsley field, compared with the posted field prices of other areas, will show great savings.

(d) Based on a 25-percent withdrawal of residuum or bottom fraction suitable for the generation of power, it is estimated that as a power source the pipe line will provide daily 11,760,000 kilowatt-hours for Diesel-engine performance and 8,750,000 kilowatt-hours for that of steam engine, giving six and thirteen one-hundredths and four and fifty-six one-hundredths times respectively

the daily average of 1,917,808 kilowatt-hours of the Santee-Cooper hydroelectric power project.

Respectfully submitted.

HENRY W. LOCKWOOD,
Mayor of Charleston, S. C.

(Compiled by the Office of Port Development, H. F. Church, director, Charleston, S. C.)

Saratoga National Historical Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York:

STATE OF NEW YORK, IN ASSEMBLY,
Albany, March 22, 1943.

Whereas the Saratoga National Historical Park embraces a section of New York State highly significant in this Nation's early struggles for independence; and

Whereas it would be entirely fitting and appropriate to convert a portion of this hallowed ground as the final resting place for veterans of the several wars in which this Nation has or may become engaged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully memorialized to pass appropriate legislation to make possible the establishment of a portion of the Saratoga National Historical Park as a national veterans' cemetery; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from this State.

By order of the assembly,

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate, March 26, 1943. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the senate,

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

Dread Gestapo Bill May Be Instrument of Terror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal-American of Wednesday, April 7, 1943:

DREAD "GESTAPO BILL" MAY BE INSTRUMENT OF TERROR

The Department of Justice, which was recently criticized by the Supreme Court for the abuse of its powers, has drawn up a bill to give itself more powers to abuse.

The House of Representatives, which has been posing before the public as a legislative body which has regained its freedom from Executive domination, belied its claims by slavishly passing the bill.

The House invited the contempt of the Nation by hurriedly and unexpectedly passing the bill at a time when the attendance of Congress was incomplete, and many of the intelligent and patriotic opponents of the oppressive bill were absent.

The Members present who voted for the bill knew full well that they were incurring and deserved to incur the contempt and antagonism of the Nation, so they voted for the bill secretly, and did not allow their names to be recorded.

Not a very inspiring exhibition of independence or of legislative honor or decency.

The bill, properly called the gestapo bill, can still be rejected by the Senate, if the Senate, by any chance should happen to possess more independence and more patriotism and more loyalty to the public than the House.

An amendment sponsored by Representative HAMILTON FISH, of New York, was attached to the Gestapo bill in the hope of guarding freedom of speech and of the press.

Perhaps the Fish amendment will do so—perhaps it will not; but why should any bill be passed requiring such an amendment, in view of the constitutional injunction that Congress shall make no law abridging either of those rights?

Was it the purpose of the Department of Justice, in advocating this bill, to obtain a statute nullifying that part of the Constitution?

Yet, inasmuch as the rest of the amended bill applied to the entire citizenry of the country, as well as to hostile aliens, it should be scrutinized most carefully in the Senate to discern how else the lives and liberties of the people may be jeopardized by its unprecedentedly drastic provisions.

For the bill contains a great number of phrases which may prove to be fangs—especially under a Department of Justice which already uses its powers not for justice but for injustice, and is criticized therefor by the Supreme Court of the United States.

In the latter part of March, George Rothwell Brown pointed out the manifest dangers of the pernicious Gestapo bill in his Washington column, The Political Parade.

Describing the bill as having been sent to the Capitol by Attorney General Biddle "to be rubber-stamped," Mr. Brown said:

"This measure is designed to give to the Government powers to cope with saboteurs and traitors and to deal with such cases as those of the German spies who landed on Long Island and Florida and were tried by military courts.

"Nobody objects to such a purpose.

"But the bill contains language so loosely drawn that there is reasonable ground for belief that it could be used for the persecution of innocent American citizens."

Since that was written, notice has been taken of the fact that the bill would turn this free country into a nation of snoopers, with one household spying on another, and with citizens in danger of terrible penalties on the mere suspicion of failing to act as informers.

Mr. Brown likewise brought to light that Members of Congress—among them the Rules Committee of the House and Representative SUMNERS, chairman of the Judiciary Committee—who feared the effects of the bill, had been assured by the Department of Justice that its powers "would not be abused."

But what assurance is that coming from a department which already abuses the powers it possesses?

Similar assurances, Mr. Brown recalled, were given that the recently enacted Stabilization Act would not be invoked to impose the $25,000 limitation of salaries, yet it was so used, and Congress has had to pass still another measure as a corrective.

This proposed new law is of such a nature throughout as to cause suspicion that some motive besides the national defense is involved. The pending bill excites amazement by the punishment it stipulates—corporation or group fines up to $5,000,000, which could possibly be invoked against perfectly patriotic organizations for purely political reasons—and personal penalties, from death sentences down, for what may be only a "crackpot" manifestation.

These powers and penalties are peculiarly dangerous considering the conspicuous fact that savage decrees and punitive political action have been entirely typical of the New Deal.

The so-called Utilities Reorganization Act was distinguished by its "death sentence" clause.

Persons receiving voluminous Governmental questionnaires, many of them so complicated as to be incomprehensible, read thereon the Government's threat of 10 years in prison, or a $10,000 fine, for returning "false" information.

And now comes this fantastic bill along, embroidered with the bodesome words "death" and "imprisonment for life."

What young Draco is devising these things for the New Deal?

Is government by terror to be imported here from Nazi Germany and Communist Russia?

The Too-Independent Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM I. TROUTMAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 10, 1943

Mr. TROUTMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer under date of April 8, 1943:

THE TOO-INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

The joint congressional committee which has been showing up extravagance and waste in the swollen Federal pay roll and in unnecessary use of official automobiles has now turned its attention to the multiplicity of Government corporations and their financial operations.

It has already discovered that 30 of these corporations set up by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other agencies possess independent borrowing powers and don't have to ask Congress for operating funds, nor are their accounts subjected to audit.

Fifty Government corporations have a combined pay roll of 109,000 employees. The committee found some corporations which it had never even heard of before. It's safe to say that the taxpayers who foot the bills have been equally ignorant on this score.

The huge obligations incurred by these agencies are not included in statements of the national debt because of supposed offsetting assets. Many of them are not related to the war program, but whether they are or not, their activities should be under the eye

of Congress and their books subjected to official audit.

No commercial business could be run after this happy-go-lucky financial fashion without coming to grief. This inquiry into what has been done with the taxpayers' money should bring about a drastic reform.

Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article prepared by me for translation into Spanish and Portuguese and for distribution throughout Latin America. The article is to be used in connection with the bicentennial celebration of Thomas Jefferson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

April 13, 1943, marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson. Probably we could refer to no figure in the world's history who represents more the philosophy for which the United Nations are contending than Jefferson. All of the people in the United States will be conscious of the Jefferson celebration this year. On April 13 the President of the United States will dedicate the national memorial erected in honor of Jefferson in Washington, D. C. During the whole of 1943 the American people will celebrate Jefferson's bicentennial under the auspices of the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission, a national organization set up by Congress to honor the author of the Declaration of Independence.

In all of the American nations, both north and south, Jefferson will be honored not only because of his democratic theories, his advocacy of the right of States to organize their own governments, and his adamant stand for a Nation to be independent of all outside interference, but also because he was in very deed one of the most farsighted of the forerunners of the present-day hemispheric solidarity which is now so universally recognized by all of the Americas. Jefferson advocated that we make our hemisphere one of freedom, and he pointed out that an attack on one member of the American states should be considered as an attack on the whole.

The so-called Monroe Doctrine has been a theory which through its varied interpretations has both advanced and retarded hemispheric solidarity. I am sure that if everyone knew the real origin of the Monroe Doctrine, no one would have any fear of it and no one would have any misunderstanding about it. It had its birth in the American Declaration of Independence written in the main by Jefferson.

The real origin of the doctrine, however, came not with Monroe's pronouncement in 1823 but with a message sent to Congress by President Madison on January 3, 1811, and with the passage of a resolution by Congress on January 15, 1811. The resolution is so remarkable in its statesmanship and its fine American spirit and so full of what today is our good-neighbor relationship, that I am justified in quoting it in full.

"Taking into view the peculiar situation of Spain, and of the American provinces; and considering the influence which the destiny of the territory adjoining the southern border of the United States may have upon their security, tranquillity, and commerce: *Therefore, resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the United States under the peculiar circumstances of the existing crisis, cannot, without serious inquietude, see any part of the said territory pass into the hands of any foreign power; and that a due regard to their own safety compels them to provide, under certain contingencies, for the temporary occupation of the said territory; they, at the same time, declare that the said territory shall, in their hands, remain subject to future negotiation."

It should also be noted here that the resolution passed by Congress in 1941 regarding territory held by non-American states in the Western Hemisphere does not add to the authority granted to the President in 1811. To prevent non-American states from using our lands as pawns in their power politics and in war is the essence of both acts. Madison and Congress in 1811 reflected not only the best of the Jefferson ideals of hemispheric solidarity but also anticipated what soon after became the great dream of Bolivar: the All-American Unity. When we realize how close Madison and Monroe were to Jefferson and the inspiration he gave them, we see that the spirit of this great world citizen would be stimulus enough for all of the Americas honoring him during his bicentenary even if there were no other reasons.

In my study of Thomas Jefferson and his theories I have always found him never moving away from the great principles which, first of all, recognized the worth of the individual in society and, secondly, insisted upon the same moral codes for nations that we demand in men. Jefferson thus recognized what is now being attained: a unity of the whole world and a unity of mankind in that world.

When I, in my official capacity as Vice-Chairman of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, was working on suggestions for the wording of the panels which were to go in the monument, I attempted to choose from Jefferson's writings those theories which to my mind represented him as a world citizen and which marked the type of thought that later resulted in the establishement of the institutions in the development of the United States which have become the lasting parts of our political and social life. I believe I can do nothing better here than to print the suggestions which I offered as the panels for the monument. All of the words used are Jefferson's; all of the thought is Jefferson's; but the arrangement of these words and thought is mine. It will be noted that the political concepts expressed in these panels not only represent Jefferson but can in very deed become fundamental in the proper functioning of the theories which are represented by the United Nations today.

"I

"Man was destined for society. Society reserves to each individual freedom consistent with peace and order.

"All men are created equal, they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights; among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To secure these rights governments are instituted, deriving their powers from the consent of the governed. Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter it."

"II

"When we find our Constitution insufficient to secure the happiness of our people, we set it right.

"The people are the guardians of their liberty.

"God created the mind free. No man shall be compelled to support any religious ministry nor suffer on account of his beliefs. All men have liberty of religious opinion. Their morality is part of their nature.

"I know but one code of morality for men whether acting singly or collectively."

"III

"God who gave us life gave us liberty. Can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that His justice cannot sleep forever. Commerce between master and slaves is despotism. These people are to be free.

"That people will be happiest whose laws are best. Those worthy by education without regard to wealth or birth should administer them."

"IV

"Equal application of law is fundamental. Females have equal rights with males. To preserve freedom crusade against ignorance; diffuse knowledge; follow truth; educate the people at the common expense. Health and morality must not be sacrificed to learning. Prevent the accumulation of wealth in select families.

"Make our hemisphere one of freedom. An attack on one is an attack on the whole.

"Our wisest policy is peace and friendship with all mankind."

Jefferson's thought and a long study of history are largely responsible for my theories with regard to world unity. I have set forth these theories at great length in my recent book, Thomas Jefferson, World Citizen, but I believe it is fitting that I should summarize its thesis here.

World economic and physical unity is an unavoidable fact. World social, legal, and cultural unity has been more a fact than is generally realized. Writers have long tended to emphasize the differences between peoples. An entirely new picture would appear if they should undertake to point out the similarities.

It is my firm belief that in the universal acceptance of democracy we have the essential of world unity. With free peoples, in free nations where individual rights protect and enlarge the citizen and where self-restraint and united control preserve the nation, a united world is possible.

A man must enjoy at least four freedoms to be in any true sense a man. He may give over political rule to one man to make war or to many men to plan for peace. He may allow the rich or the worker in any community to have control of the common interests. But in so delegating power, he must not relinquish the fundamental liberties on which democracy depends.

World unity does not mean a world of bliss; it means a world much like our own America, where struggle and clash of interest still prevail but where peaceful cooperation of over fifty-odd political jurisdictions makes possible a given end. The world may fast become like our own great cities, where men have complex citizenship and some no citizenship, yet all stand as individuals before the law. The world of the United Nations means merely that condition where states may pull against each other, some alone, some in regions of interest, yet all may unite for for the common good.

I may see a larger and more comprehensive example of unity before I die, but I do not expect to see a better-working one. I love to read of Utopias. I am a believer in the grand course—the millenium—but it will not come by fiat. It will come from struggle, planning, experiment, and cooperation. I am not one to despair when the world seems to falter on its way to the attainment of such an objective. It would indicate an

ignorance of history to expect complete success for so great an undertaking without many an apparent failure. I have full faith in the attainment of new world unity. But this better world can never come without the development of the concept of the importance of the individual. Democracy, with Jefferson's "four freedoms" is essential to such an attainment. As he held the key to the successful working of our great federation of States and distant Territories, so, I believe, he set forth the formula for successful world-wide unity of the nations.

Address of Hon. Joseph H. Ball, of Minnesota, on Anniversary of Occupation of Norway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, on Saturday evening, April 10, several thousand friends of Norway met in Carnegie Hall, New York City, to mark the third anniversary of Hitler's occupation of Norway on April 9, 1940. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered there and later delivered over the N. B. C. red network.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We meet here tonight to mark the third anniversary of the most treacherous attack ever made by one nation on another. But we also meet to celebrate 3 of the most heroic years in the history of the Norwegian people.

The 3 years just past will shine with a bright luster for future generations of Norwegians. It did not take the Nazis many weeks to occupy the soil of little, peaceful Norway after that fateful April 9 of 1940. But at the end of 3 bitter years of struggle, the Nazis are further than ever from conquering the Norwegian people.

That is why the 3 years just past—and all of us hope that there never will be a fourth—will shine out in Norwegian history. On that home front, defended by Norway's 3,000,000 people, the Nazis have not won a single skirmish.

All of us remember that night 3 years ago when the treacherous blitz struck peaceful Norway. I think it was the black treachery of that attack that brought home to many of us here in America the full measure of indecency and inhumanity of which the Nazis are capable.

During Germany's severe depression of the twenties, thousands of Norwegian families opened their homes to German children, giving them nourishing food, shelter, and safety while their homeland struggled with its economic problems.

Many of those children, grown into young men and their minds twisted and warped by Nazi teaching, just happened in April of 1940 to be visiting the Norwegian friends who had sheltered them years before. And then suddenly their Norwegian hosts found these friendly youths were really advance agents of the Gestapo, viciously betraying the generous hospitality extended them.

It is difficult to conceive of any action more contrary to every principle of decency and honor. It is perhaps the blackest mark in the long score which civilization has to settle with the Nazis.

Our enemy has paid and continues to pay dearly for that treachery. There is hunger and cold and suffering in Norway today, but there is no surrender. The iron of Nazi rule has struck only sparks from the steel of Norwegian spirit and resistance.

From the very day of the attack, Norwegian youths began to escape to England and America to join the armed forces fighting the Axis. They have come in a steady stream, some crossing the stormy North Sea to England in their little fishing boats, others escaping through the mountains into Sweden and making the long trip across Siberia to finally cross the Pacific to America.

I have had the privilege to talking to several of those young men who were training with the Royal Norwegian Air Force. Some of them had made several attempts to cross the North Sea before they finally made it. But they brushed aside those past trials. All their energies, all their thoughts, were concentrated on preparing to strike back at the Nazis and free their homeland.

The great Norwegian merchant marine, with its ships and men, fights side by side with the other Allies in what is probably the toughest front in this whole war, the battle of supply lines.

And back in Norway itself thousands of German troops are immobilized, guarding the coast against invasion and guarding against sabotage and revolt by an unconquered people. Nazis and Quislings dare not go alone at night or they are killed.

The Norwegian Supreme Court resigned in a body and hundreds of lawyers have been imprisoned because they refused to recognize Nazi decrees as having any legal force. Clergymen declined to compromise in the slightest degree with the invader, preferring concentration camps to slavery and perversion of their faith.

Perhaps the greatest compliment to the indomitable spirit of the Norwegian people was paid by the Nazis themselves. A year and a half ago they confiscated all radio sets owned by Norwegians. Previously they had taken over all mediums of press and radio for their own propaganda and the people were forbidden, on pain of severe penalties, to listen to any but German broadcasts. That did not work. The Norwegians risked the penalties gladly in order to get true news of what was happening in the world. Finally, all radio sets were confiscated, and today it is an offense punishable by death for a Norwegian to be found with one.

But somehow, through hidden radios and the underground press and word of mouth, the news does get around. The Norwegian people, in the midst of their hunger and sufferings, know that the might of a free world is gathering rapidly, and that soon their chains will be struck from them.

Their motto, and it is a great one, is: "Some must willingly die if a people shall live."

We here in America are very fortunate. Our men will fight, many of them will die, in this war. But our homes, our women, and children will escape the horrors of total war. Our cities are not bombed, our babies have milk.

Because of that fact, because our strength and our stamina is being sapped less than most, the obligations resting on the peoples of all United Nations, rest even more heavily on us here in America.

We have two obligations, obligations to our own youth fighting and dying in this war, and to the gallant and unconquered, but terribly suffering peoples of Norway and Holland and Greece and Yugoslavia, and all the other nations occupied by the Nazis.

The first of those obligations is to do everything we can to help win this war as speedily as possible. I know that 95 percent of the American people are concentrating with single-minded devotion on that one big task, winning the war. But the remaining 5 percent make a noise all out of proportion to their numbers.

They are the few businessmen who are more interested in profits than in production, the few union leaders who are more interested in collecting dues than in serving the men who work. They are the few grocers and butchers who run black markets, and the few consumers who patronize those markets. They are the wise boys who don't believe inflation will hurt them and want to get theirs while the getting is good.

No one knows better than I that our Government has not done a perfect job of mobilizing America for total war. I have served for 2 years on the Truman investigating committee, and our chief job has been to uncover mistakes and get them corrected. There have been plenty of mistakes, and the usual percentage of chiselers and grafters have turned up. But we also have found that the people of America—the businessmen, labor, agriculture, and everyone else—are on the whole doing a magnificent job.

And America is a little weary of the individual whose first instinct when asked or ordered by his Government to make some little sacrifice to help win this war is to squawk, long and loud. He complains about taxes, about rationing, about prices, and about everything under the sun.

We live in a democracy and enjoy the right of free speech. But our rights also carry with them certain obligations, and one of those obligations, it seems to me, is to help make this democratic machinery of ours work. Criticism is all right, if it is constructive, if it helps get the job done. But this 5 percent of continual yelpers are hurting, not helping that job, and I think it's time the rest of us occasionally sat down on these squawkers and told them to get to work and shut up.

Our second obligation here at home to our fighting men and the peoples who suffered the first tide of Nazi conquest, is to follow through this time and see that the horror of war does not again engulf the world.

We've said plenty of times that we must win the peace as well as the war. But just saying it isn't enough. Words will not win this peace for us any more than they stopped Hitler's tanks. We need action, strong, constructive action. And it is none too early now to begin laying the foundations for that peace.

Military men have a motto: "In time of peace, prepare for war." The reverse is even more true. "In time of war, prepare for peace." We of the United Nations would be caught badly unprepared if peace came next month. It won't come that soon, of course, but our experience in 1918 indicates that when our enemies finally collapse, the end may come very quickly.

There is one very vital difference between preparing for war and preparing for peace. One nation alone can prepare for war and can, if it desires, plunge its neighbors and the whole world into war. But it takes many nations, studying, planning, and working together, to prepare for and to maintain peace.

In other words, war can be waged by a single nation. But it takes many nations acting together to maintain peace. Norway, Holland, Greece, and Yugoslavia each discovered in 1940 that the choice between war and peace did not rest with it alone. We in the United States learned the same bitter lesson on the morning of December 7, 1941.

Joint planning and study and cooperative action among nations are essential if we are really to win a durable peace from this war. It will not be simple and it will not be done overnight. We must never suppose that once a peace treaty is written and signed, the job is done. Maintaining peace is a continuing job. It must be done every year and

by every generation. It can be done and it will be done, but only if the people of America and the other United Nations are alert, informed, and determined, and insist that their governments take the actions and adopt the policies necessary to maintain peace and stability in the world.

While it is too early, and the facts are lacking, to settle the many details of the peace after this war, it is not too early for the Allies to try to reach agreement on broad principles which would guide decisions on specific problems. And above all, we should reach agreement on the machinery to maintain peace once we have won it. For without some assurance of a durable peace, solution of immediate post-war problems will be tremendously more difficult, and it will be impossible even to approach the long-time job of eliminating the causes of wars.

How can world peace be maintained? The history of our century points to the answer. The peace-loving nations of the world must agree that all international disputes be settled by peaceful means, and they must suppress by force any attempt at military aggressions.

Agreement within the next few months by the United Nations on the machinery to do that job would constitute the greatest victory so far in this war. It would give to millions of war-weary peoples renewed hope and strength to continue the fight. It would strengthen our cause and weaken the Axis. And it would give to our men, fighting against Japs and Germans, something to fight for—a real chance that future generations will not have to do this job over again.

If America can take the lead in laying a strong foundation for a lasting peace, then we here at home will have carried out our second obligation to our fighting men and to the millions of innocent people now suffering because this job was not done 25 years ago.

Thomas Jefferson's Contributions to Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, at this time I think it is very appropriate to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which has been prepared by Dr. James E. Ward, chairman of the department of economics and government at Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson, S. C.

Thomas Jefferson was the most versatile of all public men in making everlasting contributions in so many fields for the welfare of the American people. His achievements in other ways have, to some extent, minimized his accomplishments for agriculture, which are so ably set forth by Dr. Ward.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD under the title "Thomas Jefferson's Contributions to Agriculture."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMAS JEFFERSON'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO AGRICULTURE

(By James E. Ward, chairman, Department of Economics and Government, Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson, S. C.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Several years ago the doctoral dissertation of Dr. James E. Ward, a native of Norfolk, Va., in the School of Rural Social Economics at the University of Virginia dealt in an excellent manner with Jefferson's contributions to agriculture. As an appropriate gesture in the bicentennial year of this great American, the News Letter requested Dr. Ward, a distinguished member of the faculty of Clemson College, to prepare the following article. It concerns an altogether too neglected phase of the activities and interests of the versatile Jefferson, and we are deeply grateful to Dr. Ward for this interesting and significant material.)

EXTENSIVE AND SIGNIFICANT

Jefferson set many styles in the America of his day, but he established none more firmly than his convictions on agriculture. His interest in the subject was greatest on the social betterment side, and his studies and experiments in the art were undertaken with reference to their potential possibilities. His agricultural career has its lessons for us today as it had for the people in the day and time in which he lived. However, the lessons to be drawn in the two periods of time are quite distinctive. In his own day, the lessons were to be learned in the application and experimentation with his methods of cultivation, rotation, conservation of the soil, and the use of the best implements on his estate. The lessons for us today lie rather in his conception of agriculture as an honorable occupation, capable of being operated scientifically, and of his exhaustive search for better means and methods to aid agriculture more efficiently to serve mankind.

Jefferson's ideas with reference to agriculture were far in advance of his day. He was among the first to practice crop rotation. He was a scientific farmer, and in arranging for his system of rotation "he betrayed a mathematical taste. He divided his cultivated lands into four farms of 260 acres each, and each farm into seven fields of 40 acres, marking the boundaries by rows of peach trees. * * * The seven fields indicated his system of rotation of crops which embraced 7 years. * * * Each of the four farms, under its own overseer, was cultivated by four Negroes, four Negresses, four horses, and four oxen, but at harvest and other busy times the working forces of all were concentrated."

SYSTEM OF CROP ROTATION

Anyone who studies his system of rotation would see just how modern he was. He reduced corn to 1 year in 7, and tobacco was eliminated entirely. He always stressed the maxim that where the soil is left bare the sun "absorbs the nutritious juices of the earth." Consequently, in his rotation system he did not designate any land to lie fallow, but rather cultivated certain plants, especially legumes, because he accepted the idea that such plants would absorb fertility from the atmosphere and store it in the soil. Another significant observation revealed by an analysis of his rotation system as projected on his estates, is that the crops planted in the various fields provided a continuity of employment for both the labor force and the work stock and thereby avoided excessive peak demands.

Perhaps the criticism might be made that his system of rotation is better from the standpoint of the conservation of the soil than from that of its profitableness. However, with evidences of soil mining on all sides, it was only natural that Jefferson would see to it that his estate was not cultivated in this manner. Furthermore, too hasty a commendation must not be made of this system until the prevailing conditions of the time are understood. No rotation systems were then being practiced except by certain interested individuals and the best system as to both the preservation and profitableness of the soil would have to be derived through experimentation. Jefferson was constantly experimenting with his rotation system throughout his lifetime and he often instituted beneficial changes.

"PROVE ALL THINGS"

Jefferson was not the type of farmer, of whom there were then and are today far too many, to content himself with things as they were. He was one of the first American agricultural experimentalists, and he was ever alert for better methods, willing to take any amount of pains to remedy existing conditions and practices which had proven bad. His underlying philosophy was well versed by Jefferson himself in a letter to Gov. John Milledge: "But the scripture of 'prove all things and hold fast that which is good' is particularly wise in objects of agriculture," and it is safe to say that no one on the plantations labored harder than Jefferson himself in his efforts to carry out this principle.

One sound agricultural principle Jefferson advocated firmly was deep plowing. However, his records show that to the last of his life he was still trying to impress his laborers with the necessity of it. Jefferson had observed that in the prevailing system of plowing on the hillsides in Albemarle the farmers' efforts were often wasted by the rainstorms which washed both the crops and the soil down the hillside. Consequently, he was on the lookout for some method which would remedy this wastefulness. On his return from France in 1789, he conferred with his son-in-law, Thomas Mann Randolph, about the ideas he had obtained in Europe on this problem and the result of this conversation was the introduction by Mr. Randolph of horizontal and terraced plowing brought about by the development of the hillside plow.

As a result of experimentation, Jefferson domesticated many trees and shrubs, both native and foreign. He raised and experimented with no less than 32 vegetables at Monticello and also regularly cultivated 22 different crops. Fruits were a special hobby and he cultivated or experimented with all the then known kinds of grasses. He also gave much time and effort to the improvement of the livestock of his day both by importing better stock and improving domestic breeds.

INNOVATIONS AND INVENTIONS

The agricultural methods of the Virginia farmer in pre-Revolutionary times were largely patterned after those prevalent in England. Until 1760 these were extremely crude. Most of the implements used on the plantations and farms were the products of plantation blacksmiths or the small-town handicraftsmen. Consequently, there was very little standardization, and the efficiency of the implement depended almost entirely on the skill of its maker. Unfortunately, this was a characteristic too often lacking.

Probably the most important factor in the improvement of agriculture during our history was the invention of the iron plow. This implement did not come into general use until 1825, but its predecessors, other forms of plows, were in use nearly a half century before that time. The plow of the last quarter of the eighteenth century was a wooden one covered more or less completely with strips or old scraps of sheet iron.

With such a plow it is not hard to understand why deep and thorough plowing was

not in evidence at that time. However, due to the virgin fertility of the soil, surface plowing yielded unusually good results. Jefferson always insisted on deep plowing and his sense of beauty urged him to advocate better and straighter plowing. These desires led him as early as 1788 to enter upon some speculations concerning the improvement of the then existing plows.

IMPROVED MOLDBOARD OF PLOW

It was always a delight to Jefferson to apply his mechanical and mathematical gifts to practical purposes and therefore he began this task with the enthusiasm of a man who walked at home in this field of endeavor. He doted on experiment and this presented him with a golden opportunity. His deliberations and experiments resulted in the first really great improvement in the plow. Future improvements were made on his plow, but his was the first step in that direction. Jefferson devoted his attention to the proper shape of the moldboard of the plow. His interest in it lay in the problem of so shaping the moldboard that it would do its work most efficiently and at the same time offer the least resistance. To this problem Jefferson applied mathematical principles. Notwithstanding the fact that his plow had several great defects, his contribution to the design of the moldboard cannot be overestimated as it still governs the shape of the share plows.

In addition to his invention of this moldboard of least resistance, Jefferson made several improvements in the threshing machine of his day. His third contribution as an inventor and innovator of agricultural implements was the invention of a hemp brake which was a sort of machine for bruising the woody part of hemp so as to separate it from the fiber. Jefferson gave his attention to this experiment because such a machine was badly needed and desired by the cultivators of hemp.

Although Jefferson's influence as an inventor and innovator of agricultural implements was not very extensive, his few contributions were very significant and formed the bases of many future developments in these types of equipment. The development of all farm implements depended upon the type of culture or the staple grown, and this is one reason why a large number of implements were not invented prior to 1800. Tobacco, the money crop of Virginia, required a large amount of handwork in the way of transplanting, hoeing, worming, cutting, stripping, and curing.

Moreover, mechanical progress was very haphazard in Jefferson's day and he sought to give it the competent direction of his criticism in order to aid others as he had been aided through the counsel and advice of his friends. He undertook to improve his equipment primarily because of two factors. These were the virgin soil and the scarcity of labor, and he was desirous of increasing the yield per man rather than the yield per acre. Thus his almost universal curiosity added another achievement to his extraordinary versatility.

It was his keen observation and practical power, his insight into agricultural problems and the realization of his fellow man's need for a solution which inspired him to add the role of the inventor to his long list of accomplishments.

A MEASURE OF SERVICE

Jefferson's services to American agriculture were many and varied, but none of his contributions was of greater interest to him than was his aid in improving the type of rice grown in this country. His attention in it had been aroused by the fearful sacrifice of human life entailed upon plantations in Georgia and the Carolinas in the production of wet rice, "a plant which sows life and death with almost equal hand." For this reason, Jefferson sought to learn more about the culture of dry rice, and thus it became one of his favorite agricultural hobbies and pursuits.

Rice was largely consumed in France and anxious to know from what markets they drew their supplies, Jefferson sought to find the answer to this question during his stay in France. He found that American rice was unable to compete successfully with that raised in southern Europe, and he therefore determined to find out what processes they employed there to make it superior to our rice. At first he thought that the American rice was cleaned by methods quite different from those employed in Italy from whence the best "Piedmont" rice came, and that therein lay the advantage of the Italian rice. However, upon investigation, he found the two processes to be similar and then he concluded that Italian rice must be of a better quality than the American rice. He therefore, determined to send some of its seed back to his friends in America.

He made a journey across the Alps in 1787, into the rice growing districts of Italy in order to procure the seed. At that time no one was allowed to send or take rice seed out of Italy because the government of Turin, knowing that their rice was the best of all varieties, had prohibited its exportation on pain of death, even to other parts of Italy. Falling back on what he terms "the higher law," Jefferson induced a muleteer to run a couple of sacks across the Apennines. Having little faith in the muleteer's success, he filled the pockets of his coat and overcoat with the best rice of the best rice-producing district of Italy to send to his friends in the Southern States. It came to hand in Charleston safely and was distributed in quantities of a dozen or more grains to several planters. These were carefully tended and furnished South Carolina and Georgia with the origin of their species of upland rice which is said by many to be the best rice of the world.

THE GOOD NEIGHBOR

Another of Jefferson's services to American agriculture was his interest in the introduction of the olive tree into the Southern system of culture. His paramount interest in the plant comes out in the remark that "the greatest service which can be rendered any country is to add a useful plant to its culture; especially, a bread grain; next in value to bread is oil." His recommendation of the plant had been so enthusiastic that several of his friends immediately requested plants to be sent over and some undertook its culture. Olive oil, however, despite Jefferson's generous efforts, is not yet an American product. Either because of the want of skill or perseverance in their cultivation, or because of the unsuitableness of the climate or soil, the trees did not flourish in America.

These are only two of Jefferson's seemingly unending services to the infant unskilled agriculture of his country. While he was acting in an official capacity for the United States in France, he sent information, seeds, roots, nuts, and plants to the agricultural societies in Charleston and Philadelphia. Upon receiving notice that he had been elected into the membership of the Charleston society, he sent them, with his letter of acknowledgment, some seeds of the St. Foin grass and some seeds of the cork oak for experimentation in South Carolina. There were few agricultural productions of value, or new agricultural implements, in Europe, which the thought gave the least promise of being valuable in America, that he did not send to responsible and interested persons in the United States, together with minute directions for their cultivation or operation. Even after his return to America he continued his benefactions to the agricultural societies at Charleston and Philadelphia, and also to his friends and acquaintances.

A GREAT SCIENTIFIC CONTRIBUTION

Simultaneously with the acquisition of the vast territory procured by Jefferson, while he was President of the United States, through the Louisiana Purchase, came the demand for exploring it more thoroughly. Jefferson had his own ideas as to the knowledge he wished obtained by the explorers, and he instructed Mr. Meriwether Lewis, the leader whom he had chosen for the expedition, to observe and record, among other things, "vegetable production" of the soil, "the climate and the dates at which particular plants put forth or lose their flower or leaf."

His instructions were minute and very detailed, but they showed his wonderful combination of science and practical sagacity. Viewed broadly, this expedition was perhaps Jefferson's greatest contribution to science in general.

However, he did not confine his services so far as agriculture was concerned to his own country, for he regarded the world as his country and to do good was his religion. He sent American plants, shrubs, nuts, and seeds abroad for experimentation, and in doing so he mingled private gratification with services of the highest public utility. It was in this way that he carried his benevolence wherever he went and sought to make his country better for his having lived. It was always his opinion that whoever could make two ears of corn, or even two blades of grass grow upon a plot of ground where only one grew before would deserve better of mankind, and do more essential service to his country than the whole race of politicians put together.

EVER THE FARMER

The last period of his life was that of rural and philosophic repose. In all his joys and his sorrows he was ever finding the real enjoyment of life in the pursuit of the occupation of the farmer.

To understand Jefferson aright, he must not be thought of only as a great statesman, diplomat, or philosopher, but he must be revealed with a background much more to his taste and delight as an innovator of agricultural implements, a scientific farmer, and a lover of the soil from whence he drew so much enjoyment and happiness. Whatever his virtues may have been in public life, it was only in his private life that they shone most conspicuously. It is characteristic of the genuineness of the man that, even after he had been President of his country, he gave his occupation as that of a farmer. And he did so because he loved his fields, his orchards, and his particular hobby, his asparagus beds, to the point of passion.

Thus we see the man whose interests were so varied and his life so full that he had to give a major portion of his time to other things, but who nevertheless achieved a portal in the hall of fame of agriculture through his abilities as an agriculturist, an experimenter, and an enthusiastic leader in the betterment of the agricultural society of his day and through it that of all time.

This Is My America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an apostro-

phe to America by Lt. Col. William A. Brewer. It is entitled "This Is My America," and appeared on the front page of yesterday's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS MY AMERICA

(By Lt. Col. William A. Brewer)

This is my land, this is America.

Her waters and her soil have nourished me, her air I have breathed, her trees and her hills have sheltered and inspired me.

I am one with her; her grasses and her minerals are flesh of my flesh and bone of my bone; and the sweet flesh of my ancestors has nourished her, and the blood of my ancestors fighting to keep her free, has watered her broad acres.

I am all hers and she is all mine.

Her flag is my flag; in it is not just what I see, but what I am. When I look at her flag I see only bunting and colors, but when I look into her flag I see wonderful things.

I see the breadth of her—from the spume rising where rollers of the Atlantic sweep in to the rocks of Maine to the yucca bells ringing vespers on the hills hanging over San Diego.

I see the height of her—white spires rising through New England elms, and a pueblo throned on a red rock mesa in New Mexico, and the clouded summits of Shasta and of Washington.

I see the depth of her—the carved chasms of the roots of the skyschapers of Manhattan, and the root cellar under the sod shacks on the prairies of Dakota, and the sweating rock a mile down in the Argonaut mine at Jackson.

I see the blue waters of Pend Oreille, and the brown waters of the Missouri at St. Charles, and the white waters of Yosemite, and the red waters of the Tennessee, and the green waters of the Potomac; and all that they bring to the land, and to the people; and all that they take away.

Waking, I hear the bird songs in Wisconsin elms, and drifting off to sleep I hear the long-tailed chat whistling at the moon above the black deeps of Tahoe, and the sea mew piping the sun down beyond the Golden Gate.

I see the age of her, too; the dinosaur tracks in the stone in the prison yard at Carson City, the ferns imbedded in coal in the rich black heart of Pennsylvania, the ring upon ring storying splendor inthe redwoods in the Trinity forest; and, more recently, the traces of the Indians at Canandaigua and El Reno; the westward wheel tracks of the forty-niners, and the beacons of the skypaths of the airliners.

All these I see when I look into the flag, and in it, too, I see the men and women, my kind of men and women; their roots deep in old cultures by which they won their way to the light, and their heads high as they stand up and face the light and know that it is good.

I see the children, with the sweet soft faces on which no story yet is written; and the old people with their faces on which are written mysteries and heroic poems.

I see the pageant of America's people, led by the lordly and colorful ones, but mostly Joe and Mary and Tom and Harry and Beth, the ones the papers don't write about, the ones that never are told about in the histories, because they just live and work and give their hearts' warmth to keep America alive.

I see the starry few, Abe of Springfield and Tom Jefferson and Teddy and Steve Decatur the duelling man, and old Andy Jackson, puckery and fresh to the taste as a mountain plum, and Henry Thoreau bringing the world into the confines of Walden Pond.

I see these people and these things as a part of the flag and of the land, as I am a part of the flag and of the land; and I see the land and the flag as part of them, as the flag and land are a part of me.

I see America and I hear America, I hear the music of America.

I hear the winds and clouds making a great harp of the heart, and I hear the melody of America played on that harp. The mountains bow and the hills leap at that melody which no words can tell.

I hear America in song and the song is good, the voices of the waters and the winds and the riveting machines and the saws, the voices of the men and women singing, the men singing the good spirits in their hearts after their work, and the women singing to their children while they put them to sleep.

I hear America in song and the song is good; I see America in the light and the light is good. I touch America, the dark warm rich soil of America, and the red soil, and the sandy soil, and the loamy soil; and the soil is good.

This is my America, and these are my people and these are my heartstrings on which the song is played; they are mine and I am theirs.

More Discrimination

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS J. CAPOZZOLI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, an article published in the New York Tribune of Friday, April 9, discloses that the American Bar Association has refused admission to its membership to an outstanding lawyer in my community because of his color. The lawyer involved is Francis E. Rivers, at present an assistant district attorney of New York County, formerly a member of the State legislature, a man who served in the First World War as a lieutenant of a machine-gun battalion, and who saw action in the Argonne.

I know Mr. Rivers personally. I am happy to state that he possesses an excellent reputation, has attained high professional standing at the bar, and is a patriotic American.

He was sponsored for membership by Judge Jonah J. Goldstein, a judge of the Court of General Sessions in New York County, whose passion for a square deal for everybody, regardless of race, creed, or color, has endeared himself to everyone who has ever met him.

Those of us who know Judge Goldstein have not been surprised in the least at his reaction in the matter. When Judge Goldstein became aware of the fact that Mr. Rivers was being denied membership solely because of his race, he wrote a letter to the association. Among other things, in this letter the judge stated that he could not be a member of a professional organization which bars Negroes from its membership. He took the further position that to continue his membership would in essence be contributing to the perpetuation of bigotry.

Arthur Garfield Hays, national director of the American Civil Liberties Union, also resigned from the association in protest over its failure to admit Mr. Rivers to membership.

Lawyers are the guardians of freedom in a democracy. They are charged at all times with the duty to protect the rights and dignity of the individual. The American Bar Association is made up of lawyers in good standing from all over the United States and its Territories. It maintains a unique standing in our country. It is highly regarded and respected by our fellow citizens. It is no exaggeration to say that it holds a position of leadership in the molding of public opinion, as it exercises a tremendous influence over the people generally.

The action of the association, in excluding an eminent lawyer from membership, simply because of his color, is, to say the least, most unfortunate. It is completely un-American and contrary to the high ideals of the honored profession of the law which, above all else, teaches that all persons are equal in its presence. Its action, therefore, tends to a division amongst our people at a time when complete unity is desired.

Mr. Speaker, all fair-minded persons, with no axes to grind and motivated merely by a desire to see fair-play are sincerely hoping that the American Bar Association will lose no time in correcting an obvious injustice and, further, that it will assure the public that it does not practice, nor believe in, the perpetuation of bigotry.

Misleading Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, pending before the House Judiciary Committee is the recommendation of one of its subcommittees providing for the so-called equal-rights amendment.

The resolution has been offered by Representative LUDLOW, of Indiana, and provides in article 1 that "men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction"; and in article 11, that "Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

As ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee, I shall vote against this amendment. It is all very well to say one is in favor of equal rights, but so-called equal rights raises many questions. It has far-reaching repercussions that cannot be disregarded.

It is easy to get the unwary and the unsuspecting to be in favor of equal rights, and just as easy is it to get everyone to be against sin.

Many States treat men differently than women and women differently than men. In many States the legal age for

marriage is lower for girls than for boys. In a certain State the age of consent to marriage is 12 for girls and 14 for boys. Would the equal rights amendment increase the age for both boys and girls to 14, or lower it to 12? In other States, the husband's failure to support his wife is grounds for divorce. Would the shoe be on the other foot, giving the husband the divorce if the wife did not support him? In some States, the woman reaches the age of majority at 18. The man must wait until he is 21. Under the so-called equal rights, does the majority for a man become 18 or the majority for women become 21? In California and a number of other States, there is what is known as community property, where a husband and wife own together whatever property may have been acquired during marriage. Would equal rights mean that in another State where at present there is no such community property, if a wife bought some property in her own name, the husband would also own it with her? If not, then what is meant by equal rights? Take jury service. In some States, women must serve on juries. In other States, jury service for women is opitional. There is a third class of States where jury service for women is prohibited. In a fourth class of States, women must serve but are excused if they must take care of children. Which laws would be valid? They all cannot be valid under equal rights.

I want women, wherever possible, to be placed upon an equal status with men. For that reason; that is, I have fought to allow women doctors to serve in our armed forces on a parity with male doctors. Under a ridiculous interpretation of the word "person" in the act setting up our reserve army, women doctors could not be commissioned. The Comptroller General and the Secretary of War hold that wherever in that statute the word "person" is used, it means "man" and not "woman." Thus, a "woman" is not a "person." That, of course, is ridiculous. I am fighting to change that statute so that wherever the word "person" is used, both man and woman would be meant. Wherever a woman can do the same work as a man, by all means let there be equality. But, because of biological reasons, many States have set up statutes which protect the economic, physical, and social status of women; like maternity and infant protections, no night work, special minimum wage and maximum hours arrangements. These beneficial statutes do not, should not, and cannot apply equally to men. The equal-rights amendment would destroy this hard-earned protection. This amendment would destroy beneficent industrial legislation in the interests of women and would impose extreme hardship on women who work. How about widows' pension rights? The rights of dependent wives and children to support of a husband and father? In the event of divorce, shall we do away with any preference that is given to the mother as to the custody of children? The courts would be jammed to capacity for an indefinite period to determine cases involving these difficulties.

Furthermore, no standard of equality is stated in the amendment. Would that mean a single Nation-wide standard is applicable all over the country? Or, would it mean that each State may determine its own equality within the State's confines?

The amendment authorizes Congress to enforce equality by appropriate legislation. Does this mean that Congress must act in fields now reserved exclusively to the States in matters having to do with marriage, divorce, support laws, property laws, and so forth.

It is so easy to be in favor of equality. But, remember, this amendment would constitute one of the most extreme and one of the most extensive changes in the relation of States to the Federal Government and in the relation of Federal Government to the States. These changes would be cataclysmic.

Furthermore, the correspondence I am receiving indicates hopeless confusion in the minds of the rank and file of women throughout the Nation. The women themselves are hopelessly divided on the issue.

This is no time to bring up such a controversial subject. This is the time for unity. Women should get together to correct whatever inequalities exist in the State laws between men and women. These inequalities should be levelled of until if, as, and when they make for the best interests of all—both men and women.

A Mechanism for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject A Mechanism for Peace, delivered by me over the network of the National Broadcasting Co. on the evening of Saturday, April 10, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the last few weeks it has become very fashionable to talk about commitments and plans for the future peace. Congressional authorities hold forth on this subject at great length and interesting new words are coined. Commentators, columnists, and forums all over America are concerned—and rightly so—with the subject of the future peace.

It is well for us to think these subjects through now. It is true that our first job is obviously to win the war, but it is equally true that without a victorious peace, the winning of the war can be a hollow mockery, and the shambles of this war can be a breeding place for future wars.

However, it is not my purpose today to discuss the various peace plans and policies which have been suggested. My purpose today is to discuss what I believe to be an absolutely essential mechanical prerequisite to the consideration of any peace.

In other words, we cannot plan all of the details of a trip to California from Chicago without some assurance of a vehicle of transportation. The type of vehicle and the capabilities of the vehicle will determine whether we can ever make the trip and how rapidly we can make it.

While we talk glibly of peace plans—many of them commendable and even vital—we are, nevertheless, overlooking the need for a vehicle to carry us to these peace objectives.

Under our system there are two peace-making authorities. Under our Constitution the authority to make peace is properly divided between the Congress and the executive as represented by the Secretary of State.

Now, it is elementary that before there can be any effective peace between this Nation and other nations there must be peace between our own American peace-making authorities.

Throughout American history and in the pattern of American governmental machinery, there has always been one weak thread. That thread has been the ineffective collaboration of the executive and the Congress in the conduct of a peace.

Let me make it clear at the outset that I am not criticizing this constitutional balance of power. All thinking students of government regard a balance of power as thoroughly desirable. My criticism is that throughout American history we have failed to implement this balance—that we have failed to establish the mechanics of a working arrangement between the executive and the Congress in the conduct of the peace.

It has often been said that the soldiers won the last war but the statesmen lost the peace. That must never happen again.

American history is studded with examples of the failure of the executive branch and the Congress to collaborate successfully in the establishment of a peace.

Every schoolboy in the land knows of the scathing indictment which many contemporary historians lodged against our statesmen in the conduct of the Treaty of Versailles, and we can still recall the tremendous tidal wave of public indignation over the death of that treaty in the Senate.

Almost every comment made on the Versailles Treaty and on the various treaty battles between the Executive and Congress which have studded our history, indicates the need for a plan to more adequately integrate our two peace-making authorities.

Section 2 of Article II of the Constitution provides that the President shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, providing two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

When a peace or an armistice comes, the American people, the Senate, and the President will have to face the demands of the hour. It is undoubtedly necessary for us to have a change in governmental mechanics to effect a domestic unity between the Executive and legislative branches in connection with any treaty which may be written.

Probably a basic difficulty in writing a peace treaty has been the deep-rooted belief of the Executive branch that its function is simply that of negotiating and producing a treaty, whereas the Constitution provides that the Executive shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties.

The word which has been overlooked and which should be stressed emphatically at this time when we are fighting to preserve a democratic government is the word "advice."

This period more than any other period in world history calls for something more than the routine work of producing and submitting a treaty to the Senate. It calls for advice which means cooperation in the inception steps of the treaty.

It is apparent from all of this that it serves little purpose for us to talk of peace objectives and peace between nations when there is no assurance that there will be peace between the Executive and the Congress in the conduct of a treaty. It is apparent that no final purpose can be served by an era of "high resolving" unless there is some assurance that these resolutions can successfully be implemented by an effective joint action between the Executive and the Congress.

There are a great many questions involved in a future peace; the question of an international police force; the kind of police force which is intended; who will control the force; what factors would compel war if such a force were in action; and could such a police force be created under our Constitution.

I am not attempting to answer these questions today I am merely pointing out that these are all tremendously important decisions which cannot be made unless we have taken the preliminary step of securing the endorsement and weight of both the executive and legislative branches of the American Government. That joint action cannot be secured unless there has been a formal working arrangement.

On September 17, 1942, and subsequently on January 7, 1943, I presented a resolution in the Senate inviting the Chief Executive to join with the Senate in the creation of a Foreign Relations Advisory Council.

There is nothing spectacular about this proposal. It would merely establish a council embracing the minority and majority membership of both the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs along with the representatives from the State Department.

This advisory council would in no way encroach on either the power of the Chief Executive or the Senate and would in no way destroy the constitutional balance of power. It would, however, implement that balance of power by providing a fulcrum by which the peace-making powers of the Executive and the Senate could be balanced. Such a council would provide a liaison committee between the Executive and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the Senate itself. It would serve as a clearinghouse of ideas relating to the peace.

The Constitution has laid the ground work for such a plan. It has made provision for such a balance of power, but thus far the provision has been implemented only by an admittedly faulty arrangement.

This committee, embracing both the Executive and the ranking minority and majority members of our committees dealing with foreign affairs, could properly handle proposals such as have recently been made. It could properly handle them because it would have the authority of joint action. It would have the machinery to effect compromises before these proposals were brought to the Senate for action.

All of this means that there would be less need for defeating or amending peace treaties on the floor of the Senate. It would mean that there would be fewer possibilities for political friction. All the compromises between the Executive and the Senate could be considered long before the treaty was presented to the Senate. The creation of such a council could be a splendid example of democratic government at work because it would embrace the Executive and the Representatives of the people working together on the establishment of a policy instead of separately, as has been done in the past.

This war involves the most momentous issues in the history of mankind.

The treaty which will be written at the close of this war could definitely determine the part which the United States will play in world affairs. A deadlock between the Chief Executive and the Senate of a treaty involving such momentous problems could end in disaster. That is why the creation of such a liaison group must be immediately considered. Without it, peace proposals are futile because without it there is no assurance that these peace proposals can become the effective expression of a joint executive and congressional agreement.

A Stable National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, realizing that there is a strong possibility that the fundamental principle of a stable national economy may be overlooked in the confusion resulting from maladjustment of prices as the effect of war financing and appreciative of the importance of agricultural production, as a means of supporting the national war effort, it is apparent that if we are to have an adequate supply of food the Government must insure to the farming industry the cost of production, as stated in my letter to President Green, of the American Federation of Labor. I present herewith for the consideration of my colleagues President Green's letter and my reply thereto:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., April 3, 1943.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I appeal to you in the name and in behalf of the membership of the American Federation of Labor to sustain the President's veto of S. 660, generally known as the Bankhead bill. This appeal is based upon the urgent need of the Nation's strained economic situation. I shrink from the thought of what may happen to our Nation's price structure if the Members of Congress fail to do their duty now by sustaining the President's veto of the Bankhead bill.

All who are familiar with price trends and the threatened danger of inflation can well understand the disastrous effect which the enactment of the Bankhead bill into law will have upon our economic and social life. We will have lost very heavily in our fight for stabilization in opposition to inflation if Congress fails the country now by passing the Bankhead bill over the veto of the President.

Labor responded to the appeal made by representatives of our Government to support a stabilization policy. We know that such a policy cannot succeed unless the cost of living and prices can be controlled and a real stabilization of all the items which enter into the cost of living is established and maintained.

Our sympathies are with the farmer. We have steadfastly supported practically all legislation designed to protect and promote the economic and social welfare of the farmers of the country. This action is based upon our understanding of the close economic relationship which exists between the farmers and industrial workers. Neither can promote their economic welfare at the expense of the other. Our interest in the economic welfare of farmers is one outstanding reason why I am making this appeal to the Members of Congress to sustain the President's veto of the Bankhead bill. If the vicious spiral of inflation gains new impetus through the enactment of legislation such as the Bankhead bill, the farmer will suffer equally with labor. The farmer, as well as labor, suffers first and worst of all from the effects of uncontrolled and unbridled inflation. It seems inconceivable that Congress would enact legislation which would threaten both the farmer and labor with economic injury and inflationary disaster.

The reasons given by the President for his veto of the Bankhead bill as set forth in his veto message to Congress are convincing and unanswerable. I hope and trust all Members of Congress will stand by the President and the country at this critical period in our national life by voting to sustain the President's veto of the Bankhead bill.

Very sincerely yours,
WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1943.

Mr. WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: Answering your letter of April 3 analyzing the economic situation and calling for support of the President's veto of the Bankhead bill.

Doubtless you are cognizant of the efforts that have been made in the Congress to secure the adoption of a legislative program that would insure the cost of production to the people engaged in agriculture. No doubt you have also observed that the agricultural industries have been omitted from the provisions of legislation that have been enacted to insure the compensation and the several benefits that have been secured to labor.

While the provisions of the Bankhead bill may be inflationary, I still contend that the people engaged in agriculture are entitled to the same degree of protection, in safeguarding their income, as has been given to people engaged in other industries.

Thanking you for presenting me with the expression of your views in this important issue, I am

Sincerely,
COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Post-War Blueprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave given to me, I desire to insert an article, Post-War Blueprint, by Hon. Robert Moses, of New York, appearing in the March 13, 1943, issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

The article, I feel, is most timely. But even more important, the observations in it are made by a man peculiarly gifted and expert in this field whose methods and achievements have marked him indelibly among the few truly great planners of our times.

A man of many facets, all of them brilliant, Mr. Moses is poet, magician, businessman; transmuter of the ugly into the beautiful; and in his wizardry, he makes it pay—in hard, cold cash.

Mr. Moses is rendering the Nation a real service, and a timely service, in urging, as he does in his article, something of the form and policy post-war planning should definitely follow.

The article in full is as follows:

POST-WAR BLUEPRINT

(By Robert Moses)

The last echoes of delirious welcome to the returning heroes of World War No. 1 had hardly died away when the same veterans were begging for honest jobs and, with threadbare service coats wrapped around them, were falling into line at winter soup kitchens. Lest we forget, let us jolt our memories with newspaper files of those days.

In May 1919 Gov. Alfred E. Smith called a meeting of city and State officials to arrange for cooperation to end unemployment and speed public works of every kind. In July the Reemployment Bureau, taking over the work of the United States Employment Service, reported that 1,700 ex-servicemen had sought work in 2 days. In September an appeal was made to employers to find work for 10,000 former servicemen.

In December Mayor James Couzens of Detroit estimated there were 75,000 men idle there. There were 300 applicants for every 45 jobs in St. Louis. In Youngstown 20,000 steel workers faced idleness. Textile, automobile, and steel industries in Chicago shut down.

Well, you say, that didn't last long, and we soon plunged into the silk-sock, chicken-in-every-pot era. That didn't last long, either. Things soon began to slide. Then followed other news stories which should not be forgotten when our bright minds plan the aftermath of this war.

In January 1932, 15,000 hunger marchers arrived in Washington. In New York, crowds clamored for food from the Home Relief Bureau, and the mayor's committee reduced food cards. In April, 4 were killed and 50 injured in an unemployment riot at the Ford plant in Dearborn, Mich. In Tennessee, 1,000 jobless men answered a single want-ad. In May, Philadelphia police injured 20 in an attempt to break up a march on City Hall. In December, 6,000 to 8,000 men daily were seeking work on the Brooklyn water front.

In December of 1933, Mayor-elect LaGuardia asked me to attend the organization meeting of the Civil Works Administration at Washington. It quickly developed that the Civil Works Administration was a fine impulse unsupported by sound thought, and destined for an early end. How could the Federal authorities put millions of people to work without plans or organization with the hope that anything would be accomplished? Actually the Civil Works Administration lasted only a few months. Within that period I found myself responsible for some 80,000 Civil Works Administration "clients" in the parks of New York City. The plight of this army, smoking, warming themselves by bonfires, mimicking work, fighting, getting into one another's way, and generally making a ghastly farce of so-called work projects, was indescribable. I should hate to see this scene repeated after the war. Don't forget that we are talking about a relief pay roll in one city department which in the year prior to 1934 reached a total of $90,000,000.

Already there is much talk here and abroad about public works shelves and reservoirs to anticipate unemployment, about reclaiming vast areas on fascinating and hitherto undiscovered principles, about the efficient, slumless community, the satellite town, and the accessible countryside. Most of this chatter, unfortunately, comes from those who care nothing for the past, have had little experience with civil works, lack knowledge of public finance, have never had to define and reconcile the limits of private and public enterprise, and airily dismiss the perversities of humans who are suspicious of revolutionary changes. On the other hand, there are honest and tough, if short-sighted, opponents of post-war works planning who have quite a big following. They say, "Let's get busy and win the war, and keep our minds and energies on this and nothing else. We can't afford to have our attention diverted even for a moment to peace objectives." They even say it is bad psychology to talk about post-war plans and that, if we must work on them, we should keep it dark, just as war planning is secret in time of peace. I can't follow this line of reasoning. In a democracy planning cannot be done in the dark nor can provision for the future be postponed on the assumption that we must live wholly in the present and think only of the war. It is the hope of the future that animates both soldier and civilian. In drawing pictures of tomorrow it is unnecessary either to use all the colors of the rainbow or to decree a complete black-out.

During the next 2 years we should plan public works throughout the Nation to provide useful employment for at least 5,000,000 people in the course of another 2 years following the war. This is a broad assumption, but it is conservative. No one knows the length of the war, nor how fast industry can reabsorb workers. Some industries, like steel, will find the transition quick and comparatively easy. Others will require many months for the adjustment. Our equations have too many unknown quantities, or, to vary the metaphor, it is a situation in which we would rather listen to a minor prophet than to an uninspired statistician. We must fall back on the simplest kind of arithmetic, fortified by experience, prudence, and honesty of mind.

We may as well admit that our major premises are based on a dozen probably sound but quite unprovable assumptions. First and foremost, we assume that we shall win. That is our faith, for if we lose, all plans are futile. We assume also that a just peace will somehow reconcile foreign markets with tariff barriers, and a reasonable welcome to the products of cheaper foreign labor with the maintenance of American wage-and-hour standards. We assume that to some extent we shall be called upon after the war to provide the materials for the rehabilitation of other countries. We assume that there will be enough money of some kind to tide us over the post-war depression without bread lines and soup kitchens.

As more and more of the national income is devoted to war, how can we fail to assume that post-war maladjustments will be more immediate, more severe, and of longer duration than those which followed the recent depression? On the other hand, cessation of war does not produce complete disarmament. There is also the problem of policing by our troops abroad. It seems likely that we shall taper off war production slowly, but enthusiasm for armament spending and foreign policing evaporate quickly after the signing of an armistice.

Vice President WALLACE says that peace will precipitate a dizzy drop from seventy to twenty-billion-dollar spending and that in this fall 15,000,000 war workers and returning soldiers will be tossed out into a civilian economy not ready to assume the burden, into public works planned or hastily improvised or into relief of some kind. Everything that comes from the Vice President and the Board of Economic Warfare is not necessarily gospel, and their figures on occasion have been blown up to support their conclusions. Allowing, however, for some exaggeration, the prospect is still alarming.

There is, of course, a school of cheery optimists who profess to believe that there will be a great business boom, stimulated by the vast pent-up demand for goods denied in the years of sacrifice, and bursting out before the ink is dry on the surrender of our enemies. No doubt there will be a boom, perhaps ultimately difficult to control, but it won't begin as quickly as all that. There is bound to be a gap, which must be filled by postponed public works, dubious work relief, or the hand-out, by whatever name.

Let us proceed now on the assumption that we aim at the employment of 5,000,000 on public works for 2 years after the war. At the very conservative rate of only $100 per man per month, in each month the bills for wages, equipment, material, and overhead to cover this tremendous public-works program will be $500,000,000, and that in each of the first 2 post-war years $6,000,000,000 will be required at a time when we shall have a vast public debt to service and reduce, and immense pressure to cut budgets. The more we build, the more we shall have to maintain and the higher will be our current appropriations. The only way to avoid this is to let the unemployed loaf, rake leaves, sift sand, and do Swedish exercises. Always remember that these unemployed will include many of the armed forces who will be highly articulate and justly resentful of the failure of officials, who did not fight, to provide honest work for those who did.

It is pretty well established that the cost of preparing detailed specifications for public works averages about 4 percent of the estimated cost of the works. At this rate, at least $240,000,000 a year should be spent in the next 2 years merely for the preparation of designs. Where is this money coming from? Some of it should come from the Federal Government, some from the States, and some from municipalities.

In the last depression, Federal work grants and subsidies ran all the way from 30 to 100 percent, according to the kind of projects involved. The Federal Government has thus far contributed little toward a genuine post-war public-works program. Two million, five hundred thousand dollars allotted to the Work Projects Administration, the National Resources Planning Board and the Federal Works Agency from Federal relief appropriations for the so-called public works reserve, has been dissipated. All there is to show for it is file after file of applications, occupying space needed for emergencies and tended by clerks who ought not to be cluttering up the rabbit warrens of Washington. An act to establish a Federal fund for post-war plans bogged down in Congress as the result of bickering over the agency to administer it, misunderstanding of its purpose, fear of further centralization of power, suspicion of pork-barrel distribution and contempt for certain crackpot planners. Moreover, the debate occurred at a most unfavorable time immediately following the Mayris Chaney, Office of Civilian Defense, incident.

No doubt, this program will be revived under more favorable auspices. In the meantime, the States and municipalities will be wise to begin working on their own. Probably it is just as well that the original Federal program failed, because no ultimate good can come from Federal dictation of a Nation-wide construction program reaching into every city and hamlet. The best program is one which originates locally, to which States and municipalities contribute substantially for both plans and construction, and which must therefore have passed a home test before it has any sanction back of it.

New York State, at the instance of Governor Lehman and the legislative leaders of both parties, established a post-war works commission to expedite detailed plans for a

proposed reservoir of State projects running to over $450,000,000, without leaning upon the Federal Government and without overstraining its budget, its resources, and its personnel.

New York State's highway system, through neglect and the diversion of gasoline and license-plate taxes, has deteriorated so that it now ranks low among the 48 States. Its institutions for dependents and prisoners are good as far as they go, but overcrowded and inadequate. Most of our post-war plans are therefore for institutions and highways by one name or another. At the last session of the legislature, New York laid the groundwork for modern highways to be known as through ways.

We already had State parkways of the most advanced design which, for several years before the war, greatly interested German and Italian engineers and were the models for the auto bahnen and strada which have played a prominent part in the war. Our parkways were built for passenger vehicles only, but are, of course, being used in the emergency for military purposes. Now we have a program for mixed traffic throughways, which are simply parkways without the aesthetic features and restrictions. For example, we are designing the so-called New England Throughway running from the Connecticut boundary to the heart of the Bronx, as a vital link in the future Boston-Washington express arterial system, and the Brooklyn-Queens Connecting Highway running through two other boroughs of the city and constituting another link in the route from New England to the south. The old dogma which insisted upon by-passing all population centers in laying out of metropolitan, regional, and transcontinental highways has now, fortunately, been discarded by practical builders. The cities with their suburbs constitute both the origin and destination of the greater part of through traffic, and failure to tap these centers adds to urban congestion and wastes in the cities the time which is gained in the open country.

Our State post-war commission is about to submit to Governor Dewey and to the new legislature a program for the design of small municipal projects to cost eventually another $300,000,000. Half the expense of these designs is to be paid by the State and half by the municipalities.

New York City, at the instance of Mayor LaGuardia and the city planning commission, has provided $25,000,000 for the design of post-war public works estimated to cost about $680,000,000, at the same time canceling all construction appropriations which had run into priority difficulties. Actual work on this immense planning program in city departments and in the offices of private architects and engineers began last summer. The New York City program covers practically every field of recognized municipal activity, including deferred street, highway, and bridge building and repair, new wide regional arteries with restricted access, airport facilities for freight as well as passengers, relief of overcrowding in hospitals, correctional and other institutions, new public buildings to replace obsolete structures, public housing involving slum clearance for the lowest income groups, playgrounds in neglected areas, the use of ashes, garbage, and refuse to establish new parks, and river, harbor, and other water-front reclamation by substituting gigantic disposal plants for the discharge of raw sewage into streams and boundary waters. These works which are in no sense controversial, will absorb many of the unemployed and all the funds we can afford, without excursions into dubious enterprises and into the ever narrowing territory of private enterprise.

Little reference has been made to the philosophy underlying the selection of public-works projects. As a middle-of-the-road fellow, I devoutly hope that the opportunity to employ men in the rebuilding of the country will not be used for unnecessary, extravagant, or untried improvements. I have repeatedly stated to my associates that we should aim to resume neglected work, improve and expand familiar activities which already have public support, telescope, if need be, 10 years' work into 2 or 3, but not launch into the shining, new fields which seem to beckon my more romantic friends.

I hope that those who aim at a revolution in our habits of life will be required to pass a most searching examination before they are admitted to planning staffs. One of the great advantages of leisurely design is that it allows time to weigh the need and value of public improvements and the cost of keeping them up. Those entrusted with the post-war public-works program should understand the limited but vitally important part which they are called on to play in the restoration of normal economy. This is not a subject to trifle with, because even the best-laid plans will be none too good for a reconstruction period in which, as in the days of the prophets, the nations must beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks.

Cheese Makers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very enlightening article relative to cheese makers, published in the Wall Street Journal of April 8, 1943. I feel that the article is particularly important in connection with its comments on skilled labor for cheese factories and dairy processing plants.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEESE MAKERS HAUNTED BY RATION POINT VALUES—PEOPLE PREFER TO USE COUPONS FOR MEAT—WISCONSIN DAIRYMEN SELL MOST OF OUTPUT TO UNITED STATES NOW—WORRIED ABOUT FUTURE—WANT STAMPS' WORTH CUT

(By Lewis C. French)

MILWAUKEE.—The red coupons of point rationing are haunting Wisconsin's $100,000,000-a-year cheese industry.

No one hereabouts doubts that, considering Army-Navy and lend-lease buying, the State's 2,000 cheese factories and its 186,000 dairy farms will find an eager market for all the cheese they can produce this year. But what, ask the dairymen, will happen to their civilian markets of the future?

Under point rations, meat and cheese are classed together. A pound of cheese takes eight of the housewife's points. That's the same as the point-cost of most meats, more than some. Since rationing, groceries have not been selling nearly as much cheese; in some areas demand has come close to drying up. The trouble is, the cheese makers explain, that when it comes to a choice between meat and butter or cheese, the average American takes meat and butter every time.

AMERICAN EATING HABITS

Americans have never been heavy cheese eaters in the European sense. In pre-war days Europeans consumed 30 to 40 pounds of cheese a year. In this country the top per capita consumption came in 1942 at 6.2 pounds.

In the United States cheese is looked upon as a snack; in continental Europe bread and cheese is a meal.

That's why Wisconsin dairy farmers and cheese makers are hoping that the Government will ease up a bit and lower point values for their product.

"Cheese hasn't an even break as against meat and butter," says R. A. Ades, of the Northern Wisconsin Produce Co., big wholesalers of cheese. Officials of the Milwaukee Cheese Co. observe that "people buy cheese freely only when meat is not available as the main dish." A. E. Muller, of the Wisconsin Cheese Mart, Inc., sums up by observing that "Unless there is a marked improvement in cheese sales when the Nation settles down to food rationing * * * a revision of point values for cheese must be made to move supplies."

MILLION POUNDS OF CHEESE A DAY

Currently, more than a million pounds of cheese is rolling from Wisconsin's factories every day. Last year, Wisconsin turned out better than 476,000,000 pounds; this year, if the skilled workers are available, production could top 480,000,000 pounds. Since February 15, half of all produced is reserved for Government buying agencies.

From every county in the State there's golden American Cheddar (commonly known in the East as American or store cheese). Most of this passes through Plymouth, the cheese capital of the United Nations. A large part finds its way into lend-lease channels for Britain where Cheddar, a bit drier than Americans like it, is the big favorite.

Foreign-type Wisconsin cheeses, which enjoyed a big boom when imports were cut off, aren't being produced as freely because some of their milk supplies have been shifted to Cheddar output. But hilly Green County, settled by Swiss because it looked so much like their native land, still turns out its big wheels of domestic Swiss cheese. Dodge County makes its Munster and softer brick cheeses, its Limburger. "Blue" cheeses are cured in caves bordering the Mississippi, replacing Roquefort once imported from France. Italian types, some coated with lamp black, come from the Fox River Valley.

A BIG BUSINESS

It's a big business and a big investment. Wisconsin's dairy cows alone are valued at more than $200,000,000. Now the war has turned things topsy-turvy, even though Wisconsin proudly terms its product a "prime war food."

Improving with age and curing, this concentrated high-protein food ranks high on the food list to be shipped abroad. There is not an Allied battle line or industrial production center but knows of Wisconsin's dairy foods.

Tons of cheese daily go to the American fighting forces. By dehydrating natural cheese, the Army has produced a product which, when wrapped in moisture-proof containers, is capable of standing Arctic cold or Tropic heat.

So far, Wisconsin has been able to supply Government needs and still have a fair supply left for civilian markets. Now cheese makers aren't at all sure that those carefully cultivated consumers won't change their eating habits under the prod of point rations.

There are other wartime troubles bothering the dairy industry.

First in importance is skilled labor. Not only the farms are losing manpower. The

cheese factories and dairy processing plants also are running short of trained men. "We can send cheese or cheese makers to war. We cannot send both." That's the way George L. Mooney, secretary of the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Federation, summed up the situation before the State selective-service board.

Cheese making is no job for amateurs. A novice in a big factory can ruin $100 000 worth of milk in a matter of minutes. What's more, jobs in cheese factories take strong, vigorous men. In the manufacture of Swiss, for example, the big wheels of cheese weigh around 200 pounds, and the process requires that they be moved frequently, and by hand.

Wisconsin cheese production is climbing as the season of flush milk production approaches, but still is below that of last year. Spokesmen for the dairymen say that the amount of milk and milk foods Wisconsin will produce this year depends in large part on how well the Government answers the farmers' plea for skilled labor.

Despite tremendous inroads by Government buying for the armed services and lend-lease, stocks of American cheese in storage were close to 78,000,000 pounds on March 1. But this compared with better than 133,000,000 on the same date last year. Supplies of foreign-type cheeses are running much shorter. A year ago there were nearly six and one-half million pounds of Swiss on hand; now the figure is down to 2,546,000. Supplies of brick and Munster in a year's time dropped from 1,400,000 pounds to 213,000

Administration of Jackson Hole and Other National Monuments and Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter which I have received from Secretary Ickes, together with a statement of policy regarding the administration of the Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyo., which he has sent to me. I may add that I have today submitted a resolution (S. Res. 134) authorizing the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys to make a complete study of the creation of national monuments, national parks, and other similar reservations, in order that a definite policy may be adopted.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, April 8, 1943.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Since the establishment of the Jackson Hole National Monument by the President there have come to my attention a number of letters and inquiries concerning the effect its establishment will have on private interests in the area involved. The context of many of these communications indicates that there exists some confusion and misunderstanding with respect to the President's proclamation establishing the monument as well as with the policy of the Department in administering it. Knowing of your personal interest in this matter, I am transmitting to you a copy of a statement of policy of the Department which I feel sure will clear up many of the misunderstandings which appear to be prevalent.

In the various national parks and monuments owners of private holdings have been given protection under the law and under departmental policies. Private owners in the Jackson Hole National Monument are and will be given similar protection. In establishing this monument all valid existing rights on Federal lands were protected, and the rights of private land owners are not affected. All permits, including grazing privileges and stock driveway privileges, issued by the Forest Service or other Federal agencies for use of land within the monument will be honored by the National Park Service during the lifetime of the present holders.

You may be assured that before any major change in policy is made, as stated above or in the attached statement, ample opportunity will be given local people to present their views to the Department.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Secretary of the Interior.

[Enclosure 2460430.]

STATEMENT OF POLICY CONCERNING ADMINISTRATION OF JACKSON HOLE NATIONAL MONUMENT, WYO.

In the administration of Jackson Hole National Monument by the National Park Service citizens having property or permit rights within the exterior boundaries of the newly established Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyo., will be protected in all such rights by the Presidential proclamation of March 17, 1943, establishing that monument.

Prior to the establishment of the monument, more than 76 percent of the acreage included within its boundaries already was owned by the United States, which administered it through several Federal agencies. The creation of the monument transferred the responsibility for the administration of those lands to one Federal agency, the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior.

Owners of private holdings in national parks and national monuments established since the beginning of the Federal park system have been given protection under the law and under departmental policies. The Jackson Hole National Monument will be administered under the same policies and all private owners given full protection. The use of summer homes constructed under Forest Service permits also will be continued. In fact, all permits issued by the Forest Service or other Federal agencies for use of lands now within the national monument will be honored by the National Park Service during the lifetime of the present holders, and the members of their immediate family.

This includes existing grazing privileges on monument lands and stock driveway privileges. Cattlemen desiring in the spring and fall to drive their cattle across the monument lands between their respective ranches and the summer ranges on national forest or other lands will be permitted to do so.

Solution of wildlife problems now being studied in the area will be worked out cooperatively by the National Park Service with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior and with the Wyoming State Fish and Game Commission.

Teton County will continue to collect the taxes which it has been levying on all private lands within the monument boundaries until and unless such lands are transferred to the Federal Government for monument purposes.

As to taxes other than those levied upon privately owned lands within the monument, State gas, use, sales, and liquor taxes will be collectible, as they are now in Grand Teton and Yellowstone National Parks.

Furthermore, a bill now is pending in Congress to provide for allocation to the State or States, for the benefit of the counties in which national parks are located, of a percentage of the revenues derived from the operation of such parks.

Before any change in the policy above stated is made, ample opportunity will be given the local people to present their views to the Department.

MARCH 27, 1943.

Income-Tax Collections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. SIDNEY CAMP

OF GEORGIA

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ralph Smith from the Atlanta Journal of April 9, 1943:

CRACKERLAND IN WASHINGTON—OVER FIVE BILLIONS IN INCOME TAXES ALREADY

(By Ralph Smith)

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 9.—Guy T. Helvering is a modest, unassuming, and, yes, an unemotional gentleman of the old school—a Kansan and a Democrat—whose place in history is secure as the greatest tax taker of all time. Mr. Helvering is Commissione of Internal Revenue, charged with gathering the billions required by Uncle Sam in financing the war and maintaining the domestic establishment.

Mr. Helvering comes and goes to and from his apartment in the Mayflower Hotel so quietly that none in the milling throngs could ever suspect, let alone believe, that within the past 20 days he has collected over $5,000,000,000—and while this ain't "hay," as the saying goes, it might be supposed from Mr. Helvering's manner that he so regards it.

Significantly, the billions aforesaid represent, in part, initial installments in payment of those mooted income and profit taxes of 1942, which Republicans of the House of Representatives and Mr. Beardsley Rumi want to forgive and forget.

In his quiet, unassuming way, Commissioner Helvering allows as how these initial payments exceed by some $2,000,000,000 the "hay" he gathered over a similar period last year—establishing, argue Secretary Morgenthau and BOB DOUGHTON, et al., that it is nothing short of slander to hint, as Republicans have hinted, that Americans are tax laggards and tax dodgers.

"Fie! Fie!" exclaims Congressman SIDNEY CAMP, of Georgia, "and thrice fie! fie! for those doubting Thomases who are continuing to tell the country that we must give away nine billion in order to prevent a loss of a few million dollars."

LET'S TAKE A "LOOKSEE"

The Georgia Congressman says the figures released by Commissioner Helvering shatter to smithereens the contention of Mr. Rumi and Mr. CARLSON and a flock of others that the 1942 tax obligation must be forgotten, collections skipped.

"Can you imagine anything sillier than the Treasury returning these $5,000,000,000 to the folks who paid them on their obligations to the Nation?" he asked. "Why, what would the boys in Africa and in the Southwest Pacific have thought of the disbursement of a $5,000,000,000 bonus to the stay-at-homes? And think what the recipients of this bounty

would have thought of the Congress if it had voted for the kick-back proposed by the Republicans.

"And what would have the Members of Congress thought of themselves today, marching down to the Treasury to be rewarded with the refund of the first installment on their salaries for 1942, something over $500 each?

"Talk about inflation and inflationary trends, all the farm benefits, wage boosts, extravagance, and waste we've fumed and fussed about would pale before a five billion disbursement of the tax funds gathered by Mr. Helvering.

"You remember, everybody remembers, the howl that went up when Congress voted the soldier bonus—a 'paltry' $4,000,000,000, which we were told would bring on inflation. And yet the $5,000,000,000 already collected on last year's taxes represents but little more than half the amount it is now proposed to kiss off."

INCREASES UNIVERSAL

Congressman CAMP expressed the hope that the newspapers, especially, "because the printed word lives," will publish in parallel columns the total income and excess profits collected and deposited as of March 31, 1943, and March 15, 1942. He said it would shed more light on this controversy over forgiving and forgetting than everything else that's been said.

So, first, I am taking Commissioner Helvering's figures on collections in the Southern States, as follows:

State	1942	1943
Georgia	$23, 200, 740	$42, 174, 874
Florida	27, 435, 392	34, 127, 350
Alabama	19, 686, 841	32, 890, 974
Arkansas	8, 904, 280	13, 155, 553
Kentucky	20, 830, 164	41, 146, 288
Louisiana	26, 290, 194	38, 942, 125
Mississippi	8, 290, 002	13, 529, 536
North Carolina	35, 147, 192	63, 578, 711
South Carolina	12, 825, 179	22, 246, 896
Tennessee	24, 783, 907	42, 582, 315
Second Texas	32, 484, 797	54, 288, 532
Virginia	40, 843, 459	51, 687, 739

INDUSTRIAL PAY-ROLL STATES

It may be argued with a measure of pertinence that the Southern States aren't altogether typical, since the bigger war activities with big pay rolls, are located in other sections of the country * * * and it is the wage earners, so the Rumlites contend, who'll avoid the payment of taxes.

Commissioner Helvering's collections—those initial payments—fail to sustain this contention; on the contrary, his bank deposits credit these communities with much heavier payments, indicated below:

State	1942	1943
First California	$88, 504, 114	$147, 495, 495
Sixth California	71, 727, 787	123, 402, 568
Connecticut	98, 342, 304	125, 539, 362
First Illinois	225, 743, 666	363, 553, 508
Eighth Illinois	29, 192, 478	59, 822, 920
Indiana	56, 760, 566	75, 266, 270
Maryland	72, 935, 397	117, 166, 338
Massachusetts	98, 919, 558	178, 741, 041
Michigan	213, 259, 980	221, 911, 627
First New Jersey	19, 633, 283	28, 529, 763
Fifth New Jersey	108, 455, 738	146, 417, 614
First New York	77, 083, 429	119, 418, 563
Second New York	256, 932, 259	319, 137, 650
Third New York	213, 516, 681	319, 137, 650
Twenty-first New York	26, 351, 217	40, 042, 367
Fourteenth New York	73, 673, 654	115, 382, 354
Twenty-eighth New York	53, 777, 448	92, 097, 587
First Ohio	52, 598, 108	97, 324, 408
Tenth Ohio	27, 155, 671	45, 506, 409
Eleventh Ohio	15, 346, 179	28, 613, 077
Eighteenth Ohio	125, 742, 266	209, 857, 878
First Pennsylvania	112, 840, 724	213, 949, 246
Twelfth Pennsylvania	32, 480, 334	56, 436, 835
Twenty-third Pennsylvania	127, 996, 021	190, 110, 837

NOTE.—Commissioner Helvering, upon releasing the figures above, disclosed that in many districts the total figures have not been compiled, and that in others the totals disclosed will be increased by additions and revisions.

It Sees the Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit Free Press—John S. Knight, owner and publisher—has frequently advocated the impossible.

Peace on earth, good will toward men, has the support of all Christian people, but it cannot be attained in a day. Nor can it be brought about by the use of the sword, as the Detroit Free Press has so often seemed to believe.

We shall get better days and a better world through Christianity. As an editorial in the Detroit Free Press points out, "The new world for which we all aspire must come through an evolutionary process, taking generations."

The Free Press is right. Neither Churchill nor Roosevelt, nor the two combined, nor the might of the British Empire and of the United States, nor of the United States of the World, nor the United Nations of the world, will bring universal peace and happiness.

The editorial to which reference is made is as follows:

A DIFFERENCE IN IDEAS

The scant notice Winston Churchill took of China in his Sunday night broadcast on the shape of things to come was too obvious to escape the attention of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek. The following night at Chicago, she cautioned the authors of the Atlantic Charter not to "tantalize the sorely tried, stanch peoples fighting against violence."

The Chinese, if they read into the charter any guarantee of their territorial integrity, are as likely to be as disillusioned as those Americans, who fondly think of the United Nations as a happy family fighting the same wars for the same objectives. Churchill has made it very plain that he is fighting to preserve the British Empire.

As Demaree Bess points out in an admirable article in the Saturday Evening Post, Stalin also has his own ideas about the future of China. They include the acquisition by the Soviet Union of Mongolia, Chinese Turkestan, and possibly Manchuria and other contiguous Chinese provinces, where Chinese Communists have strengthened their hold.

The idea that Stalin is interested in extending democracy is poppycock. He is interested only in obtaining defensible frontiers for the protection of his now strongly nationalistic Russia. He has not fooled his people with any dream promises. They are putting up the most heroic fight in history for the things for which he stands. Russia is our ally now because she is slaughtering our enemies, the Nazis. But she is not fighting our fight, but her own.

NO CHILDREN

A good many Americans make the mistake of thinking, as Mr. Bess says, that in dealing with Russians we are dealing with children. They know just what they want and that they have the power to take it.

When he signed the nonaggression pact with Matsuoka in 1941 Stalin "banzaied" the Emperor of Japan with the same gusto with which he once "God blessed" Mr. Roosevelt. After Hitler has been disposed of, we are likely to find ourselves and the British Empire still fighting Japan, while Russia returns to the business of consolidating its gains. As Mr. Bess writes:

"The Soviet Government today is the most completely independent government in the world. The Russians have made no specific commitments to anyone which might hamper their freedom of action either in Asia or in post-war Europe. Their adherence to the vague and generalized provisions of the Atlantic Charter was a gracious gesture, not a pledge. Even when their military position was blackest, Russian leaders refused to bind themselves in any respect in return for the help they accepted from the United States and Britain."

GREATEST ENIGMA

There is nothing enigmatic about the war and post-war aims of either Mr. Churchill or Comrade Stalin.

The world's greatest enigma, as Mr. Bess says, is not Russia but the United States. Our leaders (to use Mme. Chiang's word) "tantalize" other peoples by giving them the impression that we will back up all their aspirations for freedom from both "want" and "fear," and that we will continue on to war for generations until such things have been achieved for them—even though not by them.

For such freedom of promise we are storing up the grapes of wrath for ourselves, for we are promising things that cannot be delivered. We are raising hopes that will turn to ashes and embitter them and make us appear as false to our blithely given pledges.

The new world for which we all aspire must come through an evolutionary process, taking generations. But our national leaders talk about if as though it were to be delivered at any given moment after peace is declared.

The Manhattan Office of the Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the mid-Manhattan office of the Office of Price Administration has been handling about 10,000 rationing applications a day. The work carried on in the office is of tremendous magnitude and importance. Rationing has spread into many phases of our national life and this office alone in mid-Manhattan affects 1,000,000 New Yorkers.

Within the office are 134 rationing boards of 3 members each and a vast staff of clerical aides, most of whom are volunteers. They arrange for the distribution of many items of food, gasoline, tires, fuel oil, rubber boots, and scores of other rationed articles.

The carrying out of this huge task is under the direction of two volunteers,

Joseph Kraeler, County Rationing Administrator, and Louis Maier, Deputy Administrator. These two men and their entourage of volunteers stand between the citizenry consumers and the great branch of the Government, known as the Office of Price Administration. Ofttimes for those who come into the office, it is the first contact they have had with the Government and Messrs. Kraeler and Maier are doing all in their power to make the applicant comfortable and happy and to give a favorable impression of the Government in its rationing operations. These men and their assistants are serving their public with a minimum of inconvenience.

The office is now located at 1775 Broadway. It is huge and occupies 24,000 square feet of floor space and arrangements have been so devised as to avoid congestion and crowding of thousands of applicants who pour into the office each day.

A great deal of credit is due Messrs. Kraeler and Maier for their painstaking and voluntary efforts. It is a labor of love with them and I am willing to go out of my way any time to offer my personal thanks to them for their worthy and efficient service. I have been up to their offices numerous times and have seen them and their assistants and clerks in action. In the group of volunters will be found accountants, doctors, lawyers, dentists, housewives, architects, all ready, willing and anxious to render service to the people of New York.

Messrs. Kraeler and Maier work in closest harmony and cooperation with Sylvan Joseph, O. P. A. Regional Director, and an earnest, effective administrator, whose approach to the solution of O. P. A. problems is realistic and businesslike.

Mrs. Roosevelt Is Not the Only One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as I read the article printed herewith, the truth of it struck home to me with smashing force.

Each of us is far too ready to forget the sacrifice being made every hour by the men who really pay. Even the parents, the wives, of the men who go, who lose a limb or who die, bemoan their own fate, rather than the fate of the burnt offering which has been sacrificed on the altar of international greed for money and for power.

If a son is sent, the parent is all too ready to think that he has made the sacrifice. No doubt, the parent is inconvenienced, may in fact suffer greatly; but the son is the one who goes.

Many there are who did their utmost, because they wanted to help the people of every land, to create a situation which made war for us inevitable. Today, they go about the country, if not happy, at least without physical pain or mental anguish, urging that further sacrifices be made by those who are still at home.

If those who wish to feed and to clothe all the people of all the world could only be required to make the sacrifices, undergo the pain and the suffering, that must come to those who do the actual fighting, we would have less talk of a United States of the world, and of fighting all over the world.

It is said the rain falls on the just and the unjust. It is unfortunate that the cost and the horror of a war does not fall upon those who urge and advocate the things which make war inevitable in as great a degree as it falls upon those called to carry out their plans.

The newspaper article to which I refer was written by Helen Essary and is as follows:

DEAR WASHINGTON

(By Helen Essary)

When I finished reading Mrs. Roosevelt's column, My Day, Thursday last, I found myself feeling a trifle ill.

The President's wife was telling of adventure in San Francisco. She went to the Kaiser shipyards She cut "a beautifully decorated birthday cake." She met with her friend, Mayris Chaney, the dancer. She visited a naval hospital and saw dozens of men without arms and legs, with burns, concussions, and "innumerable other ailments." She ate an extremely good lunch and ate too much, really, having worked up her "more than ordinarily good appetite" while walking through the hospital wards. "So it is just as well that I don't walk through so many hospital wards every morning." (One must keep one's "figger.")

Then she went to another hospital "grown by leaps and bounds." She used to think it was a shame not to go through every ward in these hospitals.

Now she realizes that there are so many hospitals she simply couldn't do this. "It would take many days, really, to go through all the wards and stop to speak to each man."

"We ended by having tea with Vice Admiral J. W. Greenslade," wrote Mrs. Roosevelt, "and spent the evening with my sons and daughter-in-law and saw the newest grandchild for the first time."

I do admire Mrs. Roosevelt for many splendid things she has done. But—and this is a very big but—I did feel a trifle ill when she spoke of cake and legless men and tea and concussions of the brain and of seeing the new grandchild and miles of suffering human beings and too much lunch, all in the same jolly breath.

Of all the horrible features of war, one of the most horrible is the cold-blooded attitude of the civilian and of those, in high places who escape scot free.

Of the person who suffers no physical hurt and who, since I am being too honest, perhaps, is almost elated by the spectacle of other people in battle.

We've all got some of this kind of cruelty. We jam the moving-picture houses that show thrillers.

We look wide-eyed without flinching at shots of men being blown up, of men killing each other, of men, women, and children in their death agony.

Admitting that some of us are as brutal as panthers, it still does not become the wife of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the armed forces, to look unshaken on wounded men who have been put into their misery by this country's participation in the World War. It shocks any sensibility to have Mrs. Roosevelt turn legless men and tea with the admiral and the rest into a My Day holiday.

Mrs. Roosevelt wondered "if many people realized how many boys are coming home from this war and facing cheerfully the loss of arms or legs or other physical handicaps."

I am not interested in how many people realize how cheerfully the boys accept the handicaps and anguish brought on by no act of their own.

But I am interested in how many people know how many hundreds, thousands, of wretched boys are in the hospitals that grow by leaps and bounds.

And as for the My Day remarks that a soldier or anybody else accepts cheerfully the loss of leg or arm, this (I'm sorry, Mrs. Roosevelt, to disagree so bluntly) this just isn't so.

Nobody accepts cheerfully a cracked up body. It doesn't matter that one newly made cripple hopped about on his lovely false leg (he lost a leg as well as two arms) and sold bonds so bravely. Nor that every other wounded boy in the hospital cheered when he came into the ward. Were they likely to boo?

This war is too frightful to be spoken of in Mrs. Roosevelt's chirrupy fashion. It should not be spoken of except with the greatest solemnity by the administrators who might possibly have kept it away.

This is not Mr. Roosevelt's war. Nor is it Mrs. Roosevelt's war.

It is the war of those miles and miles of legless and armless. Of the mentally and spiritually maimed who, after the shooting is done and the last flag is waved, will have the long, long gray years ahead with no cheers from anybody and no visits by ladies of high degree to solace them.

If Mrs. Roosevelt had realized this, she could not have approached the "extremely good food" with such enthusiasm that she said gayly: "It is just as well I don't walk through so many hospital wards every morning."

I don't mean to imply that the sight of the wounded gave Mrs. Roosevelt an appetite. I do mean to say that if she had accepted a proper responsibility for the hospitals that "are growing in leaps and bounds, and would take many days really to go through," she would not have been able to eat for a fortnight. Nor would tea with the admiral and the sight of the newest grandchild have had any charm.

Secrecy Will Not Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Washington Daily News of today:

SECRECY WILL NOT WORK

As a concession to protests by the press, Members of Congress, and his own expert advisers, against his secrecy plan for the United Nations' food conference, the President has decided to stage two open sessions at the start and finish. Otherwise the press is to be barred even from entering the grounds of the Hot Springs hotel where the conference meets, and from talking with delegates. The news is to be limited to official pap which the President sees fit to feed the public through the press.

In short, Mr. Roosevelt is as determined as ever to prevent legitimate news coverage of these negotiations which so directly affect the public interest.

This policy is so absurd on its face that we can't figure out why an executive of the President's intelligence and experience would attempt it. One explanation is that the conference is to make some slick deals which can't stand the light, but we don't want to believe that.

Another explanation is that the President with his well-known flair for showmanship wants to assure the largest possible publicity for the conference, and is resorting to the classic peep-show device to stimulate curiosity. But we doubt he would be that frivolous when so much is at stake.

We don't know the answer. We don't know why he should want to keep such a nonmilitary affair secret. And we don't know why, even if he wants to, he thinks he can get away with it. There will be a hundred or so delegates from 30 or 40 nations. To bind all of them to secrecy is impossible—at least it would be the first time in history.

The net effect will not be injurious to the press but it will hurt the administration, and it may harm American interests.

That is why this self-defeating secrecy plan is so inexplicable. It so obviously jeopardizes the public and congressional support essential to any ratification of conference agreements. Already the secrecy proposal has created suspicion. As Senator GEORGE says: "If that is the program, I think it is not only unfortunate, but displays a shortsightedness not tending to give the necessary legislative support for what the conference may evolve."

Mr. Roosevelt knows how President Wilson advanced the principle of "open covenants openly arrived at" as the best protection for democracy, and how powerless Mr. Wilson was in the secret sessions forced upon him by other governments—the evil results of which helped to create the conditions of World War No 2. The American people have not forgotten either.

Secret diplomacy is poison. The drug addict is always sure he can handle it—until too late. Dope up this first United Nations conference, and the other and more difficult nonmilitary conferences to come will think they require more and more secrecy.

The whole thing is so repugnant to democracy and so destructive of American ratification that we still hope the President will take the advice of his associates in favor of normal press coverage before the May 18 conference meets.

VOLUNTEER DOLLARS

Today sees the opening of the Second War Loan campaign—an appeal to the American people to lend their Government $13,000,000,000 fighting dollars.

Thousands of volunteer workers are starting out to sell War bonds. Don't wait for one of them to call on you. Go to a bank, a post office, or one of the other places where bonds are on sale, and volunteer your money—as much of it as you possibly can—now.

If that means doing without something else you would like to buy, still your sacrifice will be small compared to that of the men in the Army and Navy who must have the guns your dollars will pay for.

They will give their lives, if need be, to defend you.

You are asked merely to lend your money to equip and maintain them and provide them a good fighting chance to win the war quickly and come safely home.

Indeed, this War loan campaign is not a call for sacrifice It is an offer of opportunity.

Opportunity to insure earlier victory.

Opportunity to invest your money safely, at good interest, for the future security of yourself and your family.

Opportunity to help hold down your cost of living and maintain the purchasing power of your dollars. For when the Government borrows direct from the people, that withdraws money from the dangerous inflationary competition for scarce goods.

You help your country and you help yourself by buying War bonds—as soon as you can, as many as you can.

Labor Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2d

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered in the House of Commons of Canada by the Honorable Humphrey Mitchell, Minister of Labor, on development of 1943 farm-labor program. The address gives a very clear and informative statement about agricultural labor problems in Canada, and I am sure it will be interesting to Member of our Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR CONDITIONS

DEVELOPMENT OF 1943 FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Hon. HUMPHREY MITCHELL (Minister of Labor). The honorable member for Huron North (Mr. Cardiff) asked a question yesterday with respect to the policy of the Government as to labor supply for agriculture for the forthcoming season. I wish to make a statement to the house on the development of the Government's 1943 farm-labor program.

National farm-labor policy, 1943: The national farm-labor policy of 1943 calls for the closest coordination of the federal and provincial departments of agriculture, other federal and provincial departments, national and local farm organizations, and the cooperations of citizens in general.

1. Stabilizing employment in agriculture: The following measures have recently been taken to strengthen the established policy of the Government to stabilize employment in agriculture; in other words, to keep essential labor on the farms.

(a) Under P. C. 246, January 19, 1943, no person employed in agriculture shall accept other employment except for:

(1) Active service in the armed forces.

(2) He may take temporary employment not exceeding 60 days in any calendar year outside an urban municipality with a population over 5,000 but not for a longer time unless he has obtained a permit from an employment and selective service office. All employment offices have been instructed that permits should not be given to those who are essential to agriculture. Provision has been made to allow for the seasonal employment of agricultural workers in logging, lumbering, mining, and fishing, when they can be spared from the farms.

(b) Under the mobilization regulations farmers and farm workers applying for postponement of military service shall be granted such postponement until further notice unless it is established to the satisfaction of the board that they are not essential to agriculture.

(c) An interpretative letter was sent on February 1 to the chairman of each mobilization board to insure greater uniformity in the application of the mobilization regulations and to emphasize the importance of retaining manpower in agriculture. This letter stressed that postponements be granted until further notice to essential agricultural workers.

The letter has been recorded at page 284 of Hansard of February 9, 1943, and I will not take time to read it now. It has clarified the situation. Some suggestions have been made that mobilization boards will not follow the procedure outlined. I have not had any such intimation from a single member of any board in Canada.

My personal contact with the mobilization boards, as members know, has been since December 1 only; however, I am confident I can depend upon full cooperation from them and on compliance with the regulations by them.

2. Dominion-provincial cooperative farm labor activity: For the past 3 years a very successful activity was carried on in Ontario on a dollar for dollar basis jointly by the Dominion and the Province whereby workers consisting of men and women and students from urban centers were recruited for farm work.

Last year a number of other Provinces entered into a similar agreement. The salient features of these agreements, in which the Federal Department of Labor shared the expenditures equally with the Provinces concerned, were as follows:

In Ontario, the financial assistance was used to expand the activities of the farm service force. This force was made up of high-school students, university students, school teachers and townspeople during vacation and spare hours. Under this arrangement over 50,000 placements were made on farms during the 1942 season. Fifty thousand persons were made available for farmers, who otherwise would not have gone near a farm.

In Nova Scotia, assistance in fruit-picking operations in the Annapolis Valley was provided. Agreements were made with each of the three prairie Provinces to provide financial assistance for the recruiting, transporting, and placement of emergency help for harvesting operations.

In British Columbia, the financial assistance was used in carrying out special measures to meet the labor requirements for fruit picking.

This Dominion-Provincial cooperative plan will be expanded and further developed this year in all Provinces. Already conferences to this end have been conducted. Suggestions have been made that we develop a woman's land army—well, you see we have had 3 years of successful experience with a much broader scheme in Ontario and to a lesser degree in other Provinces.

This year we will exceed our 50,000 individuals of 1942 in Ontario and do equally well in other provinces.

3. Return of workers to agriculture from seasonal employment: Arrangements through the employment and selective service offices are planned and will go into effect to insure that farmers and farm workers engaged in seasonal employment in logging, lumbering, and other seasonal work return to agriculture in time for spring work. These men were encouraged to leave agriculture during the winter, when they could be spared on the understanding that they would go back to the farms in the spring.

There are some 175,000 men who were moved from farms for winter work who must return to agriculture, otherwise they will lose

their rights to postponement under the mobilization regulations.

The employment offices will not issue permits to them for work in any other industry.

Positive assurance therefore exists that this large body of men will be available for 1943 farm work.

4. Existing pools of manpower to be tapped. There are several sources from which we will recruit farm labor, a few of which are:

(a) Prisoners of war: The labor department will explore the possible use of prisoners of war on farms and will assume the responsibility for this activity.

(b) Japanese in Canada: Already representatives of the sugar-beet growers of Alberta and Ontario have representatives in the Japanese towns in British Columbia negotiating for Japanese labor. We used these men successfully in Alberta, Manitoba, and to a lesser degree, in Ontario last year. In 1943 we expect still greater success.

(c) Indians on reserves: Treaty Indians from the reserves will be used on farms. This was tried out last fall and proved satisfactory and will be further developed this year.

(d) Other sources: Other sources of potential farm manpower will be explored. These include recruitment and training of women for driving farm equipment; use of civilian internees; use of men discharged from the armed forces, and numerous others.

5. Drawing from industries: A survey will be made, and based on same, industries which can do so without impairing the war effort will be required to release men and women suitable for farm work. This may mean that during the rush seasons some industries may be closed temporarily.

6. Direction to agriculture of persons unfit for military service: The authority provided under national selective-service regulations will be used to direct to agriculture unmarried men who are called for military service and are found to be unfit and who in the opinion of the national selective-service officer are suitable for farm work. These men will be directed to productive farms where labor is needed. The Government will pay transportation and, if found necessary, will make an initial allowance for work clothing. Furthermore, the department will see to it that the man is paid promptly.

7. Mobility of labor: To provide absolute mobility of farm labor so that manpower may be moved from areas where work is completed to other areas where needed, the dominion government will provide transportation when the movement is from one province to another, and will share expenditures within the province with the provincial governments. This will permit of organization of farm labor excursions and similar arrangements.

8. Local agricultural war committees: Local agricultural war committees in counties, townships, parishes, and municipalities have already been established by several of the provinces to promote organized effort in local communities to meet 1943 farm production goals. Other provinces have this same plan under consideration. Such committees can assist greatly in carrying out the details of the farm labor program. The committees would be asked to perform the following functions:

(a) To encourage within the local area the best use of existing farm manpower through the efficient planning and management of farm operations, farmers working together where practical, the sharing of labor, and the cooperative use of farm machinery.

(b) To determine seasonal and full-time farm labor requirements in the community.

(c) To encourage the transfer of labor from low- to high-productive farms and to work with provincial agricultural representatives, other provincial field men, and local employment and selective-service officers in facilitating the placement of the most productive farms of workers brought in from other sources.

(d) To assist provincial field men and employment officers in recruiting farmers and farm workers who can be spared from agriculture during the slack seasons for work in other essential primary industries.

(e) Supplying information regarding the essentiality, or otherwise, of farm workers whose cases are under consideration by the mobilization boards when requested to do so. The local committees could be of assistance by reporting the facts regarding men who have not made themselves essential to agriculture by increasing production on the farm where they are working or by moving to a farm where their services are required. They could also report men who are unwilling to undertake essential seasonal work elsewhere when they can be spared from agriculture. Such reports will be made available to national selective officials, the representatives of national defense and agriculture, appearing before the mobilization board, and taken in conjunction with reports received from recruiting committees and other sources, will enable the board to reach a decision based on the facts.

9. Movement of workers from low productive farms: Encouragement will be given to those at present on low productive farms to move to more productive farms. Each province will be requested to explore this possibility and to develop detailed plans which will best fit the local necessities.

10. Experienced farmers will be used to advise:

(a) Appointment of regional national selective service officials with farm experience: Qualified men with agricultural experience will be appointed to the employment staff of each region and where necessary within individual provinces.

(b) Agricultural division of the labor supply branch: An agricultural division of the labor supply branch has been established. On its staff are men experienced in agriculture.

(c) Close liaison with Federal Department of Agriculture: A close contact will be maintained between this agricultural division and the federal and provincial departments of agriculture.

(d) Representation of agriculture on national selective service advisory board: An outstanding farmer who is a member of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture has been added to the national selective service advisory board.

11. Discussion of program with provincial authorities. This program will be sent at once to each provincial department of agriculture and labor to be followed by detailed discussions in each province between their respective officials and representatives of the department of labor immediately.

Mr. REID. Has the minister given consideration to the utilization of the hundreds of conscientious objectors who are employed in forestry camps and who could be given work of a more pressing nature?

Mr. MITCHELL. This matter is at this moment receiving the attention of the department of labor. We expect to make an announcement within the next few days.

Mr. GRAYDON. I did not note in the minister's statement any reference to whether the government had made a nation-wide survey to find out exactly how many men and women will be required to meet the needs of the production program on the farms.

Mr. MITCHELL. We have many surveys; I should be glad to show them to my honorable friend. After all it is only a guess. The figure you get today is dead tomorrow; in fact sometimes it is dead a long time before it reaches me, owing to the constant changes in the agricultural situation in a seasonal country. But if my honorable friend would like to see the best thing we have I shall be glad to give it to him.

Mr. GRAYDON. It is not particularly for my own purposes that I am asking the question; I am only anxious to find out whether the government is approaching the matter from one point of view or the other. The government ought to know what is required before it decides on the policy to fill the requirement.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury). With reference to the letter addressed by the deputy minister, Mr. MacNamara, to the mobilization boards, will the minister say how many answers have been received, and will he lay them on the table? I happen to know of one from a member of the mobilization board in New Brunswick. It was a most constructive letter; I wish it could go on Hansard. It gave the considered opinion of a man who is doing a fine piece of work. I may add that he is not the chairman of the board, either. It would be most instructive if those letters could either be read into Hansard or printed in Votes and Proceedings. I ask the minister in any event to lay them on the table so that we may see what is the reaction of the members of these boards to the suggestion of the deputy minister of labor as set forth in that letter.

Mr. BLACKMORE. Does the Minister of Labor think that any instructions or suggestions have issued from any other department of the government to the boards, which might have a bearing upon the decisions they would make in the cases of those who might otherwise be granted postponement because they are essential to agriculture? Cases are being reported to me of men who so far as the ordinary human intelligence can see ought to be granted postponement by reason of their being essential to agriculture; but for some reason the boards are not granting postponement. It gives rise to the question whether orders are going out from the government countermanding orders from the minister's department.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the honorable member can rest assured that no orders have gone out from the government contrary to those of the Department of Labor.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn). Are not quotas sent out by the Department of National Defense to the boards asking them to secure a certain number of recruits each month? Does the Department of Labor get that direct from defense headquarters here?

Planning for the Post-War Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address regarding post-war problems, delivered by Hon. James W. Gerard, former Ambassador to Germany, on Sunday, April 11, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania, made a splendid address on the radio recently concerning the necessity for consideration now of the problems of after the war and indeed, from almost every side, there comes confirmation of the principles advanced by Senator GUFFEY in his address.

Last April 2, Senator GUFFEY, who was here in New York, and I, called upon that sage of

sages, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, not only to present our homages on his eighty-first birthday but to get his views on this subject of after the war problems. He, of course, was most cooperative and I believe that out of his interview with Senator GUFFEY something definite will come.

But there are many shoals and rocks to be avoided in this discussion. Let me give just one instance.

At the Forum of the Herald Tribune held on November 22 last, an extremely prominent American statesman spoke as follows concerning the British colonies:

"Now, let's take a specific and difficult example of what lies before us if we are to give reality to those freedoms we have proclaimed."

He then spoke of the Malayan Peninsula and the islands of the southwest Pacific and continued:

"Now, assume that the Allies reconquer those areas. Shall we return them to their previous status, where their defense was courageous but inadequate and their peoples undeveloped under the governmental custody of some one nation? Or shall they be wards of the United Nations, their basic commodities made freely available to the world, their safety protected by an international police force, the full yield of their resources used for their own health, their own education and development, and for their training in the practices of self-government?

On March 13 there appeared in the London Daily Mail an editorial which referred to a speech made by Oliver Stanley, a minister in the Churchill government, which ran as follows:

"Mr. Oliver Stanley did a valuable and timely service by his reference in a speech at Oxford to the future political organization of the British colonial empire.

"'I am convinced,' he said, 'that the first and fundamental principle is that the administration of the British colonies must continue to be the sole responsibility of Great Britain.'

"This is a direct and proper answer," continues the editor, "to the suggestion, mooted by a small but vocal section of opinion in America, that the colonial empire should be administered after the war by some vague international body. Such a proposal will never commend itself to the people of Britain.

"This country must continue to exercise direct responsibility. While in the past our administration has not always been perfect, its sincerity has been absolute, its guiding aim always the good of the peoples entrusted to our care.

"To leave the colonial peoples to the haphazard jurisdiction of some international organization, wielding authority without responsibility, and quite conceivably motivated by extranational interests and rivalries, would be a cruel disservice to them.

"Any assistance from any friendly quarter in increasing the productivity, prosperity, and reciprocal usefulness of the colonies will be welcomed. But so far as our administrative responsibility is concerned, what we have we must, for the good of all, hold."

There is a direct conflict, immediately, between an American statesman and what I am convinced is the feeling of the people of Great Britain as shown by the speech of Mr. Stanley and this editorial in the London Daily Mail—and

There is another side to this. Our statesman said that the "full yield" of the resources of those areas in question should, as I have quoted above, "be used for their own health, their own education and development and for their training in the practices of self-government."

The British introduced, for example, through many corporations, the cultivation of rubber into the Malayan Peninsula. They expended great sums in bringing the rubber plantations to bearing. Other Britishers, and even Americans, developed the tin mines of Malaya. Are these people, who risked their capital in investments in Malaya and added to the material wealth and employment of that area, to be deprived of their investments as our statesman would seem to imply?

Then, too, what will the Dutch have to say to the proposition that they are to be deprived of the administration of the Dutch East Indies area which before the war was so ably administered by them and are the Dutch and British and American companies who developed the oil resources of Borneo and Java to be deprived of their property?

It would be a calamity if our British friends should be led to think that we desire to deprive them of their colonies which, after all, they have honestly and efficiently administered.

The one thing that we need in this war is unity and nothing should be done or said to bring about disunity either among ourselves or in our relations with our allies.

Is the reward for all the sacrifices of Britain in the defense of our civilization to be the loss of her colonies? I, for one, cannot subscribe to such a conclusion.

You see that it is not as easy as it seems to the theorists to provide for the after-war administration of the world.

A friend of mine in Scotland has sent me a folder of the Never Again Association which contains suggestions, not put forward, as is stated, as a completed policy but which are intended to form a basis for further development of ideas, political, economic and juridical, which shall enable the United Nations to win the peace after winning the war.

In the short time at my disposal I cannot give all of this program of the Never Again Association but some of the provisions suggest the unconditional surrender, total disarmament, and military occupation of enemy territory to be maintained at the enemy's cost.

A token ceremony of surrender to be enacted in every town in the Reich so that the population shall individually understand that they have been beaten in the military sense.

War criminals that have escaped to neutral countries to be extradited and the trial of perpetrators of atrocity not to be left to German courts.

The Reich to be dissolved into her component parts, having regard to the future security of Europe and the restoration of territories and populations; devastated countries to be replenished from German sources, first by the restoration of stolen goods and secondly by contributions from all sources, public and individual.

Efficient measures to be taken to prevent Axis industries from being turned over to war production and the Axis Powers to be debarred from building aircraft of any kind.

Enemy nations not to be accepted for naturalization with exception as to the Jews, and the education of the Axis peoples to be placed under the control of the United Nations. The term "education" to include the press, broadcasting, the theater and the cinema, as well as schools and universities.

These, the above, are a few of the suggestions made by the Never Again Association having its headquarters in Dover Street, London.

Of course, the most difficult question will be presented by tariffs and also by the creation of the universal currency already suggested by our Treasury Department.

As to tariffs it is probable that Secretary Hull's excellent plan of reciprocal trade agreements will dispose of that question which, however, must be carefully studied with a view to maintaining the standard of living of the American workingman. By far the better currency plan has been given out by our Secretary of the Treasury. After all, gold has been the universal medium of exchange since the dawn of history and the Morgenthau plan has more solid gold than there is in the British proposal of Lord Keynes.

While we are desirous of aiding the broken countries of the world, we must not forget our own.

One of the British bishops, Dr. Haight, Bishop of Winchester, has come forward with an appeal deploring the fact that the British show satisfaction over the bombing of the cities of Germany containing civilians, thereby implying that the bombing should cease. This is an example of the hysterical weakness which may lose us the war.

As I have already said on this radio, it is practically impossible for a revolution to break out in Germany itself. The revolution will come, as in the last war, from the soldiers at the front, or the sailors in the harbor, and they will rise in revolt when they become worried about the fate of their families at home in the bombed cities and towns of Germany. Then they will turn against their Axis masters and force a surrender.

When we consider that the mass of the German people have acquiesced in the shooting of hostages, in the murder of millions of Jews and Poles, and of the Russian civilians driven out to die in the depths of winter, when we think of the French slaves working to furnish the Germans with material to murder French soldiers, and when we think of the constant assassinations in Yugoslavia, in Greece, in Belgium, and in Holland, it is only an overpowering neurasthenia that can drive people like the good bishop to make such weak and ridiculous demands.

The Germans have mercilessly bombed the cities of Europe, they have machine-gunned women and children in the streets, and now when they seem about to lose control of the air, it is not the time to talk of abandoning our most effective weapon.

Our President has not only vetoed the Bankhead bill, but by his bold action in putting a ceiling on both wages and food products, he has protected the savings, the salaries, and the insurance of the prudent, and the wages of the workers, and has encouraged the purchasers of War bonds, who now know that the value of their investments will be protected for all time.

Thomas Jefferson

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. GIFFORD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow our hearts will be afire with patriotic fervor; often when my heart is afire with patriotic fervor some sparks flow from my mouth.

A good Democrat from the South, not a Member of the House, asked me this morning to present to the Congress this comment: "When the Great Master was being taken into custody, Peter followed afar off." He implied that we are following Jefferson afar off.

In the extension of my remarks I shall quote Jefferson, because that particular quotation will not be referred to tomorrow.

It is as follows:

That I should lay down my charge at a proper period, is as much a duty as to have borne it faithfully. If some termination to the services of the chief magistrate be not fixed by the Constitution, or supplied by

practice, his office, nominally 4 years, will, in fact, became for life; and history shows how easily that degenerates into an inheritance. Believing that a representative government, responsible at short periods of election, is that which produces the greatest sum of happiness to mankind, I feel it a duty to do no act which shall essentially impair that principle; and I should unwillingly be the first person who, disregarding the sound precedent set by an illustrious predecessor, should furnish the first example of prolongation beyond the second term of office.

This is probably familiar to all of us. If he could now speak, what would he say to us?

The New Beginning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Mr. T. M. Martin, vice president and general manager of the Lion Oil Refining Co., of El Dorado, Ark., to the local Rotary Club. I commend this address to the Members of Congress and the people of this Nation. It deals with the position of the businessman in wartime as well as post-war problems. He talks very frankly and courageously on the existence of free enterprise of business and the ingenuity of the individual.

The address follows:

Man puts up his "dukes" and fights with all his might to be left alone. Wars are fought because intellectual mankind is peace loving. Although our history books tell us that the great improvements—which have so measurably contributed to the progress of the world—have resulted from war necessity, peacetimes are still the most beneficial periods to humanity.

Although there are many uncertainties connected with the war, there is one encouraging thing about which we may be sure—that is, that on the morning o. probably the most joyous day the world has even seen, this war will end. They always have, and they always will.

Knowing this, it is essential that those who are anxious about the future and what it holds, devote careful study to the problems that will immediately follow the close of war. We hear it said frequently that we should win the war first and then decide about peace and what is to follow. This is the route we selected once before. We won that war, too, but we also lost it, for we failed to think much about what had to come. The failure then was political, and not so much because we were unable to visualize the economic aftermath.

I will make no attempt to suggest the type of peace program the world must have. I will leave that to those who are trained to solve this problem, and I believe we have such men. What I shall be concerned with now is an appraisal of the businessman's position and some brazen suggestions as to what he should do about it.

SOME METHODS ABANDONED

When this country really started its preparation for war, the industrial and agricultural machinery began to gear itself for production, and we abandon certain of our standard ways of doing business—never to return to them again. At the close of this year, 80 to 90 percent of all production will be directly involved in defense. When peace is announced this percentage of all orders for materials will not be canceled before sundown of that day, as peace terms will provide for armies of occupation throughout all important countries of the world, and these armies will have to be supplied. But a big share of all business will stop, and there will be terrific confusion. When this readjustment is complete, we will do normal business under entirely new methods compared with those we gave up to begin war production. This is the reason why businessmen should be studying the requirements for the period of the "new beginning."

For the past 10 to 12 years, this country has been heading for socialism; and, if we don't do something in a hurry to stop it, we'll be in it so far, there'll be no turning back. I was never more serious in any belief than I am about that possibility. I am not talking about social security—involving old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, and the like. Some of these advancements have been progressive and very beneficial to the Nation. They are just fine if we do only what we can afford to do, as we can afford to do it, and not try to take the whole apple at one bite.

What we must stop is preconceived, deliberate Government competition with private business. Let me illustrate what I mean.

PUERTO RICO AN EXAMPLE

Puerto Rico is one of our island possessions in the Caribbean. It has its own congress, and a Governor appointed by the President of the United States, but all of its laws must have the approval of Washington. The Governor at this time happens to be Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell, a braintruster and a former professor from Columbia University. Dr. Tugwell, as most of us have heard, is using Puerto Rico for a guinea pig. He's forcing down the throats of our people on that island some of the social reforms they have in mind for us a little later. Here are some quotations from February Nation's Business about the goings on.

"Dr. Tugwell went to Puerto Rico determined to ease the island's social and economic problems. The people there, in general, tired of the status quo which, strictly speaking, has meant a great deal of turmoil for years, were willing to listen. They had elected a new political faction, the Popular Party, to power and it was with a one-vote majority in the Senate that Dr. Tugwell put through 'must' legislation designed to carry out his theories.

"First on the schedule was the passage of the land law of Puerto Rico. This enabled the insular government to take over large holdings merely by making a token payment in court. An ancient law permitting the government to take over all corporations—dried lands in excess of 500 acres already was on the books. But the new Governor wanted to make this process apply also to farms of 500 acres or more owned by partnerships and trusts. Dr. Tugwell apparently is convinced that ownership of land brings many evils. In a report to Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, whose Department exercises most control over the island, he wrote:

" 'Everyone familiar with American agriculture must know that the most hazardous situation possible to a man of family is to have the fee-simple ownership of land.'

BANK ALSO PROPOSED

"The 'must' program sets up a series of authorities, financed with public funds, which have the power to acquire and operate all forms of transportation, communications, water resources, and any type of business imaginable. First, there's a planning, utilization, and zoning board (P. U. Z. B.), which will decide where and when and how any public body will make public improvements in the island. It's headed by a former geography professor in a Puerto Rican high school.

"Next on the program was a development bank—with $500,000 capital put up by Puerto Rico—which is authorized to do business in competition with any private bank, a politically appointed board of directors setting the rules. It has unlimited power to do as it pleases with deposits.

"Next came a development corporation, authorized to engage in any or all of a large number of businesses, the list to be expanded at will by the legislature. It's headed, at $8,000 a year, by Teodora Mocosco, a clerk in his father's drugstore.

"When the island's auditor didn't like signing blank checks, Dr. Tugwell appointed another. When the attorney general of the island ruled that some of the actions were unconstitutional, he was removed by Washington, and another attorney general installed.

"Dr. Tugwell has hired seven 'experts' or advisers, answerable only to him. They serve as his cabinet, unofficially.

"One of his several publicity men spent $400,000 cabling a story extolling Dr. Tugwell's virtues to 10 large American newspapers. None used the story.

"These congressional committees currently are investigating what Dr. Tugwell is trying to do in Puerto Rico. Meanwhile, the Puerto Rico Chamber of Commerce, by a unanimous vote, has petitioned President Roosevelt to recall Dr. Tugwell. The President has not replied. The recall petition was never published until reporters learned of it in Puerto Rico.

"Islanders—not 'barons of power' in the States—first came forward with the thought that Dr. Tugwell might be using Puerto Rico as a 'guinea pig' for a master plan of government control for the United States later. That feeling was heightened when Dr. Tugwell in a report to Secretary Ickes, said with respect to the land distribution program there:

" 'It has obvious implications for the South'."

LIKES AMERICAN WAY

There is something about the American way of doing things that has been responsible for the development of the greatest industrial system in the history of the world, and for the highest standard of living of any race of people. I believe there are many principles responsible for this, but I think the greatest among all has been the incentive guaranteed to private enterprise by our Constitution (which of course for the time being we have abandoned). But we will go back to it. Now, if I am right and we are in danger of seeing the foundation crumble, we must do something about it or disintegrate.

After a few months of post-war shuffling about, if we come to our senses, and I believe we will, the country will gear itself to the job of supplying the pent-up demand for both consumer and durable goods. That will be the beginning of a very prosperous period for some, and I will attempt now to reflect what I think may be expected by the important classifications of industry and agriculture.

OIL

Because of the need for the United States to supply practically all of the United Nations with oil and oil products, the demand will exceed the ability of our present underground reserves to supply the crude oil needed, and yet maintain in the most important fields the essential conservation practices that have been applied in peacetimes.

This means that in the event of a long war, oil reserves will be greatly abused and dissipated when the war is over, and I anticipate, too, that the major reserves will more

and more drift into the hands of the strong companies. The trend is already there to look at. I believe, too, that within 12 months after the war is over the average price for crude oil will be a minimum of $2 per barrel. Much higher prices will have to come to support the coming cost of exploring and producing, to say nothing of inflation.

New pools scarcer

With the smell of war still in the air there will be a tendency, too, to conserve or supply in this country for our use, and import more oil products. New important pools will be deeper and scarcer. They're getting harder to find every day, and the industry is already concerned about a shortage. This practice, I believe, can be supported; and, although most producers today, big and little, would throw up their hands at the suggestion that they look for oil in some of our established at the close of war that will make foreign development and production desirable for American producers of oil.

The art of manufacturing products from oil will be completely revamped because the work required of such products as gasoline and lubricating oils will change with the increased demand for high compression gasoline motors, Diesel engines, and airplanes. Entirely new products from petroleum and natural gas will spring into use, and we will see the oil industry take an important position in the chemical field, more especially in rubber and plastics.

The marketing of products of petroleum will, in my opinion, change to the point where the small roadside station will never return on any important scale, but the one-stop super-service store will grow in size and importance and will sell as many items as an average chain drug store does today.

THE LUMBER TRADE

All important countries, which are now theaters of war, will have to be rebuilt, and lumber will play a very important part in this reconstruction Since America will extend credit for reconstruction, and since the American influence will be uppermost in making the terms of peace, it follows that our statesmen will shape these affairs to permit American businesses to enjoy the fruits of this labor. In the formation of these basic plans, it will be the general scheme to improve the countries that are rebuilt, through the building of permanent industry in those countries for them to keep. The old American way of exploiting the resources of foreign countries is done for. This will mean that the machinery and all durable goods required will be made in this and other important nations and shipped to such places as Africa, India, and China, to set them up in this "new beginning." From then on, local manufacturing will grow. Timber will be cut there and processed there. Rebuilding will cost less that way.

Plastics and other available synthetic substitutes will completely change housing methods. Whereas there will be a terrific demand for a number of years after the war closes for housing facilities in this country, which will be important to the lumber industry, I cannot see that it will greatly benefit from world reconstruction. Building-supply industries will have to adapt themselves to a new order.

FARMING BUSINESS

Until there is a complete turn-around in the political art of handling the farm problem, we can expect a continuation of subsidies, but I believe I can see in everything I read a desire to get back to the old way of thinking, before we heard so much about "planned scarcity."

The farmer and the livestock man are tired of the shackles they have been wearing for the past 10 years, which are now being drawn tighter, due to the need during war for producing the specific products for which there is the greatest need. They want more freedom of action and are willing to take their chances with markets controlled by the law of supply and demand. There are still those, who want something for nothing, but I believe the majority is swinging away from the regulation and regimentation which have prevented the free flow of work and trade.

Until the important agricultural countries have had an opportunity to prepare for the raising of a crop and grow that crop, there will be an enormous demand for all types of farm products from North and South America. This should require about two years after the war closes; and, after that time, the future requirements for our agricultural products for foreign markets is hazy and very uncertain.

THE BANKING HOUSE

The Federal Government, through its ramification of regulations, has restricted the freedom of action of all banks within its jurisdiction, which means practically all banks. Private initiative in banking is almost a thing of the past. It is natural during these times that a large portion of bank deposits would be invested in government securities. There is little else that provides a suitable outlet for funds; but as soon as the war is over, all types of industry and agriculture will have to be refinanced, with an eye to this period of reconstruction of which we speak.

Every war brings "new" industries, because of the intense stimulation of technology. A count made recently of the new things already developed, or known to be near completion, totalled 132 items of major interest; over 700 items of lesser technical interest, and the probability of at least 1,000 new articles of one kind and another, many of which have their trade-mark names already picked and registered but are still strange names to consumers. The whole galaxy of new things will burst upon us like a shower of brilliant fireworks. True, the process of retooling and getting ready will take time—perhaps as much as two years after peace; but some will break within a few months after peace; some indeed will be publicized within days from the war's end.

There will be many new opportunities provided for banks to loan money. War has forced many a good businessman to quit for no fault of his own. This fellow will want a new start A great number of them will have difficulty in getting security for the orthodox method of making a loan. Banks will need to be more flexible in their policy of making loans if they are to properly serve the needs of the people, and the country, during this period of reconstruction. Interest rates will rise, and much more inflation is definite. From a long-range national viewpoint, low interest on money has never encouraged a nation to grow. It serves too much as an inducement for the country to go into debt on the grounds that carrying charges are low. Sooner or later, we must reverse that deadly philosophy.

THE WHOLESALER

The wholesaler of both consumer and durable goods, if he can stick it out, has bright prospects. Immediately after the war, there will be released a big restrained demand for all useful things. Compulsory savings, investments in War bonds, and post-war credits returnable after the war, to say nothing about bonuses and pensions for war veterans, will provide the means for paying for this avalanche of goods.

For those who can stay in business and be ready for this boom period, which is as certain to come as tomorrow, the future looks bright. The feeling that the middleman is a leech and is unnecessary is always present and may grow.

MEDICAL PROFESSION

Unless some very effective work is done to prevent it, the practice of medicine will become socialized. Remember this—the medicine man is dealing with the public health, and it is not a very difficult matter for the sponsors of this movement to sell the public on the idea that the new way will bring more effective medical service at lower cost, and that a great percent of the people who are today denied proper medical care, can have it for nothing where they can't pay for it, and for less money where their means to pay are very limited.

I am against this move, as most forward-thinking people are, because I think it strikes at the heart of private enterprise, which is the life's blood of the American system. If the medical profession is to come out whole, when this is over, it must become concerned about this probability, and not assume a passive attitude, consoled in the belief that the American Medical Association will take care of the situation. As an organization, it is looked upon by those now in power as a great deal like the United States Chamber of Commerce—as just another institution fighting against the interests of the common man. Doctors, of all kinds, having to do with public health, should band themselves together and get busy.

THE LEGAL PROFESSION

I can see nothing but clear sailing ahead for the man who has cast his lot in the practice of law. The fact of the matter is, lawyers and tax men are, and will continue to be the most popular folks connected with business. There has been a wholesale stretching of all laws, in an attempt to legalize the acts of public office holders, to assist the new plan of social reform, and no one moves on anything important any more without the advice of counsel.

When all business is active, the lawyer is active. During the life of all those present, we will be involved in a period of high taxes. I believe taxes will be drastically reduced at the end of the war, and the national debt spread out for repayment over a long period of time; but we will have tax rates higher than those in effect before this war began. Many tax experts are lawyers.

THE RETAIL DEALER

Ways of doing business for the average merchant will see drastic change.

Advertising will continue pretty much along the same standard channels. It will be called upon to introduce new consumer goods of the future, and more and more merchant's greatest profit will come from products with highest national acceptance.

There will always be a place in the picture for the small merchant, but he will have to vary with the change in times and adjust his business to be competitive with the chain stores, which are just as sound in principle as mass production of automobiles and airplanes.

These projections are, of course, merely my own, gathered from whatever small contact I may have had with those who know more about it. Certainly there is a bright period of prosperity in front of us at the close of the war, which will extend for many years if our great leaders are willing to reverse some of the tendencies of the past.

In a general way, here is what came after the War of 1812, after the Civil War, and after the First World War.

1. A few months of hesitancy.
2. Then a year or more of active business.
3. A relatively short period of trade and financial readjustment.

4. A succeeding period of prosperity extending over several years.

After such a long period of deficit spending, it will be difficult to balance budgets and begin absorbing the debt, but the greatest business nation in world history knows we must do it or we must wreck. Government spending to excess will try to continue. Those who haven't thought the matter through think they have been getting something for nothing. The Government, of course, has nothing except what it takes from us, and that's all it can give us back.

A howl will go up to keep some of the Government controls now in effect, in the guise that they are necessary to avoid chaos and unbearable confusion. We must kill them as quickly as they have served their purpose.

Now, the most important thing after all is how we prepare for this new beginning in our own community. It reminds me of what my mother used to say to me when I was trying to get started: "What profit he who gaineth the whole world and loseth his own soul." What good does it do to theorize on the new beginning for the Nation unless we bring some of it home. The biggest thing, after all, for each of us individually is what kind of a community shall we provide in which to live and raise our families in that new era. It is like anything else. It will be what we make it. We get out in satisfaction in the same proportion as we put in, in effort.

Personally, I would like to see our city, county, and State much improved, at least physically, and there is plenty of room morally, of course. Local improvement is a subject within itself, with which I am unable to deal at this time, but I do want to say this.

Some of the finest people in the world live in El Dorado. There are many who have a great deal of civic pride, but we haven't the kind of a city that we are entitled to. When the war is over, I would like to see us make some changes. We need wider streets, some parkways, an adequate city park system, a civic auditorium, and other improvements in keeping with our churches, our courthouse, our city hall, and our post office. We are entitled to something outstanding we can all point to and be proud of.

To have a prosperous community that doesn't go up and down with booms, we must have a diversity of business activity. To have that, we must have more industry. To have more industry, we must do something that will help overcome some of the deficiencies I have mentioned, as well as our geographical handicaps. We are not on the main line of any railroad. Our highways are improving, but as a system they are not yet anything to boast about. We are not on important thoroughfares, and as yet we have no airport. I hope it is definitely on the way, as an adequate airport is the most important single thing before us as a community project at this time. After the war, the city that is not provided with facilities to land and service the tremendous planes of the future is destined to go backward.

We can't overcome some of these things, but we can offset our handicaps in many ways. We have to show something to attract business and industrial folks here with their plants. They won't come to El Dorado just because south Arkansas, as a section of the South, has oil and lumber. We've got to offer distinct advantages; we've got to make 'em like us and want to live and cast their lots in with us.

It will cost some money in taxes to do these things, but I believe when the time comes the people can be sold on the fact that such an investment will come back many times in the enhancement of the value of their property. This effect, if it is desired, cannot be had without devotion to the cause on the part of all upstanding citizens. To accomplish this, you will have to discover that you are not too busy to serve on the city council, and take more interest in all government.

You have to put in to take out.

"America, My Home"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have great confidence in the patriotism of the American people. It seems that in times of stress such as we are now undergoing that along with all the trouble and sacrifice that is necessary for our survival, there blooms in the heart of every American citizen a deeper realization of the real worth of our Nation.

In this morning's mail I received a beautiful poem which I understand has also been incorporated into a song, expressing the feelings of one of my constituents, Frank I. Hogan, 5905 Pacific Boulevard, Huntington Park, Calif., in regard to his home—America.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that my colleagues may read the same:

AMERICA—MY HOME
(By Frank I. Hogan)

America, America, how lovely thou art,
Thy beauty and sunshine are set in my heart;
Though far from thy shores the world I may roam,
I'll ne'er forget thee—America, my home.

There's not a spot 'neath land or sea?
Where hearts are so strong and so fancy free;
There's no other place 'neath heaven's blue dome,
So dear to my heart as America, my home.

There lovers of freedom live undefiled,
'Mid valleys so green and mountains so wild;
There the tryant's yoke has ne'er found room,
On the necks of freemen in America, my home.

True lovers of liberty in her farmsteads find rest,
And the spirit of freedom runs hot in her breast;
May the angels in all their sweetness and bloom,
From their heavenly choir bless thee—America, my home.

CHORUS

America, America, how lovely thou art,
Thy beauty and sunshine are set in my heart;
Though far from thy shores the world I may roam,
I'll ne'er forget thee—America, my home.

Thomas Jefferson and the Fourth Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMILTON FISH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop from the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, April 12, 1943, which reads as follows:

It cost more than $10,000,000 and it looks like an old-fashioned, overturned crockery thing of the sort you never see in anybody's bedroom any more. And one fact is certain—it is no memorial to Thomas Jefferson. But it is going to be squalled about mightily as such, tomorrow, in the course of a big show-off down at the Tidal Basin. Living descendants of Thomas Jefferson have been assembled from the far corners to sit out in the uneven April weather with high servants of the State and such of the common rabble as may crowd up to the vicinity of the above-mentioned marble thing, all to hear Jefferson spoken of favorably.

The marble thing itself will be celebrated as an object of beauty and purity. But the eye needs no training to tell you that overturned you-know-what is not beautiful. It is just one more quarry of marble cut up and heaped on the groaning Washington soil. And as for the purity—purity of what?

This $10,000,000 enterprise was conceived as follows: Back when Harold Ickes and Harry Hopkins were spending their billions for Public Works Administration and Work Projects Administration, a handful of the Democratic Party's sob sisters got the idea that Jefferson needed a marble memorial in Washington.

So they slipped a proviso for same into an act of Congress, overriding the laws which state that our Fine Arts Commission must approve any such thing put up here.

They also outraged architects the Nation over by secretly accepting the design of the said marble thing without competition of any kind, or any effort to stimulate a fresher or better thought than this nine hundred and ninety-nine thousandth evesore repetition of the Roman Pantheon.

They made the people of Washington furious because they insisted on this specific object to be unloaded upon us all tomorrow, and fought down attempts to convert the Thomas Jefferson Memorial idea into something really honoring Jefferson, such as a hall of free speech or a combined public library and stadium.

Washington certainly has now, as it had then, great need for each of these.

And they fooled their fellow Members in Congress. They told Congress the finished monstrosity would cost only about $3,000,000. It has actually cost more than three times that.

Finally, they outraged the memory of Jefferson, who stated in his last will and testament that he most definitely did not want any such marble monstrosity as this erected in his name. Ever. Anywhere.

Jefferson drew exact specifications for the kind of thing he wanted, a little shaft of common Virginia field stone to stand at the head of his grave bearing an epitaph he had written himself.

That was Jefferson's memorial designed by Jefferson. It excluded all such truck as this coming up tomorrow. But the sob sisters jammed this $10,000,000 whim through on the ground that since there is a marble what-is-it for Lincoln, the Democrats deserved one for Jefferson. Bigger and gaudier. Well, they got that anyhow, though at the expense of Jefferson's memory, the Nation's taxpayers and the beauty of the Washington Tidal Basin.

There will be loud cries of praise for Jefferson tomorrow from politicians who will claim him as their own with much quoting of some of the things Jefferson had to say.

But you can bet his will won't be quoted. That would put a frost on the claims that this marble thing is a Jefferson memorial. He disclaimed it in advance.

And you can bet that none of the assembled dignitaries are going to quote Jefferson on the subject of Presidents staying too long in office.

He had, however, much to say about that, and while he was President, too. Just so you won't be in any doubt, here is a set of his

remarks on that issue which ought to make Jefferson's attitude pretty plain—even to a fourth termer.

When you've read these, pass them along to a friend. They make a nice contrast to the blah you're going to hear about Jefferson for a while.

To Abner Watkins, December 1807: "Believing that a definite period of retiring from this station (the Presidency) will tend materially to secure our elective form of government, I have felt it a duty to withdraw at the close of my present (second) term, and to strengthen by practice a principle which I deem salutary."

To the Marquis de Lafayette, May 1807: "The general solicitations I have received to continue another term give me great consolation, but considerations, public as well as private, determine me inflexibly on that measure."

In reply to "Connecticut Republicans," 1808: "Having myself highly approved the example of an illustrious predecessor, in voluntarily retiring from a trust which, if too long continued in the same hands, might become a subject of uneasiness and apprehension, I could not mistake my own duty when placed in a similar situation."

From his autobiography, 1821: "The example of four Presidents voluntarily retiring at the end of their eighth year and the progress of public opinion that the principle is salutary give it in practice the force of precedent and usage; insomuch that should any President consent to be a candidate for a third election I trust he would be rejected on this demonstration of ambitious views."

To the Vermont Legislature: "If some termination to the service of the Chief Magistrate be not fixed by the Constitution or supplied by practice, this office, nominally for years, will, in fact, become for life, and history shows how easily that degenerates into an inheritance."

What About Criticism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD BUFFETT
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I have selected several quotations that deserve rereading at this time. We hear on the one hand, the injunction to refrain from thinking political thoughts in time of war, and again at the same time we see the sly moves that are being made toward a fourth term. The suggestion of no criticism would come with better grace if the Democratic Party had a better record in this respect. For something over 100 years the Democratic Party has used the war drums to bolster its political ambitions.

Abraham Lincoln was properly incensed over this Democratic practice 95 years ago when he said in this Congress:

> Does he not know (the gentleman from Georgia) that his own party have run the last five Presidential races under that (military) coattail and that they are now running the sixth under that same cover?

The soundest logic on the subject of criticism in time of war came from the lips of William Ellery Channing in his sermon in 1812 on The Duties of the Citizen in Times of Trial or Danger, and I quote:

A republican government secures to its subjects two most important rights—the right of suffrage, and the right of discussing with freedom the conduct of rulers. Resign either of these, and no way of escape from oppression will be left you but civil commotion. From the important place which these rights hold in a republican government, you should consider yourselves bound to support every citizen in the lawful exercise of them, especially when an attempt is made to wrest them from any by violent means.

At the present time it is particularly your duty to guard with jealousy the right of expressing with freedom your honest convictions respecting the measures of your rulers.

Without this the right of election is not worth possessing. If public abuses may not be exposed, their authors will never be driven from power.

If nothing reaches the people but that which would lend support to men in power, farewell to liberty.

We have lived to hear this strange doctrine, that to expose the measures of rulers is treason; and we have lived to see this doctrine carried into practice.

The cry has been made that war is declared, and all opposition should be hushed. If this doctrine be admitted, rulers have only to declare war, and they are screened at once from scrutiny. At the very time when they have armies at their command, when their patronage is most extended, and their power most formidable, not a word of warning, of censure, of alarm must be heard.

It is your duty to hold fast and to assert with firmness those truths and principles on which the welfare of your country seems to depend, but to do this with calmness, with a love of peace, without ill will and revenge. Let us remember that there is no foundation of public liberty but public virtue, that there is no method of obtaining God's protection but adherence to His laws.

Ickes Versus Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMORY H. PRICE
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of April 10, 1943:

ICKES VERSUS BARGE CANAL

It seems a pity, and something of a reproach to Congress, that one bureaucrat should be able to block thus far the best plan yet offered for relieving the Atlantic seaboard gasoline and fuel oil shortage.

We refer to Petroleum Administrator Harold Ickes' recent double play against the proposal to complete the Florida barge canal and thus open a submarine-proof waterway from the Gulf oil ports to New Jersey.

Ickes let his subbureaucrat, George A. Wilson, tell a House appropriations subcommittee March 31 that there would be no such shortages next winter. Thereupon, the House Appropriations Committee cut the $44,000,000 barge canal item from the War Department's civil functions bill. Then Ickes repudiated Wilson's testimony, and said, with the customary Ickes joy in bringing bad news, that there certainly would be eastern oil and gas shortages next winter and nothing could be done about it.

If this canal were the dream of some Florida booster or New Hampshire Senator or amateur engineer, we would doubt its practicality. It is backed, however, by no less a person than Gen. Charles P. Summerall, a former Chief of Staff with vast engineering experience. Summerall says it is practical, and can be completed in 10 months without disturbing priorities or using excessive manpower.

We think the Senate owes it to itself and the general public to look carefully into Ickes' double play, and to restore the barge canal item of $44,000,000 to the civil-functions bill.

Tax Legislation

REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand this excitement about the Ruml plan. If you want to get any tax bill through this Congress supported by the American people, you had just better forget any bill that has Ruml's name attached to it. The Ruml plan, as it came before the committee, was one of the most gigantic frauds ever tried to be foisted upon the American people. You tried to amend it and to arrange it through the Carlson plan, but those amendments were not advertised. The people are still calling it the Ruml plan. If you think for a single moment you are going to pass any bill to pay-as-you-go and then give away 1942 taxes, you have misunderstood the American people.

As far as my State is concerned, I have received about 100 letters—only 2 in favor of the plan, and 1 of those writers has since apologized. The people did not understand that it was a cancelation of the big fellow's debt. The small men who are doing all the hollering would have received 5 percent of the benefits, and those at the top, who would receive millions, would receive 95 percent of the benefits. Why does any Member in this House think for a single moment that he is going to put that over on the American people? The Ruml plan as such is out, but that does not preclude us from adopting a plan of paying as you go.

Mr. Speaker, the fine thing about the Ruml plan was that it was sugar-coated with the phrase "pay as you go," which everyone approved. When the bill came before the House with this sugar-coated slogan, some Members examined the matter in detail and found down deep and far below the surface of things that the Ruml plan contained a provision to cancel outright over $10,000,000,000 in taxes already due. Still further examination disclosed that those who would substantially benefit by the cancelation had made profits above $50,000 and running on up into the millions. The little fellows down at the bottom of the financial scale who would have had their taxes

canceled would have received approximately 5 percent of the benefits, while the big fellows would have received 95 percent. Yet it was the little fellow who was vociferously in favor of the plan. The big taxpayers sat back and watched this tax plan proceed, knowing that they would benefit if it passed.

Pay as you go is nothing new; thousands of taxpayers are doing that now. When a year's business is over everyone knows there is a tax due to the Government. Most people had that in mind when the tax became due on March 15. The tax was, in fact, due and owing on December 31, but the Government allowed the additional time of two and a half months to make the payment.

There are two classes of people who did not pay their 1942 taxes. First, those who could not because of unexpected expenditures that interrupted their plans; second, those who gave their taxes no thought until they were due.

If we now adopt a plan of paying as we go, we cannot start in before July 1; hence, there will be some old taxes to pay. If it is too burdensome for small taxpayers to pay as you go and also pay the remainder of the 1942 tax and part of 1943 at once, we should provide in the bill that these old taxes be divided into small payments covering a period of 3 or 4 years, drawing no interest. In this way the small taxpayer can pay his tax and it will not be necessary to cancel those taxes at the top, many of which will reach into millions of dollars.

The original Ruml proposal was the most gigantic fraud ever offered the American people; it was nothing but a scheme to let the millionaires increase, and shove the real tax burden on the little taxpayer. But the funny thing about it was that the little taxpayer was strong for it and did the most shouting for its adoption.

Where is the person so stupid that he cannot see that if we cancel $10,000,000,000 of the 1942 tax that we shall have to make that up in new taxes and distribute the burden down onto 44,000,000 new taxpayers? Yet the way Ruml put his plan over the 44,000,000 down at the bottom are doing all the hollering for the plan and the big boys, whose plan it actually is, are saying nothing.

The general public, with all its astuteness, can be worked to a frazzle on propaganda. During the past 3 years two events have transpired in the United States that prove conclusively that the public can be taken in in a big way any time the right propaganda is put on.

The first event was the nomination of Willkie at the Republican National Convention when he did not have a single delegate elected in his behalf. No one knew him—he had participated in no primaries—he had nothing except plenty of financial backing, and money put him over. Telegrams—all paid for—came pouring into the convention; the galleries were packed with Willkie supporters—intentionally. The press carried the most trivial Willkie remark, and most of it was trivial. The delegates were assured of big contributions to the campaigns in their States—they were shown a Republican victory—only possible under Willkie—they swallowed the bait, hook, line, and sinker, and Willkie, a docile and devoted follower of Wall Street, became the raging platform lion for the dear people.

After the campaign Willkie himself let the cat out of the bag inadvertently while in a "hot" spot in being questioned, and said: "I know I said that in the campaign but you know that was merely campaign talk." If a candidate for the Presidency cannot be relied upon when he makes a campaign statement there is not much use in paying any attention to such a person on any subject at any time.

The second great swindle perpetrated on the public was the proposed Ruml plan, and that seems to be working, but eventually it will be found out in all its details, hidden meanings, campaign funds, and political ballyhoo. If this plan goes through, the money saved to the big men will be enough to debauch and demoralize the whole political situation in the next campaign. A man whose income in 1942 was $10,000,000, and we do have such men, would be given an absolute gift of $8,400,000 because this amount would be canceled. He could afford to make some campaign contributions with this $8,000,000, and sure enough that was exactly what he intended to do if the plan was approved.

What will the next hoax be? It can be anything if there is money enough behind it. It is a strange phenomenon of the political life of this Nation that a movement with plenty of financial backing "gets there," and a movement supported by the people themselves, without cash to hand out, never gets anywhere. This raises a far more serious question. Is our democracy strong in its root growth and able to withstand dishonesty, political auctions, position, and power by puppet leaders set up by selfish interests? Will the representatives of the people in Congress stand up for principle always, or will they shrink from their plain duty because of fear of the use of money against them, or will these representatives finally accept the rattle of money as the voice of the people? There is danger of this when the people themselves accept, swallow, and devour the propaganda which the financial interests of the country hand out.

World Partnership in the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article I prepared for the May issue of the magazine Flying:

WORLD PARTNERSHIP IN THE AIR

(By WILLIAM S. HILL, Congressman from Colorado)

RECIPROCAL AIRWAY AGREEMENTS BETWEEN NATIONS MAY BE A MAJOR POINT IN THE TREMENDOUS DEVELOPMENT OF GLOBAL AVIATION IN POST-WAR ERA

The development of the airplane has made isolationism as obsolete as the 1918 Jenny. After this global war, there will be some system of world union or international federation. It will be devised upon the basis of conditions as they shall then exist. These conditions are impossible to forecast. But aviation, as the influence which has erased the potency of national boundaries will be the major force at those conferences.

The principle of freedom of the air must be a basic general premise for the post-war pacts. Indeed, there are few nations which would desire to seal the air over their territory from all other peoples. But, just as surely, the so-called right of innocent passage cannot be construed to permit the possibility of aerial reconnaissance or photography over strategic areas. In addition to the usual domestic regulations there will have to be air lanes from which foreign planes shall not deviate and stated airports which they may utilize. The extent of their cargo and passenger carrying activity will have to be settled by reciprocal agreements between the sovereignties concerned.

Reciprocal agreements between governments are just glorified horse trades. Just as there can be no hard and fast rules laid down to regulate trading, since all horses, traders, community customs, and available financing differ, so we cannot deal with all nations, much less with all air bases, as in the same category. One nation may bring a great deal more to the conference than another can show. One base may be interesting only for geographical or logistic reasons, as at the Panama Canal; another may represent the hinge on a great trade route as at Natal in Brazil; while another may be a combination of these as in Trinidad Island. Bases may have one value to one nation and a quite different aspect to another. But the nations truly desirous of having world peace will frame agreements concerning normal use of the air above all the earth by civilian commercial airplanes.

All that it takes to make international agreements work is the will to have them work. I was impressed with this fact when I inspected the great Portello Airport out of Lisbon with a group of fellow Congressmen. There planes of all nations were coming and going and there was no friction, even though they came from nations which were at war. There were British planes loading for England; German planes ready to fly to Switzerland; French planes leaving for Africa; Spanish planes, Portuguese, of course—and other nations. All recognized the territorial sovereignty of Portugal and observed the local regulations and customs restrictions. There the principle of freedom of the air was being exemplified in the midst of war. How very much simpler would be its administration among nations in time of peace.

We, and all of the United Nations, stand pledged for a victory in this global war and for world peace thereafter by mutual insistence of some sort. Just what form that will take we cannot now draft, but we are definitely in on this project and must take the lead in its fulfillment. And the snapper in the whip of enforcement, without which no law is effective, will be an international air police power.

The peoples of a large part of the world are becoming aware of the power which is America. They see or they hear about the Boeing Flying Fortresses, the Consolidated Liberators, the North American Mitchells, the

Martin Marauders which roar along the lanes toward what obviously will be highly destructive conduct. They also note the split-tail Lockheed Lightnings, the Bell Airacobras, the Curtiss Warhawks, and other types of bombers, fighters, interceptors, reconnaissance, cargo, and passenger planes as they hurry along toward the fronts in a steady stream. And the word that all that power has not come for exploitation but instead is come to enforce the policy of live and let live, is working a new spirit into the peoples of this earth. Our airmen are preparing the way for permanent peace on this earth. This is the new diplomacy.

Many bases for our aviation forces have been developed outside of our continental limits. Steps should be taken at once to make all bases which figure in our hemispheric influence permanent acquisitions.

It is not fitting that any European nation should own powerful or potential air bases off our shores. While in the control of friendly nations they are not a threat. But geopolitically they are a part of the Americas, and I favor immediate negotiations to acquire all of these islands as parts of existing nations of the Western Hemisphere. A commission would determine the method of adoption and which American nation they should join. Of course some of these island groups are now—and others might become—successful independent republics, and these would be safe under a revitalized Monroe Doctrine.

At present we own very few of the several hundred bases which we have developed and paid for dearly along the routes being used by the Army Transport Command. We have no right to establish beam and weather controls on some of these routes. We have no right to use many of them commercially. This is true of the several western Atlantic bases acquired from Great Britain in the famous destroyer deal. That, in my opinion, was an instance in which our negotiators might well have added a few western horse traders to their delegation.

The other great air bases which we have developed, or shall have developed in Europe, Africa, Asia, or on islands will have to be dealt with in the treaties which will follow the war. These airfields should be available to all nations for legitimate commercial purposes. We will approach the peace conferences with an attitude of fairness to all concerned but with the determination to end the threat of war.

The immediate post-war air trade route competition will be principally between the United States and Great Britain. Fear is being expressed in England over the development of long cargo routes by our Army Transport Command, as well as our improved cargo planes and plane production. Britain has so long ruled world surface commerce that the prospect of a large share of the new elite trade slipping away is not contemplated with equanimity.

I see no reason for us to enter into any cutthroat competition with Great Britain or any other nation along these air trade routes. We will have no difficulty in working out fair and mutually advantageous arrangements with Great Britain. Many years of dealing between our peoples have developed a modus operandi for such negotiations. The Anglo-Saxon has a fundamental sense of fair play, because of his basic training in the tradition of sportsmanship. With these people, and with other European countries, we can deal on a reciprocal basis. But the Pacific Ocean is another problem.

The United States is developing great bases all over the Pacific. When Japan has been cured of her superman complex, and has been forced to relinquish all of the countries and islands she has grabbed and despoiled, those bases will still be there. We may not want them, but we cannot afford that any other nation take them over. We will be stuck with them, and we, or some international force to which we will be the chief contributor, will have to keep them up, or at least police them—from now on.

Some few will become bases on trade routes, of course, but most of them will be strategic only. The little peoples of the Pacific are not able to protect themselves. Some sort of international patrol will have to do that job, and of course it will be largely American.

With increasing knowledge of stratosphere flying (and of the polar routes), the world's trade centers will be closer together when competitive trade is resumed. Air problems will dominate the peace conferences. As the basis of the whole peace structure the conferences will have to consider and determine just what freedom of the air is to include. The principle of the freedom of the sea, with which we have had experience, will give some hints as to how not to proceed. There is a vast difference between the low-value quantitative transport of iron ore, cement, raw wool, and such cargo in surface ships which travel 200 miles in a day, and the carrying of refined cargo at 200 miles per hour. Rules worked out for visits of slow-moving transports to points on the periphery of a country are not applicable to an air transport which could hop from New York to Detroit and return while a boat was entering a harbor.

How To Name the Presidents in Succession

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, since the question of teaching American history in our schools and colleges has been raised, I find to my surprise that many Members of Congress cannot name all the Presidents of the United States in the order in which they served.

In order to alleviate that condition, I am going to give you a little verse which was taught us when we were in primary school, as a key by which we might be able to name the Presidents in the order of their succession. It has been brought down to date. If you will remember it, you can always name all the Presidents in rotation at any time, since the first letter of each word is the first letter in the name of the President who served in that order; and there is not a surplus word in the entire verse.

Here it is:

Washington and Jefferson met many a jeer,
Van Buren had troubles plenty to fear;
Poor bankbills let Johnson go home grumbling,
And Cleveland heard clearly McKinley's rumblings,
Till Wilson held currency Hooverly rare.

Now, let us translate it. Take the first line: "Washington and Jefferson met many a jeer." That represents the first seven Presidents—Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Adams, Jackson.

The next line: "Van Buren had trials plenty to fear," represents the next six: Van Buren, Harrison, Tyler, Polk, Taylor, Fillmore.

The next line: "Poor bankbills let Johnson go home grumbling," represents the next seven: Pierce, Buchanan, Lincoln, Johnson, Grant, Hays, Garfield.

The next line: "And Cleveland heard clearly McKinley's rumblings," represents the next six: Arthur, Cleveland, Harrison, Cleveland, McKinley, Roosevelt.

The next and last line: "Till Wilson held currency Hooverly rare," represents the last six: Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt.

As I said, if you will just remember this verse, you can always name all the Presidents in the order in which they served.

I confess this little verse has more truth than poetry in it, and more history than philosophy; but it is the best and shortest key I have ever found for teaching young people how to name the Presidents of the United States in the order in which they served.

International Fund To Stabilize Currencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum on United States Treasury's proposal for an international fund to stabilize currencies, by Bronson Trevor:

I

The preliminary draft outline of proposal for a United and Associated Nations Stabilization Fund says that one of the purposes of the fund is to stabilize the foreign exchange rates of the currencies of the United Nations and nations associated with them.

A fund of at least $5,000,000,000 is set up to which each nation contributes an as yet undetermined quota, 50 percent of which is to be paid on or before the date set for commencement of the fund's operations, and consisting of from 5 to 12.5 percent of the total in gold, 12.5 to 20 percent in domestic currency, and 25 percent in its own government securities. The other 50 percent can be called for subsequently but the proportion to be paid in gold cannot be increased.

Under section III, paragraph 3, clauses A and B, during the first year of the fund's operation any nation with an adverse trade balance can obtain from the fund foreign exchange, convertible into gold, to an amount equal to 100 percent of its quota. The following year another 50 percent and the next year another 50 percent may be made available at the discretion of a majority of the board of directors of the fund, but the fund's holdings of the currency of a member country could be even further increased by a vote of four-fifths of the member votes.

A country with an adverse trade balance—this presumably would exclude the United States—could thus obtain in a period of 3 years from 15 to 36 times the amount of gold that it contributed merely by printing some currency and presenting it to the fund. Of

course, these figures would be slightly altered by the call of the other 50 percent of the quotas, though this call could be blocked by a negative vote of over 20 percent of the board of directors, but the transaction would still remain very profitable in terms of gold. Is it any wonder that Secretary Morgenthau considers this plan an alternative to "a flood of foreign loans in the United States" as experienced after the last war? Under this system bankrupt countries obtain gold virtually as a gift, paying no interest on the first year's receipts and only 1 percent on the remainder, and not having to contend with any redemptions of principal, provided that they dispose of the gold abroad in settlement of adverse trade balances. The board is authorized to require a special reserve, however, against currency holdings in excess of a country's quota.

It is obvious that the fund would be rapidly exhausted and as a consequence its stabilizing effect would be of only limited duration. This is recognized in the plan, section IV, paragraph 4, where it is intimated that a currency may depreciate in fact. However, section VI, paragraph 1, says that "Each member country of the fund undertakes the following: (1) To maintain by appropriate action exchange rates established by the fund on the currencies of other countries, * * *." To use this provision for stabilization purposes, as it undoubtedly is intended to be, could result in an endless drain on the treasury of a strong nation to prevent a rise of its currency in terms of weak currencies. To consider a specific case: The United States might be required to buy foreign currency in amounts limited only by the printing capacity of the issuing nations, in order to prevent the value of the dollar rising in terms of those currencies.

II

Section III, paragraph 9, provides for the purchase by the fund of abnormal war balances. These balances presumably represent large holdings of British pounds in Canada and South America, spent by Britain in purchases of imports. By clearing the market of these holdings Britain would be enabled to print more pounds for the purchase of imports without increasing the pressure upon foreign exchange. By a graduated repurchase scheme the fund would be left with 20 percent of its purchases of these balances at the end of 23 years, though the repurchases could be made in acceptable currency, which if it happened to be pounds would leave the fund without any diminution of its holdings.

III

Under section VI, paragraph 2, the countries which now have every conceivable restriction upon foreign exchange transactions will have an advantage over those, like the United States, that have not, because they can retain them as long as they please, and are not even requested to drop those restrictions involving capital transfers. On the other hand no country may impose any additional restrictions without the approval of the fund.

IV

According to section IV, paragraph 2, "The value of the currency of each member country shall be fixed by the fund in terms of gold or unitas and may not be altered by any member country without the approval of four-fifths of the member votes."

It should be observed that most of the actions of the fund on this subject are by a majority vote. Thus the United States could be outvoted in the determination of the value of the dollar, and in case of dissatisfaction with the valuation, would be unable to secure redress except by a four-fifths vote of those who committed the wrong in the first place.

The effectiveness of our tariff system could be destroyed by raising the value of the dollar which, while making it impossible for us to sell our exports abroad, would also enable foreign manufacturers to sell their products in our markets without being seriously hampered by our tariff imposts. By this provision almost complete control of our foreign trade can be taken out of our hands by a majority vote of the board of directors of the fund.

Another difficulty that might face the United States is that should the value of gold decline, due to the discovery of rich ore bodies of great size, as silver was affected in the last century, or by the invention of more efficient methods of extraction from existing ores, we could be compelled to continue the purchase of gold at an excessive price. Lord Keynes makes this point in his plan when he refers to the unpredictable and irrelevant manner in which the technical progress of the gold industry might alter the quantum of international currency.

V

Section III, paragraph 8, requires that every country must offer to sell all foreign exchange and gold in excess of the amount held immediately after joining the fund, for its local currency, or foreign currencies which it needs. A country with a favorable trade balance would not need foreign currencies, except for capital transactions, and the very fact that gold was piling up would indicate the absence of an outward capital flow, so that the sales of foreign exchange and gold would have to be made for local currency. The fund having power under section III, paragraph 6, to make recommendations to any country designed to increase the fund's holdings of that country's currency, it might require the purchase of obligations of the fund with the currency, which could then be used to buy the foreign exchange and gold.

Under section III, paragraph 8, "* * * each member country agrees to discourage the unnecessary accumulation of foreign balances by its nationals. The fund shall inform any member country when, in its opinion, any further growth of privately held foreign balances appears unwarranted." This provision would appear to enable the fund to restrict the expansion of the foreign investments of any country and confine the acquisition of foreign balances to those necessary for carrying on business at its present volume. As the definition of what is necessary is the criterion, there is no safeguard to prevent a mere majority vote of the fund permitting a favored country to expand its holdings of foreign balances received in payment for sales of goods, while forcing another to enter into the roundabout transaction previously described which would amount in substance to a trade of foreign exchange for obligations of the fund, which might be of a nonnegotiable character. This could deprive the penalized country from realizing any material benefit from its holdings of foreign exchange for an indeterminate number of years.

VI

Each member country of the fund by section VI, paragraph 3, undertakes to cooperate effectively for the purpose of regulating international movements of capital. Cooperation is defined as including taking such measures as the fund shall recommend. This is the broadest possible grant of power.

International movement of capital to the United States came about in the past because of confidence of the owners of such capital in the economic soundness of our Government. One method of preventing such a flow would be to injure our economic stability thereby destroying the confidence which was the basis of the capital movement. The directors of the fund by a majority vote might recommend measures injurious to our economic system which we would be bound to carry out.

That this is not a far-fetched idea will be realized when we bear in mind that France suddenly withdrew large amounts of gold from this country during the Hoover administration for the purpose of causing an economic injury to us which would compel our Government to change its policy in respect to the so-called Hoover moratorium.

Apparently to make certain that the fund will not be employed to facilitate the repayment of foreign debts, such as those owed by most of the nations of the world to the United States, section III, paragraph 5, provides that a four-fifths vote of the members would be required to authorize its use in such a circumstance.

VII

Section VI, paragraph 6, stipulates that "each member country of the fund undertakes the following: * * * (6) To furnish the fund with all information it needs for its operations and to furnish such reports as it may require in the form and at the times requested by the fund."

Under the authority of this provision the fund, by a majority vote could compel the United States to supply the names of the foreign customers of its nationals, and what these customers ordered or wished to order, with prices and other pertinent data. Following the armistice in the First World War, the British Government sought and obtained information regarding orders secured abroad by American firms, and placed it at the disposal of English export houses engaged in competitive lines of business. It does not seem unreasonable to suppose that such a practice might be repeated if we were compelled to supply such economic information.

VIII

Section VI, paragraph 7, says that "Each member country of the fund undertakes the following: * * * (7) To adopt appropriate legislation or decrees to carry out its undertakings to the fund, and to facilitate the activities of the fund." This grant of power reduces our present constitutional system of passing legislation, insofar as it applies to what the board of director of the fund pleases to consider economic matters, to a mere ritual of ratification, Congress and the President being bound to carry out the mandates of the international body.

Under section V, paragraph 1, it is declared that "All decisions, except where specifically provided otherwise, shall be made by a majority of the member votes." As we have seen, there is no provision requiring a four-fifths vote of the board except in a few scattered instances.

Even the slight protection of the so-called veto in cases requiring an 80 percent vote, with our vote amounting to 25 percent of the total, is more apparent than real. It depends entirely upon the alertness of one man, our delegate, whether or not we shall be irrevocably committed to a policy injurious to our national welfare. Furthermore, all the powers of the board including those requiring an 80 percent vote can be delegated for a limited time to an executive committee, by an 80 percent vote. The decisions of this committee apparently being by a majority vote, if our delegate acceded to this delegation of power, he would be helpless, even if he were a member of the executive committee.

That the United States Treasury is not particularly adroit in its dealings with experienced European operators in foreign exchange is indicated by the following account in Time, April 5, 1943, of a recent episode in north Africa:

"French speculators had transferred millions of francs to north Africa when the rate of exchange was 100 to 150 francs to the American dollar. Upon French advice, the United States authorities reduced the rate to 50 francs to the dollar enabling the speculators to turn a profit of 100 to 150 percent. Before the United States Treasury finally

awoke and forbade such speculation, several huge fortunes were amassed by this trading in invasion dollars."

IX

Section VI, paragraph 5, declares that "Each member country of the fund undertakes the following: * * * (5) To give consideration to the views of the fund on any existing or proposed monetary or economic policy, the effect of which would be to bring about sooner or later a serious disequilibrium in the balance of payments of other countries."

As a removal of our protective tariff with the consequent shut-downs in many of our industries would increase our demand for the produce of low-cost foreign labor, it might eliminate "a serious disequilibrium in the balance of payments of other countries." Congress under the plan, of course, would have "to give consideration to the views of the fund" even if carrying out the policies which would be recommended by a simple majority vote of the board should result in wholesale domestic unemployment. Conversely, the United States might be forbidden to export its manufactures, with a similar deleterious effect upon our economy.

Possibly the board might recommend removal of our immigration restrictions, which Congress would have to carry out dutifully, so that a horde of laborers willing to work for low wages could flood the United States and take jobs away from those accustomed to a higher standard of living. The remittances of these foreigners to their relatives abroad would undoubtedly tend to remove any serious disequilibrium in the balance of payments of other countries which might exist in our favor. It is a matter of common knowledge that immigrant remittances from the United States contributed greatly to the support of Italian exchange in years gone by, and it is conceivable that this might be used as an argument in favor of destroying our quota system of immigration restriction.

X

It is clear that the preliminary draft outline of proposal for a United and Associated Nations Stabilization Fund sets up a scheme of little benefit and great potential danger to the United States. The four-fifths vote requirement is no protection as it applies in most cases to actions beneficial to the United States, while a majority vote suffices to pass many actions which could do us the greatest injury.

The plan, to function as intended, requires an abdication of our national sovereignty in economic matters, and as this covers a large field our political independence would be seriously threatened.

The stabilization fund itself is merely a pretext to lavish subsidies upon nations economically weak, and would soon be without any but paper assets. The Treasury of the United States would in all probability be subject to a steady drain for this so-called "stabilization."

The plan places too much responsibility upon one man, our member of the board of directors, whose poor judgment, ignorance, or caprice, might cause irreparable damage to the United States. On the other hand, he would be virtually powerless to protect our interests against a majority coalition on the board of directors of the fund. The very fact that the United States Treasury sponsors such a plan as this, replete with loopholes which could be used to our great injury, indicates that we could not expect, from the present administration, at least, any very effective defense of our interests.

As the United States probably would have to ignore the mandates of the directors of the fund, in order to safeguard its vital interests, it would be wiser for us not to commit ourselves to this plan in the first place.

Tribute to Food Administrator Chester Charles Davis By Robert St. John

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, 2d

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid description by Robert St. John of the personality and attributes of Hon. Chester C. Davis, the new Chief of Food Production and Administration, delivered by him on March 31 last in one of his talks as a radio commentator.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

And now for our man of the day, a man who is likely soon to have a greater part in shaping your everyday life and mine than anyone else in Washington—Chester Charles Davis, America's new food boss. Of course, Washington does not go in for simple titles like that and so Mr. Davis here is known as the Administrator of Food Production and Distribution; but he is in charge of America's food basket, and before long he'll be telling farmers what to grow and telling the rest of us what we may eat. In weeks past you've met General Montgomery, who started out as an Irish boy running wild in the woods of Britain hunting for mythical banshees. You've met the Viceroy of India, who lives in a setting of fabulous wealth in that romantic Poona. You've met a Cabinet member whose father used his rifle in feuds with neighbors. You've met many a glamorous person whose life was packed with thrilling adventure. But the outstanding thing about Chester Charles Davis is that he is what you would call "a plain fellow," just a simple middle-western farmer, but with such down-to-earth common sense that he's succeeded at everything he's tackled. Let's start at the beginning. Chester was born 55 years ago out in Dallas County, Iowa. He got his early education in the traditional little red schoolhouse, going to classes between milking times in the winter because even youngsters were needed for planting and weeding and harvesting in the spring, summer, and fall. The Davis family knew all about "blood, sweat, and tears" half a century before Winston Churchill coined the expression. Life was hard in those early days in Iowa. Chester and the five other Davis children helped their parents virtually tear a living from the earth. The children rode lead horses to a binder, hoed and shucked the corn, fought drought and plagues. They knew all about hardships and privations.

But Chester did manage to get a good education. He went to Grinnell College, there in Iowa, working his way through the hard way—tending furnaces, shoveling snow, washing dishes. By the time he graduated, he had a profitable laundry route, and a Phi Beta Kappa key dangling from his watch chain. At Grinnell Chester worked on the college paper. Harry Hopkins (now Presidential adviser) was in Grinnell at that time, too, and it was Hopkins who persuaded Chester to take up journalism as a profession. In the years which followed the farmer boy from Iowa worked on papers as far west as South Dakota. Finally he became editor of the Montana Farmer and one of his first crusades was against certain Montana copper concerns. One of his allies in this fight was Joseph Dixon, a very militant Progressive, who, before long, got himself elected Governor and promptly appointed Chester Davis as his Commissioner of Labor and Agriculture. And then it was that Davis' career really began. The copper companies finally threw Dixon and his reformers and Davis, too, out of office. But the boy from Iowa was on the way up the ladder. He was seized up by the Illinois Agriculture Association—was actually a lobbyist for the Illinois farmers, but the Illinois farmers were poor, and Davis had to lobby without the bags of money which most lobbyists use for entertainment. But he made up with energy what he lacked in money, and his efforts were generally successful. Then came the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and Davis rapidly climbed to the very top of that organization. He was in the driver's seat—the Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration when the Supreme Court declared that organization unconstitutional. But by that time Chester Davis had won the respect and the confidence of American farmers in general.

Why not, when in 2 years he helped raise farm income from four to six billion a year? Why not, when he helped launch vast programs which benefited the producers of milk, wheat, cotton, tobacco, corn, hogs, and many specialty crops? Why not, when Chet Davis took the farmers into his confidence, consulted them at every step along the way? And besides, the farmers of America have always been aware that Chet Davis was one of them. One spokesman for real dirt farmers put it this way: "Chet Davis has what you'd call a disciplined mind, but he ain't got no eccentricities. You never see caricatures of him and you never hear many anecdotes about him. He just goes pluggin' along, making the farmers' business his business. He's like a good plow horse, compared with some fancy show horse. He's not a city fella, but he knows all about cities. He's not a smart aleck, or a book fella, but he sure has got a lot of good, common sense. He don't put on airs, and we understand him when he talks. He doesn't make any balloon ascensions. And he's no ball of fire, doesn't want to be. But he knows where he's goin' before he starts out to go there. He's never made a promise he couldn't keep. What more can a farmer ask of a man in public life, a man with whom we farmers have to do business?" That is rather typical, I think, of what his fellow farmers think of Chester Charles Davis. Now let me tell you a bit more about the qualifications of this man, for the tremendous job the White House has given him of handling that weapon of war called food.

He's lived 8 of his 55 years here in Washington, and while he has not been contaminated by what critics call the bureaucratic octopus, he does know how to get around in Washington, and (more important) how to get along with jealous bureau heads and temperamental administrators. He's been to Europe on special missions for the White House, and he knows something (from first-hand contact) about some of those foreign countries we are some day going to have to help feed. He weathered many an administrative storm in the previous high positions he's held in the Government service. He's taken on some of the cleverest men in the Nation, and he's seldom come off second best in these encounters. He's fought for dirt farmers ever since his early newspaper days. He knows the rural villages, the small towns, and the big cities of America. He knows about finance, too, because most recently he's been president of the Federal Reserve bank, out in St. Louis. Yes, despite all this, Chester Davis still hasn't changed much from the youngster who sweated in the cornfields of

his native Iowa. Now let me tell you something about the man Davis. He's often called that solid man. He's a trifle bald, with a fringe of silver-gray hair. His eyebrows are heavy and black. His gaze, through his spectacles, is direct and penetrating. When he's relaxed, his lower lip protrudes a little, as though he were deep in thought, and he generally is. But he smiles quickly and his heavy face generally wears a pleasant expression. He looks more like the bank president, which he has been, than like a man who spends most of his waking hours thinking and worrying about food, and farms, and farmers' problems. He has the typical farmer's reaction against the use of words unless they mean something. Talk to him about farm production, farm mortgages, and what to do about them, or mention droughts, farm pests, or harvests, and he'll brighten up quickly.

But if you try to discuss social theories or whether Beatrice really loved Dante, and he'll look plenty bored! Or more likely he'll adroitly change the subject to wheat, corn, or the need for increasing farm production, and what shall we do about the farm manpower situation? Davis hates the spotlight—even baby spots. A close friend once said, "Chet has a passion for farming, and a penchant for privacy." Incidentally, one thing which greatly annoys him is that breed of so-called agriculturists called gentlemen farmers—those men who earn their money in the city, and spend it in the country pretending to run a farm, which generally is nothing but a glorified country club. Here in Washington it's said that officialdom has seen Chet Davis angry only twice in all the years he's been in and out of the Capital. The first time was when a newspaper in Joplin, Mo. (back in the days of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration), ran an advertisement which read like this: "Here's a dandy way to make money! Buy my 13 acres for hog-raising. Sign up with the Government not to raise 500 hogs. It will pay you $1,000." When Chet Davis read that advertisement his ruddy face grew redder than ever. He bellowed out the single, rather mouth-filling word, "Preposterous!" And then he added: "I shall begin an investigation." His anger stunned his assistants. Not one of them had ever seen him angry before. Davis' second outburst came when the United States Supreme Court handed down a decision saying the Agricultural Adjustment Administration—the A. A. A.—was unconstitutional. Davis grew quite bitter about that decision, because he felt the Agricultural Adjustment Administration was about the most worth-while experiment of the whole New Deal—because he, as its chief, had transformed it from an administration headache into the New Deal's prize blue-ribbon exhibit—because 3,000,000 farmers had had a voice in every contract signed by Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

Chester Davis this week moved to Washington and began tackling about the toughest job which has been thrown at any man here since the war started—food rationing, the shortage of meat, the lack of manpower on the farms, the need for increasing production and decreasing consumption. From a knowledge of his background, we can predict, quite safely, how he'll go about it—with the very minimum of fanfare and publicity, because Chet Davis hates publicity. His interest is in preventing bread lines and avoiding headlines. He knows that former Mayor Jimmy Walker of New York was right when he wisecracked that "in public life, there's not much difference between cheers and jeers—it's all a matter of time." Yes, although, as a newspaperman, Davis has written many a headline, he'll be trying to avoid them for himself as he goes about his job—that tremendous job—of getting farmers to produce more, getting the rest of us to consume less, and getting the surplus into the hands of the men who are fighting this war on the battle fronts. In that job he has my best wishes for a good crop of success!

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over Station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on April 10, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District; much to my keen disappointment, the House last week voted down the pay-as-you-go plan to skip a year's taxes. Under this proposal, as you know, everybody owing taxes on last year's income could pay his 1943 taxes and not have to worry about how he was to get money to pay 1942 taxes. To the great majority of wage earners, defense workers and farmers this seems logical and easy to do. Many people weren't making much money before 1942. They obtained higher salaries last year and had to use their additional income to pay bills incurred during the lean years.

Those millions of patriotic citizens have the best of intentions and want to pay their taxes. But they can't raise money they don't have. Why, then, shouldn't they be able to get current? Why should they always have last year's taxes staring them in the face? The answer is they should not.

Some people advocated paying 2 years' taxes in one. I refused to have any part in that scheme. Frankly, I think Americans are going to have plenty of trouble paying this year's taxes to say nothing of those of 1942. Regardless of how a few who have plenty of money to pay their taxes feel, I believe that 44,000,000 income-tax payers should have their burdens made as lightly as possible.

The big question we should all ask ourselves is, Do we not want to keep the form of government for which our boys are fighting? I say to you, we cannot keep this way of life if we make conditions impossible for the rank and file of our citizens to live under. Every nation throughout history which heaped unbearable taxes upon its people has collapsed and disintegrated.

Of course I realize the more taxes and financial burdens are heaped on the shoulders of all of us, the happier are the socialistic parlor-pink individuals who are trying to convert the present system into a communistic state. They would bring about revolution by indirection. They are even now saying to the people that the present use of money is unsatisfactory and we should all adopt the method of passing around seashells or acorns or wampum like the Indians did. This is the road to ruin. My answer to these crackpots is for them to stop undermining our form of government, put their shoulders to the wheel, and start trying to win the war for a change, or at least leave the rest of us alone so we can do it. Let them put first things first or get out.

No, my dear friends, you need never worry about my ever lending any encouragement to these radicals who want to do away with our Constitution and sabotage our American life while our boys are dying for freedom and liberty all over the world. And the quicker they are weeded out of the bureaus and agencies of our Government, the sooner we will win the war and have our boys back home. They are hindering the war effort by sapping the energies of our people with their regulations and snooping.

A short time ago I protested to Prentiss Brown, the head of Office of Price Administration, about the slash of gasoline ration coupons from 3 to 1½ gallons each. I understand now there is a possibility of the 3 gallons being restored. I firmly believe that Office of Price Administration should immediately allow all A card holders their basic 3 gallons.

It is to the interest of the war effort to keep the public on the road as long as our armed forces have enough supplies of oil to carry on. Personally, I feel sure they do have. The United States produces a lot more crude oil than any other nation on earth. Even with the oil fields the Axis has taken from free nations, our resources in this vital war material are many times theirs. Since under our rationing, no one can use more than a reasonable supply of petroleum, I am certain that the public does not consume more than a very small percentage of our total supply.

Therefore, it seems to me the Government ought to assure everybody the privilege of driving his car as long as his tires last and that means allowing the average American enough gasoline to get around. The farmers in particular have been seriously handicapped by being curtailed in use of gasoline.

While we are on the subject of rationing, I think we ought to discuss the time element involved in making out the scores of forms, records, and permits before we are allowed to buy or use the necessities and consumers' goods which we have always had free access to.

I can honestly say from my own experience that the time I have spent in registering and applying and filling out papers having to do with rationing could have been devoted to many, many hours in behalf of you folks back home. Like most everybody these days, I average a 12- to 14-hour day and I work at my job during that time. Therefore, when one is required to take a portion of his time out for a long, involved ration program, I say such action is hindering the war effort. You folks are working as long as I am and your time is just as valuable as mine. Your time is needed in prosecuting the war, not in devoting yourselves to a million different whims from the bureaucrats.

Not long ago, my good friend, Mr. Frank Gannett, publisher of the Gannett newspapers, one of the most forward-looking men in America today, asked me what my solution of the farm problem would be if I had authority to deal with the agriculture of the country. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I answered Mr. Gannett as follows:

"MY SOLUTION TO THE FARM DILEMMA

(By Congressman EDWIN ARTHUR HALL)

"It may be too late to save the American farmer. It is certainly too late to waste any more time talking about the awful failure America is making of the whole food-for-victory production program.

"While the New Deal blocks the farmer in every conceivable way under the sun, Hitler announces the active participation of 4,000,000 in agriculture throughout Europe. Slave labor, doubtless, but they will raise enough wheat, corn, potatoes, and produce, enough dairy and beef cattle to feed the Axis countries for another year. That is not cheerful news.

"Regardless of glowing reports that come from Secretary Wickard's office, to the effect that the food situation on our home front is well in hand, I challenge anyone to dispute the following:

"1. The American farmer is losing the battle of food production because his cost of operation is greater than his farm income.

"2. The family-size independently owned farm which has made American agriculture the most extensive in the world, is unable to continue as a unit of production due to al-

most complete disappearance of experienced farm labor.

"3. Agriculture the Nation over is actually at a standstill because over 90 percent of farm machinery priorities have been denied.

"To me, as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, viewing the whole tragic scene at close range, the farm picture is black indeed. In addition to all the discouraging economic factors our farmers are faced with innumerable regulations from Washington, bottlenecks, penalties, directives by bureaucrats who have no more knowledge of farming than a 3-year-old boy.

"So ridiculous are these conditions that the whole subject might be laughed off as an amazing joke were it not for the tragedy of the hour. We have undertaken the hardest job in history. We must produce more than ever before in America in order to feed our civilian population, our fighting forces, and our allies. We cannot do this under the present confusion the long-haired planners have created.

"During this session of Congress, apprehensive over the almost willful blundering by the Department of Agriculture, I have constantly advocated that all laws and regulations which restrict the production of anything on the farm be repealed for the duration. I have demanded on the House floor again and again that our Government leave the farmer alone and let him produce to the limit. I reiterate that now.

"Now is the time for full steam ahead. There should be no penalizing the farmer at this late stage. Don't annoy him with asinine forms and useless papers and make him sit up all night filling them out. Aid him with elbow grease instead of stopping his work by taking away his tools.

"It is hard to believe that those in authority would be guilty of trying to scrap private enterprise in American agriculture at a time like this. Yet they are doing it, and if our food program fails they will bear the blame.

"I am willing to stake America's future on the ability of the small farmer to manage his own affairs. I think the Government must recognize this before it can be successful with the farm problem.

"I believe that the present experienced farm owner and manager must be kept on his farm to insure maximum production. The changing hands of property at this juncture will cause great loss of knowledge so needed to make the food program successful. Therefore, the entrepreneur must be kept on the farm and assured of Government assistance in his task.

"Although the American farmer, his wife and younger members of his family are working long hours, there is a dearth of farm labor caused first by wholesale migration of hands from the farm to defense plants and second by the drafting of farm boys. I don't think this labor shortage can be solved in a satisfactory manner by importing workers from Mexico and Puerto Rico. I feel our native population can do the job best.

"Therefore, I advocate the release of as many experienced farm boys as is practicable from the armed forces within the country. They must return to the farms they have previously worked on or ones like them. I also advocate permitting farm hands now employed in defense plants who are about to be drafted to return to their farms and resume their production duties.

"Such an arrangement will go a long way toward solving the farm labor part of agriculture.

"I insist that all available farm machinery be turned over immediately to dealers who will, in turn, distribute these vital parts to farmers of their localities. They are cognizant with their own local people who have confidence in their integrity. The bureaucrats must have no hand in parceling out farm machinery.

"To those in our Government who are hamstringing private enterprises on the farm, I will say: 'Don't let your mania for socializing carry you away while this war is going on. Collective farming will never work in America. State owned farms cannot produce enough to supply the demand for food. Russia has proved this. She is asking us to help feed her people.'

"In order to produce sufficient food for victory, you must unshackle agriculture, leave the farmer alone, give him back his sons whenever possible for farm help, make available to him plenty of farm machinery, stop annoying him with foolishness and guarantee him an income commensurate with his heavy costs of production."

Resolution of Lithuanian Relief Fund Committee of Amsterdam, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Lithuanian Relief Fund Committee of Amsterdam, N. Y.:

Whereas the aggressions and outrages of the dictator nations—Germany, Italy, and Japan—against the liberty of the people everywhere forced the United States to take arms to defend itself and the people's rights and liberties on land and sea; and

Whereas the United States being morally, physically, and materially one of the most powerful countries will undoubtedly bring victory for democracy; and

Whereas during this war the small nations suffered the most and some of them are entirely devastated; and

Whereas Lithuania, being one of the small nations, suffered two invasions, one of the Soviet Union in June 1940, and another of Nazi Germany in June 1941, and today finds herself under the sadistic oppression of the Nazis; and

Whereas the independence of Lithuania was proclaimed on the 16th day of February 1918, in the national council meeting at Vilnius, Lithuania, and thereafter in accordance with the agreement of all the Allies, the free and independent Republic of Lithuania was established; and

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania having thus emerged once more as a free and independent country, dedicated itself to the task of peace, industry, commerce, and learning, and thereafter the nation and its people prospered and lived in peaceful, friendly, and harmonious relations in the community of nations of the world; and

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania having a representative form of government was thus recognized and its independence thereby guaranteed by all nations, including the United States, Great Britain, and Russia; and

Whereas the people of Lithuania have no national, religious, political, or cultural interests similar or akin to those of Soviet Union or Nazi Germany or their peoples but differ therefrom in every conceivable aspect; and

Whereas the repeated Soviet Union announcements that the Baltic States question is not an open question as the Communist organ Pravda of February 8, 1943, editorially declared and which was reprinted by the Information Bulletin of the Soviet Embassy, Washington, D. C., causes fear and great concern to the Lithuanian people everywhere: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Lithuanian-Americans, loyal citizens of the United States of America, including a large number of mothers of the 300 United States soldiers now serving in our armed forces and who have close relatives in Lithuania, assembled in the American Lithuanian Club Hall, 17 Liberty Street, in the city of Amsterdam, N. Y., this 28th day of February, 1943, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania, about 3,000 Lithuanian-Americans of Amsterdam, N. Y., voice our admiration and gratitude to our President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and to the Prime Minister of England, Mr. Winston Churchill, for giving to the world the Atlantic Charter and the principles of the "four freedoms," do hereby pledge our lives and our fortunes toward the realization of those principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms"; be it further

Resolved—

1. That the Government of the United States support the rights of all nations participating in or affected by this war, be they large or small, as the Atlantic Charter provides.

2. We appeal to the Congress of the United States, when discussing the peace terms to include the demand for the restoration of the political independence of Lithuania.

3. That in order to prevent bloodshed and repetition of the predatory nations to victimize the Lithuanian people and preclude any misrepresentation of the will of the people we appeal to our Government to provide as soon as possible for the occupation of the territories of Lithuania by the military and naval forces of the United States, supplemented by the national Army of Lithuania.

4. We earnestly pray and implore the representatives of our State in both Houses of the Congress of the United States to bring to pass the above measures; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, to the Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson, and to the Representatives of the State of New York in both Houses of the United States Congress at Washington, D. C.

MATTHEW P. KAZLAUSKAS,
Chairman,
Lithuanian Relief Fund Committee.
JOSEPH OLSAUSKES,
Secretary,
Lithuanian Relief Fund Committee.

What Are We Fighting For?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, April 11, 1943, there appears an article by Edgar M. Queeny and entitled "What Are We Fighting For?" I am so impressed by this article, the reasoning of it, and the writer's clear conception of the situation confronting our

Nation, that I commend this statement to the careful and thoughtful attention of the Congress and the country.

Edgar M. Queeny is chairman of the board of the Monsanto Chemical Co. He is a war veteran. He is a gentleman, and a scholar. He is a successful and progressive businessman. It is to such thinkers and doers as Edgar M. Queeny that this Nation must look if private enterprise under which this Nation has grown great is to be preserved and extended.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I set forth Mr. Queeny's statement in full:

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR?

(By Edgar M. Queeny)

What are we fighting for? Why is public opinion on this subject still fluid and undetermined while husbands, sons, and brothers fight in remote jungles and desert wastes, when part of our Navy lies on the bottom of the Pacific and our bombers are blasting German cities? If there was any occasion for a discussion of war aims during our Revolution, Civil War, or World War, history does not record it.

We are, in fact, engaged in two wars. That is why we are confused and seek orientation. One war is being fought on the surface of our planet; it is fought with steel and TNT; it is a physical war. The other is a war of ideologies. It is a vertical war, an intellectual war, a war that is waged with aphorisms, emotions, infectious illusions, captivating mental images and taboos. Our Vice President calls it the People's Revolution; Stuart Chase, the Revolt of the Masses.

DEEP DIFFERENCES LIE IN POST-WAR PLANNING

There is no issue as to our surface war aims. In this war we fight because we were attacked. Our aim is victory and a post-war world so organized that we will not be attacked or even threatened again. But it is in the economic organization of this post-war world where deep differences lie. Some would have it that we shall "lose the peace" unless the National Resources Planning Board's recommendations are adopted. Thus we trace our way back to the war of ideologies.

One of the ideologies—that reflected in the National Resources Planning Board's reports—is a curious paradox of pessimism and idealism. Those who hold it are pessimistic about private enterprise employing returning soldiers, so they plan vast public works. They are pessimistic about private enterprise taking over war plants, so they plan on State conversion with State capital. They are pessimistic about private capital being risked in business, so they plan State loans. They are pessimistic about the imagination, rescurcefulness, enterprise, self-reliance and thrift of individuals, so they plan on State assistance "from womb to tomb."

One senses in this ideology the conclusion that the American social and economic system of the past is obsolete; that our salvation lies in exalting the State and having it plan our lives and our economy. This ideology offers a similar solution to that which Germany, Italy, and Russia adopted. Carried to its ultimate conclusion, the human relationships found in this kind of "freedom from want" were expressed by the author of Genesis, when Esau said to Jacob, "Feed me, for I am faint." And Jacob replied, "Sell me this day thy birthright." There was no unemployment in Egypt when the slaves built pyramids. There was no unemployment among Negroes before Lincoln emancipated them. There was no unemployment in Russian- or German-planned economies.

PLENTY OF BLUEPRINTS BUT NOT A WORD ON HOW

The National Resources Planning Board's reports are but the first blueprints—or pinkprints—of such a planned economy. Further blueprints to carry out Mr. WALLACE's promises that "there shall be no privileged peoples anywhere" will come later. The first ones promise freedom from want in America; later ones will propose to share America's wealth with the world so that there shall be freedom from want everywhere. Through world W. P. A.'s, A. A. A's, F. S. A.'s, and R. F. C.'s, vast public works are projected in foreign lands, and foreign industries are to be established with a lavish lend-lease. A preview of this program is contained in trial balloons sent up by the National Planning Association, an offshoot of the National Resources Planning Board. It is also implied by our lend-lease agreements.

Missing from the National Resources Planning Board's plans is any suggestion of how they will be paid for.

Shall we draw the conclusion that war is an immensely profitable adventure?

Also missing is an estimate of the Government force that would be necessary. A clue is found in Peter Drucker's study of pre-war Germany. He points out that 15 percent of those employed in the Nazi planned economy were either nonmilitary government employees or employees of business doing paper and other work required by the state.

God forbid that we trail in any of Hitler's paths, but the planners' economy, though directed toward different goals, follows the same methods Hitler pursued while he was "eliminating unemployment." Therefore, one must project on our blueprints 8,500,000 Government employees, contributing not one grain of wheat or thread of yarn to the sum of goods available for consumption but living as parasites on the production of others. Our living standards would decline, just as they did in Germany.

HOW ABOUT LABOR'S RIGHTS? WHERE THE ADMINISTRATORS?

Missing, too, is how, under the new scheme, the rights of labor would be protected, and how men of sufficient capacity to administer the new economy could be found. Current examples of the agencies administering war production, prices, wages, manpower, and food, indicate that specifications for such men are more readily drawn than filled.

The price of "freedom from want" has been shown by transposing the words into "want of freedom." All the major-domos of planning admit that it involves the loss of "some" freedom. One of them, Prof. Jacob Viner, who is more specific, concludes that central economic planning is "incompatible with a freely legislating Congress." Prof. Alvin Hansen, who helped draw the plans, adds: "Congress would have to abdicate its taxing and other powers to the Executive." And Stuart Chase, the planners' lucid prophet, has written that such economic planning must be administered with "dictatorial powers."

At this point are we not in conflict with what we are fighting our surface war for? Are we not fighting dictatorship to secure to ourselves our democratic way of life; for the freedom of the individual to speak, worship, and seek his own happiness in any economic or spiritual endeavor so long as he does not transgress similar rights of others? Without a "freely legislating Congress," can this way of a life endure? Could it endure under a bureaucracy wielding "dictatorial powers"?

In an earlier article of this series, Bishop Scarlett recalled a truism to the effect that we learn history but we do not learn from history. Why need this be so? What can we learn from history?

CITATION FROM MACAULAY ON MEANING OF REAL WAGES

Lord Macaulay reminds us that in the reign of Charles II meat and bread were luxuries and acorns and whole grain were the food of the masses; a clean shirt once a week was a privilege reserved to nobility. Peasants' wages, he continues, were 4 shillings a week and an "industrial worker, rising early and lying down late, thought himself fairly paid if he gained 6 shillings a week. * * * Laborers who were able to maintain themselves and their families by means of these wages were not the most necessitous members of the community. Beneath them lay a large class which could not subsist without some aid from the parish."

When Macaulay wrote, two centuries later, wages had risen to 12 and 16 shillings a week and those depending upon relief had been reduced to "one-tenth the inhabitants, and, in good years, one-thirteenth." England's real wages have multiplied several fold since Macaulay's time.

In this country the average industrial worker earns more in a day than Macaulay's contemporaries earned in a week, and some of them earn as much in an hour as they could have earned in a week in Charles II's time. In each of these periods, living costs, as measured by the price of wheat, are comparable.

This great improvement, particularly that of the past century, was not brought about by any government—it was the result of work of individuals. Pursuing their own self-interest, individuals dreamed and invented; they explored and prospected; they created opportunities for investment of capital and employment of others. Thus new things and more things were contributed constantly to the sum total that was available for all. Living standards increased. The tremendous strides made by America are concomitants of the greatest freedom the individual ever enjoyed in any civilization.

"ASCENDANCY OF NATIONS HINGES ON INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM"

In his monumental work, The History of Civilization, Buckle emphasizes that the ascendancy of nations hinges on the freedom of individuals from government restraint, and that whenever government becomes paternalistic and guides and regiments its economy, "the results are, first, the impoverishment and servility of genius; then the decay of knowledge; then the decline of the country. * * * In the ages of Augustus of Leo X and of Louis XIV, the same method was adopted, and the same result ensued."

Tracing this course in France, he recites that the immense impulse which was given to the highest branches of knowledge under the liberal policies of Richelieu and Mazarin, which produced such men as Pascal and Descartes in science and Moliere and LeBrun in literature and art, stopped when Louis XIV assumed the government and instituted his regimentation. From that moment until it collapsed in revolution, Buckle continues, "France, so far as great discoveries are concerned, is a blank in the annals of Europe."

While in England Newton reformed physics and remodeled astronomy, France did not produce a single man who made a contribution to science. And the genius of French artists fell so low that long before the death of Louis XIV France ceased to produce any of merit.

Buckle adds: "If we examine in the same manner the literature of the age of Louis XIV, we shall arrive at similar conclusions. The misery of the people and the degradation of the country followed the decline of the national intellect; while this last was, in its turn, the result of the protective spirit—that

mischievous spirit which weakens whatever it touches."

The nature of government is such that it, itself, is incapable of producing anything. As government can have no imagination, it shrinks from risk of any kind and seeks refuge in public works, whether they be pyramids, limeston post offices or Jefferson memorials. Public works, by their very nature, cannot be consumed by individuals; hence they never add to living standards or free men from want.

ONLY INDIVIDUALS CAN DO IT

Individuals alone are capable of invention and production: Individuals work either because it is in their self-interest to do so or because they are compelled to do so.

The former is the way of freedom; the latter that of totalitarianism. America's Constitution guarantees men's rights; Russia's declares their duties.

The ideology conflicting with central economic planning—the one generally held by businessmen—has the same human goals as planning and, I venture, much of the same wistful yearning. None of the schemes to aid either employees or the underprivileged is new. All have been pioneered by business or private institutions, for which businessmen and other individuals put up their own money.

It is in methods of achieving the goals that differences lie. This ideology—that of individualism—is based not on idealism but realism—not on pessimism but optimism. It is not founded on theory; it has a history of accomplishment. It abhors the withering hands of political bureaucracy. It has faith in the ingenuity, enterprise, and self-reliance of the individual to bring a better world into reality if there is no damper on ambition or ceiling on opportunity. In substantiation, it points not only to interpreters of history, such as Buckle, but to the miraculous contributions to national defense made by individualistic American industry, accomplishments which are in such sharp contrast to the fumbling of the war's administration by political bureaucracies.

"OF COURSE BUSINESS HAS FAULTS"

Of course business has faults. It is composed of human beings; naturally it contains the virtues and fallibilities common to the species. Society must protect itself from the abuses of business elements which, through greed or ruthless ambition, transgress public interest. But all groups—labor, bankers, politicians, and the press—have outlaws. Public interest needs protection against them, too. We should prevent what Jefferson called our cannibalistic appetites from feeding on one another.

For more than 10 years, however, business has been subject to vilification and misinterpretation by a group infested with a paranoia that business has a monopoly of chicanery and greed, and the faults of business have formed an endless parade before public view. But the remedies have not merely regulated business and outlawed abuses; they have smothered initiative, shackled expansion, and hindered investment that would create employment.

Nevertheless, out of the purge has evolved a business community with a greater social consciousness. Labor unions, for instance, are now generally regarded as a fixed part of the industrial system. After they have matured, and, if regulated reasonably in their own as well as public interest, they can become real partners to enrich the experience and resources of management. This is as it should be, because labor and stockholders have more in common interest than any other groups. Unless there are profits there can be no dividends or wages; if enterprise fails, both investment and jobs vanish. If our Nation goes totalitarian, both groups will lose their freedom and start saluting, counting off by fours, and marching to orders.

SOCIAL SECURITY NOT AN ISSUE

Neither is social security for the industrial worker an issue. I, for one, should like to see the present scheme enlarged to provide means for an adequate standard of living whenever a worker who is willing and anxious to work is idle due to causes beyond his control. This could be accomplished over a period of time, without raising prices, by a gradually increasing excise tax, capturing, at the source, part of the savings of future technological progress. The proceeds could be used not only to defray the cost of an enlarged program but to pay more adequate pensions than are provided by the current law. Many companies, including my own, now find it desirable to supplement social-security pensions.

But higher living standards for all can be attained only by the production of more necessaries and more luxuries for division by all the people. The inertia of domineering bureaucracies retards production. Public-works programs will not contribute one sack of wheat to this pool of consumable things.

A dynamic living standard requires the constant flow of new things—serving an old purpose better, lasting longer, and fulfilling some new want—into the common pool. This means a constant stream of new capital flowing into investment, which, in turn, requires that business risks again be made worth while.

TREMENDOUS WANTS

Never have the wants of nations been as great as they will be when this war ends. An exhausted Europe will need vast amounts of goods. Here everything from stoves to tires is being used up without replacement. House construction has been relatively dormant for over 20 years, but our population has grown. We haven't heard the rattle of a pneumatic hammer on a steel skeleton downtown for so many years we have almost forgotten its sound. When the war is over, farmers will have paid off mortgages, workers their time loans, and billions will have been saved in the form of war bonds.

Never will our people have been so able to buy what they want.

As ten times as much industrial research is going on as in the last war, the results will be ready for application. New industries will be ready to bloom. Indeed, it will be possible to enjoy an endless succession of new contributions, surpassing the most sanguine predictions, to the health, comfort, and happiness of living.

EXPANDING HORIZONS

Industries based on the application of science are in their infancy. Undreamed-of comforts and aids to health are possible. Radio-vision can be in full color, in three dimensions; kitchens, vacuum sweepers, and furnaces can be made as obsolete as bed warmers; a helicopter or plane can be in every garage; and week ends in Mexico or Europe can be made realities, if America's inventive and productive genius is allowed to put its mind to the job, under just regulations, but free of noncomprehending bureaucratic meddling and control. And there must be adequate incentive to both individuals and capital.

The moment the guns cease firing, I believe that, if these incentives are restored, the chemical industry alone is ready to invest several hundred million dollars a year in facilities that will take the first stride up this road to a better world. There can be full employment for all again, working not for masters but as freemen working for themselves, if we learn from history that what we are fighting for in both wars is freedom of the mind and spirit and the freedom to enterprise that are our heritage.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York:

Whereas 10,000,000 citizens of the United States are presently deprived of their right of free suffrage by poll tax laws in eight States which impose upon the exercise of the elective franchise limitations neither contemplated nor condoned by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas taking advantage of the inability of these 10,000,000 citizens, both Negro and white, to express themselves politically by participating in the choice of their representatives in government, both State and Federal, the forces of disunity and reaction have entrenched themselves in power and, thus protected, struggle ceaselessly against the consummation of the domestic and foreign policies of our Government and seek to disrupt the mobilization of all our forces for the successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas at a time when the morale and strength of the people of this Nation are needed increasingly if it is to survive, it is a dangerous inconsistency to continue to deprive any section of them of the democratic rights, to preserve which this war is being fought, but rather is it necessary to draw all men and women, no matter what their race, creed, color, or economic position, into full participation in the struggle for victory; and

Whereas the abolition of the poll tax will enable these 10,000,000 citizens to enter fully into their rights and duties as American citizens and will, at the same time, weaken those forces who place petty self-interest and personal power above the need for complete mobilization for victory as it will defeat those elements of reaction who depend upon the poll tax for their power, while it will strengthen national unity and morale: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That the Legislature of the State of New York respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to speedily enact H. R. 7, or any other similar or suitable legislation which effectively abolishes the payment of a poll tax as a qualification for voting for candidates for office in the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That a copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from this State.

By order of the assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI, *Clerk.*

In senate, March 26, 1943.

Concurred in, without amendment.

By order of the senate.

WILLIAM S. KING, *Clerk.*

Florida Barge Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "Build the Canals" from the Boston Evening American of April 8, 1943:

BUILD THE CANALS

By a vote of only 21 to 19, the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives has eliminated from a War Department supply bill an item of $44,000,000 for the construction of the Florida barge canal.

This work has been authorized by Congress, and is awaiting merely the provision of funds.

By striking out the item, the Appropriations Committee has not only nullified the will of the Congress; it has also rejected the advice of its own subcommittee on the subject, which recommended the project as being immediately necessary to relieve the fuel oil and gasoline situation in New England and all along the Atlantic seaboard.

Furthermore, the committee disregarded official and expert information that the Florida barge canal can be completed this year, in a few months; that the necessary equipment is available for the work; that relatively little manpower will be required; and finally that the canal will be the final link in an inland waterway extending from Texas to New Jersey, capable of transporting an enormous volume of merchandise safe from submarine attacks such as have driven the oil tankers out of the Atlantic coast trade.

There is an unfortunate element of misunderstanding about the Florida canal project which needs to be cleared away.

The proposed barge canal is not the same thing as the New Deal's once-attempted Florida ship canal.

The barge-canal project is not a new one.

In April 1934 the Hearst newspapers advocated the construction then of the barge canal, when ample funds were available for the purpose in the New Deal's huge public-works appropriations.

Instead of building the barge canal at that time, the New Deal—without obtaining the assent of Congress—began the construction of a ship canal on the same site, at a vastly greater cost. The ship canal was never completed.

Steamship operating companies reported that they could not use the route, although its value as a barge canal route was apparent.

Consequently, Congress ordered the ship canal project abandoned, together with the visionary Passamaquoddy power project.

However, the work that was done toward constructing a ship canal remains and can be entirely salvaged merely by completing the work as the barge canal originally projected; and that is what the House Appropriations Committee has now refused to permit, notwithstanding the expressed policy of Congress.

By way of contrast, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, has just provided State funds to improve the old and famous Erie Canal in order to increase this year the supplies of fuel oil and gasoline reaching New York areas from the Middle West.

Consequently, there can be no doubt about the utility of barge canals, both in war and in peace.

The Erie Canal, extending between Lake Erie and the Hudson River, links the whole Great Lakes region to the seaboard at metropolitan New York.

Its one disadvantage is that it is ice-locked part of the year.

The Florida barge canal will unite the Gulf States and all of the Atlantic Coast States, as far north as New Jersey, in one ice-free system.

Furthermore, by constructing the proposed Raritan canal only a few miles across New Jersey, the South Atlantic-Gulf system will be easily extended into New York Harbor.

Congress should stop neglecting and delaying these barge canal projects.

The Nation needs them, right now.

Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 9, two young men from the Midwest carried top honors in an oratorical contest held in New York City on the life of Thomas Jefferson. Of greatest interest to me was that these young men recognized and appreciated the great service Jefferson rendered to our Nation and their admonition that his advice and words of wisdom should be followed.

In that, I wholeheartedly concur and I congratulate them with the hope that not only the Members of the House but the citizens of our country will always bear in mind Jefferson's advice and plea for a united Nation that will at all times safeguard our freedom and liberty.

In this connection, the newspaper columnists, radio commentators, and the press might well heed the words of these young men and refrain in continuing to distract and confuse the minds of our citizenry as to the fundamental principles of freedom and liberty which we are striving to maintain.

"Jefferson's spirit lives," say the two Midwest youths who won the national finals in the Thomas Jefferson bicentennial oratorical contest in New York last night.

Both James J. Rathbun, 21, Northwestern University junior, who won the college division honors, and John F. Monroe, Jr., 16, a senior in the Marquette University high school, Milwaukee, Wis., have won many forensic honors.

TRIBUTE TO JEFFERSON

Rathbun said:

Thomas Jefferson knew, as you and I know, that the man who fights for something greater than himself, greater than a few men, as great as all men, cannot be wrong.

As true greatness knows neither time nor place, it becomes for us to see it now, as Jefferson saw it then. In his time a Nation yearned for the truths he taught and lived. In our time a whole world yearns. We know that to give greatness to others we must have greatness ourselves, and to retain it ourselves we must share it with others.

JEFFERSON GREATNESS

The sooner we free others from the tyranny of leaders who know not the first principle of greatness—the Golden Rule—the sooner will they know and grow and thrive upon greatness themselves.

I've been at grips with a word, but it was far more than just that. I found what greatness stands for in one man at one time—Thomas Jefferson—yet Jefferson's strongest contention was that it is within the reach of every man. I saw the essence of it grow as the truth of it spread. It's all clear now. Jefferson's greatness was in one man at one time, but it is not limited even to some men at some time. We're fighting now for Jeffersonian greatness—Jeffersonian greatness for all men for all time.

Monroe praised the character of Jefferson and described his writing of his immortal document of human liberty—the Declaration of Independence. Then he said:

These words are the cornerstone on which was built the magnificent temple of government called the United States. They came as a voice from heaven to the beleaguered, the down-trodden, and oppressed of every land.

Yes; Thomas Jefferson still lives. Let us consecrate ourselves to those principles of his on which this Nation was founded and let us pledge to him that the great blessings which God has bestowed upon this Nation will always be shared by a free people dedicated to the full and complete protection of the God-given rights of man.

In this day of turmoil and unrest, when the inalienable right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are so seriously threatened, let us all bow down and thank Almighty God that Thomas Jefferson still lives.

The Big Worry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Globe of April 7, 1943:

THE BIG WORRY

Two demobilizations face this country, perhaps in 1944 or 1945 and possibly before. Nobody can be certain. Whatever the date, both of these releases from exacting occupations, one from the armed forces, the other from the factories producing the tools of war, will be greater than anything of the kind ever known before.

Is this multitude to sell apples on the street and to rake leaves? Or are they to find places in employment suitable for decent human beings?

In 1939, when this war began in Europe, the total of the United States Army and Navy was exactly 331,001. The forces now being put into uniform are to number 11,000,000. It is reasonable to suppose that concern for the future will not permit reduction to the prewar figure but, if it is 6 times what it was when the Germans invaded Poland, there will be 9,000,000 exchanging uniforms for civilian garb.

Those leaving the factories and shipyards, where there will be no further need for their energies, will be several times as numerous as the ex-service men.

Never since the world began was there any such shift from war to peace as is the unavoidable prospect for these United States.

Plans for it are imperative and there should be no delay in making them. Congress has

had its attention called by the Executive to the duty of considering what must be done to meet the situation. So far, there has been no step taken to indicate that Senators and Representatives are concerned about the problem.

Elsewhere this is not the case. In every camp and on every ship young men are wondering about the future. They want to finish the fighting and get home. Once there, they desire to go to work. Quite as anxious for the resumption of civilian life, with pay at the end of each week and a prospect for material progress are the women of their families. Young wives, whether with or without children, are all eager for economic stability. Any person sensitive to thought trends realizes this all the time and wherever he goes.

The families with or without service flags in the windows, but with one or several members engaged in unaccustomed work at lathes or assembly lines, know perfectly well that the job is not permanent. It is destructive and permanency must be constructive. The only outlook that will be bearable to any of the demobilized, military, or civilian, or to their kin, will be of well-compensated civilian work for all who desire it.

A voluntary group, 50 men representing business, labor, and agriculture, have formed the National Planning Association, to exert their influence in having America make ready for the economic future. In their memorandum addressed to the President of the United States it is declared that "the first goal of post-war planning should be a foundation for better living through provision for enough jobs and lasting jobs." Among those signing the report are Beardsley Ruml, known for his tax plan, J. O. Chesley of the Aluminum Co., Guy Emerson, prominent banker, and others of high standing. The labor representatives are also a distinguished list, among them Robert Watt and Walter Reuther.

The basis for America's post-war economy is set forth emphatically with private business, industry, and agriculture as the primary source of jobs, providing them by producing goods and services. The Government should establish the rules of the game and put forward such programs as will mesh with private undertakings.

For this a new sense of responsibility for the welfare of the people is required.

Necessarily what is said by this association is an appeal to principles rather than an attempt to blueprint the future. Its present value is that of a rallying call.

No association of this nature can be sufficiently impressive to compel national attention to this subject. But it may be that the problem is already occupying American minds sufficiently to make beating the drum and blowing the trumpet not necessary.

Those who cannot recall the depression decade of the 1930's must be very few. Almost everybody realizes that in those drab 10 years our economy was halting and the suffering was great. Winning the war will not be enough, unless paths to decent living for Americans are laid out in advance.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Food for Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, since all we need is bad weather in 1943 to bring actual famine and food riots entirely too close for the successful prosecution of the war we are in I feel that the following letter should be food, at least, for thought:

DISHMAN, WASH., *April 5, 1943.*

Hon. WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HORAN: Ole Liland has quit. There was real pathos in his voice when Ole told me he had to give up. He loved his herd and knew of the little characteristics of each cow.

Ole was a competitor, but the right sort. He had pride of ownership; he had pride in production; he had pride in excelling; so it was hard to take a customer away from Ole, but I had pride also in knowing that Ole came to me when he needed cream or milk to make up a shortage, for just milk and cream would not do. So Ole is out. He lost $152 in March.

S. H. Doak has been dairying for 19 years. He has tried and tried to get hay, and today succeeded in getting 8 bales, which was the limit the dealer would allow to a person. Last month Mr and Mrs. Doak put in 2,604 hours with the herd and delivery of the milk. Their net above expenses was $74 or a fraction over 28 cents an hour. Doak is strong, husky, and intelligent. A farmer has to know how to do anything, so Doak is going into defense work for the duration. At $1.40 an hour he would have nearly as much in a week as the two Doaks earned in a month.

H. M. Taylor is selling out. Taylor at one time was a large dairyman, and has a farm fitted for dairying. Now he is down to two cows.

Sales of this kind are constantly taking place. I have only sent you a few of the notices of different sales. The rationing of butter is having the desired effect. We have gone from a surplus to a shortage and back to a surplus in less than a year.

There is a great to-do about a farmer causing inflation at 28 cents an hour while there could not by the wildest stretch of imagination be inflation by paying a high-school boy $1.40 an hour if he contributed to Congress of Industrial Organizations or American Federation of Labor or mine workers.

Sincerely,

J. B. CHANEY.

Employment of Recipients of Old-Age Assistance in Essential War Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an enrolled copy of Joint Resolution No. 29, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact emergency legislation to recipients of old-age assistance.

This joint resolution has been adopted by the 1943 Legislature of the State of Wisconsin.

The resolution follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 29

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact emergency legislation to permit recipients of old-age assistance to engage in essential war service under certain limitations

Whereas the manpower shortage has accentuated the dislocation of necessary food production and aggravated the lack of coordination and delivery of essential war materials that will seriously hamper and retard the effective utilization of the resources of the Allied Nations; and

Whereas such labor shortage may be alleviated by economizing and utilizing our available labor in permitting the recipients of old-age assistance to be gainfully employed to the extent of permissible physical ability; and thereby extend to these aged people the opportunity to labor for victory and democracy; and

Whereas it would appear to be unwise and foolhardy to permit the continued impairment of the ability of our farmers and manufacturers to produce the necessary supplies and material necessary for both winning the war and the peace; and

Whereas the rapid acceleration in the cost of living with the limitations imposed by a pension budget has produced want and privation to our own citizens who have been most modest and meager in their needs; and

Whereas the pensioner has been handicapped greatly not only by the increased cost of living but in the limitations imposed upon him to obtain gainful employment to supplement the pension so as to provide the minimum necessities of life; and

Whereas it is deemed advisable to alleviate such manpower shortage and the distress of such pensioners by enacting legislation for the emergency period of the war that will provide that the earnings of any applicant for, or a recipient of, old-age assistance, received for labor required for the armed forces or for the production of war goods, agriculture, or essential goods or services shall not be considered as income under such pension budget, so as to reduce such pension payment if the earnings are $50 per month or less, but 65 percent of the income in excess of $50 per month shall be considered income for the purpose of the reduction of the pension; and

Whereas such proposed legislation will enable thousands of loyal citizens to assume fully their obligations and duties of patriotic endeavor in the complete mobilization of all our manpower to work or fight to keep democracy safe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully petitions and urges the Congress of the United States to speedily enact suitable legislation that will restore the effective productiveness of our old-age pensioners without loss of pension and alleviate in part both the increased living costs of such pensioners and our critical manpower shortage for the emergency period of the war. Be it further

Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

CONRAD SHEARER,
President pro tempore of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
VERNON W. THOMSON,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ARTHUR L. MAY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Saratoga National Historical Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York:

Whereas the Saratoga National Historical Park embraces a section of New York State highly significant in this Nation's early struggles for independence; and

Whereas it would be entirely fitting and appropriate to convert a portion of this hallowed ground as the final resting place for veterans of the several wars in which this Nation has or may become engaged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the senate concur), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully memorialized to pass appropriate legislation to make possible the establishment of a portion of the Saratoga National Historical Park as a national veterans' cemetery; and be it further,

Resolved (if the senate concur), That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from this State.

By order of the assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

In senate March 26, 1943.

Concurred in, without amendment.

By orders of the senate.

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

A Commendable Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, this Federal Union is no stronger than the sum of all of the States, and I am happy, under unanimous consent, to insert in the RECORD a letter from a member of a Federal bureau which shows that the Federal and State Governments can work together, and that the bureaus which administer the laws we enact can so conduct themselves as to strengthen State administrations. I do hope that those bureaucrats who, both by word and act, seek to dominate, ignore, and short-circuit State governments will read and realize the value of real teamwork between the States themselves and between the States and the Federal Union.

The letter follows:

WENATCHEE, WASH., *April 2, 1943.*

Hon. WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALT: Enclosed is a copy of a bulletin on virus diseases of fruit trees that is just off the press, sent to you with my compliments for your personal file.

You will note that it is a publication of the State department of agriculture by Fred DeSellem's division of horticulture, and covers the results of the survey as well as a description of the diseases. You probably recall that last summer you read over an information sheet that I had prepared regarding the survey, just prior to the time that the convention of the State grange endorsed the survey project. The bulletin is somewhat unique in that it is a cooperative report of both Federal and State work put out by a State agency. At least this is one good example of a State agency trying to do something constructive about a problem within its own borders before asking the Federal Government to appropriate funds to match State money with which to carry on the work. Of course, our laboratory here at Wenatchee did cooperate with DeSellem on the project, but I carried it as part of my routine work while the State put up the real money that did the job.

There is another item of general interest that may come to your official attention sometime in the future. The problem is concerning the shipment of nursery trees into this State from other States where certain virus diseases are prevalent but which have not yet been introduced into Washington. Under the present system Washington laws quarantine against certain States where the virus diseases such as peach yellows, phony peach, peach mosaic, and several others are a serious problem. However, nurseries in these quarantined States ship stock into nonquarantined States and then reshipment is made into Washington. The result is considerable bootlegging of nursery trees into this State from areas where serious diseases are prevalent. This is particularly true concerning promising new varieties developed in quarantined States.

Since the enforcement of Washington quarantine laws comes under DeSellem's direction he is full of ideas concerning a possible solution and at the same time killing three birds with two stones. The general idea is that Fred wants to initiate a joint State-Federal cooperative plant introduction and quarantine station here in Washington that would serve the Northwest States generally. The purpose would be twofold: (1) To introduce all new varieties from quarantined areas so that they would be held for safe periods and then be released to nurserymen and growers, thereby eliminating unlawful entry of nursery stock into the States; (2) to establish sources of certified budwood of standard fruit varieties so that virus diseases now present in the Northwest States would not be propagated and spread by ill-advised growers and nurserymen. Concerning this last item, I might add that last summer's virus disease survey discovered many instances where growers had spread virus diseases in their cherry orchards by budding in pollenizer varieties where such budwood was collected from trees that were symptomless carriers of disease.

Since the States of Washington and Oregon grow many thousands of nursery trees sent all over the United States, the establishment of a certified source of disease-free scion wood made available to all nurserymen and orchardists would go a long way to guarantee that none of our own virus diseases would be sent to other States. At present the State is starting to work with individual nurseries on a small scale in certifying disease-free budwood trees but the program is necessarily limited and is not applicable or available to orchardists.

Anyway, I thought that you might possibly be interested in the general situation. If you should happen to have need for further copies of the virus-disease bulletin I will be glad to have them sent to you.

I am sure that you are having a most interesting time and experiences in Washington, D. C. The business of being a Congressman must be a breeze after following the fickle destinies of the fruit industry in the Wenatchee Valley.

With best wishes and personal regards to yourself and Sally.

Sincerely yours,

BUD REEVES,
Assistant Pathologist, United States Bureau of Plant Industry.

P. S.: Pardon my own typing. It seems to need a little practice.

B. R.

Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation Receives Gold Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, we in Oregon are proud of the record made in the building of ships for our war effort. Last week there took place in my home city of Portland, Oreg., an outstanding event, when the first lady of the land, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, christened the *Alazon Bay*, first aircraft carrier built in our area. The occasion was equally significant in the awarding by the Maritime Commission to the Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation of the Gold Eagle, the highest honor in American shipbuilding. The Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation was the first to receive this outstanding award in America.

The management and the workers in the Kaiser yards from the very outset have exhibited an outstanding contribution to our war effort in their speed and effectiveness in the construction of ships. This award just received is in line with numerous awards that have heretofore been made to these organizations for their unusual contributions to the war program. As a part of my remarks, I include an article appearing in the Oregonian of April 5, describing in some detail the launching of the *Alazon Bay* and the presentation of the award to its builders:

CRITICS HIT BY "WIZARD" SHIPBUILDER—KAISER INTRODUCES "PRESENTEEISM" TERM; HELP PRAISED

(By Stub Nelson)

Twenty thousand shipyard workers—packing every available foot of the area in front of the launching platform at the Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation's yard—Sunday sent up a rousing spontaneous cheer as their head man, Henry J. Kaiser, told the throng he "preferred to forget about absenteeism and talk about presenteeism."

Kaiser, who had arrived earlier Sunday from California with his son Henry J., Jr., coined the immediately popular word "presenteeism" while speaking at the launching of the *Francis W. Pettygrove*, Oregon's one hundred and sixty-second Liberty ship, christened by Mrs. Mark O'Dea, wife of the Maritime Commission's public relations chief.

GOLD EAGLE AWARDED

The launching was featured by the Maritime Commission's award of the Gold Eagle, highest honor in American shipbuilding, and the ceremony was doubly impressive because Oregon had the distinction of being the first shipyard in the country to win the rare and coveted pennant. Mark O'Dea made the presentation.

Before hurrying to the Oregon launching the dynamic Kaiser rushed to his Vancouver yard and personally conducted a tour of the *Alazon Bay*, first aircraft carrier built there, to see that the new vessel was shipshape for its dip into the Columbia River Monday noon.

FIRST LADY TO DO HONORS

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt will christen the *Alazon Bay* in one of the most auspicious ship launchings in the history of the Northwest.

By a simple choice of words—switching from the dreary negative to the pleasing positive approach—the miracle shipbuilder took the sting out of the absentee talk, so prevalent here for weeks.

The workers cheered again in unison when Kaiser told them that "in the seven shipyards we are managing the record of presenteeism was better than 93 percent for March."

"Rampant in the land is the idea that workers in shipyards and other war plants are slackers at heart, lazy in body, and committing with a closed mind the unpardonable crime of deliberate absenteeism in a time of national crisis.

"Nothing is further from the truth. My hat is off to the 93 percent faithful men and women in our shipyards in the Portland and San Francisco area

"The men and women of this home front army of 160,000 workers are showing their patriotism and faithfulness to the job with outstanding records.

LABOR DISPUTE EYED

"Oregon Ship's own record during March was a Liberty ship launched every other day for an average of 1.64 ships per way per month. Accomplishment such as this was not made by disciples of absenteeism, but by true Americans. They are an overwhelming majority in the thousands of war plants in this country."

Between mouthfuls of a hasty luncheon, Kaiser said that developments in the Kaiser shipyard labor hearing, which will be resumed by the National Labor Relations Board here Thursday, "saddens me."

"I'm not critical," said Kaiser "Just sad about it. It is unfortunate that labor can't, at least within its own family, settle its own jurisdictional problems.

"Labor's service to its own members will be in proportion to its ability to settle its own problems. Labor must solve them before it can hope to solve the problems of the men it serves."

"The Glory of the Years"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, each year, for a long time, the colleges of our State have held contests under the auspices of the South Carolina Intercollegiate Oratorical Association. One of the highest honors coming to any student is the selection to represent his school in this contest. On Friday night, April 2, the 1943 oratorical contest was held at Newberry College at which time a number of fine young men vied with each other for the highest honors in the field of oratory. The young man representing my own alma mater, Furman University, of Greenville, S. C., was young Charles W. McLawhorn, of whom all of us are exceedingly proud. Mr. McLawhorn won the first honors at the contest and I am pleased to insert herewith a copy of his address on that occasion:

Eight score and seven years ago our forefathers "brought forth upon this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." And then, "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity * * *," those forefathers deemed it necessary to ordain and establish a constitution for the United States of America.

And so the representatives of the several States gathered in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., to hold a constitutional convention. There the men who attended that historic conclave put into written words a document which has endured the storms of war, unrest, and political controversy for more than 150 years. In that document is still written the supreme law of a nation teeming with 130,000,000 people. William Gladstone called it "one of the greatest pieces of work ever struck off at a given moment by the brain and purpose of man."

And yet that Constitution rectified not a single one of the civil and personal grievances set forth in the Declaration of Independence. The founders of our Nation had completely forgot to include those rights for which we had just fought one of the longest, most important, and most devastating wars in all our history.

And so—almost before the new constitution could be put into effect—it had to be amended 10 times. In those amendments the new citizens of that new Nation had the American Bill of Rights, which guaranteed to every person in the United States freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press.

That was 150 years ago, and 15 decades is a long time, a time long enough to forget the value of things that once were priceless. In 1776 the people of America were willing to lay down their lives on the sacrificial altar in order to obtain the right to speak their minds freely and without restraint.

But today there are actually Americans within our own border who are not only willing but eager to lay aside the rights for which our colonial ancestors gave up their lives. There are actually Americans who cry out that because so-and-so propagates opinions differing from their own he must be forever hushed.

It only takes one keen, searching, intelligent question on the conduct of the war effort, and immediately a few stupid, rattlebrained Americans throw up their hands in despair and say, "Silence him! Silence him!"

I say it bluntly, these people are ignorant of the social and intellectual standards of their own ancestors. Their limited powers of ratiocination cannot conceive the simple but inescapable fact that to suppress a thing is to give it life.

"Truth crushed to earth shall rise again; the glory of the years are hers. But error, wounded, writhes in pain and dies among her worshippers."

If fascism be the truth, then it will in the end conquer democracy and nothing we can do to crush it to earth will prevail against it. But if fascism is error, then it will surely die among its worshippers without any help from us.

American fascism does not mean the dictatorial acts of our leaders—of Thomas Jefferson purchasing the Louisiana Territory with no power to buy it and no money to pay for it. What if Theodore Roosevelt did say, "I took Panama"? What if Franklin Roosevelt did close the banks illegally?

The real American fascist is our fellow-citizen who says, "I can't vote for him—his religion is wrong." Or, "We need a special concentration camp for labor leaders like him." Or, "You can't say that, the State Department won't like it." Or the Army. Or the Navy. Or the editor. A man does not have to wear a black shirt to be a fascist.

We have often heard that if you give a man enough rope he will hang himself. So we feed our American fascists yards upon yards of rope, and by all that's holy they are slowly stifling themselves to death. If we allow them to speak, then we are saying to all the world, "We have the Government, and although every minute of the day we are being bombarded from abroad and attacked from within, our Government still stands supreme. It is safer today than at any time in history. Standing on the foundation of civil liberties, our democracy is as immovable as the mountains and as irresistible in its progress as are the stars in their courses.

But if we attempt to suppress these false doctrines, then we are admitting that our Government is weak and fundamentally wrong. We are declaring to our enemies that we cannot allow any man to speak against the Government for fear that he will overthrow it.

Minority groups thrive on persecution. Sociologists tell us that today we would be on our knees before pagan idols had not the Roman emperors persecuted the early Christians.

But there are a few people in this country who cannot see this simple fact. They are willing to cast aside their rights to freedom of speech, religion, and the press—rights that build a force so powerful that dictators fear it; a force so powerful that mighty potentates have been humbled by it; and a force so powerful that democracy cannot live without it.

Yet some Americans would have us forsake this priceless heritage; some southerners have us put aside this guarantee of freedom; some South Carolinians would have us turn our backs on the very stronghold of America and adopt what they blithely tell us is a new order.

They tell us that this condition would be only temporary, and that America will never permanently relinquish its bill of rights. In answer to this sophistry, I say only three words—the Sedition Act. Had there been the slightest precedent in our history for such a move, the Sedition Act would be on the statute books of our land today.

Those who would do away with the Bill of Rights constitute a serious threat to our national security. In a time of great national and international crises, they are the true enemies of democracy. They betray and abandon the teachings and doctrines of those men who have been the authors and defenders of the things which have made America great. Their attack upon this priceless tradition is one of the most opprobrious, the most vicious, the most uncalled-for attacks upon the fundamentals of American democracy since Brig. Gen. Benedict Arnold betrayed the American forces at West Point.

They come to us—our friends, neighbors, relatives—they come to us like so many Absolems sitting by the gate, attempting with one hand to steal our hearts and with the other to erase our memory. They come to us as Joab pretending to take a friendly walk, but planning only to thrust the knife of treachery under the fifth rib. They come to us as Judas Iscariot saying, "Hail, Master!" but with the price of betrayal already in their hands.

Whatever we do in these next few years, whatever be our course in the maelstrom of hate and treachery that has settled over us, let us remember that the Bill of Rights is the cardinal principle of American democracy. Let us remember that this time-honored tradition can no more be blotted from the hearts of true Americans than can the exploits of John Paul Jones or Nathan Hale or John C. Calhoun.

America's watchword is today, shall be tomorrow, and must be forever: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make ye free."

Why a Beef Shortage in the Market Place?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there are about 75,000,000 head of cattle in the United States. About 18,000,000 head are slaughtered each year, producing about 9,000,000,000 pounds of meat. In addition, 10,000,000 calves are slaughtered, providing about a billion pounds of veal. If the producer could have some confidence in O. P. A. regulations; if Washington would let the packer kill the numbers which would come to market; and if the producer could have enough confidence to add another 100 pounds in live weight, which would subsequently add another 900,000,000 pounds to our animal production, ample beef would be provided for all needed purposes.

When you realize the immense storages of feed in Canada that are not being moved, which include 675,000,000 bushels of wheat, 125,000,000 bushels of barley, and 225,000,000 bushels of oats, you can appreciate the possibilities of correcting the feed situation. This may be a field for lease-lend to explore to avoid the criticism of those that think lease-lend is a one-way street. It should be borne in mind that many of these products, when finished and processed, are being shipped to England and other countries under lease-lend. Canada cannot find the shipping space for these products even if they had a world market for these grains. The wheat supply in Canada is about twice its normal needs for consumption and export.

England recently purchased 400,000 tons of Argentine fresh beef. England has had the foot and mouth disease in its cattle. You will find the quarantine restrictions on cattle coming from any country including the Isle of Guernsey a rather strict measure, if and when you try to import some of them.

It is wrong, very wrong, to have people unfamiliar with the facts continually saying that it is a few selfish beef producers in behalf of their own self-interest who are keeping the fresh meat from Argentina from coming to our markets. The best answer to that assertion is that thousands upon thousands of cattle on the hoof have been and are being imported from Mexico and Canada. I defy you to show one criticism of this importation of animals on the hoof from Canada and Mexico on the basis of the sanitary pact.

This protest against imported fresh meats is not on canned or properly processed meat, it is against fresh meat and applies not only to Argentina but to any country infested with foot and mouth disease.

Since we removed the duty on imported fats and oils last session we must give consideration to meeting the problem of a feed supply for our livestock. We should not let our own personal opinions in regard to tariffs interfere with maximum production of food needed to win this war.

The two following articles from the Christian Science Monitor of April 5 are recommended to anyone interested in the facts:

To the Christian Science Monitor:

Your recent editorial, "The United States Needs Argentine Beef," contains several misleading statements. May I direct your attention to a few?

1. "The embargo against South American beef is purely an artificial barrier maintained in behalf of a comparatively few beef growers of the United States." The fact of the matter is this embargo was established to protect the dairy cattle, sheep, swine, and beef cattle upon which more than 5,000,000 farm families depend, in part or entirely, for a livelihood against the terribly devastating effects of the hoof and mouth disease.

2. "It (the embargo) began as a temporary measure in 1927 to halt the importation of meat from a region where the hoof-and-mouth disease of cattle was prevalent." Everyone familiar with the situation knows that hoof-and-mouth disease exists wherever cattle are aised in South America and that it is particularly bad in Argentina. Quite a few cattlemen from Argentina have visited us to study our methods of livestock production because conditions in this section of the United States are similar to those in much of Argentina. I asked the most recent of these visitors how prevalent the hoof-and-mouth disease is in Argentina. After a moment's hesitation he stated that it exists everywhere.

3. "Even that embargo was probably not necessary, as the weight of laboratory evidence indicates the disease cannot be carried by frozen meat." I know of no laboratory evidence that shows hoof-and-mouth disease germs will not live in frozen meat. I shall be grateful if you will cite me to the research to which this article refers.

As an illustration of the danger of frozen meat as a carrier, I direct your attention to the fact that the last outbreak of hoof-and-mouth disease in this country, which cost several million dollars and the destruction of a large number of animals to eradicate, was traced to meat trimmings in the garbage from a ship that had purchased meat at a South American port.

C. W. MCCAMPBELL,
Department of Animal Husbandry,
Kansas State College.
MANHATTAN, KANS.

To the Christian Science Monitor:

I have before me your editorial "The United States Needs Argentine Beef." I am taking the liberty of writing you expressing our views.

First, before going into the merits of the sanitary restriction of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, it seems to me that it is a disservice to American meat consumers in this emergency to encourage them to think that only this restriction stands between them and a plentiful supply of cheap beef. Actually the shortage of meat is not merely Nation-wide in this country, but it is world wide and there is no surplus in Argentina or elsewhere in South America. Great Britain, since the war began, has been the principal buyer of Argentine surplus. I am sure that our Government would not wish to compete with Great Britain for this surplus.

Now as to the merits of the sanitary restriction, there is foot-and-mouth disease in Argentina wherever there are cattle.

We have been advised that during the past year Argentina has had one of the worst outbreaks of this disease on record.

F. E. NOLLIN,
Executive Secretary, American
National Livestock Association.
DENVER, COLO.

Activities of Natives of Alaska in Support of the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to present herewith for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copy of a newspaper account of an interview with Mr. Claude M. Hirst, General Superintendent of the Office of Indian Affairs of Alaska, with respect to the activities of the natives of Alaska in support of the war effort.

This article is taken from the April 2, 1943, issue of the Alaska Weekly, published at Seattle, Wash.

The contribution of the natives of Alaska, considering their economic condition, is indeed notable and admirable. Their patriotism and devotion are beyond question.

The article mentioned quotes Mr. Hirst, as follows:

"The natives of Alaska," said Mr. Hirst, "not only are helping the war cause with funds but many of the men are in the armed forces, and many of the others, including the women, are performing invaluable services in many ways in which their peculiar knowledge and acquaintance with northern conditions make them particularly efficient.

CARRY ON

"Our department is not planning any new projects or enterprises for the natives, but attempting to carry on our regular program touching native schools, hospitals, medical services, welfare, relief, and industry—including care of reindeer herds, skin sewing, ivory carving, totem-pole carving, and arts and crafts, and all such which looks to the permanent welfare of the natives.

"So far as the native industries are concerned, there is a larger demand for the products than can be supplied, and the need of the armed forces for certain articles made by the natives is keeping many of them engaged.

"Products of the native arts and crafts are no longer permitted to be subject in Alaska to competition by imitators or foreign or outside machine or other workers. By confining the Alaska native products to the handmade articles their art, skill, and genuineness is preserved and such as are produced are all the more prized by art collectors and others.

"All the products are now marketed through Government agencies and legitimate dealers, thus protecting the producers. Most of the articles so valued by collectors and appreciative public yield but a small percentage of the revenues needed by the natives for their subsistence, so that they must look elsewhere for sufficient revenue to help cover all their needs, but what they do produce in

pursuing their arts and crafts is turned out largely in what otherwise would be their unoccupied or idle hours.

"The natives of Alaska constitute a large portion of the permanent Alaska population, and it is the policy of the Department to do all possible for their welfare."

Because of wartime conditions, the national headquarters of the Bureau of Indian Affairs recently was transferred to Chicago. The headquarters of the Fish and Wildlife Bureau also was transferred to Chicago.

Milk Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. D. McWILLIAMS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the general food situation, and under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a resolution of the General Assembly of Connecticut, now in session, memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture concerning an increase in the ceiling prices of dairy products.

It is my earnest hope that Secretary Wickard, the Office of Price Administration, and all other governmental agencies involved in the production and distribution of food will take prompt action with respect to this matter and afford the dairy farmers the relief they seek in order that they may continue in business and accelerate, if possible, the production of this vital food product.

The resolution of the General Assembly of Connecticut is as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture concerning an increase in the ceiling prices of dairy products

Whereas the food situation grows more acute daily, this being particularly true of the milk supply necessary to meet the requirements of our greatly increased population; and

Whereas dairy farmers are going out of business at an alarming rate owing to the shortage of skilled farm labor, feed, fertilizer, and farm machinery, and to inadequate prices to meet the increased cost of production; and

Whereas some immediate action must be taken to remedy this situation and give encouragement to our remaining dairy farmers to carry on in this grave national food crisis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Connecticut General Assembly respectfully requests Secretary Wickard, the Office of Price Administration, and all other governmental agencies involved in the production and distribution of food to take immediate action to eliminate the existing shortage of milk by establishing price ceilings that will make it possible for Connecticut dairy farmers to meet production costs and to continue in business; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, Price Administrator Brown, and each of the Connecticut Members in Congress.

Russian Claims on Polish Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, at the present time there is much space devoted in the press to the Russian claims of Polish territory.

The Milwaukee Journal of April 3, 1943, took a most surprising stand in this controversy. The Milwaukee Journal's stand was ably challenged in a letter published April 10, 1943, by Joseph A. Kapmarski, the editor of the Kuryer Polski, a Polish-language daily published in my district.

Because of the general interest demonstrated in this controversy, I am making both the Journal editorial and Mr. Kapmarski's letter a part of my remarks.

The Milwaukee Journal editorial is as follows:

POLISH-RUSSIAN BORDER

Of the many border disputes to be settled in Europe, one of the most acute will be over the Polish-Russian border. This dispute has already broken into the open, though the war is still in a crucial stage and though Poland—what is left of it—and Russia are allies.

Polish circles in exile have again and again voiced their demand that the 1939 Polish border be restored after the war. Premier Wladyslaw Sikorski of the Polish Government in exile has written that he considers this border to be restored now. The Russians have made it pretty clear, however, both in statements by Stalin and in comment in th controlled Russian press, tha' Russia has no idea of restoring to Poland the eastern territories which Poland seized from Russia after the Russian-Polish war of 1920–21.

Arguing about the Polish-Russian border is an unending, though serious, indoor sport, because one can cite many borders at different periods. The political borders of Poland have fluctuated through the centuries, sometimes disappearing altogether, as after the Third Partition in 1795–96, when Russia, Prussia, and Austria took all that was left from two previous partitions.

An earlier extreme saw a Polish-Lithuanian nation reaching to the Black Sea. And the whole problem is complicated by the fact that, bordering the more or less solid group of Poles, are mixed territories where Poles and Germans, Poles and Czechs, Poles and Ukrainians, Poles and White Russians, Poles and Lithuanians are mixed through the countryside.

We do not believe that it is possible to fix the Polish-Russian border now, but we do believe that one of the most indefensible and unjustifiable Polish-Russian borders was the one that existed before Germany plunged Europe into war in 1939.

The 87,000 square miles seized from Russia by the Poles in 1920–21 contained only 6 percent Poles, according to objective studies. At the time that the Treaty of Riga (March 18, 1921) tore this huge territory away from Russia, the United States Government protested that it was unfair and that it violated ethnographic principles laid down in the Treaty of Versailles.

Under the circumstances, we do not believe that Poland can or should hope for a restoration of the border that existed in the 18 years from 1921 to 1939.

Mr. Kapmarski's commentary on the editorial is as follows:

POLAND THE CAPTIVE

To the Journal:

The history of Poland goes back a thousand years, but from your editorial Polish-Russian Border it would seem that the Polish Nation started from scratch, at the expense of the powers which partitioned it and held it captive for 150 years.

Cynically enough, you create the impression that because the political borders of Poland have fluctuated through the centuries and finally disappeared altogether, she lost the right to recover her former territory, particularly those sections on which the Polish population was forcibly shifted by the partitioning powers in a century and a half.

If it is considered wrong to deprive a bandit of his loot, then it is true, as you say, that the eastern part of Poland was torn away from Russia. And if it is true that this territory contains only 6 percent Poles, this condition was created purposely by the Soviets by the mass deportation of millions of Poles into the interior of Russia and Siberia, where the fate of most of them is still unknown.

The following figures on the population of eastern Poland before the war have never been challenged even by Russia before 1941: Poles, 5,281,000; Ukrainians, Ruthenians, 4,513,000; White Russians, 1,220,000; Jews, 1,115,000; Russians, 135,000; Lithuanians, 84,000; Germans, 89,000; unclassified, 802,000. As similar changes in the population have taken place in the part of Poland occupied by the Germans, for all anyone knows, we may next hear voices raised in defense of Germany against the restoration of Poland's rightful western borders.

Russia's role in the war against Germany cannot be minimized and should be fully appreciated, but lately a large section of the American press has gone to extremes in this respect and in its overzealousness to pay tribute to the Red army is outdoing Moscow itself. It is deplorable that a newspaper of the Journal's stature, in denying Poland any hope of restoration of her pre-war boundaries in the east, does not view this controversy in the light of historical justice and international fair play, but simply is siding with the stronger of the two disputants.

The idea that might makes right led to the last war and precipitated the present conflict. While it is yet far from a decision on the battlefields of the world, this idea still has its champions, even on the side of the Allies, sowing the seeds of new discord and bloodshed for the future.

Poland was the first country which dared to resist Hitler's demands and preferred war rather than yield a foot of her land or relinquish any of her sovereign rights. In consequence, for nearly 4 years now, she is suffering more horribly at the hands of the oppressor than any other conquered country.

Is Poland's ordeal callously and indifferently to be shrugged off, her sacrifices forgotten? Is she to be liberated from the yoke of Hitler only to fall prey to her powerful neighbor to the east? As George E. Sokolsky, columnist of the New York Sun, wrote recently: "Should Poland lose any part of her territory to Russia, every life lost in this war will have been lost in vain."

J. A. KAPMARSKI.

MILWAUKEE, *April 10, 1943.*

Are Human Lives Worth Saving?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over the radio on April 9, 1943:

Ladies and gentlemen, again and again I have taken time on the floor of the House and on the radio to call the attention of the American people to the fate of victims of Nazi barbarism. As I stated previously, I intend to go on doing so until definite steps are taken to alleviate the suffering of these unfortunate people.

Close to 3,000,000 people have been killed, maimed, slaughtered, or starved. Over 5,000,000 people are enslaved, in forced labor, without food, with disease and death taking a heavy toll among them. The whole of Europe is doomed unless the Allied Nations wake up. We must give aid today; tomorrow will be too late. The United Nations must show that democracy can cope with a crisis. Our aid must never again be too little or come too late.

The Hitler regime embarked on a wanton career of destruction to annihilate all nations that refused to follow Nazi mandates. It is needless for me to tell you that the rapes of Czechoslovakia and Poland, Denmark and Holland, Norway and France are full of horrible examples—men, women, and children murdered in cold blood. Slaughtered because they refused to give up their freedom.

All those who yielded to brute force have become the slaves of Hitler's henchmen. They are driven to hard labor and crowded together like animals without adequate food or shelter. Hitler has proclaimed the theory that inferior races do not have to eat as much as the German master race. The Germans must be fed, and what is left over, if anything is left, is given to the enslaved workers.

Hitler made the claim, or his puppets made the claim, that they are killing human beings because there is not enough food to go round. If assurances could be obtained that food would be distributed among the victims of nazi-ism, we should make every possible attempt, through existing facilities of the Red Cross, to get food to the starving people.

However, this in itself would be at best a temporary solution only.

It is no real solution to the gigantic problem facing us. We cannot help the unfortunates who have already been killed, but there are still 5,000,000 human beings who face the same fate unless every effort is made by the Allied Nations to rescue them and settle them where they may live as decent human beings. As yet, no adequate program for their evacuation and rehabilitation has been set forth.

Think of the thousands of orphaned children—Catholics, Protestants, Jews—children whose innocent fathers and mothers have been killed. Throughout our history, we have considered it our duty and privilege to help the oppressed and the persecuted. When the Third Reich first started its campaign of terror, the American people immediately tried to find a way to save the children of the occupied countries. A bill was introduced in Congress to permit refugee children to enter this country. Witnesses from numerous civic and social groups appeared before our committee pleading to have the legislation enacted into law. Church groups of all religions and denominations, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, organizations and individuals from all parts of our country and all walks of life begged to be given a chance to open their homes to these children whose homes were destroyed. From a survey I made I found thousands of families who were eager to extend the privileges of their homes to these unfortunate youngsters.

And there are people in other countries who are just as eager to help. Palestine can admit several hundred thousand more people. Palestine, the homeland of the Jews under the Balfour Declaration, can, without injury to its economic structure or that of Great Britain, absorb thousands of refugees. There are about 600,000 Jewish families now permanently settled in Palestine, each of whom would gladly take one, two, or even three refugees into their homes until after the period of this war. There are agricultural colonies suffering from a shortage of manpower because many of their members have joined the armed forces. These colonies have been asking to be permitted to bring refugees to Palestine. Judging by the benefits the Jews in Palestine have brought to the Near East and their loyalty to the Allied cause, Great Britain can only benefit by increased Jewish immigration to Palestine.

So far as we Americans are concerned, we are fighing Hitler and his cohorts; we are not fighting the people of the occupied countries. The world has always had faith in America because our diplomacy differs from that of other nations. We have no ax to grind and no desire for territorial expansion. Take, for example, our relationship with Canada. Where else can you find 3,000 miles of open boundary, without a fort and without a gun, as you do along the length and breadth of the United States and Canada? Where else can you find nations living in close proximity that do not cast envious eyes on the territory of their neighbors? Where else can you find a society, the aim and object of which is the improvement of the lot of the common man, which at no time created a barrier of class distinction? In this respect, we have gained the admiration of the world.

The Allied Nations should convey this message to the democracies of the world: That we are all God's children; that we must live up to the teachings of the Bible; that all races have an equal right to life and liberty.

We Americans are proud of the fact that no matter how concerned we have been with our own problems, we never forget the oppressed and persecuted that look to us for help. We have always given generously to those who needed our help.

The Allied Nations are wholly sympathetic toward the helpless victims of Nazi fury. The President of the United States is in sympathy with these people. And Congress made clear its stand in a resolution, the text of which I quote:

"Whereas the American people view with indignation the atrocities inflicted upon the civilian population in the Nazi-occupied countries, and especially the mass murder of Jewish men, women, and children; and

"Whereas this policy of the Nazis has created a reign of terror, brutality, and extermination in Poland and other countries in Eastern and Central Europe: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That these brutal and indefensible outrages against millions of helpless men, women, and children should be, and they are hereby, condemned as unworthy of any nation or any regime which pretends to be civilized;

"*Resolved further*, That the dictates of humanity and honorable conduct in war demand that this inexcusable slaughter and mistreatment shall cease and that it is the sense of this Congress that those guilty, directly or indirectly, of these criminal acts shall be held accountable and punished in a manner commensurate with the offenses for which they are responsible.

"Passed the Senate March 9, 1943."

The Government of Great Britain has expressed its sympathy through its Parliament, its people, and the Church of England. The neutral nations are ready to help if assured of support by the United States and Great Britain. Millions of people can be saved by immediate cooperation and action among the Allies and the neutral countries.

Action must now supersede fine words, resolutions, and protest meetings. Our attitude and our Government's attitude must change from expressions of pity to a bold policy of action. The Allied Nations have agreed to call a conference to formulate a concrete program in behalf of Nazi victims. Both Great Britain and the United States are sending official representatives to the conference, which is to be held in Bermuda. They will bring this problem and our responsibilities squarely before the American people and the whole world.

This conference can write one of the great pages of history if it provides us with a workable plan to save as many human lives as possible. I have all the faith in the world that the President will appoint able representatives. I have all the faith in the world that Great Britain likewise will send men capable of understanding the scope of this problem. The fate of millions of people will be in their hands. The question of life or death depends upon prompt action by these representatives. It is their duty, by combined effort, to find a way to save our fellow human beings from Hitler's wrath. It is our duty, in cooperation with our allies, to carry out their proposals. United in a common cause, we cannot fail.

Thomas Jefferson

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago today, Thomas Jefferson was born.

He was undoubtedly the greatest statesman of modern times, and the outstanding political philosopher of the age.

He contributed more to the political progress of mankind than any other human being of his day and generation.

He gave us the Declaration of Independence, dedicated to the proposition that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, which lighted the way for a new world, that struggling humanity might stand on freedom's summit undismayed.

He gave us the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States, which guarantees freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assemblage, struck from the minds and consciences of men the deadening caste systems of ancient institutions, and guaranteed that American shores would never be lighted by the consuming fires of

human torture inspired by political or religious intolerance.

In his first inaugural address he laid down those great fundamental principles that have guided America for more than 140 years, enabling her to arise from the struggling Colonies along the Atlantic seaboard to the most powerful Nation the world has ever seen.

Guided by those principles, America's prestige would never wane and American freedom would never die.

Nothing could be more cruel than to attempt at this solemn hour to distort the philosophy of Jefferson and make it appear that he embraced those subversive views that would produce the dry rot of our Christian civilization.

He was an individualist, he was a statesman, he was an American, he was a patriot.

In that first inaugural address, which has been pronounced the greatest speech of the nineteenth century, he enunciated those policies to which we must return, if our beloved Republic, our sacred institutions, our American way of life, and our glorious civilization are to endure.

It reads as follows:

Friends and Fellow Citizens:

Called upon to undertake the duties of the first executive office of our country, I avail myself of the presence of that portion of my fellow citizens which is here assembled, to express my grateful thanks for the favor with which they have been pleased to look toward me, to declare a sincere consciousness that the task is above my talents, and that I approach it with those anxious and awful presentiments which the greatness of the charge and the weakness of my powers so justly inspire. A rising nation, spread over a wide and fruitful land, traversing all the seas with the rich productions of their industry, engaged in commerce with nations who feel power and forget right, advancing rapidly to destinies beyond the reach of mortal eye—when I contemplate these transcendent objects, and see the honor, the happiness, and the hopes of this beloved country committed to the issue and the auspices of this day, I shrink from the contemplation, and humble myself before the magnitude of the undertaking. Utterly, indeed, should I despair, did not the presence of many whom I here see remind me, that in the other high authorities provided by our Constitution, I shall find resources of wisdom, of virtue, and of zeal, on which to rely under all difficulties. To you, then, gentlemen, who are charged with the sovereign functions of legislation, and to those associated with you, I look with encouragement for that guidance and support which may enable us to steer with safety the vessel in which we are all embarked amid the conflicting elements of a troubled world.

During the contest of opinion through which we have passed, the animation of discussion and of exertions has sometimes worn an aspect which might impose on strangers unused to think freely and to speak and to write what they think; but this being now decided by the voice of the Nation, announced according to the rules of the Constitution, all will, of course, arrange themselves under the will of the law, and unite in common efforts for the common good. All, too, will bear in mind this sacred principle, that though the will of the majority is in all cases to prevail, that will, to be rightful, must be reasonable; that the minority possess their equal rights, which equal laws must protect, and to violate which would be oppression. Let us, then, fellow citizens, unite with one heart and one mind. Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and even life itself are but dreary things. And let us reflect that having banished from our land that religious intolerance under which mankind so long bled and suffered, we have yet gained little if we countenance a political intolerance as despotic, as wicked, and capable of as bitter and bloody persecutions. During the throes and convulsions of the ancient world, during the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberty, it was not wonderful that the agitation of the billows should reach even this distant and peaceful shore; that this should be more felt and feared by some and less by others; that this should divide opinions as to measures of safety. But every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans—we are Federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it. I know, indeed, that some honest men fear that a republican government cannot be strong; that this Government is not strong enough. But would the honest patriot, in the full tide of successful experiment, abandon a government which has so far kept us free and firm, on the theoretic and visionary fear that this Government, the world's best hope, may by possibility want energy to preserve itself? I trust not. I believe this, on the contrary, the strongest government on earth. I believe it is the only one where every man, at the call of the laws, would fly to the standard of the law, and would meet invasions of the public order as his own personal concern. Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the forms of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.

Let us, then, with courage and confidence pursue our own Federal and republican principles, our attachment to our Union and representative Government. Kindly separated by nature and a wide ocean from the exterminating havoc of one quarter of the globe; too high-minded to endure the degradations of the others; possessing a chosen country, with room enough for our descendants to the hundredth and thousandth generation; entertaining a due sense of our equal right to the use of our own faculties, to the acquisitions of our industry, to honor and confidence from our fellow citizens, resulting not from birth but from our actions and their sense of them; enlightened by a benign religion, professed, indeed, and practiced in various forms, yet all of them including honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; acknowledging and adoring an overruling Providence, which by all its dispensations proves that it delights in the happiness of man here and his greater happiness hereafter; with all these blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow citizens—a wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.

About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship, with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of the state governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the general goverment in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of the revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority—the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the *habeas corpus*; and trial by juries impartially selected—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation. The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith—the text of civil instruction—the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

I repair, then, fellow citizens, to the post you have assigned me. With experience enough in subordinate offices to have seen the difficulties of this, the greatest of all. I have learned to expect that it will rarely fall to the lot of imperfect man to retire from this station with the reputation and the favor which bring him into it. Without pretensions to that high confidence reposed in our first and great revolutionary character, whose preëminent services had entitled him to the first place in his country's love, and destined for him the fairest page in the volume of faithful history, I ask so much confidence only as may give firmness and effect to the legal administration of your affairs. I shall often go wrong through defect of judgment. When right, I shall often be thought wrong by those whose positions will not command a view of the whole ground. I ask your indulgence for my own errors, which will never be intentional; and your support against the errors of others, who may condemn what they would not if seen in all its parts. The approbation implied by your suffrage is a consolation to me for the past; and my future solicitude will be to retain the good opinion of those who have bestowed it in advance, to conciliate that of others by doing them all the good in my power, and to be instrumental to the happiness and freedom of all.

Relying, then, on the patronage of your good will, I advance with obedience to the work, ready to retire from it whenever you become sensible how much better choice it is in your power to make. And may that Infinite Power which rules the destinies of the universe lead our councils to what is best and give them a favorable issue for your peace and prosperity.

Office Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. JEFFREY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] addressed the House on the subject of office officers. His remarks were fair and were directed to a problem which exists in many cities throughout the country. They evoked widespread interest in the public press.

The situation which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] described is peculiarly applicable to the city of Dayton, Ohio, where the problem of office-building space for civilian enterprise is extremely acute. On April 3, the Dayton Herald commented editorially on this speech and the situation in Dayton as follows:

COUNT DAYTON IN, TOO

Sometimes Congressmen talk too much, but then again they sometimes speak right out to say the things that a lot of other people have been thinking.

On the floor of Congress Thursday Representative JOHN M. VORYS, of Columbus, got up to tell the Members and the country what some of the "office-officers" of the Army have been doing in his home town. Drawing a sharp distinction between our fighting men and the soldiers who stay at home to direct their fighting, he said that civilians are getting tired of being pushed around by these swivel-chair commanders who handle civil functions for the War Department. And what he said sounded very much like the things many of our Daytonians have been saying "off the record."

It is true beyond the shadow of any doubt, as Mr. VORYS pointed out, that the American people do not believe anything is too good for our fighting men. If they need our meat, they can have it. If they need our shoes, they can have them. If they need our money, they can have it. Anything which the Army needs to win this war it should have and must have and will have.

But in Dayton, as in Columbus, a lot of people have never understood why some of these office officers have come to town to act as though they owned the place. Some of them, of course, would give their own right arm if they could go on active service, and this criticism does not apply to them. Others, however, know perfectly well that they are going to sit in a swivel chair until the last shot is fired. Consequently, they have taken particular pains to set up their offices in the best buildings on the best streets in Dayton, moving civilians out with little notice and great inconvenience. And for a long time it was a standing joke in Dayton that the only businessman sure of keeping his premises was the fellow who did not have an elevator in his building—because these office officers had no intention of walking up a flight of stairs even to win a war.

In joining in this criticism by Mr. VORYS, we want to make it plain, too, that we have no complaint against those officers who are conscientiously doing their duty on assignments at home. They have important work to do, and we are proud that much of it is being done in Dayton. But that doesn't excuse those fascist-minded individuals who think they can start pushing civilians around as soon as they put on a uniform.

Nebraska Aeronautics Commission Members Are Trained and Experienced Aviators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, I discussed the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the accomplishments of our Civilian Pilot Training program. The latter is now renamed the War Training Service program. I then stated that Nebraska was first among the States to have an organized private aviation school. I also indicated that the Nebraska Aeronautics Commission has cooperated in every respect with the C. A. A., the Army, and the Navy to carry out a program of aviation which would be effective during wartime and peacetime. At this time, I would like to include in my remarks a brief biography of each member of the Nebraska Aeronautics Commission. They are trained and experienced aviators, and I am glad to furnish this information about them:

Harold N. Jessen was appointed to the Nebraska Aeronautics Commission in 1942 for 4 years; since January 1934, he has been acting chairman of the commission. He resides at Ainsworth, Nebr., and his business is that of mortician.

Mr. Jessen had his first airplane ride in 1919, and from then on, he would take a bit of flying time as the money allowed. In those days students paid $25 and $30 an hour for time, and it was rather tough going for a boy trying to get through school. Mr. Jessen received his license in 1931, and from then on was flying most of the time until 1935. In 1935, he sold his ship, thinking that it would be possible to forget all about flying; however, he soon discovered that that was an impossibility, and that he would fly every time the opportunity presented itself, and in 1942, Governor Griswold appointed him a member of the Nebraska Aeronautics Commission. Although this busy Nebraska businessman finds that it takes considerable time to carry out his duties as chairman of this commission, he enjoys the work very much. In discussing aviation, Mr. Jessen has this to say:

I am sorry that it took a war to show the world the possibilities of aircraft, but I do think from now on air transportation will step into its place.

Samuel M. Kier is the city attorney of our State capital, Lincoln, Nebr., where he was born on September 19, 1895. He attended the University of Nebraska during the years 1915–17 and 1919–20. He learned to fly at Arcadia, Fla., in 1918. Mr. Kier is a commercial pilot—145–435 horsepower rating, certificate No. 8923. He was appointed to the Nebraska Aeronautics Commission in 1941 for a term of 4 years. He has a distinguished military record, being a flying cadet and Reserve officer in the United States Army in 1917–18.

Donald D. Mapes is an attorney at Norfolk, Nebr. He was appointed to the Nebraska Aeronautics Commission in 1943 to fill the unexpired term of Commissioner E. J. Robins, of Fremont, Nebr., who is now facility security officer in the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Mr. Mapes volunteered to take pilot training in the last World War, and in June 1917, after passing his physical examination was sent to Austin, Tex., for ground school at the University of Texas. He took his primary flying at Ellington Field, Tex., and later took courses prescribed at Post Field, Okla., and Taleferro Field, Tex. The last was an aerial gunnery school, and from there he was sent to France, where he took bombing instructions at the seventh area instruction center, Clermont-Ferrand, France. Upon completion of that course, Mr. Mapes was given a position at that field as an instructor and continued in that capacity until he was assigned to the One Hundredth Aerial Squadron. After he returned from France in February 1919 Mr. Mapes did barnstorming in northeast Nebraska during the summer and fall of 1919 and the spring of 1920.

Mr. Mapes has always been interested in aviation as a means of transportation, and he sincerely feels that after this war we will see great development in this field, and that towns and cities having proper airport facilities will have a tremendous advantage over other centers.

Clyde M. Sharrar is district traffic manager of the United Air Lines Transport Corporation, Omaha, Nebr. He was born at Hooper, Nebr., in 1903. Mr. Sharrar received his bachelor of science degree from the University of Nebraska in 1926 and entered the employment of United Air Lines in 1930. In 1935 he was appointed to the Nebraska Aeronautics Commission and is now serving his third appointment.

Harold P. Sutton is an optometrist, merchant, farmer, and livestock feeder, living at McCook, Nebr. He was born at Ainsworth, Nebr., April 29, 1888. In September 1917 he enlisted in the Signal Enlisted Reserve Corps, Aviation Section, and was commissioned a second lieutenant at North Island, San Diego, Calif., March 8, 1918. He had a pursuit pilot rating. Mr. Sutton was dual and cross-country instructor, gunnery pilot instructor, assistant chief instructor, School of Aerial Gunnery, Taleferro Field No. 1, Hicks, Tex. Mr. Sutton had 15 months of active service in World War No. 1, and was discharged at Port of Embarkation, Garden City, Long Island, N. Y., December 12, 1918. He was a member of the United States Officers' Reserve Corps, Air Service, and was discharged December 12, 1932, as a first lieutenant.

Mr. Sutton was appointed to the Nebraska Aeronautics Commission in 1942 to fill the unexpired term of Commissioner D. W. Kingsley, of Hastings, Nebr., who is now serving as a major in the United States Army.

The Late Daniel C. Roper

REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, have requested this time to announce to the House the death of an outstanding and distinguished South Carolinian. I refer to Daniel C. Roper, who had been residing in Washington for a number of years. He was not only prominent and interested in the affairs of South Carolina, but in national affairs. He was well known to many Members of the House and Senate. I am sure in connection with the operation of the Government of this country as well as in solving many important problems, before the country at this time that this outstanding South Carolinian will be missed.

Daniel C. Roper was born in Marlboro County, S. C., April 1, 1867, the son of John Wesley and Henrietta V. Roper. His intellectual qualifications were recognized, and at 25 he was elected to the State Legislature of South Carolina, and 2 years later, in 1897, he came to Washington as clerk of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee. It was his first step up the high ladder of Washington preferment.

He was a man of character and vision. He believed in and served a Supreme Being. No other man of his time was more motivated by more notably honorable intentions than Daniel C. Roper. He was a man gifted with patience and kindness. He sought the fulfillment of his purposes by tactful procedures. Mr. Roper was a person of rigid principles and firm convictions. The notion that people might prosper without faith in the supremacy of Divine Providence in the universe was repugnant to him. It was his reasoned judgment that poverty, disease and crime in the world increased in the ratio of neglect of Christian teaching.

Mr. Roper, who always took an active interest in the civil life of Washington, was the first president of the Sixteenth Street Heights Citizens' Association. He was at the time of his death a vice president of the Association of Oldest Inhabitants and a director of the Federation of Churches. He also served as honorary chairman of the United China Relief drive and the Russian War Relief.

He prospered in both Republican and Democratic administrations. When McKinley was President, he became special agent and investigator of the Census Bureau from 1900 to 1910. For 3 years he was clerk of the House Ways and Means Committee.

The arrival of Woodrow Wilson in the White House meant this South Carolina Democrat's elevation. He served as First Assistant Postmaster General, Vice Chairman of the Tariff Commission, and Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in the administration of President Wilson, gaining experience both in Government routine and in politics which won for him the position of Secretary of Commerce in the Cabinet of President Roosevelt. Mr. Roper was known as a conservative in the New Deal administration. He left the Cabinet on December 23, 1938, explaining that personal affairs needed his attention.

On May 1, 1939, Mr. Roosevelt named him Minister to Canada, where he greeted the King and Queen of England in the name of the United States. His tour of diplomacy was but a temporary assignment. Mr. Roper left the American Legation at Ottawa in September of that year, and from that time until his last illness he practiced law in the city of Washington.

The church was ever close to Mr. Roper's heart. He was a member of the general conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1930, and of the sixth ecumenical conference in 1931. He served as trustee of Duke University and the American University; wore the key of Phi Beta Kappa, honorary scholastic fraternity; and belonged to Sigma Alpha Epsilon, collegiate fraternity. He was a thirty-second degree Mason. He held honorary degrees from Tusculum College, LL. D., 1927; National University, LL. D., 1933; and Rollins College, L. H. D., 1934.

His attitude to me was one of friendliness, and I extend to his family in this sad hour my deepest sympathy, with this additional thought, I am sure that we will have the privilege of seeing and being with him again.

Doughton Praised for Opposition to Ruml's "Raid-As-You-Go" Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial which recently appeared in the April 10 issue of Labor, the official publication of the railroad brotherhoods, Representative ROBERT DOUGHTON, fighting chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, is roundly praised for his vigorous and most effective opposition to the fantastic tax-gypping proposal of Banker (Windy) Ruml, recently defeated in the House of Representatives after one of the stormiest sessions in the history of Congress.

As the praise of his course which is contained in the highly-influential journal is well deserved and should be given wider circulation, I ask that it may be spread upon the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my instant remarks.

Unanimous consent being indicated, the article follows:

RICH ARE STILL PUSHING FOR "RAID-AS-YOU-GO" TAX PLAN—ADVOCATES OF $10,000,000,000 MILKING OF TREASURY KEEP UP FIGHT—DOUGHTON INSISTS RUML SCHEME IS DEAD

Propagandists are still beating the tomtoms for tax forgiveness, through the Ruml plan or something like it. The newspapers are pounding for action, and friends of the rich in the House threaten to resort to a discharge petition if the Ways and Means Committee does not quickly report out legislation.

Fortunately for the Treasury, advocates of the $10,000,000,000 raid are up against a stone wall—in the person of Chairman BOB DOUGHTON, sturdy North Carolina mountaineer, who insists the Ruml plan is dead and will stay dead the remainder of the year.

Supporters of the Ruml plan are anxious that some kind of legislation be reported and put through, confident that when it reaches the Senate they will get a favorable response from the Finance Committee.

SENATE'S HANDS TIED

The Constitution gives the House the sole right to originate revenue legislation, and until that body acts, the Senate's hands are tied.

DOUGHTON is determined that the question shall be permitted to rest until late in the summer, when general tax legislation will be brought in. It will carry a pay-as-you-go plan, applicable next year, but it will not take a $10,000,000,000 slice out of Government revenues.

Before action can be completed on the measure DOUGHTON has in mind, this year will be so far gone that forgiveness of 1942 taxes will be out of the question.

So far as pay-as-you-go taxes are concerned, everybody is for them. DOUGHTON was one of the original advocates. But he is emphatically against a raid-as-you-go scheme, such as the Rumlites demand.

Virtually all the arguments for tax forgiveness were knocked into a cocked hat during the debate that preceded defeat of the Ruml plan in the House, but still another talking point has been blasted by the Treasury Department.

AMERICANS ARE NOT TAX DODGERS

The Rumlites contended that unless taxes were forgiven there would be widespread default by taxpayers. They pictured our prisons as being overrun with delinquents. The fact is that John Q. Citizen is a better American than the Rumlites conceived.

The Treasury disclosed that more than 50,000,000 tax returns have been filed, with the tabulation still in progress. Those who acknowledged their obligation constituted more than half of the entire adult population. That's mighty good, when it is remembered that the big majority of returns represent at least two adults—husband and wife.

Tax receipts for the fiscal year up to March 29 were $10,099,012,429, just about double the amount the Treasury had taken in at the same time last year.

Jefferson and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, today the Nation properly celebrated the two

hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, one of the great galaxy of statesmen who were instrumental in building the foundation of our country. His contributions to constitutional government constitute a priceless heritage with which every American citizen should become familiar.

Thomas Jefferson was not only the author of the Declaration of Independence but held high governmental positions in the Republic from that of governorship of a State to the Presidency of the Nation. While Thomas Jefferson did not participate in the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention held in Philadelphia in 1787, because he was then representing the United States as Minister to France, he did contribute to the Constitution as the author of the first 10 amendments, properly called America's Bill of Rights. Because of the important and significant position that Jefferson occupies in constitutional government, it would be well if every American citizen would pause in the midst of a busy life and devote some time to the study of the American Constitution, generally admitted to be by practically all historians the greatest political document ever penned by man.

Every American citizen should be a devoted advocate of the American Constitution, because every right we possess, either local or State or national, rests fundamentally upon that great document. In these days when we hear so much of radicalism and of freely expressed communistic thought, would it not be wise for us to briefly review the fundamental concepts of the American Constitution, which has so successfully swayed the destiny of this Nation since its origin?

May I turn back the pages of history 156 years to the Constitutional Convention? The time was May 25, 1787; the place, the statehouse at Philadelphia, then a little town of not more than 30,000 people. The Convention met in a hall 50 feet square, whose walls were already eloquent with sacred memories. There the Second Continental Congress had met and there the Declaration of Independence had been signed.

Seventy-two leading men of the Colonies had been originally chosen from the several States as delegates to this Convention. All of the States were represented except Rhode Island, which would have nothing to do with the Constitutional Convention. The greatest actual attendance of delegates from the 12 Colonies was 55, and at the end of the Convention only 39 remained to finish a work which was to make them immortal.

This notable group of men contained merchants, financiers, farmers, doctors, educators, soldiers, and lawyers. Washington was unanimously chosen as President of the assembly, and for 4 months, behind closed doors, the 55 men who attended devoted their thoughts to their country.

It was a young man's convention, the average age being only 40. Franklin was 81, Washington 55, Madison 36, Randolph 34, Hamilton 30, Charles C. Pinckney 29, and Dayton, of New Jersey, 27, the youngest man in the convention.

Out of those 55 men, 39 had been members of either the First or Second Continental Congress; out of those 55 men, 8 had helped to build the constitutions of their own States; out of that 55 men, 24 of them were college graduates; out of that 55 men, 31 of them were lawyers.

Many great and momentous problems came before the Constitutional Convention and at times the leaders were in despair as to the results, but after 4 months, on the 15th day of September 1787, the great American Constitution was perfected.

The Convention had been in session for 81 continuous days, probably consuming over 400 hours of actual debate. The original Constitution as completed, consisted only of 4,000 words, 89 sentences, and 140 distinct provisions, and even including the 21 amendments, the Constitution, after 154 years of development, does not exceed 7,000 words. Sixty-five powers are given to the Federal Government by this great document and 79 are withheld, of which 13 are denied both to the Government and to the constituent States.

Many tributes have been made with reference to the American Constitution. James Bryce, the great English statesman and author of the American Commonwealth, says:

> The American Constitution is the greatest political document ever penned by man.

And Calvin Coolidge, in his foreword to Beck's American Constitution, says:

> The Constitution of the United States is the final refuge of every right that is enjoyed by any American citizen. To live under the American Constitution is the greatest political privilege that was ever accorded the human race.

It is especially important in these days of unrest and of depression to become students of the great fundamental law. It has been our guiding genius for 154 years from the time when our country consisted of only 3,000,000 of people along the Atlantic seaboard to today with its more than 132,000,000 of people.

But no government can be automatic; it depends upon the intelligence, the integrity, and the loyalty of her citizens. Every American citizen today should study his Constitution. That great body of laws can be read in only 30 minutes of time, and yet it contains every right that we have, direct and indirect.

There are several basic principles underlying our Constitution.

First. It establishes a representative form of government.

Second. It establishes a dual form of government, each citizen living under two forms of government, the National and the State.

Third. It guarantees to its citizens individual liberty, freedom of speech, liberty of the press, right to own property, the right to worship God according to the dictates of our conscience.

Fourth. It establishes an independent judiciary and created the great Supreme Court, which has well been called the safety valve of the American Constitution and is pronounced by critics as the greatest intellectual forum in the world.

Fifth. It prevents the concentration of power in the hands of one man or a group of men by checks and balances, creating the three departments of government—the legislative, the judicial, and the executive—each department independent and yet cooperating with each other to the working of a harmonious government. This provision of our Constitution has been the safeguard of the Nation in the days agone, and the perpetuity of our institutions in the future depends upon the independence of these three functions of government.

Sixth. And, finally, it places in the hands of the President and the Senate joint power in determining the foreign affairs of our Nation.

I think that every citizen interested in his country will agree with me when I say that to know the fundamental law of his land, as embodied in the Constitution, should be a part of a necessary and liberal education. This is particularly true today when more than 8,000,000 fine American boys are in military service fighting for, among other things, the preservation of their constitutional form of government.

Pvt. Winburn E. Hendrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK NICHOLS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Winburn E. Hendrick, who for some time has served as the librarian of the House, has answered the call of his country and is now serving as a buck private at Fort Eustis, Va.

While there have been many statements about employees of Government departments seeking deferment in order to continue their work, Mr. Hendrick did not do this, though he is married and has a child about a year old. When his country called, he marched away to do his part, and I am sure that his service will be such that the House of Representatives will be honored.

Mr. Hendrick came to Washington from Tahlequah, Okla., in my district, and his brother Gerald is a bombardier in the Air Corps.

It is a pleasure for me to take this brief time to pay tribute to the fine patriotic spirit of these young men.

Labels for Canned Goods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I en-

close the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of April 7, 1943:

On February 26, Prentiss M. Brown, Price Administrator, said that grade labeling of canned goods was necessary to safeguard price ceilings. The buyer could not know whether or not ceilings were being observed, he said, unless the can bore a grade label.

Now it develops that Mr. Brown was proposing a grade label instead of a brand label. Most consumers, we imagine, supposed that he was suggesting the grade label as an additional rather than as a substitute protection.

It is true, of course, that the brand label does not tell the new customer much, but it is also true that the grade label does not give the consumer all the information he desires. The grade label on peas, for example, tells something of the size and condition of the peas when packed. It does not, however, tell anything of the methods and responsibility of the canner. Grade A peas from one cannery may be superior to the same grade from another.

Consumers have a right to demand both grade and brand designations on every can of food offered for sale. If a customer has come to like grade A "Whoosis" peas, he should be in a position to get grade A "Whoosis" peas again, if they are available. He should not be told, in effect, that all grade A peas are alike and it is none of his business who put them up. He knows better and the Government should also know better.

So let's have grade labels and brand labels. There is nothing incompatible about the combination. In fact, only through the combination can the public's interest be fully safeguarded.

Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter addressed to me by a distinguished and able member of the Philadelphia bar, Leon J. Obermayer, Esq., who contributes some valuable suggestions based upon his connection with the Selective Service System since October 1940. Mr. Obermayer speaks from personal experience and observation and from a desire to improve the operation of the system. I trust that his suggestions will receive consideration and that constructive action will be taken to eliminate the disturbing inequities which still prevail in some phases of the system's operation:

PHILADELPHIA, *April 2, 1943.*

Hon. HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUGH: As chairman of a local selective service board, I am becoming a great deal disturbed about the present draft situation, and I felt I could give you the benefit of my conclusions so that you can use them for what they are worth in connection with any legislation which may be considered in Congress.

Local boards are now drafting married men without children, which is the first step in breaking up the fine family tradition that has become the essence of America. The regulation providing that any child born after September 23, 1942, irrespective of the time of the parents' marriage, is not considered a dependent, results in many practical inequalities. Thus a man married 5 years ago, whose wife may not have been able to have children, or the children may be deceased, may have a child born after September 23, 1942, which child is not considered a dependent, and we are drafting the man. Just how the wife and infant child will get along on an allotment of $62 a month apparently is immaterial. Mothers who expect to have children in the next few months are in exactly the same position.

Apparently the selective service officials are planning very soon to draft married men with children, and based upon the number of registrants available for induction, I think it is quite likely that most selective service boards will be required to draft married men with children by July unless some other procedure is adopted.

This brings me to the chief basis of complaint about the present situation. Based upon a connection with the Selective Service System since October 1940 and a fairly conscientious effort to keep in touch with both registrants, industries, and the community, I am firmly of the opinion that the breaking up of American homes could be easily avoided if industry were compelled to surrender to Selective Service the very large number of men in industry who ought to be in the armed forces. I am told that in every large war industry in Philadelphia there are a large number of men between the ages of 18 and 30, single, healthy, and with no dependents, who should be drafted into the armed forces, but are being deferred in order to work in the industries. I am told that no effort is being made in a great many industries to replace these men either by women or married men with children, because industry does not want to be disturbed in meeting its required production schedules. I am told that in many of the war industries there are innumerable men who could be replaced by women or nondraftable men, who could be trained within a week or a month to take the place of the draftable men in industry.

Very little effort is being made to bring about this result. Manning tables have been adopted in a great many of the industries, but up to the present time, they have not resulted in releasing very many men for the service. Most of them provide for deferments for many months, and I am convinced that these deferments are much longer than is required. A great many Philadelphia industries have not yet adopted the Manning tables, and are continuing to keep employed draftable young men, because no pressure is being brought on them to replace these draftable young men.

The problem of course is complicated by the fact that there is still a very large number of employees in large war industries in Philadelphia. An executive of one of the large industries told me that they employed 300 men each week and lose 200 each week, and that most of this loss does not arise from Selective Service. Most of it arises from employees getting permission from the Manpower Commission to change their jobs on the flimsiest of pretexts. At least the result is that workmen are moving around a great deal more in a city like Philadelphia where there are many war industries in and about the city.

I fully appreciate the difficulties of the situation, and I know that they are not easily solved. On the other hand, I am jealous of maintaining the family relationships as long as it is possible to do so in order that our children may have the benefit of a father's care and training. For that reason, I am hopeful that something can be done which will bring to the Army the young healthy men without dependents who ought to be in the army, and their places taken by married men or women. As I see it, this is the only possible solution of the problem, and I do not see any active efforts being made to solve it in this manner.

With cordial personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

LEON J. OBERMAYER.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I also include herewith a most interesting article from the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 7, 1943, and a report in the Germantown Telegraph of April 2, 1943, of a letter addressed to me by Lawrence E. Boutin, public-relations officer of Houston Post of the American Legion. The two articles follow:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 7, 1943]

HUSBANDS DRAFTED WHILE SINGLE MEN REMAIN

(By Kos Semonski)

A total of 1,300 occupationally deferred young single men are listed by 3 local draft boards in south Philadelphia, although 2 of the boards have included married men in the April quota and the third plans to take them in May.

This condition in south Philadelphia is not an isolated one, a survey by the Inquirer has revealed, but, rather, is indicative of a general situation throughout the city, which will result in the first large-scale calling of married men into the services in May.

FIFTEEN THOUSAND SINGLE MEN DEFERRED

This, in turn, means that May will bring the first widespread breaking up of homes and the resultant dislocations of family life, 1 draft board official said, although 15,000 young single men are still deferred for occupational reasons.

Almost all of the 85 boards have indicated they will be forced to complete quotas with married men next month. Most of these boards still have hundreds of single men who could be used.

RECLASSIFICATION STARTS

As an example, a Germantown board has begun to reclassify married men, with the idea of using them for the May quota, although it has 400 men deferred. If these single men were called, a board member pointed out, it would postpone induction of married men without children for about 4 months, assuming normal quotas are asked.

One Germantown and one West Philadelphia board are filling April quotas with single men who have collateral dependents and will then call on its married men.

ENOUGH FOR APRIL

Three other West Philadelphia boards have enough single men for April, another has enough to last them through June, and still a fifth reported a large supply still available. This board is in a large-family neighborhood and its occupational deferments total only 75.

Two boards in the northeast still have large supplies of single men. One will not have to take married men until July, although it has already sent 2,130 men into service, and the other has enough single men and men with collateral dependents to make up normal quotas for April, May, and June.

FIFTY PERCENT ARE MARRIED

On the other hand, in a different type of section, Chestnut Hill, 1 board filled 50 percent of its April quota with married men, although single occupational deferments had been whittled down to 70.

Another board there, although cutting down on its 300 occupational deferments,

has been forced to take some married men in April and probably will not even be able to fill its May quota with married men without children, if the quota is large.

Married men will be taken in May by 2 Germantown boards in defense areas, where there are 450 occupational deferments. A northeast board will take married men this month, although it has 200 occupational deferments. In a north Philadelphia board, with 150 occupational deferments, married men are being called now.

Boards calling on married men in April also include four in north Philadelphia, two in the northeast, and one in south Philadelphia.

DEFERRED STUDENTS

One of those in north Philadelphia has some high-school students deferred until June 10 and occupational deferments totaling 300. Board employees feel that 50 of these, at least, should have been inducted some time ago.

Another of these boards has a chief clerk who firmly believes that married men should not be taken "because they are the backbone of the Nation, the ones who buy furniture and homes. They make poor soldiers, anyway." The married men are being called despite the fact that 175 single men are on the deferred list.

WILL FIGHT DRAFTING

A Germantown board is equally emphatic, insisting that it intends to fight to keep married men from being called at such an early date.

Impact of the widespread calling of married men will be felt keenly in the section covered by one board in the northeast. It is a "young" neighborhood, with many newly married couples, paying for new homes and without children. It will probably take some of these husbands in May, although it has 500 deferments, which it has begun to reclassify.

A south Philadelphia board has 300 occupational deferments, but it was forced to take married men this month and is receiving a great number of appeals principally from men who have had children recently.

[From the Germantown Telegraph of April 2, 1943]

POST DENOUNCES DRAFT DODGERS

In a letter to Congressman HUGH SCOTT, Jr., over the draft dodgers in America, Houston Post said, in part:

"According to current reports the House Military Affairs subcommittee in conference with Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, has finally concurred with our previous findings. Their estimate is that 1,000,000 men are deferred from draft, without justification. They also estimate 150,000 men of draft age are to be found on Government pay rolls in Washington.

"Since Pearl Harbor, this post has manned 24 hours every day, 7 days every week, an aircraft warning service post for the United States Army. How do you think the 192 members serving on a roof top in all kinds of weather for no pay feel about those who are avoiding the draft? How do you think their 800,000 coworkers in the aircraft warning service feel about this?

"It is not helpful to the morale to see others avoiding the draft, and getting paid $10, $15, or $20 per day while doing so. This is happening, and we know it. The manufacturers, doctors, carpenters, lawyers, bricklayers, bankers, and businessmen who make up the 1,367 membership of this post are interested in seeing America win, not only the war and the peace, but also the right to continue the American way that has made America the beacon light of the entire world.

"We look to Congress to assert its prerogatives and to provide a leadership behind which the people may rally to bring the desired victory."

LAWRENCE E. BOUTIN,
Public Relations Officer.

Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut Memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture Concerning an Increase in the Ceiling Prices of Dairy Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks, I insert a copy of a resolution adopted by the Connecticut General Assembly memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture concerning an increase in the ceiling prices of dairy products. I sincerely hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will, in the very near future, grant relief to the dairy farmers in Connecticut.

Unless something is done to aid these farmers, it is simply a matter of a short time until many of these fine herds will have to be sold.

The resolution follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
January Session A. D. 1943.

Resolution memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture concerning an increase in the ceiling prices of dairy products

Whereas the food situation grows more acute daily, this being particularly true of the milk supply necessary to meet the requirements of our greatly increased population; and

Whereas dairy farmers are going out of business at an alarming rate owing to the shortage of skilled farm labor, feed, fertilizer, and farm machinery, and to inadequate prices to meet the increased cost of production; and

Whereas some immediate action must be taken to remedy this situation and give encouragement to our remaining dairy farmers to carry on in this grave national food crisis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Connecticut General Assembly respectfully requests Secretary Wickard, the Office of Price Administration, and all other governmental agencies involved in the production and distribution of food to take immediate action to eliminate the existing shortage of milk by establishing price ceilings that will make it possible for Connecticut dairy farmers to meet production costs and to continue in business; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, Price Administrator Brown, and each of the Connecticut Members in Congress.

The Freedoms of Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. SMITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this 13th day of April 1943 marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia statute of religious freedom, founder of the University of Virginia, and twice President of the United States. Emulating the noble example of Gen. George Washington, and for the same profound reasons, he declined the third term in the Presidency and retired to his home at Monticello, in Albemarle County, Va.

I have the honor to represent the congressional district in which he was born, and spent his declining years.

His home, Monticello, where he died, looks down upon the University of Virginia, the great educational institution which he founded and supervised with pride to the day of his death.

The profound and simple principles of democratic government which he expounded and gave to the world have abided in and been cherished by the people of Virginia through the ensuing generations. Our people, with simple faith, have embraced Jefferson's principles of democratic, free government. They have believed that those principles contain the elements necessary for a lasting democracy of a free people. They view with apprehension and suspicion the innovations that depart from or curtail the fundamental rules of free government that he expounded. So popular have become his beliefs that every political party, and every shade of political philosophy, now seeks to square its doctrines with those of Jefferson. This is particularly true on this day when in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of his birth, we dedicate in the Nation's Capital a lasting memorial and monument to the man and to the great principles which he enunciated.

Those who seek to emulate the principles of Jefferson will not attain that goal until they understand the simplicity of the Jeffersonian conception of freedom. It was not freedom from any particular categories of tyranny or oppression; it was not freedom from some stated evil that momentarily afflicted the peoples of the world; it was simply freedom. All-embracing freedom for each and every citizen; not a freedom circumscribed, narrow, and defined by the laws and usages of man but the simple freedom that God gave to every individual; namely, every right and every liberty that did not transcend the equal liberties of his neighbor.

To undertake to catalog and inventory the freedoms of Jefferson is but to limit and minimize those freedoms.

Every requirement of government that unnecessarily or arbitrarily restricts and regulates the citizen is a curtailment and a denial of the freedoms expounded by Jefferson.

I believe it is not out of place on this day to direct attention to the modern tendencies that are curtailing and destroying the freedoms enunciated by Jefferson; even as we proclaim our devotion and attachment to those principles.

How far have we strayed today from his admonition that "were we directed from Washington when to sow, and when to reap, we should soon want bread"?

How can we boast of the freedoms expounded by Jefferson when we reach out with the long arm of autocratic, Federal bureaucracy to govern and control the simplest everyday functions of the individual citizen? How can we square with Jefferson's conception of freedom the maze of present-day rules, regulations, and directives imposed upon the daily lives of our people without authority from the constituted law-making arm of our Government?

How can we proclaim our adherence to Jeffersonian principles on the one hand while on the other we trample underfoot the rights of local self-government expressly reserved to the States under the Constitution we have sworn to uphold?

Of all the freedoms inherent in any system of free government, none is paramount to the God-given right to work and earn a living for ourselves and our families without toll or tribute to any man or organization of men. And yet, on this day, when we give lip-service to freedom, our Government denies to the workers of the Nation the right to work unless they pay tribute to private organizations, that by the exercise of political and economic terrorism have set themselves above all constituted authority.

Let us embrace this opportunity to reflect soberly upon our modern departures from the freedoms expounded by Jefferson. We should firmly resolve to return to our adherence to the fundamental liberties guaranteed by the Constitution, both in spirit and in letter; or we should frankly proclaim the freedoms of Jefferson to be obsolete and outmoded.

Honest statesmanship requires open adherence to one principle or the other. No mental gymnastics and flamboyant oratory can reconcile the two.

For my part, I choose the reaction of Jefferson in preference to the radicalism of the present-day policies.

The Day We Celebrate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER A. LYNCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, for 159 years the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in New York have, on the 17th of March, celebrated the feast day of their patron saint. On that day, for over a century and a half, the Friendly Sons, with their guests, have gathered at the banquet table, where Irish wit and humor reached the heights and yet where there was always that strong and evident feeling of faith, loyalty, and patriotism that so characterizes Americans of Irish birth or Irish blood.

On the 17th of March last, 2,000 Friendly Sons with their guests gathered at Hotel Astor in New York City, and when the banquet was over listened with rapt attention to the distinguished scholar and brilliant orator, Brother C. Edward, F. S. C., vice president of Manhattan College.

Prefacing his own remarks, the Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Frank Knox, stated:

Before I launch upon this little speech of mine, I should like to thank you, Mr. President, for bringing me here so that I might listen to that fine address to which we have all just listened. I have rarely heard one of greater spiritual quality or more inspirational value.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein the response of Brother Edward to the toast The Day We Celebrate:

Mr. President, terrifyingly distinguished guests, Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, and your friends, with that peculiar sense of humor possessed only by those who are Irish either in origin or in inclination [laughter], the Friendly Sons invite me to a table positively groaning under the weight of excellent food and choice beverages and, then, to make sure that I can't avail myself of such lavishness, they tell me I have to make a speech. Well, thanks to the legacy of my sheep-stealing ancestors [laughter and applause], I can cooperate with the inevitable and, with Mrs. Malaprop, I shall strive manfully to "illiterate" the episode from my memory.

Throughout practically this entire day, the canyons of Gotham were martial and merry with strains of music from fifes and drums and pipes and bands of brass. The air was green in a pageant of banners and flags which livened our hearts with the freshness of sudden spring. The streets of Gotham echoed with the cadence of marching brigades swinging along to anthem and song of Father O'Flynn, O'Donnell Aboo, Garry Owen, and St. Patrick's Day in the Morning. And this great city of the blase and the disillusioned forgot for a few hours that it is supposed to be the acme of sophistication and surrendered itself to soul-stirring exhilaration. No need to ask why. The shamrocks were growing on Broadway, every girl was an Irish colleen, and the town of New York was the county of Cork—all in tribute to the day we celebrate. [Applause.]

As I proceed with some trepidation to respond to the toast, The Day We Celebrate, I am reminded immediately of your sainted patron's constant prayer: "Wherefore may it never happen to me from my God that I should lose His people whom He has gained in the ends of the earth." Among those millions he has helped in gaining St. Patrick must have a special predilection for his Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, who, for over 150 years, have been gathering annually to sing his praises to renew their pledges of loyalty to him, and to think back wistfully to their noble heritage. And, tonight, from some glorious mansion in the heavenly kingdom, St. Patrick must be looking down upon his people, particularly his Friendly Sons, and, a little saddened and a little worried, he must be only too well aware of the fact that, once again, his cherished ones are dispersed to the "ends of the earth."

It is not too fanciful to think that on this, his day, St. Patrick has secured for his absent sons a little time for dreaming. What must they see in their dreams, wherever they are, at this moment, while we here are trying to recapture the glories of the land which St. Patrick had purged from the reptile slime of pagan grossness? They see, perhaps, this splendid gathering or others similar to it in many of the cities of our great country and they take renewed courage from the thought that such things can still be; that the freedoms for which they are fighting, and bleeding, and dying, are actualities, at least here at home, actualities which must be preserved and perpetuated. [Applause.] And, perhaps too, they see Patrick once again descending the Hill of Tara and plucking the shamrock, into which, in their musings, they read a new symbolism.

It is for them the joyous reminder of the faith, the confidence, and the love which are characteristic of every loyal Friendly Son and which elicit the admiration of all who care to see. Let us, you and I, join them in their dreaming. They may, indeed, even feel our presence and, somehow, drink with us our toast to The Day We Celebrate.

Who can blame these dreamers if the qualities recalled by the sight of Patrick make them thrill with the thought that these qualities are not merely a surface veneer, a something superimposed for the purpose of facing the world with brainless bluster or sugary sentimentality? These qualities are in the blood of them, blood in which they glory, not after the manner of some race-worshipping maniac, but which they hold in reverence because it has coursed through the veins of the world's best-remembered saints and scholars; because it has been shed upon a thousand fields of battle and never yet found wanting; because it has never been offered in an evil, treacherous, or dishonest cause. [Applause.] And, that blood surges up in them tonight to bid them be steadfast in their faith, renewed in their confidence, and courageous in their love.

There would be no point in retelling for them or for you the melancholy tale of mother Ireland's centuries of misery. The simplest reference to them startles us with the realization that a people could have lived through them and yet come to take her appointed place among the respected nations of the earth. And, how could that be? Because Irishmen from time beyond time had had the faith, faith in the destiny of their motherland; faith that a divine providence would not let divinized humanity completely forget its origins; faith that what Patrick lived and died for must have a continuity because Patrick had prayed that it might be so. [Applause.]

But there is another kind of faith which wells up in every Friendly Son's heart tonight whether he is here among those he knows and loves or whether he is fondly dreaming under some strange sky. Faith in the workableness of the American system of democracy, faith in the applicability of the American way of life. And this faith is not mere gullibility born of stupidity, nor yet is it pure naïveté born of an unwillingness to understand. Allied to his traditional sense of humor, the Friendly Son has a most accurate sense of proportion. He refuses to deny the occasional depravity of the few and he will not close his eyes to the knowledge that treachery may be nurtured from within as well as from without. He is endowed with that foresight which gives a man to see that idols of gold may have feet implanted in clay.

He has seen the principles he revered openly flouted by those whom he loved. He has seen that selflessness is a very beautiful term but an all-too-infrequent accomplishment. He has seen that publicity is too often considered an adequate substitute for worth, for merit, for value. He has seen that the heart may be poisoned while the head is being bludgeoned into submission; that the body may be bartered while the soul is being enslaved. He knows that few, very few, are totally unaffected by the accursed greed for gold, or fame, or power.

He sees all this. He knows all this. And yet he is undaunted by it all. The contemplation of all the imperfections of our democratic system does not lead him to curse that system out of hand and go chasing after other systems held out to him as panaceas. On the contrary, faith—eternal, unshakable, ineradicable faith—will urge him to flay the unhappy mortals who distort the system for their own selfish purposes. And that same faith will induce him to surround with the aureola of divinity, institutions and ideals for which men will not only die but will be willing to live. And so, the ringing challenges of our historic documents are for the Friendly Son not empty formulas or principles of confusion. They are defiances to a man's faith and the faithful Friendly Son meets that defiance, smiles, and tells himself: "I will cleave to them. In spite of treason, and deceit, and betrayal, I will cleave to them. They are good." [Applause.]

But, faith without confidence is either wishful thinking or willful self-deception. And, what virtue more natural to the loyal Friendly Son than the comforting virtue of confidence? The formation of his intellect has been aided by the traditions resident in his race, the everlasting defenders and preservers of knowledge. His blood has been enriched as it has come down to him from the generations which preceded him. His soul has been purified by the myriad sufferings of his ancestors. His body has been strengthened and hardened by the love of labor which has always typified those from whom he has sprung. And this combination of intellect, blood, soul, and body has endowed him with what some consider the very essence of knowledge, the knowledge of himself. It forces him to realize his possibilities and challenges him to balance his "what he has done" against his "what he ought to have done." Further, it turns the spotlight upon his limitations, shows him that there are fields of endeavor and thought into which he cannot enter and, therefore, that there are the rights and the achievements of others which he can neither ignore nor attempt to frustrate. With this realization of his possibilities and his limitations he looks upon the life which stretches out before him and is confident that, for him, it can become or can remain something to which one day he will look back with joy, gratitude, and self-respect. He knows that his lofty ideals, his noble aspirations, his constant industry, his well-controlled and well-directed imagination, his adaptability to service and to sacrifice will see him safely through whatever storms may beset him on his journey to eternity and he is confident, supremely confident, that at the end of the long, long road there will be the proverbial rainbow beckoning him to enjoy the peace and happiness which are rightfully his.

The two, faith and confidence, unallied with love, could, and most likely would, become little more than a mockery. I may disappoint you here as I leave to your own thoughts and remembrances those innumerable tales of the Irishman's love, of "when first he went a-wooing," or of "when first he saw sweet Peggy," and those other songs and stories which give to the Irishman his lightness of heart, his brightness of eye, and his nimbleness of foot in the dance. Those are merely the exterior manifestations of the love which I consider inseparable from the "good moral character" which you make one of the requirements for membership in your society.

That love is the total and irrevocable acceptance of what is good, and noble, and lofty, and inspiring, and, as a complementary, it is the instantaneous and eternal rejection of what is base, and mean, and sordid, and vile. And that type of love, Friendly Sons, is, I believe, your most profound instinct, instinct from the men and women behind you, generations of them, whose love, down through the ages, has made you. In a sex-crazed world, where the press, the theater, and the radio fairly reek with stories of adultery, infidelity, and perversion, it is refreshing to feel that in groups such as this, one can use the word "purity" without fear of being scoffed at. [Applause.] From time immemorial the chastity of the Irish maiden has been proverbial and the purity of the Irish husband has made him the typical example of fidelity. Defilement of every kind has always been a stranger to the Irish race and the Irish people. What a sacred deposit is yours here in our own land, you Friendly Sons of St. Patrick. What a trust is in your hands to preserve intact for those who are dreaming tonight under alien skies. You must see to it that the hip-swingers, the strip-tease harlots, the tenth-rate fakes which are becoming the natural gods of so many of your fellow Americans—you must see to it that these monstrosities must never be allowed to usurp the place of holy love and sanctifying purity. [Applause.] There must be no renegades within your ranks whose names will be dragged through law courts leaving after them the stench of an ignoble life. The preservation of the character of your race is in your hands, your race which must reject unqualifiedly those who flout its principles or are untrue to its trust.

Let us remind ourselves that we are with the dreamers, the innumerable Friendly Sons dispersed to the ends of the earth. Their time for musing is at an end. St. Patrick must give them back to dreadful actuality. Let us give them one last thought and one last prayer. Many of them, other Kellys, other Burkes, other Sheas may even this night be called before a higher tribunal to give an account of their faith, their confidence, and their love. If that dark hour comes, and they must spill out their rich red blood in some stinking fox hole on Guadalcanal, or pour it forth from the cockpit of some Flying Fortress, or mix it with the salted waters of some foreign sea, dear God in heaven, give them one last moment in which their eyes might light up as stars and they may whisper triumphantly to the vastness which surrounds them: This blood that I am giving is worthy. Part of it is the royal blood of the kings of holy Ireland. [Prolonged applause.]

German Betrayals of Italians in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over short wave radio to Africa under the auspices of the Office of War Information:

I am one of the 6,000,000 Americans of Italian descent in the United States who watch with sick hearts the German betrayal of Italians in north Africa as our Allied fighting forces there sweep on to victory.

Repeatedly the Rommel Afrika Korps has used Italians as gun fodder to cover their own escape. In every fresh retreat Italians are maimed and slaughtered and abandoned that Germans may get away.

Only recently German seizure of his motor transport caused the capture of Gen. Alberto Mannerini, former chief of the Italian Sahara command, and his staff. Italian prisoners from the Littoria motorized division were bitter, declaring that their vehicles had been commandeered for escape by a German infantry division. The Wadi Akarit line, which the British cracked last week, was held mainly by Italian infantry. When Rommel decided to retreat, the Nazis rode and Italians walked.

Now, with Rommel's beaten men fleeing toward the ports, the fate of Italians becomes hourly more desperate. I am forced to the inescapable conviction that men of my own blood will again be sacrificed in the approaching evacuation. Germans will attempt to get away; Italians will be left behind.

But Italians have it in their power to refuse to play the role their German masters will certainly assign them in this final African debacle.

The burden of removing Rommel's troops will fall chiefly on the Italian Navy.

Italian seamen, you have been risking your lives—many of you dying—to run supplies across the Mediterranean to Africa. Why should you now risk your lives—and desperately, under terrific Allied bombing—to run Germans from the bloody scene of battle while leaving your own countrymen behind?

Men of the Italian Navy, I and 6,000,000 Americans whose forefathers were Italians hope and pray that you will stand up and refuse to die for Germans in a war you never wanted—will refuse to save German lives at the cost of Italian. Save yourselves. Save your own honor as freemen. Save the country we all love so dearly from serving as the rearguard to Germany, as your blood and flesh has served in the African campaign, in the rapidly approaching destruction of the enemies of the Allied forces on the Continent itself.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION,
Washington, April 12, 1943.

The Honorable THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.,
Baltimore, Md.

MY DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: I enclose a copy of the statement, as you requested.

And I wish to thank you again for your cooperation, which I very much appreciate.

Sincerely yours,

VALMA CLARK.

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek's Speech at the Hollywood Bowl, Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SOL BLOOM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek over the network of the Mutual Broadcasting System, from the Hollywood Bowl, Los Angeles, Calif., Sunday, April 4, 1943:

All experiences, happy or tragic, leave their impress, and consciously or otherwise influence our subsequent thinking and attitude of mind.

As the seventh year of China's resistance against Japanese aggression approaches, I shall sketch a few of the incidents most vividly incused on my mind, and, insofar as it is humanly possible, adopt a detached and objective view in examining the processes of mind which led me to certain convictions.

For, from them, perhaps you may gain an insight into the lives and motives of a people who for many long years have endured the brutalities of being invaded. Time does not permit me to give you a balanced or comprehensive account of the war. I shall leave that task to the historians.

I hesitated to talk to you about war in China lest it should appear that my intent is to overemphasize the suffering of my people. On further thought I believe you would understand that the purpose animating me lies in essaying in my own mind, as well as in yours, to profit by the lessons which these years should teach us.

I shall not encumber you with the history of the perfidy of the Japanese. We can well find its counterpart and parallel in the talks between the Kurusu mission and the State Department just before the attack on Pearl Harbor, for they have a flavor familiarly reminiscent of those in the days following the Lukouchiao incident when Japan feigned negotiations with the Chinese Government while massing her troops for total invasion.

At the beginning of war in 1937, my duties as secretary-general of the Chinese Air Force kept me chiefly engaged in air activities. We had just reorganized the air force and the total number of usable planes we had was pitifully and incredibly scanty—less than 300. Of these, something short of a hundred were fighters and bombers. The Japanese, on the other hand, had approximately 5,000 fighting planes.

On the very first day of air combat our young cadets shot down 14 enemy bombers. We, ourselves, on that day sustained no irreparable loss, for, although our planes were riddled with bullet holes, they still could fly. For 3 consecutive days enemy planes attacked the same objective—the Hangchow aviation school—and each time our airmen, flying archaic Hawk II's and a few Hawk III's, matched and outfought the enemy, shooting down a considerable number.

The Japanese were completely bewildered and even went so far as to say that we had some secret beam which enabled our young pilots, many of whom were yet undergoing training, successfully to shoot down their bombers. At first we, too, could not believe that the reports were entirely accurate. The charred remains of the enemy planes, however, bore witness to the veracity of the reports.

As time passed, fewer and fewer combat planes remained to us, for most of the planes ordered before the war were not due for many months. The lack of replacements for our lost planes was further accentuated by the paucity of spare parts, and nowhere on the horizon shone there a ray of hope to mollify and alleviate our dire difficulties. Problem after problem stalked in nightmare procession.

The Nanking airdrome did not have a runway sufficiently solid to allow the take-off of the heavy Martin bombers which eventually arrived and were then being assembled. A new runway had to be made. Where was the material to be found at such short notice, especially with the Nation's transportation geared to more pressing tasks? A solution evolved. I asked myself to what more appropriate use in such an emergency could the material on the excellent roads leading to Dr. Sun's mausoleum be put than this? So we decided to tear up those roads and take that material for the runway. But hardly was the first problem solved before another interlinked difficulty confronted us. Where could we find the labor?

I thought of the thousands of refugees who were daily streaming into Nanking and undertook to appeal to them for help. Every able-bodied man responded. As the enemy planes bombed the city every day during daylight hours, the refugees worked by night—tens of thousands of them, by the dim light of kerosene lamps. Through concerted and unflagging toil the heavy runway was completed in record time, thanks to the energy, persistence, and patriotism of the refugees who gave their time and labor without stint and without murmur, asking in return no remuneration, no manifest recognition of their service.

The need for planes became ever more pressing and the devastation and destruction wrought by the enemy over the whole countryside, made it imperative that we had to resort to measures which may seem ludicrous to you. Yet what else could we do? Every effort must be made, every means must be employed to equal the high morale of the Army and the people.

The constant cry of the young cadets was to give them anything which could fly, and so we put bomb racks on the Hawk II's and III's which from that time on served both as bombers and pursuits. We also equipped the primary training planes—the fleets—with bomb racks. But, alas, the latter were found to be too fragile and too slow to be effective. To those lads, however, any machine which could go soaring into the sky meant snatching that much edge off the vast initial advantage held by the enemy.

We husbanded our small air force with the utmost care, and each mission was carefully planned so that for the least expenditure could be achieved the greatest result. It was heartbreaking to send the boys up to defend our capital from the skies or out on bombing missions, for the odds against them were so tremendous that each time many failed to come back. For many months I had worked with the boys and had learned to know them personally. They trusted me because they knew that what I had been telling them were my honest convictions: That we must fight for principles, that every man was to be judged on his own merits, that no favoritism was to be shown to anyone, but that absolute impartiality in spirit and treatment was to prevail throughout the whole air force.

Through my experience of that period I have come to be reaffirmed in the belief that any service can be built up when the directing policy is based on impartiality and fairness and when the ranks know that reward and punishment are meted out according to their just desserts.

Meanwhile the Japanese had concentrated their naval power at Woosung and under its protection landed ever-increasing numbers of troops in the eastern part of the International Settlement of Shanghai. Thus, whilst the enemy had the advantage of the International Settlement as their base for attack, our troops had the disadvantage of the International Settlement, for we were not allowed even to use it as a thoroughfare.

Our soldiers, with totally inadequate mechanized equipment and with absolutely no air protection, fought on the outskirts of Shanghai literally for every inch of land that the Japanese gained through the combined use of heavy artillery, naval guns, and incessant bombing. And the Japanese average gain was less than a mile a day.

On that front for 3 months our troops fought with the fury of the inspired, whilst the Japanese military moaned that China was not playing fair because her troops did not know when they were defeated. The spirit of our soldiers shone with steadfast splendor, and their selflessness instilled courage and determination in our sorely tried and harassed people. It was all that the high command could do to hold back the troops in their trenches. They wanted to combat the enemy at close quarters; so clear was their realization of the principles at stake, and so great their indignation that good faith could be broken by the mere whim of those who knew only desecration.

Wherever the Generalissimo went to hold conferences with his officers at the front, I accompanied him. The trips held dangers even when made in the dead of night, for rail traffic was disrupted by constant bombing and congested with troop movements, and on the highways, road lights were turned off and all motorcar headlights dimmed by black cloth lest enemy planes should spot us.

Once we arrived in Soochow just when some troop trains had pulled in. The station was a shambles from repeated bombings but the railway officials, tottering with weariness and lack of sleep, stuck doggedly to their work. Stretcher bearers worked like wordless automatons trying to clear the station platform of the wounded while more and more wounded were unloaded. Clammy, sticky blood clung like glue to our thick walking shoes while more blood seeped through the soles; still more blood spattered over us as we stumbled through the closely packed station. The wounded were huddled in every inch of available space—young men who a few hours before were full of vitality and vigor and who now were slowly being drained of life itself.

Only an occasional gasp of pain echoed across the roofless station; most of the sufferers bore their anguish in stoic silence.

One younglet, stretching out his hand, tugged at my coat as I passed him, murmuring: "Water, water." I sent an aide-de-camp to get some water. Immediately a medical officer advised me that in the case of stomach wounds no water should be given. I shall never forget the look on the young lad's face as I sorrowfully shook my head and told him that for his own good I could do nothing for him. That face so young, almost that of a child, twitching with the excruciating pain made by the gaping wound, how can I ever forget? Why should the Almighty select those so young, so innocent, so untried, to be offered as sacrament on the communion table of national honor? Have they, perhaps, sinned against the tenets of God? Or is theirs the vicarious lot of retributive justice?

It is true that life, if it is of any worth, must have as its constant companion, honor. Death occurs as the final culmination inevitable in the processes of life. And indeed it falls not to all men to share the privilege with the crusaders of truth to breathe their last while in line of duty, and to have the benediction of knowing during their last conscious moments that they are dying in the upholding of ideals more meaningful than life.

War is cruel, terrible, and revolting, and should never be permitted to recur. We who have experienced it at its worst cannot extol nor glorify it, but we take comfort in knowing that the last moments of our youths in making the supreme sacrifice are illuminated by the lambent glory of righteousness and justice while the youths of the enemy are decimated without solace that they are dying in order that civilization may survive.

To return. As the enemy landed increasingly long-ranged guns and heavy artillery, the time came when the Central Government decided that all civilians should evacuate Nanking. Hundreds of thousands of people who hitherto had made the capital their home had to take what they could carry and leave the rest to be consumed by fire in adopting the strategy of what is now commonly called the scorched earth policy. In no wise did we want the enemy to have any more advantage than we could help.

The trees which we had planted so proudly 10 years before in our high hopes to make Nanking truly the capital beautiful had to be hewn down so that the artillery could have the necessary unobstructed view.

To have watched the saplings gradually grow year by year into sturdy trees and finally to witness their tops cut off was like seeing live pets killed before our very eyes.

The Generalissimo and I were amongst the last of the officials to leave Nanking. Before we left we took steps for the removal of the irreplaceable and priceless treasures of the National Museum of Art to quarters safe

from enemy looting. Later I went outside of the city wall for a final look at the now empty buildings of the schools for the children of the revolution. Here and there in the fields beyond the campus I saw thatched huts not yet devoured by flames, some outside walls still intact, and hanging on them strings of dried beans, peas, lentils, and cobs of corn. They were the pick of the harvest and had been carefully saved as seeds for the next crop. But for these humble folks, who for generations had lived, loved, and had their being on the spot; there was now no next crop, not for many years, anyway, not until after victory is won.

During such moments I wondered whether the mania of the bloodthirsty is ever slaked by the display constantly before their eyes of the human suffering and havoc they have wrought.

Are they such diabolic Lucifers that they can only revel in human misery? Well might I have such musings, for the world now knows to what extent the Japanese military carried their calculated cruelties after they occupied Nanking and other areas; how they plundered and stripped the terrified populace of all means of livelihood, molested our women, rounded up all able-bodied men, tied them together like animals, forced them to dig their own graves, and finally kicked them in and buried them alive.

Settled temporarily in Hankow, we realized that the war would be long and hard, and that to sustain a defensive war of the magnitude and length we had in mind, Hankow was merely a stopping-off place to enable us to take stock of our weaknesses and reassess our strength in making preparations for the future. In equipment the enemy undoubtedly outstripped us in every way, for theirs was a modern army with all auxiliary services complete, including mechanized units, trained engineer corps, fully equipped medical contingents, in addition to a powerful navy and an equally powerful air force.

And what did China have? We had no navy to speak of, only an embryo air force, and an infantry equipped mainly with rifles, machine guns, and outmoded artillery pieces. But, we had manpower, which willingly volunteered its flesh and blood; we had fighting spirit, for we knew we were struggling for justice and righteousness. And, also, we had the advantages of time and space.

It was our intention and strategy to make the enemy pay, and pay dearly, for every inch of land they wrested from us, so that in time we could wear them out, provided that the will to win could withstand the onslaught of steel and high explosives.

China's long-continued resistance in the face of formidable difficulties proved that our envisionment of the situation both psychological and military was correct. To those skeptics who sneered at China's "magnetic strategy" I should like to ask: What other people in the modern world has endured the agonies of war for so long and so bravely, held so tenaciously and so staunchly to the defense of principles as the Chinese people? And in the face of such odds in fighting equipment?

Of these same skeptics, I should also like to ask: Given the same conditions, what would they have done; in our position, what could they have done?

I should like to reiterate here that we have been fighting not only for our homes and hearths; we have been fighting for the upholding of pledges and principles because the violation of one pledge means the breaking of the whole chain of international decency and honor.

During those Hankow days, the Generalissimo and I were constantly making trips to the various fronts. The ever-recurring spectacle of the hundreds of thousands of our well-to-do countrymen reduced to being refugees, fleeing on the roads over the countryside, and being bombed and machine-gunned by enemy planes, and of the thousands of dead on the roadsides awaiting burial, are ghastly memories, impossible to forget. When will the ghosts of our bombed cities, ruined villages, and myriads of men, women, and little children murdered in cold blood, be laid?

Meanwhile there was work to be done for the living. As war continued, women's volunteer organizations sprang up all over the country. Systematic coordination, however, was lacking, and, as a result, duplication of work and confusion prevailed. At a conference called in the hills of Kuling, 50 women leaders representing every section of the country came together. During those 10 days of the meeting we laid the foundations of the National Women's Advisory Council which all agreed should function as the supreme body in directing women's war efforts.

We established various departments to meet war emergencies without interfering with existing organizations, but by supplementing and coordinating local efforts. The training of girls and women to work amongst the wounded, the refugees, and as liaison between the people and the army, the care of the war orphans, the increase of production, all received the consideration they deserved.

The response to this movement on the part of women throughout the country was electric. Branch associations mushroomed overnight. Differences of opinion were freely aired and hotly contested, but the final decisions of the Women's Advisory Council ruled.

From this experience I am convinced that women can work together; they can, they will, and they must—women of every creed and belief, and, yes, of every nationality—provided the cause is big enough, and the challenge worth accepting.

A few months later the Central Government issued hurried orders for the evacuation of Hankow. I had gone to the boat to bid good-bye to several hundred of the girls whom I had helped to train for war work. How I hoped and prayed that they would reach their destination, for just the day before a boatload of refugees, including many of our war orphans, was bombed and all perished. As I was walking home I noticed that over the gutters in the streets there still remained thick slabs of iron grates. Would they not be used by the enemy to be made into bombs to kill more of our people? I mentioned this to the Generalissimo and he issued orders that all the metal should be taken up and thrown into the river.

The Generalissimo and I took the last plane which left the night before Hankow was occupied by the enemy.

Chungking, the wartime capital, now became the center of activity. The same difficulties which obtained at Hankow followed us there. Even the Government organizations had a hard time trying to find quarters, for, all of a sudden, millions of refugees poured into this district from the Hankow area. But there was one difference; we had already sustained the first impact of war, and the people had become accustomed to makeshifts in living.

Hardly had we arrived, however, before the enemy air force started their bombing and strafing again hoping thus to break down the morale of our resistance. For several years during the clear season, whenever the city was not enveloped in opaque fog, we were constantly subject to overhead attacks. In fact, Chungking and its vicinity never had a respite until the famous Flying Tigers grappled with the air marauders and fought them off. But, alas, there were not enough Tigers to patrol the vast skies over China, nor enough, to give even a little overhead protection to our valiant armies spread out in the nine war zones.

Our Chinese Air Force, as time went on, dwindled, for although Russia supplied us with some planes, the need was ever greater than what was obtained. But whenever we could we made desperate raids over the enemy's supply bases. For the rest, we had to be content with training pilots in the hope that some day planes would be forthcoming.

Anyone who has an idea of the topography of Chungking would understand the heartbreaking hardships our people had to endure. The city itself is situated on a tongue of land at the juncture of two rivers, the Chialing and the Yangtze. Steep stone steps lace their ways up and down the hillsides and the old houses were built in such a way that there was only one entrance. Oftentimes when a bomb exploded and cut off the one entrance the householders would be trapped without any means of egress. Whole sections of the city were turned into shambles by a few bombs, as the houses were so closely packed together that one incendiary bomb could set off a whole block into flames. We knew days when it was impossible to obtain coffins as the toll of death mounted.

In time, all the business section of the city was demolished, so that it was possible to stand in the midst of the city and get an unobstructed view of the rivers on both sides. It is to the credit of the resurgent spirit of our people that they were not intimidated, for after each bombing, scarcely had the air raid siren trailed off its last echo before the surviving householders returned to their burnt shops and homes and began to salvage whatever they could. A few days later, temporary shacks and buildings would make their appearance on the old sites.

Some days the raids were so close and numerous that no one had time to prepare food. Hours were wasted in the dugout; valuable hours needed for work and rest. But moonlight nights were the worst, for the marauding planes, timed with devilish cunning, came in successive waves. Terrible tiredness permeated every nerve and bone so that it was preferable to risk being bombed to death than to seek safety.

But we knew that the enemy was trying to break our morale through sheer physical exhaustion. We were, therefore, inflexible in our determination not to give in. No greater tribute could be paid to our sorely tried people than this—that in all their suffering never did they complain against their leaders. Never did they falter in the determination that the enemy must be driven from our shores.

They had faith, too, that, in the end, America and the other democratic powers would realize that it was not only for ourselves that we were fighting, and that by continuing to engage the enemy, we were giving time to the democracies to prepare their defenses. Here I should like to say that neither we nor posterity can deprive unerring tribute to the foresight and statesmanship of President Roosevelt when he envisaged to the full the implications and consequences of the struggle of right against might, and took decisive measures to enable America to become the arsenal of democracies. History and posterity will panegyrize your President's unswerving convictions and his moral courage to implement them.

We take pride in the fact that, amid all the stern and never-ending demands of war we are preparing for a just and permanent peace and for the strenuous world-building that lies before us. You, too, are taking similar steps and, like us, you are determined to contribute your share in the organization of a new and happier social order as you are in prosecuting the war.

We in China through these years of suffering have not turned to indiscriminate, gallyhate of the enemy. We shall not abrade the sharp, stony path we must travel before our common victory is won. But we, like you and

the other United Nations, shall see to it that the "four freedoms" will not assume the flaccid statutes of ethical postulates no matter how belated may be the final victory.

We shall not be cozened of an equitable peace. We shall not permit aggression to raise its satanic head and threaten men's greatest heritage: Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness for all peoples.

Bricker of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. BENDER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Raymond Moley from Newsweek of April 12, 1943:

BRICKER OF OHIO

(By Raymond Moley)

COLUMBUS.—As Governor of Ohio, John W. Bricker is at once the heir of a notable tradition—the well-known availability of Ohioans for the Republican Presidential nomination—and the victim of a great handicap—Harding's failure and the infamy of the "Ohio gang." Neither of these circumstances is relevant in appraising Bricker these days. To give him priority for the nomination merely because he comes from Ohio would be wallowing in superstition. To oppose him because of the Harding "gang" is not only senseless but cruelly unfair.

What are the facts? Bricker is not now going after the nomination. No Mark Hanna or Harry Daugherty is out prowling through the States in his behalf. There is no Presidential headquarters here in Columbus. That the 1944 Ohio delegation will be for him is taken for granted. But any Ohio Governor would get that in a year when the field is broken. This isn't to say that he won't seek the nomination. But he isn't seeking it now.

The effort to smear Bricker with Harding mud certainly won't stand up in the face of a personal, first-hand knowledge of Ohio politics going back to 1892, the year before Bricker was born. There have always been two major Republican factions in Ohio—one centering in Cincinnati; the other, in Cleveland. Fifty years ago they were bossed by Foraker and Hanna, respectively, who were followed first by George B. Cox and the late (not current) Senator Burton, and, later, by Rud Hynica and Maurice Maschke. All these regimes were of the old-fashioned machine variety. In 1920 an intermediate machine, led by Harry Daugherty and centering in Columbus, held the balance of power and spawned the crowd that followed Harding to Washington.

That sort of thing is all gone now. In the Cincinnati region the party is governed by a committee which rotates the chairmanship yearly. Cincinnati has clean government. The nominal head of the Cleveland organization is Congressman BENDER who, because his office depends upon State-wide support, must defer to Bricker. Control over all the usual prerequisities of politics is held, as it should be, by the responsible elected and appointed officials of the State. Government is run by men elected by the people, not by back-room bosses. For this change Bricker deserves major credit.

The men around Bricker speak well for him. The Lieutenant Governor and attorney general are lawyers highly regarded by the profession. Liquor control, an immensely important function under the Ohio law, is headed by a professor in the State university. Bricker's highway commissioner in his first years as Governor is now a major general in command of the Thirty-seventh Division. His tax commissioner and welfare director are well thought of by people of both parties. It would be hard to find a State with so much competence and so little politics in its administration.

When he became Governor in 1939, Bricker inherited a deficit of some $40,000,000. At the end of 1942, the State surplus was $45,000,000. He has recommended the freezing of $15,000,000 for the beginning of a 10-year post-war building program.

Bricker's history offers no ground for believing that he will side-step any pertinent issue. But because he has stuck closely to his job as Governor, he has not felt it incumbent upon him either to debate issues of foreign policy or to offer a full-dress exposition of national philosophy. As an individual, he represents a familiar American type. He was born of parents in moderate circumstances in a small town near Columbus, taught school, and put himself through the State university. After practicing law in Columbus, he served first as counsel for and, later, as a member of the State utilities commission. When Roosevelt swept the State in 1932, Bricker not only survived but was elected attorney general. His third election as Governor in 1942, by a majority of 365,000, was a phenomenal exhibition of popularity.

There is no rant, cant, or pretense in Bricker's manner; yet he has exceptional moral courage. Two years ago an account of his fight with the city of Cleveland over relief funds appeared on this page. He had, I remarked then, the faith that "a just cause sooner or later becomes a popular cause." Now, after 2 years, I have not found an informed Ohioan who does not admit that both his fight and his victory were right. There is a lot of firmness and staying power in this friendly and attractive man.

Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD a letter I sent to the editor of the Baltimore News-Post in connection with an oratorical contest they sponsored in tribute to Thomas Jefferson in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of his birth:

BALTIMORE SUNDAY AMERICAN,
Baltimore, Md., March 6, 1943.

DEAR MR. D'ALESANDRO: In the Baltimore Sunday American of March 7, we will announce the opening of a bicentennial oratorical contest in tribute to Thomas Jefferson on the two hundredth anniversary of his birth.

The contest, which will be Nation-wide, will culminate in ceremonies dedicating the Jefferson Memorial in Washington on April 13.

Competing will be high school students of both public and parochial schools and colleges and universities, forming two separate competitions. In each contest, War bonds totaling $500 will be awarded and the winners of each group will go to New York on April 5 for the zone finals, with all expenses paid.

Dr. H. C. Byrd, president of the University of Maryland, will head the distinguished group of educators and civic leaders forming the final board of judges. Dr. David Weglein, superintendent of public schools, Dr. Allan Robertson, president of Goucher College, Mrs. John T. Tucker, president of the Women's Club of Roland Park, and a staff assistant to Msgr. John Barrett, superintendent of parochial schools, will serve with Dr. Byrd.

I would like to ask you to prepare a brief statement commending Jefferson's contributions to democracy and emphasize the importance at this time in stirring up interest and enthusiasm among our youth for the principles he gave to posterity in the Declaration of Independence, etc. A comment also on the significance of the oratorical contest also will be appreciated.

Will you let me have this statement at your earliest convenience? I will appreciate it very much.

Sincerely yours,

A. R. BIRD,
Jefferson Oratorical Contest Editor.

MARCH 15, 1943.

To the EDITOR OF THE BALTIMORE NEWS-POST,
Baltimore, Md.

SIR: Permit me to congratulate you on the part you are playing in sponsoring the bicentennial oratorical contest in tribute to Thomas Jefferson on the two hundredth anniversary of his birth.

Such a contest is very valuable at this time in bringing to the attention of our young people the principles which he advocated so vigorously. They are the same principles for which the United Nations are fighting today. His ideas and philosophy are pertinent today.

Jefferson is best known for having drafted the Declaration of Independence. However, during his service in Congress he was a member of almost every important committee and drafted no fewer than 31 state papers, some of which were of the first importance. He proposed the present monetary unit advocating the adoption of the dollar as the basis of coinage, to be divided into tenths and hundredths. His report of March 22, 1784, on the government of the western territory has been ranked second in importance only to the Declaration of Independence among Jefferson's state papers. He drew up a report which was agreed to as the basis of procedure in the negotiation of treaties of commerce.

In his first inaugural address he advocated the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus, and trial by juries impartially selected. He felt that the dignity and stability of government depended so much upon an upright and skillful administration of justice that the judicial power ought to be distinct from the legislative and executive. We can readily recognize most of those principles as being a part of our democratic form of government today.

His political theories have had great influence upon the public life of America. In a sentence, his influence lives because he was one of the great liberators of the human spirit.

THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Maryland.

War Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address given by me over radio station WTMJ April 11, 1943, on the subject War Time:

Ladies and gentlemen, war time was initiated February 9, 1942, as the result of the enactment of Public Law 403 during the Seventy-seventh Congress. By this legislation, the standard time of each zone was advanced 1 hour. This legislation is to remain in effect until 6 months after the termination of the present war or such earlier date as the Congress shall, by concurrent resolution, designate.

This legislation came before the Congress strongly recommended by the President, the Army, the Navy, and the Office of Production Management. Its purpose is threefold: (1) to meet the peak demands for power in the war industries; (2) to conserve electrical power, energy, and fuel; (3) to tend to make the time more nearly uniform throughout the Nation.

In the last World War, Germany initiated the daylight-saving plan. It was finally taken up by practically all the countries engaged in the war, including our own country. In the course of the debate on the war-time bill, Congressman MCLEAN, of New Jersey, who had made an extended study of daylight-saving time, stated that it is estimated that the saving during the last World War of fuel and other material amounted to 5 percent. That percentage may be small, but it is a considerable amount when you consider the total consumed.

Canada, as well as all Europe, is now operating under daylight-saving time. The leaders of all these countries in Europe, Canada, New Zealand, and other sections of the world, including China, are not novices or visionaries. They do not make a change in the time just to be making changes, or to inconvenience any particular group. They are men of practical experience as to this very problem. They are pursuing the course which their experience and judgment has led them to believe will best contribute to the ultimate victory of their causes.

Electric power is important to every phase of the war effort, from the production of food to the production of ammunition. Of the electric power used by industry, about two-thirds is obtained from electric utilities systems. Without power to run the Nation's motors, all industrial production would come to a standstill. Lack of power in those areas of the country producing strategic and critical materials, equipment, or parts, would hamper the war effort very seriously.

The hours of daylight are limited, particularly in winter. The largest demand for electricity in the home, store, office, and street-lighting comes at an hour under standard time, when the factory use is still high. This brings about the peak demand for electricity in the year. Setting the clocks to war time, by pushing the clock 1 hour ahead, gives us as much daylight between 5 and 6 o'clock in the evening as between 4 and 5 o'clock under standard time.

The increase in daylight under war time between 5 and 6 o'clock postpones the greatest lighting use to a later hour when factory and street railway use, which is governed by the clock, has fallen off for the night. Thus the combined uses of electricity for home, office, store, and street lighting under war time require less capacity at the powerhouses than would be necessary under standard time. Briefly, power used by railways and factories is controlled by the clock, while lighting need is controlled by the sun. By changing our clocks we enlist the sun in the effort to make existing power supply contribute as much as possible toward winning the war.

The Federal Power Commission advises us that an analysis of the demand for electric power during the winter days, when the demand is at its peak, for the years 1938 through 1942, reveals that 3,000,000 kilowatts of additional power capacity would have been needed in 1942, if last year's use of electricity had followed the pattern of previous years. One-half of this saving in capacity is attributed to the institution of war time and the remainder to a number of other factors such as dim-outs.

The reduction in power requirements due to war time will continue to play an important part in reducing the need for new generating capacity and will thereby insure a steady flow of critical materials to the manufacture of guns, planes, tanks, and ships.

Should war time be discontinued it would be necessary to effect other forms of curtailment in the use of electricity which would be even more burdensome to the civilian population.

Daylight-saving, or war time, will also contribute greatly to the conservation of coal, energy, and power, thereby making these savings available for the war effort.

War time averages a saving of 1,000,000,000-kilowatt hours. Generated in steam-electric plants, this energy would require fuel equivalent to more than 10,000 carloads of coal, which would add materially to the railroad burden. Such savings, however, are of secondary importance in relation to the effect on peak demands for power, for war time has been of material benefit in making a considerable amount of electric-generating capacity available for expanding war production, which would not otherwise be so available.

The third reason for daylight-saving time was to eliminate the confusion which resulted from certain States and localities having daylight-saving time and others remaining on standard time. At the time that the House considered this measure, there existed daylight-saving legislation within as many as 16 States. This bill removed the confusion that existed under the previous system. It put the Nation on a uniform plan.

After more than a year of daylight saving, under which it has been demonstrated that a substantial contribution has been made to the power needs of our war industries, a number of State legislatures are toying with the idea of eliminating war time from within their borders. To date, three States have legislated to this end. It is most unfortunate that the legislators of these States should make this mistake in judgment, which can only bring about chaos and a slowing up of our war program, and may, thereby, put off the day of victory.

In a recent letter addressed to Senator FERGUSON of Michigan, Donald Nelson, the Chairman of the War Production Board, stated: "It is undeniable that the war time statute, as applied to the country as a whole, has been one of the most imporant contributions made by Congress to increase war production." He further stated, after enumerating the power and energy saving made under war time, "If this power capacity had not been saved, it would have been necessary for the War Production Board to provide new facilities to produce this amount of power. This could only have been done at the cost, in the use of scarce metals and equipment, of a serious deficit in the production of tanks, planes, ships, munitions, and of the erection of plants so vitally necessary for the production of synthetic rubber and 100-octane gasoline."

If it were possible to build and install all the electric generating and transmission equipment needed, there would be no worry about peaks and no need for war time. But armament demands have reduced and slowed the manufacture of such equipment. The effect on each power system registering savings under war time will be approximately the same as though it had been able to install one additional generating unit.

The State legislatures that have acted to do away with war time within their borders are reported to have acceded to pressure from State agricultural groups. It would appear from this that the so-called representatives of agriculture are libeling the very farmers they assume to represent. The farmers as a group are as patriotic and American as any other people in the country. I cannot believe that the farmer is opposed to aiding in the speeding up of war production because it might inconvenience him. The farmer is as interested in winning the war as is any other American. His son and, yes, even his daughter, is in the armed forces of our country, fighting on the various fronts of the world. His stake in the winning of the war is as great as that of any other citizen. For him, as for us, the day of victory cannot come too soon.

The gentlemen in our State legislatures representing agriculture are rendering a disservice to the farmers and their country when they oppose this measure upon the ground that it will inconvenience the farmers. They are sabotaging the war effort.

In peacetime there might be reasonable grounds for the farmers opposing daylight saving time because of the inconvenience and difficulties it causes them. The farmer may be justified in feeling it is a high price for him to pay to allow the city people an opportunity for recreation during the hours between the end of their day's work and sunset. Now, however, the situation is changed. The war time bill now in force is not for the purpose of giving recreation time. Whatever rural opposition exists is, no doubt, due to a misunderstanding of its purpose. Even were war time to conserve only enough power to build but one more gun or one more shell, it will well be worth any sacrifice or inconvenience it may cause to any citizen, for it will speed the day of victory. The gains with respect to the savings in electric power from war time far outweigh the inconveniences resulting, and it would be a grave mistake and a definite detriment to our war effort to repeal war time, or even to eliminate it during the winter months.

The United Nations and the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BUTLER B. HARE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Sergio Osmena, Vice President of the Philippine Commonwealth, delivered before the Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia on April 10:

The United Nations are engaged in a war for survival. They are fighting the diabolical attempts of the exponents of force to sub-

ject the whole world to perpetual slavery by depriving mankind of all rights and liberties within the four walls of the so-called new order. A common danger has brought them together, but more lofty aims have also impelled them in their struggle.

The United Nations are fighting to establish a new world of freedom and justice, of equality and progress, not for a privileged nation or group of nations but for all peoples. They are fighting, in the words of President Roosevelt, "with the objective of smashing the militarism imposed by war lords upon their enslaved peoples—the objective of liberating the subjugated nations—the objective of establishing and securing freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear everywhere in the world." This is a peoples' war.

The Atlantic Charter stands as the proclaimed creed of all the United Nations. This charter was framed on the stormy seas of the Atlantic, but it is a world charter. It cannot be anything less. Thirty-one nations have already subscribed to its declaration of principles, and on this declaration are pinned mankind's hopes for a better world.

My country, the Philippines, is one of the United Nations. Long before the outbreak of this war, long before the promulgation of the Atlantic Charter, the Philippines had already pledged herself to follow the cause of democracy and peace. Our formal adherence to the declaration of the United Nations took place on June 14, 1942, when President Manuel L. Quezon, in the name of the Philippines, affixed his signature to that document.

The signing of the declaration by the Philippine Commonwealth Government has great historic significance. It did not alter or impair in any sense the existing constitutional relationship between the United States and the Philippines. But by this single act the Philippines gained an international personality. Under the sponsorship of the United States and with the acquiescence of the other powers, she signed, for the first time in her history, a highly political international instrument in her own name and as an equal.

What is the Philippines to the United Nations? What does she hold for them, now and in the future? What contribution can she make toward accomplishing the difficult tasks that lie ahead?

Broadly stated, the two prime objectives of the United Nations are to win this war and to win the peace that is to follow. This war must be won before peace can come, and the peace must be won, too, in order to prevent a recurrence of war. Otherwise the vicious cycle of war and peace will continue.

The Philippines, small nation that she is, has already made substantial contributions toward attaining the first objective. During the early phase of the war in the Pacific, when every United Nations citadel there was crumbling with appalling rapidity under Japan's hammer blows, the Philippines alone withstood the enemy's relentless and devastating assaults. Besieged, isolated, and outnumbered, Filipino and American soldiers fought and died together on Bataan and Corregidor. With the support of the entire Filipino people, they waged the Battle of the Philippines for 4 long months.

From the military point of view, this firm stand in the Philippines was valuable to the United Nations. Bataan and Corregidor changed the whole course of the war in the Pacific. Our prolonged resistance forced Japan to divert large contingents from other war fronts, helped to delay the fall of the East Indies, Malaya, Singapore, and Burma, and thwarted the Japanese program for an early invasion of Australia and New Zealand. We afforded the United States valuable time to repair the destruction wrought by Japan's insidious attack on Pearl Harbor. Thus, while we engaged more and more of the Mikado's troops as the Battle of the Philippines heightened in fury, our allies in the Pacific were enabled to bolster their defenses and to prepare to deal counterblows against the common enemy. Thousands of brave Filipino and American soldiers perished in the holocaust, but not in vain.

Today, a full year after Bataan's fall, the Filipino spirit of resistance persists. Here in continental United States and Hawaii, thousands of Filipinos, young and old, have rallied to the war effort. There are already two regiments of Filipino Infantry completing their training in California, while other Filipinos are serving in various units of the United States Army, in the Navy, in the Coast Guard, and in the merchant marine Many of them have seen action and the roll of Filipino dead in various fronts is lengthening. Many Filipinos are subscribing to War bonds, and working in the war plants, on the farms and plantations, and in the Government service.

Viewed from the political angle our stand in the Philippines was also significant. By our fighting on the side of the United Nations in this war, America's policy of altruism and democracy in the Philippines was vindicated. While the defense of the Phillipines against foreign aggression is a legal responsibility of the United States as the sovereign power, we fought nevertheless—willingly and without reserve. The entire people rose in resistance against the invader, bearing the brunt of the bloody defense. We kept our pledge to stand by America "in life and in death." By fighting, we have also given the subject peoples of the world an example of performance of the inescapable duty to freedom and independence. Any nation that believes itself capable and deserving of freedom must defend itself against aggression, no matter how much weaker or less prepared it may be than the aggressor. It's duty, in any case is to meet the attack and show its readiness to assume the responsibilities which independence entails.

Having displayed a high sense of responsibility, in war as well as in peace, we have advanced also a strong argument in favor of the right of dependent peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live—as acknowledged by the Atlantic Charter. We have proved that the peoples of Asia have as much aptitude for democracy and freedom as the peoples of other parts of the world. Indeed, any dependent people, if given the same opportunity for training and development that was afforded the Filipino people, will be able to develop the habits of discipline and self-control which are essential to the maintenance of an orderly and stable government.

In the less immediate, but equally vital task of saving the peace, the Philippines stands ready to cooperate with the United Nations, however humble her role may be. Having been a victim herself of unjustified aggression, she naturally is interested in any sound plan of world-wide collective security. Logically, her immediate concern will be in her own neighborhood, the Far East.

The peculiar geographical and political characteristics of that part of the globe, with its many thickly populated states, and with peoples of diverse languages, religions, customs, and ideologies, have made it a powder keg almost as explosive as Europe. The world aggressors first began to march against freedom when Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931. It was the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and the Philippines that brought the United States into the fight.

We know now that there can be no "localized war," that aggression in one place results in war elsewhere. The Far East is by no means an exception to this new law governing a shrunken world.

We have learned from past experience that any organization that proposes to preserve peace must have force behind it. If it lacks the power and facilities to carry out its decisions, it will prove impotent against war-minded nations and will finally collapse. This was the case with the League of Nations.

Force to maintain law and order is vital in a world society, as it is in any community. Whatever form this force may assume in the future, whether it be international or otherwise, it must be sufficient to deal with the menace wherever it arises. To this force the Philippines is ready to make her contribution in manpower, materials, and facilities. If the Philippines, strategically located at the intersection of the world's airways and sea lanes, is backed by the power of the United States with whom she is affiliated by many years of association and by common democratic principles, and becomes a part of whatever international force is established by the United Nations after the war, she can serve as the bastion of law and order in the Far East.

But peace—truly lasting peace—cannot be effectively maintained through force of arms alone, no matter how strong and concerted it may be. In fact, no system based purely on force has ever managed to endure, especially when it has to meet the rising sentiment of nationalism. Such a system is bound to engender ill will and hatred. It is also bound to weaken as soon as dissension and bickering arise among those who impose it; and when this happens, the whole artificial structure collapses.

Force is not enough to achieve lasting peace. It must be supplemented by the maintenance of justice and the cultivation of understanding, good will, and cooperation among peoples. But before we can ever hope to achieve harmony and cooperation, we must first dissipate the distrust of subject peoples, for it is principally to them that the United Nations address the democratic principles of the Atlantic Charter. This war, in the military sense, may or may not be won without their active collaboration, but an enduring peace cannot be established without their wholehearted support.

How shall we win the cooperation and good will of dependent peoples? An important step toward gaining this cooperation and good will would be the unequivocal application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter to every one of them, without exception. The next step would be to turn these principles into a living reality so that they might be felt by those who doubt their value and efficacy. The dependent peoples must be made to feel that this is not a war to preserve the status quo, which, indeed, cannot be done. They must be made to realize that they have something to gain by a United Nations victory after the war, that such victory will result in their liberation, and not in a mere change of masters or in a retention of the old one.

The recognition of the right to independence of all dependent peoples who feel themselves capable of enjoying it is, however, only a preliminary step toward lasting peace. It will go a long way, but surely it will not go all the way. Even if all the nations and peoples of the world were independent and free, wars would still break out should distrust, arrogance, and selfishness continue to plague mankind. We must, therefore, educate ourselves and dispel these social maladies, nurturing a more democratic feeling toward other peoples. The myth of racial superiority and the policy of exploitation must be definitely abandoned.

The gap between peoples of different races can be bridged with understanding if the right policy is chosen. This was demonstrated by the happy outcome of the joint Filipino-American adventure. By first promulgating an altruistic policy—the Philippines for the Filipinos—and then following it to the letter and spirit, America succeeded in winning over the skeptical and antagonistic Filipinos and in changing their policy of opposition to that of cooperation.

As a result of this cooperation, great progress was achieved by our country. The universalization of education, the improvement of health and sanitation, the building up of an independent judiciary and of a sound civil-service system, the construction of roads, bridges, and other important public

works, the stabilization of the national economy, the development of self-government, and the preparation for ultimate independence in 1946—all these, and more, were accomplished in the short period of 40 years. Here, indeed, was national progress and self-development, unparalleled in the history of interracial relationship. When war overtook us in 1941 and our soldiers fought alongside their American comrades, we did nothing more than continue our policy of complete cooperation with the United States, a policy already firmly established many years ago.

In the new world of freedom and security, of peace and understanding among peoples of different races, which the United Nations hope to build, the Philippines is in an advantageous position to make a unique contribution. History has made us a people that is equally at home in the traditions and civilizations of both the east and the west. This is so because, while geographically, we are located in the Far East, absorbing in the early years the culture of Asia, we have been also the recipient of western influences in the course of our long association with Spain and the United States. It may be said of us, with some degree of accuracy, that we are the most occidental of orientals, and the most oriental of occidentals.

Midway between Orient and Occident, with Christian traditions dating as far back as the sixteenth century, with a background of struggles and sufferings, and with a record of having earned her liberation through the orderly processes of self-government, the Philippines feels that she can—and must—assist the United Nations in their determined effort to assure the fundamental human rights to all the peoples of the earth. For, in this life-and-death struggle between a slave world and a free world, the Philippines stands as a vivid example of what the nations of the west can do for all dependent peoples everywhere; and to these dependent peoples, who hunger for justice, freedom, and happiness, the Philippines symbolizes the goal that can be attained not by distrust, bloodshed, and violence but by friendship, understanding, and collaboration.

The Atlantic Charter is no new thing. Its democratic principles, with the exception, perhaps, of that relating to economic security, were all embodied in the original American pledge of liberty and self-government to the Filipino people. It is in reality a restatement of the principles enunciated in the American Declaration of Independence of 1776, drafted right here in this historic city of Philadelphia and proclaimed to the whole world.

Just as America cannot, in the immortal words of Lincoln, survive half slave and half free, neither can this world of ours remain half slave and half free. The Atlantic Charter offers a promise of a happy world to all peoples. It is our political creed today, in this dire moment when totalitarianism threatens to destroy civilization. Let it remain our creed tomorrow when peace comes, and let us live up to it forever.

Thomas Jefferson: Democrat or Republican?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly interested in the speeches of my Republican colleagues as they extolled the virtues of Thomas Jefferson, the greatest of Democrats.

I wish to emphasize again the admonition which my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] gave to his namesake the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]:

> The Republican Party must make its choice between Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson. They cannot have both, for their principles were diametrically opposed, one to the other.

I join with my Republican friends, however, in their admiration for Thomas Jefferson, the man who stood at all times for the rights of the common man and against the special privileges of the few.

As I look down the corridors of time some 200 years I can foresee in my mind's eye the One Hundred and Seventy-eighth Congress assembled here, and after today's remarkable precedent I can also foresee a series of Republican Representatives speaking in this House in eulogistic terms of another great President, the present occupant of the White House. I can see them earnestly striving to establish the legitimacy of their political descent. The tragedy of greatness too often lies in the blindness of present contemporaries and is only realized after intervening centuries by the descendants of those same blind contemporaries.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of the Secretary of State before the House Committee on Ways and Means on House Joint Resolution 111 on Monday, April 12, 1943:

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, this is the third occasion on which the Congress undertakes a periodic review of the operation of a great national policy, which has been carried forward for the past 9 years by cooperative action of the legislative and executive branches of the Government. In a profound sense, the present is the most momentous of these occasions.

At the time when the policy was inaugurated in 1934, our country and all countries were suffering from the disastrous consequences of excessive restrictions and obstructions to trade, commerce, and credit. The resulting intensive and destructive economic warfare caused a far-reaching disruption of world trade and was in large measure responsible for the collapse of domestic economies, including ours. Vigorous and determined action was needed to reverse the fatal trend toward ever-mounting obstructions. That action was undertaken through the adoption of the reciprocal trade-agreements policy.

It was clear to us that satisfactory economic recovery was impossible without a restoration and expansion of healthy foreign trade. It was clear that our foreign trade and international trade as a whole could be restored and could expand only through a reduction, here and abroad, of unreasonable and excessive trade barriers. It was equally clear that the most advantageous method of accomplishing this was to negotiate with other countries mutually beneficial trade agreements, based upon a reciprocal reduction of trade barriers.

It was also clear from the beginning that a revival of world trade was an essential element in the maintenance of world peace. By this I do not mean, of course, that flourishing international commerce is of itself a guaranty of peaceful international relations. But I do mean that without prosperous trade among nations, any foundation for enduring peace becomes precarious and is ultimately destroyed.

The reason for this is not far to seek. The political and social instability caused by economic distress is a fertile breeding ground of agitators and dictators, ready to plunge the peoples over whom they seize control into adventure and war. Economic warfare, which destroys trade and thus works havoc on production, employment, prices, values, and standards of life within nations, is always a powerful factor of rivalry, dissension, and strife between nations.

All these explosive elements were present in the international situation at the time when we embarked on the trade-agreements program. Through the trade program, our country made a determined effort to provide leadership in international cooperation and to point the way forward in the economic field. We attained a measure of success in spite of the colossal difficulties that stood in the way. Unfortunately, the momentum of deterioration in other fields of international relations was already so great, that even the progress that was being made toward placing international economic relations on a sound basis was finally engulfed in the overwhelming catastrophe of a new world war.

It is well for us to bear in mind these facts and considerations as we begin this periodic review of our trade-agreements policy. In them lie lessons for the future. To ignore them can only lead to recurrent and widespread disasters.

II

The trade-agreements program was enacted 9 years ago in exactly the form in which it has been twice renewed for 3-year periods, and is now before the Congress for renewal for another period of 3 years.

The original purpose of the act of 1934, as stated in its first section, was to expand foreign markets for the products of the United States, and so to create added employment and added income in this country. This was to be done by a process of negotiation and agreements, by which this country would obtain reductions in foreign restrictions against American products by granting similar reductions in American restrictions against foreign products. The concessions were to be adjusted "in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production." The act looked forward to increased trade in both directions, to the benefit of employment, income, and living standards, both in this country and abroad.

By the act of 1934, the President was authorized by the Congress to enter into trade agreements with other countries and, through the proclaiming of such agreements, to grant to foreign countries reductions in our tariff rates in exchange for benefits extended to our trade by the other countries. It was specifically provided that no duty could be reduced by more than 50 percent; that no article could be transferred between the dutiable and the free lists; that while the proclaimed duties would be applicable to imports from all countries, their application could be suspended in the case of countries which discriminate against American goods. It was

likewise specifically provided that no agreement could be concluded for more than 3 years. Each agreement would thereafter be subject to termination upon not more than 6 months' notice. Provision was made for full collaboration of the Tariff Commission and the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and State in the carrying out of the program. Finally, it was provided that reasonable public notice should be given of intention to negotiate an agreement, and full opportunity be afforded for the presentation of views by any interested person.

During the years that the act of 1934 has been in force we have concluded agreements under it with 27 countries. I shall not undertake to discuss the unquestionably impressive commercial results of these agreements carefully concluded under the safeguards prescribed by the Congress. These results attained under peace conditions were examined fully by your committee 3 years ago, and I assume will be examined again in these hearings. My associates will be glad to furnish you any data which you may desire to have for that purpose.

Important as was the trade-agreements program in the past, important as it has been and will be from a broader point of view, it will be more significant than ever from the viewpoint of our own material interest, when the present fighting stops. When that happens, almost every metal-making plant in the United States and many other factories and mines and farms will be faced with the termination of war orders and will be looking urgently for markets for their peacetime products. Foreign markets will be very important to us then and will continue to be essential as far as anyone can see ahead. It will be well to have in being and in working order a tested and tried instrument for obtaining the reduction of foreign-trade barriers and the elimination of discriminations against our products.

It will be well, too, to carry on the process of negotiated reduction of trade barriers wherever clearly feasible even during the war years, as we have already found it possible to do in some instances with appropriate safeguards against unforeseeable contingencies. In this way our producers will find it possible to develop their foreign business as smoothly and rapidly as possible when the war ends. To negotiate effectively to either of these ends this country will need the kind of authority the Trade Agreements Act provides. The extension of that authority, and the intelligent and careful use of it, are the best available insurance against new and old discriminations and restrictions on the foreign markets open to American enterprise and American products.

The trade-agreements program is not only a thoroughly tested instrument but also a flexible one. Plainly, after the war all manner of conditions will need to be taken into account, arising out of new forms of trade, changed values of currency, and shifting currents of commerce. The flexibility of operation which the Trade Agreements Act makes possible will enable us to adjust our commercial policy to the actual conditions of our post-war economic situation in all its branches.

III

Of the 27 countries with which we have concluded trade agreements, only tragic Finland is at war today with any of our allies, and even she is not at war with us. Of the others, 16 are now by our side, at war with our enemies. They are Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, El Salvador, France, Great Britain, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Luxemburg, Mexico, the Netherlands, and Nicaragua. Six of the remaining 10 have broken off relations with the Axis countries and are cooperating on our side in many ways. These 6 are Colombia, Ecuador, Iran, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. The remaining 4 are neutral (Argentina, Sweden, Switzerland, and Turkey), and 1 of these, Switzerland, has undertaken the heavy duty of representing American interests, including the interests of American prisoners of war, in the places which our enemies control.

The nations which entered into trade agreements did so because they were peace-loving nations, seeking peaceful relations in all respects, economic and political. It is no accident, therefore, that in the searching test to which individuals and nations are being subjected in this war, those nations which have entered into a cooperative economic relationship with us through the conclusion of trade agreements are on the side of opposing rather than aiding the forces of aggression.

As we look into the future, it is this theme of international cooperation that should be uppermost in our minds if we really want to make sure that another world conflict is not to be ahead of us after we win this war.

When the day of victory comes, we and other nations will have before us a choice of courses to follow. Basically, that choice will be, as it was in 1918, between, on the one hand, extreme nationalism, growing rivalries, jealousies, and hatreds, with the ultimate certainty of another and even more devastating war; and, on the other hand, increased international cooperation in a wide variety of fields, and at least the hope of secure peace for our children.

No one can give a promise that secure peace will really prevail. It is much harder to make the peace secure than it is to wage successful war. Many wars have been fought and won, by many nations, but not yet has any nation made its peace secure and enduring. No one nation, no two nations, can do this. For war is an international affair; in a world of many nations its prevention requires international collaboration. In the new world of the airplane all nations are the near neighbors of all others. In such a world any one strong industrial country has power to plunge the world into war with devastating suddenness and violence. To keep the peace secure will require the resolute and continuous collaboration of all law-abiding nations. It is a hard way and a long way, but it is the only hopeful way there is to prevent war.

Of the various necessary fields of international collaboration one of the most essential is the field of economic life. The goods and services by means of which men live must be abundant, and they must be well distributed. If the material basis of civilization fails, we must not anticipate that human beings will be civilized or peaceful. Solid and lasting friendships between large groups of people require mutual willingness to cooperate in the fundamental business of earning a living. That is why it is so essential, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, "to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security." This objective, and the balance of the charter, have now been endorsed by all of the United Nations. That action was taken by the hard-headed and realistic men who guide these governments, not by reason of humane sentiments alone, but because they recognize that the only way to attain these ends is through cooperative action.

Stable peace and economic warfare will not mix. We know that, now, from bitter experience. Just as we must work together to set up and operate the necessary machinery to maintain peace, we must work together to make the years of peace fruitful for ourselves and for others.

One of the most essential subjects of international cooperation in the years that lie ahead is this very one of trade and the various trade restrictions to which the act refers. What happens to international commerce has an intimate effect on many of the things that lie closest to the minds of the people of every country. The price of crops, the chance of paying off the mortgage, or of getting or holding a job, the supply and price of common articles on merchants' shelves; these are the things that foreign trade affects in every country. If both reason and experience teach anything, they teach the necessity for more trade between nations.

It has long since become axiomatic that international trade cannot be a one-way affair. The problems which it presents can, therefore, be dealt with wisely only by international cooperation, of governments and of peoples.

Nations have various ways of managing the production and exchange of goods and services. In this country we prefer that our combined domestic and international economy rest primarily on a system of free enterprise. The trade agreements program is designed to promote this end.

International trade is regulated and is necessarily affected by the tariffs, regulations, and economic institutions of the various countries. What the trade agreements program proposes is that this complex system of trade regulation, both our own and that of others, shall be administered and guided, as far as our influence extends, not in the direction of regimentation and scarcity, but in the direction of increased production, better distribution, and more abundant consumption.

That is neither Republican nor Democratic doctrine. It is American doctrine, and the greater the extent to which we can get it accepted by other nations, the better will be the prospect for our own future prosperity and peace. I am confident that the more the subject is discussed the more clearly these facts will be seen by all of us, and the more nearly unanimous we shall be in our support, not only of the measure now before us, but of all measures that make possible, in our own hard-headed self-interest, fuller international cooperation against the common scourges of poverty, social and political instability, and war, and for greater abundance, social and political stability, and secure peace.

IV

The foundations of international cooperation must be laid now, and they must be built out of mutual confidence, mutual respect, and common interest. Today, we are engaged in the greatest cooperative enterprise in history. In this struggle for human freedom, 31 United Nations, large and small, are banded together in a brotherhood of self-preservation, and 12 other nations are associated with them. While bending their utmost energy to the attainment of complete military victory and enduring the immense sacrifices which the war imposes upon them, these nations are meantime laying plans for the future.

All these hope-inspiring plans for international cooperation will come to nothing more than pious expressions unless there is confidence that the countries which participate in them are determined to have ready for immediate use, whenever needed, the necessary instruments of effective action. So far as our Nation is concerned, the continued existence of the trade agreements machinery is the most important of these instruments. It is the central and indispensable point in any feasible program of international cooperation. The only alternative is for nations to travel the same extremely narrow economic road that was traveled so disastrously during the years following the last war.

The many peoples who look toward this country with hope are watching our action on this act with profound interest. What we do about it will be looked upon as a signpost pointing to the path they can expect us

to follow. Repudiation of the trade-agreements program, or the curtailment of it in scope or time by amendment, would be taken as a clear indication that this country which, in war, is bearing its full share of responsibility, will not do so in peace. This might well weaken the ties which hold together the group of nations with which we are so vitally associated in the prosecution of the war. Extension of the program without change will mean not only that we understand the kind of commercial relationships which, from a purely business point of view, lead to our mutual well-being, but that we recognize the deeper implications of our great strength and commensurate responsibility for good or ill in the world.

Strong nonpartisan support of this nonpartisan legislation would have a most heartening effect on people here and everywhere who look forward, with profound hope, to a world rich in economic and spiritual opportunities for all.

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Help the Negro To Help Himself," by John LaFarge, which appeared in the edition of the periodical America, on April 3, 1943, concerning the valuable work being done by the National Youth Administration in training young men and women to be fitted for positions and jobs in our defense industries:

HELP THE NEGRO TO HELP HIMSELF

(John LaFarge)

For some reason, never sufficiently explained, adults are under the impression that children pay little attention to what their elders say and do. In New York, committees are hurrying to the City Hall to express their alarm over the renewed outbreaks of juvenile delinquency in places where the mutually suspicious racial groups—native white, Negro, Puerto Rican—come in close contact.

Yet, while anxious magistrates are emphatically declaring that "muggings must cease," the technique for that type of crime is being graphically depicted, as a project in mass education, by Life magazine, through the imagery of a cat springing upon its victim. The young are being trained to be tough, to use piano wire, hand-concealed blades, and stranglehold; and the Commando is the hero of the pictures, the street corner, and the hour.

When, therefore, you find young people from broken homes and overcrowded neighborhoods demoralized by unemployment, religiously illiterate, and with little prospect of opportunity for the future, it is not altogether surprising that they are somewhat intrigued by the cat and the piano wire and the stranglehold that help to sell the picture magazines to the millions. You, who are scandalized and horrified at their actions, and call for "something to be done immediately," are you so absolutely confident that you might not have joined the gang were you, as a youth, exposed to the same influences?

Plenty is to be done. Dr. J. J. Wittmer, personnel and medical director of the Consolidated Edison Cos., remarked on March 24 that "there is no one outstanding answer to the problem of absenteeism." There is no one such answer to the problem of juvenile crime, particularly when it takes a racial tinge. One of the many things, however, that can be done to counteract either of these tendencies is to give young people the initial skills and the initial attitudes which are the first step toward useful citizenship.

In view of such a necessity, it seems unfortunate that the present moment should be chosen to wield what looks like a congressional ax upon any agency which is effectively contributing that type of training. A great deal of criticism has been leveled against the National Youth Administration for various features of its elaborate make-work program, now discontinued, for student youth. Whatever may be said about that feature of the National Youth Administration, the work it is now accomplishing in the prevocational training of Negro youth seems to form one of the most important and necessary prophylactics against the twin evils of juvenile crime and industry-eroding absenteeism.

This type of work is of very recent origin. But in 1 year's time, the year 1942, there were placed, through the National Youth Administration training projects, 2,134 young men and women in responsible jobs in New York City, of whom about 25 percent were Negroes. Similar figures are available from other localities. On March 3, 1943, to use a single day as a sample, there were working on National Youth Administration shop-training projects in New York City 1,570 white young men and women and 512 Negroes.

On January 8 of this year the National Youth Administration had 700 work locations in all parts of the country. In these 700 locations there were 39,000 work stations, with 16,800 lathes, drill presses, and other heavy-duty types of equipment. Out of a turn-over of 30,000 young people a month, approximately 17,000 go into the skilled parts of war-production industries, not the automotized parts. In this manner thousands of Negro boys and girls have been trained have received jobs, and have gone forward to make their contribution to the defense of their country.

If you happen to walk along One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Street in New York City, between Lenox and Seventh Avenue, you will probably join the crowd looking through the store-front windows of the local National Youth Administration work station at the Negro boys and girls busy at their lathes and drills. If you inquire inside you will be informed they are being made "shopwise." But this means much more than learning the elementary rubrics of the machine world. It means a training in self-help, in cooperation, in self-discipline, in short, in all those things which mark the gap between the prospective citizen and the prospective criminal.

Young colored workers are being trained in job seeking by competent men of their own race. They learn to pool their experience, to save time and money in making inquiries, to acquire personal habits which will make them acceptable as applicants or as employees.

Such a training is not the whole cure, but it is a necessary part of the cure. The time has gone when the Nation can afford to let a generation of Negro young men and women grow up into dead-end jobs, any more than we can afford to lose their skills.

Space forbids even a brief enumeration of the testimony of war firms, in virtually every State of the Union, as to the value of this preemployment training received in the National Youth Administration workshops. Those who wish to inquire into this phase of the matter will find ample material at their disposal.

A certain amount of such training is being offered by other agencies, much more specialized as to the type of industry, than the National Youth Administration, and all of that is to the good. All I wish to note here is the simple and obvious truth, that the present crime menace on the one hand, and the manpower shortage on the other, have laid far too definite a challenge upon our doorsteps for us to act lightly and from hasty, partisan motives in a matter of such importance.

An example may illustrate how little is appreciated of the abilities of the young people themselves. Recently the Reverend Raymond J. Campion, pastor of St. Peter Claver's Church in Brooklyn and rector of the Little Flower House of Providence for Colored Children, at Wading River, Long Island, received a letter from the principal of the public high school at Port Jefferson, Long Island, commending the scholarship of the 10 students enrolled from the institute, 18 miles distant. The highest honors in the entire school, of approximately 475 high-school pupils, were awarded to Irene Kelly, one of the institute's children, and the names of 4 others appear on the school's honor roll, half of the enrollment from the institute.

"Our marking system is relatively severe," wrote the principal. "The marks would be recognized by the most exacting of educational institutions. I am certainly pleased to be able to report so favorably on these young people whom you have chosen to send to us." This, furthermore, was achieved in a neighborhood known not be overfriendly to Catholics or to colored people, nor apt to welcome children from charitable institutions.

The chief honor winner has chosen nursing as a career; others look forward to medicine, technical training, and other useful occupations in the future.

The hopeful prospect of useful citizenship and inspiring leadership that has been opened up for some children by the vision and sacrifice of those in public or private life who see beyond immediate appearances, is a sharp commentary upon any policy which would add to the sum of human wastage. It is the unforgivable sins of omission, far more than the poor wretched sins of commission, that breed most of the crime and misery in this world.

Reform of agencies is always in order, for none is perfect, but before they are abolished, let us weigh very seriously all that is involved in turning many thousands of Negro youth, now busily and enthusiastically developing the skills that the Creator has given them, to the prospect of the dead-end job or the idle street.

Dedication of the Jefferson Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrated the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson. In the midst of serious problems and grave dangers we turned aside to dedicate a beautiful marble monument testifying the Nation's gratitude for his life and service, giving a testimonial of our faith in the utility and the practicability of the institutions of democratic government which Mr. Jefferson helped to establish for us. It would be a great thing if today, in all sincerity, we could reaffirm our actual belief in the indispensability of democratic institutions for peoples who aspire

to be free. I use the word "democratic" in a general and not in a political sense. Jefferson had great respect for the people, great faith in the people. He wrote to du Pont de Nemours these words:

> You love them (the people) as infants whom you are afraid to trust without nurses, and I love them as adults whom I freely leave to self-government.

It would be well for us on this day to meditate as to whether in practice ours has come to be the Frenchman's attitude toward the people, or that of Jefferson. We might seriously consider in that connection, before we go too far, the effect upon the French people of this attitude of the French Government toward them, the effect upon their governmental capacity, upon their stamina and their ability to survive under the test of a great crisis like the present. Also, we might consider whether this monument we dedicated today near this Capitol, unless we preserve those democratic institutions sponsored by this champion of democracy whose birthday we celebrate, will stand as a monument to Jefferson or as a sort of mausoleum in a cemetery of buried hopes for peoples who aspire to maintain free government.

In Jefferson's first inaugural address, in 1801, with a knowledge acquired and a judgment matured by years of study and close observation, and the experience of purposeful living, he said many things we might stop to consider on this day. These were his introductory words:

> About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration.

And among them this, which I quote:

> The support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies.

While we are engaged in this great celebration, it might be well to examine that statement, not merely because Jefferson made it, but to see if that statement does not rest upon fundamental truth and fundamental necessity. See if the States, and their subdivisions, do not constitute the only machinery in our governmental organization which the people can operate in the discharge of their general governmental duties; and consider, really consider, what we are doing to these States and to the governmental capacity of our people by shifting their reserved power to a Federal bureaucracy what we are really doing to our democracy—we, who today dedicated this beautiful monument to Jefferson, who, out of the wealth of his profound understanding, declared:

> It is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration * * * the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies.

We do not speak of the wisdom which came from Jefferson's creative genius—he never claimed it as such—but of the wisdom which he had gained during his explorations into the fundamentals of life and the plan of nature for the government of man.

Near this beautiful memorial to Jefferson is the Washington Monument. Four years and a few months before Jefferson's inaugural address from which I have quoted, Washington delivered his Farewell Address to the American people. He was soon to finish his public career. He said:

> I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those out of whom a choice is to be made.

As a father to his children, and to their children, and to their children's children, for all times Washington spoke on that occasion. Out of the fullness of his experience and observation, out of the richness of his meditations as he had walked through the silent places, walked alone, and yet not alone in the silent places, he spoke. He spoke to us in words of deathless wisdom. He said to us, and I quote:

> It is important likewise that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution, in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism.
>
> A just estimate of that love of power, and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart, (ambition) is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power; by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. (That is our job). If in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

He said many other very wise things in that address, which we might consider with profit on this the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson. He said this, and I quote again:

> The disorders and miseries which result gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and sooner or later the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purposes of his own elevation, on the ruins of public liberty.

Long and deeply we may with profit meditate upon the wisdom and the warning of these words. It was a great period in which these men lived, but it is a greater period in which we are living. We are possibly witnessing now the recurrence of one of the most interesting and rarest phenomena to be observed in the course of human history, this movement up from the people. For 6 or 7 years under our own observation it has been in the process of development. President Woodrow Wilson discovered the phenomena in his examination of the record of human transactions. We are seeing this development as with our own eyes. This is what Mr. Wilson said of it. I quote:

> When I look back on the processes of history, when I survey the genesis of America, I see this written over every page: That the nations are renewed from the bottom, not from the top; that the genius which springs up from the ranks of unknown men is the genius which renews the youth and energy of the people. Everything I know about history, every bit of experience and observation that has contributed to my thought, has confirmed me in the conviction that the real wisdom of human life is compounded out of the experiences of ordinary men. The utility, the vitality, the fruitage of life does not come from the top to the bottom; it comes, like the natural growth of a great tree, from the soil, up through the trunk into the branches to the foliage and the fruit. The great struggling unknown masses of the men who are at the base of everything are the dynamic force that is lifting the levels of society. A nation is as great, and only as great, as her rank and file.

We might ponder that a long time. Examination and meditation must convince anyone that God has not put in the hearts of people the yearning to be free and self-governing and made the realization of that yearning to depend upon the will and the good disposition of one man or a few men in power. They might be ambitious to be known as great governors of a people instead of useful servants of a great people, the only aspiration a public servant in a democracy has any right to have. Jefferson was right and Wilson was right. Only the great mass of a people, self-respecting and self-dependent, fit to be free, responding to the deep impulses of a God-implanted aspiration to be free, with that aspiration interpreted and made vocal by such servants of the people as the one we honor today, in times like these, can revitalize and preserve the institutions of democratic government against their enemies, foreign and domestic.

If this movement up from the people is the real thing, to which Mr. Wilson referred, and all signs indicate it may be, politicians playing for political advantage either for themselves or their party will find themselves swept aside by the increasing purpose and strength of this movement to preserve the democracy which is coming up from the people. It is apparently an instinctive movement, one of self-preservation, among a people still fit to be free.

It would be a helpful and heartening thing for those who still believe with Jefferson that people have a right to be free, and the capacity to be free, to listen

to the wisdom of plain people who seem to be sending up from themselves that which Mr. Wilson describes as "the genius which renews the youth and energy of the people."

We might well consider on this natal day of Thomas Jefferson how much of the philosophy and wisdom of the sage of Monticello we are reflecting in our policy of government and to what degree, during the long period when the people were not alert, we have been mixing a sort of degenerate Democratic-Republican philosophy and policy of government with that of the communistic-socialistic-bureaucratic hybrid that is very potent in this country these days.

This is the high peak in the history of the ages. The mightiest issues of all times are pending. This country, this Democracy, holds the hope of the ages for peoples who would be free. We must not fail in the execution of the commission which destiny has assigned to us. This day of dedication of a beautiful structure to Thomas Jefferson is an appropriate time for a rededication of the American people to the principles of free government, of which Jefferson was one of the world's greatest champions.

Voluntary Enlistment of Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject Free Enterprise Calls for the Voluntary Enlistment of Women, which I delivered before the Conference on War and Post-War Demands for Trained Personnel, at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C., on April 10, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Under the free-enterprise system the United States has grown and prospered and become the best neighbor that the family of nations has ever known. Under the free-enterprise system we lead the world in the mechanical arts, cultural attainments, and productive capacity. Under the free-enterprise system womanhood has reached the very heights of respect and dignity and freedom of opportunity. At last we can say in truth, brains, ability, individual capacity determine the issue, not sex. At last individual merit has overcome the historic complex of sex inferiority and woman, without interference, fashions her own destiny.

And yet today America, the world's foremost exponent of the free-enterprise system, finds herself in the paradoxical position of sacrificing her very life in the destruction of tyranny and totalitarianism abroad to preserve liberty, freedom, and the dignity of man throughout the world, and at the very same time seriously debating before this historic conference the advisability of voluntarily adopting tyranny and totalitarianism here at home in the name of efficiency. If this unbelievable paradox were not so gruesome, and if we had a sense of humor callous enough to contemplate slavery for ourselves, we could very well sit back and laugh ourselves into convulsions at ourselves.

It is my purpose today, in this friendly debate with the Honorable JAMES W. WADSWORTH, to point out specifically how the Austin-Wadsworth bill will adversely affect the lives of American women and will adversely affect the best interests of this great Nation, should Congress make the terrible mistake of enacting it into law. We have the fiercest war of all history to win, and every major mistake we make will add to America's costs in blood and treasure. With such a sword supported by a single thread hanging over our heads we must above all be prudent.

The Austin-Wadsworth bill provides for drafting for work the manhood and womanhood of the United States. This bill puts all men between the ages of 18 and 65 and all women between 18 and 50 under the compulsion of Federal bureaucrats to render such personal services as he or she may be deemed best fitted to perform. Thus the bill gives Washington bureaucracy the same arbitrary control over the men and women of the United States as the Government now exercises over the personnel of its armed forces.

There is a vast difference, however, in drafting a man for the armed forces and drafting a man or woman to work for a private employer making a fat profit out of that work. The Army belongs to all of us, and is mobilized for our mutual defense and protection, while private industry is operated for private profit. They cannot, therefore, be considered to be on the same plane.

The Austin-Wadsworth bill is a direct violation of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution. It would place Federal bureaucratic autocracy in control of the liberties of American citizens. Conscription of labor is a foreign ideology and must not be permitted to take root in free America even during war. Free labor is the foundation of our free American institutions. Conscription of labor must of necessity be followed by conscription of capital—make no mistake about that.

Conscription of labor is thoroughly impractical. It is not only completely repugnant to every American workman, but it is wholly unnecessary as well. Much could be done to increase the man and woman power of this Nation.

Of labor, there is still much hoarding and wasting by industry. Transportation and housing requirements of workers have not been adequately met. Inexcusable shortages of natural resources and poor scheduling in the factories are causing an appalling loss of precious man-hours. Labor is not being utilized at its highest skill. Cost-plus formulas have encouraged criminal waste of man-hours by plant management. Absenteeism, the joint problem of management and labor, goes merrily on without effective check. There is a lack of adequate training of men and women for skilled jobs.

The Austin-Wadsworth bill would aggravate rather than cure these tragic conditions. It leaves employers free to continue chaotic and destructive employment practices. Under its provisions, industry would be deluged with a great multitude of sullen, disgruntled, untrained misfits, while ordinary civilian pursuits, so necessary to sustain an all-out war effort, would be stripped arbitrarily of its man and woman power. It will hinder and not help the war effort.

It is evidence of "fuzzy" thinking to seize upon a labor-draft measure as the cure-all to solve with one wave of the magic legislative wand all of our manpower troubles. What is needed is a more efficient use of the manpower now available. The Austin-Wadsworth bill makes no suggestion of such an approach. It ignores fundamentals and offers a remedy that cures nothing but creates a new series of disturbances that cannot end in less than complete disorder. It calls for nothing but the power to draft and the power to regiment. That is not a remedy; that is a complex.

In the holy name of freedom, it destroys freedom. If it be patriotic to fight this war against despotism—and it is—then we must fight the enactment of a bill that would impose the yoke of involuntary servitude upon an American workman and consign him or her to the tender mercies of a power-mad Washington bureaucracy. No despot equals a one-track "officecrat."

Truly the Austin-Wadsworth proposal, striking down as it does the voluntary work system, is blinded desperation resulting from lack of faith in the things that made America great.

War promotes emotional instability and a general restlessness and craving for liquor and excitement, resulting in alarming increases of delinquency and truancy among children, spreading of immorality, venereal disease, and illegitimacy among adolescents and the tragedy of broken homes, and a general upheaval all along the line.

Indeed, war places a heavy burden upon women and upon society. Women are the foundation of the family and the family is the bulwark of society. Soon the fathers are to be called and the mothers must be fathers as well as mothers. Marketing and planning the diet today is an overwhelming problem in itself, doing housework without help, shopping without transportation, caring for the sick without nurses or doctors; all of these things have placed a terrible strain upon women and made the maintenance of family life a constant struggle and in many instances a horrible nightmare.

The home ties must not be further weakened; they must be strengthened instead. Young people must be given more security, not less. Around the camps, posts, and factories the social situation is really most serious. Lonely soldiers and lonely men workers far away from home try to find solace with any women or girls they can find and you know with what tragic results.

Women should not be conscripted during war when the men are at the front and in the distant war plant since at such a time they are the custodians of our cherished institutions—the church, the school, the fraternity, the welfare program. It is their job during war not only to keep the home fires burning, but to keep the spiritual fires from dying out. Whatever comes, the religious and cultural values and moral tone of our civilization must be sustained or we lose more than the war.

Good, wholesome, straight-thinking, intelligent, stabilized women are the only hope to combat these terrifying conditions. It will take all the ingenuity, resourcefulness, and courage they can muster to meet the challenge that is theirs. A newspaper in a nearby American city this very week relates the sordid story of a gang of 12-year-old prostitutes. Family ties, family understanding, and family respect must be held intact, the family church kept alert and the neighborhood influence for wholesome family life maintained. Who is to do all this?—the women, God bless them, if it is to be done. Conscript women? Send them into far away places? Break up homes? Destroy family morale?—God forbid!

It cannot be denied that modern war requires directly and indirectly the services, the wealth, and if need be, the lives of every citizen of every belligerent country. No longer does an Army of trained fighting men alone carry the brunt of battle. Bombs fall on soldier and civilian alike. Furthermore, modern wars are fought for ideologies, philosophies, and principles, rather than for kingdoms and crowns. Germany fights for her new order and state socialism and the Allies fight for the freedoms. Little is being said about it, but one of those freedoms that

we fight most for is the free enterprise system. No part of our population has a greater stake in this war than have our women folk. They have far more to lose than anyone. For them Hitler's new order means slavery and the return of the indignities visited upon their sex during the Dark Ages. Their whole world hangs in the balance of an Allied victory. No one understands the implications involved in this war more clearly than they.

In a very practical sense this is a woman's war. Now, let us see how they respond to its burdens. To be sure they have given freely of their sons and sweethearts and husbands. But they have also given themselves just as freely and compulsion has not been required. Recently the Army, the Navy, the Marines, and the Coast Guard opened their ranks to women volunteers with the result that these branches of the military service have been deluged with women's applications. In fact, applications are coming in much faster than women soldiers can be assimilated. Does that official fact mean anything to the advocates of conscription of women? Apparently not.

Then, what of the industrial front supplied entirely by volunteers, both men and women? In the so-called munition industries, including steel mills, the aircraft industry, shipbuilding, etc., 1,600,000 women are at work, and before the end of the year 2,900,000 women will be employed. Is any difficulty encountered recruiting women? Not the least bit. In fact, again applications are more numerous than jobs.

In the industries classed as more essential industries, including coal mining, lumbering, food processing, 1,500,000 women are employed and by December 31, 1943, 1,900,000 women will be at work. In these industries there is also a waiting list of women applicants anxious to go to work. Five hundred thousand women are employed as civilian war workers outside of the factories. This number will go to 800,000 by the end of the year. Again, an abundance of women applicants.

The statistician of the War Manpower Commission told me this week that no national recruiting campaign was even being considered since, if should they do so, they would be overwhelmed with applications. A careful canvass shows that there are 4,500,000 women ready to go to work right now in the war effort. However, many of them do not live where the work is and would have to be moved to the plants and that is not the policy of the War Manpower Commission. For obvious reasons, you cannot move women about as you can men, and for the reasons which I have already dwelt upon you should not do so. Housing and family problems must be solved first. The friends of conscription have completely overlooked that fundamental.

Much could be done to make the voluntary system work better. Women desirous of doing something toward aiding in the prosecution of the war are being confused by conflicting statements and are unable to obtain clear-cut directions as to where their services are needed. Women workers have applied in vain to have their services utilized in the war effort, but after repeated efforts have not succeeded in being placed at any job. Certainly a well thought-out and developed plan to utilize women on a voluntary basis should precede any thoughts of compulsion. I must repeat over and over the volunteer method of recruiting and employing women has not been exhausted, nor can it be denied that we still have a substantial reservoir of potential women workers who could be used in the labor market to excellent advantage without doing violence to our whole social structure. Conscription of women is at least premature.

Neither the selective-service bill nor the Austin-Wadsworth bill pretends to conscript women for the various military services in the armed forces. Nor do either of them conscript female nurses or female physicians; therefore, if the Austin-Wadsworth bill should be enacted into law, women laborers would be conscripted while women in the military personnel would remain on the voluntary basis. I see neither rhyme nor reason for this strange discrimination against women workers.

There are many sound arguments for conscripting men for the armed forces during war that do not apply to the conscription of either men or women for work. For one thing, compulsory military service is self-limiting as it terminates at the conclusion of hostilities, while industrial compulsion need ha a no limitation at all. On one subterfuge or another it might even be continued by an arbitrary government as a permanent fixture in our economy.

Conscription of women must as a matter of course be coupled with distribution. It is the distribution of women—the shipping of them here and there wherever industry requires them—that disturbs me most in this proposal.

Some States have splendid protective laws for women workers. Others have no protection at all. Some States provide generous workmen's compensation payments and liberal unemployment insurance and old-age assistance, while other States make little or no provision for these things.

How would the women of this splendid group of refined and intelligent women like to be sent from their comfortable homes and happy family life into a plant in Louisiana or some other distant State as charwomen or farm workers or grease monkeys? The voluntary system permits women to choose their employment and the place of employment. The War Manpower Commission prefers the voluntary system because it permits women to live with their own families and at the same time supply the need for workers.

The enactment of the Austin-Wadsworth bill would be a confession that free labor, democracy, and the free-enterprise system have dismally failed in a great crisis and that we were compelled to resort to the vile methods of the totalitarian powers in order to win the war. I refuse to believe that slave labor is more efficient than free labor. I refuse to believe that despotism and state socialism are better than the tried and true free enterprise system of our founding fathers.

The Austin-Wadsworth bill is a decided step toward state socialism. Women know by instinct that liberty, freedom, and the dignity of womanhood are safe under the free-enterprise system, and that all of these advantages will be destroyed by state socialism or by autocratic bureaucracy.

Address by Senator Walsh at Ceremonies Welcoming Home Basil Dominick Izzi

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on Sunday, April 11, an unusual event took place in the town of Barre, Mass.

Basil D. Izzi, a 20-year-old naval gunner, who lived through 83 harrowing days on a raft in the Pacific, returned to his home town to receive a victorious welcome from his family, neighbors, and townspeople, from whom he departed a year ago to enlist in the Navy, when but 19 years of age.

Seaman Izzi was aboard a United Nations merchant ship as a member of the gun crew when it was torpedoed. He swam through shark-infested waters to a raft 6 by 9 feet, and got aboard with four others. He and his companions lived on fish, birds, and rain water after their limited supply of food had been exhausted. He was on this raft from November 2, 1942, to January 24, 1943. While on the raft, he reached his twentieth birthday. During these 83 days, two of his companions on the raft, one an ensign in the Navy, died and they were buried at sea by the three survivors. Izzi was the only American among the three who survived.

I had the honor to address the townspeople of Barre, Mass., in the presence of Seaman Izzi, his father and mother, and a large number of his enthusiastic fellow citizens. I ask that my speech be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many impressive thoughts come to mind as we stand in the presence of this young hero. First, his age; a mere youth—only 20 years of age; that he is the son of humble, but honest emigrant parents; that it is not necessary for one to enjoy high military rank in order to be a great hero; and, finally, that we are in the presence of one of the greatest surviving heroes of the present war, one who has endured and suffered severely the pangs of bodily pain, lonesomeness, hunger, discouragement, and exhaustion. For 83 long days and nights, abandoned, watching, waiting, and praying, he suffered the excruciating hardships which few human beings ever before experienced, and yet survived.

The story of this young man whom we salute today should impress all in the extent of suffering and the extreme sacrifices that our youths in the armed services are making for us. Basil Dominick Izzi exemplifies in a striking degree the courage and the faith in God and country that inspire the youths in our fighting forces. One of the great tragedies of war is that our young men, many of them mere boys, must bear the hardships, endure the agony and pain, and, if necessary, sacrifice their lives.

In paying tribute to this naval hero we must not fail to express our admiration and gratitude for the millions of his companions who on land, in the air, and on the seas are steadily and determinedly leading us to victory. In view of the example of sacrifices that they are making, we on the home front should be strengthened in our determination to bear willingly the lighter burdens and the insignificant sacrifices that the home-front war effort necessitates.

In future years the name "Izzi" will be an inspiration not only to the citizenry of his home community but to all Americans. His has not been mere lip service. He has seen, felt, suffered, and endured under the enemy's fire in order that our free institutions should not perish.

All honor to this son of Worcester County, whose parents came to this land of plenty to gain opportunities nowhere else enjoyed throughout the world and who, in turn, are proving so gloriously their loyalty and devotion to America.

It is easy to extend praise in the hour of triumph, but real appreciation and thanksgivings can best be shown through the measure of the support and aid we give them after the din and noise of the conflict is over.

We will be unworthy of the heroic services of the millions of American youths who have left home to serve us on the far-flung battle fronts if we but merely cheer and applaud those who come back to us maimed and broken in body and spirit. We must remember as well, and with undying gratitude, those who will never return. We must not cease to revere the memory of other thousands who are offering their lives and who, unlike Seaman Izzi, never had even the satisfaction of looking into the grateful faces of their fellow countrymen.

Our gratitude to the living and the dead must be more than words and cheers. We must make certain that they and their loved ones never shall want for those comforts and benefices that we, as grateful citizens, must always extend to them. With more than esteem and affection, we must strive to repay them by giving them all the necessary material things that may brighten their lives and ease their journey through life.

Americans, when you look upon the uniform of our soldiers and our sailors, you will really and effectively understand our obligation to them if you would read thereon these invisible words: "We are doing this for you."

We must not fail to extend to our defenders and their kith and kin after the war is over a share of the wealth and prosperity that they have preserved for us. However, that there is no more priceless gift we can give our war heroes, living or dead, than to preserve for them the continued enjoyment by the human family, through sound policies of government, our sacred traditions, our priceless free institutions—in a word, our American democracy.

Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. V. ROBERTSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] over the National Broadcasting Co. network yesterday evening in connection with the observation of the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In this hour of the Nation's greatest need, we turn instinctively to our great leaders of the past for guidance and strength. We long for a Washington, a Jefferson, a Lincoln. We do homage today to Thomas Jefferson. We do so remembering his vow, "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

The Declaration of Independence emerged from his humble and mighty pen; it was then, and still is, the greatest charter of human rights ever conceived by the brain and heart of man. It holds that "all men are * * * endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; * * * that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed." And then he recites "a long train of abuses and usurpations." To celebrate the memory of Jefferson is to celebrate that immortal document.

As we listened today to the tributes paid our first great Democrat by those high in the New Deal party, many of us wondered how much was lip service and how much was veneration for the principles of Thomas Jefferson The New Deal bureaucracy of today is about as like the real Democratic Party as Hitler is like Jefferson. Voracious bureaucrats, arrogant and petty, meddle in every activity of the American citizen today. We still have the form of free government but the substance is going. These forms are as hypocritical as the forms of government in Nazi Germany. Hitler has courts and a Reichstag, but we know the substance of freedom and justice is gone. The pattern followed by this administration, if continued, will lead to the same end. May the voice of the American people cry out in all its power against the further desecration of our liberties under the Constitution. As Jefferson said, "to preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt; we must make our election between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude." "If we can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy."

Principles endure; they are the same yesterday, today, and tomorrow. President Roosevelt saw eye to eye with Jefferson when he said, "Government costs too much," and, said Mr. Roosevelt, "I shall not stop that preaching; taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors. Our workers may never see a tax bill but they pay it. They pay in deductions and wages, in increased cost of what they buy, let us have courage to stop borrowing to meet continued deficits." That is what the President said when he was a candidate in 1932. Jefferson had a disciple once in Franklin Roosevelt. Today he and his official family paid tribute to Jefferson but they happily forgot Mr. Roosevelt's even more positive language than that of Jefferson when he said: "We are not getting an adequate return for the money we are spending in Washington or, to put it another way, we are spending altogether too much money for Government service that is neither practical nor necessary." And then in addition to that, "We are attempting too many functions, we need to simplify what the Federal Government is giving to the people." But that, too, was said in 1932 when the President was a candidate.

Americans will reflect upon the record of the 10 long years between that statement and today as we celebrate Jefferson's birthday.

Jefferson had a passion for "home rule." He said, "the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns, are the surest bulwarks against anti-Republican principles." Our now President was still more emphatic than Jefferson was in his stand against centralization of power in Washington. "It was clear to the framers of our Constitution," President Roosevelt said, "that the greatest possible liberty of self-government must be given to each State and that any national administration attempting to make all laws for the whole Nation would inevitably result at some future time in a dissolution of the Union itself." How to change a democracy to a monarchy? President Roosevelt gave the answer. He declared: "Now to bring about government by oligarchy, masquerading as democracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government. The individual sovereignty of our States must first be destroyed. We are safe from the danger of any such departure from the principles by which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever it seems in danger." But he said that in 1930 and shortly afterward he wrote "must" on the National Recovery Administration and the Guffey Coal Act, both of which were outlawed by the Supreme Court as despoiling the States of their constitutional rights.

It is gratifying to deserve the title of a Jeffersonian Democrat; Jefferson practiced the principles he preached. He summed it all up in these words: "The whole art of government consists in the art of being honest." The real Jeffersonian Democrats who today paid silent tribute to their saint must have been chagrined at the mock ceremonies here in the Nation's Capital—the celebration of Jefferson's birthday by Justice Felix Frankfurter and the New Deal. Real Jeffersonians must have been indignant—yea, angry—as they listened in vain for some allusion to Jefferson's deep respect for the legislative branch of the Government. The framers of "must" laws conveniently forgot today that Jefferson "determined," as he said, "to intermeddle not at all with Members of Congress, whose friendship I value too highly to risk by usurpation of their freedom of judgment and the conscientious pursuit of their own sense of duty." Did Justice Frankfurter recall that Jefferson insisted that judges should be independent of both Congress and the President in order, he said, that the courts might protect the citizens' rights by holding both Congress and the President in check?

Did we hear anything today of Jefferson's views on agriculture? Jefferson said: "Were we to be directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread." Ponder that statement; does that not seem prophetic today? Jefferson said again: "Our country is too large to have all its affairs directed by a single government." Did you hear any official exponent of the New Deal Party today quote President Roosevelt on the futility of maintaining prices on wheat and cotton, characterizing as a cruel joke any plan for farmers to allow 20 percent of their wheat lands to lie idle, to plow up every third row of cotton, and to shoot every tenth dairy cow? But that was said by candidate Roosevelt in 1932. Did Justice Frankfurter recall today the decision of the Supreme Court declaring unconstitutional the triple-A law with its program of plowing up every other row of cotton and killing the little pigs? If so, he did not mention it.

In all the official tributes to Jefferson made on this day, you heard no approval of the statement of Jefferson that "should a President consent to be a candidate for third election, I trust he would be rejected on this demonstration of his ambitious views." They could have quoted Jefferson when he said: "If some period of time be not fixed, either by the Constitution or by practice, to the services of the First Magistrate, his office, though nominally elective, will, in fact, be for life, and that will soon degenerate into an inheritance."

Oh, but if Jefferson, like Banquo's ghost, had appeared suddenly upon the platform today, what would he have said? He would have been justified in saying, "you have not come together here to praise me, you have come to bury me." For President Roosevelt said in 1932: "Remember well, that attitude and method, the way we do things, is nearly always the measure of our sincerity."

The ghost of Jefferson would also observe that we are now engaged in a world war, the objectives of that war are to bring greater and more lasting freedoms to the individual man, the man, who was ever present in Jefferson's philosophy of government. He would see us fighting two wars at the same time—one to defeat Germany, and the totalitarian way of life where the man is a pawn and the state supreme; the other war is to reform, to "make America over" in Tugwellian

phrase, to build up the power of the Executive, to extend, in the name of war, bureaucratic controls over man. He would note that these controls, under the pleasing name of "national planning," are not the plans created by war. They are the same plans of regimentation that have been advocated by the New Deal throughout its entire reign, and "the measure of sincerity" is the daily suggestion of some bureau that it should carry on through the years following the peace.

Jefferson hated bureaucracy as he hated the tyranny of George III and he would condemn bureaucracy today as he condemned the tyranny of King George, when he said: "He has erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat their substance." He would see a fiscal policy, justified by its proponents on the grounds that debt and spending are virtues and a national asset, rather than a threat to our freedom. He would see a Nation brought to its lowest ebb in political morality, where subsidies are the rule, where appointment to Federal jobs is the price of loyalty to the New Deal. Jefferson would still find the form of government he set up but the substance in danger. He would soberly remind us of the warning of his colleague, Benjamin Franklin: "They that can give up an essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." He would urge us today to appraise intelligently the state of the Union, to arouse ourselves to support our free institutions, to direct and support our servants in Congress, one of the two remaining legislative bodies in the world. He would doubtless repeat again his own words, more pertinent today than in 1789, "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Some may object to the criticism of the President and his administration during war time; some may say that even a fourth term by the President should be endured in the interest of the prosecution of the war and the writing of the peace. I say, and am sure the thoughtful will concur, that this administration ought to be replaced from the top down because of the war. This administration is dangerously inefficient and dangerously political in its prosecution of the war. Cannot free Americans agree wholeheartedly with Woodrow Wilson who said, "We do not need less criticism in time of war, but more. It is hoped that criticism will be constructive, but better unfair attack than autocratic repression. Honesty and competence require no shield of secrecy."

A Word From Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include, by request, the following letter to Congress, signed by 123 Massachusetts citizens and taxpayers:

GENTLEMEN: Since we can't come to Washington and discuss the situation with you on an across-the-table basis, the next best thing is a friendly letter. There are a few things going on in Washington that we don't like and it's your job to fix them up.

First, why all this hullabaloo over the Ruml plan? It's a pretty good idea, we think. The Treasury says it would lose money under this plan—well, they aren't making any money now with a lot of people cashing war bonds to meet tax payments. Suppose a few rich men do gain a little from it, aren't we seeking the greatest good for the greatest number? Of course, the proposed cash discount to the man who can pay 2 years' taxes in 1 year (and isn't he a rich man?) doesn't help the average man very much. Now can't you fellows just cut out all the arguments and sit down and pass a tax bill containing the Ruml plan? You could do it in a day if you really wanted to, and you'd clear up a lot of confusion by doing it. If no such plan is in effect soon, we're going to be in a tough spot when high-paid defense workers try to pay high taxes out of lowered incomes.

There's another situation which needs a little quick clarification. Under the present manpower set-up, who stands just where? We don't know, and we'd like to have some idea. Perhaps this isn't entirely your fault, but you can put a little pressure on some of these Nercesque bureaucrats and get some concrete action.

While we're on the subject of bureaucrats, for heaven's sake get rid of some of those embryonic lawyers (remember Ginsburg of Office of Price Administration?) who read a book once and are now fully qualified to boss us around. If they're so smart why do they have to ask so darn many questions about everyone's business before they can get around to saying yes or no—mostly no. We sometimes suspect that a lot of these jobs are purely political, but, of course, politics has been suspended for the duration. (Ha!) Seems to us we read recently that there are no pictures of Mme. Chiang at a Chicago meeting because the $5,000-a-year Office of War Information cameraman—the only one admitted to the meeting—forgot to take the shutter off the lens of his camera. For that annual salary we ought to get a lot of pictures, not just laughs.

Then there's rationing, particularly here in the bloody-but-unbowed East. Not even enough gas to get to the polls to vote. And what a mess fuel oil was this winter. We who managed to keep warm are thanking the oil man, not the Office of Price Administration. And now we're starting on food rationing. We know something has to be done to insure a reasonably equal distribution of food, but can't we get someone to do it other than the dream boys of Office of Price Administration? Just for example, over 80 cars of potatoes sat in Boston freight yards because those boys made a mess of potato prices, and potatoes are getting scarcer in the stores every day. But who needs meat and potatoes, they say—eat fish, there's plenty of it. Sure, there's plenty of it—lobsters are three for $2.50 instead of $1, halibut has gone from 35 cents to 85 cents a pound, and the lowly mackerel commands two bits per pound.

We could mention many more examples of inefficiency, but we want you to spend your time correcting them rather than reading about them, so we'll quit with just one more. This war has a long time to run yet, and our domestic problems are far from settled, even after 10 years of doctoring by the New Deal. So let's clean up the war first and then fix up our troubles at home, before we set out to feed every Hottentot and transform every Arab and Siamese into a social-securitized New Dealer. By all means, get together on what we're going to say and do at the peace table, but tether HENRY WALLACE and his crowd in the back pasture until practical men can settle the practical problems. Then, when we can breathe a peaceful breath and can afford to indulge in a little world-wide politicking, turn them loose, but just give them enough rope—and you know what.

Now we're going back to work, gentlemen; we have a lot of questionnaires to fill out. Please don't waste any time getting busy yourselves. Remember, this country was made great and rich and powerful because the average American was, and still is, a pretty level-headed guy. When left alone and given a chance to advance himself, he did a fine job in building a fine country. Keep on leaving him alone, give him a chance to use his own initiative, and we'll all come out on top.

(Signatures omitted.)

APRIL 10, 1943.

Daniel C. Roper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Daniel C. Roper," published in the Washington Evening Star of April 12, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANIEL C. ROPER

No other man of his time was motivated by more notably honorable intentions than Daniel C. Roper. The endowment which nature conferred upon him included the gift of patient kindliness. He sought the fulfillment of his purposes by tactful procedures. If gentleness of manner is the prime requisite of a statesman, he certainly was possessed of it to a degree well meriting such a title. Even at the height of great political battles, his temper remained unruffled, his tolerance undisturbed.

Yet Mr. Roper was a person of rigid principles and firm convictions. Religion meant much to him. He was on occasion a lay preacher of very real distinction. A basic tenet of his philosophy was the belief that there must be a strong ethical foundation for effective democracy. He had no confidence in negations. The notion that a people might prosper without faith in the supremacy of Divine Providence in the universe was repugnant to him. It was his reasoned judgment that poverty, disease, and crime in the world increased in the ratio of neglect of Christian teaching. He identified aggressive war with the pernicious growth of atheism in Europe, and frankly declared his distrust of Japan long before Pearl Harbor "because the inhabitants of that country have not listened attentively enough to Kagawa."

In the ordinary business of his career, Mr. Roper put into practice many of the doctrines of Benjamin Franklin, whose "folk wit" he ardently admired. It pleased him to be regarded as self-made and self-taught, though in point of fact he was a scholar who had the advantages of excellent orthodox training in his youth. His intellectual qualifications were recognized by election to the State Legislature of his native South Carolina before he came to Washington in 1894. Successively First Assistant Postmaster General, Vice Chairman of the Tariff Commission, and Commissioner of Internal Revenue in the administration of President Wilson, he gained the experience both in Government routine and in politics which won for him the position of Secretary of Commerce in the Cabinet of President Roosevelt. During his incumbency, he strove for cooperation between the New Deal, industry,

and organized labor. He never pretended to be a "liberal" in the modern sense of the word, yet it was an error to think of him as too conservative. The last important assignment he received—that of Minister to Canada was a gesture of gratitude for services constructively rendered to his party and his chief.

Mr. Roper remained to the end of his days a good neighbor in the District of Columbia. He lived to see the Federal City transformed, and his pride in its improvement during the approximate half century of his residence within its boundaries will be remembered by those who must carry it on. The same observation also applies to the United States as a community. He gloried in America, and if only one single claim may be made for him upon posterity it should be this: That he loved his country truly.

Fear of Bureaucracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Boston Herald of April 4, 1943:

BUREAUCRATS COW SMALL BUSINESSMEN—FEAR KEEPS HIM FROM PLEADING CASE, NO MATTER WHAT THE PINCH

(By Bill Cunningham)

General civilian business, slammed hard by the war, is registering sounds of pain. This is natural. What isn't natural is the fashion in which the sounds come out of the body. They are fearfully, furtively, and self-consciously uttered. They take the form of low moans instead of good honest yells. Asked why, the victims say they're afraid to open up.

Fear, in a democracy, isn't good.

There are undoubtedly some chiselers and connivers still sitting in big offices. Every businessman, large and small, is unquestionably trying to save as much of his bait as he can. The intelligent among them are trying to guess what lies beyond the current black-out in order to be in position to resume speed after victory. Some of them undoubtedly will cut the corners in favor of the home team if they can.

LOT OF CORNER BUTCHER CASE IN POINT

How much of their moaning, then, is caused by wounds avoidable, and even unjustly given, and how much is faked agony, or, at most, just plain—we'll say it politely—stomach-aching?

It undoubtedly depends on the individual. A rule of thumb might be that the little fellow and the little industry really are hurt, and that the big one may be, but that, when you get up into the broader brackets, you'd better keep your right hand high, as we say in pugilism.

The hard-collar boys will always stand watching.

As an example of the little fellow in bad trouble, you have to look no further than your corner butcher. He's ruined at the moment because it just chances that there's more to a steer than its entrails and organs. Not even the majestic minds of the OPA directive writers have been able to figure how to kill and cut up a cow without producing some steaks, chops and roasting meat in the process.

Under the present system, it takes a family as large as that of the late Major Cavanaugh to muster enough points to lift one of those steaks, and still have enough for the canned fish, butter, cheese, cooking fats and oils. The result is that the high-point-value cuts are piling up in the ice chest, because the average family can't afford the points even if financially richer than a beano concessionaire.

Meat in an unfrozen state, as in butchers' boxes, keeps about eight days. Then it begins to sweat and has to be trimmed. As the butcher trims, he pares off his profit because he can't raise the price to cover. As he keeps on trimming, he trims himself out of business.

NEWSMAN'S SOURCE WALKS RIGHT IN DOOR

That's the case of one little fellow whose number is legion, and there are plenty of others, with differing tunes but the same general sets of words.

But the case of entire industries, not individuals, is just as challenging, and at this point, I take the stand, and the oath, if necessary, to offer personal testimony.

Several weeks back, when it became obvious that food, in a land of great plenty, was about to become a great national issue, I was casting about for some way to get some background and expert information upon the subject. There's no point in my endeavoring to insult public intelligence by trying to pose as a master authority on matters with which I have never had the slightest acquaintance. There's no point in my trying to conceal my background.

I am an alumnus of the ball yards and the fistic battle pits, but before that I was a reporter, trained well by good men, and I flatter myself that I can still qualify. A good reporter interviews people, not himself, and in questions of this sort, he goes to the source. It was that source—some qualified source—I was seeking for information on the food situation.

All at once, it walked in the door.

It walked in in the person of one of the best executives of one of the biggest and most highly regarded food firms in this, or any other, part of America. I'd never seen the man, nor ever before heard of him, and for all I know to the contrary, that went double.

VIEWS ARE CHECKED, AND ALL ADD UP

He had with him the Office of Price Administration directives governing food rationing. They hadn't yet gone into effect, but they had been sent around in advance to the trade in order that the trade might prepare to govern itself accordingly. The trade had been trying to, he explained, but the trade was stumped. It had brought its brightest practical minds to bear on the prospectus. It had had its best legal brains go over the voluminous documents.

None could make any sense of it. All saw only one thing, and that was that it was utterly unworkable, as drawn.

I liked the man's attitude. He freely gave me his personal views. They were based on 40 years of successful, and one may even say brilliant, experience. But he asked me, in order to protect myself, please to check them, for both accuracy and opinion, against some other source, preferably outside the industry. Possibly, he said, he was a biased witness. His business was involved and naturally he was concerned, he said. Not only concerned, but mad as a hornet.

I did check his opinions and statements of fact, not alone with a shrewd and capable neutral, but certain of them with officials in Washington. They stood up completely, but here's the part of the experience I'm really coming to:

When we had finished our conference, I said to the gentlemen, "How do you want me to use this, Mr. Blank? As an interview quoting you?"

"No, if you please," he said. "Keep my name and my firm's name entirely out of it. If you want to write it at all, let it look as if it's just information you dug up yourself."

"Why?" I asked, "it's all your stuff."

"I know," he said, "but I'm afraid. I'm afraid of making trouble for my company."

COMES THE WOOL DELEGATION—AND BIG BUSINESS

Having let drive upon that matter, I apparently was accepted as a self-appointed champion of the dealers in victuals, and I was shortly waited on by a delegation from the Faneuil Hall district, with a bill of particulars covering the newly impossible situation of the butter and egg men.

Again we went through the same performance, and again I arrived at that final question, "Do you gentleman want to be quoted?" Again the answer was, "No," and again the explanation was that they feared recriminations, or professional revenge from the bureaucrats.

After the butter and egg people, came a delegation from the wool trade, and by this time I was really into big business, and big politics. These gentlemen represented 75 percent of an industry that does $200,000,000 worth of business annually, and affects almost all of New England in one way or another.

Again the story was precisely the same. Only they went further. They didn't want anybody to know that they had even seen me. Their particular fear was the Department of Agriculture. They wanted their story in print so thousands of copies of it could be distributed, especially through the wool districts of the West and Southwest. They wanted it in Washington, but, personally, they wanted to be kept out of it completely. That same word came up again—"afraid."

Then came the stocking people, and last week I struck the all-time high. This time it's so huge, it gets absolutely ridiculous, and this is the point where I resign this particular type of literature as piecework, and cover it all with general statement.

This new call to arms was handed me gratis by a general industry representing hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars. It involves what amounts to the entire merchant marine of the United States—everybody who owns or who did own ships taken over by the Government for war work. There's a lot of New England in it, for it involves our fishing fleet—something like 135 trawlers have been commandeered—and all our coal companies that haul fuel by water.

LOCALS ARE ONLY MINNOWS IN THIS STRING

But the locals are only minnows in this monumental string. It involves all the tankers and kindred maritime gear owned by such mighty corporations as the Standard Oil Co., the American Aluminum Co., and similar giants. And they have a squawk, or claim to have, although, frankly, this one is too astronomical for me.

Their trouble is bifurcated. One part of it's rates. They claim that after months of calculating with the Maritime Commission, they finally compromised on a fair rate for the use of their craft, but that in November, the Comptroller General, in auditing the arrangement, knocked 25 percent off the prices agreed on. This forces all hands to operate at great loss, they say, and it must be changed. To determine that, I'd have to audit their books, and I haven't the time to audit their books.

Their second claim of mistreatment is the arrangement that values their leased property as of September 1939, when the President issued his war emergency order. Ships bought or repaired after that date cost a great deal more, they state, and, as matters stand now, a ship which stands the owner, say, $500,000, may be sunk, and the Government, paying off at the 1939 rate, may pay

the owner, say, $300,000. The rest is dead loss to the owner, they claim, his only recourse is to sue the Government, and nobody quite dares a charge of antipatriotism by suing the Government in time of war.

Maybe it's a compliment to be asked to come galloping to the assistance of the Standard Oil Co. et al.; and if so, I bow in deep acknowledgment, but the situation at this point begins to look a little silly. Give me a little guy to fight for, preferably somebody who hasn't anybody else. People that big can hire lawyers and swing lobbies. In fact they do, and maybe have too often in the past.

But in this over-all picture there are two common denominators.

The first is nothing to worry about in terms of our future as a democratic way of life. It's a complaint against the fairness of prices hurriedly set in the new emergency of war. This is the mechanical result of whang-brained planning and pip-squeak administration by a lot of small-bore artillery where big shots are needed.

SECOND COMMON DENOMINATOR IS DISTURBING

The trail will be white with the bones of many a little business before the rains of common sense break the present bureaucratic drought, but the rains will come, for the already swollen clouds will break some day if only of their own weight.

But the second common denominator is the one that's disturbing. That's the steady beat of the word "fear" in the talk of those businessmen from the humblest of the shopkeepers to the most swollen of the millionaires. Their complaints were honest, their injustices plain, their properties and futures at stake. They had every constitutional right to a fair and square hearing, yet they were too terrified to speak in their own voices.

It wasn't merely that they thought a newspaper column could speak with more thunder. Some of them had sought the chance personally to speak in private in Washington, had received it, and when the time came had merely choked up. One man admitted it frankly and abjectly.

"I'll admit it," he said. "When I saw how that hearing was packed I realized we didn't have a chance in the world. I went there—I was sent there—to fight for our industry. I sat there and kept my mouth shut because I was afraid of what might happen to my company if I got up and said what I really thought."

This could be, of course, a plain lack of personal courage. But they can't all be yellow, and they all say the same thing. It could be that they're seeing spooks, that there's nothing to be afraid of, and that nobody will bother them. But they don't see it that way, and many of them have had personal experience. Most of them have been to Washington trying to straighten out their tangles in private, and some of them have had some very curt handling.

Some bureaucrat's third or fourth subassistant, still damp from the economics department of some distant cow college, receives them as if they stood charged with something such as robbing the blind. Perched in a stall up behind him like Poe's raven is his "procedures man," one of those three-years-out lawyers who's never tried a case, and the plaintiff is invited to go ahead. The burden of proof obviously is on him, and the general atmosphere tells him that the court hasn't much time.

One of these men told me that he was in the midst of such a session, and that he suddenly broke into the lecture being handed him with an objection. He was promptly told, in effect, to shut up. This irked him sufficiently to tell the Government representative that he wasn't accustomed to being spoken to in any such fashion and that he resented it.

"Oh, your feelings are hurt?" responded the authority with sarcasm, or so he reported. "Well, it might interest you to know that the condition of your feelings are of no concern here whatsoever."

Since when in a free country, under a process of government of the people, by the people, and for the people, should any honest citizen be barred by fear from standing up and arguing for his rights? By what authority can little professional on-the-housers order respectable taxpaying citizens around as if they were waiters?

What causes this fear? Is intimidation used? Are reprisals threatened? Have there been any authenticated cases?

Business, of course, took a terrific lacing from the present administration long before there was any war. Business, or, at least, industry has been the real hero of the war to date. Despite what was charged against it and beaten out of it, it came to the front with Pearl Harbor and, more than any other one unit, including the gallant Russian army, it has held the AXIS. Its guns, tanks, and planes supplied the means on every front, including the Russian.

A lot of apologies and a lot of gratitude are owing to American business genius and to those who direct it. Certainly fear isn't part of what it's earned, and no representative of even its civilian divisions should hesitate to stand up and protest what he considers to be a mistake of an injustice. Of course, his heart should be clean, his motives unchallengeable and the privilege he's seeking not a special one for himself.

If, in the mushrooming of bureaus, and the multiplication of alphabetical agencies, his rights are denied him and his courage has cracked, it's up to us to see that his dignity and his confidence are restored. He's a valuable man. We need him and his enterprise. This war is costing us $200,000,000 a day. Somebody's got to stay in business and help foot the bill.

"A Call to Action"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered before the Fraternal Council of Negro Churches at the Shiloh Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., on April 12, 1943, and request to have printed as a part of my comments contained in the speech before the council a resolution passed unanimously at the meeting, which I have just received from the chairman, Dr. W. H. Jernagin.

There being no objection, the address and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HON. WILLIAM LANGER, OF NORTH DAKOTA, AT SHILOH BAPTIST CHURCH, APRIL 12, 1943

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Williams, Dr. Jernagin, bishops, pastors, and members of the Fraternal Council of Negro Churches, and fellow American citizens of the Baptists, A. M. E., A. M. E. Zion, C. M. E., Episcopal, Methodist, Presbyterians, Congregational, African Orthodox Catholic, and Church of our Lord—Apostolic Faith, it is a happy privilege to be honored as your guest at this great public union meeting of these great religious organizations. I have learned of the far-reaching influence and devoted public service of your chairman, Dr. Jernagin, and the Fraternal Council of Negro Churches. Dr. Jernagin has been one of the Nation's Capital's most distinguished ministers and leaders in every project for the advancement of the American people for more than 30 years, especially in the matters of legislation under the control of the Congress and the administration of the Federal laws and appropriations authorized by the Senate and House of Representatives. Dr. Jernagin and Edgar G. Brown, director, National Negro Council, and president, United Government Employees, have been frequent visitors in the Senate Office Building, so you know the interests of the good, patriotic, and loyal Americans whom you represent have had the most active and effective consideration.

I have always been glad to have their views, and, as you also know, I have not hesitated to actively present the vital issues of your people in the Senate, both in the secret executive sessions and on the floor.

I believe as firmly today as Lincoln did 80 years ago, and Thomas Jefferson when he wrote into the Constitution of the United States, that all men are created equal and are entitled to equal rights with all other American citizens, native and foreign-born, regardless of race, creed, or color.

I believe with equal conviction that today is the very best time to stop giving only lip service to these fundamental rights, guaranteed to all Americans by the Constitution. Failure to practice what we preach is downright hypocrisy, and no true American believer in Democracy should keep silent in Congress or even in the White House in the face of the still unpublished lynchings of two 13-year-old boys in Mississippi. I for one say that the United States Justice Department has every reason to act. We agree that there are enough laws on the books and enough Federal authority to get kidnapers. I say there is no good reason that stops the Federal Government from getting the lynchers.

Certainly pass a Federal antilynching bill and the antipoll tax law, but in the meantime let the ministers and law-abiding American citizens demand that the United States Justice Department protect all American citizens in their rights, life, liberty, and equal justice to all, as well as the franchise to vote, as fully provided by our Constitution.

There are 5,000,000 American boys, including 450,000 servicemen of the colored race, fighting, bleeding, and dying for democracy on every battlefield of the world, and it is time we saw to it that the families of these brave American soldiers are not robbed, discriminated against, disfranchised, segregated on the home front, while establishing the four freedoms for all the peoples abroad.

Here in Washington the civil rights of all Americans, regardless of race, creed, or color, must, likewise, I repeat, must be enforced by the district attorney, the corporation counsel, and the United States Justice Department. It was just reported to me by Mr. Brown and Mr. Todd today, this Sabbath Day; think of it, ministers of the gospel—that a colored soldier in the uniform of our country was forced out of a restaurant on Pennsylvania Avenue and refused a cup of coffee. If an American in the uniform of Uncle Sam is flagrantly mistreated and discriminated against despite the fact he wears the uniform of the United States Government, it certainly is time for the ministers

of the Nation's Capital to turn from their morning services to mass meetings in the churches, calling the people on the home front to join in the battle, regardless of race, creed, party, or color for the enforcement of civil rights and the practice of the golden rule in the shadow of the White House and the United States Senate.

I am ready to back you up with every power I possess as an American and as a Member of the United States Senate in the 3½ years in which I will continue to vote, speak, and fight against hypocrisy and bigotry in high places.

Let me right here advise you what I proposed on the floor of the United States Senate in a speech entitled "A Call to Action." It is for all Americans to unite and organize in every community regardless of race, creed, or color. If you are with us in this fight, you and your friends here and throughout the country should write me, Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

RESOLUTION OF THE FRATERNAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO CHURCHES

Whereas Senator LANGER'S antidiscrimination amendment to the war overtime and increase pay bill will deny benefits of this legislation to the members of labor unions, such as the International Association of Machinists, including metal trades, electricians, and others, which deny membership to patriotic and loyal civil-service employees of the Federal Government in the United States Navy yards, arsenals, and Bureau of Engraving, United States Treasury, on account of race and color: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Fraternal Council of Negro Churches go on record in this citizens' mass meeting assembled, unanimously commending especially Senator LANGER, the militant sponsor of this antidiscrimination amendment, and Senator BROOKS and Senator MEAD, who joined him in the Senate Civil Service Committee, with Senator AIKEN in favorably reporting the measure, and spoke eloquently and effectively during the consideration of the bill on the floor of the United States Senate, which resulted in its passage, despite the bitter opposition of Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, and Senator BYRD, of Virginia.

Further, we urge that Senator MEAD and Senator LANGER continue the fight with the conferees of the House of Representatives, headed by Congressman ROBERT RAMSPECK, of Georgia, to insist upon the acceptance and retention in the pay bill of section 15 of the Senate bill No. 635, the so-called antidiscrimination amendment, which will insure justice to 40,000 colored civil-service navy-yard employees.

Criminal Waste and Farm Relief

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we will have before us today the agriculture appropriation bill carrying over $18,000,000 for the United States Forest Service. The Forest Service has done and is doing some excellent work. But, as in all bureaucracy, the dry rot and dead hand of inefficiency and extravagance appears. I hold in my hand a news article from the Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press, under date of April 12. This is an amazing story, and as part of my remarks I am extending it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In brief, it states that abandoned equipment from five C. C. C. camps in the Mark Twain National Forest in Missouri was collected and burned under supervision of the local forest-service director. Why was it burned? The forest-service director alleged it was because there was no legal way these wheelbarrows, saws, picks, shovels, plows, seed sowers, wheels, axes, and so forth, could be given away or sold to the farmers needing it, except by untangling red tape over a period of the next 2 years.

If this is true, Mr. Speaker, there is enough red tape in the Forest Service to make a worse conflagration, if it ever got ignited, than any forest fire. We cannot win this war by such management. It will not encourage sale of Government bonds if allowed to continue.

I am today asking the Secretary of War, who has jurisdiction over C. C. C. property, for a full report and investigation of this criminal waste of the people's money and property. If a more satisfactory explanation is not forthcoming and if proper corrective measures are not promptly taken by the responsible authorities in the War and Agriculture Departments, I will introduce a resolution for a congressional investigation.

I am for the agricultural appropriation bill, but there are more ways than just spending money, wrung from the hard-pressed people, to give relief to the farmers. It is time the administration realized it.

The article referred to follows:

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS MATERIAL BURNED IN TWO BIG BONFIRES AS WITNESSES WEEP—SOME "LOOKED AWFUL NEW," BUT OFFICIALS CALL IT JUNK AND EXPLAIN THEIR POLICY

Abandoned equipment from the five Civilian Conservation Corps camps in the Mark Twain Forest area has been collected in the two camps at Bradleyville and near Willow Springs and burned, R. E. Crowell, Forest Service director here, admitted today.

It was burned, he said, to get rid of the wooden parts, so that the metal parts could be converted to scrap. The metal scrap, he said, will be sold for salvage, probably within the next 10 days.

Citizens in both communities have reported the burnings with puzzled indignation.

Charles Ferguson, Willow Springs merchant, told the Springfield Leader and Press by telephone today that when he heard the report he flatly did not believe it—went out to the camp to see for himself.

"LOOKED AWFUL NEW"

He said he saw there, in the remains of a fire, "stoves, pulleys, chains, wire rope, picks, shovels, new grader blades, hand saws, crosscut saws, steel cots, mattocks, plows, 100 feet of 4-inch rubber hose, and a world of small tools, pliers, wrenches, etc."

Some of the stuff "looked awful new to me," he said.

Mr. Crowell denied definitely that any new equipment or any rubber hose had been burned.

From Bradleyville, outraged citizens reported "a big bonfire," and one related, "In this fire they threw a truck load of good wheelbarrows after beating the wheels off them. These wheelbarrows were hauled into this from another camp to be destroyed. Also in this fire went about 1,500 wrenches of all sizes and denominations, 40 good metal oil drums, dozens of practically new hand seed sowers, several truck wheels, automobile radiators, automobile heaters, automobile parts of all kinds, many picks and shovels which still had new paint on them, and other articles. All of this property was defaced or broken up as much as possible before throwing it in the fire. They would not sell it to anyone. Workers tried to salvage some of it, and were informed that the Government had ordered it burned and if they wanted to get in the penitentiary for 2 years pick some of the stuff out of the fire.

Mr. Crowell said here today that the Forest Service had no authority to give it away, and that there was "no basis for the sale of it."

It would have been possible to sell it, he explained, but the necessary red tape would have required a couple of years, and the metal scrap was needed right now.

JUST IMPRACTICAL

He admitted that the scrap might have included "a lot of tools that would have been serviceable to a farmer" but said they were all used and worn. "A farmer might be able to get quite a bit of use still out of a wornout axe," he illustrated.

"I'm sorry," he said, "if people seem to think we burned up stuff they could use—but there was no way to get to them." That was because, he repeated, it would not be legal to give it away, nor practicable to sell it.

Mr. Crowell explained that before the scrapped materials were gathered up at all, Army, Navy, and Civil Aeronautics Authority representatives had gone through each of the five camps and taken anything they could find of value or use to them.

What they left, he said was only worn and obsolete equipment which was salvaged for scrap metal.

Another reason why it would have been impracticable for the abandoned tools and the like to be distributed among the neighboring farmers, Mr. Crowell explained, was that, "It was all stamped with our mark on it, and if it was scattered around the neighborhood we couldn't tell our tools from others.

"It was just an impractical situation," he said.

Organized Labor Goes to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD letters passing between Hugh W. Wilkins, a young man at the naval training station at College Station, Tex., and A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. The letters were published in the April 1943 issue of The Railroad Trainman under the heading "Organized labor goes to war."

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVAL TRAINING SCHOOL,
College Station, Tex., February 21, 1943.

Mr. A. F. WHITNEY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: Because it is all too easy to take so many things of real importance for granted when one is caught in the rush

of events and particularly in times like these when the problems and activities of wartime have so changed the normal course of life, I want to take time out to express to you and the brotherhood my deep appreciation of the many real services you are rendering me while I am in the service.

It is indeed a great satisfaction and relief to know that nearly all of my personal insurance is being kept in full force by the organization, and without cost to me. It is especially gratifying to me to know that I remain a member in good standing of the labor orgazination which I have good cause to be proud of—and this also without any financial burden on me

In a broader sense, there is a profound feeling of confidence and security in knowing that while one is preparing to meet and combat the world-wide fascist threat to the institutions and freedoms which we hold dear as Americans, at home there are capable and loyal men directing the affairs of the brotherhood in a manner which gives assurance that this organization is doing its share to see that these things we fight to preserve are kept intact while we man the battle stations. I know that this feeling prevails among union men in the service generally, because many of them have said as much to me, so I don't speak for myself alone on this subject.

It is important to the service man to know that his job is protected and that conditions of labor are improving—not disintegrating—while he is away. In that respect, too, I have reason to be confident in and indebted to the Brotherhood and its officers. This includes our capable general chairman and his committee on the Pacific Electric.

In spite of vicious and none-too-subtle attempts to propagandize the service men into antagonism for labor organizations on the part of certain civilian agitators, I find that among those men who read this stuff in the papers the antagonism and content backfire into the faces of the propagandizers instead of being directed against the unions. There is a pretty general understanding, I believe, as to who is looking out for their interests in both the field of labor and of politics. Whatever may be the real motive behind those antilabor agitators, I can say with confidence that the service man is keeping his feet on the ground and his eye on the ball. He knows where the big fight is, and without exception he is ready to get into the thick of the battle and win it. No one can convince him that he should be picking quarrels with the guys (and the gals) back in the mines, factories, on the railroads and the freighters who are passing the ammunition up front. "Big names" who persist in such disruptive efforts are rapidly becoming "little names," contemptible in the eyes of the service men.

We're behind those men from the President on down who are, with great self-sacrifice, doing their utmost to unite the Nation for the maximum war effort attainable. Under such leadership as this will it be impressively demonstrated in the end that armies and navies of free people can knock the tar out of slave armies under the would-be world slave masters of Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo. It is being demonstrated even now in decisive battles against the Axis by our allies the world over. The high morale that goes with full confidence in the policies and motives of our Commander in Chief will be of major importance in spurring all of us on to doing our full part in winning the even greater victories yet to come.

The enclosed clipping from this morning's Dallas News, entitled "Divided We Stand," is pertinent to this subject, in my mind. I joined the Navy as a radio technician, second class. We're getting a rapid-fire course in mathematics and electrical engineering here and I expect to go on to an advance school later. It's interesting work and I hope to do some good in it.

With best personal regards to you and my friends in the Cleveland office, I remain,

Fraternally yours,

HUGH W. WILKINS,
Lodge 448.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *March 9, 1943.*

MR. HUGH W. WILKINS,
Naval Training School,
College Station, Tex.

DEAR BROTHER WILKINS: Your letter was most welcome to your friends in the grand lodge office. We were all glad to hear that you are doing well in the useful task assigned you as a member of our armed forces.

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is and will continue to be aggressively loyal to all of its thousands of members who have responded to the call of our country's military needs. The brotherhood is back of them morally, and it is also the policy of this union to support them materially, in the ways you mention, to the extent of its best effort and financial ability.

We on the trains and in the yards, and brotherhood officers who speak for the organization, are grateful for such expressions of appreciation from an enlisted man. Whatever the brotherhood is doing for its members who have joined the colors is due them as a matter of equity. It is not the brotherhood's gift, but your dessert. At the same time we realize practically that trade-union support, not only for union members but as well for all the men who bear the arms and do the fighting, is a substantial contribution to a necessary military morale. A man can possess ever so much physical courage, but it is not in the nature of any normal human to battle either for people or causes upon which he cannot rely. These are the simple guiding principles of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen in wartime.

Your letter went beyond matters which were personal and particular to the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. It seemed to me that it dealt with the question of military and domestic morale to such a thoughtful manner as to merit wide publication in the Trainman.

I was much interested in the enclosed clipping from the Dallas News containing an article by Prof. J. Frank Dobie, of the University of Texas, on the same general subject. About the same time, Brother C. A. Swindle, our general chairman in Brownwood, Tex., sent us a clipping of the same article by Professor Dobie, published in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram. I am going to write the editors of these two papers and thank them for giving their professional attention to these fine articles. The articles and their publication in Texas make me suspect that the people of Texas have been playing a very practical joke on the rest of the Nation, exporting some of their worst to Washington and keeping their finest citizens at home.

During the last year there has been developed a national campaign to propagandize the personnel of our Military Establishments against the civilians at home, and particularly against organized labor. This campaign has been "pointed up" recently in the speeches and public statements of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker.

Both Professor Dobie and yourself raise the question of the motive behind this campaign. I do not think the motive is to distract public attention from the misfeasance and malfeasance in the war effort of the industrialists who are behind it, nor do I think its purpose is to disrupt the war effort, although it tends to have that effect. I am not sure that Rickenbacker understands the full implication of what he is saying and doing, because many of his remarks indicate a profound ignorance. He is crude and even juvenile.

However, Rickenbacker's line of thinking, with the press agentry behind it, is loaded with dynamite. His speaking tour during his convalescence sows the seed of possible domestic controversy in America after the war. By inventing a bogus political issue, like "veterans against civilians," or "veterans against labor," which, if it can be successfully propagandized, will throw this country into post-war confusion and futility, he presents a major problem. This is on its face a reactionary device which can have but one conceivable result, call it motive, if you like, and that is; to block a constructive world peace based on the "four freedoms."

I am comforted to receive from a Navy man the reassurance that antilabor propaganda is making no headway among the men in his camp. But I am wondering if you are not underestimating the possibility that this constant needling and incitement of your buddies against the people at home will have an effect. Union members among the enlisted men and officers will no doubt understand this campaign of lies and slander, but can a majority of those who have not known labor, like many white collar and professional people, and farmers, and the younger men from the cities who have never had regular jobs in industry, resist it? If this propaganda can arouse many seasoned labor leaders to something like a state of panic, how effective may it not be with millions of our soldiers, sailors, and marines, who have not the time to think the business through, nor the facilities for getting complete information? I raise this question.

There is a great deal of division on the home front in this country, if we judge it by the amount of noise and the amount of printers' ink it absorbs. You can't define the motives behind it in a simple pat sentence. The motive cannot be traced to one big subversive, antilabor plot, where men meet conspiratorially in a smoke-filled room and decide how much they are going to pay Rickenbacker and what the grand strategy will be. There are many motives and many people and interests involved. If you want to be most general in defining the motive, I would call it hate, but that doesn't suffice. I have tried to classify the people and the motives behind this disruptive hullabaloo, which from the beginning has plagued the war effort. Roughly, you can put them in about 10 groups:

1. Roosevelt haters—mostly Democratic politicians, lead from the poll-tax areas, little, envious, petty, beady-eyed men whose schemes and ambitions somewhere along the line have been thwarted by the progressive statesmanship of President Roosevelt; whose hatred of the President has upset the functioning of their brains and viscera, and who can be relied upon to buck to the bitter end every constructive war measure the President proposes.

2. New Deal haters—reactionaries of all types in politics, finance, and industry who hate reform, and their camp following of declassed counselors, publicists, scribblers, and political toadies who get a jackal's dole for hating and fighting reform of every kind.

3. Britain haters—who have brought into this country or acquired here deep hyphenated grudges against Great Britain or the British Empire which they will pursue to the detriment of the war effort, even at the extreme cost of national defeat and the loss of democracy itself.

4. Russia haters—commonly called "red baiters," who think Communist Russia, now helping fight this country's mortal foe, must be agitated against, combated ruthlessly at all times and at all costs, even if their activities at this time result in actual aid and comfort to the enemy.

5. Labor haters—those with the National Association of Manufacturers mind, the "more profit crowd," who think all social evil flows from the program of organized labor, and who will work primarily for the destruction of labor unions in season and out, in prosperity and depression, in peace and in

war, wholly innocent of other considerations.

6. Foreigner haters—a group of professional super-patriots, the America Firsters in politics, in Congress, and in business, found in every strata of American society; the exposed and embittered isolationists who were shell shocked beyond recovery at Pearl Harbor; people who think Americanism means for them a personal sanctification not to be contaminated by contacts with other humans, who do not understand that war and peace are indivisible, and regard any expression of a progressive world view as so much "globaloney."

7. Civilian haters (please note): A small but powerful and vocal clique of World War No. 1 veteran politicians—as distinguished from the rank and file of veterans—who brought out of their service in the last war a childish hankering to wear a uniform and sidearms and carry a military policeman's stick, to run the country as it ought to be run, because civilians don't know how. Here are upstart leaders of the stormtrooper mentality in America, the gentry who would give us the castor oil when the workers go jobless and hungry and the man on horseback rides down Pennsylvania Avenue.

8. Democracy haters (1): American homespun Fascists of the Coughlin and the Lindbergh stripe, including a wide lunatic fringe of Gerald Smiths and William Dudley Pelleys and others too numerous to list, who are or should be in jail as enemies of the Nation.

9. Democracy haters (2): The American fifth column, members of which the Federal Bureau of Investigation has either jailed or driven undeground.

10. Democrat haters: An influential group of professional Republican politicians like TAFT and VANDENBERG, who are blinded in the glare of the distant 1944 elections and can't focus on the present war effort.

These 10 groups of oppositionists, loyal and disloyal, are alike disrupters of national and allied unity, and trouble makers on the home front; and they have certain other qualities in common: (a) Ninety-nine percent of them hate organized labor; (b) they are overwhelming reactionary on practically every public issue; (c) they are emotionally and mentally incapable of taking a vacation from their prejudices, hatreds, and phobias even in this time of crisis when our national security is at stake. Their ranks are shot through with an intellectual and moral confusion which incapacitates them for making a clean-cut decision on the central issue of the war.

Those who are not outright Fascists and opposed to democracy as a matter of principle, cannot decide which is preferably—an Axis victory with world fascism or a democratic victory with a democratic peace. There are people in this country who, I am tempted to believe, even fear total defeat for the Axis as much as they profess to desire total victory ofr the democracies.

They do not want to pay the cost of a democratic victory in the coin of democracy, in terms of the peace to come. They want, or think they want, to fight Hitler. They are putting up cash to buy chow and meet pay calls and supply guns and tanks and ammunition to the boys at the front, but they are not willing to put up a guaranty to our troops that the ideals of civilian living, they are told, and believe they are fighting for, will be achieved in practical realities, when they are mustered out of service.

In short, they want the Sammies in the steel helmets to fight this war for democracy and take a rain check on the "four freedoms" until they get home. They particularly want to substitute the rain check for that one about freedom from want (jobs).

Organized labor is the only real and consistent force in America which can be counted upon to stand up on the domestic political front for the "four freedoms," while the men with the weapons fight for them on the battle front. And here we arrive at the motive behind the current campaign against labor, directed at the armed forces. The strategists of this campaign know that the destruction of organized labor must be No. 1 item in their plan of action. Hence the attempts in Congress and in the State legislatures to hamstring and cripple labor unions by repressive legislation. Second, they must discredit labor among the fighting forces, and create a situation where the two will be at conflict after the war, if that is possible. Such an artificial political issue might split both the veterans and labor.

The method being used is obvious. Every insignificant strike is played up in black type, as if it were a national walk-out, a gross betrayal of the soldiers. Even wage negotiation by a labor union is painted as an act of selfish disloyalty to the fighters at the front. Outright lies about labor are published for soldier consumption. The fact that during the first year of the war only 0.06 of 1 percent of the days worked in war plants was lost by strikes, which is the real picture of organized labor's discipline and loyalty behind the lines, is never mentioned.

Other facts are trampled under hoof too in this wild stampede of reactionary propaganda across the front pages of the American press. It is forgotten that more time was lost to production by profit-grubbing manufacturers stalling for time to devise holeproof schemes to rook the Government and the taxpayers out of billions of public money. Forgotten are the millions of man-days lost by monopolistic industrialists, unwilling to expand, convert, and retool their plants for war. It is forgotten that the Nation's rubber shortage was the result of chicanery among industrialists whose only desire, right up until the shooting started, was to do business with Hitler. We are not reminded by those who constantly talk about strikers aiding Hitler, that the subversive monkey business of dollar-a-year steel men in Washington led us blindly into the bottleneck of a steel shortage; that they misled the President and the War Production Board with false reports on steel capacity, for which they should have been indicted and prosecuted. We are permitted to forget that dozens of blast furnaces were cold last summer, not because workers were striking, but because of this treachery of leading industrialists. We are not reminded by the propagandists who are poisoning the soldiers against labor, that there were similar situations in aluminum and other critical materials. It is not advertised with monotonous repetition that, while our fighters were bleeding and starving and rotting in the fox holes, steel dealers were bootlegging steel in a black market and using various devises to make illegal profits; that one of the reasons why industrialists are required to make so many complicated reports, is that there have been so many complicated schemes to defraud the Government, cover up inventories, and divert materials from war production. Nobody keeps repeating that officers of a company in Cleveland were caught red handed and convicted for selling the Government faulty parts for submarines. Who is going to tell all this to the marines while Rickenbacker tells them about labor?

Please do not take alarm at this sketchy narrative from a union man about how the other half lives during wartime. I do not offer it to you as a fair picture of our war production program, but only to illustrate what can be done with disturbing propaganda, if one has all the facilities which have been at the disposal of a Rickenbacker. I do not want to contribute a vicious part in a vicious circle of propaganda and counter-propaganda. I would not want to smear all war contractors by overemphasis on the infractions of a few, though some of the biggest. I think results will argue that manufacturers by and large are doing their best.

The fact is that our war production has been stupendously successful, one of the marvelous accomplishments of modern times. Without doubt when the whole history of the United States and the war is written, it will stand as a monument to the American people. You are getting first-class equipment and supplies of food and clothing and ammunition, and you will keep getting them in increasing quantities.

You will read, when it gets into the history books, that organized labor's war record will compare favorably with that of any other group in this country. You will read that more war contractors and merchants and landlords paid fines and served time, as trusties, for grafting and swindling and obstructing and evading war measures than there were union men, for lawless striking, or rioting, or subversive activities, or theft of union funds.

You will find, Brother Wilkins, that while the organized labor movement made an excellent war-production record, it also stood up and battled on the home front while you were away, so that our victorious country could be kept fit for a self-respecting workingman in the armed forces to come back to.

There are two ways to let you down while you are fighting. One is to fail to produce the things you need to fight and win. Another is for us to fail to keep at home the institutions and the freedoms and the security for which you are fighting. Labor is not failing you on either score.

Sincerely and fraternally yours,

A. F. WHITNEY.

Government Giving Away Rationed Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the March 1943 issue of Tax Talk, published by the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers' Associations.

The article refers to the fact that the Government is presently giving away as surplus commodities many items which are on the rationed list, and which are unavailable to many citizens—even with ration coupons.

This shocking situation cannot be tolerated. The people of this country are willing to make any necessary sacrifice in the present war emergency, but it seems to me that here is a matter which, if continued, will shake public confidence in the rationing program and lead to widespread resentment and indignation.

The article referred to is as follows:

FEDERATION REVEALS GOVERNMENT GIVING AWAY MUCH RATIONED FOOD HERE—3,000,000 POUNDS PER MONTH DISTRIBUTED FREE IN MASSACHUSETTS WHILE HOUSEWIVES' PURCHASES ARE SHARPLY RESTRICTED

The federation dropped a bombshell into Federal and State official circles with the disclosure last week that while weary housewives were trudging from store to store in often fruitless search for foodstuffs, the Federal Government was giving away 6,000,000 pounds of rationed foods with a value of more than 27,000,000 ration points which the

Federal Food Distribution Administration had hoarded in Massachusetts warehouses.

This shocking situation was made public by Norman MacDonald, federation executive director, following a federation investigation of statements made at a legislative committee hearing recently on a budget item of $285,000 a year for 2 years to pay the salaries and other costs involved in carrying on distribution of the free food.

EIGHT HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND TWENTY-THREE DOLLARS VALUE

Members of the federation's research staff started an immediate probe, which revealed that the Federal Government had in warehouses in this State huge quantities of foods, with a total value of $875,823, for free distribution, and that the list included such scarce commodities as dried beans, lard, cheese, beets, carrots, pork and beans, and tomatoes.

As a result of the disclosure the federation demanded immediate Federal action to release the foodstuffs into either military or civilian channels in order to relieve the shortage now existing in Massachusetts. The following telegrams were sent to Secretary of Agriculture Claude A. Wickard and Office of Price Administration Administrator Prentiss Brown:

"Investigation here shows more than 6,000,000 pounds of rationed foods with a value of more than 27,000,000 ration points were held by Federal Government in warehouses in Massachusetts on March 1 as 'surplus' to be given away while same food items are either nonexistent in local markets or have high ration point value. This must be but a small fraction of quantity of rationed foods held as 'surplus' in all parts of country while serious shortages of same products exist in open market. Urge steps at once to get release of this food either to military services or to regular channels of trade so that civilian supply may increase. Sure you will recognize that it is unconscionable that American householders should be unable to buy necessary food from local merchants while a Federal agency hoards vast quantities on shockingly false ground that it is 'surplus.'

BUREAUCRACY HIT

"We have here uncovered an example of bureaucracy gone hog-wild," Mr. MacDonald declared in disclosing the results of the federation's investigation.

"On the one hand the Office of Price Administration scourges our people as hoarders. On the other hand, an Office of Price Administration sister bureau, the Food Distribution Administration, dealing with so-called surplus commodities, proves itself to be the greatest hoarder in history and then has the colossal gall to ask us as taxpayers to put up $570,000 to help to finance the Government's own black market.

"Perhaps someone in the Government will try to laugh it off. But every citizen will be shocked and resentful to learn that on March 1 there were stored in this State to be given away, rationed foods having a value of 27,087,000 ration points, or a full month's ration of 48 points for 563,000 people. And those in charge say they have been handling a 'surplus' of 3,000,000 pounds a month, or a minimum of 24,000,000 points—enough for a half million people, according to the Office of Price Administration doctrine of scarcity.

"The people of this State have cooperated without complaint in a program of self-denial and hardship because they were told it was necessary. Now who can they believe? If Massachusetts has these millions of pounds of rationed food to give away, how many millions or billions of pounds must be hidden elsewhere in the country? Who is being kidded, Secretary Wickard, the Washington bedlam of bureaus, or plain John Citizen again?

"For instance, Massachusetts women have been able to buy little or no lard for their pies for many weeks. Yet the Government, on its own figures, has more than a ton of it in the State labeled 'surplus,' which it wants to give away.

BEAN POT MISSING

"The traditional Saturday bean pot hasn't been going into ovens here for more than 2 months. The reason: No beans at the grocers. But Uncle Sam's bureaucrats have 555,317 pounds of 'surplus' white beans stored here to be given away at the first opportunity.

"While the situation has not been quite as acute so far as canned milk is concerned, housewives who have felt lucky if they could pick up an occasional can or two will be at least interested to know that a 'surplus' of some 2,400,000 cans has been in storage here, requiring a force of men to turn the cases over from time to time so that the milk will not spoil.

"Butter was declared frozen by Office of Price Administration officials this week and housewives have been scurrying here and there trying to find some suitable substitute. Peanut butter would be acceptable, and hardly any is available. But in warehouses in Massachusetts 113,652 pounds are carefully stored.

PLENTY OF CHEESE

"Yesterday we had a 'cheese panic' according to the papers and today a grocer with a pound of cheese on his shelf would be mobbed. Yet there are 176,226 pounds of 'surplus' cheese on the Government list in this State.

"Most residents in this area have practically forgotten the taste of grapefruit juice because of scarcity or lack of ration points with which to buy it. But 71,000 cans were awaiting distribution from the Government store here—and, we might add, try and get one. It might be pertinent to state at this point that 16 cars—and that is cars and not cans—have been canceled.

"Tomatoes, soups, pears, peaches, prunes, and various other vegetables and fruits are also stored here in abundance.

"Here is another feature of the picture that undoubtedly will make a hit with food-worried wives and mothers. Because the State department of public welfare could not use these commodities, 572,592 cans of evaporated milk, 29,000 pounds of dried milk, and 274,330 pounds of canned pork and beans have been returned to the Federal Government for distribution elsewhere.

"Can this be how our domestic heroes plan to win the war on the home front?"

Following is a table of foods and quantities on hand in the State on March 1 and the ration-coupon value of the various items:

Federal commodities in storage in Massachusetts Mar. 1, 1943

Commodity	Total available		Ration per pound	Points total
	Pounds	Cans		
Apples	89,207			
Dried beans	555,317		8	4,442,536
Wheat cereal	148,339			
Corn meal	153,055			
Graham flour	137,705			
Wheat flour	336,327			
Lard	2,440			
Rolled oats	116,470			
Dried prunes	16,949		20	338,980
Tangerines	2,300			
Evaporated milk	2,241,842	2,473,757		
Blackeyed beans	3,349		8	26,792
Cheese	176,226			
Dehydrated eggs	44,695			
Dehydrated milk	178,090			
Dehydrated soup	21,323		16	341,168
Peanut butter	113,652			
Shelled walnuts	48,402			
Canned apples	1,930	965	8	15,440
Canned applesauce	142,888	71,444	8	1,143,104
Canned beets	59,852	29,926	8	478,816
Canned carrots	3,272	1,636	11	35,992
Cane sirup	2,251	536		
Grapefruit juice, 18-ounce	8,901	7,877	8	71,208
Grapefruit juice, 46-ounce	69,224	24,036	8	553,792
Grapefruit segments (processed)	2,016	1,008	8	16,128
Grapefruit segments	252	202	8	2,016
Canned peaches	133,501	73,656	11	1,468,511
Canned pears	67,287	37,124	11	740,157
Canned pork and beans	1,038,794	552,550	8	8,310,352
Canned tomatoes, 20 ounces	512,256	409,805	13	6,659,328
Canned tomatoes, 28 ounces	187,488	107,136	13	2,437,344
Tomatoes, process canned	1,236	618	13	16,068
Total value	6,616,836 $875,823.65	3,791,976		27,097,732

Launching of U. S. S. "Uriah P. Levy"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by him on the occasion of the launching of the U. S. S. *Uriah P. Levy*, at the Federal shipyards in Kearny, N. J., on March 28. The address was in commemoration of Uriah Phillips Levy, who had served in the United States Navy for over a period of 50 years and rose to the rank of commodore.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is our privilege today to play a small part in one of the great dramas of our country's history. This destroyer, which we now

speed upon its way, is but one more in a long line of almost unbelievable achievements—the achievements of American workers, who are fighting a stupendous battle against time, turning out the fighting ships with which our fighting men will win the battle against tyranny.

This ship bears witness to a record of American production that is unbeatable; it goes forth to serve a Navy that has proved itself unbeatable—and it is thrice blessed, for it bears the name of an American whose courage was unbeatable.

Uriah Phillips Levy, commodore of the United States Navy, was born into a family that had already been in battle on two fronts. His grandfather was a soldier in the American Revolution, and Uriah, born in Philadelphia in 1792, was destined to carry on the fight for freedom all his life.

Leaping almost literally from his cradle to the sea, Uriah Levy ran away from home and shipped as a cabin-boy at the age of 10. Before he was 20, he was master of a schooner, the *George Washington*, and with the outbreak of the War of 1812, he was commissioned by the Navy as a sailing master. Thus began 50 years of service with the Navy, during which time Uriah Levy battled against piracy and the slave-trade abroad—and against barbarism of a different kind at home.

Incredible as it seems, brutal flogging was a common occurrence in most of the world's navies 100 years ago. In 1850, there were only 2 American naval vessels on whose decks flogging was unheard of. One of these ships was commanded by Captain Uriah Phillips Levy. Captain Levy never abused a subordinate under his command. But he not only disapproved the brutal practice of flogging; he publicly denounced it, claiming that no man, not even the master of a ship, should have the power to string up another man and lash him as he saw fit. Levy was caricatured and lampooned; he was called a wild-eyed reformer, and a menace to the Navy, but criticism could not keep him quiet. His courageous stand finally won powerful supporters, and in September, 1850, Congress voted to abolish corporal punishment in the United States Navy.

Captain Levy was not the kind of man who let criticism of any kind—whether of his convictions, his country, or his religion—go unanswered. At a dinner he attended in Paris, he proposed a toast to President Andrew Jackson, and two Frenchmen, an officer and a private citizen, were heard to hiss. Levy planted a blow in both their faces and challenged each to a duel.

Fifty years of victory over piracy and prejudice finally brought Uriah Levy to the highest rank the Navy offered in his day; he became flag officer, commanding the naval forces in the Mediterranean and was accorded the title of commodore. Few names in American naval history have been surrounded with such honor, and no name could be more fittingly bestowed upon a Navy ship.

It is, indeed, strikingly appropriate that an American destroyer, sailing forth to battle with the pirates and barbarians of the Axis, should bear the name of an American hero of the Jewish faith.

We all know that the war aims of our enemies are twofold; to stamp out the last vestiges of freedom in all parts of the world and to reduce the United Nations to the status of slave states. This devilish plan was taking shape in Hitler's mind more than 10 years ago, and he worked out a simple strategy for accomplishing a substantial part of it before a single shot was fired. We call this strategy divide and conquer; the Nazis call it by the deceptive name of anti-Semitism, hoping that we, and all the other nations they have set out to dismember, will forget what Hitler brought to Europe under the false front of anti-Jewish agitation.

Hitler's own rise to power in Germany was accomplished by making scapegoats of the Jews, not because of anything the Jews had done but because they were the most defenseless minority in the nation and, therefore, the easiest targets for the opening shots in the Nazi propaganda onslaught to divide and conquer Germany.

Once this campaign had gained sufficient headway, the Nazis were able to capitalize on the suspicion and hostility they had aroused against the Jews, turning the inflamed emotions of the people first against one group, then against another. Anti-Semitism was merely the springboard for a whole series of attacks—against Catholics, Masons, political parties, labor organizations, big business, minorities of all sorts—each attack apparently occasioned by some fanciful, concocted charge which served to blind the people to the fact that what was really being attacked was the unity of the people as a whole.

This strategy of dividing the people by a continuous drumming-up of prejudice until only the Nazis were left standing together proved so successful that Hitler, and later on his Axis partners, made it the basis for the attack on democracy in every country in the world.

Now that 14 once-free nations have been reduced to slavery by this divide-and-conquer formula, the defenders of democracy are at last on guard. We know now that rising tides of racial and religious prejudice, or epidemics of political dissension, sectional jealousy and economic strife, are sure signs that Axis agitators are at work—doing the work of dictators who will leave no stone unturned to get us to fighting among ourselves in order to weaken our defenses.

But the tide has turned, and there are other signs appearing. These signs are quite plain; they may be understood in any language, whether Italian, Japanese, or German. Some of them are lighting up the skies over Europe; others may be seen in evergrowing numbers on islands in the Pacific and on the shores of Africa. And at this very moment, the U. S. S. *Uriah P. Levy* carries a message that will be spotted by every Axis eye. It says: This is our answer to all the vile campaigns that tyrants have instigated to set Americans against each other and destroy this land of freedom. America will not be deceived. America will remain united—united for freedom for all.

Price of Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a summary of the testimony before the Committee on Small Business of the House today on the price of oil and a list of witnesses our committee expects to hear on this question:

On April 14, 1943, the Small Business Committee of the House began hearings on the petroleum industry in the United States as it relates to the independent producer in particular.

The chairman, WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, in stating the purposes of the hearings, emphasized the urgent necessity for the Congress and all agencies of the Government immediately concerned with the petroleum industry to take such action as appears necessary to increase the production of oil for war and civilian use. New production must be found if this country and her allies are to be supplied with the amount of gasoline and oil which is required to fight this global war. The civilian front, which is next in importance to the armed front, will require additional quantities of petroleum products; and if present conditions in the industry are holding back an adequate production, these conditions must be corrected at once.

Russell B. Brown, general counsel for the Independent Petroleum Association of America, stated that independent producers were responsible for the discovery of 75 percent of all new oil fields in the United States in the past. However, because of price conditions, lack of sufficient equipment and manpower in the industry, new fields are not being developed, and the 1942 production was the lowest in recent history.

Col. Ernest O. Thompson, a member of the Railroad Commission of Texas, stated that in his opinion this Nation will be critically short of oil by 1945, unless the present ceiling price for oil is raised immediately; that the price of oil today controls discoveries 2 years hence; that wildcat wells cost from $25,000 to $200,000 each and require from 30 days to 2 years to drill, depending upon formations, finances, etc.; that in wildcat territory the ratio of dry holes to producing wells is 80 to 1, and that without a price incentive, which does not exist at the present time, new explorations will not be undertaken by independents.

Colonel Thompson further testified that $75,000,000 worth of oil-producing property in Texas alone had been sold by independent operators to the large companies during 1942; that these sales had been made because the small independent operator could not continue to operate his well under the present price ceilings which in Texas have been established on the basis of natural prices prevailing 5 years ago.

The witness stated that this Nation is presently using oil at a rate which is five times faster than new fields are being found and that regardless of whether or not an abundance of rubber is available for civilian tires in 1944, gasoline will have to be rationed unless the independent oil operator is encouraged to discover new oil production through price advance to cover costs and provide a proper incentive; that this method has always worked in an economy of free enterprise, and that there should be no further delay in applying the known historic American method of finding oil.

Colonel Thompson testified that he did not think subsidies could take the place of price incentive for the reason that operators would then drill for the subsidy and would not be concerned with the discovery of oil.

The committee will continue hearings on this matter for 3 more days, April 15, 16, and 17.

Witnesses who will be heard during those days include:

H. B. Fell, Ardmore, Okla., executive vice president, Independent Petroleum Association of America, Natural Shipper Well Association, individual oil producer.

T. A. Morgan, Wichita, Kans., director of conservation, State Corporation Commission, Kansas.

Harold F. Thompson, Dallas, Tex., counsel for American Association of Oil Well Drilling Contractors.

J. P Coleman, Wichita Falls, Tex., North Texas Oil & Gas Association.

J. C. Hunter, Abilene, Tex., president, Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association.

Donald P. Oak, Tulsa, Okla., independent oil producer.

L. W. Moffitt, Shreveport, La., individual oil producer and drilling contractor.

Walter Goldston, Houston, Tex., individual oil producer.

N. W. Shiarella, Owensboro, Ky., president, Kentucky Oil & Gas Association.

Thomas McManus, Bakersfield, Calif., San Joaquin Valley Oil Producers Association of California.

James Johnson, Great Falls, Mont., independent oil producer.

George D. Morgan, San Angelo, Tex., Cardinal Oil Co. (producers).

C. W. Hoffmen, Eastland, Tex., West-Central Texas Oil & Gas Association.

A. E. Herrmann, Amarillo, Tex., Panhandle Producers & Royalty Owners Association.

O. V. Beck, Amarillo, Tex., individual oil producer.

C. R. Starnes, Gladwater, Tex., East Texas Oil Association.

J. B. Milam, Claremore, Okla., Oklahoma Stripper Well Association.

J. B. Champion, Ardmore, Okla., Southern Oklahoma Oil & Gas Association.

J. E. Berry, Smackover, Ark., independent oil producer.

E. B. Shawver, Wichita, Kans., independent oil producer and president of Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association.

William L. Amsworth, Wichita, Kans., president, Wichita Chamber of Commerce, vice president, Mid State Oil Co., Petroleum Geologists-Engineers.

A. W. Cherry, Evansville, Ind., Illinois-Indiana Petroleum Association.

Leo V. Horton, Mount Vernon, Ill., Independent Oil Producers Association of Illinois.

H. M. McClure, Alma, Mich.

Phillip Faine, New Straitsville, Ohio, Ohio-Pennsylvania Grade Oil Producers Association.

Walter Locker, Wooster, Ohio, Independent Gas Producers Association.

C. C. Hogg, Pleasantville, Pa., Central Pennsylvania Oil Producers Association.

Don Andrus, Bradford, Pa., Pennsylvania Grade Oil Association presenting paper of William Brundred, Oil City, Pa., Central Pennsylvania Oil Producers Association.

J. Paul Jones, Bradford, Pa., independent oil producer, Bradford District Oil Producers Association.

George Holbrook, Wellsville, N. Y., New York State Oil Producers Association.

Carl Schwyn, Cygnet, Ohio, independent oil producer, Lima District.

James V. Brown, Washington, D. C., secretary, Crude Oil Requirements Committee, Independent Petroleum Association of America and cooperating oil producing associations.

Friday, April 16, we expect to hear Hon. Prentiss Brown, Office of Price Administration.

"Orientation" Toward Military Fascism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "'Orientation' Toward Military Fascism," written by A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Railroad Trainman of April 1943]

As the current smear campaign to discredit our civilian war agencies rises to a shrieking crescendo, comes the startling revelation that a reactionary clique of Army brass hats is quietly preparing to take over civilian functions of government as soon as public opinion makes such a move practicable.

We appreciate that this is an alarming statement, but it is our most conservative conclusion after studying a pattern of events which now add up to an alarming situation. In the confusing clatter and hubbub of political controversy which follows every constructive move our civilian administration has undertaken to push the war on the domestic front, one clear note can now be distinguished. It is a sound like an air-raid siren, a note of warning which every liberal-minded citizen and labor union member may well heed before it is too late.

Reactionaries in this country are looking forward to the day, and they are planning for the hour, when they can overthrow or drastically limit our democracy and set up some form of domestic tyranny, probably military. Whether this would be done before the end of the war or during the troubled days of reconstruction to follow, the scheme is now in the making. Recent developments should make it obvious to every Democrat that while our young men are battling a foreign axis on five continents and the seven seas, we here at home have a domestic axis to contend with. Theirs is the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo Axis. Ours seems to be shaping up between Wall Street and certain elements in the War Department.

In Wall Street it is the powerful interests for whom Ferdinand Eberstadt, of the War Production Board, spoke until Donald Nelson summoned up enough courage to kick him out of the vice chairmanship. In the War Department the fuehrer is Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, Chief of the Services of Supply, backed by a coterie of reactionary civilian functionaries.

Satellites and allies defacto of this "axis" are a large group of Representatives and Senators, Democratic and Republican, but alike reactionary, who are spitting "bureaucrat" at every honest civilian employee of the Government, and doing everything they can to discredit by slander and political sabotage the civilian war agencies, their officers, and personnel.

For months Somervell has been the prime mover in an interdepartmental fight to seize from the civilian War Production Board as much power and authority for the Army brass hats in Washington as he could, while the ambitious Eberstadt, Wall Street investment banker and subordinate of Nelson, connived with them. It is a matter of common knowledge that this clash between the War Production Board and the Somervell group took much of Nelson's time and energy. The detailed story of Somervell's intriguing around Washington has not been told, but the outline of the essential issue involved is perfectly clear.

Somervell and his military brass hats covered their trail after Nelson fired Eberstadt and President Roosevelt did nothing about Nelson, but a month later James A. Wechsler, one of PM's excellent reporters, picked it up again in Fort Leavenworth, Kans., where the War Department's Command and General Staff School has been giving an "Army orientation course" for "selected business and professional men."

In his first article on the school Wechsler described it as "a War Department school * * * training civilians to propagandize for Army control over the Nation's civilian life." Then he presented evidence substantiating the charge, which has not been refuted to anybody's satisfaction by the War Department.

The instruction given at the school fits very neatly, too neatly, with Somervell's activities in Washington. Each month the War Department "selects" a group of about 85 business and professional men to attend the "orientation" class at Government expense. The public is told that these selectees go there to receive instructions about our "military organization as correlated to the national war effort," to learn about Somervell's services of supply, "civilian programs of production," so that they can return to their communities and "resume the conduct of their part in the war program with more complete understanding of current and future problems."

These are the evasive generalities the Trainman was offered on February 13, after writing the school and the War Department to inquire just what the "Army orientation course" was all about. When we learned that George P. McNear, Jr., union-busting president of the Toledo, Peoria & Western Railway, had been given a scholarship by the War Department, we felt that there must be something about the school that did not meet the eye.

We were "scooped," however, by PM's Mr. Wechsler on February 9, who confirmed our suspicion. Somervell's school was teaching the businessmen things that did not look well in the public eye of a democratic Nation. The "students" were being taught that civilians weren't cooperating sufficiently with the war effort. Second, that the education of our youth since World War No. 1 by our civilian teachers and clergy had been all wrong, and that the boys did not respond to "emotions of patriotism, the use of martial music, parades, stirring speeches" as they did in 1917. Finally, in one of the printed lectures we get the conclusion:

"The remedy of this condition is outside our province as Army officers, although some day, if the condition gets bad enough, the Army may be forced to take over the direction of many activities now considered to be beyond the province of the military."

There you have it, the future problems with which the school is concerned, to be solved in part, we suppose, by putting a uniform on George McNear and a couple of stars on his shoulder, and letting him run the railroads like they ought to be run, a soldier with his bayonet in every cabocse.

The school, it developed, had not been content to have the brass hats wait till "der tag," when civilians like Franklin D. Roosevelt and Donald Nelson and Paul McNutt had, in the opinion of the public, made a complete mess of things. PM reveals that out of the school went propaganda against the Pepper-Tolan-Kilgore bill, which provides for a unified civilian command over manpower and war production.

A number of Senators and Representatives voiced desire for an investigation of the school. It is noteworthy that the PM exposé caused not a ripple of concern among that noisy group of Congressmen who want to have a continuing congressional inquiry into every civilian agency, and who constantly shout "bureaucrat" at the civilian employees and officials of our Government. There was no concerted outcry of horror from the stalwart defenders of democracy on Capitol Hill who want to preserve free enterprise by drafting labor.

We have no recommendation for the administration. It seems to us that the facts contain their own recommendation to the American people. For General Somervell and his swivel-chair brass hats in Washington, a sound recommendation would read something like this: "Win the war and keep out of civilian politics."

It does seem to us that if these military men would spend as much time plotting against Hitler, Hirohito, and Mussolini as they are scheming to conquer and oppress the American people, we would have a shorter war and a better peace.

For all we know, Somervell might do an excellent job leading a task force somewhere in the South Pacific.

The Trade Agreements Act and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by my colleague from Tennessee, Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER:

THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT AND THE CONSTITUTION

(By ESTES KEFAUVER)

The reciprocal trade-agreement program, fostered by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Cordell Hull, is based upon the Trade Agreement Act of June 12, 1934. It has been renewed two times by Congress for additional periods. The present act expires on June 12, 1943, and, unless extended by Congress, this most worthwhile domestic and international program will be discarded.

Inasmuch as debate on the further extension of the Trade Agreements Act will shortly be commenced in Congress, it is again well to consider what the program is and to discuss the arguments that will be made against its constitutionality. To increase foreign markets for products of the United States is the primary purpose of the trade-agreement program. This purpose is sought through reciprocal adjustment of excessive trade barriers. The general objectives of the program are to substitute economic cooperation for economic warfare in our relations with other countries; to give economic substance to our good-neighbor policy; and to create the kind of international relations upon which the structure of durable peace can be erected.

Normally, the United States produces more of a great number of farm and industrial products than can be sold in the American market. When large quantities of such goods cannot be exported our agricultural and industrial production slows down. The result is felt throughout the country in depressed prices, unemployment, and poor home markets for American products. Expansion of our trade with foreign countries benefits the whole country. It benefits directly the great branches of American agriculture and many industries that have products to sell in foreign markets. It benefits the millions of workers dependent upon these branches of industry and agriculture for their livelihood. It improves domestic markets for American producers not directly interested in export or import trade. It raises the living standards by providing more employment, more purchasing power, and more goods for American consumers at reasonable prices. Another extremely important benefit of international trade is that it promotes good relations with other countries. The Trade Agreements Program has helped us to win back some of the friendship we lost by our shortsighted tariff and war debt policies after the last war. Today the trade agreements with other nations are one of the strongest pillars in the structure of hemispheric solidarity and of our global good neighbor policy.

For the second time in the lifetime of many of us, mankind will some day be confronted with the tremendous task of rebuilding the fabric of international relationships shattered by a world war. Our country and all nations associated with us in the present conflict are resolved that the brutal forces of conquest will be utterly destroyed. We must be equally determined that international relations will be so organized as to be an open and unobstructed highway of human progress toward an enduring peace among the nations of the world.

The trade agreements program is not only a good American policy when viewed from a strictly selfish viewpoint, but it is the one tangible and presently workable international system of exchange and trade around which those requirements for a stable and peaceful world can be built.

The program works under the provision of the act authorizing the President to enter into direct negotiations with other countries for reducing excessive barriers that stand in the way of extending our foreign trade. This method was chosen as more practicable than general downward revision of the United States tariff alone, because a downward revision would not insure the reciprocal reduction by other countries of their tariffs and other barriers. The principle is not new. Efforts and some progress in the same direction were made by Presidents McKinley and Theodore Roosevelt. Experience with tariffs since the creation of this Nation has demonstrated the unworkability of having the Senate fix tariffs and ratify trade treaties.

In Congress very few Members will oppose the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act directly. The opposition, while undoubtedly aimed at scrapping the whole program, will be based upon "loftier principles" of unconstitutionality.

It is well, therefore, to give further consideration to the constitutional objections to the Trade Agreements Act which have been and will be made when the act is presented for renewal in Congress.

During the act's original consideration, and at the time of each renewal, there have been elaborate debates, particularly in the Senate, as to its constitutional validity, especially on the issues of delegation of power and of conclusion of agreements without ratification by the Senate. No court decision has passed directly on these questions; however, the legality of the act and the agreements made under it seem fairly clear.

The authority of the President under the act contains essentially two powers:

1. To proclaim and make effective tariff rates, etc., differing from those which would otherwise apply.

2. To bind the United States by international agreement and to maintain existing or new rates in effect for stated periods.

The first power, to change rates, is clearly a delegation of congressional authority. Tariff making is within two of the express powers of Congress: to tax, and to regulate foreign commerce. In proclaiming new rates, and making them effective, therefore, the President exercises, by delegation, a power which the Constitution vests in Congress. The constitutional question is the validity of the delegation.

The second power does not depend on delegation in any such clear way. Congress has no stated general power to make agreements binding on the United States. It is, indeed, probably true that, since it has express power to make tariffs, it has some power to authorize agreements about tariffs. But the general power to make international agreements is vested elsewhere, namely, as to some things, in the President as part of the Executive power, and as to other things, in the President and Senate, under the treaty clause. No one knows precisely what sorts of agreements the President may validly conclude alone, and what sorts must be submitted to the Senate. The constitutional question is (1) Whether the sorts of agreements authorized by the act fall in the Executive agreement class or in the treaty class, (2) to what extent, in view of the tariff-making powers of Congress, it may authorize agreements about tariffs without separate submission to the Senate under the treaty powers.

THE CONTEXT OF THE ACT

While the United States tariff is, in our constitutional system, within the control of Congress, it is not by any means a local issue only. Every sale of goods involves two parties, and on every international sale one of these has to be a foreigner. The terms of every sale for import into the United States and the possibility of any sale at all depend in important part on the level of our applicable tariff schedule. Conversely, every sale for export from the United States depends in part upon the level of the other country's rate. The tariff structure of every country, and especially of every important commercial country, is of critical importance to every foreign trader in the world, and behind the foreign traders it is important to every producer of goods that may be exported, and to every consumer of goods that may be purchased from abroad. It is not strange that every foreign office in the world is continuously interested in every other country's tariff.

This interest is not exclusively a selfish one, unless a concern for the general standard of living is a selfish interest. Tariffs influence, importantly, not only the profits of traders and producers but the extent to which the international division of labor may be carried, and therefore the efficiency of production everywhere, and therefore the volume of the total product, and therefore the share of every claimant in that product. If the standard of living, or the welfare of producers, traders, and consumers are proper concerns of government, then every government is of necessity interested in the tariff structure of every important trading country.

To put all this bluntly, the United States tariff is necessarily of interest to every foreign country. Many foreign tariffs are of interest to the United States. Rates may be adjustable to mutual advantage by negotiation. Negotiation and agreement are therefore an appropriate method of dealing with the subject.

From the point of view of the selfish interest of the United States, negotiation and agreement are inherently the best way of dealing with our tariff. This is so for a very simple reason. If our rates are adjusted unilaterally (whether the move is up or down is immaterial), the chance to bargain against the other country's rates is thrown away. Since what we do is of interest to others, it is altogether more intelligent for us to take advantage of that interest. We have, after all, an important bargaining position. We must indeed be careful not to use that position foolishly. But it would be extremely shortsighted not to use it at all, and the only way to use it is by negotiation.

Tariff adjustment by negotiation, then, is the proper approach. But here we meet one of the oldest and firmest principles of American constitutional law. International negotiation is the function of the President. Whatever is the ultimate power of Congress over tariffs and whatever is the veto of the Senate over treaties, negotiation with a foreign Government concerning tariff rates is exclusively the duty of the President. The Senate cannot, in our system, make a treaty, it can only consent, or refuse to consent, to a treaty laid before it. It can, of course, impose conditions, and has often done so, but those conditions are not binding on the other government unless it accepts them, and it is for the President to say whether the United States will ask for their acceptance. In everything that relates to negotiation and agreement the President must take the lead, and is the only branch of government authorized to speak for the United States.

In some cases, the President's agreement, without more, binds the United States; in others, it requires the consent of the Senate, after the event; in still others, it requires the consent or authority of Congress. But it

is clear that only the President can negotiate, and that only the President can agree. The binding force of his agreement is another question.

The situation is not unlike that of the war powers. Only Congress can declare war, raise and support armies, or provide and maintain a Navy, but only the President can be Commander in Chief. The President cannot command an Army which Congress does not raise, but Congress cannot raise an army of which the President is not Commander in Chief. Practical collaboration is essential, and is contemplated by the Constitution. It is the same with tariffs.

The factual and constitutional position then is this:

1. Tariffs are a natural and proper subject for international agreement.

2. They are within two express powers of Congress.

3. But only the President can negotiate, or agree

4. Some, but not all, international agreements require the consent of the Senate for validity.

The practical problem is how to bring these varied, and conceivably conflicting powers, into harmonious relationship for the benefit of the United States. It is a prime virtue of the Trade Agreements Act that it accomplishes the necessary fusion in a way which is both workable and dignified for all concerned.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE ACT

The act itself is short and simple. After appropriate recitals, it empowers the President "(1) to enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof, (2) to proclaim such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customers or excise treatment of any article covered by foreign trade agreements, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder." The new rates take effect on the date stated in the proclamation, and "apply to articles the growth produce or manufacture of all foreign countries," with appropriate power to suspend reductions on imports from any country which discriminates against the United States. Submission of agreements to the Senate is not contemplated Congress has exercised its own power over tariffs by delegating to the President, within the limits stated in the act, the power to fix new rates, and to agree to keep those rates, or old rates or old free-list status, in effect for stated periods. It has authorized a merger, within the limits of the act, of its power over tariffs and the President's power of international negotiations and agreement, so that the resulting single power may effectively be utilized for the benefit of the United States.

The standards and limits of the act are important and substantial. In summary they are:

1. The President may act only by agreement with another country. He may not raise or lower rates unilaterally.

2. He may act only after public notice and hearing and after seeking information and advice from the Tariff Commission and the Departments of State, Agriculture, Treasury, and Commerce. In practice this consultation is a highly organized affair, operating through an interdepartmental organization headed by the Committee on Trade Agreements, in which all the agencies named are represented. The hearings are before a related Committee on Reciprocity Information, which has an office with the Tariff Commission, a permanent secretary, and a regular and orderly procedure. "Due process" has here a known meaning.

3. The President may act only when he finds as a fact that "any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States," and that the stated purposes of the act will be promoted by the action contemplated.

4. No rate of duty may in any event be increased or decreased more than 50 percent, and no article may be transferred from the dutiable to the free list, or vice versa.

5. No agreement may be made for a fixed term of more than 3 years.

In this context, is this delegation within these limits valid? And are the agreements valid without submission to the Senate?

THE DELEGATION ISSUE

It has been clear since 1928 that Congress might lawfully make "provision for the fixing of customs duties on imported merchandise" by the President and that "if Congress shall lay down by legislative act an intelligible principle to which the person or body authorized to fix such rates is directed to conform, such legislative action is not a forbidden delegation of legislative power." As to what is "an intelligible principle" much water has flowed under the bridge in recent years.

In the present connection perhaps the most important case is *United States* v. *Curtis Wright Export Co.* The decision there depended on the validity of a delegation by Congress to the President of power to forbid the sale of arms entirely, at any place in the United States, to any of the countries engaged in the Chaco war, or to persons acting for them. The standard was as follows:

"That if the President finds that the prohibition of the sale of arms and munitions of war in the United States to those countries now engaged in armed conflict in the Chaco may contribute to the reestablishment of peace between those countries, and if after consultation with the governments of other American republics and with their cooperation, as well as that of such other governments as he may deem necessary, he makes proclamation to that effect, it shall be unlawful to sell, etc."

It was argued that the standard set up was exceedingly vague, as indeed it was, and that the joint resolution vested practically complete discretion in the President, either to act or not to act. The action authorized, a complete or partial embargo of sales to certain customers, was of course exclusively within the power to regulate foreign commerce. But the Court of 1936, in an opinion by Mr. Justice Sutherland, sustained the delegation and the President's action under it in every respect, and pointed out that in all matters affecting other countries wide delegation to the President has been the necessary rule from the beginning of the Government. "Practically every volume of the United States Statutes contains one or more acts or joint resolutions of Congress authorizing action by the President in respect of subjects affecting foreign relations, which either leave the exercise of the power to his unrestricted judgment, or provide a standard far more general than that which has always been considered requisite with regard to domestic affairs." The Court's opinion leaves no doubt that it considers this executive freedom necessary to the successful conduct of American foreign relations, and constitutionally justified by the important independent position of the President in that whole field. It is now clear, whatever was the case in 1934, that the carefully guarded standards of the Trade Agreements Act are much more than are needed for constitutional validity. They have become questions of policy, not power.

THE TREATY ISSUE

The question is whether a promise by the President, in an agreement made under the act, and effective for 3 years, to maintain a stated rate of duty in effect, is binding without submission to the Senate. Here the decisions of the court cases are not so decisive, but the result that must be reached is clear.

No one doubts that the President has power, without submission to the Senate, to make any binding international agreements. All of our Presidents since Washington have done so. Many efforts have been made to state the limits of this power.

Many agreements have been entered into with foreign countries independent of any legislation by Congress. John Marshall once said: "The President is the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations, and its sole representative with foreign nations." Pursuant to broad constitutional powers over the executive department, the Army and Navy, and foreign relations, Presidents have entered into numerous agreements which became effective without congressional authorization or subsequent senatorial approval. In 1898 the President entered into preliminary articles of peace with Spain which not only provided for the suspension of hostilities but in which Spain agreed to relinquish all claims of sovereignty over Cuba and to cede Puerto Rico to the United States. Other examples of Executive agreements made, independent of legislation, have included: The open-door policy in China, various agreements regarding fisheries, joint military occupation of islands, and acquiring bases for hemispheric defense.

The precise question for present purposes is: What sorts of agreements may be made by the President by his authority as President, coupled with a grant of authority from the whole Congress, without separate submission to the Senate?

Reduced thus to reality, the issue does not seem very doubtful. The power of Congress over the tariff is complete, and the power of the President over foreign affairs, including international agreements, is very broad indeed. When they work in harness, it would seem to be enough to assure validity, certainly, for an agreement so limited in time as those permitted by the Trade Agreements Act. An agreement that binds the United States forever, about any important matter, looks much more like a treaty than one that binds it for 3 years.

The decided cases are not very numerous. They do, however, give clear confirmation to the view that agreements made under the Trade Agreements Act are valid without submission to the Senate. *Field* v. *Clark* involved a number of questions under the Tariff Act of 1890, including the contention that the provisions of section 3, which authorized the President to impose special duties upon sugar, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides in certain circumstances, involved unlawful delegation and invaded the treaty-making power. The President had made a number of executive agreements to maintain these articles upon the free list, but none of these agreements were directly involved in the decision. The court examined the delegation point at length, and held the delegation valid. As to the treaty-making point, it said: "What has been said is equally applicable to the objection that the third section of the act invests the President with treaty-making power."

In *Altman & Co.* v. *United States*, an executive agreement with France, made under the Tariff Act of 1897 and reducing the duty on statuary from 35 to 15 percent was directly involved. The court assumed that the agreement was valid, and indeed held, for purposes of jurisdiction, that it was to be classed as a "treaty" under section 5 of the Circuit Court of Appeals Act of 1891, but found that the article imported was not a statue, and was not covered by the reduction. The decision, therefore, did not turn on the validity of the agreement.

In the Curtiss-Wright case, it will be recalled, the joint resolution had indicated that action should be taken only "after consultation with the governments of other

American Republics and with their cooperation, as well as that of such other governments as he may deem necessary." The President's proclamation recited "that I have consulted with the governments of other American Republics and have been assured of the cooperation of such governments as I have deemed necessary as contemplated by the said joint resolution." This most informal action, which neither identified the governments concerned nor described the character of their cooperation, the Court held adequate and proper. The opinion takes occasion to point out that various international powers, including "the power to make such international agreements as do not constitute treaties in the constitutional sense * * * none of which is expressly affirmed by the Constitution, nevertheless exist as inherently inseparable from the conception of nationality." The balance of the Court's opinion makes it clear that this particular power is vested in the President. It does not make clear in any detailed way what classification of "international agreement do not constitute treaties in the constitutional sense," but obviously the Court thought that an agreement to embargo arms was one.

Two recent and striking cases will complete the calendar. *United States* v. *Belmont* and *United States* v. *Pink* both involved an executive agreement, November 16, 1933, between the United States and the Soviet Union, under which the United States received as assignee the claims of the Soviet Government against American insurance companies and banks, arising among other things from the nationalization by Soviet decrees of the property of Russian companies which latter had placed funds on deposit in this country. The combined effect of the decrees and the agreement, if they were valid, was to assign to the United States Government all the intangible property in the United States of these old Russian companies, to the exclusion of foreign creditors of the companies themselves. The courts of New York held that under New York law the rights of the old creditors were not extinguished. The Supreme Court of the United States reversed the New York courts, holding that the agreement, like a treaty, overrode the New York law. As to the President's power to make the agreement, the Court said:

"The powers of the President in the conduct of foreign relations included the power, without consent of the Senate, to determine the public policy of the United States with respect to the Russian nationalization decrees. * * * It was the judgment of the political department that full recognition of the Soviet Government required the settlement of all outstanding problems including the claims of our nationals. Recognition and the Litvinov assignment were interdependent. We would usurp the Executive function if we held that that decision was not final and conclusive in the courts."

If the President has the power, without action either by the Senate or by Congress, to accept a foreign uncompensated nationalization of privately owned property, to take for the United States an assignment of the claim of the foreign government resulting from that nationalization, and thereby to override State laws and exclude private creditors from funds on deposit in this country, is there any doubt that, with prior express authority from Congress he can make a binding promise to maintain a stated tariff status in effect for a period not longer than 3 years? It must always be remembered that no one has a private right to any particular level of tariff protection. What shall be subject to duty and what not, and at what rates and for how long, are wholly public questions. They rest with the President (because he is responsible for international relations) and Congress (because it is responsible for taxes and the regulation of foreign commerce). When these two act together all the applicable authority of the United States has been exerted. No further action, either of the Senate or of any other body, is required.

There is therefore no real doubt as to the power of Congress to continue the authority it gave the President in 1934 nor of the power of the President to act under it. What Congress should do, and what the President should do, are questions of policy and practice on which Americans can take their stand as their knowledge and their judgment dictate, unencumbered by doubts about the constitutional correctness of their action.

Our War Policy in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial from the Chronicle-News of Trinidad, Colo., dealing with our war policy in the Pacific:

TOO LONG—THE REDEMPTION

Over there in Australia, at the other end of the world, the gallant Gen. Douglas MacArthur, outstanding American military personality of this war, accepted the occasion of the first anniversary of the tragic fall of Bataan to plead with his country for a redemption of the pledge of faith. Grieved by the long delay of any attempt to rescue the Philippines from the bloodthirsty Japs, the United Nations commander in the southwest Pacific area of the total war said, "From the bottom of my stricken heart I pray that a merciful God may not delay too long their redemption."

What a dramatic utterance. He it was who had led that lost cause over there soon after the disaster at Pearl Harbor. He it was who was drawn away from the sight of the humiliating debacle and given a new command. But when he left he had given his pledge to come back and free the captive soldiers, and the American and Filipino people who had "entrusted their fate to America and been enslaved."

A year has passed, and over most of that period since the fall of Bataan and the surrender at Corregidor, the American forces, aided by the Australians, have achieved splendid victories both in defense and offense, but there have not been the flow of resources to really strike effectively against the powerful enemy. Thousands of the surviving remnants of the once gallant army that defended the Philippines, are captives along with American men and women and some sixteen millions of native Filipinos. This indeed is the saddest phase of the American effort in this war.

The tragedy of the Philippines has been brought home to families of our own community and certainly in New Mexico, where practically the full strength of the National Guard of that State was caught in the hopeless but heroic struggle. Not a few from this community are prisoners of the enemy over there. It is indeed a lamentable circumstance that the paramount program of tht American military effort is to first win the victory over the Hitler Axis in Europe before making the concerted drive to redeem the islands and "Remember Bataan."

When the Japanese attacked with relentless fury in the Philippines a comparatively small and obviously inadequately equipped American force held the islands. How gallantly they fought from pillar to post is and will remain a glorious episode in the Pacific warfare. But the time came when they could hold on no longer. They were starved out, their physical strength to endure more was gone. They had to give up. That day the flag fell and was trampled upon by merciless vandals. That day the hearts of millions of American people bled. That day the cry went up wherever there were Americans, to avenge the treachery that had forced the heroic defenders of the Philippines to give up the fight.

"No army has ever done so much with so little," General MacArthur said. "One year ago today the dimming lights of Bataan's forlorn hope fluttered and died. It's prayers at that time—and it prayed as well as it fought—were reduced to the simple formula recited by hungry men through cracked lips, 'Give us this day our daily bread.' Bataan was starved to its collapse. Our flag lies crumpled, its pinions spat upon in the gutter; the wrecks of what were once our men and women groan and sweat in prison toil; our 16,000,000 faithful Filipino wards gasp in slavery under conquering soldiers devoid of those ideals of chivalry which have so dignified many armies."

It will be years hence no doubt, when the full and true story of the last struggle in the Philippines will be written. Glorious as have been the performances of our American armed forces everywhere, the glory will not have reached its full significance until that blot has been erased. Millions of American people on the home front pray devoutly, as does MacArthur, that the time shall come, and soon, when the flag will again be raised at Manila, and the ghastly prison pens shall be opened to release the ill-fated heroes of Bataan.

No military commander of modern times, perhaps, has gone through a greater agony of Gethsemane than did MacArthur, when he was ordered out of the Philippines, knowing that the officers and the men he was leaving behind could never fight their way out—never escape the ultimate fate. The pathos of those farewells can only be imagined. To his successor, General Wainwright, it was like saying, "stay and be killed or captured." For days and weeks those weary fighting men battled from crags and crevices. No relief came or could come. The surrender was inevitable.

In the United Nations plan of strategy it is Hitler first, then Hirohito. It is not for any of us, perhaps, to question any program aimed at final victory. But we can and do share the feelings of General MacArthur toward the Philippines, even though we cannot help or save the gallant men he left behind. We can but pray for the time when the mighty hosts of avengers will swarm back to the islands of the distant sea, and wipe out in the blood of yellow mongrels the tragedy of a year ago.

"I came through and I shall return," says Douglas MacArthur. God speed the day when he will have made good his vow.

Newspaper Advertising

REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in the spirit of apology. This morning's newspapers carry a story by Associated Press entitled "15 New

York stores fined $80,000 in plot against New York Times."

The story further states that—

Department of Justice officials at Washington said they could not recall a similar proceeding involving advertisers and newspapers.

The following remarks in the dispatch are attributed to Special Assistant to the Attorney General Samuel S. Isseks:

The boycott deprived readers of the New York Times of access to information regarding merchandise available to the public at the principal department stores in New York City, unless the readers of the Times read other newspapers.

Also Mr. Isseks is quoted as saying:

A number of readers of the New York Times were puzzled by the lack of advertising and even thought that there was a shortage of merchandise as a result of war conditions.

Mr. Isseks volunteered the information that—

The New York Times did not initiate the investigation, nor did it file a complaint with the Antitrust Division.

The New York Times carried the story as an Associated Press release rather than a story by their own staff, although the proceedings were held in the Federal courthouse, southern district, in the home city of the Times and not more than 3 miles from the main office of the paper.

For once in its career the owners and editors of this newspaper were practically speechless. The Times said it planned to issue no statement. Perhaps time and a sense of obligation to its subscribers and to the thinking public may change this complacent and sphinx-like attitude.

A startling and shocking phase of this whole affair is that it arises out of a business controversy between a newspaper and its advertising customers. Increased advertising rates which would not become effective until May 7, almost a month hence, are the source of the conspiracy. The New York Times demands higher rates and the advertisers rebel, with the result that an information is filed, and the rebels are fined $5,000 each. This should be a lesson to all customers of the New York Times, either to pay or to become subject to Government investigation, not on the complaint of the aggrieved New York Times, but on the alleged complaint of an anonymous and irate reader of the newspaper. Certainly no one would suspect the ownership of being a party to this proceeding.

At a later date I shall submit the whole question to the select committee of the House to inquire into all activities of the administrative agencies of Government. My reaction to the whole affair is most unfavorable, and especially so since yesterday when, on the two hundredth anniversary of that great American, Thomas Jefferson, the freedom of the press was so highly extolled. This proceeding seems to me to be freedom of the press in reverse English.

For the sake of the record, and to permit the membership of the House and Senate to become familiar with the facts, particularly since the action complained of was, at most, only contemplated and not consummated, the text of the charges follows:

TEXT OF UNITED STATES CHARGES AGAINST STORES

In the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York. April term, 1943. *United States of America* v. *Retail Dry Goods Association: Abraham & Straus, Inc.; B. Altman & Co.; Arnold Constable & Co., Inc.; Best & Co.; Bloomingdale Brothers, Inc.; Bonwit Teller, Inc.; Gimbel Brothers, Inc.; Frederick Loeser & Co., Inc.; Lord & Taylor; James McCreery & Co.; R. H. Macy & Co., Inc.; Russeks Fifth Avenue, Inc.; Saks & Co.; Franklin Simon & Co., Inc.; Stern Brothers.* Information. Samuel S. Isseks, Irving B. Glickfeld, Special Assistants to the Attorney General; Joseph T. Quinnan, Edwin J. Carrington, special attorneys; Tom C. Clark, Assistant Attorney General.

United States of America, Southern District of New York, ss:

At the April 1943 term of the District Court of the United States of America for the Southern District of New York, held in the city of New York, county of New York, in said district, comes the United States of America, acting through Assistant Attorney General Tom C. Clark, Special Assistants to the Attorney General Samuel S. Isseks and Irving B. Glickfeld and Special Attorneys Joseph T. Quinnan and Edwin J. Carrington, and leave of the court having first been obtained, informs the court as follows:

PERIOD OF TIME COVERED BY THE INFORMATION

1. Each of the allegations contained in this information shall be deemed to refer to the period of time beginning in or about January 1943 and continuing thereafter up to and including the date of the presentation of this information.

THE DEFENDANTS

2. The Retail Dry Goods Association is hereby made a defendant herein and is hereinafter sometimes referred to as the Association. Said defendant is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York and having its principal place of business in New York City.

3. The following-named corporations, hereinafter sometimes referred to as defendant corporations, are hereby made defendants herein:

Name of corporation, State of incorporation, principal place of business:

Abraham & Straus, Inc., New York; Brooklyn, N. Y.

B. Altman & Co., New York; New York, N. Y.

Arnold, Constable & Co., Inc., New York; New York, N. Y.

Best & Co., New York; New York, N. Y.

Bloomingdale Bros., Inc., New York; New York, N. Y.

Bonwit Teller, Inc., New York; New York, N. Y.

Gimbel Bros., Inc., New York; New York, N. Y.

Frederick Loeser & Co., New York; Brooklyn, N. Y.

Lord & Taylor, New York; New York, N. Y.

James McCreery & Co., New York; New York, N. Y.

R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., New York; New York, N. Y.

Russeks Fifth Avenue, Inc., New York; New York, N. Y.

Saks & Co., New York; New York, N. Y.

Franklin Simon & Co., Inc., New York; New York, N. Y.

Stern Bros., New York; New York, N. Y.

4. Each of said defendants referred to in paragraph 3 hereof is a corporation organized and existing and authorized to do business under and by virtue of the laws of the State of incorporation and with principal place of business as indicated above. Each of said defendant corporations is now engaged in business as a retail department store at its principal place of business as indicated above. The defendant corporations listed above, other than defendants, Best & Co., Russeks Fifth Avenue, Inc., and Bonwit Teller, Inc., have been for some time and now are members of the defendant association.

DEFINITIONS

5. (a) "Advertising rate committee," hereinafter referred to, means a committee of the defendant association.

(b) "New York metropolitan area," hereinafter referred to, means the city of New York and the adjacent area connected therewith in the States of New Jersey and Connecticut.

NATURE OF TRADE AND COMMERCE

6. The New York Times is a New York corporation, with its principal place of business in the State of New York, and is engaged in a general newspaper, news service, and publishing business, and publishes a daily newspaper, including Sunday, known as the New York Times, which is distributed in a substantial number of the States of the United States. Approximately 22 percent of the daily paper and 46 percent of the Sunday Times is distributed in States other than the State of New York.

The company purchases newsprint, machinery, type, stereotype metal, ink, office equipment and other supplies from without the State of New York. All of the newsprint of the company is supplied by the Spruce Falls Power & Paper Co., Ltd., of Ontario, Canada.

For the purpose of soliciting and procuring national advertising the company maintains offices in several States of the United States other than the State of New York and employs advertising salesmen who travel throughout the United States from its office in the State of New York to aid in procuring such national advertising.

The company in the course of its newspaper business buys, sells, collects, transmits, and receives news and photographs and publishes the same in the columns of its daily and Sunday papers in the State of New York and a substantial part thereof in States of the United States other than the State of New York in which its daily and Sunday papers are sold, and owns, uses, leases, manages, and operates offices and agencies therefor in such States.

The defendant corporations are engaged in the purchase and resale of goods, wares, and merchandise. A considerable portion of the merchandise purchased by the defendant corporations comes from States of the United States other than the State of New York, and a portion of the sales made by such defendant corporations to consumers is shipped to States of the United States other than the State of New York.

Certain of the defendant corporations maintain branch stores in States of the United States other than the State of New York, and many of the newspaper advertisements of such stores which have appeared in the New York Times have had forms for the purchase of such goods by mail order to consumers outside of the State of New York.

The advertisements appearing in the New York Times in many cases have stated that the goods so advertised are offered for sale in branch stores located outside the State of New York as well as the principal store located in New York City. Further, a large percentage of retail sales of these defendant corporations from their stores located in New York City are made by them to buyers outside of the State of New York reading the advertising columns of the New York Times daily and Sunday editions.

The defendant corporations did an aggregate total business in excess of $350,000,000 in the year 1942. The total advertising of these stores in the New York Times for the year 1942 was approximately $3,000,000.

COMBINATION AND CONSPIRACY

7. Since about January 1943, the defendants herein named, well knowing all the facts herein alleged, have been engaged in a wrongful and unlawful combination and conspiracy formed and carried out within the southern district of New York to determine and regulate the retail store advertising rates of the New York Times and other newspapers in the New York metropolitan area, which combination and conspiracy in fact has been in restraint of the hereinbefore described trade and commerce in newspaper distribution and circulation of advertising among the several States of the United States in violation of section 1 of the act of Congress of July 2, 1890, as amended, commonly known as the Sherman Act.

8. The aforesaid conspiracy has consisted of a continuing agreement and concert of action among the defendants, the substantial terms of which have been that:

(a) Defendant corporations boycott such newspapers, including the New York Times, that charge advertising rates other than those agreed upon and acceptable to the defendants.

(b) Defendant corporations maintain and support the defendant association, which as part of its activities, maintains several committees, among them one known as the advertising rate committee, to represent the membership of the association in its dealings with publishers of newspapers, including the New York Times, in matters involving advertising rates.

9. During the period of time covered by this information, and for the purpose of effectuating aforesaid conspiracy, the defendants, by agreement and concert of action, which, as hereinabove alleged, they conspired to do and more particularly, among others, have done and performed the following acts and things:

In or about the month of January 1943, the New York Times and defendant, R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., were negotiating regarding a new advertising contract for the following year. The New York Times suggested a new clause, giving the New York Times the option to charge for engraving cuts.

The parties could not come to an agreement, and on or about February 27, 1943, defendant R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., refused to negotiate any further and referred the matter to the advertising rate committee of the defendant association for further negotiations; the advertising rate committee invited the New York Times to be present at a meeting of such committee scheduled for March 5, 1943.

Prior to the meeting, the New York Times advised defendant R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., and on March 5, 1943, the New York Times informally notified the Advertising Rate Committee of an impending increase in advertising rates; on or about March 6, 1943, the New York Times mailed to the defendant corporations notices of a proposed increase in advertising rates of retail stores to become effective on May 7, 1943; between March 5 and March 10 the defendant corporations agreed to boycott the New York Times until it canceled its proposed advertising rate increase; and on or about March 14, 1943, the boycott became effective by the withdrawal of all the defendant corporations' scheduled advertisements in the New York Times.

The defendant corporations suggested that the New York Times substitute for the proposed advertising rate increase, a new price to the public of 5 cents for the daily Times and 15 cents for the Sunday Times. The Times refused to do this.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

10. The combination and conspiracy herein alleged was formed and carried out within the Southern District of New York. The defendants, during the period of time covered by this information and within 3 years prior to the presentation of this information carried out said combination and conspiracy within said district by holding meetings at the Empire State Club in New York City and at other places at which they agreed to boycott the New York Times.

11. As a result of the combination and conspiracy hereinbefore alleged, the New York Times has been deprived of a substantial amount of revenue. In addition, readers of the Times located both in the State of New York and outside of the State of New York have been deprived of access to information regarding merchandise available to them at the defendant corporations.

12. And so the United States of America, acting through its above-named representatives, accuses and says the defendants above named at all times during the period of time covered by this information, and particularly within the 3-year period next preceding the date of filing of this information, within the southern district of New York and within the jurisdiction of this court, in the manner and form aforesaid, did then and there unlawfully and with intent so to do, knowingly engage in a combination and conspiracy in undue, unreasonable, and direct restraint of trade and commerce among the several States, against the peace and dignity of the United States of America and contrary to the form of the statute of the same in such case made and provided.

SAMUEL S. ISSEKS,
IRVING B. GLICKFELD,
Special Assistants to the Attorney General.
JOSEPH T. QUINNAN,
EDWIN J. CARRINGTON,
Special Attorneys.
TOM C. CLARK,
Assistant Attorney General.

Protection for Home-Front Fighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I gave over the Mutual Broadcasting System on Tuesday, April 13, 1943:

I am deeply obliged to the Mutual Broadcasting Co. for the opportunity to speak briefly to you tonight on a subject which vitally concerns millions of Americans and American families now and in the future.

We are engaged in a total, global war very different from any other in the world's history. The necessary mobilization of every man, woman, and machine is witness to the scope of the fight for liberty being waged by freedom-loving people of the United Nations of the world.

The people of this great country have so marvelously and willingly responded, they have displayed such enthusiasm and zeal to and for their cause and their results have been so encouraging, that I should like to address myself to the future.

It is admitted by all that many engaged, directly and indirectly, in the war effort will return to civilian peacetime pursuits handicapped and disabled.

The Federal Government, now as in the past, recognizes and accepts its responsibility to those whose disability is incurred or aggravated by service in the active military or naval forces. Your Congress has already passed and the President has signed a bill to provide for vocational rehabilitation, including training, guidance to, and placement of disabled veterans of the present war. Authorization for such training is provided for in the act approved March 24 last and the expansion and strengthening of the veterans' training program will return many such veterans to gainful employment. I am sure that this program meets with your and everyone's active approval. The Veterans' Administrator is properly charged with the carrying out of this program. We cannot and will not avoid our responsibilities to those in our gallant fighting forces.

But what of the millions of fighters on the home front—what of the casualties in the war industries—what of the civilian defense worker injured in the line of his duty—what of the reservoir of manpower, presently handicapped, but which, with vocational training, may be directed into useful, profitable work? Should these great groups of patriotic Americans be omitted from any vocational training programs started by the Federal and State Governments? To what extent should the responsibility be divided between the Federal and State Governments? Where should the control lie? These are some of the questions any American citizen has the right to ask and these are presently the subjects of consideration by the Congress of the United States.

That the army of fighters at home—the war workers, civilian-defense workers, and others—should receive consideration at the hands of the Government was early recognized by some Members of Congress. Early last year Representative KENNEDY, of New York, sponsored a bill to compensate civilian-defense workers injured in the discharge of their duties. A bill (S. 180) for the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons is pending before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor and a similar bill (H. R. 699) is presently under consideration by the House Committee on Education, of which I am a member. Much time has been devoted to and intensive studies made of the subject by our committee. Many experts of vocational training, State and National officials, and educators appeared and testified at the public hearings. From all of this you can see that the Government recognizes its responsibilities to you who are the Government.

We must then consider whether those responsibilities should be assumed entirely by the Federal Government or be divided between it and the States.

It is conceded that, with respect to disabled veterans, the responsibility is that of the Federal Government and the several States are relieved of expenditures in this connection. But the trend of the pending legislation seeks to utilize, wherever possible, the machinery of State training programs. Under both the Senate and House bills, your State will be fully compensated for disabled veterans trained at the request of the Federal Government.

But the division of responsibility is not so easily made in the case of those injured in war industries, civilian-defense activities and those congenitally handicapped. For the assumption of responsibility by the Federal Government it is argued that since the injuries are directly the result of the war the Federal Government should provide the rehabilitation. Against that the right and duty of the several States toward their citizens is urged.

It is to me most significant that, today, we celebrate the two hundredth anniversary of that great American patriot and statesman, Thomas Jefferson. A grateful people have today dedicated to him and his ideals a beautiful memorial that will withstand the ravages of time and the assaults of false theories of

government. Today your Congress is conscious of Jefferson's advocacy of the rights of the States and will, I am certain, apply his theory in any civilian vocational-training program that may be adopted.

In all of the States, and especially New York, New Jersey, Illinois, among others, vocational-training programs are in effect and are greatly contributing to the marvelous records of production being rendered by our enthusiastic army of fighters on the home front. The monthly placement in the program of vocational training for war-production workers in New York State exceeds 4,000. My own city of New York, along with other cities, has made great progress in providing training within and without industry programs designed to bring forth the best efforts of every individual in the winning of the war, including the full contribution of those physically hadicapped people who have been rehabilitated. Your State and your city can be justifiably proud of the accomplishments of such programs.

You and I know that the enormous increase in our industrial activity, the recruitment of many zealous but inexperienced workers, the quickening of the tempo of machines will result in an increase of industrial accidents and disabilities with a corresponding increase in the need for adequate Federal and State training programs.

The legislation we are now considering provides for an equitable division of the cost of the expanded program and we are confident that you and your State will be glad to share in this most necessary and humane work.

Another important phase of our problem is—where should the administrative control lie? Which also includes an aspect of the question of the relative rights of the Federal Government and of the States. In both versions of the pending bill every possible attempt to use State facilities will be made. And this, I think, is as it should be. Local problems of vocational training should be administered by those who know best the ambitions and abilities of your neighbors. That administration should, however, be as uniform as possible, and a degree of Federal supervision will produce greater coordination of efforts and results of accomplishments.

The work entailed in preparing the necessary legislation for such an important task is great. The enactment of some bill will, however, produce untold benefits for our peacetime industrial economy and our fellow Americans who suffer disability. Its passage will be due in a great measure to the deep and sympathetic interest of Representative BARDEN, of North Carolina, the chairman of the House Committee on Education, who has devoted much time to the subject of vocational rehabilitation, and to the members of his committee Under Mr. BARDEN'S chairmanship full opportunity has and will be given to those who might assist in the consideration of the subject. The groundwork is being laid with a view of rendering assistance where it is most needed and rendering that assistance in the American way.

You have a personal interest in any program of vocational rehabilitation just as you have in any phase of governmental activity. Will you not give it some serious consideration?

You who are engaged directly in war industries, you who have so unselfishly given of your time and talents in organizing the civilian defense, comprise the army behind the Army. You are the fighters of the home front for whose protection this legislation is aimed. I trust that I have given you a clearer view of the various sides of the proposed program and of the efforts being put forth by your representatives to provide you with the protection to which you are entitled and which your Government will undoubtedly provide. Being a form of insurance for the future, it should serve as an added incentive to the men and women of America to continue to work here at home for themselves and for those who have carried and are carrying the fight to our enemies abroad. For those abroad who have so calmly, completely, and courageously answered their country's call, we at home must, each day, realize that our work, no matter what it is, becomes increasingly important, and for them we at home must determine to work harder and harder. They are waiting for our message which they want to hear and which they will hear. You who are the fighters at home can and will send out this message.

You have answered your country's call; we who are your families, your friends, your fellow Americans will answer yours; for together you and we will see this through calmly, completely, and quickly; together you and we, with the faith that comes with freedom, with the freedom that comes with righteousness, and with the righteousness that comes only with God, will win the victory and will preserve the peace.

And with the peace will come another period of industrial prosperity which will be added to by the far-sighted action of legislative leaders today who, conscious of their responsibilities, are planning now the fullest degree of protection for the members of our armed forces and for the fighters on our home front.

The Pharmacy Corps Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Johnstown Tribune of April 6, 1943:

THE PHARMACY CORPS BILL

A bill now before Congress would create a pharmacy corps for the United States Army. Because it is designed to safeguard the lives of our fighting men, it merits more consideration than it has yet received from our lawmakers. As for the general public, it is poorly informed on the subject.

The practice of the United States Army has been to train its own pharmacy technicians. They are not given a standard course such as registered pharmacists in civilian life receive, but get special training for 3 months and are then assigned to the drug departments in Army camps and in combat zones.

If registered pharmacists were not available for this service there might be less reason to criticize the practice, but it so happens that many registered pharmacists inducted into the service have been assigned to duty as gunners, infantrymen, and even truck driving, while men who may have been butchers, bakers, candlestick makers, and even truck drivers in civilian life are given 3 months' training and assigned to tasks that only graduate druggists are qualified to perform.

We suppose there are similar misfits in every branch of the service, but because it is so important to protect the health and the lives of our soldiers, the filling of medical prescriptions should be in the hands of experts.

"We Will Never Die"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

"WE WILL NEVER DIE"

For sheer horror, in an age already crowded with horrors, there is nothing to surpass the treatment meted out to the Jews in Hitler's Europe. Some 7,000,000 of them inhabited the Continent when the Nazis seized power in Germany. Except for their religion, there was nothing to distinguish them from their fellow Frenchmen and Italians and Germans and Yugoslavs and Danes and Belgians and Rumanians. In every country of Europe where, centuries before, they had taken residence, they had also taken root. They had made real—in some cases surpassing—contributions to the arts and sciences, to the culture and civilization of the Old World.

Two million Jews have since died at the hands of the Nazi hangmen and firing squads, beaten to death and starved to death. And the 5,000,000 that remain, most of them herded in ghettos that are only enlarged lethal chambers and in concentration camps, face a similar fate, unless some means can be found to rescue them from Hitler's torture chamber which is occupied Europe. That is why the "We Will Never Die" pageant staged in Constitution Hall on Tuesday night was so very much in order. It was a reminder to the world of what had happened, a warning to the world of what lay ahead. And in view of the forthcoming Bermuda conference, which is to deal with the refugee problem, it was particularly timely. We can only hope it will not prove another Evian fiasco.

Address of President Roosevelt on Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by President Franklin Delano

Roosevelt on April 13, 1943, at the dedication of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial:

Today in the midst of a great war for freedom, we dedicate a shrine to freedom.

To Thomas Jefferson, apostle of freedom, we are paying a debt long overdue.

Yet, there are reasons for gratitude that this occasion falls within our time; for our generation of Americans can understand much in Jefferson's life which intervening generations could not see as well as we.

He faced the fact that men who will not fight for liberty can lose it. We, too, have faced that fact.

He lived in a world in which freedom of conscience and freedom of mind were battles still to be fought through—not principles already accepted of all men. We, too, have lived in such a world.

He loved peace and loved liberty—yet on more than one occasion he was forced to choose between them. We, too, have been compelled to make that choice.

COMMITTED TO SAME CAUSE

Generations which understand each other across the distances of history are the generations united by a common experience and a common cause. Jefferson, across 150 years of time, is closer by much to living men than many of our leaders of the years between. His cause was a cause to which we also are committed, not by our words alone but by our sacrifice.

For faith and ideals imply renunciations. Spiritual advancement throughout all our history has called for temporal sacrifices.

The Declaration of Independence and the very purposes of the Revolution itself, while seeking freedoms, called for the abandonment of privileges.

Jefferson was no dreamer—for half a century he led his State and his Nation in fact and in deed. I like to think that this was so because he thought in terms of the morrow as well as the day—and this was why he was hated or feared by those who thought in terms of the day and the yesterday.

We judge him by the application of his philosophy to the circumstances of his lifetime. But in such applying we come to understand that his life was given for those deeper values which persist throughout all time.

Leader in the philosophy of government, in education, in the arts, in efforts to lighten the toil of mankind—exponent of plannings for the future, he led the steps of America into the path of the permanent integrity of the Republic.

BELIEVED IN MAN

Thomas Jefferson believed, as we believe, in man. He believed, as we believe, that men are capable of their own government and that no king, no tyrant, no dictator can govern for them as wisely as they can govern for themselves.

He believed, as we believe, in certain inalienable rights. He, as we, saw those principles and freedoms challenged. He fought for them, as we fight for them.

He proved that the seeming eclipse of liberty can well become the dawn of more liberty. Those who fight the tyranny of our own time will come to learn that old lesson. Among all the peoples of the earth the cruelties and oppressions of its would-be masters have taught this generation what its liberties can mean. This lesson, so bitterly learned, will never be forgotten while this generation lives.

The words which we have chosen for this memorial speak Jefferson's noblest and most urgent meaning, and we are proud indeed to understand and share:

"I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Rationing Boards Protest Reduced Value of "A" Coupon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, there is no group of more loyal citizens or finer Americans in our country today than those many thousands of volunteers who now serve the Nation on the home front—the members of the war price and ration boards of the Nation who serve at great sacrifice without remuneration. This is particularly true of the chairmen and members of the war price and ration boards of Allegheny County, Pa. They do not mind the hundreds of onerous duties they are called upon to fulfill in the performance of their sworn task to preserve our economy at home. However, the recent order of the O. P. A., through the recommendation of the Office of the Petroleum Administrator for War, reducing the value of the A gasoline coupon, and also the placing of this great industrial area in district No. 1, has resulted in confusion and disgust among the millions of defense workers engaged entirely in war work. It has created chaos and has added tremendous responsibilities to the already overburdened ration boards. It has resulted in overtaxing our transportation facilities, and is contributing in a great degree to absenteeism in the war plants. This condition must be corrected immediately. To achieve this objective, on April 10, 1943, I introduced House Resolution 205, a resolution to investigate the Office of the Petroleum Administrator for War, so that we may determine the reason why western Pennsylvania, a great oil- and gas-producing area, has been placed and remains in district No. 1.

I include in my remarks a resolution unanimously passed by the chairmen and members of the 17 war price and ration boards of Allegheny County, Pa. This resolution is attested by the chairmen, professional men, businessmen, and school professors, all of whom are known for their outstanding character and reputation in this great industrial area:

Whereas the chairman and members of the 17 war price and rationing boards of Allegheny County, Pa., wish to do their utmost to administer the rationing program justly and to serve the people of their communities honorably, we find this impossible under the present set-up and therefore protest the reduction in the value of the A gasoline coupons; and

Whereas the said 17 rationing boards represent one and one-half millions of the two and one-half million people in western Pennsylvania, most of whom are engaged in the production of vital war materials; and

Whereas the topography of western Pennsylvania does not permit adequate cross-county public transportation, such as streetcars, subways, and elevated lines, our available public transportation systems must carry our thousands of workers great distances along our rivers and valleys in order to get them to their place of employment—in many cases doubling and even trebling the distance as the crow flies. These workers normally have traveled by automobile; and

Whereas the adequate alternative means of available public transportation is already overloaded and taxed to the point of a breakdown and with the erection of new war plants and the consequent bringing in of the necessary additional war workers, our public transportation facilities will be absolutely inadequate and the war effort will consequently suffer; and

Whereas the absenteeism and tardiness in our industrial plants is ever increasing due to overtaxed transportation systems; and

Whereas the necessity of our industries having to seek workers who live at great distances from their plants to replace local workers who have been drafted also adds to the transportation problem; and,

Whereas, the forcing of hundreds of women war workers to wait on street corners in the early hours of the morning for transportation is not even common decency; and,

Whereas the United States Department of Agriculture has promoted the "back to the earth" movement by asking the public to have victory gardens (which cannot be done in our cities and be worth while), the people have been clamoring for additional gasoline and such is not provided for in the gasoline ration program, thus defeating their gardening effort; and

Whereas members of our armed forces who are home on leave, many of whom perhaps for the last time, are requesting additional gasoline; and,

Whereas thousands of supplemental gasoline requests due to the reduction of the A coupon to one and one-half gallons have placed an unwarranted and unjust burden on the already overloaded volunteer board members and the understaffed paid personnel; and

Whereas it is our firm belief that the undermining of our entire rationing program can be traced directly to the public's reaction to the handling of the gasoline rationing program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the assembled chairmen and board members, representing one and one-half million people in communities whose war plants produce 40 percent of the steel which is going into our war effort and large percentages of electrical and other equipment, present most respectfully to the Petroleum Administrator and to the Office of Price Administration the necessity and propriety of their personally reviewing the situation to the end that promptly and in the interest of efficient and successful war production, and in the interest of maintaining morale and public confidence, this group of counties may be placed in district 2.

Fred H. Sommer No. 262.1; J. H. Adams, No. 262.2; Theodore H. Doehla, No. 262.3; Joseph A. Yarsky, No. 262.4; G. W. Forney, No. 262.5; Richard E. Clemson, No. 262.6; C. E. Fulton, No. 262.7; Daniel M. Kelso, No. 262.8; W D. Bish, No 262.9; Watson McKee, No. 262.10; Harry A. Cox, No. 262.11; V. H. Dake, No. 262.12; William D. Griffith, No. 262.13; F. B. Schaming, No. 262.14; I. G. Amsler, No. 262.15; Robert J. Watson, No. 262.16; L. Neal Kloppman, No. 262.17, Chairmen.

"Globaloney"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. GAVIN Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of April 12, 1943:

"GLOBALONEY"

The administration practice of stamping everyone who disagrees with its post-war policies for world rehabilitation as an isolationist deserves public contempt.

There can be no disagreement on peace, or the steps to make it permanent, or on a concert of nations to enforce peace by the use of arms. Nor can there be much disagreement on America's participation in measures to insure the economic welfare of the world. For instance, world currencies should be stabilized, and international trade and transportation regulated without sacrificing American interests.

But a definite line should be drawn between economic and social stabilization. Fixed standards are absolutely necessary in the field of economics. Fixed standards cannot be set up in the field of sociology.

The world does not have a common language, or a common religion, or a common race, or a common standard of living.

We can help feed the world, but we cannot rebuild nations which have been destroyed. We may be able to force the aggressor nations to restore what they have ruined, but we cannot establish universal wage rates, or universal workweeks, or universal old-age security, or universal unemployment benefits.

Much as Mr. Roosevelt and his New Deal friends may talk about such establishment, it is merely chimerical. The President is neither an economist nor a sociologist. He is a politician with a messianic technique which he knows how to use and which has won him millions of votes. He has surrounded himself with social malcontents who have commercialized the slogan, "Soak the rich." This has worked so well in this country that the new dealers want to sell it to the world, quite as Russia has insisted on selling communism to her neighbors.

Winant, our Ambassador to Britain, is more at home in labor councils than he is at Whitehall He is selling our brand of socialism to the British. Vice President WALLACE is now peddling it in Latin America. Australia, which has a labor government, was to be served by Edward J Flynn, erstwhile Democratic national chairman, but the Senate refused to confirm Flynn's appointment.

Do we wish to establish social collaboration with Russia, China, and India? Will we forgive other nations their lend-lease obligations? Are we to burden ourselves with debt and taxes for years to come trying to set up some kind of a world Utopia? And if we object to doing this are we to be branded as isolationists?

Peace is going to precipitate domestic problems which will defy solution unless we apply to them the best business brains we have. Down through the ages history has demonstrated that nations have destroyed themselves through taxing their peoples beyond their ability to pay Free enterprise is what has made America great, but free enterprise cannot exist in a country ridden by bureaucrats, snoopers, and tax collectors. If we insist that we put our own house in order first, are we isolationists?

Let us mark clearly where the line must be drawn. We can be global in the establishment and perpetuation of peace. We can be global in the setting up of workable economic standards. But let us be domestic in setting up our own social standards. If we reject socialism whether on a national or international scale, are we isolationists?

The New Deal is only another name for the kind of socialization that ruined France and nearly ruined Britain. Hitler gambled on its paralyzing America's war effort. A miracle saved Britain, and only the enlistment of American business and industry in war production has saved us so far. "America first" is a good slogan. Why brand it isolationist?

War on Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from the Washington Post entitled " 'Lick the Platter Clean' Gross Can Smile a Little Now; He Has Results":

"LICK THE PLATTER CLEAN" GROSS CAN SMILE A LITTLE NOW; HE HAS RESULTS—ONE MAN CAMPAIGN CATCHING ON NATIONALLY; FARMER-CONGRESSMAN SPONSOR IS NOT YET SATISFIED

(By Robert De Vore)

A 1-minute speech in the House started a Pennsylvania Republican on his way to national fame as "Lick the Platter Clean" GROSS.

CHESTER H. GROSS, of Manchester, made the speech on March 22 after a week-end tour of Washington restaurants where he was "shocked and amazed" at the "terrific waste that is going on."

At "halves of good, big juicy steaks left on plates."

At "whole bowls of peas and other vegetables from which only one spoonful had been taken."

At "good desserts nibbled at and left."

"This, before God and man, is wasteful and sinful," he said, "and I am not going to quit talking about it until the Government sees to it that in every restaurant there is a sign on the wall as glaring as hell fire:

"The patriotic thing to do is lick your platter clean."

SOME PROGRESS, HE'S CONVINCED

Last week, 25 days and seven 1-minute speeches after he had first flung his catchphrase for economy at a Nation desperately aspiring for greater supplies of food than it ever has produced, "Lick the Platter Clean" GROSS, the little Congressman, was satisfied that he was beginning to make real progress against the notoriously wasteful eating habits of 130,000,000 Americans.

Exhibit A was the intelligence that, on the fourth day of his one-man campaign, came to him from the sounding board of Congress. He told the House: "Little did I think * * * that I was going to attract the attention of the Nation. * * * Last night in Times Square, in New York City, in one of the most patronized restaurants in America, there appeared a sign 4-feet square, with the picture of a clean dinner plate, urging its patrons to lick their platters clean."

Exhibit B was a sheaf of correspondence with Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, Chief of the Army's Services of Supply, who had written to compliment the little man on the fight he was making and to assure him that the Army would not tolerate waste, and who received in return a letter from GROSS citing complaints of Army waste on the grand scale.

Exhibit C were scores of letters that came from soldiers the Nation over, and sailors at sea, all of which arrayed such impressive case histories of Army waste as to suggest to General Somervell that the Army still has a job of saving to do.

HE'LL HAVE SOME STARTLING FACTS

Letters in mind, "Lick the Platter Clean" GROSS walked down into the Well of the House for 1-minute speech No. 5.

"Startling things have been brought to my attention in the last few days, and I intend, one of these days, to present some startling facts to the country," he said.

"For instance, in an Army camp recently, 60 gallons of creamed chipped beef was thrown into a garbage can after dinner. Another garbage wagon leaving the camp stopped on the highway and gave away to people whole cartons of unopened cereal."

Exhibit C was, he said, the appearance of his slogan in the advertising of a large baking company.

GROSS, now in full stride, told the House about exhibit D: "Now the Minneapolis Star-Journal and Tribune have joined in (with a national advertising campaign) and are carrying on in the West.

"People are sitting up and taking notice," he said.

"It convinces me that good leadership in government, giving people the facts and pointing the way will be far more effective than rationing and regimenting. Licking the platter clean is a patriotic duty."

NO NEW AGENCY FOR CHESTER GROSS

The next day, GROSS was able to report to the House that the Department of Agriculture was taking up his campaign in a big way. He said: "I have that assurance."

An official of the Department called at the office of "Lick the Platter Clean." The official and the Congressman agreed that if the country could be made sufficiently waste conscious to reduce by one-half its normal wastage of 15 percent of the food supply, the crop-production program would be solved.

But the official, related GROSS, wanted to set up a new agency to save food, and with this the legislator could not agree.

"That's the trouble with these fellows," he said. "Every time they get a problem they want a new agency to solve it. You don't need an elaborate set-up and a lot of expensive governmental machinery to get this thing rolling. Why, it's rolling already.

"What has to be done is to bring the importance of food and the vital importance of saving it to the attention of the people. Make them understand that to lick the platter clean is the patriotic thing to do and 90 percent of the people will cooperate. And the rest will be ashamed to throw out good food.

"Everywhere in restaurants people are talking about saving food, and the garbage cans are not nearly as full as they were a few days ago. So let us stop weeping about the food shortage."

HE KNOWS ABOUT FOOD PURCHASING

CHESTER GROSS is a farmer. He was born October 13, 1888, in York County on a farm that has been in his family 100 years—"That makes me a substantial citizen."

He raises hogs on his farm, 300-pound hogs, 100 pounds heavier than they would need to be to meet the Department of Agriculture's "premium hog" rating. The way to produce

pork, he said, is to raise above-weight hogs. After a hog reaches 200 pounds, you can add 2 pounds of meat to him a day "under good management."

"I ought to know. I've raised thousands of them."

GROSS also raises tomatoes, but this year, on scores of farms in York County, tomato plantings will be from 25 to 45 percent under last year because of the labor shortage. That's what started him on his drive against food wastage, that and:

"I never could stand waste—my waste or the other fellow's waste. I was raised that way."

HE HAS MADE SAVING PAY DIVIDENDS

There is ample evidence that GROSS has made saving pay. He has prospered. He and Mrs. Gross have raised seven children on the farm. He is serving his second term in the House.

Posters have been plastered on either side of the door and on the walls of GROSS' office on Capitol Hill. In big red letters, most of them blare: "Lick your platter clean." All but lost in all this bright new color, is another, older sign:

"We accomplish the difficult in a short time—The impossible takes longer."

Origin and Source of The American's Creed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as a stimulus to patriotism among graduates of schools, certain Congressmen are sending out copies of William Tyler Page's The American's Creed, which was made a public document by Congress in 1926. I am also distributing this inspiring creed to graduates, with some facts concerning it prepared by Mrs. Murdock for Arizona schools. Her presentation follows:

THE AMERICAN'S CREED

A contest (1917). One thousand dollars reward. Result: The American's Creed.

Out of 3,000 competitors for that $1,000, the winning creed was that of William Tyler Page. You know the creed, but do you know William Tyler Page?

For more than 60 years this man served our Government in Washington—from the time he came to the Capital City as a page at the age of 13, to be assigned to the Speaker's rostrum in the House of Representatives, to the time of his death, October 20, 1942. This loyal patriot served under 14 Speakers of the House. He was proud of this, and also of these other facts: One ancestor was Governor of Virginia; two ancestors were Members of the Continental Congress; his great-great-grandfather signed the Declaration of Independence; and he was directly descended from President John Tyler. It was as a clerk of the House of Representatives during the World War in 1917 that he won the $1,000 in the national competition, by writing the American's Creed as we have it today.

But let Mr. Page tell you about that experience. These are his words:

"I first learned of a national creed contest in May 1917. The contest had then been in progress for some time. I thought nothing more about it until the next day, Sunday, a beautiful May day, while walking home from church. At church I had just recited the Apostles' Creed. The thought came to me as I walked along that a secular creed should be fashioned in form, on the lines of the Christian creed, and should be subordinate to it in length.

"Knowing the Apostles' Creed to have been a compilation expressing the apostles' doctrine and principles which they practiced before the Creed was formulated, and that the source of its articles were the books of the Holy Bible, I resolved at once to write a civic creed of like form, but of different substance. But where was I to find a secular bible, so to speak? Then the thought came to me—my sources of information must be recognized, authoritative, historical documents. I did not want to use my own words. No creed worthy the name could be written in the words of any one man which could express the belief or the faith of many others. The creed, it seemed to me, should contain those things to which its subscribers had believed all along, but which never had been brought together concretely. It must be a composite, and so readily recognized as to be accepted without much controversy.

"It had been my custom for a long time, in fact ever since the Fourth of July 1898, just following our glorious victories in the Spanish-American War, to spend Independence Day in my library reading our American fundamental documents—the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the Constitution of the United States, the Mayflower Compact, speeches of great Americans, such as Webster's and Hayne's, and Lincoln's and Douglas' and Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Thus I was fairly familiar with these great fountains of patriotic literature which I called my American Bible. I thought over these things on the way home that day, and upon reaching home went right to work to formulate a civic creed."

The original key to the creed made out by William Tyler Page gave the sources of the various sentences in this manner:

"The United States of America."—Preamble, Constitution of the United States.

"A Government of the people, by the people, for the people."—Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

"Whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed."—Thomas Jefferson in Declaration of Independence.

"A democracy in a republic."—Article X of the amendments to the Constitution.

"A sovereign Nation of many sovereign States."—Article IV of the Constitution.

"A perfect Union."—Preamble to the Constitution.

"One and inseparable."—Webster's speech in the Senate, January 26, 1830.

"Established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes."—Declaration of Independence.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it."—In substance from Edward Everett Hale's The Man Without a Country.

"To support its Constitution."—Oath of Allegiance.

"To obey its laws."—Washington's Farewell Address.

"To respect its flag."—Army and Navy Regulations.

"And to defend it against all enemies."—Oath of Allegiance.

So with words borrowed from Washington, Madison, Jefferson, Webster, and Lincoln, and with whole phrases taken from the Declaration of Independence and from the Constitution of the United States we have The American's Creed, a composite of fundamental patriotic literature in exactly 100 words and, according to its author, "the briefest possible summary of American political faith, and yet be founded upon the fundamental things most distinctive in American history and traditions."

Religious creeds pertain to the Kingdom of God and usually refer to the hereafter. Our political creed pertains to a reign of justice here and now. It is a notable expression of any patriot's political faith.

How shall we appreciate this creed?

We must understand the meaning it carries; we must feel the reverence it implies; and we must perform the obligation it imposes.

This is the sum total of a patriot's duty.

America's Forgotten Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMORY H. PRICE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by Gabriel Heatter, news commentator, over station WOL in Washington.

On March 30 I offered an amendment to the Carlson bill and mailed a copy of the amendment and the statement I made on the floor of the House to Mr. Heatter, and the following is Mr. Heatter's statement, broadcast a few nights later:

With the tax bill back in committee, Congress still has time to turn delay into time gained, to redeem all that time we have lost, to undo a great wrong, by writing into its new bill a parity provision for Mr. X, America's forgotten man. For all the homes in America where income hasn't gone up a dollar in years, where the cost of living has gone up anywhere from 15 to 25 percent. Congress still has time to do for these people what parity did for the farmer, what wage-increase formulas did for labor, what contracts for war production provided for business, parity based on the dollar's true buying power.

Surely no man is prepared to say agriculture, labor, industry are entitled to that, need it to survive, but we shall deny it to millions of families in other types of work. How can we speak of equality of sacrifice when we say to a letter carrier or a school teacher or a bank clerk or an office worker or any one of a dozen other types of white-collar workers:

You will have to try to get along on your dollar even when it buys only 70 or 75 cents' worth; you will have to pay taxes on your dollars, as if everyone bought a hundred cents' worth; you will have to pay higher taxes and extra taxes and keep your family together as best you can. We can't do for you what we have done for the farmer, the organized worker, the businessman producing war goods. For all these we have worked out a parity; you will have to get by as best you can.

Mr. X, living symbol of millions of his countrymen. He never brought a petition to Congress. He never hired a lobbyist. He never went on strike. He never voted in a bloc. He merely went ahead doing his job—accepting every difficulty and handicap—trying to make his dollars reach every emergency—responding to his country's every call—giving up his sons—accepting every sacrifice—he and his wife giving nights and

days early and late to every kind of volunteer work. Yet here he is being asked to do what you and I know can't be done—make one dollar do the work of two.

Equality of sacrifice. It's democracy's most sacred law. When do we get around to providing it for America's forgotten man? The man whose income hasn't gone up a dollar. The man whose cost of living has gone up to a point which makes his plight our most pressing—our most urgent—our most important problem in all America tonight. We have got to find parity for him. When do we begin? Congress still has time—now—now—now.

Proposing Organization To Save American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Iowa Falls Citizen, of Iowa Falls, Iowa, of April 8, 1943:

PROPOSING ORGANIZATION TO SAVE AMERICAN WAY

An eastern newspaper reader urges his editor to call upon all Americans who are Americans and not followers of some fantastic "ism" to organize. This reader fears the growing power of Communists in the United States and writes that there must be a vast majority of our citizens like myself and many associates who cherish dearly the freedom of this country, its style of government as it stood for years and is now being termed old-fashioned and antiquated by the fantastic dreamers of our numerous bureaus. There must be millions who love our opportunity to go to church as they please, enjoy public schools, educate their children, have pleasures, clubs, luxuries, and comforts as no other land on the face of the earth could boast. But they waste their time and energy in just bemoaning their fate.

The enemies our old-timers are suffering from, are foisting regimentation, collectivism, labor gains, strange ideologies, and other afflictions because they are so well organized. They have more fronts than a dog has fleas in summertime. The memberships of these countless fronts are interlocking, but the officerships are all distinct; thereby giving each front a separate and distinct front-weight. They are tangible evidence of the power attained by organization.

Fewer than 5,000,000 Communists cowed and dominated the 180,000,000 population of Russia because of their organization. The much-despised "minority" in the United States can do the same thing if America is not awakened by some powerful weapon to organize and throw weight against this malignant minority.

If you will send investigators among the communistic headquarters now you will find the most startling atmosphere of victorious confidence and satisfaction. These places are like the headquarters of a victorious political party. The officers are convinced they have won their fight, and now are wholly engaged in alloting the spoils. All effort and all time is spent in distributing the workers to the greatest advantage for complete control of avenues to create discontent, dissatisfaction, tumult, and other implements of their work and to ripen the country for complete control. I watched these places before their ascent to governmental places and since, and the difference is most startling.

The great majority of our people are helpless as individuals—more truly so in the face of skilled, expert organizers trained for years in spreading their strange, fantastic ideologies.

There must be some public-spirited people—both men and women—of affluence who want to see our individualist government stand; people with means. * * * If called upon by newspapers they may proffer the necessary cash—just as Germany tendered the cash to create Bolshevism in Russia—to start a national organization to combat un-American innovations.

Such a body should be open to Democrats, Republicans, Prohibitionists, or whatnots, with but one requisite for membership—the burning desire to maintain what our forefathers attained and fought and died to maintain.

With community, county, State, and national headquarters such an organization could function to the well-being of our country. There are still shrewd lawyers and businessmen who could investigate and report to this vast organization the ulterior purpose of every bit of legislation and the policy of every candidate of all parties for guidance in protests and voting. We need it and need it now.

Such an organization should never aim at being a third party or political in any way. It should be just a patriotic, national guidance for real Americans, and the weapon of preservation of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the institutions that have made America what it once was and what it will be again by the strength of its Main Street citizens.

The organized "new order," born in the smoke-filled cellars and vermin-infested lofts of mostly foreign quarters, are elbowing their way to complete power. The only way to combat them successfully and without actual civil conflict is to summon under one organization all who place love of country on an equal level with desire to win the World War.

There does not live a true American who would not walk barefooted rather than burn a drop of gasoline needed to win the war; who would buy a single can of food knowing it would hamper a soldier; who would not sacrifice the cuffs of his pants for a trivial saving of war effort. But these same true Americans rightfully resent having social reforms, labor gains, and regimented, collective ideologies thrust upon them as patriotic war necessities.

The Japanese Problem

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I hope the gentleman from Mississippi is going to say something about the appeasement of the Japanese by Mr. Ickes. I see he is going to take some of them out on his farm.

Mr. RANKIN. If he does not mind, they may poison him.

But I want to talk about some more serious phases of the Japanese question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the appeasing of Japanese by people in this country is a horrible blunder, and sending these Japanese into the South where we do not want them is worse.

I note that the War Department proposes to send Japanese soldiers into Mississippi, bringing them from Hawaii. As I pointed out before, those Hawaiian-born Japanese were the fifth columnists who directed the Japanese in their brutal attack on Pearl Harbor; and some of the ones who were shot down in that raid were reared and educated in Hawaii, Oregon, and California.

I have protested against putting these Japanese in the American Army. The American soldiers do not want them. They know they cannot be trusted. Their ranks will be teeming with spies and trouble makers. They ought to be put into labor battalions to do manual labor and not organized into military combat units.

Mr. Speaker, that area of the South is the most vulnerable section of America. If we should be attacked at any time and an invasion attempted, it would probably be along the Gulf coast, just as was the last attempted invasion of our country in 1815.

In addition to the terrain of the area, which has not changed, and other conditions I prefer not to mention, there are more valuable military objectives in that area than in almost any other section of the country. There are the vast oilfields in Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and east Texas, coal mines and steel mills in Alabama, the Tennessee Valley Authority which is furnishing the power for our war industries, as well as the vast supply of gold that we have buried in the hills of Kentucky.

To send these Japanese into that area under these circumstances would not only be an injustice to the people of Mississippi and the other Southern States, but, in my opinion, it would be a dangerous blunder from the standpoint of our own safety.

As I have pointed out before, Japan has honeycombed this country with her fifth-column organization known as the Black Dragon Society, and has used it to stir up race trouble all over the Southern States, while boasting that she would bring on a race war in America that would seriously cripple our war effort if it did not result in our ultimate defeat.

We people in the South have had enough race trouble stirred up for us already by these flannel-mouthed agitators in and around Washington, without having that condition further intensified by placing these Japanese troops and Japanese concentration camps in the Southern States.

Do not forget, Mr. Speaker, that, as I have said before, Japan is our permanent, and probably our most dangerous, enemy, and will be until the Japanese Empire is destroyed. Today vast Japanese armies are threatening the invasion of Australia, and the destruction of the white man's civilization in the southwest Pacific; and every time a report of a Japanese victory is circulated among them, we hear of the gloating of these Japanese confined in concentration camps in the United States.

General MacArthur is pleading with outstretched hands for airplanes, men, and munitions with which to drive back these brutal hordes and to save the people of Australia from a condition worse than death.

Our boys from almost every community in America are bleeding and dying on Guadalcanal. They are straining every nerve to meet the onslaught against the continent of Australia. The white man's civilization is at stake in the contest.

Therefore, I say it is no time to be appeasing and pampering the Japanese or pandering to any other racial elements that want to stir up trouble for us at home or for our allies abroad.

Let us scatter these Japs into labor battalions, where they cannot communicate or conspire with each other, and then let us send everything we possibly can to General MacArthur and those brave heroes upon whose success depends not only the destiny of this Republic, but the destiny of our civilization itself.

National and State Regulation of Civil Aeronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the Congress will have occasion to vote on one of the most important measures coming before it in recent years—a bill amending the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

This bill, H. R. 1012, provides for a series of highly constructive steps to strengthen our civil aviation laws in order that we may be ready to maintain and further our pre-eminent position in civil aviation throughout the world. No subject could be of more pressing concern. Upon scarcely no other subject will the Congress have an opportunity to make such a great contribution toward a sound and progressive post-war economy.

I am aware that there have recently been some indications of an organized move from outside the Halls of this body agitating the postponement of action on this important measure. Postponement would be a tragic mistake. Developments in civil aviation do not move at the plodding pace of the horse and buggy. Indeed, even the swiftest and most modern streamliner streaking across the rails seems virtually at a standstill when compared with the tempo of the skyways. In this new civil-aviation industry, above all others, the necessity for preparing today to meet the problems of tomorrow is imperative.

The proposals contained in H. R. 1012 reflect 5 years of experience under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and long and careful study by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, by the Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents, by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, and by many in the civil-aviation industry. During these 5 years there has been a general crystallization of thought concerning the outstanding problems of civil aviation which require further legislative treatment, and most of those problems are dealt with in H. R. 1012.

There is relatively little difference of opinion concerning the merits of H. R. 1012 except on one point. The bill would provide that the Federal Government should have exclusive jurisdiction to regulate air commerce and air navigation. This point alone appears to have excited a certain amount of controversy. I want to discuss this phase of the bill briefly in order to clear up certain misconceptions which are obviously at the base of some of the controversy and to point out the compelling reasons for solving an admittedly difficult problem in the manner proposed by H. R. 1012.

A Federal system of government can work fairly and efficiently only if there is a proper balance in the distribution of powers between the States and the Nation. Too great a dissipation of powers among the States will cause the system to disintegrate. Too great a concentration of powers in the Nation will cause the system to crash.

In most fields of activity both States and Nation have an appropriate role to play in their respective spheres. I, for one, believe that in recent years there has been a tendency dangerously to overlook the constructive role which can and should be played by the States respecting many of the great problems of our democracy. But our long history has demonstrated, sometimes after costly and ill-advised experimentation, that there are some fields in which the Nation must carry out full responsibility.

Our national banking system and the issuance of currency were recognized long ago to be matters in which the Nation must be supreme. No one today would suggest a reversion to the banking and currency theories of Andrew Jackson. Despite the validity of the great principles of democracy which he so ruggedly championed, and despite the enduring vitality of his ideals, it must be admitted that in the world of today the decentralized banking and currency system which he espoused would bring disaster.

Again, in the field of shipping on our navigable waters, no one today would suggest a return to the era in our history when the several States exercised extensive jurisdiction over this matter. The fact is that we have come to accept without any question whatsoever the propriety of Federal jurisdiction in the case of both interstate and intrastate shipping upon our rivers and other navigable waters. We accept this proposition so unquestioningly that many of us have doubtless forgotten that there was once a day when the States fought such regulation bitterly. Until the momentous opinion by Chief Justice Marshall in Gibbons against Ogden it was vigorously contended by many great lawyers that the Nation had no power whatsoever to legislate respecting shipping on navigable waters. Even after that decision many years elapsed, at the cost of long and wasteful litigation, before it was finally established that the Nation has complete and unquestioned power in this field, and so well has this legal doctrine accorded with the realities of modern economics that today State legislation affecting shipping on our navigable waters has become relatively unimportant.

More recently a new industry has been born of America's inventive genius, the only industry other than civil aviation which utilizes the air space, the radio industry. If you will thumb back through some of the court decisions of a few years ago you will find that in this field, as in the case of shipping, efforts were made for a time to exercise State regulation. But many of those efforts were invalidated by the courts because of the practical impossibility of any successful division of authority between the States and the Nation. Today no one would suggest that radio transmission should be subject to the regulatory powers of any agency other than the duly constituted agency of the Federal Government.

I mention these examples not to suggest that in the field of civil aviation the States have no legitimate part to play but rather that we may be reminded that there actually are certain phases of our economy which are now generally recognized as being matters of complete national concern.

Now let us consider the respective roles of the Nation and the States in civil aviation.

From the very earliest days of civil aviation in this country dominant opinion has favored complete uniformity, through Federal legislation, respecting the regulation of air navigation. The constitutionality of such Federal regulation, to the exclusion of the States, was carefully considered in the early 1920's by the American Bar Association and by the Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. For a time it was felt by these constitutional lawyers that a Federal act governing the entire air space would be of doubtful constitutionality. It was therefore originally proposed that, pending a settlement of this question, some sort of State legislation regulating civil aeronautics would be necessary.

However, subsequent to certain decisions of the Supreme Court in the early part of 1922, the American Bar Association and the Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws both came to the conclusion that the Supreme Court would sustain the constitution-

ality of a Federal act regulating all air navigation. These bodies then proposed a uniform State law which would contain no regulatory provisions but would be limited to other matters having no effect on the regulation of air navigation. And in the 1922 report of the Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws this statement appears:

> There is no doubt that the Supreme Court would support a Federal statute giving the Federal Government exclusive power to register aircraft, license pilots, and establish rules for aerial navigation. If an intrastate aircraft is not inspected and not registered, its flight may endanger the safety of aircraft engaged in interstate commerce; if a pilot engaged in intrastate flight alone is unskilled and unlicensed, his conduct may well endanger the safety of pilots engaged exclusively in interstate flight; and if the rules for intrastate aerial navigation are different from those applying to interstate flight, confusion and danger to interstate flight may well ensue.

The committee's conclusion was buttressed by the following quotation from the Supreme Court's opinion in the case of the *Railroad Commission of Wisconsin* v. *The Chicago B. & Q. R. Co.* (42 Sup. Ct. Rep. 232, 237 (1922)):

> Commerce is a unit and does not regard State lines, and while under the Constitution, interstate and intrastate commerce are ordinarily subject to regulation by different sovereignties, yet when they are so mingled together that the supreme authority, the Nation, cannot exercise complete effective control over interstate commerce without incidental regulation of intrastate commerce, such incidental regulation is not an invasion of State authority.

Therefore the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws concluded that a Federal act giving the Federal Government exclusive regulatory powers over air navigation would not only be constitutional but was eminently desirable and should be supported by the States themselves.

In consideration of the Air Commerce Act of 1926, this House took a similar view of the matter and adopted a bill which would have provided for complete Federal regulation of air navigation, whether intrastate or interstate, and included in the bill a declaration which was a paraphrase of the passage from the Supreme Court which I have just quoted, stating in brief that "air commerce is a unit and does not regard State lines." At that time the Senate did not wish to go quite so far. Nevertheless, in the act finally adopted as a result of conference between the Houses it was provided that air-traffic rules to be promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce would be applicable throughout the Nation in both interstate and intrastate air navigation. Certain of the other regulatory provisions of the law were, at the insistence of the Senate, limited more closely to strictly interstate commerce.

When we came to drafting the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, in which the Air Commerce Act of 1926 was rewritten, we provided that the Federal Government should have power to apply all safety regulation, not only to interstate flying but also to any flying on the civil airways, whether or not such flying was interstate, and, in addition, to any other flying which might affect or endanger interstate flying.

As a practical matter this broad grant of jurisdiction, the validity of which has been sustained by the courts, has meant that no civil aircraft can be operated in this country today without compliance with the Federal regulations respecting both its airworthiness characteristics and its operation, and that no pilot can fly an aircraft in this country today without compliance with the Federal regulations regarding pilot certification. This is true, as a practical matter, because, due to the speed of aircraft, and the absence of physically confined highways in the air comparable to those on the ground, a pilot today cannot use an airplane to any extent at all without at sometime—and indeed, more often than not—getting on or near the civil airways or crossing State lines. The fact is that with the multiplication of aerial operations incident to the war, the Civil Aeronautics Board found it necessary to make a finding of fact over a year ago to the effect that any air navigation, wherever it might occur, is a potential hazard to interstate or military operations and must, therefore, comply with the Federal regulations.

Therefore, the proposal in H. R. 1012 that the Federal regulations should extend throughout the air space merely follows the original recommendations of the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in 1922, and the considered judgment of this House in 1926, and confirms in the law what today is necessarily true as a matter of practice.

The bill does, however, go further and provide that no State shall regulate air navigation. This provision is a necessary corollary of the principle of uniformity and carries out the thought of the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in 1922.

There has been some suggestion that even though the Federal Government should have the power to regulate air navigation throughout the air space, the States should be empowered to adopt additional safety regulations as long as they are not inconsistent with the Federal regulations. While this suggestion may at first blush appear plausible, brief reflection will disclose its fallacy.

Suppose, for example, that the Federal regulations provide for inspection of an aircraft twice a year, but that the States were to be empowered likewise to provide for the inspection of aircraft more frequently; in other words, that the States were to be able to adopt additional safety precautions. You would then be faced with a situation, which actually has been encountered to a minor extent, where aircraft would encounter differing State requirements. It is perfectly conceivable that an operator of a fleet of aircraft would, in the course of a year, have every one of his aircraft regularly operating in 10 or a dozen different States. If those States were to adopt licensing, registration, and inspection requirements in addition to those adopted by the Federal Government, the situation would become intolerable. Within a single day it is altogether possible for a given aircraft to be operated through more than 10 States, and for it to be confronted with a new set of requirements as it passes over an invisible and theoretical State boundary in the heavens 20 or more times within a period of 24 hours would lead to utter chaos. No such system is practically enforceable. No such system suits the needs of the commercial or the private flyer. No such system accords with the realities of air navigation.

Let me speak a word here for the private flier. We know how he complains at the complexity of the regulations he must abide by. It is urgent that, to assure proper development of private flying, those regulations be kept just as simple as possible consistent with the requirements of safety. Yet if on top of the Federal regulations, which he must comply with, there are to be additional State requirements, he may well have to throw up his hands in despair.

You and I can drive our motor cars from one State to another and from one city to another and we can meet the varying speed limits and other regulations with only an occasional slip-up if we exercise diligence. But the poor chap who takes an occasional plane ride in his air puddle jumper should not be compelled to face similar diversity. He has a sufficiently complicated task as it is to keep the Federal regulations in mind without having to carry a book of the regulations of every State into which he plans to fly or into which a sudden storm might blow him.

Appreciating these convincing objections to differing State regulations, some have proposed that the States should at least be permitted to adopt the same regulations as those prescribed by the Federal Government.

In fact certain States today have done exactly that. But it is carrying adherence to States' rights apart from principle in my humble opinion, to provide simply that States may adopt the same regulations as those adopted by the Federal Government. If there is to be, as there must, uniformity of regulations, then what a wasteful process it would be to have 48 different State legislative and administrative authorities parroting the regulations promulgated by the Federal authority. The consequence would be the creation of additional Government jobs to no purpose whatsoever. Moreover, if there is to be uniformity it is not enough that the words of the regulation should be uniform—it is equally important, if not more so, that the interpretation and the administration of those words be uniform. Given a single statutory or administrative rule, were there to be 48 different agencies interpreting that rule the result inevitably would be 48 different rules.

Let us turn now to the matter of economic regulation. It has been suggested that despite the need for uniformity in the regulations with respect to air navigation, when we come to the regulations affecting the economics of a commercial operation in the air, transporting passengers and property for the public, the States should be permitted to regulate intrastate commerce. It is suggested

that the States should be able to require certificates of convenience and necessity and other licenses for operations between points within a given State, to require the filing of intrastate tariffs, and to regulate intrastate rates.

Where we deal with a transport system as slow, and as relatively loosely knit, as the rail or motor system it may be that such State economic regulation is justified. However, we must never lose sight of the fact that in the air we have and must always have a closely knit system built up and operated on a national basis, the units of which move with lightning speed. These are the peculiar virtues and advantages of air transportation. Those competitive interests which would cripple it and impair its development would, I have no doubt, recommend legislative steps which would weaken those characteristics. I for one, and I am sure this House, will, however, insist that no such artificial restraints and impediments be allowed to plague this industry.

Let me cite one or two examples to demonstrate into what an impossible situation we would get air transportation were there to be separate State regulation of the economics of intrastate operation.

A few years ago an intrastate air line operation was instituted between New York and Buffalo flying entirely within the borders of the State of New York. Rates were cut. The operation in question failed to comply with the economic regulations imposed by the Civil Aeronautics Act. Suit was instituted resulting in a consent decree whereby the operation was required to abide by the Federal law. Had the decision been otherwise, had that operator been able to charge rates between New York and Buffalo, without regard to Federal requirements, this series of consequences would have resulted: The interstate rate between Boston and Buffalo would have been affected immediately. This in turn would have affected rates charged between all points east of Buffalo and points as far west as Chicago, including operations via points in Canada. Three air lines operating between New York and Chicago would have been affected at once, and it would have been entirely possible these effects would ultimately have been felt over routes of 2 other lines operating into and out of Washington because of the New York-Chicago traffic which can be and is carried via Washington. In other words, a seemingly simple operation between 2 points in a single State on 1 air line could have affected drastically the rate structure of 5 other air lines on points in at least 10 States, the District of Columbia, and 1 foreign nation.

As a matter of fact, had that particular rate cut between New York and Buffalo been permitted to continue it might very well in the end, because of the cumulative effects of the resulting readjustments over the other air lines, have affected the entire transcontinental structure even to the Pacific coast. Such possibilities are not remote in the air-transport industry. Because of the speed of aircraft, a routing which to surface transportation would appear hopelessly circuitous is not only feasible but often desired by the passengers. The result is that rates between any two points can be determined only in the light of rates between dozens and even hundreds of other points, many of them far removed.

Let me cite another example. A few years ago, pursuant to a definite policy of encouraging larger and more standard equipment on all the air lines in order that the air lines might be able more effectively to carry out their role as an adjunct of the national defense in time of national emergency, the Federal Government succeeded in having one of the interstate air lines take on an entirely new fleet of Douglas 21-passenger planes in place of a fleet of smaller aircraft. In one of the States, however, through which this air line operated it served two points within the State. That particular State happens to have been one of the very few which has imposed State economic regulation. At one of the stops in this particular State the airport facilities were not large enough to permit the new and larger equipment to operate. Accordingly the stop had to be temporarily suspended and authorization therefor was issued by the C. A. B. The State, however, refused to permit such a suspension and actually required the air line to retain enough of the smaller aircraft to continue the intrastate service. The Post Office Department felt that it was not justified in such circumstances to designate the smaller planes for the carriage of mail. It took over a year to persuade the State authorities to permit the suspension of the service in question. It is conservatively estimated that this delay cost that particular air line approximately $50,000, a financial burden which, of course, was ultimately cast upon the Federal taxpayer.

I am sure that many of those who are concerned lest State rights be infringed in this new field of air transportation would never seek to defend any such economic waste as that to which I have just referred. The very fact that the several States, with rare exceptions, have abstained from economic regulation of air commerce evidences a general appreciation of the practical impossibility of making dual regulation of air commerce work to the advantage of the public. You cannot take a means of commerce which may soon move even with the speed of sound and expect it to fit into a governmental framework divided into 49 different parts. Intrastate commerce by air must be conducted as a part of the interstate system if waste, confusion, and delay are to be avoided and if economic strength and progress are to be encouraged. As this House said in the bill it adopted in 1926, "Air commerce is a unit." It is as much a unit as is the use of the air by radio. It is even more of a unit than is the use of our navigable waters by shipping. No edict of a legislature can make it otherwise; its unity is a matter of technology and economics which man-made laws cannot change. What we must do, therefore, is to legislate so as to fit the facts.

Now let us understand what H. R. 1012 does not do. There has been considerable misunderstanding. H. R. 1012 does not impose economic regulation on the local operator of sightseeing trips who flies over the city. Its economic regulation applies solely to commerce by air between one place and another, and this definition would, of course, exclude economic regulation of the local sightseeing operator. Consequently if the States desired to adopt economic regulation for such a venture, they would be free to do so were H. R. 1012 to be adopted. Similarly the bill does not impose economic regulation upon training schools or similar aerial ventures.

Its economic regulations, and the prohibition against State economic regulation, are confined to regulation of the carriage of persons or goods for compensation or hire. This would not affect the training of pilots or the carriage of one's own goods by a private carrier or any other ventures of this nature. Nor does H. R. 1012 seek to regulate in any way the airport operator. It does not provide for licensing of airport operators or for any other regulation of such persons. If such regulation is desirable, H. R. 1012 leaves the matter to the States. Nor does the bill prevent the States from regulating aerial photography or crop dusting or any other aerial operations not constituting the carriage of goods or persons for compensation or hire. Safety regulations applicable to air navigation would, of course, be a matter, as I have indicated, for the Federal Government. But any economic regulation or any other regulation which the States desire to adopt for any such ventures would be in no way affected by this bill. Again the bill would not regulate aircraft factories; that, too, would be left to the States. Likewise the bill would not prevent State or municipal construction or operation of airports nor would it prevent State or municipal zoning of hazards in the vicinity of airports. Indeed it contemplates a cooperative State-Federal airport and airport-zoning program in which States and municipalities are to be encouraged, rather than discouraged. Likewise the bill would not prevent State measures to foster and promote aviation. Many such measures could be undertaken by the States, and the Nation as a whole would benefit by activity on the part of States and municipalities in such promotional work. Indeed the bill, in providing for a Nation-wide program of encouragement of aviation education, specifically recognizes the important part that the States are to play in such a program, and provides for assistance to be afforded to them.

The bill, then, does not constitute complete federalization of civil aviation. It leaves ample room for constructive State activities and in important respects specifically encourages such activities. All that the bill does is to provide that the regulation of flight and the economic regulation of transporting persons and property by air for compensation or hire are to be treated as a unit governmentally.

It is especially appropriate that this step be taken at this time. In the case of air navigation and air commerce the Federal Government has always been the chief regulator. The States thus far have done relatively little. In this re-

spect the history of other modes of transportation has been reversed. In the case of railroads, long before the Federal Government began regulation the various States regulated the matter extensively. The same thing is true in the case of shipping. The same thing is true in the case of motor transportation. In all those fields the elaboration of necessary Federal regulation was slow and oftentimes marred by unfortunate conflicts between State and Federal jurisdiction. For in extending Federal jurisdiction it was frequently necessary to upset well-defined State practices. In the case of the air, however, we can now, with a minimum of disruption and without treading upon well-established practices in the several States, provide for complete Federal regulation. The facts demand it. It will have to come sooner or later. It had better come now, that we may be saved the cost and the conflict between State and National authorities which a few years hence would be inevitable.

Oil Production in Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Mr. C. C. Hogg, vice president of the National Petroleum Co., of Pleasantville, Pa.:

I was born in an oil country shanty, 16 by 24 feet. Educated through extreme sacrifice by my parents. As an engineer during the last war, I had charge of the making of submarine crankshafts. I made reduction gears for the over-age destroyers which we gave to Britain at the beginning of this war. In 1919 I returned to the oil business to lighten the burdens of my parents in their declining years and have followed the vicissitudes of a small company oil producer ever since. I never expected to see the day when a bushel of potatoes would cost more than a barrel of oil or the time when the price of a barrel of crude oil would not buy a roast for the Sunday dinner. Formerly when the demand warranted a good price for crude oil, we were able to fix up our wells and to develop additional acres so that we could ride through the periods of depression. Now we are victims of a stagnation that holds no promise for the future.

With the advent of price regulation, it was necessary to have a guinea pig. The small, unorganized, ill-financed little oil producer was the first to feel the mighty hand of the Office of Price Administration.

A year ago I was invited as petroleum engineer to serve on the Industrial Advisory Council here in Mr. Henderson's office. However, after several months of conscientious service, preparing reports which found their way no further than somebody's file or wastebasket, I returned home utterly disgusted and thoroughly disillusioned.

This is not the place for discussion of the relative merits of Pennsylvania grade crude oil. To say the least it is essential for aviation. It has no superior. In 1941, 81 percent of the revenue mileage flown by commercial airlines was made on Pennsylvania lubricating oil. Each barrel of crude we produce will provide oil to lubricate one of the big aviation engines for 8 to 12 hours. Every pint of the balance of that barrel is made into critical war materials. We have no transportation problem. We are in the heart of the industrial war activity and at the back door of the vital east coast area.

It requires only common school arithmetic to figure that the total refining capacity of the United States, for lubricating oil of all kinds, will furnish lubrication for the President's contemplated air fleet and tank armada, for only 2 hours per day. We do not know the allowance our military men make for attrition, nor do we have any idea how many of these tanks or planes will never get into service. We do not know that if the motors are used, they will require at least 4 quarts of high-grade lubricating oil per engine per hour.

Need I observe that if an engine runs short of gasoline it simply stops. The tank may be refilled and it will go again as well as ever. If lubrication fails, the engine is ruined. Hence the emphasis on lubricating oil. The situation is undoubtedly in the same category as the famous horseshoe nail. I am not aware of any adequate provision having been made for the certain increased requirements for lubricating these new ships.

There has been little expansion of refining facilities in the Pennsylvania field. A number of older plants have been shut down and dismantled. They are not being replaced. The Pennsylvania refineries are not running to capacity, neither can they, on account of a shortage in the production of Pennsylvania crude for which the Office of Price Administration is entirely responsible. If the shortage becomes more acute, the cry "too little, too late" cannot be avoided.

Since the advent of core drilling, we have learned that there is undoubtedly as much high-grade Pennsylvania oil in our partially depleted field as has been recovered heretofore. We have avoided economic disaster by developing and using secondary recovery methods which enable us to recover more oil faster.

Pennsylvania producers, for patriotic reasons, are producing every barrel that they possibly can under the present regulations. It is equally true that with a proper consideration of the value of this resource that will allow a reasonable price the Pennsylvania producer can and will produce sufficient crude to supply our refiner's maximum capacity for the duration. In this emergency there should be crude oil to assure a continuous full-scale refinery-production schedule.

Three typical cases will give a picture of the plight of our small businessmen:

1. About 30 years ago two brothers and their father acquired nearly 300 acres of oil property near Shamburg. They paid for it, and each brother raised a large family. The father, one of the last veterans of the Civil War, died. Most of the children in both families, by economy and perseverance, have received a good education.

Of these young men, one is working for the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; another is an engineer with the Westinghouse Co.; another is an accountant for the United States Steel Co.; another is general superintendent of a medium-sized producing company. One of the boys is a construction foreman at an ordnance plant and one is a machine-shop foreman. The other fought it out on Bataan. He is now rotting away in a Japanese prison camp, in conditions undoubtedly more grueling than those his grandfather endured at Andersonville.

The father of one bunch of boys is running the lease. The father of the other bunch works one-half day on the lease and works a night shift in one of the Titusville ordnance plants. At the present price of oil, they cannot hire help or pay wages sufficient to carry on a more intensive operation.

Secondary recovery methods which these men could use under a little better price for oil, would enable them to produce from their property 60 to 70 barrels per day, instead of the 5 or 6 which they are now getting. The emphasis of my story is this oil will furnish the best available lubricating oil, sufficient to fly one of the high-powered aviation engines from 8 to 12 hours.

2. About 10 years ago a young man, a graduate of Yale, and with ample financial support, purchased leases not far from Pithole embracing about a square mile. They produced less than 3 barrels per day. He fixed them up and installed compressors together with electrical pumping equipment. He drilled a number of wells from which cores were taken, indicating an oil content from 5,000 to 15,000 barrels per acre. The production was increased to 65 barrels per day.

Since the apparent indifference of the Government to Pennsylvania production, as evidenced by the price ceiling, he reduced his working force to a skeleton—those necessary to keep the plant going and police the property. He left his project in the hands of a hireling, and did what seemed the most patriotic thing for him to do. He is sitting behind a desk here in Washington in an Army uniform with two silver bars on his shoulder. The production from his oil lease is less than 20 barrels per day. Of course, this is not a question for me to answer, but for the failure to put this additional oil into the war effort it occurs to me that the Office of Price Administration is more responsible than the young captain who is endeavoring to do the best he can for his country.

3. Finally the company, to which I have devoted the last 23 years of my life, has 6,000 acres in the heart of the Pennsylvania field. Before Pearl Harbor, we employed less than 50 men, largely young men whom we had trained in the newer phases of secondary recovery. I believe I had the best organization in the State of Pennsylvania for this purpose, and over 300 barrels per day production. I assure you we have done everything possible to maintain or increase this production without incurring additional indebtedness, but have not been able to do so.

There are 17 stars in our service flag. We have lost 26 men who are employed in war plants. No person has left us for employment with any other oil producer. Most of these men would prefer working in the oil business, where they have skill and experience. I know many of them would not have left had we been able to assure them at the time, that the Government was interested in the production of Pennsylvania crude oil.

This is not a "cost of living" commodity, it is a vital war material. A price is warranted that would enable us to pay a wage at least commensurate with what is paid for routine semiskilled labor.

Fortunately, our pumpers are older men. They have loyally remained on the job. Of the 12 men in our pulling crews, that is, the men who repair pumping equipment, only one was with us before Pearl Harbor. Our plants are manned entirely by new employees. Many of them have a very thin experience. Our drilling tools and cleaning-out rigs are not more than 60-percent effective. We now have 63 men and women and the job is not nearly as well done. The experienced men would have stayed on the job had we been able to pay a fair wage.

With a full realization of the whole problem and with all the weight I can command, I urge, especially in behalf of the boy in the Japanese prison, the boys in whose honor

there are 17 stars in our flag, and others from your home and mine that adequate steps to remedy the situation be made at once.

C. C. HOGG,
Vice President, National Petroleum Co.,
Pleasantville, Pa.

APRIL 15, 1943.

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Prentiss Brown of the O. P. A. is at present considering a 50-cent price increase on crude oil to increase the production of oil to meet increased demands in our all-out effort to win the war and to assist the small producers of the Nation to stay in the oil business.

Congressional Representation and Publicity in Bermuda Refugee Conference

REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said here about the conference which will take place down in Virginia on food, but not very much has been said about another conference that is probably just as important or more so. I refer to the conference that is about to be held down in Bermuda on the refugee situation.

The Congress ought to be represented at both of these conferences and I think that there ought to be publicity so far as both of these conferences are concerned.

One of these conferences is to deal with the food situation and the United States will no doubt be expected to be the largest contributor of food. The other conference, in Bermuda, is to deal with the refugee situation, and I anticipate that, as usual, a serious effort will be made to bring to this country tens of thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands of immigrants from Europe. Neither of these conferences, Mr. Chairman, so far as we have been informed, will discuss military matters. If they were military conferences, then there would be reason for barring the press during war. I can see no just reason for keeping our people in the dark on the question of food, especially when we will be called upon to contribute most of it. Likewise, why should the American people be kept in the dark on the question of immigrants which certain forces in the Bermuda conference will no doubt undertake to bring here? Both of these questions, food and immigrants, vitally affect every man, woman, and child in this country. I repeat, we have not been advised of anything of a military nature that will take place at either one of these conferences. The Members of this Congress are here to represent the American people. This Congress therefore ought not to be kept in the dark as to what goes on at these two conferences, and the American people ought not to be kept in the dark. I therefore feel that there ought to be representatives from Congress at each one of these conferences and these representatives ought to be free to come back and report to the Congress. I also feel that the press ought to be permitted to attend the sessions of these conferences with the view of giving the American people the facts.

Of course, if any matter arises in either conference of a military nature which ought to be kept in confidence, I am sure the press associations would respect the request of the conferences in these particulars. In other words, the press ought to be permitted to give to the American people such facts as will not give aid and comfort to the enemy.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Does the gentleman know that I introduced a resolution yesterday asking the Speaker to appoint a committee of three from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to go to Bermuda and sit in on that conference and report?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I know that, and I favor some such action.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Resolution for Placing of Child Care Under Centralized Federal Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted unanimously by Child Care Conference of Wayne County C. I. O. Council, held at Hotel Statler, Detroit, Mich., March 28, 1943:

Whereas much confusion and delay in establishing proper child-care centers on a national scale has resulted from a Federal division of authority in this matter; and

Whereas there is now no central agency responsible for the operation or standards of these centers, and the very allocation of funds for local administration must pass through several agencies, causing endless confusion and delay; and

Whereas this program is a vital part of war administration and must be so handled and integrated with the general war plan if production is to meet the needs of victory: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this body urge the President and the Congress of the United States to place the whole matter of child care under one agency or to set up a special agency to handle it as a war problem; and be it further

Resolved, That this agency be empowered to set standards; and be it finally

Resolved, That a sufficient appropriation be made to allow this agency to establish proper child-care centers throughout the Nation.

Oil the Sinew of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I noted a recent release from the Office of War Information which gave some impressive statistics as to the amount of gasoline and fuel oil used in the conduct of the war under battle and transport conditions.

The statement was made that the article was designed to explain to the public why gasoline and fuel oil must be conserved I would make the point that the word "reserved" should be substituted for "conserved." Perhaps unwittingly, the O. W. I. has attuned its propaganda to the philosophy of scarcity; that philosophy, through the action of bureaus, is being applied to oil as well as to foods and other commodities and materials whose volume could be increased by the observance of certain fundamental laws of economics.

Perhaps a new theory of economics has been born. Let us give it a name—the diffusion and distribution of remainders. We will use up what we have and not make the attempt to re-create or to replace.

I speak of the oil problem. I do not refer in this sense to the shortages in heating oils and gasoline created by limited transportation facilities to the East, nor to the rationing of gasoline instituted as a rubber-conservation measure. I speak of future, over-all supply, the supply for the whole Nation.

Many tens of millions of dollars of present and future taxpayers' money is now being spent in the construction of mammoth pipe lines to link the oil fields and the refineries of Texas with the Atlantic coast. No one has seriously questioned the wisdom of such expenditures, although there have been differences of opinion as to the location of one of the lines. But there are a great many who are beginning to wonder whether such lines can be kept in full operation without divesting the Southwest of its needed supply, to the point of severe injury—injury to the production of food and a partial paralysis of that vast region which relies upon the automobile and the truck to an almost unbelievable extent.

It is to be hoped that a more enlightened policy with regard to oil is being established. Consistently, for 1½ years, the Office of Price Administration has been adamant—truculently so—on the subject of crude oil prices. It froze them as of October 1941 and except for a few small local adjustments, the producers of the Nation are struggling along trying to meet 1943 costs with pre-war income.

It is a losing battle. The press is filled with accounts of sales of producing properties by independents to the large, inte-

grated companies. The independent is leaving the field, defeated not by our enemies abroad but by a few theorists whose announced basis for refusal of relief is a survey of costs applicable to the time when the price freeze was made. The skilled workers of the producing industry—the men who drill and operate the wells—have been moving to the plants that produce other war materials where no such price restraints are felt. They cannot be criticized. They must seek higher pay to meet their living costs; if the independent producer cannot meet the competition, he loses.

And the Nation loses. The war program is endangered. The O. W. I. was correct as to the vital need of petroleum on all the battlefields, whether on land, on sea or in the air. We cannot win a war without petroleum, for direct use by the Army and the Navy, nor can we win without the production of foods and of countless raw and finished products, obtainable only through the use of large volume of petroleum.

The figures on the Nation's reserves are impressive. The estimates customarily are on the order of 19,000,000,000 to 20,000,000,000 barrels. In 1942 the production of crude oil in the United States was 1,385,000,000 barrels. It is an assumption too often made by those unfamiliar with the nature of oil reserves, that we have as many years of full and adequate supply as the annual production is contained in the estimated reserves.

That is a fallacy. Perhaps we do have reserves of that magnitude, and certainly we have no reason for doubting it. But they are not producible at will. These reserves, to the extent of several billion barrels of the total, are in old fields whose wells yield small quantities daily. They cannot be hurried; they will yield their small amount per well, and then they cannot be pumped further until a slow seepage of oil into the bottom of the well has occurred. Imposing as is the total amount of oil still underground in the hundreds of such fields, it is like having millions of dollars in the bank withdrawable at the rate of a few dollars a day. The measure of utility of your fortune, therefore, is the amount you withdraw.

It is the older reserves of the Nation that suffer today under the arbitrary price policy of the O. P. A. That price was frozen; no attempt was made, so far as I can learn, to ascertain whether it was a compensatory price. Traditionally, the margin between income and outgo of the independent producer has been plowed back into the effort to discover more fields. The independent has for years found more than 70 percent of the new fields, in some years accounting for as much as 80 percent.

In 1942 he found 67 percent. The lamentable meaning of this decline is that the independent is retiring from the field of discovery effort. He does not want to retire. I know him, and his name is legion. He is never so happy as when he is drilling a well remote from the established fields, in the hope of uncovering another. But he has only one source of financing his prospecting, and that is from the sale of crude oil which he produces. He does no public financing, sells no stock, and the banks will not finance a wildcat well, for the percentage of failure is high. In 1942 the dry holes drilled in search of new fields constituted nearly 84 percent of all the wildcat wells. Exploration clearly is not the basis for bank loans.

Had the new fields found in 1942 been large ones we might share the complacency of the O. P. A. concerning the future of our oil supply—the immediate future. But they were not large. There were 260 new fields and they averaged about 1,000,000 barrels each. That means that they will in time produce that much but they will be years in doing it. So, what it means is that we withdrew from our crude-oil bank account substantially more than 1,000,000,000 barrels more than was deposited.

The petroleum geologists say that the best of the known prospects have been drilled and that the producer must venture farther out into the unknown and the geologically uncharted areas of the Nation. There is much room yet in which to explore, but Nature has established few signs to guide the explorer. The cost of exploration increases yearly and has been doing so for some time, both because of the greater hazards in drilling wildcats in geologically unknown areas and because of the greater depths to which the exploratory drilling is being carried. When I was a boy a 4,000-foot well was unusual; they were finding the shallower fields, 500 feet to 2,500 feet, as a rule. Now, 10,000-foot holes are not uncommon in many parts of the United States. The largest producing field in my State yields its oil from a depth of one and a quarter miles and one well has been drilled in my State to a depth of 14,500 feet. It was dry.

In the Seventy-seventh Congress I was a member of the petroleum subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. We held an exhaustive hearing in November. Many witnesses from the war emergency agencies, from the Army and the Navy and from the petroleum industry appeared before us. In House Report No. 2744, written pursuant to the hearings, we said:

> The facts tend to show that practically every barrel of crude disposed of at our wells today is sold at a price below replacement costs.

And further:

> The Government must so adjust the prices of petroleum and petroleum products that the petroleum industry is enabled to carry out its war tasks in full, giving due regard to the interests of the public.

I have referred to the role of the independent producer and concerning him, our committee said:

> The independent producer has been a valuable asset to petroleum discovery and developments. Dealing principally with the production of crude, he lacks the security of producers who also engage in transportation, refining, and distribution. In this diversity of business there has been a protection against losses in one line of industry while others may prosper.
>
> The independent producer should be given proper encouragement.

Upward of 20,000 oil men of the Nation bore the designation of independent producers immediately preceding December 7, 1941. The number is smaller today. Some hundreds have entered the armed services of the United States, many of whom are in the zones of battle now. Some rest forever thousands of miles from the country they served well and enduringly in peace as in war.

There remains a great army of independent producers, eager to carry on the work of finding, developing, and producing crude petroleum which they know is paramount in the execution of the gigantic effort which lies ahead. The consciousness of their responsibility is fully developed among them. They require no exhortations. Their sons and their brothers and their friends have gone forth from a thousand communities, waging combat in machines that are but dummy weapons if they lack the fuel and the lubricants, in the amount and at the precise instant demanded by the ebb and flow of battle.

There is a great reservoir of skill and knowledge in this army of independent producers. They have always found the oil and they have lost none of their natural talent for doing so. But they are men in chains, shackled by a few who give voice to aphorisms and adages of economic theory founded upon the mildewed statistics of a dead yesterday.

It is time that the fog of academic thought be pierced by the sunlight of practical reasoning. Let the doctors remove their charts and their graphs to some quiet place, insulated against all contact with the affairs of today. It is new history that is being made, and it is flesh and blood, not the statistical record of prior years and peacetime costs, that feel the impact of the bullets and the bombs.

Any wildcat well not drilled could be the one that would open a new and needed source of supply of crude oil.

Any barrel of oil not produced from a stripper well could be the barrel whose products might bring a flying fortress back from the completion of a successful mission.

In Opposition to the Hobbs Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit the statement made by me on the floor of the House on Friday, April 9, 1943, during

the consideration of H. R. 653, the Hobbs bill:

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have the privilege of representing the great industrial east side of the city of Detroit, that part of Detroit that has produced and established probably the most marvelous record of production in the whole United States of America. I must disagree with my colleague from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] when he attacks labor and labor leaders. First of all, I know that no man could get up here with bitterness and hatred in his heart for unions and union leaders and then argue intelligently about this legislation. I am not going to get too excited about what was said by the gentleman from the Fourth District of Michigan about labor leaders, but let me say to this House that we in Detroit are mighty proud of R. J. Thomas, George Addes, and other United Automobile Workers' labor leaders and for the wonderful job they have done. We have been producing. Our industry has produced. It was not just management alone that can take credit for the work that has been done there. These labor leaders deserve credit because they have held down strikes and they have seen that production has been turned out. It is very unfair to come here day after day and attack those men when they are producing and have done such splendid work in our war effort. We are proud of the fact that strikes and lockouts have been reduced to five one-hundredths of 1 percent of man-hours worked. That means that since Pearl Harbor industrial production has been 99.95 percent continuous.

The many antilabor bills being introduced in this Congress would be of no service to the war effort; on the contrary they could, if passed, be seriously detrimental to the production effort of our Nation.

A concerted effort is being made by some people in and out of Congress to attack the labor movement. These attacks do not arise on the basis of facts; rather they represent an attempt by antilabor and anti-Roosevelt elements to whip up public hysteria against our working people based on distortions, falsehoods, and appeals to prejudice.

The most highly publicized antilabor bill now before Congress is the Hobbs bill. The sponsors of this bill call it an Anti-Racketeering Act. We all agree that racketeering should be ended and that the punishments for racketeering should be severe. However, there is already an antiracketeering statute in Federal law which is called the Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934.

The trouble with the Hobbs bill is that it can be construed by the courts to prohibit and punish most of the legitimate activities of organized labor. Under its provisions a man who voted for a strike or walked the picket line would run the risk of being sentenced to a maximum of 20 years in prison or to be fined $10,000, or both. Whatever the proponents of the proposed measure may say, the language of the Hobbs bill is so broad that it constitutes a serious menace to all that organized labor has struggled for, bled for, and even died for through many decades.

The original Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934 contains all the powers necessary to ferret out and adequately punish racketeers. In that original act, sections were included to protect organized labor in the lawful pursuit of its legitimate objectives. What the Hobbs bill would do is to delete and to remove those sections which protect the organizations of working people in their hard-won right to bargain collectively with management.

The provision of the original Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934 which the Hobbs bill would eliminate says that "no court shall construe or apply any of the provisions of this act in such a manner as to impair, diminish, or in any manner affect the rights of bona fide labor organizations in lawfully carrying out the legitimate objectives thereof as such rights are expressed in existing statutes of the United States." Also in the original act is a section specifically prohibiting any attempt to direct its application against situations involving simply "the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee." These two provisions were inserted as a result of representation by the Department of Justice which has the duty of enforcing the legislation. Thus, all that the Hobbs bill would do is to delete from the present law the two provisions inserted to prevent any distorted application of the law to destroy the lawful rights of labor.

The Hobbs bill is a bad bill. It is a vicious bill. If passed, it would pave the way for the destruction of organized American labor. Let us not fool ourselves. Success of bills like the Hobbs measure will pave the way for fascism in America in exactly the same way Hitler fastened the bloody tentacles of fascism upon the unhappy people of Europe.

We all know that Hitler's first act in his own country and in the unoccupied countries, once he had the power, was to destroy the unions of the working people. Hitler knows that fascism cannot succeed where a strong democratic labor movement flourishes. Therefore, the labor movement of the United States is against the Hobbs bill. I am also against it, and many of my colleagues are against it.

There are a number of other antilabor bills which have reached one stage or another in this Congress, but this Hobbs bill appears to me to be the most dangerous because of the misleading language in which it is phrased. Let us contrast these efforts of the antilabor group with the record established by our unions so far in this war. In my congressional district the leading union is the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations. This union is now the largest in the Nation, if not in the world. Its members have already purchased around $200,000,000 in War bonds and given $2,000,000 in Detroit alone for American and Allied war relief. More than 150,000 of its members are in the armed forces of the Nation. Furthermore, most of its members at home have brothers, sons, husbands, and friends in uniform.

In addition, the U. A. W.-C. I. O. has made an enviable record in the production field, which is, of course, its chief function. At least 75 plants, many of them huge in size and in productive capacity, under contract with the U. A. W.-C. I. O. have already been awarded the Army-Navy E for productive efficiency.

Confederate Doctors and Hospital Facilities During the Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. BURCH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Hon. Maury Maverick at the meeting of the American College of Surgeons in Richmond, Va., March 19, 1943:

Surgeons, hospital administrators, and all fellow-Americans who have victory in their hearts, plus a determination to preserve the advance of science and the humanities, life seems pleasant and quiet and well-ordered here in Virginia today. And so it is. Indeed, the people of Virginia have never been those to cry and complain in days of tragedy and bloodshed. It is an honor from many angles to speak here today while the whole world thunders and crackles in flames. As a boy, I lived some of the time in Virginia with my grandmother, and attended the Virginia Military Institute. As I think of the glory of Virginia history, the thought comes to me: how fast the world moves today!

Yesterday around noon I made a speech about Abraham Lincoln in New York City, which was broadcast over the world: I finished my business in the afternoon, went to LaGuardia Field and came last night in a little over two hours here to Richmond, which was once the capital of the Confederate States of America. Not long ago it would have taken a couple of days; around the time of the Revolution, it took a month, and this brings to my mind that this is global war, fast-moving, and furious.

Now, fellow-citizens, remember this: routines of government, physical methods of warfare, methods of surgery, and of hospitalization may change—but the true ideals of the human soul never change. The principles of freedom and liberty are just as true today as they were when Thomas Jefferson set them down in writing over 150 years ago. The spirit of the oath of Hippocrates taken by doctors four centuries before Christ in Greece, needs no amendment today. And neither, my friends, do the teachings of Christ. Rather, our task is to acquire the wisdom, to interpret these teachings and principles, and then to have the courage to apply them.

For all these we fight today—the principles of liberty, of health, of plentiful food, of cleanliness and dignity, and the Christian religion, which latter tolerates all other religions, but which is epitomized in the Sermon on the Mount.

Remember the words of Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of the Causes for Taking Up Arms, issued July 6, 1775. He said: "Our cause is just. Our Union is perfect—our internal resources are great * * * we fight not for glory or for conquest. We exhibit to mankind the remarkable spectacle of a people attacked by unprovoked enemies, without any imputation or even suspicion of offence."

And Jefferson says that the people will fight on with unabating firmness, in defiance of every hazard, the people, to quote him exactly, "being of one mind resolved to die as freeman rather than to live as slaves."

These words of Thomas Jefferson ring true today; except that they are mild in comparison to what we shall have to suffer unless we maintain freedom. Had we lost the Revolution, our sufferings would have been nothing as compared with what defeat would mean today. Today we stand to lose everything.

Let us turn again to the history of the past—and of the South in particular. Yet as we speak of the South it will not be merely for southern glorification, and to make one feel good, but to make comparisons which will be of value in winning this war and doing a good hospital job. To sum up in advance, if our hospital administrators and doctors do as well as did those of the Confederacy with their always scarce and inadequate resources, there will be no doubt whatever of victory. If the women of America will do as much as the southern women did—women who had seldom ventured beyond the confines of their homes—we will surely win.

I have frequently felt the need for the type of courage and sacrifice that kept the Confederacy going when logistics and the reports showed it was already defeated. The great book by Douglas S. Freeman, of Richmond "Lee's Lieutenants," has done much to dispel the fog of prejudice that obscured the inherent cause for which the South fought and

the manner in which its leaders and people fought. Indeed, the War between the States was the most glorious chapter in our history; it was glorious alike to the North and South, for the southern fire eater and northern abolitionist both threw their blue chips into the game of death and both played to the last. To the eternal credit of Americans we stood and slugged and slaughtered and asked only the privilege of dying for our principles. Both the North and South wore the red badge of courage and both knew the triumph of death. The total casualties of both sides appeared to be about a million men; I suspect under present concepts probably 2,000,000. If the lowest figure is accepted, and should we have proportional casualties in this war, we would equal those of our ally, Russia, who has already suffered casualties of some four or five million.

Let us get this in our minds: In the War between the States we both fought for our interpretation of the Constitution, and after the war joined together under a single Constitution recreating the Union now and forever indivisible. No such chance of victory in defeat awaits us now. We either totally win or lose. If we lose, we will suffer humiliating punishment and degradation, vulgar and unsanitary death or, what will be infinitely worse, abject slavery for ourselves and our children forever.

Now friends, it has been my personal problem and duty to give service to hospitals for the past year, as Director of my division in the War Production Board. To my admittedly pleasant surprise, among a hundred other surprises found in the thrilling chapters of science, I find the South made commendable progress in medicine just previous to the War between the States.

In the Hall of Fame in our Capitol at Washington are the statues of the great entered there by the States of our Union. Only the South have honored doctors. The only three men honored as humanitarian scientists to this very day are Dr. Crawford Long of Georgia who was first to use anesthesia, Ephraim McDowell of Rockbridge, Va., later of Kentucky, the first to perform an ovariotomy, and Dr. John Gorrie of Florida, physician and inventor of the ice machine and mechanical refrigeration used to lower the temperature of rooms in which fever patients were kept. On Dr. Long's statue are these words of his: "I regard my profession as a ministry of God."

I speak as an admirer of the doctor and the hospital administrator and nurse—as one who owes his life to them on more than one occasion. Once, on the battlefields of France, where I was inspired in the dark morning of attack by an arm band of the Red Cross bending over me; another time in America many years later—and still other times—so if I make a mistake, mark it off as unintended. It's this: As you all know, medicine and the administration of hospitals went through hideous dark ages. Emerging from the dark age, doctors were still no better considered than appliers of leeches, bloodletters, and haircutters. But in the South the doctor got his first recognition as a professional gentleman of a profession, probably because theirs was a leisure class.

From books, pamphlets, memoirs, official reports of the United States Government, and the Confederate States Medical and Surgical Journal, I find many solid and interesting facts. Among them is that the Confederate hospitals were probably better, in spite of the blockade and lack of resources, than the northern hospital; in any event the record was a worthy one considering the backwardness of the times, and conditions in general.

In Richmond were numerous hospitals, among them Jackson and Chimborazo.

Let us read the words of a seemingly overpious abolitionist, who tells the truth in an official United States Government report when he says our treatment of Yankee prisoners was in some instances quite terrible, but who also tells the truth when he angrily praises southern hospitals. In fact, he says concerning the Jackson Hospital in Richmond: "I found at the rebel hospital the evidence of thorough organization and wise system—a large generosity in all the provisions for the comfort of the patients * * * no lack of supplies and needed stores * * *."

He continues: "Jackson Hospital, as conducted by the rebels, was excellent, in its general plan of organization; in its location, and its arrangement of building; in its administration; in its thorough policing; in the exceeding cleanliness of its bedding, and in the very liberal provisions made by the rebel government for the hospital fund."

And Jackson Hospital was no small institution even as one measures hospitals today. There were 2,500 well-kept beds; feather pillows, double rations from the Confederate Congress, a fine laundry, and a bakery which baked 60,000 loaves of bread a day. It is interesting to note today that the public-spirited citizens in Rockbridge County have converted the home of General Jackson into a modern hospital—a tribute to a great warrior who was first a Christian gentleman and whose last words were: "Let us pass over the river and rest in the shade of trees."

As for the Chimborazo Hospital in Richmond, it was a tribute to the medical knowledge and administrative genius of Dr. James B. McCaw. It was for its time a model of efficiency, discipline, and cleanliness. Its mortality rate, exceptionally low for those days, is a monument to the professional skill and devotion of all who served on the staff.

From records it seems that Chimborazo was the greatest hospital in the history of the world up to its time. More cases were treated there during its 3 years than any base hospital of the American Expeditionary Forces in France during the last war.

As for the women, the South was full of Florence Nightingales. I have read various stories of these Florence Nightingales of the South. Down in Charlottesville my grandmother converted the big home into a hospital; also the big barn when there came overflows of patients; and this she did for southerners and northerners alike. There were hundreds of such makeshift hospitals based on the necessity of the time.

I make all these comparisons for a definite purpose. Starved and blockaded, suffering in shortages of everything due to inflation, and inability to get certain essentials at all, the Confederates fought on. But the main thing is that the Confederate surgeons and hospital administrators and nurses did without, improvised, substituted, stretched, and by superior administration got almost miraculous results from less and less.

The truth is we face the same situation today—and this time we of America must not, cannot, and will not lose! But because of shipping conditions and various other reasons, we actually face the same situation as the Confederates, even though our scientific knowledge and equipment are a hundred times greater.

What must be our immediate conduct now and throughout this war?

First of all, do everything the Confederates did in making much out of little.

Second, utilize all existing hospital space without more building.

Third, keep new hospital construction at a minimum.

Fourth, by superior management, reduce the stay of patients to the lowest point considered safe by your staff doctor.

Fifth, promote substitute—and do without when we have to. And, mentioning just one shortage—the Confederates had a grave scarcity of quinine. So have we. The Confederates promoted substitutes in quinine—and Virginia is today doing the same thing in the Merck Chemical Co. at Elkton where atabrine is being manufactured.

Medical education was kept up in the Confederacy as far as possible, although Virginia was the only State to keep open her medical institutions. Medical education was kept up by some journals, but principally by the Confederate surgeons in the field. Let us center on the job at hand and not waste our time arguing the advantages or disadvantages of socialized medicine, but devote all our energy to winning the war.

Also, let us, in the sixth place, keep up education, research, exchange of information, and the promotion of hospitals for civilians and military alike now and forever hereafter.

Out of our present situation, we may and can make certain great advances. Previous to the War between the States the South had suffered from an overwhelming amount of quack medicines. The war and the blockade caused quack medicines to be no longer available, and the health of the southern people improved. No medication at all was found to be better than medication of the quack variety.

Quarantines kept out foreign epidemics and diseases. Although the South suffered great privations, it is believed that in many instances simple diets brought better health.

No doubt, we, as a Nation, will be better off physically today because of the necessity for revising and correcting our habits of overeating. Certainly we must turn our present-day hardships to advantages.

In many ways, rationing of food, gasoline, and other items has caused hospital administrators some serious and uncalled-for problems. By all means, rationing of goods which hospitals need should not be administered by people who know nothing about hospitals. Unfortunately this, to some extent, is the case today.

I think that the hospital administrators of America should rise up and show just exactly how they are affected; first, showing that they are already rationed, also that self-discipline based on long experience is being imposed. In any event, continuing studies of diet should be made in this war so that wherever possible, you can help solve apparent food shortages and also that your hospitals will get what is absolutely necessary for the proper care of patients

As for this war, we might as well be honest and accept the truth. Let us quit lying to ourselves by saying the war will be over any certain time, because we don't know. Moreover, like the War Between the States, when the fighting was over there was still reconstruction. And, so in this war, when the military fighting stops, there will be the problem of national and world reconstruction. Eleven million soldiers, twenty to thirty million industrial workers must all suddenly get new jobs in this country alone. The rest of the world outside the Western Hemisphere will be in a much worse condition and the troubles of the world will affect us greatly. Indeed, the world is not alone turned upside down, as Lord Cornwallis humorously indicated when he had his English band play that tune at Yorktown in 1781. Today the world is wrong side out and right side in: It is twisted in blood and hunger, it is torn apart by conflicting ideologies it is and will be misled by mass psychosis. Among other things, world-wide unemployment is certain to come.

Therefore, unless we be fools, we will prepare at once for the days and years of chaos to come.

As hospital men, for the days and years to come you must consider these things and be prepared to—

First. Admit there will be great casualties.

Second. Prepare for hundreds of thousands and millions of casualties.

Third. Mobilize the womanpower in this war now and also prepare for the problem of hospitalization of women veterans. After this war women veterans may be as many as were men of the last; anyhow their number will be great.

Fourth. Consider the hospital problem, civilian and military, as one national problem.

The time has come when we must forget this psychotic talk of being against all postwar planning. Either we plan ahead or we go back into the Dark Ages. Either we look ahead or our people will die in millions instead of tens of thousands. Not to plan ahead is to blind our eyes and consciously commit national and international suicide.

Specifically and to the point: I hope all people and organizations—and among the organizations I include the American College of Surgeons, the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars—all, I hope, will demand immediate establishment of one well-selected, nonpolitical, and unbiased commission or survey to ascertain all the essential facts about the health and hospital problem of America. Now and for the future I do not suggest the form, but I do think that if it is such as to include the three surgeon generals of the United States and the Veteran's Administrator, Representatives of the Senate and House, and members of the professions appointed by the President, in order that all forces start out united and not be harassed by jealousies as we are in so many things today, then absolutely essential work can be done and we can get somewhere.

I now discuss another point. I hope not too bluntly. I have had in my life many contacts with medical profession and hospitals. I have never favored socialized medicine, but in advocating certain measures which since are admitted by all doctors not to have the slightest flavor of socialized medicine, I was told at the time of the advocacy that it was "socialized medicine." I think my recent studies and numerous contacts have cleared my mind on that subject, and I believe I can make a statement that is clear as to objective.

Hospitals are community enterprises, maintained in whole or part by taxation, by endowment, or gift, or by fees, but a profit is not expected. Should a profit be made, no one objects, but no one gets to object but once in a blue moon, since no profit is made. Thus both doctors and hospital administrators and the people as a whole can advocate, agitate, promote, advertise, and demand hospitals and still more hospitals.

But I must here interject a hope: It is that it would be a shame if anyone, doctor, hospital administrator, or otherwise, confused his dislikes or prejudices in domestic politics with this question. The alleviation of human misery and the advance of science should not be held up by political or personal or any kind of prejudice.

Rather, let us all, doctors and hospital administrators, think in the terms of Dr. Crawford Long, and regard our profession as a ministry of God. Let our spirit also be militant; let us likewise think with the war spirit of plain old-time religion and shedding blood, but at the same time of sulfa drugs, and microscopes, and learning, and modern instruments and modern management, and unselfish service to our fellow men.

Our problems are overwhelming, but we shall not be overwhelmed. For what our sons and daughters face, we will be stout of heart, and shall not break.

We will follow a simple rule. It is written in the twenty-fifth chapter of the Gospel of St. Matthew. Christ spoke in parables of the Last Day of Judgment. The scene opens, let it be your guide, let it be your professional guide, let it be your hospital guide. Christ said:

"For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in;

"Naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me."

And after the righteous asked when they had done all these things for the Lord, the Lord said: "Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

Therefore, let us resolve that all men under God shall receive proper attention. Let us say that all men under God so far as it is possible for us to do so, will be given proper hospital and medical care.

Men today die for liberty, for the right to worship their God, and raise their eyes aloft to see the unsullied light of science. Let us resolve today that under the freedom of democracy, men may also live—and in health and strength.

Hoof-and-Mouth Disease an Uncontrollable Menace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted me to extend my remarks, I desire to include two letters I have received from the Honorable W. Arthur Simpson, of Lyndonville, Vt.

Mr. Simpson is a recognized authority with respect to matters and things involved in the raising of beef and dairy cattle. He is not only an operator, but he acts as a judge at cattle shows from Maine to California and in Canada. He knows whereof he speaks when he says as of April 3:

WILDER FARM, *Lyndonville, Vt.*

DEAR CHARLES: Your colleague, Mr. CELLER, of New York, made a statement in the House Thursday that England has been using thousands and thousands of tons of Argentine beef and has not suffered from any hoof-and-mouth disease. Will you kindly tell him that he is in error in respect to this situation? England has suffered disastrously from hoof-and-mouth disease at periodic intervals. I personally know of two very valuable herds of pedigreed shorthorns, one in Scotland and one in England, being entirely destroyed recently. They practice a very desperate remedy of slaughter in Great Britain, and it has had the effect of destroying many valuable pedigreed cattle. If hoof-and-mouth disease should be introduced into this country with its tremendous number of wild game which is also susceptible to the disease, it might become impossible to eradicate. We cannot afford to take any chances on the introduction of even a small amount of beef from South America. There are, however, no sanitary restrictions on the importation of cooked meat from that country, although there are some tariff barriers.

Very sincerely yours,

W. ARTHUR SIMPSON.

And again, as of April 9:

Supplementing my former letter regarding the situation in regard to the hoof-and-mouth disease in England, I might say that two of the herds which I mentioned were the Lockinge herd owned by Mr. A. T. Lloyd and the Aldie herd, owned by Mr. Finley MacGillevray.

What Congressman HULL, of Wisconsin, has said in regard to Argentine beef is very true. Due to the year-round grazing season in the Argentine, the natural growth of alfalfa, and the favorable climate for corn, beef can be produced there at a very low figure indeed. I have seen it estimated as low as 2 cents per pound on the hoof.

I have forwarded my colleague, Representative CELLER, a copy of these letters.

Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and a statement from the National Farmers' Union:

NORTH DAKOTA COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION,
Fargo, N. Dak., March 26, 1943.

Congressman USHER L. BURDICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Through Walter Maddock, I have learned of the move by the House of Representatives to investigate the policies of the Farm Security Administration and the attempt that is being made to label the Farm Security Administration as communistic.

While my work in North Dakota is in the field of Christian education, it does take me into contact with a great many rural people, and I have come to know quite a number of the county directors. In a number of instances I have learned something of the story of the rehabilitation of farm families. The more I learn about what the Farm Security Administration is doing the more I appreciate what is being accomplished. I certainly do not find anything in the whole program as I come in contact with it that in any way reminds me of communism. I just wanted to pass on this testimony.

Very faithfully yours,

C. A. ARMSTRONG,
State Superintendent.

WASHINGTON, April 11.—The National Farmers Union Executive Council today issued a statement commiting the organization to a last ditch fight for the Farm Security Administration even though it is abandoned by others for political expediency.

The council's statement said:

"Reported Department of Agriculture plans to continue aid to low-income farm families in order to increase food production amount to an admission that the Farm Security Administration service has proved its value and indispensability.

"In proposing to do away with Farm Security Administration by merging, transferring, and distributing its work, those engaged in a plot to assassinate Farm Security Administration now admit that continuance of its work is vital in the production of food to meet our rising war needs.

"More than a year ago, the National Farmers Union urged the Congress of the United States to authorize the Farm Security Administration to make $350,000,000 in additional loans to put more than a half million farmers into increased production.

"The appropriation was cut after a hearing before the Byrd economy committee which resembled a witchcraft trial.

"The self-righteous men who thrive upon America's economic serfdom on the commercial farms and plantations of the Nation demanded that the Agency be burned at the stake, lest it give a vision of real freedom and economic independence to the minds of down-trodden people.

"The Farm Security Administration had refused to serve the plantation owners' purposes. It went beyond giving their human workstock relief—keeping them fit for the harness another year—and attempted to give them a dismally small share in American democracy. It refused to sign them up as members of the commercial farm interests' lobbying group, as did another agency of the Department of Agriculture. It showed them how to produce food and fiber for the Nation—yes, even encouraged and helped them to do it to swell the Nation's food supply. So the Farm Security Administration was marked for death.

"In the year that followed the tremendous error of the plan for assassination became so apparent that no intelligent person concerned with agriculture and our food problems at the national level could escape it. The 435,000 farmers on the Farm Security Administration program in that intervening year increased their production of vital food crops far in excess of the national average. But they were too few. Rationing became necessary—drastic rationing that will become more and more severe as this war goes on

"The National Farmers Union, late in 1942, while there was still time to make an appropriation and get results in terms of food production in 1943, proposed that Farm Security Administration be authorized to loan a billion dollars to put more than a million farmers into greater production. We had confidence that the national administration, once the source of dynamic leadership for common men, would immediately support a proposal to tap the unused manpower of the Nation and develop the greatest existing field for added food production for America and her allies.

"We were not so naive as to believe that the privateers of agriculture would control their lust for economic advantage and power in the face of national interest and permit the little people in agriculture to produce food for the Nation, even though they themselves were unwilling to convert their fields from little needed crops to vital food and oil crops. They would fight, just as they are today fighting a battle in the name of agriculture to obtain draft exemption for workers in nonessential crops along with workers in essential crops.

"This came true. The American Farm Bureau Federation, leader of the lynch mob in 1942, was replaced by the National Cotton Council and the Delta Council, which has written out to the field for 'opinions' and 'rumors'—poison gas such as Hitler's fifth columnists use—to smear the Farm Security Administration.

"Aided by their allies of the Chamber of Commerce and National Manufacturers' Association, these Tory interests obtained a verdict against Farm Security Administration in the United States House of Representatives when it killed a $65,000,000 appropriation to the agency to marshal farm labor. It was voted specifically that Farm Security Administration should not administer the program, although it was the only agency with experience at the job.

"A higher court might have reversed this verdict. But now the report is that the decision is already written, and that Farm Security Administration is to be sacrificed on the altar of expediency—and national interests and American consumers with it.

"A general who won a brilliant campaign for greater food production is going to be shot, virtually without trial.

"We cheerfully grant those who by destroying Farm Security Administration are knowingly destroying food production, all the credit, and all the satisfaction they may get from their ignoble victory.

"It will be short lived. Their victory will come back to haunt and plague them as the hungry people of America and Allied Nations rise to condemn the deed.

"The National Farmers Union is going on with its friends, whether or not the case is predetermined, to insist that the common people in agriculture be given an opportunity to produce the vast quantities of food they can produce if given the opportunity. We have joined with the National Young Women's Christian Association, the Federal Council of Churches, the Catholic Rural Life Conference, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the American Federation of Labor, the railroad brotherhoods, the National Committee on Child Labor, and other groups to fight for adequate appropriations for Farm Security Administration. We will continue to stand with them.

"We would stand for a farm security program in peace to give underprivileged Americans an opportunity to share in our democracy.

"We will not be a party in war to a betrayal of the family farmers in agriculture whom we represent, of the consumers of America, or of America herself.

"We will not be a party to an act that, whether conscious or unconscious, amounts in its effect to sabotage."

Federal Assistance for Subdivisions of State Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a resolution sponsored by Hon. Russell Turnipseed and adopted at the recent session of the Arkansas Legislature dealing with the acute and rapidly growing problem of county and local finances resulting from large acquisitions of real estate by the Federal Government in the various States. The situation referred to in the resolution finds its counterpart in many places in this country. Unless the vital and essential functions of counties, municipalities, school districts, and other political subdivisions of the States are to be paralyzed the problem presented must be recognized and dealt with promptly. It is to be hoped that the board established by the President to study the effect of Federal acquisitions on local fiscal affairs will soon report its findings so that adequate legislation to solve the problem may be initiated and further crippling effects avoided. The resolution referred to follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 8

Whereas the purchase by the United States Government of considerable blocks of land in various parts of the State for various uses in the war effort has severely reduced the tax revenues of the State and its subdivisions because federally owned property is not taxable; and

Whereas a particular example is the Greenwood district of Sebastian County, which is a separate county insofar as finances are concerned, and which has lost approximately 20 percent of its revenues by reason of the establishment of Camp Chafee; and

Whereas subdivisions of State government affected by such Government purchases have no way of recouping the lost revenues and maintaining their necessary services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fourth General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to make some equitable provision for Federal assistance to such distressed subdivisions of State government, to the end that they may continue to provide necessary public services for their people and to give adequate protection and other services to the Federal projects located therein.

Interterritorial Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Robert E. Webb, Vice Chairman, Board of Investigation and Research, Transportation Act of 1940:

BOARD OF INVESTIGATION
AND RESEARCH,
Washington, April 9, 1943.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPENCE: I certainly appreciate your nice letter of April 7 relative to our Summary Report on Interterritorial Freight Rates.

The full report of the Board containing the analysis upon which this summary is based is being prepared for publication and will be filed with the President and the Congress within a few weeks. This report concludes that the regional differences in freight rates do have some effect on the industrial development of different parts of the country. However, the extent to which Southern and Western development has been affected is something which does not admit of precise measurement.

Our report shows that freight rates and regional differences in rate levels affect some types of industries more than others. The effect of the differences in rate levels is something which does not admit of measurement except in terms of broad judgment. Since, however, the regional differences in class rates do have some effect on industrial development, and since the existing differences in the class-rate levels are not justified by cost and transportation conditions, there is no sound reason why these differences should be continued, regardless of the degree to which they may have affected industrial development in different parts of the country.

You will be interested in reading the chapter on Economic Effects of Differences in Rate

Levels and the Structure of Interterritorial Freight Rates in the full report which discusses this question in detail.

If there is any additional information you desire before the report is filed, please let me know.

I want to reiterate my appreciation for your letter which has invited comment on one of the most important questions affecting the economic welfare of his country.

With kindest regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

ROBERT E. WEBB,
Vice Chairman.

Ruml Tax Cancelation and the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in the debate on pay-as-you-go taxation, on which there is little disagreement, a deadlock has developed because of the Ruml plan to cancel a year's taxes in the very midst of pyramiding war costs and creation of an astronomical national debt.

Let us remove all doubt that there is such a cancelation—a forgiveness—in the plan, by citing the assertion of Mr. Ruml, repeated in debate by the gentleman from Kansas, Representative CARLSON, sponsor of the Ruml plan in Congress, that it is a national disgrace to tax a dead man. Not only has Mr. Ruml, or the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], proposed no repeal of estate taxes, which are specifically assessed to disgrace the Nation by taxing only dead men, but this very argument is clearly an assertion that every estate will be enlarged by a sum that would have been collected in taxes against the estate were it not for the cancelation scheme. This admission of forgiveness is so obvious that supporters of the scheme have been compelled to argue, either falsely or ignorantly, that since the money or its equivalent would be in the taxpayer's estate, it would not be lost to the Treasury but would be recouped under the estate tax.

This argument ignores the fact that there is a $60,000 exemption from estate taxes, and that no estate tax is higher than 77 percent, and is not even 50 percent until the two and one-half million mark is passed. Worse than that, it ignores the fact that many large taxpayers have no taxable estates because they can give away $30,000 without paying any gift taxes, can dissipate an estate at the rate of $3,000 annually to every heir without having this even counted as giving, and even when taxed for giving they are assessed only three-fourths of the rate on estates. And if a taxpayer can give his money away he can also squander this Ruml gift to his estate and do it precisely at a time when such inflationary spending should be stopped short for the duration.

The mere fact that the Treasury loss does not accrue in a single year's collections does not make the loss, and the corresponding failure to curb the size of the national debt, any less a fact. Nor does the proposal to let the Treasury choose the smaller of 1942 and 1943 incomes for forgiveness, change the fact that a cancelation of a whole year's taxes at high wartime rates is proposed. Future taxpayers, or present taxpayers with relatively small incomes, will have to make it up if the war debt is not to be repudiated.

In addition, far heavier taxes must be imposed now to care for existing plans in war expenditure. The taxes required to escape serious inflation are much greater than the $16,000,000,000 addition now being proposed. They will even have to include considerable impairment of capital, so much so that there is grave doubt that the war, unless it is ended forthwith, can be prosecuted for long at such a rate of expense. My one chance to put this belief into voting on legislation came when I recently voted against the bill to extend the lease-lend program. To make this argument clear let me attempt a brief analysis of the Nation's financial position. I believe this analysis will demonstrate the folly of any and all plans for tax abatement if we hope to prevent a catastrophic inflation.

I would begin by excluding from the idea of inflation any rise in prices due only to scarcity of durable goods required for war. Such a rise is not inflationary. On the contrary, it serves the ends of war by curbing the civilian demand for, and use of, these materials. It can readily be kept from feeding upon itself if the true inflationary element, that is, the quantity of money, is kept under control. In part, such control must involve curbing the demand for higher wages to maintain accustomed living standards during the war. But the fact that money which is actually circulating is presently called "income" or "purchasing power" cannot hide the validity of the following definition of inflation which I quote from the pages of the recent book by Prof. Edwin Kemmerer on the A B C of Inflation. He says:

> The word "inflation" is one used with a great variety of meanings. * * * Most definitions of inflation fall short (of precision and simplicity). * * * Inflation is too much money and deposit currency; that is, too much currency in relation to the physical volume of business done. * * * Large issues of money mean high prices. * * * Inflation, then, exists when prices rise because there is too much money and deposit currency in circulation.

So we have to consider two things in controlling inflation and the Federal debt: First, how to keep from creating new money by selling bonds into commercial bank portfolios, thus adding to money supply when, even for the great activities of war, there is already too much circulating. Second, how much can be devoted to war out of our maximum possible productivity without reducing the civilian economy so much that taxation cannot be imposed to the point of paying for such war expense and at the same time be lightened to the point of maintaining the civilian economy at the minimum required for orderly and efficient production.

Now, in order to get clear what we mean by too much reduction in the civilian economy we shall have to point out that most of our production of real income or goods even in peacetime is directed toward maintaining our supply of production goods rather than of goods for consumption. Strictly speaking, the only real income or consumption goods we all must have continually, is our food supply. To get it, however, there are many goods and services that have to be maintained in as constant a flow as that of the food itself.

On the other hand, there are many things that wear out slowly in use which can serve for quite a while without being repaired or replaced as they wear out. We can, in other words, put off the day of reckoning and use up a certain amount of capital provided the war does not last longer than do the capital goods which we have to neglect but which are essential to the civilian economy. We are, for example, getting along by wearing out capital in the form of tires much faster than we are producing them. So when production is resumed, many more tires will be needed imperatively for civilian use than would have been required at that time had production not been interrupted. Ultimately the same thing applies respecting the whole automobile. It must be replaced at a more rapid rate than if its manufacture had not been displaced by war production.

It is this kind of need that has been designated a backlog of demand which will materialize in the post-war situation. What we have to guard against is the danger that this backlog might take fire in the midst of war and upset the whole operating scheme by which we are proceeding, all before the same thing happens in the economy of the enemy. We cannot prepare for a long war without maintaining a greater expenditure on the civilian economy than we do if we gamble on a short war or one which peters out sufficiently to permit catching up. Thus, if Germany collapses and we can keep out of trouble in Europe thereafter, the war with Japan can be prosecuted without going all out to the extent of the same impairment of capital as may have been advisable previously.

But we had better not underestimate Japan and so overdraw our capacity in developing our part in the European conflict. Such a mistake in judgment, that overdraws the peacetime capital structure, can too easily become, because of our continuous dependence on that capital in maintaining essential mechanical services, a most critically dangerous factor for disorganization which, though it may not lose the war, must cost the lives of many of our fighters. Mistakes which largely overproduce weapons that

cannot be transported and used before they are obsolete may easily have such an effect. Indeed, there are many considerations, specifically the extreme danger to surface vessels from attack by submarine and aircraft, which make large naval development and ocean transport for war an excessively expensive form of modern warfare. Long ago, while Under Secretary for the Navy in 1923, Mr. Roosevelt himself predicted that this expense would compel peace in the Pacific because all Japan and America could do across 5,000 miles of water would be to make faces at each other.

However, with Japanese air and submarine bases even now installed on American soil, it is obvious that much less than 5,000 miles of water is involved. Alaskan land and air transport looks like a cheaper and better strategic development than a large Navy and transport fleet. As to the latter, no other costs in this war are so likely to bite off too much of our civilian capital and leave it reposing in Davy Jones' locker. We can hardly hope for Russian cooperation against Japan while we are so far from being prepared to meet Russia half way. We are, indeed, letting the people of Siberia witness the fortification of our own soil against us and incidentally against Russian-American shipping lanes right on the path between Seattle and Vladivostok where there are coal and oil deposits still undeveloped to fuel such trade.

Against bad judgment our capacity to produce cannot be sustained merely by rationing or any other form of personal sacrifice. Indeed, no supine spirit of sacrifice can be called a virtue under circumstances calculated to forestall development of an early victory at the least possible expenditure of men and materials. It seems clear that there is serious danger in an over-all strategy that lets the civilian economy have only what happens to be left over in this global warfare, as if we were still fighting the battles of ancient history, or even those of World War No. 1.

We must not, however, be led by these considerations to neglect the fact that such dangers are vastly increased by the inflation that is engendered by the notion that when the god of war makes our shoes they can still be kept from pinching by turning the tax clock ahead. These metaphors are pretty badly mixed, I know, but they are just about in line with the arguments of the Ruml planners. The objection to paying 2 years' taxes in 1 year cannot stand against the necessity for paying for the war now, and paying in dollars, if we would spare ourselves the most that can be spared in paying by blood, sweat, and tears. If payments thus become excessive in some of the highest or lowest brackets they should be carried over into installments, certainly not forgiven for even 1 year to those who have had an ability to pay out of the flow of these years of wartime incomes.

As the war continues, tax rates must be raised to pay several years of pre-war taxes in a single year. And if such taxation becomes extensively uncollectible even while there is still a deficit that must be financed, either directly or indirectly, by expansion of the public debt through the commercial banks (or the Federal Reserve System directly), then the difficulty can only lie in an over-all strategy which places an excessive drain on our whole economy. Certainly, we cannot eat our cake—our capital—in war, and have it, too, for conducting our civilian economy and its production of the matériels of war.

Mr. Speaker, conforming to my vote favoring the sending to the Senate the Ways and Means Committee withholding-at-the-source or pay-as-you-go tax bill so that body and the conference committee of the House and Senate might work out a pay-as-you-earn tax-collecting plan, I wish to now urge we no longer delay our action. The following editorial from the Washington Post of April 14, 1943, gives us food for thought:

ATTEND TO TAXES

With every day that goes by, the inflationary gap grows wide and the problem of holding the line against inflation gets worse. In this crisis the first business of the House is taxation. As the Chamber which originates tax measures, it should be in the forefront of the battle on inflation, not on the sidelines. This is pretty well recognized on both sides of the aisle, and an anxiety prevails to cut the Gordian knot which is preventing the emergence of a tax measure. Several times we have suggested how it could be done. The operation is very simple. It consists of introducing to the House a new measure providing for a 20-percent withholding tax on all wages and salaries and of leaving all the variants of Rumlism to be ironed out again by the Ways and Means Committee. It is now clear that but for the Republican leadership such a plan could be adopted tomorrow.

This became evident in a brief exchange on taxation in the House on Monday. Representative DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, stated that if the leadership of both parties would agree to support a program for the enactment of a single withholding measure, he would promptly introduce such a bill and see that it got early and favorable consideration by his committee. The invitation was promptly accepted by the majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK. "I am willing to forego some of my own personal views in order to put through as quickly as possible the one thing that is noncontroversial," he said. But the minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, was not so cooperative. He insisted on a fresh test of Rumlism simultaneously with a vote on the withholding tax.

Such an attitude is very unfortunate in days which require the suspension of oratory in favor of action. While we agree with Mr. MARTIN on the need for changing the base of assessing the income tax, which is the purpose of the Ruml plan, we cannot agree that another debate such as has recently been weathered would be either wise or fruitful. The Ruml plan in the hands of Congress has degenerated into a political football. It has paralyzed the conduct of business in the House. Give the factionalism a chance to simmer down and while the country is expressing itself on Rumlism let the House take its stand on the side of the forces engaged in the crucial war on inflation. This is the immediate, the main issue in the tax debate. Action now on collection at source will breed action later on the basis of tax assessment.

Excerpt From Vision for Victory Held by Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., of Rochester, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following narration, which is, in a sense, the keynote to the Vision for Victory show which the Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., of Rochester, N. Y., presented to a total audience of 17,000 in six performances at the Eastman Theater on April 1, 2, and 3, 1943. These exercises were promoted by Mr. Herbert Eisenhard, president of Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., and Mr. Carl S. Hallauer, executive vice president of Bausch & Lomb Optical Co. Among the guests was Col. Carlos Romulo, of the Philippine Islands, an aide to General MacArthur:

You men and women of Bausch & Lomb are truly marching along with the fighting freemen of the world. What you accomplish now will decide the lives of our children, and our children's children for centuries to come.

Now, when the hour of destiny has struck, the world begins to realize how vital your work has been to humanity all down through the years * * * how important your creed, "Greater vision through optical science."

Twenty-five years ago when World War No. 1 burst upon us, the precious, vital formulas for optical glass were hid behind the smoke screen of European conflict. Yet in that stark crisis, our armies did not march into battle blind. Your company had had the faith and courage to develop the manufacture of optical glass in America so that we were able to supply the bulk of America's need. Small wonder that a grateful Government bestowed upon you the distinguished service award.

You and your forbears have labored wisely and well to make man healthier and happier throughout the years, and you labor now in this emergency, to provide him with the optical weapons of war. The gift of better vision for our armed forces—Vision for Victory—goes forth from your factories to every corner of the globe.

High above enemy territory, vigilant airmen photograph enemy terrain through lenses you provide; skilled operators of your aerial mapping equipment translate these photographs into contour maps of the territory our fighting men must conquer. Our flying warriors are guided to their destination by that miracle of optical science, your bubble sextant, trained in the knowledge of the aerial highways by your star projector. And, in like fashion, your stereo trainers educate the eyes of our fighting men to the use of your stereoscopic range finders on land and on sea—range finders which make it possible to drop death and destruction on the enemy, precisely, relentlessly, from miles away. Your height finders control antiaircraft fire to repel and bring down enemy planes—while all over the earth, your binoculars aid the watchful eyes of guardians of liberty in searching out those who would destroy this liberty.

This is the glorious record of your toil—your skill. This is in part the powerful role you play in the world-wide drama called total war. Great fleets of planes streak the skies, ships plow through vast oceans, tanks grind forward relentlessly over shell-pitted land because the instruments you helped to build made sure of their stamina and fighting qualities. Your gunfire control apparatus lends to our big guns on land and sea the deadliest accuracy in all the world. Your searchlight mirrors send probing protective fingers of light across dark skies. Battery commander's telescopes scour the battle fronts and in the midst of the chatter of machine guns and the roar of artillery, direct gunfire so that it shall not miss the mark.

Dramas within dramas, each fitting into the other and slowly rising to the climax you've set as your goal—the climax called victory, complete and absolute. Today, the sound of your determination echoes over the earth, in the roar of planes, in the throb of ships, in every sound, sight, and triumph of war. The proof of your determination floats high above your factories—the stars and stripes, the Army-Navy E, and the Treasury flag. The power of your determination mounts with your steadily increasing purchase of War bonds, bonds which build the mighty juggernauts of war, which clothe and feed the fighting men that man them.

The whole, struggling world is aware of you—you people of Bausch & Lomb. Today free men stand on the crest of victory, a dizzy height, hard bought, hard won. The world holds its breath. Liberty weighs in the balance—a balance that may be swayed by a seeming trifle. One spoiled, wasted part casually overlooked, one lost man-hour thoughtlessly flung on the wrong side of the scales might send the whole world sliding backward into slavery, ignorance, and despair. Look at your hands, you vision makers. Look at them now. Your skilled hands, your strong, quick hands, and know that in them rests the fate of centuries to come.

Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Spencer (Mass.) Leader, of April 9, 1943, by its able editor, William B. Tunstall:

BITS OF BEAUTY

"He watereth the hills from His chambers; the earth is satisfied with the fruit of Thy works.

"He causeth the grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man that he may bring forth food out of the earth." (Psalms, 104: 13–14.)

FRIEND FARMER

Last night a glorious feast was spread,
In gaily lighted hall,
Magnates and bankers, each well fed,
Were rev'ling, one and all.

Choicest of food from many lands,
With wines and cordials rare,
Thus brought and laid beneath their hands,
Presented sumptuous fare.

The jester's jokes were rich with mirth,
The songs were gay and bright,
As each one strove for fullest worth,
Of careless, gay delight.

The toastmaster praised the banker,
Who gaily answering said,
That the merchant and the trader
Gave him his daily bread.

The feasting throng, with one acclaim,
Rose to the timely jest,
And one and all, with hearts aflame,
Owned that his toast was best.

But one good man, conscience stricken,
Strove with his heart wound deep,
The burning fire made him sicken,
With thoughts he could not keep.

The master of ceremonies,
Seeing his pallid face,
In jolliest of brevities,
Asked him to take his place.

Hushed was the throng expectant,
The pale man slowly rose,
And looking straight at the merchant,
This toast he thus proposed:

"Here's to the man who plows the fields
Whence bread of life springs up,
Here's to the man whose labor yields,
The viands which we sup.

"The farmer is my friend tonight,
For if he did not toil,
The things in which we now delight,
Would still be in the soil."

VITAL

Our Government is at last awaking to the vital necessity of maintaining food production at its highest possible level. Labor and industry have for many months had a great head start in the headlong race for profits in this present hour of the country's greatest need. Clever commission agents have been reaping fabulous sums of money for procuring lucrative contracts for their clientele. Industry and management have been given all sorts of inducements in an effort to increase wartime production of wartime needs without any thought of cost. Plant extension has been encouraged by means of tax exemptions and other forms of subsidy in order to attain these ends. The drafting of manpower to fill the ever-increasing needs of an ever-increasing army of fighting men has resulted in keen competition between employers for the exemption of their workers from military service in order that they may continue to work in essential industries. In all these almost hysterical production scrambles the agricultural interests of the country have been left more or less in the background until at last the country as a whole awakes to the fact that a nation's labor and armies march on their stomachs. While the White House and Congress argue over a 5-percent increase for farm products, the housewives are paying almost double for fresh vegetables, meat, and other such items even though the farmer and the cattleman are getting little more for their products than they did before the war. If Government agencies had more effectively controlled the profiteering of the middleman since Pearl Harbor, the White House would not now be so fearful that a 5-percent increase to farmers would touch off the tornadoes of inflation. If the Little Steel formula can allow a 15-percent increase to labor, by the same token why cannot a food administration or Office of Price Administration allow a 5-percent increase to the farmers? Why should farmers, who labor 70 to 90 hours per week, be kept at starvation wages, or income, while nonexperienced, numbskull laborers in factories are allowed to earn better than $100 a week, or more than double normal wages? Under modern methods of agriculture, farm employees require a higher standard of intelligence than obtained in the old days before the farm became mechanized. A poultry farm of 5,000 hens must be scientifically managed, or it will go bankrupt; a 50-head dairy farm, in like manner, requires expert management in order to meet the modern sanitary requirements of State and Federal laws; and when it comes to dairy farms producing 3,000 and 4,000 quarts of milk a day, both management and employees must be highly intelligent to keep going. Out west where single farms cover several square miles of acreage of wheat and corn and whole counties for the grazing of a single herd of cattle, we can begin to understand how essential it is that a farm bloc should continue to battle for the very life of its constituents. The farmer is our friend today, for if he did not toil the things of which we all must eat would still be in the soil.

The Liquor Shortage Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Al Ziskie, president of the Royal Ark Association, No. 3; and Mr. John Bodenstab, executive secretary of the Royal Ark Association, No. 1:

DETROIT, MICH., *March 13, 1943.*

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: We, the undersigned, on behalf of the retail liquor dealers of Michigan respectfully solicit your help in our effort to secure immediately the release and distribution of a reasonable supply of whisky now held in bonded warehouses in order to prevent nearly 50 percent of our licensees from going out of business due to the present shortage of liquor in our State warehouses

Michigan is a so-called monopoly State; our only source of supply is the Michigan Liquor Control Commission which heretofore carried in stock large quantities of liquor. But a terrific demand for liquor of every kind developed in the months prior to November 1, 1942, when the new tax of $2 per gallon of 100-proof became effective. The public, alarmed by newspaper articles stating that the distillers would only make alcohol for war purposes and not produce liquor and that the rationing of liquor was in prospect, and so forth, bought huge quantities at the State stores and drug stores; in other words, hoarding same, quickly absorbed the available supply. Licensees also bought larger amounts in order to protect their trade, the consumers of liquor by the glass or drink, but not all were in the position to invest large sums of money in liquor stocks. Consequently these licensees are now confronted with a situation equal to prohibition in effect—without liquor available to be sold—they are out of business automatically. Their investment in leases, fixtures, license fees, and so forth, is a total loss.

It is a known fact that there is now held in bonded warehouses a stock of liquor said to total 500,000,000 gallons—enough for a 2- or 3-year normal supply. But the so-called blended brands are no longer available and the distillers in order to protect their established brands—which have been advertised extensively—are compelled to ration these in order to stretch the stock on hand over an indefinite period. Blended brands were mixtures of various kinds of whiskey of different ages—these no longer being available, we cannot think of any other solution but to suggest to reduce the proofs of the liquor in bonded warehouses from 100 to 80 or even 76.4 proof in order to stretch the supply. In order to reduce the proof an addition of distilled water is required—which may or may

not be permitted now. If permitted it would immediately relieve the situation, the stock on hand would be materially increased.

It would not affect the war effort in the least but it would protect the licensees who are indirectly the tax collectors for the Federal Government and the State of Michigan and save them from bankruptcy—from total losses. Without a reasonable supply of liquor their business is killed. Will you kindly make every effort to secure for us relief from the present deplorable condition?

Very truly yours,

AL ZISKIE,
President, Royal Ark Association, No. 3.
JOHN BODENSTAB,
Executive Secretary, Royal Ark Association, No. 1.

The Farmer—His Troubles and His Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, hungry people cannot work and maintain mass production of war weapons; they cannot nourish a war spirit; in short, hungry people cannot win wars.

The necessary food required to feed our people cannot be produced until the Government reduces the red tape and rescinds a large percent of its rules and regulations which are now being enforced, and which is truly causing the American farmer to become discouraged. They have been pushed from pillar to post. Who is to be blamed for this bungling? Is it Congress, is it the farmer, or is it the bureaucrat, who is not at all familiar with farm conditions, and yet issues rules and regulations under which the farmer must operate? Most assuredly, it is not the Congress, nor the farmer. In my opinion, the farmer's needs can be analyzed under these three points: First, labor; second, machinery; and third, the right to produce without Government interference.

The farmers have been asked to produce even more food than last year, but little consideration has been given to making these increased goals possible. The farmers have been stripped of their skilled workers until farm employment is at the lowest point in history.

Hundreds of thousands of young men have been taken from the farm and placed in the armed services, and when the farmers call attention to the shortage of manpower, about the only consideration they get is a promise to send help from cities or a promise to send a group of "90-day wonders" who have recently been imported from other States and given a schooling of 90 days in our State universities. Some of the department heads here in Washington have the idea that a man is a man wherever you put him. But the farmers know better. They know that this type of labor is liable to do more damage than good. It takes a skilled farmer to produce results on the farm, for farming is a highly skilled operation, and it takes years of training to make a competent farmer.

The squabble over the farm situation still continues here in Washington, while on the farm the spring planting is almost past. If it is not settled soon, it will be too late, and a lot of Americans will go hungry next winter. It is time this administration wakes up to the serious farm situation that faces the country.

Texas Newspapers Favor Trade Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, several days ago I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD editorials from leading newspapers throughout the United States supporting and strongly advocating extension of the trade agreements program, but the list then inserted did not include any newspaper from my home State.

Under leave granted, I submit herewith editorials from a number of leading Texas newspapers also advocating and urging the importance and necessity of extending Secretary Hull's trade agreement program:

[From the San Antonio Express of February 20, 1943]

First real test as to the permanency of this Nation's transition from a foreign policy hinged upon dangerously short-sighted isolationism to one accepting world responsibility and cooperation commensurate with its international interests will come with the congressional vote on renewing the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act before its expiration date (June 12 next).

* * * * *

The act represents the kind of give and take which nations must practice in order to live together peacefully and prosperously.

* * * * *

This issue is too fundamental to the United States future welfare to allow of partisan controversy. Judged on its merits solely, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act must be renewed.

As a developing industrial State—almost incredibly rich in natural resources and with surplus agricultural production—Texas' future largely depends on foreign trade expansion. The Reciprocal Trade Act's renewal thus should receive State-wide support. To that end, a resolution by the legislature at Austin and a popular appeal to the Texas delegation in Congress are in order.

[From the Dallas News of January 23, 1943]

Looking back over the last decade that has witnessed, first, the gathering of the storm of international discord, and then the bursting of its fury upon the world, we discern one program above all others that has been basically sound—the Hull effort toward free world trade. It was not sufficient to avert disaster; the doctrine of aggression by might, culminating in demagoguery and gangsterism, had gained too much momentum. Yet the reciprocal trade program accomplished much good by aiding in the consolidation of democratic nations against their enemies. Especially did it pave the way for our good-neighbor policy in Latin America. Today the reciprocal trade program still points the way toward the winning of the peace to follow the war.

Insofar as distrust of the United States has existed in other countries, it has been due primarily to our high-tariff policy. * * * But it will not be difficult to rearouse their fear and distrust. And we can most quickly accomplish this disastrous effect by giving the world reasons to believe that we will return to our selfish, isolationist, high-tariff policy when the war is over.

Hence, while there may be some legitimate reasons for objection to renewal of the Trade Agreements Act, they are far outweighed by sound arguments for it. The act should be renewed, and without undue wrangling, which in itself would create distrust abroad.

[From the Dallas News of January 29, 1943]

Not only must there be the will to cooperate in a world league after the war but there must be the willingness to cooperate in abolishing what is, in the last analysis, the core of isolationism, high-tariff barriers. Good judgment as well as good intention must also be exercised. For example, renewal of the Trade Agreements Act will soon be before Congress. Its passage or rejection will be a sign to the world.

[From the Houston Post of February 1, 1943]

Today's economic, political, and geographic ties between the United States and the Latin American nations herald even closer relations in the post-war world. In those southern lands we can find markets and fields of opportunity vaster and richer than most of us can imagine.

* * * * *

Latin America is our national source and market. And the removal of the Axis nations as competitors will leave an open field for us there. A major consideration in our post-war planning should be to develop our trade and industrial opportunities with our sister republics.

[From the Houston Post of February 4, 1943]

If a ship sails from Houston loaded to the guards with cotton, shouldn't that remark of President McKinley apply: "We can't hope to sell unless we buy"? Must we here in Texas wear out our soil—and soil does wear out—to build up the more-favored sections of our country—sections favored by nature for industrial production?

And if this country's industries get to producing more than the home market can take care of, one of two things must happen: Either find outside markets or shut down the plant for long periods, with consequent hardship on the workers and loss to the owners.

Finding outside markets is like hunting for a needle in a haystack, unless goods are taken in exchange, either raw or manufactured.

Production is getting something ready to sell, and selling it. Warehousing raw materials and manufactured goods runs counter to the inexorable law of supply and demand.

The Government's only legitimate part in the whole business is, as the text has it, to safeguard "equal opportunities for all; no undue restrictions to our traders and trade carriers."

[From the Bellville Times of August 14, 1941]

To our notion there is one absolute must in the post-war international economy. That must is the subscribing to the calm

yet firm admonitions of that genuine patriot, Cordell Hull; namely, international trade agreements.

[From the El Paso Times of January 10, 1943]

One of the greatest forward steps taken by the Roosevelt administration has been the reciprocal trade agreements made with foreign nations.

These agreements tend, particularly in peacetime, to promote better business and better understanding.

* * * * *

Regardless of what some of our people may think of the President's internal policies, they have confidence in the reciprocal trade agreements, for which Secretary of State Hull was largely responsible.

Congressmen would do well to remember that.

[From the Wichita Falls Times of January 17, 1943]

One of the most interesting contests due to engage Congress this year is that over renewal of the President's authority to negotiate reciprocal trade treaties.

* * * * *

One of the worst sins ever committed by any political party was the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill in 1930.

* * * * *

Under Mr. Roosevelt, the evil effects of this tariff law have been abated, not by any wholesale revision of it, but on a piecemeal basis through negotiation of reciprocal trade treaties. Not all of these treaties have come up to expectations. Generally speaking, however, they have tended to repair the damage caused by the Smoot-Hawley law. They have been negotiated in keeping with the fact that ours is a creditor Nation and that it cannot collect from its debtors unless it buys goods from them. To take away the authority to negotiate such treaties would have a most unfortunate effect upon both our internal economy and upon the plans for post-war rehabilitation. It would be a backward step.

* * * * *

The impending controversy may serve one good purpose. It may reveal to the country how strong a hold the protective tariff principle still has upon Republican minds. And the revelation will be worth much to the Democratic Party in 1944.

[From the Texarkana Gazette of March 6, 1943]

International trade is not a one-way operation, but a two-sided business, as seen by Frederick C. Crawford, president of the National Association of Manufacturers. It is closely related to the problem of world peace.

"Diplomatic peace and economic warfare cannot live side by side," he says. "If we want a market in China, Russia, India, and other nations for the goods we can produce best, obviously we must not bar those nations from our markets. If we are going to fight as a world Nation, we must also trade like one."

To most Americans today this may seem merely a clear, cool statement of fact. But what loss has been sustained, and what grief endured in the past, by failing to grasp this simple truth and act on it! And is there any assurance even now that, when this global war is over, there will be—not free trade, but a rational exchange of goods?

Moderate tariffs presumably will still be necessary to safeguard crucial industries and as a convenient way to supplement direct taxes in meeting Government expenses. But statesmen and businessmen alike are coming to realize that there is more benefit all round in encouraging international trade than in forbidding it—that properly handled, trade makes trade, promotes good will, and results in a more peaceful and prosperous world.

Following are excerpts from an article by Mr. M. H. Jacobs which appeared in the January 7, 1943, issue of the Houston Post:

"The gathering storm over reciprocal trade treaties is interesting.

* * * * *

"Mexico, Brazil, and so many other Latin-American countries are fighting on our side because, during the last decade, they have been convinced by acts and not words that dollar diplomacy and Yankee imperialism are really dead.

* * * * *

"What would it cost us today, in money and blood, to attempt to garrison and protect the whole coast line of South America and Mexico and Central America? How secure would we feel today if the whole 'soft underside' of the two Americas were wide open to invasion and peopled by hostile millions shouting 'Gringo' at every American, as they used to do before our reciprocal trade program was started?"

Delays in Handling Soldiers' Overseas Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication from the Under Secretary of War to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, together with the statement referred to therein:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., April 13, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is apparent from inquiries received at the War Department from Members of Congress that there still is considerable misunderstanding with respect to the reasons for unavoidable delays in the handling of soldiers' overseas mail.

It is with this thought in mind that I am taking this opportunity of advising you relative to soldiers' overseas mail. The Army Postal Service of the Army service forces, which provides complete postal facilities to American soldiers regardless of where they are stationed is today dispatching and receiving mail in the most expeditious manner possible to and from all overseas areas.

Attached hereto is a statement outlining some of the chief factors involved in the handling of mails by the Army Postal Service.

I feel sure that with a full understanding of the many problems encountered in dispatching and receiving mail from more than a million and one-half American soldiers in overseas theaters, Members of Congress would be in a better position to answer any inquiries which they receive from time to time relative to delays and nonreceipt of soldiers' overseas mail. I trust that this statement will be brought to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

REASONS FOR UNAVOIDABLE DELAYS IN OVERSEAS ARMY MAILS

ARMY MAILS—WHERE SENT

The Army postal service of the Army service forces is today providing complete postal facilities to American soldiers, regardless of where they are stationed. Army post offices have been set up in all overseas areas where American soldiers are serving. Mail service is provided to the front lines in combat zones and complete postal units have accompanied all American expeditionary forces. Army post offices are maintained at all ports of embarkation for the purpose of sorting, distributing, and dispatching by areas Army mails to points throughout the world.

VOLUME OF OVERSEAS MAILS

At the present time there are more than 15,000,000 individual pieces of mail dispatched every week to American soldiers in overseas theaters, most of this being in the form of letter mail.

CENSORSHIP

All overseas mails are subject to military censorship, and this factor alone is conducive to delays in handling such a weekly volume of mail.

SECRECY AND SAFETY MEASURES

On occasions it becomes necessary to hold or impound temporarily mails for certain areas and certain units of the Army in order that absolute secrecy is maintained regarding troop movements, both overseas and within overseas theaters.

IRREGULARITY OF SCHEDULES

The great bulk of the overseas mails must of necessity be transported on surface vessels. Mails can pile up at the ports while convoys are assembling and between the sailing times of convoys, but there never has been any backlog of mail for a designated area resulting from mail being left behind when convoys sailed.

SINKINGS

United States mails for American soldiers are placed on all United Nations' merchant ships and not only American-flag vessels. For this reason, practically every time a United Nations' ship is sunk on the high seas through enemy action, large quantities of United States mails are lost. During the first 3 weeks of March several million pieces of mail, contained in several thousand mail sacks, were lost through enemy action, this mail being en route to some one-half dozen overseas areas in widely separated parts of the world. This is but one instance of mail losses resulting in thousands of cases of nonreceipt of mail by soldiers overseas.

NORMAL TIME ELEMENT

The transit time involved in the transportation of mail from the points of mailing in the United States to its ultimate delivery to the soldiers in the field or combat zone is often overlooked. The delay in waiting for a convoy to assemble at the ports of embarkation, the transit time on the high seas of slow-moving vessels traveling circuitous routes in an effort to avoid enemy action, the redistribution of the mail at the overseas points of debarkation, and the transportation time from the latter port to the soldier in the field make it necessary to consider mail time in terms of weeks and not days.

MISADDRESSED MAIL

Actual and continuing counts of outgoing mail at ports of embarkation reveal that more than 10 percent of all overseas mail is either insufficiently or incorrectly addressed, thereby resulting in serious delay or making delivery impossible. Only when the soldier's full name, rank, Army serial number, service organization, and Army post-office number are used is it possible to accord the most expeditious handling to an individual piece of mail.

POSTAL PROBLEMS COMPLICATED BY MOBILE WARFARE

With modern armies sometimes traveling hundreds of miles in a comparatively short time, and with Air Force personnel continually changing their overseas stations, the Army postal service is constantly confronted with overseas personnel moving from one Army post-office area to another. It is not unusual for Army personnel to have as many as three and four Army post offices in a period of a few months, involving as many forwarding processes, before their mail can be delivered.

MEETING THE CARGO-SPACE PROBLEM

The use of V-mail, which effects a 98-percent saving in cargo space, enables the War Department to transport this type of mail overseas by air. One thousand V-mail letters weigh but 4 ounces and all the mail contained in 37 full postal sacks is reduced to a single sack of V-mail, when this service is utilized. The use of this new postal facility has reduced the transit time of mail to overseas areas by days and even weeks. A concerted effort is being made to bring about a greater use of V-mail which is advantageous to both the soldier and his relatives and friends back home.

V-MAIL—SAFETY AND PRIVACY

Unlike surface mails, which are subject to loss through enemy action at all times while en route overseas, V-mail is always assured of overseas arrival. This is made possible by holding the original until the photographic reproduction has arrived safely at its overseas destination. Some 40,000,000 V-mail letters have already been handled without the loss of a single letter. While V-mail letters of necessity must be brief, there is, contrary to general opinion, no more lack of privacy in using V-mail than in any other class of mail.

A Reporter Comes to Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said about the hustle and bustle during wartime in Washington and the confusion and lack of courtesy here that it is refreshing to find a visitor with a different viewpoint, based on actual experience. These articles were written and published by a trained observer, who for many years has reported and columnized for the Harrisburg Telegraph, in Harrisburg, Pa. He writes a political-observation column, a Roundabout column, giving personal touches to incidents which happen in and around Harrisburg, and he also writes movie reviews and news articles. His reporting is unusually keen and accurate. He is Paul Walker, of Camp Hill, Pa., a personal friend of mine of long standing. Some extracts from his articles follow:

WASHINGTON NOTEBOOK

In a recent paragraph on a flying trip to Washington, we called it the city of Southern accents.

It might also be called the city of many courtesies.

And that's for sure, especially in the Government buildings.

Bus drivers are quick to answer questions and are ready with suggestions.

Elevatormen will leave their cars to be sure you take the right turn down the long corridors.

The barbers in the House barber shop, which we happened to visit, are ready to talk on any subject, keeping on your subject.

Mary Garney, known to many of you, is the soul of geniality and charm—Congressman KUNKEL's secretary. (Didn't get to see the busy Congressman.)

The young lady from New Orleans in Senator JOHN H. OVERTON's office told us many things about her native city, said she hadn't read Herbert Asbury's The Latin Quarter, but surely will. Unfortunately Molly Gaumer (former Harrisburger) in the same office, was off the afternoon we called.

Spring in Washington is about 2 weeks ahead. Lawns are green for their first mowing.

One grammatical error in the traffic signs: No apostrophe in the "Dont Walk" signs.

You get a long, long taxi ride for 30 cents.

We've heard many stories of how they push you around in Washington and all that but doggone if we didn't get the nicest treatment everywhere we happened to be. Of course, we weren't asking for anything in particular. That may be the reason. Anyway, this a true picture of Washington as we found it.

Sincerely,

THE SEC.

A Fire Engine at Least

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is very gratifying to those of us who are interested in planning for the winning of the peace to note the interest which is being shown throughout the country on this subject, and many of us hope that the resolution which was introduced in the Senate by Senator BALL, of Minnesota, and referred to Senator CONNALLY's subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, will receive favorable attention and prompt action. This is no time to dodge such serious responsibilities, and judging from the correspondence which I have received the public is well aware of the importance of the situation. With this in mind, I am glad to insert in the RECORD the leading editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on April 13, 1943, entitled "A Fire Engine at Least." I hope it will be read and its message will be appreciated:

A FIRE ENGINE AT LEAST

A nation can drift into the gravest national decisions without benefit of trumpets. While the American people are absorbed in war news from north Africa or New Guinea they are losing touch with a less spectacular but no less vital struggle that can make victory mean much or little. This is the fight in the United States Senate over the win-the-peace resolution.

Now the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill plan is not the only chance for Americans to prevent another world war. But it does offer them the simplest opportunity they have had to make the basic decision to police the peace. Also it is the most clear-cut instrument for releasing peace plans from the threat of a Senate rejection such as wrecked President Wilson's hopes.

The resolution has been sent to Senator CONNALLY's subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. What happens to it there depends in large measure on how clearly the people see the issue and how forcefully they make their views known to their Senators. Enemies would sidetrack it for a less forthright form of words. Others, who recognize that some kind of world-security system must be organized to deal with the flames of aggression, want to wait and see what shape this fire department will take.

In effect they say, "Is this going to be merely a volunteer outfit, with national forces operating in their own neighborhoods, or is it to be a professional organization, with the engine manned by a regular crew of men drawn from all parts of the community?" Now it may be too early to count on the forming of a real international police or fire department. It is quite possible that bucket brigades will have to be called out. But plans for getting them out quicker and for buying at least one fire engine should be the minimum result of experiences with two world-wide conflagrations.

Even such moderate plans will not be made unless the American people insist. They must say that mere generalities about international cooperation will not suffice. They must be ready to send men to north Africa and New Guinea to put out little fires if they don't want to send them again after globe-girdling flames have licked at their own house, and if the fire department is to be organized better than last time the American people soon will have to make plain their purpose by demanding from the Senate some declaration along the lines of the win-the-peace resolution.

Orange, N. J., Boys in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a great privilege today to pay honor to two families from the Eleventh Congressional District of New Jersey.

Mr. and Mrs. William J. Darcy, of 196 New Street, Orange, N. J., and Mr. and Mrs. Frank Zamarra, of 667 Langdon Street, Orange, N. J., each have six sons in the armed services of our country.

The Darcy boys in the service include John, 27; Theodore, 25; William, 24; Robert, 20; Thomas, 22; and Harold, 18. The Zamarra boys include Michael, 38; Ronald, 23; Frank W. 36; James, 34; Adolph, 30; and John, 34.

Mr. Speaker, these two families are a fine example of American patriotism and in my opinion deserve not only my admiration and respect but also the commendation and respect of this Congress and the Nation.

Constructive Attack on Absenteeism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the employees and the management of the Alhambra Foundry Co., Alhambra, Calif., recently carried out a project which is about as constructive an approach to the problem of absenteeism as I have heard of. It consisted of an essay contest, in which workers at this company set forth their views on this problem and offered their solutions. I ask consent to include herewith the essay which won first prize. I wish I might include many more of them. It follows:

MEN WITH TOOLS

(By Milo Rhynsburger)

Just as important—just as deadly—just as vital as the men in planes, in tanks, and with guns, are the men with tools. In this blood-bond of men with tools and men with guns lies the strength of America.

Not all of us are privileged to wear the uniform of a soldier or a sailor, but we do enjoy the honor and privilege of wearing the uniform of men with tools; both uniforms carrying the same honor and glory—both fighting for the same cause—the continued freedom of our country and of our homes. In this war the United States is being called upon to do two things—furnish fighting men—and furnish fighting equipment; one job is as important as the other. You and I as men with tools must build this equipment and build it with this one thought in mind—Build it well and build it fast.

Our men with guns are not letting us down; we men with tools cannot and will not let them down. No one knows when the last hour of the war will come. But it will come sooner as war production is increased today, tomorrow, and every tomorrow. The life of a loved one or a friend may be saved by our efforts today. The parts we might have finished yesterday if we had not laid off, might be the parts needed so desperately to save many lives a short time from now, perhaps lives dear to us—certain lives dear to someone like us. The individuals who fail to show up for work regularly, take days off now and then—particularly after holidays and pay days, are taking actual lives of others in their own hands and, in addition to that are the cause for a greater aggregate loss of time, than do all the slow-ups and "wildcat strikes" in industry today. We men with tools are important, important to our job—important to our country. We cannot afford to treat this importance lightly. We must produce. We will produce.

Have you ever closed your eyes and dreamed of being a hero? Bands, medals, and lots of fanfare for a day—then back to the job as before. What is left? Everything is still there to the true hero and everything is the knowledge, deep in his heart, that he did a hard job and did it well. There will be no bands—no medals for the heroes among the men with tools in this war—but there still will be many heroes, men who know and have that personal satisfaction deep in their hearts—that they have done a hard job and have done it well.

Every night after the day's work is finished, let us ask ourselves this question: Have I, today, done my duty, fulfilled my obligation, to the men with guns who are willing to give their lives for me and for my family? Let us be honest with ourselves and we won't want to take time off. We men with tools can and will do our part. It's not the question of what we are doing; it's what more can we do to help win this war?

Post-War Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the subject of post-war planning is evoking great interest. Of course, every one agrees that no interest, study, survey, or work should interfere with immediate victory which is and should be the present primary objective of every citizen and all groups of citizens. It is essential, however, that consideration shall be given now to the problems of the transition period and of the future.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that, on April 3, 1943, Mr. William L. Batt, Vice Chairman, War Production Board, delivered an address on the subject of Post-War Planning at the Post-War Planning Forum conducted by the Research Institute of America at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C. The address was broadcast over N. B. C. and is as follows:

I am grateful for this opportunity to talk to you, although the subject chosen for discussion—Post-War Planning—is appallingly broad in scope, one in which generalizations are so easy and specific conclusions so difficult.

It is a good thing that this subject can be and is being discussed freely and openly, for the United States has some very grave problems to solve when this war is over; problems that will challenge our statesmanship as it has never before been challenged. It isn't sufficient that we win a military victory; that will be difficult enough, too; but the winning of an economic victory as well, is a horse of another color. The formula for winning military victories is fairly established. Its pattern will vary but its basic principles are much the same; the fighting people of all the world know them. The formula for winning an economic victory is an uncertain, an indeterminate and unknown variable, and yet we must find that formula and apply it, if our military victory is to be permanent.

Military victory, of course, is and must remain the first order of business for all Americans. The day, the month, or the year the war will end is unpredictable. The enemy is strong. He possesses lands rich in war resources. His armies are well trained and well equipped. True, he is being hurt severely—on the Russian front, by the bombing of his factories and shipyards; in North Africa; in the Pacific. But he will bleed to death slowly. We cannot wait until he has been buried before drawing the plans for victory on the economic front. If we do, it will be too late.

So, mighty and complicated questions of peace occupy our minds today, even as we devote all our physical strength to war—to the job here at home of producing the goods, the planes, tanks, ships, and guns that will enable the armies and navies of the United Nations to hasten the coming of victory abroad.

We must not blunder into peace. We must not take our place in post-war councils breathless from last-minute preparations, armed only with hastily drawn sketches of half-baked ideas for economic convalescence. We want to live in a healthy world, a world in which we can work cheerfully and constructively for the betterment of all mankind. That kind of a world won't just happen when war is over. We must go to the peace table with our blueprints carefully drawn and backed up by the will of our citizens. We must give to peace the same all-out effort that we are giving to war.

Behind the peace we seek so fervently lurk many dangers—unemployment, inflation, business upheaval resulting from uncertain reconversion to civilian production, general let-down all along the line due to physical and spiritual fatigue. The worker, the farmer, the businessman, or the Government cannot combat these dangers alone or independently. They can be averted only by intelligent, aggressive teamwork. To be successful, our emissaries to the peace table must be able to speak for all the United States. The programs and proposals they present must be the products of a meeting of American minds—the minds of business, labor, agriculture, and government. A divided nation cannot win the peace.

Post-war planning is vital to the future well-being of all our citizens, and it is encouraging to know that many agencies—Government and private—are working at the problem. The Research Institute of America deserves much credit for the work it is doing, and I have been impressed also by the activities of other private organizations, such as the National Planning Association, which are bringing out into the open the opinions of men and women in every walk of life.

Peace, which is uppermost in our daily prayers, will find the world bleeding from deep wounds. All the skill of a master surgeon will be needed to heal them and prevent infection, so that our children and their children will not be thrust into still another and more horrible war. But even the finest surgery will not hide the scars.

Business, labor, agriculture—all will feel the impact of readjustment, as all have felt the shock of war. Questions of far-reaching importance to all Americans must be answered.

How to maintain reasonably full employment in the shift from production for war to production for peace? How to protect the security of men returning from the fields of battle? How to perfect our marketing and distribution systems so that there will be no wanting for food in some communities while surpluses rot in others? What to do with the great manufacturing capacity created by war? Who is to own and operate the billions of dollars worth of plants built or financed by the Government? What to do about our huge Federal debt? What will be our attitude toward foreign trade?

These are only a few of the problems we shall find on our doorstep when Axis unconditional surrender becomes a fact. I would be presumptuous indeed to attempt to offer a complete solution to any one of them. The answers lie only in concerted thought and preparation.

The No. 1 problem we face when the war ends is to reconvert industry to civilian production without going through a long employment slump; a slump that might well plunge us into a depression so severe that recovery—if possible at all—would require years of hardship and heartaches. The American people, in my judgment, will not willingly permit such a condition to arise. They will demand an answer to this problem. Is

there anyone with the temerity to say that they are not entitled to it?

Of course, reconversion cannot be accomplished overnight. The switch from peacetime to wartime production was beset by many and great difficulties, some of which are still with us, despite the fact that the conversion seed was planted in ideal soil. Industry, when called upon to devote all its energies to war, had to deal only with one customer—the United States Government. During February, this single customer spent more than $6,000,000,000 for war goods of all kinds, as compared with war expenditures of a little over $2,000,000,000 in the same month last year, and only $600,000,000 spent in February of 1941. With such a customer, industry is able to plan ahead. Bills are paid on time. Employment remains fairly stable and at a high level. Subcontractors and suppliers of raw materials know reasonably well what will be needed and when. This single customer with the fat pocketbook will continue to buy—more and more each day—until the Axis collapses and the threat of aggression against us is ended.

With the coming of peace, however, Uncle Sam won't be in the market for vast numbers of planes, tanks, ships, guns, and other tools of war. You and I—and millions of other Americans who have been prevented by war from going to market for new automobiles, refrigerators, and many other kinds of durable goods—will once again become industry's chief customers. It will take time to get the new peacetime business going, to retool plants and retrain workers, and some period of idleness for thousands of workers is to be expected during the switch-over. How long that will be is uncertain, but the period is most important. Will these men and women have enough to tide them over by using the money they haven't been able to spend because of wartime restrictions on civilian purchases? Or will some means have to be found to keep them going until the job of reconversion has been completed?

What about the huge contracts placed by the single customer—Uncle Sam—and left unfilled when the war ends? Will Uncle Sam say to the holders of these contracts, "I'm sorry. I no longer need the things I asked you to produce. My contracts are canceled." Obviously we don't expect the Government to put industry out on such a limb and then saw it off without providing a cushion to fall on. But what kind of a cushion?

The Government cannot be expected to continue to spend vast sums of money after the war for goods that for the most part will only gather dust in storerooms. On the other hand, some sections of labor and industry will suffer severe hardship unless contracts on which work already has begun are completed. A middle-ground solution to this problem might well lie in renegotiation of all outstanding contracts when the war ends so that the profits to be realized will be so unattractive to invested capital that no one will want to keep a plant operating a single day longer than necessary to clean up the war work and get back to the business of producing civilian goods.

Up to the present time the Government has financed the construction, or has scheduled the financing, of roughly $14,000,000,000 worth of war-production facilities. Of this sum, approximately four and one-half billion dollars have been spent or earmarked for ordnance facilities; a little under three billion for aircraft plants; about two billion for shipways; three and a half billion for steel, rubber, aluminum, and other raw materials capacity; and something over seven hundred million for machinery and machine tools plants. All this obviously represents a tremendous investment on the part of our taxpayers. In addition to these vast public expenditures, private funds amounting to roughly $4,000,000,000 have been invested in plant expansions. This makes a total capital investment of approximately $18,000,000,000.

What is to be done with these plants after the war? We can assume that the Government will want to retain some of them, particularly in the field of ordnance production, as a reserve for possible future war use, although we will all pray fervently that such use will never be necessary. Such plants held in reserve would, of course, not compete with private business, but they would represent only a small part of the total number built or financed by the Government. Reconversion, particularly of consumers' durable-goods industries, probably will absorb some considerable part of the Government-financed machinery and machine tools facilities, for obsolete pre-war equipment must be replaced with the newest type tools and machinery in order to meet peacetime requirements and maintain high standards of living.

The remaining facilities built or financed by the Government—aircraft plants, ship ways, raw materials capacity, and others—would, I suppose, be purchased by private operators. Surely, the industrial opportunities of tomorrow can be of unprecedented magnitude Private industry must be encouraged to participate in these opportunities. We must not muff this great chance to go forward to greater production and distribution, to new markets, to greater economic stability. This may be one of the good by-products of the war, that private capitalism can prove that it is the best system for a majority of the people who live under it. Businessmen must make free enterprise workable by a realization that business must fit into a true democracy's pattern of life itself, in order for either free enterprise or democracy to survive.

We all recognize that private enterprise must provide the primary impetus to effective conversion of war plants to peacetime production Success largely hinges on management's skill in planning, organizing, and coordinating men, power, and materials. Management must supply the "know how" that will attract new capital necessary to a growing, stable economy. At the same time there must be the fullest cooperation and teamwork with labor, agriculture, and Government.

Labor must realize that the belief that business continually plots against society for the sake of profits belongs in the same category with the belief too common among some employers that labor spends its time planning to take over management. Both are fallacies. Both are stumbling blocks in the pathway to national security.

The role of government will continue to be an important factor. Mobilization of our resources for war has brought about many and far-reaching controls over materials, prices, manpower, and the daily habits of our citizens. The shift from all-out war to all-out peace production will involve some of the same kind of problems. New forms of assistance and cooperative action between government and business, government and labor, and government and agriculture will be needed. It is well that we are giving thought to them now. Government must establish the rules of the game and serve as impartial referee. The decisions it makes are of personal concern to every American. An alert and active government, supported by the joint efforts of our three great economic groups, can nurse us quickly back to good health, no matter how badly wounded the war may leave us.

Let us hope that by this time there is no one who believes that the United States can enjoy prosperity while the rest of the world bogs down in economic despair. I hesitate to think of the consequences should we stumble down the blind alley of isolationism. God prevent us from making that fatal mistake.

If we are to provide any assurance that there shall be a lasting peace, we must not only take our place in a communuity of nations, but we must provide leadership for that community of nations. Refusal to accept the challenge would be a cowardly betrayal of the trust placed in us, not only by our own citizens but by the war-weary, bleeding, and starving peoples of Europe and Asia whose hearts have felt the cruel knife of the aggressor. We owe it to these peoples to take a firm hand in the rehabilitation of their war-torn areas.

We shall certainly help feed the starving everywhere until they can again stand on their feet. All the food, shipping, and other materials we can spare will be needed in this vast undertaking, and I believe we will be generous with them. Fortunately, the Government has realized the necessity for preparing some solutions now. We shall be ready to meet the problem when the trumpets of victory are sounded.

The peoples of foreign lands ought to be able to rebuild their own civilizations after their immediate needs for food, clothing, and medical care have been met. But many of them will need other help from us—our technical experience—our management techniques—perhaps financial credit.

It may well be to our selfish advantage, if for no larger motives, to provide that help.

In all international dealings, we must remember that in order to sell we must be prepared to buy. Trade is not a one-way street. In the past, we wanted to sell goods abroad, but we didn't want to be paid in goods, so we built tariff barriers and took much of our payment in gold, which is now reposing in vaults at Fort Knox. Of course, that's a very much oversimplified and superficial statement of complex fiscal relationships. But, broadly speaking, it's a fact. Are we fighting to go back to such foolish and short-sighted concepts of international trade? I hope not.

The unsurpassed resources of our country—material and human—have been put to work in full measure to win the war. Full use of them will be needed to win the peace. Unless we want to be forced into still another world conflict, we must avoid the pitfalls of economic frustration and mass unemployment. The United Nations have undertaken the responsibility of leading the world out of chaos and insecurity. As the first step after the winning of the war, they must see to it that their own people have employment and an opportunity to enjoy the fruits of peace. Cooperation among the peoples and governments of the world is the foundation of a peaceful world.

We in America are planning ahead. We know the direction in which we are going—forward, with greater confidence than ever before in the basic foundations of faith, decency, and liberty which underlie our civilization. We cannot, we will not, we dare not fail.

Lasting Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, herewith I include in my remarks in the RECORD a forceful speech

entitled "Necessary Steps Toward Effective World Security" by E. Guy Talbott delivered before the City Club of Portland, Oreg.:

Through all the ages men have sought the road to peace. In the labyrinth of human byways, the broad highway to peace is yet unfound. Sages and poets and statesmen have searched in vain; still the hope of finding the path to enduring peace does not grow dim.

Elihu Root once declared that public opinion is the determining factor in America's foreign policies. Yet it is no exaggeration to say that 33 Americans control world destiny. The Constitution of the United States vests absolute treaty veto power in one-third, plus one, of the Members of the United States Senate. All treaties must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. The Senate has achieved doubtful fame by becoming known as the graveyard of treaties. The peace treaty with Spain in 1898 was ratified after a hard fight by 1 vote.

There was some justification for this constitutional limitation when that document became the basic law of the United States. That justification no longer exists in the world of today. Thomas Jefferson once said: "Some men look at constitutions with sanctimonious reverence, and deem them like the Ark of the Covenant, too sacred to be touched. They ascribe to the preceding age a wisdom more than human, and suppose what they did to be beyond amendment. * * * Laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind."

There is a proposal now before Congress for a constitutional amendment, providing that treaties shall be ratified by a majority of both Houses of Congress, rather than a two-thirds vote of the Senate. Such an amendment would democratize our treaty-making procedure, and modernize an outmoded method. A famous columnist recently declared that the treaty veto power by one-third of the Senate makes the American Constitution, in this regard, "literally the most undemocratic in the world."

In 1899 John Hay, Secretary of State, said: "The irreparable mistake of our Constitution puts into the power of one-third plus one of the Senate to meet with a categorical veto any treaty negotiated by the President, even though it may have the approval of nine-tenths of the people of the Nation."

Ray Stannard Baker, in his Life of Woodrow Wilson, said: "The deadlock between the Executive and the Senate every time we face a really critical foreign problem is intolerable. It not only disgraces us before the nations, but in some future world crisis may ruin us."

Today we are facing that crisis. At the close of this war, treaties will have to be negotiated and ratified. These treaties will determine the question of war or peace for oncoming generations. Thirty-three Americans literally hold in their hands the destiny of the world. A repetition of the treaty failure that followed the last war would certainly make inevitable another world war within a generation. The destiny of the United States is ultimately linked with world destiny. The United States can no longer be the ostrich nation in the world community. We cannot afford to plunge ourselves and the world into another era of rampant international anarchy. That will be the certain result, if the Senate should refuse to ratify a treaty pledging American participation in some post-war world organization to preserve peace.

The bipartisan resolution introduced in the Senate by Senators BALL, BURTON, HATCH, and HILL should be passed without delay. It would put the United States on record as favoring full collaboration with other members of the United Nations in post-war reconstruction, as well as winning the war. It would give assurance to our allies that this time the United States will play its proper part in organizing the world to maintain peace after the war.

In his message to Congress a few days after Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt said: "I know that I speak for the American people—and I have good reason to believe that I speak for the other peoples who fight with us—when I say that this time we are determined not only to win the war but to maintain the security of the peace which will follow."

However, no President can commit the people of the United States on matters involving treaties. That is the sad lesson we learned from Woodrow Wilson and the so-called peace following the last war. The President must reckon with the Senate. That is why it is so important that the Ball resolution be adopted. It will be adopted, if the voice of American public opinion is heard and heeded in Washington.

That public opinion supports the principles embodied in the Ball resolution was evidenced by the Gallup poll of March 24, 1943. One question asked in that poll was: "Should the Government take steps now, before the end of the war, to set up with our allies a world organization to maintain the future peace of the world?" The answers were: "Yes," 64 percent; "No," 24 percent; "undecided," 12 percent. The other question was: "After this war, do you think the United States should stay out of world affairs, or take an active part in world affairs?" The answers were: "Yes," 76 percent; "No," 14 percent; "undecided," 10 percent.

As a further indication of public opinion, five State legislatures have adopted resolutions favoring some form of world organization with power to enforce peace. The New York State Legislature adopted such a resolution unanimously in the senate, and with only 11 opposing votes in the assembly. Similar resolutions are pending in a dozen other States.

What is the Ball resolution, and why is it so important that it be passed? It is a bipartisan resolution, introduced in the Senate by two Republicans, Senators BALL and BURTON, and by two Democrats, Senators HATCH and HILL. Here is the full text of Senate Resolution 114:

"*Resolved*, That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority:

"1. To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis.

"2. To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.

"3. To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces.

"4. To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

"5. To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

"That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement."

When the resolution was introduced, the four sponsoring Senators issued a joint statement in which they said:

"We believe that an organization of the United Nations with the authority and the power to stop any future attempts at military aggression offers the best hope for maintaining world peace and stability after this war, and at the same time is the most efficient and the least costly method in lives and wealth for the individual nations to obtain security for themselves.

"It is our opinion that the overwhelming majority of the American people favor United States participation in such a United Nations organization, based on the just and democratic principles of the Atlantic Charter, as the most preferable way to maintain our own national security and help maintain world stability and peace. The only way the people can express their desire is through the Congress. Hence this resolution.

"It is our deep conviction that the basic foreign policy of the United States should not become an issue of partisan politics, that it should be decided as soon as possible so that post-war planning may be effective, and that our policy should be determined, not on the basis of past debates based on conditions then existing, but on the basis of world conditions as they are today and are likely to develop in the future."

The major Senate opponents of this measure are Senators WHEELER, NYE, and TAFT. Their criticisms are typical of pre-Pearl Harbor isolationist reasoning. In a lengthy speech in Cincinnati, Senator TAFT, after reciting his objections to the Ball resolution, said: "I should certainly be glad to support any plan if success is possible. I supported the League of Nations in 1920, and if we had joined it, and its ideals had been supported by its members, the aggression of recent years might perhaps have been checked in the beginning. I am inclined to think at the present moment that the best plan would be a league of nations in which every nation covenants to use its national forces against that nation which engages in territorial aggression, but it should not interfere with any internal affairs except possibly the question of armament."

The most outstanding opponent of the Ball resolution is the columnist, John T. Flynn. He said: "It does not originate in the interest of America but in the interest of the many groups here which pull and haul and scheme and propagandize to involve us in their rather than our own interests. The best treatment of the Ball resolution is to let it die in committee."

However, Mr. Flynn stands practically alone among the Nation's columnists. The New York Herald Tribune says: "Senator WHEELER can no doubt wrap this up in his rabble-rousing confusions, but would he dare go before any audience in the United States and honestly oppose any one of these minimum requirements for some sort of decent future world?"

Roscoe Drumond, of the Christian Science Monitor, writes: "The world knows the United States Senate has the last word. History shows it can be devastatingly negative. It can strengthen America's position before the world now by being positive and forward looking. If there is to be order in the world after the war, there will have to be policing. Americans will be far better off to have United States forces on the patrols. The Senate should act at once."

Raymond Clapper writes: "America's future place in the world will be determined, not only by what this Government and other governments can agree upon, but by what two-thirds of the American Senate will agree to. The great value of the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution is that it brings that fundamental question to a head. We had been getting the cart somewhat before the horse. What will two-thirds of the Senate vote for, in the way of recommendations now? That is the important thing for everybody to know, both here and abroad."

Ernest Lindley, writing in the Washington Post, said: "If such an agreement could be reached it would go down in history as one of the most constructive actions ever taken by the United States Senate." And Maj. George Fielding Eliot says: "The future of our country, the welfare of our children may well hang on the success or failure of this momentous resolution." And Mark Sullivan writes: "What is now taking place is a forehanded effort to avoid what happened after the Great War. It is an attempt to have, before the war ends, the debate which 23 years ago did not come until the war was over. It is an effort to assure for the United Nations a better fate than befell the League of Nations."

The New York Times said in an editorial on March 17: "The resolution sponsored by two Democratic and two Republican Senators, which advocates a specific program of closer immediate and post-war collaboration among the United Nations, is a highly encouraging sign. It indicates that leading Senators are aware of the inescapable role that the United States must play now and after hostilities if we are to win not only the war but the peace. And it shows that these Senators also recognize the supreme importance of putting aside partisan considerations and of assuring the world that this time the American President will have the support of the Senate in his treaty negotiations."

This proposed action by the United States Senate is not a new departure in our foreign policy. It is in line with many historic precedents, as a statement of specific policy in world affairs.

The absolute necessity for an organized world following the war grows out of the fact that modern technological developments have transformed the world into a compact neighborhood. In the interest of durable peace and security it is imperative that the world neighborhood be organized, with an international police force, to prevent anarchy and to preserve law and order.

What the world desperately needs today is for the United States to return to that international leadership we held from the time of the First Hague Conference in 1899 until the Versailles Conference in 1919. During that period the United States held undisputed leadership in all forms of international cooperation.

In 1899, under the leadership of William McKinley and John Hay, the United States participated fully in the First World Peace Conference at The Hague. That same year we announced the open-door policy and the following year its corollary regarding China's integrity and sovereignty.

In 1907, under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt and Elihu Root, we took a leading part in the Second Hague Conference. As in 1899, our delegation to this International Peace Conference was instructed by the United States Government to work for a world court. Forty years ago Congress voted for the world court. A few years ago the same Congress rejected the court our action had called into being.

In 1910, Theodore Roosevelt received the Nobel Prize at Christiana, Norway. In his address to the Nobel Committee, Mr. Roosevelt said:

"It would be a master stroke if those great powers honestly bent on peace, would form a league of peace, not only to keep peace among themselves, to prevent, by force if necessary, its being broken by others.

"Each nation must keep well prepared to defend itself until the establishment of some form of international police power competent and willing to prevent violence as between nations. As things are now, such power to command peace throughout the world could best be assured by some combination between those great nations which sincerely desire peace and have no thought themselves of committing aggressions."

That same year, on June 25, 1910, both Houses of Congress passed a joint resolution, without a single dissenting vote, calling upon the President of the United States to take the lead in calling an international conference, to create a world federation with the combined navies of the world used as an international police force.

Congressman Richard Bartoldt, of Missouri, author of this resolution, speaking in its support on the floor of Congress, said:

"The work of world organization or world federation was auspiciously begun by the creation of the Hague Court, and we do not propose to have it stop there, but must insist that modern conditions which impress all with the absolute interdependence of nations imperatively demand its early completion. * * * Let us reaffirm our faith in America's leadership in this great cause."

Senator Henry Cabot Lodge was the sponsor of this joint resolution that was passed unanimously in the Senate, as it had been in the House.

In 1915 and thereafter, William Howard Taft was president of the American organization called the League to Enforce Peace, working for the creation of a world-ordered society. Woodrow Wilson, following the international ideals of his predecessors, led the statesmen of the world in the creation of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

Then we became isolationists and refused any positive cooperation with other nations in the world neighborhood in the interest of building a world society.

It is no longer possible for any nation to find security in isolation. Economic self-sufficiency is a dream practically impossible of fulfillment in an economically interdependent world. No nation, great or small, is really secure unless and until all are secure.

As a nation we are committed to a program, world-wide in scope, which means winning the war and winning the peace. Our leadership is needed now as never before in world affairs. We have a responsibility to make a maximum contribution toward world organization because we are the most powerful nation on earth from the standpoint of economic resources, political prestige, and moral influence. No other nation in the world has less to lose and more to gain by helping to build an organized world than the United States.

Our own future destiny as a free people depends on the kind of world order we build following the war. It is to our interest and the interest of posterity that the world be organized for peace and that we make our appropriate contribution toward such a world order.

If this war is won and the peace is lost, the sacrifices will all have been in vain. Another generation will have to face another war on a vaster scale. We must highly resolve that those who die in this war shall not have died in vain. The very object of winning the war is to win the peace that follows. The world will go either back to utter barbarism or forward to peace and freedom.

America's rendezvous with destiny is to win this war, and then win the peace by full participation in a world organization to enforce peace in the world community. American public opinion must support the Government in winning the peace as well as the war. This responsibility rests upon every citizen who values his heritage of freedom and who wants his children to be free from war and fear of war.

Favorable action by the United States Senate on the Ball resolution is demanded both by public opinion and the facts of history. It does not constitute a blueprint for the post-war world, but it does set forth the minimum requirements for enduring peace. It should have the whole-hearted support of every American who wants his country to play its proper part in building a better world.

It was at St. Louis in September of 1919 that Woodrow Wilson made this prophetic statement:

"I feel like asking the Secretary of War to get the boys who went across the water to fight, together on some field where I could go and see them, and I would stand up before them and say: 'Boys, I told you before you went across the seas that this was a war against wars, and I did my best to fulfill the promise, but I am obliged to come to you in mortification and shame and say I have not been able to fulfill the promise.'

"You are betrayed. You fought for something that you did not get. And the glory of the armies and the navies of the United States is gone like a dream in the night, and there ensues upon it, in the suitable darkness of the night, the nightmare of dread which lay upon the nations before this war came; and there will come some time, in the vengeful providence of God, another struggle in which, not a few hundred thousand fine men from America will have to die, but as many millions as are necessary to accomplish the final freedom of the peoples of the world."

It Is Housecleaning Time in Office of War Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, 15 former employees of the Office of War Information, all of whom recently resigned, today made public a statement which I believe should be preserved in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and under leave to extend my remarks I shall include it herein.

This statement, Mr. Speaker, is a quick response to the public rejection by Mr. Elmer Davis, Chief of the Office of War Information, to the charges that the O. W. I. has been sacrificing fact for ballyhoo. These 15 writers and research workers who signed the statement, while personally friendly to Mr. Davis, say that O. W. I.'s home-front activities are dominated by high-pressure promoters who prefer slick salesmanship to honest information.

In other words, these so-called promoters are taking the Harry Hopkins attitude that the people are "just plain dumb" and are not to be told the truth and are not being told the truth.

Mr. Davis is responsible for the Office of War Information, Mr. Speaker, and if there is one iota of truth in the following statement, he should lose no time in cleaning house. The statement follows:

We had not intended to make public our reasons for leaving the Office of War Information, although most of us have expressed them fully to Elmer Davis in our letters of resignation. Misleading statements issued to the public and to Congress have made it necessary, however, for us to issue this statement.

The facts have not been correctly set forth. The question of competence of those who have resigned, which has been raised by some of Mr. Davis' subordinates, is not an issue,

inasmuch as all have been urged to reconsider their decisions and have been offered other posts in the Office of War Information. There is no disagreement regarding the size of the publications program, nor is a clash of personalities the reason for our resignations.

There is only one issue—the deep and fundamental one of the honest presentation of war information.

We are leaving because of our conviction that it is impossible for us, under those who now control our output, to tell the full truth. No one denies that promotional techniques have a proper and powerful function in telling the story of the war. But as we see it, the activities of the Office of War Information on the home front are now dominated by high-pressure promoters who prefer slick salesmanship to honest information. These promoters would treat as stupid and reluctant customers the men and women of the United States. They delude themselves that the only effective appeal to the American public in wartime is the selfish one of "What's in it for me?"

We know that Americans have an intelligence, a will to win, and a dignity which deserves the facts as well as the slogans.

We believe, as Elmer Davis has said, "That the better the American people understand what this war is about, the harder they will work and fight to win it."

The promoters who are now running the domestic information policy of the Office of War Information for Elmer Davis do not share his faith in the American people. They are turning this Office of War Information into an office of war ballyhoo.

We have never for a moment doubted Mr. Davis' personal integrity. All of us feel that his standards of truth and ours are identical. When he asked us to reconsider our resignations we offered to work for him, personally under the direction of an editor who would be answerable to him personally. We cannot be associated with the propaganda purposes or methods of those who are actually running Mr. Davis' domestic branch for him.

If any doubt remains as to why we have resigned, Mr Davis can release our letters of resignation. We shall not make any further statements on the situation. Let's get on with the war.

The signers of the statement and their former occupations:

Louise Wells Baker, Fortune researcher; Francis E. Brennan, art director of Fortune; Harriett Swenney Crowley, Hawaii newspaper publisher; Eleanor Choate Darnton, advertising woman, editor of You magazine (widow of Byron Darnton, of the New York Times, killed in New Guinea); Katharine Douglas, Fortune researcher; Harold K. Guinzburg, president of the Viking Press; Philip P. Hamburger, New Yorker magazine; Adrienne Koch, teacher of philosophy at New York University; Delia Kuhn, New York Times; W. McNeil Lowry, Illinois University faculty; Milton MacKaye, author and magazine writer; Henry F. Pringle, biographer and Pulitzer prize winner; Mary Louise Mickey Simon, Time researcher; Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., biographer; and Maria Sutherland, advertising.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, according to points in the O. P. A., brains are 4 and tongue is 6.

The know-how in Washington is partly having the social contacts—the thing small business lacks.

When Cordell Hull answers a question before the Ways and Means Committee on reciprocal trade, or any other subject anywhere, he makes a speech.

Dorothy Thompson's coming third marriage to a Czech artist proves what we have surmised—that she is non-American and unrealistic.

The Budget Director's cut of 41,000 Federal employees in the District in a few departments is startling and without precedent. Just think what an efficiency committee could do in a few weeks' work.

The secret food conference sponsored by the Department of State, to be held at Hot Springs, Va., May 18, is going to be fed everything from horse meat to hardtack from the outside world as long as it remains a secret conference.

CLARE HOFFMAN, Tuesday, took time to defend a cow in Michigan that went dry after it was discovered that she had been fed only dry hay and milked at frequent intervals for drinks by hungry children. A Texan observed quietly that it was no wonder the cow was an udder failure.

We, as farmer Congressmen, for the first time in our public lives, have been asked to shed salty tears in behalf of the five big packers. As one who has taken a shelling many times at twilight after a long day in a public stockyard by uncompetitive bidding, we refuse to cry.

The conference in Bermuda to determine just how many refugees from Europe will be given shelter in the United States will not be as congenial either as the average Sunday-school picnic. These conferences will prove as interesting now as the developing activities of Tunisia or New Guinea.

The recent charges that it is big farmers bearing down on the activities of F. S. A. is good psychology, if they can make it stick, but it is without foundation in fact. If there is anything a small, struggling farmer despises it is to see a neighbor singled out and pampered when prices are good and highly remunerative employment is everywhere.

Bedrock Policy Is Production Barrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of Congress what I consider to be one of the most significant speeches of the year.

It might well be called the voice of American business—business fighting for its life against bureaucratic repression, radical restriction, and fighting to preserve as much as it can of American democracy.

It is an address made by David R. Craig, president of the American Retail Federation, at the Retailers Wartime Conference, sponsored by the Canadian Retail Federation at Toronto on April 7.

I am sure that the Members of Congress will wish to read all of this vital address. But let me now read you one or two sentences from it. Mr. Craig told the Canadians:

> Your Government had confidence in the businessmen of Canada and appointed them to manage your wartime prices and trade board. We have utilized professional economists and lawyers. Our businessmen have been generally disregarded as if they were not to be trusted. * * * Our orders are written by bedrock philosophers.

And Mr. Craig said that the utterances of Joseph L. Weiner, head of the Office of Civilian Supply of the War Production Board, "indicate that he is a partisan of the bedrock philosophy."

Mr. Craig was moderate and restrained in his remarks.

It is almost a month now since I warned that Joseph L. Weiner is one of the most dangerous men in Washington.

If Americans go hungry—as it seems they might well do—Joseph L. Weiner is to blame. It was Mr. Weiner, Russian-born New York lawyer, who slashed the production of farm machinery 67 percent, throttling agriculture, and making it all but impossible for the farmers to produce the food needed for our armed forces, for our allies, and for our citizens.

If the free press of America is in danger, as it is, Mr. Weiner's hand may be found at the root of that danger—for it is Mr. Weiner who has urged in his bedrock tables that the essential newsprint be slashed 80 percent.

Mr. Speaker, in every action that Mr. Weiner has attempted he has sought to crush free enterprise, stifle individual initiative, destroy the free press, and shackle America to his program of social reform.

His bedrock philosophy has been discredited. His administrative acts have been repudiated. Only last week, Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, told a congressional committee that Weiner's order reducing farm-machinery production was a grievous mistake.

Joseph L. Weiner has been charged with protecting the civilian population, and he has utterly failed. Yet he is still on the job. The philosophy of an inexperienced, incompetent, and inefficient Russian-born lawyer still prevails over the sound, sober experience of loyal businessmen.

Not only does it prevail, but Joseph L. Weiner is grasping for still greater power. He has backed the Maloney bill to provide a separate, independent Office of Civilian Supply removed from the restraints, small though they have been, of the War Production Board.

Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity I ask this administration how much longer will this Nation have to put up with this man? How much longer must agriculture, business, and the press be hampered and strangled by his bedrock policies?

Weiner's policies, Mr. Speaker, are barriers to production in America. Mr. Weiner must be removed. And so that the problem may be clearly understood by all our people, I am including as a part of my remarks a portion of a news-

paper report of Mr. Craig's address in Toronto:

Your Government had confidence in the businessmen of Canada and appointed them to manage your wartime prices and trade board. We have utilized professional economists and lawyers. Our businessmen have been generally disregarded as if they were not to be trusted. It is our impression that your choice was better than ours, and we envy you your Gordons and your Burtons.

The orders which have come from your administration seem to us to be models of perfection in comparison with our own Our orders are written by bedrock philosophers who have consulted with the businesses and trades in no more than a perfunctory manner if at all, and often only after the order had been signed and sent to the Government Printer.

RAYON HOSE ORDER CITED

Recently, for example, a fantastic rayon hosiery order was published. I have not been able to find a single retailer who saw the order in its final form prior to publication. The terms of this order were incredibly bad, and they turned out to be the straw that broke the camel's back. Last week the central committee of National Retail Associations asked the Congress to investigate the Office of Price Administration to determine whether it is obeying its own law.

We must rely upon price to assure production. It is here that the bedrock view of civilian requirements becomes significant. With the bedrock view dominant, the Government establishes its prices without regard for the quantity of production which those prices will permit. Indeed, our Office of Price Administration has never paid any attention to production. We have accumulated a number of cases in which the established price was not sufficient to permit the production of civilian goods.

Such an established price is no contribution to the war effort under any view. It is a statistic for the archives, and shows merely what the price would be if the goods had been produced.

PROTECTION AGAINST BLACK MARKETS

If the maximum possible view should become dominant, there is no doubt that many prices would rise, but at least the goods would be manufactured Nevertheless, the rise need not be a runaway increase. Moreover, the maximum possible production for civilians after all the military needs have been met is the surest possible protection against the development of black markets, whose prices never appear in the official indexes.

This is a basic decision for our Government to make. The bedrock view will not produce the goods. The maximum possible view will produce them.

There is no need to labor further the distinction between these viewpoints, although many other examples could be brought up. We could cite instance after instance in the field of food production where manpower shortages have become so serious that dairy herds are being sent for slaughter and where acreage must be withheld from planting just at a time when we need all the food production we can possibly get. We could cite cases of attempts being planned to standardize the production of goods well beyond the necessity for standardization, even to the point where machinery in good working order must be turned off and left idle merely because its product does not conform to the standard, and in spite of the fact that the materials and manpower are available which are not now needed for military purposes. There are many other examples, but I will not ask you to listen to a complete encyclopedia of our blunders.

It is enough to say that most of them have arisen out of the bedrock philosophy and out of our Government's lack of confidence in the ability and the patriotism of our businessmen.

ISSUE BECOMING CLEARER

The issue between the viewpoints is now coming into clearer focus. They are converging in our price policy, our fiscal policy, and our civilian-supply policy.

We have a new Administrator for our Office of Price Administration. We have the deepest sympathy for him, for his task is to extricate the price policy of the United States from an unbelievably tangled web of conflicting regulations and personalities. He has an almost impossible task. The retail merchants of the United States wish him well and intend to support him in every move which will establish a reasonable and effective price control, for they have as large a stake in preventing inflation as any other economic group. They should like to be permitted to help, and they begin by offering to Price Administrator Brown the general principle that one of the two ways of preventing inflation is to produce and distribute the maximum possible goods for civilians which are not required by the military effort.

FISCAL CONTROL

The other way is also receiving consideration. It is the fiscal control of inflation. Our Congress is discussing the need for forced savings through a withholding tax. Such a tax was brought up as one aspect of our recent political argument about the pay-as-you-go plan, and after a time it will come up again. Here again the bedrock view may conflict with the maximum possible view, and the Congress will have to decide how large a withholding tax should be in order to fulfill all of its necessary purposes and no more.

A third area in which the issue of essential civilian requirements is being discussed is our Office of Civilian Supply. This Office is attached to our War Production Board. Up to a few months ago it was engaged primarily in promoting the conversion of civilian production to military production. That task has been practically completed, and it has turned to an analysis of what is left for civilians. In its new assignment it produced the study of the bedrock requirements of civilians, and has already inaugurated a program of production for a good many items which are necessary but which are no longer being produced because in some directions the conversion program had been too successful.

MALONEY BILL

The utterances of Mr. Weiner, the director of the Office of Civilian Supply, indicate that he is a partisan of the bedrock philosophy. They also indicate that he is in favor of the general principles of the Maloney bill. This new bill is being discussed in our Senate. It detaches the function of civilian supply from the War Production Board and establishes a new Civilian Supply Administration under our over-all Board of Economic Stabilization on the same level of prestige as the War Production Board itself, as well as the claimant agencies like the Army, Navy, Lend-Lease, and others.

Retailers have not yet reached agreement as to the position which they should take on this bill. They agree that the civilian function needs a strong position among the claimant agencies but they are not at all sure that still another Washington agency would be able to establish itself and operate effectively in time to be of real value, and they believe that the problem of civilian supply is a war production problem as much as anything else. They have much confidence in the ability and the philosophy of Mr. Nelson, who is the head of the War Production Board, and most of them are inclined to leave the civilian supply function in his hands. The bill contains some additional features which are alarming in the unnecessary extent to which they would put the Government actively in the business of production and distribution. It has been well said that retailing had asked for an April shower and was handed a hurricane.

Farm Security Administration Farmers Boost Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very enlightening letter and article pertaining to the work of the Farm Security Administration, and the success which the F. S. A. borrowers have had in greatly increasing their food production quotas.

Aside from the rehabilitation features of this agency, wartime America is vitally concerned with the increase of food production, and no group of farmers have been showing as great a percentage increase of production as the borrowers of the Farm Security Administration funds. All farmers in the Ninth District of Minnesota are working long hours to increase food production.

The following letter was recently addressed to me by Harry S. Muir, regional director of the Farm Security Administration, Milwaukee, County Courthouse, sixth floor, Milwaukee, Wis., after I had requested information concerning the F. S. A. program in the Ninth District of Minnesota:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Milwaukee, Wis.

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HAGEN: I am glad to give you the opportunity to look over the production report recently released by the United States Department of Agriculture.

I am enclosing a copy of the report that we have sent to our field offices. Like you, I was rather curious to know what the farmers of Minnesota did last year. We have just completed a very interesting report on Minnesota production. I am taking the liberty of enclosing this for I am sure that you will enjoy looking over these commendable figures.

No doubt you too will be surprised to note the astounding increases made by farm-security families. These families operate small farm units. The records of Farm Security Administration borrowers in your State indicate the extent to which necessary credit and technical help have enabled them to move from low levels of production up to a place alongside the more secure and better-equipped family farmers of the State. You will note that increases by Farm Security Administration borrowers in most war commodities have been proportionately much greater than those of the average farmer, and that their total contribution to the State's increases have been significant.

It appears to be a fact that we must look to the family-size farm to make the greatest

increased contribution to the food demand. The large farm operator has done and is doing a fine job.

He produces volume but he is confronted with labor and machinery problems. If he is able to maintain his present production, that is about all that can be expected.

In your district there are 35,673 farms. These farms, according to the 1940 census, average in size 232.3 acres. They could be classified as family size farms, for the majority of them are operated with family labor. Of these farms, about 4,000 are operated by Farm Security borrowers. The enclosed records indicate that these families have contributed toward the war effort on a National and State basis. You know what they have and are doing within your own district. You are also familiar with the part that Farm Security has played and the benefits that these families have received as the result of the financial aid and individual service we have been able to give. In all probability many of these 4,000 farm families would still be tax burdens instead of taxpayers had it not been for the Farm Security program. Now they are making a real contribution when it is so vital to our war needs.

* * * * *

I sincerely hope that the information contained herein may be of some value to you.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. MUIR,
Regional Director.

Although Mr. Muir ably summarized the value of the Farm Security Administration program to our food-production efforts, I feel that the claims he makes are even more emphatically driven home by the interesting facts and figures in the following article, which gives the report for the entire Nation:

Increases in production of essential crop and livestock products between 1941 and 1942, by all farmers and by Farm Security Administration borrowers [1]

Product	All farmers		Farm Security Administration borrowers		Percent of net increase by all farmers contributed by Farm Security Administration borrowers
	Amount increase, 1941 to 1942	Percent increase	Amount increase, 1941 to 1942	Percent increase	
Milk (pounds)	3,914,000,000	3	1,419,000,000	20	36
Pork (pounds, live weight)	[2] 2,252,000,000	13	192,400,000	36	9
Eggs (dozen)	516,000,000	15	49,800,000	31	10
Beef (pounds, live weight)	[2] 1,767,000,000	11	124,300,000	38	7
Chickens (pounds, live weight)	[2] 366,365,000	14	37,100,000	36	10
Peanuts (pounds)	1,028,000,000	70	101,700,000	88	10
Soybeans (bushels)	104,000,000	98	3,360,000	106	3
Dry beans (pounds)	110,500,000	6	30,100,000	34	27
Sugar beets (tons)	1,616,000	16	113,000	24	7

Total number of all farmers	6,097,000
Number of actively supervised Farm Security Administration borrowers producing in 1942	463,941
Proportion of all farmers who were actively supervised Farm Security Administration borrowers—percent	7.6

[1] Based on a survey, approved by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, of records of Farm Security Administration borrowers at the end of the 1942 crop year.
[2] Preliminary unpublished Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates of commercial slaughter plus home use. Chicken figures include commercial broilers.

The following article gives the figures and story for just the State of Minnesota. Let me call attention particularly to the high percentage of the increase in beef production by F. S. A. farmers:

Minnesota—Increase in production of essential crop and livestock products in 1942 over 1941 by all farmers and Farm Security Administration borrowers

Product	Unit	All farmers		Farm Security Administration borrowers		Percent of total increase contributed by Farm Security Administration borrowers
		Amount increase	Percent increase	Amount increase	Percent increase	
Milk [1]	Pound	229,000,000	2.6	72,500,000	17	31.7
Pork (live weight) [2]	Pound	180,111,000	13.7	15,555,100	43	8.6
Eggs	Dozen	48,249,000	25.9	3,464,530	53	7.2
Beef (live weight) [2]	Pound	40,016,000	4.5	7,823,200	48	19.6
Chickens [3]	Pound	27,220,000	20.2	976,740	31	3.6
Soybeans	Bushel	2,349,000	195.8	55,550	135	2.4
Dry beans	Pound	600,000	27.3	82,787	42	13.8
Sugar beets	Ton			3,707	33	[4]
Flaxseed	Bushel	1,260,000	8.6	153,338	35	12.2

[1] 1942 production estimates for all farmers are preliminary and unpublished.
[2] Estimates for all farmers are preliminary and unpublished.
[3] Estimates for all farmers do not include commercial broilers.
[4] No estimate available for all farmers' production of sugar beets.

It is with considerable pride that I point to the increased production in the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota, my own district.

In every instance, our percentage of increase tops that of the State and Nation and accounts for the tremendous amount of mail I receive from farmers and businessmen and bankers who favor a continuation of the Farm Security Administration program of helping small farmers get into increased production of food.

The article on the Ninth District follows:

REPORT ON FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM AS OF NOVEMBER 30, 1942—NINTH DISTRICT, MINNESOTA

Farm Security Administration borrowers in the Ninth District of Minnesota have made considerable increases in the production of essential agricultural commodities. A sample survey shows that the 3,089 active Farm Security Administration borrowers in the district made the following increases in production in 1942:

Product	Increase in 1942 over 1941	Percent increase
Chickens (pounds, live weight)	199,511	41
Milk (gallons)	2,272,980	22
Eggs (dozen)	1,177,770	117
Pork (pounds, live weight)	3,121,800	78
Beef (pounds, live weight)	3,459,780	85
Flax (bushel)	31,902	56

Under the rural rehabilitation loan program as of November 30, 1942, in the Ninth District, $4,178,560 had been advanced to 9,090 farm families for loans for operating goods since the inception of the program in 1935. The total collections on these loans amounted to $2,102,528, of which $1,806,991 represents repayments of principal. As of the same date these collections amounted to 94 percent of matured principal and accrued interest

Under the farm-ownership program as of November 30, 1942, $785,714 had been lent to 120 tenants, hired men, and small operators to enable them to purchase and improve family-type farms under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. Collections amounted to $86,572 of which $51,547 represents repayment of principal. The total collections of principal and interest amounted to 100 percent of maturities of principal and interest.

In addition to making, servicing, and supervising these loans, the Farm Security Administration has brought about the establishment of 10 community and cooperative services which make available the use of purebred sires, machinery, and other facilities to some 140 farm families who otherwise would lack them.

The total number of all farms listed in the 1940 census for the district is 35,573, of which 28 percent had a gross farm income under $600 in 1939.

Agricultural Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the following very pertinent telegrams to the bill under consideration. One received from Harold Brown, secretary of Montana

Farmers' Union; D. W. Chapman, president of Montana Farmers' Union; Charles J. Yearger, of Conrad, Mont.; W. W. McFarland, of Conrad, Mont.; Nels Petersen, of Conrad, Mont.; D. J. McCall, of Comertown, Mont.; and C. C. Parker, of Valier, Mont.

These wires from persons experienced in farming conclusively show that in the opinion of the senders the appropriation bill now under consideration will not meet the requirements for food production so essential to win the war:

DENVER, COLO., *April 15, 1943.*

JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Department of Agriculture appropriations bill, as brought out by committee, will sabotage American farmers' production to win war. Urge you go on House floor to demand amendments to bill to provide proper appropriations for Farm Security Administration, crop insurance, nonrecourse loans by R. A. C. C., for full production of war crops, funds for soil-conservation and crop-benefit payments including incentive payments. Sufficient appropriations for administration of Agricultural Adjustment Administration. Urge restrictions contained in bill of loans to farmers by Government agencies be stricken out. Urge you oppose any functions now under Farm Security Administration or Agricultural Adjustment Administration being transferred to Extension Service and land banks. Will appreciate your keeping me informed of your actions on this bill. Wire me collect, Great Falls office.

HAROLD BROWN,
Secretary, Montana Farmers' Union.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *April 16, 1943.*

Congressman JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
House Office Building:

Urge you do everything possible to defeat O'Neal committee bill. Our organization insistently urges support for a win-the-war program through nonrecourse loans free from banker control. Incentive payments for necessary war crops, adequate funds to continue triple A program for 1943 under farmer committeemen. We absolutely oppose any new or additional powers be granted Extension Service.

D. W. CHAPMAN,
President, Montana Farmers' Union.

CONRAD, MONT., *April 16, 1943.*

Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Agricultural departments appropriation supply bill now in House requiring approval of all Farm Credit Administration loans by commercial banks, insurance company, and others will entirely eliminate Farm Credit Administration from the loaning field and which in turn would seriously hamper the war effort. Your immediate action to avoid this calamity is respectfully solicited.

CHAS. J. YEARGER.

CONRAD, MONT., *April 15, 1943.*

Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Agricultural Department appropriations supply bill now in House requiring approval of all Farm Credit Administration loans by banks, insurance companies, and others will entirely eliminate Farm Credit Administration from the loaning field and which in turn would seriously hamper the war effort. Your immediate action to avoid this calamity is respectfully solicited.

W. W. MCFARLAND.

CONRAD, MONT., *April 16, 1943.*

Hon. JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Agricultural Department's appropriations supply bill now in House requiring approval of all Farm Credit Administration loans by banks, insurance companies, and others will entirely eliminate Farm Credit Administration from lending field and which in turn would seriously hamper the war effort. Your immediate action to avoid this calamity is solicited.

NELS PETERSEN.

COMERTOWN, MONT., *April 15, 1943.*

Representative JOHN O'CONNOR,
Washington, D. C.:

Meeting of merchants and farmers protest cut in Farm Security Administration appropriation. Use your influence to combat this vicious measure and advise results.

D. J. MCCALL.

VALIER, MONT., *April 15, 1943.*

Hon. JAMES O'CONNOR,
House of Representatives:

Please use influence to defeat Agriculture Department's appropriations supply bill.

C. C. PARKER.

Stabilizing Agriculture in the Great Plains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to discuss briefly the Nation's food supply problem as of today, offer a few thoughts as to how we got in this shape, suggest that Congress itself is partially to blame, and then propose that simplification of direct farm aid by the Federal Government must be achieved.

I have the honor to serve on a committee of 10, representing jointly the Senate and the House, which is inquiring into the possibility of inaugurating construction on some new irrigation projects in the West, as well as completing a number which are under way. In spite of the critical need for steel and other materials, and in spite of shortage of labor, it may develop that the need for food exceeds these other requirements to the point where we may have to diminish our war effort somewhat in order to increase our farm productive capacity through the West. Already the W. P. B. has indicated a recognition of this situation and has released materials for proceeding with a number of projects and has stated that much additional material might be made available if feasible projects could be built and producing by 1945. The Department of Agriculture has released its freeze orders on irrigation equipment, farm pumps, and so forth, to permit these to flow into the hands of farmers who need them.

A sizable part of the watershed of the Republican River is located in my district, stretching on into Kansas and Colorado. A rich, fertile valley, embracing 25,000 square miles of agricultural lands, it is today the victim of unwise State and National policy; and when the United Nations call for record food production in the area, it finds itself unable to meet that need. Always susceptible to the ravages of flood and drought, it might even be dependent upon outside sources of food supplies, instead of contributing mightily to the Nation's total food supplies at the time when they are needed so badly.

Food is so valuable to the United Nations today that they are willing to pay any price for it. Congress authorizes the R. F. C. to loan up to one-half billion dollars to develop the Amazon Valley so that it may produce food and other needed supplies. We import certain foodstuffs from South America by airplane today. We are helping to step up food production in Africa, Central and South America, Australia. And yet we have irreparably hindered our own American farmers by drafting their labor and withholding their essential machine repairs and replacements. The pinch for food as we know it now might well run for 2 to 3 years after an actual shooting war had ended. So the present emergency will not expire for some years to come. If the Republican Valley, and others like it through the Central States and the arid West, fail our Government in this hour of greatest need, it might be disastrous.

But when half the world resumes its peacetime pursuits, and our country is no longer begging the farmers of the western valleys to step up their production, another problem will confront us. Taxes will be high on farm lands, imports of cheaply produced foreign foodstuffs will break our markets, and those men who have bravely tried to feed the world in this crisis will again be on the verge of bankruptcy. Or if drought should strike these western valleys again, and the Federal Government be compelled to expend hundreds of millions of dollars once more for relief purposes, we will still have not directly attacked the problem of stabilizing agriculture on our own prairies and in the States of the arid West. All possible irrigation found feasible and practicable must be inaugurated to cushion the effects of droughts, and to swell the food-producing ability of our farmers at the same time reducing their costs so they may compete in the world markets. It seems to me that Congress must begin now to formulate a more effective and more coordinated program to guard our food-production machinery on 6,000,000 farms.

In 1935 a devastating flood swept through the Republican Valley, costing 112 lives, as well as millions of dollars of property damage. To guard against a repetition of that flood until protective works could be acquired, and to aid in developing extensive irrigation to permit the watershed to come safely through repeated droughts, the people of the valley formed the Republican Valley Conservation Association. It is interesting to note that in their efforts to

gain needed Federal aid and understanding, they were compelled to be in contact with 38 different Federal agencies. I believe Congress is partly responsible for this crazy-quilt pattern of cooperating bureaus and departments.

Just think of it. A flood takes 112 lives. And yet before anything can be done about it, Congress must appropriate funds and authorize the United States Engineer Corps to conduct a survey and study. Then we must approve the report of the corps, and again authorize, and then appropriate funds, by which remedial measures are provided. Or, if the damages from floods are primarily to farm lands, rather than to urban centers, we must go through the same steps with the land utilization section and the flood control committee of the Department of Agriculture, instead of the Engineer Corps. Or, if it appears that some irrigation is feasible, we go through the same monumental routine with the Bureau of Reclamation. Then when these measures fail, and drought and hard times come, we appropriate funds by the millions for relief and think we have done a good job. We are wasting millions of dollars as a Nation, and at the same time failing to correct the problem at the core. Would you believe it, from 1933 on to 1943, the Federal Government alone has expended in the Republican Valley more money than would have been required to stop future floods, and put 200,000 or more acres of fertile lands under irrigation so those people would be self-sufficient, and would not longer require relief, subsidies, or regimentation which goes with these devices.

Another instance of the complexity facing our people through the multiplicity of procedures outlined is this: When the Bureau of Reclamation has surveyed a project, and pronounced it practical and feasible, there are exactly 43 steps, all embracing interdepartmental paper work, which the Bureau must go through by congressional and executive directive before actual construction can be undertaken. This applies to the so-called water conservation and utilization, or Case-Wheeler projects. In the reclamation program proper, there are 53 steps. This is shameful.

Our Republican Valley Association found that somehow or other, they were compelled to work with the following Federal departments, all of which had some congressional or executive authorization in the field of water conservation and use: Engineer Corps, Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Agricultural Engineering and Water Facilities Section, Soil Conservation Service, W. P. A. and P. W. A., Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Geological Survey, C. C. C., Biological Survey, and so forth. It was hard to bring all of these forces under one tent so that their efforts might be harmonized and coordinated. Here the National Resources Planning Board entered as a coordinating agency. Now Congress seems disposed to do away with that body. They may be guilty of too much planning, but it seems to me that Congress is guilty of too little planning. If we have no coordination, it will be a field day for confusion.

The triple A has provided me with some figures, showing what happens to the millions which Congress annually appropriates for soil-building and water-conserving payments to our farmers. Upward of $100,000,000 is appropriated annually for this program nationally. And if the experience of my people is borne out over the country, half or more of this fund goes unearned each year. What happens to that money? Are we Indian givers, offering subsidies which cannot be earned? I know that sometimes the triple A, the Soil Conservation Service, and other departments, have not worked together as they should. This is something which should not be tolerated, especially among those divisions of the Department of Agriculture which have joint responsibilities.

On the other hand, if a man on a farm wants to build a dam to protect some rich bottom lands from floods, his annual allowance is too little to permit its construction from these benefit payments. And no other type of soil conservation or terracing or contouring is justifiable until he can whip the flood problem on his lands. We wonder why the Federal land bank loses money on some of its loans after foreclosing the hopeless farmer and liquidating his property. It is simply because much of our regulation is so tangled that no mortal can understand it, to say nothing of complying.

The following figures show the sums allotted to the counties in this Republican watershed in my district, the sums earned annually by soil building and water conserving practices, and the sums unearned. Figures cover 2 fiscal years, and, I am told, are not yet available for the fiscal year which ended September 30, 1942. I am informed by Fred S. Wallace, Chief, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, that many landowners earned far more than their allowable units or credits, and his figures reveal the fact that nearly 20 percent more was earned than was paid for. This comes about by virtue of the fact that some farmers exercise many conservation practices beyond the triple A's ability to reimburse them. At the same time, this does not minimize the fact that all farms are failing to qualify for nearly 50 percent of total allowable soil building units which are worth $1.50 in cash to the farmer at the end of the year.

Allowances for Agricultural Adjustment Agency soil-building and soil-conserving practices in Republican Valley, Nebr., for fiscal years ending Sept. 30, 1940, and 1941

County	Allowances		Payments earned		Payments unearned	
	1940	1941	1940	1941	1940	1941
Red Willow	$52,645	$46,570	$21,078.60	$31,999	$31,567	$14,571
Chase	54,949	64,157	28,860.35	37,870	28,389	26,287
Hayes	43,311	42,563	20,525.70	27,823	22,726	14,740
Hitchcock	53,448	47,244	30,240.15	28,280	23,208	32,492
Dundy	30,061	27,290	12,639.30	10,648	17,422	17,642
Gosper	38,439	33,340	14,220.00	14,759	24,219	18,581
Phelps	44,626	41,093	16,557.70	16,505	28,069	24,588
Franklin	44,068	41,061	20,652.00	20,261	14,418	20,800
Harlan	46,947	42,225	29,792.40	25,243	17,155	16,982
Nuckolls	50,149	46,402	18,632.25	13,362	31,521	33,040
Webster	49,609	47,838	35,002.50	25,156	14,607	22,682
Furnas	59,530	51,475	23,258.40	27,282	35,243	24,193
Perkins	80,845	71,472	48,901.65	45,318	31,943	26,154
Total	648,627	593,730	327,422.00	314,506	321,489	279,224

World War No. 1 Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 2347, the purpose of which is to give World War No. 1 veterans, their widows and dependents, pensions, compensation, and benefits at least equal to those which are now received by Spanish-American War veterans, their widows and dependents. According to the authorities of the Veterans' Administration, my bill in no wise decreases the pension, compensation, and benefits of any veteran or serviceman or their dependents.

In my opinion no person can justifiably contend that our Spanish-American War veterans, their widows and dependents, now receive more than that to which they are justly entitled, especially when we consider the fact that the cost of living has advanced as it has in the past months. Basic legislation to benefit substantially in the manner in which Spanish-American War veterans, their widows and dependents, are now benefited was enacted between 1920 and 1922, approximately 21 to 23 years after the conclusion of the Spanish-American War. It has now been almost 25 years since Armistice Day, 1918—a longer period by 2 or 3 years than that referred to above. Many of our World War veterans have passed away, leaving widows and dependents who, insofar as need is concerned, deserve all help and aid possible. Today in order for a child to be prepared for a life of competition in our economic order training and education are more essential than ever. The necessities of life are more expensive. That these expenses may be met, our widows and dependents of World War No. 1 veterans—living or not living—should be dealt with by our Government more liberally and generously than ever before. Doubtless because of the ages and degree of disability of Spanish-American War veterans they, too, deserve additional help at this time.

Where the World War veteran is still living, because of his age and physical condition he frequently finds it more difficult to compete for worth-while employment. This unfortunate situation is true even though his wife and children are frequently at ages in life where their needs are greatest. I can think of no time since the World War when additional aid for World War veterans, their widows and dependents, is more needed and warranted.

Surely the Congress in taking action of a helpful nature in behalf of these citizens of ours would evidence a consideration of our veterans, their widows and dependents altogether appropriate.

By my own observation what I have said is applicable to members of my own family I feel. As the grandson of I. A. Beckworth, who fought all 4 years with General Lee and surrendered with him at Appomattox and who now is buried in Smith County, Tex., as one who had 2 uncles in the Spanish-American War, 2 uncles in the World War from Van Zandt County, and who has now some 14 first cousins in this war, 2 from Smith County, 4 from Van Zandt County (3 of this 14) are now overseas, I certainly feel I am in a position to know something of the situation pertaining to service men. I hope the legislation I have submitted will be carefully considered by the Congress.

Protect Homes From Distraint and Sale for Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, now that the number of income-tax payers in the Nation will be increased from three or four millions to approximately forty-four millions a year, which will affect people of small incomes, the question of throwing around home owners proper safeguards becomes increasingly important. Undoubtedly a higher percentage of the 44,000,000 taxpayers own their homes. Home ownership contributes greatly to national stability.

It may not be generally known, but it is a fact nevertheless that our present income-tax law makes no provision whatsoever for the protection of home owners from the distraint and sale of homes to pay income taxes. The law does provide a degree of protection from distraint and sale of a few items of personal property, such as farms, a little livestock, a small amount of feed and fuel, a small amount of household furniture, books, tools, and so forth, but when it comes to protecting the home which a man and his family occupy, there is not the slightest protection in the law.

Most of our States have laws protecting from seizure and sale certain necessary personal property of an individual and also laws protecting bona fide home owners from the seizure and the sale of the homes owned and occupied by such owners. It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that such home owners in the several States ought to have at least the same protection to the enjoyment of the rights of ownership and occupancy of their homes from distraint and sale under Federal law that are enjoyed from seizure and sale from judicial processes in the several States. To fail to take this necessary step, it seems to me, may, and probably will, result in the Federal Government becoming the owner of the homes of many of our people. Such will break down our national life and cannot be tolerated in this Republic.

In order to meet what appears to be a situation which might reach serious proportions in the years to come, and especially when unemployment increases at the end of the national emergency, I have introduced today a bill which is designed to give individuals and home owners in the various States the same degree of protection against distraint and sale of personal property and real estate as these same persons enjoy under State law against seizure and sale under judicial processes. I invite your most earnest consideration of this legislation and I hope that you will join me in seeking an early hearing before the committee to which the bill will be referred and that I may have your full cooperation in prosecuting the bill to final passage.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the bill, as follows:

A bill to provide the same exemptions from distraint and sale with respect to Federal taxes as are allowed under the applicable State laws

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 3691 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to personal property exempt from distraint) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) State exemptions to apply: There shall be exempt from distraint and sale such personal property as would be exempt from sale if the distraint constituted execution on a judgment."

(b) Section 3700 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to distraint on real estate) is amended (1) by inserting before "When goods", at the beginning thereof, the following paragraph heading: "(a) In General.—"; and (2) by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(b) State exemptions to apply: There shall be exempt from distraint and sale such real estate as would be exempt from sale if the distraint constituted execution on a judgment."

Farm Security Administration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to point out the favorable features of the Farm Security Administration program as of December 31, 1942, for Oklahoma:

Rural rehabilitation loans, cumulative as of Dec. 31, 1942

Number of original loans	41,473
Average size of original loans	$438
Number of supplemental loans	98,219
Average size of supplemental loans	$163
Total amount of loan obligations	$34,687,788
Collections:	
Repayments on principal	$19,474,445
Interest payments	$2,258,013
Maturities of principal	$20,549,333
Ratio of repayments of principal to maturities of principal (percent)	94.8
Number of active borrowers	21,293

Tenant-purchase loans, cumulative as of Dec. 31, 1942

Number of applications on hand	4,212
Number of loans	1,349
Amount of obligations	$8,228,159
Collections:	
Repayments on principal	$260,485
Interest payments	$299,272
Extra principal payments	$165,381
Maturities of principal and interest	$562,489
Ratio of repayments of principal and interest to maturities of principal and interest (percent)	99.5

The table below shows the increases in production, by active Farm Security Administration borrowers, of essential crop and livestock products between 1941 and 1942, and the planned increased production in 1943 over 1942:

Product	Actual increases, 1942 over 1941		Planned increases, 1943 over 1942	
	Amount	*Pct.*	*Amount*	*Pct.*
Chickens (pounds, live weight)	1,249,390	27	2,154,020	37
Milk (gallons)	10,787,470	25	12,567,870	23
Eggs (dozens)	2,595,392	32	4,640,116	44
Pork (pounds, live weight)	10,954,423	57	23,514,690	78
Beef (pounds, live weight)	10,768,160	40	18,709,480	50
Dry beans (pounds)	470,805	53	803,894	59
Soybeans (bushels)	5,184	16	37,026	96
Peanuts (bushels)	15,500,650	261	8,309,170	39

Resolution of District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH PETERSON
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith for the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, on February 22, 1943:

Resolved by the District of Columbia Society, Sons of the American Revolution, in regular session assembled on this, the 22d day of February 1493:

1. That on this, the two hundred and eleventh anniversary of the birth of George Washington, the Father of our Country, we pay tribute to his memory and express without reservation our grateful appreciation of

the principles of freedom for which he fought and for the formation of our Republic for which he stood and for which he did so much.

2. That we pledge a renewal of our faith in the Constitution of the United States, as written by the founding fathers, as the greatest protection for our people against oppression and tyranny, in time of peace as well as in time of war.

3. That we deplore and condemn as utterly unconstitutional and un-American any delegated or other system by whatever name which denies or deprives any citizen or any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law as provided in the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

4. That we deplore and condemn as utterly unconstitutional and un-American any attempt to limit or restrict freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, or the right of the people to peaceable assembly as provided in the first amendment of the Constitution. We declare our belief that without freedom of the press our liberties would not endure.

5. That we express our appreciation and our approval of the recent action of the House of Representatives in appointing a committee to inquire into the sacrifice of constitutional rights or constitutional authority by so-called delegated bureaucratic authority, and we urge the Congress to take the necessary steps, after a full investigation, to repair or restore such rights wherever necessary, as early as possible.

6. That we earnestly urge that the three departments of our Government, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, remain separate and apart, in spirit as well as in truth, as provided in the Constitution, neither department encroaching upon the rights, duties, or prerogatives of the other.

7. That we urge the Congress of the United States to take whatever steps are necessary, under the Constitution and the laws, to see that our Constitution is preserved and maintained in full force and vigor, without regard to party or partisanship, including the Bill of Rights, and all the rights guaranteed thereunder, whether specifically mentioned in these resolutions or not, the enumeration of certain rights herein not being intended to exclude other rights under the Constitution.

8. That these resolutions be printed in the local press, the local and national bulletins, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

BENJAMIN D. HILL, Jr.,
Secretary.

The Muddle Is Serious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald of April 14, 1943:

THE MUDDLE IS SERIOUS

Not the least serious effect of the failure of the Congress to enact some sort of tax legislation is that upon sales of War bonds during this crucial period. With the whole thing now up in the air, with nobody knowing just what he may expect, the uncertainty naturally will make the larger subscribers to War bonds hesitate and proceed a bit cautiously before investing large sums in these necessary public securities. The situation boils down to this:

Who can now tell whether we are to remain on our old system of paying income taxes this year on last year's earnings, or whether we shall eventually be called upon to pay last year's income taxes along with some sort of new tax upon present-year incomes, 2 years' taxes in a single year, or whether some time in late summer or early fall we shall suddenly find that a withholding tax of 20 percent or some other figure has been thrust upon us, thus cutting our incomes and hence our ability to buy bonds in that proportion.

If the Congress had enacted some sort of tax legislation, no matter how burdensome it might be, we at least would know what we were in for and could make our financial calculations accordingly. But we don't know what is going to happen. And right now the Treasury Department, which is chiefly responsible for the failure of any sort of tax bill, is asking the public to buy bonds in the largest sum ever dreamed by this or any other Nation. Thirteen billions of dollars is not chicken feed.

This goal can and probably will be reached, but it likewise is doubtless true that many a large investor will pull back somewhat on his purse strings because he doesn't know yet where and how hard and in what manner he is going to be hit.

The failure of the Congress to act promptly and the prospective long delay before we do get action was most unfortunate and may have a serious effect upon all our financing problems. If that is the case, the Treasury Department may thank itself in large measure. Because the President and Secretary Morgenthau disapprove the Ruml plan, they preferred to kill everything rather than accept what it was apparent both the people and a majority of the Congress wanted.

Moreover, they failed to offer any sort of substitute for the Ruml plan. They just killed that, offered nothing in place of it, and so killed for months to come all tax legislation. The uncertainty of the situation is what is chiefly embarrassing, and because it is uncertain and embarrassing we may expect some reaction against the purchase of Government securities of all sorts.

Don't Forget To Write

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Sunday Post of April 11, 1943:

DON'T FORGET TO WRITE

If we named him, you might know him. If we described him, you might recognize him. If we told you where he was located in civilian life, many Post readers would say, "Oh, yes; I remember him. I wondered what became of him."

He wasn't famous. We do not think he ever got his picture in the papers. Yet he greeted multitudes of people from all walks of life, and rendered them a quick, efficient service daily, in a calm and understanding way.

He was a post-office clerk. In a large post office in one of our large cities, day after day, during the rush hours, he stood behind the metal grille doling out stamps, postcards, and advice on mailing.

He was just one of a throng of men behind the barred windows who make letter writing less a chore because they so speedily expedite the most important part of a missive we labor over—the mailing of it.

He was just one, up to some months ago, when the call came to him from the branch of service in which he had enlisted right after Pearl Harbor, and he went off to camp to take his training with the sole desire of putting a crimp in the Axis.

The training was hard. But he was beyond his teens or even his twenties. But he took it like a major and a man. And how did he end up? No; he wasn't assigned to the kitchen or the cavalry. He was made mail clerk, postal clerk, postmaster in charge, and even postmaster general, if you will, of his outfit.

He grinned about it, but he liked it. It is the best thing he knows how to do and he looks at it sensibly. It is no sinecure. The job runs from early morning until late at night. One must not only give out mail and send other mail off. One must keep accounts and everything must balance.

The other day he came home for a furlough. He talked of camp life. He laughed at its humors and groused, serviceman fashion, at its rasping points. But he was enjoying it, said so frankly, and had no regrets.

Only one thing bothered him. It did not concern him personally so much. It concerned his fellow fighting men, with whom, on some nearing day, when mail is not so important, he will charge across a shell-plowed meadow, just for America, even if it means dying.

"I have sat back and studied this business," he said seriously, as he spread his length over an easy chair and puffed his pipe. "You know, morale is the most important thing that there is in the service. We are men away from home. But we haven't forgotten home.

"Please, please send us letters. We will forego and forget everything else. We will bear and fight, and fight again—if we can only get mail from home—if those we love or those we like will just not let us get thinking we are forgotten. I know what mail means. There have been times when mail coming to us has been delayed because we have been moving around. A few days does not matter. Five or six days pass and do you know what happens? The bottom just drops out of my outfit. The men just mope and stare into space.

"What are they thinking? I know what they are thinking. They confide in me after they have called in vain for mail for the tenth time on the seventh day. Here are their words. I have heard them a thousand times, 'Something must be wrong at home. Mother must be sick. Maybe the children aren't well. Surely, someone would write.'"

It was out of the heart, as strongly and as seriously as he could put it. More letters mean more work for him. But he will revel in them. We talked of other things but he always came back to that. And as the train pulled out he shouted back, "Don't forget to write!"

The United States Should Advocate International Bimetallism After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, we are about to take up one of the most important international issues facing the world today—the money question. This issue

is receiving the attention of some of the best-informed and influential political and business leaders of our time. What the system of international money should be is ably presented by a great businessman and eminent authority, Mr. F. H. Brownell, who has made many valuable contributions on the subject of money and international exchange.

It is my privilege to present for the consideration of my colleagues Mr. Brownell's latest treatise on this important subject, entitled "The United States Should Advocate International Bimetallism After the War":

At the close of this war, what will the moneys of France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Poland, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Hungary, Rumania, Greece, and Yugoslavia be worth in international trade, and even in those nations themselves? What those of China, the Dutch East Indies, Japan, and the Malay Peninsula? Can normal international trade be reestablished and the internal economy of these nations revived unless and until their moneys are given a stabilized value?

In the settlement of the post-war currency problems, the United States, if it retains its present holdings of gold and silver, will be in a very powerful position. It owns about 70 percent of the monetary gold and well over 60 percent of the monetary silver of the entire world. Its holdings are so predominant that it is difficult to see how monetary systems, whether based on gold alone or on gold and silver together, can be adopted on any world scale without the cooperation of the United States.

It is the thesis of this paper that, in the reestablishment of currencies and their rates of exchange, the best interests of the United States and of the world at large demand that silver be restored as a monetary metal and international bimetallism be adopted.

EFFECT ON COUNTRIES PRODUCING SILVER AND GOLD

The remonetization of silver will necessarily increase its price and so especially benefit those countries which largely produce it. These are mostly in the Western Hemisphere and the largest production comes from the United States and its two continguous neighbors, Canada and Mexico. The British Empire is the largest producer of gold. The following table of production of gold and silver in percent of the total world production makes the essential comparison. Figures are for 1940, the last year for which full information is available.

Percent of total world production

[In round figures]

	Gold	Silver
United States	15	25
Canada	13	9
Mexico	2	30
Total, United States, Canada, and Mexico	30	64
Total, North America	30	66
Total, Western Hemisphere	35	77
Total, British Empire, including Canada	58	18
Total, British Empire, excluding Canada	45	9

Very obviously, an enhancement in the price of silver will especially benefit the United States and its immediate neighbors as well as other countries in the Western Hemisphere, with whom it hopes to have a large and growing trade. The United States interest in gold as a metal is far less than its interest in silver. With the British Empire, the opposite is the case.

But increasing the price of silver by reviving it as a monetary metal in no way detracts from the price of gold. Gold can command the same price under international bimetallism as at present. The British Empire will not in any way be injured by international bimetallism. On the contrary, it will receive its corresponding benefit from the silver it does produce, while the United States and its neighboring countries, because of their large production, will be very greatly benefited.

PRICE OF SILVER AFFECTS THAT OF COPPER, LEAD, AND OTHER METALS

It is not generally realized that a higher price of silver causes a lower price of copper, lead, zinc, and many other associate metals, while a lower price of silver causes a higher price of those metals. In the United States approximately 90 percent of the silver produced comes through smelters treating copper, lead, and zinc. Less than 10 percent of the silver comes from mines using the cyanide process, often in connection with gold, but not affecting the prices of copper, lead, and zinc. Few, if any, metals come from the original mine ore unmixed with other metals. Practically all mines produce more than one kind of metal. Silver is very largely associated with copper, lead, and zinc, and its value in the ore correspondingly reduces the cost of producing the copper, lead, and zinc, or other metals with which it is associated.

In 1940 the United States produced nearly 70,000,000 ounces of silver, worth at 71 cents an ounce nearly $50,000,000. Had United States silver been worth 35 cents an ounce instead of 71 cents, the cost of producing copper, lead, and zinc in the United States would have been about $23,000,000 more than it was. Conversely, whenever the price of silver increases, the cost of producing copper, lead, and zinc correspondingly decreases. It is the consumers of copper, lead, and zinc who actually and ultimately feel the effects of ups and downs in the price of silver.

A concrete example of the effect of the price of silver is furnished by the Coeur d'Alene Mines Corporation of Idaho. In 1942 it produced: Silver, 1,586,460 ounces; copper, 3,133,000 pounds; antimony, 1,840,000 pounds; net profit before Federal and State income taxes was $217,950.

Had it been forced to operate at the present world price of 44¾ cents per ounce for silver, or 25.875 cents less than the present smelter return, it would have suffered a loss of $192,546.52 instead of a profit, as the following figures demonstrate:

Net operating profit at 70.625 cents per ounce for silver	$217,950.00
Less decrease of 25.875 cents per ounce for silver (1,586,460 ounces at 25.875 cents)	410,496.52
Former profit turned into a loss of	192,546.52

The Coeur d'Alene mine case illustrates the broad principle. But it does not illustrate what would happen in the case of many mines, in which a fall in the price of silver (unless compensated by higher price of other metals) would compel leaving in the ground and permanently losing large tonnages of ore which could not then be worked at a profit, thus further diminishing the rapidly lessening ore reserves of the United States in copper, lead, zinc, and other metals.

We elsewhere point out that the value of silver, like that of gold, is largely psychological. Its utility value is greater than that of gold, but its monetary value is the chief element of the price of both metals. Placing a higher psychological value on silver, therefore, costs little, since it is reflected in a corresponding reduction of the cost of producing copper, lead, and zinc, and other metals associated with it. It, in effect, increases the ore reserves of other metals, because it enables the extraction of ore that otherwise would be left in the ground. The higher price of silver is offset by the correspondingly lower price of other metals, with the added gain of greatly increasing the national reserves of those metals. And the effect would, of course, be the same on the ore reserves and cost of production of copper, lead, and zinc wherever found throughout the world in association with silver.

THE DEMAND FOR "HARD MONEY"

History abounds in examples of paper moneys deteriorating in value and at times becoming worthless as the result of wars, revolution, and other vicissitudes of the issuing nation. Hence, mankind has always preferred "hard money." In our own Civil War of the 1860's, United States paper currency fell to a substantial discount, and when peace came there was an insistent demand to "resume specie payment."

The almost universal distrust of paper money is based on the long and bitter experience of mankind. World War No. 1 exemplified and accented it. World War No. 2 will do so again on an even larger and more universal scale.

The natives of North Africa are said to be slow to trade for the United States paper money of our soldiers, but eagerly accept their silver money. Not only will Asia and Africa clamor for "hard money," but all of Continental Europe will do so even more vigorously than after the first World War. Gold alone cannot satisfy the demand. It is insufficient in quantity. Its price would have to be increased still higher, perhaps doubled or even trebled. But the higher the price of gold the less is gold fitted to act as coin for ordinary purposes. At $35 an ounce, a gold dollar coin would contain one-thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold and would be so small physically as to make its use practically impossible. Even the $2½ gold piece in the days when gold was worth $20.67 an ounce proved to be too small for general use in the United States and was finally abandoned. How much less is gold fitted to serve the purposes of such coins as the pre-war rupee, franc, lira, our own quarter, and the many other coins of about that value.

The physical quantity of gold is so small that most financial planners of its future use propose little or no circulation except between nations themselves in settlement of international trade balances. The private citizen will have little or no opportunity to own gold coins. There will be no opportunity for the individual to protect himself against all the vicissitudes and losses which may happen to the paper money of his country because of war, revolution, or other misfortune. Why should this be? Why not provide the private citizen with the protection afforded by "hard money" of gold and silver?

It is no answer to say that silver can still be used for subsidiary coinage purposes, unless the price of silver is fixed by general agreement, much as hereafter described. Otherwise the coin of silver is better than a coin of other metal, or than paper money itself, only so far as the commercial value of the silver content exceeds the commercial value of the other metal or of paper. Unless the price of silver is fixed under international bimetallism, or by United States purchase laws, it will vary in accordance with commercial demand; and if used solely as a subsidiary coinage under such conditions will fail to satisfy the demand of the peoples of many nations for a hard money whose value they can rely upon.

CHINA AND INDIA

After this war is over the United States is expecting a great development in China. The Chinese and the inhabitants of India have always been silver-using nations. Long centuries of experience (in China recently repeated) have taught their people the uncertainties of paper money. More than ever

will they demand hard money—gold and silver, and especially silver, which best suits the purposes of the great majority of their people. If the United States wishes for the development of these nations and many others in Asia and Africa, it should use its utmost efforts to restore silver to a monetary status.

As Mr. René Léon has well said:

"China will be an independent nation and India will have the colonial status promised to it by the British Government. These two countries will hereafter be in a position to manage their own economies, their own national and fiscal monetary affairs in complete independence. They will decide upon their own international media of exchange. * * *

"India and China cannot adopt a gold standard because they cannot function under it. The humble status of countless individuals devoid of banking facilities, or without need of them, many averse to credit on religious grounds, who use the rupee, the yuan, or the tael as their medium of exchange and as their store of wealth, makes of silver their only practical currency. Unlike gold, silver can be minted into coins of small denominations adequate to the modest requirements of myriads of farmers and tradesmen who, from 1 year end to the other, seldom earn through hard labor more than $100. Nor will they willingly accept paper currency which they distrust for many reasons, not the least, if the latest, of which is the 'occupation' currency forced upon them by the invaders of their country. * * * The average Chinese * * * and Indian * * * does not aspire to the possession of gold which is beyond his reach. Silver is what they want, because silver is the gold of the masses.

"Between the China Sea and the Mediterranean there live and have their being 1,000,000,000 human beings who cannot afford the gold standard; who look upon the gold exchange standard as a system devised for their exploitation; who classify credit, as distinct from money, as the province of the wealthy few. Of these some two-fifths use the rupee as their monetary unit. From Burma through India and Arabia to the east African littoral the rupee is used by more people than is any other unit of currency on earth. And the edges of this vast region are inhabited by peoples of similar monetary habits. The Straits dollar, the kran of Persia and the Maria Theresa thaler of Abyssinia, all silver coins, are evidences of this intimate relationship.

"Possessed of the silver that India and China need, we should make it available to them as part and parcel of an international arrangement designed to facilitate world trade. For the acid test of post-war statesmanship will be the development of normal human activities and the improvement of living standards. And if we are not to revert to barter on an individual or national scale, if private enterprise is to be nurtured and the price system preserved, then we must come together and agree upon a common denominator which will serve as the anchor to which the monetary systems of the East and the West can be moored. Managed currency, nationalistic in its essence, unable to function without quotas and controls, must forever be got rid of. Post-war humanity will not allow trade once again to be adjusted to the needs of money management. It will be the other way around—money must facilitate, not hamper, trade.

"In the absence of a better system, despite the contention of some that metallic money is antiquated, we perforce shall be constrained once again to turn to gold and to silver as international media of exchange—gold for those to whom it is best suited, silver for those who cannot afford the more precious of the two metals. Nor need we fear the wholly fallacious argument of those who prate about the unworkability of a 'double standard,' for a fixed ratio will make it work."

INTERNATIONAL BIMETALLISM HAS LONG BEEN ADVOCATED BY THE UNITED STATES

The act of Congress of November 1, 1893 (sec. 311 of the U. S. Code, Annotated (ch. 8, 28 Stat. 4)), still in effect, provides:

SEC. 311. Policy of the United States as to bimetallism. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchange value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts."

The United States sent a commission to London to discuss the subject. But the British Empire was then (in the 1890's) at the very height of power, prosperity, and world influence. Its wonderful growth had followed control of the sea after Waterloo, especially because England was the first to develop the advantages of the steam engine and of modern industrial methods of manufacture. It had become the leading banking, shipping, and commercial nation of the world and all this had happened since England adopted the single gold standard in 1816. She had little interest in the production of silver. English conservatism was content to let well enough alone and saw no sufficient reason for a monetary change and so England turned a deaf ear to the United States plan.

Fifty years have now elapsed. Two World Wars have devastated the monetary situation. The old gold standard has ceased to exist. No so-called first-class nation, the United States and Russia included, is now upon a gold basis in the former sense. In our country it is a penal offense for a private citizen to own gold coins. Gold has practically disappeared from circulation as money the world over.

Now is the time for the United States to revive its demand for the adoption of the policy set forth on its statute books. Only under that policy can world confidence in money be again restored.

USUAL OBJECTION TO BIMETALLISM

What reason exists why the United States, having such a great interest in silver, should not take action to establish international bimetallism?

The usual answer is that bimetallism was tried, failed to work, and so was gradually abandoned; that bimetallism is predoomed to failure because one metal or the other will from time to time become of less value than any fixed ratio, and, whenever this happens, will drive the other out of circulation in accordance with Gresham's law that bad money always sends good money into hiding.

A review of the history of bimetallism and especially the history of gold after England went to a gold basis refutes the accuracy of the general belief in regard to bimetallism.

Bimetallism worked very satisfactorily for hundreds of years, during which at no time did the nations of the world ever agree upon the same ratio for the free coinage of both gold and silver. Ratios were approximately the same, but there were always slight differences, which did not matter so long as the world transportation system was costly and dangerous.

The failure of bimetallism under the old system can briefly be described as due to two causes: (1) The differences in ratio when transportation enabled a profit to be made through arbitrage, and (2) the failure to set and maintain a fixed price for both gold and silver.

1. The failure to establish a universal fixed ratio: Let us assume two countries, in one of which the ratio was 15 ounces of silver to 1 of gold, and in the other 15½ ounces of silver to 1 of gold. A man could take, in the country having the 15 to 1 ratio, 15 ounces of silver and exchange it for 1 ounce of gold. This gold he could take into the country having the 15½ to 1 ratio and there exchange it for 15½ ounces of silver, thus making a gain of half an ounce of silver. Pocketing his profit, he could then take his 15 ounces of silver back to the first country and repeat the process.

A man in the other country having the 15½ to 1 ratio could take 1 ounce of gold and exchange it for 15½ ounces of silver. Leaving half an ounce at home, he could take the 15 ounces to the other country and exchange it for 1 ounce of gold, which he could bring back, and repeat the process.

In both cases there would be a gain of half an ounce of silver.

The cost of transportation and risk of highway robbery for many centuries was so great that this process could not be carried on profitably except to such limited extent as to be immaterial. But in course of time the cost and risk of transportation became so much less that a money profit could be made on each transaction.

Ultimately, should such transactions go on long enough, the country having the 15-to-1 ratio would lose its gold and have silver in its stead, while the other country would lose its silver and have gold in its stead.

Obviously, this difficulty could be stopped by both countries agreeing upon the same ratio. But this was never done on a world scale, although for a long period after England went on the gold standard in 1816 the Continent of Europe generally adopted the 15½ ratio and had no trouble with arbitrage, except possibly with the United States, which was on a different ratio, but which was then a relatively small and unimportant nation, with the cost of transportation between Europe and America very high and risky.

2. The other fault in former bimetallism was the failure to set and maintain a fixed price both for gold and silver, even though the same ratio were established.

The production of silver and gold never is in exactly any one ratio for any great length of time. Either metal may increase or decrease in production as compared with the ratio between them. If there is no fixed price, the metal whose production materially increases tends to sell at a lower price in terms of the other, and Gresham's law begins to work. But if nations peg the price of each metal, this becomes impossible.

How this was proved to be necessary and was ultimately done in the case of gold is hereafter described. The same method applied to silver as well as gold, removes all the former difficulties bimetallism experienced.

While a stabilized or pegged price of each metal would automatically fix a mathematical ratio between them, the ratio would be a secondary and unimportant result. It is the fixing and maintenance at some unchanging price of each metal that is all-important.

HOW BIMETALLISM CAME TO AN END

During the Napoleonic wars England's money, as is usual in time of such a severe war, had met with difficulties. After Waterloo, as England came to consider the reestablishment of its monetary system, it so happened that her holding of gold was much in excess of her holding of silver on any ratio that up to that time had been considered.

Hence it seemed to the Cabinet of that day that it would be rather more feasible to go to gold monometallism, using their silver as subsidiary coinage, than to attempt to return to the former bimetallism. Thus, more by accident than as a result of a careful study of the subject, the act of Parliament of 1816 established gold monometallism. This did not affect Europe, which continued on a bimetallic system. As cost of transportation decreased, European nations met the obstacle of different ratios, as we have seen, by going generally on the Continent to the ratio of 15½ to 1. Bimetallism continued to prevail until after the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. This war resulted in the birth of the modern German Empire. In the peace treaty of 1871, Germany imposed upon France the payment of an unprecedented indemnity and made it payable in gold. Shortly afterward, Germany abandoned silver and dumped her silver holdings upon the other European nations. Absorption of such a large amount of silver, offered at one time in exchange for gold, was more than the Latin union could absorb and, as a consequence, all Europe abandoned bimetallism and went to gold monometallism.

The reasons for Germany's action seem to have been:

1. The purpose of weakening France further by making it more difficult for her to get the gold with which to pay the indemnity, and so postponing her day of rearmament.

2. After the Franco-Prussian War, Germany was the dominating military nation of Europe. Under the balance-of-power theory which prevailed upon that unhappy continent, it was obvious that her competition would be for some time more with England than with France. By suddenly getting an undue proportion of gold, Germany hoped to be in a better position to compete with England. Already dawning was the German ambition to become a commercial, as well as a military, rival.

The abandonment of bimetallism in Europe caused the United States to follow the same example in 1873. India, with its love of silver, stuck it out until 1893, when it, too, was forced to close its mints to the free coinage of silver, and any true bimetallic system then came to an end.

THE EXAMPLE OF GOLD

How easily all the difficulties bimetallism ever encountered could have been prevented is shown by the very different history of gold. When England went to gold monometallism in 1816, she did not take steps to maintain the price of gold always at the same level. She bought gold whenever she needed it at the then commercial rate. She rarely sold gold. The result was that the commercial price of gold varied in the open market, depending on general supply and demand. This unfavorably affected the money of England based upon gold. If the bullion value of gold became worth more than the face value of the gold sovereign, this sovereign would either fly the country or be melted down and sold for the value of the gold content.

If the price of gold went down, the effect would be the same as when any currency sells at a discount.

With gold monometallism conducted on this basis, England in effect had a shifting standard of measurement. Various efforts were made to remedy the evil, but it was not until 1844 that England finally solved the problem. Then, by act of Parliament, it became the duty of the Bank of England to maintain the price of gold at the same level, which it did by always standing ready to buy all gold that might be offered at the established price and, what was quite as important, selling gold in any amount required at the same price plus a small charge of about 3 cents per ounce for the cost of handling. That price, delivered at the Bank of England, was in United States money equivalent to the $20.67 price delivered at the mints of the United States.

Obviously, so long as the Bank of England was powerful enough to buy all the gold that might be offered and to sell all the gold that might be required at the same price, the price could not change. Other nations, including the United States, very shortly adopted the same price level.

During the nearly 90 years that followed and until the United States raised the price to the so-called $35-an-ounce level (actually $34.9125) in 1934, gold always sold at the same price. During that period the annual production of gold varied very greatly. The great gold fields of California, Australia, South Africa, the Klondike, and Canada were discovered, with consequent widely varying amounts of gold coming annually on the market for sale. There were variations in the buying power of an ounce of gold, measured in terms of commodities, but the price of an ounce of gold itself remained unchanged.

When for a time in the first World War, and again when England went off gold in 1931, the stabilizing power of England was lost, that of the United States and other nations still remained to preserve the same old price. Later, in 1934, the United States offered the so-called $35 per ounce (actually $34.9125) for gold and the power of the United States alone since then has been sufficient to keep gold at this level, just as previously the approximately $20 level had been kept stable primarily by England.

The history of gold and these two examples of maintaining its price at the same continuing level clearly indicate that nations could fix an unchanging price of silver as well as of gold. The amount involved would present no difficulty. In 1940 the world produced about 41,000,000 ounces of gold, worth at $35 per ounce $1,430,000,000. In the same year it produced about 273,000,000 ounces of silver This would have to sell at over $5 per ounce to equal the total value of the gold production of the same year. No one visualizes any such price, but even in the almost impossible event that it happened, it would not be prohibitive. If England was able to maintain the same price of gold from 1844 until the first World War, and if the United States could keep the price of gold fixed at the $35 level since 1934, is it not certain that the two together, if they agreed to buy and sell silver at the same unchanging price, would be able to maintain a constant price of silver just as they have maintained a constant price of gold? Other nations almost necessarily would soon follow.

WHAT SHOULD BE THE PRICE OF SILVER AND GOLD UNDER INTERNATIONAL BIMETALLISM?

Probably it would be wise to leave the price of gold as it now is, at the $35 level. The price of silver should be left to the careful study and determination of a body of experts, not of one nation alone but of all nations who attend the formal or informal international conference to stabilize the exchanges and influence the future money systems of the world. Matters to be taken into consideration are:

The then general price level, national debt level, and wage level; the effect on production; and, most important of all, the price necessary to supply the amount of physical metal required to satisfy the demands of the world for "hard money." Thus, ultimately, the nations of the world can best be able to adjust their currencies to international bimetallism with a supply of physical metal to answer the purpose.

As we have seen, any increase in the price of silver would necessarily mean a lower cost of production of copper, lead, zinc, and other metals with which it is associated in the mine. The consumers of those metals would thus ultimately indirectly get the benefit of any higher silver price.

A higher price of silver would give a correspondingly increased value to the over 3,000,000,000 ounces of silver held by the United States. For example, an increase of $1 an ounce would add over $3,000,000,000 to present United States Treasury silver holdings, fractions proportionately.

PSYCHOLOGICAL VALUE OF BOTH GOLD AND SILVER

Neither gold nor silver has great utility value—gold especially little. Silver has more than gold. If mankind should regard both metals as simply commodities, as it regards, for example, copper and lead—valued for the uses to which it may be put—then silver probably would sell, because of its far greater utility value, at more than gold.

But since the dawn of history, mankind has selected gold and silver as the metals best adapted for monetary purposes. It has given them a value far in excess of their utility value and which can be described as a psychological value. The price of both gold and silver is whatever is fixed by sufficient authority. If important nations agree upon the same price and take steps to maintain it, all mankind will accept that price as the universal standard.

Can this psychological value of both metals be preserved unless they are used as money which the average citizen can possess and own, at least in times of peace?

Will mankind continue to regard gold as having such value, if gold is only used for balancing international exchange, and is kept in the exclusive possession of governments, their banks of issue, or some international bank? If gold loses its psychological value from nonuse as money, what will the $23,000,000,000 worth of gold now owned by the United States be worth?

Certain it is that mankind cannot expect to have the benefits of metallic money as some protection against the vicissitudes of wars and revolution unless international bimetallism is adopted.

Congress Approves New Flag Code and Abolishes Hand Salute by Civilians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, proper respect for our flag has been an inherent characteristic of the American people since the founding of the Nation.

Old Glory is symbolic of a united nation and a free people to whom liberty is a God-given privilege as precious as life itself.

The first lesson in patriotism is a deep respect for the Stars and Stripes and the glorious ideals represented by our national banner.

Our appreciation for our flag is not diminished during peacetime, but we are prone to adopt a passive attitude in showing interest in our national emblem.

It takes the challenge of war to arouse us to a fuller appreciation of the majesty of our flag and a deeper consciousness of the protection afforded us who

are fortunate to be able to call ourselves American citizens.

Martial music and the marching of millions of our fellow citizens to far-off climes in defense of our flag serves as a mighty stimulus to our patriotism, which may have become dormant during peaceful periods.

Once aroused, we wax eloquent in reciting the history of our flag and point to its glorious traditions and to the cherished ideals of our great Republic with a zeal that bespeaks the utmost in patriotic fervor, intense love, and loyal devotion to our country. Such an awakening on the part of all of us has resulted from our entrance into the present global conflict that finds our flag being carried in majesty and splendor on over 50 battle fronts of the world.

At the present time America, as a united nation, is presenting to the world an example of the ability of a liberty-loving people to defend the ideals of their country by transforming overnight from a peaceful nation to an armed camp capable of striking a mighty blow to the forces of oppression.

Guided by the ideals represented by Old Glory, every community in this great land is rallying to the call in defense of the Nation.

Patriotic demonstrations reflect the national pride that America takes in the task before us—an early victory and an enduring peace. As a result of our national consciousness, our flag is venerated with zeal and devotion. It is the center of attraction and inspiration and confidence is received from gazing upon its bright stars on a field of red and white.

To the end that proper respect may be given to our national emblem, the Seventy-seventh Congress approved legislation now known as Public Law No. 829, Seventy-seventh Congress, which codifies and emphasizes existing rules and customs pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America.

The most important change in the customs and rules for respect of the flag is that the hand salute by civilians has been abolished.

This change was deemed necessary because of its similarity to the Nazi salute. As a result, section 5 and section 7 of Public Law 829 prescribe that when the flag is being hoisted or lowered, or when the flag is passing in a parade or in a review, all persons present should face the flag, stand at attention, and salute. Those present in military uniform should render the military salute. When not in uniform men should remove the headdress with the right hand holding it at the left shoulder, the hand being over the heart. Men without hats salute in the same manner. Aliens should stand at attention. Women should salute by placing the right hand over the heart.

When the pledge of allegiance to the flag is given all civilians stand at attention and salute by placing the right hand over the heart. However, civilians will always show full respect to the flag when the pledge is given by merely standing at attention, men removing the headdress. Persons in uniform shall render the military salute.

Thus it should be strongly emphasized that the former custom of extending the right hand with palm upward is abolished because as stated it too closely resembles the Hitlerite practice of rendering the Nazi salute.

In view of the importance of the provisions of Public Law No. 829 I am of the opinion that a great public service will be performed by the widest possible publicity to the provisions of this legislation.

For the information of the public and my colleagues in Congress, I am hopeful that an effort will be made to acquaint every American citizen with the revised rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of our flag.

Therefore I hope that everyone will find time to carefully read Public Law 829, paying particular attention to section 5 and section 7, which covers in detail the conduct of civilians when the flag is on parade, in review, or being hoisted or lowered, or when the pledge of allegiance to the flag is given. Public Law No. 829 is as follows:

[Public Law 829, 77th Congress]

House Joint Resolution 359

Joint resolution to amend Public Law No. 623, approved June 22, 1942, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America"

Resolved, etc., That Public Law No. 623, approved June 22, 1942, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America," be, and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

That the following codification of existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, established for the use of such civilians or civilian groups or organizations as may not be required to conform with regulations promulgated by one or more executive departments of the Government of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) It is the universal custom to display the flag only from sunrise to sunset on buildings and on stationary flagstaffs in the open. However, the flag may be displayed at night upon special occasions when it is desired to produce a patriotic effect.

(b) The flag should be hoisted briskly and lowered ceremoniously.

(c) The flag should not be displayed on days when the weather is inclement.

(d) The flag should be displayed on all days when the weather permits, especially on New Year's Day, January 1; Inauguration Day, January 20; Lincoln's Birthday, February 12; Washington's Birthday, February 22; Army Day, April 6; Easter Sunday (variable); Mother's Day, second Sunday in May; Memorial Day (half staff until noon), May 30; Flag Day, June 14; Independence Day, July 4; Labor Day, first Monday in September; Constitution Day, September 17; Columbus Day, October 12; Navy Day, October 27; Armistice Day, November 11; Thanksgiving Day, fourth Thursday in November; Christmas Day, December 25; such other days as may be proclaimed by the President of the United States; the birthdays of States (dates of admission); and on State holidays.

(e) The flag should be displayed daily, weather permitting, on or near the main administration building of every public institution.

(f) The flag should be displayed in or near every polling place on election days.

(g) The flag should be displayed during school days in or near every schoolhouse.

SEC. 3. That the flag, when carried in a procession with another flag or flags, should be either on the marching right; that is, the flag's own right, or, if there is a line of other flags, in front of the center of that line.

(a) The flag should not be displayed on a float in a parade except from a staff, or as provided in subsection (1).

(b) The flag should not be draped over the hood, top, sides, or back of a vehicle or of a railroad train or a boat. When the flag is displayed on a motorcar, the staff shall be fixed firmly to the chassis or clamped to the radiator cap.

(c) No other flag or pennant should be placed above or, if on the same level, to the right of the flag of the United States of America, except during church services conducted by naval chaplains at sea, when the church pennant may be flown above the flag during church services for the personnel of the Navy.

(d) The flag of the United States of America, when it is displayed with another flag against a wall from crossed staffs, should be on the right, the flag's own right, and its staff should be in front of the staff of the other flag.

(e) The flag of the United States of America should be at the center and at the highest point of the group when a number of flags of States or localities or pennants of societies are grouped and displayed from staffs.

(f) When flags of States, cities, or localities, or pennants of societies are flown on the same halyard with the flag of the United States, the latter should always be at the peak. When the flags are flown from adjacent staffs, the flag of the United States should be hoisted first and lowered last. No such flag or pennant may be placed above the flag of the United States or to the right of the flag of the United States.

(g) When flags of two or more nations are displayed, they are to be flown from separate staffs of the same height. The flags should be of approximately equal size. International usage forbids the display of the flag of one nation above that of another nation in time of peace.

(h) When the flag of the United States is displayed from a staff projecting horizontally or at an angle from the window sill, balcony, or front of a building, the union of the flag should be placed at the peak of the staff unless the flag is at half staff. When the flag is suspended over a sidewalk from a rope extending from a house to a pole at the edge of the sidewalk, the flag should be hoisted out, union first, from the building.

(i) When the flag is displayed otherwise than by being flown from a staff, it should be displayed flat, whether indoors or out, or so suspended that its folds fall as free as though the flag were staffed.

(j) When the flag is displayed over the middle of the street, it should be suspended vertically with the union to the north in an east and west street or to the east in a north and south street.

(k) When used on a speaker's platform, the flag, if displayed flat, should be displayed above and behind the speaker. When displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium, if it is displayed in the chancel of a church, or on the speaker's platform in a public auditorium, the flag should occupy the position of honor and be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's right as he faces the congregation or audience. Any other flag so displayed in the chancel or on the platform should be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's left as he faces the congregation or audience. But when the flag is displayed from a staff in the church or pub-

lic auditorium elsewhere than in the chancel or on the platform it shall be placed in the position of honor at the right of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform. Any other flag so displayed should be placed on the left of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform.

(l) The flag should form a distinctive feature of the ceremony of unveiling a statue or monument, but it should never be used as the covering for the statue or monument.

(m) The flag, when flown at half staff, should be first hoisted to the peak for an instant and then lowered to the half-staff position. The flag should be again raised to the peak before it is lowered for the day. By "half staff" is meant lowering the flag to one-half the distance between the top and bottom of the staff. Crepe streamers may be affixed to spear heads or flagstaffs in a parade only by order of the President of the United States.

(n) When the flag is used to cover a casket, it should be so placed that the union is at the head and over the left shoulder. The flag should not be lowered into the grave or allowed to touch the ground.

SEC. 4. That no disrespect should be shown to the flag of the United States of America; the flag should not be dipped to any person or thing. Regimental colors, State flags, and organization or institutional flags are to be dipped as a mark of honor.

(a) The flag should never be displayed with the union down save as a signal of dire distress.

(b) The flag should never touch anything beneath it, such as the ground, the floor, water, or merchandise.

(c) The flag should never be carried flat or horizontally, but always aloft and free.

(d) The flag should never be used as drapery of any sort whatsoever, never festooned, drawn back, nor up, in folds, but always allowed to fall free. Bunting of blue, white, and red, always arranged with the blue above, the white in the middle, and the red below, should be used for covering a speaker's desk, draping the front of a platform, and for decoration in general.

(e) The flag should never be fastened, displayed, used, or stored in such a manner as will permit it to be easily torn, soiled, or damaged in any way.

(f) The flag should never be used as a covering for a ceiling.

(g) The flag should never have placed upon it, nor on any part of it, nor attached to it any mark, insignia, letter, word, figure, design, picture, or drawing of any nature.

(h) The flag should never be used as a receptacle for receiving, holding, carrying, or delivering anything.

(i) The flag should never be used for advertising purposes in any manner whatsoever. It should not be embroidered on such articles as cushions or handkerchiefs and the like, printed or otherwise impressed on paper napkins or boxes or anything that is designed for temporary use and discard; or used as any portion of a costume or athletic uniform. Advertising signs should not be fastened to a staff or halyard from which the flag is flown.

(j) The flag, when it is in such condition that it is no longer a fitting emblem for display, should be destroyed in a dignified way, preferably by burning.

SEC. 5. That during the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag or when the flag is passing in a parade or in a review, all persons present should face the flag, stand at attention, and salute. Those present in uniform should render the military salute. When not in uniform, men should remove the headdress with the right hand holding it at the left shoulder, the hand being over the heart. Men without hats should salute in the same manner. Aliens should stand at attention. Women should salute by placing the right hand over the heart. The salute to the flag in the moving column should be rendered at the moment the flag passes.

SEC. 6. That when the national anthem is played and the flag is not displayed, all present should stand and face toward the music. Those in uniform should salute at the first note of the anthem, retaining this position until the last note. All others should stand at attention, men removing the headdress. When the flag is displayed, all present should face the flag and salute.

SEC. 7. That the pledge of allegiance to the flag, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," be rendered by standing with the right hand over the heart. However, civilians will always show full respect to the flag when the pledge is given by merely standing at attention, men removing the headdress. Persons in uniform shall render the military salute.

SEC. 8. Any rule or custom pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America, set forth herein, may be altered, modified, or repealed, or additional rules with respect thereto may be prescribed, by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, whenever he deems it to be appropriate or desirable; and any such alteration or additional rule shall be set forth in a proclamation.

Approved, December 22, 1942.

The United Nations and the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The United Nations and the Philippines," delivered by Hon. Sergio Osmeña, vice president of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, at the forty-seventh annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, in Philadelphia, April 10, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE PHILIPPINES

The United Nations are engaged in a war for survival. They are fighting the diabolical attempts of the exponents of force to subject the whole world to perpetual slavery by depriving mankind of all rights and liberties within the four walls of the so-called New Order. A common danger has brought them together, but more lofty aims have also impelled them in their struggle.

The United Nations are fighting to establish a new world of freedom and justice, of equality and progress, not for a privileged nation or group of nations, but for all peoples. They are fighting, in the words of President Roosevelt, "with the objective of smashing the militarism imposed by warlords upon their enslaved peoples—the objective of liberating the subjugated nations—the objective of establishing and securing freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom from fear everywhere in the world." This is a people's war.

The Atlantic Charter stands as the proclaimed creed of all the United Nations. This charter was framed on the stormy seas of the Atlantic, but it is a world charter. It cannot be anything less. Thirty-one nations have already subscribed to its declaration of principles, and on this declaration are pinned mankind's hopes for a better world.

My country, the Philippines, is one of the United Nations. Long before the outbreak of this war, long before the promulgation of the Atlantic Charter, the Philippines had already pledged herself to follow the cause of democracy and peace. Our formal adherence to the Declaration of the United Nations took place on June 14, 1942, when President Manuel L. Quezon, in the name of the Philippines, affixed his signature to that document.

The signing of the declaration by the Philippine Commonwealth Government has great historic significance. It did not alter or impair, in any sense, the existing constitutional relationship between the United States and the Philippines. But, by this single act, the Philippines gained an international personality. Under the sponsorship of the United States and with the acquiescence of the other powers, she signed, for the first time in her history a highly political international instrument, in her own name and as an equal.

What is the Philippines to the United Nations? What does she hold for them, now and in the future? What contribution can she make toward accomplishing the difficult tasks that lie ahead?

Broadly stated, the two prime objectives of the United Nations are to win this war and to win the peace that is to follow. This war must be won before peace can come, and the peace must be won, too, in order to prevent a recurrence of war. Otherwise the vicious cycle of war and peace will continue.

The Philippines, small nation that she is, has already made substantial contributions toward attaining the first objective. During the early phase of the war in the Pacific, when every United Nations citadel there was crumbling with appalling rapidity under Japan's hammer blows, the Philippines alone withstood the enemy's relentless and devastating assaults. Besieged, isolated, and outnumbered, Filipino and American soldiers fought and died together on Bataan and Corregidor. With the support of the entire Filipino people, they waged the battle of the Philippines for 4 long months.

From the military point of view, this firm stand in the Philippines was valuable to the United Nations. Bataan and Corregidor changed the whole course of the war in the Pacific. Our prolonged resistance forced Japan to divert large contingents from other war fronts, helped to delay the fall of the East Indies, Malaya, Singapore, and Burma, and thwarted the Japanese program for an early invasion of Australia and New Zealand. We afforded the United States valuable time to repair the destruction wrought by Japan's insidious attack on Pearl Harbor. Thus, while we engaged more and more of the Mikado's troops as the battle of the Philippines heightened in fury, our allies in the Pacific were enabled to bolster their defenses and to prepare to deal counterblows against the common enemy. Thousands of brave Filipino and American soldiers perished in the holocaust, but not in vain.

Today, a full year after Bataan's fall, the Filipino spirit of resistance persists. Here in continental United States and Hawaii thousands of Filipinos, young and old, have rallied to the war effort. There are already two regiments of Filipino Infantry completing their training in California, while other Filipinos are serving in various units of the United States Army, in the Navy, in the Coast

Guard, and in the merchant marine. Many of them have seen action and the roll of Filipino dead in various fronts is lengthening. Many Filipinos are subscribing to War bonds, and working in the war plants, on the farms and plantations, and in the Government service.

Viewed from the political angle, our stand in the Philippines was also significant. By our fighting on the side of the United Nations in this war, America's policy of altruism and democracy in the Philippines was vindicated. While the defense of the Philippines against foreign aggression is a legal responsibility of the United States as the sovereign power, we fought, nevertheless, willingly and without reserve. The entire people rose in resistance against the invader, bearing the brunt of the bloody defense. We kept our pledge to stand by America "in life and in death." By fighting, we have also given the subject peoples of the world an example of performance of the inescapable duty to freedom and independence. Any nation that believes itself capable and deserving of freedom must defend itself against aggression, no matter how much weaker or less prepared it may be than the aggressor. Its duty, in any case, is to meet the attack and show its readiness to assume the responsibilities which independence entails.

Having displayed a high sense of responsibility in war as well as in peace, we have advanced also a strong argument in favor of the right of dependent peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live—as acknowledged by the Atlantic Charter. We have proved that the peoples of Asia have as much aptitude for democracy and freedom as the peoples of other parts of the world. Indeed, any dependent people, if given the same opportunity for training and development that was afforded the Filipino people, will be able to develop the habits of discipline and self-control which are essential to the maintenance of an orderly and stable government.

In the less immediate but equally vital task of saving the peace, the Philippines stands ready to cooperate with the United Nations, however humble her role may be. Having been a victim herself of unjustified aggression, she naturally is interested in any sound plan of world-wide collective security. Logically, her immediate concern will be in her own neighborhood, the Far East.

The peculiar geographical and political characteristics of that part of the globe, with its many thickly populated states and with peoples of diverse languages, religions, customs, and ideologies, have made it a powder keg almost as explosive as Europe. The world aggressors first began to march against freedom when Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931. It was the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and the Philippines that brought the United States into the fight.

We know now that there can be no localized war, that aggression in one place results in war elsewhere. The Far East is by no means an exception to this new law governing a shrunken world.

We have learned from past experience that any organization that proposes to preserve peace must have force behind it. If it lacks the power and facilities to carry out its decisions, it will prove impotent against war-minded nations and will finally collapse. This was the case with the League of Nations.

Force, to maintain law and order, is vital in a world society, as it is in any community. Whatever form this force may assume in the future, whether it be international or otherwise, it must be sufficient to deal with the menace wherever it arises. To this force, the Philippines is ready to make her contribution in manpower, materials, and facilities. If the Philippines, strategically located at the intersection of the world's airways and sea lanes, is backed by the power of the United States with whom she is affiliated by many years of association and by common democratic principles, and becomes a part of whatever international force is established by the United Nations after the war, she can serve as the bastion of law and order in the Far East.

But peace—truly lasting peace—cannot be effectively maintained through force of arms alone, no matter how strong and concerted it may be. In fact, no system based purely on force has ever managed to endure, especially when it has to meet the rising sentiment of nationalism. Such a system is bound to engender ill-will and hatred. It is also bound to weaken as soon as dissension and bickering arise among those who impose it; and when this happens, the whole artificial structure collapses.

Peace, if it is to be lasting, can only be a people's peace, and force is not enough to achieve it. Within the domains of a people's peace, force must be supplemented by the maintenance of justice, and the cultivation of understanding, good will, and cooperation among peoples. But, before we can ever hope to achieve harmony and cooperation, we must first dissipate the distrust of subject peoples, for it is principally to them that the United Nations address the democratic principles of the Atlantic Charter. This war, in the military sense, may or may not be won without their active collaboration, but an enduring peace cannot be established without their whole-hearted support.

How shall we win the cooperation and goodwill of dependent peoples? An important step toward gaining this cooperation and good will would be the unequivocal application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter to every one of them, without exception. The next step would be to turn these principles into a living reality so that they might be felt by those who doubt their value and efficacy. The dependent peoples must be made to feel that this is not a war to preserve the status quo, which, indeed, cannot be done. They must be made to realize that they have something to gain by a United Nations' victory after the war, that such victory will result in their liberation, and not in a mere change of masters or in a retention of the old one.

The recognition of the right to independence of all dependent peoples who feel themselves capable of enjoying it is, however, only a preliminary step toward lasting peace. It will go a long way, but surely, it will not go all the way. Even if all the nations and peoples of the world were independent and free, wars would still break out should distrust, arrogance, and selfishness continue to plague mankind. We must, therefore, educate ourselves and dispel these social maladies, nurturing a more democratic feeling toward other peoples. The myth of racial superiority and the policy of exploitation must be definitely abandoned.

The gap between peoples of different races can be bridged with understanding if the right policy is chosen. This was demonstrated by the happy outcome of the joint Filipino-American adventure. By first promulgating an altruistic policy—the Philippines for the Filipinos—and then following it to the letter and spirit, America succeeded in winning over the skeptical and antagonistic Filipinos and in changing their policy of opposition to that of cooperation. As a result of this cooperation, great progress was achieved by our country. The universalization of education, the improvement of health and sanitation, the building up of an independent judiciary and of a sound civil-service system, the construction of roads, bridges, and other important public works, the stabilization of the national economy, the development of self-government, and the preparation for ultimate independence in 1946—all these, and more, were accomplished in the short period of 40 years. Here, indeed, was national progress and self-development, unparalleled in the history of interracial relationship. When war overtook us in 1941 and our soldiers fought alongside their American comrades, we did nothing more than continue our policy of complete cooperation with the United States, a policy already firmly established many years ago.

In the new world of freedom and security, of peace and understanding among peoples of different races, which the United Nations hope to build, the Philippines is in a unique position to make a valuable contribution. History has made us a people that is equally at home in the traditions and civilizations of both the East and the West. This is so because, while geographically we are located in the Far East, absorbing in the early years the culture of Asia, we have been also the recipient of western influences in the course of our long association with Spain and the United States. It may be said of us, with some degree of accuracy, that we are the most occidental of Orientals, and the most oriental of Occidentals.

Midway between Orient and Occident, with Christian traditions dating as far back as the sixteenth century, with a background of struggles and sufferings, and with a record of having earned her liberation through the orderly processes of self-government, the Philippines feels that she can—and must—assist the United Nations in their determined effort to assure the fundamental human rights to all the peoples of the earth. For, in this life-and-death struggle between a slave world and a free world, the Philippines stands as a vivid example of what the nations of the West can do for all dependent peoples everywhere; and to these dependent peoples, who hunger for justice, freedom, and happiness, the Philippines symbolizes the goal that can be attained not by distrust, bloodshed, and violence, but by friendship, understanding, and collaboration.

The Atlantic Charter is no new thing. Its democratic principles, with the exception, perhaps, of that relating to economic security, were all embodied in the original American pledge of liberty and self-government to the Filipino people. It is in reality a restatement of the principles enunciated in the American Declaration of Independence of 1776, drafted right here in this historic city of Philadelphia and proclaimed to the whole world.

Just as America cannot, in the immortal words of Lincoln, "survive half slave and half free," neither can this world of ours remain half slave and half free. The Atlantic Charter offers a promise of a happy world to all peoples. It is our political creed today, in this dire moment when totalitarianism threatens to destroy civilization. Let it remain our creed tomorrow when peace comes, and let us live up to it forever.

Jefferson and Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 13, at the Hotel Alms, in the city of Cincinnati, I delivered an address entitled "Jefferson and Education," which was broadcast from station WKRC. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today on the two hundredth anniversary of one of America's immortal and time-honored citizens, we pause for a reflective moment to pay homage to the name, the deeds, and the instruments of Thomas Jefferson—writer of the Declaration of Independence and third President of the United States of America. Born into the rustic life of the Old South and schooled in the traditions of aristocracy, Thomas Jefferson became in a few short years the firebrand of freedom and the apostle of individual rights. It was he who struck the first blow against slavery and compulsion. It was he whose glowing gift for words inscribed a number of immortal documents which still live in the hearts and minds of every American citizen.

From his gifted pen came the Declaration of Independence, which made clear for all time to come that the American people would labor always in the cause of sound government, freedom, right, and justice. From the pen of Jefferson came commentaries on economics, politics, and education, which are as valid today as they were the day he touched his pen to the parchment. And thus this man who knew slavery, who knew aristocracy, and class distinction—this man, who was himself born into the ruling caste, became during his lifetime the fountainhead of freedom, the apostle of the common man.

And as Thomas Jefferson defended freedom and justice, so too did he assail plutocracy, compulsion, and ignorance. Thomas Jefferson was one of the early advocates and stanch leaders who labored in the cause of universal education; and it was he who made tremendous contributions toward the establishment of the free system of public education, which has contributed, and is now contributing, so effectively to the continued growth and advancement of our Nation.

There is no gainsaying the fact that the forces of free and unrestricted education have rendered a most progressive and worthwhile contribution to the growth and development of civilized communities and of civilized man. The thirst for knowledge and advancement, so pronounced in America, have made of us the beacon light of the world. And all other peoples and all other lands look to us as the zenith of material and scientific attainment.

But in spite of all the inspiring and progressive contributions which education has extended to the American way of life, there has recently come to light a far-reaching and a tragic shortcoming in our educational systems. I speak now of a report which recently appeared in full detail in the New York Times, and which has been given considerable publicity by newspapers and magazines throughout the land. This report, concerned with the startling lack of knowledge in American history on the part of high-school seniors and college freshmen in schools throughout the Nation, has been a matter of considerable concern, not only to the Congress of the United States and a number of our outstanding educational leaders, but to the rank and file of our citizens as well.

The statistics revealed by this survey show, among other things, that:

1. Only 6 percent of the students questioned could name the Thirteen Original States.

2. That only 22 percent could identify Abraham Lincoln, and only 16 percent could identify Thomas Jefferson, whose memory the Nation is honoring today.

3. Only 15 percent of these students knew that William McKinley was our President during the Spanish-American War; and only 25 percent knew that James Garfield fell before an assassin's bullet.

Now, I do not want to belabor you with a long and trying tale of statistics, but I commend this report to you as necessary reading. It reveals a stunning picture. This report is published in its entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, beginning on page 2946, for Tuesday, April 6, 1943. Go to your library and read it. You will be amazed at what it contains.

Now, many of you may say that the conditions revealed in this report are not significant; and that a knowledge of history is not so important after all. With those who assume this attitude, I must contend bitterly, for a knowledge of American history is a necessary and vital adjunct to the continued growth and progress of our Nation and to the strengthening and preservation of our fundamental way of life.

It is, indeed, a shocking and lamentable thing when those who live under our Constitution, and participate in, and reap the benefits of, all our democratic functions, do not know from whence this Government grew and cannot identify many of the outstanding figures in our national life. Were Thomas Jefferson among us on this two hundredth anniversary of his birth, he would, indeed, be moved to sadness and distress at the pitiful conditions which this report reveals. For Thomas Jefferson, probably better than any other man, knew the true significance and import of education and historical knowledge. In a letter addressed to his friend, George Wythe, many years ago, he said the people themselves "are the only safe depositories of the Government; and, to render them safe, their minds must be improved. No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness." And, on the importance of the teaching of history, Jefferson further said: "History, by apprising people of the past, will enable them to judge the future. It will avail them of the experiences of other times and other nations. It will qualify them as judges of the actions and designs of men. It will enable the people to know ambition under every disguise it may assume; and, knowing it, to defeat its purpose."

What clearer, more trenchant statement on the absolute necessity and value of historical learning could be asked for than this? Those words of Jefferson are just as valid, as compelling, and as purposeful today as they were a hundred and fifty years ago.

But we need not go back a hundred and fifty years to verify the validity of this statement, for there have taken place in the modern world of recent years certain trends and certain events which might never have come to pass had the peoples they affected been familiar with, and acted in accordance with, the lessons which even a reasonable knowledge of history would have given them.

Would the people of Germany have forsworn the rights and liberties which the Weimar Republic accorded them? Would they have submitted themselves to the dictatorial rule of one misguided man? Would they have plunged themselves into the cruel and bottomless pits of black slavery and the wanton, wasteful war in which they now wallow had they borne in mind and acted in accordance with the vivid and valid lessons of history?

Had the people of Italy followed the dictates of their past history, would they ever have entrusted their destiny to that pitiful figure, Mussolini—that sawdust Caesar whose egomania and stupidity have led them down that long road to oblivion and decay?

And the people of Japan—had they acted in accordance with historical principles and trends, would they now be marching into the flaming inferno of a world war, which will see their homeland beaten into ashes and to dust?

No. These are the misguided peoples of history. They have failed to heed its valid teachings and, hence they like countless other nations before them, shall go down into oblivion and decay—a sustaining commentary on the enduring precepts of history.

Now, in the light of what has occurred in Germany, Italy, and Japan, what course is America to follow with respect to history, its blessings, and admonishments? Shall our people, too, fail of their own salvation and suffer the abandonment of their freedom and their rights? Is America, itself, already going down that long and tortuous road which leads to slavery and despair? Surely the trends reflected in this recent report show beyond contradiction that the American Nation is learning something less than the maximum lessons which history has to teach. Surely this report shows that there is grave need in America today to return to a more detailed review of and a more careful emphasis on the teachings of our own glorious history.

And so it is that I call upon the educational systems of America to return to the principles of Thomas Jefferson and to bring back the luster of America's inspiring growth and to regenerate the stature which its many outstanding men should, and must, assume in the history of America and the history of the world—for it is my belief that the preservation and continued growth of America shall always rest upon the firm determination, the high resolve, and the proper education of all the American people.

And such education shall not be complete until the principles and the men who guided the destinies of America are properly taught in our educational institutions and spread throughout the length and breadth of the land, so that every generation—no matter how far removed—shall come to appreciate, to revere, to sustain, and to strengthen, the principles which built America—the principles which have kept us, and shall keep us, free from the errors and blunders—yes, the appalling tragedies—which have fallen to those miserable people in other lands, who once knew the blessings of freedom, but gave them up for some ill-fated scheme which led them into slavery and decay.

So, I say to you, let us have a rebirth in the teaching of American history and Americanism. And with this rebirth of history and its teaching, there shall come to America a regeneration of the Jeffersonian principles of government and democracy. An informed and aroused public opinion shall strike a resounding blow against such threatening trends as the overcentralization of authority, the grand schemes of regimentation, and the vile growth of bureaucracy which have attended our governmental developments in recent years.

And this is as it should be, for there is grave need in America today to return to the teachings of Thomas Jefferson. There is grave need in America today to free our way of life from the galling restrictions of numerous and powerful bureaucratic agencies. There is tremendous need today to return countless functions of Government to the several States which comprise the American Union. There is grave need today to reaffirm and strengthen that inviolable reservoir of rights, duties, and responsibilities which every citizen in our land is guaranteed under the Constitution. And there is dire need in America today to sustain the fountains of our freedom and to strengthen the fibers of our way of life.

These are the principles to which we must return if democracy, free enterprise, and individual rights are to be preserved in America. These are the principles to which we must return if America is to go forward in freedom and in majesty—to guide and inspire the world. For these are the enduring teachings of Thomas Jefferson, these are the unerring precepts of history—precepts and teachings which will serve us well—down through all those trying and eventful generations which lie ahead.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a talk I delivered yesterday noon before the Kiwanis Club of Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, I consider myself extremely fortunate to be able to address the Kiwanis Club of Washington, D. C.

It is always stimulating and inspiring to meet with service organizations. Some of my happiest memories are bound up with the activities of Kiwanis in the Wisconsin-Upper Michigan district when I was governor of that district.

I suppose that one of the reasons why it is always such a challenge to address service organizations is the fact that they are more concerned with serving than being served—more concerned with giving than receiving—more concerned with doing things for others than to have others do for them.

A service organization located in Washington has an even greater responsibility and an even greater challenge than most service clubs.

We are located in the Nation's Capital. We are privileged to stand at the very vortex of world events. Momentous decisions which may affect the destiny of the world are made here in Washington.

Groups such as yours make a very real contribution to our national thinking and moreover you make a very real demonstration of the kind of service—the kind of leadership—and the kind of ideals for which we fight today.

Organizations such as this could not perform their functions under a totalitarian system.

Dictators do not tolerate the voluntary and unselfish contributions of any group, nor do they tolerate the ideals which motivate groups such as this.

Service groups are a very real part of our traditional freedoms and they are, moreover, a very worth-while working expression of these freedoms.

Today I should like to discuss briefly one of the great freedoms. Without this particular freedom, service clubs would find it very difficult to make their contribution.

I am referring now to freedom of speech and freedom of press.

Two hundred and thirty-nine years ago the first issue of the first regularly issued American newspaper was published. That was 39 years before the birth of Thomas Jefferson, which we observed earlier this week.

You will recall that in the early colonial days of New England, there were a great many broadsides published to correct false reports. Some of these broadsides were very similar to what we know as newspapers today. They were concerned with some of the domestic news of the Colonies and they were printed to sell as news sheets. However, they had no regular publication dates and consequently they cannot be regarded as real newspapers.

One of the very earliest of these broadsides was known as The Present State of New English Affairs, which was published in 1689. It was published and printed by a man named Samuel Green.

There must have been a great many news handbills circulated at that time, because by 1689 the Massachusetts authorities adopted a resolution which read in part:

"Whereas many papers have been lately printed and dispersed, tending to the disturbance of the peace * * *."

Then the resolution went on to provide that any persons guilty of printing or even concealing "such like papers" shall be "accounted enemies" of the government and "be proceeded against as such with the uttermost severity."

I mention this because today we are inclined to feel that we have always had freedom of speech and freedom of the press in this land.

As a matter of fact, freedom of speech and freedom of the press came only after a hard battle; and there is still today a need for vigilance against any threats to that freedom.

On September 25, 1690, a man named Benjamin Harris brought out in Boston a publication called Publick Occurrences. The publication did not have the sanction of the authorities and it was suppressed by the Governor and the council. It is extremely significant that even in this land in 1690 a newspaper was suppressed.

In the same resolution which suppressed this publication there was a provision forbidding anyone in the future to set forth anything in print without a license. That was a very drastic action, and it was more than a decade and a half before there was another attempt to give Boston a newspaper.

Of course, there were other sources of news. The New England clergy often related items of news. The bellman, making his rounds, sometimes called out matters of public interest.

Then, of course, there were many so-called newsletters. Probably the outstanding one in American history was written by John Campbell, the postmaster at Boston. His letters were written by hand, but finally the demand became so great that he was forced to use a printing press. The first printed newsletter appeared on Monday, April 24, 1704, and was called The Boston Newsletter.

Fellow Americans, in other lands we have seen the erosion on a free and untrammeled expression of public opinion. We have seen how the German authorities, the Italian authorities, and the Japanese authorities control all forms of social communication.

Goebbels in Germany has said that German newspapers are "sharp instruments of policy, ready to be played on like a piano."

The first freedoms to be lost by any people who are controlled by dictators were the freedoms of expression and press.

Service groups such as this one, particularly here in the Nation's Capital, where so much of our national thinking is expressed, are rightly concerned with the constructive achievements of the press in advancing every phase of our war effort.

Service clubs rightly have a special stake in the perpetuation of a free and untrammeled press.

Today, when the great freedoms are dying in other lands, the continued existence of freedom in this country is a great challenge to use that freedom for constructive purposes. Beyond the reportorial obligation of the newspaper, every American newspaper today is a leader of public opinion. In winnowing and sifting the news of the day, it lives up to its obligation to present only the truth. I believe that the greatest safeguard against dictatorial government is a conscientious, intelligent, constructive, unshackled, free press.

Fellow Americans, in these trying days, we need constructive leadership from the press and we need constructive leadership from groups such as these.

We know that the twin threat of censorship and propaganda led France down the long road from which there was no turning to ultimate disaster.

I do not believe that these things will happen here. They will not happen here because an enlightened people and a vigilant Congress will never permit them to happen. They will not happen here because no man and no party would be so blind as to eliminate this great safeguard for the perpetuation of freedom.

In other lands we have seen the first gray afternoon haze of government curtailment and censorship darken into the lengthening twilight shadows of an inflexible control and eventually into the thick black night of fettered oblivion.

That must never happen in this land and it never will as long as socially minded, civic-minded, service organizations such as this great club voluntarily give of themselves and their time to worth while projects which would be impossible in any land, except one where all of the freedoms are maintained.

Fifty-second Anniversary of Founding of the Pan American Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, Wednesday, April 14, 1943, marked the fifty-second anniversary of the Pan American Union—one of the most effective international organizations the world has ever seen. On the occasion of this anniversary, I addressed a distinguished gathering of Pennsylvania citizens at a Pan-American Day dinner held under the auspices of the Pan-American Day Cooperative Foundation of Pittsburgh, Pa. The people in attendance manifested a great interest in the continued development of the Pan American Union and in the continued cooperation and unity which have prevailed in pan-American relationships over the years.

While serving as Secretary of Labor, I was privileged to travel throughout Latin America, visiting its important cities, its industries, and its institutions of learning; and I was tremendously impressed at the progressive programs which were in evidence throughout that area. I also consulted with various governmental officials on the problems of immigration, labor conditions, and various other matters bearing upon our mutual relationships. Throughout my trip there I was very greatly impressed by the cooperative and progressive attitudes which were manifest in all fields and on all hands.

The Pan American Union has enjoyed a continued and strengthening growth under the able leadership of its Director General, Dr. L. S. Rowe. It is to be sincerely hoped that this Union will continue to go forward in helping to solve the mutual and related problems of its member nations.

Mr. President, as an indication of the great accomplishments that have been

made by this Union, as an indication of the common bonds which have bound us together in this very successful international enterprise, and as an indication of the tremendous effect which such a successful international organization will have upon the settlement of the post-war problems of the world, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of the address which I delivered before the Pan-American Cooperative Foundation in Pittsburgh, Pa., on April 14, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Even though the entire world is today locked in a bitter and irreconcilable conflict, it is indeed a fitting and proper thing that we should pause for a moment in the prosecution of our great tasks to honor this day—the fifty-second anniversary of the founding of the Pan American Union—a union which has endured for more than half a century, a beacon light to a stricken and perplexed world, which has sought, and still seeks, the means and the media with which to maintain peace and good will among the nations of the universe. For this Pan-American Day lays clear to all the world the fact that men and nations of all races, of all creeds, of all economies can live together in harmony and in peace—and, what is more, that they can go forward together in prosperity and enlightenment.

Even though the nations in the American Hemisphere are diverse in language and culture, though they represent various degrees of scientific attainment and that which modern man has termed material development, all these nations enjoy a common heritage—a heritage of freedom, of right, of peace, and of justice. A heritage that has served us well down through the years—a heritage that shall endure, invulnerable and strong, through all the ages which lie ahead.

This heritage came to the Americas, not through any benign gift, not through the extension of helping hands, not through sympathetic paternalism! This freedom was carved out on the angry fields of battle. It was purchased at the price of great sacrifice and many lives. Its deed is written in the blood that was let in an unrelenting struggle against oppression and domination.

As the United States rose up in tenacious and unconquerable rebellion to cast off the yoke of monarchy and short-sighted commercialism, so too did the nations of Latin America rise up to cast off the repressive yoke of European domination, and to mark out for themselves a course of freedom, self-determination, and self-government. The wisdom of these revolutions has been substantiated a thousandfold; for, in no other place in all the far reaches of the world has mankind dwelt in such enduring peace and in such strident and remarkable progress. Nowhere in all the world have people enjoyed the dignities of humanity that they have known throughout all the years in the pan-American republics.

Freedom thus born of great sacrifice and sustained through great wisdom, shall not be spent in the aimless pursuits of self-aggrandizement. Freedom thus obtained shall grow stronger and more powerful through the years, until its bastions are impenetrable and its citadels everlasting.

The common possession of a revolutionary beginning is not the only basis of mutual growth which the nations of the Americas enjoy, for their entire history has been marked with the rise of great men. As the United States was endowed with the wisdom and ability of its Washington, its Jefferson, and its Lincoln, so have the Latin-American republics been blessed with the timely appearance of such men as Bolivar, Juarez, Hidalgo, and many others, too numerous to be mentioned here. It is the spirit of these men, the ideals which they fostered, and the legacy which they gave to the world, which has served a great purpose in welding the nations of the American Hemisphere together in an unshakable solidarity.

It is small wonder then that nations born of the same ferment and sacrifice, and guided by the same type of inspiring and righteous leaders, should go forward together in peace, cooperation, and majesty, down through all the years that shall mark the history of mankind and his progress. The continued existence of Pan America owes itself in no small part to the promulgation and enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine; and, while there have been temporary intrigues, military occupations, and various attempts at imperialism in this Hemisphere, the constant resurgence of the Monroe Doctrine has rendered these attempts futile, and it has restored the growth, development, and destiny of the American Nations to the peoples who inhabit its lands and the peoples who perform its labors.

And, though for a time this Doctrine itself was threatened by a serious misapprehension and misunderstanding of the great "Colossus of the North," this difficulty too has been overcome—not by force of arms, not by blockade, not by aggression—but by mutual and conciliatory exchange of ideas and desires, and by a peaceful consummation of the purposes to be achieved. Today, the United States of America is proud to be an equal among equals in this great confederation of nations, which has grown up and thrived in the Western Hemisphere.

And, while it is the United States that has received great acclaim and great fame as one of the outstanding powers in the world today, because of its tremendous attainments in the field of economic enterprise, in the field of mass production, and—sorrowfully enough—in the field of military might, it must, nevertheless, be realized that the nations of South and Central America possess within themselves the resources and the potentialities which shall inevitably make of them great and powerful and productive nations.

The Nation of Brazil, alone, is larger in area than the continental United States, and its resources extend from the rubber of the Tropics to the minerals of its snow-crested mountains. Navigable rivers and natural harbors have made Brazil a nation of commercial importance; and its 40,000,000 citizens represent a reservoir of manpower which possesses within itself the possibilities of unlimited production.

And the Argentine—great rolling state with high mountains, fertile plains, and abundant natural resources—shall become in the space of a few short years one of the principal powers in the world's economy.

And the same can be said on a comparative scale for every other nation in the Western Hemisphere—from the Valley of the Rio Grande to the tip of Punta Arenas. For in all this vast region there lie fabulous resources yet untapped and undeveloped. Prodigious projects of water power development and irrigation shall be carried out, which will add untold wealth, stature, and advancement to these nations. And their abiding faith in freedom and individual enterprise shall bring these benefits home at an accelerated rate, and an unbounded interest, which shall be reflected not only in their material growth but in the growth of institutions of learning, of stalwart citizenship and continued and never-ending moral advancement.

In the present crisis, which has engulfed and shaken the world, the solidarity of the pan-American nations looms large in the reckonings of history and of time. For, despite the concerted efforts of all manner of foreign organizations, foreign propaganda, appeals to race, appeals to prejudice, and appeals to self-aggrandizement and individual gain, the nations of the Americas have stood together, resolute and unshakable in their allegiance to one another. In all the far reaches of this Union, there is not now one citadel of protection, nor one square mile of sanctuary from which the enemy may burrow into our hearts.

And in the great clash of arms, which now echoes and reechoes across the world, a world in which American freedom and American development hang in the balance, we find all the resources, all the ingenuity, all the manpower, and all the productivity of pan-America dedicated to the complete and inexorable destruction of our enemies. The great Republics of Mexico, Brazil, Bolivia, and many others, have joined with the United States in a proclamation of war against the forces of dictatorship, tyranny, and repression. Other nations have severed all diplomatic and commercial relations with the Axis. In this display of solidarity, a great and resounding mortal blow has been struck against this triumvirate of aggression—for there is no more powerful weapon than this: That the self-declared masters of Europe, of Asia, and of the world know that all the powers, and all the peoples, and all the principles of pan-America are arrayed against them; and that these peoples, these powers, and these principles shall survive the struggle and attain the inevitable triumph. For these peoples, these principles, and these powers represent the righteous and unconquerable forces of progress, democracy, and the majesty of man. There is no power in all the world, however great, however ruthless, however cunningly deployed, that can ever hope to overcome or to invade such a formidable citadel as this. As when the day of the inevitable triumph of the forces of right and justice comes, the peoples of Latin America and North America shall go forward together to a new and more bounteous era of prosperity, progress, and mutual growth.

For with each passing day as the earth and the universe grow smaller and smaller, and the airplane, the radio, and the other developments of the mind of man complete the conquests of the world and bring all its areas into closer cooperation and interaction, it is but another inevitable conclusion that the peoples and the problems of the American hemisphere shall assume a cohesion that was never before deemed possible. After this war is over there shall occur an era of economic development unparalleled in the history of the world. The resources, the goods, and the services of all the American countries shall be interchanged on a reciprocal basis, to the elevation and improvement of all the peoples concerned. For already great projects of road building, great schemes of air traffic, accelerated rate of coastal shipping, and unprecedented railroad constructions are shaping up throughout the Western Hemisphere. These improvements shall bring a new progress, a new understanding, and a more intimate solidarity among the peoples of America.

But the post-war era shall not be an era of economic cooperation alone. It shall be an era of political cooperation and peaceful undertaking as well. For history has shown to the world that the American nations are at home with peace, that they can dwell in peace, that they seek after and respect peace. As an indication of the high resolve of the American nations to preserve peace there are two outstanding examples:

On the border between Canada and the United States there is not a single fortification. Armed men do not man their posts, facing each other across a hostile frontier.

There is no hatred, no intrigue, no denunciation, and no disunity. The free relations between Canada and America are an inspiration to all men who believe that enduring peace among nations is a practicality that can be, and must be, attained if the progress of the world is to be assured.

And in the lofty mountains of the Andes, that inspiring chain that looms high on the continent of South America, there still stands the Christ of the Andes—a monument dedicated to the preservation of peace between Chile and Argentina—a monument that was fashioned out of the very materials that were to have gone into munitions and arms of war. This monument still endures and the message it gives to the world yet inspires the hopes of all mankind wherever they may be.

But the peace which comes at the end of this war shall bring heavy responsibilities to the peoples and the nations of our hemisphere. For, in these lands where peace rather than war is the accepted status, all the eyes of the world shall be turned toward us to see what we shall do. And it is in this era that we shall reaffirm the fundamental rights of man. We shall strive toward a new and greater freedom and a more inspiring, more enduring type of self-government and human progress. It shall be inevitable in the years to come, as it has been in the years that fall behind us, that this union of the American nations, whose anniversary we commemorate this day, shall live always in the hearts and minds of men as a monument to the abilities, the advancement, and the enduring principles of all mankind. For here in this hemisphere we shall create a peace so enduring, a cooperation so complete, and an understanding so unshakable that historians shall write of us in all ages: That here in this New World, here in this most recently civilized of all lands, men of all races, of all creeds, and of all undertakings labored together in honesty and in resolve, and here created a world of peace, of enduring justice, and of unrivaled good will and progress among men and the instruments of men.

Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD two very interesting and able articles prepared by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. The first was delivered over the National Broadcasting Co.'s Victory Hour program in connection with the celebration of the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial, and the other was prepared for publication in the Jefferson Bicentennial issue of the New Masses.

There being no objection, the address and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEFFERSON GAVE US OUR WAR AIMS

Just 2 hours ago, on this two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, the American people dedicated to him here in Washington a beautiful memorial, which will proclaim to future generations the high place he holds in the minds and hearts of Americans—a place beside Washington and Lincoln, the other great leaders to whom we have erected memorials in the Nation's Capital. This was most fitting and proper, not only because of the great service Jefferson did his own countrymen but also because of the great service he did common men throughout the world by insisting that all men are created equal and that they can govern themselves.

This Victory Hour program was built around the theme, Jefferson Gave Us Our War Aims, and that, too, is most fitting. For we are today fighting once again to establish and preserve democracy, and no one has done more than Jefferson to give meaning to that word and to establish the freedoms for which it stands.

We today are fighting for human freedom on a world-wide scale. We are fighting against tyranny, against the doctrine of government by a single will, the will of a fuehrer or a duce; and, conversely, we are fighting for Jefferson's idea, that all men are created free and equal, and that governments derive their authority from the consent of the governed—the people.

We say we are fighting for the "four freedoms." Although Jefferson never called them that, no man fought harder to establish them than did Jefferson.

Jefferson laid particular stress on the freedom of speech and freedom of the press. He realized that any form of government that could tolerate these freedoms, could never become otherwise oppressive; and that only where free discussion is permitted can the people expect to reach sound conclusions on issues of importance. "Where the press is free, and every man able to read," said Jefferson, "all is safe."

Jefferson also stood stanchly for freedom of worship and always mentioned it first in his own list of freedoms. In 1779 he wrote the bill for establishing religious freedom, which the Virginia Assembly enacted into law in 1786. That was the first law ever passed by a popular assembly giving perfect freedom of conscience; and places its author among the great liberators of mankind.

But what of freedom from want? Jefferson did not refer to it as such, but he evidently had it in mind when he insisted on freedom of opportunity, and especially freedom of educational opportunity. He believed that the chief object of government is the happiness of the individuals who make up the nation. He saw personal liberty, the right to a job, and the right to property, as essential to the pursuit of happiness. He stood for economic freedom, and that means freedom from want.

Jefferson did not specifically mention the fourth freedom, freedom from fear, but it is plain that he considered this essential to human happiness. He hoped that the great experiment in a people's government here in America would prove to the world that men can be made secure in their persons and their property, despite the conflicts of interest which have always beset human relations.

We think of Jefferson, rightly, as a great American citizen. But he was also a world citizen, and, as such, he wanted the "four freedoms" not only for his fellow Americans but for common men everywhere. And here again he furnishes us one of our great war aims—the aim of making all men free.

If he were living today, Jefferson would, of course, be fighting the Axis Powers. He would insist that nations be as moral as we expect individuals to be. He would try to bring all nations into some world system of law and order, without which there can be no peace and, therefore, no freedom from war or the fear of war. As one of the creators of our Federal Union system, Jefferson helped to point the way for all peoples to unite in one common government, so that law and reason, not force of arms, may at last be the arbiter of differences between them.

American democracy offers a tested plan which can serve all mankind. Fifty-five determined men created our Federal system. There must be 55 determined men somewhere now who can do for the world what Jefferson and the other founding fathers did for the original 13 poor, discouraged, disunited States of America. If we can find them we shall win the peace.

JEFFERSON AND THE NEW WORLD

It is well that the people of the United States—and, I may say, the world in general—are celebrating the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson at this time.

Jefferson was a great revolutionary, but he was also one of the most constructive statesmen the world has seen, and the revolution he helped make so meaningful is still the greatest force in the earth. When he became the Chief Administrator of the United States he never lost sight of the fundamental theories underlying the American Revolution, and the institutions he helped create reflect to this day ideals which were his. He assumed that the principles of the American Revolution were for all mankind; therefore growth made that Revolution a living and developing organism, and the new order dreamed of by the founding fathers became a reality.

Next time you get an American silver dollar certificate, study it. Turn it over, read the motto of the Great Seal of the United States engraved on it, and feel the real driving power and the eternal spirit of the founding fathers. Annuit coeptis novus ordo seclorum (He, God, has smiled on our undertakings). This is important to the world today. The present war, if made purposeful, must too be given meaning.

Probably mankind's three greatest political, economic, and social revolutions will culminate with the end of this war. India's, China's, and Russia's revolutions must now be united and their objectives must be blended with the war aims of the victors, or the theories for which we are fighting will not become the facts of world life and habit.

It is to Jefferson, then, that the world must turn. In his philosophy and his administrative genius we shall find that world unity and outlook so essential now if we are to succeed.

In Jefferson above all the world's great revolutionaries we have the key to the new world for he was in very deed "Sometimes a Virginian, sometimes an American, always a citizen of the world."

The new world order must be built around the essence of Jeffersonian thought, the nature and the rights of man.

It is the men, women, and children of the world that must become united if the clash of groups is to cease. Man, not the state, is the important element. States are made up of men, and governments were created by men and must become and remain their agents. When the German, the Italian, and the Japanese people tell that to Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, the American Revolution will have circled the globe, and God will bless the undertakings of men and the new order of the world will be established.

The American silver certificate is worth much more than a dollar. It carries the prayer and the hope of our founding fathers. And as they wrote, "Annuit Coeptis Novus Ordo Seclorum," our American soldiers and sailors, as they move forward in the earth, say, "God bless our undertaking in this new order of the world." No man on earth will refuse an American dollar, and the time is fast coming when no man on earth will refuse to welcome our American boys and girls, for healing will be found in the wings of their victories.

The philosophy of Jefferson goes forth with our American-trained soldiers and sailors and the people of the world will soon note that

"Man was destined for society," that "the same God who gave us life gave us liberty," that "our wisest policy is peace and friendship with all mankind," and that "it is impossible not to be sensible that we are acting for all mankind."

Since ancient times men have conceived of some sort of world organization. In other words, the bad logic of strife between nations which resulted in the sacrifices of individuals for causes they knew very little about, brought about men's attempting to overcome the calamity of war by uniting nations. Seldom has the thought been to unite peoples. Our history writing has been for the most part of a nationalistic character. Our interpretation of man has always emphasized his tense loyalty to his immediate surroundings. That, of course, is necessary. No one wants to be disloyal to his family or his friends or his town. But a loyalty which shuts the door to fact gains a person nothing.

Jefferson's outstanding characteristics are expressed in his devotion to the idea of overcoming those slogans which bind men to untruths or to half-truths, to break down those loyalties which cause men to sacrifice for causes which end in destruction.

Aristotle taught that man was a social animal. Jesus discovered the individual and his worth, and Jefferson gave that individual his proper place in society. When once Jefferson went the whole way and laid his philosophy of life, his interpretation of history, his political theories, and his hope for a new world on the fundamental basis of the nature of man, he pointed the way not only to man's political, moral, and spiritual salvation, but also to the ultimate salvation of the world. His theory that man was destined for society, when coupled with the philosophy of progress which he accepted, gave us the real meaning not only of society but also of destiny. Never once does Jefferson look backward. His life, his hope, is forward-looking. The sacrifices of the present are justified only in a realization that from them future good will result. He was therefore a natural revolutionist, but his revolution was always what people a century after his time called evolution.

Jefferson's faith in man was based on his belief that man is essentially good by nature, plus the notion that if man were properly trained his reactions would be good, plus the idea that in these men by nature good, properly trained, rests the surest and safest way to stability and to the good life for all.

Other men have said that men are good by nature and must be trained. Other men have talked about the general will or the theoretical unity of mind of mankind. Other men had accepted the notion of some sort of popular sovereignty whereby the will of the majority should have its way but the will of the minority should be protected. But it was the genius of Jefferson that united the idea of a trained citizenry to the practical ballot box and thus kept reason and order in the world by the united wills of the majority of the well-trained persons. This is the key to the stability of modern democracy. With Jefferson we may well say: "Who can limit the extent to which the federative principle may operate effectively?" and "The larger our association, the less it will be shaken by local passions."

That we have not attained in its fullest Jefferson's dream is of course admitted. Admitted and lamented is the fact that in some places in our own country all of the people have not an equal chance of education, nor have they an equal chance at the ballot box, nor have they an equal chance for the ordinary opportunities of a good life. Still, more men have those chances than have ever had them before, and still the future possibility of a better world has never been blotted out.

If the concept of the United Nations is ever to be realized, it must be built upon Jeffersonian fundamentals. We cannot have a unity of nations without the democratic process; that is, the right of the small nation to exist side by side with a great nation must be a right that cannot be questioned. Minorities must be respected, even if minority will shall never be accepted.

Freedom for "me" only is of course not freedom. Liberty for the few is of course not liberty. The great fundamentals which were Jefferson's four freedoms—the right to have and to hold, the right to think and to aspire, the right to go and come, and the right to worship how or where we wish—are the only basis upon which a United Nations can be built.

To Jefferson there was no birth of freedom and liberty in this world. In its theoretical sense he taught that "The same God who gave us life gave us liberty." There have been those people and those nations in the world who have thought that liberty was meant just for them and not for all. They have followed that ideal only to lose both liberty and freedom themselves. Let us today remember that. Liberty is the choicest gift of the gods. If we are selfish with it, we lose it. If we grant it freely, we gain it. If we cherish it and protect it in others, we make it more certain for ourselves. That must be our approach if we are to make the concept of the United Nations a reality for the peoples of the world.

That Jefferson was not only a great American but also a great world citizen is evident to the student of his writings. Said he, "Possessing ourselves the combined blessing of liberty and order, we wish the same to other countries * * *" and "I sincerely pray that all the members of the human family may, in the time prescribed by the Father of us all, find themselves securely established in the enjoyment of life, liberty, and happiness." Although sadly, in some places, the ball of liberty has temporarily lost its momentum, is not the hope "that the whole world will, sooner or later, feel benefit from the issue of our assertion of the rights of man" the cause for which men are today giving their lives?

Jefferson's was a philosophy of progress. No generation is bound by the decisions of those who have passed away. Each age must meet and solve its own problems and must be left free to meet every new situation. His progressive philosophy is designed for a world of free, cooperative men. His is a message to all mankind. When the dictatorships have fallen of their own weight, when the philosophy of the single-will state has destroyed itself, then the Jeffersonian gospel of freemen will rise to assume its destined place and lead a united world to freedom and happiness.

Wastage of Manpower and Its Uneconomical Utilization in the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I present the manuscript of a radio speech which I have prepared upon the wastage of manpower and its uneconomical utilization in the war effort, and request unanimous consent to have it published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, fellow Oregonians. Because so much which is published about public men and their activities is untrue, and because many things which citizens should know about Federal business is withheld from them, I welcome this opportunity to speak to you through the courtesy of this radio station. It is my intention to tell you, in my own way, during this planned series of addresses, what I can, which may be advantageous for you to know.

As a member of Senate committees which have most to do directly with national defense and the conduct of the war, I have spent much time and effort in making inspections of military and naval establishments throughout our country; but mostly in the Pacific coastal area, west of the Rocky Mountains, and in Alaska, where I was escorted by fighter planes into the combat area of the Aleutian Islands. I have had conferences in the field with the area commanders and with their officers and men in the service. I have learned by personal contact and observation and by actually inspecting equipment in place, what I never otherwise would know. For this I have been criticized by those whose purpose should be obvious to all intelligent persons.

High military authority advised me in 1939 that if an enemy power should establish in Alaska a base for military objectives, the entire Pacific coastal area would be exposed to enemy attack. I got active at once. We now are better defended in this area than otherwise we would be.

The conduct of the war is an issue so fraught with disaster for our Nation that it overshadows and subordinates everything else. Its importance rises above any individual, above any organization, above any political party.

It does not belong to the Democratic Party under whose administration this war was precipitated. It does not belong to the Republican Party and its aspirants for office. It belongs to all Americans as their own vital problem.

It is officially estimated there will be a million American war casualties this one calendar year of 1943.

In the days of preparation before actual hostilities occurred at Pearl Harbor, those who talked loudest for war did the least to prepare our Nation for it, so now those who through demagoguery have been led to consider themselves underprivileged, undernourished, and underhoused are drifting and idling while others work, and our combat forces lack weapons and food. If it had rained $20 gold pieces this afternoon some persons would be in breadlines tonight.

Regardless of who may have made any statement to the contrary, I state to you here and now that from the beginning of our preparation for possible war more than 3 years ago to this very hour strikes have delayed very materially our war effort.

Let me remind you that only 4 short years ago France had the largest and apparently the strongest army in the world. It crumbled without a battle.

The sit-down strike originated in France. There are powerful subversive elements at work in our own country which, if not curbed, and curbed promptly, in their mad grasp for power, profit, and preferment, ultimately may reduce American citizens at home, and our men and women in the combat services abroad, and the very persons who, themselves now seek special advantages for themselves, to the unhappy and humiliating present condition of all the people of France.

The international financiers and traders and the organizers of strikes and slow-downs, the manipulators who would obtain excessive war profits, and the politicians in highest places of government who cater to large blocks of regimented voters, all—all—must some day give an accounting to the American people for their subversive actions which now threaten the success of our combat forces in the battle areas, and the security of our homes, jobs and employments—and the preservation of constitutional government.

Where today are the gains of the international bankers and traders of France? Where today are any benefits of sit-down strikes enjoyed, by the laboringmen of France? Where today is there any security to the family life and homes of France? Where today is the Government of France?

When the workmen of France failed to produce, France failed industrially. When France failed industrially, France failed politically and when France failed politically, the Army of France crumpled as a house of cards.

The pattern for defeat is right before us and all the fourth-term political propaganda with which a manipulated moving-picture industry and a Federal Bureau of War Information floods the country, at taxpayers' expense, will not change it.

It is time to let the light of "truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth" into the dark places of some aspects of Federal activities. Let us know the truth and correct our faults that we may do better than we have been doing. That production has improved from the worst possible, is not good enough to save General MacArthur and his heroic forces.

While most workers are attempting to produce their most and best, yet we have among us those who prevent them from doing so, and also there are those who are not earning their wages or salaries. I call attention to those who are retarding production in the hope that I may cause the production of everything needed by our country at war to be increased.

From now on, fewer workers must produce more than ever or disaster may overtake us.

Constructive criticism is patriotic service of the highest order and should not be suppressed or intimidated as it has been. I hope that this is still "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people" and that freedom of speech and freedom of the press is still preserved; otherwise you may never learn the truth and thereby your efforts be misdirected by officially organized propaganda in our own country.

I have had the Truman committee of the Senate send a special agent into the western area to visit and inspect, to reexamine and to verify, modify, or disapprove my own previous report on production and conditions in war industries. He has just returned to Washington and conversed with me about those items to which his attention was limited. My observations on them have been verified.

I have charged:

1. That the Government's interest in maximum production of war needs has not been protected, because management has not made effective an accurate and complete system of internal checks to guarantee that all the pay-rollees for whom the Government is reimbursing management for bonanza wages are actually on the job and contributing, by their labor, what they are being paid to do.

2. That many pay-rollees while present at the plants were idle unnecessarily.

3. That loyal, competent, industrious, and patriotic workers were not permitted to do their best and produce their most because of certain regulations imposed upon them and management by labor racketeers who demanded a low rate of production in order to make more jobs.

4. That management permitted, or was compelled to permit, obviously incompetent and irresponsible and irregular workers to retain places on pay rolls if and when they reported at the plants.

5. That strike masters are able to force these and other subversive practices, including slow-downs, on management by the attitude of the Federal administration itself.

6. That labor racketeers exacted a fee from workers in war industries as the purchase price of a permit to work, as a condition precedent to a patriotic American workman securing a job wherein he could make his contribution to supplying the life line to our American boys and girls in the combat services.

7. That strikes and slow-downs have retarded the supply of vitally needed foods, fibers, and minerals to our combat forces all over the world, with the result that there have been needless loss of life, casualties, and military disasters, and the hazard of ultimate defeat in our war efforts.

Under Secretary of War Judge Patterson, while testifying on March 18—just a month ago—before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, of which I am a member, stated, "We should have produced at least 500 more planes in the month of February." How General MacArthur needs these planes now! Month after month this failure to produce the maximum plant output with the facilities and resources available goes on all over the country. If maximum production had been early effected, the Japs would not now be established on our own island of Kiska. Our western area—the Oregon country and Alaska—would be better defended. I doubt if our Philippine Army would have been captured on Bataan Peninsula, and I know General MacArthur's forces would not now be so desperately handicapped as they are.

One of the sources of inefficient use of manpower is the craft rules of the various unions whereby a mechanic in one line of work cannot perform work belonging to another craft, even though he sits idly by waiting for another type of worker to perform a simple task which he readily could do himself.

I am pleased to learn that unions in the Seattle area have decided to eliminate some of these craft classifications whereby there is a reduction from 27 craft classifications in 1 union to 3. This is a commendable step in the right direction.

Way out there across the wide Pacific Ocean General MacArthur and your own sons are fighting with their backs to the wall—outnumbered and short of everything they need with which to fight and keep alive so that they can continue to fight; while tonight in Portland and Seattle and in every other industrial center in the Nation, the gambling halls and the beer parlors are crowded with improvident recipients of bonanza pay rolls, and there are strikes and threats of strikes throughout the country. Their dissipations tonight will disqualify many workers from doing much good work tomorrow.

How would you like to have your boy's life depending upon the careless work of a man whose head and hands are still affected by his nightly, if not daily, dissipations? I am convinced that an unwarranted number of airplane fatalities, exclusive of combat, are caused by mechanical failures resulting from poor workmanship.

Under our form of Government an enlightened, aroused, and united public opinion can demand reforms and accomplish its purposes. That is the democratic process.

Where are those responsible citizens who will, with order and firmness, demand that for the duration of the war, at least, strikemasters and the racketeers of labor cease their subversive and paralyzing control over the manpower in our war industries and that the shiftless, irresponsible, and irregular pay-rollees get to work at whatever they may be capable of doing? "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Tonight, as your Senator, I have expressed frankly my convictions on a vital subject of national importance in the conduct of the war. The lives of our boys and girls in combat services and victory in the war are at stake. It is no time for any man, public or private, to measure his own personal fortunes as they may be affected by his patriotic duty to the national interest.

Selective Civilian War Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN R. AUSTIN

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, before the House Military Affairs Committee, on April 13, 1943, relating to House bill 1742, which corresponds to a bill I introduced in the Senate, S. 666, which is known popularly as the Austin-Wadsworth bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have asked my views on H. R. 1742, the Austin-Wadsworth bill, which would establish a system of selective civilian war service. I endorse this bill. Only through such a measure will we be able to marshal our maximum strength and utilize it fully in waging war. The mobilization of our full strength is an important goal, for the sooner we can make the best effort of which we are capable, the shorter will be the war and the fewer will be the lives lost in winning it.

We have come a long way on the road to total mobilization since the summer of 1940 when the Congress, as recommended by this committee, took the first great step in mobilization for war, by adopting a system of selective military service. Since then the Congress has taken many further steps in mobilization. It has provided for the requisitioning of property for any war purpose. It has authorized the direction of industry to engage in any war effort that the Government deems necessary. It has subjected contracts to renegotiation for excessive profits. It has imposed drastic taxes. It has subjected prices and wages to the control of Government. It has authorized the allocation of materials according to priorities, and it has subjected food and other essential items to rationing. These steps were taken because, after careful consideration, it was found necessary to substitute for voluntary peacetime systems controls by means of which planned direction could be given to our mobilization for total war. These measures give ample power to muster our industrial resources in support of the war, regardless of the wishes of the proprietors.

In the manpower field, on every man of military age there is the obligation to serve in the armed forces, if and when needed. We could not have raised our Army on a voluntary system. But for mobilization of the far larger forces which are necessary at home to back up our fighting men, we have thus far relied on a voluntary system with various indirect pressures.

The war has caused serious dislocations to our economy. The adjustment from peace to total war is a complex process. In a war economy, manpower does not distribute itself

effectively for war purposes by the competition of men for jobs and of jobs for men.

There is a widespread belief that victory is in the bag, that we can take things easy and all will come out right.

That is not the belief of the War Department.

We believe that the means of victory are in our hands, that we will defeat our foes. But we believe also that the struggle will be a bitter one, that the casualties will be heavy, and that the winning of the war will demand our utmost effort as a Nation.

George Washington wrote this in the Revolution, and it is worth repeating today:

"The satisfaction I have in my successes that attend us is always allayed by a fear that it will lull us into security. Supineness and a disposition to flatter ourselves seem to make parts of our national character. When we receive a check, and are not quite undone, we are apt to fancy we have gained a victory; and when we do gain any little advantage, we imagine it decisive and expect the war immediately at an end. The history of the war is a history of false hopes and temporary expedients."

Eisenhower's armies are doing well in North Africa. They will drive the Nazis and Italians into the Mediterranean or force their surrender. But that struggle is merely a preliminary skirmish when viewed in its setting in the entire war scene. The Nazis still hold their vast gains in Europe. The Japanese still hold the rich resources they seized last year in the Far East. Those are the chief battlegrounds, and those battles have not yet been fought. Anyone who sees the war as already won is looking at the scene through rose-colored glasses.

The war will be a hard one. The end is not in sight. We have underway an all-out drive by the fighting forces. We have underway a vast munitions program to equip the fighting forces and to assist in equipping the forces of our allies. All this takes manpower—the right men and women in the right jobs. Any failure to use our manpower to best advantage will do damage to the fighting power of the Army.

Our allies, as well as our enemies, have systems of national civilian war service. In consequence, they are more fully mobilized than we are. Take the British. They adopted universal war service 3 years ago. From all reports their system works well.

It has not destroyed democracy. It has not resulted in suppression of the liberties of the British people. But it has enabled the British people to get a planned direction to the place in which they can best serve in the war, and every Britisher knows that there is equal treatment under the law and equal obligation on everyone to do his or her part toward winning the war. That seems to me to be true democracy—equality of obligation along with equality of right.

We do not consider it undemocratic to draft a man into the Army, where he works hard at a pay scale below that of civilians, endures the hardships of service far from home, and risks life and limb in fighting for his country. Can it be undemocratic to tell a man to stay at his machine in an airplane factory and work for his country?

I have heard the objection raised that the man who works for a private employer helps to make a profit for the employer and so should not be subject to compulsory assignment. How real is that objection under today's conditions? The wages are subject to Government control. So are the prices and the profits. The product manufactured is what the Government directs. In substance the employer receives a fee from the Government for the use of his facilities and for his managerial skill.

I want to speak briefly of the manpower controls now being exercised.

I do not wish to be understood as ignoring the effort which is now being made. To the extent that we are dealing with local situations in particular areas or industries where labor and management are organized, the cooperative efforts of labor and management under the leadership of the War Manpower Commission, have made progress.

The alternative is not between voluntary action and national selective service. In the steps that have already been taken in so-called voluntary action, resort is had to compulsion. The attempt is made to freeze men in their jobs by blacklisting them from securing other jobs. The attempt is made to control hiring by depriving employers of the right to hire freely and by exerting other indirect compulsions. But these indirect methods have their limitations. I will point out a few.

First, where these methods are effective, they are effective through indirect pressure not defined by statute, with the delay and the tendency toward arbitrariness which is inherent in such situations.

Second, there are vast areas in our manpower pool on which we must draw where there is no effective basis for organization either among employers or employed. We have an immense pool of unorganized white collar workers and of workers in nonessential activities which must be drawn on. There are vital problems of the better distribution of farm labor.

Third, there are situations where the supply of labor to be drawn on is not in the geographical area where the need exists, and consequently where the present system of regional and area directors and management-labor committees does not function effectively. There is no means today to transfer a man from one locality to another or from one job to another.

Fourth, the threat of using the selective-service system does not touch men over 38 years of age or any women.

Fifth, there is an inherent weakness in any voluntary system. The American people are not unpatriotic. But unless I am badly mistaken, Americans like to feel sure that everyone is being treated alike. As soon as it is evident that some people are breaking the rules and getting away with it, or that some are not doing their full share, there is a general relaxation of effort. We have examples on hand in the efforts made to save gasoline and rubber on a voluntary basis. The way to avoid the "let George do it" attitude is to put the equal obligation of service on everyone.

The Army has a vital interest in our manpower controls, even though the administration of such controls properly are in civilian hands. On the effectiveness of such controls depends the Army's ability to wage war successfully.

Much of the discussion about manpower has centered around the size of the armed forces. This has been fixed at 11,000,000, of which 8,200,000 are to be in the Army. In this discussion and the discussion of the labor needs of agriculture and industry, the chief stress has been on numbers, on quantity.

But in planning the best use of our manpower we cannot afford to overlook the point of quality. Wars are not won by mere numbers, whether the units be airplanes, tanks, machine guns, or men. Intelligence, training, and physical endurance in men are as important as speed, firepower, and maneuverability in weapons.

Mere numbers will not meet the war needs of the Army. Any old 8,000,000 men will not do. We need capability in quantity for the junior officers who are to lead our troops. Enlisted technicians must be available in quantity. The Army in 1943 will require that 900 of each 1,000 soldiers be assigned to jobs requiring some degree of specialized training in addition to basic military training. Alertness and aptitude are essential to rapid training in the complicated mechanisms of modern war. The Army must have the men best capable of absorbing this training. Above all, the Army needs vigorous, strong, young men.

To give the armed forces the best men possible for their task—and no one can quarrel with that objective—it is necessary to make sure that war industry, agriculture, and other activities are not wasting or hoarding manpower. Neither the armed services nor the civilian economy can waste manpower by employing individuals below their highest potential.

There is an essential weakness in our program for raising the manpower of this country to its highest qualitative potential. While the armed services can direct a man to the task for which he is best fitted anywhere within the service, in industry hundreds of thousands of men remain at tasks below their highest potential because no agency of Government has the authority to direct them to the right job. Inertia, uncertainty, habit, employer, suasion, or community relationships make a man hesitate to change his employment for one that contributes more to victory.

Remember there is only a limited number of physically fit young men. When manpower in the civilian economy, because of lack of adequate controls, is so distributed as to keep a large block of our youngest and best men out of the armed forces, there is no escaping the fact that our armed forces will as a direct consequence not be as good as they should or could be. That is one of the reasons I am disturbed about the "back to the farm" movement which has received so much newspaper attention these last few days.

Everyone will agree that we must have adequate farm labor to produce the crops which have been set as our objective in 1943. But we have been dealing with the farm labor problem chiefly in terms of the numbers of people who are needed. We have not given sufficient attention to the kind of people who should do the job.

I have tried to obtain some statistical evidence of the extent of the back-to-the-farm movement. While this movement is too recent to obtain satisfactory evidence on its extent, I have been able to confirm that there is such a movement and that it is apparently Nation-wide.

Whether the back-to-the-farm movement will seriously cripple vital war industries in certain localities, whether in certain places it will create an oversupply of agricultural labor while still leaving other agricultural areas in short supply, all that remains to be seen. It is plain enough that the movement is uncontrolled. I cannot think of any better evidence of the necessity for the controls proposed by the Austin-Wadsworth bill than the back-to-the-farm movement which we are now witnessing.

I want briefly to give you a few examples of certain of our labor supply problems.

There are various estimates as to the number of workers who must be transferred from less essential to more essential jobs if scheduled requirements are to be met. One conservative estimate is that 3,000,000 workers must be so transferred this year. It is certain that there will be large demands for manpower in the aircraft industries, the shipyards, and elsewhere.

It is estimated, for example, that 380,000 people must be added to the air-frame industry alone by the end of this year. This is in addition to the job of replacing those who go into the armed forces. Seventy-six percent of this increase will be in areas of critical labor shortage or in which a labor shortage is expected within 6 months.

In face of these facts, we are still producing such things as artificial flowers, jewelry, toys, novelties, and like items which have nothing to do with winning the war. In November 1942 there were 15,000 workers employed in toy manufacture; 17,000 in jewelry; 16,500 in curtains and draperies; and 10,500 in perfumes and cosmetics. Frequently such industries operate in labor-shortage areas. Because many of the workers are women, the existing controls have not brought about their transfer to essential war jobs.

Our manpower difficulties are well illustrated by the copper-mining situation. Practically every pound of copper is needed for and goes into munitions. It was apparent last June that our supply of copper could not meet the demands for ammunition for our men at the front. The limiting factor was manpower. Men were leaving the mines to go into other industries. It was impracticable by ordinary methods to secure the necessary replacements.

A use was made of so-called indirect sanctions. Any man who left a copper mine without permission was blacklisted with Government contractors, but that proved ineffective. In order indirectly to force men from mines that were less essential, other mines, such as gold mines, were closed down, though there was no method of insuring that the men who left such mines would go to the copper mines.

Miners in copper mines were deferable on occupational grounds under the draft, but we combed through the Army to find men who had previous hard-rock mining experience and permitted them to volunteer to work in the copper mines. The decline in copper production was halted by furloughing over 4,000 men from the Army to work in the mines.

But even these measures have not solved the problem. Mines today are not fully manned. We still need more copper than we are getting. Every extra ton of copper we can mine here is 1 less ton we need to bring in valuable bottoms from South America. We have yet to feel the effect of the failure through shortage of manpower to carry on adequate development work and preparatory mining. In the new mining facilities which are planned in order to increase the necessary output, we face in the next few months a lack of men to put to work to make those facilities effective.

There was no lack of cooperation on the part of management or labor in dealing with copper. Instead, it has been an outstanding instance of the patriotic willingness of all to cooperate in the task. But the results have been cumbersome and ineffective. What was needed was an orderly, comprehensive system backed by direct legislative sanction to harness the cooperation and patriotism of all, and to mine copper. With an occupational inventory which would disclose skills, actual or potential, for mining and a proper administration, the fairness of which would be guaranteed through the use of local boards, manpower problems such as this can be handled.

Lumber production in the Pacific Northwest furnishes another example. Production of Douglas-fir lumber has fallen considerably behind requirements because of labor shortages in logging operations. These shortages have been caused in large part by men leaving logging camps to go to places where they receive more money for easier work. Today we have no means of transferring them from the shipyards back to logging. As a result, the armed forces are experiencing critical difficulties in procuring lumber for such essential war uses as ponton bridges, airplanes, barges, landing boats, etc.

We have talked total war constantly. It is time to wage it. The defeat of our foes will require it. The sooner we all put wishful thinking aside and realize fully that the road that lies ahead is long and hard, the sooner will be our victory.

We should do our best to disprove Washington's statement that war is a history of false hopes and temporary expedients. False hopes lull us into inaction, and temporary expedients result in the too-little-and-too-late impotency which brought about this present conflict.

We owe full support to the men fighting and dying for their country on distant battlefields. We should not let inaction or resort to temporary expedients hamper our effort to back them to the limit.

It is my firm belief that not until there is imposed on every man and woman the equal obligation to render service in the war effort will this country make the all-out effort which is necessary and of which it is capable. Not until then will we keep faith with our fighting men at the front.

Nation's Official Tribute to Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Nation's official tribute to Thomas Jefferson by Claude G. Bowers. The address was authorized to be prepared for the Jefferson Bicentennial Commission.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION'S OFFICIAL TRIBUTE TO JEFFERSON

(By Claude G. Bowers)

By an act of Congress, approved by the President, provision has been made for a national observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, in which all elements of our national life are asked to participate.

This decision for a national celebration is based upon the fact that the activities and political philosophy of Jefferson gave body and soul to that which we call Americanism. It has no relation to party politics; it is our interpretation of nationalism; it is our flag of patriotism.

In the writing of the Declaration of Independence Jefferson gave vivid, concrete expression to the democratic concept of society which was inherent in our people. It is so simple and easily understood that he did it in a paragraph:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

This is the foundation stone of democracy.

Again he interpreted the spirit of the American people when, on the completion of the Constitution as it came from the convention, he protested that no provision had been made for the protection of the people against a possible abuse of power. "A Bill of Rights," he wrote, "is what any people is entitled to and which no government has a right to refuse or rest on inference."

REAWAKENS DEMOCRATIC SPIRIT

From his post in Paris he wrote the leaders among the revolutionary fathers with whom he was so intimately associated, insisting on this point; he urged this point of view on Washington and on Madison, who was the most useful member of the Constitutional Convention; he awakened anew the democratic spirit and put it on the march, and in the end the Bill of Rights was written into our fundamental law.

This, written in the form of the first 10 amendments, is the most essential part of the Constitution, if liberty and democracy are our aim, for the other parts, involving the mechanics of our system, may be changed as conditions may necessitate; but so long as the Bill of Rights remains we are a free people, and no government can deprive us of our liberties without usurpation or revolution.

Every item in this Magna Carta of our freedom has been a vital part of the political philosophy which Jefferson had formulated in his youth for his guidance as a citizen.

DEMANDED FREEDOM OF PRESS

He stood militantly for the freedom of the press that the people might be informed and intelligently meet their democratic obligations; that freedom of speech is necessary; that tyranny, or even its approach, may be checked at once by driving it into the open; that the writ of habeas corpus is essential as a protection of the citizen against arbitrary power, and that the sanctity of the home cannot be violated without due process of law.

These are the sustaining pillars of the superstructure of a free society.

And Jefferson made another contribution to Americanism in leading the bitter battle in Virginia which ended in the adoption of his statute of religious freedom.

He believed that Americanism means the rendering unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's, and he knew that a man's relation to his Maker is beyond the legitimate interference or dictation of any government, and that every citizen must be guaranteed the right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience.

EPITAPH CITES AUTHORSHIP

He made that Homeric fight; he took the blows of the religiously intolerant, and it is significant of his estimate of that contribution to the happiness of man that in the epitaph he prepared for his tomb he passed over the places of distinction he had held and asked to be remembered as the author of the Declaration of Independence, and of the statute of religious freedom, and as the founder of the University of Virginia.

These, to him, were the abiding achievements of his life; for these deal with the eternal needs for human happiness, and with the things necessary for the protection of the freedom of the human spirit.

Other contributions made by Jefferson in the making of the Nation and the moulding of the people would alone suffice to place him among the two or three foremost of the founding fathers.

He was perhaps the first of the founding fathers to conceive and urge a plan for a public school system to place an education within the reach of every child; and he proposed and urged the plan more than a decade before the adoption of the Constitution.

He was the first and foremost of the statesmen whose vision penetrated the thousands of miles of intervening wilderness to the Pacific sea, and foresaw the endless cavalcade of covered wagons of the pioneers who would redeem that empire to the purposes of man. And because his was a continental mind, he launched the historic expedition of Lewis and Clark on his own initiative. He assisted in the formation of the plans; he consulted and corresponded with Lewis in the preparation; he followed the drama of

that blazing of a trail with a keener interest than the maneuvering of his political enemies; and he had prescience enough to know that this was an outstanding achievement of his administration.

When other statesmen were indifferent to our right to the free navigation of the Mississippi, Jefferson was declaring that right essential to the safety and prosperity of the Nation before the Constitutional Convention was in session.

And out of this conception of a continental policy came his purchase of Louisiana, which forever put at rest the problem of the Mississippi and added a vast and rich empire to the national domain.

He played an important role in the framing of the ordinance of the Northwest Territory.

SET FOREIGN POLICY PATTERN

For 5 years previous to the adoption of the Constitution he was giving form and spirit to our foreign policy and as Washington's Secretary of State he laid down principles on which we act today.

Thus, in the creation of our Foreign Service he was a leading architect; in the presidency he definitely set the Republic on the democratic tack; he foresaw and made provision for the vast domain that now reaches to the Pacific, and he gave us Louisiana and thus removed the dangers of frontier controversies

But, while these achievements by themselves would have given him a permanent place in history as one of the greatest of our statsmen, it is not for these that the Nation is preparing to celebrate the 200th anniversary of his birth.

For foreign policy may alter with changed conditions; territory may be gained or lost, but the contributions of Jefferson that will abide as long as freedom has a friend came from his mind and heart as an American, and not from any public station that he held.

It is the political philosophy of this profound student of political science that forms the cornerstone of the system that reflects the American way of life.

If we dare think and give free expression to our honest thought, it is because he fought the battle for us more than a century and a half ago.

If there are no shackles on the press and there is freedom in the sanctum of the editor, it is because of the battles that he fought.

If men may peaceably assemble to discuss their grievances in the light of day with the consent of the Government, it is largely because of the leadership he gave in the first days of the Republic.

If men may worship God according to the dictates of their conscience and without proscription for their religious views, it is due more to the author of the ordinance of religious toleration than to any other man.

And if the children of America, without distinction resting on wealth, are pouring into publicly maintained schools throughout the land, it is due in a measure to his intelligent pioneering long before such things generally were dreamed of by the rest.

ALL AMERICANS HIS DEBTOR

It was not, therefore, without reason that Lincoln once declared that "the principles of Jefferson are the axioms and the definitions of a free society."

There is no one in America today who is not his debtor, and none who stand for liberty and democracy who will not proudly participate in paying tribute to his memory and in declaring a renewed allegiance to the Americanism which he embodied in a creed.

This celebration comes when most needed, for never in two centuries has the spirit of liberty and the ideal of democracy been so arrogantly challenged by powerful alien forces that proclaim their deliberate intent to destroy the American way of life that Jefferson symbolizes.

Because of the forces of tyranny that are on the march there never has been a time in our history when we have needed as we do today a rebaptism of patriotism and a rededication to the principles for which Jefferson fought and wrought.

LANGUID DEMOCRACY NEAR TREASON

In his own day he forged in the fire of liberty a fighting democracy that left its imprint on our institutions, and in these days when alien forces are spreading devastation in their wake as they trample democratic peoples and enchain them, every instinct of self-preservation demands a militant fighting American democracy for the defense and preservation of the things that to us are sacred—things sanctified by the blood of our forebears who fought and died for their attainment.

From the grave at Monticello the spirit of Jefferson summons all true Americans to a rededication of themselves, their lives and fortunes, to a ringing reassertion of the principles of democracy, for in these days a languid democracy is next to treason.

In public meetings in the colleges and public schools and through the press and public assemblies in all the towns and cities let this tribute to the philosopher of American democracy be made the occasion for a renewal of our faith in the things for which our fathers stood and which make for freedom.

Government Control of News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very thought-provoking article entiled "Government Control of News," written by Mr. Frederic W. Collins, of Washington Bureau, Journal-Bulletin, and printed in a recent issue of the Providence Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF NEWS AN INCREASING THREAT TO FREEDOM OF PRESS

(By Frederic W. Collins)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—The newspapers of the United States congratulate themselves frequently on their alertness against threats to their freedom. In the opinion of this correspondent, however, they are permitting a progressive abridgment of their right of free access to legitimate news of the Government.

They make a brave outcry, for example, against the star-chamber arrangements for the United Nations Food Conference and neglect the conditions which allow the development of such arrangements.

Resistance to a force of this magnitude requires collective action by the newspapers, carried on without let-up.

The newspapers ought to be interested in this. Newspaper readers should, too. Something happened in Washington the other day that might serve to put the issue on a personal, intimate footing with the reader. The story could be called Jeff Davis and the Freedom of the Press.

JEFF WANTED TO KNOW THE NUMBER IN TRAINING SCHOOL

Everybody who ever reads the Providence Journal or Evening Bulletin knows Jeff Davis, the marine and yachting editor.

He wanted to know how many men the United States Maritime Commission now has in its training schools for seamen. That is the only solitary thing he wanted. A figure. He asked me to get it for him.

This was routine. I called a man named George Mehrtens, in the Division of Public Relations at the Maritime Commission. Ordinarily, public relations men are anonymous but this time we're going to name names.

Mehrtens is a good public relations man, who thinks that newspapers ought to have information. With the best intentions in the world, hoping to save some time for us both, he referred me direct to a man who, he said, could give me the answer in a minute. Usually a Government information man gets the facts or figures himself and relays them back to the reporter. Mehrtens was improving on this.

The man he referred to me was Lt. Samuel H. McConnell, United States Naval Reserve. I told him who I was, what paper I represented, and what I wanted, and mentioned that I wanted it for someone else.

Lieutenant McConnell asked me who was going to write the story and what the nature of the story was to be.

"Why did the Maritime Commission need that information?" I asked.

In order, Lieutenant McConnell replied that what he said could "coincide with previous releases."

The lieutenant said he was sorry, that he couldn't give the figure out unless I told him who was going to write the story and what its nature was to be.

I told the lieutenant that strictly as a matter of principle I would not give a Government agency any such information as a condition of my getting a legitimate item of fact.

He said it was the commandant's orders. The commandant, I learned, is Lt. Comdr. H. H. Dreany, United States Naval Reserve, assistant commandant, United States Maritime Service, in charge of procurement and training of apprentice seamen.

I asked for a better explanation of why I was expected to trade information for information. Then I got the real answer.

The Maritime Commission had "had so many stories based on rumors." The Commission had to know whether the reporter "really wants to know what the schools are like." The Commission "doesn't want him to write stories on information he's picked out of the air." The Commission "wants him to go to the right source to get his information."

In other words, the Maritime Commission wanted to indoctrinate the reporter.

Remember, this is Jeff Davis wanting the information, and the information he wants is a plain, unadorned figure.

Does anybody reading this believe that Jeff Davis has to go to a school of indoctrination conducted by the Maritime Commission—or anpone else—before sitting down to write a story?

Or that Jeff Davis has to tell the Maritime Commission what he is going to write before he writes it?

I told Lieutenant McConnell, to quote myself accurately, that I'd be damned if I would establish the precedent of giving a Government agency any information on who was going to write a story or how he was going to write it. That these were matters simply and solely the responsibility of the newspaper. That it was none of the Government's business. And that under my interpretation of the principle at issue, a Government agency was obligated to give out legitimate factual information even if it

knew the information was to be used as the basis for an attack upon the agency.

The lieutenant, who had been courteous throughout, said again that he was sorry, but the information would not be given out "until we know how it's going to be used."

I had called Mehrtens about 11 a. m. It was now 11:30. My principles were still intact. But I didn't have the information I wanted.

The next step, and one taken reluctantly for reasons which will be explained, was resort to the Office of War Information. I called George Lyon, head of the Office of War Information news desk. George Lyon is another who believes that newspapers should get the information they want. Part of his job is to fend for reporters who run up against arbitrary suppression of information by Government officials. It is significant in itself that there has to be such a functionary and it is chiefly good luck that the place is occupied by a man who is willing to put up a battle for the newspapers.

George went through routine. He called Mehrtens. Mehrtens called Lieutenant McConnell. Backed up by the Office of War Information, Mehrtens was able to get the figure, and telephoned it to me. (Sometimes not even the Office of War Information can pry information loose from the Government.)

This sounds like a short process. It is not. By the time I had the figure I had started after at 11 a. m., it was 3:30 p. m.

WHAT HAD HAPPENED TO THE FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Now, let's see what had happened to the freedom of the press.

First off, what I wanted was war information only by a strict construction of the term. At no time was any question raised as to security. There was no suggestion that publication of the figure might aid the enemy. So, actually, the Office of War Information had no proper place in the proceedings under the general definition of its duties.

Second, when I called the Office of War Information I was put in the position of having another Government agency, however well-intentioned it may be at the moment, interposed between myself, the reporter, and the Maritime Commission, the news source. Since only a simple figure was involved, this did no harm. As a matter of practice, however, it rules out the direct contact which is helpful to, perhaps essential to, efficient reporting.

Third, I was making a minute contribution to a series of precedents inimical to free reporting; helping the entrenchment between the reporter and his source of a Government agency whose good intentions are not guaranteed to be eternal.

Fourth, I was forced to spend four and a half hours on something that should have required only a minute.

Fifth, I had laboriously succeeded in punching one small hole in the policy and dragging a fact through it, but, supposing Lieutenant McConnell got his mind changed for him, I still had achieved only the most infinitesimal change in the policy itself. The people throughout the Government who adhere to it would never know the difference.

This incident would not be worth discussing at all, let alone at such length, if it were an isolated one. It is not.

The attitude of mind toward the newspapers which this incident demonstrates finds expression in many ways. It becomes not only an effort to keep information from the newspapers, but an effort to tell them how they shall conduct themselves.

The President plays the game of writing our stories for us, and even making up our front pages for us. Papers play up meat shortages one week, he tells us in a press conference, and the next week there are headlines that meat is spoiling there's so much of it. That is bad for morale, says the President, and he advises us: Don't overplay shortages. He gives no recognition to the 100 percent probability that if the newspapers had not yelled their heads off, the shortages might still prevail.

The natural inclination of Government to conceal its mistakes is at the bottom of the policy. Mr. Roosevelt, however, has helped to develop the suppression, canalization, and influencing of news to a fine art. He has a grudge gainst the daily papers. Anyone who has watched him at close quarters for any length of time knows that he likes to do things in secret. The news policy he pursues has ardent devotees among swarms of low types in every corner of the Government who consider that supporting it is a required element of their loyalty to the Chief.

Mr. Roosevelt's attitude was recently summed up by an anonymous newspaperman in these words, reported by Arthur Krock in the New York Times:

THE PRESIDENT HAS HIS OWN IDEA OF A FREE PRESS

"The President's notion of a free press is quite different from our own. We talk of freedom of information, really, whereas he talks of how to get his point across. His interest is in how a free press can best be used."

Does not the story of Jeff Davis and the freedom of the press read as if the Government's part was written from that text?

This attitude at the top is a bulwark for the suppressionist at the bottom. There is no recourse, no court of last resort to offer protection and relief to an aggrieved reporter or newspaper.

Elmer Davis, head of the Office of War Information, is credited by some with having improved the Government's news policy. But so far as can be seen, Mr. Davis has never got at the roots of reticence in the War and Navy Departments, for example, despite his authority to do so, and I have been told in so many words that their news policies are dictated in great detail by the White House. Americans still had to depend upon London for their first hints that great news was developing at Casablanca. Americans will still find many major military developments reported first and most completely by Churchill in the House of Commons. Americans got their first news of tremendously important proposals for international monetary stabilization from the British Treasury. American reporters were after the Casablanca story. American reporters are in the combat zones. American reporters were trying to pry the money story out of our Treasury Department long before it broke in London. But the Government wasn't saying anything. Of what importance is a better management of canned hand-outs in comparison with the day-in and day-out strangulation of news sources occurring under Mr. Davis' nose?

The newspapers of the United States need to hold a Casablanca conference of their own and determine upon the utter destruction of the Government's policy of news suppression. Nothing short of collective action, continuously maintained, can achieve it. They can and should turn on the heat and keep it on until no official in Washington or anywhere else in the Government would dare to be caught holding out information to which the public is entitled. They should initiate and force through a cleaning out of every public relations man, big and little, who stands in the way of free reporting, and the Washington press corps could supply names and evidence. They should make it a straight-out fight on pure principle. They should not feel that they can settle the issue, for example, by winning the Associated Press case, where the cry of organizational self-interest can be raised against them, nor on questions of newsprint supplies, or mailing rates, or prices per copy, when economic self-interest can be charged against them. They should take their stand on the plain, bedrock principle of the freedom of the press, freedom for the Jeff Davises to do their work and do it right, without being cut off from the raw material of the news, without submitting to a Government catechization in order to get it.

Construction of Power Plants in the United States and Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I request to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a factual statement which I have prepared about the strange conduct of certain persons in the executive branch of our Government which has resulted in the construction at Federal expense of a great power project in Canada at the very time these same gentlemen delayed the already congressional authorized projects in our own country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A number of United States hydroelectric plants, on which construction had started, were frozen by the War Production Board because of an alleged critical situation in certain strategic materials.

At the same time, our governmental agencies, working through some lend-lease provisions, released approximately the same amount of strategic materials which would be needed to complete the American plants, and permitted them to be used for the construction of a great power plant in the Saguenay River in Canada, which is planned to generate 1,200,000 horsepower of energy.

On the face of it, there is the appearance of greater concern for the development of power, with our funds, in this Allied country than there is for development of publicly owned power within our own Nation. This has many aspects of a most confusing nature for patriotic Americans in this war emergency, and has still further ramifications in respect to the post-war production work of essential metals and chemicals. I deem it worthy of serious consideration by this Congress.

For many years I have followed the possibilities of power development on the Columbia River. During the course of this experience I reached some definite conclusions. The principal conclusions affecting the security and economies of this country and of my State and region were:

1. This Nation was, comparatively speaking, backward in the development of electrochemical and electro-metallurgical industries.

2. To develop such industry would require large amounts of high-class, low-cost firm hydropower.

3. That with such lack of development this country was not in a position to fully defend its position in war or peace.

Accordingly, when I came to the Senate I early successfully urged the installation of the last six units at Bonneville and the completion of this plant. I also assisted the Washington delegation on the authorization for the Grand Coulee plant, and other dele-

gations for like power in other sections of the country, as I knew from conditions in Europe the urgent need for such early installations. As the only member of the Senate Appropriations Committee from the Northwest and Pacific coastal States, I was able to make a substantial contribution in this direction.

Congress had passed these authorizations by the time the President addressed Congress and declared an emergency, on May 16, 1940. The National Defense Commission was created shortly after the President's address. After allowing due time for organization, I called, in company with my colleagues and House Members from Oregon and Washington, on Mr. Stettinius, then Chairman. We found Mr. Stettinius tied up with organization matters and unfamiliar with the western situation, but he kindly agreed to send his principal technicians to a conference in my office.

THE CONFERENCE OF JULY 15, 1940

As a result of these arrangements, Messrs. W. L. Batt, Gano Dunn, Grover Holden, and C. K. Leith, representing Mr. Stettinius, met with the delegation from Oregon and Washington in my office on July 15, 1940, nearly 18 months before Pearl Harbor. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] took part in this meeting, and the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] was represented. During this meeting the delegation placed before these technicians information on the advanced provisions, made by Congress at Bonneville and Grand Coulee, and factual data on the mineral and clay resources of the region, and urged that this power be put to work early as a defense requirement. After a morning's discussion these technicians advised us that the defense metal-power program did not need the full utilization of the authorized and provided Columbia River facilities. I would not take "no" for an answer, and continued to urge my position on this vital defense matter.

Within a few months the errors of their early decision were becoming tragically apparent. Mr. Batt changed his position when testifying before the Truman committee nearly a year later. Ever since the July 1940 meeting I have pressed for full utilization of these facilities. Others in the Northwest delegation have done likewise. From July 1940 to date we have not received anything from these people or their staff but evasive replies. A year ago I tried to secure something definite from Mr. Krug when he was before the Appropriations Committee, but without success.

STRUGGLE FOR UTILIZATION

Last September I wrote the President suggesting that the Columbia River power be fully put to work in the war effort. He replied stating that it should, and defined the major principles applying to this application. It so happened that these were the principles I had set forth when the Bonneville appropriations were under consideration by the Senate Committee. A copy of the President's letter went to Mr. Donald Nelson, but still I secured no action. I again took this up with Mr Nelson last January and once again about a month ago when Mr. Nelson called at my office. A short time ago Mr. Nelson sent me Mr. Krug's report, which did not answer my inquiry. The net result of these delaying actions have been a wastage of power, delays in the air material program, a lengthening of the war, a waste of public funds, a violation of policies written into law by Congress, injury to a splendidly conceived project, a partial destruction of enduring markets, and injury to the economies of the region I represent. I was at loss to understand Messrs. Batt's and Krug's actions. I could find no valid explanation.

SHIPSHAW

Within the last few days publicity has come out concerning the Shipshaw transaction. This could explain the attitude of the officials of the war agencies. The secrecy of the Shipshaw transaction breeds deep suspicion, especially in the light of the facts I have narrated. According to press reports, Mr. Batt engineered the Shipshaw deal. In this I can see possibilities of great post-war injury to the region I represent. Congress and the American people need to be told all the facts, so that proper action can be taken. I have no quarrel with the Aluminum Co. at this time, as I have no evidence on which to base any allegation. I do have sufficient evidence that Messrs. Batt and Krug have nullified the vision of Congress and have violated policies written into law.

As a result of this transaction, Western Power projects, authorized by Congress totalling above 1.0 million horsepower have been suspended by the Power Branch of the War Production Board. Strangely the Western capacity, halted by War Production Board, equals substantially the capacity of priority allocations given by War Production Board to Shipshaw. In addition, about 500,000 horsepower in Federal power projects located east of the one-hundredth meridian have also been halted. Included in the War Production Board stop order are Grand Coulee units 7, 8, and 9, representing 450,000 horsepower.

An effort was also made to slow the construction progress on the last four Bonneville units. This would have eventually halted the Bonneville units, if an early fight had not been made for the retention of these units. The same fight was put up for the three Grand Coulee units, but when the derating order was issued in July of 1942, progress on the Bonneville units was too far advanced to stop shop work.

The Federal funds covering the shop work on these authorized, but halted, projects is approximately represented by a unit price of $45 per horsepower, or $67,500,000 for all the halted projects. The Coulee appropriations and contract authorizations covering units 7 to 9 represent $22,000,000 out of the $67,500,000. This figure, by strange coincidence, is nearly the same as the reported Shipshaw advance payments from Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The picture as I see it, from my own actual experience, is not wholesome. The major issue at this time is whether the personal decisions of Messrs. Batt, Krug, and other members of their staffs, are superior to the acts and will of Congress. If the President does not clarify this situation, then it is up to Congress to step in and examine this reported mess. The published facts indicate that the War Production Board has descriminated against the western States, so that potential resources of this vast region have not been used to the fullest extent in the war effort. The result is obvious.

Pay Increase Demands of the United Mine Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES M. LaFOLLETTE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. LaFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, let us think a little before we denounce the United Mine Workers. It seems to me that before Members of Congress participate in the clamor which is being raised throughout the country against the United Mine Workers, we should have some information before us as to the monthly or annual wage which a very high percentage of these miners receive.

I know that during the summer of 1942 a friend of mine, who was the president of a local in the soft coal area in southern Indiana, drove 60 miles a day, 30 miles each way, to work; that his average weekly wage, working every day that the mine was in operation, did not exceed $21 a week. At the same time high-school boys were being paid over $40 a week as janitors in the war industries operating in Vanderburgh County, Ind.

Who is there who will have the nerve to say that a man with a family should receive $21 a week while doing the hazardous work of mining coal, while boys out on a summer quasi-holiday lark should be paid $40 a week for running around with a broom? We must remember that these wages are the lowest wages which were being paid in these industries and that you and I, as taxpayers, are paying this wage directly because these war contracts are direct obligations of the Government. Surely it would be well for men of other unions, particularly those unions which were practically fathered by the United Mine Workers, to withhold their criticism of the efforts of John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers to better the wages of these coal miners against not only the operators but also against the vindictive hatred of the national administration.

I shall speak only of the things which I know personally, and I now wish to include in this statement excerpts from a letter from a president of another United Mine Workers local in Warrick County in southwestern Indiana with whom I went to high school as a boy and whom I have known since that time as a member of the American Legion and an active, hard-working member of a selective-service board. This man is no roustabout roughneck, but a highly regarded citizen of Warrick County, Ind.

You have heard much concerning the $2 increase demanded by our leader, Mr. John L. Lewis, and for your own information I know you will appreciate the opinion of one from the rank and file, whom you are personally acquainted with. It is not only my personal opinion, but the opinion of all miners of this coal-producing area when I say that we are entitled to a substantial increase in wages.

The basic day rate man with a wage of $7 per day, 5 days a week, seldom exceeds a 10-day pay, two pays per month, thus figuring around $140 per month. Now let's deduct the check-offs from that amount. Those of us who are subscribing to a 10-percent check-off for War bonds, would total $14; plus the 5-percent Victory tax, $4.80 (computed by the Treasury Department); and our union dues, international, district, and local union, totaling $3.90; thus leaving the miners with the balance of $117.30, an average of $22.32 per week. These figures are based on full-time employment. Any day lost will be a deduction of $7 per week.

Now, Charlie, let us be fair and reason this situation out. From that meager amount we must provide food, clothing, heat, lights, water, medicine, and other necessities of living. Then you must agree with Mr. Lewis when he states that the miner is fully entitled to a $2-per-day increase.

It is amusing and disgusting to me when the War Labor Board, saying that wages could not be raised other than provided by the Little Steel formula, when I see men who are making $60 to $80 per week. Even women and girls are making that amount at war plants in your own Evansville. Not only that, but the postal employees are given the right to work at the war plants along with their regular job of carrying the mail, thus affording them their regular salary of some $200 per month, plus another $200 or better at the war plant. They are making a juicy $400 or better per month. Then the administration will say to the coal miner, you are amply paid. You shall get no increase. When some 450,000 miners are giving our sons, daughters, our dollars and our lives if necessary, to a just cause. It just doesn't seem fair.

This leads me to the conclusion that this thing ought to be solved by collective bargaining, and that the miners' demand for an annual wage should not be tossed aside as an unjustifiable or socialistic demand.

I also have in my files a letter from one of the most successful operators in my district which discloses that his mine could run practically on an annual basis, and that running 243 days in a year the average wage of all employees, excluding foremen, office men, and officials, was $2,097. Figuring a 50-week year, the people doing janitor work in war industries are making about this annual wage and yet no one would dare say that they have a skill comparable to that of a miner or that their work compares in its hazards.

As I recall, one of the underlying purposes of the Guffey Act was to bring about some stabilization of this industry so as to afford more stable employment. Certainly, if we are going to need an annual supply of coal, we can insure it with a formula based upon some reasonable concept of an annual wage.

If it strikes people as unusual to consider the problem of coal on an annual basis, am I not justified in calling attention to the fact that the Government is authorizing a subsidy now to the oil companies covering the difference between the transportation of petroleum to the eastern coast by tanker and the cost of transportation by rail tank car? This is justified in time of war on the theory that we have to have this petroleum on the eastern seaboard and that we would be confiscating the property of the oil companies if we forced them to continue to sell their products to the public at the old price when their transportation charges have been greatly increased as a result of submarine attacks upon tankers on our eastern coast. No one has questioned the payment of the Government subsidy to preserve the properties of the oil companies and to permit them to pay their employees a decent wage by having the Government assume this difference in transportation.

Am I crazy if I suggest that some arrangement by the Government to guarantee a reasonable annual wage for coal miners, even if it involves a subsidy to that industry, stands on no different ground than the present subsidy to the oil companies? In other words, if it is right to subsidize a man in order to save his property, why is it so terribly wrong for human beings to ask for conditions in the coal industry which will give them a living standard, comparable to that enjoyed by other war workers, for work which is more hazardous than 90 percent of that being conducted by other war industries?

I also must say because I try to walk down the middle of the road that it would be statesmanlike labor policy for the United Mine Workers to make intelligent concessions in order to bring into effect the principle of an annual wage for these workers, certainly during wartime. If the Guffey Coal Act, which we are about to extend, will not permit this to be done, then the act has been a failure.

Let it be understood that I do not advocate a subsidy as the necessary or proper solution; I merely point out that we do have existing subsidies and that the consuming public pays for it even though the granting of subsidies is a nice, indirect method of hiding it from the public.

Lt. Gen. Ben Lear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., and which pays tribute to Lt. Gen. Ben Lear, now commanding the Second Army, and who is subject to retirement on May 12 next, under the regulations of the War Department.

General Lear is a distinguished soldier. Under his command literally thousands of men who had never seen military service before were trained and are now meeting the responsibilities of war in all parts of the world with courage, fortitude, vision, and ability.

The people of the city of Memphis will miss General Lear, who established his headquarters in that southern city, and who has fulfilled every high sense of civic obligation.

"OLD SPIT AND POLISH"

The automatic retirement of Lt. Gen. Ben Lear on May 12 does not mean that his long period of splendid service has terminated, and it is this fact which leavens the announcement that he is soon to relinquish command of Second Army. While his departure from the Midsouth will occasion deep, sincere regret, it will be compensated for, to some extent, by the knowledge that the War Department has further useful work for him to do to the benefit of the Army and the Nation.

Actually, he will be merely changing station, for an order immediately recalling him to active duty will accompany that which places him on the retired list of officers of the Regular Army. The law compelling his retirement is an old one. It is rigid. Whether it is wise in time of war is debatable, but no purpose can be served in arguing that point. It is the law, and the War Department meticulously obeys.

It is going to be very difficult for Memphis to say good-bye to General Lear. He is not only a grand soldier, but has been a grand citizen. It was of the utmost importance that the civilian population come to understanding of Army methods and the reasons why a definite pattern is followed. No Army officer of the many we have known who have been stationed at Memphis has accomplished more than General Lear in developing that needed understanding, and what he has done has been achieved unostentatiously.

There is a great deal we could write of him now, for it has been our privilege to know him rather intimately. He wouldn't like it. First, last, and always, he is a soldier—and they don't come any better. He has the true soldier's burning love of country. He has said and done the things which he, as a good soldier, believed best for the Army and best for country, and in the doing he has been completely unafraid.

The successful innovations in troop training which he instituted are matters of record, and the entire Army has benefitted thereby. His great job has been to produce "soldiers fit to fight." That desire has dominated everything he has done—even to his thinking and his dreaming.

For a long time we have wanted to give him a nickname. If we were to choose one it would be "Old Spit-and-Polish." No other fits him quite so well. It means rigid insistence that troops everlastingly do those things which produce the clean equipment the fighting demands and which inspire pride in appearance, unit and cause.

That is not all. It means that a man will be so disciplined—body and mind—that when, under stress of battle, his soul and emotions may revolt, he will automatically do the right thing—that the inspiration "not to let his outfit down" will dominate every other reaction. That is the real motive behind the type of discipline General Lear demands, and which has led to the accepted estimate of him as being a "strict disciplinarian." The record to date of this war has proved that the "spit-and-polish" outfits have distinguished themselves high above the rest.

Perhaps what we mean by the phrase has no better illustration than an incident involving a battalion of the Argyle and Sutherland Highland Regiment, a British regular outfit. The battalion, stationed at Singapore, spearheaded the British defense columns in Malaya. It left Singapore for the peninsula tip with full wartime strength of about 1,400 men.

If fought a delaying action all the way down the peninsula and back to Singapore. Because it had been first out it was assigned the head of the British column on the return over the causeway. Out of the original 1,400 there were 79 officers and men left. There was no sneaking back into Singapore in the dead of night. The lone piper left struck up the old Scots' air, Cock o' the North, and back over the causeway, in light of day and under enemy fire, marched the 79—the battalion decimated, but gallantry and pride and discipline undefeated. The panic-stricken civilian populace had an example that day. That's "spit-and-polish." It could be said another way—79 "good soldiers" marched into Singapore.

That's what Ben Lear has been teaching the American Army—to do things that way.

We wish him no life of ease, but a new, tough job, and along with it a good horse to ride, and always the health to sit straight in the saddle as befits a good cavalryman.

The Enforcement of Soviet Citizenship on Polish Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "One and a Half Million Poles Reported Held as Red 'Pawns'," which was written by the brilliant Chicago Tribune staff writer, Mr. Walter Trohan, in the Chicago Tribune under date of April 11, 1943:

ONE AND ONE-HALF MILLION POLES REPORTED HELD AS RED PAWNS—USED TO GAG OPPOSITION TO TERRITORIAL GRAB

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 10.—Evidence that Russia is pressing her claim to eastern Poland by enforcing Soviet citizenship on one and a half million Polish refugees in that country has been received by the American Government.

The Soviets have stopped releasing refugee Poles, under a program arranged by Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, Polish prime minister-in-exile in London, and Josef Stalin, Prime Minister of Russia.

The "reds" have been using the one and a half million Poles as pawns in one of the greatest mass blackmail plots in history, according to information received here. The exiled Polish government in London has been told by indirection not to press for full restoration of the pre-war Poland, because things might go badly for the Polish refugees.

Jan Ciechanowski, Polish Ambassador, conferred with President Roosevelt this week. It was assumed they discused the latest Polish problem. However, neither the White House nor the Polish Embassy would say more than that the Ambassador presented a message from Premier Sikorski.

RED CLAIMS PUBLISHED

Russia advanced her claim to eastern Poland in an article written last February in Pravda, official organ of the "red" government, by Alexander Korneichuk, member of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. Since the appearance of the article, which attracted world-wide attention because of its acknowledgment of Soviet imperialistic designs, Korneichuk has been made undersecretary for foreign affairs, a position which corresponds to that held by Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles.

With the announcement of Russia's territorial ambitions, according to the information received here, the Polish refugees became hostages to the Soviet Government. All token releases of Polish refugees were halted and a systematic campaign was begun to enforce Soviet citizenship on the Poles.

Those refugees, who refuse to take out Soviet passports, it was reported, are denied food and are sent to enforced labor camps. Reports of the beating of patriotic men, women, and children, who have refused to place themselves under the "red" flag, have been received here.

The attempt to enforce "red" citizenship on the Polish hostages followed reported British blessing of Russia's imperialism. It was reported that British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden during his recent mission here urged American leaders not to thwart Russian expansion aims, at least for the present.

The Poles involved were driven into Russia during the Russo-German partition of their country in the fall of 1939. At that time they numbered 1,800,000 men, women, and children, many of them Jews.

OVER 300,000 HAVE DIED

Between 300,000 and 400,000 died, including Jan Pilsudski, financier and brother of the Polish soldier-statesman, Marshal Pilsudski, and Alexander Prystor, former Prime Minister.

When Poles in America celebrated a mass for these dead in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City, the State Department, reportedly motivated by Communist sympathizers, attempted to call off the solemn memorial on the ground the prayers might embarrass the Soviets.

Russia promised to release all the Polish refugees, but allowed only 145,000 to leave the country. These have found temporary refuge in Persia awaiting transfer to the New World. Arrangements were made for shipment to Mexico. However, none has been transferred to date and only 10,000 have received visas.

It was reported in American relief circles here that the Soviet campaign for enforced citizenship of the refugees has upset humanitarian efforts among the Poles. Distribution of food, clothing, medical supplies, and other necessities has been overturned by the Red campaign and many of the refugees are in dire want, it was said.

Pay As You Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the building and construction trades council of the metropolitan district of Boston, to endorse the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan of taxation:

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION
TRADES OF THE
METROPOLITAN DISTRICT,
Boston, Mass., April 14, 1943.

Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WIGGLESWORTH: At regular meeting of the Building and Construction Trades Council of the Metropolitan District, held Monday, April 12, the Secretary was instructed to communicate with you and inform you that our council voted "to endorse the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan of taxation."

Therefore, in accordance with the foregoing vote, we beg to advise that our council has in affiliation to it 52 local unions composed of building and construction trades workers, ranging from laborers to skilled mechanics.

During 1942, these workers have been employed in various construction projects and their earnings have reached an unprecedented high in the construction industry. For the first time in 2 years, we now have members of these various unions returning to the loafing halls, and we anticipate a tremendous step-up in the numbers of unemployed because of the let-down in governmental construction, particularly, and we know definitely that until the war is over, there will be no city, town, or State construction, neither will there be investment of private capital in the construction of mercantile, manufacturing, or residential buildings, for reasons with which you are acquainted.

The point that we want to make is that during 1941–42, our workers received full-time wages, now they are on part-time employment. They have not saved any money because the money they received has gone to pay off debts, has provided a better standard of living, and has created a false impression that good times were here and were to continue indefinitely. These people now are faced with paying taxes on their 1942 income and, no doubt, will be forced to skimp and sacrifice, mortgage their homes, and give up essentials in order to pay this tax.

On the other hand, however, if the pay-as-you-go-tax plan is in effect, the load would be eased. The workers would adjust themselves to paying taxes as they pay their bills out of current income and would not be piling up a debt that would overwhelm them.

We feel that there is considerable merit from the workers' point of view in the pay-as-you-go plan of taxation, and we urge that you support this form of payment of income taxes thereby relieving the worker of the burden that he now, of necessity, is forced to carry.

Very truly yours,

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN DISTRICT,
E. A. JOHNSON, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

Hull Unaware of F. D.-Eden Poland "Deal"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington-Times Herald of today:

HULL UNAWARE OF F. D.-EDEN POLAND "DEAL"

Secretary of State Cordell Hull yesterday denied knowledge of a reported agreement between President Roosevelt and British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden calling for restoration of Poland's pre-war boundaries.

The agreement was reported in dispatches from London. Hull said if such an agreement had been effected he would probably, but not necessarily, have information of it.

DAVIES' STORY CHALLENGED

The London report surprised diplomatic circles here because it had been widely believed Eden came here to secure the President's endorsement of Russian aims, which Britain is believed to have approved, to take over a large section of eastern Poland.

As Hull denied this Government has pledged itself to restore pre-war Poland, Polish Ambassador Jan Ciechanowski sharply challenged a Life Magazine article written by Joseph E. Davies, former ambassador to Russia, which indorsed the Soviet's claim to eastern Poland.

In the first Polish official expression on the Polish-Russian frontier dispute, which was precipitated by the advancement of Soviet claims in an article written by

Aleksander Kornejtchuk, under secretary of foreign affairs, for official Red newspaper Pravda, the Polish Ambassador listed four inaccurate statements by Davies:

"1. Ambassador Davies' statement that Poland's eastern territories were carved out of and taken away from Russia is both incorrect and misleading because it implies that these territories were seized by force and held by Poland against the will of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"STATEMENT INCORRECT

"2. Further in this article Ambassador Davies says that 5,000,000 Ukrainians were arbitrarily converted into Polish citizens after the last war. This statement is incorrect.

"3. Contrary to Mr. Davies' assertion, there was no such thing as a Curzon commission under the Versailles Treaty and the conference of Versailles did not settle the eastern boundaries of Poland. Nor was the so-called Curzon line the line of racial demarcation of Polish and Russian nationalities.

"4. In another paragraph of his article Ambassador Davies states that it was Poland who has now raised what he is pleased to call these controversial frontier matters, and that this was done contrary to the implied consent to the postponement of the determination of the issue until after victory."

The Ambassador said the Polish-Russian frontier was fixed by virtue of the Treaty of Riga, concluded March 18, 1921, which treaty was approved by the Allied powers in 1923, and that the frontier was not fixed by force.

As a result of this treaty, he continued, answering the Davies assertion of enforced citizenship of Ukrainians, the acquisition of citizenship on both sides of the Polish-Soviet border was natural.

FIXED BY RIGA PARLEY

"The citizenship of these populations was never assailed or questioned by either of the signatories to the Riga treaty," he said. "At no time * * * did that population ever express the desire to be incorporated to Soviet Russia or to Soviet Ukraine."

The Ambassador said the so-called Curzon line was a tentative demarcation line which Lord Curzon, then British foreign secretary, suggested in the hope of stopping Polish-Soviet hostilities in 1920. The line was rejected, he said, by the "reds" and the frontier was finally fixed by the Riga conference at the conclusion of hostilities in a Polish victory.

The Ambassador labeled as a misstatement of fact the Davies assertion that the Polish Government had raised the boundary issue. He charged it was first raised by Under Foreign Secretary Kornejtchuk in the Communist organ Pravda, which article was officially circulated in the official Information Bulletin by the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

Stabilization of International Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems that will face the post-war world will be the stabilization of international exchange.

Two plans have been proposed. One by the Treasury Department of the United States, sponsored by Secretary Morgenthau, and one by the government of Great Britain, which seems to be what is known as the Keynes plan.

The fundamental difference, as I grasp it, is this: The Morgenthau plan would introduce a gold basis for this international credit mechanism. The Keynes plan makes it merely a bookkeeping credit, which I feel is not as sound as the Treasury plan.

As yet we have had no proposals from either Russia or China. It is my hope, however, that the proposals these two governments offer will be given full consideration.

Personally, I like the Morgenthau plan. It seems to me to be in accord with the psychology of the present.

I am confident that businessmen, the world over, would feel that an international exchange unit based on gold would be more stable than one based on a mere bookkeeping entry.

Without attempting a too elaborate detail of the provisions of the two proposals, I am inserting a draft of the principal differences between the two plans which the Treasury kindly supplied.

First. The Treasury draft provides for a fund with resources of gold, local currency, and government securities contributed by the participating countries. These resources would be used to sell foreign exchange for local currency, under adequate safeguards, to countries requiring such exchange for their current transactions.

The Keynes plan provides for book credits in the form of bancor to be available to countries with a debit balance on their international transactions, the financing of this deficit in local currency to be undertaken by countries with a credit balance on their international transactions. The appropriate debit and credit balances for each country would be represented in terms of bancor on the books of the International Clearing Union.

Second. The Treasury draft provides that voting power be distributed among participating countries on the basis of their subscriptions to the fund. The subscriptions of each country would be based on a combination of such factors as its holdings of gold and foreign exchange, its national income, and changes in its balance of payments position.

The Keynes plan provides that voting power be distributed among participating countries on the basis of their pre-war foreign trade. Some provision is made for reducing the voting power of countries with excessive debit balances and increasing the voting power of countries with credit balances on the books of the International Clearing Union.

Third. The Treasury draft provides a distinct limit to the obligation of any participating country to provide funds for facilitating the maintenance of stability in exchange rates.

The Keynes plan for an international clearing union does not provide such definitive limits, although penalties are placed upon countries whose debit balances exceed their allotted quotas.

One thing is certain, if we are to avoid economic chaos and black night in the turmoil that will necessarily ensue in the post-war period, some such plan will have to be adopted.

The present Treasury plan, as well as the Keynes plan, is purely tentative. To my mind it is similar to an architect's drawing of a building, showing elevations and floor plans but minus detailed specifications.

It does, however, present an opportunity for discussion and to that extent it is an important contribution to this single but tremendously important phase of post-war planning.

Army Postal Service Is Training Men To Carry on the Huge Task of Handling Army Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult problems confronting the Army is the colossal task of moving and distributing mail to our soldiers all over the world.

The Army Postal Service is meeting this problem with an ever increasing efficiency.

Men are being constantly trained in the method of handling the Army mails. A school is conducted at West Chester, Pa., for this purpose.

Col. C. C. Garner, deputy director for planning of the Army Postal Service, delivered an address on Wednesday of this week to a graduating class of the school at West Chester. Colonel Garner, like many other officers in the Army Postal Service, was an experienced and able postal official in civilian life. He was in the United States postal system from May 1920 until the time he entered the Army Postal Service.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the address of Colonel Garner to be printed in full at the conclusion of these remarks for the information of Members of the Congress.

The Army Postal Service operates as a unit of The Adjutant General's Department. The director of this service is Brig. Gen. C. S. Adams, now on duty overseas. Col. W. A. Kenyon is acting director during his absence. The executive officer of this service is Col. George E. Isaacs.

These men, along with Colonel Garner, head a devoted and loyal unit of the Army that is constantly striving to overcome, and sometimes overcoming insurmountable problems, to keep the mail flowing to our soldiers.

The address referred to follows:

I welcome you into the ranks of the Army Postal Service. On behalf of the entire Army postal organization I extend to you our heartiest congratulations on the successful completion of your Army postal training course.

Today marks the beginning of a new and highly significant era in Army postal organization. It likewise represents a milestone of

progress for this great world-wide postal system, which is being operated by the War Department as an integral part of the Army itself.

From this beautiful campus here at the West Chester State Teachers College you men who have just completed the prescribed postal course of the first enlisted postal school ever to be established will go forth to areas throughout the world where American troops are stationed.

You will carry with you a basic and fundamental concept of the Army postal problems and by so doing you will be in a position to better serve the Army in the providing of complete postal facilities.

As members of the first graduating class of Enlisted Branch No. 9 of the Army Administration Schools, you have rounded out your basic military training with a specialized training in Army postal operations. This, added to your previous postal experience in the civilian postal system prior to your entrance into the Army, should, and I feel does, qualify you admirably for your respective assignments.

In coming into the Army Postal Service it is most important that you have a keen appreciation of your duties and responsibilities. This, I know, has been instilled in you here at this school, and upon this point I cannot dwell too strongly.

Let us, for a moment, pause to contemplate the importance of our job.

It is not overstatement for me to tell you that the manner in which you as individuals fulfill your respective assignments will be reflected in varying degrees in the fighting qualities of American troops now engaged in an all-out strugle for the preservation of our democratic ideals.

For, we must not for one instant fail to comprehend to the fullest the vital role which the mails play in maintaining and boosting morale among American troops. Ours is a citizen Army. The great majority of its members have only recently left their homes, their families, their friends, and their jobs. They have only recently left their native or chosen communities. In many cases they have been moved to the far corners of the earth. Some are serving on the rim of the Arctic, some around the Equator, some in the wilds of New Guinea, some on the sands of the western desert, some on lonely outposes in the South Pacific—all thousands of miles from home.

Their every thought is on winning this war and winning it in the fastest possible time. But the underlying and most precious thoughts in their mind from day to day are of loved ones back home; of their mothers, their fathers, their brothers, their sisters, their sons, their brothers, their sisters, their friends. Their only means of maintaining this human link with these folks back home is through the Army Postal Service and the facilities it provides.

To them, mail is as important as food. This but few will deny. It is your job to get this mail to and from them. By the service you render so likewise will their morale be fixed.

Ever cognizant of this, the War Department and the Army is doing everything within its power and exerting every effort at its command to provide the best possible mail service at all times to American soldiers.

Your ingenuity will be taxed—your resourcefulness challenged—and you as postal experts will be constantly called upon to meet problems with which you were never confronted in the post offices in which you served as civilians.

This is the challenge you have accepted in completing this course. This is the challenge the Army Postal Service expects you to meet. By so doing you will be making a definite and outstanding contribution to the maintenance of the all-important Army postal link.

In the larger sense you will be making a singular contribution to the soldiers whose mail you are handling—a contribution to their morale in the form of mental ammunition which will be reflected in their fighting qualities.

Yours is a responsibility as great as that held by any enlisted man in any branch of the Army, because your efforts will touch intimately thousands of soldiers and thousands of their families, relatives, and friends at home.

The Army Postal Service, in providing mail facilities to and from and within all overseas theaters of operation, is today performing the greatest single postal job ever undertaken by any postal system, civilian or military.

To have a part in this vital service which means so much to every man in the Army from the highest ranking general officer to the rawest recruit is a privilege and an honor which you should cherish.

Yours is a grave responsibility to your fellow soldiers, to the Army proper, and to the people of America. You have been carefully selected and carefully trained. To your care has been entrusted an important role in maintaining the personal-communications link between soldiers in the field, in combat zones, in the front lines and their families, relatives, and friends back home.

Never, for a single moment, misplace that trust, that confidence, that responsibility which is now yours.

I thank you.

Nebraska's Tri-County Project Can Produce Enormous Foodstuffs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of this Congress to an irrigation project out in Nebraska. This was originally called the tri-county project, but is more properly referred to as the Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District. It serves the counties of Gosper, Phelps, Kearney, and Adams.

This territory has an excellent soil and with this irrigation water it can be made to produce in a manner that is excelled by no other area. Right now it is not in production like it should be, because of the manpower shortage, the need for machinery, and the need for some further development in the way of additional ditches, land leveling, and like work, which again calls for manpower and machinery.

In the efforts of the Government of the United States to increase food production and to do it quickly, immediate attention should be given to the great potentialities of this splendid area. The people of that area have lived through years of drought, working to make irrigation become a reality. If given a chance now they can render an unusual service to our country in added food production.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a resolution from the Tri-County Water Users Association; following this, a letter that I have received from Mr. Chester Davis and my reply thereto:

"Whereas the tri-county area comprises 170,000 acres of class 1 irrigable land, with ditches already constructed and 1,000,000 acre-feet of water already in storage in the Kingsley Dam, which has a total capacity of 2,000,000 acre-feet, but only 55,000 acres is now being irrigated because of the lack of suitable and sufficient farm equipment, shortage of farm labor, and land development. And further that if land-leveling equipment and credit facilities could be made available to the farmers and landowners in this district the irrigated acreage for 1944 production could be doubled: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we the board of directors of the Tri-County Water Users Association, an organization of the irrigation farmers under the tri-county system, do hereby petition the Water Conservation and Utilization Division of the Farm Security Administration for assistance in getting the land properly developed for efficient irrigation and in getting of additional farm equipment and labor to properly cultivate and crop the land so that this district can materially increase in 1944 the production of the food so badly needed in the war effort."

By action of the board of directors at a special meeting held on April 6 it was requested that the above petition be sent to Senator Hugh A. Butler; Senator Kenneth S. Wherry; Congressman Carl T. Curtis; Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture; Chester C. Davis, Food Administrator; and C. H. Willson, Area Director, Water Conservation and Utilization Division of the Farm Security Administration.

TRI-COUNTY WATER USERS ASSOCIATION,
AXEL L. SJOGREN, *President*.
CLARENCE A. PETERSON, *Secretary*.

FOOD PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1943.

Hon. CARL T. CURTIS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: I appreciate your keen interest in increasing the production of war-needed crops and in the fuller utilization of lands under the ditches of the Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District for this purpose as expressed in your letter of March 31.

Representatives of several Department of Agriculture agencies interested in the production possibilitiies of this area recently discussed the situation with the agricultural engineer and assistant chief engineer of the district. Approximately 60,000 of the 170,000 acres in the Platte River watershed served by this District will probably be irrigated this year by about 900 farmers. Water is available for the remaining 110,000 acres, but under existing circumstances th/ prospects for its application to the land in the near future are not good.

Technical assistance to farmers in laying out farm ditches and laterals and making available heavy equipment for leveling about 20 percent of the land are necessary to place it in condition for irrigating. Efforts are being made to help the district locate heavy equipment suitable for lateral construction and land leveling with a view to preparing additional land for irrigation next year at a reasonable cost.

As you have indicated, it appears that shortage of farm labor and farm machinery

will be important facors influencing the kinds of crops grown and amounts produced unless existing deficiencies can be met.

The War Production Board has recently authorized some increase in the allotment of materials for manufacture of farm machinery so the prospects are that the present general condition of shortage will evenutually be somewhat relieved.

The war boards of the three counties in which the district is situated have certified the area for location of Civilian Public Service camps.

Extensive efforts are being made to locate and mobilize labor for use on farms in various parts of the country. We are particularly aware of the importance of adequate labor supplies in the food production program and are hopeful that these efforts will succeed in alleviating the shortages in areas such as the central Nebraska district.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER C. DAVIS,
Administrator.

APRIL 13, 1943.

Hon. CHESTER C. DAVIS,
Administrator, Food Production and Distribution Administration,
United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DAVIS: I want to thank you for your letter of April 12 in reference to a greater utilization of the lands under the ditches of the central Nebraska public power and irrigation district. I appreciate what the Department of Agriculture is already doing along this line.

The purpose of this letter is to request that, if at all possible, there should be assigned to this area one or two camps of conscientious objectors. The men and boys in these camps are more or less familiar with agriculture, and I believe they would be of the type of help of the greatest value. This area has great potentialities for the production of food, and we should not let the year 1943 go by without utilizing it to the fullest extent.

Again thanking you and with personal greetings, I am,

Yours truly,

CARL T. CURTIS.

The Trade Agreement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee of the House is hard at work trying to figure out the wisest procedure with regard to the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act. From its very inception, the act has not been satisfactory for several reasons. The first is the secrecy which, in the past, has been thrown around the trade negotiations by the State Department. Notices of negotiations were given. Interested parties testified. The State Department then proceeded as it saw fit, according to its own policy, and, apparently, without much regard for the tariff requirements of the country. Constitutional questions have been involved, because these trade agreements are in effect treaties, and, under the Constitution, the United States Senate is required to act on all treaties and approve by a two-thirds majority vote if the treaties are to go into effect. In some countries, the parliamentary situation is entirely different from that of the United States in that their governments can be changed at any time by a vote of no confidence on the part of the parliamentary body. This is not true in the United States.

Another point involved which has been a very difficult one is the most-favored-nations clause in these agreements. Whereas most of the other nations dealing with us accord to us alone any advantages of trade, we, in following the most-favored-nations clause, grant to all other nations, except those with whom we are at war, all of the advantages we grant to the nation entering into an agreement with us. This in effect operates to cause the United States to give away all of its trade advantages to countries which are not granting us any advantages at all, so that when we come to negotiate with them we have no stock in trade left.

Fourteen nations with whom we have trade agreements permitted no part of the treaty to go into effect until their legislative bodies had approved them. Twelve other nations permitted only a tentative and temporary operation of the agreements until their legislative bodies confirmed them. Four little countries only, Belgium, Cuba, Ecuador, and Peru, permit their executives to have the power given President Roosevelt—the sole power to put the agreements into effect. This means that 26 out of 30 nations with whom we have treaties required legislative knowledge and action on these treaties before they could be finally effective.

The question arises as to why this rule should not apply to the United States. In other words, why should not the American Congress know the details of and have the power to act on these trade agreements exactly the same as do these 26 other countries?

Of course, whatever plan is discussed for having the Congress take affirmative action to ratify these trade agreements, or to require action by both Houses of Congress to negative the agreements after they are made by the Executive, immediately involves the constitutional question of the treaty-making power of the Senate.

The American people ought to be made aware that great power is vested in the President, and by him in turn in the State Department, under these trade treaty-making powers. Therefore, since these treaties have an effect upon the lives and the welfare of every man, woman, and child in the Nation, certainly it would appear that the Congress ought to know how far these powers are being carried, and in what far-reaching commitments the United States may become involved through the Chief Executive.

The American people ought also to be made aware that if the Congress refuses to renew the Trade Agreements Act, that action would not cancel or bring to an end any of the trade agreements we now have with other nations. Those agreements would continue in effect until one or the other country had given 6 months' notice of intention to discontinue the agreement. About the only reason for continuing the act at this time is the psychological effect upon other countries allied with us in the war effort. For some years after the war ceases, there probably will be little or no such thing as foreign trade conducted as it has been in the past. All trade possibly may be governmentally managed and directed. The power thus to control all trade is enormous. Such power is susceptible of abuse, or of mistaken, though sincere, misuse, and commitments could be made which would deeply involve the American people in responsibilities which might easily prove difficult and perhaps economically impossible to carry out. There are many Members of the Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, who sincerely believe that such broad powers, carrying with them the ability to involve the American people in far-reaching and disastrous commitments, is too great to be entrusted to any one man and that Congress should renew its constitutional powers and pass upon these treaties before they are carried into effect. These are some of the problems with which the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is wrestling in trying to determine the proper conditions under which the Congress should continue the Trade Agreements Act.

The whole question should be kept strictly free of partisan political taint and should be worked out on the basis most advantageous for the American people. We can do this and at the same time be fair to the peoples of other nations.

The United States Should Have a Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of debate these days on the general subject of our post-war policy and of our war aims, but little if anything is done about it. We should have a clear and complete declaration of America's war aims and of her position at the post-war peace table. Our people and the people of the world should know just what we are fighting for and what we will seek when we accept the unconditional surrender by our enemies.

On that subject, I submit herewith a very well written and forceful editorial taken from a recent issue of the Plymouth Daily Pilot:

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD HAVE A FOREIGN POLICY

Congress has begun the consideration of what the United Nations should do in making the peace after the war and what part the United States shall have in the making

and carrying out of those treaties. Writers galore, from the President on down, have been setting forth what they think Uncle Sam should do to "win the peace." Plans for continued world peace, for world reorganization and for the creation of an idealistic global fix-up are becoming more and more common. Everybody who dreams of a world as it ought to be is publishing his plan to settle all problems after the war so that all peoples will be satisfied, happy, and well fed.

In the meantime, Uncle Sam has no foreign policy which may be called a policy; no policy to which one may point and say: "That is our policy in dealing with foreign nations; that is what you may expect from the United States."

Great Britain has a foreign policy and has had for a hundred years or more. The core of it is that she will maintain a big navy and keep control of the oceans. That is necessary because her commonwealths ring the globe. Just as important as a big navy is the policy that Great Britain will always look out for Great Britain first, last, and all the time.

There are a few principles which the United States has established which form parts of what might be made into a foreign policy. They can be listed as follows:

1. The Monroe Doctrine, which we have quite consistently followed since its making in the 1820's, but which has been considerably changed of late.

2. In 1898 we brought about the "open door" policy in regard to China. Combined with that was the implication of the independence of China as a nation. It was that policy which brought us into conflict with Japan, for Japan refuses to yield to the "open door" idea. We believe our people quite generally back the "open door" policy in China.

3. We believe that the United States should keep complete control of the Panama Canal. The Nation will agree on that.

4. The policy of nonaggression and of peace with all nations is one which we may say all parties and all our people favor. But not peace at any price. We will not go to war unless attacked, is the way we put it. Sinking of the Maine was the immediate cause for the Spanish-American War; sinking of many United States ships by German submarines was the immediate cause of our entrance into the First World War; attack by Japan on Pearl Harbor plunged us into this war.

Connected with this is our desire to keep out of foreign entanglements, the purpose being to keep out of war. But we have spread over the globe so far and wide that it is almost impossible not to become entangled with some nation.

5. In the last war we adopted the policy of not taking any spoils of war, either territory or things. Yet we did acquire some new bases. Is that to be our policy at the end of this war?

6. Once upon a time we had a doctrine of the "Freedom of the Seas." We fought for that doctrine and made it stick, although other nations would not agree. In recent decades, however, we have backed down on the freedom of the seas policy. Once we dared say to the bully nations who interfered with our freedom of the seas: "Now you boys go ahead and fight all you want to, but, be sure you keep your hands off our ships!" Now we timidly crawl back to our coastline and say to these nations: "Oh, please, sir, please don't attack our ships. We will keep out of your way; we'll be good."

Yes; it is high time we formed a foreign policy. We need that first, before we start out to reorganize the world. We should know quite definitely what our foreign policy is before we try to tell other nations what their foreign policy should be.

The principles and policies listed above form quite a basis for what might be formed into our foreign policy. If these, or any of them, constitute our foreign policy, somebody ought to say so. Whatever we adopt as a foreign policy should not be a mere partisan pronouncement; it should be the policy of and for the whole Nation, a policy on which all parties could unite as against the world.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I reproduce a letter just received from a constituent of mine who presents his views in reference to the tax bill which recently was recommitted to the Ways and Means Committee:

WEST BROS. DEPARTMENT STORES,
Minden, La., April 3, 1943.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I was glad to note in the papers this week that you voted against the Ruml plan for forgiveness of a year of income tax. I feel as you undoubtedly must that with the heavy expenditures for the war effort that we need more money instead of foregiveness of taxes.

I am saying this even though it would lower my taxes or delay the payment of same. I know my taxes are very small considering what many others are but Mrs. West and I will pay around $65,000 Federal income tax on last year's return. A great portion of our income was made because of the war effort; that is, war industries being located where we have stores. My associates and myself will pay our $200,000 in income taxes based on 1942 rates and we will pay it quarterly in equal amounts. However, if we were on a pay-as-you-go basis by forgiving 1942 taxes the estimate of our income for the first quarter wolud be small, and the same is true of the second quarter profits, so consequently the first, second or third quarters of a taxable year we would not pay near as much tax per quarter as we will by paying the following year; as we naturally would not show as much profit in our business the first three quarters as we do the last quarter as that is the time we make the majority of our profit.

I don't pretend to be a tax expert and don't know too much about taxes except to pay them; but it seems that if we could get on a pay-as-you-go plan over a period of 3 or 4 years without much forgiveness it would be much better than the Ruml plan, which it seems to me works in favor of people like we are (that is people in business) and salaried people, and I again want to commend you on your stand on this question.

Yours truly,

H. O. WEST.

I think this letter is worthy of special consideration. It represents the patriotic views of many of our citizens who want to match, as far as a businessman can, the sacrifices of our boys in the armed services. It is the attitude of our citizens such as this that has made America great and which will carry our banner through many a day of trial to final victory. I cannot believe that the people of this country desire to do less than their full part toward victory.

Education of the People, by the People, and for the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include with my remarks herewith a most significant letter recently received by me from Mr. John Carson, the Washington director of the Cooperative League of the United States of America.

Mr. Carson's letter will be self-explanatory I am sure. In it he sets forth a proposal which appears to me to be the logical end result of any democratic system of education, namely the projection of that educational system into the homes of the Nation and the continuance of the educational processes throughout the adult lives of our citizens. It is after all not reasonable for us to believe or to act as if we believed that education can be completed at the end of a high school, or a college, or even a professional course of study. For true education is life itself, and the need for such education continues throughout our existence on this earth.

Furthermore, we are in a position to profit from the experience of some of the cooperative study groups which have been organized in our own country, notably in the State of Ohio, from the experience of the people of Nova Scotia, and from the experience of the folk schools of Denmark.

The letter follows:

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1943.

Hon. JERRY VOORHIS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: I am happy over your inquiry about the school, or conference on taxation and fiscal problems and inflation held at the University of Minnesota a few weeks ago, and which was described in our cooperative newspapers. If you will bear with me, I shall attempt to tell you that story. It may be, in fact I think it is, of great national importance. I think the Cooperative League U. S. A. is laboring with the birth of a real idea and a real program of adult education. I should add and emphasize that the conference was a school and that it should have been described as a school.

It has been said by some of our ablest observers that the finest expression of democracy in the world might have been found in Denmark prior to the war. And every observer to whom I have talked has ascribed that

democratic development and that high degree of civilization to the folk schools of Denmark and the real adult-education program fostered by the folk schools.

I know of your interest in education and of your many efforts to develop greater interest in the problems of democracy. Likewise, I know of your understanding that the welfare and health of any democratic society depends entirely upon the efficiency of the educational processes in that society. You have said that in much the same manner that the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis said it. You have observed that the success of educational processes depends not only upon the ability of the educator to teach but also upon the interest and desire and the ability of the students to learn. It seems to me that the Danish folk schools succeeded so marvelously because of the ability of those leaders to inspire a desire to learn, almost an insatiable desire to learn.

Many of our Cooperative League leaders have talked about the possibility of developing a folk school in this country. I should hesitate to express an opinion but I have been impressed that the Danish school succeeded because it grew right out of the roots of Denmark. It was a natural expression of the Danish society and the Danish culture. I have wondered whether we should not think more about using the educational facilities we now have to accomplish the purpose reached by the Danish folk school.

Our universities, public and private, and our high schools offer us today the established institutions of learning, the centers that we need. They are organized to send out currents of education. They must have the other pole to form the circuit, the pole of mobilized learners and mobilized interest in learning.

Our consumer cooperative study clubs or discussion groups, affiliated with our great cooperative regional organizations which are members of the Cooperative League U. S. A. are ideal neighborhood schools. There are thousands of these clubs. They are no ephemeral thing. They have survived the test. They have long and successful experience. Other groups have study clubs. Various organizations of women, of organized labor, of organized farmers are interested in this general effort. Professional men might become interested. We know from experience that our consumer cooperative study groups could develop into the American folk school. The experience in Nova Scotia proves that is not only a possibility, that it is a certainty as leaders emerge from these study groups.

Those were the facts, the experiences, and the thinking behind the school at the University of Minnesota about which you inquired. The story of that school went back to a day last summer when we, in the Washington office of the Cooperative League U. S. A., were asked to assist in presenting to the Federal Trade Commission an argument in support of a petition to establish certain standards of quality for certain goods. The Government expert then told us how he, when active in university life, had spent years in research in that particular field. The people of that State should have been and would have been interested in his work if they had been inspired to be interested but the work had been done, as so much other research work in universities is done, in the cloister. The value of this work, paid for by the people of the State, was lost because of the nonexistent arteries of education and the dead roots back home. This man waxed enthusiastically over the suggestion that a way could be found and should be found to take the university and that work out of the cloister and back into the kitchens and parlors and the cooperative study clubs. That experience caused us to begin wrestling anew with this problem of giving great vitality to our educational processes.

At the congress of the Cooperative League U. S. A. held in Minneapolis last September, the congress which you attended, representatives of the cooperative regional organizations, A. J. Smaby and Glenn Thompson, of Midland Cooperative Wholesale, of Minneapolis, and A. J. Hayes and Edward Whitney, of Central Cooperative Wholesale, of Superior, Wis., arranged to approach the very earnest educators at the University of Minnesota and to discuss the possibility of organizing a short school, let us say, of 3 days' duration, on the general subject of finance, taxation, and inflation. It was proposed to invite representatives of many organized groups in Minnesota to participate in the school, and to exclude none.

It was planned to provide a lecture course in which every phase of the national and State and municipal fiscal problem was presented by very able professors and that at the end of the "school," the groups represented should assume the responsibility for carrying that information back to the people for study and discussion. It was proposed also that later another "school" on this general subject should be held to appraise the effectiveness of the work and to encourage a sense of responsibility on the part of those interested.

The "school" was held at the University of Minnesota. Representatives of organizations of women, of cooperative organizations, of one farm organization, of financial institutions, sat through the days and nights with professors who exposed every phase of the general problem. The Budget of the Federal Government was examined, the sources of revenue discussed, the effect of expenditures and of taxation on inflation was also discussed and the terrors of inflation were exposed. The tax and budget problems of local governments, cities, and counties and townships were discussed by very competent men. The next step was for the group leaders to develop the method for taking that information back to the people.

You know, of course, that the Universities of Minnesota and of Wisconsin, and of various other States have done much in this general field of adult education. But I think the program adopted for this school at the University of Minnesota offers the facilities, heretofore lacking, to make this adult education program successful. The development of our study clubs or discussion groups and their association with the universities offers an opportunity to make the program successful. I hope that the professors in our high schools may be brought into this work and thus encouraged to become leaders in the study clubs of their communities. Thus the seed is thrown out at the university and the study clubs mulch the ground and give light and air and life to the seeds as they fall back home.

I am not attempting to deal here with our cooperative schools, already established, Rochdale Institute in New York, the Midwest Management School in Chicago, the local schools associated with each regional wholesale, the correspondence school just formed. These cooperative schools will continue to do their work and make their contribution to cooperative education. I am thinking of extending to those not now associated with the cooperative movement the opportunities of a real adult-education program.

Obviously, the Cooperative League U. S. A. was pioneering in this effort, and still is. The league was not attempting to make this a consumer cooperative venture but was merely assuming the burden of organization work and offering to others the opportunity to assume leadership.

But if this pattern can be developed, it can be expanded to other fields, to the arts and sciences, to music, to literature, to the drama. Again, consumer cooperative organizations already are doing much in those fields. The Cooperative League U. S. A. has a division and a secretary to promote national interest in that field to which has been given its proper name, "recreation" or "re-creation."

Is not there an opportunity here to develop a folk school in this country?

Is there not here a plan which most professors would welcome to take the university and the high school out of the cloister and back to the people?

And right now, when universities and high schools are worrying about students, is there not the golden opportunity to develop a real adult education program and thus discover masses of new students? We may discover thousands of men and women who were deprived of a university education by financial reasons, men and women who were compelled to pay through taxation for those universities they could not use and which they needed to help them in a race where they had all too many handicaps.

Is not there a challenge here? I assure you the Cooperative League U. S. A. is doing its part and will continue to struggle on to meet the challenge successfully.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN CARSON,
Director, Washington Office,
Cooperative League U. S. A.

Money—The Most Important Issue Before the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House, this is the first of a series of installments to appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of one of the greatest speeches explaining the origin, history, and manipulation of our monetary system ever made in the Congress of the United States. A speech prepared with the most painstaking research by the eminent Senator from Missouri, the late F. M. Cockrell.

Now that the nations of the world are again undertaking to standardize their several monetary systems in an effort to stabilize international exchange it is timely and fitting that we reexamine the plan by which our present monetary system was established. In order that we may be guided by the experience of the past in formulating a monetary program and devising a monetary system that will best serve the needs of the people of all countries in the conduct of both domestic and international trade and business in order to promote the advancement and safeguard the welfare of ourselves and the people of all countries.

The first installment of Senator Cockrell's speech follows:

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, no more important measure has ever been pending in the Senate than the present bill, no measure fraught with more important results to the present and coming generations. Its importance demands and justifies its fullest consideration.

Gold and silver by the common law of England, transplanted here by our ancestors, were money and a full legal tender in payment

of debts upon a perfect equality as coin and bullion down to the adoption of our Constitution. We had the true bimetallic system.

By the express terms of our Constitution—

"The Congress shall have power * * * to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures."

And further:

"No State shall * * * coin money * * * or make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts."

Our Constitution clearly establishes bimetallism, and vests in the Congress the exclusive power to provide by laws for coining gold and silver metal into money and then to regulate and fix the legal-tender value of such coin and of foreign coin as such money. The Constitution does not give Congress the power to regulate the value, the market value, the commercial value, of gold and silver as metals, as commodities. It only gives the power to regulate the value of the coined gold and silver, whether of domestic or foreign coinage. It clearly gives to each State the right to make such gold and silver coins a legal tender in payment of debts.

Gold and silver coins are the money of our Constitution, which when enacted, only recognized what previously existed. Congress has no power to declare that either gold or silver coin shall not be money—no power to demonetize either gold or silver coin or both. Well did Daniel Webster declare:

"I am clearly of opinion that gold and silver at rates fixed by Congress constitute the legal standard of value in this country, and that neither Congress nor any State has authority to establish any other standard or to displace this standard."

When we demand that Congress shall by law fix the ratios between gold and silver coined in our mints into money and give to each equal powers and privileges, free or equal unlimited coinage, we demand only obedience to our Constitution.

Congress, by "An act establishing a mint and regulating the coins of the United States," approved April 2, 1792, exercised its constitutional power by establishing a mint and authorizing the coinage of gold, silver, and copper coins, and placed gold and silver upon a perfect equality, and gave to each unlimited coinage, and to the coins of each full legal tender in all payments, the gold coins to be eagles, half eagles, and quarter eagles of the declared value of ten, five, and two and one-half dollars, respectively, 11 parts pure gold to 1 of alloy; and the silver coin to be dollars or units, half dollars, quarter dollars, dimes, and half dimes, and made them all a full legal tender in payment of any and all sums.

The weight of the gold in $1 if coined would have been 27 grains standard and 24.75 pure, and the weight of the silver in the dollar or unit was 416 grains standard and 371¼ grains pure, and the value of this silver dollar was to be that of the Spanish milled dollar as then current. This law further declared—

"That the money of account of the United States shall be expressed in dollars or units, dimes or tenths * * * and that all accounts of the public officers and all proceedings in the Congress of the United States shall be kept in due conformity with this regulation"—

And—

"that the proportionate value of gold and silver in all coins which shall by law be current as money within the United States shall be as 15 to 1."

This, our first monetary law, continued in force until June 28, 1834.

Congress, by "An act concerning the gold coins of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1834, and to take effect July 31, 1834, reduced the standard weight and fineness of the gold coins from 27 grains standard and 24.75 pure in the dollar to 25.8 standard and 23.2 grains pure to the dollar, being a reduction of the standard gold of 1.2 grains and of the pure gold 1.55 grains to the dollar, and declared the new gold coins a full legal tender in all payments, and made all gold coins previously minted receivable in all payments at the rate of 94.8 cents per pennyweight.

Congress, by "An act to establish a mint and regulate the coins of the United States," approved January 18, 1837, fixed the standard for both gold and silver coin of the United States at 9 parts pure to 1 of alloy, and the weight of the silver dollar at 412½ grains, and of the half dollars, quarter dollars, dimes, and half-dimes correspondingly, and made them all legal tenders for all sums whatever. Thus the alloy was reduced, while the pure silver of 371¼ grains was retained in the standard silver dollar.

The standard weight of the gold coins was not changed, but the fineness was fractionally advanced, so that a gold dollar if coined would have contained 23.22 grains pure gold instead of 23.20, and these reductions by the laws of 1834 and 1837 of the weight and fineness of the gold coins changed the relative valuation or ratio of gold and silver in coinage from 1 to 15 to 15,988, and increased the coining rate or legal-tender value of gold in this country 6.589 percent, and both gold and silver bullion and coin were continued upon a perfect equality at the prescribed ratio.

Congress, by an act to authorize the coinage of gold dollars and double eagles, approved March 3, 1849, authorized the coinage of gold dollars, each to be of the value of $1, or unit, and double eagles, each to be of the value of $20, or units, with full legal tender and free coinage.

Congress, by an act amendatory of existing laws relative to the half dollar, quarter dollar, dime, and half dime, approved February 21, 1853, reduced the standard weight of the half dollar from 206¼ grains to 192 grains, a reduction of 14¼ grains, and the quarter dollar, dime, and half dime correspondingly, to take effect from June 1, 1853, and made them legal tender for all sums not exceeding $5, and they could only be coined upon Government account from silver purchased in the market.

This law continued the unlimited coinage, with full legal tender, of gold and silver bullion into gold coins and the standard silver dollar, and imposed a mint charge upon the depositor, whether the metal was coined or cast into ingots or bars, of one-half of 1 percent. This law also authorized the coinage of the 3-dollar gold piece, with full legal tender, and by the act of March 3, 1853, this law was made to take effect from April 1, 1853, and the charge for casting gold or silver into bars or ingots was reduced to the actual cost thereof.

By the law of March 3, 1853, the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to establish in New York City an assay office for assaying and casting gold and silver bullion and foreign coin into bars, ingots, or disks, and the Assistant Treasurer at New York was made the treasurer of such assay office, and was authorized, upon the deposit of gold or silver bullion or foreign coin and the ascertainment of its net value to "issue his certificate of the net value thereof, payable in coins of the same metal as that deposited, * * * which certificates shall be receivable at any time within 60 days from the date thereof in payment of all debts due to the United States at the port of New York, for the full sum therein certified," and the same charge was made as at the mint. This is the origin of our gold and silver certificates.

Congress, by "An act to provide ways and means for the support of the Government," approved March 3, 1863, authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to issue certificates for gold coin or bullion deposited in sums of not less than $20, such certificates to be receivable in payment of interest on the public debt and duties on imports.

Congress, by "An act revising and amending the laws relative to the mint, assay office, and coinage of the United States," approved February 12, 1873, and known as the Coinage Act of that year, established a single gold standard and declared the gold dollar piece of the standard weight of 25.8 grains, the unit of value, and prohibited the coinage of the silver dollar of 412½ grains, but continued the coinage of the half dollar nineteenths of a grain, or to 192.9, and the quarter dollar and dime correspondingly, and limited their legal tender to any amount not exceeding $5 in one payment, the silver bullion to be purchased for such coinage and coined on Government account, and also authorized the coinage of the trade dollar of 420 grains standard silver to be a legal tender for $5, which legal tender was repealed by the law of July 22, 1876.

From the foundation of our constitutional Government to February 12, 1873, our laws maintained our constitutional bimetallic system unimpaired—gold and silver upon a perfect equality with full monetary functions.

The standard silver dollar, containing 371¼ grains of pure silver, was maintained as the unit of value. The law of January 18, 1837, only reduced the alloy in the silver dollar 3½ grains, and made the dollar, silver and gold, 9 parts pure and 1 part alloy, instead of 11 parts fine and 1 part alloy.

The law of February 12, 1873, establishing the single gold standard and demonetizing the standard silver dollar of 37¼ grains pure silver and 412½ grains standard silver 0.9 fine and 0.1 alloy, was passed by a Congress overwhelmingly Republican in House and Senate, and was approved by a Republican President.

The Senator from Ohio, Mr. Sherman, was the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, and had charge of the bill in the Senate and well knew its provisions and effects. It is almost absolutely certain that there were not three other Senators, nor five Members of the House, who knew at the time that law was enacted that it demonetized the standard silver dollar or established the single gold standard.

At that time there was no discussion of the coinage question. There was no public demand for any legislation relative to the value, the fineness, or the ratio of gold and silver coin. Neither one of them was in actual circulation as money. Each one of them was at a large premium. A silver dollar of 371¼ grains pure was more valuable than a gold dollar 23.22 grains pure; or the standard silver dollar of 412½ grains was of more value as an article of merchandise in the open markets than the standard gold dollar of 25.8 grains.

There was something back of this, Mr. President. I am not going into a controversy at this time in regard to the motives that inspired the action which deliberately and intentionally led to the enactment of the law of 1873, and for which this country must hold the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio alone responsible, because I do not believe another Senator knew what was contained in that bill. The Senator from Ohio did know it.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Faulkner in the chair) Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. COCKRELL. With a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. PALMER. I am curious to know why some other Senator did not know it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Simply because there was no discussion. Every Senator who was here then and who has ever spoken on the subject since, has admitted that he did not know it; and the documents I have here give a full and complete history of this whole movement from 1861; they are included in the reports of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Director of the Mint. But the history of it is contained specially in documents sent to Congress and which were not

laid upon the desks of Senators, in all probability, or if they were, they were treated by Senators just as such documents are too often treated today—they did not read them, that was all. They ought to have known it, but they did not.

Mr. PALMER. I have understood from the history of the matter that the bill was several times printed and amended.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I have here a more complete collection of the documents on that question than I have ever yet seen or heard read in the Senate from the beginning, the recommendations of the mint officers, and the letters they sent out all over the country to doctrinaires to get their views upon coinage, and the recommendations they have given here for striking down the standard silver dollar, and all that. The Senator from Ohio (Mr. Sherman) is the only one that has ever pretended to know, and he pretends to be as innocent as an unborn child of what was going to be the effect of it, as I shall show before I get through.

Mr. PALMER. Innocence seems to have been the general condition of the Senate about that time.

Mr. COCKRELL. It seems so. Why? Because of the haste with which the measure was pressed through after it was brought up. It was brought up, read, and passed upon the assurance that it was simply a coinage law. No controversy arose over it to amount to anything. It was a bill of 65 or 66 sections. It received the same consideration that many long bills receive that are brought up here and upon which no discussion arises, no demand is made for the reading and Senators know nothing about them, and with regard to which the great masses of the people of this country have never been informed. They were not heard upon this matter. There was no demand for that legislation from any part of the world.

At that time, or rather on June 30, 1872, we had $1,794,277,650 outstanding interest-bearing United States bonds and $413,566,968 non-interest-bearing obligations, mostly United States notes, making a total of $2,207,844,618 liabilities—interest- and non-interest-bearing—of which $200,000,000 were the funded loan of 1881, issued under the law of July 14, 1870, and payable in coin of the standard value of the United States gold and silver dollars on said July 14, 1870. Nearly all the remaining liabilities—over two billions—were payable in any legal-tender dollars—gold, silver, or greenbacks. The distinguished Senator from Ohio has time and again—and I have his quotations here—asserted upon this floor that the 5-20 bonds were honestly and justly redeemable and payable in legal-tender greenbacks, that they were sold for greenbacks, exchanged for them, and could lawfully and justly be paid in them.

In the calendar years 1871 and 1872, we coined $1,117,136 and $1,118,600, and in the 1 month and 12 days—January 1, 1873, up to February 12, 1873—when its coinage was prohibited, we had coined $296,000 standard silver dollars, showing a very rapid increase in the coinage of such dollars.

Yet, with this record standing upon our books, the Senator from Ohio, who has been Secretary of the Treasury and ought to know this record, and the Senators who favor gold monometallism and oppose the rehabilitation of silver, have time and again proclaimed to the world that the people would not have silver coined into dollars.

The Senator from Ohio said in his speech here this very session that it was dropped because nobody was having it coined. Yet here is the record. In the 2 years, 1 month, and 12 days prior to February 12, 1873, we had coined 2,531,736 standard silver dollars—nearly one-third of the total coinage of such dollars to that date.

Mr. PEFFER. Will the Senator from Missouri be kind enough to give the aggregate production of our silver mines for those years?

Mr. COCKRELL. I will give it hereafter. I do not want to put it in at this point. I have the complete figures, but they come under another head.

I shall hereafter discuss the causes leading to the passage of the law of February 12, 1873. It was not generally known for months after that the coinage law of February 12, 1873, had demonetized the old standard dollar and authorized a trade dollar of 420 grains with legal tender limited to $5.

How was that received by the people? What effect had that and the legislation of foreign nations upon the financial condition of this country?

The panic of September 1873 swept like a deadly simoom from one end of this land to the other and affected to a very large extent foreign nations, sweeping away millions and billions of their gains from hard labor. No less a cyclone politically followed this action of the Republican Party. In the next general election in November 1874, the Democratic Party elected an overwhelming majority of Representatives to the Forty-fourth Congress, and the scepter of full power passed from the Republican Party.

America Must Produce More Planes; Production Estimate for 1943 Falls From 125,000 to 90,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have read with a sense of dismay the reports that our aircraft output will fall far behind the estimates announced to our people and to the world. It is said that the goal for this year is to be 90,000 instead of 125,000, and there is a feeling that this figure will not be reached by several thousand.

I have addressed an urgent request to the War Production Board to cut every piece of red tape, and eliminate all bottlenecks which have caused this most unsatisfactory situation to exist. There is no excuse which can be recognized as strong enough to curtail the output which we must have and send to the fighting fronts, if a speedy victory is to be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, there are manufacturing and transportation difficulties, to be sure, but General MacArthur and other leaders of our war effort against well-equipped enemies must not be denied the planes which we have assured them are to be forthcoming in this crucial year of 1943. Walter Trohan, in the Washington Times-Herald, writes of this plight of production as follows.

America's plane production program is being revised radically downward for the second time this year, it was authoritatively learned yesterday.

The original goal set by President Roosevelt was production at the rate of 125,000 planes a year by the end of 1943. It was found that this goal could not be met so it was reduced by 18,000 units to 108,000 planes.

At the time it was said that reduction was being made because stress was shifting from quantity to quality. Faster and more powerful planes would be secured as a result of lowering the goal, the President said.

Now, it has been found that the 108,000 plane goal was too high and it has been reduced to 90,000 planes. Competent air experts estimate that actual production will fall short of even the new goal and a further revision to 85,000 planes may be necessary.

METALS SCARCE

Plane production probably reached a new high in March at 6,000 planes, but it must be pushed further to meet the 90,000 plane goal or the 85,000 plane expectancy. December output was 5,500. This dropped 500 planes in January, but went back to 5,500 in February.

The chief reasons for the downward revision of the schedule are scarcity of basic materials, principally aluminum. There is a shortage of aluminum bars and aluminum extrusions, the heavy aluminum parts formed by machine under tremendous pressure.

There is also a shortage of various areonautical instruments and various plane parts. This shortage is made more acute by irregular flow of plane components due to complexity of scheduling problems of manufacture.

Another difficulty is that the Army and Navy order more planes than are needed or think they can get in order to spur on manufacturers, it was said. They place orders for 10,000 planes when there is only material for 8,000.

REDUCES PRODUCTION

It is true the services get the 8,000 planes wanted, but the scramble and delay reduced production of the planes ordered and future production of the second manufacturer.

The air production program has also been retarded, to some extent by squabbles between the Army and Navy for planes. The Army moved in ahead of the Navy and secured production rights to most planes, particularly bombers, and has been loath to surrender any of these.

F. A. Miller

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson, whose two hundredth anniversary we are celebrating this week, laid down a code for freedom back in 1823. One of these freedoms was:

Freedom of the press, subject only to liability for personal injuries. This formidable censor of the public functionaries, by arraigning them at the tribunal of public opinion, produces reform peaceably, which must otherwise be done by revolution. It is also the best instrument for enlightening the mind of man, and improving him as a rational, moral, and social being.

The following story from Editor and Publisher, relates the rise and growth of the South Bend Tribune, one of the fore-

most newspapers in the Middle West, and the life work of its president and editor, Mr. F. A. Miller:

F. A. MILLER HAS GIVEN 56 YEARS TO SUCCESS OF SOUTH BEND TRIBUNE—PRESIDENT AND EDITOR, 75, IS SON OF COFOUNDER—BELIEVES NEWSPAPER SHOULD BE OPERATED WITH SOME DEGREE OF MODESTY

(By George A. Brandenburg)

If courageous sincerity, plus a lot of common sense, are adequate measurements of newspaper publishing, then Frederick A. Miller, president and editor of the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, has contributed his full share to the success of that paper, approaching its seventieth anniversary as a daily.

Mr. Miller, now 75 years old and with 56 years of newspaper service to his credit, assumed the editorial and news management of the Tribune late in 1892, following the death of his father, Alfred B. Miller, cofounder of the paper. For more than 50 years he has been the active head of the Tribune, a typical average-sized American daily newspaper, situated in a community noted for its wartime production and home of the famed Notre Dame University and St. Mary's College.

"A newspaperman's success is the result of hard work, definite thinking, and close attention to business," said the modest, soft-spoken editor during an interview with Editor and Publisher. "The Tribune has tried to be a paper for the people. I think a newspaper should be operated with some degree of modesty."

EDITOR OF OLD SCHOOL

Mr. Miller is an editor of the old school and while he still clings to many of the most cherished traditions of a free press, he has kept pace with the swiftly changing picture in modern communications, including ownership of a radio station as early as 1922 and pioneering of news broadcasts when many editors shook their heads in utter dismay.

His foremost obligation is to his readers. He has never held public office, either elective or appointive. He believes that when newspaper editors or publishers accept public office they interfere with the independence of their newspapers. He has always believed the publication of news to be the principal function of a newspaper. Advertising and circulation, important as they may be, have always been secondary, even though few newspapers in Indiana have circulations equal to the Tribune's, or carry a larger volume of advertising. Its circulation is the largest of any Indiana newspaper outside of Indianapolis.

Quiet and retiring almost to the point of shyness, Mr. Miller can be as resolute as the "hardest-boiled" editor on record when the occasion demands. Nothing irritates him more than a threat and seldom does anyone try it. He constantly impresses upon his staff the importance of good English in reporting and interpreting the news. In fact, he believes there is a tendency among newspapers to use too much of the everyday American slang in news stories. He generally goes through the paper each day, marks any errors with a blue pencil and sends the clips with a note to the people responsible in the hope they won't let it happen again.

"I know that in the rush of producing a daily paper it is impossible to have every word and every sentence in perfect order, but I believe that should be the object of every newspaper writer," he remarked. "It should be remembered that many persons look upon their favorite newspaper as their instructor and therefore are likely to be guided in their use of words by it. In some cities, I think this true in South Bend, the newspaper is or has been used in public schools as a factor in instruction. If that is true, how necessary that every endeavor should be made for correctness in everything published."

DREW PLANS FOR PLANT

The Tribune is South Bend's only daily newspaper and owns WSBT, the city's lone radio station, for years a Columbia Broadcasting System affiliate. But for many years the Tribune knew the full import of competition from its rival morning and evening competitors, the old News-Times, which suspended publication December 27, 1938. The Tribune is published afternoons and Sunday mornings in its modern three-story plant, the floor plans for which were drawn by Mr. Miller while in bed in Columbus Hospital, Chicago, in February 1919.

When the News-Times suspended, leaving the Tribune supreme in a city of more than 100,000 population, Mr. Miller wrote a classic letter to his employees, in which he stated:

"It is a tremendous, overwhelming, almost crushing responsibility and one which we must collectively and individually in a way meet that will impress the people with whom we come in contact and convince them we do appreciate it and will continue to give them the best that is in us. Satisfactory and complete, service must be made in every instance in every department. * * *

"The natural tendency when a daily newspaper is placed in the unfortunate position of being the only daily newspaper in a city is to assume, consciously or unconsciously, that with competition eliminated one no longer needs to be alert. This could be true in respect to those who collect news on the theory that 'if we do not get it today we will have it tomorrow.' This theory must not prevail in respect to the Tribune. News must be sought with the same alertness, the same intelligence, and the same desire to be first as if the Tribune had the most active and most irritating competition. Tribune news gatherers must not assume any other attitude. They must show as much interest in the Tribune as they did when we had competition. To do otherwise will be to indicate a waning interest in one's work in the Tribune, and its progress, and can have but one result.

"The business office, the advertising department, and the circulation department are in closer contact with the public than any others except the news department. The persons in those departments must exercise special and constant efforts to be courteous, accommodating, and efficient both when meeting people over the counters or otherwise and when talking with them on the telephones. Never must there be the slightest act or word that will cause any persons to think the Tribune believes it can be independent because it is South Bend's only daily newspaper. Attention should be so satisfactory as to impress the customer with the idea that the Tribune knows the meaning of service and tries to interpret it to the fullest extent in courtesy, affability, and accommodation. * * *"

Mr. Miller himself follows the foregoing precepts in his daily routine. His office on the second floor, across the hall from the newsroom, is open to anyone who may call. There are no formalities about seeing the editor. A silk American flag stands at the right of his desk. This flag flew on the National Capitol in Washington and was presented to Mr. Miller on his seventy-fifth birthday by his Congressman friend, ROBERT A. GRANT, of South Bend. On the walls are autographed pictures of many important personages, including Republican past Presidents, Senators, motion-picture stars, and a Democratic President maker—James A. Farley.

The Tribune, A Paper for the People, is Mr. Miller's motto. Fair-minded and friendly, Mr. Miller sees to it that the Tribune gets back of every activity of public interest which will be for the good of South Bend. He follows the practice of keeping a record of the space (news and advertising) given to worthwhile civic and charitable projects. He figures such space at card rates and sends a receipted bill to the organization at the close of each campaign, with the Tribune's compliments.

REALIZE VALUE OF SPACE

"Such a policy makes groups realize the value of the space given them," he explained to Editor and Publisher. "Few persons fully appreciate the cost of news space in the paper. I believe publishers could profit from a public-relations standpoint by following such a program in their own communities."

A vigorous editorial writer in his own right and a crusading editor when the occasion demands, Mr. Miller does not tolerate business office or advertising interference with the news and editorial policies of the newspaper. Essentially, the Tribune may be classed as a Republican newspaper and Mr. Miller as a Republican editor. However, neither can be regarded as other than independent. He has many Democratic and labor friends. Aside from taking part in affairs of the Indiana Republican Editorial Association, Mr. Miller has never assumed an important political role and has preferred men and issues, rather than party, in local and State politics.

As for the Tribune, he has kept it free from any hint of political dictation or subservience. Probably its most recognized example of newspaper courage came in 1924 when it waged unrelentless war upon the Ku Klux Klan when that organization was a political power in the State of Indiana. At the expense of dwindling circulation Mr. Miller kept up his editorial attack on the Klan until its power was broken and many of its leaders thoroughly discredited in the eyes of the public.

WARTIME RESPONSIBILITY

Another example of outright independence was the case in which a South Bend bank president was found dead with a gun at his side during the early depression days of the thirties. A verdict of suicide was returned, but businessmen in high places endeavored to have the Tribune suppress the suicide. Mr. Miller stood firm and printed the truth. The opposition weakened under pressure and said the man died from a heart attack. A few weeks later the bank failed. South Bend people then realized and appreciated the integrity of the Tribune.

Mr. Miller was responsible for the present Indiana statute which prevents any court or committee from making a newspaperman in that State divulge the confidential source of his information. Although the bill was defeated the first time it was introduced, Mr. Miller, working with the Hoosier Press Association, succeeded in getting the bill enacted about 2 years ago. When the bill was finally passed the Governor sent Mr. Miller the pen with which he signed the bill.

With America at war, Mr. Miller sums up the wartime responsibilities of an editor simply by stating: "Regardless of a paper's attitude toward the present administration in Washington, I think a newspaper should do everything within reason to help this country win the war."

And the Tribune is doing just that. It staged one of the most successful scrap drives in the country last fall when Donald Nelson of the War Production Board called upon the newspapers to "get in the scrap." Likewise, St. Joseph County, of which South Bend is the county seat, is recognized as one of the most "bond buyingest" counties in the United States and has made its quota every month. In September 1942 it doubled its quota by several hundred thousand dollars.

The Tribune is doing everything within reason to meet the Government requests for reduction in the use of newsprint. It has reduced its 2 pages of daily comics to 1 page by reducing the width of comic plates; eliminated panels, features, and other space-taking subjects. Churches, which have been given about $10,000 worth of space a year, have been cut. Writers are expected to reduce space as much as consistently possible by shorter articles. Local pictures are less in number and many of them reduced in size to save metal, film, and chemicals. Further reductions are in mind should newsprint conditions require.

Mr. Miller was reared in an atmosphere pungent with the smell of printer's ink. Born in South Bend, he was the only child of Alfred B. Miller, who founded the Tribune along with Elmer Crockett as a weekly on March 9, 1872. A year later, on May 28, 1873, the Tribune was established as daily and has never missed an edition. F. A. Miller reflects the good fortune of having had the heritage of a grandfather who fought slavery until his type and presses were thrown into the Ohio River, and of a father who was for a half a century one of Indiana's noted editors.

FOUNDER'S SONS CARRY ON

The founders of the Tribune were brothers-in-law. Today Mr. Miller and Charles E. Crockett, sons of the founders, are carrying on the sturdy traditions of that successful union. Associated with them is Franklin D. Schurz, vice president of the Tribune and manager of its radio station. Mr. Schurz is a nephew of Mr. Miller.

Mr. Miller started his newspaper career at the bottom, carrying papers as a boy in 1880, and later setting type in the Tribune composing room. After this came reportorial work. He joined the staff as a reporter July 3, 1888, after graduating from high school and it was from this job that scarcely more than 5 years later he was called upon to take up the work of his father, who died December 10, 1892, as directing head of the Tribune.

In the matter of civic enterprise, Mr. Miller is principally to be credited with having helped to organize the South Bend Chamber of Commerce and with having served as president of South Bend's Indiana Centennial Association, formed and incorporated in 1916 for the observation of Indiana's one hunredth anniversary of Statehood. With the South Bend Chamber of Commerce, besides having been one of the organizers and members of the first board of directors, he served as the first president of the body in 1909. Mr. Miller is a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors and of the National Press Club at Washington. In religion he is a Presbyterian.

Upon the death of Mr. Crockett, F. A. Miller was elected president of the Tribune on June 16, 1924. His associate, Charles E. Crockett, secretary of the company, also represents the interests of the Elmer Crockett estate. Mr. Crockett is in charge of the business office and attends to the accounting while his partner runs the news and editorial departments. Charles Crockett is a competent person who manages the pay roll for the nearly 300 Tribune and WSBT employees. He points with pride to the group insurance, hospitalization, and pension plans the Tribune has inaugurated for its employees. Today, approximately 40 employees are in the armed forces.

WORKED IN ALL DEPARTMENTS

Franklin Schurz, Harvard graduate, and a certified public accountant, with a California license, joined the Tribune October 5, 1925. He came to work with overalls, starting in the stereotyping department. He worked in all departments before assuming his present executive duties.

Mr. Miller is one newspaper publisher who did not fear radio as a competitor and has made his station a valuable adjunct to the Tribune. WSBT goes in heavily for public service. There isn't a cause or an organization which has a legitimate reason that does not get its fair share of time on the air.

To Franklin Schurz goes much of the credit for the Tribune's astute campaign of gradually winning over readers from the opposition in the days before the News-Times suspended. Because of his certified public accountant mathematical background, Mr. Schurz conceived the idea of reader surveys as early as 1925–26; before Dr. George Gallup had popularized this technique of measuring reader interest. Consequently, the Tribune knew which features were popular with the readers, and which were not. Changes were constantly made in features and news presentation, in accordance with reader reaction as revealed in the surveys conducted by Mr. Schurz.

A gain in circulation resulted, because the Tribune knew, in part, at least, what interested the people. Circulation has expanded from approximately 49,000 to more than 80,000 following suspension of the News-Times in December 1938. The Tribune ran 12 different columnists over a testing period and then asked the readers to vote for the most popular. Comics were similarly tested. The Tribune also learned the value of local news pictures and was ahead of the parade during the trend to local pictorial coverage in the early thirties. The Tribune installed its own engraving plant and employed the services of three local news photographers.

WALTON MANAGING EDITOR

Robert Walton is the able managing editor of the Tribune. A former Tribune reporter, Bob Walton was recently called back to his alma mater from the Associated Press, where he was formerly news photo editor in the Washington bureau. He directs a staff of 35 people, including news bureaus in Mishawaka—twin city of South Bend; Niles, Mich., Goshen and Elkhart, Ind. The Tribune has staff correspondents throughout its circulation area in northern Indiana and southern Michigan.

As the sole daily in South Bend, the Tribune tries to get both sides of a controversial question the same day. Mr. Walton explained the paper has learned that such a policy makes for better feeling on both sides, rather than carrying one side today and the other tomorrow, with the result that the second-day story usually denies the first day's version.

The Tribune prints three editions daily in the evening field. They include the State, with page 1 devoted to State news; home, with local and national news predominating; and green sheet city final for street sales. Mr. Walton follows the policy of keeping inside pages open for spot news, including a heavy volume of national news furnished by the three major wire services.

"Telegraph news today is your best news," Mr. Walton told Editor and Publisher. "Local stories have lost much of their importance for the duration, except those stories which relate directly to the war effort. Because of the wide reader interest in national news, especially war dispatches, we find it advisable to featurize local news whenever possible."

NEWS EXECUTIVES

Assisting Mr. Walton are Russell P. Johnson, city editor; and James Derby, telegraph editor. Sports news gets an exceptionally heavy play in the Tribune, with Notre Dame's teams in the spotlight, plus a comprehensive coverage of high-school sports. Jim Costin is sports editor, assisted by Robert Overaker and Dave Gallup. During the Indiana high-school basketball season, the Tribune often carries as many as 35 stories and summaries of northern Indiana high-school basketball games in the Saturday issue. The Tribune also goes in heavy for action pictures of Notre Dame's home football games.

Gerald E. Cosgrove, associate editor, writes most of the Tribune's editorials, although Mr. Miller takes a turn occasionally. Mr. Cosgrove, who came to the Tribune from the Dubuque (Iowa) Telegraph-Herald in 1927, strives to balance his daily budget of editorials among local, State, and national issues. He finds today, however, that editorials dealing with national and international problems predominate. "A newspaper which adheres to local editorials entirely cannot adequately serve its readers," he said. "The first World War blasted us out of our provincialism and this war is teaching us to think in world terms. Even the smallest daily has to 'cover the world' today to satisfy its readers' craving for world news. Editorial writers must keep this fact constantly in mind."

Although South Bend is an active war production center and its factory workers are riding the waves of war prosperity, the Tribune is keeping its eye on the nonwar production towns in the South Bend area. It is endeavoring to maintain its circulation coverage in those spots even under the handicaps of curtailed delivery service and newsprint conservation. Neil C. Snyder, circulation manager, and Nelson E. Dodge, assistant circulation chief in charge of State circulation, see ahead to the day when war work will be over and these surrounding towns will be an important part of the South Bend market.

ADVERTISING CHIEFS

Edward J. Meehan, formerly national advertising manager, is the aggressive acting advertising director in the absence of W. Stacy Bowman, now in military service. The Tribune does not go in for cooperative pages designed to promote the war effort, under sponsorship of local merchants. Neither does the Tribune accept hard liquor advertising. Clarence Harding is acting national advertising manager for the duration.

R. S. Pridmore, veteran mechanical superintendent, directs the Tribune's production force, which includes a number of employees with long records of continuous service. The Tribune prints its own 12-page Sunday color comic section.

The entire Tribune-WSBT operations are housed in a three-story plant, with the radio station on the third floor. Studios are "floated" on rubber and springs to eliminate vibration from the newspaper's mechanical departments, which are laid out on the second and ground floors, following compact modern streamline production patterns.

Coming back to the quiet man with gray hair and sparkling eyes, who, despite his 75 years, is the active directing head of the paper, we find him proud of the "spirit of friendliness" that exists between management and employees.

Mr. Miller contrasted the two generations of journalism he has known through more than a half century of daily practice by stating: "There is less of the vitriolic nature in newspapers today than in the past. This is painfully brought to my attention when I go through the old files of the Tribune."

He has witnessed many major changes in newspaper publishing in the past 50 years and while maintaining a vigorous editorial position, he fully appreciates the increased obligations placed upon publishers in "one-paper" towns. He has met the challenge in South Bend, yet he speaks not of promotions or public relations, but rather of the primary function of a newspaper—to print the news fearlessly, but with good taste.

Mr. Speaker, this story is typical of the free press that has been one of the foundation stones of our free way of life and of our system of free enterprise that today is fighting for its life against bureaucratic domination.

The Pay-As-You-Go Tax Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an interesting letter on pending tax legislation sent to the majority leader by Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1943.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: The Congress of of Industrial Organizations has viewed with increasing concern the wrangling which has followed in the wake of the vote in the House of Representatives on the pay-as-you-go tax issue. In the heat of the partisan conflict there is danger that the best interests of the tax-paying public may be completely defeated.

The pay-as-you-go issue is not a party issue. Members of both parties in Congress share the responsibility for the failure of Congress to enact a pay-as-you-go plan. Members of both parties have the duty of joining in the enactment of a sound plan.

The people of the Nation are in favor of a program for deduction of taxes currently from wages so that tax obligations may be more easily met. They insist that the adoption of such a program should not result in an oppressive and unworkable burden upon those in lower income brackets who might otherwise be called upon to commence payment of 1943 taxes while still obligated to pay portions of their 1942 taxes. On the other hand, the people are equally insistent that the popular demand for a pay-as-you-go plan must not be used as a cloak for a tax grab for the highest income brackets through the Ruml plan.

It is unfortunate that each side in the conflict in the House has refused to yield to the Nation's insistence upon a sound pay-as-you-go program. We respectfully urge that there is still time for such a program to be enacted.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations has urged and urges once more that taxes on 1943 income be deducted from the income as it is earned commencing as soon as possible. To avoid an oppressive burden upon taxpayers in the groups least able to make payments on 2 years' taxes at the same time, the Congress of Industrial Organizations has urged that the 1942 tax obligation be abated to the extent of the full normal tax and to the extent of the surtax on the first $2,000 of taxable income only. Such a plan would place 90 percent of the Nation's taxpayers upon a completely current pay-as-you-go basis. It would minimize the regressive windfalls characteristic of the Ruml plan.

We urge that in a spirit of constructive unity on important war measures and to the end that the atmosphere may be cleared for an examination of the more important basic tax problems, the Ways and Means Committee, Democrats and Republicans alike, forget their past differences and join in an immediate report to the House membership of a sound pay-as-you-go tax plan.

Very truly yours,
PHILIP MURRAY,
President.

Daingerfield Blast Furnace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives and the Senate in the State of Texas have adopted a resolution requesting the War Production Board to give approval of the application for the construction of a steel plant at Daingerfield, Tex.

There is now under construction at Daingerfield a blast furnace that will be completed within the next few months. It will have a capacity of 1,200 tons per day of pig iron.

The resolution is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 59

Whereas there is an almost inexhaustible supply of iron ore located near the surface in various counties in east Texas, and there is likewise accessible requisite limestone and coking coal which have been tested and approved to the satisfaction of the War Production Board; and

Whereas the War Production Board has heretofore approved a project for the acquisition of properties and the construction of facilities, including a 1,200-ton blast furnace and appurtenant coke ovens, ore beneficiating plant, and other facilities for the production of pig iron in the vicinity of Daingerfield, Tex., which plant has been under construction for several months by Lone Star Steel Co. as agent for Defense Plant Corporation, and it is anticipated that said plant will be in operation during the present summer, and at which time it will have an annual productive capacity of approximately 432,000 net tons of pig iron, filling an urgent need in the present war emergency; and

Whereas it has been called to our attention that an application has been filed with the War Production Board for the approval of another project to be operated in connection therewith, to wit: A steel mill, including open-hearth furnaces and rolling mills and appurtenant facilities for the manufacture of steel plates and other steel products necessary in the war effort; and

Whereas it is desirable to have completed a fully integrated steel plant where the pig iron is being produced, where the necessary raw materials are readily available, and where transportation facilities are altogether adequate; and

Whereas the construction of such steel plant is necessary not only for the furtherance of the war effort, but will provide facilities needed in the southwestern area for the manufacture of steel products after the termination of the war, and furnish a means of utilizing some of the vast resources of this State: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas (the senate concurring), That we request the War Production Board, Washington, D. C., to give its approval to the application for the construction of said steel plant, to the end that these natural resources of our State may be utilized; and that copies of this resolution be sent by the chief clerk of the House to the Chairman of the War Production Board and the two Texas Senators in Washington.

PRICE DANIEL,
Speaker of the House.
FRED MAWRITZ,
President pro tempore of the Senate.

The Japanese Peril

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the American people are not awake to the grave dangers of coddling the Japanese, it is about time that they found out just what it means. The Koreans, who have for years suffered from Japanese persecutions, and who can speak and understand the Japanese language, can give us more information than all the propagandists the O. W. I. could recruit from the crackpots on the staff of PM from now till doomsday.

In this connection I am inserting part of a letter from a citizen of California showing what one of these Koreans reveals as to the Japanese peril. We are in grave danger in the Pacific area. The white people of Australia are threatened with destruction, or with a fate worse than death.

For God's sake, let us give General MacArthur help now. Let us send all the help we possibly can to the southwest Pacific at once and destroy Japan, the greatest menace the white man's civilization has ever known.

The letter referred to reads, in part, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *April 12, 1943.*

Talked with a friendly Korean yesterday, a much-traveled man, speaking seven or eight languages. He handed me enclosed clippings, and marveled at the suicidal stupidity of our officials in putting arms into the hands of Japanese and trusting them just because they happened to be born on this side of the Pacific. A cobra is a cobra if born in an American zoo, and is no different from cobras born in their native land; it has no desire to change itself in any manner and could not do so if it had such a desire. And it is the same with our Nisei Japs, all of whom have hundreds of close-blood relatives in Japan, and love Hirohito.

"Japanese never fight Japanese, and never will," the Korean declares, "but will quickly unite with the enemy and shoot down your white soldiers, blow up your ships, set fires, etc., when the crucial moment arrives. Everywhere from Seattle to San Diego I have been hearing your beloved Nisei talking (in Japanese) about the perfect success of the Pearl Harbor massacre and destruction, and gloating over it. But no word of criticism or condemnation has ever come from the mouth or pen of any Nisei anywhere, while all of you loyal white Americans everywhere have been unceasingly denouncing, by speech, in all public prints, by radio, etc., that treacherous stab in the back. Such sly, cunning silence proves that the Nisei are your enemies, and not one whit different from the foreign-born Japanese, and should be tried for high treason.

"That Camp Manzanar affair, wherein a lot of foreign Japs so realistically tried to mob a Nisei Jap who was (apparently) 100 percent for the United States was all a staged affair to convince you white Americans that the Nisei are loyal and can be trusted and will help you to fight Japan, if you will arm them and make soldiers of them. I've heard Nisei back East, as well as out here and in

Hawaii, talking about it, and how completely the simple-minded American officials had been fooled.

"The few Japs killed and wounded in making the affair appear genuine are secretly hailed as heroes by Tokio officialdom. And those who bought stamps and bonds did so only to fool you; I've heard them talking it all over in great joy."

I told the Korean about a plan I had studied out to drag every Nisei Jap under our flag out into the open and make him (and her) declare himself, thus ending their treacherous silence. Each and every one of them should be compelled to write with pen and ink an answer (and under oath, at that) to the following questions, which would be printed on a sheet of paper:

1. Do you believe that the Pearl Harbor massacre on December 7, 1941, was a sly, cunning, treacherous stab in the back worthy only of savages and murderers?

2. Do you believe that the Japanese Emperor Hirohito, the Son of Heaven, and his leading officials, who planned and sanctioned that massacre and destruction, should face a firing squad?

3. Would you like to be one of a firing squad to help execute Hirohito and his comurderers?

4. Who do you hope will win this war in the Pacific—Japan, or the United States of America?

"Good," exclaimed the Korean. "They should have been given these simple but effective tests of loyalty long ago. But I do not think that even one Nisei, to save his face—or his neck from a hangman's noose—would write 'yes' to the first three questions, and 'United States of America' to the fourth. And yet they are clamoring for their constitutional rights."

Any and every loyal American would be eager to answer. In fact, we have all answered—and given the right answer—over and over again and without being asked or compelled to do so. Hence, even hesitancy or unwillingness of any Nisei is prima facie evidence of sly, cunning treachery and wartime treason and calls for a firing squad. The very least we should do is to quickly seize all and put them to work (no pay) in military concentration camps where they cannot set fires, poison water, food, etc., or do other devilment—things the Korean has often heard Nisei talk about. And all their property of all kinds should be confiscated at once.

The Korean avers that one cherished hope of our Nisei is (he has heard them talking about it) that one or more of them will be made a crew member on each of our warships, in which case the ship's magazine would be detonated at the first good opportunity. And he has heard them derisively snickering at our downright idiotic simplicity in arming them, trusting them, and giving them every opportunity in a score of different ways, to do us to death and destruction. No other government on earth, they say, would do that, but would arm and trust those only of its own blood, race, and ancestry. Pearl Harbor, they laugh, meant nothing at all to us, and we now think we're going to get Japanese to fight and kill other Japanese—their own relatives included.

There is a law, Mr. RANKIN, not made in any hall or preserved on any paper. It is a law of nature—her first law—the law of self-preservation—an instinct with which nature is supposed to have endowed every creature that lives and breathes, and without which no animal, tribe, or nation will long survive. It was due to an entire lack of that instinct that brought about Pearl Harbor. We permitted the swarming, breeding, 2-cent-a-day Japanese from the other side of the Pacific—an unlike people in blood, ideals, and religion—a religion that declares their emperor has a right to rule this world and that it is the duty of his subjects to go forth and take it for him—to flock to our west coast. Then we further cut our own throats in their favor by calling their offspring American citizens, enabling them to acquire scores of thousands of our best irrigated acres, become our merchants, etc., to a large extent.

They sent back to Japan hundreds of millions of our good money to build warships, airplanes, etc., enabling them to slaughter and enslave millions of Chinese and grab millions of acres of their country, and to do us to death at Pearl Harbor.

Constitutions and all other man-made laws are entirely secondary to Nature's law of self-preservation. Therefore, if we've got the common sense of dumb brutes—or even worms—we must be guided and governed by the instinct of self-preservation now (no matter what the Constitution may or may not indicate) in seizing all American-born Japanese and putting them to work, like the foreign-born, in concentration camps, as it is suicidal idiocy to arm or trust any person whose veins are filled with Japanese blood. There were scores of Nisei in the Pearl Harbor attack, and all our Nisei rejoiced secretly; this Korean has heard their joyful talk everywhere. He says that, in addition to making (the least hesitancy will prove them Benedict Arnolds) every one of them write answers to those 4 questions, each should be compelled to write a composition of not less than 100 words on the Pearl Harbor massacre, under the printed heading, "Death to Hirohito and his coassassins." Pen, ink, and paper is the only kind of a gun that should ever be put into the hands of any of them, plus agricultural tools, and far away from buildings, drinking water sources, food stocks, etc.

Even the Japanese themselves, this Korean says, marvel at our unexplainable lack of the instinct of self-preservation in allowing such a far-off people to come to our shores at all—a totally unlike race, whose religion declares that their Emperor is God.

No European country, he points out, was so simple-minded as to permit a single Jap to buy, own, lease, or cultivate an acre of its soil, or even sell a peanut or black boots; and even in Germany and Italy today this is true; and it is equally true in Japan regarding Germans and Italians, although they are all in the Axis and fighting shoulder to shoulder. And had not Britain kept them out of Australia and New Zealand, the sly, cunning, treacherous, Pearl-Harbor-blooded-Son-of-Heaven worshippers would have swarmed and bred there and taken, long ago, all that territory for their emperor-god, reducing to a slavery of hellish torture all the whites so unfortunate as to survive—a fate that is being endured today by the scores of thousands of American and British and other captives of the Japanese, and will never end until flesh and blood can endure no more and the slave passes out, the Japs not caring, the Korean says, as they already have millions more than they need, and want to get rid of a lot of them—particularly the unskilled, aged, sickly, crippled, etc., thousands of such being turned over to young Japs being trained as soldiers, who use them as live sandbags in bayonet practice, our Nisei declare, as the gushing blood gives the young soldier more pep and makes him more bloodthirsty.

"I wish your Washington officials could hear and understand what the American-born young Japs say (in Japanese) about them and torture," the Korean reluctantly remarked. "It is too terrible to relate, but I'll say this much: They'll be worse than dragged at the chariot wheels of the conquerors—stripped naked, their mouths stuffed with filth, they'll be lashed, prodded, goaded for greater speed as they haul automobiles, etc., loaded with merrymaking Japanese soldiers and officials."

Another thing he has often heard our young Japs talk about (the older and foreign-born Japs said little, but the younger ones were full of life and ideas) was the special State of California investigation some 25 years ago and what it revealed: Even at that time the Japanese controlled 1,000,000 of California's best irrigated acres—90,000 by ownership in fee simple, and 910,000 by lease. And another startling thing was that they were outbreeding the whites 10 to 1.

"Even if it was only 5 to 1," the Korean reminded me, "that, even without any war conquest, would certainly make them predominant in California in 25 years more; and in Oregon and Washington it would be the same a dozen years later. Your State, county, and city officers would then be Japanese, and your delegation to Congress, too. In fact, everything would be Japanese. I have heard Japanese scholars and statesmen themselves declare that the American citizenship clause in your Constitution could not possibly have referred to Asiatics, as at that early day and date those who put it there knew no more about Asia and its inhabitants than they did about the man in the moon. I have seen in a collection of old books a copy of a miserable little atlas used in the schools of the British Isles at that time, and still later, and so little was known of even Russia that the only thing shown in the vast region, where the fighting is now taking place, was a scatteration of tiny, crude figures of headless men. It was white men who braved the terrors of the unknown, as you are well aware, in discovering America, and also people of Caucasian blood who subdued the wilderness, fought America's wars and made the country what it is today.

"Hence, citizenship means for Caucasians only, and—naturally and justly—for the descendants of the Negroes who were brought here against their will in colonial days. And it is, of course, the just right and privilege of every government to grant citizenship at any time to any of its good friends and allies. But, regarding any and all people under your flag of Japanese blood and ancestry, it is imperative to your national salvation that you at once rule that they are not citizens, but dangerous enemy aliens, and work them, under strict military rule, far from factories, etc., where they cannot possibly set fires or do any other damage.

"Your Nisei have fathers, mothers, uncles, aunts, etc., who came from Japan, and they all love each other and their swarms of relatives in Japan, their 6,000-year-old religion, and their Emperor-god—the Son of Heaven—many times more than you white people love each other and your religion; and if you think they are now going to renounce all that and fight their fathers and mothers and other relatives, their religion and their god, you exhibit a mental imbecility that is truly pathetic—and suicidal. I've heard the young Japs in Hawaii and here on your coast chattering it all over from every angle hundreds of times long before Pearl Harbor, as well as since. Don't trust them, I warn you.

"How best to convince your Government that they were not Japanese at all but loyal Americans who wanted to fight for the United States of America and should therefore be made part of your armed forces on both land and sea was the burden of their thoughts and talk. The Nisei held that it was hopeless to get your officials to trust and arm the foreign-born Japs. So the two kinds of Japs, a distinction without a difference, combined and schemed together and pretended there was deadly hostility between them to make it appear the Nisei are above suspicion and 100 percent patriotic, the Manzanar 'riot' and shooting being 'put on' solely to prove it. It is all simply an extension of the sly, cunning Pearl Harbor treachery the Japanese worked at Washington and which enabled them to do you to death on December 7. The thousands of full-blooded Japanese you are now arming, training, and trusting, together with still more thousands running loose in the

United States, insure your defeat, all Japanese are declaring.

"Your President should quickly call into consultation representatives of Canada, Britain, Russia, and China. Lots of Japs were born in Russia (eastern Siberia), but how many has she put in her armed force and how many are allowed to run about loose? And of the tens of thousands born in China, how many are helping that country in its fight for existence? The tiny flame in a lantern burned your Chicago, and matches in the hands of your Japanese-blooded Nisei, scattered everywhere, will do the same now to your cities, factories, etc. The perfect success of the Pearl Harbor stab-in-the-back so elated your Nisei that a large percentage of them were in favor of starting burning and dynamiting right away. Some were so enthusiastic and bold that in the Jap fishing village, tea houses and poolrooms, and on their fishing boats in and about Los Angeles harbor they talked it right out loud at times—and even in English quite often.

"Several years ago in Vancouver, British Columbia, I heard a bunch of Canadian and British military and naval officers discussing and comparing Australia and California. All regarded the Japanese here as terribly detrimental and a serious menace. They thought it strange that your Government permitted Japanese-blooded people, who all hate you and are your secret enemies, to become prosperous landlords by acquiring scores of thousands of your best irrigated acres, which have cost the white population hundreds of millions in building dams, reservoirs, canals, ditches, highways, etc., while over a third of your own people possess neither land nor a domicile of any kind—not even a cave. One of the Canadians declared we were nobly helping the Japs in still another way to seal our doom—by educating them, which made them more proficient in a score of ways in working our destruction."

Tell the Russian Ambassador that this Korean has heard Japs saying that about 4,000 or 5,000 bombers may be suddenly sent over Vladivostok, and so forth, as soon as conditions are really favorable — clouds just right, or at night, wind right so Russia will hear nothing, and so forth—the Japs determined to quickly destroy every gas and oil tank and airplane, thus making every Jap city safe. Russians must not, for one moment, relax their vigilance.

Again I say, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot afford to delay sending planes, men, and munitions to General MacArthur, in order to save Australia now, and our own country later, from invasion and probably subjugation by these loathesome Japanese—the most deadly peril that has ever threatened the civilization of mankind.

Let us not wait till we have another Pearl Harbor disaster.

Farm Security Administration

REMARKS

OF

HON. MERLIN HULL

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily opposed to the movement to abolish the Farm Security Administration and the great work it is doing toward increasing production of farm products by helping thousands of worthy people expand their operations. The F. S. A. has done a lot of good in my home county, and in our district. There is a serious situation as to the shortage of food in our own country, and it will become even more serious as time goes on. Certainly now, of all times, we should help the farmers expand their crops and the production of dairy products.

I have obtained from the Farm Security Administration the following statement as to what it has done in the 11 counties of the Ninth District of Wisconsin. That statement is as follows:

Farm Security Administration borrowers in the Ninth District of Wisconsin have made considerable increases in the production of essential agricultural commodities. A sample survey shows that the 3,430 active Farm Security Administration borrowers in the district made the following increases in production in 1942:

Product	Increase in 1942 over 1941	Percent increase
Chickens (pounds live weight)	162,035	39
Milk (gallons)	3,109,222	18
Eggs (dozen)	428,800	34
Pork (pounds live weight)	625,520	13
Beef (pounds live weight)	682,240	40
Soybeans (bushel)	10,880	250

Under the rural-rehabilitation loan program as of November 30, 1942, in the Ninth District $4,023,933 had been advanced to 9,639 farm families for loans for operating goods since the inception of the program in 1935. The total collections on these loans amounted to $2,632,995, of which $2,299,956 represents repayments of principal. As of the same date these collections amounted to 106 percent of matured principal and accrued interest.

Under the farm-ownership program as of November 30, 1942, $744,298 had been lent to 126 tenants, hired men, and small operators to enable them to purchase and improve family type farms under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. Collections amounted to $49,518, of which $26,771 represents repayment of principal. The total collections of principal and interest amounted to 103 percent of maturities of principal and interest.

In addition to making, servicing, and supervising these loans, the Farm Security Administration has brought about the establishment of 7 community and cooperative services which make available the use of purebred sires, machinery, and other facilities to some 273 farm families who otherwise would lack them.

The total number of all farms listed in the 1940 census for the district is 32,883, of which 18 percent had a gross farm income under $600 in 1939.

To protect the Nation's milk supply, the Farm Security Administration is carrying on in Wisconsin a program to prevent good cows, heifers, and calves from being sold for slaughtering. The program, which is national in scope, was begun in January when the scarcity of skilled farm labor, combined with the high price of beef cattle, seemed likely to result in loss of many good dairy animals.

The Farm Security Administration attempts first to keep herds in production by supplying dairy operators with labor, credit, or other needs. If the operator must, nevertheless, sell all or part of his herd, the Farm Security Administration seeks to find buyers among other dairy farmers who are equipped to keep the animals in production. If these measures fail to suffice, the Farm Security Administration buys the animals, using funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and arranges for their resale to farmers who are able to expand their milk herds.

It has been found that in almost all dairy areas there are operators who are not using to full capacity their labor, land, feed, and other resources. Since the beginning of the program, the Farm Security Administration has received more than twice as many requests for cows as there have been cows offered for sale.

In Wisconsin, in addition to supplying dairy operators with assistance in maintaining their herds and arranging for sales of animals direct to farmers, rather than to meat buyers, the Farm Security Administration by March 5 had purchased 234 animals which otherwise would have gone to slaughter.

Farm Security Administration and the American Medical Association

REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I presented an endorsement of the American Medical Association in regard to the work of the Farm Security Administration. At this time I desire to be more particular and present the following endorsements in respect to that organization:

STATEMENT BY DR. MORRIS FISHBEIN, EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

I am glad you mentioned the farmer because the Farm Security Administration has already included under its plan of medical care, cooperating with the county medical societies, a total of 135,000 farm families out of some 780,000 families in the United States, and that plan is being extended with the cooperation of the medical profession as a system of paying for medical service and providing the farmers with good medical care.

STATEMENT BY FRANZ GOLDMANN, M. D., ASSOCIATE CLINICAL PROFESSOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH, YALE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

The farmers eligible for the service of a Farm Security Administration program, in general, are appreciative of the action taken on their behalf. They are learning, by practical experience, the financial and psychological advantages of pooling their resources so as to budget and thus pay the costs of medical care; they discover the significance of organized self-help through group prepayment in contrast to dependence on poor law service, on asking for credit, or on the charity of physicians. Under prepayment, they find it easier to obtain medical care. Many experience regular medical service for the first time. All get a feeling of protection because they can be prompt about taking care of illness, sometimes avoiding serious or costly treatment. * * * The farmers wish to improve rather than abandon the plans, because they are convinced that the good outweighs the bad.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY CONFERENCE OF STATE SANITARY ENGINEERS

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this Conference of State Sanitary Engineers, in executive meeting here at Detroit, October 7, 1940, do commend the

Farm Security Administration for making it possible to conduct these practical demonstrations in rural sanitation.

STATEMENT BY DR. C. F. VOHS, CHAIRMAN OF THE MEDICAL ECONOMICS COMMITTEE OF MISSOURI STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

I think the medical profession in Missouri can be proud of the steps it has taken in the last few years. Low-cost medical care is no longer a theory. It's a fact. We now have 58 county medical-care programs for low-income rural families who are being helped by the Farm Security Administration. These were established by county medical societies with cooperation of Farm Security and along lines acceptable to the American Medical Association.

STATEMENT BY DR. A. M. CRAM, PRESIDENT OF THE VERMONT MEDICAL SOCIETY

When the Farm Security Administration first came to us two years ago and explained its rehabilitation program and the part that health plays in its success, we were naturally interested. The thing which most appealed to us was the fact that the program as finally developed has not disturbed in any way the ethics of our profession. Every family has free choice of physician, and every physician has free choice of patient. Participation in the plan is voluntary on the part of both doctors and the patients. In fact, as this plan operates, there is no interference from the Government, the State, or any other third party, to disturb the normal function of giving these families medical care

STATEMENT BY DR. WALTER A. LEONARD, CAMBRIDGE, N. Y., MEMBER PUBLIC HEALTH COUNCIL OF NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

In Washington County we got tired of seeing people neglect themselves because they didn't want to ask the doctor to serve them for nothing. We decided to find a way to put good medical care within the reach of everyone. That's why we were interested when the Farm Security Administration came to us with a proposal for a voluntary health plan which would make it possible for Farm Security Administration borrowers in the county to pay their doctors' bills in advance of illness.

STATEMENT BY A. M. SIMONS, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF MEDICAL ECONOMICS, AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

The Farm Security Administration has now adopted a policy of close cooperation with State and county medical societies and is pledged not to introduce any plan against the opposition of such medical societies. The 1940 report of the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration says (Report of the Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, 1940, p. 91):

"The entire program has been worked out in close cooperation with the State medical associations and local medical societies. Before a medical plan is set up in any State a memorandum of understanding is drawn up by the Farm Security Administration representatives and the State medical association."

The State and county medical societies to which this program has been presented have, with a number of exceptions, generally agreed that the income classes included in these plans were not previously receiving proper medical care and were at least partially dependent, and also that the physicians who had cared for them in the past received little for the services supplied.

A request addressed to the secretaries of State medical societies in which Farm Security Administration medical plans exist brought much information of value in arriving at conclusions as to the professional point of view. In general, the answers to the question as to the attitude of the profession brought a vote of nearly 4 to 1 on the satisfactory side. The States reporting lack of satisfaction were almost invariably those whose experience with such plans was confined largely to the earlier and more experimental stages. Criticisms were more frequently made in localities where economic conditions did not indicate a need for any special plan. Twenty-one out of 28 States reported that the families included were receiving more or better or at least earlier medical care than they had received before introduction of the plan. There was almost equal unanimity of opinion that the physicians as a whole received more money under the Farm Security Administration plan than they had been able to collect from the same body of patients previously.

The Farm Security Administration has expressed its desire to cooperate with prepayment plans operated by State and county medical societies wherever possible and at present is working in cooperation with such plans in California, Oregon, and New Jersey and is negotiating with the western New York plan.

It is doubtful if head-on opposition can greatly affect this trend. The House of Delegates of the American Medical Association has laid down the principles which determine its policy. The first of these is the foundation of all the others. It reads: "All features of medical service in any method of medical practice should be under the control of the medical profession." No complaints that this principle is infringed in any Farm Security Administration plan have been reported.

This would seem to be the most general and basic test of the acceptance by the medical profession of any plan of payment for medical service. All other phases may be subject to bargaining and compromise, but any yielding of control of the standards of medical care to those unqualified to exercise that control is a betrayal of the trust which has been confided to the medical profession.

Memorials to Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, many splendid remarks and speeches were made in this Chamber and at the beautiful marble memorial on the south side of the Tidal Basin today as we celebrate the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of that great exponent of liberty—Thomas Jefferson. No weak words of mine can add to his illustrious fame, but I do take this opportunity to express in small degree my admiration for this leader of American democracy and to show my conviction of his preeminence in three great fields of human endeavor. I always think of him as the Great Liberator—freeing the citizen from bonds of political tyranny, emancipating the eager mind from the chains of superstition and ignorance, and unfettering the human spirit for communion with its Author.

Four years ago, on the invitation of the University of Missouri, I visited that great institution of learning on the one-hundredth anniversary of its founding. Members of the faculty took me to a spot on the campus where is erected, not over the grave of Jefferson but as a marker of historic significance, the gravestone which first marked his tomb at Monticello, and there I saw on that weathered stone inscribed the three things which Thomas Jefferson himself indicated that he would have his fellow citizens remember of him: First, author of the Declaration of Independence; second, founder of the University of Virginia; and third, father of a statute providing for religious liberty in Virginia. Admirers of Jefferson have long recognized his outstanding leadership in these threefold efforts to free human society in body, mind, and spirit.

As a physical memorial the beautiful marble pantheon on the shore of the Tidal Basin dedicated today to Thomas Jefferson on the two-hundredth anniversary of his birth is a pleasing and appropriate structure. However, we have often been told that monuments to a great man are not necessarily physical and are not most enduring when carved in marble. Believing that a more appropriate and lasting monument should be that of the mind or of the spirit, I have long pondered another kind of monument to Thomas Jefferson. I feel that an institution which would promote learning and make it available to the most capable youth of America, of both sexes, of all races, creeds, and color would certainly be in keeping with that great philosopher.

Accordingly, as one means of liberating the human mind from the bondage of ignorance I am suggesting that a revolving fund known as the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Educational Trust Fund be set up, the purpose of which should be the selection and training for leadership of the most capable youth of our country in appropriate institutions of higher learning of the student's choice. Toward that end I have prepared a bill—H. R. 2533—which would establish such fund and make provisions for its administration in a way in keeping with Jefferson's philosophy.

The introduction of this bill—H. R. 2533—this week is in keeping with our Nation-wide celebration of the two-hundredth anniversary of Jefferson's birth. Of course, this move should have been made long ago, and I am one of those who have pondered it for several years. Although we are in the midst of this terrible war, I cannot see that that fact should delay the passage of this bill or the creation of this fund at the present time. Such a fund will be needed after hostilities cease, and, according to the terms of the measure proposed, the fund will aid the war effort by being invested in Victory bonds. Thus, this proposed move would directly aid the successful conduct of the war and be immediately available for maximum usefulness after the war.

The creation of an educational fund as a monument to Thomas Jefferson will strike a responsive chord in every understanding heart. The questions likely to arise regarding such a fund pertain to details of administration. What American youths would be eligible to participate? Could such a fund be administered without the various prejudices which so often enter into those matters?

Would this fund duplicate or hinder other worthy educational efforts? Would such a fund mean a heavier pull upon the taxpayers or a disproportionately heavy burden upon the American public?

In answer to these inquiries I am prompted to say briefly that the fund I propose is to be enacted by Congress into national law, yet does not call for an appropriation of any magnitude out of the Public Treasury. Having spent most of my life in the cause of education, I am naturally interested in education in all of its phases. I would not think of proposing any new plan which would hinder any existing plan of education. The one proposed in the bill I am introducing does not stand in the way of or hamper any present educational activity. A fitting educational plan, of which Thomas Jefferson would approve, must be scientific, broad, and fair enough to seek out and encourage human intelligence and worth wherever found.

Therefore my proposal is to have a fund administered by impartial authority in the interest of truth. Such a plan would aid the most capable young people in every State and locality, of every political complexion, race, and creed, determined only by the young person's ability to compete and take leading rank. These are strict and difficult requirements, but I believe that a great national educational fund can be established and administered on such a basis. In this belief I have great hope for this fitting kind of memorial to Thomas Jefferson.

Farm Credit and Loan Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the present agricultural appropriations bill now before the House forcefully impresses every serious student with the need for a real farm-credit program. I have, therefore, introduced the following resolution:

That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation, in the several regions of the United States, of the operation of the various agricultural credit and loan programs administered or supervised by the Secretary of Agriculture or by any agency, administration, corporation, or association in the Department of Agriculture or by any agency, administration, corporation, or association subject to administration or supervision by any officer, agency, administration, corporation, or association in the Department of Agriculture, with a view to determining, among other things—

1. Whether such programs are efficiently operated on a sound credit basis;

2. Whether other sources of credit are, and will continue to be, available for the same purposes on reasonable terms to meet the needs of farmers; and

3. Whether any of such programs should be discontinued, or, if not discontinued, whether any modifications should be made therein.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) before October 1, 1943, the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by h m, and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorials regarding the Farm Security Administration:

[From the Birmingham Age-Herald of April 15, 1943]

SAVE THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

In the distressful years when the present administration's program for rural aid, rehabilitation, and progress first came into being, these operations centered around humanitarian help for stricken families and a better balance in the country's economic structure. Then, surpluses were a great problem. Farm families still are in need of assistance in putting themselves on a sound, self-sustaining basis. Much still remains to be done to improve the Nation's economic balance. But surpluses are no longer the great problem. On the contrary, increased agricultural production, particularly of food, is a major necessity in strengthening and speeding our war program. Not only this country, but a large part of the rest of the world looks to American food production for salvation. Yet, in the face of this great emergency need, and with humanitarian and economic problems still acutely existing in our farm situation, there is a movement in the House which would abolish the Farm Security Administration and, in effect, greatly curtail the program which the Department of Agriculture has been carrying forward in rural areas.

IS THIS LOGIC?

Where might the Nation logically look for a large part of any increase in agricultural production? Is it not to those farm families which in the past have been severely handicapped but which, through reasonable, carefully conceived, and administered assistance, may be put in a position to better their production?

Figures issued by the Department of Agriculture showing increases in production of essential crops in 1942 amply support this assumption. The percentage of increased production by actively supervised Farm Security Administration borrowers is consistently above that for farmers generally. That is to be expected, of course. But it is precisely because it is to be expected that this program now should go forward on a scope expanded as far as is feasible and sound, instead of curtailed.

Last year there were, according to Farm Security Administration figures, 463,941 supervised borrowers. They constituted 7.6 percent of the Nation's 6,097,000 farmers. Yet they produced 36 percent of the Nation's increase in milk production for the year.

They also contributed 27 percent of the increased production of dry beans; 10 percent of the gain in eggs, peanuts, and chickens; 9 percent of that in pork; 7 percent of that in beef and sugar beets.

STAGE OF THE FIGHT

The movement to abolish the Farm Security Administration as such and transfer its curtailed credit functions to the Farm Credit Administration has reached the stage where such action has been recommended by the House Appropriations Committee. However, the relative strength of Farm Security Administration sentiment in the House as a whole will be greater, it is hoped, than in the committee.

The Budget Bureau has recommended that the Farm Security Administration receive $38,354,682 in appropriations, plus $127,500,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for loans. The committee recommended that these amounts be reduced to $12,000,000 for rural rehabilitation and $40,000,000 for loans. Such a curtailment of the program for aiding distressed families and enabling selected tenant farmers to purchase homesteads, together with the abolition of the Farm Security Administration organization, would be a tremendous blow to the constructive program which has been going forward now for a period long enough to make possible substantial reduction of early mistakes and the elimination of much of the purely experimental nature of these operations.

There have been mistakes in this program. There has been waste. This paper never has undertaken to present a blanket endorsement of Farm Security Administration operations. But it is convinced that its work, on the whole, has been highly constructive; that the men who have directed it, in the great majority, have been efficient, earnest officials conscientiously devoted to their responsibilities and increasingly successful in what they have been doing, as their experience broadened.

COLLECTIVISM?

This work has been mainly directed toward the rehabilitation of needy families, and the extension of opportunities for capable tenants to become farm owners.

Critics of the program have, in some cases, likened it to undertakings in Soviet Russia. This has been a very loose, unjustifiable charge, in our opinion.

There is certainly nothing un-American in helping distressed families on our farms—and through government. Hundreds of thousands of families had to be helped in our cities in the years of depression. The same thing has been as urgent a need in rural districts. The extent of need in both cases got far beyond the capacities of private assistance and self-reliance. So government had to act. Nothing was plainer.

In the rural rehabilitation program, the steadfast objective, we think, has not only been to meet immediate human necessities

but to increase opportunities for self-help. Naturally, such efforts have called for supervision, both for the purpose of protecting the Federal program and giving the maximum assistance to families receiving aid. If that is collectivism, it is also humanitarianism, Americanism, and good sense.

PROGRESS MADE

We believe that the Farm Security Administration has achieved a substantial measure of success in its rehabilitation program.

The tenant farm-purchase program is already demonstrating its soundness and its vast possibilities for the future.

This is the time to strengthen those programs, not to debilitate or destroy them.

This is the time in the interest of these families, in the interest of improving our national economic structure—which were the original objectives, still valid—and also in the interest of our war program.

The Budget Bureau's recommendations for the continuation of this work are relatively small—some 165,000,000—when compared to total war costs. There are places where governmental expenditures can and should be cut down. But we do not believe that sound rural rehabilitation should be curtailed. And we believe that the Farm Security Administration is best qualified to carry on this work.

[From the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser of April 15, 1943]

THE ATTACK ON FARM SECURITY

One can stop a headache by beheading the victim, but the treatment is more drastic than the situation calls for. And particularly when the headache may have been gone these several years.

During its lifetime the Farm Security Administration, guilty often of too much ambition, has nurtured to its bosom more than one headache. One of its earliest weaknesses was its readiness to seize upon untried "braintruster" programs, sometimes a strange brew of farm routine and communistic economy, and push them to their inevitable collapse.

But for those programs that failed in years past, there have been programs that succeeded. Notably among the latter have been such farm boons as the tenant-purchase program, operating under the Bankhead-Jones Tenant-Purchase Act, and rural rehabilitation.

It is customary for those who oppose the Farm Security Administration to ignore the good of Farm Security Administration even as they emphasize all that has proved impractical in years past. The specter of Tugwellism offers most of the ammunition to those who would behead Farm Security Administration.

If Tugwellism is dead in the Farm Security Administration, and if those who oppose Farm Security Administration must seek to reanimate Tugwellism to accomplish the end of Farm Security Administration, then the Congress and the Nation as a whole may be expected to listen with some skepticism to the wordy attacks on Farm Security Administration. The case against Farm Security Administration must be weak, indeed, if the mistakes of years ago are the only evidence against it.

This month's issue of the Progressive Farmer rises editorially to the defense of Farm Security Administration in a well-reasoned editorial. It says:

"Friends whom we know to be honest, earnest, and sincere think they see a bugaboo in the Farm Security Administration. They may know things that we don't know, but few of the charges made seem to hold water in the light of the few things we know. Here are a few of the things we think are well worth keeping:

"1. The tenant-purchase program: When the Bankhead-Jones Tenant-Purchase Act was passed and approved, it was hailed as one of the greatest advances in American history. We still think it was. It made it possible for worthy tenant families to buy farms on terms they could meet. Some of America's best families are tenant families. This act has made it possible for a few of the most worthy to own homes of their own. Why shouldn't this act be preserved?

"2. Rural rehabilitation: City laborers without jobs weren't the only ones to suffer in 1932, 1933, and all the other years of the depression. Thousands of farm families were caught with bare cupboards, few clothes on their backs, and scarcely a roof over their heads. But they weren't put to raking leaves. They were helped to put their debts on a satisfactory basis, were staked to a mule and a plow, and were aided in making arrangements for a crop. We doubt if any phase of the whole relief set-up was better managed than this one.

"We will always have those who are victims of misfortune. Crop failures, ill health, mistakes in business ventures, loss of livestock in epidemics, and so forth, take their toll year in and year out. Why not retain the agency that is prepared to stake the farm victims of misfortune and give them another start?

"3. Supervision: Services of Farm Security Administration to those in need of a lift do not stop with the lending of small sums. Planning aid is given and supervision provided to make certain that the person helped knows how to make the best use of the funds and facilities afforded. Provisions for an adequate home food supply through garden and canning, milk cow, pigs for slaughter, and chickens and eggs are required as part of the year's work. In many communities, cooperative ownership of important machinery is made possible. One of its greatest contributions has been its investment in good health through having made better medical services available.

"The present Farm Security Administration was saddled with some serious blunders made by its predecessors in some of their wild efforts to effect relief during the depression. Let's not destroy the goose because she has a black feather in her tail. Let's pluck the feather and save the goose.

"The progressive farmer believes that, as a whole, Farm Security Administration has done a fine job. It has helped 30,000 farmers to become landowners and it has come to the aid of other thousands of small tenant farmers who were able to find help from no other source. Now that the war calls for all-out production, Farm Security Administration has a logical place in the program. It is the small farmer who is least troubled by labor shortage. With Farm Security Administration loans and supervision he can maintain or increase farm production in 1943 to an extent greater than any other group of farmers. Figures made public just a few weeks ago show that Farm Security Administration borrowers, representing but 7.6 percent of the Nation's farms, produced more than a third of the Nation's increase in milk in 1942. Ten percent of the total increase in chickens and eggs came from these same farms and 9 percent of the increase in pork."

In the four States served through the Montgomery office of Farm Security Administration, there has been a spectacular increase in food production, traceable largely to Farm Security Administration borrowers. In 1942 Alabama led the Nation in the largest percentage increase in any one item. Soybean production in this year over the year preceding showed a spurt of 2,531 percent.

The entire Farm Security Administration program is threatened by Tuesday's House subcommittee action. Congress might do well to avoid precipitate action. If there are mistakes still being fathered by Farm Security Administration, they may be eliminated without junking a program that has proved of inestimable worth.

There is such a thing, you know, as using the momentum of a worthy crusade for purposes that are unworthy and cheap.

Too Much Loafing in Shipyard; Union Rules Disgust Echo Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Granite Falls (Minn.) Tribune of March 11, 1943, gives to us one reason for labor shortage upon the farms of America today. Wasting labor in shipyards or anywhere else is little short of criminal today and the Congress should make every effort toward eliminating this waste of manpower. Read the experience of Albert Reibe of Echo, Minn., a man too patriotic to loaf on the job:

TOO MUCH LOAFING IN SHIPYARD; UNION RULES DISGUST ECHO WORKER

There may be a shortage of labor in some shipyards in the United States, but this is not the case in the Swan Island yard near Portland, Oreg., says Albert Reibe, Echo carpenter, and he should know for he has just returned after working in this yard for the past month.

Furthermore, from what Mr. Reibe learned by talking with other workmen employed in the Swan Island yard, the same conditions exist in all shipyards in the country. He said that 24 days of this graft and loafing was about all he could stand, so he quit a job that paid $1.32½ per hour, with time and a half on Saturday, to come back where a man was expected to "put in an honest day's work for an honest wage."

There are 25,000 men employed in this one eight-way shipyard, says Albert Reibe, but he declares emphatically that 1,000 men who are willing to put in the kind of work days as we know them in this section, could accomplish just as much. It just about turns a man's stomach to know that such conditions exist while a war is being fought, this Echo man told the Tribune Tuesday.

GETS UNION PERMISSION

After working as a carpenter and well digger in the Echo community for many years, Albert Reibe went to Portland shortly after Christmas to get a job in the shipyards, his supposition being that carpenters would be badly needed.

After making an application to the union and being given permission to work provided he paid the union $2.50 per week for a temporary permit, Reibe was put on a cleveting gang whose business it was to plumb the metal sheets placed on a ship's frame before they were welded together.

There were 12 men in the gang, with 2 additional helpers who were supposed to run errands and carry anything that had to

be carried. We'll let Albert tell about his shipyard work from here on:

"Well, there were 12 of us cleveters and 2 helpers in the gang, and we were on what is known as the swing shift that goes to work at 3:30 in the afternoon and works until 11:30 at night, with a half hour off from 6:30 to 7 o'clock for lunch. Of course, we got paid for the time we spent in eating."

FIFTEEN MINUTES' WORK

"Our crew had a leader, and after we had checked in for work at 3:30 he would tell us to go down to some certain part of the ship on this way, tank 8 or 10 or 13—these were all tankers that were being built and the ship was divided off into a number of tanks—and clevet the plates and then to wait there until he called us to another job.

"This job would take us about 15 minutes at the longest, and then we would stand about waiting for the leader to come back and give us something else to do; but in all the days I spent there he never showed up twice in the same shift. After he would give us this one job to do he would disappear and we wouldn't see him again until the next day.

"I never put in such long days in my life. We would stand around, or sit and talk hour after hour. The leader told us if we saw anybody coming with a white collar on to move about as though we were working, which we did. I am positive that the gang I was on never put in more than 15 minutes of work in any 8-hour day that I was there.

"No; this was not true of our gang alone; it seemed to be true of everybody that worked out there. Everything drags and there are more workmen sitting about doing nothing than there are working. I am positive that 1,000 men putting in a workday as we know a workday back in this country could accomplish just as much as those 25,000 men and women working at Kaiser's Swan Island yard."

WOMEN GOOD WORKERS

"Yes; I understand they say there is a shortage of labor in the shipyards, but I just wish you could go out there and see for yourself. Every ship built is costing many, many times what it should and is taking much longer than it should take. Much more could be accomplished if they had one-third the number of men there.

"They've got a lot of women working at the Swan Island yard and one thing I'll say for them: I saw less loafing among the women than among the men. Most of them seemed to be putting in an honest day's work.

"You know these two helpers I told you about? Well, if our gang during its 15 minutes of work happened to need some tool, or a stick or something, none of us could go get it. We'd just have to sit there until one of the helpers showed up and then he'd go get what we needed. This is a union rule and many is the hour wasted as a result."

Albert Reibe said that the food and the sleeping quarters were both fine. The workmen were charged about $13 a week for room and board and no one could ask for a better room nor better board than what the shipyard workmen get. They sit eight men to a table in the dining hall and everything is served country style with each man having just as much to eat as he wants. There is pie and cake on the table for all three meals. Plenty of butter, milk, cream, and meat always."

But, says Albert, he just couldn't stand the loafing. If it had only been possible to have put in 8 hours of work during the day he would have been on the job yet, but standing about for 8 hours just pretending you were working was too much for him. He stood it for 24 days and then quit the job and returned to Echo where, he says, "people know what an honest day's work is."

Exports and Imports, 1922–41

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

UNITED STATES WORLD TRADE EXCEEDED $128,000,000,000 IN THE PERIOD 1922–41

This is the greatest record ever achieved by any country and proves conclusively that the United States of America has not been a "hermit nation," that its tariffs have not been "unsurmountable barriers," or that the policy of our people has been that of "isolationism."

For the past 20 years the United States of America has been the world's most generous foreign trader, exporting over $70,000,000,000 worth of merchandise and importing over $58,000,000,000 worth—a total in foreign trade of $128,000,000,000.

Year	Exports	General imports
1922	$3,831,777,000	$3,112,747,000
1923	4,167,493,000	3,792,066,000
1924	4,590,984,000	3,609,963,000
1925	4,909,848,000	4,226,589,000
1926	4,808,660,000	4,430,888,000
1927	4,865,376,000	4,184,742,000
1928	5,128,356,000	4,091,444,000
1929	5,240,995,000	4,399,361,000
1930	3,843,181,000	3,060,908,000
1931	2,424,289,000	2,090,635,000
1932	1,611,016,000	1,322,774,000
1933	1,674,994,000	1,449,559,000
1934	2,132,800,000	1,655,055,000
1935	2,282,874,000	2,047,485,000
1936	2,455,978,000	2,422,592,000
1937	3,349,167,000	3,083,668,000
1938	3,094,440,000	1,960,428,000
1939	3,177,178,000	2,318,081,000
1940	4,021,564,000	2,625,445,000
1941	3,317,595,000	2,417,307,000

The above are United States Treasury customs report figures.

The Reply of the Polish Ambassador to the Former United States Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Honorable Joseph E. Davies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the complete letter of the Polish Ambassador, J. Ciechanowski, to rectify some inaccurate statements of Hon. Joseph E. Davies, which appeared with an elaborate array of maps and an article of praise for Soviet Russia in the March 29, 1943, issue of the Life magazine:

Mr. HENRY R. LUCE,
Editor, Life Magazine,
Rockefeller Center, New York City.

DEAR MR. LUCE: I regard it as my duty to rectify some inaccurate statements contained in the article entitled "The Soviets and the Post-War" by the Honorable Joseph E. Davies, former United States Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which appeared in the special issue of Life of March 29, 1943, and I take the liberty of asking you kindly to publish this letter in the next issue of Life.

It is not my intention to express any views concerning the general trend of Mr. Davies' article, but as Representative of Poland in the United States I feel I must at least correct the most important inaccuracies directly concerning Poland, contained in that article.

(1) Ambassador Davies' statement that Poland's eastern territories were "carved out of and taken away from Russia" is both incorrect and misleading because it implies that these territories were seized by force and held by Poland against the will of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The real facts of the matter as as follows:

After the World War Poland's independence was restored. The Polish-Russian frontier was fixed by virtue of the treaty concluded in Riga on March 18, 1921, directly and freely negotiated by the plenipotentiaries of Poland and Soviet Russia and Soviet Ukraine and was recognized officially by the Allied Powers by the Conference of Ambassadors on March 15, 1923.

It should be remembered that already on September 9, 1918, the Soviet Government published a decree dated August 29, 1918, canceling all treaties concerning the partitions of Poland of 1772, 1793, and 1795, as well as all subsequent treaties relating to Poland up to 1833. Article 3 of this Soviet Russian decree states:

"All agreements and acts concluded by the Government of the late Russian Empire with the Governments of Prussia and of the Austro-Hungarian Empire relating to the partitions of Poland are forever annulled by the present resolution, considering that they are contrary to the principle of free determination of peoples as well as to the juridical revolutionary conception of the Russian Nation which has recognized to the Polish Nation the 'imprescriptible' right to decide its own fate and its unification."

This decree was signed by Lenin, Karakhan, and Bonch-Bruyevich and was officially communicated to the Government of the German Reich on October 3, 1918.

By virtue of this decree Poland had the right to the restitution of all the territories which belonged to her before the first partition of Poland in 1772, but by the Treaty of Riga Poland renounced her right to a substantial part of these territories. This is clearly evident from article III of the treaty which stipulates that:

"Russia and the Ukraine renounce all rights and claims as regards the territories situated westward of the frontier, as defined under article II of the present treaty. Poland on her side renounces, in favor of the Ukraine and White Russia, all rights and claims as regards the territories, situated eastward of the aforesaid frontier.

"Should the area situated westward of the frontier as fixed by article II of the present treaty, include territories being under dispute between Poland and Lithuania, the question of the sovereignty of either of the two states over these territories concerns exclusively Poland and Lithuania."

(2) Further in his article Ambassador Davies says that "Five million Ukrainians were arbitrarily converted into Polish citizens after the last war." This statement is incorrect.

As a result of the freely negotiated Polish-Soviety Treaty of Riga, the acquisition of citizenship of the populations living on both sides of the Polish-Soviet border was a natural consequence of that treaty. The citizenship of these populations was never assailed or questioned by either of the two signatories to the Riga Treaty. The interests of Polish citizens of Ukrainian nationality were fully represented in the Polish Parliament by their numerous elected representatives. The number of Ukrainian members of parliament varied from 22 to 43 in the course of the five parliamentary elections held in Poland during the peace period. At no time since the signature of the Riga Treaty did that population ever express the wish to be incorporated to Soviet Russia or to Soviet Ukraine. Since the signing of the Riga Treaty up to the Soviet invasion of Poland in September 1939, Poland's territorial status was never assailed or questioned by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Likewise, in the course of the same period, Poland never laid any claim to territories of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In the light of these facts, Mr. Davies' assertion about arbitrary enforcing of Polish citizenship on the Ukrainians in Poland is entirely unfounded.

3. Contrary to Mr. Davies' assertion, there was no such thing as a "Curzon commission under the Versailles Treaty," and the Conference of Versailles did not settle the eastern boundaries of Poland. Nor was the so-called Curzon line the "line of racial demarcation of Polish and Russian nationalities."

The so-called Curzon line was a tentative demarcation line which Lord Curzon, then British Foreign Secretary, suggested in July 1920 as a possible temporary armistice line in the hope of stopping Soviet-Polish hostilities. At that time it was rejected by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and, on the termination of Polish-Soviet hostilities, free negotiations between Poland and Soviet Russia culminated in the signing of the Riga Treaty, which finally settled the frontier.

4. In another paragraph of his article, Ambassador Davies states that it was Poland who has now raised what he is pleased to call these controversial frontier matters, and that this was done contrary to the "implied consent to the postponement of the determination of the issue until after victory."

This is also a misstatement of facts. The Polish Government did not raise the boundary issue for the simple reason that it continues to regard the Polish-Russian border as definitely fixed by the Treaty of Riga. Moreover, in paragraph 1 of the treaty signed between the Polish and the Soviet Governments on July 30, 1941, it is stated: "The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics recognizes the Soviet-German treaties of 1939 as to territorial hanges in Poland as having lost their validity." The consequence of this statement is clear: The Soviet-German agreements partitioning Poland having thus been explicitly nullified, Poland's territorial statu quo previous to September 1, 1939, as determined by the Riga Treaty, must be regarded as being in force.

The attempt to raise a controversy on the subject of the Polish-Soviet frontier was first publicly made by Mr. Aleksander Kornejtchuk, member of the Supreme Council of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, recently appointed Deputy Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union. Mr. Kornejtchuk published an article in the official organ of the Communist Party, Pravda, reported from Moscow on February 20, 1943, by special cable to the New York Times, and reproduced and circulated in the information bulletin of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, No. 19, of February 25, 1943. This, in fact, was the first public statement issued by a high-ranking Soviet spokesman assailing Poland's rights in regard to her territorial status.

In view of Mr. Kornejtchuk's statement of February 20, the Polish Government in London published an official statement on February 25, 1943, in which, among others, the Polish Government declares that "so far as the question of frontiers between Poland and Soviet Russia is concerned, the status quo previous to September 1, 1939, is in force, and it considers that undermining this attitude which is in line with the Atlantic Charter, is detrimental to the unity of the Allied Nations * * *."

This goes to prove that, contrary to Mr. Davies' contention, Poland's eastern boundary was first publicly questioned by a Soviet Government spokesman.

I am,

Yours sincerely,

J. CIECHANOWSKI,
Ambassador of Poland.

Transportation Needs in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, everything has been subordinated to the program of our armed forces, and this policy has been carried to the extent of curtailing the supply of farm machinery. Every industry and every activity of our people have felt the imprint. The needs of the Army and the Navy have been given the right-of-way.

Even the transportation problems of our country have been made secondary in order that nothing might interfere with our war effort. There will come a time, however, when some attention must be given to our domestic transportation needs. The development of waterway transportation facilities cannot be neglected indefinitely. Neither can the railroads continue to operate unless their rolling stock is replaced and other equipment provided. These same remarks apply with equal force to motor vehicles and particularly trucks.

It does seem rather ridiculous for an agency of the Government to furnish copper, steel, and other materials to a private power concern in northern Quebec and fail to give any consideration to the needs of our domestic economy. I refer, of course, to the Shipshaw project which I discussed recently. My remarks on that subject appear in the April 2 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I have a further discussion of that matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 8.

IT TAKES TRUCKS TO DELIVER THE GOODS

Mr. Speaker, recent announcements by the Government that the total new stock of light and medium trucks will be exhausted by July 1 should make us all stop and pause. Nothing is said about heavy trucks and trailers, but from last available figures there are only a few thousand of these, so perhaps we are running out of a supply of them also.

No doubt the policy of stock piling our new trucks and trailers right after Pearl Harbor, when manufacture for civilian use was discontinued, was a wise thing. But we could not expect that stock pile to last forever. Motortrucks and trailers wear out rapidly enough in normal times, but with the increased strain on national production brought about by the war they are disintegrating even faster today. With the exception of the trucks and trailers added to the stream of commerce from the stock pile we had on hand over a year ago, no new equipment has been put in operation.

There are perhaps better than three and a half million trucks and trailers of all descriptions—light, medium, and heavy—in use throughout the United States. And judging by the prices of second-hand trucks, ceiling prices for which were recently announced, there exists a greater demand than there is supply. How rapidly these three and one-half million trucks are going to the scrap pile I do not know but it is reasonable to assume that it is at a faster pace than in normal times.

The congressional district I represent is expected to produce more minerals, more farm products, more timber products, more cattle, and more fish. All of these operations are in some respect dependent directly or indirectly upon transportation by trucks and trailers over the public highways. If my colleagues will look over their districts they will find that these or other pursuits, all necessary for the war and civilian economy, are dependent upon a sound, safe, and efficient highway transportation.

We all know how long it took to switch over our factories to the manufacture of war materials. It is only natural that it would take time to again place some of the truck and trailer manufacturers back to work producing their normal vehicles. This is not a matter for post-war planning, but one for present-day war planning. The war effort cannot be permitted to suffer by any break-down in our highway transportation system. The War Production Board, charged with the responsibility of producing for the country during wartime, should promptly make a study of this problem so that the needs of the military and civilian effort will not break down.

Farm Security Program Lauded by Minnesota Bishop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the pending Agriculture Department appropriation bill, I was particularly impressed by a letter which was addressed to me by Bishop J. H. Peschges, of Crook-

ston, Minn., concerning the Farm Security rehabilitation program.

Bishop Peschges is known throughout Minnesota and the Northwest for his excellent understanding of farm problems. He has traveled considerably in farm areas and studied and observed first hand the results of the F. S. A. program of helping the small farmer and his family. Naturally he is vitally interested in the rehabilitation of the newer and younger groups of farmers.

Financially distressed and discouraged and debt-burdened farmers do not make good citizens. Bishop Peschges is interested in correcting the causes.

When so much money is being expended to help big industrial corporations' failure to continue a program which will help the little farmer and the small-town merchant will have a very dangerous and demoralizing effect on American life.

The letter by Bishop Peschges follows:

BISHOP'S HOUSE,
Crookston, Minn., April 8, 1943.

Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HAGEN: We have no intention of butting into the affairs of our elected representatives at Washington, but occasionally they may welcome a considered expression of opinion in matters of practical concern to all of us. In this light, I beg to make a few comments.

The matter I wish to bring up is Farm Security. I am not very much interested in the name of the office that administers the work or handles the funds, but I am very vitally interested in the social philosophy that brought Farm Securty into being, and in the continued practical application of that social philosophy through some sympathetic Federal agency.

I have seen the work that Farm Security has done in these parts, have visited the families that it has served, and have witnessed their evident satisfaction and happiness in being ableto get a new start toward proving themselves respectable, self-respecting, and decently self-supporting citizens. Under whatever name it has functioned or may continue to function, Farm Security is one of the finest pieces of constructive social legislation that our Congress has ever enacted, and I regret exceedingly that its very existence seems now to be threatened.

If I interpret public utterances and movements correctly, there seems to have developed a well-defined trend that has been graphically expressed in the words "to heck with the little fellow; let's help the big fellow." This at best is a dangerous attitude, and manifests a very un-American frame of mind. The little fellow is still the backbone of the Nation, here as elsewhere, and if we are not willing to safeguard the well-being of the little fellow at home as well as of the little nation abroad, our boast of fighting for fundamental rights in this war is but a sham.

By its very nature and purpose, Farm Security was set up to help the little fellow on the farm who could not get elsewhere the credit needed to make a real go of his farm activities, but who had, or at least gave promise of having, the qualifications necessary, if given reasonable assistance, not only to stay off the public relief rolls but also to make himself and family properly self-sustaining. It was not destined to be just another lending agency, but rather an agency for building or rebuilding the character and outlook of at least some of our less fortunate and seriously-buffeted farm folk through prudent economic reconstruction. The big fellow can usually take care of himself, but the little fellow, who perhaps has been unfortunate, but has not lost his ambition or willingness to work hard, needs encouragement and practical assistance. His kind are still decidedly numerous in our land.

It may be objected that Farm Security has made mistakes and is duplicating services rendered by other agencies. No one will question that it has made mistakes, but what live agency has not made or is not making mistakes, and even serious mistakes? Apart from some minor slips that I know of, Farm Security in these parts has done an outstanding job. If there is needless duplication of effort, let there be by all means a reduction in the number of bureaus, but do not let this work become a mere adjunct to an agency that has no appreciation of or sympathy for the splendid social contribution involved in recent Farm Security activities. Let us not scrap this in the name of present all-out material efficiency.

With cordial personal greetings and best wishes, I remain,

Respectfully yours,
Most Rev. J. H. PESCHGES, D. D.,
Bishop of Crookston.

Illinois Urges Increase in the Production of Synthetic Rubber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith for the consideration of the Congress, the following Resolution adopted by the Senate of the Illinois General Assembly on the 10th day of March and concurred in by the House of Representatives of said Assembly on March 31, 1943:

Senate Joint Resolution 7

Whereas after the enemy obtained control of over 92 percent of our normal supply of raw rubber, the Baruch Rubber Survey Committee recommended that an annual production of 1,106,000 tons of synthetic rubber must be attained if our essential civilian and military motor vehicles are to be kept rolling throughout this mechanized war; and

Whereas Rubber Director William M. Jeffers has done his best to follow the program outlined by the Baruch committee, but the program has been sharply cut by other agencies of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the necessary highway transportation of war workers, war commodities and needed civilian supplies will be tragically crippled unless more tires are soon made available; and

Whereas the agricultural and petroleum industries are prepared to supply the main basic ingredients for the manufacture of synthetic rubber tires: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois hereby commends Rubber Director William M. Jeffers for his efforts to keep the wheels rolling under the American military machine and the civilian economy; and be it further

Resolved, That the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois memorializes the Members of the United States Congress to do all in their power to make immediately available sufficient metals and other critical materials to build and equip as many factories as are needed to produce annually a minimum of 1,000,000 tons of synthetic rubber; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be mailed by the Secretary of State to Vice President Henry A. Wallace, Speaker Sam Rayburn, majority and minority leaders of both parties in each House of Congress, all Illinois Congressmen and Senators, Rubber Director William M. Jeffers, War Production Board Chairman Donald M. Nelson, Office of Defense Transportation Director Joseph B. Eastman, Office of Price Administration Director Prentiss M. Brown, and Economic Stabilization Director James C. Byrnes.

Grazing of Cattle in National Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram received from the California State Senate, which is self-explanatory. Anyone conversant with the livestock problems of California will readily see the necessity of this concession being granted by the Department of the Interior:

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., *April 16, 1943.*

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I am directed by the senate to telegraph to you the following Senate Resolution No. 104, adopted by the senate relative to grazing of cattle on or adjacent to national parks:

"Whereas the war effort requires increased production of livestock and to that end various agencies of the Federal Government have requested and sought to encourage the increased production thereof; and

"Whereas over one-half million acres of California's best range land are now in military reservations where livestock cannot be grazed, and this loss must be replaced by other land if increased production is to be had; and

"Whereas there are within the State of California several national parks which have an overabundant supply of feed capable of supporting large numbers of livestock throughout the summer months without endangering the food supply for deer and other wildlife and without interfering with the use and enjoyment of such parks by tourists who are now unable to use the park facilities to the same extent as in years past; and

"Whereas thousands of acres of range lands adjacent to the Lassen Volcanic National Park heretofore used have been made unusable for grazing purposes because of threatened livestock trespass action against livestock owners in the event their livestock wanders into the park and by requiring fencing which has not heretofore been required; and

"Whereas by reason of the aforesaid policy thousands of acres of feed in the counties of Tehama, Shasta, Lassen, Inyo, Tulare, Fresno, Mono, Tuolumne, Mariposa, and others have been made unusable to producers: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California,* That the Federal authorities be and the same are hereby requested to make available the grazing lands within the national parks in California to the livestock producers of this State; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the lands adjacent to the Lassen Volcanic National Park be made available by a more liberal policy as to the incidental trespass of livestock from said lands in said park; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to send by telegram a copy of this resolution to Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing California in the Congress of the United States."

J. A. BEEK,
Secretary of the Senate,
State of California.

The President's $25,000 Statement a One-Legged Alibi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, when about a week ago I listened to the alibis offered by the President for letting the debt bill pass without his signature, I laughed at the reasons he gave in attempting to explain why he could not veto the rider repealing his Executive but unwarranted and unauthorized edict in re the $25,000 salary ceiling.

I was amused at the hypocrisy actually involved and was entertained by the predicament in which the President found himself by reason of his misguided and unwise attempts to be judge, jury, and executioner—Supreme Court, President, and Congress—three-in-one unity, and all at the same time.

The President knew very well while he was talking that he had no one but himself to blame, or at least no one except himself and his advisers. He could not kick the Republicans around, for as much as the severest critics to be found of his act and the strongest opposition to him came from his own party. So he undertook to take Congress for a ride on a "rider."

The more I have thought about this and talked with others about it, the stronger has become my conviction that if it were not, and had not been, a deliberate attempt to camouflage the issue, to make another attack and to take another crack at Congress, which had stepped on Presidential toes, it probably would be just as well to pay no attention to the President's statement. Since it was what it was and is what it is, the more I have thought about it, as I say, the more convinced I have become that as one Member of Congress I do not care to be, and will not permit myself as a matter of record to be, misrepresented by the President to the people. I propose to defend myself and my actions in the premises. If, incidentally, I speak for Congress, I do it as for myself and without authorization from anybody.

I do not propose to stand or lie supinely by to see sacrificed all the rights and prerogatives of Congress or the people as represented in Congress just because of all the hue and cry concerning that unity which the President deliberately attempts in his statement to destroy and to disrupt.

I am for the President's policies as Commander in Chief, but I am opposed to his administration's policies internally and economically. I believe them to be destructive of all those things in which I believe and for which I stand, and for which we are fighting to win the war.

It will profit us nothing to win the war if we lose that we are fighting for; namely, the ideals of the founding fathers.

The New Deal theories are not those of the founders of the Republic who provided latitude and longitude for growth and change, but not along the lines of the New Deal program which reverts to feudalism, collectivism, and worse.

In the first place, for the President to accuse Congress of legislative trickery in the use of what is known as a rider is in the premises reductio ad absurdum. It is cry-baby stuff beneath the dignity of the President. He it was who first hit below the belt and struck the first foul blow when, incensed over the fact that Congress did not accept his limitation suggestion, he reached out and struck, and below the belt, when he issued the order without authority of law, against the expressed will of Congress, and deliberately in defiance thereof.

Congress in order to reassert itself adopted a parliamentary procedure used many times in emergencies, although I do not approve of its use, too generally. It used the rider in order to save a day, an occasion, and the people. Congress attached the salary-ceiling repealer to an essential measure, deliberately, and well knowing that the President would not dare to veto it, but would have to accept it under the circumstances. That is what made the President mad although he himself has more often resorted to the use of a rider and has sponsored more legislative riders on important bills than has any President who ever occupied the White House. The rider has become a favorite method to be employed by this administration in an endeavor to override Congress and to carry out its pet projects expeditiously.

So, when the President attempts to discredit this particular legislative procedure, it is a matter of the pot calling the kettle black. His record condemns him at the outset and speaks louder than any statement made as a demagog in anger and defeat.

The fact is—and the people should know it—that the Congress was justified in doing exactly what it did do and had to do in order to protect its self-respect and prerogatives in the present occasion.

The President by Executive order wrote into the law something which was not there; he defied Congress when he ordered something which he had recommended and the Congress had repudiated. He deliberately and autocratically defied the express will of Congress. By the use of an Executive order he broke the law as laid down by Congress. As the Chief Executive he undertook to legislate against the recorded contra-legislative action of Congress. For such action there is no justification and he could find no adequate authority. In the language of the street, he made up his mind he would try to tell Congress where it got off and where to go. Unfortunately for him, they did not accept his ticket or take his direction.

In the President's way of thinking, the rider is unfair. That would seem to be true from his standpoint only when it cannot be used to his advantage. That is not cricket.

The people know that the Senate and House by overwhelming majorities, in the emergency created by the President in deliberate definance of Congress, adopted a parliamentary procedure intended to stop the President in his tracks. This it did. Congress proposed to let him know that the arrogant disregard of the will of Congress by the Executive would not be tolerated, and was not approved. It succeeded.

Of course Congress is not uninformed with respect to the fact that the program of the President, undertaken to be carried out by his Executive order, had its origin in the platform of the Communist party. Congress did not like that. It did not like a lot of other things, which have happened but will never happen again, along radical lines and class legislation for which this administration has been an active proponent.

Then again, Congress recognized the Presidential penchant for "determining by Executive edict" matters of base policy which are solely "the province of Congress." Congress proposed and proposes to put a stop to such procedure. It is opposed to such usurpation of its undelegated prerogatives.

Any attempt to smear Congress for having asserted itself is, and will be, a boomerang. The people spoke in the last election. Congress has undertaken to carry out their mandates.

This particular bit of peevish demagogy has no equal in any state paper or document so far as I can find.

The President made an issue out of his attempt to override the legislative branch. He was hoisted by his own petard. The reaction of the people to his statement is positive proof of that fact.

What Will the Florida Barge Canal Cost and Can It Be Built in 1 Year?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members of the House and Senate, as well as others, may have the facts pertaining to the cost of constructing and equipping the Florida barge canal, and as to whether the canal and equipment can be completed in time to fur-

nish oil to the East, I am including herewith a summary of the testimony given before the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives at the hearings on the civil functions bill of the War Department.

Among the proponents who testified before the committee were the following: Maj. Gen. Charles P. Summerall, United States Army, retired, chairman of the Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida; Mr. Arthur A. Johnson, president of the Arthur A. Johnson Corporation, of Long Island, N. Y., who stated that he hoped to obtain the contract for the construction of the canal; Mr. Henry Buckman, engineering counsel for the Ship Canal Authority of Florida.

Among those who testified on the part of the Government were: Mr. Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Administrator, Mr. George A. Wilson, Office of Defense Transportation, Mr. Lee R. Cowles, Assistant Director of Transportation, all of the Petroleum Administration for War; Mr. Glen Taylor, Office of Defense Transportation; Mr. W. I. Elliott, War Production Board; Col. James P. Growden, of the Army and Navy Munitions Board; Sam Loveland, of the Maritime Commission.

Other witnesses were: Brig. Gen. Theron D. Weaver, Deputy Director, Resources and Production Division, Services of Supply, and member of the executive committee of the Army and Navy Munitions Board; Capt. Ralph S. McDowell, United States Navy, for the executive committee of the Army and Navy Munitions Board.

I have not mentioned numerous Congressmen who testified for or against the project. The record is short, concise, to the point, and exceptionally complete. The witnesses impressed me with their sincerity and honesty and as being desirous of doing that which is best for the war effort. The differences of opinion, I believe, were honest, based upon the facts and interests which the witnesses undoubtedly had in the outcome of the hearings. The following is a short summary of the testimony given on both sides of the question:

1. Cost: According to the proponents of the bill, the canal would cost $44,000,000. The Chief Engineer of the United States Army says $60,000,000.

2. Proponents say it would cost $451,250,000 to build the canal, including equipment units such as barges, tugs, etc., to transport 1,600,000 barrels daily (p. 145 of the hearings). R. K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator, itemizes the cost at $1,522,625,000. (See p. 175 of hearings.)

3. Canal proponents' figures are based upon 65 percent of the tugs and barges being constructed of wood and 35 percent steel. The Petroleum Administrator's office says only heavy residual oil or about 10 percent of the total can be transported by wooden barges and 90 percent would require steel barges; that no wooden barges could be used because of the various hazards, including fire hazard (pp. 173 to 176 of the hearings; p. 159 of the hearings). Both parties base their figures upon the assumption that the total requirement of 1,600,000 barrels per day is to be transported by canal, which, of course, would not be true, as 535,000 barrels will be transported next year by pipe line. Assuming that 50 percent is to be transported, you would, of course, cut each figure down to 50 percent, or whatever percentage of the oil that is to be transported by canal.

COST OF TRANSPORTATION OF OIL FROM THE TEXAS OIL FIELDS TO EASTERN SEABOARD STATES

By tanker before the war, 21 to 24 cents per barrel.

Present cost of transporting by tanker, as fixed by Maritime Commission, 40 cents per barrel.

Cost of transporting by rail, $1.65 per barrel.

Cost of transporting by canal, $1 per barrel.

Cost of transporting by pipe line, 35 cents per barrel.

No subsidy will be paid on pipe-line transportation and the 35 cents per barrel would be paid by consumer and would liquidate the entire investment within 5 years (p. 198 of the hearings).

SUBSIDIES

The subsidy is the difference between the tanker cost fixed by the Maritime Commission at 40 cents per barrel and the actual transportation cost. Under canal transportation, subsidy would still be paid of 60 cents per barrel which is the difference between present tanker transportation cost and canal transportation cost (p. 169 of the hearings).

INVESTMENT

Government capital would have to be used. No private individuals or corporations will invest money in barges and tugs to transport oil at $1 per barrel when tankers can transport the oil at 21 to 24 cents per barrel in peacetime and pipe lines at 35 cents per barrel including amortization of capital investment of pipe lines in 5 years. Capital invested in barges and tugs would be a loss after the war.

It would cost $3 a barrel to transport oil in drums through the canal (p. 170 of the hearings).

NEW METHODS OF TRANSPORTATION AVAILABLE IN 1943

1. Pipe lines: One 24-inch pipe line to be completed July 4—capacity 300,000 barrels per day. This pipe line can be stepped up to 450,000 per day (pp. 149 and 158 of the hearings). One 20-inch pipe line as far as Illinois by September and through to the East by December. This pipe line will transport 235,000 barrels daily without subsidy at 35 cents per barrel paid by the consumer and liquidate the total investment in 5 years (p. 198 of the hearings). This is additional capacity over what we had last year.

2. Supplying oil to the East: Mr. Wilson of the Petroleum Administrator's office stated that when these two pipe lines are completed "we will be able to meet the full east coast petroleum requirements on the basis of continuing gasoline rationing substantially as it now is and supply normal requirements of fuel oil and other petroleum requirements for domestic and off-shore use" (p. 199 of the hearings).

STEEL

Under date of March 24, 1943, Mr. Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator, wrote me as follows:

"At present, a program calling for ultimate construction of some 500 wooden barges and 100 tugs is in process of completion under the direction of the Office of Defense Transportation. This program was authorized in December 1942. At present, contracts for the construction of some 80 tugs and about 260 wooden barges have been let to various yards. The time necessary to construct a single barge ranges from 40 days to 3 months, and for a tug, from 4 to 6 months. It would be impossible to arrive at an accurate time estimate covering the construction of 9,600 barges and 3,995 tugs unless one could base one's estimate on the number of yards available in which the work could be done, and the number of vessels which each yard would undertake to build simultaneously.

"It is the opinion of this office, however, that with existing yard facilities and with the projects already under construction and authorized which now are utilizing the capacity of such shipyards, it is questionable whether or not sufficient equipment could be constructed within a period of 2 years which would be capable of moving an additional 200,000 B. D. from Texas Gulf ports to Trenton, N. J., let alone moving 1,500,000 B. D.

"It should be pointed out that the use of steel for large-diameter pipe-line construction involves minimum interference with either the shipbuilding program of the Maritime Commission, the barge-conversion program of the Office of Defense Transportation, or with the production of bombs. The barge and shipbuilding program is predicated upon the use of rolled plate while the large-diameter pipe-line program is predicated principally upon the use of drawn tubing, which is produced in separate mills not capable of producing rolled plate. It is interesting to note that in the construction of the 24-inch war emergency pipe line, the question arose as to the possible interference which this construction might have upon the bomb program. Drawing of pipe for the Big Inch line was stopped for a sufficient period of time to permit the drawing of necessary bomb casings to meet the requirements of the armed forces. Drawing of pipe for the Big Inch line was then resumed. Similarly, it is believed that no interference would arise in a future possible expansion of the presently planned large pipe-line program."

Space will not permit me to quote other testimony. However, I had Mr. Buckman, representing the proponents, give me a statement covering the main items of cost. I then had Mr. Davis, Petroleum Administrator, and the Government authorities take that statement and give their side by way of comparison. You will find the comparison on pages 172 to 176 of the hearings. If you will read just these 4 pages, it will give you a complete story. I have no desire except to give you the facts.

ADDITIONAL FACTS AS TO RAIL TRANSPORTATION

The testimony further shows that we now have 71,000 railroad tank cars in the service engaged in the transportation of oil from the Texas oil fields to the Atlantic Seaboard States, and that these tank cars will transport 708,000 barrels per day of the 1,600,000 barrels required daily from September 1943 to August 31, 1944—see page 173 of the hearings.

Proponents compare the cost of constructing the barge line with the cost of producing or building additional requirements for shipping such oil by rail. It is not proposed nor has the administration proposed to build additional rail equipment to transport oil. The question is, Shall we construct new pipe lines or shall we construct the canal and the equipment necessary to move the oil by way of the Florida barge canal? The testimony to the effect that oil can be transported at 35 cents per barrel by pipe line without subsidy and upon the basis of amortizing the capital investment within 5 years was based upon the theory of building and transporting through the large 20- or 24-inch pipe

lines. As the pipe lines become smaller the cost of transportation, of course, increases. It should be noted that the witnesses who testified for the Government in opposition to the construction of the barge canal and regarding the cost of transportation by various methods and regarding the cost of constructing oil barges, tugs, and other necessary equipment are all men who have been actually engaged in that business for years and men who are now constructing barges for the Office of Defense Transportation.

PRIORITIES AND TIME WITHIN WHICH THE CANAL CAN BE COMPLETED

The testimony of the contractor to the effect that he could complete the canal within 10 months was based upon the condition that he be given superpriority: First, in the transportation of equipment required to build the canal; second, superpriority on critical materials required for the canal; third, that no one must interfere with his manpower. See page 116 of the hearings.

The same superpriorities would have to be granted for the steel required in the building of barges and tugs as set forth in the letter from Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator, quoted hereinbefore. Superpriority would mean that the canal and the equipment would take priority over shipbuilding including destroyers and antisubmarine boats. It would mean taking priority over all material needed to manufacture everything required by the Army and Navy for combat and noncombat service. On page 195 of the hearings, Dr. W. Y. Elliott, Director of Stock Piling and Transportation Resource Division of the War Production Board, testified in part as follows:

Mr. ENGEL. Would you consider that this canal would have a priority over everything else?

Dr. ELLIOTT. I want to make that clear. I would not myself consider any project a "superpriority" project without considering all other essential shipping at this time and I believe that you would support me in that shipping program on which our whole success of the war depends is the most essential.

When Dr. Elliott completed his testimony there was no question in the minds of any of the members of the subcommittee, but what Dr. Elliott and the War Production Board would not consider the canal or its equipment as a superpriority. Brig. Gen. T. D. Weaver, a member of the executive committee of the Army and Navy Munitions Board testified in part as follows:

The question that was put to me yesterday afternoon was: What effect will it have upon the munitions program? The general answer to that is somewhat along the lines stated quite well by Dr. Elliott—that it has to be balanced as to critical materials or critical components in the immediate future as compared with the needs of the military program in the immediate future. As we see it, there cannot help but be some interference with military programs by the use of steel, pumps, conveyor equipment, transformers, and things of that nature, which undoubtedly go into a project of this sort, and especially manpower. It is apparent as it now stands, that there are other things in the military program which possibly everyone would grant are ahead of this project.

Capt. Ralph C. McDowell, representing the United States Navy on the Army and Navy Munitions Board testified in part as follows:

The Army and Navy Munitions Board would be quite concerned about the amount of structural steel, steel plates, and shapes that would have to be devoted to the program of building tugboats and barges, the alloy steel that would have to go into the important items, particularly the Diesel engines, and, going with that the manpower, the shipyard manpower, that would be involved in the construction of the boats. So far as the Navy and the Maritime Commission are concerned, the question of steel plates has been quite tight. We have been having difficulty in getting a proper allocation or distribution of steel plates between the agencies. And any program that would involve decided reduction in the amount of steel plate that would be available to the Navy or the shipbuilding program would be a matter of considerable concern to the Navy. That is merely an amplification of Dr. Elliott's statement from the Navy's side (p. 201 of the hearings).

I again wish to call your attention to the letter quoted herein by Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator, in which he points out that pipe-line construction does not require rolled-plate steel, but is predicated upon the use of "drawn tubing which is produced in steel mills that are not capable of producing steel plate."

Anyone who says that the canal and its equipment can be constructed within 10 months in the face of the above testimony must indeed be optimistic.

The Anti-Racketeering Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorials:

[From the Washington News of April 10, 1943]

270 TO 107

The Hobbs bill, bitterly opposed by leaders of organized labor, passed the House of Representatives yesterday by 270 to 107.

The bill is the reply of the House to the Supreme Court decision which held that Congress intended unions, their officers, and members, to be immune to punishment under the Federal anti-racketeering law. It makes plain the intent of one branch of the present Congress that unionists, like other persons, shall pay the penalties of that law if they obstruct interstate commerce by practicing robbery and extortion. We believe it safeguards adequately all legitimate union activities.

Twice before, in less than three years, the House has passed conspicuous legislation opposed by labor leaders and the administration—the Smith amendments to the Wagner Act, by a 258-to-129 vote in June 1940; the Smith anti-strike bill, by a 252-to-136 vote, three days before Pearl Harbor. Both died in the Senate Labor Committee.

The greater margin given the Hobbs bill by the branch of Congress usually most sensitive to public opinion, probably will encourage independence on this measure in the Senate. We hope so. Certainly it is the most impressive warning in 10 years that labor leadership is getting very near the time when it must act to rid unionism of racketeering and other abuses or see Congress act.

[From the Washington Post of April 10, 1943]

HOBBS BILL

The fact that a controversy developed over the Hobbs bill is indicative of the meager progress that has been made toward the adoption of a sound labor policy. During the last decade Congress has acted many times to bolster the rights of organized labor. It has properly eliminated the abuses which put union men at a disadvantage in many industries. Now labor is more powerful than it has ever been before. Emphasis now should clearly be placed on the responsibilities that go along with power. But in this field Congress has accomplished very little to date, largely, it appears, because of the one-way reform complex of the administration.

Probably the mildest of all the reforms suggested to curb abuses of power on the part of oganized labor is the Hobbs bill. It outlaws only robbery and extortion when those crimes delay, affect, or obstruct interstate commerce. Of course robbery and extortion affecting interestate commerce are crimes for all other groups today. Indeed Congress included every criminal act of this sort under its Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934, but the Supreme Court carved out a special exemption for thieves and thugs acting in the name of unions. Yet the attempt in Congress to eliminate that invidious distinction has met with the most bitter opposition from organized labor.

Shortly before the bill went to the House for debate the Judiciary Committee amended it to make absolutely clear that it would not encroach upon any legitimate right of organized labor. But the bill still met with stiff opposition. Here is a discouraging commentary on statesmanship in the labor movement. Any politician would know better than to fight for the privilege of engaging in robbery and extortion to gain his ends. Fortunately, the House passed the bill yesterday. That is an excellent day's work. The very substantial majority piled up for this bill (the vote was 270 to 107) should encourage prompt action by the Senate. Even more important, it should break the log jam which has held back other reform measures that are now urgently needed.

[From the Denver Post of April 10, 1943]

The Hobbs antiracketeering bill which the lower House of Congress adopted Friday by a vote of 270 to 107 should receive speedy Senate approval. Its purpose is to deal with racketeers who are hiding behind the mask of union labor just the same as with any other criminals. Under a recent United States Supreme Court opinion, antiracketeering laws which now are in force do not apply to members of a labor union. The Hobbs bill would correct this defect and outlaw all kinds of racketeering.

Under the Hobbs bill any person found guilty of interfering with interstate commerce "by robbery or extortion" will be subject to a maximum of 20 years' imprisonment and a $10,000 fine. The measure also would outlaw "interference during the war with the transportation of troops, munitions, war supplies, or mail in interstate or foreign commerce."

There is nothing unfair to organized labor in the Hobbs bill. It does not deprive any labor union or any member of a labor union

of any legitimate right. All it does is outlaw the extortion and thuggery of criminal racketeers who have wormed their way into labor unions and who have been using these organizations as a cloak to cover their nefarious activities. It will put an end to the practice of thugs, operating as union agents, stopping farm trucks as these enter big eastern cities and forcing a farmer to pay $8 or $9 to "hire a union driver" he doesn't want or need.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 10, 1943]

THE HOBBS BILL

The vote by which the House has passed the Hobbs anti-racketeering bill, 270 to 107, is a plain indication that the people of this country are determined to put an end to the flagrant abuses which have been practiced with impunity in the name of unionism by a small and irresponsible segment of organized labor. Because of the strength of this public sentiment, it is all the more surprising that the responsible spokesmen for labor should have exerted such strenuous efforts to defeat the bill in the House.

An anti-racketeering bill was passed almost 10 years ago, but the Supreme Court, in a much-criticized decision, held that Congress had intended to grant immunity to union members for acts that would be criminal in character if committed by anyone else. To rectify the damage done by this ruling, Representative HOBBS, of Alabama, prepared and introduced the measure which now goes to the Senate. His bill was carefully drawn to safeguard all legitimate union activities, and as a further precaution against injustice, Chairman SUMNERS, of the Judiciary Committee, offered an amendment on the floor which provided specifically that the Hobbs bill was not to be construed as taking from labor any of the rights conferred under previously enacted legislation. This amendment was adopted by the House.

The acceptance of this protective amendment did not bring about any decline in labor opposition, however. Spokesmen for the principal unions, while not attempting to defend or justify in any way the practices at which the Hobbs bill is aimed, nevertheless insisted that they were unqualifiedly opposed to the remedy proposed in the measure. This is an attitude which suggests that the representatives of labor have learned nothing from the experience of certain elements in the industrial world who, by refusing to put their own house in order, merely brought about the imposition of the most stringent legislative restrictions.

In view of their record in the House, it may be supposed that labor spokesmen will continue to fight the bill in the Senate, where it goes to the Committee on Labor and Education, which has not been sympathetic to any measure opposed by the national unions. In this instance, however, it is to be hoped that the decisiveness of the vote in the House and the temper of the people at large will be sufficient at least to insure an opportunity for a vote on the measure by the Senate.

[From the Enquirer of Cincinnati, April 11, 1943]

LABOR RACKETEERS REBUKED

The passage of the Hobbs bill—a measure to make robbery and extortion punishable under the 1934 Anti-Racketeering Act—by a House vote of 270 to 107 serves notice that Congress is through feeding from the hands of labor lobbyists. The Hobbs bill was opposed by unions on the rather strange inference that robbery and extortion should, on occasion, be within the legal rights of organized labor.

The measure can be traced, probably, to a decision by the Supreme Court, handed down last summer, nullifying convictions obtained against a group of union employees charged with interfering with interstate truckers who did not employ union drivers. While violence resulting from union disputes doubtless will be curbed should the measure become law, the most important feature of the House vote is the fact that it gave to the powerful labor lobby its first defeat administered by the present Congress.

Both the farm lobby and the labor lobby now have suffered set-backs in Washington. In the Bankhead bill the farm group hoped for another easy victory. But the Presidential veto and a change in a majority of the Senate opinion put that inflationary proposal back in committee. Now the other powerful threat against a stabilized economy, the union labor bloc, has received its rebuke.

The great mass of public opinion has been awakened to the dangers of legislation by bloc, at least during times as critical as these. There is an increasing demand that Congress pay attention to national, rather than group, welfare. It is to be hoped that recent developments along both the labor and agricultural home fronts are only a beginning; that Congress shall continue to defeat any interest, or interests, which put their own selfish desires above the good of the Nation.

[From the Knoxville Journal of April 11, 1943]

BIG LABOR LOBBYISTS GET THUMPING, BUT CAUSE OF WORKERS ADVANCES

Labor lobbyists in Congress were defeated Friday by overwhelming passage of the Hobbs bill, aimed at elimination of labor racketeering, but the cause of labor gained rather than lost.

This will be so, if the bill is finally enacted into law, because the broad program of the unionized workingman is weakened rather than strengthened by any kind of abuse carried on in the name of organized labor.

The Hobbs bill was drawn to cover certain loopholes in existing law that gave to the labor racketeer a license to practice extortion or larceny under the protection of statutes set up to protect labor's legitimate rights.

Labor politicians opposed the Hobbs bill on the grounds that it was penalizing all labor for the transgressions of a few, but the House was not impressed. Its Members evidently proceeded on the principle that similar objections could be made to existing statutes providing penalties for murder, arson, or any other crimes of which, fortunately, only a small percentage of citizens are guilty.

It is to be hoped that the time is not far off when the country's labor leadership will not be so quick to construe any attempt to regulate unions, to insist upon their acceptance of the responsibility equal to their power, and to otherwise demand that they get on a footing like any other business, as an attempt to destroy the labor movement. Labor should be getting close to the adult stage now, with intelligence enough to discriminate.

[From the Anniston (Ala.) Star of April 11, 1943]

A SIGNAL ACHIEVEMENT

There is something almost epochal in the fact that Congressman SAM F. HOBBS of this district was able to pass his anti-racketeering bill in the House last Friday by a vote of 270 to 107, because it had become a fact admitted by many Members of both Houses of the Congress that no bill could meet with success if it was opposed by organized labor. Labor, indeed, had come to exercise as much sway in Congress as had organized business before Franklin D. Roosevelt came into power.

The bill seeks to stop the practices of extortion and robbery. It had its inspiration in acts of violence in the State of New York when union members sought by force to make farm salesmen entering the city outside the State pay a union member to drive and unload their trucks. Acts of violence took place and when union members were convicted they appealed to the Supreme Court, which held that the 1934 law outlawing racketeering practices was inadequate to cover the case in question.

Labor unions opposed the Hobbs bill with all their power, but Judge HOBBS consistently denied that the bill was aimed exclusively at labor. It covers all acts of violence in such cases and it was surprising that responsible labor leaders would attempt to defend the practices that the bill sought to curb. As a matter of fact, it should have had labor's emphatic support, because sporadic instances of racketeering on the part of some union members was endangering the entire union movement in this country. In time, therefore, we believe that honest labor leaders will come to recognize that HOBBS has done them a favor instead of a disservice.

Be this as it may, however, it is believed that the bill would not have passed had the House Members not entertained so high a regard for the legal knowledge of Judge HOBBS and for his innate sense of fair play. He is in fact by no means a labor baiter, and yet it required a high degree of courage for him to defy the strongly entrenched labor lobby. His achievement deserves to rank with that of the administration in upholding the President's veto of the Bankhead bill over the equally strong farm union lobby. It is to be hoped that the two victories, considered together, indicate a growing sense of independence on the part of the Congress and a higher appreciation of the larger public interest that is to be served by their votes.

[From the Detroit Free Press of April 12, 1943]

WHY THE OPPOSITION?

Over the protests of organized labor the House has passed the Hobbs bill and sent it to the Senate, 270 to 107. Thereby considerable wonder remains as to the reasons for labor's opposition. A measure which would make robbery and extortion in interstate commerce punishable under the 1934 Anti-Racketeering Act, orders nothing labor leaders and reputable unions need fear. Labor spokesmen who oppose the Hobbs bill seem to have let themselves be jockeyed into a wholly untenable position.

[From the San Antonio Express of April 12, 1943]

HOBBS ANTI-RACKETEERING BILL PASSES THE HOUSE

Evidencing Congress' determination—facing a rising popular demand which also is reflected in the States' legislative record—to hold organized labor accountable for the just, legal, and orderly exercise of the power it has attained over the Nation's industry, the House lately passed the Hobbs bill by an impressive majority, 270 to 107.

Previously that body had rejected the Celler amendment—requested by American Federation of Labor spokesmen—which would have recognized as allowable any union activities heretofore legalized. Revealing its mood, the majority also refused to reduce the maximum penalty for extortion from 20 years to 10 years in Federal prison, or to cut the $10,000 maximum fine. An amendment which would have redefined robbery, under the proposed law, was as emphatically rejected.

As the House has approved it, therefore, the Hobbs bill would apply the full force of

the Copeland Anti-Racketeering Act, 1934, to union-labor agents.

That legislation is necessary to set Congress right after the United States Supreme Court had decided that union men who held up trucks entering New York City, compelled the operators to hire union drivers and pay their fees, were engaged in legitimate "union labor activities" such as the Copeland law specifically exempts.

Aroused by the circumstance that Congress apparently had legalized hijacking if done in the name of organized labor, indignant citizens the country over have been demanding corrective legislation. The record thus far indicates that they are getting quicker results from State than from National lawmakers.

Texas' Manford bill—lately passed, that Governor Stevenson allowed to become a law without his signature—is a case in point. At last, however, the House at Washington—reconstituted by the November elections—has acted. Will the Senate follow through? Recalling what befell the Smith bill (to freeze labor relations for the duration, require upon registration, and prohibit strikes in war industries) last year—pigeonholed in committee after it passed the House—that is problematical.

The Senate may act if it shall hear from the people—as it should. An aroused citizenry will not go on tolerating one set of laws for the masses and another set for labor unions.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of April 12, 1943]

IT'S PROTECTION FOR LABOR

The Hobbs bill just passed by the House is the direct outgrowth of a Supreme Court opinion a year ago in which the High Court itself suggested that such legislation be enacted. It is not an antilabor bill any more than the Supreme Court itself is antilabor, or the nearly 3-to-1 House majority which favored the measure.

The bill does one thing and no more: It makes the Federal antiracketeering law applicable to labor as it is to the rest of the country. The law as originally drawn did not so apply, the Supreme Court majority found in its opinion, and, therefore, could not be used in the prosecution of racketeering cases. The Court admitted that the cases under legal test—forcible seizure of trucks entering New York City—involved racketeering, but said that Congress had not brought such practices within the Federal act. The Hobbs bill brings them within the act. It does nothing more.

The leading House opponent of the bill, Representative CELLER, of New York, asserted that labor officials themselves had condemned the practices which are declared to make the measure necessary. That being the situation, what legitimate objection could be made to the bill? It would simply be an aid to labor officials in maintaining the standards they desired to maintain.

Labor has opposed the Hobbs bill because of the fear it would be used as an entering wedge for further legislation and also because of the fear this particular legislation might be employed in restraint of legitimate activities. But Congress consistently has blocked proposed restrictions on labor and there is not much evidence today that this attitude will be changed. Furthermore, an amendment to the Hobbs bill—adopted by the House—guarantees to labor all the rights it has been accorded in a series of Federal enactments. These include the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction law, the Clayton antitrust law, the Railway Labor Act, and the National Labor Relations Act.

That assuredly is adequate protection. The Hobbs bill itself is a protective measure in labor's own interest—just as Federal laws applying to reprehensible practices by a few men in industry are a protection to industry as a whole. Industry has not been left and could not be left to police itself in such cases. The same principle applies to every group in the country. The Hobbs bill simply is an application of that principle.

The States' Responsibilities—Now and After the War—Address by Governor Broughton of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED L. BULWINKLE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, Hon. J. Melville Broughton, the Governor of North Carolina, delivered a very timely address at the Southern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments on Post-War Problems in the States on April 16, 1943, at Atlanta, Ga. Under unanimous consent, I include this speech in the RECORD:

For the first time in the history of this country the question of States' rights has become a national issue. If Daniel Webster and John C. Calhoun were living today they would be collaborating instead of debating. The issue is no longer narrow, sectional, or economic. It is not even political in a strictly partisan sense. Republican governors and Democratic governors are vying with one another in their robust championship of the rights of States. This is new and wholesome. In this unprecedented circumstance lies the best assurance that our unique form of government will survive its greatest crisis and proceed unimpaired into a larger destiny.

It cannot be denied that centralized government in its bureaucratic manifestations has attained proportions that are alarming. The war has necessitated much of this, and unsound tinkerers in government have undoubtedly sought to use the emergency to exploit schemes that are abhorrent to our form of government—schemes that would wither in the normal light of true American principles. But we may take heart in the aroused consciousness of the States and of the people. We are not going to have in America either a dictatorship or a totalitarian form of government.

In every war in which this country has engaged there has been a vast expansion of Federal power. However, the American people have always regained with the return of peace the liberties which they surrendered in time of war. History will, I am sure, repeat itself.

But the preservation of our American Government in its dual form will not be attained merely by the assertion of the rights of the States. Rights involve responsibilities. We are here asked to consider the States' responsibilities now and after the war.

Broadly outlined, the States now have the responsibility, jointly and severally, of dedicating their all to the supreme task of winning this war. Whatever yielding of State prerogatives that may truly be needed to this end should be done without quibbling or delay. Whatever barriers impede the flow of transportation, the utilization of manpower and the production of essential implements or goods should be ungrudgingly removed. Any State which would permit selfish or partisan consideration to hamper its contribution to the war effort is unworthy of a place in the roll of American Commonwealths. Under the incomparable Washington we came perilously close to extinction at our very birth as a Nation because of a narrow and petty attitude on the part of Continental States. A repetition of such conditions might well destroy the existence so miraculously attained.

If the war should continue through 1944—which now seems highly probable—the solidarity of the States in respect to their wartime responsibilities will be subjected to a further test, because in that event we will for the first time in over 130 years of our national history be involved in a Presidential election while engaged in war with foreign powers. To be able to go through a national political campaign of this proportion and at the same time wage successfully a war of unprecedented extent will indeed demonstrate the durable qualities of our American democracy. We may well have every confidence that this result will be attained. Furthermore, we may be assured that regardless of the outcome of such political contest the might of America with accelerated power will continue to be exerted toward the goal of complete victory and lasting peace. The people of the United States will not elect as President any man whose past and present record give indication either of lack of zeal toward the cause for which we fight or lack of purpose to strive, after complete victory, for internationally guaranteed peace with full American participation.

Dealing specifically with the responsibilities of the States for the duration of the war, the following may be mentioned as outstanding:

The administration of the Selective Service System has been a State responsibility in cooperation with the Federal authorities and should continue as such. Without the prodding of Federal bayonets and through responsible State administration operating with local committees we are well on the way toward building an Army and Navy of over 10,000,000 men. Nothing comparable to this has ever been accomplished by any democratic nation. The results have amazed the world and have constituted one of the finest manifestations of democratic efficiency in all history. In my own State we have through the Selective Service Administration already sent over 200,000 men into the armed services, and I have received as Governor of the State less than a dozen individual complaints of discrimination or other alleged unfairness. This is but another demonstration of the fact that our people will respond even to the highest call that can be made if they are permitted to have a part in the processes of such call. Many other Federal agencies which have ignored this principle and resorted to bureaucratic methods might well take note of such results.

The most acute problem, at least in the Southern area and perhaps in the entire Nation, at present is the shortage of farm labor. The States cannot ignore their responsibility for dealing with this question. Furthermore, while full cooperation with all related Federal agencies is wise and necessary, the States are going to have to solve the problem of farm labor for themselves. Delays and confusion of counsel in Washington, some of which may be inevitable, are such as to subject us to disaster in our agricultural operations if we rely wholly upon help from that quarter. In keeping with somewhat similar efforts in many other States, North Carolina has set up its own farm manpower commission, with a full-time director in charge. This commission is rallying the support of schools, municipalities, civic groups and even the churches in a great voluntary movement which gives assurance that we are going to be able in a State which ranks not lower than third agriculturally in the Nation to cultivate, produce, and harvest the greatest food and feed crop in our history.

The whole program of civilian defense is essentially a State responsibility. After recovering from some early and serious blunders in Federal direction, this activity is now functioning admirably in virtually all of the States. Federal authorities have wisely learned that this is an important job which only the States can adequately perform, with only such Federal or regional direction or control as may be necessary to fit the pattern of national defense.

It is the prerogative of the State to coordinate the work of various agencies operating in connection with the war program. The work of coordination is all the more important because of the multiplicity of such agencies. In fact, there are vastly too many Federal and, in many instances, State agencies dealing with the same general subject. I am informed, for example, that there are over 100 different agencies dealing with the question of recreation as a part of the war program. Determined purpose should be exerted in State and Federal leadership to reduce the number of agencies and avoid existing duplication and confusion. Twenty-five percent of the agencies dealing with war problems, certainly in civilian aspects, would do a better job, at vastly less expense, than is now being done by the whole number.

The States should be willing and ready to take over every responsibility which they can handle better than the National Government. For example, while certain Federal agencies were fighting among themselves as to which should have the responsibility and power for directing a program of day nurseries for the children of women industrial workers, a number of industrial States have already worked out for themselves satisfactory programs. Why, apart from some overweaning desire for bureaucratic power, should we not frankly and realistically assign to the States every function in the war program which they are capable of performing?

Such functions as forestry supervision and protection, public health, agriculture, unemployment compensation, education, workmen's compensation, employment service, and numerous others are primarily State responsibilities and ought to be so regarded both by the Federal and State governments. The best results in all of these and many other related activities have been attained under a policy of State responsibility with Federal cooperation.

In brief, it should be the attitude of the State to assume fully every responsibility which is normally within its sphere and to discharge such responsibility in such spirit and policy of cooperation with the Federal Government as will best promote the national welfare.

Furthermore, even in time of war the States cannot and will not evade their responsibility for combating fiercely any Federal encroachment upon State prerogatives not actually necessary for the successful prosecution of this war.

And what may be said of the responsibilities of the States after the war?

Undoubtedly the first responsibility of the States after the war will be unitedly to demand the return to the States of those prerogatives which have been voluntarily yielded to the Federal Government or encroached upon in the interest of national efficiency and safety during the emergency. We have been hearing altogether too much about "permanent gains" on the part of some who envision the delegation or arrogation of Federal power during the war period as a definite and permanent step toward State socialism resembling the totalitarian pattern. On the basis of these implied gains, such a group would proceed, if unresisted after the war, to such goals as Government ownership, or at least domination, of transportation, power, industry, and insurance. Such theories are not in keeping with the American form of government, and the States have the responsibility even now to gird themselves for unrelenting combat after the war with any group which would seek to perpetuate such gains or retain such un-American objectives. Free enterprise, with such regulations, State and Federal, as will prevent exploitation of labor and assure the protection of the competitive principle, is the foundation of our national greatness and the surest guaranty for our future.

But let the States be reminded of this: We cannot solve the problems or meet the needs of the people merely by academic discussions or assertion of rights. We must be prepared as States to do a better job and more adequately to serve the people. The States cannot be unmindful of the fact that much of their own failure to serve adequately the people who constitute their citizenship has been in the past and, if continued, will be in the future, an unfailing invitation to Federal encroachment.

The great body of the common people of this Nation have not been content with mere theories of government. Poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, inadequate educational facilities, starvation wages, and pitifully small returns for the labor and sweat of the man of the soil are factors which have brought about the almost revolutionary change in the nature and scope of Federal activities. Whether we like it or not, this tide, welling up from the homes and hearts of the American people, demanding better living conditions, has swept forever away many of the narrow limitations of government conceived by the founding fathers. There are those who are still sitting by the abandoned camp fires of the past, who yet believe that we can and should return to the ancient landmarks. Their hope is in vain.

The true function of government is to promote the welfare and the happiness of all the people. The people of this country will never again submit to those conditions which too long existed in this country. Child labor, unconscionably long working hours, inadequate and unjust wages, poor housing and unwholesome living conditions, low standards of public health, unequal educational opportunities, and pitiful farm prices, in contrast with the vast enrichment, frequently through artificial and unrighteous circumstances, of a relatively small percentage of the people, are conditions which will not be tolerated.

Fundamentally, the people may prefer less government, and certainly less bureaucratic Federal Government. They believe inherently in the old principles of local self-government and State's rights; but they also believe in having for themselves a reasonable share of the Nation's prosperity and a fair chance for themselves and their children to live under decent conditions. The vast majority of the people are willing to give up many things of sentimental or traditional value provided they are able to eat, wear better clothes, and enjoy the comforts and conveniences of life. If they could get these and still maintain the old principles of government, well and good; but if they cannot, they will not hesitate to look to the Federal Government for relief, and no amount of harking back to ancient creeds will deter them.

Those of us who believe in the fundamental principles of State's rights and local self-government may as well concede frankly that much of the almost terrifying expansion of Federal encroachment upon the original domain of the States has come about because State governments failed to meet the challenge of the new day. Inadequate educational opportunities, archaic labor and regulations, unrelieved hardships and inequities suffered by the working people, low-pitched politics and unjust class and race discriminations have all too frequently caused the people to lift their eyes beyond the horizon of State lines and call for relief from the Federal Government. Fortunately, there has been an awakening social consciousness in most of the States with a resulting quickening interest in State government. The best answer, indeed the only one, to the alarming and rapid spread of Federal encroachment is to give to the people a better government through State agencies. Conditions like these cannot be met either by harking back or moaning low.

Inevitably, there will fall upon the States after this war, and indeed before its termination, a very large part of the relief burden. The Federal Government, with a national debt which may attain a total of $300,000,000,000 or more—and I have no criticism of whatever total may be necessary to win this war—cannot in the very nature of things carry on in the future the comprehensive program of relief undertaken in recent years. Fortunately, economic conditions have already eliminated the necessity for much of the relief program as indicated by the wise termination of several Federal agencies. Certain others might well be terminated without any damage to the program of progress.

In any event, however, the States may as well plan as a part of their responsibility in the future a program of relief. It is perhaps well that this is so. Where the sources of relief are closer to the beneficiaries, where the burdens are being borne by those in position to scrutinize the administration of relief and welfare, there is less likelihood that fraud and imposition may result. There can be no just criticism of relief extended in meritorious cases. Neither State nor Federal Government can be indifferent to conditions involving dire necessity and possible starvation. However, we must guard ourselves against any system that would develop an ever-increasing number of people who are willing, even where necessity does not exist, to eke out an unemployed and shiftless livelihood upon the basis of a state or government dole. Extension of relief beyond the period of definite and positive necessity will have a corroding influence upon character and good citizenship. Undoubtedly, larger responsibility on the part of the States in this function will have a wholesome effect.

A very definite responsibility of the States after the war will be to carry on a program of public improvement, improved housing facilities, highway construction, extension of parks and recreational facilities, and many other activities which will afford employment while meeting a definite public need. Well advised States are already planning such programs. It would be dangerous to delay such study and planning until the hour of urgency and confusion that may follow the termination of hostilities and the demobilization of our great armies.

After-war problems will undoubtedly be great, but they will not be insuperable. America is destined to have an even larger and ever-growing place in world leadership; and in this destiny the individual States will have a responsible and glorious part.

The People Are Not Fooled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, neither the fourth-term advocates nor the bureaucrats are fooling the home folks.

Two editorials from home papers—one from the Cassopolis Vigilant and the other from the Allegan Gazette—demonstrate what practically every Congressman knows; that is, that the people who elected and sent them here have and use more common sense and good judgment than do the bureaucrats, the new dealers, and the do-gooders.

Part of the editorial from the Cassopolis Vigilant, written by William Berkey, who is thoroughly familiar not only with local conditions but with the questions confronting our Nation, and who for years has been a member of the Michigan State Board of Agriculture, is as follows:

We are a bit tired of hearing radio news commentators charging Congress with failure to enact a pay-as-you-earn income-tax law. In fact, we are beginning to wonder to just what extent radio is under administrative control and dictation, for when things go wrong most of them blame it on Congress and soft-pedal any criticism of the Chief Executive and his group of advisers. Congress may have its faults at times, but failure to pass a pay-as-you-earn income tax cannot be directly charged against Congress. That part of America's reading public which followed the day-to-day news reports know full well that the chief opposition to the proposed pay-as-you-earn law came from President Roosevelt, Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, and Finance Committee Chairman DOUGHTON, and that defeat of the measure was due in a large measure to threat of a veto; and yet, in the face of those facts, we have heard a number of times over the radio charges that Congress had failed in its duty to pass such a measure. When we hear such assertions and then witness some of the news movies, we feel that Government propaganda is somewhat one-sided.

* * * * *

Those who opposed the farm price bill and helped the President kill it are now favoring "incentive" payments to farmers to produce crops. The President fought the farm price bill on the ground that it would cause inflation. The question that comes to our mind is this: Is there a difference between "price" money and "incentive" money? Why is it that "price" money would cause inflation and "incentive" money would not? Are they different kinds of dollars, one shrinkable and the other expandible? Or, are those fellows down at Washington (including the President) just trying to "kid" the American farmer? We asked this last question of a nearby farmer, and he gave us an explanation as he sees it. He says there is no difference in the money; but if the farmer received his money as the price for what he grows, he would feel free and independent; but that if he accepts checks from the Federal Government through the Agricultural Adjustment Administration as incentive payments, he will still be under the thumb of the Government. Think it over and reach your own conclusions.

The editor of the Allegan Gazette is a younger man, but he has fixed and definite ideas about what is good for this country and its people, and from day to day he meets the men and the women who do the producing; who aid in furnishing the food to sustain the war effort, and whose sons and brothers have been sent to fight this war.

Douglas E. Alcock is the editor and publisher of the Allegan Gazette, and over the newspaper office is the office of the county triple A. Alcock meets the administration's local planners. He knows what they think and he knows how they feel, and he knows, as well, the views of the farmers of the county. His editorial is as follows:

The administration seems much concerned, at a rather late date, on the question of inflation and on the grounds that the Bankhead parity bill is out of bounds on the anti-inflation program that measure has been vetoed.

President Roosevelt says the bill is "wholly inconsistent with our stabilization program and therefore dangerous alike to our constructive farm policy and to our whole war effort." Perhaps it is being entirely out of order to inquire what stabilization program and what constructive farm policy is involved? As yet the stabilization program seems to be aimed primarily at stabilization of one group while another is permitted to run wild and if there is a constructive farm policy that fact has not been discovered as yet by a great majority of the farmers.

No, as Lincoln is reported to have said, "You may fool all the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all the time; but you cannot fool all of the people all the time."

To that may I add that you cannot fool a majority of them very much of the time.

Back in the so-called sticks the people are still honest, industrious, and thrifty and they still love the old Constitution; still adhere to our forefathers' way of doing things. That way has made our country the envy of the people of all nations and we still have the best form of government for the average man.

The Anti-Racketeering Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newspaper editorials:

[From the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen-Patriot of April 12, 1943]

NO HARM TO THE LABOR CAUSE

Leaders of organized labor are aroused by the passage of the Hobbs anti-racketeering bill by the House. They marshal their forces for a bitter fight against it in the Senate.

But this measure which arouses such enthusiastic opposition can do no harm to the real labor cause. It is aimed solely at some of the questionable practices of certain labor unions intent on extending their powers. A common example of what this bill is aimed at is the practice of requiring a farmer, driving his own produce to market, to take on a union driver as soon as he enters a city. The union driver must be paid the union scale, although he performs no useful service unless demonstration that truck driving is the exclusive right of the union can be called a useful service. But violence has followed the refusal of farmers to take on the extra drivers and the extra expense.

The aim of the Hobbs bill is only to put an end to rascality in the name of labor.

The business world went through the same kind of legislative examination and restriction when the Sherman Act was passed. But business was not permanently harmed, and it is admitted now those regulatory laws were necessary to protect the public from the unscrupulous dealings of the minority who never learned how to handle their great wealth and their power fairly and honestly.

Neither will the Hobbs law, in its present form, harm the labor-union movement. It will cause it to stand higher in the public estimation. Enforcement must be left to public officials who can be expected to be fair and honest in their administration. No honest union can object to it.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal of April 12, 1943]

HOBBS BILL BACKGROUND

The House of Representatives has passed the Hobbs bill against racketeering as represented by the practice of robbery or extortion in interstate commerce Labor leaders have bitterly protested the definition of terms because they say it will infringe on some of the recognized rights of unions. The charge is just as vigorously denied by equally well-informed sources. In any event, the House found no virtue in the union objections and passed the measure by a vote of 270 to 107. It now goes to the Senate, formerly the graveyard of efforts to amend in any way the privileges conferred on organized labor by New Deal legislation.

The background and inspiration of the measure that provides prosecution under the 1943 Anti-Racketeering Act for those who indulge in robbery and extortion as part of their participation in interstate commerce is both interesting and pertinent. The best-known case involves farmers bringing their own produce to New York City and their relations with the union of teamsters and such like. The farmers were met at the city limits by union members who demanded a fee of several dollars before the vehicle went on to its destination. In some instances, the farmer drove his own vehicle after he had paid off. In other cases, the farmer had the daylights whacked out of him when he refused to pay. In other circumstances, vehicles were damaged or destroyed.

The Supreme Court eventually ruled that unions, no matter if they did indulge in the practices above named, were not liable to prosecution under existing laws. It suggested that these performances were reprehensible and that it was up to Congress to make them illegal. The same principles were held to apply to other cases of like nature. Clearly enough, the state of affairs is outrageous and not to be tolerated, whether or not the Hobbs bill is the best remedy. It is at least a remedy and union leaders have offered nothing, let alone a better solution. We have said many times that an enlightened labor leadership would have gone out in front in correcting such abuses. That correction is going to be had is shown conclusively by the overwhelming vote for it in the House.

[From the Pittsburgh Post Gazette of April 13, 1943]

HOBBS BILL

The attempt to amend the Federal Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934 was brought about by a Supreme Court decision which rejected the conviction of members of a New York teamsters' union found guilty of stopping trucks at the city line and extorting "wages" from the truck owners.

No one defends this practice. The national president of the teamsters' union not only disavowed it, but issued an order prohibiting it in future. But the Supreme Court decision left a gap in the law, by interpreting

it as the intention of Congress that the Anti-Racketeering Act should not apply in such cases.

Congressman WALTER of Pennsylvania, speaking for the Hobbs bill, asserted that the Supreme Court had "through the most tortuous decision that ever came from the pen of a justice, found something that Congress never intended to be in the act of 1934." And, presumably looking in the direction of the Supreme Court, he said: "Now, with the hope that my voice can be heard across the park, I want to state that it is the intention of the Committee on the Judiciary to enact legislation for one purpose, and one purpose alone, namely, to correct the unfortunate decision in the Local 807 case."

The House passed the bill, with committee amendments, by a vote of 270 to 107. Opposition, however, apparently is developing in the Senate, which has consistently buried virtually all House efforts to amend labor laws. But the Senate can no longer dodge the real issue. If it fails to pass this bill, or so amends it as to make it meaningless, the Senate will have admitted that it is its present intention to grant unions an immunity from punishment for acts which even the president of the union most directly affected deplores. The Supreme Court based its decision on the intent of Congress. It is up to Congress to show what its intent really is—and the House has done that by a large majority vote for the Hobbs bill.

[From the Akron Beacon Journal of April 13, 1943]

TO STOP ALL RACKETS

No one but a robber or a racketeer has anything to fear from the amended Hobbs bill, in the form adopted last week in the House by a vote of 270 to 107.

The bill simply makes the Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934 do what everyone, including Congress, thought it did in the first place—prohibit and punish all kinds of racketeering. The Supreme Court, by a bit of tortuous reasoning last year, exempted unions from its provisions.

But to make sure that the bill does not infringe upon any of the legitimate activities of unions, an amendment was added which declares that nothing in the "act shall be construed to repeal, modify, or affect" labor's rights under the Clayton, Norris-LaGuardia, Railway Mediation, or National Labor Relations Acts.

The language is now so plain that any remaining opponents of the bill are putting themselves in the strange position of defending robbery and extortion. We hope that the Senate will pass the bill without delay.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 13, 1943]

SAUCE FOR THE UNIONS

The extent to which special privilege has been heaped on organized labor in the last decade is nowhere more forcefully illustrated than in the Hobbs bill, which was passed by the House on Friday. In the simplest terms, the bill declares that labor-union members shall be subject to the laws of extortion and robbery which govern the rest of the American people.

It is incredible that special legislation should be necessary to establish a principle which has been fundamental in American life since the inception of the Republic. However, the necessity was created by last year's Supreme Court decision exempting unions from prosecution under the Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934.

The decision was handed down with reference to union extortion in New York City. Under a local union rule, trucks entering the city were required to take on a member of the union. The rule was enforced by strong-arm squads. A farmer taking his pig to market was stopped at the city line and forced to hand over a sum of money equal to a day's pay of a union truck driver.

The facts were not in dispute. It was admitted that a New York union was emulating the Barbary pirates in exacting tribute from traders. However, the opinion written by Associate Justice Byrnes in a master stroke of rationalization declared that it was not the intent of Congress to forbid racketeering by unions.

The House vote seeks to correct that misapprehension. The Senate should speedily concur, as final passage will be particularly effective at this time. Under President Roosevelt's latest directive on inflation control, Byrnes, who is now economic czar, has been made virtually supreme in price and wage administration. Senate approval of the Hobbs bill may clear up any ideas he still retains about special treatment for unions.

[From the Chicago Daily News of April 14, 1943]

CRIME IS NOT DEBATABLE

The Senate should lose no time in passing the Hobbs anti-racket bill sent to it by the House of Representatives, after its passage by a vote of 270 to 107.

The Senate is the world's greatest debating society, but the Hobbs bill is really not debatable, unless some debater cares to debate in favor of highway robbery. That 107 votes should have been cast against the bill in the House is amazing evidence of the political cowardice engendered by pressure groups who use such tag lines as "anti-labor" or "anti-farmer," or anti-this or anti-that.

However, the affirmative vote of nearly 3 to 1 shows that the terror of tags is vanishing, even from professional politicians. If pressure groupers are wise, they will soft-pedal their epithets. Otherwise the "anti" names may become popular labels to be proudly worn by "antis" of all sorts merged into an anti-racket party. Kansas and Colorado have already passed the sort of drastic laws enchaning labor unions that purblind labor lobbyists have been inviting by their criminaloid sophistries.

In passing the Hobbs bill to apply the Federal anti-racketeering law to crimes committed under pretense of waging a "labor dispute," the House of Representatives really rose to a challenge of the Supreme Court. The Court held, in a case where strong-arm thugs were holding up trucks entering New York and compelling them to fork over the amount of a union teamster's daily wage, that the convictions had been voided by the exceptions written into the antiracketeering law by Congress, which exempted acts growing out of "labor disputes" from the provisions of the law. It was a hard case. Hard cases make bad law, but in this case the Supreme Court said that Congress had made the bad law.

In commenting on the case at the time, this newspaper did not criticize the Court, but contended that it had taken the right step to compel Congress to begin reforming the laws giving to officials of labor unions special privileges denied to other citizens. That we believed to be the inherent vice of such legislation, not the mere fact that crime might be committed under the cover of the laws.

The Hobbs bill goes no further than eliminating, or attempting to eliminate, a privilege to commit crime. By expressly providing that it cannot be construed in derogation of the Clayton law, the Norris-LaGuardia law, and similar statutes, the Hobbs bill fails to Americanize our labor legislation and slaps in the face the keynote of the Declaration of Independence, that all men are born free and equal.

But the Hobbs bill is at least a start on the journey to economic and industrial democracy.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 15, 1943]

THE POLITICAL MILL—HOBBS BILL IS NOT AN ATTACK ON LABOR, BUT ON ORGANIZED RACKETEERING

(By Gould Lincoln)

Once again the House has knocked at the door of the Senate, passing the Hobbs bill to prevent racketeering in interstate commerce. The bill is designed to put an end to extortion by local unions teamsters, chauffeurs, stablemen, and helpers. These insist on payment of specified sums by owners and operators of trucks and produce sent into New York and other cities. It is made necessary by a decision of the Supreme Court, holding that these union members cannot be prosecuted under the Federal Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934.

The bill has been strongly opposed by organized labor leaders, despite the fact that Chief Justice Stone, in a dissenting opinion, held that to condone what was being done by members of the New York local "would render common-law robbery an innocent pastime." The Hobbs bill is an amendment to the Anti-Racketeering Act, eliminating language in that law which was construed by the Court as making it impossible to reach such extortionists.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

In the Senate the bill has been referred to the Judiciary Committee, and not to the Committee on Labor, where so many House bills dealing with labor have died in the past. Chairman VAN NUYS turned the bill over to a subcommittee for consideration, headed by Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming. The other members of the subcommittee are Senators MCCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada; CONNALLY, Democrat, of Texas; AUSTIN, Republican, of Vermont, and FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan. It is Senator O'MAHONEY'S purpose to give the measure early consideration. The House passed the bill with a vote of 270 ayes to 107 nays. It is expected that if the bill is brought into the Senate itself, it will pass also by a substantial vote.

Representative HOBBS, Democrat, of Alabama, author of the bill, who has fought day in and day out over a long period to get action on the measure, during the debate in the House made this significant statement:

"Many of the enemies of this bill claim that they are fighting it not because of its provisions, but because the provisions might be construed by a biased court so as to punish legitimate activities of organized labor. Last year when the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee was holding hearings on the precursor of this bill that argument was made so often and so earnestly that the question was asked if the then bill should be amended so as to outlaw only interference with interstate or foreign commerce by robbery or extortion, if that would meet this objection. The answer was an emphatic 'yes.' This bill is that amendment. It does limit the field of its condemnation to interference with interstate or foreign commerce by robbery or extortion. But still the opposition on this alleged ground persists."

PEOPLE SHOULD KNOW TRUTH

There are those who shudder at the idea of passing any legislation which is attacked by the leaders of organized labor. They say this is no time to disturb or anger labor, with a war on. Well, if the passage of a bill to prevent extortion and robbery will upset the war production, it is about time the American people understood it.

The case that came to the Supreme Court originated some years ago in New York. Mr. HOBBS said that a New Jersey truck farmer made the mistake of thinking this was a free country. He contracted to deliver a truckload of cauliflower to a shipside in New York every so often. When the farmer and his two sons arrived with their truck in New York they were stopped by four "goons" who told them they would have to pay $9.42 for the delivery of a large truck or $8.41 for the delivery of a small one, since only members of the local teamsters' union could deliver perishable products in New York.

The farmer and his sons resisted. In the end they and their truck were thrown into the river. "Police officers," said Mr. HOBBS, "deserved and were given full credit for helping to save the farmer from drowning. No arrests were made. No prosecution followed."

Efforts have been made to show that the cases, and there were others, which brought about the suit settled finally by the Supreme Court last year, were isolated and a thing of the past. Nothing is further from the fact.

The second title of the Hobbs bill, suggested by Joseph B. Eastman, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, punishes any attempt to interfere with the shipment of troops or war supplies. It is similar to a law enacted during the World War.

The Hobbs bill is not an attack on the rights of labor or on organized labor. It is an attack on racketeering, which is no more a union right than it is a right of any other group or citizen.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 15, 1943]

Recent headlines announce that friends of labor in the Senate are planning a finish fight against the Hobbs bill. It may well turn out that the genuine friends of labor are those who vote for it.

Money—The Most Important Issue Before the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House, this is a presentation of the second installment of the speech of the late Senator Cockrell, of Missouri, on money.

In presenting this part of Senator Cockrell's speech, it is realized that few at this late day may be interested in a review of the parliamentary maneuvers in the Congress in the struggle over the money question. A struggle between the advocates of the restoration of silver in our monetary system to be affected by the full utilization of all the silver produced by the free coinage of the metal into standard silver dollars and the opponents of silver working for a more universal use of national bank note currency, a kind of money which yielded at that time to its creators, the national banks; the interest income accruing on the Government bonds deposited with the Secretary of the Treasury as security for the issuance of an equivalent amount of national bank notes; and the additional interest yield received by the banks from the circulation of these national bank notes themselves loaned out by the banks to borrowers at current rates of interest. It seems that the real motive of the bank-money advocates was camouflaged by the contention for the standardization of our money on a gold basis.

The record presented here by Senator Cockrell is an important part of the history of the program that has been followed in establishing our present monetary system which led to subsequent financial developments world-wide in their effect.

The second installment of Senator Cockrell's speech follows:

FOREWORD

Mr. President, something has been said—a good deal has been said—in regard to the record of the two parties upon the silver question. I propose briefly to give that record—the record of the Democratic Party and the record of the Republican Party as well—upon this silver question:

In the Forty-fourth Congress, March 4, 1875, to March 4, 1877, the President was Republican. In the Senate there were 46 Republicans, 29 Democrats, 1 vacancy. In the House of Representatives were 107 Republicans and 186 Democrats. Congress convened December 6, 1875. On March 27, 1876, H. R. 2450, from the Committee on Appropriations, was pending. It appropriated money for a deficiency for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and in section 2 provided for the issue of subsidiary silver coins in the redemption of fractional currency.

Mr. Reagan, of Texas, offered an amendment making the trade dollar legal tender for any amount not exceeding $50, and the silver coins less than a dollar for any amount not exceeding $25. This was agreed to: Yeas, 124—99 Democrats, 22 Republicans, 1 Independent; nays, 94—28 Democrats, 65 Republicans, 1 Independent. As amended, the bill passed: Yeas, 122—50 Democrats, 70 Republicans, and 2 Independents; nays, 100—80 Democrats, 18 Republicans, and 2 Independents.

April 10, 1876, in the Senate, Mr. Sherman, from the Finance Committee, reported the bill with amendments; one amending section 3 so as to authorize the coinage of a silver dollar of 412.8 grains—a legal tender not exceeding $20 in any one payment except for customs dues and interest on public debt, and stopped the coinage of trade dollars. Another—a new section 4—authorized the exchange of silver dollars for an equal amount of United States notes to be retired, canceled, and not reissued; and also for silver bullion at its market value.

That was the policy at that time of the senior Senator from Ohio. It was to substitute a standard silver dollar of 412.8 grains, and that would make it the exact mathematical ratio of 16-to-1; it was to issue those silver dollars and with them retire and cancel the greenbacks, the full legal-tender United States notes.

By changing the bullion in silver dollars to 412.8 grains the exact ratio of silver to gold, 16-to-1 was proposed. After discussion and a full speech by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Sherman], he moved to strike out all after section 2 of the bill, in order to disembarrass the bill of a silver-coinage question, and leave it as an independent question to be afterward settled. This motion was agreed to, and the Reagan amendment was stricken out.

The House concurred in the Senate amendments for the same reason, and the bill became the law of April 17, 1876.

On June 10, 1876, Mr. S. S. Cox, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported a joint resolution to issue the silver coins in the Treasury to an amount not exceeding $10,000,000 in exchange for an equal amount of legal tender notes, to be kept as a special fund, to be reissued only upon the retirement of fractional currency, which was passed without a division.

June 21, 1876, in the Senate, the House joint resolution was amended by adding a section prohibiting the coinage of the trade dollar except for export trade; thus striking down the trade dollar, the only dollar authorized by the coinage law of 1873.

That was the action of the Republican Senate at that time destroying every solitary silver dollar, even the trade dollar.

June 28, in the House of Representatives, Mr. Payne, from the Banking and Currency Committee, reported for concurrence in the Senate amendments. Mr. F. Landers, of Indiana, moved to amend the Senate amendments by adding an amendment for free and unlimited coinage of the standard silver dollar of 412½ grains, with full legal tender, which was agreed to; yeas 110—85 Democrats, 23 Republicans, 2 Independents; nays 55—16 Democrats, 37 Republicans, 2 Independents.

July 1, 1876, in the Senate the Finance Committee reported nonconcurrence, and a conference was asked and agreed to without division. The House agreed to the conference.

The conferees, except Mr. Landers, reported to the House of Representatives an agreement, receding from the Landers amendment with substitute of sections 3 and 4, increasing the amount of subsidiary silver coin to be issued in redemption of fractional currency, not to exceed $10,000,000 and authorizing the purchase of the silver bullion for such coinage at market rate, to be made without loss in such coinage and issue, and took from the trade dollars any legal tender and limited their coinage to export demand. Agreed to. Yeas 129—66 Democrats, 62 Republicans, 1 Independent; nays 67—50 Democrats, 15 Republicans, 2 Independents.

July 14, in the Senate the report was adopted without division. It became the law, as the joint resolution of July 22, 1876.

On June 10, 1876, Mr. S. S. Cox, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported H. R. 3398, of three sections—very similar to joint resolution of July 22, 1876. It was passed without division.

In the Senate June 28, 1876, the bill was considered on the report of the Finance Committee to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert four new sections. This was a substitute proposed by the Senate Committee on Finance, headed by the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Section 1 provided for the coinage of silver dollars of 412.8 grains, to be legal tender for sums not exceeding $20.

Section 2 provided for exchanging such dollars and minor coins for legal tenders to be canceled and not reissued or replaced.

Section 3 provided for purchasing silver bullion at market rates for such coinage, to be made without loss in coinage and issue.

Section 4, prohibiting legal tender of the trade dollar, and limiting its coinage to export demand. This was before the law of July 22, 1876, had been enacted.

On June 28, 1876, Senator Bogy moved to strike out in section 1 the words "not exceeding $20," the effect of which was to leave that dollar with full legal-tender quality in the payment of all debts. That was agreed to. Yeas 18—8 Democrats, 10 Republicans; nays 14—3 Democrats, 11 Republicans. On June 29, the bill was recommitted to the Finance Committee and was never reported back. It was killed in a Republican Senate.

July 24, 1876, in the House of Representatives, Hon. William D. Kelley, Republican, moved to suspend the rules and pass a free

and unlimited coinage bill. Yeas 119—84 Democrats, 33 Republicans, 2 Independents; nays 68—27 Democrats, 40 Republicans, 1 Independent. Two-thirds not voting "yea," it failed.

On July 19, 1876, in the House of Representatives, Mr. Bland, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, reported H. R. 3635, for free coinage of gold and silver. December 13, 1876, at the second session of the Forty-fourth Congress, Mr. Bland offered a substitute for H. R. 3635, for free and unlimited coinage of silver dollars of 412½ grains, with full legal-tender power.

Mr. President, this was placing the standard silver dollar just where it had been from the organization of our Government up to the date of the passage of the law of February 12, 1873. It was restoring to it all the functions of money, the same as were enjoyed by gold coin. This was agreed to, and then passed: Yeas 168—123 Democrats, 45 Republicans; nays 53—17 Democrats, 36 Republicans. The bill as passed was sent to the Republican Senate, and never considered in the Senate. It slept the sleep that knows no waking, under the kindly care of the distinguished Senators from Ohio [Mr. Sherman], from Iowa [Mr. Allison], and from Vermont [Mr. Morrill].

That is for the Forty-fourth Congress, the first Democratic House of Representatives. Now, what were the actions of the Democratic Party and its results in that Congress?

1. The Democratic House of Representatives passed a provision increasing the legal tender of the trade dollar of 420 grains from $5 to $50, and the subsidiary coins from $5 to $25, by 124 yeas—99 Democrats, 22 Republicans, and 1 Independent; nays 94—28 Democrats, 65 Republicans, and 1 Independent. The Republican Senate amended, authorizing silver dollars of 412.8 grains legal tender to $20, except customs and interest and their exchanges for greenbacks to be retired and canceled, and for silver bullion at market rates That was the answer made by the Republican Senate to the demands of the Democratic House.

2. The Landers free-coinage amendment was agreed to in the House of Representatives by—yeas, 85 Democrats, 23 Republicans, 1 Independent; nays, 16 Democrats, 37 Republicans, 2 Independents. Defeated by a Republican Senate.

3. House bill 3398 for subsidiary coins for redemption of fractional currency, amended in a Republican Senate, for silver dollars of 412.8 grains legal tender to $20, and exchangeable for greenbacks to be canceled; and on motion of Mr. Bogy the restriction of legal tender to $20 was stricken out by 8 Democrats and 10 Republicans, to 3 Democrats and 11 Republicans. Recommitted and killed in committee.

4. Kelley's free-coinage bill received—84 Democrats, 33 Republicans, and 2 Independents, to 27 Democrats, 40 Republicans, and 1 Independent.

5. Bland's (H. R. 3635) substitute for free, unlimited coinage passed by 123 Democrats and 45 Republicans to 17 Democrats and 36 Republicans; and in the Senate killed in the Finance Committee.

We come now to the Forty-fifth Congress, from March 4, 1877, to March 4, 1879. At that time there was a Republican President. In the Senate there were 39 Republican Senators, 36 Democratic Senators, and 1 Independent, David Davis. In the House of Representatives there were 136 Republicans, 156 Democrats, 1 vacancy.

In the first or called session of the Forty-fifth Congress, on November 5, 1877, in the House of Representatives, Mr. Bland moved to suspend the rules and pass "An act to authorize the free coinage of the standard silver dollar and to restore its legal-tender character." Agreed to. Yeas 164—97 Democrats and 67 Republicans; nays 34, only 10 Democrats and 24 Republicans. Among the yeas were Messrs. Carlisle, Hunton, and Mills.

This bill, as passed by the House, was as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be coined at the several mints of the United States silver dollars of the weight of 412½ grains troy of standard silver, as provided in the act of January 18, 1837, on which shall be the devices and superscriptions provided by said act; which coins, together with all silver dollars heretofore coined by the United States of like weight and fineness, shall be a legal tender, at their nominal value, for all debts and dues, public and private, except where otherwise provided by contract; and any owner of silver bullion may deposit the same at any United States coinage mint of assay office to be coined into such dollars, for his benefit, upon the same terms and conditions as gold bullion is deposited for coinage under existing laws.

"SEC. 2. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

"Passed the House of Representatives November 5, 1877.

"Attest:

"GEORGE M. ADAMS, *Clerk.*"

November 21, 1877, Mr. Allison, from the Finance Committee, reported the bill with amendments to strike out the clause beginning "and any owner of silver bullion" and to insert his purchasing clause, and to add section 2 for an international monetary conference.

In other words, the distinguished Senator from Iowa, as the mouthpiece of the Republican finance committee, reported to strike out the free and unlimited coinage clause of this House bill and to place in it the silver-purchasing clause of not less than $2,000,000 nor more than $4,000,000 of silver per month; and then to sugar-coat it with the International Monetary Conference.

February 15, 1878, this amendment was agreed to. Yeas 49—16 Democrats, 33 Republicans; nays 22—17 Democrats, 4 Republicans, 1 Independent (Mr. Davis). The amendment, section 2, was agreed to. Yeas 40—10 Democrats, 29 Republicans, 1 Independent; nays 30—24 Democrats, 6 Republicans. Mr. Booth's amendment by a new section for silver certificates was agreed to. Yeas 40—21 Democrats, 27 Republicans, 1 Independent; nays 14—8 Democrats, 6 Republicans. Other amendments were voted down and the bill as amended passed. Yeas 48—24 Democrats, 23 Republicans, 1 Independent; nays 21—7 Democrats, 14 Republicans.

February 21, 1878, in the House of Representatives the purchasing clause was concurred in. Yeas 203—74 Democrats, 129 Republicans; nays 72—68 Democrats, 4 Republicans. The international-agreement section was agreed to. Yeas 196—77 Democrats, 119 Republicans; nays 71—63 Democrats, 8 Republicans.

February 28, 1878, the bill was vetoed by President Hayes and passed on same day over his veto. In the House of Representatives, yeas 196—118 Democrats, 78 Republicans; nays 73—22 Democrats, 51 Republicans. In the Senate, yeas 46—25 Democrats, 20 Republicans, 1 Independent; nays 19—9 Democrats, 10 Republicans.

Under this act 378,166,793 silver dollars have been coined from silver bullion, costing $308,199,262, leaving the seignorage at $69,967,531.

Mr. President, it was known at the time when this bill was passed, from the published declarations of President Hayes, that a free and unlimited coinage silver bill would be vetoed. This bill, the Allison-Bland bill, or the Bland-Allison bill, or the law of February 28, 1878, was not what the friends of bimetallism and the true friends of unlimited coinage of silver demanded. It was all that they could get. It was then held over them in terror that the President would veto any bill recognizing the unlimited coinage of silver. Not only was that carried out, but after it was limited to not less than $2,000,000 nor more than $4,000,000 he still vetoed the bill, because it was a subversion of the policy of the Republican Party which it had deliberately established after the close of the war—the single gold standard. This was the first encroachment made upon the single gold standard, and that it has resulted in untold blessings to the people no one can deny.

Where would the country be today if you were to strike out all this money circulation, these 378,000,000 of silver dollars that have been coined from year to year? They have been a part of the currency of this country, and they have been an aid to prevent more dire calamities than have already befallen us.

January 16, 1878, in the Senate, Mr. Matthews submitted his concurrent resolution, declaring that all United States bonds issued under the refunding and redemption acts of July 14, 1870, and January 14, 1875, could be paid at the option of the Government in standard silver dollars of 412½ grains without violation of public faith or in derogation of the rights of public creditors. It was then hurled in our teeth, every time we mentioned the subject of unlimited coinage of standard silver dollars, that we were repudiators, that we were trying to pay the bonds, the precious bonds of the Government, which ought to be paid in gold, in a debased standard silver dollar. To put an end to this the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Matthews], afterward one of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, introduced this resolution; and, after the fullest discussion in the Senate, that resolution was agreed to. Yeas 43—23 Democrats, 19 Republicans, and the Independent, Judge David Davis, of Illinois; nays 22—7 Democrats and 15 Republicans.

That was sent to the House, and on January 29, 1878, it was agreed to. Yeas 189—116 Democrats, including Messrs. Carlisle and Mills, 73 Republicans; nays 79—23 Democrats, 56 Republicans.

Here was a positive declaration that all the bonds of the Government, including the funded loan of 1907, could honestly and justly be paid in the standard silver dollars of 412½ grains. That passed the Republican Senate by the vote I have just given, and was passed in the Democratic House by an overwhelming vote. It was intended as a declaration of the law upon that question and the line of conduct to be pursued by the administration in its execution of the law of February 28, 1878, the Bland-Allison law.

March 5, 1878, in the House of Representatives, Mr. Springer moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill to authorize the coinage of gold and silver upon the same terms, and to permit deposits thereof in the Treasury for the same purposes. It provided for unlimited coinage of each alike, with full legal tender, subject to mint charge of actual coinage cost. (This was after the passage of the Bland-Allison Act.) Yeas 140—102 Democrats, 38 Republicans; nays 102—25 Democrats, 77 Republicans. Two-thirds not favoring, it failed.

December 9, 1878, in the House of Representatives, Mr. Durham moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill to stop coining trade dollars, and to exchange standard silver dollars of 412½ grains for them, and then recoin such trade dollars into the standard full legal-tender dollars. Yeas 153—104 Democrats, 49 Republicans; nays 91—20 Democrats, 71 Republicans. It failed, two-thirds not voting in the affirmative.

On the same day Mr. Fort moved a suspension of the rules and passage of a bill declaring any discrimination against standard

silver dollars by national banking associations a defiance of our laws, and instructing the Committee on Banking and Currency to report a bill for withdrawing their circulation. Yeas 151—106 Democrats, 45 Republicans; nays 89—16 Democrats, 73 Republicans. Not two-thirds affirmative, it failed.

Scarcely had the Bland-Allison law been enacted and a dollar coined and issued under it when the national banks of New York conspired to prevent any beneficial results flowing from its enactment, and ever since that day they have fought it with all the power they could bring to bear. They have refused largely to keep it as a part of their reserve. In other words, they have put the mark of condemnation upon it in every way that it was possible for them to do.

I come now, Mr. President, to the Forty-sixth Congress—1879 to 1881.

The President was Republican; the Senate, 42 Democrats, 33 Republicans, 1 Independent. In the House of Representatives 148 Democrats, 130 Republicans, 15 Nationals. President Hayes called an extra session March 18, 1879.

June 27, 1879, in the Senate Mr. Vest offered a concurrent resolution declaring "that the complete remonetization of silver, its full restoration as a money metal, and its free coinage are demanded alike by the dictates of justice and sound statesmanship." Mr. Allison moved its reference to the Finance Committee. Agreed to. Yeas 23—4 Democrats, 19 Republicans; nays 22—21 Democrats, 1 Independent.

At that time the distinguished Senator from Delaware, Mr. Bayard, now our Ambassador to England, was chairman of the Committee on Finance. The resolution slept the sleep that knows no waking.

The Way They Railroad in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the plan for controlling railroad employees in Russia as reported in current press dispatches parallels the plan used in France to break a railroad strike there some years ago. When the railroad men struck for higher wages and improved working conditions, the French Government simply called the military reservists among the employees to colors and then ordered them to operate the railroads, and the strike was broken.

Maybe it cannot happen here, but it has happened in France and Russia and we now have military reservists in our country.

Under the permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD there is inserted an article taken from the Washington News of April 16:

RED RAILWAY CREWS GO UNDER ARMY LAW

Russia is placing all her railroads under martial law to stamp out a lack of discipline among a small minority of transport workers, the official Tass News Agency reported today.

All railway employees will be on a military footing for the duration and subject to courts martial, the agency said in a broadcast. The tribunals can send recalcitrant workers to the front in penal companies "if they are not liable to stronger punishment."

Jefferson Day Proclamation of Governor Broughton, of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 19 (legislative day of Friday, April 16), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Raleigh News and Observer, of Raleigh, N. C., containing the proclamation which Governor Broughton of North Carolina issued in connection with the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson. The proclamation was prepared by Hon. Josephus Daniels, the present editor of the Raleigh News and Observer, and formerly Secretary of the Navy and Ambassador to Mexico.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 13 TO BE JEFFERSON DAY—GOVERNOR ISSUES PROCLAMATION ON TWO HUNDREDTH BIRTHDAY OF SAGE OF MONTICELLO

Governor Broughton yesterday issued a proclamation noting the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, on April 13.

"North Carolinians need no urging to make this anniversary a day of new dedication to freedom and peace," the proclamation states.

The Governor said that, at his request, the tribute to Jefferson contained in the proclamation was prepared by Josephus Daniels, to whom the Governor referred as "the foremost exponent of Jeffersonian democracy in the public life of our Nation today."

PROCLAMATION

The proclamation:

"The two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson recalls the historical record of North Carolina's consistent devotion to his teachings and its wholehearted support of the great reforms he fathered. It is the proud distinction of our State that it made a supreme renunciation when it listened to and heeded the request of Mr. Jefferson that a few States should postpone the ratification of the Federal Constitution until provisions guaranteeing the 'four freedoms' had been incorporated in that immortal document. North Carolina and Rhode Island alone gave the full measure of devotion to the Bill of Rights when they elected to remain out of the new government until the right to speak, to worship, to assemble, to print were embedded in the greatest document ever struck off at one time by the hand of man. From its earliest settlement, this State battled when fighting was necessary for the freedom of religion and freedom of the press.

"In our day, a successor of the Sage of Monticello calls for the addition of the other essential rights in a democracy—freedom from fear and freedom from want. They are the essential and logical corollaries of the 'four freedoms' which Jefferson's wisdom embalmed forever in our national chart.

"On this anniversary, on the occasion of the dedication of the Jefferson Memorial in our National Capital on April 13, the people of the whole country will pause to do honor to the author of the Declaration of Independence who, more than any of the fathers, set the new Republic upon the road to the character of government which has become the example to all liberty-loving people of all eras. North Carolinians need no urging to make this anniversary a day of new dedication to freedom and peace."

Jesse Jones and Rubber Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article about the able Secretary of Commerce, entitled "Jesse Jones Succeeds," by Owen L. Scott, which was published in the Washington Evening Star of April 18, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JESSE JONES SUCCEEDS

(By Owen L. Scott)

This country's rubber problem, so far as war needs are concerned, is just about solved. There is assurance of a supply of rubber far above probable military demand.

At the same time, most other war production problems are well in hand. Output of munitions, in very many cases, is running far ahead of the ability to transport those munitions to the battle fronts. It even is proving necessary to cut back the production of some munitions.

These two developments are a testimonial to the effective operation of Jesse Jones' Defense Plant Corporation. Mr. Jones not so long ago was being criticized on the ground that he was not putting enough drive back of his job of war plant building. There were charges that he was failing to get going on an adequate rubber program, and that he did not put enough drive back of this or that expansion plan.

Results now are speaking for themselves. Those results are beginning to be startling.

Most of the criticism of Jesse Jones had concerned his synthetic rubber program. There were alarmed cries that the country would run out of rubber before his plants could get going. Yet, today, synthetic rubber is being turned out in Government-owned plants; and that production, in individual plants, is running about 25 percent above estimates of what the plants would produce. By this year-end, on the basis of present official estimates, synthetic rubber output will be running at a rate of above 800,000 tons a year.

Actual wartime consumption of rubber, including lease-lend exports, is running at not much more than 400,000 tons a year. There

is a supply of crude rubber on hand of about that much. The result is that, with large-scale synthetic rubber production coming up, automobile owners will be assured of some new tires in 1944. The program that will produce the rubber for those tires is the program that Mr. Jones laid down and stuck to through all of the criticism.

It is much the same story with other war plants.

The amount of aluminum turned out by Government-owned plants, privately operated, is several times the pre-war production of aluminum. In the case of magnesium this production is very many times that of pre-war. The giant new aircraft industry was financed by Mr. Jones and that industry is turning out planes far faster than they can be transported, serviced, and supplied with gasoline by the Army.

In fact, the Defense Plant Corporation, of which Mr. Jones is Chairman and of which Sam H. Husbands is President, owns $9,000,000,000 worth of plants and machinery. It has built and equipped 1,022 plants in 43 States and is building 457 more. Its possessions include 395 aircraft plants, 70 arms plants, 54 radio and communications plants, 161 machine-tool factories, 42 shipyards, 57 iron and steel plants, 43 aluminum plants, 24 magnesium plants, and 10 plants connected with synthetic rubber production.

Because real political and economic problems of much importance in the post-war period concern the aluminum, rubber, and magnesium plants, the Government itself is operating 22 of these plants. Other plants are Government-owned but leased to private operators.

There are beginning to be questions about the post-war use of these plants. Some commentators are suggesting that the way may be opened to large-scale gifts of plants to private industry and to a whole series of Muscle Shoals.

Mr. Jones is not concerning himself about the politics involved in these and other issues. Instead, in the contracts he has made and is making he makes sure that the Government interest is protected. Private industry has an option to buy most of the plants that it now is operating on lease. But under the terms that Jesse Jones has exacted they must pay the full costs plus 4-percent interest, after deducting rental payments, or cost less depreciation, in order to acquire the plants.

In the case of Government-owned and operated plants in rubber, aluminum, magnesium, oil pipe lines, and tin smelting, there are no options given to private industry to purchase. Congress will have to decide what the country wants to do with these properties after the war.

The big point is that Jesse Jones, with his Defense Plant Corporation, has financed creation of a vast war industry within a brief span of months. This new war industry is turning out an avalanche of war materials. It is turning out these materials, in most instances, faster than they can be transported to the scenes of war action.

Probably the most notable record of all will be made in synthetic rubber, where an industry will have been created from scratch, within little more than a year's time, that can produce as much rubber as this country formerly used in peacetime and much more rubber than required for war purposes alone.

It turns out that Mr. Jones' refusal to run off on all kinds of tangents, as one interest after another came up with pet rubber-making ideas, is paying out now in dividends. The types of rubber the country now is to get are the types about which most is known and which are most tried in actual use.

Comment by Gould Lincoln on Speech of Hon. Albert B. Chandler, of Kentucky, as To Strengthening Forces in Pacific Area

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 19 (legislative day of Friday, April 16), 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Gould Lincoln which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, April 17. The article, in Mr. Lincoln's column, "The Political Mill," is headed "CHANDLER, in demanding strengthening of Pacific, sounds doctrine that is good Americanism."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL—CHANDLER, IN DEMANDING STRENGTHENING OF PACIFIC, SOUNDS DOCTRINE THAT IS GOOD AMERICANISM

(By Gould Lincoln)

Senator CHANDLER, a Democratic member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, rose in the Senate yesterday and strongly urged that steps be taken immediately to increase American striking and defense power in the Pacific, from the Aleutians to Australia. He demanded, too, that more planes be sent to China.

The Kentucky Senator, a supporter of the administration, was chairman of a subcommittee which last summer visited Alaska and the Aleutians A full Senate listened to his remarks with great attention. Recent reports of strong Japanese concentrations in the south Pacific, plus General MacArthur's plea for greater air strength and news that the Japanese were persisting successfully in developing air bases on Kiska and Attu, despite American bombings, gave point to what Senator CHANDLER said.

The Kentucky Senator's warning, however, was met by a statement from his colleague, Senator BARKLEY, Democratic leader of the upper House, that the war cannot be won by strategists in the Halls of Congress. Senator BARKLEY further declared that all commanders in every area of the war were demanding more supplies and men—including General MacArthur. He was willing, he said, to leave strategy decisions to the generals.

CRITICIZED OFF FLOOR

The attitude of the Democratic leader and other administrationists in the Senate was that the speech of Senator CHANDLER was unfortunate. Some of them went so far, in conversation off the floor, to say the speech was an attack on the conduct of the war by the administration. One characterized the speech as "a Republican speech."

On the contrary, the speech was a good Democratic speech. Nothing could be more harmful to the administration than a serious reverse in the Pacific area. The country has been told again and again that the strategy in this war is to defeat Hitler and Mussolini first and then turn the full strength of the United States and Britain on Japan. In the meantime, the Allied forces are to hold off the Japanese.

There has been an increasing feeling in this country, however, that not enough support is being sent to the commanders in the Pacific. Secretary of War Stimson, only 2 days ago, took cognizance of this feeling. He announced that reinforcements are being sent to General MacArthur.

NATION PUT ON NOTICE

This is not a war to be fought along political lines, Democratic or Republican. General MacArthur and Admiral Halsey, with the forces at their command, have done masterful jobs in the South Pacific areas. They know, presumably, the tasks that are before them. They are in position to know the strength which the enemy has to hurl at them.

General MacArthur's straightforward declaration that land-based air forces of the Allied Nations must be increased to meet the growing threat of Japanese strength has put the Nation on notice. What he has said has been more than backed up by what high Australian officials have urged. The Chinese have been knocking at the door for months for greater assistance in the way of weapons and planes.

Some of the Democratic Senators who listened to Senator CHANDLER took a different position from that of Senator BARKLEY. Senator GEORGE of Georgia, for example, while disclaiming any attempt to be a military strategist, said that with a reported output of more than 5,000 planes a month, this country should be able to send 500 planes to MacArthur and another 500 to China—or even 1,000 to each.

UNFORTUNATE FEELING

No one expects the administration to announce the disposition of the military forces and supplies. No one expects a revelation of military secrets that would be of value to the enemy But it is peculiarly unfortunate that there should grow up and spread about this country a feeling that the Pacific area is the stepchild of this war. And it is even more unfortunate that there should be a whispering campaign that partisan politics have something to do with the situation.

New Dealers are too quick to see an attack on the administration in these demands—such as that voiced by Senator CHANDLER—for greater military and naval strength in the Pacific. Senator CHANDLER frankly declared that the Japanese are one of the strongest enemies we have in this war. He just as frankly pointed out the error of permitting them to increase their strength, and the danger not only to Alaska but to the whole Pacific coast if the Japanese are permitted to construct air bases in the Aleutians, from which they may send bombing expeditions to disrupt our lines of supply and to prepare for a real attack on United States territory.

TIMELY WARNING

The eyes of the country have been focused on the Pacific ever since the disastrous Jap attack on Pearl Harbor, since the fall of Singapore, and the conquest of the Philippines. There was great encouragement from the blows which have been struck at Midway, the Coral Sea, in Guadalcanal, and New Guinea. But the more recent reports of Japanese activity in the Pacific have been disquieting.

Senator CHANDLER sounded a timely warning. If there was any political significance in it, it was good Democratic doctrine. Aside from that, and of greater importance, it was good American doctrine.

The Future of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 19 (legislative day of Friday, April 16), 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an address I recently delivered at a meeting of the Greater Cleveland Council of Smaller Business of America held at Cleveland, Ohio, March 26, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAS SMALL BUSINESS A FUTURE?

I need not tell you how much I appreciate the opportunity of coming before this organization of small businessmen to discuss a subject of paramount importance to the Nation—the future of small business in America.

It is particularly gratifying to me because I well remember the interest your organization has taken in preserving and strengthening the position of small business in our national economy. In 1940, you sent your representatives to confer with the platform builders of both major political parties, urging a national policy of support of small business. Both major parties in that year adopted planks making the preservation of small business enterprise a vital national aim.

Meanwhile public interest in the present status in the future of small business has been steadily increasing.

During the past 50 years, the whole world has seen a steady march toward the monopolization of industry and commerce. We all know what this trend has actually accomplished in some of the countries abroad. In Germany, the Government took the lead in the cartelization of her business and industry. That movement in Germany brought Hitler to power and laid the foundation for its present tyrannical totalitarian regime.

In America, long before the war, the rise of monopoly and the trend toward centralization of industry had already brought about the amalgamation of thousands of small firms into huge financial and industrial organizations. We were rapidly being converted into a Nation of big business. This trend did not come about as a natural evolution. As in other countries, it was fostered primarily by powerful financial promoters who took no heed of its economic and social consequences. Power and greed were the main forces behind the movement. It had become a common occurrence for promoters to clean up ten or twenty million dollars between breakfast and luncheon in these corporate manipulations and consolidations. In America, as in Germany, we were rapidly following the road to totalitarianism. Many of our statesmen, economists, and businessmen foresaw the consequences of this course. To prevent this trend, long ago antitrust laws were enacted. The enforcement of those laws, however, has been intermittent and at best has contributed merely to retard the growth of monopoly. Antimonopoly enforcement alone will not arrest the trend toward collectivism. We must establish a fixed national policy against the further concentration of business and encourage a program of decentralization. The Nation must be thoroughly aroused against the danger of the collectivistic economy we have been building.

A few official figures might illustrate this point. By 1938, less than 5 percent of all the corporations reporting to the Government owned 87 percent of the assets of those corporations. One-tenth of 1 percent of the corporations owned 50 percent of the combined net income, while 4 percent of the corporations earned 84 percent of the total net profits.

The Temporary National Economic Committee of the United States Congress had delved into this question in a most thorough manner. In its final report, published in March, 1941, that committee stated:

"Most of the wealth and income of the country is owned by a few large corporations * * * these corporations are owned in turn by an infinitesimally small number of people * * * the profits from the operations of these corporations go to a very small group, opportunities for new enterprises, whether corporate or individual, are constantly being restricted."

The general claim that centralization of industry raises efficiency in production has been found to be without foundation. The great mergers in this country have in most instances merely brought together diverse industries, which only added to the burdens of management unfamiliar with the special problems of the individual industries which they had absorbed.

Similarly, the claim that centralization is justified because it facilitates the development of new methods and inventions has been clearly disproved. The U. S. Patent Office statistics show that of all the patents issued between 1921 and 1938, 42.9 percent went to individuals and 34.5 percent to 17,571 small corporations. Thus individuals and small corporations accounted for 77.4 percent of all the patents issued within that period. Mr. Frank B. Jewett, president of the greatest laboratory of big business—the Bell Laboratories, Inc., confirms this finding in the following statement:

"Fundamental patents which mark big changes in the arts, are more likely to come from the outside than from the inside. I think, in the majority of cases, the chances are 10 to 1 that the fundamental idea will come from outside the big laboratories."

It is commonly known that big corporations are quite often the graveyards of new discoveries and inventions. They resist change and progress and yield only to pressure from competitors. They often buy up new inventions in order to prevent the rise of competition which would force them to institute changes in their industrial establishments.

With the advent of the war, this trend toward centralization has been greatly accelerated. The larger corporations were well represented in Washington; the procurement officers of the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission had a high regard for these big concerns because of their engineering staffs and their plant capacities to absorb war contracts. It was much easier to deal with the big corporations than with a multitude of small ones. Therefore, when war orders began to flow, it was natural that they should go first to such firms.

By the end of 1942, we discovered that 252 firms had been awarded prime war contracts totaling about $67,400,000,000; that a single corporation, the General Motors Corporation, had received $7,251,000,000 in war orders; that 16 big firms had been awarded each over $1,000,000,000 in prime contracts.

Meanwhile, a shortage of raw material began to affect the small plants. There was not sufficient raw material for both war and civilian production. Civilian production was curtailed and in some instances, it had to be suspended altogether because war requirements had priority.

Without war orders and without raw materials for the production of civilian goods, many of the 184,000 industrial units of our economy were faced with ruin. To this were added the problems of labor, rationing, freeze orders, etc., all of which greatly aggravated the conditions facing small business in general.

Instead of converting the smaller plants to war production, the Government, at the outset, was induced to embark upon an extensive program of plant expansion. By the middle of March 1943 the Defense Plants Corporation had authorized the construction of new plants for the war effort valued at $9,175,190,258, an investment corresponding to ninety-thousand-and-odd manufacturing and mining companies of the United States in 1939. A similar program of expansion was financed by private capital.

This unprecedented expansion program called for great quantities of critical materials, manpower, and skilled technicians. With the war demands mounting by the hour, the satisfaction of those additional requirements for the construction of the new plants and all the appurtenant devices and machines essential for their operation had to be accomplished at the expense of the civilian economy. This drastically affected the raw-material requirements of the manufacturing enterprises engaged in civilian production.

In due time, the plight of small manufacturing units was bound to have serious repercussions upon the situation of the wholesale and retail establishments The flow of merchandise was gradually being reduced to a trickle; in some instances it was suspended altogether. Stocks on hand began to grow shorter, and without much prospect for improvement, stores, especially in the hardware and similar lines, began to shut down. Business generally was affected. What this might mean to our economy if permitted to continue, I need not review before an audience which is fully cognizant of its implications. When we consider that in 1939 there were about 1,600,000 small retailers and about 70,000 small wholesalers in the country, we can easily understand how many millions of lives are affected by this situation. What affects these small merchants in turn affects thousands of others who depend upon them for trade or services. Thus, whatever hurts one segment of our economy, inevitably proves detrimental to our economy in general. They are all links in one chain, with the weakest link determining the strength of the chain as a whole

Sensing the oncoming economic hurricane which was developing 14 months before Pearl Harbor, I introduced a resolution in Congress on October 8, 1940, providing for the creation of a special Senate committee to study and survey the problems of small business enterprises. The resolution was finally adopted and this special Senate committee soon began to function.

I am happy to say that the members of this Senate committee, Democrats and Republicans alike, have been working in perfect harmony toward our objectives. Your own State of Ohio is contributing in no small measure to the work at hand. Your senior Senator, Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT, has been one of the most active and constructive members on the committee. He has been giving generously of his time and his recognized talents to help solve these serious economic problems. Your junior Senator, Hon. HAROLD H. BURTON, although not a member of our committee, has also, from the very start, taken an active part in the task of preserving and strengthening small business. Our committee has acted with unanimity on every problem thus far considered. A similar committee has been set up in the House of Representatives under the able chairmanship of Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, and it has been equally effective in meeting this great national problem.

Much has already been accomplished, but much more remains to be done if small busi-

ness is to weather the storm brought about by the conditions I have described, now greatly accelerated by the war. Time will not permit me to give you a detailed account of our achievements.

The work of these congressional committees has contributed greatly toward making the country small-business-minded. Both committees are working in complete harmony with one end in view—the preservation of small business. The weight of an awakened public opinion and the constant proddings of the committee have forced the several national procurement agencies to recognize small business enterprise in awarding contracts. Thousands of small business enterprises throughout the country have already benefited from these activities.

Frequent committee hearings have brought out many startling revelations, as you have no doubt read in the press. Until exposed by our committee, in one Army procurement district, for example, about 85 percent of all the war contracts were being received from Washington earmarked for a few large firms. Similarly, all uniforms for naval officers were ordered from two big manufacturers, to the exclusion of hundreds of smaller tailoring establishments which could have given just as satisfactory service. These conditions have been rectified, thus affording many smaller establishments an opportunity to contribute their share to the war effort and remain in business until fairer weather is with us once more. Similar efforts are being carried out in all areas of the Nation.

We have enacted legislation creating the Smaller War Plants Corporation to help distribute war work and finance small manufacturers able and willing to take war orders. This agency has been provided with a fund of $150,000,000 and full authority to take prime contracts itself and farm them out to smaller units. Of course, this was something new in the annals of our Government functions and it has taken some time to effectively launch its activities. However, it has already succeeded in aiding many small firms. It is now perfecting its field organization where small plants will be given consideration without having to run to Washington in quest of war contracts.

In this connection, it is only fair to say that the Army and Navy are now fully cooperating with the Smaller War Plants Corporation. They have themselves set up in their procurement agencies small business units to cooperate with the Smaller War Plants Corporation and see that small plants are remembered when contracts are being awarded. From now on, we are looking for more tangible results from that source and with the aid of the new chairman of the Corporation, Col. Robert W. Johnson, an able and experienced executive, it is fair to expect that small business will be able to secure a greatly increased share of war work.

We have enacted legislation to help thousands of dealers and distributors, affected by rationing regulations, to borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on their stocks of merchandise or to dispose their stocks to the Corporation. This legislation was extremely beneficial to the thousands of automobile dealers of the Nation affected by the stoppage of automobile production and tioning of cars, as well as others affected by like onditions.

We have brought about legislation to remove, as far as practicable, the unnecessary burdens imposed by the multiplicity of forms and questionnaires sent out by Federal agencies—an exasperating situation which was costing business very dearly in time and labor.

Quite a number of other measures are in process of legislative study. Our committee is sponsoring legislation to create an administration of civilian supply. The importance of this proposed legislation is generally appreciated. The welfare of the people on the home front is vital to the successful prosecution of the war. Without the wholehearted effort of our workers in the mines and factories sustained through the efficient maintenance of our civilian life, our armed forces would be crippled.

This is a war of production. We are faced not only with stupendous production schedules for our own men but for our gallant allies who are with us in this fight to a finish for the preservation of human liberty and dignity. A subcommittee on mines and mining, which I recently appointed, will soon introduce a bill to bring about an expansion in the production of metals and minerals essential in the war effort and also in our civilian economy.

During the past 9 or 10 years scores of bills were introduced in Congress to provide equity capital for small business. Thus far no legislation has resulted. Now one of our subcommittees is preparing a comprehensive bill based on the principles underlying the Federal Housing Act to provide long-term loans for small business. I am sure this will prove a most helpful measure in preserving and fostering small business enterprise.

Another subcommittee is formulating legislation to prevent big manufacturing and wholesale tire dealers from monopolizing the industry in the field through branch houses and agencies. If enacted this measure will help retain the tire business in the hands of the small independents.

In the course of the administration of the act creating the Smaller War Plants Corporation certain weaknesses have been disclosed. We are now preparing amendments to strengthen that measure and make it more effective and serviceable to small business enterprise.

Our committee has been acting as liaison for small business enterprises in their dealings with the procurement agencies, the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration and all other Government agencies whose functions are affecting their existence. We have been instrumental in directly aiding many such smaller units of our economy to secure war contracts when they were about to close down through the exigencies of the war.

Our committee has published many reports of its activities which have found wide circulation throughout the country. I must give the American press full credit for its splendid cooperation in giving wide circulation to our findings and our reports. The committee and I personally appreciate very much this valuable service and patriotic effort on their part.

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY PRESERVING SMALL BUSINESS?

When the term "small business" is mentioned, many people think of the corner grocery store and wonder what all the shouting is about. If that store should disappear as a result of the war, many people think, no great harm will befall them. When we use the phrase "small business" some people are led to think that since it is only small business, it is not worth while losing sleep over it, much less to make an effort to actually preserve it.

Few of those who think in that vein realize that what is commonly called small business is in reality the largest segment of our industrial and distribution economy. In my vernacular, the term "small business" means any business which is genuinely engaged in competition with others in the same line and is not a part of a monopoly group or does not control a substantial volume of trade in a given industry. This applies to business units in the manufacturing as well as distribution business.

Statistics as of July 1942 indicate that business enterprises with a tangible net worth in excess of $20,000 accounted for 9.7 percent of the total number of business organizations in our whole economy, while the so-called small business represented 90.3 percent. These figures prove the relative importance small business is playing in our economic system. It is the most truly and effective competitive section of American business.

The enlightened big business executive of today is not unmindful of the dependence of the larger organizations upon the smaller business units for their welfare. Many big enterprises find an outlet among the smaller manufacturing plants for their semifinished products, and as for distribution, most of them are practically entirely dependent upon small business.

Testifying before the Senate Committee on Small Business some months ago, Mr. Philip B. Reed, chairman of the General Electric Co., said:

"If small business goes, big business does not have any future except to become the economic arm of a totalitarian state, such as is the case in Germany and Italy. * * * Out of flexibility, the vigor, and the competition afforded by small business comes the constant spark that has made free American enterprise one of the great progressive forces in the struggle of man for mastery of the physical universe."

If such an attitude had predominance in the past among the big business interests of America, there would have been no need for congressional committees to deal with small business problems; there would have been no problems. Unfortunately, his is one of the voices in the wilderness. For 50 years, big business has allowed itself to be used as a vehicle for ushering in collectivism in the United States.

From another source, from the mouth of big finance, there comes another acknowledgement of the importance of small business not only to our economy but to our very existence as a free Nation.

"The perpetuation of these small business plants and other small businesses," wrote the Index of the New York Trust Co., "is of national import, because small business has long been considered a bulwark of the American system of free enterprise. Successful operation of small business throughout the Nation is generally accompanied by a diffusion of economic power, normally gives to both producer and consumer a wider latitude of choice, and insofar as it affects political power, helps to make possible the continuation of civil liberties."

There is another voice—the voice of the monopoly and cartel group. That voice is now silent. The war is on, and while our boys are shedding their blood on distant battlefields to the end that our liberties and freedom may remain with us for all time, it might be construed as unpatriotic to advocate at this time further centralization of economic power and influence. However, in certain quarters they yet make themselves felt quite perceptibly.

In years past, we have heard a great deal about the need for more business in Government and less Government in business. This propaganda has been quite effective.

We have had more business in Government all right, but it has been big business, and the result has been disastrous to small business. It was big business in Government that permitted and fostered the rapid centralization of business in this country during the decade following the last war. It was big business in Government that slowed down the enforcement of antimonopoly laws and brought on the inflation and Wall Street collapse of 1929. I think it can be charged also that big business influence in the various war agencies in Washington contributed to the

concentration of war orders in the hands of big concerns and brought about much of the costly plant expansion at Government expense while completely ignoring the capacity of small plants to help in the war work.

I must confess that the present administration in Washington deserves much of the criticism which has been leveled at it in permitting the war-production program to be controlled almost exclusively by big business interests. We have bowed too much during the past, and particularly during the present war, to the big-business executives of the Nation. They must be held responsible for some serious mistakes, such as the failure to properly plan for essential production of steel, of synthetic rubber, of strategic and critical minerals, and other scarce raw materials.

I do not condemn big business indiscriminately. Many of our big industrial institutions have made almost miraculous contributions to war production. If big business can be big, efficient, and successful on its merits, there is no basis for criticism.

I do condemn big business, however, for seeking to stifle the institution of free competitive private enterprise—for trying to gobble up everything—for entering into monopolistic agreements and cartels of foreign nations designed to freeze out small concerns, raise prices, and restrain production in this country, and which, incidentally, has had a serious effect on the whole war effort. I condemn big business for seeking to strangle competitors in the home market and for creating some of the serious social problems in the big industrial centers of our country resulting from greedy collectivistic policies. Big businessmen generally must begin to see more eye to eye with men like Mr. Reed of the General Electric Co., whose utterance I have just quoted, announcing the truism that, "If small business goes, big business does not have any future except to become the economic arm of a totalitarian state, such as is the case in Germany and Italy." These are the forces against which we and all the other freedom-loving peoples are arrayed—this is what we are determined to stamp out in the international arena, and are equally determined to prevent its taking hold in our country.

Big business must be brought to see that by endangering our system of private, competitive enterprise they are also imperiling their own existence. If their policies are carried to their logical conclusion, it will mean that eventually totalitarianism will be the fate of this country. Whether it be brown, black, or red makes very little difference. The freedom which the founders of this Republic had established for us and which made it possible for us to grow rich and prosperous and the world's greatest influence for human welfare will be no more. That, I am sure, is not what the vast majority of Americans want. That, I am equally certain, is what Americans will never permit to happen here.

That is why we, in both Houses of Congress, are unanimous in the resolve to fight totalitarianism abroad and stand guard over our cherished institutions at home. That is why I am confident the Nation will stand back of the Congress in this struggle to preserve the true character of free, private competitive enterprise, which has afforded our American people an opportunity for expressing themselves freely in the respective fields of their choice. Such people will never submit to the dictates of economic feudalists, whether they be of domestic or foreign origin.

Whoever helps maintain free and untrammeled small business is therefore helping the cause for which we are now locked in mortal combat with the would-be enslavers of mankind.

I thank you.

Persecution of the Jews by the Nazis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 19 (legislative day of Friday, April 16), 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered before the mass demonstration meeting, under the auspices of the St. Louis Council of the American Jewish Congress, by Col. John J. Griffin, chairman of the Council of Draft Boards of St. Louis, Mo.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We today join forces with all human hearts throughout the world, that are not calloused by the practices of the forces of evil, in protest against the persecution of the Jews by the Nazi oppressors, if we as Christians do not raise our voices in protest against this persecution by using our talents and power to stop it then we are not exercising the precepts of Christian mercy and charity that is our belief.

It is of little use uttering tirades against anti-Semitism unless such tirades are accompanied by action; that action must be of the type and kind that will stir public opinion the world over, to bring relief of every possible kind of succor the victims of this appalling cruelty of the Nazis and bring an end to this human brutality. Words are weak and cold—deeds and speedy deeds are needed to put a stop to this brutal campaign for the extermination of a race. Justice must be done—and quickly.

The blood of innocent victims of this savage hatred cries aloud from earth to the highest heavens for vengeance. Almighty God who has said "Vengeance is Mine" certainly will not turn a deaf ear to that cry. The guilty will suffer in the measure of the cruelty they have perpetrated, but yet this thought gives little consolation to those who are at this moment suffering tortures more extreme than human suffering ever inflicted on a helpless people by a pitiless persecutor.

I believe that persecution and murder of a defenseless people solely because of the manner in which they pay homage to their Creator or because they came of a race different from the majority of people who make up the nation in which they reside, is as abhorrent and cruel as was the butchering of the first-born of Israel by the order of Herod.

Holy Writ informs us that from Terah of Ur, father of Abraham, grew a race of people whose principal pursuit was agriculture, and yet who, by necessity, were constrained to leave country districts and concentrate in large cities, who have been the medium of evolving and promulgating the Ten Commandments upon which rests the entire structure known as moral law, which is the great dividing line between man and beast; a people whose noblest quality was that of their devotion to and their following of the teachings of God, through Moses delivered to them. We have read in Holy Writ of their wanderings in the wilderness; of their wars with the Philistines; of their form of government, regulated by judges; of their selection of Saul as their first king. We have read of the glories of David and of his successes in war, finance, government, and literature. We know of Solomon and his almost unbelievable wisdom and riches. We follow these people through their triumphs and sorrows, through their clashes with Cyrus, with Roman legions, with English and Spanish kings, and we find them finally scattered throughout Holland, Spain, and Portugal, in Poland, in Germany, in Russia; and we know that today there are about 15,000,000 of this ancient people still distinct; and that for no reason, save only the tyrannical whim of a Hitler, that they are being driven from their homes, robbed of their property, that they and their children are being slaughtered by the armed soldiers of Hitler. There are about 3,000,000 Jews in Poland; 1,500,000 in the Ukraine; 2,500,000 in Russia, and 500,000 in Germany. In the United States of America there are approximately 4,250,000 Jews, most of these residing in Greater New York.

I know from my personal experience, as does every other citizen of this community, that the Jew is a law-abiding, patriotic citizen of the United States. I know that he is in ardent favor of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom in the worship of his Creator. I know that these people pay their debts and but few of them are objects of charity upon any municipality or State. I know that they are among the most charitable people I have ever met. There has never been a movement in this city or any other city of the United States with which I am familiar, but that the Jew has been munificent in his contributions toward charity—charity for the maintenance of the orphan, charity for the care of the sick, charity for those that have been struck by pestilence or by wind or by earthquake.

I know that history puts down as the most gifted and scholarly of the children of Adam a vast number of Jews. Among these I might casually mention Meyerbeer, Mendelssohn, Rubinstein, Disraeli, Spinoza, Heine, Wassermann, Einstein, Koch, Freud, Michelson, and the Rothschild family.

It was in 1898 that the American people were so outraged by the manner in which Weyler, general of the Spanish Armies in Cuba, treated women and children and old men confined in what is known as concentration camps, that they began a campaign of denunciation of these barbarities, which resulted in the United States of America going to war with Spain and liberating Cuba.

It was in 1917, primarily because of the impending doom which the armies of the Emperor of Germany were bringing to the British Empire and the French Republic, that our Nation struck a blow that brought victory to the armies of the Allies, and now, today, we, the people of the United States, of whatever creed and from whatever ancient stock descended, say to the victims of the cruel butchers of Hitler's army, "For this crime we promise, in the name of God, to rescue these people and to punish all guilty for this inhumanity to defenseless persons, and I say to the people residing in the conquered countries of Europe, if you come to the haven of America we will bid you welcome; and we promise that if you will but come here that you will enjoy every right and every privilege that is guaranteed the citizens of the United States by that immortal document called our Constitution."

The meeting today being a stop Hitler demonstration, in my opinion the best way to do that is to defeat Hitler and all the Hitlers of the world with their followers so decisively that never again will such a scourge of human depravity be attempted. To do this there are three things necessary:

1. That the people of the world turn their minds and their hearts to the God in heaven and recognize divine authority and live accordingly.

2. Place more value upon living their lives under the precepts of decency and honesty and less value upon the material things.

3. Forget differences of a political or racial nature and unite as a united American people has never been united before.

If you and I and every American worthy of the name, as members of the civilian army, will, as a united American people, do our job at home in the same united, unselfish way our armed forces are doing it on 32 fronts, you may rest assured that the defeat of Hitler will be swift and thorough, Satan again driven back into the depths of hell from which he emerged to bring the battle of anti-God into the open.

The Eagle That Is Remembered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 19 (legislative day of Friday, April 16), 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in an article written by him, Irving Dilliard, editorial writer for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, pays a very unusual tribute to the courage and integrity of former Governor John P. Altgeld of Illinois. I ask that this article, entitled "The Eagle That Is Remembered," which was published in the Survey Graphic, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EAGLE THAT IS REMEMBERED

(By Irving Dilliard)

I am prouder of the University of Illinois now than I have been at any time since I wore the cap and gown of the graduate in a fragrant prairie Junetime 15 years ago.

This particular and unusual pride is based not on University of Illinois research or public service in the social sciences or pursuit of the liberal arts. It is not due to some new scientific achievement of the university's justly noted divisions of chemistry and engineering. It is not because the truly great agricultural experiment station at Urbana has added to its many laurels. Certainly it does not stem from Ex-Coach Bob Zuppke's last football team.

I am genuinely proud of the University of Illinois because of the name which has been given to one of its buildings. For the trustees of the university have done the literally inspired thing of distinguishing the building which houses its college of law with the official name of Altgeld Hall, in corrected memory of one of the most reviled men in American history.

This is an act of justice which should be known not only throughout Illinois, from Jane Addams' native Cedarville near the Wisconsin line to the tip end of "Little Egypt," which sired Bryan and Borah. It is an act of justice that deserves to be known wherever men care about the righting of wrongs, however old. It sets an example for universities and colleges the country over. Especially should it be marked in the law schools which are training the members of the legal profession in the United States—and shaping their ideals.

John Peter Altgeld was elected Governor of Illinois just 50 years ago. He took to the State capitol in Lincoln's Springfield a quiet and abiding love of fairness and an unyielding devotion to the welfare of ordinary people; it is significant that his parents brought him, a baby 3 months old, from Germany in the spring of 1848. Did any American ever come up a harder way? The poverty that cradled him in Ohio was the most abject kind. He had virtually no schooling and worked his way to Missouri as an itinerant, penniless farmhand. His appearance was against him and a heavy German accent was a constant handicap.

Here it is enough to say that John P. Altgeld did come up that hard way, that he taught a rural school, that he joined the Granger revolt of the seventies, that he became a country lawyer and was drawn in time to the adventurous Chicago which rose from the ashes of the great fire, that he was a millionaire when he was elected Governor as a Democrat in the year of Cleveland's second triumph.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was a boy 11 years old at the time Altgeld launched his New Deal in Illinois. That is one way to show what a social pioneer Altgeld was. Another way is merely to list a few of the legislative enactments of his 4-year administration: laws regulating labor by women and children and requiring factory inspection; laws establishing an inheritance tax and setting up a probation system; laws providing the beginnings of State civil service and bringing new standards of humanity to charitable and penal institutions.

Thus it is that Altgeld would have been entitled to a sure place among progressive leaders had there been no Haymarket bombing in 1886 and no pardon from his hand for the three surviving prisoners 7 years later. But there was that pardon (less than 6 months after Altgeld took office) and it touched off a storm of abuse which raged throughout the country. Newspapers, magazines, ministers, and public speakers sought to outdo each other in branding Altgeld as an anarchist as bad as, if not worse than, the men he had freed from prison.

The New York Times said: "Governor Altgeld has done everything in his power * * * to encourage * * * the spirit of lawless resistance and of wanton assault upon the agents of authority * * * exactly in tone with the wildest anarchist leaders." The Rev. H. A. Delano told his Baptist congregation in Evanston, Ill., that "a Nero in Rome, a Paul of Russia, a Napoleon in France showed more care for the people than has this man by this deed." And at the annual Harvard alumni dinner in Cambridge, Abraham Lincoln's son, Robert Todd Lincoln, denounced "this act of a demagogic governor with a little temporary power, this slander upon justice," and then exhorted "Harvard men to stand firm in the midst of such dangers in the Republic." As Theodore Roosevelt charged that Altgeld "would connive at wholesale murder," Justice David J. Brewer of the United States Supreme Court asked a Fourth of July assembly if he was "to be another Jefferson Davis?"

The Illinois Governor reviewed the evidence in an 18,000-word statement, called Reasons for Pardoning, which remains to this day a masterpiece of analysis and honest dealing. But he summarized it all in a simple sentence to his old Ohio neighbors when he went home to bury his mother a few days after the issuance of the pardons: "Those fellows did not have a fair trial, and I did only what I thought was right."

It took America a long time to learn that he was right. When Altgeld died 40 years ago, Clarence Darrow spoke at the funeral of his friend, because clergymen were afraid it would cost them their pulpits if they conducted the service. By 1912 he was, in the title of Vachel Lindsay's moving poem, The Eagle That Is Forgotten. But time did have its way. At length a monument was raised in Altgeld's memory in Lincoln Park, Chicago, and in 1934 his portrait was hung in the Governor's reception room at Springfield. The definitive reappraisal which was so sorely needed came 6 years ago in Harry Barnard's scrupulously honest biography, written with much-needed perspective. And now there is Altgeld Hall at the University of Illinois.

This last recognition is more fitting than is evident from the main facts of Altgeld's public life. When he became Governor, the University of Illinois occupied 4 old buildings and had a faculty of 48. When he left office at the end of 4 short but crowded years, 6 new buildings had been provided for, the faculty was increased to 170, and the legislature in response to Altgeld's urgings had appropriated $722,700 as against $201,350 in the preceding 4 years. One of these new buildings was the romanesque library, now used by the College of Law, in whose founding Altgeld was instrumental. He also proposed the organization of schools of medicine and pharmacy. How much Altgeld did for higher education in Illinois was told by Dr. Edmund Janes James, long president of the University of Illinois. Dr. James said that Altgeld "raised this institution from a comparatively insignificant country college to the rank of a great school of learning, the foundations of which are broad and deep."

Somewhere in the law school building which now bears his name it should be possible to place prominently these words from an address which Altgeld made as Governor at the University of Illinois, June 7, 1893:

"You turn to the courts of justice; you think of a goddess, blindfolded, holding the scales; you recall eloquent things about eternal justice, etc., and you say, here I will find exact right, here wrongs are corrected, the strong are curbed, and the weak protected

"You will be disappointed. The administration of justice, or rather of the laws, is better than it ever has been, but it is only a struggling toward the right, only a blind groping in the darkness toward the light

"The men who administer the laws are human, with all the failings of humanity. They take their biases, their prejudices with them onto the bench. Upon the whole, they try to do the best they can; but the wrongs done in the courts of justice themselves are so great that they cry to heaven."

That is the charge to his profession of the governor and lawyer and judge whose name has been given to the University of Illinois College of Law. Surely its faculty and students must somehow have a different feeling toward the law, surely they must have a new sense of the law's social mission now that their building is a memorial to John Peter Altgeld. Surely here is an influence that will spread far beyond Urbana and the Illinois prairie.

Comment by Fred Pasley on Senator Chandler's Speech as To Strengthening Forces in Pacific Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 19 (legislative day of Friday, April 16), 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article

written by Mr. Fred Pasley entitled "West Coast Menaced by Japs, Senate Told."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily News of April 17, 1943]

WEST COAST MENACED BY JAPS, SENATE TOLD

(By Fred Pasley)

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 16.—Solemnly warning the American people that they do not realize the gravity of the situation in the Pacific and that another Singapore is not beyond the realm of possibility, Kentucky's Democratic Senator, ALBERT B. CHANDLER, today made an impassioned plea not only to strengthen Gen. Douglas MacArthur's air-ground forces but to launch an offensive in the Aleutians that will blast the Japs off American soil.

A member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee and chairman of a subcommittee that last September inspected our Alaskan outposts, CHANDLER declared that the Japanese are already entrenched on Kiska and Attu and may use the islands for land-based planes to attack both Alaska and the Pacific coast preparatory to an invasion.

CHANDLER, a stanch administration supporter, startled his hearers with an indictment of President Roosevelt and War Department officials for alleged laxity in the defense of the North Pacific after his subcommittee had supplied them with a secret report of conditions there.

After disclosing that the findings had been submitted "directly to the President of the United States * * * nearly 8 months ago" with a five-point program for countering the Japanese occupation, CHANDLER said that:

"So far as I have been informed during those 8 months, no determined effort has yet been made actually to dislodge Japs from Kiska or to regain possession of those islands."

WILL BRITAIN HELP?

It was while discussing the need of more planes for General MacArthur that CHANDLER tossed another bombshell on the Senate floor, this one aimed at Great Britain's promised war effort against the Japanese. Remarking that America has no assurance Russia will ever fight the Japs, CHANDLER asserted:

"It should be remembered, too, that many of the people of this country indicated to the people of England that the German war was theirs prior to the Japanese attack on us at Pearl Harbor. I do not say that they will, but I know that they (the English) could say to us when they were no longer in danger that perhaps the Japanese war is our war."

Repeatedly, Majority Leader ALBEN W. BARKLEY attempted to soften the Chandler charges with the familiar arguments that we haven't enough planes and ships and men to control the land, sea, and air on all fronts. CHANDLER went right ahead with his indictment.

"If the recommendations of the committee had been followed (8 months ago)," he insisted, "we should have blasted the Japs from American territory at Kiska and they would not now be there."

"Should not the Senator have added," questioned New Hampshire's STYLES BRIDGES, also a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, "that wholly inadequate reinforcements were sent to Alaska?"

"Certainly they were inadequate to get the Japs out of our territory," replied CHANDLER.

"IT COULDN'T BE DONE"

Answering another question by BRIDGES concerning the North Pacific, CHANDLER said he had undertaken to compare the attempt of the Japanese "to go up the Aleutians" to the situation in Malay when the Japs went through the jungles and down that peninsula.

"Many persons have said they could not go up the Aleutians and attack Alaska and the continent of the United States," said CHANDLER, and then recalled how the Japs had attacked "one of the most powerful fortresses in the world, that of Singapore, and reduced it in a very short time."

CHANDLER's information is that the Japs have entrenched themselves so cleverly at Kiska, that "although we bomb them every hour" with heavy bombers, they are amply protected. He doubted whether "this bombing is doing us any good."

It was a full dress speech that the youthful Kentuckian delivered this afternoon. Galleries and Senators alike gave him their fullest attention.

After relating that his committee submitted its report to the President and Senate Military Affairs Committee on September 1, CHANDLER disclosed that it contained a complete inventory of men, munitions, and equipment, including the number and type of planes for the entire Territory of Alaska and the Aleutians.

Although the report was secret, CHANDLER explained that "in view of the current grave situation," he wished now to give the committee's recommendations. Revealed for the first time, these are:

1. The imperative and vital need for a completely unified and responsible command for the Alaskan and Pacific coast areas.

2. Immediate recognition of the commanding position of the Territory of Alaska in the necessary offensive and defensive actions controlling the Western Hemisphere.

3. Recognition of Alaska as the shortest route between the Japanese and American mainlands, as the vital airplane ferry to Asia, and—unless properly garrisoned immediately—a real threat to the further invasion of American soil by the Nazi powers.

4. The recognition that Alaska and Siberia are the key to the most effective offensive that this Nation can launch against the Japanese mainland.

5. That Japan is actively setting up effective fortifications on American soil at Kiska and that further delay in dislodging them from this American outpost will inevitably result in greater losses of men and equipment.

CHANDLER warned that "regardless of press reports and the statements made by some of our military men minimizing the Japanese gains in this area, it is a deadly serious situation and the longer they are permitted to remain there the higher will be the cost in men, munitions, and equipment in order to dislodge them."

Turning to the South Pacific, CHANDLER said:

"The enemy must be attacked with the utmost possible vigor and his installations and shipping destroyed. It is suicidal to give him time to dig in."

OUR "TOUGHEST WAR"

"I believe," he added, "that it is time now that the leaders of our Government and our military men realize the deadly seriousness of the Japanese menace to the people of the United States. The war against Japan is no second-class war. It is, in my opinion, the toughest struggle that has ever faced the people of the United States.

"We have no assurance that Russia will ever fight Japan."

Then he added the significant words:

"I do not say that the British will, but I know that they could say to us—when they were no longer in danger—that perhaps the Japanese war is our war."

SORELY DISAPPOINTED

Reverting to the all-important question of vital supplies for MacArthur, CHANDLER described him as a magnificent gentleman and a real fighting man whose "expressions are ones of mingled sadness and bitterness," and that:

"It is apparent to every citizen of the country that he is sorely disappointed because he has not been furnished the adequate planes, men, and equipment to conduct an offensive against the Japanese.

"This must not be continued. The sacrifices of our men in that area have been too great and the heartache to the people of America too real. Those who have so far carried on so successfully must be supported."

Clean-up Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, today is the first day of "clean-up" week, and there has been so much discussion as to unsanitary conditions in Washington, that I, as a member of the District of Columbia Committee, feel each and everyone of us have a part to play in helping to remedy existing conditions.

The following letter received from a friend of mine is so timely, since it is "clean-up" week, that I think I am justified in placing it in the RECORD:

APRIL 10, 1943.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Diplomats returning to Europe from Washington in the nineteenth century described that city of magnificent distances as an unkempt, ill-tended wilderness, dotted here and there with public buildings on trackless unpaved country roads. "Flocks of geese waddl d on the Avenue, and hogs, of every age and color, roamed at large, making their muddy wallows on Capitol Hill and Judiciary Square. People emptied refuse in the gutters, and threw dead animals into the canal." That is a description of Washington during the Civil War.

The wilderness has been filled up, public buildings have multiplied and expanded and paved streets run everywhere, animals no longer roam at large—they're too valuable—but the filth and the lack of civic pride unfortunately remain.

It has been customary to lay the blame for all that goes wrong in Washington on the lack of franchise and on the fact that the vast majority of the population are not residents of the District. But we are all of us Americans, and as such should take as much if not more pride in our Capital than in our native towns.

Take a walk down the main thoroughfares. What do you see? Newspapers, empty cigarette packs, orange peels, cellophane wrappers—and the streets and sidewalks in front of every movie theater covered with discarded wads of chewing gum. This despite the fact that trash cans are provided at almost every corner downtown.

On the side streets the filth is even greater, empty beer, liquor, and pop bottles, broken glass, old cartons, rags, dead flowers, anything that is no longer useful is heaved out on the street for someone else to pick up.

The city is getting dirtier every day. We have a much larger population than we used to have and fewer men on the sanitation force to clean up. Filth breeds disease as well as unsightliness and from the practical point of view as well as from that of our civic duties as Americans, we should become aroused and do something.

Now, what has this got to do with me? you may say. And anyway, this is a free country, isn't it, and people should do as they please?

Yes, this is a free country and no one is advocating any gestapo tactics to make people conform to rules which thoughtfulness of others and duties as a citizen should lead them naturally. It has a lot to do with you individually.

First, you can be more careful yourself. Next time you want to throw away an empty cigarette package or an odd bit of paper, walk to the nearest corner and put it in the trash can. If you see a newspaper blowing about the street, pick it up. Would you be willing to allow trash to litter up your own front lawn? Well, the city is just as much a part of your responsibility as your own lot. You're a citizen, aren't you? Suppose someone does see you pick up things in the street and raise an eyebrow. Fine. You may have planted an idea, and I'll bet that behind the curiosity lurks a slight sense of shame.

Then, too, you can urge your friends to agitate for reform. If we individuals talk it up enough, soon the various civic bodies and the press, sensitive to opinion, will take it up. It won't hurt anybody and may do some good. The only effective way to keep the city clean is to mobilize public opinion and to make the transgressor feel uncomfortable.

Sincerely yours,

S. C.

Fighting and Dying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herein a splendid editorial appearing in the Boston Post of April 16, 1943, entitled "Fighting and Dying":

FIGHTING AND DYING

It was a pity that Secretary of War Stimson and high military officials in Washington were forced to make a public defense of American troops in the Tunisian drive.

But there was no other course open. The armchair strategists here at home at last went too far in pontificating on the war moves and merited the stern rebuke given them for implying that our soldiers had blundered.

For it was an unfair indictment, without complete knowledge of the facts, to say that United States Infantry and tankmen who have been fighting and dying in brilliant actions against the Germans had failed in their objectives, particularly that of cutting the German Army in two.

These soldiers of our country who battled for 22 days without a let-up, suffered substantial losses and yet fought the professional Nazi battalions to a standstill, were deserving only of praise and gratitude.

Even if they had failed in some objectives, they still would have the glory of engaging so much armor of the Nazi forces that the brilliant British Eighth Army was immeasurably aided thereby in cracking the Mareth line.

But they did not fail. The Stimson statement makes clear that in the assignments they undertook they were superb and that dividing the German forces by a lunge through to the coast had never been a given objective of our troops.

This is not the first time that amateur interpreters of communiques here on the home front have read into the official dispatches from the fighting front meanings which were not justified.

Another notable case is the pronouncement of a home-front strategist on the first day of the Coral Sea battle. He saw in the fact that Japanese battleships were running down the coast of Australia a defeat for the American fleet.

When the final score was tallied it developed that the Jap ships were allowed to approach land so that MacArthur's land-based bombers could take off and smash the Nipponese sea-going forces in one of the greatest of sea victories.

No one wishes to interfere with the right of anyone to put their own interpretation upon world events while it is in progress. Being a grandstand quarterback is an old American trait. But this is war, and to translate a few facts into a seemingly authoritative and expert analysis before all the facts are known is dangerous.

Battles may not be won or lost thereby. But morale may be hurt. The pride and confidence Americans have in their fighting forces might be shaken momentarily. And, if the men who are valiantly going through hell for all of us hear about it, what are they going to think?

Appeal of Polish Roman Catholic Union of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an appeal adopted at a meeting of the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America:

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 12, 1943.*

The following appeal was adopted at the plenary meeting of the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, duly held on April 12, 1943, in Chicago, Ill., all national officers being present:

"Whereas the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America fully considered the following sad and grievous facts; that

"The Government of Soviet Russia lays baseless claims to large sections of Poland, wherein are situated the old Polish cities of Lwow, Tarnopol, Stanislawow, Wilno, Bialystok, Nowogrodek, and the lands of Polesia;

"The Soviet Government unjustifiedly denies Polish citizenship to millions of Poles forcibly transported from Poland into the interior of Russia and to Siberia.

"About two and a half million Poles were transported to Russia. Among these were 800,000 Polish children, of whom 400,000 have perished, and the remainder will soon suffer this same fate unless immediate aid is extended to them.

"The German forces in Poland consistently and continually conduct mass murders of Poles and systematically make use of the most vile and bestial means, unknown up to now by the civilized world, for the designed purpose of the complete extermination of the Polish Nation: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America has concluded that the stand of the Soviet Government and the communistic press in the United States for the annexation of lands of sovereign and independent nations creates disunity and impedes the concerted effort of the Allied Nations to defeat Germany, Japan, and Italy, and that the brutal and savage conduct of the Nazis transgresses all Christian principles and degrades all mankind; be it further

"Resolved, That the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America express its unswerving faith in the actions, wisdom, and justice of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the consummation of the aims and principles laid down by him in the Atlantic Charter.

"We express the hope that the United States, together with England and all other Allied Nations, will check and forestall the ambitions and plans of its enemies or allies who now or in the future may desire or attempt to seize the lands of sovereign and independent states and thus selfishly cause discord and war among the nations.

"We hereby state that our membership of more than 150,000 has at all times fully cooperated with President Roosevelt and our Government, has unceasingly strived in aiding the war effort of our country, and promises to continue to exert its utmost effort in service to our country.

"The executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America appeals to the Members of Congress, the press and radio commentators, that in considering and commenting on post-war solutions they insist that no injustice be done to Poland, which first dared to oppose the Nazis and which at all times during her long and glorious history fought valiantly for her liberty and the liberty of the nations of Europe.

"We call on the Government of the United States to halt the mass murders of Poles by the Nazis and to materially and morally aid the destitute and suffering Polish men, women, and children in Soviet Russia.

"We ask our Congressmen and Senators to consider the interests of tortured Poland and express our gratitude to the Members of Congress, who have fought for justice for the enslaved and oppressed nations.

"We call to our membership to purchase United States War bonds to the limit of its ability and to be generous in the contributions for relief of the Polish civilian population in Soviet Russia and other countries.

"We express our gratitude to the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States for its generous contributions for relief of Polish war victims and ask continued support of this cause.

"We beseech almighty God to grant an early victory to the Allied Nations and to establish a just and permanent peace for all nations."

For the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America:

JOHN J. OLEJNICZAK,
President.

STEPHEN S. GRABOWSKI,
Secretary General.

Alphabetical Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a few of the alphabetical agencies which have been created during

the past few years, as well as 10 points listed by the Land O' Lakes News:

P. W. A.—Federal Works Agency.
N. R. A.—National Recovery Act.
N. I. R. A.—National Industrial Recovery Administration.
U. S. M. C.—United States Maritime Commission.
H. O. L. C.—Home Owners' Loan Corporation.
A. A. A.—Agricultural Adjustment Agency.
C. C. C.—Civilian Conservation Corps.
N. Y. A.—National Youth Administration.
S. S. B.—Social Security Board.
B. W. C.—Board of War Communications.
F. D. I. C.—Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
F. S. A.—Federal Securities Administration.
N. A. C.—National Archives Council.
T. N. A.—The National Archives.
N. L. R. B.—National Labor Relations Board.
N. H. P. C.—National Historical Publications Commission.
N. M. B.—National Mediation Board.
U. S. H. A.—United States Housing Authority.
U. S. E. S.—United States Employment Service.
F. I. C.—Federal Insurance Corporation.
C. W. A.—Civil Works Administration.
R. A.—Resettlement Administration.
F. P. H. A.—Federal Public Housing Authority.
F. H. A.—Federal Housing Administration.
C. C. C.—Commodity Credit Corporation.
F. C. I. C.—Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.
F. S. A.—Farm Security Administration.
S. C. S.—Soil Conservation Service.
A. M. A.—Agricultural Marketing Administration.
F. R. E. B.—Federal Real Estate Board.
C. E. S.—Committee on Economic Security.
W. P. A.—Works Progress Administration.
F. C. C.—Federal Communications Commission.
O. B. C. C. C.—Office of Bituminous Coal Consumers Council.
R. R. B.—Railroad Retirement Board.
S. E. C.—Securities and Exchange Commission.
T. V. A.—Tennessee Valley Authority.
B. I. R.-T.—Board of Investigation and Research-Transportation.
C. A. A.—Civil Aeronautics Authority.
N. I. C.—National Investors Council.
D. P. C.—Defense Plant Corporation.
R. R. C.—Rubber Reserve Company.
M. R. C.—Metals Reserve Company.
D. S. C.—Defense Supplies Corporation.
W. D. C.—War Damage Corporation.
D. L. C.—Disaster Loan Corporation.
F. N. M. A.—Federal National Mortgage Association.
R. A. C. C.—Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.
C. F. B.—Combined Food Board.
A. O. A.—Administration of Operation Activities.
E. I. B. W.—Export-Import Bank of Washington.
E. H. F. A.—Electric Home and Farm Authority.
C. P. A.—Council of Personnel Administration.
P. R. A.—Public Roads Administration.
E. P. C. A.—Emergency Price Control Act.
F. P. A.—Food Production Administration.
O. E. S.—Office of Economic Stabilization.
P. A. W.—Petroleum Administration for War.
S. W. P. C.—Smaller War Plants Corporation.
P. I. W. C.—Petroleum Industry War Council.
N. R. P. B.—National Resources Planning Board.
L. O. P. M.—Liaison Office for Personnel Management.
O. E. M.—Office of Emergency Management.
S. S. S.—Selective Service System.
N. W. L. B.—National War Labor Board.
O. C. D.—Office of Civilian Defense.
O. C. I. A. A.—Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs.
O. D. H. W. S.—Office of Defense and Health Welfare Services.
O. D. T.—Office of Defense Transportation.
O. L.-L. A.—Office of Lend-Lease Administration.
O. S. R. D.—Office of Scientific Research and Development.
O. W. I.—Office of War Information.
W. M. C.—War Manpower Commission.
W. P. B.—War Production Board.
W. R. A.—War Relocation Authority.
W. S. A.—War Shipping Administration.
O. P. A.—Office of Price Administration.
B. E. W.—Board of Economic Warfare.
N. H. A.—National Housing Agency.
F. C. A.—Farm Credit Administration.
R. E. A.—Rural Electrification Administration.
S. A.—Sugar Agency.
P. C. D.—Petroleum Conservation Division.
O. P. C. W.—Office of Petroleum Coordinator for War.
W. E. P. L.—War Emergency Pipe Lines, Inc.
B. C. D.—Bituminous Coal Division.
P. R. R. A.—Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration.
B. P. A.—Bonneville Power Administration.
N. P. P. C.—National Power Policy Committee.
O. C.—Office of Censorship.
F. R. C.—Facilities Review Committee.
P. W. R. C. B.—President's War Relief Control Board.

[From the Land O' Lakes News]

TEN POINTS—THEY COST SO LITTLE—THEY ARE WORTH SO MUCH

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.
3. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.
4. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.
5. You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.
6. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.
7. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.
8. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.
9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence.
10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

Report of National Resources Planning Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 19 (legislative day of Friday, April 16), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and illuminating article entitled "From the Cradle to the Grave," written by George Creel and published in Collier's magazine for April 10 last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

"FROM THE CRADLE TO THE GRAVE"

(By George Creel)

The somewhat grandiose report of the National Resources Planning Board, whether purposely or unthinkingly, conveyed the distinct impression that it was blazing trails through a virgin forest of economic hazards. Certainly Congress, suddenly buried under 450,000 high-sounding words, accepted the document as original thought, and loosed an irritated protest against having America's war effort messed up by the proposal of new and untried ideas.

On the contrary, an American social-security plan has been in operation for more than 5 years, and some 600,000 retired wage earners, wives, widows, and dependent children have already received $230,000,000 in monthly benefits. Not a perfect system as yet, to be sure, but a going system long before England's Beveridge broke into print, or the National Resources Planning Board began its deliberations.

Moreover, constant study has been given to ways and means of remedying gaps and inequalities, and as a result a simple, sane program has been perfected that will provide a single, comprehensive social-insurance plan for the whole population. It will give every American some measure of protection against economic hazards from the cradle to the grave. It will be presented to Congress as nothing new, merely larger building on time-tested foundations, not an interference with the war effort, but coordinative and cooperative.

Here is how the plan works now, after 5 years of operation:

Say that I am holding down a job in an industrial plant. If I choose to quit work at 65, I can rely on a fixed monthly payment for the rest of my life. My wife is also counted in. On reaching 65, she will be paid a sum equal to half of my monthly benefit. Not a fortune, to be sure, but enough to keep us off charity while preserving our pride and self respect.

INSURANCE, NOT ALMS

Figuring out what I'll be entitled to is no more complicated than simple arithmetic. Assume that my monthly earnings have averaged $100 since 1937, the year that the old-age and survivors' insurance law went into effect. The benefit payment is 40 percent of the first $50 (or $20) plus 10 percent of the remaining $50 (or $5), and to this $25, I add 1 percent for each of my 5 years of coverage, making a total of $26.25. Adding the $13.13 my wife will get gives $39.38 as the amount we will receive each month as long as we live. It is also my right to earn up to $15 a month more from odd jobs, without becoming ineligible for these benefits.

On the other hand, if I die before retirement age, leaving my widow with two children, she will get three-fourths of my $26.25, along with half of that amount for each child until they are 18. Not bad at all. Her $19.69, plus $26.25 for the two youngsters, provides a monthly total of $45.94 with which to keep the wolf from the door. Insurance money, not alms.

A pretty good bargain for the Creels. All I am paying for my protection is $12 a year, my employer putting up an equal amount. If my wife and I live to be 75, we will have received $4,725.60 in benefits. In case my wife becomes a widow, with two children under 18, the return is even larger. Say my children are 8 and 10 when I die. By the time the younger is 18, payments to the three will have reached the sum of $5,198.88. If I have been

paying ever since 1937, when the plan was started, the cost to me will have been $60.

The system insures me against unemployment as well as old age. If I lose my job, I will be entitled to $12.50 a week, half of my average weekly wage, for a maximum of 20 weeks—a tidy sum when no pay checks are coming in. For this $250 I will not have paid a cent; unemployment insurance benefits are provided by a tax of 3 cents on the dollar levied on employers, except in four States.

I am lucky, of course, in belonging to a favored class, for not every American can get social insurance. Back in 1937 Congress viewed the plan as radical and risky, even though a similar system had been operating successfully in Germany since 1889. The lawmakers cautiously provided insurance only for industrial workers, excluding farm labor, domestic servants, employees of Federal, State, and local governments and self-employers.

Even with my special privileges, however, I have a number of complaints. While safeguarded against unemployment and a forlorn old age, I am not protected against illness or disability. If I purchase such protection elsewhere, my social-security benefits will be reduced by exactly the amount of the benefits I get under such outside contracts.

The fact that the administration of unemployment insurance is in the hands of the States also puts me up against it. Each has its own rules and regulations, and if I move from one State to another, and then lose my job, the chances are that I'll get no benefits at all, due to failure to qualify. Worse still, no two States see alike on the amount or duration of benefits when a man is out of a job. Quite a few make you wait for 2 or 3 weeks. Some pay benefits only for 8 weeks, and others for as high as 18 or 20 weeks; some pay as little as $5 a week, some as much as $20.

These inequalities, however, are trifling compared to those found in our Public Assistance program, meaning the care of the needy aged, the needy blind, and dependent children. Each State decides for itself what it can give in the way of relief, and the Federal Government matches dollar for dollar up to $40 a month for the old and blind, and up to $18 a month for the first child and $12 for each additional child in the same family.

Fair on its face, but not so good in practice. Say that I was over 65 in 1937, therefore barred by age from insurance under the law, and that I am penniless and without means of support. My State decides to give me $20 a month, and the Federal Government puts up an equal amount, a total of $40 for my keep. If my State, however, can only afford a grant of $5 a month, then only that sum is matched, and I'll have to scrabble along on $10 a month. What a State can give, of course, is determined by its financial condition, and high-income States are in a position to be more generous than low-income States, although needs may be the same.

Payments for old-age assistance range from $9 in Mississippi to $41 in Colorado, and for the needy blind from $10 in Alabama to $47 in opulent California. Aid for dependent children runs from $16 in South Carolina to $64 in more prosperous Massachusetts. In the past year, the Federal Government has paid out $397,000,000 in dollar matching, and exactly 53 percent went to 10 highly industrialized States. California, for instance, received as much for its aged as did 20 other States with 3½ times the number of needy old people.

These are some of the obvious weaknesses of our security planning. Here are the proposed corrections:

To the 46,000,000 now earning benefits and paying premiums, it is proposed to add the millions engaged in farm labor and domestic service, the millions employed by Federal, State and local governments, and the millions of self-employers. Congress will also be urged to extend the present system so as to provide maternity care, cash hospitalization, insurance against disability, and in all likelihood, benefits for medical treatment.

Certain liberalizations will also be proposed, such as a minimum old-age retirement benefit large enough to guarantee maintenance, and a reduction in eligibility age from 65 to 60 for insured women, wives, and widows.

ARGUMENTS FOR CORRECTION

Arthur Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board, supports the proposals by persuasive arguments. Why, he asks, should we insure industrial workers and exclude farm labor, domestic servants, self-employers, and other low-income groups that cannot possibly lay by enough to provide for old age? What is the point in getting excited over dependent children and doing nothing about the maternity care that will enable mothers to bring healthy babies into the world? Why give protection against unemployment and old age, and none at all against invalidism and disability? Why maintain fine-spun distinctions between States as to what constitutes dependency in children?

Congress will be asked to take administration of unemployment insurance from the States and create one standardized Federal system—a 1-week waiting period, for example, with benefits of half of the worker's average weekly earnings, and payment for as long as 26 weeks if necessary. There may also be some recognition of the plight of the unemployed worker's wife and children, for when a man is out of a job his benefits are often too small to support his family.

The proposed changes look to me like simplification and economy: One set of wage records, only one report from an employer, and a single account into which all contributions for social insurance purposes will be paid. Every community with its own office, with everything under one roof, and each State with its own councils to handle appeals.

More liberal definitions of neediness will be stressed, and the need of Federal grants to lower-income States beyond mere dollar-matching. Increase or removal of the maximum limit on Federal contributions for the care of dependent children may be pressed.

While similar to the British system in some respects, the American plan differs widely in others. The Beveridge proposal is based on flat-rate contributions and flat-rate payments. A man earning $3,000 a year and one earning $300 each pays the same and receives the same. In the United States, benefits are related to wages, up to $250 per month.

The Beveridge plan would pay benefits as long as the worker is idle or disabled. The American plan proposes a limit of 26 weeks for unemployment benefits, and disability coverage only when the cause is nonindustrial. State workmen's compensation laws won't be disturbed. Beveridge wants comprehensive medical care, while Altmeyer stops short of hospitalization.

Under the Beveridge plan, one-half of the social-insurance bill would be contributed by employers and employees, and the other half by the national exchequer. In the United States, employers and workers will bear the whole cost for a long period, and the Federal Government should never have to foot more than a third of the bill. The cost of the unified, enlarged, and liberalized system will be about 10 percent of pay rolls, half from employers and half from workers.

At the start, receipts will run far ahead of disbursements. Even at the present rate, the old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund amounts to $3,688,109,914, and would more than double that by 1955. When old-age benefits start pouring out, however, the cost will go up to 15 percent of pay rolls, and the increase will come out of the Federal Treasury. After 30 or 40 years, say around 1975, there will have to be a three-way split—5 percent from employers, 5 from employees and 5 from Government.

Today the bill for old age and survivors' insurance is 2 percent of pay rolls, divided between employer and employee. The rate for unemployment compensation is 3 percent, all contributed by management except in four States. Lumped together, this gives 5 percent of pay rolls as the total cost of the present system, with 4 percent coming from employers and 1 percent from workers. It seems quite a jump from 5 to 10 percent, but the higher figure will doubtless be finally accepted.

On January 1, 1944, they point out, the existing rate for social security and unemployment insurance combined will automatically increase to 7 percent, split between management and employees. The jump will then be from 7 to 10 percent—an increase of only 3 percent, which will be borne entirely by workers.

Taken as a whole, the social-security crowd differs strikingly from other New Deal crews—not a wishful thinker or star-gazer among the lot. Although convinced that the proposed changes are sound and necessary, easy sailing is not expected. Many Senators and Representatives are stoutly opposed to continued emphasis on social gains. In view of the present enormous outlays, even some friends of the plan think it should be held back until the end of the war.

Arthur Altmeyer, the country's leading authority on social insurance, does not think so. With enthusiasm bedrocked in facts and figures, his common sense, reasonableness, and sincerity have made him a most successful pleader before congressional committees.

SAVE NOW FOR THE FUTURE

"The present time," he said to me, "offers a golden opportunity to build up substantial reserves. War pay rolls are pouring money into the pockets of workers, the amount of unemployment is small, and 600,000 men and women, eligible for retirement benefits, are staying on the job. Some 43,000 have actually gone off the rolls to do war work.

"When eight or nine million soldiers return to civil life, and some 20,000,000 war workers change back to peacetime production, postwar adjustments are bound to entail many hardships. Isn't it better to set up a comprehensive social insurance system, able now to meet every need, than to wait until the emergency is on us?

"Here is another strong point," Altmeyer added. "When the national income shrinks at the war's end, the steady and increasing flow of these benefits will go far to sustain the general purchasing power and maintain employment at high levels."

Plausible and persuasive as far as this writer is concerned, but then I'm not a Senator or a Representative. One thing that encourages the Social Security Board is the support of organized labor. Although the increased cost of the proposed changes does not affect the employer, falling entirely on the employee, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations have both come out enthusiastically for the expansion and liberalization of the existing system, holding that the larger protection will more than make up for larger premiums.

The Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to place in the RECORD a letter

personally delivered to me on April 15, 1942, by a representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Also a telegram received from the Oklahoma Farmers' Union:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., April 15, 1943.

To the House Committee on Agriculture:

Agriculture is facing a critical situation, and farmers everywhere are becoming increasingly concerned over the manner in which some phases of Government programs affecting agriculture are being administered. Two separate attempts to pass additional legislation to correct such conditions have resulted in a Presidential veto in one case, and the threat of a veto in the other. The American Farm Bureau Federation has submitted to the Congress a 15-point program (copy attached) which is designed to improve our national farm program and to increase the production of food and fiber to meet the war emergency. We stand ready to support to the limit every proper effort of Congress to attain these objectives. Based on experience to date, however, it now appears that the principal hope of correcting the situation on many important issues is through limitations on the use of appropriations.

Recognizing this situation, the House Appropriations Committee has sought to utilize its authority over appropriations to correct the situation insofar as possible. We believe that careful study of the provisions of the appropriations bill will reveal the fact that most of them are not only highly constructive, but also that they are well within the purposes and objectives of the basic legislation which your committee has formulated. It is our considered judgment that failure to approve these constructive measures will place in jeopardy the entire farm program, primarily because of the rising tide of resentment on the part of farmers against the manner in which some phases of the program are being administered.

In this crisis, we hope and trust that the friends of agriculture will not become divided. To do so would be disastrous. Due to the action taken by your committee in opposing a rule requested by the Appropriations Committee waiving points of order against the provisions of the bill, floor action may result in the impairment or possibly complete elimination of many vitally important provisions of the bill. We therefore earnestly appeal to the committee to reconsider the action which has been taken and support the request for a rue. We make this appeal in spite of the fact that we do not support all of the provisions of the bill.

We feel that it would be most unfortunate for two great committees of Congress to become divided in a controversy which might result disastrously for America. When the friends of agriculture become divided, the farmers always lose. Your great, constructive contributions to the cause of agriculture are a matter of record. We appeal to you now to take a step which seems to us as the only safe way to meet a practical situation which has arisen at a dangerously late hour.

Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation; R. W. Blackburn, secretary, American Farm Bureau Federation; J. F. Porter, president, Tennessee Farm Bureau Federation; Francis Johnson, president, Iowa Farm Bureau Federation; C. Chester DuMound, president, New York State Farm Bureau Federation; Frank White, president, Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation; Hassil E. Schenck, president, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.; C. O. Wolf, president, Kansas Farm Bureau; Walter L. Randolph, president, Alabama Farm Bureau Federation; Ransom Aldrich, president, Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation; Herbert V. Vorrhees, president, New Jersey Farm Bureau; H. H. Nuttle, Maryland Farm Bureau, Inc.; R. W. Brown, president, Missouri Farm Bureau Federation; J. Walter Hammond, president, Texas Farm Bureau Federation; H. L. Wingate, president, Georgia Farm Bureau Federation.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *April 15, 1943.*

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to support an American farm program; not to abolish Farm Security Administration; don't want production loans reduced; we need Federal crop insurance on wheat and cotton. We need parity payments. We need nonrecourse loans on straight war crops, funds for conservation, and crop-benefit payments. We need triple A functioning in all counties 100 percent. We need incentive payments on straight war crops. This Appropriations Committee report to the House is an astounding blow to our war farm program and national unity in these times of grave national emergency. Why start economizing with farmer and food for freedom farm program? The people don't want Congress playing politics with American farmer and hindering his opportunity to produce in abundance. We need all encouragement Congress can give. Give same liberal support to agriculture which Congress has extended to other war industries. Why single out only farmer appropriations and at same time hand lavish billions to other war industries? We are entitled to same liberal support that has been extended to others in our national economy. We urge you to support a just appropriations program for agriculture.

OKLAHOMA FARMERS UNION,
TOM W. CHEEK, *President.*

Congressman Fathead Explains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Herb Graffis from the Chicago Times of April 18, 1943:

CONGRESSMAN FATHEAD EXPLAINS

(By Herb Graffis)

We champions of strictly free enterprise have thought up a wonderful way of saving the taxpayers' money and kicking those terrible, "red"-loving, starry-eyed new dealers in their fat budgets. The beautiful idea also will be a slug at "That Man" who refuses to solve all the world's problems by saying he won't run again.

The idea is terrific and we champions of free enterprise—but of nothing else free, except for us—can put it across.

The idea is to lop the Department of Agriculture budget so the nickel per day subsidy for school children's lunches will be cut off, and the penny milk will be discontinued.

What do you mean, kids shouldn't go hungry just because a band of well-fed pols have thought of a way of making the new dealers wince? Let those kids get out and hustle their own grub. It will make them strong, rugged Americans. Yeah, a lot of those kids who were supported in loafing and luxury at Civilian Conservation Corps camps did grow up to die to save their country, but it was a gamble and we don't want gambles.

Feeding those hungry children is the job of private enterprise. Think of how well the sisters of the Guardian Angel Orphan Nursery back of the yards handled that job before we made them and the babies they cared for soft with Government subsidy! The sisters used to get up before daylight and go down to the South Water Market to collect what the produce merchants and farmers threw away as unsalable. Out of that the sisters would reclaim enough to feed a flock of kids.

Understand, it isn't the money involved; it's the principle of the thing. There are 5,301,544 kids in 73,001 schools in the whole country getting a free hot mea. a day on the nickel-per-kid-per-day subsidy, and 1,360,389 children in 8,500 schools getting a half pint of milk a day on the penny milk deal.

But that sort of stuff has gotta stop. It's getting out of hand for Congressmen. The kids' free-lunch programs for the unattended children of working fathers and others back of the yards is sponsored at seven busy places by the Back of the Yards Neighborhood Council. This is a case where we must treat the public's money as carefully as if it were our own. Otherwise those kids might be fed enough to grow up to be Democrats.

The Back of the Yards Council and school boards ain't the bunch to get a penny of this kid-feeding fund. They just want all the kids fed, no matter what the religion, color of parents, party affiliations of the kids may be. Those kids and their folks may get the idea that the New Deal had something to do with children getting fed, so we'll knock out the feeding program right now.

There will be a lot of softies, Republican and Democrat, who will hold this against us, but what do we care? They'll forget and we'll teach "That Man" we are the bosses of the country.

Views of the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by John Paschall, editor of the Atlanta Journal:

There was much wisdom and common sense in the well-remembered remark of Vice President Thomas R. Marshall: "What this country needs is a good 5-cent cigar." This homely comment was made, if I recall correctly, during the troublous days after the First World War, when the country lost its sense of proportion, and many men in high places lost their tempers with disastrous results to the Nation and the world. While Vice President Marshall probably enjoyed a good smoke at small cost, I feel sure his good 5-cent cigar statement had a much larger meaning that might well have entitled it to more serious interpretation than it received. What I think the Vice President meant was that this country needed to get back to a simpler way of living and thinking and a more honest sense of values.

What this country really needs just now is a good common-sense political psychiatrist, who will point out that most of the ills we complain of are imaginary. They are the product of an obsession, an anti-New Deal, anti-Roosevelt complex or phobia,

which has thrown many of our best citizens out of balance.

As a consequence of this anti-New Deal, anti-Roosevelt grudge, nursed through the years, some of our best minds seem to be out of focus. They view everything that emanates from the White House with enmity or disdain, just because of its origin. Without his good humor, they have adopted the philosophy of Groucho Marx, the professor in the Marx brothers' college picture Horse Feathers, which gave us all a good laugh along about 1935. In that song Groucho sings:

"A month before my son was born
I started to yell from night 'til morn,
'Whatever it is, I'm against it!'
And even if I commenced it—
I'm against it!
And when you've improved it and condensed it—
I'm still against it."

That is good comedy for the Marx Brothers, but it is a tragic state of mind for intelligent citizens to adopt in relation to politics and government in these critical times.

There is an old saying, not of New Deal origin, I am sure, that only smart people go crazy. Whether that is a scientific fact, or just almanac philosophy, I don't know, but it does appear that many smart businessmen have let the New Deal weigh on their minds, or perhaps on their prejudices, until their thinking about our political economy has become negative rather than constructive.

If the New Deal is as bad as many smart citizens think it is, there should be some w[illegible] of combating it, or correcting it, other than denunciation. Offhand, it is difficult to recall a new political idea originated by the New Deal opposition that has appealed to the good sense and the imagination of the people, who must be depended upon to put ideas to work in a democracy. The Ruml plan perhaps is one, and there may be others, but the fact remains that many citizens have let anger and bitterness consume them when they should have been thinking up answers more convincing than such loose terms as crackpot, Communists, dictators, bureaucrats, and Fascist. These words mean little except that the man who uses them has substituted prejudice for thinking.

You can't defeat a New Deal in politics by standing around pointing the finger of scorn at it. No more than General Motors could take the leadership in small-car sales and popularity by spending its time making fun of a tin lizzie. If business and financial leaders, who dislike Roosevelt and think his political philosophy unsound, tried to compete in free enterprise about which they speak with so much justified pride, if these successful industrialists employed the same technique in competing with new ideas in their own business that some of them have used in fighting the New Deal, free enterprise would have long since been dead and buried in this country.

Business and industry have given America a fresh new deal every year. In so doing, they have satisfied the ever-expanding demand of the Nation for new and better products. Business and industry spend thousands of dollars each year to get new ideas and find better methods. They strive not only to keep up with the procession but to lead it. They look to the laboratories and to research, to chemists and engineers, to men with vision, to tell them how to do things better and more efficiently and more cheaply.

They look for, employ and even endow men with new ideas who can do things that have never been dreamed of before. Business in America has been built on ideas, not on prejudices. Business of today is big and miraculous because of the vision of men who looked ahead and had no time to stand still and nurse their hates and prejudices. Business knows this, and unhesitatingly sets aside millions of dollars each year for scientific study and research.

They do not caution their scientists and engineers to find something to justify their old methods and old models. They ask them to find something new and useful, something that will add to the pleasure and the comfort and the richer living of the world.

But in politics a good many successful businessmen, who have grown rich on the profits from new ideas, seem unable to fight the New Deal and President Roosevelt except by denouncing them and wisecracking about them. It never seems to occur to many Roosevelt and New Deal haters that hate diminishes and makes impotent the hater, with little damage to the object of their hate. For 10 years many of them have raved about the New Deal, without stopping to inquire what the heck keeps it young and thriving.

In one of the Town Hall forums on the subject of criticism in wartime, George V. Denny, Jr., president of the Town Hall, Inc., gave a striking example of the faults of destructive criticism. Said Mr. Denny: "I hold in my hand a ball, half of which is painted black. The other half is white. The black half faces the audience. I can see only the white half. If I were to ask the audience the color of this ball, every member of it would naturally report to me that it was black, and they would be right from their point of view. Yet from my point of view the ball is white, and we could have a terrific argument over this question, if we did not have the wit, or imagination, or courage to turn the ball around and see that it is both black and white. How easily we could resolve so many of the conflicts of today if we would do this simple thing."

Mr. Denny has given us a sure guide toward constructive criticism. Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal have many faults and have made many mistakes, no doubt, but the picture is not all black, any more than it is all white. We can begin turning the ball around by admitting that any administration that has survived three national elections must have some good and lasting qualities.

Although it was freely predicted by the New Deal's predecessor that grass would grow in the streets of our cities, nothing like that has happened. A good many victory gardens may be found in our cities, but, for the most part, the grass is on the lawns of comfortable home owners and in the parks which have been multiplied and beautified by New Deal measures.

Let us take a look at our national income. In 1929, the peak year of business prosperity under a strictly business administration, the national income had reached the booming sum of $82,691,000,000. In 1930 the figure dropped to $69,104,000,000 In 1931 it was $54 249,000,000, and in 1932 it reached a low of $40,089,000,000. In 1933, the year Mr. Roosevelt went into office, the national income climbed to $42,504,000,000. In 1934 it reached $50,611,000,000. In 1935 it was $55,794,000,000; in 1936, $65,226 00,000; in 1937, $71,853,000,000; in 1938, $63,903,000,000; in 1939, $70,771,000,000; in 1940, $77,185,000,000; in 1941, $94,700,000,000; and in 1942, $119,800,000,000. Eliminating the war year and the pre-war year, it can hardly be said that the economy of this country has gone to the dogs under the New Deal.

All of us must realize that if private enterprise had been destroyed by the New Deal, industry's miraculous contribution to war production would have been impossible.

Still looking on the white side of the New Deal ball, we find that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, 2 years and a half before Pearl Harbor, the total income taxes collected in the United States was $2,178,430,970. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, the total income tax collected was $2,121,073,129; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, it was $3,462,028,369, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, it was $8,002,481,776. This year, of course, it will be from two to two and one-half times this amount.

Comparing 1939's income tax total of $2,178,430,970 with the figure for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, $746,791,404, we find that private enterprise was doing fairly well during all the peace years of the New Deal, and a good deal better than it was doing when Mr. Roosevelt took over.

Coming a little closer home, how are we doing in Georgia? Marion Allen, United States collector of internal revenue, reports that from January to December in 1940, 85,000 income-tax returns were filed in this State, and a total of $15,815,744.02 collected. These were taxes on incomes earned in 1939, 2 years before Pearl Harbor. From January 1 to December 31, 1941, 148,635 returns were filed, and the sum of $34,874,816.97 collected. For 1942, 277,642 returns were filed, and a total of $91,544,474.57 has already been collected. The total tax returns filed in Georgia this year, I am informed, will reach 500,000, and the total collections will hardly be less than $250,000,000.

The New Deal ball looks white and bright when you turn it around into the sunlight of fair criticism. The country is not broke, and democracy is not dead. And neither is free enterprise. Let's leave the grouching to the good-humored Marx brothers, save our digestions, and thank God for the blessings of America. If you don't like the New Deal, give us a better one, but for goodness' sake, let it be a new model, becoming to the greatest free enterprise system in the world.

Army Day With United States in Global War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, with warm personal friendship for the author and with pride in his untiring work for a better world, I call attention to a special Army Day feature article, written for the Monticello (Fla.) News by Ed G. Clayton, World War veterans' bard:

ARMY DAY WITH UNITED STATES IN GLOBAL WAR

(By Ed. G. Clayton)

Army Day, that day of thanks to God for the safety and services of our Armies, in peace and war, passed quietly by Tuesday, April 6, without the customary parades and speeches of other days The War Department suggested that all parades of war veterans organizations and the armed services be withheld, for reasons obvious to all of our citizenry. We are at war and the parade of the armed forces at home, the armed forces on battle fronts of the far Pacific and North Africa are related to us daily over radio, and the screaming headlines of our newspapers, making Army Day of 1943 a day of sacrifice, blood, sweat, and tears.

JEFFERSON COUNTY'S CONTRIBUTION

In historic Jefferson County, Fla., with its county seat, Monticello, straddling the famed Spanish Trail where Ponce de Leon once rode at the head of his Spanish steel-helmeted troopers searching for the fountain of youth; brushing aside the hostile opposition of the Seminole Indian tribes who tried with

their arrows and stone hatchets to bar his path; Jefferson County has sent some 600 of her sons into the United States armed services, the larger percentage to the Army. In the Tunisian war of mobility, some of her sons are in action; on the Atlantic partol guarding the lifeline of supplies to England, Africa, and Russia, her sons stand to their guns; reaching out some thousands of miles into the far limits of the blue Pacific with the task squadrons of naval forces they carry on fearlessly the wartime duty assigned them; on the Australian front, Buna, Guadalcanal, the network of strategic island bases which infest the Pacific battle zone, they are there, thin-lipped, unsmiling, but carrying on.

They know nothing of shortage of gasoline, care nothing; they know not of meat rations, coffee limitations, shoes and sugar, rubber and rum; they have a nasty job to do, "kill your enemy before he kills you," and they are doing it thoroughly without qualms, without pity, and without remorse, for their eyes have seen the handiwork on battlefield and ocean of Nazi and Japanese new orders. They want none of it; will have none of it, and they offer their battle-trained physiques to the enemy's fire, and if need be they die with the shadow of a pain-racked smile in their tired eyes, a bloody foam on their lips, and if our ears could be attuned to their last gasp, it would be, "God, take care of mother and dad. Guard our America."

THE SONS AND SONS' SONS OF THE AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES (1917–18)

Twenty-six years ago, April 6, Army Day, President Woodrow Wilson affixed his signature to the Senate resolution declaring a state of war with Imperial Germany, and America undertook to achieve victory for her sore-pressed allies, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Russian White Armies fighting the revolution. The record of that First World War is an open book to our people and the world. It was the battle of Imperial Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, Bulgaria, against the free democracies; the battle of terrible armed strength bent on conquest of the world; the forced and infamous abrogation of treaties (scraps of paper) by the Prussian Junkers, and it failed of fruition because resurgent democracy in its bitter travail enlisted the tremendous manufacturing resources of the United States, and its quickly trained and equipped armies to administer the coup de grâce to the hordes of Wilhelm, King of Prussia, Emperor of Germany.

THE DIE IS CAST

Army Day, April 6, 1917, was the first visible evidence of the rainbow of hope shining like the Star of the East over the black skies of Europe, which reflected nothing but the sheen in mirage of blood, desolation, death; heard nothing but the moans of dying combatants and starving peoples trampled under the heels of the juggernaut of war. For 3 weary years Britain and France struggled to hold the Hun. They failed, so it was to that great democracy of the west; to that inspired leader of America, Woodrow Wilson, that the prayers of a suffering Belgium and a tortured France were impinged on the wailing winds. Two and a quarter million American soldiers, fresh, untiring, imbued with the fire of youth and adventure smashed into the redoubtable Hindenburg line, blasted with 1,000,000 combat troops and 15,000 cannon the unconquered Bois Argonne (Argonne Woods), turned the German flank—and "kamerad" was the resultant equation: the armistice of November 11, 1918.

America, after the war was won, repudiated her President, kicked the League of Nations overboard; so today, after the passing of many Army Days, America must pay and pay high for the isolationists' triumph of 1919, and the blood of our sons must again enrich the soil of foreign lands, dye the lower ocean depths of earth's great waterways to the dirge of sorrow and tears plucked from the heartstrings of the mothers of America, before the elusive eagle of victory perches on the standard of our flag, the Stars and Stripes. True, history repeats:

America's willful stubbornness after leaving great cemeteries of her soldier-dead in France, to cooperate in the League of Nations is undeniably a factor in the rise of Hitler and nazi-ism, so she again enters the crucible of fire called mechanized war, and the prayers of her people, north, south, east, and west, again seek the support of that sustaining arm—the invincible majesty of God.

THE HOME SALUTE

From the hills and the plains, the valleys and mountains, America stands erect, bloody but unbowed; faces with calm eyes the disasters of a year of war, confident that final victory will emerge from the chaos of unpreparedness; that the might of the home front in support of our battle men on the seven seas and the fighting continents will wrest victory from the itching hands of infamy as portrayed by der Fuehrer and Hirohito.

From her great factories pour bombers and fighter planes by the tens of thousands; from the arsenal of democracy sweep monster tanks and heavy artillery self-propelled and equipped with murderous concentration of fire power; from her cities, her farms, and her towns pour millions of her youth to the splendidly located army training camps and naval stations—the picked echelons of democracy, the men who will win the war. From her shipyards dotting thousands of miles of coastline on the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, slip down the ways to the waiting sea, merchant ships, submarines, destroyers, cruisers, battleships, corvettes, and mother ships, gunboats for coast patrol, fast torpedo boats, until the quiet of the night is blasted with the clank of metal monsters, sleek, efficient, and manned with fighting trained crews to seek the enemy wherever they may find him, and sink him, America's noises of the night.

Yes, those noises of the night penetrate through the vast wastes of the Pacific; they are heard by Tojo in Tokyo, and by the Son of Heaven in his palace; they traverse the wild spaces of the Atlantic to sting the listening ears of Herr Goebbels, arch cynic of the Nazi dynasty; they annoy and bewilder the obese Goering and the bemedalled generals of the German general staff; they rupture the eardrums of der Fuehrer, for he, more than any of his armies of blackmailers, murderers, and thieves, senses the inevitable doom the noises of the night across the waters invite.

But, to America, they are as the tinkling tones of cathedral gongs dragged over cobblestones; they are the clanging hammers of democracy at bay, fighting back, fighting to avenge her ruptured honor; hitting with the massed strength of 130,000,000 virile bodies at the forces of darkness, horror, and bestial cruelty—the Axis Powers—on and on until the angels smile again in heaven, and peace resurges the world, with liberty, amity, and brotherhood of man.

Proposed International Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the two leading nations of the world, England and the United States, are about to undertake to devise and establish an international monetary system in an effort to provide a better medium for international exchange.

In considering the proposed currency program in light of the monetary experience of the several nations down through the ages, it is doubtful if any monetary plan that embraces the several nations can be made to work successfully that restricts the use of either of the money metals, gold and silver.

What this plan may lead to is presented in an article by Mr. Sidney Norman, prominent businessman and publicist of the United States and Canada, which is inserted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues:

DUAL CURRENCY PROPOSAL IN TENTATIVE REFORM PLANS POINTS TO WORLD-WIDE USE OF SILVER

(By Sidney Norman)

Publication of the broad provisions of the Keynes and Morgenthau plans for monetary reform has caused no surprise. It has merely confirmed the general conviction that the first post-war step by Great Britain and United States would be an effort to restore gold to its position as final measure of value in international trade.

There seems to be no inclination to restore the gold standard as we have hitherto known it. Since, between them, the United States and British Commonwealth hold 80 percent of the gold above ground and about as much more of the known metal yet unmined, the recently announced plans will doubtless prevail when the time comes for action, at least in a general way. There appears to be little reason to look for any great difficulty in reconciling the differences.

There are, however, some important differences between the two proposals as they stand. The Keynes plan proposes establishment of an international bank; the Morgenthau plan, a stabilization fund for world-wide control. Then, too, there is the clause in the latter plan which arrogates to United States the power of veto. It may be assumed that such a suggestion will not be unanimously endorsed unless greater necessity for its adoption than is now apparent has been demonstrated.

ENCOURAGEMENT FOR SILVER

Silver is not specifically mentioned in either draft but producers and friends of the white metal find encouragement in that part of the American draft proposing that each country operate on a dual currency basis, one for world trade and the other for domestic purposes. Certainly, in any currency acceptable the world over, silver is the only "dual" metal carrying its own ancient, ingrained sense of real value.

Many of us believe that no plan can be successful in a world sense that does not recognize the fact that there are a billion human beings in Asia who have always insisted, and will henceforth continue to insist even more strongly, upon metallic currency as the only one of real value, and that currency silver. That is the only generally recognized basis of value, and it applies both to China, now an important unit of the United Nations, and with equal force to India, where, since 1926, the Treasury has been selling silver and replacing it with paper rupees, which have never been popular and never will be. We have not forgotten that revolution in India was narrowly averted in that country early in 1918, when Great Britain was forced to borrow 200,000,000 ounces of silver from the United States to redeem paper rupees under suspicion in the popular mind.

Unless some sensible, concerted effort be made to place silver upon a definite basis of value, as compared with gold, efforts to

rehabilitate the Far East, and implement our fervid protestations of desire to create a brave new world, will fall flat. As is asked in a recently published brochure, Money in the Post-War World, by Rene Leon: "Will we attempt to enforce western standards upon the East and thus, having denounced colonialism, will then practice monetary imperialism?"

BIMETALLISM SOUND

The same authority, in supporting the policy of bimetallism, says:

"This monetary policy is sound today, not only for us (United States), but for the British Commonwealth of Nations. If similar legislation were now enacted in London, success of the policy would become certain. This, in turn, might save India's membership within the Commonwealth. No one is in better position to appreciate this than Prime Minister Churchill himself."

Summed up, friends of silver, those who believe its world-wide restoration to monetary place alongside gold is necessary to full flow of world trade upon a stabilized basis, may take heart from events, now shaping as a result of this devastating war and the necessity of recognizing all nations as partners in one great enterprise—the restoration of and preservation of peace.

The teeming East is unquestionably coming into its own. It cannot longer be ignored, exploited, nor forgotten. Its march toward economic equality with the West, and our own prosperity in peace, demand action. Both will be accelerated or impeded by the degree with which we study its peculiar problems and give to or withhold from it a safe, universally recognized monetary basis for trade with all the world.

Agricultural Appropriation Bill

REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are certain very important facts which must be considered in this appropriation bill for agriculture before any Member of Congress passes judgment on the bill.

We must not lose sight of the fact that our country is in a war to the finish and to win that war decisively we must have food and lots of it, but neither must we lose sight of the fact that our United States Treasury's balance sheet is looking mighty bad right now, and will look a lot worse before this war is won. So, it is the responsibility of every Member of the House to assist our farmers in getting the largest production possible for the least dollar outlay, which ultimately comes from their own pocketbook, the United States Treasury. Let us bear in mind that the farmers have their problems and plenty of them, also that they are all taxpayers and they do not want us to spend money which is not necessary.

Being a member of the Appropriations Committee and, as such, I have insisted that all nonwar and needless expenditures be cut to the bone, and although I represent a farm district I want to be consistent, so have favored the sizable cuts made in this Agricultural appropriation bill, which to my way of thinking is still sufficient to insure the greatest possible production of food and fiber, and is fair to our farmers who are every bit as concerned about the welfare of our country as are any of us here in this House of Representatives.

At first glance one might say this appropriation has not been cut, but bear in mind an item of $193,623,000 is carried in this bill to pay the obligations made for full parity payments for the crop year of 1942 to fulfill a promise that must be kept. However, nothing is provided in this bill to make parity payments for the 1943 crop year, as it is reasonable to expect all crops will sell for parity at the market place in the very near future. The Appropriations Committee made a further cut below last year's appropriation for conservation and use of land resources of $144,470,072 and $200,000,000 below the Budget estimate.

Regarding the transfer of authority from the Farm Security Administration to the Farm Credit Administration, to me this transfer is necessary and justified in the light of the evidence that was presented to the Appropriations Committee. Conclusive proof was given that there exists much overlapping authority between these two lending agencies; also that the Farm Credit Administration had discharged their duties in a more commendable and businesslike manner than had the Farm Security Administration. Further that the F. C. A. could adequately handle the duties of the F. S. A. and without undue hardship on any borrower, or prospective borrower who cannot borrow from private banks, or other private lending institutions, where they must apply before they are eligible for a Government loan, as provided in this bill, and rightly so.

It hardly makes sense, Mr. Speaker, when one representative of the Government, a bank examiner, refuses to permit a bank to loan money to a farmer, then the next day another representative of the same Government, an F. S. A. agent, makes the loan; but that very thing has been going on for quite some time, we are informed.

Grain loans to the farmers by the Commodity Credit Corporation is to be continued as in the past under the provisions of this bill, which includes $4,500,000 for administrative expenses. The Appropriations Committee has reinserted the unqualified prohibition of the sale of such stocks at less than parity price. The committee felt this provision justified and necessary to keep a solid bottom under the price of these commodities to insure and promote full production without resorting to further subsidies from our already overburdened United States Treasury.

REGARDING SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Mr. Meril Travis of Taylor County, Iowa, in my district, wrote me a few days ago appealing for more technical assistance to help the farmers of his soil-conservation district. He explained that the district supervisors, of which he is chairman, had requests from 172 farmers who wanted to increase their production of food this year by using soil-conservation practices, but that he was informed the Soil Conservation Service did not have any additional men to send. My inquiry of the Soil Conservation Service here in Washington as the result of Mr. Travis' appeal bears out the fact that a lack of sufficient funds prevents the Soil Conservation Service from hiring enough men to help all the farmers who are anxious to produce the food our Government needs to win this war. Furthermore, I learned that there are a number of soil-conservation districts that have been established by farmers throughout the country that have asked the Soil Conservation Service for technical help but they have not gotten it. Why? Because the Soil Conservation Service has not been given enough funds to meet the requests from farmers.

Now, our soldiers are not going to defeat Hitler and Hirohito on empty stomachs.

I have in my possession a map of the United States that shows the States in gray—42 of them—that have passed an enabling act for the formation of soil-conservation districts, local governmental agencies created for the purpose of soil and water conservation. The blackened areas on the map show the location of the districts that the farmers and ranchers have voted in and where work on the land is in progress. I am pleased to say my district is about 80 percent organized already. Note that all but one of the important agricultural States have passed soil-conservation district enabling legislation, and I understand that State is considering its passage this spring. There were in the United States as of February 15, 841 soil-conservation districts established which included 490,000,000 acres on which lived two and one-third million farmers and ranchers.

Our farmers are most anxious to get this assistance because they have learned that they can increase their production at least 20 percent by using soil-conservation methods without increasing their acreage. In other words, they can make four farms produce what five ordinarily would, using soil-conservation practices and measures. Furthermore, using conservation practices does not involve additional labor or machinery. It means utilizing Nature's way of growing things such as planting on the contour, storing water in the soil to aid crops over a drought, and many other simple measures. That is what Mr. Travis and so many other soil-conservation district supervisors want. Technical assistance to learn how to do these things that increase yields and save the soil. I firmly believe that we should encourage the Soil Conservation Service to lend all assistance possible to the farmers in these soil-conservation districts by appropriating a sufficient sum for this purpose. I am heartily in favor of economizing on everything except that required to win the war. The Soil Conservation Service is assisting farmers in a most effective way in their effort to grow the food necessary to win this war. To be perfectly honest, I had hoped this part of the bill could have been spared the ax, but I shall go along.

I am informed that the Soil Conservation Service completed a reorganization just a year ago that resulted in a material reduction in personnel in their Washington and regional offices. They reduced the number of their regional offices from 10 to 7 and thereby saved more than a million dollars in overhead. This reduction in personnel in their administrative offices placed more technical men down on the land to directly assist farmers and ranchers in planning and applying soil-conservation practices. The soil-conservation district movement is growing, and I believe it is because the farmers recognize it is a movement in the direction of increasing production during the war as well as maintaining their land resources for continued production after the war, and because it is managed by the farmers themselves.

Most of our farmers realize what happened to them after the last World War and they are not going to get into the same position as they were then. They are looking out for their land because they know that is one thing that helped make this country, and I want to help them. We must protect our land from destruction by soil erosion and other hazards.

All of you recall that after the last war the great catastrophe on the land, the best example of which was the Dust Bowl. We do not want any more Dust Bowls but I am saying that we will have them if we continue to push farmers to produce food beyond the land's capacity. We have already destroyed 100,000,000 acres of land that once grew crops in this country and have seriously damaged an additional 200,000,000 acres.

The amount made available to the Soil Conservation Service to assist farmers to increase production and maintain their soil resources is just a meager sum in comparison to that which we are expending for the total war effort; it will not be economy to keep this assistance from farmers, but rather a contribution to the war effort.

Last year we appropriated $20,130,000 to carry on this very worth-while and necesary soil-conservation service. This bill carries an appropriation of $17,130,000, which I hope will be sufficient to give farmers the assistance necessary to insure full production. I am sure it will be spent wisely.

Let's Not Desecrate the Memory of Thomas Jefferson

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if Thomas Jefferson could press back the veil that hides us from that mysterious realm where he has for more than a hundred years occupied his chamber in the silent halls of death, and realize what is going on here, he must have suffered many disappointments during the celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of his birth.

The confusing fulminations of Justice Felix Frankfurter, delivered inside the Library of Congress, which Jefferson's genius helped to create, were enough to add another pang to his death.

But the concerted effort on the part of a large number of left-wing radicals to distort Jefferson's views, and drag him down to the level of Karl Marx, must be painful beyond endurance.

If his glorious spirit could look inside the newly dedicated Jefferson Memorial, and dictate the inscriptions, they would undoubtedly include that part of his first inaugural address in which he laid down those fundamental principles upon which our Government must forever stand if our free institutions are to endure.

It is, without exception, the greatest statement on the government of humanity that ever fell from the lips of man; and by all means it should have been inscribed in full on any memorial dedicated to the life, character, and service of Thomas Jefferson.

It reads as follows:

About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our Government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations.

Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship, with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of the revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority—the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till Regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over the military authority; economy in the public expense; that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected—these principles form the bright constellation which has gone before us, and guided our steps through an age of revolution and reformation.

The wisdom of our sages and the blood of our heroes have been devoted to their attainment. They should be the creed of our political faith—the text of civil instruction—the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm, let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

New England Motorists Urge Repeal of Federal Use Tax on Automobiles

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the Federal use tax of $5 on motor vehicles is bitterly resented by the motorists of the Nation who are insistent that such an unsound and discriminatory levy be abolished by repeal of the legislation authorizing such a tax.

Since the introduction of H. R. 2010 on February 26, 1943, I have received letters favoring the repeal of the Federal use tax from practically every State in the Union.

The following letter from the Boston Automobile Club under date of April 7, 1943, discloses that a resolution was passed by that organization urging Congress to repeal the use tax on automobiles. The clubs in attendance at the meeting included automobile clubs from Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Maine, and Connecticut. These clubs are affiliated with the American Automobile Association.

The letter from the Boston Automobile Club is as follows:

BOSTON AUTOMOBILE CLUB,
Boston, Mass., April 7, 1943.

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
Old House Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE VAN ZANDT: Answering your very kind letter of March 30, I am very pleased to advise that at a meeting of the New England Conference of American Automobile Association Clubs, held at the Hotel Statler in Boston on April 5, a resolution was passed urging the repeal by Congress of the special use tax on automobiles, contending that the tax was unwise and discriminatory, particularly at a time when it is levied on automobiles, the use of which is extremely limited by virtue of the fuel shortage.

The clubs in attendance at this meeting were as follows: Automobile Club of Hartford; New Hampshire division, American Automobile Association; Automobile Club of Springfield; Bancroft Automobile Club; Haverhill Automobile Club; Maine Automobile Association; Automobile Club of Berkshire County; Lawrence Automobile Club; Automobile Club of Rhode Island; Tri-County Automobile Club; Connecticut Motor Club; Litchfield County Auto Club; New Bedford Automobile Club; Boston Automobile Club.

Very truly yours,

E. S. HARDING,
Business Manager.

Personal Privilege

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein three letters—a letter from the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown to Congressman JED JOHNSON with a notation on the margin thereof by Mrs. Wilburn Cartwright; a letter I wrote to Hon. Prentiss M. Brown regarding the notation by Mrs. Cartwright, and the last letter is Mr. Brown's reply to me.

Mr. Speaker, these letters are supplemental to my speech on personal privilege on the floor of the House on April 16. The charges made by Mrs. Cartwright, who quoted the Honorable Prentiss Brown as saying that I came to his office half drunk and he refused to see me, are emphatically denied by Mr. Brown, with a full explanation of my activities regarding the 4–H and F. F. A. boys and girls of Oklahoma. I believe with this explanation and these letters that any fair-minded person will agree with the famous scholar who opined "Truth crushed to earth will rise again." Insofar as I am concerned the incident is closed. I have been completely exonerated by the Honorable Prentiss Brown without having to make a personal denial.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1943.

Hon. JED JOHNSON, M. C.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have sent the following telegram to Office of Price Administration district offices:

"Effective March 25, 1943, an amendment to MPR 169 exempts 4–H and F. F. A. Club animals from the custom slaughtering provisions of paragraph 1364.401 of MPR 169, where such animals are certified to be club animals in a sworn certification by the club agent, agricultural county agent or vocational agricultural project leader, and written permission for such exemption is received from the local Office of Price Administration district office.

"Club cattle or calves mean any cattle or calves which have been bred, raised, and fed only, by a member of a 4–H or F. F. A. Club.

"Slaughter of such animals may, if necessary, be charged against civilian quota for the next quota period."

After your conversation with me and in view of the facts you presented, I went into the matter very carefully with the above result.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN.

Our Third District Congressman takes credit for putting this over, and in the Antlers American (his own paper) he is called the Churchill of the Kiamichis.

Fact is, Prentiss Brown said STEWART came to his office half drunk and cussed out his clerks in such a manner that he refused to see him.

Mrs. WILBURN CARTWRIGHT.

APRIL 16, 1943.

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Office of Price Administrator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Attached is a copy of a letter from you to Congressman JED JOHNSON. You will note in the margin that you are quoted by Mrs. Wilburn Cartwright as saying that I came to your office half drunk and you refused to see me.

I would like to have a statement from you as to the truthfulness of the above statement. I called your office this morning and went before Congressman PATMAN'S committee twice. I am anxious to have your statement immediately. Will you please do me the favor of answering me this day?

Very truly yours,

PAUL STEWART.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1943.

The Honorable PAUL STEWART,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEWART: I was before the House Small Business Committee this morning—the Senate Small Business Committee this afternoon. Consequently, your letter of today's date did not reach me until 5:30 this afternoon.

As to the note, apparently signed by Mrs. Wilburn Cartwright, on the copy of my letter of March 25 to Congressman JED JOHNSON, of course I did not make any such statement about you.

I am sure you yourself recognize that I could have made no such statement because you will recall that you did not ask to see me, nor did you come to my own office. Certainly you know I could not refuse to see you when I had not been asked to do so.

Inquiry discloses that, at your request, our congressional information unit arranged a conference for you with the people in charge of the matter. Later, the congressional information unit called your interest to the attention of my executive assistant. Congressmen JOHNSON, DISNEY, WICKERSHAM, and WEST, and I believe others, had contacted me after a meeting of the House Agriculture Committee which I had attended at the Capitol at about the time the matter was under discussion.

When a decision was reached, I wrote letters to those who had contacted me. Mr. Shaw, my executive assistant, who knew of your interest and of your representations to the congressional information unit and others of the Office of Price Administration staff, personally called you on the telephone on the floor of the House of Representatives to advise you of the action taken and to find out who in Oklahoma City should be advised. At your suggestion, Mr. Shaw had a wire sent to State Senator Phil Lowery at Oklahoma City and it is Mr. Shaw's recollection that you stated that you were going to telephone Senator Lowery.

From the above, I am sure it is plain that I not only had no reason to, but could not have, made the statement attributed to me concerning you.

I hope I may have the pleasure of meeting you in the near future. With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator.

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on April 17, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, I know it will be of interest to all of you to hear a few impressions I received during an informal gathering of some 50 Members of Congress at the White House a week ago tonight. It was my privilege to be a guest of the President on this occasion and the evening was a memorable one indeed.

This was the first really serious chat I have had with Mr. Roosevelt. Needless to say, I was bent upon asking him as many questions as possible about the course of the war.

After coming through the east entrance of the White House, I traversed the long corridor bordering on the Presidential gardens and in climbing a flight of spacious stairs, I found myself before the famous Lincoln drawing room. I was greeted in a most cordial manner by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and then was ushered into a small circle of chairs where the President sat discussing the plight of disabled soldiers who had been sent back from the various fighting fronts. Something must be done to rehabilitate them, he insisted, and I agreed with him.

The President mentioned Binghamton and the Triple Cities to me and asked how things were going in our community. He also inquired about Mayor Hopkins and expressed his deep regret over his recent illness. He asked me if the mayor was improved and I told him "yes." The President said he was glad to hear it and for me to give the people of our section his best.

I then said to him, Mr. President, what is your frank opinion from the information you have at hand of the progress we are making in the war? Which front do you feel is showing more promise, North Africa or New Guinea?

The President answered me smilingly and said he felt our progress was relative, that we are coming along according to his plans. He was unable to pass judgment, he said, and make comparisons of the different theaters of war because the situation changed so from day to day.

I had the opportunity of talking at some length with General Marshall, who was at this party. As you know, he is Chief of Staff and is the very personification of soldierly appearance and bearing. He is one of the best looking men in the United States Army.

I told General Marshall that my brother Charles is now in Hawaii with a New York regiment training for jungle fighting. He was interested at once and had high words of praise for all the New York State boys out there.

"There are many stationed there," he said, "and many more have been shipped from there on to Guadelcanal and New Guinea. The boys don't like to leave the Hawaiian Islands because the weather is well nigh perfect there, from 70° to 80° all the time."

"I don't need to tell you," he added, "that they strike a different atmosphere when they are sent from there into the steaming tropical islands down under."

"In more ways than one, General," I answered, and he smiled grimly. "Is it true that there are nearly a half million American boys now in North Africa?"

"That would be telling," he winked, "but you can bet there are more there than you ever dreamed of."

After my chat with General Marshall, I circulated about the beautifully paneled Lincoln Room and shook hands with several of my colleagues in the House, as well as with Senators BURTON, of Ohio, CURLEY BROOKS, of Illinois, BREWSTER, of Maine, and others. I met Admiral Leahy, Ambassador to France, who is doing some important staff work in Washington now.

Then I sat down to lunch with Admiral Ernest King, supreme commander of our Atlantic Fleet. Our principal subject of conversation was the U-boat menace. I asked Admiral King if there really were 700 Nazi

submarines operating in the Atlantic. He said probably not all at the same time, but that there were plenty of them. He said he believed the U-boat situation had taken a turn for the better. "Just how serious a toll do these subs take of a large convoy?" I asked the Admiral.

"Well," he answered, "these submarines have improved their technique. They used to travel in twos and threes, but now they operate in huge wolf packs along the convoy lanes. They have taken a very great toll of our shipping and are responsible for most of our troubles."

"However," he continued, "they can't begin to sink all the ships we have in operation. It is too great a task for all the submarines in the world. A million and a half tons of new shipping is sliding down our docks each month. This will be stepped up as time goes on."

"The superiority of our United States Merchant Marine is responsible for such efficient convoy service. We can well be proud of these great ships and their valiant crews."

"What is being done to eliminate the U-boats?" I asked.

"About the most effective way to get at them," replied Admiral King, "is to invade their home territory and bases. One of the most concentrated areas for our activity is in the Bay of Biscay off France. We have mined the approaches to all sub bases in heavy fashion so that when they return from battles with convoy vessels to obtain repairs, refreshment, or to refuel, they are bound to meet with trouble. Then, too, we are sure to contact large numbers of these submarines due to the necessity of their periodical return to home bases."

The admiral concluded that he is well satisfied with our progress in the war to eliminate U-boats.

"We are bound to have them under control before long," he believes.

Perhaps my most enlightening talk of the whole evening was with General "Hap" Arnold, who as you know is head of our rapidly growing air forces. "Hap" Arnold was recently made a full general along with Generals Marshall and Eisenhower. You will recall that only four other men have been so honored. One of the first full generals was John J. Pershing of World War No. 1.

General Arnold is therefore entitled to wear four stars on each shoulder. He is a husky, well-built man with florid complexion and has tremendous endurance and strength. He needs it for the job the President has given him, namely, to build the most powerful air force the world has ever seen.

General Arnold says that the 5,000 planes per month production which we have now reached is not sufficient to meet the tremendous demand for aircraft America now faces. He claims that most of these are going to train the 86,000 pilots who will make up the motivating factor of an air force of over 2,000,000 men. It is hard to conceive of such gigantic numbers. This is several times more than the entire Axis war effort can ever be able to muster.

General Arnold believes that our superiority in the air has already been reached. The Germans have only 6,000 planes and their reserve has dwindled to about 300 planes. Added to that, they must divide their total by three because they are now on the defensive at three fronts—the Russian, the Tunisian, and the home defense against terrific aerial bombardment which all Europe is receiving nightly from the Royal Air Force and American Flying Forts.

American replacements, the general maintains, will take up our 5,000-plane-a-month production for a while yet. But just as sure as the sun rises we will continue to increase our air superiority. On the other hand, the Germans are already unable to make their 1,800 planes a month output take care of the losses they sustain daily. "Victory for our cause at this rate is just as certain as the present existence of America," General Arnold concluded, "the only element involved is time. It may be 6 months, it may be a year, before we crack them."

One more point which I know will be of interest to you people is the general's statement that American airmen are shooting down two German planes to every one of ours and six Jap planes to every American one lost. This is an almost unbelievable figure.

"The Japanese Zero," said General Arnold, "is a good Sunday afternoon airplane. I feel sorry for the men who have to fly them against ours."

After my pleasant and informative visits with the President, Generals Marshall and Arnold, and with Admiral King, we all gathered about the President and he called on the aforementioned gentlemen to give a general report of the whole war up to the present, as well as several careful prognostications.

I suppose I neglected the wishes of many folks back home as well as my own curiosity when I failed to ask the President about his plans for the fourth term. I should have told him that many of my letters reveal to me that a lot of people are interested in knowing what he is going to do. I feel personally that he should make his plans known to the American people before long and not keep everybody in suspense.

At any rate, I left the White House satisfied with the information I had received from the military and naval authorities and was glad indeed of this chance to view at close range the caliber of the men shouldering the greatest responsibilities our Nation has ever faced.

The remainder of my time this evening is going to be used to acknowledge several hundred communications I have been receiving lately from members of the Endicott Leather Workers Union, urging me to support the anti-poll-tax bill soon to be considered in the House. As you all know, I went on record last year as being violently opposed to denying any citizen of the right to vote because of his race, creed, or color.

I reiterate that stand at this time. I assure you members of the Endicott Union that regardless of how we may agree or disagree upon other legislative matters, I am in 100-percent agreement with you in this subject. Ever since I have been in public life I have stood for equality of opportunity to all men and women whether they be white or black, Jew or gentile, Catholic or Protestant. I pride myself on my steadfastness to this principle and regardless of my many other shortcomings, I am determined to fight for the preservation of constitutional liberties of racial equalities and of the rights of all our citizens no matter where the consequences of this action may land me.

I therefore solemnly pledge myself to support and to vote for H. R. 7, the bill which provides for the abolition of all poll taxes and will assure 10,000,000 neglected citizens of the American privilege of voting in free elections from now on. I believe this to be the only way we can maintain our American freedom. I feel certain that our great Nation will be benefited to an untold degree by the passage of the anti-poll-tax bill.

By voting for this measure, I feel that I am but keeping faith with our beloved sons now at war who will return home and look for an America free from racial prejudice, free from intolerance, and free from the vicious subversive doctrines which dangerous crackpots and revolutionaries would now preach against American institutions and way of life.

Let us all pray to a just God who has given us the power and will to travel as far as we have on the road to victory to grant us that for which we eternally hope.

In closing, I am going to quote the splendid poem written by my able friend, Mr. Samuel Hale, of Oxford, which he sent me a few days ago:

"A PRAYER

"Too oft O Lord Thy guiding hand
We have ignored or thrust aside.
Too often we have from Thee strayed
Enwrapped in selfishness and pride.
Lord God of Nations, bear with us
May we renew our waning trust.

"Grant us O Lord, to see the right
And boldly follow where it leads,
To join our brothers in the fight
For freedom, in their hour of need.
Grant us sufficient strength, we pray,
Be with us all the fearful way.

"May we be free from pride of wealth;
Nor glory in achievements great,
But trust in Thy own loving hand
To safely guide the ship of state.
O Lord, our God, in Thee we trust.
Abide with us. Abide with us."

St. Patrick's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. BURCHILL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, New York, N. Y., March 17, 1943:

In the year A. D. 387 a baby was born who came to be known as St. Patrick. March 17, the anniversary of his death, is celebrated throughout our land by all our people, whatever their descent—Yankee, English, Scotch, German, Dutch, Scandinavian, Italian, black, and white—even Republican and Democrat! But especially by the Irish.

If I recall correctly, Sam Johnson said that the Irish were a peculiarly fair and just people because they never spoke well of one another. One might add, "except of St. Patrick."

Why should the anniversary of this humble saint be celebrated century after century by the great and the small, the rich and the poor, of all races, nationalities, and creeds? The significance of the celebration of St. Patrick's Day lies, it seems to me, in something deeper than the Irish reverence for their patron saint. The answer may be simply the symbolism of St. Patrick as the father of the people, for "Patrick" means father. Born in slavery, he lived to liberate the human spirit at the westernmost edge of the ancient world and to father a great people. In his great heart were the hearts of all he knew. He shattered the ancient spiritual tyranny of the druids and the pagan kings and chieftains at Tara. From Croagh Patrick, the holy mountain on the wild coast of Connaught, where St. Patrick meditated and where millions have worshiped him from time out of mind, there has flowed down through the centuries of darkness and light an ever-gathering confidence and faith in the spiritual democracy of mankind.

Today we are fighting everywhere to survive history's last and blackest challenge to the dignity and freedom of man's soul. Somehow I cannot escape the feeling that ours is a chapter, pray God the last chapter, in the eternal struggle for the spiritual liber-

ation of mankind for which St. Patrick lived, and for the political liberation of mankind for which his Irish people have never ceased fighting.

But I came here tonight not as a philosopher, but as Secretary of the Navy, and I suspect you would prefer me to stick to that role and leave the philosophical contemplation of our disordered world to my more devout friend, Bill Jeffers. I am reminded of the charming story of the Scotch Presbyterian minister in a small town whose great friend was the Irish Catholic priest. They used to spend long summer evenings together on the minister's front porch talking in the twilight, reflecting on the mysteries of man and his universe. When it was time to go home the priest would rise and say: "Well, I'll be goin' home now, Brother Thomas, and we'll both be for doin' the Lord's work—you in your way and me in His!"

I do not know whether America was discovered by an Irish monk named Brendan in 585, as many Irishmen insist. But, like every American, I do know that Irishmen have played a great part in the development of this country, as a glance at the roster of this ancient and distinguished society, which was born with the Republic, will prove. I suppose speakers at celebrations of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick not infrequently review the contributions of the Irish to our country from the Irish-born signers of the Declaration of Independence down to modern times, with, I hope, a word of thanks to the unsung legions of simple, humble Irish workmen whose sweat and toil in generations past built our cities and pushed the railroads out to the western frontiers. However, I am going to eschew the temptation to pay my homage to the Irishmen who helped to win and enrich this country.

But of one or two I must remind you because they are deathless names in the United States Navy. It was John Barry, of County Wexford, Ireland, who has been called the father of the United States Navy. He it was who received from the Congress of the United States the first naval commission, dated December 1775. And it was he who commanded the brig *Lexington*, the first continental vessel commissioned in the war. Then there was John Shaw, who arrived from Ireland in 1790. One of the brightest stories in our naval annals is the cruise of another ship with a glorious name which he commanded, the *Enterprise*. And it was an Irish-born orphan girl who came to this country, married, and gave us Commodore Perry, who won the Battle of Lake Erie when the United States was very young and he was 27.

But every civilized country has had its Irish heroes. I can remember from my school days the poignant exhilaration of the story of the siege of Limerick, and the Irishmen, "wild geese" I think they were called, who escaped to France to fight another day. It used to be said that the Irish had fought and won the battles of every country but their own. Three million sons of Erin are buried on the battlefields of foreign lands. Five hundred thousand died in France during the First World War. And now, again, every day you see Irish names in the war news. Be they British soldiers or American, they have not forgotten that freedom is a prize and not a gift.

Now this talk about fighting Irish reminds me that when I was overseas in the last war, Mrs. Knox fearfully scanned the casualty lists every day. She told me afterward that there were always plenty of Kellys on the list but not many Knoxes. And then she added dryly that the Knoxes were evidently pretty careful, and the Kellys apparently did all the fighting! I comforted myself by replying that of course the Irish were fighters, quoting the familiar remark that: "The Irish sprang from nobody, at everybody!" But I couldn't get the best of her. She retaliated with the suggestion that I had better leave the fighting to the Irish and behave like a Scotchman who keeps the Ten Commandments and everything else he can lay his hands on!

I am reminded that an Irishman, one of our fightingest admirals, told me when we were talking about the splendid fighting quality of our forces in this war, that an Irishman fears no one except another Irishman. Admiral Callaghan, who died heroically on the bridge of the *San Francisco* in one of the most gallant, unequal, and successful sea battles of all time, might have been the author of that remark but he wasn't. Nor was it Capt. Mike Moran of the *Boise*. Yet they typify for me that quality of audacity which has contributed so much to Irish greatness. Someone has described this as "the recklessness of courage." Call it recklessness if you please, but it is the rare gift of offensive mind and spirit, of intuitive audacity, which at a moment's notice so often turns defeat into victory and victory into route.

These days at home and this war abroad call for that type of leadership; a type of leadership which, to quote Woodrow Wilson, "will erase from its vocabulary the word 'prudent.'" Prudence never blazes its way through a trackless waste to discover a new civilization. Prudence has always shirked anathemas at dreamers of dreams and characterized their efforts for human betterment as futile and unscientific. Had dreamers of the past listened to the advisors of prudence, the galley slaves, the chains and the superstitions that for so long held men enthralled would be with us still.

As you know, I have traveled a great deal, visiting our camps and stations. Last month I completed a trip of more than 22,000 miles through the South Pacific area, and I want to say that you can resolve any lingering doubts in your mind about the fighting quality of the American lad of 1943.

I confess a couple of years ago I had some doubt as to whether the spirit of our forefathers who won and saved this country, the exultant spirit of freemen who preferred principles to porridge, still animated this generation. I was, I confess, apprehensive lest sophistry and ease had obscured the panorama of our past and the vision of our future. The Japs and the Nazis and many of our countrymen had the impression before we went into action that Americans had grown soft and pliable from comparatively good living, comfort, and paternalistic security. The Axis doctrine was guns instead of butter. They rigidly conditioned their people for war with the most powerful nation on earth, assuring them that we were decadent and undisciplined; that we were sleeping slothfully; that our heartbeat was slow; that we were mice, not men; that we could not and would not withstand hard knocks; that we couldn't "take it"!

Well, we took is for a while, and now we're dishing it out. And the men who are doing it are the same old breed of Americans. The stories that you have read are not overdrawn. I wish I had the words, I wish I had the time, to describe the laughing spirit, the resolution, the courage of those fellows who are fighting your war in paralyzing cold and crowling heat from Alaska to Burma, from Murmansk to Africa. I've seen them on desolate, lonely, blazing islands doing their job day and night. There is no complaint;, only restless impatience to get up to the front. I've seen them in the steaming jungles, sweating and grinning. There is no complaint; only restless impatience to get up closer to the enemy. I've seen them on the ships, and in the air—farm boys and city boys, from every walk of life, of every national descent, all tumbled together, all yearning to get up the line, as they call it. And I've seen them in the neat little iron cots, row on row, dazed with malaria, wounded and wan; struggling to grin and whisper simple, gallant little stories that make you feel very humble and very proud of your breed. There must be many poignant dreams of home, and many, many heartaches out there, but there's no complaint, because they're fighting men in the mold of our greatest traditions.

Those are the men who are fighting your war. They will teach the Nazis and the Japs some badly-needed lessons before they come sailing home again. And I can assure you, with all the confidence of the converted, that the jackals of Berlin and Tokyo made a fatal miscalculation when they told their people that America's thirst for freedom was quenched.

And we have just begun to fight. But already the Japs have learned some hard lessons from those boys. Perhaps you'll be interested in some estimates about the Japanese shipping position. They can't hold us back while they consolidate their stolen empire without ships, you know. At the beginning of the war we estimated Japan's merchant tonnage at 6,369,000 gross tons. Estimated losses up to March 1 are 1,857,000 tons, or almost one-third of her entire merchant fleet. Perhaps half of this has been replaced by seizure of foreign vessels in Asiatic waters, new building, and salvage, but the total tonnage available to Japan today is probably 14 percent less than that with which Japan set out to establish her grandiose "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere." And, as I say, we have just begun to fight. More warships, more planes, more submarines are going out to join the hunt.

I cannot and you would not want me to discuss the strategy of the war in the Pacific, but it is no secret that Japan, even if her lines of communication are shorter than ours, is just as dependent on shipping as we are to prosecute this war successfully, and in the long runs perhaps far more so because of her limited resources of raw material at home. Nor is it any secret that our purpose is to destroy the Jap Navy. A nation that uses a fleet like a bully uses a club to intimidate and subdue weaker powers must not possess one if we are to have the enduring peace in the world for which we and our allies are paying such a frightful price in blood and treasure.

But, though the omens are good, the journey to victory has just begun. No one in the Navy Department—I could go further and say no one in our Government directing any phase of this war—believes that we have reached a secure position of affairs. In the Atlantic we are confronted with a menace of formidable proportions. We have vast areas of the world to reconquer. But our enemies are aware of this fact: Thanks to the mighty exertions of Russia, Britain, China, and our country, we have reached the point where the conduct of this struggle will be from now on of our own choosing. The initiative is ours. The Axis is on the defensive from this time forward to its utter defeat. In no small measure this has been made possible by the thousands of American men and women who have clenched their fists and stepped up production of essential tools of war to a degree unprecedented in human history.

This, we can say to the befuddled leaders of Germany and Japan, is the record of a Nation which they assured their people was decayed within and too soft to fight. No propaganda machine ever devised will be able to keep this truth from the bewitched masses in Germany, Italy, or Japan when our full united strength is launched against them. Let them remember, then, that their gods were false gods; that as they sowed so shall they reap.

I mentioned a moment ago the danger of excess prudence in a world and at a juncture of human affairs that cries for boldness, for imagination and for brave leadership. Franklin Roosevelt, our Commander in Chief, is

audacious. Like all those Americans on the far-flung bases and battle fronts, he is impatient to get on with the business; to come to grips with all the terrifying problems that lie between us and victory in the field and, greater still, victory at the peace table.

Prudent advisors of the President would have had him stay back in Washington rather than fly across an ocean to get a first-hand look at an enemy your sons and brothers are facing. Beyond the great decisions of that conference with another inspired leader, Winston Churchill, the very news of his visit was a tonic to the enslaved freemen of France, the stoic sufferers in Poland, the persecuted peoples of all Europe. Hitler tried to suppress the news of that meeting, but it was impossible in a day when radio disregards frontiers, and when brave men daily risk their lives to keep the underground newspaper presses going in every occupied country.

President Roosevelt's visit to the African front lifted the hearts and the hope of millions of unchained spirits groaning under the Nazi heel. It was a guarantee that America and her people had heard their cries, that together with all decent people of the world who have banded together as the United Nations, we are promising them liberation and a peace that we intend to make lasting.

The historian writing many years from now, and looking back on this historic meeting at Casablanca, will conclude, I suspect, that Mr. Roosevelt's flying voyage was the token act that sealed the inescapable participation of the United States in world affairs. An American President had gone to Africa to complete an understanding with our allies for the winning of a war and to assure our friends and warn our enemies that America is in the world to stay.

We have come a long way fast. All but the impossible has been accomplished. The doubters are dismayed. Our Commander will lead us boldly. With faith, with vision, with imagination we can break the shackles of the past, for man's most ancient and elusive aspiration—peace and justice—is within our grasp.

But we must not, we dare not, falter in the harder days ahead. We must not falter when we face the price of peace. And let us always remember that there was a time—it was only yesterday—when proud France collapsed, when many Americans looked on Britain's struggle against a ruthless, triumphant Nazi war machine as a lost cause. England could never hold out, they said. Germany's overwhelming air fleet would obliterate British industry, blast British cities off the map, annihilate the British people if they did not capitulate at the Fuehrer's command and make way for his triumphant entry into Buckingham Palace. And Hitler thought so, too.

Well, as Mr. Churchill himself invited Herr Hitler to do, look at them now. A miracle took place in England which was as amazing as the miracle that has been taking place in the United States. For, to free men, freedom is still more inspiring than fascism. The spirit, the great will of the English people, kept their chins up until they could harness their industry and forge new weapons to protect themselves. Our security in this country today, our opportunity for the future, we owe in great measure to English men and women who did not know when they were whipped. They did not falter.

This is St. Patrick's Day. It is said that he used the three-leafed shamrock to help the people of Ireland grasp the idea of the Holy Trinity. He lifted the fierce and gentle spirit of the Irish to an ennobling new concept of spiritual emancipation. Today we stand on the threshold of a new era of emancipation for a world that has been chained to its bloody past. It is a majestic prospect. We must not be afraid. Fear, prejudice, reaction are our enemies; vision and courage to explore the unknown, our friends. Irish poets and patriots for 500 years have enriched the minds and enflamed the hearts of men. As in the past, their gayety and their sadness—their warm humanity—will help us find the way to a better world.

For the great Gaels of Ireland
Are the men that God made mad,
For all their wars are merry
And all their songs are sad.

Patriots' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution introduced by me today:

Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775

Whereas the 19th of April, 1775, witnessed the first military engagement between the American colonists and British troops, and the fighting that then occurred at Concord and Lexington, Mass., formed the prologue to the mighty drama of the Revolution and determined the character of its first campaign; and

Whereas the significance of April 19 in the history of our country is not to be measured by the extent of the military forces that engaged in local battle in 1775, but by the direction and strength of the intangible forces then set in motion which in due course established the United States of America; and

Whereas a frequent recurrence to the events out of which this Nation arose, and a better understanding of the principles upon which our forefathers grounded their independence cannot fail to stimulate and renew that high sense of patriotism which has ever been the glory of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue his proclamation, annually, emphasizing the significance of the events that occurred on April 19, 1775, calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all public buildings on April 19, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the patriots who laid down their lives for the cause of independence.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan, from today's Washington Post:

RUML PLAN
(By Mark Sullivan)
SKIPPING A YEAR

The Ruml tax plan, pay as you earn, is to come before Congress again. When it was before the House last month, it was defeated. For that defeat there was a plain reason. The Ruml plan was entwined with a quite different idea, the withholding tax—the two merged into a single bill. Because of that there was not opportunity to vote on the merit of the Ruml plan as an idea standing alone.

Subsequent to that defeat, advocates of the Ruml plan last week persuaded the House leaders to let the plan come up again. Now, as before, much will depend upon whether the plan comes up in a form permitting a straight vote on the principle of the plan—uncomplicated by other matters, or by details of its application. About the principle of the Ruml plan, everyone can think clearly, and come to decision readily. When attempt is made to follow the plan into details of its application, confusion arises.

The principle is utterly simple: Taxes ought to be paid in the same year in which income is earned—and not, as now, in the year following. The existing system is an "always a year behind" system. The Ruml plan is a "pay in the year you earn" plan. To the "pay as you earn" principle there is general assent. There can hardly fail to be.

But now we come to applying the principle. The first broad application is as simple as the plan itself. We will pay this year's taxes out of this year's income—pay 1943 taxes out of 1943 income. That is what "pay as you earn" means.

So far, so good. But now we encounter the first complication. It arises, not out of the plan, but out of putting it into effect; it arises out of changing over from the existing system to the new plan.

In making the change, we see at once an awkward fact. Under the existing system, we already owe taxes on 1942 income. What shall we do about that? We can't pay two taxes in 1 year—at least not many can, and none should be required to.

The answer that occurs to everyone is: Very well, just drop last year's tax—skip it, wipe it off the books. And that is the right answer.

But the moment that answer is made, real puzzlement begins. It comes from critics who say, "If we skip a year's taxes, won't the Treasury lose?"

To that question, supporters of the Ruml plan have made the wrong answer; not really wrong, but inexact. Supporters have answered, "No, the Treasury won't lose anything." In the broad sense, that answer is roughly true. But when the supporters say the Treasury literally won't lose anything they lay themselves open to a deadly jeer from critics. The critics, turning to a law of mathematics, say: "Twice nothing is nothing. Hence if the Treasury loses nothing by dropping 1 year's tax, why not drop 2 years—or 5, or 10, or forever?"

About the Treasury losing anything, the true answer is that the Treasury will not lose anything this year. This year the Treasury will take in as much by collecting on 1943 incomes as if it were collecting on 1942 incomes. (Actually, the Treasury will take in rather more, because 1943 incomes are on the whole greater than 1942 incomes.)

But the puzzlement remains. How can it be that we skip a year's taxes without the Treasury losing anything? Surely the Treasury must lose something, somehow, sometime. As to that, the answer is "yes," in a sense the Treasury will lose something. It will not lose this year, nor in any other single year. But, spread over a long series of years, the Treasury will lose something.

What the Ruml plan does is reduce by 1 the total number of yearly tax payments a citizen will make throughout his life. Under the Ruml plan, a taxpayer who lives 20 years would make 20 tax payments. Under the existing system, the always-a-year-behind system, he makes 21 payments—the last one being made by his heirs. The essential virtue of the Ruml plan is the remission of that final after-death payment. It permits the citizen to die without a year's taxes hanging over him, to be paid by his heirs. And that's the way it should be.

So far as there is loss to the Treasury, it is spread over many years. Besides, if the Treasury really wants that final after-death payment, the Government can call it by its real name, an inheritance tax, and collect it as such.

If the new arrangement between leaders of Congress means that the Ruml plan is to come up the next time in a simple form, which permits voting upon the principle of the plan uncomplicated by other considerations, it will be overwhelmingly adopted by Congress, will be acceptable to the public and will do no detriment to the Treasury.

The Anti-Racketeering Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Boston Herald of April 14, 1943]

ANTIRACKETEERING

Friends of labor should be just as eager as its foes to obtain enactment of the Hobbs antiracketeering bill, which the House has passed by a vote of 270-107. It aims at a serious abuse, the Supreme Court having so constructed various laws that certain violent acts of labor unions are not subject to Federal control. Congress could have enacted remedies if it had been disposed to do so or the President had made the request, but it has not chosen heretofore to do anything. The measure was objectionable to labor leaders in its original form, as they considered that it would strip them of some of their rights As amended by the House, however, it safeguards the position of labor and does little more than outlaw practices which hardly anybody defends and bring them within the reach of the strong Federal arm.

This is not an issue of unionism and antiunionism but of slugging, manhandling, gross abuses and circumvention of the law. There are state provisions against the criminal practices complained of, but the violations and the Supreme Court decisions indicate strongly the need of further action.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of April 10, 1943]

LABOR SHOULD JOIN THIS FIGHT

Representative COLMER, of Mississippi, says that if Congress is "not big enough and strong enough" to pass the Hobbs antiracketeering bill, then it cannot pass any bill "to which labor objects."

It is most unfortunate that the debate over this bill should seem to create a test of strength between Congress and American labor, particularly since the purpose of the measure is to end racketeering practices found in a minority of unions. The attitude of organized labor toward the bill, however, makes Mr. COLMER's appraisal correct.

No honest union man or union official condones racketeering for a moment. The Supreme Court, in a decision last year in the New York truckers' case, pointed out a loophole which makes impossible the prosecution of labor racketeers under certain circumstances. The Hobbs bill, passed by the House yesterday, is a move to close that loophole. Instead of fighting the bill, organized labor should be cooperating with Congress in an effort to curb the crooks.

Soviets Hold Poles Captive and Polish Officials Urge Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles from the Times-Herald, of Washington, D. C., entitled "Soviets Hold Poles Captive, Catholics Told," and "Probe of Red 'Atrocity' Urged":

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 17, 1943]

SOVIETS HOLD POLES CAPTIVE, CATHOLICS TOLD

The National Catholic Welfare Conference charged yesterday that Russia is holding some 1,500,000 Polish refugees as virtual hostages to coerce the Polish Government into recognizing Soviet claims on territory taken from Poland in the 1939 partition.

The charge was based on a report by the conference's news service received from Lisbon. Source of the information was not revealed.

It said that 2,000,000 Poles originally were deported from Poland to remote provinces of Russia after Soviet occupation of eastern Poland and that of these an estimated 450,000 have succumbed to hardship and mistreatment and 140,000 have been permitted to leave for the Middle East.

"By a recent Soviet decree," the report said, "all Poles deported into Russia henceforth are to be considered citizens of Russia, and, simultaneously, the Soviets have resorted to the disruption of Polish relief activities and to the confiscation of relief supplies sent to the unfortunate Polish people in Russia from the United States."

[From the Washington Times-Herald of April 18, 1943]

PROBE OF RED "ATROCITY" URGED—POLISH OFFICIALS HERE CALL FOR INQUIRY

(By Adele Allerhand)

Official Washington was seriously agitated yesterday by reports emanating from reliable London sources that mass murders of Polish war prisoners are being perpetrated by the Soviets.

Deeply concerned, Polish Government officials here joined with the National Catholic Welfare Conference in demanding that Russia reverse its attitude toward Polish hostages, and redeem its pledge, given in July 1941, that Polish war prisoners and deportees would be released. Addressing the International Red Cross, Polish officials have requested that a duly appointed commission conduct an immediate impartial investigation of the outrages.

Charging the Soviets with an attempt to blackmail the Poles into agreeing to Soviet claims on prewar Polish territory, and with maltreatment of Polish prisoners refusing to adopt Red citizenship, the National Catholic Welfare Conference accused the Reds of holding 2,000,000 Poles as "virtual hostages."

These Polish refugees, driven into Russia in the fall of 1939, were promised their release 2 years ago. To date, say informed persons, only 145,000 of them have been permitted to leave the country.

Several days ago the German press and radio reported the shocking discovery of the corpses of 10,000 Polish officers, originally imprisoned at Kozielsk, prison camp in the vicinity of Smolensk, and massacred by the Russians in 1940. Repeated Soviet denials led Polish officials to demand proof of the continued existence of the officers in question.

POLES SEEK ANSWER

Declaring themselves eager to be convinced, members of the Polish circle here insist that Russia can give the lie to the Nazi accusations only by producing the prisoners alive. Amplifying their request that the International Red Cross take the matter in hand, prominent Poles have advanced the alternative suggestions that:

1. A neutral Swiss-Swedish-Turkish mission be sent to Germany to ascertain the facts. 2. That the "reds" permit designated American Army officers of high rank to meet the prisoners. 3. That members of the Polish embassy in Kuibyshev be allowed to see them.

The situation had its inception on September 17, 1939, when the Russians, on their invasion of Poland, took 190,000 prisoners of war, representing both an active and reserve army. Among the reservists were university professors, doctors, lawyers and teachers, noncommissioned officers for the most part. Also included were between 8,000 and 11,000 commissioned officers.

THREE SEPARATE CAMPS

Prisoners were interned in three separate camps, the largest being Kozielsk, to which 4,500 officers were assigned; the second, Starobielsk, near Kharkoff, where 3,800 men were imprisoned; the third, Ostaszkowo, near Kalinin with 380 officers.

Early in 1940 the prisoners were told by Soviet authorities that they might rejoin their families in Poland. Between 60 and 300 men were daily permitted to head west toward Smolensk. From April of that year on the camps were gradually depopulated as small detachments of men were released day by day In June, a group of 400 men was sent to Griazoviec, somewhere in central Russia.

Following the German attack on Russia in July 1941, simultaneously with the signing of the Polish-Soviet pact, Russia pledged herself to release all Polish captives, both prisoners of war and refugees.

That pledge, say the Poles, has been only partially fulfilled up to the present. As far back as the early fall of 1941, the Polish Government requested the release of the imprisoned commissioned officers for the Polish Army, raised in Russian territory. By the end of August a small aggregation of officers made their appearance from Griazoviec. But the 8,500 officers, 7,000 noncommissioned officers and privates had vanished.

From time to time Polish Ambassador Stanislav Kot and Premier Wladyslaw Sikorski renewed their representations to the Soviet, only to be met with silence or the empty assurances that the request eventually would be granted. A document listing the names of 4,000 officers was presented to the Russians, but none of the officers listed was ever heard from.

STATE DEPARTMENT SILENT

Calling to mind the line taken by British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden during his recent visit here when he was reported to have impressed on American leaders the necessity for abstaining from interference with Russian expansion aims, officials of the United States State Department maintain an ominous silence.

Called upon for an opinion regarding the alleged massacres and the mishandling of Polish hostages, the answer is simply, "Nothing to say."

The attitude of Soviet representatives here lends itself easily to interpretation. A Russian spokesman, pressed for a reply, confided reluctantly that he "didn't know much about the story. It's just another one of those German lies. You'd better talk to somebody else about it."

Service of C. I. O. Maritime Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an interesting article written by Raymond Clapper appearing in the Boston Traveler of April 16, 1943, commenting on and interpreting the useful service done by the C. I. O. maritime unions "in emphasizing inefficiencies that are costing us shipping space at a most critical time when the whole offensive power of the Allies depends on increased shipping." When constructive suggestions are made it is only fair that credit should be given where credit is due. In this case it belongs to the C. I. O. maritime unions:

WASHINGTON

(By Raymond Clapper)

(Raymond Clapper is on his way to Sweden, one of the few neutral "listening posts" left in Europe. He will report his observations there by wireless. The column below is one of several he prepared before leaving Washington—Editor.)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—Every hour that a ship is idle is that much urgent shipping space lost.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations' maritime unions are doing a useful service in emphasizing inefficiencies that are costing us shipping space at a most critical time when the whole offensive power of the Allies depends on increased shipping.

These criticisms come from the men who are handling cargo. They head into a basic recommendation for truly unified control over ship operations by the War Shipping Administration.

Ship loading is somewhat on a cost-plus basis so that contractors do not lose money, and indeed may actually benefit by a delay and waste of longshoremen in loading.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations' maritime unions in their memorandum to the War Shipping Administration say that one of the chief factors making for inefficiency and preventing full utilization of ship facilities is the failure, through bad planning and lack of coordination, to have ship cargoes assembled and ready for speedy loading.

Agencies such as the Army, Navy, and lend-lease have their own depots for assembling cargo. Often a ship must make several movements to different docks in port before completing loading. Each of these movements to another dock wastes from 12 to 24 hours. Often in eastern ports a ship must make five or six such movements before it is ready to sail.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations maritime unions say that a great deal of progress has been made toward coordinating full use of dock facilities, but that the problem still exists. Incidents are cited in sufficient detail to be convincing. One ship was held a week because 400 tons of steel had not arrived.

Cases are cited, for instance, of ships docking to pick up 500 tons of powdered milk or 300 drums of gas or some other item which in itself can be loaded quickly. Unnecessary movement from dock to dock eats up time.

Ships have been forced to meet the convenience of cargo location instead of cargo being assembled in a way to insure speedy loading.

Ships have brought in wine from Australia while other ships going west have carried wine out to Pacific islands.

The maritime unions assert that failure to work cargo on a continuous around-the-clock basis is one of the most serious causes of delay in the turnaround of ships. The War Shipping Administration has directed that stevedoring companies work around the clock when cargo is available, but apparently operations are far below that standard. In most cases the unions say night work takes the form of working the same gang extra hours rather than operating all night. Ships docking over the week end rarely begin work before Monday morning. The unions say it is not uncommon for ships in New York or other eastern ports to work only a half-day on Saturday and to knock off on Sunday. Instances are cited of loading that could have been accomplished in a day and a half instead of 6 days.

The maritime unions say the War Shipping Administration to date is replete with inefficiency and lacks the boldness, imagination, and initiative that must spark the work of such an agency. It has yielded too much to the pressure of peacetime commercial practices and to the jurisdictional demands of other agencies, the maritime unions say. They also charge that it has denied labor a full voice in the effort.

The maritime unions want full and complete control by the War Shipping Administration over the entire merchant marine shipping pool of the United States, and return of ships to it from the Army and Navy. They want time quotas set for the discharge and loading of all vessels, and full accounting for any failure to meet those schedules. They suggest bonuses to employers and labor for exceptionally good performance. They propose that the War Shipping Administration and the labor unions jointly organize the longshore labor supply into a national labor pool and that labor shall be dispatched to ports where needed, under a tripartite control of government, labor, and management.

America After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my speech entitled "America After the War," delivered over the National Broadcasting Co. network from its Washington studios, April 17, 1943, as follows:

AMERICA AFTER THE WAR

It has been often said that there are two roads for America to take after the war. One, the traditional American course—the road of freedom, of free competitive enterprise; and, two, the road to economic strangulation, such as recommended by those who would have Government manage all business. To express it somewhat differently, but in the manner in which I view the future after the war, I say that we will have two ways from which to choose: One, the road of promise—the road of freedom which is the traditional and successful American course of free competitive enterprise; and, two, that course which can hardly be called a road, but instead, should be called an economic quagmire. It is that economic quagmire which I shall discuss briefly tonight.

When we have won this war and our enemies as military powers have been destroyed, Americans stand ready to begin the job of reconstruction. We are most concerned about reconstructing our own America. We want our country to be free again. By free we mean that we want to throw off the yokes of war. During the war we expect these hardships and strict limitations on our freedom. In addition to limitations of freedom for the duration of the war, we are willing to make any kind of a sacrifice necessary for American victory. Let there be no misjudgment on this point. Americans are of one single purpose in this war effort. Because of this singleness of purpose, we will have our victory. We, the people, also know what we are fighting for. We are fighting to keep America the same good old place we have known it to be in the past. Accordingly, many of us are planning how we should return to that peace so that our return will bring the greatest benefit to the greatest number of our people.

It is now reported that about 250 commissions, agencies, committees, and associations and institutes are making plans for America and the world when the war ends.

It is about time that the Congress of the United States began to do something about the subject of post-war economy for America. Unforunately, the whole subject of planning for the post-war world has been brought into disrepute because of some of the fantastic schemes which have had the most advertising. It has been hurt also by the fact that the very word planning is associated with the philosophy of those who want to run the country and the world by vast armies of bureaucracies and by the baleful institution of executive directives.

When you look at some of these plans you will be very much surprised, because some of these plans—plans proposed by some very influential people in this Government—include stripping from the Congress most of its powers to perform its functions under the Constitution. Such a move would amount to political revolution and conversion from a republican form of government to a Fascist-type state.

There are two agencies in the Government that have been authorized to do the official planning for this administration. One of them is the National Resources Planning Board. The other is the Board of Economic Warfare. The National Resources Planning Board is supposed to be making plans for the United States when peace returns. The Board of Economic Warfare, in addition to handling the war problems of the Government on the economic front, is also planning for the social and economic set-up of the whole world after the war. Global planning is the mouth-filling word that is used by these agencies to describe their function.

But, there is one thing about the plans that are being made by these bodies which

ought to excite the apprehension of all Americans. I think it is a fair statement that Americans generally have confidence in America's future and in our ability to make the present economic and social system work. We have not asked for some other economic system in its place.

In my opinion no planning group which starts with the conviction that the present system is done for, is out-dated and ought to be scrapped, should be entrusted with this grave subject.

Both these agencies—the National Resources Planning Board and the Board of Economic Warfare, so far as their planning activities are concerned, are convinced that the present economic system is finished.

They have advertised to the world that our frontier is gone, that our population expansion has slowed down to a snail's pace, that our technological development has matured and that there are, therefore, no important inventions or devices or changes in form of production in sight. I, for one, think such statements are utterly insupportable. I do not believe that invention and ingenuity and science is done in this country. On the contrary, I believe we have just started. While they are making these pronouncements the world is at war and the fertile mind of man is spawning incredible improvements in transportation and production, which will recast the world in times of peace. The psychology of these planners is in no way progressive. On the contrary, it is a psychology of a dark age advocated only by defeatists.

These men are doctrinaires—in fact a group of "vampire economy" doctrinaires—they are a clique of schematic philosophers who have a theory as to how our Government, our society, our economic system ought to be revolutionized. They have not invited anybody in to confer with them. They have not sought to bring together the best experts in all fields, to get the product of the best brains in the country on this greatest and most baffling of problems. They have their minds made up and they have been scheming and contriving to put their own new school of social thought into operation in this country. They have been using planning as a cloak to change our economic life. They have been using the planning function as a cover to put into effect their own peculiar doctrines—doctrines, mind you, which the overwhelming weight of economic opinion rejects.

These men—these economists of the National Resources Planning Board and the Board of Economic Warfare—have decided that our only hope is to throw private business into the arms of the Government, to make the Government of the United States the great investor, to have this Government go on year after year, when the war ends, borrowing countless billions of dollars and spending these dollars in order to create income for the American people. Business, industry, they say, will no longer borrow the savings of the people because the opportunity for profitable investment has disappeared or at least has become so limited that a man with money to invest cannot find a place to invest it. Therefore, the Government must do the borrowing and spend these billions year after year in order to keep our people at work. Such is their defeatist philosophy.

On March 10 the President sent to the Congress the report of the National Resources Planning Board. This report to the Congress came after the House of Representatives had voted the discontinuance of this agency, and after I had introduced a resolution directing the Federal Trade Commission to make a thorough analysis of all post-war plans—whether they be proposed by Government agencies or by private agencies. There are ample reasons in official Washington to justify the belief that the administration does not want the Congress to have any committees or special programs on the subject of post-war study or planning. This causes justification for some alarm. It is difficult for the average person to believe that our own Government would tolerate the persons on the Federal pay roll who actually plan, with the aid of Government funds, the destruction of our American economic system. That is difficult to believe, and yet it is a fact. It is a part of the National Resources Planning Board's report. This report or plan may be very roughly divided into two sections: One, a very comprehensive and elaborate plan for social security which has been referred to as the program for "cradle to the grave" security; two, a plan by which the Government would eventually take over the life and death control of all business enterprise in the Nation. In the case of Government ownership and control of business the plan is entirely foreign to America.

I shall not discuss the first part of the plan tonight. All of us agree that some forms of social security are worth striving for. Therefore, this subject is not at issue. There is undoubtedly much in this social-security part of the plan which is worthy of consideration. The public does not have to swallow the portions which are political bait. This social-security part of the post-war plan, as offered by the present managers in Washington, is the cellophane wrapper and pretty blue ribbon which carries the real package of the plan. The second section is the real hope and dream of the new "vampire economy."

The Government will borrow your money and with your money, the Government will buy the stocks and bonds of business. Accordingly, the Government will help you manage your business and in fact become a partner. Never forget that when the Government becomes a partner in business it becomes the principal partner and that when the Government becomes the principal partner in business, business becomes the tool of politics. When all enterprise comes under the management of Government, both management and labor become slaves of the state. Private management cannot exist under such a plan and labor will lose its right to bargain, with the result that labor instead of being free becomes slave. All of this involves a continuous and enormous public debt going ever higher and higher after the war. Instead of finding a plan for the liquidation of the public debt after the war these planners frankly plan to greatly increase the debt.

This plan is not new. This plan has been borrowed part and parcel from Germany and Italy. It is the very type of national life against which we are fighting. It is nothing less than amazing that we should have handed to us these foreign ideologies worked into a post-war plan with Government funds, at the very time when we are spending every bit of American money and energy to crush these foreign types of slavery.

These same doctrines were the very ones put into operation by those misguided thinkers across the ocean who brought into existence the totalitarian and fascist states. Enormous spending by the Government, and an illimitable public debt was the womb and body of fascism and totalitarianism—a tragic economic philosophy which is in fact thousands of years old in the history of dictatorships.

I have faith that American business can bring about full employment in the post-war period. American business is faced with the enormous task of reconversion to peacetime production after this war is won. There is every reason to believe that America faces a new era of prosperity in the post-war period. Old abuses must not be permitted. We must actually prevent monopoly either by private business or government. Monopoly in any form causes paralysis of our free competitive economy. We must make sure that small business survives because it is the very keystone in the arch of free enterprise. The continuance of present day war controls would mean eventual economic disaster.

We are concerned about the return of our fighting men. Are they to come home to a place on the dole, handed out by paternalistic Government, or to a job—a free job in industry? One is the shackle and chain of economic slavery, with eventual security for none; the other, is the free way of life with opportunity for all.

Destroying the enemy on the field of battle will not alone guarantee the preservation of our free form of government. The greatest battle which must be won is the economic battle for America. That battle comes after we have triumphed over our enemies on foreign battlefields. As Americans, we must resolve that we shall not have shed the blood of thousands of American boys on the battlefields of the world in vain.

We want to again have our own free America—after the war.

Farm Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, representing one of the most important agricultural districts in the United States where the farmers are contributing so much to the war effort in a patriotic endeavor to grow rice, cotton, sugarcane, sweetpotatoes, Irish potatoes, soybeans, oats, hay, truck, and foodstuffs of all kinds, I am alarmed and disappointed by the many strangulations, edicts, directives, discriminations, and regulations which our farmers have to battle which emanate from Washington, especially when our people are trying so hard to increase production of all of these foodstuffs so necessary to win the war.

I have complained before of the Selective Service paying little attention to the deferment of essential skilled farm labor and dairy workers in my district. Notwithstanding these protests Selective Service continues to take away from the farms and dairy cattle industry too large a percentage of these necessary workers. How in common sense can this agency expect our farmers to increase food production if they insist upon depleting the farms of these workers? What can the dairy industry do when they must operate under the below cost of production of O. P. A. ceiling prices for milk. In the meantime the Government is subsidizing the producers of milk in other portions of the country. I am daily deluged with letters from my constituents protesting against these injustices.

In addition to some of the protests received as herein outlined, the latest objections which are being made are to the

provisions of H. R. 2481 which is now under consideration and which bill undertakes by appropriation to legislate in many instances, and deprives our farmers of many of the benefits and services which they have previously enjoyed, and to which they feel they are justly entitled, to say nothing of the reduction of the appropriations for certain departments and financial assistance which was of so much help to the farmers, especially the small farmers. I have in my district thousands of small farmers and farm tenants and share croppers who have been greatly assisted through governmental agencies, not only to increase food production but also in helping them to acquire land and farm for themselves, as well as to acquire livestock and dairy herds. I have in my home parish alone over 7,468 farms, and other parishes have nearly as many. The practical abolition of the Farm Security Agency is nearly complete in this bill, and while my colleagues and myself will make every effort to save this Agency, and while I have been assured that in the proceedings to follow, amendments will be introduced to save the four cotton-classing stations, and that section 2, page 93, and section 3, page 97, will be amended or stricken out of the measure, I would like to include in the RECORD two of the many letters which I have received in connection with this bill, to wit:

JENNINGS PRODUCTION
CREDIT ASSOCIATION,
Jennings, La., April 15, 1943.

Re Agricultural Appropriations Committee.
Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGREEMAN LARCADE: I am informed that on April 13, the above Appropriations Committee recommended that no government agency be permitted to loan money to a borrower that was able to secure funds from other sources. Part of the language of the above bill I quote:

"None of the funds herein appropriated or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to pay the compensation or expenses of any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture, or of any bureau, office, agency or service of the department, or any corporation, institution or association supervised thereby, who engages in or directs or authorizes any other officer or employee of the department, or of any such bureau, office, agency, corporation, institution or association to engage in the negotiation, solicitation or execution of any loan which has not first been offered to and refused by a private loan agency customarily engaged in making loans of similar character and at comparable rates in the regions where such loan is proposed to be made."

Wish to say for your information, and this statement is well known to you, that back in 1933 the farmers were hard pressed for credit or funds to put in their crops. The Congress of the United States came to the rescue and created the Farm Credit Act of 1933. This setup I am sure you are familiar with.

In 1934, the Production Credit Associations were organized over the United States, and the Jennings Production Credit Association, located in Jennings, was organized to serve the parishes of Jefferson Davis, Calcasieu, Cameron, Vermilion and Acadia. It has been in continuous operation since that time, growing in volume and service to the farmers of this territory. This office has loaned in the nine years of its existence previous to 1943, $11,500,000 and its losses have been less than one tenth of 1 percent. A farmer to borrow money through this institution must purchase stock in amount of 5 percent of his loan.

I would understand from the above quotation that if this bill is passed we cannot make a farmer a loan to produce his crops unless he had previously applied to a private loan agency or bank and first be turned down by them. If my understanding of the language of the above quotation is correct, then I could safely say for more than a thousand stockholders that own this association, we would respectfully ask that you use your influence and vote against that part of the bill above quoted. I wish to say further that we loan no Government money. We get our funds from the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank, and they in turn get their funds from selling their short-term debentures to the investing public. However, the Government does own stock in this association, and they paid for same with Government bonds on which we get the interest thereon. There is no appropriation made from year to year for the activities of this association; it is self-supporting.

If my interpretation of the above quotation is in error, then I would thank you to write me as soon as possible as to how you interpret this quotation. If my interpretation of the quotation is correct, I would again thank you for an answer as to what your action will be when the above bill comes up for passage.

Thanking you for your reply at your very earliest convenience and with personal regards, I remain

Yours very truly,
THOMAS HUTCHINSON,
Secretary-Treasurer.

OBERLIN, LA., *April 15, 1943.*

Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LARCADE: During the last few days I have heard over the radio and noticed in papers that certain people in Washington wish to abolish the Farm Security Administration. Being an average farmer and a close observer of different farm programs in this parish I feel that I should express my feelings to the State Representatives and Senators in Washington who are representing the people as a whole and not small selfish groups who think only of enriching themselves at the expense of the small farmer or laborer. I do not think it fair for the larger farmers to demand the abolition of any movement that is trying to give the small farmer a little better place in life.

I have watched the activities of the Farm Security Administration in this parish for several years and I want to assure you that the Farm Security Administration has never attempted to do anything in this parish that will hurt the large operators. There are in this parish a number of small farmers who could not purchase a decent pair of mules before the Farm Security Administration. Now these men have good teams, equipment, and are paying their bills to the Farm Security Administration and their local merchants. Don't you agree with me in that these small men deserve a chance to earn a decent living for themselves rather than being forced to work for $1 a day on large farms and live in huts that offer very little protection to their families?

In my own community, until the last year or two, the farmers were depending only upon 5 acres of short-staple cotton for a living. We normally produced about one bale of cotton per year. Last year with the assistance of the Farm Security Administration we organized and formed a small association and borrowed funds to install and equip a deep well for irrigation purposes. The Farm Security Administration also assisted in making available rice farming machinery. This set-up for about 15 families cost a lot of money, yes, but at the end of the first year these farmers who had been producing one bale of cotton repaid the Farm Security Administration as much as $1,000 per family, had their own seed and food rice for another year, and in several cases filed income-tax forms for the first time in their lives. As for the deep well and machinery we paid two installments, have funds to operate this year, and a reserve for an emergency.

The Farm Security Administration also assisted us in purchasing a nice herd of cattle for each family and several registered bulls for the community.

Some of these one-bale-of-cotton farmers paid as much as $600 in 1942 for rent. Since converting our farms to rice these farmers have purchased their homes and their payments to the Government will be about one-fourth as much as their rent. Besides really contributing large quantities of rice to our Nation's food program, these families are beginning to become real assets to their communities rather than just low-income tenants.

For your information I am attaching a copy of the operating statement for our project which speaks for itself. This association is run by a board of directors and not by dictation from Farm Security Administration people. It is just as democratic as it can be. The Farm Security Administration only furnished the capital and helped us to do real planning.

As for the Farm Security Administration labor program, we find that families being transferred outside the parish are all located on small farms and producing only three or four units or less. Maybe these families can produce something that will add to our country's food supply in their new locations. I see nothing being done in this parish that will hurt anyone who has farm labor that is fully employed.

I do not want to see the Farm Security Administration abolished and I am asking you as a representative of all the people of Allen Parish to lend your full support to securing future appropriations for the Farm Security Administration. I am speaking for myself and a large number of small farmers of this community.

Yours sincerely,
SOILEAU COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC.,
CLEEGE CHAUMORT, *Manager.*

I think, Mr. Speaker, one of the best arguments made in favor of the Farm Security Administration is covered in an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of April 17, 1943, and I ask that the portion of the editorial to which I have reference be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whatever its errors or excesses, the Farm Security Administration is needed to give the United States a balanced, comprehensive program of food production. More than any other agency of the Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration has helped and befriended the small subsistence farmers, the family farms of America. It has sought to give a measure of independence and dignity to the otherwise disinherited little men of agriculture—the cotton choppers, tenant farmers, sharecroppers, and migrant workers. The productive abilities of these people must be fully utilized if we are to achieve the mammoth harvests of food necessary to win the war and determine the character of the peace. It is a scandal that this year we face a decline in food production.

A major portion of the country's food comes from large commercial farms. These are already operating at or very close to their peak efficiency and productivity. But there are some four million farm families whose gross income in 1940 amounted to less than $1,500; half of these grossed less than $600. Their productive potential has by no means been realized. It can be harnessed to the war effort only if the small farmers are given Federal aid in the form of funds for equip-

ment and fertilizer and in the form of technical aid and supervision. Another urgent task is to help the small farmers to switch from nonessentials like cotton to essentials like peanuts and soya beans.

These forms of assistance Farm Security Administration is peculiarly equipped to render. Its activities in the midst of war should be directed exclusively to just such war-related functions. It must forget some of the social theories which have confused its purposes in the past. It must operate strictly as a war agency to mobilize America's rural manpower as effectively as possible for the maximum production of that quintessential weapon of war and peace, food. Congress can best promote this purpose not by abolishing Farm Security Administration but by streamlining it.

Secretary Ickes Recommends Price of Crude Oil Be Increased To Give Incentive for More Production and Prevent Monopoly in Oil Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Small Business of the House composed of Representatives ROBINSON of Utah, KEOGH, JACKSON, KEFAUVER, HALLECK, LEONARD W. HALL, PLOESER, STEVENSON, and myself has just concluded an investigation of and public hearings on the price of crude oil. The public hearings were April 14, 15, 16, and 19, 1943. Our report will be made tomorrow, April 20, 1943. In the meantime I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from the Petroleum Administrator for War to the Administrator of the Office of Price Control in which an increase of 35 cents per barrel of oil be allowed in order to obtain more oil which is one of our greatest weapons of war and also to prevent monopoly in the oil business. It is as follows:

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, April 7, 1943.

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration.

MY DEAR MR. BROWN: By section 3 of Executive Order 9276, the President placed upon the Petroleum Administrator the duty of recommending to the Price Administrator such adjustments "in the schedule of prices charged for petroleum as will, in the judgment of the Petroleum Administrator, assure the efficient wartime operation of the petroleum industry and the maintenance of adequate supplies of petroleum for war, and essential industrial and civilian uses." After months of study, I have reached the conclusion that I must now recommend that a general upward adjustment of crude oil price ceilings averaging approximately 35 cents per barrel, with necessary equivalent and concurrent adjustments in petroleum product prices, is required to attain those objectives relating to the supply of petroleum and the efficient wartime operation of the petroleum industry, concerning which the President has asked that I express my judgment.

Exploration for and production of crude oil involve enormous risks. Evaluations of these risks cannot be reduced to exact mathematical formulas. They are peculiarly a subject for informed judgment. But the absence of an exact mathematical relationship between crude oil supply and crude oil prices must not be allowed to hide the fact that the rate of new discoveries and the ultimate available production from presently known reserves are in no small degree a function of price. Our studies convince us that in a matter of months, unless new fields are found more rapidly, secondary recovery stimulated, and somewhat higher cost production prolonged, we face first a loss of recoverable reserves arising from a wasteful forcing of such flush fields as we still possess, and shortly thereafter an actual scarcity of sufficient amounts of even reasonably low-cost crude oils.

I recognize fully the dangers of price inflation. But price inflation connotes an unwarranted rise in prices without promise of increasing supply. My fear is that unless we are prepared now to permit some increases in oil prices in order to stimulate increases in our available supplies, our reserves will continue to be depleted at such a pace that only a drastic increase in prices—perhaps several dollars a barrel, as contrasted with a tenth of that amount if we act now—will be required to find and produce the oil we are certain to need both during the war and after. An inflationary price spiral, once started, is difficult to arrest. A deflationary effect upon our ultimately recoverable reserves, and our daily capacity to produce, can likewise spiral and be difficult to arrest. Once we are compelled to produce our oil fields in excess of their efficient rates, we lose both ultimately recoverable production and daily capacity to produce.

I do not know what you will consider to be the effect upon other prices of a rise in crude-oil prices which, when translated into products, will amount to less than 1 cent per gallon. That is a matter which has been entrusted to your judgment rather than mine. So far as the consumers of petroleum products are concerned, I am sure that they prefer moderate prices and adequate supplies for the long pull rather than to be compelled to pay for artificially low prices now with ridiculously high prices and scarcity a very little later. Measured in terms of our oil supply—the task entrusted to me—I am not prepared to assume the responsibility of risking a repetition of what occurred at the close of the last war, when after crude-oil prices had been rigidly frozen and our reserves depleted, crude-oil prices rose to $3.50 and even $4.30 per barrel and untaxed gasoline to 25 or 30 cents per gallon. Moreover, had that war lasted but a little longer, the oil shortage might then have made it difficult to supply the armed forces with enough oil. The possibility of such difficulty in this war, if it be long protracted, is a risk that should be carefully considered.

I shall not burden you in this letter with the details of the careful surveys which I have had made showing the extent and the decline in our known crude-oil reserves during the past few years. Suffice it to say that we believe our reserves to be larger, when measured in barrels, than the petroleum industry has frequently estimated, but much smaller, when measured in years' supply, than the American people have recognized. The industry has followed the practice of making estimates on what it termed a conservative basis. The flaw in this type of estimating lies in its tendency, since 1938, to screen a decline in newly discovered oil. For by the simple expedient of enough yearly corrections for past conservatism some industry statisticians have made it appear that reserves have kept pace with consumption. But corrected figures do not represent new discoveries. This Office has found that if the subsequently corrected reserves of each field discovered since 1928 are actually allotted to the year in which that field was found, we have not found enough new oil during the last 4 years to replace withdrawals necessitated by constantly accelerating demand. As one independent oil expert has aptly described it, we need to find more oil with the drill and less with a pencil.

Actually, it is relatively unimportant whether presently known reserves total 20,000,000,000 barrels as the industry recently has estimated, or somewhat more, as our surveys show. Neither amount can be produced in toto in less than half a century. Neither amount is capable of sustaining withdrawals at the rate of 1,400,000,000 barrels annually much beyond the present year. What is worse, if it becomes necessary to produce existing fields in excess of efficient engineering rates, ultimately recoverable reserves will have to be corrected downward as they have been corrected upward.

You may ask how much of a price increase is required to rectify these conditions. I do not know exactly and I am quite certain no one else knows. If anyone knew with mathematical exactitude, finding and producing oil would not involve such enormous risks. But this I do know—an increase in price makes it economically possible to increase recoverable reserves (1) by postponing the date of abandonment of thousands of pumping wells, (2) by the installation of more and better secondary recovery equipment, (3) by drilling edge properties and so-called marginal locations, and (4) by attracting venture capital from both within and without the petroleum industry to undertake that greatest risk of all, exploring for new fields. Of course, material, labor, and other costs have risen in the producing branch of the oil industry. With the introduction of overtime, necessitated by the 48-hour week, labor costs will rise still further. Such factors as these can be more or less exactly measured. But none of these items of added cost, however much they can and do justify some increase in crude-oil prices, is as important as the hard, cold facts of declining rates of discovery and increasing demands.

My present recommendation of an increase in the price ceilings for crude oil may be too little, but strictly from an oil standpoint, I am confident that it is not too much. Fortunately, the Government can test it pragmatically, just as the industry always has in times past. If in the months to come the action now recommended reverses the decline in reserves or the rate of new discoveries, we shall know that it is effective. If not, the subject should be reexamined. To the extent that some may derive a small windfall from such an increase, I prefer to leave that to be largely recaptured by existing taxation rather than have the Government itself enter this most speculative of businesses, or by indirection, reach the same result by undertaking the colossal task of administering some subsidy arrangement. The true costs of finding and producing oil, including the risk of loss as well as the chance for profit, ought to be borne by the users of the product in proportion to their use and not become a governmental charge against user and nonuser alike.

In the specific application of general upward adjustments in crude-oil price ceilings, I recommend that due allowance be made for radical changes in the sources and methods of transporting crude oil which have occurred since prices were frozen almost 2 years ago. For example, Gulf coast crudes formerly hauled to east coast markets by tanker enjoyed a transportation advantage as against many interior crudes. Now, with crude and products moving overland rather than by sea, this condition is reversed. Accordingly, in order the better to solve the problems of local shortages arising from the disruption of normal methods of transportation, it would seem desirable for some crudes in some areas

to be advanced more than 35 cents per barrel, and in other cases less. Here actual differentials based on reasonable exact formulas can be worked out between our respective offices with the aid and assistance of industry.

As to what I have called necessary equivalent and concurrent adjustments in product prices, unless these be made, the small, nonintegrated, independent refiners will be squeezed between the two millstones of rising raw-material costs and fixed refined-products prices. This not only tends toward monopoly but also may result in a loss of refining capacity which cannot be spared. All that I urge at this time is that in translating higher crude prices into higher product prices, a very substantial part of the necessary increases should be placed upon fuel oils. Only thus can we preserve and protect our essential reserves of crude oil by deterring their dissipation in admittedly inferior uses. Our known supplies of coal are measured by thousands of years—our known supplies of crude oil by little more than a decade. Coal readily can be used where oil too frequently is burned. Quite recently coal prices have been advanced. Comparative price levels as between these two commodities must not be frozen in such a manner as to make it profitable to burn the scarce rather than the plentiful fuel.

I am sure you realize the magnitude and the complexity of revising price ceilings to effectuate these general recommendations in a specific and practicable way. It is hardly a task that either of our hard-pressed staffs should be asked to undertake unless it is known in advance that your Office, in which the power to make the adjustments resides, agrees, that some general crude-oil advance is justified by the basic facts here submitted. It may be that you will desire to consult with the Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization on this point. My views, of course, represent my judgment on the oil situation only. Having weighed these views, you or the Director of Economic Stabilization may deem the risk of an oil shortage less grave than the risk of other possible effects upon the Nation's economic structure. If so, under your statutory powers, that is clearly a decision that you, not I, should make.

I am sure that I need not add that all of the documentary detail on this whole subject, both that submitted to this office by the industry and our own independent surveys, is available to you and your staff.

This recommendation is sent to you under personal cover and by messenger further to assure against any publicity or disclosure prior to such time as you yourself may desire to make known its content. I have been at pains to see that those on our staff here who have worked on the problem respect the confidential nature of the assignment, and I have every confidence that they will do so.

I shall appreciate an early expression of your views.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Administrator for War.

Hon. Prentiss Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, Hon. Prentiss Brown, Administrator of O. P. A., addressed a notable meeting of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce at Roanoke, Va. I include two editorials on the subject:

[From the Roanoke Times of April 17, 1943]

PRENTISS BROWN

It is safe to say that a considerable number of Roanokers in the audience at the stimulating and highly informative program presented at Thursday evening's session of the War Conference of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce were present primarily for two reasons: (1) To honor John Stewart Bryan on the occasion of the presentation of a plaque to the Chancelor of the College of William and Mary as the "Virginian-of-the-Year"; (2) To see and hear the Hon. Prentiss Brown, Director of the Office of Price Administration, whose 15-minute address broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System was followed by a more intimate and intensely interesting talk of approximately 30 minutes to his immediate audience.

Senator Brown made a most favorable impression on those who were seeing and hearing him for the first time. And that includes most of those in his audience, it is safe to say. Not only was he most gracious and pleasing in what he had to say about Virginia, its distinguished United States Senators and Representative WOODRUM, of the Sixth district, who introduced him to the gathering, but his discussion of the responsible task which the President has entrusted to him marked him as an earnest, patriotic public servant who is thoroughly imbued with the tenets of Americanism and is striving to conduct rationing and price regulation in a sane, reasonable and practical way that will enlist the support and merit the approval of the American people, who, after all, stand to benefit by price regulation and rationing far more than they will be adversely affected by the measures which the Office of Price Administration finds it necessary from time to time to adopt.

Pleading earnestly for unity on the home front, which he emphasized was absolutely necessary if victory is to reward the Nation's war efforts, Mr. Brown warned his audience that the stress of war is imposing an unprecedented strain on our national economy and one which will call for the united effort of the American people to bear successfully. He expressed confidence in ultimate victory, provided the people give to their leaders the support to which they are entitled and without which they cannot discharge their responsibilities in an adequate manner.

Most of us had never seen Prentiss Brown before. We watched him with interest and listened to him attentively, for, after all, here was a man into whose hands has been placed more power over the habits and daily lives of the average American household than was ever wielded by any other individual prior to the organization of the Office of Price Administration. We came away encouraged and comforted by the impression that the President made a wise choice when he turned to Prentiss Brown to straighten out the tangle and confusion, little short of chaos, that had arisen in the Office of Price Administration under a preceding regime.

Prentiss Brown will make mistakes, no doubt. So would any other man in his shoes. But he will have an open mind on the subject of his own decisions and he will have the courage to rectify his mistakes when it is clear that errors have been committed. He has no illusions of grandeur or infallibility. He is an honest, practical, patriotic American who is trying to do a good job and who realizes that in its performance he must necessarily tread more or less sharply on the toes of a good many people from time to time.

That is the sort of man we plain folk can tie to. That is the sort of man we plain folk like to see running our Government. That is the sort of man we plain folk are willing to support and give our backing. A politician, perhaps, but an honest politician who is devoted to his country and desirous of serving its best interests to the limit of his ability—that's the way Prentiss Brown impressed us.

[From the Roanoke World-News of April 17, 1943]

REFLECTIONS ON PRENTISS BROWN

Reflection upon Prentiss M. Brown's address here Thursday evening leads one to the agreeable conclusion that the new Office of Price Administration Administrator is well equipped for his trying duties and is determined to carry out a fair and just wartime regimentation program.

If some who heard him expected a rousing, "rip-snorting" speech, they were disappointed, for he isn't that kind of man. If some who heard him expected a pronouncement that rationing isn't necessary, they were disappointed, for we cannot escape such controlled distribution during the emergency. If some who heard him expected proclamations of eased restrictions, they were disappointed, for the period of critical shortages and even more acute transportation difficulties has not ended.

Yet all who listened to his address must have derived some degree of satisfaction from the following:

(1) Prentiss Brown is, first of all, an American. Hence he gives every promise, by actions and by personality, that we shall have no regimentation solely for the sake of it. There is nothing about the man to prompt the suspicion that he is indoctrinated with socialistic or communistic theories. He is a down-to-earth American thinker, a practical individual who is the exact antithesis of Leon Henderson. He is an American citizen who knows Congress and the people represented in Congress.

(2) His objective is to gain public confidence in a necessarily annoying program—not through antagonism of the public or through willy-nilly restrictions, but through a calm, considered handling of a disturbed economy. He will not fight against the people; instead, he will work with them.

(3) He recognizes the complexities of his job, the political and other pressure under which he must work, but is resolved to make this part of the home front fortifications secure.

(4) He sees the absolute necessity for mutual understanding of the numerous issues involved in transforming the Office of Price Administration into an effective, workable war agency. (Moreover, he admits freely that a united America is imperative lest we become a divided people.)

These are something more than mere impressions taken from a first-hand view of the Office of Price Administration Director at work. Prentiss Brown's record shows him constantly in touch with the problems of the average citizen, and his personality supports the record—when he finished his radio broadcast Thursday evening, and began speaking somewhat informally, he was just one American talking to other Americans, and that counts for a great deal.

The persistent question is: Will the Washington extremists let an honest man do an honest job with Office of Price Administration?

Or will there continue to be stubborn contradictions from the men who so dearly love to plan our social and economic lives in accordance with Utopian idealism?

If Mr. Brown overcomes the obstructions placed in his way by these extremists (and we believe he will), we shall preserve the basic structure of our economy. That, at the very least, is the way it looks today as "the new Office of Price Administration" begins to find its way.

Department of Agriculture Appropriations Bill, 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, my amendment to that section of the Agriculture appropriations bill, providing funds under the Marketing Service which deals with cotton statistics, classing, standards, and futures acts, restores funds for the operation of offices at Charleston, S. C., Savannah, Ga., Mobile, Ala., Galveston, Tex., and Altus, Okla.

Funds for these offices were stricken from the Agriculture appropriations bill at the direction of the Bureau of the Budget and aggregates $54,848 for the operation of the offices in question.

I have no complaint with the Appropriations Committee and want the RECORD to clearly indicate my feeling of esteem and admiration for the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], and each of his colleagues on the said committee.

My complaint is with that agency known as the Bureau of the Budget. Under our democratic procedure it has long been the policy of the House that its legislative committees should handle authorization measures before this body should consider appropriation measures.

During the past few years the work of many important committees of this House has been by-passed by certain Government agencies, working through the expediency of the Bureau of the Budget. Often have appropriation items been submitted to the Appropriations Committee without having first been considered by the proper legislative committee. Furthermore, these items have been submitted to the Appropriations Committee executive session and Members whose districts are affected have not had occasion to learn of contemplated action which vitally affects their respective constituents. Last week I brought to the attention of the House this lamentable condition and finally today the time has come for you to take action pursuant to my earnest request of a few days ago.

I feel confident that the House will restore each of these offices as provided by my amendment. To show the importance of retaining the service incorporated by these five offices for the benefit of our farmers and cotton merchants I submit herewith a brief outline of each of the acts of Congress referred to at the beginning of my remarks:

THE SMITH-LEVER ACT

DIGEST OF ACT

Provides for the diffusion of useful and practical information relating to agriculture and home economics among the people through cooperative agriculture extension service furnished by colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture. This cooperative agricultural extension work shall consist of the "giving of instruction and practical demonstrations in agriculture and home economics to persons not attending or resident in said colleges in the several communities, and imparting to such persons information on said subjects through field demonstrations, publications, and otherwise."

Annual appropriations are provided.

REASONS FOR ACT

The reasons for the act were (1) to provide machinery to bring to the attention of the farmer and his family demonstrated truths and practices of successful agriculture; (2) to make rural living desirable and profitable as an occupation; (3) to carry to the farm the approved methods and practices of the agricultural colleges, experiment stations, and the Department of Agriculture; and (4) to impress the farmer with new methods and experimentation which could not effectively be done by printed bulletins, etc. (38 Stat. 372; U. S. C. 7:342.)

COTTON STANDARDS ACT

DIGEST OF ACT

Requires, after August 1, 1923, the use of official cotton standards of the United States, in connection with all classification, publication of price or shipment of cotton in commerce, sales by sample excepted. Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to issue, suspend, and revoke licenses to classifiers of cotton; to determine classifications of cotton, which shall be prima facie evidence in United States courts; and to cause the inspection and sampling of cotton involved in any transaction or shipment in commerce.

Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish official United States cotton standards to be effective not less than 1 year after date of issuance, the official standards established under the United States Cotton Futures Act to remain effective until changed under authority of this act.

Defines offenses in relation to cotton standards and provides penalties for such violations.

REASONS FOR ACT

The bill is designed: (1) To afford to cotton producers benefits similar to those enjoyed by producers of and dealers in grains under the Grain Standards Act; and (2) to improve conditions and methods of classification and arbitration in the buying and selling of spot cotton to the end that certain existing commercial risks may be lessened and that transactions may be safely consummated at lower net cost. (42 Stat. 1517, U. S. C. 7:51–65.)

COTTON STATISTICS ACT 1927

DIGEST OF ACT

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to collect and publish annually statistics or estimates concerning grades and staple lengths of stocks of cotton on hand in United States warehouses on August 1 of each year. Following the release of such statistics, he shall publish three estimates of grades and staple lengths of cotton of the current crop.

In all such reports the cotton recognized, on such date, as tenderable for future delivery under the United States Cotton Futures Act, shall be stated separately from that which may be untenderable under said act.

Refusal to furnish requested information and unauthorized publication thereof are misdemeanors.

Reduces the number of such statistical reports required from the former acts from 11 to 5, and provides for a report of acreage in cotton cultivation on July 1, and reports on September 1 and December 1 of acreage abandoned since July 1. (44 Stat. 1372; U. S. C. 7: 471–476).

REASONS FOR ACT

The primary reasons for the act were: (1) to reduce the number of reports, thus disturbing the market less frequently and (2) to provide for separation of tenderable and untenderable cotton, thus giving a truer picture of conditions.

SMITH-DOXEY ACT

DIGEST OF ACT

S. 1500, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, upon written request of producers organized to promote the improvement of cotton, to determine and certify the classification of cotton so produced. He shall also collect and distribute timely information on market conditions, and shall post at gins, post offices, etc., in the Cotton Belt, information on prices of various grades and staple lengths of cotton (adding to U. S. C. 7: 473; 50 Stat. 62).

REASONS FOR ACT

The object of this bill is to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for the classification of cotton and to authorize the Secretary to furnish timely information to cotton producers with respect to market supply, demand, location, condition, and prices for cotton. (House Rep. No. 482, 75th Cong., 1st sess.)

Is Anything Wrong With This Proposal, or Do You Entirely Agree?

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include therein the text of a bill which I introduced last week, I am bringing before the public a plan which I have long considered desirable. The primary purpose of this plan is to provide opportunity for further education and scientific training to the highest type of young persons in America. This is not to be a gift to them but an opportunity to reach a goal afforded those who can qualify in character, ability, and in determination to achieve by their own resources. Is this not a very desirable thing?

My bill, just mentioned, H. R. 2533, would set up a revolving educational trust fund, not appropriated out of the Public Treasury but obtained from financial sources to whose use in this public way very few can raise any objection. It would take certain unclaimed accounts in national banks, without depriving the banks of any rightful thing, and by that means would make available over $100,000,000 for this laudable purpose. Several commonwealths have similar funds escheat to the State but may not take such funds from our national banks.

During this war the investment of the trust fund in United States bonds would enable it to work for victory until the coming of peace, after which it would be available for said educational purposes. Now, this fund need not necessarily be dedicated a memorial to Thomas Jefferson or to any other man, but starting it

at a time when the Nation is celebrating the two-hundredth anniversary of Jefferson's birth, it would indeed be a very fitting monument to the Sage of Monticello.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H. R. 2533

A bill to create a revolving educational trust fund as a memorial to Thomas Jefferson by providing for the use of unclaimed deposits in national banks for the purpose of making loans to young men and women to assist them in obtaining a higher education, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the national banks of the United States are hereby authorized and directed to pay sums equal to the amount of unclaimed deposits in each bank to the account of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Educational Trust Funds Board, which, as trustee, shall administer such funds and make loans therefrom to young men and women to assist them in obtaining a higher education. As used in this act the term "unclaimed deposits" means deposits which have not been increased or decreased, or on which interest has not been credited at the request of the depositor, within 14 years or more, with respect to which there are no known claimants other than the depositor, and the depositor of which cannot be found.

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created a Thomas Jefferson Memorial Educational Trust Funds Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"), which shall be composed of seven members, one appointed by the President, who shall be chairman of the Board, one appointed by the President of the Senate, one appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, one appointed by the Chairman of the Social Security Board, one appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and one appointed by the Commissioner of the United States Office of Education. Each member of the Board shall hold office for a term of 7 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term by the official which appointed such predecessor, and (2) the terms of office of the members of the Board first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire as follows: The term of the member appointed by the President on July 1, 1950, the term of the member appointed by the President of the Senate on July 1, 1949, the term of the member appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives on July 1, 1948, the term of the member appointed by the Secretary of the Interior on July 1, 1947, the term of the member appointed by the Chairman of the Social Security Board on July 1, 1946, the term of the member appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System on July 1, 1945, and the term of the member appointed by the Commissioner of the United States Office of Education on July 1, 1944. No member of the Board shall receive compensation for his services as such member, but shall be reimbursed for necessary travel and subsistence expenses while away from his official station on the business of the Board.

(b) The Board shall appoint an executive secretary, who shall receive compensation at a rate not exceeding $8,000 per annum. The Board shall have the power to employ and fix the compensation of such other officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out its duties under this act.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the Board to act as trustee of the funds paid to its account in each national bank, to administer such accounts with the aid of the national banks, to facilitate the making of loans therefrom, to provide for the repayment of such loans, and to prescribe all necessary rules, regulations, and procedures appropriate to carry out its duties under this act.

SEC. 4. The Board is authorized and directed to pay to each national bank, in order to reimburse it for expenses incurred in aiding the Board in administering the funds in such bank constituting funds of which the Board is trustee, one-half of all money received as interest on such funds.

SEC. 5. While the United States is engaged in the present war, it shall be the duty of the Board to invest the funds of which it is trustee in direct obligations of the United States, in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war.

SEC. 6. Six months after the cessation of all hostilities in the present war, it shall be the duty of the Board to utilize the funds of which it is trustee for the purpose of making loans to young men and women desiring and qualifying for a higher education, found to be eligible on the basis of need, outstanding ability, scholastic aptitude, and such other merits as shall be prescribed and defined by the Board. The loan made to any one person in any 1 scholastic year shall not exceed $1,000, and shall not be granted during more than 4 years. All loans shall bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum. The principal of such loans shall be payable not more than 6 years after graduation, and payment thereof shall be covered by insurance.

SEC. 7. It shall be the duty of the Board so to administer this act that the young men and young women receiving aid under the terms of this act shall be chosen on a competitive plan without distinction of sex, race, color, or creed but solely on the basis of character, ability, and need, the number to be apportioned among the States according to population.

SEC. 8. Upon the payment by any national bank of unclaimed deposits to the account of the Board, the bank shall be relieved of all liability in respect of such deposits, and the account of the Board in each national bank shall be solely liable for legally established claims concerning unclaimed deposits in such bank. The Board, upon its determination that a claim is valid is directed to make payment to the claimant. In any case, the Board is directed to indemnify and hold harmless the national banks on account of claims in respect of unclaimed deposits.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, from time to time, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Money—The Most Important Issue Before the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House, there is presented herewith the third installment of Senator Cockrell's speech.

In the interest of brevity, the Senator's recital of the record of the parliamentary maneuvers of the two political parties in dealing with the issue of silver money for the 10-year period from 1879 down to 1889 has been omitted.

In reviewing the record of the struggle between the silver advocates and the bank-money advocates camouflaged by the gold-standard issue, it is interesting to note the political trend of that day. First, the silver advocates were in control of the House of Representatives—Forty-fourth Congress—which passed a free-coinage-silver bill, only to have it killed by the opposition in the Senate. Later, when the silver advocates were successful in removing the silver opponents in control of the Senate and succeeded in passing a free-silver-coinage bill in the upper body of the Congress, propaganda had done its work and control of the House had passed to the bank-money advocates, who were successful in blocking the passage of the Senate silver bill—Fifty-second Congress.

Senator Cockrell has explained how the Bland bill that provided for the free and unlimited coinage of silver as it was passed by the House was altered by the Allison amendment in the Senate to a silver purchase bill that provided the purchase of 4,000,000 ounces of silver per month. This installment of his speech reveals the plan that was put through the Congress to discredit silver money and embarrass the Federal Government under the provisions of the Sherman Silver Purchase Act which replaced the Bland-Allison act, by increasing the amount of silver purchased by the Treasury from 4,000,000 ounces per month to 4,500,000 ounces per month, to be paid inTreasury notes with a proviso that the Secretary of the Treasury was required to redeem the "Treasury notes in gold or silver coin at his discretion." What followed is history.

The bank-money-advocates quickly took advantage of this law to drain out the Treasury's gold reserve—and at the same time contracted bank credit to make a horrible example of the silver money program in the financial depression that ensued and made a bond issue necessary to replenish the diminishing gold reserve being constantly withdrawn by the mechanics of this plan. The bitter truth in this whole sordid scheme was that the bank interest motive prevailed.

The third installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

In the Fifty-first Congress, March 4, 1889, to March 4, 1891, Mr. Harrison, Republican, was President. The Senate was 47 Republicans, 37 Democrats. The House of Representatives, 173 Republicans, 154 Democrats, 1 Wheeler, 1 vacancy.

June 5, 1890, in the House of Representatives, House bill 5381, known as the Windom silver bullion purchase bill, was pending. Mr. Bland moved to recommit, with instructions to report back a bill for the free coinage of silver. Yeas 116—101 Democrats, 14 Republicans, 1 Independent; nays 140—12 Democrats, 128 Republicans. The substitute offered by Mr. Conger was then passed. Yeas 135—135 Republicans, not a Democrat; nays 119—112 Democrats, 7 Republicans.

June 17 the bill was reported by the Finance Committee of the Senate with sundry amendments; while it was pending Mr. Plumb offered an amendment for free and unlimited coinage, which was agreed to. Yeas 43—28 Democrats, 15 Republicans; nays 25—3 Democrats, 22 Republicans.

After long wrangling in the House of Representatives, June 25 a vote was had on the Senate free-coinage amendment. Yeas 135—113 Democrats (including the Honorable Roger Q. Mills), 21 Republicans, 1 Independ-

ent; nays 152—22 Democrats, 130 Republicans. The Senate amendments were then nonconcurred in and conference had. The conference report was agreed to in the Senate July 10, by a vote of 39 yeas, all Republicans, and 26 nays, all Democrats, and in the House of Representatives, July 12, by 122 yeas—121 Republicans, 1 Independent (Featherstone), and 90 nays, all Democrats.

The conferees agreed to a bill with sundry amendments. The conference committee substituted in the bill as it passed 4,500,000 ounces for $4,500,000, and they modified the legal tenders "except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contracts," and they substituted for the bullion-redemption provision a requirement that upon demand the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem the notes in gold or silver coin in his discretion—and the declaration that it is the established policy of the United States to maintain a parity between the two metals at the present legal ratio, or such ratio as may be provided by law, and to require 2,000,000 ounces of the bullion purchased to be coined monthly into dollars until July 1, 1891.

Mr. President, this was practically and entirely a new bill, agreed to in the conference led by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. Sherman, the great bimetallic leader of the Senate today. The changes entirely subverted the bill, bad as it was as it passed the Senate and as it passed the other House. Instead of redeeming the Treasury notes issued in the purchase of silver bullion with their equivalent in silver, upon the demand of the holder, the Secretary of the Treasury was required to redeem these notes in gold or silver coin in his discretion, and then the promise of the policy of the United States was put in here to maintain a parity between the two metals at the present legal ratio. I shall have occasion hereafter to comment on this matter in connection with the President's message. It was to maintain the parity of the two metals, not the two coins.

These were the most material changes, and I had the privilege and the honor of protesting against those changes and in predicting that the law would be miscoustrued and enforced by an unwilling administration, just as it has been. I am glad to realize—I am sorry for the consequence of the realization however—that every prediction I made upon the floor of the Senate in opposition to the approval of that bill as reported by the conference committee, has been verified. The distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Lindsay, did me the honor to quote a large number of passages from that speech, and I stand here today without any apology for uttering one of them. Were that bill pending again today as it was then I would simply repeat what I then said.

But what has been done since, Mr. President? I want to get at all the efforts at legislation on the silver question before discussing it.

On January 5, 1891, Mr. Stewart moved to consider Senate bill 4675, displacing the Federal election bill. That was agreed to. Yeas 34—26 Democrats, 8 Republicans; nays 29 Republicans.

On January 14, 1891, Mr. Stewart moved a free-coinage amendment to the bill, which had been laid aside up to that time. That was agreed to. Yeas 42—26 Democrats, 16 Republicans; nays 30—3 Democrats, 27 Republicans.

After the bill had been discussed a long time and various amendments made, my colleague Mr. Vest, offered a free and unlimited coinage provision as a substitute, and that was agreed to. Yeas 39—24 Democrats and 15 Republicans; nays 27, 1 Democrat and 26 Republicans.

Now, remember this was only a short time ago in the Senate, only in 1891, 2½ years ago. A great many of the same Senators are still here.

January 15, 1891, in the House of Representatives the bill was referred to the Coinage Committee and reported February 21, 1891, adversely and by order of the committee placed on the calendar and no further action was had.

In the House of Representatives, February 6, 1891, on the sundry civil appropriation bill, Mr. Bland moved a free coinage amendment, but was ruled out on a point of order. Then Mr. Bland appealed from the decision of the Speaker, and the ruling of the Speaker was sustained. Yeas 134—7 Democrats, 127 Republicans; nays 127—116 Democrats, 11 Republicans.

Now we come to the Fifty-second Congress, 1891–93, Mr. Harrison, President; the Senate 47 Republicans, 39 Democrats, 2 Independents; the House of Representatives 235 Democrats, 86 Republicans, 9 People's Party, 2 vacancies.

In the House of Representatives March 24, 1892, House bill 4426, for the free coinage of silver, etc., was pending. On motion of Mr. Burrows to lay on table the yeas were 148—80 Democrats, 68 Republicans; nays 149—130 Democrats, 12 Republicans, 7 People's Party. A motion to reconsider was agreed to—yeas 150, nays 148; and the motion to lay on the table again defeated—yeas 145, nays 149. After continued filibustering the House adjourned, and no further action was had.

July 1, 1892, in the Senate, Senate bill 51, for free coinage, complete as amended, passed—yeas 29—17 Democrats, 10 Republicans, 2 Independents; nays 25—7 Democrats, 18 Republicans. Sixteen paired for and 16 against it—13 Democrats and 3 Republicans paired for, and 2 Democrats and 14 Republicans against. Counting votes and pairs and the yeas would be 45—30 Democrats, 13 Republicans, 2 Independents; nays 41—9 Democrats, 32 Republicans.

In the House of Representatives July 5, 1892, the bill was referred to the Coinage Committee. July 6, Mr. Tracey's motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency was disagreed to—yeas 43, nays 129. Other filibustering motions were resorted to.

July 13—Mr. Catchings, from the Committee on Rules, reported a resolution to consider Senate bill 51. The previous question on the same was ordered. Yeas 162, nays 130—101 Democrats, 61 Republicans, yeas; 114 Democrats and 16 Republicans and Independents, nays. The resolution was then rejected. Yeas 136—118 Democrats, 9 Republicans, and 9 Alliance; nays 154—94 Democrats, 60 Republicans.

That was only a little over a year ago, a short time.

Now, I want to go a little further in the Fifty-second Congress.

December 7, 1892, the distinguished Senator from New York, Mr. Hill, introduced Senate bill 2534 for the repeal of the law of July 14, 1890, except the fifth and sixth sections, and as this is a very remarkable bill I am very glad the distinguished Senator is present. I say the Senator from New York introduced Senate bill 3524 for the repeal of the law of July 14, 1890, except the fifth and sixth sections, which was referred to the Finance Committee, and was never reported back to the Senate.

This is a very remarkable financial measure, evidently representing the matured thought and judgment of the distinguished Democratic leader from the Empire State of New York. It proposes to stop the purchase of silver and the issue of Treasury notes, and all coinage of the silver bullion already purchased, and to leave in the Treasury the great mass of silver bullion uncoined—and a mere commodity—and the large amount of United States Treasury notes issued and outstanding deprived of all monetary functions, including legal tender and redemption in coin—a bastard; an illegitimate issue of United States notes.

Well may we all pause before this wonderful prodigy for financial legislation. The junior Senator from Nevada, Mr. Stewart, came to its rescue on December 12 by introducing and having referred to the Finance Committee an amendment adding to the Senate bill 3524 a provision for the free and unlimited coinage of the standard silver dollar.

December 21, 1892, the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. McPherson, introduced a joint resolution (S. Res. 126) for the suspension of all purchases of silver bullion under the law of July 14, 1890, until otherwise ordered by Congress. Ordered to lie on the table. No further action had.

On January 4, 1893, the Senator from Nevada, Mr. Stewart, offered a free-coinage amendment, which was laid on the table and printed.

January 9, 1893, the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Aldrich, offered a substitute, reaffirming our purpose to maintain the parity in the value of gold and silver coins and United States notes and for the issue of bonds—here is the milk in the coconut—to be sold for gold to maintain such parity, and the suspension of purchase of silver bullion in the discretion of the President, and repealing the purchasing clause if there was no international bimetallic agreement, before January 1, 1894.

But to go back a little to show the interest of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. Sherman, in anything that squints of international bimetallism or international monetary conferences; July 14, 1892, the Senator from Ohio introduced and had referred to the Finance Committee, Senate bill 3423, for the repeal of the clauses of the law of July 14, 1890, for the purchase of silver bullion and issue of Treasury notes in the purchase, to take effect January 1, 1893.

July 6, 1892, the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Mr. Allison, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, had reported the sundry civil appropriation bill, with an amendment, providing for the international monetary conference that met at Brussels last year, and of which he was a member. That was on July 6. Immediately, on July 14, the distinguished Senator from Ohio brings in his bill to repeal his own protégé and wipe it out of existence, in ample time to have its proper effect on the proceedings of the international monetary conference to be held at Brussels, and to be referred to in their proceedings, as it was.

I will read that now, to see how our representatives over there talked to those clad in the purple robes of authority—kingly regal authority.

Third question.

This is by Mr. Cannon:

"The present policy of the United States, in regard to the purchase of silver, was defined by Mr. Cannon in the following terms:

" 'The United States has seriously taken into consideration the idea of repealing the Silver Purchase Act of 1890; the two political parties as well as——' "

Oh, yes; "as well as"—

" 'the great bankers of New York have advised this repeal, and if during this conference some arrangement is not attained, it is more than probable that America will not continue disposed to buy annually 54,000,000 ounces of silver at the market price.' "

Was it not peculiar that just as soon as any indication of an international monetary conference was visible upon the horizon by a proposed amendment in the sundry civil appropriation bill, the senior Senator from Ohio, claiming to strongly favor bimetallism, should come in with a bill for the destruction of his own offspring.

On January 17, 1893, Senate bill 3423 was reported from the Finance Committee by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Sherman], amended

by changing the repeal from January 1, 1893, to January 1, 1894, and adding a new section authorizing national banks to issue notes to face value of bonds.

Now, Mr. President, remember this bill was introduced on the 14th day of July, 1892. Congress was in session for some time afterward. It convened again in December. Not until January 17, 1893, did the distinguished Senator from Ohio bring back his own bill for action in the Senate. He must have been exceedingly anxious for the passage of the bill, considering the long time he consumed before reporting it back. Then what was it when reported back? It repealed the purchasing clauses after January 1, 1894, and then added a new section authorizing the issue by national banks of dollar for dollar of their circulation, the very identical kind of a bill that the distinguished Senator from Indiana, the chairman of the Finance Committee, has already reported to the Senate and is now pending on the calendar. That amendment was exactly in the language almost of the present bill. It gave the banks the power to issue up to the full face value of their bonds.

January 19, 1893, the senior Senator from Colorado, Mr. Teller, offered a substitute for free coinage of silver.

January 19, 1893, the junior Senator from Colorado, Mr. Wolcott, offered a substitute for coining all silver purchased and to be purchased under said act, differing in that respect. It was simply to compel the coinage of all the silver purchased and to be purchased under that act.

February 6, 1893—now we are in the present year—my colleague, Mr. Vest, offered an amendment restoring the Bland-Allison law of February 28, 1878, as a substitute.

February 6, 1893, the distinguished Senator from New York, Mr. Hill, made a speech, and moved to consider the bill reported by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Sherman.

The junior Senator from Indiana, Mr. Voorhees, moved to lay that motion on the table. That was ruled out of order on a point made by the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Hoar. The motion was then voted on; yeas 23—12 Democrats, 11 Republicans; nays 42—20 Democrats, 20 Republicans, and 2 Independents.

Mr. President, that was only last February. Now, if our Republican friends were so exceedingly anxious for the repeal of the act of 1890 why did they not repeal it when they had the President, the Senate, and the House? Why did they not make more determined efforts when they had the power and the responsibility? Did we see any of them turning somersaults trying to get a vote upon a repeal clause? Not a bit of it, Mr. President. They were not half as anxious to repeal that act under a Republican administration as they are to repeal it under a Democratic administration. For many years they had borne the odium of the gold standard they had established in 1873, and they were not willing under their own administration to unconditionally repeal the law of 1890 and reestablish the gold monometallism of 1873; but they are willing to do it under a Democratic administration. Wonderful patriotism. Wonderful disinterestedness.

But, Mr. President, what has been done under the so-called Sherman law of July 14, 1890? Up to September 1, 1893—I did not have time to get the data up to October 1—up to September 1, 1893, $151,804,170 in the United States Treasury notes therein authorized have been issued in the purchase of 163,047,664 ounces of fine silver of the coinage value of $210,809,100; and 36,087,185 standard silver dollars—costing for the bullion $29,110,116.25, the seigniorage being $6,977,038.75—having been coined. If all the bullion purchased up to September 1, 1893, were coined the number of silver dollars in excess of the Treasury notes then outstanding would be $60,318,741.

Probably about fifty millions of the Treasury notes have been redeemed in gold, and very little in silver dollars. Over $150,000,000 have been added to the volume of our money circulation. Why have $50,000,000 in gold been paid out in the redemption of these Treasury notes instead of silver dollars? The law of July 14, 1890, says that these notes "shall be redeemable on demand in coin," and "that upon demand of the holder * * * the Secretary of the Treasury shall, under such regulations as he may prescribe, redeem such notes in gold or silver coin at his discretion, it being the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio, or such ratio as may be provided by law." And that after July 1, 1891, "he," the Secretary of the Treasury, "shall coin of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act as much as may be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes herein provided for, and any gain or seigniorage arising from such coinage shall be accounted for and paid into the Treasury."

These words I have quoted are all parts of the same law—must be construed together and according to their clear intent. The first clause makes the Treasury notes redeemable in coin—the standard silver dollar is coin—is money absolute—a full legal tender in payment of "all debts and dues public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract."

The Treasury notes are debts of the United States—are public dues. There is no express stipulation in the law for their payment in gold. Why, then, have they been redeemed in gold?

It is claimed that the declaration "it being the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio" so controls the action of the Secretary as to prevent his exercising the discretion nominally vested in him if by such action the parity between gold and silver may be disturbed. The law says nothing about the parity between gold and silver. It says to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other.

Has the Secretary maintained the two metals, gold and silver, on a parity with each other by redeeming the Treasury notes in gold? It is absurd to claim that he has, while with the very Treasury notes he has been purchasing silver bullion at about 56 to 64 cents on the 412½ grains standard silver. He has utterly failed to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other. While the law gives the Secretary the right to "redeem such notes in gold or silver coin at his discretion," yet in the very next sentence it tells him expressly and unequivocally, and not nominally, how he shall exercise that discretion, namely:

"He shall coin of the silver bullion purchased * * * as much as may be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes herein provided for."

It does not say for a part of such notes, or such part of them as may not be redeemed in his discretion in gold, but for the redemption of the Treasury notes herein provided for; for the redemption of every Treasury note authorized to be issued by him by said act. Manifestly, then, a refusal by the Secretary to pay these notes in gold if demanded would not destroy the parity between the two metals—gold metal and silver metal—and would not establish a discrimination in favor of gold, but, on the contrary, does actually establish a discrimination against the silver dollar just as fully and effectually as if on demand he should redeem silver certificates issued for silver dollars in gold.

Mr. President, I confess that I have been greatly astonished to be informed, as I believe reliably, that under the present Democratic administration silver certificates calling for so many silver dollars deposited in the Treasury to be returned on demand have on presentation been paid in gold.

Mr. McPHERSON. Does it weaken them?

Mr. COCKRELL. Does it harm them? It is a breach of trust, a breach of faith. It is yielding to a dishonest and a dishonorable demand. It is bowing the knee to gold monometallism. It is acknowledging and establishing gold as the single standard. It is degrading the money of the world and the money of the United States, the silver dollar, and making it a subsidiary coin worth nothing by itself until it is redeemed in gold.

Good Lord, How Times Have Changed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, April 17, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, it is pitiful to me to see any organized group, in this special instance the leaders of the American Farm Bureau Federation, attempt to dictate to the Congress what should be done to some other farm group or perhaps thousands of innocent farmers.

You know the thing that has brought about this war, as far as I am concerned, is purely selfishness. I can readily understand how many of the real large farmers of the country, as well as various selfish groups, may be interested in destroying any attempt on the part of the Congress or the Federal Government to do anything that might be helpful to a class of citizens who are unable to do those things that should be done that would tend to protect them from the selfish "grazing" of other groups, those who are organized and who are well financed.

On January 26, 1943, certain members of the National Cotton Council of America met in conference in Memphis, Tenn. You know Mr. Oscar Johnston, who is at the head of this organization, is the largest cotton producer in the world, operating, as I understand, for a British syndicate. In a printed statement submitted to Members of Congress by this group, I find the following statement:

We recommend that either the future activities of the Farm Security Administration be restricted and confined exclusively to the accomplishments of the original objective of Congress—

Listen to this—

or preferably, in the interest of economy, that these worthy features of the program be transferred to other established agencies of the Department of Agriculture which are eminently qualified to handle them.

Now, this is going on by these well-organized groups while these thousands of poor farmers—with their large families, boys and girls, thousands of them growing up in poverty and ignorance because of their helplessness in doing those things that these well-organized groups are able to do—are out on these farms in a pitiful position, unless the representatives in Congress who are interested in agriculture, as well as humanity, defend the rights of this type of unorganized farmers.

You never see any of these farmers lobbying around Washington or appearing before any committee opposing any other group or even defending their own rights. As far as I am concerned, this is a class of people—and we have millions of them in this great country of ours—who actually need representation in the Congress of the United States.

You do not have to worry about men like Oscar Johnston or Ed O'Neal. Listen to "Brother" Ed O'Neal. I am quoting from a letter submitted to the members of the House Committee on Agriculture after the Rules Committee of the House had granted the request of my committee, that is not to report a closed rule:

Due to the action taken by your committee—

House Committee on Agriculture—

in opposing a rule requested by the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations waiving points of order against the provisions of the agricultural appropriation bill, floor action may result in the impairment or possibly complete elimination of many vitally important provisions of the bill. We therefore earnestly appeal to the committee to reconsider the action which has been taken and support a second request for a rule.

In fact, I understand, based on the request of Mr. O'Neal, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. CANNON of Missouri] requested the Rules Committee to rescind their previous action and grant a closed rule. I am thankful, however, that the Rules Committee, realizing just what has been going on and especially in connection with the present agricultural appropriation bill, refused for the second time to grant a closed rule.

These large farm operators do not want anything done in the way of helping thousands of helpless farm families, no doubt for the reason it would tend to drain these thousands of helpless farm families away from these large farms, and for the further reason, because of the supervising of the farming operations of these small farmers, proper production, proper marketing, and so forth, it might place them in competition with these large farm operators.

As previously stated, it is definitely understood by me and the members of my committee, that the Farm Security Administration has engaged in various activities which were never intended when this agency was established. But they did not get the money from my committee to do all of these things. Seven members of my committee, appointed by me recently, by authority of the House, are now engaged in a thorough investigation in connection with the activities of the Farm Security Administration, proposing to get the facts, after which legislation will be considered in an orderly manner before my committee, a legislative committee, that will weed out the bad and continue the good. Just why these groups, Oscar Johnston and Ed O'Neal, for instance, or the Committee on Appropriations, realizing that we are now engaged in this investigation, would want to bring in a bill under a closed rule and destroy the whole outfit, is beyond me.

To show you the handiwork of selfish groups, turn to page 97 of the agricultural appropriation bill now under consideration, and read section 8. As stated today in my remarks on the floor of the House, I am reminded of an incident which happened in my State in connection with the employment of a laborer. This laborer was always given his meals on a table in the kitchen. One day, for some reason, this laborer found himself ushered into the dining room, where he was privileged to view the beautiful furnishings and bounteous spread upon the table. As he seated himself at the table and viewed the contents thereof, he looked up and made this remark: "Good Lord, how times have changed."

Now what I want to get over to you in referring to the laborer's statement is, following the depression, when banks, corporations, and insurance companies, having made loans to farmers for production purposes, mortgages on their land, got caught and they were loaded with what appeared to be worthless accounts and papers, these groups were just as anxious as anybody for the Congress to do something about it in the name of the farmer. As usual, these groups had quite a lot of influence on Congress, and the Federal land banks, seed loan, and production credit corporations were established. The land banks took care of the situation, giving tremendous relief to the lenders on farm lands by bailing out these institutions and by taking over the customers of these concerns. The seed loan agencies came along and continued the operations of thousands and thousands of farmers who were unable to go back to the banks and get loans because of their financial condition, they could not get the money anywhere else.

Now that everybody believes that we are prosperous, there is plenty of money in the banks, farmers are in fairly good shape, somebody has persuaded the Committee on Appropriations to write into the pending bill—I am sure that the great masses of the farmers of this country did not do it—section 8, which states that no farmer shall be given a loan from any of these agencies until he has applied to some bank, corporation or insurance company, and has been turned down. "Good Lord, how times have changed."

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I am inserting herewith an editorial carried in the Post this morning. I do not always agree with editorials carried in the Washington Post, but the writer of this article seems to have the real facts in connection with this very important matter:

FARM FIGHT

Abolition of the Farm Security Administration, as recommended by the House Appropriations Committee, would signal the complete domination of the Department of Agriculture by the point of view of the large commercial farmers and by the Farm Bureau Federation, which speaks for them. Nothing so clearly demonstrates the Farm Bureau's identification with commercial farming interests as its long and bitter hostility to Farm Security Administration. The Farm Bureau, it should be remembered, has exerted its very considerable political power to wreck the anti-inflation program. Its advocacy of the Bankhead and Pace bills was designed to raise farm prices with complete disregard for the national economy. Its opposition to incentive payments as a means of encouraging production reflects a callous lack of concern for the welfare of small farms.

Whatever its errors or excesses, the Farm Security Administration is needed to give the United States a balanced, comprehensive program of food production. More than any other agency of the Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration has helped and befriended the small subsistence farmers, the family farms of America. It has sought to give a measure of independence and dignity to the otherwise disinherited little men of agriculture—the cotton choppers, tenant farmers, sharecroppers and migrant workers. The productive abilities of these people must be fully utilized if we are to achieve the mammoth harvests of food necessary to win the war and determine the character of the peace. It is a scandal that this year we face a decline in food production.

A major portion of the country's food comes from large commercial farms. These are already operating at, or very close to, their peak efficiency and productivity. But there are some 4,000,000 farm families whose gross income in 1940 amounted to less than $1,500; half of these grossed less than $600. Their productive potential has by no means been realized. It can be harnessed to the war effort only if the small farmers are given Federal aid in the form of funds for equipment and fertilizer and in the form of technical aid and supervision. Another urgent task is to help the small farmers to switch from nonessentials like cotton to essentials like peanuts and soya beans.

These forms of assistance, Farm Security Administration is peculiarly equipped to render. Its activities in the midst of war should be directed exclusively to just such war-related functions. It must forget some of the social theories which have confused its purposes in the past. It must operate strictly as a war agency to mobilize America's rural manpower as effectively as possible for the maximum production of that quintessential weapon of war and peace, food. Congress can best promote this purpose not by abolishing Farm Security Administration but by streamlining it.

You Do It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, "let George do it" seems to be the attitude of not a few of those who were convinced that the United States should get into this war, send its men to fight it, and, after victory had been won, join in forming some sort of a world supergovernment.

Sometimes it was called Union Now; sometimes the United States of the World; sometimes the United Nations of the World. The basic idea, however, was always the same. It was that, this being a wealthy and a great and powerful Nation, we were under some sort of an obligation to force peace, our economic

theories, and our theories of government upon the whole world, even though we had to convince and convert the recalcitrant by the use of the sword or its more modern equivalent, bombs.

The mailed fist was concealed in the velvet glove of the "four freedoms." Having, then, either exterminated or subjugated other nations, we were to surrender our independence, adopt a doctrine of interdependence, police and feed the world, and, of late, furnish the gold and the resources to establish an international bank. Perhaps you would have gained no profit from that banking system, but someone, by preference those of foreign countries and their associates in this country, would have been enabled to stabilize their incomes.

WALLACE, as you know, has been preaching to the American worker and taxpayer this doctrine of giving away everything, even your shirt, for, lo, these many months. But WALLACE, if you will recall, profited with his hybrid corn, which made 2 bushels grow where 1 had grown before, even while he insisted that farmers cut down their acreage. The result of his policy was to produce as much as before. But one incidental advantage was that WALLACE sold more hybrid corn.

Another typical uplifter and dogooder is Secretary of the Interior Ickes. He, like WALLACE and Eleanor Roosevelt, whose mileage seems to have been in no way limited by either the travel, gas-, or rubber-rationing program, insists that everyone—except present company—should contribute to the war.

The farmer's son, the farmer's brother, the factory worker, and, in short, every able-bodied citizen should go to war, shoulder a gun, and march away to the beat of drum and the waving of the flag. But not Ickes' hired man. His attitude is set forth so clearly, so concisely, and so accurately by Frank C. Waldrop in the Washington Times-Herald of this morning that it is printed herewith. It is as follows:

ICKES SETS AN EXAMPLE

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

That sassy talk by Secretary of the Interior Ickes concerning draft deferments ought to be a great morale booster for the downtrodden private businessman who notes the Federal Government has 840,578 men of draft age on its pay roll and wishes he had the nerve to ask his draft board to leave just one young man behind to do the heavy work of business administration and learn the trade so there will be somebody to fill the shoes of the next old fellow to pop off from overwork and heart strain.

Ickes in his appearance before House Military Affairs subcommittee investigating draft dodgers in the Federal departments gave out to the effect that he has asked deferment for not too many but too few young men in the Interior Department. He wants good people on the job around his place, he said, as if that were some special idea of his own coinage, and then he snooted the congressional committee thusly:

"I must report to you that I propose, to the extent of my restricted powers, from now on to make more requests for deferment."

He isn't joking. He has set the pace for his Department by writing a yard-long letter to a local draft board demanding deferment for the Honorable Abe Fortas, his Under Secretary.

The Honorable Fortas, who is 32 years of age, able-bodied, and a red-hot follower in days past, makes $10,000 a year as Ickes' understudy. His wife, Carolyn, puts aside a tidy $5,600 per annum also, as a Department of Justice attorney.

There are no children or other dependents. The Honorable and Mrs. Fortas are a typical couple of the sort ordinarily being torn asunder by the demands of the draft. He is able to stand the rigors of military service, and she is able to support herself. The Honorable Fortas, therefore, would by now doubtless be in uniform, except that Greatheart Ickes has stepped in to save the day.

Greatheart says he practically couldn't get through his day's work without the Honorable Fortas, a man of highly specialized talents, at his elbow. You may, therefore, wonder what the record is, on under secretaries.

When Ickes took over the Department of the Interior there was no under secretary at all. Theodore A. Walter was appointed First Assistant Secretary, and did all the work now given to an Under Secretary, as had first assistant secretaries in all preceding administrations.

But on August 5, 1935, Ickes got him an Under Secretary, by name Charles West.

Three years later Ickes removed West's desk, and locked the door as a gentle hint that he wanted Charlie's resignation.

The next man on the hot seat was Harry Slattery, who was chief coat holder for Ickes from June 4, 1938, until January 2, 1940, when one Alvan J. Wirtz had a whirl at the job.

Mr. Wirtz resigned in little more than a year, and so on July 8, 1941, former Representative John J. Dempsey, of New Mexico, tried to make a go of things, but he didn't have the necessary rubber backbone.

In less than a year, Dempsey gladly left for his home State of New Mexico, and ran for Governor, pausing now and then to mutter curses in the direction of Washington.

P. S. He won, and is doing a good job for his State today.

Mr. Fortas took over on June 25, 1942, and doubtless is very happy in his work—providing he has a strong stomach and few sensibilities.

After all, he has to look at Ickes several times a day.

But on his record he is not particularly superior to his predecessors.

Each of these gents was a lawyer, and perfectly capable of performing the lawyer's duties of seeing that the Secretary's papers were in order, and that nothing was signed that shouldn't be signed.

That's about the principal burden of being Under Secretary of the Interior, aside from the special burden of having to look at Ickes and listen to him.

And each of Fortas' predecessors was past 38, and several had dependents, too. They were not draft material then nor would they be today. Men of their age and qualifications are available today if Ickes wants any such around him.

But Greatheart has other plans. His fresh talk to the congressional investigators ran to the effect that he needed good men, who are hard to find. Also, that young men could work harder than older ones.

Fortas is young and he suits Ickes. He holds the papers right side up so the old man won't sign them backward.

All true. Yet what draft board is giving a break to any private business in this country on such grounds?

On the contrary, business is being told to close down if it can't get along with oldsters, girls, and any kind of compromise it can think up.

If any private enterprise were to face up to a draft board with the kind of impudent backchat Ickes gave the congressional investigators, somebody would call for a cop, and the business involved would suffer.

Why is Ickes allowed to run his outfit on luxury lines when taxpaying companies and citizens have to take the best they can get and like it?

Why should any Federal department today set an example of going after "more, not less," exemptions, hard up as this country is for manpower?

The House Committee on Military Affairs doesn't have to swallow insults from Ickes.

He has set a bad example to the country in saying he is going to fight to keep his men out of the draft even though older men to replace them might be had.

He has asked for some congressional discipline. Is there anybody up on the Hill with nerve enough to dish out same?

Mr. Speaker, if your boy is in Australia, New Guinea, Guadalcanal, North Africa, Iceland, Greenland, or the Aleutians, or just somewhere here in America, remember that, according to Ickes' theory, he was not needed here at home. But Ickes' understudy, Fortas, who draws down $10,000 a year and whose wife, Carolyn Fortas, takes a neat $5,600 per year, as a Department of Justice attorney, are both essential to Ickes' program.

It is about time that those who were so anxious that we get into the war begin to make a little sacrifice themselves, instead of loading it all on George.

The Liquor Trust or Monopoly and Hold-the-Line Order

REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are vitally interested in seeing that the President's hold-the-line order against inflation is carried out without respect to persons or interests. Under the recent freezing order of the Manpower Commission the plowman's hands are frozen to the plow; the miner's to his pick, and the welder's to his torch. War is no occasion for profit to anyone, and yet, while most Americans are seeking to cooperate in this hold-the-line program, I want to present to the House information of a flagrant and inexcusable violation of the anti-inflation program by an effort on the part of the liquor trust to gain a monopoly in this industry. The Big Four in this industry is composed of McKesson & Robbins, National Distillery, American Distillery, and Schenley.

Let me present a few examples of their inflationary operations. About January 1, 1943, McKesson & Robbins bought the Fairfield Distillery at Bardstown, Ky., that had for many years used the brand name "Pride of Nelson," a liquor with a good reputation that was a straight bourbon whisky, but this brand was immediately withdrawn from the market.

The owner of $25,000 of this stock, which he at all times previous to this fabulous and exorbitant sale had offered at sale for $400 for the entire $25,000, received for his portion of the stock the sum of $102,000.

Let us look at another case. About January 1, 1943, the Cummings Distillery at Athertonville, Ky., was sold to one of the Big Four. Its stock had never sold better than 90 cents per share, but in this sale the stock was bought for $13.50 per share. All their old established brands were immediately withdrawn from the market and nothing released to replace them. The purpose of this program must be apparent to the Members of the House. In withdrawing these brands from the market a shortage is made to appear and a cheap blend of whisky can be substituted, and no doubt will be substituted on a large scale at unprecedented profits.

Let us take another case. About April 1, 1943, the National Distillery and McKesson & Robbins bought out the Glencoe Distillery of Louisville, Ky., for which they paid approximately three and one-half million dollars. This distillery cost approximately $270,000 to build. The buyer paid for 30,000 barrels of whisky at the price of $2.25 per gallon, although the O. P. A.'s ceiling on old whisky is $1.21 per gallon. About 5,000 barrels of 1942 distillation was figured at $2 per gallon, while the ceiling by the O. P. A. is fixed at 89 cents per gallon, so the sale of this 5,000 gallons was $1.11 in excess of the ceiling price. How can these concerns do this sort of thing in violation of the O. P. A. ceiling prices? Let the O. P. A. answer.

And now let's look at the latest effort on the part of the whisky monopoly to gain control of another independent. On or about April 10, 1943, the American Distillery and the firm of McKesson & Robbins contracted to buy the T. W. Samuels Co. at Deatsville, Ky., for the sum of approximately $13,000,000. The paid-in capital stock of this company is valued at $100 per share, and it is estimated there are about 10,000 shares of this stock. Why is their stock suddenly worth 13 for 1? Let the O. P. A. answer that one. One individual, I am reliably informed, has 10 shares of this stock for which he paid $1,000, and he is now being offered $10,000 for his share by the Whisky Trust. How can you justify holding the line all along the way against workingmen, farmers, and everyone else, and allowing this fellow to dispose of his holdings at an inflationary value of 13 times their real worth? Again the O. P. A. should answer, or perhaps the Securities and Exchange Commission should take a hand.

This concern has on hand approximately 125,000 barrels of whisky, which at O. P. A. ceiling price is worth about $7,000,000. The distillery and warehouses at very best are not worth more than one million, or a total of $8,000,000. Nevertheless, five million extra is being paid for this distillery in excess of its inventory value. Now in this deal the wholesalers have already been informed that the old reliable brand name of T. W. Samuels is to be withdrawn from the market and that no more will be available, although from the Government records they now have on hand 125,000 barrels. This, too, is monopolistic practice to create an imaginary shortage. The American Distillery, which is now negotiating to buy Samuels, in October 1942, bought the Ben Burke Co. at Boston, Ky., for $19,000,000. They withdrew all of the old well-known Mr. Boston whisky and the Ben Burke brands, and substituted in their place a number of blends with new names at much higher prices.

Now, let us look at the way these purchasers intend to pay for their products. They are getting a portion of the money by a practical form of assessment of the wholesalers throughout the territory which they serve. Certain wholesalers have been called by officials of this company and told to send New York drafts for $100,000 and that in return they would be given a contract for 10,000 cases of whisky, to be delivered over the next 15 months. The wholesalers are without anything to sell. They must either put up the money or continue to be without business. As a consequence, some of them have already put up their share of the money. Here is how these purchasers make the present stocks pay the exorbitant and fabulous prices which they are paying for these remaining independent distilleries in order to effect their monopoly. They take 1 gallon of T. W. Samuels whisky and blend it with spirits or new whisky and make 4 or 5 gallons, or even more, for this 1 gallon, and they then put it on the market under a new brand name and sell it, in some instances, higher than the old brand originally sold for. This is a problem which the O. P. A. should immediately investigate, for this practice of paying fabulous and fictitious prices could not be continued except through the aid, intentionally or otherwise, of that branch of O. P. A. that has supervision over these matters, and if we are to "hold the line," the O. P. A. must move immediately to stop this practice, which is not only destroying a great industry in my State, but is breaking the line against inflation and making the line harder to hold for the others who seek to follow suit. The problem also applies to the Department of Justice Anti-trust Division. We ought to call in another Thurman Arnold.

It is estimated that whereas in 1938 there were 68 independent distilleries in my State, there are now about 8. The end of this policy means that the big four will control the entire industry in America, and then the matter of prices and quality will be controlled completely by this monopoly. Kentucky, the home of good liquor, has been hit hard under the belt by this Liquor Trust. Note the headline carried in Sunday's Courier Journal, "Who's got the bourbon? Liquor stores here haven't."

1943 Food Outlook

REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD W. LANDIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, we had a banner year on the farm in 1942, due to unusually favorable weather conditions, improved seed, more modernized farm equipment plus a wartime demand and an insured market. We produced 14 percent more than we did in 1941 and 12 percent more than we did in the previous record year of 1937.

Vegetables were a major source of farm income last year. Commercial vegetable production in 1942 broke all records. Acreage was increased about 18 percent in principal crops for canning and processing. Production of tomatoes, corn, peas, lima beans, and string beans for canning increased 13 percent. Canned kraut and beets were reduced by restrictions on cans. Cucumbers were reduced because of labor problems.

The acreage of vegetables for market was about 1 to 6 percent less, but production was about 4 percent higher than any previous season. New production records were established for carrots, celery, lettuce, onions, and tomatoes. The cantaloup and watermelon crops were among the smallest in the last 12 years.

VEGETABLE SHORTAGE

This year the outlook for food production does not appear so good. The favorable conditions are moisture, improved seed, wartime demand, and the anticipated fair price. The unfavorable conditions are frosts, scarcity of farm labor, and reduced plantings. The Agriculture Situation announces that there will be an 11 percent reduction in vegetables in 1943. Therefore we must urge the importance of victory gardens to supplement part of the vegetable shortage. Our Nation has already lost 10 to 15 percent of the 1943 vegetable pack due to delay, bungling and the lack of understanding of practical agriculture by the bureaucrats.

Some of the immediate problems of the processors are the difficulties of securing labor, the lack of adequate machinery, the question of reasonable prices along with 1943 grade labeling. Unless we have some action to aid the processors in the next few days the Nation will lose 30 percent of the 1943 pack. Fruit and vegetable producers and processors cannot be expected to produce at a loss. The American people are willing to pay a few cents more for food rather than do without. As for example, if Indiana canners were to get the proper price for canned tomatoes it would only cost the consumer 49 cents more per person, for the entire year, if one used all of his ration coupons for canned tomatoes. If the Government adds subsidies it would

cost the consumer about 71½ cents more. Whether you increase the price or give subsidies, the money will come out of the consumers' pockets just the same.

INFLATION

I realize that some farm prices are high enough but vegetable prices are too low. Every time someone mentions giving the farmers a small increase in order for him to make a living, we hear the cry of inflation. A small increase of 49 cents per person each year will not cause inflation. We will have real inflation if we do not produce enough food for our domestic population. An abundant food production is our best guaranty against inflation.

BLACK MARKETS

In the First World War we stimulated production by giving reasonable prices and thus obtained results. We increased our export food supply to Europe from 3,500,000 tons to 18,000,000 tons. Very few black markets developed in this period because reasonable prices were adjusted close to the farm as possible and the wholesaler and retailer were only assured of a reasonable profit in handling the distribution of farm products. Today under the present system we have many black markets because prices were adjusted from the consumer instead of from near the producer at which point the adjustment should have originated. It does not take a genius to decide on reasonable prices. I prefer fair prices to subsidies because subsidies are economically unsound and vicious. Producers and processors are at the mercy of the bureaucrats under the subsidy system. Subsidies will cost the taxpayers more than fair prices.

Unless we have action, now, it will be too late. We are already too late for some areas. I understand that the House Agriculture Committee and the canners themselves have been working for months to give the canners and processors the green light to produce a maximum 1943 pack. The O. P. A. is holding up the maximum production pack. The farmers and processors of Indiana and America want to produce the food to win the war. If we do not get immediate action the O. P. A. and the Agriculture Department must shoulder the responsibility of any future food shortage. They must face the criticism that will result from a food shortage.

FOOD CONFERENCE

Mr. Speaker, many people believe that instead of holding a world food conference on how to distribute the food not yet produced, we should have a national food conference to present a program that will enable us to produce enough food in the United States to feed our armed forces, our civilians, and assist our allies. For example, the policies of the bureaucrats in the O. P. A. and Agriculture Department have already made it almost impossible to currently purchase a pound of potatoes in the market place, and their regulations have arrested the flow of dry beans in certain areas from the primary producer (the farmer) into market channels. Other food products are in a similar position right now. The O. P. A. and Agriculture Department bottlenecks must be removed or we will do well to provide food for our armed forces and our civilian population, even to a less moderate degree than now.

Post-War Vampire Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. HANCOCK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the thoughtful and eloquent address delivered by my esteemed colleague from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] before the Better Builders Association of Onondaga County, State of New York, at their annual banquet in my home city of Syracuse, on April 14, 1943:

POST-WAR VAMPIRE PLANNING ECONOMY

It is now reported that about 250 commissions, agencies, committees, and associations and institutes are making plans for America and the world when the war ends.

It is about time that the Congress of the United States began to do something about the subject of post-war economy for America. Unfortunately, the whole subject of planning for the post-war world has been brought into disrepute because of some of the fantastic schemes which have had the most advertising. It has been hurt also by the fact that the very word "planning" is associated with the philosophy of those who want to run the country and the world by vast armies of bureaucracies and by the baleful institution of executive directives.

STRIP CONGRESS

When you look at some of these plans you will be very much surprised, because some of these plans—plans proposed by some very influential people in this Government—include stripping from the Congress most of its powers to perform its functions under the Constitution. Such a move would amount to political revolution and conversion from a republican form of Government to a fascistic type state.

OFFICIAL PLANNING AGENCIES

There are two agencies in the Government that have been authorized to do the official planning for this administration. One of them is the National Resources Planning Board. The other is the Board of Economic Warfare. The National Resources Planning Board is supposed to be making plans for the United States when peace returns. The Board of Economic Warfare, in addition to handling the war problems of the Government on the economic front, is also planning for the social and economic set-up of the whole world after the war. "Global planning" is the mouth-filling word that is used by these agencies to describe their function.

But there is one thing about the plans that are being made by these bodies which ought to excite the apprehension of all Americans. I think it is a fair statement that Americans generally have confidence in America's future and in our ability to make the present economic and social system work. We have not asked for some other economic system in its place.

In my opinion, no planning group should be entrusted with this grave subject, which starts out with the conviction that the present system is done for, is outdated, and ought to be scrapped. The only result which we can hope for from such planners is a program to destroy our system.

FREE ENTERPRISE DONE

Both these agencies—the National Resources Planning Board and the Board of Economic Warfare—so far as their planning activities are concerned, are convinced that the present economic system is finished. Of course, they do not tell us that frankly. They do not dare to say that to us in the literature they publish. As a matter of fact, they are continually protesting that their plans are all made to rehabilitate the capitalistic system. Nothing is more false. If you will go to their writings and addresses and their books, you will find that they have already put themselves on record that our present system is just about finished and that the only hope of the free enterprise system surviving is by taking the Government in as a partner. Mind you, the Government is to be the senior partner, and, by the way, the partner who will put up all the money.

FRONTIER GONE

They have advertised to the world that our frontier is gone, that our population expansion has slowed down to a snail's pace, that our technological development has matured, and that there are, therefore, no important inventions or devices or changes in forms of production in sight. I, for one, think such statements are utterly insupportable. I do not believe that invention and ingenuity and science is done in this country. On the contrary, I believe we have just started. I read a piece the other day written nearly 15 years ago by one of the greatest scientists in this country—Dr. Whitney, then head of the laboratories of the General Electric Co., the man who was for years the associate and colleague of the famous Dr. Steinmetz—in which he said that in the field of electricity alone, in spite of all the wonderful progress that has been made, we have hardly scratched the surface. Dr. Whitney listed a group of subjects on which scientists were working which he said were certain to be developed and which would produce the greatest revolution in the ways of life and methods of production that this country has ever known. Can you imagine entrusting the planning of the future of this country to a group of men who begin with the defeatist assumption that our free enterprise system is dying and that science has already exhausted itself in the field of industry? While they are making these pronouncements the world is at war and the fertile mind of man is spawning incredible improvements in transportation and production, which will recast the world in times of peace. The psychology of these planners is in no way progressive. On the contrary, it is a psychology of a dark age advocated only by defeatists.

These men—these economists of the National Resources Planning Board and the Board of Economic Warfare—have decided that our only hope is to throw private business into the arms of the Government, to make the Government of the United States the great investor, to have this Government go on year after year when the war ends, borrowing countless billions of dollars and spending these dollars in order to create income for the American people. Business, industry, they say, will no longer borrow the savings of the people because the opportunity for profitable investment has disappeared or at least has become so limited that a man with money to invest cannot find a place to invest it. Therefore, the Government must do the borrowing and spend these billions year after year in order to keep our people at work. Such is the defeatist philosophy.

BORROWED MONEY

For the last 10 years we have been rocking along spending yearly borrowed billions and spending them on Work Projects Administration and Public Works Administration and other alphabetical agencies to keep people at work. A great many perfectly honest men believed that this was necessary. They said we had gotten into a jam, that the great pump of American business which pumps wages and other payments out to the American people that constitutes the national income had broken down. They thought that this pump was out of order and that it needed priming, and they said: "Let us spend a few billion dollars to get this pump—the pump of private industry—started again." And so Congress authorized the expenditure of around three billions. But that didn't work. Then it authorized the expenditure of still more billions and it kept it up right up to 1940, before the war, until we had poured, all told, about $27,000,000,000 into the pump. Well, obviously after that a lot of honest-minded men began to ask themselves if this was such a good plan. The Government didn't have any other plan. The Government today has no other plan. And then along came the apostles of the new economics, some of them from Harvard University, if you please, and said: "Why, gentlemen, what you have been doing is the correct thing. You have been proceeding according to the principles of science as developed by the new economics. The only trouble is that you have not been spending enough. You should spend more."

Mr. Rexford Tugwell said: "We have not produced recovery because we have borrowed and spent only three billions a year." He declared that we should borrow and spend at least $12,000,000,000 a year. Some of these economists say we should spend ten billions and others go as high as thirty billions, but they all say unless the Government does this our whole economic life will collapse.

Now, you can imagine how pleasant all this was to those who had been spending without effect and who were getting discouraged when these economists patted them on the back and told them: "Do not be discouraged. You are on the right track. All you have to do is to double and triple and quadruple your spendings."

Well, you know what they did. They brought these men to Washington and they made them the thinkers in chief of these planning groups that I have been talking about. These are the men who are making plans. Of course, they are planning projects—bridges, roads, tunnels through the mountains and under the rivers, vast enterprises of all sorts which will cost ten, fifteen, twenty, or thirty billions a year, but the projects they plan are not the important thing. The important thing is the principle, the theory that is at the bottom of all their planning, namely, that it must all be done in order to provide the Government with means for borrowing and spending more billions.

These men have not been planning. Their plans were made before they got to Washington. They are doctrinaires. They are a bunch of schematic philosophers who have a theory as to how our Government, our society, our economic system ought to be revolutionized. They have not invited anybody in to confer with them. They have not sought to bring together the best experts in all fields, to get the product of the best brains in the country on this greatest and most baffling of problems. They have their minds made up and they have been scheming and contriving to put their own new school of social thought into operation in this country. They have been using planning as a cloak to change our economic life. They have been using the planning function as a cover to put into effect their own peculiar doctrines—doctrines, mind you, which the overwhelming weight of economic opinion rejects. Leader, among this group of "vampire" economy doctrinaries, is Dr. Alvin H. Hansen.

GUIDING IDEAS

One of the earliest pamphlets of National Resources Planning Board is entitled "After the War—Full Employment," published in January 1942. This pamphlet was prepared for the Board by Dr. Alvin H. Hansen and is so labeled. This is one of the pamphlets officially described by the Board in November 1942 as offering its underlying objectives and guiding ideas.

In this pamphlet Dr. Hansen lays down the proposition outlined in his book, namely, the principle of the dual consumptive economy, in which private business will produce the goods and the Government will assume responsibility to assure a sustained consumption (p. 3). He describes this on pages 3 and 4 of the pamphlet thus:

"We know from past experience that private enterprise has done this for limited periods only. It has not been able to insure continuous and sustained demand; private industry and Government together must act to maintain and increase output and income sufficiently to provide substantially full employment."

Throughout the pamphlet appear the well-known arguments that appear in Dr. Hansen's book, Fiscal Policy and Business Cycles, and the Harvard and Tufts book, An Economic Program for American Democracy—namely, that (1) public debt is something very different from private debt because private debts must be paid and public debts need not; (2) public debt is not a burden since it increases income; (3) the taxes collected to meet interest charges are not lost as they are paid right back, largely to institutions that benefit the community as a whole; (4) public debt should be used as an instrument of public policy to control the magnitude of the national income, while taxes are used to effect its distribution.

Dr. Hansen suggests a post-war national income budget as follows:

Consumption	$80,000,000,000
Net capital formation (including public works and housing)	10,000,000,000
Defense (including International Reconstruction Finance Corporation)	10,000,000,000

Since the Board has offered this pamphlet by Dr. Hansen, its most influential adviser, as containing a statement of "underlying objectives" and "guiding ideas," there is little room left to doubt that the theories of Dr. Hansen are those which lie at the bottom of all the Board's planning.

But this is not all. Throughout almost all the reports and pamphlets is the recognition of this theory as the underlying principle of all that is being done by the Board.

Mr. Rexford Tugwell said in 1940 that our spending program had failed to produce full recovery because we had not spent enough. We had spent only around three billion a year whereas the Government should spend twelve billion. In its pamphlet, The Future of Transportation, issued in September 1942, the Board said:

"Inevitable readjustments following the present war will require far-reaching participation in productive investments designed to stimulate and maintain a high level of national income. Although billions of dollars have been spent in the past to provide emergency relief employment on transportation projects, results have been grossly inadequate in the light of what might have been attained."

Throughout all the pamphlets and reports is the idea that we have built up our national income during the war by vast public expenditures and that the same devices can produce the same results in peace. Thus in the pamphlet After Defense—What?, issued January 1942, the Board says:

"The full employment and prosperity which is coming with the defense effort proves that we can have a full employment system and balance the production-consumption budget at a high level if we are determined to do so."

Indeed various members of the administration confirm this, for they continually assert that we are going to accomplish all the miracles of abundance when the war ends by "a bold use of the public credit." Mr. WALLACE and Mr. Milo Perkins of the Board of Economic Warfare have said this.

PERMANENT INSTRUMENT

It is necessary to repeat, however, the most important fact respecting these opinions and that is that all this is suggested not as a mere emergency device to tide us over the post-war transition period, but as a permanent instrument of public policy to create a high level of national income. And it means, therefore, a continuously rising public debt. We are assured by the President that the national debt will be two hundred and ten billion in June 1944. If the war should end at that time we must look to at least 1 more year of spending as great as during 1943–44. The peak of spending in the last war was reached in the year following the war. It is coming to be generally recognized that the national debt will be swelled by the war effort to not less than three hundred billion. It is at this point, with a debt of three hundred billion, that the Planning Board proposes to launch a vast program of public expenditures with borrowed funds, adding each year to the stupendous debt and doing this permanently.

The idea has been expressed by the Hansen group sponsoring this theory thus:

"The notion that Government spending can be resorted to only as a temporary emergency device must be abandoned. A program must be developed which recognizes the necessity for permanent public investment."

Again they say:

"We advocate a long-term program of Government investment financed through borrowing of savings which would otherwise go to waste."

Dr. Hansen admits a limit to public debt. He thinks that there must be some proportion between debt and national income, but he does not believe that national income can be increased without increasing the debt, and he says in his book Fiscal Policy and Business Cycles that we cannot look forward ever again to the balanced Budget for any considerable period.

SIX-YEAR PLAN

How all this money is to be spent is not yet made very clear. The National Resources Planning Board has made a list of public works projects which are already available for what it calls its 6-year plan, thus going Germany two better on the 4-year plan and Russia one better on the 5-year plan. This is only a beginning, however. A careful reading of all the pamphlets and reports indicates that the Board supports another theory, namely, that public funds must be used to invest in private industries, purchasing the bonds or stocks of railroads, utilities, or other industries in order to supply the credit which they believe is not forthcoming from private sources.

VAMPIRE ECONOMY

Moreover, these same doctrines, I wish to emphasize, were the very ones put into operation by those misguided thinkers across the

ocean who brought into existence the totalitarian and Fascist states. We are now at war with the fruits of their evil policies, and yet their disciples—either from ignorance or intent—are roosting in our midst and, under cover of the distractions of war, are preparing to build in America what our soldiers are tearing down with bayonet, hand grenade, and machine gun in Europe. Enormous spending by the Government, and an illimitable public debt was the womb and body of fascism and totalitarianism—a tragic economic philosophy which is, in fact, thousands of years old in the history of dictatorships.

I don't want you for one moment to get the impression that your industry is going to escape this "vampire" economy and the beneficence of joint partnership with government. On the list of joint partnerships come urban developments, transportation terminal reorganization, river-basin developments, agricultural rehabilitation, all transport facilities—including terminal reconstruction, consolidation of railroads, highway transport, expansion of air transport, new river and harbor developments, pipe lines and housing. So, according to these plans, you are to be the junior partner of government which means that you will be no partner at all, but instead the dupes of this fantastic and fascistic program. Never forget that when the Government becomes the investor, the Government becomes the principal partner in business and when the Government becomes the principal partner in business, business becomes the tool of politics. And, when that happens we have the same kind of an economy that Hitler runs in Germany.

PLOESER RESOLUTION

On March 8 1943, I introduced a resolution in the House which will direct and authorize the Federal Trade Commission to make a study of post-war planning with the cooperation of the Small Business Committees of both the House and Senate. This enables the Congress to take into its hands the all-important task of successfully rehabilitating the American economic system. The reason for delegating this task to the Small Business Committees of the House and Senate is that I firmly believe that the small-business unit is the keystone in the arch of free competitive economic enterprise. The purpose is not to diminish the important role that big business plays in a free competitive business economy, but rather to make sure of the survival of typically free American small business. The role which the Small Business Committees in the House and Senate would play in this investigation is one of cooperation with the Federal Trade Commission.

I introduced this resolution so that upon completion of the Federal Trade Commission's study of post-war planning, which would be July 1, 1944, the Congress would be in a position to proceed, immediately upon cessation of hostilities, to steer our democracy clear of the reefs of those pernicious foreign economic philosophies which have already worked such a tragedy before our eyes.

INTEND TO STAY AMERICAN

Above all, American public opinion is particularly realistic at this time. The people do not intend to be led by a group of visionaries who have already demonstrated their inability to manage the national affairs of the United States in the peacetime of the past decade. Propagandists may write to their hearts' content, in their effort to smooth the way for a World War Projects Administration, supported by the United States taxpayer, but they will never blind the American public to their one and foremost interest—American post-war security.

It is my belief that Americans intend to stay American with the guaranty of continued political and economic independence.

If we are to again enjoy free prosperity, it becomes our duty to maintain just as many units of business as possible during the prosecution of the war. These units must have a fighting chance to rehabilitate themselves after the war. They must have the opportunity to a full participation in the post-war reconstruction period. Their right to live and prosper must be guarded zealously. The existence of private monopolistic control or the imposition of governmental regimentation of business can destroy post-war prosperity in America.

We are not living in a free economy now, during the war. Furthermore, we expect a forced economy during the war period of forced production. But this is not prosperity and none should be so deluded. The continuance of present-day war controls would mean eventual economic disaster.

RETURN TO A FREE JOB

We are concerned about the return of our fighting men. Are they to come home to a place on the dole, handed out by paternalistic Government, or to a job—a free job in industry? One is the shackle and chain of economic slavery, with eventual security for none; the other, is the free way of life with opportunity for all.

In my opinion, these men must be gradually reinfiltrated into our economy. That should be done in a way which gives back their civil liberty immediately, with assurance of limited military sustenance until they individually have the opportunity to reestablish themselves. Industry must be given its freedom to reconvert and reemploy these millions of heroic and deserving American men. I do not favor the destruction of worth-while gains or the return of old abuses, but I shall always oppose the imposition of governmental abuses which pretend to be for the common welfare.

Your particular industry may be threatened with plans of widespread Government activity which would replace you. I believe that you can well supply the materials, the credit, the manpower, and the competent management for the proper and adequate housing of the Nation. The post-war reconstruction period will demand of you just such performance. I believe that in a free economy you can do a better and more economical job than Government has done or will be able to do.

It becomes the task of the Congress to protect this democracy from economic failure after the war.

THE BATTLE FOR AMERICA

Destroying the enemy on the field of battle will not alone guarantee the preservation of our democratic form of government. The greatest battle which must be won is the economic battle for America. That battle comes after we have triumphed over our enemies on foreign battlefields. We have yet to win the economic battle for America. As Americans we must resolve that we shall not have shed the blood of thousands of American boys on the battlefields of the world in vain.

Freedom for your industry, as well as all industry, means our chance to develop American post-war prosperity—worthy of our tradition—a challenge to the future.

The Oil Situation in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 13, 1943.

Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: You have asked, for yourself and your colleagues, what transportation plans are being made so that the shortages of petroleum experienced in New England last winter may be prevented in the 1943–44 period. I am glad to comply with your request. Very recent developments have materially changed the transportation program for this year. Reply to your request has been deferred until some of the uncertainties in these developments could be cleared up. There are still some possibilities which cannot be accurately forecast but these will be indicated in the course of my reply.

My responsibility, as you know, is in the field of transportation. It is the duty and purpose of the Office of Defense Transportation to make every possible effort to provide the transportation that is needed for the military and essential civilian needs. All matters involving petroleum supply are a function of the Office of Petroleum Administrator for War. He determines the quantities and kinds of petroleum that may be shipped and the points of origin and destination. Out of the total quantity of petroleum that can be moved into the eastern seaboard territory, by all of the available means of transportation, the Petroleum Administrator for War has the sole governmental authority to determine what part shall be shipped for civilian uses into New England.

For this reason I shall not undertake to discuss in this letter any questions of supply or the quantities of petroleum that may be required for civilian and military uses. I say this as a word of caution because, while the transportation situation for 1943 and 1944 indicates marked improvement, it would be a mistake to draw conclusions from that fact without advice from the Petroleum Administrator, who secures current information as to the demand—both domestic and offshore—for petroleum products.

The explanation of the primary cause of the shortage of petroleum supply which has been experienced in New England is so well known to you that it need not be repeated. It centers in the loss of coastwise deep-water transportation which has thrown the whole burden upon overland movements. I mention it here only for the purpose of stating that in the analyses and forecasts which follow, no reliance has been placed upon a restoration of transportation by tankers during the coming year. That seems the only safe assumption. If it should prove to be possible to use some tankers in Atlantic coastwise service, that, of course, would relieve the situation to the extent of the quantities so transported.

Stocks of petroleum in the eastern seaboard area, especially of fuel oils, have been very much depleted and are not only below safe working quantities, but, with respect to certain grades, are at critical levels. They must be built up as rapidly as possible if a recurrence of last winter's experience is to be avoided. In addition, the overland transportation capacity must be as substantially increased as the available facilities will permit.

The part that storage of necessary petroleum products plays in the New England situation is particularly important. Normally, those products are accumulated in storage to meet peak demands. The percentages of storage capacity in barrels to the consumption by States in New England as

shown in the White Report, May 19, 1942, are as follows:

	Estimated rationed consumption	Storage capacity	Percent of storage to consumption
Maine	8,180,000	3,401,609	41.6
New Hampshire	5,325,000	636,640	12.0
Vermont	3,090,000	927,326	30.0
Massachusetts	57,865,000	10,491,524	18.2
Rhode Island	15,725,000	5,404,104	34.3
Connecticut	23,215,000	5,529,299	23.8
Total	113,400,000	26,390,502	23.3

The available, properly located storage should be filled on a planned program between now and November, without, of course, interfering with current offshore movement. The problem of transporting products into New England in the summer months is substantially less difficult than in the winter months. As you, of course, know, the critical situation in New England this past winter resulted from the fact that operating quantities in storage fell well below safe working margins and this in turn was due to inadequacy of transportation facilities.

Inasmuch as the Petroleum Administrator for War designates to the Office of Defense Transportation the kind and quantity of petroleum products to be shipped to all parts of the United States, the Office of Defense Transportation, as a service organization, will undertake to transport to New England, with the available facilities and such additional facilities as can be developed, the quantities and kinds of petroleum products that are designated.

The several means of transportation that directly and indirectly serve the New England area are: Pipe lines, barges and tankers, tank trucks, and tank cars.

In order that you may have a complete picture of the transportation problem, I will discuss briefly the transportation program involving each of the above means of transportation. This, I hope, will advise you of the progress that has been made to date and the plans for the future.

DELIVERIES BY PIPE LINES

Increased deliveries of petroleum and petroleum products to the New England area are only indirectly the result of the program for new construction, reversal, conversion, and enlargement of our pipe-line transportation system, inasmuch as New England does not have, at present, the advantage of direct connection with the network of pipe lines reaching from the Southwest to the Atlantic coast and must be served, in final delivery, by other means of transportation.

Every additional barrel of oil that can be transported into district 1 by pipe line, regardless of the terminus of such a line, releases other means of transportation such as tank cars or barges, and this will permit greater distribution into the New England area.

In an effort to secure the maximum utilization of existing pipe-line facilities and to provide for new construction, enlargement, conversion, reversal, and interconnection in order to achieve the level of transportation services required, much has been done in the past year by the industry and the Government agencies concerned with the problem. The endeavor has been primarily to secure adequate civilian and military supplies for the east coast area and to provide in this area such supplies as are needed for the offshore demand of our armed forces.

The principal projects still incomplete are the 24-inch war emergency pipe line, being constructed from Longview, Tex., to the New York-Philadelphia area, and the 20-inch products line designed to transport oil from the Houston-Beaumont area in Texas to the Atlantic seaboard. The Office of Defense Transportation has supported before the War Production Board the request of the Petroleum Administrator for approval of materials necessary to construct these two pipe lines. I believe that both of them should be completed as rapidly as possible.

Many of the projects completed or under construction do not permit deliveries by pipe line directly into district No. 1, but by shortening tank car and barge haul, contributes substantially to this end. Pipe lines delivering directly into district No. 1 are operating at practical capacity and the following tabulation indicates the extent to which deliveries have been increased over the past year:

Daily average deliveries by pipe lines into district No. 1—year 1942

Barrels per day:

January	64,193
February	80,142
March	103,290
April	105,533
May	130,225
June	131,367
July	125,032
August	128,388
September	127,540
October	130,454
November	130,469
December	158,633

It is anticipated that deliveries for the first quarter of 1943 will be substantially above December 1942, due to the completion of additional projects Figures for this period are not yet available.

For the second quarter of 1943, we expect the then completed pipe lines into district No. 1 will be delivering at the rate of 211,768 barrels per day. The 24-inch war emergency pipe line when completed into district No. 1 should have the effect of increasing third-quarter deliveries to 364,893 barrels per day. The fourth-quarter deliveries should average 482,350 barrels per day.

Surveys are now being made for the 20-inch products pipe line from the Houston-Beaumont area to Seymour, Ind., for which approval was given on January 26, 1943, by the War Production Board. Orders for materials have been placed and contracts are being let.

The Petroleum Administrator for War has requested approval by the War Production Board for enough steel to construct the extension of the 20-inch products line from Seymour, Ind., to the Atlantic seaboard, and this has had our support. The granting of such approval, if materials are made available, including all necessary pumping equipment, means that the line will have a maximum capacity of 235,000 barrels of gasoline per day. The line can be built more rapidly than the 24-inch line, and it is estimated that it can be completed to Norris City, Ill., by September 15 and to the Atlantic seaboard by the end of 1943.

We are advised that the pumping equipment is more critical than the pipe. For this reason, it is possible that only every other pump station may be installed, initially. This will cut the capacity of the line from 235,000 barrels per day to 166,000 barrels per day until such time as all of the pump stations are installed. The latter figure has been used in the attached exhibits.

Giving effect to seasonal variations and assuming approval by the War Production Board to the extension of the 20-inch products line, the estimated deliveries into district 1 by pipe line are as follows:

Barrels per day:

April, May, June, 1943	211,768
July, August, September, 1943	364,893
October, November, December, 1943	482,350
January, February, March, 1944	621,015

Exhibit A furnishes the details upon which these quarterly averages are based.

DELIVERIES BY WATER

Substantial additions to inland waterway transportation equipment have been provided by our conversion and construction program.

At present we are converting 116 dry cargo barges into tank barges. Over 30 of the converted barges are in service moving crude petroleum and products eastward.

We are building 21 river towboats, 100 intracoastal tugboats, 307 (6,000 barrel capacity) wooden tank barges. Some of the tugboats should be ready for operation in June; all of them should be ready by October. The 21 towboats and the 307 tank barges should be ready by November 1.

In lieu of the construction of an additional number of wooden barges as previously planned, an alternative program of constructing 168 steel barges of 9,500 barrels capacity is under consideration by the War Production Board.

There are at present four main water routes by which petroleum products can be moved into district 1:

Via the Great Lakes to Buffalo.

Via the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Pittsburgh.

Via the Gulf Intracoastal Canal from Texas to Florida.

Via the open Gulf from Texas to Florida.

Via the Great Lakes to Buffalo

The movement down the Great Lakes will start in April, increasing during May and June, and reaching an average for July, August, and September of at least 76,000 barrels per day. This is the minimum estimate furnished us by the Office of the Petroleum Administrator and, in order to be conservative, we have used that estimate in the attached exhibits. However, the State of New York has undertaken some dredging operations in the New York barge canal, based upon statements of representatives of the Petroleum Administrator that oil can be provided for a movement of 122,000 barrels per day, and we hope that the figure of 76,000 barrels which we have used in the exhibits can be substantially increased. The movement will decline somewhat in October and November and stop in early December with the closing of the Lakes' navigation season.

The reason that the movement will not start at full capacity during May and June is that considerable tanker equipment will be needed to put products into the storage tanks located on the Great Lakes under designation of shipments by the Petroleum Administrator. The decline in October and November is based on the estimates of the Office of the Petroleum Administrator that there will not be sufficient products available at Great Lakes ports for eastern movement.

Via Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Pittsburgh

In the month of February 1943, the movement via this route was as follows: 56,781 barrels per day northward on the Mississippi River from Baton Rouge to Helena, Ark.; 99,274 barrels per day northward on the Mississippi River from Memphis; 82,241 barrels per day eastward on the Ohio River from Cairo to Mount Vernon, Ind.; 72,096 barrels per day northward on the Ohio River from Mount Vernon, Ind., to Cincinnati and intermediate points; 29,309 barrels per day northward on the Ohio River from Cincinnati to Pittsburgh.

The volume moving on this route into district 1 is less subject to seasonal variation, and the quantity shown in exhibit B is the amount that we feel can be maintained during the year. There will be a large increase in the amount of petroleum going up the Mississippi and Ohio rivers as far as Cincinnati. The conversion of dry cargo and merchandise barges into tank barges will contribute to this increase.

The reason for stopping the barge movement at Cincinnati is that it is much more economical, from a transportation standpoint, to forward the petroleum by tank car from Cincinnati to the East than it is to consume the additional barge days in moving it to Pittsburgh. While the movement

by tank car from Cincinnati to Pittsburgh requires only 1 or 2 days, it takes at least 8 days to move the oil by barge. Therefore, in order to move the greatest amount into district 1 by a combination of barge and tank car, it is more efficient to discharge the barges at Cincinnati, which is in district 2, thereby increasing the tank-car movement into district 1.

Via Gulf Intracoastal Canal from Texas to Florida

In the month of February 1943, 52,814 barrels per day moved eastward from New Orleans via this route. This movement will increase steadily during this year. The amounts moved should be, on an average, at the rate shown in exhibit B. In this movement, the rate of increase will depend on the time when the trans-Florida pipe line will begin to operate and when the number of boats and barges in our construction program will be completed. The latest available information is that the movement through the trans-Florida pipe line will start about May 1. The terminals for handling residual oil will be finished in July. As soon as all of this equipment is available for service, there will be a substantial increase in the amount of residual fuel oil movement into district 1 via the Gulf Intracoastal Canal.

Via open Gulf from Texas to Florida

The average daily movement over this route during the month of February 1943 was 44,715 barrels. It is anticipated that the traffic will remain constant as long as the tankers and barges now being used remain in this service.

DELIVERIES BY TANK TRUCKS

In view of the fact that one tank truck can release twelve or more tank cars on short haul movements, and because of a shortage of over-the-road tank truck equipment, the War Production Board recently approved our request for the construction of 1,092 new tank trailer units. These will be used throughout the United States to replace tank cars on short haul movements. Seventy-five of these units have been allocated to tank truck operators who are operating within and into New England. These additional units will aid materially in distributing the supply of fuel oil and kerosene in this area.

The remainder of the new trailers have been distributed in various sections of the country where there has been a concentration of short-haul tank-car movements under Office of Defense Transportation permits. The tank cars released by substitution of tank trucks will be used in the long-haul supply route to the East. It is expected that a substantial number of additional tank cars will be diverted to eastern service in this manner. It must be remembered, however, that there is an increasing requirement for tank cars for military supplies outside of district 1, and this is an offset to additions of tank cars for eastern service which might otherwise be made.

As in every other State in the Union, each of the New England States has a petroleum transport advisory committee made up of independent and major oil-company representatives, for-hire, and private tank-truck operators. Their experiences of the past winter in coordinating truck transportation in their respective States will help considerably in doing this job more efficiently during the coming year. During the early part of this year, we appointed a consultant in Boston to assist in coordinating the activities of the various New England committees. This has helped us keep in close touch with the overall truck-transportation situation in New England and will be continued during the coming year.

We feel that the tank-truck capacity in the New England area is now reasonably adequate and that if a sufficient quantity of products is delivered to New England by the various means of transportation described herein, the truck facilities now available in New England will permit deliveries of all available products.

DELIVERIES BY TANK CARS

In an effort to bring as large a volume of petroleum and petroleum products as possible into district 1 by tank cars, the Office of Defense Transportation issued order No. 7, revised. This order provides, among other things, for control of all tank cars, assignment of tank cars, more prompt loading and unloading, expansion of loading and unloading facilities where necessary, more rapid repairs to cars, and a larger proportion of loaded and empty car movement in symbol trains. Railroad executives and employees have been asked to devote, and are devoting, steadily increasing attention to the expediting of both loaded and empty movements of tank cars.

On December 29, 1942, the Office of Defense Transportation issued an order freezing in eastern petroleum service all tank cars engaged in that movement on that date. This order prohibits the removal of any car from that service without permit. There are now, and have been since December 29, 1942, approximately 70,000 tank cars in district 1 service.

Our aim has been to bring tank-car deliveries up to at least 900,000 barrels per day—a mark reached and exceeded for the first time in the week ending April 3—and to maintain this movement at not less than that level. Deliveries averaging at least 810,000 barrels per day can be safely predicted and in order to be conservative we have made our exhibit C estimates on this basis without taking into consideration the temporary effect of the unfinished pipe lines in shortening tank-car hauls or the continuing effect of the increased movement by tank barge.

In view of our experience thus far, we feel that we can conservatively estimate the following additions to tank-car deliveries into district 1 as the result of the partial completion of the 24-inch and the 20-inch lines to Norris City.

Second quarter of 1943, from 24-inch line, 75,000 barrels per day.

Third quarter of 1943, from 24-inch line and the 20-inch line, 52,000 barrels per day.

Fourth quarter of 1943, from 20-inch line, 50,000 barrels per day.

First quarter of 1944, no addition; 20-inch line completed to east coast.

In considering these figures, we must take into account the tremendous load which is being placed on the motive power of the railroads. All estimates of tank-car movements must be predicated on the ability of the railroads to move the number of tank cars offered them in the coming year and at the same time perform other necessary transportation functions.

Much of the success we have attained in increased movement by tank cars is traceable to the use of trainload movements. For the week ending August 22, 1942, 52 percent of the tank-car movements into district 1 was in symbol trains. For the weeks ending March 20 and March 27, 1943, 90 percent was in symbol trains. We are continuing our efforts to move even a higher percentage of products in trainload quantities.

Substantial improvements have been made and others are in progress in railroad terminal facilities and in the unloading facilities of oil companies. These improvements will reduce the turn-around time of tank cars.

For example, a study of tank-car movements revealed that necessary improvements had to be made by the Central Railroad of New Jersey. This railroad is handling the bulk of the oil deliveries into the congested New York area. Upon recommendation of this office and the Petroleum Administrator for War, the Defense Supplies Corporation has cooperated with the Central Railroad of New Jersey in building the following projects: Tremley yard, Tremley, N. J.; South Shore branch, west end of proposed Tremley yard; Carteret branch yard; storage track at Sewaren; yard at West Eighth Street, Bayonne.

These projects are at present under construction with materials allocated by the War Production Board on March 23, 1943. This will accelerate the handling of tank cars on a more efficient basis in the congested area along this railroad.

Additional studies have been made of the railroads' facilities and the unloading facilities of the oil companies serving the eastern seaboard from Norfolk, Va., to Portland, Maine. These facilities, in combination with the railroad improvements, when installed, will reduce the turn-around time of tank cars.

The shortage of steel for additional tank cars has necessitated our looking for other types of petroleum containers. Fifty box cars are being equipped with flexitank cells for handling fuel oil. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad has also completed an approved type box car for handling oil. This is now undergoing test runs. One hundred air-activated cement-carrying container cars are at present being converted for carrying fuel oil or kerosene. These container cars, 35 of which are completed for service, will carry approximately 12,000,000 gallons of additional kerosene or fuel oil per year into New England.

On January 19, 1943, the railroads started a movement of kerosene in drums loaded in box cars to New England. This movement has augmented the New England supply and has risen to 24,000 barrels per day since that time, and Defense Supplies Corporation has authorized its continuance until July 1. This movement has not been included in any of the forecasts shown in the exhibits attached.

In this connection, it will be of special interest to you to note that since January 9, 1943, a total of 1,232,564 barrels of kerosene in drums has been shipped to district 1, of which 1,195,816 barrels were delivered into New England. The receipts by States were:

	Barrels
Massachusetts	635,218
Rhode Island	280,641
Connecticut	199,908
Maine	80,049

These shipments of kerosene in drums to New England have averaged 108,711 barrels per week, 15,530 barrels per day.

No substitute vehicle on rails is as efficient as tank cars for transporting liquids. We have asked the War Production Board to authorize the construction of 5,000 type 103, 12,500-gallon-capacity tank cars for transporting crude oil and its products. In addition, we have requested 250 high-pressure tank cars for carrying special products of high-vapor pressure, necessary principally in the manufacture of synthetic rubber. These additional new tank cars, if built, will replace the several hundred tank cars of all types destroyed in wrecks during the past year and somewhat reduce the extreme shortage of tank cars.

Exhibit C, covering the period April 1943 to March 1944, inclusive, is the transportation forecast covering all means of transportation, except ocean tankers. Let me say again, however, that this forecast has been made on a most conservative basis. As indicated elsewhere in this letter, there is reason to believe that in various respects it may be surpassed in actual performance.

The Office of Defense Transportation will continue its efforts to utilize every possible means of transportation so that the Atlantic seaboard area, including New England, may have at least its essential petroleum requirements.

I am sending a copy of this letter to your New England colleagues, as requested.

Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH B. EASTMAN,
Director.

EXHIBIT A

Office of Defense Transportation, Division of Petroleum and Other Liquid Transport—Forecast, deliveries by pipe lines into district 1

[Present capacities, estimated increased capacity, and estimated future deliveries into district 1 in barrels per day]

Carrier	Commodity	Capacity		Estimated deliveries into district 1											
				1943									1944		
				Second quarter			Third quarter			Fourth quarter			First quarter		
		Present average annual	Final average annual	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March
COMPLETED PROJECTS															
Buckeye Pipe Line Co.:															
Mantua, Ohio, east	Crude	57,000	57,000	59,850	59,850	59,850	59,850	59,850	59,850	57,000	57,000	57,000	51,300	51,300	51,300
Mantua, Ohio, to southwest Pennsylvania lines.	do	19,150	19,150	20,108	20,108	20,108	20,108	20,108	20,108	19,150	19,150	19,150	17,235	17,235	17,235
To Eureka pipe line	do	4,200	4,200	4,410	4,410	4,410	4,410	4,410	4,410	4,200	4,200	4,200	3,780	3,780	3,780
Ohio Oil Co.: To Negley, Pa.	do	28,000	28,000	29,400	29,400	29,400	29,400	29,400	29,400	28,000	28,000	28,000	25,200	25,200	25,200
Plantation Pipe Line Co.: District 1 deliveries.	Products	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	[2] 57,000	[2] 57,000	[2] 57,000	[2] 57,000	[2] 57,000	[2] 57,000
Sun-Susquehanna system: District 1 deliveries.	do	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION															
24-inch war emergency pipe line	Crude		165,000					86,625	173,250	165,000	165,000	165,000	148,500	148,500	148,500
Do	Products		125,000					62,500	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000
20-inch war emergency pipe line[1]	do		166,000										166,000	166,000	166,000
8-inch products pipe line	do		12,000		12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Total	Crude	108,350	273,350	113,768	113,768	113,768	113,768	200,393	287,018	273,350	273,350	273,350	246,015	246,015	246,015
	Products	90,000	393,000	90,000	102,000	102,000	102,000	164,500	227,000	209,000	209,000	209,000	375,000	375,000	375,000
	All	198,350	666,350	203,768	215,768	215,768	215,768	364,893	514,018	482,350	482,350	482,350	621,015	621,015	621,015
Quarterly average					211,768			364,893			482,350			621,015	

[1] Approval of extension line to district 1 has been approved by War Production Board.

[2] Throughout when handling kerosene and heating oil.

EXHIBIT B

Office of Defense Transportation, Division of Petroleum and Other Liquid Transport—Forecast, deliveries by water into district 1, April 1943 to March 1944, inclusive

[Thousands of barrels per day]

Route	Apr. 1943	May 1943	June 1943	July 1943	Aug. 1943	Sept. 1943	Oct. 1943	Nov. 1943	Dec. 1943	Jan. 1944	Feb. 1944	Mar. 1944
Great Lakes	8	50	60	76	76	76	65	50	5	0	0	0
Mississippi-Ohio Rivers	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35	35
Gulf intracoastal	65	70	75	80	90	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Subtotal	108	155	170	191	201	211	200	185	140	135	135	135
TANKER												
Texas to Tampa, Fla	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	35	50	50
Total	138	185	200	221	231	241	230	215	170	170	185	185

EXHIBIT C

Office of Defense Transportation, Division of Petroleum and Other Liquid Transport—Forecast, deliveries by all methods of transportation into district 1, April 1943 to March 1944, inclusive

Thousands of barrels per day]

Period	Pipe lines	Barges				Tankers, Gulf-Florida	Tank cars	Total transportation
		Great Lakes	Mississippi-Ohio	Gulf Intracoastal	Total			
Second quarter, 1943	212	39	35	70	144	30	885	1,271
April	204	8	35	65	108	30	860	1,202
May	216	50	35	70	155	30	897	1,298
June	216	60	35	75	170	30	897	1,313
Third quarter, 1943	365	76	35	90	201	30	862	1,458
July	216	76	35	80	191	30	897	1,334
August [2]	365	76	35	90	201	30	854	1,450
September [3]	514	76	35	100	211	30	835	1,590
Fourth quarter, 1943	482	40	35	100	175	30	860	1,547
October	482	65	35	100	200	30	860	1,572
November	482	50	35	100	185	30	860	1,557
December	482	5	35	100	140	30	860	1,512
First quarter, 1944	621	0	35	100	135	45	810	1,611
January [4]	621	0	35	100	135	35	810	1,601
February	621	0	35	100	135	50	810	1,616
March	621	0	35	100	135	50	810	1,616

[1] Does not include transportation in drums.
[2] Completion of 24-inch line to Atlantic seaboard estimated Aug. 15, 1943.
[3] Completion of 20-inch line to Norris City estimated Sept. 15, 1943.
[4] Completion of 20-inch line to Atlantic seaboard estimated Jan. 1, 1944.

A Public Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La., under date of April 16, 1943:

A PUBLIC ISSUE

Stripped of its extraneous details, the effort by President Roosevelt and his administration aides to bar newspaper correspondents from the coming international food conference settles down to the simple question of whether food produced by the people of the United States can be bartered or given to other nations through secretly made deals without approval or knowledge of the people producing, paying for, and actually giving away that food.

No delicate diplomatic angles are necessary in an international food conference called to deal in fairness with all peoples who are fighting on the side of the decency in this war. If the question of allocation and division of food among people fighting side by side for their own preservation cannot be accomplished openly and fairly, then those people are not worthy of the decency they supposedly are fighting for and they might as well disband and quit wasting the blood of their sons.

If delicate diplomatic angles actually are involved in a conference between allies concerning division of their own food, then that fact by itself automatically creates suspicion that deals are contemplated which the political makers fear could not be consummated if the public knew exactly what was going on. Regardless of how true or untrue

such suspicion might be, it cannot be avoided if negotiations are conducted in secrecy imposed by individual political edict.

The matter of divulging information of value to the enemy does not figure in any way because it is covered fully, adequately, and efficiently by existing censorship regulations and by the oft-proven determination of the press, and all other forms of communication, never to permit anything of that nature to take place.

It should be plainly understood by the American people that this question of barring information on public affairs is by no means merely a dispute between the President and the press or between the New Deal and any part of the press. Newspapers and other forms of communication and publication, such as radio, oral commentators, magazines, etc., are merely instruments for distribution of public information. They neither make nor control the nature of that information. When they are barred from the source of information, the people themselves are barred from knowledge of what is happening.

The sole question involved in all of this is whether a temporary political administration of our United States Government can, by edict of one individual or one group of individuals, bar the people themselves from knowledge of what that political administration is doing with public trust temporarily reposed in it by those people.

Under the set-up which the President and his aides advocate, not only the agencies for public distribution of information are barred but the Members of Congress who are sent to Washington by the people.

In other words, the plan is that there shall be no person in or around the proposed International Food Conference except political appointees—which can only bring added suspicion that the proposed secrecy and censorship also may have questionable political angles

This is not the first effort by the present Washington administration to bar public information from the public, nor can anyone reasonably imagine it will be the last; nor have all of those efforts come under a pretense of war necessity. They had their inception far back in the peace years. If a policy of secrecy and needless censorship can be set now for such an important matter as international distribution of food, then it is certain also to be the policy established when the time comes to determine the part of the American people in making and preserving the peace. If America's food can be doled out internationally behind closed doors, then America's interests in the postwar world can be handled the same way.

The whole problem is one for every individual citizen.

The mother with children still at home has a right to know what her Government is doing with food her husband or her neighbors produce and which her children need.

The mother with son or husband in uniform, or perhaps already beneath the ground of Africa, New Guinea, or Guadalcanal, has a right to know what the Nation's political leaders do or plan to do with the victory for which the sons, husbands, and fathers of the Nation fought.

The father, son, or husband who comes back from war wounded or whole has a right to know the steps being taken by his Government in securing the victory for which he fought.

They won't have that knowledge if the present Government course on public information becomes permanent. That course, censorship of nonmilitary information and barring public information at its source, is an issue directly between the Government itself and the people themselves. It can be ended or prevented only by the people letting the Washington Government know that they fully understand the issue and mean to meet it.

F. S. A.'s Promises Plowed Under in Wallace's "Promised Land"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "F. S. A.'s Promises Plowed Under in Wallace's 'Promised Land'," from the Washington Times-Herald of April 18, 1943:

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION'S PROMISES PLOWED UNDER IN WALLACE'S "PROMISED LAND"

(By Marcia Winn)

PLUM BAYOU, ARK., April 17.—Six years ago HENRY WALLACE, then Secretary of Agriculture, stood on a porch here in the Arkansas delta and made one of his speeches about dreams.

"Dreams," said WALLACE, gazing out over 5,800 acres of bottom land dotted with 96 little dream castles, "the stuff of which living things are made. There lies * * * a promised land * * *."

UTOPIA IN THE MAKING

He was speaking at the dedication of America's first rural resettlement project, the Plum Bayou homesteads. It was on November 20, 1936; Mr. Roosevelt had just been elected to his second term, and here, on this land, Utopia was about to unfold.

Each of the 96 dream castles was a model farm home. Rich soil had been bought at a cost of $198,000, model homes had been built, and a guiding mentality was coming out of Washington.

The Secretary said he hoped private industry would see the significance of the mighty project. He said he wanted businessmen to look it over and be convinced that "thousands of farms like these can be sold on a business basis as a paying proposition."

"Come back and see them a year from now, 5 years from now," he invited his audience. "I certainly shall."

DREAMS GLOBAL DREAMS NOW

WALLACE has never come back. He has moved on to more global dreams.

In the meantime, his first dream here appears to be in process of dissolution.

Today, as the Farm Security Administration, its sponsor, is undergoing fire in Washington, Plum Bayou's original 96 homesteaders, placed there by a process of scientific soothsaying, have dwindled to 22.

The other 74—including T. W. Counts, the farmer into whose hands Rexford Tugwell, aide to WALLACE, dropped the keys to farmstead No. 1 with the declaration that "These are not the keys to houses; they are keys to the future"—either left in despair or have been evicted by their landlord, the Government.

No one bought a farm. No one had a chance to. Only one tried—a farmer named Booker M. McDade. When he essayed to buy his farm at the end of 5 years he was told he could not. Instead, he learned he might remain in the unhappy status of tenant farmer.

SUCCESS FIGHTS EVICTION

This made Mr. McDade sorely unhappy. When he took over his dream castle No. 76 it glowed like a jewel in the middle of an old cotton patch. He worked its 36 acres so assiduously that he was able to pay the Farm Security Administration $2,000 in crop rents in the 5 years, send his boy and girl to college, acquire a nice herd of dairy cattle, and put $2,200 in the bank.

He began to write protesting letters exposing gaping defects in the Plum Bayou dream. He told of discriminations; of strange prices at the cooperative store. And in December he was asked to leave. He did not, and in March a marshal stumbled through the high water to his front door to hand him an eviction notice.

McDade is still here. He is fighting his eviction, as is his neighbor, Ernest Priest, whose acres have been under water for two springs now.

Their stand is singular in that it is considered audacious for a poor tenant farmer to talk back to a Federal godmother.

Well, McDade has four attorneys, and all good ones. If the case ever comes to trial, the fantasy of Plum Bayou may come into the open, if it does not come out in Congress before then.

Back in June 1936 the Government bought the land. It happened to be land with a long history of being under water every spring, but this, presumably, didn't show on the Washington blueprint of its 5,800 acres. Nor did the swarms of malarial mosquitoes which sweep in over the high, wide, protective levee. An impartial sanitary engineer warned against it, but no one heeded him.

MODEL PROJECT, BUT—

The blueprint showed 5,800 acres, and scientists divided this into 96 segments, the acreage of each varying with the size of the farm family.

Each unit had a neat, white bungalow electrified and screened, with running water. Each unit had a model barn. It was built to hold 100 bales of hay, and the Farm Security Administration discovered, a little late, that each farmer required 300 bales to feed his livestock through the winter.

The McDades' experience, as they relate it, is probably as good an explanation as any of (1) some of the workings of the project; (2) why the 76 families left; and (3) why so many homesteads now are vacant.

"We'd been here 3 weeks," McDade began, "when the project manager called me in and said, 'I think I've got your car sold.' I said, 'What?' He said, 'Why, you can't have a car and stay here * * *' 'We told him to take the place, and we'd go find another.' We was fixin' to leave when we got word from the higher-ups—'You stay here.'

"The next trouble came when I stopped borrowin' from 'em (Farm Security Administration). The first 2 years I borrowed to make my crop. They said we had to. The next year I borrowed from a bank. That made 'em mad.

"They charge $8 a ton for fertilizer, so last year I went out and bought some for $7 and hauled it in * * * it's things like that makes 'em mad at me.

"WEREN'T READY TO SELL

"They told us when we came that if you was out of debt at the end of 5 years they'd issue a contract and you could buy the place. They said we'd get it 15-percent cheaper than the estimate ($4,000) because the house was built with Work Projects Administration labor.

"But you can't get any understandin' out of these people. When I checked up, they said they weren't ready to sell."

(An Arkansas Farm Security Administration official yesterday said the Plum Bayou people now are being offered sales contracts. He admitted the procedure had not been started until this spring.)

"The way it looks to all of us," McDade said, "when you get out of debt and can handle your own things, they want you to leave.

"Looks like they want a big debt. If everyone was like us, what use would there be for any managers? They want to keep the personnel."

Value of the National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Chattanooga Times of April 10, 1943, which points out a part of the good service the National Youth Administration is rendering. The editorial is as follows:

THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION WELDERS

If the National Youth Administration was ever a haven for young loafers and parasites, it has certainly changed its spots. The National Youth Administration is doing a good service in this territory by taking boys and girls who might become worthless loafers and teaching them the manly art of welding and sheet metal work.

The National Youth Administration has a welding shop here at No. 1 Market Street. Its agents go out and find boys and girls from 16 to 24, being careful to get those who are not working on farms and who are out of schools. These are taught welding and sheet metal work here. The plant runs 16 hours a day and soon will be on a 24-hour basis.

As soon as the youths are proficient in this vital war work they are sent to National Youth Administration induction centers near war plants in the South. One of these is near the great shipyards at Brunswick, Ga. The workers are then put into the war plants at wages usually starting at 68 cents an hour and often higher.

In the Chattanooga shop of the National Youth Administration 42 boys and 11 girls are now learning welding. Five boys were transferred yesterday to the induction center at Savannah, and will go in a war plant there. J. Boyd Hixson is shop supervisor for the National Youth Administration school at No. 1 Market Street.

It is worth noting that the National Youth Administration, when it trains these youths, follows them up and watches over them until they have actually received their first pay checks in the war plants. The National Youth Administration investigates the boarding house where they are to stay while they are in the war plants, and sees to the payment of the first week's board. The boys and girls who are taking this training in the National Youth Administration welding shop here are paid at a rate of $22.40 a month while training.

They are doing a real work in the war and more of them are vitally needed. Mr. M. V. Snoderly, National Youth Administration project manager for east Tennessee, explains to the Times that there are six centers in east Tennessee where these youths are trained in war industry. A new resident school for girls has been started at Rockwood.

The National Youth Administration is under the War Manpower Commission and is one of the best suppliers of trained labor for the war factories. This seems worth mentioning because many people may be surprised that the National Youth Administration is teaching girls how to wield the acetylene torch instead of the lipstick, and that it is converting potential loafers into brawny shipbuilders instead of converting shipbuilders into loafers as so many critics of the National Youth Administration have falsely contended.

Two-Way Trade and Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, from Collier's for April 24, 1943:

TWO-WAY TRADE—AND PEACE

(By ALBERT GORE, Member of Congress from Tennessee)

Congress will soon have to make a decision that may determine when—and if—we shall have another war. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is scheduled to expire June 12 and, unless it's extended, the United States will once again start leading the world back into the economic stupidity that has been the foundation of all modern wars.

The trade-agreements program is the most intelligent approach we've ever made to economic cooperation with the world—the basis for world peace. It was a ray of light in a dark, war-omened decade, yet it has been maligned beyond limit. Its operation has been distorted, its achievements minimized, its purpose misrepresented.

Weeks of strenuous preaching couldn't lay out all the truth, because the subject is both big and complex. But I would like to unwind a few of the more monstrous misconceptions of the program. I feel a certain vicarious paternity for the program, since I come from the same district in Tennessee which produced Secretary of State Cordell Hull, originator of the trade-agreements program, and I have studied the subject as intensely and objectively as I know how.

Opposition to the trade agreements comes roughly in two groups. First, is opposition based on the seductive economic theory that we could and should be a self-sufficient nation, dependent upon no one but ourselves for anything. It is a foolish theory, originating more in national pride than in intelligence. Second, is opposition of the special interests who want to protect their own businesses and industries. This opposition stems from selfish greed that results in the American people paying disgracefully high prices for the things they need and want.

No great industrial nation can be economically independent without sacrificing many of the necessities, conveniences, and luxuries of everyday existence, or without smothering its industrial life. Self-sufficiency means that we import virtually nothing; which means that we export nothing, either, because other countries will not buy our goods in any quantity unless we buy some of theirs. Yet if we produced domestically enough of some commodities to meet all our needs, we would have tremendous surpluses of other related products, and we'd have nowhere to sell them.

For example, if we produced at home all the wool, hides, and skins we need, we would normally have huge surpluses of meat. If we produced all the coal tar we need—it is a by-product of the coking process—our coking industry would be thrown off balance. If we supplied all our crude-oil needs from domestic refineries, we would normally produce too much gasoline. The high-protectionist boys protest that lowered duties throw men out of work and cripple industry generally (which they do not); but imagine the havoc these three scattered sample surpluses would create in our economic system, and look at what would happen to some other lines of business if we followed through completely on the self-sufficiency idea.

In 1937, a more-or-less average peacetime year, we sold abroad more than 43 percent of our cotton crop, nearly a third of our leaf tobacco, more than a third of our dried fruits, more than a tenth of our automobiles, nearly a sixth of our agricultural machinery, more than a fifth of our office appliances. Think for a while of what would happen to these major enterprises if we chopped off their foreign markets.

THE GOOD OLD DAYS

Under the trade agreements, many of our increases in exports were in commodities in which we had serious surpluses. Wheat flour was a good example. Exports went up 82 percent since we started making agreements. Exports of canned vegetables (we actually had surplus canned vegetables in those blessed days before the war) rose 80 percent. Exports of automobile parts climbed from $90,638,000 in 1933 to $348,887,000 in 1937. Exports of electric machinery, pigments, paints, varnishes, and dairy products likewise increased, and whenever we sold these excess products we reaped more employment prosperity.

At first glance, the proponents of inordinately high tariffs for the protection of American business make a most appealing case. What the high protectionists actually want is an exclusive system whereby we sell only what we don't want and buy only what we can't possibly make here. But it won't work. As I said before, we can sell to foreign countries only if we buy from them.

Of course, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is full of sad-sounding stories of damage done the pottery manufacturers, the silver-fox breeders, the lace workers, the fish industry, and the producers of hand-made glassware. Now, some specific jobs may have been lost and some business houses may have been hurt by our trade concession. But if we have a jot of patriotism in us, we must look at the bigger picture.

Isador Lubin, the Chief of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, has figures showing that the number of workers engaged in making goods for export to countries with which we have trade agreements increased by great leaps from 1934 to 1938. For example, the number of wage earners making agricultural machinery and leather goods to be sold to agreement countries increased three times. The number making office furniture went up almost a third; the number making electrical appliances went up almost a half; the number making paper and paper goods went up almost a fifth; the number making iron and steel goods went up a third; the number making industrial machinery went up two-thirds.

In all but two of these lines, the increase in labor engaged in making goods for agreement nations was greater than the increase in labor making goods for nonagreement nations; and the two exceptions were largely due to the buying of war goods.

If increasing employment in seven major industries from 20 percent to 300 percent is throwing people out of work my mathematics are cockeyed. Take one specific case: In our reciprocal trade agreement with the United Kingdom, we gave substantial tariff concessions to British wool textiles, which should have meant, according to the protectionists the dismissal of workers from domestic woolen mills and great hardships on American woolen firms. But in the first 10 months of 1938, employment in American woolen mills increased 26 percent over the same period the year before.

What it all boils down to is this: If we have to see a couple of hundred men lose their jobs in order to give a couple of thousand men work, I think it's the patriotic and decent thing to do for the country's sake.

I could sit here all night and cite figures proving that the trade agreements have caused innumerable shifts of just that sort. I don't know how convincing they'd be. Unfortunately, the opponents of freer world trade appeal to emotions, and it takes a mighty strong statistic to stand up against a good, rousing sob story.

However, the whole thing can really be summed up in terms of dollars and doughnuts. In 1933, our total exports amounted to $1,675,000,000. In 1937, the nearest to a normal year we had just before the war, they had jumped to $3,349,000,000. Our imports rose from $1,447,000,000 in 1933 to $3,083,000,000 in 1937 Despite this increase in business (every cent of which represents more work and more prosperity for the whole world) our exports still exceeded our imports. We still had a favorable balance of trade. We were still, in other words, on the big end of the horn.

In our agreement with Mexico, for instance, we agreed, among other things, to cut our tariffs in half on spirits of turpentine, lead, garlic, and certain types of men's and boys' footwear. In return, Mexico reduced its duty on United States wheat by 40 percent, on cotton textiles by 25 percent, on some electrical equipment by 38 percent, and on lard by 22 percent. Mexican imports of our lard alone ran up to a million dollars in 1940. Also, Mexico agreed not to hike her duties on our automobiles, trucks, breeding cattle, and other items, a great convenience to our industries which plan production far ahead.

OUR BIGGEST CUSTOMER—CANADA

Our trade with Canada outranks the trade between any two other countries in the world, and Canada is the only nation with which we have made a second trade agreement right on top of the first. In the first, we made concessions on a number of things, including aluminum, fox furs, maple sugar, and nickel, which we needed or wanted.

Canada reduced her duties on grapefruit, oranges, dicti ting machines, tractors, automobiles, and parts from this country. Our exports of automobiles and parts amounted to only $2,350,000 in 1935 The agreement became effective on January 1, 1936, and by 1937, these exports had jumped to $15,218,000. The second agreement brought about an increase in our exports to Canada of 142 percent. Is that giving anything away?

One of the most thoroughly distorted aspects of the trade-agreements program is the most-favored-nation policy. It's been part of our tariff system for a long, long time. It simply means that any concession granted to one nation is automatically granted to every other nation which does not discriminate against our commerce. When we promised Brazil to lower our tariff on manganese, we also lowered it for every other country—providing those countries gave us all the breaks they gave other people.

High-tariff proponents have charged that, under the policy, we have given concessions to countries that never did anything for us, yet the record shows we have benefited immeasurably by the policy. We have used it to break down serious discriminations against our goods.

In the beginning of the program, Australia discriminated sharply against our manufactured products, so she was placed on our blacklist and received no benefit from the most-favored-nation policy. She became more and more worried as the United States entered into agreements with one country right after another. Wool was one of Australia's big concerns. She became quite apprehensive lest, in a trade agreement with the United Kingdom, Turkey, or some other country, we might agree to lower our duty on wool, and that she would be ineligible to share the benefits.

Australia, therefore stopped her discrimination against our products, which amounted to more than $10,000,000 annually, and she was removed from the blacklist. In a subsequent agreement with Argentina, the United States agreed to lower its duty on several grades of wool by 11 cents, a blessing which Australia then could share.

Our behavior under the reciprocal trade program has been a long way from our arrogant and illogical conduct after the last war. Until the trade-agreements program was adopted, our tariff rates were flat and inflexible. They were set by Congress in the midst of logrolling and lobbying activities that sometimes reached scandalous proportions, and they always went up, never down.

Indeed, the United States led the mad race of nations toward economic isolation. Each successive boost of our trade barriers brought retaliatory restrictions by other nations.

The traditionally low-tariff liberal Canadian Government—one of our two best customers—enacted a tariff bill increasing tariff rates affecting some $250,000,000 of our exports to Canada. Also, duties were made automatically reciprocal—which, in plain language, warned that if United States tariff rates were raised, Canada's duties would be raised accordingly United States corn had been on Canada's free list. But when our 1930 Tariff Act raised the duty on corn to 25 cents a bushel, Canadian duty on our corn became 25 cents, too. Corn from other countries of the British Empire remained on Canada's free list, and that from the Union of South Africa freely entered the Canadian markets. It wasn't pleasant for our corn growers.

Mexico increased duties on lard, dried fruits, vegetable oils, and on five-hundred-odd textile products, among other things.

Even Great Britain, traditionally a free-trading nation and our other best customer, instituted not only a general system of tariff protection, but—what was more disastrous to us—established a system of Empire preferences, designed to give every Empire member country an advantage in Empire trade, which it succeeded in doing. As an illustration, a duty of 10 percent was placed upon all lard imported into the United Kingdom from any nonempire country. This hit us where it hurt; we normally export nearly half our lard.

BASIS FOR WORLD PROSPERITY

So, the trade-agreements program represented more than an alteration in tariff method. It was a distinct change in United States policy and philosophy. Inherent in it was the recognition that world peace and prosperity must be based upon economic cooperation.

These principles of international cooperation are embodied in the lend-lease agreements. By these and by the Atlantic Charter, we have pledged to our allies and to the world "to promote mutually advantageous relations" and provisions "open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion * * * of production, employment and the exchange * * * of goods * * * and to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers."

The world is looking to the congressional battle on trade agreements as an indication of how seriously or lightly the United States regards these promises and agreements.

Repudiation of that principle at this critical time would undermine world confidence in the nobility of our war aims. It would notify the world that the United States was back on an isolationist tack. It would demonstrate that the United States did not have and apparently could not have a sustained foreign policy.

The end of the war will find the United States with the greatest producing capacity of any nation in world history. We shall need outlets for that production and we shall also need access to the world's resources more acutely than ever before, because of our increased domestic demands, and because of the rate at which war is consuming our resources now.

The United States cannot avoid the responsibility of exercising leadership in world reconstruction and rehabilitation. Rejection of this duty and privilege would mean that economic warfare would continue, thus rendering any military peace futile and only temporary. The history of the between-war period has proved that.

I do not claim that the trade-agreements program is a panacea for all ills, but I firmly believe its principles are the only way out of post-war misery.

Racial Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert Quillen, appearing in the Atlanta Constitution of April 16, 1943:

LAW CAN'T GIVE YOU ANOTHER MAN'S RESPECT, BUT CAN GIVE YOU A CHANCE TO EARN IT

(By Robert Quillen)

Perhaps you have heard about Charles C. Spaulding, an elderly Negro who ranks high by any standard used to measure men. Archibald Rutledge had a piece about him in the Saturday Evening Post some weeks ago.

He is the head man of a $60,000,000 insurance company, the biggest business institution in the world owned and operated by Negroes. The business includes a bank and a bonding company, and its hundreds of employees are educated, highly trained experts.

Where is it located? If you do not know, you probably will say it could happen only in New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh, or Detroit. But this great Negro institution is in North Carolina.

It was established 44 years ago by Spaulding and two other young Negroes who had neither capital nor experience—nothing, in fact, except character and an idea and the courage of their ignorance. They financed it as they earned the money, and Spaulding was earning only $10 a month as a dishwasher.

Spaulding has made millions, but now his chief concern is helping the people of his race by teaching them to help themselves.

He says, for example—and this will seem heresy to certain uplifters in Washington—that equality shouldn't be demanded because it can't be given. It can't be won by coercion and intrusion. And Utopian dreamers can't bestow it on anybody.

That should be obvious to everybody. No power of law can force one man to accept another as an equal. Equality is earned. And if a man can earn equality, it is not given to him; it is simply conceded as a fact.

Spaulding says segregation doesn't keep Negroes from rising, and that too is obvious. His own success is the proof. The poor of every race are segregated by economic necessity, and the rich segregate themselves.

Of the myth of social equality, Spaulding repeats what has often been said here—that social equality doesn't exist among white people. It doesn't among the colored, either. Always and everywhere people are divided into groups by their breeding, training, money, and taste.

Negroes, given opportunity to share and absorb an established civilization, have made great progress in one century. Given fair opportunity to help themselves, they will soon earn the rank to which their abilities and industry entitle them. It is the process by which all men must climb, whatever their color may be.

Continue the Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the small farmers of America and those interested in their welfare are alarmed over the movement to destroy Farm Security Administration. This one agency of our Government, which is trying to rehabilitate the little fellow, should have the encouragement rather than the opposition of the Appropriations Committee. The one sizable way production of food can be increased in this country is to secure larger production from the small farms and by the small operators. Farm Security Administration has rendered valuable service in helping bring about an increase of production on the small farm and yet some groups would discontinue its service entirely. Many leading newspapers of the Nation are alarmed over the situation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "America Needs Farm Security Administration's Food Production," an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Sunday, April 18, entitled "Farm Security Administration Battles For Its Life," and the conclusion of an editorial from the Birmingham News of April 16, 1943:

The Washington Post:

Abolition of the Farm Security Administration, as recommended by the House Appropriations Committee, would signal the complete domination of the Department of Agriculture by the point of view of the large commercial farmers and by the Farm Bureau Federation, which speaks for them. Nothing so clearly demonstrates the Farm Bureau's identification with commercial farming interests as its long and bitter hostility to Farm Security Administration. The Farm Bureau, it should be remembered, has exerted its very considerable political power to wreck the anti-inflation program. Its advocacy of the Bankhead and Pace bills was designed to raise farm prices with complete disregard for the national economy. Its opposition to incentive payments as a means of encouraging production reflects a callous lack of concern for the welfare of small farms.

Whatever its errors or excesses, the Farm Security Administration is needed to give the United States a balanced, comprehensive program of food production. More than any other agency of the Department of Agriculture, Farm Security Administration has helped and befriended the small subsistence farmers, the family farms of America. It has sought to give a measure of independence and dignity to the otherwise disinherited little men of agriculture—the cotton choppers, tenant farmers, sharecroppers, and migrant workers. The productive abilities of these people must be fully utilized if we are to achieve the mammoth harvests of food necessary to win the war and determine the character of the peace. It is a scandal that this year we face a decline in food production.

A major portion of the country's food comes from large commercial farms. These are already operating at, or very close to, their peak efficiency and productivity. But there are some 4,000,000 farm families whose gross income in 1940 amounted to less than $1,500; half of these grossed less than $600. Their productive potential has by no means been realized. It can be harnessed to the war effort only if the small farmers are given Federal aid in the form of funds for equipment and fertilizer and in the form of technical aid and supervision. Another urgent task is to help the small farmers to switch from nonessentials like cotton to essentials like peanuts and soya beans.

These forms of assistance Farm Security Administration is peculiarly equipped to render. Its activities in the midst of war should be directed exclusively to just such war-related functions. It must forget some of the social theories which have confused its purposes in the past. It must operate strictly as a war agency to mobilize America's rural manpower as effectively as possible for the maximum production of that quintessential weapon of war and peace, food. Congress can best promote this purpose not by abolishing Farm Security Administration but by streamlining it.

The Richmond Times-Dispatch, Sunday, April 18, 1943:

As the tide ebbs and flows in the House of Representatives with respect to the Farm Security Administration, we should like to direct attention to the editorial on this page from the Washington Post which speaks of Farm Security Administration's all-important role in the production of food for the war. This strong editorial is especially noteworthy, since the Post was nothing like so sympathetic to Farm Security Administration in comment published some weeks ago.

Moreover, the friends of Farm Security Administration have succeeded at last in creating a pressure group in Washington which seems able to battle on something like even terms with the hostile farm lobby. The changed position of so important a paper as the Washington Post, combined with the establishment of this Emergency Committee for Food Production, with its influential elements from agriculture, labor, and the consumer, have put a different complexion on the fight.

Particularly significant is the adherence of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations to the cause of Farm Security Administration. They are understood to have taken the position that since they are being forbidden to break through anti-inflation controls, under the stabilization order issued by the War Labor Board on April 13, they don't want the farm lobby to do so, either. That lobby is composed largely of mass-production farmers who are out of sympathy with the small farmers aided by Farm Security Administration, and is the major element in the effort to eliminate that agency. Moreover, the statement is attributed to Chester Davis, the new Food Administrator, that he is favorable to the Farm Security Administration.

Spokesmen for the Emergency Committee for Food Production say they expect the major test of the agriculture appropriations bill, directly involving Farm Security Administration, to come in the Senate. But the current maneuverings in the House are extremely important.

Those who may object to the setting up of another pressure group in Washington for the purpose of saving Farm Security Administration should consider that in no other way is the agency apt to be saved. The anvil (Congress) may wince under the hammering of more than one smithy, but the end result is steel.

The Birmingham News, April 16, 1943:

The one question to be asked is, Do we need the Farm Security Administration? The answer is that we not only need it but need it more imperatively now than ever before because of the urgent food requirements of the war. The fine record of the Farm Security Administration in increasing food production among its hundreds of thousands of clients is well known. They have increased their production of food more, proportionately, than the rest of American agriculture. That might have been expected, because the big farmers and the successful farmers were already producing at a high rate of efficiency, and the best hope of increased food production lay among the handicapped little farmers such as the Farm Security Administration is helping.

Thus the Farm Security Administration is important to the war effort. Its peacetime need is great, too. Surely no one has forgotten the blight of farm tenancy. One of the main purposes of the Farm Security Administration, which administers the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Purchase Act, is to help deserving tenant farmers buy farms. We cannot afford to let our tenant purchase program suffer. Nor can we afford, either in economic or in human terms, to let submerged farm families go without the help they need to rehabilitate themselves.

Has America allowed the war to dim its memory of the growing blight of farm tenancy which led Congress to pass the Bankhead-Jones Act? Has America forgotten the increasing hordes of migrant farmers—the "Okies" and the like—which became so serious a problem before the war?

The Farm Security Administration was established to deal with these grave national problems, and it has done so effectively. When the war came it turned out that the Farm Security Administration was in position to do an outstanding job of helping to produce the food we need to win the war.

In war and in peace alike we need the Farm Security Administration. Let us see to it that we keep it. Let us not allow selfish and jealous interests to "pull the wool" over the eyes of the American people about the work of one of the most useful and constructive agencies ever established by our Government.

Post-War Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COSTELLO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, at the present time there is a great deal of discussion regarding post-war planning and post-war economy. One seldom hears mention of winning the war without also hearing a comment on the

winning of the peace. Unfortunately, in all our discussions our attention is focused too much on the European situation and too little on the problems here at home.

The most important concern of this country should be the question of full employment for our available manpower once this war is brought to a victorious conclusion. Many feel that it is the responsibility of Government to see to it that none shall lack for employment. Some insist that some socialistic program is our only solution. Because of the interesting discussion of this problem of employment contained in an editorial in Southern California Business, I am including it in my remarks believing that it may be helpful in directing our thinking in this regard. The editorial is as follows:

WHOSE JOB IS JOB-MAKING?

It is said, "Business must accept the responsibility for full employment in the post-war era."

Statements of this sort are not only implied in certain official utterances but are made by leaders of business organizations and post-war planning groups. It is said that the American people will not stand for another period of unemployment and that if business does not absorb the millions who will need jobs, business itself will be done away with.

This is dangerous and misleading talk. If it persists business again will be the scapegoat for bungling policies, policies for which businessmen are no more responsible than other segments of the population.

Four points need to be made:

1. BUSINESS RESPONSIBILITY NEEDS UNDERSTANDING

From a popular point of view, business is an existing number of X Y Z corporations, partnerships, firms, companies, etc. Each of these concerns, providing it is existing at war's end, will employ all the people it can—all the people who can be accommodated within the framework of market potentialities and business solvency. Natural desires for success and growth assure maximum effective employment.

From this point of view business is responsible for providing jobs only to the extent that workers are employed effectively and economically. In fact, business has a responsibility never to go beyond this point. Otherwise, it ceases to exist. It can then provide no goods, no services, and no employment.

This point may be surprising to some, but to substantiate it one needs only to examine any particular business situation. Will the farmer hire more hands than he needs? Will the aircraft plant employ workers to make more planes than there is a market for? Will the shipbuilder build ships for which there is no cargo?

Yet, if employment offered by each business firm is to be limited to the potentialities of its own market it is clear that existing firms cannot offer jobs to all who will be seeking work at the end of the war. Many firms, now thriving, must be dissolved or greatly contracted in size as war production declines. Some may convert to peacetime forms of production, but many will give way to new concerns. Therefore, the idea that those business concerns which are in existence at war's end must absorb the millions of servicemen and displaced war workers is unrealistic. And it is mischievous to spread such a notion.

2. ENTERPRISE IS THE ANSWER

From another point of view, however, business is not a particular frozen group of people or corporations, but an enterprising way of life into which people from all classes come and go, fail and succeed, according to their abilities, their self-disciplines, their ambitions, their initiative.

If full employment is to be achieved it will be because there are thousands of enterprises yet unborn, today only faint ideas or promising hopes in the hearts and heads of servicemen, war workers, or civilians who have as yet to strike out on their own.

In this sense, and in this sense alone, enterprise has the responsibility for full employment, post-war or any other time. This is the same as saying that the enterprising side of each of us has the responsibility of looking out for our own individual welfare. It also implies that each of us will help remove the obstacles to the enterprise of all of us.

3. THE ENTERPRISING SPIRIT MUST BE REBORN

The enterprising spirit has been discouraged, harassed, and repressed. Consequently, millions in recent years have come to hope for employment only with some other party—with some already existing enterpriser. Since this hope cannot be fulfilled, Government provides doles and relief projects. This results in higher taxes. Taxes burden business and reduce its capacity to give employment.

True, the idea of people becoming enterprisers rather than relying wholly on someone else to do the enterprising carries with it no assurances for success, for high pay, for short hours, for easy work, or for pleasant working conditions. It does, however, carry with it more opportunity for all of these things than any other system.

4. WHERE RESPONSIBILITY REALLY LIES

This idea carries with it the opportunity for good things if enterprise is made attractive; if success is applauded rather than belittled; if there are assurances of fair play and free markets; and if there are guaranties against broken contracts, predatory practices, and fraud.

The responsibility for full employment, therefore, rests with those of us who have influence in the creation of these conditions which make for opportunity and freedom in enterprise.

To the extent that businessmen have influence in creating these conditions, they have responsibility for full employment.

To the extent that people in government or people in labor and in farm organizations have influence in creating these conditions, this responsibility is theirs.

It is important that our thinking on this issue be straight, not to avoid undeserved blame, but to settle on those of us who have a big job to do, and right now.

Kentucky Does Its Part

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD W. CREAL

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. CREAL. Mr Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, and while the bond sale is in progress, I wish to insert a letter from a soldier, written to the editor of some papers in Kentucky. Kentucky is answering the call in everything asked in this war as it has always done in every war. Whether it be volunteers, bond sales, Red Cross, or any other aid Kentucky has never defaulted in its obligations:

To the EDITOR:

I wrote the two following paragraphs a few weeks after entering the armed forces. My home was in Louisville before I entered the Army.

I am now a soldier, a wife's husband, a mother's son; I am the pride of a family and part of a home. I love my life as you love yours. I am a youth in years and experience, yet I am a gambler, betting the highest stakes a man can wager—my life. If I win you win; if I lose I have lost all. The loss is mine and there is a grieved wife and mother, a saddened family and a broken home to which I can never return.

I ask only for the Godspeed and support of my countrymen in return for laying upon the altar of my country, my all for bravery and blood. Will you furnish bullets and bread? Will you bet your gold while I bet my blood? Will you hazard your wealth while I and many others risk our lives?

We are the flowers of a nation's manhood the glory of a noble race—I am the American soldier—I am the boy in the trench.

Pvt. MATTHEW ABELL.

Address of Hon. Richard M. Kleberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, leave having been granted I include herewith a speech recently delivered by Hon. RICHARD M. KLEBERG before the National Canning Association. One thought expressed by Mr. KLEBERG especially attracted my attention and that is the observation that the Federal organization was effected with the major objective the formation of a more perfect union of the people of the States.

Certainly we should have that as a constant objective and it should be the general public attitude that whoever contrary to that objective seeks to disunite our people, array section against section, or class against class—who has that purpose is an enemy of the central objective and need which was responsible for the formation of the Union.

The address follows:

I deem it a special privilege to be here this morning, even though I had to play hooky to keep this appointment. We have a rather contentious piece of legislation coming up on the floor this morning, and it is barely possible that you gentlemen may be witness to the fact that I may have missed a roll call.

The public generally, in the confusion which exists nationally, and by sections, in this country, have little or no conception as to just what the Congress of the United States is, what it means, what its problems are, and what it is called on to do. Every so often we find in the press and hear over the radio bitter condemnations of the Congress of the United States. The people in the country read these condemnations, some of them quite carelessly, as our correspondence reflects on the whole, and they are not conscious of the fact that the criticism, in fact, is one which

goes back to their powers of selection—goes back to the demands which arise right from and within the people themselves, as to just what Congress does. So much from one who is just one four hundred and thirty-fifth of the lower branch of Congress, which is engaged, you might say, in making speeches. I am not one of those who make many speeches. I come to you here this morning just as one of you, but as one who is charged with the high responsibility of representing not only a congressional district in the great State of Texas, but likewise one who performs a representative duty of high trust in a nation of over 130,000,000 people.

You fellows in the canning business are just as much a part of the service organization which I represent as I am. In troubled times like these, it is well to remember that our country was born, primarily, as you know, out of great dissatisfaction and inability to withstand the pressure from another country of which we were at that time a part and with which we today find ourselves allied in the common cause. We started out with a remarkable Declaration of Independence, the author of which is to be enshrined in the memory of this country by the dedication of a great memorial to him next week. I belong to the party which he founded. I still find no measure of fault with his principles, most of which are still applicable today.

When the Constitution of the United States was drafted, it started out in its first expressed thought, setting out its major objective, as the formation of a more perfect union of the people of the States. And my first statement, what I really have to say to you today, is going to be one which comes from a deep feeling that we have not sufficiently, or sufficiently well, heeded the original admonition contained in the compact to which all Americans have agreed. The confusion which exists today is not conducive to the fulfillment of that primary objective, the formation of a more perfect union. The influence of government today upon our way of life has reached a high point, in these distressed times, from which I believe thoughtful Americans can derive considerable optimism—justifiable optimism. Through our history in the past we have run into tough spots like this before, and it looks like all the way through the years that we have existed since our Nation was founded, things had to get just so bad before they began to get better. I believe we have just about reached that peak. I believe that today marks the beginning of a period of united endeavor on the part of all groups—due to one of nature's laws, the personal law of self-preservation—that is going to bring us, not rapidly enough to meet necessities of the case, I am afraid, but certainly rapidly enough to save the situation, to a more tolerant understanding, and again we will be confronted with the opportunity to do our level best.

The notice that I was to speak to you came so suddenly that I was unable to prepare a manuscript, which I would like to have done, so if you will just let me ramble on, what I have to say can be summed up in a few words.

My principal interest is to get you gentlemen to understand, if you will, what one on the inside of one of the branches of government sees in the picture of the tomorrows to come. Confusion is always the enemy of attainment. It has been so through all the ages. The first thing we have to do is to begin to smooth out a most confusing phalanx, composed primarily of experiments and theories which were intended originally to be of service. Today we are confronted with the question as to which is the most important, the formulation of legislation, its enactment into law, or its application, administration, and execution in its impact upon the people. We are operating under many laws and regulations today which have not given heed to the well-thought-out original charter, the Constitution of the United States, and the constitutions of the several States. That is the cause of a lot of the confusion. In the regulations under and by which these laws are administered, we find a wider departure from that original document. It is like a ball team playing ball under certain well-established rules of the game; if those rules are thrown up in the air, inside baseball comes to an end; it becomes literally a sort of a riot on the side lines. There can be no well-developed coordination on the part of the players to function as a team.

Originally this compact was established—I refer to the Constitution—to indicate the rules of the game under which freemen were to work out their own salvation and problems. This Nation was built, gentlemen, primarily by just the right mixture of brains and guts—not too much brains, but enough; not too much intestinal fortitude, but enough. And it was played according to the rules of the game. We now find ourselves in confusion, due to our having failed to see clearly and analyze matters many of which were not then in the concept of those who drew up the rules of the game.

We have today a world which has changed in concept, due to the accomplishments of men of scientific endeavor—a completely different world. The geography of Eric the Red, of Columbus, of Pizzaro, and of all the early navigators, and of those who navigated the seas during World War No. 1, is completely different in concept with reference to the juxtaposition and accessibility of portions of the earth which are inhabited by man. The route, for instance, from San Francisco to Berlin, under the old geography, would, in the mind of most of you, be a line across the State of Missouri by air, crossing the eastern seaboard a little north of New York and going out across the North Atlantic to Berlin; but the new geography sets that line from San Francisco, across Oregon, north across Alberta, Canada, north of Baffin's Bay, across the tips of Greenland and Iceland, and the southeast tip of the Scandinavian peninsula, and into Berlin from the northwest, 1,000 miles shorter than the route that the old geography would indicate that a navigator would take. The entire world has shrunken to a point where the accessibility of centers of population, one to the other, and of the trade markets and trade routes, are comparable to the reduction in distance that I have just given you.

Now the problem that confronts our Nation today is one which has never been even approached either in size, or responsibility, in the history of the world. The eyes of every civilized person in this world—be he enemy or be he ally—are turned upon the United States of America. The Christian civilized peoples and those far off in the East and Asia, together look to the United States of America to save the world situation—to solve this confusion, this strain, this mass malignity, which has never before been equaled.

In this World War there are two things we must do and they can be summed up in one word, and all of the elements involved are a part of that word "PRODUCE"—we must produce. We have to produce mentally, we have to produce physically, and we have to produce the things which sustain life, and a large part of that duty falls on you gentlemen. The products of the fields in this country have increased in their importance, due to the world situation. And they are in your hands because of your having placed them in packages easy to handle and transport; in addition you have added permanency to important food products which, in the main, were perishable and are perishable until you gentlemen process them.

The Congress of the United States and the Army of the United States are a part of the same gang. The armed forces of this country have as their first objective to keep and make permanent the American way of life, to insure that it shall not be destroyed by forces from abroad. And in the Congress of the United States we have a job to preserve it in this country. The home front is our battle field and it is my job in Congress, under my oath—one of 435—to do my dead level best.

If we go back to peacetime, we find a people completely nonmartial in spirit, peace-loving to a degree with which no other people can compare; but once the martial spirit of this Nation is aroused, we are probably the most warlike of any people on the face of this globe. Our system of government provided a certain elasticity to meet situations just like this—in peacetimes the ability to decentralize, which is the ideal from my point of view of government, and to simplify and to remove in the main the impact of government upon free enterprise; but in wartime we are quickly able to bring our forces and powers together in a centralized, effective manner to meet a situation such as we have today. The change in the world and change in the position that the United States occupies both geographically and economically, and finally the change in its responsibility of having more than itself to think about, along with the law of national self-preservation and self-defense, are the things that have brought about the conditions existing today.

One of the greatest enemies that freemen have, and that individuals have, is their proneness to be the victim, in the main, of probably more of the human frailties than those which are possessed, for instance, by people who have been raised in slavery. People who have lived under the iron hand of a dictator—it never occurs to them to speak their minds; never occurs to them to even disagree, even though they may feel that things are going wrong. But in this country, every man has a mind of his own, everyone has a mouth through which that priceless thing known as free speech comes forth. And among these elements that come to those who are individualists, through various ways and by national characteristics, is the one of going off half cocked. It afflicts people in high places just as it afflicts people in low places. But we are becoming awake to the deeper gravity of the situation, even those people who were most intolerant are beginning to recognize that, and are beginning to tone down their pronunciamentos and the expressed intolerance of their views. Pride of authorship even is undergoing a decline.

Men find that they are going off half cocked, and this is a good sign. Men in Government recently dealing with matters in which you gentlemen were vitally interested—grade labeling—at one time not so far past had come to definite conclusions without considering the matter that it was essential and that they were going to require it. You have seen a change in that attitude which is hopeful. You see a situation developing on Capitol Hill where more consideration is being given to a major problem that has to do with defense against a common enemy—inflation. You see some reconsideration everywhere by men who recently indulged in what might be termed a sham battle with a couple of tax bills.

Everybody knows that taxation is one of the major weapons that civilized man uses against the evils of inflation. Everybody knows that a tax law must be tolerant first of the people and its impact upon the people, particularly with reference to their ability under it to meet the tremendous demands brought upon them by the war. Some propositions have been advanced which, were this country at peace, could not have been discussed at all. I say very frankly that when

it comes down to the final analysis, the closer the people of the United States come to an understanding, not only of the problems which confront them but also with those who are charged officially with the responsibility of carrying on the Government of the United States, the better off we are going to be.

I want at this juncture to tell you frankly that I was greatly pleased, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, to hear both sides of the labeling question reasonably well aired, even in the too limited time available. The importance of the two branches of Government has no bearing except to call attention to one particular thing—there never was a time in the history of this country when the exercise of prudent jealousies concerning the rights of Americans was quite so important. Let me add another adjective—prudent and tolerant jealousies. This is no time to cuss a man out and make him mad; this is no time to indulge in practices which we have recently been using in a wild and unrestrained manner. This is no time to appeal to prejudices; this is a time when the best reasoning in this Nation is called upon to give expression and take action upon the problems we have.

If there are any differences between the administrative and executive branches of the Government, I would like to say for the legislative branch that, first, we function under exactly the same oath; second, we have exactly the same immediate and vital objectives—which is a twofold one, the winning of this war in a thorough and conclusive fashion in order that we may build, God willing, a sound peace. In order to do that it takes good, well-trained soldiers, and plenty of them, and those good soldiers have to have plenty of food and good food.

Production today depends upon our ability to solve the propositions I have laid before you so that we can get to work. Confusion today is as great an enemy as any other one thing of the cause upon which we are engaged. Some time ago I made a speech in which I said that the first thing Americans had better do was to stop and think well and remember the vital importance of our first job, that of doing things the American way. In the last World War a new use for barbed wire was developed. It was used as an entanglement to prevent or impede the advances of the enemy. There were shortages of barbed wire in certain spots. Today with production of food and well-trained men as the very essence of our united effort, we find the administrative branch of the Government in certain bureaus and agencies, manufacturing red tape at a speed far in excess of our production of men, arms, and food. Red tape today, in its negative way, is serving the enemy better here at home than barbed-wire entanglements on the other side.

It takes time to simmer down on these things. These facts do not come to the attention of a whole people immediately; they grow on you. I think the facts are apparent now. Witness this practical application of fact: My good friend, your president here, interested Mr. Graefe in betting on a horse by a certain name. You put a horse in training, say he has the background of noble equine ancestors, Man of War out of the daughter of Sir Gallahad the Third, and you put him out and train him until he is 2, 3, or 4 years old. That does not mean he is a race horse. He has got to get on the race track and actually win before he is a race horse, and he has got to win or stay up close to the bunch and win in other tests until he gains experience. This applies beautifully to a lot of the young folks in this country who are beautifully trained, insofar as education and physical training in preparation are concerned, but until they are out on the active track of business life and take upon their shoulders the job of being a constructive and productive citizen, I hold that they can have no knowledge, effective or practical, of the multitudinous things that occur in this great race in which we are engaged today.

It will be well today to remember that approximate regulations to govern the various highly advanced industries and lines of endeavor of our people can be expected to come only from the minds of those who are acquainted with these industries by having been tested on the ground themselves. Let's not be too hard about this thing; let's remember that a lot of boys without such experience have been making mistakes pretty rapidly. Too high a value has been set on pride of authorship in regulations and plans. A lot has been said about changing horses in midstream, but nobody has ever considered that sometimes streams change.

It would be interesting to compare the impracticability of completely changing the American way of life and of taking a bunch of race horses and hooking them to a manure spreader and expecting them to do a good job. I make the suggestion now, and I will repeat it as long as God gives me life and permits me to serve—I state my firm conviction that the very best and the first thing we had better get together on is trying to do our dead level best the American way and not some new untried way. The man who will be enshrined out there next week made a statement over a century and a half ago during the consideration of our organic law, a statement which for prophetic verity has seldom ever been equaled. He said that one good government is a blessing to the whole earth, and because of the American way of life built up under that Government, the United States today as a Nation and as a people find it is shouldered with a burden of responsibility never before even approached in the whole history of the world.

The thing that has been true in our feasance in this country we had better keep on guarding against. We have gone too far along appeals to prejudice, and division into classes and groups. Better begin on that original job of forming a more perfect union, which can never be accomplished with a nation divided by reactions occasioned by prejudice rather than reactions which come from our God-given reason. You had better remember always, gentlemen, in these days and times, as we march along, that through all of the pages of history from the first page right down to the present tragic chapter, class prejudice and appeals thereto, class legislation and class disruption, have always produced the most sinister of all products, the essence of tyranny. It is not in the book of the United States of America to function amidst confusion occasioned by prejudice, occasioned by intolerant, undemocratic expression as between Americans.

When I talk to you gentlemen of the troubles that you have—and there will be troubles tomorrow as there are today—remember that the American way of doing this job is to come up to the Congress of the United States, where under the Constitution your views are entitled to be heard in the halls of state. Discuss the matter with those who represent you there, and with them take up discussion with an equally responsible executive branch of government, a branch of government just as determined and devoted to do its duty as we are. But we have become divided; we have reached a point where it is difficult for the legislative and executive branches to discuss things on an even keel of mutual understanding. I believe that a day of understanding is coming: I believe our Commander in Chief is coming to see these things; I believe that had our Chief Executive more time to think over the many and difficult problems devolving upon him, he might have taken different action at times.

I am willing to argue, to debate with any man and remain his friend at the end of the debate, provided he is willing to confine his discussion to pertinent, rational issues. I believe that the most useless individual among us is the one who is following the line of the demagog. I don't believe this is the day for that. I don't believe, while men in uniform are risking their lives, their health, bodies, and their future to save this great Nation, that men in the public service should be afraid to risk their political future by the full and complete performance of their American duty.

In the field of canning there is no man so ignorant as not to recognize its importance to the war effort. There is no man so dumb and so dense that he does not know that every impediment thrown in the way of the operation of this great industry to its fullest productive capacity means disruption to the war effort. I believe that fact is not going to escape the attention of any man in government. We may have to call it to the attention of some here and there, but I do not believe that it is going to withstand the common sense produced under a freeman's government and under a government where free enterprise has enabled us to produce the materials, ammunition, and food necessary to the maintenance of American rights.

Press and Radio Correspondents Serving With the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 9 last I had the privilege to speak briefly on the floor of the House in regard to the courageous and distinguished services of the press and radio correspondents who are serving with our armed forces. I sought to call attention to a bill I was introducing that day to provide for the issuance of a medal in recognition of these services. The bill is listed as H. R. 2445 and is pending with the Committee on Military Affairs.

Yesterday, at the annual luncheon of the Associated Press, Mr. Kent Cooper, general manager, paid tribute to 14 press and radio reporters who have been listed as dead or missing in the war. I should like to read this part of his speech:

It would be unthinkable that there could be a gathering representative of the American press such as this without solemn thought of one thing In this terrible war there have gone from the United States since Pearl Harbor many brave soldiers whom we all honor, but on this occasion I should like to single out the soldiers of the press. These reporters all have ability. They all have courage. Some of them have lost their lives.

In honoring our own Associated Press dead or missing since Pearl Harbor, we should, as they would have us do, equally honor all. And so I name: Jack Singer, of the International News Service; Eugene Petrov, of the North American Newspaper Alliance; William McDougall and Harry Percy, of the United Press; Ben Miller, of the Baltimore Evening Sun; Ben Robertson, Jr., of the New York Herald Tribune; Byron Darnton and Robert P. Post, of the New York Times; Mrs. Lea

Burdett, of PM; Melville Jacoby, of Time and Life; Harry Crockett and D. Witt Hancock, of the Associated Press.

And to that list I want to add the names of two newsmen in the radio field: Frank Cuhel, of the Mutual Broadcasting System, and Don Bell, of the National Broadcasting Co.

I pause for a moment of silence in reverent memory of them all. And as I do so every Associated Press wire throughout our country is simultaneously still.

It is little I do, Mr. Speaker, in asking that national recognition be given to the soldiers of the press who bring us day-by-day accounts of our fighting men I hope the Committee on Military Affairs will take early and favorable action on the legislation I have proposed.

Possible Tax Delinquents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday April 20, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Democrat of December 14, 1942:

POSSIBLE TAX DELINQUENTS

Here's the story as we heard it:

The man on the trolley was talking. "A funny thing happened Sunday afternoon. A Packard sedan, a cream-colored job, with white sidewall tires, drove up to the house. The driver alighted, went to the back door and rang the bell. It was a young Negro who for several years had been a community yard man He used to work for me 2 days a week, 1 or 2 days for neighbors. We paid him 30 cents an hour * * * we liked him and were pleased when he got a job about a year ago in construction work. It seems he is skillful with concrete."

Doubtless you can guess the rest of the story. But maybe your version won't contain the moral drawn from this one.

When the young Negro was asked how he was getting along he said that he had been knocking down $125 to $160 a week at camps and other projects, working overtime and Sundays

The Packard was his, and as a defense worker he was able to buy it. When asked why he had bought such an expensive automobile he said he was buying those things which all his life he had been wanting. In the car was his wife and four children.

When asked if he had been putting anything aside for his income tax bill he replied: "Income tax What's income tax?"

And the conversation ended with the young Negro wanting to borrow $2 with which to obtain enough gasoline for the ride he had in mind.

Such shortsightedness is not confined to young Negroes who suddenly acquire undreamed of wealth. Far from it. Few Americans are able to think intelligently when they come into possession of sudden riches. Too many believe that money will buy anything.

The real moral to the story is that there are millions of workers who are no more familiar with income taxes than was this Negro. They are hardly to be blamed. But the fact remains that they are certain to become tax delinquents next year and what can be done about it?

That's for Congress to decide for there is no provision in our tax laws to force them to save enough to pay their income taxes. We couldn't put a million persons in jail for not paying their taxes, even if the law permitted it. Yet, the Government cannot afford to permit wholesale tax evasions, thereby throwing a heavier burden upon those who do pay.

Make This Tax Pay-As-You-Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. FREDERICK PRACHT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial of the Philadelphia Inquirer dated April 18, 1943, captioned "Make this tax pay-as-you-go":

MAKE THIS TAX PAY-AS-YOU-GO

The prospect for income-tax relief before it's too late to do much good to the 44,000,000 burden bearers has been appreciably brightened by the getting together of the Republican and Democratic leaders of the House to end the disgraceful deadlock.

As the Inquirer has said before, this issue is too vitally important to the American people to be made a political football. The suffering taxpayers aren't concerned as to which party gets the credit. What they want is action.

The fact is that nothing can be accomplished without the full cooperation of both parties in Congress for the public welfare.

While precise details are not definitely decided, it is now assured that the bill to be reported to the House will have as its chief feature a 20-percent withholding tax.

All are agreed on the advantages of this simple, automatically collectible levy, which would not be an additional tax but a means for making weekly or monthly payments from income as it is earned

The Treasury realizes that without the withholding tax there will be an inevitable falling off of revenues, through countless defaults by persons who have never before been confronted by an income tax and are now unable to make the necessary provision for large lump payments

That is what's giving the Treasury so much concern—not the plight of the taxpayers, for whom it has shown such scant consideration.

Even Chairman DOUGHTON is now strong for the withholding tax He and his lieutenants of the Ways and Means Committee have been hearing from the country in a way to make their ears burn.

But everybody should clearly realize that, standing by itself, this worth-while levy bears only a superficial and wholly deceitful resemblance to real pay-as-you-go.

The withholding tax absolutely demands the Ruml plan as well. For unless taxpayers are freed from the old senseless so-called obligation against last year's incomes they will continue to be denied the full, permanent relief which is their due.

The principle of the withholding tax clearly illumines the indispensable advantages of the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan.

Collection of income taxes at the source would be decidedly convenient for all concerned and ought to be enacted. But the Ruml plan is an absolute necessity.

With the withholding tax, together with the Ruml plan, in effect, installment payments would increase as current income rises and payments would decrease or stop entirely as one's income falls or fails entirely. In the latter event complete cessation of income through death of the breadwinner or loss of his job, would leave no debt owing to the Government.

With the withdrawal tax alone in operation the amount taken by the Treasury would also vary according to current income, but with a whale of a difference should individual disaster befall.

The unfortunate taxpayer or his family would be sharply reminded that they were still held liable for a whole year's back taxes.

It is evident that simply collecting taxes from income as earned, unless those taxes are applied to that income, instead of to that of the year before, will mean no genuine and lasting relief to the taxpayer.

The thing to do is to report a withholding tax bill to the House and then attach an indispensable amendment embodying the sensible Ruml plan. If the House fails in its duty, then the Senate must stand firm for pay as you go.

This is the hope of the millions of taxpayers who have suffered such needless anxiety and suspense these many months at the hands of Chairman DOUGHTON and his fellow obstructors of the people's will.

Motors in the East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. FREDERICK PRACHT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Philadelphia Dispatch captioned "Motors in the East":

MOTORS IN THE EAST

With the rationing of meat, butter, cheese, and cooking fats and oils in the forefront, the Nation has not paid so much attention to the new ruling on A coupons limiting each coupon to 1½ gallons. In some part this is due, no doubt, to the fact that only the 16 Eastern States are affected.

Nevertheless it is true that there are 8,500,000 motorists along the Atlantic seaboard and the new ruling cutting in half the amount of gasoline which the average motorist may have has caused a great deal of discussion.

Everyone is agreed that first we must have enough gas and oil for our men abroad. The question as yet is one of transportation, and many believe that had the situation been properly regulated there would not have been so great a shortage at home.

It is asserted that the automobile situation in the East is in a critical state, which may force many thousands of filling stations to close. One reason for constantly changing rules and doubt as to the real situation is by many believed to be that too many authorities have a hand in the regulation with the Office of Defense Transportation, the Office of Price Administration, and the Office of Petroleum Coordinator for War, all with something to

say about the rules. This, it is said, has caused a considerable amount of friction.

Thomas P. Henry, president of the American Automobile Association, declared recently "one agency knows little about what the other is doing and why. It took all the tact and diplomacy of the Office of War Information to secure an agreement between the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Petroleum Coordinator for War on a simple explanation to the public of the recent cut in coupon values." He continued:

"The knowledge that car owners in the Dominion of Canada are permitted 2,160 miles per year while car owners in the adjacent sections of the United States are allowed only 1,080 miles a year did not help the situation." This probably is true, especially since Canada does not produce any of its own petroleum but must import it from the United States.

It may be repeated that the people want Uncle Sam to have a priority on all gas and oil needed for military purposes, but they would like to be assured that everything is being done efficiently to assure important transportation at home.

Reserves and Supply of Petroleum to Meet Essential Needs Can Be Maintained by Adequate and Fair Price

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows of the importance of petroleum to this Nation and our allies. The problems of the petroleum industry have become the problems of this Government and must be so accepted. I want to here and now sound another warning and emphasize that we are fast approaching an alarming situation. The supply and reserves of petroleum are declining, the exploration is declining, many stripper and marginal wells are being closed down and abandoned and the small independent producer being forced to quit. This is happening because governmental agencies have not recognized the need of an increase in price of crude petroleum to prevent this condition to continue. I say, Mr. Speaker, it will be a tragedy indeed if these problems of the petroleum industry are not immediately recognized and something done about it.

Finding new pools and developing them cannot be accomplished overnight. It usually takes at least 2 years for the results of new development to be made effective. We have been blessed in this country with this great industry and in having people with the will, spirit of adventure, and ingenuity to develop it. It has become an important part of our national life and even more important in winning the war. We must maintain an adequate supply and increase our reserves and we must lift the yoke from the small independent producer in order that he may have an opportunity to survive.

This situation is not something new. For over a year it has been called to the attention of this Congress and the proper agencies of the Government. Yet nothing has been done, which is further evidence of short-sightedness of the agencies authorized to correct existing inequalities.

The oil industry has many problems and peculiarities different from other industries. First, it does not reproduce itself and thereby it is necessary as we use and consume our reserves that new pools and additional reserves be discovered. Second, it is a most hazardous industry and is a challenge to any man. Yet it has many problems similar to other industries, which have become the responsibility of our Government, particularly the problems of production, transportation, refining, distribution, and price of the finished product.

We have given a lot of consideration and made much progress toward the problems of transportation, refining, and distribution and to some extent of our production, but very little and practically nothing has been done in regard to price.

Mr. Speaker, we hear so much about incentive and subsidies. The people in the petroleum business can be stimulated to carry forward this development and meet our demands only by fair, just, and equitable price in the market. The price is a basic and fundamental incentive and to destroy the price incentive, for the development and progress of this or any other industry means the destruction of the industry.

Again, I repeat, it is the duty and the responsibility of this Government, the Executive, and governmental agencies, to recognize the importance and adjust immediately this basic and fundamental problem. Already this important problem has been too long neglected, and we find ourselves facing a dilemma at a most serious and critical period in the history of our Nation.

Our subcommittee on petroleum of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which has been studying continually the problems of the petroleum industry for many years, made a report to this House last year, in which it was disclosed that we were facing serious problems with the oil industry in respect to our reserves, present and future essential supply. This committee report called to the attention of Congress and the governmental agencies as well as the Nation the turn of events from the wasteful production and the surplus of a few years ago to the conservation and deep concern of our supply being maintained.

I do not claim to know all there is to know about the oil industry. I have seen it in all of its phases from the Smackover boom days of wastefulness in the early twenties to the present day effective conservation practices in my State. We have seen the peacetime civilian needs continually increased, and, of course, it is common knowledge that our military needs have exceedingly accentuated the demand. Our committee revealed last year the apparent shortage of our reserves. Our reserves today are not as large as they were a year ago. The demands have been increased on this product and the discovery of new reserves is steadily on the decline.

I am speaking to you, Mr. Speaker, about the new fields found each year, and those that have been found have a decrease in the number of barrels of oil recoverable in each new field. This condition must not continue to prevail and something must be done about it. What are the reasons that this situation has been apparent and how can they be corrected? In the first place, the cost of exploration has greatly increased, due to the intense geological and geophysical activities necessary, because of greatly increased drilling depths, because of increased wages, and the increased cost of materials.

These facts in addition to regulatory practices brought on by the war has decreased tremendously the activities of exploration in this country. Many who have gone out of this business at least temporarily, because of this situation, would no doubt continue if the price adjustment had been made accordingly.

Practically everything affecting the life of this Nation has had an increase in price, generally speaking, except petroleum. It is true there are many of our commodities of about the same price today as they were a year ago, but what about 3 years ago or 5 years ago? The average price of oil since about 1934 or 1935, according to information before our committee has been approximately $1.18 per barrel. It is now approximately the same price. There was no decline in exploration and no dwindling of our reserves and no forcing of our people out of business, so long as the price of oil was stabilized on a fair and equitable basis and in accordance with the cost of exploration, wages, materials, and production. But in the last 2 years, the price of this product being maintained substantially the same and the cost increasing tremendously, has brought about a most deplorable situation.

I am, of course, concerned about the rising cost of living. I am strongly in favor and have supported, because I believed it necessary to the economy of this Nation, price-control laws and policies. Without it, I think we would have already had ruinous inflation. With an increased economy against a diminishing supply, I recognize the fundamental necessity of having price control. However, the principle and the administration of the control should be fair and acceptable in the operation of all business. It has been so recognized in practically every other commodity except petroleum, and the result has been an increase in the production of those commodities.

We have done a wonderful and marvelous job in the way we have increased the production of materials of war, food, and all kinds of supplies, and we are still increasing that production to meet the needs of our increased demands, and yet by our own failure to properly act accordingly in the petroleum industry we see our supply decreasing.

What else is evident because of an inadequate price. Many of our small and independent producers have gone out of the business. Many are operating today

with the increased cost of production at a loss. They are holding on in the hope that the Government will correct this situation. These are the people that are continuing the operation of the stripper and marginal wells. I know something about the problems with which they are faced. Several thousands of them are in my district. Millions of our reserves are dependent upon the continued operation of these stripper and marginal wells. Every time one is closed down, and many are being closed day by day because the tremendous cost of production is more than the actual return, diminishes our supply for present needs and our reserves for the future.

Mr. Speaker, the backbone of the petroleum industry is the small and independent producer. The future and continued progress of this important industry in this country depends on their being permitted to continue in this business.

It has been shown that 17 to 20 companies, 2 years ago, owned 60 percent of the oil business. Today they own 70 percent of the oil business. Why? Because of the inadequate price the small independent businessman is forced to go out of the business, and only the major companies are able to survive, and the trend is driving this industry upon which our people are so dependent to a monopoly of the big companies.

Our committee on petroleum, in its report last December, among other things recommended "the Government must so adjust the price of petroleum and petroleum products that the petroleum industry is enabled to carry out its war task in full, giving due regard to the interest of the public." At the instance of the Petroleum Council of War, which meets in Washington the first of every month on the problems of the industry and to supply the demands of the military and essential civilian needs, the Petroleum Administrator for War has on April 7 recommended to the Office of Price Administration a general increase in the price of oil.

Mr. Brown, the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, says there is no doubt but that under the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942, which is the basis for the President's "hold the line" order of April 6 or 7, the regulation of a price of a commodity like oil may be undertaken by the Price Administrator, which price may go up where necessary for the effective prosecution of the war. Mr. Brown's interpretation is that under the law and the order, the price increase necessary for the effective prosecution of the War is certainly authorized. Not only is it clearly shown that it is necessary because of the prosecution of the war that adjustment in price of oil be made, but for the future of this country, it is equally justified.

We do not know how long this war is going to last, and we certainly, with an abundance of caution, should not only be farsighted in this matter but assured that regardless of how long it may take to win the war, we will have an adequate supply of this vital product.

Inter-Allied Conference on Refugees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced a resolution in this House, House Resolution 209, asking that the Speaker be given both the authority and a mandate to appoint three members of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization as an official committee of the House to sit in as observers at the Inter-Allied Conference on Refugees now being held in Bermuda. No action has been taken on my resolution.

In order to call the attention of this House again to this conference, and to the reason and purpose back of the conference, I include in my remarks an editorial in today's Washington Times-Herald entitled "F. D. R. and One Freedom." This editorial reveals the reason for holding the conference on the refugee problem in Bermuda, and it should spur the House to action upon my resolution:

F. D. R. AND ONE FREEDOM

President Roosevelt was at the peak of his power, we think, on the morning of last November 3. That was election day. That evening, voters in the congressional elections had cut the Democratic House strength from 267 to 222 and raised Republican strength from 162 to 209. Dissatisfaction with the administration's conduct of the war was generally regarded as the main reason.

FOOD, REFUGEES, AND PRESS GAGS

The President took that occasion of election excitement to send Congress a message asking Congress to surrender to the President for the duration the power to change tariff and immigration laws. Congress refused. The President is now trying to bypass Congress and the people in these two matters vitally affecting the present and future welfare of the country.

Now in session in Bermuda is an Inter-Allied Conference on Refugees and what to do about them. It is presumed that this conference was fixed in Bermuda to make it inaccessible to the press and Congress for want of transportation.

Scheduled to open May 18 at Hot Springs, Va., is an Inter-Allied Conference on Food problems during and after the war. Here again, Congress and the press are to be barred by present administration plans.

The scheme plainly is to have these conferences deliberate and decide in secret, and then hand their recommendations to the President, so that he can present them to the people as an accomplished fact, which the people can be told to take and like.

The Board of Directors of the American Society of Newspaper Editors has now gone into the fight to tear off these administration gags.

"FOUR FREEDOMS" ON THE SKIDS

"Without adequate information," says an American Society of Newspaper Editors' statement issued Sunday, "sound public opinion cannot be formed * * * A pattern is being established, which, if continued, will stifle the right of free inquiry and prevent continuous flow of full information to the public."

Signing the statement are such well-known editors as William Allen White (Emporia, Kans., Gazette), Tom Wallace (Louisville, Ky., Times), Wilbur Forrest (N. Y. Herald-Tribune), James M. North (Fort Worth, Tex., Star-Telegram), Erwin D. Canham, (Christian Science Monitor), Basil L. Walters (Minneapolis Star-Journal), and American Society of Newspaper Editors President Roy A. Roberts of the Kansas City Star.

Resolutions, too, are pending in Congress to demand Congressional representation at the Food Conference. These resolutions are sponsored by Senator HOMER FERGUSON (Republican, Michigan) and Representative FRED BRADLEY (Republican, Michigan).

We can all be confident that if the administration wins this fight to bar Congress and the press from these conferences, the American people will have little to say in war and post-war decisions affecting their food, living standards, money, sovereignty, etc. All these matters will be handled for them, with objective reporting and free discussion ruled out. Incidentally, freedom of expression, one of the "four freedoms" the President has said we are fighting for, will be dead in this country. With that freedom dead, the prospects of the other three—freedom of religion, from want and fear—will be very dark.

The Fourth-Term Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Samuel Grafton from the Washington Evening Star of April 15, 1943:

PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENT OF DECISION NOT TO RUN AGAIN WOULD HURT UNITED STATES

(By Samuel Grafton)

Some political realities: The plain truth is that if President Roosevelt announced right now that he will not run for a fourth term he would be left without power to fight the war. He might receive a better press, but he would cease to be a major force in the American or world scene. He would become like one of those French Presidents, respected but inconsequential.

This situation is not of his making. It exists nonetheless. Once he issued the announcement, his prestige with his opposite numbers, Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek, would drop to a bare five points above zero. He would be unable to engage in any major undertaking with these men looking beyond the end of the next year. Actually, his term of effective office would be even shorter and they would know it. The moment the two candidates were named next summer, Mr. Roosevelt would become a mere interim holdover, and he would remain so until him term ran out.

I do not say that this situation is good or bad. I merely say that it exists. It is a condition of the war, like the weather. What to do about it I do not know. Neither does Mr. Roosevelt. And so he does, and can do nothing about it.

His power to run is his power to punish interference with the war effort. Without a clear majority in Congress (and, except on

paper, he has none) it is almost the last item of political power he has left. He is his own final bogey-man. He uses himself to frighten Congress with. Once he announced he would not run again, Congress might love him more, but it would listen to him less.

MUST STAY ALIVE POLITICALLY

Under the circumstances, he hardly has the right to make the announcement. This is a separate question from that of whether he actually does run again or not. The question is whether the man who shapes our war shall keep himself politically alive or render himself politically dead at this moment.

It will be noticed that those Republican newspapers, like the New York Herald Tribune, which are wholeheartedly for the organization of a more stable world, are in no special tizzy on the fourth-term issue. They do not want a fourth term. They would much prefer a Republican President with Mr. Roosevelt's ideas on world organization. But they have looked behind the arguments and have seen the naked face of reality.

They have stumbled on the curious fact that the President of the United States is really the President of the United States. If he renders himself powerless, then the United States has a powerless President. That is not good for the United States.

The opposition would like to separate Mr. R., the President, from Mr. R., the man. He can't oblige. He is stuck with himself. Mr. F D. Roosevelt is the prisoner of his office. In dealing with foreign countries he does not have the right to destroy his bargaining power, because it is our bargaining power.

FORCED TO BE SILENT

So he is compelled to keep silence on the fourth-term issue. He would be compelled to do so even if he did not want a fourth term. I believe he does want a fourth term. It makes no difference. He cannot make himself a political zero just before the invasion of Europe and the definition of the terms of the peace. Or, rather, he can do it, but at the price of turning effective world leadership over to Mr. Churchill and Mr. Stalin, with himself a lame duck at the conference table.

We Americans happen to like a system in which we elect officials who are in effect premiers—i. e., political leaders—by popular vote, for fixed terms. That makes us the only major country in the world in which it is possible to have a premier who is, politically, a lame duck. In every other country the premier is a temporary official, chosen by the parliamentary majority; he has the reality of political power, or he does not remain the premier. Mr. Roosevelt is dealing with premiers. If, in these circumstances, he dares not make himself a political blank, that is the price we pay for the system we like. It is not a plot. Mr. Roosevelt cannot make himself a lame duck without making America a lame duck.

So, it is not so easy for Mr. Roosevelt to say those blessed words. Maybe he is stubborn. Political realities are stubborn, too.

Amendment of the Securities and Exchange Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas:

House Concurrent Resolution 30

Whereas Congressman LYLE H. BOREN, of Oklahoma, has introduced a bill in the Congress of the United States (H. R. 1502) amending the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934; and

Whereas the purpose of said bill is to remove the ambiguity in that act touching the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission to regulate securities issued by States or political subdivisions or instrumentalities of States; and

Whereas public financing by States or subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof should not be restricted by bureaus of the Federal Government but are matters of purely local concern: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact the bill aforesaid (H. R. 1502) at an early date to the end that public financing by States and subdivisions thereof may be freed from the hampering influences of the ambiguity of the present law; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Arkansas is hereby directed to immediately send a duly certified copy of this resolution to each of the Representatives and United States Senators in Congress.

Approved March 15, 1943.

Gasoline Rationing in Western Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RODGERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following:

When gasoline rationing was first inaugurated, western Pennsylvania was not included with the so-called 17 eastern seaboard States. The regional dividing line passed east of our petroleum and refining area as well as our highly industrialized area. This was sensible. The regional line passed through comparatively sparsely settled area, not highly industrialized, and without the transportation problems of western Pennsylvania.

Later this regional dividing line was moved to Pennsylvania-Ohio State line passing through the industrialized area of western Pennsylvania and eastern Ohio resulting in the inconsistent and contradictory situation of having two values for gasoline coupons, namely, 4 gallons in Ohio and now in effect, 1½ gallons in Pennsylvania. This could not help but be productive of the dissatisfaction and confusion which has resulted. But on top of all that, western Pennsylvania produces unrefined, or natural gasoline, and while the quality is not as high as refined gasoline, yet it serves as motor fuel. Even under normal times, there was a local market at the wells for this natural product.

Under present rationing rules this natural gasoline cannot be sold unless coupons are collected at the same time. Since storage facilities are limited, production either has to cease or the surplus natural gasoline be returned to Mother Earth.

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette in its issue of Friday, April 16, carried quite an extended story with front page, two-column headline as follows: "Well Owners' Gasoline Rationing Nearest Top in Asininity."

The story states that some of these operators are liberal in taking care of former customers and relates the following interesting story with reference to an operator and a minister of the community. The newspaper correspondent states that he talked with both the country minister and the producer involved but withholds their names.

This is the story:

The minister of one of these mountain churches up here drove up to the lease of one of the small producers who for years has sold gasoline right from the well. He has two lone A coupons left in his book and an almost empty tank.

"Look, Reverend," the producer said when he had run 6 gallons in the tank, "I'm pouring this stuff back in the ground because I can't sell it. So when someone I know drives in I sell him what his coupons call for and give him whatever his tank will take in addition. But I don't want to be responsible for you doing anything that ain't right."

The minister reflected. Then he told the oil man:

"Well, I've long held that the Lord wouldn't hold with the burning of the wheat. And he wouldn't hold with plowing the cotton under and the killing of little pigs and the cattle. And I'm sure that the Lord wouldn't hold with the dumping of this precious gasoline into the ground.

"So fill 'er up."

Newspapers Should Be Admitted to International Food Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, one of the live questions of the hour is the insistent demand of the American people that an unhampered, factual, free press shall be permitted to function and limited only by military and war necessities. So far as I can ascertain, the consensus of opinion is that the President is not justified in excluding newspapermen from the United Nations conference on food soon to be held in this country. There appears in the Monroe (Mich.) Evening News a pertinent editorial, and pursuant to the privilege granted to me, I include that editorial which is as follows:

BACK TO DARK AGES

After Secretary Hull had announced at a press conference that arrangements were being made to admit newspapermen to the

United Nations conference on food, President Roosevelt countermanded these arrangements and insisted on keeping the correspondents away from the scene of the meeting. This was his original idea, apparently based on his experience at Casablanca where all meetings were held in secret, and against the advice and pleading of Secretary Hull and Elmer Davis, the Office of War Information Chief, he has insisted on maintaining it.

There was every reason for holding the Casablanca conference in secrecy, for it was, presumably, a strictly military affair. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill got together with their military, air, and naval chiefs and mapped the strategy for the 1943 campaign. The people of both Britain and America are willing to trust their leaders to plan the military phase of the war. They realize that these plans must be kept from the enemy for obvious reasons. They reserve only the right to criticize such plans when they do not appear to be getting results.

There is no similar reason for secrecy at the food conference. It is strictly a civil matter, involving no strategy that must be kept from the enemy. If the meetings are held at Hot Springs in secrecy, public opinion in the nations represented can have no bearing on the outcome, and even the conclusions, under such circumstances, may be withheld from the people. We do not believe the people are ready, in the democratic nations to be represented at Hot Springs, to turn over such a civil matter entirely to their leaders.

Under present plans not even Congress will be represented at the food meetings. Apparently it is the administration's intent to hold a star-chamber session and then present as accomplished facts, the solutions arrived at to Congress for the necessary ratification and enabling legislation. If we know Congress, we can forecast trouble ahead. Yet it seems to be the idea of Mr. Roosevelt that by holding the parley behind closed doors any differences of opinion voiced by the delegates will never leak out. Far more evidence of dissension and disunity is likely to result from this method when Congress goes to work on international food arrangements which it had no part in drafting.

To hold international conferences on nonmilitary affairs in complete isolation and behind locked doors is a step backward to the Dark Ages in diplomacy. It is the method Mussolini and Hitler use in their Brenner Pass confabs. It is the negation of democracy and implies on the part of the leaders a lack of trust and confidence in the people they represent. We wonder how the people of the other nations to be represented will feel toward America when they learn that Mr. Roosevelt, the world-wide symbol of democracy, has excluded them from the conference he has called to meet in the United States.

Does he intend all the United Nations foregatherings to be modeled after the Axis pattern at Brenner Pass, or after the Pan-American conferences which have always been open and aboveboard?

School Teachers and the Victory Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD a letter received from Mr. Z. L. Madden, president, the South Carolina Education Association, clearly showing the inequity and hardships imposed on the school teachers, that great and underpaid group of local Americans, through the present system of collecting the Victory tax. The letter follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Spartanburg, S. C., April 16, 1943.

Hon. J. P. RICHARDS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RICHARDS: We wish to call your attention to what seems to us to be an injustice to teachers in the calculation of the Victory tax. I give below two illustrations of what we refer to:

First, the Victory tax applies to those receiving more than $624 per year. For those paid monthly the procedure is as follows: Monthly payments minus $52 multiplied by 5 percent. Thus a teacher whose contracted salary for a year is only $600 (and therefore really exempt from the tax) would have to pay 73 cents each pay day if she were on a 9-month pay plan. The Government would collect $6.75 for the year, which sum would have to be returned to the teacher after March 1944. It seems entirely reasonable to us to exempt from the whole procedure all teachers employed on contract for annual salaries which amount to less than the basis exemption. Incidentally, about 70,000 teachers in the United States receive less than $600 per year. How many Federal clerks are required to undo the Victory-tax collections for those people who are not really subject to the tax in the first place?

A second type of inequity arises in the case of the teacher who receives more than $625 per year (and therefore is subject to the Victory tax) but receive her annual salary in 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 monthly payments (incidentally, 75 to 80 percent of the public-school teachers of the United States are not paid in 12 monthly installments). A teacher who is not paid in 12 installments is required to make advance payments of taxes, which payments may be large enough to endanger his budget.

Let us illustrate: The teacher's annual contract salary is $900. The total Victory tax for the year should be $13.80. On a 9-month pay plan this teacher receives $100 each month. The tax is computed: $100 minus $52 multiplied by 5 percent equals $2.40, which sum multiplied by 9 equals $21.60. Thus the teacher has overpaid $7.80—a sum that is of great importance to one receiving less than a subsistence income. Even if the credit is given later and an adjustment made, this teacher has been penalized for being on a 9-month pay plan. The penalty would be even greater for those on 6, 7, and 8 monthly payments. Is it not possible for the Bureau of Internal Revenue to work out tables of amounts to be withheld monthly when the pay plan is not based on 12 monthly payments? If this were done, the total amounts withheld for the year would more closely approximate the 5 percent due than is the case under the tables issued by the Bureau.

We feel that this should be called to the attention of the collector of internal revenue. If you can be instrumental in correcting this inequality, you will render a great service to the teachers of South Carolina and of the Nation as a whole.

Cordially yours,

Z. L. MADDEN,
President, South Carolina
Education Association.

Keep the Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, granting that there has been some mismanagement in certain instances in the administration of the Farm Security program, I share what I am constrained to believe is a prevailing opinion in the House that the F. S. A. should be preserved.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an editorial from the Atlanta Journal and a column from the Atlanta Constitution, written by Mr. Ralph McGill:

[From the Atlanta Journal of April 16, 1943]

PRESERVE THE F. S. A.

Judge MALCOLM TARVER, able Representative from the Seventh Georgia, talked sound sense to the House in the opening debate on the attempt to abolish the Farm Security Administration. He pointed to the useful function it is performing in aiding 417,000 farm families to win their own economic and social independence, as well as the powerful part it is playing in obtaining the food production necessary to the winning of the war and the peace.

Congressman TARVER knows whereof he speaks. In his district the Farm Security Administration has done a notable work. It has been an agency of rehabilitation to a large and important class of people who were suffering from ills not of their own making. What they needed was not relief but assistance in terms of opportunity by which they might work out their own salvation. This, Farm Security Administration could do and has been doing throughout rural America.

The status of the attempt to destroy the Farm Security Administration is at the moment clouded by a parliamentary tangle as to jurisdiction. It was the Appropriations Committee which made the present move by cutting off the enabling funds. The Agriculture Committee declares that action to have been an invasion of its own field, and also a wrongful act in that it violates the ban against writing legislation into an appropriation bill.

However, that embroilment may be solved, we express the hope that our Georgia delegation will strive for the maintenance of the good things in Farm Security Administration. It has been and can continue to be a powerful instrument for the welfare of the humble folk of the farms who constitute so large a percentage of our population. These things in Farm Security Administration that may have been wrong or poorly handled can be corrected, and the good things retained.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of April 16, 1943]

ONE WORD MORE

(By Ralph McGill)

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION SORELY NEEDED

Certain pressure groups in and about Congress who consistently oppose anything designed to help the ragged-edge small farmer to own his own piece of ground are making what looks to be their most successful fight to abolish the F. S. A. (Farm Security Administration).

The Farm Security Administration is to be abolished under the provisions of a bill reported out by the House committee. It will be vigorously, and one may hope, successfully opposed in the House and Senate.

The farm bloc opposed it because the farm bloc admittedly thinks the Nation would be better off without the small farmer. Most of the farmers Georgia has would not be regarded well by the farm bloc group.

Their idea is that there should be a number of large farms and a great amount of farm labor.

The selfish reason they oppose the small farmer, who is just barely hanging on, getting any help is because they want him to remain as a tenant, sharecropper, or laborer. They oppose any and all attempts to make him an independent owner of a small farm.

This year they have tried to say there is a "red" influence at work in the Farm Security Administration. As an illustration they point out the fact that the small farmers who are under the Farm Security Administration program work together in cooperative market associations.

One of the tragic facts about our small and medium farm operations has been the fact that a farmer with a small amount of produce had difficulty getting a market and more often than not had to take what was offered. Cooperative efforts, in which many small farmers pool their products so as to make carload lots for the market, are their salvation.

A great many persons in the city think about the Farm Security Administration, if they think about it at all, as merely a plan to help a farmer who is poor, small, and landless get credit.

It is much more than that, as I would like to show.

THE PROGRAM

Farm Security Administration helps the little man in many ways. There are an estimated 2,000,000 farmers who are in need of help. At least 1,000,000 are on the ragged edge.

The Farm Security Administration has been able to reach but a small percentage—7.6 percent of all farmers. The number actively supervised during 1942 was 463,941.

The tenant-purchase plan, which helps make landowners of some of our best people who, because of disaster, misfortune and sickness, have occupied a tenant status. There is certainly nothing wrong with being a tenant, but hundreds in each State want to own a piece of land for themselves.

Once benefited by a long-term Farm Security Administration loan, the Farm Security Administration imposed a supervision which enable the borrower to make the best of his loan and facilities. Planned gardens, chickens, canning, a pig or so for slaughter, a milk cow—all these were a part of the plan.

Thirdly, there was the rehabilitation feature in which smaller loans were made to farmers who had lost, during the depression, all they had. They were staked to a mule, a plow, and given a start on a crop and some food production.

That's all there is to the Farm Security Administration, which the farm bloc and, apparently, some of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration leaders are seeking to kill. Those Agricultural Adjustment Administration leaders who have agreed to it, do so because they think they will save the Farm Security Administration. As a matter of cold fact, the Farm Security Administration is much more worth saving than the triple A as it now stands. It has become so bogged down in paper work that its record of assistance to the farmer is badly off.

The Farm Security Administration record of repayments is astoundingly good. There are failures, of course. But the percentage of failures is small. It is the failures the Congressmen hear about. The enemies of the act make sure the failures are well advertised. The 10 who succeed where 1 fails are conveniently overlooked.

TO BRING IT HOME

It seems to me this program should be viewed in the light of conditions today. It is needed more than ever. The large farms already are doing all they can.

The small farmer showed the Nation in 1942 what he could do if given a chance. The Farm Security Administration supervised farms, representing only 7.6 percent of the Nation's farms, were responsible for almost a third of the Nation's increase in milk in 1942. Ten percent of the total increase in chickens and eggs came from those same farms. Twenty-seven percent of the increase in dry beans came from the Farm Security Administration farms. Nine percent of the increase in pork and 7 percent of the increase in beef were their further contributions to the Nation's food supply.

Let's bring it home.

Four hundred and fifty-five carloads of essential foods were produced in 1942 by Farm Security Administration borrowers in four southern States—Georgia, Alabama, Florida, and South Carolina.

Georgia led with 177 carloads. Alabama was next with 159.

These carloads of food were from farms which, before Farm Security Administration put them and their occupants on a workable basis, were not producing enough to provide a healthy diet for those on that land.

These four States now produce—from small Farm Security Administration farms alone—455 carloads of essential foods. It is estimated that 22,000 pounds of chickens go into one car; that 24,000 pounds of pork go into one car. And so on.

Farm Security Administration has done a job. There is no possible way to discount it.

It is paying back its loans.

It is needed now—when the Nation and world needs more food—more than ever. It is to be hoped that Georgia's representatives will not be led away by the farm bloc and its affiliates who want to stop this aid to the small farmer who can be given a boost.

Georgia has plenty of them who need that boost.

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House, there is presented herewith the fourth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money.

In the previous installments the Senator has revealed the change in legislation that opened the way for the bank-money advocates to discredit silver and embarrass the Government by securing the redemption of the Treasury notes paid out in buying silver, in gold, thereby draining out the Treasury's gold reserve required for the payment of the interest and principal of the outstanding bonded indebtedness which was payable in gold.

In reviewing the history of the development of our monetary system the Senator is leading up to the establishment of an international monetary system in Europe, commonly called the Latin Union, in the middle of the last centry. A sytem by which the contracting nations standardized their coinage and made their metallic money interchangeable. A system that worked successfully until it was broken down by Germany after the defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian War in 1870, when Germany upset monetary equilibrium in Europe by closing her mints to silver and demonitizing silver money and thereby increasing the weight of France's war indemnity obligation payable to Germany in gold.

It is reported that after the delivery of the initial indemnity payment by France to Germany the German and English banks together were in possession of 90 percent of the world's gold supply—a condition that influenced the demonitization of silver by Germany and may have had some connection with the demonitization of silver in the United States 3 years later, in 1873.

The fourth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

Mr. GEORGE. Is there any law authorizing the Secretary to pay silver certificates in gold?

Mr. COCKRELL. There is not on the face of any book of law in the United States an act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury on the demand of any king or potentate or representative of any foreign syndicate or gold syndicate to redeem silver dollar certificates in gold coin. No man can show it. Read your silver certificate, if you have one in your pocket. There is no question about what it means. I have here a little one, but it is just as good as a big one, I presume.

"This certifies that there has been deposited in the Treasury of the United States one silver dollar payable to bearer on demand."

"One silver dollar payable to bearer on demand"; and yet, I am told that our Secretary of the Treasury has upon the demand of the holders of these silver dollar certificates paid them in gold. I say he has no right to do it. I say it is not in pursuance of the democratic policy of the United States, maintained from the foundation of our Government up to this day. I say it is in violation of every principle and policy which our Government has ever proclaimed. We have made silver money as absolutely and unqualifiedly irredeemable without price as we have made gold; and he had no right when a man came to him with an illegal, unjust, infamous, and iniquitous demand, mad for ulterior ends and ulterior purposes, to force this country to a single gold standard, to bow to any such demand and pay out any such gold dollars.

Mr. PEPPER. Here is the law.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no question about it. It is simply a certificate that so many silver dollars have been put there and they are kept on deposit to be returned to the holder. Now I will read the law. Section 3 of the Bland Act provides—

"That any holder of the coin authorized by this act may deposit the same with the Treasurer or any Assistant Treasurer of the United States, in sums of not less than $10 and receive therefor certificates of not less than $10 each, corresponding with the denominations of the United States notes. The coin deposited for or representing the certificates shall be retained in the Treasury for the payment of the same on demand. Said certificates shall be receivable for customs, taxes, and all public dues, and, when so received, may be reissued."

As a matter of course, any banker or any gentleman having financial transactions with

a friend would, if that friend came and asked that he might have gold in lieu of silver certificates, or in lieu of fractional money, or in lieu of greenbacks, or anything of the kind, give it to him; but when a man comes with silver certificates and makes a legal peremptory demand upon any United States Secretary of the Treasury or subtreasurer that they must be redeemed in gold. I care not whether he is the representative of the Rothchilds of England, or of Great Britain itself, or of Germany, or any other nations or kindred on earth, he has no right to be paid the gold.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Will the Senator from Missouri permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. COCKRELL. With a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. MCPHERSON. This morning we listened to a very severe criticism by the Honorable Senator from Alabama, Mr Morgan, in which he found much fault with the Committee on Finance for striking from the House bill a certain provision, which I will read:

"And the faith and credit of the United States"—

Mark the language—

"And the faith and credit of the United States are hereby pledged to maintain the parity of the standard gold and silver coins of the United States at the present legal ratio, or such other ratio as may be established by law."

I should like to know whether the Senator from Alabama or the Senator from Missouri best represents the contention of the silver advocates in the Senate. The Senator from Alabama criticizes us for striking from the bill a provision of law which would require a demand that the Treasury of the United States shall redeem the silver coin in a way to preserve the parity. The Senator from Missouri now declares that it is contrary to law; that it is a degradation of silver, and the Secretary of the Treasury has no right to redeem it in gold. Who represents the contention of the silver advocates here, the Senator from Missouri or the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. COCKRELL. I can answer that we both represent it; and we both represent that Grand Old Party which has maintained its organization for over a century amid all the storms and political upheavals that have driven every other political organization out of existence. We represent the system of money that it maintained until that system was supplanted by the Republican policy of 1873, establishing the gold standard. I wanted the Senator to ask me that identical question, because we shall have much to do with it hereafter. Does the maintenance of two metals at a parity demand that one of them, just as absolute and as irredeemable as the other, shall be redeemed in the other? No, sir. That is a false interpretation of the law. I have quoted it. I have shown that the pretended claim that the Secretary of the Treasury had to redeem these Treasury notes in gold to maintain the parity is false. There is not a particle of foundation for it, in my judgment. He violated the spirit of the law. It is true he has the option, but that option is further governed by the declaration that he shall coin of the bullion purchased with Treasury notes a sufficient amount to redeem the Treasury notes—every one of them.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Let me ask the Senator from Missouri what is to assist the silver coin to keep step with gold in exchanges and maintain the parity if it be not an exchangeability into gold?

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, that has nothing to do with it. Money is without price and is irredeemable. We have made silver money. We have not made it a limping leg to gold. We have not made it subordinate to gold. Anyone who undertakes to interpret the law in such a way that the silver dollars coined under the law are redeemable in gold is the worst kind of a gold monometallist.

No, Mr. President; I care not who it is; I do not stand with anyone upon that kind of bimetallism. The silver dollar is money, absolute money. It is irredeemable in anything on earth, or above it, or beneath it. It is the equal of gold in every respect. We do not seek to maintain silver in the light in which the Senator from New Jersey speaks of it. We say let it walk side by side with gold. It will do it if you just let it alone. It will walk with it as it has always done. It commanded a premium in your cowardly gold metal right in the markets of New York during the recent panic. Yes, sir; it has always maintained it. You can take your silver dollar and go into any market in the United States and buy with it just as much as you can buy with the gold dollar.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Will the Senator yield to me for another question?

Mr. COCKRELL. With a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. MCPHERSON. In respect to the attitude of the silver advocates in this body a great panic has unquestionably been maintained; and I want to say to the Senator that a well-executed counterfeit would have commanded a premium sometimes during the panic.

Mr. COCKRELL. It would do it now if nobody could discover it. No, Mr. President, this panic has not been produced by the silver dollar. It has had nothing more to do with producing the panic than the gentle evening zephyrs. This panic has been growing for years; and the conditions were in such a state of progress that the bankers intended to force this country to redeem all its money in gold, just as the Senator is wanting to do, and whom he is representing, and the aristocratc nations of Europe have joined them. They say we will have the single gold standard and we will have the money of the world redeemable in that single gold standard. That is the battle we are fighting now.

That is the enemy we are contending against now. He is covered behind the breastworks of distinguished citizens here and taking refuge behind them and their opinions, but that is the real enemy we are fighting. When this Government goes to redeem absolute money with any other money, particularly when that is silver, and demanding that it shall be done, it is degrading the silver. You do not redeem money, absolute money, metallic money. You may redeem legal-tender paper currency, but you do not redeem gold and silver. A man goes to the Bank of France with a million or a billion dollars of silver francs and demands gold. Does he get it?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Why?

Mr. COCKRELL. Simply because they do not intend to degrade silver by making it subsidiary to gold.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. COCKRELL. With infinite pleasure.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. Is not every dollar of silver in circulation by express terms redeemable in gold?

Mr. COCKRELL. Not one of them.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. The Senator and myself differ on that point.

Mr. COCKRELL. I challenge the Senator to show one line of law authorizing any United States officer to redeem a silver dollar in gold.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. By the terms of the Latin Union?

Mr. COCKRELL. Not by the terms of the Latin Union.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. By the terms of the Latin Union each respective nation agreed that it would redeem and exchange every silver dollar outstanding in the hands of a citizen of every other country for gold.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes; but that is not silver in France, and the Senator knows it. He knows that is a miserable subterfuge.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. The Senator uses harsh language when he says it is a miserable subterfuge.

Mr. COCKRELL. I mean no offense.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. I am accustomed in debate to be civil. If we are to bandy opprobrious epithets, if the Senate is to degenerate into mud slinging, I think, with all due respect to my venerable friend that I could sling as much mud as he.

Mr. COCKRELL. Undoubtedly, and more.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. But my sense of propriety and decency would prevent me.

Mr. COCKRELL. When I said it was a subterfuge I meant simply in argument, and the Senator knows it is a subterfuge.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. I know nothing of the kind.

Mr. COCKRELL. I will show him that it is.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. I believe the contrary.

Mr. COCKRELL. I will show the Senator. He is a strong lawyer, and he knows what it is to dodge around a point.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. Let me tell the Senator I never dodge half as much as he does. I think he is as artful a dodger as I ever met in my life.

Mr. COCKRELL. Now, let us see what the Latin Union is. We all know about that. The Latin Union binds France to redeem its coin held by other nations.

Mr. TELLER. Not the individuals.

Mr. COCKRELL. It does not relate to the redemption of silver coin circulating in France, and my good friend from Louisiana, whom I love so tenderly, will admit it. There is no use talking about that.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me?

Mr. COCKRELL. With a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. If my answer to the question which the Senator has made does not affirm the proposition which I stated, then I do not know how a proposition can be affirmed. If silver is outstanding issued by the French Government and the French Government has entered into an obligation not treating it as ultimate money, but that every dollar of it outstanding held by another nation shall be redeemed in gold, the existence of that obligation renders every dollar redeemable in gold, because the man who desires to redeem the silver in gold has only to put it into a position where it comes under the obligation which forces it to be redeemed in gold.

Mr. COCKRELL. That does not relate to silver in circulation in France, as the Senator knows. I say that silver money circulating in France and in the hands of the people within its territorial dominion is not redeemable in gold.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. Ah, yes; if the Senator will allow me; but the faculty and power to put a dollar in a position where it has a right to demand gold follows that dollar in the hands of every individual in the world, and gives it an attribute which makes it as good as gold.

Mr. COCKRELL. How can the citizens of France, with 600,000,000 silver dollars, place that silver coin in the hands of foreign government?

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. Very readily, when the time comes.

Mr. COCKRELL. The idea that six or seven hundred million of coined legal-tender dollars in France equal there to gold in the payment of the national debt, and in the payment of taxes, and in the payment of the personal obligations, and the purchase of millions and billions of dollars' worth of products there, is going to be sent to some foreign government—Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, or Greece, forming the Latin Union, and given into the hands of those governments, in order that they may come back to France and demand under the Latin Union that these coins shall be redeemed in gold, is an impossibility.

Mr. TELLER. I ask the Senator if he will allow me to make a suggestion in reference to the statement made by the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. COCKRELL. With pleasure.

Mr. TELLER. The Latin Union provides that when France shall have Italian money, and Italy has French money, that they shall strike the balance and if it shall be found that France has more of the Italian money than Italy has of the French money, that that shall be redeemed in gold. That is the Italian money which shall be redeemed, which is circulating out of the country in which it is coined. Under no provision of law or any practice in France has a single French 5-franc piece ever been exchanged for gold, and it cannot be done by law.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Why not?

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from New Jersey asks why not. Because there is no law requiring it. I do not mean to say that a Frenchman may not, if he chooses, exchange a 5-franc piece, or a number of them, for gold, but there is no policy in France for redeeming silver in gold; and if any Senator makes such a statement he is making that which he cannot sustain.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. If the Senator from Missouri will allow me one moment, I will make clear the statement I made. The Senator from Missouri made a broad statement that any money which was redeemable was not ultimate money.

Mr. COCKRELL. Metallic money, I mean.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. Metallic money. Then he went on and referred to the Latin Union, and I immediately called attention to the fact that the very states that form the Latin Union found it necessary in order to form it to enter into an agreement among themselves that this money should be redeemed in gold.

Mr. TELLER. If I may suggest, the contract was this: As long as Italy had French money she redeemed French money in French money.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. She redeemed it in gold.

Mr. TELLER. Not at all. She struck the balance, and when she could no longer redeem it in silver, because she had not French silver, then she was obliged to redeem it in gold.

Mr. WHITE of Louisiana. Then I say this was not ultimate money, and they provided that she should get gold for it by the terms of the Latin Union. My argument is that the faculty of redeeming that money in gold, however remote that faculty was, gives the attribute to the money which makes it equivalent with gold resulting from that very stipulation; and that, in my judgment, is what enabled the Latin Union to keep the silver afloat which it has kept afloat.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is a contingency so far remote that it does not have upon the circulation of the francs of France within the territorial dominions of that great Republic even the influence that ordinary moonshine would have upon it. It is simply mythical. It has grown up in the vivid imagination of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Now, if the Senator from Missouri will yield to me for a single moment, I want him to be exactly correct in his speech here, which he is soon to publish, I suppose, and judging from the amount of references that he has before him he has camped here for a week or two, and therefore it will be no interference.

Mr. COCKRELL. It never is any interference, whether I am making a long or short speech.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The agreement made between France and the states of the Latin Union is an agreement which relates only to intercourse between those nations and must end at the termination of the period of time for which the agreement was made. If there is an Italian coin or Belgian coin in her possession, Italy and Belgium are required to pay her in gold, and vice versa. The Senator is quite right, however, when he says that France is not obliged by law to compel the redemption of silver coin in gold coin to maintain the parity; but that she does it in practice is obvious and certain. No man who goes to the Bank of France or to any bank in France and asks for the exchange of a certain amount of silver coin or silver francs in gold coins, Napoleons, if you please, is turned away empty.

Mr. COCKRELL. As a matter of course, not.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Silver—the silver franc being the unit and standard of value in France, the charter of the Bank of France requires the bank to receive these coins on deposit and pay them out to those who deposit them; that is, the public Therefore, the silver coins stand alone; but in practice France does exactly what the Government of the United States does. It always redeems the coin in gold when gold is asked for, not in sums suited for export, because upon export gold they demand a slight premium. The premium is very slight, for the reason that if gold cannot be exported, commodities must be exported to take the place of gold; and if a high premium is put upon it, it bears very heavily upon the exchange of commodities.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no doubt but that a banker in the United States or anywhere else who had a spirit of accommodation and any of the milk of human kindness about him would exchange a few dollars of gold for a few dollars of silver, or anything of that kind. But I say if a citizen of the United States were to go to the Bank of France and present any considerable number of silver dollars for gold and demand them as his right he would be quickly turned out of the Bank of France.

Mr. MCPHERSON. If the Senator will allow me a moment longer, I was going to ask him a further question. The Bank of France today has some $250,000,000 of gold coin. I speak in round numbers.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is about right.

Appointment of "Lame Ducks"

REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, further answering the gentleman from Ohio, I am amazed that men who have been here for years, three or four terms, should for political reasons continue to criticize the appointment of a Member of Congress to any position. In my opinion, any Member who has served here 4, 6, or 8 years has in all probability attained experience and knowledge in governmental affairs that should fit him to a very high degree to execute the duties to which he may be assigned far better than are fitted many of the clerks from large corporations that the Republicans put in and who have had no experience in governmental activities. I feel, therefore, that this criticism of the appointment of an able and experienced Congressman just because the people were probably misled in defeating him is unfair, unjust, and unreasonable.

Mr. Speaker, sadly remembering when there was a Republican President in the White House and the appointment of a large number of ex-Senators and ex-Members of Congress—whom the Republicans now love to refer to as "lame ducks"—whether under Presidents Harding, Coolidge, or Hoover, I cannot recall that at that time a single Democratic Member criticized any of the appointments. Among the many outstanding Republicans appointed were such men as former Representative Bascom Slemp, of Virginia, who served as secretary to President Harding, Representative Newton, of Minnesota, who similarly served with President Hoover, Representative Ogden Mills, of New York, appointed as Secretary of the Treasury, Representative William E. Humphrey, of Washington, who later sought to serve under the Democratic administration, and many others, all of whom made good with the exception of two who had served in the Congress and were appointed who, later, unfortunately, failed in the performance of their duties, namely, a former Senator from New Mexico appointed to the Cabinet who was involved in the famous Teapot Dome scandal, and the other, a former Member from Delaware serving as Alien Property Custodian who, yielding to the influence of big interests, became badly involved.

Mr. Speaker, I, myself, have always believed that a Senator or Representative, having only a short period of service in the Congress, by reason of the knowledge and experience that he has gained, is invariably better fitted for most any position in the Government service than those without such experience. Surely the Democrats appointed by President Roosevelt since he took office are men of ability and integrity and they, too, with the experience they have had in the House are better qualified to serve the country than men without similar experience.

I recall with pride the appointment of ex-Members by President Wilson who served in the Cabinet, namely, A. Mitchell Palmer, Attorney General; William B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor; and William C. Redfield, Secretary of Commerce. There followed the appointment of David J. Lewis and many other former Democratic Members who served with credit to themselves and to the party, and who rendered real service to the country.

Mr. Speaker, thus far President Roosevelt has appointed some former Senators and ex-Members of Congress all of whom are giving splendid and efficient service to the Government. Yes; I repeat, some Democrats have been appointed and let me mention the names of some of them:

FORMER SENATORS AND EX-MEMBERS OF CONGRESS APPOINTED TO FEDERAL OFFICE BY PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

Secretary of State Cordell Hull.

Prentiss M. Brown, Price Administrator.

James F. Byrnes, Director and Chairman, Economic Stabilization Board.

James P. Pope, Director, Tennessee Valley Authority.

Ewin L. Davis, Federal Trade Commission.

Guy Helvering, Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Marvin Jones, Court of Claims.

Sam Hill, United States judge.

Thomas Eliot, Social Security Board.

William Arnold, United States judge.

William P. Cole Court of Customs Appeals.

Michael L. Igoe, United States district court.

T. Alan Goldsborough, United States district court.

Fred M. Vinson, United States circuit court of appeals.

Frank E. Hook, recently appointed to Federal office.

Hugo Black, Justice, Supreme Court.

Henry L. Ashurst, Board of Immigration Appeals.

Josh Lee, Director, Civil Aeronautics Board.

James M. Houston, National Labor Relations Board.

William A. Ayres, Federal Trade Commission.

Former Senator Minton, United States circuit court of appeals.

David J. Lewis, Railroad Mediation Board.

Raymond S. McKeough, regional director, Office of Price Administration.

Former Senator Miller, Arkansas, United States district court.

Earl Major, United States circuit court of appeals.

Edward C. Eicher, chief justice, United States District Court, District of Columbia.

Arthur D. Healey, United States district court.

John McDuffie, United States district court.

James M. Barnes, assistant to the President.

Henry M. Schwartz, recently appointed to Federal office.

Mr. Speaker, I have given this partial list of appointees from the Democratic ranks for the information of those Republicans who proclaim that they are cooperating with the administration and aiding in the war effort yet, who at every opportunity find fault with the President and the administration in order to detract from the extraordinary and difficult service the President is rendering to the country. They have gone so far, as has the gentleman from Ohio, as to criticize the appointments the President has made, and my reason for inserting the list of appointees is to make it easier for the Republican gentlemen to identify them in the future.

Mr. Speaker, let them scan this list and I defy them to question the integrity, ability, or honesty of any of them. Every one of them has been appointed to extraordinarily high position, and I know they will prove to the country and in later years they will be acclaimed, to have rendered real, efficient service. I grant that the President has made mistakes in appointing some Republicans in heading departments and agencies. Unfortunately, these heads have gone afield in appointing as their aides men who were inexperienced in preference to men experienced in governmental affairs who were in sympathy with the policies of the administration, and the activities of such departments and agencies are reflected in the criticism directed against them.

Mr. Speaker, the list which I have submitted is a sizable one, but it will not measure up to one appointment for each of our 48 States. The President appointed all of these gentlemen and it is to be regretted that he was unable to appoint many more such able men as these tried and experienced legislators than the hundred or more of the conniving, shrewd Republicans who have been forced upon him by bar, real estate, commerce, and other other associations, most of whom, serving in positions of trust, are undermining his humane efforts, and using their position for their own benefit and advantage to the detriment of the administration and the Government.

Mr. Speaker, instead of the President being criticized in his appointments of former Senators and Representatives, he should be commended in obtaining their efficient, trustworthy, and useful services for the good of our country.

New Dealism Colors New Office of War Information Booklet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial by David Lawrence which appeared in the Evening Star of Monday, April 19, headed "New Dealism Colors New O. W. I. Booklet."

This editorial verifies some of the statements made in my speech of April 1 to the effect that the Office of War Information frequently is far more interested in issuing purely political propaganda and bunk—looking toward a fourth term—than it is in its designated job of giving the American people factual war information.

The editorial follows:

NEW DEALISM COLORS NEW OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION BOOKLET—PUBLIC FUNDS USED TO TAKE SIDES ON CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

(By David Lawrence)

Elmer Davis is a nonpolitical person trying to do his duty in the Office of War Information, but the job is so big and the possibilities of misuse of his office are so numerous that to protect his own good name and the distribution of really important war information he ought to forbid at once the writing of all books and pamphlets on domestic questions by his staff and rely wholly on the newspapers, the radio, and the movies for dissemination of official material.

No more flagrant case of abuse of power and misuse of public funds could be found than in the amazing book of 120 pages called Battle Stations for All, of which 140,000 copies have just been distributed. It is already obsolete because certain important claims made therein have already been changed by current developments.

While Elmer Davis is doubtless innocent of any such intention, the book is a splendid piece of propaganda for the renomination and reelection of President Roosevelt for a fourth term. Some parts of it read like a campaign textbook for stump speeches. It is full of New Deal phrases, strikes out with the same innuendoes and catch phrases at different groups which have been the victim of a class hate during the last decade and leaves to some extent the impression that the war is not with Europe altogether, but between the supporters and opponents of the New Deal.

CONTROVERSIAL MATERIAL

The book is supposed to be "the story of the fight to control living costs," but while containing certain factual data, it envelops much of this in a series of chapters which are highly controversial and can hardly be justified as pieces of war information.

Thus, what difference does it make whether the Treasury did or did not get its way in the controversy about mandatory income-tax returns? What business is it of the Office of War Information whether this is or is not a loophole for avoidance of taxes? Why should Congress be criticized by inference and be made to appear as against national policy when it sidetracks the plan for incentive payments sponsored by Secretary Wickard?

Why should pages and pages be given to the enthusiastic endorsement of the work of the War Labor Board in correcting inequalities and inequities when the President has since by Executive order reversed that policy? Why should the maintenance of membership for labor unions be so extravagantly endorsed as one of the Nation's basic labor policies when there are so many citizens in America who do not think it should be a basic labor policy at all and who have tolerated it only as an emergency measure anyhow? Why are all the New Deal phrases such as "ever normal granary" and "labor knows how greatly its position has improved in recent years" and "the farmers have improved their lot" included in a book of war information?

ARGUES ON TAXING BONDS

Why also are President Roosevelt and Stabilization Director Byrnes mentioned so often and in such favorable terms while Congress—also a part of the Government of the United States—is so rarely mentioned?

Why also should we find in a book of this kind all the arguments which the New Deal has made for the last several years against tax-exempt bonds, giving the impression that it would be constitutional for the Government to break faith with its bondholders? Even the breaking of faith as between the State and city governments and the people is boldly advocated in this paragraph on page 38 of the book:

"It has been argued that these securities represent a contractual obligation on the part of the Government to leave them tax-exempt. The obligation is not that of the Federal Government but of the State and municipal governments. This obligation can be weighed against various other obligations which have had to be violated or shelved because of the war, those of millions of drafted soldiers, for example."

Is this doctrine of broken faith and broken contracts the kind of ethics with which an Office of War Information should be attempting to indoctrinate the American people with the people's own money and with book paper that is being denied book publishers and other publishers of the printed word?

The time has come to amend the appropriation laws so that the funds of the Office of War Information cannot be used for any such purposes again. Evidently the new dealers who write the above type of pamphlets are too slick for Mr. Davis, for he can't read all their copy and devious writings. So the safest thing from the people's standpoint is to stop

it all and confine the Office of War Information to news releases such as those to which the Committee of Public Information confined itself primarily in the last war. Otherwise, the Office of War Information will become a suspect agent of fourth-term politics.

Tax Legislation

REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL R. LEWIS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, that there is an insistent demand from the people that Congress enact the 1943 tax bill as early as possible in order to permit taxpayers to budget their resources and know what they are going to have to pay in income taxes has been highlighted in my correspondence this week by a letter from a constituent who states, in part, as follows:

I am willing to concede that the 1942 income taxes worked a hardship on millions of people. But whose fault was that? Was that the fault of the people? What chance did the people have to budget their incomes and make provisions for the 1942 tax? * * * It is the Congress who are responsible. All last year, instead of passing the 1942 tax law early in the year and letting people know what they were going to have to pay, all you fellows did was dilly-dally * * * then wait until the year was almost over before the bill was passed, instead of passing the bill and getting it over with, so the people could budget their incomes and have the money to pay. * * * Now, here we are going into the fourth month of 1943, almost 4 months of 1943 are gone, and the same procedure is repeating itself; there are wrangles, petty jealousies, politics, as usual, but no tax bill. * * * I am getting * * * fed up with such monkey business. I demand action, and I demand it at once. I want my Congress to pass a 1943 tax bill, and I want it passed now, not at the end of the year I want to know, right away, how much of my income I must lay aside each pay day to pay my taxes for 1943. * * * If you fellows wait until the end of 1943 to pass a 1943 tax bill, I do not want to hear any bellyaching about irresponsible people or any more of that dry rot, shifting your responsibility from your shoulders off onto mine.

Mr. Speaker, there is, in this communication from my constituent, a demand, which I believe is almost universal, for a 1943 tax bill now, immediately.

There is also, Mr. Speaker, in this letter, no recognition of the fact that Secretary Morgenthau and the Treasury Department are largely responsible for the failure of Congress to enact 1942 tax legislation early in the year so that the people would know what to expect in the way of taxes.

I doubt if my constituent who wrote the above quoted letter had any knowledge of the confusing part which the present administration, through its Treasury Department, played in submitting three widely differing revenue programs, the second coming months after the first, and the third months after the second. With the presentation of each new Treasury Department proposal many long days of hard, tiresome work on the previous plan were negated.

During the short period since the present Congress convened January 6, it has repeatedly demonstrated a determination, until now entirely lacking during the Roosevelt administration, to exercise its responsibility as the lawmaking body of our Government. Already undue confusion and delay has occurred over the question of current payment of income tax, and it is stated that additional taxes are to be requested later of the American people. Yet no new tax bill has been brought before the House of Representatives for enactment. I call this to your attention in order that you and all Members of Congress may realize that the people of this country are placing the blame for the delay to enact tax legislation squarely upon the shoulders of Congress and are demanding that Congress act promptly on the matter of a 1943 tax bill. This matter is of paramount national interest. We should preserve that reputation for probity and statesmanship which Congress should justly deserve and must have if it is to remain our bulwark of freedom.

"St. Wapni"—Key to Presidential Succession

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the question is frequently asked who would become President in case of a vacancy in both the Presidency and the Vice Presidency, and in various Cabinet positions.

The words "St. Wapni" are a key to the Presidential succession. Each letter in these words is the first one in the name of the Department, the head of which would succeed in order to the Presidency, except the Department of Justice, which is represented by the Attorney General who is indicated by the fourth letter in this key.

The letters of these words, "St. Wapni," represent the Department in succession as follows: State Department, Treasury Department, War Department, Attorney General, Post Office Department, Navy Department, Interior Department.

It only extends to and includes the Department of the Interior, which was the last Department created prior to the passage of the Act of Presidential Succession in 1886.

For the information of the House I am inserting at this point a copy of the statute on this subject which was enacted on January 19, 1886, and reads as follows:

SEC. 21. Vacancy in offices of both President and Vice President: In case of removal, death, resignation, or inability of both the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, or if there is none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Secretary of the Treasury, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Secretary of War, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Attorney General, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Postmaster General, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Secretary of the Navy, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Secretary of the Interior, shall act as President until the disability of the President or Vice President is removed or a President elected: *Provided*, That whenever the power and duties of the office of President of the United States shall devolve upon any of the persons named herein, if Congress be not then in session, or if it would not meet in accordance with law within 20 days thereafter, it shall be the duty of the person upon whom said powers and duties shall devolve to issue a proclamation convening Congress in extraordinary session, giving 20 days' notice of the time of meeting.

Income-Tax Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including copy of an address I delivered before the American Taxpayers' Association in New York City on Friday, April 16, 1943:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before this meeting, which is sponsored by the American Taxpayers' Association, and discuss current tax problems. No one, I believe, can study our tax structure without reaching the definite conclusion that the personal income-tax debt and the levying of taxes retroactively have become a danger to the solvency of the Treasury and a real embarrassment to the taxpayer.

You gentlemen, I assume, are familiar with the developments in Congress respecting pay-as-you-go taxation. As businessmen, I take it you have been depressed by the inability of your lawmakers to agree on enactment of a law that has the approval of fully 90 percent of the taxpayers. It is regrettable, indeed, but that is only a part of the muddled tax picture at Washington.

The other part, I daresay, concerns you fully as much, perhaps more. That part is the retroactive feature of our general tax program. Last year it was late October before the Revenue Act of 1942 was approved. You businessmen did not know until late in October what taxes you would be called on to pay on the earnings of your firms for the preceding January—for the first 10 months of the year.

Now, I submit you can't run private business that way and hope to be successful. Nor should we run Government business on a basis of retroactive taxation. Business has a legitimate right to know what taxes it must pay on profits without delay. It has a right to know early in each year just how

great a tax load it must carry. To delay the decision until five-sixths of the year is passed, and then to tax retroactively the earnings of that five-sixths of the year is inexcusable.

How about the personal income-tax payer? During the last 8 years we have reduced exemptions and have increased the rates, in many cases several hundred percent. Worse than that—we have further burdened him with a retroactive tax load of several months. In fact, last year Congress threw in 10 months of retroactive taxes for good measure. Is it any wonder that our personal income-tax payers are demanding pay-as-you-go tax legislation?

I am opposed to any repetition of last year's delay. It is wholly unjustifiable, either in peace or war. It should never be done that way again. It certainly should not be done that way in 1943. The Revenue Act of 1943, when it is passed, should apply to 1943 income only if it is passed early in the year Otherwise, it should not begin to apply until 1944. That is a fair, just, and equitable rule to follow for any year. Any tax bill passed late in any year by Congress should not begin to apply—except, perhaps, for certain excise taxes—until the following year. Only under such a policy can business and individuals determine what they must pay and make their plans accordingly.

Neither individual taxpayers nor business enterprises can make proper provision for accruing their tax liabilities. When rates were low and exemptions were more liberal, the burden of these retroactive tax increases could be borne without too much difficulty, but recent retroactive increases have been so great as to seriously disrupt personal and business budgets.

For example, the First Revenue Act of 1940, which provided certain increases to take care of expenditures under the defense program, added about a billion dollars to the tax burden. It was not passed until the middle of the year.

The Second Revenue Act of 1940, which imposed the excess profits tax effective as of January 1, 1941, was not enacted until October 8, after more than 9 months of the year had gone by.

The $3,500,000,000 Revenue Act of 1941 was not enacted until September 20, after nearly 9 months of the year had passed, but was made retroactive to January 1.

The $7,000,000,000 Revenue Act of 1942 was not enacted until October 21, after nearly 10 months of the year had elapsed, but it was made retroactive to January 1.

I need not remind you that when Congress imposes retroactively tax increases of this magnitude, all taxpayers, individual and corporate, are dealt a very serious blow.

The extent to which taxes have been increased in the last 2 or 3 years is clearly indicated by comparing past and prospective collections from individuals and corporations. Here is the relative income and excess-profits tax burden on corporations by fiscal years:

1941	$2,044,000,000
1942	4,687,000,000
1943 (estimated)	9,685,000,000
1944 (estimated)	14,465,000,000

In other words, corporate tax collections in the next fiscal year will be 700 percent of what they were in the fiscal year 1941.

Here is the relative income-tax burden on individuals, by fiscal years:

1941	$1,417,000,000
1942	3,263,000,000
1943 (estimated)	7,262,000,000
1944 (estimated)	13,086,000,000

In this short period, the individual income-tax burden will be increased over 900 percent.

Of course, these figures reflect increased national income as well as increased rates. However, let me give you a few comparisons of recent increases as applied to individual incomes of various sizes.

Take the case of a single person with an income of $1,000. Under the 1940 act, his tax was $4; under the 1941 act, it was $21; and under the 1942 act it is $107, including the net Victory-tax liability. This is a 2,700-percent increase since 1940. As the income increases, the percentage of increase falls.

The single person with a $2,500 income paid $64 under the 1940 act; $165 under the 1941 act; and $446 under the 1942 act, including the net Victory tax. In this case the increase is 700 percent.

The single person with $5,000 income paid $172 under the 1940 act; $483 under the 1941 act; and $1,105 under the 1942 act, including the net Victory tax. In this case the increase is nearly 650 percent.

The single person with $10,000 income paid $586 under the 1940 act; $1,493 under the 1941 act; and $2,783 under the 1942 act, including the net Victory tax. Even in this instance the increase is over 400 percent.

These increases would be burdensome if applied only to future income, but their impact is nothing short of terrific when applied retroactively, as they have been in each case.

If income taxes were placed on a current-collections have been confined exclusively to lem of retroactive increases, inasmuch as all tax changes would apply only to future income. However, since proposals for current collection basis, we would not have this prob-personal income taxes, the necessity would still remain for providing against retroactive increases on corporations. As long as we find it neces ary to continue to increase taxes, I feel that such increases should take effect only prospectively, and not retroactively. Only in this way can our citizens and our business enterprises make the necessary adjustments to bear the load.

It is vital to our taxpayers that we get our citizens on a pay-as-you-go basis. My thought is that this method of collecting taxes currently might be called pay-while-you-got-it legislation.

On the opening day of Congress I introduced a bill in the House providing for this legislation on the basis of the Ruml plan. After extended hearings and executive sessions lasting several weeks I became convinced it would be impossible to secure approval of my original bill containing Mr. Ruml's suggestions. It was then that I introduced the Carlson bill, H. R. 2245, which is basically the Ruml plan. This bill provided for moving the tax clock ahead 1 year with modifications that would eliminate some of the windfalls that might result because of increased income due to the war. This is the bill I offered on the floor of the House as a substitute to the proposal submitted by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee. It was defeated by a vote of 215 to 198. The House, being dissatisfied with the committee proposal, rejected it by a vote of 248 to 168. The unfortunate part of the whole procedure was that the issue in the debate revolved around the word "forgiveness."

We may arrive, by a process of reasoning, at a forgiving of 1942 taxes, but it is folly to start with that idea. That is putting the cart before the horse. Let's start with the horse. This whole controversy does not revolve around the rightness or wrongness of canceling a year's taxes; it revolves around two very important and very fundamental questions. Opinions may differ about them, but they must be settled on their merits before any plan can evolve out of this muddled mess. I'll number them 1 and 2 and discuss them separately, because they are indeed entirely separate parts of the tax problem.

I

First, is it necessary or desirable that Federal income taxpayers be put on a pay-as-you-go basis? Sometimes this is called the collection-at-the-source basis because those receiving wages and salaries would be collected that way. The name doesn't matter. Most people have a fairly clear idea of the meaning of the question. They know there are just two alternatives.

Either we go on, as in the past, paying in 1943, out of 1943 income, the tax on 1942 income, and the same in future years; or we find some way to pay currently in 1943, out of 1943 income, the tax on 1943 income. Here is a clear-cut issue. It should involve no heat or impassioned oratory. It is merely a matter of practical procedure. I am not going to line up the arguments for one or the other of these two procedures. The arguments are pretty well known to most people. I happen to believe—and I think it can be shown—that we cannot go on on the old basis, that some way will have to be found to get taxes paid in the year in which the money is earned by the taxpayer and by some form of collection at the source.

It would be nice if everybody were provident enough to lay up voluntarily in 1 year enough money to pay his income tax that year or the following year, but human nature just doesn't work that way. Particularly with the tremendous number of people paying income taxes now who never paid them before, and with the sizable amounts that millions of people will have to pay to Uncle Sam, it becomes, in my opinion, an impossible task to get people to save in one year enough to pay taxes in the next or even to pay the current year's tax. That this is the situation today will be proved, I think, by statistics of War bonds turned in to pay the March 15 installment, the amount of bank borrowing to pay the installment, the relatively small amount of tax-savings bonds bought and turned in, and by cross-section checks of the public practice in this matter. And, as the year goes on, and more installments fall due, the difficulties of finding means of making payments will increase to an extent that might mean wholesale defaults in payments.

Furthermore, with millions of new taxpayers, how are they going to be rounded up without some form of collection at the source? Unless all who are liable for taxes volunteer to make returns and send in their payments, it will take a bigger enforcement army than anybody has imagined to get in the money. It is anybody's guess as to how many will seek to escape payment, but my guess is that it will be an appreciable part of the total of those who are liable under the law.

Of course it can be argued that collection at the source is not necessarily the same as pay-as-you-go. Employees could be authorized to deduct from wages in 1943 the tax due from their employes on 1942 income. That could be done, but with difficulty. The trouble is that if a depression year should follow a year of prosperity, there would be many unemployed or with reduced incomes, and in millions of cases it would be absolutely impossible to get the money to pay taxes on a previous year's income. Anyone who thinks differently is deluding himself. When the tax debaters talk about loss of income to the Government, let them think seriously about the almost certain loss of income in some bad year if we go along on the present plan—even if collection at the source should be added to it.

And when a worker dies, what about the difficulties of getting from his small and often pitiful estate the money that he owes in taxes on his previous year's income. If anyone contemplates with complacency his Uncle Shylock dipping his fingers into almost every widow's purse, no matter how meager its contents, he is less of a realist than I am. Taxes on dead people are all right in principle—but not when they reach down into the home of nearly every wage earner in the land.

No; under the new conditions we cannot go along on the old basis. Every argument points to getting on a pay-as-you-go basis and, equally, to some form of collection at the source. But why argue this matter? Doesn't everybody agree? Perhaps not everybody, but nearly everybody. The public opinion polls show it. The debate in Congress showed it. I believe that 9 out of 10 Congressmen are for it. And I strongly suspect that the Treasury people are for it too—being realists who are afraid that, by any other plan, they won't get the money.

Please understand that I recognize the mechanical difficulties of paying as you go or collecting at the source. The difficulties are great. They are not, however, insurmountable if the end is worth the effort.

It's too bad we can't stop at this point and have a vote on this single question. Divorce the issue from everything else—even divorce it from the practical question of how to put the plan into effect, and I'll venture that the vote in Congress would be overwhelmingly in favor of the principle of paying in 1943, out of 1943 income, the tax on 1943 income. And the same would go, of course, for any other year.

Of course, if the country should not want to go on this basis, then we stop right here. There would be no need for debating any other issue. Everything depends on how we look at this first and fundamental question. But I'll assume that the country is wise enough to know it can't continue with the present plan of always being in debt to the Government—not with thirty or forty million taxpayers. I'll assume the great majority has decided that we must get on a pay-as-you-go basis. Where do we go from there?

That brings us to the second fundamental question that will have to be decided. It stands on its own feet. It is related to the first question only in that it must be decided if we have concluded that we must start a pay-as-you-go system.

II

The second question is: Can the Treasury in any 1 year get more than 1 year's taxes out of the taxpayers? Or, putting it in current terms, can we collect in 1943 the tax on 1943 income and, also in 1943, collect all or part of the tax on 1942 income? Here is a straightforward question involving a lot of things, including practical politics. Leaving out the politics, it is largely a question of fact. How much in taxes can the Government take from the people and still leave enough for the necessities of life and also enough to buy War bonds? I suspect the answer is 1 year's taxes and no more. Who, realistically, thinks otherwise? Oh yes, there is a small percentage of the people who have been forehanded and provident—who saved in 1942 enough to pay their taxes on 1942 income—who can pay the amount saved, and also pay as they go as far as tax on 1943 income is concerned. But I am certain their number is relatively small. The answer could readily be found in a cross-section check of the populace, if anybody seriously thinks enough has been saved out of 1942 wages and salted away to make a double tax imposition in 1943 a possibility.

Why not be realistic? The great majority of people will be scraping bottom to find enough money in 1943 to pay taxes on 1942 income; and, if in 1943 they are also required to pay the tax on 1943 income, we'll have plenty of trouble. I won't say we'll have riots and wholesale tax defaults, but we'll have conditions that won't be pretty. Surely no sane Congress would vote such a thing.

So I think we'll have to rule out getting more than one year's taxes in a single year. The issue is perfectly clear-cut. We should try to get 2 years' taxes in one—or we shouldn't. That's all there is to it. How do you suppose the vote would go in a popular poll? Ninety to one? About like that. And my guess is that the vote in Congress would be just about as overwhelming.

So where do we stand at this point? We have decided (1) that with many millions of new taxpayers we can't continue on the basis of always being in debt to the Government and that we must establish some pay-as-you-go, collection-at-the-source method of tax payment and collection. And we have decided (2) that we can't collect more than one year's tax in any single year. Here comes the hard part. Here is where, with the courage of our convictions, we have to face the logical conclusions from those convictions. There is no use pussyfooting about it. If we are in agreement up to the present point, we have to face boldly the problem of what to do about the taxes on 1942 income, and we have to face that problem in accord with our conclusions on the two fundamental problems that we have already decided.

III

There are only three things that can be done about taxes on 1942 income:

(a) We can collect them.

(b) We can defer them.

(c) We can abate them.

Let's look at each of these things.

(a) Collect them. But we can't collect them, at least in 1943, if we have agreed that (1) we must get on a pay-as-you-go basis and if (2) we have agreed that we can't collect 2 years' taxes in one. So we don't need to argue this alternative.

(b) Defer them. Here is an attractive will-o'-the-wisp. Defer them how long? Pay half in 1943 and half in 1944? Try to do it. We have agreed that not more than 1 year's taxes can be collected in any one year. But let's make it easy and spread the payments over, say, 5 years. Surely that ought not to be a burden on anybody. No? Everything is a burden that is labeled a tax. And what about the wage earner who dies after making 1 year's payment? Is Uncle Shylock going to take the other four-fifths out of his burial insurance? Not if I know my United States. And what about a series of depression years? They could come, you know. How would the tax be collected then? And what is to prevent a big-hearted Congress, after 1 or 2 years, impressed by the pressure from home, from canceling the whole outstanding back debt? The odds are in favor of that very thing.

But why not go the limit and defer the whole tax until the taxpayer dies? This has actually been suggested. Once more you would be dealing with millions of poor widows who would have little enough with the wage earner gone. It just isn't in the cards. And, anyway, why worry about payments? Can you imagine a debt like this hanging over the heads of millions of people without some future Congress doing something about it? If installment payments were permitted, anybody would be foolish to make them. The chances are 100 to 1 that the whole debt would be wiped out in some moment of congressional expansiveness. Not a single practical or honest thing can be said in its defense

(c) Abate them. If we must get on a pay-as-you-go basis and if we can't in 1 year collect more than 1 year's taxes—if that means that we can't collect 1942 taxes in 1943, and if deferment is a peculiarly unsound and impractical proposal—what is there left to do? Just one thing. Abate the 1942 taxes. Call it forgiveness or cancelation or what you will. It is an absolutely logical conclusion from our premises and from our previous conclusions. There is no escaping it. It follows from what has gone before as the day follows the night. If there is a spark of logic in our national thinking, we have got to come to that decision.

Months of study have convinced me that the proposal submitted by Mr. Ruml to move the tax clock of the Nation ahead 1 year will sooner or later be adopted. It was only after extensive study and research that I introduced my own bill along this line. Despite the demagogic statements that have been made about forgiveness, about Mr. Ruml personally, and about the loss to the Federal Treasury, I still contend this is the only practical solution. It is a simple matter to talk about forgiving $10,000,000,000 taxes, but an analysis will convince anyone that this loss to the Federal Treasury takes effect only when an individual's income declines or ceases. This loss would be spread over a generation of time.

A final word about loss of income to the Government. Of course, if we could collect more than 1 year's taxes in 1943, there would be loss of income if the 1942 taxes were canceled. We must balance the need of getting on a pay-as-you-go basis and the impossibility of collecting 2 years' taxes in one, against the current loss of income if the 1942 taxes are canceled. We can't have them both. That is why I have said that we must first decide the two fundamental basic questions about tax procedure. If we decide them as I think the overwhelming majority of people would decide them, we must then take the inescapable consequences.

But take a look at the alternative. Suppose we go on as we have been—paying this year a tax on last year's income. When a taxpayer dies, how much of his debt to the Government will be collected? You can guess as well as I. My guess is that in millions of cases there will be little or no payment possible from the wage earners' negligible estates. And, if we go on as at present, a depression year following one of prosperity is likely to cause millions of tax defaulters.

Over a period of years all we should practically lose by the Ruml plan would be the very questionable amount of taxes that would be collected from dead wage earners' estates if we were to continue on the present basis of always being in debt to the Government.

The Farmers' Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE FARMERS' PROBLEMS

BIGLERVILLE, PA., *April 19, 1943.*

The fruit growers, farmers, and their employees have always been at the weak end of the whole economic structure compared to defense workers, steel employees, railroad men, and factory workers. They are accustomed to working 10 hours a day in the field, with an hour's extra work in the morning, and then in the evening doing chores, getting equipment ready, and so forth. Most farmers work at least 72 hours a week.

Because of the farmer and his labor being so poorly compensated, he generally lives in a home where there are poor conveniences. His wife works hard, helping with the farm operations such as milking, feeding the chickens, hunting the eggs, and helping on the farm in many ways and for which no consideration is given She often does as much work as a regular farm hand.

It is no wonder that farmers are trying to get away from the farm so they can make $75 to $100 a week in nearby plants when they don't need to take any chances such as getting the crops in the ground, harvesting and in some cases losing their investment. Last year because of the wet weather in this section a lot of crops such

as oats, wheat, hay, and tomatoes were lost. We ourselves figure that if we get two crops out of 3 years that this is a good average.

The fruit growers in this section don't average over 5,000 to 10,000 bushels of peaches and apples per year. In a favorable year like last year, having a good crop and fairly good prices, he hasn't made more than ordinary wages.

The following shows the average figures from all three of our apple farms for the last 2 years:

	1941	1942
Cost of labor per bushel	$0.1473	$0.2142
All other costs such as spray material, fertilizer, depreciation, repairs, etc.	.2200	.2747
Profit per bushel on apples	.2842	.3055

With labor increasing 50 percent over last year and with the cost of all other materials increasing decidedly, if we can't get more for our apples we will have very little, if any, profit.

M. T. Hartman, county agent of Adams County, says that the farmers and growers have not made any money in the last 10 years, and on what little profit they made last year they had to pay a heavy tax.

An advance of 10 cents a dozen to the jobber for No. 2 cans of tomatoes, corn, or string beans and a selling price of 1 cent a can advance to the consumer for a family of five only means a total increase for a whole year of $4.80. It is not one-fourth as much as is generally spent for picture shows alone. A very small increase to the consumer will bridge the gap for the grower and his employees.

Why should we have subsidies by the United States Government, when the housewife has all the money she needs to pay for everything at a fair price? It is true that we don't want to have runaway prices, but it is likewise true that this is an opportune time for the farmer and his employees to have a comparative remuneration for his services to the defense workers, steel employees, railroad men, etc. Who can say that by the farmer getting part of what belongs to him is going to cause inflation?

Only by the farmer and his employees getting fair consideration are we ever going to have a contented and a prosperous nation. The very reason that labor wants to work off the farm in the various factories is because they get more money. It is self-evident. Besides the work is much more pleasant. The farmer only has one chance at a crop in a year, and there is no guaranty at that. Farm labor as a general thing doesn't have regular employment, and besides is exposed to all kinds of weather.

In order to get enough of food it is necessary that the farmers be compensated for their labor.

THE C. H. MUSSELMAN CO.

Ship Construction in 1943 to April 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, during the month of March 1943, all former records for ship deliveries were broken. The American shipyards delivered into service 146 vessels totaling 1,516,000 tons deadweight. This corresponds to a rate of 5 ships a day and more than 18,000,000 tons a year. Admiral Vickery informs me that he is content that the 1943 shipbuilding program will be carried out on schedule provided the necessary steel plates and other materials continue to be received as required. Although in December when deliveries reached 4 ships a day the Commission's schedule called for 5 ships a day by May, this rate has already been achieved. The Commission points out that, among the factors which have made this result possible has been the splendid cooperation merchant shipyards received from the Iron and Steel Branch of the War Production Board in the allocation of the necessary steel plates.

Of the 146 ships delivered in March, 103 were Liberty ships, 19 were the Commission's long range C-type vessels, 12 were large tankers, 11 were of special types, and 1 was a powerful seagoing tug. In addition, a number of smaller craft, including 3 harbor tugs were delivered into service.

West coast yards held the lead for March in tonnage output by delivering 50.8 percent of the total, the east coast was second with 36.49 percent, and the Gulf coast turned out 12.62 percent.

The Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation of Portland, Oreg., continued to lead the shipbuilding field, delivering 18 Liberty ships, this representing a rate of 1½ ships per way for the month. Close upon its heels, however, was California Shipbuilding Corporation, Los Angeles, Calif., with 17 Liberty ships, and in third place was Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., Baltimore, Md., with 16 for the month.

The complete list of yards and their deliveries is as follows:

Shipyard	Number of vessels	Type of vessel
Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala.	2	Tankers.
Avondale Marine Ways, Inc., Westwego, La.	1	Sea-going tug.
Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., Baltimore, Md.	16	Liberty.
Bethlehem-Sparrows Point Shipyard, Inc., Sparrows Point, Md.	2	Tankers.
California Shipbuilding Corporation, Wilmington, Calif.	17	Liberty.
Consolidated Steel Corporation, Ltd., Wilmington, Calif.	6	C-1 cargo.
Delta Shipbuilding Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.	5	Liberty.
Federa Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Kearny, N. J.	3	C-2 cargo.
Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, Houston, Tex.	3	Liberty.
Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation, Pascagoula Miss.	2	C-3 cargo.
J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc., Panama City, Fla.	1	Liberty.
Kaiser Co., Inc., Swan Island, Portland, Oreg.	2	Tankers.
Kaiser Co., Inc., Vancouver, Wash.	9	Special type.
Kaiser Co., Inc., (outfitted at Oregon), Vancouver, Wash.	1	Liberty.
Kaiser Co., Inc. (Richmond shipyard No. 3A), Richmond, Calif.	2	Special type.
Marinship Corporation, Sausalito, Calif.	2	Liberty.
Moore Dry Dock Co., Oakland, Calif.	3	C-2 cargo.
North Carolina Shipbuilding Co., Wilmington, N. C.	10	Liberty.
Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, Portland, Oreg.	18	Do.
Pennsylvania Shipyards, Inc., Beaumont, Tex.	2	C-1 cargo.
Pusey & Jones Corporation, Wilmington, Del.	1	Do.
Permanente Metals Corporation (Richmond shipyard No. 1), Richmond, Calif.	7	Liberty.
Permanente Metals Corporation (Richmond shipyard No. 2) Richmond, Calif.	11	Do.
South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation South Portland, Maine.	7	Do.
Southeastern Shipbuilding Corporation, Savannah, Ga.	3	Do.
Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester Pa.	6	Tankers.
Western Pipe & Steel Co., San Francisco, Calif.	2	C-3 cargo.
Total	146	

It will be interesting to note the complete list of yards and their deliveries in the first quarter, as follows:

Shipyard	Number of vessels	Type of vessel
Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala.	2	Tankers.
	2	Liberty.
Avondale Marine Ways, Inc., Westwego, La.	2	Sea-going tugs.
Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., Baltimore, Md.	29	Liberty.
	19	Special type.
Bethlehem-Sparrows Point Shipyard, Inc., Sparrows Point, Md.	6	Tankers.
California Shipbuilding Corporation, Wilmington, Calif.	45	Liberty.
Concrete Ship Constructors, National City, Calif.	1	Concrete barge.
Consolidated Steel Corporation, Ltd., Wilmington, Calif.	12	C-1 cargo.
Delta Shipbuilding Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.	15	Liberty.
Federal Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Kearny, N. J.	6	C-2 cargo.
Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, Mobile, Ala.	1	Do.
Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, Houston, Tex.	16	Liberty.
Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation, Pascagoula, Miss.	5	C-3 cargo.
J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc., Panama City, Fla.	1	Liberty.
Kaiser Co., Inc., Swan Island, Portland, Oreg.	3	Tankers.
Kaiser Co. Inc., Vancouver, Wash.	26	Special type.
	3	Liberty.
Kaiser Co., Inc., (outfitted at Oregon), Vancouver, Wash.	5	Do.
Kaiser Co., Inc. (Richmond shipyard No. 3A), Richmond, Calif.	3	Special type.
Marinship Corporation, Sausalito, Calif.	7	Liberty.
Moore Dry Dock Co., Oakland, Calif.	6	C-2 cargo.
North Carolina Shipbuilding Co., Wilmington, N. C.	28	Liberty.
Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, Portland, Oreg.	41	Do.
Pennsylvania Shipyards, Inc., Beaumont, Tex.	3	C-1 cargo.
Permanente Metals Corporation (Richmond shipyard No. 1), Richmond, Calif.	18	Liberty.
Permanente Metals Corporation (Richmond shipyard No. 2), Richmond, Calif.	30	Do.
Pusey & Jones Corporation, Wilmington, Del.	1	C-1 cargo.
Rheem Manufacturing Co., Providence, R. I.	1	Liberty.
Leathem D. Smith Shipbuilding Co., Sturgeon Bay, Wis.	----------	Coastal cargo.
Southeastern Shipbuilding Corporation, Savannah, Ga.	4	Liberty.
South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation, South Portland, Maine.	15	Do.
Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa.	15	Tankers.
Todd-Bath Iron Shipbuilding Corporation, South Portland, Maine.	3	Liberty.
Western Pipe & Steel Co., San Francisco, Calif.	4	C-3 cargo.

Totals—262 Liberty ships; 48 special types; 26 tankers; 16 C-1's; 13 C-2's; 9 C-3's; 1 coastal cargo; 1 concrete barge; 2 seagoing tugs.

Tonnage: 3,763,000 dead weight.

The Maritime Commission, the American shipbuilding companies, the shipyard workers, and all who contribute the plans and materials for these ships so essential to victory are pointing the way in which all America should march and will march to victory.

Well, did Sir Clive Baillieu, head of the British raw-materials mission say at Lansing, Mich., as reported in the Baltimore Sun of February 17, 1943, that this Nation's shipbuilding program was truly miraculous and probably will be regarded by posterity as America's supreme contribution to the winning of the war.

No charges of absenteeism against shipyard workers can besmirch or smear that record. The facts speak for themselves.

In an article appearing in United News, issue of January 22, 1943, it was pointed out that the record of achievement in this war shows that the soldiers moved overseas numbered 887,000 in the first year of this war as contrasted with 373,000 in the first year of the last war; that the Army moved 10,414,000 measurement tons of cargo to foreign ports in the first year of this war as contrasted with 1,725,000 in the same period of the last war; that the average length of haul in this year is more than twice that of the last war; that in the last war as many as 200,000 freight cars loaded with war materials were backed up on railroad sidings as far as Chicago; that in this war no more than 10,000 cars—a minimum working stock—are backed up to be unloaded at ports; that only by keeping the ways clear, can there be assurance that a rush shipment can be made of some particular weapon or material; and that the element of distance is another complicating factor, as illustrated by the remote distance to Australia and northern Russia.

With stronger efforts, forgetful of all else save our country, let us unite as never before and march to victory. United we stand, and united we will win.

Gasoline Rationing in Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEX GREEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I call to your attention House Concurrent Resolution 2 by the Florida Legislature which urges that all Florida be included in the Gulf States gasoline and oil ration zone. I thought that you would be interested in it and that you may be willing to cooperate with Florida in this justifiable request.

Adequate supplies of gasoline and oil reach Florida through existing intracoastal waterways from Texas and Louisiana oil fields to Port St. Joe and other points of the western part of Florida.

Under the present gasoline ration zoning that portion of Florida west of the Apalachicola River is included in the oil ration zone of the Gulf States, while that portion of Florida east and south of the Apalachicola River is included in the eastern gasoline and oil ration zone.

Obviously, it is workable, equitable, and just that all Florida should and could be included in the Gulf States gasoline and oil ration zone. We have heretofore and are again urging the gasoline rationing administration to give favorable consideration for this request. It is appropriate and timely that the Florida Legislature has officially requested this justifiable relief. I ask your cooperation.

The resolution follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 2

Whereas the United States of America, Office of Price Administration, in establishing the eastern gasoline and oil ration zone, placed all that part of the State of Florida lying east of the Apalachicola River in said zone, which zone extends along the Atlantic Ocean, from and including the State of Maine to and including all the State of Florida east of the said Apalachicola River; and

Whereas in establishing the Gulf States gasoline and oil ration zone, the States of Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and that part of the State of Florida west of the Apalachicola River was placed in said zone; and

Whereas the entire State of Florida, because of its location and proximity to the said States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, and to the inland waterway extending along the Gulf coast, logically and rightfully belongs in the said Gulf States gasoline and oil ration zone instead of the eastern gasoline and oil ration zone: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States, the Office of Price Administration of the United States, and all national officers, boards, and agencies having any relation to the administration of the gasoline and oil rationing program, be and they are each hereby requested and urged to transfer that part of the State of Florida lying east of the Apalachicola River from the eastern gasoline and oil ration zone to the Gulf States gasoline and oil ration zone, where it logically and rightfully belongs; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress from this State, to the President of the United States, and to the National Office of Price Administration.

Approved by the Governor April 16, 1943.

Divide and Destroy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Generoso Pope, publisher of the Il Progresso Italo-Americano. The editorial was reprinted in the New York Times of April 12, 1943:

DIVIDE AND DESTROY

"Divide and rule" is an old principle of aggression and oppression. Hitler and Mussolini did not originate this ignoble idea. They have merely developed this detestable doctrine into something much worse—to divide and ruin, to divide and destroy.

The horrors of anti-Semitism painfully confirm this. First, Hitler chose his scapegoat. He pounced savagely on Germany's smallest and most helpless minority—the Jews. Flushed with a quick and bloody triumph over them, he next turned on the Labor and Liberal organizations. Having tasted much blood, the fuehrer then lashed out with full fury at Germans of the Catholic devotion. He lost no time laying his brutal heavy hand on many of the Protestant faith. The universities were soon transformed from seats of learning into stalls of ignorance and blasphemy of truth. One victim at a time at home! One target at a time abroad! This is the ruthless Nazi policy of divide and destroy. This has been the gory thread running through Hitlerism within the Reich and beyond its boundaries.

The Jews were not the only ones considered inferior to the so-called master race. The attack on the Jews inside Germany was made in order to sharpen in the minds of the Germans a sense of superiority over all other nations. Thus Goebbels raved: "The English are called the Jews amongst the Aryans." And the best Hitler could say, in Mein Kampf, about the Italians was that they were a culture-bearing rather than a culture-creating people!

However, anti-Semitism not only terrorizes and despoils its victims but simultaneously brutalizes and degrades the perpetrators themselves. Pitting race against race, cultivating and exploiting race prejudice, is the most characteristic sign of conniving ruthless demagogues.

In Germany, this savage race hatred has been bolstered up by false science into a terrible weapon of international warfare. Indeed, it is no accident that the most cowardly and brutal evil of our century should be the cornerstone of Nazi theory and practice. Hitler's inquisition and incendiarism against all those who do not measure up to Goebbel's stature as a specimen of pure Aryanism have robbed Germany of some of its finest artists, intellects, literary figures, and scientists. Of the 28 Nobel Prizes won by German scientists (1901–27) in physics, chemistry, and medicine, 7 were Jewish, although the Jews were an insignificant proportion of the population. For the first time in 200 years, Germany cannot claim a single composer of even second rank. With Einstein, Reinhardt, Bruno Walter, Lotte Lehman, and others in exile, enslaved Germany is all the more culturally impoverished and spiritually bankrupt.

Among the blackest crimes committeed by the Fascist regime against the Italian people was Mussolini's importation of anti-Semitism from Nazi Germany. When the Italian Nation was free, it was proud of its Israelite sons like Prime Minister Luigi Luzzatti, the steadfast champion of the common man for half a century, brilliant, incorruptible financial genius, and Foreign Minister Sidney Sonnino. Independent Italy revered its Lord Mayor Ernesto Nathan as head of the metropolis of the Catholic world. Fervent pride runs through us as we recall Daniele Manin, that courageous leader of the Venetian Republic in its heoric defense against Austrian tyranny. Only the Nazi race rioters and their squirming Fascist imitators can deny the great credit brought to Italy by such Israelites as the world-famous criminologist Caesar Lombroso; the great jurist, Mortara; and the renowned associate of Marconi, Dr. Alessandro.

Hitler's gauleiters have robbed at least 15,000 Italian Jews of their jobs. Among those whom Mussolini has driven out is the doctor who delivered the babies of the royal family, Dr. Artom, now in Philadelphia. Italy has been deprived of the services of Tullio Levi-Civita, its greatest mathematician and member of the Vatican Scientific

Academy, and Admiral Paolo Maroni, amongst many other notables.

Divide and destroy! This is the driving force of nazi-ism-fascism. It breeds oppression and tyranny. It sends whole nations reeling backward into barbarism. It destroys the real and profound unity of free peoples and replaces it with a brutally enforced national uniformity and regimentation. It comes to a ghastly climax in rapacious racialism. Its prologue is anti-Semitic; its epilogue is antihuman. In its wake follow explosive divisions, paralyzing fear, and undying hatred. Dictatorship brings only stewing dissension and embittered antagonism—bound to boil up in blood.

We Americans of Italian origin want none of this barbarism in the United States. We say the whole world has had more than enough of it. The more we do to banish this plague from the face of the earth the sooner will the world be a better place to live in. Toward the triumph of tolerance, freedom, and civilization none of us can do too much too soon.

Good Neighbor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 67 to provide that January 1 be observed as Good Neighbor Day, and so proclaimed by official action of the President.

As a matter of fact already, under the leadership of the Good Neighbor Foundation and the I Am An American Foundation, splendid observances have been conducted on January 1 expressing the type of friendship existing between the nations of the Western Hemisphere. The major credit for this should go to Benjamin Neal, the founder and moving spirit of the movement.

I quote herewith from a number of outstanding leaders of present-day America as to their point of view on this matter. It is my earnest hope that this joint resolution can be passed:

What a wonderful thing it will be when this kindly plan takes such roots in the hearts of all the people as to become a national tradition * * * a Good Neighbor Day. (Gov. Harry W. Nice, of Maryland, 1938.)

The Good Neighbor Day plan, initiated in 1934, and celebrated each New Year's Day since that date, is an excellent and practical example of the precepts found in the Golden Rule. (Gov. Frank P. Merriam, of California, 1938.)

A few years ago there was started by Benjamin E. Neal, a Californian, * * * a nonprofit, noncharity movement to bring happiness and comfort to many because of the simplicity, the humanity, and the unselfishness of its purpose. (Gov. Leslie Jensen, of South Dakota, 1938.)

In keeping with the good fellowship that has been so characteristic of Indiana, I subscribe wholeheartedly to the Happy New Year Dinner Club (original feature of Good Neighbor Day) which brought so much happiness to many thousands. (Gov. Clifford Townsend, of Indiana, 1938.)

During the past several years, New Year's Day has been officially proclaimed as Good Neighbor Day by a majority of the Governors of the 48 States. It has become an occasion devoted to extending hospitality and good cheer to the unfortunates and building good will between all peoples. (Gov. Culbert L. Olson, of California, 1941.)

The great humanitarian purpose of this organization is the dissemination of good will and genuine friendliness among the needier citizens of the community by the provision of wholesome food, by invitation into one's home or by other means of cultivating a good neighbor relationship. (Gov. E. D. Rivers, of Georgia, 1938.)

I want to congratulate you on the commendable purposes of this worthy movement, and gladly accept the invitation to serve in the capacity designated by you. (Gov. Homer M. Adkins, of Arkansas, 1941.)

I am also very happy to become an original sponsor of Good Neighbor Day. (Gov. Sumner Sewall, of Maine, 1941.)

This year more than ever before the citizens of the Western Hemisphere have the opportunity to engender a spirit of good will among the democracies and free people to this hemisphere, pointing toward a more complete understanding of godliness and good neighborliness. (Mayor Edward J. Kelly, of Chicago, 1941.)

I do hereby proclaim January 1, 1943, as Good Neighbor Day in the State of New Mexico and urge all citizens of the State to observe the simple tenets of friendship and brotherly love to the end that Americans may lead the way toward good neighbor practices everywhere. (Gov. John F. Miles, of New Mexico, 1942.)

Now, during this time of war, it is more than ever important that the spirit of brotherly love permeate those nations which are united for the purpose of preparing this world for this force as an eternal thing. (Gov. Keen Johnson, of Kentucky, 1942.)

In the coming of a New Year surrounded by clouds of strife, we look into the future with determination that 1943 will see our fullest contribution to the realization of all the principles behind Good Neighbor Day. (Gov. Herbert R. O'Conor of Maryland, 1942.)

Since the start of the present war, Good Neighbor Day has taken on the wider significance of fraternity between all the United Nations, who today work and fight on the basis of good will and cooperation to defend the world against the enemies of peace and brotherly love. (Gov. Murray D. Van Wagoner, of Michigan, 1942.)

We are happy to cooperate with you in your great work. (Gov. Charles Edison of New Jersey, 1941.)

I wholeheartedly endorse Good Neighbor Day. (Gov. William H. Wills, of Vermont, 1942.)

We of Colorado should join with our country in showing our friendship toward the rest of the nations of North and Central and South America. And I urge everyone to consider the business of learning the Spanish tongue to the end that the one greatest factor in becoming good neighbors may be exercised. (Gov. Ralph L. Carr, of Colorado, 1942.

This feeling of fraternity among the United Nations, furthered and supported by this simple observance (Good Neighbor Day), can exert an influence for good, which if properly supported, can reach out and envelop nations and peoples with a spirit of friendship, love, and charity. (Gov. Chase A. Clark, of Idaho, 1942.)

No New Year's resolution could be more fitting than one which commits you to the policy of being a good neighbor, not only on the first day of the new year, but every day of our lives. (Gov. Lloyd C. Stark, of Missouri, 1938.)

In the United States, the occasion (Good Neighbor Day) has been devoted to extending hospitality and good cheer to the unfortunate, renewing old acquaintances and making new friends. (Gov. Sam H. Jones, of Louisiana, 1941.)

The Good Neighbor Day celebration is a symbol of the ever increasing spirit of friendship and respect which exists between the Americas. Please count me among those who will greatly rejoice with the complete success of your celebration. (Hon. J. M. Troncoso, E. E. y Ministro Plenipotenciario of the Diminican Republic, 1941.)

I have always felt that the good neighbor spirit should be not only a beautiful sounding phrase but a clear and definite goal for young and old, to be practiced in good faith and consideration at all times in every walk of life in every conceivable way throughout the breadth and length of the New World by means of courtesy, service, and understanding. To this end I offer my wholehearted cooperation. (Hon. Rodolfo Salazar, Los Angeles Consul of Mexico, 1942.)

I am glad to convey to you my sincere felicitations for the good work of the organization over which you preside, which I firmly believe will help immensely to build up a better knowledge, understanding, and as a result of that, a deep friendship and cooperation between the people of the Pan American nations. (Hon. Juan M. Gutierrez, Los Angeles Consul of Argentina, 1942.)

Following the traditional spirit of my country in regards to any program of inter-American cooperation, please be advised that this consulate, and personally myself will be ready to lend assistance and collaboration to your plans. (Dr. Jose A. Paquero, Los Angeles Consul of Ecuador, 1941.)

It is our sincere belief that your plan will be of inestimable value in further bringing to the fore the strong ties which bind the various nations of North and South America. (Hon. Harry Alonzo dae-English, Los Angeles Consul of Paraguay, 1941.)

This movement that you intend to carry out here must be extended to all the States of the Union, to Canada, to Central and South America, and the Antilles. We do not know each other at all, and, in consequence, there never could be developed a feeling of real friendship. On my part I am making a detailed report of the activities of your association to my Government in order that something similar will be done in the Dominican Republic. (Hon. Ismael Aviles, Los Angeles Consul of the Dominican Republic, 1942.)

I feel that you have done a great work in the steps you have taken in bringing about more close relations between the Americas. I congratulate you and thank you for your very great effort in behalf of pan-Americanism. (Hon. A. Posse-Rivas, Los Angeles Consul of Venezuela, 1941.)

We should not miss any occasion to symbolize the complete solidarity of the American peoples (I mean all the peoples of this hemisphere), and I think that January the 1st—the Good Neighbor Day—the first day of the year in which, I hope, the United States will defeat her enemies is the most proper date for the representatives of the countries of this continent to be together. (Hon. Manual Eduardo Hubner, Los Angeles Consul of Chile, 1941.)

I have learned with pleasure of your wonderful undertaking to bring the nations of this hemisphere closer together. I congratulate you for your new feature of "Good Neighbor Day," and, of course, wish you all success. This is indeed a work which we all should sponsor and encourage, and you may rest assured that it has my heartiest cooperation. (Hon. Julian R. Caceres, Minister of Honduras, 1941.)

For the Glory of God, for the Dignity of Man, for Devotion to Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered recently at Hendrix College, by Rabbi Ely E. Pilchik, of Tulsa, Okla.:

Hear all you who labor and bleed and die that America shall live, in the beginning God created the heaven and earth. On the sixth day the Almighty breathed life into man, the crown of his creation. The heavens are the abode of God, the earth He bequeathed to man.

Now the earth was filled with the bounty of God. From its bosom man drew coal to keep him warm, iron with which to make things, oil to enable him to traverse the length and breadth of this earth, and all manner of minerals to serve man and to enrich his days. Upon its face the earth grew grain from which man could make bread, and timber out of which man could build a home, and cotton from which man could weave clothes, and all manner of fruits and vegetables that man might prosper. Flocks grazed and strayed upon the fields of the earth, fish played in earth's sylvan stream, and from these man derived food and strength. What a magnificent heritage God bequeathed to man, this good mother earth. Eternal thanksgiving to God.

How happily man could have lived upon this bountiful earth. But man heeded not the teachings of his Creator. Man became quarrelsome, he divided himself into many groups and many nations. Man waxed greedy and tore the crumbs of bread out of the mouth of his brother—strife began. Barriers spring up between men—religious, geographical, economic. And man drew the iron from the bosom of the earth, not to make of it the useful plow and pruning hook but the destructive sword and spear. Man slew his brother. Mother earth, once so beautifully green with life, was stained with the red blood of violence. There was chaos and confusion, and there was cold and hunger, and the crown of God's creation was tarnished. For man heeded not the teachings of his Creator.

But lo, in later centuries a great miracle occurred upon this sinful earth. It was as if the Almighty gave man another chance. A new continent was discovered—a rich and resourceful continent, America they called it. And to it flocked many children of man to begin life anew, to try living once again in accordance with God's will. They came from many lands, spoke many tongues, worshipped the same God in several ways. They were dreamers of dreams and weavers of hopes, they poured into this new land their strength and their joy and their sorrow. They brought forth a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Indeed, they even believed that all men were endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and among these were life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness. It was the kind of land that God had intended to have upon this earth. America, they called it. Eternal thanksgiving to God.

Among the many peoples who landed on these shores were the Jews—an old people, a bruised people, a people eternally dedicated to God. There were some who called them God's chosen people, but they were really a God-choosing people. These people had sprung from a glorious land, Palestine, they called it—a land where men seemed to draw nearer to God, a land that nurtured God-intoxicated men, a Moses and a Jesus and a Mohammed. The Jewish people were born in freedom, weaned on the Ten Commandments, lullabied by the Psalmist, disciplined by the Seer. But the Jewish people were not to hoard their spiritual treasures, they were to be the carriers of the ethics of Moses and the songs of David and the prophecies of Jeremiah, to all mankind. For the blessings of God, spiritual as well as material, are not the possessions of one group but are to be shared by all the children of God.

And so the Jewish people taught their ethics and songs and prophecies from generation to generation and from father to son, and many people were persuaded by their mission. Among the Jewish people was one named Joshua of Bethlehem, whom the Greeks called Jesus, and another named Saul of Tarsus, whom the Greeks called Paul. And these God-imbued saw God in a somewhat different light, and thus Mother Judaism gave birth to a daughter, Christianity. And mother and daughter lived side by side for many centuries, sometimes disputing as members of a family will, but more often loving and respecting one another, for after all both sought the same God. And in the golden land of America especially, Judaism and Christianity lived together in peace and worked together in concord for the glory of God, for the dignity of man, and for devotion to country, eternal thanksgiving to God.

Those who found God through Christianity were many in this America, and those who found Him through Judaism were few. The many and the few engaged in the common task giving their all proportionate to their number.

Among Christopher Columbus' intrepid little band of mariners were several Jewish seamen, including Rodrigo De Triana and Luis De Torres.

Once this land was discovered no time was lost in erecting sanctuaries to God. The Christians were many in number and so they built their first church in the early sixteenth century. The Jews were a handful and so they waited until 1683 to build their first synagogue on old Mill Street in New York.

To this land came the pioneers of Jamestown and pilgrims of Plymouth Rock. They began to plant and build. Our American forefathers were a godly people and they were steeped in the teachings of the Old Testament, and they named their young by Biblical names. There are those who say "Hebraic mortar cemented the foundations of American democracy."

And the Thirteen Colonies had complaints against the mother country. Bravely they proclaimed a Declaration of Independence. This was revolution, this was war. A mere 3,000 Jews lived in America during the Revolutionary War, 300 of them served in the militia and the Regular Army; and among them were Lt. Col. Isaac Franks and Maj. David Franks, and Maj. Benjamin Nones—staff officer under George Washington. And Haym Salomon, who gave all his possessions and his very life that the Continental Army might continue the campaign.

Christian and Jew, each according to this number, served in the Revolution. It was won. A new nation salutes the sun—the United States of America, founded on a Constitution, buttressed by the Bill of Rights. Eternal thanksgiving to God!

No longer say General Washington, say now, President Washington. The founder and the first President wrote several letters to the Americans of Jewish faith. To the congregation in Newport, R. I., he wrote:

"The citizens of the United States have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more, that toleration is spoken of as if it were by indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural right, for happily, the Government of the United States which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection shall demean themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions their effectual support. May the children of the stock of Abraham continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants, while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid."

And the young Republic grew and it flourished and it prospered. For it had found favor in God's eyes and He smiled beneficence upon it. And when there was war again, as in 1812, Christians and Jews, according to their number, gave their all. And among those who fought valiantly in this war was Commodore Uriah P. Levy, United States Navy, and Captain Mordecai Myers, United States Army. The war was won. And the Republic continued to grow and to prosper and its name became honored in the lands across the seas. Eternal thanksgiving to God.

And more people came to these shores. Christians and Jews from every land. For they were refugees from the ravages of political and economic and social and religious persecutions in the Old World. They came here and joined hands with the builders of the New World.

Behold, grievances are multiplying among the States of the Union. Differences of opinion, quarrels, skirmishes, the Nation splits—war between the States. And about this time there were some 200,000 of Jewish faith in America—6,000 served on the side of the North and 1,200 on the side of the South. Many fell, Christians and Jews, but that Nation of the people, by the people, and for the people, did not perish from the earth. Eternal Thanksgiving to God.

And the war-torn Nation buried its dead, fulfilled its days of mourning, and with malice toward none and charity toward all, bound up its wounds and resumed its growth.

And now more people came from across the seas, Christians and Jews from many lands. As these immigrants entered New York Harbor they beheld with prayerful gratitude the benevolent figure of the Statue of Liberty. And they noticed that upon her bosom was engraved these lines written by an American woman of Jewish faith, Emma Lazarus:

"'Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp!' cries she
With silent lips. 'Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore;
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost, to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.'"

And the tired and the poor and the tempest-tost swarmed to this land. And they tilled this soil and they erected these buildings, and they spanned this continent with road and rail. Christians and Jews from many lands, according to their number gave to America their brain and brawn. Both looked heavenward in prayer, and the Almighty looked down upon them and smiled as though to say, "This is as it should be, my children, bless you."

And now it was the twentieth century. Men across the seas began to quarrel for more

colonies and for trade. Fiercely they competed with each other and then an explosion, the World War. Once again misery and sorrow cloaked the earth. Those in battle respected neither the property nor person of neutral America. War-hating America, peace-loving America, enters the war not for conquest and gain but for the glory of God, for the dignity of man, for devotion to country and for the living principle of democracy.

Christian and Jew, each according to his number, participated under the American flag during World War No. 1. More than 200,000 of Jewish faith were in the American armed forces; 3,000 of them fell on the battlefield, 10,000 were injured. When the war was won the Nation rose from its dead, bound up its wounds, and resumed its mission of building a land worthy of God's presence. Eternal thanksgiving to God!

A decade passes, then another—and again there is discord. The war to end wars fell short of its goal. The people across the seas failed to recognize the spark of the Divine in man. They failed to respect the dignity of humanity. They would not believe that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that among these were life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They dealt treacherously each man against his brother. The law of the jungle became the law of the land. The mailed fist of the strong smote the jaw of the weak, and the iron heel of the tyrant ground into the dust the defenseless.

* * * * *

Behold, America has been treacherously attacked. Once again we find ourselves engaged in a great war testing whether our way of life under God shall long endure. Even, as yesterday, our aims in this war are not conquest nor gain * * * our aims had been proclaimed in ages past by the prophets. Today America has emblazoned these prophetic ideals upon her shield:

Freedom of speech: "These are the things that ye shall do: Speak every man the truth with his neighbor—," the prophet taught. And America heeds his words and replies, God granted to every man a glorious faculty—speech. Man everywhere shall have the right to speak in accordance with the dictates of his heart; let him only remember to keep his tongue from speaking evil and his lips from uttering guile—let him speak truth.

Freedom of religion: "My house shall be a house of prayer for all people," the prophet taught. And America heeds his words and replies, Is not God's house the whole wide earth? Every man, everywhere, shall have the right to worship at the altar of his choosing.

Freedom from want—"Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house, where thou seest the naked, that thou cover him, and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh," the prophet taught. And America heeds his words and replies no man anywhere shall starve. Every man everywhere shall have a roof over his head and a garment to wear and the opportunity to earn a livelihood.

Freedom from fear—"And they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation nor shall they learn war any more. But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree and none shall make them afraid," the prophet taught. And America heeds his word and replies, no man anywhere shall have fear. Every man, everywhere shall have peace.

For these we labor and bleed and die, we of Jewish faith, side by side with our Christian brothers, for devotion to country, for the dignity of man, for the glory of God.

Penny Milk Program in Chicago Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Sun of April 18, 1943.

SCHOOL BOARD TO FIGHT FOR PENNY MILK PROGRAM—COMMITTEE LEAVES FOR CAPITAL TODAY TO SEEK CONGRESS AID FOR FREE LUNCH PLAN

In an attempt to save the penny milk and free hot-lunch program in Chicago schools, threatened by an economy move in Congress, a committee from the board of education and the back of the yards council will leave today to appeal to congressional leaders in behalf of the program. The committee will include F. O. Washam, director of the bureau of lunchrooms of the board of education, and Joseph B. Meegan and the Reverend Edward Plawinsky, assistant pastor of St. John of God Church, representing the back of the yards council, which sponsors the milk and lunch program in its area. Father Plawinsky is president of the council.

In addition the board of education is seeking a separate rationing classification for nonprofit child-feeding programs.

PROVIDE FREE LUNCHES

The penny milk and the free hot-lunch programs provide a healthful, balanced midday diet for tens of thousands of school children in Chicago, free or at nominal cost.

Under the penny milk program, inaugurated in Chicago schools 2 years ago, approximately 4,000,000 half-pint bottles of milk are distributed to children in public and parochial schools for a penny a bottle.

The Government pays the producer cost at country plants, which is about 1.75 cents a bottle, and the school board pays the distribution cost, also about 1.75 cents a bottle. Thus the board loses three-quarters of a cent on each bottle of milk sold, which amounts to about $30,000 a year.

SURPLUS SUPPLY DWINDLES

The free-lunch program, started here in 1938, has been operated with Government surplus foods, supplied by the Food Distribution Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

With the recent decline in the amount of surplus foods available, the school board or other sponsoring agency has been permitted to purchase in the open market foods from an approved list supplied by the Government receiving compensation at a rate not exceeding 5 cents per lunch.

Even when surplus foods were available from Government warehouses, the board was permitted to purchase such items as salt, baking powder, cocoa, macaroni, molasses, ginger, dry mustard, and spaghetti, which were not available in surplus food stocks.

HELPS WORKING MOTHERS

The cost of preparing the food is borne by the board or other sponsoring organization.

Continuation of the milk and lunch program is particularly important at this time, Meegan explained last night, when many parents, particularly from lower-income areas, are engaged in defense work and are unable to provide proper food for children during the day.

"With more and more mothers going into war work, the problem of adequately feeding children is one which should have the attention of all patriotic Americans," he said.

PARRAN ASSAILS WASTE

He also emphasized the importance of the milk and lunch program to scholarship and to the lowering of juvenile delinquency, always a problem in wartime. He referred to a recent statement by Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, who said:

"We are wasting money trying to educate children with half-starved bodies. They cannot absorb teaching. They hold back classes, require extra time of teachers, and repeat grades. This is expensive stupidity, but its immediate cost to our educational system is as nothing compared to the ultimate cost to the Nation. Something like 9,000,000 school children are not getting a diet adequate for health and well-being. And malnutrition is our greatest producer of ill health. Like nearly fresh fish, a nearly adequate diet is not enough. A plan to feed these children properly would pay incalculable dividends."

Chicago at present has 455 schools with 402,787 children participating in the school milk program, and 282 schools, serving 151,000 complete lunches daily to school children.

Schools in the "back of the yards" area participating include St. Casimir's Academy, St. Michael's Slovak grade school, St. Martin's Evangelical Lutheran grade school, Davis Square Park, Guardian Angel Nursery, St. Peter and Paul grade school, and Our Lady of Good Counsel School.

Bishop Bernard J. Sheil is a director of the Back of the Yards Council, which is composed of 185 separate organizations.

DISCONTINUE EXPANSION

Early in April the food distribution office of the Department of Agriculture, which administers the Government's part in the milk and lunch programs, received orders to discontinue the expansion of such programs for the remainder of the fiscal year, which gave rise to apprehension on the part of the sponsors of such programs that they might be discontinued altogether.

The committee from Chicago will seek to impress upon Congress the importance of continuing the programs at least for the duration.

Statement of Jack Lait, Editor in Chief of New York Mirror

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a letter received from Mr. Jack Lait, editor in chief of the New York Mirror:

NEW YORK MIRROR,
April 17, 1943.

The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CARLSON: The Mirror desires to call your attention to the item in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix of April 7, page A1692, sponsored by the Honorable USHER L. BURDICK of North Dakota.

This item contains some dubious and some completely false statements.

The subject matter which it concerns, being part of a daily release of Washington Merry-Go-Round, a widely syndicated daily feature, submitted in due course by United Features Syndicate, when read by me, was subjected to the usual check for accuracy, which all reputable newspapers apply whenever possible on matter offered for publication from sources not originating within its own news-gathering facilities.

The Mirror learned in this process that the item submitted was broadly and specifically inaccurate. One statement therein, which is completely false, quoted Beardsley Ruml as saying: "But where does that leave me with my Macy clients?"

The Mirror verified that Mr. Ruml has no clients in Macy's; that he is a paid executive, and that the so-called clients are paid executives. The Mirror was unable entirely to verify such broad statements as:

"Macy's has one or two older members of the firm who would like to retire, but after they finish paying taxes each year they have no appreciable nest egg left to live on. So, if they could be forgiven last year's taxes, they would save on the scale of $840,000 taxes if they had $1,000,000 income. And this saving would be enough to live on comfortably the rest of their lives."

Subsequent statements in the item, with alleged parallels to past political events, further colored the item with the elements of a crusade rather than a report or editorial comment, and, therefore, cast suspicion on its entire content and purpose.

The editor, within his professional discretion, therefore, decided to eliminate it from publication in the Mirror.

The statements of the Honorable Mr. BURDICK on page A1693 are untrue and reckless, as follows:

1. "Within a few minutes executives of Macy's department store demanded of the New York Mirror that the story be killed."

No executive in Macy's department store demanded that this story be killed, or made any other demands in reference thereto. I wish to state that in my 40 years of newspaper experience, no department store has ever requested, or even suggested, that any item be withheld from publication or changed in any way.

2. "The Mirror obliged immediately."

This, of course, in its premise, quoted above, is untrue.

3. "Thereafter a kill was sent to all editors and the story never saw the light of day."

It is true, as per attached telegram, that the syndicate ordered the story withdrawn. The reason therefor is unknown to the Mirror. The Mirror has no ownership connection with the syndicate, and the Mirror at no time asked the syndicate to withdraw the story from other client newspapers; the Mirror took it for granted that when the syndicate withdrew the story, it, like the Mirror, did so on the grounds of inaccuracy.

If any other influence was exerted on the syndicate, the Mirror was ignorant of such action; nor was the Mirror surprised by the action of the syndicate, since it is common practice for honorable newspaper institutions to kill items found to be inaccurate after release.

4. The Honorable Mr. BURDICK states further that the Macy store is a heavy advertiser in the Mirror.

It is true that Macy's, together with other New York department stores, consistently advertise in the Mirror.

To recapitulate:

Macy's did not ask the Mirror to kill the story; and the Mirror would have withheld the item on grounds of inaccuracy had it referred similarly to persons or institutions with no advertising connection whatsoever.

The undersigned herewith respectfully requests that you bring about publication of the truth in this matter to undo the falsification in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD item above referred to.

Sincerely,

JACK LAIT,
Editor in Chief.

Addresses of Mexican and United States Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following translation of the speech delivered by President Avila Camacho, of Mexico, in Monterrey, and the text of President Roosevelt's address from the New York Times of April 21, 1943:

AVILA CAMACHO'S ADDRESS

Mr. President, because of the fundamental virtues which distinguish you and because of the significance of the solemn moment in which your visit to Mexico is being carried out, this occasion is not only a motive of deep satisfaction for my country but also an incontrovertible proof of the progress attained by our two peoples in their desire to know each other, to understand each other, and to collaborate, without interruptions or falterings, in order to achieve the democratic aspirations which unite them.

Mexico has not been obliged to alter in the slightest degree her basic policy in order to find herself at the side of those nations which are fighting for the civilization of the world and for the good of humanity. Our true path has not varied. Our historic sense of honor continues the same as that to which we gave expression in the past with our arms in order to defend our territory and to sustain our institutions.

If our position of solidarity with your country in the present emergency had implied for us some unforeseen change in our course, our cooperation would not enjoy the unanimous support which it has been granted by Mexican public opinion.

What, then, are the causes of our firm and sincere cordiality? Your Excellency, personally, is giving me the best reply to this inquiry.

In effect, neither Your Excellency nor I believe in negative memories, because we both place our hope in the soundness of principles, in the perfectability of men, and in the constructive capacity of ideals.

NO FOREIGN MODEL FOR UNITED STATES

You furnish us with an eloquent witness of a similar capacity of the spiirt which for some years has guided your country and which has led it to strengthen by all possible means the generous systems of equality and independence. In this process—which owes so much to your ablity as a leader—the United States has not been obliged to seek a foreign model.

In order to feel that your true greatness is not based upon dominance but rather upon the respect of sovereignties and on harmony under the law, it was sufficient for you to return with precision to the lesson of your greatest heroes. Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln are present in the current decisions of your country. And among your other claims to fame, Your Excellency undoubtedly possesses that of having inflexibly fought to apply to the relations between the countries of this hemisphere the teachings of the famous liberators.

Mexico will never forget your participation in the structure of that new American policy which, because it is so much in agreement with our national purpose, we could without boastfulness proclaim as ours. Good neighbors. Good friends. That is what we have always wished to be for all the peoples of the earth.

It was certainly not hatred which causes us to enter the war in which we find ourselves. Nor was it a petty interest in possible practical advantages. We know perfectly well that any struggle is strenuous and that nothing durable can be created without constancy in privations and without steadfastness and severity in sacrifice.

With the same clarity we know the only conquests which the United Nations will obtain will be the moral conquests of dignity in thought, of autonomy in conduct, and of the overthrowing of might by right. And Your Excellency understands all this especially well, you to whom—as the champion of the Atlantic Charter—there is reserved a transcendental role in this time of unprecedented importance.

Our countries do not wish for a mere strategic truce obtained simply so that the world may again tomorrow fall into the same old faults of ambition, of imperialism, of iniquity, and of sordid privilege.

DESIRE FREEDOM FROM THREATS

We desire to live together free of the perpetual threats which derive from those who seek supremacy. Free from the supremacy in the domestic field which—as we were able to note during the period in which this war was prepared—led certain elements to place their class interests above the interests of the whole group. And free from the supremacy in the foreign field, the constant results of which are violence, death, and the ruin of culture.

In order to bring about such a living together, we must above all destroy the machinery of barbarism constructed by the dictators. Circumstances will determine for each one of us the degree of direct participation in active combat which this obligation may warrant. But there is one thing which is in reach of all: the carrying on of the fight immediately at home against those evils which offend and concern us in others.

A campaign of such universal extension is not won alone in the trenches of the enemy. It is also won at home through greater unity, through more work, through greater production, and through the benefit of pure democracy in which our brothers, our comrades, and even our enemies may discover a promise capable of giving to their lives a better content.

The difficulties with which we will be confronted will be very great. I recognize it. However, the energies of the people who are fighting against Nazi fascism and the honesty of the statesmen who direct them are high pledges that the faith of which I speak will not be destroyed in the deliberations over the peace.

In order to contribute to the work of the post-war period the United States and Mexico are placed in a situation of undeniable possibilities and obligations. Geography has made of us a natural bridge of conciliation between the Latin and the Saxon cultures of the continent. If there is any place where the thesis of the good neighborhood may be proved with efficacy, it is right here in the juxtaposition of these lands.

EXAMPLE FOR ALL AMERICA

Our successes and our errors will have in the future a tremendous significance, because they will not represent only the successes or failures of Mexico and the United States but rather an example, a stimulus or a deception for all America. There is our primary responsibility. And thus there can best be appreciated the usefulness of these interviews which permit us to consider at close range our problems and try to solve them with the best and clearest understanding.

You have been witness of the enthusiasm with which my fellow countrymen have assumed the burden assigned to them by these virile times both in the carrying out of military service and in the multiple activities required by the industrial and agricultural mobilization of the country. At this table you see gathered together diverse representatives of a particularly enthusiastic and hard-working region. The other regions of the Republic of Mexico have also united in the rhythm of a production which is continually furnishing a quantity of aid to the arsenal of Allied production.

Within the same spirit our workmen, every day in greater numbers, are going to the fields of the United States to lend their assistance in tasks which for the time being have had to be abandoned by farmers who have been drafted. This assistance, which is being coordinated with North American mobilization is—in addition to a symbol in which we understand the duties of reciprocal aid between peoples—a demonstration of the strong will which animates us.

For my part I am glad to express to you the admiration with which we in Mexico observe the prodigious effort being made by your country to hasten the end of the war. The enthusiasm with which your young men have rushed to battle areas and their bravery in offering their lives for the redemption of the oppressed awake in us an austere and continental pride.

At the same time I congratulate myself on this opportunity of shaking the hand of a loyal friend. I repeat to you, Mr. President, together with the sentiments of solidarity of my country and our wish for the success of our common cause, the desire that the relations between Mexico and the United States of America may develop—always—along the channels of mutual esteem and unceasing devotion to liberty.

ROOSEVELT'S RESPONSE

Your Excellency's friendly and cordial expressions add to the very great pleasure which I feel at being here on Mexican soil.

It is an amazing thing to have to realize that nearly 34 years have passed since the Chief Executives of our two nations have met face to face. I hope in the days to come every Mexican and every American President will feel at liberty to visit each other just as neighbors visit each other—just as neighbors talk things over and get to know each other better.

Our two countries owe their independence to the fact that your ancestors and mine held the same truths to be worth fighting and dying for. Hidalgo and Juarez were men of the same stamp as Washington and Jefferson. It was, therefore, inevitable that our two countries should find themselves alined together in the great struggle which is being fought today to determine whether this shall be a free or a slave world.

The attacks of the Axis Powers during the past few years against our common heritage as freemen culminated in the unspeakable and unprovoked aggression of December 7, 1941, and May 14, 1942, and the shedding of blood on those dates of citizens of the United States and of Mexico alike.

Those attacks did not find the Western Hemisphere unprepared. The 21 free republics of the Americas during the past 10 years have devised a system of international cooperation which has become a great bulwark in the defense of our heritage and our future. That system, whose strength is now evident to the most skeptical, is based primarily upon a renunciation of the use of force and the enshrining of international justice and mutual respect as the governing rule of conduct by all nations.

MEXICO'S RULE IS EMPHASIZED

In the forging of that new international policy the role of Mexico has been outstanding. Mexican Presidents and Foreign Ministers have appreciated the nature of the struggle with which we are now confronted at a time when nations much closer to the focus of infection were blind.

The wisdom of the measures which the statesmen of Mexico and the United States, and of the other American Republics have adopted at inter-American gatherings during recent years has been amply demonstrated. They have succeeded because they have been placed in effect not only by Mexico and the United States but by all except one of the other American republics.

You and I, Mr. President, as Commanders in Chief of our respective armed forces, have been able to concert measures for common defense. The harmony and mutual confidence which has prevailed between our armies and navies is beyond praise. Brotherhood in arms has been established.

The determination of the Mexican people and of their leaders has led to production on an all-out basis of strategic and vital materials so necessary to the forging of the weapons destined to compass the final overthrow of our common foe. In this great city of Monterrey, I have been most impressed with the single-minded purpose with which all the forces of production are joined together in the war effort.

And Mexican farm workers, brought to the United States in accordance with an agreement between our two governments, the terms of which are fully consonant with the social objective we cherish together, are contributing their skill and their toil to the production of vitally needed food.

IDEA EXCHANGE IMPORTANT

Not less important than the military cooperation and the supplies needed for the maintenance of our respective economies has been the exchange of those ideas and of those moral values which give life and significance to the tremendous effort of the free peoples of the world. We in the United States have listened with admiration and profit to your statements and addresses, Mr. President, and to those of your distinguished Foreign Minister. We have gained inspiration and strength from your words.

In the shaping of a common victory our peoples are finding that they have common aspirations. They can work together for a common objective. Let us never lose our hold upon that truth. It contains within it the secret of future happiness and prosperity for all of us on both sides of our unfortified border.

Let us make sure that when our victory is won, when the forces of evil surrender—and that surrender shall be unconditional—then we, with the same spirit and with the same united courage, will face the task of the building of a better world.

There is much work still to be done by men of good will on both sides of our border. The great Mexican people have their feet set upon a path of ever greater progress, so that each citizen may enjoy the greatest possible measure of security and opportunity. The Government of the United States and my countrymen are ready to contribute to that progress.

We recognize a mutual interdependence of our joint resources. We know that Mexico's resources will be developed for the common good of humanity. We know that the day of the exploitation of the resources and the people of one country for the benefit of any group in another country is definitely over.

STRESSES INTERDEPENDENCE

It is time that every citizen in every one of the American republics recognizes that the good-neighbor policy means that harm to one republic means harm to every republic. We have all of us recognized the principle of independence. It is time that we recognize also the privilege of interdependence—one upon another.

Mr. President, it is my hope that in the expansion of our common effort in this war and in the peace to follow we will again have occasion for friendly consultation in order further to promote the closest understanding and continued unity of purpose between our two peoples.

We have achieved close understanding and unity of purpose. I am grateful to you, Mr. President, and to the Mexican people for this opportunity to meet you on Mexican soil and to call you friends.

You and I are breaking another precedent. Let these meetings between Presidents of Mexico and the United States recur again and again and again.

Ignoring the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I say deliberately, that not only the executive branch of our Government but you the legislative, as well as the judicial branch, are out of step with public sentiment and public opinion. The people demand that all three branches of their Government once more respect the Constitution. They demand that each of these branches function in its own particular sphere. They resent any encroachment of one branch upon the other. They demand the abolishment of government by bureaucracy.

The people are getting tired of being bossed and bulldozed by the little autocrats in the various set-ups throughout the Nation. Many of these act not only without authority of law but in violation of law and the Constitution. The time has come when the executive, the legislative, and judicial branches of our Government must remember that war does not abrogate the Constitution. The time has come when official Washington must again respect the Constitution and the laws made pursuant to its provisions.

We all know that in time of war the military arm must have full and complete control of military operations, but a declaration of war does not abolish Congress—nor abrogate the Nation's laws. Congress should still shape the policies that govern the civilian population. The people demand that Congress accept its responsibilities—that it once more write the Nation's laws.

We should view with suspicion any bill handed to us by any bureaucratic department. No department should be allowed to usurp legislative power. No department should be allowed to function in violation of the Constitution. In a democracy at war the people are all equally eager for victory, but they will not surrender their Constitution, or their form of government. They deny that a democracy cannot win a war. They proclaim that it is only because we were a democracy that we have won our wars in the past. That it is only because we are a democracy that we are going to win this one.

It is not necessary to surrender our intellect in order to win this war. It is not necessary to become regimented serfs in order to win. We have had wars before and we did not surrender out liberty then, and we are not going to do it now. While our sons are winning the war on foreign battlefields, we must protect their democracy at home. We must not surrender and permit the establishment of a bureaucratic government.

We must forever be on our guard. The greed for power—bureaucracy—is more dangerous than the greed for money. We must never surrender the right to think out loud. In spite of the fact that all of our avenues of publicity are now more or less under the control of official Washington, we must insist upon freedom of speech and press—freedom of conscience. We must give constructive criticism whenever and wherever it is needed.

Congress has given too many blank checks to the Executive and through it to the bureaucracy. The chickens of this legislation have now come home to roost. The one-man-made laws made under these blank checks by Executive orders and administrative edicts, from January 3 to April 2 consist of 4,223 pages. While the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the same period, which contains all the speeches in both Houses of Congress, consists of only 2,948 pages. The time has arrived for this Congress to abolish this unconstitutional method of Government.

In recent years all three branches of our Government have flaunted the Constitution. They have attempted, through Executive and administrative orders, to impose upon our people unconstitutional restrictions and requirements. They have made people dishonest, if it is dishonest to violate an Executive order, or an administrative edict, made without authority of law, or made in violation of both law and the Constitution. The ignorance of bureaucracy is responsible for the black markets.

Assuming to act under the authority of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, the Seventy-seventh Congress under the pressure of the Department of Agriculture, passed Public Law No. 74 and sections 331 to 339, inclusive, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended. Under these laws, if constitutional, the Secretary of Agriculture can control the number of acres planted to wheat on every farm.

He can compel the farmer to plow under wheat planted 8 months before the law was passed. This just because some bureaucrat in the Department of Agriculture thinks the farmer planted too much. Under these laws, the farmer who failed to destroy his crop was penalized 49 cents a bushel for 1941 and 57 cents for 1942 on so-called excess wheat. The limit of the penalty is prescribed by Congress. It is fixed at 50 percent of the loan value.

If Congress can penalize a farmer 49 cents or 57 cents a bushel for raising wheat, then it can penalize him $1 or $100 a bushel. Once grant the authority, then the sky is the limit.

It is true that in the Filburn case the Supreme Court did not give Filburn any relief. It did, however, not hold these laws constitutional. In that case Mr. Filburn permitted the Department of Agriculture to virtually stipulate him out of Court. It was stipulated that, but for these laws the farmer would have received only 40 cents a bushel for his wheat, whereas because of them he received $1.16. This stipulation was incorrect and untrue at both ends.

The world market during the period that Mr. Filburn's wheat was raised was not 40 cents a bushel but considerably higher. It was around 62 cents a bushel at Winnipeg, an exporting country, and around 90 to 95 cents a bushel at Liverpool. The market price in the United States was around 85 cents a bushel, not $1.16. These laws did not raise the price of wheat, but, if anything, kept it down.

It is true that the opinion of the Court in that case contains dangerous dictum, but the decision itself disposes of the case by saying in substance that Mr. Filburn having received benefits under the act could not question its constitutionality.

The Court says:

> Whether the subject of the regulation in question was production, consumption, or marketing is, therefore, not material for purposes of deciding the question of Federal power before us. That an activity is of local character may help in a doubtful case to determine whether Congress intended to reach it.
>
> The same consideration might help in determining whether in the absence of congressional action it would be permissible for the State to exert its power on the subject matter, even though in so doing it to some degree affected interstate commerce.
>
> But even if appellant's activity be local though it may not be regarded as commerce, it may still, whatever its nature, be reached by Congress if it exerts a substantial economic effect on interstate commerce and this irrespective of whether such effect is what might at some earlier time have been defined as direct or indirect.

If that definition is accepted, then, the Supreme Court has rewritten the interstate commerce clause to mean not only all commerce between the States and foreign nations, but all local commerce within a State. If that is constitutional then there is nothing to the Constitution except the interstate commerce clause. Then all the rest of the Constitution is mere meaningless verbiage. Such a construction cannot be put upon the interstate commerce clause by anyone who can read and understand English.

I submit that this is not the Constitution. The Constitution says:

> Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

The word "among" means commerce between States. It does not mean commerce within a State. "Among the several States" does not mean that Congress has the right to regulate the commerce within a State which is purely local. It surely does not mean that Congress can tell the farmer what he may eat and what he may not eat. Any decision of any court that holds to the contrary is an unconstitutional decision.

No Member on this floor has a higher regard for the members of the Supreme Court than I have. I consider them men of extraordinary legal ability. I do not believe that all of the language in the Filburn case is their matured judgment. The Constitution is not the President nor is the President the Constitution. It is the document of "we the people" and they alone can alter or amend it. Congress cannot abrogate it nor should a court misconstrue it. This is not permissible even in periods of great inertia. The inertia may after all be common horse sense.

The subject matter involved in these laws is of great public concern and interest. They are national in scope and affect the agricultural activities of millions of farmers. They endanger the Nation's food supply. They involve millions of dollars of penalties, which have been and are being unlawfully collected under an unconstitutional law.

These laws attempt to control intrastate agricultural activities and production under the guise of regulating interstate commerce. They do not deal with interstate commerce, nor even with intrastate commerce, as such, but deal solely and exclusively with intrastate production of wheat and farming activities.

Their aim is the control and curtailment of the production. They do not operate on interstate commerce, but aim to control the farming activities of the farmer himself. They invade the rights of the State, attempting to regulate its internal affairs; they invade the private home of the farmer within the State by directing him as to what he may produce and what he may not produce. These laws were written by the bureaucrats in the Department of Agriculture. Congress did not write them, but a submissive Congress passed them.

If finally held constitutional, they will divide and set community against community, State against State, and section against section. They may be the rock upon which the sisterhood of 48 States will ultimately perish.

These laws do not regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, but in fact, interfere with, hinder, and tend to destroy commerce. They attempt to control intrastate production and intrastate farming activities. They curtailed and restricted the production of an essential food product, wheat, to the detriment of the general welfare of the Nation. They cannot be sustained as constitutional under any previous decision of the Supreme Court. They are not constitutional, the Filburn case notwithstanding.

It must be clear that these acts do not only interfere with interstate commerce, but tend to destroy it. If I raise 10 sheep

and my family consumes 5 and I sell 5, then there are 5 for intra- or interstate commerce, but if I am compelled to reduce the number of sheep I raise to 5, then I have destroyed the commerce in the other 5, be it State or interstate.

It is equally clear that if I raise 100 bushels of wheat and my family consumes 50, that then I have 50 bushels for commerce, but if I am restricted to only 50 bushels, then I have none whatever for either State or interstate commerce. These facts are so self-evident that they need no further explanation. It is partly because of this interference with the production of the Nation's food supply that there is danger of hunger and want in the land of plenty.

If these acts are constitutional, then Congress can prohibit a person from making a single lead pencil and either using it himself, or giving it to his wife as a birthday present. Then Congress can direct the number of eggs that a hen is allowed to lay per week. It can compel the farmer to dispose of, or give to the Secretary of Agriculture, any hen that lays more than three eggs per week. This, because some lead pencils and some eggs do enter interstate commerce.

If this law is constitutional, then a farmer's wife who raises sheep, shears the wool from their backs, spins the wool on an old spinning wheel, knits the yarn into a sweater, can be told by Congress that she cannot wear the sweater, but she must give it to the Secretary of Agriculture or store it or else she will be penalized.

If this law is constitutional, then Congress can prohibit any farmer from raising any wheat and using it for his own family and his own livestock. Then Congress can provide that a farmer with 10 children could be prohibited from milking and keeping more than 1 cow and if he keeps and milks 2, then the Government will have a lien on all the milk until he pays a penalty, which amounts to confiscation, to the Secretary of Agriculture.

I repeat that if this law is constitutional, then, since some human beings, under certain circumstances, become interstate commerce, Congress can pass an act limiting the number of babies that a farm family is allowed to raise. It can say that any farm family that raises over four babies shall be fined $1,000 unless they give one of them to the Department of Agriculture and then if the fifth baby comes along, as sometimes happens, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have a lien on all five children until the penalty is paid.

Absurd as this may seem, that is exactly the kind of laws that Congress passed under the pressure of the bureaucracy in the Department of Agriculture. Under these laws the Department attempted to penalize the farmer for raising wheat for seed, feed, or for his family's consumption. It makes that a crime which is a virtue, it attempts to penalize and punish the farmer for feeding the Nation.

In fact these acts do not attempt to regulate interstate commerce. It is their purpose to curtail interstate commerce of domestic wheat. It attempts to bring about this result not by regulating interstate commerce, but by controlling acres of production. Surely an acre of land cannot be made the subject of regulating interstate commerce. The acre itself does not walk across boundary lines. It is true that some of its soil occasionally takes an interstate excursion in a dust storm, but as far as we know the Department of Agriculture has not yet been able to regulate that.

Congress cannot legally annihilate the Constitution—the fundamental law of the land—under the guise of proceeding under the interstate commerce clause. We submit that both Congress and the courts have gone to the extreme limit in that direction. The time has arrived for the pendulum to return.

Not even the mistaken notions of necessity, of surpluses, of the Department of Agriculture can annul the Constitution. The people alone can alter that instrument. It is not for Congress or the courts to amend the Constitution by reading something into the interstate commerce clause that is not there.

The bounds of the whole Constitution must be respected. One part, or one clause, must not be used as an excuse to annihilate every other part of the instrument. The Constitution must be read, interpreted, and upheld as a whole. The whole instrument is flexible, to be sure, but it is not self-destructive. It does not contain the germ—a clause—for its own annihilation.

If Congress can punish a farmer for planting wheat 8 months before the law is passed, by penalizing him, then it can also punish him by putting him in jail. Then the degree of punishment is in the discretion of Congress. Neither can Congress make the planting of wheat, or farming operations, entirely within a State, an unlawful or criminal act. This is beyond its constitutional power.

The framers of our Constitution prohibited Congress from giving one State preference over another. Each State is free to compete with every other State in industry, in agriculture, and in manufacture. As far as intrastate activities are concerned, no State can be limited, restrained, or discriminated against by the Federal Government.

Yet the laws here under consideration would freeze production of wheat in each State. This, in accordance with its past production. It in fact says to the State of Vermont and to other States: "You cannot, in the future, produce much wheat because you have never produced much before." If Congress can do this, then it can do also the opposite, and say to the State of Kansas: "You have produced enough wheat in the past, you cannot produce it in the future."

If Congress can do this in the case of wheat, then it can do it was every other agricultural commodity or manufactured article. Admit this doctrine and constitutional government ceases to exist.

The laws here in question deny the citizens of each State all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States. They attempt to freeze a certain class of citizens in a certain business, farming, into a status quo. The citizens of each State have a right to compete with the citizens of every other State in the production of agricultural products. That right cannot be taken away from them, constitutionally, by Congress.

The citizens of each State have a right to change their vocation or occupation from one to another within the State without asking the Secretary of Agriculture for his permission. To hold otherwise is to be intellectually dishonest with ourselves and with our form of government. We are 48 States but one Nation. Each of us has equal right to compete with the citizens of every other State in the production of food and wealth. We have the constitutional right to eat the same or different food without interference by the Department of Agriculture.

Less than 20 percent of the 6,000,000 farm families plant wheat in a given year. It is not always the same farmer who plants wheat. Agriculture is in a constant flux. The kind of products grown by the individual farmer changes from year to year, depending upon conditions far beyond the control of the Department of Agriculture.

The laws complained of attempt to give to a class, and to a small group of that class—less than one-tenth of all the farmers—the power to legislate, to put into operation a policy of restricting production of an essential food product—this by a referendum vote of that small group, and yet binding upon all of us. We submit that this is not a ministerial power, but a legislative power. A power that affects the entire Nation.

If this can be done in the field of agriculture, it can be done in the field of manufacture—in all industry. Then Congress can delegate to any group the power to curtail production by a referendum vote. This in utter disregard of the welfare of the Nation, or the want and suffering of the people. It can give to any group the power to penalize and imprison if its policy is not followed. Such a policy is a total stranger to our Constitution. It is foreign to our way of life. It cannot be sustained.

Certainly the production of wheat, on one's own farm, entirely within one State, cannot be prohibited or controlled by a penalty tax, under any act of Congress. Yet, that is the whole intent and purpose of the penalty tax, in the acts here under consideration. It is true that an attempt is made to do this by subterfuge, in the name of interstate commerce. The farmer cannot be classified occupationally as a dealer in interstate or intrastate commerce, or as a dealer in lottery tickets, or adulterated food, or white slave traffic, or stolen automobiles, or kidnaped persons. He is engaged in an honorable and lawful occupation—feeding the Nation.

The 49-cent-penalty tax amounts to confiscation of the farmers' wheat. At no time since 1930 have the farmers received cost of production for their wheat. From 1930 to 1940 they received from 69 to 75 percent parity prices. They fed the Nation at a loss. They donated their services and the services of their wives and children to the Nation—the honeyed words and the camouflage of the Department notwithstanding.

In place of giving them a 100-percent parity, or cost of production, Congress has been imposed upon and gave them an unconstitutional penalty tax, and the 265,000 bellwethers on the pay roll of the Department of Agriculture cannot continue to fool us. Over 23,000 of these are of draft age. Some of these serve no useful purpose. They burn up gasoline and wear out tires in attempting to boss and bulldoze their fellow farmers.

The laws here under consideration, with a boldness not heretofore attempted in any act of Congress, attempt to usurp the power and rights expressly and absolutely retained by the people and reserved to the States. If, under the guise of interstate commerce, Congress can go into the States and fine farmers for raising wheat under a law, 8 months after the wheat had been planted, then the end of our Constitution has arrived.

These laws virtually make a slave out of the farmer. They require him to pay the penalty or give the so-called excess wheat to a Secretary of Agriculture for nothing. It takes labor to produce wheat. If, after it is produced, somebody else can take it, or exact 49 cents a bushel from you for raising it, it seems to me that constitutes involuntary servitude.

I submit there has been a growing tendency to disregard the rights of the States and to centralize power in Washington. I deny, most emphatically, that this has been for the good of the Nation.

I submit that the struggle in the future will be to recover some of those rights, so readily surrendered by the people to the Federal Government. Power always wants more power, and we are no exception to the rule, but let us come back to the Constitution.

The powers the people have given to the General Government are named in the Constitution, and all not there named, either expressly or impliedly, are reserved to the people and can be exercised only by them or upon further grant from them. *United States* v *Williams* (194 U. S. 295).

I challenge the Department of Agriculture to point out to us under what provisions of the Constitution Congress has the right to give to him the power to control and regulate the production of wheat. No such power exists; therefore, Congress cannot give it to him, or much less even delegate it to him.

The States within their spheres are as independent of the General Government as the General Government within its sphere is independent of the States. Both must respect the Federal Constitution.—*Buffington* v. *Day* (11 Wall. 124).

The Food Blockade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a letter prepared by me and signed by 53 first-year Republican and Democratic Congressmen, dated April 19, 1943, addressed to the President of the United States and to the Honorable Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain, in care of Lord Halifax, British Ambassador, and delivered by messenger last Monday:

APRIL 19, 1943.

TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT and PRIME MINISTER CHURCHILL:

For over 1900 years Easter has been the symbol of hope to the Christian peoples of the world. Easter Day stands for the faith of humanity in a new life, in being born again. But on Easter Day in 1943 that hope will not be rekindled for millions of our Christian allies in Europe—unless we act now.

This Easter, America is fighting and working for a new day in the world, an era of international good will. No world of righteousness and justice can be built of the corpses of little children. This tragic fact is ignored in the blockade against food.

Ways and means are believed available to get food to the millions of starving children in France, Belgium, Holland, Poland, and other United Nations. South American food supplies, Swedish ships, bank balances of these occupied countries here are all reported ready for the task. Swedish and other neutrals can distribute the desperately needed food supplies to the children of these helpless peoples. Such a program would be stopped immediately if supplies were hijacked by the Nazis. The relief efforts now helping stricken Greece demonstrate the merit of this plan.

Humanity demands that we make this effort. As Easter arrives, let the blockade stone be rolled away from the sepulchre of these hungry little ones, now slowly starving to death. (In a typical French industrial district, 65 percent of the children are reported already tuberculous—a death sentence to them unless we act soon.)

"And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth Me. * * *"

These words come to us from the lips of Jesus of Nazareth. Shall we repulse His plea?

America's good faith will be judged by her actions now. So we plead for a decision that will roll away the stone from the sepulchre of these little ones, the children of occupied Europe.

Yours for mercy,

Max Schwabe, Missouri; Walter E. Brehm, Ohio; Walt Horan, Washington; Norris Poulson, California; William C. Cole, Missouri; Wat Arnold, Missouri; Harry P. Jeffrey, Ohio; W. P. Elmer, Missouri; Henderson H. Carson, Ohio; Edward O. McCowen, Ohio; Brooks Hays, Arkansas; Chet Holifield, California; A. M. Fernandez, New Mexico; Fred Norman, Washington; Daniel Ellison, Maryland; L. H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Tom Murray, Tennessee; Mike Mansfield, Montana; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Hubert S. Ellis, West Virginia; William I. Troutman, Pennsylvania; Grant Furlong, Pennsylvania; Robert Hale, Maine; Leroy Johnson, California; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Howard Buffett, Nebraska; Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming; Jay LeFevre, New York; Joseph Mruk, New York; Homer A. Ramey, Ohio; Marion T. Bennett, Missouri; Ranulf Compton, Connecticut; Fred E. Busbey, Illinois; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; Angier L. Goodwin, Massachusetts; Winifred Stanley, New York; Louis E. Miller, Missouri; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa; Sid Simpson, Illinois; B. W. Kearney, New York; Harris Ellsworth, Oregon; Earle D. Willey, Delaware; John Phillips, California; P. W. Griffiths, Ohio; Christian A. Herter, Massachusetts; Hal Holmes, Washington; Jim McCord, Tennessee; John P. Newsome, Alabama; Cal D. Johnson, Illinois.

Thefts From Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SID SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and in connection with a bill, H. R. 2537, introduced by me April 19, 1943, to extend the provisions of the National Cattle Theft Act to all livestock, poultry, and agricultural commodities, I include the following editorial appearing in the April 14, 1943, issue of the Pike County Republican entitled "Tell the Sheriff":

TELL THE SHERIFF

R. C. Saunders, chief of the Bureau of Rural Crime Prevention in Illinois, and his assistant, former Sheriff Bell, of Winnebago County, were here last week checking up on rural crime in Pike County.

Here is one of the strange things they found.

They found that many Pike County farms are being looted by thieves and the farmers fail to report the thefts to the sheriff or other officers.

The men from the State bureau went out into the country and interviewed four farmers who had never reported any losses. They found that property had been stolen from these four farmers in the aggregate amount of $900 worth.

Said the State officials to the Republican: "Ask your farmers to report losses to your sheriff just as soon as they are discovered."

The officers, local and State, cannot trace and recover property that they don't know has been stolen. With the help of the police radio network, criminals may be apprehended and stolen goods recovered if farmers waste no time in reporting thefts.

Rural thievery is on the increase. It is running into many thousands of dollars annually in Pike County. Citizens must rally and put a stop to it.

Officers estimate that on Pike County's 3,151 farms there is more than $3,000,000 worth of movable property that is subject to being carted off by thieves.

Hogs are being stolen from Pike County farms. Hogs are being butchered on the farms by meat thieves. The hogs are skinned, their carcasses cut up and the cuts of meat carted away by night.

A farmer across the river in Missouri has lost 26 head of cattle by theft. Livestock of all kinds is being rustled.

Said Mr. Saunders: "We hear of a cow being stolen and we don't think as much about it as if $150 had been stolen. But it amounts to the same thing."

The State officers, after their brief survey here, were of the opinion that if a complete check was made of the county's farms, it would be found that nearly every farmer has suffered loss of one kind or another from thieves and rustlers.

Thievery, in the opinion of the officers, is going to increase rapidly, because of the black markets in meat.

They expect widespread rustling of livestock for these illegal markets.

If you have anything stolen, tell the sheriff. Tell him now.

The Ginsburg Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, 1943, the Times-Dispatch, one of the leading newspapers in Virginia, published an editorial on the Ginsburg case. Under unanimous consent I insert the editorial at this point in my remarks:

DISCREDITING VIRGINIA

Representative JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, of Bristol, apparently is quite proud of himself for his rabble-rousing outbursts against David Ginsburg, former general counsel of the Office of Price Administration. He reiterated recently that he would apologize to no one for his attack on Mr. Ginsburg's draft record, and he added: "I am the one who brought the matter out in the open."

Well, there are a lot of Virginians who are humiliated at having a man capable of this below-the-belt attack on a public official, as a spokesman for their State in Washington. Mr. Ginsburg has his faults, no doubt. Most of us have them, even Representative FLANNAGAN. But it has been demonstrated, to the satisfaction of reasonable persons that David Ginsburg was not a draft dodger; that he resigned as general counsel of the Office of Price Administration, saying specifically in writing that he was doing so because he did not wish to embarrass that agency or to be accused of dodging the draft, and that Administrator Prentiss Brown refused to accept his resignation. Ginsburg insisted a short time later on resigning to accept a captaincy in the Army, but now he has gone in as a draftee, thanks to the pharisaical and self-righteous breast-beating of FLANNAGAN and his ilk.

We are unable to discern a single irregularity in Ginsburg's draft record, or anything even mildly questionable about it, from beginning to end. Just what Representative FLANNAGAN thinks he is accomplishing by his abusive attack is a mystery. If he wants to put himself in such a light before the people, we have no particular objection. But when he smears an innocent man and thereby reflects on the State of Virginia, we rise in protest.

On April 9, 1943, I wrote a letter to the editor of the Times-Dispatch, asking that same be published. On April 13, 1943, the letter was published, and at the end of the letter the editor added a note. I insert the letter and the editor's note at this point in my remarks:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 9, 1943.*

To the EDITOR, TIMES-DISPATCH,
Richmond, Va.

MY DEAR SIR: While, my dear Editor, I will not embarrass you by asking what influence motivated you in writing the belated editorial endorsing the draft record of Mr. David Ginsburg, I do desire to make a few observations on the editorial, and I hope you will give the same publicity to my observations that your dastardly editorial enjoyed.

To begin with, I presume you read the draft record of Mr. Ginsburg, as I presented same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24. I indulge this assumption because you state in the editorial:

"We are unable to discern a single irregularity in Ginsburg's draft record or anything even mildly questionable about it, from beginning to end."

Well, I confess that I am unable to prescribe for the mental and patriotic condition of the man who will read the record and then make such a statement. I am definitely of the opinion, however, that such a man needs the immediate attention of a red-blooded patriotic American psychiatrist because, according to my way of thinking, there are several things the matter with such a one's mental and patriotic make-up.

I note in the editorial that this statement appears:

"Well, there are a lot of Virginians who are humiliated at having a man capable of this below-the-belt attack on a public official, as a spokesman for their State in Washington."

Now, my dear editor, outside of your righteous and glorified self, who are these humiliated Virginians? I have received hundreds of letters from Virginians who have read the RECORD, some from among our ablest leaders of state, some from among our ablest educational leaders, some from among our ablest businessmen, some from among our ablest and most consecrated church leaders, and some from just ordinary war mothers and fathers, and, so far, not a single adverse criticism from the sons and daughters of the State that gave birth to this Nation. Moreover, my dear editor, my condemnation of the record of Mr. Ginsburg has the unanimous approval of every member of the Costello committee, and, so far as I know, of every Member of the House of Representatives.

As to "this below-the-belt attack!" While standing for what I have conceived to be the right has brought me into no few controversies, this is the first time I have ever been accused of hitting below the belt. I do not fight that way, and I think my bitterest enemy will bear testimony to the fact. The truth is, my dear editor, I did not hit below the belt in this case. I simply took Mr. Ginsburg's own record—the record that he himself made—and hit him, not below the belt with it, but right between the eyes.

Permit me to again quote from the editorial, and I am through:

"Representative JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, of Bristol, apparently is quite proud of himself for his rabble-rousing outburst against David Ginsburg."

Quite the contrary, my dear editor, I take no pride in exposing the transgressions of any man. But, when I found out that literally thousands of young able-bodied men had found shelter from war service in the departments at Washington, I started out to do everything in my power to run them out of their departmental shelters on the home front to the battle front, where patriotism dictates they should be. And again I repeat, for my activities in this respect I apologize to no man. I did not start out to call names, and had Mr. Ginsburg not attempted to pull a fast one as detailed in my speech of the 24th, his name would not have been mentioned. That the exposure and the excellent work that is being done by the Costello committee (which, as you probably know was appointed for the very purpose of getting young men out of the departments and into the Army) is bringing results is too well known for comment. Yes; General Marshall's army is today being greatly strengthened from recruits from departmental Washington. Let the good work go on is the prayer, I know, of all patriotic American war mothers and fathers. I still stand by my closing words in my Ginsburg speech:

"Treat all of our boys alike is all that I ask. No patriot will ask more; no patriot will stand for less."

Yes, my dear editor, you are the only Virginian that I know of that has been humiliated. And if you want company to humilitate around in I am afraid you will have to leave Virginia. This being true, probably it would do you good to come up to Washington and sob around with Mr. Ginsburg for awhile. No doubt the association would straighten you out in several things.

Yours very truly,

JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—Congressman FLANNAGAN'S letter is no more convincing than his windy speech in the House on the same subject. It is thoughtful of him not to "embarrass" us by inquiring as to "what influence" motivated our publication of the editorial in question. The only influence was our desire to see justice done.]

Mr. Speaker, all I ask the people of Virginia to do is to read the whole record. Having done this they need not write and inform me of their verdict, because, knowing that the people of Virginia are patriots, I know that their verdict will be condemnation.

The State of the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a transcribed statement made by me on Saturday, April 17, over the KMPC radio station at Los Angeles:

This is Congressman TOM FORD, of the Fourteenth Congressional District, speaking.

I have been asked by KMPC to use its facilities for the purpose of reporting to the people of Los Angeles and southern California on the state of the Nation.

Certainly in carrying out this program KMPC is rendering a distinct and valuable public service. I wish to express my appreciation.

What is the state of the Nation today?

The state of the Nation is critical, probably more critical than in any period of its history.

The United States is waging a war, not on two fronts, but on seven seas and five continents, in other words a global war—and there's no baloney about it.

This is not entirely a war of ships and tanks and guns and planes and armed men. This is a war of peoples. A war of world conquest. A war in which all must share. It is a war, it is true, where the young men, the able men, the strong men, must do the actual combat work. But for every man on the firing line there must be from 10 to 15 men and women working behind the lines.

We who enjoy the personal safety privilege of fighting behind the battle lines are really beginning to realize that we, too, are important. That we, too, have responsibilities. That we, too, must bear burdens; be

subjected to inconveniences; tighten our belts, thrust out our chins, square our shoulders, and fully realize that we are the men and women behind the men behind the guns on land, sea, and in the air.

It has taken time to get our forces organized, our production going at full blast, our home front working in unity.

That is natural, but from the blasts of criticism in the newspapers and over the radio, it might appear that time has been wasted and that little has been accomplished. This is not true, except in a very minor degree. It must be remembered that prior to Pearl Harbor a majority, or pretty close to a majority, of the people did not believe that a war was inevitable and were militantly frank about saying so. In the face of this, we did, under the leadership of our President, take the initial steps in building up our defense. Our production of ships, planes, and munitions was enormously expanded before Pearl Harbor. This was done in the face of terrific opposition which made many Members of Congress hesitate.

It so happens that I did not hesitate. I voted for all defense measures, including the draft. I did so on the principle that we had better have an army, a navy, and an air force and not need them than suddenly to need them and not have them.

In spite of a slow start, in spite of all our wishful thinking and lack of vision, in spite of confusion incident to the inauguration of such an immense, such a truly colossal program, we have at least 6,000,000 trained men in our land forces. We have what now amounts to a 2-ocean navy. We have 60,000 planes ready for the air and in the air. We are producing ships and guns and tanks and munitions in volume and number in excess of all our allies and enemies combined, and within 16 months of Pearl Harbor.

We have suffered reverses in this war and we must expect more of these. But every day we grow stronger on every front and in every branch of the service. We know now that we are going to win—and the enemy knows it.

We also know that victory depends upon our pushing forward our production on every line, on the full cooperation of every one of us in every effort that will contribute to victory, on unbroken unity and stern determination to work harder to produce more, to withstand propaganda, and frown on rumors, to do, each of us, our part cheerfully and with all our energy.

In such a miracle of production as ours, there have inevitably been mistakes, blunders, miscalculation. No thinking person can wonder over this. It is inconceivable that such a mighty effort could be carried on without any errors. We may in very truth feel proud of our achievements, of the very high percentage of efficiency and of cooperation we have had. Sound criticism is helpful, carping criticism is never helpful. When in doubt, it is wise and patriotic to keep silent.

Very recently we have heard much in the newspapers and over the radio about the shocking amount of absenteeism among the workers in our war industries. A prominent Member of Congress recently stated that in last December there were 12,700,000 man-hours lost in large industries due to absenteeism. That shocked the House. But some of us decided that facts are often meaningless unless analyzed, broken down, and interpreted.

The first thought that occurred to me was that much absenteeism is naturally due to accidents. Obtaining from the Department of Labor the statistics on accidents in 1941—the latest obtainable—I discovered that the total of man-hours lost on account of accidents averaged very nearly 21,000,000 per month in 1941. Comparing that with the nearly 13,000,000 man-hours lost last December from all causes, I noted with satisfaction how greatly absenteeism decreased after Pearl Harbor. The total loss of man-hours from all causes last December, you will note, was less than the loss due to accidents alone in the preceding December.

That revived my spirits, confirmed my belief that our American workers, men and women, are not slackers. I find, too, that much of the absenteeism is due to the fact that workers in industry now include many men and women beyond the age formerly at work. And that the physical standards have been lowered, even to the extent of permitting handicapped persons to have the opportunity to work. This is right and wise. Nevertheless, it stands to reason that workers over 50 or 60 and those who are classed as handicapped cannot be expected to work every day of every week, at the hard jobs they are filling. Women, too, must naturally have to take a weekday off now and then, especially those who have a family including small children, who demand and must have attention. Sickness at home makes it imperative for the working mother to remain home for a day or two or longer. Taking all this into account, we are able to discount a lot of the uproar, much of which is fostered in order to prejudice the public against labor.

That is a terrible charge to have to make, but it is unfortunately true. True, too, is the fact that many of the accidents causing absenteeism could be prevented if sufficient safety devices were installed. That is what the crusading radio commentators and the press should bring to public attention. Stop accidents; improve sanitary conditions in plants where these are bad; provide for proper day care of the children of women workers; provide better and swifter transportation for war workers. Do all these things where necessary and thus cut down absenteeism to the minimum.

Yes there are doubtless a few lazy and indifferent workers, who are not interested in giving all they have to defeat the Axis. But confidential reports show that these disloyal workers are few in number and that this number is being decreased by closer checking, with dismissals in gross cases.

The real answer to the absenteeism charge is found in the statement made by Secretary of the Navy Knox that "many ships are coming off the ways fully a year ahead of original expectations."

The same is true as to planes, tanks, and guns, which would seem to contradict the claim that absenteeism or anything else is holding up production.

Last fall, if you will recall, the demand for the opening of a second front was in full cry. The second front has been established and, whether we all appreciate the fact or not, it constitutes one of the miracles of naval and military organization of all time. Now the cry is reverberating over the land for an enormous and immediate increase of aid to China. Certainly every real American wants to give all aid possible to China now, and wants that aid increased a hundred or a thousand fold, just as soon as possible. To listen to the master armchair strategists one would suppose that aid could be gotten to China just like that. The wisenheimers either forget, or fail to understand, that when the Japs took Burma they closed the Burma Road, the main artery over which supplies could be gotten to China. They forget, or appear to forget, that whatever aid in the form of munitions and guns and tanks and planes that can now reach China must be flown in by plane and flown over mountain ranges that are among the highest in the world and under atmospheric conditions that are among the most difficult in the world.

In spite of these difficulties, which at first appeared to be insuperable, the Army Transport Command has, day in and day out kept a steady stream of supplies going to China—not all that we would like to send, it is true, but a steady stream of such supplies as it is possible to send by the only means of transport available.

If, as we all hope, the United Nations succeed in breaking the Japanese hold on Burma in the next few months, the Burma Road will be opened and supplies, in unheard of quantities will supplement the present air-flown volume.

That is what we all want; it is what the administration wants; it is what the military and naval leaders intend to accomplish as quickly as is possible. The President in a recent broadcast stated positively that aid to China was one of the primary objectives of the near future.

There is another school of critics that insists on devoting our whole military and naval effort to the defeating of Japan in the Pacific. They totally ignore the grim fact that the Pacific is not the only front on which we are called upon to fight. They have assumed that we should leave the European front to the British and Russians. It would be duck soup if we could, but unfortunately the Axis strength is of such a formidable character that such a course might be, probably would be, fatal to victory. Such a move would, of course, please Hitler and Mussolini mightily.

So, my friends, I do not agree with those who maintain that all our strength should be concentrated in the Pacific. General MacArthur and Admiral Halsey seem to be doing very well indeed. They started from scratch with an enemy entrenched by surprise moves and today they are whaling hell out of him wherever he appears and they will continue on the offensive. The constant increase of planes and tanks and guns and munitions will inevitably drive the Jap to seek cover. Then MacArthur and Halsey will attack Japan on her home grounds and thus fulfill the President's promise when he said, "There are many roads that lead to Tokyo and we intend to use all of them."

Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of the special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations acting pursuants to House Resolution 105, Seventy-eighth Congress, on the fitness for continuance in Federal employment of Dr. Goodwin B. Watson, Dr. Frederick L. Schuman, and Dr. William E. Dodd, Jr., all of the Federal Communications Commission:

APRIL 21, 1943.

The special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations created pursuant to House Resolution 105, Seventy-eighth Congress, "to examine into any and all allegations or charges that certain persons in the employ of the several executive departments and other executive agencies are unfit to continue in such employment by reason of their present association or membership or past association or membership in or with organizations whose aims or purposes are or have been subversive to the Government of the United States," have procured and examined the evidence in the cases of employees of the Federal Communications Commission named by the chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate

Un-American Activities in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives February 1, 1943, and now submit the following report in regard to these employees.

The special subcommittee understands the purpose of House Resolution 105 to be that said committee shall procure the evidence in each individual case from each department or agency of the Government having any such evidence, and from such evidence, supplemented by direct testimony from the employee, arrive at a proper determination of the matter within the provisions of the resolution.

Your committee secured the services of the Honorable Matt H. Allen, of North Carolina, as attorney, and has assembled in the cases above-mentioned evidence from the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the United States Civil Service Commission, the Interdepartmental Committee, and the Federal Communications Commission. It is voluminous. After an examination of the available evidence by members of said committee, each employee was invited to appear, and did appear, and explain under oath in detail his answer to the various allegations.

The employees of the Federal Communications Commission whose records have thus been examined and whose testimony has been heard are as follows:

Dr. Goodwin B. Watson, 509 West One Hundred and Twenty-first St., New York, N. Y., chief analyst of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Federal Communications Commission; salary, $6,500 per annum.

Dr. Frederick L. Schuman, 2410 Eleventh St. North, Arlington, Va., principal political analyst in the German section of the Analysis Division of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Federal Communications Commission; salary, $5,600 per annum.

Dr. William E. Dodd, Jr., 220 North Greenbrier, Arlington, Va., assistant news editor, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Federal Communications Commission; salary, $3,200 per annum.

Your committee has dealt with the investigations directed under the House resolution as in the nature of an inquest of office, with the aim to make such recommendations as may be justified, toward purging the public service of anyone found guilty of subversive activity by reason of membership or association, past or present, in certain organizations, where such association or membership is thought to be incompatible with the obligations of an employee of the Government.

This Nation has attained its greatness through the ideals and philosophy of freedom written into its Charter and Constitution. Safeguarding this philosophy this Nation has attained a position in the world never attained by any other nation. After more than 150 years, and with less than one-fifth of the area of the world under its flag and less than one-seventh of the population of the world, the United States of America has vouchsafed unto its citizens opportunities never before offered to any people in the world; it has done for years more than one-half the total business of the world, and is spending annually as much as all the other nations of the world in the uplift and education of its citizens. We own and control one-half the wealth of the world, and our power of production of those commodities essential to human existence is equal to that of all the balance of the world. These facts convince us of the wisdom of our forefathers in the establishment of our form of government and fills us with pride when we contemplate the indefinable spirit of these people who have lived in this Nation and those who still live here and follow the flag of freedom, those people who have always been willing and are now willing to offer their lives to protect these inalienable rights so well defined in our Declaration of Independence, those rights and duties which have made us great and strong and which we will never willingly surrender.

This committee asserts that it is not hostile to what is known these days as liberalism. We recognize that intelligent, constructive criticism of our philosophy of government will always be helpful. Our political party system will take care of constructive criticism and use it to further promote governmental efficiency. We do not welcome destructive criticism which has for its purpose the overthrow of this Government and the establishment of another or other forms of government hostile to ours and incompatible with those cherished ideals which have made us great and placed us in the forefront of human attainments. We insist that those men and women who love this Government and believe in its legal and constitutional powers should have the responsibility of running it, and those who foster and associate with any organization, whatever may be its name, which has for its purpose the overthrow of this Government or the substitution of another form of government should not be intrusted with official responsibility. This question has been decided at the bar of public opinion, and we shall abide by that decision.

The Constitution of the United States rests upon public opinion. When that ceases to support it the end will be at hand. America's future depends upon the citizens' reverence for this Constitution. The profound political philosophy which brought it into being, and the basic principles which underlie it are not familiar even to many of our college graduates. This Constitution with its fine equilibrium between efficient power and individual liberty remains the best hope of the world, and any Government employee who fosters or sponsors or supports any organization which would undermine this foundation for a free government ought not to be employed by any department of Government in any position of trust.

"Subversive activity" has not been defined by the courts or by Congress, and your committee must necessarily undertake a definition. For the purposes of these examinations the following is adopted, namely:

"Subversive activity in this country derives from conduct intentionally destructive of or inimical to the Government of the United States—that which seeks to undermine its institutions, or to distort its functions, or to impede its projects, or to lessen its efforts, the ultimate end being to overturn it all. Such activity may be open and direct as by effort to overthrow, or subtle and indirect as by sabotage."

DR. GOODWIN B. WATSON

Dr. Watson admitted association or affiliation with 12 or more organizations as follows, namely:

1. American League for Peace and Democracy
2. American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.
3. American Student Union.
4. American Youth Congress.
5. Conference on Pan-American Democracy.
6. Consumers Union.
7. Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo.
8. Descendants of American Revolution.
9. International Workers Order.
10. League of American Writers.
11. National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights.
12. Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy.

A number of these organizations have been designated by the Department of Justice as "front organizations" and others as "questionable." These organizations have not been adjudged by the courts or by Congress as subversive. They have operated either without constitutions or bylaws, or when their aims and purposes have been brought into question the constitutions and bylaws have been withheld or destroyed. No witness can be found who will or can produce any records of these organizations. But the "court of public opinion" of the United States has passed judgment upon them and has found them subversive and un-American.

In the organization of our armed forces we know that no officer is permitted to lead our boys upon the battle fronts who advocates a philosophy of destruction and overthrow of our institutions and Government. If our military leaders on the far-flung battle fronts have deemed it wise and necessary to safeguard and protect our boys against false and distorted doctrines and philosophies, it would seem equally necessary and important that we on the home front should give a similar protection and safeguard to our soldiers and citizens at home, against entrusting official responsibility to those whose acts, philosophies, and teachings would destroy us from within.

Your committee finds from the evidence that Dr. Watson for several years past has associated himself on many and frequent occasions with men and associations whose aims and purposes were subversive to this Government, and has associated himself with men who advocated the overthrow of this Government. We further find from the evidence that Dr. Watson has written various articles for several magazines reputedly controlled by subversive interests, and in a number of these articles Dr. Watson made unfavorable comparisons between other governments and our Government, and in other articles he criticized our capitalistic and profit system and advocated its overthrow.

Upon consideration of all of the evidence, your committee finds that the membership and association of Dr. Goodwin B. Watson with the organizations mentioned, and his views and philosophies as expressed in various statements and writings constitute subversive activity within the definition adopted by your committee, and that he is, therefore, unfit for the present to continue in Government employment.

DR. FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN

Your special subcommittee has examined Dr. Frederick L. Schuman and all evidence pertaining to him as submitted by the committees heretofore referred to, and does not find sufficient evidence to support a recommendation of unfitness to serve in the employment of the Government at this time.

DR. WILLIAM E. DODD, JR.

Your committee finds that the evidence in the case of Dr. William E. Dodd, Jr., shows, by his own testimony, that he was a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy and that he resigned from that organization not because of its character but to "return to Virginia, to my farm, and to run for Congress." This organization was listed by the Department of Justice as a "front organization" and has been so found by the Committee on Un-American Activities and the Interdepartmental Committee.

Further, Dr. Dodd openly, and in the opinion of the committee, definitely admitted his long-standing and continued membership in the Washington Bookshop which he retains to this day. This organization has likewise been listed as a "front organization" by the Department of Justice. Dr. Dodd testified before the committee that he knew the organization had been found to be subversive, but that he did not feel any obligation to resign his membership in it.

As to his association with Communists, Dr Dodd testified to the committee that he entertained Harry Bridges a a cocktail party in Dr. Dodd's apartment attended by 30 people. He stated to the committee that he knew deportation charges were then pending against Mr. Bridges based upon membership in the Communist Party, but claimed that he did not know who the people were who attended the party or who finally paid the bills, but thought that a Miss Gardner, secretary of the Harry Bridges committee, did pay the bills.

The committee found a long list of organizations under whose auspices he had lectured or with whom he had been associated. However, his own direct testimony of belonging to "front organizations," together with other facts testified to by him, and particularly his admitted statement quoted in the World Hails the Twentieth Anniversary of the Soviet Union convinces the committee that his philosophy of government is directly opposed to our ideals and system of government.

Upon consideration of all the evidence your committee finds the membership and association of Dr. William E. Dodd, Jr., with the organizations mentioned, and his expressed views and philosophies of government constitute subversive activity within the definition adopted by the committee, and that he is, therefore, unfit for the present to continue in Government employment.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN H. KERR, North Carolina,
Chairman.
ALBERT GORE, Tennessee.
CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico.
D. LANE POWERS, New Jersey.
FRANK B. KEEFE, Wisconsin.

Absenteeism in War Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS F. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, very recently we have heard much in the newspapers and over the radio about the shocking amount of absenteeism among the workers in our war industries. A prominent Member of Congress recently stated that in last December there were 12,700,000 man-hours lost in large industries due to absenteeism. That shocked the House. But some of us decided that facts are often meaningless unless analyzed, broken down, and interpreted. The first thought that occurred to me was that much absenteeism is naturally due to accidents. Obtaining from the Department of Labor the statistics on accidents in 1941—the latest obtainable—I discovered that the total of man-hours lost on account of accidents averaged very nearly 21,000,000 per month in 1941. Comparing that with the nearly 13,000,000 man-hours lost last December from all causes, I noted with satisfaction how greatly absenteeism decreased after Pearl Harbor. The total loss of man-hours from all causes last December, it will be noted, was less than the loss due to accidents alone in the preceding December.

These facts supply convincing proof that our American workers, men and women, are not slackers. I find, too, that much of the absenteeism is due to the fact that workers in industry now include many men and women beyond the age formerly at work. And that the physical standards have been lowered, even to the extent of permitting handicapped persons to have the opportunity to work. This is right and wise. Nevertheless, it stands to reason that workers over 50 or 60 and those who are classed as handicapped cannot be expected to work every day of every week at the hard jobs they are filling. Women, too, must naturally have to take a weekday off now and then, especially those who have a family including small children, who demand and must have attention. Sickness at home makes it imperative for the working mother to remain home for a day or two or longer. Taking all this into account, we are able to discount a lot of the uproar, much of which is fostered in order to prejudice the public against labor.

That is a terrible charge to have to make, but it is unfortunately true. True, too, is the fact that many of the accidents causing absenteeism could be prevented if sufficient safety devices were installed. That is what the crusading radio commentators and the press should bring to public attention. Stop accidents; improve sanitary conditions in plants where these are bad; provide for proper day care of the children of women workers; provide better and swifter transportation for war workers. Do all these things where necessary and thus cut down absenteeism to the minimum.

Yes; there are doubtless a few lazy and indifferent workers who are not interested in giving all they have to defeat the Axis. But confidential reports show that these disloyal workers are few in number and that this number is being decreased by closer checking, with dismissals in gross cases.

The real answer to the absenteeism charge is found in the statement made by Secretary of the Navy Knox that "Many ships are coming off the ways fully a year ahead of original expectations."

The same is true as to planes, tanks, and guns, which would seem to contradict the claim that absenteeism or anything else is holding up production.

If, upon careful investigation, avoidable absenteeism is found to be really high, I suggest that the right way to reduce such absenteeism is by such voluntary pledges as are now being made by the workers in various plants.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add this comment: These newspapers and radio commentators who are so disturbed by absenteeism could, if they would, do a real service by calling the public's attention to the fact that the casualties on the industrial front, to date, far exceeds the casualties on all fronts on which our Army, Navy, and Air Force are fighting.

Why, may I ask, do not the newspapers and the radio and the congressional committees that are so disturbed about absenteeism get busy and do something about this situation?

America at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House of Representatives, I am inserting the following article prepared by Mr. Louis J. Kehoe, attorney and writer, of Wellman and Washington, Iowa:

Congress as a unit of government in our constitutional system, and each Congressman and Senator as individuals, can well enter the new year with a period of serious reflection on the extraordinary responsibilities and dangers that lie ahead. They might also give consideration to their neglect and omissions in the past in the way they performed or failed to perform their constitutional duties as the representatives of the American people.

Never since the First Continental Congress has the legislative branch of our Government been confronted with the vital problems that involve the very continued existence of our representative form of government as will face Congress in the next 2 years.

The writer is not an officeholder or an office seeker, and the conclusions that follow are the result of many talks with a wide variety of the people that make up a true cross section of this country, so if some of the statements hereinafter made appear somewhat sensational, it can be said as an honest defense of said statements, that they are not in any way colored by expediency and are but an honest effort to describe existing realities as they really are, regardless of who happens to be hit by the implications of these realities.

REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT IS NOW BEING WEIGHED IN THE BALANCE BY THE PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY.

The people of the country are beginning to realize they are at the crossroads of their destiny as a Nation. They are becoming uncertain in an ever-increasing measure as to the effectiveness and durability of a representative form of government and are divided as to the possibility or desirability of retaining it as a system that should prevail in this country.

In the existing confusion brought on by the methodical assaults made by the executive department on the integrity and competency of the legislative department of our Government, and the continued and increasing encroachment of the executive department on the fundamental prerogatives of that division of government, which have gone almost unchallenged, the people are beginning to wonder whether or not their interests are best served by continuing allegiance to our constitutional system of representative government or whether their allegiance might better be given to a person who has arrogated to himself a monopoly on all that is honest, wise, and good for the people of this country.

In short, the burning question now in the minds of the people is: Shall it be government by popular representation or government by decree of an Executive acting through a multitude of puppet bureaus which are managed and controlled by the appointees of that Executive and answerable only to him as the self-anointed fountainhead of all government in this country?

Make no mistake, Mr. Member of Congress, those conflicting sentiments are regretfully

now in delicate balance in the minds and hearts of many Americans. That question with all its implications and consequences will be answered during your term of office, and the proper answer is your individual responsibility.

A few years ago all of us would have considered a crisis of this kind inconceivable, and many of you may still regard it so. You may choose to ignore this warning and proceed as you have so long done in the past, following lines of least resistance, and letting things take their course. If you do, America's greatest tragedy lies not far ahead. It has been said, "None are so blind as they who have eyes but will not see." Let is be hoped that your indifference to this situation will not provide one more added proof of the accuracy of that statement.

That this question has become an issue in the minds of many Americans is due in no small measure to the indifference of Members of Congress in the past 12 years, who were more concerned with political buck passing than they were with the courageous discharge of their duties as statesmen.

While Congressmen remained sleepily indifferent to the past encroachments of the executive department, the executive department of the Government has lost no opportunity and left nothing undone to take advantage of the sheepish attitude of Congress. It has fortified its popularity and entrenched its influence by ingratiating itself with the people in the reckless and lavish distribution of Government funds to the populace. This has purchased the esteem and confidence of the people for the Executive, and for the multitude of bureaus that have been set up to administer his decrees.

As the popularity and the prestige of the Executive has been enhanced by such executive generosity, the contempt of the people for their representative Congress has grown in the same ratio, until now many regard Congress as only a sheepish crowd of figureheads to be handled and controlled by the Executive as a shepherd would a herd of sheep.

Honestly, Mr. Member of Congress, can the people be blamed for this attitude?

Every successful business and every good businessman will take an inventory occasionally to see just where he stands and determine what factors have contributed either to the success or failure of his enterprise.

It is very necessary at this time that such an inventory in our Government policies be taken to honestly determine our present situation and perceive the course the Government is taking in this country, the mental attitude of our people and what is to be the probable result if the present trend is allowed to continue. Let this be the inventory of statesmen rather than politicians. At least while you are considering this subject, get your back up and avoid being cowed by the strong armed bureaucrats and pressure groups. Do not let the flag-waving bluster of the executive department with all its windy bureaucrats and opportunist dreamers deter you from dealing with realities. You are doing the most patriotic thing possible when you expose the fantastic dreamers and political fakers now infesting the executive division of our Government. Show them in their true colors as the advanced guard for a collectivist form of government they hope to have established in this country.

It has been rather disquieting to see some of these bureaucrats boldly defy Congress and brazenly state that regardless of congressional attitude they will enforce their bureaucratic regulations on our stunned and confused people. When Congress takes this rebuff and meekly submits to these autocratic bureaucrats and their arbitrary orders, it is small wonder that our people are beginning to have misgivings as to whether or not we still have a representative form of government in this country.

Henderson, Jeffers, Eastman, Byrnes, and other bureau heads have all very recently openly defied our elected representatives in Congress who were elected by us to make the laws, and contemptuously stated that their orders and decrees would be obeyed to the letter regardless of congressional attitude. They in effect have openly stated that they regard themselves as responsible only to the President and are not responsible to public sentiment and will not allow the elected representatives of the people to influence them.

Can a representative form of government tolerate such a rebuff to the chosen representatives of the people and meekly submit to such an exhibition of autocratic contempt from the Executive and his bureaucratic puppets and hope to survive? Obviously it cannot and will not. Much has been said in recent years about leadership and its necessity, and the writer or anyone else attempting to be reasonable will concede that adequate leadership is necessary. However, there is a distinction between leadership and dictatorship. What the people have expected is leadership by the Executive in working with Congress, but we have long since passed that place. This leadership has now developed into a dictatorship, with many of the peculiar characteristics of dictatorship as it now exists in the totalitarian nations we are now at war with.

While our men are dying to crush this dictator philosophy with all its evils in other countries, we must be on our guard to see that something of a like character will not get started here.

During the formative period of our constitutional form of government the matter of check and balance of power in that type of government perhaps received as much or more consideration than any other problem confronting the statesmen of that time, and in order to guard against danger to the representative nature of that type of government three divisions of influence and power were set up within our system of government, each to be a check on the other branches and provide a guarantee that no one division would develop into an autocratic system that would endanger the basic principles of a representative government of a free people. These three branches of government are known as the legislative, judicial, and executive departments. The legislative department to be composed of the elected representatives of the people to make the laws in accordance with the pattern provided by the Constitution, the judicial to interpret the laws to see that they in their nature do not violate any of the constitutional limitations, and the executive department to enforce the laws enacted and interpreted by the legislative and judicial divisions.

At the time our Government was founded the supreme dread of our early statesmen was that it should ever become an instrument of force in the hands of any individual or combination of individuals to prevent the people's free enjoyment of their personal liberties or to provide any individual or combination of individuals with a means of forcing on the people acceptance of the whims and notions of any one man or combination of men in matters of government.

Until the era commencing about 10 years ago the sphere of influence of each of these departments of Government was very generally respected and each of these departments was careful to stay within the limitations of its own department. Since that time the very thing the founders of our Government most dreaded has been gradually coming to pass, namely, a disposition on the part of one division of Government to dominate and control the other two branches—and as was perceived by them, this trend started in the executive department and has been growing with increasing speed each year, until now it is reaching alarming proportions.

No one who makes any pretense of observing current happenings the past few years will dispute the fact that authority and influence of the executive department of our Government has grown beyond all limitations contemplated in our Constitution and that the executive department has dominated and reformed the judicial department by adding to and changing the personnel of that department, until now it is little more than a subordinate division of the executive department, and whose remaining duties consist of little more than giving judicial color to the Executive's decrees. In line with this change, we have seen our Supreme Court give judicial sanction to revolutionary intrusions of pressure groups on the constitutional liberties and freedoms of the people of the country. We have seen this tribunal put the stamp of its approval of downright lawlessness by individual labor racketeers. We have seen this same august tribunal put the stamp of its approval on decrees of the Executive and ill-advised enactments of the Executive-dominated Congress that take away property rights and personal rights in open defiance of the provisions of the Constitution. We have seen the unprecedented exhibition of members of that august tribunal being shuttled from that position to head bureaus of the executive department, thus demonstrating the complete dominance of the executive department over the judiciary better than anyone could describe it. It is plain that the unorthodox decisions of the Supreme Court, as above described, were the result of the whip influence of the executive department, and any child would know they tended to destroy the very basic concepts of our constitutional freedom and liberties.

What has happened to the judicial division has also taken place with respect to the legislative branch of our Government. During the last decade government by representation has largely become a fiction, as each Congress since 1932 has spent a very large part of the time delegating its constitutional prerogatives to the executive branch of the Government, proposed laws were drafted by the Executive and the bureaus under his department and sent to Congress with a must order attached and often with peremptory directions that the proposed act must be passed without any modification, and at least in one very recent instance a time limitation was given by the Executive beyond which Congress was directed they must act, or else. Congress acted with the abject obedience that a trained animal would give under the lash of its trainer.

It is this tendency on the part of Congressmen in the past to follow the lines of least resistance, coupled with an unnatural aggressive attitude of an ambitious Executive that has produced a situation that now endangers the future of representative government in this country. During this period of congressional indifference and Executive aggression the people were lulled into a state of complacent security by the shrewd but questionably ethical conduct of the Executive in distributing Government benefits to various groups to prevent any noticeable or effective popular expression of resentment against this transfer of most governmental functions to the executive department.

This shifting of all government to the executive departments is progressing much faster this past year under the screen of war necessity, but there is still a very large amount of Government money being paid in benefits of one kind or other to keep the people calm while this transition in Government is being completed. When this is accomplished and the executive department takes full control, then we have dictatorship

regardless of what it is called, and regardless of the motives of those who have brought it about.

A dictator when simply described is nothing more than a self-appointed political trouble shooter; he is born of a crisis he thrives on and during a crisis, his continued existence depends on a continuing crisis, and he dies as a political factor when a crisis, either artificial or real, ceases to exist. It seems characteristic of all dictators or those who seek to be, to retain such extraordinary powers that they have and continue to seek more in order to perpetuate themselves as career-men saviors of their peoples. They will bring on one crisis after another in order to justify their continued political existence in that dictator role.

If we have the moral and political courage to look facts in the face when we examine the record of our political and economic maneuvers in this country for the past 10 years, we can perceive without much difficulty a well-defined trend to have the Executive seize upon one crisis after another to progressively develop executive dominance over all government in this country.

Even in face of many assurances given time after time by the Executive to the American people, that the growing centralization of power was to be but a temporary expedient to care for a then present crisis, we see little or no harmony between these assurances and subsequent activities of the executive branch of the Government. Only one consistency in the whole set-up meets the eye, and that is the consistency with which one crisis follows the other in the past 40 years and the consistency of the Executive in demanding and getting cumulative grants of additional power to meet those declared emergencies, many of which were artfully created by the executive department of our Government.

An examination of the legislative record of Congress for the 9 years preceding the war will reveal the disquieting knowledge that little has been done by our Congress but yield to the ever-growing demands of an Executive that more and more power be delegated to him and to provide huge appropriations of funds to finance the economic and social experiments carried on by the executive department under the grants of power given that department, until a very large part of the intimate and detailed activities of every person is controlled or regulated, not by law, but by Executive decree. Such a state of affairs was never contemplated by the Constitution or those who had any part in its preparation.

The above references are entirely directed to our activities in peacetime and has no reference to the vast added war powers authorized since the start of this war. No one desires to handicap the prosecution of the war effort by restricting the President unduly in the discharge of his duties, but it is disquieting to see these extraordinary powers surrendered by our elected representatives without definite assurance that they be returned at the conclusion of the war and not retained by the executive department on the pretext that the after-the-war crisis requires retention of such authority by the President and his puppet bureaus. Even in war Congress should preserve its prerogatives in our constitutional plan of government and discharge its duties with dignity and dispatch free of political logrolling, and where it is necessary to delegate additional power for efficiency in administration provision should be made to limit its use, exact an accounting to Congress by the agencies using it, and insure the termination of the grant at the conclusion of the war.

It is also disquieting to note the apparent inclination on the part of prominent persons in the executive department to toy with the idea that after the war some supergovernment must be established in the world to preserve the new order they hope to see established. They seem to be intrigued with some visionary plan to have existing nations, including our own, surrender a substantial part of their sovereignty to an international super-government reserving only to the member nations limited authority to deal with local matters of government. Such a program has been hinted at in the past by some rather prominent leaders in both parties who appear to be carried away in their zeal for a world new order that is supposed to insure absolute equality to all peoples in all lands. Granting that their motives may be noble, the writer cannot believe that after the war, even though we do win, we are going to be on the threshold of a heavenly era where the baser instincts of men and nations will have vanished and we can safely rely on any super-government composed of representatives of all world nations to secure to us the blessings of liberty and freedom we have been accustomed to enjoy under our constitutional democracy.

Until lately this international super-government for the world idea has only been hinted at by our political leaders, some of whom are in both parties. However, one of the leading proponents of such an arrangement seems to be vice President HENRY WALLACE. In a recent address he openly advocated such an international super-government calling it a federation of nations and plainly stated that under such a program we would be allowed to retain supervision over local and domestic matters (surely a generous condescension by Mr. WALLACE, the inference being that all other matters in which we as a nation would be interested would be under the control of this international super-government. Mr. Willkie recently made statements that indicate he too is playing around with some such idea and the President and other leaders of more or less national prominence seem to be flirting with an idea of this kind.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that if Congress neglects to restrain these emotional dreamers as Congress is supposed to do under our Constitution, they are very likely to initiate some such a program that will liquidate the sovereignty of this Nation and reduce us to the status of just one unit in an international supergovernment of federated nations.

It is to be hoped that this Congress will rise to its responsibility and will curb these political dreamers. It is hoped that this Congress will by its actions provide the American people with assurance that this war, even if won by the Allies, will not signal the end of our country as a sovereign and wholly independent Nation.

It would indeed be bitter irony for our young men who are fighting and dying for the purpose of preserving America as they knew and loved it, to return and find that political dreamers and idealists had used their efforts and sacrifices as a stepping stone to liquidate their independence and freedom in order to bring into being a fantastic international supergovernment. What a travesty on the memory of all those who fought and died during our early history and during our years of development as the greatest Nation on earth would be now, to have all the ideals and independence they struggled for sacrificed and thrown aside by those in whose care the Nation was entrusted.

It is also a bitter irony, when we hear our Government leaders harping about all they are doing to preserve the American way of life, to see America's independent business enterprises falling like autumn leaves under the barrage of bureaucratic assaults by the Government in their ill-advised war program. Private business in America is no less an essential basic consideration in keeping our way of life than is agriculture, labor, and other factors that make up our economy, and it is a disaster of major proportions, when we see responsible business concerns, that have endured for generations in some instances, falling a needless casualty of this war.

The writer knows of his own personal knowledge of 10 private business concerns out of 36 in 1 town, that are now out of business and their doors locked.

These are the same people who are asked and have demonstrated their willingness to buy bonds until it hurts and aid in the many other war activities. Some of these businessmen were leaders in these war programs. It is both inconsistent and unreasonable for the Government to demand further cooperation from these people, when they are being economically strangled by the mountains of red tape and bureaucratic Government restrictions and regulations put forth by the Government bureaus of the executive department, the personnel of which seems determined to put all business under their absolute and detailed control.

The present rationing system, regardless of the motives of persons responsible for it, is a distortion of reason and absolutely unworkable, and in its application is very unfair and inequitable. The large chain business concerns are given a very unfair advantage. They seem to have been allowed to have a plentiful supply of merchandise to sell, while the independent business is denied all but a token shipment on his orders. The result cannot be otherwise than business extinction for the independent operator, whether that result is intended or not by the Government.

The writer knows of his own personal knowledge of these instances, many of them, one of which is that an independently owned lumberyard in a town of about 1,000 population, whose credit is without question, can get but a handful of lumber and other building materials to sell, while in a town 8 miles away and smaller in size, a chain lumberyard gets all the lumber and building materials they require to carry on their business. Such a situation cannot mean anything but disaster for the independent concern.

This situation is particularly tragic, when we consider, that these independent business enterprises are about the only factor in our past economy that have not been subsidized by the Government in their grand distribution of benefits over the past few years. They are about the last of the self-sustaining units in our economy. They have not in the past and are not now asking Government benefits, and most of them would refuse them, for they know and realize the basic unsoundness of such a policy, but they do ask, that in their struggle for survival in this era of ruthless competition from the chain concerns, that they at least not be handicapped by their Government in this battle against extinction.

They are willing to do their full share in this war, and haven't asked, nor do they expect to ask any blanket exemptions of their help in the conduct of their work, like many other organizations, have sought and are continuing to seek preference to avoid military service. They are willing to do much more than their share in proportion to their resources than the big competitive outfits, but they hope to have this needless campaign against them by the Government stopped and they look to this Congress for relief from further outrageous and needless Government restrictions imposed on them by the executive bureaus, both during and after this war.

International Exchange Stabilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS F. FORD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the post-war period will be one pregnant with serious international problems, social, political, and economic.

One of the major problems that will be faced, must be solved if normal international trade is to be resumed.

That is the problem of international exchange stabilization. Two plans have been proposed. One by the Treasury Department of the United States sponsored by Secretary Morgenthau, and one by the Government of Great Britain, which seems to be what is known as the Keynes plan.

The fundamental difference, as I grasp it, is this: The Morgenthau plan would introduce a gold basis for this international credit mechanism. The Keynes plan makes it merely a bookkeeping credit, remotely tied to a final gold basis.

Personally, I like the Morgenthau plan. It seems to me to be in accord with the psychology of the present.

I am confident that businessmen the world over would feel that an international exchange unit based on gold would be more stable than one based on a mere bookkeeping entry.

It is important for many reasons, but the chief reason is that merchants the world over will want to know that when they sell a bill of merchandise they will receive the exact dollar equivalent in foreign exchange of the amount of the bill.

If I may be permitted at this point to make an observation, I desire to pay a tribute to Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury.

In times past it has been said that a former Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew Mellon, was the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Hamilton.

Mr. Speaker, I want to amend that statement by saying simply this. Secretary Mellon's task was merely to deal with a Treasury surplus. Admitted that such a situation involves problems, I beg leave to insist that they were minor problems with which any tyro could deal. Mr. Mellon dealt with them by remitting corporate and personal income taxes. With congressional approval, of course, that was a very popular program, human nature being what it is.

Secretary Morgenthau's problem was entirely different. He was called upon from the first day of his incumbency to deal with deficits which he inherited from the Hoover administration and which problem was and has been intensified every day of his incumbency. That he has carried on with deficits is a fact, not a fancy. That because of his masterly handling of the Nation's finances, we have been able to finance a war that costs more in a few months than the World War cost in its entirety, and has kept the national credit at the highest peak in its history and interest rates at the lowest is a genuine achievement which actually entitles him to the title of the greatest Secretary of the Treasury of all time.

I am sure that our modest and unassuming Secretary would be the first to deprecate this statement as exaggerated, but, Mr. Secretary, your modesty to the contrary notwithstanding, the facts speak for themselves.

Following the United States Coast Guard Around the Globe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1943, there appeared a speech by me on the subject of the Coast Guard in war.

The same subject is so graphically portrayed by Bainbridge Crist in the article entitled "Following the United States Coast Guard Around the Globe," which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star of April 18, 1943, that I desire that it shall be preserved in connection with that speech. I include that article as a part of these remarks:

FOLLOWING THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD AROUND THE GLOBE

(By Bainbridge Crist)

In this war, as in all others, the United States Coast Guard has been living up to its motto—Semper paratus—Always ready. In the last war it suffered the greatest proportionate loss of life among the commissioned personnel of the various services. Now, in the second World War of a generation, the Coast Guard is again in action—in the Atlantic, in the Solomons, and in the landings of north Africa.

In the short space of 2 years, the Coast Guard has grown 10 times, giving it a strength now of more than 170,000 men, including temporary reserves. It is now larger than the peacetime Navy. Its activities are many and varied. Its men guard docks, patrol beaches and harbors, the skies, man Navy transports and landing barges, and comb the high seas in the relentless quest for enemy submarines.

On the whole, the far-flung activities of the Coast Guard have been less publicized than those of other branches of the service. But when the Coast Guard has broken into the headlines it has been in a sensational manner. There was the story last summer of young Coast Guard man John C. Cullen, who discovered the Nazi saboteur on Long Island. Then, in March of this year, the Coast Guard cutter *Campbell* became front-page news in sinking a German U-boat while engaging in a 72-hour running fight with a "wolf pack" of submarines. And after that came the announcement that for the first time in history a Coast Guard man, Lloyd M. Morris, of California, had been awarded the Purple Heart decoration.

LANDING IN THE SOLOMONS

Perhaps one of the most dramatic letters of the war has come from a Coast Guard man, Lt. C. C. Humphreys, who took part in the landing operations in the Solomons. In a letter, which went to Coast Guard headquarters, he wrote to his brother:

"I wonder if the home fronters could picture the invasion of the Solomon Islands. This was the first real offensive move by United States forces in this war. Can you see our landing barges, loaded with troops, heading into the beach in the face of machine-gun fire, and the job of landing equipment and supplies while harried by naval gunfire, planes strafing and bombing. The entire crew working continuous watch, with no reliefs, to unload thousands of tons of guns, tanks, ammunition, provisions, etc., from the ship into boats.

"Running these big transports and the landing boats is one of the jobs of our Coast Guard personnel in this war. Each landing boat has a crew of 3 Coast Guard men. Then there is a Coast Guard officer (beachmaster) and about 40 of our men (beach party) who go on the beach to supervise the landing of the boats, the unloading, and repair and salvage of the boats when they get damaged or stranded.

"Can you imagine the transports in one of these operations being attacked by high-level bombers out of reach of the ships' gunfire, with those damn bombs dropping too close for comfort and now and then finding the mark?

"Then an attack by squadrons of Jap torpedo planes skimming just over the water at 250 or more miles per hour straight at the transport, 20 or more planes at one time, with flaming planes smacking the water all around and an occasional one going to roast in flames on the deck of a transport. The air full of machine gun, antiaircraft, and large-caliber shells from the transports and their destroyer and cruiser screen, all aimed at the planes, but hitting where they may among the closely packed ships.

"And the falling shrapnel? The terrific din like the inside of 40 boiler factories and the whole area within a 5-mile radius full of tracers and bursts like an explosion in a fireworks store. And not one plane left to tell Tojo what happened. Just smoke columns rising out of the sea and a blazing transport falling out of line.

NIGHT ATTACK

"Imagine 30 or 40 or more ships in close formation during such an attack with a few submarines, shore batteries, and dive bombers thrown in for good measure. No; they couldn't imagine what that would be like unless they were there, and even then, memory being mercifully short, vivid scenes fade in a few weeks.

"Nor could they picture a night attack by enemy cruisers and destroyers, with enemy planes dropping liverish green flares over them, the better for the enemy ships to see them, my dear, and the stillness and blackout on the ships in the slender hope that the enemy eyes and ears won't see or hear, because, after all, what chance could a transport, or 20 of them, have against cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. The 'home front' ought to see what happens to a ship when a few cruisers let go broadsides at it point-blank range at night. And they should see what happens to the crew of that ship. We saw 3 days of this sort of stuff in the August 7 attack on Guadalcanal and Tulagi."

There is a place in the Solomons called Sleepless Lagoon, well known to the men of the Coast Guard who served there. After spending 2 days and nights landing marines and supplies on the beach at Guadalcanal in the original invasion, a group of Coast Guardsmen were ordered to take their boats offshore, anchor them, and get some sleep.

But, in the words of Petty Officer James D. Fox:

"We didn't get much sleep though. It was raining as hard as I've ever seen it come down, which made it mighty uncomfortable, to begin with. Then, just as we were getting accustomed to those elements, the Jap Fleet let go with all they had at our ships offshore. The battle lasted all night—the most terrific naval fight I've ever seen, and, while it was spectacular as a fireworks display, it wasn't very soothing. Sleep was about out of the question, not only that night, but every following night. It became known as Sleepless Lagoon."

Officer Fox, who once fled his tent with 72 holes from Jap shrapnel and bullets, said Coast Guardsmen did not confine themselves to operating boats, but dug their own machine-gun nests, while others joined artillerymen in manning guns or joined the infantry. Other jobs included picking up flyers forced into the sea or making "sneak" trips by boat to Tulagi, a distance of 18 miles from Guadalcanal, to pick up supplies.

INVASION OF NORTH AFRICA

In the United States invasion of north Africa, too, the Coast Guard was active supervising the unloading of transports on a 24-hour basis, putting men ashore, as well as ambulances, tanks, and jeeps. Each barge carried nachine guns for antiaircraft protection. Most of the invasion barge instructors, it is said, are former surfmen from Coast Guard stations, who are accustomed to handling boats under all kinds of weather and seas. The motto of the surfman, by the way, is: "You have to go out, but you don't have to come back."

Six Coast Guard men of an advanced unit helped pave the way for a mass landing of American troops at Fedala. The job was to find out if the French had detected troopships offshore, and to do this they had to spend an hour on the Moroccan beach, close to the heavy guns of the coast. After moving as close to the garrison as possible, the men finally signaled with a flashlight to the troopships that all was well.

Although Coast Guard aviation operates under Navy direction it has preserved its own unity for administrative purposes. In the first 6½ months of the war, Coast Guard aviators flew 23,442 hours, in which 17,842,231 square miles were searched and patrolled and 2,245,357 were cruised. And in that same period, when the total strength was only about 100 planes and 107 pilots, 6,032 patrol flights were made, with 63,233 surface vessels and 12,051 planes identified.

THE FOOD BOMB

At the Elizabeth City, N. J., Air Station, 2 enlisted Coast Guard men, Harvold V. Booth and Frederick J. Denis, perfected the food bomb which is dropped to survivors of torpedoed ships. The so-called bomb, said to resemble a depth charge, has a soft concrete cap, which disintegrates in contact with the water. It includes 7 cans of water, a first-aid kit, a pint of whisky, 2 rations, and several packs of cigarettes and matches. In the first 6 months of last year, 310 assistance flights were made, resulting in the rescue of 508 survivors picked up by surface vessels directed to the scene by air.

The Coast Guard reports that in general its air activities fall into 3 categories—patrol, search, and convoy coverage. Coast Guard aviation got its start back in 1915 at Hampton Roads, Va. It was tried because of the number of schooners which were disabled off the coast. The idea worked of facilitating rescues by planes and the following year an appropriation act authorized the Coast Guard to establish, equip, and maintain 10 air stations along the shores of the United States. The service has grown by stages throughout the year, so that by 1941 the Coast Guard had 92 pilots, all graduates of the naval air station at Pensacola. By July of this year, Coast Guard expects to commission 80 more aviators and have an additional 160 enlisted pilots.

ON THE HOME FRONT

The Coast Guard is active on the home front, too. One new unit is the volunteer port security force, which started in Philadelphia to help protect piers from sabotage, fires, and other preventable accidents. Dr. Arnaude C. Marts, president of Bucknell University, who headed the plan in Philadelphia, is now in Washington with the rank of captain in charge of organizing similar units in other cities. Baltimore is already organized.

Under the plan, men who are too old or otherwise unavailable for the draft, are asked to volunteer for 12 hours a week or more to guard piers in their home cities. They are issued uniforms, which they wear only while on duty; carry arms and are subject to military discipline while on duty. They are not paid. In Philadelphia 800 men applied for duty within 48 hours after the plan was announced in the newspapers.

Then there is the Coast Guard "picket patrol," made up of all sorts of small and medium-sized boats. The main jobs of these boats in the fight against submarines are observation and rescue. With the Navy lacking sufficient vessels for the undertaking, the Coast Guard got the assignment of procuring private boats and fitting them out.

Sailing vessels, the Coast Guard states, have proven valuable in observation work, for their ability to move through the water silently gives greater sensitivity in listening for submarines or avoiding detection by undersea craft. The average motor yacht is usually not sent so far offshore or for such long periods. Men in this service include bankers, brokers, a former member of Congress, yachtsmen, school teachers, factory workers and young college boys.

Another wartime function of the Coast Guard is administering laws regarding construction, equipment, manning, and inspection of commercial vessels. This work, once handled by the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation of the Department of Commerce, is now in the hands of the Merchant Marine Inspection Division of the Coast Guard, headed by Capt. H. C. Shepheard.

The history of the Coast Guard goes back over a period of more than 150 years, starting back in 1790 when Congress authorized the establishment of a fleet for a revenue cutter service. Although its primary function was to prevent smuggling, an act of 1797 authorized the cutters to defend the coasts. It was not until 1915, however, that the revenue cutter service was made into the Coast Guard. It was constituted as a military force of the United States, operating under the Treasury in peacetime and as part of the Navy in war or when the President so orders it.

The Smear Still Continues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, that the smear still continues is evidenced by the article by David Lawrence printed under the date line of March 3, 1943:

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

(By David Lawrence)

THE CAMPAIGN TO SMEAR CONGRESS

WASHINGTON, March 3.—Just about the time Congress shows signs of regaining its independence, the new dealers have started to smear the legislative body with the charge that it is interfering with the war effort.

The transparency of the charge and the motive behind it will be more apparent in the coming weeks, but it is a strange commentary on what has become almost an obsession with the new dealers, namely, that the legislative branch of the Government need not function, especially in wartime.

For nearly 10 years now the Congress has been an obedient rubber stamp for the executive agencies and now, when the people in the 1942 elections expressed their protest and send independent-minded representatives to Congress, a hue and cry is raised about it by the administration's spokesmen.

It is true the Congress could theoretically by obstructive measures interfere with the war effort but as long as the President possesses the veto power it is unlikely that any proposal of that nature could become law. Many observers forget that the Chief Executive, under the Constitution, is not only more powerful than two-thirds of one House of Congress but more powerful also than a roll call in the other House if it happens to record one less vote than a two-thirds majority.

Any bill which can command the two-thirds vote of both Houses necessary to override a veto is likely to be a popular measure wanted by the people. Such a bill would inevitably require the support of a substantial number of members of both political parties, and it is not probable that any obstructive measure damaging to the war effort could command such a big bipartisan vote.

So the administration supporters are really drawing a smoke screen across the Congress issue and are trying to prevent that body from asserting its prerogatives and expressing its judgment on matters vital to the people. The best thing that can happen to a constitutional democracy, particularly in wartime, is to let the legislative body debate and discuss proposals for the government of the whole people. If the Congress doesn't participate in the lawmaking process and attempts are made—as has happened too often recently—to write laws by means of Government regulations with the excuse that broad powers are contained in the original statute, the confidence of the people in government is weakened.

In a war to preserve democracy it is important that democratic institutions be not impaired. The effort to smear Congress and charge it with desiring to interfere with the war program is so palpably a ruse to divert public support from the National Legislature that it ought to be labeled what it is and exposed to view.

It is significant that the cry of too much interference by Congress is coming almost entirely from New Deal quarters. But it will neither intimidate nor swerve Congress from reasserting its legislative function.

The American people will endure hardships if they are convinced these are necessary. One reason they sometimes look with skepticism on rationing rules is because they do not have confidence in the bureaus which issue the regulations. And one reason why that confidence is lacking is because the people's representatives in Congress have been ignored.

The idea that Congress is superfluous has been assiduously cultivated by new dealers for nearly a decade. Their first set-back came in the last elections and now some of them are trying to overcome the effects of that mandate by a cry of lack of patriotism. Congress has before it several proposals which should not be passed, as, for instance, any reduction in the figures on manpower set by the joint Chiefs of Staff as necessary. But the debate on that particular item will do more to clarify the need and get public support for a big army than an Executive order which has been developed in secret.

Congress is cumbersome at times, and even unwieldy, but it is the people's own body, and with all its defects it is still the custodian of legislative power in our democracy.

Only the Theater Could Do It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, last week the American theater performed another of its modern miracles. Along with the daily demonstrations by the Stage Door Canteen of New York and Washington it manifested anew that with all of its make-believe, at heart and at the base the institution itself is built on the humanities and is among the eternal arts.

This miracle participated in by 750 persons produced the very tangible and substantial sum of a quarter of a million dollars for the American Red Cross.

Perhaps we are all too prone to accept the theater as something trivial or, at the most, of passing value. That such a conception is false is proven again by this exhibition.

That we may more fully appreciate the continuous efforts and achievements of the theater I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House as well as to the country at large, an editorial from the April issue of Equity. This should be read by every thankful citizen who finds enjoyment in the theater and who will be happy to be reminded of another of its good works:

ONLY THE THEATER COULD DO IT

On Monday night, April 5, the entertainment world presented a benefit for the Red Cross at Madison Square Garden, New York. The pageant which served as a finale was conceived by President Bert Lytell, of Equity, and enlisted the services of some 750 persons, stars of the theater, motion pictures, radio and music, choruses from half a dozen theaters, servicemen, bands, and actors of all sorts.

As it reached its stirring climax, when 300 girls in white uniforms, each carrying a bouquet of red carnations, marched up the stairs to form a huge red cross, the audience rose in unanimous tribute.

It was a great show for a great cause, and Equity extends its thanks and appreciation not only to its own members, but to all the persons who played any part in its presentation. As a good sailor once said when asked who had been responsible for winning a naval victory: "There is glory enough for all."

There was more than that in this spectacle for the Red Cross, for that splendid organization will receive in the neighborhood of $250,000 as the result of this effort.

But it occurs to Equity, also, that only the theater or, if you choose, only the entertainment world could have created, prepared, and presented this production. Only its people, who have the experience and skill to undertake such a project and to attract such a patronage.

That experience and skill, when coupled with the readiness that is found nowhere so often and so eager to serve as in the theater, is a valuable asset to the Red Cross and to the country at large.

It is something which is not universally appreciated at its true value, Equity believes, and is too often scattered and dissipated in nonessentials. Other nations in this crisis are better aware of its possibility than we are and make better use of resources not as well equipped as our own. But it should not merely be appreciated but paid for, as the Government pays for all other services it commands in this crisis, and it is worthy of any pay it may receive.

When Mr. Lytell, at that show, pledged the resources of the theater, to the service of the Red Cross and of the country, he was making no idle promise. The theater is behind him in that pledge and stands ready and eager to answer the call.

But as yet there is no coordinated program to utilize the full resources of the theaters, or to obtain the maximum use of the talents it has to devote to that work.

There are beginnings of such use in several directions, but they are no more than beginnings. The camp shows are doing a great work, but they are so few in number that they do not begin to cover even all of the camps, let alone playing to all the men in the camps they visit.

The Lunchtime Follies have visited a few dozen plants where they might play in thousands. And their value has been attested wherever they have gone.

Aside from these ventures the great problem of arousing and educating the civilian population has had just one tentative touch, the production to teach food conservation which has recently been organized by the United States Department of Agriculture.

But there are still many things which the theaters could do better than any other agency which have never been explored, have, perhaps, scarcely been discussed.

We have always been a wasteful people and careless of our natural resources. The war is teaching us to have more respect for material resources, but we could still learn from other nations the value of our potential resources of mind and talent which lie untouched and, it may be, unsuspected.

There is still no better way to teach many lessons than by dramatic presentation. Equity hopes that the Government will realize that soon and will turn to the theater for the ideas, personnel, and material for that program. If it does, it will not turn in vain.

But the theater must be permitted to continue if it is to furnish such assistance. A theater which has been denied priorities, which has been deprived of its ability to travel, which has been drained of money and personnel cannot serve as it would like or as it could. If the theater is essential to this war effort, and Equity is convinced that it is, then it must be treated as an essential industry by the Government. For it is only the Government which can do that. And this Equity asks not as a privilege but as a right to enable it to serve the Government and the people of this country.

A Bill Proposing To Remove Discriminatory Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing H. R. 2547, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to provide for the establishment of scales of rates, according to zones, for the transportation of property by common carriers by railroads.

Senator TOM STEWART, of Tennessee, will introduce the same bill in the Senate. The bill has been very carefully prepared by experts and is considered by informed persons to be the best approach to the problem of eliminating discriminatory freight rates.

We expect to arrange for committee hearings as soon as possible.

The text of the bill is as follows:

A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to provide for the establishment of scales of rates, according to zones, for the transportation of property by common carriers by railroad

Be it enacted, etc., That part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 1 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 1a. (1) For the purpose of the establishment, as provided in this section, of rates for the transportation of property by common carriers by railroad subject to this part, the United States shall be divided by the Commission into units of area 30′ square, identical with a quarter of the area formed by the intersecting parallels of latitude and meridians of longitude, represented on appropriate maps or plans, and such units of area shall be the basis of eight railroad rate zones, as follows:

"(a) The first zone shall include all territory within such quadrangle, in conjunction with every contiguous quadrangle, representing an area having a mean radial distance of approximately 50 miles from the center of any given unit of area.

"(b) The second zone shall include all units of area outside the first zone lying in whole or in part within a radius of approximately 150 miles from the center of a given unit of area.

"(c) The third zone shall include all units of area outside the second zone lying in whole or in part within a radius of approximately 300 miles from the center of a given unit of area.

"(d) The fourth zone shall include all units of area outside the third zone lying in whole or in part within a radius of approximately 600 miles from the center of a given unit of area.

"(e) The fifth zone shall include all units of area outside the fourth zone lying in whole or in part within a radius of approximately 1,000 miles from the center of a given unit of area.

"(f) The sixth zone shall include all units of area outside the fifth zone lying in whole or in part within a radius of approximately 1,400 miles from the center of a given unit of area.

"(g) The seventh zone shall include all units of area outside the sixth zone lying in whole or in part within a radius of approximately 1,800 miles from the center of a given unit of area.

"(h) The eighth zone shall include all units of area outside the seventh zone.

"(2) It shall be the duty of the Commission, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, to establish scales of carload and less-than-carload rates for the transportation, by common carriers by railroad subject to this part, of each commodity or class of commodities transported by such carriers, and to prescribe, in such scales, just and reasonable rates which are uniform in relation to distance throughout the United States; except that for any particular character of service, in the case of any particular commodity or class of commodities, (a) the same rate shall be made to apply with respect to transportation from any point of origin within any unit of area established

pursuant to paragraph (1) of this section to every point of destination within such unit of area, and (b) the same rate shall be made to apply with respect to transportation from any point of origin within any such unit of area to every point of destination within any given zone established pursuant to paragraph (1) of this section.

"(3) The Commission, upon complaint or upon its own initiative, and after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to interested parties, may from time to time make such modifications in the rates prescribed by it under this section, not inconsistent with the provisions thereof, as it shall find to be just and reasonable.

"(4) The rates prescribed by the Commission under this section shall be published, maintained, and charged by common carriers by railroad subject to this part, for the transportation service to which such rates apply, and after such rates have become effective no other rates shall be published, maintained, or charged by such common carriers for such transportation service."

SEC. 2. In order to give effect to the provisions of section 1a of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, the Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized and directed—

(1) to prepare and make public, by such procedures as may be appropriate, within 9 months after the enactment of this act, proposed rates to carry out the provisions of such section;

(2) to enter upon hearings, within 12 months after the enactment of this act, concerning such proposed rates; and

(3) to issue, after full hearings, an order or orders, to become effective not later than 2 years from the commencement of such hearings, prescribing such rates as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of such section.

SEC. 3. All provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, which are inconsistent with the provisions of section 1a thereof, are hereby repealed.

Home Labor Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, in these stirring times, attention is seldom focused upon the problems or the conditions of the many thousands of sound, progressive communities which have not been given war training activities or war industries. We will do well not to lose sight of these communities, for it is their normal, healthy existence which will show the way to better living when peace returns. I have read an able discussion of one phase of this situation, and I call it to the attention of the Congress. It was written by my friend Stanley Parkman in the Gadsden County Times at Quincy, Fla.:

HOME LABOR PROBLEMS

There is a great deal being said in the newspapers about the labor problems of the Nation and when the subject is discussed it usually relates to some difficulty that is being encountered with organized labor in the vast industrial centers. There is also another type of labor problem—one that has nothing to do with strikes and that seldom gets on the front pages. It is the problem of the small employer in cities like Quincy and in sections like Gadsden County.

This particular labor problem reaches even the housewife who employs only a cook or a nurse and strikes hardest at the employer who is in no way connected with war industry but is trying to hold his little business together in times that are most difficult.

Many people have left Gadsden County and places like it all over the Nation, seeking fortunes in war industry and "mushroom" businesses. More and more of these war-inspired businesses have developed nearby and with each one of them more people are drawn from this county. Most people are familiar with the sacrifices they must make in living comforts in the crowded defense centers but are lured by wages that often double their salaries in Gadsden County.

There are a number of vital factors that should be taken into consideration by our people, however, before they leave the things they have built up here. A primary consideration should be the fact that employment in Gadsden County has been steady for a long time. It has never been spasmodic. The number of jobs available and the wages paid for those jobs have generally increased. Most employers take a personal interest in the people working for them and are willing to make sacrifices that employees might be kept with a feeling of security.

When the war is won, if Quincy and Gadsden County follow their present policy, there will be no automatic removal of war industry and "mushroom" business, because they never will have been here. There will be no throng of people thrown out of jobs here with disregard by their employers as to their future welfare. If anything in this Nation survives this war and is stable after the victory, it will be good, solid, farming sections like Gadsden County.

Local employers are doing the very best they can during trying times. Many of them are losing money every month in an effort to keep their employees on present wage scales. Most Gadsden County businesses are making less money than they were before the war, and those that have been in a position to step up profits are doing so in competition to the shipyards and hundreds of other war industries.

It will be wise for employees in our section to take all these factors into consideration before making changes. Remember these things before making demands for salaries that compare with those of war industries. And, remember that every effort is being made to hasten the victory that will make you want to come back to Gadsden County to live.

In the Interest of Farmers and Agriculture in General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have voted today to eliminate subsidy payments, parity payments, conservation payments, incentive payments, or payments in any other form to the farmers from the agriculture bill because, unfortunately, the farm leaders have refused to agree that those expenditures or credits by the Government, running into many millions, should be taken into consideration in fixing the parity prices. I called attention to the matter when the Pace bill and the Steagall bill were up for consideration, and on which bills I reported special rules making them in order for immediate consideration.

I then pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the agricultural leaders were making the same mistakes that some of the labor leaders had made in the past. Fortunately, the labor leaders, with the exception of Mr. Lewis, have not made any unreasonable demands. They have shown real patriotism, and that is, indeed, gratifying at this time.

Unfortunately, that is not the case with the agricultural leaders, notwithstanding that agriculture, in contrast with the wage earners, especially the white-collar men and women who have not received any increases in their meager wages and salaries when the prices of food have been soaring sky high, having advanced in some instances 100 and 200 percent. And this, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that agriculture last year and this year has received various governmental aids and the prices of farm products have advanced from 200 to 500 percent above the prices of recent years.

Regardless of what the farm leaders say, I know that 95 percent of the farmers of this country are better off than ever before and do not themselves ask or seek the unfair legislation that would still further burden the cost of living of those of small earnings.

If the farm leaders persist in their unreasonable pressure they will find themselves in the same unfavorable positions that some of the more unreasonable labor leaders found themselves a year or two ago. Labor leaders generally have seen the error of their ways and are acting with intelligence and wisdom. I wonder if the farm leaders will see the light.

Back in 1907, when I entered the House under a Republican administration, the total appropriation for the Agricultural Bureau, in the interest of agriculture and the farmers generally throughout the country, amounted to around $24,000,000.

Since President Franklin D. Roosevelt's election the appropriations in the interest of agriculture amounted to that much on the average per week. In other words, we have appropriated on the average per week for the past 10 years as much for the farmers and agriculture as we had appropriated for the entire year of 1907. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot quite understand why the farmers of the country fail to realize and appreciate the benefits and advantages that have accrued to them, the aid given them, under the Roosevelt administration. Is it possible that they are misled and not informed of the facts? Surely they owe some recognition to and appreciation of the party that has done so much for them. Instead, all I hear is criticism and a clamoring for more and more benefits, not on the part of the individual farmers themselves, but by the highly paid professional legislative farm representatives and, yes, lobbyists. I cannot quite understand that the farmers should fail to show some degree of reciprocity to those who have helped them so tremendously as this administration.

PRICES AND BENEFITS UNDER HOOVER—PRICES AND BENEFITS UNDER ROOSEVELT

Have the farmers forgotten that under the Hoover Republican administration and before Roosevelt took office in many instances they were obliged to leave part of their crops unharvested, not because of a shortage of labor, but because of the low prices then obtainable for their crops?

Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that they have forgotten that wheat was selling for around 29 cents, corn for 19 cents, hogs and cattle for 3 cents a pound, and cotton for 5 cents a pound, and all other vegetable, fruit, and dairy products at correspondingly low prices? This was at a time when their farms were being sold.

Realizing that the human memory is short I again call attention to and insert the prices received by farmers for their commodities in 1932 under the Hoover administration, and in 1943 under the Roosevelt administration:

Farm prices	1932	1943
Wheat	$0.38 per bushel	$1.19 per bushel.
Corn	$0.31 per bushel	$0.90 per bushel.
Oats	$0.15 per bushel	$0.55 per bushel.
Rye	$0.28 per bushel	$0.64 per bushel.
Barley	$0.22 per bushel	$0.70 per bushel.
Peans (dried)	$1.97 per bushel	$5.37 per bushel.
Cattle	$4.25 per hundredweight (4¼ cents per pound).	$12.36 per hundredweight (12⅜ cents per pound).
Hogs	$3.34 per hundredweight (5⅓ cents per pound).	$14.63 per hundredweight (14⅝ cents per pound).
Calves	$4.95 per hundredweight (5 cents per pound).	$14.18 per hundredweight (14⅕ cents per pound).
Sheep	$2.19 per hundredweight (2⅕ cents per pound).	$7.09 per hundredweight (7⅐ cents per pound).

Mr. Speaker, naturally we all have great admiration and respect for the individual farmers of the Nation. As a Member of Congress for 37 years, and chairman of the Committee on Rules for many years, I have always supported legislation that aided agriculture and the farmers, though the district I represent in Chicago comprises wholly an urban constituency.

CONCLUSION

However, in the future I shall be guided by the action of Members representing agricultural districts whether they will at times give favorable consideration to legislation bearing on the needs of millions of wage earners who, unlike the farmers, have no home of their own, who are obliged to pay high rents and buy all of their necessities and foods out of their meager earnings which have not increased despite the fact that foodstuffs have risen I appreciate that there is a large spread between what the farmer receives and what the consumers are obliged to pay for farm products. This situation deserves and will receive shortly a thorough investigation.

In conclusion I call upon the farmers of this Nation to be fair and show appreciation to an administration that has done so much for them.

I Confess My Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek from the Washington Evening Star of April 19, 1943:

"I CONFESS MY FAITH"—MME. CHIANG PLACES CONFIDENCE FOR GUIDANCE IN PRAYER—GENERALISSIMO'S WIFE TELLS HOW FIRES OF DOUBT FORGED DESIRE TO DO GOD'S WILL

(Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, like her husband, China's leader, is a Christian. She and her brothers and sisters are members of the Methodist Church and were educated in American colleges. In this article, which follows one by Generalissimo Chiang in which he professed his religious beliefs, she discusses her life as a Christian.)

(By Mme. Chiang Kai-shek)

By nature I am not a religious person. At least not in the common acceptance of that term. I am not by nature a mystic. I am practical minded. Mundane things have meant much to me, perhaps too much. Mundane, not material things. I care more for a beautiful celadon vase than for costly jewels.

I am more disturbed as I traverse the crowded, dirty streets of an interior city than I am by the hazards of flying with poor visibility, which my husband and I experienced the other day. Personal danger means nothing to me. But I am concerned that my schools for the children of the revolutionary heroes shall raise for them, and perhaps for the communities in which they return, the standard of living, and the quality of life.

QUESTIONING MIND

Also, I am more or less skeptical. I used to think faith, belief, immortality were more or less imaginary. I believed in the world seen, not the world unseen. I could not accept things just because they had always been accepted. In other words, a religion good enough for my fathers did not necessarily appeal to me. I do not yet believe in the predigested religion in palatable, sugar-coated doses.

I knew my mother lived very close to God. I recognized something great in her. And I believe that my childhood training influenced me greatly, even though I was more or less rebellious at the time. It must often have grieved my beloved mother that I found family prayers tiresome and frequently found myself conveniently thirsty at the moment, so that I had to slip out of the room.

Like my brothers and sisters, I always had to go to church and I hated the long sermons. But today I feel that this church-going habit established something, a kind of stability, for which I am grateful to my parents.

MOTHER ALMOST SPARTAN

My mother was not a sentimental parent. In many ways she was a Spartan. But one of my strongest childhood impressions is of mother going to a room she kept for the purpose on the third floor to pray. She spent hours in prayer, often beginning before dawn. When we asked her advice about anything, she would say, "I must ask God first."

And we could not hurry her. Asking God was not a matter of spending 5 minutes to ask Him to bless her child and grant the request. It meant waiting upon God until she felt His leading. And I must say that whenever mother prayed and trusted God for her decision, the undertaking invariably turned out well.

As long as mother lived I had a feeling that whatever I did, or failed to do, mother would pray me through. Though she insisted that she was not our intercessor, that we must pray ourselves, yet I know for a certainty that many of her long hours of prayer were spent interceding for us. Perhaps it is because religion in my mind is associated with such a mother that I have never been able to turn from it entirely.

NO PRAYERS AGAINST JAPAN

One day I was talking with her about the imminent Japanese menace, and I suddenly cried out in irresistible intensity of feeling:

"Mother, you're so powerful in prayer. Why don't you pray that God will annihilate Japan—by an earthquake or something?"

She turned her face away for a time. Then looking gravely at me she said: "When you pray, or expect me to pray, don't insult God's intelligence by asking Him to do something which would be unworthy even of you, a mortal."

That made a deep impression on me. And today I can pray for the Japanese people, knowing that there must be many who, like Kagawa, suffer because of what their country is doing to China.

During the last 7 years I have suffered much. I have gone through deep waters because of the chaotic conditions in China; the lopping off of our richest provinces, the death of my saintly mother, flood, famine, and the intrigues of those who should have been helping to unify the country.

All these things have made me see my own inadequacy; more than that, all human insufficiency. To try to do anything for the country seemed like trying to put out a great conflagration with a cup of water.

THREE PHASES TO RELIGION

During these years of my married life, I have gone through three phases as related to my religion. First, there was a tremendous enthusiasm and patriotism—a passionate desire to do something for my country. Here was my opportunity. With my husband, I would work ceaselessly to make China strong. I had the best of intentions. But something was lacking. There was no staying power. I was depending on self.

Then came the second phase. These things that I have referred to happened, and I was plunged into dark despair. A terrible depression settled on me—spiritual despair, bleakness, desolation. At the time of my mother's death, the blackness was greatest. A foreign foe was on our soil in the north, a discontented political faction in the south, famine in the northwest, floods threatening the millions who dwell in the Yangtze Valley. And my beloved mother taken from me. What was left?

And then I realized that spiritually I was failing my husband. My mother's influence on the general had been tremendous. His own mother was a devout Buddhist. It was my mother's influence and personal example that led him to become a Christian.

KEPT HIS PROMISE

Too honest to promise to be one just to win her consent to our marriage, he had promised my mother that he would study Christianity and read the Bible. And I suddenly realized that he was sticking to his promise, even after she was gone, but losing because there were so many things he did not understand.

I began to see that what I was doing to help, for the sake of the country was only a substitute for what he needed. I was letting him head toward a mirage when I knew of the oasis. Life was all confusion. I had been in the depths of despair. Out of that, and the feeling of human inadequacy, I was driven back to my mother's God.

I knew there was a power greater than myself. I knew God was there. But mother was no longer there to do my interceding for me. It seemed to be up to me to help the general spiritually, and in helping him I grew spiritually myself.

Thus I entered into the third period, where I wanted to do, not my will, but God's. Life is really simple, and yet how confused we mak. it. In old Chinese art, there is just one outstanding object, perhaps a flower, on a scroll. Everything else in the picture is subordinate to that one beautiful thing.

CALLS ON GOD FOR GUIDANCE

An integrated life is like that. What is that one flower? As I see it now, it is the will of God. But to know His will, and do it, calls for absolute sincerity, absolute honesty with one's self, and it means using one's mind to the best of one's ability.

I used to pray that God would do this or that. Now I pray only that God will make His will known to me.

God speaks to me in prayer. Prayer is not self-hypnotism. It is more than meditation. The Buddhist priests spend days in meditating. In meditation, the source of strength is one's self. But when one prays he goes to a source of strength greater than his own. I wait to feel His leading, and His guidance means certainty.

In the feudal time of the Three Kingdoms, there was an old general called Ts'ao Ts'ao. Once upon a time he was going on a long march. His soldiers were weary, thirsty, discouraged. He said to them, "From my horse I can see a beautiful garden, full of luscious plums." Their mouths watered, new strength and courage came to them. But for how long? The plum garden did not materialize, and the soldiers were more weary than before.

TEMPORARY BUOYANCY

That to me is like meditation. There is a buoyancy of spirit for a time. It may help when there is no oasis in sight. But when I am spiritually thirsty, I do not think of plum gardens—I go to the fountain of living water.

Prayer is our source of guidance and balance. God is able to enlighten the understanding. I am often bewildered, because my mind is only finite. I question and doubt my own judgments. Then I seek guidance, and when I am sure, I go ahead, leaving the results with Him.

Our finite minds beside His infinite mind seems to me like this: I go walking and the hills loom above me, range upon range, one against the other. I cannot tell where one begins and another leaves off. But from the air (I seldom have time to travel any other way now) everything has a distinct contour and form. I can see things so much more clearly. Perhaps that is like my mind and God's. And when I talk with Him, He lifts me up where I can see clearly.

I do not think it is possible to make this understandable to one who has not tried it. To explain to one who has had no experience of getting guidance what it means would be like trying to make a stone-deaf person understand the beauty of a Chopin sonata.

What I do want to make clear is that whether we get guidance or not, it's there. It's like tuning in on the radio. There's music in the air, whether we tune in or not. By learning to tune in, one can understand. How is it done? As Brother Lawrence told us long ago, "by practicing the presence of God." By daily communion with Him. One cannot expect to be conscious of God's presence when one has only a bowing acquaintance with Him.

In conclusion, with me religion is a very simple thing. It means to try with all my heart and soul and strength and mind to do the will of God.

I feel that God has given me a work to do for China. In this Province of Kiangsi, thousands of fertile rice fields are now devastated ruins; hundreds of thousands of families have been rendered homeless. Rural rehabilitation must follow, helping the farmers back to their land and to better conditions of life. This is no small task. In fact, China's problems in some ways are greater today than ever before.

But despondency and despair are not mine today. I look to Him who is able to do all things, even more than we ask or think. At this time of writing, I am with my husband in the heart of the bandit area. Constantly exposed to dangers, I am unafraid. I know that nothing can happen either to the general or to me till our work is done.

President's Trip Has Earmarks of Beginning of Fourth-Term Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday's press announcements of President Roosevelt's inspection trip came as no surprise to the Members of this House. We have known for a week that he was making this trip, but have refrained from saying anything about it because we knew that the press was gagged and there would be no news releases until the green light was given.

Significantly, Mr. Speaker, this trip by the President closely followed the return of Postmaster General Frank Walker, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, from a coast-to-coast political inspection tour. And the President's itinerary has taken him through States where it is known his political fences are sagging badly.

For my part I believe it would be far more important right now for the President to give some personal attention to General MacArthur's plea for more bombers to defend Australia against the threatened Japanese invasion. In the face of MacArthur's recent statement outlining the seriousness of the situation in Australia, the present trip by the President seems rather out of place.

One would think we are fighting this war under a plan of Cook's tours. In planes that could well be utilized by our fighting forces we send "Hardship" Harry Hopkins to London and Russia; Wendell Willkie to Europe and Asia and make him an expert on international relations in 49 days; Mrs. Roosevelt to London to gather material for her syndicated newspaper column; and Vice President WALLACE to South America when he should be on the job to which the people elected him. Now the President, himself, makes an extended tour by special train and especially built de luxe bombers.

Mr. Speaker, to me this Presidential tour has all the earmarks of the beginning of the fourth-term campaign. This pretext of visiting defense establishments is old stuff.

Freight-Rate Discriminations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Howard Suttle, newspaper correspondent, as it appeared in the Sunday, April 18, 1943, News and Courier of Charleston, S. C., on the subject of freight-rate discriminations:

SOUTH GAINS GROUND IN FIGHT TO EQUALIZE FREIGHT CHARGES

(By Howard Suttle)

WASHINGTON, April 17.—Special. The South's long fight for elimination of arbitrary freight rate schedules that have given the industrial East a distinct economic advantage over the rest of the country is at last bearing fruit.

Southern Members of Congress encouraged by the recent report of the transportation board of investigation and research, have prevailed upon the leadership of the Southwest and West to join in moving for action to place in effect the board's recommendation for specific legislation ordering equalization of freight rates.

Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of Greenville, chairman of the southern policy committee, reported that a prime objective of this organization of southern Members of the House of Representatives is that the recommendation of the board, created by Congress in 1940, be transformed into legislation at the earliest opportunity.

Specifically the board found that Congress should write into law a directive to the Interstate Commerce Commission to put into effect a Nation-wide system of freight rates within 3 years to provide equal opportunity for economic development of all parts of the country, without artificial rate handicaps or preferences.

Congress was urged in the report to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to draw up a proposed national class rate system within 9 months, start hearings on the plan within the next 3 months, and put into effect a final order for such a system within the next 2 years.

Nelson Lee Smith, of New Hampshire, chairman of the transportation investigation board, did not go all the way with his colleagues, Robert E. Webb, of Kentucky, and C. E. Childs, of Nebraska, on their recommendation for legislative action. He declared in a separate statement that the board could

"perform its greatest service by emphasizing the opportunity which both the carriers and Commission now have to deal with this problem in an adequate, prompt, and comprehensive way, unfettered by adherence to traditional regional groupings and boundaries, and unhampered by concepts of rate making which have outlived their usefulness."

The chairman agreed with his colleagues, however, that class rates (those applying to manufactured products) should be made "as nearly uniform throughout the United States as differences in transportation costs will justify and the revenue needs of the carriers will permit."

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION PROBE NEARING COMPLETION

Representative BRYSON and his colleagues of the southern policy committee are awaiting only the completion by the Interstate Commerce Commission of its own investigation of the rate problem. The Commission has completed hearings and is now studying the records.

The transportation board's report is not the only official document recording the asserted discrimination of prevailing rates against the South and other sections outside the official territory, generally described as the area bounded on the west by the Mississippi River and on the south by the Ohio River.

Paralleling the board's recommendations, reports of the Tennessee Valley Authority on transportation facilities and rates, first of which was issued in 1937. In these reports, Tennessee Valley Authority rate authorities found that the level of freight rates is 39 percent higher in the South and 61 percent higher in the Southwest than rates prevailing in the so-called official territory. Both the board and Tennessee Valley Authority also found that prevailing differences in rates restrict market areas of manufacturers outside official territory and retard economic development of outlying territories by discouraging location of new industries.

DEWEY ADMITS ADVANTAGE

Southern leaders fighting to remove freight rate discriminations have found a more responsive ear of easterners during the past years because many individual manufacturers who have located plants in the South, particularly since the war, but still maintain interests in the "official territory" have cause to know personally of the disadvantages to southern industry in the present arbitrary rate adjustment.

But even these are not all the easterners who have publicly admitted that the "official territory" enjoys a transportation rate advantage.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, in a statement read before the Interstate Commerce Commission during its recent hearings, impliedly admitted that his State has such an advantage and asked that the advantage be maintained.

Pioneer in the South's fight for more equitable transportation rates is L. Joe Folse, native Louisianian, who, as director of the Mississippi Board of Development, 17 years ago issued continuous appeals to citizens of his section to organize for a fight against discriminatory rates.

His appeal for such a South-wide organization first bore fruit with the formation of the Southern Conference of Governors, in which the fight has become paramount.

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK and Representatives L. MENDEL RIVERS, of Charleston, and JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of Florence, have notified Representative BRYSON of their full cooperation in the southern policy committee's plea for prevailing upon Congress to follow the transportation board's recommendations.

The Fourth-Term Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as prominent New Deal office holders and office seekers are continuing to suggest that the President is making his plans and appointing his field forces to conduct the first fourth-term drive (draft) in American history, it occurs to me that the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald of last Sunday might be of interest to the Congress and the country:

THE FOURTH-TERM ISSUE

On April 1, Frank Walker, National Democratic chairman, said he hoped the 1944 Presidential campaign would be a short one by agreement of both parties.

On April 11, Harrison E. Spangler, National Republican chairman, wrote Mr. Walker that this would be quite O. K. with the Republicans if Walker would assure the American people that President Roosevelt "does not have the ambition for and will not under any circumstances accept a nomination for a fourth term."

To this, Mr. Walker uttered a vague reply to reporters, to the general effect that he had read Spangler's letter only in the papers (many of which printed it verbatim), and that "this is no time for politics. Let us get on with the war."

A straight-out "Yes" or "No" answer from Walker was called for. Instead, Walker ducked—and ducked again in a letter to Spangler which added nothing to Walker's spoken statement. So it is fair to assume once more that Mr. Roosevelt wants a fourth term and is now actively angling for renomination.

IS ROOSEVELT INDISPENSABLE?

Let's consider the issues on which the fourth term campaign will be fought out if Mr. Roosevelt is renominated.

For one, there will be the indispensable-man issue, the Democratic plea that Mr. Roosevelt is the one man who can win the war for us as fast as it can be won, and then arrange the best possible peace.

Is Mr. Roosevelt indispensable to winning the war?

Suppose Thomas E. Dewey were President, or John W. Bricker, or Earl Warren. Does anyone suppose that Eisenhower, Patton, MacArthur, Halsey, Nimitz, or Arnold would fight the war any less fiercely and loyally than they are fighting it now? The question answers itself. These men's loyalty is not to Roosevelt, but to their country, to the President of the United States, no matter who that man may be at the time.

Is Mr. Roosevelt indispensable as Commander in Chief of our armed forces? If he were, there would be some force in the argument that he ought to be kept in charge of our war effort for the duration—if not as President throughout, then perhaps as Secretary of War later on.

Examining Mr. Roosevelt's war record from Pearl Harbor to the present time, however, we cannot see that his performance as Commander in Chief has been extraordinary. He is a well-educated, widely informed civilian gentleman, into whose lap a global war suddenly fell. He has faced up to the emergency and has done his best.

Nevertheless Pearl Harbor was a disastrous and a disgraceful defeat, and the President was Commander in Chief at the time and acquainted with all the circumstances. We do not see how he can avoid accepting some of the blame. The Japanese are strengthening their Aleutian footholds; Australia is sending special envoys to ask for more help from the United States; our boys have fought bravely in north Africa, but without complete success. Our strategy and tactics there have not been phenomenal.

MAIN ISSUE

But the paramount issue in the expected fourth-term campaign will be the fourth term itself, and whether any man at all should have one.

If Mr. Roosevelt gets it, the same argument now being used for a fourth term would then be used for a fifth; namely, that the world is a very stormy place and Mr. Roosevelt, because of his wisdom and experience, is the one American fitted to guide the country through the storm.

It is only human to want power, and to strive to increase what power one has. Indeed, it is widely known that Mr. Roosevelt is not willing to delegate sufficient responsibility to either his civilian or his military subordinates. Likewise, if the succession is not ordained, as in a monarchy, a self-made dictator usually tries to appoint his own successor, in order that his ideas may continue to prevail.

We shall expose ourselves to this possibility if we elect Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term. That is to say, we shall vote to trade our democracy, which has served us well, for a 1-man government based on the proposition that only 1 American out of 132,000,000 of us is wise enough to govern this country.

That Mr. Roosevelt is anxious for a fourth term seems clear to us from all the straws in the wind. That he is now actively working for renomination seems equally clear.

We are probably going to vote this thing up or down in November 1944. The choice is the most important one which this country has made since it became one country.

Taylorville, Ill., Honors Missing War Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVAN HOWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include therein two clippings from the April 16 issue of the Taylorville, Ill., Breeze-Courier, I wish to call attention of the Members of the House of Representatives to a splendid tribute paid to a young American, Lt. Jack Stokes, who has been reported as missing in action since last February 25.

On the occasion of Lieutenant Stokes' twenty-sixth birthday, the citizens of Taylorville and vicinity purchased $325,475 worth of War Savings bonds. This is not only a novel way to promote the sale of War bonds, but it is a demonstration of the fine spirit of cooperation on the part of the people of Taylorville in

their patriotic desire to make every possible contribution to the successful prosecution of the war.

It is indeed a fine and unstinting demonstration of patriotism and devotion which will hasten the day of our inevitable triumph. I wish also to pay tribute to Lieutenant Stokes' parents, Mr. and Mrs. Howard Stokes; his sister, Lillian; the publisher of the Taylorville Breeze-Courier; and to those citizens who made this activity possible.

The articles referred to follow:

TAYLORVILLE HONORS JACK STOKES BY BUYING $325,475 IN BONDS

Taylorville citizens paid fitting tribute to the twenty-sixth birthday of Lt. Jack Stokes yesterday by purchasing $325,475 worth of War bonds at the Stokes drug store operated by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Howard Stokes on the northeast corner of the square.

Lieutenant Stokes, according to the telegram received by his parents from the War Department on February 25, is missing in action. A member of the Army Medical Corps, he was on his way to the fighting front when his ship was torpedoed by an enemy submarine and sunk somewhere in the Atlantic area.

Originally, Mr. and Mrs. Stokes, in cooperating with the Second War Loan drive now in progress had wished to sell $5,000 in War bonds at their store as a tribute to their son. The idea met with such instant response among their friends and those of Lieutenant Stokes that the goal was raised. Local people have been coming to the Stokes drug store in increasing numbers and yesterday, which was Jack's birthday, $37,000 worth of bonds were sold to 198 persons who called at the store.

Impetus and realism was given to the county bond sale yesterday afternoon when five airplanes piloted by Jack Kennedy, Henry Arbogast, Gus Candioto, and Louis Neighbors of Taylorville, accompanied by two planes from Decatur flew over the city. The air raid warning signal at the city water plant announced their arrival but the bombs which they dropped were leaflets bearing the message that it is a privilege to buy War bonds, while war bombs may be had from the Axis free.

Mr. and Mrs. Stokes said this morning that they would continue Jack's birthday drive through tomorrow and that they would have War bonds for sale at their store throughout the remainder of the Second War Loan campaign. They urged Taylorville to remember—They give their lives—you loan your money.

STOKES FAMILY GRATEFUL FOR TRIBUTE PAID HERO SON

Mr. and Mrs. Howard Stokes and daughter Lillian request the Breeze-Courier to express their thanks to those who contributed to make the birthday celebration for their son and brother, Lt. Jack Stokes, recently reported lost in the North Atlantic, a success.

Especially do they want to thank James Hunter, James Humphrey, Marshall Burris, and Frances Sutton and Evelyn Purnell, of the two local building and loan associations, who practically closed up shop to spend the day taking bond applications at the drug store. The post-office employees also assisted magnificently.

They appreciate the bombardment of the city from the air during the afternoon by Jack Kennedy, Henry Arbogast, Gus Candioto, and Louis Neighbors in their planes accompanied by two planes from Decatur. This bombardment was made possible by the cooperation of the local unit of the Civilian Air Patrol.

And, of course, their thanks and those of America go to the way the people of Taylorville and vicinity responded to their invitation.

Stokes Drug Store will continue to have bond applications at all times.

Thanks again.

Money—The Most Important Issue Before the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the fifth installment of the speech of Senator Cockrell on money.

In this section of the Senator's speech the debate reveals the struggle between the bank-money advocates to force the Government to redeem silver money with gold money and the silver-money advocates who fought to continue the age-old Government plan that made a fixed weight of silver and a fixed weight of gold our monetary unit—the dollar—which was legal tender for all debts and dues, public and private.

The fifth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

Mr. MCPHERSON. The Treasury of the United States has $100,000,000 of gold coin standing under and behind her $1,000,000,000 of silver money and paper money. The Bank of France is abundantly able to make exchanges as she pleases; and there is no condition, no pledge, and no law requiring the exchange The Government of the United States, upon the other hand, is confronted by a positive law which says that you must maintain the parity between the two metals. With $100,000,000 of gold in our Treasury to redeem a thousand or eleven hundred million dollars of paper and silver, and to maintain the parity between the different kinds of money, certainly there is a wide difference between the situation of France and the situation in this country.

Mr. COCKRELL. I understand the Senator, and will he permit me to answer his question in the Yankee fashion of his own State by an interrogatory? The Senator holds that the silver dollars, the silver certificates, the United States Treasury notes issued for the purchase of silver bullion, and the greenbacks are redeemable in gold?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I mean that we have Treasury notes issued to the extent of $150,000,000, and under the law which authorizes their issue for the purchase of silver that it is provided that they shall be redeemed in gold at the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, and there is no discretion left with him. And I say if he fails to pay in gold those notes with which he is expressly required and commanded to maintain the parity, then all the silver issues of the Government stand practically upon the same foundation.

Mr. COCKRELL. In other words, then, all the silver dollars are redeemable in gold?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Not at all.

Mr. COCKRELL. This is a very important question, and I want to know exactly where we are. The Senator contends that the United States Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, in the purchase of silver bullion under the Sherman law are redeemable in gold or silver, at the option of the Secretary of the Treasury, and if gold is demanded he must pay gold. Now, what relation does that have to the silver certificates issued for the silver dollars coined under the Bland Act?

Mr. MCPHERSON. If that money itself is discredited by the failure of the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain the parity it affects in like manner every silver issue by the Government, because the contention of people today is that the Government has proceeded in the direction of injecting silver into the circulation to such an extent that it is impossible to maintain the parity and we are fast drifting to a silver basis. That is the contention.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, the people of the United States do not make any such contention. A few bull-run, panic-stricken bankers of New York may make the prediction that they are scared to death over silver dollars. The masses of the people in New Jersey, the toiling masses, are not sending up their petitions here telling you and me that they are afraid to receive silver dollars. This panic made to order has demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt the unbounded illimitable and unlimited confidence the masses of the people have in the standard silver dollar. You may search the United States from Maine to Texas, and from Florida to Alaska, and you cannot find a man, woman, or child who will refuse to receive the silver dollar just as quickly as the gold dollar, the silver certificate just as quickly as the gold certificates, and to receive the greenbacks or any of them

The people of the United States are intelligent and patriotic enough to know that every dollar of money issued by authority of Congress is just as good as any other dollar, and they treat it as such. It is only the bankers who have lost confidence, and that is done because of their overnervousness and their fears and apprehensions of what may come to pass in the future, based upon the ulterior object of establishing a single gold standard, and that is the aim of my friend. He has said enough here to convince me that he stands for the single gold standard and for everything in the shape of money in the United States to be redeemable in gold—the silver dollar and the silver certificate. I have, then, truthfully said that the battle waging in the Senate is between the bankers and the plutocrats of the world on one side for a single gold standard, in which all other moneys shall be redeemable at their sweet will and pleasure, and the people on the other side for the maintenance unimpaired of the monetary functions of silver as an equal money with gold, whatever amount may be coined by our Government.

I am very glad this colloquy has come up. It is a question that I intended to discuss further on, and I am glad that it has been developed now. We know where the friends of this bill stand. We know the battle that is before us. We know the objects to be attained. We know the interest our toiling masses have in this great struggle; and we propose to stand by them and defend their interests against the combined powers of the plutocrats of the United States and of every nation, kindred, and tongue on earth; and you shall not succeed.

But, Mr. President, I was criticizing the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, for, as I was told by a distinguished Senator, the holders of these silver-coin certificates had demanded gold, and he had yielded to that demand. I say it was wrong. I say furthermore he has a perfect right in equity and justice, under the law, to redeem the United

States certificates that were given in payment of the purchase of bullion in silver coin, and while the law gives him nominally the right to redeem in gold or silver at his discretion, yet under that right his discretion is modified. Now, I will read that clause of the law.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to interrupt the Senator to know if I understood him aright.

Mr. COCKRELL. I will yield with pleasure.

Mr. TELLER. Did the Senator from Missouri state that the Treasury Department had redeemed silver certificates proper in gold?

Mr. COCKRELL. Silver coin certificates. That is my information.

Mr. TELLER. I will state that a few days ago—not more than 20—I called on the Treasurer of the United States and made that inquiry, and he informed me that they never had redeemed the silver certificates proper in gold. I do not mean the Treasury notes, but the silver certificates. He said they never had redeemed them in gold, and I venture to say now there never has been a dollar of them redeemed in gold.

Mr. COCKRELL. My colleague gave me the information.

Mr. TELLER. It is a mistake.

Mr. COCKRELL. I understood my colleague to say expressly that silver coin certificates—not the United States Treasury notes issued for the purchase of bullion—had been redeemed in gold.

Mr. TELLER. No.

Mr. VEST. At the time that the first million dollars was drawn out in gold from the United States Treasury for exportation it was stated in the press, and I have always understood it to be true that a large amount in silver certificates was included in the million dollars, and that the Treasury Department paid out gold indifferently upon any of the paper circulation of the United States. I so understood them from the President's declaration at the time it was made. I do not remember the exact date, but it was a formal declaration made by the President to the effect that every dollar issued by the United States in any sort of obligation (I suppose, of course, that it referred to the paper obligations of the Government) should be paid in the coin which the holder demanded. If reference can be made to that statement, which I have not at command, I think it will be found to amount to that.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly; I only want to get at the facts. It was in conversation with my colleague that I got this information, and I am glad that he has explained it just as it is. I do not want to do injustice to any human being on earth.

Mr. TELLER. The $1,000,000 referred to by the junior Senator from Missouri were not silver certificates, but Treasury notes. Since that time I have put on record a letter from the Treasurer and a letter from the Secretary. The Secretary of the Treasury replied to a Senate resolution declaring that no silver certificates have been redeemed in gold.

The editor of the Century Magazine, in an article about three months ago, declared that all the silver certificates were redeemable in gold and that is why they continue to circulate as money. A friend of mine in Colorado, a distinguished lawyer of the State, addressed him a courteous letter, saying that he thought he was mistaken, and called his attention to the documents I had presented to the Senate on that point. The editor replied in a brief letter (declining to publish the gentleman's letter, as the class of people who make such charges always do, without knowing anything about it) that "no matter what Mr. Foster has done, I have the evidence that Mr. Carlisle is redeeming them in gold." So when I came here I went to the Treasury Department, rather than put in a resolution of inquiry, and asked the present Treasurer, Mr. Morgan, whether that had been done, and he informed me that it had not been done. If it has been done at all it has been done since the 4th of March, and I do not believe it has been done at all.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me to ask the Senator from Colorado a question?

Mr. COCKRELL. With pleasure.

Mr. PALMER. The Senator from Colorado says the notes he describes have not been redeemed in gold. Have they been redeemed at all, any of them?

Mr. TELLER. They have not. In reply to the resolution of the Senate the Secretary answered about a year ago that they had not been redeemed in gold nor in any paper that drew gold or could command gold. They have been redeemed, of course, in silver coin.

Mr. PALMER. Is it an established fact that they have been redeemed in silver coin?

Mr. TELLER. It is an established fact that they have been redeemed in silver coin. Quite a quantity have been redeemed in silver coin.

Mr. VEST. If it does not interrupt my colleague——

Mr. COCKRELL. No; certainly not.

Mr. VEST. I wish simply to make one suggestion. It seems to me rather an immaterial point so far as this discussion is concerned whether the silver certificates have been paid in gold by the Treasury or not, because the bullion notes, as they are called, the Treasury notes issued under the Sherman Act in payment of silver bullion purchased by the Government, unquestionably are paid in gold, and under the terms of those notes they are payable in silver, because there is a lien upon the silver bullion that is purchased for the payment of those notes, and the discretion is given to the Secretary of the Treasury to coin all the bullion that he deems necessary to redeem those outstanding bullion notes. So, in point of fact, it makes very little difference logically as to whether the Treasury Department has paid the silver-coin notes in gold or not.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, there is a vast difference in the legal effect of a certificate calling for so many dollars, stating that so many dollars have been issued returnable to the holder on demand, as to whether it is to be paid in a different kind of coin or not. That is a material question. I do not withdraw one solitary word I said about anybody who would redeem those silver-coin certificates in gold simply upon demand and not simply as a mere accommodation, because he has no right to do it in the world; but when it comes to the United States Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, in the purchase of silver bullion, the law expressly gives to the Secretary the right to redeem them in gold or silver coin at his discretion. There is no question but that it is in his discretion; but it is contended that certain clauses in that law compel him to pay gold.

Mr. GEORGE. That it takes away the discretion?

Mr. COCKRELL. That it takes away the discretion. On the contrary, I say that certain clauses in that law ought to control and limit his discretion.

Mr. GRAY. What clause?

Mr. COCKRELL. That last clause.

Mr. GRAY. The parity clause.

Mr. PEFFER. The clause requiring only coin enough to redeem them.

Mr. COCKRELL. Here is the provision I refer to; that after the 1st of July 1891—

"He shall coin of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act as much as may be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes herein provided for."

That follows after the parity clause, and after the provision for redemption in the discretion of the Secretary in gold or silver.

Mr. GRAY. May I ask the Senator from Missouri, then, what relation in his opinion the parity clause in the law of 1890 has to the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury in redeeming those notes in coin, or whether it has any or not?

Mr COCKRELL. That parity clause was put in in conference. It is the provision of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, and it is a peculiar makeshift. It is made to catch going either way. Now let us look at it:

"That upon demand of the holder of any of the Treasury notes herein provided for the Secretary of the Treasury shall, under such regulations as he may prescribe, redeem such notes in gold or silver coin, at his discretion, it being the established policy of the United States to maintain"—

What?—

"the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio, or such ratio as may be provided by law."

Now, shall the Secretary of the Treasury, beginning under Secretary Foster and continued under Secretary Carlisle, by redeeming these Treasury notes in gold bring up a metal containing 412½ grains of standard silver equal to the gold? That is the question. That is what the law says. It says the metal. I say that the Secretary did not accomplish it. It is a mere subterfuge, a pretext to say that that law, which is impossible of execution, has compelled him to do anything of that kind. Oh, no, Mr. President. You cannot interpret that law to mean that he shall keep the gold and silver metals on a parity with each other by redeeming the silver coin in gold. It does not say anything of the kind.

Mr. GRAY. If I do not interrupt the Senator——

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, no.

Mr. GRAY. I wish to ask him, if he will allow me, whether he thinks that the Secretary of the Treasury in construing his duty under the last paragraph of the second section of the act of July 14, 1890, ought to exercise his ingenuity to see how he could evade the obvious apparent, perfectly plain meaning of that clause by a verbal construction which would transfer his duty in maintaining a parity between the two metals to merely a duty to maintain the parity between the two metals as bullion without regard at all to the obligation to maintain the two metals at a parity as coin? Whatever we may say and however nice we may be in our distinction between metal in bullion and metal in coin, undeniably metal in coin is as much metal as metal in bullion, and the only metal that he could possibly maintain the parity of with gold was the metal in coin.

Mr. COCKRELL. Metal in coin ceases to be metal and becomes money.

Mr. GRAY. Oh, well, metal in bullion ceases to be metal and becomes bullion.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no money unless it is coined.

Mr. GRAY. It is precisely the same as to say that metal in bullion ceases to be metal and becomes bullion.

Mr. PALMER. May I ask the Senator from Missouri a question?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. PALMER. What does he do with the ratios? They are to be maintained at the present or at some other ratio. Has not that ratio relation to coinage alone and not to the metal or the coin?

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Ohio, who fathered the amendment in conference, has never yet been able to explain exactly what it meant or what it does mean. I do not know that it was intended that it should be plain. It was passed in an emergency. It was passed

in order to kill the free-coinage bill which had been passed by the Senate, and which, if the conference committee report had been rejected, would have become a law or would have been vetoed by the President at that session. This provision was put in in conference, and it was a makeshift. It could not be anything else, because it says the notes shall be redeemable in coin; and then it goes on and says that they shall be redeemable in gold or silver coin at the discretion of the Secretary, and then they inject a little stump speech and a little promise into the law, such as is proposed to be injected into this bill, and then they set that up as a pretext for doing just what they want to do, and that is to establish the single gold standard.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I want the distinguished Senator to understand that so far as I am individually concerned, and as I understand it so far as those who think and vote with me upon this question are concerned, we resist no contention on the part of the Senator from Missouri or any other Senator which proclaims that it is the intention, the desire, the determination of this Government, whether you like it or not, whether you wish it or not, to maintain all the money of this country, whether it be paper money or silver money, whether it be in bullion or in coin, on a parity with gold. Now, let us have no controversy on that subject.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not occupy that position. I am for good money. I am for honest money. I am for one kind of money and only one kind of money, and that is a full legal-tender money, good money; good for the bondholder and the banker, good for the soldier and the citizen, good for the millionaire and the toiling laborer alike; paying a thousand million dollars of indebtedness or buying a dollar's worth of groceries. I want the same kind of money maintained by the sovereign power of the United States as absolute and irredeemable money whenever it is made out of metal. I want the paper money redeemable in metallic money. You have my financial system—gold and silver unlimited in amount and irredeemable in quantity, absolute money in the hands of the people, and no paper that is NOT redeemable in either gold or silver. Today there is not a dollar issued by the sanction of the United States within its territorial limits that is not just as good as any other dollar.

Mr. GRAY. Why not?

Mr. COCKRELL. Because it is a legal tender by the power of the Government. It is law that gives it money value, pure and simple.

Mr. GRAY. How maintained?

Mr. COCKRELL. Maintained because everybody wants it to pay debts. It will buy anything a man wants. This despised and abused silver dollar, even among the gold plutocrats of New York, commanded a premium of 3 and 4 percent, and some of the gold monometallist bankers made a handsome profit in selling the silver dollar as full money. I understood from the newspapers that one broker there made nearly $1,000,000 in selling silver money.

Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech on Thomas Jefferson, delivered by the Hon. James A. Farley at the spring conference of the one hundred and ninety-ninth district of the Rotary International for western Massachusetts and northern Connecticut, at Springfield, Mass., on April 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Americans everywhere are pausing this week to honor the memory of Thomas Jefferson. Two hundred years ago that great man was born. His life was destined to span the most critical period in our history and, in fact, in the history of all the western world. He was destined to be the witness of the slow development of discontent in America which ended in the American Revolution. He saw that revolution fought through to a successful conclusion. Subsequently, as our representative in France, he saw the French Revolution grow and burst in all of its fury. As a member of the first administration, he saw our great experiment in democracy begin. For more than 30 years he was either high in office in our Republic or a close and influential observer of its operations. He died, rich in honor, a full 50 years after he had written the charter of our freedom, the Declaration of Independence.

There is much concerning the art of politics and government that we can learn from books, but the best lessons are those which come from experience. In order to understand the problems of free government, we must have seen it under the actual test of practical operation. Judged on that basis, the observations Jefferson made about government have a unique value because they grew out of the richest and most varied experience any American public man has ever had, and I include Washington, Hamiliton, Madison, Monroe, and Lincoln.

He had seen at first hand how governments, by neglecting plain lessons of experience, can lose the confidence of the people and ultimately drive people into revolt. He had seen how difficult it is for leaders to create new forms of government to take the place of old and worn-out forms. He had seen how hard it is to keep the public strong and steadfast in the face of a long and costly war. It was also his privilege to see how the early forms of government, created during the Revolution, proved inadequate to meet the problems of the peace that followed it. He was privileged to see the new government start under the new Constitution, and to know what its critical problems were. Later, he was the chief organizer of a great political party, and saw that party rise to power through the slow progress of compromise. Through his 8 years of service as President, he saw the problems that the Chief of the Government must meet. And, finally, Providence granted him many years for calm reflection in his retirement—years during which he formulated in writing the lessons learned in many years of experience.

It has been a source of some amusement to me this week to note how many people of widely different political views have found in Jefferson's extensive writings justification for their own activities. In some cases, their claim that Jefferson would have approved their own views must be taken with considerable caution. It must be remembered that Jefferson said many things on many occasions about many different sorts of situations, and the words he used to describe these situations may not at all be applicable to problems that we face a century or more later.

But, nevertheless, it seems to me that the fact that the name of Jefferson is being hailed with respect, admiration, and affection by men of both political parties and of many factions within these parties is a most significant thing. It speaks for the breadth of Jefferson's philosophy and his profound understanding of all sorts and conditions of men. But in a larger sense, it is encouraging because it shows how vast a number of propositions are agreed to by all of us, despite differences of parties.

For myself, I have never found it possible to hate those with whom I disagreed in politics. I have made it a principle of my life that basically both parties are American parties, that both are made up of patriotic men and women, and that both seek the same end through different means. That being true, there must be mutual respect between all parties if we are to maintain the fundamental unity required in a great republic. Perhaps this is a reason why both parties respect the memory of Jefferson. There are those who hail him because of his broad humanitarian sympathies; there are others who hail him because he believed in limiting the powers of Government; there are others who hail him because he believed so profoundly in education; there are others who hail him because he was so intensely an American; and there are still others who hail him because he believed in reasonable cooperation with the rest of the world. All these people are right, because Jefferson's sympathies and understanding were so universal that he profoundly believed that a man's political views should not be narrow and intolerant.

Perhaps the greatest lesson that I have learned from Jefferson was his hatred of intolerance, both in politics and in religion. I quote Jefferson:

"I tolerate with the utmost latitude the right of others to differ from me in opinion without imputing to them criminality. I know too well the weakness and uncertainty of human reason to wonder at its different results. Both of our political parties, at least the honest part of them, agree conscientiously in the same object—the public good; but they differ essentially in what they deem the means of promoting that good. One side * * * fears most the ignorance of the people; the other, the selfishness of rulers independent of them. Which is right, time and experience will prove. We think that one side of this experiment has been long enough tried, and proved not to promote the good of the many; and that the other has not been fairly and sufficiently tried. Our opponents think the reverse. With whichever opinion the body of the nation concurs, that must prevail. My anxieties on this subject will never carry me beyond the use of fair and honorable means, of truth and reason; nor have they ever lessened my esteem for moral worth, nor alienated my affections from a single friend, who did not first withdraw himself."

A second great lesson which has always been an inspiration to all who believe in democratic processes was Jefferson's unfaltering faith in the ultimate judgments of the people. In Jefferson's time, it was not easy to hold that view. Everywhere men believed that the judgments of a few who were possessed of fortune, education and high birth should make the final decisions about the destiny and welfare of human beings. They believed that the lives and destinies of less fortunate human beings had been vested in them as a sort of trust, and that their decisions as to what was best for the common people must prevail.

Jefferson did not accept this view. He believed that fundamentally people were entitled to make their own determinations themselves. He realized that popular government resulted in many mistakes and that on countless occasions the public took actions which were ultimately injurious to it. He saw that people were often deceived by false leaders and false beliefs and that often the passions of the multitude burned away reason, discretion, and considered judgment. Despite these things, Jefferson believed that it was better for humanity to progress slowly, to learn from its own mistakes, than to take

from the average man the liberty to make decisions for himself. He saw that while a dictator might, for a short time, provide great benefits and bounties for the people, ultimately the interests of a dictator and the interests of the people were deadly enemies. He would, he said, rather make progress slowly and be sure that it ended in permanent security than to seek the illusion of security through the dictation of any one person or of any small group. I quote Jefferson:

"It should be remembered, as an axiom of eternal truth in politics, that whatever power in any government is independent is absolute also; in theory only, at first, while the spirit of the people is up, but in practice, as fast as that relaxes. Independence can be trusted nowhere but with the people in mass. They are inherently independent of all but moral law."

While Jefferson believed in the wisdom of the people, he also realized the dangers to their liberty that lurked on every side. He sought to protect them against those dangers through a republican form of government. He, as well as the other great men of his time—Madison, Monroe, Hamilton, Washington, and Franklin—believed first in representative government. They placed the power to make laws in legislative bodies elected by the people. They set restrictions on public servants, both as to the extent of their power and the length of time that they were called upon to serve. Jefferson, in particular, urged constantly that the wider public official responsibility was spread the safer it would be. Above all, he believed in an independent judiciary, protected from politics and capable of making decisions among the complex issues that arise among men.

Moreover, he believed in local government. He believed that an infinite number of services should be reserved for the communities and the States. He believed that a proper distribution of power between the States and the Nation, and between the States and their subdivisions was essential, not only to liberty, but to efficient government. Furthermore, he believed that the less interference by law in the private affairs of each individual, the less the danger of tyranny.

As President, Jefferson, by a single act—the purchase of Louisiana—extended the resources of our Nation over a great continent. We must always bear in mind that this purchase of Louisiana was accomplished at a time when this infant Nation was practically surrounded by clashing empires. When Louisiana was purchased, war among the great empires of Europe had been going on for years. Canada, Louisiana, Florida, and the countries to the south were but pawns in this great struggle. It was Jefferson's desire to protect the boundaries of the United States and, so far as he could, push out of this hemisphere these age-old conflicts and ambitions. He believed that our influence in the world and our happiness at home depended upon a strong, unified, and immensely resourceful Nation. His interest in the West was boundless. He sent exploratory expeditions into all parts of our great territory. And he planned wisely for a wider development of our resources. He was, in effect, the first apostle of the conservation of natural resources. No statesman ever did more to expand the boundaries of this Nation and to make it secure against foreign attack.

It is appropriate that his final years should have been devoted to education. To him, education meant vastly more than the mere training of a selected few to hold the more lucrative and honored positions in the world. Education, to him, meant the fullest guaranty against the loss of liberty. He realized that a democracy demanded citizens who were not only literate and wise, but that it demanded men and women who were used to the discipline imposed by education. He knew that an effective citizenship must be a thinking, reasoning citizenship. He saw that this could only come through the spread of popular education. He saw that, whatever boundless resources this country might develop, resources without restraint would produce chaos and destruction. And he labored to make men grow in wisdom as they grew in resources. He saw, above all, that if higher standards of living, more happiness, more appreciation of beautiful things and more interest and enjoyment in social relations were not to be attained through democracy, democracy itself as a form of government would have failed. In short, he saw freedom as a way of life, and happiness as the end of the state.

As we pause to recognize the great lessons that Jefferson taught us, let us not overlook the bearing that those lessons have upon our present concerns. Once more we are engaged in a great war. That war is being fought to make secure for us and for future generations the forms of freedom which we have inherited from the great past. In fighting that war it is well to keep in mind that if freedom fails here among us, it cannot be secured anywhere in the world. The greatest of all teachers is example. Only inasmuch as we prove ourselves capable of discipline and learn from our mistakes and build security for men and women of all groups, shall we really influence a world that is torn with hatred, with hunger, with poverty, and with bloodshed.

Let us frame our political principles and conduct our political activities as Jefferson wanted us to do, with tolerance, with understanding, with good fellowship, and with mutual respect. So doing we will be acting in the spirit of the finest traditions of true Americanism.

Justice to the Farmer Means Food, Without Which We Cannot Win This War

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, there are many inconsistencies and inefficiencies on the part of our officials and bureaucrats here in Washington that are greatly retarding the war effort both at home and on the battle front.

Justice is the greatest concern of man on this earth, and now, of all times, the United States Government should deal justly with its people. The farmers are being hit and hit hard. They have the greatest difficulty in buying farm machinery, and it is well-nigh impossible to obtain repairs for what they have. The Government continues to take their boys from the farm where they are needed and put them in the armed forces where their services at this time are not needed. Thousands of farm boys have been taken into the armed forces, and thousands upon thousands of farms that should be producing food are idle because old men and women and children cannot cultivate them. This morning I received a letter from a farmer 65 years of age, who is unable to cultivate his farm of 120 acres. Among other things, he says:

I have three boys, two in the Army, and the other one is called for the 16th of this month. I can't find labor anywhere. I am 65 years old, and can't cultivate my farm of 120 acres. We have been cultivating 80. I'll just have to sow it down in lespedesea clover and let it rest. Most of my neighbors are in the same boat. * * * If we feed the hungry we will have to have tools to work with, and someone to do the work. We get a few young town boys out to help us a little, but they can't get the harness on the mule, much less drive him. I don't want such labor. Would you?

I have another letter from the county judge of Anderson County, Tenn., one of the two counties of my district in which the War Department is acquiring title to 56,000 acres of land. From the farms comprising this 56,000-acre tract, 1,000 farm families have been dispossessed.

In October 1942, when I learned that the Government intended to acquire this vast tract of land, I sent identical telegrams to President Roosevelt, Vice President Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, and Secretary of War Stimson. I quote from these telegrams:

One thousand farmers in 56,000-acre area being taken over by War Department for military purposes in Anderson and Roane Counties, Tenn., have been ordered to move. Their plight is desperate. They desire to acquire and operate farms. Farmlands are scarce. Delay in payment to them is threatened, and will be disastrous.

Appraisers from distant States, for the most part, who had formerly appraised for land-loan banks, and who were accustomed to putting low values on the farmlands on which loans were made by these banks, were sent into these two counties to place a value upon these lands.

From the beginning the owners were dissatisfied with the shockingly low values placed on their farms by these appraisers. The Government at once took possession of most of these lands by filing a blanket condemnation proceeding against the owners in the United States District Court at Knoxville, Tenn. Many owners, when thus confronted with litigation with their Government, reluctantly accepted the amount offered them for their farms, and in virtually every instance the farmers whose farms were thus taken were unable to purchase farms of anything like the same value as the ones they had been forced to give up with the money that the Government had paid them for their homes. And in the cases where the Government finally got around to the point where it paid into court the sums which it was willing to pay for the farms being condemned by it, the Government would not agree for the landowner to withdraw more than 75 percent of the inadequate price offered him for his property, and 25 percent of said price is being held in the hands of the clerk of the court awaiting the outcome of a trial between the Government on the one hand and the landowner on the other. This trial may be postponed for a year or more, and the landowner, of course, in order to undertake to obtain the fair value of his land from the Government, must employ a lawyer and pay a lawyer fee out of the price of his farm.

After the Government files a condemnation suit against a landowner it pays

into court what it claims is the fair value of the farm. If the farmer is willing to sacrifice his property in order to get his money quickly and go elsewhere and endeavor to buy another farm, that ended the matter. Many people are afraid to litigate with the Government and many accepted the amounts offered them for their farms, even though the prices were inadequate. Others refused to accept the amount offered. The next step in such a case is for the judge of the court to appoint a jury of view to go upon the premises, look at them, and then hear testimony as to the fair market value of the property at the time it was taken by the Government.

On the 17th day of February of this year attorneys for certain of these land owners made a motion before the judge of the United States District Court at Knoxville that a jury of view be appointed to go upon the premises and fix their values as above set out. Thereupon the special attorney representing the Department of Justice resisted said motion of the land owners on two grounds:

First, he stated that process had never been served upon the defendants, and that their motion was premature, as they were not even parties to the suit at that time.

Second, that the parties making the motion had not filed an answer to the petition and declaration of taking, and were, therefore, not in a position to move for the appointment of a jury of view.

Third, he also stated that although the parties whose homes were being taken from them were the "ostensible owners" of the property taken, yet the United States Government was not sure just who the true owners were.

An attorney for the landowners then stated to the Court:

> Although process has not issued, the petition to condemn these properties was filed in November, 1942, and the farms of the property owners have been taken from them and the United States Government has deposited in this court the amount which it states is adequate compensation and has named the owners of said farms.

The judge of the court then wanted to know why the jury of view should be appointed before the defendants to the suit had answered, in view of the fact that when the true owners were established they might be satisfied with the amount of the award of the Government and that the award of the jury might be a futile gesture. The attorneys for the land owners then asked permission to be allowed to amend their motion to set out the fact that the persons making the motion were owners who had been dispossessed of their property and that they were not satisfied with the amount paid into court by the Government. The judge of the court then suggested that the three men then sitting as the commission hearing the Tennessee Valley condemnation suits be appointed a jury of view to fix the value of the farms in this 56,000-acre area. The attorneys for the land owners and the attorney for the Government then agreed to the appointment of these three men, instead of the usual number of five, to act as a jury of view.

But before this was done, the attorney for the United States Government stated that he did not care how many men passed on the value of the property; that the Government would not be satisfied if the award was increased, and that it was a useless gesture to appoint a jury of view, since the case would be tried before a jury of 12 anyway.

This remarkable attitude on the part of the Government attorney was so arbitrary as to shock the sensibilities of those who heard it. The three gentlemen who had been acting as commissioners in fixing the value of lands condemned by the Tennessee Valley Authority were then appointed and directed to go on the property, hear the witnesses, and fix the value of the farms being taken by the Government.

I have furnished to the Under Secretary of War many affidavits from land owners in this area and from reputable citizens who know the value of farm lands in that section, and have appealed to him repeatedly to treat these people justly—all to no effect.

In the early part of this year I furnished him the following splendid statement by citizens of Roane County with respect to the value of their farms:

WHEAT, TENN., *January 8, 1943.*

Hon. JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, land owners and taxpayers of Roane County who live in the area that was recently condemned by the War Department, feel that we are not being offered enough for our property. In numerous instances we are offered $15 per acre, or less, for good farm land. In practically every instance in relocating to another farm of equal size, fertility, and so forth we have to pay anywhere from one third more to three times as much as we are offered for our present homes.

We, as citizens of this area, are willing to gladly give up our homes, even though they have been owned by the same family for generations in many instances, in order to aid in helping to win the war, providing we are able to duplicate our present homes with the money received from our present homes. We are willing to do without compensation for sentiment attached to our present homes. We do feel that it is only fair and just that we receive present market prices for our homes.

Most of us were planning to increase our production of food, which our Secretary of Agriculture has so strongly urged the farmers of America to do. But how will we, as farmers, be able to do our part in this war effort in the production of food, if we are not able to buy other farms to take the place of our present ones? In fact, many of us, unless we can receive more than is being offered, will be forced to discontinue farming.

We ask you, in the name of justice, to make a thorough investigation. We still have sufficient faith in our Government to believe that the United States will ever be true to our Constitution, which guarantees freedom and justice for all of its citizens.

C. C. Watson, John C. Armold, B. H. Magill, Robert Rather, Duncan Rather, Nancy Hembree, John E. William, Mitt Stringfield, D. M. Jones, Jesse M. Jones, Earl Stringfield, Catherine Roberts, Noah Roberts, Cordell Hembree, Robert May, W. F. Elzey, Julia Waller, J. H. Stonecipher, Sallie B. Patton, Ralph L. Phillips, H. C. Freels, J. Lu Arnold, G. W. Grubb, W. C. McNew, Clifton Grubb, Edith Armold, J. K. Rather, A. L. Robinette, C. W. Gallaher, Mrs. John F. Grubb, E. S. Hembree, Gertrude Hembree, C. R. Magill, J. D. Davis, Ernest Gallaher, Mrs. Geo. H. Gallaher, W. L. Weaver, C. B. Freels, E. E. Freels, W. T. Freels, Mrs. Josie Robinette.

I cannot take the time to set out all of said affidavits, but they disclose a shocking state of facts and gross injustice to the landowners on the part of the agents and officials of the Government. One striking example is that of the property of Mrs. James H. Stewart, whose husband served with credit in the armed forces of this country and was wounded in action. She was offered $5,200 for a 333-acre river farm, the value of which, with improvements, is from $14,000 to $15,000.

In this area Anderson County and Roane County own magnificent modern public-school buildings and grounds.

At Wheat, in Roane County, the county owns property that was formerly owned by Roane College. The War Department has appraised this property at $53,620. The two appraisers, on behalf of the county, both of whom are thoroughly competent, appraised the property, one at $90,365, the other at $96,600. The appraisal of the value of the buildings involved is confirmed by that of an experienced builder and architect of the highest repute.

To satisfy myself as to the justice of the complaints of these landowners, in company with the county judge, T. L. Seeber, of Anderson County, a property owner, a man of fine judgment and who knows the value of lands in that county, I went upon many of the farms in Anderson County which are being acquired by the Government. I am a landowner in the adjoining counties of Campbell and Knox. I have lived in that section all of my life, and I know farm values. The farms upon which I went with Judge Seeber were being condemned and taken by the Government at prices fixed by its appraisers of from one-half to two-thirds of their value.

I have in mind one piece of property owned by a minister of the Gospel, William Hightower, one of the best men I ever knew. He lost both hands in an accident and has lost the sight of one eye. He is a splendid citizen, and yet the Government, in this instance, is undertaking to take his home for less than half of its actual value. As showing the attitude of the Government with respect to these lands and the owner thereof, I called the attention of the Under Secretary of War, Judge Robert P. Patterson, to a statement made by the attorney in charge of the prosecution of these condemnation suits, which was published in the Knoxville News-Sentinel, a daily paper with a circulation of some 50,000, which circulates all over Anderson and Roane Counties. Referring to the farmers, he said:

> I have yet to find one who will admit that he is making a penny on his farm—"just

barely enough to pay taxes," he would say. To hear him talk, you would think he made a mistake when he decided to take up farming, but when the report gets out that there is a prospective buyer in the neighborhood, the price of his land immediately goes up. It applies to all businesses as well as that of the farmer.

CITES THREE CLASSES

Mr. McKenzie says there are three classes of property owners. One class—the biggest majority—claims and receives a fair value for properties, he says. Another group has honest differences of opinion with the Government as to appraisal theory, and in such cases it is necessary for the court and jury to determine the value.

"Last comes the small minority deliberately trying to dig into the United States Treasury for all they can get," says Mr. McKenzie.

"Only in the United States," says Mr. McKenzie, "does the fundamental law of the land, our Constitution, guarantee to every citizen the payment of 'just compensation' when property is taken by his Government."

It is known to every lawyer that the provision of the fifth amendment to the Federal Constitution, to the effect that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation, is contained in the Bill of Rights and is a part of the law of England.

There could be but one reason for the Government attorney's statement with respect to this being the only Government in the world that pays its citizens for their property when it is taken for public use, and that would be to create the impression on the part of these landowners that the payment by the Government for the property involved is an act of grace on its part, which might be withdrawn.

The jury of view appointed to fix the value of the lands involved in this area has reported on two cases: In one case where the owner was offered $8,572 for his land by the Government, the jury of view, experienced real-estate men, went upon the premises, heard evidence as to the value of the farm in question, and fixed the value of this farm at $12,250. In the other case the Government offered the farm owner $7,037, and he was awarded by the jury of view $7,250, and $787 for crop damage.

The Government, in the acquisition of these farms, is not dealing with a foreign foe. It is not dealing with aliens. It is dealing with the citizens of this country, all of whom are patriotic, and many of whom have boys today fighting for their country all over the world.

This Nation is giving away billions of dollars to other nations and other peoples of other lands. It should promptly pay to each and every landowner in Anderson and Roane Counties, Tenn., whose farm and whose property is being taken from him the value thereof. It should do this as an act of simple justice on the part of the Government to its citizens. It should do it as a part of the war effort. The owners of these farms are farmers. They wish to remain farmers. They cannot buy other farms and they cannot make a much-needed crop this year unless the Government ceases its warfare on them and pays them what is justly due them. It has taken their farms. It should pay them without further delay.

ANDERSON COUNTY,
STATE OF TENNESSEE,
April 16, 1943.

Hon. JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your request, I want to give you the results of the land suits with the War Department.

T. W. FOX, whose original appraisal was $8,572, was granted $12,250 by the jury of view. Andy Rayfield, whose appraisal by the War Department was $7,037, was granted $7,250 with a crop damage allowance of $787. They have heard evidence in four other cases but no decision has been given by the jury of view.

Immediately upon the decision of the jury of view in the first two cases mentioned, the War Department filed an appeal. So it is thought that all the remaining cases may be tried in Federal court rather than before a jury of view.

Sincerely yours,

T. L. SEEBER.

ATHENS, TENN., *April 13, 1943.*

Hon. JOHN JENNINGS, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND OF THE PUBLIC: At your request I am checking a few of the bulletins and will tell you what we need most as farmers to grow food for the war. We need repairs for the farm machinery, and farm labor. I have three boys, two in the Army and the other one is called for the 16th of this month. I can't find labor anywhere. I am 65 years old and can't cultivate my farm of 120 acres. We have been cultivating 80. I'll just have to sow it down in lespedeza clover and let it rest. Most of my neighbors are in the same boat.

Thanking you for anything you are able to do for the farmer, I am,

Yours very truly,

W. F. ELROD.

P. S.—Judge S. C. Brown tells us that you are doing all you can for us farmers, but if we feed the hungry we will have to have tools to work with and someone to do the work. We get a few young town boys out to help us a little, but they can't get the harness on a mule, much less drive him. I don't want such labor. Would you? W. F. E.

MAYNARDVILLE, TENN.

We as farmers realize the need of all the food we can raise. We are doing all we can to meet that need. With good growing seasons and enough help we are hoping to do that. I have just given an order for a tractor plow sometime ago but haven't got it yet. It was given through our county agent to be delivered at Knoxville. Help is scarce on some of the farms, and wages high.

Your friend,

J. R. STOUT.

Beryllium

REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time I have had occasion to speak on the subject of beryllium, nor is it the first time this metal has been up for consideration both in legislative and administrative circles. In a speech on May 12, 1941, I coupled up the situation, as I saw it on that date, with the developments it had made from the time it was considered by the Temporary National Economic Committee in May 1939.

Every word said about that new and vital metal, beryllium, in the hearing before the Temporary National Economic Committee, of which I was a member, and every word I uttered in my speech of May 12, 1941, should be read carefully by the Members of Congress because I believe developments in the past 2 years have been of such an unusual nature, coupled with happenings of such a sinister nature, that the whole subject warrants a thorough congressional investigation.

In 1939 beryllium was not a nationally known metal. However, despite all the obstacles thrown in its way, its usefulness had been fully shown and my remarks of May 1941 were very conservative as to the part that metal would play in the broad field of national defense. Today it is indispensable. It is solving thousands of military needs of our armed forces, many of them of such a secret nature that I am obliged to refrain from going into details. In all probability any hearing on this subject will have to be conducted, largely, in executive session.

The Congress, however, in its duty toward the hundreds of thousands in our armed forces to whom disaster would come should this metal fail, ought to see to it that the executive departments of the Government do not allow this industry to be operating under the supervision of amateurs, speculators, manipulators, or saboteurs and it should particularly see that those who are experienced and who have been serving the Nation's needs are kept at their stations so that quality and quantities can be maintained. I regret that just the opposite is taking place, and I insist that something be done about it.

Let me say for the record that the development of the beryllium copper industry in America is the result of the foresight of just one man—Mr. Andrew J. Gahagan—who had the vision, courage, ability, and tenacity to overcome every kind of opposition the industry has faced until at this moment the production has risen to a volume running into millions of dollars per annum. Most men accomplishing such results are accorded great acclaim, but not so with Mr. Gahagan because he has offended great interests, foreign and domestic, by driving through to success.

He is the largest holder of both preferred and common stock in the Beryllium Corporation, yet, just recently he has been summarily discharged from official relations with the company by a band of ruthless buccaneers whose record and inexperience should be thoroughly aired and whose motives should be laid bare to the American people while there is yet time to protect the industry and to see that the quality of metal is

not impaired and that coming new processes are not prevented from being utilized by our war machine.

Back in 1939 the record shows quite clearly the evident desire of the vast copper interest to throttle this business because of the competition it would offer to bronze and brass, regardless of the fact that, due to its high strength, hardness and other physical properties, many parts could be made with much less copper, which is now a rather precious metal.

To pave the way for this subtle performance, poison has been injected throughout Government agencies such as the W. P. B., the R. F. C., Army and Navy, scientific advisory boards and elsewhere—none of these moves were promoted by honest purposes, but done in order to discredit leaders in the beryllium industry. Such poison was welcomed in certain administrative channels, particularly in spots where the dominating light-metal interests are heavily entrenched.

Such things as are going on are not serving the interests of America, but those of the enemy countries, and it is heading up to a point where the copper interests will manipulate the beryllium industry when the war is over. An investigation, skillfully conducted, will draw from unwilling witnesses information to fully support my charges.

In the light metal field, magnesium and beryllium are making great strides. In these fields we find Anaconda Copper Co. in control of the vast basic magnesium enterprise; we find over a period of 20 years a sustained price on magnesium—year after year—50 percent higher than that of aluminum.

We find the Dow Chemical Co. licensing different concerns, including the Diamond Alkali Co. Notwithstanding the millions of dollars which the Beryllium Corporation has spent in making beryllium possible for American war needs, we find an offspring of the Diamond Alkali Co., with very small capital but with very strong political influence behind them, coming to Washington and picking up a half million dollars in defense plant loans for the purpose of developing a beryllium plant, although no experience whatever is apparent on the part of these promoters that would indicate their ability to make the metal as compared with the existing plant of the Beryllium Corporation and the defense plant being built in conjunction therewith at Reading, Pa.

We find assistance in connection with another beryllium operation which apparently is receiving funds as required when only a short while ago the head of that corporation stated publicly that he saw little merit in the outlook for beryllium copper uses although at the same time he strenuously denied the charge that there was any working relationship between his company and the vast copper interests of Anaconda.

All of these things might have gone unnoticed except for recent happenings which indicate clearly a concerted move to throttle this industry and impair the war effort, intimidate and eliminate Mr. Andrew Gahagan from managerial relationship to the industry he has developed. In fact, it seems Mr. Gahagan is to be discredited as much as possible and made to appear to be a promoter but not a producer, a visionary but not a man of vision, an experimenter but not a man of experience; yet, the records, if I could quote them here, belie every word or rumor that is being spread about him.

The middle of last year he was superseded in the management of the Beryllium Corporation and the direction of the affairs of the company was put in the hands of a soap maker and not a metal maker, with the result that production slumped terrifically, in fact, to such an extent that Mr. Gahagan was hastily reelected to his former position in order to stop the slump and restore the business to normal operation. This he did in an amazing manner until at the end of March of this year the business had reached a volume the highest in its history and was operating smoothly and efficiently and they were rapidly approaching the point where they could fully meet the military needs for beryllium.

In fact, the success of the company by that time had reached a point where certain individuals appeared on the scene—apparently with the idea of again slowing down production—and they again discharged Mr. Gahagan and again they have set up an organization in no way experienced in the making of this metal.

An examination of this group in itself would warrant an investigation to determine whether their real purpose was to provide for or impair military requirements for this country. If this group is prompted by ulterior motives, if any German sympathizers are found, it should be put into the record and proper punishment should be meted out to any guilty ones. If it is prompted by vindictiveness and selfish motives, it should be determined whether the war effort is being sabotaged. These are not times when business can go contrary to the war needs and when German-controlled—or even American-controlled—groups can disregard war needs and selfishly take actions never justifiable although frequently allowed in peacetimes.

I suggest to the Military Affairs Committee that they take immediate cognizance of the situation so that all facts are scrutinized, because it is important to maintain present operating standards and to keep intact the organization upon which this country must largely depend for beryllium for aircraft and other vital war requirements.

Commodore Perry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks made by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] over the network of the National Broadcasting Co. from Washington, D. C., in connection with the Commodore Perry program of April 17, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The National Broadcasting Co. is giving an exceptional service to the American people in this broadcast about Commodore Perry.

Perry's trip to Japan was epochal from a historical standpoint, but above all, the lesson which we get from his success is the one which the American people need today.

Perry studied to accomplish his ends. He realized that success depends on knowledge. He had had the experience of Americans in China for several generations, and he had had the best study in regard to Japan before he left. His knowledge plus his common sense made him an ideal representative of his Government on this mission and insured his success.

Undoubtedly the temptation to blast away and accomplish his purposes by force was in his mind, but he resisted this, gave notice to the Japanese that he would be back, sailed away for several months, and spent his time studying ocean currents and gaining knowledge about the waters around Japan. When he came back the Japanese had seen his point, had become convinced of the wisdom of accepting his proposal, and they then offered him a treaty.

One Japanese attempt at camouflage is worth mentioning here. The Japanese had been told of the American cannon and especially of the new mortar which shot over hills. The Japanese named this gun the "frog gun," because it squatted like a frog. When Perry returned to the harbor the Japanese had gathered together all the temple bells within the Yokohama-Tokyo vicinity and had placed them along the shore. Temple bells mounted upside down looked like mortars. But they had forgotten that Perry had spyglasses, and therefore temple bells did not frighten him.

The Perry expedition was really not successful in Japan until 20 years after his first visit. It was not until after the Satsuma Rebellion that the Japanese had become converted to the action of their Government in opening their trade to foreigners.

We must approach our problem in the Far East today in the same way Perry did. Let us study to achieve a real appreciation of the strength of our enemy and a thoughtful understanding of the problems of peace. Then success will be ours.

That the American people today will show the wisdom of the great Commodore Perry is my firm belief. That the people of Japan will see the light again as they did in Perry's time is my fervent hope.

Launching of Steamship "Benito Juarez"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER T. BONE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, on April 14, there was launched at Houston, Tex., the steamship *Benito Juárez*. The spon-

sor of the ship was Mrs. Esequiel Padilla, wife of the Secretary of Foreign Relations of the Republic of Mexico.

This incident gives further expression to the finer relations which have been established between this country and Mexico. Upon that auspicious and happy occasion an address was delivered by the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who is one of our most distinguished Members. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow citizens of the Americas and distinguished guests, it is not possible for me to conceive of a more favorable array of circumstances than those prevailing on this afternoon of April 14. Today is Pan American Day; today the Americas are committed to a task replete with idealism, with high honor, and with prophecies of high destiny; today we are performing the more than pleasant task of dedicating a small, yet significant, unit of that ever-growing machine of military and naval might which is coursing those highways of effort which lead to victory.

History is a relation of significant events, and incidents of importance are the products of great personalities. The glorious history of the Western Hemisphere has its full complement of illustrious men who through their high-minded and self-sacrificing endeavors have won eventual freedom for their fellows and distinction for themselves. In this exclusive circle of the nobility of achievement, none is more worthy of respect and veneration than Benito Juárez, the great Mexican, who, as lawyer, Governor, President, soldier, and patriot, spent his every energy and talent for the betterment of his people.

On this occasion it is fitting to survey the salient events of his life, and to observe that his career is in most respects analogous to that of all champions of human rights. Of poor Indian parentage, he graduated in law in 1832, was named an advocate of the Supreme Court of the Republic in 1834, and appointed Governor of the State of Oaxaca in 1847, which position offered him his first opportunity to fight for the cause of justice. His liberal views soon involved him in difficulties with President Santa Ana, who had him imprisoned in 1848. Escaping to New Orleans, Juárez returned to Mexico in 1855 to take an important part in the revolt against Santa Ana. Under the succeeding administration of Comonfort, Juárez was given the portfolio of justice, and it was in this capacity that he issued his first great reform measures. When Comonfort fled the Presidency, Juárez declared himself President in 1858, which year witnessed the beginning of the most momentous events in Mexican history. In 1861 Juárez was elected Constitutional President. Fighting the armies of France on the one hand, and the crumbling of his own position on the other, due to the bankruptcy of his Government and the shattering of his troops, he steadfastly refused to desert the cause of Mexico or to relinquish his position as Constitutional President. With the defeat of the armies of Maximilian and the departure of the last French troops from Veracruz in 1867, Juárez returned to Mexico City to be reelected to the Presidency. Elected for a third time in 1870, he suffered the revolt of defeated candidates and died in 1872, when the struggle was at its height.

Benito Juárez did not dominate his epoch, and in no sense did he even remotely control the reins of authority. Neither did he approach the completion of those plans for Mexican greatness to which he had dedicated his life. His achievement should not be measured in terms of the completion of enterprises, but rather by the yardstick of dogged adherence to those principles of justice and equality which have come to be the symbols of our American democracies. Benito Juárez can be compared to those strong-armed artisans who, utilizing the unpolished and heavy tools of their trade, lay the rough yet sturdy foundations of a structure, or of a vessel such as we are christening today. The refined and delicate beauty of the cathedral projecting far above the level of the earth too often blinds the beholder to the stones which sustain it. These are the materials contributed by Benito Juárez to the edifice which is Mexico.

Like all men of accomplishment, obstacles only served to challenge his genius and to prod his enthusiasm, for he ever held to the firm conviction that poverty, misfortune, reverses, and the like were only stepping stones to the temple of human rights upon which he had ever fixed his kindly vision.

What could be more proper than to assemble here today to christen with the name *Benito Juárez* a ship of the United States Government? This act of recognition of a great personality of Mexico by the Government of the United States serves to emphasize the fact that Mexico and the United States are not only neighbors in a geographic sense, but that our proximity has long ago entered the spiritual sphere. The name of Benito Juárez, along with those of Washington, O'Higgins, Mitre, San Martín, Sucre, Lincoln, Bolivar, and a host of others, are the jewels in the crown of American achievement. These are the men who have activated the wholesome and natural ambitions of mankind to live free lives under law and order; to carry with intelligence the torch of human rights, and to champion the equality of American states and their absolute privileges as independent nations. That is why the event which we witness today is of such great significance, for it constitutes the forging of one more link in the golden chain of inter-American relations which is fast approaching a stage of completion; it is what can be referred to as inter-Americanism in action; it brings to a head the point that the defense of the Americas is a common cause, to which all the nations of this hemisphere should pledge their allegiance. That is why it can be said that the *Benito Juárez* belongs to every American. It symbolizes the Bolivarian idea which, first exposed to continental view during the renowned Panama conference of 1826, has developed through the years into the American family of nations which is constantly being welded into a closer unit of international importance. Let the spirit of Benito Juárez further unite our efforts toward the complete realization of inter-American cooperation, with the feeling, as stated by President Avila Camacho on another historic occasion, that we are sailing on one and the same ship, under one and the same flag. This is perhaps the greatest of our post-war projects, to which we should dedicate ourselves without qualification or reserve.

The selection of Señora de Padilla, the genial and charming wife of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Mexico, as sponsor of the *Benito Juárez*, brings me great personal pleasure and satisfaction. Every American should be grateful to the Honorable Ezequiel Padilla for the great work which he has performed in favor of hemispheric solidarity, and especially for his effective labors at the Pan American Conference at Rio de Janeiro.

The limited time at our disposal this afternoon excludes the possibility of paying due tribute to the workers and management of our American shipyards. It is a weak commentary to say that they are rendering high and efficient service to the present issue. But in spite of my inability to command the proper language of praise for their efforts, you and I know only too well the embracing significance of the role they are playing today.

As a final word and since I am not in the least unmindful of the high honor and privilege afforded me to speak on an occasion of this kind, I should like to venture a prediction which I am certain must be in every mind, that the good ship *Benito Juárez* will go out to sea with the courage and tenacity of the man whose name she bears, and that she will be a never-ending source of pride to every friend of freedom and the lash of every enemy of liberty.

Address By Hon. Jesse H. Jones Before the Committee for Economic Development

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, before the Committee for Economic Development.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My associates and I in the Department of Commerce have been privileged to meet with the Committee for Economic Development a number of times in the initial stages of your program, and I am glad to meet with you at your first general meeting; speaking especially to those of you with whom we have not met before, we in the Department regard the work of this Committee as of paramount importance to the future of business and the economic security of the Nation.

Private initiative must be ready to occupy its rightful place when the war is over. It should be ready to take hold as Government withdraws from the field of war production. If it is to do this, it must have plans, even though they may be imperfect. These plans must be broad and practical if they are to be of value. They must represent the best thinking of business and industry from every sort of endeavor and from all parts of the country.

The Committee for Economic Development, set up as it is on a national scale, working in harmony with business and Government, can do a great deal in post-war planning. The views and needs of every section of our economy and of the country should be included in the planning.

Despite the many problems that you will have to consider, we should look forward to the post-war period with that same courage and determination with which we are prosecuting the war. Certainly we should not tolerate a single defeatist thought. The job of world reconstruction will challenge the talents and imagination of every constructive thinker. It will absorb so much in the way of men and materials that there need be no serious lack of work for a considerable period. Your problem will be to see that business and industry are ready for their place in the undertaking, and that, as representatives of private initiative and private enterprise, you are prepared for your part with a sound program.

We all know that the problem is to provide jobs at a living wage for every person willing and able to work, and that, my friends, is some job. To do this we as a Nation must maintain high levels of production and find markets for the output of our farms and factories. We will have to do this if we are to avoid another post-war depression such as the one that engulfed us in the late twenties, or probably much worse.

We hear a great deal these days of the cost of war. We are advised that our Government will have to spend $100,000,000,000 this year to prosecute the war. We realize, too, that before the war is won, we must spend many billions more. But because of the immediate nature of war expenditures, we are apt to forget what the depression cost us.

The Bureau of the Census recently compiled some very interesting figures on the licking we took after the 1929 collapse which ended the post-war boom. These figures reveal that the value of manufactured products decreased $112,000,000,000 in the decade of 1930–39 as compared with the decade 1920–29. Factory wages decreased $20,000,000,000 between these two periods. Retail trade was $75,000,000,000 less in the 1930–39 decade than it was in the previous 10 years. Farm income was $32,000,000,000 less. Railroad income suffered a decrease of $19,000,000,000, and a third of our railroads went into receivership. Our exports fell off $24,000,000,000. We all know and felt the cost in bank, business, and industrial failures, and the drop in farm prices, which reached an all-time low. On top of that, we had to spend billions of dollars on the Work Projects Administration and benefit payments to farmers in order to cushion the general collapse. These few items I have cited—and they by no means constitute all of the costs that can be laid to the door of the depression—total more than $250,000,000,000, a figure some now cite as the probable cost of this war to the United States. It must be obvious to you businessmen that if we are to pay the cost of this war, we cannot do it by indulging in another depression, for depressions cost as much as wars.

The vastness of our post-war problem may seem more real to me because, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other agencies under my supervision, much of the governmental expansion of industrial facilities has been done. Some of you may be familiar with the speech I made only a few days ago in which I emphasize the size of the Government's investment in facilities for war production. The Defense Plant Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has built and owns more than 1,500 plants for all sorts of basic materials and finished products. In some fields, such as aluminum, magnesium, and rubber, Government will at the end of the war have a much greater capacity than private industry. In some lines, such as aircraft and airplane parts, Government will own many times what private industry has built. In still other fields Government plants will be a major factor.

Congress will have to decide how these Government properties are to be operated in peacetime, and it will need the advice of every thinking man. In my view Congress can be relied upon if those of us in business will be honest and frank with Congress. It will be bad for the country, and each and everyone of us, if any group attempts to take selfish advantage in the transformation we will have to face. It is, however, possible, if business and industry seek to cooperate wholeheartedly with Government, that much of the war expansion can be put to work usefully for the United States and for many parts of the world. Certainly there will be an opportunity for private initiative and private capital to replace Government in business. It is your responsibility to see that this opportunity is not missed.

One of your big jobs is to work out plans that will be acceptable to Congress so that we will not have to charge all of the billions we are now spending only to the cost of war. This much is certain, that if the businessmen of the country, either through the Committee for Economic Development or in some other way, do not have concrete, practical suggestions for the conversion of industry from war to peace, Government will have to make the decisions. Under such circumstances what the Government does may not be to your liking In that event we would have only ourselves to blame, for it seems to me that, if the past 10 years have taught us anything, it is that business cannot merely express dislike for what Government does. It must be prepared to offer practical solutions based not on privilege—but service and the common welfare.

The factors which should give you enthusiasm for the responsibility you have undertaken as members of this committee are that, with the coming of peace, there will be many opportunities for our farms and factories, our man-hours and money. Many parts of the world will have to be rehabilitated both physically and materially. This will greatly increase our foreign trade. There will be markets enough. The problems will be to fill, and of course to finance, orders, not to get them. In the United States alone, the consumer demand will be tremendous, and the Government's policy of war savings should release money enough to provide a substantial demand.

These after-war markets, both at home and abroad, will offer American business a great opportunity, and to be ready for them requires all of the intelligence and ingenuity at our command. It is a big job to mobilize every company in America to prepare for high levels of employment and productivity. That is what I understand the Committee for Economic Development is attempting to do. It has never been tried before, and that constitutes a challenge to you.

President Roosevelt last year said that winning the peace was one of the patriotic aims of the United States. That assurance should convince us that he wants sound post-war planning; that we must, even in times of great emergency, give thought to the future. Whatever your committee is able to accomplish toward the solution of post-war problems will pay big dividends to every man, woman, and child in the United States.

We at home must carry on with the determination to have ready for our boys when they come back a world where opportunity still exists and the rights and privileges our generation has enjoyed are available to them

As I said at the beginning of these remarks, the Department of Commerce is deeply interested in what you are attempting to do, and we are grateful to you for your willingness to give so much of yourselves and your time to post-war planning. We know your efforts wil be rewarded, and when we can help, we will be glad to.

World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered last Sunday morning over station WMAL, in Washington, D. C., by Lothrop Stoddard dealing with world events of the past week.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This week even the swelling tide of victory in North Africa has been overshadowed by the controversy which has arisen over the situation in the South Pacific. Last Sunday I noted the beginnings of that crisis, pointing out the ominous state of affairs there and citing Gen. Douglas MacArthur's bitter reflections on Bataan Day, the tragic anniversary which marked the end of our resistance in the Philippines. Since then the controversy has been intensified. It has been marked by a series of sharp exchanges between MacArthur's headquarters in Australia and official Washington as represented by the Secretaries of War and the Navy. It has spread to the hall of Congress and is being taken up by the press and the general public. In my opinion, this is a good thing, provided we understand what it is all about. Far more than an argument between soldiers and bureaucrats is involved. The real issue we face concerns the grand strategy of this war and involves the future course of our national life.

Nothing could be more unfortunate than to try and choke off discussion of this vital matter by branding criticism of the official course of action as facetious or even unpatriotic. An instance of this attitude occurred Friday on the Senate floor. Senator CHANDLER, a Democratic member of the Military Affairs Committee, urged that insistent warnings of danger from Japan and pleas for help be heeded by strengthening our position in the Pacific and the Far East all the way from the Aleutians and Australia to China. He was immediately countered by Senator BARKLEY, Democratic leader of the upper House, who said that he was willing to leave decisions of strategy to the generals, while another administration spokesman, Senator PEPPER, commented that congressional strategists "can't claim any more authority than any other swivel-chair strategists," so he was willing to defer to the generals' judgment.

Now we ought clearly to realize that such remarks contain a deep-going fallacy. While generals and admirals do run wars, once they have started, the basic planning as to how and where they shall be fought is done by the Executive head of the Nation. This is strikingly shown in the present conflict. For more than a generation our armed services had regarded Japan as the logical enemy, and the American people heartily concurred after the sneak punch at Pearl Harbor, the worst blow we had ever received. But the President, our constitutional Commander in Chief, thought otherwise. From the very start, Mr. Roosevelt decided that the main weight of our war effort should be thrown, not against Japan, but against Germany and its European Axis satellites. That basic decision was made by him in accordance with his official and intimate advisers, mostly civilians. The primary function of the generals and admirals at those White House conferences was to give technical judgments as to how the grand strategy already decided upon could best be carried out. The Army and Navy were thus handed a job cut out for them, no matter what they thought about it. They are forbidden by the rules of the service from publicly discussing, not only their professional activities but also the strategic concept which lies behind. Indeed, they are mainly concerned with the technical problems which confront them rather than with the reasons which created those problems. Hence, to argue, like Senators BARKLEY and PEPPER, that we should leave everything to the generals and defer to their judgment is to miss the

essential point, which is that the generals are merely agents—technical agents carrying out fundamentally political decisions made for them by the executive branch of Government. The discussion now agitating the country concerns only incidentally specific military and naval dispositions or operations. The real issue is whether or not the original White House decision to concentrate against Germany rather than Japan was sound, and also whether, even though then sound, changing conditions may not have rendered desirable a change in emphasis as between the two main war theaters. Grand strategy should be conceived, not as a rigid formula, but as a delicate balance, continually oscillating and determined not merely by strictly military needs but also by diplomatic, economic, and ideological factors. Obviously, such complex decisions cannot be left to generals and admirals. They must be made by the President and his qualified advisers. On him and them, rather than on the armed services, rests the over-all responsibility.

But, in a constitutional democracy such as ours, responsibility implies accountability. And no such accountability is possible unless discussion and criticism of the war effort and policies take place. Our British cousins understand this very well. In Britain, a clear distinction is made between the over-all direction of the war and its technical prosecution. It would strike the average Britisher as both odd and unseemly if he were told that he should not discuss the general method of waging the war, but should leave such matters to generals and admirals. No one knows that better than Prime Minister Winston Churchill, who fully realizes his continuous accountability to Parliament and public opinion, and who never tries to dodge that obligation.

Bearing all this in mind, let me try briefly to review the evolution of our grand strategy. The original decision to concentrate against the European end of the Axis was determined in the lights of the situation which existed in December 1941. At that dark moment, our new allies, Britain and Russia, were hard pressed. Germany's armed might and prestige stood at its zenith, while Japan's was still an unknown quantity. The "Hitler first" formula then adopted can thus be defended as being in accord with the realities of the moment. But, "Hitler first" was never meant to mean "Hitler only." It was recognized that a certain proportion of our war effort must be earmarked for use against Japan. This qualification mollified early critics who believed that we should have struck first against Japan. Though not convinced, they acquiesced.

However, before long, their doubts reawakened. Britain stood firm, while Russia repelled the great German onslaught which, on the day of Pearl Harbor, was within sight of Moscow. But Japan showed undreamed-of strength, and 6 months after Pearl Harbor had conquered Singapore, the Dutch Indies and Burma, and threatened Australia. Furthermore, the Japanese revealed a ferocity, ambition, and fanatical hatred which made them, on a long-term basis, perhaps the most dangerous foes of our national life. Yet the "Hitler first" formula was still so rigidly adhered to that we could do nothing more than fight a defensive war in the Pacific, while our ally, China, was almost entirely neglected. Japan was left unmolested to exploit and fortify the vast new empire that she had conquered, even though this might enable her to become invincible to subsequent attack. In Australia, in China, and among our own armed forces in the Pacific, apprehension and criticism mounted steadily as time went on. Their understanding, from MacArthur down, had been that they would be given aid enough to harass the Japanese and prevent them from full consolidation of their gains. Yet even those limited hopes were not realized, and they could do little more than hold on, waging war on what was bitterly described as "a shoestring."

The gloom deepened from Canberra to Chungking when our great expedition to North Africa and the Casablanca Conference showed by deed and word that the Pacific and the Far East were assigned to minor roles by our grand strategy until Hitler had been disposed of. And even that was not the worst. Casablanca practically gave the green light to Japan, and Tokyo presently showed a disposition to take full advantage of the fact. American and Australian air patrols discovered a rapid building up of Japanese strength all along the vast 3,000-mile island arc north of Australia which boded no good to that isolated continent or to our supply line across the Pacific. Warning after warning was sent from MacArthur's headquarters and from the Australian Government that, unless more aid was sent, even a defensive war might prove dubious, yet Washington's response proved unsatisfactory.

The climax came early last week with the stepping up of Japanese mass air raids on our bases in New Guinea and the Solomons. Then it was decided to bring matters to the attention of the American public. Accordingly, General Blamey, Australian commander of Allied land forces, gave his sensational interview to press correspondents at General MacArthur's headquarters announcing the vast extent of Japanese preparations, while next day MacArthur himself issued his grim communique that the Japanese had "complete control of the sea lanes in the western Pacific. * * * If we lose the air, naval forces cannot save us." Those two statements started the current controversy. In Washington, Secretary of the Navy Knox countered General Blamey's interview by one of his own, in which he threw doubt on the danger to Australia, and when MacArthur issued a supplementary warning, Secretary of War Stimson indirectly rebuked the general by referring only to appeals from "Australian officials" and stating that "priorities must be determined in the light of detailed studies of the whole global military situation."

The unresponsive attitude of Messrs. Knox and Stimson must logically be considered as reflecting the White House. They are the President's spokesmen, bound by Cabinet policies. On the other hand, MacArthur and his subordinate, General Kenney, head of our Air Forces in the South Pacific, must think the danger very pressing to have engaged in a controversy with their departmental chiefs. Army officers do not air their grievances in public save under exceptional circumstances. What they have been telling us during the past week is that there is a grave possibility of a disaster in their field of operations. They do not intend to be made the scapegoats if a disaster occurs, so they are putting the responsibility just where it belongs, which is right on the President's desk and in the administration's lap. David Lawrence emphasized this in his column in the Evening Star Thursday when he wrote: "If there should be a debacle for us in the Pacific, the blame would rest squarely on President Roosevelt." In similar vein the Star's political commentator, Gould Lincoln, analyzed the harmful effects upon the administration and the Democratic Party of a major defeat in the Pacific, which public opinion would inevitably ascribe to the administration's misjudgment of grand strategy, for which it is basically responsible. Indeed, it is my humble opinion that such a catastrophe might produce a political earthquake, which would result in the unprecedented spectacle of a genuine coalition Government eschewing partisan politics for the duration. To many persons that would doubtless be a consummation devoutly to be wished.

And now, in closing let me express my gratification at the interest which my radio audience has displayed in the little poem I recited last Sunday entitled "White Solitude," written by a young Navy officer and giving his impressions of Midway Island at the time of the memorable battle there last year, in which he was engaged. Being unpublished, it required the consent of his family before I could broadcast his name. In response to several requests as to his identity, I will say that he is Randolph Dickins, Jr., now lieutenant junior grade, and 22 years of age. As I said last Sunday, I believe that the poem is a significant contribution to our war literature.

Sponge Iron

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on sponge iron, and particularly as it relates to possibilities for the use of sponge iron from the ores of Connecticut, delivered by H. A. Brassert, of Hartford, Conn., March 18, 1943. An estimate of cost of printing the address has been made. The cost will be $112.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to be here this evening, and to have the opportunity to talk to you on a subject which at this time is of such great interest—sponge iron. What I will talk about tonight is sponge iron from the ores of Connecticut, its history in the past and its opportunities in the future. I want to preface my remarks by saying that I have not investigated any of your iron ore deposits, although the most promising of them appear to be within a radius of 30 miles, more or less, from my own farm near Washington, in Litchfield County.

A great deal has been said about sponge iron, and not everything has been correct. I want to clarify at the start one of the points on which there has been misinformation and controversy. Sponge iron is not going to replace mass production of pig iron and steel—as made by the orthodox methods in blast furnaces and steel furnaces—certainly not in a hurry, if ever. Sponge iron is made from iron ores by removing most of their gangue and oxygen content without melting the iron. There are many ores from which the silica can only be separated economically by melting in the blast furnace. Furthermore, it is not in the province of sponge iron to replace the ordinary grades of iron and steel; but being a virgin metal of high purity it should be reintroduced as a leading quality metal for the production of the finest steels and for many special products requiring metal of the highest quality. In bringing about the rebirth of this old art, advantage can be taken of all that modern science has to offer as well as the latest technique in metallurgy and

handling of materials. The State of Connecticut with its highly developed industries has need of fine steels which might be produced economically from native ores.

Sponge iron is the oldest form of iron known to man. The unsurpassed quality of the ancient irons as represented by Damascus swords, Toledo blades, the Delhi iron column in India, is due to the fact that they were forged from unadulterated virgin metal produced directly from the ores. Charcoal was the fuel. About the middle of the last century sponge iron went into the discard in the Western countries with the depletion of a handy supply of charcoal and of accessible, easily mined ores, under the growing competition of pig iron produced in blast furnaces using anthracite and coke, and of steel made from such pig iron and scrap, the supply of which was rapidly increasing. The puddling process, Bessemer steel, and finally, open hearth and electric steel, took its place.

The manufacture of sponge iron in this State of Connecticut started in 1657 and lasted over 250 years; local mines supplied the ore to forges and charcoal furnaces operating in many parts of the State but particularly in the Housatonic River valley. The records show that as early as 1734 iron ore was mined in Litchfield County. The first steel bar made in the United States was made in Connecticut. The Salisbury iron produced there was famous not only throughout the eastern part of the United States, but in many other parts of the world. They were shipping Salisbury iron to England in the years before the Revolutionary War. We know that the Salisbury ore was high in manganese. It must also have been an ore of high purity, very low in phosphorus and sulfur; otherwise, with the method used then of reducing the ore with solid carbon (charcoal), such impurities would have combined with and spoiled the iron. With today's method of concentration and low-temperature gaseous reduction, lower-grade ores can also be used for making a high grade of sponge iron.

The most important producers in the old days were the Ore Hill Mine, and the Davis and Chatfield Mines, all on the eastern slope of the Toccunuc Range. In late Colonial days, the Colony of Connecticut was the iron-making center for all New England, and many of thee furnaces in Massachusetts and New York State used Salisbury ores. On Mount Riga there was a great forge, the smoke of which could be seen for 50 miles. It was the wonder of its day.

In 1762 young Ethan Allen, later to win fame at Fort Ticonderoga, built the first blast furnace in the State of Connecticut, near Litchfield Associated with him were John Haseltine and Samuel Forbes, who put up the capital. Ethan Allen, being a profane man, as the saying went in those days, swore that he would "turn out the best blankety-blank cannon metal in those parts." He kept his word. Cannon cast in the Litchfield furnace, out of Connecticut ores, proved best of all in the Revolutionary War; the guns on the *Constellation* and *Constitution*, "Old Ironsides," as well as at the Battery on the tip of Manhattan, were made from Salisbury iron, as were many tons of cannonballs, iron tires for wheels, axles, and much of the chain booms that were strung across the Hudson and Long Island Sound to keep out the enemy fleet. The great anchor for the *Constitution*, a prize achievement of the time, was forged at Litchfield and had to be hauled down the mountainside by a dozen yoke of oxen. Those were stirring days for Salisbury, which enjoyed the first armament boom in the history of the country; 2,000 men worked day and night making shot and cannon, musket barrels, and other munitions of war. And they turned out a product second to none, of which the citizens were justly proud—Salisbury iron; so the chronicles tell us.

In 1835—108 years ago—the Connecticut Legislature, at the request of Governor Edwards, voted an appropriation for a survey of the mineral resources of the State. The work was entrusted to two of the leading scientists of the day: Prof. Charles Upham Shepard, who issued his very illuminating report on the mineral resources in 1838; and Dr. James G. Percival, who published an exhaustive study of the State's geology in 1842.

Professor Shepard in his report in 1838 to the legislature, points out that in addition to the well-known iron-ore mines at Salisbury there were also equally important deposits of high-grade ores at Sharon, Kent, New Preston, Redding, Newtown Winchester, and Roxbury, to mention a few. As far as I can learn, no official survey of these properties has ever been made; therefore nothing definite is known about the approximate tonnage and quality of the ore reserves. All that is known as a fact is that magnetite, hematite, limonite, and siderite ores do still exist within the borders of the State, and that the founding fathers and their successors made a superior grade of iron out of some of these ores. Professor Shepard gave his opinion in the following words: "It may confidently be asserted that not one-half of the workable beds are as yet fairly uncovered." Of course, the total amount of ore actually mined probably did not exceed a few million tons, but on the other hand, mining facilities in those days were poor and inadequate to produce ore from any but the shallow beds; in fact, exploration methods as we know them today did not exist, nor was it possible to mine at depths which are commonplace in mining today.

Whether the publicity given to the iron ore resources of the State had something to do with it or not, the period from 1840 until shortly after the Civil War saw the building of charcoal blast furnaces in many parts of the State. A partial list shows that at one time or another there were blast furnaces operating at East Canaan (five furnaces in all), Bulls Bridge (two furnaces), Chapinsville (two furnaces), Colebrook, Cornwall Bridge, Huntsville (three furnaces), West Cornwall, Falls Village, North Kent (three furnaces), Killingworth, Lakeville, Lime Rock (three furnaces), Kent (two furnaces), Salisbury (two furnaces), Preston, Robertsville, New Preston, Roxbury, Joiceville, Sharon Valley (two furnaces), Stafford Hollow, and Sharon.

In 1840 Connecticut ranked fourth in the United States in production of iron and steel, Michigan third, Massachusetts second, and Pennsylvania first. That decade marked the peak of the iron and steel industry in this State, and although some furnaces kept on operating until 1898, and one of them—at East Canaan—until 1923, the industry rapidly declined in the 1880's, not because the ore deposits were worked out or exhausted, but because iron could be produced cheaper elsewhere By 1920 there were only three furnaces in operation in all New England; two of these were at East Canaan, belonging to the Salisbury Iron Co.; the other at Richmond, Mass. Since 1923 all have closed down. The competition of the anthracite and coke blast furnaces of Pennsylvania using more and more of the high-grade, low-cost ores of the Lake Superior region provided competition that the Connecticut forges and foundries which were based on charcoal could not meet. One by one the furnaces were closed down, the mines abandoned. Salisbury iron, which once proudly dominated the quality iron market, has become a memory—one of which the people of this State, however, may justly be proud.

Vitally important changes in the American iron and steel industry may soon begin to take shape. For nearly half a century the iron ore market has been dominated by the cheap and vast output of the Mesabi Range in the Lake Superior region; but now its great open pits are commencing to show signs of exhaustion. The demands of two world wars and the great building period of the twenties have brought this about sooner than expected. The Lake Superior region will be forced into more and more expensive underground mining and benefication of low-grade ores on a much larger scale than is practiced today. Concentrates made from the lean ores will gradually take the place of the cheap open-pit ores—but ores found in other parts of the country, low-grade as well as richer ores, may then again come into their own. If they are located near suitable supplies of solid, gaseous, or liquid fuel and near consuming centers, economics may once more be in their favor. In fact, who knows but the pendulum may have swung a full circle and the ore deposits of Connecticut, Massachusetts, and neighboring New York, which once supplied iron and steel for the Eastern States, may again become an important raw material, not for the ordinary products, but for the finest uses to which iron and steel can be put.

There can be no question as to the suitable quality of the ores consumed in the old days. They were proved over a century and a half; the important question now is the actual tonnage and quality of the ores remaining in the untouched reserves; the possibilities for economic exploitation; the cost of production. In this connection, it must be kept in mind that many ore veins in the State are thin, and therefore expensive to mine, but that this handicap may be compensated for by saving in freight rates and high quality of the final iron and steel products.

There are many ways in which sponge iron can be made. The ancients mixed the iron ore with carbon and brought it to a sufficient temperature so that a pasty or liquid slag was formed which could be squeezed or hammered out of the mass of metal. The metal was forged or reheated and forged—sometimes several times—for the production of the highest quality bars. The original forges were open fires blown with hand bellows, and later with bellows driven by water wheels. Out of these small Catalan fires, shaft furnaces were developed; but still the metal produced was a low carbon metal which could be forged directly and which was not brought to the molten state. It was only when the height of the furnace was increased so that the metal absorbed more carbon from the charcoal and its fusion point was thereby lowered that molten pig iron could be produced. As long as this pig iron was made from charcoal blown with cold blast, it was still reputed as a superior metal. When the furnace grew larger, hot blast was introduced, and the fuel became anthracite and finally coke, more impurities were absorbed by the pig iron and some of them went into the steel. Metal made in the puddling process was also adulterated by the use of half of the metal in the form of pig iron and some of the gangue of the ore was retained. The removal of the silicon, carbon, sulfur, phosphorus in the pig iron has been the task of the steel processes developed in the past 75 years, first the Bessemer, then the open hearth and last, the electric furnace. But the removal of sulfur and phosphorus could never be complete; and in these processes nitrogen and hydrogen, which we know are detrimental, are absorbed by the metal, though present in exceedingly small quantities. Whether the absence of nitrogen and hydrogen in sponge iron made without melting—especially of that made at relatively low temperatures—is the answer, modern scientific research will soon tell us. At any rate, the quality of the original virgin metal made directly from pure ores in the Catalan forges without melting has never been reached.

The process I prefer to use is a new method for making sponge iron—by gaseous, low tem-

perature reduction and compacting to produce a dense, metallic structure. It uses gases instead of solid carbon as a reducing agent, and operates at very low temperatures, between 1,300° and 1,500° F. for most hematites, and between 1,100° and 1,300° F. for magnetites, in accordance with the kind of gas used, pure hydrogen requiring the lowest temperatures. The blast furnace works at a temperature of 3,000° F. The gases I prefer to use are hydrogen or gases containing high percentage of hydrogen. The process produces a continuous stream of porous, spongy, reduced fines which are immediately compressed or briquetted into a dense, heavy stock while still hot and protected by a reducing atmosphere against reoxidation. These briquets can be made into finished steel either by melting in the open hearth or electric furnace, or they can be used directly for the production of bars and shapes by forging, rolling, or extrusion; or the reduced powder, if made from sufficiently pure ore concentrates, may be used by itself or mixed with other metals or suitable substances in the powdered metal industry for the production of many high quality metal parts and new commercial articles.

The Brassert-Cape reduction unit which is now being installed at the Republic Steel Corporation's plant at Warren, Ohio, is a modification of the well-known Herreshoff furnace, with a slotted hearth installed for final reduction in the bottom of the structure. The Herreshoff furnace is a highly developed unit long used for many purposes such as roasting, calcining, drying, and desulfurizing materials. Its use for reducing iron ores at low temperatures by hydrogen, however, is new. The main structure of the furnace has not been changed except for the addition of one or several slotted hearths at the bottom of the usual 10 or 12 superimposed rabbling hearths. In the slotted hearth, the reducing gas bubbles through the ore bed in such a manner that no grain of material can leave the furnace without having been in contact with the gas. In fact, the charge is moved across the hearth and out of the furnace primarily by the gas.

The Herreshoff furnace is a simple cylindrical vertical unit with a slowly revolving, hollow shaft in the center. Rabbles or teeth are mounted on the shaft and move the ore across the hearths successively, inwardly and outwardly, turning the ore and exposing all of it to the gas. The ore drops from one hearth to the other while the gas flows upward, each time flowing through the dropping ore and passing over the ore in each hearth as it is turned over by the rabbles. An additional quantity of gas is injected directly into the ore through the rabble arms which are hollow, and get their supply of gas from the central shaft. On the upper Herreshoff hearths the ore is dried and preheated, and on the lower hearths it is partially reduced. If it requires roasting on account of sulphur, or if requires calcining, this is also accomplished in the top hearths. At any rate, the ore is preheated and prereduced to the desired degree before it reaches the final slotted reducing hearth or hearths in the bottom.

We have designed two forms of this hearth, one a V-type, in which there are a number of concentric small V-shaped troughs placed across a large V which serves as gas container. The gas bubbles through the fine slots in the bottom of the multiple V's, and imparts to the ore bed a state equivalent to fluidity so it flows around the hearth to the discharge end. The gas ducts are so designed than any ore fines falling though, in case the gas flow is interrupted, may be easily removed through the bottom.

The other type of hearth is built of radial segments, forming inclined slots between them which resemble the blades of a turbine. The gas flows through these slots into the ore bed, moving the bubbling, fluent ore stream spirally outward toward the point of discharge. This hearth design has been adopted for the Republic plant. The gas is introduced into the ore bed, and the rate of travel of the ore fines is retarded and regulated by the rabble teeth. The hearth is constructed of easily-removable sections. The design of the slots prevents any ore fines falling through when the gas flow is interrupted.

The only mechanical parts in the furnace are the rabbles which propel the ore charge in the Herreshoff hearths and which are meant to break up any possible gas locks in the slotted hearths. The operation of the reducing furnace is entirely automatic and thermally controlled. Provision is made for the introduction of gas at various levels and exact temperatures can be maintained in all of the hearths. The problem of sticking, due to local temperature rises, the bane of former reduction processes, has thus been solved successfully.

Hundreds of Herreshoff installations have given many long years of satisfactory service at higher temperatures than are required for the gaseous reduction of iron ores. Compared to the blast furnace which, with its auxiliary equipment, is an intricate apparatus, the Brassert-Cape low temperature reduction unit is a comparatively simple apparatus. It works at low temperatures, whereas the blast furnace in its lower portion has to deal with temperatures of around 3,000° F. As stated before, the blast furnace lining has to be protected at the various stages against abrasion by the descending stock, against corrosion by gases, slags, and sheer fluxing by the high temperatures in the bosh and hearth. The armament of the lower part of the blast furnace is not unlike that of a battleship. The blast furnace is about 100 feet high and charged not continuously, but by batches with an intricate electrically controlled apparatus. The Herreshoff furnace on the other hand, is only about 40 feet high and smaller in diameter. Operating temperatures in our process will in no case exceed 1,500° F. The wear and tear in the Herreshoff is, of course, infinitely smaller, if only on account of this temperature difference. The ore is charged at the top continuously by a simple, well-known type of feeder; it moves through the furnace at a controlled rate. At the bottom, the revolving rabbles control and insure uniform delivery of the reduced fines into the chute which feeds the briquetting rolls.

The feeding of the ore, its movement through the furnace, its discharge into the briquetting rolls, are continuous and entirely automatic. In the blast furnace, charging of the raw materials, discharging of the slag and iron is done in batches. It is not continuous. The danger of explosions in the Brassert-Cape reduction furnace has been eliminated, since the entire apparatus is enclosed and constantly under a positive gas pressure.

The complete low temperature gaseous reduction plant consists of a number of units. First, there is the gas preparation plant; if the gas contains sulfur, gas desulfurizing apparatus must be installed; where natural gas is used a gas re-forming or cracking plant is needed. The prepared gas next passes through a heat exchanger and then through a preheater before entering the furnace. For the compacting of the reduced ore at the bottom of the furnace, briquetting rolls are provided, placed immediately underneath the discharge of the reduced ore fines. Here the iron powder is compressed while still hot and under a reducing atmosphere, forming dense melting stock briquettes. Miscellaneous equipment for the handling of the raw material and of the finished product, such as cranes and endless belts, a gas washer for the cleaning of the spent gases, control apparatus and instruments, complete the installation.

The gas from the coke oven mains flows through the various preparatory stages and into the reduction unit. The spent gases issuing from the top are washed to remove the water vapor, the product of the reaction. Half of the gas is returned into the direct reduction unit; the other half is sent back into the steel mill gas main, there to be consumed in steel making and heating furnaces. The removal in the process of ore reduction of some of the hydrogen contained in the coke-oven gas results in an increase of its heating value and its luminosity, so that the gas becomes more suitable both as fuel in the steel works furnaces and for other uses.

The cost of operation and maintenance of a low temperature unit will naturally be less than that of a high temperature melting apparatus such as a blast furnace, with all its expensive machinery and equipment. The operation of the low temperature reduction plant is entirely continuous, practically automatic, and under complete control. It is certainly cheaper to operate than a blast furnace and its coke plant, both of which are high-temperature equipment which have to be discharged periodically, and still have manual and intermittent features in the operation and much complicated auxiliary equipment.

In my experience, a great many ores have been investigated; and it was found that it was easier to work with our high-grade eastern magnetite concentrates than with any other ores. Most minerals in which the gangue is free can be used for this purpose. Such ores will be subjected to magnetic concentration before or after reduction and before briquetting. Iron ores become magnetic upon being reduced wholly or partially to the metallic state. Therefore, magnetic concentration becomes possible after passing the ore through the low-temperature gaseous-reduction process, even when using hematites and other nonmagnetic ores. As long as the temperature remains below the limit of magnetic permeability, as it does in this case, this magnetic concentrating step might be taken after reduction while the reduced ore fines are still hot. Or they can be submerged in a cooling liquid and then subjected to wet magnetic concentration, reheated in a reducing atmosphere and briquetted. At any rate, the continuity of my process need not be interrupted.

There are, however, ores in which the gangue, although free, is so intimately associated with the iron oxides that separation by washing, flotation, magnetic, electrostatic separation, or air tabling is not economically feasible. In that case, the excess gangue left in the ores after possible concentration enters the sponge iron briquettes with the reduced iron. The briquettes can then be melted in a cupola, a rotary or tilting furnace, and the molten gangue separated by the usual way from the molten metal by flushing it off with the molten slag. The molten metal, free from gangue, is transferred to the open hearth or electric furnace for conversion into steel.

Then there are many ores in which the iron oxides are so finely dispersed or intermingled with the gangue that no adequate separation is possible except by exceedingly fine grinding, causing the formation of slimes which cannot be handled. Or the oxides may be chemically combined with all or some of the gangue compounds. Such ores cannot be used for the production of iron and steel except by melting in the blast furnace or by chemical solution.

I believe that the direct reduction process offers the proper method for the recovery of titanium, vanadium, and chromium values contained in ores which cannot be worked economically at present. Pyrites residues and roll scale are other possible raw materials.

Sponge iron is an excellent raw material in the manufacture of high-quality steel on account of its great purity, the practical absence of sulfur and phosphorus, the fact that it is not contaminated like scrap with harmful and uncertain constituents, and also the absence of nitrogen and other harmful gases.

The sponge iron produced in the low-temperature reduction process is far too good a material merely to replace scrap, even the highest grade of scrap, although in the present emergency that will be its first function. The full value of this product can only be shown when used substantially alone in the making of the finest steels.

Of especial interest to the Connecticut foundrymen may be the idea that he can produce his own metallic stock by the ownership of such a plant, that he would no longer be dependent upon the uncertain supply of pig iron and scrap. He could make a melting stock for his cupolas or steel furnaces directly from the ore. He can regulate the carbon and the alloy content as he desires, for the production of the most suitable foundry and malleable grades of steel castings.

Thus the new low-temperature gasecus reduction process offers a chance to industry to revert from the highly centralized integrated units to economical small-scale operation. This makes possible the distribution of a number of small sponge-iron plants feeding local industries and creating employment in small towns and rural communities without disturbing the economic equilibrium of the industry at large.

The extent of such a development and its commercial possibilities can only be determined after scientific exploration of the iron ore reserves in the State, as well as the neighboring Berkshire Hills of Massachusetts and New York State, also of available fuels and of the economic structure involving transportation costs of raw materials to the point of manufacture and of the sponge-iron product to the markets, and the utilization of byproducts, particularly of the valuable spent gases.

If old records show that in 1730 iron ore was carried on horseback in leather bags from the Ore Hill Mine in Litchfield County to the forges and foundries of Housatonic, now known as Great Barrington; if in 1885 Governor Holly was able to say (and I quote): "Salisbury iron has been proven by tests over 150 years—at armories, at arsenals, and navy yards—to have greater tensile strength and resisting power than any other iron ever produced" (end of quote), then today, with modern transportation and modern technical methods and all the advantages of modern science, Connecticut should be able to revive its old iron-making industry and develop it to give highest quality specialty steels to its machine-tool and other industries serving its own and the Nation's armories, arsenals, and navy yards.

NOTE.—I have used the term "sponge iron" in the broad sense in which it has recently been applied to all iron made directly from ores—without melting in the blast furnace. Actually, sponge iron is an intermediate product only, the result of removal of oxygen from the ore, which leaves a porous structure. As soon as the reduced porous iron is forged, hammered, or otherwise compacted, it loses its spongy nature and appearance, and becomes solid iron, really wrought iron. This is what was made in the old Catalan forges, often called bloomeries, of Connecticut, and other States in the Eighteenth Century. When later they learned to make big iron in charcoal furnaces, this was refined in the molten state by adding ore and a spongy ball was the result, from which the slag was squeezed out and then it was immediately forged while still hot. The resulting wrought iron bars could hardly be called sponge iron, but I have used the term because it has now had such wide acceptance.

Mr. Eden's Good Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of the issue of Saturday, April 17, 1943, entitled "Mr. Eden's Good Advice—To Us."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. EDEN'S GOOD ADVICE TO US

When Anthony Eden, British Foreign Minister, spoke to the Maryland Assembly late last month, he said: "First let me say I feel at home here. From my earliest years I have been steeped in the atmosphere of Maryland. It is a keen personal pleasure to stand in Annapolis where Robert Eden once stood. A few miles away, in the city hall at Baltimore, now hang the pictures of the Calvert family from which I am proud to be descended. They are friendly faces which I recognize from my childhood days when they looked down on me from the walls of my father's house."

When Mr. Eden reported to the House of Commons on his American mission—we have yet to learn what made this the most important and successful of his career—he said: "Perhaps I may be allowed here one observation on the nature of our relations generally with the Government and people of the United States. I think it is a mistake to try to base these relations mainly upon sentiment. We may not always like each other very much. I think it a mistake to try to base them in common origins, common parentage, even common language, because there will be occasions when we differ from one another, and I think it is desirable to base them on their true foundation, which is a common interest in the maintenance of world peace and in preventing a repetition of these catastrophic world conflicts every 20 years."

If Mr. Eden's remarks in the House of Commons could be taken in all truth to reveal what his second visit to the United States at this time had taught him, and if that became British policy, the affairs of the Empire would be ready for the family counselor and the last will and testament. The old institution would be picking at the covers and asking why it was getting dark so soon. But Anthony Eden, standing where his ancestor, Robert, had stood and looking at the Calvert pictures which looked down on him as they had done in his father's house, did not receive any such impressions nor will his Government act on such ideas. We could profit if it did.

England is the only magnet which can draw the United States into foreign wars. In the Maryland Assembly Mr. Eden could see its polarity. If England could restrict its wars to Boer size, Afghan size, or Crimean size, with the outcome in no doubt, this country would keep its troops at home regardless of what was happening in other parts of the world and its conduct would not be thought unseemly. The Chinese incident from its beginning was an outrage against treaties we had signed and against a peaceable people. We recognized that and deplored it. The suggestion that we put the treaties into effect and fight for China would have been thought crazy unless the British had asked us to join them. They refused to join us.

We had regret for the fate of Austria. We knew the Czechs as a fine people. We were sorry. That was all. The attack on the Finns was particularly hard to take. It was as if a universally respected family in the community, in a small house down the street, had been attacked by thugs in the night and all the neighbors had pulled down their blinds. Again we were sorry. But when England's new war threatened England's existence, America was on its way across the water with everything it had. Each time we find specious reasons for this action. Its for humanity, it's for peace, it's for democracy, it's for decency and civilization, none of which issues ever becomes involved in the dangers, misfortunes, or sufferings of any other people.

Until 1898 England was invariably hostile to us. It was a continuing enemy from the Revolution until shortly before the Spanish-American war, when it began to find a common interest with the United States for its own security. It had encouraged the Indians to attack our frontiers, refused to evacuate territory surrendered in the peace treaty, had stirred up trouble in Florida, and maintained a controversy in Maine, tried to keep Oregon away from us, undertook to keep Texas out of the Union, participated in the preliminaries of the French invasion of Mexico, nearly provoked war over Venezuela, and was indifferent to the responding hostility these acts caused in the United States.

The incidents preceding the Boer War and the war itself, with other demonstrations of hostility in Europe, opened the eyes of British statesmen to the fact that their policy had left them without a friend in Europe. A sense of their own insecurity caused a complete reversal of their American attitude. They endeavored to gain a new friend and possible ally by substituting amiability for truculence, and they succeeded. They undertook a sentimental approach to American susceptibilities by offering Rhodes scholarships, by accepting rich Americans far beyond their normal social position in the British way of life, by taking part in Anglo-American organizations, by changing the uncomplimentary tone of English newspapers, by taking up our diplomats in the courts of Europe, in the days when there were courts, and losing no opportunity to create good will in the United States.

The common interest mentioned by Mr. Eden has always been British self-interest. The British Government has never been willing to lend a hand to any international policy the United States has projected as its own, and would not even join Mr Stimson to protect its own Chinese stake when the treaties involving China were violated by Japan. Mistakes such as this have cost the British Empire heavily. General MacArthur is now trying to pull it out from the consequences of supporting Japan instead of the United States. The idea that the United States is in cooperation with Great Britain merely as one of the colonial appendages, bound to carry out British polices, makes a sorry showing on the map today. We could profitably accept Mr. Eden's advice to consult only our own interests.

New Mexico Boy's Prayer on Bataan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article

entitled "New Mexico Boy's Prayer on Bataan Wins Praise," published in the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Morning Journal of April 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW MEXICO BOY'S PRAYER ON BATAAN WINS PRAISE—CAPT. MAX MILLER WRITES OF BERTRAM SANDOVAL'S FAITH UNDER FIRE; BOTH NOW ARE PRISONERS

Some of the fortitude and faith of American soldiers who were in the Philippines was revealed recently in a prayer composed by one of the members of the 200th Coast Artillery during the Battle of Bataan when it was at its worst stage.

The composer was Pvt. Bertram Sandoval, member of an anti-aircraft division of the 200th who was reported a prisoner of the Japanese Feb. 5, 1943.

The story of the composition of the prayer was told by Capt. Max Miller, commander of Sandoval's unit Battery B.

According to Captain Miller's version (he is also a prisoner in the Philippines), he found Sandoval silently praying during the last days of the battle. Miller approached him and asked him what he was doing. Sandoval replied that he was praying. Miller liked the prayer and asked Sandoval to write it down.

The poem, entitled, "Commander of All," displays the unswerving optimism of the Americans on Bataan. Its deep religious feeling and poetical intonation are characteristic of Captain Miller's reference to the "unwavering hope * * * even in defeat," of the Americans.

In his last letter to his wife, who now is residing in Clovis, Miller says: "Yes; they waited and hoped for help that never came; but even then they never lost faith as they went down in defeat, carrying for the first time in its history our flag, the Star-Spangled Banner. Their hope never wavered even in defeat, for they had faith in us. Not only did they hope in us; they hoped in our God. They believed that He would help them."

Sandoval attended Menaul School here and was graduated from the University of New Mexico in 1939. He was former head of the welfare department in Taos.

Two brothers of Private Sandoval are also in the armed forces. They are Sgt. Harry E. Sandoval, stationed at Kirtland Field, and Pvt. Jacob Sandoval, stationed in Greenville, Pa., with Army chemists.

Organization and Collaboration of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials dealing with the subject covered by Senate Resolution 114—one is from the Christian Science Monitor, another from the Chronicle of Augusta, Ga., and the third from the Post Tribune, of Gary, Ind.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 3, 1943]

HESITATIONISM

America cannot drift into peace, but can hesitate and haggle its way into another war. Failure to take a positive stand for effective policing of the peace is one way of deciding once more to invite aggression. Sumner Welles, as Under Secretary of State, has constant occasion to know that the biggest question about United Nations planning for the peace is, Will America help maintain it?

This awareness was reflected in his speech to the New York State Chamber of Commerce. He pointed out that uncertainty about the United States' course is bedeviling the whole effort to shape a just and durable postwar world. If America joins a world-security system it will be strong. If it is strong there should be more opportunity and more freedom for the peaceful development of nations and individuals.

Two measures soon to come before Congress afford the people of the United States an opportunity to stop drifting and to take positive steps toward winning the peace. One is the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution by which the Senate would declare its support for American participation in a world-security system. There is some danger that timidity and delay will denature this declaration. The other measure is the bill to renew the trade agreements act. There is also some danger that a partisan effort will be made to tie the hands of Secretary Hull and Mr. Welles by refusing to renew the present act and insisting on Senate ratification of reciprocal-trade agreements.

Both of these dangers can be overcome and turned into positive safeguards if the people will make their purpose known to Congress. A Senate declaration for the policing of the peace would greatly advance United Nations plans. And renewal of the Trade Agreements Act would show that America is ready to cooperate in a postwar economic structure that will give essential support to peace. There is little frank isolationism today. The influences that would wreck the peace take a subtler form which might be called hesitationism. It can have the same effect unless recognized and overcome.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle of April 8, 1943]

SHOULD TAKE OUR STAND

The American public, through every medium at its command, should see to it that the Ball resolution proposing post-war cooperation between nations does not die a-borning.

No greater harm could come to the prospects for a lasting peace than for Congress to shy off from this simple commitment, and leave the rest of the world to wonder whether the United States, after the war has been won, will be willing to shoulder its responsibilities as a member of the world family of nations, or whether we intend to stay in our own backyard and shun the troubles and fights of our neighbors which inevitably lead to a war which eventually involves us.

The world should be put on notice without delay that the American Congress, acting for the people, is prepared to approve the agreements which our President will negotiate with the other United Nations.

In the present instance we have an unhappy precedent by which we can be guided in making our decision. History records that on March 4, 1919, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge presented to the Senate a resolution signed by 37 Senators which, in effect, warned the world that sufficient votes could not be secured in the Senate for ratification of the League of Nations Covenant.

It was in the dark shadow of this attitude of American noncooperation that the League of Nations was born. It bore this stigma from the beginning, and it is not too much to say that the Lodge resolution sounded the death knell of world cooperation and doomed the League of Nations as a medium for keeping the peace.

The world should know at once that the Congress of the United States stands ready to cooperate after the war, and that the forces of isolation which retreated after our entry into the war will not be allowed to reform their ranks and make a new assault as soon as the guns cease firing.

Congress can take an affirmative stand on the matter of collaboration by adopting the Ball resolution, and roll back the clouds of uncertainty and doubt which trouble the other nations of the world.

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune of April 1, 1943]

PUBLIC APATHY ENDANGERS POST-WAR PLANNING

Some time ago the Ball-Hill-Burton-Hatch resolution calling for organization of a United Nations group to take constructive and immediate action toward winning the peace to come was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There it has lain since and despite wide newspaper discussion of it the country has remained apathetic. A dispatch this week from Washington quoted Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, a member of the committee, reporting he had received less than a dozen letters in reference to the resolution. Others indicated that lack of public interest was startling in view of the deluge of mail generally received when legislation of much less importance is being studied.

Perhaps there is still not sufficient understanding of the significance of the Ball resolution. Otherwise greater effort would be made to inform the Foreign Relations Committee members of the desires of their constituents. Personal communications are important and when sufficient interest is shown they can determine the course of important legislation.

Sponsors of the resolution announced themselves as merely spokesmen for a considerably larger group of Senators. The resolution was discussed with President Roosevelt before its introduction in the Senate.

Its passage now is important not only to the post-war world, but in the present conduct of the war. The Atlantic Charter is a nebulous thing and it is not binding on the United States. Our allies know that and because we lack a definite policy, because our post-war aims are extremely nebulous, it would not be surprising if some, at least, become rather dubious about our place in the peacetime scheme of things. If they could have some assurance on our post-war policy; if at least the beginning of a world organization could be set up now through the good offices of the United States, doubts and misgivings could be allayed.

The Ball resolution would give weight to the democratic principles of the Atlantic Charter. It would provide the basic foreign policy we now lack.

The United States, long among the great powers of the world, cannot agree finally to any treaty without the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate. It is the Senate which will finally decide what will be the

foreign policy of our country when the war ends.

Twenty-three years ago President Wilson's hopes for a post-war world that would bring an end to war were scuttled by a partisan Senate. We do not want that to happen again.

"We are confident today of winning the war," Senator BALL said recently. "We do not have the same confidence that the United Nations will win the peace. There is uncertainty and questioning here as to the post-war policies of Russia and China and Great Britain. And, if we can believe the reports in our press, there is uncertainty and questioning in the governments of our allies as to what United States post-war foreign policy will be.

"A part of that uncertainty stems directly from the fact that no one knows yet what will be the attitude of the United States Senate, whose consent is essential under the Constitution. And that is a question on which only the Senate itself can speak.

"We believe the United States would prefer, as its post-war policy, to participate in an organization of nations, dedicated to justice, democracy, and fair treatment for all peoples, as the most effective and least costly method of achieving security for ourselves.

"The only way to find out whether our allies are prepared to join us in that collective effort is to ask them. But we cannot propose or ask effectively until the Senate has indicated its position."

That argument is hard to refute. At least it is worthy of definite action on the floor of the Senate. But unless an apathetic public becomes aroused enough to write their Senators—or the members of the Public Relations Committee—there is danger the resolution may lie there unsung until it is again too late, and we shall have lost another peace.

Senator FREDERICK VAN NUYS, of Indiana, is a member of that committee. Senator TOM CONNALLY, of Texas, is chairman.

In the Good Old American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me the words of a patriotic song written by Mr. John W. Cleaton, attorney at law, 216 Evans Building, Washington, D. C., entitled "In the Good Old American Way." I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the song was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE GOOD OLD AMERICAN WAY

(By John Cleaton)

I

From the battles in Virginia through Gettysburg, P-A.,
That's all since been settled in that good old-fashioned way,
With love of home and country, we have unity today
In that good old American way.

Oh, I love my home in America,
That land of the free and the brave.
I'll die or live in liberty,
In that good old American way.

II

It's the land of boyhood playgrounds, our churches and our schools,
Where lots of flags are waving and the people they do rule.
It's government by the governed, and that we, too, approve,
In that good old American way.

III

America is our homeland, our birthplace, and our graves;
That's why it's dear to Yankees—in any number of ways.
Being true blue to our colors, we'll fight for her today,
In that good old American way.

Draft Board Headaches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Draft Board Headaches" published in the Arizona Daily Star of April 15, 1943. The draft boards throughout the United States deserve a great deal of credit for their hard work and the efficient manner in which they have handled a very difficult job.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRAFT BOARD HEADACHES

The headaches of the officials serving on local draft boards are increasing instead of decreasing as the confusion of directives and regulations continues. Faced with definite quotas and a knowledge of how those quotas are going to fit definite areas, the local draft boards are compelled, in many instances, to make decisions on the facts in hand and without the full benefit of Washington's benediction. The reason for this is that new regulations arrive constantly, many of them contradictory in terms.

The attitude of the local draft boards toward the situation was well expressed in the statement of Monte Mansfield, of Draft Board No. 2, when he said:

"If the war lasts long enough we may have to draft married men maintaining a family relationship, but rest assured that we will take the young unmarried men first.

"Few young men in defense industries can be considered key men, and unless it is proven to us that they are absolutely essential to the war effort, and cannot be replaced, we shall draft them when the time comes."

This statement makes sense. The term "essential," as it applies to industrial and agricultural work, can be best interpreted by the draft board on the spot, making the decision on the individual case. These boards have the facts before them. They are made up of men who are working hard to do a difficult, unpopular job well and will base their decisions on the facts as presented in the huge majority of cases.

It would be far better if these boards were permitted to exercise a great amount of authority in making such decisions instead of being hobbled with constantly changing directives which hamper rather than assist in the task of supplying the Nation's need.

No sensible citizen questions the fact that the military forces of the Nation must be raised to whatever size competent military leaders decide is needed. Their task is to plan and prepare for the ultimate victory. No one, without knowing in detail the need, can judge the number necessary for the proper completion of this task. Behind the lines industry and agriculture must be maintained. All these things are obvious. But these obvious needs cannot be fulfilled efficiently unless the confusion of regulations and directives now being aimed at the draft boards all over the country are clarified.

In the meantime the local boards are forced to proceed on the basis of common sense. We have every confidence that such procedure will result in few injustices.

Suppression of Liquor and Vice Around Military Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from the Tampa (Fla.) Ministers' Association relating to legislation to protect the armed forces from the liquor and vice traffics.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAMPA MINISTERS' ASSOCIATION,
Tampa, Fla., March 8, 1943.

Hon. R. R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: We are writing you, not personally but officially, as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

The union service assembled at Hyde Park Methodist Church in Tampa, Fla., on March 7, 1943, voted to request the pastors present to write to you stating that the congregation desires Congress to pass protective legislation for our armed forces from liquor and vice traffics similar to that enacted by Congress in 1917.

The congregation requested that this action be read on the floor of the Senate and be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully yours,
TAMPA MINISTERS' ASSOCIATION,
By HARRY H. WALLER, *President.*
FRANK T. ANDERSON, *Secretary.*

Leadership of President Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Roosevelt Does It Again; Congress Should Try It" published in the Philadelphia Record of April 21, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROOSEVELT DOES IT AGAIN; CONGRESS SHOULD TRY IT

Once again President Roosevelt has electrified the country with the daring of his wartime leadership

As in the inspection trip through the Middle West and the Pacific coast last September and in his epoch-making flight to the conference at Casablanca in January, the President again has inspired the home front and the men who fight.

His just-revealed trip through training camps in the Southeast, and on to Mexico, fulfills the promise he made last September in the face of criticism—to visit other parts of the country in the spring.

At Parris Island the President saw in the training given the Marines the reason so many dead Japs were left in the Solomons.

At Camp Forrest, Tenn., when he saw the training given the Eightieth Infantry Division he learned why—as General Eisenhower reported last week—we captured 4,680 Axis prisoners in Tunisia in the period since March 16 while only 859 of our men were missing.

At Fort Oglethorpe, Ga., he saw the Army's newest branch, the WAAC—a visit so informal that many of the auxiliaries ran out with their hair in curlers.

And all of us held our breath as we read how the Chief Executive watched war maneuvers only 100 feet from the danger zone where machine guns and 81-millimeter howitzers were hurling live ammunition.

All of us are proud, too, to hear the first-hand report from our President that our men are fit and raring to go ready to start fighting the minute they set foot on European soil to open the second front we know is coming.

That announcement was an appropriate present for Hitler on his birthday.

The President found—as he did last September—that Washington is lagging behind the rest of the country in war spirit.

The people throughout the country, he reported, had a better sense of proportion and perspective. In his whole trip, he said, he didn't find a single bloc.

And in response to a question, the President said he thought similar inspection trips for others would be a good idea.

Last week the Record suggested taking a group of Pennsylvania's dirt farmers to Washington to show the farm bloc what the problems of real farmers were. The President's suggestion is much better.

The farm bloc should take a trip around the country and consult the men in the fields instead of lobbyists in the Carlton Hotel.

The silver bloc, too, blocking full use of our silver in war, should take a trip around the country.

And the antifarm bloc—the Representatives who by a voice vote yesterday undermined a large part of the administration's food program by blocking incentive payments, killing the Farm Security Administration, and discontinuing the crop insurance program.

All of them would learn about the American bloc, the majority of the American people, who put the war ahead of all else.

What the President reported to the American people from Mexico last night we don't know as this is being written. We will discuss it in a later editorial.

But we know we all are cheered by our President's trip and by the lessons he drew from personal contact with the people. Now we'll have to measure up to them.

Post-War Opportunities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, at the request of the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Post War Opportunities," written by Charles Allen Thomas, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WIDE HORIZON

POSTWAR OPPORTUNITIES

(By Dr. Charles Allen Thomas)

The list of chemistry's contributions to the war effort is long, but in any recital you would note the constantly recurring theme of the contributions of chemistry to the individual—his weapons, his food, his clothing, and his shelter. But what about his morale? During the long, trying experiences through which our fighting men are passing, what do they think about? What are they looking forward to?

The answer is well known. They are looking forward to a home, a family, and a job by which they can earn an honest living. Let us think for a moment about the return of our boys who are now in north Africa or Guadalcanal, and who have undergone the rigors and horrors of this war.

They will not be concerned about balancing the Budget or about the total amount of the war debt; they will not care whether the Democrats or Republicans are in power; or whether this country has undergone a deep social or political change—the theme which you hear now intoned over the radio so frequently.

How tolerant are they going to be of explanations instead of offers when they ask for a job? What will their answer be when they are told that industry has been concerned solely with the building of tanks or the production of war chemicals, and that jobs will be forthcoming only after industry has had an opportunity to retool for peacetime activities, or an opportunity to develop new industries in which they can be employed?

They will want, and have a right to expect, a job right then and there. Having escaped the death of a hero on the battlefield, they do not want to return to the agonizing torture of unemployment. This prospect is definitely not a morale builder, and we must not allow such misty specters to cloud the vision of our fighting men.

The winning of the war is our first job, but our responsibility does not end there. Post-war planning is being given serious consideration in high places. Various economists, theorists, and political scientists are thinking and talking and writing on the best method of conducting post-war affairs. But, regardless of all this talk, regardless of the political or social complexion of the post-war world, it is still up to the chemist, the physicist, and the engineer to supply the new things which will create new jobs for the returning men.

Expansion within the chemical industry depends primarily upon research, and it often takes years for a laboratory conception to graduate into a large plant reality. Therefore, if we are to have new products and processes ready at the end of hostilities, research and development should be initiated now. I believe that most of us at home are restless, and have had periods of soul searching in trying to ascertain whether we have done, and are doing, our full share.

Many of the problems upon which we are working may seem rather far-removed from the war effort, but may I suggest that, in adjusting your work to the maximum of patriotism, you bear in mind the dual role of the chemist and the chemical industry in this emergency. Just as we are striving to equip our fighting forces with the tools that they need for successful participation in today's highly intricate warfare, so must we strive to guarantee to these men the preservation of the ideals for which they are fighting.

A small number of technical men may bring about the employment of thousands of people. Five thousand research workers may create jobs for millions. I like to look on the research worker as a catalyst in the heterogeneous reactions of society. Is it wise to put all of our catalysts in uniform, so to speak? Five thousand scientists, or potential scientists, under arms can do no more than 5,000 other men—a very small group, as our armed forces go today—but 5,000 scientists, if working on new developments, may create jobs for millions of returning soldiers.

In all truth, you are the vanguards who will go ahead of the returning Army to lead the way, a battalion of men by profession equipped to meet your greatest challenge—to see that our men coming home will not find a barren and frustrated economy.

The Black Dragon Society Stirring Race Trouble in Washington

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if something is not done to stop the Communists in this city of Washington we are going to have a race riot here which is likely to disrupt this Nation.

Today, according to the newspapers, Negroes are picketing white restaurants in an endeavor to force them to serve Negroes in the restaurants. They say that they are going to try to force every restaurant in Washington to do this. The other day they forced one on U Street to open its doors to the Negroes, which, of course, closed it to the whites. They went elsewhere. Let me read what they are alleged to have said:

> We promised him that we would take up the same procedure against any other restaurant in the neighborhood to which his white customers might go.

In other words, if these white people go to any other restaurant, then these

Communists behind these Negroes will agitate them into picketing those restaurants. I have warned you time and time again, and so has the F. B. I., that the Black Dragon Society of Japan is organized among certain elements of the Negroes in this country and along with the Communists they are stirring up all the race trouble they can.

Nothing could be more hurtful to this country or more disastrous to the Roosevelt administration than a race riot in Washington at this time.

Money—The Most Important Issue Before the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the sixth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money.

In the debate recorded in this part of the speech we come to the issue that caused much discussion and dissatisfaction with the monetary system after the resumption of specie payment subsequent to the close of the Civil War when France maintained 15½ to 1 ratio to our ratio was 16 to 1. A disparity that operated to drain the silver from this country to Europe.

This monetary situation permitted the money brokers to make a profit of 3 cents on each American dollar they exported from this country to France and was used for one of the excuses for the demonitization of silver.

The sixth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

Mr. GRAY. If the Senator will permit me, do I understand his proposition to be that the declaration of the Government that both coins shall be full legal tender is all that in his opinion is necessary to maintain that parity which he talks so much about?

Mr. COCKRELL. I think it is.

Mr. GRAY. How does he account for the fact—for I would really like to know—that at the time of the demonetization of silver in 1873 you could not exchange at a parity five gold dollars for five silver dollars when they were both full legal tender?

Mr. COCKRELL. There was none coined.

Mr. GRAY. There was an absolute premium of about 3 percent.

Mr. COCKRELL. There was a premium on silver over the gold. If you have a silver dollar, and the silver in that dollar in some other place is worth 3 cents more than the gold dollar, and you have a neighbor who is so obliging as to want to make 3 cents out of you and is going to such other place and proposes to give you a gold dollar, I do not suppose you would refuse it to him. The metals in the silver and gold dollars were above the coining value. I admit that up to 100 cents the silver dollar could not pay any debt in the United States better than the legal-tender dollar.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator and I agree precisely as to the fact, and the cause of that fact, it seems to me, would settle the question I asked.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not at all; it does not settle it. The value was not as money. The value by the Government remained unchangeable. The metal in the coin may be far more valuable before coinage than its money value after being coined into money, and the silver metal of 412½ grains is worth 103 cents, while when coined it is as lawful money worth only 100 cents.

Mr. GRAY. I ask the Senator, if it does not disturb him, whether the same reasoning would not apply to the greenback as it was in 1865 and the gold and silver dollars when they were both legal tender and full legal tender.

Mr. COCKRELL. The gold dollar paid no more than the silver, the silver dollar no more than the gold, and the greenback as much as either one of them in legal tender. When you intervene between individuals and the payment of debts then your gold would buy more because then we had no specie resumption. We were not on a metallic basis at all. Today your silver dollar is worth just as much as your gold dollar. You cannot make any distinction between them.

Mr. GRAY. Then I agree with the Senator, and the reasoning would apply of course if you made a dollar out of 412 grains of copper.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I was criticizing the construction placed upon the law of July 14, 1890. When it is said that it compelled the Secretary of the Treasury to redeem in gold, I say when the whole of it is taken together with the last clause, which says that the Secretary shall coin of the bullion purchased by the notes issued under this act a sufficient amount to redeem the Treasury notes, it means what it says, that the Secretary has a perfect right under that provision to coin every solitary dollar of the silver bullion which is now in the Treasury, and he has the right whenever one of these Treasury notes is presented for redemption to pay it in a coin dollar, and in my judgment he ought to do it. It would not destroy the parity between the coined silver dollar and the gold dollar, but would establish and maintain that parity. As it is, preference is given to gold and silver is made inferior. Silver is not held up side by side with gold, and silver ought to be paid in redemption of those notes.

Mr. MCPHERSON. If the Senator will allow me, in considering the instructions found in the law of 1890, does he draw a distinction between the right to do and the power to do?

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I do not know that there is any great difference between them. I would construe the law for the purpose of maintaining silver and not for the purpose of degrading it. I would make silver as respectable as gold, and whenever a man came and demanded gold I would make him take some silver, and I would show him that in my estimation silver was the equal of gold. That is done in France; we have the right to do it here; but we are the only nation in the world, so far as I know, that bows the knee to every foreigner or anybody else who wants gold.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Rather than degrade silver, as the Senator states it, he would allow the parity to take care of itself and silver to travel alone. That is the idea.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator can have his own idea of it. Every silver dollar now in circulation and every silver dollar to be coined under existing law is absolute money, and I say that is a proper subject for the redemption of any outstanding obligation of the Government except the gold certificates. There is not a bond of the Government today which cannot be paid honestly, justly, and equitably in standard silver dollars—not one.

The very object that these foreign bankers and brokers and money loaners have had in coming to the Treasury under Secretary Foster and demanding of him the redemption of the Treasury notes in gold, was to degrade and debase silver and establish the single gold standard practically in this country. In my humble judgment, when the late Secretary Foster yielded to the importunate demands of the gold ring and the gold brokers of New York for the redemption of United States Treasury notes in gold, he failed in administering and executing that law fairly and justly; established unwise and unjust precedent, and gave into the hands of the gold brokers and bullion speculators unjust and dangerous privileges and powers. It gave them the weapons and the pretexts for demanding the issue of gold bonds and the repeal of the Sherman law

Had he executed the law in a friendly spirit and coined the bullion and redeemed the Treasury notes issued in its purchase in the standard silver dollar, not a dollar of gold would have left this country more than did leave it, and the people of the country would have rejoiced with exceeding great joy to see the standard silver dollar in the eyes of the law the full equal of the gold dollar in legal tender and debt-paying power, so recognized and proclaimed by the Government and by the new incoming Democratic administration. The precedent he established should have been held up "not as a pattern to emulate, but as an example to deter," and should never have been followed. I think that very fact had a good deal to do with the scare and with the panicky fears which have been engendered in the minds of doctrinaires.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Will the Senator permit me a moment right on that point, for I know he is exceedingly good natured always?

Mr. COCKRELL. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I know the Senator means to get at the exact facts of this case. I want to ask the Senator, suppose the Secretary of the Treasury had acted upon the proposition just now made by the Senator and had not redeemed the Treasury notes, as he did redeem them, in gold, but had made those notes or obligations payable in silver, what would have been the result upon the panicky condition of the country? It was feared that the Secretary was going to do that very thing, and he came very near doing it because of the want of free gold to do otherwise. What would have been the effect, as I said upon the panicky condition of the country to know that we had gone upon a silver basis?

Mr. COCKRELL. My judgment is that we should have had no panic. My judgment is that then there would have been no reason for manufacturing the scare which holds the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. We should have had none of it. That added to the intensity of the panic. Why? I am not quoting dates, and I am not in the habit of referring to the newspapers for authority, but it has been quoted time and again, and I believe it has been quoted here in the Senate, first, that the Secretary had intimated that he was going to redeem these Treasury notes in silver dollars and it did not produce any panic. Afterward the President issued his pronunciamento, in which it was stated again—I do not know whether the President said it or not. I am not responsible for the statement, for I am not reported, apparently by authority from the White House, that the President had stated that all the obligaions of the Government should be redeemed in gold.

Up to that time the only paper currency in the United States redeemable in gold or silver were the United States legal-tender notes, the greenbacks. They were expressly redeemable in gold or in silver. Then the greenbacks stood upon the silver coinage and upon the gold coinage. That was their metallic base. It gave a wide and substantial base sufficient to have held a superstructure of a billion dollars.

Mr. MCPHERSON rose.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope the Senator will wait a moment and let me answer his question. He thinks he knows what I am going to say, but I am not going to stop until I answer his question.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Very well.

Mr. COCKRELL. There was the base. Three hundred and forty-six million dollars in greenbacks were outstanding and over $150,000,000 of United States Treasury notes issued for the purchase of silver bullion under a law which certainly, beyond any question, gave the Secretary the right to redeem in silver. The President proclaimed to the world that all these obligations should be redeemed in gold. The silver coin was knocked from under the financial body, and it began to totter and sway here and there, because, instead of $346,000,000 in greenbacks resting upon the silver and the gold, it had the whole amount resting upon the gold, with the addition of $350,000,000 of silver coin certificates and $150,000,000 of United States Treasury notes. The bankers of Europe saw it, the financiers of this country saw it, and they said this mass all thrown upon the one gold base cannot be supported by that one golden leg, and all the other props and foundations have been ruthlessly torn away from under the fabric by the proclamation of the President.

What occurred? Foreign bankers refused to continue their advances to make investments. They said, "You cannot hold up that great fabric on this one gold leg of $100,000,000." Hence came the demand for bonds, then came down the representatives of the foreign bankers, and they had the audacity to demand of Secretary Carlisle as I read in the speech of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Blackburn, the issue of $150,000,000 of gold bonds to add to the strength of this one golden leg, trying to support this mass which was making it wave here and there like a broken reed.

Here was the pretext. Then they said, "Now is the golden opportunity; we will force the United States to come to a single gold standard and to continue to redeem all its obligations, silver dollars and all, in gold coin; we will force them to issue bonds to get the gold; we shall have the selling of those bonds, with the interest, commissions, and brokerage, and we shall have that much of a safe fund in which to invest the money that we secure through our banking operations." No, no, Mr. President. There it was they commenced squeezing. The New York bankers joined them. I do not mean all the bankers, but the leading ones there, who are interested in foreign exchanges, the Heidelbachs, the Ickelheimers, and other foreigners here who are speculating off the world's exchanges. They had a right to do that; but they had no right to come and ask the Government of the United States, the grandest nation on earth, to bow to their infamous and imperious demands.

They then commenced the squeezing process, and they kept on extending it. They intended to extend it only far enough to scare the Senator from New Jersey and the rest of us. This is just what they wanted to do. Then they commenced the process of sending to every organized community wherever they had the name of a man, or a registry, or a city directory, or a country directory, circulars telling them to telegraph the President to call Congress together to repeal the Sherman law, or the country is going to hades. They sent telegraphic messages by the cartload and Congress has been convened; and here we are [laughter], and there is not yet unconditional repeal at the demand and behest of the foreign gold rings and syndicates.

This is the best time this country has ever had to establish a permanent financial system. We have no election coming on this fall, we have all an abundance of leisure on our hands, and I am convinced that we are better informed upon the financial question today than the Senate ever has been or will be again. Now is the accepted time; now is the day of salvation. [Laughter.] We had for years a monetary financial system independent of the systems of any nation, kindred, or tongue upon the earth. Less than 4,000,000 strong in 1776, we proclaimed ourselves entitled to be a free and independent Nation, and for 8 long years we resisted the power of the mistress of the seas, old England, established our independence politically, socially, civilly, and in every other way, and entered upon a financial system without having once conferred with England.

We paid no more attention to old England when we established our financial system than we did to the Hottentots. As an independent Nation, endowed with all the attributes of sovereignty, we proclaimed to the world our system without calling on them. Great Britain undertook to thrash us and make us yield to the imperious demands of her empire that "once a subject of Great Britain, always a subject"; that when one of her citizens came to the United States and became panoplied with the rights and authority of American citizenship, she still had a right to take him upon the high seas and impress him back into her service. It was under a Democratic administration that this infamous demand was resisted. The War of 1812–14 followed. We were only in our teens, in our minority, comparatively with other nations, but we whipped old England and drove back the old lion to his island lair, and we have made him stay there, closely confined, ever since. [Applause in the galleries.]

The Vice President rapped with his gavel.

Mr. COCKRELL. We have no favor to ask of any nation when it comes to establishing our financial system. They do not ask any favors of us. Think of the miserable position in which we are placed. Mexico established her financial system and never sent any monetary commissioners to confer with us. Guatemala, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and what not, all over the world, all of these countries established their financial systems, and we have never been honored with a monetary delegation from any nation on earth sent at its own request; and yet we must not move a peg; we must stand still and wait for an international agreement. I am tired of it; I am sick of it. I want to see the Senate rise to the dignity and the power which the people in their sovereign capacity have confided to it in the Constitution. I want to see it establish a monetary policy for the United States and maintain it; and when any syndicates or combinations or rings come here and undertake to juggle with our finances, with our Secretary of the Treasury, and try to intimidate him and drive him to grant their requests, we will have it in code of the United States that they are to be shown the door with the tip of the boot.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, if my colleague is not interrupted too much I should like to recur to the point in regard to the payment of the silver certificates in gold. I did not think I was mistaken about the construction the Secretary of the Treasury put upon the power conferred upon him. As to whether he has actually paid any of these silver certificates, of course, I make no issue of fact, and his statement will be conclusive, but that a silver certificate must be paid in gold, if demand is made upon him by the holder, is unquestionably the declaration of the President and the Secretary. I hold in my hand a letter from Mr Carlisle, published some months since for the purpose of informing the people of the United States as to the policy of his Department. Referring to the Sherman Act he uses this language:

"By the terms of the act the Secretary was required to pay for all silver bullion purchased by the issue of new United States Treasury notes, payable in coin, and it provided that upon demand of the holder of any such notes they should be redeemed in gold or silver coin, at the discretion of the Secretary, 'it being,' in the language of the act, 'the established policy of the United States to maintain the two metals on a parity with each other upon the present legal ratio, or such ratio as may be provided by law.'"

Now, says the Secretary——

Mr. TELLER. From what does the Senator read?

Mr. VEST. From Secretary Carlisle's letter published in the Washington Post.

Mr. GEORGE. What is the date?

Mr. VEST. I do not see the date.

Mr. TELLER. It was published sometime ago.

Mr. VEST. It was published in July, some 3 months ago. It was published at the time this so-called panic commenced, before this session of Congress was called.

Now I come to the material part of it.

"In the execution of this declared policy of Congress it is the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury, when the necessity arises, to exercise all the powers conferred upon him by law in order to keep the Government in a condition to redeem its obligations in such coin as may be demanded, and to prevent the depreciation of either as compared with the other."

That does not apply to the Treasury notes alone, but to all the obligations of the Government, and it is beyond any sort of question whatever. The fact is it has been placed in practical operation, and this administration has declared, both through its President and its Secretary of the Treasury, that holders of silver-coin certificates will be paid in gold if they demand it. If that is not the meaning of this language, then the English language has ceased to mean anything.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. On the 10th day of March 1892 the Senate passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to inform the Senate what amount of Treasury notes has been issued under the provisions of the act of July 14, 1890.

"The amount of silver dollars coined under the provisions of said act.

"The amount of silver bullion now in the Treasury purchased under the provisions of that act.

"Whether the silver dollars coined under the provisions of that act were available for the ordinary expenses of the Government or whether they are held for the redemption of Treasury notes.

"Whether silver dollars or silver certificates have been redeemed or exchange for gold, and, if such redemption or exchange has been made, the amount thereof.

"Whether silver dollars and silver certificates that are received for public dues are used in the discharge of Government obligation; and, if so, what class obligations are discharged with silver certificates and silver dollars."

I need only read the reply of the Secretary as to the redemption of the silver certificate, that being the only matter in discussion. I quote from his reply of the 22d day of March 1892, the following:

"Respecting redemption or exchanges of silver dollars and certificates, I have to state that the Department has not redeemed silver dollars or silver certificates in gold or gold certificates, nor has it exchanged silver dollars or certificates for gold or gold certificates."

That seems to be explicit on that point. On February 13, 1892, I received from the Treasurer of the United States, in answer to

a letter which I had addressed to him, the following:

TREASURY OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, February 13, 1892.

Hon. H. M. TELLER,
United States Senate.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your favor of the 12th instant, in which you ask whether silver certificates have been redeemed in gold coin, in what amount, and on what authority. I have to state in reply thereto that, so far as this office is concerned, it has never been done, nor have any of the subtreasury offices been authorized to do so, and no departmental instructions have been issued to that effect.

Respectfully yours,

E. H. NEBEKER,
Treasurer, United States.

Production of Butter and Cheese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the weekly reports as to butter and cheese production in the United States. The following official information from the United States Department of Agriculture shows that butter production is being maintained but that cheese production is much lower than last year:

Changes in weekly creamery-butter production

Geographic divisions[1]	United States production	Change from same week year ago
	Percent	*Percent*
North Atlantic	2	−15
South Atlantic	1	+11
East North Central	28	+8
West North Central	49	+2
South Central	8	+5
West	12	−13
United States	100	+1

[1] North Atlantic: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. South Atlantic: Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. East North Central: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. West North Central: Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas. South Central: Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas. West: Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Oregon and California.

Production of creamery butter for the week ending April 15 gained 2 percent from the preceding week, according to the United States Department of Agriculture. Compared with the corresponding week a year earlier output was 1 percent greater.

All the principal geographic areas of the country showed increased production from the previous week. Production of the North Atlantic was 3 percent higher while the South Atlantic gained 9 percent. In the East North Central output increased 1 percent due to gains in the production of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, which more than offset declines in Michigan and Wisconsin. Increased production in Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, and Nebraska caused a 2-percent gain for the West North Central area, in spite of unchanged output in South Dakota and Kansas and lower output in North Dakota. Sharp gains in Oklahoma and Texas were chiefly responsible for the 6-percent rise for the South Central area. In the Western States production gained 2 percent and was generally higher, except in California.

Changes from the corresponding week a year earlier ranged from a decline of 15 percent in the North Atlantic to a gain of 11 percent in the South Atlantic. Production of the East North Central was 8 percent higher due to gains in all the States except Indiana. The West North Central reported a 2-percent increase while the South Central was 5 percent higher. A 13-percent decline in the output of the West was largely due to sharply lower production in California and Oregon.

Changes from the previous week's production in the Big Three butter-producing States were: Wisconsin a 2-percent decline, Minnesota a 1-percent gain, and Iowa a 2-percent gain. From a year earlier Wisconsin's output was 12 percent higher; Minnesota's, 4 percent higher; and that of Iowa, 2 percent lower.

Weekly American cheese production—Changes in production for week ending Thursday, Apr. 8, 1943

Geographic divisions	United States production	Same week year ago
	Percent	*Percent*
North and South Atlantic	5.1	−52
East North Central (except Wisconsin)	15.2	−28
Wisconsin	50.8	−16
West North Central	8.5	−32
South Central	10.2	−28
West	10.2	−22
United States	100.0	−22

[1] North Atlantic: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont-Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York-New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. South Atlantic: Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. East North Central: Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin. West North Central: Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas. South Central: Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas. West: Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, and California.

Production of American cheese continued to gain seasonally for the week ending April 8, being up 5 percent from the preceding week, according to the United States Department of Agriculture. Compared with the corresponding week a year earlier production was 22 percent lower. During the month of March total milk production on farms was 1 percent greater than a year earlier.

In Wisconsin, production increased seasonally but at a lower rate than in other areas of the country, the gain being 3 percent. Compared with a year earlier output was 16 percent lower.

Gains from the previous week occurred in all areas of the country and in all the major cheese-producing States except California. The 8 percent gain in production in the North and South Atlantic was largely due to increased production in New York State as several factories returned to the manufacture of American cheese. Output of the East North Central except Wisconsin increased 4 percent and that of the West North Central, 5 percent. Sharp increases in all States of the South Central caused an 11 percent gain for the area. In the West output gained 6 percent.

All areas continued to show reduced output from a year earlier, ranging from 16 percent lower in Wisconsin to 52 percent lower in the North and South Atlantic. Production in New York State is currently much below that of a year earlier, when extremely large quantities of milk were diverted from fluid milk plants to the manufacture of American cheese. Percentage declines elsewhere were: East North Central (except Wisconsin) 28, West North Central 32, South Central 28, and the West 22.

Agricultural Appropriation Bill—1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I have previously spoken in regard to the provisions of the agricultural appropriation bill and have outlined the problems confronting the farmers of my district. Foremost among these is the shortage of farm labor, and in order to relieve the situation, congressional action is necessary.

This is an all-out war in which food is just as essential as ammunition. Highly trained help is needed in the production of food just as skilled labor is required in the manufacture of machine guns and airplanes. Selective Service officials, however, refuse to leave sufficient men on the farm to assure an adequate food supply and, as a result, I predict that this country's 1943 food crop will be 25 percent or more under that of 1942. Even under the most favorable weather conditions we cannot equal last year's crop, much less increase it, without the necessary farm workers. The farmer must not only find men to plant his crops but he is faced with the prospect of having even greater difficulties in finding men to harvest the crops this fall. The planting season is short while the harvest season sometimes runs over a period of several months. By the time the harvest period arrives many more farmers will be in the armed forces unless some action is taken by the Congress.

The same problem affects the dairy farmer. His valuable herds need skilled care and attention. He cannot afford to place them under the care of itinerant workers.

I have, therefore, introduced a bill to establish an Army Agricultural Corps as a unit of the United States Army. My bill would set up a military unit to help in the production of food and ease the farm manpower shortage.

This bill is designed to check the drain on agricultural labor and keep workers on the farm in a military status and thus prevent the threatened drop in food production. Shortages of manpower and machinery are the twin evils plaguing the American farmer. The fertile sections of the South will be called upon to produce a great portion of the vital foods needed for our fighting men and to meet lend-lease needs, but this program cannot be met without the workers to plant and harvest the crops. The various plans offered for re-

cruiting of farm labor—such as the women's land army, and the hiring of school children—offer no real solution to this problem. Many crops require skilled handling and cannot be entrusted to inexperienced workers. And women and children cannot operate, and repair, farm machinery successfully. It has been suggested that farm youth be furloughed during peak periods, but here again we have no real solution. The farmers must have more than periodic aid if they are to do a real job.

Deferring necessary farm workers from the draft would provide a solution, but local draft boards, for the most part, fail to apply liberal interpretations to the standards now provided for such deferments. Many farmers refuse to appeal their cases because they do not want to be accused of evading a duty to their country. My bill provides a solution for these problems.

The text of my bill is outlined below:

A bill to establish an Army Agricultural Corps for service in the Army of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established in the Army of the United States for the period of the present war and for 6 months thereafter or for such shorter period as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation shall prescribe a component to be known as the Army Agricultural Corps for service in agricultural occupations and endeavors in connection with the production of agricultural commodities (including the raising, feeding, caring for, and management of dairy animals and other livestock and poultry). The total number of men and women enlisted or appointed in the Army Agricultural Corps shall not exceed the number authorized from time to time by the President, and in no event shall exceed 1,000,000.

SEC. 2. (a) The enlisted personnel of such corps shall consist of (1) enlisted men who are serving in the land or naval forces of the United States within the continental limits of the United States (excluding Alaska), and who have the qualifications required by subsection (b), who shall be assigned for duty in such corps within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act or after the date of their induction into the land or naval forces, whichever date is the later; and (2) women between the ages of 18 and 55 enlisted in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the last paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended (54 Stat. 213).

(b) Each member of the enlisted personnel shall have had substantially a year's experience in an agricultural occupation or endeavor in any capacity in connection with the production of any agricultural commodity (including the raising, feeding, caring for, and management of dairy animals or other livestock or poultry).

(c) All laws and regulations now or hereafter applicable to enlisted men or former enlisted men of the Army of the United States and their dependents and beneficiaries shall, in like cases and except where otherwise expressly provided, be applicable respectively to enlisted personnel and former enlisted personnel of such crops and their dependents and beneficiaries.

SEC. 3. The commissioned officers of such corps shall be selected from men appointed as officers in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the joint resolution of September 22, 1941 (55 Stat. 728), and ordered into the active military service of the United States. In the appointment of officers of such corps preference shall be given to men who have previously served honorably in the land and naval forces of the United States in time of war. The commissioned officers of such corps and their dependents and beneficiaries shall have all of the rights, privileges, and benefits accorded in like cases to other persons appointed under such joint resolution and their dependents and beneficiaries.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War shall prescribe, procure, and furnish uniforms, insignia, accessories, and equipment for the corps. The prominent feature of the insignia of the corps shall be an American eagle with wings outspread.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of War is authorized and directed to prescribe such additional regulations applicable to such corps and to the members thereof as he may deem necessary.

War Refugee Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I am inserting herein a night letter sent by Maximilian Francis Wegrzynek, president of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent to Harold Willis Dodds, chairman of the American Delegation of Anglo-American Conference on War Refugee Problems, Hamilton, Bermuda:

APRIL 20, 1943.

HAROLD WILLIS DODDS,
Chairman, American Delegation,
Anglo-American Conference on
War Refugee Problems,
Hamilton, Bermuda:

The Bermuda Conference is an expression of the desire of free peoples to discharge their obligations toward the victims of totalitarian terror leaving in its wake millions destined to die from starvation, disease, and all forms of physical and moral misery. In view of the fact that the entire war refugee problem must be considered as applying to all races, creeds, and political beliefs in all affected territories, your deliberations cannot leave unconsidered the fate of 2,000,000 Polish victims of the Russo-German attack on Poland in 1939. The fact that Russia is now fighting on the Allied side has not lessened the plight of the remaining victims of her former aggression. The murder of Alter and Ehrlich; the public statements of Bishop Gawlina to the effect that about 400,000 of the 1,000,000 children deported to Russia have already died from hunger, epidemics, and neglect; the recent revelations of the alleged murder of 3,000 Polish officers, prisoners of war, and the hitherto unanswered statement of the Polish Government regarding the disappearance of over 10,000 officers—all these show that the fate of the remaining deportees in Russia is at stake. While it is humanly impossible now to materially aid the victims of Hitler's terror, we can and should rescue the Polish victims in Russia to whom aid is now accessible. Our one-way passage of millions of dollars' worth of lend-lease goods going to Russia daily cannot be complete unless we open a passage out of Russia for her unwilling prisoners, citizens of Poland, our ally, who has sacrificed more than any other nation for our common cause. Submitting the above plea, I feel that I am expressing the sentiments and wishes of over 5,000,000 Americans of Polish origin as well as of the entire Polish Nation now deprived of the right to speak for itself.

MAXIMILIAN FRANCIS WEGRZYNEK,
President, National Committee
of Americans of Polish Descent.

The Political Mill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. MAY

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln from the Washington Evening Star of April 20, 1943:

THE POLITICAL MILL—SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS HAS SUPPORTED WAR EFFORT, BUT HAS SHOWN SPIRIT OF INDEPENDENCE

(By Gould Lincoln)

The Seventy-eighth Congress, which assembled January 6 and is now in its fourth month, has demonstrated great willingness to advance the war effort. It has appropriated huge sums for the war machine. It has extended the national debt limit from $125,000,000,000 to $210,000,000,000 so as to assure plenty of cash, outside of revenue derived from taxation. It has extended the life of the important Lease-Lend Act, so that the United States can continue to ship vital supplies to the Allied Nations, and receive supplies from them for its own armed forces abroad.

Support of the New Deal, however, is another story.

The new Congress came to Washington with blood in its eye. The November elections had resulted in large increases in the Republican membership. These Grand Old Party successes were due to a growing dislike of the domestic policies of the New Deal administration, and to resentment at the administration price control, rationing, and the like.

LIVED UP TO PROMISE

The promise was made, however, to give the President the fullest support for the actual conduct of the war. That promise has been lived up to. At the same time, the Congress has shown an independence which was lacking during the first 10 years of the Roosevelt administration—except on rare occasions, as for example, when the President proposed to enlarge the membership of the Supreme Court so as to insure New Deal opinions from that tribunal.

Now that Congress is looking forward to a brief respite over the Easter week end, its accomplishments may be surveyed briefly. The House has passed and sent to the Senate seven major appropriation bills. The Senate has passed them, too, and two have become laws. The others are in the conference stage.

The Congress, in these appropriation bills, has struck at some of the strictly New Deal civil agencies, denying several of them funds and pruning the appropriations for others.

The act extending the life of Lease-Lend went through both houses with almost no opposition. This marked a great change from the original passage of the act, when this country was not at war and when it

was argued that the plan might lead us into the conflict.

VOIDED DOLLAR POWER

In the measure increasing the debt limit, however, the Congress struck at the President, charging him with exerting powers under the Price Stabilization Act of October 1942 which Congress had not intended to give him. It tied on to the debt-limit bill a rider voiding the President's Executive order limiting all salaries to $25,000 a year. The administration tried in every possible way to defeat this blow at the President, but failed. The President permitted the bill to become a law without his signature. He issued a statement denouncing Congress for placing the salary limitation rider on the debt-limit bill, which did not make for better feeling between the Congress and the White House.

The Senate flatly refused to extend the President's power to devalue the dollar, although it extended the life of the act creating the $2,000,000,000 stabilization fund. Secretary Morgenthau was unable to convince the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that this power to devalue should be continued. It is expected the House will follow the lead of the Senate in this matter.

A signal defeat for the President was the virtual refusal of the Senate to confirm the appointment of Edward J. Flynn, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, to be United States Minister to Australia. When it was found that a majority could not be mustered to confirm this appointment, it was withdrawn by the President. The President was charged with paying a political debt to his friend with an appointment of extreme importance in a war area.

Another defeat for the President is found in the failure to get favorable action on the appointment of former Governor Allred of Texas to the Federal bench. The nomination has been tied in a double bowknot in the Senate Judiciary Committee. The President was charged with playing politics with the courts, since Mr. Allred resigned from the bench last fall to run for the Senate against Senator O'Daniel, an anti-administration Democrat, and having been defeated, was within a few months again appointed to the bench.

HOBBS BILL PASSED

Both the Senate and House passed the so-called Bankhead farm bill, designed to give the farmers "parity prices" without counting in the benefit payments made them by the Government. The President vetoed the bill on the ground that it would start an inflationary spiral. The Senate sent the veto to the Agricultural Committee without acting on it. It is put on ice until the country knows whether the Government yields or does not yield to John L. Lewis and his demands for a $2-a-day increase for the coal mines.

The House has passed the Hobbs bill to outlaw racketeering by members of teamsters' unions, and it is before the Senate Judiciary Committee. The labor unions and arident new dealers opposed the measure. It has passed also the Kilday bill, which amends the Selective Service Act so as to defer married men and married men with children from the military draft until after all the unmarried men had been subject to induction. The Pace bill, which would have farm parity prices take into account the increased cost of farm labor, passed the House, but has been held up in the Senate, on the ground that it is inflationary.

One of the main battles in Congress has been over the so-called pay-as-you-go income-tax plan. After nearly 3 months of consideration by the Ways and Means Committee, the issue was thrown into the House. The Carlson-Ruml bill was first defeated and then the committee bill. Public pressure has been so great for this legislation, however, that it has been revived, and Minority Leader MARTIN has put the House on record that unless some action is had, there will be no Easter recess for House Members at all.

Oil—Danger of Scarcity—Price Should Be Increased To Encourage More Production and Prevent Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, our Committee on Small Business of the House has concluded hearings on the question of the price of oil. There are certain outstanding facts that should not go unnoticed. One is that we are using our oil five times as fast as we are discovering new fields; that it is necessary to discover at least one major field each week which we are not doing, in order to insure an ample supply of oil; that if something is not done, we are likely to find ourselves in the position within the next 1 year or 2 years of having plenty of tires but no gasoline for essential civilian uses. The testimony is undisputed that unless something is done to prevent it, a few major oil companies will soon own the oil business in the United States. The United States has one-half of the oil reserves in the world, so these few companies would own one-half of the oil business of the entire world.

Secretary Harold Ickes, who is Petroleum Administrator for War, has recommended a 35-cent per barrel increase immediately. It is the hope of our committee that this increase will be put into effect immediately, and the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown, Price Administrator, is being advised of our wishes, and we are also advising Mr. Justice James F. Byrnes, of the White House.

The views of our committee are set forth fully in a letter addressed to the Speaker of the House [Mr. RAYBURN] which is as follows:

APRIL 20, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives comprised of Representatives J. W. ROBINSON, of Utah; EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York; HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington; ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee; CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana; LEONARD W. HALL, of New York; WALTER C. PLOESER, of Missouri; WILLIAM H. STEVENSON, of Wisconsin, and WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, chairman, has just concluded an investigation of the petroleum-supply situation with particular reference to—

(a) Means of assuring adequate supplies for our armed forces and for essential civilian use; and

(b) Preventing the growth of monopoly in this industry through price and other governmental policies which would force the independent, small operators out of business.

The committee has received testimony from independent operators and their representatives from every section of the country; from the Petroleum Administrator for War, Secretary Harold L. Ickes, and from Price Administrator Prentiss M. Brown.

A final report will be submitted as soon as it can be prepared. In the meantime, however, this situation is so desperately critical that the committee desires to submit the following conclusions and recommendations based upon the testimony of the industry representatives and Government officials mentioned above.

CONCLUSIONS

1. In the absence of prompt, effective action, the United States faced the certainty of an acute shortage of crude petroleum with which to meet our war and essential civilian requirements. The apparently encouraging situation with respect to our increased supply of rubber may well be in part offset by our inability to obtain sufficient petroleum products.

2. The committee finds that since our entry into the war our capacity to produce and make available for use crude petroleum has been reduced more than 200,00 barrels per day. Notwithstanding existing restrictions on use, it has been necessary to withdraw from above-ground storage approximately 58,000,000 barrels during the past year. During this same year discoveries of new oil amounted to approximately one-fifth of current consumption. This is the lowest discovery rate in many years. New secondary recovery projects to increase the production of oil through application of proven methods entailing considerable capital outlay are now practically at a standstill. Loss of petroleum reserves through the abandonment of stripper and marginal wells is increasing at an alarming rate.

3. The independent producer of petroleum has discovered the principal part of our petroleum reserve. He has furnished the principal competitive force in the industry. Through price restrictions and material and manpower inadequacies many independents are being forced out of this industry. Increasingly the properties owned by independents are being acquired by a relatively few large integrated companies. The tendency is toward monopoly. The Petroleum Administrator testifying before the committee said that 2 years ago 20 companies owned 60 percent of the oil industry and that today the same 20 companies own 70 percent. Monopoly will eventually add greatly to the cost of petroleum products to the consumer.

4. The problem of obtaining additional production or even of maintaining present levels of production is preeminently a matter of price. The problems of shortages of materials and manpower in the petroleum industry should also be given immediate attention and action.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We recommend that the over-all ceilings on crude petroleum prices be lifted to a level which will encourage ample production and prevent monopoly.

The Petroleum Administration for War has recommended an average over-all increase in the price of crude petroleum in the amount of 35 cents per barrel. That recommendation should be made effective by the Offices of Price Administration and Economic Stabilization without further delay. The agencies of Government upon which responsibility for petroleum supply rests should maintain a continuous and close scrutiny of price requirements and relationships to enable such prompt adjustments as may be or become

necessary to insure an adequate supply of crude petroleum to meet war and essential civilian requirements.

The committee recognizes that a proper relationship must be maintained between the prices for crude petroleum and the refined products thereof. Since the present study by the committee was confined to the primary problem of crude prices, this relationship was not explored.

2. Clearly there has not been sufficient consideration given to the requirements of the petroleum industry for materials with which to operate. Oil is ammunition. Every possible effort should now be made without delay to supply materials required for the production of petroleum.

3. The manpower supply in the petroleum producing industry has been greatly depleted because of the inability of the industry to increase its price sufficiently to enable it to compete in the labor market with industries whose position has not been so severely restricted by price. This problem should have close attention to the end that the labor ranks of the industry may be maintained sufficiently to continue essential exploratory and developmental work and production.

4. The President has established the Office of Petroleum Administrator for War charged with the primary responsibility for petroleum supply. The recommendations of that office should carry great weight with other agencies of Government concerned with these recommendations.

Respectfully submitted.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman for the Committee.

Belvedere Junior High School Does Its Part—And More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, Belvedere Junior High School in Los Angeles County is not a school where wealthy children go, indeed most of its boys and girls come from homes that are very modest. Some of them have had a struggle to stay in school. A very large proportion of them are Americans of Mexican and Spanish-American descent.

This school's principal, Mr. Stanley Foote, and his faculty have so inspired their students that the record of this school in support of America's war effort could well be copied by many another school throughout our country.

As evidence of these statements I include herewith the Victory Program Enlistment Pledge which this school is using:

VICTORY PROGRAM ENLISTMENT PLEDGE

Belvedere Junior High School has launched a Victory Program in which pupils will be given an opportunity to help more directly in the war effort.

Enlistment is voluntary.

Signature of pupil, parent, or guardian and home-room teacher must appear on the pledge.

THE ENLISTMENT PLEDGE

I hereby pledge myself to do everything in my power to aid my country which is at war. I will devote my time and energy to this purpose. I will do nothing to bring dishonor to myself, my family, my school, or my country.

I will at all times look, act, and be a good American.

Home-room teacher_____
Parent's signature_____
Pupil's signature_____
Home room_____

In a recent scrap drive the pupils of Belvedere Junior High School collected over 200 tons of scrap metal—enough to build two medium tanks.

More of this fine record is set forth in the following article, Our School Goes to War, from the December 7, 1942, issue of the Los Angeles School Journal:

OUR SCHOOL GOES TO WAR

(By Forrest M. Lamson, Vice Principal)

BELVEDERE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

When our country broadcast S O S for scrap iron, steel, rubber, and other strategic materials, we felt that we wanted to do our part and join with the schools of the Nation in gathering these needed materials.

A committee went to work and for 3 weeks carefully planned for home-room contests, publicity, transportation, and all the other necessary details of a successful salvage drive. We decided that we would hold our drive on 2 days—that is, until the morning papers stared us in the face telling of the huge pile of metal that Bret Harte Junior High had gathered and the enormous pile of metal gathered by Kern Avenue Junior High, our near neighbor. We immediately went into a huddle and revised our strategy. In less time than it takes to tell, a reconnaissance mission was on its way to Kern Avenue to see for ourselves the pile of metal which they had gathered. Our mouths dropped open as we viewed the mountain of fenders, engines, washing machines, and boilers that dwarfed our own efforts by comparison. With this "shot in the arm" we went home to tell the story.

SUPPORT FOR ARMED FORCES

That afternoon, Wednesday, October 23, our G. A. A. girls had accommodatingly planned an assembly in the auditorium. Our boys had planned a special field day on the athletic field. As they gathered for this event a microphone was set up and an assembly called. The boys were asked if they would give up their game to assist in gathering metal to support their fathers, cousins, and brothers who are in the armed forces. The response was instantaneous. In less than 10 minutes old boilers, stoves, baby buggies, automobiles—in fact, practically anything you could mention made of metal began to find its way into our athletic field. When the dust had cleared away from the first day's drive, we proudly exhibited some 30 tons of metal on our grounds—but the end was not yet.

What about the girls? Well, girls are good Americans, too, and are not afraid of work. In the days that were to follow, an assembly "sparked" by an army jeep, was followed by a later assembly, at which time a flight of army P-38 pursuit planes dipped their wings in salute to the energetic youngsters at Belvedere. As they roared overhead we realized that we, too, had caught the fever, and that in a way we were serving our country.

THOROUGH COMMUNITY HOUSECLEANING

Never has our community had such a thorough housecleaning. Tires, flatirons, mowing machines and pianos, farm tools, radios, and a few well-worn bath tubs added dignity to our collection. When the final gong sounded we estimated that we must have over 200 tons of this precious metal.

Enough scrap metal for—
One thousand .50-caliber machine guns.
Two thousand .30-caliber machine guns.
One thousand 20 mm. aircraft cannon.
One hundred 37 mm. tank guns.
Two medium tanks.
One thousand 100-pound aerial bombs.
One hundred 1,000-pound aerial bombs.
Twenty thousand hand grenades.
Ninety 75 mm. howitzers.

Yes, our pupils, together with the pupils of the city, have made a real contribution of materials to the war effort. This is not, however, in our estimation, the most valuable part of this whole effort. Probably the greatest value is what has happened to our boys and girls and to our faculty. Having participated in a program which we know directly assists our country, we probably stand a little straighter and feel that we have a somewhat greater personal stake in the things which we are fighting for. Yes; we have had an extra dividend of loyalty, cooperation and service as a result of this drive.

Office of Price Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Clyde G. Morrill, Executive Director, Independent Oil Men's Association of New England:

INDEPENDENT OIL MEN'S ASSOCIATION
OF NEW ENGLAND,
Boston, Mass., April 15, 1943.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Our association has in times past been very critical of the way in which we have been received by the Office of Price Administration in connection with problems that affect our industry, resulting from different rulings they were making.

Since former Senator Prentiss Brown has taken over the administation of Office of Price Administration there has been a complete change in the attitude and feelings of the executives with whom we have met and talked. Their change of attitude means that we within the industry feel that we are on a cooperative basis with them rather than on the previous basis where there was constant controversy.

I wish particularly to report that Mr. Joel Dean, head of the Fuel Oil Rationing Division has been most cooperative in attempting to see the industry's side of the rationing problem. He has met with us and discussed quite freely changes that should be made, and we believe he is earnestly endeavoring to meet our views.

I am very much impressed with Senator Clyde Herring, Mr. Brown's assistant, who seems to be doing a thoroughly capable reorganization job in that important Government department.

One of the changes that might well be copied by other Government departments is the change made in their publicity division. A really effective division has been

organized to inform fully consumers and industry on the necessity for regulations that must be imposed.

I believe that this is something that you should know because I have discussed the attitude of Office of Price Administration on a number of occasions.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE G. MORRILL,
Executive Director.

N. Y. A. Program in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement setting forth the activities of the National Youth Administration in New York City:

National Youth Administration has been of distinct benefit to the war industries located in New York City and in the Greater New York area Over 4,300 National Youth Administration trained youth, in the brief period from August 1, 1942, to February 24, 1943, have gone from the New York City training centers of National Youth Administration directly into employment in local industries manufacturing war matériel. These youth were trained as welders, sheet metal workers, draftsmen, machine-shop helpers, radio technicians, and in other skills that are vital to the war effort. Hundreds of these youth, both boys and girls, have gone to work for the Brooklyn Navy Yard, the Grumman Aircraft Corporation, Sperry Gyroscope, Western Electric, Long Island Machine Tool and Die and many other companies of similar critical importance in the war effort.

A typical letter from one of these companies, speaking of the work of National Youth Administration, complimented the organization "on the fine and vital work it (National Youth Administration) has been doing in supplying the aviation industry on Long Island with well-trained employees." Continuing, this same company expresses the view that the National Youth Administration training center "has been instrumental in saving this company both time and money in supplying us with satisfactory workers." Commendation such as this must be deserved or it is not forthcoming over the signature of responsible company officials.

Approximately 800 National Youth Administration trained youth have entered the armed services from Greater New York. A large proportion of the 800 were listed as reservists in the United States Signal Corps, and the training they received required and had the approval of Army officials.

At National Youth Administration war-production training centers, innumerable articles have been and are being produced for the armed services. Most of these orders are of a kind which manufacturers do not care to bother with. Nevertheless, these pieces and parts which National Youth Administration trainees produce represent a contribution of no mean order to the progress of the war effort. As of April 15, 1943, more than 700,000 items were completed by the National Youth Administration in the New York City area and accepted by United States Navy officials at the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Approximately 1,600 youth are in training every working day in the various New York, Brooklyn, and Long Island training centers. Seventy-five percent of all trainees are in training for machine-shop work, welding, or radio. These skills, as is well known, are of vital importance at this moment in our history. The National Youth Administration in the New York area and throughout the country is adding thousands of young men and women every day to the ranks of the semiskilled; and these youth have gained their experience in actual production work in National Youth Administration shops.

A brief listing of the National Youth Administration war production training centers in the Greater New York City area and the number of different youth who have received training there in the past 9 months, follows:

Brooklyn, 1045 Atlantic Ave.

Sheet metal shop	425
Auto repair shop	250
Power sewing shop	715
Gas and arc welding	650
Total	2,040

Brooklyn, 980 Atlantic Ave.

Machine shop	2,500
Arc welding	600
Total	3,100

In addition there is a mechanical drafting unit at this location which has 50 youth per month in training.

New York City, 145 East 32d St.

Clerical unit	425
Radio unit	[1] 2,100
Total	2,525

New York City, 317 West 125th St.

Machine shop	[2] 219

Oyster Bay, Long Island

Machine shop and sheet-metal shop	500

[1] Excludes 600 Reservists from the Signal Corps of the Second Service Command who have received training at this National Youth Administration shop.

[2] Established in December 1942 for Negro youth.

Tribute to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARD JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. WARD JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, our flag is daily becoming more of a symbol of freedom and we hear many different tributes made to that emblem of independence. A very original and impressive tribute was recently made to the Stars and Stripes by Mr. Howard L. Burnett, a past patron of the Eastern Star of Long Beach, Calif., copy of which tribute reads as follows:

A TRIBUTE

We are all familiar with the symbolic meaning of the Stars and Stripes, but a tribute to the flag calls for something other than oratory.

That something is devotion, loyalty, and sacrifice. How well we know of the sacrifice of blood and treasure that has been made by our men and women to preserve it.

In many of our State capitols are sacredly preserved battle flags, bullet-riddled and blood-stained, carefully hung and guarded behind plate glass and rail.

Several years ago I visited the Smithsonian Institution in our Nation's Capital and stood before a flag which is sacred to all of us. It was that Star-Spangled Banner of which the immortal Francis Scott Key so vividly expressed in song the feeling of emotion within his breast when he beheld that flag still flying over Fort McHenry after that fort had undergone a night of terrific bombardment.

These flags of Nation and State remind us of the heroism of those who fell in battle that this Union might be cemented.

Tonight our men and boys are out there somewhere making the same sacrifices which our forefathers made that we may enjoy the principles of freedom rather than be governed by a barbarian or feel the crushing heel of a ruthless dictator.

Let us here and now rededicate our lives to that grand old flag so that it may continue to proudly and triumphantly wave o'er land and sea and the home of the free and the brave.

HOWARD L. BURNETT.

The Government Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT RAMSPECK
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the secretary of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FOR AERONAUTICS,
Washington, D. C., April 12, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Chairman, Committee on the Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RAMSPECK: Please let me offer a constructive suggestion as to the House provision for the $5,000 ceiling in the pending Government pay bill. The omission of a ceiling is of fundamental importance far beyond the significance of the cost involved, particularly as it affects the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, for the following reasons:

When, under the act of February 10, 1942 (Public Law 450), the working hours of field service employees of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics were extended from 39 to 48 hours a week, or a net extension of 24.2 percent on an annual basis, compensation was increased 21.6 percent. The Government, in lieu of recruiting, training, and providing additional space and facilities for the first 24.2 percent of necessary expansion, not only saved those items of expense but secured additional services to that extent without tapping the country's shrinking manpower reservoir and paid for such additional service, not time and a half, as stated in the law, but actually only 89.4 percent of base pay. This provision was so advantageous to the Government and fair to the taxpayers that it was extended without scruple to all grades in our field service and without a ceiling.

This action had the effect of boosting morale and productivity greatly out of proportion to the increase in required working hours. Hundreds of our employees, anxious to do everything possible to win the war, worked considerable irregular overtime, occasionally for long periods at the rate of 60 and 70 hours per week, without compensation in excess of the 21.6 percent provided for a 48-hour week.

Then came the act of December 21, 1942, which superseded the act of February 10, 1942, and which by reason of the $2,900 limitation and $5,000 ceiling, resulted in a reduction in pay for 9 percent of our personnel, including virtually all key personnel. The reductions vary in amount up to the loss of the full 21.6 percent overtime pay for those with base pay of $5,000 or more.

The importance of morale in the Federal service cannot be overemphasized. It is a precious asset. It flows from the top down and it can be lost. Our organization has had exceptionally high morale. The act of December 21, 1942, with pay cuts retroactive to December 1, was a serious blow to morale. It lessened the confidence of our employees in our organization. It caused financial worries and domestic difficulties which have, to say the least, caused discontent and impaired efficiency.

I have explained to our personnel in the upper brackets that the act of December 21, 1942, was temporary legislation expiring April 30, 1943, and that in the meantime the Congress would restudy the whole question carefully and that they should be patient. They were reassured by the introduction of bills in both House and Senate removing the $5,000 ceiling, although retaining the $2,900 limitation. We did not intrude upon your time nor request a hearing before the Civil Service Committee, because the bill as introduced had no ceiling. Then it was reported and passed by the House with a ceiling.

Under the Senate bill, with a limitation of $2,900 but no ceiling, percentage of increase payable at the various entrance grades above $2,900 would vary from 19.6 percent at $3,200 down to 7.8 percent at the highest entrance salary, and the rate per hour paid for overtime would in all cases be less than base rates, varying from 81 percent at $3,200 down to 32 percent at the highest entrance salary. The following table summarizes the percentages:

Overtime compensation—$2,900 limitations, no ceiling—based on increase from 39 to 40 hours per week

Base rate	Overtime compensation—percent of base pay	Overtime rate per hour—percent of base rate
Up to $2,900	21.6	89
$3,200	19.6	81
$3,800	16.5	68
$4,600	13.7	56
$5,600	11.2	46
$6,500	9.7	40
$8,000	7.8	32

The cost of removing the ceiling, stated in the Senate committee's report as $6,396,000 is but 2.001 percent of the total overtime cost under existing law.

May I say with all sincerity that in my opinion, as a Federal career official of over 30 years' service, responsible for and now worried about the preservation in our organization of a high standard of morale, the removal of the ceiling as proposed in the Senate amendment is necessary in the interests of good administration. To retain the ceiling in order to save money is actually to ignore justice for those in the upper-pay brackets, to invite the loss of morale and to cause worry, distress, and loss of health and efficiency among those who are the backbone of our Governmental structure, and disproportionately to lower their standard of living. In the long run, it would prove a losing policy with ill effects that would be far reaching.

Respectfully yours,

J. F. VICTORY,
Secretary.

Overtime Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

MANITOWOC, WIS., *April 12, 1943.*

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KLEIN: I have read with interest your remarks on the civil service overtime bill, H. R. 1660.

Though I realize that everyone today, in all walks of life, have their own particular problem, I will present the plight of the civilian naval inspectors here at Manitowoc.

At the present time we are working under the 1923 Classification Act, and there has been no increase in the base pay since then.

The farmer has the parity law, the workers the Little Steel wage law. What law is there for us to benefit by?

Many of us are trained mechanics, getting less pay than those that we supervise and work with, and have added responsibilities that go with inspection work. Here is an inequity.

You will find here at Manitowoc inspectors from all parts of the country, some from your State, too. They had to move here. Those that were successful in finding living quarters brought their families here and moved their furniture here, too. And those who were not so fortunate to find homes here have to now maintain two homes. This all costs money. Look what it means to the children, it breaks into their schooling in the changing of schools, etc.

Before we get our check there is deducted from it the 5 percent for the retirement fund, 5 percent for Victory tax, and 10 percent for bonds, and we help and do our bit in all drives like the Red Cross, community funds, etc., besides. Along comes the income tax. Some of us paid from $100 to $400, and most of us had to borrow money to pay it as we did not have enough income to do so. Where would we be were Congress today to enact the 20-percent Victory wage tax?

Then there is the inequity of the inspectors of the Maritime Commission, and the civil inspectors of the Navy. Both do the same work, get paid by the same boss, United States Government, under the Civil Service Act, and still the former gets paid a higher rate than do the latter. Why?

We have done our bit, we will do more. But in view of the above, we look to you Members of Congress to enact legislation, to assist us in meeting the cost of living, which has risen beyond all bounds of reason and not within our present income.

Thanking you, we are the

MANITOWOC UNITED STATES
NAVAL INSPECTORS,
GEO. F. SHERWIN, *Chairman.*

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the last thing to be rationed is liquor—finally had to do it.

O. P. A. and O. W. I. are the other two great new front-line units besides the Army and the Navy.

This column endorses fraternizing on this hemisphere, if it does not cost us too much afterward.

One way to discourage train riding is to make it uncomfortable. They are planning it that way.

Washington, too, has 50,000 dogs, and Gabriel Heatter puts them right alongside of boys and girls.

There are 16,000 picture shows in the country cooperating with the O. W. I. in propaganda and information.

Washington, D. C., is the great nerve center of our war and is the most prosperous city in the world—pay-roll town.

Women in uniform, in camps, marching, and saluting is something new in war also. It is no doubt a thrilling experience.

There is an Easter vacation on in Congress, in fact, if not on paper. Each day must see the clock punched to hasten the zero hour for Ruml and CARLSON.

A headline says, "11,000 see Cassis capture Guadalcanal 'cap'"—at Pimlico. If those 24 hard-liquor places just outside an Army camp in Louisiana were called Bataan Boulevard, it would be O. K.

Two of the most beautiful ceremonies in Scottish Rite Masonry are extinguishing the lights on Maundy Thursday evening and the relighting of the lights early Easter morning. Easter is hope and faith—things this old world needs now, if it ever did.

Speech of Hon. Vito Marcantonio, of New York, in Tendering Annual Award on Behalf of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born to Hon. Earl G. Harrison, United States Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me:

For some time prior to our entry into the war and since then the foreign-born in our midst have been subjected to numerous forms of discrimination. We find them deprived of work because of lack of citizenship, and at the same time we find them unable to become citizens for a long period, being compelled to wait because of inadequate facilities and insufficient forces. Also in many instances, which have been reported to the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices, employers have willfully denied employment because of racial bias to the foreign-born of several racial origins. People are still denied the right to naturalization because of the geographic locations of their birth and the color of their skins. Deportation and naturalization laws have also been utilized against people whose only crime has been that of having been prematurely anti-Fascist and of still being militantly anti-Fascist. I refer to the attempt to deport Harry Bridges and the proceedings for the denaturalization of Schneiderman.

The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born has valiantly engaged in an endeavor to destroy discriminatory practices, break down the indefensible and unnatural barriers that have been set up against the foreign-born and to alleviate the resultant hardships.

The discriminatory treatment of our foreign-born is not in keeping with the best American traditions with respect to the immigrants within our family, nor is it compatible with the ideas for which men and women of this Nation and of the United Nations are fighting and dying.

Therefore, it is most prudent for us to now review our historic policy in relation to our foreign-born.

In June 1776, in dealing with the status of the foreign born in Virginia, Thomas Jefferson declared: "All persons who, by their own oath or affirmation, or by other testimony, shall give satisfactory proof to any court of record in this colony, that they propose to reside in the same 7 years, at the least, and who shall subscribe the fundamental laws, shall be considered as residents, and entitled to all the rights of persons natural born."

Again, in his first annual message to Congress in December 1801, Thomas Jefferson recommended the following: "I cannot omit recommending a revisal of the laws on the subject of naturalization. Considering the ordinary chances of human life, a denial of citizenship under a residence of 14 years is a denial to a great proportion of those who ask it, and controls a policy pursued from their first settlement by many of these States, and still believed of consequence to their prosperity. And shall we refuse the unhappy fugitives from distress that hospitality which the savages of the wilderness extended to our fathers arriving in this land? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe? The Constitution, indeed, has widely provided that, for admission to certain offices of important trust, a residence shall be required sufficient to develop character and design. But might not the general character and capabilities of a citizen be safely communicated to everyone manifesting a bona fide purpose of embarking his life and fortune permanently with us? With restrictions, perhaps, to guard against the fraudulent usurpation of our flag; an abuse which brings so much embarrassment and loss on the genuine citizen, and so much danger to the Nation of being involved in war, that no endeavor should be spared to detect and suppress it.

This democratic policy, a child of the great principles of the Declaration of Independence, was reaffirmed and reenunciated 60 years later in Cincinnati by Abraham Lincoln on the occasion of the celebration of his 52d birthday.

The then President-elect Lincoln in response to a serenade and greeting by members of a German Workmen's Society said:

"As to Germans and other foreigners, I esteem them no better than any other people—nor any worse. It is not my nature when I see a people borne down by the weight of their shackles—the oppression of tyranny—to make their life more bitter by heaping upon them greater burdens; but rather would I do all in my power to raise the yoke, than to add anything that would tend to crush them. They are all of the great family of men, and if there is one shackle upon all of them, it would be far better to lift the load from them, than to pile additional loads upon them."

Consequently, to foreclose an asylum for the foreign born on this globe and make their life more bitter by heaping upon them greater burdens is not in consonance with the American tradition, established by these helmsmen of our Republic.

It is likewise prudent that we appraise our treatment of the foreign born in the light of the realities of a total war which is being fought on the political, production, as well as on the military front.

Here, among the foreign born, together with our Negro brethren, we have a great reservoir of manpower. I submit that in such a war, where it is crucially vital to utilize men, women, and even children to win the unconditional surrender of the enemy, it is disastrous, because of bias and un-American and undemocratic tendencies to prohibit the full utilization of these members of our great family of men from the fullest participation possible.

Further, lest we forget, this is an anti-Fascist war for the liberation of people everywhere in the world, carried on by the united people of the United Nations. Our every act, our every attitude, must be in conformity with the cause for which people are fighting. To segregate people in a class, to divide them from the rest of the people, not only makes for that division and disunity which lends so much aid and comfort to the Axis enemy, but by the very nature of discrimination sets up the false God of racial and color supremacy, which true Americans and real patriots have never accepted and have never worshiped.

In fact, American fighters for liberty, British fighters for liberty, Soviet Union fighters for liberty, Chinese fighters for liberty, fighters for liberty in the conquered countries and freemen, Negro and white, all over the world must find a striking resemblance in such treatment of our foreign born to the very things that they are seeking to crush and destroy for all time.

To abolish now the undemocratic practice of discriminatory practices will redound greatly toward insuring the democratic victory in this democratic struggle.

It is indeed a source of great comfort to know that in the course of the past year one who occupies a position of great trust in our Government has outstandingly administered the duties of his high office in a manner which will facilitate the participation of our foreign born in the war program, for this is evidence of the trend toward the triumph of democracy. For his work in this direction, the Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born is proud to award to him, the Honorable Earl G. Harrison, United States Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, through Dr. Kendall, this medal which is a token of recognition on our part for his recognition and application of the policy and statesmanship of Jefferson and Lincoln, and for his efforts toward a realistic contribution to a people's victory in a people's war.

The 28,000 High Schools of This Country Should, by Next Fall, Teach Aviation Courses; Civil Aeronautics Administration Preflight Aeronautics Program Contributes Greatly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the 28,000 high schools of the United States can and must be the reservoir from which will come, in future years, the trained young men and women who are to make this Nation outstanding in aviation leadership.

It is my privilege to express deserved tribute to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which undertook in February 1942 to foster and encourage an aeronautics training program for youth as a national asset in war and in peace.

PREFLIGHT IN CHARGE OF BRUCE UTHUS

Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion to study this work by the C. A. A., which is in charge of Bruce Uthus, of the preflight aeronautics program. Only a few days ago Justin Herman, his assistant, appeared before our West Virginia Advisory Aviation Committee and told of the development which is being made, not only in my State, but in hundreds of centers throughout the country. The program has had two major objectives:

First. The development of a well-qualified pool of youth for the air forces; in effect, the creation of a reservoir of youth whose initial training for the air forces would be effected prior to more advanced training in the air branches of the Army, the Navy, or the C. A. A. War Training Service.

Second. The preparation of youth for participation in the gigantic development of aviation and the expansion of air commerce in the post-war world. This second objective requires no different or additional activity since the basic, elementary principles of aeronautics are the same for both military and civil aviation.

YOUNG MEN GO INTO AIR FORCES

Air commerce draws its strength from youth. The same preference for youth is expressed by the military air services. Every year over 1,200,000 youths complete their high-school education. Over 600,000 are boys. It is estimated that as many as 40 percent of these boys will go into the air forces. More and more of our young women are going into commercial aviation and are being looked to for auxiliary services of the air forces. After this war the bulk of the personnel for our expanding air commerce must come from these very high-school graduates—both boys and girls.

The first measure undertaken by the C. A. A. to prepare these youth for the air forces and for post-war aviation development was to foster and develop a

program to introduce preflight aeronautics instruction in the public, parochial, and private high schools of the United States. Instruction in the elementary principles of the science of aeronautics such as aerodynamics, airplane structures, meteorology, navigation, airplane engines, and radio communications, were considered to be the minimum training needed for a basic approach to aviation whether for war or post-war participation and understanding. Drawing upon its experience with the Civilian Pilot Training program, now the C. A. A. war training service, the Administration came to the conclusion that this was essential training which should and could be undertaken at the high-school level in the current year. Such instruction is commonly referred to as preflight aeronautics.

The preflight aeronautics program met with obstacles from the outset. Teaching materials suitable for the high-school level were not available. Teachers needed training in aeronautical subject fields in order to instruct preflight aeronautics courses. The majority of school authorities were not clear as to what they could do to fulfill their responsibilities in aviation education. Technical advice and guidance were needed. Teaching aids were sought in this uncharted field of instruction.

Students, however enthusiastic about their future in aviation, were in need of goals of proficiency toward which they might strive, because enthusiasm without proficiency in the field of aviation is not enough. For practically all of the 28,000 high schools in the United States, with the exception of the few in the District of Columbia and in one or two other cities which were experimenting in this field, preflight aeronautics in February 1942 represented a great unknown.

REAL PROGRAM IS UNDERTAKEN

The preflight aeronautics program during the past 12 months has been able to meet and solve these problems in part as follows:

First. To develop preflight aeronautics teaching materials, including both student text materials and teachers manuals, a research program was instituted in March 1942. Comprehensive materials suitable for the junior and senior level of high school were developed and published. With such study resources, preflight aeronautics courses of high scientific standards were started in September 1942, the beginning of the school year. In addition research was conducted in the development and preparation of relevant aviation materials in such courses as mathematics, physical science, industrial arts, biology, geography, cartography, and so forth, and these materials were also completed in time for use in the fall term of 1942. The supplementary materials are useful in preflight aeronautics as well as other courses by providing an understanding of the relationship and application of these subjects to aviation.

Second. To help provide qualified teachers for pre-flight aeronautics, the C. A. A. made arrangements to admit teachers of this subject to the C. P. T. ground school classes in the summer of 1942. Over 2,000 were trained. Of these many have continued their training and have reached the level of proficiency sufficient for them to obtain C. A. A. ground instructor ratings. By stimulating and cooperating with teacher training institutions, the administration was instrumental in persuading these institutions to train another 3,000 teachers as a part of their 1942 summer sessions.

Third. To give technical advice and guidance to the thousands of school authorities and teachers who needed and asked for help, the C. A. A. provided them with the services of a small staff of consultants. These consultants besides fostering and encouraging the introduction of aeronautics in the high school curriculum were of immeasurable assistance to the school authorities in helping them to plan and organize preflight aeronautics courses, and to increase the quality of the instruction given. However, such services have been limited by staff and fund considerations.

Fourth. To meet the need for teaching aids and equipment, intensive research was also conducted in this field by the C. A. A. Comprehensive and annotated guides and references to aeronautical teaching resources, both theoretical and applied, were developed and distributed to school authorities.

Fifth. To provide students of preflight aeronautics with some goal toward which they might strive in order to obtain a high level of proficiency, the C. A. A. made available to high-school students of preflight aeronautics the C. A. A. examination service of its General Inspection Division. Through the high schools these students may take the C. A. A. Private Pilot Ground School examination. Students who pass the examination in one or more fields receive the C. A. A. certificate of aeronautical knowledge. Students who pass all four subject fields of the examination are credited with achieving the ground school knowledge required for the C. A. A. private pilot certificate. If such students obtain proper flight instruction they may qualify for their private pilot certificates. Since the vast majority of preflight aeronautics classes started during this school year, most students will take this examination for the first time in May and June of this year. The examination is given only upon election of the student and permission of the school authorities. Appropriate study guides have been developed and made available to the schools interested in increasing by this method the scholastic proficiency of preflight aeronautics students.

The C. A. A. has fostered and encouraged other measures by other public and private agencies which are designed to facilitate aeronautical education and provide incentive for achievement. It is the duty of the present Congress to encourage and support, in every possible manner, this type of program. A responsibility rests very definitely on our shoulders.

COOPERATION OF ALL UNITS IS ASSURED

All this has been done with the endorsement of the air branches of the Army, and the Navy, and in cooperation with Federal, State, and local educational authorities. The C. A. A. works closely with the Army and Navy air services to guide its preflight aeronautics program along lines of greatest training value to those services. Cooperation is likewise extended to the United States Office of Education for which technical materials and services have been provided from time to time. The C. A. A. has respected the sovereign rights of State and local educational authorities in its program of fostering, encouraging, and rendering of technical guidance services in the field of aeronautical education. And consistent with the American pattern of education the acceptance, direction, and operation of such programs in the schools is a matter for local determination.

The response of the schools has been indeed heartening. Close to a quarter of a million boys and girls in their last year of high school are receiving instruction in preflight aeronautics this year. Although there is much to be done this represents an encouraging start.

The Aeronautical Education Program of the C. A. A. offers a large and important field for the widespread development of aeronautical knowledge and training as a national asset in war and in peace. To my busy colleagues, I say, let us not be so absorbed in day by day problems that we fail to properly provide the stimulus and assistance to those youth, who with our help, can and will train for winning this conflict—and preserving the peace for all time.

Relation of the Defense Program to Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Select Committee Conducting a Study and Investigation of the National Defense Program and its relation to the small business of the United States:

I am L. H. GAVIN, Representative from the Twentieth District of Pennsylvania. I, first, want to take this opportunity to compliment the chairman and the committee on the excellence of their work. It deserves the heartiest commendations of the oil producers of the country for bringing about this hearing to secure a price increase of 50 cents for oil.

I represent a district in which the oil industry was born in 1859. It is the oldest oil-producing State of them all. In the nearly 84 years since Col. E. L. Drake made his dream come true, Pennsylvania has produced more than 1,000,000,000 barrels of crude petroleum of the highest grade from a lubricating standpoint. It is one of the six States of the Union in the billion-barrel class.

It has produced oil and it has produced oil men. The men have gone forth to all

the oil-producing regions of the world. They have been the pioneers in countless of the fields. Not an oil-producing State in the Union but owes something of its petroleum reserves to the Pennsylvanians who steadily extended the horizons of the world of petroleum. Many of them devoted their talents to refining, and to them we owe much of the success of that branch of the industry. They are constantly improving upon the products of crude oil and have found new ones. The military men can tell you something of what our Pennsylvania refiners mean to the war effort.

Pennsylvania is the oldest of the oil States. That does not mean that it is the least virile. Its daily production is not great, compared to that of some of the States farther west, but it is nearly 80,000 barrels a day and we all well know how important that quantity, located as it is, loomed during the period of the East's oil shortage.

The amount of production can be increased. The methods are known. In the Bradford district, oil producers learned about a quarter-century ago that they could put water into an oil sand and move greater quantities of oil into old wells that were about ready to be abandoned. The result has been that about 200,000,000 barrels of oil have been produced by that process and about that much more will be recovered in the same manner before the field has been exhausted. That is, it will be if the producers can get enough out of it to pay their costs

There are other parts of the Pennsylvania oil country where daily production can be increased, whenever the money and the equipment are available. The oil producing area of the State is in excess of a half million acres. There are nearly 85,000 producing wells—about one-fifth of the number in the United States. Their daily average last year was a half barrel per well; the production of the smallest is expressed in terms of gallons, not barrels, per day.

Mr. S. T. Yuster, associate professor of petroleum and natural-gas engineering at Pennsylvania State College, who has devoted most of his time for years to the work of getting more oil out of Pennsylvania's fields, recently said that "a material increase in the price of oil would have the double effect of making the capital available for new developments and prolonging the life of the unstimulated wells."

There has been much discussion about the stripper wells. That is the only kind we have in Pennsylvania. That is also true of New York, West Virginia, and Ohio—the States that produce the famous Pennsylvania grade lubricating oils. The stripper-well industry of my State—and larger share is in my district—employs some 10,000 persons and pays to those employees more than $20,000,000 a year. That is important. Still more important is the result of their efforts. We need more oil for the war. Here is a place to get a greater amount than is now being produced. It is going to take some money to get that greater amount. The producers know how to do it. They are the descendants of the men who started the petroleum industry. They have never stopped learning how to improve their skill. Just a few miles from my home and not many miles from the site of the first well ever drilled for oil, a new method is soon to be given a trial. It is a form of mining. The shaft has been dug. I understand that the oil men who put in the money for this experiment are waiting on somebody in Washington to authorize them to use some steel with which to drill the horizontal holes from the bottom of the shaft hundreds of feet into the oil sand. They have been waiting for many weeks.

Now I have confined my remarks to the territory I know best, but I have been paying some attention to the national oil problem for some little time and what I have said about Pennsylvania applies to the rest of the oil-producing country. We have upward of 500,000,000 barrels of oil that can be gotten out of the Pennsylvania fields, not this year, or next, but we can start immediately to increase the amount we are now getting. For the Nation, there are several billion barrels in such old fields as we have in my district.

What shall we do? Shall we go on dividing up what is left, rationing in ever smaller bits while the professors debate endlessly their theories of how to proceed in a dream world, or shall we return to a world of reality and apply the remedy that has always worked when the ingenuity of man was allowed to function in any lawful manner that he desired?

A solemn and terrible day of judgment awaits those who willfully interfere with the productive processes of this Nation, whether it be in the production of foods, war equipment, or oil.

Today, we, this Nation, are engaged in an all-out war effort. Everyone seems to be concerned about food, wheat, corn, cotton, soybeans, flax, peanuts, beef, sheep, lambs, butter, oleomargarine, silver, zinc, copper—but little is being said about the importance of having sufficient quantities of oil to meet the needs and demands of this Nation of ours now fighting on 17 different fronts and to meet the demands of our allies who are depending upon us to furnish the oil to carry on the fight to bring this war to a rapid and early conclusion. This is no time for bickering over price with our American boys making the supreme sacrifice every day, but it's a time for action, to build up the inventories and stock piles to meet the demands that will be made upon us over the months that lie ahead. It seems that bureaucracy is still riding high. The Petroleum Administrator for War, recognizing the seriousness of this situation, after months of study and research, has recommended to the Office of Price Administration that a price increase be granted immediately, and that should be at least 50 cents a barrel. The small producers of oil of the country have been on a starvation diet for the past 10 years. The price of oil has been static since 1941. No one questions that material costs have greatly increased, that labor costs have gone up several hundred percent in some instances; manpower becomes scarcer every day. It has been proven that production has rapidly declined; that our reserves are rapidly being depleted; that no new discoveries are being made; that little or no exploration is being carried on. We know we are using more oil than we are producing. Last year we produced a billion three hundred and ninety million barrels of oil and we used a billion four hundred million barrels of oil; and everything indicates that practically no new discoveries are being made. The consumption has steadily risen so it becomes evident of the necessity for an immediate price increase of at least 50 cents a barrel to induce the small producer and wildcatter to find new prolific oil fields.

If we want more oil, and we have got to have it, or there is a possibility that we might lose this war, as well as the peace that follows—the only way to get new oil, more oil, is to pay the man who goes out after the oil a sufficient price to at least pay for the lifting costs and make it a profitable venture. The oilmen are as fine a group of devoted and patriotic Americans as ever lived. All he asks is a chance to break even.

I am of the opinion that the bureaucrats are determined to ignore the Congress, and they pay little or no attention to the requests that are being made of them. Their crackpot philosophy of production for use, and not for profit, becomes more apparent every day and we all know that back of every successful enterprise is the profit motive. It's the American way. It's the system that built America. If a person can't break even or make a dollar, why sink holes in the earth to find oil?

Permit me to state that when crude price warrants, new fields will be opened, old fields will be rehabilitated, and production will be on the increase. When there is no profit there is no incentive to anyone to secure more oil. The small producer does not have the money to carry on.

We are heading for a crisis in this country unless we secure the oil to meet our war demands. It is evident that the small independent is fast fading out of the picture. It might also be stated that he is paying the taxes to keep the bureaucrats on the pay roll who are now out cutting his throat. All these facts have been brought to the attention of the power-drunk bureaucrats, but they say every war has its casualties. So the small independent producer is the casualty of the petroleum industry. However, let me remind bureaucracy that even in warfare we try to look after the casualties by giving them first aid and immediate attention whenever they are badly hit, no matter where they may be.

But the economic casualties mean little or nothing to the bureaucrats who never built a business or met a pay roll but who are particularly ambitious to regiment the people of America under their plans of social reform and schemes, all contributing to the elimination of thousands of small independent producers and businessmen. This will simplify matters when they later attempt to regiment the people of America into some totalitarian form of regimented bureaucracy.

A price increase on oil must be granted to the small independent producer if he is to survive, and further dilatory tactics on the part of the bureaucrats should not be tolerated in the Congress.

I wish to be recorded as having called this to the attention of the Office of Price Administration so that in the event we wake up 6 months from now without the necessary oil to supply the armed forces of the United States, our ships, planes, tanks, submarines, mechanized equipment, and so forth, that we can charge those directly responsible for having thwarted the will of the American people.

Nothing is more important in America at the present time than to secure more oil, without which we cannot possibly hope to win the war.

Hindsight Versus Foresight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article in the April issue of the Norwalk Tire and Battery Topics entitled "Hindsight Versus Foresight," as follows:

HINDSIGHT VERSUS FORESIGHT

Last fall the so-called best brains in the rubber industry and Office of Price Administration went to work on a plan to give relief to tire dealers who had frozen stocks when tire rationing became effective. The result was that the Government would take from dealers, through manufacturers, all tires and tubes at the purchase price plus 10 percent to cover what they called out-of-pocket expense in handling and in addition would pay all transportation covering the return of such

tires and tubes. To protect the Government from loss the Office of Price Administration stated they would permit a 16-percent increase in the list price of all tires and tubes as of a certain date. When the transaction was completed it was found that 16 percent would not cover the cost. Consequently, the Defense Supplies Corporation, a special Government agency formed to handle the transaction, decided that the added cost of the tires and tubes, if and when the manufacturer repurchased them for redistribution to their dealers against rationing certificates, which was made permissible, would be 45 percent above the manufacturer's car-door cost of the tires and tubes which he (the manufacturer) had turned over to the Defense Supplies Corporation under the deal.

A long story could be written on this subject and charges of bad faith could be sustained but we will not dwell on that. It will suffice to say that the Government spent $50,000,000 to $60,000,000 on this deal of accepting tires and tubes from dealers to relieve them of the financial difficulty they were subjected to because of tire rationing and it cost the ultimate users of the tires and tubes this much or more to repurchase than would have been necessary had the deal been handled in a sensible, businesslike way, i. e., by the Government advancing money against tires and tubes held by dealers, in the form of a consignment arrangement, to be repaid as the tires and tubes were sold. How simple this would have been and how much less costly to the ultimate users of the tires and tubes.

Our only reason for bringing this matter to light is the hope that those responsible, if ever confronted with another problem of this kind, will reflect sufficiently long to determine how the situation could be handled without any cost whatsoever. When we think of all the fuss made to keep resale prices down to prevent inflation, an action with which we concur, then think of the amount of inflation thrown into tires and tubes through Government mismanagement, it makes us wonder whether or not those entrusted with the management of our war problems actually have practical experience or brains enough to "feed hay to a donkey."

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the reciprocal trade agreements program shortly to be extended is based on the proposition that to increase foreign markets for United States industrial and agricultural products is economically sound, politically wise and socially desirable.

The general objectives of the program are to eliminate, insofar as possible, economic warfare and substitute economic cooperation, a goal which if possible to attain, would go a long way toward eliminating war with all its evil, devastating, and disruptive consequences.

It is in fact the good-neighbor policy, expressed in commercial relations. Its natural concomitants are friendly social and political relations, a condition precedent to peaceful relations.

IT IS AN ECONOMIC NECESSITY

Normally the United States can and does produce more of a great number of farm and industrial products than can be sold in the American market at remunerative prices.

When large quantities of such goods cannot be exported, our agricultural products pile up in unmarketable surpluses and our industrial production slows down. The result is felt throughout the country in depressed prices, unemployment, reduced wages, and poorer home markets for American producers.

Trade between nations declined sharply after 1929, largely because most nations, including the United States, set up excessive barriers against imports. By thus making it difficult for its people to buy things they needed and desired from other countries, each country made it difficult—in many cases impossible—for its own producers to sell their exportable surpluses in other countries.

The value of the foreign trade of the United States fell even more rapidly than that of the world as a whole; it dropped from $9,640,000,000 in 1929 to $2,934,000,000 in 1932.

As world trade diminished, employment and incomes fell, and the worldwide economic depression was deepened and prolonged. Between 1929 and 1932 our foreign trade dropped nearly 70 percent, national income 43 percent, cash farm income 58 percent, wages and salaries in manufacturing industries 53 percent.

IT IS A PROFITABLE UNDERTAKING

Expansion of our trade with foreign countries benefits the whole country:

First. It benefits directly the great branches of American agriculture, and the many industries, large and small, that have products to sell in foreign markets.

Second. It benefits directly American producers who use imported raw materials or semimanufactured products in making their finished products.

Third. It benefits millions of workers dependent upon these branches of agriculture and industry for their livelihood.

Fourth. It improves domestic markets for American producers not directly interested in export or import trade; any American farmers and manufacturers who can sell more of their goods in foreign markets, and their employees, are better customers for the goods and services of Americans not in the business of exporting or importing.

Fifth. It raises living standards by providing more employment, more purchasing power, and more goods for American consumers at reasonable prices; the exchange of products we grow or manufacture to better advantage than other countries, for things that other countries can grow or manufacture to better advantage than we can, is enlarged to our mutual advantage.

FOREIGN TRADE IS TWO-WAY

Foreign trade necessarily is two-way trade. We cannot export unless we import; we cannot import unless we export. Our exports provide purchasing power for the things we import; our imports provide purchasing power to foreign countries for the things they buy from us. People in foreign countries can buy our products only to the extent that they can acquire United States dollars with which to pay for them, and the only way they can acquire dollars is through the sale in this country of their products (including gold and silver) and services or by borrowing. Loans, even if available to them, merely postpone the ultimate necessity for payment in the form of commodities or services. If such payment is prevented, defaulted debts are inevitable.

HOW THE PROGRAM WORKS

Direct negotiation with other countries is the method prescribed by the Trade Agreements Act for reducing excessive barriers that stand in the way of expansion of our foreign trade. This method was chosen as more practicable and more effective than general downward revision of the United States tariff alone. Even if feasible, such a revision would not insure the reciprocal reduction by other countries of their tariffs and other barriers, including discriminations, against our export trade.

METHOD IS SIMPLE

Specifically, the act empowers the President, in order to obtain concessions from other countries on American exports, to modify excessive United States tariff rates, to bind existing tariff rates against increase, and to guarantee continued duty-free entry of products now on the free list.

The act does not empower the President to modify tariff rates except under a trade agreement; it does not empower him to reduce the duty on any foreign product under a trade agreement by more than 50 percent or to transfer any item from the dutiable list to the free list.

It does require that trade agreements be concluded only after the President has sought the advice of the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, the Tariff Commission, and other appropriate agencies of the Government, and only after public notice and full opportunity for presentation of information and views by any interested person.

All Government agencies concerned with foreign commerce cooperate, through interdepartmental committees, in studying all pertinent facts and views. Before any trade agreement is concluded, public notice is given of all products on which concessions by the United States will be considered, and public hearings are held before representatives of the Goevrnment agencies concerned. Resulting recommendations in regard to trade agreements are submitted to the President through the Secretary of State.

CONCESSIONS ARE GLADLY GIVEN

The United States, in negotiating a trade agreement, asks a foreign country to lower its excessive tariff rates on our products or to liberalize quotas or exchange restrictions on them.

Such concessions and assurances against higher trade barriers have been

obtained from countries which are important customers for thousands of American products, both agricultural and nonagricultural, comprising one-third of all United States exports.

Under trade agreements, the United States has agreed to tariff reductions or to the continuance of existing tariffs or free entry in the case of imported products needed or desired by American producers and consumers. Concessions are granted on imported commodities more or less similar to those produced in the United States when they are in the national interest, and when reciprocal concessions are obtained in return, but only after exhaustive study has indicated that such concessions will not cause serious injury to American producers. In appropriate cases imports of such products at the reduced tariff rates are limited in amount or restricted to seasons when similar American products are not marketed in quantities sufficient to satisfy the needs of American consumers.

MOST-FAVORED NATION CLAUSE

The traditional trade policy of the United States is not to discriminate between foreign nations, but to extend equality of tariff treatment to all who do not discriminate against the trade of this country. This policy is embodied in the Trade Agreements Act. Under it a lower rate of duty on a given product in a trade agreement with a foreign nation—other than Cuba—applies also to the same product from any third nation, unless that third nation is found to discriminate against the products of the United States. This policy enables the United States to require other countries, as well as the other party to the trade agreement, to give our exports nondiscriminatory treatment.

This policy of fair treatment on a reciprocal basis pays large dividends in dollars and cents to American producers, who are thus protected against foreign tariff and other discriminations. It promotes peaceful commercial relations. Discriminatory trade policies create resentment and invite retaliation.

RESULTS OF THE PROGRAM BENEFICIAL

The United States has concluded agreements with 25 foreign countries. These countries, in the order in which the agreements were signed are: Cuba, Brazil, Belgium, Haiti, Sweden, Colombia, Canada, Honduras, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Nicaragua, Guatemala, France, Finland, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Turkey, Venezuela, Argentina, Peru, Uruguay, and Mexico.

About 65 percent of the total foreign trade of the United States is carried on with the countries with which reciprocal trade agreements have been concluded. The United Kingdom and Canada are, respectively, the largest and the second largest customers for American exports.

Trade agreements have been concluded with all of the other American republics except Bolivia, Chile, the Dominican Republic, Panama, and Paraguay. Negotiations with Bolivia are under way. Over 90 percent of the trade of the United States with the other American republics is with the trade-agreement countries.

The trade-agreements program contributed substantially to the increase in United States foreign trade between the inauguration of the program and the outbreak of war in 1939. Other factors have also, of course, affected the volume and nature of our trade.

During the 2-year period 1934–35, United States total foreign trade averaged $4,100,000,000 a year. In the 2-year period 1938–39, the average was $5,300,000,000.

The contribution of the trade-agreements program to the increase in our foreign trade is indicated by a comparison of United States trade with agreement and nonagreement countries.

In the 2-year period 1938–39, when 16 trade agreements were in effect, United States exports to the countries covered by these agreements averaged 62.8 percent greater than in 1934–35 when only 1 agreement was in effect for a year or more, while our exports to all other countries increased by only 31.2 percent.

Our imports from the 16 agreement countries averaged 21.6 percent greater in 1938–39 than in 1934–35, while our imports from other countries averaged only 11.1 percent greater.

These comparisons reinforce the common-sense conclusion that reduction of excessive tariffs and other barriers to the exchange of our goods for those of other nations tends to support and enlarge our foreign trade.

TRADE AND GENERAL RELATIONS IMPROVED

Trade agreements improve trade relations generally between the United States and the foreign countries concerned. The agreements themselves provide a basis for consultation on matters dealt with in them. Beyond this, the cordial atmosphere fostered by the agreements paves the way for friendly discussion of other trade and economic matters not directly involved in the agreements.

Economic cooperation through mutually beneficial trade agreements tends to promote good general relations with other countries. The trade-agreements program has helped us to win back, to our great advantage, some of the friendships we lost by our short-sighted tariff and war-debt policies after the last war. Today the trade agreements with the other American republics are one of the strongest pillars in the structure of hemispheric solidarity and of our global good-neighbor policy.

THE PROGRAM IN WAR AND PEACE

Our existing trade agreements with the United Kingdom and Canada entered into force on January 1, 1939, the year in which war began in Europe. The agreement with Turkey took effect in May of that year. During the war period 5 new agreements have become effective: with Venezuela, in December 1939; Argentina, in November 1941; Peru, in July 1942; Uruguay, on January 1, 1943; and Mexico, on January 30, 1943. During this period four supplementary agreements—two each with Canada and Cuba—were concluded.

Wartime trade controls, scarcity of shipping, and military considerations have come to dominate the nature and extent of our foreign trade. Nevertheless, a considerable amount of trade continues to be influenced primarily by economic considerations. The trade-agreements program exerts a beneficial influence on our trade relations with friendly countries and on our own war effort.

The agreements provide valuable insurance, now, against a repetition of the tidal wave of trade barriers and discriminations that swept over the world after the last war. They provide, now, a solid foundation for resumption of mutually beneficial trade after the war, when so many of our agricultural and industrial producers will need foreign markets if they are to avoid curtailment of production and ruinously low prices, and when American industry and consumers will need imported raw materials and semimanufactured and finished products.

Trade agreements, old as well as new, help to bring about close economic cooperation between this country and the other united nations in the joint effort to achieve complete victory at the earliest possible moment. These agreements stand today for economic cooperation, in war and peace; for a world in which men everywhere can produce in accordance with their ability and exchange their goods on a fair and reasonable basis. For this reason, an active trade-agreements program during the war strengthens the determination of the United Nations to win a victory that will be worth the cost; it inspires confidence that the United States will do its share in creating conditions favorable to prosperity and security after victory.

AFTER THE WAR, COOPERATION

Secure peace after victory must be built upon the solid foundation of economic cooperation. Economic insecurity and social unrest, caused in considerable part by excessive trade barriers and discriminatory trade policies, helped to spawn a Hitler and to plunge the world into this greatest of all wars before it had recovered from the last one. After this war, economic cooperation, not economic warfare, must be the rule.

The governments of the United Nations, in subscribing to the Atlantic Charter, agreed "to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity"; and affirmed their "desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security."

In article VII of the mutual-aid—lend-lease—agreement of February 23, 1942, the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom agreed that:

In the final determination of the benefits to be provided to the United States of

America by the Government of the United Kingdom in return for aid furnished under the act of Congress of March 11, 1941, the terms and conditions thereof shall be such as not to burden commerce between the two countries, but to promote mutually advantageous economic relations between them and the betterment of world-wide economic relations. To that end, they shall include provision for agreed action by the United States of America and the United Kingdom, open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and, in general, to the attainment of all the economic objectives of the Atlantic Charter.

Similar article VII provisions are contained in mutual-aid agreements with China, the Soviet Union, Belgium, Poland, the Netherlands, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Norway, and Yugoslavia. Australia and New Zealand have accepted these principles, and Canada, although not a recipient of lend-lease aid, has subscribed to them.

The trade-agreements program, if extended by the Congress prior to June 12, 1943, will be one of the most effective means of applying, in cooperation with other countries, these agreed-upon principles for the attainment of the economic bases of an enduring peace.

Just a word as to Secretary of State Cordell Hull: This distinguished son of the great State of Tennessee has in his advocacy of reciprocal trade agreements contributed immeasurably to the economic, political, and social structure of a world that some day—let us hope soon—will fully appreciate his far-visioned and unselfish efforts on behalf of world peace and the blessings of liberty.

The Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the importance of producing sufficient food for our armed forces, our domestic requirements, and our foreign commitments, together with the World Food Conference to be held on May 18 requires that each and every one of us obtain as good a picture of the food situation as possible.

Livestock, livestock products, and vegetable oils are being given major attention. I am including in my remarks a letter and table as submitted by Mr. J. A. Becker, principal agricultural statistician of the United States Department of Agriculture. A study of this letter and table will show that as far as quantity and numbers are concerned, we are still statistically in a very strong position as far as these products are concerned. The question, outside of the weather and the other risks of production involved, is whether we are going to use the inventories we now have for their best use during wartime. I repeat, this table shows that we are still statistically in a position to meet the food problem. We can do so if Washington will give the producers some sound leadership.

One fact is more evident every day. We cannot expect to have a production program and a control program at the same time and efficiently operate to obtain maximum production of food.

You will note in the table that the federally inspected slaughterings are running 16 percent above the 1937–41 average, though the 1943 are only 94 percent of the 1942 slaughtering for the same period. The fact that only 82 percent as many veal calves were slaughtered under Federal inspection for the first 3 months in 1943 in comparison to the 1937–41 average can be attributed to the fact that the producers evidently prefer to convert their milk into the milk pails rather than to market it in the form of veal on as large a scale as they have in the past. You will note that there were 31 percent more hogs slaughtered under Federal inspection in the first 3 months of 1943 than there were in the first 3 months of the 1937–41 period and that the slaughter for the first 3 months of 1943 is 4 percent greater than in 1942.

You will also note that there was 12 percent more milk produced the first 3 months of 1943 than there was in the same period of 1937–41 and that the production of milk for the first 3 months of 1943 is practically the same as the first 3 months of 1942.

From the weekly Government reports which I receive it appears that the butter production in factories has been fairly well maintained, although the production of butter is gradually becoming less. It is, however, still 1 percent above last year's production at this time.

The American cheese production is showing that less was produced this year than during the same months of 1942. It indicates that we are producing only 78 percent of the cheese that was produced in 1942. No doubt the reduction of fat in whipping cream and the reduction in the amount of butterfat in ice cream have been influences in maintaining this butter production up to this time. Fluid-milk consumption is being maintained, or increased.

You will note in connection with eggs that we are producing 44 percent more than the 1937–41 average and that the first 3 months of 1943 we produced 16 percent more than the corresponding months of 1942.

There are two other factors that should be taken into consideration. These are, first, that imports of many of these products have been materially reduced, and second, a considerable portion of some of these food articles are being needed for shipment to our armed forces, lease-lend, as well as to occupied countries.

If the producers of livestock products could be given more assurance and more of a feeling of security by Washington, increased production would result. If feed could be provided for this livestock there is no reason why additional amounts of this livestock and livestock products could not be produced.

There are about a billion bushels of barley, oats, and wheat in Canada that most assuredly cannot be shipped to a world market. I understand that plans are now being made to provide our producers of livestock products with some of these feeds. If the feed can be provided at reasonable prices, 100 to 400 pounds per animal can be added onto the beef cattle marketed in this country. A 100-pound increase in weight would add 9,000,000 pounds of meat in addition to the meat provided by the 18,000,000 head that are slaughtered in this country each year. This would be an increase of about 10 percent in beef production. The 26,000,000 cows in the United States that are producing only 4,600 pounds of milk could easily have an average of 500 pounds of milk a year added to their yearly production. This would add 13,000,000 pounds of milk to the national production of 119,000,000,000 pounds.

The O. P. A. must change its attitude and position on their rulings if maximum production of food is going to be obtained. Until they do, it is going to be an uphill fight on the part of the producers of our country.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
Washington, D. C., April 17, 1943.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: Some time ago you asked for information concerning production of livestock and livestock products in 1943. Now that the figures for the month of March are available, it is possible to give you information for the first quarter of the year. The information is shown in the table below:

Production of livestock and livestock products during first quarter of 1943, with comparisons

Commodity and unit	1937–41 average	1942	1943	1943 as percent of 1937–41 average	1943 as percent of 1942
Livestock (federally inspected slaughter):					
Cattle, thousand head	2,316	2,877	2,705	116.8	94.0
Calves, do	1,318	1,323	1,081	82.0	81.7
Hogs, do	10,992	13,857	14,427	131.2	104.1
Sheep and lambs, do	4,324	4,687	4,718	109.1	100.7
Livestock products:					
Milk, million pounds	23,837	26,679	26,912	112.9	100.9
Eggs, millions	10,241	12,731	14,806	144.6	116.3

The figures on federally inspected slaughter really relate to marketings, but they are as close as one can get to production figures at this time of the year. I know that you realize that livestock slaughtered during the first quarter of this year was largely produced last year. Sometimes increases in slaughter represent cutting down of inventories, particularly in the case of cattle. At other times they may represent speeding up of marketings in response to price changes. Contrariwise, reductions in federally inspected slaughter may accompany the building up of inventories or holding back from market. You will see from the attached copy of the report on Livestock on Farms January 1, 1943, that the livestock herds from which these marketings came were greater on January 1 this year than last year for all species except sheep.

The figures for milk and eggs are estimates of production based upon reports from crop correspondents.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH A. BECKER,
Principal Agriculture Statistician,
Division of Agricultural Statistics.

Quit Quibbling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Watchman Advocate, Friday, April 16, 1943:

QUIT QUIBBLING

The Petroleum Administration, through its policy of issuing indefinite rulings and limiting the full expansion of oil fields in the tri-State district—Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky—is slowing down oil production in a location where oil production would be most beneficial to the war effort. The tri-State district has several natural advantages that should be recognized and taken advantage of:

1. The oil is near the surface.

2. A minimum quantity of steel is required to recover the oil.

3. It is near the industries that need oil.

4. Its shipment would impose a minimum of burden on transportation facilities.

5. It is the largest producing field near the eastern seacoast, where the shortage of oil is causing the greatest difficulties.

Allowing fields as potentially great as the tri-State field to simply maintain their present production is unfair to the developers of these fields and the landowners on whose land oil is found. And, certainly, this unfairness will be reflected in the final picture of our war effort. At the present moment the geography of our war effort makes the tri-State oil field an important factor in our national welfare. Anything that is detrimental to the fullest and fastest production of oil in this district is accordingly detrimental to the fullest and fastest prosecution of the war.

The Petroleum Administration should establish some definite rules under which the production of oil in the tri-State oil field can reach its maximum in the shortest period of time possible.

Execution of American Prisoners by Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, cold horror grips every American heart as the execution of helpless American prisoners of war by the Japanese becomes known. The full measure of the bestial cruelty of these subhuman monsters is at last clear to us. The shame done to our martyred dead breaks like a wave upon us, drenching our Nation with fury.

As we grieve for our tortured dead, let us be sure that the shocking reality of this deed is borne home to our people in every walk of life. The suffering and death of our soldiers must not go unavenged. There will be a day of reckoning. And on that day we want no faintheartedness.

The captured airmen of the Tokyo raid were tortured and killed in open defiance of all the laws of God and man. Civilized human beings do not kill prisoners of war. Pray God that this Nation never forgets nor forgives that act.

The criminal Jap Nation must be brought to the bar of justice. We must completely defeat those people, drive them to their knees. Then, for those responsible for this and other outrages there must be swift, sure retribution.

For a nation which breeds inhumanity there is no place in the civilized world. The return of peace should not bring the right of world trade and neighborly commerce to these people. They should be cast out from the world family of nations. There is no place for mad dogs.

Labor and the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is most disturbing to every patriotic American to know that while our boys are fighting all over the world and while many of them are dying for America and for the high ideals of a free people, that such things as I am about to bring to your attention are going on right here among us, and at a time when every good American is anxious to work hard for victory at the earliest possible moment.

This morning, I received a letter from an esteemed friend, and one of those fine Americans, a veteran of World War No. 1, with a copy of a notice enclosed which was passed out to employees of B. M. I. on the date indicated.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, that you will agree with me after reading this notice and letter that we should waste no time in passing such legislation as will immediately and effectively deal with this kind of un-American tactics by a few rotten, radical racketeering, sabotaging union leaders. I say in the strongest and also in the most appealing words at my command that we had better act before the American people act for us. Now unless this serious problem is taken in hand and solved our returning soldiers will surely handle it in a most effective way when they return home, and no fooling. If you doubt that statement just ask the next 10 servicemen you meet, how they feel about the subject. The notice referred to reads as follows:

APRIL 13, 1943.

Subject: Union membership and hiring.

MR. FRANK W. SWITZER:

In response to your request the following is an excerpt from the current agreement between Basic Magnesium, Inc., and American Federation of Labor:

"ARTICLE II. Union membership and hiring: 1. Employees of the company prior to September 5, 1942, who were not members of the union and who do not choose to become members of the union are not required as a condition of employment to become members. Employees who were members of the union prior to September 5, 1942, shall during the life of this agreement, as a condition of employment, remain members of the union. Employees hired subsequent to September 5, 1942, shall make application for membership in the union within 15 days after the execution of this agreement as a condition of employment and shall become and remain a member of the union."

Upon notice by the union that any employee, subject to the terms of the above section, who fails to comply therewith it would be incumbent upon the company to dismiss any affected employee for failure to meet these terms.

CARL L. HYDE,
Personnel Director.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *April 18, 1943.*

DEAR BEN: I am enclosing copy of a letter which has been passed out to a number of employees of B. M. I. The general idea is to force everyone to join the American Federation of Labor or be fired off the job for noncompliance. I believe there has been a national emergency declared as well as certain laws passed; Executive orders issued and so forth, whereby everyone was expected to work in some vital war industry without interference of some saboteur slackers, who demand tribute be paid to them for the privilege of working to help bring your own sons back alive from this war. I have four boys in the service, and scattered in different parts of this world and naturally resent this type of force being used in our war effort.

I am working in the stores department of warehouse and have been here about 5 months. First 2 months we were permitted to work 10 hours per day and occasionally a seventh day. Then hours were reduced to 8 per day and positively no overtime or extra days. This apparently happened only in our department and I guess was O. K., although a great number of times, in my opinion, a greater and better effort could have resulted if some extra hours were permitted. It has the apparent effect of enforced absenteeism. Then comes these notices (enclosed) which indicate discrimination and a lot of other un-American policies. Would like to hear

from you with any advice or information that would help combat some of these strong-arm methods of any union or group. Also, would like to have you send a copy of the enclosed notice to Senators GILLETTE and WILSON, also "Manpower" McNutt. Ben, I am not sending this letter for any destructive purpose, but just to pass information along in hope it may serve for some constructive purpose.

Yours very truly.

I have purposely omitted the writer's name as I would not want him to suffer the penalty that might be imposed for bringing this un-American practice to the attention of his Representative in Congress, for which I sincerely admire him and thank him, and sincerely trust his efforts and his purpose will bear fruit at our hands.

Absenteeism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following newspaper article from the Washington Star gives an account of absenteeism, about which so much has been said and written. I think this article, as well as the hearings held by the House Labor Committee, indicate that the laboring people are doing very splendidly as a whole. Their absenteeism is not any greater than that which is evidenced by any other group of our society.

When one realizes that in many cases the husband and wife are both working, I think we should keep in mind that in many of these congested areas someone in the family must spend considerable time finding the food to feed the family.

The ruling of the O. P. A. allowing the people doing manual labor such a small amount of meat per week and still leaving it possible for anyone with the price to go from restaurant to restaurant and eat as many steaks as he may desire is going to have a serious effect on production as well as on absenteeism. One does not have to be a nutrition expert to know that men in mining camps and logging camps and those doing other heavy manual labor cannot perform this work on any two or three pounds of meat per week.

This difficulty is all the more apparent when we realize that a rather large percentage of our population lives on farms and in relatively small cities and villages, close to the place where the food is produced. In other words, the food situation has and will continue to be more serious in metropolitan areas, especially where there has been a large influx of workers and where established stores have not been in operation in the past.

The article referred to follows:

FIVE AND FOUR-TENTHS PERCENT ABSENTEEISM REPORTED IN MARCH—SURVEY INCLUDED SICKNESS AND ALL OTHER REASONS

The average rate of absenteeism in American industry in March was 5.4 percent, according to a special survey made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Secretary Perkins reported today. The survey covered 1,613,000 wage earners in 2,754 manufacturing plants and 169,000 workers in 571 mines.

Secretary Perkins made public the figures in a letter to Chairman VINSON of the House Naval Affairs Committee, before which she recently testified on various aspects of absenteeism.

Comparatively few manufacturing establishments had rates of less than 2.5 percent according to the survey. Half of the wage earners were employed in establishments with rates ranging from 3.4 to 6.4.

Absenteeism was defined in the survey to include any whole shift on which the employee had been scheduled to work but did not report for work. It includes, therefore, absences from work because of sickness and all other reasons. It also includes absences that were excused as well as those that occurred without satisfactory reasons.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics has been gathering information on absenteeism in shipyards since April 1942, and in aircraft establishments since January 1943. According to Secretary Perkins, the average rate of absenteeism in these industries in February was 9.2 and 6.7 percent, respectively. The reports for these two industries covered virtually all employees.

Shot Bolt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of April 16:

SHOT BOLT?

After much agony the legislature last year reduced the number of Pennsylvania Congressmen from 34 to 33, as necessitated by the 1940 census, by reducing the congressional districts from 34 to 32 and providing for the election of one Congressman-at-large.

There is now a lot more agony about another proposal to divide the State into 33 districts, so that each Congressman can have one.

Charges of gerrymandering are heard. It is the kind of job that probably can never be done to the satisfaction of everybody.

Behind the question of the fairness of the apportionment lurks another—whether the legislature is competent at this stage to enact any congressional apportionment act.

The interesting view has been advanced that once the legislature has passed a valid apportionment act, based on the latest decennial census, it has shot its bolt so far as that census is concerned.

The State constitution supplies no guidance on the legal point. Once an apportionment has been agreed upon, however, something is to be said for letting it stand until new census figures provide the basis for a change. The continual political turbulence that might otherwise result is not pleasant to contemplate.

Investigation of the Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the investigation of the Farm Security Administration not only should be, but will be, constructive. The fact that I participated in the preparation, presentation, and passage of all legislation pertaining to the Farm Security Administration, and actively supported every appropriation which has been made for this agency and the various programs which it is administering, should be convincing evidence of my friendship for the agency and for the tenant farmers of the Nation which it is seeking to serve. I had the pleasure of discussing the great problem of farm tenancy with Mr. Roosevelt, at a White House conference, during the time that the bill was being considered by the House Committee on Agriculture, of which I am a member. The "baby was born" in our committee and the members of our committee have been its best friends.

The present temporary unpopularity of the Farm Security Administration has been brought about by an almost complete misunderstanding of the intents and purposes for which the agency was created. Selfish groups and shortsighted individuals have inspired destructive propaganda and have constantly sought to destroy the very worth while efforts of this agency to give a degree of aid and comfort to the worthy tenants and sharecroppers of America. Unfortunately, the Farm Security Administration inherited from the Resettlement Administration and other agencies which had been created by Executive orders, many projects which were already in great disrepute. The projects referred to were undertaken and created pursuant to authority given to the President in relief acts passed in the early days of this administration, and most of these projects have been dismal failures. Many of the experiments referred to should never have been undertaken and in my opinion should be immediately and orderly liquidated.

Congress, as far back as 1937, directed that the projects above referred to be liquidated and expressed its disapproval of the creation of additional colonies such as those at Arthurdale, in West Virginia, Penderlea, in North Carolina, Lake Dick, in Arkansas, Cumberland Homesteads, in Tennessee, and other similar

projects throughout the country. Congress also directed the Farm Security Administration to cease the operation of cooperative farm projects and to otherwise change policies regarding the ownership and operation of the properties involved, and further provided that additional real property should not be purchased and subdivided as had formerly been done by the Resettlement Administration.

Unfortunately, those responsible for the administration of Farm Security paid little or no attention to these direct mandates from Congress, and instead of liquidating, embarked upon an even more ambitious program. By the passage of the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Purchase Act Congress intended to encourage home ownership and to assist worthy tenant farmers in becoming home owners. The purpose of the act just referred to was to rehabilitate tenant farmers in communities of their own choosing and to place them on the road to actual home ownership, rather than in the mere occupancy of farm property.

Quite contrary to this policy the Farm Security Administration, under its own pet policies of government ownership of land has purchased large tracts of farm land and has in some instances leased the property to individuals for as long as 99 years. The occupants of the property would be under strict governmental supervision and would operate with each of the lessees, having a community of interests in property rights, both real and personal, including work stock, machinery, and equipment used in connection with the farming operations, and each sharing in the net proceeds derived from the sale of farm commodities produced. Certainly this cannot mean home ownership.

In an editorial which appeared in the Puerto Rico World-Journal, on May 22, 1941, Dr. George Mitchell, Assistant Administrator, Farm Security Administration, who was then visiting in San Juan, is quoted as having said: "This fee simple ownership of property is the greatest detriment to our national prosperity." The editorial states that Dr. Mitchell advocates a long lease tenure of farm land, subject to cancelation when it is demonstrated that the lessee is improperly using the land. Almost similar views have been expressed by other Farm Security Administration officials. Such views are in direct conflict with the intent of Congress and with the ancient land policy of this Nation. The courts of all American jurisdictions look with favor upon the fee simple ownership of property. In other words, the administrators of the Farm Security Administration obviously favor government ownership of property rather than fee simple ownership, which has been traditional in America. We, on the other hand, did not want farm tenants to become mere wards or tenants of the government, but rather to be permitted to enjoy the pride and security of home ownership. A constant refusal of the officials in charge to comply with the wishes of Congress in this regard has greatly contributed to the present unpopularity of the Farm Security Administration.

By the passage of the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Purchase Act in 1937, we authorized the creation in the Department of Agriculture of a corporation to be known as the Farmers Home Corporation, and we had every reason to believe that such a corporation would be immediately created upon the passage of the bill, but until this date no such corporation has been created or permitted to function.

I shall not attempt to enumerate the many accusations of maladministration which have been directed at this agency of the Government, but everyone may be assured that the select committee recently created to conduct the investigation will make a diligent effort to separate the false from the true and to obtain accurate information regarding all of the criticisms and accusations which have been leveled against the agency and its administrators.

As some evidence of the accuracy of the statements herein contained, reference is made to an official ruling issued by Hon. Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, on March 5, 1942, in which he in effect convicted the officials of the Farm Security Administration of malfeasance in office, in that he found that they had purchased large tracts of land and had created a corporate device, without authority, to accomplish indirectly that which had been prohibited by acts of Congress. An outstanding example is the acquisition by the Farm Security Administration, through the corporate device, of a 42,000-acre tract of land in Bates County, Mo., from Lord Scully, of England. Before this transaction was consummated I personally advised the administrator that he had no authority in law to make the purchase of the land from Lord Scully as contemplated. My position in this regard was ignored by him but was sustained by the ruling of the Comptroller General, to which I have just referred.

In the belief that an immediate investigation of the Farm Security Administration was necessary, in an effort to save its worthwhile features and programs, and definitely without any idea of destroying any worthwhile program which had been undertaken, I introduced the resolution, and in my efforts to secure the investigation I had the unanimous support of the 25 members of the House Committee on Agriculture, and the resolution was finally given the support and approval of the Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader, and passed without opposition. I intentionally did not provide that the select committee would be appointed by the Speaker of the House, as is usually done, but on the other hand provided that the committee should be appointed by the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, from among the membership of that committee.

Congressman FULMER, of South Carolina, Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, has served in Congress for many years and has always been a friend of the tenant farmers of the Nation. He was free to make his own selection. I have personally known for a number of years each member who was appointed to serve on the select committee. I am familiar with each Member's background, and I, frankly, do not believe that the tenant farmers of America could find seven better friends in Congress than the seven men who will be in charge of this investigation. Each member of the select committee thoroughly understands the purposes for which the Farm Security Administration was created, and each Member fully appreciates the worth-while activities of this agency and the great responsibility which rests upon him in connection with the investigation. I know, therefore, that the investigation will be full, fair and friendly, and will be in all respects constructive.

The proposed investigation has been thoroughly misunderstood by many of our people.

To give you some idea of the magnitude of the activities of the Farm Security Administration I need only to call attention to the fact that this agency of the Government has aided more than a million and a half farm families, or approximately seven and a half million people. Since the beginning the Farm Security Administration and the other agencies transferred to it have expended almost a billion and a half dollars. Farm Security Administration's activities reach into all of the agricultural countries of continental America and into our off-shore possessions. In an effort to save all worthy activities of the Farm Security Administration and to ascertain the true facts sought by the investigation, the committee will act as expeditiously as circumstances will permit.

Memorial Pageant "We Will Never Die"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW L. SOMERS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1943, many Members of this House attended the memorial pageant "We Will Never Die," which was presented in Constitution Hall before a most representative and distinguished audience, including the First Lady, 7 Supreme Court Justices, headed by Chief Justice Harlan Stone, Cabinet members, and leading diplomatic representatives of 40 nations and more than 40 Members of the Senate.

I believe I speak for all those who attended when I say that this pageant was a most brilliant and soul-stirring dramatization of the epic story of the Jewish nation.

Some of America's greatest men of art assembled and volunteered their services to make We Will Never Die a most effective and remarkable presentation—headed by Ben Hecht, Billy Rose, Moss Hart, and Kurt Weill, who authored and produced, and Paul Muni, Edward G. Robinson, Sylvia Sydney, Luther Adler, Jacob Ben-Ami, and Kurt Baum who portrayed the leading roles.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I hereby insert the conclusion of the We Will Never Die pageant. This powerful, truthful, and prophetic words will go down in history as the noblest outcry of the tortured human soul:

FIRST NARRATOR. We, the actors who have performed for you tonight are nearly done. But there is another cast of actors involved in this tale whose performance is not done. This cast is our audience. Our audience tonight is a notable cast playing vital roles on the stage of history. It is to this audience more than to any group of human beings in the world that the dead and dying innocents of Europe raise their cry, "Remember us." And tonight it is not as actors playing parts on a stage soon to be dismantled, but as the spokesmen of a people that is being exterminated, that we stand before you—the official, the accredited, the elected makers of history. Two million Jews have been mercilessly destroyed in Europe. Four million surviving Jews are to be destroyed by Christmas, according to the pronouncements of the German Government. To utter these miserable words anywhere else in the world would be to cry for pity. To speak them here tonight is a summons to action

SECOND NARRATOR. Better than we our audience knows the two separate stories of Europe—the story of war and the story of massacre. It knows that as many defenseless men, women, and children have been massacred by the Germans as have died on all the battle fronts. The story of the massacre that we have told tonight is incomplete. For we have spoken only of the Jews who lie dead on the steps of civilization. They occupy only part of the massacre ground. Beside them lie millions of Poles, Greeks, Jugoslavs, Czechs, Dutch, French, Norwegians, and others. But we have spoken only of the Jews because the killing of the Jews is a special challenge to history makers. Other peoples have been villainously slain by the Germans in the effort to reform them, subjugate them, silence them, or frighten them. The Germans have no such program for the Jews. They desire neither their reform, nor subjugation. They desire only their extermination. Death to all Jews is their cry. And not only death but shame. They must die not as casualties of politics—but as scabrous and undesirable animals unrelated to the human family. The unarmed peoples of Europe have been villainously slain—but only that. The Jews have been not only villainously slain but robbed of their character. Slain and defiled, massacred and robbed of their epitaph as human beings—is the tale of their extermination.

FIRST NARRATOR. Who thus condemned the Jews? Who thus robbed an honorable people not only of life but of their fair name? Was it the Germans alone? It was the German who spoke and killed. But there are other ways of passing sentence than by speech and deed. There is the way of silence. As much by the silence of the world as by the howl of the posse has the jew been condemned. The silence of our history makers has made them honorary members of the German posse.

SECOND NARRATOR. In this city, not far away, are the halls from which Justice has sounded her loudest battle cries, the chambers from which have issued man's noblest promises to tomorrow. Stranger than the mass murder of the civilian millions of Europe is the silence of these halls today. Stranger than the brutality of the massacre is the quiet of its onlookers in these chambers.

FIRST NARRATOR. For we are more than a nation at war, more than an arsenal, more than a battle line. Above and beyond the valor of our working and fighting millions, America is a dream of justice, a light held aloft to the sacred ways of humanity. We have brave soldiers who are fighting to victory. But the massacre of the unarmed civilians is beyond the reach of their guns. The desert and the Mediterranean are their battle front and they are honorably engaged on it. The massacre of Europe is our battle front—and we are not honorably engaged on it.

SECOND NARRATOR. In the historic halls of this city many great deeds and dreams have been forged. We ask that the silence of these halls be broken again. We ask for a second front against the crime of Europe, not a military front of soldiers, tanks, and planes. But a second front of the human spirit against massacre. The crime of Europe calls for the mobilization of every shred of righteousness and spiritual power left in the world. On the field of battle soldiers die. On the field of massacre civilization dies. The thunder of civilization against the swamp-like antics of the German Government is alone capable of stopping the German crime against life. Such a thunder unleashed by our own representatives and by all the nations that serve the cause of God would be more terrible than an army with banners. Such a moral thunder would strike terror into the souls of the German people.

FIRST NARRATOR. For they are people, human creatures, though they serve a vile master blindly. Though they obey his call to the murder of the innocents, they are still people. Steeped in blood, with the mark of Cain blazing from their brows, the obsessed and despairing and murderous Germans still belong to the human family. There are human laws and memories of human brotherhood buried under their blindness. The cry of an outraged humanity can reach them. Moral thunder can shatter the evil beyond the range of shell and flame. The Germans have been told by their masters that the slaughter of Jews is a mystic necessity. And they obey because they are Germans. They obey because the greater master voice of humanity is silent.

SECOND NARRATOR. Our valiant soldiers are using to the last ounce of their power the weapons given them. But we who hold the weapons of morality—the cry of wrath and outrage, the words of righteousness which more than armies have made the shape of the world—we do not use our weapons. We betray our victories by not winning them in the name of the decencies for which they are fought. The dead and dying who litter the steps of civilization had only one cry, "Remember us." Speak for us, they said, before you become too guilty in your silence even to mourn us. Speak for us and give not only the Jews but mankind back its fair name.

FIRST NARRATOR. The Jews have only one voice left to raise among the governments. It is an ancient voice. It is the voice of prayer. Here in the great and historic city of Washington they raise it tonight. Perhaps the dead will hear it and find comfort. Perhaps the dying will hear it and find hope. Perhaps the "four freedoms" will hear it and find their tongue.

George J. Burke, New O. P. A. Chief Counsel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the long arm of government control and regulation today reaches from Washington into every home and every activity of our people. None of these governmental agencies is more potent, more effective, and at times more disconcerting than the Office of Price Administration. None of these groups is so thoroughly discussed and ofttimes cussed from Main Street to Wall Street.

The recent Administrator, Leon Henderson, pursued a method not in keeping with American ideals and not conducive to cooperation on the part of our liberty-loving, freedom-enjoying persons accustomed to the American way of life. As a result, the O. P. A. has been lacking in accomplishment. When former Senator Prentiss M. Brown was made Administrator, our people took new hope. They recognized that there was to be a change in the Henderson "crack-down" philosophy. However, everyone familiar with the set-up of this agency in Washington knows there must be changes in the organization and that little improvement is possible as long as the Administrator functions through subordinates imbued with the Henderson notions.

The country has been led to believe that Mr. Brown has a different concept of O. P. A. control and, bearing out this thought, it is heartening to note his recent appointment of George J. Burke as Chief Counsel of the Office of Price Administration. I believe that the new counsel will measure up to these expectations. I have known George Burke personally and well for many years. He is not an office-seeker. He is not a job-seeker. He comes to Washington at personal and financial sacrifice. I know well that he would not be here unless he felt he could render a patriotic service to his country in this hour of our distress. Yes, he is a Democrat—always has been—and is what I like to call a Jeffersonian Democrat, and the good Lord knows that we need more of that type right now.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission granted to me, I include an article from the Ann Arbor News, George Burke's home-town paper, which speaks for itself, and is as follows:

BURKE KNOWN FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

George J. Burke, who is being considered for appointment as Chief Counsel for the Office of Price Administration in Washington, is one of Michigan's outstanding lawyers, with a long record of public service. He also is one of the recognized leaders of the Democratic Party in the State.

Mr. Burke, who has been a lawyer in Ann Arbor since 1907, first brought his name before the public as prosecutor of Washtenaw County from 1911 to 1914. From that position he has risen to prominence as a former member of the State crime commission and the State corrections commission, and as a member and past chairman of the State civil service commission.

As a Democratic Party leader, Mr. Burke, in former years, was a candidate for State attorney general and for justice of the State supreme Court, but in recent years he has consistently declined to run for public office. He has served as temporary chairman and keynote speaker at Democratic State conventions, but in 1939 refused to accept appointment as chairman of the party's State central committee, and in 1940 he refused to run for the United States Senate.

I also include an editorial from the same paper which is as follows:

MR. BURKE GOES TO WASHINGTON

Appointment of George J. Burke, Ann Arbor attorney, to be general counsel of the Office of Price Administration, obviously is one of Prentiss M. Brown's important acts of reorganization which he hopes will simplify and, indeed, humanize food price fixing and rationing throughout the country.

In his new post at Washington, Mr. Burke will have an important voice in formulating Office of Price Administration policies. These policies are due for a change, in several ways, which Brown, administrator of the office, has recognized ever since he took office, Mr. Burke's views on the subject, based on practical experience as a citizen and as a lawyer, "out in the country," as contrasted with the views of officials whose experience and theories are of a purely Washington or academic character, with political factors involved, should be highly beneficial in charting the future course of the Office of Price Administration. Obviously, Mr. Burke and Mr. Brown are in accord on matters of general policy; otherwise, the former would not have accepted the position, for he is not the man to conduct himself in an official capacity in a manner contrary to his personal convictions. Neither is he the man to enter any situation with his hands tied, so far as getting things done may be concerned.

Mr. Burke, in a statement issued in Washington, expressed the opinion that the pyramid of price-fixing and rationing policies should be reversed, with the base of enforcement in the local communities which are acquainted with local conditions, rather than in the Nation's Capital, which is "remote, slow of action and bureaucratic in methods."

The new Office of Price Administration general counsel pointed out that under the present policy, a local complaint in a Michigan city, which could be handled reasonably and with due consideration for the merits of an individual case, must be relayed to the State office in Detroit, then referred to the regional office in Cleveland, and finally to Washington. By the time action finally is taken, the condition from which the complaint originally arose may have ceased to exist.

There should be less coercion of the citizenry by Washington, in handling the rationing problems, in Mr. Burke's view, and Mr. Brown appears wholeheartedly to agree with him. In other words, there ought to be less enforcement from Federal headquarters and more observance by the public, with the cooperation of local officials in a position to understand situations as they arise. Simplification of the methods, then, along with authority of local boards to deal with problems on a human basis, ought to bring about a great improvement in the rationing and price-fixing situation in general. Conditions are different in various parts of the country, due to many local conditions, for this is a big Nation geographically—too big to have its affairs either in peacetime or wartime handled in all of their details from offices situated in distant places with methods of centralized control.

So it is easy to see that Mr. Burke's appointment, while of immense local interest in Ann Arbor, where he is a citizen and professional practitioner, and also in the State, where he is prominent in public service and other affairs, is a matter of national concern. It would appear to presage an about-face in the methods of conducting matters of primary importance in the daily lives of all Americans.

Because Mr. Burke is the kind of citizen he is, and because his attitude on Office of Price Administration policies is well known, his appointment might be considered as, in effect, an announcement that Office of Price Administration will soon be conducting itself as a servant of the people rather than as an autocratic organization issuing peremptory demands without regard to the unnecessary hardships that may result in some communities or for the personal problems of individuals.

In conclusion, I feel justified in assuring Mr. Burke that he is welcome in Washington as head of the Legal Division of the O. P. A., and that the Congress is especially interested in a recent statement made by Administrator Brown when he said:

I do not know whether we can cut down to 10 lawyers, but we are going to have a whole lot less than the 2,700 we now have.

Mr. Speaker, the new Chief Counsel is just the man to humanize this agency. He will put efficiency and economy in the administration. We shall expect much from him and the people from his own State of Michigan wish him well.

Distribution of Electric Power to War Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UMATILLA ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Hermiston, Oreg., April 15, 1943.

Hon. LOWELL STOCKMAN,
Congressman, Second District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STOCKMAN: It has recently been brought to our attention that Congressman DITTER, of Pennsylvania, has represented before Congress that our organization, along with public-power agencies in this vicinity, has been acting as a middleman in the distribution of power to war agencies and as such has been the recipient of excess profits therefrom.

Please allow me to inform you that the inherent nature of our organization is such that it is not to our best interests to follow such a plan of action. I refer to the fact that ours is a nonprofit organization organized under the laws of the State of Oregon for the purpose of serving its members, especially those located in areas heretofore unserved by central-station service. We, therefore, are not operating for the purpose of making a profit excepting that insofar as we can assist the members to do their work at less cost or with greater ease and convenience than they have been able to in the areas affected heretofore, and in this way enable them to profit by its use at a cost which will insure continuous service with no dividends being paid to other organizations or private individuals.

We feel that we have been able during the past 2 or 3 years, in addition to serving the surrounding rural territories and in this way increasing food for defense and war activities, to assist directly in the war program in this area by providing facilities whereby the Umatilla ordnance depot might have the necessary light and power to carry on its program effectively.

The cost of this service to the War Department has been as low as could be made consistently and at the same time insure the stability of our organization. Even now I am informed that a new contract covering service to the Umatilla ordnance depot is in it final stages of approval, which will allow us to pass on reductions due largely to the decreased cost of wholesale power over and above what we formerly paid to the Pacific Power & Light Co., whom we understand is directly connected with the Washington Water Power Co. We are now buying our power wholesale from the Bonneville Power Administration, the power being transmitted over the facilities of the Pacific Power & Light Co. The saving effected thereby for the Umatilla ordnance depot is slightly above $1,000 per month for the present consumption. In addition, we have provided additional facilities for that service at a cost of over $11,000 to our organization which the new rate will retire.

These savings perhaps could have been realized sooner had it been possible to negotiate a contract with the War Department in a shorter time. We submitted a new contract to them as of October 6, 1942, for that purpose and it is only just now being returned with their approval. In the meantime we have been forced to bill upon a rate approved by an earlier contract in order that funds might be dispensed by the finance section in payment for the service. Later billings will no doubt allow credit back to the effective date of the new contract.

In view of the fact that Mr. DITTER's misstatement of the facts in connection with our activities is in all probability recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I respectfully request that you have a refutation of his statement recorded therein also.

Very respectfully yours,
R. L. WOOLLEY,
Manager.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Colorado Springs Gazette:

MARTIN'S GOOD FIGHT

A strong, fighting minority in a legislative body is invariably a factor in improved performance. Its presence is evident in Congress, where JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., the Republican leader, with the support of a strong minority, is keeping alive the issue of pay-as-you-go taxation.

If it were not for Republican opposition, Representative DOUGHTON, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, would have succeeded in forcing through Congress a conventional tax bill ignoring the stern economic realities. Republicans have prevented the majority from following the line of least resistance.

By reason of their slender majority, the Democrats must remain in constant attendance at the House sessions. They are weary of the grueling grind and want to go home, leaving the controversial tax bill hanging in thin air. Mr. MARTIN raises a restraining hand, insisting that the adoption of tax bill is a congressional responsibility that must be fulfilled without delay.

This is inconsiderate and even cruel, from the viewpoint of weary Members of Congress, but it is encouraging to the American people to know that when it is necessary to whip the majority into line in order that a duty to the Nation may be fulfilled there is someone on hand to perform the task.

Tree Planting and Arbor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today is a holiday that holds particular interest for the people of Nebraska. It is Arbor Day and is observed in many States in honor of a great American and a great Nebraskan, J. Sterling Morton. He it was who uncreasingly urged the people of his State and of the other States in the Great Plains to plant trees. Today that once treeless region is now dotted with groves set out by those settlers who took his advice.

Nebraska has honored him by placing his statue in the Halls of the Capitol at Washington. His home at Nebraska City, which he named Arbour Lodge and on whose grounds he planted trees of every variety, is now a State park.

We cannot leave the thought of Arbor Day without recalling the tree claims of the early settlers. Those of us in the middle years especially those who lived in central and western Nebraska, remember these early attempts to provide the trees that nature denied us. My father homesteaded a tree claim in Pierce County in the early eighties. To prove up on one of these claims the homesteader was required to set out a certain acreage of trees. Much land was acquired in this manner. Through all the years since then the farmers and townspeople of Nebraska have consistently planted trees. Many of them set aside Arbor Day for this work. They planted groves around their home buildings and windbreaks to protect gardens and orchards.

Then in 1934 the Federal Government, as a part of its plan of erosion control, instituted the shelterbelt program. I shall always believe that someone in the Department of Agriculture had been reading the writings of its former Secretary, J. Sterling Morton. On the plains of North and South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas millions of trees have been planted.

The primary purpose of the shelterbelt project—

Said Mr. H. H. Bennett, chief of the Soil Conservation Service, in a recent article—

was to develop wind barriers on farms in the plains to protect the soil and the crops. The first trees were planted in the spring of 1935 under a plan of leasing the planting sites. Beginning during the year of 1936, the work was set up as a cooperative undertaking with the individual farmer. This program continued under emergency appropriations through the spring of 1942, supplemented during the 1942 fiscal year by $222,000 appropriated by Congress for the purpose under authority of the Norris-Doxey Act. The public investment in this project totals over $14,000,000.

Mr. Bennett goes on to say:

As of June 1, 1942, a total of 222,825,220 trees had been planted on 33,185 farms.

Nebraskans will be interested to know that 45,416,610 trees were planted on 51,621 acres on a total of 6,944 farms in our State alone.

Nebraska is proud of the fact that its noted citizen was a pioneer in this great endeavor and that a day has been set aside in many States to do him honor in such a practical way. Here in Washington two trees have been planted in his honor. The one, an elm on the grounds of the Department of Agriculture, commemorates his service as Secretary of Agriculture in the cabinet of President Cleveland. The other, a pine, was planted on the grounds of the Capitol by the Nebraska delegation in Congress on Arbor Day 1936 at a ceremony attended by the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and others.

To J. Sterling Morton, father of Arbor Day, advocate of tree planting, and great Nebraskan, we of his beloved State pay our homage and respect.

TREES

I think that I shall never see
A poem lovely as a tree.
A tree whose hungry mouth is prest
Against the earth's sweet flowing breast;
A tree that looks at God all day,
And lifts her leafy arms to pray;
A tree that may in summer wear
A nest of robins in her hair;
Upon whose bosom snow has lain,
Who intimately lives with rain.
Poems are made by fools like me,
But only God can make a tree.

—*Joyce Kilmer.*

Address of Hon. Charles M. LaFollette

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Hon. CHARLES M. LAFOLLETTE given at Fort Wayne, Ind., on April 16, 1943:

Mr. Chairman and fellow citizens of Indiana who live in Allen County, I definitely appreciate the invitation extended to me by the Allen County Committee for Victory and Enduring Peace to speak here tonight. It was my privilege on February 23 to address, at Indianapolis, Ind., a group of citizens of Marion County who, like you, were nonpartisan and nonsectarian and designated their organization as the Indiana Committee for Victory.

That organization, like yours, was composed of men from every religion, from every race, and from every economic class of the city of Indianapolis. They were working together and studying and learning to appreciate and respect each other's opinions while studying the question of the most effective way by which the United States of America could avoid being involved in another world war 25 years hence.

Therefore, I feel justified in presuming to define, for the purposes of this talk, the aims of your organization as well as to state its aspirations and its hopes in much the same language as that which I used on this other occasion, approximately 2 months ago. I, therefore, state as my belief that this committee has in mind a definition of the term "victory" which encompasses the idea of a final, successful defeat of the armies of our foes, ending in their unconditional surrender and involving no peace which does not include as a condition of surrender the surrender of our enemies at the same time to all of the nations alined with us against a common enemy or enemies. I also assume that this committee, in its concept of victory and enduring peace, contemplates not only a military victory, but expresses a courageous hope for a post-war international order which would afford the people at least a hope of solving or suppressing the causes of war and the civilization-destroying 25-year cycles of war which we are now evidencing as a fact.

I shall not appeal to your emotions. The high purposes which cause you to meet here must not be prostituted by any cheap emotional approach on my part to the purposes which have induced you to form your committee and to come together here tonight. Instead, I shall try to be factual, logical, and above all, lucid. In so doing, I must risk being boring, because I believe that the issues before America today call for honest, forthright, factual discussion upon the part of a speaker, and your presence in the audience presupposes that that is what you wish to receive from a speaker instead of mouth-filling phrases and emotional claptrap. When a nation is at war and men are dying, a speaker who would use such an appeal evidences little understanding of the tragedy of war and less appreciation of the value of human life.

I am convinced that an inward desire for a new concept of the relations between men all over the world and consequently between the governments of those men has its foundation set in the rock of spirituality; consequently, I believe that a search for means and methods of effectuating by open and democratic discussion this spiritually inspired hope is fundamentally honorable and American in every aspect.

A week or two ago, I received a letter denouncing me for being an exponent of "Satanic" internationalism. Since this charge is diametrically opposed to my understanding of the nature of the search for a better world order, I think it is proper to examine the charge in the light of what is being said in America and the world by religious leaders in every predominant American creed so that we may understand upon which side of this question Satan and God are alined.

In Cincinnati, Ohio, in December 1942, under the auspices of the Central Conference of American Rabbis at the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, the American Institute on Judaism and a Just and Enduring Peace was held. It is possible for me to quote only a paragraph from the inspiring discourses which resulted from that meeting. I quote:

"International peace is the very essence of the ethical doctrines of Judaism, and the propagation of it has been part of the historic mission of Israel. The ideal of universal peace springs directly from Judaism's concept of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Racial, national, and cultural divisions among men have historical and moral value and serve the purposes of the Almighty. The emphasis of Judaism, however, has been upon their harmonious coexistence and their collaboration in establishing God's kingdom on earth."

Very recently Protestant thinking upon this same question has been summarized in

a book entitled "Religion and the World of Tomorrow," by Van Kirk. I again quote only one paragraph from that excellent work, which appears at page 141.

"It is at this point that the churches of Christ must assert their leadership. Christians can never be content with reestablishing the world as it existed before the war. If the physical properties of bombed cities cannot be restored but only reconstructed, how much more necessary is it that civilization itself shall not be restored but reconstructed? Nobody—least of all Christians—wants the old world back.

"There must be a new world—a world in which there is a return to religion. Not a religion of medieval ethics, not a religion of meaningless theologies, not a religion of static institutionalism, but a religion of transforming power, a religion of life, a religion that identifies itself with the enfolding drama of a world bent upon change. No other kind of religion will be able to uproot the secularism of which this war is only a symptom. The theological idea that God is 'wholly other' than the world which He fashioned and the human beings whom He created, falls far short of the needs of the new world order for which Christians are praying."

Perhaps there are those who would have you believe that it is only Jew and Protestant who have spoken on this subject. Such people are either uninformed or they speak falsehoods which may be disrobed and revealed in their naked nastiness by anyone who is acquainted with Roman Catholic thinking of today. Permit me to quote from an article by Charles Keenan entitled "World Order Requires Rule of Law, Not of Men" which appeared in the edition for April 3, 1943, of America, the Jesuit weekly:

"But neither individuals nor governments have sufficiently adverted to the fact that right can exist only in the frameworks of law. In human affairs, there are no rights except under law.

"This order of rights and obligations is the juridical order whose recognition was called for by Pope Pius XII in his allocution of Christmas, 1942.

"The Law of Nations, to which we need return from our present state of international anarchy, should be a framework of law embodying the fundamental principles of that juridical order.

"This means, of course, a modification of the idea of the sovereignty of states. That doctrine of sovereignty making each state the court of last resort for the adjudication of its own acts, has been one of the chief obstacles to a stable world order. The intense nationalism of recent centuries has strengthened the tyranny of this idea. Men are taught to resent the intrusion of any outside authority of their own state. They were taught to fear the dangers of an unfair decision of some world court. They did not realize that they were acting like men who would abolish the police force because of the interferences of an official traffic officer or an occasional wrong decision in the police courts."

If despite this article, there are any who are still doubtful, let me remind you that in 1940 during the celebration of the Mass at the main altar above St. Peter's tomb in the Vatican Basilica, the Pope, the head of the Roman Catholic Church, offered this prayer:

"That there be set up an order of things more just and more harmonious—an order that would tend to give to every people in tranquility, in liberty, and in security that proportion of the earthly resources of property and power which belongs to each, so as to make possible the fulfillment of the orders of the Creator: 'Increase and multiply and fill the earth.'"

My friends, I say to you, be not afraid for these are the words of those to whom the God of Moses and the God of the Christus has in these times revealed His aspirations and His hopes for mankind. Your yearning for a better world order and your hope that a way may be found to end war reflects the thinking and the purposes of the Creator and Ruler of the universe. It is not a question of courageously supporting His purposes, rather let us say we would be cowards if we deserted our search for methods to bring it about. For be sure of this thing—that on earth God has no hands to work with except our hands, no heart to be broken except our hearts and, and no brains to think with except our brains. We must not, and we shall not, break the heart of our God or prostitute the talents which He has given us as the means of effecting His purposes.

It is also charged by the unthinking and the unscrupulous that those of us, who believe that this Government, by the inherently democratic process of open debate and discussion, shall evolve and produce a new national foreign policy, are deserting some fixed national foreign policy which it is traitorous for us to desert.

The people who make such a charge bulwark themselves behind the bastion of Washington's Farewell Address. Let us examine this bastion and if it shall crumble under the impact of logic and reason; then having taken the rampart, will we not be justified in calling upon our opponents to surrender or to retreat to a new line of fortifications which, I assure you, since our cause is just, will likewise disintegrate if we will subject it to the power of understanding and reason.

It is proper first to call your attention to the fact that Washington's Farewell Address treated not only with the question of foreign policy, but that he treated with such subjects as continuance in office, public support of the Union, large standing armies, political parties, opposition to government, the result of party spirit, religion and morality, and national justice as well. I have reviewed this historical truth for you in order that you might understand that Washington did not devote all of his last public address to the American people to his opinions upon foreign policy, but this question only occupied a small segment of that great speech.

Furthermore, it is apparent to all men who can reason that the applicability of a truth announced in the past to a present situation depends upon existence of similar or analogous facts in the present for its persuasiveness or its right to control or dominate the making of a decision in a later age. As a matter of fact, if time would permit, I believe that I could build a very credible argument in support of the national foreign policy which I think is required today from most of the thinking which Washington revealed in his Farewell Address to the public.

Time will not permit, nevertheless, let me point out that in his Farewell Address Washington made this revealing statement:

"Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient Government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest guided by our justice shall counsel.

"Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation?"

At that time, of course, we enjoyed a "detached and distant situation" which "invited and enabled us to pursue a different course."—Washington's Farewell Address was published on February 19, 1796. In June of that year it took Mr. Rufus King 23 days to sail from New York directly to London; in 1797 it took John Marshall 48 days to go from Philadelphia to The Hague in the Netherlands; in 1786 a hardy traveler left the southern coast of Alaska in May and arrived in Russia 3 months later; and in 1806 it took a month to sail from San Francisco to Alaska. Of course, Washington was right when he spoke in his day of "our detached and distant situation." Washington also spoke of the time "when we may defy material injury from external annoyance" by reason of our future material strength which he then foresaw as well as our then existing "detached and distant situation." But Washington could not foresee that on December 7, 1941, Japan could "give us provocation" and found it easily possible "to make acquisition upon us" or within 5 days thereafter Germany and Italy would declare war upon us without any provocation upon our part which justified their actions under the rules of international law as then existed. Surely I need not tell you that today you can come from any part of western Europe to America by plane in fewer hours than it took Rufus King days to go from New York to London; and we are constantly told by our scientists that the era of air travel is in its infancy. Need I remind you again, that less than 30 days after Pearl Harbor, to wit, on the 1st of January 1942, our rubber situation was so acute that all stocks of rubber were frozen, and that by April 9 the Japanese had captured Bataan and before midsummer had cut us off from all then available resources of natural rubber? I do not need to tell the housewife, or in fact, any American, that we are rationing tin; and although the amount of critical materials which we are importing into this country under the most hazardous conditions in order to maintain our war effort, must remain a military secret, yet it is a fact which you and I have every reason to accept today as a factual truth. I ask you then, if George Washington were living today whether he would say now that we can safely "defy material injury from external annoyance?" I think not, for Washington was a logical thinker as well as a great patriot.

Can anyone demand for the purpose of being convinced that I speak further upon this subject?

Upon the affirmative side of our position, I turn to Washington and to our Revolutionary and constitutional statesmen as our authorities in support of our demand for a national foreign policy which will be factual in its approach to the problems presented by the world today.

We believe that it is essential that there shall be developed in America today a permanent foreign policy for this Nation which will declare this Nation's policy to the world so that the world may know what that policy is without regard to the change in the political make-up of the national administration. I think I can logically establish for you that the situation which confronted our forefathers, at the time they met to create a constitution under which 13 separate States could live, approximates very closely the situation in the world today which demands a higher degree of government, limited originally in its scope, but having the power to deal with those questions history now discloses cannot be dealt with by treaties and pacts alone.

Dunbar, in a book entitled "A History of American Travel," discloses that in 1771 one John Mercereau established a stage line between New York and Philadelphia which would make the trip in a day and a half and that prophetically he called this stage coach of his "the flying machine." It took 4 days to go from Boston to New York in 1793, and a traveler in 1802 took 4 days to go from Boston to New York, a day and a half to go from New York to Philadelphia; 15 days to go from Philadelphia to Charleston, S. C., and 2 days to go from Charleston to Savannah, Ga., a total of 22½ days, at a cost for stage fare alone of $70, and, in addition, the traveler had to pay his own meals and

lodging. Do you think that there was much communication of thought or much mutual understanding between the masses of the citizens of the separate American Colonies and their neighboring Colonies when the statesmen of these Colonies met to create a new form of government, a national constitution to which those separate States (in which the masses of citizenship were so completely removed from each other) were to delegate certain powers which each of these States had heretofore exercised for itself? Remember, now, for a minute the hardships and hazards connected with travel between those States at that time; remember the time that it took to travel between those States at that time; remember that the expense of travel was such that only the very wealthy could afford that luxury; then admire and reverence the capacity for State sacrifice, the passionate longing for unity, and the tremendous moral courage of the delegates to that Constitutional Convention to form a new and higher degree of government which took from these isolated Colonies the power to levy duties, imposts, and excises; the power separately to engage as States in commerce with foreign nations and among each other; the power to require vessels bound from one State to the other to clear or pay duties in another. Indeed our forefathers went further, on the affirmative side, they granted the power to organize a national police, a national army, and to limit and control the militia and armies of those separate States.

But greater even than the foresight and the courage of the leaders of the Thirteen States who met to create the Federal Constitution, was the magnificent courage, understanding, vision, and yearning for peace and a greater world, of the masses of the peoples of those colonies. It is from them that the masses of our people must take their inspiration and their guidance. Today the American people, with all of the imperfections which are still present in our media of public expressions, know more about the peoples of Europe and the Orient than the farmer on the mountains of New England knew about the peoples of Georgia; the masses of the people even in the city of New York, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, knew less about the people of Philadelphia than the masses of the people of Fort Wayne, Ind., know about the people of Moscow, or of London, or of Chungking.

Assuming for the purpose of argument that the masses of the people of the United States are in complete disagreement with the colonial policy of England toward India or with the economic, antireligious, and social philosophy of Russia, nevertheless, I doubt if there was much less disagreement between the masses of the northern colonies, composed of pioneering farmers and sweat-shop working artisans, and the people of the South who were already building up a society featured by a brilliant, cultural, but nonsweating white aristocracy and sweating black slaves and sweating de trop low whites at the bottom. Yet despite these tremendous economic and social differences which existed at the time our Constitution was written and adopted, the people of those colonies were capable of subordinating their differences and lack of opportunity for mutual understanding or trust, in order that there might be created a new, higher degree of government, to be denominated the "United States of America," out of the formation of which our forefathers could aspire to peace, economic stability and the growth of national greatness. I challenge the present masses of America to emulate their capacity for hope and faith. For if the challenge is not met, then, in less than 25 years, we will visit upon our children a holocaust of death and blood-letting which will cause this generation to be damned by the lips of all generations to come.

I may not know what men want, but surely the women of today have the right to demand statesmanship from leaders and from the masses of the same high caliber which prevailed at the time of the formation of this Union, for it is upon women, the bearers of children, that the brunt of our failure will fall.

As for those who would quote Washington, I bring you his immortal words spoken at the time the Constitutional Convention was gathering:

"It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honorable can repair. The event is in the hand of God."

I call upon all Americans to analyze Washington's Farewell Address in the light of its factual background and to read the words which I have just spoken in the light of their historical, factual background and then decide whether or not I have the right to claim Washington upon our side of the issue which is confronting the American people today. As for me, I wish we had a thousand Washingtons in America at this very hour.

In support of our demand for a national foreign policy let us recall that since the Constitution was originally adopted, the separate States of the Union have pursued a uniform policy of adherence to the National Government without regard to the political party which was in control of the State government. There was, of course, the exception to this uniformity of policy at the time of the Civil War, but since that disagreement was settled there no longer has been any question as to the policy which the States of the Union would take with reference to their adherence to the National Government.

It is true that there have been campaigns conducted within States with reference to the extent to which they would permit the Federal Government to control economic and social problems arising within the States, but there has been no question of adherence to the Constitution and to the Federal Government since the Civil War without regard to politics. With this example before us, it is our duty to work out, by free and open discussion, the limitations of a fixed national foreign policy which in its adherence to that effective form of a higher degree of international government which our people will accept, shall be as firmly established as a national policy, as the policy of the States, with reference to their adherence to the national Constitution is established and fixed as part of State policy.

Therefore, I am driven to the conclusion that, just as the separate States met for the purpose of creating a national constitution, it is necessary for the United Nations to meet now for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with the specific and limited authority within the framework of what is known generally as the Ball or Four-Senator resolution now pending in the Senate of the United States. Because the Senate of the United States, under the constitutional provision that the President may only make treaties with the advice and consent of the Senate, must make the ultimate decision, I do not think it fitting or proper that I discuss tonight the context of that resolution. However, as one of 26 Members of the lower House of the Congress who signed a letter approving that resolution in principle, I have thought it proper and entirely fitting for me to present to you tonight some of the thinking which has moved me to sign that letter.

Before closing this discussion, I do want to acknowledge, of course, that the delegates to the American Constitutional Convention met after the Revolutionary War. I am positively of the conviction that representatives of the United Nations should meet during this conflict. I acknowledge that the analogy which I have been building up ceases to exist upon this point. It would take another address of equal length to fully set out my reasoning, but I ask you to indulge me just long enough to refer you to a new booklet issued by Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson entitled "New Approaches to Lasting Peace" which is a supplement, in a sense, to the final manuscript of the "Problems of Lasting Peace" which was sent by them to their publishers in May 1942. Permit me to quote briefly from this pamphlet:

"With all the conflict of emotions and of interest, the task of peacemaking after the victory will at best be fraught with huge difficulties and great dangers.

"The degenerations and emotions of world wars in many ways reach their most destructive point immediately after firing ceases. Peacemakers are at the most disadvantageous moment for rebuilding the world.

* * * * *

"Therefore, if the tragedy of Versailles is not to be reenacted, there is one essential preliminary to any peacemaking; that is, before the end of hostilities there should be clear and unequivocal agreement between the victorious powers as to the mechanics of peacemaking.

And upon the question of the need of something else beside treaties and pacts, let me offer you two further quotations:

"The world has tried many other methods of maintaining peace—balance of power diplomacy, imperialism, peace pacts, and multilateral treaties and nonaggression agreements."

That was Senator JOSEPH H. BALL, of Minnesota, speaking on the floor of the United States Senate on March 16, 1943.

Now, listen to this:

"With a view to establishing the equilibrium of power and the peace of that part of the world, all the resources of negotiations were exhausted and triple and quadruple alliances were formed; but they were scarcely formed before they were broken, giving an instructive but afflicting lesson to mankind, how little dependence is to be placed on treaties which have no other sanction than the obligation of good faith, and which oppose general consideration of peace and justice to the impulse of any immediate interest or passion."

That was Alexander Hamilton speaking in the last decade of the eighteenth century.

Your presence here tonight is enough to convince me that you have an abiding conviction in the justice, in the efficacy, and in the Americanism of the causes and purposes for which you have met. But if there are doubters or faint of heart among you, I give you Hamilton, I give you Franklin, I give you Jefferson, I give you Washington, I give you the courageous, foresighted, liberty-loving masses of the peoples of the Thirteen Colonies, and finally and above all, I have given you Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of the living God. For it is written in Matthew, the twenty-second chapter in the thirty-fifth to the fortieth verses:

"That a Pharisee and a lawyer came to Him seeking to tempt Him and saying:

" 'Master, which is the great commandment in the Law?' Jesus said unto him: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all they heart, with all thy soul and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment and second is like unto it, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.' "

Marketing of Farm Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1941, I introduced H. R. 1382, a bill to provide for the development of marketing and marketing services for farm commodities. The bill authorized a very modest appropriation, beginning with $1,000,000 for the first fiscal year and increasing a million dollars annually until the end of the fifth fiscal year, and providing that the sums made available should be apportioned by the Secretary of Agriculture among the several States to the State departments of agriculture, with a particular view to providing a marketing system which would furnish a steady flow of standardized farm commodities to centers of distribution and would provide for farmers adequate and readily available marketing services for the commodities produced by them.

This bill was approved by the United States Department of Agriculture, by the Bureau of the Budget, by every secretary and commissioner of agriculture in the United States. It was likewise approved by the Extension Service and by many farm leaders and organizations, but unfortunately was not approved by the House Committee on Agriculture. The bill provided that all educational functions, including teaching, research, and extension, should be administered by the colleges of agriculture, and had the bill been enacted at or about the time that it was introduced, we would now have the United States Department of Agriculture, the Extension Service, the agricultural colleges, and all of the State departments of agriculture cooperating in the prosecution of its objectives.

We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars teaching the farmers of America how to produce. We have spent other hundreds of millions of dollars teaching our farmers how to control and regulate production, but we have rendered little assistance in the field of marketing, a field which has already been too long neglected.

I am sure that we have the best distribution system in the world, but I do believe that it can be made even more efficient, and certainly more economical. It is absurd to suggest that our distribution system cannot be improved or made less expensive. We know that many leeches, bloodsuckers, and parasites are greatly burdening our distribution system and constantly increasing the wide spread between the farm and the city table. Our merchants and our system of doing business are superior in many respects, and while we, of course, appreciate the splendid services which are being rendered by the retail merchants of America, we cannot lose sight of the fact that the farmers are taking more than their share of abuse and are wrongfully being accused of fostering all of the evils of inflation.

Some time ago I called attention to the wide spread between the prices received by producers and the prices paid by consumers. The farmer is so far removed from the ultimate consumer that he is never in a position to defend himself when he is cursed and accused of being selfish and greedy.

I have just reintroduced the bill which was formerly H. R. 1382. It is today even more badly needed than it was at the time it was originally introduced. I hope that it will receive the very serious consideration of the House Committee on Agriculture and the entire membership of Congress. While it may not remove all of the imperfections and remedy all of the evils in our present marketing system, I have every reason to believe that much real good will be accomplished if the bill is enacted into law.

I submit for your consideration three brief editorials, one which appeared on April 9, 1943, in the New York Sun, entitled "Tomatoes: $700 a Ton"; one which appeared in the News and Observer of Raleigh, N. C., on April 5, 1943, entitled "Wanted: A Statesman"; and another which appeared in the same paper on April 11, 1943, entitled "Spread Is Too Great":

[From the New York Sun of April 9, 1943]

TOMATOES $700 A TON

A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture has invited Washington housewives to submit detailed figures on their expenditures for food. One such witness has already turned over to Senator NYE sales slips covering innumerable purchases for her family of four. Through these items of household bookkeeping the subcommittee hopes to learn something about the spread between the prices that the farmer receives and those that the consumer pays.

In the House of Representatives a similar inquiry seems to be imminent. Representative COOLEY, of North Carolina, the other day told his colleagues that in the retail grocery stores of Washington tomatoes, cucumbers, and string beans were selling at the rate of $700 a ton; spinach at the rate of $200 a ton; and green peppers at the rate of $900 a ton. Representative COOLEY's calculations were on the basis of prices by the pound; presumably any Washingtonian with storage space for a ton of spinach or tomatoes could get a better rate. In any case, such prices are sometimes identified as approximately what the farmer receives for his produce. Representative COOLEY for a long time has been trying to persuade his colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the spread between farm and retail prices. At the present time not only the committees of Congress but the Office of Price Administration as well are interested in this subject, and Washington housewives who keep books may be the first expert witnesses.

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of April 5, 1943]

WANTED: A STATESMAN

Why is it that comparatively the farmer gets so little for what he produces and the consumer pays so much? If the spread was not so great, the problem of the high cost of living would not evade solution. The statesman who can devise a plan to end this wide difference, with fair profits to merchants and justice to transportation companies, will deserve the highest place in the hall of fame. This is the supreme need.

Woodrow Wilson looked to reaching this goal, but his Secretary of Agriculture was more interested in finance and foreign policies than in bringing the producer and the consumer closer together, the paramount attainment to solve much of the problems of the cost of living and the threat of inflation. One of the expenses that could be reduced is transportation. A year or so ago when the railroads were in a bad way, the Interstate Commerce Commission gave authority to the railroads to hoist freight rates 6 percent and also passenger rates. Today the Commission, seeing that the railroads are making money hand over fist, earning more than at any time in history, has under consideration reducing the rates. High authorities say that if freight rates were lowered 10 percent this would help to prevent inflation provided the reduction affected the price the farmer and manufacturer gets for his product.

It has been suggested that, in addition to a reduction in transportation rates, the prices on all articles sold be fixed at a fair rate so that producer, merchant, and consumer can be protected. Every item that enters into the ultimate cost should be studied and excessive prices prevented. Only in this way, and by renegotiating contracts that are making millionaires of Government contractors, can justice be done to all.

Wanted: A statesman who can end the too-wide spread between what the producer receives and what the consumer pays.

[From the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of April 11, 1943]

SPREAD IS TOO GREAT

Congressman COOLEY is on the right track in trying to find a way to end the too-wide spread between what the farmer receives and the consumer pays for the products of the farm. He pointed out that in retail stores in Washington tomatoes are selling at $700 a ton, while the farmers get a price so much lower that the spread is wider than the Potomac. It would add weight to his argument if Mr. COOLEY would give the price by the pound charged for farm products in Washington and contrast them with the price the farmer receives. The biggest task of statesmanship is to put an end to this spread that is injurious alike to the producer and the consumer.

Nazi Massacres of Jews in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution protesting Nazi massacres of Jews in Europe

Whereas harrowing reports from many sources, now authenticated by our State Department reveal the unbelievable tortures and mass murder inflicted by Nazi barbarism on innocent Jewish men, women, and children; and

Whereas these inhuman persecutions are pursued with the avowed purpose of utter

annihilation of the millions of Jews living in Nazi-dominated Europe; and

Whereas these ruthless persecutions of a defenseless people, not even sparing innocent children, threaten the spiritual and moral liquidation of civilization; and

Whereas the moral pressure of an aroused public opinion, together with America's determination to seek justice for all mankind, can stay the hand of these executioners and bring to suffering Israel the light of hope and faith in their supreme agony: Be it

Resolved, That we, the National Council of Jewish Women, Chicago section, representing organized American Jewish womanhood, acknowledge the courageous words of the President of the United States, bespeaking the sympathy of our country for the victims of the Nazi terror and calling its perpetrators to strict accountability in a day of reckoning that will surely come; and be it further

Resolved, That we express to the President of our country our firm hope and faith that the American people and those of the United Nations will follow his great example, and give to the desperate and agonized Jews of Europe assurance that their suffering shall find surcease and redress in a free and just world. The National Council of Jewish Women, Chicago section, calls upon American womanhood to join in expressing to the President wholehearted support of his stand, and, furthermore, urges upon our Government and the United Nations the pursuit of a vigorous policy of action to achieve the rescue of the Jews who have survived the Nazi fury.

The Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, through its general manager, Mr. M. W. Thatcher, has something very interesting to say on the farm situation. This statement embraces an address delivered by Mr. Thatcher over a radio hook-up of 14 stations on April 18.

I think the entire address is of great interest to the people of the Northwest and the Nation, and it is presented herewith in its entirety:

Good afternoon, fellow Americans, I speak to you today, with mixed emotions, because I have both good news and bad news for our farmers and the consumers. On the side of good news, I shall report today the forward progress of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in its purchase of the huge St. Anthony & Dakota Elevator Co. On the side of bad news, I shall report on the legislative front at Washington.

Farmers have, for several years, benefited by annual appropriations from the Federal Treasury; that is, the Congress has appropriated nearly $1,000,000,000 each year directly for the benefit of the farmers of the Nation. Some of the benefit funds covered:

1. Parity payments.
2. Soil-conservation payments.
3. Crop-insurance expenses and part of the losses.
4. A subsidy to cut all land bank mortgage interest rates to 3½ percent and Federal farm mortgage interest rates to 4½ percent.
5. Appropriations for Farm Security Administration to take care of and to help low-income farmers needing rehabilitation loans to enable them to produce more food and fiber so that they might enjoy better living conditions and their children gain an education.
6. Appropriations for distribution of food to the helpless, maimed and blind, and to the children of low-income people through hot school lunches.

The many desirable and needed help programs which I have just enumerated are on the way out unless more Congressmen and people who vote for Congressmen wake up and do something about it.

The huge appropriations from the Federal Treasury each year to carry on these social and economic programs, of course, must be provided by a favorable vote by both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Appropriations must first be passed upon by the House of Representatives.

Before the House votes upon appropriations, a House Committee on Appropriations considers the problems before the Nation. This Committee on Appropriations holds hearings and representatives of farm groups, along with others, are permitted to appear and tell what they think should be appropriated and why.

Between them, a certain group has temporarily won the battle. This group, or part of it, has stood for one or more of the following, adverse to the interests of the war effort, the farmers' interests, and the consumers' interests, according to our views.

1. Cut soil-conservation payments down to $300,000,000 as against $400,000,000.
2. Complete elimination of parity payments.
3. Complete elimination of Farm Security Administration.
4. Complete elimination of crop insurance.
5. Complete elimination of Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation with nonrecourse notes for the production of war-risk crops, such as flaxseed, soybeans, potatoes, beans, etc.
6. Complete elimination of food relief for the helpless, maimed, blind, and the underfed school children who have been receiving the benefits of the hot school-lunch program.
7. Destruction of Farm Credit Administration with its Federal Land Banks and Bank for Cooperatives through a joker provision in the appropriations bill.
8. Turning over the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program to the extension service and county agents, thereby making Charlie McCarthys of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration farmer committeemen.
9. Disregarding incentive payments for extra production of essentially needed farm war crops, which were promised to the farmers by Secretary Wickard, the President of the United States, and the Federal Bureau of the Budget.

Now, I shall name the group which has fought in whole or in part for the destruction of these programs which I have just enumerated. Here they are: The American Bankers Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Council for Farmer Cooperatives, the National Federation of Milk Producers, reactionary Members of Congress.

Now, here is the group which has opposed this destructive program: The National Farmers Union, the National Federation of Grain Cooperatives, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation, the Oregon Grange, the National Rural Church Federation, composed of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, the National Child Welfare Group, the liberals and progressives in Congress, the Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the United States.

On Palm Sunday, in a world war, which group would you wish to join and throw your support to?

If you do nothing, you have not enough energy or interest to be a real part of your Nation at war or care what your Nation is to be in the future.

If you care to join the group which desires to protect the weak and underemployed farmers who are without adequate credit to produce more on the farms.

If you care to have your Nation keep its pledged word given to the farmers to make incentive payments for increased production of war-risk crops and to furnish incentive credit through Farm Credit Administration to increase war-risk crops.

If you care to keep triple A programs in the hands of the farmers.

If you care to preserve Farm Credit Administration, with its Federal land banks, Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and banks for cooperatives.

If you care to preserve crop insurance for wheat and cotton farmers.

If you care to preserve adequate funds for soil-conservation purposes.

If you care to continue to help provide food for the helpless, maimed, blind, and underfed poor children in school, then wire and write to your Congressmen and Senators to provide the appropriations promised by the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Federal Bureau of the Budget.

I am not condemning on this Palm Sunday. I am reporting on what is happening now in Washington, D. C.—now—and beginning again tomorrow morning—the debate on these appropriations goes on in the House of Representatives.

I wonder what will come out of this legislative fight in Washington as to these funds to be appropriated for the next year, a war year. The House will end its debate and cast its votes during Holy Week. What must God think as He looks down on this sordid period in our history? I am not condemning. We are doing all we can to help the people of this Nation on the farms, in the villages, and in the cities, to a better and more secure way of life. You make your choice to stand with us or not, to communicate at once with your Members in the House of Representatives at Washington, D. C., or not. We have done all we can. It now rests in the hands of the voters in the towns and on the farms to do what they will.

I honestly believe that if the facts were known to the farmers, 95 percent of the members of the Farm Bureau and the Grange would join hands with us in our position on this bitter fight as to the appropriations which I have been discussing. There are but a handful of leaders of the opposition group whom we believe to be responsible for this disunity in agriculture.

GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION BUYS ST. ANTHONY & DAKOTA CO.

On the side of good news, the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, after lengthly negotiations, has purchased the St. Anthony & Dakota Elevator Co., with headquarters in the Chamber of Commerce building, Minneapolis. We have bought this business, lock, stock, and barrel—all its assets—$2,700,000—and have assumed its liabilities of $360,000, a net purchase price of $2,340,000. The purchase consists of inventories of grain, lumber supplies, etc., together with over 200 parcels of property.

The properties include 136 country elevators, 38 lumber yards, feed mills, coal sheds, country dwellings, etc. Employees numbering over 200 are now a part of the staff of

the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association. Our staff of employees now numbers about 600.

With the purchase of this large business, we have added 4,500,000 bushels of space to our present capacity, and about 10 million bushels more in grain and seed per year. This purchase puts us in the lumber business. We now are not only the largest grain cooperative in the United States but also the largest grain marketing organization in the United States.

This purchase puts the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association in business in two new States—Iowa and Nebraska. We now operate facilities in eight States—Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Montana, and Washington, and do business from coast to coast.

You loyal stockholders and directors of farmers' elevators, you directors and stockholders, and employees of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, more and more you are seeing the reward for your loyal patronage and faithful service to this grain-cooperative movement.

You are determined, you are on the cooperative march, you have just won another great battle in your war for economic security through the cooperative movement.

I am proud to be your general manager and testify to my faith in your ultimate victory fo reconomic security in a free, democratic Nation.

APPEAL TO WASHINGTON

In conclusion, I want to go back to the bitter fight at Washington in the House of Representatives, as to the appropriations for agriculture, consumers, and the war effort for the next fiscal year of this Nation in relation to food and fiber. How could an issue be more serious than the one discussed this afternoon?

The debate on this bill for appropriations begins again tomorrow morning and will have been concluded before Good Friday. It is so important, it is so serious—won't you take a few minutes' times to wire your Member in the House of Representatives to support the appropriations promised by the United States Department of Agriculture and supported by the National Bureau of the Budget and the President of the United States?

You owe it to the war effort, your Nation, and yourself to spend this little time and money yet this very day.

Keep producing, America, to give us food for freedom.

Pay-As-You-Go Income-Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. GIBSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to place a few statements in the RECORD on the very controversial issue that has been worked up in the House over the suggested pay-as-you-go income-tax plan.

I have been sick and forced to view the proceedings on the subject from the outside as a spectator instead of as a Member of the House. This peculiar position I have occupied has had nothing to do with my views on the subject as they were definitely fixed soon after this plan was brought forward by Mr. Ruml which fact will be sustained by the assistant whip who took a poll before the matter was before the House. This did give me an opportunity, however, to view the scene as the public views our actions.

No one is more aware of my many weaknesses than I myself, and I admit that I am not in any sense a financial expert. Furthermore, I desire to say that it is not my desire to be critical of the majority members of the Ways and Means Committee, as I am personally fond of them all and regard them as gentlemen not only whose integrity is above question, but as men of outstanding ability, some of whom I regard among the ablest of our entire membership. I must say, however, that the action taken by the House on this measure is the most glaring example of fumbling I have ever witnessed by any deliberative body. I have been totally unable to understand the attitude of at least a few who played important roles in the drama.

Instead of approaching the matter as one of most vital importance to every American citizen and the economic structure of our national life, they have actually assumed the position that it was a personal insult to them to attempt to work out a sensible pay-as-you-go plan. I am not mad about the matter and do not care to make any hurtful remarks as was much in evidence during general debate. However, had I attempted to engage in a naming contest I would have designated the bill reported by the committee a stillborn monstrosity.

It has been said that the reason our side of the House opposed the pay-as-you-go plan was because it was sired by the elephant instead of the donkey. If we do not wake up and go to giving not only thought but protection to the rights of the people against the many injustices being practiced on them, we will soon be having litters instead of individuals sired by the elephant.

The conduct of the majority party on this measure brings very forcefully to my mind a story I used to hear about the gypsy's mule. It was stated that a farmer residing near a spot where gypsies had recently set up a trading post had gone down and bought a mule that was very highly recommended and especially his eyes. The farmer got on the mule and started home and when he came to a turn in the road, the mule instead of turning went straight on over a brush pile, a roll of wire fence and into a mud hole and stuck, where he remained and, of course, the farmer deserted the sinking ship and returned to tell the gypsy what he thought of him, and, among other things stated, "you told me he could see." The gypsy said, "he can, he ain't blind; he just don't give a damn." I fear the public's answer to the majority plunge into this mud hole will be the same as the gypsy's. You will never make the public think you were that blind.

I well realize that taxes and heavy taxes must be paid by the citizenry of this country and that it is our duty to provide laws for their collection. I realize further, that we are only representatives of the people and that we get our authority from them. Why, then, should we use our taxing authority to punish them? Is it not our duty to make the payment of these great sums as painless as possible? I am happy that I have never been able to look on my Government as a monster out to forage on the people but have been able to keep in mind, that the Government breathes only through the nostrils of its people, that its heart beats only in the breast of its people and that it can bleed only from the wounds of its people, and that even though it must be supported by the genius and labor of its citizenry, it has no right to inflict needless pain upon such citizenry.

Let us analyze this question, first should we get on a pay-as-you-go plan, if so by what means is it possible without breaking down our economic system.

We must first admit that this administration is partially responsible for the necessity of this heavy tax. In the very beginning as high as $12 per day was paid to men who had never earned more than $1.50 per day, and this in great volume throughout the land, and right there is where inflation started. I could cite numerous cases today where such men are drawing from $300 to $400 a month, and other men who have put their life in work at a given trade only making from $200 to $300 per month. For instance, I know one men who is a finished machinist and railroad engineer who has put his entire life in this work and who is now past 50 years of age and running an engine every day and draws only about $250 per month, and others who have never put a day in work at a trade until 2 years ago who are making more than $300 per month. We have further stood idly by and seen initiation fees of from $50 to $200 charged for the right to work on Government jobs. This alone has run into billions of dollars that the taxpayers must pay from which no benefits have been received. Then should it not be our duty to make it as light as possible on the men who fall into the class above referred to who have suffered the effects of inflation and who have not been granted an increase in pay?

I entered Congress on January 3, 1941, and with a few others advocated within a month or two thereafter a withholding tax on the theory that a great majority of those receiving inflationary wages referred to would spend their money as they made it and never pay any tax unless it was withheld. More than 2 years have passed and billions of dollars of taxes again lost, thereby increasing the burden on the man who has put his life in his job and who will remain on it when the days of this wasteful spree are over, but yet we have done nothing. When we came back after Christmas this year it seemed that the membership had realized that some sort of withholding tax must be put into effect. Then may I ask why it was not enacted into law before February 1 and on that date began collecting tax by withholding at the source? This failure has cost those who must pay millions more. I think delay is the greatest sin committed by the National Congress. This question is so simple that anyone within 2 hours' study

should see without question that at least the 6-percent regular and 13-percent surtax should have been forgiven for the year 1942 or either all of 1942 taxes provided that each taxpayer pay on the year in which his income was the greater 1942 or 1943, and that it should have become law and been in operation before time to file returns. The public has a right to be disappointed in the bungling this matter has had. I believe that when this Congress makes up its mind that it is an independent body and each Member goes to thinking for himself or herself the country will be much better off.

It is common knowledge that the rank and file of the paying public cannot pay but 1 year's taxes at the time and, therefore, forgiveness is necessary if we get on a cash basis. The majority bill provided discount for those of wealth whom it does not hurt to pay taxes, but nothing for 90 percent of the taxpayers. The discount would have saved those being subject to tax on a million dollars approximately $51,000 for 1 year but not a dime for the poor who needed help. Under the provisions of that bill anyone drawing pay checks would have been forced to pay not only 1942 and 1943 but one-half of 1944 taxes to have received full advantage of the provided discount. The bill provided that 1942 and 1943 tax must be paid in full by June 15, 1943, to receive full discount and that on July 1, 1943, all salaries and wages would become subject to a 20-percent pay-roll tax, which, of course, would be applied on 1944 tax. I cannot see how anyone in good conscience and with a straight face could advocate any such inequalities in a democracy, and then to have the Treasury Department come out with the statement it was backing this plan 100 percent makes you frown with disgust.

I have at public addresses and at every other opportunity advised my people to get their house in order for the post-war period. In other words, to get out of debt and try to save some cash to form a cushion for the lean days that must follow. It seems unthinkable that the Government instead of trying to assist the people in being prepared for this shock, would deliberately bind 90 percent of its citizenry by law to meet this period in debt to the Government on an average of 20 percent of their annual income in the fat years which, no doubt, would equal a full year's income in the period in which this debt would stand as a monster before them. Do we want to provide a law to prepare customers for an enlarged W. P. A.? Has this Nation not played Santa Claus enough? The first step toward enslaving a people is to impoverish them. This let us not deliberately do in the voice of democracy.

Let us be realistic and quit playing hide and seek, and shadow boxing. Suppose you owned and operated a general mercantile business and had for years carried all your customers more than a full year at all times, absorbing the resulting losses. If you, presuming it to be possible, were then given the option to forgive all accounts of all customers and go immediately on a cash basis, knowing that all your customers would continue to buy every article they used from you, and that they and you would live until the end of time to enjoy this change in business custom, would you prefer to go on a cash basis or continue in your old way? The question answers itself. Why deny your Government this advantage? There would be millions more taxes collected this year. All that would ever be lost would be the privilege of the Treasury Department to build up a field force equal near to our armed forces to try to collect worthless paper at further heavy expense to those who must, after all, pay the tax. If those in charge of our Government would apply just ordinary business judgment to its operation, expenses could immediately be cut at least 40 percent. In the name of the people, the life of the Nation, I ask you when shall we start?

From the press I see staggering, bewildered, and confused sentiment in the Congress, looking wistfully toward some system of spreading out payment of some portion of 1942 tax over a period of years. Please do not do this. Our failure to pass this measure is crime by omission of duty, but to force debt on the people of the Nation as individuals to choke them through days of depression to follow would be crime by commission. We have placed our public debt at a high-water mark and one that is dangerous within itself, but if we now go to tying personal obligations onto our individual citizens as carry-overs we have sounded the death knell of democracy.

I was reared poor and am yet poor, which has brought to me a knowledge that could have come from no other source. That is how about 90 percent of the people live. I know their problems, their emotions and impulses, and finally, first-hand, their hardships. The average American citizen has so many obligations and his family so many needs that are never filled until he by necessity spends what comes into his hands.

As a clear example, suppose the farmer and laboring man on ordinary salaries were forced by the Government to pay their gasoline tax on March 15 each year instead of "as-they-go." This will give you an idea of the difference in the burdens the two plans impose on the individual taxpayer.

Think of the thousands of railroad men and others who have received no raise in pay and are forced to meet the high cost of living along with those whose incomes have been more than doubled, let us give them one break.

It has been amusing to me of recent months to observe, among other things, that when a fellow is trying to sponsor a cause with no merit, he falls on the weapon of what the soldiers would say if they were here, and if he cannot square with you any other way, he will accuse you of being pro-Axis, simply because you do not subscribe to some fool idea he has worked up.

I would like to remind you that each soldier has a father and mother, or wife and child, or other loved ones in American homes, and when we honor and protect the American home and the democracy for which they are fighting we will be answering their prayers.

Let me tell you some of the questions that they will ask you when they come home. The first one will be, What have you done to protect the economic structure of this Nation while we were fighting for its physical protection? The next will be, Why did you let the labor racketeers, such as Harry Bridges, John L. Lewis, and others, commercialize on our blood while we with our comrades bled and died on the field of battle to protect your homes, and that democracy may live? Why have you let those of socialistic and communistic ideals honeycomb our Government at large salaries, sapping the marrow from the very bones of our democracy while we fought in mud and blood, cold and heat, with empty stomachs and empty purses, to protect abroad that which was being destroyed by parasites at home, who have never even respected democracy.

Mr. Speaker, let it be hoped that reason will prevail and the rights of the people respected, and this great body in whom the people have expressed their faith may redeem itself.

St. Patrick's Day in North Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written from somewhere in Africa by Pvt. (1st cl.) Carl Ryan to the Honorable Thomas Doogan, clerk of the superior court in Boston:

STILL SOMEWHERE IN AFRICA,
March 26, 1943.

Hon. THOMAS DOOGAN,
Clerk, Superior Court,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR TOM: Just received your letter and it was good to hear from you.

We really celebrated St. Patrick's Day here at our new location. For a time during the day I missed the wearing of the green and South Boston's open house and big parade. But, Tom, we had something else—something that will make us long remember St. Patrick's Day 1943. Boston's own and greatly beloved Bishop Francis J. Spellman, returning from a trip to Rome and a visit to the Vatican, celebrated mass here St. Patrick's night. It was a memorable occasion.

Bishop Spellman, I suppose, could have celebrated mass in one of the large cities, but instead he journeyed to our location. We had little notice, but the word spread like wildfire of the bishop's visit and officers and enlisted men alike rushed into town, availing themselves of any and all forms of conveyance. All were anxious to see and greet the bishop. There were members of combat crews, attired in their flying togs—some shaven and others who looked as though they had only waited to dash cold water on their faces to freshen up after the day's mission. There were smartly attired officers and enlisted men dressed in whatever uniform the day's duties called for. All crowded into a small building ordinarily used for moving picture shows and whatever entertainment

comes along. Empty wooden bomb crates served as pews and a small altar was hastily erected on the stage.

And it was not Catholics alone who attended the St. Patrick's Day service, Tom, for I noticed men of several other denominations among the overflow throng. Bishop Spellman literally beamed as he entered the building, and his famous smile seemed to reach the farthest corner of the dimly lighted "cathedral." The service was scheduled for 6:30 p. m., and the bishop arrived only a few minutes before. He walked to the stage, and here, in front of the altar and in front of the congregation, donned his vestments. Catholics figuratively wiped their eyes as if to clear away an optical illusion, for never before had they witnessed such a sight. But there was no room and no time for privacy. The beloved bishop took the inconvenience in stride, wasted no time in preparing himself, and the mass started exactly on time. He was assisted by one of the chaplains and an officer who, probably, had little time to brush up on the Latin of his altar-boy days.

In a brief sermon Bishop Spellman informed the fighting men that he would always remember St. Patrick's Day 1943. First, because, he said, it was the first time he had celebrated mass in the afternoon, and, secondly, because he celebrated it away from St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City. He said he felt free to say that his own parishioners would prefer that he celebrate mass as he was doing rather than being with them on St. Patrick's Day. The bishop paid tribute to the devotion of the fighting men and the good work being done by the chaplains, and he reminded the soldiers that the better the Catholic they were, the better the soldier they would be, and, conversely, the better soldier they were the better Catholic they would be in the present crusade. "God bless you all," he concluded.

Before and during the mass, the chaplains heard confessions and there was a steady stream to the confessionals. It seemed that practically all in attendance wanted to receive communion. I was among the first 20 to receive and like all others it was the first time I had received the sacrament on a stage several feet above the rest of those present. We were instructed to file up the left stairs leading to the stage and, after receiving communion from the bishop in front of the altar, to leave by the right stairs. More than 200 received communion, Tom.

Before saying the last prayers, Bishop Spellman announced that although he didn't know how many of the men would have to return to their duties immediately, he would remain after mass to greet personally all who desired. I think everyone present, including the scores who crowded outside in the hope of catching a glimpse of the bishop, filed to the stage to shake his hand. We were instructed, Tom, to give our name and our home city. Once again, your old friend was way up in the front and when I gave my name and Boston as my home, it seemed as though he gave an extra tug to my hand and I was treated to a smile that to me included all those at home in the city in which he had spent so many years. "What parish?" Bishop Spellman asked. I told him and before I had a chance to name the pastor, the bishop had supplied the missing information. It was just another display of the bishop's remarkable memory and his gift for remembering names. He gave me the impression that he would have liked to chat for a time but, with hundreds behind me, there was no opportunity to do so.

I think every Massachusetts man in the organization and in neighboring units attended the mass and greeted the bishop, and I feel sure that, as in my case, all will remember St. Patrick's Day 1943 for many, many years to come. Bishop Spellman's visit, his kind words, warm welcome, and friendly handshake seemed to bring all our loved ones closer. It was truly a great St. Patrick's Day for us all.

I am enjoying the best of health, Tom, and I hope you and the family have been well. If the fuel shortage and the good old New England winter is a blizzarding, let me know, and I'll ship you post haste a package of this thermometer-jumping African sunshine. Don't get any wrong ideas, Tom. I'll still take our good old Boston and New England weather sunny side up or not.

With best regards to you and the family and all my other friends in the old Hub.

I remain, as ever,

Your pal,

CARL RYAN,
Private, First Class.

Food—The Deciding Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, "Food—The Deciding Issue," is the title of an editorial written by James H. McGraw, Jr., president of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD—THE DECIDING ISSUE

OUR FOOD PROBLEM REMAINS TO BE SOLVED

The first thing the Germans did when they occupied Czechoslovakia, Poland, Belgium, France was to empty all warehouses. Everything went into trucks headed for Germany.

The Nazis knew that this war would be won by the army that had the most supplies and the best supply system.

The Nazis knew that supplies are as essential as guns. They knew that the most essential of all supplies is food.

Being the only people on earth who can watch women and children starve, the Nazis seized upon food as their most powerful instrument for disciplining the masses. They added famine to their arsenal of conquest.

The flocks and herds of Europe are being consumed with alarming rapidity. The desperate shortage of meats and fats is growing steadily worse. Our Allies are short of certain foods that we must supply if we expect them to carry on.

And as we supply them, as our imports are curtailed, as our fighting men consume more than they do in civil life, and as we fail to increase our production rapidly enough, we, too, become short of certain foods.

Former President Herbert Hoover, speaking before a conference of the Governors and Representatives of 12 Midwestern farming States in Des Moines on March 15, sounded the warning that American agriculture, beset by Washington bungling on manpower, farm machinery, and price systems, strangling production and distribution, is facing a deterioration which may bring on a national food shortage such as led to the collapse of Russia, the defeat of Germany in the First World War, and the fall of France in the present war. Unless this deterioration is stopped, warns Mr. Hoover, we cannot hope to win the present conflict.

Complications of similar magnitude face the food processor and the distributor.

Never in the history of the world has man's dependence on food been so crucial. Yet it is not easy for us to grasp the full significance of the crisis. We are so accustomed to finding milk, eggs, and butter on our doorsteps every morning, we are so used to filling our pantries from the shelves of our grocers and markets that we accept food as something that is due us on demand. We do not stop to think that we never are more than a few meals ahead of famine.

But this picture has changed. Now we are faced with food rationing, and every day the shelves of our food markets become more bare.

Let it be noted that the appointment of two Food Administrators has not solved the food problem. It is still with us; daily it becomes more critical. Unless it is solved, and solved quickly, the very food that ex-Food Administrator Wickard said would "win the war and write the peace" may lose the war and lose the peace.

Put very simply and clearly, the food problem amounts to this: We are trying to feed upward of 200,000,000 people. We are trying to do it with the farms and other facilities that heretofore have been capable of feeding about 145,000,000 people (our present population plus a 5-percent surplus).

Had the Government foreseen the need and planned ahead, we could have begun by 1941 the enlargement of our farm production and food-processing capacity. Two irreplaceable years have been lost.

The gravity of the situation becomes apparent when we consider that 50,000 factories are required to process our foods. Food processing not only is America's biggest industry—it is one of America's most important for, without processing, most foods would perish before they could reach the consumer. The term "processing" covers the salting, drying, smoking, pickling, chilling, canning, packing, and other methods of preservation that make it possible for us to eat in 1943 food that was produced in 1942. Few realize that most of the food we shall eat in 1943 was produced and processed last year, that most of the seed we plant this spring will grow food for 1944 or perhaps later.

In one important process of preservation, tin and rubber are vital materials. When the Japs captured Malaya and the Netherlands East Indies more than half of the world's tin and nearly all of its rubber fell into their hands. This forced drastic changes upon our entire food economy. The importance of tin-plated steel containers, tops for glass jars and rubber gaskets is fairly obvious * * * metal food containers alone consume, every year, more than 2,700,000 tons of steel.

The aggression of Japan has snared our whole food industry in a maze of intricate packing problems. It has enforced recognition of a new principle of food technology, i. e., that the method of food preservation is determined by the type of container available. The tin, steel, and rubber stringency compels many food processors to adopt unfamiliar methods—methods that call for a great deal of new equipment. This, in turn, involves the use of critical materials that are so urgently needed for other war purposes.

This conversion of the food processing industry to meet these exacting restrictions has been greatly complicated by two factors that have increased its wartime burden. Indeed, it is these that provide the principal reason for civilian food rationing.

The first of these is the task of feeding our armed forces overseas. Allied ships are being sunk at an alarming rate and the loss of cargo is considerable.

The second factor gravely augments the first. Under lend-lease our country is undertaking to feed our allies to the extent of approximately 60,000,000 people.

Types of food required for lend-lease and the armed forces are the finest we can produce. They are the high protein foods, especially meats, cheese, and milk; and the protective foods which rate high in vitamin content. Peculiarly enough, the more valuable a food is from a nutritive angle, the more specialized is the processing required to preserve it.

The food processing industry, handicapped as it is, is meeting today's challenge with resourcefulness and enthusiasm * * * despite container complications and shipping shortages.

It is accomplishing its Herculean task by resurrecting and modernizing a method of food preservation that is as old as mankind. Probably you have read a great deal about dehydration. You actually may have eaten dehydrated food, but right now nearly every bit of dehydrated food is earmarked for the armed forces or for Lend-Lease.

Food processing never will be as spectacular as the production of bombers or tanks. But under today's conditions, the performance of the food processor is no less important * * * no less inspiring. When we consider that dehydrated food is compressed into solid blocks with a density nearly equal to that of coal, so that almost a whole meal can be carred in a vest pocket, and that half of the shipping space is thereby saved in transportation, we begin to appreciate what the processors have contributed to meet the food problem imposed by the war.

But they have not only contributed new methods, they are achieving new highs in production. And now they are asked to do what borders on the impossible. Consider dehydrated egg powder. Normal production in pre-war years was about 3,000,000 pounds. In 1940 this was increased two and one-half times, in 1942 it was stepped up again, this time forty-fold And in 1943 the call is for another 60 percent boost, to make a total of 480,000,000 pounds. Dried milk powder production of 350,000,000 pounds in 1940 must be increased to 685,000,000 pounds in 1943.

Vegetables, which were a small item to the processor before the war, now are dehydrated in enormous quantities. The vegetable dehydration industry has had to grow by leaps and bounds without benefit of the high priorities accorded to arms, ship, and aircraft building. Production of dehydrated vegetables in 1942 was four times that of 1941, and 1943 calls for a sixteen-fold increase over 1942.

Total dehydrated food production in 1943 is scheduled at 1,750,000,000 pounds, dry basis * * * all for export. Multiply that by 10 and you have a rough approximation of the astronomical amount of raw materials that will have to be produced.

Many problems remain to be solved in the troublesome days that lie ahead. But with all his resourcefulness, man has little control over the weather. A severe drought could wipe out all of man's carefully laid plans. If we are tempted to reassure ourselves with the thought that the food situation probably is not so serious as it is painted, it will be well to remember that last year's crop increase over 1941 was due to better than average growing weather.

The war-bred food crisis that now confronts us will be met only by immediate measures to insure a food production ample to allow for adverse weather conditions. The food processing industry is capable, but has not been granted the needed help in coping with its tasks. The food problem as a whole involves all three functions of production, processing, and distribution. And if we are to master the problems that now beset us, all three of them must be coordinated under a single administrative control. "Food will win the war and write the peace." But if American food is to do that double job, we must develop a capacity for food administration comparable with the genius of our food industries.

JAMES H. MCGRAW, Jr.,
President, McGraw-Hill Publishing, Co., Inc.

The United States and World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting radio address delivered by Hon. James W. Gerard on April 18, 1943. Mr. Gerard, as everyone knows, is a fine scholar, and has extensive knowledge of world affairs. Whether one agrees with all his views of not, they are entitled to consideration on any matter which Mr. Gerard discusses.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The four distinguished Senators: Senators HATCH, BURTON, HILL, and BALL, have been here and have won the town with their idea of a study by the Senate of the final terms of peace and the objects of the war.

As the Senate must, under our Constitution, finally approve any treaty of peace, it seems only reasonable that the Members of the Senate should consider the final terms and into that consultation bring the people of the United States.

Of course, there is the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate charged with the supervision of proposed treaties which must first be submitted to this committee.

But after this war so many questions will arise, not usually included in treaties, that it seems to me there is a real need for an extra committee to study particularly the economic aspects of the world after the war, and the people at large, to be so vitally affected by any economic policies adopted, should have a chance to hear and discuss the various measures which may be proposed.

After the last war, professors, historians, geographers and theorists flocked like flies to Versailles, and then that awful document was slapped on the desks of our Senators who were asked, in no uncertain terms, to sign on the dotted line.

This time there must be full consideration in our Senate, and the various senatorial committees, without bickering or jealousy, can cooperate in the study of the questions presented.

Woodrow Wilson, somewhat smothered by the intrigues of Versailles, is on record for "open covenants openly arrived at."

Senators do not come to New York often enough. Perhaps the founding fathers were right in putting the Government in Washington in its own little independent principality, District of Columbia, where they would be unaffected by the views held either in the country districts or the great commercial cities. But we here, in New York, can learn much of the attitude of the country at large from the Senate representatives and the Senators, in turn, by visiting New York oftener, can learn something of the problems that confront us in this, the greatest taxpaying unit of the United States.

Of course one of the great problems of after the war is how Germany should be treated and in this connection I read with great interest the book by Dr. Richard M. Brickner, assistant professor of clinical neurology, College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University, called Is Germany Incurable?

The Doctor has written a book at once scientific and interesting, two adjectives that cannot always be applied together to books written by scienists.

Dr. Brickner's theory is that the Germans suffer from mass paranoia. When I was a judge of the New York Supreme Court, it was one of my duties from time to time to commit to institutions those unfortunates who had lost their minds and one of the most frequent forms of insanity, for insanity has many distinct forms, was that of paranoia.

The paranoiac suffers from delusions of persecution and usually appears sane on all subjects except those connected with his delusions.

For instance, one day I was examining a man whose relatives and friends said that he was insane, and I said, "Why, this man is as sane as any of you," whereupon one of the lawyers passed me a slip of paper on which was written, "Ask him about the red-headed man." I did so, and the paranoiac immediately showed signs of violent insanity and said that he knew the red-headed man was waiting outside the courthouse to persecute and kill him.

It is possible for the people or a nation to suffer from mass hysterics, one of the sufferers reacting on others and these in turn reacting on the whole population. An instance of this is the heresy of the Flagellants when in the Middle Ages great masses of people, beating themselves with whips and chains, paraded through the principal cities of the Continent.

I believe that the sense of both cruelty and inferiority so characteristic of the modern German character stems from the time of the Thirty Years War, when from 1618 to 1648 Germany was swept by contending armies and so great were the sufferings of the civilian population that the population of Germany fell from 24,000,000 to 4,000,000, and after the war, in an effort to restore the population, polygamy was permitted, even to priests. Only the ruthless survived. The German historian, Ludwig Häusser, who wrote the history of the Rhenish Palatinate, states that much of the country was lying fallow, villages had disappeared and it was easy to count on one's fingers the peasants who had escaped the massacres, the plague, and famine. Cannibalism had been introduced, and the unfortunate people devoured carrion, and when that was lacking they ate the bodies hanging on the gibbets, the corpses stolen from the churchyard or the neighbor they had treacherously killed. He states that at the end of this Thirty Years War, in 1648, in the Palatinate, there were shops devoted to the sale of human flesh.

The cruelty of these survivors as well as the dreadful fate which had assailed them, was undoubtedly transmitted to their descendants and the cruelties of the Germans today toward the Jews, unrebuked by any one in the population, as well as the shooting of hostages, is but a hereditary impulse transmitted from the period of the Thirty Years War.

It is going to be hard to reeducate the Germans, hard to make them members of the civilized nations of the world and especially hard today when Hitler, by his method of pagan education, has brought up the younger generation with a lust for cruelty which will be enhanced by the bitterness of defeat.

If it be true that those who have passed to the other side can learn what is going on

on this earth, what must be the feelings of General Billy Mitchell as he looks out from the bars of heaven and sees how his prophecies have been fulfilled in that air power means mastery in war.

General MacArthur in Australia appeals not for ships or for armies, but for airplanes because with these he can blast from the air any invading armada before it reaches the shores of Australia, as was done recently when the Japanese Fleet of 22 ships was absolutely and entirely destroyed by his efficient forces of the air.

I crossed on a steamer once with Billy Mitchell when he was returning from a visit to Europe, especially Russia, and was much impressed by his cool, professional exposition of the situation and for his admiration for what he sensed to be the powers of the Russians.

The armies of Rommel and Von Arnim are being forced into one corner of Tunisia and I am afraid that before they are driven into the sea, the British, French, and American forces will suffer great losses, but when the Axis forces once have been driven out, then the strategists in the United Nations will have to consider where to invade the fortress of Europe.

The landing in Norway would be of little use because they could not get at the heart of Germany from there. If they landed in Italy, while they might get possession of that country, they would be barred from advancing in the north by the barrier of the Alps which stops the way even from Italy into France. Before a landing is made in Greece, Crete would have to be occupied and then mountainous country to the north again faced. Probably a landing in the low country of Belgium or Holland or in the south of France would prove most advantageous. The valley of the Rhone is the centuries old route to northern France and then to Germany while, on the other hand, a landing in Belgium or Holland would be the nearest point to the heart of the German realm.

We may be sure that our high command, in consultation with the British and French, will carefully study this question of a second front and make no invasion without a reasonable chance of success.

In spite of Russian and Tunisian defeats, the Germans have a mighty force, superbly armed, at their disposal and the disaster at Dieppe shows how costly a landing can be.

At home our President made a brave fight and halted inflation. In this he was backed by the great majority of Americans, always touchy about the value of our money. Do not forget that the selfish interests of many were defeated in the days when the Greenbackers and the Free Silverites sought, some innocently enough, perhaps, to turn our currency, savings deposits, bonds, mortgages, and debts into the equivalent of wampum or dead leaves. There was some justification for the free-silver movement in the money situation at that time, but the proposals of the Silverites were economically unsound.

Our Secretary of the Treasury recognizes in his proposed plan the force of gold, for countless centuries the lure of all mankind. And anyway, we have a great store of that metal which must not be made useless by any crazy policy.

From Czechoslovakia comes and news about Mme. Frantiska Plaminkova, a senator of that country and once its representative at the League of Nations. She was president of the Czechoslovak Women's Council, and when asked by the Germans to open a campaign for the active collaboration of Czech and German women, she sarcastically said that it seemed inconsistent to ask Czech women to engage in political activity when Hitler, the Fuehrer, had declared that women should not take part in politics. For this she was cast into jail, her property confiscated, and now news comes that she was hanged.

If you do not buy War bonds to defeat the Germans, that can happen here.

Address of Hon. Francis Biddle Before the Swedish Colonial Society, Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech before the Swedish Colonial Society at Philadelphia, Pa., Saturday, April 10, 1943:

President Melvin, ladies, and gentlemen, the President of the United States, who is himself a member of the Swedish Colonial Society, has asked me to extend to his fellow-members, on this the society's thirty-sixth anniversary, his best wishes for its continued success and influence; and to say in his behalf how appropriate it is that the society should be celebrating today the three hundredth anniversary of the establishment by Governor Johan Printz of sovereignty in Pennsylvania and of the first law court, the first church, and the first school—the three free institutions which today we are in so large a measure defending.

America is a land of many races. A common ideal has drawn these races, over the centuries, to our shores. They were leaving the restraints of a civilization which they had outgrown to discover a civilization that they could freely create after their own longing. Into the web of the new country's strength went the differences of many nations—the sober English with their law of the common man; the Irish who would learn to live at peace under a government which was a part of them; Italians, with a sense of the richness of the earth: Germans, Greek, Russians; the hardy Scandinavians, and earliest among them the Swedes.

In 1626 a trading company, sponsored by King Gustavus Adolphus had been formed; and in 1638 two little Swedish ships, the *Kalmar Nyckel* and the *Fogel Grip*, sailed up the Delaware River, and the territory of New Sweden was founded. The land was rich and fruitful, as too were the settlers. One of them wrote that his cow had two calves, his ewe two lambs, and his wife twins—all in one night! And William Penn, reporting on "The Present State of His Majesty's Isles and Territories in America," in 1687, had this to say: "I must needs commend the Swedes' respect to authority and kind behaviour to the English; they do not degenerate from the old friendship between both kingdoms. As they are people proper and strong of body, so they have fine children, and almost every house full; rare to find one of them without three or four boys, and as many girls; some six, seven, and eight sons. And I must do them that right, I see few young men more sober and laborious."

Henry Goddard Leach has spoken of the Swedish levnadslust—the "joy of life," expressing "the poise, the joyousness, the smiling intelligence, the rhythm of Swedish personality and living." In Pennsylvania, and later in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, with their simple habits of hard work and orderly living, and their Lutheran or Protestant religion, they were soon integrated into the new country. They found the country good, and they wrote home about it. "And I can tell you," one of them wrote to a friend, "that here we do not live frugally, but one has eggs and pancakes, and canned fish, and fresh fish, and fruit of all kinds, so it is different from you who have to sit and suck herring bones."

The Swedes loved the independence of the new land: "One thing I like about this country," one of the new immigrants wrote in 1903, "is that you do not have to be always taking off your hat to people. In Sweden you take off your hat to everybody you meet, and if you enter a store you take off your hat to the clerk. Another thing that makes me like this country is that you can share in the government."

Out of Sweden, which today numbers but 6,000,000 inhabitants, more than 1,000,000 came to America in the years following 1850—skilled tradesmen, laborers, farmers, carpenters, painters, shoemakers, tailors, blacksmiths, watchmakers, gardeners. They were patient, steadfast, persistent. They supported Lincoln in 1860, and again in 1864. They furnished outstanding officers to the Union army in the Civil War. General Ernst Mattais Peter von Vegesack, eager to serve under General McClellan, gave up his commission and enlisted as a private, serving at Yorktown and Williamsburg. Following the battle of Hanover courthouse he became a major on McClellan's staff; and, after Gaines Mill, where he covered General Porter's retreat, a colonel of the Twentieth New York. At Antietam he stormed Frederick Center, after it had been twice taken and lost. He held up the regimental banner when it had fallen, and led the charge in person. The next morning Lee's army broke up and moved south.

Another Swedish hero of the Civil War was Col. Ulric Dahlgren, who was born in Bucks County, Pa., in 1842, and joined the army at 19. He made a daring raid at Fredericksburg and with one company held the town against a large force of Confederate cavalry. His leg was amputated because of a bullet wound in a minor engagement preceding the battle of Gettysburg and he was retired. But he would not remain out of the fight. He was chosen to command a picked column of 500 cavalrymen to lead a hazardous expedition to liberate prisoners at Libby Prison and Belle Isle. Before the raid, in which he was killed, the boy wrote his father, Admiral John H. Dahlgren: "There is a grand raid to be made and I am to have a very important command. I may be captured or I may be tumbled over, but it is an undertaking that if I were not in, I should be ashamed to show my face again."

And then there is the glorious story of the *Monitor*, the Yankee "cheesebox on a raft."

John Ericsson was born in Sweden in 1803. In 1826 experts in London rejected his first invention, the caloric engine, based on the principle of expansion of gases under heat, on the ground that they saw no reason why it worked. He developed and perfected the screw propeller, and in 1837 launched a small ship, equipped with two independently acting propellers, which made successful trips on the Thames. Yet the Lords of Admiralty declared that it was impossible for his boat to steer, as the power was in the stern.

Ericsson went to America and became a citizen in 1848. He built a 600-ton iron frigate with a heavy gun and range finder for the Government, raced the *Great Western*, the finest boat afloat, and beat her. At the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853, Ericsson returned to some earlier plans for a turret warship. At that time a ship's guns were

fired only from broadside, which made it necessary for the ship to carry a great many, and consequently for these to be light. Ericsson made a model of a revolving steel gun turret, sent it to Napoleon III, but got it back with the Emperor's compliments.

When the Civil War broke out Ericsson wrote to Lincoln on August 29, 1861, offering "to construct a vessel for the destruction of the rebel fleet at Norfolk and for scouring the southern rivers and inlets of all craft protected by rebel batteries. * * * In making this offer," he added, "I seek no private advantage or emolument of any kind. Attachment to the Union alone impels me to offer my services at this fearful crisis, my life if need be, in the great cause which Providence has called you to defend."

Within 100 days the *Monitor* was built. The Confederates had raised the United States frigate *Merrimac* from Norfolk harbor and fitted her with an iron ram and iron plates. The new armored monster shot and rammed the *Congress* and the *Cumberland* and drove the *Minnesota* aground, all wooden ships. Secretary of War Stanton was panic-stricken. He urged obstruction of the harbors by local authorities. "The *Merrimac*," he said, "will change the entire character of the war; she will destroy seriatim every naval vessel; she will lay all the cities on the seaboard under contribution * * *. I have no doubt that the monster is this minute on her way to Washington and not unlikely we shall have a shell or a cannonball from one of her guns in the White House before we leave this room."

But the *Monitor* had reached Hampton Roads. Though condemned by all the older naval officers she had the enthusiastic support of Captain Scott, and, what was more, of Mr. Gideon Welles, the Secretary of the Navy. On March 9, 1862, the little *Monitor* forced the ironclad "monster" back into Norfolk, and the relief in Washington was immense. * * * The Swedish Minister, Count Piper, was bursting with pride. For had not the son of a Swede invented the now world-famous *Monitor*? "At one stroke"—as the London Times said—she had "revolutionized naval warfare * * * rendered all then-existing navies obsolete." Many years later Admiral Stephen B. Luce wrote of her: "The *Monitor* was the crystallization of 40 centuries of thought on attack and defense, and exhibited in a singular manner the old Norse element of the American Navy; Ericsson (Swedish) built her; Dahlgren (Swedish) armed her; and Worden (Swedish) fought her. How the ancient skalds would have struck their wild harps on hearing such names in heroic verse! How they would have written them in immortal runes!"

Lincoln had been assassinated, and the tragedy found a deep response in Swedish hearts across the ocean. "Why should the death of a man thousands of miles away," wrote Axel Johan Uggla in his diary, in Hallefors, Sweden, "lie so heavily on my heart and soul? * * * I feel that I not only knew him but that he was my friend. His simple greatness, earnestness, his sincerity and warm human understanding have made him dear. * * * One day when men are ready to be honest he will be looked upon as the great American and one of the great men of all lands and all times."

We in America tend to think sometimes that we alone have led the world in the formulation of democratic institutions. But democracy, like all human institutions, is a growing and changing organism, that tends to atrophy if ever it becomes static. In some of the smaller countries of Europe social experiments, largely unknown to us, have now for several years achieved practical results. I refer particularly to the great Swedish cooperative associations which have been used so successfully to resist the growth of monopolies, to keep prices down, and to enlist the interest of the people themselves in movements that so obviously affect their daily lives. The Swedes before the war had established a new relationship between the government and individual enterprise, particularly in the field of electric utilities, in which not only the central government, but local communities were given the relation of partnership with private interests. Thus the problem of regulation was seen in terms of joint association of interests, a problem that so often in America was thought of as necessarily involving irreconcilable antagonisms.

This approach seems to me more creative, even more practical, than the older conception of government as the policeman of private initiative. The Government must learn to serve business, as well as to regulate it; and both should combine to render service to the public as a whole rather than continue the fruitless and often highly theoretic and therefore unreal struggle as to which is to control. As we approach post-war problems we should do well to consider what the Swedish experiment in these fields may contribute to our efforts toward their solution.

Today—for many years—there has been no such thing as a Swedish population in America. The Swedes are a very part of the American frame, their strength is the very strength of our bone and sinew. And as I mention the Swedish names of a few of the heroes of this war, think of them as Americans only, with the proud memory of their Scandinavian backgrounds, remembering how much we owe to Sweden:

Capt. Frank P. Bostrom, of San Antonio, Tex., won the Distinguished Flying Cross for taking a B-17 Flying Fortress 1,500 miles from Australia to the Philippines to get Gen. Douglas MacArthur—"1,500 miles," as the citation reads, "of enemy controlled air, over open seas, and through storm areas. * * *" Captain Bostrom was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross a year ago for participating (I quote) "with great personal skill and cool daring in a bombing mission which resulted in heavy damage to installations in enemy hands at Nichols Field, Philippine Islands."

Staff Sgt. Donald T. Ostlund, of Dewey, Ill., was decorated with the Air Medal last November for his courage and determination in a bombing mission against two enemy transports escorted by two destroyers, moving toward Buna, New Guinea. In the face of intense antiaircraft fire and interception by three Zeros he strafed a destroyer and a transport, helped to repel attack of the fighters during 3 successful bombing runs, on the first of which his airplane was severely damaged and the rear gunner killed.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Frank E. Christofferson of the Navy comes from White Bear Lake, Minn. He is 24 years old. He has had 3 awards for gallantry in action—the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal, and the Silver Star Medal. Let me quote the first citation about his action against enemy Japanese in the battle of Midway on June 6, 1942: "With utter disregard for his own personal safety, Lieutenant Christofferson took part in persistent bombing and strafing attacks against fleeing enemy forces in the face of tremendous antiaircraft fire."

We know today the threat of the Nazi shadow hanging over the country of Sweden. She has not, like her sister countries, been overrun and trampled to earth by the bloated international bully. And yet she is not free; nor can she be ever free until that terrible shadow of invasion is lifted from her cities and from her fields. So that her future, as the future of all free men everywhere, depends upon the ultimate crushing of Germany, upon the final certain victory of the allied free nations fighting for their common end.

Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before a meeting of American Taxpayers Association held at the Canadian Club, New York City, Friday, April 16, 1943:

For the longest time we have been hearing fulminations against the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan. The opposition has practically said nothing against it but have done so in millions of words. That opposition reminded me of Haley's comet seen in the heavens many years ago. It was 50,000 miles long but of no material substance whatsoever.

The tax debacle that we witnessed in the House recently was pricipally due to lack of direction and leadership on the part of the Treasury. Apparently that entity did not know what it wanted. It could not make up its mind. It first opposed the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan and then announced its own double tax pay-as-you-go. Finally it right-about-faced and embraced the Ways and Means Committee tax proposal which was the very opposite of pay-as-you-go. Randolph Paul and his entourage had many other suggestions and plans. It was like a diamond that one turns this way and that way. You will always see one of its many facets. The Treasury apparently wanted to shine in all directions. It dismally failed. I hope at this juncture it is chastened. It it pertinent to ask—What shall we do now?—you who are anxious to develop a sensible and logical pay-as-you-go plan. Frankly, I feel that you should stand by your guns, stand as firm as the Rock of Gibraltar and insist upon the Ruml plan as modified by my distinguished colleague from Kansas, Representative FRANK CARLSON. It is well for you to use whatever power and influence you have to develop public opinion in that direction.

I suggest that you wake up America and stump the Treasury experts. The Treasury has held its hands high up to heaven, piously favoring a pay-as-you-go system. It opposed the only simple, sensible plan to bring this about. It allowed the story to go undenied and therefore it was guilty of complicity in spreading the canard that the Ruml plan was a plan to aid the rich. The plan that is espoused, namely the Ways and Means Committee proposal, assuredly would aid the rich and only the rich. It offered extraordinary inducements to pay 2 years' taxes in 1 year. It permitted substantial discounts to do this. Only the rich could afford it. To my mind, of all the bills, the Ways and Means plan was a real rich man's bill. Only the wealthy could arrange to get enough money together by June 15 (according to that plan) to pay 1942 and 1943 taxes and thereby earn a 6-percent discount on the 1943 bill. If the wealthy taxpayer could not get the money until September 15, he would nevertheless make a 4-percent discount. If finally, he couldn't arrange to get the money until December 15, he would get a special Christmas gift of 2 percent. This discount idea would mean nothing to the average taxpayer. He could not meet the terms and conditions but the man of excessive wealth could dig into his capital without much ado

to get the discount. To get away from this charge, the Treasury called its suggestions, amortizations, partial payments, postponements, and other high-faluting appellations. The camouflage wouldn't work. There are 28,000,000 who must pay income taxes for the first time, primarily because of high wages, and secondly, because taxes are now exacted from persons with smaller incomes than in the past.

The largest number of income-tax payers was 17,000,000 persons. Now there will be 45,000,000 total income-tax payers. The tax collecting machinery must be expanded by over 200 percent. This is a very serious problem. Thousands and thousands of new taxpayers are unfamiliar with the forms that must be filled out. Many thousands have no bank accounts. Many of the workers subject to taxes are migratory. They move from one town to another. Their employment is not steady. They go from one employer to another. Many habitually spend their incomes as fast as they earn it. Few save for taxes. It is as clear as the nose on your face that tax delinquencies will be stupendous unless these new taxpayers particularly are put on a pay-as-you-go basis. Most of these taxpayers want to be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis. The Gallup poll showed conclusively that a preponderate majority of Republicans, Democrats, and even those in the lower brackets as well as those in the higher brackets, favor the Rum pay-as-you-go plan. To be more specific, that poll showed 83 percent of the Democratic taxpayers and 87 percent of the Republicans wanted it. It is interesting to know that the plan was favored by the highest percentage of persons in the lower range of incomes.

I agree with brother FRANK CARLSON in scrapping 1942 and taxing and paying 1943 income in the year 1943. All bugs in such a plan can be taken out. No one should get any undue enrichment. No one should have any undue advantage. The Carlson-Ruml plan, as I understand it, would cancel 1942 income payments for all citizens except those with incomes of more than $20,000 annually who made more in 1942 than they will in 1943. In that event, they would pay on the income of the year of higher earnings, and payment on the other will be canceled. But if both their 1942 and 1943 incomes exceed that of 1941 by more than $50,000 (the defining mark of a "windfall"), a special tax is imposed on the abnormal sum: 25 percent on the first $500,000 of the excess and 50 percent on the remainder.

The Carlson bill also continued the 20-percent withholding tax so that the employer would deduct from the employee's envelope 20 percent of the wages he received.

Appropriate amendments could be added to the bill which would result in voiding any possibility that any handful of overnight war millionaires could hold onto their great war profits. When anyone dies within a certain designated period within our generation there could be death dues enacted so as to take away any unnatural advantage or gain. If the so-called skipping of 1942 taxes in any respects within a reasonable period of time, would yield unconscionable gains to anyone, such gains should be eliminated through inheritance taxes, death dues, or increased income taxes, to siphon off such gain. It might be that finally some people will have squeezed out some sort of favoritism, some sort of unfair gain. It may be the plan cannot be made foolproof and imprevious to such inequality. Let us assume that is true. Nevertheless, I believe with William James that we must, even in a tax situation, do that which is the greatest good for the greatest number.

The Carlson bill would have its beneficial effects fall most markedly upon the group earning from $1,700 up to $10,000 a year, with by far the greatest class being within the income bracket between $1,700 and $5,000 a year, the vast white-collar class.

The income for 1942, based on a 1940 dollar, for those taxpayers above the income level of $10,000 a year was about eighteen billions.

The income for the group between $1,700 and $10,000 a year amounted to seventy-three billions.

The income of the group below $1,700 was nine billions.

Thus the greatest benefits for the greatest numbers would come from the Ruml-Carlson plan because it would benefit the tax group having the greatest numbers ($1,700 to $10,000 group) with aggregate income of seventy-three billions.

When we devised daylight saving, there was no cry that any segment of the population would profit unduly. We simply set the clock ahead and rich and poor enjoyed the sunshine for the same number of hours. Thus, if we turn the tax clock ahead 1 year all would benefit—all taxpayers.

Frankly, the Government can, at any time, make income taxes as thumping big as the necessities of war require. To say, therefore, that the Government would lose by any so-called forgiveness is so much balderdash. If any plan does not raise adequate revenue, the taxes are increased. Remember the Government has a moral as well as an actual lien on all our income. The Government can lose nothing. It makes no difference if 1943 taxes are paid in 1943 or 1944 as far as the revenues or intake are concerned. The Government must get all its needs. The contents of the bottle is still the same although the label may be different

A misleading argument against the Carlson bill was that the Government would lose ten billions revenue. The falsity of this argument is only equaled by the truth of the statement that the national income for 1943 will be greater than that of 1942.

The Department of Commerce reports that whereas the national income for 1942 was nearly one hundred and twenty billions, the income for 1943 is expected to be one hundred and forty billions. Thus, even if there was no increase in tax for 1943 over 1942—and there will be—the revenue would be increased by the amount of the tax on twenty billions additional income.

Thus if 1943 income were substituted for 1942 income even with the same rate, the Treasury will receive more revenue—1942 income will yield about ten billions, but 1943 income will yield about thirteen billions—three billions more.

Furthermore, what is going to happen when the war is over? Say in 1945 or 1946? Peace will be declared and then may come a tremendous industrial let-down, a tremendous economic slump. It may be precipitous. It may not be gradual. The reduced income that will follow, if we are not on a pay-as-you-go plan will make it mighty difficult to pay any previous year's taxes. The Government may not be able to collect adequate sums at the time of the let-down, if we are not on a pay-as-you-go plan. Then may come great tax losses. The Government may not be able to squeeze more taxes out of the Nation. What then? Is it not then, therefore, to the Government's advantage to place the Nation as quickly as possible on a pay-as-you-go plan? Let me illustrate by a typical case:

Bill Jones was a porter for an office building at a salary of $1,000 a year. This past year he became a carpenter's helper at $105 a week, or $5,260 a year. He should have no trouble paying his income tax this year, but one of these days the Government will stop using carpenter's helpers at $5,260 a year, and then Bill may be lucky to go back to his old job at $1,000 a year. When he goes back, since his income taxes are paid a year after he has earned the income on which they are assessed, Bill will then have to pay the tax on $5,260, or the sum of $985, out of his income of only $1,000, and will have only $15 to live on for an entire year. It would be better for Bill and better for the Government if he had paid his tax of $985 while he was getting his income of $5,260, which would have left him, $4,275 to live on, and then when his income dropped back to $1,000 a year, he would have to pay a tax of only $89 out of that income and would have $911 to live on, instead of only $15 It is no answer to say he should have saved when he had it. He just didn't and won't.

Once bitten, twice shy. The country has been bitten by the Treasury and will be shy of any plan the Treasury may propose. In the cloakrooms of the House, someone said that one of the opponents of the Ruml plan had an open mind on the subject and one of my colleagues very quickly retorted that he had an open mind—yes—open on the top and on the bottom, while yet another Member, speaking of a second Treasury opponent of the Ruml plan, said that every time the gentleman opens his mouth, he subtracts from the sum total of human knowledge.

Business, Labor, and Agriculture Speak Together for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following joint statement by the business, labor, and agriculture committees of the National Planning Association is so fine a statement and so significant coming from the men who make it that any comment on it by me would be superfluous. I am proud to include the statement and the names of the men making it with my remarks herewith:

JOINT STATEMENT BY THE BUSINESS, LABOR, AND AGRICULTURE COMMITTEES OF THE NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION

This is a statement by men who, whether cataloged "Business" or "Labor" or "Agriculture"—or "Democrat" or "Republican"—believe that what happens to this country after the fighting is over is of personal concern to every American.

We remember what happened after the last war; we believe in preparing now for after this war; and we are unwilling to see the idea of post-war planning made a political football, a grindstone for the axes of special-interest groups, or a bone of contention between those who want to go back to the past and those who want to blueprint the perfect world.

We have been brought together by the National Planning Association to be members of three of its committees on post-war planning: The business committee, the labor committee, and the agriculture committee. We represent no one but ourselves; we have no authority to speak for our companies or our organizations. But by our occupations and experience we think we reflect something of the three great economic groups into which we and most Americans classify themselves.

In order to help business, labor, and agriculture measure up to their responsibilities and opportunities for building a better coun-

try for us all, the National Planning Association has asked us to help it serve as a common meeting ground for joint consideration of post-war proposals and programs, wherever originating.

Specifically, we propose to look at the policies and plans of government, business, labor, agriculture and social and educational groups from our respective committee's points of view; to bring out into the open any conflicting points of view; and then to seek mutual agreement on those elements which appear workable and in the interest of all.

Our function is not so much to create new plans as to seek out the best of postwar planning from other sources. We do not intend to duplicate either the work or research facilities of other organizations, but we shall, if it seems advisable, initiate original studies to the end that knowledge and understanding may guide our own thinking and help us to view a tremendous national problem objectively and with open minds.

As we start our work we find ourselves in agreement on these points:

1. If, when the fighting is over, we have ex-soldiers selling apples on the street, or masses of workers idle in present war production centers, or people starving in one part of the country while food surpluses rot in other parts, we shall have lost this war. It will be too late to "plan."

2. Post-war planning must be faced realistically. We must prepare now against unemployment during the reconversion period and for full and continuing employment under a peacetime economy. The first goal of post-war planning should be a foundation for better living through provision for enough jobs and lasting jobs.

3. The basis of America's post-war economy should be private enterprise, with private business and industry and agriculture continuing to operate as the people's primary means for providing jobs and producing goods and services; with Government performing its constitutional function of establishing the rules of the game, acting as impartial referee, and effecting fiscal policies through taxation and expenditure programs, such as public works, that will mesh with private undertakings.

4. But the private-enterprise system must adjust itself to a changing world. Before there can be blue prints there must be unity of purpose among all groups, with realization that our group interests are identical. There must be fullest cooperation and teamwork, based on mutual trust, on the part of business, labor, agriculture, and Government. This trust can't merely be assumed; it must be honestly earned through practice in the first place, and thereafter preserved by continuous good faith, performance and collaboration.

If our private enterprise system is to go forward, there must be a new sense of responsibility for the welfare of all the people.

5. None of America's economic groups is self-sufficient. We are dependent upon each other. The terms "business" and "labor" and "agriculture" lose their capital letters and become "We, the people" when we realize that all the millions of us are consumers—each other's customers; that there cannot be full and continuing employment unless more people have the means to buy more of the produce of our collective brains and hands and invested savings. Specifically—

We of the business committee recognize that management is dependent upon labor to man the machines and provide new capital from its savings. We recognize the principle of collective bargaining as a sound and fair American principle. We also know that what most men and women want for the future is a sense of security against unemployment, sickness, and destitute old age, together with a feeling of participation through their minds as well as their muscles to the continuing progress of the business that employs them and to all productive enterprise.

We of the labor committee recognize that labor is dependent upon management to furnish the over-all "know how," to organize technical and commercial research and develop it fully, and to attract from private savers the new capital necessary to a sound and growing economy.

Together, we of the business and labor committees recognize our dependence upon agriculture as producers and consumers.

We of the agriculture committee in turn recognize that agriculture is dependent upon business and labor; that there cannot be profitable markets for our products except as the rest of the Nation prospers and has the means to buy.

6. All of us—business, labor, and agriculture—agree that there must be adequate incentive to encourage risk and responsibility; otherwise, dollars saved will not be dollars dared for backing new possibilities for new jobs opened by new ideas, nor will the new ideas themselves be forthcoming.

7. Recognizing that unemployment among those who want to work cannot be completely abolished, we believe that a national security program is both necessary and desirable, and that nutrition, education, vocational guidance, and other phases of public well-being are matters of concern to all the groups to which we belong.

8 Post-war planning should start at home, but we should be blind to exclude the world in making plans for our own future security. If we are to have full and continuing employment here we must make customers of the people of other nations and be prepared, therefore, to be their customers as well. The rehabilitation of war-torn areas, the development of backward countries, and a fair share of protective policing are in our own selfish interest.

We must make certain that we and our children and their children won't have to go through still a third and more terrible war.

Agriculture committee: Henry B. Arthur, Swift & Co; Frank App, Seabrook Farms; Murray Benedict, Giannini Foundation; John D. Black, Harvard University; Eugene W. Burgess, General Mills, Inc., Harry B. Caldwell, North Carolina State Grange; Harry Clark, Mountain States Beet Growers Marketing Association; Oscar Johnston, National Cotton Council of America; Allan B. Kline, Iowa Farm Bureau Federation; Donald Murphy, Wallace's Farmer and Iowa Homestead; Lowry Nelson, University of Minnesota; Howard W. Odum, University of North Carolina; James G. Patton, National Farmers' Union; Theodore Schultz, Iowa State College; Charles W. Smith, Eastern Oregon Wheat League; Thad Snow, Charleston, Mo.; Glenn J. Talbott, North Dakota Farmers' Union; M. W. Thatcher, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association; Odin Thomas, Harry Ferguson, Inc.; Marcel J. Voorhies, American Sugar Cane League.

Business committee: J. O. Chesley, Aluminum Co. of America; A. D. Chiquoine, Jr., Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborne, Inc.; F. J. Curtis, St. Louis, Mo.; Guy Emerson, Bankers Trust Co. of New York; T. G. MacGowan, Akron, Ohio; S. T. Henry, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.; S. A. Holme, Schenectady, N. Y.; Arthur A. Hood, Johns-Manville, Inc.; Anderson Pace, Illinois Central System; David C. Prince, Schenectady, N. Y.; Leo H. Rich, Walter Dorwin Teague; Beardsley Ruml, R. H. Macy & Co.; H. Chr. Sonne, Amsinck, Sonne & Co.; Charles J. Stilwell, Warner & Swasey Co.; P. B. Stull, Hercules Powder Co.

Labor committee: James Carey, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Frank Fenton, American Federation of Labor; Clinton S. Golden, United Steel Workers of America; Marion H. Hedges, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Paul Hutchings, International Association of Machinists; Julius Luhrsen, Railroad Labor Executives Association; Lazare Teper, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; Walter Reuther, United Automobile Workers; Emil Rieve, Textile Workers Union of America; Harold Ruttenberg, United Steel Workers of America; Boris Shishkin, American Federation of Labor; Raymond Walsh, Congress of Industrial Organizations; Robert Watt, American Federation of Labor; David Kaplan, International Brotherhood of Teamsters; Solomon Barkin, Textile Workers Union of America.

Failure To Fully Utilize the Small Colleges in the War Effort Is a National Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the Nation, there can be found many fine outstanding colleges and universities, which institutions can, if fully utilized, render a great service to our war effort.

I am disappointed and disturbed over recent actions of the Army and Navy in curtailing their air-training program and withdrawing from institutions of learning where they have already established a training program. The best information available would indicate that America needs more and more pilots and other skilled flyers. Where we reckoned in tens of thousands of flyers yesterday, we need hundreds of thousands today.

I am informed that one type of aviation training program that has heretofore existed in about 250 colleges will hereafter be confined to about 100 colleges. This is a waste of existing facilities. Many of these facilities were put in by colleges and their surrounding communities at great expense in order to further the war program.

The colleges of America can be further made use of in the training of WAVES, WAAC's, the marines, and SPARS. Right now, this Government is expending fabulous sums for rent of hotels, apartment houses, and dwellings in the city of Washington and in the city of New York to take care of these young women. This is a waste of money. Furthermore, these college campuses would be a far better place for the training of these young women.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as possible, the Army and Navy and every other Government agency should refrain from boondoggling projects in our great cities and utilize the fine, well-equipped colleges and universities, which are anxious to have their program conform to the needs of our country in this crisis.

Antitrust Policy During the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Tom C. Clark, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, before the American Business Congress, New York City, Thursday, April 22, 1943:

I am indebted to the American Business Congress and the Columbia Broadcasting System for this opportunity to bring to you a short picture of the activities and policies of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

Antitrust, too, has gone to war. It has gone to war to preserve free enterprise—the freedom of choice for which our soldiers and sailors are dying. It has gone to war to see to it, through our prosecution of war frauds, that our men get the best equipment in the world when they meet our enemy on the battle lines. It has gone to war to see that Uncle Sam is not cheated by war chiselers. It has gone to war to help enforce the domestic war economy of priorities, rationing, and allocation.

Most of the time of the Antitrust Division is now devoted to war prosecutions. These include war frauds and the prosecution of criminal offenses involving rationing, price ceilings, food and agricultural allocations, and priorities. American business by and large is honest, but there are a small number of predatory men who put their profits above their patriotism. They would steal from Uncle Sam either by delivering bad material, overcharging, or by using some other trick to secure an additional dollar. While we call these offenses war frauds, in time of war they are little short of treason. We are ferreting out such offenders as quickly as possible, and I am glad to report that quite a number have been caught. To date millions of dollars have been paid back into the Treasury, and many more millions have been saved the Government by reason of these prosecutions. Rigid, uncompromising enforcement of war frauds will continue.

But tonight we are going to talk of antitrust enforcement and what it means to you and me in our everyday life.

America was late in starting production of materials for war, and the start was hindered by old business practices: Collusive control of markets and production; the long, ruinous breaking down of productivity to keep those controls tight; trade-practice techniques to protect the old and established and to exclude the new; patent pools; domestic monopolies; international cartels—the whole dangerous collection of tools monopoly had machined.

These dangers were not new. My predecessor as head of the Antitrust Division, Judge Thurman Arnold, saw them clearly. He performed a signal service to the Nation in warning against them and taking it upon himself officially to do something about it. I am keenly aware that in succeeding him I am stepping into a pair of man-sized shoes; and I know that there are many individuals in this country who can recall getting quite a kick out of them.

This does not mean that American industry is in for an indiscriminate kicking around. Today when the bulk of our big industry has gone over to production for war, the responsibility of the administrator of this Nation's antitrust laws is, as I see it, somewhat comparable to the job I had in the last war, that of a top sergeant of infantry. American business is now wearing the uniform. My job is not to interfere but to help see to it that these industrial soldiers keep in step, follow the rules laid down by the laws of the United States, and try to kill off the enemy, not each other. As the big ones grow bigger on war production, we must see to it, as we say in my part of the country, that they do not get too big for their britches; and at the same time we must protect the small industrial soldiers so that they do not find themselves without any britches at all.

The American people and the enlightened leaders of American business hope that we shall be able to preserve in our country the principle of free enterprise. But this does not mean the freedom of the old, the established, the entrenched, to gang up on the new, the small, the unprotected. It does not mean the freedom of dollars to blackjack brains. It does not mean freedom to abduct knowledge, to deprive the American people of the fruits of their greatest human resource, inventive genius. It does not mean freedom to conspire through cartels or otherwise with gangster nations preparing for aggression against us, or to create, privately, a gangster economy threatening depression and poverty for our people.

It does mean freedom of opportunity for all people to engage in legitimate business on an equal footing, with special privileges to none. It does mean freedom of American dollars to buy the most for their American owners.

The protection of this freedom is our obligation to America. Particularly is this true now, for in the race to get the tools of war made quickly there has been a tendency to leave our war production to the large corporations. It has already resulted in bigger and bigger big business, and a steadily rising rate of fatality for small business. With the cooperation of the War Production Board, we are trying to alleviate that condition.

To continue such practices there can be but one result—the death of small business—and along with it the death of free competitive enterprise in American life.

Recently Congress was told that at the beginning of our war program 175,000 companies were providing 70 percent of the Nation's manufacturing output and 100 corporations were producing 30 percent. Today, 2½ years later, this ratio has been reversed; now 100 corporations hold 70 percent of the war and essential civilian contracts, while 175,000 small companies hold 30 percent. To those 100 corporations has gone the great bulk of the $14,000,000,000 worth of new plants built at Government expense. Some of these corporations demanded and secured the right after the war to buy and control these new facilities constructed at Government expense. These figures tell the tragic tale of the fate of small business resulting from the false notion that only the big can produce efficiently.

What does the record of monopoly show? I need not labor the point, but I call your attention to the monumental junk heaps of aluminum pots and pans commandeered from the housewives of America, the piles of scrap rubber and old iron now scarring the public squares of our cities; the pleas of our armed forces for binoculars; the enormous difficulties we have experienced in the production of magnesium, electrical equipment, plastics, machine tools, critical chemicals and vital medicines—all memorials to the role monopoly has played in this war.

Try today to make an electric lamp, a glass bottle, an aluminum pot, a pair of spectacles, synthetic rubber, vitamin products. Try to make any of these things without first receiving permission from a private group which has usurped power over industry. Try even to get that permission. Try to produce and sell these goods competitively. Try to reduce prices, install improvements. You will either bend to the will of these industrial giants or be broken.

After the war the enormous industrial plants created for war purposes must be converted to peacetime production. The danger America faces is that these plants will not be in competition and that general access to raw materials and markets upon which depends the peace and prosperity of the peoples of the world will be controlled by a small group which will set up its own trade barriers by private agreements, commonly known as cartels. We must not permit the reestablishment of the cartel system. It is the purpose of antitrust to prevent such a move and do it now.

This exceptional danger, however, goes side by side with an exceptional opportunity. Our war plants will in peacetime be capable of showering us with bounty beyond any previous human experience. In the monopolistic industries where scarcity has been planned for and capitalized, we shall emerge from the war with no scarcity of productive equipment. Some of our more tightly held monopolies of patents and know-how are being broken as information is diffused to meet war needs. New industries based upon plastics, light metals, plywood, cargo transportation by air, and similar innovations are in preparation. If we can prevent the suppression of these new products after the war, keep production uncontrolled, and the new industries competitive, restraints of trade will become impossible for the older industries which will be obliged to compete with the new. The battle of competition must be won upon this new industrial frontier.

The stakes of this struggle are enormous both in prosperity and in freedom. If the Nation's new plants and knowledge are fully used after the war, our standard of living may well be half again higher than ever before in our history. Furthermore, our productive strength will permit us to contribute to the establishment of a sound peace by helping in the relief and reconstruction of distressed peoples. But if monopolies succeed in restricting the full use of our productive resources, our domestic life will be beset by unemployment and a falling standard of living, and we shall have no surplus of goods or of energy to spend upon reestablishing the peace of the world. By preserving competition and small business, we shall safeguard the common man's opportunity to be independent and to try new ideas. If we allow competition to be superseded by great enterprises which divide the domestic and world markets among themselves, we shall have succumbed to a business feudalism which will not long tolerate the existence of a vital political democracy.

The spirit of the antitrust laws is thus intimately linked with the values which the free peoples of the world are fighting to preserve.

Enforcement of the antitrust laws is no short cut to Utopia. I cannot predict that we shall solve all of our problems by preserving free enterprise, but I do say free enterprise can only be saved by preserving small business now. To this end Antitrust maintains its Small Business Unit. To date it has assisted thousands of small businessmen in solving their problems.

American business, large and small, has nothing to fear so long as it plays the game fairly, according to the rules; but those who get offside must be prepared to pay the penalty. Speaking for the Attorney General of the United States, Francis Biddle, I can assure you there will be no witch-hunting, no uprooting of American customs or traditions; but there will be practical, swift, hard-hitting law enforcement. If you think the antitrust laws are dead, just ask some of the New York department stores. They recently made an attempt to use their combined economic power against a New York

newspaper. They tried to control advertising rates. If they had succeeded in this attempt, if the Antitrust Division had not taken action, the way would have been open for any group with enough power to try to control editorial policy and the character of the news. Not even the department stores themselves were aware of the implications of their act. To tolerate any such misuse of economic power is to jeopardize not only free private enterprise, but the whole range of our cherished rights.

I have just hit the high spots. The job is ours together. We want to counsel with you about it. With the firm backing of the American people the battle for a free world will be won, and along with it can go the victory for free industry.

Address of Hon. Joseph H. Ball, of Minnesota, at Victory Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief talk I gave on the Blue Network at the Metropolitan Opera victory rally on Saturday, April 24, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One nation alone, bent on aggression, can start a war. But only many nations working together can maintain peace in the world.

Because of this basic fact there is only one logical, realistic road to lasting peace. That is the road of United Nations' cooperation—first, to win the war; second, to maintain peace by stopping future military aggression; and, third, to work out together the problems of international social, political, and economic relationships which, if not solved peacefully, do explode into war. Common sense and our democratic tradition both point toward an organization of peace-loving nations as the effective, sensible method of establishing this machinery and the military force which is the only argument an aggressor will heed.

Congress and the individual Members of Congress bear a heavy responsibility to plant Uncle Sam's feet firmly on this road to lasting peace, because Congress in the past has blocked effective American collaboration to maintain world peace and stability.

By clever use of a misleading phrase—"no entangling alliances"—a minority has blocked effective use of America's tremendous power and influence on the side of world peace. The same appeals to prejudice and fear may be expected again. Let the American people ask the authors of such appeals whether adherence to an outworn slogan is worth the lives of thousands of American boys in another war.

There are two ways for this Congress to help set America and the world firmly on the road to lasting peace. One is to renew the Reciprocal Trade Treaties Act which expires in June. The primary purpose of that act is to permit the executive branch of our Government to work out mutually advantageous deals with other nations by which all of us may gradually lower the excessive tariff walls built up in the twenties and thirties.

These tariffs contributed to the strangling of world trade and commerce, forcing nations dependent on outside markets and raw materials to attempt a policy of economic self-sufficiency, a policy which inevitably leads to aggression and war because no nation has the varied resources necessary for complete self-sufficiency.

Effective planning now by the United Nations is necessary if we are to begin building a durable peace when we have won this war. Because of America's past record of isolation and the fear we may attempt that policy again, a strong commitment by Congress and the American people to the principle of effective international collaboration to maintain peace is needed now to make this planning for peace effective. That is the second peace obligation of this Congress.

Pending in the Senate is Resolution No. 114, introduced by Senators BURTON, HATCH, HILL, and myself, two Democrats and two Republicans. It would make such a commitment. Congress exists to serve you, the people. It should make your overwhelming desire for a durable peace effective through national policy such as this resolution proposes. It will do that if you, the people, make your voice heard in Washington, make clear to your Senators and Representatives your overwhelming demand that this time we win the peace as well as the war.

Thank you.

The Saga of Fifteen Intrepid Air Pilots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem entitled "The Saga of Fifteen Intrepid Air Pilots," written by Lt. Col. Ben Greene, Jr., of Anderson, S. C., a hero of the Southwest Pacific, who has been engaged in bond sales in South Carolina since his return to this country. The poem was published in the Anderson (S. C.) Daily Mail of April 21, 1943.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SAGA OF FIFTEEN INTREPID AIR PILOTS

(The story of the men of Squadron 35 who fought bravely and died in the South Pacific, as written in New Guinea by their leader, Lt. Col. Ben Greene, Jr., of Anderson, and recited by him at yesterday's War bond rally)

This poem is dedicated to Squadron 35,
To those now dead from us still alive.
There were fifteen of our lot to pass away,
And we'll miss them all forever and a day.

They gave their lives, it's needless to say,
So the folks back home may live the American way,
And their funerals were simple, no parades or flowers,
But they were heroes all, those boys of ours.

The first pilot left us on April 11.
He traded silver wings for a pair in Heaven.
He was "Gilly" to the boys, to you and me,
But for all Army records, he was Gillingham, Bernard P.
He crashed on take-off by dawn's early light
While attempting to join an early training flight.
It was hard losing him in this kind of way,
But death plays no favorites, nor any special day.

So back to your planes, get 'em in the air!
There's no time left for sorrow or despair.
There's a job to be done. Rough times ahead.
Gilly said this even though he was dead.

Our training continued and we prepared for the day
When we'd meet the Japs and make them pay.
We called Hitler a devil, for he's no man;
The Emperor is, too, and all in Japan.

Finally our orders came through one early morn
To "Take off for an island by the name of Horn."
The first leg of this trip was uneventful for all,
But the second was fatal—we lost Long and Hall.

This disaster was due to bad weather and rain,
And searches were made, but they were in vain.
So, farewell, John! So long, Jack!
We'll avenge your death before we're back.

The rest of the squadron finally assembled at Horn,
And we took off from there the following morn.
Ready and willing we were, soon in action we'd be,
After this leg of the journey across the Coral Sea.

Our destination at last, a known place of fame,
A port in New Guinea, Moresby by name,
Serene in its beauty, and even romantic perhaps,
But just a base in the jungles to fight the Japs.

We landed our fighters and taxied to position.
We reported to "Operations" and were assigned a mission:
"Take off at once," read the order that day;
"Strafe Salamaua and then hit Lae."

Buzz Wagner led the flight on that memorable quest,
And he fought like a devil, and so did the rest.
Many planes were destroyed, much damage was done,
But we all returned safely—all but one.

What happened to him we are unable to tell,
But he was last seen flying and fighting like hell.
No one saw him go down on sea or on land,
But one thing is sure: we lost Eddie Durand.

He was soon followed in exactly the same way
By two more pilots on the fourth of May.
Their orders were the same as the ones before:
To first hit Lae and then Salamaua.

It was still dark, an hour before light
When the fighters roared off and joined in a flight;
Their information was meager, and no maps to be had;
Little did they know that the weather was bad.

They flew over jungles and land so strange
And thousands of feet up stood the Owen Standley range.
This they crossed through the Kokoda Gap;
They headed west; look out, Mr. Jap!

But the weather turned bad, closed in all around,
And it was still too dark to see the ground.
So the flight leader called, knowing what they were to face,
"Fly back to Moresby, land at your base."

But the second flight didn't hear the call,
And they flew on through the rain, weather, and all.
They reached the target and strafed the drome,
Fought enemy fighters and then turned for home.

All returned safely but two of our best,
Hooker and Talbot didn't land with the rest.
We counted the minutes, we let an hour pass,
And then after that we knew they were out of gas.

We stood around our planes with hearts heavy as hell,
Two more gone, gee, but they were swell!
But we couldn't turn soft, we had to steel our will,
And we became cold and hard, and with a lust to kill.

We pledged to slay all Japs and retake their ground,
To destroy their bases and planes bring down.
And a hatred was born, deep within our hearts,
To annihilate these devils, the Yellow Upstarts!

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Colonel Greene's poem, as he explained to his listeners, is still incomplete. The foregoing section was written soon after the battles described, and the story of the death of his other companions will be added at some future time.)

Creation of a War Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a radio broadcast delivered by former Gov. Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, urging the formation of a war council. The broadcast was delivered over the Columbia Broadcasting System on April 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

What are the future policies of America?

That is the great question that the world is asking today.

And since the last election, which gave the Republican Party such a resurgence of strength, the world has been asking itself, What is the position of the Republican Party and what are its policies? The American people are always interested, of course, in the national issues confronting them. And even in time of war they insisted on being free to discuss these policies and to take up opposing sides if they do not agree.

Today there is one question on which there is no division of opinion in America: We must win the war. Our thoughts, our energies, our wealth are devoted to that end. There is scarcely a home that has not contributed either a son or a daughter to the cause of our beloved country.

This war is not a New Deal war; this is not a Democratic war; it is not a Republican war; it is America's war. Anything that is said, anything that is done should be said and done to bring us victory in the shortest possible period of time.

It is obvious that there are certain difficulties in discussing at this time all questions of the post-war future. It is also obvious to the observant citizen that there are currents and countercurrents of opinion in the United Nations.

To discuss these differences of opinion with complete frankness subjects one to the charge of creating disunity in the war coalition and of threatening victory. But if we remain silent on the pitfalls and dangers—both domestic and foreign—which confront the American people, we threaten America. But in spite of these difficulties there are certain questions that must be faced today. They must be dragged out into the open. They cannot be ignored.

We need, above everything else, and we need at once, a real and actual and functioning war council. The chief administrative officials of the country must have some place where they can meet and settle their difficulties, so that they can go about their business of winning the war without having to maneuver for their own particular policies through publicity and wire pulling.

It is not a question of the rightness or wrongness of any one policy. Each man sincerely believes that his own position is essential to victory. But there is no place where policies can be readily and finally determined. They are dragged through the various boards and bureaus and commissions in Washington until they become a national scandal and Congress is at last compelled to force a positive decision by the Chief Executive.

There is no question in my mind that we are going to win, this war. The military is doing a good job. But on the home front we are muddling through this war. The present administrative confusion must stop or it will cost the American people dearly, not only in dollars but in misery and deep tragedy. We must have, and have at once, an efficiently organized council of war, similar to the one Woodrow Wilson created, and used so effectively in the settlement of home-front problems in the last war.

Moreover, we must not forget that we are at war with Japan as well as with Germany.

As I said earlier, a discussion of foreign policy is difficult because of the danger of creating a rift in the coalition of the United Nations. And, come what may, it is the United Nations which stand for the kind of civilization we believe in. But in spite of these difficulties there are certain things that must be faced. For instance, there is too much inclination at the moment to pay attention to the lace and ruffles of our foreign problems. By this I mean such things as our Treasury's plan for a series of great international organizations designed by ambitious, dreamy bureaucrats to impose on the world a managed economy, the very thing we are fighting.

There is too much inclination to sneer at the simple, straightforward rules which the experience of the human race shows must not be violated. Honesty, integrity, responsibility, and international relationships based on "open covenants, openly arrived at."

The most prosperous period, and on the whole the most peaceful that the modern world has enjoyed, was the period which lasted from 1815 to 1914. Surely we can learn a lot from studying that period. When there is already a channel marked out by lights, a steamboat captain does not go following fireflies through shallow waters. Let us, therefore, consider in this time allotted to me by the courtesy of the Columbia Broadcasting Co. what made this period so prosperous and, on the whole, so peaceful.

Some people will tell you that this long era of prosperity was due to an international police force called the British Empire. That "police force" may have helped prosperity but, in my opinion, it does not cause it. The real foundation of that prosperity was a stable currency. That stable currency facilitated international exchange. It fostered the production and sale of goods; it protected world-wide commerce. The period between 1815 and 1914 was a period of financial honesty—a period of extraordinary governmental financial responsibility; it was the period of the greatest spread of representative government; it was a period of international live and let live; it was the period of the greatest rise in the standard of living of the average man; it was the period when governments truly began to accept responsibility for the welfare of their people; it was the period when governments began to realize that business must not be allowed to run wild; it was the period of the greatest integrity of governments.

Of course in recalling this era of peace and prosperity, I do not mean for one moment to imply that we should be satisfied with the progress made in that period. The world will go ahead. We have had some bitter lessons and we must translate these lessons into concrete policies. But since this period of the world's history was one of growth and advancement—of progress and increasing well-being for the average man—I want to remind you that its success was based upon the simple, straightforward, fundamental virtues applied to international affairs. Nations on the whole were honest in their dealings with one another. Nations were proud of their integrity. Nations accepted their responsibilities. Nations paid their debts. The Republican Party must insist when this war is over that we follow an international way of life where the everyday virtues are as strictly regarded in the relations between nations as they are between man and man.

The disorganized and distressed peoples of the world are looking forward to America, as always, to establish and maintain a righteous peace based on justice. It is not surprising that they should look to us for this. When our Republic was founded the fathers of the Constitution provided not only that we should have majority rule, but also that the rights of the minority should be zealously protected. And because heretofore we have always protected these rights, the peoples of the world know that they have nothing to fear from any peace approved by the people of the United States.

Now is the time for the United States to step into the leadership of the world, not for imperialistic purposes, and not in an imperialistic way. Now is the time for the United States to offer the world an example by the continued protection of the rights of the minority at home. Now is the time when, by simple integrity, by straightforward financial policies, by human, honest, and decent consideration for the rights of others, the United States must lay the foundation for a lasting and durable peace.

In the international field a foundation has already been laid and by the Republican Party.

Mr. Churchill a few weeks ago announced the idea of regional councils to preserve peace—one for Europe and one for Asia. He did not need to mention the Western Hemisphere; a great regional council of pan America was created under Republican leadership 30 years ago. And this Republican idea promises to spread over the world as the very foundation of future peace.

Do We Need F. S. A. Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, the magazine Nation's Business had prepared an article entitled "Do We Need F. S. A. Today?" by Fred V. Larson, for publication in the May issue.

The article has been removed from publication because it is quite likely that such publication may come too late. In any event, it is a most important and effective contribution to the debate, and for that reason I extend it into the RECORD with the hope that every Member of the House and Senate will give it particular attention:

DO WE NEED F. S. A. TODAY?

(By Fred V. Larson)

The problem of whether or not to abolish the Farm Security Administration, which has been popping up each spring for 3 years, is again on the congressional doorstep.

This time the agency is expected to get its most thorough airing. One member of the seven-man committee appointed to investigate it told the House of Representatives:

"The purpose of this investigation is to ferret out the communism and other un-American activities of officials in the Farm Security Administration. Many of them utterly disregard the law under which the agency was created, establishing policies contrary to the intent of Congress—and, in other words, run the agency so that they will take care of the conduct of individuals from the cradle to the grave."

Commonly termed the F S. A., but not to be confused with the Federal Security Administration, the Farm Security Administration was organized in 1937 to take over the functions of the Resettlement Administration, made famous by the projects of Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell.

The famed "Tugwelltowns," none of which worked out in real life, are still with us but under new management. Many have been sold at auction to independent contractors (at great loss to the Government) and are now serving as private rental property. The Farm Security Administration is using others for experimental purposes with poor farmers who had been persuaded to become its "clients."

Perhaps the most famous of these Tugwelltowns is the Lake Dick Farms, Inc., near Altheimer, Ark., built on 3,500 fertile acres bought in 1936. It served as a rehabilitation project for 2 years, but then the resettlement idea came into vogue and, with the aid of the Farm Security Administration, all the original buildings were demolished and 80 new houses built. These houses, with electric refrigerators, electric lights, electric washing machines, and beautiful cook stoves, represented the acme of d sire (so the sponsors believed) of any poor tenant farmer and his family.

The poor farmers, however, did not take to the project. The 80 houses filled up quickly at first, but soon the turn-over became terrific, in the words of one observer. Only by the greatest persuasion was the Farm Security Administration ever able to keep more than 47 of the houses occupied during the "repression" of 1938. This figure was maintained in 1941, when things were booming in Arkansas and cotton was selling for more than it had in many years.

At Lake Dick, each farmer works for the central cooperative agency, supervised by the Farm Security Administration in Washington. He has his own house and garden, but he can't point to any particular 40 acres and say: "That's mine—when it's paid for." He is working for Lake Dick Farms, Inc., and is just as much a tenant of the Government as he was a tenant of the private plantation from which he moved. Theoretically, he is building up an equity in Lake Dick Farms and shares in the profits at the end of each year. Under the plan, everything is owned jointly.

The cooperators—those who do the work—have different stories about the plan's success. Since turn-over has run about 90 per cent, only about 10 of the original farmers are on the place. Each family head works for 10 cents an hour, or $1 for a 10-hour day. The average annual income from this day labor in 1940 was $310. In the course of the year the families drew an average of $275 each in money for food, clothing, electric bills, and other household expenses. The average balance payable at the end of a year's work ran about $35 in 1941, maybe twice as much this year.

Participation in the profits (if any) is negligible. Profits and loss registered by the project manager were:

1938: Loss of $1,200. The place was overrun with Johnson grass and profit was impossible, Farm Security Administration men said.

1939: Profit of $2,500, from which the first year's loss was deducted. Seventy-five percent of the net profit, or $900, was divided among the cooperators, according to the time each devoted to the year's work. The average was $15.

1940: Profit of $1,200. The project manager said a big crop, 769 bales of cotton, was produced. Price on 200 of the bales was low because of its poor quality.

Considering that 2,200 acres were cultivated that year, the manager had to admit that the profit "was not what it should have been," but averred that the value of the farm had been doubled because of the way it was cultivated. Private plantation owners who heard this smiled Even a mediocre plantation owner in Arkansas who doesn't get a bale to an acre on similar land is ashamed.

When it is considered that none of this money went into amortization of the cost of the project and that the first payment of a $50,000 loan by Farm Security Administration to the cooperative to buy farming equipment was not paid until 1940, it appears that the cooperative's "real profits" are nil, that it will be many years before the Government gets back even a part of the interest on its investment, not to mention the principal. At latest reports, the houses at the project are filled, but only because war plants have been located in the immediate section.

Other "Tugwelltowns" have fared as badly. Oscar Johnston, president of the National Cotton Council, submitted a partial list recently with the comment that they are now liquidated, or in process of liquidation:

The Greenwood (Ala.) Homesteads, which cost the taxpayers $828,000, sold for only $129,665.

The Jasper (Ala.) Farms, which cost $1,052,858, sold for $95,370.

The Duluth (Minn.) Homesteads, which cost $938,894, sold for $225,742.

The Arthurdale (W. Va.) Homesteads, which cost $2,646,000 sold for $175,000.

Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR, of Tennessee, who was invited to see the celebrated Cumberland Settlements on top of the Cumberland Mountains, built by Farm Security Administration's predecessor, came back to tell his colleagues that he saw some "wonderfully fine stone houses, or mansions."

"Some of them were empty," he continued. "But an occasional relief worker was found living in a stone mansion much handsomer than I have ever lived in in my life, and I have lived a good, long life. I enjoyed seeing the project, but it made my heart bleed * * * to think that our Government is spending $120,000,000 on matters like this."

On another occasion, the Senator pointed out that these homesteads, built for poor mountaineers, had attracted only two or three to come down out of the hills.

All in all, counting the expenditures of its predecessors (only the name was changed), the Farm Security Administration has spent more than $1,000,000,000 since the idea of helping tenant farmers become landowners became a settled Government policy. This year, as last, the agency is asking Congress for a budget of $172,000,000 to carry out its administrative activities, which range from administering the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to liquidating the various Tugwelltowns that it helped to foster.

But this year the agency has what appears to be a valid plea: It says it wishes to continue needed food-production work, for which, according to its sponsors, it is admirably suited. Its proponents say that the agency has learned much by its past mistakes and is now able to give the Nation a run for its money. Pointing to tremendous increases in milk production last year, the agency claims that its 473,941 farm borrowers, representing only 7.6 percent of the Nation's 6,097,000 farm operators, increased their milk production by 1,419,000,000 pounds or 36 percent of the Nation's total increase.

"This was a 20-percent increase over their 1941 production, compared to a 3-percent increase made by all farmers."

However, according to what the Department of Agriculture calls minimum milk needs, each adult in the United States should drink at least a pint of milk a day and each child should drink a quart. Since the average Farm Security Administration family has 5 members, its milk needs for a year total 2,190 pounds, or almost as much as the boasted average family increase among the Farm Security Administration clients.

However, since statistics can be suited to either side of an argument, experience is the criterion by which the agency's work must be judged. By that test, according to farmers, Farm Security Administration has been found wanting.

Take the Lake Dick project as typical. Admittedly, in 1940, only 769 bales of cotton were produced on 2,200 acres. Another 1,000 cultivable acres were not farmed. The average privately managed farm in that section in 1940 produced from 1 to 3 bales of cotton an acre.

Proponents of Farm Security Administration cannot take refuge in other crops and offset these deadly figures. On every count, whether it is growing soybeans, raising livestock, ginning cotton, or preserving strawberries, private operators make better production records than do the Farm Security Administration cooperative operators. Yet, statements continue to appear that Farm Security Administration operators have shown remarkable increases in production in items ranging from prunes to rye. Such claims are possible because Farm Security Administration forgets to tell the amounts. If you grow 1,000 tons of wheat this year and 1,100 tons next year, your increase is only 10 percent. But if you grew only 10 tons last year and grow 100 tons this year, your increase is 1,000 percent.

Increases have undoubtedly been made. But the question is: Could the Farm Security Administration clients have made greater increases under the direction of private farmers who need their help today as never before. Would not this manpower, in short, be more useful if it were used more efficiently? The answer seems obvious.

"It's like this," one outstanding agriculturist said recently. "The Farm Security Administration and many of the friends of Vice President WALLACE and Dr. Tugwell in Washington still view our problem as if we were living in a time of agriculture abundance. Yet, we are now in a period of scarcity and the attempts to keep Farm Security Administration in action are evidences of this backward thinking that characterizes many Government leaders today."

If not in growing crops, is not Farm Security Administration helping the war effort in other ways? Here, too, the picture depends upon the script writer and the director. The Farm Security Administration's press agents answer:

"Yes, we are moving needed workers into scarce-labor areas when and as needed. We are taking poor tenants off poor land and putting them on richer land, where they can produce more in the food-for-freedom program."

This sounds excellent, but different stories come from plain dirt farmers who have had to call on Farm Security Administration for labor at times. A small Arizona farmer told a Senate committee that the Farm Security Administration was not fitted for the job of transferring labor, on the basis of his experience with its functionings. Regarding the Farm Security Administration sponsored tour of Arkansas workers to Arizona, in the course of which the workers were feasted on chicken dinners and housed in "spotless" rooms while on the job, he testified:

"We found a large proportion of these workers unfit for any kind of labor—persons in the last stages of tuberculosis, who were told that in Arizona they might effect a cure, even if they could not work; that they would be given free medical care and otherwise cared for.

"There were active cases of syphilis, confirmed alcoholics, and people choked up with asthma, who, by their own admission, had not done a day's work in 2 years; women expecting to become mothers any day, men over 70."

Farm Security Administration, as Gov. Sam H. Jones, of Louisiana, said recently, indeed is a "curious counterpoint of good and bad."

The businessman has a firm interest in the low-income farmer and nonproductive, ever-moving tenants. He knows that poor farmers mean less purchasing power, less trade, fewer customers. Little businessmen, like all Americans, want to see tenant farmers grow out of tenant farming and become prosperous landowners, but many of them doubt that playing Santa Claus is going to revolutionize these tenants' thinking and living. Everybody wants to help the poor, but plans that work only on paper and cause millions to be wasted are questionable in the middle of a total war.

C. B. Baldwin, Administrator of Farm Security Administration, and Tugwell protege, is an able, intelligent gentleman and outspoken in his desire to perpetuate the agency he heads, for which he is paid $8,000 a year. Mr. Baldwin maintains that there is a problem among tenant farmers; that Farm Security Administration has attempted in a scientific, fair, and sensible way to help the great number of tenant farmers to become self-respecting, home-owning farmers with a stake in their community and their Nation.

He is on record as believing that the work of the Farm Security Administration should be expanded, although he admits that many mistakes have been made.

He believes, as many others believe in Washington, that it is right to lend money for tenants to buy funny books or to use in any of a variety of ways not commonly connected with a bedrock family economy. These extras, he insists, are what make good citizens. He believes that paying a farmer's poll taxes (in effect, by lending him the money for this purpose) has no effect whatsoever on the farmer's attitude toward political parties, personal integrity, or fiscal thinking generally.

Among the outspoken new opponents of the Farm Security Administration is Oscar Johnston, who, in addition to his work on the Cotton Council, is resident president of the largest cotton plantation in the world, and makes it a point to visit many farms each year to get the plain farmer's viewpoint. He recently declared:

"I am convinced it was not the purpose of Congress to establish an agency which would employ the services of thousands of employees as supervisors, inspectors, appraisers, etc., to handle and conduct the operation of farms by its so-called clients, who are nothing more or less than tenants.

"I am convinced that it was not the purpose of Congress to authorize the establishment of an agency which would devise a system ostensibly designed to enable farmers to acquire and own their homes, but in actual practice makes it so nearly impossible for a farmer to buy and pay for a home that, when, as was recently the case both in Alabama and Arkansas, a so-called client did succeed in paying for his home and became entitled to receive a deed to it, the fact was a news item comparable to the item of 'man bites dog.'"

I charge that Farm Security Administration employees in Mississippi and Arkansas have, in the recent past, sought to set up farmer union organizations. I charge that the Farm Security Administration is wastefully spending millions of dollars of public funds. I know that Farm Security Administration is sponsoring the development of so-called cooperative gins, cooperative warehouses, cooperative marketing agencies, and I assume that they will shortly be establishing, if they have not done so already, cooperative cotton oil mills. Nominally, these co-ops belong to the "clients" operating the lands they are undertaking to purchase. Actually, they are being financed by the Federal Government.

That Mr. Johnston's views are not confined to himself and other "big" farmers can be seen easily in page after page of congressional hearings, replete with statements by little farmers and little businessmen regarding the functionings of the agency. Typical of these is a letter sent recently to Senator JOHN H. BANKHEAD:

"We are landowners and taxpayers, and have always been your supporters and hate to have to complain to you, but your Farm Security Administrator has taken three of our best tenant families and has tried to move two more good families. These families were all satisfied, doing well until the Farm Security Administration got them.

"It was always our understanding that the idea of the Farm Security Administration was to place on a higher level the lower class of tenants, and not to go around breaking up landowners by soliciting their best tenants.

"We do not feel that it is right for our Government to bankrupt us and destroy us, because we have saved, accumulated lands, paid our taxes, always kept up public roads, churches, the courts, and the Government. It seems unfair to take our tax money to destroy us.

"Therefore, we urgently appeal to you for some relief.

"Yours very truly,

"J. C. MOORE MERCANTILE CO.,

"By C. A. WEBB, Jr."

Mr. Webb just about summed up the realistic attitude of the plain dirt farmers and the little businessmen who have come in contact with Farm Security Administration.

Do we need Farm Security Administration today?

Urgent Necessity for Extending Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee of the House is considering legislation for the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements which will soon come before the House of Representatives for consideration.

This should not be a partisan issue and many of our antiadministration newspapers and individuals are actively supporting the extension of these trade agreements.

Last Sunday's issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, one of the leading newspapers of the Midwest and a critic of many policies of this administration, had this to say about the necessity and desirability of extending these reciprocal trade agreements:

RENEW THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Considerable heat—political heat, to be sure—is being engendered in Congress over renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements with 27 nations which expire next June. The legislation is being attacked for several reasons, none of which we believe valid.

Certain Republican Members of Congress declare it gives Secretary Hull too much power, and that Congress should have a larger voice in the making of the trade treaties. Others attack it because it gives too much latitude to free trade. Others say the program contributes to war rather than promotes peace. Secretary Hull has a word for such argument—"piffle."

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 is one law that has worked. By its use Secretary Hull has been able to promote the good-neighbor policy to such good effect that lining up the Western Hemisphere on the side of the United Nations was largely a formality. In a practical way, it has benefited us. United States foreign trade slipped to a low of $2,934,000,000 in 1932. It rose to $5,495,000,000 by 1939. By permitting the Government to lower tariffs on a reciprocal basis, exports increased to the extent of 63 percent with trade-agreement countries from 1934 to 1939, and 32 percent with nonagreement nations during the same period. Imports during that period with agreement countries rose to 2? percent, compared to 12 percent with nonagreement nations. The war years doubtless show greater proportionate gains in our dealings with agreement countries.

After the war our biggest opportunity will be in the realm of trade. Now we are exporting guns, airplanes, food, machinery, et cetera. In the post-war era, the world will need the multitude of commodities required for rehabilitation. We will be producing far more than we can consume, however vast may be our domestic demands. We must have an outlet for this production, and we

will have the greatest merchant marine in our history to carry our exports around the world. But to sell our goods we must have prosperous customers, and these customers cannot be prosperous unless they, too, can export. Despite our wide variety of production, we are still a valuable market for these export nations. So, we must trade with them, with full consideration for the protection of our own industry against the evils of dumping.

Psychologically, renewal of the reciprocal trade pacts will react to our benefit. It will prove to our good neighbors that the post-war era will not see us crawl behind high tariff walls and rely on our own self-sufficiency. It will assure the world that we will cooperate in the solving of economic problems, and that we are willing to take our place in international trade, where the policy is give and take.

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 which expires on June 12 should be renewed.

Free Principles of Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Free Principles of Jefferson," published in the Witness of Dubuque, Iowa.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE PRINCIPLES OF JEFFERSON

The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of a free society, says Lincoln of Jefferson.

Here are some of his free principles:

In his inaugural address, March 4, 1801, Jefferson said:

"I deem the essential principles of this Government (to be) * * * Equal and exact justice to all men; * * * the support of State governments in all their rights as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns, and the surest bulwark against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people; * * * absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority; * * * the supremacy of the civil over military authority; economy in public expense; * * * the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; * * * freedom of religion * * * press * * * persons and trial by jury."

"The true barriers of our liberty in this country are our State government." (To De Tracy, 1811.)

"Were not this great country divided into States, that division must be made, that each might do for itself what concerns itself directly and what it can so much better do than a distant authority. * * * Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap we should soon want bread." (Autobiography, vol. 1, p. 113.)

"I am not for transferring all the powers of the States to the general government, and all these of that government to the executive branch." (To Gerry, 1799.)

"Where powers are assumed that have not been delegated, a nullification is the rightful remedy." (Kentucky Resolutions, 1798.)

"In a government like ours it is the duty of the chief magistrate, in order to enable himself to do all the good that his station requires, to endeavor by all honorable means to unite in himself the confidence of the whole people." (To J. G. Jefferson, 1810.)

"It would be a dangerous delusion were a confidence in the men of our choice to silence our fears for the safety of our rights." (Kentucky Resolutions, 1798.)

"The constitutional remedy by the elective principle becomes nothing if it may be smothered by the enormous patronage on the general government." (To McKean, 1801.)

"An honest man can feel no pleasure in the exercise of power over his fellow citizens." (To Duane, 1813.)

"It is rare that the public sentiment decides universally or unwisely, and the individual who differs from it ought to distrust and examine well his own opinion." (To Findley, 1801.)

"To open the doors of truth, and to fortify the habit of testing everything by reason, are the most effectual manacles we can rivet on the hands of our successors to prevent their manacling the people with their own consent." (To Tyler, 1804.)

"The duty of an upright administration is to pursue its course steadily, to know nothing of these family (party) dissensions and to cherish the good principles of both parties." (Forman, Jefferson, Life and Writing.)

"If I could go to heaven but with a party I should not go there at all." (To Hopkinson, 1789.)

"I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple * * * and not a multiplication of offices and salaries merely to make partisans and for increasing by every device the public debt on the principle of its being a public blessing." (To Gerry, 1799.)

"Considering the general tendency * * * to increase expenses to the ultimate term of burden which the citizen can bear, it behooves us to avail ourselves of every occasion which presents itself for taking off the surcharge; that it may never be seen here that after leaving to labor the smallest portion of its earnings on which it can subsist, government shall itself consume the residue of what it was instituted to guard." (The Stateman's Manual, vol. 1, p. 155.)

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed by Miss Ruth Neal, corresponding secretary of the Business and Professional Women's Club, of Clearfield, Pa., to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. The letter endorses Senate bill 637, the so-called Federal Aid to Education bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB,
Clearfield, Pa., April 16, 1943.

Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: On behalf of the members of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Clearfield, I am writing you to request you to approve the Federal aid to education bill, S. 637.

Due to the many school problems, created by the war, we feel that Federal aid is necessary in order to solve them. In rural areas especially, many teachers have left their positions to work in war industries because of the higher wages paid. At the same time they are greatly needed in their own profession to expedite the training of high-school youths, to supervise young children whose mothers are working in war plants, etc. Also many defense areas are so swamped with families of new war workers that school facilities are woefully inadequate and without adequate funds juvenile delinquency is bound to increase.

Therefore we ask you to give your support to the Federal-aid for education bill.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH NEAL,
Corresponding Secretary.

International Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Ernest Lindley, entitled "What Is an International Police Force?" The article appeared in the press on last Wednesday, April 21.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS AN INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE?

(By Ernest Lindley)

The Associated Press has polled the Senate on the question, Do you favor committing the Senate and country now to a post-war course of preserving the peace through an international police force? Twenty-four Senators expressed themselves as favorable, and 32 as opposed, while 32 were noncommittal and 8 were unavailable.

The response does not augur well for favorable action in the near future on the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution in its original form. This resolution would not bind the Senate or the Nation. It is intended only to obtain an expression of the present sentiment of the Senate, which the world knows was responsible for rejecting the League of Nations and which many of our allies think will lead the United States back to isolationism after this war. The backers of the Ball-Burton-Hill resolution believe that such a course would be folly and that a majority of the American people favor collaborating with our allies to keep this war won, once it is won. They realize, though, that until our

allies are convinced that such will be our course, the influence of the United States in the organization of the peace will be much less than it should be. Until they are sure they can count on us mainly of our allies must consider alternative arrangements, and if their doubt lingers too long, our national interests may suffer and the opportunity may be lost to organize an enduring peace.

To achieve its purpose the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution should pass by at least a two-thirds majority, since that is the majority which the Constitution requires for the ratification of treaties. The Associated Press poll shows that one-third of the Senate is now opposed to the resolution, while another third or more remains uncertain.

The creation of an international police force is, however, only one of the specific proposals incorporated in the resolution. It is the most troublesome, probably the least essential, and possibly the most extreme.

What is an international police force? It is not defined in the Associated Press question, or in the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution (although the authors have explained what they mean by it). An international police force may mean one thing to one person and another thing to another person.

Does it mean an international navy, air force, and army would completely absorb the armed forces of all the United Nations and take its orders solely from a United Nations legislative or executive body? And, if so, how would the international legislative and executive bodies be organized?

Would it be a smaller United Nations constabulary assigned to specific policing duties in specific areas—say the policing of Germany after it had been disarmed?

Would it be an assemblage of units of various national navies, air forces, and armies, collaborating under treaties or military agreements subscribed to by their respective national governments?

These are only a few of the alternative interpretations. With refinements the list could be expanded indefinitely.

The great powers among the victors in this war surely will not pool all their armies, navies, and air forces in an international police force which takes orders solely from a United Nations executive or legislative body and owes allegiance to the United Nations rather than to individual nations. If such a thing ever comes to pass, it will be in the more distant future.

What the authors of the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution have in mind is the creation of a smaller international constabulary to which the separate United Nations would assign a portion of their forces. Such a force might police certain fixed areas from certain assigned bases. It might be a highly mobile force, but its mobility would depend not only on the composition of the force but its access to bases. Such a force could exist side by side with national military establishments. It would be, in all probability, very much smaller than the separate military forces which such nations as Russia, Britain, and the United States would retain under their own sovereign controls.

But the enforcement of peace will not depend, in all probability, on the organization of any separate group of military forces designated as an international police force. If the principal victors stick together in a determination to enforce the peace, they can enforce it. Unless they stick together, it cannot be enforced.

The central question is whether we are willing to commit ourselves to use the armed power of the United States in collaboration with that of other nations to enforce the peace. This may be vague, but it is fundamental. If the Associated Press had asked that question, or something like it, the response from the Senate almost certainly would have been more favorable.

Contribution of Livestock Toward Winning the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the Bottineau Courant of April 14, 1943, showing that in the State of North Dakota even the livestock are doing their share toward winning the war.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOW HAS 16 PIGS—ALL LIVING YET

C. F. Geiszler of north of Kramer reports that he has had good luck with his new-born pigs this year, and says that one of his sows had 16 pigs, and all of them are living, with good chances of survival. This means that 14 of the pigs will nurse at a time and 2 will have to wait, since the sow can only nurse 14 at a time.

Real and Secret Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Evening Post of New York City of the issue of April 16, 1943, entitled "Real Democracy and Secret Democracy."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REAL DEMOCRACY AND SECRET DEMOCRACY

Senators BALL, BURTON, HATCH, and HILL show us how in a democracy intelligent officials who have a plan and believe in it are eager to employ every means to let the people know all about it.

These four Senators are firmly convinced, and so are we, that the United States should take the initiative now in organizing all the United Nations for full collaboration in war and peace.

They believe, and so do we, that "Unless some agreements on basic principles are reached now, the forces tending to drive the Allies apart—economic rivalries, jealousies, nationalism, and urgent domestic problems—will become dominant when the war ends and may block effective collaboration to maintain peace."

These four Senators want to insure, and so do we, that this time, when the President negotiates a treaty it will not be repudiated and the other signatories left out on a limb, as happened when the Senate refused to sustain President Wilson after the last war.

And we think it is a heartening sign that our democracy is alive and vigorous when these four Senators can disregard party lines, step down from the elevation of Capitol Hill together, and ask all the people to interest themselves in a vital aspect of our domestic and foreign affairs.

EVIDENCE OF DISTRUST

These men obviously don't hold with the State Department's theory—as manifested in north Africa—that foreign affairs is a business to be confined to experts and connivers working in an atmosphere of suave and superior secrecy.

These Senators proceed upon the assumption that the people are quite capable of taking their facts straight.

We think they are right. But too many people in government think otherwise and proceed with a combination of razzle-dazzle and secrecy to nudge the minds of men along the way they have charted.

Which is why, despite the demur of Elmer Davis, that we are inclined to accept at full value the explanation of Harold Guinzburg, Henry F. Pringle, and their associates for their mass resignation from the Office of War Information.

Theirs is a harsh indictment: "* * * the activities on the home front are now dominated by high-pressure promoters who prefer slick salesmanship to honest information. These promoters would treat as stupid and reluctant customers the men and women of the United States. They delude themselves that the only effective appeal to the American public in wartime is the selfish one of "what's in it for me?"

We couldn't credit this charge so easily if there were not plenty of other evidence of a powerful official belief that the people can't be trusted with straight facts.

But there is the evidence, for example, of the secrecy which has been thrown around the coming International Food Conference at Hot Springs, Va., and the Refugee Conference in Bermuda.

EVIDENCE OF PLANLESSNESS

The constitutional rights of freedom of the press and of speech are to be curbed to the vanishing point to insure that only officially approved facts are to be made public.

Clearly this indicates an official attitude that the people can't be trusted with facts. But it indicates something else, too.

It is a dead give-away that our representatives are entering these conferences without a definite plan.

Granted that our delegations knew what they wanted and what they were prepared to give, and granting that the plan would bear the light of day, they would be as eager to let all people know about it as the four Senators are to let the Nation know about their plan. They would want the people to know. They would need the people.

But as we said at the outset, that is what intelligent officials do in a democracy. We have the democracy. Our shortage is in intelligent officials.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial in the April issue of the American Federationist by William

Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, entitled "Social Insurance," together with an article from the same magazine entitled "Toward Security" by Eveline M. Burns, Director of Research, Technical Committee on Long Range Work and Relief Policies, National Resources Planning Board.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL INSURANCE

(By William Green, president, American Federation of Labor)

Post-war planning must begin soon after declaration of war, for whatever principles we follow and whatever commitments we make will determine actions and decisions after the war and at the peace table. We cannot begin afresh, but must go forward from where we are. This fact is the basis for labor's insistence upon the maintenance of the principles and institutions of democracy.

Even under the pressure of war, labor believes it should have opportunity to give up rights, instead of having them torn away by arbitrary action. And when freedom of action is given up labor representation in the governmental agency making decisions should be provided as a matter of right.

The problems that will arise at the end of fighting will be so tremendous and so fateful that we dare not wait until peace is actually here before considering the problems and trying to map plans to solve them.

The American Federation of Labor, which early foresaw the great revolution that would come in our own economic organization, as well as the opportunity for democratic leadership in world affairs, urges—as a bulwark in our domestic affairs—the establishment of a stable and adequate social insurance system to carry workers safely through the changes and emergencies that lie ahead.

Insurance is our modern method of providing against personal emergencies that interrupt income earning. One must have the means of paying the costs of living or else accept public or private charity. Self-dependence is essential to character and to personal integrity; it is, therefore, essential to the national well-being and fiber that wage earners have insurance to provide them during emergencies with funds they may rightly regard as their own.

Since workers' earnings are generally too small to enable them to buy individual insurance, they look to society to set up machinery for collective insurance. In making this provision, society benefits by decreasing the costs of relief and by increasing the opportunities for self-dependence, thus raising the level of national capacity. Employers benefit by escaping high taxes which heavy relief costs necessitate and by the improved morale of workers who know they are protected against the degeneration that comes with unemployment and life on the dole.

Social insurance must be on a sound basis—paralleling the labor market and adequate to take care of the workers covered. Workers must have basic income while looking for new jobs, when accidents or sickness disable them and when their bodies no longer permit them to meet the requirements of work. Already millions of workers have left peacetime jobs in which they had built up equities, and they know that after the war, when jobs may be scarce, they will have to shift again. Other workers have left good jobs to enter the armed forces. All these persons, as well as business undertakings, are entitled to have the stabilizing assurance that, thanks to their country's provision of adequate social insurance, they are protected against fear, want, and hunger.

We must take action now, in time of full employment, to accumulate the necessary reserves. These reserves will be invested in Federal bonds usable by the Federal Government as credit for war purposes.

With equal care, our Government, in cooperation with our democratic allies, must make plans now and enter into understandings which will make it possible for us—this time—to win the peace. Labor wants to see world mechanisms established that will deal with the causes of war and enable all nations to have social and political institutions conducive to their social, material, and spiritual growth, without any one nation or combination of nations imposing a philosophy of life or a method of government on other nations.

TOWARD SECURITY

(By Eveline M. Burns)

In the years 1933–40 this Nation made tremendous efforts to meet the worst consequences of widespread want, both in physical suffering and in the loss of morale due to mass unemployment.

During these years we spent, in all, $26,000,000,000 from Federal, State, and local funds. In some months we aided as many as 28,000,000 people, and at any one time during this period from 10 to 22 percent of our population was receiving help.

But our efforts were piecemeal and without a clear sense of direction. They had to be varied because we were dealing with a very complicated problem, but too often one attempt nullified the accomplishments of another. Our twenty-odd public-aid programs suffered from the general tendency to regard them as temporary remedies for evils that would soon pass away.

Of all these programs we had until recently no complete overall picture. At the end of 1939, at the request of President Roosevelt, the National Resources Planning Board appointed a committee on long-range work and relief policies to draw up such a picture for the Nation, to evaluate our attempts to provide security for our people and to suggest how we can assure to all our citizens that freedom from want for which we are now at war.

These are the objectives of the report on security, work and relief policies recently transmitted to Congress by the President.

The committee started off from the assumption that all our various public-aid programs—work and youth programs like Work Projects Administration, Civilian Conservation Corps, and National Youth Administration; the social insurances such as old-age and survivors insurance, unemployment compensation and workmen's compensation; assistance to the aged, the blind, the dependent children, and needy persons on general relief, and the farm security programs—were related parts of a broad attack on insecurity and unemployment.

Instead of treating each program by itself, as had usually been done in the past, the committee tried to consider the results of all the programs working simultaneously. It tried to ask and answer some very fundamental questions:

Is public aid available to everyone in need?

Is the security provided enough to permit people to maintain themselves in decency and health?

Is the burden of financing public aid fairly and effectively distributed among the various units of government?

Have we organized our efforts so that separately they do not conflict with each other and together they make real security possible?

Where we have failed, how can we make sure that our failures will not be repeated?

In each case the committee tried to give an answer for the Nation as a whole and to discover whether the situation is different in different parts of the country or for different types of people.

IS PUBLIC AID AVAILABLE?

The answer to our first question should banish any smugness we may feel about our social security. We do have a system of security for some groups and some people within these groups. But other groups—and, indeed, a large proportion of the needy people in whole areas of this country—receive no public aid at all or receive aid that is a disgrace in a wealthy nation like our own.

All the social insurances fail to cover the need for this type of security. Large groups of workers, including agricultural labor and farm operators, the self-employed, employees of Government and nonprofit corporations, who formed about half of our working population in 1940, are excluded by law from our most comprehensive program—old-age and survivors insurance. Even of the workers nominally covered a certain proportion have earnings so low or so irregular that they are unlikely to qualify for benefits, even though they pay taxes on every dollar of their wages.

Except for inadequate workmen's compensation in most States, and a temporary disability insurance program just going into effect in Rhode Island, we have no social-insurance protection against the loss of income due to sickness.

On our work programs we never at any time between 1933 and 1940 employed as many as half of the unemployed workers of the country. Even the Work Projects Administration, which aimed to give work only to the needy unemployed, had waiting lists for assignments that ran at times over 1,000,000. In many sections of the country there have been long waiting lists for old-age assistance and for the other special types of aid.

All these facts would not be so disturbing if there were everywhere a basic underpinning program through which income could be assured to needy people who for one reason or another cannot meet the requirements of the special programs. But there are sections of the country where local public funds are not available for relief in any form, and in others the amounts available are so limited that the numbers who can be cared for are negligible. In 1 month in 1940 there were estimated to be two-thirds of a million families eligible for relief but not receiving it whose only form of help was surplus commodities. Such a form of public aid cannot seriously be considered an adequate response to the demand of the people for freedom from want.

Since Pearl Harbor public-aid rolls have steadily declined as they will do in any period of labor shortage. But many of our public-aid families contain no employable member, and hence general employment conditions have no effect upon their need. The committee estimated that, even with full employment, we must plan on a continuing need for public aid on the part of at least 3,250,000 families. It is noteworthy that even today, when we are in the throes of a labor shortage, there are more than 4,000,000 families needing and obtaining some kind of socially provided income.

If a needy person succeeds in being accepted on a public aid program are the payments large enough to permit him a decent standard of living?

In seeking the answer to this question, the committee used as a yardstick the Stecker emergency budget, which includes only the minimum essentials for health and is admittedly unsafe to use over a long period of time. The cost of this budget for a family of four in 46 cities in 1940, as established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, averaged about $900 per year.

When the payments on public aid programs in that year were measured against the cost of the emergency budget, the committee found that only part of the recipients

of a few programs received payments exceeding this minimum and many payments fell far below it. Social insurance payments were, in general, more adequate, but even here, payments were far from high. And in unemployment compensation the duration was so short that most of the claimants in some States exhausted their benefits before finding new jobs. The Work Projects Administration security wage did not provide the emergency level of living for a significant proportion of project workers. In all but a few States, the level of living possible under aid to the aged, the blind, and the dependent children was also low.

But the conditions revealed by the committee's special study of general relief in 59 cities were worst of all. None of these cities, which included those known to deal most generously with their relief clients, gave as much as 100 percent of the cost of the emergency budget in 1940. Only six cities granted between 80 and 100 percent. And in two of these cities the relief grant was less than one-fifth of this minimum. Even when the value of the surplus commodities received by clients was added to the cash grant, the total aid available in five cities was less than the amount allotted to food alone in the emergency budget.

Perhaps the most discouraging revelations of the security report are the great variations in the availability and adequacy of payments between regions of the country and between groups of recipients. In general, needy persons in the Southwest and Southeast, Negroes and migrants fare worst of all. It is a striking fact, too, that we have provided much better on the whole for our aged than for our children. General-relief recipients are apt to be the worst off of all groups.

Why do we have this gap between need and help, and why is such security as exists often unworthy of the name? The committee found that one reason, of course, lies in the wide variations in wealth between regions of our country, which have led on the one hand to greater need in those regions and on the other to small appropriations for public aid. These limited funds have had to be spread thin over as many cases as could possibly be handled. Where grants could be made at all, they were often appallingly low.

In 1 month in 1940, 9 States, all of them in the South, paid on the average less than $10 per month to a family on general relief. But low appropriations are not entirely due to financial stringency. The lowest average grant in the group just mentioned was not made by the State with the lowest per capita income. Two poorer States made considerably higher grants. It is undeniable that some communities have been unwilling to make proper provision for their needy, and discrimination against certain groups is clearly evident.

Perhaps the most important reason is the general assumption that people who cannot qualify for any one of our special programs can surely get help from the general-relief program. Unfortunately this is not the case. This program is one of the two which receive no Federal funds at all, and something it is the responsibility of local units alone. It is obvious that counties or cities with the fewest tax resources will probably also have the greatest need for such a program.

It is thus evident that part of our failure to provide security for all our people is due to our methods of financing public aid. We have not yet succeeded in distributing Federal aid, much of which is on a matching basis, so that the most aid goes to regions with the most need. Nor have we distributed Federal aid among programs so that there will be everywhere a balanced development of the different programs. The Federal Government has contributed 75 percent of Work Projects Administration funds, 50 percent of funds for aid to the needy aged, blind and dependent children, and nothing at all to general relief.

In choosing our revenue sources for public aid we have often used sales and other consumption taxes which bear heavily upon the very people whose need we are aiming to reduce. And we have not recognized public aid financing as an important part of our whole fiscal and economic policy. In other words, by and large the nation is still treating public aid as an emergency measure.

The complicated administrative organization of public aid, which is the result of our many diversified programs and of our Federal system of government, causes real difficulties for applicants for public aid and for employers and other citizens who supply information and pay taxes. Needy people find no central office where they can discover what services they are entitled to, and they may well be confused by the many points of access to the different programs. In particular, the constructive potentialities of the local employment office have not been fully realized and too little effort has been made to enlist employer and worker participation. Employers are irritated by the numerous and uncoordinated requests for information from the many agencies administering public-aid programs.

Having surveyed the operation of our many public-aid programs in the past decade, the committee urges a sixfold attack upon the problems of economic insecurity and unemployment.

First of all, preventive and constructive measures should be more fully developed. For instance, much of the need due to ill health could be eliminated or prevented by greater use of public funds for the treatment and prevention of disease, and for rehabilitating workers now incapacitated for earning their own living. Minimum-wage legislation and such broad attacks on low productivity of entire regions as the Tennessee Valley Authority are other useful preventive measures.

Second, for all workers who have exhausted 26 weeks' unemployment benefits, public work should be provided. Not leaf-raking, but a carefully planned and adequately financed program of work on projects of genuine usefulness to the community. Workers should be eligible for these programs without a means test. They should receive as nearly as possible prevailing rates of wages for full-time work with standards of efficiency similar to those in private industry.

Third, we must pay special attention to the needs of youth. Maintenance grants should be made to help them to stay in school up to the normal school-leaving age and to go on to college or technical school if they can profit by higher education. Special work programs for youth should be provided to instill good work habits and familiarity with the use of tools, so that our young people on attaining maturity would be equipped to compete effectively with adults. That special attention should be paid to the health of youth the results of selective-service examinations make clear.

Fourth, so far as possible the need for income by people who are too old or too young to work, or have lost their breadwinner, as well as those unemployed for less than 26 weeks should be met by social insurance. Loss of income through temporary and permanent disability should be covered by insurance now lacking in our system. Extending insurance in this fashion to all groups and their dependents will not be possible overnight, but certain groups should be covered at once and many insurance laws should be amended to provide more significant benefits. In the case of unemployment compensation, dependents' benefits and a longer duration of the compensation (26 weeks' maximum) should be provided. The committee urged federalization of the system and abolition of merit rating as essential steps in the reform of the unemployment-compensation program. It proposed a Government contribution toward the costs of all the social-insurance programs as the only way to bring social insurance within reach of the lower-income groups.

Fifth, for all needy people who cannot qualify for work programs, social insurance, or liberalized special assistance programs, general public assistance must be made everywhere available. Social insurance can never provide for all the needy or for all types of need. We may hope that with full development of insurance and work programs the number to be provided for by a general relief program will be relatively small. The program recommended differs radically from the general relief which prevailed during the depression years. A Federal grant-in-aid for this program is imperative, since the present reliance on the often limited resources of States and localities makes it impossible for this program to fulfill its true function as a basic underpinning service for all the other types of aid. The new general public assistance should place great emphasis on rehabilitation.

Sixth, the committee recommended expansion of all those social services vital to the health and welfare of the country. Such services as education and public health must be available to all. Detailed recommendations for these measures lay outside the committee's terms of reference, but their relation to public aid was so obvious that the committee urged immediate action on the part of the Federal and State Governments to initiate plans.

The committee made many recommendations for carrying out these general principles through specific programs, some of which have been indicated in the foregoing.

Others include creation of an information service in each community where applicants may learn what help is available and may be referred to the proper program. Access to all programs for employment and insurance would be through the employment service. The public-welfare office would be the channel of access to all programs where eligibility is based upon need.

Finally, the committee urged that the ordinary citizen should be kept better informed about the objectives and activities of all public-aid programs and that he be given greater opportunity to participate in policy-making and in such administrative activities as service on appeal boards. Only if the people understand clearly what social security means, and participate intelligently in the effort to provide it, can we achieve real freedom from want.

Uses of Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, printed in the April edition of the trade magazine, Coal Age, describing the rise of a new giant industry based on coal. Coal is a natural resource which we have in great abundance in many States, especially in my own State of Montana.

The possible development of this great new industry is entitled to the most serious consideration of the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COAL'S NEW HORIZONS

(By Harold L. Ickes)

Outstanding among drastic changes the present world conflict is bringing about in our way of living is the use of coal on a scale and for purposes never before seriously considered, even in its heyday as the Nation's overwhelmingly preponderant source of fuel and energy.

The use of coal for new purposes and in ever greater quantities should profoundly vary our economic pattern. It scarcely can fail to increase the size and importance of many industries while creating new and powerful ones. Later, I shall discuss in some detail one new industry based on the use of coal which already looms on the not too distant horizon as a virtual necessity. In its establishment I hope soon to lend an official hand.

Many of the innovations and extensions in the future use of coal will stem from progressive diminishment of this country's oil reserves and the resultant increasing need of a substitute source from which petroleum-like products can be made. Others will be the logical outgrowths of expediencies thrust upon us by the war.

It requires no seer to foretell that the day is approaching when petroleum must be supplemented as an industrial and domestic fuel and as a source of gasoline. For the last several years petroleum consumption has been greatly in excess of the discovery of new reserves. For this reason it is prudent to look to coal and oil shale as sources of .iquid fuel. I do not anticipate that a great quantity of liquid fuel made from coal or oil shale will be needed to make up for natural petroleum deficiences within the next few years. But when and as it is needed we should be ready to produce it in whatever quantities are required. Again, as petroleum reserves diminish, plastics, chemical, and explosives will be derived from coal in increasing quantities.

A detailed prognostication, however, carries weight only to the extent to which it is linked, logically and convincingly, with the past and present. Before we go further, then, we should ask the question, What are the facts in the history of coal which throw significant shadows on the future?

Probably the most important fact has been the continued discoveries for many years of new, prodigious petroleum reserves, coupled with the perfection of cheap processes for refining it into liquid fuel. These wrought many changes in the pattern of the country's development and in the habits of its fortunate citizens.

Supplied with an abundance of relatively inexpensive gasoline, many Americans have been able until recently to satiate their inherent passion for rocketing from place to place at what once would have been considered an incredible speed. The physical pattern of our cities, the texture of our economy, and our social customs reflect this extreme mobility. Until recently, too, many of us have found it as convenient as it was agreeable to play with a few gadgets and let our oil-burning furnace do the rest. Our security against attack and our ability to make swift and devastating forays against our enemies alike are dependent upon ample supplies of high-octane gasoline.

In brief, gasoline and fuel oil provide conveniences, luxuries, and security which Americans have grown to regard as inalienable rights and which they never will give up so long as they have arms with which to fight. These rights might never have loomed so large in our habits had we not had an abundance of petroleum. But since they have become an inseparable part of America's design for living, Americans will seek to preserve them when our petroleum reserves and imports are inadequate to meet the demands of this mobile and industrial age. The practicable and perhaps the most feasible way to do this is to develop, on a commercial basis, known methods of making liquid fuel from coal, lignite, or oil shale.

"When our petroleum reserves and imports are inadequate" describes a time which may be far less distant than even the better informed have foreseen. Yet it is a phrase which is certain to provoke incredulity. It will even call for ridicule from the many who are somewhat less than well informed. The public at large has been thoroughly imbued with the idea that America has unlimited oil reserves because we have been exploiting them at a greater rate than the rest of the world. But what is the truth about our oil reserves? And what difference will it make in our lives after the war if we do not again have our customary peacetime flow of oil?

The fact is that discoveries of new oil reserves have been for several years past at a rate scarcely equal to one-third the rate of consumption. However, extensions of older fields, together with such new discoveries as have been made, have been adequate to maintain our proved reserves at nineteen to twenty billion barrels. Since we are consuming petroleum at the rate of approximately one and four-tenths billion barrels a year, our known reserve is 13 or 14 times our present annual rate of consumption. This does not mean that we will exhaust our present known petroleum reserves in 13 or 14 years, for reasons I shall take up more fully later.

No one can deny, of course, that this reserve may be increased in time to come by the discovery of new oil fields, although our geologists long have warned that discovery could not keep pace with established consumption. On the other hand, it is equally probable that our oil resources may be depleted at a rate much more rapid than we anticipate because of the necessities of war and of possible errors in our estimates.

In any event, with petroleum reserves at a low level, it is no part of wisdom for you or me to sit idly by, twiddling our thumbs, while waiting for accidents or miracles to solve the inevitable problems already so uncomfortably close at hand in supplying the Nation's liquid fuel and oil requirements. Ordinary common sense demands that we take positive action immediately to prepare ourselves to meet any exigency which may arise as a result of dwindling and possibly eventual disappearance of our oil reserves.

MUST HUSBAND OIL RESERVES; PRODUCE FROM COAL OR SHALE

The first practical step is to initiate whatever action may be necessary to husband our diminishing petroleum resources. We must reserve the higher fuel values of petroleum for those uses that cannot be met so efficiently, if at all, by the direct combustion of coal. The exercise of this public policy can in no way excuse us for not immediately developing practical methods of producing gasoline, kerosene, Diesel fuel, other liquid fuels and lubricants either from coal, oil shale, or both.

As a specific move in this direction I am preparing to recommend to the Congress legislation which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to build and operate a demonstration-type industrial-scale coal-hydrogenation pilot plant or plants. Before I can be boiled alive in some of the oil that we still have left for trying to shove the Government into competition with private enterprise on another front, let me offer my reasons for believing that this legislation is not only wise but indispensable to our future security.

It already is known to all industrial chemists that gasoline and other petroleum products may be obtained from coal and lignite by both direct and indirect hydrogenation. Both processes were invented and first put into commercial-scale production in Germany. The annual production rate today from German plants of both types is estimated at 5,000,000 metric tons or more. This is believed to be more than one-third of Hitler's wartime requirements for Luftwaffe, tanks, and all. Imperial Chemical Industries is operating a direct hydrogenation plant in England with a capacity of 3,540 barrels a day. Other commercial plants of unknown capacity are, or were, in operation in France and Japan. The development of processes for coal hydrogenation on a commercial or semicommercial basis in Germany and Japan reflects the foresight of war-bent countries without appreciable internal petroleum resources. In the United States, where the delusion of inexhaustible oil resources lingers tenaciously, we have been able, so far, to make only a gesture toward solving the liquid-fuel problems that inevitably will be ours if additions to our known reserves keep on diminishing at the present rate, to say nothing of the difficulties we may encounter if that pace becomes accelerated.

As early as 1935, before this world war arrested our startled attention, scientists in the Bureau of Mines were keenly aware that petroleum discoveries were lagging behind consumption. They suggested immediate experimentation with coal hydrogenation. We began to ask Congress for funds for this purpose in 1935. In 1937 the first drop of oil flowed from the apparatus in the Bureau's experimental small-scale direct-hydrogenation plant at Pittsburgh.

This plant has a capacity of 100 pounds of coal per 24 hours. Its main objective has been to study hydrogenation of coals from the more important coal and lignite beds in the United States. Fourteen coals have been assayed. The Bureau has received an appropriation for this fiscal year for laboratory-scale experimentation with indirect hydrogenation. Much less is known here about this process. The Germans have been successful in concealing vital information.

Laboratory research, important as it is, cannot do the great amount of full-scale developmental research which can be accomplished only in a full-scale demonstrative pilot plant. With petroleum reserves dropping toward dangerous levels this research obviously should be undertaken at once to protect the Nation from possible disaster in this field such as it suffered with synthetic rubber.

The assurance of a future supply of counterfeit (although of coin current value) petroleum products is a matter of public concern and public safety. So I think that it is wholly in keeping with present public thought that Government should undertake this large-scale research. Considerable private research along this line has been conducted by generous privately financed research groups, but unquestionably more rapid progress can be made with Government financing and with the cooperation of Government chemists and engineers with those of industry.

To begin with, we need data for designing commercial plants and on construction costs. Lacking these, we can hardly expect that private capital will readily venture to finance a brand-new untried industry, no matter how large and important it is likely to grow in the future. Part of these data may be obtained, perhaps, by the simple expedient of borrowing engineers from Imperial Chemical Industries, which built and operates the plant in England previously referred to. I shall hazard the guess, however, that most of what we need to know we shall have to learn the hard way. In my opinion, the answers to any

number of vital questions can be found only by undergoing the actual experience of building and operating demonstration-type plants.

Answering these questions will consume an unpredictable amount of time. Since we must race against too quickly disappearing oil reserves, we cannot get started too soon. Almost 15 years elapsed from the time a German scientist first discovered the direct process of coal liquefaction until a large commercial plant was put into operation. This indicates that much research work was necessary, especially to solve difficult problems attending the development of equipment for the process.

Driven by the American passion for putting things on a paying basis, we must go even further in our developmental work than did the Germans. Neither their plants nor those in England, France, or Japan are, or ever have been, in a strict sense, on a commercial basis. Commercial operation of these plants has been made possible only by large government subsidies in some form or other.

Of equal importance is the need for intensive large-scale research in the chemistry of the processes. At present, the octane rating of gasoline produced by the direct process is 70 to 75. This number can be increased to 85 or 90 by adding tetraethyl lead. The indirect process yields gasoline of such a low octane number that it must be reformed by cracking before it can be used as a motor fuel, although the Diesel fuel recovered by this method is excellent. Before we can depend upon coal as a source of our airplane fuel we must find a way to boost the octane number to 100. German aviators right now are depending on leaded gasoline from direct hydrogenation, which we believe cannot have a higher octane rating than 90 at the most.

Another problem which must be whipped is the cost of producing gasoline. We have plausible estimates ranging from 12 to 25 cents a gallon. This is two to four times the cost of gasoline from petroleum. If the cost of production can be held at the lower figure, the retail price of gasoline recovered from coal should not exceed the average price of petroleum gasoline by more than 10 cents a gallon at the most. It is possible that the cost could be brought still lower through chemical research. For example, 5 tons of high-volatile bituminous coal, 6.5 tons of subbituminous coal, or 9 tons of lignite are used by the direct-hydrogenation process in making 1 ton of gasoline. Only about 40 to 45 percent of the original heat units remain in the resulting motor fuel. Perhaps a method could be developed whereby some of this lost energy might be retained.

It would be necessary to double the present production of coal to meet its normal uses and supply a sufficient quantity to provide the normal production of gasoline in the United States. Future research may result in a higher yield of gasoline per ton of coal and thus cut the coal requirements to some extent.

Although we estimate known petroleum reserves as equal to 13 or 14 years' requirements, nature has no valve that we can set, thereby causing oil wells to flow or yield through the pump a year's requirements in a 12-month period. It is estimated that it will take about 50 years to extract the known existing petroleum from the ground. This means that, lacking new discoveries, we shall suffer from a shortage of petroleum products while we still have large reserves in the ground unless we act at once to supplement them from one or more sources within the space of a very few years. This can be done in one or two ways or a combination of both—importation or hydrogenation.

When it was first proposed that the Bureau of Mines begin experimentation with coal liquefaction for the recovery of gasoline, some leaders in industries interested in the continuation of an ample supply of inexpensive liquid fuel gave the idea a good-natured brush off. Said they, the Government shouldn't spend a plugged nickel in this form of research. Why should it? Aren't our petroleum resources practically inexhaustible? Perhaps these and many others have changed their minds and now will favor this form of research after all.

If our reseach is to be of any value, it must be carried on in a full-scale demonstration-type commercial pilot plant. It must be carried on, in its initial stages, at a loss. We cannot estimate precisely the amount of money that will be necessary for this purpose. It is obvious, though, that it is better to subsidize the initial work, which doubtless will lead to placing coal hydrogenation on a paying basis than to subsidize the industry for many years to come as has been necessary in Germany, Japan, and England.

This discussion of coal as the possible future source of our gasoline must not be construed as indicating that I have lost sight of the possibilities of oil shale. I have them very much in mind, but it would be unwise for numerous cogent reasons to put all our eggs in one basket.

The Bureau of Mines has carried on extensive experiments in the recovery of oil from shale. On the basis of available data this process would appear to be somewhat cheaper than obtaining gasoline and other petroleum products from coal.

No worth-while comparison of relative production costs can be made, however, until both have been given a full-scale trial over a period of time long enough to develop them fully. For this reason I am convinced that experimental work with coal and shale should proceed simultaneously. It may prove to be cheaper to derive our liquid fuels from shale, but in addition to the actual cost of production there are numerous other factors to consider. Among them is the fact that virtually all of our known oil-shale deposits are in Utah and Colorado, although shale oil can be extracted, not too economically, from some of the black shales east of the Mississippi. The freight charges from Colorado to centers of population and industry in the East might tip the scales in favor of coal mined and processed in the East or in other sections where coal is available near a large market for gasoline.

Considering the limitations of transportation, it would be worse than foolish to depend upon a single locality for the source of our gasoline and oil in some future crisis comparable to the present one. The location of our most prolific oil fields in the midcontinent and far-western areas has been the cause of transportation problems which led to our shortages in the East.

On the other hand, coal and lignite are found in more than 30 of our 48 States. By locating properly our future coal-hydrogenation plants we can solve the transportation problem by producing liquid fuels within easy distances of the places of their consumption.

It was the distance of oil reserves from centers of industries—in some instances 5,000 miles—which led the Soviet Union to experiment with hydrogenation of much more accessible coals. It must be remembered, too, that our deposits of oil shale are sufficient to yield our liquid fuel requirements for only 50 or 75 years at the present rate of consumption.

In any event, the oil extracted from shale is of a low quality and plants for its hydrogenation, if gasoline is wanted, will have to be built just as in the case of coal.

COAL HYDROGENATION OUTLOOK INCLUDES RUBBER AND PLASTICS

One result of the country's present synthetic-rubber program is bound to be a new market for coal. At present the Government contemplates the manufacture annually of 700,000 tons of Buna-S rubber. The major raw materials for this rubber are one-fourth styrene and three-fourths butadiene. Styrene is derived from coal. At the inception of the proposed program its butadiene requirements will be derived chiefly from petroleum and alcohol. However, butadiene can, and doubteless later will, be made from coal as petroleum supplies grow smaller.

Agriculture is expected to benefit to the tune of $81,900,000 annually and the petroleum industry at the rate of $22,300,000 from the rubber program. The amount going to coal will be less than $10,000,000. A considerable portion of the larger sums might have found their way into the hands of bituminous coal producers if they previously had carried on sufficient research to establish a technologic and engineering basis on which plant construction could have proceeded rapidly.

Contrary to what seems to be a popular conception, synthetic-rubber manufacture, when it eventually is established, is reasonably sure to remain as one of our large postwar industries. It is true that the estimated cost of making synthetic rubber is higher than the price we used to pay for natural rubber from the Dutch East Indies. However, some years are bound to elapse between the time the islands in question are recaptured and the resumption of rubber production on a large scale. Many economists and other experts believe that the Dutch never again will be able to keep the cost of labor at the low figure of prewar days. Thus the cost of their product is obliged to be higher whenever it appears on the market again. The price of South American rubber has for some time approached the cost of synthetic-rubber manufacture.

Aside from the question of cost, it is inconceivable that the United States again would expose itself to the mercies of a foreign source of rubber, which might be cut off overnight.

However, before coal can assume the role in synthetic-rubber manufacture that would be justified, research and development must be greatly expanded. Despite the present limited participation of styrene, the demand for it is going to place a strain on the benzol supply needed elsewhere in many vital industries. A method must be developed for producing styrene independently of benzol. Likewise there must be extensive research on the subject of butadiene. The Bureau of Mines is investigating butadiene from the point of view of both direct and indirect coal hydrogenation processes on a laboratory scale. These studies will be speeded and given greater significance when carried on in a full-scale commercial plant.

Another industry dependent to a large degree on coal is destined, when hydrogenation of coal is more fully developed, to reach a new stature and diversification. I refer to plastics. Growth already is under way due to the compulsions of war. Shortages of metals, which in some instances will be permanent, have led to plastic substitutes. In some uses these have proved superior to the original article. The growth of that section of the industry which uses raw materials derived from coal now faces a sharp limitation. Its expansion depends on the quantity of organic materials made available as by-products in the manufacture of coke from coal. The quantity of these materials, in turn, is limited by the demand for coke. Hydrogenation of coal on a commercial scale will overcome this limitation. Hydrogenation will increase the yield of tar acids—phenol, cresols, xylenols—used in making plastics by about 10 times those obtained in coke manufacture.

Possibly claims that are too extravagant have been made for the future of plastics. Nevertheless, they already are replacing more critical materials where the requirements are lightness, transparency; insulation of heat, sound, and electricity; and ease of fabrica-

tion, and where the strength or hardness of steel is not essential. Many articles, such as airplane windows, automobile safety glass, dentures, unbreakable spectacles, and a host of others, now are made of plastics derived from resins which may be synthesized from coal.

The possibilities of plastics from coal range from a bottle cap to the crystal clear nose of a bomber with 4,000 square inches of surface. In fact, milady's chic appearance from head to toe, literally speaking, is the gift of coal to beauty. Hairdressers are fixing permanent waves with a plastic material that can be made from coal, and nylon hose are an ingenious derivative of coal, air, and water.

Along with raw materials for plastics, coal hydrogenation will make available the tar bases which serve as raw materials in several organic-chemical processes. Hydrogenation, likewise, will increase the production of benzol and toluene for the manufacture of explosives. The quantity of coal that goes into the ultimate output of plastics, chemicals, solvents, and dyes may continue to be a small percentage of the total mined. The cost of synthetic rubber or gasoline produced from coal may be greater than the cost of natural rubber or gasoline refined from petroleum in the absence of further experimental work in hydrogenation. But in weighing the value of coal hydrogenation we must take into account the economic advantages which may result from producing in a single plant such a range of products as gasoline, oil, raw material for rubber, plastics, explosives, pharmaceutical chemicals, dyes, and organic chemicals.

COLLOIDAL FUEL, "FLUID COAL," COKING, MARKED FOR INCREASE

While gazing on coal horizons which, measured in time, may be 1 or 10 years distant, coal producers should not neglect to observe the events of the moment. They must not fail to take cognizance of what obviously will occur as soon as hostilities cease. They should study changes, accomplished or inevitable, with respect to the probable impact upon their business.

One immediate consequence of the war is of vast importance to the whole bituminous coal and related industries. This is the enforced conversion from fuel oil to coal, especially by large industrial consumers. There can be very little doubt that this conversion will be, for the most part, permanent. Thereby, the coal industry will regain much of the business it has lost to competing fuels since the days when it furnished 90 percent of the Nation's fuel and energy and the other 10 percent came chiefly from water power and wood.

There are two compelling reasons for this belief. First is the rapid decline of petroleum resources. Lacking vast newly discovered oil resources here or great importations of cheap foreign oil, it is not to be presumed that smart businessmen forced to convert to coal because of a lack of oil will court the possibility of repeating this sad experience within a few years. No matter from what source we derive our oil and liquid fuels, there always will remain a heavy residual oil which can be burned economically under boilers. But will there be enough to go around? One bit of concrete evidence that big industrialists intend to be prepared for all fuel emergencies is the increase in installations of dual fuel plants. These are constructed so that they may consume either coal or oil, whichever may be cheaper or more readily available.

The second reason for believing that conversion to coal will be more or less permanent, regardless of the possibility of new petroleum discoveries, is the huge cost of conversions. In the larger plants it must be calculated in tens of thousands and sometimes in hundreds of thousands of dollars. I do not have a price list handy, but I recall that several years ago a large utility company installed four new underfeed stokers at a cost in excess of $600,000. When you spend money like that you usually keep what you get as long as it is serviceable.

Because their power plants were engineered exclusively for the use of fuel oil, some large industries are finding it impossible to convert to coal, short of tearing down their works and building them over again. These have turned to an investigation of colloidal fuel. This is a mixture of oil and coal suitable for use in oil-burning industrial furnaces.

In weighing the value of coal hydrogenation we must take into account the economic advantages which may result from producing in a single plant such a range of products as gasoline, oil, raw material for rubber, plastics, explosives, pharmaceutical chemicals, dyes, and organic chemicals.

Colloidal fuel was the subject of an intensive study as long ago as 1917 and 1918. Its use appears to solve some of the consumer's problems although it adds several. In installations where the mixture can be used without seriously reducing the boiler rating it can be the means of saving as much as 30 percent in oil. This would result in the conservation of scarce fuel, but it would not lower the cost of operation.

The costs of pulverizing coal fine enough, treating the mixture to render it stable, or installing mechanical contrivances to keep it mixed raises the price to a figure comparable to oil. However, colloidal fuel may be a godsend to plants with furnaces having a limited combustion space and passage for gases, and no provision for ash disposal. These conditions would make the use of solid fuel difficult, if not impossible, without rebuilding the furnaces.

To these industrial markets recaptured gratuitously by the coal industry because of circumstances, research has added and is adding others. Research long ago demonstrated the possibility of using so-called fluid coal. This is coal finely pulverized at a central plant and blown to various furnaces by air pressure. It can be circulated about plants in pipes which can be tapped wherever the fuel is needed, just as oil pipes can be tapped.

The use of so-called fluid coal in the past has been confined largely to big utilities. Its wider adoption by industry probably has been retarded by several circumstances. First, oil was cheap and seemingly plentiful. Second, it is necessary to guard against explosions when using finely pulverized coal. Third, complex machinery and trained crews are needed to handle it. Industrial consumers, unquestionaly, will turn in greatly increased numbers to this form of fuel whenever needed machinery for its preparation and use is available.

The feasibility of using powdered coal in metallurgical processes has been demonstrated fully. It is being used instead of oil or gas in many heat-treating and billet-heating furnaces. Another war-induced development of the moment, the repercussions of which will be felt in the immediate future, is the program fostered by the Coordinator of Solid Fuels for War and the Bureau of Mines, looking toward a higher grade of more uniform coke.

Coal and lignite are found in more than 30 of our 48 States. By locating properly our future hydrogenation plants we can solve the transportation problem by producing liquid fuels within easy distances of the places of their consumption.

It has been estimated that 100-percent participation in this program by all byproduct coke ovens would result in an average increase of about 50 tons of pig iron a day per blast furnace in operation in this country. One phase of this program which will be of service to the coal industry is the careful study being made to determine the location and properties of coking coals in the United States. The fear that industries depending on coke may migrate soon because of the exhaustion of good coking coals in the East appears groundless, at least for the present.

It is true that many of our long-worked deposits of high-grade coking coal are beginning to run short. However, there are still unopened many deposits of good coking coal in eastern Kentucky, West Virginia, and even in parts of Pennsylvania. And we still indulge in the wasteful practice of sending good coking coal to steam plants.

In the pursuit of our better-coke program we are encouraging the installation of washing apparatus at mines to reduce the sulphur and ash content of the coal, as well as to keep sulphur and ash uniform. Installed as a war measure, the washers unquestionably will continue to operate in the ensuing period of peace.

This program likewise includes selective methods of mining so that high sulphur and ash coal will be loaded and brought out separately from the coal better suited for coking. Technicians are encouraging storing and mixing methods which lead to more uniform coke. They are advocating revised means of loading coke ovens to obtain uniform bulk density. They are suggesting ways of charging ovens to get uniform sizes of product and provide maximum wind passage to obtain higher production. At the end of the war these improved practices should have become part of a superior technique in common use throughout the coke industry. As the war-created demand for steel lessens, it is almost certain that most of the beehive ovens will again close down. However, there is a strong possibility that byproduct ovens can be operated close to their present rate of production as the result of the improved methods of operation.

I foresee this possibility because of two present trends. The increasing use of plastics, the growth of synthetic-rubber manufacture, and similar developments are likely to create a demand for all of the byproducts which can be made available from coal carbonization until that process, on a commercial basis, results in the production of far more and cheaper tar acids and other byproducts. It is wholly within the realm of probability that the production of byproducts will, for a time, assume primary importance, while the production of coke takes a secondary role.

A second reason for believing that the demand for coke may remain firm after the war stems from the conversion from oil to coal, both by large industrial users and by domestic consumers. Wholesale conversion is bound to be followed by smoke ordinances such as that pioneered by St. Louis, which the city has been able to maintain despite attacks based on wartime expediency. Even where smoke ordinances are lacking, it is sound business for soft-coal producers to encourage the elimination of smoke. Atmospheric pollution, dirt, and grime associated with bituminous-coal combustion originally led many consumers to abandon its use and turn to a cleaner fuel.

There are two avenues of approach to the problem of smoke elimination. One is to burn a fuel which is actually smokeless. Coke made by the improved methods being adopted as wartime measures certainly is such a fuel. When the need for war goods is ended, releasing supplies of coke, it is wholly possible that the demand will remain at a high level to meet the requirements of both domestic and industrial consumers for smokeless fuel. The second method by which the same end can be achieved is to burn bituminous coal in apparatus properly designed and engineered for smokeless combustion. Improved equipment for smokeless combustion, new types of automatic stokers, and even hand-fed stoves designed to burn bituminous coal smokelessly have been developed recently. Priorities have kept them off of the market. They will sweep onto the market just as soon as materials for

their manufacture are released. Consumers will be delighted to learn that they can heat or generate power as cleanly and as conveniently as was possible with oil fuel.

COAL PREPARED FOR THE FUTURE BY STABILIZATION MEASURES

I have dwelt at some length upon the more distant horizons of the coal industry, but one might well ask: "What about the prospects for the more immediate future—that period of readjustment and reconstruction that will follow the termination of the fighting?" Well do many of those still in the industry who lived through the period following the First World War remember what happened then. In that period there was a brief artificial prosperity for the coal industry due to shortages of coal brought about by shortages of railroad equipment and disturbances in the mining and transportation industries. Prices of coal skyrocketed to as high as $20 per ton in some instances. The price-peak period, from 1920 to 1922, was followed by a sharp increase in mine-production capacity. Investors, attracted by the high prices for coal, expanded mining capacity as manpower and materials became available.

During the time when industries were being converted from war manufacture to peacetime operations, the consumption of fuel decreased. But, when the reconverted industries again began to turn out civilian goods, the consumption of fuel increased. Bituminous coal did not participate in that rising fuel market. Competitive fuels increased, while the consumption of coal decreased, relatively, partly because of the competition of other fuels and partly because of increased efficiency in the use of coal.

It is my opinion that coal requirements will remain at high levels during the many years of peace once we have reconstructed our economy on a peacetime basis.

This situation ushered in an era of destructive competition in which producers fought for survival, with price-cutting and other undesirable practices as their principal weapons. These conditions brought near-ruin to the industry, resulted in great losses of investments, bred differences between labor and management and created one of the Nation's most difficult economic problems. For 15 years prior to 1940, the industry suffered a net loss every year, ranging from about $7,500,000 to about $51,000,000 per annum. Permanent relief was not found until the establishment of minimum prices and marketing rules and regulations by the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior under the Bituminous Coal Act on October 1, 1940.

In view of this precedent, what can we reasonably expect to befall the industry at the conclusion of this war? Will it again be confronted by the evils of excess capacity and be torn by a savage competitive war for sales?

We may expect at least a brief slump in fuel requirements during the readjustment period that will follow this war. But I think I can frankly state that the industry has in the Bituminous Coal Act a very effective barrier against recurrence, in the post-war readjustment period, of the demoralization that followed World War No. 1. However large or small this slump may be and however long it may continue, the industry should fare far better than it did the last time.

The need for market stabilization, even in times of rising coal requirements, has been demonstrated. Seasonal effects upon the coal market, lack of balance between the sale of the different sizes of coals, and other characteristics peculiar to the coal industry create problems even during times of increased coal requirements. These problems have a ready solution in the stabilizing effect of the minimum prices and marketing rules and regulations established under the Coal Act.

Every major coal-producing nation in the world has been faced with these problems. In each one government action has been necessary. Other countries have subsidized the operators, nationalized the industry, or regimented it into a creature of the state.

The horizon of the coal industry in the United States is brightened by the fact that we have found a way to deal with its problems in a democratic American way. We shall not have to follow the course of these other nations. By relieving the markets of burdensome practices and through cooperative effort by the industry and the Government, the Coal Act affords a means of enabling producers to compete in a fair and orderly manner.

It is quite unlikely that enough mine machinery can be manufactured during the war to supply the requirements of the industry. Consequently when the war is over we may anticipate machinery installations running into millions of dollars.

The coal industry should be able to come through the readjustment period after this war in a sound condition, ready to take up its responsibilities for providing the fuel to regain our prosperity and improve the American standard of living.

This unquestionably will be a longer war as it is a greatly vaster one than the last. Its requirements in materials dwarf almost to insignificance the output of 1917 and 1918. To meet them, the production of civilian goods has been scaled down to a point never approached in World War No. 1 and the end is not yet here.

When we finally nail Hitler's hide on the coal-shed door to dry, we shall need tons upon tons of everything. There will be a tremendous market for the many things that we shall require—automobiles, structural steel, typewriters, electric refrigerators, homes, buses, mine machinery, and a hundred thousand other products. It is quite unlikely that enough mine machinery can be manufactured during the war to supply the requirements of the industry. Consequently, when the war is over we may anticipate machinery installations running into millions of dollars.

An immense quantity of fuel and energy will be required to produce these needed civilian goods. You can safely bet your No. 2 ration book that coal this time will furnish its fair share of that fuel and energy. Petroleum cannot be expected to push it into a back seat as it did before.

It is my opinion that our coal requirements will remain at high levels during many years of peace once we have reconstructed our economy on a peacetime basis. Later on, the need for coal to make more and more liquid fuels to supplement growing petroleum deficiencies will lend strength to the market.

What is the capacity of our bituminous coal reserves to bear this new load? Our reserves are estimated at 3.2 trillion tons, half of which is low grade.

The vastness of our coal reserves is no excuse for waste. In normal times approximately 35 percent of the soft coal is wasted in mining. This is due to the fact that it has never paid to attempt to recover all of the coal within a vein. During the war, coal is being mined at a rate far higher than normal. It is a natural assumption that waste has been increased with haste. Consequently the war should be followed immediately by a major drive to cut down waste. In this drive producer and labor associations and organizations and Government agencies should cooperate. It should be accompanied by intensive research, investigation, and education. Special studies should be made of mechanical mining, having as their objective the development of techniques or new equipment to obtain maximum recovery.

Such a campaign necessarily will add to the pent-up demand for more and better cleaning plants which will be released after the war.

To me, the future of the coal industry looks brighter than its past. It can be made still better by continued research in many fields. Until this research has been accomplished it remains true, as H. H. Lowry, director of the Coal Research Laboratory, Carnegie Institute of Technology, once declared: "The producer of coal does not know the value of the product he sells nor the consumer the worth of the material he buys."

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House, there is presented herewith the seventh installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money.

In considering the issue under discussion in this debate, we must not lose sight of the fundamental principle of economics that any money to be stable in value and purchasing power must increase evenly with the growth of population and commerce which averages around 3 percent annually.

In this connection we find that the production of gold and silver taken together and used as money at their natural ratio will increase the annual supply at the average rate of 3 percent.

The use of these two metals as money is the only plan that has ever been devised to supply the required volume of basic money—a principle that few of the bimetallists of the past generation took the trouble to explain. The use of other metals as money has been suggested, sometimes in derision; copper, which would far exceed the required 3 percent, or platinum, which on account of its scarcity would fall far too short.

By discarding silver and using gold alone as basic money, the deficiency in the required 3 percent annual increase in the money volume has been supplied since the demonetization of silver by the use of bank-credit currency in the form of paper money. This money system, when supported by public confidence, has been made to work under favorable conditions only to crash and cause a financial depression in times of business adversity.

The seventh installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

On the 7th of December 1892, the Secretary of the Treasury addressed the following letter to me in answer to a letter of mine to him:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 7, 1892.

Hon. H. M. TELLER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SIR: I have your favor of December 7. I beg to inform you that silver dollars are not in law or in practice exchanged for gold or for paper that calls for gold.

Very respectfully yours,

CHAS. FOSTER.

To that I have nothing to add, except the statement that I was recently informed by the Secretary that the same practice prevailed, of paying the silver certificates only in silver dollars, not in gold.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the Senator mean the present Secretary?

Mr. TELLER. Not the present Secretary. I have never conversed with the Secretary on the subject, and know nothing about what he may think on the subject.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The Senator from Missouri on my right, Mr. Vest, will please note that in the letter which he has read from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Treasury does not recognize the silver certificates as an obligation of the Government. The Government coins money; it coins silver dollars. The Government does not redeem its coins, unless it may be to call them in for abrasion or something of that character. For the convenience of the people of this country it issues a certificate which stands before the coin dollar, and does serve us as money. The certificate calls for its own redeemer under the law. It may be surrendered at the Treasury, and the Government is obligated to pay to the holder a silver dollar in exchange for his certificate issued. It is not an obligation of the Government in the sense used in the letter, and as distinguished from the obligation of the Government based upon the deposit of bullion and the bullion certificate.

Mr. VEST. I should like to see where that is stated in the letter from which I have read.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The law states it for itself. The law makes no obligation upon the Treasury to redeem a silver certificate in gold. The Government itself proposes to accept the silver dollar and the coined dollar for all debts, obligations, taxes, revenue, and everything due to it. The Treasury of the United States redeems them every day through the customhouse. They are received in New York for customs dues; they come to the Treasury, and the Treasury redeems them. That is the redemption which the Treasurer of the United States gives the silver dollar or the silver certificate; but in the sense employed by Secretary Carlisle, he does not treat it as an obligation of the Government; that is, as he treats Treasury notes, of which he was speaking in the same letter.

Mr. VEST. We have had a great many surprises in this debate, but I must confess that this confession is the most surprising of all. I rather think when the Senator from New Jersey convinces the people of the United States, and especially the capitalists of New York and elsewhere, that the silver certificates are not an obligation of this Government, he will find them rapidly discredited.

What is an obligation of this Government? It is a promise to do something; it is obligatory on the Government to do something. What is a silver certificate? It says that the Government of the United States shall pay a certain amount of standard money, silver dollars, to the holder of that certificate. Is not that an obligation of this Government? Upon whom rests any obligation at all as to silver certificates, if not on the Government of the United States?

More than that. If it did not interrupt my colleague too much, I could go on and read from Mr. Carlisle to show his argument that all these silver certificates rest upon so much gold. Again and again the New York newspapers and all the advocates of the policy which the Senator from New Jersey has been so conspicuous in urging upon us have claimed that one defect, and one great defect, in our system was that we had an enormous pyramid of silver resting upon a small pedestal of gold. If the silver certificates are not part of that pyramid, I confess that I am enlightened to a very large extent.

Mr. MCPHERSON. If the Senator from Missouri on my left, Mr. Cockrell, will bear with me a moment, I want the Senator from Missouri on my right, Mr. Vest, to understand that I contend that the Government of the United States is impliedly bound to keep every obligation of this Government, gold, silver, certificates, and all, I do not care what they may be in coin or paper, on a parity with gold.

Mr. VEST. That is all of it.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I was speaking of the Secretary's letter, and I say there is no law which will require the Secretary to redeem that obligation. What is it? Let us read it:

"This certifies that there has been deposited in the Treasury of the United States one silver dollar, payable to the bearer on demand."

How payable? The law steps in and tells you that the holder of that silver certificate is entitled to a silver dollar at the Treasury of the United States or at a subtreasury of the United States. It is nothing more nor less than a warehouse receipt, under the law. Therefore, I say that the Secretary of the Treasury in the letter from which the Senator read, unquestionably, in speaking of the obligations of the Government, did not treat the silver certificate as an obligation of the Government which it was required to redeem in gold, under the law.

Mr. VEST. I differ with the Senator as to what the Secretary of the Treasury means. I think, upon asking the Secretary, the Senator will find that the Secretary did include the certificates.

I should like to ask the Senator another question as to a higher authority than the Secretary of the Treasury. I ask him if the President of the United States, 5 months ago, did not state further that every obligation of this Government and every dollar issued by it of every description should be payable in the coin demanded by the holder?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I do not recall the exact language. If the Senator has the letter of the President and has quoted the exact language, I should like to see it. I assume that the President of the United States gave utterance to some such declaration, but I want the Senator to understand that the contention I make in this matter—and I presume it is the same contention made by the President, because I do not think I differ very much with the President in regard to these matters—is that every obligation of this Government in the form of money of whatever nature or character, be it silver dollars or paper dollars, it is the duty of this Government to maintain upon a parity with the very best money of the world.

Mr. VEST. The Senator is unquestionably clear enough upon that point. I think, too, the President has been clear enough upon it. I am not attacking the sincerity of the Senator, or the President, or the integrity of their intentions in that regard at all. It has passed into current political and financial history that for a time the impression prevailed in the city of New York amongst the speculators and capitalists that if Mr. Carlisle, the Secretary of the Treasury, reached his $100,000,000 reserve, as it is called, which is the proceeds of the sale of bonds under the act of 1875, to make good the use of greenbacks, he would then refuse to pay gold except upon greenbacks or gold certificates.

The stock market fell from 6 to 10 points under that rumor. It was believed in New York that the subtreasurer, Mr. Jordan, had received instructions not to pay out any gold except upon greenbacks after that reserve was reached; and it is notorious that this became a subject of discussion in the Cabinet, and that 20 minutes after 2 o'clock on that eventful day Mr. Carlisle telegraphed to the subtreasurer to pay out the gold. At any rate, if I am inaccurate as to details, the New York capitalists held that every obligation of this Government, including silver certificates, would be paid in gold. I was therefore most profoundly astonished to hear from the Senator from Colorado, Mr. Teller, this afternoon that the Treasury Department had informed him by implication that that was not the policy of this Government.

Mr. TELLER. I did not say that the Treasurer said it was not the policy of the Government. I simply asked him if the Department was redeeming silver certificates in gold. Here is the question—and there is no use of evading it—suppose I go to the subtreasury or to the Treasury here in the city of Washington tomorrow, present a silver certificate, and demand gold, would it be paid in gold or not? Without undertaking to answer for the Administration—for I have no right to do so—I have no question that it would, or else the declaration of Mr. Cleveland as President, in which he declared that every obligation of this Government would be paid in gold, would be negatived. I have no idea that the Treasury would take refuge behind the construction that we hear today for the first time from the Senator from New Jersey, that silver certificates are not obligations of this Government.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I assume that the Senator from Missouri has no disposition to do me an injustice in the broad statement he has made.

Mr. VEST. Not the slightest.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I think he has not quoted me exactly correct. I do say—at least if I did not so say, I intended to say—that a silver certificate was not an obligation of this Government, in the sense in which Mr. Carlisle was speaking of it in his letter, nor was it an obligation of this Government in the sense that the Treasury was compelled to redeem it in gold.

Mr. PALMER. If the Senator from Missouri will allow me to proceed for a moment, perhaps he may be able to give me the information I am seeking.

Mr. COCKRELL. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PALMER. I find in the report from the Treasury on the 1st day of October that there was in circulation of silver certificates $326,849,827. I have believed that they were a part of the Government's indebtedness, which was redeemable at the Treasury and payable in gold. Now, I wish to ask if any Senator will furnish me the information, whether it is true that there is in circulation now $324,955,134 which is understood to be redeemable in silver—I mean according to the practice of the Department—or whether it is not the practice of the Treasury to treat the silver certificates as a part of the indebtedness to be provided for in gold? I ask for information.

Mr. COCKRELL. To what does the Senator refer?

Mr. PALMER. In circulation, $324,955,134.

Mr. COCKRELL. Those were silver certificates issued under the Bland law, which I will read.

Mr. PALMER. Without discussing the question, I desire to ask the Senator, with his permission, for specific information, whether that amount is regarded by the Treasury Department as redeemable in silver?

Mr. COCKRELL. I cannot speak for the Treasury Department. I know that for every dollar of these silver certificates outstanding there is a coin dollar in the Treasury of the United States, and I was astonished when informed by my colleague that those certificates had been redeemed in gold.

Mr. PALMER. The Senator from New Jersey referred to the $324,000,000 a moment ago, but, as a matter of fact, I desire to know whether it is true that that amount is regarded by the Treasury as so far distinct from other Government issues, that the other

Government issues are redeemable in gold while this amount is redeemable in silver?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Allow me to answer the Senator in this way; in practice, yes. The Treasury maintains a parity. Under the law there is no requirement upon the Treasury to redeem the silver certificates in gold or to redeem them in anything except the standard silver dollars which are in the Treasury for the purpose of making those redemptions upon demand. The Sherman law, as the Senator is aware, does provide for the parity to be maintained as between the two metals. Prior to the passage of the Sherman law there was never any obligation, as I understand, on the part of the Government as to silver issues that should be redeemed in gold.

Mr. PALMER. The Senator does not quite meet my question, whether, as a matter of fact and practice, this amount of $324,000,000 in silver certificates is treated as redeemable by the Treasury.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I repeat, practically, yes; as a matter of law, no.

Mr. TELLER rose.

Mr. COCKRELL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado to offer a resolution.

Mr. TELLER. I ask to offer a resolution in order to settle the question whether the Government is redeeming in gold or not. I will read it because I think I can read it better than it can be read at the desk:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether silver dollars or silver-coin certificates have been redeemed or exchanged for gold or paper that are by law or practice of the Government redeemable in gold."

I desire to ascertain whether they have been exchanged for gold, or greenbacks, or Treasury notes.

Mr MCPHERSON. The Senator ought to say "redeemed by the Treasury." He has not stated that.

Mr. VEST. I will state to the Senator from Colorado that that does not exactly meet the point which we are discussing. I understand that the Treasury has already informed him that they have not redeemed silver certificates. The point I should like to be informed about is whether the holder of a silver certificate can obtain gold upon it now, under existing laws, from the Treasury.

Mr. VANCE. I desire to remind Senators of the fact that a few weeks ago the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Jones, introduced a resolution calling upon the Secretary of the Treasury to say whether or not applications which had been made at the Treasury for silver had been refused; and if so, why. My recollection is that the answer of the Secretary of the Treasury was that there had been applications made, which had been refused for the reason that the silver in the Treasury by law was required to redeem the certificates outstanding against it. Perhaps some Senator may remember when that was, and remember correctly if I have erred in my statement.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator is correct about that. The answer was made, and it is printed as a document, to the effect that the Department had not issued silver certificates in exchange for gold because the silver in the Treasury was required to meet the silver certificates outstanding.

Let the resolution offered by the Senator from Colorado be passed.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Colorado, before the resolution is acted upon, to a fact which seems very apparent to everybody, and that is, since the present administration came into power—and I assume that this is addressed to the present Secretary and to his administration——

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. MCPHERSON. There had been then no free gold in the Treasury, and the Secretary was working upon the reserve. Therefore, if it had been the practical policy of this Government in the past, say, during the former administration, when there was an abundance of gold to do it, I assume that that ought to be brought out by the resolution, because I take it that since this administration came into power there has been no gold whatever with which to redeem any silver.

Mr. TELLER. We have in the neighborhood of $100,000,000 of gold. It ran down, I believe, to $92,000,000, but has not been below that.

Mr. VEST. We have had free gold in the Treasury within the last 3 weeks.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly. I now ask for the present consideration of this resolution as I have modified it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read as modified.

The Secretary read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate whether silver dollars or silver-coin certificates have been redeemed by the Treasury Department or exchanged for gold or paper that are by law or the practice of the Government redeemable in gold."

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I have passed in review the legislation up to the act of July 14, 1890. I come now to the question, What is proposed to be done by the pending bill? Let me give its history.

House bill No. 1, to repeal a part of the act of July 14, 1890. In the House of Representatives August 28, 1893, on the free-coinage amendment at present ratio the yeas were 124—100 Democrats, 13 Republicans, 11 Populists; nays 227—116 Democrats, 111 Republicans. On free coinage at 20 to 1—yeas 122; nays 222. On the restoration of the Bland-Allison law, yeas 136—110 Democrats, 15 Republicans, 11 Populists; nays 213—103 Democrats, 110 Republicans. On the final passage, years 240—139 Democrats, 101 Republicans; nays 110—76 Democrats, 23 Republicans, 11 Populists.

In the Senate August 28, 1893, House bill No. 1, referred to the Finance Committee; August 28, 1893, reported by Mr. Voorhees with an amendment substituting Senate bill 570. This report of the substitute by Mr. Voorhees represents the majority of the Finance Committee of the Senate, composed of 11 Senators—6 Democrats and 5 Republicans—and is favored by 2 Democrats (Messrs. Voorhees and McPherson) and 4 Republicans (Messrs. Morrill, Sherman, Allison, and Aldrich), and is opposed by the minority, 4 Democrats (Messrs. Harris, Vance, Vest, and Jones of Arkansas) and by 1 Republican (Jones of Nevada).

The bill proposes the repeal of the clauses of the law of July 14, 1890, authorizing the purchase of silver bullion and the issue of United States Treasury notes for its purchase, and declares our policy to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts; and further declares that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetalism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States in the markets and in the payment of debts.

Assistance to Servicemen and Servicewomen When the War Is Over—They Should Be Encouraged To Engage in Local Business With Government Aid If Necessary—Also They Should Be Encouraged Now To Save Their Money in Hope of Using It for Such Good Purpose When War Is Over and at the Same Time Retard Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, winning the war is the first consideration. This is an assured fact in the near future or whenever it takes place. The next important thing to be considered is to do everything possible for the servicemen who will make this victory possible. With this in mind, I am looking forward to the post-war period to give these servicemen an opportunity to enter business when they return to their respective homes.

There will be many buildings over the United States constructed with Government money. These should be utilized in every way possible to give these champions of freedom an opportunity to be free themselves in the future. These plants can be used for that purpose.

For illustration, individually these servicemen should be given a well-earned chance to be independent with a business of their own. Aside from this, some of these servicemen, who have worked up a companionship with their buddies on the front, should be given an opportunity to pool their efforts on even a larger scale. They could pool their funds and, in addition, should be assisted in getting credit at commercial banks with certain Government guaranty to help them embark in any business for which they are best fitted.

There possibly will be a receiver appointed for all Government property used in the war effort at the end of the war. Plans could be worked out to cooperate with local people in an effort to use Government-owned property, machines, and tools and also land to assist these discharged servicemen.

These servicemen will naturally want to go back to their own homes and they should, in every way possible, be provided with an opportunity to enter a business of their liking. The additional effect of a policy of this kind would also aid in developing the country on an area basis.

There are many plants now being used for manufacture of war material located in territory heretofore devoid of such businesses. These should be utilized to the fullest extent. Another advantage of this would be to encourage greater decentralization development and to di-

versify opportunities. At the same time, this will also prevent Government ownership and monopoly.

Following the last war, Germany, which did many crazy things, also did some that were constructive. At the end of the last war in that country, a concern employing 100 or more people was required to give employment to at least 1 percent of its personnel to those who fought in that war. Those incapacitated in certain ways by the loss of a foot or leg or an eye were given jobs which they could readily perform.

Our country must be rehabilitated in a sense by continuing to share opportunity and work. This can only come through a continued wide diversification of opportunities in order to use to the fullest extent the buildings, grounds, machinery, and tools that can be adapted to the production of civilian goods.

With Government help, credit can be arranged for these returning servicemen so that they will be able to get the needed money to enter business in their own right. This money could be guaranteed in the same way that banks are secured under the Housing Act and through Commodity Credit loans.

This is an obligation due to servicemen and everything possible should be done to encourage them for the excellent victory they will have won against oppression and dictatorship.

ENCOURAGE SAVINGS AND PREVENT INFLATION

In order to prevent inflation, it is necessary to hold down excessive purchasing power. One of the best ways to prevent inflation is to encourage a policy that will cause people to save their money rather than spend it. If the millions of servicemen are informed of a definite program now that our Government has for their relief when the war is over, which can be taken advantage of in a more substantial way if they have money to invest, they will now be encouraged to save their money rather than spend it. It helps our Government in the war just as much for a serviceman to save $100 as to invest $100 in Government bonds. Last December, Public Law No. 813 was enacted. It was signed by the President December 18, 1942. It provides that servicemen may deposit any amounts of money in multiples of $5 or more with the Government and receive 4 percent interest on this money if the money is not withdrawn within 6 months. In other words, if it is deposited more than 6 months, 4 percent interest is paid, but the serviceman may withdraw it any time he chooses, but no interest will be paid if it has not been on deposit more than 6 months.

It occurs to me that if the servicemen have a program mapped out for them at an early date that will convince them that they will have business opportunities offered to them for consideration with the help of the Government when this war is over, they will thereby be encouraged to save their money and use it to such a fine advantage when peace comes.

War in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, on April 28, last evening, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] delivered an address along the lines of the speech which he made in the Senate on April 16, to which reference has been made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow countrymen, I am privileged to speak to you tonight on a subject that is very near my heart, and is also near to the heart of the American people. I want to express my gratitude to the Evening Star's radio station, and to Mr. Lothrop Stoddard, my host upon this occasion, for the opportunity to discuss with you the importance to us of the war in the Pacific.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs since 1939, I have viewed with considerable alarm the growing strength of the Japanese and our failure to recognize them as a serious threat, a definite menace to our country.

Repeated warnings by General MacArthur; by General Kenney, chief of our air forces in the Pacific; by Dr. Evatt, Australian Minister of External Affairs; and by our beloved friend, Emanuel Quezon, President of the Philippine Commonwealth, as to the gravity of the situation confronting the Allied forces in Australia and in the Pacific, can no longer be ignored.

I speak to you as a strong supporter of the armed services of the country. Upon no occasion, either before Pearl Harbor or since, have I failed to support adequate preparedness and vigorous conduct of the war by our Government. As a Senator of the United States I feel very greatly my responsibility to all the people of the country, and I would not feel that I had performed my full duty to my people if I failed to make known to them a dangerous situation which I feel needs the very urgent attention of the Government of the United States.

From a military point of view there are today two important war sectors in the Pacific. One represents the heavy Japanese concentrations north of Australia and has produced a direct threat to that continent. The other is the continued presence of the Japanese on the islands of Kiska and Attu in the Aleutian chain.

I shall discuss briefly both of these threats and undertake to estimate the terrible consequences of our failure to act immediately in those areas in order to prevent possible disaster.

We went to war because of the treacherous Japanese attack on the people of the United States at Pearl Harbor. Regardless of the fact that we hated Hitler and earnestly desired to help England in her struggle for freedom, all of the things that occurred before Pearl Harbor on the Atlantic side failed to convince a majority of the American people or our Government that we ought to take part in the war.

When the Japs delivered their treacherous blow, they destroyed the striking power of the Pacific Fleet and placed this country immediately on the defensive in the Pacific. Japan's great southward thrust commenced simultaneously with her attack on Pearl Harbor and the list of disasters mounted one by one—Pearl Harbor, Hong Kong, Singapore, loss of the Philippines, occupation of the Dutch East Indies, then Burma and the Shan States, and then the temporary cutting off of China from the rest of the world.

In this way within 4 months after Pearl Harbor they acquired the most compact and perhaps the wealthiest economical empire the world has ever seen. In Malaya they gained an annual output of 480,000 metric tons of rubber, 80,000 tons of tin, 1,250,000 tons of iron ore and in the Netherland East Indies and Borneo they acquired an annual output of 7,500,000 tons of petroleum and half a million tons of rubber. Instead of being a blockaded country without resources, she now possesses abundant resources and is imposing a blockade upon the United Nations.

When the President of the United States ordered MacArthur from the Philippines to Australia, it was the general understanding that MacArthur would at the earliest possible moment organize and conduct an offensive from the Commonwealth of Australia and retake the Philippines from the Japanese.

I cannot commend to you too highly the magnificent courage of Emanuel Quezon and his more than 90,000 Filipinos who fought loyally beside our own American boys in the defense of Bataan and Corregidor. Somehow, with God's help, MacArthur's hand must be strengthened to such an extent that he can carry the war to the enemy in the South Pacific.

Recently, ominous warnings have come from that direction. Estimates have been made that there are 200,000 Japanese soldiers in the ring of islands north of Australia. Fleet concentrations are near enough to produce the threat of an invasion to Australia. It seems fairly certain that MacArthur does not have a sufficient number of bombers and fighter planes to permit him to carry the fight to the enemy. It may be possible that he does not even have enough fighter and bomber planes to meet minimum requirements for holding off a possible Japanese invasion of Australia. It is cruel enough not to supply him with sufficient planes to make an offensive against the Japs in the South Pacific, but it is suicide and tragic to speculate on the safety and security of the Australian Commonwealth by failing to give him adequate air power to prevent a threatened invasion of the Commonwealth of Australia.

If we have learned anything so far in this war, we ought to have learned that you cannot win the war on the defensive. Without the power to carry the fight to the enemy, you have only one choice ultimately and that is subjugation to his wishes.

I have urged our military leaders in Washington to revise the strategy of the Pacific war to the extent that they recognize the seriousness of the Japanese menace to the people of America. It is suicide, in my opinion, to permit the Japs time to dig in in the South Pacific. If they are given this time, I fear that they will grow so strong—both economically and militarily—that the war in the Pacific may last 10 years or 20 years or may go on forever. The murder of our American flyers by the Japanese is a clear indication of the extreme cruelty and brutality of our enemies. No longer should there be any citizen of the country who fails to realize the strength, resourcefulness, and menace of our enemy in the Pacific.

The plane production in the United States has greatly improved in recent months and

we have been able to dispatch on frequent occasions thousand-plane raids over Germany. I have urged our military men in Washington to spare a few hundred of these planes for MacArthur and a few hundred of these planes for General Chennault and our willing and brave Chinese allies.

I do not undertake to minimize the difficulties involved in getting planes to China and planes to Australia, but somehow I feel that they must be gotten there and that they must be used against the enemy before it is too late. I fear that China may not be able to stay in the war another year or 2 years unless more help goes to her soon.

As far as I am informed, our Government has no assurance that we can expect any help from Russia in the war against Japan, and while I know of Mr. Churchill's declaration to help us bomb Tokyo, I also know of his speech a few weeks ago in which he at least hinted of the possibility of a partial demobilization of the British when the war in Europe is ended.

I am anxious to whip Hitler and to completely destroy every vestige of Hitlerism and what it stands for, but I would hate to see a time come when the United States would have left on its hands a war with Japan, with all of its disadvantages, and the help only of China—a gallant nation without arms.

Our strategy must be revised in the light of the present world situation. Our slogan must not only be to beat Hitler first but it must be "beat Hitler and beat Japan and strike either or both of them wherever and whenever it seems best in order to adequately secure the people of the United States from destruction."

And now may I comment on the situation in the North Pacific. The Military Affairs Committee of the Senate was so concerned with the situation in Alaska that last August they send a special committee to make an investigation of the military establishments in Alaska and in the Aleutian Islands.

Few Americans realize the tremendous size and importance of Alaska. It has 590,884 square miles and 378,000,000 acres of land. Prior to the outbreak of the second World War, we were undertaking to guard all of that tremendous Territory with two companies of American Infantry soldiers at Chilkoot Pass Barracks. We had at that time virtually no airfields or defensive installations. We moved immediately to strengthen the defenses of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands. All of you will recall the historic prophecy of Billy Mitchell, who said that he believed in the future that he who holds Alaska will hold the world. He further said that he considered it strategically the most important spot on earth.

It could be seen by a glance at the map that, by way of the Aleutians, the route from Japan to the mainland of the United States was nearly 1,400 miles shorter than the route between Japan and the United States by way of Pearl Harbor. So it is obvious that we were inviting attack against this country by way of an undefended route, 1,400 miles shorter than the route the Japs chose.

My subcommittee spent nearly the entire month of August 1942 visiting all of the important military establishments in the Northwest Territory, the Yukon country, and all the way out to Nome on the Norton Sound. We flew down into the Aleutians to the farthest advanced American base, 100 miles west of Dutch Harbor, where the Japs made their attack on June 3 and 4 last year. Military men in that area agreed that if the Japs had attacked Dutch Harbor in force in June, they would have taken that important and strategic harbor.

Failing to take Dutch Harbor, the Japs went back and landed their troops on the island of Kiska, one of the Rat group west of the Andreanofs. The taking of Dutch Harbor would, of course, have been a great calamity to the people of the United States. Dutch Harbor controls the shipping through the Unimak Pass and our supplies to Nome would have been cut off forthwith. The whole Aleutian chain west of Dutch Harbor would have fallen immediately into the hands of the Japanese. This is one of the several narrow escapes that we have had in the Pacific. At Dutch Harbor, land-based aircraft would have been approximately 2,000 miles from Seattle, and it is barely possible that our shipping to Hawaii would have been entirely cut off.

The Military Affairs Subcommittee was so tremendously impressed with the danger to the United States that the committee came hurriedly back to Washington and reported its findings directly to the President of the United States, to Admiral Leahy of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. In that report, dated September 1, 1942, the committee had the following to say, and I quote:

"The Japs are rapidly fortifying the Island of Kiska. The planes we have on the ground are reported to be slower and less maneuverable than the Jap Zeros. The longer we delay offensive action against them, the more expensive it is going to be in men and material to dislodge them. There is no question in our judgment of the extreme importance of the Alaskan territory and Siberia as strategic points to any offensive against Japan, and likewise for Japan to use against us. The situation there is in the opinion of the committee bad, but can be remedied very quickly and effectively by the addition of troops, planes, and equipment. Certain minimum additions are suggested."

This statement was contained in a secret report made 8 months ago. During the 8 months which have elapsed, for some reason—I know not why—we have not been able to dislodge the Japanese from Kiska. They are still there. So long as they remain there, they are a menace to all the people of the United States. The failure to dislodge them has made the job harder. The Japs have dug in. They have nearly completed a fighter strip on the island of Kiska and a bomber strip is nearing completion on the Island of Attu. When these strips are completed—if they are—land-based aircraft can come by short hops all the way from Tokyo to these islands and they would not be more than 2,600 or 2,700 miles from Seattle. Recent reports from our flyers say that we could bomb them until doomsday and that the bombing would have very little effect upon their hold on these two important places. They have collected material, men, equipment, and planes, and have established themselves to the extent that it is now believed—as the committee stated 8 months ago—that it will be very costly to us in men and materials to dislodge them.

I should like for every citizen of the country to realize the gravity of this situation. I feel that he would want to lift up his voice or say a prayer that our military men will see this dreadful menace before it is too late. A recent book, Bushido, written by Alexander Pernekof, details what happens to a people when the Japanese military takes control. The lights go out. The civilization which we have known disappears. The peoples that they conquer undergo extreme cruelty and brutality. It is the story of the puppet state of Manchukuo—it is the story of Singapore—it is the story of the Philippines—and unless we are wide-awake, vigilant, and determined, it could be the story of the Aleutians, of Alaska, and of the Pacific Northwest.

I am deeply concerned over this situation, and I am anxious that the officials of the Government and our military men realize fully the importance of the war in the Pacific. I fear they do not at present realize its seriousness. They have never counted it a major war, in my opinion, and we shall never succeed in overcoming this frightful enemy until we take into account the fact that he is a powerful, resourceful, and relentless foe.

I know that those of you who have given sons and daughters in this cause and whose sacrifices are great, and whose heartaches are real, want our country to give its attention to this dreadful menace. I know that those of you who still have sons on the firing line want those sons supported in such a way that the ultimate victory will not be too long delayed and not be too costly in American lives.

I appeal to you not only to say a prayer, but to use your influence with your Representatives in the Government, to make them in some way aware of the danger which the country faces from the Pacific.

I have not spoken to you as a military strategist. I have spoken to you as one of your fellow citizens, one of your humble servants, earnestly anxious to apprise you of dangers about which I fear all of you do not know.

May He who holds the destiny of all of us in the hollow of His hand strengthen and sustain the hands of those noble sons of ours who carry on this bitter, cruel war. It was not a war of their choosing. May the God of Providence save many of them from the wrathful fury of the god of war, and may the perpetual light of God's sunshine be always upon those who, in the cause of freedom, again give their all so that another generation may live.

The Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem entitled "The Farmer" written by Mrs. Barbara Whitney, of Washington, D. C., and published in the Washington Post of April 28, 1943.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be published in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER

(1943)

This is his golden shield, this is his saber,
Raised in a battlefield, lifted with labor,
Drawn on a deadly foe who would enslave us!
(Farmer, your corn will grow spears that can save us).
Manned is the trenchant plow, soil turned for sowing,
Hard on a tired brow spring's promise blowing.
Soldier—through mud and storm, lantern outswinging,
Down the dark path the warm pails of milk bringing.
Marshal of mind and brawn—planner of reaping—
Up at the gray of dawn, late vigil keeping
Night's starry flag unfurled over barned cattle,
He who must feed the world charting his battle!
Wheat will be golden soon! Buckler and saber!
God of the harvest moon, prosper this labor!

—*Barbara Whitney.*

The Silver Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there has just been placed in the hands of Congress a proposal to lease-lend silver to Great Britain.

As the principal beneficiary of our Government lease-lend program, England has for sometime been endeavoring to get a large quantity of free silver from this Government, as stated on several occasions by the Secretary of the Treasury. They now boldly propose to take our silver and coin it into money for their own use. A use that our Government, for some unexplained reason, has steadfastly refused to make of this silver, we now propose to give to Great Britain—surplus silver, bought and paid for by the people who accepted silver certificates at face value in exchange with the Government for their goods and services.

This is the same silver we were told only recently that was indispensable for use in our war industry. It now develops, according to the memorandum of the proposal submitted to Congress by the Lease-Lend Administration, this silver is not needed, as stated in paragraph 7, which I quote:

> According to the War Production Board, not all the billion ounces of Treasury free silver committed to the Defense Plant Corportation is tied up, and sufficient silver is available to meet the British request.

For the information of the Members of the House there is inserted here a copy of the proposal of the Lease-Lend Administration to transfer silver to Great Britain:

PROPOSAL TO LEND-LEASE SILVER TO GREAT BRITAIN

1. It is proposed that about three and one-fourth million ounces of free silver from the Treasury stock be lend-leased to Great Britain.

2. The British have stated that they urgently need a total of 5,000,000 ounces of silver by the 1st of June. Two million ounces of this silver are needed early in April.

3. The Treasury has certified that the British request for silver is a reasonable one. One-third of the silver is needed for essential war industry requirements and two-thirds for coinage (domestic and overseas).

4. Mr. Batt, of the Combined Raw Materials Board, has stated that not more than one and three-fourths million ounces can be obtained from Canada and the remaining three and one-fourth million ounces must come from the United States or Mexico.

5. The position of the War Production Board is that the newly mined silver situation, domestic and foreign, is too tight to permit the United States or Mexico to furnish three and one-fourth million ounces of such silver to Great Britain. Metals Reserve Company has a stock pile of silver of only two and six-tenths million ounces.

6. Treasury free silver not committed to the Defense Plant Corporation for nonconsumptive domestic uses is needed by the Treasury for future domestic coinage needs.

7. According to the War Production Board not all of the 1,000,000,000 ounces of Treasury free silver committed to the Defense Plant Corporation is tied up, and sufficient silver is available to meet the British request.

8. Metals Reserve will make 2,000,000 ounces of silver available from its stock pile of silver within 30 days provided that it is assured that the silver will be replaced from silver subsequently obtained for lend-lease purposes.

9. The British are willing to agree to return an equivalent number of ounces of silver at the end of the war.

Remember Great Britain, until recently, has been producing 70 percent of the world's gold supply and has now in South Africa alone, according to figures that can be obtained from the Bureau of Mines, a proven gold reserve of 400,000,000 ounces of gold yet to be mined—400,000,000 ounces of gold on which we have set a price of $35 per ounce.

What is Great Britain doing about silver in her dependencies? At the very time she is trying to get a donation of our silver the American Mining Congress Journal for February tells us:

> The people of India lack confidence in the pound sterling. The exchange value of the rupee has declined since civil strife developed in India last August, but the price of silver in Bombay rose from 62 to 93 cents an ounce. This high price was reached in November. In spite of the fact that the melting point of the old rupee is approximately 87 cents an ounce, the Indian authorities show no signs of apprehension with regard to the dehoarding of the old rupee silver coins of eleven-twelfths fineness, irrespective of their loss of legal tender status beginning in May 1943. In other words, the Indians prefer the old high-silver content rupee coins to the new low-silver content coins regardless of the loss of legal tender status of the higher silver content rupees.

At the same time the British Government for India is repudiating their standard silver coins they are imposing an import duty on silver of 7½ cents per ounce as calculated in our money. This action by the British Government for India is confirmed in a report just secured from the Department of Commerce, which I quote:

> The Indian Government * * * finally took steps to debase the rupee and subsidiary silver coins. * * * The silver content of the half-rupee coin was reduced from eleven-twelfths to one-half, thereby changing the composition of the coin 82½ grains of fine silver and 7½ grains of alloy to 45 grains of each by a government decree published in July 1940 In December a new rupee coin, also debased to 50-percent silver content, or 90 grains of fine silver and 90 grains alloy, was issued. * * * The issue of the new rupees was a compromise between paper money and hard money. Comparatively few people in India are accustomed to using bank checks and paper currency. * * * King Edward VII rupees and 8-anna coins ceased to be legal tender after May 31, 1942. They, like the Victoria rupees previously recalled, were to be replaced by the new King George VI coins with the security edge and 50-percent silver content.

The effect of the debasing of money of the Indian people on our trade with India and the Orient when their money must be exchanged for gold in international trade should be apparent to anyone. The purchasing power of the money of the Indian people in trading with this country has now been cut in half and all this in spite of the commitment made by Great Britain at the London Monetary Conference in 1933 to withhold the sale of silver and to cooperate in the stabilization of the price of this metal.

If the administration leaders in control of our monetary stocks grant the request of the Lease-Lend Administration and donate several million ounces of silver for coinage into British money, they certainly have a short memory. They should remember how the silver obtained from our Treasury, under the provision of the Pittman Act, was manipulated to destroy the purchasing power of our oriental customers and destroy our Asiatic trade which started the financial tailspin in this country that upset business and was largely responsible for the ensuing depression, which is fresh in the memory of most of us. The plan followed in manipulating silver to accomplish the result was simple.

First, the silver coinage of England was debased from 925 fine to 500 fine by melting down the coinage and adding 50 percent alloy. The 90,000,000 ounces of silver extracted in the debasing process was dumped in the markets of the Orient without noticeably affecting the price of silver.

Next, India was shifted from a gold-exchange standard to a gold-bullion standard with provision that the gold paper rupee would only be redeemed in quantities of $8,000, and then only in gold bullion. Naturally, the Indians were unable to use gold bullion for money. The banks soon retired the silver rupee by paying out deposits in paper rupees.

A tax of 18 cents an ounce was then imposed on the importation of silver and the government proceeded to dump the retired Indian silver on the oriental market until the bullion price broke to 25 cents per ounce, and the United States trade in the oriental market was lost with the decline in the price of silver exchange.

All this may seem of little importance to the man on the farm or the logger in the woods of the Northwest, or the wheat farmer of Idaho, together with all the businessmen that depend on the local industries for their prosperity.

But when the warehouses and docks of China became blocked with wheat and flour that the consumers of the interior could not buy, and the loss of our export market backed up on our western cities, and the price of wheat fell to 18 cents a bushel in parts of Idaho, and farmers could no longer buy lumber and fence posts and the forest products from the mills and woodsmen, and relief lines of farm hands and lumberjacks began to form in western cities, we knew that something was wrong. Whether we understood the cause or not—as we listened to our so-called economists explain—our financial distress was the result of the war of some 10 years past.

Early in life we are told that "Experience is a dear teacher, but fools will learn in no other school." Can our financial and administration leaders make fools of us again? We have had this so-called free silver bought and paid

for, procured at no expense to the taxpayer; much of it has been on hand and lying idle for a number of years. Why do we not use it for money and ease our tax load in this great war emergency instead of donating it to England to use for money?

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very illuminating article written by Walter Lippmann. The article is on the subject of reciprocal trade agreements, and I think it merits examination by every thinking American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

MR. HULL'S FALSE START

Secretary Hull has persuaded the administration leaders in Congress to take the position that congressional action on the Trade Agreements Act should be made the test case of American foreign policy in the post-war world. There are excellent and compelling reasons for the extension of the act. But the effort to inflate its importance to a point where the fate of the world hangs upon whether Congress may pass on Mr. Hull's agreements is, surely, a grave error.

For it is not true that the vote on the amendment proposed by Senator MCNARY is or can be made the test of our general policy. To say that it is the test, to ask the rest of the world to regard it as the test, is to make much too much out of comparatively little and to have lost our sense of proportion. It is to make the question whether Congress shall have a chance to pass on tariff schedules the crucial question of our own future and of the world's peace. This is not the crucial question, and no good can come of pretending that it is.

The imprudence of posing the biggest issues on a test of this small issue is evident when we remember that if Congress extends this act unamended for 2 or 3 years, no Congressman is thereby committed to vote favorably on any treaty or any other measure which may come before him. But if Congress amends the act—say by providing, as Senator MCNARY asks, that Congress may within 60 days by majority votes in both Houses, disapprove an agreement—if Mr. Hull is defeated on this question, then Mr. Hull will spend the rest of the war explaining to this country and to foreign governments that Congress did not really repudiate him and that he still has the power to negotiate. Mr. Hull has, in fact, asked for a vote of confidence on a question where he cannot win, in the sense that he has made sure of the future support of Congress, and where he may suffer a disastrous defeat.

Moreover, by identifying the future of American foreign policy with the very subordinate question of the power of the Executive to alter tariff schedules, Mr. Hull is making it excessively difficult for himself to conduct our foreign relations. Why should the great question of American security be identified with the notion that Congress shall have no voice in making international trade agreements? Why should Congressmen be told that they must decide the issues of peace and war on whether they have a say or do not have a say about the price of cattle, wool, and peanuts?

What sense is there in inaugurating the great decisions on the American future by saying to Congress: "By your vote on whether the Executive alone may alter tariff schedules, you are committing yourselves on whether the United Nations are to remain united and are to organize the peace of the world; and we shall tell the world that if you insist on having something to say about tariff schedules, then America will not take part in safeguarding its own vital interests by organizing the peace."

There are, I believe, practical reasons why reciprocal trade agreements are best made by Executive action, though in principle the right of Congress to pass upon them can hardly be disputed, and ought not to be denied. But these reasons are peculiar to the tariff. In Congress the making of tariffs has almost always been a local issue affected by pressure groups, and therefore never planned and carried out in the general national interest. But this very special reason, which alone could justify Mr. Hull's position on the trade agreements, disappears when we come to the larger agreements for security and reconstruction. These will require continuing congressional majorities to sustain them year after year. Our foreign policy will require authorizations, appropriations, and legislation to make it effective, it cannot possibly be settled by one grand debate and one dramatic vote.

It is a false start, therefore, to inaugurate our post-war foreign policy by a measure which, instead of including Congress in the complex operation, excludes it. It is probably desirable that Congress should not fuss too much with the trade agreements. But Congress will have to participate in the much more important agreements that are to come, and, therefore, the present procedure for trade agreements is not, and should not be treated as, the precedent for the future.

Senator MCNARY'S proposal is in fact a much better precedent for the future. It gives the Executive the initiative unless majorities in both Houses disapprove within a specified time. This is a liberal and flexible procedure, admirably suited to the real problems which lie ahead. For it enables and induces Congress to participate continually in the formation of foreign policy. And unless Congress does participate, unless there are developed dependable congressional majorities to support American foreign policy, we shall not be able to have a foreign policy.

Once we take this view, we shall see, I think, that the basic issue is not whether Congress or the Executive shall decide foreign policy. Mr. Hull has made a serious mistake in posing this issue. The basic issue is whether foreign policy shall be formed and sustained by the President and a majority in both Houses of Congress, as Senator MCNARY proposes, or whether one-third of the membership of one House shall have the veto over the will of the majority.

The veto power of one-third of the Senate is the real obstacle to the conduct of American foreign relations. Under this power a Senator who is against a treaty has two votes whereas a Senator who votes yes has only one vote. No Representative has any vote. Thirty-three Senators, therefore, count more than 63 Senators and 435 Representatives. Thus, as Alexander Hamilton put it, "a pertinacious minority can control the opinion of a majority * * * and * * * the sense of the smaller number will overrule that of the greater."

It is here, and not over the Executive's sole power to make trade agreements, that the issue will have to be joined. That is where it will be joined if the State Department is making proper preparations for the coming peace. The issue will be joined by following the well-established American precedent of negotiating agreements which come before Congress in a form where they require the approval of majorities in both Houses, or come into effect unless disapproved by majorities in both Houses. Few, if any, of the agreements will, we may hope, come before Congress in the antiquated form of treaties which are subject to the veto of one-third of one House.

The method of majority rule rather than minority veto has an ample, ancient, constitutional foundation. It will no doubt be attacked by a few Senators as an infringement of their special, peculiar prerogatives. But the issue will not be seriously in doubt if the people and if Congress as a whole are asked to choose between the prerogatives of a minority and the rights of the majority to rule.

Synthetic Rubber Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely article entitled "Manufacture of Synthetic Rubber From Grain Might Have Avoided Current Priorities Row," written by Dorothy Thompson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE RECORD—MANUFACTURE OF SYNTHETIC RUBBER FROM GRAIN MIGHT HAVE AVOIDED CURRENT PRIORITIES ROW

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The Under Secretary of War has stated that our all-out air war is threatened with an immediate shortage of high-octane gas.

Mr. Ickes, the Petroleum Administrator, says the trouble is due to competition between high-octane gas and synthetic rubber for scarce machinery.

High officials of the Navy Department assert that vessels needed to fight submarines cannot put out to sea because equipment has been diverted to the synthetic-rubber program.

There will be attempts to reduce this struggle to the question: Should we have more or less synthetic rubber? That is not the question. We need vast quantities of synthetic rubber.

We also need vast quantities of high-octane gas.

We have a shortage of high-octane gas because high-octane gas ingredients are diverted to the manufacture of Buna S, and because the manufacture of Buna S from oil, which has not yet overcome all teething troubles and requires much critical material, has been favored over other processes for its production which would not deprive the air forces of a single drop of gas.

CONTROVERSY BEGAN WITH WAR

From the day that the war cut us off from natural rubber there has been a controversy between oil and grain as a basis for synthetic rubber. The oil companies who had bought the rubber process from the German chemical

trust leaped into the game. The chemists, who favored rubber from grain, had nothing but reason on their side.

The Russians, who had been making synthetic rubber for years, used grain and offered us their formula, but it was neglected. There was the so-called Polish process, which is also based on grain, so that evidently rubber can be made from grain. Mr. Jeffers knows it. Mr. Nelson knows it. But grain has not had a look-in.

The process of making rubber from oil is the following: Oil is "cracked" to form liquid and gaseous substances. In the gas produced we find butane and butylene. The former, which is also a constituent of natural gas, becomes itself butylene if deprived of two hydrogens. This butylene is the chief substance for making high-octane fuel, but it is also convertible into butadiene, which is the base of Buna S, by eliminating two hydrogens.

DIFFICULTIES AVOIDABLE

This last stage in the process is an intricate operation, as admitted by the chemists interested in it. The entire process is tedious and requires many critical materials.

There is no reason why we should have these difficulties. Butadiene can be produced and has been produced without using a drop of oil by processes which either don't go through butylene at all or, again, by producing pure butylene without a drop of oil—namely from grain.

There are three methods of making butadiene and therefore Buna S by fermentation of grain. One can make alcohol and from it directly or through various intermediate stages produce butadiene by the Russian or Polish method. One can ferment grain to butylene-glycol, which in turn is convertible directly into butadiene. Or, one can produce butyl alcohol and acetone, and transform the former into chemically pure butylene, the same substance which so far has been made exclusively from oil.

PROCESS IS SIMPLE

The industrial production of butyl alcohol has been practiced in this country for 25 years; it is simple and requires comparatively little critical materials. This country has a large number of ordinary alcohol plants and few adaptations are needed or producing buty. alcohol. The American people through their Government hold in their granaries millions of bushels of grain, bought and paid for, out of which to make all the butadiene they need.

But butadiene does not present the full solution of the rubber problem. Buna S is hard, good for the tread, but not for the inner parts of tires. The Baruch report has already stressed that the ideal basis for synthetic rubber would be isoprene. Isoprene is known to produce soft rubber, and its production would thus not only relieve the pressure of the demand for butylene but would improve our chances to get satisfactory tires. There is some little isoprene made in this country and chemists know that it is possible to make this important substance fairly easy.

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the 8th installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. In this part of Senator Cockrell's speech he brings us to the beginning of a movement of the standardization of international money. In his report of the effort of our Commissioner Alexander to induce England to standardize her coinage with that of the United States, England apparently evaded the issue and the report of our Commissioner at that time is summed in Senator Cockrell's observation, "that nothing was accomplished." In following Senator Cockrell's account of the monetary development of that period it appears that the outpouring of gold from California and Australia resulted in many of the nations adopting the single silver standard.

The eighth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech follows:

Suppose the bill passed and became a law, what would be our monetary condition? We would have in our Treasury silver bullion of the coinage value of $176,990,207, and the only authority for its coinage into standard dollars would be the words in section 3:

"He shall coin of the silver bullion purchased under the provisions of this act as much as may be necessary to provide for the redemption of the Treasury notes herein provided for."

How much would be coined without any additional legislation? This is a material and vital question, considering the past and the statement of the President in his message to this session.

"This declaration—"

Referring to the established policy to maintain the two metals at a parity—

"so controls the action of the Secretary of the Treasury as to prevent his exercising the discretion nominally vested in him, if by such action the parity between gold and silver be disturbed."

And that—

"A refusal to pay these notes in gold, if demanded, would discredit and depreciate obligations payable only in silver, destroy the parity between the two metals by establishing a discrimination in favor of gold."

It seems to me almost absolutely certain that no more silver bullion would be coined. I cannot reasonably come to any other conclusion. There would be left in the Treasury a hoard of silver metal of the coin value I have just stated.

While I firmly believe the Secretary of the Treasury would still have ample authority to coin all the bullion into standard dollars, yet it seems to be absolutely essential that there should be added to the bill express requirement to coin all such bullion into standard dollars. Without such coinage of the bullion on hand we would have $383,245,365 coined under law of February 28, 1878, and $36,087,185 coined under law of July 14, 1870, making a total of 419,332,550 standard silver dollars added to our money currency, having full legal-tender power in the payment of all debts, public and private, and before the law and in the confidence of the honest toiling masses the equal in every respect of the precious, cowardly, idolized gold dollar and bearing the sacred inscription, "In God we trust," "first used by our national mint in issuing the 2-cent copper coins in 1864, during the depths of the late rebellion. The subsequent use of the motto on all our larger coins, both of silver and gold, was expressly authorized by the act of Congress of March 3, 1865. Those solemn words, so full of historic significance, are now permanently interwoven as a vital portion of our national coinage," quoting the language of Hon. Samuel R. Ruggles. Now we are tantalized and ridiculed by the enemies of silver because we have that sacred and consecrated inscription placed upon the silver dollar. They say to us, "You want us to trust in that motto for the 20 or 25 cents that the silver dollar lacks of being equal to the gold dollar."

These would be the only fruits of our 20 years' struggle in behalf of silver as the money of our Constitution. The passage of the pending bill "would absolutely demonetize silver as to the future coinage, and leave it supported by not one word of legislation," and "absolutely sweep from under the silver currency every vestige of law." It would restore in full force and vigor the despised and abused law of February 12, 1873, demonetizing the silver dollar, stopping its further coinage, and establishing the single gold standard.

For 20 years the Democratic Party has denounced from every housetop, in every highway and byway the crime of 1873, and has struggled in Congress—beginning in 1876 with the first Democratic House of Representatives elected since 1860—to expunge it from our records and substitute for it laws rehabilitating silver as money equal with gold. I have given the record of these fierce struggles during this period. With singular unanimity our party passed the free-coinage bill in November 1877, but in consequence of the Senate being Republican, we had to yield to the Bland-Allison Act. Even that was vetoed by a Republican President, and was passed over his veto.

The record shows the struggles our party made for a better law, and in the great contest of 1890, with the President, Senate, and House Republican, the Republican House passed the bullion-purchase bill, repealing the purchasing and coining provisions of the Bland-Allison law over a solid Democratic vote. In the Senate a free coinage substitute was passed, receiving 28 Democratic votes and 15 Republicans, with 3 Democratic votes and 21 Republican votes against. The Sherman law did not receive a Democratic vote in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

Mr. DOLPH. If the Senator will yield to me for a question, I desire to ask him if the Democrats have possession of both branches of Congress, the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the administration besides, why do they not pass a free-coinage law?

Mr. COCKRELL. We will if we can.

Had that bill been an unconditional repeal of the Bland-Allison law, and thereby have restored the law of 1873, I believe I am justified in saying not a Democratic Senator would have voted for it. Is there one who would?

If there is one I will thank him to answer. I pause for a reply.

Our Republican friends in full control passed the Sherman law, not as good a law as the Bland-Allison law but infinitely better than the law of 1873. We were then unwilling to substitute it for the Bland law, and I reiterate every word I then uttered against it. Every prediction I made in regard to its execution by unfriendly executive officers has been verified. Were it pending today, as it was then, I would repeat the speech I then made and the Senator from Indiana would doubtless do likewise. It is not pending as a measure in lieu of the Bland law.

That is the proposition, pure and simple. You cannot avoid it, you cannot run around it. There it is. Whether you intend it or not, you accomplish it. The pending measure is to repeal it, and with the Bland law, and restore the crime of 1873, the demonetization of silver and the establishment of the single gold standard.

I shall never vote to restore the odious law of 1873. Yet I am asked to so vote. My answer is given in the eloquent language of the senior Senator from Indiana—spoken with so much force and emphasis on this floor on February 17, 1893, as follows:

"I should vote today for the coinage of all the American product of silver. I would go

further. I would vote as Thomas Jefferson advised, for free coinage of silver the same as gold. I would vote, in the language of the Democratic platform laid down at Chicago last June, that 'We hold to both gold and silver as the standard money of the country and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal and without charge for mintage,' only stipulating, as we did in that great platform, that the two dollars, the one of silver and the other of gold, shall be of equal intrinsic value and purchasing power.

"I should have voted the other day to take up what is known as the Sherman Act and for its repeal, but for the fact that its passage would absolutely demonetize silver and leave it supported by not one word of legislation. I thought the measure was audacious. I thought it an outrage to ask men like myself and others to absolutely sweep from under the silver currency every vestige of law. That is not what we meant at Chicago; that is not what the people mean.

"I should vote for the repeal of the Sherman Act simply because it is vicious in principle, but it must be in connection with something better. You might as well authorize a circulating medium based upon tobacco by the hogshead, or cotton by the bale, as upon silver in its bullion shape. It must be coined into money, and such is the position of the Democratic Party as declared in national convention."

And still I am asked to vote for this bill and thereby vote to restore in full force and effect the crime of 1873. Again my answer is in the forceful language of Kentucky's most gifted son, Hon. John G. Carlisle, uttered in the House of Representatives on February 21, 1878:

"According to my view of the subject, the conspiracy which seems to have been formed here and in Europe to destroy by legislation and otherwise from three-sevenths to one-half of the metallic money of the world is the most gigantic crime of this or any other age. The consummation of such a scheme would ultimately entail more misery upon the human race than all the wars, pestilence, and famine that ever occurred in the history of the world. The absolute and instantaneous destruction of half the entire movable property of the world, including houses, ships, railroads, and all other appliances for the carrying on of commerce, while it would be felt more sensibly at the moment would not produce anything like the prolonged distress and disorganization of society that must inevitably result from the permanent annihilation of one-half of the metallic money of the world."

I can never vote for restoring such a law, the result of such a conspiracy, and surely entailing the dire results therein so graphically portrayed.

"But," say the Democratic advocates of repeal, "we do not propose to stop with the simple repeal. After that is secure we promise and solemnly declare that the efforts of the Government should be directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States in the markets and in the payments of debts."

That is a futile promise. It is already an accomplished fact. Every silver dollar coined by our mints today has equal power with any other dollar—coined or issued by us—in the payment of debts and in the purchase of articles in our markets. The standard silver dollar today has equal debt-paying and purchasing power with the gold dollar within our domain, and in all our markets—the only markets over which we have any control, legislative or otherwise.

Why then this pretext in this bill of promising something which already exists and to the strength of which no supplementary law we can enact will add anything?

Again our friends say that is not our only promise. We declare expressly that it is—

"The policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets, and in the payment of debts."

You say this is the promise of our last national platform. I admit it; but I ask by whom, by what body was that platform promise to be redeemed, and how? Your only answer must be by Congress and by congressional legislation, and not by mere congressional promise. Think of the absurdity, the ridiculousness of the pretense of redeeming a platform promise by a congressional repetition of such promise. Is this the redemption the voters in November last expected and voted for?

We can make no legislative promises binding any subsequent Congress. If such promises bind at all, they can only bind us, this Fifty-third Congress.

Why, then, shall we make this promise without any effort whatever to redeem it? Why not strike out the promise and do now what we promise? When shall we have more time? When shall we understand the situation, the monetary conditions, any better? Think of the abundant leisure we shall have from now on until the close of this Fifty-third Congress, on the 4th of March 1895. Here we are, robust, healthy, capable of the vastest physical endurance—60 hours if you want. Why should we not do it now?

How, in what manner, by what legislative process or otherwise, do you propose to redeem this promise? If by congressional action, then why not make it a part and parcel of this measure? No, Mr. President, there will never be such a glorious opportunity for the Congress of the United States to establish its financial system as it has today. We know more than we have ever known before, we have more leisure than we ever had before; we are all in a better humor than we have ever been before; we are all more patriotic and less partisan, because we behold a majority of the Republican Party in the front ranks of the administration, leading the Democratic administration to victory. [Laughter.] It is a glorious spectacle, and what a splendid time for nonpartisan and patriotic legislation, with our Republican friends coming over and helping us, and all bimetallists. There is not a Senator here who does not declare himself a bimetallist except my distinguished friend from New Jersey [Mr. McPherson], who I believe, is the only one who has not planted himself squarely upon bimetallism. Why can we not get together? Why can we not, as sensible men, enact a financial system for this great country?

But some Senators who favor this bill say that we as a nation can only maintain bimetallism with a perfect equality of gold and silver with unlimited coinage and full legal tender, by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of Europe. I ask, Why not? Senators will doubtless reply because the value of silver has so largely depreciated that we, as a nation, independently of other leading nations, cannot open our mints for the free and unlimited coinage of the silver dollar of 412½ grains and maintain it at a parity with gold; that that quantity of silver is only worth in the markets of the world from 54 to 65 cents on the dollar.

In response to this statement I beg the indulgence of the Senate to present in detail the reasons why, in my judgment, an international agreement with European nations is absolutely impossible now, and the causes which have produced the depreciation of silver as a metal.

(At this point the honorable Senator yielded for a motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business.)

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1893

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, in my rejoinder to the reply of our opponents that we cannot independently of other nations open our mints for the free and unlimited coinage of silver, I beg the indulgence of the Senate to present in detail the reasons why, in my judgment, any international bimetallic agreement with European nations is impossible now, and the causes which have produced the depreciation of silver as a metal.

I assert these propositions: That the United States by the misrepresentations and unfounded statements of our citizen and official representatives have caused the discriminating legislation of European nations and our own Nation in favor of gold and against silver, and that this discriminating legislation alone has caused the depreciation of silver measured by or relatively to gold; and that our own conduct, the actions of our representatives, have made such international bimetallism impossible now. International agreement upon the relative value or ratio of the coinage of nations and the unity of coins has been the dream of doctrinaire statesmen for years past.

Under a joint resolution of Congress of February 26, 1857, the Secretary of the Treasury, Howell Cobb, appointed Prof. J. H. Alexander, of Baltimore, a commissioner to confer with the functionaries of Great Britain relative to some plan "of so mutually arranging, on the decimal basis, the coinage of the two countries as that the respective units shall hereafter be easily and exactly commensurable."

Professor Alexander visited England in 1857 and 1858 and made known his mission. He was referred by the Lords of the Treasury to the Master of the Mint, and was finally informed by Malsbury, of the Foreign Office, that Her Majesty's Government was not prepared to invite a conference on a project requiring parliamentary action and not considered by the public nor discussed in Parliament, but would confer and consider with him on any proposal which he might be instructed to make. Professor Alexander, in his report, says:

"This conclusion expressed with a caution that is, I believe, habitual with the Government of Great Britain in contemplation of any change in existing institutions of establishments there, is in reality all that could be arrived at under the conditions of my instructions."

Nothing was accomplished.

What were the causes leading to and influencing the discriminating legislation in favor of gold against silver? It is astonishing to me that among all the writers upon the financial troubles beginning after 1865, no one of them has undertaken to show the moving causes which induced so many nations in Europe to change from the single silver to the single gold standard and to abandon bimetallism. There was some cause for these things. This no one can doubt. Why have these economic writers not gone to the foundation and ascertained what caused Germany to change from a single silver standard to a single gold standard? She had, under the excitement of an overflow of gold in 1857, changed to a single silver standard to avoid an overflow of money. In 1871–72 she changed to a single gold standard. Other nations did the same. What were the motives which led them to enact this discriminating legislation? I say it is remarkably strange that no economic or financial writer has ever attempted to trace these causes.

Take the monetary status of 1860. Great Britain, Portugal, and Turkey were the only three European nations having a single gold standard. Great Britain had maintained the double standard at the ratio of 15.2 to 1 from

1717 to 1797, when specie payments were suspended and continued up to 1821, and on June 22, 1816, during this specie suspension, adopted the single gold standard, which was the first discrimination by law of any important commercial nation against silver, and in her markets the price for silver, a mere commodity, has ever since been regulated by the value of her single-standard legal-tender gold coins.

The cause prompting England in establishing her single gold standard is manifest. Specie payments were suspended, and she had a great mass of worn, clipped, and mutilated coin, current and legal tender, and yet varying greatly in metal value and weight, and was looking forward to the early resumption of specie payments, and was a great creditor nation, having vast commercial transactions with the civilized countries, and was practically the money center of the world, with the nations paying tribute to her and interest in money on loans, and desired to unify her coinage in the interest of her creditor-ruling classes and increase the purchasing power of the dollar, its value, and hence adopted the single gold standard, and yet retained a subsidiary silver coinage with legal tender for 40 shillings for the transaction of the vast amount of business among her masses, and established the grand central market in London for the sale and disposition of the entire silver products of the world as a mere metal or commodity, to be there measured by her own gold legal-tender coins.

In 1860 all Asia used silver as the standard money. Austria-Hungary, The Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Spain, and Russia had the single silver standard. France, Belgium, Switzerland, and Italy had the double standard with free coinage and full legal tender at the ratio of 15.5 to 1. Germany had the single silver standard at the ratio of 15.6 to 1, adopted on January 24, 1857.

Theaters of War—The Battle Against Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered over the radio on April 12, 1943, by Hon. Chester H. Smith, professor in the College of Law of the University of Arizona.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All government is the result of the application or threatened application of brute physical force. To him who proves himself on the field of battle goes the title—ruler, governor.

All government is the result of battles or campaigns or wars. But it is not safe to say that all battles or campaigns or wars result in or establish government. Some who are defeated in battle rise again and fight. They do not admit defeat. The British 8th Army was defeated at Tobruk, but it rose again, retreated to El Alamein, regrouped its forces, added reinforcements, and inflicted on Marshal Rommell's Afrika Korps a decisive defeat, chased the Germans across north Africa, defeated them again at the Mareth Line and again at Gabes. Our American forces were defeated at the Maknassy Pass and Kasserine Gap in Tunisia, but they rose again and drove the Germans back through the mountain passes. The Russian armies were defeated time after time by the German juggernaut, but they rose again. They still fight.

Neither is it safe to say that the winning of a war results in or establishes more than a temporary government. We fought the last war to make the world safe for democracy. This was a rallying cry to bring about victory. The war was won—the victory was in our hands. What did we do with it? We failed to establish a government on the foundation of our established superiority in force. We pulled out, we withdrew from the field of battle to let the enemy rise again. Not only did he rise again, he shook off the dust of defeat. He gathered food and ate. He gathered strength and attacked. He built up a fighting power never before equaled on the earth.

No single power on earth, it appears, could have stopped the fighting power built up by the Germans as they rose again. Alone, England could not have long stood against the foe which had been defeated in 1918. Russia was able to stem the German advance only because the Germans had spent much power in the defeat of France and the Low Countries and against the British and because Germany had to divert much military power to protect herself from the west and to police her conquered territories.

If England, if Russia, if the United States—if any one of these is saved, it is not due to the strength of any one but because of the combined power of all together. It can truly be said that England saved Russia; that Russia saved England; that England saved the United States; that the United States saved England; that Russia saved the United States; and that the United States saved Russia. And after Japan joined the Axis Powers it might well be said that China played her role in saving her allies and that they and each of them may save China.

Perhaps we are saying only the fittest shall survive. Not only shall they survive. The fittest shall survive and they shall rule. It was recognition of this principle that led the Germans to build up their military machine. They intended to establish a supreme world government on the foundation of their sheer military power. The idea is absolutely sound. It is the only sound principle on which government can be based.

And what has stopped the forward movement of this military giant? Fear of annihilation and the instinct to survive have driven England and the United States to espouse the cause of Russia and Russia to espouse the common cause of the English-speaking democracies. Fear of impending doom dangling before the eyes of these nations has compelled them to seek each other's help, to pool their physical brute forces against the common enemy. It has forced them to recognize each other for what they have and are.

In the face of threatened destruction a nation, like an individual, brings into play the latent, dormant powers of a giant. In this Russia has surprised the world, and most of all, the common enemies. In this England has shown powers of recuperation after little less than a mortal blow with the fall of France which has astonished the world, including her own people. In this China has absorbed shock after shock from an invading enemy which only a nation with the manpower and philosophy of an aged people could absorb without capitulation. In this the United States has shown powers of production and organization with such speed and volume that we have surpassed even our own projected goals.

We have said (1) superior physical force establishes government, (2) a defeated enemy sometimes rises again and attacks with overwhelming power, (3) sometimes that power is met with still superior force. These were in the minds of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill at Casablanca when they declared that this Second World War must result in unconditional surrender of the Axis Powers. They saw a defeated enemy rise again. They and millions of others know that such an enemy, even when defeated a second time, if thereafter not controlled by force until a different habit of mind is established, may rise again and develop such overwhelming power that there may be no superior force to cope with it or meet it.

How close we came to defeat at the hands of our present enemies can only be realized when one thinks of what would have happened had the Germans continued their drive across the English Channel at Dunkerque; had Germany not attacked Russia; had England and the United States not determined to send lend-lease aid to Russia; had the United States failed to throw in her lot with England long before Pearl Harbor; had there not been a Pearl Harbor to unite our people as one against the Axis. Had one of these things not happened, what might have been our fate or the fate of the civilized world is difficult to imagine. One thing is sure—things might well have been quite different than they are.

No sensible businessman would subject the future of his business to such hazards unless under compulsion. Why, then, should we, if we win an unconditional surrender, subject the future of ourselves and our posterity—indeed, civilization itself—to such risk and chance? Populations are growing. Science progresses. Man's inventive genius surpasses the imagination. The destructiveness of war implements is on the increase. Wars are being fought on a grander scale. We have come to a point where one slip in the conduct of a war or mere chance in the proper use of superior force of the enemy might cast civilization back to the darkest age.

Our leaders are not willing to assume responsibility for subjecting us in the future to such risks. That is the reason plans are being made for the period after the war. We are moving in the right direction. We are making a good start by inviting representatives of the United Nations to a food conference in the United States. This conference is to be held in just 15 days, April 27. One of the least controversial subjects on which a conference could be held is food. This should do much to start a series of conferences among those nations now bound together by a common cause and fighting a common enemy for their preservation. Our invitation to other nations and their acceptance disclose an attitude of cooperation. A friendly reception by our representatives and an amicable discussion of common food problems can do much to put all the United Nations on a common and equal footing. Frank and honest disclosures of each other's willingness to assist and to be assisted can create bonds of mutual respect and determination to work together harmoniously. Several nations, including Russia, have accepted our invitation to this food conference.

Submission to the United Nations by England and the United States of plans for a post-war fiscal system is another step toward cooperative effort in the financial field. These plans are merely submitted for discussion, after which a United Nations conference will be held.

It is only by a united and cooperative effort of the "big four" nations that the post-war world can be controlled and peace maintained. These "big four" nations are

England, Russia, China, and the United States.

We have few choices for the post-war world. First, we can do as we did after the last war, refuse to cooperate with other nations in the future and return to isolationism and dream our dreams of security. Second, we can return to our peacetime pursuits and build an army and a navy and an air force so as to be ready for the next war. The creation of such military force by one nation would involve such expenditures as to be fairly no less than crushing in its burdens, and would likely lead to national bankruptcy. Indeed, the protection of ourselves would mean literally our paying for protecting the entire world. Third, we can recognize that we are a member of the family of nations and face that fact whether we like it or not. Such recognition should dictate that we cooperate with the other nations in an earnest attempt to set up an international government based on our superior physical power to prevent further wars.

Such an attempt can have but two results—either it will succeed or it will fail. If it succeeds, then our present generation will have been the most kind and beneficient generation in world history. We shall have prevented the curse of war from being visited on the generations of the future. If the plan fails, then the results can be no worse than another war which will be sure to follow any other course. But an earnest and determined attempt to prevent all wars is almost certain to do one thing—that is postpone the time of the next war. If it is postponed for 10 or even 5 years by our efforts, then we shall have rendered a great service to mankind. Postponement of the next war for any period of time will have justified our change in national policy from that of isolationism to that of being a member of the family of nations.

I am not telling you that a world without war or even postponing the time when the next war may take place will be the millennium or the perfect world. Far from it. Stupendous problems will still have to be solved. Battles of the first magnitude will have to be fought. But the battles to be fought will not be physical battles; they will not be battles of physical violence and violent deaths to large numbers of men. The battles will be word battles—battles in which intellectual giants will pitch their brains against other brains. They will be the battles which Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, and grand old Benjamin Franklin fought in the constitutional conventions when this Nation was established.

Battles of ideas fought through the medium of words can rock the foundations of nations as profoundly as the bloody battlefields of war. Young Mr. Pitt shook the whole British Empire with his fiery defense of the Colonies. The Lincoln-Douglas debates rocked the entire structure of this Nation before the Civil War. The debates in our Congress and before our Supreme Court on the constitutionality of New Deal legislation made every State-rights advocate and every nationalist quiver.

The principal difference between the world of the past and that of the future, if we can establish a government which has the power to prevent wars, is this: International disputes—i. e., questions on which nations differ between themselves and which must be settled in favor of one or the other—will be settled in the courtroom of an international court by battles of words and a judgment of the court rather than by the haphazard killing of the young men of both nations. In one case the right of a nation is determined by its might, by the impact of its power to kill exerted on its adversary. In the other case the right of a nation is determined by a group of impartial men or judges who listen to the arguments of the representatives of both nations and then declare their judgment according to international law.

Race and Religious Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article, written by columnist William A. Caldwell, that recently appeared in the Bergen Evening Record, of Hackensack, N. J.

It is an impartial discussion of the race and religious problem now facing this country, and is one of the finest reviews that it has been my privilege to read on this very grave situation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIMEON STYLITES

(By William A. Caldwell)

I don't want anyone to get the idea that I am anti-Gentile; some of my best friends are goyim, but sometimes my loyalty is tried; sometimes I almost think there oughta be a lawr.

There's no question that the race problem has gotten out of hand again and is going to worsen fast.

Currently in circulation by word of mouth and in print are three colossal lies:

1. That Jews are operating the black market

2. That Jews are running the United States Government, and not well.

3. That Jews are evading military service and cashing in on the domestic inflation.

To discuss these does them more honor than they're worth, but to keep the record straight the bald facts may be stated:

1. The black-market problem does not exist at the retail level at which the humble Jewish shopkeeper functions. It is at the level of distribution, monopolized by so-called Christian corporations.

2. A friend of mine who likes statistics tells me that the percentage of Government personnel of Jewish extraction is lower than the percentage of Jews in the total population.

3. This is a libel not of Jews but of the Selective Service Administration, which has taken some pains to expose, disprove, and denounce it.

But anti-Semitism is getting a little stronger every day. We would be blind to be unaware of it. We would be foolhardy to ignore it.

THE LAST RESORT

Anti-Semitism serves two masters. Both are Fascist. One, of course, is Adolf Hitler. As David Elliot, field representative of the United Chemical Workers (Congress of Industrial Organizations), told union members gathered to say goodbye and good luck to the organizer, Charley Davey, the other night, the powers of darkness will try more and more frantically to divide us against ourselves the nearer we come to our victory. If anti-Semitism diffuses our effort so much as to reduce our output one tank a day, it is worth an Iron Cross to the Fuehrer. Few are the saboteurs trained in Essen who could do so well.

But this tendency of so many of my Christian friends to blame all ills on the Jew is dangerous for a reason more terrible even than that.

I insist that an American fascism is not so implausible a nightmare. As noted here the other day, economic power in the United States has in 2 brief years been shifted from the 175,000 small businesses, the demos of democracy, to the 100 great—and interlocking—corporations. The history of these corporations has not been notably democratic. And along with the growth of economic power in an elite has progressed the growth of applicable political power in the centralized Washington military elite. There is a discernible similarity between the American scene today and the scene in Japan before the so-called young militarists' coup d'état of 1934.

The coup itself, especially because of our tendency to present to potential conspirators a compact centralized plexus of control, could be a mere matter of a police squad and a few minutes. I cannot believe it is against the public interest to point out that the seizure of the Federal Communications Commission, the Office of Price Administration, the so-called Pentagon, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and perhaps the financial bureaus, would clean matters up. It is another cogent reason why government should spread itself a little thinner.

What is lacking in the United States now is a mass base for fascism. This, I hold, anti-Semitism—and the conditions which give rise to anti-Semitism—could provide. Just now, in spite of having only yesterday paid the heaviest income tax of your life, you're willing to let the old system slide along as is for a while. But suppose that, year after year, those taxes continue as we beat against the fortress of Europe and the outposts of the Japanese Empire; suppose rationing gets more stringent; suppose we get morose and bitter and frustrate.

Are you sure that we who cannot now resist the temptation to declare the Jew our scapegoat should be able to resist a fine, frank, blonde, rootin' tootin' demagogue with a case against Jews, a program for pogrom, and a request for plenary extralegal powers just long enough to purge a few international bankers? Are you sure that some of us wouldn't like to see a star of David in yellow on our business competitors' windows?

HOW DO YOU PLEAD?

Anti-Semitism is worse than dynamite, it's a strong drug. You cannot take it or leave it alone. You cannot dabble in it just a little. Once you attribute anything, except possibly the configuration of his skull, to a man of any race because of his race you are, to that extent, straight Nazi.

It has been proved again and again. And this too has been proved: That the same processes which make for anti-Semitism also make for anti-Italianism, and anti-Catholicism, and all the other byproduct brutalities of the Fascist racket. Most of us, I think, understand that.

And yet in the course of a single day this department, which lives a fairly cloistered life, has encountered these things:

1. A poem, being distributed in multigraph in downtown New York, about the Jewish maiden sneering at Christian soldiers going on to war

2. A letter attributing the meat shortage to Jewish hoarders.

3. A telephone call describing a parking place opposite a theater as jammed with Jews' automobiles

4. The observation in a conversation that Jewish profiteers are not prosecuted because Jewish lawyers in Federal bureaus connive with them.

I do try to live an obscure, respectable life. I prefer to get along in fellowship with my brethren. Some of my best friends are Christians, but there are times when almost I think there ought to be a law. It would provide bleakly that anyone using the word "Jew" in any sentence—except in a class on ethnology or a synagogue—should be beaten cordially over the skull with a baseball bat until enlightened. The toleration of idiocy can be carried too far.

War in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on April 16 the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] delivered a magnificent address in the Senate reviewing the situation in the Pacific. On the same date Earl Godwin, the very popular radio commentator, made some remarks with reference to that subject in his radio program entitled "Watch the World Go By." I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Godwin's comments be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, folks. On my desk today is a fairly thick packet of typed arguments from the Australians as to why the United Nations should quit looking at the Japanese menace as a No. 2 affair and make it a No. 1, grade A size war, same as the war on Hitler. But I will put that aside and bring out as news tonight the same sort of plea from an American, a United States Senator who has been pretty far out on the Aleutians and who is deadly serious when he told the Senate today that the Japs are a much worse and a deadlier foe than the Nazis. It was Senator A. B. CHANDLER of Kentucky, "HAPPY" CHANDLER, who said that our fight with the pesky Japs is the deadliest struggle ever faced by the American people. CHANDLER, I believe, is the first Senator to even approach any criticism directed toward our General Staff's policies, but he said today in the Senate that if the General Staff had listened or paid attention to General Buckner up in Alaska, the Japs would not be on Kiska today building airfields and a submarine base.

He urged more aid for the Chinese. Argued that the Japs must be driven out of the Aleutians. If, said "Happy," we can send a thousand planes over Europe in a day, we can spare the Chinese the 500 planes they say they could use to drive the Japs out of the skies.

Chandler has by no means lost faith in General Marshall, he said, but he, Chandler, is definitely on the side of MacArthur and his pleas for more men and munitions, especially planes, and a greater and deeper appreciation of the Japanese as a terrible foe.

CHANDLER said he was concerned lest the United States give all its attention to the war against Hitler and then find itself "left alone except for the loyal support of China, a magnificent people without arms, to fight the Japanese."

First Easter Service on the Capitol Steps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, on April 25 the Capitol Fellowship Forum sponsored the first annual Easter program on the United States Capitol steps. I was pleased to attend the services as a member of their senatorial sponsoring committee. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief poem by Horace C. Carlisle, a citizen of the District of Columbia, and clerk in the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, describing the first Easter service on the Capitol steps.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST EASTER SERVICE ON THE CAPITOL STEPS

At the east front of the National Capitol,
On Easter morning, nineteen-forty-three,
Calmly assembled a host of Americans,
And many others, from over the sea,
To celebrate, for the first time in history,
Christ's Resurrection, the first Easter day,
On and in front of the steps of the Capitol,
In faith's inspiring American way.

Throughout the service, a sacred solemnity—
Calm and serene as the sunshine that spread
Over the scene a sweet, hallowed significance—
Glorified Him who arose from the dead.
In every heart a sure sense of security
Seemed to steal over the worshippers there,
While the sweet spirit of faith, hope, and charity
Characterized every speech, song, and prayer.

In every musical note was a reverence
That sifted out on the spirit-charged air,
Which thrilled the waiting and worshipful audience
With the assurance that God, too, was there.
In the forefront of this service, so beautiful,
Christ's Resurrection was placed with the prayer
That peace may rise again, in all its sanctity,
Ere the world's nailed to the cross of despair.

This Easter service, in front of the Capitol
Of the United States—and of the world—
Sets a significant, marvelous precedent,
Here, where the Stars and Stripes are unfurled.
"Christian America" has real significance
When, in the front of the Capitol, we,
In the observance of Easter, are solemnly
Teaching the truth that can keep nations free.

May this significant, long-delayed precedent,
So inexpressibly sweet and sublime,
Down through the years, to the end of posterity—
Until eternity terminates time—
Occupy, in our American history,
Space on its fairest, most picturesque page,
To mark the day, when our Christian America,
In this way, outlawed the war of the age.

Christ's Resurrection gives hope to humanity—
Evil must die, yea, but goodness must live—
"Truth crushed to earth will rise" in all its purity—
Nations, at war, will get back what they give—
Christ's Resurrection is fraught with assurances
That, though we die for a cause that is just,
We'll live again, throughout endless eternity,
If, from our hearts, we sing, "In God We Trust."

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Agricultural Work by Pensioners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER THOMAS

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story appearing in General Welfare News-Advocate of date May 3, 1943, entitled "Pensioners May Work in Agriculture."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENSIONERS MAY WORK IN AGRICULTURE—CONGRESS ACTS TO SAVE CROPS—ENACTS PORTION OF GENERAL WELFARE ACT, H. R. 836

SENATOR ELMER THOMAS LEADS BATTLE

A portion of the General Welfare Act, H. R. 836, was enacted into law last week when Congress, in response to a drive led by Senator ELMER THOMAS (Democrat) of Oklahoma, in cooperation with the General Welfare Federation of America, adopted and sent to the White House for signature House Joint Resolution 96, providing that all those on old-age assistance anywhere in the Nation may work in any sort of agricultural work during the war, and for 6 months thereafter, without danger of forfeiting their pensions. Senator ELMER THOMAS of Oklahoma, working with Ira M. Finley, of Oklahoma City, chairman of the national executive board of the General Welfare Federation of America, led the battle which resulted in the inclusion of a subsection (f) in section 5 of the joint resolution, which made an appropriation of $26,100,000 to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943. This subsection dealt with the problem of old-age pensioners being allowed to work in agriculture without loss of their pensions and covered the situation in a most adequate manner.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION AS TO PENSIONS

The text of subsection (f) of section 5 of the resolution, as finally approved by the Senate and House of Representatives after being favorably reported by the conference committee, is as follows:

"(f) Notwithstanding provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of April 1943, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual arising from agricultural labor performed by him as an employee, or from labor otherwise performed by him in connection with the raising or harvesting of agricultural commodities, after the date of enactment of this joint resolution and prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, shall not be a basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title."

RESOLUTION VERY BROAD

The resolution adopted is very broad and covers agricultural labor of every kind, including "farming in all its branches and

among other things includes the cultivation and tillage of the soil, dairying, the production, cultivation, growing, and harvesting of any agricultural or horticultural commodities (including commodities defined as agricultural products in section 15 (g) of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended), the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry and practices (including forestry or lumbering operations) performed by a farmer or on a farm as an incident to or in conjunction with such farming operations, including preparation for market, delivery to storage or to market or to carriers for transport to market." It does not apply to "service performed in connection with commercial canning or commercial freezing or in connection with any agricultural or horticultural commodity after its delivery to a terminal market for distribution or consumption." It covers not only farming work performed by employees but labor otherwise performed in connection with the raising or harvesting of agricultural commodities, which means that the farmer himself, the tenant farmer, the sharecropper, and anyone else who works on a farm, comes under the protection of the measure.

INTENT OF SUBSECTION

The purpose of subsection 5 (f), which Senator THOMAS is responsible for having inserted into the measure during the committee hearings, is, as the Senator explained on the floor of the Senate on April 8, 1943 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 3115), "to permit recipients of old-age assistance to work as agricultural workers during the war, and for 6 months thereafter, without having such assistance discontinued or reduced."

The conference report explains that the provision will enable the States, if they so desire, to continue to pay old-age assistance at the present rates notwithstanding income from agricultural work, with no danger of losing Federal funds.

A BOON TO HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS

This provision adopted by Congress, and which the President will doubtless sign within a few days, will prove a boon to many hundreds of thousands of the Nation's 2,229,518 old-age pensioners as well as aiding our war effort at this crucial period of the Nation's history. The 667,000 who draw their pensions under title II of the Social Security Act rather than under title I are already allowed to work in agricultural work or in any other work not covered by the contributory features of the Social Security Act—the limit in the "covered" occupations being $14.99 per month.

GENERAL WELFARE ACT'S ENACTMENT WOULD PROVE BOON TO MILLIONS

The enactment of the General Welfare Act, H. R. 836, would extend this principle still further and would prove a boon to millions of our senior citizens as well as helping the war effort still further. Under the General Welfare Act, of which Senator THOMAS has for years been one of the main Senate backers, this same right to supplement old-age pensions by outside labor in any field, but not to exceed $30 per month, would be accorded to all and would not be limited to any extent whatsoever in the case of the 20,000,000 or so people who would be brought under the contributory features of the Social Security Act by this bill in addition to the 50,000,000 or so already covered. The resolution before the Congress was limited to agriculture, hence Senator THOMAS, who is one of the ranking members of the Senate Appropriations Committee to which the resolution was referred, could not make his amendment any broader than he did. He consulted with Mr. Finley of the federation as to the wording of his amendment and Mr. Finley made a constructive suggestion with reference to it. The final draft of the amendment was made by a conference committee of Senate and House Members, of which Representatives LOUIS LUDLOW and ELMER H. WENE, both among the 128 signers of the nonpartisan General Welfare Act steering committee resolution, were members. Both supported Senator THOMAS' splendid move to aid the aged of our land as well as rendering such substantial assistance to the war effort. Senator THOMAS served 13 years in the Oklahoma State Senate, 4 years in the United States House of Representatives and is now serving his seventeenth year in the Senate of the United States. He certainly knows how to get things accomplished after 34 years in the legislative field. The aged of the Nation owe a real debt of gratitude to him for his latest maneuver on their behalf.

Organization and Collaboration of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Facts To Be Faced," from the Wall Street Journal of April 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW FACTS TO BE FACED

Senators BALL, BURTON, HATCH, and HILL on Wednesday addressed a public meeting in New York in support of their resolution pending in the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, which pledges support of the United States to some organization of the United Nations equipped with sufficient force to keep the peace in the post-war world.

It can be said for the resolution that it at least is not another blueprint. What it amounts to is no more than declaration of a willingness to participate in a general plan for keeping the world's peace. Any such plan, when its details are worked out, must come up for consideration by the Senate and receive a two-thirds majority before the country is committed to any definite course of action.

Nevertheless, general as are its terms, it marks a significant change—or the beginning of a significant change—in the mood of many from that of the country in 1919. The essence of that change, insofar as there is change, is recognition of the fact that for good or for ill the world today is not the world as we thought it to be in 1919, one in which a great country like our own could pursue its course pretty much unaffected by what was taking place around it. We are now beginning to realize that our peace may not be solely in our own power to preserve.

Which being so, it seems to this newspaper that it is necessary for us—and for all other nations—to move with caution in the exploration of this new territory, rather than to proceed with a series of tentative "maps" made in advance and representing rather a vision of hopes than a record of actualities, only to find out too late that we have missed our way.

If there is any single portion of the future which is least susceptible of blueprinting it is this one. To those who are bending feverishly over their drafting boards it may be suggested that the surest way to prevent their diagrams from ever being realized is to press them upon us before we are ready. One step at a time is the only safe rule. The first step is to realize that we have to move. We seem to be taking that step—and that is progress, for in this case, as the French say, it is the first step that costs.

Federal Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, Dr. Paul S. Taylor, of the California State Board of Agriculture, has sent me two quotations, one taken from Horace Greeley in 1870, and the other written in 1887. These quotations remind us of the discussion over the Farm Security Administration at the present time. Therefore, I ask that they be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and quotations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD
OF AGRICULTURE,
Berkeley, April 23, 1943.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: For those who know the good works that Farm Security Administration has done, and will need to do in the future, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD makes hard reading these days.

The attached documents seem pertinent in answer to some charges that are characterized more by their violence than by intellectual integrity and knowledge of history.

It seems appropriate to place documents on cooperative farming in your hands when men are so on the attack.

Sincerely,

PAUL S. TAYLOR.

[From the Business Side of Farming, by Dr. George Austin Bowen, Woodstock, Conn., Massachusetts State Board of Agriculture, 1887, pp. 238–240.]

Can the New England farmer maintain himself and his family, keeping abreast with the times, developing his material resources, and leave the farm the better for his occupancy? Unhesitatingly, I answer "yes." But not by the old system of farm business, but by cooperation. In other words, by following the modern system of business. I believe in New England agriculture, and beyond that I believe in the people her soil has developed: in their perception, keenness, and good judgment, which prompts me to say that I have faith in their future actions. * * *

The old-fashioned system of changing work was a good one, and can today be carried to other things. Expensive farm machinery can be owned in common. Stock for breeding purposes on neighboring farms need not be duplicated, but made a subject of joint ownership, thereby securing a far better animal, and lessening the expense, both of

purchase and of keeping. A $100 bull will do far more toward improving the stock of a neighborhood than two $50 ones will, not to speak of the time spent in the care of the extra beast, which is considerable in the course of a year. This is practical cooperation, and here and there we find it carried out successfully. Go a step higher—form partnerships. Some of the most successful farmers of my acquaintance have made their money in this way. Extend the system further; let it embrace the dairies of all the farms of a section; for if two can work together to an advantage, greater numbers can secure greater advantages.

[From What I Know of Farming, by Horace Greeley, 1870, p. 248]

COOPERATION IN FARMING

The word of hope and cheer for labor in our days is cooperation—that is, the combination by many of their means and efforts to achieve results beneficial to them all. It differs radically from communism, which proposes that each should receive from the aggregate product of human labor enough to satisfy his wants, or at least his needs, whether he shall have contributed to that aggregate much or little or nothing at all. Cooperation insists that each shall receive from the joint product in proportion to his contributions thereto, whether in capital, skill, or labor. If 1 associate had 10 children and another none, communism would apportion to each according to the size of his family alone, while cooperation would give to each what he had earned, regardless of the number dependent upon him. Thus, the two systems are radical antagonists, and only the grossly ignorant or willfully blind will confound them.

The Polish Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Again the Polish Question," published in the Washington Times-Herald of April 29, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGAIN THE POLISH QUESTION

We suppose most Americans' first reaction, on hearing the news that Russia had broken with the Polish Government, was: "What Polish government?"

The answer is that there is a group in London which escaped Poland from the incoming Germans and Russians in the fall of 1939 and which calls itself the Government of Poland. It is headed by Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, who uses the title of Premier of Poland.

With this exiled government, Russia has maintained diplomatic relations since soon after Hitler attacked Russia in late June of 1941. Russia has now broken off (or "suspended") those relations because it claims Sikorski's government has amplified German charges that the Russians murdered some 10,000 Polish officers and buried them near Smolensk in 1940. This, says Moscow, is a Nazi lie, and it was the Germans who murdered those Polish officers.

Moscow's position is that the exiled Polish Government is plotting with Hitler in hope of annexing to a revived Poland, after the war, parts of "Soviet Ukraine, Soviet White Russia, and Soviet Lithuania."

Our Government at Washington is described as "perturbed" over the whole mess. This perturbation puzzles us.

The fact is that the Polish question goes far, far back into the history of eastern Europe.

Poland has for centuries been a battleground for Teuton and Slav. Probably the main reason has been that Poland is flat and not easily defended. Anyway, in 1795, in the third partition, Austria, Russia, and Prussia divided what was then left of Poland among them, and Poland as a geographical entity ceased to exist until after World War No. 1.

Class distinctions in Poland were always extreme. The peasants and the workers were very poor and almost totally illiterate. They were kept that way by the landlords, abetted by the army officers; and these top dogs were very rich and aristocratic.

The Polish Government after World War No. 1 was in the hands of this class, with Gen. Josef Pilsudski after awhile (1926) coming into dictatorial power via a military uprising. Sikorski's exiled Polish Government is made up of members of that same old Polish aristocratic class of officers and big landlords. It is liked by the Churchill Government of Great Britain, and the Churchill Government is a Conservative Party government.

The Russians claim to be on the side of workers and peasants everywhere, and against landlords and aristocrats. The Communist formula for destroying the power of such people is to destroy those people themselves—"liquidate" them, in Russian parlance.

So, though the Russians may not have killed the specific 10,000 Polish officers around whom the present dispute rages, they certainly did kill all the Polish officers and aristocrats they could catch when they moved into Poland in the fall of 1939.

From Russia's point of view, this is a class war as well as an international war. Stalin can be counted on to communize every piece of extra territory he may snag out of this war. If he is a big factor in beating Germany, he will naturally take all of eastern Europe that he wants.

THE CORRIDOR AND THIS WAR

Still speaking of Poland, it is interesting to remember that the prime mover which brought on the present war was the Polish corridor. This was the opening to the Baltic Sea which the World War No. 1 peacemakers gave to Poland, thereby cutting East Prussia off from Germany.

As late as the spring of 1939 Hitler offered to settle for a two-level connection at that point, one level to be used by Poland for communication with the Baltic coast, the other by Germany for communication with East Prussia. Britain and France said "No," and promised to fight Germany if Germany seized the corridor. On August 24, 1939, Hitler announced that he had made a nonaggression treaty with Stalin.

On September 1 Hitler stabbed into Poland, and on September 3 Britain and France declared war on Germany. Things are now in a growing mess, with Russia showing less and less friendship for the Allies into whose camp Germany forced it, and talking more and more like an old-time imperialist power with reference to its post-war plans.

Some day Americans may learn that these European problems are of long standing, and go deep into the roots of European history, class hatreds, race hatreds, etc., etc., and that we can't solve them. We hope we'll learn.

The American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Fortunes and Our Sacred Honor." This editorial appeared in the Monday, March 15, issue of the Bergen Evening Record, of Hackensack, N. J., and was written by John Borg, publisher of this paper.

This is an outstanding editorial and of great inspirational value. I wish that every citizen of the United States could have an opportunity of reading it.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FORTUNES AND OUR SACRED HONOR

Next month the freely elected Government of our people is going to ask them to buy at least thirteen billions of United States Victory bonds. We all know the proceeds of such sales are required to finance in part our current all-out war for self-governing survival. Some of us realize the necessity of country-wide individual purchases of those bonds—to the limit of every citizen's capacity—to absorb the Nation's excess spending power and to prevent an inflationary cycle that would cause us to lose the peace at home after we have won the war abroad. What are the other incentives that should rally all Americans to that bond-buying cause? Let us see.

It seems superfluous to tell an intelligent American people that all of the 135,000,000 citizens who comprise the United States of America are partners in that vast cooperative enterprise, that they are entitled to all of its individual benefits, and that they must assume their corresponding share of the national liabilities.

It seems equally superfluous to say that no cooperative enterprise, either public or private, can grow, prosper, or long survive unless the partners who comprise it put into that common cause more than they from generation to generation take out of it. As a matter of fact, any American who tries to extract from our national enterprise more than he contributes to it, especially in wartime, at least tacitly defrauds all of his other civic partners in that common cause.

Most Americans were taught those fundamental principles of the best form of self-government yet devised by man in the finest public educational system in the world. But they live in a high-speed, competitive world which in the hustle and bustle of their daily lives causes them frequently to forget. So perhaps we ought to scrutinize again our historic past in order to set our vision for a free future. Perhaps that will clarify our thoughts as to why this generation is fighting and working and saving to preserve a heritage more priceless than life itself for us as well as our posterity.

Every American schoolboy has read—and many of us oldsters have forgotten—the burning words which in 1775 set aflame the hearts of 4,000,000 colonists and caused them 1 year later to establish on this continent a new nation dedicated to self-governing principles that were revolutionary in a monarchistic world. Those burning words of

Patrick Henry have since inspired men and peoples everywhere to prefer death to enslavement. To refresh our memories, here are the words: "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death."

Our deathless Declaration in 1776 enunciated the doctrine of inalienable human rights and that governments derive their just powers only from the consent of the governed. Thus was born the ideal of civic masters and public servants which is the priceless heritage of all Americans till time shall be no more. And the "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty" of the same Patrick Henry has in each succeeding American generation been practically applied to fulfill its trust to its posterity. Our generation is doing it now for our children and our children's children.

In 1789 the new Nation which emerged from the 7 years of privation and death required to convert the new governmental ideals into accepted international fact adopted our inspired Constitution, which gave practical effect through fundamental law to the human and governmental truths enunciated in the Declaration.

Motivated by constitutional guaranties that protected individual as well as property rights, 4 million new citizens in the Thirteen Original States along the Atlantic seaboard expanded their common enterprise from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. That vast area of more than 3 million square miles contains the greatest contiguous natural resources of any nation in the world. In 1861 it had a population of 35 millions, who fought an internecine war to determine whether the Union of States as then constituted could survive. It did, but at a cost which taught Americans for all time that ballots are infinitely saner and cheaper than bullets to decide any future sectional or political controversies that may arise among them.

Then followed almost a quarter century of reconstruction as a prelude to an era of industrial development which made the United States the richest and potentially the most powerful nation in the world. We were envied and feared alike. There were 100,000,000 of us in 1917 while Germany was trying to inflict on the world her doctrine that might transcends right in international relations. We had to contest that thesis, and we entered the war. We won it, and thought that self-determination of peoples in their governing forms was assured. We subsequently lost the peace at Versailles because our allies forgot the historic lesson that current hatreds breed future hatreds.

Now there are 135,000,000 of us engaged in a war which is total in its action as well as in its ultimate conclusion. Three nations, banded together as an axis, populated by one-fourth billion people, and controlled by utterly brutal international gangsters, have violated every law of God and man in their mad lust to enslave the other one and three-fourths billions of people of this earth. One of those nations while extending the right hand of diplomacy stabbed us in the back with the other at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. Japan unquestionably perpetrated that dastardly treachery with the connivance of her other Axis partners.

All the moves of the Axis supermen were carefully planned and calculated long in advance. But they made a fatal miscalculation about America. Because of our high standards of living, they thought we were a nation of softies and sissies who would curl up and quit. They forgot that our millions of potential fighting men were taught in 10,000 American public school and collegiate athletic fields and gymnasiums the value of teamwork—how to take it and how to dish it out. They also forgot that men and women after emerging from such a crucible have an unquenchable fire of liberty in their hearts and the individual initiative of freemen in their heads. They forgot that such citizens had rather die on their feet for liberty than live on their knees in enslavement to dictators anywhere.

Ten millions of those worthy successors of the founding fathers are now enrolled in our armed forces to preserve their national heritage, which was embodied in our deathless Declaration and the inspired Constitution which implemented it. If we necessitous stay-at-homes require inspiration to supplement the efforts of our fighting civic partners abroad, let us again look at that Declaration. That inspiring last sentence is the very essence of our continuing self-governing partnership, with all of its benefits and all of its responsibilities. It reads: "And for the support of this Declaration with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Our 10,000,000 young relatives, friends, neighbors, and civic partners are laying their lives on the altar of those sacred principles. We who must stay at home to work, to pray, and to save for that common cause can do no less than pledge our fortunes and our sacred honor to help them. Each generation of Americans since 1776 has thus rendered an account of its stewardship to our priceless self-governing heritage. Our generation might well pledge with its heart and its mind: "Faith of our fathers, holy faith, we will be true to thee till death."

JOHN BORG, *Publisher.*

The Silver Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a column by Mr. Robert P. Vanderpoel, financial editor of the Chicago Herald-American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

SILVER SENATORS MAY BE DUE VOTE OF THANKS

(By Robert P. Vanderpoel)

There have been few things economicwise about which more misinformation has been circulated, not only by word of mouth, but also in print, than silver.

Because this country's silver program was a haphazard sort of thing and failed to represent a clear-cut policy it was always quite indefensible.

On the other hand, it was attacked largely not because of what it was or wasn't, but rather because of a deep prejudice against silver on the part of the traditionalist school of economics, which favored gold, and partly because of private interests which desired cheap silver for their selfish purposes.

As a matter of fact, the silver program of the United States, as indefensible as it was, has proved something of a boon to this country.

PUT TO GOOD USE

We had a great stock pile of silver, a substantial portion of which has been put to excellent use in the war effort. If we had had similar stock piles of copper, lead, zinc, aluminum, nickel, magnesium, antimony, and other metals we should now have been far ahead of where we are in our war program.

Recently there has been a great deal of propaganda to the effect that a few selfish "silver Senators" would not permit silver to be used in the war effort. Despite denials of such a position by the silver Senators, this charge continues to circulate. It has been encouraged, we suspect, by a small element which has been anxious to have Treasury silver thrown on the market not as an aid to the war, but to enable this group to carry on a profitable business.

It is interesting to note, therefore, that R. J. Lund, director of the War Production Board's miscellaneous minerals division, testifying before a Senate subcommittee, stated that the silver made available for war purposes has been adequate to meet all needs.

TWENTY-FIVE THOUSAND TONS BEING USED

He declared that some 25,000 tons of silver had been earmarked for use in specified war plants and that plans had been advanced for allocations of even more silver to other projects.

The use of silver "On this tremendous scale," he asserted, was possible only because of the acquisition of the white metal over a long period of years.

When the record is finally written, maybe it will be found that the United States owes a vote of thanks to that little group of "willful Senators" described by one New York financial writer as "Twelve Men Against the Nation."

The War With Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I am informed that today is the occasion in the city of Tokyo when millions of Japanese will pay obeisance to the so-called Son of Heaven. In this connection I think it is worth while to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram which I received today from Mr. James R. Young, American newspaper correspondent. I ask unanimous consent that it may be so printed.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., *April 29, 1943.*

SENATOR GUY GILLETTE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In recent years you have done a fine job in exposing Jap subversive activities in the United States.

The big surprise for you, however, might be in the demonstration in Tokyo, April 29, when millions of Japs will pay obeisance to the Emperor.

We have been at war with Japan 16 months.

The Emperor approved the execution of our aviators.

The Japs have violated all international treaties and commitments.

Yet, Senator GILLETTE, as you well know, we have groups in this country who are today

actively campaigning for a negotiated peace with Japan.

Among your own colleagues are men who think we might negotiate a peace with Japan.

You are aware that in the Senate and House, and in several American cities, we have people who agree with the State Department and the Office of War Information that nothing must be said of a derogatory nature of the Emperor of Japan, and that we must rescue the Emperor that we may deal with him when the war is over.

What are the silent thoughts of the survivors of the battle of the Philippines, who lived on pickled fish heads, blue flies and horse meat when they hear over the Japanese controlled radio that war production is threatened when John L. Lewis starts his campaign on behalf of Hirohito?

Respectfully,

JAMES R. YOUNG.

Manpower Mobilization Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, much quiet pressure is being exerted to secure favorable action by the Congress on the Austin-Wadsworth mobilization bills which provide for making all men between 18 and 65 years of age, and all women between 18 and 50 years of age, subject to draft for civilian work necessary to the war effort.

These bills provide for the drafting of civilians through local draft boards. The President would be empowered to determine the needs of agriculture and industry and the relative importance to the war effort of each. Upon this determination the quotas would be fixed and individuals could be drafted to fill deficiencies in various subdivisions of agriculture and industry. Transportation for persons selected, including dependents and household effects, would be paid to and from place of employment by the Government. Training would be given those needing it to equip them for their new jobs.

These proposals are, in short, intended to make of civilians soldiers without uniforms. The minute Congress passes such an act the United States of America has then and there passed into a military dictatorship. This cannot be denied, because the moment we concentrate political power and economic power in the same group, we have nothing less than dictatorship, regardless of what it may be called.

This would be such a grave step that it ought to be taken only after every possible effort has been exhausted to make voluntary cooperation work effectively. The administration's argument that the law would not be enforced until it should become evident that efforts to mobilize labor for the war effort voluntarily have failed is a specious argument in view of the administration's lack of real effort to make voluntary cooperation possible. The people are still being kept in ignorance of what they are supposed to do voluntarily to contribute to adequate cooperation in war production and essential civilian services.

It is said in some circles by those in position to know that there is not the slightest disposition on the part of certain elements in the War Manpower Commission to induce voluntary cooperation. So persistent are these reports, and apparently so well founded are they, that it is becoming obvious the Congress must make, through some special committee empowered to compel attendance, to administer oaths and to subpena documents, a thorough investigation into the operations of the War Manpower Commission and the Budget Bureau's operations in connection with the Commission in order to determine whether or not there has been any effort worthy of the name exerted by the War Manpower Commission and the Bureau of the Budget to make voluntary cooperation effective.

It is believed by those closest to the picture that such an investigation would uncover what would amount to a studied effort on the part of some elements in the Commission to prevent effective voluntary cooperation, or such gross stupidity as to amount to the same thing in the final results.

These bills propose to establish in the United States a system of forced labor, such as exists in Germany and Japan with merely a degree of difference. We might just as well cast aside all pretense and look these bills in the face. Their enactment would impair the constitutional guarantee against the taking of property without due compensation or without due process of law. Their enactment would violate the constitutional freedom of American citizens from involuntary servitude; at least, the effect would be that.

These bills, if enacted, would permit favoring of particular sections of the country, or different branches of agriculture and industry, as against other sections and other branches, through the assignment of selectees. Under the terms of these bills, the President could, through transportation or exportation of labor, ruin sections of agriculture or industry, destroy local tranquillity, break up families, and create all sorts of racial problems.

While it is argued these bills would not directly interfere with free speech or free assembly, no intelligent person can doubt for a moment that they would have the effect of doing both. Since these civilians, both men and women, would, in effect, be soldiers without uniform, subject to orders, they would not dare complain, criticize their overseers, refuse to go where told, refuse to do whatever work might be assigned them, and accept whatever compensation and living conditions might be provided for them. That is the essence of involuntary servitude.

The Congress owes to the American people the solemn duty of trying in every way possible to render voluntary cooperation effective before it turns its back on our American system, for which American men and women are fighting and dying on the battle fronts, and takes the path to the very kind of dictatorship we are so desperately struggling to oppose for ourselves and the rest of the world.

The Congress and the people should ponder well the Biblical injunction that a man profits nothing if he gains the whole world and loses his own soul. How could America profit from its sacrifices of blood and treasure if it wins the war and loses its own freedom?

Every liberty-loving citizen ought forthwith to write to his Representative and Senator in Congress demanding that a thorough investigation be made and that no effort be spared to make voluntary cooperation effective in the mobilization of manpower.

Training of Girls by National Youth Administration for War Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH O. BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Pearl Strachan, dealing with certain activities of the National Youth Administration in connection with the current consideration of whether the Administration shall be continued. The article is published in the Christian Science Monitor Week magazine section of April 17, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GIRLS LEARN TO DO THE JOB

(By Pearl Strachan)

Girls have gone into the shops at Quoddy village for war production, training along with the boys. More than 160 have arrived already at this Maine seacoast community of the National Youth Administration, and every Wednesday a new group is added. Like the boys, they came from all over the New England States and from New York State, and the same age limits apply—from 16 to 24. Many of them are under 20, and for the first time in their lives out on their own.

This brings the youth trainee population at Quoddy up to 711. What threatened to become a ghost village 6 years ago, when Congress halted the New Deal's plan to harness the great tidal power of the Bay of Fundy, became instead the source of a continuous flow of manpower. Thousands of young men trained at Quoddy since 1937 have taken their skill into defense factories and shipyards, or, in the armed forces, proving extremely useful.

The girls are having everything the boys have. They put in a workweek of 45 hours, combined classroom teaching and shop experience. At 7 in the morning they line up in their trim overalls and turbans for breakfast in a dining room that seats 900. They sign on for work at 7:30. Dinner is served between 11:30 and 12:30. The working day finishes at 4:30, and an hour later they have supper. On Saturdays they work from 7:30 to 12:30.

After a night at Kendall Dormitory, where the girls are housed in airy and well-heated but extremely simple quarters, I followed them into the shops and found they had already mastered certain crafts to the point of production. A girl of 17, from Machias, Maine, had learned in 6 weeks how to operate a boring mill in the machine shop. Since leaving high school she had hired herself out by the hour taking care of neighbors' children. She wanted to learn a trade and do something for her country. Someone in the United States Employment Service told her about Quoddy, and she applied.

Other girls were working at lathes and grinders and drill presses. In the aviation sheet-metal shop a girl who had had 3 years of college was putting a patch on the side of an airplane. She had won the warm commendation of her instructor by making an intricate metal fitting and placing it exactly right inside the plane. She had excelled at riveting and welding.

In the lecture room of the aviation-engines department a very attractive young woman was writing a composition on the fundamentals of aerodynamics, while another talked to me about motors and carburetors. A high-school graduate from a small Maine coastal town was bending sheet metal for aviation engine racks.

Four girls who had studied chemistry or physics and advanced mathematics were among a group of young men learning to assemble and disassemble aviation instruments. It was precision work requiring the utmost patience and accurate measurements and calibrating to the thousandth of an inch. They used a watchmaker's or jeweler's lathe. A course of 480 hours was calculated to fit them for industry, at a salary of $1,500 base, plus 20 percent to start, with promise of rapid increase according to progress.

Technical training is not all the girls are getting at Quoddy Village. Louis Varrichione, the project director, a dynamic and forthright individual, feels that the training must be, more than anything else, for the preservation of the democratic way of life. All activities at the village, therefore, are designed to instill into the minds of the young workers their responsibility to their country and to the rest of mankind.

To the junior project foremen, chosen among the youth to keep order and see that village rules are observed, he says, "Remember that in addition to leaders, our country needs good citizens and intelligent and discerning followers who have the ability to judge between sound and faulty leadership." Leadership, he points out to the J. P. F.'s, brings responsibility rather than special privileges, and the need for setting a good example.

The father of four children himself, he is deeply concerned about young people in these war years and after. He is urging special attention to the problems of the early teens. So much is being done, he points out, to entertain the men in uniform during their leisure, while the boys and girls of from 13 to 17, too young to get into the armed forces, and on fire to do something, are being neglected.

Youth at Quoddy will not be giving employers problems of absenteeism when it gets into industry, if the character training there is anything to judge by. Every morning at a quarter to seven the young people are lined up in the gymnasium for brief exercises before breakfast. First comes a morning prayer, recited by a junior chaplain. There are three—Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish. They take turns. The prayer is sufficiently undenominational to be acceptable to all. It must not, however, be just a wordy generalization. Something short, asking for divine help in doing the production job, in cooperating with fellow workers, is acceptable. The salute to the flag follows; then the singing of some "pep-up" song, and an inspection of the ranks to make sure that all are neat and clean and that the proper clothing is worn. Girls must wear coveralls or slacks and have their hair confined, for safety's sake, under a net or a turban. Boys are not allowed to wear their good suits in the machine shop. For most of them the shop environment is new also, and they need lessons in economy.

The group of attractive colonial-style buildings which were put up for Quoddy workers on the abandoned power project, and intended as temporary accommodation, serve the National Youth Administration as both residences and business quarters. The families of the senior personnel live in tidy white houses facing the bay, with a view of wooded islands and the nearby coast of New Brunswick. From Eastport, 3 miles away, a small boat carries passengers to Campobello Island, where the Franklin D. Roosevelts have their summer home.

One long dormitory building houses the boys, and another the girls. All must be in bed by 10:30 p. m., except on Fridays and Saturdays. There is a dance in the gymnasium every Friday night. Girls leaving Kendall dormitory in the evening are carefully checked in and out by the counselor on duty. The boys are allowed to enter the main living room between certain hours of the evening and on Sunday afternoons, after 2 o'clock.

Miss Evelyn Derry, who is administrative assistant in charge of girls, has had a good deal of experience with young people. For a number of years she had charge of important Young Women's Christian Association centers in China. She served in the same capacity in a number of cities in the United States.

Mr. Varrichione, who came to the United States from Italy when he was 6 years old, has had a varied career, which appears to have given him a thorough understanding of youth's needs and problems. The young people at Quoddy think the world of Mr. V, as they call him, and try earnestly to live up to his expectations of them. He served in the United States Navy between the ages of 14 and 18, and on settling down again in Massachusetts became active in boys' club work, which he has carried on in some form ever since.

The 16-year-old boys and girls who go to Quoddy must be officially out of school. There is no race or religious barrier. Transportation to the village and back to the home or point of induction is paid by the National Youth Administration, provided the term of from 3 to 4 months' training is completed. Young people who wish to leave before their training is finished must furnish the money for their transportation home.

While at the village they receive food, housing, medical and dental care, and all necessary bedding and household linen free of charge. They are paid $10.80 in cash each month, to take care of personal needs such as haircuts, tooth brushes, and spending money. The clothing they are advised to take with them is working overalls and simple sports clothes for leisure hours.

Quoddy has a system of youth government, for "Mr. V" is very eager to teach the boys and girls the responsibilities of citizenship. The experience in exercising self-government, he states, will help to prepare them for full responsibility as adults. The youth government consists of an executive, a legislative, and a judiciary branch. A large room has been set aside as the senate chamber.

The girls, of course, will have an opportunity to hold office along with the boys.

Placement reports of young men who have been trained at Quoddy should be encouraging to the girls. The February list, for example, shows a large number of mechanics taken on in industry at $1,500 a year to start with. One young man is getting $50 a week cutting diamonds in a defense plant. A sheet joiner receives $52 a week. A carpenter in a shipyard is listed at $55 a week, a coppersmith at $40, an electrician at $35.30, a tack welder at $58 a week.

The United States Employment Service has a representative at Quoddy who makes industrial contacts for employment when the young people finish their training course. The shop units operated are: drafting, foundry, machine shop, sheet metal, welding, aviation aircraft, aviation, sheet metal, aviation engines, aviation instruments, radio. Most of the girls enrolled feel that it is by such training that they can make their particular contribution to the war effort.

The Pan-American Ideal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Pan-American Ideal," delivered by me before the Pan-American Club of the Young Men's Christian Association, Washington, D. C., on April 29, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the Pan-American Club, the pan-American ideal is a part of a long and interesting history of inter-American developments, reaching back into the origins of the American republics. As early as 1810 the Republic of Chile ventured the idea of a confederation, and in 1811 the same country declared itself in favor of an alliance of all the American peoples. In 1818 the Argentinian, San Martín, and the Chilean, O'Higgins, looked forward to a continental plan. But it remained for Bolivar, of Venezuela, the creator of five republics, to call together the delegates at Panama in 1826 in an effort to activate the ideal of continental union. In so doing, Bolivar gave expression to the fraternal aspirations of all America. The flame of the pan-American ideal was constantly renewed by Peru between the years 1846 and 1864, and it can be said that the United States was not foreign to this continental plan from the very beginning. Let us not mention the retrocessions suffered by this ideal throughout the Americas, for we must speak today only of that which should bring us closer together, and not of that which tends to separate us.

No American can dwell upon the significance of pan-Americanism without commenting at length on the figure of Simon Bolivar, the liberator of northern South America, and the embodiment of a personality so complex that all extremes of human reactions found a welcome within his mind and heart. His realism manifested itself when shortly after the death of his young wife he undertook, through the dangerous business of revolution, the hard and brutal task of liberating a continent from the rule of an unsympathetic European power. After the battle was won he was idealist enough to pour his remaining energies into the work of unifying Spanish America into a confederation of states.

From these humble and apparently fruitless beginnings, the American republics emerged triumphant; victorious to the extent that the Bolivarian ideal was not in any way to fade into oblivion with the passing of the Great Liberator. On the contrary, new personalities were to appear on the American scene to carry with intelligence and enthusiasm the torch of human rights and to champion the equality of American states and their absolute privileges as independent nations. The Bolivarian ideal, from its inception, had emphasized these principles, regardless of territorial extent, population, or military strength. These guiding tenets of inter-American relations reached their summit of expression at the Eighth International Conference of American States at Lima, Peru, in 1938, when our Secretary of State was moved to observe that "in our conference we have demonstrated our unshakable determination to respect the integrity of individuals and of states, to uphold the sanctity of the pledged word, and to make needed changes through the orderly process of consultation in a spirit of mutual accommodation." These are fine words indeed, but let us all hope and pray that the printed proceedings of the Eighth International Conference of American States be translated into operations of an active and effective character. No thinking American should quarrel with that declaration, but to a great extent it is left to organizations such as this Pan American Club to support the efforts of our governmental authorities and the leaders of the pan-American movement throughout the Americas in the task of fostering the high ideal of inter-American solidarity.

Although it is not a new idea, it bears repetition to say that it is not enough, not nearly enough, to limit our defense and maintenance of the pan-American ideal to lip service alone. It behooves every friend of pan-Americanism to call upon the unified efforts of every organization, within and without the Government, to educate the people of all the Americas to the full significance and importance of a sound plan of inter-American cooperation. The education of the North American public will doubtless be a long and arduous process, for even in the face of present efforts, which are more determined than ever before in the history of the pan-American movement, our citizens are not inter-American-minded. This is our immediate problem, although the future may present others of even greater difficulty.

It should seem obvious to any American, be he in Patagonia or Newfoundland, that a solidly established scheme of inter-American cooperation, based upon principles of mutual and reciprocal aid, cannot but redound to the material and spiritual benefit of the entire Western Hemisphere. And we need not stop at the 3-mile limit of our coastal waters, for doubtless such an organization of nations would serve to be a most healthy inspiration to the rest of the world to work with us. I do not believe that the Western Hemisphere can assume its role in the affairs of man and isolate itself from the rest of the world. That is why I hope for the eventual cooperation of all nations in a plan of decent associations and contacts.

Of all the projects receiving the attention of our Government today, there is none which calls for more sincerity and seriousness of effort in the post-war period than the perpetuation of the pan-American ideal. To be realistic, however, permit me to state that the success of the pan-American movement does not necessarily depend upon sentiment; on the contrary it must establish its foundations upon the cold and calculated aspects of the mutual benefits, material and otherwise, to be derived therefrom by every member of the American family of nations. It does not require a superior mentality to understand the sensibility of pan-Americanism, and the only reason why the movement had to await an international crisis to receive any real consideration and attention from our Government is simply because of the almost complete lack of interest in or knowledge of Latin America on the part of our citizenry and leaders alike since the birth of the Republic

It has often been observed that the lack of a considerable group of informed citizens may become a real danger, particularly in a country like the United States, where foreign policy is influenced considerably by public opinion. Due to North American attentions, bordering upon worship of the supposedly superior civilizations of Europe, Latin America has been ignored for all practical purposes. To be sure, there have always existed small groups of thinking citizens who made every effort to nourish pan-American relations, but even in university and governmental circles their voices were too weak to be heard above the din of other issues, very often of much less importance to the Nation. The present world crisis has brought into focus not only the desirability of practical pan-Americanism, but also the absolute need for such a scheme if we are to witness the healthy operation of our plans for hemispheric solidarity. We had better not indulge in too much wishful thinking, and entertain the notion that with the termination of the present world struggle the ills of the universe will be settled for once and for all. As stated a moment ago, this crisis threw the Americas into each others' arms, proof positive of the natural need that we have for each other. In future years issues will arise, as they have always arisen, which will call for the unqualified adherence to a common purpose on the part of the American republics, and it is for this fundamental reason that we should not permit the disintegration of the inter-American structure which is now in the prdcess of construction. The chain of inter-American understanding must perforce be composed of links forged with the solder of mutual respect and consideration, each nation being ever mindful of the rights and prerogatives of the other republics as free and independent members of a great family of political entities. This is the honest and practical thing to do; it is the only sensible attitude to take. Otherwise our relations with one another will evolve into a treadmill of misunderstanding, mutual suspicion, bickering, and confusion. We refuse to believe that the peoples of the Americas will ever permit such circumstances to prevail.

We must come to understand and respect each other's way of life through the process of studying the history, the customs, the civilization, and the languages of the Americas. We must learn not to condemn another nation's ways solely because they are different than our own. We must make every effort to practice the tenets of our own Constitution, which are founded upon principles of tolerance, good will, and freedom. We must avoid like the plague the vicious ruts of prejudice, narrow-mindedness, and provincialism, and never permit our thinking to become blinded by the black clouds of supposed self-sufficiency.

The recent visit of President Roosevelt to Mexico and that of Vice President WALLACE to Central and South America are nothing less than signal triumphs for the pan-American ideal. The nations of Latin America can now be assured of our attitude, for to say only that these events are of transcendental importance is to put it mildly.

So it is that I am pleased and proud to add my voice to the ever-swelling chorus of those North, Central, and South Americans who faithfully and sincerely support the principle of inter-American unity, toward the end that the Bolivarian ideal may be perpetuated for the mutual benefit of all the American republics in every field of human relations after we have effected the peace which we so anxiously await.

Planning for the Post-War Period

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered in New York City on Thursday, April 29, before the War Council of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The war is not yet won, but we are moving forward on many fronts toward final victory. We are witnessing the mobilization of our manpower and resources on a scale hitherto unknown. A vast production program is approaching its peak and may reach the peak in the early winter months.

By the end of 1943 we will have about 9,700,000 men in the armed forces. We will have about 20,000,000 men and women engaged in direct war industries. Perhaps 2,000,000 men in the armed forces will not seek to return to private employment. Factory employment today is half again as large as the average for 1929, and about two and one-half times that of the low of 1932. After the war some of the women in industry, both peacetime and war, will wish to return to the home; many of them will be reluctant to give up their jobs. Many of the aged groups will want to get at once on the pension list, but gainful employment for about 55 to 56 millions will be necessary after the war. How will we meet the imperative demand for reasonable and constant employment of fifty-five or fifty-six million workers? Of one fact we are certain: Employment, production, and economic demand are interdependent.

We may find it necessary to make temporary provision for the men and women in the armed forces and services. This should be done now and before the war ends. If postponed, political groups and parties will vie with one another in trying to secure the soldiers' support and vote. Through slow demobilization over a period of many months, with wartime compensation continued, we may in part meet the immediate problem. But the American soldier will not be long content with this or any like plan; he will be looking for constant employment. We may find it expedient to continue temporarily the operation of some of the war plants. But this is not the final answer.

Much official post-war planning is proceeding on the theory that with the end of the war the Government must embark upon a program of public spending in order to avert widespread unemployment and an economic crisis. It is now possible to state with more or less accuracy the steps in the evolution of public spending in the United States. Until a recent date, public spending has been defended as a means to be employed by Government in periods of economic crisis to restore balance and to provide relief. A public-works reserve was first proposed; that is to say, in times of normal or above-normal production, the Government should abstain from public-works expenditures but should make plans for needed public works and carry these plans into execution at the beginning of a depression for the purpose of supplementing the income of private business and checking unemployment. This idea did not involve the borrowing of money by the Government.

It sought a condition of balance by which the Government would not add to the boom tendencies during a period of expanding production but would withhold its spending for a period of declining production.

In 1933 the pump-priming theory was advanced. Deficit financing by Government was defended upon the theory that public money in quantities would set the slackened private-business machine working again. This was an emergency device, to be abandoned as soon as the private-enterprise system began to work. Later, however, the theory of certain academic economists was heard in Government circles, to wit, that depression is a chronic phenomenon in the free-enterprise system, if indeed it does not grow out of it. It was said that the capitalist system or the system of free enterprise is no longer capable of functioning effectively because the dynamic element in the system has been private investment; that the savings of millions of people must be brought back by the Government into the stream of spending; and that private investment cannot be revived on a scale sufficiently broad to absorb the savings of the people because opportunities for investment are no longer open. Generally, it was asserted that the frontiers had disappeared with the opportunity for territorial and resource expansion; that the population increase was slowing down, and that technological development had matured. You remember the familiar statements that there were no longer in sight any great inventions as the railroads, as the automobiles, which called for huge expenditures and investment. If the premise is accepted, then the conclusion necessarily follows that the free-enterprise system is helpless to recover its energy and that this is not purely an emergency condition but a characteristic of the system itself which will remain constant.

For these reasons, and more which need not be repeated, a new type of economic organization was recommended—a system under which the Government will become a continuous borrower of the savings of the people and will use these savings on various kinds of projects for the purpose of creating national income. It follows as a corollary that continuous increase in the national debt is contemplated, not as a matter to be feared and resisted but as a desirable means by which the national income will be increased, even though the national deficit continues at five, ten, or even fifteen billions of dollars, or more. We are admonished that this condition need not create alarm because the savings of the people will be marshaled to support a permanent program of public works, supported by high taxation and deficit borrowing.

A few influential leaders in Government have accepted this theory and much of the planning for the post-war world is built upon it. It is not the character or size of the projects to be carried on which is important, the matter of high importance is the philosophy upon which is rests. Plainly stated, it is that our system of free economy is through; that it cannot provide the consumptive demand which will enable it to produce at a rate and on a scale sufficient to provide constant employment. The theory, which has been but inadequately described, has been called the dual consumptive economy as distinguished from a dual productive economy. At first it was not suggested that the Government would borrow money to take over industries or to operate them either in competition with or to the exclusion of private industry. Under the system Government would merely assume responsibility to assure a sustained consumption by providing all the additional income necessary. Lately, and since the outbreak of the war in Europe, the idea that we have built up our great national income by vast expenditures of public money and that the same device can be retained not merely in a period of emergency but continuously to produce the same results in peacetime, has been pressed home with increasing vigor.

The theory that public spending of borrowed money must not be considered as an emergency device but as a permanent instrument of public policy is too widely accepted. The majority of those who have accepted the theory have done so on the implicit understanding that Government would borrow money to invest in needed public improvements, to supply the consumptive demand for increased and increasing production, but that the Government itself would not enter into direct competition with private industry. Already, however, the recommendation for a form of copartnership between Government and private industry in certain enumerated key industries has appeared. Clearly, the idea is held that the Government must borrow the savings of the people to be used to invest in private industries, purchasing the overriding and controlling stocks and securities in great industries; and it will follow as a corollary that Government itself must eventually become more and more the sole owner of such industries. It is difficult to envision a system of enterprise half Government owned and half privately owned.

Let it be clearly understood that Government responsibility in the economic field will increase rather than decline in the post-war period; that Government control will be exerted as it has not been exerted in the past to correct the abuses in our highly complex economic system. In short, that the private-enterprise system is not an end but that back of it are people with privileges and rights to be preserved, and that, above all, human values must be conserved.

That the private-enterprise system has sometimes failed or else has proven itself to be inadequate cannot be denied, in view of our experience of one short decade past. That system is definitely on the spot again, or will be when the war ends. If fairly constant employment cannot be provided, the American people will turn to Government, even though the mistakes, inadequacies, or policies of Government are, ironically, responsible for the failure. It is this turn which must be forestalled. By and large, the American people do not wish to see their Government turned general employer. In this thought we are united. Again, we believe the vast majority of the American people are willing to rely upon our free-enterprise system as the surest means of preserving essential human values and freedoms with which we are blessed. If we are to succeed, public policies must be adopted and followed which will make possible not only the operation of the free-enterprise system but its constant expansion.

There are factors favorable to the post-war prosperity of private enterprise. These have been often stated. First, it may be noted that the major engineering problems of reconversion to peacetime operation may not be as great as commonly supposed. An economist of note has estimated that difficult engineering problems of conversion will be confined to industries responsible for less than 10 percent of commodity production. At the end of the war it is certain that deferred demand and shortages will be large—perhaps twenty-five to thirty billion dollars by mid-1944. It is also certain that the expendable surplus of the people in the form of cash, demand deposits, time deposits, War Savings bonds, etc., will be larger than ever before in our history. This spendable surplus has been referred to as liquid surplus assets, and it is reasonably certain that the people are holding such assets, not for the purpose of permanent saving but for the purpose of spending when the opportunity to spend again exists.

During the period of depression business accustomed itself to think of levels of production and income which we now know to be low. Several careful students have concluded that the present level of employment, if sustained, will produce a gross national product at current prices of approximately $155,000,000,000. This is above the production in 1942—slightly under the present rate of production. But a normal increase over 1929 would fall not far short of the $155,000,000,000 figure. We must again accustom ourselves to think in terms of the normal, despite the lingering memories of the low levels of the depression years. There are also factors unfavorable to the prosperity of post-war enterprise which need not be here listed.

The matter of supreme importance is the prompt approval of public policies which will make it possible for the enterprise system to furnish the jobs and to meet the certain obligations of the post-war period. Private enterprise must face termination of contracts with huge sums due from the Government. It must also face the possibility of a huge volume of Government-owned surplus property. These factors, on the one hand, with excessive taxes and severe regulations of many kinds, on the other hand, can place enterprise between the jaws of a vise. There must be no serious errors in these matters.

Most plans for the future give some attention to taxation, but it may be stated (with regard to the errors of generalization) that dependable post-war planning in the business field begins and all but ends within the four corners of our Federal revenue laws. Many post-war problems which now engage attention will take care of themselves, industry by industry, plant by plant, through the ordinary operation of the incentive system if the revenue laws permit. We are excluding in this generalization, as a matter of course, the all-important question of our relations with the rest of the world after this war and of our participation in any kind of world organization. Most of the anticipated troubles which are likely to arise out of labor relations, tendency toward monopoly, unployment, and the like, will largely adjust themselves if the free economy is preserved.

Certainly more than one-half of the capital in American business is so-called equity capital. From what sources have we obtained this capital? We have issued and sold common and preferred stock; we have borrowed money from individual investors; but more than one-half of it, by and large, represents reinvested earnings. Public issues of common and preferred stocks and direct personal investments of the owners of business will remain important sources of equity capital. There are strong reasons supporting the belief that in the immediate future reinvested earnings must be depended upon to furnish even a greater part of the equity capital of industry. Industry was generally prosperous as it entered World War No. 1, and taxes did not prevent business from making large earnings and creating considerable reserves during that war. We had but shortly emerged from a great depression at the beginning of World War No. 2. Government debt was very high and taxes were already high. Tax rates have rapidly risen. The national debt is still rising. I need not remind you that our tax rates at present are the highest in our history and that the "tax take" is much larger than many of the experts estimated at the time of the passage of the 1942 Revenue Act. The rapid expansion of our industries for war production is a familiar tale. Certain it is that with the end of the war and the wholesale cancelation of Government orders, many workers will be out of jobs and many industries, such as aviation, shipbuilding, etc., will face very difficult problems if not bankruptcy or receivership. This undoubtedly will be true unless we meet the threat through some form of savings for use in the post-war years, and the speedy change in our revenue laws to permit the creation of reserves, before taxes or at least upon favorable tax terms. Reserves must be ade-

quate, not only to finance conversions back to peace, but for new enterprise, the building of new industry.

We must reexamine the tax treatment which we are now giving to dividends paid. I do not suggest that dividends in the hands of individual stockholders should be exempted but even here some favorable tax treatment must be considered. I do not suggest that the tax burden should be lighter now during the progress of this war, either on the individual or the corporation. It is better that taxes be placed as high as we can now bear them, provided always that a reasonable portion of the earnings of individuals and organized business is covered into the Treasury and there held as a certain reserve against the day when the war ends. Direct tax levies cannot be greatly increased, if at all, during the war but additional levies may be made for the purpose of savings or loans. Provision should be made at once legalizing adequate reserves both to the individual and to the corporation.

To sum up, industry must be financed. Free enterprise supplies the required funds from savings—from accumulated earnings, from investors, from creditors. The savings of the people, in turn, have their source only in earnings. The circle is simple: The system lives upon the savings of the people; those savings are available only if industry can offer an attractive inducement; and hope of profit after taxes is the sound incentive. But the circle is also fragile: It is broken, perhaps beyond repair, if taxes destroy all hope of profit. When the circle is broken, then free enterprise cannot function; and the Government steps in.

During war, at least during a war of reasonably short duration, the immediate return to the industry, and to its owners and creditors, becomes a secondary consideration. Our "take" for the Treasury can be much greater Industry generally has turned to war production without regard to profits. Industry is to be commended upon its position that it seeks no profit from war. But we must not destroy confidence in future profits

The Revenue Act of 1942 was framed and adopted by the Congress with all these factors, and many others, considered and balanced. Its high rates frequently extract for the Treasury as much as 95 cents out of every dollar of industry's profits It can remain in force during the war only if there is hope of reasonable taxation after the cessation of hostilities Speaking, as I can, only for myself, I am happy to outline briefly my present views:

1. Corporate and individual income taxes cannot be greatly increased.

2. Reserves for post-war contingencies and for conversion to peacetime activities, and for deferred maintenance and repairs, must be established and built up out of earnings during the war.

3. The present rate of tax upon capital gains may prove too high—certainly it should not be increased—and the greatest benefit of the special treatment of capital gains and losses lies in a certainty of their stability.

4. A system of encouraging the purchase of War bonds out of current earnings is preferable to a scheme of compulsory saving.

5. Our tax laws and policies should not be nullified by the imposition of taxes by uncontrolled administration under the guise of renegotiation or price fixing.

6. There are several potent mistakes which must be corrected, particularly in the excess-profits tax and the post-war credit provisions.

7. A reasonable pay-as-you-go plan for individuals should be adopted.

8. If we require greater revenues than the present laws will produce, they should be sought from new sources, and a general sales tax should be considered.

9. The nonwar expenditures of our Government, both during and after the war, must be maintained at a minimum.

10. The excess-profits tax should be repealed or greatly reduced promptly upon the cessation of hostilities.

11. The profits of industry should be taxed but once, and we must find a satisfactory substitute for the present system of taxing them as earned and again as they are distributed.

The American people are united for victory, for final victory. In the crucible of war, which is not yet won, America is finding her soul again, and more and more our people will shake themselves free of the seductive voices, speaking in terms of Old World theories and concepts falsely advanced as the basis of progress and a final Utopia. We will constantly strive for security—security for all our people—but we will not forget that all the large pages in human history have been written by the men and races who were willing to fight for economic freedom, civil and political liberty. The vast majority, at least, understand that political liberty is inseparably linked with economic freedom. In the meantime, "the good-neighbor policy" at home between government and the people, without class division or distinction, will strengthen America's arm for the hard task of peace ahead.

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the ninth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. In this installment of Senator Cockrell's speech he brings us to the most momentous international monetary undertaking ever tried, up to that time, in the world's financial history. The monetary convention of France, Belgium, Italy, and Switzerland—joined later by Greece, Rumania, and the States of the Church—in a convention or contract to standardize their coinage and do away with the inequalities of international exchange, more commonly known as the Latin Union.

In the succeeding installments of Senator Cockrell's speech, we will find the record of the negotiation of the representative of this Government in dealing with the representative of European governments in an effort to effect one of the greatest monetary reforms of that or any other time.

The review of the reports and recommendation of the Department of the Interior of that day as to the tribute to be extracted by the Government from mining the ores in public land closely resembles the present-day policies of the head of this great Government department—policies that the mining experience of past generations have proven absurd and impractical.

The ninth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

Such was the condition of coinage in 1860.

Now, let us trace our own action; let us see what influence we, through our representatives, one of whom, the senior Senator from Ohio, Mr Sherman, is upon this floor today, have had in bringing about the present condition. In 1862, the Commissioner of the General Land Office of the United States, Hon. J. M. Edmunds, in his annual report to the Secretary of the Interior, described "the great auriferous region of the United States * * * embracing portions of Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado, all of New Mexico, with Arizona, Utah, Nevada, California, Oregon, and Washington Territory, and other mountain ranges."

And then said, "These mountains are literally stocked with minerals, gold and silver being interspersed in profusion over this immense surface and daily brought to light by new discoveries. The precious metals are found imbedded in mountains of quartz, rich washings marking the pathway of rivers and floods. Besides their wealth in gold, no part of the world is so rich in silver mines as Nevada and New Mexico, and yet these may be estimated as only in proportion to the gold fields, which are in process of development with amazing results."

The recent discoveries in the Colorado or southern portion of California, and in the regions stretching thence away up to and north of the Salmon River in Washington Territory, are every day stimulating the mining enterprise of our people. Prior to the gold discoveries in 1848, at Sutter's race in California, the gold product of the world was only an average of eighteen millions. In 1853 the yield of California was seventy millions, about four times the aggregate gold product of the world prior to 1848, and that sum may be set down as the present average from that State alone. If we compare the known gold fields elsewhere in our domain with the yield of California we would have, if an equal ratio of labor was applied, an annual value of between three and four hundred millions. That an adequate amount of labor to this end will be at hand when peace returns is not to be doubted.

He then suggests that an immense revenue may be readily obtained by subjecting the public mines there to lease under quarterly payments Mark the language, because it has been misleading in Europe ever since.

"An immense revenue may be readily obtained by subjecting the public mines there to lease under quarterly payments, or quarterly tax as seigniorage upon the actual product."

And then states the amount of the public debt, and that—

"A tax of some 8 percent on the whole yield of the mines * * * would pay off the interest."

And then says:

"The yield of the precious metals alone of this region will not fall below $100,000,000 the present year, and it will augment with the increase of population for centuries to come. The value of these mines is absolutely incalculable. * * * Within 10 years, the annual product of these mines will reach $200,000,000 in the precious metals alone."

There is a distinct statement that these mines were public mines belonging to the Government, upon which a tax could be levied, and that statement has been thrown in the face of our delegates to almost every international monetary conference we have had.

He asserts that while his estimate may be somewhat extravagant he believes "experience will demonstrate that the estimate is too low."

The Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Caleb B. Smith, in transmitting this report to the President, qouted from it and said:

"The present annual production in California is estimated to average $70,000,000, and the Commissioner after extensive inquiry from all available sources estimates the production of gold the present year at $100,000,000."

And then said:

"If an amount of labor relatively equal to that expended in California had been applied to the gold fields already known to exist outside of that State, it is believed that the production of this year, including that of California, would have exceeded $400,000,000."

Four hundred million dollars in 1 year, and you ask me how did these exaggerations and misrepresentations of our officials have any weight or influence with foreign nations? I answer:

In September 1863, at Berlin, an international statistical congress was convened for the express purpose of considering the question of weights, measures, and coins, and was composed of delegates from Australia, Belgium, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Holland, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Prussia, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and many other nationalities and provinces, and our Government was there represented by Hon. Samuel B. Ruggles, duly appointed and accredited by the President of the United States.

On September 11, 1863, Mr. Ruggles, as our representative, presented to that congress a written statement in which he quoted from the official report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office of 1862, the parts which I have just read, and then added:

"From the documents and other evidences now before the International Statistical Congress, it must be apparent that the auriferous regions of the United States are destined sooner or later to add materially to the supply of precious metals, and thereby to affect the currency of the world, especially if taken in connection with the capacity of the auriferous regions of Russia, Australia, and British America, and the possibility of increased activity in the mines of Mexico."

He then suggested the appointment of a commission "to collect such facts as may be gathered from authentic sources in respect to the probable future production of gold and silver, and to present them for consideration to the International Statistical Congress at the next or some future session."

It is easy to imagine with what alarm, apprehension, and consternation these glowing descriptions, exaggerated statements, of the rapidly approaching avalanche of gold and silver must have been received, considered, and digested by these assembled doctrinaires from the nations of the earth in their efforts to solve the question and to determine and agree upon the weight and standard for the coinage of such masses of the precious metals.

These exaggerations were continued from year to year. They were all spread before the representative men of every nation in the world, the men who were delegated by their governments to represent them in considering the question of weights, measures, and coinage. As a matter of course those reports were made back to every one of the governments represented just as a full report was made to our Government here. But I shall go on and show that these exaggerations continued from year to year.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in the finance report of December 4, 1862, in speaking of the metalliferous regions of the United States, said:

"This product of gold and silver during the current year will not probably fall very much, if at all, short of $100,000,000, and it must long continue gradually yet rapidly to increase. If this product be subjected to a reasonable seigniorage as suggested by some, or if, as suggested by others, the mineral lands be subdivided and sold in convenient parcels with proper reservations in favor of the miners now in occupation of particular localities, a very considerable revenue may doubtless be obtained from these regions without hardship to the actual settlers or occupiers."

Here is another intimation that these are public mines.

The Director of the Mint, in his report of October 27, 1862, to the Secretary of the Treasury, described in glowing colors the gold and silver yield of our country, and said:

"Adding together all these sources of supply of both gold and silver, we may safely estimate an annual yield in these items of $175,000,000, or seven times the amount produced annually for some years prior to the year 1815."

The Director of the Mint, in his report of November 23, 1864, quotes from the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office of 1862, and then goes on to describe the probable yield of the precious metals in this country, and says:

"I anticipate a production of gold and silver for the year 1866 of $200,000,000."

He also estimated the yield of 1865 at $120,000,000, and then said:

"In submitting the above estimates of the annual production of gold and silver I concur with the Commissioner of the General Land Office, who computed the yield of the precious metals in 1862 at $100,000,000, although I am not unaware that the computation of the San Francisco press greatly reduces the aggregate."

The Director of the Mint, in his report of September 29, 1865, said:

"The reports from the gold and silver mining portions of the United States are of the most encouraging character. The developments of the past year prove the supply of these minerals to be inexhaustible * * *. It is not easy to obtain any other reliable statistics than those officially appended to the report of the Director of the Mint, but these do not assume to give the amount of the entire production of the precious metals. The shipments to other countries must be large.

"For example, we are vaguely assured that the silver mines of Nevada average a shipment of 1 ton daily, which would equal $12,000,000,000 annually. * * *

"We have had frequent opportunities for conversation with persons who travel or reside in the various mining regions of the United States and of contiguous provinces, and it is interesting to hear their accounts of the vast development of wealth and prospects of profitable industry. We also have an interesting statement, and one particularly so at this juncture of our national affairs, from a proprietor in the gold region of North Carolina, that 'the system of paid labor is likely to show its just and natural effects in the increased return of gold.'"

In order to ascertain with accuracy our productions of gold and silver, Congress, in the sundry civil appropriation law of July 28, 1866, appropriated $10,000 to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to collect reliable statistical information concerning the gold and silver mines of the Western States and Territories. Mr. J. Ross Browne was appointed the special commissioner for the collection of mining statistics, and on November 24, 1866, submitted his preliminary report, accompanied by many statistical and special reports, and said:

"Assuming the estimate of the product of bullion as above given to be approximately correct, it will be seen that the States and Territories on the Pacific slope produce annually upward of $100,000,000 of the precious metals, a quantity more than 4 times as great as the total product of the world less than 30 years ago. The improved processes for the extraction of these metals from their ores made within the past 2 years and the constantly increasing area over which gold and silver mines are being developed furnish strong guaranties that there will be no abatement of the product for years to come. * * * The approximate estimate already given of the gold and silver product of the Western States and Territories for 1866 shows a total of $106,000,000, or nearly double the combined bullion of the Government and all the banks of the country."

Much consideration is given to the celebrated Comstock lode, and Mr. Brown quotes from a report made by Baron Richtofen in 1866 on the Comstock lode, its character, and the probable mode of its continuance and depth, in which he said:

"In winding up these considerations we come to the positive conclusion that the amount of nearly $50,000,000 which have been extracted from the Comstock lode is but a small proportion of the silver awaiting future extraction in the virgin portions of the vein from the lowest level explored down to indefinite depth; but that, from analogy with other argentiferous veins as well as from facts observed on the Comstock lode, the diffusion of silver through extensive deposits of middle and low grade ores is far more probable than its accumulation in bodies of rich ore."

On March 5, 1868, Mr. Brown submitted a full and final report under said appropriation, in which he said:

"No uneasiness need be felt as to a decrease in the source of supply. After many years of travel through the mining regions I feel justified in asserting that our mineral resources are practically without limit. Explorations made by competent parties during the past year in many parts of the mineral region hitherto unknown demonstrate that the area of mineral deposit is much larger than was ever before supposed."

And then, referring to the probable production in Mexico, said:

"The production should rise to $50,000,000 a year, and those companies which could get possession of the best mines should make princely fortunes for all their shareholders."

And then, speaking of the yield throughout the world, said:

"A great increase in the production of gold and silver is probable. In California, Australia, and Siberia gold mining is now conducted under many disadvantages."

And, in speaking of the results of the mining, discussed how individuals are enriched by mining and how nations are enriched by mining and how the precious metals fall in value, saying:

"A third effect of the production of the precious metals in large quantities is that the prices of other articles generally are affected. We want gold and silver for coin and for use in the arts, and the smaller the supply relative to the demand, the higher the value."

And then says:

"But whatever may be the relative position of the two metals, it is certain that the time is not far distant when the price of the two as compared with other products of human labor must fall perceptibly. But the production will become much greater than it is. The vast improvements that have been made both in gold and silver mining in the last 20 years are applied to only a few mines, and the reward for those who introduce them into other parts of the world is so large and so certain that the introduction cannot be delayed to any remote period. If all the argentiferous lodes of Mexico, Peru, and

Bolivia known to be rich were worked with the machinery used at Washoe their yield would really flood the world. * * * The inevitable fall in the value of precious metals will be of benefit to mankind generally. It will reduce the wealth of the rich and the debts of nations. Those national debts now existing will be reduced 20 or 30 percent, the interest as well as the principal."

All these statements have been published abroad throughout Europe and are as familiar to the citizens and financiers there as here; in fact, are far more generally known there than here.

While we were thus appalling the nations of Europe and their learned doctrinaires with these fairy tales of the inexhaustible and incalculable production of gold and silver—an overwhelming flood—our officials were not idle in demanding and pleading for the single gold standard and the demonetization of the standard silver dollar, the utter destruction of our democratic constitutional bimetallic system maintained from the foundation of our Government.

I will throw a little light now upon the Demonetization Act of 1873, as to how it came to be passed.

The Director of our Mint, in his report of October 10, 1861, said:

"The gold dollar of the United States, conforming in standard value and decimal character to all the gold and silver coinage of the country except the silver dollar, has been properly selected and should be retained for the standard of value for all coins used or employed in commercial or governmental transactions with other nations.

"The silver dollar of the United States, differing as it does in commercial or decimal value from any other silver coins in our country, cannot, without disturbing our decimal system and producing confusion in the relative value of our gold and silver coinage, be used as a standard. * * * As the dollar, which is the unit of our money, is represented in gold coin, it would seem desirable not to have any other dollar in any other metal; but if this is inadmissible and the silver dollar should be retained, then it should be reduced to eight-tenths of an ounce to be in true relation to our other silver coins. * * * The reason for its retention having ceased, either we should cease to coin the silver dollar or it should be made to conform in weight and value to our lesser silver coins."

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his finance report for 1862, says:

"In his last report the Secretary took occasion to invite the attention of Congress to the importance of uniform weights, measures, and coins, and the worth of the decimal system in the commerce of the world. He now ventures to suggest that the present demonetization of gold may well be availed of for the purpose of taking one considerable step toward these great ends. If the half eagle of the Union be made of equal weight and fineness of the gold sovereign of Great Britain, no sensible injury could possibly arise from the change; while, on the resumption of specie payments, its great advantages would be felt in the equalization of exchange and the convenience of commerce. This act of the United States, moreover, might be followed by the adoption by Great Britain of the Federal decimal divisions of the coin, and thus a most important advance might be secured toward an international coinage, with values decimally expressed."

The Director of the Mint, in his report of October 21, 1863, says:

"Permit me again to refer to the anomalous character of the silver dollar of the United States and to the remarks on this subject in my report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1861. The dollar is our unit of value, but the value of the gold and silver dollars under existing laws is not the same, and therefore we have no certain or determined standard of value. Gold, being more fixed and certain in its valuation, is not only better than silver as a standard of value in our monetary system, but better expresses the equivalent value of foreign coin in our currency, and therefore the gold dollar should be by law adopted as the unit of value of our money."

The Director of the Mint, in his report of October 3, 1864, says:

"Permit me again to refer to the anomalous character of the silver dollar of the United States and to the observations on this subject in former reports. The whole dollar should be made in weight and value the exact multiple of our fractional silver currency, and the gold dollar should be by law declared to be the unit of the value of our money."

The Director of the Mint, in his report of October 25, 1867, speaking of international coinage, says:

"The first claim that meets us is the fact that in some commercial countries gold is the principal medium of trade, in others silver. To maintain these at a steady relation may be given up as an impossibility. We must therefore calculate or assume that as the world grows richer one nation after another will fall into the wake of those which have taken the lead in adopting gold as the standard, using silver only for subsidiary purposes."

Gold for the civilized, intelligent, aristocratic classes, and silver for the toiling millions, the masses of the people; and that, too, to be a subsidiary silver coinage, limited according to the laws of England to $10 of legal tender.

"Nearly 5 years ago (December 31, 1862) a letter on this subject was addressed to the Treasury Department from the Mint, in which the precise ground was taken which has lately been agreed upon by the Paris conference."

I will come to that directly.

"If the proposed international coinage of gold should become a law of the United States the reduced weight would call for a recoinage; and this would be a proper moment to introduce an improvement which the progress of counterfeiting loudly calls for."

In connection with these exaggerations and falsehoods let us trace their effect. What effect did they have? Here are causes, falsehoods, misrepresentations, but believed to be true, and when believed to be true having just as much effect as if true.

On the 23d day of December 1865, France, Belgium, Italy, and Switzerland united in the monetary treaty "to regulate the weight, title, form, and circulation of their gold and silver coins," whereby they agreed to coin of gold only the pieces of 100, 50, 20, 10, and 5 francs in weight, standard, tolerance, and diameter, and of silver only the 5-franc pieces of standard weight and fineness, with unlimited coinage and legal tender for such coins; and further agreed to coin in amounts as herein prescribed for each state, silver coins of 1 and 2 francs, 50 and 20 centimes, of reduced fineness and limited in legal tender to 50 francs; and that any nation could join the convention by adopting its monetary system in regard to gold and silver coins, and that the convention should remain in force until January 1, 1880.

In this convention, known generally as the Latin Union, Belgium, Italy, and Switzerland strongly favored a single gold standard, with subsidiary silver coins under 5 francs.

What induced this convention and the formation of the Latin Union?

Foundations of a Durable Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I delivered on the evening of April 29, at a United Nations meeting held in Boston, Mass., sponsored by the Joint Council for International Cooperation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

First, permit me to congratulate you men and women on taking the time and devoting your thought and energy in these busy days to discussions such as this one tonight.

I cannot overemphasize my deep conviction that, next to winning the war itself, building the foundations now of a durable peace is the most important obligation we on the home front have today. That conviction is shared by many leaders in Congress and in the administration, and many of us are devoting every moment we can spare from pressing duties to that task. But of necessity, the number of people we, as individuals, can reach is limited, compared to the number that organizations such as yours can contact.

The effectiveness with which groups such as this succeed in mobilizing and crystalizing public opinion in America, and in bringing that public opinion to bear on Government, will determine whether our world solves the problem of preventing war or whether our kind of civilization finally goes under in a greater and more terrible World War No. 3.

Under our system, it is the people themselves who in the long run determine basic policies of their Government. A democratic government cannot long maintain policies opposed by a majority of the people. Quite often democratic governments lag behind the people in adopting new policies. I believe our National Government is so lagging today. Only an informed and alert people, determined to have their Government translate into positive, constructive action their will to peace, can make certain that the job will be done. The obligation resting on those at home today, the mothers and fathers, the wives and sweethearts and brothers of men in service, is even heavier than normal, because they must speak not only for themselves, but for the men who are fighting and dying in this war.

On March 16, four Senators, convinced of the tremendous urgency of this problem, introduced in the Senate Resolution No. 114, asking the Senate to take the first step toward winning the peace after this war. Two of us, Senators HATCH of New Mexico, and HILL of Alabama, are Democrats, and two, Senator BURTON of Ohio, and myself, are Republicans.

We believe that it is essential: first, that all doubt in the minds of our allies as to whether the United States will collaborate as effectively in maintaining peace as it is in winning the war should be removed; and second, that the basic foreign policy of the United States, as it affects maintenance of world peace, should be decided now, that it should be a bipartisan, continuing policy, and that it would be tragic for us and the

world if this issue, touching so vitally the lives of future generations, becomes a partisan political football.

The United Nations are paying heavily today for their failure to foresee and plan for total war against the Axis. Building a durable peace is an even tougher and longer job than mobilizing for total war, and already it is far past the time when a start should have been made on the foundations of that peace.

There is one vital difference between preparing for war and preparing for peace. One nation alone can prepare for and precipitate war, but only many nations working and planning together can prepare for and maintain a durable peace. Norway, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium learned that lesson in the blitz of 1940. We in the United States learned the same bitter lesson on December 7, 1941.

Our resolution sets forth briefly and clearly the minimum essentials on which we believe United Nations agreement should be sought before the war ends if we are to have a fair chance of maintaining the peace after it ends. Let me read its text:

"*Resolved*, That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority—

"(1) To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis.

"(2) To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.

"(3) To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces.

"(4) To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

"(5) To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

"That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement."

That is the full text of our Win The Peace Now resolution. It proposes that the United State. declare now that we would prefer as our foreign policy to collaborate with the other United Nations in a strong and effective organization to maintain world peace and stability when we have won this war.

We need a strong commitment to this basic objective now by the Senate for four reasons. First, our allies are going to decide their basic post-war policies during the war and long before it ends. No responsible government can afford to wait until the fighting stops to develop such policies. To do so would simply invite chaos. Our allies did not wait until the fighting stopped to develop such policies in World War No. 1 and they are not doing so in World War No. 2.

Second, the tremendous political, economic, and military power of the United States inevitably will force us to play a major role in world affairs after the war. An isolationist policy for the United States in the light of the facts of the world today, is completely unrealistic. We will help maintain world stability in the post-war world. The question is whether we shall have a strong voice in shaping that post-war pattern now, or whether we shall be forced by circumstances to help maintain a world order which we had little or no part in determining.

That leads to the third reason for action now by the Senate. The United States is the only great power in which two-thirds of the Senate must ratify Executive commitments on foreign affairs before they are binding. In view of Senate action on the Versailles Treaty 23 years ago, our allies can scarcely be blamed for questioning whether the United States will collaborate as effectively in maintaining peace as it is in fighting the war.

Because of that uncertainty, our allies are seriously considering what policies they will adopt if they finally conclude that they will have to do the best they can to maintain world stability without the complete support of the United States. That, it seems to me, is the logical interpretation of Prime Minister Churchill's talk of a council of Europe dominated by Britain and Russia. Any such purely regional approach to what is manifestly a world-wide problem, whatever its emotional appeal, does not meet the issue. Boiled down, it is simply a bigger and better balance-of-power system, and in the end is likely to lead only to bigger and more terrible wars.

Positive action now by the Senate defining United States policy would eliminate this uncertainty and make it possible for the United Nations to tackle the problem of preventing future wars on the only basis on which it can be approached realistically—on a world-wide basis. And, at the same time, such a positive declaration from America would strengthen tremendously our Government's influence in the international post-war planning now going on. Our proposals will carry much more weight if our allies are sure we will help carry them out. And we believe that American influence will be all in the direction of a more democratic, a more just, and a more durable peace.

The fourth reason for action now is perhaps most important of all. The forces pulling the United Nations together and making for cooperation—our common cause, common enemies, and the necessity of working together to win the war—are dominant now, and will continue so as long as the war lasts. But these cohesive forces will lose much of their strength the moment victory is won. Unless some agreements on basic principles are reached now, the forces tending to drive the Allies apart—economic rivalries, jealousies, nationalism, militarism, and urgent domestic problems—will become dominant when the war ends and may block effective collaboration to maintain peace. That is why formation of a strong and effective United Nations organization now is essential.

Of course, agreement on effective machinery to maintain peace by stopping future aggression does not at one stroke assure permanent peace and stability. It does not tackle the basic causes of war. But it does assure a period of peace, free from aggression, in which the nations of the world can tackle those basic causes, such as stabilization of trade relations and air commerce, toning down of extreme nationalism and militarism, fair treatment for minority groups and stabilization of currency.

All plans for future progress in the world, and progress here in the United States, hinge on the maintenance of peace. That is the first essential step. And no one disputes seriously the fact that, at least in the immediate post-war period, the presence of force ranged against any would-be aggressor is essential to maintain peace. The question is whether the force should reside in individual nations or in a United Nations organization.

At the heart of our resolution is the proposal that there be assembled a United Nations military force, capable of being ordered into immediate action to suppress any attempt at military aggression.

We need only recall the history of the past dozen years to realize that individual nations, particularly those devoted to peace, will not go to war simply to stop aggression and save the peace of the world. They will go to war only to stop a direct and vital threat to their own security.

At any time up to 1937, the military force of the overwhelming majority of nations wanting peace would have been sufficient to crush any aggressor. The aggressions in Manchuria, Ethiopia, Austria, and Czechoslovakia could have been stopped if all the peace-loving nations, even all the nations since attacked by the Axis, had mobilized their combined forces to stop them. But that force was never mobilized effectively because during the time it took for the peaceful nations even to attempt to agree on a joint course of action, the aggressors had seized what they wanted and presented the world with a fait accompli. And the world would not fight to undo what had been done. Would-be aggressors are not deterred by world opinion, diplomatic protests or discussion of economic sanctions. Like the gangsters of our prohibition era, they recognize only force.

Recent developments in warfare, which make a durable peace more imperative than ever, also make possible a realistic solution to this problem. The importance of air power, the tremendous striking force of comparatively small land and sea units, and the high degree of mobility of air, sea, and land forces, make it possible to assemble at strategic bases throughout the world a military force, which even though relatively small in numbers, would still be strong enough to stop by itself any attempt at military aggression by any nation except the three great powers, Britain, the United States, and Russia. And we may as well be realistic and recognize that any attempt to cooperatively maintain peace must rest on the good faith and the nonaggressive intentions of those three great powers.

It is our thought that such a United Nations force would consist of units assigned to it by the various powers, with the understanding that such units would be ordered into action immediately by the United Nations organization to suppress any attempt at military aggression which it found to be taking place. The mere existence of such a force probably would obviate in large degree the necessity for its use. We have such a force now in north Africa, where English, French, American, New Zealand, and Australian troops are fighting under a United Nations command headed by General Eisenhower.

The United States, Russia, and Britain undoubtedly will continue to maintain large military establishments in the immediate post-war period. None will put all its eggs of national safety in the international collaboration basket. But as the international machinery to maintain peace gradually proves its effectiveness, we can look forward to gradually reducing our individual armaments and taking from the backs of our people this crushing burden.

Few of us have considered seriously just how crushing that burden may be. I am sure that those who talk glibly of the United States maintaining a strong enough army, navy, and air force to be impregnable against any possible attack have not counted the cost of such a policy in reduced living standards for our people. We have spent over $100,000,000,000 in less than 3 years and are just beginning to make our military force effective on the battle fronts.

Modern weapons—tanks, airplanes, guns, and ships—become obsolete very rapidly, and they are required in vast quantities in modern warfare. Even if we participate in a strong world collective security system as a backstop to assure our own safety, our military expenditures for some years after this

war probably will run at least ten billions a year. If there is no collective security and we must depend entirely on our own force, the costs inevitably will double, triple, or even quadruple, always with the strong possibility that we still will have another war.

That would mean, in specific terms, that the present high Federal tax rates would have to be still further increased and continued indefinitely, because we cannot run in the red forever. It would mean the continuation of rationing, of lower living standards, of strong and close Government control of industry and every facet of our daily lives. And in the end it probably would mean another war.

A collective security system is by far the least costly and the surest method for us to safeguard our own national security.

But a far more powerful argument than the cost in wealth for a collective security system is that the only sure way to keep the United States out of future wars is not to have future wars. Our Nation alone cannot police the world or prevent wars. It is to our own interest to support the strongest possible world machinery to maintain peace. Furthermore, it is our obligation to the thousands of our young men who are risking and giving their lives not alone to defend the Nation but to save future generations from the same fate.

Some machinery or tribunal to settle peacefully disputes between nations must go hand in hand with the outlawing of war as a means of settling such disputes. That is the reason for the fourth function assigned the United Nations in our resolution.

The first three functions we would delegate to a United Nations organization relate to the winning of the war itself—to assist in mobilizing resources of all member nations to fight the war, to establish temporary governments where needed, and to administer relief and rehabilitation programs.

These things will be done in any event. But these activities will strengthen our chances of a durable peace, and even to a certain extent set the pattern of that peace, if they are done through a United Nations organization instead of by single nations or by one or two nations acting under a loose agreement. The more techniques and procedures for collective and cooperative action by the United Nations we can develop during the war, the better will be the chance of effective collective action to maintain peace.

Finally, we propose that the organization of the United Nations established now to work out the principles which will guide them in solving specific problems of the peace, provide for the growth of such organization, for the admission of new members and the taking on of new functions as needed, and that the principle of no territorial aggrandizement enunciated in the Atlantic Charter be adopted by the organization.

We live in a changing world—one that has changed with bewildering rapidity in recent years. Any organization seeking to control and direct the forces making for peace or war in our world must also be capable of growth and change. It cannot be dedicated solely to preservation of a status quo. In the long view the major function of such a United Nations organization should be to relieve international stresses and strains before they explode into war. For that purpose it must have flexibility and the capacity for growth and change.

There was published in newspapers recently the results of an Associated Press poll of the United States Senate on the question:

"Do you favor committing the Senate and country now to a post-war course of preserving the peace through an international police force"?

The results of that poll are a warning to every peace-loving American that, despite the fact we are on the way to winning the war, we are at this moment in grave danger of losing the peace.

The fact that 24 Senators favored such a commitment is very encouraging. The fact that 40 more did not commit themselves either way is not particularly significant because many Senators make it a rule never to commit themselves in advance of a roll call. But the fact that 32 Senators, just 1 less than the number required to block ratification of any treaty, are opposed to such a commitment is a danger signal the significance of which cannot be overemphasized.

Many of those 32 opposed said they favored our collaboration to maintain the peace, but they wanted to wait and see; they wanted to study every detail of any proposal before they committed this country to even the principle of effective collaboration.

Just what chance is there for the United Nations ever to get together on a decent peace program if every nation should adopt the policy of waiting to see what every other nation would do before making its own plans? The answer, of course, is none.

A policy of drift, a policy of wait and see, a policy of giving lip service to the ideal of world peace but of scuttling every realistic attempt to achieve it by quibbling over details, has landed peace-loving America in two wars in one generation. And as sure as I stand here tonight, that kind of policy will get us into world war three within 10 or 20 years.

Forewarned is forearmed. The American people know now that we face as tough a fight to win the peace as we do to win the war. How strongly and effectively the peace-loving people of America mobilize in that fight will determine the outcome.

We have purposely, in this resolution, tried to state broad principles and avoid blueprinting details or mechanics of the United Nations organization. Those details can be worked out only by agreement with our allies. No nation that believes in democracy can take the position that unless every detail of such an organization is exactly what it wants, it will not participate. Democracy simply would not function in such an atmosphere. It would be futile and only contribute to needless controversy for the Senate to try to determine those details now.

The world has tried many other methods of maintaining peace—balance of power diplomacy, imperialism, peace pacts and multilateral treaties, and nonaggression agreements. All have failed. The most recent and the broadest in conception was the League of Nations. It failed largely because at the critical moment it could not act decisively. It failed at least partly because the United States, one of the three or four most powerful nations in the world, was not a full partner in that effort to achieve lasting world peace.

The American people will not be misled by quibbling over details, nor will they subscribe to the argument that an issue touching so vitally the future of our children should be dodged merely because a few leaders will oppose it and provoke bitter debate. Short-sighted leaders, here and in other nations, afraid of controversy and lacking the courage to take the bold action demanded by circumstances, have let the world drift into war for the second time in one generation. That must not happen again. The basic foreign policy of the United States should not and must not become an issue in partisan politics. It should be determined not on the basis of past debates based on past conditions, but on the basis of the world as it is today and on the basis of what policy will best serve the people of our Nation in the light of present conditions.

There is only one logical, realistic road to lasting peace. That is the road of United Nations cooperation, first to win the war, second to maintain peace by stopping future aggression, and third, to work out together the problems of international social, political, and economic relationships which, if not solved peacefully, do explode into war. Any other road leads to more wars and back into another dark age for humanity.

By clever use of a misleading phrase "no entangling alliances," a few leaders have time and again blocked effective use of America's tremendous power and influence on the side of world peace. The same appeals to fear and prejudice may be expected again. Already they are heard. Let us ask the authors of those appeals whether adherence to an outworn slogan is worth the lives of thousands of American boys in another war.

Congress exists to serve you, the people. It should make your overwhelming desire for a durable peace effective through national policy, by committing this Nation to a realistic program to maintain world peace. It will do that if you, the people, make your voice heard in Washington, make clear to your Senators and Representatives your overwhelming demand that this time we win the peace as well as the war.

Twenty-five years ago, on the battlefields of France, our fighting men helped win victory in the First World War. But we lost the peace after that war. History must not repeat itself; that tragedy must not happen again. We who serve at home in this war owe a solemn obligation to the Colin Kellys, the Meyer Levins, the Henry Majeskis, the Hans Christiansens, and the Edmund Schroeders, to all the gallant youths who have given, and who will give, their lives in this war. It is our obligation to them to find the way to permanent peace, to do our share to make certain that 15 or 20 years hence the sons of these heroes of today do not fight and die in some distant skies in another and more terrible war. Let us pray God that we shall not fail in that obligation.

Prize Orations of Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Oratorical Contest

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to note the contribution by American youth to the bicentennial of Thomas Jefferson, and feel it appropriate to stress the part played by the youth of the Middle West, particularly from my own great State of Wisconsin.

As part of the Nation's tribute to the father of democracy, the Thomas Jefferson bicentennial oratorical contest was sponsored nationally by the New York Journal-American and other Hearst newspapers, with the most gifted college and high-school students, boys and girls, competing for prizes of great value.

These prizes were in equal sets, one for the high school, one for the college champion, and consisted of a $1,000 War bond, a medal, and a trip to Washington to participate in the dedication of the magnificent Jefferson Memorial.

I am happy to record that the high-school oratorical championship for the Nation was won by a Wisconsin boy, John F. Monroe, Jr., 16, a senior at Marquette University High School in Milwaukee.

The college championship was won by a student of Northwestern University in Evanston, Ill., James J. Rathbun, 21, of Webster, S. Dak., who entered the Army on April 20.

Both these fine, clean-cut youths visited me during their stay in Washington. Through them the youth of the country was honored in the course of their visit to the Capital. Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt met the boys and congratulated them. Mr. Archibald MacLeish personally guided them on their tour of the Congressional Library. Many of our highest-ranking Government officials extended similar courtesies, as did foreign representatives at our Capital.

They were special guests at the dedication of the Jefferson Memorial, privileged to sit in proximity to the President as he delivered the dedicatory address.

I note also that this splendid contest was conducted nationally by a University of Wisconsin graduate, and one-time classmate, Mr. Charles Roland, of the staff of the New York Journal-American.

The scope of the competition is demonstrated when I point out that young Monroe first won a contest in his own high school; then for one section of his city, then the championship for Milwaukee—and a $250 War bond. His next step was to win over high-school rivals for the entire Middle West. Ultimately, in New York City, vying against champions of the Pacific coast and the east coast, he was awarded top honors by four distinguished judges, each the chairman of the speech department of a leading college or university. Rathbun won likewise over parallel competition.

Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and for myself I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the prize oration by John F. Monroe, Jr., of Milwaukee, which won him the national championship among high-school orators, and also the prize oration by James J. Rathbun, of Webster, S. Dak., a Northwestern University student, which won him the national championship among college orators.

I conclude, Mr. President, by stating that the contest among our college and high-school students as sponsored by the Hearst newspapers constituted a signal public service and outstanding example of journalistic enterprise.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Wisconsin is granted, and the orations will be printed in the RECORD.

The orations are as follows:

TEXT OF HIGH SCHOOL WINNER'S ORATION—"THOMAS JEFFERSON STILL LIVES IN SPIRIT OF REVOLUTION"

Following is the text of the prize-winning high school oration by John F. Monroe, Jr., Marquette University High School, Milwaukee, Wis.:

"THOMAS JEFFERSON STILL LIVES

"On July 4, 1826, the fiftieth anniversary of our independence, the last faint glimmer in the life of Thomas Jefferson was snuffed out. On that same day John Adams lingered on his own deathbed. Not knowing that earlier in the day his friend and colleague had passed away, John Adams' last words were: 'Thomas Jefferson still lives.'

"In a very significant sense, John Adams spoke the truth. Thomas Jefferson still lives, not only as a reverent memory, but as a powerful influence in our distinctly American view of government, and its relations to human rights and needs.

"Yes, Thomas Jefferson still lives. But why is it that this man should live many generations after his contemporaries were forgotten in their unattended graves?

"Why is it that the undying fame of Jefferson should endure as long as America remains essentially American? Was it because he led a scholarly life devoted to study and learning? I think not. Many men, far more learned, have long since passed into eternal oblivion.

"Was it because fellow citizens recognized his qualities of leadership and native ability, and chose him to be their Chief Executive? Possibly, but many of our Presidents are little more than names today. No, it was much more than this. But what was it that brought about the immortality of Thomas Jefferson? To find our answer to this question we must turn back the pages of history to the balmy days of June 1776. In the Philadelphia home of a bricklayer, Thomas Jefferson, then a young Virginia delegate to the Continental Congress, sat working at a crude wooden desk of his own design.

"Several of his colleagues, recognizing the quality of his mind and his forceful powers of expression, had asked him to draft the Declaration of Independence.

"As he sat laboring over his desk, pen poised, Thomas Jefferson, the great apostle of American democracy, had a vision. It was a vision of God, the Divine Architect, creating a cosmic commonwealth of infinite beauty and making it ready for His children.

"Truths held evident

"Vast fertile plains to yield the things that sustain life, great rivers that flow in majesty to the seas, majestic mountains that rise in towering grandeur to tle very feet of their Creator. All things that make for the prosperity and happiness of the human race were embraced in God's gift to man on the morning of creation.

"As he beheld this vision Jefferson saw all the people of this Nation freely participating in these great gifts of God.

"It was with this vision before him that Jefferson penned his immortal document of human liberty

"'We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.'

"These words, ladies and gentlemen, explain the immortality of Thomas Jefferson. They are the cornerstones upon which was built the magnificent temple of government called the United States. They came as a voice from heaven to the beleaguered, the downtrodden, and oppressed of every land—freedom of political action, freedom of conscience, freedom from the whip of masters, equal rights to all, special privileges to none.

"'Yes; he still lives'

"Yes; Thomas Jefferson still lives. Let us reconsecrate ourselves today to those principles of his on which this Nation was founded and let us pledge to him that the great blessings which God has bestowed on this Nation will always be shared by a free people, dedicated to the full and complete protection of the God-given rights of man.

"In this day of turmoil and unrest, when the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are so seriously threatened, let us all bow down and thank God that Thomas Jefferson still lives."

JAMES J. RATHBUN'S PRIZE-WINNING JEFFERSON COLLEGE CONTEST ORATION

Following is the text of the prize-winning college oration of James J. Rathbun, of Northwestern University:

"MORE THAN A WORD

"Have you ever picked a fight with a word? Did you ever come to grips with an abstract term you thought you knew all the time, yet which for no particular reason reared its head, captured your imagination, challenged your mind?

"I had that unique experience just the other day. I came across the word 'greatness.' What is this intangible 'X' so many men seek, but so few men achieve? True greatness, I finally concluded, must be something truly great men never feel, just as smallness is never felt by small men. How I came to that conclusion is what I'd like to talk about with you today.

"As a house is only as strong as the brick and mortar with which we build it, so is an individual only as great as the strength of the common clay of which he is constituted. His conscience directs his choice of good rather than evil, of truth against error, of the right that makes might. And with this he recognizes the yardstick of human equality. He knows that young men and old men, rich men and poor men, white men and black men and yellow men are, first and above all, men.

"Take for example this scene: The place—the breakfast rooms at Conrad's boarding house on Capitol Hill in Washington. The time—the morning of March 4, 1801.

"A tall, stout figure of a man appeared at the door of the breakfast room, entered, and took his usual seat at the lower end of the table. Mrs. Brown, wife of the Senator from Kentucky, didn't think this fitting and proper. She thought that on this day of all days, the newcomer should take the place he had consistently refused in the past, at the head of the table, near the fireplace.

"With politeness, yet firmness, President-elect Thomas Jefferson declined the honor.

"Common sense

"Would Jefferson have called that greatness? He had written the essence of greatness some time before, so to him it was common sense, fair play, and the acknowledgment that to speak a doctrine is one thing, to live it as well is quite another. Jefferson did just that.

"He showed that the bootblack can be as great in his way as the Wall Street millionaire can be in his, or the farmer in his, or the factory worker, or the soldier, or the student—or the president of a country

"He showed that you and I can be great, not by who we are or how much we own, but by how we live, and what we do with what we have. These things Jefferson took as self-evident truths, as they had been demonstrated by a certain Nazarene some 1,800 years before his time.

"And I found a second secret of greatness, too. It was one of those common things that aren't common at all. I call it the ability to see a need, find its remedy and effect a solution. I call it the courage that says no job is too great, the humility that says no job is too small, and the tenacity that says 'I'll see the thing through.'

"Quality of a man

"It's the quality of a certain early Virginian who first planned, then planted, then cultivated his own garden at Monticello. It's the quality of the same man who conceived in his mind a great university, then drafted its blueprints with his own skill, then aided in its construction with his own hands.

"It's the same quality of the same man who declared certain inalienable rights of all men, then forged a new pattern of self-government to guarantee those rights, then

guided that Nation with courage and vision through the faltering steps of its infancy.

"A great American

"For these reasons I call that Virginian a great American and a great man.

"Thomas Jefferson knew, as you know, that the man who fights for something greater than himself, greater than a few men as great as all men, cannot be wrong.

"Only when the last human has breathed his last breath will the doctrine of Jefferson, whose name has become symbolic of a whole political philosophy, be outmoded and outworn.

"As true greatness knows neither time nor place, it becomes for us to see it now, as Jefferson saw it then. In his time a nation yearned for the truths he taught and lived. In our times a whole world yearns.

"We know that to give greatness to others we must have greatness ourselves, and to retain it ourselves we must share it with others.

"The sooner we free others from the tyranny of leaders who know not the first principle of greatness—the Golden Rule—the sooner will they know and grow and thrive upon greatness themselves.

"Our common goal

"I've been at grips with a word but it was far more than just that. I found what greatness stands for in one man at one time—Thomas Jefferson. Yet Jefferson's strongest contention was that it is within the reach of every man. I saw the essence of it grow as the truth of it spread.

"It's all clear now. Jefferson's greatness was in one man at one time, but it is not limited even to some men at some time.

"We're fighting now for Jeffersonian greatness for all men, for all time."

Legislative Attempts to Prevent Strikes

REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of America have been and are aroused because of the strike of coal miners which even yet is in progress. We all know that this strike imperils our war effort and delays the winning of the war. Appeasement concerning any individual or group of individuals is no more practicable and workable than appeasement practiced by the authorities of one country with reference to another country. Appeasement breeds not respect, but disrespect, not trust but distrust and not cooperation but contempt.

In 1940 I began efforts to initiate interest in adopting legislation to prevent delays and strikes; the written record reveals this. Other Members of Congress have fostered similar efforts, and several times in the last 2 or 3 years the House has gone on record by adopting legislation against delays in our war plants. The reason I have favored and voted for legislation to prevent strikes is that I have felt and I do feel very sure that no person or no organization, particularly in time of war, will defy the law of the land as quickly as he will defy an Executive order, rule, or regulation.

The attitude of the executive authorities of our Government concerning antistrike legislation, insofar as I can determine, has changed little, if any, since our first defense efforts and our efforts to prepare for war began. I feel I speak as one who has carefully studied this question since 1940. Even as recent as some 3 weeks ago I wrote a letter to the President asking him whether or not in his opinion antistrike legislation was needed to facilitate the prosecution of the war. To this day no indication one way or the other has been received by me.

At this point I wish to include in my remarks a portion of one of the speeches I have made concerning delays and strikes. The speech from which I quote was made March 18, 1942:

Obviously, from the foregoing communications the authorities of the executive branch of our Government refer only to the fact that consideration is being given the question of delay. This has been the situation for more than 15 months, according to the record, as here portrayed. And the situation has not changed, according to the press today, March 18, 1942. I quote the second paragraph of a front-page story concerning strikes which appeared in the Washington Post today:

"Telling reporters at his press conference of conversations earlier in the day with his union labor war cabinet, Mr. Roosevelt said he did not believe the country needed further legislation at this time, since such things should not be rushed when they are going pretty well."

This same news story is partly headlined with the words, "President defends 40-hour week."

Today May 3, 1943, there appears in the Washington Post, an article by Mark Sullivan entitled "Labor Crises." I herewith include a short portion of the article:

The crisis is a consequence of a wish, tenaciously held by the President, to keep labor relations in his own hands, to prevent Congress from legislating on it. Again and again, when Congress was on the point of passing legislation which would have covered the present coal situation, and probably have averted it, Mr. Roosevelt has intervened. On occasions, after the House passed such legislation by votes of more than 2 to 1, and with more than half the Democrats voting for it, Mr. Roosevelt used influence with party leaders in the Senate to prevent that body from acting.

With the permission of the House, I ask to include the full speech I made March 18, 1942:

UNINTERRUPTED AND MAXIMUM PRODUCTION MOST ESSENTIAL IN OUR WAR EFFORT

[Speech of Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH, of Texas, in the House of Representatives, March 18, 1942]

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, for many months I have been devoting much time, attention, and effort to the problem of delays in our national defense and offense program.

The President of the United States announced the policy of our Government with reference to delays many months ago.

I herewith submit a letter written by the Secretary of Labor, November 27, 1940:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, November 27, 1940.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Your letter to the President concerning the strike at the Vultee airplane plant, Downey, Calif., was referred to me so that you might be informed as to what the Government was doing to bring about a settlement. John R. Steelman, Director of Conciliation of this Department, settled the controversy yesterday, and work has been resumed in the plant.

As you know, the President announced yesterday, following a conference with Army, Navy, and labor representatives, that it is the policy of the Government to keep factories engaged in defense work open and that the problem of dealing with the labor situation in connection with national defense is under daily consideration.

Very truly yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

Some 4 months after November 27, 1940, because numerous delays were transpiring, I requested the Chief Executive to state to me whether or not in his opinion the authorities of our Government possessed power to prevent strikes and delays. The two letters which follow verify this fact:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 19, 1941.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: I have your letter of April 9, 1941, inquiring as to the authority now possessed by the Federal Government to terminate delays resulting from industrial disputes in the event the Conciliation Service and the National Defense Mediation Board are unable to effect a settlement.

I have asked the Secretary of Labor to go into this question and to reply to your inquiry.

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 23, 1941.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: The President has referred to me for reply your letter dated April 9 inquiring as to the authority now possessed by the Federal Government to terminate delays resulting from industrial disputes which the Conciliation Service and the National Defense Mediation Board are unable to settle.

I have asked the Solicitor of Labor to go into this matter and as soon as his investigation is completed I shall be glad to communicate further with you.

Sincerely,

FRANCES PERKINS.

The question often has been asked, "Do the authorities of our Government have the power to prevent these delays?" Mr. Gerard D. Reilly, the Solicitor of Labor, answered this question in a letter to me, written May 8, 1941. He concludes by saying:

"And, finally, for the occasional situation in which both prevention and impartial mediation are unsuccessful, the Government has authority to step in and act directly to assure resumption of production or an adequate alternative source of supply."

After I received the statement by Mr. Reilly, written May 8, 1941, which concludes

with the above-quoted statement, I asked the Secretary of Labor whether or not she concurred with Mr. Reilly. She answered my inquiry May 10, 1941, with the following letter:

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
"*Washington May 10, 1941.*

"The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH, M. C.,
"*House of Representatives.*
"*Washington, D. C.*

"MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: I have your inquiry with regard to my concurrence in the opinion in the memorandum which I sent you yesterday, the memorandum having been prepared by the Solicitor of the Department.

"In response to your original inquiry I asked the Solicitor to make a study of the various possible types of authority available to the Federal Government to bring about termination of delays resulting from industrial disputes which it was assumed had not been or could not be settled by the Conciliation Service and the Defense Mediation Board.

"Mr. Reilly, Solicitor of the Department of Labor, made a report summing up a variety of powers and remedies which the Government has under existing law. It is in no way a statement of views or private opinions, but an exploration of all of the legal powers which the Government has under a variety of statutes. I believe this to be a correct summary.

"Sincerely yours,
"FRANCES PERKINS."

The official communications to which I have referred clearly state the President announced November 26, 1940, "that it is the policy of the Government to keep factories engaged in defense work open," and according to the Secretary of Labor and the Solicitor of Labor, that "the Government has authority to step in and act directly to assure resumption of production."

To be as certain as possible concerning the need of additional legislation, I again wrote the President and the Secretary of Labor letters November 7, 1941; I wrote still another similar letter to the Secretary of Labor November 18, 1941. The answers to my letters follow:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 18, 1941.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Your letter to the President of November 7 has been received, as well as the extension of your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The President is giving very thoughtful consideration to all suggestions for legislation which will overcome delays in the production program due to any cause.

Thank you for your letter.

Very sincerely yours,
EDWIN M. WATSON,
Secretary to the President.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, November 19, 1941.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH, M. C.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: I have your letter of November 18 and note that you are asking me a question: "Is it still your opinion that no legislation is needed to prevent delays in national defense industries?"

All suggestions for legislative remedies are being given close consideration for practicality, administrative possibilities, constitutional effects, as well as for desirability.

Yours very truly,
FRANCES PERKINS.

Obviously, from the foregoing communications the authorities of the executive branch of our Government refer only to the fact that consideration is being given the question of delay. This has been the situation for more than 15 months, according to the record, as here portrayed. And the situation has not changed, according to the press today, March 18, 1942. I quote the second paragraph of a front-page story concerning strikes which appeared in the Washington Post today:

"Telling reporters at his press conference of conversations earlier in the day with his union labor war cabinet, Mr. Roosevelt said he did not believe the country needed further legislation at this time, since such things should not be rushed when they are going pretty well."

This same news story is partly headlined with the words "President Defends 40-Hour Week."

Although the authorities of the executive branch of our Government have made the positive statements they have power to insure uninterrupted production, many Members of the House of Representatives, being anxious to provide our armed forces with an abundance of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and feeling that delays and strikes should completely cease, have endeavored constantly to enact legislation to make as certain as possible that no slow-down or let-up in production would characterize our war effort. I am glad to say I have had a part in each of these efforts to prevent delays, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will disclose. I wish to refer to some examples of the efforts which some of the Members of the House have made. On July 29, 1941, I was one of the 114 Members of the House of Representatives who voted for legislation to prevent delays in our national-defense program; however, 255 Members of the House voted a different vote to that cast by me. On December 3, 1941, more than 3 months ago, the House passed a strong bill designed to prevent delays; I supported the bill, which passed by a vote of almost 2 to 1. The bill, if enacted into law, would be very effective, but it has never been acted on by the Senate. Besides provisions with reference to the closed shop, labor-leader racketeering, and jurisdictional strikes, etc., the bill contains a section that deals with the problem of extortionate fees which are being charged those sincere and patriotic citizens who demand the right to work.

House Members frequently inquire as to why the Senate does not consider the bill we sent them more than 3 months ago. I cannot answer this question; however, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from a news item which appeared in the Washington Post March 5, 1942. The pertinent portion reads:

"Secretary of Labor Perkins will be called before the Senate Education and Labor Committee next week 'for information' on the defense labor situation, Chairman ELBERT D. THOMAS of Utah disclosed last night.

"Senator THOMAS of Utah said Miss Perkins was invited 'merely because we wish to keep ourselves informed' and not because the committee was contemplating any labor legislation.

"THOMAS personally opposed legislation as 'untimely' and said there was no likelihood of the House-approved Smith bill, drastically regulating unions during the emergency, ever clearing his committee.

"'If the committee reported it and it passed the Senate, I think the House would repudiate its former approval when it went back to them,' said THOMAS. 'My opinion is that things are proceeding satisfactorily under the National War Labor Board.'"

Many of the American people are in accord with the sentiment expressed in the telegram I herewith quote:

CARTHAGE, TEX., *March 16, 1942.*

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH:

Six million Texans expect General MacArthur to be saved. War profits and 40-hour weeks for management and labor must go by the board. Let's do something about it.

R. G. BROWN.

I now strongly urge the Senate to consider the legislation which we sent them more than 3 months ago.

Work is the secret weapon of any nation. All of our plants must operate not merely 40 hours per week but to the fullest capacity, the type of capacity described and urged by Production Director Donald M. Nelson, March 10, 1942, in the following news item:

[From the Washington Post of March 11, 1942]

"BLASTS PART-TIME USE

"The public, Nelson said, is far from complacent and wants production with such 'intensity of feeling' that it will make sure it gets it 'one way or another.'

"Indicating the possibilities of the drive he announced last week to raise existing production rates by 25 percent, Nelson said that if all equipment now involved in war production were used 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 'we would practically double the man-hours' now going into military production.

"Nelson noted that 20 percent of American war plants now operate only 5 days or 5½ days a week. Many plants, he added, closed on Sundays. In many others, the second shift uses only 40 percent of the plant facilities, and the third shifts use only 20 percent.

"This, he concluded, means that thousands of machines needed for munitions work now stand idle part or all of every week end and from 8 to 16 hours every week day.

"In another illustration, the production boss said that if the facilities of all the Nation's 31 aircraft engine and propeller plants were used to the same extent as those of the three with the best records, production could be increased immediately by 25 percent.

"Similarly, if all of America's 153 machine-tool factories operated at the same level of utilization as the top three, machine-tool output would be stepped up by 45 percent, he said."

I desire to say, on February 27, 1942, I was one of the 62 Members of Congress who, by standing vote, supported legislation to permit people to work more than 40 hours per week in national-defense industries throughout the duration of the war.

The people of this Nation at this very moment are praying to God to give them enough strength to work not just 40 hours per week, but enough strength to work as many hours of every day, week, and month as is needed to defeat the Axis Powers.

Not long ago the Congress of our Nation approved an appropriations bill for approximately $32,000,000,000, the largest ever passed by Congress; this bill constitutes the major answer of the greatest democracy, America, to the dictators and oppressors of people. By it and similar bills we are evidencing that we had rather have victory at any cost than peace at any price. Deplorable it is that some unjustifiable waste and extravagance have characterized our defense and victory effort up to now; nothing is more reprehensible than war profiteering. It is my sincere hope that not one penny of the $32,000,000,000 or sums to be later appropriated will be wasted and that the small businessman who is now faced with the greatest difficulties ever confronted by him will be permitted to participate in our all-out program of production to the end that delivery of arms, ammunition, and implements of war may be hastened and that President Roosevelt's policy enunciated January 6, 1942, when he delivered his most recent message to Congress may be carried out. His words were:

"We must convert every available plant and tool to war production. That goes all the way from the greatest plants to the smallest—from the huge automobile industry to the village machine shop."

May this policy soon be carried out.

Paraphrasing lines we all often have heard, I would say in this day of mechanized warfare that—

"Heights of nations reached and kept
Were not attained by sudden flight
But they while other nations slept
Were toiling onward in the night."

Indeed, the people of our Nation in this uncertain and tragic hour must be toiling onward in the night.

Creation of an International Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the results of the Gallup Poll, as published in the Washington Post on Sunday, May 2, on the question "Should the countries fighting the Axis set up an international police force after the war is over to try to keep peace throughout the world?"

I might add that the poll showed 74 percent in favor of the proposal.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 2, 1943]

PUBLIC OPPOSES SENATORS' WORLD POLICE PLAN VIEWS

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., May 1.—A striking contrast between the views of the American people on one important post-war proposal is revealed today in a public opinion survey throughout the Nation.

Two weeks ago the Associated Press polled the Senate on the issue of an international police force, a proposal embodied in the Ball resolution. It found that among those Senators ready to express themselves at this time, the weight of opinion was against immediate commitment of the Senate and the country to the international police-force idea.

The public takes a different attitude.

When the institute put the world-police proposal to a vote of the people in a sampling referendum thoughout the 48 States, the results showed three voters in every four in favor of a policing organization.

POLLS COMPARED

Following is a comparison of the Senate poll results and the vote of the general public:

Associated press poll of Senate

"Do you favor committing the Senate and country now to a post-war course of preserving the peace through an international police force?"

Yes	24
No	32
Not voting	40

Institute poll of United States public

"Should the countries fighting the Axis set up an international police force after the war is over to try to keep peace throughout the world?"

	Percent
Yes	74
No	14
No opinion	12

The one-sided nature of the vote is a pretty fair indication that unless events change opinion to a remarkable degree, the public would vote in favor of an international police force in any election, or referendum, calling for a direct vote on the issue. This would be true whether the principle alone were involved or whether the vote was on an immediate commitment of the country to the world police plan.

The Nation-wide support for the idea is illustrated in the vote of the five states across the country with the large populations. On the basis of institute interviews in those States, the vote is as follows:

	Yes	No	Undecided
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
New York	77	14	9
Pennsylvania	74	15	11
Illinois	68	19	13
Ohio	69	18	13
California	79	11	10

Throughout all geographical sections of the country the proposal is favored by heavy majorities.

Thus far the police force proposal shows no signs of becoming a political party issue, so far as the reactions of the rank and file are concerned.

TREND IS UPWARD

The idea of an international police force has made rapid strides in the United States during the past 3½ years. The great impetus came, of course, after the outbreak of the war in Europe in 1939. While there was considerable sentiment for an international police force prior to that event, nevertheless the majority was only a small one.

By last August, however, when Secretary of State Cordell Hull advocated the proposal in a Nation-wide radio address, sentiment was overwhelmingly in favor of the step. The trend of opinion follows:

	Yes	No	Undecided
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
August 1939	46	39	15
August 1942	73	16	11
Today	74	14	12

Threats Against Members of Congress

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON] relating to the sins of John L. Lewis and the coal strike situation generally.

I want to call to your attention a letter from Ira E. Zimmerman, National Vice President, Ninth Civil Service District, of Kansas City, Kans., which threatens to retire Congressmen for voting against the increase in pay of salaries of Federal employees. Every job held by a Federal employee was provided by Congress and, according to Mr. Zimmerman's letter, have reached the proportions of 1,500,000 employees and affiliated through the American Federation of Labor, which, in my opinion, is nothing short of a government by these employees within the Government of these great United States.

I know the people of my district are counting on me to take a position to redeem this Government from the bureaucrats and such type of threatening employees as Mr. Zimmerman, notwithstanding the Hatch Act he has the audacity in the concluding two lines of his letter to say:

We will certainly remember those who prove to be our friends and also those who are not.

I voted against this measure which, in my opinion, in round numbers, will cost the taxpayers of the United States over a billion dollars a year. This amount of money is sufficient to pay the parity in wages to the farmers of America. Such a bill, you will remember, recently passed both branches of Congress and was vetoed by the President for being inflationary. How can it be that a billion dollars to create a parity between the farmer and labor will be inflationary and a billion dollars to increase Federal employees will not be inflationary? I leave this to you to make the calculations.

During the recess I spent the most of last week in the Third Congressional District of Oklahoma and the people are much concerned over these wartime strikes, and especially the present coal strike. They believe that the time is ripe for Congress to act and outlaw strikes and equalize opportunity between organized and unorganized labor and between small business and big business. Not only are the civil forces of our country aroused but our brave soldiers in uniform assert themselves in opposition to strikes.

With one short week out of Washington, I have come to the conclusion that the peace following the war will be written by the men on the battle front and that we should only concern ourselves to a temporary peace following the war.

It is no new experience to me to be threatened by union labor organizations. I was not sent here as their representative out of deference to the unorganized laborers of this country. Truth is, the president of the American Federation of Labor, the Oklahoma A. F. of L., sent a letter to every member of the union seeking funds to defeat me and asking him to make himself a committee of one for this purpose. I appreciate that the average member of the union does not condone or agree with all that these self-appointed labor leaders do and say. These are wartimes and the Government is being financed from the sale of bonds and this increase of a billion dollars will require the selling of an additional billion dollars worth of bonds each year and we all know that our Government is insisting upon the whole people, regardless of race, creed, or former servitude to invest to the limit in the buying of bonds and following these remarks the Congress will go into a Committee of the Whole taking up the tax bill which will increase the cost of Government to the ordinary taxpayer for many years to come, even though it has a forgiveness

provision wherein many who have become rich through Government contracts from the sale of bonds, will be the principal benefactors.

I do not know nor would I hazard an opinion as to the minds of Congress, but the public generally feels that the psychology is right to enact some sensible labor laws and as for me and my household I am ready to go. What about you?

The letter from Mr. Zimmerman to me is as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION
OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES,
Kansas City, Kans., April 28, 1943.

Congressman STEWART,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: It was a great surprise to note that you voted against continuing the payment of overtime to a million and a half Federal employees, several thousand of which reside in your State. It is hoped that you will be willing to change your vote and vote to reconsider when Congress reconvenes May 3.

Needless to say these employees are loyal and will work these long days and long weeks without sufficient remuneration if this legislation is not passed. It will also be impossible for them to continue their purchases of War bonds.

There are several locals composed of civil-service employees who are members of the American Federation of Government Employees living in your State. We will certainly remember those who prove to be our friends and also those who are not.

Respectfully,
IRA E. ZIMMERMAN,
National Vice President,
Ninth Civil Service District.

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

WE NOMINATE MME. CHIANG KAI-SHEK

We hereby nominate Mme. Chiang Kai-shek for the position of chairman at the peace conference. No other person in the world is better qualified.

The first lady of China is outstanding in many respects. By education, and a profound intellectual interest in world affairs, a deeply religious nature, and a remarkably keen and sympathetic understanding of the aspirations and the problems of the common people of all nations at war, she has the attributes so essential to the person who must guide the delicate and complicated proceedings at the inevitable peace conference.

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek understands the oriental as well as the occidental trend of thought. Nurtured in the traditions of ancient China, but educated in the New World, she can intelligently weigh the many complexities which will arise between the aspirations of all the races which will be represented around the peace table.

Important in the consideration of her selection is the bond of friendship which exists between China and Russia, and between China and India. It would be impossible to find another person who would have the same confidence of these two nations.

Extremely important, it would seem also, is to decide now that Mme. Chiang Kai-shek will be that chairman. If the people of Japan, Germany, and Italy are advised that she will occupy that responsible position it is quite likely that the will for peace will be heightened among the aggressor nations, and their will to fight correspondingly lessened. In her they will recognize one who has the human tolerance and sympathies necessary for a just peace.

Do we hear a second to the nomination?

Excessive Fees in Securing Contracts

REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the week before Easter recess of the House of Representatives this body considered H. R. 1900. The bill, as you remember, dealt with the payment of excessive fees for services in connection with negotiation or securing contracts and supplies for the Navy. I have an abiding interest in the objectives sought after and to be achieved in the passing of that bill. It is unspeakable that today there are a few men in our country who have waxed fat off governmental war contracts while those on the farms, in the factories, on the production lines have had their incomes fixed by law and the boys at home and overseas are called upon to give their all in this supreme effort and at $50 per month.

I am happy to remark, Mr. Speaker, that the payments of these illicit if not criminally procured profits exposed on this floor are in no wise traceable to those charged with the letting of the contracts.

The job of converting this country from a peacetime economy to all-out war production was most certainly a stupendous job. In my opinion, the two men most responsible for this splendid efficiency are Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, and Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, the commanding general, Services of Supply. We all owe them a debt of gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, there have been colossal blunders. Sometimes I have despaired at the inability of the armed forces to obtain supplies necessary to defense through the W. P. B. as it has been operating. I have discussed the continuing confusion with several manufacturers from my own district and State. There is some benefit to be expected out of the new C. M. P.—Controlled Material Program. I share their fears that if not simplified that system also will bog down as did the old priority system.

Already it has become evident that with the complexities of controlled materials class "A," items class "B," items class "B–1" and class "B–2"; that with bills of materials, "prime consumers," a great variety of "secondary consumers," "components," "constituent parts," "end items," "presents," and a hodgepodge of nomenclature involving "lead time," "production time," "P" lines, that shortly we will find the national production economy in the same plight that we find the food-rationing system.

Today the United States Army supply forces must stand with hat in hand, before the War Production Board as a "claimant agency" seeking their every need for a pound of copper, aluminum, steel, or tin, as well as all other strategic and critical materials necessary to the industries that are concerned with the production of hundreds of thousands of items necessary to national defense.

A million and one gadgets that are essentially and preponderantly Army procurement items are still subject to allotment, not to the United States Army as a claimant agent but to some one of a score of new bureaus set up within what is called the W. P. B. industries divisions.

After talking to those manufacturers, I really wondered how the Army actually was able to get its necessary materials through the mass of red-tape, paperwork, liaison, and expediting called forth by the W. P. B.

I am waiting till I see more of the operation of the new C. M. P. when the plan is put into full working. If there is then no improvement, you can expect to hear further from me on that question.

It is not often that a Member of the House rises to pay tribute to another for work well done.

The complexities of the political situation today seemingly precludes frank acknowledgment of achievement by those charged with administrative activities. It is in recognition of a job well done upon which I want to address the House today.

Mr. Speaker, since the dawn of civilization no people in all history were ever faced with such a stupendous problem as the one which confronted our armed forces after the murderous attack upon Pearl Harbor.

The problems of the United States Navy were comparably small as compared with those of the Army. The Navy was already a highly integrated unit. The plan and design of vessels of war are fixed problems currently and well established long before the designs can be executed. The task of such problems comprehend expansion and mobility rather than of a constantly fluxing change. They more closely approach fixity rather than variations and change.

Those of the Army were stupendous in contrast with the Navy. They deal about equally in human equations and engines of war. Napoleon once said, "An army travels on its stomach." That would only imply an ample supply of food. There were no railroads, no telephony, no telegraphy, no radio. Napoleon's service of supply did not have to furnish planes and bombs, bomb sights, and tanks. Then they counted the number of bayonets or rifles in an attack, not the manpower, the tank power, the size of cannon, the number and the speed of airplanes.

The war of science, of chemistry, of plastics had not yet evolved.

The Napoleonic strategy—Food and brawn and blood were the essence of victory.

All that however now has changed. Today it is not a question of "the quickest and the mostest" that determines upon whose banners victory will perch.

To the ancient war waging problems of black bread, bullets and blood have been added every skill and science known of enlightened civilized man. The power of war is the power of ponderous presses often operated by women in a production line far removed from the field of battle.

War supplies of critical steel, tin, copper, zinc, iridium, tungsten, and divers other mineral substances are added to the products of the farm and sea. These are then wrapped up with nitrogenous and other products taken out of the air, and the whole processed into war materials that see or talk, or run or shoot or swim or fly.

In the brief time of but a few months every known skill, art, and phenomenon has been marshaled into service or otherwise absorbed into our armed forces.

The old Quartermaster Corps quickly gave way to the new Army Services of Supply. Military and civilians alike were rapidly assigned to that service. I question if in all the centuries that have passed, if ever before, so great an organization has ever been perfected equal to that developed in Army Services of Supply under its present chief Gen. Brehon Somervell.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been conscious of that unfolding development. It so happens, however, that a letter recently got into my hand, that was addressed to all the personnel as well as to the men and women workers in the production lines of our war industries.

It was a simple homey letter. It abounds in frank expression, telling of contradictions and disappointments. It recites achievements and things realized. It tells of hopes and of ambitions that are to be achieved.

It was not the kind of a letter that we would ordinarily expect from a "brass hat."

It is such a human document, so replete with good tidings, dealing with so many problems that are of such vital interest to us here in Congress that I am submitting it for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I hope every Member will find time to read it. It will not only bring to your notice the accomplishments of a great soldier and executive and administrator but inspire recognition of the merits he brings to the task with which he is charged. The letter can in truth be construed as constituting a personal report to the membership of the House by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, Commanding General, Services of Supply, United States Army.

Mr. Speaker—

> Let others hail the rising sun,
> I bow to one whose work is done.

The letter referred to follows:

The Services of Supply is 1 year old.

It has been a momentous year. In 12 short months we have created within the War Department one of the largest organizations for service ever conceived by man; we have staffed it competently; we have set objectives that most men insisted could not be reached in twice 12 months. We have attained those objectives.

The first phase of our job has been accomplished with great credit to you and to the organization as a whole. We are well into the second phase. It, too, will be accomplished. There is no obstacle so great that, working together, we cannot overcome it.

Let us look briefly at what we have done so far.

We have procured $17,000,000,000 worth of supplies and equipment for the Army.

In that huge task we have never permitted the urge for increased production to retard the development of new and improved weapons or to interfere with making the finest quality of articles for our fighting men. During the year, we have brought many important weapons into production. This includes the new medium tank, several calibers of self-propelled artillery, radio for previously unknown uses, and many other important items.

We have accepted delivery on a large portion of this immense program. We are speeding delivery on the remainder.

We have inducted, classified, and assigned more than 4,000,000 men.

We have fed these men adequately, clothed them, housed them, and have kept them well.

We have constructed $6,000,000,000 worth of military facilities.

We have moved over 1,000,000 men and 14,000,000 tons of supplies and handled millions of domestic movements.

We have set up an administrative organization for the largest American Army in history, and have made that organization function.

To the military and civilian personnel in the Services of Supply, I here and now say: "Well done!"

To our associates in the other branches of the armed services, to our fellow workers in industry and commercial life and in the other governmental agencies, I offer my deepest gratitude.

Your achievements are of such magnitude that no single pair of eyes can see them all at once, no single mind encompass all of them. Therefore, let us study them part by part, so that knowing the parts we can better judge the whole.

Let us first look at your procurement efforts. You were harried and harassed by the necessity of getting immediate results and by many changes of plans.

These changes were inevitable. The fluidity of war, the stress of shortages first in one raw material and then in another, the unpredictable shifts of enemy strategy, our experience on the field of battle—all these required revision from time to time of the Army supply program. There will be many revisions in the future. War is never static; our plans never can be permanently fixed.

But in spite of these obstacles we pressed forward steadily. We are still moving forward. We will continue to move forward at increasing speed.

With the cooperation of the War Production Board we will carry out our responsibilities under the controlled-materials plan. We are making good progress in the renegotiation of contracts, and in so doing we contribute our share to the general effort to prevent inflation and dislocation. Also, with the aid of the War Production Board, we materially increased the use of small plants geared to the war effort. We will further increase the use of these small facilities.

In our first year we systematized our relations with the other United Nations on all questions of supply procurement and munitions assignment. Our relations with our allies are on a sound basis of mutual understanding. This is an achievement of which we all may be proud.

Having obtained the supplies, it was our duty to make sure that they quickly reached the hands of troops. This we did, without maintaining excessive inventories.

The part you played in logistics overseas, and especially with regard to the African campaign, was superb. You were given a job to do; you did it. At the same time you kept that other long pipe line full—to the southwest Pacific. Only a well-geared, well-oiled, smooth-running machine could have accomplished so much, so well, so quickly. When you are called upon to perform similar feats in the future, I know you will succeed as well.

Without skill, loyalty, and immense efforts in the administrative services, we could not have succeeded. Without the benefit of hard-working, self-denying staff divisions our plans would have bogged down. Without the complete cooperation of every one of the supply services we would have failed.

There is time to mention each service and division only briefly. Our personnel activities have become increasingly important. Manpower in all its phases—in the armed forces, in agriculture, and in industry—is rapidly becoming a most vexing national problem. We have solved many manpower difficulties and many others are in process of solution.

We have laid a good foundation for the better use of both civilian and military personnel. The officer shortage with which we began the year has been greatly relieved; civilian personnel is more efficient and more properly used. We have placed increasing emphasis on training, on the greater utilization of women, on the curtailment of paper work. We have aided in the settlement of many labor disputes.

We have prepared the greatest single long-range educational program ever set up in a single generation and have done it in a few short months. I refer to our training program in American colleges and our pre-induction courses in our high schools. The latter, already functioning, will save millions of man-hours of instruction of new soldiers; the former will provide the technicians and specialists we need in mechanized war. Our plans to keep high the morale of troops are being realized. We are supplying men where they are needed. We have expanded our facilities for training officers and men and are improving our methods of instruction.

In the administrative services I want to mention the organization of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, their fine accomplishments, and the difficulties still to be overcome in the expansion of that Corps.

We have amalgamated the National Guard and the Reserve and Reserve Officers Training Corps into the Army of the United States on time and with little waste motion.

In this day of enemy-inspired hatreds our chaplains have led the way in the cooperation of all faiths. They have done their job well.

The high standards of justice maintained in the Army are a credit to the Judge Advocate General. Prompt payment of nearly $4,000,000,000 a month, with almost a complete absence of peculation, is a tribute to the efficiency of the Office of the Chief of Finance. The fact that only last week investigators announced that there had been almost no sabotage in our industrial plants proves that the office of the Provost Marshal General is on its toes. We are proud of the spirit instilled in our Corps of Military Police.

Our Army Exchange Service has taken half a billion dollars' worth of everyday needs to soldiers stationed far from retail trading centers.

We all know about the splendid job of standardization, simplification, and decentralization carried out by The Adjutant General. In this department I want particularly

to mention the advances the Army Postal Service has made, and especially the establishment of V-mail.

Let us look briefly at the accomplishments of the supply services. Army Ordnance in this 1 year has expanded production seven times. Establishment of the Ordnance Automotive Center at Detroit has speeded production and simplified procedures. We have developed new weapons, some so revolutionary that they quickly modified the science of tactics. Other new weapons are in process now. We have redesigned old weapons to procure greater efficiency. We have established production-control methods which give us maximum flexibility in meeting the changing demand of war

Every American should be proud of the M4 tank. In spite of fireside strategists, the men who actually know insist that this is the finest tank on the battlefield. We are producing ordnance in immense quantity. In the First World War our allies furnished most of our artillery, all our tanks. Today the situation is reversed. We must not only supply all our own weapons, but vast quantities for the other United Nations. This we are doing. The quantity and the quality of the arms flowing from our arsenals to all the world's battle fronts surely must be ominous to our enemies.

New types of clothing to fit new types of war, new rations to meet new conditions and world-wide shortages and still maintain a balanced, adequate diet, plus the ability to keep up with procurement schedules are the outstanding accomplishments of our office of Quartermaster General in the first year of Service of Supplies.

Completion on time of the greatest construction program in history, the training of large numbers of combat troops, and the contribution to a new phase of aerial warfare through the development of steel landing mats are high lights in the work of our engineers.

The fact that only about 1 percent of our troops are disabled through illness, less than 3 percent from all causes, and that those wounded in battle are given prompt and adequate treatment, is proof that our Medical Corps lives up to its finest traditions. The development of new uses for sulfa drugs by Army doctors, new antimalaria measures, the extensive application of blood plasma, and new, quick evacuation methods for the wounded are examples of the forward-looking plans of our Medical Corps.

Working in secrecy, our Signal Corps has revolutionized communications and detection devices that will affect not only the winning of the war but the daily lives of all people in the peaceful years to come.

The movement of men and supplies by our Transportation Corps in our first year has been one of our outstanding accomplishments. Working in conjunction with the Navy and the Maritime Commission, we have shipped overseas six times the volume of supplies we did in the first year of the First World War, two and a half times as many men; this in spite of the much longer distances now involved. We are prepared to do nearly three times as much this year. Next year we will increase the volume even more.

We have produced a million incendiary bombs in our first year of Service of Supplies. At the same time we trained all our troops to defend themselves against gas.

In all our efforts we have never lost sight of the necessity for conservation. Evidences of this are found in our manufacturing processes and in the reduction of waste in garrison and in the field.

Let us not forget our service commands. Our plan to decentralize authority and responsibility has worked out even better than we had hoped. These commands are giving daily evidence of their effectiveness.

All of the accomplishments would have been impossible without the active support of the Secretary, the Chief of Staff, the Under Secretary, and the Assistant Secretaries. All have given us the inspiration of their leadership and their unstinted support. We should never forget this. We are similarly indebted to our associates, the Air and Ground Forces and the General Staff for their sympathetic handling of our common problems and their cooperation in their solution.

At this point I want to leave behind us what we have accomplished and examine briefly what lies ahead. Of course we have not solved all of last year's problems. In addition, we shall soon meet other major problems that fall into four categories.

First is procurement. Here on the whole we are in good shape. With few exceptions we have met the needs for supplies and equipment. We have met them on time. In spite of the fact that required production this year is two times as great as for 1942, I feel that, in general, we have taken the necessary steps to insure the accomplishment of the 1943 program. The major areas in which we must concentrate our procurement effort are briefly these:

We must continue our drive to get deliveries at a tempo greater than last December. Our record in January was not too good. We dare not fall so far behind in the first 6 months that we need to make up a deficit later. The time to get production is early in the year and not at the end. Only our determination to help the Air Forces and the Navy is holding us back now and even with the deference we are paying to the needs of sister services, materials are becoming available which will make the required speed-up possible.

I am told that our preparations for carrying out the control materials plan and our execution under this plan to date are superior to that of any other agency in Washington. I believe that this is true. I also know that we cannot yet check off control materials plan as something we have accomplished and reduced to routine. Bills of materials are not all they should be; our estimates need greater accuracy; our schedules are not yet perfect. We have not perfected our organization or our procedures in all echelons for administering the control materials plan. However, I am still confident that control materials plan will work and must be made to work. Recent changes in the War Production Board have not affected this picture, and I am convinced we can count on its cooperation. Certain supply services have made a tremendous drive in the past few months in our scheduling of production. We must keep up this pressure until scheduling is one of the things behind us.

With increasing operations overseas, we must pay particular attention to learning the needs and to revising models to meet the flaws disclosed in combat. We must provide promptly all new items of equipment and improve existing types as dictated by combat experience.

The next major category of present and future problems is the supply of our armies in the field. This encompasses storage, distribution, transportation, maintenance, rehabilitation, and salvage. Our supply operations must be geared to and ahead of our forces in active theaters of operations. The major items in this field are these:

Maintenance, repair, and spare parts. I believe none of you is satisfied with this particular activity in the continental United States. Special attention must be extended to our forces overseas.

Warehousing needs improved organization and more streamlined methods. Use of personnel in our depots can be greatly improved.

Stock or inventory control requires immediate attention. We must have a simple uniform mechanism to distribute and redistribute supplies and equipment in the right quantities at the right time. I fear that here we are going through too much paper work without getting corresponding results. The new stock control should help on all fronts on this problem.

The whole field of transportation will continue to require our best efforts. Making the best use of limited shipping, we must gear our activities to know and meet the needs of theaters of operations. Our relations with the War Shipping Administration are excellent and our working relationships are improving. This is a war of transportation and no effort must be spared to reach 100-percent efficiency.

Finally, we must insure a systematic and efficient flow of supply through our manufacturers, through our depots and ports to the debarkation ports. We must intensify our efforts to make sure that troops going overseas leave with full equipment.

Thirdly, there is a category of problems which I term "Management." This past year we have built an organization. We have been producing and getting to the users the supplies, equipment, and services that are our mission. Some of the latter have been done by brute strength and awkwardness, much of it hand-to-mouth. We have been pushed by immediate problems, have solved day by day the many major crises that arose. For most of you it has required long hours and strenuous efforts. On the whole, we now are providing a steady flow of the things we must provide. We have reached a considerable degree of stability in organization and in results. We now should devote more attention to internal management, to techniques to secure our end results with the least waste of effort. We must critically examine methods and procedures. We must develop simplified, coordinated systems. We should establish such routines that we are not plagued day after day by minor crises.

We must again and again simplify our work, eliminate nonessential procedures, activities, reports, records, and other paper work. We must eradicate duplications, overlapping, and conflict. We need to install the best practices of specific elements of the organization throughout all elements. We need to decentralize further the functions and authority to field installations. In other words, to use a hackneyed phrase, we need to streamline our management techniques and methods.

Finally, as a fourth major category of the problems we face I would like to speak of the program which General Styer recently inaugurated for the more effective use of personnel This is serious. Any unnecessary drain on manpower is becoming increasingly inexcusable. In the urge to get results we have not been too careful in limiting personnel. We got the results—we did the right thing but the time arrived toward the end of the year to consolidate our position. This program is an attempt—and a good one—to get this problem out of the talking stage and on the road to tangible results. You have already received some and you will receive more instructions on specific measures which must be carried out. The whole personnel problem can only be solved by commander through command channels. I want you to give these matters your personal attention. Don't be driven into this—take the bit in your teeth—forge ahead on your own initiative.

I have said many times that this is a world of people and not of tanks and guns. Although sound organizational structure and a simple and coordinated framework of systems and procedures are essential in any complex undertaking, they are useless without good leaders. We—you and I—are the leaders. Success or failure depends on us. We must not lose our sense of urgency. We must have the same intense drive that is

required of troops in the front lines. We must see situations as they actually are instead of as we hope them to be. We must have such an overwhelming indignation upon the discovery of delays, ineffectiveness, or unsatisfactory conditions that we move ruthlessly to remedy them and remedy them at once. We must not fall into pitfalls of empire building and jurisdictional jealousies.

Much of our work throws us in contact with other agencies, our allies, the Navy, civilian bureaus and departments, other branches of the War Department. Our relations with these are of the best.

We must get results. We may become impatient with delays that cooperation with other agencies inevitably entails. Let us not under any circumstances be irked by these contacts—let us not become intolerant of their views and problems and let us not under any provocation, no matter how great, be drawn into useless bickering which turns our blood into bile and taunts us into anger against those with whom we should work in harmony Remember it is the Japs and Germans we hate and it is the Army's job to put them to the sword and not those who work with us to that end.

Our motives, our capacity, and even our integrity will be questioned One would be less than human not to be disturbed by such attacks. Our duty to our country, our jobs, and ourselves, however, demands that we ignore them. No matter how difficult it may be, our faith in our cause and in ourselves must rid our systems of this poison and keep us from retaliation.

As I said on my return from my recent overseas trip, I was impressed by the unity of purpose and action everywhere. We cannot afford to engage in any intra-S. O. S. battles or in the battle of Washington. There's only one real battle going on in the whole world right now Each of you is contributing to it. Each can be responsible for your share of ultimate victory.

Although we have done well, we must not rest on our accomplishments. The future will place even greater requirements on us. We have worked hard. We shall have to work harder.

There is not much glamour or glory in our work. All of us would prefer a combat assignment. All of us cannot be there. Our satisfaction must come from a personal sense of work well done each day—from the realization that our work must be done if the fight is to be won. To this satisfaction I wish to add my deep appreciation of your accomplishments, my thanks for your outstanding loyalty to me, and devotion to the work of the organization.

Amendment of the National Housing Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the insurance of share accounts in savings and loan institutions has been available through the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation for the past 8½ years and the program is no longer in the experimental stage. I have watched the course of the share insurance plan closely from its start in 1934, believing that we in the Congress had provided a most valuable device for safeguarding the savings of millions of American people. After a year it was easily apparent to those of us who had studied it that the premium charge of one-fourth of 1 percent of insured liabilities per annum was excessive. Legislation enacted May 28, 1935, lowered the premium charged a savings and loan institution for insurance of its accounts to one-eighth of 1 percent. Thus the first overestimate of the needed income of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation was corrected in part.

One-twelfth of one percent per annum was considered a sufficient premium for commercial banks to pay for insurance coverage by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, when the permanent program for insurance of bank deposits went into effect June 30, 1935. This precedent and the further experience of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, with its infinitesimal losses, indicated to some of us that a premium of only one-twelfth of one percent per annum was justified likewise in the insurance of savings and loan accounts. Accordingly on May 10, 1937, I introduced in the House of Representatives of the Seventy-fifth Congress a bill (H. R. 6929) to amend the statute—title IV of the National Housing Act—so that the premium charged the savings and loan associations for insurance of their accounts should be just one-twelfth of one percent. A measure containing a similar provision passed the House of Representatives of the Seventy-sixth Congress on May 31, 1940, but failed of consideration by the Senate of that Congress. Again on October 2, 1941, I introduced in the House of Representatives of the Seventy-seventh Congress a bill (H. R. 5742) to provide for this reduction, but the pressure of war legislation made it impossible to bring the bill out of committee.

Thus 6 years after the need first became readily apparent for a reduction in the rate of premium charged savings and loan associations for insuring either accounts, there are 2,400 associations paying an excessive premium for a protection which this Government instrumentality could afford to give them for much less. These savings and loan associations are encouraging people to save money. Ever since I have had any knowledge of them—for a period of more than 35 years—they have been encouraging people not to spend all they make. They are an important factor today in the great fight on the home front against inflation. They should be put in a position where they can give greater encouragement to savings and thrift. They should not have to pay out of the earnings which would accrue on the savers' money an exorbitant fee for the insurance of accounts.

I present some statistical data to demonstrate that the reduction in premiums is justified. Supporting data, consisting of exhibits A and B, are attached.

First. The income of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation from 1934 to 1942, inclusive, was over $42,000,000. This income was derived from premiums, admission fees, and earnings on capital. Losses were only $3,200,000 during that period and operating expenses were kept at approximately $1,700,000. Thus the Corporation had total expenses and losses of less than $5,000,000 during this 8-year period. They amounted to 11.5 percent of income, leaving 88.5 percent of income in reserves and surplus of the Corporation. From this it is evident that the premium is unnecessarily high.

Second. The earned income from insurance premiums and admission fees alone was approximately $16,000,000 in this first period of 8 years. Expenses totaling $1,700,000 as pointed out in the last paragraph were thus only about 10 percent of earned income from premiums and fees, and the losses, $3,200,000 pointed out above, were only about 20 percent of income from premiums and fees. Thus the ratio of combined losses and expenses of the Corporation to date has been only 30 percent of income from premiums and fees alone. Upon this basis, which is aside from any earnings upon any Government capital or accumulation in the Corporation, it is apparent to me that the premiums charged are unnecessarily high.

Third. A study of the record indicates that the Insurance Corporation has put into reserves and surplus an average of 88.5 percent of its gross income, and that the amount transferred to reserves and surplus has in no year fallen below 70.9 percent. From these figures, it is evident that the one-eighth of 1 percent premium now charged and the one-eighth of 1 percent assessment now chargeable are too high.

Fourth. Private casualty insurance companies and fire insurance companies customarily charge and collect premiums which are about twice their losses and only slightly in excess of their losses plus expenses. This Government Insurance Corporation has charged and collected premiums and fees which are more than 13 times its losses and which are over 8 times its losses plus expenses. I submit that this comparison with the practice of well-managed private insurance companies leads to the conclusion that the premium charged by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation should be reduced.

Fifth. Premiums and fees which would have been collected if the premium had been one-third less would have amounted to $11,000,000. The cumulative actual losses of $3,200,000 would have been less than 30 percent of premiums and fees, under such conditions, and the expenses of $1,700,000 would have been less than 15 percent of premiums and fees. On this supposed reduced premium charge, the total of losses and expenses would still have been less than 45 percent of premiums and fees only. Again, it is evident that the premium now being charged is too high.

Sixth. Gross income of the Corporation has already been cited as over $42,000,000 in the period since the insurance of accounts in savings and loan associations was started. Had the premium been reduced by one-third, the $3 200,000 losses during that period would have been less than 10 percent of gross income, and the $1,700,000 of expenses

would have been only about 5 percent of gross income. On such a reduced premium basis, the combined losses and expenses would thus have constituted only about 15 percent of gross income. One must draw from this the conclusion that the premium rate now being charged is too high.

Seventh. I submit the record of the share-insurance fund of the Cooperative Central Bank of Massachusetts to demonstrate that the ultimate risks involved in carrying on such an insurance operation do not require the high premium today being charged. The cooperative banks in Massachusetts are the counterpart institutions of savings and loan and building and loan associations in other States. I submit this record because doubtless the question is going to be raised as to whether or not our 8 years' experience with the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is sufficient to measure the ultimate risks. Early in the recent depression the State of Massachusetts established its share-insurance fund requiring all of the more than 200 cooperative banks in that State, with assets totaling more than half a billion dollars, to pay assessments to the fund to cover losses. Thus this fund assumed all predepression and depression losses upon every cooperative bank in the State, good and bad. Their record appears to indicate that this fund has absorbed and paid substantially all of the losses of the last depression. Those losses for a 9-year period covering predepression, depression, and post-depression losses in institutions, good and bad, have been only approximately one-third of 1 percent of share capital of all the banks for the cumulative period. This means that assuming all of the losses in all of the banks, good and bad, has averaged a cost of only about one twenty-fifth of 1 percent per annum to the insured banks. From these facts it seems clear to me that the one-eighth of 1 percent being charged by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, insuring only selected risks, is too high, and that even the one-twelfth of 1 percent which we suggest is conservatively high.

Eighth. It may be called to our attention that the losses of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation were substantially greater in 1942 than in any other year. Such contention, however seems to me to be completely answered by the fact that the major portion of the 1942 losses of the Corporation were depression losses of insured associations not charged off until that year, having been overlooked when insurance was granted. Furthermore, it still should be borne in mind that even in this year of its greatest payment of losses the Corporation added over 70 percent of its gross income to its reserve and surplus.

Ninth. The Government is interested not only in stabilizing a thrift and savings program in the United States at this time, when financial confidence and the encouragement of thrift are so imperative, but also in encouraging home ownership with minimum interest rates. This insurance premium, which is paid in full by the insured institutions in cash annually, is necessarily an element of the interest rate which they charge home borrowers. Therefore, it seems clear to me that the Government is interested in a reduction of the insurance premium charge if it can safely be made, and I have presented the facts on which I base my own conviction that the reduction can be safely made.

In addition to the reduction of the insurance premium to one-twelfth of 1 percent per annum, I feel that there is another inequity in the statute creating and governing the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and this measure attempts to correct that. The statute—title IV of the National Housing Act—provides for a cumulative dividend of 3 percent per annum on the $100,000,000 capital stock subscribed by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation when the Insurance Corporation was set up. This dividend ought to be waived and its requirement discontinued for two reasons:

First. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation ought not to be required to pay a cumulative dividend when other similar Government instrumentalities do not pay dividends for Government capital used by them. The statute creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, allotting it $150,000,000 out of the Treasury for capital, provides:

Section 264 (d) of the National Banking Act as amended:

> Such stock shall have no vote and shall not be entitled to the payment of dividends.

The Government provided the original capital for the Federal Housing Administration and no dividends are required. The Government has contributed to the surplus of the Federal Land Banks from time to time upon a basis requiring no dividends, and in addition has, from year to year, absorbed the losses of the land banks.

Second. The stock of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is owned and held for the Government and the earnings, whether paid out in dividends or not, belong to the Government and should remain in the fund to provide fully adequate capital as the number of savers and investors using this form of insurance steadily increases.

I am hopeful that sometime during the present session of Congress the Banking and Currency Committee will have time to consider the question and recommend favorable action to my colleagues in the House. After all our local thrift institutions are the finest instrumentalities we have for promoting the basic American virtues of saving money and home-ownership and we should never be unmindful of those things which make for their progress and better ability to serve their communities.

EXHIBIT A.—*Operations of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, years ending June 30*

	Total	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942
Income:									
Insurance premiums	$15,716,049	$182,011	$785,309	$1,346,078	$1,881,450	$2,291,893	$2,631,241	$3,063,115	$3,534,952
Admission fees	285,994		37,468	66,351	65,927	45,353	19,022	24,371	27,502
Interest on bonds [1]	26,322,377	3,034,755	3,033,352	3,146,349	3,262,879	3,392,132	3,474,396	3,497,811	3,480,703
Total	42,324,420	3,216,766	3,856,129	4,558,778	5,210,256	5,729,378	6,124,659	6,585,297	7,043,157
Operating expenses [2]	1,709,014	86,577	111,241	158,582	217,069	289,520	256,076	265,016	324,933
Losses	3,198,274			2,025	102,820	285,989	537,472	546,468	1,723,500
Recoveries	20,202					4,753	13,355	2,094	(3)
Net losses	3,178,072			2,025	102,820	281,236	524,117	544,374	1,723,500
Operating expenses and net losses	4,887,086	86,577	111,241	160,607	319,889	570,756	780,193	809,390	2,048,433
Number of settlements	26			1	3	3	5	4	10
Ratios:	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Operating expenses to total income	4.0	2.7	2.9	3.5	4.2	5.0	4.2	4.0	4.6
Net losses to total income	7.5	0	0	0	2.0	4.9	8.5	8.3	24.5
Operating expenses and net losses to total income	11.5	2.7	2.9	3.5	6.2	9.9	12.7	12.3	29.1
Proportion of total income available for reserves	88.5	97.3	97.1	96.5	93.8	90.1	87.3	87.7	70.9

[1] Includes profit on sale of securities.
[2] Includes amortization of bond premium and commission on bonds.
[3] Not available.

Sources: Annual reports, Federal Home Loan Bank Board; hearings, independent offices appropriation bill for 1944.
NOTE.—For the calendar year, 1942, losses amounted to $1,723,500; it is estimated that this was the approximate loss for the year ending June 30, 1942 (Federal Home Loan Bank Review, February 1943, p. 154). As of Dec. 31, 1942, disbursements to associations amounted to $4,900,000.

EXHIBIT B.—*Operations of the share insurance fund of Cooperative Central Bank of Massachusetts*

	Years ending Aug. 31									
	Total	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942
Income:										
Interest on investments	$90,224	$9,555	$24,011	$17,033	$15,186	$7,362	$344	$660	$1,583	$14,490
Interest on loans	367,515		12,942	28,434	61,594	64,716	59,005	47,919	50,770	42,135
Real-estate department	184,365		27	28,764	104,599	7,471	14,321	26,247	1,671	1,265
Fines	6,130			142	1,125	1,366	1,281	760	918	538
Paid-in assessments	5,776,803	[1]	[1]	[1]		[4] 4,557,605		[2] 606,012	[3] 305,387	307,799
Total income	6,425,037	9,555	36,980	74,373	182,504	4,638,520	74,951	681,598	360,329	366,227
Operating expenses [5]	246,407	9,345	18,206	38,081	64,236	29,701	21,347	18,977	18,478	28,036
Losses	[6] 1,530,125									
Total operating expenses and losses	1,776,532									
Ratios:	*Percent*									
Operating expenses to total income	3.8									
Losses to total income	23.8									
Operating expenses and losses to total income	27.6									

[1] Of this amount, $4,257,768 was paid in prior to July 1, 1938, and $269,838 was paid in as of July 1, 1938.
[2] This figure is the 1939 and 1940 assessments.
[3] This figure is the 1941 assessment.
[4] Includes real-estate expense.
[5] Established losses and arbitrary write-offs of assets of liquidated bank, as of Aug. 31, 1942, Eleventh Annual Report of Cooperative Central Bank of Massachusetts, p. 15.

Source: Annual Reports of Cooperative Central Bank of Massachusetts.

John L. Lewis and the Coal Strike

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is useless for Members of Congress to waste words concerning the sham battle that has been raging over the coal strike.

John L. Lewis has won his fight. He got just exactly what he was after, and that was for the Federal Government to take over the coal mines and give the miners a raise of at least $2 a day, which raise, by itself, amounts to more than the average cotton farmer makes working all day in the hot sun.

As I said on last Saturday, there is no use mincing words. Up to the present moment this controversy has resulted in a great victory for John L. Lewis and a great defeat for the American people. The administration is now reaping what it sowed in forcing through the Wagner Act and the wages-and-hours bill. As long as the present labor laws remain unchanged on the statute books these labor racketeers will treat Congress as a joke and the administration with contempt. The result will be that the honest laborers of the country and the American people as a whole will suffer in the long run—if we do not lose our form of government and our sacred institutions in the meantime.

Now is the time to decide who is going to run this country. The American people, and especially our boys in the armed forces, want to know. Let us give them the answer they deserve, and not just make a bad situation worse—and permanent.

Taking over the coal mines and raising wages at the expense of the taxpayers is not going to solve the problem. The next thing will be a demand to take over the oil fields, the railroads, the telephone and telegraph systems, and then private factories and other private enterprises.

I wish President Roosevelt would send a message to Congress at once recommending the passage of laws to make every labor union doing business in two or more States or in the District of Columbia take out Federal charters, file regular accounts of expenses, and become amenable to Federal laws and answerable to the Federal Government. Then Congress should pass legislation outlawing strikes in war industries and labor racketeers and protecting the honest laborers from such impositions, and the country from these unnecessary disturbances.

If we are going to represent the American people, and the American soldiers who are doing the fighting and dying in this war, for God's sake let us get about it.

We cannot permit a few racketeers to cripple our war efforts by promoting sit-downs, slow-downs, strikes, and other disturbances, while our young men are fighting and dying to save this Nation.

The following significant editorial appeared in this morning's New York Times:

TWO WEEKS' TRUCE

The 2 weeks' truce in the coal strike which was announced last night by Mr. Lewis, just as President Roosevelt was about to appeal to the miners to return to work, at least means that there will be no immediate disruption of the domestic economy of the United States and no imminent danger that our troops in the field will lack weapons and munitions. But the truce is only a truce. Mr. Lewis shows no repentance of heart and no sign of abandoning his objective. And while the President's address was all that the country could hope that it would be—clear, firm, and unyielding in its determination to uphold the public interest in a time of crisis—the manner in which the announcement of the truce was made by Mr. Lewis is far from reassuring. Work will be resumed under a 15-day extension of the old agreements, "during which new contracts will be negotiated between the union and the United States Government" as "the new employer of the miners." Is "the new employer" to bargain with Mr. Lewis while its alter ego, the Government, stands firm on the theory that it was Mr. Lewis who made it impossible to bargain fairly under the accepted procedure for the settlement of labor disputes?

Mr. Lewis all along has been set to win three points: First, to get from the Government a better settlement than any other union has yet been able to achieve in wartime; second, to get that settlement without submitting his case to the War Labor Board, on which he has poured his bitter scorn; third, to get for his union substantial wage increases, whether or not these increases broke through the President's hold-the-line order on inflation.

The situation as it shaped itself last night by no means ruled out the possibility that Mr. Lewis may still win on all three points. There were reports that a settlement may be reached, during the forthcoming negotiations with the new employer, on the basis of an annual wage based on a 6-day week. No other union now enjoys such a guaranty, and the granting of it would completely satisfy Mr. Lewis' first point. Moreover, he would, in such negotiations, achieve his aim by direct bargaining, after refusing in the first instance to take his case before the War Labor Board. Finally, while a settlement on the basis of a guaranteed annual wage might seem technically to stay within the hold-the-line order on inflation, it would not do so in fact. This formula carries a concealed wage increase which would be more inflationary in its effect than a candid and open hourly increase. In the 5 pre-war years from 1935 to 1939 the average working year in the soft-coal industry was 182 days. A compulsory working year of 312 days would add 130 days to this. This in itself would increase the annual wages received by the miners by about 70 percent as compared with the pre-war year, even if we do not include the effect of the overtime rates involved.

All this is to anticipate the possible results of the negotiations which are to be held during the period of truce. But certainly it can be said that if a settlement were reached along these lines, and in this manner, the repercussions would reach far and wide. When the annual wage formula was brought up for consideration at an earlier stage of the present controversy, and before it was rejected as impracticable, our Washington dispatches reported: "Labor officials who expressed the desire for the annual wage said that if the miners' union received this provision in this contract there would be no way of stopping every other union from demanding similar treatment." The door to such demands would be thrown wide open by the establishment of any precedent which proved: (1) That the War Labor Board is no longer the court of last resort in wage disputes; (2) that the hold-the-line order on inflation can be broken; and (3) that a union can win especially favorable terms for itself, departing from the normal terms for other unions, if its leadership is bold enough and reckless enough to strike against the Army and the Navy.

To our fellow democracies, who have found it incredible these last few days, that a union would strike against the Government in wartime, the present proposal for a brief truce will itself seem astonishing. Who is this strong-willed man who dares to give the Government 2 weeks to come to terms with him? Who is this man who says "You need not worry about the safety of your soldiers and sailors for another fortnight, but then look out for trouble if you haven't given me a contract"? Who is John L. Lewis, and from what source does he derive this unexampled power?

Mr. Lewis has been able to do what no labor leader in any other democracy on the face of the earth would dream of daring to do in wartime—put a pistol at the head of his Government by abetting a strike in a vital industry—in part because Mr. Lewis is as shrewd as he is bold, in part because of the hold on his followers which his earlier victories have given him, and in part, it must be said, because Mr. Lewis' own Government itself, over a period of years, has permitted and even encouraged him to acquire and to use his present power.

The strike that began last Wednesday, the strike which the President described as no less crippling to our armed forces than a defeat in battle, is in no small part the logical result of an administration policy which has been at all times deliberately one-sided in its treatment of labor questions, always encouraging the growth of union power but never demanding an increase of union responsibility, always quick to punish employers for any failure to bargain collectively, but never at any time during Mr. Roosevelt's whole 10 years in office, willing to enact a single statute to restrain the abuses of union labor.

If Mr. Lewis has been, and still is, in a position of unexampled power, it is for one important reason because the Government helped him get there. Some of the peacetime chickens have come home to roost.

Richard Nash Elliott, Assistant Comptroller General

REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Richard Nash Elliott, of Connersville, Ind., has completed his term as Assistant Comptroller General of the United States. His service in that high office was both loyal and faithful in the discharge of his trust. Richard Nash Elliott came to the Sixty-fifth Congress, and served continuously through the Seventy-first Congress, and, after that service was completed, he assumed his duties as Assistant Comptroller General, serving under the Honorable John R. McCarl, the Honorable Fred H. Brown, and the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren. Richard Nash Elliott, from the days of his practice of the law, throughout his service in the State legislature of his own State of Indiana, in the years of his service as city attorney of his own city and during that span of 14 years that he served in the Congress of the United States, and in his capacity as Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, has ever been loyal and faithful to his trust—he has been a devoted and painstaking public servant—an outstanding statesman and official.

Mr. Speaker, it is to men of the high type of Richard Nash Elliott that we owe a debt of deep gratitude for the honest and faithful service rendered to our country. As he steps aside our wish is that time and the years may be generous, and that the happy recollections of the expressions "well done thou good and faithful servant" will forever remind him of his loyalty to his country.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my own remarks on this subject, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therewith an article appearing in the Sunday Star, of Washington, D. C., of date April 25, 1943, written by Mr. J. A. Fox, in which he sets forth the life and work of the subject of this sketch, the Honorable Richard Nash Elliott, which article follows:

ELLIOTT WILL RETIRE FRIDAY AS ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER GENERAL—INDIANAN HAS BEEN IN FEDERAL SERVICE FOR 26 YEARS

(By J. A. Fox)

Richard N. Elliott—"Dick" to his former associates in Congress and "the Judge" to the staff of the General Accounting Office—is retiring Friday as Assistant Comptroller General, ending 26 years in the Government. He is 70 today.

His outstanding impression of this long service?

That no man is indispensable.

Propped back at the desk in his high-ceilinged office in the rambling old Pension Office Building, the Indiana-born Elliott, whose speech still is tinctured with the friendly drawl of the Hoosier farmlands, talked over his years in the Capital and philosophized on the impermanence of political eminence.

"It didn't take me long to discover how unimportant the individual is here," he mused. "When I came to the House there were good men there—able men. I'd wonder how things would get along without them. Well, after a time, they'd go, and in a little while it didn't seem to make any difference. That's the way it was always."

WENT TO CONGRESS IN 1917

Mr. Elliott, a Republican from Connersville, came to the Sixty-fifth Congress from the old sixth district of Indiana on July 3, 1917, victor in a special election after the death of Representative Daniel W. Comstock.

He was defeated for reelection more than 13 years later, in November 1930, when the Democrats captured the House midway in President Hoover's term. Leaving the House the following March 4, he was sworn in a few days later as Assistant Comptroller General, under an appointment by Mr. Hoover. The term is for 15 years, but the statutory retirement age intervenes.

In his years in Congress, which covered the first World War period and witnessed the bitter fights over woman suffrage and prohibition (he voted for both), Mr. Elliott became closely identified with the modern development of the Capital, serving as chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which directed the Pennsylvania Avenue triangle building program.

He was also one of those responsible for the erection of the Supreme Court building, although, as he says, there might not have been a court building even today had it not been for the interest displayed by Chief Justice Taft, his successor Chief Justice Hughes, and Justice Willis Van Devanter.

ACTED AS CONTROLLER GENERAL

As it happened, Mr. Elliott acted as Controller General for much of his term in the General Accounting Office. When the tough-minded John R. McCarl relinquished office on July 1, 1936, it was confidently expected that President Roosevelt quickly would name a successor, for the Controller General's Office had become a battle-ground. Mr. McCarl's ideas as to the legitimacy of many New Deal expenditures differing radically from those of the administration.

It was 3 years, however, before former Senator Fred H. Brown of New Hampshire became Controller General, and in that time Mr. Elliott passed judgment on expenditures, contemplated and made, running high into the hundreds of millions. He didn't hunt trouble, and neither did he evade any responsibility, and while there were a few clashes, the relationship between the General Accounting Office and the administration became much less strained. Illness shortened Mr. Brown's tenure, and again "The Judge" took over, conducting the office until his old congressional friend, Lindsay C. Warren of North Carolina, became Controller General.

Despite his stanch republicanism, Mr. Elliott has had a weakness for Democrats; that is, some Democrats. Champ Clark of Missouri, Speaker of the World War Congress; Senator Oscar W. Underwood of Alabama; his fellow Indianian, Thomas R. Marshall, Woodrow Wilson's Vice President, and John Nance Garner, former Speaker and Vice President, were those of the opposite political faith whose friendship he has cherished.

But he still thinks that the outstanding figure in Congress in his day was Representative James R. Mann of Illinois, Republican leader for a long time. The late Speaker Nicholas Longworth was another whom he ranks high among the Republicans.

HOBBIES ARE FISHING AND POETRY

Fishing and poetry are the Elliott hobbies, and he has a regard for Robert Burns that borders on heresy, considering that James Whitcomb Riley, the Hoosier poet, came from his neighborhood. Mr. Elliott also has been known to flirt with the muse on occasion himself, and some of his whimsical lyrics were printed in the April issue of the Watchdog, the mimeographed publication of the General Accounting Office employees, in connection with his forthcoming retirement.

Fishing is one of his favorite topics for poetry, and a recent effort, dwelling on the piscatorial—and feminine—attractions of coastal North Carolina was highly publicized down in that country.

Mr. Elliott says there is absolutely no connection between that seashore rhapsody and the fact that a vacation on which he is about to embark with Mrs. Elliott will be spent in the mountains of West Virginia.

John L. Lewis and the Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on the 30th of April I prepared a news release relating to the actions of John L. Lewis in connection with the coal strike. I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

John L. Lewis has not only opposed the Government, he has defied it. In time of war he is leading a rebellion, not so much to gain advantage for the miners as to gain power for John L. Lewis.

However worthy the claims of the miners are, it is not democracy for all other claimants to submit their cases to the War Labor Board and John L. Lewis to scorn and spurn this Board, set up by the President and acquiesced in by the country to handle disputes relating to wage increases.

The time has now come for a showdown. We are fighting dictators abroad. It is up to the President to show the Nation that we are not going to have any dictators here.

Lewis has done more to hurt the cause of labor than any man in the country. We might as well settle right now whether any individual, or any group can with impunity sabotage the war effort. If we cannot settle that, we cannot win the war.

The Congress and the country will stand behind the President as he "with malice toward none; with charity for all" clearly maintains the national interest and squelches this incipient insurrection.

The Duty of the Press

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, our boys are being killed in ever-increasing numbers on the battlefields of the world. They are said to be dying in defense of the "four freedoms," one of which is the freedom of expression. Yet while these boys are giving their all, we in Congress meekly submit to suppression of freedom of speech and press within our own Nation.

By Presidential edict, the press of this Nation has been barred from free and adequate coverage of the forthcoming so-called International Food Conference to be convened in Hot Springs, Va., under armed guard, May 17. The conferees will meet in an atmosphere not unsimilar, insofar as to the military guard is concerned, to the recent incarceration of the Japanese Embassy officials in this same hostelry. During the past week, the cat was let out of the bag and we learned that instead of an international food conference what will actually be discussed are six points—

First. Coordinated utilization of international economic and military resources during the war.

Second. Setting up of machinery to referee international disputes.

Third. Establish temporary governments in occupied countries.

Fourth. Provision against territorial aggression on the part of any member nation.

Fifth. Establishment of an international police force.

Sixth. Extension of relief in rehabilitation of all member nations and occupied territory to be supplied by the United States.

Mr. Speaker, on April 13, in company with my colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan, Hon. HOMER FERGUSON, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 18, on which no action has yet been had. Under date of April 27, I wrote the chairman of the Rules Committee respectfully requesting an immediate hearing on this important resolution which, in addition to providing adequate press coverage for this conference, would at the same time provide that a joint committee of the House and Senate should likewise sit in attendance at these sessions, in order that the Congress of the United States—as representatives of the people—may be kept fully and adequately informed of the progress of these discussions, no matter how preliminary they may be in their actual nature. I insist that it is our duty to insure that we have open covenants—openly arrived at—in the conduct of this war and in any of our commitments for the post-war world.

Mr. Speaker, the duty of the press these days is set forth in a splendid editorial by George E. Sokolsky in the New York Sun issue of April 19 last, which I extend at this point as part of my remarks:

THESE DAYS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

THE DUTY OF THE PRESS

In a free country it is the obligation of the press to supply the people with the news. No newspaper is large enough to provide all the news. No newspaper is always correct or accurate, nor is all news judgment impeccable. But the job of the newspaper is to print the news as it gets it. In a free country, the only justification for the suppression of news is that its publication would be of advantage to the enemy, but with regard to such news the full onus of suppression should rest with the military authorities.

Whenever a politician wants news suppressed, particularly when the objective is to cover up his own shortcomings, he devises a formula which is usually insincere, dishonest, and obvious. The current formula is "unity." But the newspapers have no right to be misled into the acceptance of any such formula. Their sole obligation is to their readers, and when they betray that obligation, for any reason whatsoever, they betray the trust of an agent.

And that brings me to the question of the food conference that President Roosevelt has called and from which he has excluded the press except for the opening and closing set-ups. This food conference will be attended by all the United Nations, including the four fighting ones, and the object of the meeting is to figure out a procedure for getting food in circulation. Most of the food in question will be from the granaries, slaughterhouses, ranches, and farms of the United States of America, and the American people have a right to know everything about those meetings.

In the last war, under the direction of Herbert Hoover, America fed the hungry wherever we could get to them, and we fed them after the war was over, and we fed foe as well as friend. That is the record. But this time the record is marred by inefficiency and deceit. We do not know whom we are feeding, how much, or where We only know that we ourselves are short—even the soldiers in the camps are being rationed. We know that we are short because of 10 years of grave mismanagement of the American agricultural policy under the direction of the philosopher, HENRY WALLACE. We know that checks are still being paid to those who do not grow. A friend of mine in January of this year received a soil-conservation check from the Government, most of the money being paid to him for not putting hogs on this land—and that at a time when there is a meat and fat shortage in the country.

We know these things, but we do not know what Harry Hopkins and the other directors of our lives plan to do to the food of our families at the forthcoming conference. We do not know whether they plan to ship butter to dairy countries and wheat to countries where rice is eaten. In fact, having observed some of the errors of judgment of our rulers, I should not be surprised if someone evolved the brilliant idea of sending coffee to Brazil or tea to China. And that would be no nuttier than killing little pigs for any reason whatsoever.

Now, the moral obligation of the press is to get the facts and to publish them. If the newspapers of the country would recognize their duty and refuse to publish a speech unless a representative body of reporters heard it; if they would throw all "hand-outs" into the waste-paper basket and send their reporters on good, old-fashioned, leg-work reporting and interviewing, we should be printing and reading news and not propagandistic buncombe. If the newspapers instructed their reporters to get the facts of the Food Conference by all the means known to first-class reportorial journalism, and if that news were printed with or without Office of War Information approval, the people would be protected. The President's announced intention of suppression should be used by the newspapers to kill the "hand-out"—the worst abuse of journalism in all its history. If reporters cannot be present, reject the Government "hand-out."

Hoarding of Food in Japanese Camps in Wyoming

REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, civilized people the world over thought Hitler reached an all-time high in downright oppression and brutality. We saw the time when the Gestapo unmercifully shot down every man in one village or another.

But it remained for the Japs to show us the real goods. Like a thief in the night, and at the very time they were arbitrating in Washington, they struck that dastardly blow at Pearl Harbor. Now we are told how they murdered some of our boys who participated in the raid on Tokyo. Last night a dispatch from Tpkyo states that appropriate punishment will be meted out to 25 of our boys captured in the Philippines. They say we are soft. In some ways, I think we are soft.

About a year ago, a relocation camp was established near Cody, Wyo. Over 10,000 Japs are interned in that camp. Most of them are presumed to be loyal, but 1,200 are admittedly disloyal, and have asked to be returned to Japan. They agitate against the very Government that is feeding them.

A week ago the Denver Post conducted an investigation of this camp. They found stored and hoarded there sufficient rationed goods to maintain these 10,000 Japs for 3 years 7 months and 14 days. Without question these Japs are being coddled and pampered and treated better than the people of my State. They found Fordson tractors in abundance, and farm machinery of every description, such as is rationed and allocated to the farmers of Wyoming. Some of these tractors are used for field racing for the amusement of the Japs. They found 120 sets of mule harness, but no mules. Earl A. Best, assistant steward at this center until a month ago, has made charges that there has been food wastage, spoilage, hoarding, and high living at this camp.

Mr. Carberry, who made a personal investigation of the situation at the Heart Mountain Camp in Wyoming, writes in the Denver Post of April 23 issue, in part, as follows:

I saw a carload of the finest oranges and another carload of the choicest grapefruit being unloaded and stored. In mess-hall ice boxes I found crates of avocados. Hidden in attics I discovered cases of cereals and fruits and shrimp—shrimp that is purchased for the Japanese residents in the little 10-ounce cans for which the American housewife must not only give 31 cents in Denver stores but 3 precious red points as well. I discovered canned vegetables—tomatoes, beets, beans, peas, spinach, pumpkin, corn, and sauerkraut—with fruits, including pears, peaches, cherries, and blackberries, with a total point value of 20,017,222—twenty million seventeen thousand two hundred and twenty-two. This checked against the camp population of 10,300 equals a supply of these rationed foods which should last for 3 years, 7 months, and 14 days. I gained admission to the bulging warehouses and the foodstuffs found there were beyond belief. It was interesting that the very first kitchen I asked to inspect was No. 21-27. Accompanied by War Relocation Authority officers, I entered the pantry. It was well stocked. There were sacks of rice and the shelves were loaded down with every type of canned fruit and vegetable.

"Where," I asked the Japanese cook in charge, "are the rest of your supplies?" He protested loudly. "Everything," he said, "was in plain sight." I asked to see his attic. In this attic, the very first one I entered, I found secreted under the eaves, 10 cases of corn flakes and 10 cases of fruits and shrimp. In the warehouses I found 268,293 cans of rationed vegetables, 114,885 of these the No. 10 cans and 153,408 No. 2 cans. I discovered 141,405 packages of cereals—corn and wheat flakes, Rice Krispies, Grape Nuts, Farina, rolled oats, and similar breakfast foods. Stacked to the eaves in the warehouses, and on the pantry shelves in the mess halls were 61,914 jars of jellies and jams—grape, peach, plum, orange, strawberry, apricot, and apple butter. There were 58,840 pounds of macaroni, spaghetti, and noodles, and 10,320 pounds of dry beans and split peas. I found 6,853 gallons of mayonnaise.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Wyoming are up in arms about this matter. That situation is an insult to the mothers of our boys fighting in the Pacific. An investigation is being made by the authorities of the War Relocation Board, but we are convinced that this will be another whitewash. This is sabotage of the war effort. The Dies committee should investigate these charges immediately, and if substantiated, then appropriate action should be taken to remove every official involved from the pay rolls of this country.

Thoughts on Good Friday

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, since the House last met another Good Friday has passed into history. We have had the usual resurgence of sermons and literature dwelling upon the meaning of that sacred day and I think we may hope that we are all a little better from the wealth of discussions associated with this climacteric period in the life and death and resurrection of the Redeemer, but to my way of thinking the most significant of all the pronouncements on Good Friday this year did not come from a pulpit nor from the lips of a minister nor from the cloistered depths where men of God commune with divinity.

It came from the greatest police officer in the world today—J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He is the greatest, not only because of his personal ability, not only because of the superefficiency of the vast organization of which he is the creator and the master mind, but even more because he is humane, because he loves his fellowmen, because his feet are planted on the Rock of Ages.

I read in an obscure corner of a newspaper a few days ago some Thoughts for Good Friday contributed by Mr. Hoover, and I am going to rescue those thoughts from their out-of-the-way niche on the advertising page and insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I would like for everybody in this bleeding world to read them. I believe they are a clear expression of the altruistic viewpoint of Americans in the cosmic struggle that is going on. Here they are:

THOUGHTS FOR GOOD FRIDAY

(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation)

Throughout the world today peace-loving men have taken to arms lest the unbridled fury of power-mad aggressors destroy all that we know to be good and righteous. On this Good Friday let us humbly look to the cross for strength and inspiration. There in the suffering figure of Christ, who brought peace to the world, we will find assurance that no sacrifice can be too great when our cause is just. He gave His life for love of us. We will not rest until His peace has been regained for all men.

Surely a message like that coming from the world's greatest police officer who deals with hardened criminals but recognizes character and the priceless value of the human soul, is worthy of more than passing notice. Can anyone imagine Heinrich Himmler, the merciless chief of that murderous engine of repression, the Gestapo, appealing to his fellow mortals to look humbly to the cross for strength and inspiration? Can anyone imagine the heads of the secret police of Fascist Italy and benighted Japan giving expression to such sentiments of all-embracing humanitarianism?

These thoughts of Mr. Hoover are great thoughts. They ought to leap across continents and take possesison of the minds of men everywhere. In a world fast being swallowed up in paganism they sound like a rallying call to the human spirit.

At a time when the world needs a Saviour more than it ever needed one before, Mr. Hoover's thoughts on Good Friday should encourage men of righteous purpose all around the earth to try to find a common denominator of Christian collaboration and service to the end that when we fight our way through this psychosis and come out on the other side we may discover our new world—the world of our dreams—resting on the everlasting foundation of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. They are vital thoughts which should find a welcome response in the hearts of right-thinking people in every land and should be helpful in overthrowing power-mad aggressors and in bringing about the peace with justice for which the world in its agony yearns—the peace of Christ.

Nikolaus Copernicus, the Great Polish Astronomer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by

Malcolm W. Bingay from the Detroit Free Press for Wednesday, April 28, 1943:

THE EYE OPENER

(By Malcolm W. Bingay)

April saw the celebration of the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, who made articulate to all mankind the age-old dream of human liberty.

In May the world will celebrate the four-hundredth anniversary of the death of Nikolaus Copernicus, who touched the spark that gave to mankind the scientific age.

We know pretty much all there is to know about the great apostle of democracy, but we know little about the precursor of the age in which we live. The famous Polish astronomer only won his immortality on his deathbed—dying at the age of 70 on May 24, 1543, just as the first printed copy of his world-shattering treatise, The Revolutions of the Heavenly Bodies, which he had dedicated to Pope Paul III, was placed in his almost lifeless hands.

This gentle scholar and devout churchman was the greatest "no" man in all history. He came out bluntly and said that the world was not flat, that it moved around the sun and not the sun around it—after the human race had accepted for 1,000 years the dictum of Aristotle that it was the stationary center of the universe.

This world's greatest eye-opener was a doctor, a lawyer, a mathematician, and a theologian. While he never took priestly orders, he acted continually as a representative of the church in economic, administrative, and political affairs in Poland. He gave his medical skill to the poor without fee, and in 1522 organized currency reform for the Diet of Graudenz.

As a youth he took a pilgrimage to Rome and in Italy his imagination was captured by the Renaissance, the rediscovery of the knowledge of the ancient Greeks. He heard hints of the half forgotten Pythagoreans that the earth was but a small part of a great celestial system.

By 1530 he had completely developed his own theory which was to change the course of human thought, but he did not make it public. As he wrote Pope Paul in his famed dedication: "I considered in my own mind how absurd a performance it must seem to those who know that the judgments of many centuries has approved the view that the earth remains fixed as center in the midst of heavens, if I should, on the contrary, assert that the earth moves; I was for a long time at a loss to know whether I should publish the commentaries which I have written in proof of its motion."

The authenticity of this part of the dedication has been questioned but it is known that for more than 30 years he had held his document in secret and only made it public at the insistence of Cardinal Schonberg, who transmitted to the author a formal demand for its release from Pope Clement VII. Still he was fearful that it would so shock the minds of the people as to do more harm than good.

Copernicus stands alone as the great nonconformist because he refused to believe something just because everybody else said it was so. There were many flaws in his theory but he was the stick of dynamite that blew away the past and made it possible for his three great disciples, Kepler, Galileo, and Newton to follow through and chart the universe.

It was this Big Three who reduced the laws of celestial mechanics down to some semblance of working order so that they could be applied to the laboratories and harnessed to man's use. With the exception of Newton none of them possessed the modesty of Copernicus. When he had finished his great work on the laws of planetary motion, Kepler wrote:

"Nothing holds me. I will indulge in my sacred fury. I will boast of the golden vessels I have stolen from the Egyptians. If you forgive me, I rejoice; if you are angry, it is all the same to me. The die is cast, the book is written—to be read either now or by posterity, I care not which. I may well wait a century for a reader, as God has waited 6,000 years for this observer."

Galileo was even more arrogant. One of the greatest minds the world has ever known, he became a convert to the Copernican theory and improved upon it.

"His discovery of the satellites of Jupiter," says Herschel, "gave the holding turn to the opinion of mankind respecting the Copernican system, and pointed out a connection between speculative astronomy and practical utility." But he fought with everybody—with theologians and his fellow scientists.

Dr. William Gilbert, court physician to Queen Elizabeth, became the first disciple of Copernicus in England. "The father of electricity," he developed the polar theory. Over in Prussia, Otto von Guericke was the first German convert and created the first man-made vacuum. Centuries later—after thousands of others had added their bit—it was relatively simple for Thomas Edison to take these two principles and give to us the incandescent light—one of the great scientific triumphs of the ages.

Copernicus opened the floodgates of mankind's inventive genius—and we are still riding on that flood. It is but at its beginning. While politicians argue, a new world they know not of is in the making.

Rubber Production

REMARKS

OF

HON. BARTEL J. JONKMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people have again shown that they are dedicated to every measure and sacrifice necessary to win the war. They have shown a unity of purpose and an organized response to the $13,000,000,000 bond drive from which the administration might well take a lesson. In my district the quota was oversubscribed before the month had expired.

In the meantime the administration during the same month has again given a pitiful demonstration of inefficiency, lack of organization, and hamstringing of the war effort. This time it was Under Secretary Patterson, O. W. I. Chief Elmer Davis, and Secretary Ickes clashing with "It-Can-Be-Done" William Jeffries, the Rubber Administrator, who was appointed by President Roosevelt to produce rubber for the essential needs of the war program. In his objective he apparently has the support of War Production Chief Donald Nelson, while bureaucrats, brass hats, and star gazers surreptitiously seem to throw monkey wrenches in his machinery.

In other words, "the procrastinations, indecisions, conflict of authority, clash of personalities, lack of understanding, delays, failure to build a greater stock pile of crude rubber" which the Baruch committee nearly a year ago said to be "so dangerous that unless corrective measures are taken immediately this country will face both a military and civil collapse" still hamstring our war effort and constitute the outstanding characteristic of administration leadership. If the war should be lost or unduly protracted and extended, it is this element that from the present perspective will have to assume the responsibility.

The administration does not seem to realize that only organized effort will win the war and that an effective organization is one under a competent head in which every unit works reciprocally and intensively toward a common end. The failure to perfect such an organization, and the responsibility, therefore, does not lie with the gentlemen or any one of them who gave this demonstration of frustration and futility.

As has been said before in the Well of this House, it must be laid directly at the door of the President who, after 10 years as Chief Executive of this great Nation and after 17 months of this devastating war, still fails to put into operation the fundamental principles of all successful executive action, and that is that for a difficult job there must be created an organization with a competent administrator at its head who has full power and responsibility; that for many difficult jobs there should be as many such persons all again brought together under a war cabinet or some similar over-all agency, under an administrator, with final power and responsibility for reconciling their respective claims and needs in correlation to harmonious organized effort.

Congress has already invested the President with all the powers necessary for him to establish such an organization. It is up to the administration to act.

This is the greatest need of the war effort today. In this connection it may also be repeated what has before been said in the Well of this House, that the American people know the President cannot, single-handed and alone, win this war; but they also know that he is the only person in the United States who can single-handed and alone lose the war or protract and lengthen it at a terrific loss of lives and property through failure to act on this simple and well-established principle.

Equal Rights Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the executive board of the

Wayne County C. I. O. Council, of Detroit, Mich., on April 13, 1943:

Whereas the Senate Judiciary Committee has favorably reported out the antilabor so-called Equal Rights Amendment; and

Whereas many Senators and Congressmen are misled by the phrase, "Equal Rights," and do not understand the threat to the rights of all working women embodied in this piece of legislation; and

Whereas this amendment would abolish all State laws setting minimum work hours for women, all minimum wage laws in service industries and other occupations in intrastate commerce; maternity provisions, widows' pensions, and all laws which differentiate but do not discriminate against women; and

Whereas the fact that labor has failed to exert its full power against this reactionary measure, while antilabor forces were active and have enlisted the aid of the uninformed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this body go on record as strongly condemning this measure as a threat to the rights for which labor has fought for a hundred years; and be it further

Resolved, That this body demand that Michigan Senators and Congressmen oppose this measure; and be it further

Resolved, That all locals be urged to demand that our Representatives and Senators oppose this bill; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Michigan Senators and Congressmen; to the national Congress of Industrial Organizations legislative committee in Washington; to all affiliated locals and the press.

Submitted by Local 51, United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, and adopted by the executive board of the Wayne County Congress of Industrial Organizations council on April 13, 1943.

The Long-Run Issues in Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from PM for today:

THE LONG-RUN ISSUES IN COAL

(By Max Lerner)

President Roosevelt's excellent radio talk to the miners last night and the calling of a truce in the coal strike by John L. Lewis, have changed the whole situation for the better. There can be little doubt now that a contract will be signed, whether between the miners and the operators, or the miners and the Government.

That John L. Lewis is still thinking not of the country's welfare but of his own power politics should be clear from the timing of the return to work. The President in his speech asked the men to return on Monday. Lewis announced that they would return on Tuesday. The reason he advanced for causing the country the loss of the extra day's coal production is flimsy. He could easily have used the radio announcements to get word to his district leaders in time.

It was as if he was saying to the American people that he, rather than President Roosevelt, is boss of the coal miners.

The whole strike episode is not one to make American progressives happy. It should prove one of the turning points in their education. For what has happened is that an unscrupulous labor leader has taken a set of labor grievances and turned them to his own political purposes. In short, we must learn that the strike is a weapon that can be turned against progressivism as well as used for it.

For the people this war is a struggle against organized cruelty and inhumanity. For John L. Lewis it is simply an episode in his own career. For the people the coal strike is a fateful blow at continuing war production. For John L. Lewis it is a political adventure. It gives him a chance to put on the spot the man for whom he has a greater hatred than any other man—the President. It exposes the President to the danger of losing a part of his labor support. And that, for Lewis, is enough.

HAD TO END

The strike has ended, as it had to. Any other result was inconceivable, because any other result would mean that Lewis had been able to create a state within a state, capable of destroying the larger state in its moment of greatest danger.

But even with the strike ended, the long-run issues that furnish its setting will not have been resolved. These issues are four:

The miners have been getting wages too low for living costs. This means doing something at both ends—wages and prices. As far as price-control goes the whole mine strike incident may prove to have been not without its value. It has dramatized for the complacent higher-income groups and the quiescent Office of Price Administration officials that a worker's wife has a hard time in the face of mounting prices and the black market. And the President will now have a more united support than ever for a vigorous campaign to stop price rises and roll them back.

As far as miners' wages go, it is time to adopt the principle of the guaranteed workweek and production year in the mines. Over a long-run period it is continuity of work that the miners care most about. And right now the guarantee of a 6-day workweek, with overtime for the sixth day, would meet fully the desires of the men, and would not be unduly inflationary.

The miners have been getting rations inadequate for the type of work they do. There are differences in food requirements which the rationing system should take account of. A sedentary worker needs less food than a manual worker. And from the standpoint of the Nation, a manual worker in the heavy essential industries must be taken care of first. Even after wage adjustments it will be important either to provide larger rations for miners and others like them; or we could well follow the example of the English, and provide canteen service in the mines at Government expense, so that the men could be assured at least of a hot and nourishing lunch.

FLEXIBLE MACHINERY

Labor requires strong and flexible machinery for the adjustment of grievances. I think there is no doubt that Lewis was insincere in rejecting the War Lar Board's jurisdiction. Nevertheless he was in a better position to do so after the President had virtually tied the Board's hands by making it a subsidiary of James F. Byrnes. A strong and independent War Labor Board must be restored, with power to make decisions not only in the light of economic needs, but also in the light of the whole labor situation.

Finally, labor needs genuine belief. A nation which resorts to patriotic appeals in order to keep its labor force in the war is not a nation that has enlisted the full strength of that labor force. American labor will respond to patriotism. But it will work better if it has more than speeches and newspaper editorials to spur it on. It will work better if it feels that the war economy is not wholly in the hands of industrialists. It will work better if it feels that big salaries are limited as well as wages. It will work better if it is not made the target of attacks by labor-baiters. It will work better if an adequate tax program is adopted.

In short, if we want to invoke the greatness of our labor people, we must instill in them the passion of belief. But they will not catch the contagion of it unless they are convinced that there is equality of sacrifice in this country of ours.

And that requires, on the part of the President and Congress and industry, not words but deeds. As long as there are words without deeds, the John L. Lewises will thrive.

Birthday of the Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues today in honoring the birthday of the Polish Constitution.

May 3 is a day of deep pride and great hope to Poles throughout the world—to the suffering millions in occupied Poland, to tens of thousands in the Polish armed forces in the Middle East, in Britain, and on the seas, and to the thousands of refugees in India, Persia, and Africa.

On May 3, 1791—152 years ago today—Poland became the first country in Europe to have a written democratic constitution.

To a people deprived during the greater part of the past 150 years of their right to their own political existence, this Constitution is a deathless testament to their political genius and a spiritual justification of Poland's unbroken will to remain an independent nation.

The May constitution in many ways resembles the American Constitution. It recognized that "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people." As in the American Constitution, it adopted the principle of the division of authority, setting up executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

The Polish Constitution also accepted the principle of religious toleration. It said:

For as the same sacred faith enjoins on us to love our neighbors, therefore we should guarantee to all people peace in the faith and government protection, and therefore freedom to all rites and religions in the Polish lands, according to the country's laws.

The Poles are particularly proud of their constitution, because it came into being without a bloody upheaval. It ameliorated the injustices in Polish society as a whole without causing any of the

Polish classes undue sacrifices. This tradition of peaceful democratic revolution explains in part the deep sympathy between the Polish people and their American and British allies.

No man was more impressed by this fact of the importance to democratic tradition of Poland's peaceful revolution than the great British parliamentarian and democrat Edmund Burke, who said of the Polish Constitution:

In contemplating that change, humanity has everything to rejoice, and to glory in; nothing to be ashamed of, nothing to suffer. Not one man incurred loss, or suffered degradation. All, from the king to the day laborer, were improved in their condition. Everything was kept in its place and order; but in that place and order everything was bettered. To add to this happy wonder (this unheard of conjunction of wisdom and fortune) not one drop of blood was spilled; no treachery; no outrage; no system or slander more cruel than the sword; no studied insults on religion, morals, or manners; no citizen beggared; none imprisoned.

The feeling of the Polish people themselves for their constitution is perhaps best expressed by their greatest national poet, Adam Mickiewicz:

This law did not emerge from the brain of an isolated sage, from the lips of a few administrators, but was drawn from the heart of the great mass; it is not merely written in black and white, but it still lives in the memory, in the desires of the generations, and it is a living law, rooted in the past, and developing in the future. In the May constitution, the national element, the child of past traditions, is nurtured on the new present-day needs of the nation. Hence it has been well and justly said that the May constitution is the political testament of the former Poland.

The freedom of the individual and the freedom of the nation, which form the fundamental credo of Poland, constitute not only the main principles of Polish policy during its present period of enslavement but they give the Polish cause the universal character of a war for freedom which all civilized peoples applaud.

Wherever in the past the struggle for freedom was fought, there Poles were to be found. In their long fight for their own freedom, they have always realized that they were fighting for the ideal of universal freedom: They knew long ago that freedom, like peace, is also indivisible.

Today once again the Polish nation commemorates the anniversary of the May constitution, and on this day, above all other days, Poles everywhere in the world are singing:

While we live she is existing
Poland is not fallen;
We'll win with swords resisting
What the foe has stolen.
Poland! Shall the foe enslave thee
Sadly and forever;
And we hesitate to save thee?
Never, Poland, never!

And all Americans whose hearts and hands go out to their brothers in the love of freedom sing that song today, with the heroic and martyred sons of Poland.

Aid for General MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Baltimore News-Post of April 27, 1943:

D'ALESANDRO TOLD MACARTHUR WILL GET AID

Assurances of the War Department that there "will be an increasing flow of military supplies, particularly aircraft," to the American and Australian forces battling the Japanese in the Pacific war zone were received today by Representative THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, of the Third Baltimore District.

Congressman D'ALESANDRO on April 16 wrote to Secretary of War Stimson demanding that the Pacific front be given immediately the supplies and equipment needed to halt the Japanese.

RECEIVES REPLY

The letter in reply from the War Department, received today by Congressman D'ALESANDRO, says:

"The combined chiefs of staff are charged with meeting the over-all requirements of all the United Nations and with allotting to our many fronts the weapons and other military supplies needed both for defense and for the offensive operations which are contemplated.

"The allocation of a limited supply to meet very large demands is a very difficult task. Priorities must be determined in the light of detailed studies of the whole global military situation.

KEPT IN MIND

"I am sure that it is unnecessary to tell you that the needs of the southwest Pacific are being kept constantly in mind and that there will be an increasing flow of military supplies, particularly aircraft, to that theater.

"Thanking you for bringing your views to our attention, you may be assured that we will keep our American and Australian flyers supplied with sufficient planes, not only to replace losses but also to build up our aircraft to counter the increasing enemy air strength."

War Bond Purchases in Utah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I call to the attention of the House the extraordinary response made by the people of my State in the purchase of United States Government bonds. Not only did the State exceed its quota, but the most important of all was the wide distribution of individual purchasers. In spite of the many inconveniences and hardships as a result of the war, it is very evident that the people are determined to see it through. I want to add my humble congratulations to the former Governor, Charles R. Mabey, Mr. Hogle, and Mr. Bamberger, and those who assisted them in leading our people in this patriotic endeavor.

The following editorial is taken from the Salt Lake Tribune of April 24, 1943:

UTAH LEADS THE NATION; FULL QUOTA IN HALF TIME

Today's parade in Utah's capital city will be a triumphant march toward the goal of victory. Shoulder to shoulder, patriotism and generosity will pass between cheering crowds lining the streets to be traversed by veterans of former wars, by soldiers, sailors, aviators, marines, and coast guards in training, by high school and military bands, by uniformed women of the auxiliary corps and Red Cross contingent, by the Gold Star Mothers, by motorized equipment and by platoons of workmen off shift—all of whom are performing heroic parts in the tragedy being enacted in the global theater of war.

Many of the spectators—those who witness the glorious pageant moving forward to inspiring strains of martial music—also have contributed essential aid to the war effort. They have made arms and munitions, tanks and planes, available to the fighting forces—and they have raised Utah's banner of Americanism to the highest standard among those of the entire Union.

Not only has Utah gone over the top in subscribing her quota but reports indicate that Utah was the first to cross the line. Furthermore this record was attained when the allotted time for solicitations was barely half gone. This glorious achievement, while stimulated by revelations of Japanese brutality and barbarism, may be attributed to the inherent Americanism of Utah people and to the untiring efforts of the volunteer workers under the intelligent and inspiring leadership of Charles R. Mabey and James E. Hogle, Utah members of the Twelfth Federal Reserve District war finance committee.

Too much credit cannot be given Clarence E. Bamberger, manager of the Salt Lake division of bond solicitors, and his capable aides.

According to statistics already tabulated, 51,214 citizens or residents of the State had loaned the Nation $50,418,915 up to noon on Thursday. Nor is the inflow ceasing up to date.

It was a magnificent display of patriotism, of confidence in the leaders of our Army and Navy, of determination to win the fight against might that seeks to dominate right.

Present Unsettled Coal Situation Hinders War Effort; Lewis Forgets Responsibility; Miners Need Some Raise in Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the workers in our great coal mining industry are justified in a wage increase. What

this amount should be must be determined sanely. This cannot be accomplished by threats or strikes, but must be brought about through orderly procedure. I believe the miners, deep in their hearts, agree with this feeling. I herewith include copy of a telegram sent last Saturday night to the Bluefield (W. Va.) Telegraph, in which I set forth my comment on this tragic situation:

BLUEFIELD, W. VA.

In 1919 John L. Lewis, not as ruthless or dictatorial as now, faced with closing the mines in time of the country's crisis, said in answer to the court:

"I cannot fight my country."

He has now forgotten his responsibility to his nation in a far more crucial hour, and follows the dark star of his own destiny, while our well-equipped and resourceful foes gain satisfaction and strength by the shutdown of the coal industry.

President Roosevelt, speaking February 28 of last year, declared:

"If any dispute arises we shall keep on working while the dispute is solved by mediation, conciliation, or arbitration—until the war is won."

The zero hour is here, and the people of all parties and creeds are demanding that our Chief Executive make good what he promised America so we can have, in his own words, "uninterrupted production."

Congress must share the censure for not having acted with courage in enactment of antistrike legislation. In advocating such a measure I repeat the following expression, made during House debate December 2, 1941:

"Legislation (against strikes in wartime) passed which is restrictive in nature is aimed, not at the large body of patriotic men and women, but aimed at the small minority. It penalizes those who, like a cancerous growth within the body politic, are ruining the great labor movement in our Republic."

What I said then is even truer today, and I fervently hope and pray that loyal labor and responsible leaders of unionism will rally back to their jobs, so vital to the successful and speedy prosecution of this terrible war.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it was Oliver Wendell Holmes who said: "New occasions teach new duties." The time is here when all of us, not as groups but as Americans, must write not a new Bill of Rights, but a Bill of Duties. Let us write it in our hearts, and not base it on selfish consideration.

Takes On a Little More Power Each Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Cincinnati Times-Star on Thursday, April 29, 1943, under the title "Takes On a Little More Power Each Day," in which Morris D. Ervin, veteran Washington newspaper correspondent, calls the attention of his reading public to an insidious expansion of bureaucratic power which seriously endangers our form of government. The article is as follows:

TAKES ON A LITTLE MORE POWER EACH DAY—THUS MCNUTT, ADMINISTRATION LIEUTENANT, DETOURS AROUND CONGRESS

(By Morris D. Ervin)

WASHINGTON, April 29.—A review of the career of Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt for the past year constitutes an excellent study in the acquisition of power as it is practiced by the Roosevelt administration. It might be entitled "The Road to Dictatorship."

Just a year ago Mr. McNutt was put at the head of a new and very weak-kneed agency set up by the President for the purpose of working out a national manpower policy and suggesting legislation to carry that policy into effect. Just the other day Mr. McNutt issued an order forbidding men in this country to quit one job for a better one without first obtaining his consent on pain of going to jail for a year. Yet in all that time he has not proposed that Congress pass any legislation on the subject of manpower and Congress has passed none.

The natural question is: "How does McNutt get that way?"

And the answer is that he got that way by taking on a little more power each day, so little that it was hardly noticed at the time and was not, therefore, objected to.

MAKING A STUDY

For a time after McNutt took charge of the War Manpower Commission nothing happened, or, at any rate, nothing seemed to happen. McNutt said he was making a study of the situation and that he thought legislation would be necessary.

There is some evidence that President Roosevelt was not at all satisfied with him during his first few months on this assignment. At any rate it is known that the President tried to persuade Secretary of the Interior Ickes to take the job, but that the latter talked him out of it.

Then McNutt began to change his tune somewhat. He said that unless he had more power to cope with conditions it would be necessary to have legislation. So the President gave him more power. It is interesting to note that it was not Congress that increased his powers. On December 5 the President placed the Selective Service System under the War Manpower Commission and gave McNutt control over all hiring and recruitment of workers essential to the war effort. No more was heard from McNutt about the need for legislation after that. In fact, from then on, he frowned on any suggestion that legislation was needed. It could all be handled, he said, by a "voluntary program" under this direction.

His next move was to designate critical areas, about 30 of them, and he decreed that workers in these areas were no longer free to move from job to job. All hiring must be done through the United States Employment Service. Men in essential industries could be rehired only if they could get a statement of availability from the War Manpower Commission. This was enforced by cracking down on employers who hired men without McNutt's approval.

RAIDS ANOTHER LAW

Soon after that McNutt borrowed some of the powers of the Selective Service Act and used them as a means to enforce his "voluntary" system. Men of draft age in nonessential industry were told that unless they shifted to war industries they would no longer be deferred, regardless of how many children or other dependents they might have. Here was the first instance of McNutt's borrowing power from an act covering one field to enforce his ideas in a completely different field. The Selective Service Act was passed by Congress for the purpose of obtaining men for the armed forces. McNutt was using its powers to control hiring and firing in industry.

Then McNutt's powers were widened again by Executive decree. This time the President proclaimed a 48-hour week, and gave McNutt the power to lengthen or shorten the workweek beyond that figure and to say where it should be applied.

And then to top it off, a week or so ago, McNutt issued his order forbidding workers in war industries, and in some others, too, to leave their jobs and accept better ones. And again he borrowed powers and penalties from a law covering one field to enforce his decrees in an entirely different field.

"The hiring by an employer of a new employee," the McNutt decree states, "or the acceptance by an individual of new employment, in violation of this regulation, is subject to the penal provisions of the act of October 2, 1942." But that act was an act to control inflation, and says nothing about penalties for hiring.

THE METHOD

This is not intended as an argument that the things that have been done by McNutt should not have been done. It isn't so much what has been done as the way it has been done that is being complained about. Undoubtedly the manpower situation in the country was in a state of terrible confusion and needed to be straightened out. But the customary way to bring order out of such chaotic conditions is through legislative action. And if Congress can't pass a law taking care of all the details, it can at least pass a law setting forth general principles and policies to guide executive action.

But that has not been done, and it has not been done chiefly because the Executive discouraged legislative action. Instead, McNutt has from time to time seized a little more power and extended his field of control a little wider until now, without benefit of law, he is threatening to put citizens in jail if they ignore his decrees.

Of course there has been the usual plea that legislative action is a slow process. But Congress was ready to act on the manpower situation a year ago. The delay in getting the right kind of legislation was not that Congress was unwilling or slow to act, but that the Executive was slow or unwilling to suggest the legislation. In fact, the conclusion is inescapable that the Executive did not want any legislation. The complaint is not that workers have been frozen in their jobs. That, perhaps, should have been done long ago. The complaint is that one man has taken it upon himself to order this step without first obtaining the necessary authority from the representatives of the people.

Down the Middle of the Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Science Monitor of April 20, 1943:

DOWN THE MIDDLE OF THE ROAD

(By Erwin D. Canham)

DOES AMERICA HAVE BASIC UNITY?

"Once again," writes Pearl Buck in the New York Times magazine, "our longing for

retreat into irresponsibility is about to hold back the progress of mankind. We still do not come out with the clear statement of what sort of world America wants and will pledge herself to bring into being."

Then, in even more stinging language, Miss Buck says: "Instead of thinking about the sort of world which would be best for America, we are thinking of isolationism and race prejudice and business greed and the American way of living and keeping our boys at home and a dozen other ideas, all of which we love better than the idea of America itself, a country of free people that can be secure only in a world of free peoples cooperating with one another in mutual responsibility and to mutual advantage."

How does Miss Buck document her charge that Americans "love" their various prejudices better than the idea of America itself? Well, she insists further: "Scratch any of us, from Roosevelt down to a little man on the street, and you never quite know what you will find—a Democrat or a Republican, an isolationist, a Communist, an imperialist, or a new dealer."

And in contrast, speaking of the British, Miss Buck says: "Nobody believes the English are disunited, however ferociously they disagree with one another, for everybody knows they are agreed on one thing, and it is that England is to be preserved at all costs, even when those costs are the sacrifice of everything that is personal, including personal opinions. Even Hitler must now know for the sake of England the rich and the upper classes will give up wealth and position, and that for the sake of England labor will give up labor's rights and follow even leaders whom they denounce."

She adds: "England has already achieved a unity with Russia, for example, that is as yet impossible to us because of our preoccupation with communism and our own Communists. The English people are so sure of the Englishness even of their own Communists that they cannot regard them as a menace. We are not so sure of ours."

The unity of the Russian people is equally firmly established. In Miss Buck's words, "England knows that Russians are fighting for Russia as the English people are fighting for England."

These observations about the unity of the British and Russian peoples—it is noteworthy that Miss Buck omits her beloved China—are convincing. But is it equally true that Americans, in spite of their surface differences, are quite as divided as Miss Buck believes? If so, then the United States faces a staggering internal problem—a problem which is a menacing drag on our hopes for a better world—a problem which must indeed be taken with dead seriousness by Americans.

Few of us would care to say that Miss Buck is wholly wrong. Certainly prejudices and passions have repeatedly got in the way of the American war effort. One major reason why we still indulge these practices is that we are not physically under the bombs. The military threat on both Britain and Russia has been sufficient to fuse internal differences. Both nations showed they had basic character and patriotism enough to join rather than split in time of peril. Were the United States in equally visible peril, our supreme testing time would come. And remembering the intense mood which prevailed immediately after Pearl Harbor, can we not believe that America, too, would have fused in the crucible?

One need not doubt, too, that Britain and Russia possess inherently a greater degree of unity than the United States. Britain's is based on a high degree of historical, racial, and even religious homogeneity. The historic and semireligious causes for Russian unity are equally deep rooted.

Granted that American labor, industrialists, persons living in large mass contact of race, and other special groups do manifest a distressing degree of selfishness, does that mean that under this burden Americans do not also possess certain bases of agreement?

Is there no such thing as the American dream? Does it not emerge anew in hours of national peril? Is it altogether clouded today? What does it mean, anyway? First, of course, it means freedom of opportunity—for individuals, groups, racial or religious minorities. We know we do not attain the dream. But the dream is there and we must strive ever harder toward its realization.

Moreover, does not the experience of our citizens' Army, Navy, and Air Force prove a degree of unity among very different Americans? It is true, as Miss Buck says, that some white soldiers objected to the social equality offered Negro troops in Great Britain. This condition was in a noncombat area. While the behavior of white American troops was not defensible, it was understandable enough under the circumstances as the product of historical and psychological conditions.

If you took Miss Buck's advice to "scratch" an American soldier what would you find? Surely you would not find a new dealer, a Democrat, Republican, or Communist. You would find an American. He would be a man making great sacrifices to preserve the American things on which he sets store.

Americans are united by their love of America. The boy from Flatbush and the boy from North Dakota. Some of the rest of us may not precisely see the appeal of this place, or that; the windswept barrens of the high plains, the hot and dirty streets of the city. But there are American boys fighting because they have learned to love those barrens or those streets better than anywhere else on earth, and after they have seen the Vale of Kashmir, they may well prefer the streets of Brooklyn. It's funny, but it's patriotism.

Of course, we should long since have put this patriotism to work—much harder. We should have realized and explained these things on which we agree, we should have made it plain to the people at home that our national peril is just as great as if bombs were dropping or an army pressing at our borders or pillaging our soil. In short, we have not articulated our unity, and we are constantly articulating our differences. As long as this process continues, Miss Buck's thesis will be unchallengable. When we begin to mine and mint our unity, we will start to live up to our responsibilities.

War Risk Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from a Baukhage broadcast, Blue Network, Monday, April 19, Washington, D. C.:

A week ago the President signed Public Law No. 36. That law immediately made what is estimated as a million and a half men eligible for war-risk insurance which they haven't taken out, men, many of them right now perhaps poised on the edge of battle.

According to this law all those men in the armed forces, and this includes the women, except the WAAC's, can still take out the full $10,000 Government insurance if they haven't done so already. Premiums are deducted from monthly pay.

Here is what happened: Back in October 1940 the law was passed making all members of the armed forces eligible for this $10,000 worth of insurance. It wasn't compulsory. The men had 4 months to do it—after that they had to take a physical examination and fill out a complicated form to do it. A lot of the soldiers didn't act back in 1940. It was still just a defense measure, we weren't going to war, there was a political campaign on. No pressure was put on the fellows. Many who did sign up signed for one or two or perhaps three thousand only.

Those were the fellows who are overseas now, the first to go. The War Department realized the situation. And they set to work. The bill was finally banged through Congress giving members of the armed forces another chance—until August 10 of this year. All they have to do is make written application through their commanding officer—no medical examination, no medical history statement. That means that the men at the front, serving on subs where they couldn't possibly get a physical examination if they wanted to, men who have already been wounded and are lying in the Army and Navy hospitals today, can still get the benefit of that protection which the law gives them.

The War Department, suddenly plunged into war, did little about the situation until last November. Finally, it was realized that only 25 percent of the men on the early casualty lists were insured. Efforts were made to bring in more, but at the front a physical examination was impossible, the complicated forms couldn't be filled out; there were other obstacles. So the Department called on a retired Army officer who was in the insurance business, Colonel Harrel, veteran of the last war, with more service medals and wound stripes than most generals. He went to Congress and hammered through a new law and set the wires humming to American commanding officers all over the world: "Sign 'em up." He got things moving. Now every commander in the 50 or more American outposts throughout the world, in America, and at the reception centers has been ordered to urge the men to sign up for the full amount of protection. Already the number of policies has jumped in size and percentage. And between now and August 10 every man, even those who were turned down when they made application before, can get the full amount of insurance on application. Even if they have no money for the first premium that has been provided for, the Army will advance the first premium.

It is a crying shame that so many men have gone out unprotected; there is no use crying over that spilt milk, but now the thing is to see that the rest of the men get their protection. It is up to the commanding officers and your next of kin to help by reminding the boys—not merely because it is their duty to those they leave behind, but a duty to themselves—that insurance will be a wonderful nest egg when they come back. And if there are any soldiers listening to me who haven't taken out the full ten thousand, see the top sergeant right now, and remember this—no red tape, no exam, no past-medical-history statement. You are eligible. And take a tip from me, I know; the small deductions from your pay for premiums are nothing to what that protection means to you and your dependents; and if any officers are listening, well, sir, it's your responsibility too.

New Deal Failures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio speech delivered by me at New Haven, Conn., on May 1, 1943:

Good evening. As I expected when I broadcast in New Haven last Saturday evening, I came back to Washington late this afternoon. I shall now have time to study the details of the new income-tax bill which the leaders advised me will come on the floor of the House as the first order of business next Monday.

According to the daily press, Chairman Doughton has taken the Newsome-Compton pay-as-you-earn bill, introduced on April 9, for his compromise plan. True, he did change to 3 years for our 5 years in which to pay off last year's tax. As I have said before, who gets the credit for the final bill is unimportant, but that we get a deduct-at-the-source tax bill at once is all important.

During the recess I visited Hartford and talked with the Governor, several department heads, and with members of the legislature and was formally received by the State senate through the courtesy of Lieutenant-Governor Hadden. Also I talked with many plain everyday citizens in New Haven, Meriden, and around the district. I want to give you my impressions and reactions from all of these contacts and certain criticisms, and talk to you about the over-all picture of our Government today; also about your share in repairing some of the damage, of which many of you have complained, before it is too late.

I do not think it is good tailoring to measure a man today solely by the brand of his politics or the cut of his clothes. I did not go to Washington merely to take part in the inevitable collapse of the overbuilt New Deal. My aim is construction, not destruction. My politics are American, not selfish.

True, I am a member of the Republican Party and I believe myself to be loyal to the better Republican standards, but that does not prevent me from sympathizing with the plight of the American people as a whole and not as Democratic, Republican, or independent voters. I do not differentiate in my handling of the problems of the people of my district and I ask that you do not differentiate in the consideration which you may give to the views and opinions I express tonight. They are not spoken from the viewpoint of the so-called politician, but from the viewpoint of an American who seeks to protect our way of life.

There has been a growing lack of faith in Government in the minds of the people in recent months. They feel the effects of ill-advised past legislation, of discriminatory treatment, and of incompetent and sometimes frightened administration.

I have taken my place in Congress, not to add to the lack of faith, but to restore if I can renewed confidence and belief in the wisdom and advantages of the constitutional form of government; to take my share of the blame for errors and omissions and to move as rapidly as is consistent with that wisdom to eliminate conditions which threaten the welfare of all of the people of this country.

I do not want to become known as a Republican whose sole aim in this Congress is to oust the bureaucrats simply because they carry the New Deal label. Some of them are admirably fitted for their jobs. Some are woefully unfitted.

I do not want to become a constant, harping critic of the policies and the trends of the New Deal administration simply because they are New Deal in origin. But it is equally important to me, and to you, that I do not overlook the very great need for reform in this present Federal Government setup. I must raise my official voice along with yours against abuses that are fast approaching the danger stage.

Every day my mail is full of the woes of the people of the Third District—people that are members of all political parties or members of none. They want relief from New Deal political appointees and injustices, they want my help to escape from the tangled webs of red tape and restrictive and discriminatory regulations that are needlessly strangling their businesses, disrupting their homes, endangering the future of their children, threatening their freedom, now under the guise of "war measures." They are not being selfish. They are as American as you and I—they work, they fight, they buy bonds, they are willing to sacrifice all that is necessary if it is right and just and sensible and equitable.

They do their part, but in return they want some measure of encouragement from their Government, some small knowledge they will not end up being treated as herds of cattle, but will continue to enjoy the freedom guaranteed by our Constitution.

They can get no such assurance from the trend of our Government today. They can get no such assurance from the daily spectacle of our war leaders—such as Nelson, Ickes, Patterson, Forrestal, Jeffers, and others—calling each other names, and like a group of child tattletales, blaming each other and one and another for the half-baked plans, and for the mistakes of the alphabetical hodgepodges they supposedly direct as czars.

They can get little assurance from the overall picture of World War No. 2. Its end is not in sight. The United States is still a long way from accomplishing what it will have to accomplish with armed men before victory is ours.

The war effort is still pretty much a domestic effort that is only slowly being transferred into action against the enemy. The production colossus we have developed in this country is still a midget in its contact with our enemies.

Indecision is largely responsible for those conditions. One group of our war leaders wants to fight a slow war, another group a fast war. The submarine menace is not the whole cause of the trouble.

Who do you, the people, blame for these conditions?

Do you also properly place the blame for all the present uncertainties of life, the shortage of gasoline, the coming shortage of food, the conflict of the New Deal bureaucrats which constantly endanger our war effort; for the other delays, indecisions, errors, conflicting statements, discriminatory regulations, and attempted regimentation of our people?

Who is to blame? Is it Congress, which is prone to move slowly, but which has done its part in pulling wide the purse strings to make available tremendous sums of cash for war purposes and has approved almost every bit of legislation asked for to advance the war effort?

Is it the people who work day in and day out, buy bonds, sacrifice luxuries and necessities alike and by their labor have piled up an actual surplus of war materials—who have given willingly of their sons and husbands and fathers?

Or is it the New Deal which appoints, directs, plans, limits, decrees, hedges, and too often obstructs?

They took credit for earlier successes—can they now escape the blame for these colossal failures?

The New Deal administration in 10 years of spending and taxing, to my mind, has never solved one problem of the American people without creating a bigger one to take its place. It never solved the first and major problem of the long depression—unemployment. It gave a small percentage of the people relief; it gave the New Deal faithful high-salaried jobs, and it gave the American people the highest taxes in history and the largest public debt the world has ever known. It gave business rules and regulations, and labor rights and prerogatives, but it created no productive jobs during peacetime.

Finally, it solved the unemployment problem by giving us a war, for which they were not wholly to blame, nor for its spread wholly to be excused, but in the doing created problems more costly than unemployment, more damaging to the American way of life than relief, more harmful, time will prove, to the progress of the American worker than lower peacetime wages.

Only by realizing the cause can the cure be effected. One does not swallow more poison to offset an earlier dose.

There are no words with which I can describe adequately the abuses which are practiced in Washington, the conflicting statements of supposed authorities, the petty frictions over divided authority, the autocratic disregard for the public and sometimes the Congress. The waste of money, of time, and of manpower is prodigious.

Millions and millions of dollars, some of it plain graft, are thrown away every week. The pockets of the taxpayers are drained to pay unbelievable sums for unbelievable activities whose only value is to perpetuate the New Deal in office and delude and enslave the American people. Propaganda and worthless publicity manufactured by 35,000 paid publicity agents flows out of Washington like the waters of a bursting dam—cost $100,000,000 and more annually—and the American public is drowned beneath the flood. It is designed to excuse the failures, and to preach new and better Utopias to come.

The New Deal has created a Frankenstein of government over which it has lost control. This was again brought to public notice this week when the labor Frankenstein, John L. Lewis, stood defiant before his Government—unpunished and unpenitent. I would like to discuss this latest coal strike in detail, but I want to await developments. Meanwhile I think every able-bodied striker in the coal mines who does not return to work should be drafted into the Army at once, and the conspirator or conspirators responsible for the strike arrested for sabotage.

There is little time now to cry over spilt milk. The war is on, it must be won and it must be paid for. There is little that can be done to protect this generation from suffering for our past foolishness and our neglect of the duty to control our Government as provided in the Constitution and in all the election laws of our country.

I have given you a few of my own personal thoughts and reactions on our Government and on what people are saying and thinking today. I believe we must look to the people as a whole to aid us in solving our problems. Unfortunate though it may be, under the conditions that confronted them the people themselves created the New Deal. Now either the people must support Congress in its efforts to hold back and then stop this tidal wave of bureaucracy that is about to overwhelm us, or all will be lost. Meantime, the people must give us counsel, advice, and support in the job ahead of repairing the damage and returning to constitutional government.

Thank you for listening and good night.

Sale of War Bonds at Weaver High School, Hartford, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, there were times during the period of 1929 to 1939 that I wondered about the future security of the United States. I wondered if the youth of America could live through that 10 years of depression and grow up loyal to our form of government. The spread of such doctrines as the Oxford oath was discouraging. However, to the everlasting credit of the youth of America they have come through the period of depression—a period during which many of them had no recollection of the family bread winner bringing home a weekly pay envelope.

In spite of such a handicap, these young people are demonstrating that they are as loyal as any patriotic American. The other day I received a letter from Mr. Frank H. Burke, principal of Weaver High School in Hartford, Conn., in which he gives me a brief report of the outstanding record of participation of students and faculty of Weaver High School in the purchase of United States War bonds and stamps, culminating in a special drive staged during the scholastic week ending April 16.

Because I am so proud of this report, I am going to quote from Mr. Burke's letter:

Beginning in January, we decided to make a special effort to increase the weekly sale of bonds and stamps. We increased our sales to a point where the amount ranged between $1,500 and $2,300 per week. On Friday, April 9, in special brief assemblies, we asked the school to purchase $10,000 worth of bonds and stamps during the coming week to signalize Weaver's participation in the national second war loan drive. We felt at the time that we were setting a goal which might be difficult of attainment. A week later, Friday, April 16, the weekly report showed that we had sold in this school, in a period of 4 days, War bonds and stamps to the value of $42,402.35. Thus, in 1 week, purchases in this school had almost equaled the quota of $50,000, which we had set for the entire school year. The previous sale of bonds and stamps in this school from September 1942 up to April 9, 1943, had totaled $22,388.60. We have, therefore, sold to date this year in Weaver High School, War bonds and stamps amounting to $64,790.95. Our enrollment is 1,330 pupils.

Much of the credit for the success of our undertaking is due to Mr. William R. Waring, commercial instructor at Weaver High School, to whom I delegated responsibility for promoting, organizing, and administering the continuing campaign.

The pupil participation in our special weekly drive reached 99.8 percent; we have, of course, been running well above 90 percent for a long time—a fact which is evidenced by the United States Treasury flag flying just below the Stars and Stripes at Weaver High School.

Conscription of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include a certain statement made against the Austin-Wadsworth bill—commonly called the conscription-of-labor bill by Mrs. Broy.

Mrs. Broy before her marriage to United States Consul Broy was the widow of a very highly respected former Member of this House, the late Thomas Upton Sisson, of Mississippi. Mr. Sisson was for many years a member of the Appropriations Committee. Mrs. Broy received her first lessons in good government from Congressman Sisson, and she seems not to have forgotten them.

Mrs. Broy spent 10 years in Europe with Mr. Broy. During this period, this active, brilliant woman studied social and political conditions in 14 European countries.

When Mrs. Broy returned to the United States in 1938, recognition of her great understanding of foreign affairs was given by the fact that the late Senator Key Pittman, then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, recommended that the President appoint her to the post of Ambassador to Russia. Mrs. Broy had the strong endorsements of religious leaders of various denominations and leading women in both the Republican and Democratic Parties as well as of leaders in both Houses of Congress for this high position.

In other words this woman, who was born "deep in the heart of Texas," has come to be recognized by many as a very deep thinker on international affairs.

Mrs. Broy, speaking as a Christian woman, recommends Europe for the Europeans, the Orient for the Orientals, and the Near East for the Near Easterners when the world is ready for a just peace. Mr. Churchill mentioned something about spheres of influence in his last speech. Perhaps Churchill and Stalin could manage Europe when the war is over, says Mrs. Broy.

Mrs. Broy points out in her statement before the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate that conscription of labor under the proposed Austin-Wadsworth bill would bring conscription of capital since capital cannot function without labor:

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the conscription of American workers, both men and women, adults and minors. I am certain that we have not exhausted our patriotic appeal, and that we can find an intelligent and efficient procedure by which properly to allocate labor for agricultural and industrial activities. I am sure that we can meet the present emergency in a manner that will be in accordance with our American ideals.

While our boys are on the fighting fronts, some of us are determined to be the watchdogs of freedom and liberty at home.

We have the finest form of government on the face of the globe. I am a staunch supporter of our republican form of government.

As a Christian woman, daughter of a Baptist preacher, I am a firm believer in the principles contained in the Sermon on the Mount. I believe in the liberty of the individual citizen—that this liberty is a sacred thing under God—that it is one of the principles on which the Constitution of our Republic was founded. I have no racial or religious prejudices. I therefore have very definite convictions as to how our world problems will finally be worked out. Any Bible student can know the truth about these things if he will take time to study the last book of the New Testament—The Revelation. All of the prophecies of the Old Testament were fulfilled, and the prophecies of the New Testament are now being fulfilled—absolutely. Now for the four reasons why I think this bill should not pass:

1. Labor in America must always be free. It must never be conscripted. Conscription of labor is a foreign ideology, and must not take root in free America—not even during wartime. American labor is the bulwark of our American institutions.

2. Conscription of labor would bring conscription of capital. Conscription of free American labor automatically conscripts and smothers to death free American enterprise, or American business, as it is commonly called. This bill would kill initiative. Capital cannot function without labor.

3. Senate bill 666 would destroy the orderly procedures of democratic government provided for in our Constitution. This bill would prevent the maximum number of workers from voting. For example, suppose this bill became law. Then the 1944 elections come along. By this top-down system, workers have been conscripted and sent all over the United States away from their voting precincts and home States. It is difficult to get a maximum absentee vote even where the laws allow this, but in 13 different States of the Union there are laws forbidding absentee voting. This is nearly one-fourth of the number of States in the Union. This number includes one of our great States which has 35 electoral votes—namely the State of Pennsylvania. Now when the Nation is going through such a crisis as the present one, it is highly important that there be no interferenece with the balloting of the American people. When the power of the ballot has gone, or has been seriously interfered with, then the heart of democracy has stopped beating.

4. The mothers and fathers of young American daughters will permit their minor daughters to do war work on farms and in factories in their home neighborhoods, or in conditions approved by their parents, only if the necessities of war make this urgent, but they will bitterly resent and oppose any bureaucratic interference with the orderly upbringing of their children.

In order to get at our war worker problem in an efficient way, the Nation should be divided up into various industrial and agricultural areas. In these areas surveys should be made, not by inexperienced academicians but by factory and farm management.

When this has been done, then the need for workers in the various districts together with rates of pay for the varicus kinds of work should be made known to the public in a simple way.

Americans are a wonderful people. They have always risen to meet any emergency. I think we should have better leadership and organization work in connection with these particular problems.

But I suggest that there is the possibility of another and better way out of our present troubles. I now offer my substitute for Senate bill 666.

Bible prophecies and recent events indicate to me that peace is near at hand. I recommend that you, Mr. Chairman, considered by many people in this country, especially the women, to be one of the outstanding statesmen of our time, take steps together with the other members of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, in requesting the Senate to ask the President, together with our military leaders, to explore immediately the possibilities of a truce.

Our boys and men in uniform are brave and true and their performances to date have been magnificent. No reasonable person on the face of the globe could doubt that military victory will surely be ours, if we fight to the finish. That is without question.

But I propound this question today: Isn't it possible that our enemies have had enough now? And if they have, then why not stop the slaughter of our men? If a peace feeler is sent out—it should not be done in the usual secret diplomatic way but it should be sounded "from the housetops." I mean that the question of peace should be propounded over the radio, that the question should be sent out in all the principal languages of the world, so that the women in the enemy countries may help to put the pressure for peace on their leaders.

The women in these countries are probably in no way responsible for the outrages which their governments have committed. But I am sure these women who now constitute more than half of the population of the enemy countries must be sick at heart from having their boys and men return to them sore and bleeding. And while I am speaking particularly of women, may I say how unfair it would be to conscript women of the United States before they have been given equality of rights in the Constitution.

Certainly, we have everything to gain and nothing to lose by exploring the possibilities of peace now. Our President is the one person in the whole world who can, with dignity, make such a move. He will lose nothing if the suggestion is not adopted

I have been told that Pope Pius XII has said very recently that he will approach the leaders of Europe on the subject of peace. I have been told that certain New Deal Senators close to the President have, within the last few weeks, been urgently talking the possibilities of peace now to the President. I take my stand with these Senators and join hands spiritually across the sea with Pope Pius and say, "Let us explore the possibilities of a just and lasting peace now."

I suggest the following practical steps as the first set-up if the world is ready to take this great step—

1. A truce during which period the leaders of the world can explore the basis of a just and lasting peace.

2. A defense and economic unit of the 21 American republics and Canada—the islands of the Atlantic to belong to the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

3. Europe for the Europeans.

4. The Orient for the orientals. The exploitation of these peoples by other nations of the world should cease.

5. The Near East should be organized and run by the peoples of these rich countries. Their leaders have told me that they do not want to be dominated either by Germany or Great Britain when this war is over. They are different in customs, habits, and appearance from the Europeans. God has given them their rich countries to enjoy themselves.

The last part of verse 5 of chapter 13 of the Book of Revelations says, "And power was given him to make war for forty and two months." Forty and two months equals 3½ years. Mr. Chairman, the 3½ years are up. The new earth as promised in the Scriptures is at hand. I thank you.

Statement by Stephen Leacock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to the Pan American's Forum of the Future for the following statement from the pen of Stephen Leacock, author and economist and one of Canada's most distinguished citizens:

To every child we must give the chance to live, to learn, to love.

Misery breeds war

You can never have international peace as long as you have national poverty.

You may multiply the pomp of the parade ground as you will, but if behind it is the festering slum. war will come, as certain as the spread of pestilence.

What I mean in a plain way is that we must enter on a vast, a titanic struggle against poverty and want. What we United Nations did in war we must do in peace, the same union of hearts, the same purpose for all.

To effect this we must unlearn our economics, scrap the whole of it. I have personally 50 years of it to throw away.

The fault with economics was the assumption that what can only be done by the spirit could be done by material interest. * * * Business had done much for mankind; but society won't hold together on a business basis alone. * * * Nor on any basis which excludes the animating spirit of the common man.

There is no fear that the world will not easily support us all. A family may be crowded, but a nation never. Even Malthus, who invented the theory of overpopulation, married and was a father.

Especially with the children lies our chief chance. Older people are battered out of shape. Their faces cannot be altered now. But to every child we must give the chance to live, to learn, to love. Nor does social regeneration mean the obliteration of individual life. The roots lie too deep. There are limits to the amalgamation of society, to the common enjoyment of everything by everybody. One's own is one's own.

Many of us would rather have a house all our own in the bush than share a palace with a prince—especially with some of them.

We can have a League of Nations if we like. If we do it will be a consequence, not a cause. Try to buy happiness, by the quart or by the yard, and you never find it. So with good will on earth. Cannon frightens it. Treaties fetter it. The spirit brings it.

STEPHEN LEACOCK,
McGill University, Montreal.

This, my friends, is not the philosophy of Hirohito, Hitler, or Mussolini. It is not the philosophy of conservatism or isolationism. It is the philosophy of the common, decent men and women, regardless of race, color, or previous condition everywhere.

It is a philosophy that must be utilized and breathed into our post-war planning, else all the blood and treasure expended and the suffering and anxiety that this cruel war has wrought will have been in vain.

"Wanted—Seed Money" and "Renegotiation Takes a Prize"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it seems fitting that today, while the House is considering the Ruml tax bill—a plan which I believe offers one of the best shock-absorbing measures yet proposed for the post-war period, that I should insert in the RECORD, two editorials written by the editor and publisher of American Machinist, Mr. Burnham Finney, entitled "Wanted—Seed Money" and "Renegotiation Takes a Prize":

WANTED—"SEED MONEY"

Perhaps you are familiar with the term "seed money." It means to the farmer the money with which to buy seed before he can plant crops to grow food and other necessities. No seed money, no crops.

Businesses are in the same fix as the farmer. Their need for seed money is as great as his. If they are to design, develop, and manufacture goods, they must have money to finance the project.

Aside from their initial investment and borrowings, their seed money must come from profits which can be reinvested in new machines, new methods, and new products. By that means a market will be found for their goods, and they will be able to employ a maximum number of people.

The problem of seed money is especially acute in feast-and-famine industries, such as machine tools.

Only one way is open, short of outright Government subsidy, to keep the machine tool industry going through lean years as well as fat years. That is the obvious method of storing away some of the bounty in good times to provide for the bad times.

What would have happened if that method had not worked back in the twenties? Machine-tool building as an industry would have been wiped out during the black years of the thirties (it came close to being wiped out as it was). And where would we have been when we suddenly awoke in the summer of 1940 to our perilous and almost defenseless position as a Nation?

The answer is that we would have been completely sunk. Upon an adequate supply of machine tools rest our industrial structure, and more particularly our munitions and war goods industries. Without the hundreds of thousands of the world's finest machine tools that we were able to pour out of machine-tool builders' plants on relatively short notice, our unpreparedness would have lasted long enough to have brought disaster upon ourselves and upon our allies.

While machine-tool builders have been working day and night providing machine

tools for the arsenal of democracy, they have deliberately and consciously been manufacturing trouble for themselves after the war. Available figures show that in the 4 years 1939 to 1942, inclusive, the industry produced more machine tools than in the preceding 40 years.

The country will possess more good machine tools at the end of the war than it possibly will know what to do with. The post-war job of the machine-tool builder to keep his plant and men busy is going to be terrific.

What is all of this leading up to? Just this: In the renegotiation of war contracts we hope that Government officials will bear in mind the facts just recited. Machine-tool builders are not making bombs and shells and guns which will cease to be used at the war's end. Their wartime products, in the main, will be adaptable to peacetime requirements.

These are the people who will be in special need of seed money. They will be eager to develop new machines of the latest type and to try to provide, as nearly as possible, the full employment that all of us want.

To do that, however, they must be permitted to retain a sufficiently liberal share of their current net profits to have the necessary seed money for postwar readjustment.

BURNHAM FINNEY.

RENEGOTIATION TAKES THE PRIZE

It is time to debunk renegotiation, because it is far from being what its advocates claim.

Take savings to the Government. Most of it would come back to Uncle Sam anyway, in excess-profits taxes. To be specific, some eight hundred thousand out of every million dollars would be recovered in that way, regardless of renegotiation.

When we started making war goods and had no experience with them, prices were set mostly by guesswork. As we gained "know-how" and costs came down, many contractors voluntarily reduced prices and returned excess profits.

Price-adjustment boards should not get credit for the sweeping savings claimed by certain spokesmen, but only for the sums which they are instrumental in securing and which otherwise would not be returned to the Treasury.

Renegotiation is a bedeviling experience. It operates by no fixed formula. It has no printed regulations. It is surrounded by indecision, secrecy, and vagueness. The manufacturer is on the hot seat constantly until his own renegotiation is completed, because there is no precedent to guide him (all precedents having been tossed aside).

Even when the process is completed, he is still in the dark. Results are not uniform. They vary with the opinions of different local boards. Moreover, there is no assurance that Washington will accept a local board's decisions.

Renegotiation robs manufacturers of any incentive to reduce costs or to strive for greater efficiency. Sums recovered from more efficient units are sure to be greater than those recovered from less efficient units.

The task of renegotiation, as it now stands, is so vast and complex that price-adjustment boards have scarcely made a start.

The individual company meanwhile hovers in a state of anxiety and indecision, not knowing what its actual earnings were in 1942 and not being able to make its plans intelligently for the future.

If it plows back sizable sums, and wisely, into its business to do a better job and to strengthen its position, how much will it be penalized by renegotiation?

If it is a durable-goods producer dependent upon building up reserves to survive in the lean years later on, how much will it be permitted to keep for such purposes?

Answers to these and other vital questions involved in renegotiation are formulated through the opinions and prejudices of officials working behind closed doors who are not elected to their posts.

As an example of legislation which has about it the odor of political opportunism and which sets out to catch a guilty few and in so doing penalizes everybody else, renegotiation takes the prize.

Should we wish to prevent profiteering, there are other and better ways of doing it. If we must have renegotiation, at least let's restrict it to prime contractors and not try to apply it all over the map where it does far more harm than good.

BURNHAM FINNEY.

Stupid and Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Times of April 22, 1943:

STUPID AND DANGEROUS

By a peculiar and perhaps useful coincidence, the current soft-headed agitation for the return of loyal Japanese civilians to the west-coast areas from which the Army evacuated them as dangerous potential enemies comes just as long-silent Tokyo is issuing almost daily threats of devastating raids on this same west coast and when our own defense commands are warning us to prepare for them.

Probably there is no intentional connection between the two. But there is not much doubt that some, at least, of the eastern leaders, official and other, of the movement to release from evacuation centers and return to their former homes thousands of Pacific coast Japanese have been the victims of purposeful propaganda. Neither is there any doubt that the return of these Japanese would constitute the best possible of fifth-column preparation for enemy attacks on our coastal regions. Certainly the reported attitude of the War Relocation Authority favoring their return is highly inconsistent with the official criticism of our civilian indifference to probable raids.

To those who pooh-pooh the idea that resident Japs ashore would be of assistance to such raiders may be commended the Roberts Commission report on the elaborate enemy spy system in Hawaii which helped to make Pearl Harbor possible. They might consider the fact that Australia and New Zealand, the only two Pacific countries which have kept Japs out, are the only two in which there are no known fifth columns, and the only two which have so far been relatively free from raiding and sabotage. They should recall that it was the investigation of our Navy intelligence into the undercover activities of west coast Japs which was largely responsible for the order to evacuate them. They may be reminded of the evidence of shore collaboration with enemy raiders on this coast prior to the completion of evacuation and of the fact that there has been nothing of the kind since. They should take note of the quantity of war and spy material seized in Federal Bureau of Investigation raids on Jap centers before these were broken up last year, and of the Pearl Harbor Day riots in the Jap evacuation centers at Manzanar and Poston, Ariz., last December. Particularly should they mark the circumstance that the Japanese are among the most clannish people on earth, and that, though some two-thirds of those in this country are supposed to be loyal American citizens, there has been no published instance in which a "loyal" Jap has given information of enemy activities on the part of any of his countrymen.

This is not meant in criticism of the action of Lieutenant General De Witt modifying his original exclusion order permitting Japanese-American soldiers on furlough to revisit their former places of residence. Such men are comparatively few in number. They are in Army uniform and under Army control. Many of them have been long in the service. Their furloughs are of uncertain timing and of too-short duration to permit of much damage-doing, were those enjoying them so disposed or had they the civilian accomplices with whom to carry it out. As Japanese, they would be marked men and under constant observation, regardless of how they might dress; their own safety would require that they remain in uniform. This is an entirely different thing from a general return of Jap civilians. If, for any reason, it was thought advisable to make some sort of a concession to the pro-Nisei element, this is the least undesirable course.

Apart from those born of misplaced sympathy and well-meaning ignorance, the chief argument advanced for relaxing the military restrictions on the 110,000 or so of interned Japanese in this country is that it is a waste of manpower as well as of money to keep them cooped up when they might be put to useful work.

To this there are several answers. One is that the 110,000 is actually a much smaller number in terms of persons who could do useful war work other than perhaps agriculture. Many are women and children. Comparatively few have training or talent for anything but soil tilling.

A considerable number do not even speak English. In most of the permanent concentration centers, they are enabled and encouraged to raise food for their self-support. If they were released to serve, under observation, as additions to the general farm-labor supply, they would still have to do so and this, together with the American manpower diverted to keep a necessary watch on them, would make the net gain much smaller than seems to be anticipated.

For safety's sake, it is admitted that they should be widely scattered among white people, rather than to be allowed to flock by themselves. Against this is the powerful argument that few Americans would work with them, in agriculture or anything else. Spokesmen for typical war industries in and around Pittsburgh made this clear when queried on the subject by the Allegheny County American Service Institute. As for trying to mix Jap farm workers with whites for food-raising purposes, the reaction of the Pajaro Valley and Watsonville (Calif.) Defense Council, condemning the proposal, may be taken as representative. The people of the coast States who know the Japanese by long personal contact with them are virtually a unit in opposition to their return. How much of the recent smashing defeat for reelection of former Governor Olson of California was due to his suggestion that the Japs be recalled for agricultural work cannot be estimated, but it was undoubtedly considerable. There are worse things than food shortages.

As a race, the Japanese have made for themselves a record for conscienceless treachery unsurpassed in history. Whatever small theoretical advantages there might be in releasing those under restraint in this country would be enormously outweighed by the risks involved.

Louis Silo Gottlieb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, Louis Silo Gottlieb, who died at the Washington Sanitarium and Hospital at Takoma Park, Md., on Sunday night, March 28, 1943, was a prominent figure in the District of Columbia since the year 1909. He was an attorney at law, a member of the District bar, and a member of the bar of the United States Supreme Court.

For years Mr. Gottlieb acted as special assistant deputy to the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate, until appointed secretary to the Sergeant at Arms, which post he held until January 31 of this year when, in the midst of his serious illness, upon the new incumbent taking office, his appointment was terminated. In these capacities he performed faithfully and well many confidential missions of state.

Mr. Gottlieb, who was born in Palestine, came to America as a very young boy. He worked his way to this land of the free, first going to France, then, as captain's aide, through stormy seas and calm, stopping at many ports in many lands, finally reaching New York City, where he made his home with an aunt.

When in New York but a very short while he got a job which paid him $1 a month with room and board. A short time later he was cajoled by his fellow workers into buying a lottery ticket for 25 cents, on the installment plan of 5 cents weekly. This is not fiction—he won the lottery and the $150 collected went toward bringing to America his mother and small sisters and brothers from the Holy Land.

He worked hard and long hours, and saved when he could, and it was not long until he attained his life's ambition and took up law at night. For many years he was attorney of the Hebrew Immigrants Aid Society in the District of Columbia.

Many outstanding statesmen on Capitol Hill, practically all of whom he has now joined in the Great Beyond, were personal and beloved friends of Mr. Gottlieb. Among these were the late Senators Borah and Royal S. Copeland, and Supreme Court Justice Brandeis.

Mr. Gottlieb was a thirty-second degree Mason and a Shriner. He was buried with Masonic rites.

Louis Silo Gottlieb was a distinguished citizen and gentleman, and every person who knew him was happier for the opportunity to have met him. Throughout the corridors of the Capitol, which he traversed daily for so many years, his spirit doubtless will long remain and will be close to those who were so accustomed frequently to greet him there.

Good Post-War Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of the Congress and the American people the fact that the United States Government is now giving serious thought to problems which are bound to face us when we have finally effected the surrender of the powers threatening to return the world to slavery.

Hardly a day passes without publication by newspapers and magazines throughout the country of uncensored phases of proposed plans for operation by the United Nations of the economy of the Axis Nations during a post-war reconstruction period.

Winning the peace is just as important as winning the war. Had we, as a Nation, given more thought and attention to peace plans during World War No. 1, it is probable that World War No. 2 would never have been fought.

That Government officials charged with administering our relations with the other nations of the world are looking about for leaders who are experienced with the business operations of other people and capable of directing such business operations in a master peace plan is demonstrated in a story published recently in my home city of Charleston, S. C. The article, from the pen of Mr. Howard Suttle, Washington correspondent for the Charleston News and Courier, is submitted herewith:

WASHINGTON, April 24.—Special: Uncle Sam had a great deal more in mind for Sterling G. Harris than continued operation of his crab meat canning plants when the "gentleman with whiskers" declined to induct the Port Royal packer into the Air Corps last Wednesday.

"Food for Victory," of course, is an all-important slogan, but the importance of food supply in the war effort will be supplanted by development of United Nations peace policies during the post-war reconstruction period.

When the war is ended with a United Nations victory, some American who is an expert in the operation of Japanese fisheries will, in all likelihood, be selected to supervise such operations during the period of reconstruction. Behind the scenes in the gigantic post-war planning task now under way, Mr. Harris has been mentioned prominently for such an assignment.

Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles has reason to recall vividly the somber warnings embraced in memoranda on Japanese fishery operations submitted to the Government by the Port Royal packer during pre-Pearl Harbor days. These warnings even reached the White House desk of President Roosevelt following hearings before the Tariff Commission. During the hearings, Mr. Harris, as chairman of the American Crab Packers' committee, sought a tariff on Japanese canned crab meat sufficiently high to permit domestic seafood producers to compete with the slant-eyed fishermen.

The crab man from South Carolina was one of several who advised Uncle Sam that the Japanese were financing an armament program with fishery products caught in American waters, produced in floating canneries off our coasts, and sold in the United States in competition to higher grade domestic products.

He also warned that the Nipponese floating cannery system, in which cheap labor was employed in turning out products under questionable sanitary conditions, afforded the Tokyo war lords a wonderful opportunity for espionage.

Post-war planning authorities now recall the successful fight Sterling Harris made in 1940 before the Tariff Commission for increased import duties on Japanese canned sea food. The thorough manner in which he presented the case of American fishery interests and the close study he had made of Nipponese business tactics brought him not only to the attention of American diplomatic authorities, but also the gratitude of a United States food supply industry that is second only to agriculture. He also brought out the surprising fact that crab meat ranked second only to silk in dollar volume of imports from Japan.

The Blue Channel Corporation, of which Mr. Harris is president, started operation 5 years ago at Port Royal. New plants have since been constructed at Belhaven, N. C., and Morgan City, La. These three plants produce more canned crabmeat than the combined output of all other American plants.

Because of his inability, due to price ceilings, to pay his crab suppliers, the fishermen, at a rate comparing with prevailing labor wage scales, Mr. Harris made plans several weeks ago to shut down his plant and enter the Air Corps. He applied for an Air Corps intelligence assignment, was accepted and ordered to report to Washington for induction.

When the Air Corps authorities learned, however, of the volume of his food production, they obtained the ear of Chester Davis, Food Administrator, who, after conferring with Price Administrator Prentiss Brown, assured the Port Royal packer he would be permitted to operate his plants under conditions that would forestall loss if he would abandon plans to close them and return to personal supervision of their operation.

Bonds and Underwriters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Public Opinion, of Chambersburg, Pa., for April 8, 1943:

BONDS AND UNDERWRITERS

The community in which you live, either by choice or chance, is a very definite part of the collateral that makes the sum total of the United States of America investment. That community, anywhere in any of the 48 States, is helping to establish for all time that "the United States War bonds are the greatest investment in the world—bar none!" Whether War bond proceeds go directly to

munitions, to facilities designed for their manufacture, or to sustain the men of the services—that human element for whose service welfare every sacrifice must be made—is for governmental agencies to determine.

The task of Federal wartime financing entails endless planning by the United States Treasury, the syndicate, so to speak, which entrusts the people, the underwriters, with the responsibility of both selling and buying. The second war loan will be launched next Monday with $13,000,000,000 as its goal. Each political subdivision, the State, or Commonwealth, and then the counties composing it, has been apportioned its share or quota of the bond issue to "sell and buy."

The financier and business-minded buyer can discuss, logically, the advantages of the seven different types of securities involved in the loan. But the layman, the average bond buyer, knows only that the war must be financed and that he is buying bonds because it is his patriotic duty.

Perhaps our Federal Treasury might consider in its future loan planning the ever-present uncertainty of the post-war period as it affects each political subdivision, which is now meeting its quota whether it be in boys or bonds. Would a Federal War bond issue, with a post-war premium (or commission) for the "underwriting" subdivision, give the bond-buying taxpayer additional patriotic incentive? The premium, based on the amount of bonds sold or quota attained, to be applied only to a public works program determined by the local government of the county; said premium to be held in escrow by the State government for post-war distribution to its subdivisions. An available post-war fund, resulting from such premiums earned by "underwriting" Federal war issues, would assure a public works or improvement program for local subdivision requirements under locally determined specifications, and might be a factor in helping to simplify the sales effort. Under such a program both large and small taxpayers would be less apprehensive about available funds for a practical program to meet inevitable demands for public expenditures in the post-war era.

We Should Punish Traitors Wherever Found

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. and the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation through their executives, have been guilty of sabotaging the war effort. There can be no excuse justifying treason. Why should we show mercy to officials in industry who conspire to endanger our boys in the front lines by deliberately reducing the quality of the products made in such industry? The country is continually being agitated by those who vent their spleen against and upon labor leaders for alleged racketeering, but there is little feeling or excitement generated against great industries whose officials are guilty of sending to the war fronts defective wire, steel, and miscellaneous war equipment.

A recent editorial in the Philadelphia Record sums up the situation in a persuasive manner. The editorial is as follows:

SWIFT JUSTICE NEEDED FOR ALL SABOTEURS

Are there two grades of sabotage in wartime America?

You can't blame the public for wondering.

Four weeks ago two cases of deliberately faulty work on war materials were revealed.

One was the arrest of a welder in a Baltimore shipyard, for faulty work.

The other involved officials of the Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation, who were charged by the Truman committee with falsifying tests and permitting delivery of 28,000 tons of warship steel that was not up to United States standards.

On Monday, the Baltimore welder was sent to prison, for a year and a half. Said the judge:

"Persons in war work must be made to realize the importance of their work."

We all agree with the judge.

But—nothing whatever has been done, beyond a grand jury hearing, to settle the case of the Carnegie-Illinois officials.

Worse yet, it was last December that five employees of the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. were indicted by a Federal grand jury on charges of supplying our Government with defective cable and tampering with the devices by which the cable was tested.

Said Attorney General Biddle:

"I can conceive of nothing more vicious or treacherous than deliberately supplying our armed forces with defective war material, and I am informed that only the alertness of Government inspectors * * * prevented enormous quantities of defective wire and cable from being transported to our troops overseas."

As it happened, some of that cable did reach the fighting fronts.

But the case against the Anaconda Co. and the five men indicted with it will not be tried until June.

What's the answer?

Are there two grades of sabotage:

Grade A, when committed by an obscure worker, without funds to hire important lawyers;

And grade B, when committed by officials of big corporations who have a flock of high-priced lawyers on their pay rolls?

This is, as some officials constantly remind us, war.

Such long-winded, red-taped, double-faceted justice is hard to defend in peacetime.

It is indefensible in wartime.

There are not two kinds of sabotage.

Those who actively hamper our war effort, endanger the lives of our boys, gamble with the success of our arms in battle deserve the fastest, surest kind of justice this Nation knows how to produce.

The Baltimore welder deserved what he got, and more.

Why his case could be disposed of in a few weeks, while it is taking months to dispose of the others, is something which calls for action by our highest officials and highest courts.

Let judges interrupt their routine when necessary to deal with such cases. Let attorneys be compelled to speed up their efforts so that sabotage—all kinds of it—can be dealt with while this war is still on.

Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

APRIL 29, 1943.

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator, Office of Price Administration.

DEAR MR. BROWN. For over a year now almost every mail that comes into my office (and there are four deliveries a day, as you know) contains a letter or more from some Montana farmer, cattleman, sheepman, or dairyman, all telling the same story—condemning the short-sighted and unfair treatment accorded them. And I say short-sighted and unfair advisedly. Of all the groups in the United States—and my conversations with other Members, both on and off the floor, clearly show me that this isn't purely a local situation—the farmers and ranchers are the only ones who have had little or no consideration.

We have indiscriminately handed out huge subsidies to big business (I noted a statement a short time ago by a congressional committee that 32 corporations, organized by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, have loaned practically $20,000,000,000 of Government funds almost exclusively to business concerns and at very low interest rates) and, after a short fight to prevent war millionaires, gave in to industry by handing to them a chance to make millions on their cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts.

That industry has and is taking all they can get we all know to be so. The files of the General Accounting Office are literally choked with evidence showing that the practical operation of the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee form of contract is to impose an unreasonable burden on the taxpayers of America. The Truman committee has uncovered volumes of evidence showing to what extent the American people are being bled white by a group whose motto seems to be "bigger profits than ever." No wonder the blood of the American public begins to boil when they read of ships which the Government sold only a short time ago for as low as $5 a dead-weight ton now being bought back by the Government at up to $75 a dead-weight ton; of the Government contracting with private shipowners for the use of their ships at the rate of about $1,000 a day on a time-charter basis and then having the owner-operators tying up in a port for 51 days before unloading vitally needed munitions and supplies for an American force in the New Hebrides Islands; of salaries of high officials of many of these cost-plus contractors raising from a low 30% to as much as 700%. It is difficult to understand why these officials and employees suddenly become so valuable that they are entitled to double and triple the salary they were receiving just before they came under the blanket of the cost-plus contracts.

I was in favor at that time, and I am now, of taking the profits out of war. It is inconceivable to me that profits should be made out of the killing of our sons and the destruction of millions of dollars worth of

prope ty. But those profits were allowed and that is where inflation really began to high-ball.

Now, where does the farmer come in at? He has asked that his added labor and price costs be allowed him when computing his costs and what happens. He is accused of being a greedy so-and-so and of insisting on his pound of benefits even if it means losing the war.

Let me say here and now that no more patriotic group lives than the American farmer. He too has sons over there. He doesn't want inflation as he knows it would ruin agriculture along with the rest of the country.

He is not holding back but is doing his level best to meet Uncle Sam's call for food production, because he knows food is vital to victory. But the farmer expects—and must have—more labor and more machinery.

Between selective service and the higher wages paid in industry the farmer's labor supply has been just about drained dry. And the farmer's manpower is the key to 1943 goods. We are told that 400,000 farm laborers left the farm in 1942, and many of them after completion of the harvest.

Aside from the draft, it is little wonder that farm labor is leaving the farms. Let us look for a moment at the average monthly farm wage for Montana which averages about $12 a month better than the national average. In 1939 the monthly wage with board was $37.10 ($53.20 without); in 1940, $38.60 with board ($54.80 without); in 1941, $44.70 with ($63.90 without); and in 1942, $63.30 with ($84.20 without), and the prices being paid ranch hands by the cattlemen of my State are fully $50 a month more than wages being paid farm hands.

Now compare that with an advertisement which has been running for 2 weeks in a Montana paper offering $250 and up for "inexperienced help" in a certain shipyard on the coast, and only today I have received a letter from a very large cattleman in my district, who, in disgust at the steady stream of his employees leaving for war and Government jobs, writes, "Jim, how in hell can we raise cheap meat and compete with the Government hiring our labor? The Government has been and is doing lots of work in Helena and Great Falls, and the wage scale they are paying is from $10 to $12 for water boys and watchmen to $30 a day for skilled labor and truck drivers. Shearers are getting about $30 a day and board, lambers are asking from $5 to $10 a day, sheepherders $125 a month and up, with board." And these are only a few of many illustrations that I might make, but the point I am making is how can the farmer afford to meet that kind of competition?

The answer is that he can't afford to or he would do so. The plain truth is that the farmer, getting what he is for his product, would be forced out of business if he tried to meet those wages. And the sad part about the whole thing is that many are being forced out of business. In one city in my State 7 out of 16 dairies have been forced to sell. These herds that took years to build up are being destroyed overnight. This certainly doesn't compare very favorably with the record of the British, who, under their agriculture program, have maintained milk production at an unexpectedly high level and have even shown an increase in the numbers of their dairy cattle.

And if those were all the difficulties the farmer has to meet and overcome it would be bad enough, but such is not the case. I am informed and asked to help, almost daily, those fast diminishing farmers who now find that their decrease in manpower calls for an increase in machinery and who upon making application for some vitally needed piece of farm machinery are told, as they have been in my district time and time again, that there is not enough to go around, that the quota in that locality has been taken and no further machinery is available. You know, of course, that the manufacturers of farm machinery in this country have been allowed only six-tenths of 1 percent of the total amount of steel produced, while at the same time we have sent out via lend-lease over $17,000,000 worth of farm machinery to our allies abroad so far this year. And mind you that machinery shortage and labor shortage comes in the face of the fact that the American farmer is told that he is expected to increase his output by an estimated 10 to 20 percent in order to feed our overseas forces and fulfill our lend-lease quotas.

Much has been said that at this time the farmer is better off than at any time in his history. Now granted that that be true that doesn't mean that the farmer is receiving what he should for his labor and produce. Testimony brought out just recently before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry disclosed that the estimates of the Department of Agriculture for 1942 indicate that half (the lower half) of the farm population did not break even on a cost basis in 1942. Their living expenses were larger than their cash incomes. Further testimony brought out the fact that a break-down of the farm incomes showed that three-fourths of the farm families of the country had an income of approximately $177 per capita a year, and that half of them had an income of only $495 to $500 per family, or about $100 per capita a year.

Let us turn now and see what prices that not-so-prosperous-as-was-imagined group is paying for many of the necessities of life which they cannot raise and the increase in which prices are being largely attributed to them. Food prices in Seattle are up from 30 to 350 percent since January 1941; food prices in New York City have risen as much as 177 percent in the last 12 months. Now, as I have said, it is a popular thought that the farmer is largely responsible for this increased cost of living but I do not think the facts bear this out. The farmer is now getting $1.22.7 per bushel for his wheat and $12.80 per 100 pounds for his beef whereas a year ago he was getting 99.7 cents a bushel for his wheat and $10.71 per 100 pounds for his beef. A little simple arithmetic will show that in neither case is there any 177 or 350 percent raise in the price the farmer has received.

The question then arises, where or whom or what is responsible for this tremendous and unjustifiable increase in the cost of the necessities of life? In answering that question you have placed the blame where it rightly belongs—at the door of unsound and unnecessary inflation.

Now, it is my opinion that some inflation is not only good but desirable for certainly we all agree that deflation, the opposite end of inflation, is just as bad and undesirable as is serious and uncontrolled inflation. We all saw in the period from 1929 to 1933 that deflation in its consequences may be as serious as inflation. So that the start or origin of this cycle of inflation is directly traceable to the deliberate monetary planned inflation of the present administration set in motion in 1933 and 1934 by the devaluation of the gold dollar, the silver-purchase policy, and by expanding the volume of circulation of Federal Reserve notes and deposits by creating an artificial spending market. This as I say was at that time necessary and desirable because the purchasing power of the people was out of balance with the potential selling power of business and industry. At that time, on March 31, 1934, the amount of money in circulation was $5,394,000,000 or a per capita average of $42.69. On March 31, 1940, the amount of money in circulation had risen to $7,511,000,000 or $57.04 per capita; by March 31, 1941, to $8,924,000,000 or $67.32 per capita, and on March 31, 1942, had only risen to $11,566,000,000 or $86.15 per capita. Now if some such plan as the Baruch plan (which is substantially what Canada and England adopted soon after their entry into the war) had been put into effect at that time I believe the inflation spiral would have been stopped before it became too dangerous and too much out of control, but it wasn't, and just 1 year later we now find that as of March 31, 1943, there is $16,251,000,000 in circulation or an average of $120.04 per capita.

Under the Baruch plan prices of all kinds as well as rents, wages, and fees were to be stabilized as of a particular time in the past far enough back so as to represent a fairly normal demand-and-supply level. The author of this plan claimed that its simplicity, its equitability, and its quickness of action plus its favorableness to a good public morale was justification for its adoption and I think that had such a plan been put into effect we would not be in the difficulty we now find ourselves in. In view of the fact that war breeds inflation, as we all know and have seen by experience, we should have anticipated our present status and taken every means to guard against just what has happened before. We didn't and are now paying the price. As I see it, we have fallen down on the three most effective ways of curbing inflation—by taxation, by enforced savings, and by instituting some plan in time to control prices, wages, rents, etc.

Another point that has for the most part escaped observation is the fact that basic food staples for the lower income groups have risen out of all proportion to the price rises recorded on such items as jewelry, fine kitchenware, furs, and costlier luxury foods and apparel. There has been an effort to explain this as a result of higher labor costs, but I think the real reason lies in out-and-out profiteering.

Manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers know that the wage earner today has more money than any time in the past 10 years, and they are out to make a "killing." The fact that the farmer and other smaller groups who haven't profited as a result of the war happen to be brought to near-starvation levels is incidental and doesn't concern that group. That is one reason I so vigorously protested in my letter to you of the 23d of April the proposed total abolition of grade labeling as just another example of the way ceiling prices are being circumvented.

I hope then you will take this letter as it was meant—as a sort of weathervane of public opinion. To the American public you exemplify the administration, and that administration, of which I am a legislative Member, in the minds of the farmer and a large measure of the American public, has not given the farmer adequate consideration for the work the farmer is doing and the important part he is playing in the winning of the war. It is my opinion that more consideration has to be given to the question of the farmer's manpower situation—that he be allowed labor costs to meet industrial competition for his farm help—that machinery be given the farmer as and when it is needed and as much as is needed; and, that prices are pegged once and for all. If every time one group or another gets a raise prices are allowed to go up then, of course, we are going to have inflation—it is my contention that as prices have always anticipated the next raise in costs that to again allow them at the end of the inflationary spiral is doing nothing but allowing that group a double crack at the consumer and buying public and in so doing you have accelerated the pace of our inflation.

I think it is high time that the farmer and the American consumer be given a break and that inflation is stopped where it has always started—in allowing out-of-line and inflationary prices.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. O'CONNOR.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. GWYNNE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, the radio address of President Roosevelt last night was a splendid statement of the case of America against John L. Lewis. In his expressed determination to proceed with the war regardless of opposition from any source, the President will have the overwhelming support of the people. It is probably true that the miners have cause for complaint. That should be promptly investigated by the body set up for such a purpose. There is no reason to believe that this group representing the entire Nation will be unfair in its decisions.

The fact remains, however, that we cannot have a strike at this time. The threat to the war effort is too great to allow such a course to be adopted under any circumstances. I believe the President has sufficient authority as Commander in Chief to handle the situation. If, however, additional legislation is necessary or desirable this Congress should supply it at once.

As part of these remarks I include an editorial from the April 30, 1943, issue of the Marshalltown Times-Republican, Marshalltown, Iowa:

F. D. R. SHOULD STAND FIRM

It would be unthinkably tragic to assume that half a million union soft-coal miners are unpatriotic. It was therefore the correct approach for Roosevelt to appeal to miners as Americans to get in and pitch and bring out coal needed to fight a war and protect the Nation.

It would be fatal for the President to admit that the United States Government does not have power to handle situations in time of war fraught with danger comparable to crippling defeat on the battlefields. It was therefore right and just for the President to demand that miners who have quit work go back to their jobs and stay there.

The question has not been at issue whether anyone, John L. Lewis particularly, liked or disliked the machinery which his Government has set up for conduct of the war or its personnel any more than there could be an issue arise whether a soldier likes the command of his superior officer or the cut of the officer's hair.

War factories, railroads, ships, homes of war workers, and soldiers' barracks must have coal. The supply must not be cut off any more than the supply of food, guns, ships, planes, tanks, or ammunition. No leader, nor any group, can be permitted to jeopardize the war effort or endanger the lives of our fighting men and a shortage of coal would soon accomplish that catastrophe.

Threatened coal strike, as Roosevelt says, is a threat against the United States Government. So Lewis not only placed himself in position for a showdown, Roosevelt and the Government have been placed at the point of showdown too.

Events may happen quickly. As this is written Lewis is in session with union leaders. If Lewis doesn't backtrack before 10 o'clock Saturday morning, the hour fixed for miners to return to work, Roosevelt should proceed to whatever lengths are necessary to prevent a coal strike and maintain the dignity of the United States Government at home and abroad.

A government which sends its citizens to battle must not weaken or falter against any home force which threatens to halt the war.

Backyard Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a timely article on home gardens in the food production program:

BACKYARD PATRIOTS
(By H. R. Cokeley)

There is no longer a question that the United States is facing an alarming shortage of many foods in 1943. So those who desire adequate supplies of fresh wholesome vegetables might start helping themselves. Moreover, by doing this, they will be contributing materially toward the downfall of Hitler.

In 1942 the agricultural production in the United States was up 12 percent and the American armed forces and their allies received 13 percent of the total farm production. In 1943 fully 25 percent of the total farm production is to go to the armed forces and the Allies, according to Secretary Wickard, of the United States Department of Agriculture. And recent reports from some 3,000 county agricultural agents indicate that the crop acreage actually will be reduced this year.

Although estimates of the county agents varied from a 1- to 30-percent reduction, depending upon the respective sections of the country from which received, all revealed a strong tendency to cut down on farm operations because of labor shortages.

Mr. Wickard also says that more than one-half of the 1943 pack of canned fruits, vegetables, and juices will be purchased by the Government for the armed forces and lend-lease. This restriction will leave only about 33 pounds of canned goods per person per year. Some of the percentages of canned goods to be reserved on the basis of 1942 production will be as follows: green beans 58, beets 84, carrots 100, spinach 43, tomatoes 49, tomato juice 13 peas 48, sweet corn 42, lima beans 56, asparagus 49, and pumpkin 51.

To forestall a threatening national food problem the Nation's farmers probably have done everything humanly possible. But thousands of farm boys and farm laborers have been inducted into the Army, and industry has made a staggering drain on men who have been connected with agricultural activities in the past. So the almost overwhelming demands on farmers must be met with greatly depleted manpower units.

Some relief to the farm labor situation is being rendered through the Farm Security and Agricultural Extension programs, involving relocation of hill farmers and others underemployed, but the effects in 1943 will not be sufficient to relieve fully the strain on agricultural enterprises. Therefore, backyard and vacant-lot gardens become almost a national necessity.

For a family of 5 a garden, 40 by 100 feet, will do wonders if the soil is suitable, the crops wisely planned, and the proper attention given. In the latitude of Baltimore gardeners should ordinarily be able to live out of such size home gardens for 4 months out of the year and at the same time harvest enough excess tomatoes, beans, corn, beets, and other vegetables to fill 200 quart cans, and there should be root crops to be stored for winter use.

Under the rationing regulations a family of 5 will be able to buy only about the equivalent of 100 quarts of canned goods per year. So a garden supplement becomes almost a necessity. Furthermore, those having vegetables of their own production will be able to select canned goods in the markets in such a way as to add variety.

There are probably many persons who feel the need of help and advice in contemplated garden projects. Fortunately, provisions are already made to supply these. Government-supported agricultural agencies are located in practically every county seat throughout the United States and they are ready to give free assistance to all, working on production programs and assisting where necessary with canning problems. So there should be no hesitancy in launching a garden project.

Around every town and city in America, there are probably thousands of idle backyards and vacant lots well adapted to the production of vegetables, and now the Nation needs to have these plots utilized. If the average equivalent of 700 additional 40 by 100-foot gardens (this estimate includes enlargements of 1942 plots as well as new gardens) may be produced in every county in the United States in 1943, the hard-pressed farmers will be relieved for the most part of meeting the vegetable needs of 10,000,000 people. In addition, a great burden will be taken off the strained transportation facilities of the country by such a vast quantity of food being produced where consumed.

Thus, by helping themselves to fresh vegetables from their own home gardens, Americans will also be paying heed to an urgent patriotic call.

War Supplies for the Southwest Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein a letter from Dr. J. H. Gammon, a leading physician of Knoxville, Tenn., and an excerpt from a letter to him from his son, Lt. John L. Gammon:

Hon. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JENNINGS: I am enclosing clipping from letter received from my son, Lt. John L. Gammon and commanding officer of his company somewhere in Australia, which is self-explanatory.

I hope you will carry out his wishes in every detail possible.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Yours very truly,
J. H. GAMMON, M. D.

"I'm glad to hear that the President is sending more planes to this theater. We need every plane, ship, and gun that you can possibly spare for cleaning out the Japs. The sooner we get these materials in numbers, the sooner we can finish our job and come home. Try to make the Congressmen at home devote every effort toward more supplies for the allies in the southwest Pacific."

Poles Cooling Toward Roosevelt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, since the days of the Revolutionary War when Kosziusko and Pulaski, great Polish patriots, gave their all to George Washington and America in helping us establish our great Democracy, we find the pages of American history filled with heroic exploits of Polish Americans in every war since 1776. The Polish people here are a fine, patriotic group of Americans. In the mills, the mines, and in every battlefront of the world we find Poles doing their part today to help exterminate a barbaric enemy. Many Polish leaders continuously warned us about our "isolationism" long before many Americans realized the dangers of Nazi and Japanese designs for world conquest.

The Poles, as a people, regardless of their political affiliation, have been great supporters of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and his foreign policy. A splendid example is Victor L. Alski, editor and publisher of the Polish Weekly Pittsburgher—Pittsburczanin—America's leading Polish newspaper. Victor Alski, although a registered Republican is an American—first, last, and always—and he has frequently editorialized the President's foreign policy. An editorial that is worthy of the attention of all Americans, and especially the Poles in America, appeared in the Pittsburczanin on April 16, 1943, in which Alski took issue with the Scripps-Howard newspaper syndicate in its published statement, "Chicago Poles are said to have been cooling toward Roosevelt because of Russia's purported designs on Polish lands." I am happy to include in my remarks Alski's translated editorial answer entitled "Poles Cooling Toward Roosevelt?":

POLES COOLING TOWARD ROOSEVELT?

The Sunday editions of the Scripps-Howard Syndicate, in their weekly column "Washington Calling," anent eventual fourth term for President Roosevelt, published among others: "Mayor Ed Kelly of Chicago, third-term promoter, has been silent about fourth. A possible reason: Chicago Poles are said to have been cooling toward Roosevelt because of Russia's purported designs on Polish lands."

We are quite confident that the Poles in Chicago will most emphatically protest against such insinuations, and that all the Americans of Polish extraction will do likewise. This unfounded, and taken-from-thin-air, accusation against the Chicago Poles is in exact contradiction to the feelings of the great masses of Americans of Polish origin, who not only are not "* * * cooling toward President Roosevelt," but, on the contrary, have for him an ever-growing esteem, and are in full accord with his policies, especially in international politics. If anything, this sentiment is general, not only among the Polish Democrats, but to the same extent among those registered Republican. Yes, there might have been—especially before the war—differences of opinion among the Republicans of Polish extraction on the domestic issues of the administration, as far as international policy is concerned. President Roosevelt enjoys the fullest support of all American Poles, regardless of party affiliation.

As to the purported designs of Russia on the eastern Polish lands, Poland and all Americans of Polish origin rely above all on their tried friend, President Roosevelt, confident that his great political experience and profound sense of justice will motivate him in upholding the status of Poland against any designs of her eastern neighbor.

As a matter of fact, the American Poles see in President Roosevelt the foremost warranty that the interests of Poland—who contributed so much in the fight against the totalitarian systems and whose sacrifice on the altar of the united cause has been and still is the greatest—will be protected against any and all designs of any nations and groups, who, under the mantle of military strategy or other vague reasons, strive to commit another historical crime on the prostrated Polish Nation.

It is most desirable that the above inference of the Scripps-Howard syndicate, which can only be described as an insinuation, be immediately and most forcefully rectified, so that the present record of loyalty and gratitude of the American Poles toward President Roosevelt continues without blemish; while preventing at the same time various groups from implicating Poland and the American Poles in their desire to settle political differences, by using the question of Poland's eastern boundaries in their vicious intrigues.

We again repeat the well-known fact—the Americans of Polish origin are and will be solidly behind President Roosevelt, confident that he is our best and surest guaranty for a just peace and for the return to Poland what is indisputably her land.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

WHITE ADVERTISING CO.,
Cleveland, Ohio, April 29, 1943.

FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. BOLTON: Pardon this delayed reply to your letter of April 1. I just want to add that I am glad to know that you are exerting every possible effort and influence in the House to get back to constitutional government—war or no war.

This is also to report my opinion and that of all my acquaintances here on the curtailment of our traditional free press. We definitely feel that the restrictions being placed on the food conference are unhealthy, undemocratic, and opposed to the principle of open covenants openly arrived at. If the American people are going to pay the bill and do without a lot of things they are certainly entitled to know all the details on who wants what as well as what the President proposes to give away and to whom he wants to give it. By getting only a final report of the conference decisions, the American people will be kept completely uninformed on any suggestions made by delegates which the President, for political reasons, wishes to hold in secret. This press curtailment, if it is not stopped, can have the same effect as it had in Germany and there is serious danger of you yourself becoming a member of another dummy Reichstag before this war is over.

There is no other possible way whereby people can protect their rights except by writing the duly elected Representatives, like yourself. Safeguarding one of the most important of the four freedoms is therefore in your hands.

Sincerely yours,

HARM WHITE.

A Suburb Discovers Slums

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under extension of remarks, I desire to reprint in the Appendix of the RECORD an able editorial from the Christian Science Monitor, as follows:

A SUBURB DISCOVERS SLUMS

For many Americans, Japan's killing of prisoners has been almost as much of an awakening as Japan's peacetime assault on Pearl Harbor.

Before December 7, 1941, they had been like complacent residents of a model suburb, only mildly concerned about slum conditions in the adjacent metropolis until gang warfare brings a murder to their own doorstep. Even then, they did not quite sense the ramifications of evil that produced that outrage; few Americans at first understood why Pearl Harbor was attacked.

The killing of prisoners helps to explain.

These murders tear another gaping hole in the veil of isolationism and let suburbanites peer into the sewers of the world community's mental slums. It gives them a shocking view of the kind of thinking that produced the present upheaval. Berlin's approval of Japan's brutality reminds Americans that it is all of a piece; their aviators have been tortured now as much as the Jews of Europe have been tortured for 10 years. The murder of prisoners is not new to Mussolini or to Hitler.

Americans now have come a little closer to the frightfulness that the Chinese, the Czechs, the Poles, the Norwegians, Dutch, French, Spaniards, Yugoslavs, Belgians, and Greeks have known only too well. To speak of paying back these enormities is worse than idle. The evil cannot be undone. But every military success of the Allies restricts its present field of operations and frees oppressed peoples.

America's new awareness of aggressive barbarism has already spurred the buying of War bonds. It should lift the whole tempo of the war effort. It should help Americans to recognize, as they did not recognize even after Pearl Harbor, that their own quiet suburb is not safe so long as gangsters roam the streets of Europe and Asia, so long as crime festers in the back alleys of world thought.

In 1937 many of his fellow citizens scoffed at President Roosevelt's idea of quarantining the 10 percent of law breakers. They could hardly do that today. Even the thoughtless can see how much more difficult and costly it has now become even to check interna-

tional crime. The thoughtful are convinced that they must, if only for their own protection, be their brothers' keepers, never neutral for an instant when oppression and aggression raise their heads. The Tokyo murders should confirm that conviction.

They should also clarify the task that lies beyond victory. Even complete triumph will not now wipe out the kind of thinking which has produced a welter of such crime. It will chain the criminals, but that is only the beginning. The larger task will be to keep them chained and to provide an opportunity for the suburbs to help clean up the slums—the tribal myths, the racial hates, and economic injustices—which would produce still more crime.

Active Labor Leader Discusses Recent Developments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, we hear much from representatives of capital these days concerning the mistakes and errors characterizing the war program. We hear many yappings and carpings relative to absenteeism. Newspaper columnists and radio commentators vie with each other in denouncing organized labor and in insistence that the wealthy citizens of America be given further relief. The greatest examples of hypocrisy and inconsistency in modern history have been provided in recent months by these speakers and writers.

The President was reviled and denounced for attempting to limit net incomes to a ceiling of $25,000 per year. Under the Ruml plan those enjoying the highest incomes in America would be given a complete waiver of 1 year's tax liability. Those who insisted the sky should be the limit for salaries of wealthy executives, and those who asseverated that a windfall gift of a waiver of tax liability for 1 year's income tax, would combat inflation—at the same time demanded a ceiling on all farm prices and a ceiling on all trade-unionists' wages—what a farce. The public has never been given the truth concerning the Ruml plan and its implications. Repeatedly, we are told that under that proposal the taxpayer would continue to pay annually to the Government his income tax. Of course, he would. But when the taxpayer died his estate would be relieved of paying the next year's tax. That is something its proponents neglected to stress or scarcely to mention. If I owe a bank several sums of money, represented in promissory notes, and the bank hands me back one of these notes marked "paid in full," am I to insist that because no actual money was paid by either party, I am not the beneficiary of such a transaction? When a tax liability is waived for 1 year, one's assets are increased correspondingly. To the extent one's debts are reduced, his property increases. That is elementary.

Mr. Guy H. Rader, secretary of shop stewards of the Tacoma-Seattle Shipbuilding Corporation, Tacoma, Wash., recently wrote me a double letter in which he discussed current developments from the standpoint of the trade-unionist. I recommend its reading to all who would be interested in knowing the worker's viewpoint. The letters are as follows:

TACOMA, WASH., *March 30, 1943.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COFFEE: Enclosed you will please find the answer of the shop stewards, of all three shifts of the Seattle-Tacoma Shipbuilding Corporation workers, to the hue and cry of labor-haters in the press and on the radio about so-called absenteeism. This answer is being sent to various papers and to Congressmen from this State.

It is quite significant that the violent attacks against labor came, largely, from America First, isolationist, and poll-tax backgrounds. These, by promoting disunity and industrial strife, are certainly not promoting the war effort. Lindbergh received a medal for his services but some are scabbing on him by serving Hitler without pay. The workers in defense jobs and the men on the battlefields are defending far more than these would like to leave for us to defend.

And let me say here that the workers are certainly resentful of Eddie Rickenbacker and his labor-baiting tirades.

The spectacle of the fight over the Ruml tax plan leads one to realize that the progressives, if there be any, have much to do. It is unthinkable to pretend that all the reactionaries are Republicans and all the progressives are Democrats. Certainly, if the Progressive bloc, providing there is much left of it, had been functioning properly there would have been a nonpartisan grouping of forces behind an honest-to-God tax program. To see valuable time spent in battling along strict party lines is enough to sicken any worker.

The yapping of the reactionaries, their acts of disunity and of oppression, are but the deeds of desperate men. Never before have there been so many members of organized labor in this country. Labor has made tremendous strides of late years. Barriers of race and religion are beginning to crumble. These traitors in our midst would turn the clock backward and wipe out the gains of the American people, if they could. They would change this from a people's war into a war of oppression, if we would only let them.

We must defend democracy at home and abroad, in the shipyards, the mines, the mills, the farms, the homes, and even in the halls of Congress. Let us do all things possible to defend our gains, to strengthen and improve our Democracy, and win a people's peace from this people's war.

Sincerely yours,

GUY H. RADER,
Secretary Shop Stewards, Day Shift, Seattle-Tacoma Shipyard.

AN OPEN LETTER ADOPTED BY THE SHOP STEWARDS OF ALL SHIFTS AT THE SEATTLE-TACOMA SHIPYARDS, TACOMA, WASH.

During the last few weeks the problem of absenteeism in war industries has held the front page in the press and the right-of-way over the air waves and many probable causes have been offered as to the reason thereof.

In the majority of probable causes advanced labor has been made the goat and repressive legislation offered as a remedy. The theory has been advanced by some of these probable causes that the war-plant workers, not having their inwards flattened out like a postage stamp and enjoying the luxury of a full stomach for the first time in 10 years, don't really care about anything else and do not realize that they are soldiers as important on the industrial front as their brothers in the combat lines.

We represent 25,000 workers employed in all the crafts in this yard and to our knowledge no conclusive effort has yet been made to find out just how many absentees have no good reason for being absent. During the winter months, especially December and January, there has been much sickness among the workers, which includes an increasing number of middle-aged and older men. These putting in 10 to 12 hours going to and from the job and working, in many cases, entirely unprotected from inclement weather, and some even 7 days a week. Such conditions have made absenteeism compulsory to many workers, including the younger men, and we believe that on proper investigation absenteeism will prove one of the minor causes of the lack of production and that critics are wrong accepting as fact what has not yet been fully determined.

As to the suggestion that workers are not now hungry enough and that they do not realize the seriousness of the war in which our country is engaged, we wish to call attention to the fact, and not a probability, that the vast majority of the workers in this plant have sons, brothers, and nephews in the armed services and more going in every day, and the War bond purchases are well up to the top.

We vigorously dissent from most of these opinions, probable causes, and so-called facts about the cause of bottlenecks in production and keenly deplore the lack of efficiency. We are ever conscious that we are in every sense of the word soldiers on the industrial front, where we also have our dead christened by the blood of the workers and the tears of their loved ones when the crushed and broken body was borne back to them.

Yes, indeed, we realize the dangers, privations, and menacing sudden death confronting our boys on the far-flung battle fronts and the seven seas; where they go down to watery graves without a moment's warning and, even though full fed for a season, we are yet capable of loving our own flesh and blood and our country.

We are only soldiers and not generals and while we know someone has blundered, the generals never tell us the reasons why, so we can only cuss and try.

The neck of the bottle is at the top and you cannot hit it by shooting at the bottom. Let the sharpshooters of the press, the radio, and Capain Rickenbacker raise their sights.

GUY H. RADER,
Secretary.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Tuesday, April 27, 1943, commenting on Secretary Hull's position on the extension of the reciprocal trade treaties, as follows:

HULL DISTORTS ISSUE IN TEST ON TREATIES

(By Walter Lippmann)

Secretary Hull has persuaded administration leaders in Congress to take the position

that congressional action on the Trade Agreements Act should be made the test case of American foreign policy in the post-war world.

There are excellent and compelling reasons for the extension of the act. But the effort to inflate its importance to a point where the fate of the world hangs upon whether Congress may pass on Mr. Hull's agreements is, surely, a grave error.

For it is not true that the vote on the amendment proposed by Senator McNary is or can be made the test of our general policy. To say that it is the test, to ask the rest of the world to regard it as the test, is to make much too much out of comparatively little and to have lost our sense of proportion.

It is to make the question whether Congress shall have a chance to pass on tariff schedules the crucial question of our own future and of the world's peace. This is not the crucial question, and no good can come of pretending that it is.

The imprudence of posing the biggest issues on a test of this small issue is evident when we remember that if Congress extends this act unamended for two or three years, no congressman is thereby committed to vote favorably on any treaty or any other measure which may come before him.

But if Congress amends the act—say, by providing, as Senator McNary asks, that Congress may within 60 days by majority vote in both Houses disapprove an agreement—if Mr. Hull is defeated on this question, then Mr. Hull will spend the rest of the war explaining to this country and to foreign Governments that, Congress did not really repudiate him, and that he still has the power to negotiate.

Mr. Hull has, in fact, asked for a vote of confidence on a question on which he cannot win in the sense that he has made sure of the future support of Congress, and on which he may suffer a disastrous defeat.

Why should the great question of American security be identified with the notion that Congress shall have no voice in making international trade agreements? Why should Congressmen be told that they must decide the issues of peace and war on whether they have a say or do not have a say about the price of cattle, wool, and peanuts?

What sense is there in inaugurating the great decisions on the American future by saying to Congress: By your vote on whether the Executive alone may alter tariff schedules, you are committing yourselves on whether the United Nations are to remain united and are to organize the peace of the world; and we shall tell the world that if you insist on having something to say about tariff schedules, then America will not take part in safeguarding its own vital interests by organizing the peace.

There are, I believe, practical reasons why reciprocal trade agreements are best made by executive action, although in principle the right of Congress to pass upon them can hardly be disputed, and ought not to be denied. But these reasons are peculiar to the tariff.

In Congress the making of tariffs has almost always been a local issue affected by pressure groups, and therefore never planned and carried out in the general national interest.

But this very special reason, which alone could justify Mr. Hull's position on the trade agreements, disappears when we come to the larger agreements for security and reconstruction. These will require continuing congressional majorities to sustain them year after year.

It is a false start, therefore, to inaugurate our post-war foreign policy by a measure which, instead of including Congress in the complex operation, excluded it.

Senator McNary's proposal in fact is a much better precedent for the future. It gives the Executive the initiative unless majorities in both Houses disapprove within a specified time. This is a liberal and flexible procedure, admirably suited to the real problems which lie ahead.

For it enables and induces Congress to participate continually in the formation of foreign policy. And unless Congress does participate, unless there are developed dependable congressional majorities to support American foreign policy, we shall not be able to have a foreign policy.

Once we take this view we shall see, I think, that the basic issue is not whether Congress or the Executive shall decide foreign policy. Mr. Hull has made a serious mistake in posing this issue.

The basic issue is whether foreign policy shall be formed and sustained by the President and a majority in both Houses of Congress, as Senator McNary proposes, or whether one-third of the membership of one House shall have a veto over the will of the majority.

The veto power of one-third of the Senate is the real obstacle to the conduct of American foreign relations.

Full Retribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

FULL RETRIBUTION

All the American people today are experiencing the same feeling of deepest horror that was expressed by President Roosevelt in his official announcement yesterday that the Japanese Government has admitted the barbarous execution of some of the American flyers who fell into the hands of the enemy following last year's air raid on Tokyo, in flagrant and inhuman violation of the international law that applies to the treatment of prisoners of war. The entire Nation is saddened and grieved at the deaths of these gallant young heroes and patriotic martyrs and its heartfelt sympathy goes out to their bereaved families in their tragic loss.

An accompanying and equally strong reaction is a countrywide wave of intense and righteous anger and a vigorous demand for definite assurance that the Japanese war lords responsible will be held accountable after the war is over and the victorious United Nations are in a position to visit upon them personally and individually the full punishment merited by this unspeakable crime that they have perpetrated.

The trumped-up charge against the American flyers is that they intentionally bombed nonmilitary objectives and deliberately fired on civilians, and the Japanese are carrying their viciousness to such a point that they are refusing to treat as prisoners of war those they did not execute. The American Government brands this allegation as false, and it stands out as ridiculous and absurd when the ruthless bombing of Manila by the Japanese air forces is recalled.

Clearly the purpose of this savagery is an attempt to intimidate the American Government into refraining from future air attacks on Japanese cities, but it will fail beyond any question. Last night Gen. Henry H. Arnold pledged the full might of the Army Air Forces to avenge the cruel murders of our flyers and he definitely mentioned Tokyo as the objective of further raids. Furthermore, the men in all the other branches of our armed forces unquestionably will be inspired by the memory of their dead comrades to fight even more determinedly than before to bring this war against a fiendish enemy to the earliest possible end.

Our country will not retaliate by similar executions of Japanese prisoners, even though the first impulse of most Americans probably was in favor of that course. That would not punish the really guilty persons and it would drop the United States to the same low level of bestiality and lawlessness as the treacherous, uncivilized enemy. President Roosevelt declared yesterday that the American Government has informed the Japanese Government that it will hold responsible and will bring to justice officially and personally all those Japanese officers who have participated in these diabolical crimes. That guaranty should be made effective when the war ends victoriously for us, and Hirohito, Tojo, and the other Japanese war lords should be made to pay with their own lives for the brutal killing of these fine, clean young American heroes. Nothing less will satisfy our people.

Telegram From the President of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union of Toledo, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following telegram from Mr. Harry H. Cook, president of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union of Toledo, Ohio:

The American Flint Glass Workers' Union supports the American policy and position of the American Federation of Labor in opposition to the landing in American markets of foreign competitive goods at less than American cost of production. The American Flint Glass Workers' Union is unalterably opposed to continued authorization for trade treaties unless said authorization provides for congressional approval or Senate ratification that such trade treaties be terminated at the conclusion of the present war or that no provision be made for the entry into American markets of foreign-made competitive goods at less than American cost of production. The position of the American Federation of Labor presented to the platform committee of both political parties has not been changed by any authorized action. We are forwarding to you a copy of the position of the American Federation of Labor on restrictive immigration and on tariff legislation. We would appreciate your placing our position before the Ways and Means Committee.

HARRY F. COOK,
President, American Flint Glass Workers' Union.

Ralph W. Page Writes in Philadelphia Bulletin on Scientific Monetary System for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of profound encouragement and gratification that I ask unanimous consent to include herewith a portion of my remarks in the RECORD, two columns written by Ralph W. Page, appearing in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin for April 24, 1943, and April 23, 1943, respectively. These columns will speak for themselves.

The column of April 24 constitutes one of the ablest brief expositions of the monetary proposal which I have advanced over a period of years that I have yet seen in print. The column for April 23, as will be evident, sets forth the major facts regarding the so-called Giro system which was developed by Norwegian businessmen prior to the occupation of that country by the Nazis.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of April 24, 1943]

DIGGING AT THE ROOT OF ALL EVIL

(By Ralph W Page)

WASHINGTON, April 24.—Representative JERRY VOORHIS of California has introduced a bill in Congress to revise our whole money system, Government finance, and banking structure (H. R. 118, 78th Cong.).

It provides that the Government shall purchase the Federal Reserve banks and establish a monetary authority to supersede the Federal Reserve Board and management of the banks.

This authority would retire all money outstanding and substitute one type: "United States currency." Thereafter even commercial banks would have to have 100 percent currency coverage for all deposits, and each deposit would be a separate trust fund guaranteed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Except in emergency temporarily to retire money to prevent inflation, the Government would never issue any more bonds or interest-bearing obligations. It would provide the Treasury cash to pay any appropriations beyond tax receipts up to the point where this created full employment and full use of our productive capacity. At this point the authority would "designate the level of the buying power of the dollar" as the "stabilization level."

It would then cease issuing money, and begin calling on the Treasury to collect and turn the currency in for cancelation.

The duty of the Authority would be to maintain prices within a narrow margin by the release or contraction of United States currency.

There would be no other source of inflation or deflation. For commercial banks could neither create nor contract credit with customers' funds The country would be on a cash basis. And very soon it would have no debt. For the Authority would provide the Treasury with this same currency to pay all maturities and buy bonds at par at any time.

VOORHIS believes that the main cause of depressions and fluctuations is that private banks now control our medium of exchange. This medium is not money. It is checks and drafts on bank credit which has practically usurped most of the functions of money

As a result he says "the uncontrolled expansion and contraction of this synthetic medium of exchange induces recurrent periods of uncontrolled and disorganized inflation followed by disastrous periods of equally uncontrolled deflation, bankruptcy, and distress."

He proposes at one lick to substitute a mathematically regulated volume of exchange for one that is subject to the hopes, fears, whimsies, and confidence of credit lenders. At the same time he proposes to stop paying banks interest on bonds He says the banks do not pay money for bonds. They simply provide their own credit, and that the credit of the Government is better than the credit of the banks. In fact, it is the same credit.

All this presupposes that Congress will legislate appropriations sufficient to maintain full employment of men and machines, and, in reverse, sufficient taxes to recapture any inflationary surpluses.

This proposal certainly opens possibilities, and, possible or not, it should create a furious debate that might very well lead to considerable public education upon the nature and use of money. VOORHIS is not the only authority who believes the crisis in our industrial system is not a crisis in private enterprise—meaning the private ownership and operation of production—but in the control and management of money.

And however radical Government control of the value of money may appear to be, it is so provided in the Constitution of the United States in fiat and unequivocal language.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of April 23, 1943]

VOORHIS' GIRO BARTER BANK IDEA

(By Ralph W. Page)

WASHINGTON, April 23.—Representative H. JERRY VOORHIS, of California, has studied every aspect of the history, use, and nature of money—a subject which Disraeli said drove more men crazy than any other, except love. We are all angry about it. It is the root of all our domestic quarrels. And even so, few try to explain what is to become of the huge bonded debt created by the war.

VOORHIS has an answer. He has figured out a new money and banking system incorporated in several bills he recently introduced in the House.

The purpose of this article is to sketch a Norwegian experiment that caught his fancy. It reveals a principle and so lays a foundation for understanding his suggested legislation.

In Norway the depression stopped trade, contracted money and credit. Factories closed, merchants couldn't sell. Services had few customers.

To remedy this stagnation a substantial group of businessmen in Oslo tried out what they called a giro association or bank, a plan which spread also to Sweden and Denmark.

H. H. Giodvad Grell, who helped promote this system, and is now starting a giro corporation in this country, has explained the process.

A Giro bank operates with no money. It requires no capital. It charges no interest. It makes no profit. And yet it started the factories running, the goods moving, and made the services busy.

The steps are these:

A cross section of the industrial and commercial community agrees to accept the bank's checks as money or as a substitute.

The bank is then organized with a directorate and a management that commands the respect and confidence of the community. This is the crux of the whole plan. The bank then extends members credit based as usual upon the security of the business and the ability and reliability of the borrower.

But the terms are novel indeed. Instead of an interest charge there is a service charge on each check drawn. There is no set date for repayment. The agreement is that checks drawn on this credit are nonnegotiable. All the payees, or recipients, can do is to take the checks to the bank and get a similar credit for themselves. They get no money. But they can use this credit in turn to buy any goods or services from other members, or anyone who will accept the checks.

The result is that members (that is, any persons who want to join) have a complete medium for exchanging the goods they have for any they desire. They have a draft upon an existing wealth, but no money of the conventional kind. It is a round robin barter.

Loans are made and liquidated on a new principle. The bank and the borrower agree upon the probable volume of transactions and turn-over that will be required to finance the loan. Then a deduction is made from every check the borrower issues at a rate to amortize the loan when the premediated turn-over has taken place.

This plan offers a single system for the collection of taxes combined with an automatic expansion and contraction of the medium of exchange in harmony with the economic activities of production and distribution. Voorhis recognized its possibilities. It fortified the convictions which underlie his proposals for radical changes in American banking and Government finance.

War Production Training Program of the National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, within the past several months criticism of various Government bureaus, departments and agencies has seemingly become a popular pastime. We hear this criticism voiced, often in the bitterest terms, wherever the critics can find an opportunity and hearing—in the press, over the radio, from the platform, on the floor of both branches of the Congress. From these sources, always looked upon by the American people as reliable, the streams of critical comment have been flowing outward, growing in extent and bitterness, until there is today grave danger that the flood will seriously undermine the confidence of the American people in democratic government.

It is not, perhaps, phenomenal that every complaint and criticism hurled at those in responsible charge of various departments of our Government is always labeled "constructive criticism." To those who like to air their grievances, all criticism is constructive. Likewise, those who habitually indulge in criticism of public agencies always reserve to themselves the right to determine whether or not their criticism is constructive or otherwise. It is quite natural, therefore, for these critics to resent

any suggestion that their comments are in any way destructive.

As a matter of fact, no criticism is constructive unless, in addition to pointing out the evils complained of, it also points out a cure for such evils. If a critic fails to suggest a better course of conduct than the one he condemns, then his comments are destructive, at least to the extent that they serve no good purpose.

Among many agencies of the Government that have had their full share of criticism leveled at them for some time past, the National Youth Administration is outstanding. It has always been somewhat of an unsolved mystery why the guns of the critics should be turned on this agency. Outside of the Civilian Conservation Corps, I know of no similar organization with as good or as clear record of efficiency and accomplishment. Taking the work of the National Youth Administration in my home State of West Virginia as a fair example of its operation, I can confidently assert that in my judgment this is one agency of the Government that has rendered a magnificent service to the youth of the country.

Back in the year 1941, while visiting at Charleston, the capital of West Virginia, I was pleased to accept an invitation to visit the station and training school established by the N. Y. A. in that city. At that time this station was engaged in training a large number of boys as machinists. On the day of my visit, this group of trainees had just completed the task of fabricating 5,000 steel cots to fill an order from the United States Army. I was told that before the boys could undertake to fill this order it was necessary for them to build the machines necessary to make the cots. This they had done. Under the supervision of a skilled foreman these boys had built the necessary machines out of materials they had salvaged from some old discarded machinery which they secured from various sources. Using the machines they had thus cleverly constructed, they completed their contract with the Government and delivered the 5,000 steel cots within the time limit specified.

At the time of my visit the country was entering upon the gigantic task of gearing our factories to the war effort. Expert machinists were in demand. A majority of the boys at this school were farm boys. Few of them had any knowledge of or training with machinery. Notwithstanding, however, this lack of experience, hundreds of these boys after passing through a period of training at the Charleston station, were immediately placed in employment with various privately owned industries. The foreman at the station told me that, quite frequently, boys had come to him direct from the farm who had never seen other than the most ordinary pieces of machinery, and some of these lads soon developed a mechanical aptitude almost incredible. In a number of cases, he said, boys with no more than six weeks of training were able to accept jobs in privately owned and operated machine shops as skilled mechanics.

From Charleston I went to Wheeling, W. Va., where I visited a similar N. Y. A. station. With the exception that I here found girls as well as boys taking the course of training, the work being done at Wheeling was upon the same pattern as that at Charleston. At both stations I was impressed greatly by the earnestness and enthusiasm of the young trainees as well as by the deep interest in their welfare shown by those in responsible charge of the training program.

For several months past we have heard considerable criticism directed at the National Youth Administration war production program. And there have been those who have advocated a drastic curtailment in these activities. It would certainly seem that those indulging in this adverse criticism have overlooked the fact that this Nation is facing a critical manpower shortage. It should be evident that to curtail in any way the vital flow of trained labor to war industries at this time would not only be folly but would be a most comforting gesture toward our country's enemies. Training through production is, I understand, the technique utilized by the National Youth Administration war production training program. I am advised that through this program there is being furnished daily 700 trainees for war industries throughout the country. I am further advised that the program has met with the approval of industry and that this type of trained labor is being requested in ever-increasing numbers. By this token, it would seem that expansion rather than curtailment of the N. Y. A. facilities is in order.

If the National Youth Administration was engaged in operating normal or peacetime civic improvement projects, the idea of abolition or curtailment of its activities might have some merit, but it must be realized that the 39,000 work stations of the Administration are furnishing training in such critical occupations as machine shop, welding, aircraft sheet metal, foundry, pattern making, electricity, radio, and other essential lines of employment. I am advised that trainees, with the preliminary industrial training received by them from the N. Y. A., are being given employment in shipbuilding and drydock industries, aircraft companies, machine-tool industries, ordnance depots and plants, radio and electrical equipment manufacturers, garment industries, and numerous other industries engaged in filling vital war contracts.

As I have already indicated, I have followed with intense interest the work of the National Youth Administration in my home State of West Virginia. This interest has led me to seek full information upon the activities and the accomplishments of the agency in my State. I not only found that information interesting, as indicating that the National Youth Administration has done and is doing a wonderful service for the State but it was also of interest as an index of what was being done for the country at large. The information I have gathered shows that in the State of West Virginia the National Youth Administration is currently operating seven work locations of both a resident and nonresident nature, with approximately 1,000 work stations furnishing training to young people from all counties and communities in the State in the various metal and mechanical fields.

Since the inception of the war-production training program from July 1, 1941, through March 31, 1943, these 7 work locations have maintained a weekly average employment of 2,118 trainees. During this same period 8,312 trainees have left the war-production training projects in the State of West Virginia for employment in war and related industries. This figure does not include the 1,126 young people from these projects who have entered the armed forces of this country—many of them accepted immediately in the technical branches of the service.

The National Youth Administration has developed induction-type projects to transfer labor from a labor supply area to points of critical labor shortage. Since most of West Virginia is a labor-supply area, the National Youth Administration transferred from this State during the period of July 1, 1941, to March 31, 1943, 3,808 youths to these induction-type projects located in the State of Connecticut; at Norfolk, Va.; Baltimore, Md.; Dayton, Ohio; and Rocky Mount, N. C., where they received employment in war industries. During the period of training these same youths have produced through the war-production training technique many articles that have contributed either directly or indirectly to the war effort. From the period of July 1, 1941, through March 31, 1943, the following items have been produced by these trainees while in training at the stations of the National Youth Administration of West Virginia:

Ten thousand double-faced loading pallets for the United States Army; 20,000 cooks' and bakers' uniforms for the United States Army Quartermaster Corps; 10 torpedo adjusting stands for the United States Naval Torpedo Station, Alexandria, Va.; 10,496 steel Army cots for the United States Army Quartermaster Corps; 316 radio converters for the Civil Air Patrol; 3,200 first-aid kits for the State of West Virginia; 10 interoffice communicating system sets for the State of West Virginia; 9 radio doors for the United States Department of Justice; 540 cartridge containers for the Philadelphia Ordnance Depot; 1 control system for the Office of Civilian Defense; 2 gun mounts for the United States Naval Ordnance Depot; 15 extractor curb caps for the Ordnance Depot, Radford, Va.; 6,000 metal fire rakes for the Forestry Service; 1,200 ship ladders—100 hulls—for the United States Maritime Commission.

The above list of articles made by the trainees during the period mentioned was compiled from information secured from an authentic source. It is my understanding that many other similar items of a custom nature were manufactured by this group during the same period.

It is a pleasure for me to pay tribute to these accomplishments of the National Youth Administration. It is doing an

important job and rendering an exceptional service not only to the Nation at large during this critical period in our history but it is also rendering a service of incalculable value to the youth of our country.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following text of a discussion on the National Radio Forum arranged by the Washington Evening Star and broadcast on the Blue Network, April 21, 1943. The speakers were Representative A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, and Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania.

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD M. SIMPSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Ladies and gentlemen, I speak as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives opposed to the passage of House Joint Resolution 111 without certain safeguarding amendments.

By this resolution Congress delegates to the President the power for 3 years to make trade agreements with foreign nations as he chooses, and to make them without ever submitting them to Congress for its approval. By this same resolution the President is delegated the power to increase or decrease by 50 percent the rates of duty placed by Congress on imports into the United States. He thus is empowered to make new laws without the approval of your elected representatives. Once this resolution passes, even if every Member of Congress opposed an agreement, in whole or in part, which the President wanted, the Congress could do nothing about it.

Truly this resolution proposes to give the President a blank check so vast in its implications that, when filled in by these so-called trade agreements, it may represent a check against the interests of every factory worker, farmer, miner, housewife, manufacturer, and businessman in the United States. We have had enough of blank checks to the President during the 8 depression years of his administration. A blank check is an admission of weakness on the part of Congress—an admission that the Congress cannot or will not perform its legislative duty, choosing rather to pass its job on to the President.

This present Congress has risen to the occasion and is trying to restore government by law to the American people. Congress is asserting itself and jealously guarding its constitutional rights; it is no longer issuing blank signed checks to the President to be further delegated by him to bureaucrats. As a result, the country has renewed faith in its Congress as the people's protection. The people want Congress to make laws and it wants the President to administer them.

I have said that once the President (without the approval of Congress) makes a trade agreement with a foreign nation, opening our markets to their products, the Congress is powerless to change the agreement without breaking faith with the foreign government concerned. This is true even if every Member of Congress recognizes the agreement to be ruinous to our farmers, for example, or to an industry which for our national security we are encouraging and building up.

Another example. Suppose the war ends in the next several months, an end devoutly to be wished. Immediately every nation in the world could begin shipping into the United States rubber, free of any import duty, rubber secured and processed by the cheapest kind of coolie labor—rubber which would be in immediate competition with the product of the wonderful synthetic rubber producing plants the Government is building today at a cost of $700,000,000 to the American taxpayer. These plants are designed to take care of our rubber needs in the future—they do and will employ free American labor at high wages, and they insure that never again will we be caught short of rubber in time of war.

Just think of it. Because of a trade agreement with Peru, which produces only a little rubber, in which we agree to admit her rubber free of duty, every nation of the world with which we trade may send in its rubber duty free, because of the generalization of our concessions.

Yes, even though our trade agreement is made with Peru, under our trade policy known as the most-favored-nation clause, the same reductions in duty made under the agreement are available to every nation in the world. It is truly free trade to those nations for they make no commitments or concessions at all.

Thus, while we never had one of these agreements with Japan, she profited at our expense by every agreement we made with other nations. You recall, I am certain, those hundreds of items, American flags among them, so prevalent in our stores before Pearl Harbor, bearing the words, "Made in Japan." Much of the "Made in Japan" goods was permitted to compete with American-made goods because of trade agreements we made with other countries. Thus, skilled American labor found itself walking the streets after these agreements while goods produced by cheap Japanese labor was shipped us in payment for our scrap iron and gasoline with which the Japs blasted China.

There is no competitive foreign trade today. International trade today is war trade—it is lease-lend, rationed and controlled by governments. There is no business excuse whatever for these trade agreements now. We must not forget, however, that these agreements do tie our hands when it becomes necessary to protect ourselves against a flood of cheap foreign-made goods in the post-war period.

The administration seemingly recognizes the original purpose of these trade agreements is of no moment today. In 1934, seeking a justification for the blanket authority to the President, it was claimed that the trade agreements were "for the purpose of expanding our foreign markets and bringing about recovery." In 1937, when their failure to expand foreign markets was all too evident and world peace schemes were in fashion, their extension was demanded as a means of achieving world peace. Needless to say, they failed in that purpose In 1940 their renewal was demanded by the President as a means of keeping the United States out of the war. They failed again.

Now, in 1943, a new excuse and justification had to be found if the authority to continue these trade agreements is to be granted. This time we are assured that through these agreements made without the approval of Congress, a lasting peace will follow this war.

We are too prone to confuse business under these trade agreements with idealism. The administration tells us they are to the economic advantage of the worker and farmer—that they are made by "Yankee traders," thus implying that we seek the better of the bargain. If we drive a hard bargain, we don't make friends—in the long run we make enemies.

Because there is no free competitive world trade today there is no present need for these trade agreements as such. Their value today is only in their effect upon the morale of the people of the nation with whom they are made. There they are interpreted to indicate the policy this country will adopt toward them in the post-war world.

In this respect trade agreements approved by the Congress could properly be construed as expressive of our national policy. But trade agreements made by traveling political appointees, without congressional approval, may only mislead the contracting nation as to our intentions.

Of the 30 nations with which we have made agreements, 26 were not finally effective until approved by the legislative body of the other contracting nation. Surely this resolution should be amended to require the approval of your Congress before the proposed agreements become effective.

A Camouflaged Tax Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of April 26, 1943:

A CAMOUFLAGED TAX INCREASE

With the emergence of the new Ways and Means Committee majority tax bill, the opposition to the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan begins to take on an intelligible pattern.

The argument, for example, that the Ruml plan would be "inflationary," because it would leave in the hands of the rich money to spend that they would not otherwise have, did not make sense at the time it was put forward. As Randolph Paul, speaking for the Treasury, admitted, "It is not correct to assume that the foregiveness of a year's tax liability combined with corresponding current income-tax collection would reduce the cash flow into the Treasury. * * * Each individual subject to taxation in 1942 has 1 year's liability canceled, but he is at the same time required to pay another year's liability 1 year sooner than he otherwise would."

On the assumption that the choice was merely between paying the same rate of income tax on the basis of 1942 income or of 1943 income, the objection that the Ruml plan would leave the taxpayers with more money during this year or the next had no point. But on a quite different assumption—on the assumption that we could and ought to force taxpayers to pay more than 1 year's taxes in 1 year—the objection becomes intelligible. It at last becomes clear, from the new Ways and Means Committee majority proposal, that the former opponents of a pay-as-you-go plan wish to turn that plan into a left-handed device for increasing tax rates in the next 3 years.

The committee majority plan may be thought of as a plan for collecting 1⅓ years' taxes in each of the next 3 years (except that the extra tax will be at 1941 rates rather than 1942 rates). Or it may be thought of as a disguised plan for increasing income-tax rates in the next 3 years. Assuming that there is no increase in the 1942 rates in the next 3 years, what the majority proposal does is to put into effect a much more progressive scale of rates than the 1942 rates. In fact, on some of the higher incomes the rates due in the next 3 years will clearly be higher than 100 percent. They will confiscate all income at these levels and force a digging into capital. The amount of capital levy will bear no relation to the actual capital of the individual involved, but only to his income.

The question involved here is not at all whether a further rise in income-tax rates in the next 3 years is or is not desirable. If such a further rise is feasible without causing unreasonable hardship or economic disruption it should be put into effect, for maximum revenues are essential. But any new scale of rates should be put into effect solely on its own merits A rise in rates should not be disguised or camouflaged as something else. The Ways and Means Committee and the Treasury should publish frankly the new scale of rates that would actually be imposed under the new bill. Only if we are clear about what we are doing are we likely to act with intelligence and fairness.

Preventing Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Albert S. Goss, Master, National Grange, on preventing inflation, appearing in the National Grange Monthly for May 1943.

Since inflation and its prevention is a very important and timely subject at present, I recommend this article for study by Congress and the country.

The article follows:

PREVENTING INFLATION—THE RIGHT PLAN AND THE WRONG WAY

There are two distinct schools of thought with reference to the control of inflation. One school favors establishing price ceilings, enforced by fines and penalties. The other advocates making use of economic forces by increasing production of goods and controlling purchasing power. The former is based on an economy of scarcity and requires a huge army of enforcement agents. The latter is based on an economy of abundance and is largely self-enforcing. The former is bureaucracy at the height of its glory. The latter is a decentralized approach to a tough problem. The passage and veto of the Bankhead bill is the result of a clash between these two groups.

The President first attempted to prevent inflation by the price-ceiling method. A number of reasons contributed to the failure, but two are outstanding. First, he tried to control prices without controlling labor, although everyone knew it couldn't work. Second, the price ceilings strangled production, as they have always done wherever tried.

When the program failed, the President called for more power. Then Congress took a hand. It realized that the President was trying to do an impossible thing, something that had been tried many times and had always failed. It recognized that the basic cause of inflation is the pressure of increased income on decreasing supplies, and that the price-ceiling method was reducing the supplies and protecting a fast increasing income. In other words, it was essentially inflationary.

CONGRESS FAVORS ABUNDANCE

Congress determined that we should adopt the abundance method of attack and wrote into the Price Control Act of October 2 certain limitations designed to protect the Nation against food shortage. They first attempted to assure farmers production costs by placing certain limits on ceilings. Since the existing parity formula (which was used) is completely cockeyed, it was recognized that the limits established were far from effective on many commodities—merely an expression of intent—so a very definite mandate was written into the act to prevent abuse. The act provided that modification shall be made in maximum prices * * * in any case where it appears that such modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes or where * * * the maximum prices will not reflect * * * increased costs.

Immediately upon passage of this act the President issued an Executive order which ignored these two mandates and stuck to the original impossible price ceiling method. It has failed again, and will continue to fail, because it violates basic economic law. The reason is simple.

The price ceiling method ignores costs. There are hundreds of kinds of uncontrollable costs, largely arising from war dislocation. They spring up in 10,000 localities and when the costs bump into the ceilings, production is strangled, and the producer either reduces production or quits. In the aggregate we create an enormous shortage. Price ceilings never created a pound of food. They reduce production, create shortages and "black markets," in which the wealthy get what they want at exorbitant prices, and the poor do without.

Inflation never existed where there was an abundant supply of goods. The remedy therefore is to encourage abundant production. After prices are adjusted to meet costs and encourage production, if a shortage still exists, the answer is to reduce the demands to fit the supply. This can be done in two ways.

TWO METHODS OF CONTROL

The first way is by rationing. It is possible to create a surplus by rationing, and a surplus is the most effective medium for controlling prices. Witness the recent meat shortage with the black markets. In less than a week after rationing was established, butchers had more meat than they could sell. They began cutting prices. They reduced their orders to wholesalers and packers, and rapidly the surplus is working its way back to the producer. This is plain economics and does not require an army of accountants and snoopers. Production will soon fit itself to the demand.

The second way of reducing demand to fit the supply is to syphon off excess income by forced savings and income taxes. We have $35,000,000,000 in excess income seeking to buy consumer goods. A large part of this should be used to pay taxes to help meet the enormous war bill, and much of the balance should go into savings to be available for use when the war is over. So far, our only concern has been to prevent most people from paying any of the increased costs of war dislocations. We must have the political courage to face the issue.

It is only fair to the President to say that he recognizes the seriousness of the food shortage. Where production costs bump into price ceilings, he proposes to postpone the day of reckoning by paying subsidies to keep farmers in business. In this column we have given many reasons before why subsidies should not be used, so we will confine our present comments to three reasons, only emphasizing the fact that the other reasons are none the less valid, although they are not repeated.

REASONS FOR AVOIDING SUBSIDIES

1. Farmers have no assurance that Congress would be short-sighted enough to provide hundreds of millions in subsidies, and without such assurance are not likely to plan crops which bid fair to result in loss.

2. It would be impossible to man a force big enough to examine into the millions of cases and prove losses.

3. Let us assume that prices are held below cost and farmers are granted subsidies to keep them in production: As the war progresses and costs rise, subsidies must go up, and we develop an increasingly unbalanced price structure. When peace comes and we have to balance the budget, subsidies would be one of the first items to be cut out. Then either the farmers would have to increase prices or go out of business. If we refuse to pay production costs when we have $35,000,000,000 of surplus income, what chances would there be of raising prices when income and employment start down? The answer is none. Agriculture would face a collapse worse than that which followed the last war. We want none of it.

The vetoed Bankhead bill attempted to force the administration to follow the mandate of the Price Control Act and abandon its hopeless price ceiling program. The issue is whether Congress has the power to do this. It is unfortunate that the Bankhead bill appears necessary to secure compliance with the law. It is also unfortunate that the issue should be raised just when labor is demanding substantial wage increases, for talk of the danger of inflation beclouds the fact that Congress is really insisting on a more effective method of preventing inflation than is now contemplated.

A FOUR-POINT PROGRAM

In our judgment, rigid price controls are causing serious food shortages and speeding the day of inflation. They should be abandoned at once. In their place we should have a 4-step program:

1. Encourage abundant production, and where necessary use support prices for that purpose.

2. Use rationing to keep the demand in balance with the supply. Coordination of lease-lend and military purchases and storage with civilian needs should be effected.

3. Syphon off a substantial part of surplus income through forced savings and income taxes.

4. Use price ceilings only in period of transition or to prevent profiteering.

Faternally,

A. S. GOSS,
Master, National Grange.

This War on Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial which appeared in the Wheeling Intelli-

gencer March 24, 1943. This editorial very concisely brings to attention the acuteness of the Pacific war.

Last fall, this newspaper raised the question of whether or not the war against Japan was being prosecuted with the vigor the size of the undertaking called for.

A winter of fighting has gone into history since then. We seem to have made some headway in the Pacific, or at least to have held our own. But it still seems to the Intelligencer that not enough United Nations effort is being put into this phase of the war.

It is simple enough, as we have remarked before, to sit in a chair thousands of miles away from the scene of action, and out of an abysmal ignorance of the strategy of global warfare pick flaws. Nevertheless, we make bold to assert that the obvious strategy of marking time with Japan while Germany is being mopped up is giving the United States and Australia the worst of it.

We say this is the strategy, because Mr. Churchill virtually so declared in his recent broadcast, and because the progress of the war all points in that direction.

We have no doubt whatever of the good faith of Mr. Churchill and the English people. But we think it is a hazardous and costly strategy from an American standpoint for several reasons.

Upon several occasions, the opinion has been expressed in these columns that Russia is interested solely in the defeat of Germany; that she will not lift her hand against Japan, and that Stalin will make a purely Russian peace when Germany has been defeated. We have no criticism of Russia to make because of this. We believe, as a matter of fact, that it is the sensible, realistic position for Russia to take and we know of no occasion upon which Stalin has tried to create any other impression. Support of this viewpoint comes from a well-informed source. Demaree Bess, writing in the Saturday Evening Post, points out that Russia has but one commitment—to defeat Germany; that, regardless of the Atlantic Charter, she has European territorial aspirations which she considers essential to her safety; that she has no commitment to fight Japan and probably will not do so.

So that it is a reasonably safe calculation, it would seem to us, to count Russia out of the war on Japan. And, no matter how noble the present intention of everybody on our side, we do not know what the turn of events will bring. Frankly, we are a little afraid of Japan. We are afraid that, if the war is not carried to her with sufficient vigor now, she may so establish and entrench herself in the territory she has overrun that dislodging her will prove a much more difficult task than might now be supposed. And with Russia out of the picture and Germany disposed of, who knows what the international shuffle will turn up? Strange things have happened in world politics and can happen again.

Ambassador Grew, perhaps the best informed American alive on Japanese affairs, has warned us many times against trifling with the Japs. He tried without success to prod the American Government into a realization of Japan's purposes long before Pearl Harbor. He has sounded warnings several times since against permitting Japan to get too firm a foothold in the vast island domain she has occupied. And as recently as last week the Australian Minister to the United States, speaking in Toronto, Canada, warned against this same policy of taking it too easy with Japan. He expressed the fear that defeat of Germany may not come about soon and that, unless Japan is hard pressed in the meantime, she may have become quite formidable by the time the United Nations are ready to turn their full force on her.

After all, this is our war with Japan. It was Japan, remember, who bombed Pearl Harbor. And while we all realize the importance of bringing about the defeat of Germany and are willing to continue making sacrifices here at home in order that arms and food may go to Russia and England and elsewhere, and while we are willing that our men fight in Africa and Europe, we have a right to demand that the Japanese be not permitted to get out of hand in the meantime.

Jeffers Confounds Early Critics and Railroad Rate Cuts Panic Truck Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two articles written by Allen Dean for the Detroiter, a weekly published by the Detroit Chamber of Commerce, for April 19 and April 26, 1943:

[From The Detroiter of April 19, 1943]

JEFFERS CONFOUNDS EARLY CRITICS

Curbs on the use of automobiles have gone far enough, in the opinion of Rubber Director William M. Jeffers. April 3 he told the Midwestern Governors' Conference, in a letter exhibited by Senator GUY M. GILLETTE, Iowa Democrat, that if the rubber program is carried through as planned, it will be unnecessary to restrict the use of tires on automobiles.

The rubber chief went further. He said recommendations that trucks and busses be taken off the highways were "sadistic" approaches to the problem of tire conservation.

All credit to Jeffers for his breadth of vision and unequivocating position. He has fooled many by the unswerving determination and fairness with which he has directed his campaign to keep materials, weapons, war workers, and the every-day automobile driver rolling along in war tempo.

When Jeffers got the nod from President Roosevelt September 15, 1942, to take over the rubber job recommended by the Baruch investigating committee, many a transportation man shook his head and muttered under his breath, "A railroad man running highway transportation won't work."

It was not without cause that they pronounced these doleful predictions. Had not the Union Pacific Railroad which Jeffers headed been a principal contributor to Joe Hayes' campaign to destroy truck operations in the Mississippi Valley? Had not Senator BURTON K. WHEELER'S searching inquiry into railroad campaigns against motor carriers (S. Res. 71, Rept. No. 26, pt. 2 of the 77th Cong.) shown that the railroads beyond Chicago had through their Western Association of Railway Executives systematically set about erecting weight, length, and tax barriers at gateway cities along the Mississippi River?

Small wonder then that highway transportation officials recalled the ancient adage "What you believe depends upon who you are," and contended that Jeffers had been so steeped in a policy of truck and bus annihilation that he could not forsake his heritage and become a champion of rubber-borne transportation.

But in truth he has done just that. Recall his fight with Senator ELLISON D. (COTTON ED) SMITH, South Carolina Democrat, and powerful Senate Agriculture Committee over issue of rayon versus cotton as a tire-making fabric.

Said Jeffers, "I don't intend to be influenced by anybody, anywhere, anytime. * * * The trouble with this whole situation is that it has been a muddle of men who were afraid some congressional committee or pressure group wouldn't like their decisions."

When Senator SMITH stuck in a barb, "Whose bread I eat his song I sing," Jeffers roared his resentment, got the chairman to say he was not necessarily thinking of the rubber boss.

Another fight that tried the 66-year-old railroad man's mettle was the feud over grain alcohol-petroleum as the source for butadiene, a principal ingredient for synthetic rubber. Jeffers has pressed production from petroleum plants to fullest utilization; nursed along the alcohol exponents without finally declaring himself on question whether alcohol would finally prove more economical.

Jeffers has had to battle his own War Production Board, too. Faced with the necessity of distributing critical materials over the Nation's entire war production program, steel, cast iron, alloys, copper and a dozen other vital materials needed to build the synthetic rubber plants have not had priorities fall freely from Donald Nelson's reservoir.

The rubber chief began by demanding materials for 1943 building of 65 to 70 percent of annual production recommended by Baruch—later revised it downward to a rock bottom of 49.5 percent.

February 1 found Nelson providing capacity for only 41 percent of the output recommended by the Baruch committee. Without Jeffers' insistence, Army and Navy officials would have cut the program to 200,000 tons for 1943 (19.5 percent).

In his second progress report to Congress issued February 18, he said, "As of today plants now sequenced and under directive, together with those finished or expected to be finished during the next few months, have total rated capacities of 452,000 tons of synthetic rubber a year, or 43.6 percent of 1,037,000 tons recommended by Baruch committee."

Jeffers has brought us a long way from the turmoil and despondency of last summer. His promise, "I've got a job to do, and by God I'm going to do it, come hell or high water" was a challenge that caught on with his fellow Americans. It was new hope standing on the shoulders of the hopeless preceding era. On July 7, 1942, the United Press had headlined "Roosevelt Says All Tires in United States May Be Seized."

Concurrently Price Administrator Leon Henderson had been credited with saying "there will be no rubber for 3 years for civilians' automobile tires, and the Government may come to snatching tires off civilians' cars and giving them to 'a preferred class of civilians'."

Promising now to forsake Washington when the security of the rubber production program is certain, Jeffers can point to accomplishments brought about under most trying circumstances—submit it as eloquent answer to the September 17, 1942, Detroit Free Press editorial comment. "Appointment of a railroad man to handle the rubber program is an experiment that only results can justify."

ALLEN DEAN.

[From the Detroiter of April 26, 1943]

RAILROAD RATE CUTS PANIC TRUCK OFFICIALS

Railroad revenues may be too high, as found by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but many motor carriers are operating

in the red. On April 12 (reopened Ex Parte 148, increased railway rates, fares, and charges—1942) the Commission issued an order canceling freight rate increases (6 percent) which they had given the railroads March 18, 1942. While the truck lines added a similar increase to their rates at the same time, they were not required to seek authority to do so hence are not legally affected. This arises from the fact that railroad rate scales as a whole are prescribed as maximum charges that may be collected, while motor carriers are not held down by such orders.

Basic reasoning for this difference is partly historical, partly practical. On the historical side, railroad rates were developed over a long period of years when there was little actual competition and the public was pretty much at the mercy of the rail lines. The eastern class rates (east of the Mississippi and north of the Ohio-Potomac Rivers) were prescribed in 1931, southern scales in 1925, western trunk line rates in 1931, southwestern rates (consolidated cases) 1927. Prior to these cases, there was no precise pattern of rates in the several territories. Many unlawful charges existed, particularly in violation of the provision that rates to intermediate points should be no higher than to more distant points on the same route.

Previous to regulation of motor carriers, they had little in the way of published rates. Some of the general common carriers did attempt to emulate the rail tariff forms prescribed by the Commission, but for the most part truckers carried their rates in their hat.

When the Motor Carrier Act became effective July 1, 1936, the truck lines were required to have every charge on file with the Commission. They grabbed off the class rate scales, freight classification, numerous rules and regulations appearing in railroad tariffs. From that date forward their revisions consisted largely of reductions. This was accomplished for the most part by naming "commodity" rates (usually special charges designed to cover a steady flow of volume traffic between key points).

By 1938 revenues had so declined that the Commission put a floor under truck rates by issuing minimum rate orders (Ex parte No. MC–21 and others). Thus, the orders against the motor carriers were the opposite of railroad regulations—a floor rather than a ceiling. While these minimum truck rate orders have since been lifted, the pattern of regulation remains—truck lines have no specific limit on their charges; railroads may not go above prescribed charges.

On the practical side there is good reason for this difference in treatment. Any person may purchase a truck and enjoy whatever economies he can effect. On the other hand, no individual or corporation can create a railroad that will have more than local use.

Against this background then, we must reflect upon problem of motor carriers seeking increases while railroads are ordered to give wholesale decreases.

Truck officials claim they are going to disregard the competition of the railroads and keep their rates at prevailing levels, in fact increase them in specific spots. Some are insisting their service is not actually in competition with the railroads—is so superior to rail service on merchandise freight that it is competitive with express, which costs two to five and one-half times more.

This may be true of the larger common carriers of general commodities that operate over several States, but it cannot be true of the trucking industry as a whole. Express traffic is "peanuts" when considered in relation to the movement of manufactured goods, and even the less-carload-merchandise traffic of the country. If motor carriers want to concentrate upon a high-speed service for high-value commodities that are amenable to greater sale by quick delivery, their theory of rate making is correct. On the other hand, if they want to expand their usefulness to commerce as a whole, they must think in terms of charges and services tailored to the transportation requirements of business. This does not mean operating without profit. It does mean taking the increase realistically on the traffic that can and should bear it.

Those who now are primarily less-truckload operators are dreaming of a way to increase their rates while still keeping competitive with the railroads. Carrier officials have observed that Dr. Ford K. Edwards, head cost analyst of the Interstate Commerce Commission, has testified in the pending class rate investigation (ex parte No. 28300, et al.) that the railroad less-than-carload merchandise traffic does not pay its way—is subsidized by the carload traffic, as is true with the passenger service of most carriers. The truckers figure they may be able to convince the Commission that the decision in Ex Parte 148 was partially wrong and that they should prescribe higher less-than-carload rail rates, thereby giving motor carriers a chance to preserve their own charges.

Other remedies are being toyed with by truck officials. The most immediate thrust is at the small shipments that take nearly as much manpower and vehicle operation as larger ones. Shippers now pay as little as 58 cents for handling up to 100 pounds. This includes a free pick-up at origin and a free delivery to the customer at destination.

Before the war, such a charge was not adequate to cover handling a single shipment at any traffic volume point such as Detroit or Chicago. The charge was let stand because often there were much heavier shipments to be picked up at the same time, offsetting loss on the minimum lots. Now, truckers say the minimum shipments have become preponderant.

A specific check of shipments handled on January 27, 1943, was made by 29 carriers operating in central territory. Of the 27,092 bills of lading offered them that day for single-line hauls, 9,172 (35.8 percent) were for minimum shipments with charges less than $1.25. Add 243 minimum shipments (11.4 percent) shipments of from 1 pound to 500 pounds that incurred charges less than $1.25. Add 243 minimum shipments (0.9 percent) with charges in excess of $1.25 and it is found that 48.1 percent of the bills handled were minimum shipments.

The carriers are publishing tariffs to become effective about May 20, 1943, raising the minimum charge to $1.25. They have had audiences with Office of Price Administration in an effort to avert a suspension request to the Interstate Commerce Commission. They have also talked with shipper groups in an effort to wean them away from protest. Whether the Commission will refrain from suspension on its own motion if no objections come from substantial protestants is not known. This, then, is one attack that has already been launched.

Another proposal is to increase by 10 cents per 100 pounds charges on all shipments weighing 5,000 pounds and under (originally announced as 2,000 pounds). This was subjected to public hearing by the carriers' rate bureau on April 14. The increase would apparently be in addition to the $1.25 minimum previously mentioned, thus raising it to $1.35. It is not expected this increase will be attempted until the revenue results of the $1.25 minimum have been determined. Central Motor Freight Association board of directors will consider it May 10. The carriers forecast a 3.95 percent increase in gross revenue which will help greatly to overcome the perilous financial operating condition of many carriers. The association reported that the operating ratio of its members for January 1943 was 100.5, that they handled 20,000,000 more pounds of freight than January 1942, operated 2,700,000 less miles, yet had their net income disappear. The Nation's railroads in December 1942, comparable month, had ratio of 61.6 percent.

Still another proposal that the central territory carriers have been flirting with is a straight 10-percent increase on all traffic and services. This was the device used by the Atlantic States operators, but the Commission suspended it on request of Office of Price Administration. Hearing has not been had. The experience with Office of Price Administration in the East has been largely responsible for the central carriers attacking specific rates that do not pay their way, rather than seeking blanket increases. It is hoped that Office of Price Administration may consistently permit increases designed to cover actual costs, not consider them to be born of the general spiraling in expenses. The Interstate Commerce Commission will sometimes consider average expenses; Office of Price Administration will not.

When the quarterly reports for first 3 months of 1943 are in (about April 26), the operators expect to be able to say how much additional revenue will be required to obtain a satisfactory operating ratio. Whatever may be their judgment as to the specific advances in charges that must be made, we believe they cannot ignore railroad competition even during the war. Money is still the most important factor in every business transaction. Businessmen will not pay more than absolutely necessary to assemble their materials and market their products. Indeed, it would be mismanagement to do so.

Making truck charges higher than rail on merchandise traffic will only throw business to the railroads—business they cannot now satisfactorily handle, that they should not in the interest of the war effort be required to absorb. Further, in the after-war era, the motor carriers will find their merchandise traffic has dried up and that they are in the low-volume field of "express," already the target of air transportation.

In 1942 the railway express business of the country amounted to less than 750,000 tons. During the same period, railroad less than carload totaled 5,584,736 tons. Freight forwarded business handled on railroads totaled 3,242,152 tons. The less than train load that moved by truck is not known. Let the motor carriers ponder the fertility of these two fields before they choose to relegate themselves to the "luxury" class in transportation.

ALLEN DEAN.

Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

SEIBERT & RIGGS,
New York, April 26, 1943.

Hon. JAY LeFEVRE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LeFEVRE: I am intensely interested in the present consideration by the Congress in respect of the treatment of income taxes. Whatever will be done does not affect me personally to a great extent for at my age the impact of income taxes, even though it causes capital impairment, will not affect too much my comparatively few necessities during my remaining years. I

think, therefore, that I can think of income tax treatment without prejudice and my thoughts run not only to the effect of taxes upon the comparatively poor man but also their effect upon the future of this country.

The standards of living here (not enjoyed anywhere else in the world), as well as our immense productive power, were built up over a course of years by poor men but by poor men who were thrifty of money and fertile with ideas and who were permitted as a reward to enjoy for themselves and their families the results of their thrift and energy and even to enjoy the pleasure of distributing those results to the good of their fellow citizens. Upon that basis we have grown strong.

I cannot imagine a country strong and virile, the backs of whose citizens are bowed under the weight of taxes and of collection of taxes made under the whip of the tax gatherer.

It is certain, however, that we must win this war at no matter what cost. It is equally certain that every cent raised by taxes and by the sale of Government bonds must be expended solely for the purpose of winning the war and for no other purpose. It follows, therefore, that there should be a positive expression by the Congress that all expenditures during the war, at least, should be made only for the war effort and for no other purpose except the barest necessities of conducting the Government—no "side shows" should be permitted. An expression of this intent by the Government will aid the morale of every one of us.

The burden of taxes should be so weighted that it will balance well upon the shoulders of all.

Is the burden well balanced if the poor man, who now for the first time feels the full weight of taxes, must pay taxes upon an income earned last year and still have a tax debt to pay after he is dead? Is it well balanced if it compels the taxpayer to pay taxes for the preceding year out of income for the next year, at which time his income may have been largely diminished? (Few save enough for taxes and even a withholding tax cannot apply to all income nor be fixed by an exact amount to meet fluctuating taxes.) Is it well balanced if he has set aside a portion of his income for taxes and finds at the end of the year that a higher tax bill has been imposed upon him for which his savings are not sufficient? Is it well balanced if the same process is repeated another year? Is it well balanced if the withholding of his income at the source should not be sufficient to meet taxes of the succeeding year? Is it well balanced if the withholding of his income at the source should be more than sufficient to meet taxes of the succeeding year?

Will not such a process of unbalance create confusion worse confounded by the unknown future taxes of each succeeding year? Under such a system will not every man of poor means look to the future not with hope but with despair?

It seems to me that the nomenclature of "forgiveness of taxes" which has been attached to the Ruml plan is incorrect. The Ruml plan, in fact, is a "change of basis of tax" rather than a forgiveness of taxes.

It seems to me a terrible thought that any legislator in order to change the basis of the collection of income taxes could give any consideration whatsoever to compelling citizens in these times of hardship to pay in one year a tax for one year and even a portion of a tax for another.

The change to the Ruml plan basis would cost the Government only one thing, namely, the right to collect income taxes in the year in which the taxpayer dies. On the other hand, to the taxpayer the Ruml plan would give a man a balanced burden and enable him to face increasing Government costs with some hope.

The buying of the change of basis from an income tax on the preceding year to an income tax on the current year is a cost to the person of ordinary means that ought to be unthinkable.

Yours very truly,

W. H. SEIBERT.

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over Station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on April 24, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, this program is dedicated to the parents, wives, and children of our fighting men. This evening, I am going to talk about some things of great importance to all of you who have loved ones in the service.

We've seen the newspapers, magazines, and the movies just filled to overflowing, and rightly so, with vivid tales of the unparalleled heroism of these great, American soldiers and sailors. Their praises we sing on every occasion, and most properly, for they are deserving of the very best America can give them. They are the protectors of everything we hold dear; our country, our Constitution, our beautiful flag. The Nation must never be allowed to forget these dauntless boys.

But there are others whose praises we do not sing, in fact we hardly stop to consider their existence or their importance. Little indeed is the attention paid to you mothers, fathers, wives, and children of the boys you sent away with a prayer on your lips and hope in your hearts. Yet you are the folks who have made as great a sacrifice as can be made in this ghastly war.

I ask you, is there any pang as great as that lost feeling which the fond mother knows as she clasps her much-loved son to her breast in sad farewell, to send him forth to an uncertain career of smoke and battle? I ask you, can anyone tell me of a greater weight than the heavy heart carried by the loving father while he counts the days, the weeks, and months he will endure before his sons return from the conflict? I ask you, is there sacrifice to compare with the sleepless nights endured by those dear parents wondering, watching, tossing, waiting, and longing for the happiest day they will ever know, the day these sons return?

The furrows in the brow deepen, the hair whitens, the tears come often, their thoughts turn ever to their great sacrifice. They smile through the mist at each other, these loving, patient parents, for they are proud of the blue stars in the little service flags which shine from their windows to tell a troubled world of their undying faith in their country.

But in spite of their pride, the pang of the mother, the weight on the heart of the father are there. They will be to eternity. There is no sacrifice greater than theirs. And what of the soldier's wife? Too little is said of her. Too little consideration is paid her amid the bustle of more and more men leaving their homes, too little consideration is given that wife who must keep the home her husband left. She must keep that home lest he lose faith in that for which he is fighting. Great is her sacrifice. I ask you, is there that which can compare with her lonely, aching heart?

And what of the soldier's child? What sacrifice is greater than the loss of the father who was to guide that little one through all the years around life's pitfalls, through life's narrows? There is no greater loss. There is no greater terror than night for the child, a long, dark, dreary night without the help which only the absent father could give.

But we are imposing sentiment; the facts are there and we must face them. These boys are gone for the duration. We are proud they went, yet we owe them this much, to interest ourselves in their loved ones, their brave mothers and fathers, their faithful wives, their dearest children, all must be considered and looked after. They shall be cared for. With a deep sense of responsibility for them all, I have introduced a bill in Congress which provides for doubling the dependency allotment of every soldier's child. This will raise the amount the first child receives from $12 to $24 a month without additional contribution from the service man. This will raise the allotment of the second and remaining of the children from $10 to $20 a month without further contribution from the father. These increases will make it more certain that Uncle Sam watches over the children of the Nation while their fathers march away to war.

There may be those who will ask why so much concern at this time over the children? Congress just passed the Kilday bill to defer fathers for a long time. Oh, no, my dear friends, although I voted for the Kilday bill which will leave fathers until the very last to be called, the answer is that many fathers have gone already and the other pools will soon be exhausted. Fathers are bound to be called in large numbers before long.

The answer, then, is to do something before it is too late. We must not see little children undernourished and starving in this country. When that day comes, the cause for which their daddies are fighting will be lost. Our solemn duty is to guarantee to every man who goes to war that his children will be provided for.

We will not accomplish this under the present arrangement. No child can live on $10 a month. No lonely mother, scrimping and saving and eking out an existence for herself can properly feed and clothe her child on $10 a month. Yet Uncle Sam owes this to the child, the mother, and the soldier father.

There is not a man in Congress who worked harder to pass the Dependency Allotment Act of 1942 than I did. I voted for this measure with the greatest of satisfaction. I was grateful to God for the privilege of belonging to the Congress that provided for these splendid parents, wives, and children of all our service men.

I soon came to the conclusion, however, that the allotments were not adequate. Few people give this much thought because the shoe has but recently begun to pinch. Married men with families have been drafted for the past few months by our local boards, but not as generally as they will be taken when the other pools are exhausted. The Kilday bill wisely provides for an orderly draft.

Therefore, the majority of our people will soon be affected. They will realize the impossibility of feeding and caring for a child on $10 a month. They will also realize how impossible it is for a parent to live on the $37 maximum allotment now received. There are many, many older persons whose sons are in the service and who are unable to make a living now that those sons are gone to war. Those older people must be provided

for. They cannot make out on what the law prescribes for them.

I say to you that a dependent mother or father of a man in service should receive as much as a dependent wife with no children. It must be a great sense of comfort to a soldier who has sacrificed a lucrative job at home, out of which he has taken care of mother and dad, to learn these dear ones will have to exist on not more than $37 a month each. It must be a great boon to those boys whose mothers and fathers have depended upon them as much as their wives to know their parents cannot receive more than two-thirds of a wife's allotment.

To correct this rank injustice I have therefore introduced another bill which calls for fair treatement of older people and parents of servicemen. This enables the mother or father to receive as much as the wife or up to $50 a month each.

To my many elderly friends throughout the Thirty-fourth Congressional District who are members of the Townsend Clubs and to those interested in this cause, I commend this bill. I believe it will be a real boon to you who have sons in the service upon whom you have been dependent I further believe this bill is the opening wedge to permanent old-age security, which our Congress was nearly ready to recognize and put into effect before we became involved in this terrible war.

Dear friends, let me read to you the titles of both these bills I have recently introduced in Congress.

The first is a bill amending the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, to increase the allowance to dependent children.

The second is a bill to amend the same act to increase allowances to dependent mothers and fathers.

One measure will double allotments for each soldier's child from $12 to $24 a month. The other bill provides for as much money to be paid dependent mothers and fathers of servicemen as wives now receive or an increase from $37 a month to $50 a month each. In each case, please bear in mind that these benefits will not call for any added contribution from the serviceman's pay.

There are those who will condemn these measures which I have presented for the betterment of the great majority of people in my district. To these objectors I will say, something must be done soon for the little children who will be rendered helpless and destitute when their daddies are drafted. I don't propose to wait until suffering and hunger have embraced the people I represent. I will not be guilty of sitting back and allowing deplorable conditions to prevail which my bills will avoid and correct. I refuse to stand idly by while helpless older people and countless children go without food and shelter because Congress has failed to allow them enough money to buy these necessities. I'm not callous and hardboiled enough to countenance such horrible things without trying to do something to help those who need help. And lastly, I'm not enough of a hypocrite to send the fathers of these little ones and the sons of those noble American parents into the service and at the same time neglect their beloved families at home for whom they fight and die.

There is, of course, a limit to what any man can do to save the situation. But as your Representative in the Congress, your hired man, if you prefer, I am determined to do everything in my poor power to protect the helpless and weak against the ravages of fate and circumstance.

In conclusion, I want to remind you loved ones of the men in our armed forces that you are deserving of every consideration from your Government. If you have any difficulties whatsoever with your allotments, your soldier benefits, war-risk insurance, or anything else I want you to feel free to write me. Let me also remind you of my desire to be of such service to you as I can regardless of who you are as long as you reside in my district, whether you are rich or poor. If you are troubled with delay in your allotment money, I will see to it that you have immediate response and consideration. If you desire to learn anything about your boys in the service. I can help you. If you are having difficulty with any department of Government, get in touch with me. Remember, those in power and authority in Washington and elsewhere are your servants. You, the people are the masters of your own destiny. Be sure to write me if I can help you.

Buck Passing Will Not Win the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, while the President claims credit for all achievements, he follows the policy of indecision and buck passing which he has pursued ever since he was Governor of New York. He is greedy for power, but he will not assume responsibility.

The present dispute between Jeffers, Rubber Administrator, and Patterson and Ickes is typical. His so-called settlement of the soft-coal strike in 1941 is another illustration of the method of saying one thing, doing another. At that time he said:

The Government of the United States will not order, nor will Congress pass legislation ordering, a so-called closed shop.

Nevertheless, administrative agencies immediately began to force workers into unions.

His handling of the present coal strike will again demonstrate his method of saying one thing, doing another. Just a few days ago he called upon all to "hold the line," meaning that prices should not go up. Yet today there are indications that he intends to make concessions to Lewis' mine workers by way of wage increases or by forcing down the prices of farm products, which will make it impossible to "hold the line."

An editorial in the Chicago Tribune of April 30 puts the case clearly and accurately:

WHERE RESPONSIBILITY LIES

Congress has it on the word of Chairman Nelson of the War Production Board that the recent attacks upon Rubber Director Jeffers by Secretary Ickes and Under Secretary of War Patterson were unjustified. They charged that Mr. Jeffers' seal to keep the country rolling on rubber had prolonged the war by curbing production of aviation type gasoline.

Instead, Mr. Nelson's testimony made plain, the blame for any curtailment of gasoline production, and the Navy's delay in providing escort vessels and other ships to fight submarines, lies with the Army and Navy bureaucrats. Again they have demonstrated that they do not understand the war we are fighting.

All three programs—rubber, aviation gas, and escort vessels—are competing for such commonplace items as gages, valves, pumps, and heat exchangers. The rubber program was set up last June and given priorities which the Army and Navy production board approved. These were trimmed down in December and January, and Mr. Nelson said that he would not change the allocations if he were doing the job over.

Senator TRUMAN, chairman of the committee before which he was testifying, asked Mr. Nelson if he had had difficulty in getting the Army to cooperate in scheduling aviation gas requirements.

"It failed to anticipate anywhere near its present requirements," was the reply.

"And the Navy didn't make up its mind until last January about requirements for escort vessel construction," said Senator TRUMAN. "I thought this might be one reason for the present controversy."

"I think it is, sir," said Nelson.

But the real responsibility goes beyond Mr. Patterson, Mr Ickes, or Secretary Knox. Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan, struck upon it when he asked why the controversy was carried to the public. Mr. Nelson ducked. He said the answer lay in personalities, which he preferred not to discuss.

The answer lies in one personality, that of Mr. Roosevelt. It lies in the fact that he is an incompetent executive. He demonstrated that in peacetime and his deficiencies are magnified by the greater responsibilities of war The controversy went to the public because Mr. Roosevelt, as usual side-stepped it. No one but he can coordinate the war activities of the Government, and he is incapable of the task. The so-called indispensable man is the greatest single handicap to the efficient waging of the war.

American Federation of Labor Urges Congress To Renew Reciprocal Trade Agreements Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article appearing in the American Federation of Labor, a weekly news service, for April 27, 1943:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR URGES CONGRESS TO RENEW RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS LAW

WASHINGTON, D. C.—American Federation of Labor President William Green, appearing before the House Ways and Means Committee, urged Congress to renew President Roosevelt's authority to conclude reciprocal trade agreements with other countries.

"The Congress owes this duty to the peoples now enslaved by fascism, the millions who hope and long for the day when they attain their freedom and join with their liberators in the establishment of a lasting peace founded upon freedom, security, and mutual trust among nations."

Chairman Doughton of the Ways and Means Committee congratulated Mr. Green upon the statement he presented and added:

"The people of the United States owe you an everlasting debt for the great contribution you have made to the war effort by maintaining industrial peace and by expediting production."

Mr. Green emphasized that it would be a tragic mistake to change our policy with re-

gard to reciprocal trade agreements in the midst of a war when we must depend so heavily for aid and materials upon the nations of South America and other countries with whom such agreements have been negotiated. He added:

"What if Congress now, in the midst of the war, should reverse this policy by refusing to renew the authority for reciprocal trade pacts? In my opinion such refusal would shake to the very foundations the faith of our allies and of other nations in our leadership and our aims in this war. Such action would arouse suspicion over our motives and cast distrust over our willingness to participate in the reestablishment of a just and equitable economic order after the war.

"Most important of all, such refusal would undermine the war effort itself. It would arouse distrust in our policy, provide our enemies with a powerful weapon of disruption, and goad our allies into seeking other sources of economic stability and economic strength than America's post-war industry and trade.

"We must win this war. We cannot win it alone. The logic of our declared policy binds us to our allies in the present hostilities and in the future peace. The policy dictated by that logic must be pursued to conclusion if victory is to be won and if victory is to bring to us and other nations full opportunity for economic growth.

"The principle of reciprocity in international trade is paramount to the solution of our post-war economic problem. The continued application of this principle is essential to the achievement of full emloyment and to the preservation of our system of free enterprise. Thus the renewal of the reciprocal trade policy not only accords with the promises expressed by the United States to the peoples of the world, but also coincides with our own best interests.

"The evidence is conclusive that reciprocal trade agreements have made possible a substantial increase in the exports of American goods, resulting in a notable increase of employment in the industries concerned. This increased employment in export industries exceeded by far any possible displacement of labor which might have been brought about by the concessions we have made to other countries.

"Reciprocal trade agreements did not open the floodgates to the mass importation of foreign-made goods. The relative status of the United States as an importer from the trade agreement countries compared with the non-trade agreement countries remained stable from 1934 through 1939. On the other hand, the ratio of increase of American exports to trade agreement countries almost doubled in comparison with our exports to non-agreement countries.

"In this connection it is important to note that the largest share of benefits derived by the American workers from the reciprocal trade policy through these experts has been in higher wage industries. The record shows, at the same time, that the imports under the trade agreement program have not impaired the wage standards and have not resulted in job displacement as was feared by the opponents of the policy. This evidence demonstrates that the net effect of the program was to benefit the American worker by sustaining and expanding employment in the rescission of 1938.

"In the light of these facts I submit that labor in the United States has not suffered, but gained, from the application of the reciprocal trade policy. This policy enabled the United States to extend world markets for both agricultural and manufactured products.

"Assurance of outlets for our goods in a peace-time world market is imperative if a post-war depression is to be averted. Equally imperative is the assurance of cooperative reciprocity to other countries with which we are to trade. The responsibility for this assurance rests with Congress. American labor and the workers of other nations who are fighting this war with us look to Congress to discharge that responsibility and to make clear and decisive America's declaration of intentions toward the part it will assume in post-war reconstruction."

Production of Magnesium in Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by A. E. Cahlan, from the Las Vegas (Nev.) Evening Review-Journal of April 16, 1943:

Production at Basic Magnesium is now more than 100 tons per day. It hit the century mark during the visit here of Chairman Con Kelley and President Hobbins of Anaconda. Next milestone they're shooting at out there on the hillside, is to hit the mark that will make Basic Magnsium, Inc., the greatest producer of magnesium in the world.

At the moment, Dow Chemical's Texas plant, built by the Government, is turning out 7,400,000 pounds per month. Basic Magnesium, Inc., is running between 6,000,000 and 7,000,000 pounds with only 6 of the 10 units in production. It will be a gala occasion when the local plant pushes ahead of Dow, and it won't be long now. You'll hear more about this later.

There are two things going on out there at the moment that have the utmost significance. Before very long the chlorine problem will be history. That there ever was such a problem goes back to the moments of hysteria surrounding the discovery, shortly after the outbreak of the war, of an impending steel shortage. Orders were issued to cut the use of steel by a certain percentage, and it was up to the engineers in the field to figure out where.

The Army took a pot shot at the magnesium plant and knocked out 4 tons of steel in each of the 10 electrolysis units. With this steel went the ventilating system. It is now being restored, just as rapidly as critical materials will permit. Air now changed once every 10 or 15 minutes, will be changed every 60 seconds. In addition, all the gases at the plant will be neutralized. This will all be completed shortly, and you'll hear no more about chlorine trouble.

That's good news, for it means vastly improved working conditions, elimination of the only menace to health of workers now present in the plant. Many of the workmen now on the job are numbered among the unsung heroes of this war, risking as much as the men in the front lines, that the production of magnesium might go on.

Off in one corner of the vast area is a modest little building which from outward appearances isn't at all impressive. There are only two or three men at work there, and considered alongside the vast machinery of production, the little unit doesn't amount to much. No towering walls, no great electrical installations, no scurry and bustle of motion that marks most of the rest of the plant. But—

What goes on in there right now, may determine the future of the magnesium industry in these parts after the war. They're making castings in that building—castings from magnesium produced at the plant. There are all sorts of molds, large wheels, pulleys and such, all of which will be thoroughly tested to determine what this metal will do in the industrial field.

Magnesium is new in this country, and its qualities are far superior in strength and lightness, to aluminum which has a general usage. The latter metal is well established as monarch of the light metal field. Magnesium is an interloper. It must force its way in and prove itself against all the opposition the mighty King Aluminum can muster.

This process is just barely getting under way. It will take shape as production kinks are ironed out And in my humble judgment, magnesium will prove its utility—will prove its right to an important place in the vast development coming in the light metal field.

And this—the Basic Magnesium, Inc., plant—will be the proving ground, make no mistake about that. The men working in this little building I spoke of, are doing the job right now. They'll continue, and as time goes on, their work will be expanded. They're pioneering in a new field, and the results attained already, have been quite satisfactory.

There are many byproducts to be developed which will help the production cost considerably. And they will be developed as the plant goes into the groove of smooth production. It's my hunch, that the truly splendid executives and engineers Anaconda has sent out, will be able to get the cost of production down to a competitive basis for the post-war period, and that the Basic Magnesium, Inc., plant will become one of the great industries of the land in peacetime operation.

In my opinion, the big battle for Basic Magnesium, Inc.'s, existence will not be fought along this front, important as it is—but with the aluminum trust and the great international cartel which still seeks world control of all industry and markets. There are indications on every hand right now that no effort will be spared to knock Basic Magnesium, Inc., out of the picture as soon as the war is over.

It is my prediction that the local plant will come through this one successfully, too. But there'll be a fight in which Nevada's congressional delegation will have a major part.

St. Joseph County, Ind., Triples War Bond Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, St. Joseph County, Ind., is still the "bond buyingest" community in the Nation. This county was first assigned a war bond quota in the month of May 1942. That quota was oversubscribed, as has been every monthly quota since that date. In the month of September 1942 St. Joseph County set out to double its war bond quota and at the close of that drive it was my privilege to announce to the House that that objective had been attained.

The country has just completed a highly successful second War bond drive.

The national goal of $13,000,000,000 has been surpassed. As a part of that drive, St. Joseph County was assigned a quota of $6,070,000. To substantiate my statement that it is the "bond buyingest" community in the Nation, it is my privilege to report that that quota has been more than tripled.

Our section of the country, the Midwest, did more than its share in men and dollars in the winning of the First World War, but the $18,250,000 in War bonds sold in the month of April represents more than the total of all war loans in the entire county during the entire period of the First World War.

That is the kind of record that Americans everywhere are making today, and that is the kind of a record which will bring this war to an early and successful conclusion.

The following story appeared in the Sunday, May 2, edition of the South Bend Tribune, South Bend, Ind.:

Climaxing a year of monthly successes in oversubscribing War bond quotas, St. Joseph County today holds the distinction of tripling its $6,070,000 quota in the United States Treasury Department's second war loan drive.

Incomplete reports at the close of business Saturday indicated total sales of Government securities in the county since April 12 yere $19,145,796.75, according to William Klusmeier and Albert McGann, cochairmen of the county's war finance committee which directed the April drive. This total is $935,796 more than triple the county's quota. Final reports expected to be available Monday will raise that total, the cochairmen said.

In the opening week of the war loan drive the county doubled its quota. On the final day of the drive, Saturday, the triple figure was reached and exceeded. Mr. Klusmeier and Mr. McGann termed it "a glorious end to a year of outstanding achievement." The first War Bond quota was assigned to the county in May of 1942. Each successive month the War Bond quota was oversubscribed by the county's "champion War Bond buyers," and last September the quota was doubled.

When the county doubled its second war loan quota the cochairmen notified Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, in Washington. Saturday morning another telegram was sent to Mr. Morgenthau:

"Incomplete returns in St. Joseph County, Ind., today show this county, with a quota of $6,070,000, to have bought more than $18,250,000, which is triple our quota. We are a major county and have never missed a War Bond quota. We are just a little proud of our record in loaning money to the Government to finance this war."

That telegram was sent by the cochairmen as soon as they were sure that the country was over the triple mark. Later reports from agencies raised their sales figure.

Securities dealers, banks, and other sales agencies in the county extended themselves in promotion of Government securities during the drive. Big money responded with orders for millions. The "little fellow" came in strongly with purchase of series E War bonds and the series F and G securities which are within the purse limits of modest money. It was far from big money's show although the bulk of sales in the drive weighed in on the side of big corporations.

The county's War Savings staff, headed by Mr. Klusmeier, and the county's Victory loan commi'tee, headed by Mr. McGann, joined hands to form the war finance committee to put the drive over.

WSBT, the South Bend Tribune's broadcasting station, came in strong at the finish with pleas over the air to War bond buyers who were urged to order their bonds now. A total of $8,000 was sold through that medium with police squad cars delivering the bonds to purchasers who called the radio station by telephone. In Mishawaka bond buyers called the First National Bank and their bonds were delivered by police car.

Mr. Klusmeier said Federal Reserve figures show that the county's April investment in Government securities was more than the total of all war loans in the county during the last World War.

The national second war loan $13,000,000,000 goal already is reached and officials in Washington said Saturday that when the tabulations are completed next week the sales figure is expected to be in excess of $16,000,000,000.

Address of Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable James A. Farley before the Men's Club, Temple Beth-Emeth of Flatbush, Brooklyn, N. Y., Wednesday, April 21, 1943:

When Charlie Burston asked me to come over here and talk to you I was, frankly, very flattered because I had heard of the fine men's club which had been built up here, placing it in the forefront of such organizations in the city and in this country. But, at the same time, I was more than hesitant because I did not feel that I, who had spent most of my years in public life, was qualified to address an organization which held so carefully aloof from questions of a political nature.

So I asked Mr. Burston what he wanted me to talk to you about and he said, "Write your own ticket." Well, I am afraid I can scarcely compete with the eloquence of your spiritual leader, Rabbi Levinson, and with the scholarship of some of the distinguished men who have spoken from this very platform. Nevertheless, I must confess I felt the urge to get together with men who find time in a daily busy life to come together and discuss the spiritual values of our community.

What I should like to talk to you about tonight, from the standpoint of an average layman, is a subject on which volumes have been written and millions of words spoken. I mean faith. By that I don't intend to imply any particular faith or manner of worship—I mean the simple faith with which every human being is endowed by his Creator at birth. It is easy to say, "have faith," but people are human and very often, no matter how hard they try, their faith is shaken in ideas and ideals that have often been set up and have been found to rest on shaky foundations.

We thought that in the twentieth century we had reached a fairly high plane of civilization. We thought that tolerance, friendship, and understanding were being brought to an almost perfect realization. Of course, we had our national and international quarrels, we had our differences of opinions, but at least we sought to get together in an effort to smooth the path to better understanding.

And then came the great shock. A group of international gangsters brought out almost overnight their engines of destruction and the whole world was set afire. It is blazing now and the question that we are asking ourselves is, "Will we be able to extinguish the flame?" For the moment it is not a question of sitting around a table and talking it over in a spirit of give and take and with a genuine desire to find a solution. That, I am afraid must wait for the future.

The only thing that concerns us at the moment is to destroy completely the gangsters who, if victorious, will throw civilization into a state bordering on chaos. And they, alas, have been responsible for the weakening of the faith of millions who see nothing but disaster ahead of them. It is indeed needless for me to tell you how important it is to win this war.

Democracy—we have been hearing that word on every hand—in the newspapers, on the radio, in public forums, at patriotic rallies, and yet there are many who are apt to miss the real significance and meaning of democracy. There is still some intolerance and unfriendliness and where those exist we cannot have true democracy. On the other hand, it is encouraging to know that Catholic, Jew, and Protestant are getting together more than ever in an effort to bring about a closer coordination between these three great creeds. The good balances the evil, but so long as there is a single vestige of intolerance in this country, we will not have attained the fullest fruits of democracy, and I say to you tonight, that it is a tribute to democracy that I, a Catholic, am invited to speak before the members of an organization allied with a Jewish Temple.

Such a thing could not happen in Nazi Germany. I might mention other countries where such a procedure would be impossible. Yet not so long ago a great welfare organization, holding a Sunday broadcast, had a Jewish Rabbi, a Catholic priest, and a Protestant minister, as well as the choirs of the three denominations, who joined in a religious program. I ask you, Where else in the world could such a thing happen? Think of it! Three clergymen of three different faiths and their choirs, under one roof—each one speaking his mind without the slightest restriction or regulation as to what he wished to say. There it is—freedom of worship and freedom of speech.

Talk about a league of nations; why, we have a league of nations in the city of New York. Side by side live men and women as friendly neighbors—8,000,000 of them, men and women of all extractions—Germans, Italians, Greeks, Jews, Irish, Russians, Bulgarians, Armenians—well, I could go on and on, but you know as well as I do that in the melting pot of which Israel Zangwill spoke many years ago there has been blended a form of real democracy that will never be destroyed. Yes; these people may have their quarrels and misunderstandings, but they have breathed in the air of democracy and they found it so inspiring and so stirring that they will fight to the death any attempt to take it away from them. Read the casualty lists that come from abroad and see how many names suggest the origin of those who found America a haven and a refuge.

For as their parents threw off the shackles of their oppressors years ago and came to this country because they had a genuine faith in democracy, so their sons, in the same spirit, will stand on the battle line to fight for the maintenance of that freedom.

No, I am not pessimistic I have faith in democracy, and I have faith in the future of this country. Out of it all I believe will spring a greater and nobler America. I see the time when the last vestige of intolerance will have been eliminated from the life of our Nation. If we hold that faith in democracy is essential to our survival, then we must also hold that faith in a Supreme Being is also essential to the highest welfare of our society.

As I stand here on this platform talking to the members of a Jewish men's club, my thoughts go back to the time when the Father of his Country, facing disaster, retired and kneeled and prayed; I am thinking of Eddie Rickenbacker in the hopeless predicament in which he found himself on the wide expanse of the Pacific, and I can see in my mind's eye those men, after being 21 days in the rubber boat, kneeling and offering up a simple prayer to God—and the faith of Washington and Rickenbacker and millions of others never falters, it is the same kind of faith that is now part of the fighting spirit against totalitarian tyranny It is something that I cannot explain, and I venture to say that no one has really been able to explain with any degree of reasonable accuracy the philosophy of faith Yet it is a feeling that is so ennobling, so soul-filling, that without it human beings would perish.

We have faith in those boys on the battle line. It is that faith which really holds together our home front. For in a broad sense all the activities of those at home are predicated on the single thought that they must be victorious if democracy is to survive.

When we pray for ourselves we ask for personal well-being, success, and numerous other things that human beings desire. But when we pray for those boys we not only beseech Divine Providence to guide them, but by implication we pray for the ultimate well-being of all men and women and children on the face of the globe We know that only under a democracy can men live as brothers.

This brings me back in thought to over 150 years ago, when five men met as a committee in a little house in Philadelphia to consider ways and means of forming a government which Abraham Lincoln later characterized as a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." These men were Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Roger Sherman, and Robert Livingston. They sat around a table and talked over plans to knit together 13 colonies into a strong government that would function as a true republic of the people. Out of these gatherings in Philadelphia came the Declaration of Independence.

History does not record the exact conversations that occurred at these meetings, but if we give our imagination a little play we can almost guess what they said. They were probably not very different in discussions than men would be today if they sat around to debate or formulate a plan. They are charged with the responsibility of doing something tangible and they undoubtedly approached their problem with a full sense of the sacredness and importance of their task. I have no doubt that from the very outset these five founding fathers of the Republic had faith in the people who had turned to them for preliminary guidance. They believed that the people themselves could be trusted to carry out, through democratic processes, the ideas and ideals underlying a democratic community. That faith in the people is clearly shown in the very utterances of Franklin, Jefferson, and Adams, and in weaving the pattern of our Republic, they never lost sight of the fact that the real rulers of their destiny were the people themselves. They had faith in the people.

When the founding fathers began to make known the results of their deliberations, they kindled a creative spark in the people. That is to say, they inspired the community to give impetus to the ideas of Franklin, Jefferson, and Adams, for, not only did the founding fathers have unswerving faith in the people, but the people had faith in themselves and were willing to pay with their lives in order that a great democracy might form the basis of the Republic that was about to be born.

As I said a moment ago, I am certainly not pessimistic. From humble beginnings we have grown into a great democratic Nation. It is not enough that we had the material resources to build a nation—we also needed an unqualified faith in our destiny. The seed that the fighting fathers planted has blossomed into America—the finest flower of democracy!

We have been reading of the atrocities committed by the Nazis in their incredible campaign of extermination of the Jews from Central Europe. It has made us heartsick, and no matter to what faith we belong, we have prayed and hoped that the United Nations would find some way to save the remnants scattered in the concentration and labor camps of central Europe. You may say to me, "If such a thing has happened, how can we have faith in the kindness of men?" Yet, I have not lost my faith in the ultimate destiny of civilization. The Jews have gone through many troubled and tortured periods in the past, and they have always survived. In the times that followed these trials and tribulations, they have played a stronger and nobler role in the progress of civilization, and so it shall be when Hitler and his satellites will be just a bad memory. The Jews had faith in their own destiny and the world has faith in them as a great race.

And so may I close with an incident described in a book by James Hilton called, The Story of Dr. Wassell. The scene is somewhere on the front, the hour is late, and a Dutch padre and a doctor are talking and reminiscing after a hard day. The doctor is getting a little drowsy and then he thinks of something and turns to the padre and says, "Padre, how do you feel about a bit of a prayer tonight before we turn in?" The padre replies, "Certainly, doctor." So they both knelt beside the bunk and prayed, the padre in Dutch The doctor said the Lord's Prayer first of all, and then, "O God, we thank Thee for keeping us safe so far. O God, keep on keeping us safe. Give all the boys a quick recovery and look after Renny, and let's win the war good and proper this time so all the boys can go home. In God's name, amen."

The doctor and padre arose. The doctor had never been good at impromptu praying, but he turned to the padre and said, "Now I feel much better."

It is significant that the nations, the governing personalities of which practice the simple faith, exemplified by this story, have possessed the strength to overcome the materialistic initial advantages of the aggressor nations, and are speeding on the way to victory The year just passed has depicted the power of faith over ruthless narrowness. Despite any of the hardships of today, we in America can go our individual ways as free citizens, in the full confidence that the practice of faith will bring from on high, blessings on the efforts of our Commander in Chief, our armed forces, and the whole citizenry of this great empire of States Our progress will be a shining example emblazoning the way to a peaceful world, wherein all men can lead their lives according to the dictates of their own conscience, in harmony and contentment.

In the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock from the New York Times of April 29, 1943:

IN THE NATION—THE WANTON WAYS OF CONGRESS WITH TARIFF BILLS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—Congress has a very bad record in tariff legislation because of the selfish nature of the subject. Once posed, the issue of the tariff always and instantly produces pressure groups seeking various advantages. Divided, none of the blocs can be sure of getting its share of the spoils. United, nearly all of them can get substantially what they are after. The results, with one or two exceptions, have been log-rolling tariff acts in which rates were raised and a static economy of nationalism was strengthened against the rest of the world.

This nationalistic economy helped greatly to bring on the present war by closing American markets to peoples abroad who needed access to them to acquire or maintain fair living standards. Our attempt was to sell as much as we could to everybody at high profits and buy as little as we could from them at the lowest possible cost. It was to correct this condition—to substitute what Representative ROBERTSON, of Virginia, calls an expanding economy for a static one, and provide a surer means to preserve it—that the present Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, devised the reciprocal tariff-agreements system.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT

The rights of Congress to control tariffs were retained by a careful limitation of the negotiating and contracting powers that Congress delegated to the Executive in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Congress in this legislation "established a trade policy for the United States and provided for periodical review of the administration of this policy," as accurately stated in a memorandum supporting renewal of the act which was issued this week by Mrs. Harris T. Baldwin of the National League of Women Voters. Thus, Congress has not surrendered its function to the Executive, but simply loaned a part of it under specified conditions. And it has not been responsibly charged that this loan has been abused or that it was unconstitutional to make it.

Because of all these facts, the Republican proposal—that henceforth trade agreements shall not take effect until a majority of both branches of Congress has had 60 or 90 days in which to cancel them if it so elects—is destructive of all the gains under the system. It would turn the American tariff back toward log-rolling and a static economy. It would replant the seeds of world war which the United Nations are now uprooting. And it would restore no lost authority to Congress because Congress has not lost any.

A PERILOUS LURE

Yet the Republican proposal has a very special lure to many who would have opposed it heretofore, and, since the division of renewing the act substantially as it stands is close, that lure is perilous. It is founded in the healthy circumstance that after years of supine surrender to the Executive, Congress is reasserting and recapturing its powers, and that is all to the good. To many the argument is appealing that a provision for congressional review of each trade agreement is a logical step in the renaissance of Congress.

Another alluring argument in favor of the proposed amendment to the act is this: Some post-war settlements will be made in the form of agreements instead of treaties, requiring a majority of each branch for ratification instead of merely two-thirds of the Senate. It is unthinkable that these agreements should not be subject to congressional approval. Since trade pacts lie at the root of post-war settlements, why should these be exempt from that submission?

REASONS AGAINST

The answer is that they are not exempt because they are formulated within the limits and in the manner specified by Congress. Congress, if it chose, could draw up specifications for other post-war agreements. But that device, which is practical and sensible in the matter of making trade pacts, is not so in the matter of the other agreements that are to be drawn. Congress should not loan even specified powers of review with respect to the latter. Yet it could if it wanted to.

The chief reason why the Hull method is so great a forward step in tariff making is, as said before, the wanton ways of Congress with this kind of legislation. Any congressional consideration of a group of tariff items nearly always brings on a general revision, logrolling, increased rates, and a higher wall to shut off our markets from the rest of the world. If, therefore, Mr. Hull is obliged to negotiate with one eye on Capitol Hill we shall revert to the worst tariff eras and the reciprocal program will be dead.

It might be recalled that President McKinley had come to this conclusion shortly before his death. He had been directed by Congress to negotiate reciprocal treaties—not agreements—incorporating limited reductions. Not one emerged from the Senate committee. At the time of his assassination McKinley was making ready to renew the fight for ratification and in his last speech he endorsed the position which Mr. Hull has made our international economic policy. But McKinley did not have the legislative instrument; Mr. Hull invented it later. It has worked well and should not have its edge taken off.

Bombing of Rome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW J. MERRITT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Tablet of Brooklyn, N. Y., on April 24, 1943:

On March 26, London newspapers carried headlines anncuncing that the Royal Air Force bombed the suburbs of the city of Rome. The Italian Government confirmed this in a communiqué statin~ that attacks by British airplanes were made at Camp Leone, 21 miles by rail and at Cisterna, 31 miles outside of Rome.

Now while Vatican City is the residence of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, and encloses also the Basilica of St. Peter's, yet, both Vatican City and the 400 churches outside of Vatican City and the 365 religious houses, convents, monasteries, and institutions, are an integral and inseparable part of the Holy Father's diocese as the Bishop of Rome.

The fact that the warring nations are engaged in this great conflict against the warning and protest of the sovereign pontiff has not made Rome a party on either side or other than what it always has been and will be, namely, the Eternal City.

For Rome, the Eternal City, is neither a city nor a capital in the same sense as Tokyo, Berlin, Vienna, or London. Rome is the mother of all nations. She belongs to the world. Rome belongs to 331,000,000 Catholics including 40,000,000 Catholics in North America, 61,000,000 Catholics in South America, to millions of Frenchmen, Irishmen, Spaniards, Portuguese, Italians, Australians, Canadians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Bavarians, Germans, Austrians, Asiatics, Africans, Poles, and many others all over the world.

Rome belongs to the 2,000,000 Catholics in Massachusetts, to millions of Catholics in New York State, to 2,000,000 of Catholics in Pennsylvania, to the million and a half Catholics in New Jersey, to the 2,000,000 Catholics in Ohio, and Illinois, the Catholics in California, Texas, Oregon, to say nothing of the 12,000,000 of Catholics in other States besides the 60,000,000 Catholics in Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Mexico, Peru, Colombia, Uruguay, and many other South American countries.

Moreover, each one of the cardinals all over the globe is the designated protector and patron of a church in Rome.

PRESERVED FOR AGES

Rome has been preserved by the Christians of all ages and of all countries—and it still is. Its treasures are gifts from every country, from every nation. They constitute the priceless history of mankind. But far transcending the great art treasures, paintings, sculptures, mosaics, altars, each offering the genius of every age, far exceeding all of these are the sacred soil of the martyrs, the Circus Maximus, the catacombs, the sepulchers of SS. Peter and Paul the holy remains of countless popes and saints.

These are not the property of any nation, but of every nation. They belong to the entire Christian world. To bomb Rome constitutes an outrage on humanity itself. No benefit can possibly come to anyone in bombing Rome.

To bomb Rome would be a foul and dreadful desecration of the Cross of Christ, the relics of His crucifixion, of the Christian martyrs, the shrines, and even the bodies of the saints. Among the countless hallowed places which could be ruthlessly blown to shreds by a bomb attack are the following:

The Church of Santa Maria Maggiore, containing the column to which Jesus was bound for His scourging; the Chapel of Domine Quo Vadis, covering the spot where Peter, fleeing from death in Rome, met Christ coming into Rome by the Appian Way. "Lord, where goest Thou?" the Apostle asked; and Christ answered: "To be crucified again."

The Church of St. Agnes, which stands on a part of the ground where St. Agnes was exposed to shame and where she was put to death; the Church of St. Cecilia, built upon the site of her home and in which was buried the body of that great saint; the Church of St. Giuseppi dei Falagnami; built upon the ancient Tullian dungeon where St. Peter was imprisoned.

The Church of St. Lawrence, built upon the cemetery grounds where St. Lawrence is buried and which has a sacred relic—the original gridiron upon which the saint suffered martyrdom.

WHERE SAINTS WERE IMPRISONED

The Church of St. Maria in Lata, where St. Paul and St. Mark were imprisoned; the Church of SS. Martin and Luca, which contains the body of St. Martina, the Roman martyr; the Church of St. Pudentiana, which contains the wooden table used by St. Peter as an altar for the celebration of the Eucharist.

The Church of St. Maria (sopra Minerva), erected on the ruins of a temple of Minerva. This was the titular church of the late Cardinals McCloskey and Farley, of New York. Beneath the high altar rests the body of St. Catherine of Sienna.

The Church of St. Clement, Pope and martyr. This is the titular church of Cardinal William O'Connell, of Boston. It was the paternal home of the saint whose name it bears; the Church of St. Bonaventure, which contains the body of St. Leonard of Port Maurice; the Church of St. Bernardo alle Terme, which is built on the site of the baths of the Roman Emperor Diocletian.

The Church of St. Crisogono, the titular church of the great Cardinal Stephen Langton who forced King John of England to sign the Magna Charta; the Church of St. Paul Outside the Walls, begun in the year 200, is the burial place of that great Apostle. In 1823 it was destroyed by fire. The whole world contributed to its restoration. The Khedive of Egypt sent pillars of alabaster; the Emperor of Russia sent the precious malachite and lapis lazuli.

The mausoleum of St. Constanza the daughter of Constantine the Great; the Church of the Holy Cross founded by St. Helena wherein the relics of the True Cross are preserved; the Church of St. Augustine in whose Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament is the tomb of St. Monica, the mother of St. Augustine; the Church of St. Lawrence which covers the cemetery in which the body of that saint was buried.

The Church of St. Bartholomew containing the relics of that great saint; the Church of St. John Lateran containing portions of the Holy Crib and relics of the great Apostle St. Matthew; the Church of St. Cyril in which the body of this saint is buried in the basilica; the Church of The Gesu where among the relics on the Altar of St. Francis Xavier is preserved an arm of that saint; the Church of St. Ignatius which contains the bodies of St. Aloysius and St. John Berchmans; the Church of St. Isidore belonging to the Irish Franciscans.

The Church of Saint Maria in Ara Coeli built upon the site of the ancient citadel of Rome and the Temple of Juno; the Church of SS. John and Paul in whose basilica rests the body of St. Paul of the Cross, founder of the Passionist Order; the Church of St. Peter in Vincoli built in the year 431, and which contains in a precious reliquary the chains worn by St. Peter in Jerusalem and in Rome, presented to Pope Sixtus III by the Empress Eudoxia. In the adjoining cemetery the bones of 2,300 martyrs taken from the Catacombs are buried.

The Church of St. Salvadore della Santa Scala, the church of the Passionists which, according to legend, contains the stairs of Pilate's praetorium which were bathed with the Blood of Christ; the Church of St. Stephen, erected on the ruins of the Temple of Isis, belonging to the Trinitarians.

FROM WHERE SAINT AUGUSTINE WENT FORTH

The Church of St. Gregory from which Pope Gregory the Great sent forth St. Augustine from the adjoining Benedictine Monastery with 40 monks to preach Christianity to England; St. Peter's Basilica is built upon the exact spot where St. Peter was crucified head down in the gardens of Nero. The erection of St. Peter's was begun by Emperor Constantine the Great. St. Peter's contains the towel with which Veronica wiped the face of Christ; also the head of St. Andrew, also the lance which pierced the Saviour's side; also the bodies of the two Apostles Simeon and Jude Thaddeus.

All true Christians will shrink with horror at the thought of the destruction of these and countless other priceless records, archives and monuments of Christian faith and its achievements, linking all Christendom back through the ages, not only to the Apostles, but directly to Jesus Christ the Redeemer of all mankind.

Napoleon the Great sent a French army into Spain, which was received by the Spanish people with friendly spirit. But when the French soldiers began to desecrate the Spanish churches, the enraged Spanish people turned on them literally and tore his army to pieces.

The Communists, atheists, and pagans the world over will exult if Rome, the imperial capital of Christendom, with its churches, tombs, altars, monuments, relics of the True Cross, and other relics, becomes a huge conflagration, and the sacred bones of its holy martyrs consumed and lost forever.

What Kind of a Peace Must It Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a sermon by Dr. Clifford E. Barbour, of Knoxville, Tenn., on the subject What Kind of a Peace Must It Be?

WHAT KIND OF A PEACE MUST IT BE?

The subject this morning is, What Kind of a Peace Must It Be? and the text is the well known phrase out of the Book of Proverbs, chapter 29, verse 18:

"Where there is no vision, the people perish."

There has been a good deal of criticism lately of any talk of peace, and particular criticism of those who seek to discover what kind of a peace it should be. People are saying, "Get on with the war. That is our responsibility at the moment. That is our burden. We cannot get away from the war. Get on with the war and then talk about peace."

Well, in the days when we used to be able to take our cars for a cross country ride, there were times when we were forced to travel along a difficult detour. We had to watch what we were doing; we had to be careful of the pit-holes and the ruts; we had to take care of the narrow places and the ditches on either side; we had to be careful of the sharp turns and the dangers thereof. But we also kept our attention on the way to get back to the main highway, and we always had in our mind the destination where we wanted to arrive. Now, we're on a detour—a difficult detour, full of pit-holes—with many dangers that might bring disaster to the progress we would like to make. We must give our attention to the demands of the detour, but we also want to know how to get back on the main highway, and where we want to go after that.

There are a great many who have been describing the kind of a destination they want our world to achieve—a great many—the Town Hall of the Air, the Prime Minister of England, the Assistant Secretary of State, the defeated candidate for President—all have been producing descriptions of the destination they think the world should want to win. The Federal Council of Churches, and even Mr. Ely Culbertson has now produced a book on what kind of a destination we should want to arrive at after the war. Everyone is describing the destination. I don't want to describe the destination. I want to suggest something about the highway that will get us there.

We have tried again and again, throughout history, to lift mankind immediately out of war into peace, forgetting that peace is the achievement of progression—not something that comes with victory. Peace is something to be won not through arms but through effort. About 75 years ago there was completed in London the famous Crystal Palace, to signify to all mankind that men have now learned to live together in peace and amity. In several short years Germany and France were at each other's throats. Just after the turn of the century there was completed in The Hague through the gift of Andrew Carnegie, the Peace Palace, to mark again the achievement by mankind of peace. And in a few short years we were engaged again in a bloody struggle. Following that struggle we established the League of Nations, and the Kellogg Peace Pact was signed by every civilized country in the world, signifying that never again—never again—would we resort to arms to settle differences between peoples. That scrap of paper has been blown to the winds.

We've tried again and again I say, to lift man out of war into peace, forgetting that it is a matter of progression. We must remember that, "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

What kind of a vision?

I

Well, first it must be a long view. We must remember that getting out of the detour and on to the highway is only an event, and peace must be an experience.

One of the outstanding books of the last few weeks and one that will be outstanding for many more months, by Herbert Agar, "A Time for Greatness," has this to say:

"Germany and Japan stand for the doctrine that the strong must conquer and enslave the weak, for that is the law of life—as it was the law of the Spanish Main, as it is the law of the wilderness. Here are eternal opposites. The United States has become the shield and symbol of freedom, and Germany is the shield and symbol of piracy. It is not complacency to admit this fact; it is humility. We have not yet deserved the responsibilities which are ours; but we have inherited them. If we try to deny them we shall lose our souls.

"One awkward truth about our position is that Germany and Japan, standing for piracy, can establish their world upon the field of battle. We cannot. Victory in the field is everything for them; they have attained their end when they have spilled sufficient blood. Victory in the field is barely a beginning for us. It is essential, yet it is nothing in itself."

We must win a military victory, but getting off the detour and onto the highway is only an event; peace is an experience. We must have a far view, a long view, and, as we travel along the highway that we know will lead us to peace, there are some things we will have to do. That takes me to the second thing.

II

"Where there is no vision, the people perish." The view has to be a long view, but it also has to be a calm view.

Whatever is done after military victory must not be done in the heat of anger. After the strain of enduring the difficulties and the dangers of the detour, we must relax if we are to travel successfully along the highway. We must have calmness to give us judgment. And in the words of probably the second greatest peacemaker that has ever lived, "With malice toward none, and charity for all, we must do the right as God gives us to see the right."

Notice, he says, "the right"—not rights. In anger people seek to secure their rights. When two neighbors go to law, they go to law to secure their rights. When they sit on the back porch and talk it over, they come to see what is right. We must seek to know what is right rather than seek to secure our rights.

So we must have a calm view as we journey along with our caravan. The colonial peoples as well as the conquered people must be taken into our progression. The misled people as well as the misused people must become part of our entourage. If this is to be the century of the common man, then all things must be common: the basic resources for physical living must belong to all; the avenues for health and happiness must be open to all; education for all; religion for all—so that the common man may not merely have his desires satisfied—oh no—but that the common man may become uncommon.

And as the Bishop of Long Island said in his sermon last Sunday in New York, "Nothing is settled unless it is settled right." Differences between neighbors are never settled until they are settled right. Differences between groups are never settled until they are settled right. And we see, year by year by year, what happens when groups seek their rights, forgetting the right.

III

Well, this war will never end until we seek, "with malice toward none, but with charity for all"—under the guidance of God, to discover what is right among men. That requires the long view, the calm view, and a kind view.

If we want that which is right, we shall have to do what most Americans will find it difficult to do—and those Americans who have been hurt will find it hardest to do—we must forgive our enemies. If we want peace we must forgive our enemies, and by some means we must get him to accept that forgiveness. We must both learn to sit down on the back porch as good neighbors and settle our differences as friends. If we want peace, there is no other way.

Dorothy Thompson, in her column some months ago, said:

"Machiavelli, who is a much misunderstood and misinterpreted philosopher * * * said that the only way to treat a conquered nation was either utterly to destroy it—lay waste the land, and uproot and destroy the race in stock and branch—or immediately integrate it indissolubly into a new international order."

The last time we tried to get away with doing neither of these things. There a few in our world who would like to do the first—to destroy our enemies stock and branch, utterly to wipe them off the face of the earth—there are a few like that. Most of us are not like that. But most of us do not have enough wisdom, and enough faith, to forgive. The last time we neither destroyed our enemy nor accepted him, with the result that we have on our hands what we have on our hands. Had we been wise enough to integrate him again into an international society in which he would have had a decent chance with all others, we wouldn't have had this present war on our hands. And if we don't this time, then our little babies will have another one on their hands. Either we must destroy him—wipe him off the face of the earth—or we must accept him. There is no middle ground.

IV

We must learn to practice Christianity. That's the last view that we must have in this vision—the Christian view, the view which follows the pattern of the Golden Rule: "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you even so to them"—the view which, recognizing the differences that exist among peoples, develops mutual respect among peoples; the view which recognizing qualities that are different among men, recognizes also the personality that is common to all men. It means treating other people as members also of the family of God—all other peoples.

A person who does not treat the members of his own family with the same respect that he desires to have from them, is not worthy of the name of brother. The person who only uses his family to get what he wants in life, is unworthy of his family. And if we claim kinship of God, we must live as brothers of all of God's children, else we are unworthy of sonship.

"Where there is no vision, the people perish." Unless we catch that vision—a long view, a calm view, and a Christian view about life—unless we do—we might as well give up hope.

In February 1861 Lincoln said this—mind you, he had the war all ahead of him; he was in front of serious pitholes—he said this:

"If we do not make common cause to save the good old ship of the Union on this voyage,

nobody will have a chance to pilot her on another voyage."

We can apply the same words to our day. If we don't make common cause to save the ship of human civilization on this voyage, nobody will have a chance to pilot her on any other voyage for a long, long time. This is the kind of a peace it must be.

Our Father, touch us—touch each of us—with a sense of his own responsibility toward making the world a fit place, a decent place, a clean place, for our children and our children's children, and for the sake of our Lord and his God. We ask for Jesus' sake. Amen.

The Shipshaw Project in Canada Is Paid for Without Interest by Credulous Uncle Sam

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I. F. Stone in The Nation recently wrote an intriguing article discussing the disturbing facts connected with the Shipshaw project. In subsequent talks on the House floor I shall elaborate upon that project in all of its aspects. I shall reveal how this project was given the green light while simultaneously public power projects in the United States were denied priorities of sufficient grade to enable them to secure the critical material needed to complete the various enterprises. The Shipshaw project in Canada will be completed in November 1943. Significantly, all features connected with it were kept secret until they were inadvertently disclosed in newspaper dispatches to the New York Times, dated January 30, 1943.

I have introduced House Resolution 212, which is now pending before the House Rules Committee, the purpose of which is to have Congress create a special committee to investigate the Shipshaw project, as well as other seeming discriminations against power developments and projects in the United States. The Shipshaw project is owned by the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd., a subsidiary of the Aluminum Trust. We have retarded in this country the development of the light-metals industry; we have held back magnesium manufacture; we have refused to promote or discouraged the making of aluminum by processes or means other than those approved by the Aluminum Trust. It is time that Americans woke up to the dangers and insist that the practices against which I have heretofore inveighed should stop.

The article from The Nation is as follows:

THE SHIPSHAW SCANDAL

(By I. F. Stone)

WASHINGTON, March 28.—Curiously enough, none of the Congressmen who were so scornful of Tennessee Valley Authorities on the Danube have said anything about Shipshaw on the Saguenay. To establish public-power projects in foreign countries is philanthropic folly but to endow a dam in Canada for the Aluminum Trust is statesmanship. So at least I read the minds of these Congressmen and of some sectors of the conservative press. Mind reading is necessary, because they have decided to keep as quiet as possible about the affair. From their point of view, there has already been too much talking by well-meaning but unsophisticated friends. For the whole deplorable revelation, it seems, is due neither to PM nor to the Washington Merry-Go-Round but to the New York Times, which in all innocence and with no intent whatsoever to muckrake, let slip a hint of the facts. "If only they hadn't printed that story," said a Power Trust stooge in a Washington hotel lobby after a day of arduous labor at the War Production Board. "That story" is the dispatch from Ottawa published by the New York Times last January 31, "New power plant gives Quebec lead." The tip-off (the ivory-towered editors of the New York Times have grown unused to the wicked ways of crusading journalism) was the sentence which said, with childlike delight and ingenuousness, "Not the least amazing thing about it [the Shipshaw power development on the Saguenay River in Quebec] is that it is already paid for. * * *"

On investigation, it turned out that this $65,900,000 project, which will not be completed until November, was more than paid for months ago. Inquiry, subterranean inquiry (for Jesse Jones does not make a fetish of candor), in Washington by Drew Pearson and this correspondent disclosed that Jesse Jones had given the Aluminum Co. of Canada an advance of $68,500,000 interest free under contracts signed in the spring of last year. This was enough to pay the entire cost of the project, plus a pourboire of $2,600,000. The day after this was published in the Merry-Go-Round and PM, C. D. Howe, Canadian Minister of Munitions and Supply, rose in the House of Commons at Ottawa to explain—and there were further disclosures. Howe picked up a copy of the Ottawa Evening Citizen which carried a summary of the American stories headed "Canadian plant is financed by American funds." "As a matter of fact," Howe explained disingenuously, "this is wholly inaccurate. The Shipshaw development was built with the corporate funds of the Aluminum Corporation of Canada." Later, under prodding from nasty members of the opposition, Howe was a little more explicit, though almost as bland. "An advance payment was asked for the metal," Howe said of the aluminum to be produced with the power to be generated at Shipshaw, "and the money received was not capital; it was revenue—in other words, the sale of a product and the payment for it." That the entire cost of the project was paid off in advance, an interest-free advance payment against aluminum to be delivered by the end of 1945, is presumably a mere detail. Many a manufacturer would like to do business with the Government on such a basis. This, to adapt the terminology used by critics of railroad labor, is indeed featherbed financing.

Howe's explanation revealed that the British had also made an advance payment "of the order of $10,000,000 to $12,000,000" and Australia of "I think $3,000,000 or $4,000,000"—he was oddly vague. He also disclosed that the Aluminum Company of Canada had the aid of the government of Canada in obtaining these not unfavorable terms. The plant might have been built with the proceeds of a loan at interest from the three governments, but of this conventional method Howe disapproved. "I took objection," Howe declared, "to other governments lending money to the company to meet the capital outlay subject to repayment after the war. We have tried to avoid burdens of that kind. What was finally evolved and accepted by the purchasers was that the Aluminum Company would sell at the current market price a block of aluminum to the three companies totaling the figure I have just given." Howe had not given it, but the advances obviously total $81,500,000 to $84,500,000. The Aluminum Company itself seemed to consider these arrangements somewhat better than the "common practices" they were termed by Howe. For the Ottawa Hansard reports this amusing tidbit during the debate:

"Mr. COLDWELL. If I may ask a question, is it not fair to say that by advance payment on future purchases of aluminum the United States is assisting in paying for this plant, as are also other governments?

"Mr. HOWE. No. I am coming to that now.

"Mr. COLDWELL. I have their prospectus before me, and they make that statement.

"Mr. HOWE. Do not mix up two things."

Howe did not specify what he meant by "two things." Perhaps one of them was what one may properly boast of to one's shareholders; the other, how one should discreetly explain it to the public.

This is more than another case of financial favoritism to the Aluminum Co. That is an old story at the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This is part of what will be seen more clearly in later years as a gigantic plan to enable the Aluminum Trust to dominate the power and aluminum business in North America. It demands investigation, and it is good to see that Senator TRUMAN, to whom we owe earlier aluminum revelations, has addressed an inquiry on it to Jesse Jones and that Congressman COFFEE of Washington has introduced a resolution in the House calling for a joint Congressional investigation. Unless there is pressure upon Congress, the Coffee resolution will be buried, and the Truman committee may let the sheer volume of its activities distract it from the Shipshaw scandal. The Northwest, the Southeast, and New York State are the areas from which that pressure should come, for enough is known to show that public-power developments in the Columbia River basin, in the Tennessee Valley, and in the St. Lawrence area were sidetracked to make way for Shipshaw. More important than the financial terms granted the Aluminum Co. by Jones is the fact that Shipshaw was given preferential treatment on priorities at the War Production Board while major additions to capacity at Grand Coulee and Tennessee Valley Authority and a badly needed transmission line between New York City and the St. Lawrence were stalled and finally shelved.

Had these American projects been private and the Shipshaw project public, there would long ago have been an outcry from the press, for Shipshaw has been built in the Canadian wilds under the most difficult of circumstances while much more accessible sources of power here have been ignored. I quote again from the tell-tale New York Times account of Shipshaw: "For many months it has been a 'hush-hush' war mystery not to be written about. * * * But strange tales circulated in Quebec Province about how the work was being carried on in temperatures 30 degrees below zero, of the blasting of 18,000 cubic yards of solid rock, of the big dam at Lake Manouan, 170 air-line miles up in the wilderness, where there is no railroad and no road, so that everything, men, horses, and thousands of tons of equipment, including bulldozers, trucks, and steam shovels, had to be flown in."

Compare these conditions with Grand Coulee, where a dam and a powerhouse wait for three generators long ago authorized by Congress, generators which would add close to 350,000 kilowatts of capacity to the Bonneville area. Compare these conditions with the Tennessee Valley Authority, where Congress has authorized downstream generating

units with some 600,000 extra kilowatts of capacity. Why were these and smaller public-power projects in California's Central Valley denied priorities on generators and turbines while equipment was rushed to Shipshaw? Why was copper sent to Shipshaw, though it was denied, despite the President's instructions and the War Department's approval, to the Massena-New York transmission line which is all we need to tap the 500,000 kilowatts of capacity now idle in the New York City area? How the New Dealers would be trounced for their impracticality and for sacrificing the war effort to public power if the situation were the reverse of what it is.

The answer is that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the War Production Board are both dominated by enemies of public power and friends of the Aluminum Trust. The foremost of these is Jesse Jones. They want no more expansion at Grand Coulee or elsewhere in the Northwest because it would be public power and because Congress provided in the Bonneville Act that this power should not become the basis of any industrial monopolies, as in aluminum. They want only so much expansion in Tennessee Valley Authority as is necessary for the convenience of the Aluminum Co. and other big metal and chemical concerns. They would rather leave 500,000 kilowatts—the base for the production of 500,000,000 pounds of aluminum a year—idle in New York City than build a transmission line which might ultimately bring cheap St. Lawrence power back to the metropolis. They have laid their plans well. Promises by Jones to set up more producers of aluminum have been forgotten. With the exception of one small project for Olin Corporation, all the Government-owned plants are under Alcoa operation. All were designed by Alcoa, and use an older and less efficient method of separating the aluminum from the alumina. This will provide an argument for scrapping them after the war because they will be unable to compete with more efficient and lower-cost Aluminum Trust plants here and in Canada. Several of the biggest, like that in Queens, N. Y., have been located in high-cost power areas, and this will furnish another argument for selling them to the junk man. Finally, the Aluminum Co. of Canada, with its cost-free power and aluminum plants on the Saguenay in Quebec, will be in a position to sell the light metal more cheaply in this country than any Government or private plant.

The Shipshaw project, financed cost free out of public funds, will provide a new argument in the fight the Aluminum Trust has waged for two generations to stifle, if it could not dominate, the development of the St. Lawrence. Shipshaw, says that New York Times story, "will give far more power than Canada would have obtained from the St. Lawrence waterways scheme." The objection to Shipshaw arises from no nationalistic animus against a development in Canada but from objections to a private deal which will enable the Aluminum and Power Trusts to undercut public power and the industries dependent upon it on both sides of the border, in Ontario as in the Northwest, the Tennessee Valley, and New York. In the last war we built Muscle Shoals and then fought two decades over its control. The public finally won. The Aluminum and Power Trusts, thanks to Jesse Jones and the War Production Board, have been able to pursue a wiser policy this time. They have arranged for us to build them a new and greater Muscle Shoals, a project as great as Boulder Dam, in the Canadian wilds. And this time they arranged in advance that though we foot the bill, the property shall be theirs.

A Speech Teacher Looks at Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by the House, I am reprinting herewith an article written by me and appearing in the current issue of The Gavel, official publication of Delta Sigma Rho, a national honorary society to which many Members of Congress belong:

A SPEECH TEACHER LOOKS AT CONGRESS

(By KARL E. MUNDT (CA), Member of Congress from South Dakota, president, National Forensic League)

When the editor of the Gavel asked me at the speech teachers' convention in Chicago to prepare an article reproducing my remarks at one of the convention's sectional meetings, I consented with the thought (1) that the editor might well forget to remind me of my promise or (2), if he did, it should be comparatively easy to dictate again what I had previously discussed before the teachers of speech. However, the editor's memory proved indefatigable and mine inept.

Since my talk at the convention was strictly "off the cuff" and inasmuch as I discarded what few notes I had prepared for the occasion, I am preparing this article under the same title as my remarks in Chicago, but that may largely comprise the sum total of the resemblance between the two. After all, however, I presume a speech teacher who daily sits in Congress is entitled to more than one look, and he cannot be expected to see the same things every time he surveys his surroundings.

I did emphasize one fact in Chicago, however, that I wish again to stress for readers of the Gavel. Despite conflicting cursory comments of casual observers and the comparatively ill-informed conclusions of some who simply watch congressional behavior from the galleries or try to reenact its significance by studying the cold pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is my studied opinion that public speaking (in its broadest concept of including all persuasive forms of the spoken word) today wields as great an influence in today's Congress, if not greater, than at any time in our American history. I make this statement advisedly and with full realization that many columnists, radio commentators, editors, textbook writers, and other evaluators, whose opportunity for examination of the power of speech is limited to public debates and a study of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, have offered opposite conclusions. In this article I want to point out a few of my reasons for emphasizing the highly important part that the speech art plays in the science of legislative government today.

A great many factors, some obvious and some not ascertainable, enter into the composite influences which determine the manner in which Members of the Senate and the House vote on the legislation which forms the fabric of public law that today governs so much of what we do, what opportunities can come to us, what we can earn and save, and what use we can make of our professions and abilities. Among the most important of these influences are the following, which I have not attempted to list in order of importance: Party principles; administrative pressure; attitude of constituents; the public press; the spoken word; personal convictions of the individual legislator. Of this I feel sure: Far from the bottom of this list of influences comes the power of the spoken word in all its ramifications and with its variety of opportunities for producing results.

The most obvious use of the spoken word in the modern art of self-government as exemplified in the American Congress is, of course, the floor debates which visitors witness from the gallery and which students read from the pages of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At times this level of debate is pretty low; at other times it ranks extremely high. Debates of the Seventy-seventh Congress on such vital issues as the adoption of the lend-lease policy and the modification and final repeal of the neutrality law at times rated well with debates of the early Congresses on measures of the first magnitude. In drama, in the tense attention they procured, in the marshalling of evidence and the use of logic and persuasion, in the type and style of delivery used, and in general importance, even many critics of the significance of modern congressional debates have credited the foregoing modern debates with a high standinng. What they may have lacked in the flowery eloquence and oratorical phraseology of earlier debates they more than made up for in the rapierlike repartee which frequently took place and in the direct development of points of fact which has come to characterize effective speeches in today's impatient era. Students applying the reader's test equally to these latter debates and the comparatively important ones of earlier Congresses will be impressed by the fact that both were excellent and that the contrasts are more those of changing styles of public address than those of changing degrees of effectiveness in public speech.

However, the influence of the spoken word in shaping the laws under which we live is far from limited to what meets the reader's eye as he scans the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to the somewhat distorted sounds which waft up to him in the galleries as the listener tries to follow the debates in the House of Representatives, for example, which is the world's largest legislative hall and enjoys far from the world's best system of amplification.

Many times the most important legislative decisions are made in the committee room; and here, even more than in the public debates, the power of the spoken word is the persuasive and convincing force which adds or deletes an amendment and which ratifies or defeats a bill. In the committee room—many times meeting in closed, executive session—the individual Senator or Representative, meeting with a group of from 15 to 40 of his fellow committee members, persuades and prods, convinces and cajoles, deplores and demands, insists and inveighs—all by the spoken word—in an effort to impress his will upon his fellows. I am certain that the most severe critic of the influence of modern speech in shaping legislation would recede from his position if he could sit for just 2 weeks in closed committee hearings and watch legislation being shaped almost exclusively by the ability of members to convince their colleagues by the content and method of their spoken words. In fact, speech is the modus operandi by which the committee works; witnesses testify effectively or not because of their ability to "say it well"; motions succeed or fail frequently more from their manner of presentation than their inherent but not apparent worth; and, finally, the committee convinces the full membership of Senate or House by the ability of its members, in turn, to present well in public speech the decisions made by the committee.

The written word falters and fails badly as a vehicle of conviction in committee sessions. In closed sessions and "off the record" meetings, the attitudes of constituents are not as influential as in public debate. The public press shrinks in importance in committee sessions where no reporters are admitted. Even party principles frequently fade into insignificance compared with the ability of a member to support or denounce a proposed decision by committee members. Administrative pressure, too, fares best when the faithful follower of his leader operates in the open so that there can be no question about just who has stood up to be counted.

Of all influences shaping legislation in the committee room, the spoken word alone gains in importance as compared with the same influence operating on the floor of either Chamber of Congress. Let those who would have it that the spoken word is less important in Congress, today, than formerly, refute if they can the generally accepted fact that government by committee (rightfully or wrongfully) is much more the general practice now than it was 20, 50, or 80 years ago. Unless they can refute that fact, they cannot sustain a conclusion that effective speaking today is less important than in former days.

I have not mentioned the obvious fact that radio today plays an important part both in bringing popular opinion to bear upon Members of Congress and in affording Congressmen an opportunity in turn to influence popular opinion. Simply to state the fact is, of course, to prove the point. Radio speeches succeed or fail in direct relationship with the speaker's ability to use wisely and well the spoken word. Thus radio brings into play in lawmaking and in self-government a whole new field of influences and counterinfluences which were unknown in the era which some critics of present-day congressional speaking would like to select as "the golden age of congressional oratory."

To say that speech is less important in lawmaking today because it has been streamlined, geared to modern reactions, adapted to the expanded influence of the committee, projected through a microphone is no more logical than to say that the wheel is less important in today's transportation because it has been incased in rubber (before rationing), geared to a gasoline motor, attached to an automobile, and no longer operated on a wagon or a horse-drawn buggy. More people ride on wheels today than ever before, even though the wheels are different. And I believe it valid to point out that more important congressional decisions are motivated by speech today than ever before, even though speeches have changed and the place of speaking and the method of delivery may have altered.

Looking at Congress for more than 4 years, I have tried from the standpoint of a teacher of speech to evaluate the speaking I have heard by the only criterion which really counts—its effect upon its auditors. Judged by some of the textbooks I have read and by many of the speech principles by which good speaking is frequently judged, I must admit that many speeches which produce results might not rate too high on the score board of a speech critic. To say this is to criticize neither the speaker in Congress, the textbook, nor the very essential services of the speech critic. Textbooks on effective speaking, proper principles of speech, the helpful admonitions of instructors and critics are all important, and those which emphasize methods based upon the study of real audience reactions serve a most valuable purpose. While many speeches in Congress are effective even though in violation of valid principles of effective speaking, they are effective only because the techniques they display are part of a powerful personality on fire with an idea which is being given verbal expression with all the force and fervor of a deep conviction. And effective as such a speech in violation of proper principles may be, there is none who can say that it might not be longer remembered and thrice as effective if it avoided running contrary to established principles of effective speaking.

Representative HATTON SUMNERS, of Texas, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, and greatly respected and beloved sage of the House, one time answered a colleague who was persisting in using the "Will the gentleman yield" technique of interjecting himself into HATTON SUMNERS' speech by asking whether Mr. SUMNERS had read first this book and then that and then the next one by saying, "Frankly, I haven't read so very many books about facts but I know a lot of the facts about which books are written." So it is with speaking in Congress. Many Members have not studied so many of the principles in books about what comprises either good speech architecture or effective delivery, but they have learned from experience a great many of the principles about which books are written. Based on the practical standard of results procured, the speeches of many of these Members rate high. I can personally testify to the fact that I have frequently seen votes changed on the floor of the House—and on important issues too—when the so-called "big guns" of sides Pro and Con are wheeled out to go into oratorical action near the closing time of memorable debates. On minor issues, the speech observer watching from the floor and understanding the natural voting inclinations of many Members can give abundant testimony to the innumerable times when a persuasive speech given at the optimum time produces surprising results, upsets political predictions, and proves once more that as a weapon of persuasion at least the word is still mightier than the sword.

Attempted comparisons of the style of speaking used in Congress at various 40 to 50 year intervals or the degree of comparative excellence of such speaking are of course futile because no competent authority who hears the congressional speeches of today was also listening to what was being said and how it was delivered a half a century ago. Thus for a comparison of the quality of the speechmaking itself we must rely either upon second-hand reports or conjecture, and the findings of neither are valid nor impressive enough to warrant very scholarly conclusions. The architecture of congressional speeches throughout most of the history of this Republic is, of course, available to students and scholars; thus whereas it is virtually impossible to compare or contrast the manner and merit of the speaking, the style of speech structure can be most thoroughly studied.

I have spent some time, myself, reading many congressional debates of the past in an effort to compare them with what I have heard on the floor of the Senate and the House. Speeches were more eloquent in days gone by, but they were also more redundant; earlier speeches were more adjectiverious, but I doubt that they were more activating. Acrimony, bitter partisanship, personal attacks, extravagant flights of either fact or fancy, exuberant egotism, sentences of lung straining length, invective, and similar frailties and foibles of speakers of all times and eras were at best as numerous—and it is my studied observation that they were far more numerous—in the congressional speeches antedating 1900 than they are since the turn of the century. Modern speeches also reveal gratifying elements of directness, cogency, moderation, and pointedness by comparison with the earlier speeches. Yes! There are exceptions to all rules and glaring exceptions to all generalities. Great choirs of critics may deny these observations, but I am obdurate. Until better evidence has been submitted, I'll cast my critic's decision for the speakers—in and out of Congress, but especially in—whose speeches have been made during the twentieth century. At least I feel certain the delivery and speech construction of these speakers is better adapted to twentieth century audiences—and therefore better speech today—than the methods and speech construction of any other American era.

It will be noted that throughout this article I have sought to apply the rule of realism to the evaluation of a speech. Not its rhetoric nor its readability but its effectiveness in results procured is the measure of mightiness which I hold to be of most concern in rating the quality of a speech or the qualifications of a speaker. During my years in the teaching profession I developed for myself as a personal philosophy of education this goal: "The function of a teacher is to train people to influence human behavior wisely." I was not interested in educating hermits or recluses. I did not care to train men and women to stand like iron deer in a park as pillars of erudition which shed no light and exerted no influence in the environment which they inhabited. Unless those with whom I worked went forth "to influence human behavior," I felt that as a teacher I had failed. If that influence was not directed "wisely" for the improvement of mankind, the development of better government, the wider adoption of sound principles of cooperation, good will, peace, and progress, I felt that all of education had failed. Speech teachers share their portion of the educational responsibilities—if my philosophy of education is sound—for training citizens to influence human behavior "wisely." They must help mold ideals and aspirations as they train folks to model speeches and give them effective articulation. But further than that, speech teachers shoulder most of the responsibility for training citizens to "influence human behavior." This goal of what I have sometimes called "kinetic citizenship" is a specific responsibility of the teacher of public speaking. Other fields of education make their important contribution, but the job of training citizens to influence their fellows—and that wisely—is the fundamental responsibility of the sincere and able men and women who are today engaged in the expanding field of speech education.

It follows from the fact that I rate the general effectiveness of the spoken word in Congress today as highly as I do that I believe American teachers of speech today—in grade schools, in high schools, in colleges and universities—are shouldering their significant responsibilities with fidelity to duty and with steadily expanding success. There is, of course, as there will always be, yet room for improvement. And because I firmly believe that the methods of democracy require that more and more men and women be trained in effective speech so that they can "influence human behavior wisely" I trust that speech training in this Republic may continue to move upward and forward among the fields of modern training which are steadily growing in significance in terms of what "the good citizen needs to know" in this global era of civilization.

Poland Will Live Again—Great and Glorious. Polish Heroes in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, Poland will live again—great and glorious. We

are blessed with the greatest leader and humanitarian in our history, our President, our Commander in Chief, Franklin D. Roosevelt. I have confidence in our President. I have faith in his honesty, integrity, and sense of right and justice. He will not fail the Polish people. He will not fail the Slavs. We can repose our faith, our trust, our confidence in him.

Having introduced House Joint Resolution 78 on February 5, 1943, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski Memorial Day, and having lately received so many inquiries about my speech on Polish heroes in America, probably as a result of the Polish-Russian situation, I have asked for permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and am submitting the speech as delivered on Monday, June 4, 1934, on the occasion of the passage of House Joint Resolution 36:

[Remarks of HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI, of Michigan, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, June 6 (legislative day of Monday, June 4), 1934]

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I cast my vote in favor of Joint Resolution No. 36, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1934, General Pulaski Memorial Day. I am proud of the fact that there was not a dissenting vote.

With the passage of this resolution the President will call upon the officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all the Government buildings and will invite the people of the United States to observe the day in schools, halls, and churches with appropriate ceremonies, commemorating the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the Polish patriot who fought and died for the cause of American independence.

Well representing Polish nobility, Pulaski is often referred to as "Count Pulaski" in historical works. He was born in Podolia, Poland, at a time when that nation was undergoing a severe internal political battle. With rapacious neighbors beginning to conspire against the freedom of his people, the boy Pulaski was consumed with an early desire to ward off danger, and evinced a keen interest in military affairs at a very young age. Long before he reached his majority Pulaski joined in the guard of Duke Charles, and thus gained a rigorous and practical experience in the art of warfare.

In 1769 he joined his father, Joseph Pulaski, in what was termed "The Confederation of Bar," this confederation being a conjointure of Polish noblemen, each one of whom pledged his time, his fortune, and his life to the salvation of Poland. Casimir Pulaski and his brother, Francis, became the active leaders in the movement. The older leaders were soon dispersed, some going abroad; others were confined in dungeons. Pulaski's father was one of those confined in a dungeon prison, where he later died.

But despite this Casimir carried on, and at the head of a small force of cavalry he performed heroic feats. With his brother he became a constant terror to the Russians, who were trying to capture him. Against overwhelming odds for 4 years this great patriotic organization under this great leader fought to oust the enemies of Poland from his country. But all their efforts proved fruitless. During this time one of General Pulaski's brothers was killed before his eyes, the youngest brother taken into captivity, and many of his countrymen were doomed to misery.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski was the leading spirit of his countrymen in this unequal struggle to preserve the country intact. Although but 25 years of age, he was the acknowledged leader and the hero of his countrymen. Heedless of his foe, which was much more powerful, he fought with a zeal and tenacity that made him renowned as a cavalry leader throughout the Continent of Europe.

General Pulaski not only lost his father and brother in this glorious attempt to save Poland from the first of her ignoble partitions, but his estates were confiscated and he was proscribed by King Stanislaus and had to travel to Turkey. Soon thereafter, in 1772, Count Casimir Pulaski issued his memorable manifesto, in which he said in part:

"I am not astonished that the enemies of my country resolved on her ruin, should direct their shares against those who most firmly resist their impetuosity, and that they should regard as such the brave Poles whom they have sacrificed and who are still repelling their most cruel attacks. * * * My destiny was clear, when at the age of 21, far from yielding to the amusements of youth, I regarded every moment as lost which was not employed in repelling the enemies of my country. * * * I have endeavored to mark my course by an invincible fortitude. Neither the blood of one of my brothers, which was shed by the enemy before my eyes, nor the cruel servitude of another, nor the sad fate of so many of my relations and compatriots has shaken my patriotism."

Perhaps no better insight into the sturdy character of Pulaski, who is revered both in Europe and America, could be given than the above excerpt from his manifesto. He traveled to Turkey, but, repelled with the feeble notions of liberty entertained by the Sultan, he journeyed on to Marseilles, France, and from there to Paris. It was in the French Capital that he made the acquaintance of Benjamin Franklin and young America's struggle for independence. Benjamin Franklin, writing from Paris to General Washington on May 29, 1777, said:

"Count Pulaski, of Poland, an officer famous throughout Europe for his bravery and conduct in defense of the liberties of his country against the three great invading powers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, will have the honor of delivering this into Your Excellency's hands."

General Pulaski landed in America the middle of July 1777, and after presenting his letters to Washington and Congress waited for Congress to take action. In the meantime Washington's army passed through the streets of Philadelphia. Spurred by the sight of marching soldiers, Pulaski, restless and eager to aid our cause, decided not to wait for his commission, but to follow the army as a volunteer. In Europe a member of the nobility, an officer of distinguished prestige, in America a private in the ranks. Such was Pulaski. Not self, but service, was his life's motto.

The night of September 8, 1777, Washington assembled a council of war to decide which position the Army should take in defense of Philadelphia. The upland, across the brook of Brandywine, was chosen. The Army moved to this position at dawn. The enemy's attack was expected on the 11th and about 9 o'clock of that day the red uniforms appeared. The battle started. The vanguard, under General Maxwell, retreated under heavy pressure. The rest of the Army was stretched out lengthwise for a considerable distance along the brook. The right wing was under the command of General Sullivan, and the left wing, to the south, was under the command of General Armstrong.

General Wayne and General Proctor commanded the cannon and the artillery. Washington remained with the reserve, which was commanded by General Greene, and Pulaski was stationed by the side of Washington.

Upon the withdrawal of General Maxwell the British kept up fire, but did not attempt crossing the creek. Washington was about ready to strike a blow at the enemy, but first wanted to be convinced that the opponents' main forces were not circumventing him for an attack at the rear. To that end a detachment was sent out to explore the region. About 2 o'clock an orderly dispatched the news that the enemy could not be seen on any of the roads on the opposite side of the creek. An order of attack was about to be issued when a man in a cart was noticed waving his hat and striving to reach headquarters. The man turned out to be Squire Cheney, with the startling news that the main forces of the enemy had crossed the Brandywine to the north and were fast approaching the Army's rear.

Washington immediately directed the division of Sullivan, together with the brigades of Conway, Stirling, and Stephans to meet the enemy. They hurriedly arrayed themselves for battle, just as the British were spied on the road. Thereupon the British vanguard showed itself on the plain. The American artillery opened fire. Hessian riflemen were playing havoc with the American front ranks. At the same time a column of infantry rushed to the upland occupied by the Americans. The center was holding up under the bombardment but both wings were fleeing. The enemy then concentrated on the center which soon wavered. Chaos reigned.

At this juncture Pulaski secured Washington's permission to use his bodyguard, some 30 horse, and launched a furious attack at the pursuers. With great skill he wedged into the side of the pursuing column. Swinging their sabers from left to right, this small detachment brought confusion to the ranks of the enemy. The pursuit was momentarily checked. Pulaski's forces took shelter with General Greene's army and together they held the enemy while the rear of the American Army retreated to Dillworth. There the road narrowed and the Americans gained a vantage point where they could withstand the onslaught of the enemy. Thus Washington's Army was saved.

Within 2 months after his arrival on September 15, 1777, Congress elected Pulaski "commander of the horse, with the rank of brigadier."

General Washington's letter to Congress recommending the appointment of Pulaski read as follows:

"This gentleman has been, like us, engaged in defending the liberty and independence of his country and has sacrificed his fortune and his zeal for these objects. He derives from hence a title to our respect that ought to operate in his favor as far as the good of the service will permit."

Shortly afterward Washington's Army was saved from an almost inevitable destruction at Warren Tavern, near Philadelphia, only by the warcraft of Pulaski. He also engaged in the Battle of Germantown. On the day of the Battle of Germantown he was sorely disappointed and mortified. There were but four regiments of cavalry raised and not one of them completed Three of them only, such as they were, had joined General Washington's Army, and on the day of the battle, guards were furnished out of those regiments to attend on the Commander in Chief and on other generals. This was a matter of deep regret and bitter chagrin

When General Washington had taken his winter quarters at Valley Forge, the cavalry were sent over into New Jersey on account of forage and for other service on that side of the Delaware. Pulaski made his headquarters in Trenton.

Weary of the lapse in activity subsequent to these previous battles and dampened by the pettiness of the command under which he was stationed, as well as the tardy tactics of Congress in carrying out his suggestions for the improvement of the infantry, Pulaski expressed a wish to return to Europe. Washington persuaded him to remain, however.

In March 1778 he asked permission from General Washington and Congress to organize an independent corps, later to be known throughout the Colonies as the Polish Legion. In equipping it he is said to have spent $50,000 of his own funds. These horsemen, among other arms, bore the famous Polish lances, a new weapon on this continent. Rated as the most expert horseman in the American cavalry, his service in leading and inspiring the cavalry was of inestimable value. From the time Pulaski took command it became a notable weapon of offense and defense. It is entirely possible that without it the cause of independence would not have been won.

Then followed the Battle of Charleston, S. C., when the city was besieged by 900 British troops from General Prevost's army. Although not altogether successful in his assault, Pulaski held the city 2 days until the arrival of reinforcements.

Probably Pulaski's most distinguished service was rendered in the siege of Savannah, Ga., although this move was made contrary to the sound advice of Pulaski, who pled a delay of a number of days due to their unpreparedness. Pulaski was here made commander of the entire cavalry, both French and American. During the battle their scheme failed. The French became entangled and their Admiral D'Esaing was wounded. Chaos resulted in the ranks. Hoping to rally the men and regain order, Pulaski rushed into the thick of the battle. Leading his men in a desperate charge, he received a wound in his right thigh and was carried from the field of battle fatally wounded. Pulaski died 2 days later while on board the brig *Wasp*, leaving Savannah Harbor on the way to Charleston. According to his friend and companion in arms, Capt. Paul Bentalou, he was buried at sea, and funeral services were held afterward in the city of Charleston.

In this manner, at the age of 31 years, ended the life of one of the most active and greatest patriots of his time. A man well born, of handsome physique and liberal education, who abandoned a life of ease and complacency for a career of unnumbered hardships and much bitterness. His was a proud and magnanimous personality, but he had to contend with petty men and the crudeness of a nation in its genesis. His corps of lancers and light infantry, which were recruited mostly in Baltimore, has since become famous under the name of "Pulaski's Legion" He is known as the founder of the American Cavalry. Pulaski, like Washington, could have chosen the easy course. They were both men of large means. But they recognized the responsibility of wealth and rank.

An equestrian statue, which stands between Thirteenth and Fourteenth Streets on Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, commemorates this hero of two hemispheres.

The splendid funeral honors paid by the citizens of Charleston to the memory of the brave Pulaski—the united regrets of the people and of the Army at the loss of an officer no less beloved than he was useful, and the last tribute of respect offered to his memory by Congress have already evinced the sensibilities and gratitude of our Nation. The gallant son of Poland had enthusiastically espoused the cause of America. He served that cause with zeal, ardor, and fidelity.

Pulaski died as he had lived—a hero, but an enemy of kings. Since the time of Pulaski others have come from his native land to mix their blood with the blood of other peoples to make one common country and to build a single destiny. Many Americans of Polish extraction have offered their lives in defense of this country on many battlefields—in the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and in the great World War. The blood of Pulaski still flows in the blood of his countrymen.

To the memory of Pulaski, William K. Palmer dedicated these beautiful words:

"Columbia! He died for thee
Cheerfully, and for liberty!
Honored forever more
On this Atlantic shore
Palms for Pulaski! Palms!"

GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSZKO

I want to at this time also speak a few words on another Polish hero—one of the greatest heroes of the Revolutionary War; a man deserving of the praise of every American citizen for the part he played in the war for our independence, Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko.

General Kosciuszko was born February 12, 1746, of an ancient and noble family at the Chateau Mercez-Wczyzua, a dependency of Sienniewicze, near Brezesc, Litenski. In those days to be the son of a nobleman meant to be born to arms, and at the early age of 18 he was graduated from the cadet college at Warsaw, where he proved to be a brilliant student. He was selected by the King and sent to France for a still higher education. As an engineer he studied first at Versailles and then Paris, afterward going to Brest and other ports. Kosciuszko also visited England, and after 7 years spent in study abroad he returned to Poland to receive his commission as a captain and was placed in charge of the fortifications and restorations at Kracow.

Early in 1776, when he was on duty near the castle of Somowice, in a manor of that name belonging to a rich nobleman, he fell deeply in love with the daughter, Louise. The haughty parents rejected with scorn this poor nobleman, and an elopement was the consequence. The lovers escaped in the night and were well on their way to a distant town, where they planned to be married, when the father with his armed soldiers, overtook them. A combat ensued, Kosciuszko defended himself and his ladylove with lion-hearted courage, but one against so many could not prevail. He sank wounded to the ground and was left for dead by the father, who carried his daughter off in triumph When Kosciuszko awoke to consciousness all that he found of his beloved was a handkerchief stained with his blood. Forty years later when he died, his body was found covered with grievous wounds, and that handkerchief was found next to his heart where it had rested during the struggle of our Revolution; during the glorious triumphs in battles for his country's life; during his second visit to America, and during his long years of exile in France.

After the loss of his fiancee he resigned his commission in the Polish Army. He pledged his share of his parental estates as security for the loan which enabled him to journey to Paris. Here the news of the fight of the Colonies for independence kindled his imagination, and he determined to go to the aid of America—a Polish knight errant in the cause of liberty. He obtained a letter from Benjamin Franklin and journeyed to America, where he sought the camp of Washington. General Washington was at once taken by his dash and placed him on his staff as an aide. On learning that he had had a scientific education General Washington commissioned him chief engineer on October 18, 1776, with the pay of $60 per month and the rank of colonel. In the spring of 1777 he joined the northern army where his ability as an engineer was of invaluable use in the campaign against Burgoyne. His fortifications at Van Schaick and elsewhere, his able judgment in the choice of battlegrounds, contributed much to the skillful retreats and firm stands of the Continental Army before Burgoyne's rash advance. He was ordered by General Gates to erect fortifications in the defense of Saratoga, and this task was accomplished with great brilliancy and speed. For a long time the defense of the Hudson had been of paramount importance; the brief respite gained by the defeat of Burgoyne rendered this a favorable moment to render it impregnable. West Point was chosen for its commanding position, and its fortification was finally conferred, over the head of the French engineer, Radiere, upon Kosciuszko.

General McDougall wrote to General Washington:

"Mr. Kosciuszko is esteemed to have more practice than Colonel Radiere and his manner of treating the people is more acceptable than that of the latter."

The map of West Point made by Major Villefanche at the time shows 11 forts at that strategic position, but how many of them were built by Kosciuszko is difficult to say. He probably had the direction of all of them. He gave so much satisfaction to the people at West Point that General Parsons and Governor Clinton joined in desiring that he be continued there, and Washington in a dispatch says:

"To his care and sedulous appreciation the American people are indebted for the defenses of West Point."

Little is now left of his fortifications, but the monument erected on the elevated parade ground called Kosciuszko's Garden to his memory by American youth will remain a grateful tribute forever. That America today can regard West Point with pride is, in large measure, due to Kosciuszko, who first suggested for a national military school the spot where it now stands.

In September 1778 Kosciuszko acted as second to General Gates in a duel fought at Yorktown with General Wilkinson. This duel caused much hard feeling among all concerned and came very near resulting in a duel between Kosciuszko and Col. John Carter, the second of Wilkinson.

In August 1780 Washington offered Kosciuszko the appointment of engineer in the Army of the South, under General Gates, which he accepted with thanks. But before he could reach there his old friend had been defeated at Camden and deprived of his command.

Gen. Nathanael Greene had been appointed as his successor. While awaiting Greene's arrival, Kosciuszko spent some time in Virginia among the planters. He saw there the Negroes at close quarters and was brought face to face with the horrors of slavery. It was then that, with his keen susceptibility to every form of human suffering, he acquired that profound sympathy for the American Negro which 17 years later was to dictate his parting testament to the New World. Upon leaving America from his second visit, he gave Jefferson his power of attorney and wrote out the will in which, more than half a century before the Civil War, the Polish patriot advanced the couse of emancipation:

"I, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, being just in my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States hereby authorize my friend Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own as any others and giving them liberty in my name, in giving them an education in trades or otherwise, and in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers or mothers, husbands or wives, and in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country and of the good order of society, and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful, and I make the said Thomas Jefferson my executor of this.

"T. KOSCIUSZKO.

"FIFTH DAY OF MAY 1798."

There was difficulty in putting this testament into effect, as Jefferson was of advanced age at the time of Kosciuszko's death. It was never carried out; but in 1826 the legacy went to found the Colored School of Newark, the first educational institute for Negroes in

the United States, and which bore Kosciuszko's name.

Upon Kosciuszko's death, William K. Palmer wrote the following:

"His dust in Poland rests—
His urned heart a shrine!
Poland! He is thy son!
Columbia! Also Thine."

Kosciuszko was present through the whole campaign of the Carolinas, and was regarded with strong affection and admiration by General Greene. True to his ideals, at the Battle of Eutaw Springs he restrained a carnage which outraged his feelings and he is said personally to have saved the lives of 50 Englishmen. When the campaign changed to one of guerilla warfare he fought as a soldier, not as an engineer. At length Charleston fell and in December 1782 the American Army entered the town in triumphal procession, in which Kosciuszko rode with his fellow officers, greeted by the population with cries of welcome.

Peace soon followed. Kosciuszko had fought for 6 years in the American Army. He had become an American landowner by virtue of a grant by Congress. He was elected a member of the Society of the Cincinnati, whose motto, "Omnia relinquit servare republicam," his own life so perfectly illustrates. General Greene wrote of Kosciuszko as follows:

"Colonel Kosciuszko belonged to the number of my most useful and dearest comrades in arms. I can liken to nothing his zeal in the public service, and in the solution of important problems; nothing could have been more helpful than his judgment, vigilance, and diligence. He was fearless of every danger. He never manifested desires or claims for himself, and never let any opportunity pass of calling attention and recommending the merits of others."

Congress belatedly conferred upon Kosciuszko the rank of brigadier general with an acknowledgment of its "high sense of his long, faithful, and meritorious services."

Soon after this Kosciuszko returned to Europe with his fast friend, Count Niemcewicz, the Polish poet, who was his college companion, was his aide while in the American Army, was his fellow prisoner in Russia, returned with him to America, and later joined him when an exile in France.

Kosciuszko lived quietly on his paternal estate in Poland for the next 4 years, but when in 1788 the Diet authorized the expansion of the Polish Army, his talents were pressed into service of his country and he was commissioned a major general. The Polish Constitution, passed on May 3, 1791, amidst an outburst of national rejoicing, swept away many of the old abuses. Poland reformed would have been an insurmountable barrier to Russia's designs of conquest. Catherine, seeing this, forced upon the small number of nobles she held in her hand distrust of the liberal constitution. In 1792 she declared war on Poland and the Russian Army crossed the frontier. The only Polish general who had practical experience of war was Kosciuszko.

During the 3 months of desperate fighting Kosciuszko figures as one whose bravery and skill time after time preserved the army. Kosciuszko's name was covered in glory in the fight at Dubienka, on the banks of the Bug, on July 19, 1792. The Battle of Dubienka was but a week old when the King abandoned himself to the reactionary schemes of Catherine and the Confederation of Targowicz. Kosciuszko was made a lieutenant general in recognition of his valor, but the army was ordered to cease hostilities and recalled to Warsaw. Honor forbade the Polish officers to retain commissions in a service that was no longer truly national but virtually controlled by Catherine and those who were playing into her hands. In his resignation to the King, Kosciuszko, in a few laconic words, laid down his command. "Since," his note runs, "the changes in national conditions are contrary to my original oath and convictions, I have the honor to request Your Royal Majesty for the favor of signing my resignation."

When the Russian Army entered Warsaw the Polish Army was reduced to small divisions and scattered throughout the country, thus rendering it powerless. Kosciuszko left the country by way of Galicia, but the Austrian Government, alarmed at the popularity of Kosciuszko, gave him 12 hours in which to quit the country. He then journeyed to Leipzig and on to France to ask the country's assistance for his beloved Poland. He arrived in France when the European coalition was being formed, and seeing that no help could be obtained from this country, he remained in seclusion during his visit.

When he returned to Leipzig in the summer of 1793 the condition of Poland was lamentable. Secret patriotic societies were being formed by the youth of Poland and Polish delegates journeyed to Leipzig to ask Kosciuszko to become the leader of this movement. The great moment of his life had now arrived, and Kosciuszko reentered Poland as the champion of her freedom.

On the morning of March 24, 1794, Kosciusko attended mass in the Capuchin Church, where the priest blessed his sword. At 10 o'clock he walked quietly to the town hall. Dense throngs had filled the market place. At the head of his soldiers, Kosciuszko stood before the crowds on the spot now marked by a memorial tablet. As far as his gaze reached he saw his countrymen and countrywomen with eyes turned up to him as to a deliverer. Many wore his portrait and carrried banners with the inscriptions: "Freedom or Death," "For Our Rights and Liberty," and "Vivat Kosciuszko."

Drums rolled and the Army took the oath of the rising, and then, in a dead silence, Kosciuszko stepped forward. With bared head, with eyes lifted to Heaven, and his hand resting on his sword, the new dictator of Poland took his oath:

I, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, swear in the sight of God to the whole Polish Nation that I will use the power entrusted to me for the personal oppression of none, but for the defense of the boundaries, the regaining of the independence of the nation, and the firm establishment of freedom. So help me God and the innocent passion of His Son.

He ordered the act of the rising to be read. This act was in part founded upon Kosciuszko's remembrance of the American Declaration of Independence. For the first time in Poland, thousands of nobles and peasants side by side signed their adherence to the act. The levy of the military forces, the arrangements for the taxation, and the necessary business of the rising were at once commenced, and Kosciuszko spent the rest of the day in these affairs and in his correspondence. On the same day he sent out four proclamations: One to the Army, one to the citizens, one to the Polish clergy, and one to the women of Poland. He begged for men, weapons, horses, and provisions for the national army. His appeals soon found response. On the 1st of April he left Kracow at the head of a small army to take the field against the Russians, who were about to attack General Madalinski.

On April 4, 1794, 3 days later, the famous Battle of Raclawice was fought. This great victory over Russia was won by the peasants who, armed with scythes, Kosciuszko at their head, swept like a hurricane upon the Russians, carrying all before them. Upon the battlefield, before all the army, he flung off his uniform and donned, in honor of his peasant soldiers, their dress, the sukmana, which henceforth he always wore. The moral effect of this victory was enormous and enabled Kosciuszko to realize his dream of an army of the people.

Although Kosciuszko had to raise an army, secure money, ammunition, provisions, and horses, he neglected nothing that would ensure the success of the rising. Shortly he came forward with his civil reforms. He abolished serfdom, he requested churches and convents to contribute all silver not absolutely necessary for their services to the national treasury, he begged the loyalty of the Greek Orthodox, and enlisted the aid of the Jews. He governed single-handed until May of that year.

The nation, the King, were in his power, but he remained always a simple soldier. Instead of decorations for conspicuous service, he offered rings, snuff boxes, and watches. But this did not last.

On the 7th of June, Kosciuszko was confronted by the Russian Army, to whose assistance the Prussian forces unexpectedly arrived in the night. The overwhelming numbers of the enemy and their superior machines of war carried the day against the Poles. Kosciuszko's horse was shot from under him and he himself was wounded. The Poles fought with desperate valor; but retreat was ordered by Kosciuszko. The Poles retreated in perfect order while the provisional government of Poland negotiated with France, Austria, and the Porte. But every diplomatic means failed. After this defeat and the defeat of the Poles at Kracow, Kosciuszko pushed on to Warsaw. The Russian and Prussian Armies advanced on Warsaw. On the 13th of July 1794, the Russian and Prussian Armies were seen from the walls of the city. Kosciuszko's army numbered 26,000, of which only 16,000 were regulars, while the enemy totaled 41,000 regulars and 235 cannon. Day after day the Poles fought in defense of their city.

During the time of the siege Kosciuszko never removed his clothes. His very presence seemed to inspire the soldiers and civilians alike. Finally the armies of the enemy were no longer seen before the city he had saved. There was no public triumph, but masses were sung in every church in the city.

The triumph, however, was but temporary. The Prussians soon returned. Russia sent a new and powerful army, and Austria also invaded the country. Kosciuszko, fighting desperately against Russia and Prussia, had no army to send against this third enemy. The days of the rising were now numbered.

On the 10th of October 1794, the Battle of Maciejowice was fought. For hours the enemy was kept at bay, but their superiority in numbers and skill proved irresistible. In the hottest part of the engagement Kosciuszko had three horses killed under him. Mounting again, and at the head of his principal officers, he made a grand charge into the midst of the enemy. Again his horse was killed, as were most of his officers; others were taken prisoners. At last, exhausted and bleeding, he was wounded by the lance of a Cossack. The great man lay senseless among the dead. Finally he was recognized despite the plainness of his uniform. He was still breathing. His name even now commanded respect. The Cossacks made a litter of their lances and carried him to the general, who ordered that his wounds be dressed and that he be treated with the respect his distinguished position merited.

As soon as he could be carried he was ordered by the tigress Catherine to be brought to St. Petersburg, where she condemned him to prison for the rest of his days. He was confined in a dungeon in the castle Gregory-Orieff, where he remained 2 years as a state prisoner and until the death of Catherine on November 6, 1796. Her son Paul then set him free with the words, "I have come to restore your liberty. I have always pitied your fate, but during my mother's rule I could do nothing to help you."

Kosciuszko requested that if he were released, that all the prisoners scattered in

Russia and Siberia also be given their release, and this was granted by Paul, who, in turn, required him and the leading Poles to take an oath of allegiance to himself.

While Kosciuszko had been in prison the Third Partition was carried out by Russia, Austria, and Prussia. Poland had ceased to exist as an independent state.

Kosciuszko's wounds were still open and unhealed when he was set free. He at once started to England. The whole of London made haste to visit him and he found himself a great hero. He was loaded with presents by the ladies, all of which he returned to the donors. With gaping wounds, unable to walk and with a mind ill at ease, he did not care for or enjoy the festivities of the great and gay. After staying in England a week he began his journey to America on June 18, 1797. Two months were taken in the journey before his arrival in Philadelphia—his second visit to America. He wrote General Washington of his arrival and Washington, from Mount Vernon, replied, congratulating him on his safe arrival and welcoming him to the land "whose liberties you have been instrumental in establishing." Although invited by Washington to visit him at Mount Vernon, Kosciuszko was never able to accept this invitation.

He traveled from Philadelphia to New Brunswick and from there to New York, where he visited General Gates at Rose Hill. Before leaving New York he received from Congress a grant of 500 acres in recognition of his military services. This property was located on the extreme western border of the United States military lands, the site of the present city of Columbus, Ohio. Kosciuszko, whose convalescence was slow, spent nearly all of his time reclining on a sofa, sketching, and painting in water colors and India ink. After his visit with General Gates he returned to Philadelphia, where he often saw Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson wrote to General Gates:

"I see Kosciuszko often. He is as pure a son of liberty as I have ever known, and of that liberty which is to go to all, not only to the few and rich alone."

After receiving a package of letters from France some time in March 1798, Kosciuszko made arrangements to sail suddenly for Europe. He gave no explanation for the suddenness of his return. By the end of June of that year Kosciuszko reached Paris. His arrival centered upon him the gaze of the whole world. Sympathy for himself and the Polish cause he heard expressed on all sides. At the news of his return the Polish legions awakened to renewed life. In 1800 Kosciuszko wrote his Manoeuvers of the Horse Artillery, which was sent to America, where it was translated and published. A copy of this was presented to Thomas Jefferson.

About this period Kosciuszko became acquainted with a Swiss family by the name of Zeltner, and he moved to their home, at Berville, near Fontainbleau. In 1806 Napoleon, from Berlin, requested the services of Kosciuszko as leader of the revolting Poles, but Kosciuszko, with little faith in Napoleon, refused this command.

During 1814 Kosciuszko communicated with Tsar Alexander I frequently in Paris on the independence of Poland, and in a personal interview this was promised to the general.

Alexander stated that with a little patience this would be accomplished. The question of Poland was also before the Congress of Vienna as one of the most pressing problems of the stability of Europe. Kosciuszko journeyed there to discuss this with the Tsar, but he derived little satisfaction. In May 1815 Russia, Austria, and Prussia signed an agreement for a new partition of Poland. The Tsar had betrayed Kosciuszko's confidence. Kosciusko refeused all offers of office and honor in the newly partitioned Poland. He chose a voluntary exile with his friend Zeltner, former Landvogt of Lugano, who was the Ambassador of Switzerland to the French Republic.

While France was under the banners of a republic many Poles served in the army in Italy. They found in the Casa Di Loretto the sword of Sobieski, the lion-hearted King of Poland, who had saved Christendom from the invasion of the Turks at the great Battle of Vienna and sent it to Kosciuszko as the only man living worthy of such an inheritance.

On October 17, 1817, a voluntary exile in Switzerland, Thaddeus Kosciuszko died. The eighteenth century was prolific in great men, but in the long list there were no other two whose characters excited so much admiration, whose deeds called forth such eloquent eulogies from the philanthropists, scholars, and statesmen in every country, as were accorded to Kosciuszko and Washington. Even in his exile Kosciuszko was faithful to Poland—her purest and the greatest of her Poles. And his greatness was the greatest in that it was not his own personal greatness alone; it was the greatness of Poland. There was in Europe no man whose fame was more brilliant, whose patriotism was more pure, and whose character for fierce bravery, gentle acts, and virtuous conduct throughout his life was more unsullied, than Thaddeus Kosciuszko

Kosciuszko, though honored mostly for his heroic deeds in war, should nevertheless be as greatly honored for his other attributes. He was generous to a fault and never turned a beggar down. In fact, what little money he had in this world was given away to the poor and needy. While living with the Zeltners, Kosciuszko rode every day long distances into the Jura Mountains to hunt up cases of charity among the poor peasantry. He never passed a poor man without stopping to give him a few cents, the lowest he ever gave, as he usually gave one or two dollars. His horse soon became used to his master's ways and stopped every time he saw a poor man. On one occasion he sent young Zeltner to carry a message and told him to ride his horse. Young Zeltner soon found that he could not get the horse past a poor man until he had opened his purse and before he got home he found himself entirely out of cash. Kosciuszko lived an exemplary life and was one of the strongest characters in history.

An artist of no little ability, the aquatint, printed in colors, of Thomas Jefferson, is considered one of the finest portraits of Jefferson.

The letter of Kosciuszko to Count Segar shows his great love for his country:

"When the Polish Nation called me to defend the integrity, the independence, the dignity, the glory, and the liberty of the country, she knew well that I was not the last Pole and that with my death on the battlefield or elsewhere Poland could not, must not, end. All that the Poles have done since then in the glorious Polish legions and all that they will still do in the future to gain back their country sufficiently proves that albeit we, the devoted soldiers of that country, are mortal, Poland is immortal."

Kosciuszko's life and record is that of the greatness of the truly great. His deeds will live forever, not only in the hearts of his own countrymen but in the hearts of every American who loves his country, for the great part Kosciuszko played in our fight for independence.

OTHER HEROES

At this time it is well to point out that Kosciuszko and Pulaski were not the only Poles who took part in America's struggle for freedom in the Revolutionary War. There was Col. Michael Kowacz, Lieutenant Colonel Botzen, Maj. John Jolereski, Capt. Joseph Baldeski, M. Kotkowski, Litowski, Maciej Rogowski, John Zielinski, John Kwiryn Mieszkowski, Lts. August Grystyn, George Elholm, Michael Grabowski, George Uzdowski—Navy, Capt. Felix Miklasiewitz, and Maurice Bieniowski, Jerzmanowski, Krasscwski, and Tariecki, who also served as officers. Besides these Poles there were a great many who served as privates in the Continental Army.

Daniel Liczko, a naval lieutenant in Holland's Navy, and an early settler, was a Pole. The Poles worked with the Hollanders as farmers, laborers, and merchants, and through their conscientious efforts, added to the wealth of this colony. Peter Stuyvesant, the famous Governor of New Holland, knowing well the qualities and virtues of the Poles, in 1659 brought in as many as possible, settling them around Fort Orange.

They were loyal and fought for the defense of New Holland from the attacks of the English. Dr. Alexander Carol Kurcjiusz (Kurtius) founded the first high school in New York; in 1659 he founded an academy in New Amsterdam. It was a Pole who founded and conducted the first high school in the largest city in America.

Olbracht Zaborowski, a Polish nobleman, settled in New Amsterdam in 1662. He later became the owner of a vast acreage of land along the Passaic River. He became well versed in the Indian language and acted as a sort of judge in the disputes between the white settlers and the Indians, and later he became one of the first judges in New Jersey. This family is one of the best known and most famous in America. As years went by the name gradually changed from Zaborowski to Zabriskie. There are many descendants of this famous family who are living today.

In 1774 Jacob Sadowski helped in surveying the land in the State of Kentucky. Jacob and Joseph Sadowski, with a crew of 40 people, founded the city of Harrodsburg, the oldest city in Kentucky. Jacob Sadowski is the first white man after the French and the Spaniards to have navigated the Cumberland, Ohio, and Mississippi Rivers to New Orleans in a small rowboat.

Karol Blaszkowicz, a noted surveyor, was the first to map the sea coast of New England. Even today his work is regarded as having been excellently accomplished.

It was Peter Strawnicki, a rich banker in Amsterdam, who gave financial aid to the United States when America was young and its treasury was empty. He was one of the wealthiest men in the country at that time, owning some 5,000,000 acres of land in New York and Pennsylvania.

There were such learned men as Kajetan Wegierski, Juljan Ursyn Niemcewicz, and others. Adam Kurek was the founder of the first brass bands in America and wrote many compositions. Juljan Fontana, a noted musician and friend of Frederick Szopen (Chopin), came here as well as the great sculptor, Henry Dmochowski (Sanders), Alexander Sengteller and Alexander Raszewski, steel engravers. Joseph Podbielski, the noted translator of Polish works into English; Paul Sobolewski, poet and journalist; Adam Gurowski, a noted author; Dr. Ludwig Szpaczek, Dr. R. Thomain of New York, Dr. Henry Kolussowski of Washington, all took part in our early colonial life. The Polish clergy were also represented in America. Around 1800 we find Father Kossack, a Jesuit, Father Boniface Krakowski, and Father Francis Dzierozynaski. This was long before there were any Polish parishes established.

In 1854, Rev. Father Leopold Moczygeba brought over 100 families, who, after suffering great privations, finally established a settlement at Panna Marja, Tex. This settlement was so named in honor of the Blessed Virgin, Mary. They even brought with them the cross and the bells from the village church in their own country to peal the glory of God in this new land. This is the oldest Polish parish in the United States.

Col. Casimir Gorowski achieved fame as an engineer in Canada and held high offices. He built the first bridge at Niagara Falls. The lands of Louisiana and Utah were surveyed by Joseph Truskolaski, and Capt. Karol Radziminski helped to establish the boundary line between the United States and Mexico.

The first polytechnical school in America was founded by Leopole Boech. Joseph Karge, Arthur Grabowski, and Joseph D'Alfons became the most noted among the professors of America's institutions of learning. Maj. Henry Glowacki, of Batavia, N. Y., became one of the outstanding attorneys. Dr. Felix Wierzbicki gained renown as the author of the first historical book written on California.

Much could be said about the other Polish heroes of the Revolutionary War, but it is best expressed by the four lines dedicated to them by John A. Joyce, the American poet:

"Polish heroes in their might
Fought in freedom's holy fight,
Brilliant as the stars at night
To maintain the pure and right."

There were about 400 Polish settlers in the colony established by Capt. John Smith. Of this number but 60 survived through the severe winters of 1609 and 1610. These Poles were honest and industrious. Captain Smith said at that time: "The English settlers never knew what a day's work was except the Dutchmen and the Poles." The overseers of the Colonies praised the Poles highly for their industry and tried to get more of them to come to Virginia.

When the right of vote and the right of voice in the first Parliament in America, the House of Burgesses at Jamestown, was denied the Poles by English overseers, they unanimously protested and a strike followed. The authorities were finally forced to yield and the court records of the Virginia Company of London, under the date of July 31, 1619, shows the following decision:

"Upon some disputes of the Polonians resident of Virginia it was now agreed that they shall be enfranchised and made as free as any inhabitant there whatsoever. And because of their skill in making pitch and tar and soap ashes, shall not die with them, it is agreed that some young men shall be put unto them to learn their skill and knowledge therein for the benefit of the country thereafter."

So even before the arrival of the *Mayflower* the Poles had raised the question of political liberty and equality and were successful in the first fight for this cause on American soil.

The Poles likewise aided in bringing Texas into the Union in the revolution of the Texans against Mexico. Many Poles were killed in the memorable massacre of Colonel Fannin's detachment at Goliad, Tex. One of them, the valiant Piotrowicz, commanded the artillery section. In the war with Mexico, 1846 to 1848, the Poles again played a prominent part. Those who are particularly well known as the result of this war are Capt. Karol Radziminski, Capt. Napoleon Koscialkowski, Sgt. Ignatius Szumowski, and many others.

In the early colonial days the Colonies were settled mostly by the English. The Poles were very few in number at that time; however, we find very many interesting figures of Polish extraction taking an active part in developing America and giving to this new land of liberty the art, culture, and learning that they had brought with them from their native country, Poland. The Americans of Polish extraction may well be proud of their history in this new Nation.

Poland was known as the "bulwark of Christianity in Europe" and has often been called "The Knight Among Nations." America was yet unknown and undiscovered when Poland had universities and led the world in education, science, and culture. No country in Europe enjoyed such freedom as existed in Poland. They had freedom of religion and freedom of speech. It was for this reason that the neighbors of Poland became frightened and set out deliberately to destroy that nation. They were afraid that it would lead the subjects in their own countries to revolution and to demand the same measure of freedom and liberty that the citizens of Poland enjoyed. Very few Poles came to America previous to the partition of Poland. They were contented and satisfied to live in their native country.

However, we find some of them settled in America even long before the arrival of the *Mayflower*. The English Government, in cooperation with the Virginia Company of London, brought over many skilled Polish workers for the express purpose of manufacturing ship necessities for export to England, and glass and trinkets for Indian trade.

During the Civil War about 4,000 Poles served in the Union Army and about 1,000 in the Confederate Army. At this time there were about 30,000 Poles in America. Gen. W. Krzyzanowski organized one of the first companies of militia in Washington. Maj. A. Raszewski formed two companies of the Thirty-first Infantry in the State of New York. They wore Polish uniforms at first and were known as the Polish Legion. In Cincinnati the Poles, under Maj. Maurycy Weselewski, also formed their own company in the Twenty-eighth Infantry of Ohio. The greatest number of Poles who saw service in the Union Army came from the States of New York, Missouri, Ohio, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

The Poles were the first to give up their lives in the Civil War. Thaddeus Strawinski, an 18-year-old student, was killed in the attack on Fort Sumter. The first Union officer to fall on the field of battle was Capt. Konstanty Bledowski on May 10, 1861. Gen. Wlodzimierz Krzyzanowski is without doubt the most famous of the Poles who took part in this bloody war. He rose from the ranks to the position of general. He took part in the Battles of Cross Key, June 8, 1862; Bull Run, 1862; Chancellorsville, May 1863. In July 1863 he was at Gettysburg. He also was instrumental in stopping Gen. Stonewall Jackson. He fought many victorious battles in Tennessee but was always humane and kind in his treatment of Confederate prisoners and toward the people in the Confederate territory where he was in charge.

In 1867, after the United States Government had purchased Alaska from Russia, General Krzyzanowski was appointed as the first Governor. He held Federal positions in Panama and New York. He died in New York January 31, 1887. The men under his command idolized him. As a token of love and respect they presented him with a beautiful sword with the following inscription thereon:

"In deep respect to our beloved commander, from the officers and men of the Second Brigade, Third Division, Third Army Corps."

One of the best-known Union cavalry leaders was Joseph Karge. He took part in many brilliant military exploits. Congress gave him the rank of brigadier general in recognition of his leadership and bravery. After the war he went back to the profession of teaching and held the chair of professor of languages and foreign literature at Princeton University. He became one of the best-known educators of his time. He died December 27, 1892.

Other famous Poles who took part in the Civil War were Capt. Alexander Bielaski, adjutant to General McClernand, Capt. Joseph Gloskowski, Lt. Julius S. Krzywoszynski, who received honorable mention for meritorious service and gallant conduct. Lt. Wladyslaw A. Wrotnowski, engineer, was killed in action at Fort Hudson in Louisiana, May 27, 1863. Capt. W. Kossak, engineer, was a member of General Grant's staff. General Sherman said of him that his plan of the battle of Shiloh was—

"The best I have ever seen and his fortifications during the siege of Corinth, Miss., were excellent."

Col. Emil Shoening, Lt. Col. George Sokalski, Capt. Louis Zychlinski, Capt. Teofil Michalowski, Capt. Edmund Zalinski (later professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology), Capt. Peter Kiolbassa, Capt. Maurice Kraszynski, Capt. Edmund Hulanicki, Capt. Thaddeus C. Hulanicki, Capt. Edward Antoniewski, Capt. Edward Radniecki, Lt. Karol Borowski, and Adjutant Wladyslaw Leski may be found among the famous Union officers.

The Poles also gave meritorious service to the Confederacy. Among them were Gen. Kasper Tochman, Col. Vincent Sulakowski, who was also a great engineer, Lt. Col. Hipolit Oladowski, Capt. Peter K. Stankiewicz, Capt. Leon Jastrzembski, Col. Arthur Grabowski, who later became mayor of Baton Rouge, La.

The Poles fought valiantly and bravely in the Civil War. Many of them were veterans who had seen service in the Polish uprisings in their battles for the liberty of Poland. There were about 165 Polish officers in the Union Army and about 30 in the Confederate Army. In the Spanish-American War about 85,000 Poles saw service in the United States Army. This represented about 10 percent of the total Polish population in the United States.

The war records contain numerous Polish names cited for bravery and merit. Of the first 100,000 soldiers who enlisted and volunteered for service in the World War, 40,000 were Poles. The total number of Poles serving in the United States Army during this great conflict amounted to 300,000. The first American soldier to lay down his life was Sgt. John J. Czajka, killed in action November 13, 1917, while leading his patrol of men of Company A, Twenty-sixth Infantry. Two Poles, one a Chicagoan and the other from Milwaukee, captured the first German prisoner taken by the American Army. Sgt. Michael Ellis (Eliasz) captured single-handed 10 machine guns and 60 prisoners.

Besides those who saw service in the American Army, 25,000 Poles enlisted as volunteers in the Polish Army of France. Throughout the history of America the Poles have always proved themselves to be faithful and loyal to the extreme. Although they number only 4 percent of the total population of the United States, the casualty list contains 12 percent of American soldiers of Polish extraction who gave their lives for America on the fields of France.

Without any doubt it was this great loyalty and patriotism of the Poles to the United States which caused this country, and that great Democratic leader, President Woodrow Wilson, to include in his 14 points the mandate that Poland shall be free and independent, with access to the sea.

There are today over 5,000,000 hard-working people of Polish extraction contributing by their efficient and conscientious labor to the development of national resources and to the progress of industry and to the growth of America. They are not rich in money. Their richness lies in their industriousness, loyalty, and that great love of the United States of America that will be an everlasting monument in the hearts of their children after the riches of others will be gone and forgotten.

Mother's Day Address by Hon. James J. Davis, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, last evening I delivered an address before the mothers of Adas Israel Congregation, at the corner of Sixth and I Streets, in this city. I understand the good mothers of that congregation sold $120,000 worth of fighting War bonds last evening. I ask that a part of my address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mother's Day this year comes into a troubled world. This day, on which we commemorate the spirit of patient sacrifice, unfaltering care, and undying love, which are motherhood, finds the sinister forces of tyranny and aggression loosed upon the world. It finds a world of two irreconcilable camps pitted against each other in a struggle to the death. It finds freedom and slavery waxed in violent conflict, the end of which is not yet in sight. Indeed, Mother's Day this year will find few indications that the powers of peace and love which have typified this day throughout the years still abide in a world torn as it is by battle and by barbarism.

The darkness of night has again cast its pall upon the world. Mankind, the world over, is enduring grave hardships, and in some quarters of the world mankind is being subjected to the most inhuman, bestial, and appalling atrocities that the world has ever known. The world is dark indeed, and men grope in the darkened recesses of the universe, seeking out the light of eternal day

And in this dark hour, the mothers of the world endure in silent suffering the ravages of our time. Theirs is a darkened and a disillusioned world. The breadth of their sacrifice and the depth of their anguish are beyond human measure. Millions of men face each other in battles of blood. Yet, every one of these men, no matter what his race, is some mother's son. Men the world over are being broken, maimed, and killed—and all these men are mothers' sons. Homes once tranquil and full are now consumed by a stifling yoke of uncertain emptiness. Young smiles, old loves, and gay hearts are missing. Yes; the world is at war. But mothers' hearts are bleeding. Their life's work is being spent upon the altar of war. The heavy blows which fall upon the world are rending the hearts and racking the bosoms of mothers everywhere in the world.

Mothers are being made to suffer, and yet they are not the cause of these sufferings. Throughout the world mothers' sons are being spent in angry battle, but the mothers of the world are not enemies. There is a kinship in motherhood which transcends all the arbitrary and man-made boundaries of nation, continent, and creed. The mothers in a free world are fortunate, for they at least are aware that their sacrifices are being made in the cause of right and justice. The mothers in a free world know that their status is reversed and protected by law. Free mothers know that their children are their own and not the pawns of any dictator or superstate.

But what of those mothers bowed 'neath the weight of dictatorial slavery and oppression? What of them, whose children are snatched away from them, almost at birth, to have their minds and morals poisoned with the deadly doctrines of the dictators? What of the mothers of Germany and Italy, whose bodies are wasted in the almost mechanical production of manpower for a deluded state? What of these mothers whose sons are dying for a cause they do not understand—a cause which cannot merit their support? What of the mothers of Japan, where motherhood is still a function of slavery and a regulation of the state? Yes; there are slave mothers in the world, and their hearts are bleeding, too. They have suffered the same pains. They have endured the same sacrifice; but, unlike the free mothers of the world, these mothers of slavery have never really possessed the children which they suffered to be born. Let us give a thought to them in this hour of darkness. There could be no more compelling argument against the Fascists than their own heartless and ill-conceived system, wherein mothers are slaves and motherhood is a prerogative of the state.

The persecuted races which are now suffering over vast portions of the world receive the compassion and sympathy of all mothers everywhere. Today, thousands upon thousands of children, wander aimlessly and without hope, over the face of Europe and Asia—their bodies wracked, their minds weakened from suffering and from want. Many of them starve in the streets or in the fields. Food which might have restored them is not to be found. Many others roam at large in forests, in ruined towns, and in abandoned camps. Truly, they are a lost generation of mothers' children.

What a pitiful thing that these flocks have strayed or been driven from the protective call of the shepherds who were their mothers. Yes, mothers' hearts bleed throughout the world, and men complain about sacrifice.

As surely as the mothers of the world endure this soul-quenching darkness of the night, so shall they inherit the light of an eternal day. For, out of this turmoil there shall come order. Out of this fury there shall come peace. Out of this hatred there shall come love. America, historic mother of the world's oppressed children, shall lead the way, and mother love shall find its full expression in the world that is to come.

The prophets of pillage, the philosophers of hate, the merchants of death and demoralization, who have enslaved the peoples and mothers in the Axis nations, and who now seek to enslave the peoples and mothers of all the world, shall be struck down and punished. The cancerous doctrines which they have foisted upon the world shall be isolated and destroyed. They and all their evil works shall be buried forever in the past. Broken homes, ravished races and conquered lands shall be restored. And those wandering bands of unguided children shall be led to a haven and a home. The battles will end. Rancor will die. And those who have endured the inhumanities of this dark hour shall strive henceforward to sustain the eternal light of justice.

In the coming of this new era, the mothers of the world will find for themselves a definite and a powerful place. Never again shall motherhood be bound down in the casts of slavery. Never again shall the forces of tyranny and barbarism sacrifice the handiwork of motherhood upon the altar of war. Mothers of every race and every creed shall see their children born in freedom, reared in peace and matured in homes and institutions which shall be free, progressive, and eternal. This is what every mother seeks. This is what the world shall have.

So, in this hour when the world is dark the hearts of mothers are heavy in their grief, I say to them, your sacrifices, your anguish, and your tears are not in vain. Soon the shroud shall lift and you shall behold the light of day. The very spirit of motherhood shall attend and restore this bleeding world. Your heart shall beat for all the world, and your tender care and your unfaltering love shall succor and sustain the world. Truly this coming day shall be an enduring day for all mothers—a day upon which no night shall ever fall.

Address by Hon. James M. Mead, of New York, at Graduation Exercises at the Ordnance School, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the able Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] at the graduation exercises of the Officer Candidates Division of the Ordnance School, at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md., on April 24, 1943, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I should like to add that Lieutenant Mead, son of the Senator from New York, was one of the graduates in this class.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The story is told of our famed General Chennault, now commanding officer of the United States forces in China, that in addressing a group of young pilots, he said:

"When I'm in the cockpit, I'm just a guy named Joe."

This war has taught us many lessons, not the least of which is that the sooner the rest of us climb into the cockpits and become just other guys named Joe, the sooner this war will be won.

If I may borrow General Chennault's expression, I address you today not as a United States Senator but simply as another guy named Jim, a humble citizen who has a vital share in the studies which are consummated in these ceremonies today. Perhaps I could venture the assumption that you boys might allow me the rare privilege of speaking for all the Joes and all the Jims in your family units who join with me in sharing your common accomplishments.

If there is one sentiment I know I may take the liberty of expressing for every parent who has a son in your ranks, it is that of pride in the fact that you have proven yourselves worthy of leadership in the Ordnance Division of the United States Army, and if I could express the hope which swells their hearts, it is this—that your service in the uniform of your country will add luster to the record of the Ordnance Division and that it will bring honor to the family name you bear.

The success with which you handle your future responsibilities will depend, not only upon the training you received here, but also upon how effectively you apply that training to the problems you meet in the field.

Warfare today requires a swift movement of troops; a rapid concentration of forces. It requires a building up of enormous fire power against successive objectives with breath-taking speed Modern battles are fought largely by platoon leaders in combat organizations. In ordnance organizations, likewise, the units are frequently dispersed so that successful operations depend upon the ingenuity, skill, and the resourcefulness of the junior officers.

The carefully prepared plans of higher commanders can do no more than start you off in the right direction, at the proper time and place, with the necessary tools, equipment, and men. Thereafter, you are on your own responsibility for the success of your mission rests entirely with you.

If you properly understand your tasks; if you have a working knowledge of the tools with which you are equipped; if you know the strength of your command as well as its limitations; if you have inspired the complete confidence and loyalty of your men; then things will go well with you and with your outfit

By this time, most of you have received your assignments. From this auditorium, many of you will go directly to 1 of our 75 theaters of operation, to the battlefields where our soldiers are now fighting.

Modern warfare, as you have been taught, is based upon three principles: strategy, tactics, and logistics.

Strategy is planning what must be done. This is the function, primarily, of your highest officers—your supreme commanders

Tactics is the method of doing it This is generally decided by your field commanders, but it is the junior officer's responsibility to see to it that his men carry out their mission in the most effective manner

Logistics is the supply of the matériel with which it is to be done. That includes your job, gentlemen.

This last classification embraces everything the fighting men must have—food, clothing, ammunition, and guns. But a soldier has gone for days without food—he has been forced to discard clothing in some battles when it hampered his movements. But without guns and ammunition, ready for instant use at all times, he is powerless and impotent. Without these, the cause for which he is risking and giving his life is a lost cause. Without these, the hopes of nearly all the people on earth perish. Without these the desperately fighting people of all the United Nations are sunk. That is your specific job, gentlemen.

The task confronting your generation challenges the imagination of man and taxes his ingenuity Never in all the history of nations has warfare been as widespread as complex, and as destructive, as is the war which has called all of us to the colors. To carry on the tasks involved in this war requires all the resources, all the matériel, all the scientific knowledge, and all the personnel which can be mobilized for the account of our military organization.

One of the greatest tasks includes the production, transportation, operation, and the maintenance of the military equipment with which our armies fight. It is your job to see to it that the American soldier on every single front of our far-flung battle lines is fully and at all times, equipped with the rifles, the mortars, the guns, the ammunition, and all the other fighting equipment required. It is your job to stay with them and to make sure that every bit of firing equipment is in excellent condition.

To do your job well, to give to your country more than is expected of you, to set an example for the men who serve under your command; to set an example as well for your fellow Americans to follow, is the place of honor reserved for you in this global struggle for defense of human freedom.

The intangible manifestation of your training here at Aberdeen has given dignity to your bearing; has added height to your stature. In my mind's eye I can see the happy, carefree, untrained American boys who gathered here a short time ago from the city streets and the country crossroads of this fair land of ours, strangers to one another but inspired by a common cause. Today, as I look upon you members of this graduation class, those same happy carefree American boys of yesterday, I now see the trained military leader, the polished soldier of today, the man to whom America now looks for strength. I see now stout-hearted, keen-eyed, alert, resolute, disciplined, well-trained men, all eager and ready to fill the responsible role to which you have dedicated your life; I now see Army officers grimly determined to preserve America for this generation and those who are to follow us.

While we at home know not what the future may hold in store for you, other than the service of our country, we do know that we are better fortified now as a result of your transition; we know that, because we too have grasped some of the spiritual strength with which you are now endowed.

Another result of your accomplishment is the fact that we will both profit immensely in the improvement of the collective service we will render to the Nation's cause. You have helped us by helping yourself, and together, our ultimate triumph is invincible.

One of the handicaps of a democracy is our lack of military preparedness. We naturally strive for peace. The making of war is a thing apart from our philosophy. Under these circumstances, when the clouds of war threatened our skies, and our security was menaced, the democratic processes we now fight to preserve speedily fashioned the framework of a huge military machine. Millions from every walk of life, strangers to the art of war, entered the armed forces over night. A huge task confronted our small staff of military instructors. With but a few thousand to train millions, it appeared an insurmountable bottleneck a few short months ago and many were the cynics who said it couldn't be done. But it could be done, and it was done.

These training schools were established in every State of the Union. Scenes such as we now witness this morning have been enacted and reenacted in all of those schools. Today we have the best-trained and the best-equipped army in the world, and an officer complement that will live up to our highest military traditions.

The relationship between the college graduate and his alma mater is comparable to the feeling that will live forever in your hearts for Aberdeen, and for the loyal, patient, industrious, and intelligent instructors who have made it possible for you to realize the high honor that is yours today—an officer in the Army of the United States. Those men, following the line of duty, serve here to give you and your successors the benefit of the knowledge and experience which is theirs. They sacrifice the opportunities and the glory to fight with the men at the fronts. Although they may still remain within the confines of Aberdeen, they will follow you in spirit wherever you go. They will take genuine satisfaction and justifiable pride out of your every accomplishment.

And now, Colonel Billingsley, I make bold to speak both for the class and their families and friends, by expressing a personal message of gratification for the great part you and your associate officers have taken in the work leading up to the ceremonies of today. As West Point and Annapolis are to the cadet and the midshipman, Aberdeen will be a name sacredly enshrined in the hearts of all of us.

Family Week

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, we have had "Be Kind to Animals Week," "Wartime Packaging Week," "Want Ad Week," "Honey for Breakfast Week," "National Egg Week," but at last, at long last, we are having a "Family Week." It is high time that honor was paid to this keystone of our national life.

Especially in these perilous times we recognize the value of the home as the bulwark of the Nation. And in paying tribute to the family we recognize it as the very foundation on which this bulwark is built.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in my remarks the following editorial from the Tablet, of New York:

FAMILY WEEK

It is about time that the American people got around to celebrating one "Week" with some genuine significance. We have run the gamut of "Weeks" from "Grapefruit Week" to "Ride a Roller-Coaster Week" until there are more weeks to be celebrated than there are weeks in a year. But now, at long last, plans are being made for the celebration of a "Week" that should have been given first rank in all such observances.

The family is the unit of society. It is the keystone of the arch over which any nation must march in progress. Let the family degenerate and the nation will disintegrate. In this country we have seen already far too many of the evils which Pope Leo XIII described in his encyclical on the "Evils of Society" thus: "The dignity of Christian marriage has been violated. Citizens have substituted legal concubinage for the legitimate union, married couples have neglected their mutual duties of fidelity, children have not observed the respect and obedience due their parents, and ties of domestic affection have been relaxed—as a most detestable example and gravest prejudice to public morals—pernicious and regrettable separations have succeeded an insensate love." Every effort to direct and to encourage parents and children in the accomplishment of their mutual duties, and to inspire in our youth the true ideals of Christian family life is useful and worth while. Consequently, "Family Week" can serve a highly important purpose in this direction.

Because of conditions peculiar to this war period, it is especially important that every means be utilized to keep in the forefront of our thinking the value of home and family life. The war effort has been the occasion, if not the excuse, for a trend away from the responsibilities of the home. It has taken married women and mothers away from the family into industry. It has produced a serious problem of juvenile delinquency in many sections of the country. Together with the absence of many husbands and fathers in the armed services, it has tended to disturb and

to disrupt home life. At the same time it is becoming more apparent that the apostles of communism and of totalitarianism are only too eager and too energetic in seizing the opportunities now afforded to nationalize the care and education of children and to socialize family life under state control. Such ideas as community kitchens, and other services offered to replace family life, such as day nurseries for mothers in war work, are fostered by the socializers in the interest of their doctrines.

"Family Week" should sound the true note that there can be no adequate substitute for the relationships between parents and children within the home. There is no other means by which the function of the family can be supplied except in accordance with the laws of God and in harmony with the dignity given to holy matrimony and to the Christian family by our Lord Jesus Christ. Insistence on this truth should be the highlight of the "Family Week" observance. The future of our great Nation will depend in great measure upon the strength and the quality of our family life. So far as "Family Week" will help to bring this truth home to the American public, it will serve a useful and important purpose.

Tribute to William Randolph Hearst

REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a tribute paid to William Randolph Hearst by the Grand Parlor of the Native Sons of the Golden West on the occasion of his eightieth birthday anniversary

Mr. Hearst served in this body. His parents were California pioneers. His father, George Hearst, represented the State of California in the United States Senate, and his talented mother, Phoebe Apperson Hearst, was known throughout the land for her many kind and benevolent acts.

W. R. HEARST ACCORDED TRIBUTE BY NATIVE SONS—BIRTHDAY SALUTE CITES FIGHT AGAINST JAP CALIFORNIA INFILTRATION

William Randolph Hearst, who celebrates his eightieth birthday today, was saluted by his fellow members of the Native Sons of the Golden West yesterday in a resolution praising his persistent fight against "infiltration of Japanese" into the economic and political life of California.

The resolution, which praised Mr Hearst as one of California's "most distinguished sons," was passed unanimously by the grand parlor of the Native Sons in San Francisco.

Pointing out that the State of California has "been strengthened and guided upward" by Mr. Hearst's loyal concern for her welfare, the resolution also paid tribute to the memory of his parents, the late United States Senator George Hearst and the late Mrs. Phoebe Apperson Hearst.

Passed at a meeting presided over by Lloyd J. Cosgrove, grand president, the resolution read:

"Whereas the Native Sons of the Golden West, committed for 66 years to the cause of carrying on the great work of the pioneers, to the end that California should reap the rewards of its great heritage, and having sought and obtained the loyal cooperation of its great membership, pauses to pay tribute in particular to one of her most distinguished sons; and

"Whereas the determined efforts of the Native Sons of the Golden West to preserve this land of rich resource and richer opportunity for the white race, have been strengthened and guided upward and forward by the wholehearted cooperation of one of her most gifted sons; and

"Whereas Brother William Randolph Hearst, who joined Stanford Parlor No. 76, Native Sons of the Golden West, 57 years ago at the age of 23, and is presently an active member of Sea Point Parlor No. 158, Sausalito, and who, on April 29, 1943, observes his eightieth birthday anniversary, and having given abundantly of his talent to the advancement of the interests of California, notably in his insistent and persistent editorial admonitions against permitting infiltration of Japanese and the oriental way of life in the economic and political life of this State; and

"Whereas the Order of the Native Sons of the Golden West, desiring at the same time to honor the memory of his distinguished pioneer parents, the late United States Senator George Hearst and the late revered Mrs. Phoebe Apperson Hearst: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That Brother William Randolph Hearst, be and he is herewith tendered the sincere salute of his Brothers of the Native Sons of the Golden West on the occasion of his eightieth birthday, with the further expression of the hope that his great abilities and greater loyalty will sustain them for many more years in the inspiring task of preserving California, the Golden, for Californians."

The Doughton Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter from Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and a statement of the National Lawyers Guild in support of the Doughton tax plan:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 30, 1943.

DEAR SIR: The Congress of Industrial Organizations has consistently favored a program for deduction of taxes currently from wages so that tax obligations may be more easily met. However, we have insisted that the adoption of such a program should not result in an oppressive and unworkable burden upon those in lower-income brackets who might otherwise be called upon to commence payment of 1943 taxes while still obligated to pay portions of their 1942 taxes.

On the other hand, the people's demand for a pay-as-you-go plan must not be used as a cloak for a tax grab for the highest income brackets through the Ruml plan.

To this end the Congress of Industrial Organizations has urged that taxes on 1943 income be deducted from the income as it is earned commencing as soon as possible. To avoid an oppressive burden upon taxpayers in the groups least able to make payments on 2 years' taxes at the same time, the Congress of Industrial Organizations has urged that the 1942 tax obligation be abated to the extent of the full normal tax and to the extent of the surtax on the first $2,000 of taxable income only.

As a practical matter, the House of Representatives will, on May 3, be confronted with two alternatives: (a) the pay-as-you-go plan set forth in H. R. 2570, referred to as the Doughton plan; and (b) the Rumi plan.

The issue which divides these two plans is the extent to which forgiveness of the 1942 tax liability will be extended to those income groups which can afford to pay their obligations to the Government. The Ruml plan, as a complete forgiveness of the entire 1942 tax obligation, is designed to create a windfall for all the high-income groups. For this reason the Congress of Industrial Organizations has consistently opposed this program.

Unfortunately, while President Roosevelt was seeking to effectuate a national economic stabilization policy regarding wages and prices, Congress saw fit to bestow a special privilege upon high-income groups by its repeal of the President's order limiting net annual salaries, after full deductions, to $25,000, thereby giving leeway for further increases on the higher salaries. The Ruml plan is but a continued effort to obtain additional privileges for high-income individuals.

A vote for the Ruml plan must therefore be construed by all Americans as a vote on behalf of wealthy individuals who seek to evade their obligation to pay their 1942 taxes to the Government.

The Doughton plan, as incorporated in H. R. 2570, will result in a forgiveness of the major portion of the 1942 tax liability for the low-income groups but with a higher percentage of the 1942 taxes for the middle and high-income groups than that originally proposed by the Congress of Industrial Organizations' plan. In light of the present situation, the Congress of Industrial Organizations is willing to extend its support to the Doughton plan as an effective compromise

In so doing the Congress of Industrial Organizations expressly reasserts the position which it has taken with reference to the 1943 tax program, which has yet to be considered by Congress, that (a) the so-called Victory tax must be repealed, and (b) personal exemptions must be increased to assure a minimum standard for the low-income groups.

On behalf of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, I most earnestly request your support for H. R. 2570 and your assistance in defeating the Ruml plan.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MURRAY,
President.

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD IN SUPPORT OF THE DOUGHTON BILL

The National Lawyers Guild urges Congress, in the interest of prompt passage, to adopt the Doughton bill to place the Nation's individual taxpayers on a pay-as-you-earn basis. The imperative need for a pay-as-you-earn basis. The imperative need for a pay-as-you-earn tax system is recognized on all sides. We believe that the Doughton plan affords an equitable means of achieving that highly important objective

In essence, the Doughton plan provides that the tax on 1942 incomes shall be recomputed by applying the 1941 rates and the 1941 exemptions of $750 and $1,500 instead of the higher 1942 rates and the 1942 exemptions of $500 and $1,200. Under the Doughton bill, therefore, the 7,000,000 new taxpayers with net incomes under $750 and $1,500 who paid an income tax in 1943 for the first time, will become current The Doughton bill provides a cancelation of from 9 to 14 percent of net taxable incomes of all

taxpayers. The percentage of tax reduction to taxable income for specified income levels is shown in the attached table.

The Doughton bill is in striking contrast to the Carlson-Ruml plan which would cancel 100 percent of 1 year's tax liability, even though the taxpayer had a very large income and had no need for cancelation relief. The Carlson bill, a slightly modified version of the Ruml plan, would forgive the entire tax liability on 1942 or 1943 income, and would result in a total cancelation of approximately $10,000,000,000.

The Doughton plan is far more equitable than the Robertson-Forand plan which would cancel 19 percent of the total taxable income of all taxpayers, whether that income was $2,000 or $1,000,000. Thus, it is estimated that the Doughton bill would cancel about $4,400,000,000 of the $9,800,000,000 total estimated liability on 1942 income, while the Robertson-Forand plan is estimated to cancel $7,600,000,000. Congress must reject the Knutson plan which would cancel 75 percent of the 1942 tax on earned income and 50 percent of the 1942 tax on investment income, and which follows in the footsteps of the Ruml plan and suffers from all of its basic defects.

Under the Doughton bill, a taxpayer who owes taxes on 1942 income would become current in 3 years, or before then if he makes earlier payment for which he is allowed specified discounts. The Doughton bill imposes no real hardship on anyone since the reduced 1942 tax may be paid in installments over a 3-year period (1944–45–46) and an additional 36 months' extension may be obtained in cases of undue hardship in meeting these installments. Nevertheless, the opponents of the Doughton bill contend that in the case of the higher income levels, it calls for payments in excess of the individual's income during the 3-year period. This argument conveniently overlooks the balance of the 1942 income which the large income recipient has after his living expenses. This balance, which is the bulk of the large income taxpayer's 1942 income, is in the form of savings, purchases of tax-anticipation certificates, or investments—earmarked for the payment of 1942 tax obligations. These reserves, quite obviously, are more than enough to take care of the reduced 1942 tax which leaves the 1944 income, for example, to take care of the tax liability on 1944 income without any hardship.

Collection at the source, an essential element of a pay-as-you-go system, would begin on July 1, 1943, on wages and salaries. These collections would be applied to the tax on 1943 incomes, as would be the payments made during the first 6 months of 1943.

The National Lawyers Guild has at all times urged that cancelation to afford relief from double payment should be based on actual need and must avoid the unwarranted and inequitable windfalls of the Ruml plan. The Guild still believes its proposal to cancel the tax on the first $2,000 of 1942 income after exemptions is the soundest solution to the problem of transition. The essence of the Guild proposal has only very recently been adopted by the New York Times (editorials of April 19, 23) which suggested as a compromise that Congress forgive "the tax on, say, the first $5,000 of income of every taxpayer for 1942."

Of all the tax bills before Congress, the Doughton bill alone approaches the tests of sound pay-as-you-go legislation and therefore deserves the support of the American people—in the absence of a bill limiting cancelation to the lower incomes. However, all attempts to increase the amount of cancelation for the higher bracket incomes beyond the levels set by the Doughton bill must be vigorously resisted.

April 28, 1943.

Price of Feeder Cattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

COUNCIL BLUFFS SAVINGS BANK,
Council Bluffs, Iowa, April 27, 1943.

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

FRIEND BEN: I am handing you herein a photostatic copy of a resolution that was passed here in March, the original of which I sent to Senator WILSON to be presented in the Senate, and I thought you would like to have this for the House RECORD.

There is no question but what our feed lots are not being filled with green cattle to take the place of the fat ones which have been going to market recently and with the Government raising the price of feed, lowering the price of the fat cattle and the fat hogs, there just isn't going to be as much meat produced in this section as there has been. The farmers just cannot see their way clear to look a loss in the face and take our feeders at the prices they are now compared to the fat cattle prices.

With best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

B. A. GRONSTAL,
President.

At a meeting March 24, 1943, at Council Bluffs, Iowa, of the Pottawattamie County Bankers' Association (which association is in the heart of the cattle feeding territory) it was disclosed that our cattle feeders are alarmed at the present price of feeder cattle. They are declining to take out new feeders because of the present ceiling on meat and no ceiling on live cattle which has brought about a condition that feeder cattle are costing them as much or more per pound than they are currently receiving for fat cattle and feel that there should be a differential of about 2 cents per pound between feeder and fat cattle of about the same quality.

In order to assure a continued supply of butcher meat for the consumer and armed forces, we urge the Government to see that a proper differential between feeder and fat cattle prices is maintained as an incentive to keep the feed lots full and utilize to the best advantage the abundance of feed through the experienced operators in the feeder territories. We deem this of special importance because of the shortage of meat.

Avoca, Iowa: Avoca State Bank, Frank C. Vierhus; Citizens Savings Bank, R. G. Peters; Carson, Iowa: State Savings Bank, Fred A Childs; Council Bluffs, Iowa: Council Bluffs Savings Bank, P. A. Gronstal, President; First National Bank, George W. Woods; City National Bank, Robert W. Turner; State Savings Bank, A. C. Blanchard, President; McClelland, Iowa: McClelland Savings Bank, L. W. Barnes; Neola, Iowa: Farmers & Merchants State Bank, Rolland W. Hall; Oakland, Iowa: Citizens State Bank, Lewis W. Ross; Oakland Savings Bank, W. L. Spencer; Treynor, Iowa: Treynor State Bank, J. W. Gronstal; Underwood, Iowa: Underwood Savings Bank, Edward F. Hubbard; Walnut, Iowa: Walnut State Bank, W. J. Otto; being members of the Pottawattamie County Bankers' Association.

Pay-As-You-Go Income-Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

LA CROSSE, WIS., *April 19, 1943.*

Hon. ROBERT H. DOUGHTON,
Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Hon. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON,
Members, National House of
Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: I submit for your consideration proposed pay-as-we-go form of income-tax plan which may be briefly explained as follows:

1. A pay-as-we-earn Ruml, Carlson, Doughton, or any other name you may wish to call it.

2. A gross income tax to be assessed against all salaries from the President down through the Senate and House of Representatives, all white-collar workers in Washington and throughout the Nation, and all other salaries paid on a monthly or definite time basis, and all gross business of every nature, kind, and description.

3. All taxes assessed against 1942 income to be divided into 20 equal payments and collected quarterly during next 5 years.

This plan, when couched in legal language, will meet every requirement. It will not only produce abundant revenue to carry on the war, but will provide an ample surplus to pay a decent pension to old age, the crippled, blind, and permanently disabled from any cause, and to care for millions of women and children ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed.

Men and women on salary, and the worker in the shop and factory, don't want any return. They don't want to be classed as so many checkers on a board to be moved about at will.

They want the right to stand side by side and buy bonds along with those clothed in purple and white linen.

This is not Russia. This is not Germany. This is America; and we Americans who produce the wealth of this country want to pay our just share of taxes to support the Government and win the war, but we also want bureaucracy and big business to pay in exact proportion. No more; no less. A gross income tax assures this equity of assessment.

Your withholding-tax scheme is a stab in the back of the sons of toil. It will place them side by side with their aged fathers and mothers who barely exist on the scanty dole allotted to them by the social-security racket.

A gross-income tax is equal justice to the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the worker and the aristocrat.

Yes; we have heard the propaganda-clothed argument that a gross-income tax will bankrupt the small businessman; that he will go out of business because he cannot earn enough to pay his taxes and support his family. If the small businessman does not

know just how to absorb the tax and still make a profit, then there is little hope for him under any condition.

Page after page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been filled with argument pro and con on how to raise necessary taxes to prosecute the war, all to no avail.

Why not now turn your attention to the common-sense method outlined above, and enact a Federal tax law that will apply equally to all people and all business in direct proportion to income?

W. S. COZAD.

They Also Serve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Traveler of April 29, 1943:

THEY ALSO SERVE—WOMEN PRAISED FOR WAR WORK—317,000 IN NEW ENGLAND PLANTS, CIVIL SERVICE SHARE HONORS WITH UNIFORMED SISTERS

Prominence of the WAAC's and WAVES in the Nation's war drive should not leave the American public to minimize the importance of the essential work done by women civil-service employees and the sacrifices of the millions of nonuniformed women throughout the land.

Such was the admonition today of Miss Florence Birmingham, of Brighton, president of the Woman's Political Club of Massachusetts.

Back from a trip to Washington where she delved deeply into conditions facing women civil-service employees, Miss Birmingham stressed that these girls are working fully as hard as and in many cases making even greater sacrifices than the uniformed women of the WAAC's, WAVES, SPARS, and women MARINES.

"Women in defense plants throughout the country are doing every bit as much in releasing young men, physically fit, for service in the armed forces," Miss Birmingham said.

Contrasting the attractive promises of training, food, and living conditions made in recruiting women for the uniformed branches with the blunt literature of the Civil Service Commission, she said:

"One Civil Service Commission folder is entitled 'Wanted: Stenographers. Uncle Sam Calls for Office Volunteers.' It is dramatic in the stark simplicity of its warning that war work means concentration on the task at hand, self-discipline, and self-sacrifice."

MUST MAKE SACRIFICES

There is no free training, free clothing, or pleasant campus environment for these girls, Miss Birmingham emphasized. Instead, they are told they can't expect to walk to work, that Washington is crowded, quarters are not spacious, girls will have to double up and stenographers and typists must forego some of life's little conveniences, Miss Birmingham reported.

By comparison, he stressed, the WAAC's and WAVES are vastly better off in spite of the fact that their work is not more vital to the war drive than that of the women civil-service employees.

"To get all possible facts," said Miss Birmingham, "I journeyed to Washington to talk with the Civil Service Commission there. I went bearing a letter of introduction from Senator DAVID I. WALSH.

"They told me that recently the Defense Housing Registry in Washington listed more than 4,000 houses with available rooms in Washington and in nearby communities in Maryland and Virginia.

RENTS ARE HIGH

"The majority were in residential areas 30 to 45 minutes from Government offices. An additional 2,000 rooms were listed as available in nearby communities.

"Average room rents are $25 to $35 a month for single rooms and $35 to $50 for double rooms. Room and board and with two or more in a room ranges from $45 to $55 per month. Properly balanced meals cost $1.25 a day.

"If WAVES, WAAC's and SPARS have no need of hurried drug-store snacks, the Civil Service Commission cannot assure their employees of a like happy situation.

"The earnest worker on a 48-hour stretch a week, often with overtime, has little time to shop for groceries, nor for cooking meals. She starts off to work in the morning fortified solely by a drug-store counter breakfast.

"Dormitories for girls have been constructed, but the confusion is not yet in hand."

GIRLS WORRIED

Over one situation in particular, civil-service employees appointed for the duration and 6 months are deeply worried, Miss Birmingham said. That is whether civil-service girls who hope to gain permanent appointments after the war will be automatically displaced by the uniformed women. Miss Birmingham told of putting this question to civil-service officials. She continued:

"I was told that if the WAAC's, WAVES, SPARS, and MARINES should be rated as actual veterans, meriting veterans' preference and veterans' benefits, they would take the place of civil-service employees.

"I replied that fear of such a happening hangs heavily over the patriotic hearts of Government war workers. A great injustice would be done to civil-service workers in the Army, Navy, and ordnance departments.

"Women workers in such departments have not enjoyed the glamor of drill, marches, and uniforms. They know only the humdrum routine which they accept uncomplainingly and handle with efficiency and enthusiasm.

"I reminded the Civil Service Commission that many women in the noncombat forces of the WAAC's, WAVES, SPARS, and MARINES receive the same pay as commissioned officers in the armed forces, while there are few, if any women supervisors in the new Government war bureaus constantly springing up in Massachusetts and through the Nation.

THREE HUNDRED AND SEVENTEEN THOUSAND IN NEW ENGLAND

"The answer of civil-service officials was that they could only make recommendations. The bureau heads made the actual appointments."

Regional Director William A. Foley, of the First United States Civil Service District, Boston, told her, Miss Birmingham said, that there were approximately 317,000 New England women engaged in war work, both within the Government service and outside of it.

She quoted House Minority Leader Joseph W. Martin, Jr., as telling her:

"The civil-service employees, and particularly the women, have proved their loyalty, efficiency, and patriotism in this great crisis. They are entitled to the thanks of all."

Other nonuniformed women, Miss Birmingham said, received these words of tribute from Representative PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton:

"Perhaps the greatest praise of all must be reserved for the courageous mothers of our country who, while their sons and husbands are in the fighting forces at home and abroad, keep constant vigil over the integrity of the American home and hearthstone in these most trying times of food shortages and rationing."

And Miss Birmingham added her own comment:

"Perhaps this war period demands that women who are carrying on the work of the home front must hold the spotlight. If so, let all women workers receive due credit, for all women, not a few groups, are patriotically and earnestly striving to lead America to victory."

There Can Be Full Employment Without Governmental Regimentation or Harm to Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have been contending in the House and elsewhere that the wise and vigorous employment of sound monetary, fiscal, and social security policies, coupled with a vigorous pursuit of an antimonopoly program, could form the heart of America's answer to the necessity of providing jobs and opportunity to men returning from winning the war and of assuring a full home market for our goods after the war.

One of the best expositions of this general point of view that I have seen is the following article by Mr. John H. G. Pierson which appears in the Free World for April 1943.

WHAT CHANCE FOR FREE ENTERPRISE AFTER THE WAR?

(By John H. G. Pierson)

It is unthinkable that after this war a situation will again be allowed to exist in America in which men and women will be unable to find jobs. But is there in fact any possibility that we can prevent the return of unemployment without, in the process, digging the grave of free enterprise? This question may seem indecent to economic prudes, and funny to planners committed to rigid interpretations of planning, and in the armed forces, wherever located, there are people who really would like to know the answer.

The answer offered here is in the affirmative. Full employment need not preclude free competitive enterprise. But that is not to say that free, competitive enterprise will be saved by giving pep talks or invoking the American way. It won't. Nor will it be saved by merely reapplying, more vigorously than before, the economics of the 1930's. Many economists seem to feel that the political problems involved in securing a full-employment economy after the war present a large question mark, but that the economic problems have all been solved. Surely the latter part of this proposition is not well founded in fact. At least if encouragement to economic individualism is supposed to be part of the picture, the last word has not yet been said.

The question at issue, so far as domestic public policy is concerned, is the proper relation between public investment in the broadest sense, control over aggregate individual

purchasing power—or, better, aggregate consumer spending—and antitrust action. The trouble with the usual public investment approach is that it does not show how all the needed jobs can be assured without creation of an environment hostile to traditional forms of enterprise, and does not accurately control purchasing power. Also, on the theoretical side, it needlessly assumes that, when total investment and total saving are out of line, investment is the one that must change. The trouble with much of the consumer-demand theory is that it overlooks or minimizes the power of unregulated monopolies to prevent production and employment from expanding in step with expanding demand for commodities and services. The trouble with almost all current formulations is that they pay too little attention to the possibility of applying the underwriting principle in economic affairs on a broad national basis. Or else, if they advocate this principle, they limit economic flexibility by underwriting individual markets one by one rather than the national market as a whole.

If these contentions are correct, then it is still worth while to spend some time on the fundamental or strategic factors in economics. Work must be done on the details of their application in the post-war world, and some of this work as it relates to the ideas contained in the following pages is now going on in Washington. But the present discussion only deals with general alignments among the fundamental elements.

II

No one will deny that before the war we had already moved far away from nineteenth century approximation of laissez faire. It would be somewhat academic to try to measure the further distance we have traveled down that road since Pearl Harbor. As a result of priorities, allocation of men and material, price controls, and so forth, many small businesses are going to the wall, monopoly threatens to increase, or actually does increase, and the rates of operation of our going production enterprises are being more and more regulated by Government. This last is an evident necessity, but it narrows the scope of free enterprise, at least for the duration.

Now the advocates of planned production take the position that, even for peace, the competitive system has reached the end of its usefulness and must be superseded. For the sake of the argument, let us make some concessions to that point of view. At some future date it is conceivable that competition, as we have known it, may practically disappear. This is debatable. And in any case, even if it were not, the date could hardly be predicted. However, the advance of modern technology has tended to concentrate production in larger units, and these have very often acquired the characteristics of monopoly or partial monopoly and created a need for regulation in the public interest. The advantage of size—at least, in many cases—is greater efficiency. The penalty is the disappearance of competition as the laissez faire economists conceived it. It is not a foregone conclusion that technology need always favor bigness, any more than that technology is always the explanation where bigness exists. Moreover, certain services and also certain commodities can never be produced on a large scale. Nevertheless, the possibility arises that at some future date mass-production methods will have driven individualistic competition from practically every corner of our economy. In that case, public regulation of production is likely to become so general that it clears the way for systematic, over-all production planning.

The only reason for tentatively sketching this distant perspective is that it helps by contrast to define the post-war foreground. If we finally do come to over-all production planning—in a country with so deeply ingrained traditions of individual enterprise and competition—the explanation will most likely be technological. This can be ventured because public opinion hardly ever runs ahead of the facts; a lag is more to be expected. On the other hand, the explanation for the current trend toward administrative controls is altogether different. Obviously the war is responsible, not technological change. If this is so, then it reinforces the usual presumption (and the findings of certain public opinion polls) that most, or at any rate, very many Americans will want to go back to a free, competitive economy when the war is over. Barring the possibility of an extremely long war, or an outcome destructive of all the conditions that permit choices to be made, economic individualism will again make a powerful appeal.

How much economic individualism can post-war America stand?

No quantitative guess will be ventured here. Presumably the maximum possibility is somewhat smaller than the maximum possibility was before the war, because of technological progress in the meantime. But the real issue is whether any approximation of the maximum possibility can be made actual, and if so how. The indispensable condition for stability, democracy, and freedom after the war is sustained full employment. Is there any ground for supposing that we can have full employment in post-war America without accepting a far larger measure of governmental administrative control over our production system than is required by strictly technological considerations?

In certain quarters the tendency is to give up on this question without a struggle. A case in point is supplied in a news letter put out by a leading firm of management engineers. The authors correctly diagnose our central post-war problem: "Our fundamental problem is how to create an industrial system that will insure a continuous production and exchange of goods and services that people need, so that all who want to work may have the opportunity to do so and the money with which they can buy all the things produced by other workers." But they then propose as a solution a system of planned production, with details unspecified but with the following general characteristics. "Its keystones would be: planning and budgeting industry operation, coordinating it nationally, creating and maintaining cooperation between individual companies and between labor, management, and stockholders, and having necessary governmental support." In other words, what they are suggesting is a further departure from individualistic methods of determining individual business rates of operation. This is probably also the view of many other Americans who are pessimistic about the possibility of getting full employment any other way. The view in question assumes that we cannot hope to secure coordinated control of the over-all volume of production and employment unless we establish some form of coordinated control of individual production quotas.

Without minimizing the difficulty of the problem or saying that competition can revive where the basic conditions for it have gone and cannot be restored, it may be pointed out that we have never had a program capable of combining full employment with a technologically given maximum of free competition. The two fundamentals of such a program would be a monetary-fiscal policy able to keep up the effective demand for commodities and services, and a monopoly and competition policy oriented to technological realities.

Both are essential. Neither one is sufficient without the other. Were we to try to sustain full employment through monetary-fiscal instruments alone, the attempt would fail. In a regime of pure competition we could probably control the over-all volume of production and employment rather accurately by controlling the size of the total demand for products, first taking into account any expected changes in costs. But, obviously, this could not be the case if monopolies were able to neutralize an increase in demand by raising their selling prices. On the other side, were we to put our trust entirely in a system of governmental regulation of individual rates of operation, and were we willing to push such a system of administrative controls to its logical conclusion, we could secure full employment, but only by sacrificing free production for market.

III

A monopoly and competition policy oriented to technological realities would have the following characteristics:

It would make proper distinction between areas in which monopolistic situations are "natural" (inevitable for technical reasons) and areas in which monopolistic situations are "artificial" (based on unnecessary, unfair restraints of trade).

Then it would deal adequately with both types of situation. It would support and enforce competition in lines of production where competition has a real chance. For instance, it would help little business to borrow money on fair terms, make the patent system encourage innovation rather than buttress intrenched positions, and vigorously suppress restrictive and collusive practices in general. And at the same time it would regulate the inevitably monopolistic lines of production as far as regulation was necessary. That does not mean that perfect efficiency in terms of low-cost production would result or be considered attainable or important. Rather it means that the new public utility rules (as they might be called) would be designed to prevent such raising of prices and limitation of output as might defeat the full-employment objective or interfere seriously with a balanced use of the Nation's resources.

All this presupposes that it is or might be possible to distinguish areas that are inevitably monopolistic from areas of workable competition. Presumably that can be done with a reasonable degree of success if the available data are assembled and studied, in the light of modern economic theory, with the objective clearly in view. The sources for data include, for example, the case studies made by the Antitrust Division and Federal Trade Commission and the findings of the Temporary National Economic Committee monopoly investigation. Out of such materials a practical set of criteria can probably be constructed for identifying workable competition on the one hand and monopoly (monopoly in the public sense rather than the narrow or pure sense) on the other. Our knowledge of the contents of these two major subdivisions of the American economy will then amount to more than a mere enumeration as of a particular date. Our knowledge will include, in addition, an understanding of the main distinguishing characteristics, with the obvious advantage that this will facilitate reclassification whenever reclassification becomes necessary.

A given industry may for a while possess the characteristics of competition, and be subject to the rules of the game applying to competition, but later on, as a result of technological progress, that industry may have to come under the different rules applying to monopoly. The criteria will help show when this transition is required. Thus they will facilitate an orderly progression of our economy, based on technological realities. A slight variation of this procedure also might be worth considering. There will doubtless be border-line cases in which the technological picture is not clear. In these cases it might be best to leave the choice between operating under rules of competition and

under rules of monopoly to the industry itself. Even in certain intrinsically less puzzling cases the choice might be left to the industry.

For example, an industry might be asked to choose between restricting the activities of its trade association to the point where exemption from scale-of-operation regulations could legitimately be granted and, on the other hand, permitting its trade association to suppress competition and in that case subjecting itself to the regulations in question. Any resulting losses from the standpoint of not securing the technologically possible maximum of free competition might be more than compensated by the gains from the standpoint of retaining more free choice. This could, however, be true only where a choice thus registered represented a fair consensus of the businessmen affected, and not a vote dictated by a powerful minority in the industry. And, of course, it also presupposes, to begin with, a set of monopoly regulations capable of accomplishing what it is necessary to have them accomplish.

IV

It is now time to turn to the other essential element, a monetary-fiscal policy able to keep up the effective demand for commodities and services. For only through such a monetary-fiscal policy can government give competitive enterprise its maximum support.

The dominant school of thought on this subject is preoccupied with the problem of investment—ordinarily interpreted to mean production of capital goods, including consumers' capital goods such as houses. Much has been said in recent years about the need to make up for deficiencies in private investment by expansion of public investment—which, again, may in part take the form of facilities to provide free services direct to the consuming public. In some quarters it is estimated that we must be prepared to have a public investment program after the war ranging in cost anywhere from zero up to $20,000,000,000 a year, or else give up the idea of full employment.

On the whole this is not, in the opinion of leading spokesmen of the investment school today, a matter of priming the pump to get things started. It is a matter of filling up gaps as they occur. Naturally the gaps do not always have to be connected with investment activity, or filled with public investment. While that is ordinarily supposed to be the case, other possibilities are also taken into account. More broadly, what is advocated is the filling of any gaps in private employment by means of expansion in public employment. More broadly still, what is suggested is that government assume responsibility for specific employment-giving production activities to the extent that private initiative falls short. It is of course true that public construction expenditures frequently represent payments for work supplied by private concerns on a contract basis, in which case government is not the actual employer. But in any case the essential idea is that government closes up the gaps.

The arguments advanced for this type of policy have rendered two great services. In the first place, they have stressed the fact that governmentally initiated production activity must be used as the final balancing item to maintain full employment. It is hard to see how anyone who supports the objective of full employment can quarrel with that. It is clear that the indicated principle must apply during the stresses and shifts of the immediate demobilization period. Moreover, it must apply at other times as well. For example, some fluctuation would be bound to occur in the level of private employment even if the final markets for the products of private enterprise were stabilized. Because of changes in the rate of introduction of new inventions, fluctuations in the rate of replacement of fixed equipment, and certain other factors, the capital goods industries in particular would tend to be busier at some times than at others even if the sale of consumer commodities and services were proceeding at an uninterrupted and steady pace. The further merit of the gap-filling approach to monetary-fiscal problems is that its advocates, looking around for large chunks of activity with which to fill large gaps, find themselves supporting (more strongly than ever) an extension of public enterprise or responsibility into certain fields in which it is indeed overdue.

There are fields into which Government has not yet gone and should in future go, or into which it should go to a greater extent than it has hitherto, simply because certain badly wanted services will otherwise not be supplied. This ought not to startle anybody. Roads and education, to mention but two historical examples, were once considered to belong in the province of private enterprise. Times change. Looking ahead to the kind of peace we want, it hardly seems open to question that Government should lay out very substantial amounts to help clear our slums and bring decent housing to the people, provide some approximation of adequate medical care for everyone, move ahead toward universal educational opportunity, and conserve and develop the natural resources of the land we live in. Moreover, mention of these particularly obvious fields for public activity as well as expenditure is not intended to deny the existence of others, if the need can be fairly shown.

But precisely here is the weakness of the gap-filling approach, which tends to blur the line between need for products and need to create jobs. Normal or nonemergency public activities should in most cases go forward unconditionally. It is not a question of looking to see if there are employment gaps that require filling. It is enough that the end products of these particular public activities are considered by most people to be desirable for their own sake. On the other hand, emergency public works or work projects stand on a different footing. Of course, such work as serves no useful purpose should be barred in any event, and the authorized projects should be carefully selected so that the end products are as valuable as possible. But that does not alter the fact that in these cases employment provides the real justification, not our need for the end products.

Unfortunately, the gap-filling approach, pure and simple, invites confusion of this distinction. Its adherents are tempted to overplay the intrinsic usefulness (usefulness of the end products) of this or that public activity which can, to be sure, fill gaps, but would perhaps not gain general acceptance on that basis. Their argument rings slightly hollow. Under analysis it is found to imply the existence, year after year, of a tremendously broad zone of indifference, a zone millions of jobs and billions of dollars broad, with regard to which it is supposed to be practically impossible to say whether public activity is preferable to private enterprise or vice versa. This may conceivably be so, but, considering the magnitudes involved, it taxes the average man's credulity. Thus in one way it may even hurt a cause for which in other respects the same persons have fought with skill as well as devotion—the cause of the public services that are genuinely needed.

The difficulty arises because the gap-filling school has not devoted enough attention to keeping the gap from opening up in the first place or has not found the right means for the purpose. Many adherents of this school wish to encourage private initiative and make various suggestions as to how it should be done. However, their main concern is to show that gap-filling public investment is itself an encouraging rather than a discouraging factor. To this end they point out that the investment is to be limited to creating products not sold in competition with the products of private enterprise. With varying degrees of emphasis, depending on the extent to which they retain a faith in the pump-priming theory, they add that such public activities stimulate private enterprise indirectly as a result of their demand for raw materials and equipment. Finally, they lay particular stress on the so-called multiplier effect—the consideration that investment (in this case public investment) puts out purchasing power by way of its pay rolls, which in turn helps enterprise as a whole find markets for its products.

Much of this, so far as it goes, is perfectly sound If the pump-priming results anticipated by the more optimistic members of the school could be counted on, it would even mean that public investment could be permitted to taper off after a while because private enterprise would expand as a result of the stimulus received from the original increase in public investment. But that possibility—no stronger word is justified by the record—does not meet the ultimate objection. For it would still be true that, during all fill-in periods, the free competitive sector is narrower than it would be if the economic environment supported competitive individual enterprise up to the technologically given maximum. This is the issue that is never met by any program of filling gaps.

V

Clearly the country needs a policy of positive support for competitive enterprise as a whole, and lip service to that idea is not enough. Furthermore, the policy should be of a fundamental and practical nature. Most of the measures suggested, whether by the public investment school or by the opponents of Government intervention, are either good but in themselves inadequate (for example, removal of taxes that deter enterprise) or else of highly doubtful effectiveness and in any case socially undesirable (for example, wage cuts).

By contrast, a fundamental and practical policy would include, with other encouraging measures, a direct and unequivocal support of aggregate consumer demand. It would peg this demand at levels sufficient to provide a market for the output of commodities and services private enterprise can bring to market when it is operating on a scale that leaves no employment gap to be filled. Consumer demand would not in the last analysis be supported indirectly by way of the purchasing power put out by a gap-filling public investment program; the objection to that has just been noted. Rather it would be supported and controlled directly, by having Government give and stand back of a guaranty of aggregate consumer spending.

To begin with, Government would estimate, on the basis of wage rates and other factors, the amount of consumer spending needed to take next year's full-employment output off the market, and would peg the size of the consumer market as a whole by underwriting the total estimated in that way. This would amount to opening up the draft to keep the fires of enterprise burning. Without favoring one enterprise more than another, it would create the environment in which business initiative as a whole would have the opportunity to show what it can do. To describe this still differently, it would provide a full-size framework for private enterprise.

A radio manufacturer, for instance, would not have his own market underwritten, but, since he would know for certain that consumer demand as a whole would not shrink, he would benefit in proportion to his competitive ability to attract customers. An industry like the steel industry, in turn, while it would necessarily still face the competition of aluminum and magnesium, could

count on a steadier flow of orders than is possible as long as nothing secures the aggregate sales of consumer goods embodying or produced with the help of steel, aluminum, magnesium, and all other materials.

Whenever full employment was not achieved as a result of the inducement given by this guaranty, Government would expand its flexible program of public-work projects. Thus it would indeed fill any remaining gaps—but with the distinction that the gap-filling program would here be the final line of defense against unemployment and the front line. Finally, Government would see to it that by adjustment of the full-emotionalism volume, of payments to income thus brought about, a total of consumer spending emerged that was neither in excess of nor less than the amount guaranteed. This it would do by subsidizing or taxing, or lending to or borrowing from, consumption directly, if and as necessary.

Such a policy would not correspond to the view that total saving must always govern total investment. Those who insist on the need for public investment hold that total investment can be allowed to decline when we achieve a more equal distribution of income, since that will weaken the tendency to save, which is, of course, strongest in the upper income brackets. In the meantime, however, they submit that we have no reasonable choice but to make investment outlays equal to the total of the voluntary savings accumulating at a full-employment level of income. But it is hard to see why that must necessarily be so. We might equally well cut down total saving, inasmuch as that can be done without interfering with the individual's right to save. Suppose, for example, that a tendency toward oversaving required government to subsidize individual consumption, under the consumption-pegging policy in spite of the existence of full employment and a full-employment volume of money income. In that case, the funds for the subsidies could in whole or in part be borrowed by "tap issues" directed at the savers who had found no investment outlets for their surplus incomes.

So far as expense is concerned, such a program would raise the costs of government to the extent that an oversaving problem as such made consumption subsidies necessary for fulfillment of the guarantee. On the other hand, it would lower the costs of government, as against what a full-employment program by the straight gap-filling method would involve, to the extent that the incentive provided by the guarantee cut down the size of the employment gaps to be filled. The net effect upon costs might well be favorable, provided the program were linked up with advances on other critical fronts in our economy. The monopoly and competition policy already suggested would help translate the inducement of the guarantee into actual private production and employment, and would thus limit the expenditure for public works. A progressive system of taxes and a wise strengthening of our social insurance system to meet the needs of the aged, the sick, and persons handicapped in various ways—the common man's charter to which, as also to adequate labor standards, America already stands morally committed—would favor the spending of individual income and therefore minimize the oversaving tendency.

If the above analysis is correct, then what is needed next on the monetary-fiscal side is a working out in detail of the problems of mechanics involved in the direct adjustment of total consumer spending to guaranteed levels. There are two halves to this. A satisfactory way must be found to support consumer spending when, full employment notwithstanding, it tends to fall short. To date there has not been enough discussion of the problem to indicate the relative merits of tax reductions, tax rebates, special national-income security payments, and other techniques (including timed bond redemptions in the early post-war years) that might be used for this purpose. Further exploration should likewise suggest the most acceptable way of keeping consumer spending from exceeding the guarantee. Whenever that tendency is uppermost rather than the other, the suggested policy requires that the excessive demand be removed from consumer markets. That will avoid a price inflation danger such as we face today.

It will be seen that a monetary-fiscal policy along the indicated lines rests on the following argument. In general, the volume of public investment, including public services to the consumer, should be decided by judging the end products of the various Government enterprises on their merits. To be sure, some public investment is needed for another reason—as a final balancing item to offset temporary declines in private investment. Ordinarily a rather small amount should be sufficient under the latter heading, although at times when an abnormally rapid physical transformation of the economy is under way, as will be the case in the demobilization period after the war, the amount may be fairly large.

The volume of private investment over a period of years should be allowed to work itself out as a result of the progress of invention, the rate of interest established, and the demand "derived back" from the demand for consumer commodities and services. Aggregate savings should be cut down to the level of aggregate investment as thus determined by its private and public components. The rest of our potential production energy, up to the level of full employment, should be thrown into producing commodities and services to be bought by individual consumers in the proportions they think best. To make this possible government should underwrite aggregate consumer spending at appropriate levels, which can be done right away without waiting for income to be distributed differently.

VI

After this war the first condition for justice, and even for peace itself, is that we make full employment the cornerstone of the American economy. Returning to the opening question, full employment will not necessarily permit us to follow along the trend line of maximum opportunity for free, competitive enterprise. But neither will it make that impossible. We ought to be able to combine full employment with a maximum of free enterprise if we want to. The requirement appears to be a technologically valid policy for monopoly and competition linked up with a monetary-fiscal program centered on a pegged total of consumer expenditure.

A Notable Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in the city of Indianapolis appropriate ceremonies are being held today in recognition of a splendid achievement of the patriotic and devoted women of our city and State under the leadership of Mrs. Donovan A. Turk, president of the Indianapolis Council of Women, and Mrs. Maxwell Droke, chairman of the Americanism committee of that organization.

The ceremonies today, with Gov. Henry F. Schricker, of Indiana, Mayor Robert H. Tyndall, of Indianapolis, and officers from Camp Atterbury, contributing to the high lights, climax a general outburst of community felicitations over the successful consummation of the huge task of furnishing 300 day, or recreation, rooms at Camp Atterbury.

When the idea first occurred to Mrs. Turk, president of the Indianapolis Council of Women, it seems like a monumental undertaking, and indeed it was, but Mrs. Turk and her associate, Mrs. Droke, knew they could depend upon the last-ditch support of as loyal people, both women and men, as can be found anywhere. The Indianapolis Council of Women is a powerful women's organization of our State, with 190 affiliated women's organizations and 36,000 Indianapolis members.

By everlasting persistence the ladies raised the necessary funds and secured and installed the furniture. This operation involved the transportation of more than 350 truckloads of furniture from Indianapolis to Camp Atterbury.

When the War Department officials learned of the splendid services of the Indianapolis Council of Women they tried to think of some appropriate way of expressing the gratitude of the department and the armed forces. The laws and the regulations do not provide for citations in such a case, so it was decided that a frank and proper procedure would be to send letters of appreciation to the ladies. In a communication to me dated April 16, 1943, Judge Robert P. Patterson, the Under Secretary of War, said:

> I would deem it a pleasure if you would forward to Mrs. Turk and Mrs. Droke my enclosed letters of appreciation in behalf of the War Department for the splendid contribution that they, together with members of the Indianapolis Council of Women, have made to the comfort of the men undergoing training by furnishing the day rooms at Camp Atterbury. It is indeed gratifying to know of their splendid work in the interest of military personnel.
>
> I am also enclosing, for your information, copies of letters of appreciation from the commanding general, Eighty-third Infantry Division, Camp Atterbury, and from the commanding officer, Camp Atterbury, which have already been sent to those ladies.
>
> In regard to citations for Mrs. Turk and Mrs. Droke, the War Department has no appropriate citation which might be given for recognition of their services.

The following letters are interesting:

APRIL 17, 1943.

MRS. DONOVAN A. TURK,
President, Americanism Committee,
Indianapolis Council of Women,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MRS. TURK: Word has come to me of your splendid contribution to the achievement in furnishing the day rooms for Camp Atterbury, Ind.

I regret that the War Department has no appropriate citation to acknowledge our gratitude for such invaluable service in the welding of our Nation and its armed forces into an inseparable unity.

Our appreciation which I convey through these words, however, can in no degree measure up to the satisfaction which you must derive from your knowledge of what your achievement has meant to the thousands of

men who have benefited through your generous sacrifice and effort.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

APRIL 17, 1943.

MRS. MAXWELL DROKE,
Chairman, Americanism Committee,
Indianapolis Council of Women,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MRS. DROKE: Word has come to me of your splendid contribution to the achievement in furnishing the day rooms for Camp Atterbury, Ind

I regret that the War Department has no appropriate citation to acknowledge our gratitude for such invaluable service in the welding of our Nation and its armed forces into an inseparable unity.

Our appreciation which I convey through these words, however, can in no degree measure up to the satisfaction which you must derive from your knowledge of what your achievement has meant to the thousands of men who have benefited through your generous sacrifice and effort.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

MARCH 30, 1943.

MRS. DONOVAN A. TURK,
President, Americanism Committee,
Indianapolis Council of Women,
Indianapolis, Ind.

MY DEAR MRS. TURK: In behalf of all the military personnel at Camp Atterbury, I express our sincere thanks and appreciation for the splendid work done by the member organizations of your council, in furnishing nearly 200 day rooms here This has necessitated sending several hundred truckloads of furniture over, and making numerous trips personally to the camp. It has been an outstanding demonstration of the positive accomplishments that can be achieved by our American women on the home front.

The project has been one of large proportions and has been ably accomplished Many hours of hard work, both at Indianapolis and here, were necessary to get the job done. Your patriotic, unselfish service means recreation and pleasure to thousands of soldiers at Camp Atterbury, and there is not a single man who isn't benefiting by your efforts, and who wouldn't thank you personally if he had the opportunity.

As their spokesman, I again commend your council for conceiving and handling this project. Every single person in every member organization of the council deserves appreciation for her support. Especially, we send our sincere thanks to you two ladies who carried the burden of leadership and overseeing the big job Any project is only as successful as the leadership back of it, and the complete success of this undertaking reflects high credit upon you both.

It is requested that you convey my appreciation to each member of your organization.

Sincerely yours,

WELTON M. MODISETTE,
Colonel, Cavalry, Commanding.

HEADQUARTERS, EIGHTY-THIRD
INFANTRY DIVISION,
Camp Atterbury, Ind., March 25, 1943.

INDIANAPOLIS COUNCIL OF WOMEN,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MRS DROKE: I wish to thank the organizations and women of the Indianapolis Council of Women for the splendid results in furnishing the day rooms of the Eighty-third Division.

The spirit in which this was done is to be commended, and the pleasure the men are receiving from having a place to relax during off-duty hours is the reward for your efforts.

Wishing you and the Indianapolis Council of Women success in all your future undertakings.

Yours truly,

F. W. MILBURN,
Major General, United States Army,
Commanding.

APRIL 29, 1943.

MRS. DONOVAN A. TURK,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MRS. TURK: It is to me a matter of deep regret that I shall be unable to attend the ceremonies at Indianapolis next Tuesday when appropriate recognition will be bestowed upon the Indianapolis Council of Women for its very remarkable achievement in furnishing all of the day or recreation rooms at Camp Atterbury. I had fully intended to come, for I wanted to show by my presence my appreciation as a citizen and as a Representative of what I think was as fine a piece of work as has been done by civilians anywhere during this war. The fates were against me, however, for on next Tuesday the much controverted and highly publicized tax bill will be up for a vote and it is necessary that I shall be here to respond to the roll calls.

Without the least intention of flattery, I cannot tell you how much I admire you and Mrs. Droke, the chairman of the council's Americanism committee, for your daring conception and successful execution of the Herculean task of furnishing the 300 day or recreation rooms at Camp Atterbury. That certainly was a monumental undertaking and its accomplishment is a tribute to ability and everlasting persistence. I am told that the total operation involved the transportation of more than 350 truckloads of furniture from Indianapolis to Camp Atterbury Of course, this splendid feat could not have been possible without the generous and loyal cooperation of various patrictic individuals and groups, and to them also and to the silent but nonetheless effective partners in the enterprise who contributed financially to make the grand conception a reality is due the praise of a grateful Nation.

Let me add that while I shall not be able to be with you in the flesh next Tuesday I shall be with you in spirit, and I want to congratulate you and your associates on the faultless consummation of an undertaking which I think was perfectly grand and a credit to American achievement.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

One-Hundred-Octane Gasoline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the subject of 100-octane gasoline which was made by Hon Robert C. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, before the Truman committee, on May 3, 1943.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am here to discuss the situation of 100-octane gasoline. I made the statement some days ago that we were short of 100-octane gasoline, the fuel which is used for our combat planes, and that unless strong measures were taken to correct this situation, the full effectiveness of our planned air strength would be reduced.

I would like to say at the very outset that I have no personal quarrel with Mr. Jeffers. I hold him personally in high esteem and respect his character and patriotism. I deeply regret that my recent remarks should have been interpreted as reflecting on either. I had no such intention. He has performed his duty in pressing the synthetic-rubber program vigorously and I don't resent it On the other hand it is my duty to make every effort to see that our supplies of 100-octane gasoline are ample and Mr Jeffers should not resent my efforts along these lines either. Both programs are claimants before the War Production Board by whom decisions on priorities are made. The chairman of that Board is responsible to see that these decisions are fair and in the interest of the war effort.

Here is what I said about the shortage in 100-octane gasoline. I repeat it now: "The choke point of this whole picture is 100-octane gasoline. Unless drastic measures are taken which will permit us to complete in time the plants now started, there can be no question but what our offensive will be materially weakened.

"To make full-strength offensive possible we must have planes, with gas to fly them And we must have crews. To get the crews which we need for this offensive, they must be trained in combat ships.

"While these men are flying training planes they use 91-octane gasoline. That does not interfere with this situation at all. But before they are sent into actual fighting against the Germans or Japs they have to be taught how to handle combat planes, and that takes 100 octane."

It is my understanding that production of 100-octane gasoline has been delayed by the priority subordinating it to the production of synthetic rubber Mr. Ickes has testified in regard to this. He is in charge of the program for producing high-octane gasoline. The Army does not control either the 100-octane gasoline or the synthetic-rubber program. It is, however, the largest consumer of both. We feel that we are going to get the rubber, but we have grave concern as to whether we will get the necessary 100-octane gasoline.

I have been pressing for more 100-octane gas for a long time. I am charged with the duty of seeing that the Army's needs are met. When a situation arises which I believe will have grave consequences I would be remiss if I did not endeavor to take all appropriate corrective action I must and will do what I believe is necessary to supply our fighting forces and those of our allies

Importance of 100-octane gasoline: I trust that you will bear with me while I explain briefly the importance of 100-octane gasoline.

We are in the midst of the hardest struggle we have ever faced. Our foes have 17,000,000 men in the field, 17,000,000 desperate, battle-hardened men. We must throw our total resources in if we are to win.

A large part of those resources is required to build up our fighting power in the air. Air supremacy is indispensable to success in the war. The armed forces are therefore committed to a vast program of air power. We will have the most powerful air force in the world, more powerful than the combined forces of our foes. We will produce the maximum number of planes. We will train the maximum number of pilots and crews. But unless we have the necessary supplies of fuel for those planes, it is clear enough that we cannot put forth our full effort in the air.

For the earlier stages of training we use training planes, and 91-octane gasoline will suffice as fuel for training planes. But in the later stages of training—transitional training and operational training—we must use combat planes, the very equipment the

flyers will fight in overseas. These planes require 100-octane gasoline.

Our Air Force flying training program is calculated to furnish the number of pilots and crews needed for the planes we are producing, so that planes and trained crews can be moved into combat according to strategic plans.

If we do not have sufficient 100-octane gasoline to fly the number of hours required by our standards for transitional and operational training, there are only two alternatives: we can either reduce the number of crews we turn out in a given period of time, or we can lower our training standards. We do not intend to adopt the latter alternative.

Let me add this: 100-octane gas gives greater power, resulting in (1) quicker takeoff, (2) greater speed, (3) steeper climb, (4) higher ceiling, (5) longer range.

Present shortage: Right now there is a serious shortage in 100-octane gasoline. Production is considerably less than requirements, and there are no stocks on hand in this country.

Let there be no mistake or misunderstanding about the reality of the shortage. The official report of the Petroleum Administration for War, under date of April 1943, shows a shortage for April of 30,000 barrels a day, for May a shortage of 44,000 barrels a day. For months, supply has been below requirements. I have a chart prepared by the Petroleum Administration for War, which shows that for every month of 1943 the curve of estimated production is below the curve of requirements.

Because of the shortage in March gasoline supplies for transitional and operational training in this country had to be cut. Some of our combat planes in this country had to be grounded. In consequence, we were not able to train pilots and crews at the scheduled rate. The shortage in April was larger, and the losses in training were larger. I will furnish the committee with the figures in executive session. They will convince you of the seriousness of the case. Unless something is done, the shortages in the months to follow will result in even more serious consequences.

Mr. Nelson, I understand, stated to the committee that the grounding of planes for operational training in this country was the result of faulty distribution of 100-octane gasoline rather than of over-all shortage. He said that the gasoline might be "at the wrong points." In this he was mistaken.

Inasmuch as we have been unable to maintain any reserves in this country, Mr. Nelson's remarks on maldistribution were undoubtedly directed at our working supplies or operational reserves at overseas bases.

We must build up at overseas bases supplies of gasoline necessary for operations there, in the same way that supplies of rations and ammunition must be built up at overseas bases. The reasons for this ought to be self-evident. There are long distances between the sources of production in this country and the points of consumption at the battle fronts—distances that involve a trip of 6 months in some cases and a trip of 3 months in many cases. Remember that planes and crews sent to reinforce our forces overseas can, in 3 days by flying, get to combat areas which it will take 3 months by land and by water to supply with the fuel necessary to maintain those same planes and crews in combat. These long lines of supply by water are subject to interruption by hostile action. If adequate supplies are not maintained overseas, the sinking of tankers en route to a theater could result in the grounding of planes in that theater. There is also the risk that part of the supply at the overseas bases will be destroyed by enemy air attack.

It is indispensable to military operations to build up sound operational reserves overseas. They should be larger today than they are. The amounts of these operational reserves are set by the combined Chiefs of Staff. The allocations of gasoline to the various theaters are made monthly by an inter-Allied board.

Mr. Nelson compared production and consumption for February and March, pointing out that production exceeded consumption in those months. Such a comparison does not prove anything. The only true comparison is between current production and current requirements. Current requirements take into account three important factors which are not reflected in current consumption figures. These three factors are: First and all important, the time factor, the time necessary to transport the gasoline from the refinery to its place of use. Thus gasoline produced in April should be compared to domestic consumption estimated for May and to overseas consumption estimated for July. Second, because of our rapidly growing air strength, future consumption for which we must produce today will be much greater than current consumption. Third, actual consumption figures do not make allowance for the building up of overseas supplies.

I repeat, the true picture is given by a comparison of current production and current requirements. In the case of combat areas overseas, current requirements take into account the time necessary for transportation, the risk of sinking at sea, the rate of consumption after arrival, and the size of the reserves to be built up. It is an indisputable fact that current production is by no means sufficient to meet current requirements.

Requirements: Requirements for today are more than 50 times what we were using 3 years ago, and requirements for the future are more than double requirements for today. Most of the 100-octane gasoline to fill those requirements must come from American refineries. The petroleum industry has made an excellent record in responding to the needs, considering the rapidly mounting demands made on it and the difficulties encountered in obtaining the equipment necessary for altering plants and building new plants. The delays encountered in carrying out the production program, I am told by the Petroleum Administration for War, have been due primarily to delays in deliveries of equipment for the new plants.

It has been said that the Army and Navy did not make the full extent of their requirements known sufficiently far in advance. There is a measure of truth in that. It will always be so in war, at least in the earlier stages of war. The armed forces always want something "the day before yesterday," as the saying goes. The best that can be done is to lay down a program based on a plan of military operations, figure out the requirements called for by the program, press for the filling of the requirements, and be ready to revise the requirements as soon as the changing needs of war make it evident that existing requirements will not give the fighting forces what they must have. In regard to 100-octane gasoline, a good job in stating requirements has been done, all things considered, even though the ultimate extent of our requirements was not realized a year ago.

The main facts are, first, that our requirements are not being met today and, second, that we do not as yet have the production recommended by the War Department in February 1942, over 14 months ago.

The failure to meet requirements is made even more serious by a new, vitally important and very encouraging factor. As I informed the Petroleum Administration for War some weeks ago, the requirements presently stated will soon be revised upward, so that the problem of producing enough gasoline to fill them will be all the harder. Our requirements in the past have taken into account the assumption that a certain percentage of planes will be lost in combat each month. This percentage is called the attrition rate. From combat experience we are today finding that the percentage of planes actually lost in combat has been much lower than the anticipated percentage. In other words, our success in air combat has been much greater than we expected, with smaller losses of planes. But this very success makes our job more difficult. We are going to have a bigger air force sooner than we expected. To take advantage of this, and we must in a war which depends so much on air supremacy, will require larger amounts of 100-octane gasoline sooner than we expected.

Competition with synthetic rubber: Secretary Ickes has testified to you that one of the causes of this tight condition in 100-octane gasoline lies in the superior priorities given to the synthetic rubber program last winter. He is in charge of the gasoline production program. The priorities to which this program is entitled are determined by Mr. Nelson. The Army is in the position of a customer.

The two programs—100-octane gasoline and synthetic rubber—involve the building of plants. Mr. Nelson told you that plants for high octane gasoline and rubber require the same components all along the line. They use the same equipment, such as heat exchangers, valves, compressors, boilers, and so forth. He also told you that the superior rubber priorities hurt the 100-octane program more than any other program.

Secretary Ickes told you that the rubber priorities had caused a loss to his 100-octane gasoline program of nearly 4½ million barrels and a further loss beyond this which was "not susceptible to precise demonstration at this time, but which is none the less a real and practical matter."

The synthetic rubber program is an important program. I do not believe, however, that today it is as urgent a program for war purposes as the 100-octane gasoline program. And there are other important programs, including escort vessels and merchant shipping.

But there is every indication that the rubber situation is in much better condition than 100-octane gasoline. I take it that the recent relaxation of restrictions placed on use of rubber would not have come about if the rubber outlook had not improved to the point that any crisis in the supply of rubber has been passed. From present indications there will be rubber but not enough 100-octane gasoline.

In sum, we need more 100-octane gasoline. We need it badly. Unless something is done to relieve the situation, unless steps are taken to accelerate deliveries of materials and equipment to the plants under construction, we will not get the gasoline we must have.

Mission to Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted

in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement made by our former Ambassador to Russia, Hon. Joseph E. Davies, as a prologue to his great play "Mission to Moscow." This statement breathes so well the ideals of a great American that I am sure it is of general public interest.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I was your Ambassador in Russia, I little expected to write Mission to Moscow, much less see it projected on the screen, but when Germany attacked Russia, the Soviet Union became one of the nations fighting Hitler, and it was a desperate hour.

If Hitler were to destroy the "red" armies and smash the Soviet Union, the three aggressor nations would dominate Europe, Asia, and Africa. The riches of these three continents and the enslaved labor of three-quarters of the population of the world would be harnessed to conquer the rest of the earth.

The Americans would be next. Us. Unity among the forces fighting Hitler was vital; nothing as I saw it was more important than that the fighting nations should understand and trust each other. There was so much prejudice and misunderstanding of the Soviet Union, in which I partly shared, that I felt it was my duty to tell the truth about the Soviet Union as I saw it, for such value as it might have.

If I were down there in the audience with you, there are certain things that I would want to know about the man who is telling the story, so that I could assess the reliability of his judgment and his bias, or his lack of bias. Those things about me you are entitled to know. I would want to know them if I were you. Well, they are very simple. My people were pioneers. They came to New Orleans in a sailing ship. I was born in Wisconsin, educated in the public schools, graduated from University of Wisconsin, and went to Washington as one of Woodrow Wilson's young men, and practiced law successfully in New York and Washington. My religious convictions are basic. My sainted mother was an ordained minister of the gospel. I think that I am peculiarly the product of our great country, and its free institutions and opportunities in a competitive society of free enterprise, that is not only free but is fair and regulated.

I came up the hard way, and I am glad of it. I had a deep conviction and firm faith that that system and our form of government is the best the world has yet produced for the common man, such as you and me.

I went to Russia with that conviction, and I returned from Russia with that conviction. But while I was in Russia I came to have a very high respect for the honesty of the Soviet leaders. They respected the honesty of my conviction, and I respected theirs. I also came back with a firm conviction that these people were sincerely devoted to peace, and that what they and their leaders most desired was to live as good neighbors in a world at peace. That peace has not yet been won. If unity, mutual understanding, confidence in each other is necessary to win the war, it is still more necessary to win the peace. For there can be no durable peace without an agreement among those nations that have won the war, that they will project that peace and maintain that peace and protect that peace. Without understanding, mutual understanding, confidence in each other, there will be no durable or secure peace, and if that should happen, then the dead in Flanders Fields, Guadalcanal, China, Dunkerque, Africa, the Ukraine, would not sleep, for we again would have broken faith with the dead, and hope of humanity, dead and living, would once again be betrayed. That is why I wrote Mission to Moscow. That is why I am deeply grateful to the motion-picture industry and the patriotic citizens who comprise it, to the great organization of dramatists, artists, and technicians who have projected this book upon the screen for you, my fellow citizens of the Americas, and for you, my fellow freemen of the world.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an able and timely editorial entitled "Just Plain Common Sense," published in the Tucson (Ariz.) Citizen, of April 28, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUST PLAIN COMMON SENSE

The approval of the administration's reciprocal trade agreement program by the House ways and means committee was to be expected. Just as the Nation cannot safely isolate itself from the rest of the world neither can it expect to build a high tariff wall about its industries to the extent of impoverishing the nations who must and should deal with us.

With due regard to the ideologies with which we have excused our entry into two world conflicts, the fact still remains that most wars are the direct result of economic pressure due in large measure to the scramble for world trade and with little regard as to how it is secured.

It is true that we have built up an almost religious regard for "our standard of living" and it will not be easy for us to relinquish any of the gains to labor or society generally achieved through a thoroughly selfish regard for our own commercial skins. But we must compromise with some of our reactionary ideas, if we are going to become good neighbors and at the same time have safe neighbors. We cannot subsidize ourselves into a thoroughly safe and secure commercial existence except to deal fairly and equitably with the rest of the world and see to it that the nations of the world acquire the same ethical view of trade relationships with us.

We have aspired and reached great heights industrially and commercially. It has become quite natural for us to look down at the other fellow and to pity him for his low standard of living and his lack of prowess in protecting his own markets. It has developed a sort of commercial astigmatism bad for us and not too good for envious neighbors. Now we have reached the turning point and while new commercial trails must be blazed carefully they must be blazed considerately as regards those with whom we deal. Just as we must not permit the development of vicious cartels that would undermine our own trade structure, so must we refrain from high tariff walls and unrelenting trade practices that would paralyze our neighbor's chances in free competition with us. Otherwise treaties will be broken, nations will combine against us, and wars for survival will follow.

If we are as astute in building world markets as we have been in developing our domestic markets, we should have no fear in entering into trade agreements with the nations of the world providing for no greater reciprocal favors than we ourselves would extend.

Our Post-War Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I submit herewith the very able address delivered by Hon. Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, at the thirty-first annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce in New York on April 29, 1943:

Justice Holmes used to say that the essential fact about the pollywog was the wiggle. He would then go on to elucidate the parable—Man, he said, is born to act; to act is to affirm the worth of an end; and to affirm the worth of an end is to create an ideal. It is by action that we live, as individuals and as a nation. All our plans for the future, all our meetings and conferences, if they are divorced from action are words, mere sound waves mingling with the endless echoes which this earth sends out each second into infinite space, and without more meaning.

In this sense the fundamental problem of American post-war economic policy—or any policy—is our capacity for unified, sustained and steadfast action. It is not the intellectual problem of knowing what to do. The world is engaged in a second world war within a quarter century, not because there was not enough intelligence on the planet to know good from evil, or right actions from wrong actions, but because it is one thing to know and it is another thing to act upon that knowledge—and to act together with millions of other men and women.

To be capable of action, sustained and steadfast, this democracy and every other as well, must achieve unity of purpose upon the fundamentals. One of the most disturbing phenomena of our recent history has been the ease with which we relapse into bitter, partisan quarreling. This factionalism can paralyze our will and our capacity to act as a nation in the world of nations.

Disagreement and debate are, of course, a part of the democratic process. Democracy works through public discussion and the thrashing out of differences of opinion. But this is a means—and the best means we know—to an end. The end is decision—decision which is accepted by all—decision which results in action. Democracy becomes frustrated and feeble when differences are preserved for their own sake, when factionalism is kept alive to prevent that very unity upon which alone effective action as a nation depends. We shall never be capable of action if individuals and groups devote themselves to assaults on every proposal in the effort to secure the greatest possible advantage for themselves.

We have seen France destroyed by the inability of the people to pull themselves together and act with unity and strength. Then we have seen the British people close ranks after Dunkerque, by becoming one people with one will, so multiply their strength

that all the might of Hitler could not break them. We have seen the same thing in the unyielding resistance of a united Russia and a united China. Even where the purpose for which a people are united is a perverted and evil one, as in the case of Germany and Japan, we have learned to our cost that the result is powerful.

The first task before us then, if we are to act as a Nation, strong and determined to meet the challenge of our destiny, is to pull ourselves together and to agree upon our fundamental course of action. If we can do this, I have full faith in the rightness of our decisions and in our strength to endure.

The very difficulties of the years which will follow the war make it essential that we have that sure sense of direction which alone makes determined and coherent action possible. They will not be easy years. The transformation of American life from the activities of peace to a vast organization for total war has been a colossal task affecting every person, every community, every industry in the land. The change back again will be a task equally great and will require action equally far reaching.

Millions of men and women will be returning from military and civilian service in direct war activities. They must find speedy and productive employment. Whole industries must convert from war production to peace production. They must find markets for their goods. In lands which have suffered destruction by war and looting by the enemy, people will need help in creating again the means of self-support.

It will take a steady and resolute people to plot and hold a course amid the confusion and pressures which these years will bring. Some among us will lose their heads and fall to quarreling under tension, others will want to take actions which nullify one another to appease powerful groups; still others will follow any panacea monger who promises an effortless solution. And there will always be those who for their own interest knowingly mislead and incite passion and prejudice. But the job can be done—and done even beyond our hopes—if the mass of us will make our decision upon the simple truths which all of us have so painfully learned; and, having made it, remember that "no man having put his hand to the plow and looking back is fit for the Kingdom of God."

The men who made this democracy and this Nation out of a continent and many diverse peoples held, as Thomas Jefferson phrased it, "certain truths to be self-evident." Today we also know certain truths to be self-evident. That knowledge, if acted upon, can give us unity and direction and strength.

We know that defense is not a winning strategy. We know that only by offensive attack upon the problems which lie ahead can we hope to win solution. We know that the only solution is one which provides more production everywhere for the needs of mankind which will not be denied, more employment, more trade, better living standards. We know also that no nation can achieve this solution by isolating itself; that, if any attempts to do so, it not only injures itself but it imperils all others; and we know that joint and simultaneous attack is essential to success.

If these statements are platitudes, so much the better. It means that to us they are self-evident, that there is no substantial dissent from them, and that we can agree and act upon them. No one, so far as I know, believes that the way for this or any other Nation to provide for the needs of its people is to reduce production throughout the world, or that the way to care for the returning soldiers and our present war workers is to reduce employment. There are no advocates for the view that the steady decline of international trade between the wars contributed to the welfare or security of anyone. No one claims that lower living standards is a goal to be sought. We are far more fully agreed than we know.

Not only are we agreed upon our basic direction but a large number of the nations of the earth are agreed with us upon the same course. For this is the course stated in the Atlantic Charter and in the Declaration by the United Nations of January 1, 1942, which has been endorsed by 31 nations. It is stated in article VII of the Master Lend-Lease Agreements with the United Kingdom, China, the Soviet Union, Belgium, Poland, the Netherlands, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Norway, and Yugoslavia, and adopted by Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. These agreements look toward agreed action "open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers; and in general to the attainment of all the economic objectives" of the Atlantic Charter. The same principles are declared in the resolutions adopted by the 21 American republics at Rio de Janeiro in January 1942.

It is not too much to say, then, that these truths are held to be self-evident by the whole free world, which is agreed that they both point the way and call for action. The task before us is to act by taking those steps which clearly fall within the area of agreement and not waste time with fear and factional fighting about matters which lie far ahead and beyond it.

Certain steps within the economic field seem pretty clearly indicated. They must be predicated upon a world in which peace can and will be maintained. But, in turn, such a world must be predicated upon the adoption of the broad economic courses which have been mentioned. Peace is not likely if men must struggle for shrinking means of livelihood. The steps which are necessary for the expansion of production, employment, and consumption almost state themselves when one states the problem.

At the end of this war vast areas of the earth will be in need of goods of all sorts, but particularly of equipment for every kind of industry and agriculture to produce what they and others need. For some time they will need to buy more than they can sell. On the other hand we and a few other countries will have a vast unimpaired productive plant and millions of workers released from war production, all looking for markets and employment, both at home and abroad.

In other words we can be and will need to be a capital exporting nation. But we can neither get a return upon this capital nor permit those who use it to support themselves by selling a part of their products unless we join actively in the restoration of international trade. On the contrary, we shall destroy not only our markets and our customers but also our own economy and every chance of pursuing the course which we are all agreed is essential to an ordered and decent world if we are so blind as to cut off the currents of trade that would flow to us. The process is all one process and we cannot block one artery without starving gangrene.

This is the problem with which we are faced. We already know a good deal about it. We know how not to try to solve it. We know that we cannot solve it by attempting to maintain here an isolated island of prosperity in a world of misery and depression. The past two decades have taught us the impossibility of that course. We know that we cannot solve it by letting matters drift. For they drift into the rapids that lie just above the cataract. And we know also the truths and the course which I have ventured to call self-evident.

There remains only action—not action to create some all-embracing world system, but the minimum action essential to permit a bold launching upon the course which we all know we must follow. To do this requires some joint program among the nations to enable the people of each nation to use the funds which they have in the markets where they wish to buy. The purchasing power which exists or is earned must be made liquid and usable anywhere.

Secondly, joint action among the nations is necessary to create purchasing power by furnishing capital where it is needed and can be well employed to expand production. Our own amazing development was made possible by the capital furnished us from abroad. It is the method of expanding production, employment, and consumption which can benefit both the country furnishing it and the country receiving it. Capital sent abroad means purchases made in our markets. It enables the country receiving it to increase the productivity of its factories and farms, which is the essential foundation for higher standards of employment and living. Many difficult problems will arise in working out methods and procedures for making capital available. But they are not beyond human ingenuity and could be solved by a fraction of the brains and courage which are surmounting the great difficulties presented in the conduct of the war.

The third and essential step is to press on with the dredging of the channels through which goods can come to us. These channels have been clogged with obstacles. For nine years the government, under the Trade Agreements Act, has worked with painstaking care to reduce them in number and size. Thought has been given to every interest involved. Procedures have been developed so that every side of every question can be fully presented, argued and considered. Steadily and carefully the work has gone forward. Thirty-one trade agreements have been made with 27 countries, resulting in the material reduction of a multitude of trade barriers and the elimination of many serious discriminations against our products. Over a thousand items of our tariff have been modified to date under this procedure.

The Congress now has before it a bill to extend the Trade Agreements Act for another period of 3 years. The action taken upon this bill is of vital importance to every one of us. It is not unfair to say that it is a test of our capacity for sustained and consecutive action in the economic field. Certainly it will be so regarded, and other nations will make their judgments of us and their plans to work with us accordingly.

No question can exist that upon the purpose and principle of the act and upon its essential and central part in the whole process of expanding production and consumption the country is united in agreement. We are determined that we shall not go into another spiral of depression after this war. We are determined that the great productive power of the country shall be used to create the opportunity for a better life for all our people. We know that other people demand the same opportunity to work for the same end, and that neither we nor they can achieve it if the flow of goods is dammed up in either direction. We are agreed upon the purpose of this act.

We are agreed also upon its method. It has been tried and found fair and practicable. No other method has produced anything but frustration, controversy, and dissension. We have tried general tariff legislation. We have tried negotiated agreements subject to ratification, and this failed. We have tried other formulas, and none holds

any hope of successful action. For 9 years we have tried this method, and we know that it will work and will work fairly.

No one could have any doubt of that who listened to the succession of witnesses who have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives at the recent hearings on the renewal of the Trade Agreements Act. This chamber of commerce has taken an honorable and leading role. It has been joined by spokesmen for the great labor organizations, for manufacturers' and business associations, for agricultural organizations, for women's associations, and numerous public and citizens' groups. It is fair to say that the overwhelming majority of all our national groups and of the press is solidly behind this action as a tangible indication of our national will to work with other like-minded nations in the tasks of peace, as we have done in the tasks of war.

This, then, is the first test of whether we are doers of our word and not talkers only—the test first in time, and, perhaps, first in importance. For it will show whether we can pull together and act upon what we know to be the only course which for ourselves and for all others leads out of the wilderness. In Smollett's Roderick Random there is a scene on an old wooden ship of the line in which one of the heavy guns comes loose from its moorings and crashes back and forth across the 'tween decks with the roll of the ship, crushing men, stacing holes in the side, and causing death, ruin, and destruction.

Our power for good or evil in this world is so great that it is unthinkable that there should be lacking the moral and intellectual force to control and use it as all of us would believe that it always has and must be used for the liberation of the bodies and spirits of men from misery to opportunity and life.

The Farm Program and the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Gordon Roth, director of public relations of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, on the food for freedom program, April 4, 1943, which was broadcast from station WLOL over the affiliated stations of the North Central Broadcasting System.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The work-worn and weary Seventy-eighth Congress is still on dead center after 3 busy, hectic months, with little, if anything, to show for its efforts in trying to shape the Nation's wartime economy. Its first quarter of deliberations were marked by acrimony and tension and procrastination.

On the farm front the so-called farm bloc, with the cotton politicians and spokesmen for the American Bankers Association, bungled and bungled and bungled.

The spring planting season is under way and there is little that Congress can do now one way or the other. But the farmers must lay their plans now for what they need next fall and in 1944.

If democracy is to work, the majority of citizens must meet situations like this as mature individuals, and this means they must be able to solve their problems "with their brains in full control of their emotions." They must be ready to take full responsibility.

There are three issues which now have a vital effect on the farm program and the war effort. They are farm legislation, farm credit, and farm cooperatives. On farm legislation there's the Bankhead full-parity bill, the Pace bill, and the infamous attempt to destroy R. A. C. C. and nonrecourse loans. On farm credit there is the encouraging story of what R. A. C. C. loans have done so far, as well as the sordid story of pressure being brought to kill liberalized farm credit. On cooperatives its their role in supporting sound farm legislation and liberal farm credit.

Now the legislation: The Bankhead bill, which would have prevented the fixing of price ceilings at less than parity, was vetoed by the President. The decision, which still waits, is whether Congress will override the veto. The Farmers Union stated its position on this issue last September when it told Congress that the Farmers Union stands for full parity for agriculture, and no more. Whatever the merits of arguments for revising the parity formula, to do so at this moment would break faith with the Nation, they said.

In the meantime, Food Czar Chester Davis has the authority to reject any price ceilings at less than parity that in his opinion work undue hardship on the farmers. No doubt Mr. Davis already is analyzing theoretical parity prices as against actual farm prices and may adjust some of the great disparities which exist and for which a fair adjustment is necessary.

Now for the Pace bill, which would include the cost of farm labor in computing parity. It is likely that the President will veto it should it pass the Senate. For a long time the Farmers' Union was the only farm group—now other groups have joined—which opposed this measure. It opposed it because it felt that it did not help the family-type farmer but rather favored big commercial operators, the cotton, tobacco, and rice growers for example. It would provoke a consumer revolt and would lead to inflationary dangers. In addition, it was economically unsound and would penalize the very farmers its sponsors professed would benefit by it.

The Farmers' Union statement was given to Congress. It said in part:

"The Pace bill would not make any careful price adjustments between particular commodities which need it. Rather, it would raise, by 13 percent or more, a haphazard and even undetermined list of commodities without relation either to need or to effect upon total farm production. The bill would not modernize the parity formula, but would make parity less useful both to farmers and to the Nation's war effort.

"If the provisions of the Pace bill had been in the parity formula since 1933, the total farm income between then and 1941 would have been lower by billions of dollars. That is why all farm leaders until 1941 opposed putting in labor costs. The very reasons which now make the Pace bill such a dire threat to a stabilized price level would have made parity prices far lower from 1933 to 1941.

"Here's why: The base period of 1909 to 1914 was before the mechanization of farming. Farm wages were much higher, in relation to the rest of the prices paid by farmers, than they were in 1930 and in 1941. In this base period of 1909 to 1914 cash labor costs made up 32 percent of all farm expenses. In 1942 the same cash labor costs made up only 12 percent of all farm expenses. During the 1930's, when extremely low wage rates prevailed for farm labor, the percentage was even less than 12 percent.

"The dangers of the Pace bill are evident. It would encourage inflation now. Some estimate it would add $3,500,000,000 to the Nation's food bill. When the war is over it would depress farm prices deeper and more rapidly because it is likely that labor costs will then drop.

"We urge the Senate to vote down this measure decisively and thus help end the misleading and ill-conceived efforts to meet our farm-production needs by tinkering with parity. Let the Senate turn its attention to devising for farmers the kind of income insurance and incentives for increasing production which have been extended to industry. Farmers need that kind of help."

The bill to liquidate the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation—the R. A. C. C. and its nonrecourse loans—rests in the Senate. The inspiration for this bill comes from the Byrd Economy Committee and the American Bankers Association which opposed liberalized, incentive credit and nonrecourse loans for farmers.

We told you last week who the sponsors were—Senator WHERRY of Nebraska, Senators BYRD, GEORGE, MCKELLAR, and NYE of North Dakota.

Whether or not this bill which would strangle incentive loans to farmers, passes or is defeated, depends entirely upon what you voters want your Senators to do. Letters to your Congressmen will do the job for you.

Now, on farm credit: Congress has thus far refused to appropriate the funds which the Government last winter announced it would need to encourage production of vital crops. The incentive payments, thus far, are held up by the so-called farm bloc.

In the meantime, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation F-2 nonrecourse loans are helping thousands upon thousands of farmers to increase their acreage of vital war crops, such as flax, potatoes, and soybeans. Farmers secure these nonrecourse loans through their own county war boards. In a few counties, the war boards are making it difficult for farmers to get these nonrecourse loans. But in nearly all of the counties, however, there is full cooperation with the bona fide farmers of the community.

If you have had an difficulty in getting a nonrecourse Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan, get in touch with your State Agricultural Adjustment Administration director, or drop a letter to Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, 1923 University Avenue, St. Paul, explaining your problem, and we'll help you all we can.

Many county war boards are sending farmers seeing these loans to local bankers. If the local banker can make a loan on the same terms, or at the same rate of interest, he is entitled to all the business he can get.

We'll repeat what we told you last week. The Food Production Administration has sent out a simplified form to every county war board called Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation FP-20. There is just one question on this form which the farmer must answer. That question is, "Are you able and willing to finance, out of your own funds, or through other credit agencies, as great a quantity of crops or livestock as you propose to finance through Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation?" If you state "No," you are then eligible for a loan on a limited liability or nonrecourse basis. You are then entitled to receive the credit necessary to prepare the soil, buy the seed, plant the crop, and harvest it through Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. You repay the loan when your crop is harvested, but if you have a crop failure you need not repay the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loan.

These loans, of course, are not for permanent improvements. They are just to put in vital war crops, such as flax, of which this Nation needs 50,000,000 bushels this year, and the price at present is at a 14-year high.

Last week we gave you a few examples of the kind of loans Regional Agricultural Credit

Corporation is making and what it is doing to increase production. Each week hundreds and hundreds of these kinds of loans are being made, while, at the same time, there is a bill in Congress to destroy the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation because its sponsors say it is hampering the war effort. This at a time when there is an increased need for credit facilities.

Back in 1900, you could start farming with an investment of $3,000; in 1930 the amount of capital rose to $8,000, and most recent figures estimate that $11,000 is needed to start farming today. Bankers should realize that the greatest need is to help the farmer get out of debt—not deeper into debt.

In the past, too much attention has been paid to the value of collateral, and insufficient attention paid to analyzing the income of the farmer as an indication of his ability to pay. Bankers know, or should, that over-emphasis on collateral results in excessive lending during periods of high land values and rising prices. Then, when values and prices go down, the debt is a heavy burden which may force the farmer to let his land and buildings deteriorate or become delinquent, lose his farm, and become a tenant. That is why there must be a decent credit program now, so that the farmers are not compelled to put up their farms to get enough money to put in the crops which are needed now to help win this war. The farmer should not be compelled to mortgage his post-war security in order to get funds now to put in war crops.

That is why the Farmers Union and its cooperatives have demanded that the farmers get a fair deal on credit. This was emphasized by M. W. Thatcher at the National Farmers' Union convention in Oklahoma City last November, when he said:

"Money is merely a medium of exchange, a measure of value, a system of bookkeeping. Interest, therefore, must not exceed the cost of administering credit; anything beyond that is usury.

"We must brush off the antiquated misconceptions of yesterday. We must recognize that gold is no longer a standard of value. Now, we are measuring our money by such valuable things as wheat, livestock, wool, shoes, and clothing. We cannot let any outmoded economic theory shackle us in planning for the full world of tomorrow."

This is the opinion of the general manager of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, the Nation's largest grain-marketing cooperative and one of the largest of the farm-marketing cooperatives, which annually handles over two billion dollars worth of products for 2,000,000 farmers. This is part of the program of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, which goes beyond merely returning earnings and savings to its farmer patrons; beyond the economic functions of lowering costs, improving quality, and service.

The cooperatives have been a tremendous influence in the economic education of farmers since they cannot succeed without full membership and understanding. We have even profited by failures, because they have added to the experience that has made success possible.

We hope we have made it clear to you how the gap between what is going on in Washington and in your own local community is not as great as you may have imagined, especially if you are active in your farm organizations and in your cooperatives.

And in building this economic democracy for agriculture, which will match our political democracy, you are gaining access to the facts which will help make you strong. Democracy needs a strong backbone, and its backbone is still agriculture.

So, for your own good and the good of your country, organize, take part in your Farmers Union meetings—join your cooperatives.

And when you do, remember, Grain Terminal Association is the co-op way.

Lend-Lease for War Only?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I have read with lively interest an article which appeared recently in the Nation's Business entitled "Lend-Lease for War Only?" This interesting commentary was written by our friend and associate, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. It is so informative and thought-provoking that I should like to call it to the particular attention of the Members of the Congress. Therefore, I request unanimous consent to have it published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEND-LEASE FOR WAR ONLY?—A FINANCE COMMITTEE MEMBER DISCUSSES THE PUBLIC INTEREST IN A $63,000,000,000 PROGRAM

(By Senator HUGH A. BUTLER, Nebraska)

The recent action of Congress in extending lend-lease for another year presages the continuation of what is already a multibillion-dollar foreign-aid program and involves perhaps the transfer of still more billions to foreign governments for the ensuing year.

This much the American public knows. It knows, too, that lend-lease originally was intended to help those nations which have since become our allies to fight a war. The public knows further that it next became an implement to speed up the United Nations' war effort. We approved it wholeheartedly if it meant the saving of a single American life, if it meant that the war could be won more swiftly.

What the public does not know, but perhaps suspects, is that this lending program is actually an outright donation program—the most colossal dole of all times. Few people know either that the $18,000,000,000 appropriated directly to the President for lend-lease is only about one-third of the total involved in the program.

If the American people are to have their promised part in post-war planning, if they are to have confidence in their Government, if they are not to be disillusioned as they were after the last war by what they termed the trickery of their former allies, it is necessary that they should know all commitments and policies, past and future, of their Government which do not involve military expediency. One place where facts should be made plain is lend-lease.

The total sum involved and the ultimate purpose in the lend-lease program have been matters of conjecture for some time. Actually, the amount involved is approximately $63,000,000,000, which, as time goes on, may be considerably increased. This $63,000,000,000 is made up of:

Three appropriations—$18,410,000,000—made to the President for Lend-Lease, and $45,016,650,000 of authorized Lend-Lease transfers of goods and services procured from Army appropriations, Navy appropriations and other departments.

Nor is this all. Authorized expenditures for foreign construction for plants and equipment production total $2,000,000,000. The plants built and owned by the United States Government and the equipment for plant construction and production in foreign nations, together with that portion of domestic manufacture to be transferred to Lend-Lease, although the Defense Plants Corporation finances the operations, adds an estimated $4,000,000,000 more.

About $5,000,000,000 more might be added by including the amount contracted by Board of Economic Warfare, and Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiaries for purchases abroad. These bring the total to $74,000,000,000.

Even beyond this figure, defying estimation, is the amount of funds which may be transferred for lend-lease purposes from the Naval Appropriations Act of 1942 and subsequent similar appropriation acts and the amount which the new Russian protocols may call for.

It is significant that Assistant Secretary of State Acheson stated recently that Russian aid has been stepped up enormously and that Secretary Wickard concurred in this opinion.

A second point of confusion is the reciprocal feature of the program. The public wants to know what is to be returned to the united States under lend-lease agreements. Members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, themselves in the dark, have asked many questions about the value of "reverse lend-lease."

As far as can be ascertained, slightly more than $1,000,000,000 has been returned in goods or services.

Early in the present war, many patriotic Americans hesitated to become allies of debt defaulters. The distrust and disillusionment which might ensue if the American people are fooled into believing that lend-lease billions will be repaid after the war might well influence the conclusion of a successful peace.

It will not do for Mr. Stettinius to declare that even a reasonable estimate in dollar terms or in ship tons of the value of lend-lease in reverse is impossible. The American public will demand to know.

The distrust of the American people will not be lessened when they become aware of certain disconcerting practices of the Lend-Lease Administration in its dealings with nations obtaining strategic supplies under this arrangement. In many instances these recipient nations produce metals, strategic supplies, and other commodities which we need. The natural arrangement would seem to be reciprocal trade arrangements, but instead of this these nations receive lend-lease aid free while the United State buys needed materials from them for cash.

The American public will also want to know if the 14 other claimant agencies which have a call on the requirements committee do not to some extent duplicate the specific activities of the Lend-Lease Administration. They will want to know if the broad general principles of the Lend-Lease Administration are not also duplicated by the Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Board, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Office of Services of Supply, the Red Cross, the War Production Board, and others.

The public will want to know if it is true that nonessential materials are being shipped abroad at the expense of home consumption; if products shipped to Britain under lend-lease eventually find their way to South American markets to compete with our own products; if large quantities of lend-lease are lost or stolen and never traced; if food spoilage, transshipments, and reshipments exceed all reasonable limits; if lend-lease aid has been used to serve politics rather than war aims.

WORLD-WIDE WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION?

Once these questions are answered our people will have more confidence in the lend-lease program.

Beyond the winning of the war objective of lend-lease, the public might well ask, "Where are we headed for in post-war international relations?" Article VII of each lend-lease

agreement provides that the terms of the final settlement shall be such as to promote the economic objectives of the Atlantic Charter. It pledges each of the signatories to work with all other countries of like mind for "the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures of production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples." Lend-lease officials even now encourage hegemonic use of vast sums of money. The latest expression of this trend is the signing of the 15 secret Latin-American agreements.

Such a trend, both in the European and in the South American theaters, has raised the question whether lend-lease is not the opening hand-out of what will finally become a world-wide Work Projects Administration. The door is open to just that, because the Lend-Lease Act provides that "the terms and conditions under which any foreign government receives aid shall be those which the President deems satisfactory, and the benefits to the United States may be repayment or repayment in kind or property, or any other direct or indirect benefit which the President deems satisfactory."

In this connection, it will be remembered that Harry Hopkins, now in a position to influence and control lend-lease to a greater extent than anyone except the President, was formerly Administrator for Work Projects Administration.

Although, when the House Foreign Affairs Committee requested him to appear and testify on lend-lease, Mr. Hopkins replied that he had nothing to do with that agency's administration, he is charman of the Munitions Assignment Board which must authorize all lend-lease requests for transfer of materials. Furthermore, final determination of lend-lease benefits rests with the President and Mr. Hopkins is special adviser to the President.

In reviewing the broad philosophy underlying lend-lease, one continually bears in mind the fact that lend-lease was sold to the American public on the basis which the name implies: Lend or lease Secretary of War Stimson, testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, emphasized that lend-lease was set up as a Government instrument to overcome the difficulties of the dollar exchange problem between ourselves and other nations which needed American equipment and food. Mr. Stettinius, Lend-Lease Administrator, in his report on the lend-lease operations up to December 31, 1942, said: "It was in our interest that the flow of weapons and other supplies furnished to promote the defense of the United States should not be interrupted by a lack of dollar exchange."

WHY NOT LEND MONEY?

On this basis, the American public has subscribed to War bond drives. They believe they have lent this money, leased this material—not given it. They believe this because they have not concerned themselves sufficiently with the intricacies of the problem to ask, "Why did we not lend the money in the form of dollar exchange if that is necessary?"

The only logical answer to this question is that the original intent of lend-lease was not to lend but to give.

The President himself indicated that position when he told a press conference on December 17, 1940: "What I am trying to do is to eliminate the dollar sign—get rid of the silly, foolish old dollar sign."

There is a tremendous conflict between the sound policy of helping foreign nations and receiving materials from foreign nations on a commercial trade, export-import paid-for purchase basis, and the Lend-Lease Administration policy of giving away aid. If continued indiscriminately that policy would ruin private trade, an effect already foreshadowed by the squeezing out of business of numerous exporting and importing firms all over the world.

NO REASON TO BUY

It may be contended that an amendment is entirely feasible to prohibit the Lend-Lease Administration from giving away materials in all cases where the Government has information that a foreign nation can buy.

Of course, a more nearly ideal situation would be for Federal agencies to work primarily through private concerns of this country and foreign nations. Since the Lend-Lease Administration works primarily through Government, it frequently authorizes exportation of material on what is tantamount to a gift basis when the transaction might well have been carried out through commercial trade. Obviously if foreign nations can get something for nothing, they see no reason to buy it.

In doing these things Lend-Lease has obviously taken long steps away from its original purpose as an emergency system for supplying war materials to those countries in a common war effort.

It has moved swiftly toward becoming an extensive, socialistic system of mutual aid, relying in the main on a principle of irrevocable subsidy from the United States Treasury. This is an absurd, costly, dangerous trend embracing the concept that the United States will subsidize foreign nations indefinitely and finance their socialization forever at Work Projects Administration, poor relief, state socialism levels. Mathematically, the American purse is not big enough for this task.

In summary it should be said that close watch should be kept on the effect of an overgrowth of lend-lease activities in transferring supplies.

The General Accounting Office should be encouraged to exercise the same—or more strict—control over the expenditures of the Lend-Lease Administration that it exercises over the finances of other Government agencies, particularly in regard to reciprocal lend-lease accounts. With this in mind, the latter agency should be restricted to use only such funds as will aid primarily in the war effort. Similarly, any unwise hegemonic use of vast stores of supplies should be meticulously avoided.

By no means should it be allowed to implement State socialistic economic theories of a vast international scope.

At all events a full accounting of lend-lease activities in all their ramifications should be made. Without it, a just final determination of its benefits may be impossible. That final determination should rest with Congress.

Execution of American Fliers in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the script of a radio address delivered by Mr. Lothrop Stoddard on April 25, 1943, which has to do with the execution of American fliers in Japan and the characteristics of the Japanese people.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last Wednesday, a wave of grief and wrath passed over America at an announcement from the White House. The President's statement read in part: "It is with a feeling of deepest horror, which I know will be shared with all civilized peoples, that I have to announce the barbarous execution by the Japanese Government of some of the members of this country's armed forces who fell into Japanese hands as an incident of warfare. * * * This recourse by our enemies to frightfulness is barbarous. * * * It will make the American people more determined than ever to blot out the shameless militarism of Japan."

Mr. Roosevelt, of course, referred to our airmen captured after the raid on Tokyo and other Japanese cities made a year ago and led by General Doolittle. The indications are that, before being executed, those unfortunates were tortured. Japanese spokesmen blatantly uphold the act, assert that any other airmen attacking Japan will be "given a one-way ticket to hell," and indeed extend the penalized zone to include Manchukuo and other parts of the Japanese Empire. Thus do Japan's leaders compound their felony and aggravate their defiance of the elementary code of warfare which, for ages, has prevailed among almost all peoples above the grade of savages.

This atrocious attitude need not surprise us, because it is just one more revelation of the Japanese nature exhibited throughout the history of this truly insufferable people. Their entire conduct during the present war reeks with inhuman atrocities. The mass slaughters in China, the massacre of British prisoners at Hong Kong and elsewhere have been repeated in Burma. The day after the President's announcement, the Government of India reported that the Japanese had "murdered in cold blood" a substantial number of British and Indian prisoners of war captured on that front. These atrocities are committed on orders of the high command, and the Japanese soldiers are encouraged in their frightfulness, one common custom being the use of living prisoners tied up as targets for bayonet practice. Murder, torture, rape—these are committed wholesale wherever the Japanese hordes blight conquered lands with their pestilential presence. That is the foe we face in the Pacific—a foe who combines elemental savagery with a malevolent intelligence and with a lust for power and plunder which is insatiable.

Many commentators have attempted to draw a distinction between Japan's leaders and the mass of the population. I am sorry to say that I do not believe it. For a quarter century I have studied Japan attentively and have consistently warned against it as a great and growing danger to our race and our civilization. It is more than 23 years since the publication of my best-known book, The Rising Tide of Color, wherein I discussed the subject in detail. And long before my time, other writers had penned similar warnings, among them our own Homer Lea, the Australian Charles H. Pearson, and the Englishman, Meredith Townsend. But those warnings were lightly dismissed as alarmist exaggerations. Well do I recall how bitterly I was attacked as a sensationalist and a disturber of international relations. Well, the wheel of time has turned, and we now confront hard facts that cannot be disputed.

A favorite saying of Al Smith's used to be: "Let's look at the record." Japan's record is written foul across the book of human history, and that record shows a singularly self-

centered island people set on the outer fringe of the Asiatic continent; a people obsessed from the begining by a spirit of inordinate ambition, pride, and greed, which made them a perennial scourge to their neighbors. From the dawn of their history, the Japanese have felt themselves the elect of mankind, predestined to hack a path to primacy with the Samurai sword. Their islands are, to them, The land of the Gods. Their native religion, Shinto, which means The way of the Gods, is a mere jingo worship of warrior spirits, with virtually no ethical significance. Every Japanese believes implicity that he is ruled by a dynasty of God-emperors, enthroned for over 2,500 years, and descended from Japan's divine patron, the Sun-goddess Amaterasu Omikami, and that this divine effulgence embraces the whole Japanese people, which is thus The Yamato race, literally, Seed of the Sun, destined eventually to dominate the entire world under the mystical doctrine of Hakko ichi-u, which means the 8 corners of the earth under the one imperial roof. I reiterate: all this is believed. The Sun Goddess is no pallid myth. In Japanese eyes she is very much alive. To Amaterasu's great shrine at Ise go statesmen, generals, admirals, the Emperor himself, to confer with their divine patroness and gain her inspiration. That is Yamato Damashii—soul and spirit of Japan. That is the sinister dynamic with which we have to deal.

This Japanese spirit is militarism incarnate. We justly reprobate the militant totalitarianism of Germany and Italy. Yet they are very recent phenomena, whereas the Japanese evolved, centuries ago, both the underlying idea and the system itself. More than a thousand years before Hitler and Mussolini were born the pattern of Japanese national life was fixed with the establishment of military feudalism in the seventh century A. D. Thenceforth the soldier was the Japanese ideal, to which all else was subordinated. Therein lies the germ of that barrack-room socialism which the army has perfected during the past decade, and which is the pattern for the future—unless we smash it, once and for all. A preview of Japan's present bid for unlimited empire was staged in the sixteenth century, when the great General Hideyoshi, the Japanese Napoleon, raised a huge army and started to conquer Asia. That attempt failed, but the ambition remained in Japanese minds, and when Japan emerged from its subsequent period of isolation, just 89 years ago, a small group of master minds undertook not to harmonize Japan with the modern world but to learn the secrets of western power and use them for Japan's immemorial dream of empire. They took over, basically unchanged, the structure of old Japan, with its rigid discipline maintained, not only by Gestapolike police methods but even more by a system of education going back to the earliest times, which imposed complete thought control. Those master minds buttressed the traditional thought control by intensified psychological sanctions. Emperor worship and the nationalistic cult of Shinto were streamlined and put on an efficiency basis, while the military code of bushido (the way of the warrior), hitherto confined to the Samurai soldier caste, was indoctrinated into the whole people, which soon became a solid block of fanatics, eager to make any sacrifice for their god emperor and the divine destiny of the Yamato race, membership in which is almost as impersonal as that of bees in a hive. Japan was thus being spiritually as well as materially prepared for that course of limitless expansion and domination which has always been cherished by its leaders, and Japan's course of empire has thus far certainly paid rich dividends. The Japan of 90 years ago had a total area of 148,000 square miles (slightly less than the area of California) and a stationary population of 26,000,000. Today the Japanese themselves number 73,000,000, increasing 1,000,000 per year, while they dominate an area of nearly 3,000,000 square miles (the size and the United States) and over 400,000,000 people.

Now, just let's ponder what that means. This monstrous structure won by the sword is no accident. It has been built up by careful planning and preparation, and the same qualities can be counted on to develop its huge natural resources and exploit its vast subject populations in the shortest possible time. Each month, each day that this predatory empire is allowed to consolidate will make its destruction harder at an almost geometrical ratio. And let us further realize that Japan's psychological preparation keeps pace with the material. The barrack-room socialism set up by the war lords who rule Japan is today energizing the Japanese people as never before, especially its youth, who are being indoctrinated in a philosophy more ruthless than even the Hitler jugend. An American authority on Japan, Willard Price, recently wrote: "If those 5,000,000 youthful firebrands become the Japanese Army of tomorrow, they will constitute an army the like of which in fanatical fury has never before been seen. * * * Only by penetrating Japan itself and wiping out its armed forces * * * can the future be safeguarded."

Another thing which every American must realize is that, to this Japan militant, the United States is the ultimate enemy. Therefore its leaders unanimously proclaim that America must be thoroughly beaten, and the Japanese people are being schooled in the thought that they must prepare to fight a hundred years war, if that be needed to finish the job, which is our lasting downfall as a great power. Thus, with equal determination, we must steel ourselves to the conviction that, with Japan militant, neither truce nor compromise is possible. Probably never in human history, since the days of Rome and Carthage has there been so implacable a struggle between two great peoples. It is literally delenda est—one or the other must be destroyed.

Yet, however vital to our national future, the destruction of Japan militant will be a tremendous task. And right here let us face another grim fact: Most of the job will have to be done by us. We can depend on neither Britain nor China to play more than secondary roles in the drama, and we should not depend on Soviet Russia at all. Unfortunately, we cannot make even a real start on our herculean task until our commitments in Europe and Africa are terminated. But we should never for a moment forget the job in the Pacific; for only by such understanding can we be spiritually prepared for a crucial testing time, once victory over the European end of the Axis is assured. At that psychological moment, it may well be that Japan will offer us a superficially attractive compromise peace. We will possibly be war weary and yearning for an end to bloodshed and sacrifice. The temptation may be great. But Heaven help our children and our children's children if we yield to that temptation. A compromise peace with Japan would spell another and worse war, perhaps a series of wars, with a deadly enemy grown great beyond all present imagination. No matter what it costs us now, we must see the job through.

That job must be, not merely the defeat of Japan's armed forces and the proscription of its present leaders, but the destruction of the entire current structure of its national life. What that means was expressed so well in the Evening Star last Friday by Maj. George Fielding Eliot that I cannot do better than quote him. "A case can be made," he writes, "for the need for the continued existence of Germany as an industrial and commercial power in Central Europe. No such case can be made for Japan in East Asia. From the moment of her sudden emergence from the shadows of mediaevalism, the influence of Japan upon her neighbors has been wholly pernicious. She has contributed nothing to those neighbors save blood, sweat, and tears; nothing of the world at large save cut-throat competition, a flood of shoddy exports, and constant anxiety as to her intentions. * * * It will therefore, in all probability, become the duty of the United Nations, as the victors in this war and the trustees of civilization, to remove that influence once and for all. By this I do not mean the extinction of the Japanese people, but I do mean the complete and ruthless destruction of Japanese industry, so that not one brick of any Japanese factory shall be left upon another; so that there shall not be in Japan one electric motor or one steam or gasoline engine, nor so much as a book which tells how these things are made. The Japanese islands have within themselves neither iron, nor oil, nor high-grade steam coal. Lacking these and forbidden to import them, the Japanese people cannot reconstruct their industry. They will be compelled, in order to live, to devote all their energies to agriculture and the simpler forms of silk production. Let them be compelled to do so, and so trouble no more a world into which their advent has brought nothing but sorrow and war." That is Major Eliot's formula. And I heartily agree with it.

Declaration of War Policy by the Republican State Central Committee of Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 4 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, the leaders of the Republican Party in my State, desirous of unity of action by all Americans in the national war effort, have issued a statement of war policy, a copy of which has been transmitted to me by Mr. Niel R. Allen, chairman of the Oregon Republican State Central Committee. I request unanimous consent to have it published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Proclaiming our determination to win this war without compromise and to win a secure peace, keeping our representative government intact; our conviction that this can and will be done, and our full support of the Government therein; and to those ends declaring the people's demand for a total war waged by the whole people, our home front reorganized for efficiency, equality, unity, and speedy victory; and insisting unalterably that the war can and must be won within the Constitution without violating its spirit or sacrificing representative self-government; the Republican State Central Committee of Oregon calls upon the national executive committee seasonably to declare a positive party program which shall—

1. Voice the people's demand for an efficient war program, insisting that the Government must reorganize war production through a coordinated plan eliminating duplications and nonessentials, freed of profiteers and stripped of waste, purged of inflation, pledged to frugality, and securing national unity and justice through equal service for all with special privilege for none; and

2. Voice the people's demand that the President fully direct his existing constitutional Executive authority and those powers delegated by the Congress to unshackle America's unlimited productive power now; and under appropriate legislation to wisely mobilize all our resources of manpower and property needed for an all-cut war by the whole people, organized efficiently under unified command of America's most capable leadership regardless of party; and

3. Voice the people's demand that the Congress exercise its full function and meet its full responsibility in the vigorous and efficient prosecution of the war, and if the President's existing authority is found insufficient for necessary Executive direction of the war, needed additional emergency war powers be promptly and expressly granted by the Congress through legislation limited to the duration of the war, consistent with and based upon just powers constitutionally derived from the consent of the governed; and

4. Organize a dynamic party effort in support of total war for speedy victory so decisively won that the world shall be a safe place for America, with freemen and free enterprise free of fear in America; and by insisting upon wise administration of free government, to guarantee that we shall have a peace under representative republican forms, preserving inviolate our personal rights and liberties under the Constitution and its Bill of Rights, fully protecting and fortifying our American governmental, economic, and social structure; and

5. Make clear to the people this essential patriotic function of our party as a cooperative opposition, loyally devoted to preserve America and those American principles of fundamental human right and liberty which give us our freedom.

By act of the State Central Committee, with approval of the 36 county central committees, and supported by Oregon Chapter of Pro-America, Young Republican Federation of Oregon, Oregon Republican Club.

NIEL R. ALLEN,
State Chairman.

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the tenth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. In this installment of Senator Cockrell's speech we learn of the monetary convention and the establishment of the International Bimetallic Union and the invitation extended to the Government of the United States to join the convention in a plan to standardize our money with the other nations in the Union.

Senator Cockrell presents documentary evidence of the manipulation of the United States representatives that prevented our Government from joining the other member nations in standardizing the coinage to stabilize international exchange.

In reviewing the history of this convention we learn that President Lincoln appointed the Commissioner General, who later appointed as our representative to the International Monetary Convention, Samuel B. Ruggles of New York. Had President Lincoln lived, the standardization of our money with the coinage of Europe might have been accomplished.

In this part of the Senator's speech we also learn how easily and simply our Government could have joined the convention of nations and standardized our money with theirs. He says, "all we had to do was simply subscribe to it * * * we only had to strike out 12½ grains of our standard silver dollar, reduce it to 400 grains and thus bring it down to the ratio of 15½ to 1.

The tenth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

The Minister of Finance, in his report in 1866 to the Emperor of France, concerning a bill relating to this monetary treaty, for it was necessary in order to carry out the provisions of the monetary treaty that act should be passed by the Corps Legislatif, says:

"For ages the yield of silver has been greater in value than that of gold. Since 1846 the proportion between the values of the quantities of the two metals annually extracted from the mines has been reversed. * * * These great quantities of gold, coming for the most part from California and Australia, have thus rendered this metal far more abundant in the issues of coin in all the countries which admitted it, either as principal money, as, for example, England, Portugal, Brazil, the city of Bremen, or as money concurrently with silver, as did France and Italy. The abundance of gold has even caused the introduction of this metal into the monetary system of countries which lately rejected it, as, for example, Switzerland, Belgium, and English India."

And states to the Emperor that the silver 5-franc pieces were either exported or melted down and replaced by gold, the cheaper metal, and the object was to reduce the fineness of the silver coins and retain them in circulation. Here we see a scare, a dread, and an excited apprehension of an avalanche of gold to the banishment of silver.

The states of the church on June 18, 1866, and Greece and Rumania in April 1867 joined this Latin Union.

In March 1865 the Government of France called the attention of our Government to the project of the Paris Universal Exposition of 1867, and our Government agreed to participate and appointed Hon. N. M. Beckwith Commissioner General for the United States who, on July 17, 1866, transmitted to Secretary of State Seward, Document No. 216, containing the project of a law submitted to the Corps Legislatif for a coinage as proposed by the Latin Union, and giving reasons in favor of that monetary treaty, and detailing the proceedings wherein it was stated that "the opinion in regard to a single standard is still divided, both in the financial and scientific world."

A number of sensible men believed "that while Australian and Californian gold inundates European markets the double standard is useful in making the value of silver sustain the value of gold."

And some go so far as to say that, with the double standard in commercial and financial crises, one metal serves as a counterpoise to the other. And for the same reason they say we must not expect silver to go out of circulation, for the discovery of new mines, improved methods of working them, and the return of silver coin accumulated in the east, caused by the introduction of gold as money in those remote and unopened regions, will restore the former abundance of that metal.

Mr. Beckwith also transmitted Document No. 282, being "Report of the committee to examine a bill relative to a monetary convention passed between France, Belgium, Italy, and Switzerland." This report approved the monetary convention and submitted a bill for carrying it into effect, which was duly passed into law.

The committee discussed the question of double standard as follows:

"A question of another nature arose in the committee. As the two monetary standards have long been a source af annoyance, why did we not adopt gold as the only standard, like England and many other nations, and thus settle it definitely at once? The committee was not in favor of it. We certainly cannot say what the future may have in store for us, but nobody can say but what the measure may be soon adopted. It is too soon yet. Though theory and logic may be for a single standard, facts show that the double standard offers great advantages in practice.

The two help each other, and in time of crises one serves as a balance to the other. The use of both metals moreover facilitates our commercial relations with other countries by allowing our merchants a choice of the coin best suited to the stranger. Does a difference of the value between the two metals of late years give a sufficient cause for such a radical reform? If silver is preferred today, the preference may change by the discovery of vast silver mines or a great reflux of silver from the east by reason of the sale of our manufactures in those countries. The proposed law prudently confines itself to present necessities without pretending to look into the future.

Mr. Beckwith also transmitted a copy of the monetary convention of December 23, 1865. We now see clearly the actual scare and apprehension of a continued deluge of gold; and that the convention, the Latin Union was formed primarily for the protection and preservation of silver as money, then so scarce compared with gold, and the maintenance of bimetallism:

"ARTICLE 12. Any other nation can join the present convention by accepting its obligations and adopting the monetary system of the union in regard to gold and silver coins."

Here is international bimetallism established by France, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, and Greece. France alone had maintained bimetallism ever since October 1785. Now Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, and Greece join this bimetallic league. There is no question of their ability to maintain it. But we see what caused this monetary conference. It was to keep siver in their countries and not have it entirely expelled by the overabundance of gold with which they were being flooded. To do that they reduced the quantity of silver in the minor coins and left the 5-franc (the dollar) with full legal tender, unlimited and free in coinage.

At this very time, as I stated before, France was preparing for the Paris Universal Exposition, to begin in April.

In March 1865, she had called the attention of our Government to it, and Mr. Lincoln had appointed Mr. N. M. Beckwith commissioner general. An advisory committee had also been appointed in New York, of which Mr. Samuel B. Ruggles—this same man who was in the Berlin Statistical Congress of 1863—was a member, and chairman of group 5, on mines, metallurgy, etc.

On October 9, 1866, Hon. Samuel B. Ruggles was designated by Secretary Seward to take charge of that branch of the representation at the exposition relating to uniform weights, measures, and coins.

Now, Mr. Ruggles gets himself appointed as the representative of our Government to the Paris Universal Exposition on the subject of weights, measures, and coins.

Meetings, composed of members of the scientific commission, the imperial commission, and the foreign commissioners at Paris, for consultation regarding measures for drawing public attention to the subject of uniformity in weights, measures, and coins, were held.

I want to show just exactly the connection of Mr. Ruggles, and how he, in connection with the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. Sherman, manipulated the proceedings to be had in the international monetary conference of 1867.

I do this to show what position he was in, and how he could use that position.

On January 4, 1867, Mr. Berthemy, envoy of France to the United States, submitted to Secretary Seward a copy of the monetary convention of December 23, 1865, and invited the United States to become a party to it.

That is the only time the United States was ever offered an opportunity to become a member of an international bimetallic union. Here it is. I want the Senate to understand it, and I want the country to know why we did not accept it. Here was a bimetallic system upon the ratio of 15½ to 1 maintained by France since October 30, 1785, and all we had to do was simply to subscribe to it. There was no international complication connected with it; nothing to do but simply subscribe to it, and agree that we would coin certain coins. In order to come to that, we only had to strike out about 12½ grains of our standard silver dollar, reduce it to 400 grains, and thus bring it down to the ratio of 15½ to 1.

I want to read to the Senate from the documents before me, because I propose to show that this was an opportunity, an invitation, to the United States to join an international bimetallic union of Europe, and the distinguished Senator from Ohio and Mr. Ruggles prevented it. Never was such a chance had before, and never has there been such a chance since. Here was the standard prfected, tested for nearly a hundred years, already agreed to, with an open clause, with an open door for any nation to join in it; and that great nation, France, once our ally in our sore trouble, the nation which helped give us our independence from Great Britain, the nation which has stood by us closer than any other foreign nation, came with the friendly offering of international bimetallic coinage, the thing we have been talking about ever since 1873.

I shall read from these documents a few passages so that we may understand exactly the situation. I do not desire to do an injustice to anyone, but I think the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio has never been given credit—so-called—for the very efficient part he took in bringing about a single gold standard.

I quote now from Senate Executive Document No. 14, Fortieth Congress, second session, the message of the President of the United States in answer to a resolution of the Senate transmitting a report from the Secretary of State concerning the international monetary conference held at Paris in June 1867 This is the letter of Mr. Berthemy, representing France, to Mr Seward:

"SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith to Your Excellency a copy of the text of the monetary convention, concluded December 23, 1865, between France, Belgium, Italy, and Switzerland.

"As you will see, Mr. Secretary of State, this act went into force the 1st of August last, reconstituted, under the guaranty of an international contract a monetary union which had existed in fact between these four states, but which diverse measures, adopted without preliminary understanding, had broken up during late years. These measures, adopted successively in Switzerland, in Italy, and in France, had a sole object, that of putting an end to the abnormal disappearance of fractional silver money, or standard change money indispensable for payments of trifling amounts. To the same evil they opposed the same remedy, the lowering of the standard, but according to different rules and proportions. The Swiss pieces for instance, coined at the standard of eight hundred thousandths fine, while those of France and of Italy were at the standard of eight hundred and thirty-five, had to be refused in the public treasuries of the empire as well as in those of the Kingdom of Italy.

The inconvenience of this state of things was not long in becoming apparent, and causing, perhaps more keenly than in past time, the appreciation by the populations of the four bordering states, of the advantages of the monetary communion by which they had been formerly benefited. For the purpose of satisfying the just claims and pressing interests of trade the government of the Emperor last year proposed to Belgium, to Italy, and to Switzerland, to entrust to a mixed international commission the care of reestablishing the ancient uniformity by taking account of facts accomplished, and of the new conditions of the monetary circulation of Europe. Commissioners appointed by these different states assembled at Paris under the presidency of M. de Parieu, vice president of the council of state, and, in stating the causes for the convention of the 23d December last, they have fully met the immediate end which was assigned for their labors, according to the expression used by the Minister of Finance of Belgium, on submitting to the Belgium Chamber the project of law intended to sanction the convention: "This act contains in effect, within itself, saying the unity of stamp, a monetary system, complete for moneys (coin), property so-called, to the exclusion of bullion (base coin)."

At this time the gold and silver coinage of these four states is conducted under conditions that are identical. In what relates especially to fractional silver of the piece of five francs for real change of standard money, which alone can meet the demand for small transactions, the standard of eight hundred and thirty-five thousandths has been definitely adopted. This is the figure which, already adopted in France and in Italy, has seemed best to satisfy the conditions of the problem which was in discussion for a solution—that is to say, to give to fractional metallic coins of the union the highest intrinsic value and the qualities of a good alloy, at the same time doing away with the premium they had reached from the relative depreciation of gold, which allowed speculation to melt them up and export them at a profit.

Express provisions limit, moreover, the emission of this legal small change, and serve also as the corrective of the lowering of the standard value. Precise rules reduce to the smallest possible figures the allowances for cost of fabrication, so as to maintain the money of the union in a constant normal condition. In fine, you will remarks, Mr. Secretary of State, a clause which is detached from the rest of the stipulations, exclusively destined to determine the monetary regulations of the four countries. I desire to say something of the accession which article 12 guarantees to any other state. This clause may be considered as the manifestation of a wish that sprung up in the proceedings of the international conference, and has not been without influence on the happy issue of the negotiations. After having brought about the disappearance of divergencies of which they recognized the inconveniences, the delegates of France, of Belgium, of Italy, and of Switzerland, seeing a population of 70,000,000 of souls thenceforth endowed with the same monetary system, must quite naturally have been led to fix attention on an interest more general. Without entering on the examination of a question which it was not their mission to solve, they expressed in the name of their governments the desire to see the union, as yet restricted to four countries, become the germ of a union more extended, and of the establishment of a general monetary circulation among all civilized states.

Mr. President, here it was; and here we are urged to become a party to it, which we could have done without sacrificing one particle of honor, one particle of convenience, or the sustaining of one nickel or a penny of cost.

I read further:

"The Government of the Emperor would be very happy to see this proposition well received, but, at the same time cannot dissemble the difficulties and objections it might encounter.

* * * * *

"If for the moment objections too weighty prevent the Federal Government—"

Pleading with us now—

"If for the moment objections too weighty prevent the Federal Government from adhesion to the convention of 23d December, the Government of the Emperor would not the less attach special value to being informed of these obstacles and to learn what observations may have been drawn forth by the examination of that international act.

* * * * *

"Thus also, in case the Federal Government without wishing to accede to the union actually constituted, should be disposed, either to enter into arrangements destined to establish equations between some of its monetary types of gold or silver, and those which the convention may determine, or to take part in an international conference at which might be discussed the means of arriving at a more extended monetary understanding, the Government of the Emperor will entertain with readiness the overtures which might be addressed to it in this view."

Now, Mr. President, we see the offer. We see the pleading of this great nation. Now let us trace the progress of it.

Mr. Seward, February 13, 1867, says:

"Having consulted the Secretary of the Treasury upon the subject, I have the honor to state in reply to your note that this Government, both in its legislative and executive departments, has repeatedly manifested its interest in the question of international unification of monetary standards; that the importance of a standard unit of equal value in all commercial countries for the uses of account and currency is fully recognized and appreciated; and that the ideal object presented in your communication being acceptable, it only remains to be decided how the desired result may be brought about.

"It is to be hoped that neither the quadripartite convention nor the proceedings already adopted by the four governments under its provisions, will be held to preclude any of those governments from entertaining considerations in favor of its modification which may be offered by other governments in the interests of a system universally acceptable."

Mr. Berthemy replied May 27, 1867, to Mr. Seward's letter, and after stating the preliminaries, says:

"In consequence, a formal proposition has been transmitted through the diplomatic medium to divers governments in order that they might cause themselves to be represented in a commission which should meet at Paris on Monday, the 17th of June next, at the hotel of the department for foreign affairs. This conference would be presided over conjointly by the minister for foreign affairs and the minister of finance."

When our replies were received the French Government determined then to hold an international monetary conference so that we could have a full opportunity of discussing this question and entering into it. I will read further from what Mr. Berthemy said. I have just read from page 5 giving the notice to our Government that the monetary conference had been called. I now read from page 6:

"There is no need to add that the commissioners will assemble without any program arranged in anticipation"—

Now, mark you; this is very important—

"There is no need to add that the commissioners will assemble without any program arranged in anticipation. They will thus be able to look more freely for a solution of the difficulties which would oppose an assimilation between the systems actually in operation. This mode of proceeding, which has already received so happy application at the conferences of 1865, appears at this time of greater utility, inasmuch as different countries, while appreciating the importance of the object to be attained, would have the means of recurring to divergent opinions. The conference proposed has not otherwise any immediate object than to call out an interchange of views and discussion of principles; in a word, to seek for the basis of ulterior negotiations."

That conference was to meet on June 17, 1867, and Mr. Seward appointed Mr. Ruggles as the representative of the United States to that international monetary conference. But before the monetary conference met Mr. Ruggles, who was already the commissioner of the United States to the Universal Exposition on the subject of weights, measures, and coinage, was there getting in his work, in direct violation and disregard of what the French Government had said should be the meeting of the conference, no program laid out, or anything of the kind. Mr. Ruggles, as a member of the preliminary international committee on the uniformity of coinage organized by the imperial commission, had been at work. For what? For the single gold standard.

Mr. ALLISON. How was that preliminary committee arranged?

Mr. COCKRELL. The preliminary committee was arranged by the commissioners of the different nations to the Universal Exposition. The several representatives got together and formed a preliminary committee, and this preliminary committee had gotten together and determined in their wisdom to anticipate the action of the convention and have a cut-and-dried platform for the convention to act upon when it met. It was just like when a political meeting is to be held a few gentlemen get together and draw up the resolutions that must be adopted.

Now, somebody else was aiding Mr. Ruggles in this important work of representing the United States. He had in that important work the potential influence of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, Hon. John Sherman, then chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate. Now, mark you, we were invited to join the Latin Union for bimetallism. What were our representatives there doing? Invited to a feast to partake of bimetallism, and our representatives go there with a dish of their own and say, "Not one of the dishes you have invited us to partake of will we partake of. No, no. We must have our own diet." I want to read the letter of Senator Sherman.

Youths Who Never Knew "Old Deal" Called To Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Westbrook Pegler, from the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 28, 1943:

YOUTHS WHO NEVER KNEW "OLD DEAL" CALLED TO FIGHT

(By Westbrook Pegler)

The Doakes kid, Joe, Jr., was taken into the Army the other day. He is 18 years old and a very patriotic American, but of a new and different sort.

Young Joe Doakes was born in 1925 and was a little less than 8 years old when President Roosevelt was inaugurated the first time. He has lived all of his conscious life to date under the rule of Mr. Roosevelt and the New Deal. In his mind, Mr. Roosevelt, Mrs. Roosevelt, Henry Wallace, and Harry Hopkins are the fixed government of his country for he has never known any other.

Unconsciously, during these years between babyhood and young manhood, the Doakes kid has been influenced by the events, the methods, and the ethics that have swirled around him. He can't remember when it was improper to toss off a solemn promise and break it with a mocking grin, when gangsters were held to be outlaws, when the Government was scrupulous to obey the laws and disdained clever tricks upon the people, when high personages were careful not to claim special privileges on a pretense of public service and a citizen could oppose a policy without fear of personal reprisal.

NEW IDEAS OF CITIZENSHIP

He does remember, because it happened the day after Pearl Harbor, that, after President Roosevelt had taken a public vow not to deliver a lot of coal miners to John L. Lewis, a man named Steelman, acting in the President's name in the role of arbitrator did for him precisely what he had sworn he would not do. Because his Government did that and because this is the only government he has ever known, the Doakes kid thinks that was pretty cute and his regard for his own promises is affected accordingly.

He has a sense that the best citizenship and the best way to get along is to belong to the crowd that is in power. He noted, in his juvenile way, that Harry Hopkins made a nice piece of change out of magazine stuff which he didn't even have to write himself, at a time when the President was damning war profiteers and, further, that although Hopkins warned the common citizens that they must live a hard life, Harry is living higher and making more money than ever before in his life. And it has not escaped the Doakes kid's attention that anyone who sticks his neck out is likely to be handed an iron cross by the President to signify that he is a traitor or vilified by LaGuardia, Ickes, or the New Deal Party press or even hounded by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

OLDER GENERATION CONFUSED

The Doakes kid has heard his old man mutter that such a way of doing ain't right and grumble that they didn't do that way before 1933, but the day before 1933 is just olden times to him and he figures that his old man is getting along.

The old gent has tried, at times, to explain that right is right, but he hasn't a very good command of language or logic and goes by instinct, so he hasn't made much of an impression. Moreover, he is confused, himself, and vaguely suspicious that the Government of these last 10 years has purposely kept a lot of lamp shades, tennis balls, and Indian clubs in the air at all times so that he couldn't concentrate for long on any one thing.

The kid has never known anything else but the New Deal and its moral code and he is just one of a whole generation of Americans, boys and girls, who have been so conditioned, as the ideology writers would say.

Like the young generation that Mussolini seized to train in fascism from childhood, these Americans, who naturally look to their Government for the highest example, have been getting a course of what the Navy calls indoctrination since they first were able to realize that there was such a thing as the Government.

PROMISE THEM ANYTHING

That is why the Doakes kid doesn't take very seriously all he hears about the four freedoms everywhere in the world. He figures, what the hell, promise them anything and appoint an arbiter to break the promise, keep yourself in power and take care of your own mob and if one of those small nations puts up a beef, put it on the defensive with your propaganda.

Withou' conscious reasoning, Joe Doakes, Jr., reckons to deal with the rest of the world as he has seen his own Government deal with the people of the United States of America, because that is the code under which he grew up and he knows no other.

Wartime Air Transport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 3, 1943:

WARTIME AIR TRANSPORT

Commercial air transportation has been called a young man's activity. Certainly it has shown every symptom of youthful energy and ready adaptability to war'ime conditions. The report of Col. Edward S. Gorrell, president of the Air Transport Association of America, on the performance of domestic air lines in 1942, makes good reading. The airplane that flew 1,200 miles a day before Pearl Harbor now flies more than 1,600 miles and in some instances more than 1,800 miles a day. Although a very substantial number of aircraft have been turned over by the lines to the Government and available equipment thus was sharply reduced in 1942 as against 1941, the lines were able to set new records for the year in all three categories of cargo, mail, and revenue passenger-miles flown. Indeed, Colonel Gorrell states that air cargo showed an increase of 108 percent and mail volume an increase of 55 percent. These figures give an inkling of what is sure to come when air transport can take up peaceful rather than military burdens. The domestic air lines carried 40,101,657 pounds of air express during 1942, nearly 40 times the poundage of 1933, and the separate pieces of mail carried last year reached the astonishing total of more than 463,000,000.

But transportation is only one of the wartime jobs being done by these carriers, who are on a 24-hour schedule in all departments. Their shops are open the clock around for the servicing of military and naval planes. Their Wartime Training Institute gives specialized schooling to thousands of officers and men of the Air Transport Command, and their familiar domestic routes have thrown out tentacles to every battle front, maintaining schedules of remarkable frequency and incredible distance at the behest of the armed services. The air lines of the United States have met their major challenge in a fashion of which they can be proud.

Pay-As-You-Go Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Endicott (N. Y.) Daily Bulletin:

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAXATION

The pay-as-you-go income tax fight is scheduled to be renewed in Congress early in May after our Congressmen end a 10-day recess.

After an attempt to form a bipartisan front on this highly controversial legislation, Republicans and Democrats finally gave up hope, and the House Ways and Means Committee reported a modified version of the original Ruml plan, which would forgive taxpayers a bit more than 40 percent of 1942 taxes with the balance to be paid over a 3-year period.

One point the House is beginning to understand is that the public is determined to have income taxation placed on a pay-as-you-go basis, and, although the Democrats opposed the Ruml plan, they have receded from this position at least partially, and are now willing to approve at least partial forgiveness of 1942 taxes.

Most encouraging part of the action in the House is that a bill has been discharged from the Ways and Means Committee that embodies even partial forgiveness of last year's taxes.

Chairman Doughton was strongly opposed to any forgiveness of 1942 taxes, and the change in his position is a major concession considering the strength with which he opposed tax forgiveness only a few weeks ago when all income tax measures before the House were returned to committee.

Major difference between the Democratic and the Republican positions now is not a question of whether there should be any forgiveness at all, a position which the Democrats originally opposed, but the degree to which forgiveness of 1942 income taxes should go.

This is a question that will have to be fought out on the floor of the House. It is so technical that it is difficult for the public to express itself except to make it clear that it insists on pay-as-you-go taxation and that it is opposed to double taxation this year.

We believe that a vast majority of American citizens were in favor of the Ruml plan as it originally existed, modified perhaps to the extent that provisions would be included so that a taxpayer earning a much smaller income this year than last would not be permitted to escape paying on his larger income.

Most encouraging is the fact that the House is ready to act after its recess. We need pay-as-you-go income taxation badly, and the sooner it is law the better it will be for taxpayers and the Nation's Treasury.

Justice Owen Roberts Backs Federal Union Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, April 5, 1943, the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator carried a story from which I quote a part:

Justice Owen J. Roberts, second oldest member of the Supreme Court, has written Clarence K. Streit, president of Federal Union, Inc., and author of Union Now, that "You can put me down in the list of supporters of the Federal Union idea." Streit announced this today in Washington, where he is arranging to move headquarters of the organization from New York City in accordance with a decision of its national board. * * *

Generally rated the most conservative member of the Supreme Court, * * * Justice Roberts is one of its two Republican members. He was appointed by President Hoover in 1930 after his prosecution of the Teapot Dome oil case.

Chester C. Davis, new wartime Food Administrator, was chairman of the resolutions committee of the 1942 national convention of Federal Union at St. Louis, which drafted the organization's present policy. This policy calls for the establishment of two international organizations—one, a general "organization to include all the peoples of the world," and within it the other, a federal union formed by the United States and other peoples having the "strongest possible bill of rights" and "compelling natural ties" to unite them as the first step toward an eventual federal union of all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 1, 1943, Mr. Justice Roberts made an address at the dinner of the American Society of International Law. This address is in my opinion the best statement of the basic necessities for the political organization of the post-war world that has come to my attention. This address should be studied carefully not only by every Member of Congress, irrespective of party, but it should be read and reread by every citizen of the United States of America who is putting forth his efforts so that we may win this war and so that the winning of it will not have been in vain.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this significant address by Mr. Justice Owen J. Roberts, of the Supreme Court of the United States:

The development of international law in the last 50 years has been substantial. It seems fair to say that this recent development is greater than the world has witnessed in historical time.

International law, viewed as the formulation of the customs of civilized nations in the conduct of their mutual relations, has become a great corpus of jurisprudence through the consensus of experts working in the field. In addition, there has recently grown a large body of consensual international law embodied in the formal agreements to which nations are parties.

The last 2 decades have also witnessed an encouraging advance in the resort to adjudication of international disputes. The practice of submission of questions arising between nations to the Permanent Court of International Justice has been a long step forward in the recognition of right principles in composing international differences.

In the years following the First World War there seemed reason to hope that, by a course of evolution, nations would come to adopt thesce methods of adjusting their mutual concerns and that the rule of reason and justice might more and more pervade the settlement of questions arising between them.

The invaluable services of the League of Nations in many fields, but particularly those of health and hygiene, economics, and industrial relations, gave hope of further progress and fuller understanding and cooperation. The many peace treaties by which nations covenanted to make their best endeavor to settle disputes arising between them, without resort to force, seemed to promise the ultimate outlawry of war. The general satisfaction with the work of the Permanent Court of International Justice foreshadowed increasing resort to that tribunal.

The League of Nations itself was far in advance of anything the world had known as an instrument of international political control of national sovereign rights.

But it became increasingly evident from 1933 that all existing instruments of international cooperation and adjudication would prove inadequate to preserve the world from resort to force. It became evident that the only existing sanction of international faith and honor, namely, the sentiment of the majority of civilized men, would prove insufficient to deter some nations from flouting both the express covenants to which they were parties and the corpus of established principles of international law which has grown with the advance of civilized living. The present war is witness to the fact that, in world crises begotten by race pride, by the lust for national aggrandizement, and by national selfishness, international law is powerless.

The international role which the United States has played has been conditioned upon the state of public opinion in the Nation.

In each of the two world wars our Government, responsive to the popular will, initially attempted to play the part of a neutral. In both cases our citizens have, after serious and costly delay, discovered that the world's business is our business; that we cannot erect a wall and sit safely behind it while the flames of war rage beyond our borders; that we must act not only for the vindication of the principles to which our Government is dedicated but, from a merely selfish point of view, we must defend the personal and economic freedom of our citizens or lose it. And so, tardily and unwillingly, the people of the United States have been forced to throw the weight of their will and their resources to the support of the efforts of nations fighting to vindicate those principles for which we stand. I believe that we have come to realize that we cannot, as a nation, live in isolation; to understand that, if we are to have the essentials of our free democratic way of life we must join other nations in means and methods to perpetuate world peace through world cooperation.

Our recent experience teaches that all the expedients to which the nations have turned are insufficient to keep the peace. We have learned that leagues, treaties, agreements, voluntary submission of disputes to a world

court, fall short of reaching the goal. What other recourse is there? Our own national experience as a federation of independent sovereigns seems to point to at least one avenue to be explored. Is it not plain that, so long as national sovereignty remains absolute, no means will exist for preventing the abnegation of the obligations of international good faith. Must there not be a fundamental framework of government to which the people of each constituent nation surrender such portion of their nation's sovereign prerogative as is essential to an international order; that each nation be bound by certain agreed rules so that no single nation, and no group of nations, can, for any reason, or for no reason, assert its or their unbridled will by resort to arms?

What I read, and what I hear, leads me to believe that, amongst men of your background and training, and indeed amongst the thinking laymen of the United States, the overwhelming opinion is that some such organic and fundamental law must be adopted if we are to have world order and world peace. Men differ widely as to the character of the structure and the powers to be conferred upon a supra-national government and the machinery by which those powers are to be implemented. These are matters in connection with which experts like yourselves can be of inestimable aid. The difficulties of framing such an organization admittedly are enormous. They challenge the best ingenuity and skill of the most expert.

Naturally there will be differences as to detail. But it seems to me that there ought not to be much difference of view respecting certain fundamental requirements. Supra-national law must be law affecting and binding individual citizens of the nations belonging to the supernational Government, in the same sense that the law of the United States, consisting of the Constitution, and the statutes adopted pursuant to it, bind every citizen of the Nation. The contrast between the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution in this aspect is sufficient to enforce the conclusion. The United States could never have persisted through the 150 years of its life if the laws of the Nation has been addressed to, and binding upon, the States as entities rather than upon the individual citizens of the States. The police force of any government necessarily must enforce the law of that government against its citizens—not against the state or nation to which those citizens belong. Enforcement as against a citizen is a police function; enforcement against state or nation as an entity is war.

The psychology back of Federal legislation is that the citizen's loyalty and fealty to the Nation stands over against his loyalty to his particular state. That balance of loyalties, with all its obvious value, would be lost if issues between the Federal Government and its constitutent members were closed by the mandate of the Federal Government to the State and instead of to its citizens.

It seems obvious that a world government must have a representative assembly to implement its delegated powers. Equally plain is the necessity for an executive to administer the laws and see to their enforcement. And under that executive there must be an independent police to effectuate the legislative policy and the executive action pursuant to it.

Lastly, there must be a judiciary to which disputes between the citizens and the supra-national government, between citizens and any nation a party to that government, and between nations, must be submitted for adjudication.

These three instrumentalities are essential if we are to avoid the weakness and inefficiencies of all prior forms of international cooperation. Treaties, league covenants, and agreements which may be repudiated at the wish or whim of any nation party to them leaves the adherents to the compact little or no power to compel recusant signatories to comply with their undertakings. And a world court whose jurisdiction can only be invoked by willing nations is helpless to prevent such violation of plighted faith.

I shall not stop to discuss the details of structure and powers of international government. As I have said, these matters challenge the ingenuity, the skill, and the imagination of those who are indoctrinated in the theory of government and who are expert in international law. Given adherence to the fundamental propositions I have stated, I have enough confidence in the intelligence of mankind to believe that a convention of delegates from the nations can overcome the difficulties presented, as the Constitutional Convention of 1787 overcame those confronting it.

I turn to some objections and caveats currently put forward. First, it is said that nations are not ready to be tied together in a complicated governmental organization wholly new and untried. I answer that the important matter is not how much but how little authority should, in the first instance, be delegated to any such government. It would seem that a very simple bill of rights—a power to raise and support armies, a commerce power analogous to that exercised in the United States by the Congress, a power to create an international medium of exchange, and a power to create a federal postal system, would be essential, and that little, if anything, more should initially be attempted; perhaps not so much.

It is said that any such project is but the mental concept of the amateur and the naive; that nations, other than the existing democracies, would find the scheme antithetic to their notions of government and international relations and consequently would refuse adherence to it. My answer is that, while we should make the framework broad enough to permit the ultimate entry of every nation which desired to join and was able to institute a popular form of government approximating our notions of democracy, we should not wait to organize a supra-national government until all, or a great majority of nations were ready and willing to enter. Certainly the people of the British Commonwealth of Nations and the people of the United States would understand and readily accommodate themselves to such an organization; and in western Europe there are many more nations of which the same may be said. These, if they keep the door open to others of like mind, could, with the greatest advantage, now amalgamate in an international government. Indeed it might be better that, in the first instance, they alone should do so. This could be no affront to other nations, but, on the other hand, it would have the enormous advantage of presently consolidating international policy in respect of the post-war settlement. It would obviate discrepancies and differences, confusion and delay, and the inherent weakness which follows from divided counsels.

Of a piece with the same criticism is the assertion that nothing should be done toward post-war world organization until after a long cooling-off period. In my view, no doctrine can be more dangerous. When the war ceases, great populations will be left without government, without national solidarity, in utter confusion with respect to the future. For the allied nations to endeavor, by negotiation amongst themselves, to provide a stop-gap while they jointly plan their future course with respect to other nations and other peoples will beget only discord, the emergence of the age-old national jealousies and claims, and result in an ultimate settlement comparable to that at Versailles. If, when the peace comes, a strong union of democracies speaks on these matters with a united voice, and holds out even to the conquered people of Europe opportunity for ultimate partnership, under proper conditions, a very different picture will be presented.

The last and most prevailing objection is that the people of the democracies, and especially the people of the United States, will never consent to surrender any portion of the national sovereignty. If this objection be valid, that ends the discussion. We may as well then throw up our hands and let the world roll on into chaos. Unless the United States espouses, and promptly and vigorously urges, a project of world organization, none such will reach fruition.

No plan of organization, however apt, however desirable, can have any chance of adoption or successful operation unless it is backed by the sentiment of the American electorate. The man in the street may not be competent to judge of the details of such a plan But he is competent to comprehend the principles upon which a union should be built. He is competent to envisage in a broad way what it is he is willing to have his Government adopt, what elements of national sovereignty he is willing to surrender and to pool with the peoples of other nations, and he is competent to say whether he wishes his Government to embark upon a daring but hopeful experiment of world organization.

Unless the great majority of our people agree that their chosen leaders shall adhere to an acceptable form of world organization nothing can be accomplished. Our national way is for the leaders, students, and experts to impart to their fellow citizens their views and their reasons for holding them, and thus promote sound public opinion. Men like yourselves who must feel that this war will be fought in vain unless we can win the peace have a high duty to enter the forum of public opinion and make your influence felt.

And our Nation will not take her stand for unselfish and enlightened international cooperation unless her leaders are convinced that it is the will of an overwhelming majority of our people that an appropriate organization be created to that end Nor will our leaders speak to the leaders of other nations with authority unless the body of public sentiment in this country gives assurance that what is agreed upon will be carried out by our Government. It will be as unfair as it will be fatal to leave our representatives in the equivocal position in which President Wilson stood after the proposal by him, and acceptance by our allies, of the plan for the League of Nations.

Our obligation then is to arouse and enliven public sentiment in this country in support of an integration of our own and other nations in a world organization having the purpose and the power to adjust the relations of the peoples of the earth in accordance with the dictates of justice, and to promote and, if necessary, enforce the peaceful composition of all differences and disputes which may occur.

Polish Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a newspaper article which

appeared in the Chicago Times, concerning Polish freedom:

POLISH FREEDOM

One hundred and fifty-two years ago the nobility and gentry of Poland, "valuing more than life and personal happiness, the political * * * independence and * * * freedom of the nation, resolved upon a * * * constitution."

During this period Poland has been a free nation for only 21 years, between 1918 and 1939. Her first defeat came in 1772, when the nation was partitioned by her neighbors. Nineteen years later, when the constitution, whose anniversary is celebrated today, had been adopted, Catherine the Great, of Russia, reacted to its cry for independence by completing the partition of Poland between herself, Prussia, and Austria. By 1795 Poland had ceased to exist as a nation.

But the Polish people did not cease to exist. Conscious of a national heritage extending back to the tenth century, they rejected the foreign cultures imposed on them by their conquerors, and every year, on May 3, they remembered their first great constitution, which patriotic Poles still rank with our Declaration of Independence, Britain's Magna Carta, and France's Declaration of the Rights of Man.

They remembered it in the summer and autumn of 1939, when Hitler threatened, and when he struck Poles fought as they had been trained to fight for their national existence. That they lost so readily seemed somehow strange until the great Army of France also collapsed before the same foe.

Poles remembered the 1791 constitution again, when the fourth partition of their country occurred in 1939. For them the new Russia of the Soviets and the old one of Catherine the Great differed but little, hardly more than did the new Prussia and Austria of Adolf Hitler from the old Germanic monarchy of the Kaisers. Poland had been divided between those neighbors before.

Against their power, the Poles thought they could count on their own unwavering nationalism, and on America, France, and Britain. For freedom-loving Poles, persecuted in years past by their German and Russian masters, had contributed to the revolutions that made America and France free. And in return, the American and French Republics always had supported Poland's bid for independence.

On today's anniversary of their charter, the Poles face greater difficulties than ever before. A more ruthless enemy has occupied their homeland. Their people have been murdered and starved. And Russia seems as anxious as ever to partition their country again, when the war has ended.

As for the Poles in what remains of Poland—they of all the peoples in Europe have known how to reject every form of compromise with their conquerors. Not one Polish Quisling has been found by anyone.

As if by magic—and for these supreme individualists it is the magic of persecuted nationalism—all Poles today echo the words of their constitution: "More than life and personal happiness we value external independence and internal freedom."

Conservation of Wildlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Lucas County (Iowa) Conservation Club, which calls attention to the need for serious study and consideration by the War Production Board of the conservation of wildlife and a reasonable quota of shells for hunters and game lovers:

Whereas surplus crops of game birds and game animals here in Iowa constitute a tremendous potential supply of food which can be made available only if the same can be harvested by hunting; and

Whereas the supply of shot shells and metallic ammunition is not sufficient at the present time to provide an adequate supply for the next hunting season; and

Whereas rabbits and other small game prosper and increase here in Iowa to the extent that they become pests and will do considerable damage to garden and grain crops if not controlled and their numbers held in check by an annual harvesting of such excess population; and

Whereas ringnecked pheasants have here in Iowa increased to the extent that they are a nuisance and are doing considerable damage to grain and forage crops; and

Whereas migratory waterfowl, during their fall migration while passing through Iowa feed in large numbers in grain fields and will do extensive damage to such fields if not kept under control; and

Whereas it will be an economic waste of valuable food resources if surplus game crops cannot be adequately harvested due to lack of sporting ammunitions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Lucas County Conservation Club of Chariton, Iowa:

We earnestly recommend to the War Production Board of the United States that they release to hunters of record such minimum of shot shells and metallic ammunition as may permit the harvesting of the surplus game crops during the war emergency; and

The petitioners respectfully request the War Production Board to give serious study and consideration as to the strategic values of the food to be harvested and the probable reduction of damage to farm crops, be weighed in the balance against the value of the strategic materials to be diverted from front-line uses to home-front use; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the Member of Congress from this district and to both Iowa Senators and to the War Production Board of the United States with the request that this matter receive their most earnest consideration.

Adopted this 26th day of April 1943.

LUCAS COUNTY CONSERVATION CLUB.
H. L. MANN, *Secretary*.

Against the Puerto Rican Independence Bill—Testimony of Mr. Rafael Carrión a Representative Puerto Rican Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks granted by the House, I am presenting copy of remarks of Mr. Rafael Carrión before the Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. Mr. Rafael Carrión is an outstanding citizen, a representative Puerto Rican businessman:

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a question, the reply to which might be most enlightening for a better understanding of the problem before us. I wish to make it clear that I am not here representing any particular group or interests. I speak as an American citizen who is vitally interested in the welfare of Puerto Rico and whose points of view are entertained by the vast majority of the sound-thinking element of the island.

For the last 30 years I was engaged in various activities and have been a close observer and student of the social and economic problems affecting our community. I feel, therefore, that I am fully qualified to express an opinion on what is best for Puerto Rico.

I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland: What is the purpose of the proopsed legislation or what objectives he expects will be accomplished by it?

Is it to be construed as a response to demands from the people of Puerto Rico?

I do not know of any such demands having ever been made.

It is true that we have in the island a number of people who have in the past advocated secession and who would still react sentimentally to any probability of absolute independence for the community. This group, however, represents a small portion, and the vast majority of the people of the island have now developed into full-fledged citizens of the United States. In fact, the president of the political party which is exercising power today in the island and which party includes in its realm most of the supporters that independence has ever had there, made it definitely clear during the course of his campaign that the political status of Puerto Rico was not to be an issue during his administration.

When the present bill was introduced in Congress, there was the natural reaction in public sentiment and a good many messages were sent up here which, to those not familiar with conditions in the island, would indicate a certain amount of local approval. Such reaction, you can be assured, is only apparent and in a large degree has been prompted by a feeling of hurt pride which is within all human beings, and which would tend to draw us away from any company in which we are not welcome.

On the other hand, this country has had definite evidence of the loyalty and sincerity of Puerto Ricans as American citizens; evidence which cannot possibly be subject to question. The extension of United States citizenship to the Puerto Rican people in 1917 represented for us the culmination of a long-cherished ambition and was interpreted as a promise that our destinies were forever linked with those of the American Nation. This citizenship was accepted heartily and in good faith and our children have been brought up and educated under the principles established by Jefferson and Lincoln. For us the United States is our country. We have lived a wholesome life, as part of the American community, under American ideals and no power on earth today should be able to take this privilege away from us.

At this stage it is well to emphasize how distressing it is that the subject should come up at a time when we are all endeavoring to serve our country hand in hand with our fellow citizens of the mainland. We heartily condemn any attempt that will disrupt our future destiny as part of the American Commonwealth.

Is the bill intended as a gesture in line with the present international sentiment? I have heard very sound-thinking people, both in Puerto Rico and on the mainland, express the opinion that it should be to

the best interest of our Nation to give frequent evidence of our good faith when assurances are made to Latin-America that we do not seek territorial conquest. In this connection the offer of independence to Puerto Rico at the present time might appear to be definite proof of such good faith. I doubt if this motive has at all served as inspiration for Senator TYDINGS, but it would seem utterly unfair to have Puerto Rico act as the guinea pig in such a demonstration. The countries of Latin-America do not need any additional evidence of our sincerity of purpose nor further proof of our "good neighbor" sentiments. In fact, any effort to cast Puerto Rico away on its own today would appear childish in the face of current events, when we have seen the experience in the Philippines and particularly with Puerto Rico occupying a prominent position as an outpost for national defense in the Caribbean.

Is it offered as a solution of the present social and economic problems affecting the community? I must confess that in proffering this part of my question I do so with a feeling of sarcasm. There is not one single man in this gathering who is not convinced within his own heart that the soluton of the problems of Puerto Rico would be seriously jeopardized if we were now left to fight our own battles unassisted; and the dangers of independence would not be eliminated or minimized by any safeguarding provisions or by whatever offers of future assistance the proposed legislation might incorporate.

If the offer of independence had been made to Puerto Rico at the time when General Miles landed on our shores, or if we had received any indication that such would be the ultimate political status of our community, the extension of independence today would probably be less hazardous. As it happens we were led to believe otherwise. The Jones Act, upon conferring United States citizenship on the Puerto Ricans, gave us evidence of the desire of this country that we should become a part of the Nation, and every single Governor that has been appointed to the Island during the last 40 years (with the only exception perhaps of the present incumbent) has assured us in no uncertain terms that the destinies of Puerto Rico were forever linked to those of our Nation. Under such auspices it was only natural that we should have endeavored to develop our community along American standards.

For over two score years we have devoted our energies and best efforts toward the enhancement of mutually profitable relations and we have given particular attention to the utilization of the island resources in the production of such goods as were required in the mainland, even to the extent of making our community entirely dependent on the continent for its daily livelihood. Any attempt at this stage which would tend to disregard such relations and the efforts that have led to them would be little short of criminal.

Is the bill to be interpreted as an effort to get rid of a burdensome relative? It has been said on various occasions by rather prominent people in the country, that Puerto Rico has been a burden to the United States. There is nothing further from the truth, and I am particularly happy of this opportunity to express my most emphatic protest against any such irresponsible statement. It is true that our country has spent and is spending a lot of money in Puerto Rico—many millions, possibly hundreds of millions—but if we look back on the records we will find that this was only during the last 10 years and in line with the new policies of the administration, as part of a Nation-wide program.

Prior to 1932 Puerto Rico never had any need to ask for assistance of any kind from the mainland. We had our problems, we had our difficulties, but we always managed to work them out somehow. We were a hard-working community, trusting to our own efforts and our own initiative and enterprise, pretty much as any of the States in the Union were doing at that time. In recent years we have seen evidence here of a sincere ambition and a definite determination to extend to the island such financial assistance as might be necessary to help in the solution of its many problems. For this, I assure you, we are all most grateful. Whether such assistance has been properly tendered or wisely administered is another matter. The truth is that we now have an unemployment problem in Puerto Rico which we never had before and there is more proverty and misery in the island today than we had 10 years ago. It was perhaps unfortunate that in the carrying out of such rehabilitation measures as have been extended to Puerto Rico, the opinion of the practical sound-thinking elements of the island has never been solicited, much less taken into consideration. As it happens, most of the work so far done has been to no avail to the Puerto Rican community and a serious detriment to the taxpayers of the Nation. Even in the carrying out of the various new activities which have come about as a result of the war, the men that are given the higher responsibilities are very often the least equipped for the jobs, and in the solution of the various day-to-day problems arising from the shortage of shipping facilities and otherwise, we have never seen any effort to enlist the assistance of men who, through a period of years, have shown their capacity for executive ability and efficient administration. On the contrary, most of the difficult work is placed in the hands of inexperienced men who are not familiar with conditions and who are being faced with problems larger than they are capable of coping with.

Is the bill intended as a means of washing our hands of the Island's present political mess? No one who is familiar with the history and traditions of the American people would ever consider such a premise, and it doesn't occur to me that there is the slightest possibility of any intentions along these lines, but I only bring up the subject to emphasize the absurdity of even suggesting a solution such as has been proposed, at a time when general conditions in the Island are perhaps more serious and require more careful thought and judicious consideration than ever before. This is no time to jump to conclusions, however drastic. There is plenty of ground for constructive work and we would rather see an effort to bring together the minds of sound-thinking, mature element, both here and in the Island, in a conscientious attempt to work toward a solution of the Island's many problems, with due regard for the peculiar circumstances governing our local conditions, and without in any way interfering with the much more important problems that are today facing our people as a free nation.

And now, for a last question, which is not the least important. Assuming that independence should be forced on Puerto Rico, we can safely anticipate that more than 50 percent of the population will hold on to their American citizenship. What are we going to do with over 1,000,000 United States citizens who will reside as foreigners in an independent country where they represent the majority of the population?

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RANULF COMPTON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, as I sat here in the House yesterday afternoon I listened with a great deal of personal interest and a stifling sense of sadness as speaker after speaker extolled the people of Poland and expounded upon stories and facts concerning their history; their heroism throughout the centuries; their heroism and bravery and sacrifices down through the years; of the engulfing tragedy that is their lot today.

I join with all of my colleagues in their feelings of sorrow and shame that it is still possible for such inhumanities to continue in a time of enlightened civilization.

The Polish people do not need me to speak for them. They speak for themselves. They work for themselves and they fight for all of us. As I listened yesterday the picture that developed in my mind was blurred. Something was missing. I could feel the horror; I could sense the courage; but a very integral quality of the Polish people was left out. It was their gayety.

Courage goes hand-in-hand with gayety and freedom. Only a brave people can be gay or can be free. A people who can sing and dance and laugh and love through adversities and tragedies are a brave people and the memory of their bravery will live forever—long after the story of their suffering is forgotten.

It was such courage and gayety that made America. It is such courage and gaiety that will rebuild Poland.

On a few occasions I have been permitted to join with Polish groups in the celebration of some simple ceremony. Inherently they are a happy people. They are simple and good and kind and graceful and fun-loving. To them a laugh is worth a thousand groans in any market. They love honest laughter as they love the sunshine. They carry a song in their hearts and the tragedies they move among today are not Polish tragedies—they are tragedies of civilization—borne by the Polish people in the interests of civilization.

Do not let this observance of the Polish Constitution Day take on too much the aspects of a funeral. Poland still lives. The Polish people can still fight. The Polish people can still laugh. So, for a few moments at least, 'et us remember Poland as a free country, the Poles as a free people. Let us listen to the lilt and swing of her polkas, to the laughter of her girls, and the happy clamor of her youth.

Though the people of Poland are an oppressed minority in Europe today, the history of their courage and gayety will

have a major influence upon the future of their race.

When all tragedy has gone Poland will rise again—still a happy, carefree nation. I salute the gayety that once again will be Poland's.

Capitol-to-Campus Column Speaks for H. R. 757

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to be able to include with my remarks herewith a portion of the column entitled "Capitol to Campus," written by Mr. Robert A. Marshall, of Washington, and published in a good many of the college newspapers throughout the country.

This column refers to three bills which I have introduced, and I am naturally very appreciative of the support given them therein:

SOMETHING TO COME BACK TO

WASHINGTON.—First concrete proposal to assure college students who interrupt their education to serve in the armed forces that they'll have help in resuming their education when the war's over is here.

Congressman JERRY VOORHIS, of California, has dropped a bill into the legislative hopper that may do the trick.

VOORHIS, one of the most distinguished of the young liberal voices in the House, believes Congress has a particular duty to prepare for the future after victory is won. He is one of the first men in either Chamber to make the recent National Resources Planning Board reports on social-security policies a springboard for action.

In H. R. 757, one of the three bills he introduced recently, VOORHIS asks for an appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for educational grants to any person who serves 6 months or more in the armed forces.

The measure would provide grants of $500 a year to help ex-service men to continue their schooling. As many as three successive annual grants could be made to one person. Those who hold honorable discharges for disability incurred in the line of duty would also be eligible.

"America will need to have these young men continue with their education and training when the war is over," Voorhis told the House. "This bill makes it possible for them to do so and establishes the equal right of those not able to finance such education with those who can. The justice of such a measure will, I am sure, recommend itself to all."

The two companion bills introduced by the Californian are also of interest to college students now in service.

H. R. 756 extends benefits of unemployment insurance to veterans of this war by providing 26 weeks of full coverage to those with at least 90 days of war service. The rate is about equal to that paid a man earning $30 a week.

By allowing a veteran to become eligible for regular unemployment compensation before his benefits under the bill are exhausted, the proposal would offer a substantial measure of security during the period of adjustment to civilian life.

The third bill, H. R. 758, says that military service between October 1, 1940, and for a year after the war is over shall be considered as employment covered by the old-age annuity provisions of the Social Security Act. In other words, soldiers would be building a reserve they can tap when they reach 65, just as does a person in private employment covered by the act.

College students may be inclined to give little thought to "when I'm 65," especially when "after the war" seems remotely vague. But they'll do well to keep an eye on JERRY VOORHIS' three bills.

Air Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut:

Senate Joint Resolution 154

Joint resolution memorializing Congress concerning House bill No. 1012 and Senate bill No. 246 affecting air commerce

Resolved by this assembly:

Whereas the Congress of the United States has before it for consideration, House bill 1012 and Senate bill 246 affecting air commerce; and

Whereas air commerce (air lines) represents a minor part of civil aviation and private flying and fixed-base operations represent a major part of civil aviation whose operations are not interstate in character, and therefore are of no concern of the Federal Government, the pending legislation would deny to the State their inherent rights to govern within their own State and would seriously jeopardize private flying and fixed-base operations; and

Whereas, by applying the intent of this legislation to other forms of transportation our national economy would be seriously affected; and

Whereas there is no immediate need for this legislation as the President of the United States is vested with full power under the Defense Act to regulate all aircraft, civilian or otherwise, if necessary; and

Whereas those men who are serving their country in the various branches of service are unable to voice their sentiments or opinions on this proposed legislation at this time, and they are the persons who have contributed more to the development of aviation and are entitled to their place in aeronautics when and if they return from activity duty; and

Whereas there is ample time for such legislation to be considered in the future since consideration has not been given future development and improvements which will change methods now used in the regulations of aircraft: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the State Legislature of Connecticut respectfully requests that no action be taken on the above-mentioned bills or any similar bill or bills by Congress until the present war is over and peace is established; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the clerk of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the clerks of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of Congress, and to each of the Connecticut Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Tax Legislation and National Solvency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States wisely provides that all tax legislation must originate in the House of Representatives, the branch of Congress closest to the people, and whose Members must all be elected by the voters themselves, since none can enter this House through appointment. It is the responsibility of the Ways and Means Committee of the House to prepare and propose all tax legislation and until that committee has acted the House cannot act on tax measures. Likewise the Senate cannot act on tax legislation until it is worked out by the Ways and Means Committee of the House and brought in to this body to be debated, amended, ratified, or modified, and given tentative approval. It is then sent over to the other side of the Capitol for further discussion and decision, after which it is returned to the House for final approval or disapproval. It is because of this constitutional arrangement that we find ourselves again today considering a step in the process of tax legislation. About a month ago we were similarly confronted with this initial step in the process of developing a tax bill and since the House failed to reach an agreement on any proposal at that time the whole matter was recommitted to the Ways and Means Committee for further study and we are today acting on the results of that study.

When the Ways and Means Committee brought in its tax legislation about a month ago, it brought us two bills instead of one. One was the Doughton proposal which failed to provide a workable means of letting taxpayers pay as they earn and the other was the so-called Ruml-Carlson plan which made it possible for taxpayers to become current and get on a pay-as-you-earn basis but in so doing opened up loop holes through which some war profiteers and high-income taxpayers could escape with a substantial portion of their incomes untaxed for 1942. Both bills were found to be objectionable by the membership of this House. I personally voted against the Ruml-Carlson plan because I did not believe then and I do not believe now that war profits and

excessive incomes should escape taxation or that it is necessary to provide such an escape in order to put America's 44,000,000 taxpayers on a pay-as-you-earn basis so that the taxes for any specific year can be paid out of the income earned in that year. I also was among those voting to recommit the tax bill to the Ways and Means Committee because I hope that by further study the Committee would arrive at some practical program of tax collection which would protect our national solvency, enable our taxpayers to meet their obligations on a current basis, and prevent any abatement of taxes on war swollen incomes. Those votes were made on March 20 at which time I said that unless the loop holes through which war-swollen incomes might escape taxation were effectively plugged I would continue to vote against any pay-as-you-earn tax program, desirable though it is, that the Treasury be permitted to tax war earnings while they are available and before they have been spent and their revenues forever lost to the Federal Government.

Since March 20, the Ways and Means Committee has been laboring hard and long in an effort to agree upon a program of pay-as-you-earn tax collections which would best serve both the taxpayer and the country. Unfortunately, there has not been a meeting of minds among the members of the committee despite the fact that precious time is fast slipping away, money is being lost forever to the Federal Treasury, and the need for additional revenue for the Government is becoming daily more apparent. Fortunately, however, all three of the proposals confronting us today—the Doughton plan, the Carlson plan, and the Forand-Robertson plan—are decided improvements over the proposals on which we had an opportunity to vote on March 20th. While the committee has reached an impasse in which all members agree that the time has now come for this House to take action on some tax proposal and it is evident there is no purpose to be served in again referring the whole problem back to the Ways and Means Committee, those of us who voted against the Ruml plan and the first Doughton plan on March 20 can take comfort from the fact that our successful opposition will today result in a much more satisfactory piece of tax legislation being sent from this body over to the Senate. It is true the resultant delay has been disturbing both to taxpayers and to the tax collecting agencies, but the definite improvements in the bills before us today more than compensate for the time which has been lost. However, I think we all can now agree that the time to take some constructive action on tax legislation has arrived. We cannot get the legislation many of us want today, but by sending it along to the Senate we can free the Ways and Means Committee to consider legislation to raise new revenue and we can give the Senate an opportunity to continue the perfecting process. Furthermore, we can and should reserve to ourselves the right and the duty to pass final judgment on this tax bill when it returns from the consideration of the Senate which cannot have an opportunity to deal with it until we give tentative approval to some form of tax bill.

A moment ago, I said some definite progress has been made in the past 4 weeks in perfecting this tax legislation and in bringing about agreement among the various opinions as to how best to fashion desirable pay-as-you-earn tax legislation. For example, all bills before us today provide methods by which taxpayers can become current and get on a pay-as-you-go basis so that indefinite and sizeable tax obligations will not always be hanging over them; secondly, all bills before us today contain withholding provisions for collecting taxes at their source so as to be sure that the huge pay rolls of industrial workers in war plants contribute their just portion of taxes; thirdly, all bills give exemptions up to $3,500 for men in the armed services and provide for the abatement of their taxes if they die in the service; finally, all bills provide for some abatement of the 1942 tax levies so that by starting the pay-as-you-earn withholding taxes now, taxpayers can work toward a current payment basis without assuming an impossible load of double taxation at existing high rates in any 1 year. These provisions are now in all three bills and the differences which remain are differences as to degree and to method rather than differences relating to principle or to policy. Congress and the country, therefore, seem agreed that it is in the interests of national solvency and tax collection efficiency that a system of pay-as-you-earn taxation be fashioned so that the tremendous volume of wages, salaries, and profits now represented in our National income shall be tapped by taxation during the period of its existence so that the Government will not suffer a huge tax loss at the end of the boom period by virtue of the fact millions of taxpayers might then be unable to pay in a depression year the taxes they had earned in a previous high-income year.

In addition, the new Carlson plan has one distinct improvement which in my opinion makes it vastly superior to the so-called Ruml plan before us on March 20 and which is a definite concession to those of us who both then and now refused to support any pay-as-you-earn tax plan which offered a loop-hole through which war profiteers and high income taxpayers could escape with their war-swollen profits tax exempt. I refer to the provision in the new Carlson plan, as now amended, which establishes 1940 as the last year of normal peacetime earnings and labels as war profits or war-inspired income all excessive increases in income which have taken place in 1941, 1942, and/or 1943. The new Carlson plan contains a provision which specifically excludes from tax abatement any and all income which represents over $5,000 of war-swollen earnings or profits. In other words, where incomes are greater by $5,000 or more in any of the war years than they were in the peace year of 1940, they must pay their regular tax levies in addition to the 1943 tax schedule provided for reaching a pay-as-you-earn basis. Thus the Carlson proposal is in harmony with the great sentiment prevailing in America that there shall be no war millionaires growing out of this war and that those enjoying substantial increases in earnings or profits as a result of the war shall have these war-swollen revenues subjected to what amounts to a special individual excess war profits tax. This feature of the Carlson bill, in my opinion, is a distinct improvement over any of the bills before us on March 20 or over the present Doughton plan which treats all income alike, whether war inspired or not, and which therefore would abate a considerable percentage of taxes on war profits.

I am especially gratified personally at the inclusion of this special tax provision against war profits in the Carlson plan, since it is a provision of tax legislation which I have long and earnestly advocated. Over a year ago I wrote a letter to Chairman GEORGE, of the Senate Finance Committee, endeavoring to have a similar provision written into the tax law of the last session of Congress. I have spent many hours in meetings with the members of the House Ways and Means Committee, both in commitee groups and in individual conferences, trying to have this provision incorporated into the tax legislation before us today. I tried without success to have this provision adopted into the measure brought before us on March 20. Since then I have continued my efforts in every way I could to have this special tax on war profits and excessive war incomes included in one tax plan or another. I am highly gratified, therefore, that it is today an important part of the tax proposal set forth in the new Carlson plan. It is a big step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, all legislation is a matter of compromise. We Members, as individuals, seldom get legislation which is 100 percent in conformity with our desires. The American system is to bring about a meeting of minds by the operation of give and take. I am frank to say there are still features of the new Carlson plan which I do not approve, since I am fundamentally opposed to any abatement or forgiveness or deferment of taxes in wartime which is not absolutely essential to the development of a workable pay-as-you-earn and collect-it-while-you-can system of tax collection.

I would therefore prefer to see the $5,000 figure cut down to something resembling the $2,000 figure incorporated in the Forand-Robertson bill. I would like to see still higher income rates evolved for certain of the higher income brackets. I would like to limit tax abatements to cases where the payment of higher taxes would cause a real hardship. However, in the choice between the Carlson proposal and the Doughton proposal, it seems to me that right and logic ride with the Carlson plan since it does include the special tax on the profits of war which the Doughton plan fails to provide. The Forand-Robertson plan by using another legislative device reaches the same war-profits objective of the Carlson plan and contains some other features which are commendable. This we all realize, however, that the uncertainty and doubt which are perplexing

the 44,000,000 taxpayers of the country should not be unnecessarily prolonged. The time has come when this House must take some action clarifying the tax situation. Consequently, I am prepared to vote to send to the Senate today whatever tax legislation we can agree upon provided it retains the fundamental principle that war-swollen profits and excessive high incomes are prevented from enjoying tax exemptions.

Mr. Speaker, it might be appropriate before concluding to say a word in response to the question which is sometimes asked, Why pass any legislation at all at this time to govern or change the methods of tax collection? The answer to that question becomes apparent when we consider the fact that the existing tax levies were not established until October of last year—10 months after taxpayers had started earning the incomes to be subjected to that tax. Thus taxpayers were given no opportunity to plan ahead for the tremendous tax increases which the necessities of war have imposed. Not until October of 1942 did taxpayers know who would and who would not be asked to pay taxes on the incomes which started in January of that year nor how large the income tax levies would be. Seven million new taxpayers were brought onto the tax rolls in October who did not know in January that they were to be taxed. None of the 44,000,000 taxpayers in America could learn until October how much of their incomes starting that January would be demanded by the Government. As a result of this unfortunate situation the Treasury Department reports many tax delinquencies and many who have paid their first quarter's tax had to borrow the money from loan sharks and pawnbrokers to meet their assessments. As taxes go higher, and go higher they must, during this war and for sometime afterward, the same difficulty will be repeated again and again. Taxes levied in midyear or later are made applicable to the incomes starting with the beginning of the year, and millions of taxpayers are unable to work out budgets to meet their taxes through no fault of their own since they cannot anticipate in advance how large their taxes will be. It is for this reason that all elements and groups in this Congress are supporting some form of pay-as-you-earn taxation so that these inevitable losses to the public treasury will be stopped, and so that sincere taxpayers will be given an opportunity to pay their taxes out of current incomes rather than becoming unavoidably delinquent. The same pay-as-you-earn provisions and withholding taxes which protect the thrifty also prevent the intentional tax dodger or chiseler and the reckless spender or profligate wastrel from defrauding his Government of that portion of his income which is due it through taxes.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we all realize that the Senate will completely rewrite and revise any legislation passed by this House today. This is not our final opportunity to express our attitudes toward tax legislation. Mr. Speaker, I do not want my vote today to be misunderstood in any way. I am not endorsing by this vote any tax legislation which may come back from the Senate. I reserve my right to oppose or approve of such legislation when it comes before us on its merits and on its merits alone. I simply do not want to be a party to obstructing or further delaying action on a bill which is as fundamentally important to our national solvency and our whole war program as is the development of an effective method of tax collection during this emergency.

I am hopeful the Senate will improve this legislation and make its provisions against war profiteering even tighter. If these provisions are weakened, I serve notice now I shall oppose the final passage of this tax legislation just as vigorously as I did all within my power to defeat the tax legislation before us on March 20 because of its failure to plug the holes against unwise and unjustifiable tax exemptions. I want my position to be crystal clear. I want it known now that my vote today does not imply in any way what my vote will be on final passage when the tax bill comes back from the Senate. My vote on that day shall be determined entirely upon the basis of how well that bill represents what I believe to be the fundamental considerations in determining upon just, honest, and effective tax legislation in time of war.

Defeat the Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, you gentlemen all are old enough to remember the worst crash in the history of our country, when banks, insurance companies, and nearly everyone was insolvent or on the verge of bankruptcy. At that time, namely, in 1931 and 1932, and even in 1933, whether they were stunned by the crash or whether they couldn't find a Ruml to come to the front to have their taxes forgiven, I don't know. Therefore, it is amazing and unbelievable, when we have had the greatest prosperity, especially the last 3 years, which I am positive will continue for many years, that they should muster the nerve to try to use you to assist them evade payment of their 1942 taxes when we have three times as great income as we had in the years 1931 and 1932.

The avaricious group feel that they cannot again get by with a refund racket as they did when they syphoned out of the Treasury in 1922 and 1923 over two and a half billion dollars after the Republicans had taken over.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, you remember the howl they made only last year when we passed the Ramspeck congressional retirement bill, which really would not have cost the Treasury in 10 years what you are asked to forgive to only one of the hundreds of Rumls.

Mr. Speaker, yes, I was home. While home I saw and talked to thousands in large meetings. I made several addresses in the bond drive, and in that connection I am proud to say that the people of Chicago again demonstrated their loyalty and patriotism by oversubscribing by nearly double their allotment. During my short stay I was visited by eight or nine committees. These committees did not come to urge me to vote for or against the Ruml plan but to urge me to stand by our President and by our boys at the front who do not ask to be forgiven their obligation to the Government, but who, instead, are giving their lives. Many, thank God, are surviving, but giving their limbs, their eyesight, and blood, and are brought home permanently disabled. They are the sons of the Ruml-despised wage workers, the white-collared boy, and the farm boy—yes, men of the masses, on whom you will be asked to unload the future tax burdens, by a sales tax, if the Ruml plan is adopted. I admit that there are a few who asked me to support the Ruml plan, most of whom I learned had accepted it as a mere pay-as-you-go plan and were not aware of its real purpose and effect; the others were just plain covetous and selfish men.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] stated that his own plan was no more to his liking than it is to the gentleman from Virginia, and I think he is justified in feeling that way about it. Mr. Speaker, I do not think we should hold the minority leader responsible for the Ruml conspiracy, as he unfortunately is under pressure to support it by those in control of the Republican Party. And what applies to the minority leader I know applies to the majority of you, because you, like me, realize and recognize that this avaricious or selfish group will try to use you to the limit, and the first chance they have they will forget you.

And what applies to the Ruml scheme, Mr. Speaker, applies nearly as strongly to the Carlson and Robertson plans. The Committee bill, as drafted now, is the bill that should become the law, and I feel that when the Senate acts they will adopt the House Ways and Means Committee bill in preference to any other suggestions. Though it forgives it is fairer to the small taxpayer than the Carlson bill.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I shall insert excerpts from a letter received from Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, who aims to be right on fair and equitable legislation in the interest of the workers of this country. They follow:

> On the other hand, the people's demand for a pay-as-you-go plan must not be used as a cloak for a tax grab for the highest income brackets, through the Ruml plan.
>
> The issue which divides these two plans is the extent to which forgiveness of the 1942 tax liability will be extended to those income groups which can afford to pay their obligations to the Government. The Ruml plan, as a complete forgiveness of the entire 1942

tax obligation, is designed to create a windfall for all the high-income groups. For this reason the Congress of Industrial Organizations has consistently opposed this program.

Unfortunately, while President Roosevelt was seeking to effectuate a national economic stabilization policy regarding wages and prices, Congress saw fit to bestow a special privilege upon high income groups by its repeal of the President's order limiting net annual salaries, after full deductions, to $25,000, thereby giving leeway for further increases on the higher salaries. The Ruml plan is but a continued effort to obtain additional privileges for high-income individuals.

A vote for the Ruml plan must therefore be construed by all Americans as a vote on behalf of wealthy individuals who seek to evade their obligation to pay their 1942 taxes to the Government.

Mr. Speaker, what the Ruml big boys are attempting to do is to obtain forgiveness for something they owe—not what they own—to give away something that is not theirs. If the Ruml plan should be adopted, you and I and the masses will be forced to pay this forgiveness for years to come. I appeal to the House to defeat it.

The Bermuda Conference Just Another Gesture—What Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, when the Bermuda Conference on Refugees opened it assumed the usual pattern of diplomatic lack of candor and a plentitude of verbiage.

True, we cannot expect miracles, but we want more than palaver, telling us what cannot be done. The conference was a "nice" gesture. It gave us positive relief. Words were stretched into conferences, conferences into learned reports, and reports into satisfied conscience. What now?

Victory, the spokesmen say, is the only solution. In the meantime, let the millions guilty of no wrongdoing be trampled to death, their lives snuffed out by lethal gases and guns, the women outraged and the children mangled. After victory, disembodied spirits will not present so difficult a problem; the dead no longer need food, drink, and asylum.

Two million Jews dead already, but we are told to wait, wait until Nazi blutbaden "liquidate" the refugee problem for us. Yes, soothe with words those awaiting the end and murmur consolingly, "Death will release you."

The setting of the conference aroused suspicions. The exclusion of the fourth estate except representatives of the syndicated news services strengthened our skepticism. Bermuda was inaccessible save by air and the priority of plan accommodation was practically unobtainable except for the armed forces. The conference, therefore, was hermetically sealed against the pitiless searchlight of publicity—so essential to any granting of genuine relief. Agencies long familiar with the distresses of the persecuted abroad, like the Quakers and the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, were barred.

Their valuable practical suggestion was unavailed of. All deliberations and conclusions were according to plan and schedule of the State Department and the British Foreign Office. The delegates were moved across the chess board by the diplomats. They gave as much voice to their own sentiments as does puppet Charlie McCarthy.

The benefits still undisclosed, I wager, could fit into a tiny capsule. Maybe, I am mistaken and at least one of our delegates might yet kick over the traces and knock the protocol to smithereens. Maybe, he will have courage enough to challenge Chairman Dodd's statement, "The cooperation of others must be solicited," and ask why Canada, Brazil, British South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Belgium, Holland, and France with huge mandated African colonies with plenty of room for refugees were not invited. Maybe he will have courage to ask why only the difficulties are emphasized and no emphasis placed on the fact that human lives are at stake.

Mr. Law, British delegate, asked that the persecuted place no hope on the Conference. Why? Because it had none to give?

The Bermuda Conference was a belated answer to a call for a conclave made months ago. But the United Nations were not invited. They were invited to the Food Conference at Hot Springs—Why to one and not to the other? Here only Britain and the United States participated.

Much water will go over the dam before a final report of findings is made. This report will only bind Britain and the United States. Then neutral countries will be contacted, singly or at another conference. More precious time gone and more complications, more diplomatic tight-rope walking.

Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden in the House of Commons was pressed by Miss Rathbone a member, as to whether the conference would be empowered to agree on immediate measures of relief and not merely to discuss them for reference to another body. Mr. Eden stated that the conference can only decide on immediate steps as far as they concern the two Governments, but as to other governments, the measures will be referred to them.

Time is of the essence, for 10,000 victims are killed by the Nazi Vernichtungkolonnen daily, and 10,000 more are made homeless. Hitler's hangmen do not wait for any Bermuda.

The conference was to be exploratory. We already have stock piles of such explorations and blueprints of rescue and relief. Our own State Department is gorged with plans. These again were trotted out as if they were new. We needed no Bermuda conference for such an exhibition of old plans. Deeds, not words.

Reservations were set forth which so narrowed the framework of the conference as to render its structure unadaptable for the end sought. All refugees were to be considered as one group without regard to race, religion, or political belief. Secondly, areas for refuge were to be sought as near as possible to the homeland to permit their return upon cessation of hostilities.

It is quite obvious to even the most casual observer of the European scene that the needs of one oppressed group differ from another or a third. The urgencies of rescue differ in degree if not in kind. It most certainly cannot be solved in lumping all groups together. To rephrase an adage, sauce for the goose may be poison for the gander.

Let us not delude ourselves. The conference labored and brought forth a mouse. Unless some concrete action is set in motion, the Bermuda conference will be another "bloomin'" flasco like the Evian Conference on Refugees. The delegates have already expressed themselves as dedicated to saving only those refugees now in neutral countries. These victims are already saved. We are not so much interested in them; we are interested in getting more hapless victims out of Hitler's clutches. There need not be any conference to save those already saved.

Glib statesmanship and bad arithmetic.

The fact that the question of food was not considered at the conference is a tragedy in itself. Millions of children undernourished and starving with their telltale swollen arms and legs and distended stomachs, ravaged by tuberculosis, abound everywhere in Europe in and out of Nazi-controlled countries. It is charged that the Nazi will steal the food shipped. That has not been the case in Greece or in France. In any event, efforts should be made to bring food on mercy ships under the International Red Cross. The same ships that take food from Canada to Greece and from Argentina to the occupied countries can be used. There is plenty of food in South America we can use, over which the British through the British Purchasing Commission have exclusive buying rights. Should there be evidence that the Nazis are pilfering this food, the giving thereof should be stopped summarily. However, we should take our chances; there is too much at stake. Furthermore, this food need not cost the American taxpayer 1 cent. There are sufficient Norwegian, Belgian, Dutch, and French blocked funds in this country to buy any quantity of food. These funds can be released by our Government, and the children of those nations can be fed with the food bought with these moneys.

I repeat, victory is not the only solution. What of Palestine? What makes the MacDonald White Paper of 1939 so sacrosanct that its limitation allowing so restricted a number of immigrants into Palestine cannot be lifted? Out of the 75,000 total permitted entrance thereby

within a period of 5 years, only 29,000 more can enter. Yet it is authentically reported there is room in Palestine for 2,000,000 more, or a total of 400,000 additional families. If the Bermuda Conference is earnest in seeking areas of asylum, would it not be well to examine the MacDonald White Paper? Why did not one of our delegates have the courage to tell their British colleagues that England has violated the Balfour Declaration and Mandate by its atrocious White Paper of 1939?

The Congress of the United States has not been silent. It pointed the way by the unanimous adoption of a resolution wherein the name of the dictates of common humanity, it condemned the brutal and indefensible outrages of the Nazi regime against millions of helpless men, women, and children and demanded that this slaughter and mistreatment cease. The resolution was a clarion call to the Bermuda Conference to rise to action and not sink into a morass of more words, more discussion, more meandering plans, lest we forget what we are fighting for.

The Bermuda Conference, I fear, has dismally failed.

It was not difficult to foresee the Bermuda Conference as just a mere gesture when the names of the delegates on both sides of the Atlantic were announced. Those selected had never displayed any real understanding of the horrors faced by the defenseless victims; the attendant problems had been alien to them from the start. Not one had displayed a genuine and understanding interest in the mass murders, the blutbaden, prior to or at the conference.

To the next conference, presumably the International Committee on Refugees, whatever its complexion, be it of allied and/or neutral countries, must be sent men with courage, understanding, sympathy, and vision, men who are not under the thumb of the protocol. Men of experience must be chosen as delegates, those who have been to devastated regions and know from personal observations how best the refugees and potential refugees can be served, how the obstacles can be surmounted, men who will not talk in terms of difficulties that cannot be solved, but who will bring the pressure of personality and profound compassion to bear upon the conclave so that something will be done—done in the neutral countries, in the areas controlled by the United States and Great Britain, and especially in Palestine. Our delegates must be possessed of the courage to urge rescue through methods of exchange for prisoners of war by means of the International Red Cross, who deals with all belligerents, and urge the necessity for the use of mercy ships to transport food to the ravaged minorities. These are but a few of the possible avenues of relief and rescue. I want to leave you with the thought of the driving necessity for concerted action on the part of the Allied Nations to save a helpless people from the extremities of torture to be followed by total annihilation. Our humanity is there. Do not let it sink beneath the weight of inertia.

Typical American Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, only a few days ago I visited my district in Nebraska and talked with many friends whose sons have gone to war. Many of them had letters from their boys. Some of the letters came from boys who are overseas and many came from boys who had just gone to camp to be trained before going into actual battle. The Pierce Call of Pierce, Nebr., is keeping in close touch with the boys who leave Pierce County. Recently that enterprising weekly newspaper published a letter from a typical Nebraska boy. I include it in my remarks:

A KID'S LETTER TO HIS PARENTS—"BOBBIE" GERMAN WRITES A TYPICAL AMERICAN BOY LETTER TO HIS FOLKS

It is hard for the Call writer to think of "Bobbie" German as only a kid. But in a letter to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Ed German, received the past week from Sheppard Field, Tex., we realize that "Bobbie" is a man—Robert E. German—full grown and matured, enlisted in the armed forces of Uncle Sam with a determination to become one of the pilots of the bombers and giant fortresses that are doing such wondereful work in Europe, Africa, and the south seas in the cause of liberty and world's peace in future years.

While in Pierce High School, "Bobbie" was ambitious to become a "sky pilot." Upon his graduation he took preliminary training at the Government air field at Norfolk. Arriving at the age of 18 years this spring, he registered with the local draft board and expressed a desire to enlist in the Air Corps. The result is he has been at Sheppard Field taking basic ground training for several weeks. He has met every test and as a cadet is now qualified to go to an advanced school for final training as a full-fledged air pilot. The boy, "Bobbie" German, is now the man, the soldier—Robert E. German. Read his letter to his parents.

SHEPPARD FIELD, TEX., *April 13, 1943.*

DEAR FOLKS: I received your packages today, the clothes, and camera, but the officers wanted to know everything, even before I got to look at the package. I also got a letter from Aunt Mae and Lee James. Also received your letter and certificate. Was there a wind blowing today? Nebraska was never like this. If you think you have a wind, just come down here. We drilled for 4 hours this morning The wind came up, and the dust got so thick we could hardly see the barracks, which are only a block away. Finally we wore our gas masks for the rest of the drill period. My letters may be short, but I'll try and write a few lines every day, but they push us pretty hard in drill, and from now on my letters may be a day apart. This afternoon we saw shows of the Battle of Midway taken by the Navy, a picture made by the Germans (not us, but Hitler). It was a propaganda picture of the superrace and supposed power of the German Nation. Also a sketch of General Arnold's speech. This is a part of the training period. I was standing at retreat and was thinking of things as I stood in line (in between times trying to wink a fly off my nose—a real job when you are not supposed to move a hand or muscle during the officers' inspections). You know this job is a lot bigger than only me and the tough top sergeant. It's for the United States that I am here—for you and dad and the rest, not the draft board. One thinks it also means that you and dad will also be there when I come back. It means a whole lot more, but I cannot put it into words. The Army is tough, but I'll be tougher.

I'm here for a purpose and the best is none too good to get the best of training. I like it now and look forward to the tougher things just to see if I can make it and when I meet the tests, as I have been doing since I arrived here, it makes you feel proud.

When I hear the National Anthem in Retreat formation, I can't help but squaring my shoulders a little more and sticking out my chest. When I see the flag, it means a lot to me. I could go on and on, but it's only a few minutes until "taps" (lights out). so I'll try and finish. I have a goal to make now. To make as good or a better soldier than my dad, of whom I'm mighty proud. If I do, then I can come home and tell "taller tales" than he does at the Legion reunions and kinda take care of him at those gatherings!

I sure look forward to those letters from home. We boys will even take a bawling out from the sergeant for being late, just to get mail. Will be seeing you in 6 months.

Love,

BOB.

Feeding World Not Up to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am submitting an article from the Boston Sunday Post of May 2, 1943.

FEEDING WORLD NOT UP TO UNITED STATES—SHOULD DO OUR SHARE, BUT CAN'T CARRY ENTIRE BURDEN—OWN FOOD SUPPLIES LIMITED

(By Robert L. Norton)

It is just so much nonsense to talk about feeding 300,000,000 starving people in Europe when the war ends unless the agricultural situation in this country is remedied. We are encountering shortages today in essential foodstuffs, such as potatoes and butter, meats and fats.

There is a possibility that real hardship will be experienced in our own households, and, despite the optimism expressed by some of our armchair experts, it will be a tremendous task to maintain the flood of food supplies to the Allies and their armies on the present scale of production.

It is but natural that the best-fed country in the world should engage in some grumbling when its food standards are reduced. There is no great deprivation as yet and the apprehension that we may not have enough to eat does not appear to be justified.

Nevertheless, we are told by the dictators of our home economy that as the war progresses, as our armed forces increase, and the needs of the Allies are multiplied, there will be less and less food.

FOOD CAN SAVE WORLD AFTER WAR

America is beginning to comprehend the necessity of tightening its belt if the war is

to be won. People generally, we think, have come to understand that food is just as important in the winning of this desperate war as tanks and planes. In fact, agriculture must be envisioned as a munitions industry.

And it must be clear that food will take the first place in saving the world from chaos and anarchy after the war.

Never before in our history have we had to worry about our food supply. It may be true, as Mr. Roosevelt has frequently stated, that one-third of the Nation has been underfed, but the emphasis is more on malnutrition and the failure to "marry health and agriculture," rather than on the lack of volume produced. Sowbelly and beans, hog and hominy are classic examples of bad American diets. But we have had no experience with starvation, which is the normal fate of millions of other peoples, even in peacetime.

Although we have always raised enough food in this country to support our population and have taken it for granted that we were self-sufficient, nevertheless, in recent years 10 percent of our foodstuffs have been imported.

HARD FACTS STRESSED BY HOOVER

There is a wide difference of opinion and a spreading controversy as to whether we will be able to feed millions of other people and still continue to maintain an adequate food supply for our own population. It is a main topic for discussion and debate in Congress, in the public forums, over the air, and among the people.

The question of food likely occupies the attention of more people today than the changing panorama of the war. In the overwhelming adoption of the Lease-Lend Act by Congress was reflected the understanding of our people that contributions of food to the Allies is as necessary to winning the war as guns and planes.

The hard facts of the food situation and the outlook for the future have been impressed upon our minds through the expert testimony of former President Hoover, who has had more experience in feeding starving millions than anyone else in this country and possibly in the world of today.

SOME STRONGLY IMPRESSIVE POINTS

"Food supply," he says, "has now become secondary only to military operations in determining the outcome of the war. It is not a problem to be dealt with in emotional terms. Nevertheless, its ultimates are victory and peace, the loss of millions of human lives or the saving of them. When firing ceases we will be faced with three or four hundred million starving people. That such monstrous things should be, is but part of the crimes of Hitler, Togo, and Mussolini."

Getting down to brass tacks, he points out that we are exporting less than half the fats and meats to our allies that we did in the last war, for then we had to support France, Belgium, and Italy, also, and with this lesser burden of exports we are threatened with greater shortages of meats and fats on our own home front than in World War No. 1.

Countering the optimism expressed within recent days by some of the economists of the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Hoover points out that at the end of the last war we had 26 percent more beef cattle for each 1,000,000 of human population than we had 23 years later on January 1, 1942. We had 26 percent more hogs in proportion to the population.

Proportionately we had 5 percent more milk cows than now, and today we have less chickens in proportion to our population, although they work harder and produce more eggs.

WOULD ABANDON MANY GRAND PLANS

There is a rising crescendo of sour notes being interjected in the hallelujah of the world planners. For instance, the distinguished Fred R. Fairchild, professor of political economy at Yale University, says: "Our hands are fully occupied in winning the war. We must abandon illusory expedients for the control of business cycles, curtail military expenditures, balance the Budget, avoid repudiation of the public debt and start reducing it."

"And we must abandon the grandiose notions of America policing, feeding, reconstructing the world. We must give up the Atlantic Charter and all the things it proposes to have America do for the world. America cannot afford to do these things. If we drop these pretensions it will require courage, fortitude, foresightedness. They will test the very fiber of the American community. But if we can do it we have no need to fear that economic conditions are going to wreck us."

MUST DO OUR PART AS CHARITY

There is a good deal of surly muttering in Congress over the fact that the legislative end of the Government is apparently not to be represented at the food conference of the United Nations to be held at Hot Springs, Va. Typical of this feeling, which is finding open expression, is the comment of Representative SHAFER, of Michigan:

"We do not believe that our young men overseas, who will run this country in years to come, are planning in their trenches and fox holes to spend the rest of their lives slaving to raise the standards of living among the head hunters of Borneo. And neither do we believe that the people of this country generally will long submit, after the war is over, to the tax load that would be necessary to make good all the promises now being made in their name by the Washington star-gazers."

The statement of Mr. SHAFER, of course, is somewhat extravagant. And Mr. Hoover, to the contrary notwithstanding, we cannot view the sufferings and starvation of millions of people in Europe and elsewhere without an emotional reaction. In charity, if for no other reason, we must respond to their appeal and share our comparative plenty, now, and after the war. Failing to do so would belie generosity, sympathy, and Christian charity as boasted national characteristics.

HOW IS EUROPE TO BE FED?

On the other hand, there must be a display of hard-boiled realism in the process of raising enough food during the war for our civilian population, our armed forces and lease-lend, while increasing this supply to enormous proportions after the war, thus forging the chief weapon for peace in the world.

But the question is "How is Europe to be fed?" How will we find the means to supply a tremendous quantity of food, medicine, livestock, and farm machinery after the war when our agricultural system is now strained to the limit to produce the vast supplies necessary to feed the armies in the field and some part of the civilian populations of our allies?

Presumably the purpose of calling the international food conference is to survey these problems. Some 34 nations are to be represented. Differences of viewpoint, which are certain to develop, the demands of various nations upon American economy and such collateral questions as trade and tariffs after the war are sure to arise at this conference.

Under the present set-up, however, it is doubtful if the American people will be fully informed as to what takes place, since the administration plans to set up a high fence, barring out representatives of the press and the radio.

AMERICANS ENTITLED TO BE TOLD

Statements are to be issued from time to time, or at the finish, revealing the results of the conference. The American people are directly concerned with proposals for the distribution of their food supply, now and after the war. They are entitled to have this information. Whether such information will be supplied in sufficiency to satisfy their intense interest in this most important matter will only be determined when the conference meets.

Probably no conclusions can be arrived at in this conference. There is too much uncertainty as to the outcome of the war and as to what conditions we will be confronted with if the decision is long postponed. The immediate food situation will be canvassed.

Many thoughtful Americans feel, however, that our people are entitled to know what contributions our allies propose to make toward the feeding of unfortunate millions after the war. They feel that we cannot afford to play Santa Claus after this war as we did after World War No. 1.

WE CAN'T DO IT ALL ALONE

In the first place, there is no possibility that the United States alone will be able to feed the world after this war, even although it stands ready to contribute its full share.

Neither is there any prospect of making up any surpluses in foods other than grains during the war. We will have all that we can do to feed our armies, our civilian population, and the armies of our allies.

CAN USE ALL WE CAN RAISE IN UNITED STATES

There is no likelihood of accumulating great reserve supplies for use after the war, even if our agricultural production is measurably increased. Plainly we can use all the food we can raise under our present commitments.

So that some understanding as to what our allies propose to do in the direction of a joint effort to feed suffering people after the war is demanded.

The necessity for planning is not to be denied. And the difficulties in the way of rehabilitation of these countries are as great as those which we are presently meeting in the all-out effort to defeat the most powerful and ruthless combination of military strength that the world has ever experienced.

Agriculture must be placed in the first rank of the war effort alongside planes and ships. It is imperative that we build up our flocks and herds along with the products of the victory gardens. This is highly possible and should have been undertaken long ago, were it not for the miserable fumbling, incompetency, and mishandling of the whole agricultural problem and the interrelated problem of manpower, prices, and wages.

If food shortages are to be aggravated as promised in this country, people will put up willingly enough with the deprivation as necessary to winning the war, but once peace is declared they will look first to an adequate food supply for themselves and cast off the shackles of regimentation. And woe betide the bureaucracy which seeks, too long, to perpetuate restrictions of the war.

At the same time, we must be alert not to lose the peace in the winning of the war. Our supreme objective is to contribute our might and resources to some form of world organization which will band free peoples together so that we shall not encounter another such supreme disaster in time to come.

However, if our representatives at the food conference face the hard facts and meet what are unquestionably the demands of our people they will press the question of equal or proportionate responsibility in the gigantic task of feeding starving millions after the war.

NO MORE GREAT SURPLUSES

It has been necessary during the war for Great Britain to draw heavily upon us because its food supply has been cut off from other countries, beef from Argentina, mutton from Australia, dairy products from New Zealand and from Norway and Sweden. The British Empire became a great food-producing unit as it merged the resources of the Dominions to the exclusion of other nations.

It is to be presumed that these relations will be resumed after the war and trade lanes reestablished in competition with the United States. Existing surpluses will be quickly absorbed.

The time was when we talked about great surpluses at our disposal which could be used for feeding the world after the war. These surpluses no longer exist except in cotton and wheat. As a practical matter we are close to hardpan today.

Our experience in the last war was not dissimilar, although on a much reduced scale. Yet we made great strides during the war in increasing the production of flocks and herds, as well as vegetable oils. Over the whole period of that war our hog population increased by 22 percent, our beef cattle by 27 percent, and our milk cows by 10 percent. It was this increased production that enabled us to supply our allies and prevented hardships on our own home front. And it was the salvation of Europe last time. It may prove the salvation of Europe this time if agricultural production can be geared first to the war needs and then to the equally important job of winning the peace.

In Europe, food will be the primary and immediate necessity as Axis-occupied countries are freed. All nations with the exception of Germany, Portugal, Sweden, and Switzerland will have endured long years of malnutrition. No other war in history has been so marked with planned starvation, deliberately calculated mass murder.

WILL TAKE YEARS TO SOLVE PROBLEMS

It will not only be a question of volume of food which should and will be considered by the United Nations conference, but the revision of outmoded processes. Starving people will need more than seeds and tools. If we are going about the creation of a better world it must be recognized that agriculture, like industry, is part of the web of international life. It is possible of organization, so that fewer people will die of hunger in the future, if we give it half the attention which in the past statesmen and diplomats have accorded trade and financial advantage.

The problem will not be solved overnight. It will take at least a generation, even if there is real purpose and determination, as well as sincerity in the efforts of this country and its allies to mitigate want and hunger in the post-war world.

The staggering needs were set forth by the League of Nations in its study of world conditions between wars. These embrace 50 percent greater production of cereals, 90 percent more meat, 125 percent more milk and dairy products, 125 percent more vegetable oils, 300 percent more fruits and vegetables.

Production and distribution; that is the answer. Only greater production will wipe out the black markets in this country.

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, not anticipating the sudden action which precluded further debate and the delivery of my speech I am extending my remarks on the bill.

Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of the tax bill on March 26, at which time the Ruml substitute was defeated by the action of the House, I pointed out various important and valid reasons why I was unalterably opposed to the Ruml plan and exactly why I favored the passage of the committee bill. The speech, though not a gem of oratory, challenged the attention of many of the Members who, themselves, told me that my arguments shed much light upon the respective values of the bills and did impress favorably these same Members, some of whom were in doubt, others who were definitely opposed to the committee bill.

Seemingly, therefore, some points which I covered had substantial value in that they were informative and I dare say unchallengeable. None of these remarks, however, were published by any of the newspapers favoring the Ruml plan because like many of the radio commentators, they were selfishly opposed to the committee plan. They were to be the greatest beneficiaries under the Ruml proposal.

In more than 10 years of service in this House, I have witnessed some stormy sessions and have been the recipient of much abusive and coercive correspondence stimulated by selfish interests. I recall only too well the avalanche of inspired telegrams and letters which flooded my office in connection with the Frazier-Lemke bill, the Townsend plan, and the barrage of vicious communications which sought to break my spirit and will to vote for such measures as the securities and exchange bill with the famous so-called death sentence invented by certain newspapers on behalf of their utility holding company clients, and the same type of campaign which singled me out for abuse was adopted in my State because I refused to go along and vote against the reorganization bill.

Many other similar instances of pressure originating with and emanating from selfish groups sought to change my determined course as in the case of compulsory joint returns. In every instance I stood my ground and was resolved to follow through along the course which I deemed just and proper. The financial interest in most instances was the motivating force behind pressure which was generated in our own districts. In many instances, however, strong foreign and subversive actions sought to undermine the Government of the United States. High-sounding names were assumed by organizations having selfish objectives, and many respectable and patriotic organizations were taken over as fronts for foreign propagandists. These groups within these organizations were as ruthless and unscrupulous as could be imagined and were determined to force a Member of Congress to respond to their wishes, and if one failed to be tractable, all kinds and dire consequences were threatened.

One unpatriotic group went so far as to hang me in effigy because I refused to betray my country, but whenever I felt that I was right, regardless of consequences, I always stood my ground, and now, Mr. Speaker, I feel the same way about the original Doughton bill. I thought it was economically sound and desirable, but the minority leadership, aided by a group of Democrats, after the majority of the House defeated the Ruml plan, recommitted the committee bill, where it was permitted to die.

Today we are considering a committee compromise, but some newspapers and periodicals which publish only such portions of congressional speeches as they deem wise and expedient for their own purpose are still unwilling to accept any compromise. They demand a full pound of flesh and are willing to take a chance on getting nothing. Right here and now, Mr. Speaker, I want to rise in defense of the distinguished and beloved chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who has been maligned and abused by some of the scribes and false prophets of the press who are unworthy of their profession. They have not only charged him with sins of commission and omission but with dominating the committee and ruling its membership with an iron hand, but they have gone so far as to attempt a sinful detraction from his most distinguished congressional service record. Moreover, they resorted to a campaign of personal smear and name calling. One journalistic pauper living upon the ill-gotten earnings of a journalistic scoundrel in Boston which, judging by the number of letters received, fell flat, went so far as to inaugurate a campaign that is as low in its method as any that has ever been brought to bear. One brief paragraph from a diatribe of several columns will give you some idea of the depravity and meanness of the author:

> If you really want to give your invective a work-out, let it go at the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, a legislative rhinestone from the esteemed Commonwealth of Michigan. You can reach him, likewise care the House Office Building, or, if you want to be quite annoying about it, gig him at his home address, which is 4655 Kenmore Drive.

This type of a pharisaical and unprincipled writer is the kind who will seek to intimidate, abuse, and vilify your wife and your children to exercise control if you are in public life, and will go further, he will try and agitate the feelings of the people to inspire lynching. But I want to say to these people, that I would relinquish my seat in the House rather than to yield to this class of publication and the unprincipled men who are permitted to spew their venom and vile misinformation upon respectable communities.

In my own city of Detroit the venerable and ordinarily sound and responsible Detroit Free Press overlooked many and important points in my remarks and went off-course so far as to charge me editorially with smearing. All important points of the speech favoring the committee bill and in opposition to the Ruml plan were conveniently overlooked, violent opposition was taken to a reference regarding my ideas which were more than mere suspicions, that the minority might be induced to hold fast in its support of the Ruml bill by promise of campaign contributions from a well-filled Republican campaign war chest. Similar statements were made on the floor in many instances and during the fight regarding the compulsory joint return proposal contained in the original 1942 tax bill, my friend, the distinguished Representative from New York [Mr. REED] made a point-blank charge against his

own fellow minority members that rang through this Chamber more cuttingly and sharply than did my more cautiously phrased remarks. There was no exception to his remarks, at that time or since, there was no charge of smear, and I assume that the Free Press makes out a very poor case now and was hard pressed for argument when it chose to strike at me on one point because it is the only one to which they could tie.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are considering a compromise, a compromise which excludes, let us say properly it forgives, the taxes due and payable under the 1942 act to all the taxpayers in proportion to their ability to pay. Over seven million subject to the 1942 act will be exempted entirely; this is the element, you will recall, over which the Rumlites cried bitter tears but whom they are unwilling to excuse from payment unless they, too, in the high brackets are entirely forgiven.

The committee report gives a complete and detailed outline of the bill's provisions and I am not going to take the time to discuss the various tables, suffice to say the bill contains "collection at the source" and "paying as you go" with complete remission in the lowest brackets and partial remission on a graduated scale from that point up to and including the biggest taxpayer. It contains the virtues of the Robertson bill and, so far as I know, none of its weaknesses, it forgives and forgets the substantial amount of $4,400,000,000.

I hold fast to the original plan of no remission because I suspect and fear that coupled with the full remission under this or especially the Ruml plan there would be an attempt made later in the year, when a new tax bill is considered, a reimposition by a higher schedule of taxation, the entire burden of forgiveness of revenues plus billions more upon the shoulders of the lower-inome taxpayer, and in that classification you will find not only the people who are patriotically and at great sacrifice aiding the Government but you will find also our returning soldiers and sailors, the men and women of our armed forces who are giving their all for the country. I warn the minority, and I say with due deference to my colleagues of the majority that I shall stand on this floor and oppose a committee bill or any bill that will attempt to impose unconscionable rates in the lower brackets in order to recapture this forgiveness and that I will insist first upon hiking the rates from the top down instead of from the bottom up. Instead of foisting any Federal sales taxes upon the people, I believe it will be more proper and just to hike the corporation taxes, particularly the surtaxes and the excess-profits taxes.

Mr. Speaker, my attitude in connection with the tax bills heretofore and now have always been defensible. I feel I can go before my constituency and successfully defend my position. I am willing to go before my people on the issue of the $10,000,000,000 abatement or forgiveness due in revenue to my Government which was proposed under the Ruml plan and I am certain that my people will sustain me.

W. P. A.'s Half-Billion-Dollar Monument in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the Work Projects Administration in Michigan has been the sole support, for a time at least, of about 2,000,000 persons, and has left an indelible mark on the State in the form of a half-billion-dollar monument.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including therein an article from the Detroit News of April 26, 1943, written by Ben F. Wigder. The article describes some of the record of the W. P. A. in Michigan under the able leadership of Abner E. Larned, State administrator.

The Work Projects Administration which was born as the aftermath of World War No. 1 is dying by this one. By the end of April it will be a memory. The war has drained away its people.

Whether you believe with those who hold that Work Projects Administration was wonderful, or with those who say it was outrageous, or with still another class who believed it was both, the fact remains that the seven-year program has made an indelible imprint on Michigan and the Nation.

Michigan has a number of vital tangible monuments as a result of the program. But perhaps, more important, Work Projects Administration demonstrated that men and women wanted a chance to work, not a dole, during the period of terrific mass unemployment.

The program in this state called for the expenditure of $530,389,595, including $417,125,697 of Federal funds and $113,263,897 as the sponsors' contributions to the various projects.

AIDED ECONOMIC LIFE

"It should be emphasized," Abner E. Larned, State Work Projects Administration administrator, said, "that the distribution of this money in the form of wages earned not only has benefited the recipients through restoring their morale and through the preservation and development of their skills, but it has, as well, been of enormous benefit to the economic life of the communities in which the money circulated.

"Over and above the material benefits that have accrued to the State, benefits that will serve the State long after all of us are gone, are the human services that Work Projects Administration has rendered."

The peak load of Work Projects Administration employment was reached August 24, 1938, at which time 201,630 certified persons were employed. Figuring four persons to a family, this means that approximately 806,520 Michigan citizens were dependent for their livelihood on the Work Projects Administration.

Larned pointed out that 500,000 different Michigan persons have at one time or another been employed on Work Projects Administration projects.

"This indicates," he said, "that the Work Projects Administration has been the sole means of support, for a time at least, of about 2,000,000 Michigan persons.

IN THE DARK DAYS

"Created during the dark days of the depression, Work Projects Administration faced in Michigan an unemployment crisis without parallel anywhere else in the Nation," Larned recalled. "The program served as a bridge to carry Michigan from those dire depression conditions in the early thirties when no jobs were to be had to the present, when employment opportunities are abundant."

Inventory of Michigan Work Projects Administration's contribution to the store of capital goods makes a substantial list. The Work Projects Administration has erected, renovated, or enlarged scores of public buildings, including many now used by the armed forces.

It has constructed miles and miles of roads, highways, bridges, and sidewalks and drained miles of swamps, erected traffic signs and signals. It has built hospitals, libraries, schools, auditoriums, police posts, gymnasiums, stadiums, and recreational buildings. Public hospitals, penal institutions, firehouses, garages, storage buildings, and armories are living testimony to Work Projects Administration's accomplishments.

The Work Projects Administration has served hot meals to school children. Sewing projects, providing employment for needy, jobless women, have produced garments and other articles for distribution among needy families and to public institutions.

TALENTS UTILIZED

Unemployed musicians, sculptors, painters, actors, handicraft workers, and teachers, were given employment by Work Projects Administration so that their talents, training and skills produced efforts for the benefit of their communities.

Since the day of its inception, Work Projects Administration has been fitting men and women through training to leave its rolls for private employment. In July 1940, the national defense training program offered preemployment refresher courses for Work Projects Administration workers. These courses included aircraft mechanics and maintenance automotive mechanics and machine shop, and sheet metal workers and welders.

Of the 25,000 persons trained in Michigan, 82 percent found jobs as a direct result of this training, Larned said.

"Work Projects Administration in Michigan from its inception has been a cooperative endeavor," Larned said. "The administrative staff of Work Projects Administration and our sponsors have all been partners in a great enterprise.

"The scores of cordial letters that these sponsors are writing us in these closing days of Work Projects Administration indicate that ours has been a most unusual and close association. Always we have been working together for the best interests of Michigan and its citizenry."

DEBATE ENDLESS

Work Projects Administration's friends contend that accomplishments reveal shovel-leaning could not have been this agency's major preoccupation; critics asserted the same benefits could have been realized at less cost. The debate may be endless.

Larned pointed out that the Work Projects Administration program improved as soon as the Government insisted that the sponsors of local communities contribute 25 percent toward the cost of projects.

"The early program unfortunately did not always reveal the wise planning by sponsors as later," Larned said, "and it was embarrassing at times to see large numbers of workers cluttering some project because of lack of equipment or poor planning.

"The Work Projects Administration program in any community was exactly what the people of that community wanted it to be. Projects were decided by local government officials and the people of their own communities were put to work when they could not find employment elsewhere."

One defect in the early Work Projects Administration program, cited by Larned, was the limited work days for project workers who could put in only as many hours at set pay as their classification permitted. Higher-bracket skilled project workers put in only three days a week because of pay limitations.

Larned is proud of his staff. Most of them have had opportunities to get the other jobs but they stuck with him so that he could liquidate his Work Projects Administration affairs to the last penny and the last detail.

After the war, Larned prophesied, Work Projects Administration or a kindred program may be needed again, and he added: "Work Projects Administration has done a great job, and we hope it will do even a better job when it is called into being again."

The Work Projects Administration's record in Michigan

New public buildings	810
Buildings repaired and enlarged	2,680
New airports and landing fields	17
Airports, improved and enlarged	63
New bridges	470
Bridges, reconstructed or improved	240
Swamped acres drained	300,000
New sidewalks (miles)	1,000
New streets and roads (miles)	3,300
Improved streets and roads (miles)	19,000
New parks, playgrounds, and athletic fields	230
Improved parks and playgrounds	610
New and remodeled fish hatcheries	16
Reforestation—trees planted	32,000,000
Sewers constructed (miles)	1,510
Water mains constructed (miles)	840
Culverts:	
New	59,000
Reconstructed	5,500
School lunches, Michigan children outside of Detroit (meals)	16,000,000
Detroit sewing projects (garments)	2,145,034
Michigan sewing projects (garments)	4,000,000

On the Right Track

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial carried in the Columbia Record, an outstanding afternoon paper, my district, Columbia, S. C., concerning my bill, H. R. 2400, which has for its purpose repealing all laws passed by the Congress levying taxes on oleomargarine and other discriminatory acts on this splendid domestic product.

ON THE RIGHT TRACK

Representative H. P. FULMER, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, has introduced a bill to repeal all Federal restrictions on the production and sale of margarine. It is a bill which should be enacted into law.

A phenomenal increase in the consumption of margarine, even before the rationing of butter went into effect, is reported by the Bureau of Internal Revenue at Washington. Based upon the yield of present Federal taxes on margarine, the Bureau estimates that production reached 61,900,000 pounds in January, the latest month for which figures are available, an increase of 75 percent as compared with January 1942. Domestic consumption of margarine rose about 50 percent during the same period. Formerly an insignificant item of export, margarine is now being shipped abroad in large quantities under the lend-lease system.

Margarine has a present coupon value under rationing of 5 points a pound; the rationing value of butter is 6 points. The average retail value of margarine in mid-February was reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as 23.3 cents a pound; the average price of butter was 55.6 cents a pound. The price of butter has increased 13.1 percent since February 1942; the price of margarine 8.9 percent.

Margarine is now being fortified by the addition of both vitamin A and vitamin D. Its manufacturers contend that their product thus enriched is equal in nutritional value to butter—a contention which is, of course, disputed in the dairy States. The standard vitamin A enrichment of margarine is 9,000 units. The vitamin A content of butter varies from 4,000 to 25,000 units, but the average is 9,000 units. Margarine for shipment to North Africa where there is great undernourishment is being enriched by the addition of 30,000 units of vitamin A.

The War Production Board has cut the authorized production of most commodities in which fats and oils are basic materials—shortening to 88 percent, soap to 84 percent, paints to 50 percent—but has authorized an increase in margarine production during 1943 to 180 percent of 1941 production. This gives an authorized margarine production of about 635,000,000 pounds, compared with an estimated production of creamery butter for 1943 to 1,745,000,000 pounds. About one-fourth of total output of butter will be required for the armed forces for lend-lease so that the per capita consumption of butter is expected to drop this year 16.8 to 12.7 pounds.

Margarine will not be able to replace the full amount of butter withdrawn from domestic consumption, nor will manufacturers be able to achieve the full increase authorized in their production, because of the shortage in fats and oils. It is estimated, however, that for the full year 1943 the margarine output will amount to 160 or 165 percent of 1941 production.

Several of the States have moved that 1943 sessions of their legislatures to remove restrictions on the sale of margarine. In Oklahoma a bill approved by the Governor February 4 repealed the entire oleomargarine law, including taxes, license fees, and other restrictions. In New York and Oregon restrictions on the use of margarine in State institutions have been suspended. In Wisconsin even taxes and license fees have been reduced and similar legislation is pending in eight other States.

Most of this State legislation is to remain in effect only for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. The bill offered in Congress by Representative FULMER would permanently repeal the Federal taxes of 10 cents a pound on colored and one-fourth of a cent a pound on uncolored margarine and all other Federal restrictions on production and sale of the butter substitute. Oleomargarine as sold now in the United States is made entirely from American farm products. The Federal taxes which Representative FULMER attempts to repeal were originally enacted to help the farmers. They are now operating to hinder the farmers and at the same time contribute unnecessarily to the cost of living for millions of American families who buy oleomargarine.

Great Game of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted me to extend my remarks, I am including, by request, a newspaper clipping from the Washington Post of Monday, April 26, entitled "The Great Game of Politics," written by the distinguished columnist and political analyst Frank R. Kent:

If the old carnival saying of "the monkey's dead and the show's over" were altered to read "the New Deal's dead and the show's over," it would describe with complete accuracy the situation as it is generally viewed today in Congress. The significance of some of the things that recently have happened there has not had the public notice it deserves.

For example, there was the House action last week in killing a large part of those costly and radical experiments in regimentation and regulation which, in the early days of the Roosevelt regime, it had enthusiastically endorsed.

Perhaps it is the war, but it is strange that more was not made of the murderous blow which flattened out a whole flock of agencies created when Vice President WALLACE was Secretary of Agriculture, and his Under Secretary, the ebullient Dr. Rexford Tugwell, colorfully proclaimed the New Deal intention "to make America over."

The contrast between the Congress which then swallowed with scarcely a gulp an administration philosophy, which ran contrary to common sense, and this Congress, the popular branch of which has just repudiated that philosophy, is striking, indeed. That the repudiation was effected without the least evidence of public disapproval makes the whole business explainable only on the ground that the tide that ran so long in one direction really is running now in the other. It was an undoubted reflection of the change in public sentiment—a widespread desire to be rid of amateur reformers and their dubious schemes to circumvent natural economic laws.

SLASHES AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS

What the House did was to slash the Agriculture Department's next year's budget $250,000,000 below the President's recommendation. It did this deliberately, well knowing and well warned of the consequences. Among these may be listed:

1. Under House action, about $70,000,000 in direct payments and loans which farmers otherwise have received is now denied them.

2. The Farm Security Administration, particularly dear to the Tugwellian school and primarily established to aid the down-and-out sharecropper of the South, about whom so much has been written and spoken, has been wiped out—abolished.

3. The crop insurance idea, designed when Chester Davis was Agricultural Adjustment Agency administrator, to protect the farmer against weather and reimburse him for damage by drought, has been abandoned.

4. Various informational, promotional, and inspirational programs have been ordered consolidated or eliminated.

Of all these things, the outstanding piece of repudiation is that of the Farm Security Administration. This was the most radical

of all the New Deal agencies, strongly supported by the Congress of Industrial Organizations and often accused of communistic and collectivist tendencies. A desperate administration fight to preserve it was made and the decisiveness with which it has been chopped down is a measure of the revolt.

An effort to have the Farm Security Administration restored in the Senate will be made, but the prospects are poor and the spirit of its defenders very damp. The significant feature of all this is that the killing of these New Deal agencies was done neither by the Republicans nor by any combination of anti-New Deal Democrats and Republicans. It was done by the vote of Democrats who, in the early days, had rubber-stamped every administration proposal—taken their White House orders and gone straight down the line.

WAS NOT IGNORED

The change from complete congressional subserviency to an almost unprecedented independence of the White House is very great. But what makes the revolt—and it is correct to call it a revolt—really remarkable is that it has nothing whatever to do with the war. The House support of Mr. Roosevelt's war policies and foreign diplomacy is as strong as opposition to his domestic policies is pronounced.

Usually the House, composed of 435 men never more than 18 months away from an election, either general or primary, is the best barometer of popular opinion. It is generally indicative of feeling in the country. If such is true of its present attitude toward the administration's domestic policies, then, indeed, "the monkey's dead and the show's over."

I am also including, by request, a newspaper clipping, source not known, relating to what the writer considers a real job for Congress.

A REAL JOB FOR CONGRESS

(An editorial)

The coal controversy has at last reached the disgraceful stage of a personal slugging match between the President of the United States and the president of the United Mine Workers of America.

The National War Labor Board has done what John L. Lewis all along has intended that it should do—it has bowed itself out of the dispute by referring it to President Roosevelt.

The fact that Lewis has been able to force such an issue upon the President and upon the President alone means simply that ours has ceased to be a government of laws and has become a government of men

That is a condition which only Congress has power to cure.

The president of the United Mine Workers is as shrewd as he is ruthless. He long ago discovered that the fatal flaw in the War Labor Board's make-up was its extralegal character. This Board was not created through the regular legislative machinery. It was brought into being on January 12, 1942, by an Executive order which cited the authority vested in the President "by the Constitution and the statutes of the United States." In other words, it was a good scarecrow as long as crows permitted themselves to be intimidated by it, but was not so good when any particularly valiant crow refused to allow itself to be intimidated.

Congress must remove this rags-and-tatters dummy and its ridiculous broomstick. It must put an adequate legal custodian into the scarecrow's place and arm it with a proper shotgun.

The President's telegram to Lewis sounds a note of firmness which is indeed welcome. Its three-fourths of entreaty is outweighed by its final assurance that all the power invested in Mr. Roosevelt as President and as Comamnder in Chief of the Army and Navy will be invoked to prevent interference with the conduct of the war. Even so, this still leaves the Executive in an unpleasant and anomalous situation.

The situation of Congress is different. Congress had no share in creating the War Labor Board. No specific act of Congress serves as a foundation for that Board's jerry-built superstructure of decisions.

Cannot Congress now see that it has a responsibility no less grave than that of the President? Members of the House will return on Monday from the Easter recess. They return to face the gravest menace to this country since Pearl Harbor—a threat to its productive capacity.

Unless they provide prompt and efficient legislative relief, the Senators and Representatives will have ignominiously failed in their duty.

Constructive Aviation Legislation Needed, H. R. 1012 Embraces Many Important Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 23, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, 17 years ago, in the air commerce bill of 1926, the House of Representatives adopted the following declaration for civil aviation:

> The Congress hereby declares * * * that air commerce is a unit and does not regard State lines and that interstate and intrastate air navigation are so mingled together that the United States cannot exercise complete effective control and protection of air navigation in interstate and foreign commerce and prevent interference therewith without incidental regulation of intrastate air navigation in the navigable air space.

Congress did not go quite so far as this declaration in the act of 1926 as finally adopted, but that act did recognize the fundamental indivisibility of the air space and of navigation and commerce therein when it made the Federal air traffic rules applicable to all flying—intrastate as well as interstate.

The House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is now perfecting a bill which reaffirms the principle championed by the House in 1926. It is hoped that this time both branches will support the judgment voiced by the House in aviation's earlier days.

The measure, H. R. 1012, introduced by an air pioneer, Chairman LEA of California, is being revamped to meet certain objections of those groups and persons who are sincere advocates of a sound aviation future. It incorporates principles for which many of us in the Congress have been fighting for years. It provides for the first time a clear policy for the active promotion of private flying, it lays a foundation for a concrete program of Federal-State aviation education, it makes the Civilian Pilot Training Program a permanent feature of our Government's aviation activity, it sets forth the basis for sound airport zoning on a cooperative Federal-State basis, and it contains many additional constructive provisions.

But, most important of all, it provides that there shall be one set of rules—Federal rules—for the regulation of all air navigation and all air commerce.

There is a guaranty for the first time, to the private flyer and to the commercial operator alike, in that they will be subject to only one regulatory authority and that they will never meet the possibility of duplicating or conflicting regulations among 49 different jurisdictions. If regulations are wrong they will have to go to only one place to secure correction. If one set of regulations is complied with they will not have to worry about the possibility of violating some one or more of 48 others.

Aviation has been plagued by divided jurisdiction in the past. Prior to the adoption of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 aviation had, indeed, been seriously crippled because the Federal Government's jurisdiction was divided among different agencies. With that act, divided jurisdiction among Federal agencies was ended. H. R. 1012, if adopted, will assure that there will never be a similar division or conflict as between the Federal Government and the several States.

Fortunately the States have, on the whole, been careful thus far to avoid regulation conflicting with that of the Federal Government. But if we are to learn from experience in the case of other transportation, notably motor transportation, serious and burdensome conflicts and duplication will arise unless preventive action is taken by Congress.

The proposed legislation does not, however, entirely exclude the States from aviation activity. On the contrary it leaves to them full freedom in all the promotional phases, where local initiative is so important. Moreover, they remain free to foster airport construction, to police and maintain order at airports, to license and regulate airport operators. They are encouraged to zone the approaches to airports. They are free to license and regulate the business of training pilots and other aeronautical technicians and are offered assistance in programs of aeronautical education. They may license, protect, and foster private flying clubs. They may license and regulate local sight-seeing operations. The Federal Government's exclusive jurisdiction extends only to the regulation of the operation of aircraft in the air, including the rules applicable to taxying on the take-off or landing, and to the regulation of point-to-point air transportation of persons or property for hire.

I am inclined to feel it would be wise to provide that the States shall have the power to enforce the Federal regulation of air navigation, concurrently with Federal enforcement. Such a step would aid in policing. However, this matter presents difficult legal problems which, perhaps, should be worked out at a later

date after a careful survey and consultation between State and Federal enforcement agencies.

As soon as the war is over there will be a tremendous growth in civil aviation, surpassing the most elaborate dreams of a few years ago. We must prepare for that development now so we will be ready to go forward the minute victory has crowned our banners. Foremost among the steps we should take is that of assuring that there will be only one book of rules applicable throughout the country. Just as the air is indivisible, so is the regulation of its navigation.

Organization and Collaboration of United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Boil It Down" published in the Fort Myers (Fla.) News-Press of April 19, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOIL IT DOWN

Of several measures before the Senate defining this Nation's post-war international policy, a resolution which Senator PEPPER has just introduced is about the best of the lot. It calls upon President Roosevelt to tell the world officially "that the United States is ready to enter into a solemn pledge that it will within 6 months after the conclusion of the war in Europe become a full member of an acceptable form of the United Nations in order to implement the Atlantic Charter, to safeguard peace, and promote world welfare by cooperating with other free peoples."

That is a good deal simpler than the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution, which says about the same thing in a whole lot more words. Introduced by two republicans and two Democrats who are leaders in the Senate, the four-ply resolution has received much publicity and some strong support, both in Congress and elsewhere, because it would quite definitely put the world on notice that the United States has abandoned isolationism and will not, this time, retire into its shell to let the hard-won benefits of victory go up the flue. However, the resolution has also met with opposition—largely on the ground that it sets forth in too much detail what our policy will be and thereby provides an "out" if there should be a slip-up in any particular.

That probably is a valid objection. Wilson's 14 points were too many and got him into trouble when some of them were ignored by the Versailles Treaty. Had he stated only one condition for an armistice—"a just peace which the United States will join the Allied Nations in enforcing with measures for collective security"—the Germans would have surrendered just as quickly as they did to a lot of high-minded eloquence and the Senate would have ratified membership in a more potent league of nations than the one that had to be created without us.

Senator PEPPER's resolution has the virtue of avoiding the pitfalls which Wilson encountered and for which the Ball, etc., resolution would head us. He names three things: To safeguard peace, implement the Atlantic Charter, and promote world welfare. That, we think, is about what the American people want though it is more than many of them would settle for. "Implementing the Atlantic Charter" can get us into unnecessary difficulties and "promoting world welfare" is superfluous. Senator PEPPER's resolution is better than the others largely because it is briefer, but if he would boil it down to a pledge that we shall stick with the United Nations in "safeguarding world peace" it would be better still and something no American would oppose.

We doubt that our allies care very much whether we are going to implement the Atlantic Charter and assurance that we shall promote world welfare goes without saying. What they are concerned about is whether we are going to join in safeguarding peace. They remember all too well that the last time we ran out on them and they know it was because the United States Senate refused to ratify a treaty which our President had a foremost hand in negotiating. That is why an expression by the Senate is desirable at this time It need not go into details; it will be sufficient to say, as definitely as possible, that the military might of the United States will remain with the United Nations to guarantee the collective security of all.

Until that assurance is given, Russia and England, particularly, must keep in mind that either singly or in military alliance they may have to look after themselves in the "brave new world." If they must do that Russia will probably insist on some buffer states that would be in conflict with the Atlantic Charter, and England would be chary about loosening up in India "to promote the welfare of the world." Clearly we cannot effectively serve the cause of the "four freedoms" and contribute effectively to making this a better world until we have safeguarded peace. And when that is done the rest will follow in due course.

Old-Age Assistance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am bringing to the attention of the Congress a communication from the Missoula County Old-Age Pension Association. These elder citizens of my home community are all well known to me, and their opinions are worthy of the deepest consideration. I would like to go on record as being in full accord with their contentions, and to assure the Congress that they know whereof they speak. The communication follows:

MISSOULA COUNTY OLD-AGE PENSION ASSOCIATION,
Missoula, Mont., April 30, 1943.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This letter is directed to you for the purpose of finding out if it may be possible for Congress to enact some additional legislation to cover the needs of the old folks during the present war.

It is needless, perhaps, to point out at this time the desperately bad conditions to which the old people have been reduced as a result of the ever-increasing costs of the bare necessities of life and the basic commodities. This trend in the past 12 months has been, and is now, steadily upward, in spite of the efforts of the Government to freeze prices at certain levels.

Surely it is not expecting too much even at this stage of the game to ask our legislators to enact such legislation during the lifetime of the present Congress that shall go direct to those whom it is intended to benefit the most.

Will you personally do something about giving this humanitarian piece of legislation your attention and support, so that we can truthfully say, "This war is being fought to make this a better world to live in, even for the old folks who live in America." The time to act is now. A few billions spent to save the old people at home should be a good investment for the future.

Thanking you for your attention and consideration of this matter, I remain,

Yours truly,

BIRD BAUGHER,
President.
RALPH W. DOWNING,
Secretary.

Roosevelt and Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, Westbrook Pegler on May 3 gives one idea of the way Roosevelt and Lewis have played the game. It is as follows:

TUCSON, ARIZ., May 3.—The one man who is solely to blame for the strike of the coal miners and the resultant damage equal, as he himself has estimated to the loss of a battle in the field, is President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. Roosevelt, knowing the dictatorial, ruthless, and selfish character of John L. Lewis, raised him to power by the grant of many favors. In November 1941, long after he and Lewis had broken and shortly before Pearl Harbor, he allowed Lewis to welsh on an agreement to abide by a decision of the old National Defense Mediation Board in the dispute over the closed shop in the so-called captive coal mines.

If an employer or an industry had agreed, as Lewis did, to abide by the decision of a Government agency and then had rejected the official decision, that employer of industry would have been scourged up and down the land by all the powers of the New Deal Government. Indeed, in previous cases the Government had seized properties and tried to operate them in the fumbling, bungling way of the embittered incompetents, failures and malcontents who infest the maze of Government bureaus in Washington. The properties were seized not for failure to obey any law or abide by any agreement but for refusing to submit to the rule of the President's henchmen in the union racket.

The Federal Shipbuilding Co. was one victim whose operations were impaired by picketing, harassment, and seizure was for the sole reason that the company refused to violate that declared principle of the Wagner Act which guarantees workers the right to

select their own collective-bargaining agents. The union, one of the Lewis group of unions, insisted that the nonjoiners be compelled to accept its services as bargaining agent and with the help of the Government the union won while the erstwhile free workers, the principle of freedom, and the Nation lost.

The Toledo, Peoria & Western Railroad, an efficient freight line which paid good wages, was beset with a demand for the adoption of the fake-work, make-work, man-wasting feather-bed rules of the unions. The company held out against bombings and other subtleties and stood on its lawful rights. For this it was punished by seizure and the feather-bed system was installed while Paul McNutt and others in Washington were raising the cry of manpower shortage, and imposing by devicus and oblique methods that conscription of labor, which Mrs. Roosevelt first proposed to the Nation after an interesting Sunday evening conversation about a year ago. With loafers still making idle motions on mock-jobs not only on the railroads but in many other works, notoriously on the highway freight trucks entering the New York and New Jersey area, other men are put under compulsion on the ground that there is a shortage of manpower.

The welshing of Lewis in the captive coal mine case was flagrant, defiant, and clear-cut. Two officials of his miners' union were planted on the old Mediation Board to represent his interests, and when the decision came down it was 9 to 2 against him. His men, Philip Murray, now president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations and a bitter enemy of Lewis, and Thomas Kennedy were the two men who cast the minority vote in his favor. When the decision went against him, Lewis took Murray and Kennedy off the board, and that was the end of that agency.

Then followed the snide and dishonest trick. The President had vowed publicly that "the Government of the United States will not order nor will Congress pass legislation ordering a so-called closed shop." But far from moving against Lewis, the President blocked legislation passed by the House to place on unions responsibilities equal to their powers and privileges. He appointed a new board of three men to settle again a dispute which already had been decided against Lewis by an official agency whose ruling Lewis had agreed to obey, and then repudiated.

Lewis was one member of this new board, and it was a foregone conclusion, of course, that he would vote for his own interests. Benjamin Fairless, president of the company which owned the mines, was the second member, and it was certain that he would vote for himself. The third member was John R. Steelman, of the Federal Conciliation Service, and it was absolutely certain that he would vote for Lewis.

Steelman entered heartily into the spirit of the fraud, withdrawing temporarily from his Federal status so that he could say that he was not acting as a Government agent, although, of course, it was perfectly plain that he was acting for President Roosevelt and that he would vote with Lewis against Fairless and give Lewis the closed shop which the President had solemnly declared this Government would never concede.

The morning after Pearl Harbor, Steelman's decision came out. Lewis had won. The President of the United States had broken a solemn pledge and repudiated a principle on which he had placed a high value.

Although Murray has since been flattered, consulted, and referred to as a labor leader of high principle, he showed his principle when he repudiated his undertaking by resigning from the old Mediation Board under the orders of Lewis, whom he has since denounced as a tyrant and a notorious liar, merely because a decision went against him.

These people are all political creatures of the President's creation. He raised them from obscurity and nonentity and they are his babies and he is responsible for their acts.

New York Marches On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following under this date. The New York Herald Tribune has inaugurated a series of leading editorials which discuss a subject of the most vital importance to my city and its citizens. However, I propose to hold my own comments in abeyance, pending completion of the editorial series:

NEW YORK MARCHES ON

I. THE CITY'S GREATEST INDUSTRY

The city of New York has been under various kinds of attack in its spectacular career of more than 300 years. Never until lately, so far as we can remember, has it been charged with lack of success. Now the hue and cry of the critics is on in full voice. The great metropolis, they whisper, or shout on occasion, is at last slipping.

New Yorkers have seldom worried about their town—it has always been too big to worry about, too cosmopolitan to induce either apologies or boastfulness. (It might be a better town if there had been more worrying.) But there is something better than self-confidence built on nothing more than habit, and that is the same quality founded on tangible assets. It is true that manual industry has lost ground in the city, as both the Hanes and Herlands reports indicated. Yet the surest, the fundamental, index of its growth and vigor—the volume of retail sales in the 50-mile area of the metropolitan market—showed a new all-time high in 1942. Why this apparent contradiction? We have already pointed out in these columns what seems to us the reason.

It is because the most tangible of the city's assets, for the present and for the future, is one often overlooked. We mean the city's attraction for the vast industry of business management which makes New York the world's greatest center of organization, operation, distribution, the New World's greatest center of design and culture—and still growing. It is the city's hidden industry.

Business management, to be sure, is a part of all industry; but within less than two generations it has come to represent a distinct unit of effort, as distinct as a manual craft or collection of crafts, with workshops in great office buildings rather than lofts or factories. The differentiation had its beginning with the big industrial mergers of the 1890's. But until the 1920's it was still true that the typical American enterprise was administered by the business department of the plant or factory, located on the spot, a part of the works. Then, with consolidations the natural order of the day, business management, centralized administration, became an industry unto itself. And in greater proportion every year it established itself here.

This influx has more than offset whatever exodus of manual trades and workers may have taken place. Careful calculation puts the national total for personnel in the industry of business management at 10,000,000. This total exceeds the number of workers in 8 other great industries combined. Of this total the share of New York's metropolitan area to date is 1,600,000, or 16 percent. Even a better realization of this city's attraction for this enormous and expanding industry may be had from the fact that of the 100 largest corporations in America 41 have their headquarters here and another 53 have New York branch offices. Their plants, incidentally, are scattered all over the United States. We print elsewhere in this article in some detail the statistical background of this industry.

Quite as impressive as these figures are the great office buildings of the city. What, in the main, is in them? If we could visualize smokestacks on these structures as symbols of the single, separate industry which fills them, we would be better able to appreciate its size, growth, and scope within the last two decades. The whole midtown area as we know it today, for example—with Rockefeller Center, the Empire State Building, Chrysler Building, Graybar Building, Chanin Building, Lincoln Building, and many others—rises skyward as proof of the fact that American industry has decided that New York is the logical and inevitable site of its headquarters.

On this physical side there is also the amazing growth of what is accurately known as the metropolitan area. The critics point to losses in population within certain parts of the city. But the other side is just as bright as this is dark. The flight of population from Manhattan has been more than offset by phenomenal gains during the twenties in the Bronx and during the thirties in Queens In these respective decades these two boroughs grew faster than almost any other large community in the United States The suburban area, which is really a part of metropolitan New York life, grew enormously—and hundreds of new communities sprang up in Westchester, suburban Long Island, and New Jersey. All this is unmistakably part of the New York scene and includes many of its finest and most prosperous sections

No one need be told that from the point of income and expenditure or of cultural standards business-management workers are extremely desirable residents. They make up now just about a third of those gainfully employed in this district. Their numbers and their proportion will increase—particularly as all of us cooperate to make this a completely civilized town to live in. That is the real goal, and its attainment will pay dividends. It should not be lost sight of in any wild-goose chase after the impossible or the unimportant.

Protecting Servicemen's Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, the casting of votes by the servicemen and women who have left their homes in the line of duty, is a matter of paramount importance to them and to our Nation. Those who are on the firing line defending their country, or I may say, preserving its existence, are very definitely entitled to express their views as to the administration they want when they come back. To deprive these men and women of a voice in the future control of governmental matters would be failure to give justice and equity to the valiant.

By calling attention at this early date to the organization of the necessary machinery for the preparation of ballots in

connection with absentee voting, and recognizing the many details that must be perfected before the individual vote can be cast, there should be no possible excuse for a lack of adequate facilities. There is time to prepare to give each serviceman and woman every opportunity to express his or her political preference. I am making this suggestion now so that if the machinery needs to be perfected, we should find out what is necessary, pass the additional legislation, and supply the appropriations to complete all details.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks, letters and documents addressed to me by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. The services well appreciate the importance of voting by their personnel, and recognize the magnitude of detail involved.

Mr. President, may I say further that if the secretaries of state of the several States have any suggestions about this subject in which I may be of assistance, I hope that they will not fail to communicate with me.

There being no objection, the letters and documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C., April 22, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: Your letter of April 16, 1943, addressed to the Secretary of the Navy and requesting that you be furnished with sample ballots and printed matter which has been used in connection with members of the armed forces overseas casting their votes, has been referred to this Bureau.

There are enclosed herewith a copy of Bureau of Naval Personnel Circular Letter No. 133-42, ALNAV No. 199, and W.D., A.G.O. Form No. 560, on the subject of voting by members of the naval forces of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

RANDALL JACOBS,
The Chief of Naval Personnel.
C. C. BAUGHMAN,
By direction.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 28, 1943.

Hon. ROBERT F. WAGNER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WAGNER: I have your letter of April 15, 1943, requesting material and sample ballots used in the casting of votes by members of the armed forces overseas.

When Public Law No. 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, became effective, the War Department immediately accomplished the task of distributing 6,000,000 postal cards throughout the Army. In some instances, it was foreseen that because of the distances involved that it would not be possible to make delivery of these postal cards in ample time to permit individuals to take advantage of their prerogative. The War Department consequently issued instructions by radio to certain foreign stations authorizing the appropriate commanders to improvise cards similar to those prepared by the Department.

I am enclosing, in accordance with your request, two of the blank cards provided by the War Department. While copies of those prepared in accordance with radio instructions are not available, they conformed in general to those furnished by the Department.

Since the exercise of franchise by members of the armed forces under provisions of the aforementioned public law is a personal matter between the individual involved and the secretary of state of his home State, the War Department has no information as to the number of men who obtained ballots through the use of postal cards, nor does it have copies of ballots supplied military personnel in response to requests by postal cards. Since you state that you are acquainted with War Department circulars 155, 263, 321, and 324—1942, you are familiar with the instructions issued by the War Department on this subject. These instructions should have afforded every member of the Army the opportunity to apply to his respective secretary of state for the necessary ballot to enable him to vote.

I trust this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Circular Letter No. 133-42

BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
September 26, 1942.

From the Chief of Naval Personnel.
To all ships and stations.
Subject: Absentee voting by members of the naval forces of the United States, as provided for by Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved September 16, 1942.
Reference: (a) ALNAV 199 (which advised that subject legislation had been approved and outlined its provisions).

1. By the subject Federal law there is provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from their usual place of residence.

2. The law is applicable, notwithstanding any provision of State law relating to the registration of qualified voters, to every individual absent from the place of his residence and serving in the land or naval forces of the United States, including the members of the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, the Women's Navy Reserve, and the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, who is or was eligible to register for and is qualified to vote at any election under the law of the State of his residence. The law applies to elections where the vote is cast for electors of the President and Vice President of the United States, United States Senators, and Representatives in Congress. The law also provides, in case that the State legislature of a State shall have authorized it, for voting for candidates for State, county, and other local offices, and with respect to any proposed amendment to the State constitution or any other proposition or question which is to be submitted to a vote in the State.

3. The law further provides that no person in military service in time of war shall be required, as a condition of voting in any election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, to pay any poll tax or other tax or make any other payment to any State or political subdivision thereof.

4. In accordance with the provision of the law, there are being printed, and will shortly be distributed throughout the service, post cards which will serve the individual as a means of requesting a war ballot from the secretary of state of the State of his residence. These post cards may be transmitted free of postage in the United States mails.

5. Post cards will be printed on one side as follows:

(Date)

Secretary of State of: ---

Being on active duty in the armed forces of the United States and desiring to vote in the coming election, I hereby apply for an official war ballot.

My home address is ---,
(number and street)
in the city, town, or village of ---,
in the county of ---, in the State of ---, and my voting district or precinct to the best of my knowledge is ---. I desire that the ballot be sent to me at the following address:

(Signed)

Signature certified by:

(To be signed by any commissioned officer)

On the reverse side of the post card will be printed:

Free
(Official war ballot)

Secretary of State of: ---

(City)

(State)

6. With reference to paragraph 2, it is not the privilege of the commanding officer or any other officer to determine "who is or was eligible to register for and vote at any election." The determination of the qualifications of an individual is a matter which rests with the competent election officials. Any commissioned officer of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard is, however, authorized, by the subject law, to certify applications by post card and also to administer and attest such oaths as are required by this law.

7. The only steps necessary for a person to take in order to cast his ballot are: (1) Apply to the commanding officer for post card; fill in and sign card (card must be certified by a commissioned officer). Mail post card, postage free, to secretary of state of home State; (2) upon receipt of war ballot, execute in accordance with instructions accompanying ballot. Oath may be executed by any commissioned officer of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. Ballot is returned postage free.

8. Any person not electing to vote in accordance with the provisions of the above law may vote whenever practicable in accordance with the law of the State of his residence.

9. The law provides for a liberal construction of its provisions in order to effectuate its purposes, which is construed by this Bureau to mean that reproduction, in letter form or other practical means, of the post card described above would be permissible when circumstances warrant such action. All decisions as to the acceptability of applications for ballots and the ballots themselves would, however, be outside of naval jurisdiction.

10. Commanding officers and all other officers concerned are charged with the responsibility for (1) giving this notice full and complete publicity; (2) making post cards available to those requesting them; (3) assisting in the preparation of applications for ballots; and (4) executing oaths when requested.

11. Officers must scrupulously avoid advising any person that he should or should not vote or offer advice as to the manner in which he should vote.

L. E. DENFELD,
Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel.

Legislation approved to provide a method of voting in time of war by members of land and naval forces absent from place of their residence. Notwithstanding any provision State law persons eligible to register are qualified to vote for United States Senators and Representatives in Congress and payment poll tax or other tax not required. Law provides Secretary of the Navy will send printed post card applications to all ships and stations to be executed by absentee members who desire to vote and returned to secretary of State of residence. Post cards will be mailed within one week. In order insure absent members opportunity to vote personnel stationed outside United States and those in the United States where delay in mails possible should address letter to

secretary of State of residence as follows: "Being on active duty in the armed forces of the United States and desiring to vote in the coming election, I hereby apply for an official war ballot.

"My home address is _____, (number and street) in the city, town, or village of _____, in the county of _____, in the State of _____, and my voting district or precinct to the best of my knowledge is _____.

"I desire that the ballot be sent to me at the following address _____." Signature.

Position of United States Tobacco on the United Kingdom Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, since American-grown tobacco is one of our major export crops, it occurs to me that the situation regarding this very important agricultural commodity should receive appropriate consideration at the international conference which will soon be held at Hot Springs, Va. Although tobacco is one of the two major export agricultural commodities of the Nation, it is grown in a rather limited area in this country, and since none of the American delegates to the conference are entirely familiar with our tobacco export situation, I am afraid that this very important agricultural commodity may be overlooked at the conference. Although tobacco is not a food, it is, by many, considered a necessity.

In future negotiations in connection with reciprocal trade agreements I earnestly hope that the officials of our Government will insist upon fair treatment being accorded to the producers of American-grown tobacco.

Prior to the establishment of the Empire duty preference, tobacco used in the manufacture of products in the United Kingdom was comprised of approximately 91 percent United States leaf, 6 percent other foreign types, and 3 percent special types of tobacco grown in Empire countries. The effect of the preference, which has been in force since September 1919, has been to encourage the production of United States types of tobacco in British Empire countries for export to the United Kingdom where lower costs to manufacturers as a result of the preference has brought a gradual shift to Empire leaf. Between 1920 and 1933, the year that the reciprocal trade agreement with the United Kingdom was concluded, the production of American-type flue-cured leaf in Empire countries rose from about 11,000,000 pounds to approximately 135,000,000 pounds, and in 1938 the proportion of United States leaf used by United Kingdom manufacturers had declined to 74 percent of the total, other foreign leaf to 2 percent, and Empire leaf—largely American-type flue-cured—had increased to 24 percent.

In the negotiations for a reciprocal trade agreement in 1938 the United States Government requested the abolishment or a reduction in the preference granted by the United Kingdom on Empire tobacco. At the time the full duty on unstripped leaf containing the usual 10 percent or more moisture was 9s. 6d.—$2.32—per pound, and that on Empire leaf 7s. 5½d.—$1.82—which gave a preference of 2s. ½d.—50 cents—per pound. The United Kingdom Government would not agree to abolish or reduce the preference but did agree to examine the possibilities of a reduction after the termination of the commitments in the Ottawa agreement, which were to extend to August 1942, and in the meanwhile agreed not to increase the preference.

The United Kingdom Government adhered to the agreement and did not increase the preference. Between 1938 and 1942, however, it raised the duties on both foreign and Empire leaf on five separate occasions. The fifth increase, made in April 1942, brought the full rate to 29s. 6d.—$5.95—and the rate on Empire leaf to 27s. 5½d.—$5.54—per pound. No adjustment was made in the rate of preference until April 1943, when the proposed United Kingdom budget provided that it be reduced from 2s. ½d.—41 cents—to 1s. 6½d.—31 cents. Accompanying this adjustment was a further all-around raise in duty which brought the full rate to 35s. 6d.—$7.16—per pound and the Empire rate to 33s. 11½d.—$6.85—per pound.

There are ample facilities in the Empire countries for producing tobacco of the types and qualities now being substituted for United States leaf, and its production has continued to expand despite war conditions. The flue-cured crops in southern Rhodesia in both 1940 and 1941, of which about 90 percent was exported to the United Kingdom, were substantially above the output in any previous year and the 1942 crop was about 8,000,000 pounds greater than the 1941 crop. India's flue-cured production, grown largely for export, has been increased rapidly; the 1940-41 and 1941-42 crops each exceeded previous records. In Canada an increase in acreage over 1940 was permitted in 1941 and the flue-cured acreage allotted in 1942 was increased to 100 percent of the record 1939 area that yielded an export surplus of about 35,000,000 pounds. For 1943 there is to be no restriction on acreage.

Our tobacco farmers are now restricting their acreage and drastically curtailing production of tobacco. Instead of producing tobacco, they are producing less profitable crops but crops which are deemed more essential to the war effort and certainly they should be given careful consideration in all future transactions with friendly nations. I indulge the hope that tobacco may be considered at the Hot Springs conference and that our delegates may examine the chart which I am now placing in the RECORD which indicates a very substantial loss in the export of flue-cured tobacco.

Tobacco, flue-cured: Estimated farm sales weight of exports to principal countries, 1926–40

[Million pounds]

Marketing year beginning July 1	United Kingdom	China	Japan	Australia	Canada	Germany	Netherlands	Other	Total
1926 to 1927	165.7	84.2	9.8	23.8	15.1	13.0	8.0	29.2	348.4
1927 to 1928	191.0	78.2	13.4	24.9	17.3	15.5	9.7	41.9	391.9
1928 to 1929	206.8	150.7	16.9	21.1	17.3	16.0	10.9	49.2	488.9
1929 to 1930	223.8	149.4	12.0	22.4	15.7	10.2	8.4	60.2	511.1
1930 to 1931	223.5	173.3	14.1	26.7	12.9	13.1	8.8	50.5	524.9
1931 to 1932	155.2	91.5	5.3	12.7	12.3	9.8	11.2	45.4	343.4
1932 to 1933	152.9	90.0	5.8	10.0	8.6	5.2	5.6	41.0	319.1
1933 to 1934	198.6	99.3	9.3	12.6	9.3	9.8	13.5	36.9	389.3
1934 to 1935	182.1	30.2	11.3	17.5	9.2	1.6	4.2	36.4	292.5
1935 to 1936	264.8	27.4	7.8	21.1	4.4	7.8	8.3	35.8	377.4
1936 to 1937	202.4	46.3	11.8	22.3	4.4	3.4	10.5	56.5	357.6
1937 to 1938	279.8	41.7	2.3	21.0	4.3	5.6	9.3	62.1	426.0
1938 to 1939	269.9	59.7	----------	24.4	3.3	6.4	7.2	55.8	426.7
1939 to 1940	116.6	63.5	----------	24.3	7.4	.9	21.8	60.4	294.9
1940 to 1941 [1]	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	160.0
1941 to 1942 [2]	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
1942 to 1943 [2]	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

[1] Preliminary. Data for individual countries have not been published since March 1941.
[2] No data have been published since October 1941.

Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 5 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, last night the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] made an important contribution to the subject under discussion today, in a radio speech on the program Congress Speaks. Because of its timeliness and the quality of its presentation I ask that the address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have been asked to discuss during the next 6 minutes some aspects of the Connally bill. First introduced on November 17, 1941,

it was never taken up by the Senate in the Seventy-seventh Congress. On March 1, 1943, it was reintroduced and thereafter reported to the Senate on March 30, 1943, unchanged. Apparently much of the public and the press think it was intended to apply to the coal strike, so-called; not so. People have been told that passage of this bill would save the war effort from interruption due to a strike. Naturally no one wants the war effort interrupted. There are millions of loyal workers in the United States who are just as interested as management and just as sincere as the Senators speaking to you tonight, in their desire that production for the war not be interrupted. They have sons and husbands and fathers fighting on every front, and, of course, they wish our fighting men to be supplied and equipped in the best possible respect.

It is strange how many people jump to conclusions with reference to a particular bill without analyzing whether or not the measure will accomplish what it is represented to do. Yet there are at least a dozen amendments pending. Indeed, Senator CONNALLY himself today offered a complete new substitute for the original measure.

First, the bill as it now reads relates to any plant which is equipped to manufacture, produce, or mine articles required for national defense or which may be useful in connection therewith. It is difficult to think of any article or material which may not be useful, so you see, it is pretty broad.

Second, under the bill, if in any such plant there is an interruption of operations as a result of a strike or other labor disturbance, the President may seize the plant. The plant may be seized when there is a strike, yes, but the President does that anyhow. It may also be seized if there is a labor disturbance—whatever that is. There is no definition of the term and no standards are set up in the bill. If a group of workmen, and the bill does not say how large or how small a group, do not wish to work for management any longer, but wish to work for the Government, all they have to do is go on strike, or create a labor disturbance. Then, assuming other conditions stated in the bill have been met, the President may seize the plant from its owners. The language does not relate in terms to a labor union, as some think, it applies against any workers, in any plant, just so it is equipped to produce an item which may be useful in national defense. The plant may not actually be producing for the war effort; if it be equipped, it comes within the bill.

Third, if the bill actually were necessary to give the President the power to seize a plant in which there is a strike, under what possible authority will you say that the President over the past 2 years took over many industries? I remember when the President seized the North American Aviation Co. plant in June 1941, Attorney General Jackson, now on the Supreme Court, wrote an opinion saying, in part:

"The distinction between loyal labor leaders and those who are following the Communist Party line is easy to observe. Loyal labor leaders fight for a settlement of labor grievances Disloyal men who have wormed their way into the labor movement do not want settlements; they want strikes. That is the Communist Party line which those who have defied both the Government and their own loyal leaders to prevent a settlement of the strike have followed."

Obviously, as the Attorney General pointed out, some small group of Communists can cause a labor disturbance and, under this bill, the President can seize almost any plant in the United States and take it from its owners. Then, if he does so, all workers in such plants would become liable for criminal and civil penalties in the event of interruptions in production, under the conditions named in the bill. Before the owners can get their own plant back, the President would be authorized to determine what will constitute operation "in a manner consistent with" the needs of national defense.

After everything is said and done, the bill ignores the fundamental fact that the administration has persistently and purposefully used its power to prevent the establishment of a labor policy by Congress, indeed Senator CONNALLY stated as much on the floor of the Senate when he discussed this bill a year ago. We have through 15 months of war proceeded under Executive orders, changed from time to time until the general public, our workers, and employers alike are confused and do not know what to expect from month to month. The bill, therefore, fails to approach the basic problem. We are still without a labor policy, and this bill fails to state one. It is inherently susceptible of gross abuses; depending upon administration, it may or may not accomplish the objectives it is said to reach. One thing is certain, it could permit many results which the American people do not want.

Why America Is Meat Hungry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech entitled "Why America Is Meat Hungry," delivered by me over station WHN, New York, on Tuesday, May 4, 1943, as follows:

I have been asked to speak at this time on the subject of Why Is America Meat Hungry? This request is undoubtedly due to the fact that I have spent considerable effort in recent months in an attempt to untangle many of the complications which have been created by the Office of Price Administration and which have added much to the confusion of the meat problem in America. These efforts have been made as a member of the Special Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives in the Congress.

For months now, the Small Business Committees of both the House and Senate have persistently attempted to bring about a solution of the problems of meat distribution and supply for the people of the Nation. Though the solution seems well within grasp, it has to date been stubbornly blocked by the efforts of the meat branch of the Office of Price Administration. Why the Office of Price Administration should be so tenaciously holding to blunderous rules in the face of meat shortages, black markets, and widespread failure of meat slaughterers and processors, wholesale distributors, and retailers, is most difficult to understand. I think it is high time that the public be told some of the facts. I make these statements in the hope that the Price Administrator, Mr. Prentiss Brown, will take immediate cognizance of this most serious situation and, without further procrastination, act in the interest of the people of the Nation. This interest involves meat supplies for the Army, Navy, and lend-lease, and for the millions of American people on the home front who are needlessly being deprived of meat while tons of meat are being wasted and destroyed.

The meat problem became acute in this Nation early last fall, or about 8 months ago, and it was a most pressing problem at the opening of this year. It was estimated many months ago that the Army, Navy, and lend-lease would require about 30 percent of the entire meat output of the Nation. This left 70 percent of the meat supply of the Nation for the consumption of the civilians. If a war-swollen national income was to be used in part for the purchase of normal or increased civilian meat demands it was very plain that two dangers threatened: (1) increase in prices as demand increased, (2) a general breakdown of the meat-distribution system of the Nation as people with more money and appetite than normal attempted to buy more than their share of the meat supply. The first threat was a part of the inflationary runaway which the Nation is trying to avoid by the application of price control. The second was the threat which comes inevitably when any inflationary trend begins in the market of any commodity and which prevents the poor and middle-class wage earners from the opportunity to enjoy their just share of this vital food—in this case meat.

I do not believe that there is any American in normal health who objects to having his meat supply cut 30 percent in order that the Government will have ample supplies of meat for the men in our fighting forces, or for the purpose of supplying essential meat to our allies through lend-lease.

The first step in the Office of Price Administration program, many months ago, to restrict the civilian supply to 70 percent was to put slaughtering quotas into effect. The Office of Price Administration gave each slaughterer of meat animals a civilian quota. In other words, there was a limit to the amount of live animals a slaughterer could butcher and sell to the civilian channels of supply. All meat butchered over that amount had to be sold to the Army, Navy, and Lend-Lease. It happens that the great meat industry of the Nation depends upon more channels of trade than just the slaughterers. The meat you eat may come directly to you from the slaughterhouse, but the chances are that after being slaughtered the meat goes to a meat processor, whose business it is to prepare it into the cuts you like—to take portions of that meat which are good food, but which are not suitable for table cuts, and make these portions into sausage. If the slaughterhouse performs this service then the chances are that your meat moves through a wholesaler before arriving at your corner grocery store.

The people then depend last of all upon the corner butcher to supply them with their meat for the table. When the Office of Price Administration gave a quota to the slaughterers they did not give a quota to the nonslaughtering processors or to the wholesalers or to the retail butcher. It was error sufficient to cause trouble when quotas were not allowed all along the line of meat distribution, but the Office of Price Administration added additional oil to the fire by establishing a ceiling price at only one level. Office of Price Administration did not put a ceiling price on the live animals with the result that the price of live animals continued to advance long after the ceiling had been put on processed meats.

The result was inevitable—every time a slaughterer killed an animal for meat he lost several dollars per carcass. This caused financial loss to all of the slaughtering houses in the country in their butchering operations and only the big packers, who enjoyed many avenues of processing and by-products and wholesaling, could continue to make a reasonable profit. While the big packer lost money every time he killed an animal, he managed to make up the losses through other processes.

In addition to destruction of the packing house business in the country, the independent processors and wholesalers were deprived of meat with the result that their customers

were also deprived of meat. Ultimate result—some sections of the country received plenty of meat—many sections received very little—and some sections received none. Your butcher added to all his other wartime hardships the unnecessary hardship of having his meat refrigerator empty and his customers meat-hungry. Office of Price Administration has admitted the hardships caused by these rulings, but has refused to correct them. The refusal has been by harmful waiting—by blind procrastination. This condition has gone on for many months and is the real reason why America is meat-hungry—unnecessarily meat-hungry.

What happened as a result of this unfair management on the part of Office of Price Administration? People who had the money to pay for meat at any price offered, paid that price, and some unscrupulous persons who were adept at racketeering went into the slaughtering business—with a quota—and sold meat to retail outlets at prices above the ceiling price. This was—and is—the black market. The black market was mothered by the Office of Price Administration. Months after all of this condition was noted by Office of Price Administration, they still stubbornly refused to recognize the black market as the result, and insisted on treating the problem as the cause of their troubles. The fact remains that the black market did not exist in the meat business prior to the rulings of the Office of Price Administration. It did come into existence as a result of these rulings.

One of the most distressing results to be found in the black market today is the fact that men heretofore honorable businessmen, who have had to make desperate moves to continue their very existence in the meat business, have had to resort to the black-market operation in order to make a living. Our own Government, through the mismanagement of Office of Price Administration, has made criminals of formerly self-respecting citizens. The shame is on all of us for tolerating such a condition. The very health of every member of your family is endangered by the unsanitary conditions surrounding the handling of meat in the black market. The people are ready and willing to stamp out the black market, but they also demand sensible management on the part of the Office of Price Administration so as not to do things which create such dangerous and illegal conditions and practices.

The Office of Price Administration contended that point rationing would correct all of these evils, but it has not. Point rationing has not corrected the killing loss. After 1 month, point rationing has not corrected the unequal distribution of meat throughout the country because to this date the Office of Price Administration has not given quotas to all of the various channels of the meat trade. The situation grows daily worse, while a group of incompetents sit in the meat branch of the Office of Price Administration and continue to blunder their way along. When these blunders are recognized as they have been and they are not corrected, the people have every right to question the sincerity of the men in charge. It becomes the duty of the Office of Price Administration to see that the meat branch either performs its duty to the war effort and to the people now, or remove the men in charge forthwith and replace them with people who are willing to perform and who recognize the fact that America is needlessly meat hungry.

I told you that the Office of Price Administration said that point rationing would correct these ills, and that after 1 month of point rationing the ills grow greater. Let me now tell you what has taken place in the administration of point rationing on meats.

Sausage and sausage products have never enjoyed the status of the meat-of-the-meal on the American dinner table. Office of Price Administration knows this. Sausage has found general use in this country for sandwiches and for extra lunches or entertainment or picnics. Sausage has not been considered by the American family so much as a meat, but instead as a meat extender. The Office of Price Administration put the same point value on popular sausages as they did on a good cut of fresh beef, with the result that the American housewife will not spend her points for the sausage. Who could blame her? This condition was called to Mr. Brown's attention before a hearing of the Small Business Committee of the House by me more than 3 weeks ago, and Mr. Brown said that they recognized the error and it would be changed. His word was promptly kept, and it was changed. The point value was reduced from 7 to 6. The American housewife would not pay 6. Who could blame her? The result is that the sale of sausage has fallen off tremendously just at a time when it may be desired that we civilians eat more sausage and less fresh meat. The sausage business is facing paralysis and retailers and wholesalers and makers and handlers of sausage are being forced to destroy this perishable meat by the hundreds of thousands of tons nationwide. This intensifies the civilian demand for meat and creates additional, needless shortages—creates the most sinful waste at a time when we cannot afford to waste anything—much less rationed food for a nation which is becoming more and more meat hungry.

I have personally appealed to the Office of Price Administration twice by letter to further reduce the point value on sausage. These appeals have been answered by a further reduction from 6 to 5. The sausage people who should know, and the housewives who do know, say that this will not sell sausage for us for the American table. It is time for action. The meat branch has gone far beyond helpful price control—it has actually been on a course of destruction of the meat business of America. The Office of Price Administration is making the situation worse through refusal to act upon the facts which they have, and have had for months. They are destroying the independent and small business units of the meat industry in America, and causing the people to go meat hungry. Where there is need we will all be willing to do anything, including the endurance of hunger, to win this war and preserve our freedom—but we will not tolerate continued bad administration.

Unless action is had soon, the Office of Price Administration will awaken within a few very short months to learn that the American meat-packing industry has crumbled and is then unable to supply the meat we will need for our Army, our Navy, and our people, to win this war.

This is why America is needlessly meat hungry.

Unequal Freight Rates Should Be Adjusted—Transportation Problems After the War—Address of the Honorable Prentice Cooper, Governor of Tennessee

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Prentice Cooper, Governor of the State of Tennessee, and chairman of the Southern Governors Conference, has, since he became Governor of Tennessee, taken a leading part in calling the Nation's attention to the unequal and discriminatory freight rates existing in the South and West. Governor Cooper made a splendid presentation of this problem in an address before the Southern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments in Atlanta, Ga., on April 16, 1943.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein Governor Cooper's address:

Governor Arnall, members of the conference, and guests, it is a pleasure to have the privilege of addressing this distinguished assemblage upon the subject of transportation problems after the war, because I believe the existence of regional transportation barriers is the most important domestic issue before the United States today. From the South's standpoint, I may say as chairman of the Southern Governors' Conference that I am convinced that the greatest single obstacle toward raising the per capita wealth of the South is the freight-rate structure which discriminates against the commerce of our region. We should base our appraisal of future transportation problems on a knowledge of past and present transportation policy and its consequences upon the Nation as a whole and upon the South in particular. There is nothing which promises to contribute more to the future development and advancement of the South and the welfare of the Nation as a whole than modernized transportation with regional discriminations eliminated.

It is clear that the discriminatory freight rates now in effect operate to discourage and exclude industry in the South and to keep the South a raw-material-producing region and consequently a low-income region, and thus contribute to produce the economic ills of the South.

The South is a land of plenty in the sense that it is richly endowed with natural resources, but its people are the poorest in the United States. The discriminatory freight rates against the South are largely responsible for this condition. The mountains of the Appalachian Range are loaded with ageless wealth; they contain at least 40 of the minerals most useful to modern life. There are billions of tons of coal and iron and likewise of limestone, marble, and clay. Other minerals include bauxite, copper, zinc, manganese, mica, and valuable clays. Our forest resources are no less important. There are oak and hickory in my own section; short-leaf and loblolly pine and hardwood in the Mississippi Basin; oak, chestnut, yellow poplar, and white pine on the Appalachian highland; river-bottom hardwoods on the alluvial plains of the Mississippi; and long-leaf and slash pine stretching over the vast reaches of Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina.

The South is also a region of great agricultural wealth, with dark-fired and burley tobacco in Kentucky, Tennessee, and North Carolina; cotton in the Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and west Tennessee; and truck crops in Georgia, Florida, and Louisiana. The entire Tennessee Valley brings forth a diversity of crops, including sweet potatoes, corn, hay, dairy products, livestock, and fruits.

The South possesses a great wealth of natural resources, and its economic ills are not due to any lack of physical resources. The South, including the 13 States generally recognized as such, has one-half of the country's land where there is a frostless growing season of 6 months in the year. The soil of the South is rich and of great diversity, growing a wide variety of products; it embraces more

than a third of the Nation's first-class farming acreage. The South has two-thirds of all the land in the United States receiving a 40-inch annual rainfall or better. The South possesses 40 percent of the Nation's forests. The South contains more than a fifth of the Nation's coal, and mines more than a tenth of the Nation's iron ore annually. It produces two-thirds of the Nation's crude oil; it furnishes one-half of the Nation's marble; Texas and Louisiana produce 99 percent of the Nation's sulfur; and Florida and Tennessee produce 97 percent of the Nation's phosphates.

As was stated by a special committee named by the President of the United States to study economic conditions in the South (Report of the National Emergency Council, July 5, 1938):

"The paradox of the South is that while it is blessed by nature with immense wealth, its people as a whole are the poorest in the country. Lacking industries of its own, the South has been forced to trade the richness of its soil, its minerals and forests, and the labor of its people for goods manufactured elsewhere."

Viewing the present freight-rate pattern of discrimination against southern manufactured products, one would think that the sole use of these Southeastern States has been to produce raw materials for the outside world. Coal, iron, marble, grain, lumber, and other raw materials have been going out for many years on trains, barges, and ships. Much material wealth has been drained out, while little has filtered back. This wealth has gone to increase the fortunes of people who live to the north and east of us, while little has remained to enrich the people who produce it.

This policy of exploiting our raw materials, in order that inhabitants of other areas may enjoy the benefits of processing them, has substantially limited the income of the people of the Southeastern States. Laborers who produce low-cost basic commodities are paid low wages, while laborers who produce high-cost fabricated articles are paid correspondingly high wages. The miner who brings forth iron ore has only enough skill to wield pick and shovel and use simple mine machinery, while the laborer who fabricates iron and steel into complicated machines, farm implements, or automobiles is a skilled worker. The miner is poorly paid and he and his family exist on a bare subsistence level, while the automobile worker or machine-tool worker is highly paid and he and his family live on a standard of decency which raises the level of the whole national economy.

The 1940 United States census showed that the per capita wealth of the States in southern freight-rate territory is $1,161, which is less than one-half of the naticnal average of $2,335. The per capita income of these States is only $317 per year, compared with $573 for the Nation as a whole. The value of school property per enrolled pupil in the States we represent is only $124, as compared to an average for the United States as a whole of $300. These economic results have followed upon the transportation policy which has been visited like a plague upon the South for three generations.

One of the most striking phenomena in the development of the American Continent is that the trend of population and industry since 1890 has traveled in a diametrically opposite direction from the path followed before that time, when population was being diffused from the East into the interior.

The building of the railroads helped during the period prior to 1890 to diffuse population into the interior of the United States. But when manufacturing increased in importance, inward diffusion slowed down, and around 1890 it reversed itself. For the past 50 years factories have been springing up along or near the coastal areas at a greater rate than they have in any other section of the country, with the result that a new attraction to workers and their families has been established along the deep-water margins. Population and industry have concentrated since 1890 in the 324 counties out of more than 3,000 in the United States which border on one of the four main bodies of water surrounding the Nation, or which lie along channels at least 27 feet deep which connect with these bodies. Between 1890 and 1930 population in these coastal counties increased almost 250 percent as much as in the Appalachian region and the Mississippi Basin, and 65 percent more than in the Nation as a whole. This concentration of population has been accompanied by concentration of industry in the coastal counties. While these counties had only 36 percent of the national population in 1935, they produced more than 50 percent of the national value of manufactures for that year.

The transportation policy which has encouraged the use of the great interior basin of our country as the source of raw materials has contributed to this result. The railroads facilitated the shift of population and industry toward the deep-water margins by making it possible for industrial centers to obtain food and raw materials in sufficient quantities from the interior of the country. This has resulted in the disproportionate development and use of the long-haul in interterritorial transportation at the expense of the development and use of the short-haul in regional transportation. The bulk of commodities must move to or from the extreme borders of the country for processing.

This is an unhealthy situation for the Nation as a whole and makes for national disunity and national economic instability. More commodities should be processed in the South where they are produced. Since the Southern Governors' Conference started the first organized effort to secure for the South equality of freight rates here in Atlanta in April 1937 a great deal has been accomplished.

The Southern Governors' Commodity Rate case has been won; this gave relief on a number of commodities, saving the South many millions of dollars annually in freight rates. The Southern Livestock case has been won; this gave relief to southern shippers of livestock. There is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission the Southern Governors' Class Rate case, the same being Dockets No. 28300, Class Rate Investigation, 1939, and No. 28310, Consolidated Freight Classification. Since all the evidence in these two dockets has now been submitted, a decision is expected in the summer or early fall of this year. Considering the evidence submitted and the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission has authority to grant relief from regional trade barriers, we may confidently anticipate that the South will be freed from the blight of discriminatory freight rates and that basically equal freight rates, mile for mile, will be granted east of the Mississippi River, and that equitable freight rates will be established throughout the Nation as a whole. I definitely expect an early solution of the discriminatory freight rate problem so that it will not remain one of the transportation problems to be solved after the war. Existing regional trade barriers, which operate to impede traffic like Chinese walls dividing various parts of our Nation, definitely obstruct the most efficient prosecution of the war; and the present heavy movement of traffic between various sections of the country only serves to emphasize the injustice now being done the South.

While only a relatively small portion of war industries has been located in the South as compared with the North, yet there are a sufficient number located in the South to make it all-important that they continue in peacetime operation. Unless a freight rate pattern is established that will be immediately available at the conclusion of the war and that will give the plants now engaged in war production an opportunity to survive in peacetime operation, there would be little hope that such plants could continue to operate.

The plea of the South is not only for regional justice; it is also a plea for national unity and for national economic stability. To quote from House Document 271 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session:

"Those who welded the indissoluble union of States found that the policy of creating a national commerce and protecting it from artificial barriers was the touchstone of the birth and growth of a nation. Allegiance to that fundamental policy today demands the adjustment of these regional freight-rate structures to remove discrimination which obstructs and distorts the flow of commerce and inhibits a natural economic development of the national resources."

In further considering transportation problems after the war, it may be observed that the railroads in the post-war world may find themselves only one of several major forms of transportation. The advance of science and technology has brought to maturity diversified systems of highway, waterway, pipe-line, and airway carriers which will make a formidable competitive bid in the post-war world for transportation service. In this country we have produced through public taxation, with astonishing rapidity, the greatest system of improved highways in the world. Interconnected inland waterways have brought about a modern revival of water transportation.

Perhaps the most significant development of all has been in the field of air transportation. Air transportation has been stimulated by a nation-wide system of airports and airways, and through mail payments, programs of pilot training, safety regulations, and research. But beyond all this, the war has given tremendous impetus to the development of the aircraft industry on a mass-production basis. The Southern States will find it necessary to prepare themselves for the time when, as Eddie Rickenbacker said to me not so long ago, "Every town of 500 will have its airport."

Air transportation enthusiasts not only expect to weave a network of passenger, express, and freight air lines, but also to circle the globe with distance-shattering schedules. It is already said that no airport in the world is more than 60 hours from any other airport in the world. In 1939 all the air lines in the country operated only 350 transport planes, and with this small plant, they were able to transport between 10 and 15 percent as many passenger-miles as all the Pullman cars. When the war ends, the aircraft industry will have capacity to build more than 100,000 planes a year. But a fraction of this would be needed to provide passenger transport planes sufficient to carry a much larger proportion of passenger travel than has ever been air-borne in the past.

For common carrier service larger and speedier planes have been continually developed. With the increase in size of the plane, operating costs per plane-mile are increasing, but the costs per unit of traffic are declining. The future gives promise of economical cargo planes, some of which are being planned in radically new forms and designs. The time is not far distant when different types of airports will be constructed for the development of different types of air carriage, and the important urban centers will have several airports, in which there will be a separation of passenger traffic, freight traffic, and private use. And it is unquestionably true that the time is close upon us when first-class mail traffic will move exclusively by air, whenever time can be saved.

The future progress of the South definitely calls for the integration of transportation by rivers, highways, railways, and airways. Economy of transportation costs is one of the

great needs of the area. The future of the railroads of the South depends upon their continuance as the principal agency for the movement of heavy freight. Most rail traffic is designed to suit carload operations, and where terminal handling does not become too great a burden, the rail carriers are capable of meeting almost any amount of inland-waterway competition.

In some sections of the South channels of movement have already become available and are being maintained for the operation of barges on inland waterways. The cost of such transportation on a ton-mile basis is very low. The need for cheap water transportation is the direct outgrowth of two conditions peculiar to our country. One is the great distance over which many commodities must be hauled. The other is the high cost of rail and other forms of land transportation.

Every post-war transportation problem should be solved so as to preserve the principle of equality of opportunity for the citizens of all parts of our country. Notwithstanding the fact that equality of opportunity is the very foundation rock upon which our Government rests, the present freight-rate structure discriminates against individuals, against States, and against regions with flagrant disregard of this fundamental principle of justice. The South does not today enjoy equality of opportunity with the States of the North and East, as is shown by a few typical examples taken from various parts of the South which I would like to cite in closing:

Rates on baled cotton, a raw material, are the same from the South into official territory as they are in the East But the equality ends when this same cotton begins to be processed. Rates on unfinished cotton cloth are 10 percent higher when it moves from the South into the East than when the entire movement is within the East. If the same product is bleached, the discrimination is 11 percent; if it is processed into oilcloth, the disparity is increased to 54 percent.

Mississippi manufacturers of cottonseed-oil products are under a similar handicap. Rates on the raw product from the South to the East are 7 percent higher than the rates within the East. When refined for use as a cooking or salad oil, the discrimination is 24 percent, and when processed into oleomargarine, it is 35 percent.

The production of pig iron in Alabama is subject to little or no discrimination, but if an Alabama manufacturer converts this pig iron into steel plates, he immediately encounters a 27-percent-rate handicap with his northern competitor. The same Alabama iron may end up as a part of a steel tractor, with a 40-percent disadvantage; or as a mechanic's hand tool, with a handicap of 51 percent.

In Chattanooga a manufacturer of electric water heaters is in direct competition with a Pittsburgh firm To ship his product to Peoria, Ill., in official territory, the Chattanooga manufacturer pays a freight rate of $1 per hundredweight. His Pittsburgh competitor is approximately the same distance from Peoria, but his freight rate is only 70 cents. The Chattanooga firm must thus meet unjust discrimination amounting to more than 42 percent of its competitor's rate.

Louisiana producers of sulphur, a prime necessity for many industrial uses, may move their raw material into the Northeast on rates 13 percent below those governing movements entirely within the Northeast. But the rates on sulphuric acid, a simple manufactured product, discriminate against the Louisiana producer by 15 percent. If the sulphur is processed into agricultural insecticides, the handicap amounts to 70 percent.

Dallas has a firm engaged in the manufacture of shoes, with the natural advantage of close proximity to the cattle ranges, the source of raw leather. The Dallas firm competes with many firms in Boston, the center of footwear manufacture. Yet the Boston firms can ship shoes to Memphis, Mobile, and St. Louis, which are much closer to Dallas, for less freight charges than can the Texas manufacturer. With equal rates, Dallas would be able to compete on equal terms with Boston in the retail markets of Knoxville, Savannah, Chicago, and Indianapolis, each of which cities is midway between the two producing centers.

Both Jacksonville and Chicago produce automobile storage batteries, and both are the same distance from Washington, D. C. But in order to sell a $3.65 battery in Washington, the Jacksonville manufacturer must pay 11 cents more in freight charges than his Chicago competitor. The freight rate handicap eats up more than 40 percent of the net profit per battery of the Jacksonville manufacturer.

Both Mobile, Ala., and Bound Brook, N. J., are producers of composition roofing, and Indianapolis is an equally distant potential market. Yet a 20-ton carload of roofing shipped to Indianapolis will incur $16 more in freight charges if it comes from Mobile than if it comes from Bound Brook.

These isolated instances but reflect a condition which permeates the entire transportation set-up of the South as compared with the East. The manufacturers pay on the average of 37 percent more to ship their products in the South than northern manufacturers pay to ship goods the same distance in the North. If the southern manufacturers ship into the North and East, they must overcome a handicap of approximately 35 percent more in freight rates than their equally distant northern and eastern competitors.

The South is only asking for equality of opportunity, and all unbiased investigators, including governmental agencies, investigating freight rates, have recommended the elimination of discriminatory freight rates. The National Resources Planning Board, in September 1942, pointed out that the Transportation Act of 1940 prescribed regional discrimination in rates, and so the Board recommended that the Interstate Commerce Commission seek a fair solution of this problem in an objective and dispassionate spirit. On March 25, 1943, the President transmitted to Congress the recommendation of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the abolition of regional freight-rate barriers. On March 30, 1943, the Board of Investigation and Research, established under the Transportation Act of 1940, made its report to the Congress of the United States recommending that the freight-rate structure provide: "Equal opportunity for the economic development of all parts of the country without artificial rate handicaps or preferences." All these recommendations recognize the principle of justice between different regions of the country, and that is all the South is asking for.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the House will begin consideration of a joint resolution by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to extend for another 3 years the rapidly-expiring Trade Agreements Act of 1934. It would give me an exquisite pleasure to help repress the wheezy suspirations of this legislation and aid it to early demise. However, that is not to be. It is apparent that there are sufficient votes in this House to continue this act somehow, in some way, in some form. But I doubt whether it will be continued with the full grant of dictatorial power which now embosses this act more than any other piece of legislation produced by our anti-Jeffersonian friends—the New Dealers of this administration. On the eve of this conflict, it is my intention today to call to the attention of the House the grave responsibility which lies upon it if it consents to depart from the constitutional process and again entrust to an impractical foreign-trained group of individuals in the State Department control of our domestic commerce by virtue of controlling the terms and conditions of our foreign commerce. I shall also venture a few predictions based upon our sad experience of the past.

At the beginning of the war—and we are possibly just at the beginning—with Germany and Japan, the people of our country are giving considerable solemn thought to war's aftermath. They are wondering, and well they might, what the new world may be and where we may find ourselves amid the complicated and difficult processes of world reconstruction. Already we have a fore-taste of world planning. We are to have a world-wide triple A which will control production. We are to have a world bank financed with the gold which we will have to dig up in Kentucky. We are to have national export quotas for export products such as wheat in which the United States gives up its rightful share and then we are to have gift quotas to help rehabilitate the war-stricken nations of Europe in which we give more than our share. What is left of the credit and financial resources of our nation after this war is completed—assuming victory—is to be extended in some way, somehow, to rebuild these other countries.

Meantime, under the policy of the New Deal, the people of the United States have climbed to a very high tableland of wages and living expenditures. In increasing degree to maintain these standards the Government, I predict, will move from subsidy to subsidy. I can even vision the shrinking New Dealers raising the wage rates of the miners far above the Little Steel formula and then covering up by subsidizing the operators instead of raising the prices of coal. Whatever may come out of that, inflation is definitely a part of the future picture. Such a settlement as seems in prospect may even present a post-war picture wherein England will find it more profitable to ship us coal than cotton goods—until such time, of course, as oil gradually displaces coal as a basic fuel.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that our internationalistic masters have overrated the capacity of our good neighbors in other lands to share and share alike. I am confident that we will, in the post-war period, find ourselves confronted with the same nationalistic avaricious

playing for position and playing for advantage that characterized the immediate post-war period following the old World War. And gentlemen here will recall what happened in the 3-year period following the armistice of November 11, 1918. At that time much of the Allies' needs were strained through the industries of the United States. We had taken raw materials and transformed them in order to save shipping. We had artificially developed many industries which were fated to collapse following the beginning of peace. We had plowed up millions of acres of land and turned the use of that land into the production of food products needed by war. We had overexpanded almost every branch of our own agriculture and we blithely at that time had expected a grateful Europe to continue to purchase from us in remembrance of what we had done for them.

Now, just what did occur? As rapidly as shipping space could be made available, the surplus stocks which had been accumulating during a 4-year war began to move into consumption. The wheat and wool and butter of Australia and New Zealand, the dairy products and grains and meat of Argentina, the oils and fats in raw material from the Orient and Africa moved across the water into western Europe, leaving the high-cost farm products of America begging for a market. Great quantities of these same foreign products poured into the United States—a flood sweeping our farmers into financial strain and bankruptcy. By June of 1920 the condition of agriculture had become so precarious that farmers clamored at the doors of Government for relief. A sympathetic Congress, elected that year, proceeded to apply as a first remedy some measure of restraint upon this deluge of imports by passing the Emergency Agricultural Tariff Act in April 1921.

The majority report of the Ways and Means Committee on April 13, 1921, in submitting this act to the House, is a cogent appraisal of the situation and, referring as it does to some products produced in my own State of Michigan, I desire here to quote briefly from that report:

> The rates of duty carried in title I of this bill were agreed upon during the last session of Congress to cover emergency conditions which still exist. They will be in force for 6 months. It is not the purpose of the committee to make them permanent. The rates of duty to follow them in the permanent tariff bill are now being carefully considered in the committee.
>
> The bill provides for the following rates of duty:
>
> Wheat, 35 cents per bushel.
>
> Wheat flour and semolina, 20 percent ad valorem.
>
> Flaxseed, 30 cents per bushel.
>
> Corn or maize, 15 cents per bushel.
>
> Beans, 2 cents per pound.
>
> Peanuts or ground beans, 3 cents per pound.
>
> Potatoes, 25 cents per bushel.
>
> Onions, 40 cents per bushel.
>
> Rice, cleaned, 2 cents per pound; rice, cleaned for use in manufacture of canned foods, 1 cent per pound; uncleaned rice, 1¾ cents per pound; rice flour, meal, etc., 1 cent per pound; rice paddy, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.
>
> Lemons, 2 cents per pound.
>
> Oils: Peanut, 26 cents per gallon; cottonseed, coconut, and soybean, 20 cents per gallon; olive, 40 cents per gallon in bulk, 50 cents per gallon in containers of less than 5 gallons.
>
> Cattle, 30 percent ad valorem.
>
> Sheep: One year old or over, $2 per head; less than 1 year old, $1 per head.
>
> Fresh or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork, 2 cents per pound. Meats of all kind not provided for herein, 25 percent ad valorem.
>
> Cattle and sheep and other stock imported for breeding purposes, free.
>
> Cotton, with staple of 1⅛ inches or more, 7 cents per pound.
>
> Wool, unwashed, 15 cents per pound; washed, 30 cents per pound; scoured, 45 cents per pound.
>
> Wool, advanced beyond washed or scoured condition, 45 cents per pound in addition to rates of duty imposed by existing law.
>
> Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by polariscope not above 75°, 1.16 cents per pound; each additional degree by polariscope, four one-hundredths of a cent per pound additional; molasses not above 40°, 24 percent ad valorem; molasses above 40° and not above 56°, 3½ cents per gallon; above 56°, 7 cents per gallon.
>
> Butter, and substitutes therefor, 6 cents per pound.
>
> Cheese, and substitutes, 23 percent ad valorem.
>
> Milk, fresh, 2 cents per gallon; cream, 5 cents per gallon.
>
> Milk, preserved, condensed, sterilized, 2 cents per pound; sugar of milk, 5 cents per pound.
>
> Tobacco, wrapper and filler, $2.35 per pound; if stemmed, $3 per pound; filler, unstemmed, not especially provided for, 35 cents per pound; if stemmed, 50 cents per pound.
>
> Apples, 30 cents per bushel.
>
> Cherries, 3 cents per pound.
>
> Olives, in solutions, 25 cents per gallon; not in solutions, 3 cents per pound.
>
> One of the most serious obstacles to the revival of industry is the paralysis of agriculture. Title 1 of this bill, to protect certain farm products, is submitted to Congress for the welfare of the Nation as a whole. It is not sectional. It is not for the benefit of one class, because its passage will be for the good of all. The purchasing power of farmers has been in large part destroyed and must be restored before good times can be hoped for.
>
> While it is true that we are in the grip of a Nation-wide industrial and business depression, which has distressed many, impartial observers are of the opinion that agriculture is the hardest hit of all. In addition to abnormally low prices, and in some instances no price at all, practically everything the farmers buy is from 50 to 100 percent higher than pre-war levels.
>
> The consuming public and the commercial public have an absolute and definite interest with the farmer in helping him to make cost of production and a fair profit.
>
> The primary interest of the consuming public in the farmer is that he keep on producing food. The farmer will do that only if he makes a profit on his production. If he must sell his commodities below cost of production, he must go out of business or lower his standard of living to such an extent that he is a public menace. In either event the consuming public will suffer.
>
> The same holds good in respect to the so-called commercial sections of the public. The automobile manufacturers expected to sell many tractors, trucks, and cars in the rural sections of the United States. They would have done so if the farmer had continued to make profits. The instant commodity values collapsed farm credits closed, and the farmers were unable to purchase anything except actual necessities of life. The inevitable result was a collapse not merely in the automobile industry but in every collateral industry.
>
> Automobiles are here used simply as the illustration of one out of dozens of distinct and separate important industries so affected.
>
> There is now a large surplus of farm products in this country caused partly from underconsumption, but chiefly by the dumping here of great quantities of foreign products. This surplus will continue to increase so long as present world conditions exist. Our country alone among the large consuming countries of the world is able to pay for imported commodities. In this country is the one market where cash and credit conditions and exchange rates make it possible to buy and hold the world's surpluses until consumptive demands can absorb them, or until the same can be sold abroad, sometimes, unfortunately, on time. In other words we have been buying the surplus of other countries for cash and reselling them abroad on time.
>
> Wheat is one of the products which have been admitted to our country in large quantities which have seriously disturbed and depressed our domestic market to the great loss of wheat growers. The months of September, October, November, and December are those during which the marketing of wheat is most active During those months last year our markets were demoralized by the receipt from Canada for domestic consumption of 32,777,889 bushels of wheat, a substantial portion of it going to the Minnesota mills. This amount has been since increased to over 44,600,000 bushels. And still more serious, it is estimated that there are 35,000,000 bushels of wheat at Fort Williams, Canada, awaiting the opening of navigation, which will be within a week, to be shipped to American ports for domestic consumption. Domestic wheat prices cannot withstand the pressure brought by continually increasing our surplus by importation. As a result of these importations prices have declined rapidly, being now far below the cost of production, and the American wheat grower faces destruction. It is essential that this bill be passed quickly in order to prevent the dumping of the wheat just referred to, as well as other commodities mentioned in the bill.
>
> The sheep raisers are in desperate condition. Ninety percent of the 1920 wool clip is still in their hands, and there is no sale for it at any price. There is now in this country 2 years' supply for the manufacturers and 100,000,000 pounds are on ships headed for our ports. In addition to this, millions of pounds of frozen lamb have been imported and are now in cold storage.
>
> Peanuts and peanut oil imported directly from Japan, but produced chiefly in China and India, have already broken the price of American peanuts to a ruinous point and will probably cause abandonment of a large percentage of the peanut acreage. Peanuts are produced primarily in China, India, and central Africa. Any one of these countries produces far more than the United States under the most primitive methods of culture and with the cheapest possible labor. No growers of America can compete with them. If the peanut industry of the United States is worth preserving, the imposition of a duty is essential. It is not a case of reducing the cost of peanuts to the consuming public. It is a case of allowing a great American industry to survive and of preventing the complete control in the future of the price of the commodity from being lodged in a handful of foreign speculators and merchants.
>
> Beans are raised in China and Japan on land that has an average current value of approximately one-tenth of the American bean land by labor that is paid approximately one-twentieth of corresponding American farm labor. Even the hand picking is done

by child and woman labor, which costs the Chinese and Japanese less than one-twentieth of the corresponding cost in this country. Chinese women are paid 17 cents per day.

It is impossible to raise beans in New York, Michigan, Colorado, or California for less than 6 cents a pound. Nevertheless the Japanese merchants can land Chinese beans on the Pacific coast for anywhere between 2 and 3 cents a pound without losing a penny on the transaction. Chinese beans are now for sale in all portions of the United States at prices below the American cost of production, and the American bean producer is distressed and helpless.

The farmers of the United States with their high standards of production and high standards of American labor are placed in direct competition with the products of an entirely different civilization, under which much lower wage and labor standards are maintained. It is a conflict between the American civilization and the economic expression of the oriental civilization. In such a conflict the American farmer is completely beaten unless the Government gives him the artificial assistance of protective duties Without a protective differential the American bean industry is doomed. Already the bean acreage of Colorado and adjoining States has been reduced in three years to one-fourth of the 1918 acreage.

In California a similar result is noted for the districts devoted to small beans. In Michigan a reduction of about 50 percent is indicated by preliminary reports.

Much the same conditions are found in respect to rice and other farm products imported from Japan and China. American growers of peanuts, beans, rice, and other products which are imported from China and Japan cannot reduce their cost of production to compete with the oriental standards of living; they cannot increase the production per acre so as to equalize the enormous advantage of the oriental cheap labor. They cannot make even the cost of production without the aid of protective duties. Without this aid the grower will go out of business and the people will buy these commodities in the future at whatever price the foreign speculators choose to place upon them.

Some people say that the farmers must find relief by increased sales to foreign countries. This might be efficacious if the foreigners were financially able to buy. The citizens of our own country bought nearly $900,000,000 worth of farm products from foreign countries last year. Save this good home market with its good American dollars for American farmers and do not compel them to sell their surplus to foreigners on time.

The revival of the agricultural industry will help to put 3,000,000 idle men to work, and when they are profitably employed they will in turn help to restore the normal domestic consumption of farm products.

From the standpoint of the public it is believed the costs of retail will not be materially affected by reasonable duties on farm products. Under our present very faulty distribution system, which is sadly in need of reformation, the prices paid to farmers seem to bear little relation to the final sales price. For instance, we have seen the price of wheat reduced in half during recent months and the cost of bread remains at the same exorbitant price in most if not all the cities. Onions and some other products which are now unsalable on the farm excepting at far below cost of production are selling in the stores at about the same price as formerly.

Some people may be disposed to say that if an industry is not particularly important to the country, it might be best to let the industry die and try to secure cheaper foreign products; but it ought always to be remembered that the foreigner, with the monopoly in his hands, may take advantage of it. It has been found at times that when the foreigner has a monopoly on something America needs, the American consumer is squeezed bitterly, without the least possible chance to protect himself. Therefore it is unwise to drive out an industry and permit complete control to go into the hands of a group of foreigners not subject to regulation from this country. Where the industry is important, such as the primary agricultural industries of the country, there is no excuse whatsoever for permitting the industry to be abandoned by reason of the inability of the farmers to make a profit.

The prosperity of this country is based primarily on agriculture. If the American public permits class after class of American farmers to be driven out of their industries by competition from one source or another, the whole country will be impoverished gradually but surely. The farmer will not be the only sufferer; the whole public will go down with him. This is the teaching of history.

The sooner the average man realizes that his interest is absolutely inseparable from that of the agricultural producer, the sooner will the entire country be on a more prosperous footing.

We are told, Mr. Speaker, that 30 or 31 of these trade agreements have been signed with 27 foreign nations. That means that with some like Canada we have executed supplemental agreements. We also find that of the German war-dominated nations, to wit, Czechoslovakia, France, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, and Switzerland, we have only suspended our trade agreement with Czechoslovakia.

With regard to the internal products of the other nations, nothing has been done apparently on the grounds that there is still a chance to trade with the colonies of some of these nations. In consequence, other nations of the world with which we have no trade agreements are profiting by our failure realistically to eliminate concessions made on the internal products of these countries with which we signed agreements that are now under domination of the Germans. I ask: Can there be any other excuse for failure to take into consideration this condition than the desire to use the power of the trade agreement as an instrument to reduce our Tariff Act of 1930?

Also, I predict that recovery in the war-stricken countries of Europe will be much more rapid than some people would like to have us believe. The first demands of these countries will be for foods and clothing to carry them over the early stages of reconstruction. Their next demands will be for machinery with which to reequip their mills and factories. Their third demand will be for feeds and breeding stock.

So during the early stages of recovery we may expect a continued demand for our agricultural and our industrial products. However, as Europe, Asia, and Africa get under way, do not deceive yourselves. Their needs will be more and more supplied in the form of raw materials by those countries of the world which, due to accumulated surpluses and because of lower costs of production, are better equipped to do that job.

I predict also that the surplus products of these nations will flow toward us and thus displace domestic market outlets for our farmers and jobs for our workers, just as they did in the years immediately following our last World War.

Address of Hon. Francis Biddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, Carnegie Hall, New York, N. Y., April 13, 1943, on the occasion of the presentation of the Four Freedoms Annual Award by the Italian-American Labor Council:

Mr. Justice Douglas, members of the Italian-American Labor Council, ladies and gentlemen, I am deeply touched, Mr. Justice Douglas, by your introduction of me to speak to this great audience. The presentation of this beautiful medal by the Italian-American Labor Council is an honor which I too well know I do not deserve. But that knowledge on my part makes me no less proud to receive this generous token of your appreciation. Tonight, in acknowledging my thanks, and my deep emotion at having thus been honored by your members, I take it that you wish, in making the award, to record publicly your deep satisfaction at my action, taken almost exactly 6 months ago, and declared here in Carnegie Hall, New York, in releasing Italians in the United States from the burden of being classed as alien enemies. I take it also that just as in that action I represented the deliberate policy of the National Government, and made the decision with the approval of the President of the United States, so you tonight are expressing your gratitude, not to me as an individual, but as the Attorney General of the United States, carrying out the mature policy of a great country which, in the midst of a war with the kingdom of Italy, could be wise and clear-sighted enough to recognize that in truth Italians on these shores owed their first loyalty and love to the land where they had chosen to live. Tonight you represent not alone the members of the Italian-American Labor Council, but all Italians in our country, and all Americans of Italian descent. Thus you bear their universal gratitude through me to the American men and women, their brothers and sisters, who make up our country; a country which thus said, by so simple an act of justice, that these 600,000 Italians were in fact a part of us.

Some of you may remember that I said on Columbus Day "We now have the results of 10 months of an unprecedented exercise of wartime vigilance. We have watched these Italians, these so-called alien enemies, we have investigated, we have acted on the slightest impulse of doubt. We have taken no chances. And what do we find? We find that out of the total of 600,000 persons, there has been cause to intern only 228, or fewer than one-twentieth of 1 percent." Six months after the release of Italian aliens from the status of alien enemies, the number of Italians interned is 270—still under one-twentieth of 1 percent.

I added for the benefit of those who were affected by this change that they had proved their loyalty to the democracy which had given them this chance, and that they should see to it that all Italians remain loyal. This they have done; and I am convinced that they have fulfilled and will continue to justify the confidence we have placed in them.

This occasion is made doubly memorable because it marks the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson. All over our land today that anniversary is being reverently celebrated. For Jefferson is one of the great heroes of our American world, whose memory stirs the hearts of men everywhere today. It is fitting that a democracy should honor its dead heroes, for they are the cherished symbols of its own deep aspirations. The forward movement is slow, faltering at times, but I venture to think that in our land it has been continuous; and we can discern its direction and measure its progress by the achievements of our great men. Wise old Benjamin Franklin, industrious, homespun; Washington, who wanted to live at home and tend his farms, but did what he had to do; Jefferson, whom today we honor; Alexander Hamilton and John Marshall; Andrew Jackson; then Lincoln, a little melancholy, deliberate, humorous, who held our Nation together; Grant and Lee, those two great soldiers; Theodore Roosevelt, with his "square deal"; Woodrow Wilson, who knew that isolationism must go, that some day there would have to be a new international human order. And among our great names I know that history will place in strong outlines the courage and statesmanship of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who marshaled the free peoples of the Western Hemisphere to stand against world inroads of despotic tyranny.

A democracy is not a town meeting where each neighbor's voice can be heard. The people choose their leaders, they must then trust them. They will forgive much, mistakes, human weaknesses. They will differ in detail in ways and means. But unless they can understand and choose the important issues, the wider policies, democracy can suffer failure and disintegration in the larger sense. The people must today balance their individual discomforts and irritations against the vast human outcome of the future. They must see the relation between sacrifice and victory, and they must daily choose. For the country that you love is nothing less and nothing greater than the people. And the people know that the price of leadership invariably is vilification and the suffering that comes to strong men in public office—the hatred of the little jealous men for all great figures who lead the people; the hatred and slander that were piled on Jefferson, on Lincoln, on Wilson.

Jefferson almost welcomed it as proving the strength of a country where speech and the press were free. In his first inaugural he did not denounce the Federalists as monarchists (as he believed them to be) but invited them to rejoin the Republican faith. "If there be any among us," he said "who wish to dissolve this Union, or to change its Republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

Lincoln, his eyes sad but his lips smiling, would turn away the shock of the abuse by his slow humor. Someone asked him what it felt like to be President. He considered for a moment. "Well," he said, "it's like the man who was asked what it felt like to be tarred and feathered and run out of town on a rail. 'Except for the honor', the man answered, 'except for the honor, I'd just have leave of walked.'"

Jefferson's father was neither well-born nor wealthy but his mother came from one of the most distinguished and aristocratic families in Virginia. In person, tall and loose-jointed, sandy-haired and freckled, carelessly dressed, he had simple habits and disliked form and ceremony. I like to think of him remaining up to the day of his first inauguration at Conrad's boarding house and then walking to the nearby Senate Chamber of the uncompleted Capitol to receive the oath of office from his cousin, John Marshall, the Chief Justice; or riding alone to open Congress and hitching his horse to the post at the gate.

He was a great statesman. What has, I think, so firmly held the outline of his greatness in the American imagination generation after changing generation is the positive quality of his beliefs. To Jefferson, government was no end in itself. It was but a means to human happiness. Freedom was more important than order, for freedom was the secret of happiness, and all men were entitled to the pursuit of their own happiness.

For this buoyant faith, youthful as national ideals are counted, and often perhaps naive, this faith in our world, in our dream, in our power—what he himself called "This Government, the best hope of man"—this surely is the faith that has conquered and built this continent in so short a time. It is the wellspring of our untamed imagination, of our restless individualism.

And so today when we celebrate his noble spirit we should remember that he was never afraid—afraid of what the people might do if given power to rule themselves; afraid of too much education; afraid of tolerance; afraid of what might happen to the world when war was over.

He would not be afraid today were he with us, but would think of this war as another step in the long struggle. He would see how many of the fundamentals for which he had fought with all his powers are now accepted—universal education, religious tolerance, the gradual growth of democratic institutions. He would see them threatened once more, and he would throw all his strength into their defense. And in the midst of the war he would sit down like the beneficent human architect that he was, to plan the world that is to follow the war—a world that might be nearer to perfection if only men had more faith in mankind.

This is the hour when we can be great as a nation, or when we can fail. I do not doubt but that we shall win the victory—but let us win greatly. If we fail it will be because, even under the stress of war, with the losses and sacrifices of the best and the bravest, we have not yet learned to act for the largest unity. Today and each following day we can achieve the unity of our national soul. We speak first of United Nations, but let us be sure we speak of a united America. Those who rejoice to sow dissension among us will stress the fact that in this far-stretched country we have many nationality groups, and that within these groups there are separate factions. There is room in our life for the expression of individual ideas, for the furtherance of special programs. But separate leadership leads too often to rivalries, rivalries to disunity.

It is when we begin to eliminate factions that we shall be better united as Americans. Then we shall no longer speak of Irish-Americans, or Swedish-Americans, or Italian-Americans. This does not mean that we shall not look back to the dear homes of our ancestors for the traditions and culture that have enriched our groups. But that will not prevent us from being united as a single people, stronger for the underlying cultural diffusion. In that day an Italian-American will be no different from an Irish-American or any other kind of American.

Do you think only Italians were proud of First Lt. Alexander R. Salvatore, of Glendale, Calif., who was awarded the Silver Star for gallantry in action over Kokoda, New Guinea, on September 15, 1942? He departed on a lone reconnaissance flight with orders to attack Japanese concentrations of any kind. He attacked a supply pile, descending in the face of two machine guns firing at him, and strafed the objective. Sixty Japanese dead were later found on the spot.

Sgt. Pete R. Muscarello advanced into enemy-held territory between two hills at Guadalcanal against machine-gun and sniper fire which was so sudden and heavy that about half the men started to retreat. He exposed himself openly to the fire, succeeded in stopping the men, and regained the lost ground. He was awarded the Silver Star by President Roosevelt. Pete Muscarello is an American. Home town, Chicago.

Anthony W. Brunetti enlisted in the Navy at 18, in 1941. He was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross, with this citation:

"For extraordinary achievement in aerial combat as rear gunner in an airplane of a scouting squadron in action against enemy Japanese forces in the Battle of the Coral Sea on May 8, 1942. Brunetti successfully repelled an enemy attack on his plane, shooting down one of the hostile aircraft in the engagement. His courage, skill, alertness, and a complete disregard for his own personal safety were directly responsible for the saving of his own plane and the destruction of one of the enemy aircraft."

Tony Brunetti is an American boy from Bridgeport, Conn.

Perhaps they have heard of these American boys in Genoa and Naples, in Rome, Milan, Turin, Florence, through the towns and villages of Tuscany and the Piedmont. I am told that the Gestapo has supplanted the Ovra; and that in every village and city, behind the puppet official of Mussolini, sits a member of the Gestapo. Italy, under the heel of the Gestapo, forced to lick the boots of the Tedeschi! Italy, of whom Garibaldi once said:

"O Italy! * * * When thou once more shalt rouse thyself, they will tremble at the defeat of their united powers, combined in the league of Hell, to oppress and degrade thee. Be great, then, once more, O Italy! And then the powerful voice of the Almighty will be heard by all thy sons; and the hungry and cowardly vultures which destroy thee will be stunned by its thundering sound."

Too long has Italy, under a traitorous rule, been deaf to that old call to valor. The cowardly vultures still go on with their work. Today the glory that Mussolini once promised echoes bitterly in Italian ears. Glory? What a glorious opportunity the German war machine held out to those Italian divisions which Mussolini poured into battle at Hitler's command! The opportunity to cover the German retreat in Russia, from Alamein—anywhere in which dying might serve to spare German lives. Yes; the opportunity to serve as protectors and saviors of the super-race. Hitler has been most generous in dispensing that opportunity. Whenever that glorious occasion arose, under a blazing desert sun or on the snow-swept steppes in midwinter, invariably the honor of perishing was given the Italian soldier, while the German elite guards, the panzer divisions, were hurried homeward.

For this distinction, some sign of gratitude might have been expected—and it has been forthcoming; to Italy's sailors has been given the honor of maintaining a life line across the perilous Mediterranean. While the planes of the Luftwaffe are busily engaged in protecting German armies and German cities, these Italian sailors are given exclusive rights to the protective canopy of the blue skies above.

How long the Italians can bear up under such lavish honors, I do not know. There is a limit to the amount of such heroics that any nation can take. It is time that the Italian soldier and sailor cast off this mantle of glory—the glory of dying for Germany—so that it may be worn by those who most deserve it—the German Nazis themselves.

The time may not be long. Even now the bell tolls and each man must make his choice. Death will come, and suffering in the barricaded streets. But there will be the marching of feet of the mighty army of liberation, the army of liberation bringing freedom to the conquered land of Italy. Each man must make his choice—whether to accept that army, or to follow the discredited ranks of the weak tyrant who has sold Italy to her oppressors. We then will know our friends—and we will know our foes.

Our Plan for Post-War Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, during the last 2 years the American people have heard much about the subject of post-war conditions. Little of the details of the program, however, have been disclosed to the public. Apparently it has been left to Kingsbury Smith, a well-known writer, to tell the people of this country what their part of the program is to be after the wars are ended. He speaks with the assurance of one who has an intimate knowledge of the subject he discusses. It is evident that he is fully and authoritatively informed.

Mr. Smith is the author of an article entitled "Our Plan for Post-War Germany," appearing in the May issue of the Reader's Digest. It is termed a "detailed report on Washington's answer to the question, 'What shall we do with Germany after the war?'" This article is so amazing and based upon what must be considered much and continuous wishful thinking, rather than upon a knowledge of human nature and an understanding of the practical world in which we live, that the picture as he presents it appears fantastic.

I call the attention of the reader to the first sentence in the fourth paragraph of the article which says:

> While it is anticipated that the preliminary military government will be a joint Allied undertaking, the American Government is preparing to handle the problem alone if necessary.

It must be clear that other nations will not be in a position to contribute to any extent with men or money to these activities. So if the above sentence is interpreted as it without a doubt will be interpreted, other nations will consider it an invitation to permit the American people to do the whole job themselves. This will involve keeping a huge army of American boys in Germany and probably other places for a generation. It will also involve the spending of many billions of American money wrung from the taxpayers of this country.

If this program is to be embarked upon after the war, it should only be after the American people have been fully advised as to the details of the same and after they have given their approval.

Mr. Speaker, a former valuable and long-time Member of this House now living in the West—and I refer to our old friend, the Honorable Frank Crowther—forwarded me a clipping from the Denver Post of April 29. It is an article by Merryle Stanley Rukeyser entitled "False Hopes Fostered by 'Better World Boys.'" It deals with the subject above discussed. Mr. Rukeyser brushes aside the fog of wishful thinking and takes a look at the picture in all its nakedness.

[From the Reader's Digest of May 1943]

OUR PLAN FOR POST-WAR GERMANY

A DETAILED REPORT ON WASHINGTON'S ANSWER TO THE QUESTION: WHAT SHALL WE DO WITH GERMANY AFTER THE WAR?

(By Kingsbury Smith)

If America's official planners have their way, the German people are to be given one more chance after this war to prove they can become peaceful, cooperative members of a sane society of nations. But this time the Germans will have to learn to be good the hard way. Strict control for an indefinite period of years, under a policy of stern but just treatment, is the objective envisaged by Washington officials.

These plans, of course, are still in a state of formulation. Some of the views expressed in this article represent ideas rather than concrete plans. New developments may change them. With these reservations in mind, the following is presented as the American program for the post-war treatment of Germany:

After the occupation of Germany by Allied forces, under the terms of unconditional surrender, the first step will be the establishment of a military government by the commander of the occupying forces. Its purpose will be: First, to safeguard the occupying forces and to maintain a favorable military situation; and second, to preserve law and order among the civilian population.

As soon as Germany has been completely occupied, a supreme Allied military and civil government should take over. This government would control the administration of Germany; supervise the total disarmament of its air, land, and sea forces; direct the decentralization of its industries and readjustment of its economic life.

While it is anticipated that the preliminary military government will be a joint Allied undertaking, the American Government is preparing to handle the problem alone if necessary. Army officers and civilian experts who have had considerable experience in government, speak German well, and have been acquainted with that country in the past are being trained to act as "civil affairs officers." The War Department alone is planning to train more than 1,000 top administrators to help govern Germany.

These American Gauleiters are being prepared at the United States Army School of Military Government at Charlottesville, Va., created in May 1942. Two classes of 150 each have already been graduated after a 4 months' course.

The course includes not only the laws, customs, economy, and psychology of the German people, but the preparation of definite plans for taking over specific areas. For example, if an American general should occupy Hamburg, a plan will be available for establishment of military government there, along with the trained administrators who helped prepare the plan.

These Americans are being taught that the best results will be obtained by a policy of justice, honor, and humanity, that a military occupation marked by harshness, injustice, or oppression will leave lasting resentment in the hearts of the German people and will sow the seeds of future war.

Special military police for Germany also are being trained by the War Department at Fort Custer, Mich. Our Navy, too, is preparing contingents for service in Germany. In addition, keymen in the State and Treasury Departments, the Board of Economic Warfare and several other governmental agencies are being carefully selected for special training as technical experts.

It is intended that these administrators and technical experts will continue to work with the supreme allied government that succeeds the military government.

The military government's first step, American planners believe, must be the quick round-up, trial, and punishment of war criminals. It is feared that otherwise the people of the conquered territories, where Quislings and local Nazis have cooperated with the Germans, will take matters into their own hands. One Fighting French spokesman estimated that a million people might be killed in France alone unless proper preventive measures are taken.

Another reason for swift and pitiless action against the war criminals is to convince the German people that their leaders can no longer escape retribution for starting wars.

Plans are now under way for the establishment of a United Nations commission to investigate war crimes. Its members may also serve on the United Nations court which will try the higher German officials, including Nazi Party leaders responsible for the barbaric slaughter of Jews in Europe. It is intended that every high-ranking Nazi, including Hitler, Goering, and Goebbels, shall be brought to immediate trial.

As for Hitler, it is considered highly probable that he will commit suicide. If he is captured, the American Government will favor trying him before a United Nations tribunal on charges of mass murder, with execution by a firing squad if found guilty.

German Army generals who permitted war crimes in occupied territories under their command will not escape punishment. And the American Government has been compiling an "atrocity list" of Gestapo men, SS troops, and other German agents charged with perpetrating crimes against the peoples of conquered countries. Other governments are compiling their own lists.

There are to be no deals of expediency with Nazis, and all party leaders will immediately be removed from public office. On the other hand, since many German public servants were compelled to become associated with the Nazis in order to exist, it is intended to retain much of the civilian personnel of the public services and police forces of Germany—men who can be relied on to do their work loyally under strict control.

Parallel with these early occupational moves will be measures for the immediate and total disarmament of Germany, except for small arms required by the police force to maintain civil order. German civil aviation will be allowed to train only a small number of pilots. The number of airfields will be limited and placed under close Allied supervision. Allied air forces will be stationed at the main German airdromes.

Because discharged soldiers of a defeated nation are ripe for revolution, many German soldiers will be kept mobilized temporarily and used as labor battalions to help rebuild the devastated areas not only of their own country but of the countries invaded or bombed by Germany.

As part of the disarmament of Germany and the drastic reduction of its overdeveloped war industries, it is considered necessary to remove a great deal of machinery. Most of this will be given to the conquered nations, to replace the machinery either taken or destroyed by the Germans. German industries left intact will be prohibited from manufacturing munitions or implements of war of any kind. Germany will not be permitted to rearm, secretly or otherwise, for a very long time. There will be no "token" army that can be used as the nucleus for training an officer class, nor will the Germans be allowed to hold maneuvers with unarmed troops using mock guns and tanks—one of the mistakes the allies made the last time.

While our officials are determined that Germany shall never again become the dominant military power in Europe, it is not planned to deprive the Germans forever of sharing in the work of an international police force. When they have proved that they have permanently renounced their belief in militarism as an instrument of national policy they can be allowed to play their proportionate share in the collective-security system that is designed to maintain world peace. This is something they cannot hope for, however, in less than a generation of good behavior.

America's planners intend to limit relief measures in Germany to the minimum required to prevent revolution and chaos. There is no disposition to play Santa Claus. Furthermore, the people of Nazi-conquered territories have a priority on our relief resources. In the interest of lasting peace and a stable world order, however, it is felt that we must prevent famine, disease, and economic chaos in Germany.

This will mean food and medical supplies during the emergency period after occupation of the country. It may mean seeds and fertilizer to help them plant crops. The sooner they can grow enough to eat, the sooner we can stop sending food. When harvest time enables them to start feeding themselves, the surplus above that needed to maintain subsistence will be diverted to those European countries whose farm lands were destroyed by the Nazi military machine.

Our emergency food relief measures will be directed chiefly to German children, probably under American Red Cross auspices. The American flag will be prominently displayed at distributing centers. We want the children to know where the relief is coming from.

It is in basic matters of statehood, however, that the German people are to be compelled to pay most severely for the criminal folly of following Hitler in his mad movement of world conquest. The American planners feel that Germany must be drastically decentralized as a political and economic unit, even to the point of breaking up the country into separate states or regions.

This idea is not dictated by revenge, but by a genuine desire to find a solution for Germany's militarism. It is felt that most of the good that has come out of Germany, such as its literary and musical culture, developed when that country was not practicing nationalism. Therefore Germany must not be allowed to remain a single, powerful industrial and political unit.

During the probationary period, political parties which advocate extreme nationalism will be prohibited. Close watch will be maintained to make sure such political movements do not develop underground. Disobedience will bring immediate and drastic economic sanctions, followed, if necessary, by military force to break up the movements and liquidate their leaders.

In the economic field, it is intended first to reduce and decentralize Germany's industries. Germany's cartels will be broken up, and surviving industries will be placed under strict allied control. At first, the benefits which Germany derives from her agriculture and the rest of her economic life will be limited to a point that will assure self-subsistence and permit rehabilitation of devastated areas. Later, as the German people give evidence of good faith in helping in the peaceful reconstruction of Europe, the benefits will be increased until they enjoy full equality of commercial opportunity.

It is believed that Germany must be allowed a limited amount of foreign trade to enable her to obtain raw materials, such as cotton and oil, needed for peaceful purposes. The American planners consider Germany to be the workshop of Europe, and there is no disposition to scrap the workshop. The intention simply is that it shall be used for peaceful and not warlike purposes.

Some American planners believe that an educational campaign will have to be undertaken in Germany to erase the stamp of Hitlerism. They favor the establishment of an international educational comission, including responsible German members, to draft a program for teaching factual world history to adults as well as children. For this purpose it is hoped to enlist in Germany the aid of the radio and the press, and of religious organizations, Catholic and Protestant, in converting the German people to a policy of peaceful cooperation with the rest of the world.

The American planners are not resigned to the idea that the German people cannot be made peaceful and contented members of a sensible society of nations. But if their plan is to work, the government will need the overwhelming support of American public opinion. Unless America accepts its full share of responsibility in making the plan work, it will collapse. Germany will become a prey to the vengeance-seeking peoples of Europe—and the seeds of the third world war will be sown. We cannot have lasting peace if the people of any large nation, and especially the Germans, are treated as parians.

[From the Denver Post of April 29, 1943]

FALSE HOPES FOSTERED BY "BETTER WORLD BOYS"—POLITICIANS AND PROFESSORS AREN'T GOING TO SIT AROUND IN SECRET SESSION AND WAFT NATION INTO PROMISED LAND—PROGRESS NOT PRODUCT OF SWORD

(By Merryle Stanley Rukeyser)

The spirit of economic quackery is in the air.

In bidding for popular favor in wartime, it has become fashionable to promise a better world after the struggle.

These essays in blue sky are not confined to any single political party or economic class. Politically, the movement has become bipartisan with the recent appointment of a Republican House committee to study post-war problems, and with the creation of committees on post-war plans by various business organizations.

Of course, this column is entirely sympathetic with all efforts to achieve a more orderly economic transition from war to peace, and has pioneered in advocating such efforts; but it questions the wisdom or the common honesty of labeling such humble offsets against threatened catastrophe as assurances of a better world.

HOW MUCH DAMAGE IS REAL QUESTION

With the wholesale destruction of life and property on a global basis as a result of the Axis depredations and aggression, the real question is how much damage will be done to the post-war economic fabric. It is a sheer illusion to assume that the sword will automatically usher in a period of sweetness and light. Culture, economic and social progress come through peaceful evolution, not suddenly through the sword. It is a mistake to misinterpret the characteristics of victory. Military defeat of the Axis is necessary if world progress is to be resumed, but the event merely clears the way for the peaceful steps needed for progress. This war, from the viewpoint of the United Nations, is analogous to the use of the surgeon's knife to cut away the cancerous growth of Axis aggression.

When the surgeon cuts away cancer, he does not promise that the surviving patient will be able to lick Joe Louis. He merely says that a successful operation will give the patient an opportunity to continue to struggle and compete with his fellow men. Likewise, victory in this war will give the democratic nations an opportunity to continue to struggle and to apply their intelligence and their energy to economic, social, and political advancement. The mere physical ending of hostilities will not of and by itself usher in the millennium.

WELL-BEING RESTS ON PRODUCTIVITY

Men talk glibly about the coming of a better world. No one can oppose the objective, but it is high time that someone challenged the prevailing wistfulness and pointed out that a better world can be achieved only through the sum total of the efforts of men in the arts, sciences, and in industry. It is not to be had for the asking; it must be wrested from reluctant forces through lifelong exertion on the part of millions of individuals, each contributing to the general welfare.

Those who deal in the currency of ideas and who make irredeemable promises about a better world give the impression that we have had a less than perfect universe because of villains at home and abroad. They forget that greater material well-being rests on increased productivity, which comes in an undramatic way through supplementing the human muscle with power equipment and better tools. They appear to overlook that material betterment springs from the results of patient research and searching in the laboratories. They tend to undervalue the contribution to world betterment made by the unsung workers in factories, on farms, and in the service occupations, and by men in management who direct them.

The better world boys give the impression that, if you gather politicians and professors from various countries around at a secretive counsel table from which the press is excluded, that they will readily concoct a formula which will assure progress.

TIME TO TELL UGLY TRUTH

I think that, if we eliminate the cant from current discussions, our long-term prospects will be improved. Americans have the toughness to achieve their gains the hard way—through thrift and industry. They do not need assurances that benefits will be handed down by Mamma Government.

After World War No. 1, especially in Europe, the degree of disillusionment and cynicism was beyond precedent. Discontent represented the ratio between promise and performance. The failure to attain the promised land led to popular confusion and despair, which created opportunities for the Fascist who exploited the looming popular loss of self-confidence.

If we start telling our people the ugly truth, we shall better prepare them for the exigencies of the post-war period. Thus we shall set in motion psychological forces to combat the threatened deterioration. And we will heighten our prospects for moving upward and onward if we start out with a clear understanding of the conditions which in the past made for national prosperity. This would represent a scientific approach to post-war conditions and prospects, as opposed to the Coué school of post-war economics which now appears to be in vogue.

The Government and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "The Government and the War," the second of two William H. White Foundation lectures, by the Honorable Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, delivered at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., Monday, May 3, 1943:

In my first lecture I spoke of the democratic ends for which we fight this war and some of the traditional difficulties which must be overcome in our own thinking if democratic purposes are to be genuinely achieved. I pointed to the fear of change and the horror of planning, the tendency to view complex problems in terms of such oversimplified dilemmas as the choice between socialism and laissez faire; the assumption of a rigid distinction between the functions of government and of private enterprise, with government inevitably evil and enterprise necessarily good; the suspicion of experts in government as an abiding threat to popular rule. These are difficulties which go not merely to the structure of government—the distribution of power among the various branches of the Federal Government and between the Nation and the States; they go to the entire governmental enterprise and thus determine in the largest sense the measure of our aspirations and our powers. Speaking in December, it seemed appropriate to state our essential problems in such general and long-range terms. You will understand why it is that speaking in May I intend to concern myself with recent developments and to outline our difficulties in much more immediate terms.

I

I take no risk of overstatement when I say that the 5 months since I first addressed you have been months of unmistakable reactions. This is not surprising in view of what has been accomplished and the sacrifices that grow increasingly necessary as the war program proceeds. That the reaction should have become swiftly articulate following an election which resulted in gains to the opponents of the administration was to be expected. Its manifestation in Congress has, of course, taken the form of an attack upon the executive branch of the Government, the powers under which it operates, the appropriations by which it functions, and its extensive civilian personnel.

The lawmakers, having vested the broadest powers in the President to supplement his constitutional authority as Commander in Chief, having directed the Executive to act promptly and vigorously, now protest the exercise of delegated powers by challenging the necessity for having delegated them at all. The attack transcends particular acts of alleged maladministration and includes the field of administration as a whole. Administrators, whether old line civil servants, New Deal administrators, or businessmen employed in the new war agencies, are grouped as "bureaucrats"; and the legislators appear as popular champions, struggling to win back for the people the powers which the "bureaucrats" have usurped. Administration is discussed as if it were essentially incompatible with legislation, and the attack on administrative agencies gathers new life. Even some of the friends of the New Deal program, giving voice to the popular sentiment, hit the new sawdust trail which leads to casting out the "bureaucrats" from the body politic.

This climate of opinion, manifested in daily discussion on the floor of Congress as well as in action on specific measures, was given its most pointed expression in the mounting enthusiasm to investigate the executive branch and all its works. The standing committees of the House and Senate, including the great Committees on Appropriations, are the traditional media through which the Congress maintains its necessary critical awareness of the details of administrative operations. A number of special committees were, in addition, functioning at the close of the last session, notably the Truman committee established to investigate the national defense program and the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. A score of resolutions introduced at the present session in the House and more than a dozen in the Senate proposed to add to the normal work of the established committees' special investigations into various aspects of the work of the executive branch. Many of the proposals, particularly in the House, were for the creation of special committees.

By the middle of March the House, in addition to continuing the Dies committee and the Committee on Small Business, had by resolution authorized the Committees on Military and Naval Affairs to investigate the progress of the war effort; it had empowered the Civil Service Committee "to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in the departments and agencies of the Government, including Government-owned corporations"; it had created a select committee to investigate the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission, to determine whether the Commission is "acting in accordance with law and the public interest"; it had established a select committee to investigate the Farm Security Administration (which it subsequently voted to destroy) "with a view to determine whether or not such activities are being carried on in accordance with the policies of Congress"; it had authorized the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to conduct an investigation into the progress of the entire defense housing program; it had directed the Committee on Appropriations, through a subcommittee, to examine charges that certain persons in the employ of the executive agencies are unfit for public employment because of association with subversive organizations; it had granted general authority to the Committee on Appropriations "to conduct such studies and examination of the organization and operation of any executive department or * * * agency * * * as the committee may deem necessary to assist it in connection with the determination of matters within its jurisdiction"; and, finally, it had established a special committee "to conduct investigations of any action, rule, procedure, regulation, order, or directive taken or promulgated by any department or independent agency of the Federal Government where complaint is made" to the committee that the action deprives citizens of constitutional rights or otherwise exceeds the agency's power or inflicts a penalty without affording an opportunity to present a defense "before a fair and impartial tribunal."

I cite this enumeration not in criticism of the House or any of the committees, but rather to exhibit the temper of the Congress with respect to the executive branch after 17 months of war. There is hardly a field of executive action that is not being critically reviewed—often by several committees in succession or even at the same time.

At least one Member of the House, Representative DIRKSEN, of Illinois, has made clear that he regards it as appropriate for Congress not only to investigate the executive agencies as the occasion arises but to maintain a day-by-day review of their activities in the exercise of their rule-making authority. On January 25 Mr. DIRKSEN introduced a resolution—thus far not adopted—proposing to establish a joint committee on administrative review, to which all agencies would be required to submit their rules and regulations before they could become effective. Within 10 days the committee would determine whether the rule submitted runs "counter to the intent of Congress in creating and delegating the functions for the enforcement of which it is proposed." If the agency is notified that the proposed rule does violate the intent of Congress, as construed by the committee, the rule could not be made effective until the expiration of 40 days. Even if Congress took no adverse action during the 40-day period, it may be assumed that the objection of the committee would in normal circumstances have the force of a moral veto.

Mr. DIRKSEN fully recognizes that implementation of his plan would necessitate the establishment under the aegis of the committee of a corps of congressional experts to study what the administrators propose to do. He has in mind that the committee will actually police administrative procedures. This is indicated by his comments on the resolution. "There must be bureaucratic discipline," he said, "there should be review. I am persuaded that a great many bungling procedures of the Office of Price Administration could have been avoided if a group of legislators could sit down with a staff and examine them meticulously and straighten them out and send them back and say 'with these modifications they are all right.' So we need legislative review."

II

Whether or not the suspicion of the executive branch thus articulated in Congress reflects prevailing public sentiment I shall not undertake to judge. It is, to be sure, one of the great functions of Congress to act, as it has been said, as "an organ of registration, an instrument of criticism, a sounding board through which the voice of the Nation can make itself heard." Congress is the immediate link between the people and their servants in the executive branch, the ever-present guaranty that administration will remain reasonably close to the line of popular will. It is in fact extraordinary how fast the irritations of private citizens over what they believe to be unnecessary or unfair in government are translated into congressional criticism of administration. What begins in specific complaints soon swells into attacks on policy. A Member of Congress, finding himself often enough the unhappy victim of an enraged constituent's dissatisfaction with an impersonal "government," acquires a relish for the word "bureaucrat," which it is not difficult to understand. But the President of the United States is also an elected official. He is, as Woodrow Wilson once tried to explain to a foreign diplomat, bound to be the interpreter of the great majority of the American people. "It is his duty to divine the moment when the country requires action and to take the action which the great majority demands." The President has not deviated from his course or altered the essential policies on which the operations of the Government have been set.

Whatever the state of popular opinion may be when tested by specific issues, it is clear enough that the attack upon the bureaucrats was not without popular appeal. Men

and women throughout the country were feeling the impact of total war in its progressively stronger pressure on the domestic front. The manpower barrel seemed almost empty, though we knew that it had not yet yielded half enough. The last stages of the conversion of industry from peace to war were being completed. Regulations and complicated restrictions seemed to multiply overnight. Could not the Government just issue a few simple orders and let the public, eager to further the grand effort, cooperate to the limit? Who was the Government to say what work was necessary for the war and what was not? What did the Government know about local conditions, about the needs of any particular locality, about the problems and the point of view of a minority group, about the urgent yet conflicting needs of farmers, of workers, of industrialists, and consumers?

If this is what people were thinking, we have no cause for surprise. Add to this the frustration that all of us feel at not being able to do more to win the war. Our sons, our brothers, or our husbands are fighting or may fight at any time, yet there is so little any one of us can accomplish to further the total effort, to lighten the burden they bear. Small wonder that we look for a whipping post, and find it in that part of the Government that wears civilian clothes.

But after the whipping post has been duly whipped we recognize, as indeed we must, that as President Wilson wrote during the last war, "There is obviously but one instrumentality through which the war can be carried to a successful issue," and that instrumentality is the Government of the United States. Apart from the actual conduct of hostilities, the essential functions of the Government are and must necessarily be performed by civilian agencies, agencies which must remain in civilian hands.

III

You may say, I suppose, that I began by discounting congressional criticism and now have put aside popular discontent, thus demonstrating that I, too, am a bureaucrat and nothing more. But if the test of a bureaucrat is either insensitivity to criticism or a belief in the infallibility of the executive branch, I cannot qualify.

That there are weaknesses in the executive branch, its structures and organization and the occasional fragmentation of its authority, cannot be denied. That there are incompetent persons among the 2,943,919 employees shown in the last enumeration is of course true. What is important is that the Government is essentially sound. For the Government of the United States today is not a party government It is not a New Deal government. It is an aggregate of the best available civilian talent which this country can marshal, drawing upon persons who are not committed to activity in industry or agriculture or state or local government, no less necessary to be maintained than the work of the Federal Government itself. If that is so, a broad indictment of the personnel of the Government must necessarily fall to the ground. The largest single question that those who would expel the bureaucrats must ask themselves is who is available to take their place. Viewed as anything more than change in the direction of Government from the top, it is not a question to which, so far as I know, a satisfactory answer can be made.

The size of the Government has often been represented in grossly misleading terms. While the total personnel of almost 3,000,000 has received great currency, it has not been adequately understood that approximately two-thirds of this total, or about 2,000,000 Federal workers, are employed in the War and Navy Departments; principally, of course, in the arsenals, shipyards, Government airplane factories, and the other services of war production and supply. The balance of approximately a million employees is about double the civilian personnel employed by the Federal Government (exclusive of the War and Navy Departments) in July 1919. It is about 300,000 more than the total employees of the Government in 1933. And of the million employees outside the War and Navy Departments at the present time, 175,000 are employed in agencies exclusively devoted to the war; and 319,896 are employed in the Post Office, hardly a bureaucratic enterprise. In spite of this I do not say that the Government may not be overstaffed. Keeping in mind what has been done in the space of 2 short years to convert our productive capacities to the business of waging a total war, to exert the necessary controls over the domestic economy of 130,000,000 people, to mobilize the national manpower, and to maintain the ordinary functions of Government at the same time, it is natural that the instrumentalities developed for these purposes should prove not to be fool-proof. I say only that responsible criticism must take into account the magnitude of our achievement and the dimensions of the problems by which we have been faced.

Not the least of the problems confronted—and one that has by no means been overcome—is that of keeping the governmental organization together in the face of a constant drain upon its personnel. For employees of the civilian government, like those of private enterprise, have entered the armed services during the past 2 years at a constantly accelerating pace. As of December 1942, 26 percent of the male personnel within the ages of 18 and 37 years had already entered the armed forces; a much larger percentage would necessarily obtain today. Yet charges were made and widely played up that the Government was a draft evader's paradise, with occupational deferment the order of the day. On December 15 the President appointed a distinguished and disinterested committee composed of Paul Bellamy, chairman, Eric Johnston, and Ordway Tead to investigate the problem and formulate a general policy to govern the deferment of Federal employees. The committee, in submitting its recommendations—since adopted by the President and approved by Congress—found that in the Federal establishment "the extent of draft deferment has in the aggregate been moderate and conservative. A figure of slightly less than 2 percent of the employees deferred is a good showing. It compares favorably with the experience of private industry in which a percentage figure of deferments at least twice as high is not deemed to be excessive and unwarranted."

The committee reported in February; its recommendations were adopted in an Executive order issued by the President on March 6; the report and the order were transmitted to Congress on March 10; on March 17 the Senate Committee on Military Affairs reported favorably a bill to give explicit legislative approval to the Executive order; and by early April the bill had become law. But at the same time that all this was taking place a subcommittee of the House Committee on Military Affairs undertook an examination of the deferment problem, with emphasis on individual cases, and the country was given the impression that the executive branch was guilty of wholesale evasion of the draft. Great publicity attended a finding that over 800,000 of the 3,000,000 Government employees are within the military-service age, ignoring the fact that most of the individuals in question are husbands and fathers who have not yet been called up, with only an infinitesimal fraction deferred on occupational grounds.

I speak of the deferment problem at this length because it is important to take into account that the civil government as well as the armed services are engaged in fighting this war. I have in mind not only services performed by civilians directly related to military operations, such as the work of the Board of Economic Warfare and the War Production Board, and similar functions performed throughout the entire civil establishment. I mean to include any governmental service reasonably necessary in time of war. If such an essential activity collapses in the civilian branch it will necessarily be built up in the armed services, which quite properly will not hesitate to use personnel otherwise useful in the hostilities themselves. The Army and Navy now parallel much activity performed in civilian agencies. At the same time much of the skilled professional and administrative manpower that is being withdrawn from the civil government is employed in noncombatant work in the armed services inferior in importance to the work formerly done. If, as I believe, it is important to the country that civilian functions remain in civilian hands, there should not be military priority in such cases for obtaining civilian personnel. Functions should not be allocated between the military and civil branches only on the basis of a shortage of manpower produced by operation of the Selective Service Act. If experience on this score is necessary, we have but to turn to the British example, carefully contrived in this war to avoid the mistakes of the last.

You will not understand by what I have said that I challenge the right and the duty of Congress—or for that matter of anyone else—to criticize and investigate the Government even in the midst of the war. The priority of Congress in matters of legislation and legislative policy should never be disputed by the administration. The nature of the criticism and the extent of the investigation that can contribute to the attainment of our common goals are matters of honest judgment. Every investigation takes precious time from Government officials, time otherwise devoted to the discharge of their normal duties and the administration of the war effort. It offers, in compensation for this loss, the valuable opportunity to set the ground-work for legislative action; to obtain legislative approval of what the Government is doing or attempting to do; to set the facts straight on the record to clear the air of suspicion and recrimination, to advance the cause of public understanding at a time when it is needed most. Where there is suspected extravagance or negligence, a congressional investigating committee can perform with promptness and effectiveness what in substance corresponds to investigation by a grand jury. The Truman committee offers a striking example of this kind of work.

No one would defend the type of congressional investigation symbolized, as T. Harry Williams has recently reminded us, by the famous Committee on the Conduct of the War established at the end of 1861, because of the dissatisfaction of the Radicals with Lincoln's war aims and his conduct of the war. The committee, consisting of three Senators and four Representatives, was granted broad powers to investigate "the general conduct of the war," past, present, and future, and to summon persons and papers before it. As one Senator grimly put it, the purpose was to "probe the sore spots to the bottom."

Executive sessions did not prevent news of what took place behind closed doors from finding its way into the press or into speeches on the floor of Congress. As Professor Williams suggests: "The committee was an experiment in civilian, congressional control of

the executive and the military in a democracy at war." The consequences do not warrant attempting the experiment again.

It is equally true, however, that the agencies of the executive branch can do much more than they have done to maintain adequate contact with the Congress, presenting through the medium of the standing committees the facts and the problems involved in administrative action with the fullness and continuity that cooperative effort demands. Some at least of the present controversy with respect to the exercise of delegated powers would never have arisen in any serious form if the Congress had felt itself adequately consulted in the flow of daily operations and sufficiently informed. Let me illustrate by contrasting two recent experiences in legislative matters closely affecting the war.

The first, which typifies the executive-legislative relationship at its worst, is the history of the Free Movement bill, which proposes to empower the President to suspend for the duration of the war legislative restrictions on the free movement of property, persons, and information required for the effective prosecution of the war. It was intended to speed up the whole war effort and remove unnecessary delays, an obviously meritorious purpose. But the administration—or more exactly that portion of the administration interested in the passage of the bill—were not alive to its controversial aspects. The immigration laws, the customs laws, and the espionage laws have behind them long years of controversial history. The potentialities of political excitement were accentuated by the fact that the bill was introduced in the last days of the Seventy-seventh Congress, when many defeated Members were still sitting, and all were anxious to get home for a rest after an unusually long session. The stage was set for an explosion, and the explosion came.

Those in charge of the bill did not take the trouble to discuss it with the legislative leaders before causing it to be introduced. It was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, presumably on the ground that it involved the customs laws, although the members of the Immigration and Judiciary Committees would probably have been more familiar with the problems involved. The members of the Ways and Means Committee did not have the sense of participation in the proposed legislation which would have resulted from prior informal discussion or from carefully planned hearings. Had such discussion taken place, there is little doubt that the broad powers which the bill purported to confer on the President could have been so modified as to make it obvious that no fundamental changes were being requested; and the ensuing violent opposition to the bill might have been forestalled.

The basis of the attack was that the immigration restrictions were being opened wide. What would prevent the admission to this country, under the excuse of war necessity, of hundreds of thousands of immigrants beyond the quotas fixed by law? Abuse of executive power, undermining our institutions, government by executive orders—these charges raised such fury that it was then too late for the proponents of the bill to suggest, as they did, that they would readily agree to a clause providing that nothing in the bill should affect existing quotas.

It would be difficult to find a more striking example of failure of the legislative and executive branches to participate to a common end. Yet the result was unnecessary. The bill involved no genuinely controversial issues, or at least would not have involved them if the problem had been presented to Congress by the executive authorities in terms which afforded an adequate opportunity, prior to the public hearings, to achieve a cooperative solution of the actual problem at hand.

The legislative extension of the Lend-Lease Act by the new Congress, a measure of incalculable importance to the conduct of the war, presented a very different picture. In the 2 months before the bill was introduced detailed discussion was held with legislative leaders and the committee chairmen. Their judgment was obtained in advance on whether the extension should be for 1 year or a longer period, on the timing of the bill, and its relationship in time of the Lend-Lease Appropriation Act; and on various substantive features. Prior to this discussion seven public reports had been made to Congress on the operations under the act, and, shortly after the new Congress had convened, a special report was submitted covering the full program. A detailed and frank disclosure was made of the whole program during the hearings. The questions of committee members were answered directly and promptly. As a result they felt that they were—as indeed they were—participating in this unique and, in a sense, experimental legislation.

Some of the Republican members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee felt, for example, that lend-lease should be extended for 2 years rather than 1. The administration took the position that an extension for a year would suffice, that Congress should watch the operation, and, they felt confident, would extend it again if it proved satisfactory. How could the reaction of Congress be otherwise than sympathetic to such an approach? Another minority member of the committee proposed an amendment to the committee report, which was unanimously accepted, praising the Lend-Lease Administrator and his staff for the outstanding job which they had done in carrying on the lend-lease program. The vote in the House in favor of the bill was 407 to 6; in the Senate, 82 to 0—in spite of the fact that a few months before there was evidence that there might be bitter political opposition to the bill when introduced. When Congress knew the facts and understood the importance and success of the program, it acted promptly and sympathetically to approve and extend it. Incidentally, the country was educated, and the mistaken impression that we were depriving ourselves of needed goods without any quid pro quo quickly disappeared. The bill was signed by the President on the same day that it was passed by the Senate—the second anniversary of the passage of the original act.

The history of the bill shows what can be accomplished, even in moments of tension, by careful planning between the two branches, advance discussion, complete disclosure, adequate deference to the responsibility of Congress and hearings which are carefully prepared. The type of relationship typified by this experience should be attainable in many fields. Reliance by Congress on the great standing committees and responsive development by the Executive branch of the possibilities of cooperative effort should go a long way toward relieving the tension which has recently characterized the Washington scene. Substantive differences will, to be sure, remain. But the Government of the United States transcends any particular policies, and is not the property of a political group, whether the party in office or the opposition. What is of abiding importance to the conduct of the war is that the area of tension between the Congress and the Executive be reduced to minimal terms.

The Government's domestic war program is comparatively simple in outline. To attain maximum production of arms and essential products; to insure a wisely balanced distribution of manpower; to keep men at work by mechanisms which assure both management and labor a fair solution of their conflicting interests; to allocate scarce materials among the various needs—military and civilian, foreign and domestic—competing for consideration; to control prices, wages, and profits and thus, without inequity to any of the interested groups, hold off the terrible threat of inflation—these are the fundamental objectives that our Government or, for that matter, any government in time of total war must pursue. The complications inhere in the procedures designed to achieve the objectives and the obvious difficulties of executing policies so all-embracing in scope. To us total war is a new experience, requiring above all things an informed and serious public opinion. Those who undertake to guide public opinion owe a duty to recognize accomplishments as well as to point out mistakes.

The country has been turned to war production at a strikingly increasing pace. A magnificent army has been built up, splendidly trained, well-equipped. Our great Navy, with constant additions turned out far ahead of schedule, has shown what it can do in the Pacific without weakening the convoy of men and munitions to all parts of the world. Strikes have been held at a minimum. Public order has not been threatened, and civilian institutions have been maintained. While the cost of living has increased in this period of enormous expansion, unprecedented in the history of the world, the increase has not been dangerously extensive if we prove able to hold the line. These are the achievements of no single group—management, labor, government, and the people everywhere have pulled together. Certainly the results do not indicate that any sweeping criticism of government, which conceived and directed the program, is justified by the facts.

I am tempted, therefore, to think that we are in a transitional stage of the war. Immediately after Pearl Harbor politics were pigeon-holed (it was said for the duration), the President got everything he asked for, Congress and the States did not oppose but insisted on comprehensive executive action. But then the manpower pinch was not felt; food was plentiful; inflation had only begun to look over the horizon. Today we are in the middle period, the period of irritation, of revolt against the inevitable change in our standards of living, necessary if we are to win, of criticism leveled at every mistake, however inevitable.

The air is full of charges and countercharges, so that sometimes we wonder where the war is being waged. The third stage of the war has not yet begun. I mean the period when we shall have learned to accept the controls we have imposed on ourselves. It will take time to rectify our mistakes, to integrate the different programs, to have them understood and adopted. Such a unity has been achieved in England, but only after several years of experience of war. This is a larger country, younger and therefore with a shorter national tradition, with mixed bloods, greater in population as in territory. Yet what we have done in a year encourages the thought that the problems which seem so difficult now will prove soluble before very long, that the final great effort will find us united and determined, not only to win—that we are—but to forego the recriminations and the squabbles that sap our strength and consume our time.

Only when we have reached this final stage of concerted effort shall we fully perform our duties to our country and our cause. For as Woodrow Wilson reminded us, speaking on a May evening 25 years ago, we have two duties:

"The first duty is to win the war. The second duty, that goes hand in hand with it, is to win it greatly and worthily, showing the real quality of our power not only, but the real quality of our purpose and of ourselves."

Ruml: Who Is He?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, now that the House has passed the personal income tax bill, embodying as it does much of the proposal of Beardsley Ruml, it will be of interest to consider the training, background, and work of the man who first brought this proposal to the attention of the public. As a part of my remarks, I include an article appearing in the United States News of the issue of May 7, which is now on the newsstands. The article is as follows:

MAN BEHIND THE RUML PLAN: GOVERNMENT REFORM AS A HOBBY—SKIP-A-YEAR TAX IS JUST ONE PRODUCT OF PROLIFIC CREATOR OF IDEAS—AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT, SOCIAL SECURITY, LEND-LEASE INFLUENCED BY HIS THINKING

Beardsley Ruml, having turned Congress upside down with his skip-a-year tax plan, already is deep in new studies of post-war finance, economics and other things. For Mr. Ruml is not a one-idea man. He grinds out ideas as fast as an ungreased wheel generates heat. But the Ruml ideas are not so easy to trace back to their point of origin. They are to be found in the most unexpected corners of Washington.

In erudite and economic circles Mr. Ruml was well known in the capital long before the Republicans embraced his tax plan. He is a member of that little-seen group of thinkers whose work goes ahead irrespective of what party is in power in Washington. These thinkers use the wealth of vast research foundations to make studies and reports with which they try to mold the world into new shapes.

Their hand is felt in many ways. To varying degrees, sometimes vaguely and uncertainly, Mr. Ruml's name has been connected with the planning that went into the formulation of such New Deal programs as Agricultural Adjustment, Social Security, spend-lend and work relief, and into such phases of the war activity as lend-lease.

The extent to which Mr. Ruml's name fits into the legislative legend that has grown up around these and other measures to which it has been linked is not always clear, perhaps not even to Mr. Ruml himself. For he delights in conversation, likes to provoke discussion and good hot argument during which he tosses his ideas around with abandon. Any person who catches one of them is perfectly free to go out and use it as his own.

Mr. Ruml was busy spreading ideas even before the New Deal came to Washington. In the early '30s, when he was dean of social science and professor of education at the University of Chicago, Mr. Ruml was one of a three-man committee that worked out a domestic allotment plan that eventually landed in the Agricultural Adjustment Act. One of his coworkers was M. L. Wilson, then an obscure professor at the University of Montana. Mr. Ruml contributed his ideas to the plan and moved on. Mr. Wilson stayed with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration through its ups and downs in varying capacities.

The first Ruml activities in Washington began in the Hoover administration. Col. Arthur Woods, then chairman of the Spelman Fund, picked Mr. Ruml to serve on the President's Committee for Unemployment Relief in 1931. They were hunting desperately for ways to put millions of unemployed to work. The first operation was begun with money supplied by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. By gradual degrees and changing titles, the agency evolved finally into the New Deal's Work Projects Administration. Mr. Ruml was in and out of Washington, taking an interest in the evolutionary processes, dropping ideas into New Deal minds, all through these years. Some of his ideas were put into practice. How many, no one can say.

His own contact with Colonel Woods had been formed in the earlier stages of his career. Mr. Ruml, after studying at Dartmouth, had taken his degree as Ph. D. at the University of Chicago. That was in 1917, when he was 23. Five years later, at 28, Mr. Ruml had become director of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund, and, as such, took a deep interest in social-science studies.

It and kindred agencies put money into all sorts of economic and social research projects, into studies of governmental administration and public management. Usually the work is done without fanfare. Funds are supplied to finance the development of an idea, or a research project. An organization, or a committee, or a board is created. And a new band of thinkers goes to work. Upward of a dozen such agencies are housed in one building in Chicago.

When the New Deal came in, with a wish to apply social thinking to government, these big, private, nonpartisan agencies were natural sources of information. Mr. Ruml, after serving as dean of social science at the University of Chicago, later went to R. H. Macy & Co., in New York, as its treasurer. He continued to do all sorts of unpublicized jobs for the administration. On occasion, he visited the White House, but he never was an intimate there. He was not a member of the committee that worked out plans for the Social Security Act. But he helped to pick the men who did work it out.

The spend-lend program was straight down his line of thinking. He was one of the foremost advocates of deficit spending. One of the clearest outlines of his views is:

"The financial transaction of disbursing $1,000,000 in Work Projects Administration wages will produce national income in excess of $1,000,000 in the course of a year, since the money paid out will be respent by those who received it and by those who receive it from them. So, also the disbursing of $1,000,000 for the salaries of Government employees or for public works will produce income per annum in excess of the amount of the initial financial transaction."

Just beyond this point, Mr. Ruml takes off into the linguistic stratosphere in which economists and scientists breathe and live, but where ordinary persons suffocate. He tells his story in mathematical formulae with coefficients and effects, x's and y's, and winds up with the conclusion that 37 minus 33 equals 4. Friends say it is typical of Mr. Ruml, even if somewhat abstruse.

The Ruml connection with the lend-lease plan is tenuous and uncertain. But as far back as 1932, he set up a commission of inquiry to study a national policy of international economic relations. He took a personal interest in the work, was a member of the commission. Working with him was his old friend, Robert M. Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago. Another member was Isaiah Bowman of Johns Hopkins, the geographer who helped work out the international boundaries of the Versailles Treaty and is busy with post-war planning for President Roosevelt.

The commission's report did not jar the earth. But Mr. Ruml personally came up with the conclusion that the United States should begin laying up huge stock piles of tin and rubber. That was in the early thirties even before Japan had begun to move in China. Few persons saw anything wrong with America's tin and rubber supply. Mr. Ruml got mostly smiles.

The broadening scope of his interests reached into various sectors of the international field. The work of the Rockefeller Foundations not only was national but international. When Nelson Rockefeller came to Washington as coordinator of inter-American affairs, he asked Mr. Ruml to serve as an adviser, another of the part-time, unpaid jobs that the Macy treasurer was collecting.

By this time, Mr. Ruml was planting ideas all over the country. He was an adviser to the State Department's Division of Cultural Relations, trustee for at least three private agencies, member of three fraternities, two clubs, director of at least one economic research agency, member of one private planning association, and an adviser to the National Resources Planning Board.

The National Resources Planning Board renewed an old association with Charles Edward Merriam, with whom Mr. Ruml had studied and worked at the University of Chicago. One summer in Europe, with Louis Brownlow, now director of the Public Administration Clearing House and a White House adviser, and Mr. Merriam, Mr. Ruml had helped to work out the final plans from which grew the Council of State Governments and a group of collateral agencies on public administration, welfare, works, planning, taxes, and housing. They drew part of their support from Rockefeller funds.

Owen D. Young resigned as a New York director of the Federal Reserve Board and Mr. Ruml stepped into that place. Marriner Eccles, Governor of the Federal Reserve, moved him into the unpaid job of chairman of the New York bank later. Through their work on the board developed the Ruml friendship with Randolph Paul, now counsel for the Treasury.

Mr. Paul was the first man to get a glimpse of the Ruml tax plan. Mr. Ruml took it to the Treasury. Mr. Paul and the experts studied it and rejected it. At their suggestion, he took it to the Senate Finance Committee. Congress has been chewing it over ever since. It became one of the few Ruml ideas that ever took the parental name. Even that was not deliberate. The brainchild simply wandered home to its father's doorstep. Perhaps no one was more surprised than Mr. Ruml when the idea he had turned out for the administration was twisted into a Republican weapon.

But this did not impair his friendships in governmental quarters, though it might well have. He and Mr. Paul still are on as good terms as ever. Mr. Eccles and his fellow Reserve Board workers have the same high regard for him, even though the Federal Reserve does not like its officials to lose their personal anonymity and sponsor ideas as individuals. They like the ideas to go into the common pool. But Mr. Ruml's good-natured frankness prevented misunderstanding. He simply went ahead grinding out other plans.

One of his fresh ideas calls for an assurance of Government spending to take up the sag in employment after the war. He figures that business and Government must cooperate to that end. But this is only one of the things that claim his attention. Mr. Ruml has plenty of other ideas.

Antitrust Policy During the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Tom C. Clark, Assistant Attorney General of the United States, before the American Business Congress, New York City, Thursday, April 22, 1943:

I am indebted to the American Business Congress and the Columbia Broadcasting System for this opportunity to bring to you a short picture of the activities and policies of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

Antitrust too has gone to war. It has gone to war to preserve free enterprise—the freedom of choice for which our soldiers and sailors are dying. It has gone to war to see to it, through our prosecution of war frauds, that our men get the best equipment in the world when they meet our enemy on the battle lines. It has gone to war to see that Uncle Sam is not cheated by war chiselers. It has gone to war to help enforce the domestic war economy of priorities, rationing, and allocation.

Most of the time of the Antitrust Division is now devoted to war prosecutions. These include war frauds and the prosecution of criminal offenses involving rationing, price ceilings, food and agricultural allocations, and priorities. American business by and large is honest, but there are a small number of predatory men who put their profits above their patriotism. They would steal from Uncle Sam either by delivering bad material, overcharging, or by using some other trick to secure an additional dollar. While we call these offenses war frauds, in time of war they are little short of treason. We are ferreting out such offenders as quickly as possible, and I am glad to report that quite a number have been caught. To date millions of dollars have been paid back into the Treasury and many more millions have been saved the Government by reason of these prosecutions. Rigid, uncompromising enforcement of war frauds will continue.

But tonight we are going to talk of antitrust enforcement and what it means to you and me in our everyday life.

America was late in starting production of materials for war, and the start was hindered by old business practices: Collusive control of markets and production; the long ruinous breaking down of productivity to keep those controls tight; trade practice techniques to protect the old and established and to exclude the new; patent pools; domestic monopolies; international cartels—the whole dangerous collection of tools monopoly had machined.

These dangers were not new. My predecessor as head of the antitrust division, Judge Thurman Arnold, saw them clearly. He performed a signal service to the Nation in warning against them and taking it upon himself officially to do something about it. I am keenly aware that in succeeding him I am stepping into a pair of man-sized shoes; and I know that there are many individuals in this country who can recall getting quite a kick out of them.

This does not mean that American industry is in for an indiscriminate kicking around. Today when the bulk of our big industry has gone over to production for war, the responsibility of the administrator of this Nation's antitrust laws is, as I see it, somewhat comparable to the job I had in the last war, that of a top sergeant of Infantry. American business is now wearing the uniform. My job is not to interfere but to help see to it that these industrial soldiers keep in step, follow the rules laid down by the laws of the United States, and try to kill off the enemy, not each other. As the big ones grow bigger on war production, we must see to it, as we say in my part of the country, that they do not get too big for their britches; and at the same time we must protect the small industrial soldiers so that they do not find themselves without any britches at all.

The American people and the enlightened leaders of American business hope that we shall be able to preserve in our country the principle of free enterprise. But this does not mean the freedom of the old, the established, the entrenched, to gang upon the new, the small, the unprotected. It does not mean the freedom of dollars to blackjack brains. It does not mean freedom to abduct knowledge, to deprive the American people of the fruits of their greatest human resource, inventive genius. It does not mean freedom to conspire through cartels or otherwise with gangster nations preparing for aggression against us, or to create, privately, a gangster economy threatening depression and poverty for our people.

It does mean freedom of opportunity for all people to engage in legitimate business on an equal footing, with special privileges to none. It does mean freedom of American dollars to buy the most for their American owners.

The protection of this freedom is our obligation to America. Particularly is this true now, for in the race to get the tools of war made quickly there has been a tendency to leave our war production to the large corporations. It has already resulted in bigger and bigger big business, and a steadily rising rate of fatality for small business. With the cooperation of the War Production Board, we are trying to alleviate that condition.

To continue such practices there can be but one result—the death of small business—and along with it the death of free competitive enterprise in American life.

Recently Congress was told that at the beginning of our war program 175,000 companies were providing 70 percent of the Nation's manufacturing output and 100 corporations were producing 30 percent. Today, 2½ years later, this ratio has been reversed; now 100 corporations hold 70 percent of the war and essential civilian contracts, while 175,000 small companies hold 30 percent. To those 100 corporations has gone the great bulk of the $14,000,000,000 worth of new plants built at Government expense. Some of these corporations demanded and secured the right after the war to buy and control these new facilities constructed at Government expense. These figures tell the tragic tale of the fate of small business resulting from the false notion that only the big can produce efficiently.

What does the record of monopoly show? I need not labor the point, but I call your attention to the monumental junk heaps of aluminum pots and pans commandeered from the housewives of America; the piles of scrap rubber and old iron now scarring the public squares of our cities; the pleas of our armed forces for binoculars; the enormous difficulties we have experienced in the production of magnesium, electrical equipment, plastics, machine tools, critical chemicals, and vital medicines—all memorials to the role monopoly has played in this war.

Try today to make an electric lamp, a glass bottle, an aluminum pot, a pair of spectacles, synthetic rubber, vitamin products. Try to make any of these things without first receiving permission from a private group which has usurped power over industry. Try even to get that permission. Try to produce and sell these goods competitively. Try to reduce prices, install improvements. You will either bend to the will of these industrial giants, or be broken.

After the war the enormous industrial plants created for war purposes must be converted to peacetime production. The danger America faces is that these plants will not be in competition and that general access to raw materials and markets upon which depends the peace and prosperity of the peoples of the world will be controlled by a small group which will set up its own trade barriers by private agreements—commonly known as cartels. We must not permit the reestablishment of the cartel system. It is the purpose of antitrust to prevent such a move and do it now.

This exceptional danger, however, goes side by side with an exceptional opportunity. Our war plants will in peacetime be capable of showering us with bounty beyond any previous human experience. In the monopolistic industries where scarcity has been planned for and capitalized, we shall emerge from the war with no scarcity of productive equipment. Some of our more tightly held monopolies of patents and know-how are being broken as information is diffused to meet war needs. New industries based upon plastics, light metals, plywood, cargo transportation by air, and similar innovations are in preparation. If we can prevent the suppression of these new products after the war, keep production uncontrolled, and the new industries competitive, restraints of trade will become impossible for the older industries which will be obliged to compete with the new. The battle of competition must be won upon this new industrial frontier.

The stakes of this struggle are enormous both in prosperity and in freedom. If the Nation's new plants and knowledge are fully used after the war, our standard of living may well be half again higher than ever before in our history. Furthermore, our productive strength will permit us to contribute to the establishment of a sound peace by helping in the relief and reconstruction of distressed peoples. But if monopolies succeed in restricting the full use of our productive resources, our domestic life will be beset by unemployment and a falling standard of living, and we shall have no surplus of goods or of energy to spend upon reestablishing the peace of the world. By preserving competition and small business, we shall safeguard the common man's opportunity to be independent and to try new ideas. If we allow competition to be superseded by great enterprises which divide the domestic and world markets among themselves, we shall have succumbed to a business feudalism which will not long tolerate the existence of a vital political democracy.

The spirit of the antitrust laws is thus intimately linked with the values which the free peoples of the world are fighting to preserve.

Enforcement of the antitrust laws is no short cut to utopia. I cannot predict that we shall solve all of our problems by preserving free enterprise, but I do say free enterprise can only be saved by preserving small business now. To this end antitrust maintains its Small Business Unit. To date it has assisted thousands of small businessmen in solving their problems.

American business, large and small, has nothing to fear so long as it plays the game fairly, according to the rules but those who get offside must be prepared to pay the penalty. Speaking for the Attorney General of the United States, Francis Biddle, I can assure you there will be no witch hunting, no uprooting of American customs or traditions; but there will be practical, swift, hard-hitting law enforcement. If you think the antitrust laws are dead, just ask some of the New York department stores. They recently made an attempt to use their combined economic

power against a New York newspaper. They tried to control advertising rates. If they had succeeded in this attempt, if the Anti-trust Division had not taken action, the way would have been open for any group with enough power to try to control editorial policy and the character of the news. Not even the department stores themselves were aware of the implications of their act. To tolerate any such misuse of economic power is to jeopardize not only free private enterprise, but the whole range of our cherished rights.

I have just hit the high spots. The job is ours together. We want to counsel with you about it. With the firm backing of the American people the battle for a free world will be won, and along with it can go the victory for free industry.

Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. McKENZIE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by the Honorable Eugene L. Poirot, a real dirt farmer, of Golden City, Mo. I think he ably explains the place the Farm Security Administration has in our wartime economy:

The Farm Security Administration, thought of primarily as a relief organization by some people for a certain group of farmers, is not a money waster but a money maker for the Nation, and is a pleasant shock absorber for some of the impacts of war. More than $185,500,000 in actual, appraisable, food producing, net capital has been added to the national economy directly by its supervision of one-half million farm families who were broke and unproductive a few years ago. This $185,500,000 is not gold or Government bonds; it is dairy cows, beef, chickens, hogs, sheep, and farm equipment. It and the products resulting from its use are those things that people eat and wear. All the money and all the power of Government could not bring into being one of those animals even 1 day sooner than nature has decreed. This is important at a time when we need more food production at once, because it takes a year of care to make a calf and it takes another two years before this calf will be giving milk as a cow. The important fact is, however, that they are here now when we need them badly. They were made out of the inorganic dirt of American fields by very poor farmers and their families under the supervision and with the credit extended by the Farm Security Administration.

Were it not for the Farm Security Administration, families who represent only 7.6 percent of all the farmers, last year's increase in milk production would have been 36 percent short, last year's increase in pork production would have been short by 9 percent, last year's increase in eggs, chickens, and peanuts would have been short by 10 percent, and last year's increase in beef production would have been short by 7 percent. These should be significant items in the national economy of a food-rationed people who probably for the first time in their lives realize that all the money they have cannot buy food unless someone has first produced it out of the dirt that lies soft and mellow in American fields awaiting the seed and the rain and the skill of American farmers.

To talk about the economy of saving dollars by abolishing an agency that makes this kind of contribution to food production, while the fires of war consume the treasures of liberty that man has lived a thousand years to create, is a dangerous pastime. This pastime can only be indulged in by those who, still well fed, live in the illusion that a nation is only strong if its budget is balanced and it has most of the world's gold buried in its bosom. Their awakening would perhaps come with the burning timbers of liberty's structure falling in a tangled mass about them, but that would again be too late. It is the realist who has long recognized that the strength of a nation runs parallel to the diligence with which it maintains its agriculture and the welfare of its people.

The Farm Security Administration should not need to be justified on the basis of its dollar and cents return. Its value in placing a sound economic and social base under that class of low-income, inefficient, underproducing farmers of which there are more than 3,000,000 out of a total of 6,000,000 farmers should cause the public to demand an extension of its duties and services to serve many more than the one-half million it now serves, so as to insure an even greater supply of food than is now being produced. However, it is perhaps significant to the economy minded taxpayers that the Farm Security Administration borrowers who applied for credit that in the past had been denied them from regular channels, both private and public, have already paid back to the Federal Government 90 percent of the principal of their loans that have become due. It is significant that in my State Farm Security Administration has loaned, as of December 31, 1942, $27,345,668, of which $15,071,288 principal has matured. Total collections, interest, and principal, are $16,044,363. Other States will have similar records. It should also be significant to your chamber of commerce and the business interests it represents that these half million farm families have already increased their net worth by 43 percent which is reflected in added purchasing power through the Nation and will be increased in greater proportion after the war. Remember, the families were broke. Many of them were sick. Many of them had large families and they were underemployed, underproductive, and undernourished. They were either on, or at the door, of direct relief. Their minds and the minds of their children were ready to absorb any of the political "isms" that anyone wanted to talk about. The only "ism" they were questioning was the American "ism" with which they thought they had become familiar. Because of the large families, this group is contributing many sons to protect our Americanism. Many Farm Security Administration families have from three to five members in the service and are proud of it.

These families and the farms they operate are now going units of production, self-supporting and grateful for the chance they have had. They have increased not only their net worth 43 percent but also their cash income by 70 percent. They have increased their net family income by 80 percent. They have increased their production for home use by 101 percent. In 1942 they produced and processed on the average for home use 297 quarts of fruits and vegetables, 428 pounds of meat, and 472 gallons of milk with which to feed their families each year. This is an increase of 114 percent over that which they had before, and it is a direct result of the work of the Farm Security Administration; because they insist that a family must first be able to live at home on the foods grown and processed and of the kinds that will make strong bodies and healthy men and women. Significant at this time is the additional fact that this increased degree of self-sufficiency adds that much more in processed food to the general food supply than would have otherwise been available.

I could go on with a string of tables and figures, but since they are available at almost any county Farm Security Administration office and, in any case in the State office, I will not try to cover all of them here.

I am just an American farmer, the son of a Frenchman who loved the American soil and adopted it as his native land. I love it too, because it has been good to me and to the Nation of my birth. I would have the feeling that I had failed my children and my America if I did not, in my small way, refer to some of the signs that point to a national decay that begins at the grass roots of American fields.

It is dangerous to exploit our American soils because food comes from there. We have already passed the point of diminishing returns in crop yields for much of our soil. The trained minds of skilled and observing men are piling up facts relating to animal and human nutritional diseases that have their beginning in lowering mineral level of our soil. Though we are for the time being producing more, we will have less soil minerals to draw from the next time.

Significantly supporting this thought, according to the 1940 census, is the fact that out of more than 6,000,000 farmers, 3,421,000 or 64 percent live on land that gives them an annual income of less than $800 per year. This is a very small part of the national agricultural income, from a very large part of the land. It suggests an exploitation of land and people that Americans some day may not be able to pay in dollars, but will be paying in terms of the health and lives of their children. Are we perhaps starting to pay now with food rationing?

I do not believe anyone who understands agricultural production, and who is familiar with the degeneration of our soils and accompanying human distress, would be willing to allow its continuation, and allow the agriculture it now supports to drift down the channel of bare economic survival, until in the end it arrives at the level at which it becomes a public burden. Would it not be far better if Farm Security Administration which has proven its capacity to take the lowest of this group and make substantial producers out of them would be permitted to extend its functions to include many more of them?

I do not mean to leave the impression that we can hope to get enough production out of these low-income farmers and their farms to supply the food production we need now. That job, in i staggering immensity, must be done by all farmers and not just the remaining 36 percent who have been carrying the major part of the production load, and who unfortunately have been placed under almost unsurmountable handicaps in the loss of labor and machinery. The fact remains, however, that we are not in a position to take chances with so vital a thing as food production, so that we can toy with the idea of cutting down Federal expenditures that will interfere with it. This group of 3,421,000 farmers is a lot of people and the increase from each of them would count up as a significant total. If estimates are at all accurate, this group loses 200,000,000 man-days labor per year. If this lost manpower were properly applied and directed on good land, it could produce annually 18,000,000 tons of pork, or 4,000,000,000 gallons of milk, or 360,000,000 dozens of eggs.

There is no agency in the field with either the authority or the experience that could attempt to do this, other than the Farm Security Administration. It is, however,

limited in measure by available funds and personnel. Your chamber of commerce and the various other chambers of commerce could give Farm Security Administration support that would pay dividends in terms of food now, and increase wealth and stability after the war resulting from the utilization of this wasted manpower and improperly used land.

Some day the war will end and our men who have fought well will return. Many of them who have been farmers will want to return to a farm somewhere. Many, who because of their injuries will be unable to find their place in industry. Many of these would perhaps find comfort and happiness on a small farm somewhere, and, with the guidance and credit available through the Farm Security Administration, could with their families make a living.

In appraising the value of an agency we often forget some of those intangible things that we cannot put down in dollars and cents. The things that keep a man fighting after he is licked. I have known farmers, who with a leaky roof over their heads, and a broken floor under their feet, would, in one last gesture of hope for a crop, scoop into the balance all that they possessed, along with a year of their life—well seasoned with the suffering of their threadbare, undernourished family—and then wait for a year to see if they had won or lost. The bitter resentment that must come to a man who in desperation has tried so hard and lost, breeds immeasurable hatred of something or someone that he may believe has caused it all. If the facts could be tabulated we would probably find that the Farm Security Administration has to its eternal credit the prevention of this in many of its 500,000 families.

Many of us had better investigate those things we oppose. In my opinion the Farm Security Administration has justified its existence in a national economy by creating through its supervision more than $185,500,000 in new usable agricultural wealth. If this amount with the productive capacity it represents were to be credited to its administrative costs, they would appear small. It further justifies its existence in being in a position to further increase the production of food and war crops so badly needed. It has shown that through its supervision, that low-income farmers can become good credit risks, and that they may again represent significant buying power for the products of industry. The morale it builds is not measurable but it is perhaps of the kind that makes American soldiers the best in the world. It is in a position to be of important service to these soldiers when they return from the battlefields of the world to try again to find the peace and comfort in a land that is their home.

Dr. F. F. Brown and the Faith of Our Fathers Living Still

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, we are a people whose God is the Lord. In this hour of trial, when the hearts of men are being "sifted out before the judgment seat," our people are turning more and more to the "faith of our fathers living still." This is true at home. And from the battle front where death rides on every breeze there comes the heartening, inspiring message that our boys from the Christian homes of this land have not forgotten the prayers they learned at their mothers' knees. By a power that is higher and mightier than any on this earth they are being sustained and strengthened as they battle for home, loved ones and the liberty born of the Christian religion.

From foundation stone to dome in the house of our existence the essence of American freedom is the sanctity, the divinity of the human personality. Man, into whose nostrils the Creator breathed the breath of life, and in whose sacred body there dwells a living soul, was not made to be a slave. "Know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

This we know, the best people in this land are in the church. My city of Knoxville is a city of churches and churchgoers. Every Christian denomination is represented among them.

One of the great churches in our midst is the First Baptist. For 22 years its beloved pastor, Dr. Fred F. Brown, has gone in and out among our people in a ministry of mercy, devotion, and sacrifice, doing good and earning golden opinions of all men.

On Sunday, May 2, the church celebrated the twenty-second anniversary of his ministry. The following tributes were paid him:

The cumulative value and blessing of the 22 years of Dr. Brown's ministry with us, filled with loving service in the name of the Master, cannot be measured in words or approached in thought. We can only say "Thank you," and pray God's blessing on him as he continues to lead us in His name throughout the unmeasured future. (The board of deacons.)

I am glad for this opportunity to express my thanks and admiration for Dr. Fred Brown. His ability, coupled with his gentle Christian spirit, has made him one of the foremost Christian and civic leaders of our city, State, and southland. Congratulations to Doctor Brown and the First Baptist Church upon their twenty-second anniversary. (Rev. T. C. Wyatt, moderator, Knox County Association of Baptists.)

For 14 years I have known Dr. F. F. Brown. He is a Christian gentleman, a good minister, courteous, sympathetic, and considerate of the rights of others. His contribution to the religious life of Knoxville is inestimable. (Rev. H. K. Williams, president, Knoxville Baptist Pastors' Conference.)

"We are workers together with God," said Paul to his faithful companions in the Gospel. For 22 years we have worked together with our good friend and fellow minister, Dr. F. F. Brown, for the salvation of the people and for a better Knoxville. We have shared many burdens and responsibilities together in the name of Christ. We have loved him and found him a real Christian friend. We pray our Heavenly Father's richest blessings upon him. (Rev. George J. Creswell, president, Knoxville Ministers Association.)

May I, with others, express my appreciation of the contribution made to the city of Knoxville by Dr. Fred Brown through the past 22 years? While I have only been in the city a comparatively short time, I have been here long enough to know that he is a great influence for good and that his ministry will have lasting results. With cordial greetings and best wishes to Dr. Brown and the First Baptist Church. (Dr. J. A. Bays, pastor, Church Street Methodist Church.)

My sincere congratulations to First Baptist Church and Dr. Fred F. Brown upon this the twenty-second anniversary of his ministry with you. It has been a marvelous ministry. His presence is a benediction upon the entire community and increasingly so each year. Every member of First Christian Church joins me in sincere gratitude for the life and ministry of Dr. Brown. Personally I love him deeply. (Dr. Harry Cooke, pastor, First Christian Church.)

Twenty-two years of Christian ministry in this city is an enviable record, but to have served it with such distinction as Dr. Brown has done calls forth spontaneous felicitations from all his fellow Christians in Knoxville. The demands on the Christian pastor are varied and innumerable and never ending. He must be the fountainhead of comfort with those who have been struck hard blows by life; he must keep sweet and replenish his own expanding faith, for his people look inexorably to him for growth in the Christian life; he must dream dreams and see constant visions of how he can lead his congregation ever onward to fulfill the place the church in the modern world must adventurously strive toward; he must in his sermons write what is the equivalent of three books a year; and he must move among his people with that morning face that lures them into the fellowship in harmony, unity, and devotion. All this Dr. Brown has conspicuously achieved during his fruitful pastorship in our midst. Whether it be presiding over a congregation of tremendous size, or building a costly and modern church building, or exerting a community leadership, or shepherding his flock with a rare winsome gentleness—all this he does ably, humbly, and effectively We can all pray devoutly that he may be spared for other score years of blessing and of good. (The Reverend Richard R. Beasley, rector, St. John's Episcopal Church.)

For 22 years Dr. Brown has been one of Knoxville's most outstanding ministers. He is beloved not only by the members of his church but by the citizens of the entire State according to my observation. His ability as a preacher, his deep spiritual nature, and his fine and engaging personality readily impress people of all classes. His fine influence over the students of the University of Tennessee and his deep interest in all educational affairs, together with his support of all of those enterprises that go to make a better community, make him a most valuable citizen of Knoxville and of the State of Tennessee.

Both personally and officially I am deeply devoted to Dr. Brown, and I rejoice with the congregation of the First Baptist Church at this time of the celebration of the twenty-second anniversary of his ministry to the First Baptist Church of Knoxville. My prayer is that a gracious Providence will spare him for many years to come, and that we shall have him with us through those years in continuation of his fine services here.

May God bless him and the church and the community that he serves so admirably. (Dr. James D. Hoskins, president of the University of Tennessee.)

For 15 years now, Dr. Brown and I have been closely associated in various activities incident to the religious and philanthropic life of Knoxville. We have become intimate friends. I want to offer my congratulations and every good wish both for him and his people on this occasion of his twenty-second anniversary. (Dr. Clifford E. Barbour, pastor, Second Presbyterian Church.)

In these 22 years Dr. Brown has become more than pastor of First Baptist Church. Great Christian, scholarly preacher, able counselor, Christian statesman, tactful leader of men, he has been lifted by the love and admiration of his fellow men to the position of minister to all the people. As dean of the ministry in our city he is especially held in high esteem by his fellow ministers.

We congratulate pastor and people on this happy occasion and pray that God may continue to bestow upon you all the riches of His

grace. (Dr. Emmett B. McGukin, pastor, First Presbyterian Church.)

I am very glad of the opportunity of joining with hosts of friends and admirers in offering my sincere congratulations and expressions of esteem upon the occasion of the twenty-second anniversary of the pastorate of Dr. F. F. Brown at the First Baptist Church.

His labors of love with which his name has been connected for so many years have made him honored and beloved by countless numbers. Such a reward is beyond price.

Through the coming years may he enjoy the blessings of health and peace in abundance. (Dr. J. Homer Slutz, pastor, First Methodist Church.)

And characteristic of the man is his anniversary message:

For the twenty-second time I am sending a brief anniversary message to the congregation of the First Baptist Church. I would make the same appeal to you today that breathes through the messages which I have tried to write before—an appeal for thanksgiving and gratitude to God for His marvelous blessings upon us. Truly, "The Lord hath done great things for us; whereof we are glad."

Our hearts are very tender as we think today of the number from our congregation whom the Father has called into the spirit world since our last anniversary. Their spirits seem to hover near and call us to complete consecration of our lives and our all to our Saviour, our Lord, and Master. In His name we face the work committed to us here at the First Baptist Church and under His guidance, in His strength, we move on in His service.

In all probability the days immediately ahead of us will hold more searching experiences than any similar period of our lives. Facing these experiences we ask: "Who is sufficient for these things?" As we search our hearts for an answer to the pointed question, we find the answer: "Our sufficiency is of God." Calmly, trustfully, confidently, gratefully, we say: "Our sufficiency is of God."

Let this be a day of dedication for all of us. Looking into the face of our Lord let us say with another:

"With beating hearts and outstretched hands,
And waiting feet Thy servant stands—
Call Thou early, call Thou late,
To Thy great service dedicate."

Mrs. Brown joins me in sending love to those of you who are unable to be present for the church services today—those of you who are kept at home by illness—the larger group of young men and women scattered over the world with the armed forces of our country.

For 22 years you have surrounded me and mine with your rich love, your sincere prayers, and your unfailing loyalty. Thinking of you all I say from the depth of my spirit: "I thank my God upon every remembrance of you."

God bless you everyone!

Your pastor,

F. F. BROWN.

Keep the Old Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert the following editorial published in The Emporia (Kans.) Gazette under date of April 13, 1943:

KEEP THE OLD FAITH

This country is facing a serious danger in its educational system. The college world has been called upon to aid in the training in technical and scientific fields through a year-around, speeded-up program of studies. Which is all right. The Nation, in this struggle, needs every ounce of energy and every measure of wisdom to contribute specialized services in medicine, engineering, dentistry, chemistry, physics, and in the crucial need for additional teachers to hurry up the total war effort. So far so good.

But colleges still should remain colleges and not military, naval, and technological training schools. We should give all the college war-training that we can. But we should not forget that cultural colleges, after all, are the arsenals of democracy in the sense that they prepare, cherish, and expound the faith upon which democracy is founded, the guiding faith which makes or breaks a nation. It was not said idly that "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." That was one of the most profound sentences in the philosophy of Christianity. Upon it is founded our system of public education.

And the emphasis should be on the word "know." "Ye shall know the truth." Facts are not the truth. Technical training is not the truth. The truth can be found only in the wide horizon, the high vision, the noble purpose that comes from men and women who study the contemplative sciences, who know the humanities, the great literatures, the great organizers of learning, the great philosophies. Only as this country is able to keep alive the fires of culture will our democracy be saved.

This is written merely to emphasize agreement with a report recently issued by the National College Work Council which stood sturdily behind the entire war effort as it touched the work of American colleges.

The report of this council believes that the National Youth Administration should be used to promote college war-training and also to give a wider field wherein young men and women, any young man or woman aspiring to a college education, who can pass the necessary intelligence test, may have a chance. The College Work Council would eliminate the upper age limit of 25 as a factor to employment on college war-training and work programs desiring a college education and fitted to take it in the case of any person who has served in the armed forces.

The council recommends war-training and work programs shall be established to operate on a 12-month basis and any student would be eligible to National Youth Administration training who, in the opinion of appropriate college authorities, based upon high-school records in the case of entering freshmen, give promise of superior performance in college training. Advanced freshmen, sophomore, junior, senior, and graduate students who have established satisfactory standing in their scholastic work at any institution, according to this report of the National College Work Council, should be eligible for consideration to participate in the National Youth Administration program.

This country cannot let colleges devote their entire time, either during the war or after, to material things, and the National Youth Administration program which has done so much real work in the last 10 years to promote college education, should be available during the war and after the war. For it is one of the real agencies of this administration whose record is absolutely spotless.

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over Station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on May 1, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, this program is offered to you every week for the purpose of giving you some idea of the activities of your Congressman or, as I prefer to have you call me, your hired man in Washington. It has been my hope that you would let your wishes and desires be known to me while I am working for your interests in the National Capital. I have not been disappointed in realizing that hope.

I have tried to present to you, ever since I have used this fine radio station for a medium, as accurate a picture as possible of my views and outlook on the great issues now at stake on the ever-changing national and international scenes and on the general conduct of the war as it affects each and every one of us. As your representative I have insisted upon making my own decisions and casting my own votes without responding to pressure groups or to powerful individuals. I have, however, withheld judgment on these issues until I consulted with you folks back home, although I feel that independent action on the part of any lawmaking body and its members is necessary for the preservation of our form of government. I likewise believe in the wisdom of obtaining an intelligent report of the true feelings of the majority of you people who hired me before I make important decisions.

As the result of these pleasant talks with you every Saturday evening, I am able to do a better job for you people, my boss. My mail never fails to bring many letters from those who listen regularly to these broadcasts and who I am glad, have taken me up on my offers of assistance with their problems. Those among you will vouch that I have answered your letters quickly and always respond willingly if there is any possibility of complying with your requests. Very often, I will say, there is.

I never fail to welcome the opportunity of being of service to you wives, mothers, fathers, and little children of our boys in service. Who deserves more thoughtful consideration? Who needs more real encouragement? No one in the whole war effort. Nothing is too good for your boys. Nothing is too good for you.

Therefore I urge you to write me, particularly those of you who are new in my district. There are thousands of new faces in our area, due to the influx of war workers. New homes bring about new problems. Be sure to get in touch with your Congressman if you feel I can assist you with these problems. Always bear in mind that those in authority in your Government are your servants, not your masters. At this juncture I wish to thank the able management of station WNBF for making available the time for my weekly programs.

Last week, you will recall, I introduced two bills in Congress. One of these provided for

doubling allotments for children of servicemen. The other bill called for placing dependent mothers and fathers of servicemen on the same basis as wives. I pointed out the tremendous need there is going to be for the children as more and more daddies are drafted. I believe it is absolutely impossible to support any child on $10 a month. I call for $24 a month for the first child and $20 for each of the others. How enthusiastic, I ask you, is any father going to be to fight, if he leaves for the front worrying about his family? Nothing will make him more resentful than to think Uncle Sam would neglect his loved ones

Well, Uncle Sam won't neglect the soldier's loved ones if Congress passes the Hall bill to double children's allotments. We cannot have little ones going hungry in America. They shall not go hungry if I can help it. They must be cared for. Many have asked me, why not increase dependency allotments for servicemen's wives also? My answer is that I would like to do this but I feel the greatest need is to the little children. The wives can almost always obtain ready employment. They can take care of themselves. If they deserve an increase, it will come.

But the children present a different picture. They cannot survive on the money they now receive. Nor can the old people. I know many parents who previously depended upon their sons, now departed for the fighting fronts. Now they are destitute on a maximum of $37 each from their allotment. You folks who are Townsendites will realize how little that is. I say to you that dependent parents should receive the same consideration as wives. My other bill takes care of this.

During the 1942 campaign, I promised that if I were reelected to Congress, I would push for the allotment increases I am asking tonight. I pledged to you people I would ask my colleagues in the House to study the whole dependency allotment question. To me, a campaign promise is sacred. To me it is not something to shout about before an election, to garner votes. A campaign promise should be kept just like any other promise. A candidate's word before the votes are cast should be as good as his bond.

At that time, however, many were doubtful about the necessity of allotment increases. Furthermore, they did not believe they would ever need an allotment. Now the whole picture has changed. Everybody is thinking about allotments for wives, children, and parents. They are going to think a lot harder if they do not get sufficent amounts to take care of their loved ones.

Let me read to you part of a speech I made to Congress on this subject of allotments last week. I quote:

"Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to announce that I have introduced a bill which will double the allotments of servicemen's children from $12 to $24 per month for the first child of a veteran, and for the second child and each remaining child of servicemen from $10 to $20 a month.

"I am acting for this reason. Unless some action is taken before very long, while married men are being drafted, you will see the children they have left behind them subsisting on inadequate money and unable to be fed properly on the $10 a month they now receive.

"I hope the House will give serious consideration to proposals of this kind. I ask that a great deal of study be given by the Committee on Military Affairs to this question. It is all very well to let the soldier's wife go along with $50 a month because she is able to supplement her income by getting a defense job or something of that kind. However, it is not physically possible for a little child to live on the $10 or $12 a month that is allotted to him at present."

At this time I want to reiterate what I have said in many speeches over this station. If you want me to obtain your allotment money for you, be sure to get in touch with me in the House Office Building in Washington. Perhaps your husband or son has made application for allotment to you but this has been held up for some unknown reason. Call on me because I have excellent contacts with the War Department and I can obtain immediate results for you.

Then, perhaps, you have been hesitant about making inquiry because you did not know where to go or what agency to contact. Again I say to you, get in touch with me and I will help you. There is no excuse for any worthy dependent of our soldiers, sailors, and marines going without money for food and shelter. There is no reason why American citizens who are sacrificing as much as you are and your boys are should encounter any difficulty or delay in getting your allotments. I repeat, if you don't get satisfaction from the source you are using to obtain your allotment, let me know. I can and will help you.

There is one other angle in this present military world which I think will affect many of you folks listening to me tonight. Scarcely a family in my whole district, because of the intense patriotism of its people, does not have some member of it in the armed forces. Scarcely a mother or father or wife or child of a man of military age does not lie awake nights thinking of and longing for the day when that son or husband or father will return from this ghastly war; I say to you tonight that if I can do anything to lighten the burdens of that man in the service, or of you, of his family left behind, I hope you will not fail to call on me. You may not be receiving mail from him or he may write to tell you he has not received yours. Such a condition should be investigated right away. I will be glad to look into this if you will write me about it. I have located and contacted many scores of soldiers and sailors. My office is at your command to find out whatever available information the War Department may have regarding your loved ones.

I have received a number of letters from home telling me of a rumor which has been going the rounds indicating that Office of Price Administration soon plans to discontinue the present 1½-gallon coupon and restore the basic 3-gallon coupon for motorists. I don't know what their plans are at the time of this transcription but I think this is a swell idea. To me it is ridiculous that A-card holders should be discriminated against. As you know, I have already protested to Prentiss Brown, Office of Price Administration Chief here in Washington. I am writing again this week to Mr. Brown to see if there is any truth in this rumor. Personally, I hope there is because I feel that the American people should be allowed to drive their cars just as long as there is any surplus gasoline not used by the armed forces.

Quick, easy transportation can be best realized and needless confusion quickly eliminated by letting the defense worker, the farmer, the businessman, and all the rest, retain the use of their cars. This will be a great boon to the war effort. Again, I say, I hope the basic 3 gallons of gasoline allotment will be restored to all.

Every American will view with interest the coming food conference around May 18 at Hot Springs, Va. This, as you know, has been called by the White House and will include delegates and representatives of nearly 40 nations. It has been recently disclosed by those in authority that this gathering is really not a food conference at all but rather a forerunner of post-war planning which everybody is viewing with great circumspect and care.

I have no special comment to make upon the wisdom of a move of this kind. I do feel such meetings should be entered upon with caution on the part of our diplomats.

What I do resent, however, and do protest vigorously, is the arbitrary way with which orders have been given to bar the public and the press from participating in this conference. Up to this hour I am transcribing, no answer has been given to my demand that the doors be flung open to the radio, the movies and the press so that all the people will know what is going on. The Diplomatic Corps has no right whatever to bind the whole Nation to a lot of secret agreements and understandings about a post-war world. I sincerely hope that high-handed star-chamber tactics of this kind will be thrown out the window and that all America will be allowed to witness this important prelude to what will come after victory is ours.

What Are We Going To Do About It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a letter received from a voting constituent of mine presently residing in Chicago. This man is a typical patriotic American working man, one whom I have known for many years and who formerly worked for my father. As you will note from the letter, he has three of his own sons and an adopted son now in the service and also has a sister who enlisted and is now a lieutenant in the nurse corps. I think this letter is important for every man and woman in this House to read and study carefully and to you all I propound this one question—What are we going to do about it?

The letter follows:

APRIL 16, 1943.

Hon. FRED BRADLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND FRED: I suppose you will be surprised to hear from me after all this time but I have thought about you many times lately. In fact, I wrote you a long letter sometime ago that I never mailed.

I get a glimpse of your name in the paper once in awhile in regards to one thing or another.

Fred, I am going to ask you to read this letter all the way through very carefully and get an idea of what the "men" in the field are thinking—the wage earners and voters—in regards to a couple of things.

First, I would like to go into the food prices as the average man and woman views it. You see the average wage for 40 hours a week is about $45 and I will give you a picture of his expenditures and what his chances of survival are, as follows:

Rent per week	$12.50
Groceries	18.50
Defense bond	4.50
Shop insurance	.40
Hospitalization	.50
Transportation	2.00
Shows for family	2.00
Gas, lights, telephone	2.50
Victory tax	1.65
Social Security	.45
Total	45.00
Wages	45.00

No clothing, recaps, insurance, Red Cross, community fund, incidentals, oil, repairs, school expense such as carfare, lunches—not even one beer after work. Now you see, Fred

why the boys have to cash their bonds in just the minute they are past the 60-day period?

It's kind of silly, isn't it? They wonder why in hell the farmer gets $16.50 per hundredweight and the grocer gets $60. In other words, why are they allowing the middleman to get away with murder? Ears, tails, joints, liver, innards, and all the rest; they sell it all. The average person isn't dumb—at least not for long.

Instead of spending weeks in fighting over some damn bill that is for prestige only, why don't the boys get up and shout for help for the real workers, the ones who are paying the Congressmen, Senators, etc.? The middleman puts this big money in the sock, and the shopman buys the bonds, pays the Victory tax, etc. Give it some thought, friend. It might say trouble a little later on, eh?

Cauliflower, 37 cents a head. A lousy turnip costs 35 cents. Inferior beef and pork chops, 59 cents per pound; hamburger, 33 cents per pound. Can you tie that? Does head lettuce, turnips, etc., cost anymore than ever? That much more, anyway?

Get me a job investigating the difference in price between the farmer and the customer, and I will earn every damn cent, and I know where to look. Now, mind you, I am not seeking a position; I am only stating that, if I can do it, someone else can.

Now, don't get sore, boy; you have a little further to go with this masterpiece. I am just giving out with some unvarnished truth, and let it land where it may.

Well, FRED, my three sons and an adopted boy are now in the service, and may God return them to me all in one piece. You know my interest in all young fellows, a sincere interest. I get many letters from all over the world now, and I visit with many returned from the front. In fact, that's the reason for this part of my letter. I interviewed a man last night whose brother has just returned from Casablanca and is now at Percy Jones Hospital at Battle Creek, where my sister is a lieutenant nurse (enlisted). This young man has lost both legs, one above the knee and one below. Tough luck. His fourth day out, and he brings back some startling news. Now get this.

They were under English command and the Americans were pushed out in front ahead of the English. They were stripped of their American tanks and given inferior English ones. He voices the opinion of our boys there and someone had better start England going in this war by effort and not talk. You remember the last war? Why in hell do we Americans allow this. They took two bamboo poles and stretched a blanket and operated on this boy without any anesthetic. Does this have to go on forever?

I think Congress and the House better start to see that England gets into this instead of New Zealand, Australia, Canada, and America. What do we care about them? There will always be an England and they will fight to the last American life and dollar.

Well, I guess I am through friend, and please believe me, my intentions are not to offend anyone but sometimes a rank outsider can paint you a picture that you don't see in your everyday hustle and bustle. Just slow down long enough to study this letter and then get a few of you with some guts and get up and start something. Will you for a friend and willing helper?

You know the fight game is my baby, Fred, and I am used to guts and also failures. I love a good fight if it's "clean."

Will you please at least answer and let me know where you stand. Give my regards to Blackney, Woodruff, and Prentiss Brown, and let me wish you all good health and fortune.

Your very good friend,

CECIL V. PRINCE,
Chicago, Ill.

P. S.—Yes; I am in Chicago now with the Buick people doing my bit. Hope to see you in the not too far future. I am not prejudiced. Just wondering.

Don't you wish we were up in our home country for the summer? Alpena, Rogers City, Cheboygan, St. Ignace? Boy, how I miss it. I hope the Jews get rich enough from this war so that there will never be another. Don't you?

Just one more thing, Fred. The people wonder why the prices were allowed to soar so high before the ceilings were set. Some day they are going to ask. 1940 prices would be about O. K.

They all notice these things, you know. You would be surprised what the working class talk about at work. It isn't the scarcity of food but the price the people are squawking about. They don't mind doing without.

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the eleventh installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. In the last installment of Senator Cockrell's speech we learned how easily and simply this country could have joined the family of nations in standardizing the coinage of the several money systems on a gold and silver basis.

The failure of our delegates to accept the plan has had such a tremendous effect on the welfare of all people in all countries that the failure of the proposed plan, as explained by the Senator, is of interest to everyone and is repeated here.

Here it is. I want the Senate to understand it, and want the country to know why we did not accept it. Here was a bimetallic system upon a ratio of 15½ to 1 maintained by France since October 1785 and all we had to do was simply to subscribe to it. There were no international complications connected with it—nothing to do but simply subscribe to it and agree that we would coin certain coins.

In order to come to that we only had to strike out about 12½ grains of our standard silver dollar, reduce it to 400 grains and thus bring it down to the ratio of 15½ to 1.

The eleventh installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

Remember this monetary conference was to meet on the 17th of June. On the 17th of May, just a month before it was to meet, Hon. Samuel B. Ruggles addresses a letter to Senator Sherman in which he invites him to give some expression of his views, etc., and Senator Sherman replies as follows:

"HOTEL JARDIN DES TUILERIES,
"May 18, 1867.

"MY DEAR SIR: Your note of yesterday, inquiring whether Congress would probably, in future coinage, make our gold dollar conform in value to the gold 5-franc piece, has been received.

"There has been so little discussion in Congress upon the subject that I cannot base my opinion upon anything said or done there.

"The subject has, however, excited the attention of several important commercial bodies in the United States, and the time is now so favorable that I feel quite sure that Congress will adopt any practical measure that will secure to the commercial world a uniform standard of value and exchange.

"The only question will be, how this can be accomplished.

"The treaty of December 23, 1865, between France, Italy, Belgium, and Switzerland, and the probable acquiescence in that treaty by Prussia, has laid the foundation for such a standard. If Great Britain will reduce the value of her sovereign 2 pence and the United States will reduce the value of her dollar something over 3 cents, we then have a coinage in the franc, dollar, and sovereign, easily computed, and which will readily pass in all countries, the dollar as 5 francs and the sovereign as 25 francs.

"This will put an end to the loss and intricacies of exchange and discount. As the gold 5-franc piece is now in use by over 60,000,000 of people of several different nationalites, and is of convenient form and size, it may well be adopted by other nations as the common standard of value, leaving to each nation to regulate the divisions of this unit in silver coin or tokens.

"If this be done France will surely abandon the impossible effort of making two standards of value. Gold coins will answer all the purposes of European commerce. A common gold standard will regulate silver coinage, of which the United States will furnish the greater part, especially for the Chinese trade.

"I have thought a good deal of how the object you propose may be most readily accomplished."

Now, here is the gist of it:

"It is clear that the United States cannot become a party to the treaty referred to."

That is the language. This is the reason given—

"They could not agree upon the silver standard; nor could we limit the amount of our coinage as proposed by the treaty. The United States is so large in extent, is so sparsely populated, and the price of labor is so much higher than in Europe, that we require more currency per capita. We now produce the larger part of the gold and silver of the world, and cannot limit our coinage, except by the wants of our people and the demands of commerce."

Here the Senator writes a letter 1 month before this monetary conference is to be held to one of the delegates to that conference, who is also representing and manipulating another intermediate or preliminary committee.

"It is clear that the United States cannot become a party to the treaty referred to. They could not agree upon the silver standard."

That is, they would not agree upon the bimetallic standard of the Latin Union. They must have the silver part of the bimetallism stricken out.

You may ask how did that letter have any influence? Was it published? Did it fall into the hands of anybody? In order to show exactly how Mr. Ruggles manipulated and used the influence of Senator Sherman, I quote from page 7:

"Mr. Ruggles to Mr. Stewart, May 30, 1867."

Remember, Mr. Ruggles had gotten Senator Sherman's letter on May 18. He refers to Mr. Berthemy transmitting to our Government the Latin Union conference, and says:

"To that treaty the United States are now invited to become a party, in the communication from M. Berthemy, Minister of France at Washington, to the Secretary of State of the United States, a copy of which, forwarded from Washington by the Department of State, reached the undersigned on the 29th of May, instant."

He then goes on and states that he had suggested to M. de Parieu the necessity of a

modification in the common unit of gold coin, and then that he had been introduced to the French Emperor; and I read now from page 8 what he says:

"Upon that occasion the Emperor, after expressing very cordially his gratification that the United States of America had shown their willingness to aid in unifying the coin of the world, proceeded in a straightforward, business way to ask, 'What do you wish France to do in aid of the work?' To that interrogatory it was answered, first, that much could be done by distinctly recognizing in the official documents and discourses of the Government the international unification of coin, as a result of cardinal importance to be attained at the Universial Exposition."

Then he goes on and says:

"It was further urged that the United States of America, politically, commercially, and geographically had a peculiar interest in the subject, etc.

* * * * *

"In answer, the Emperor asked, in a kindly tone"—

No doubt, as Mr. Ruggles had proposed nothing and asked for nothing, but told about the desire of our country and its greatness and grandeur—

"Can France do anything more in aid of the work?"

A very pertinent question.

"To which it was replied, France can coin a piece of gold of 25 francs, to circulate side by side on terms of absolute equality with the half eagle of the United States and the sovereign, or pound sterling, of Great Britain, when reduced, as they readily might be, precisely to the value of 25 francs. The Emperor then asked, 'Will not a French coin of 25 francs impair the symmetry of the French decimal system?' To which it was answered, 'No more than it is affected, if at all, by the existing gold coin of 5 francs'; that it was only the silver coins of France which were of even metric weight, while every one of its gold coins, without exception, represented unequal fractions of the meter.

"It was then stated to the Emperor that an eminent American statesman, Mr. Sherman, Senator from Ohio, chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States, and recently in Paris, had writtn an important and interesting letter, expressing his opinion that the gold dollar of the United States ought to be and readily might be reduced by Congress, in weight and value, to correspond with the gold 5-franc piece of France; that the letter was now before"—

Before—

"the international committee having the question of uniform coin under special examination, to which letter, as being one of the best interpretations of the views of the American people, the attention of the public authorities of France was respectfully invited. The Emperor then closed the audience by repeating the assurances of his gratification that the important international measure in question was likely to receive active support from the United States.

"The letter of Mr. Sherman, above referred to, dated the 18th of May 1867, originally written in English, was presented in a French translation a few days afterward to the international committee in full session, where it was received with unusual interest and ordered by the committee to be printed in both languages. A copy is herewith transmitted for the information of the Department of State."

Now, I read from page 13, the letter of Mr. Ruggles to Mr. Seward of July 18, 1867. He says:

"The undersigned is gratified to learn, by the communication from the Department of State of the 21st of June last, that the steps thus taken for securing the uniformity of money are approved by his Government; that he is warranted in encouraging the expectation that the United States may give its adhesion to a conventional arrangement which may be susceptible of termination within a period to be specified in such arrangements,' and that 'the views so ably set forth' in the letter of Mr. Sherman 'will be so far approved by the public sentiment, the Congress, and the Executive of the United States as to secure a concurrence of the Government in any reasonable plan for producing the desired reform.' "

Now, you must remember that this is the preliminary conference before which he laid this letter. What does he say?

"The subject of a uniform coin did not actually come into discussion, either in the international committee or the subcommission on coins, until early in the month of May."

Now—

"On the 17th of May the undersigned presented to the international committee the letter of Senator Sherman in a French translation, which was received with lively interest, and forthwith ordered, with the approbation of the imperial commission, to be published both in French and English. It is but due to the history of the unification of money to state that the earnest and active agitation of the subject in a practical form on the part of the United States exerted its full share of influence in leading the Government of France to adopt the decisive measure of inviting in diplomatic form an authoritative 'conference' of delegates, duly accredited, from all the nations of the European and American world practically accessible to meet at Paris on the 17th of June, not merely for an exchange of views or a discussion of general principles, but 'practically to seek for the basis of ulterior negotiation' between the nations.

"The importance of this step had become evident at an early day to the French authorities, and especially to M. Esquirou de Parieu, first vice president of the 'conseil d'état,' preeminently distinguished by his long and well-directed labors in the cause of monetary unification, adorned by his learned and eloquent writings, replete alike with accurate knowledge and classic taste. He was one of the delegates on the part of France who successfully negotiated the quadripartite monetary treaty of the 23d of December, 1865, between France, Belgium, Switzerland, and Italy, the beneficent effects of which enlightened measure are now illuminating continental western Europe from the German Ocean to the Mediterranean, carrying, in his own graphic language, 'a common coin of equal value from Antwerp, across the mountains of the Oberland, to the classic coast of Brundusium.'

"As early as the 21st of April last the undersigned had argued and urged upon M. de Parieu the importance which would be attached by the United States of America to the coinage by France of the gold piece of 25 francs, and the consequent necessity of modifying that portion of the quadripartite treaty which would prevent the issue of a coin of that denomination."

At this point the honorable Senator yielded to Mr. Allen.

Mr. COCKRELL. I was reading from the letter of Mr. Ruggles, transmitting these reports and commenting upon it, which gives the insight into the modus operandi by which the preliminary programme for the monetary conference of 1867 was cut and dried and presented to it, and the influence and power that the distinguished Senator from Ohio exerted. I am going to state what occurred. He tells what he did himself. He says on page 16:

"On this occasion the very important question of abolishing the double standard of money, retaining only gold, was elaborately discussed, and with singular ability and ingenuity by distinguished French economists holding opposite opinions. On putting the question to the vote of the numerous and intelligent audience, the single standard of gold was adopted by a large majority. The question of the gold unit then coming up, the English delegates"—

Now, mark you—

"the English delegates earnestly opposed the proposition of the international committee adopting as the unit the gold 5 francs, and urged the substitution of 10 francs in its stead, expressing their belief that the Government of Great Britain would consent to issue for the purpose a gold coin of that amount to be denominated a 'ducat.' This substitution was opposed by the undersigned in behalf of the United States, on the ground that their half-eagle when reduced to 25 francs, would be an even multiple of the 5-franc unit but not of the 10; that the dollar, whenever made precisely equivalent and equiponderant to the 5 francs, would be practically if not nominally the monetary unit, and the actual denomination in which money contracts embracing different countries or distant quarters of the globe would or might be payable; that the more important and higher issue soon would be, not between the 5 francs and the 10 francs as the unit, but between the dollar, decimally and easily divided, and the sovereign (or pound sterling), not decimally but most inconveniently divided in shillings, pence, and farthings, but which, by the very peculiarity, had hitherto maintained an undue predominance in the money payments of the world. The debate was closed by the Prince president submitting the question to the vote of the meeting, which resulted nearly unanimously in favor of the unit of 5 francs.

"It is proper to add that the Government of Great Britain was not represented as such at this reunion, nor in any discussion at any previous meeting of the international committee, but duly appeared by accredited delegates at the international monetary conference."

Thus before the international monetary conference had met, this preliminary committee, an international committee, had cut and dried the whole program of a single gold standard. Mr. Ruggles goes on and says:

"The advocates of a uniform coin cherished the belief that the Government of the United States is not to be discouraged or discomposed by the temporary delay or hesitation of any government in Europe to participate in the widespread work of monetary unification, destined sooner or later to become the crowning civic achievement of modern times.

"In the earlier agitation of this subject at the International Statistical Congress at Berlin in 1863, the delegate from the United States found a large and influential delegation from Great Britain zealously engaged in the great endeavor to unify the money of the world. In the present effort of the assembled nations 'not for a day, but for all times,' the clear good sense and sterling liberality of the English people will not allow their Government to lag or linger much behind. The fire but recently kindled is rapidly diffusing its light throughout the world.

"The farsighted negotiators of the quadripartite monetary treaty of 1865, though seriously embarrassed by the fallacy of a double standard, now generally discarded, succeeded in establishing a uniform system not only of gold, but of silver, over a large and populous portion of Europe, since increased by the adhesion of the pontifical states and of Greece; thus including by a singular felicity in this newly enlightened region of the globe the two great seats of ancient civilization."

Now, I wish to read from what one of the English delegates said in that monetary conference, a gentleman who has figured in almost every other conference since then, Mr. Rivers Wilson. I read from page 55:

"The English Government was obliged to accept the cordial invitation from the Government of the Emperor to participate in

this conference, because a refusal would have shown a want of courtesy, and would have made it liable to accusations of prejudices upon this very important question.

"Indeed the English nation is in a position much more independent upon this question than most continental nations.

"So long as public opinion has not decided in favor of a change of the present system, which offers no serious inconveniences either in wholesale or retail trade, and until it shall be incontestably demonstrated that the new system offers advantages sufficiently commanding to justify the abandonment of that which is approved by experience and rooted in the habits of the people, the English Government could not believe it to be its duty to take the initiative in assimilating its coinage with those of the countries of the Continent. But the English Government will be always ready to aid and attempt to enlighten and guide public opinion in the appreciation of the question, and facilitate the discussion of the means by which such an assimilation so advantageous in theory may be effected.

"Thus, while consenting then, to be represented in this conference, the English Government has found it necessary to place the most careful restrictions upon its delegates; their part is simply to listen to the different arguments, to study the situation as developed in discussion, and to report to their Government."

The attitude of Germany was that at that time she was considering, herself, a political program which might include her local monetary question, and therefore she would not be bound by anything that was done.

Baron de Hock submitted report No. 4 on the unification of coinage, and the recommendation was the adoption of the series of gold coins now in use in France, adopted by a large part of the population of Europe, and recommending this as the basis of the uniform system sought.

"It is extremely desirable that the system of two different monetary standards should be discontinued wherever it still exists."

That the gold standard should be adopted.

I read the remarks of Mr. Meinecke, of Prussia, on page 34 of this report. The German Empire had not then been formed, and Prussia was represented by Mr. Meinecke. He said:

"He did not pretend to ask the sympathies of the conference in favor of the Prussian monetary system, for he thinks that the standard of gold in the countries which have adopted it cannot be replaced by the standard of silver in force in Prussia only. Prussia, then, must renounce its standard if she wished to rally under a general monetary union. However, Prussia is content with a silver standard; the monetary circulation of which it is the basis is excellent, and there is no urgent reason for introducing there a change so considerable as that which would result from the change of this standard. On the other hand, the difficulty of adopting the gold standard is much greater for Prussia than for any other country. Nevertheless without having the thought of modifying at this time its monetary system, the Prussian Government would not fail to take the matter into consideration if the labors of the conference should aim at establishing a basis for a general monetary arrangement."

The international monetary conference continued in session until July 6, 1867, when it adjourned. During its discussions, on page 36—

"Mr. Ruggles said it would be as impossible to abolish the expressions of the dollar in the United States as that of the sovereign in England, but that both might be retained in reducing their intrinsic values. For the sovereign it would be a reduction of only 20 centimes; for the dollar on the other hand, the reduction would be 3½ percent on its value. The United States was ready to make this sacrifice in view of monetary unification; such was the opinion of the American people, and after the next winter a general reminting of coin, however considerable, might commence."

Mr. Ruggles further said, as the representative of our Government, that the double standard had never practically existed in this country, and said—now listen:

"The original act of Congress, which was passed at a time when we were less enlightened than today, either by study or experience, sought to establish a double standard by giving to gold coin and silver coin equal legal currency in payments whatever might be the amount of the debt."

Less enlightened than now! Jefferson and Madison, and Hamilton and Washington were ignorant on the financial question; they amount to nothing; they imagined that they could establish a double standard, but they had failed. Now, what further does he say:

"And that we have sufficiently learned that the system of a double standard is not only a fallacy, but an impossibility, in assuming a fixed relation between the values of two different products, gold and silver. The value of each of these depends upon the quantity produced, and this quantity is beyond the power of legislation. A diminution of value is and ever will be the inevitable result of the increase of supply."

I want to read a little further from Mr. Ruggles. Says he on page 41:

"It is true that the silver dollar is still retained as lawful money for debts of any amount, but of a total silver coinage of $136,351,512, 4,366,340 only are in dollars, while $131,985,472 consist of subdivisions of the dollar

"Almost all the divisional pieces which had been coined before the passage of the law of 1853 have disappeared, in obedience to the fundamental and inexorable law of demand and supply, which sets at naught all attempts made to fix by legislation the relative values of the two metals. The legislators and the people of the United States have sufficiently learned, if not by study, at least by experience, that the system of a double standard is not only a fallacy, but an impossibility, in assuming a fixed relation between the values of two different products, gold and silver. The value of each of these depends upon the quantity produced, and this quantity is beyond the power of legislation.

"During the 56 years which immediately preceded the year 1850 the United States coined in gold dollars $85,588,038, and in silver $78,322,969, which represents a supply of about $1.12 of gold to $1 of silver. From 1850 to 1866, inclusive, the coinage of gold has been $759,648,453 and of silver $59,027,843, which represents about $12.50 in gold to $1 of silver.

"Admonished by so great a change in the relative supply of the two metals the United States now share without reserve the conviction more and more extended through the civilized world that it is impossible to establish a double standard which must presuppose a fixed relation between the values of the two metals."

In a written argument presented to this international monetary conference on June 28, 1867, he discussed the probable yield of gold and silver in the United States, and said—I want the Senate to note this:

"Its annual product, now nearly $100,000,000, may eventually reach three hundred or four hundred millions. The money of the world must be unified now or never. * * * It is moreover to be considered that the United States and Great Britain may continue to add for many successive periods of 15 years, the gold to be produced in America and Australia, which will probably fall little short for each period of $655,352,325 for the United States and $455,235,695 for Great Britain, the amounts respectively coined during the 15 years just elapsed We will not dwell upon what cannot be forgotten, the possibility of a still more enormous product that would result from the more extensive developments and discoveries in the vast auriferous interior of the United States, a field as yet only partially explored.

"Without going too far in measuring the gigantic monetary future in reserve for the world, we will simply say that the work of unification cannot begin too soon."

I could read many other extracts here.

This international monetary conference, after discussing the various monetary systems, utterly ignored the monetary conference of December 1865, the Latin Union.

No wonder, Mr. President, that this international monetary conference recommended the establishment of the single standard of gold, with silver as a subsidiary minor coin, when they were enlightened by such exaggerations as I have just read, coming from officials of our own Government professing to be statisticians and to know the facts they presented.

This international monetary convention unanimously decided against the adoption of the single silver standard, and in favor of the single gold standard exclusively, the Netherlands alone dissenting on the gold standard, and unanimously affirmed that it was "more easy to realize monetary unification by mutual coordination of existing systems, taking into account the scientific advantages of certain types and of the numbers of the populations which have already adopted them."

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have studied the Ruml plan. I have read Mr. Ruml's explanation. I have read the editorials in the leading newspapers of the country and listened to days of debate. I have been for it from the beginning and to date have neither read nor heard any argument presented by which I would feel justified in changing my position. If it gives the taxpayers a break I am in favor of that. We have turned the time clocks backward and forward, scolded about it each time, but it did not affect us materially. I believe the same can be done with the tax clock. I have been through my district last week, talked with all classes of people, and my people are unanimous for the Ruml plan and I shall support the Carlson bill.

Rural Electrification Can Help Win the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following article published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat for

Wednesday morning, April 28, presents so forcibly the vast importance of rural electrification, not only as a long-range benefit to American farmers, but as an important factor in meeting the farm labor shortage, that I felt it should be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

R. E. A. will go down in history as one of the greatest forward steps ever taken by the United States and it deserves the wholehearted support of the Congress.

The article follows:

ELECTRICITY FOR MISSOURI FARMS—POWER MACHINES HELP IN SOLUTION OF LABOR PROBLEMS—10,000 FARMERS IN STATE NOW ELIGIBLE FOR RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION SERVICE

(By Virginia Tracy)

Electrify the farm—that's the answer of the Rural Electrification Administration to the pressing problem of meeting food production goals in the face of a farm labor crisis. Let electricity take the place of the hired hand, says Harry Slattery, Rural Electrification Administration Administrator, and you'll not only save money, but increase production.

A year ago this wouldn't have been possible, for the War Production Board had clamped down on the use of critical materials for such purposes and even work that was already under way was halted in midair.

But today those rigid regulations have been relaxed—not that the situation in the metals field has changed, but because the need is so great that even Donald M. Nelson, War Production Board chairman, concedes farm electrification to be the best possible use of materials on hand. Who wouldn't when farmers all over the country testify—as did a typical group in Pennsylvania recently—that their additional food production with electricity will represent 51 tons of food for every ton of metal used. "From a practical standpoint," said Nelson in announcing the new ruling, "no other use exists for these frozen stocks comparable to the benefits to be obtained from completing the electrification of these farms."

THE FIRST CONCESSION

The first evidence of a change of attitude came in January when the War Production Board permitted Rural Electrification Administration borrowers to extend their service beyond already existing power lines. This concession, however, was offered only to large farms—that is, farms that had at least 10 animal units. An animal unit may be 1 milk cow, 10 beef cattle, three brood sows, 75 hens, or 40 turkeys. Just the other day, however, the authorization was further liberalized to include small farms—those with but 5 animal units.

"Now we're getting down to brass tacks," said Slattery, commenting on the new order. "For it's the small farmer who is most capable of expanding his production. The big farms are already largely mechanized and are going full tilt Under this new ruling the small farmer, who has only his wife to help him, will benefit tremendously. He can build an electric chick brooder, for instance (instructions and diagrams are available at Rural Electrification Administration headquarters), and his wife can double or treble her annual production of chickens. One woman in Georgia raised 10 times as many after her farm was wired as she did before. Rural Electrification Administration farmers this year expect to produce at least 20 percent more broilers than they did last year through the use of electric water pumps (which save hours previously spent drawing and carrying water), brooders, and night lighting."

Since poultry isn't rationed, just think what this will mean to the folks who run out of meat coupons.

PIG BROODERS

Designs are available, too, for electric pig brooders, which farmers everywhere credit with saving at least one pig out of each litter. Through this arrangement, the little piglets are assembled in an inclosure too low for the sow to crawl under. They're kept warm by electricity rather than mother love, and the young porker who would have been mashed otherwise is thus saved, to say nothing of his little brother who was previously left out in the cold. A tiller of the soil in Palmyra, Mo., averred in a recent letter to Rural Electrification Administration that before the installation of his electric brooder his loss ran as high as 25 percent of each litter as a result of exposure, crushing and injury. The year 1943 will see an increase of 24 percent in the production of hogs, Slattery predicted.

The milking machine, made possible by electricity, is another godsend to the farmer who's having a heck of a time finding help. Brawn isn't needed to operate this contraption. A frail woman, a handicapped or elderly man, can do it successfully and more than duplicate the work of two able-bodied workmen of preelectricity days.

SAMPLE CASES

On a turkey ranch near Mount Vernon, Mo., where the yearly crop used to average 1,500 birds, 4,300 turkeys were raised last year through the introduction of such labor-saving devices as an electrically operated water system and an electric brooder.

Near Bourbon, Mo., there's a huge pond where the fish are fed by means of electric lights. In case you can't figure that one out—we'll tell you. The lights are placed just above the surface of the water and the insects they attract provide the necessary provender for the members of the finny tribe who dwell therein. The dough the owner used to spend on ground beef and chopped liver for his piscatorial pets is now saved and his production is vastly increased.

Just a hundred miles north of St. Louis is one of the best rice farms in the country, and it's irrigated entirely by electricity. Although it takes about a thousand gallons of water a minute for a 50-acre rice field during the growing season, the manager of this ranch, which specializes in rice production and is believed to be the northernmost rice field in the country, told the Rural Electrification Administration it cost him $200 less annually to irrigate with electric power than it did with the gasoline motor he used before the estate was wired.

Indeed, the benefits accruing to the agriculturists of the country from the introduction of electricity into their homes and barns are legion. The safety angle, for one thing, is a big factor. With the buildings wired, the farmer can tend to his indoor chores before dawn or after dark—without the fire hazard of a lantern—and have more time for his field work in the bargain

Farm women are benefiting by electricity in a variety of ways, according to the Rural Electrification Administration Administrator. The gals in the sticks have just as many household gadgets as their city cousins. Some, he said, have been known to use their electric washing machines to churn butter and their wringers to shell peas. Why, one guy over in Illinois, who got tired waiting for an extension of his service, simply hooked an old barbed-wire fence to his house wiring, ran it to the Rural Electrification Administration cooperative line, and, though it sounds screwy, got electricity over it. This story came from Rural Electrification Administration headquarters, and, though the folks at 420 Locust Street don't recommend any such shenanigans, it's set forth here for what it's worth. An electric plow is even reported to be in an experimental stage and the chances are it'll work eventually.

10,000 ELIGIBLE IN STATE

Ten thousand farmers in Missouri are eligible for electricity under the new ruling, Slattery said—not for convenience and luxury, as we urbanites are wont to regard electricity—but for the production of food. Indeed, in order to qualify, the farmer must have some type of equipment requiring electricity such as a water pump for livestock, a milking machine, milk cooler, milk sterilizer, incubator, brooder, feed grinder, or dehydrator for fruits and vegetables. The length of the connection is limited to 100 feet per animal unit and must have the approval of the local Department of Agriculture War Board.

The Rural Electrification Administration doesn't own or operate anything, Slattery explained. It lends money to farm groups organized expressly for this purpose. These cooperatives engage their own engineers, let their own contracts, and put up their own power lines. They keep their own books, bill themselves (they all know how to read their own meters) and pay their bills into the cooperative association's fund. This, in turn, is used to pay back the Rural Electrification Administration. They even publish monthly mimeographed papers for the members. Of course, the Rural Electrification Administration Administrator went on, they are given assistance every step of the way. Inspectors are sent out to see that the engineering is sound and that the lines are properly built; auditors go over the books periodically to make sure they're correctly kept, and management engineers help organize the groups, which usually average about 1,200 families. There are 804 Rural Electrification Administration financed rural electric systems in operation in the United States.

That electricity pays its way is apparent in the figures the official gave us. The cost of a mile of line is about $750, he said. All told, Rural Electrification Administration has loaned more than $360,000,000 to farm groups since its organization in 1935. The cooperatives are allowed 25 years to pay back the loan. It's a graduated system and no repayment is required for the first 30 months. The interest runs around 2½ percent. Though only $28,000,000 has come due, more than $38,000,000 has been repaid; the groups have bought $5,000,000 worth of Government bonds and have $10,000,000 cash in the bank. The percentage of groups whose payments are overdue is negligible—just about one-half of 1 percent of the total.

FIFTEEN MILLION DOLLARS LOANED

Some $15,000,000 has been loaned to Missouri farmers, who now operate 36 energized systems. Prior to the creation of Rural Electrification Administration, slightly more than 10 percent of the farmers in this country had electricity—less than 750,000 out of a total of more than 6,000,000. These were largely located near towns. More than 2,000,000 farms are now wired, over 57,000 in Missouri alone. More than 38,000 of these are on Rural Electrification Administration distribution systems. The others are on the lines of power companies "which have adopted our construction standards, use our literature to some extent, and now have their own rural departments."

And how does the cost of electricity compare with the cost of a hired hand? The average electric bill for the farmer with a milking machine, chicken and pig brooders, a water pump and a radio (an important item, for it provides him with weather broadcasts) is less than $10 a month. In the old days a farm hand got $30 a month and his keep—to say nothing of a room under the eaves. Today, you can't get one—and even if you could, his salary would run around $60 or $75 a month.

"That piece of wire," Slattery said, pointing to the top picture illustrating this story, "is

little—not as big around as your finger—but it carries a whale of a kick. It would take a man working hard all day long to produce the same amount of work electricity will produce for a nickel."

Heroes of Guadalcanal Deserve a Break

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, when the handful of marines on Guadalcanal were confronted with 30,000 Japs, who had thus far run roughshod over the Philippines, Singapore, and the East Indies, this little band of fighting men called for help. The One Hundred and Sixty-fourth Infantry, composed mostly of North Dakota boys, was the answer to their prayer. Today no marine can be found who has anything but the highest praise for the One Hundred and Sixty-fourth. How well they performed, the world now knows, but the price they paid is still unknown.

These boys—what is left of them—have earned the right to come home to rest. After 4 months of actual battle, it is not alarming to learn that they have suffered with malaria, undernourishment, and shell shock. No one who has not actually seen one of these shattered boys can understand their condition.

Dr. O. J. Hagen, of the Fargo Clinic, Fargo, N. Dak., is one of North Dakota's leading citizens as well as an outstanding physician. He is the father of one of these boys. He has written me what he thinks should be done, and I not only wholeheartedly approve his opinion but think his letter is of such outstanding interest that I present it in full:

FARGO CLINIC,
Fargo, N. Dak., May 1, 1943.

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: What I want to ask is that if you feel interested and justified, I would like to see you use your great influence in behalf of the boys who fought at Guadalcanal in getting them home for a breathing spell. I live in Moorhead, Minn., myself, but that does not deter me from interesting myself in behalf of these boys. In fact, my own boy, the older, volunteered and entered the National Guard for he got tired of waiting around for the draft. So he went with the now famous One Hundred and Sixty-fourth Infantry for Camp Claiborne and to New Caledonia and on to Guadalcanal.

But it is not because my own boy is in the group that I am asking you to use your influence in behalf of these boys. I am an intimate of many of them and know what a bang-up job they did, and America knows it by now—or should.

Remember that the Japs had run roughshod over Thailand, the Philippines, Bataan, and Corregidor, Singapore, and on attacking what they called the soft Americans—they would do likewise with them. Thirty thousand of them streamed in on Guadalcanal. The first Marines were being continuously outnumbered, and they called for help. The One Hundred and Sixty-fourth Infantry, stationed on New Caledonia, was ordered onto the beleaguered island. For 4 months—2 months longer than what is the ordinary time in direct combat zones—they battled and killed thousands and drove the rest into the sea—not in ordinary terrain—but in a steaming jungle and only fox holes for their homes. When they came out, scores of them were mental wrecks, 80 percent with malaria, hundreds suffered physical hardships as evidenced by lack of food and six weeks of continuous bombardment reducing their weight by 30 to 40 pounds, but they carried the campaign to victory in what Eddie Rickenbacker termed a "hell hole ten times worse than New Guinea."

Here, then, is the One Hundred and Sixty-fourth Infantry, composed of young farm kids and village boys from North Dakota, winning a victory nationally acclaimed as the first and most decisive the Japs have had to face. They are resting now, decimated and shattered on a southwest Pacific island, it is true, but why don't they deserve the respite of a homecoming when there are five or six million in our camps who have never gone out of the United States. As I understand it, only 100,000 Americans are out of this country. Have not these boys earned a little rest and a little recognition for the magnificent job they helped to carry to a fortunate conclusion?

Think it over and if you feel that they deserve what I have suggested, throw your great oratory into the fray in behalf of the most gallant boys that ever carried arms for the honor and glory of Ameria.

Yours with much regard,

O. J. HAGEN, M. D.

Why Should We Return to Gold?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in considering the plan recently proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury for the establishment of an international monetary system to be placed under the control of an international board and the reported plan proposed by England to do the same thing in another way, it is encouraging to find that thoughtful people all over our country are giving the money question their serious attention. Under the permission to revise and extend my remarks, there is presented for the consideration of the Members of the House an article on money by Mr. W. C. McClure, of Camden, Ark.:

WHY SHOULD WE RETURN TO GOLD?

(By W. C. McClure)

When silver was demonetized in 1873, Carlisle of Kentucky, said: "This crime will bring more economic misery upon mankind than all the wars and all the whisky," or words to that effect.

Carlisle was one of the brightest minds that ever represented any State in Washington. He was persuaded to favor the gold standard by Grover Cleveland against his will. Cleveland may have been honest, but Carlisle is reported to have died with a broken heart because of having, even for the time being, surrendered his convictions.

In planning for a better world after the war, we cannot afford to surrender our true and honest convictions.

One of the things the world will learn from this war is that money is nothing but a medium of exchange. No less an authority than Alexander Hamilton, our first Secretary of the Treasurer, and the political arch enemy of the philosophy of Jefferson, was opposed to the gold standard or the silver standard or any single standard of legal tender.

Bimetallism, gold and silver, in the proper system; not only for America but for all civilized nations. Bimetallism was the money of our fathers—it is the money of the Constitution. Under such a money system, young America made remarkable progress. In 1873 silver was demonetized. We hear it mentioned as the "crime of '73." Corruption was practiced and the truth later came out.

It was England, under Lord Rothschild, who instituted the gold standard. It was England that went off—was forced off—the gold standard in September, 1930. In less than a week, seven other nations followed England—and at once all of them made rapid strides in regaining their foreign trade. They far outdistanced America, France, and other gold standard countries.

Look at France today, look at America tomorrow, if we return to the gold standard. There is danger lurking. It leaked out the other day in England. About the same time Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, gave out a release that "We should return to gold."

We next read that the Claytons, Bearles, Curries, and others of their faith are getting together and "blending the high idealism and shrewd business savvy" to work out a plan for a stabilized world system of currency. But doubtless there is an underlying scheme to return this country to the gold standard so that the control of money can be more easily manipulated by a certain class for their own profit—with the man who is looking down on the hot furrow and the man who is looking down over the hot forge slated to foot the bill.

Thomas Edison said that "Gold is the trick mechanism by which money is controlled." Shakespeare said: "Gold, this yellow slave, will knit and break religions; it will bless the accursed; it will make the hoar leprosy adorned; it will place thieves in power, and give them title, knee, and approbation with Senators on the bench."

Under the gold standard actual money becomes scarce and substitutes for money drawing interest becomes more abundant—until somebody cries wolf! wolf! and a panic takes place. During our last panic an old Negro asked: "Boss, whar is de money all at?" He was told: "Uncle, there never was much actual money." And that was the truth. Under the gold standard we can safely do business only with those countries who are able to settle their trade balances in gold. Such countries are limited at best.

With gold and silver as legal tender, we can ship China or Mexico or India all the cotton and other things they want and let them pay the difference or trade balance in silver if they have no gold. And, how are we hurt, if silver be again made legal tender?

The Congress of the United States has the only power under the Constitution to "coin money and regulate the value thereof." If Congress should declare crowder peas to be legal-tender money we could, with crowder peas, pay our debts and buy things we need and want.

Granting that the money question is a great question, it can be said that it is a simple question. All great things are simple—and the greater they are the simpler they are. But in shaping a world-wide flexible and workable system of trade currency, let us not leave it only to those men who make their living by and out of the handling and manipulation of money.

Bimetallism gives the option of settlement to the debtor. Gold alone as the one legal tender enables the creditor to make

exactions of the debtor to the extent, all too often, of strangulating trade. The life blood of circulating medium takes on the hardening of the arteries, in consequence.

In America we are now not on either the gold standard or the silver standard. Abe Lincoln financed the Civil War on greenback money and on bonds payable in "lawful money of the United States when presented for payment." It was the smart thing to do. It was the only thing he could do.

If our money system is to remain on the time-tested plan of a metallic base, gold as the king is all right, if he has silver on the throne as queen to make him behave himself.

Gold and silver in proper ratio of respective value fixed by law is the money system America began with. It is the money system so often recorded in the Bible. It is the system for the average man. It is the money of the masses—beneficial to all honest working individuals and to all proud but poor struggling smaller nations. This move to return to gold will again imprison mankind. Experience reveals nothing in its favor. The gold standard sets up money as a false god and many worship at the shrine; while under our money system before silver was demonetized, history records that a man's word was worth something.

CAMDEN, ARK., *April 15, 1943.*

Commencement Address at Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at the one hundred and eleventh commencement of Gettysburg College on April 26, 1943:

President Hanson, members of the graduating class, ladies, and gentlemen, I appreciate more than I can tell you the privilege of participating in this program today. When Doctor Taylor conveyed to me the invitation to say a few words to you on this occasion, I could not say "No," in spite of the fact that Congress itself seems to need a few words of wisdom. I could not resist because I spent many years—in fact, I think the best years of my life—attending and teaching in colleges very similar to this. To come here and to have a part in these exercises is to recapture, for a few hours, that delectable feeling of youth and hope which I thoroughly enjoyed for so many semesters. All my life, until the beginning of this year, I have been a student. Now I am a Congressman with little opportunity to study anything except what the butchers, the bakers, and candlestick makers think of the Office of Price Administration

Although this is the first time that I have visited this great college, I have heard a great deal about it and the fine work that it has done in the liberal arts. I know that it has lived up to the expectations of its founders, who stated, in the opening paragraphs of its charter, that this literary and scientific institution "promises to exert a salutary influence in advancing the cause of liberal education." This college, along with many others scattered through this land of ours, has furnished a disproportionate number of the great leaders of this Commonwealth and this Nation. It will be a sad day for our people if the small liberal-arts institutions are ever forced to close. Even the exigencies of total war must not be permitted to bring about this disaster. During the past several decades this country has relied entirely too much upon technical or so-called practical instruction. It is evident from the circumstances which confront us today that such instruction is not adequate for the promotion, or even the survival, of our democratic civilization. Unless we can develop the understanding of our people and the leadership in our Government, which a liberal education is designed to do, there is little hope for our ultimate salvation.

We are gathered here today primarily to honor those of you who have distinguished yourselves by the excellence of your intellectual achievements in this college. You graduates have demonstrated that you possess superior intellects and a proper sense of values. A proper sense of values is the essence of wisdom and the foundation of greatness. The confusion so prevalent in the world today is, in a large measure, due to the inability of men to evaluate, to discriminate, to choose between that which is true and that which is false and illusory in the affairs of mankind. That you graduates possess this power is evidenced by your presence here today and by the honor which this great college is bestowing upon you.

I realize full well that it has been said before, and that it may seem trite to say again, that you young men and young women are the hope of this Nation. Nevertheless, I do say so, and with much more conviction than I have ever said it in the past. That conviction arises from the realization that never, since the Dark Ages, has the concept, the principle, of the democratic society and the dignity of man been so dangerously threatened with extinction as it is today. I believe that we find ourselves in this precarious condition largely because too few of our citizens have had the opportunity to obtain an education in the liberal arts such as you graduates have had. It is only from such a course of study that one may obtain the wisdom and understanding necessary to solve the difficult problems which confront our modern and complex world. Therefore, if these problems are to be solved at all, they must be solved by you who have been so properly prepared for this great task. Only knowledge and understanding of the fundamental bases of our society can overcome the provincialism that so sorely threatens this Nation today.

It is evident, I believe, to everyone, that the ultimate source of our trouble and of our danger is in our international relations. In other words, war is the fundamental evil of our civilization and war is a matter of relations between nations. The difficulties which beset these relations are not likely to be understood nor solved by electrical experts or chemical geniuses. A profound understanding of history, philosophy, religion, political science—in short, of the liberal arts—is, I believe, indispensable to an effective solution of this problem in human relations. As I have said before, a proper sense of values is essential to wisdom. The essence of a sense of values is the power to appreciate the ever-changing relations that exist among men and among nations. For an individual to understand his true relation to all other individuals is a mark of greatness. Likewise, for a nation to be truly great, it must evaluate and understand its relations to other nations.

This Nation has failed to evaluate properly its relation to the society of nations. We apparently have no conception of the realities that exist in the international field. The self-reliance and the pride in individual accomplishment, which were effective in promoting our prosperity, both individually and nationally, during the youth of our Nation, has blinded us to the realization of the fundamental and essential interdependence, not only of men but of nations, in this complex mechanical world. The great depression of the early thirties demonstrated this truth in our domestic and individual relations. The present war is a second demonstration, within a quarter of a century, of the same truth in our international relations. But too many Americans still fail to grasp the significance of this second clear and terrible warning.

After more than 160 years of existence, the most powerful nation in the world is awakening to the fact that it has no foreign policy. Some may say that this is not true—that our foreign policy has consistently been that of isolation from the rest of the world But isolationism is not a policy; it is the negation of or the lack of a policy. The hermit in his cave can scarcely be said to have a policy toward the world. He simply wishes to be let alone.

Of course, it is not true that the United States has ever been literally isolated from the rest of the world. The expression is purely one of degree. With regard to the Western Hemisphere, we have had the Monroe Doctrine. We may recall, of course, that Great Britain suggested this policy as a check on the designs of the Holy Alliance, and, furthermore, put teeth in it, until recent years, by virtue of her command of the high seas. Even though we were never forced to do much about it, except in two or three minor instances, nevertheless, we did adopt it. Our good-neighbor policy is the outgrowth of that doctrine. It is true that from 1917 to 1919, under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, we momentarily recognized our obligations to the principles of our own Declaration of Independence, but we quickly withdrew again into our shell and drifted heedlessly along the road to war. Aside from this, we have simply denied any serious responsibility to share the burden of trying to bring order into the chaotic international arena.

We refused to join the League of Nations or the World Court. It is true that we protested politely to Japan over China, to Italy over Ethiopia, and to Hitler ad nauseam. But throughout these many years, can it be said that we had a positive and consistent foreign policy to support order against disorder, right against might, or freedom against slavery? Did we commit ourselves definitely and sincerely to anything until we were kicked in the stomach at Pearl Harbor and reacted as any animal does to the infliction of physical pain? One could say that our policy was that of opportunism or appeasement, but both are unworthy of a great nation. I think it is more magnanimous to say that our timorous international attitude has simply been no policy at all, which, for the lack of a better name, we call isolationism.

I believe that the common people of this Nation have already sensed the fact that in this modern world of instantaneous communication and swift transportation, isolation is a figment of the imagination; that it simply does not, and cannot, exist. The common citizen has discovered that, in our complex and highly specialized domestic economy, rugged individualism has already given way to the integration of his economic life in the common effort to maintain our society in this troubled and changing world. Some of the dreamers of the old school deny this and seek to turn the clock of history back to those idyllic days of their youth. They are afraid of the future and seek refuge in their memories.

The Beveridge plan in England and the report of our own National Resources Planning Board are both inspired by the realization of the fundamental changes in the relations of men that have resulted from the impact of science and technology on our society.

The confusion and diversity of opinion regarding these proposed plans result largely because, politically and psychologically, we are not prepared for them. All of us, however, have for years felt that something is wrong with our society. In the midst of huge surpluses of all kinds of goods we have depressions, unemployment, closed banks, soup kitchens, and now a second war that threatens the existence of our way of life. These two plans are the initial gropings by our capitalistic society for a solution of these sicknesses which have so deeply afflicted that society.

I should like to suggest that the source of our troubles may be found in our failure to recognize what I have called the essential interdependence of all men and of all nations. I believe that both our world wars have been occasioned, or at least promoted, by a failure to recognize this truth.

The individualistic policy of the United Nations, prior to the war, is now giving us a hideous demonstration of the effect of an attempt on their part to deny the truth of the basic interdependence of all nations. As Sir Norman Angell has so aptly expressed it:

"This war has come upon us because we have rejected the elementary social truth upon which all humane society is based, namely, that the most primary right of all—the right to life, the right not to be killed and tortured—can only be made a reality by the general fulfillment of an obligation, the obligation of men to defend that right on behalf of others. The community as a whole, men collectively, must defend the right of each to life, or that right cannot be defended at all. Individual defense is in the long run a physical impossibility. If each individual—whether individual person or individual nation—takes the position that he will fight for his own life but not for others, then any violent minority can, by ganging up, subdue a vast majority, for it can apply 'the simple and deadly plan of one by one.' Ten men can overcome a thousand if each of the thousand says: 'I will fight for myself alone; I will not cooperate with others.' For in that case the ten do not face a thousand, they only face one—one at a time."

Can anyone deny the validity of this analysis after the experience, one by one, of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and France? (Only because of an unexpected blunder on the part of Hitler can we omit England and many others.)

If any single circumstance can be said to have caused this war, I believe that Hitler's realization that his opponents would follow the "one by one" road to destruction should head the list. In spite of all the social, psychological, or economic alleged causes of war, I think the decisive cause is the conviction by the aggressor that he can win. In arriving at this conviction I am sure the each-for-himself, the one-by-one isolationist philosophy of this and other democratic nations was the principal consideration in the German mind after Munich

Isolationism, the so-called policy of the United States, is a direct negation of the fact that today all nations are interdependent, that a war between any two of them affects all other nations, not only economically and politically, but also, in the end, physically. When some politicians talk as if we have a choice between participating actively in the attempt to bring order into the chaos of international relations, on the one hand, and withdrawing from the world, on the other hand, they are talking nonsense. We cannot withdraw from the world. The only choice left to us as a nation is to participate with the other nations in the formation of a system of collective security, or participate against them in a savage struggle for national supremacy and imperialistic expansion. Twice the Germans, and now the Japs, have attempted the latter course and I am confident that history will record their failure. It is inconceivable to me that our people cannot see that the only solution for civilized man lies in the former course: That is a system of collective security for all nations.

Our failure to see this up to now is rooted in our improper sense of values, in a perverted and confused perspective regarding our relations to the other nations of the world. In the process of exploring and developing this wild and fertile land of ours, our attention became so firmly fixed on our domestic affairs that we forgot the world in which we live. Our material success enlarged our national ego until we believed that we could ignore all other peoples and continue smugly along the trail of bigger and better gadgets for everybody. We were unresponsive to the suffering of the Chinese, the Ethiopians, and the Spanish. Later we thought that the fate of the Poles, the Jews, and all the other peoples of Europe was no affair of ours. Finally, Pearl Harbor shocked us into the realization that we are not a god among nations, that we cannot stand superior and isolated above the struggles of lesser peoples for liberty and the dignity of man.

Out of the humiliation of Pearl Harbor and Bataan and the sacrifices incident to the winning of this war, I think there has come the hope that our people may see our relations to the other peoples of the world in their true perspective. It is not merely an unselfish or humanitarian obligation to other men that they shall see, but on the contrary, they surely must see that, as a practical, selfish matter for the preservation of our very existence as a great and free people, it is absolutely essential that we cooperate with the other nations of the world in creating a system of mutual security.

In conclusion, may I say that regardless of whether or not this analysis of our international policy is correct, it cannot be denied that a true solution of these difficulties must be based upon a thorough understanding of human relations, and that such understanding is the glory of the liberal arts college. The devotion to quality, to excellence rather than mass, is the real distinction of your college. May I conclude with a quotation from Gracian to the words of whom age has lent luster and verity, just as it has to Gettysburg College:

"Rate the intensive above the extensive. The perfect does not lie in quantity, but in quality. All that is best is always scant, and rare, for mass in anything cheapens it. Even among men the giants have often been true pygmies Some judge books by their thickness, as though they had been written to exercise the arms, instead of the mind. Bigness, alone, never gets beyond the mediocre, and it is the curse of the universal man that, in trying to be everything, he is nothing. It is quality that bestows distinction, and in heroic proportions if the substance is sublime."

A Tribute to Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of an address delivered by the Honorable Ralph A. Bard, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, before the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, April 5, 1943:

Almost 16 months ago to the day you people underwent, with our armed forces, the treacherous Japanese attack that turned our Nation from one striving to hold an honorable peace to a Nation united as it never was before rushing along the road of war. A Nation determined not only to avenge the attack on this island, but to see that the foes of democracy were destroyed so that this world might once again live in a peace that will endure down through the ages—a peace that will assure our children and our children's children of the opportunity to enjoy the freedom we are fighting for.

From every corner of our Nation workmen have rushed to this island to join with your people in the task of repairing our wounded ships at the navy yard so that they might be speeded back to the fighting lines of the Pacific. I say that the spirit of the workmen in the shipyards and war facilities on the mainland is high, but in all my travels I have never seen a better spirit and morale than that of the workers and loyal residents of the Territory.

The debt of gratitude that the mainland owes to the residents of this island for withstanding and having an actual part in the repelling of our enemies in the initial attack of this war cannot and, I am certain, will never be forgotten.

This island, although at the present time a bit removed from the scene of actual operations, is the spearhead of Navy action in the Pacific.

Here engineering miracles are performed daily by our thousands of yard workmen. Wounded ships come into the harbor—battered by enemy bombs and shells—and, I am most happy to state, are repaired in record time. Officers and men in charge of these vital operations, many of them friends of you here today, take as much pride in their record-breaking work as those officers and men who man the ships in action against the enemy.

Through song, picture, and story I have learned about this enchanting island, the island of peacetime, but I never realized how this garden spot of the Pacific had been changed from what was known as the Paradise of the Pacific to a fortress for freedom that forms an impregnable background and base for our advanced operations in the Pacific.

I would indeed be remiss were I to neglect at this time the opportunity of paying tribute to the civilian residents of this island for the manner in which they have backed to the limit the War bond program of the Nation.

Since that fateful day, December 7, 1941, civilians, war workers, and members of Hawaii's fighting forces have joined hands with those on the mainland in the common purpose of complete defeat of the foe.

The Nation is proud of the singular war service you have rendered. We salute you. Yours is a task that merits the Navy's "well done."

The Role of Big Business in Saving Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by

Col. Robert Wood Johnson, Vice Chairman, War Production Board; Chairman, Smaller War Plants Corporation; Washington, D. C., before the Economic Club of Detroit, Mich., April 19, 1943:

Honored guests, members, you are looking at the man who took the job that nobody wanted. We are all working under stress and strain, and the time has come when it will do a lot of good to get out of town for a few weeks, because one of the difficulties of solving this problem has been the lack of realistic, simple, straightforward thinking; and, if you don't mind my saying so the lack of hard work and sweat, because you won't do this job by conference or by conversation.

Now, let's take a look at it. First, let's define the job. And, of course, secondly—which is not easy—let's get everybody to agree to the definition.

The job is to put to work the distressed small factories of the United States. It is not to save agriculture. It is not to save service industry. It is not to act as a wet nurse to business that is going pretty well. It is not to take in the fellow who has four times more business than he ever had and is distressed because he hasn't eight. It is not to take care of family troubles, although some have been presented on my desk. It is to save small industry in distress. Stop!

So we now have an agreement by the House and the Senate, by the administration, by the services, by the War Production Board, that the definition of a distressed plant is a plant operating at less than 66⅔ percent of its normal capacity; and its normal capacity is the average of 6 years before the war, or, if they haven't the figures, the 1941 volume in dollars, adjusted, if it is a borderline case, to the Department of Commerce index figures, to adjust it for price increases since.

That is the definition. Any plant doing more than that is not our responsibility. Any plant doing less is.

Now, let's see how big that problem is. I am quite prepared to be quoted, with this reservation, that Government figures deserve a little more study than some others.

But as a matter of common sense and judgment and looking over what I have seen and what my men have seen, I am prepared to go on record today that there are not over 5,000 distressed plants in the United States. That is No. 1.

No. 2: That the volume of business that is required to put those plants up to normal is so infinitesimal that, if properly directed, this thing can be licked in 90 days, and stay licked, but that "if properly directed" covers a multitude of sins.

Now, we won't go over any old ground here, because everybody in this room knows all about it. Let's be specific and talk about Michigan.

Today, at the top limit, there are 252 distressed plants in Michigan, and probably under a more careful scrutiny, with that definition, there would be less.

Now, what can we do about that? That not only gives us the definition of the problem but it also gives us our measuring device from here out. We are not going to talk about prime contract or wages. We are going to take the net. And every 60 days I shall report to Congress and the Nation the number of distressed plants in the United States. If there is an increase, they had better hire another fellow after a reasonable time. And if it is decreasing, she is coming in the bag.

That is the figure we are going to use, because that is the net. So we get, (a) a definition of our job, and (b) a measuring device to see how we are doing.

Having arrived at that, what is the next principle? To solve it on the industrial front. If there is one last place in the United States to do a day's work, it is Washington; and, if there is one last place to come to, it is the same city. All right. Everybody admits that. And then they go to Washington.

There is just enough truth in it, and just enough reason for it to make it stick, because in a great many bureaus and agencies we have not decentralized in the true sense of the word. We talked decentralization and we acted centralization; and the place to get an order remained Washington.

Well, it is not going to be so. This job cannot possibly be done by reaching over into the Navy Department and finding some gadget, and then trying to reach down to south Texas and locate just the right plant in which to put it. Why? Because that would take more men than any agency has or should have. The taking of prime contracts by the Smaller War Plants Corporation is impossible, except under unusual circumstances. Otherwise it would mean that we would set up a procurement department larger than the Navy, Army, Maritime Commission, Treasury, and Defense Plant combined. On the face of it, that is ridiculous. And yet men are still laboring under the delusion that the answer to this question is to set up an institution that will give out prime contracts to everybody in the United States.

I know how long it took to build the Ordnance Department. I know how long it takes to build a business. And this war will be over twice before I can build that kind of bureau. So it is out. However, we will use the power we have to take prime contracts, where, by doing so, it will result in putting to work the unused productive facilities of small business concerns to augment war production and for essential civilian purposes.

But the place you can do it is where you have men like Daniel Hutchins and Hugo Weissbrodt, who meet up with the man in business, large or small, who know each other, and know what they are talking about on the industrial front. Solve it there. Give them the tools with which to do it.

Now, let's put into this one principle as differing from normal times—these aren't—that it is the course of wisdom at this time for big business to support its smaller competition. By support, I do not mean to build that into greater competition after the war. I mean that big business won't allow the war to destroy little business; that big business won't take advantage of the war to destroy little business. But that little business won't take advantage of the war to unduly enhance their position. And that definition is geared to stop that.

What we aim to do is this—for big business and medium business—and especially medium business—to take their share of the national load, properly apportioned, to maintain these small businesses on what might be termed the status quo of pre-war days. No more; no less. That is not asking you to develop new competition, but it is asking you to retain your normal competition as the greatest single defense that you can have in support of your business in the future.

Now, let us break it down. Roughly, there are five plans of attack organized and laid out, because the buying power of the United States can be divided into five groups:

One, the war procurement agencies.

Two, the prime contractor. Remember, the prime contractor is a larger buyer today than the Government, because most of the 1943 program has been assigned.

Three, State, county, and local governments, buying daily millions of things, whose interest can be directed to do this job. And, gentlemen, I am not talking theory. I have tried this in pilot plants throughout the United States, and they are ready to go.

Next, ordinary commercial business and everyday industrial business. Department stores, chain stores, mail-order houses, civilian products. And, strangely enough, I find that these businesses have had no device to put their finger on distress. I find, in talking to the larger buyers in New York last week, that they not only came aboard with trumpets playing, but that they went right to setting up the machinery of doing it, which I hope to bring to Detroit soon when I have a buttoned-up package for you.

These men wanted to find these plants. Why? Because their purchasing departments have been roaming the water front since their former suppliers have said, "We can't take your business because we have taken so much war business," or this, or that, or some other reason. I am inclined to suspect that private business can do more to solve this problem than Government.

And, finally, I have learned that in the War Production Board there are 525 industrial advisory committees. Now, that is a lot of committees, and a lot of industries; and they meet periodically, and they are doing a great job. So we are going to ask them to go to work for us, following the theory that it is the course of wisdom for large business to support its smaller competition; and so we will take the smaller competitors and say to industry that has the business, "Here is the little group of people. You don't need to serve them Ask me who my competitors are, and I will tell you what they can do, what their names are, what their ability is, how much business will keep them where they were, and just what type of thing they can do best. I don't need to send some engineer out there." And that goes for every successful businessman in this country. He knows his competition. He knows best how to cure it.

I am asking industry to take these plants which I will spot, and take them to the men who know the most about them, and I am asking them to take their proportion of the national problems, because this is no one man's job. This is everybody's job.

And I find industry will do it. I have tried it in several cities. It seems a little odd at first to help your competitor, but this is war, and they get on the line, and perhaps they will do more good than anyone else.

And also the banks. The banks for years have been dealing in distress; banks have big customers, and they have little customers. Banks, organized banks, should be able to carry the message that it is the course of wisdom at this time for large business to support its smaller competition. And so we are going to ask banks to do that.

Through that process, what are we doing? We are directing the buying power of the Nation toward the support of distress. It is the job of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to find that distress, and we must have it accurately so that we don't take you down the wrong path. We must have it adequately, so that that information is sufficient for a transaction.

I hear a great deal about surveys. Everybody has been surveyed today. But you do have to have enough information concerning your plant to make a transaction, and that is the amount you want. And that is the amount that we are prepared to give you, especially here in Detroit.

Let me make this technique clear. It is not our proposal to run through the order sheets of all the miscellaneous technological details of these Government bureaus. It is not our proposal to run through the buying departments of prime contractors. They know their business much better than we ever will. It is our idea that instead of running up and down the halls of bureaucracy, be it corporate or Government—and the Government has no monopoly on it, believe me—that we will assign these plants by mutual agreement; and that assignment will be for the duration of the war, because otherwise, if you go through all the sweat and kick aside all the hurdles and put the bunkers out of the fairway back out where they belong, and 90 days later you do it over

again, that won't work. This thing has to be solved by the men who can solve it.

Let's look at it another way. Here is a guess. I do not believe there are over 20,000 important purchasing men in the United States today. That includes government. If 20,000 men decide that it is the course of wisdom to help small business, whether it be because of the congressional act, whether it be because they want more material and cannot get it, whether it be because there is too much concentration of labor, whether it be because there is a shortage of housing, whether it be because they think it is sound sociological judgment, never mind, so long as they arrive at that state. When they have arrived at that state, gentlemen, they do the job. But before they arrive at that state, let me tell you from bitter experience, they have 47 reasons why it cannot be done, and most of them are good.

This did not start yesterday. Those of us who have run purchasing departments can remember something, I hope—although I am getting a little off the line—I am getting some bad habits.

Can you remember the purchasing agent who found it easier to buy everything from one place? Whoever dealt with a purchasing department who hasn't seen that judgment? Can you remember the fellow who found it better and easier to write the next order, "Same as last, Bill Jones"? Well, maybe you had good purchasing departments. I ran into that a good deal. Now, to convert that man took some doing.

I will tell you where I found out about small plants. In 1930 I went out to sell a business in a depression, and the toughest competition I had was small plants. I believe so strongly in small plants that I have done what some of the best managements in the United States have done here in Detroit—broken their business into component parts.

A small plant might be a big place with 5,000 people in it, or it might be a little place of 10. It depends on the industry. But when you get a unit system combined with good management, you have something; and you will make that greater plant look sick many times.

That doesn't go for all industries, but it does go for a good many.

So, buying from small plants is smart. It was smart in the depression. The best managements I tried to sell were buying from small plants. And it is just as smart now as it was then. Only, in addition to the usual business reasons, you have this problem which has been thrown in the lap of Congress as a result of the pressure and circumstance of war.

So, gentlemen, in the final analysis, this thing is even more simple than my explanation. It is a state of mind. It is no more and no less than a state of mind; not only on the part of the corporation president—who is a nice gentleman, and who goes along; but with all deference, he isn't worth anything to me, because he doesn't buy anything.

It is a state of mind on the part of the man who buys something, whether he be a Government procurement officer, a private buyer, or anything in between. And if that man will direct his attention not only to small plants but to the distressed small plants which will serve him, and if 20,000 men in this United States today were to decide that this was the course of wisdom, this job is in the bag—it is automatic.

And as I believe that it will contribute very largely to winning the war and that it will contribute very greatly to a better country during and after the war, I ask you to do what is necessary to create that state of mind here in Michigan, and to direct it on the spot, and the only spot that counts.

Let's not spray the woods. Let's hit the target. I will supply the target. And, in our mutual defense, I ask you to accept the principle that at this time the course of wisdom is for large business to support small business.

Investigate Rickenbacker's Sponsors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there are no more loyal people anywhere in the United States than those who are members of 32 local unions at Grand Forks, N. Dak., affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. These good Americans, 2,500 strong, have forwarded to me a set of very important resolutions on a matter that concerns our united war effort, and I herewith present those resolutions in full:

RESOLUTIONS OF GRAND FORKS TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

1. Whereas the city of Grand Forks, N. Dak., has 32 local unions with a membership 2,500 members, most of whom are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor; and

2. Whereas all of our union members are 100 percent American in thought, word, and deed; and

3. Whereas our country is now engaged in an all-out total war against the barbaric, inhuman, and treacherous Axis Powers; and

4. Whereas, our union members together with the rest of our community are doing everything in their power for the speedy defeat of these Axis Powers; and

5. Whereas all of our union members comply with all laws and regulations that are laid down for them by the President of these United States, by our Congress and by the various agencies of their Government in the pursuit of this present, terrible war; and

6. Whereas any effort made by anyone to divide the people of our great country during a time like this should not go unchallenged; and

7. Whereas Capt. Edward V. Rickenbacker has been making trips throughout the United States making speeches criticizing the President of these United States of America who, as Commander in Chief of our armed forces, should have the support of every man, woman, and child of our great land; and

8. Whereas Mr. Rickenbacker is president of the Eastern Airlines and uses this mode of transportation in going from section to section in his campaign of abuse of the working people and their chosen representatives and his attacks upon the President of the United States; and

9. Whereas in an effort to create a more effective atmosphere in the halls where these tirades are delivered Mr. Rickenbacker has men in the uniform of our armed forces on the stage about him;

10. Whereas by his charges and accusations, always speaking in generalities of evildoers without mentioning names or specific instances, the result of his appearances and addresses tend to, and do, divide the people and create disunity to an extent harmful to the war effort: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to make an immediate investigation of this campaign of abuse and disruption being waged by Mr. Rickenbacker for the purpose of determining the following:

1. The individuals or corporations sponsoring this unusual, unwarranted, and destructive activity of Mr. Rickenbacker.

2. The real ownership of Eastern Airlines and the possible connection between this ownership and what such ownership would gain if Rickenbacker's program for destroying the labor organizations of America could be put into effect.

3. The amount of subsidies given by the Government of the United States to Eastern Airlines since the company began operation.

4. What purpose the ownership of Eastern Airlines would have in causing the American people to lose confidence in President Franklin D. Roosevelt as our Commander in Chief, through the insidious statements made by Mr. Rickenbacker about the President in these addresses.

5. The association or affiliation of Mr. Rickenbacker with companies or concerns other than the Eastern Airlines, and their interest and expectations of gain should the labor organizations and the wage-rate system be abolished as advocated by Mr. Rickenbacker.

CYRIL P. O'NEILL,
Legislative Chairman.

Approved by the Grand Forks Trades and Labor Assembly in regular session this 28th day of April 1943.

O. M. RYAN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Grand Forks Trades and Labor Assembly.

Prohibition of Manufacture and Sale of Alcoholic Liquors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following petition, signed by citizens and voters of Knox County, Tenn., who favor the enactment of H. R. 2082:

To the Congress of the United States:

To reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization, we, the undersigned citizens of the State of Tennessee, petition the Congress of the United States to pass H. R. 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina.

This petition, and others like it, has been signed by more than 5,000 church members of Knoxville and Knox County, Tenn., and was sent me by Mrs. H. C. Sanford, of Knoxville, Tenn. Mrs. Sanford is an outstanding civic leader.

National Youth Administration War Production Training Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. E. E. COX

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the National Youth Administration war-production-training program in Georgia is preparing 2,000 youth regularly in 45 shop units at 15 locations in the State, and sending them into war industries having critical labor shortages. Over 4,800 boys and girls in Georgia alone have gone from N. Y. A. shops to war-production lines in the first half of the current fiscal year. The history of N. Y. A. and its present contribution to the war effort are of such significance as to merit attention at this time, and I ask the privilege of extending my remarks that I may present in some detail the remarkable and heartening story of N. Y. A.

The plight of youth caught in economic stress of the thirties is common knowledge. The demand upon the morale, stability, energy, and skill of youth in wartime is common knowledge. The contribution of N. Y. A. in peace and in war should be common knowledge.

Designed to provide wages for idle young people in return for honest work, N. Y. A. from its inception has achieved remarkable results in practical accomplishment.

In a construction program giving to Georgia boys their first real jobs and their first experience in use of hand tools, N. Y. A. built 276 public buildings and repaired and remodeled many more, comprising schools, community centers, lunchrooms, libraries, and recreational facilities in 151 of the 159 counties in the State. With good judgment, N. Y. A. in predominantly rural Georgia emphasized construction of vocational buildings, and 164 were built for rural high schools in about 120 counties. These buildings house farm shops, vocational agriculture classrooms, home-economics laboratories, canning plants, and freezer-storage units operated by the schools, and representing an approximate valuation of $850,000, of which N. Y. A. supplied $650,000 and local school boards $200,000. The contribution of this planning and accomplishment in terms of the present food crisis is obvious.

Three large summer recreational and training camps for State-wide use of Georgia youth were constructed, one in Fulton County for 4–H Clubs, one in Newton County for F. F. A. clubs, and one in Peach County.

Some 20,000 boys received construction experience under N. Y. A. in Georgia and are now repairing their own homes and building barns, brooder houses, and similar farm necessities; building ships, military establishments, and defense housing; doing advanced mechanical work in the armed services and industry, developed from their initial knowledge of handling tools. Need the return on this relatively small investment be measured in dollars and cents?

I cite the construction work as typical of N. Y. A. peacetime activity, all of which was suspended in 1942 in favor of war-production training. Other phases of the program provide parallel history just as thrilling: Girls working as hospital attendants and nurses' aides, now serving in the Red Cross, military medical branches, and private hospitals; girls working in school-lunch programs and other food-preparation and service activities, now helping to feed war-concentrated groups; youth in clerical work for public agencies, now performing war-important office work; youth in handcraft and ceramics projects, now using their developed manipulative skills in war industry assembly lines; youth working with vocational agriculture teachers and agricultural extension agents, now using their experience in food production and preservation. The details of these activities are impressive.

No arm of the Government exhibited more intelligent foresight and leadership within its sphere of activity toward organization for war than did the National Youth Administration.

Directly after Munich in the fall of 1938 and well before general preparation for defense, N. Y. A. began encouraging extensive development of production shops as work projects for youth, anticipating with complete accuracy the need for new workers trained in the metal and mechanical trades and taking the lead in preparing young women in such trades. At strategic locations in Georgia, industrially and geographically, N. Y. A. construction workers erected adequate shop buildings under a standard pattern for production work.

Machine tools discarded by the Navy and other agencies as of no further value were secured by N. Y. A. rebuilt by the youth under competent journeyman supervision, and set up in the shops for production work. Such money as could be set aside in the budget was used to purchase new machine tools at a time when there was no demand for them. Thus by the time the Nation began to become the arsenal of democracy, N. Y. A. had throughout the country a network of well-equipped shops prepared to do essential production work for war agencies while training new workers for war industry.

Adjacent to the shop centers in Georgia, N. Y. A. either built or secured the use of resident facilities in order to bring to the shops young people living too far away to travel each day between home and shop. Now the State has seven major centers, each training new workers from about one-seventh of the State's counties, located at Carrollton, College Park, Marietta, Clarkesville, Augusta, Savannah, and Brunswick, with feeder units at Fayetteville, Dalton, Toccoa, Madison, Vienna, and Waycross.

The 45 shop units at these 15 locations provide 1,145 work stations in 14 occupations having critical labor shortages, such as welding, machine, sheet metal, and radio. The use of these work station for one to three shifts a day provides for training about 2,000 youth at a time, two-thirds of whom are given subsistence at the resident centers. The average stay at the projects is about 8 weeks.

The youth work in the shops on eight-hour shifts 6 days a week. They are paid $22.40 per month if they live at home and $10.80 if they receive subsistence at the project. Nearly half of the youth are girls and the ratio of girls is climbing steadily. The work they do is production for war agencies, principally the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission, with the war agency furnishing the materials and N. Y. A. processing them at no further cost to the agency. The orders are of the type for which there are no industrial bidders, special "nuisance" jobs. Typical orders are: Marietta, 100 wood executive desks for W. P. B. and 50 metal hoods to cover cooking ranges for the Army; College Park, 150 adjusting screws assembly for C. A. A. beacon lights and 25 metal roof jacks for Conley Army depot; Brunswick, ship ladders, platforms, and clips for 167 Maritime Commission cargo vessels, work being divided out among 7 shop centers.

During the period from July 1, 1942, to February 28, 1943, in Georgia approximately 4,800 N. Y. A. youth were trained and placed in jobs in war industries, other concerns doing work related to the war effort and in Government service. This means each station has been operating at an efficiency of 420 percent, excluding the present employment of 2,002 youth.

The Southeastern Shipbuilding Corporation, Savannah, Ga., alone has employed 564 youth trained by N. Y. A. Other large vital industries in Georgia, such as Brunswick Marine Construction Co., J. A. Jones Construction Co. in Brunswick, and Bell Aircraft Corporation, Marietta, are employing young men and women trained in N. Y. A. shops.

Assignment of youth to the respective projects is handled by several workers stationed in the counties served by the project. They work closely with the United States Employment Service and local citizens and recruit out-of-school young women and young men not likely soon to be drafted and who do not have available other means of preparation for war industry employment. Extreme caution is taken to avoid affecting adversely the farm-labor situation.

Health examinations are given N. Y. A. youth through arrangement with private physicians and public health officials. In the first 8 months of this fiscal year, the agency gave physical examinations to 5,886 youths, revealing a variety of conditions requiring attention.

The average cost per youth per month for the program in Georgia, including management, recruiting, direct shop supervision, food, lodging, and health services, 24-hour supervision at resident centers, shop operations expense, work clothes, property and transportation, and youth wages, is about $79. The aver-

age turn-over is 100 percent every 2 months. The cost of N. Y. A. war production training seems precious little by any standard.

The efficiency of the National Youth Administration and the flexibility of its service make it an essential part of the Nation's war effort, and I give it my fullest endorsement and support.

Manpower and Federal Funds Wasted

REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government totaled 2,991,287 at the end of March 1943, a net increase of 1,065,213, or 55 percent over the 1,926,074 recorded in March 1942. The March pay roll was $552,700,300, compared with $309,764,679 in the same month in 1942, an increase of about 78 percent. On March 31 there were 286,841 civilian Federal employees in Washington, with the month's pay roll listed at $58,972,074. This indicates that while the increase in personnel in the Capital was about 20 percent, the pay roll jumped about 43 percent, or more than twice as much.

The War and Navy Departments on March 31 had 1,989,187 civilians on the pay roll, or more than twice as many as the total number on the entire Federal pay roll at the peak of the First World War. However, most of the other Federal departments and bureaus have as many or more employees than they had prior to the war. Thus, while emergencies come and go, the Federal pay roll gets bigger and bigger, and the national indebtedness increases at an alarming rate.

The House Civil Service Committee has been investigating Federal personnel in order to eliminate waste of manpower and duplication and confusion in our bureaucracy. Likewise, the Director of the Budget has ordered the separation of unnecessary employees from the pay roll; but when will there be some tangible evidence in the monthly reports of the United States Civil Service Commission?

How can we win this war against the Axis Powers when there is criminal waste of both manpower and the taxpayers' money on the part of this administration?

The President has returned from another extensive trip throughout the country to inspect the war activity and announced that he was impressed with the Nation's military and industrial proficiency. One of his conclusions is that he found the country as a whole has a better perspective on the war, a better sense of proportion, is sobered in temper and more intelligent in its attitude than a good part of Washington.

The Chief Executive neglected to specify which part of the National Capital is not thoroughly aroused as to the critical aspects of the war effort. However, as the Federal Government has about 300,000 civilian employees in Washington, it is reasonable to assume that the President was indicting the personnel of his own administration.

Competent and unbiased observers in the Capital have been impressed by the inefficiency, extravagance, and red tape prevalent throughout the executive departments, and sense the need for streamlining. Many of the new dealers appear to consider the war as merely another emergency which should be utilized fully to expand bureaucracy, as well as planned economy. Dollars are being rolled out of the Federal Treasury with little regard for the vast financial obligations incident to prosecuting the war. A congressional committee recently revealed that a total of 840,578 men of draft age was on the Federal pay roll. Politics still influence much of the administrative work in Federal departments and bureaus.

Possibly the comments of the President are pertinent. He is the Commander in Chief and directs the war program in Washington. If he has been dissatisfied with results, why does he not clean house, demand greater efficiency, and see that intelligence is displayed by the appointees of his wartime administration?

To Feed or Not To Feed

REMARKS

OF

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, when at home last week I had the opportunity to talk with numerous cattle feeders in my district. The question in the minds of most of these farmers is to feed or not to feed. Their indecision is due to the lack of spread in cost and selling prices now prevailing in the cattle markets. Mr. Farmer is wondering and trying to figure out how he can buy feeders from the ranges at a cost, laid down to him at his town, of approximately 16 cents per pound, feed and fatten these cattle, and then sell them at or near the same 16 cents per pound price.

We all realize we are now facing a beef shortage. If we are to raise more beef, then some plan must be devised to enable the feeder to at least break even or make some profit through his operations. Yes, he makes a gain in the increased weight put on these cattle, but that in itself will not compensate for the price of all kinds of feeds fed into the animals nor afford pay for the great amount of labor and every-day care that must be given beef cattle if they are to do well in the feed lot. While the average farmer has no desire to get rich through feeding cattle, he does feel he is entitled to a price spread that will afford him a normal profit. Unless such spread is soon made possible, I fear that many feed lots will begin to empty and fail to be filled again this fall. To me it seems the price of range cattle is completely out of line in comparison to the price paid at present for finished beef.

I am including in my remarks an editorial from the Chicago Tribune, dated May 4, entitled "Do You Want More Beef?" This editorial emphasizes the problem of cattle feeding and cattle prices and is well worth your best thought and consideration. I, therefore, hope you will read it carefully:

DO YOU WANT MORE BEEF?

The Hereford steers being fattened on the Tribune farm gain an average of 2 pounds a day. When they are sold as prime beef at the stockyards that 2 pounds would be worth 34 cents on the hoof, if present prices prevail, which is unlikely. But the feed that the steers eat costs 38 cents a day. The labor to care for them, their bedding, and other items raise this cost to 44 cents. In short, the fattening process, taken by itself, shows a loss of 10 cents a day for each animal.

That, of course, is not the complete story. But it is a fairly typical experience in the great midwestern cattle-fattening industry. Unless costs are reduced, a responsible economist in the industry assures us, this situation is going to inflict an increasing scarcity of beef on the country during the war and put the whole cattle industry in danger of economic collapse after the war.

Most Middle Western farmers who fatten cattle buy the animals from western ranges, where they are calved and attain a certain growth on grass feed. The stock fattener has two possibilities of profit in his operation aside from the byproducts in the form of manure and the fattening of hogs. The first is in the actual gain of weight of the animals. That gain, as the figures from the Tribune farm demonstrate, is today more likely to become a loss. The second is in the improvement of the quality of the beef.

There are a few westerners who profess a fondness for range beef and a number of crackpots in Washington who have suggested that it be inflicted on the country during the war on the theory that the more hardships the rest of us suffer the better it is for our souls. But aside from this minority the present generation of Americans wants its beef improved in quality by being fattened on corn and protein foods.

When an Illinois or Iowa farmer buys a 650-pound steer and feeds it until it weighs half a ton, he may actually lose money on the 350 pounds that the steer puts on, but he expects to profit by raising the quality and price of the 650 pounds of meat that he bought on the hoof. On the other hand, if he buys a 400-pound steer calf and keeps it in his feed lot long enough to raise it to a prime beef animal, he usually pays as much per pound for the calf as he gets for the prime steer, and his only hope of profit is in putting weight on the animal at a lesser cost than he can sell it for.

Shortly after the last war the middle western farmers bought calves because feed was generally cheap and the stock fattener could make a profit on the gain in weight. That is no longer true. With high-priced feed, the best chance the middle western farmer has of breaking even on his beef operations is to buy steers and raise the

grade of the meat as he fattens it. In consequence, the burden of raising the calf to a yearling or 2-year-old steer has been shifted back to the range country and, even so, the high price of feed is making it difficult to move the steers into middle western feed lots.

Although the price of live cattle is not fixed, the same effect is achieved indirectly by the price ceilings that have been placed on beef at the wholesale and retail levels. The Office of Price Administration has announced a further reduction in meat price ceilings, effective next month, with an expected "roll back" in livestock prices which, some livestock economists believe, may reduce the price of cattle as much as a dollar a hundredweight.

When stock fattening becomes unprofitable the natural result is to reduce the supply of meat. The same undesirable end is accomplished by insufficient supplies of feed, and price ceilings on feeds, and particularly on the so-called supplements which furnish protein to the steers' diet, are also operating to produce scarcity.

The result of these two forces, aided, of course, by the scarcity of farm labor, will be to provide less and less meat at a time when we need it most, and at the same time to pile up on the ranges of the West a surplus of aging steers which will threaten to glut the market and break the whole livestock price structure after the war.

The remedy, as livestock men see it, is to encourage the fattening of beef by allowing enough of an increase in prices to insure farmers against the losses with which they must gamble today and, at the same time, to stimulate the production of feeds by raising the ceilings on feed.

That, of course, will raise the cost of living. But raising prices has always been an efficient and automatic way of dealing with shortages. It reduces the consumption. Within limits this probably would do little harm to the national diet, since the increased cost of meat would be met in part by greater economy in its use. Fundamentally, of course, this consideration is a minor one. It doesn't help anyone to keep the price of beefsteak down if you can't get the beefsteak.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. What price does the feeder have to pay for corn now?

Mr. ARENDS. Approximately a dollar in my district.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman touch on that in his remarks?

Mr. ARENDS. I will if I have the time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Purchase by the Government of Domestic Silver

REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURICE J. SULLIVAN

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill will come up for consideration today.

I understand that the report will recommend that the House recede from the Celler amendment, which was stricken out in the Senate, and which amendment reads as follows:

No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used directly or indirectly during the fiscal year 1944 for the purchase or procurement of silver under the provisions of the Silver Purchase Acts, namely, the act of June 19, 1934, and the act of July 6, 1939, or for the carrying out of any of the provisions of said Silver Purchase Acts.

I am speaking in favor of the report insofar as it refers to the Celler amendment.

It is claimed that the purchase by the Government of domestic silver constitutes an outrageous expense on the Government and an outrageous subsidy to the silver producers. Every time the Government buys such silver it pays the producer $71.11 per 100 ounces in silver certificates, practically at the cost of running the printing presses, and minting the bullion, if and when called on to redeem the paper. In other words, 55 ounces out of each 100 ounces are coined into silver dollars and the remainder, or 45 ounces, are held by the Government as a free gift from the miner.

I do not think anyone who will read section 4 of the Domestic Silver Purchase Act will contend that the Government is out one penny in buying domestic silver at 71.11 cents per ounce, or will deny that the Government profits by the transaction to the extent of 45 percent of the silver purchased.

Silver is a money metal, not a mere commodity. She is a full sister, not a stepsister, of gold. At a time when we in the United States, in common with all the peoples of the world, were looking about for some refuge from inflation, for some money that is hard and incorruptible, having at least some intrinsic and traditional worth, and having had through the ages the confidence of learned and unlearned alike so that it is accepted as value by weight with or without the stamp, we should view with suspicion any step that may lead to the further chaos of currencies—the further degradation of what we know as the royal metals.

It may be that my conservatism is ill-advised. It may be that my doubts and apprehensions are unwarranted and exaggerated, but let us at least approach this problem directly and not in a collateral way through the embarrassment of an executive agency and arm of Government in the administration and enforcement of two well-considered acts of the Congress standing on the books of the written law. If we are to repeal these acts, let us set out to do so rather than beset a rider who is having all he can do to run down the blind horse of war now trampling alike on the graves of the dead and the hearts of the living.

PRICE OF SILVER AFFECTS THAT OF COPPER, LEAD, AND OTHER METALS

It is not generally realized that a higher price of silver causes a lower price of copper, lead, zinc, and many other associate metals, while a lower price of silver causes a higher price of those metals. In the United States approximately 90 percent of the silver produced comes through smelters treating copper, lead, and zinc. Less than 10 percent of the silver comes from mines using the cyanide process, often in connection with gold, but not affecting the prices of copper, lead, and zinc. Few, if any, metals come from the original mine ore unmixed with other metals. Practically all mines produce more than one kind of metal. Silver is very largely associated with copper, lead, and zinc, and its value in the ore correspondingly reduces the cost of producing the copper, lead, and zinc, or other metals with which it is associated.

In 1940 the United States produced nearly 70,000,000 ounces of silver, worth, at 71 cents an ounce, nearly $50,000,000. Had United States silver been worth 35 cents an ounce instead of 71 cents, the cost of producing copper, lead, and zinc in the United States would have been about $23,000,000 more than it was. Conversely, whenever the price of silver increases, the cost of producing copper, lead, and zinc correspondingly decreases. It is the consumers of copper, lead, and zinc who actually and ultimately feel the effects of ups and downs in the price of silver.

Political Propaganda in the Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, increasing concern is being evidenced by many people in Washington over the possibility that educational materials on war matters, addressed to both school children and adults, may be carrying propaganda on one side or the other of highly controversial subjects, and that such educational materials may even be tinged with propaganda subversive of our American ideals and democratic institutions.

This concern was the subject of a recent newspaper column by David Lawrence in which he flatly accuses a group of New Deal theorists with invading the public school system of the United States with political propaganda, and of having put something over on the National Education Association, using that nonpartisan organization as the medium for extolling the philosophy of an omniscient and all-wise state.

Referring to a 93-page booklet entitled "My Part in This War," written in cooperation with certain university and high-school educators and Federal Government economists, and being distributed to students through the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Mr. Lawrence says that along with some well-presented, useful information there is an

adroitness of phrase and clever camouflage to cover up certain definitely prejudiced views on controversial subjects and that "as is customary with such propaganda there is only the Government side."

Whether or not the booklet to which Mr. Lawrence so strenuously objects is a fair illustration of Government-inspired or politically inspired literature passing as educational material it is a fact that the Congress, educators in every State and community, and the people themselves must be on guard against the indoctrination of youth being substituted for education, more in time of war than they ordinarily need be in times of peace.

That the education of our young people should be administered by State and local educational authorities, without domination or interference by the Federal Government, is a principle which has been zealously defended since the Constitution was adopted. Under the stress of war, with its accompanying centralization of power in the Federal Government, it would not be surprising if an extension of that power into the field of education should be attempted. But here, more than in any other field, the doctrine of States' rights should be kept inviolate. Federal control of education would be a step hard to retrace, a step which could easily lead to partisan, one-sided, even a Hitlerized control over the ideas and thoughts with which young minds are nourished and which guide their development.

There have been several attempts to establish in the Federal Government a Department of Education with a Secretary of Education sitting as a member of the President's Cabinet. Some of those attempts have been made by Members of Congress in the form of bills and resolutions. In each case, fortunately, the plans of those who would centralize the control of education in Washington have been defeated. Educators of national repute together with those of no special prominence joined in objecting to a Federal Department of Education because they could foresee its consequences.

The United States Office of Education, set up by Congress years ago as a part of the Department of the Interior, and now a part of the Federal Security Agency, has not received the disapproval of educators in principle, although the actual operations and value of that office have aroused considerable criticism at times. The Office of Education is simply a "service agency," aiding State and local departments of education, and administering the allocation of Federal funds voted by Congress for the assistance of State and local education departments. It has no authority to dictate the ideological character of education.

If we are to keep our public schools free of political and partisan propaganda at the same time that we give our young people a realistic education in the problems of modern living and working, Congress must be ever alert to any attempts by Federal officials or employees either to alter the Federal Government's relationship to State and locally controlled public school systems, or to make use of their official positions or public funds to influence the character of education. In fulfilling this duty, Congress should be governed by three principles:

First. Federal funds should never be used for the printing, publishing, or distributing of school textbooks.

Second. Materials published by Government agencies for general distribution which may be used in public schools should be scrutinized most carefully by the proper committees of the Congress to prevent any suggestion of propaganda from appearing in them and to guarantee the unbiased treatment of both sides of controversial issues.

Third. No Federal official or employee should be permitted to prepare, write, or endorse school textbooks without first submitting them to the proper congressional committees and securing their approval. A private individual working for a corporation is usually required to get his company's approval in such cases. So should a public individual working for the Government.

These measures, combined with the careful scrutiny of educational materials and methods offered to State and local school authorities, will do much to keep propaganda out of our schools. If it gets in, it will slowly but surely begin to eat into the foundation of democracy. We want an informed but not a propagandized public.

Metallurgy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio speech which I recently prepared on the subject of metallurgy and its development as a contribution to the war effort and the later industrial needs of the Nation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good evening, friendly Oregonians. While our wars rage and our boys and girls are in the Nation's combat forces all over the world, it is vital that effective action be given promptly to the supply of all needful things required by them.

Tonight I shall tell you about metallurgy, a new major industry for the Oregon country, the urgent demands upon it by war industries, and the hope of retaining it as an important factor in our permanent, domestic economy.

During the past several months those of us of the Oregon congressional delegation who are most interested in the project have been battling to secure and retain the establishment at Albany, Oregon, of a federally financed and operated electrometallurgical laboratory. That we have secured it is an important achievement; and that we have succeeded in retaining its location at Albany is most vital to the development of this new major industry in Oregon.

Three years before war was declared by our country, Congress authorized the President to accumulate stock piles of strategic materials. At about the same time appropriate committees of the Senate appointed subcommittees to go to various parts of our own country for the purpose of ascertaining from experienced miners in the mineral areas their recommendations how best to proceed to develop ore bodies most quickly. I was sent to the Oregon-California area by the Military Affairs Committee and I held hearings in Portland, Grants Pass, and San Francisco in the summer of 1941.

For this official activity then, I now am criticized by those ambitious and designing persons who would rather win a personal political campaign than win the war, or save the lives of our men in the combat services.

As a result of these hearings and similar hearings held in other areas by other Senators, the Federal Bureau of Mines and the United States Geological Survey were authorized and directed to expand and expedite their efforts to find new ore bodies of strategic minerals and to recommend methods for increasing the output of mines already in production. Our foreign supply of a number of strategic metals was being shut off by enemy submarines. Without an ample supply of these strategic metals the construction of airplanes, ammunition, armaments, ships, and supplies could not continue to be produced in the volume necessary to equip, furnish, serve, and transport our combat forces. Time and volume of production have been, and still are, of the greatest national importance.

On account of congressional authorization and appropriations, in which I took an active and effective interest, our production of strategic ores in the western areas of our country, including Alaska, have greatly expanded since 1939, but the present rate of production of certain other metals also must be increased.

This country, prior to the summer of 1941, was illy prepared to maintain its supremacy in war, or in peace, because of the lack of electrometallurgical and electrochemical industries.

Low-cost, large volume power is an indispensable factor in commercial metallurgical production. I was well informed on this subject early in my service in the Congress and had ascertained conditions in Germany, our greatest commercial rival and our then most likely possible enemy.

To strengthen our national position in this connection, early in 1939 I supported congressional authorizations and appropriations for the construction and placement of two generating units at Bonneville and three at Grand Coulee. At this time also I saved the Tennessee Valley Authority appropriation in committee.

In the fall of 1939 and the spring of 1940 I was able to have added four Bonneville units and three Grand Coulee units in the appropriations bills. I succeeded in including these Bonneville units in the appropriation bill after the executive department had disapproved them, and in the summer of 1940 I saved another Tennessee Valley Authority appropriation and added three more generators for the Grand Coulee power project. I likewise supported appropriations for other western plants, defense activities, and public power projects.

In the winter of 1941–42 I successfully proposed the Shasta Dam compromise and Senate policy report. Because of these early successful activities I believe I have the right

now to demand full utilization of the hydroelectric resources which Congress provided for the Columbia River area.

Having secured and made available large blocks of cheap hydroelectric energy for the use and development of industry and its pay rolls in the Oregon country, the problem now is to put it to the best and greatest possible use without delay.

It is my purpose to secure all the Federal aid for the establishment of new and larger pay rolls in the Oregon country which prudent foresight and sound, reasonable planning may justify. That determination suggests, among other things, the greatest utilization of the minerals in the Oregon country and the development of permanent industries with their pay rolls, from latent, as well as active, natural resources.

It is our plan to establish in the area served by Bonneville cheap electric power, reduction plants, and smelters to reduce ores to metals. Then, to establish in this same area, rolling-mills and extrusion plants to convert metals into shapes and forms. Then, to locate, also in the area, mills and plants to manufacture the metal shapes and forms into all the multitude of articles, parts, engines and finished products with which to conduct the war; and which, when peace again blesses us, may be converted into the manufacture of all the various implements and articles of commerce. Metallurgy is the genesis and the source of a new and permanent industry in Oregon.

Oregon is fortunate in having as its Director of the State Department of Geology and Mineral Industry, Mr. Earl Nixon, one of the foremost metallurgists in the county. I have been kept advised and informed by him, and his cooperation with the Federal Bureau of Mines has been invaluable.

At present, aluminum in various processes is transported four times across the continent—chromium twice at least. And so it is with other metals. Economy justifies this plan which I have outlined and the maximum utilization of the hydroelectric power of the area, demands it.

Today, the attention of industry is directed to the West coast. The names "Grand Coulee," "Bonneville Dam," "Columbia River aluminum plants," "Boeing," "Kaiser shipyards" are synonymous with achievement.

The Pacific Northwest is 3,000 miles from Washington, D. C., but its influence is felt here in our Capital, over in Africa, down in the South Pacific, up in Kiska, and over in Germany. Boeing bombers from Seattle, made from aluminum produced by Bonneville power, are dropping bombs on our enemies all over the world. Many of the structural parts for those bombers are made by manufacturers in Portland. Mercury from Oregon quicksilver mines is going into explosives rained on the Axis war centers in Europe, Africa, and Asia. It is also used in antifouling paints for American fighting ships. Antimony from our Pacific Northwest mines is going into shrapnel, and into submarine batteries. Chromium, which is mined from Coos County beach sands, is going into stainless steels in war equipment. Lead from our Pacific Northwest is going into bullets and into submarine batteries along with antimony.

Ships made in Portland are carrying supplies and equipment on the sea lanes of the world to our armed forces and are bringing back raw materials for forging war weapons and for helping to feed our civilians.

While our situation with respect to the so-called strategic metals has eased, we have been confronted with unprecedented demands in the light metals field. Before Pearl Harbor we were producing less than 30,000,000 pounds of magnesium a year, but our needs now are more than 20 times that amount. Before Pearl Harbor, we were producing about 600,000,000 pounds of aluminum a year, but the needs now for our vast airplane production program and other fighting machines are approximately 5 times that amount.

Hydroelectric power, available in quantity and at low cost in the Pacific Northwest has resulted in the establishment of aluminum plants in the area, and is helping to meet the Nation's demands for this vital metal.

The American supply of bauxite, which is an aluminum ore, is only sufficient to meet our demands for the next 2 years, and our foreign sources are not now available to us on account of the activities of enemy submarines.

We must find other sources than bauxite for making aluminum. Aluminum can be obtained from certain clays. To develop improved processes for extracting aluminum from aluminum clays is to be one of the chief functions of the long delayed operation of the Electrodevelopment Laboratory at Albany.

The Federal Bureau of Mines has carried on an intensive exploration program in Oregon and has reported to me that the Hobart Butte deposits in Lane County contain more than 5,000,000 and possibly 10,000,000 tons of the finest clay. There is another vast clay deposit near Molalla, Clackamas County, which the Bureau is exploring.

The Bureau is carrying on in the Pacific Northwest ore-testing studies to utilize lead-zinc ores.

In Columbia County, Oregon, and elsewhere in the Pacific Northwest, are iron deposits which should be developed for post-war needs. The Bureau of Mines has reported that several million tons of iron ore are indicated in the Columbia County deposits. There now is a small sponge iron plant in operation at Cascade Locks, Oregon. It must be given every encouragement to grow, prosper, and expand.

The Pacific Northwest has large reserves of coal, and the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines have studied the Coos Bay coals of Oregon. The Geological Survey estimates the original reserves of coal in the Coos Bay area at 1,000,000,000 tons.

You can now understand why the establishment of the Bureau of Mines' Electrodevelopment Laboratory at Albany, Oregon, is of such great importance to the war effort and to Oregon's subsequent development. This laboratory, which will be staffed with metallurgists and other skilled technicians, will mark the beginning of a new era for the Oregon country. There will be developed there new methods for the treatment of low-grade, or off-grade, minerals. In the West are potential ores of aluminum, magnesium, chromium, manganese, nickel, zinc, copper, and other strategic minerals for which processes can be developed.

The Albany laboratory will point the way to the production of many alloys for a multitude of useful purposes. The Pacific Northwest long has awaited a laboratory to serve as a clearing house of information in research and will provide that technical information which cannot otherwise be obtained.

This is the time to lay the groundwork for the post-war industrial Pacific Northwest. The thousands of war workers are there, and their skills will be lost, and their unemployment a tragedy, unless jobs are found for them when peace comes. The shipyards are there, ready to build more cargo vessels and later new luxury liners. The airplane plants are ready to turn again to ocean-spanning transports. The cheap electrical energy is there. But all these facilities are dependent upon the factors—minerals, raw materials, and cheap power. And those, too, are there and must be ready for operation as quickly as possible to help in winning the war, and to provide more jobs for the otherwise unemployed, when victory is won.

In closing, I want to remind the people of the Oregon country of the early and constant support which Senator McNARY has given to the Bonneville power project. The great worth of his long public service must now be obvious to all.

Noteworthy Accomplishments Prove Value of Foreign Trade Zones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the foreign-trade zone was set up under the Celler Act of June 18, 1934. I followed with interest the progress of the foreign trade zone, or "free port," that has been established at New York. One of the most interesting annual reports emanating from the Foreign-Trade Zones Board appeared recently in the May 1, 1943, issue of the Foreign Commerce Weekly. The Foreign Commerce Weekly is the final medium of the Department of Commerce for the dissemination of commercial and industrial information gathered throughout the world.

I have naturally followed with great interest the progress of the New York foreign-trade zone and in whatever aid I have given to that zone, which is operated by the city of New York, with Harry Shanks as its splendid operating head, I have found ample reason to give much credit for their cooperation to Wayne C. Taylor, Under Secretary of Commerce, and Tom Lyons, executive secretary of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

I herewith set forth portions of the annual report for the fiscal year 1942 submitted by the Foreign-Trade Zones Board:

NOTEWORTHY ACCOMPLISHMENTS PROVE VALUE OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES

In its annual report for the fiscal year 1942, transmitted to the Congress several days ago, the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, headed by Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones, emphasizes the post-war value of such facilities in our principal ports and hints at possible Federal Government action to establish such zones if local interests, public or private, "fail to formulate definite plans" immediately after hostilities cease.

The report points out that in the New York foreign-trade zone large quantities of miscellaneous foreign merchandise have been accommodated in transit or for subsequent transshipment when possible to various foreign countries. Much of this material was essential to our national war program. As a result, the Federal Government was able to acquire strategic supplies which, except for the existence of the zone, might never have reached the United States.

Signed by Secretary Jones, Secretary of War Stimson, and Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, who constitute the Board, the report points out that when the United States entered the war against the Axis Powers it quickly became evident that warehouse facilities in principal ports on the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts were seriously inadequate.

MILITARY EXIGENCIES

This lack of adequate facilities for handling port traffic necessitated embargoes and orders by military and emergency transportation agencies requiring the removal of foreign import and export merchandise to inland areas in order to provide essential storage facilities for military operations at our ports, thus throwing an additional load on an already heavily burdened inland transport system.

"War requirements for existing port facilities and the suspension of commercial construction," the report states, "have resulted in a dearth of available zone sites, but ocean terminals erected or extended to meet the military and lend-lease program can be readily adapted later for foreign-trade-zone purposes and thereby aid future 'good neighbor' relations and trade policies."

NEW YORK ZONE SETS RECORD

At the end of the last fiscal year the New York foreign trade zone was the only such area in operation. Each succeeding year since this New York facility was established in 1937 it has set new records for value of merchandise handled.

Since Pearl Harbor, military necessity has required the New York zone to curtail its operations and to transfer a large part of them to a series of piers on the Manhattan side of the Hudson River.

OTHER PORT OFFICIALS ACT

However, the growing importance of the New York zone in developing foreign commerce, especially in overquota coffee and sugar, Brazilian and Peruvian cotton, Latin-American canned meat, Sumatra tobacco, Chinese and Bolivian tungsten, and various other products, have prompted officials of several Gulf ports to take definite steps looking toward the establishment of similar facilities in that area. For example, applications for grants to establish such facilities have been filed by the Harris County Houston Ship Channel Navigation District for a zone at Houston, Tex., and by the Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans.

In addition to these applications from public authorities, an application was received during the fiscal year from the Western Hemisphere Corporation of New Jersey to establish and operate a foreign-trade zone in the Greenville Section of Jersey City, port of New York.

The Board has these applications under consideration, and officials of a number of other ports on both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts are understood to be giving serious consideration and study to the question of establishing foreign-trade zones to meet post-war conditions and shifting trends in world trade.

LAW'S BASIC PURPOSE

The purpose of the law authorizing the establishment of foreign-trade zones, approved June 18, 1934, generally is to provide enclosed and policed areas, under Federal supervision, in or adjacent to ports of entry where foreign and domestic merchandise may be landed without application of the customs laws.

In such a facility, goods may be stored, processed, or otherwise manipulated, but not manufactured or exhibited to the public, and may be exported or brought into customs territory subject to the laws and regulations of the United States affecting imported merchandising.

FACILITIES REQUIRED

To qualify under the law for consideration as a foreign-trade zone, the area covered by an application, among other things, must have adequate ships, docks, wharves, warehouses, loading and mooring facilities, where the zone is adjacent to water, and, in the case of an inland zone, must have adequate loading, unloading, and warehouse facilities. This latter provision for inland zones is especially significant in the light of the amazing development of air cargo transport.

FUNCTIONS PERFORMED

The functions performed by a foreign-trade zone are illustrated by the handling of Sumatra tobacco in the New York zone. Facilities for warehousing and marketing this thin-leaf tobacco were erected in the New York zone by Dutch growers at a cost of nearly half a million dollars. More than $40,000,000 worth of Sumatra and Java tobaccos have been brought into the zone for storage and sale during the past 2 years. It is understood that a sufficient quantity is on hand to meet the needs of the American cigar industry for a number of years.

New York City's annual report sets cut many of the advantages of the foreign-trade zone for the manipulation and storage of foreign and domestic merchandise over the bonded warehouse and drawback systems.

INCOME AND EXPENSES

The operating records and accounts of the foreign-trade zone are maintained on a calendar-year basis. According to its annual report for the year 1941, the gross operating income was $691,329 and operating and administrative expenses were $428,385, including $29,374 representing the cost of United States customs officers whose services are paid by the grantee. The net profit to the city for 1941 was $233,570.

The report of the city shows receipt during the year 1941 of 4,216 lots of merchandise weighing 136,860 short tons and having a value of $88,623,194. Although there was a decrease in the tonnage received, the number of lots and value of merchandise represents an increase from 1940 when 2,952 lots of merchandise, weighing 215,658 tons, valued at $83,431,000, were received in the zone. Similar figures for 1937, the first year the zone was in operation, were 92 lots of merchandise weighing 10,600 tons and valued at $1,174,000. In 1941, 232 different commodities from 48 foreign countries were received at the zone.

Cargo received in the zone in 1941 was transported by 40 vessels engaged in foreign trade, 603 inland waterway and harbor craft, 2,140 motortrucks, 53 rail cars, and 16 parcel-post and hand-lot deliveries.

ZONE'S PROGRESS SHOWN

The progress of the zone since January 1, 1938, is reflected in the following data:

Merchandise received	1938	1939	1940	1941
Lots	1,285	4,346	2,952	4,216
Short tons	38,895	100,845	215,658	136,860
Value	$5,752,000	$39,082,000	$83,431,000	$88,623,194

The total tonnage and value of merchandise forwarded from the zone during the years 1940 and 1941, including exports, reexports, transshipments, and imports, were as follows:

Item	1940		1941	
	Tonnage	Value	Tonnage	Value
	Short tons		*Short tons*	
Foreign goods reexported	70,288	$13,234,000	24,194	$9,866,499
Foreign goods imported	70,847	16,572,000	60,217	31,016,307
Domestic goods exported	67,121	48,836,000	22,177	27,157,891
Domestic goods imported	2,534	276,000	4,523	684,459
Total	210,790	78,918,000	111,111	68,725,156

SOME SALIENT DETAILS

In 1941, 40 percent by weight and 25 percent by value of all foreign merchandise forwarded from the foreign-trade zone was reexported or transshipped abroad. Similar figures for 1940 show that reexports and transshipments were 50 percent by weight and 45 percent by value of all foreign merchandise forwarded from the zone. This decline in 1941 is attributable in part to the fall o France, as prior to its occupation by the Germans that country had received substantial tonnage through the foreign-trade zone.

Distribution of merchandise from the zone to 75 foreign countries amounted to 47,320 short tons, valued at approximately $37,276,003; and merchandise imported into customs territory of the United States from the zone in 1941 weighed 78,640 short tons and was valued at $35,739,852. Total receipts and shipments represent a decrease under 1940 of 39 percent in weight and 1.7 percent in value. The merchandise remaining in the zone on December 31, 1941, weighed 66,433 short tons and was valued at $36,169,018, being a substantial increase in the amount and value of merchandise in the zone over that at the start of the year 1941.

Merchandise shipped from the zone in 1941 was transported by 8 vessels engaged in foreign trade, 834 inland waterway and harbor craft, 6,139 motor trucks, 31 rail cars, and 409 messenger deliveries.

In order of value, the 10 leading commodities handled at the zone in 1941 were: Tobacco, $26,237,314; tungsten ore, $11,035,693; airplanes and parts, $9,649,116; cotton, $9,424,386; machinery, $7,977,604; auto parts and trucks, $4,666,171; coal-tar dyestuffs and colors, $2,490,914; tonka-beans, $1,833,963; distilled spirits, $1,139,487; and preserved meats, $1,165,876.

In order of importance, by value, of merchandise received in the zone, the 10 leading countries in 1941 were: Netherlands East Indies, $26,509,018; United States, $24,840,300; Brazil, $7,577,325; China, $5,158,113; Switzerland, $3,241,292; Burma, $3,021,803; Mexico, $2,233,580; Argentina $2,194,087; Venezuela, $1,886,356; and Bolivia, $1,830,821.

In order of importance, by value, of merchandise shipped from the zone, the 6 leading countries in 1941 were: United States, $35,875,500; United Kingdom, $21,933,573; Egypt, $2,162,361; China, $2,075,239; Canada, $1,756,695; and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, $1,461,024.

MANY KINDS OF MANIPULATION

The deputy collector in charge states that more than 50 various forms of manipulation and processing, covering numerous commodities, were carried on in the zone during the fiscal year. Some of the principal types of manipulation included:

The weighing, sampling, and cleaning by electrostatic, electromagnetic process, tabling, flotation, grinding, screening, roasting, leaching, mixing with other lots and repacking into domestic drums, of tungsten ore and antimony.

Maturing, examining, reconditioning, sampling, weighing, destroying damaged leaves, and repacking tobacco.

Examining, grading, and repacking diamonds.

Examining, assembling into domestic cases, and repacking watch movements for export via parcel post.

Ventilating, turning, ridging, culling, tinting, bagging, destroying rots, and weighing Brazil nuts.

Examining, labeling, and repacking foodstuffs, tobacco, and cigarettes, for shipment to the International Red Cross at Geneva for American and other prisoners of war in Axis countries.

The examining, cleaning, and repacking of seeds, grains, and drugs.

Examining, cutting, sampling, combining parts of different lots with domestic products and repacking cotton and woolen piece goods for export.

The examining, sampling, recoopering, bung-filling, gaging, affixing, strip stamps of liquors (brandy, rum, wine, and whisky).

Examining, labeling, repacking into domestic cartons and destroying and reexporting rejects of South American canned meats.

Grading, cleaning, splitting, polishing, and repacking chickpeas.

Trimming leather.

The examining, sampling, repacking in domestic containers of olive oil.

Grading, cutting off fringes and repacking rugs and fringed merchandise.

REFUGEES' EFFECTS

Of the original 2,200 vans and 6,000 other packages of refugees' effects originally sent to the zone by Europeans fleeing the Nazi terror, there still remain only 136 vans and 1,000 other packages. Besides regular deliveries on appraisement entries, during the past fiscal year the operator has taken title, under local warehouse statutes, to 89 delinquent lots embracing 64 vans and 180 other packages. These were sold at 8 public auctions in the Zone after the operator had entered the effects and paid duty thereon.

This method of disposal has proved very satisfactory, as the amounts realized have been sufficient to reimburse the operator for the duty as well as to meet all accrued charges and to leave a surplus to be held in trust for the original owners of the goods.

DUTIES COLLECTED MOUNT

The collection of customs duties on merchandise imported into customs territory during 1941 amounted to $2,867,352. For the previous years of 1937, 1938, 1939, and 1940 the amounts were $29,936, $345,635, $732,167, and $1,931,296, respectively. The increase in 1941 compared with 1940 was nearly 50 percent.

The collection of this revenue was at no additional expense to the Government, as the salaries of customs officials are borne by the grantee.

Tribute to the Late Lt. Gen. Frank Maxwell Andrews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post there is an editorial paying tribute to the late Lt. Gen. Frank M. Andrews, who was killed in a tragic airplane accident over Iceland day before yesterday. General Andrews was one of the great pioneer airmen of our country. He was a fine soldier, a splendid gentleman, and a great leader. I wish to join in this tribute to him, and ask that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANDY ANDREWS

Let us mourn with the Army the death of Lt. Gen. Frank Maxwell Andrews, our commander in chief in the European theater, in a flying accident over Iceland. He is the greatest single loss we have suffered in this war. He had served successively at the head of the Caribbean defense command, the Middle East command, and the European command. In all these posts he had done a superb job, both in organization and in comunicating his own buoyant and combative spirit to the American troops.

There was nobody quite like the warmhearted "Andy," except perhaps the man whom he succeeded in 1920 in command of the air occupation forces in Germany, Gen. "Billy" Mitchell. General Andrews was a flying general. Not for a minute did he live apart from his passion for air power. And, like Mitchell, he suffered for it. In 1939 he was reduced in rank from a major general to a colonel and sent to San Antonio, where he languished till the following year, when he was rescued by Presidential order. The specific cause of his demotion is not in the record. It is said that he made himself a nuisance to the longbowmen of the Army by insisting on the four-engine bomber. At the time he was commanding general of the General Headquarter Air Force. "Give me four engines, or take these stars," is the defiant way he is said to have put it. They took his stars, but, praise be, the four-engine bomber was put into our air program.

Andrews was the leader of as gallant a group as has ever distinguished the American Army. All of them shared Andy's passion. They served with him in the Headquarters Air Force which was set up in 1935. This was the first step toward building an organization for air power in this country. Prior to that time, according to William Bradford Huie, in the Fight for Air Power, "all the airplanes we had were attached to the various corps areas. Most of the squadrons were still called observation squadrons, and the General Staff had not admitted that the airplane had any function other than to accompany the Army to which it was attached and to aid in tactical operations." Andy had on his staff such enthusiasts as General Kenney, General McNarney, General Bradley, Colonel Knerr. They proceeded to develop the doctrine for the employment of air power which is guiding the conduct of this war.

General Andrew's influence as a trail blazer for air power is part of the annals of our Army. Had he lived he would have added new laurels to his fame as an organizer and as a leader of men. That he should have died in the way he did is the more lamentable. It was said of the 59-year-old Andrews that he never allowed another man either to land or take off when he was in a plane. Doubtless he was at the controls when the crash occurred that killed him. His death should provoke an order from the War Department that no officer in any responsible command should be his own pilot. Men of the caliber of General Andrews should not be allowed to risk their lives needlessly.

Let Us Not Betray the Members of the Armed Forces With the Meaningless Statement of 1917–18—"Nothing Will Be Too Good for You Boys When You Return"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, while intensive efforts are being directed toward a complete victory at the earliest possible date in the present conflict, the problems of a post-war world are being given serious consideration in all quarters.

We have been apprised of several plans that seek to bring order out of chaos after the smoke of battle has given way to world-wide peace. There are two principal schools of thought regarding economic conditions following the cessation of hostilities.

Some are of the opinion that there will be an unprecedented demand for civilian goods, principally clothes, household appliances, new automobiles, new homes, furniture, and numerous other commodities. Another group of post-war planners sees this Nation's commerce playing a leading role in supplying the needs of foreign nations as they struggle to rehabilitate themselves after this great war of destruction that has, through incessant bombing raids, destroyed property reaching in value to billions of dollars.

As one contemplates the commercial activity on both the home front and in foreign nations there is the possibility that an erroneous conclusion may be reached as to the possibility of an unemployment problem. At first glance one may be tempted to conclude that in supplying the needs of the world and our own domestic demands that unemployment may be unheard of and that an era of prosperity will follow the signing of the peace treaty. Yet despite the apparent revitalization of our peacetime industries many economists are in agreement that there will be a net loss of jobs in industry of approximately 8,000,000 in comparison with employment records for the wartime period. In addition to the loss of 8,000,000 jobs it is felt many women will elect to remain in industry and that the entrance of young people into employment channels will more than offset the retirement of older workers. The women and younger workers are expected to swell the total of 8,000,000 jobs to a figure of nearly 12,000,000.

Demobilization of our armed forces is not considered by economists in making the above computations. Therefore, they point to the fact that if peace comes in 1943 or early 1944, there will be approximately 11,000,000 service men and women to be absorbed by industry, raising the total of jobs to approximately 19,000,000.

Although there are two different schools of thought on the subject of unemployment following the signing of peace terms, it is significant that the more conservative group places the unemployment figure at about 16,000,000. Thus, the consensus of opinion of informed observers confirms the view that unemployment is very likely to become a major problem of our post-war world.

Mr. Speaker, during the Seventy-seventh Congress when this Nation began to mobilize, and young men and young women began the march from civilian positions to military assignments, my memory recalled the distressing situation that confronted the members of our armed forces at the close of the First World War as they sought to return to civilian life and resume their former peacetime vocations.

Many of us will vividly recall the thousands of young men who after receiving their honorable discharge from the service following the 1918 armistice found to their dismay that the oft-repeated statement, "Nothing will be too good for you boys when you return," was in reality meaningless and untrue. This fact was indelibly impressed on their minds as they pounded city pavements or traveled from State to State in a vain effort to secure employment.

To guard against a repetition of such an attitude of ungratefulness and to assist in maintaining the morale of our returning servicemen and women from the present war, I introduced a bill during the Seventy-seventh Congress providing that after discharge, all members of our armed forces be permitted to draw their monthly pay for a period of 6 months to enable them to become adjusted to the problems that will confront them in being returned to civilian life. This legislation has been reintroduced by me in the present session and is known as H. R. 923 and reads as follows:

H. R. 923

A bill to continue the pay of all persons serving in the armed forces of the United States for 6 months after the termination of the present conflict

Be it enacted, etc., That the pay, exclusive of allowances, of all persons in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, who are, after termination of hostilities of the present war, honorably discharged from such service, and who served at least 90 days therein, shall be continued for a period of 6 months from the date of their honorable discharge, separation, or release from active service, during which 6 months' period such persons, if not transferred to inactive reserve status, shall be deemed to be members of the inactive reserves forces: *Provided*, That in no event shall the monthly pay of any such persons, during the 6 months' period, exceed $200, and should such persons during such period resume active-service status, payments under this act shall terminate as of the day preceding entry into active service: *Provided further*, That within the monthly pay limitation imposed herein, the increased percentage in pay allowed for foreign service shall apply where any such service is shown.

Legion Commander's Report on the War in North Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the address of National Commander Roane Waring of the American Legion, delivered at Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C., on Thursday evening, April 22, 1943, which is a report on his tour of the North African battle front.

The matter referred to follows:

I can think of no better way to start my report to you, my fellow Legionnaires, and to you, the millions of Americans everywhere, on my tour of the North African battle front, than by nailing a German propaganda lie.

Vicious rumors have been sweeping the United States for many months that the Allies in this global war against Axis tyranny were disunited, were not working hand in hand, and were not even fighting enthusiastically shoulder to shoulder.

During the past 5 weeks I have flown 25,000 miles by air, traveled many hundreds more by car and jeep, visiting the entire zone of combat operations in North Africa. I have lived with, eaten with, and talked with American, British, and French troops. I have found the fighting men of these United Nations, from generals down to buck privates, acting everywhere in full, complete, and sympathetic accord, and cooperating with mutual respect and admiration in the big job of pushing Rommel's army into the sea.

That's a tough job. Rommel is leading his battle-experienced professionals with skill and daring. But I have come home with the full confidence that the days of the German Afrika Korps are numbered. The American-British-French forces will soon write a German Dunkerque into the history of this war.

I have seen the American doughboy of 1943 in action. I want to tell you that you need have no worry on the score of his ability to fight. He is the same American soldier that the American soldier has always been. His morale is high today despite the desperate combat he has fought. He is impelled by only one determination, and that is to win the war and win it in the quickest time possible.

The American soldier has adapted himself to the modern technique of warfare in a manner that fills my heart with pride. In a day when all the accent is on speed and mobility and alertness, he is trigger fast and reacts swiftly in emergency.

In the forward areas it was necessary for us to travel in sturdy little Army jeeps. These are ideal vehicles for use on roads frequently strafed by German planes. You can abandon a jeep while it is still in motion when a suspicious aircraft appears. At the front we were cautioned to keep a sharp lookout for planes flying over or parallel to the road, and to take no chance on planes we couldn't identify at once. If a plane appeared heading in our direction we were instructed to leap for the roadside safety.

A road sign impressed upon us why our boys over there have learned to move fast.

The sign read:

"Major Blank is buried here. His last words were: 'Hell, don't stop, it's only a Spitfire!'"

Well, it wasn't. It was a German plane.

I can assure you that before we finished touring the battle line in Tunisia, Warren Atherton, our military aides, and I were thoroughly schooled in the maneuver of leaving a jeep in a hurry. In fact we broke some records. On one occasion, as we fled from our dust-churning jeep, we stumbled for cover into a tank mine field. Fortunately, we didn't set off any mines.

I propose to report to you the facts as I have seen them. I want to give you the answers to some of the many questions that are in the mind of every loyal American today.

Our mission was undertaken at the invitation of General Marshall, the Chief of Staff of our Army. He desired us to make the tour in order to familiarize ourselves, first with the type and method and efficiency of our military-training installations in America; and second, to observe the operation and functioning of our Army in Africa.

The trip afforded us the opportunity of getting a clear conception, broad in its scope, of our military preparations at home and our operations at the front. From this we have drawn our conclusions. Upon those conclusions my report to you is based, consistent, of course, with necessary military restrictions.

During our entire tour of 7 weeks we saw much to admire and much even to marvel at. We also saw some things to regret.

Our first stop was at the great air base training schools around San Antonio. We observed there not only the training of the flying personnel but also the training of the mechanics and maintenance crews so necessary to keep our planes aloft.

We watched large-scale maneuvers by armored and motorized divisions on the great open spaces of the Mojave Desert where training proceeded under conditions simulating actual warfare.

We inspected many schools and training centers where our antiaircraft artillery are being instructed in the most modern methods of locating, detecting, and destroying hostile planes. At Fort Bliss we saw the training of troops under live-ammunition fire.

In San Francisco we marveled at the great coast-defense installations, strong enough to stop any enemy invasion by air or water. There we also saw the operation of a large embarkation port, and the storing of vast military supplies and equipment.

In Los Angeles we went through four of the large airplane plants, saw the assembly lines from which the finest fighting ships of the skies lift their wings daily in uncounted numbers. We noted the large number of women workers in these plants.

We called at the Army school at Leavenworth, Kans., where the higher commanders and their staffs are being trained for field command.

We visited the great Army school at Benning, where large numbers of young men selected from the ranks, having particular qualities of leadership, and who have already had their basic training as enlisted men, were being instructed in their duties and responsibilities as platoon commanders and junior officers. The training there was most practical and in the best modern methods known to Army training. We had explained to us the method of grading these young men in order to be sure that proper selections were made and that efficient ones only would be commissioned. Nothing there was taken for granted. The young officer who comes out as a second lieutenant can only do so after he has passed the grilling test and received the approval of a trained staff of instructors, as well as observers. It gave one a great thrill to see these fine upstanding youngsters, hardened and tanned from their work in the ranks, being trained for the leadership and responsibility of leading other young Americans. The deadly earnestness with which these youngsters took their job, the seriousness with which they devoted themselves to the work, is the strongest evidence that they have the proper qualifications for leadership. This was most encouraging to me, and I know it will be to the fathers and mothers of soldiers to know that their sons, when they go into battle, will do so under a competent and thoroughly trained platoon commander.

Upon the whole, the conclusion can be definitely drawn that no other American Army in any other war has been as carefully trained, nor as superbly equipped to enter the combat zone as the Army of the United States of today. I can frankly say, from my own World War No. 1 experience, that these men today are better trained and better equipped and better led than we were in 1917 and 1918.

I was greatly impressed with the earnestness with which the higher officers, charged with the training of our fighting men, are going about their jobs, and the pride they are taking in the accomplishments of their men.

Our senior officers are showing understanding and appreciation and a consideration in meeting the problems of the enlisted men and are welding bonds of teamwork for

the fighting army that will destroy our enemies.

I was riding with a general officer returning from a demonstration put on by a well-trained platoon. The general's chauffeur, overtaking the platoon along the road, honked to the men to get out of the way. The division commander said: "Hold on there, those men are tired. They have done a good job. You, move over to the side and go by them." As the car passed the platoon, the general leaned out and said: "Thank you, gentlemen, that was a fine piece of work!" His answer was an enthusiastic cheer.

We left America for the war zone with a complete picture of the immense backlog of our Nation's mobilized strength behind the Allied push in North Africa. We had seen the vast panorama of the building of the greatest war machine in world history—the amazing assembly lines from which poured thousands of massive tanks, powerful war planes, great guns, tank destroyers, ships—the training centers in which hundreds of thousands of young Americans were learning how to kill. We flew over fertile plains and through the valleys which were supplying the food for soldiers, sailors, and civilians alike. And then we left to witness the practical test of this gigantic machine of war in actual combat. Our first stop overseas was at Casablanca, a surprisingly modern city of 500,000. There, and at other ports, we inspected the large base installations where all of the supplies, matériel, and replacement troops are landed. We visited the great centers where our American boys are being further trained and hardened to fit them for the heat of the African desert and for the cold of the Atlas Mountains.

At these African ports we learned at first hand the problems the Army faces in keeping the life lines of supplies flowing to our forces on the Tunisian front. It is more than 1,400 miles from one of these ports to the firing line, or as far as from New York City to Denver Replacement troops, tanks, guns, munitions, food, and medical supplies have to run the gantlet of the submarine packs in the Atlantic to reach these ports.

Right here I want to pay tribute to a fighting Navy of a fighting America that is getting these vital supplies to Africa. The perfect coordination and splendid cooperation that exists and that is evident on every hand between our Army and our Navy is one of the inspiring assurances of ultimate victory.

When once delivered in the African ports these essential supplies have to be moved over some of the highest mountain ranges in Africa. There are no great networks of railroads or fine highways. There is only a single-track rail line over which miniature-type freight cars are operated. On toward the front this line changes to narrow gage, necessitating the transfer of supplies from train to train. We are, of course, moving much matériel by trucks, but the roads are not good and the grades are terrific. Any interruptions in traffic on either the lone rail line or the highways causes immediate congestion and the paralyzing of the movement of supplies. The size of the transportation job becomes evident when one considers the fact that it requires 500 tons of supplies for one combat division to keep it going 1 day Yet I want to report to you that American engineering, American ingenuity, and American determination are keeping these life lines open to the fighting men at the front, despite natural obstacles and the enemy's attempts to cut our lines of supply.

We missed most of these traffic conditions by flying over them. As we approached the fighting area, however, we discreetly took to jeeps. We jolted up to General Patton's headquarters at Gafsa just when our troops were expecting a German attack. Our aerial observers had reported a panzer unit heading that way and only 18 miles away.

This was after American troops had recovered most of the ground lost to Rommel in the first blitz drive he had unleashed against them. That blitz had been a costly but a most valuable lesson to our troops. It had changed every American soldier almost overnight from a maneuver veteran into a battle-tested veteran. It made the war a personal affair for every one of them. It lighted the fire of deadly hatred for the Nazis in every American heart. On every man's face was written the grim determination to avenge the deaths of his comrades in Kasserine Pass. Into that bitterly personal war atmosphere, tense with suppressed excitement, we stepped from our jeeps.

The threatened German attack turned out to be a mere feint. But it enabled us to observe the fighting spirit of our men at the front Every American soldier knows he has either to kill or be killed.

Our fighting men on this front are grimly at war. They are dug in on mountain sides, along ridges, and in the valley slopes. They were holding these positions under the trying conditions of extreme heat in daytime and severe cold at night, eagerly awaiting the order to attack. They were constantly on the alert for attacks, day and night. They must scan not just the landscape but also the skies for the enemy. They are getting sufficient food but not always enough cover or blankets. It is not easy to replace blankets that are lost in action. Despite all these hardships our men are determined that Rommel and all his hellions will never again crash their lines. This is the story of the evolution of the citizen soldier of America into a first-class fighting man, ready and able to kill and destroy. We will never win this war until all of our troops graduate into this iron-willed destroyer class.

Some of our swivel-chair and typewriter strategists at home have called our men in Africa green and inexperienced troops. They are wrong. Our troops were not green. They had received magnificent training. They were inexperienced in battle only because they had never before been in actual combat, had never been shot at, and had never before killed an enemy. They are becoming veterans now. They have paid and are paying the price of experience. When they have fully acquired that experience they will be the equal of any troops on any firing line on any front of this global war.

Do not misunderstand me. This is no apology for the American fighting man. He has never needed any apology in any war. He needs none in this war. It is a simple statement of fact made in justice to him and to refute the fallacy preached by some critics that because in his first contact with the enemy he was not successful that he has failed to meet the high standard of the American fighting man of the past.

As an officer who led fighting men in the last war, I repeat that our Army today is the best we have ever had. They have the best equipment. They are the best basically trained American troops in all our history. They have the best officer leadership of any American army of any American war. They need only the battle edge that comes from combat with the enemy. They are getting that edge. Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito know that better than anyone else.

I have told you of the terrible price we have paid in casualties for the gains we have made in North Africa. I know that all America is deeply concerned over this tragic cost. I wish to assure the country that the high command in Africa has provided the best of hospitalization and care for the American wounded. There are splendidly equipped evacuation hospitals back of the firing line. These evacuation centers and the base hospitals in the rear are manned by the finest medical and nursing staffs in the world.

The evacuation hospitals have every facility possible under field conditions. The base hospitals located mainly in school buildings in the base areas have every modern facility not only medically and surgically but all the necessary utilities such as heat, light, and water. No pains have been spared to provide for our wounded the best medical and surgical and nursing care possible.

Fully equipped modern hospital trains are available. In cases of great emergency seriously wounded men are flown in airplane ambulances hundreds of miles to the rear. For instance, at Casablanca, 1,400 miles from the front, I saw a group of wounded soldiers delivered by plane to a base hospital in only 11 hours.

We cannot give credit enough to the tireless services of the medical men and nurses in caring for our wounded.

We saw our first prisoners of war in this area, both Germans and Italians. We visited several prison camps. Most of the prisoners were Mussolini's soldiers. We saw also some wounded prisoners, including officers. We were struck by the surliness of the captured Nazis. Far from being glad to be safe in prison camps, these German fighters frankly admit they would like nothing better than to escape and rejoin their army. Italian prisoners, though, are quick to show their satisfaction with being captured, and regard it as lucky to be captured.

But do not believe stories that Italian soldiers, or the German troops, are suffering from lack of sufficient food and equipment. That is not true. The prisoners show no physical evidence of the lack of proper nourishment. Their uniforms and equipment compare favorably with those of our men.

At one prison camp, we saw captured Italians, stripped and moving under shower-baths. Almost without exception they were strong, well-developed young men. There were no weaklings among them. Almost invariably the prisoners captured from Rommel's Afrika Korps are fine specimens of physical manhood. Their clothing and equipment, of course, show the effects of the terrific campaign they have gone through.

On the other hand, prisoners taken from the northern group of the German African army around Tunisia are not so physically fit. Many of them are still in their teens. They show lack of sufficient training.

According to some reports the opposite is true on the Russian front. There the Germans are said to be using increasing numbers of older men who have passed their physical primes.

Some observers point to these conditions as proof that Germany has reached the limit of her fighting manpower and is facing a shortage of men of military age. Perhaps this is so. I should like to believe it.

But there is another explanation that should be given careful consideration. It is quite possible, perhaps even probable, that far from having exhausted herself, Germany has merely been expanding her substandard manpower on the African and some portions of the Russian fronts, and has been conserving her best manpower divisions for the battle of Europe.

This is why I am so deeply concerned over the general feeling of optimism that is prevailing in this country. The average citizen is convinced that our victory in this war is all wrapped up and ready to be delivered. Nothing could be further from grim reality.

The war in Africa is just a preliminary. Hitler knows he cannot win in Africa. But he is still confident he can stay winner in Europe.

From the bottom of my heart I wish I could bring to you tonight a message of as-

surance of a quick and easy victory—a victory without further heavy cost in American blood and lives.

I cannot truthfully make that kind of a report to you.

It is my honest duty to tell you bluntly that our country today is committed to not one but two hard wars. I have stood with bowed and uncovered head beside the endless rows of fresh crosses on African soil. There will be many thousands more of such crosses before the flags of freedom will wave in triumph over Tunis and Bizerte.

We must not lose sight of the grim fact that the end of the war in Africa will mark only the beginning of the battle of Europe.

The battle of Europe will be fought on a vaster and deadlier scale.

We must stand by our determination to fight it out at all costs until we win. Hitler and what he stands for must be destroyed! There is no other thinking alternative for a liberty-loving people.

We must continue to be willing to pay the price, if it takes years of paying. That paying will come harder and harder. Our foes secretly hope the time will come when we will be unwilling to continue to pay for an absolute victory. As the national commander of the American Legion, I say to you that so far as the American Legion is concerned, every new American soldier grave in this war is but one more rivet in our determination to fight this war to a smashing military triumph. We will not permit the spector of appeasement ever to throw its shadow on the crosses of our hero dead!

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, old Fort Riley was the setting of an Easter Sunday Army review by the President.

A Republican won as mayor of Baltimore against a would-be fourth-term Democrat.

The sit-down chickens of Detroit have come home to roost. He sowed the wind and now reaps the whirlwind.

The overriding of the Bankhead bill veto was temporarily halted with the order freezing labor and other things.

Like a local in the small town weekly newspapers: Representative GROSS, of Pennsylvania, goes home tonight to ride a corn planter for 3 days.

Now that Harold, the Ick, has been made mine superintendent, the Chief will give the miners the raise he did not want John to get credit for.

What chance would Joe have to talk if a famous flight were made to Russia? And who else would know for a year what Joe said if he did?

Helen Essary confesses that after all her "strugglin', strivin', and knowin'" her life has been a failure, for she has never been invited to the big red house on R Street.

A companion WAACsed eloquent at the sight of a girl in uniform in Topeka last week, driving a milk wagon and delivering, WAVE-ing in and out of houses. She was really taking a man's place.

Do not get all "het up" over the House tax bill. It has just reached first base. The Senate is second base, the conference committee is third base, and the White House is home plate. There are no outs, however.

From one who knew the parents of John L. Lewis even before their marriage, and the mine leader's family: John got his bulldoggedness from his father, his mentality from his mother, and his culture from his wife.

A new Monroe Doctrine has broken out on R Street in D. C. The preliminary evidence disclosed that there is too much food in the Capital City and that a 9 p. m. curfew for war contractors would be good. Any way, it will not be harness and saddles this time.

Strikes in Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "It Couldn't Happen Anywhere Else," from the Argus, of Seattle, Wash., the issue of May 1, 1943.

In connection with the editorial I ask that there be printed a supporting article which appears on the reverse side of the same page of the Argus, under the headline The Stroller.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT COULDN'T HAPPEN ANYWHERE ELSE

In Dallas, Tex., last Tuesday, SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House and defender of the New Deal's labor policies, asserted: "Not many strikes are occurring now." On page 2 of this issue of the Argus there appears a brief and incomplete recapitulation of organized labor's April contribution to the Axis war effort. It is not a nice story. It is an almost incredible story. It is a story of treason involving hundreds of thousands of guilty persons, of revolution against our Government in wartime, of wanton murder of our soldiers and sailors, and of sabotage of our war industries. It couldn't happen in Germany or Italy or Japan.

THE STROLLER

Thirty days hath April:

WASHINGTON, April 1.—The Senate war investigating committee condemned John L. Lewis' attitude in asserting that his no-strike compromise was not "necessarily binding."

CHICAGO, April 2.—A dispute over seniority rights of two workers halted production of war materials today at Ford Motor Co.'s assembly plant here.

SALT LAKE CITY, April 3.—Mill workers called off a threatened strike [after receiving raise] that would have halted a fourth of the Nation's copper production.

PITTSBURGH, April 4.—An estimated 1,600 American Federation of Labor laborers went on strike today at the Kobuta synthetic rubber plant here, declaring the United States wage adjustment board had refused their demands for a pay increase.

NEW KENSINGTON, PA., April 5.—The Aluminum Corporation of America disclosed today that its Army-Navy "E" award had been withdrawn because of loss of production hours due to strikes.

LANSING, MICH., April 6.—United Workers Association union, Committee of Industrial Organizations affiliate, has recommended that the Government "permit. sponsor, or direct" a 5 percent monthly bonus for workers who have a perfect attendance record.

WASHINTON, April 7.—The War Labor Board is studying an "incentive pay" bonus plan to increase production in "problem plants" of the aircraft industry.

DETROIT, April 8.—A work stoppage interrupted production of war vehicles in the Highland Park plant of the Ford Motor Co. here today, affecting 5,000 workers.

DETROIT, April 9.—A wage dispute that caused men in the transportation division of Ford Motor Co.'s River Rouge plant to stop work hampered production of amphibean jeeps.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., April 10.—Workers involved in a work stoppage at two war plants here tonight were facing immediate induction into the armed services, draft board officials announced.

GARY, IND., April 11.—Production halted today in the No. 5 shop at Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corporation's Gary plant after union steel workers refused to work due to a grievance the nature of which was not clear. The shop produced high-grade armor plate.

NEWARK, N. J., April 12.—Labor troubles involved two important New Jersey war industries today. At Bendix Aviation Corporation's plant at Bendix workers who walked out yesterday were dismissed.

CLEVELAND, April 13.—United Automobile Workers at Thompson Products, Inc., major producer of aircraft parts, went on strike in protest against the dismissal of 12 men.

TOLEDO, OHIO, April 14.—President of the Willys-Overland Motors, Inc., said today the plant's Army jeep assembly line was closed and 2,500 workers thrown into idleness as the result of a strike at the Spicer Manufacturing Co., which provides axles for jeeps.

WASHINGTON, April 15.—The Chairman of the War Labor Board told strikers at the Universal Cement Co.'s plant at Universal, Pa., today that they were violating labor's pledge.

TROY, N. Y., April 16.—Operations in the blast furnace of the Republic Steel Corporation's plant here were suspended today when members of the Congress of Industrial Organization's United Steel Workers union walked out in protest over dismissal of a master mechanic.

CHICAGO, April 17.—A partial strike at the Illinois Gear and Machine Co. has affected war production in a protest against the dismissal of Richard Keith, union official, on charges of absenteeism.

WASHINGTON, April 18.—Senator HOLMAN, Oregon, charged Thursday that "if it were not for labor racketeering, there would be more than enough planes, guns, and tanks for General MacArthur."

SAN FRANCISCO, April 19.—United States District Judge A. F. St. Sure dismissed indictments against 78 members of an American Federation of Labor painters' union who had refused to paint Government housing projects with spray guns because it would cut down available work for the union's members.

HOQUIAM, April 20.—Workers returned to the Hoquiam plant of Rayonier, Inc., after a 10-day strike resulting from a Congress of

Industrial Organizations-American Federation of Labor jurisdictional dispute. Officials said the plant is making vital war material.

EDGEWATER, N. J., April 21.—Several thousand workers of the Edgewater plant of the Aluminum Co. of America were under local union orders to strike Thursday.

HARLAN, KY., April 22.—A 2-week strike of workers at two mines at Louellen, Ky., ended today, but 2,000 men remained idle at 3 other struck mines in southeastern Kentucky.

PITTSBURG, April 23.—Pennsylvania plants producing 12,000 tons of fuel daily for war-busy steel mills were closed by a coal miners' walkout.

NEWARK, N. J., April 24.—Strikers at the Celanese Corporation of America's big plant here continued picketing today after President Roosevelt ordered them to return to work. War Labor Board said the strike had curtailed vital war production and hampered 21 other plants.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., April 25.—Approximately 4,500 United Mine Workers' union members went on strike here yesterday.

WASHINGTON, April 26.—Although United Mine Workers spokesmen said no work stoppages had been authorized, 10,000 miners laid down their tools and there were reports of "slowdowns" in some pits continuing to produce war-vital fuel.

NEW YORK, April 27.— John L. Lewis raised the threat of a full-scale soft-coal strike tonight. * * * By the day's end 50 mines were closed and 28,000 miners had put down their tools.

CLEVELAND, April 28.—Unionists on Cleveland streetcar and bus lines struck at midnight tonight * * * ignoring a plea of Under Secretary of War Patterson to call off the strike.

LACKAWANNA, N. Y., April 29.—The strike in the billet yard of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation's Lackawanna plant has seriously impeded output of urgently needed alloy steel for war products, the plant manager said.

BOW LAKE, April 30.—Work on the Seattle-Tacoma Airport was at a standstill, with members of the operating engineers' union still on strike.

THE STROLLER.

Selective Service Classification of Physically Unfit Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey by Mr. Francis E. Kelly, attorney at law of Boston, Mass.:

APRIL 28, 1943.

Maj. Gen. LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL HERSHEY: Many loyal Americans have sought my advice after they were rejected for military service due to some physical defect and placed in class IV-F, which your department has designated as the class for all persons mentally, morally, or physically unfit, in addition to persons dishonorably discharged from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

For some time I have been waiting for someone in authority to change this unfair designation or for someone to call it to the attention of the American public so there might be a public demand for a much-needed change.

I am informed that the majority of men in class IV-F have been placed in that class by reason of some physical defect over which they had no control. You may well imagine the feelings of those Americans who have been rejected because of a physical defect to find their record showing they have been placed in the same class as persons who have been designated as being morally or mentally unfit for service and persons who have been dishonorably discharged from the armed services.

I have the greatest sympathy and regard for persons who are mentally sick, but in my humble opinion, persons mentally or morally unfit and dishonorably discharged persons should be placed in separate and distinct classes from persons with a physical defect, especially after reading your Official Selective Service Regulation to Draft Boards as to what constitutes a morally unfit person. According to your printed regulations you have ordered placed in class IV-F, and I quote:

"A person convicted of treason, murder, rape, kidnaping, arson, sodomy, pandering, or any crime involving sex perversion, or any crime involving illegal dealing in narcotics, or a person who is in jail. A person that has been convicted on two or more occasions of any offense for which he could have been punished by death or confinement for a term exceeding 1 year in a penitentiary or prison, or a person who is a chronic offender with pronounced criminal tendencies."

Surely there is not a shortage of numbers or letters for separate classes to be established.

Your department has designated four separate and distinct classes for conscientious objectors, divinity students, non-declarant aliens, and Government officials, namely, IV-B, IV-C, IV-D, and IV-E.

I know the feeling a person endures when he is ready and willing to serve his country and is rejected due to a physical defect, as more than a year ago, I attempted to enlist in the Army and Navy but was rejected because of an old eye injury sustained in athletics. Because of my age, I am not subject to the draft under your present regulations. I am in IV-H class and accordingly, will not be forced to suffer the humiliation of being placed in class IV-F. I make the preceding statement to prove that this is not a selfish request on my part but is an earnest, fair request in behalf of the hundreds of thousands of men (and their families) who in the past 2½ years have been rejected due to some physical defect and placed in class IV-F. I feel confident that your department will make such changes as are necessary to properly classify all persons whose physical condition prevents their serving in the armed services of the greatest country in the world. An early reply to this request will be appreciated.

Respectfully,

FRANCIS E. KELLY.

Lewis Against Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lewis Against Nation" published in the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., of May 4, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEWIS AGAINST NATION

Under a fortnight's truce which John L. Lewis has decreed, the soft coal miners will return to work today, and for a new employer, the United States Government. The mine operators will be mere onlookers.

A few of the miners returned yesterday, but the vast majority are obeying the dictates of John L. Lewis rather than Sunday night's stern appeal of the President that they return yesterday. They are following Lewis rather than the Commander in Chief of a Nation fighting for its life.

From what happened Sunday night, and what did not happen yesterday, it must be very clear to every American that Lewis and the national leaders of the miners' union do not yet know that the country is at war, or that if they do know, they are interested in but one thing—that their will shall prevail.

Lewis' arrogance is not one whit less today than it was a week ago, when he refused to be a party to War Labor Board negotiations, and later when he permitted a general strike to become effective through automatic termination of a contract.

He has said that he will not do business with the War Labor Board. As matters stand today, he will not have to do business with it. On that point he has scored a victory of sorts. Negotiations will be with Secretary Ickes, and any new contract will be made with the United States Government, which is now operating the mines.

The President assured the people that the War Labor Board would have to approve any contract so negotiated. Yet is it likely that the Government's own agency would disapprove a contract made by another governmental agency directly responsible to the President?

The people can only hope that no concessions have been made to Lewis as a result of which the truce was ordered. There is much talk of the evasive, face-saving method represented by a 6-day week work clause for the miners. In that way, they would get time and a half for the sixth day worked, and make up, it is said, what they have sought through a flat-scale hike. Most of the miners—probably 90 percent—are already working a 6-day week.

The President made no reservations in saying that coal will be mined, and that whatever protection is required will be forthcoming. He has not receded from his announced position that there shall be no breaching of the Little Steel formula. That is tremendously important.

If Lewis gets anything out of his selfish maneuvering—his subjecting the Nation to a general strike in a time of its gravest peril—there are many others who will be immediately demanding as much, and he will have provided them with an example of how to get it.

The aircraft workers, steel and shipbuilding workers—many more—are watching Lewis' effort to break the Little Steel formula. If he succeeds they will consider it a green light for them, and a strike epidemic could follow.

The word "truce" will sit poorly with the American people. Since when, they rightly ask, has the leader of any minority group acquired the right to create a hazardous situation for the Government and then call a truce—a temporary cessation of hostilities? That is more of Lewis' arrogance. He puts a time limit on his own good behavior and that of his followers.

His timing in announcing it was the height of impudence and insolence which does not escape the people. The President—the Commander in Chief in wartime—had, a day

previously, set an hour at which he would address the people.

It was a solemn hour for which the whole Nation and a goodly portion of an anxious world were waiting. Then, a few minutes before it arrived, there came the announcement that John L. Lewis "had called a truce." It was clever timing, but not good manners. It wasn't even decent.

John L. Lewis has a "truce" with the Government and with the Government's representatives, but he has none with the people.

Col. Msgr. Aristeo V. Simoni

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN GORSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a stimulus to patriotism and as an example of the importance of the great service rendered by chaplains in our armed forces, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of Friday, April 9, 1943, and the statements of Brig. Gen. John M. Willis, United States Army, Commanding Officer at Camp Grant, Ill., which portray in part, the splendid record of service, the patriotism and example set by chief chaplain at Camp Grant, Col. Msgr. Aristeo V. Simoni, who received the Distinguished Service Cross during World War No. 1:

PASS THE AMMUNITION

A chaplain who passed the ammunition long before Pearl Harbor was discovered the other day in the retirement at Camp Grant of Col. Aristeo V. Simoni, to whom was awarded during World War No. 1 a Distinguished Service Cross. His official record states, "At a time when the shortage of ammunition was great he not only carried large quantities of it to the line but distributed it to the men on the line." He also rescued six wounded men, bringing them "through a terrific machine-gun and grenade fire."

A native of Italy, a resident of Chicago for many years, he went overseas with the Thirty-third Division and later served with the Twenty-eighth Division. He remained in service as chaplain until his retirement.

"Fighting for the defense of our country, its ideals, and homes is an honor and duty of every American citizen," he said in his farewell sermon. "Never be ashamed to profess and practice your religion. Remember, there are no atheists in the fox holes in our front lines."

Here is recommendation for the highest military award:

AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES,
December 17, 1918.

From Commanding Officer, Third Battalion, One Hundred and Eleventh Infantry, to Commanding General, Twenty-eighth Division (through channels).

Subject: Gallantry in action of Chaplain Aristeo V. Simoni.

1. I wish to call to your attention the extraordinary heroism and bravery of Aristeo V. Simoni, chaplain in Third Battalion, One Hundred and Eleventh Infantry, while in action against the enemy during the Meuse-Argonne offensive.

2. Under continual shell fire and almost constant machine gun and sniper fire, Chaplain Simoni did care for the wounded as much as any Medical Corps man. This he did throughout the whole offensive.

3. While on La Chene, Tondu penetrated the enemy's line to care for wounded, who had infiltrated in the enemy line attempting to capture machine-gun nests.

4. At a time when the shortage of ammunition was great, he not only carried large quantities of it to the line, but distributed it to the men on the line.

5. Throughout the whole time he was very sick, but refused to be evacuated to the hospital. Chaplain Simoni in addition to his extraordinary conduct and bravery on La Chene Tandu, was with the battalion on every one of its previous attacks. In all of these he has exhibited the greatest of bravery and self-sacrifice, and I would respectfully recommend him for the highest award.

WM. A. BATTLEMAN,
Captain, One Hundred and Eleventh Infantry, Commanding Third Battalion.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS

In presenting the Distinguished Service Cross to Chaplain Simoni at Colombey-La-Belle, France, before the entire Twenty-eighth Division, General Pershing read the following citation:

Aristeo V. Simoni, first lieutenant, Chaplain, One Hundred and Eleventh Infantry. For extraordinary heroism in action near Le Chene Tondu, France, October 3, 1918. Upon learning that there were six wounded men in front of our lines, Chaplain Simoni asked for two volunteers, and, with the aid of these men, successfully brought the wounded men to our lines through a terrific machine-gun and grenade fire.

General Order No. 44, War Department. April 2, 1919.

HEADQUARTERS CAMP GRANT AND
MEDICAL REPLACEMENT TRAINING CENTER,
March 31, 1943.

1. This is the final monthly report to be submitted by Chaplain Simoni while on active duty. He retires on account of age this date. For the last 23 months he has served under my command. His influence has been felt by every individual who has passed through this camp since its inception, December 16, 1940. His example of patience, attention to duty, sympathetic attitude, kindness, and saintlike manner have been an inspiration to all of his associates.

2. A sincere attempt was made to have him recalled to active duty upon his retirement and continue his work at this post. As his departure from this post is a distinct loss to its organization, it is regretted that this request was not favorably considered by the War Department.

JOHN M. WILLIS,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Commanding.

In a communication addressed to Brig. Gen. William R. Arnold, chief of chaplains, Brig. John M. Willis wrote:

As you know, Chaplain Simoni has done outstanding work at this post. I cannot say too much for his conscientious attention to duty. Under Chaplain Simoni's leadership the religious activities have taken a very prominent position in our post life. The attendance at the chapels is the best I have ever seen. The chapels themselves are the best equipped I have seen, and a comment to that effect is made by all officers who visit them.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I bespeak the sentiments of the citizenry of Illinois in particular, and of all good Americans, in conveying to Colonel Chaplain Simoni our gratitude and appreciation for rendering such splendid service to our country.

Memorial to Maj. Gen. Alexander E. Anderson by Hon. James A. Foley, Surrogate, New York County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. FAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein a memorial address made by Surrogate James A. Foley, of New York, at the meeting of the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, on the life of Maj. Gen. Alexander E. Anderson.

Maj. Gen. Alexander E. Anderson, brilliant military leader, passed away on December 24, 1942, at Camp Howze, Tex., while in command of the Eighty-sixth Infantry Division.

He was born in New York City on November 23, 1890, the son of Thomas and Sarah White Anderson. He was educated at the parochial school attached to the Church of the Epiphany and at De La Salle Institute in Manhattan.

His career as a soldier began in 1910, when he enlisted as a private in the old Sixty-ninth Regiment of the National Guard of our State. Promotion came rapidly because of the recognition of his energy and his natural aptitude as a soldier. He advanced to first lieutenant in 1912, and to captain in 1916. He then served with his regiment on the Mexican border. At the outbreak of the First World War in April 1917, the Sixty-ninth was transferred to Camp Mills, Long Island, where it became a unit of the famous Rainbow, or Forty-second Division. The old regiment had acquired a new regimental number, the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry, but the former title will forever be associated with it. The Fighting Irish Sixty-ninth had its own special personality, with the bouyant spirits, the military élan, and the religious ardor that mark our race.

The regiment was fortunate in its heroic and revered chaplain, Father Francis P. Duffy. He wrote the achievements of its officers and men in his book, Father Duffy's Story. In it, early in 1917, he analyzed the high qualities of the then Captain Anderson. He foretold the splendid services which were to be rendered and the high honors that were to come to this young officer.

Father Duffy wrote: "Alexander E. Anderson, of Company E, is a Sixty-ninth man by heredity. His uncle, Colonel Duffy, commanded the regiment in 1898. His cousin, Maj. John Duffy, was in the regiment when Anderson was old enough to join it—and he joined it as a private just as soon as they would let him. He is a soldier through and through. His family and his business are near to him, but the Sixty-ninth is first in his thoughts. He has gone through all the stages from private to captain without any family favoritism and today he stands out as the keenest captain in the regiment. He went to an officers' training school 2 years ago and graduated with a hundred percent. Sometimes they call him the 100-percent

soldier, a title which grates on him exceedingly, for he hates such labels of praise, whether meant or not. Colonel Hine has asked me for the names of three captains who might be recommended for majors in emergency. I told him I would make only one, and after that one, half a dozen or more. 'Oh,' he said, 'you mean Anderson. That is what the battalion commanders all say.' "

The regiment was one of the first arrivals in France as part of our American Expeditionary Forces. Captain Anderson had his first battle experience in the area of Lorraine in the Luneville sector, and later at Baccarat. He went through this period of 4 months, in the early part of 1918, in bitter trench warfare and dangerous patrols, with the handicaps of localized engagements and without the typical and successful American freedom of maneuver in the open field which was to come in the succeeding months.

He was promoted to major in early 1918 and was placed in command of the Second Battalion

His regiment was then assigned to Champagne where he served from July 4 to 18, 1918.

Here he had an outstanding and glorious part in the bitter defeat of the last and greatest German offensive of the war.

The Rainbow Division was placed with French divisions under the command of a brilliant French veteran—General Gouraud.

The importance of this victory and his part in it can only be tested by the previous defeats of the Allies.

Ludendorff's shock troops had been successful in breaking through the British Army of General Gough, in March 1918. Later the Germans broke through the British and French armies in Flanders. Another great offensive drove south from the Chemin des Dames and reached as far as Chateau-Thierry, where the German advance was stopped by the American soldiers and marines hastily thrown into the line.

The ambitious plans of the German general staff contemplated the final and complete defeat of the Allies in Champagne. A break-through would have severed the Allied armies, with their right rolled up and crushed toward Verdun, and their left smashed against the line of the Marne and Paris.

These plans were completely foiled by the resistance of the French and American Armies in the famous Champagne-Marne defensive during the 3 days—July 15 to 18, 1918. In it Major Anderson was to achieve high distinction for his bravery and leadership.

His battalion occupied the first line in this battle. Under one of the heaviest artillery bombardments of the war, coordinated with enemy machine gun, mortar, and grenade attacks, he and his men stood steadfast until the Germans were utterly defeated. All through the battle, Major Anderson displayed valor, coolness, and inspiration to those under his command. The Champagne defeat of the Germans was the Gettysburg of that war.

From that turning point came the first great counteroffensive of the allies at Soissons and the subsequent defeats of the Germans up to their final collapse and the Armistice.

Father Duffy gives an eye-witness account of Major Anderson's part in this epic battle. He wrote at the time in his diary: "I think that our friends are going to be disappointed unless the Germans can spare a division or two to smother Anderson's battalion. Their orders are 'fight it out where you are,' which is Anderson's translation of Gouraud's phrase, 'no man shall look back, no man shall retreat a step.'

"Gouraud means it; and Anderson means it. I take great pleasure in observing him these days. A young fellow yet, just 29, and fresh from civil life—but a born soldier, with the carefulness of a soldier in making plans and in looking after his men, and the hardness of a soldier in ruling and using men, and a streak of sentiment carefully concealed which is a part of the soldier's make-up. It is interesting to me to see the elements of school training showing in a man's character and views. In his views of life, discipline and self-sacrifice, Anderson is a Christian Brothers' boy. I sometimes feel that old Brother Michael had more to do with the making of Major Anderson as I know him, than his own parents had. One result of his education had been what most people nowadays would consider a detriment—his devotion to duty is so sincere that it has produced the effect of despising publicity; this he carries to an extreme. Well, he may or may not win fame in this war, but one thing I know, that the soldiers of his company or of his battalion are delighted to have him over them in a fight and will unanimously rank him as one of the greatest soldiers this regiment has ever produced."

Major Anderson next participated in the battle of the Ourcq in late July and early August. The counterattack of the Allies was then in full swing. The Sixty-ninth was assigned to the difficult task of driving the Germans back in this sector. They were faced by the best fighting divisions of the German army, including one of the Prussian Guard. With the same cool courage, Major Anderson led the attacks of his battalion in these bloody engagements and successfully attained the objectives at Meurcy Farm, at Seringes, and northward far along the Ourcq River. For his heroism here, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

After that great victory he participated at the head of his battalion in the successful achievement of the American Army under General Pershing in pinching out the St. Mihiel salient in September 1917.

Finally, he served in the Argonne campaign in the bloody attacks of his regiment at St. Georges and Landres-St. Georges and in the last phase of that drive which reached Sedan.

Father Duffy describes humorously how, in the final days, Major Anderson, with a half a dozen men, captured the town of Chaumont in the Northern Argonne alone and for himself.

After the Armistice, Major Anderson served in the Army of Occupation on the Rhine. He was there promoted to the rank of lieutenant colonel of his regiment.

In all of his engagements, and in the fiercest fighting, he possessed a charmed life. Although constantly under fire and always in the front line, he was never wounded, gassed, or shell-shocked. That fact is all the more remarkable when the tremendous casualties suffered by his regiment are mentioned—there were 644 killed and 2,857 wounded, a total of 3,501 during a period of 180 days in which they were in direct combat with the enemy. He came through heroic and unscathed.

After his return to New York he maintained his keen interest in the Sixty-ninth. He commanded it as colonel between 1934 and 1938. In the latter year he was promoted to brigadier general and assigned to the command of the Ninety-third Brigade of the Twenty-seventh Division of our National Guard.

The oncoming of the second World War found him again in active service with his brigade of the Twenty-seventh Division in its camp in the South and later on our western coast, and in Hawaii. His sterling ability as a leader was rewarded by his promotion in 1942 to the rank of major general. That honor has come to very few National Guard officers in either the first or second World War.

Within a few weeks after assuming his new position, and on Christmas Eve of 1942, he passed away suddenly from a heart attack. The tremendous mental and physical strain incidental to the organization of a new division must have brought about his untimely death. He died as surely for his country as if he had made the supreme sacrifice on the fields of North Africa, or the South Pacific Islands.

Many military honors came to him from his country, his State, and the Republic of France in recognition of his valor and leadership in action.

His decorations included the United States Distinguished Service Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Victory Medal with six clasps, the Army of Occupation Medal, the Legion of Honor of France, the Croix de Guerre with Star and Palm, and the Long-Service Medal of the New York State National Guard.

His citation for the Distinguished Service Cross reads:

"For extraordinary heroism in action at Bois Colas near Seringes-et-Nesles, France, July 29, 1918. During a counterattack by the enemy, Major Anderson, with great courage and disregard for his own safety, gathered together a small number of men and with them rushed to the support of a thinly held line. Exposing himself to concentrated machine-gun fire, he exhorted his men to stand fast, greatly encouraging the men engaged and resulting in the complete repulse of the enemy forces."

His citation for the Distinguished Service Medal reads:

"For exceptionally meritorious and distinguished services. He served with the One Hundred and Sixty-fifth Infantry throughout all its operations, displaying military attainments of the highest order. By his fearless bravery and splendid leadership he at all times inspired a notable spirit among the members of his command. His unflagging energy and resourcefulness in overcoming the numerous adverse conditions which confronted his command marked him as an officer of splendid soldiery qualities. By his sound tactical judgment, keen foresight, and aggressive fighting spirit he proved himself an important factor in the successes of his regiment and division. He rendered services of conspicuous worth to the American Expeditionary Forces."

He was president of the New York chapter of the Rainbow Division Veterans Association.

Since his death further tributes have been given to his memory. Only yesterday there was launched at Kearny, N. J., a large United States Army troop ship. It was christened the *General Alexander E. Anderson*.

General Anderson typified the highest qualities of fighting Americans of Irish blood who have earned fame in every war in the history of our America since the Revolution. He had a keen and sentimental interest in the culture and history of Ireland. He was always an ardent advocate of its independence and in the years after the close of the First World War was an active leader in movements to promote that cause.

He was strongly religious in his devotion to his God and to his church. He had a clear, unclouded faith, and was proud of it. Whether in battle or in inactive areas, he was an inspiration to his associates and to those whom he led.

He had unselfish and unswerving loyalty to his friends.

Single-minded and high-minded, giving and receiving trust, he was a model of traditional military qualities.

Yet, with them, he had extreme modesty.

He had a quick and sure sense of strategy and of tactical position. A rigid disciplinarian, and yet, because of his sympathy and understanding of his men, able to inspire them with respect and confidence in his leadership.

In civilian life he displayed the same energy as in the military service. Over a period of 25 years he helped build up and main-

tain a prosperous contracting business, the Daniel J. Rice Co. His family life was ideal. He was survived by his widow, Mrs. Mary B. McGoldrick Anderson, three daughters, Miss Joan Anderson, Mrs. Howard L. Felchin, and Mrs. William Chambers, and his two soldier sons, Lt. Daniel J. Anderson, United States Army, and Sgt. Alexander E. Anderson, Jr., United States Army.

He was vitally interested in the meetings and other activities of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick.

The name of Gen. Alexander E. Anderson will live in American history. It will live in the hearts of his friends.

It will live in his wonderful contribution to the glorious record of his regiment and the Rainbow Division.

It will live in the annals of our society.

James A. Foley, chairman; William Peter Cavanaugh, Joseph F. Higgins, James McGurrin, Eugene J. McCabe, John P. O'Brien, John J. Phelan, Louis B. Rice, Committee.

Constitutional Amendment Respecting Taxes on Incomes, Gifts, and Inheritances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a Senate concurrent resolution of the general assembly of the State of Delaware, approved April 22, 1943, concerning a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution with respect to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution of the United States, relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing limitations on taxes so levied; and repealing the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Whereas there is now pending in the current session of the Congress of the United States, proposed legislation to repeal the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and to amend the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; and providing for a limitation of taxes thereon; and

Whereas the people of the State of Delaware are greatly interested in the passage of such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Delaware (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows: That application be and it is hereby made to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

ARTICLE

SECTION 1. The sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration: *Provided*, That in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which the Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of death or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on incomes for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

SEC. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3 laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect: Be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide, as the mode of ratification, the said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each Delaware Member thereof.

Approved April 22, 1943.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, certainly no one can deny the importance of world trade, nor the value of amicable world trade to the future peace of the world. However, it is a subject that is never closed and one in which the Congress, as representatives of a productive and progressive people, should have and hold a continuous and active interest therein. I was very much interested in the following constructive story which was printed in the Washington Times-Herald this morning:

G. O. P. DEMANDS CONGRESS RIGHT TO REVIEW TRADE PACTS

(By Arthur Sears Henning)

That the Roosevelt Administration has sold America down the river in international trade agreements is one of the principal counts in the Republican indictment of the Hull reciprocal tariff program, which the President is asking Congress to extend for another 3 years.

Secretary of State Cordell Hull, according to statistics cited by the Republicans, has brought about in less than 9 years under his authority to execute reciprocal agreements more radical revision of the tariff downward than Congress ever legislated. He was open handed in granting other countries cuts in American tariff rates but obtained insignificant concessions in return.

ASK RIGHT OF REVIEW

This is one of the reasons for the Republican demand for a provision in the extension legislation according Congress the right of review of future tariff deals with other countries or the power of veto of specific agreements within 60 or 90 days.

The House is about to consider the extension of the program and the prospect is that it will be passed by both Houses. The only question is whether it will be modified by amendment. The Republicans do not oppose tariff reciprocity, which has long been Republican doctrine, but they insist that reductions of American duties shall be fully reciprocated.

Mr. Hull has proclaimed that the vote on this measure is the test of America's disposition to cooperate with other countries after the war to maintain world peace and improve economic and social conditions; that if Congress fails to endorse the administration program our allies will lose confidence in us as post-war collaborators.

HULL'S CONTENTION DISPUTED

Mr. Hull has been taken to task extensively for this argument, even by members of his own party who feel that he has jeopardized his cause by a contention that is not true and that reflects an obsequious attitude toward our allies. Mr. Hull's attitude is being contrasted sharply with that of Prime Minister Churchill who, so far from worrying about the opinion of Britain's allies when it comes to the protection of Britain's interests, bluntly says: "What we have we hold."

The Secretary's attitude, of course, is that of the President and his entire administration, which is that the depression was caused by the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act and that the current war was caused partly by the Smoot-Hawley Act and partly by the failure of the United States to join the League of Nations. As to the depression in the early part of which the Democrats came into power the Republicans ask why the administration with its overwhelming control of Congress did not repeal the Smoot-Hawley Act, if it was really so iniquitous. The late Democratic Speaker of the House, Henry T. Rainey, once said his party did not dare repeal it because "we do not want this market flooded with the products of cheap labor in other countries."

EUROPE BLAMED FOR WAR

As to the war, the Republicans and not a few Democrats ask why the administration should parrot Europe's blaming of America when it is a notorious fact that Britain and France and other League powers could have checked Hitler when he occupied the Rhineland, and but for selfish interests could have stopped Mussolini's African aggressions even without Mr. Roosevelt's cooperation, which the President freely gave till they ran out on him.

Although the administration assailed the Smoot-Hawley Act as a prohibitive tariff, the average rate of duty before the reciprocal agreements went into effect was only 15.6 percent compared with Britain's 18.4 percent, Italy's 23.5 percent, Germany's 43.6 percent, Mexico's 23.2 percent, Brazil's 37.4 percent, and Spain's 72.6 percent. Only Belgium's 15.1 percent, and France's 13.2 percent were lower.

Analyzing the State Department's statistics, John Lee Coulter, former member of the Tariff Commission and former member of the State Department's committee on reciprocity information, informed the Ways and Means Committee of the House that Mr. Hull obtained tariff concessions to the United States on only 25.4 percent of the American exports to the countries entering into the agreements while granting reductions of the United States tariff on 63 percent of all dutiable commodities imported into the United States from those countries.

RESULTS RECITED

"While we granted on the average," said Coulter, "tariff reductions amounting to 43 percent from the rates previously in effect and bound only rates on just a few items, foreign governments in most cases merely bound rates of duty and other trade barriers and granted reductions in duty or increase in quotas on only a few scattered and relatively unimportant items.

"From this statement it can hardly be said that the trade agreements were reciprocal in character inasmuch as foreign concessions amounted to relatively little compared with concessions granted by us. Certainly there is nothing in the nature of Yankee trading indicated by this record. It is doubtful whether this record could even be described as good-neighbor conduct, since foreign countries in general had higher rates of duty and many additional trade restrictions than we, and it would seem that the conduct of two good neighbors would have been to bring treatment of commerce more nearly to a common level. Instead, we further reduced our tariffs while foreign countries made relatively few reductions and merely agreed not to further increase the disadvantages imposed upon our exports."

NO GAIN RESULTED

Coulter showed that no substantial gain of exports resulted from the reciprocal tariff agreements.

"Increases in exports after 1934," he said, "were as great or greater to non-trade-agreement countries. They were due in part to the increase in price levels and in turn to the general increase in world purchasing power.

"Part of these increases were due to normal recovery from depression, part to preparations for selfdefense or war, and part to various other special factors such as our subsidized wheat and cotton programs.

"The import side of the picture is much more simple and may be dealt with briefly. The public was of the impression that we would make only such concessions in rates of duty, etc., as necessary to get concession from foreign countries. In other words, the program was popularly called "Yankee trading." In fact, the United States proceeded to carry out quite methodically a general tariff reduction with little reference (a) to loss of revenue, (b) to increase in quantity of imports displacing our own labor and increasing unemployment, or (c) the effect upon the commodity price structure in this country.

"Fortunately, from the standpoint of those in charge of the program, the concessions were made during a period of expanding industrial activity and rising prices, so that much of the damage was obscured for the time being. It may be expected to show itself much more completely when the millions of workmen in other countries who have been drawn into defense programs, invasions, war, etc., happily return to productive labor and seek an outlet for the products of peace."

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of April 29, 1943:

IN THE NATION—THE WANTON WAYS OF CONGRESS WITH TARIFF BILLS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, April 28.—Congress has a very bad record in tariff legislation because of the selfish nature of the subject. Once posed, the issue of the tariff always and instantly produces pressure groups seeking various advantages. Divided, none of the blocs can be sure of getting its share of the spoils. United, nearly all of them can get substantially what they are after. The results, with one or two exceptions, have been log-rolling tariff acts in which rates were raised and a static economy of nationalism was strengthened against the rest of the world

This nationalistic economy helped greatly to bring on the present war by closing American markets to peoples abroad who needed access to them to acquire or maintain fair living standards. Our attempt was to sell as much as we could to everybody at high profits and buy as little as we could from them at the lowest possible cost. It was to correct this condition—to substitute what Representative ROBERTSON, of Virginia, calls "an expanding economy" for a static one, and provide a surer means to preserve it—that the present Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, devised the reciprocal tariff-agreements system.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT

The rights of Congress to control tariffs were retained by a careful limitation of the negotiating and contracting powers that Congress delegated to the Executive in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Congress in this legislation "established a trade policy for the United States and provided for periodical review of the administration of this policy," as accurately stated in a memorandum supporting renewal of the act which was issued this week by Mrs. Harris T. Baldwin, of the National League of Women Voters. Thus, Congress has not surrendered its function to the Executive, but simply loaned a part of it under specified conditions. And it has not been responsibly charged that this loan has been abused or that it was unconstitutional to make it.

Because of all these facts, the Republican proposal—that henceforth trade agreements shall not take effect until a majority of both branches of Congress has had 60 or 90 days in which to cancel them if it so elects—is destructive of all the gains under the system. It would turn the American tariff back toward log rolling and a static economy. It would replant the seeds of world war which the United Nations are now uprooting, and it would restore no lost authority to Congress because Congress has not lost any.

A PERILOUS LURE

Yet the Republican proposal has a very special lure to many who would have opposed it heretofore, and, since the division on renewing the act substantially as it stands is close, that lure is perilous It is founded in the healthy circumstance that after years of supine surrender to the Executive, Congress is reasserting and recapturing its powers, and that is all to the good. To many the argument is appealing that a provision for congressional review of each trade agreement is a logical step in the rennaissance of Congress.

Another alluring argument in favor of the proposed amendment to the act is this: Some post-war settlements will be made in the form of agreements instead of treaties, requiring a majority of each branch for ratification instead merely of two-thirds of the Senate. It is unthinkable that these agreements should not be subject to congressional approval. Since trade pacts lie at the root of post-war settlements, why should these be exempt from that submission?

REASONS AGAINST

The answer is that they are not exempt because they are formulated within the limits and in the manner specified by Congress. Congress, if it chose, could draw up specifications for other post-war agreements. But that device, which is practical and sensible in the matter of making trade pacts, is not so in the matter of the other agreements that are to be drawn. Congress should not loan even specified powers of review with respect to the latter. Yet it could if it wanted to.

The chief reason why the Hull method is so great a forward step in tariff-making is, as said before, the wanton ways of Congress with this kind of legislation. Any congressional consideration of a group of traiff items nearly always brings on a general revision, log-rolling, increased rates, and a higher wall to shut off our markets from the rest of the world. If, therefore, Mr. Hull is obliged to negotiate with one eye on Capitol Hill we shall revert to the worst tariff eras and the reciprocal program will be dead.

It might be recalled that President McKinley had come to this conclusion shortly before his death. He had been directed by Congress to negotiate reciprocal treaties—not agreements—incorporating limited reductions. Not one emerged from the Senate committee. At the time of his assassination McKinley was making ready to renew the fight for ratification and in his last speech he endorsed the position which Mr. Hull has made our international economic policy. But McKinley did not have the legislative instrument; Mr. Hull invented it later It has worked well and should not have its edge taken off.

Post-War Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMMET O'NEAL

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening, March 30, 1943, a meeting was held of 19 retail merchant's associations which are actively operating in Louisville, Ky., in conjunction with the Kentucky Merchants' Association.

Mr. Harry W. Schacter, president of Kaufman-Straus Co., delivered a very thoughtful and informative speech on the subject A Better World After the War, and What the Retailers of America Can Do To Help Bring It About. During the discussion which followed, a questionnaire was distributed touching upon some of the important post-war problems. Two hundred and sixty-five prominent retailers received the questionnaire and to date 93 percent of them answered the questions.

The questionnaire follows with information as to the viewpoint of these men of wide business experience:

MARCH 30, 1943.

To the Retailers of Louisville:

Below is a questionnaire listing some of the major problems facing us today. If you will cooperate by answering it, we can begin creating public opinion for a better world after the war, which may have far-reaching effect.

Your individual answers will be kept strictly confidential. Only the composite

totals will be published and a copy of the result will be mailed to those who answer.

Won't you please answer and mail it promptly in the enclosed envelope. No postage is required.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY W. SCHACTER,
President, Kaufman-Straus Co.

WHICH POSITION IN EACH QUESTION MOST CLOSELY COINCIDES WITH YOUR THINKING?

BUSINESSMEN IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS

94 percent: 1. (a) I believe that we businessmen should take the same initiative in public affairs which we have always taken in the management of our individual businesses.

6 percent: (b) I believe that we should occasionally interest ourselves in public affairs only when our direct interest is vitally affected.

None: (c) I believe that we should not bother at all about public affairs, but leave the handling of these problems to those elected or appointed for that purpose.

ISOLATIONISM

80 percent: 2. (a) I believe that America must take its place in the world family of nations after the war.

19 percent: (b) I believe that America should consult with the other nations about the post-war world, but that we should concern ourselves primarily with the affairs of our own country.

1 percent: (c) I believe that America should return to the same isolationism to which it returned after last World War.

WORLD FEDERATION

90 percent: 3. (a) I believe that we should have a world federation after the war, with a world court backed by an international armed force.

6 percent: (b) I believe we should have an international federation like the League of Nations after the last World War, but with no armed force to back it up.

4 percent: (c) I believe that we should not have any international arrangements, but make the best arrangements we can with other countries for our own interest.

FOREIGN RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

89 percent: 4. (a) I believe that America should join with other nations in the work of relief and rehabilitation of the needy countries after the war.

8 percent: (b) I believe that we should leave such relief and rehabilitation to whatever private American agencies might care to do this work.

3 percent: (c) I believe that we should have no part in the relief and rehabilitation of other countries, but leave each of them to work out their own destiny.

PLANNING OUR ECONOMY

Sixty per cent: 5. (a) I believe our Government should have a hand in planning our all-over economy, through private enterprise, to bring about the maximum efficiency of our national production and distribution.

Twenty percent: (b) I believe the Government should concern itself only in the control of public utilities, and leave the rest of the economy alone.

Twenty percent: (c) I believe we should go back to the system of leaving all industry strictly alone to work out its own affairs.

POST-WAR EMPLOYMENT

Seventy-two percent: 6. (a) I believe that the Government should lay plans for seeing to it that all of our people have jobs, and that the Government be prepared to provide such jobs as private enterprise cannot or will not provide.

Nine percent: (b) I believe that we should go back to the modified Work Projects Administration program after the war, but leave job finding essentially to the workers themselves.

Nineteen percent: (c) I believe that we should let industry work out this problem entirely on its own.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Seventy-three percent: 7. (a) I believe the Government should widen our social security program to provide freedom from want for all who are permanently unable to work, or who are temporarily incapacitated.

Twenty-one percent: (b) I believe that we ought to stick to the present social security program after the war.

Six percent: (c) I believe we should go back to the conditions after the last World War, and leave to each individual to work out his own security.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT

Ninety-five percent: 8. (a) I believe that our Government ought to streamline our whole governmental structure—national, State, and city—to remove overlapping functions and to eliminate waste and inefficiency.

Five percent: (b) I believe that we ought to get along with our present governmental structure.

(c) I believe we ought to expand our governmental structure, and bring more government into our national, State, and city life.

Unity for Democratic Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit an address of Rev. Michael J. Ahern, S. J., of Weston College, to the Rotary Club of Lawrence, Mass., as it was reprinted in the Lawrence Evening Tribune of April 29, 1943:

UNITY FOR DEMOCRATIC VICTORY PRIEST'S TOPIC

Rev. Michael J. Ahern, S. J., of Weston College was the guest speaker Thursday noon at the meeting of the Rotary Club held at the Young Men's Christian Association. The address was broadcast by radio station WLAW. His talk, Unity for Democratic Victory, was as follows:

"Unity is the state of being indivisibly one, it is the union of many constituent parts or elements into a harmonious and concordant whole. Expressed more popularly it is the condition of many people who are all pulling together toward a common goal. President Roosevelt said in a speech to the Nation, after he had eloquently told stories of three Americans on the fighting fronts, 'Our soldiers and sailors are members of well-disciplined units. But they are still and forever individuals—free individuals. They are farmers, businessmen, workers, professional men, artists, clerks. They are the United States of America. That is why they fight. We, too, are the United States of America. That is why we must work and sacrifice. It is for them. It is for us. It is for victory.'

"What is the principle which unites 135,000,000 free individuals—still free and forever to be free—into the harmonious whole that is to achieve the final victory? Is it because we hate people? Or is it because other people are disunited that we must be united? Perhaps it is because we hope merely to preserve free enterprise and to insure the increase of merely material prosperity or its preservation. All these motives are ephemeral, when they are not sordid; they would be sorry motives for that 'indomitable will and determination of the people' by which in the words of the Chief Executive 'this great war effort must be carried through to its victorious conclusion.' The motives for American unity both in war and in peace must be as lasting as America, and must be as enduring as those self-evident truths on which the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are grounded; eternal truths because they are the gift of God.

"Wartime is a time of high, even hysterical, emotion. Patriotism is an emotion, but it is not merely an emotion; it is a conviction founded on reason and, for a believer, on faith also. 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself' is a command to love, not only your individual neighbor in the aggregate of the social unit which we call our country. The only country of our affections and loyalty is the United States of America. Although all of us, under the Stars and Stripes, have a heritage of culture from the lands from which we or our fathers or our ancestors have sprung, we owe those countries no political or national allegiance. We owe allegiance solely to the United States, and we want no other motive for this loyalty except the law of love of God and of our neighbor because he is a child of God, and is our fellow American.

"There are approximately 50 racial strains among the citizens of the United States, and though we sometimes place an adjective, followed by a hyphen, before the word 'American,' that hyphen would be a strange anomaly if it derogated by one jot or tittle from the word 'American' that follows the hyphen. If you must have a hyphen, then say that you are an 'American-American'; but better simply say, "I am an American." And if there are other citizens that doubt your patriotism or loyalty because of your racial origin, then you may appeal to the tradition of your United States, that the sons of all the races under heaven have spilled their blood in the defense of this country; and that this commingled blood still carries the life of this Nation vigorously and enduring. There is no greater treason to this unity of the blood than the attempt to poison that stream of American life by any divisiveness whatsoever, even a divisiveness of words that would set one class against another. A man is not assumed to be dishonest until he proves that he is not a thief; nor is a man assumed to be un-American until he proves that he is not a traitor. His law-abiding life is his document of loyalty, and the death or the readiness to die, of his sons, and perhaps himself, is the measure of his devotion.

"QUOTES STATEMENTS

"I am going to quote four short statements from four Catholic authorities on the fundamental issues behind this world conflict because these statements express the eternal principles of all international and national unity. The first is the famous encyclical of the late Pope Pius XI, which was issued on March 14, 1937, and which has for its title 'The Persecution of the Church in Germany.' This encyclical was banned from Germany by Hitler but it was published there in spite of him and has since been read by millions, both Catholics and non-Catholics, in all parts of the world. The Pope said, speaking to the German bishops:

"'If the tree of peace which we planted with pure intention in German soil has not borne the fruit we desired in the interests of your people, no one in the wide world who has eyes to see and ears to hear can

say today that the fault lies with the church and her head. The lessons of the past years make it clear where the responsibility lies. They disclose machinations that from the beginning had no other aim than a war of extermination. In the furrows where we labored to plant the seed of sincere peace, others were sowing, like the enemy in the Holy Scripture, the tares of distrust, of discord, hatred, calumny, of secret and open enmity against Christ and his church, and enmity in principle, fed from a thousand springs and working with every means at its disposal. With them and only with them as well as with their open and silent supporters lies the responsibility that now, instead of the rainbow of peace the storm-clouds of destructive, religious conflicts are visible on the German horizon.'

"PEACE PRINCIPLES

"On Christmas Eve 1941, as he did on the same occasion in 1939 and 1940, the present Pope Pius XII laid down principles of durable international peace, which are the very antithesis of all militarian heresies. He said: Speaking of the new order, which 'must be founded on the unshakable and immovable rock, the moral order, within the limits of an order so founded; there is no room for the violation of the freedom, integrity, and security of other States, no matter what may be their territorial extension of their capacity for defense.

" 'There is no place for open or occult oppression of the cultural and linguistic characteristics of national minorities, for the hindrance or restriction of their economic resources, for the limitation or abolition of their natural fertility.

" 'There is no place for that cold and calculating egoism which tends to hoard the economic resources and materials destined for use of all to such an extent that the nations less favored by nature are not permitted access to them.

" 'There is no place for a total warfare or for a mad rush for armaments.

" 'There is no place for the persecution of religion and of the church.'

"I do not think that the Atlantic Charter went as far as these declarations of Pius the Twelfth.

"BISHOPS SPEAK

"The American Catholic bishops speak.

"Here is the letter sent to President Roosevelt by the Catholic bishops of the United States:

" 'DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As Chief Executive of our Nation, you have called upon the American people for full service and sacrifice in a war of defense against wanton aggression. Congress in grave and inspiring unity has spoken the will of a great Nation determined to be free. We, the Catholic bishops of the United States, spiritual leaders of more than 20,000,000 Americans, wish to assure you, Mr President, that we are keenly conscious of our responsibilities in the hour of our Nation's testing. With a patriotism that is guided and sustained by Christian virtues of faith, hope, and charity, we will marshal the spiritual forces at our command to render our God-given blessings of freedom.

" 'We will do our full part in the national effort to transmute the impressive material and spiritual resources of our country into effective strength not for vengeance, but for the common good, not for national aggrandizement, but for common security in a world in which human rights shall be safeguarded and the will to live on the part of all nations, great and small, shall be respected, a world in which the eternal principles of justice and charity shall prevail.'

"The ultimate strength of a people is in the things of the spirit. The historic position of the Catholic church in the United States gives us a tradition of devoted attachment to the ideals and institutions of government we are now called upon to defend. Our predecessors, in the third plenary council of Baltimore, solemnly declared: 'We believe that our country's heroes were the instruments of the God of Nations in establishing this home of freedom; to both the Almighty and to His instruments in the work, we look the grateful reverence, and to maintain the inheritance of freedom which they have left us, should it ever, which God forbid, be imperiled, our Catholic citizens will be found to stand forward, as one man, ready to pledge anew their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.'

"Today in the face of the peril they feared, we reaffirm their solemn words. We give you, Mr President, the pledge of our wholehearted cooperation in the difficult days that lie ahead. We will zealously fulfill our spiritual ministry in the sacred cause of our country's service. We place at your disposal in that service our institutions and their consecrated personnel. We will lead our priests and people in constant prayer that God may bear you up under the heavy burdens that weigh upon you, that He may guide you and all who share with you responsibility for the Nation's Government and security, that He may strengthen us all to win a victory that will be a blessing not only for our Nation alone but for the whole world.

"CARDINAL'S MESSAGE

"Finally, I quote from the inspiring Easter message of Cardinal O'Connell which was published in part in many parts of the land and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a year ago. It has been printed also by the Massachusetts State Council of the Knights of Columbus for distribution everywhere, in a first edition of 500,000 copies. No more patriotic utterance has been made since we entered the war. Among other things Cardinal O'Connell said:

" 'What America offers and gives and maintains for her citizens is a treasure so precious that it is sacred. The preservation of that heritage is to every American a sacred trust and with the possession of that trust goes the sacred obligation to preserve, defend, and perpetuate it. That is the meaning of true patriotism.

" 'The defense of our altars and our homes is an obligation which rests upon every citizen. The founders of this, our beloved Nation, were ready to offer whatever they possessed, even life itself, to maintain the sacredness of their civil rights and their religious freedom, and we know that Americans today are no less determined to maintain, with God's great help, our land, our country, our homes, our altars, and the precious inheritance of our American way of life.

" 'In all humility we beg God's assistance in our Nation's struggles for her rights and possessions. And, we say it in deepest humility on this glorious feast of the risen Christ, the triumph of His cross will sustain the heart of America in facing the sacrifices which are necessary for ultimate success.

" 'We beseech our risen Lord and Saviour to bless our beloved country, to strengthen its arm, its heart, and its soul, so that, looking beyond our temporal trials, we may behold, with a blessed hope, the complete deliverance from our enemies, who are also the enemies of all international law and justice until, please God, peace again, the peace of Christ, the peace of justice, the peace of universal brotherhood shall rest upon this sorrowing earth, and bring with it to every citizen of this blessed land eternal gratitude to God, and a renewed appreciation and understanding of all that the greatness of America, our beloved country, means to every inhabitant who dwells therein.'

"Fellow Americans, Lincoln prayed at Gettysburg that by victory in the Civil War this Nation under God might have a new birth of freedom. We pray that this freedom may not be strangled in its maturity by the enemies of all international law and justice—the description of our enemies which you have just heard from His Eminence. Let me close with another quotation from the same illustrious source, the hymn written and composed by the cardinal, and sung thousands upon thousands of times every year in Catholic churches and assemblies all over the world. It is called The Cross and the Flag:

" 'Hail banner of our holy faith,
Redemption's sacred sign;
Sweet emblem thou of heavenly hope,
And of all help divine.
We bare our heads in reverence
As o'er us is unfurled
The standard of the Cross of Christ,
Whose blood redeemed the world.

" 'Hail banner of our native land,
Great ensign of the free;
We love thy glorious stars and stripes,
Emblems of liberty.
Lift high the Cross, unfurl the flag;
May they forever stand
United in our hearts and hopes,
God and our native land.' "

O. P. A. Is Liquidating Independent Business

REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge the Members of the House to be prepared to stop New Deal liquidation of independent retail merchants when the appropriation bill for the O. P. A. comes up for consideration in the near future. As long as the Henderson group of superintellectuals remain in control and dictate O. P. A. policies, the only opportunity Congress will have to stop O. P. A. reforms will be to deny the use of appropriations for such purposes.

Our country is engaged in a desperate war. Our first job is to bring victory, and in so doing, we must not permit economic theorists and planners to destroy our American system and way of life. It is my understanding that American men are fighting to save our American system and way of doing things. It is up to Congress to save the small business of our country. If small business is destroyed by New Deal bureaucracy, the backbone of American democracy is gone forever.

I want to call your particular attention to a timely article by Flint Garrison which significantly points out the calamity hanging over the heads of independent retailers as a result of O. P. A. reform policies. It is time for Congress to act before it is too late.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION AND BRANDED LINES

(By Flint Garrison)

Calamity hangs over the heads of the independent retailers of this country. It will descend upon them if the Office of Price Administration carries out its presently indicated price-control program. The first

step in this program already has been taken in M. P. R. 339—the recently issued rayon hosiery order which has created such confusion in the hosiery industry and brought so much opposition from the manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of hosiery. Because this is the first of a series of orders of a similar nature which are now in process in the Office of Price Administration, we think independent retailers should be made aware of the program and what its effect upon them is likely to be

Here is the program: In order to simplify its problem of checking compliance with its orders, the Office of Price Administration plans to require all manufacturers to produce goods under fixed standards and specifications. These standards will be set up by the Office of Price Administration. Under these standards all manufacturers in any line will theoretically produce the same thing. There will be no individuality in the lines of merchandise so standardized. All 42-gage hosiery will be the same and so will be all 14-pound union suits, all chambray work shirts, all 8-ounce denim overalls—and so will be all other volume items.

On each of these standard items will be attached at the factory a ticket or label on which will be printed its grade and its dollars and cents retail ceiling price. There will be one price for chains, another price for independents. There may be two prices for independents: a price for large stores and a price for small ones The ceiling price for chain stores will be lower than the celing price for independents.

Through such orders the Office of Price Administration will in effect say two things to consumers:

"1. There is no such thing as individuality or distinctiveness in merchandise All hosiery is the same, all underwear is the same; all work shirts—all overalls are the same All these goods are made according to our specifications. One manufacturer's product is no better than another's. All brands and trade-marks are meaningless.

"2 You will see from the ceiling prices we have ordered on all items of standard merchandise that chain stores sell goods cheaper than independents."

Of course, the Office of Price Administration won't specifically issue a statement in just these words, but the effect of its program of standardization and preticketing will have the same effect as though it did issue such a statement.

We think the net result will be the most damaging thing that ever happened to the independent retailers of this country And we also think the administration, through the Office of Price Administration, will give to the chain stores the biggest boost they have ever received.

But give the chains credit. So far as we can learn, this program is not their baby. It's an Office of Price Administration project pure and simple. Apparently the parents of it in the Office of Price Administration are perfectly willing to turn business upside down and inside out in order to simplify their job of checking compliance with their orders.

And don't charge this thing to Mr. Prentiss Brown. The program was started and was well under way long before he became Administrator of the Office of Price Administration. He probably is not yet quite aware of it. It is a project of the theorists about whom you have heard so much of late.

There is no justifiable reason we can discover why this program should be followed. Most certainly it will not increase the production of goods. Changing the products of all manufacturers in order to make them conform to one set of specifications will cut down the production of all manufacturers until they get tuned up in the new products. In some lines uniform specifications will throw certain specialized types of equipment out of use altogether. Requiring all manufacturers to use the same cloths and the same yarns will also enormously increase the difficulties of material supply. This phase of the matter is too broad and too complicated for use to go into details, but we assure you manufacturers have given us plenty of examples. You can write it down that the indicated Office of Price Administration program will not increase the supply of goods.

Neither will the program help us win the war. If we could be shown that the program would help us win the war, we would be glad to see it adopted, even if it puts every independent retailer in the country out of business. But it won't help us win the war: It will actually detract from our ability to win the war. The resentment and animosity which this program will arouse among more than a million and a half independent retailers of the country, their clerks, their families, and their friends will have a definitely detrimental effect on their morale. Lowering the morale of this vast body of our people will not help us win the war.

The only thing this program will accomplish will be to make it simpler and easier for the Office of Price Administration to check compliance. Forgive the English, but we are called upon to pay a hell of a price for this convenience.

We are against the whole proposition. We think it will be immeasurably harmful. We think it should be stopped. There is nothing more we can do to stop it. We have argued against it with Office of Price Administration officials for the past 90 days and so far have got nowhere.

Certain officials in the Office of Price Administration apparently intend to go right ahead with this program no matter how objectionable it may be to business generally. M. P. R. 339 (the rayon hosiery order) is the first step in the program. There is an underwear order, a work shirt order, an order on overalls, and others now in process in the Office of Price Administration. If you want them stopped you'll have to get busy yourself.

It won't do you much good to write to the Office of Price Administration or even to Mr. Prentiss Brown. You'll have to take this matter to Congress. Write to the two Senators from your State and to the Congressman from your district. Tell them, simply, directly, and personally, just how you feel about this matter and how it will affect you. Also write to Senate Committee on Small Business, Room 13-B, Senate Office Building, and House Committeee on Small Business, Room 114, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., and tell these two committees specifically how you feel about the matter and how this Office of Price Administration program to preticket retail ceiling prices on staple products generally will affect your business.

And you'd better do it in a hurry. There is no time to waste.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Minnesota has been very active in behalf of small business. Just what progress is being made in distributing this spending for war purposes down in the grass roots?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry to say from the information that I have received, no particular effort is being made to spread that money down to the small businessmen of the country.

Mr. KNUTSON. Donald Nelson told me two months ago that he was bringing a Colonel Johnson into the picture to devote himself entirely to bringing about a better distribution of the war work.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is a lot of publicity on it but we have had publicity for the last 10 years that something was going to be done to save the small business of the country but it has not been done to any extent, and that is particularly true when it comes to help for the small independent retail merchants.

Martyred Missionaries at Guadalcanal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on November 27 the Associated Press carried a delayed story from Guadalcanal. Father Albert Detheye, a Dutch Catholic priest, arrived at American military headquarters with details of how two missionary fathers and two sisters were captured by the Japanese on Guadalcanal and had been executed because they refused to tell the United States Marines it was useless to resist.

Natives said the missionaries were bayoneted through the throats. They were Fathers Arthur Duhamel, of Barker Street, Methuen, Mass., and Henry Oudeengberink, of the Netherlands. The sisters were Mary Odilia, of Alsace-Lorraine, and Mary Sylvia, of France.

With Sister Mary Edmee they were captured on October 21 at Ruavatu, on the northeast coast of Guadalcanal, just before a battle. Sister Edmee and Father Detheye escaped, but the others were executed after refusing Jap demands that they go to the American forces and say it was useless for them to resist on the island.

Father Duhamel, the courageous priest mentioned in the dispatch, was a former resident of my district, and his devotion to his cause and his heroism have become a byword among these people.

I include here an article by Bishop Cushing, as told by Rev. Terence P. Finnegan, United States Army chaplain, under date of March 23, 1943, which appeared in the Pilot on May 2, 1943:

THE BURIAL OF THE MARTYRED MISSIONARIES AT GUADALCANAL

(As told by Rev. Terence P. Finnegan, United States Army Chaplain, under date of March 23, 1943)

"Sometime in September of 1942, at Ruavatu Mission, Guadalcanal, two priests of the Marist Order, Fathers Duhamel and Engberink and two nuns, Sisters Odilia and Sylvia, matched their ccurage, grown strong at the foot of the cross, with the philosophy of modern paganism. Christ won in the reddening of the sands of Guadalcanal with the blood of four martyrs.

"The ——— reconnaissance troop had extended its patrols eastward beyond the Bokokimbo River. Stories had come to us of the

heroism of the martyred priests and sisters of the Marist Order and of the malicious and wanton destruction wrought at the Ruavatu Mission. Busa, a native chief, had shown to Maj. Gen. J. Lawton Collins the hidden burial place of Ruavatu's martyrs, and he immediately authorized me to restore as far as possible the mission's chapel and houses. He gladly acceded to my request that I disinter the bodies of the priests and sisters and rebury them before the little house of God they had loved and served so well.

"With a small detail of three men I left our bivouac area to proceed by a Navy tank lighter to Ruavatu Mission. The whole afternoon of March 5, 1943, was spent in the sad work of sorting out the debris covering to a foot in depth the floors of the rooms of the priests and sisters. Every religious article and all personal mementos were systematically and wantonly torn, to be cast in shreds to the floors. Only a few standard books remained intact. We carefully considered every article, hoping to salvage what we could; to return some keepsake to their families and to restore what we could for the priests and sisters we knew one day would come. Little in the houses could be saved, so all was burned and the rooms restored to order. The once beautiful chapel was especially discouraging. While the building itself remained intact, torn vestments and broken statues were scattered about the floor. I searched so hopefully for the chalices, ciboria, and ostensoria that I knew should be there. None was to be found. The vessels for the sacred oils had been crushed underfoot before the altar. Surely the ciborium with the Most Blessed Sacrament could fare little better. Needless to say we cleaned the chapel, very depressed in spirits.

"Ere long I learned of the heroism of these missionaries. Knowing the arrival of the enemy was imminent, the priests had sent the natives into the hills. They refused all pleas to retreat. They were to stay. I read a letter written to Father Engberink warning him of possible results, yet they stayed on. Their capture, of course, was a foregone conclusion, and with them were taken two native boys who continued the story for me. The enemy had demanded that one go to the Marines, then at Lunga Point, to paint a vivid picture of an irresistible army advancing on them and that departure from the island was their only salvation from complete annihilation. One priest was to be held as hostage with the two sisters. That order was refused. At that they were bound and starved for a week. As though starvation could break the will of such as these! They were then taken 5 miles up the beach toward the Lunga Point and again the demand was made. Again the refusal. And there on that beach the priests and sisters died as only heroes can, martyrs to their God and their country. The two lads had escaped the night before into the bush. The Marines had then been on the way, and it is believed that none of these murderers escaped their vengeance. A little way from the beach buried in a native house we found their broken bodies.

"After mass we marched the 5 miles up the beach to where our dead were finally buried. We carefully wrapped them and on improvised stretchers we carried them back. It was such a long hike that the sun was setting when we had still a mile to go. So we rested there for the night. The next morning saw us on the way again. The graves had already been dug. Two for the priests in front of the church on the gospel side and two for the sisters on the epistle side. We placed their wrapped bodies before the altar and I said the funeral mass for them. These natives had loved them much. The eyes of all were misty as we covered them. They covered them immediately with flowers and branches and they told me that every Saturday they would return to redecorate their graves. Repeatedly they asked me to come back again, and when would some more priests come to stay? That I assured them would surely come to pass and probably very soon."

BISHOP CUSHING.

Interference by Labor Leaders in Construction of Pipe Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an advertisement, a news article, and an editorial from the Cape Girardeau Southeastern Missourian, each concerning the activities of labor-leader racketeers who are interfering with the laying of the two big pipe lines from Texas and the Southwest oil fields to the Northeastern States. According to these and other reports, labor-leader racketeers, or their goon squads, have beaten up some of the men who were working on this war project, and have otherwise used force and violence as well as the threat thereof in an effort to intimidate the workers, and thus bring about discontinuance of construction of the pipe lines.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STATEMENT

To the People of Southeast Missouri:

The global war in which our Government is now engaged has made greater demands for petroleum products, including high octane gasoline, than was ever known before in the history of the world. The war effort made demands on all transportation facilities until new transportation means became necessary.

Our Government, through one of its agencies, organized the War Emergency Pipe Line Corporation for the purpose of acquiring right-of-way and constructing a large pipe line from the Texas oil fields in order to transport gasoline from the Southwest to the Atlantic seaboard, to be used by our fighting men on all the fronts, for bombers, fighter planes, for subchasers, destroyers, and all the various implements of war being used by our fighting forces.

The construction of this line is one of the prime essentials to speeding up and ending this terrible catastrophe.

The War Emergency Pipe Line Corporation awarded contracts to the undersigned firms to construct a portion of this line and to unload the pipe and distribute it along the right-of-way for use in the line.

We gladly undertook this work for our Government as a part of our contribution to the war effort, and we immediately moved our equipment into southeast Missouri for the purpose of doing this work expeditiously, as time was of the essence of the contract.

We of necessity brought with us key men in our organizations who are skilled in doing this kind of work, but have employed and expect to employ local laborers and employees in connection with the fulfillment of our respective contracts.

The wages we pay are as high as any wages paid for similar work in this area, all such wages having been approved by the War Labor Board, from which we cannot deviate.

Our employees are satisfied with the wages, the hours, and the conditions under which they work.

We do not have and never have had any controversy with a single employee over wages, hours, or working conditions.

Since we have started on our work, Joseph Edward (Buck) Newell, of St. Louis, Owen Femmer, of St. Charles, R. M. Secor, of Ste. Genevieve, Ted Nischwitz, of Edwardsville, Ill., and John Rathouz, of St. Louis, have insisted that all of our employees must become members of certain labor unions and that all men we employ must join or become members of their unions before we will be permitted to build this pipe line.

We have no quarrel with organized labor.

We do not propose to discriminate against a man in our employment because he is a member of organized labor; neither do we intend to compel any of our employees to become members of a labor union against their wishes.

Since we came into southeast Missouri to do this war work some of our employees were assaulted in the coffee shop of the Marquette Hotel. Others of our employees were brutally assaulted while at their places of employment in Scott County.

The men who have demanded that all of our employees join certain labor unions, as well as the men who committed the assaults at the Marquette Hotel and in Scott County, were not employees of ours and never have been and did not represent or have authority to represent a single employee on our pay roll.

There is no controversy between our respective companies and their employees, the only controversy is as to whether or not so-called outside labor leaders can interfere with the prosecution of our war contracts because we will not compel our employees to join their unions and pay tribute to them.

While our sons and brothers and husbands are making supreme sacrifices for the maintenance of our form of government and for the protection of our homes and the rights which our Constitution gives, we believe that all patriotic citizens should and do resent efforts to interfere with the production or distribution of essential war materials where there is no dispute as to wages, hours, or conditions of employment.

We ask for the hearty support and cooperation of the loyal, patriotic people of southeast Missouri in our effort to construct this pipe line in order that high-octane gasoline may be delivered to our fighting forces on battle fronts all over the world.

OIL STATES CONSTRUCTION CO.,
General Contractors.
C. HOBSON DUNN,
Transportation Contractor.

ORDER ACTION ON PIPE LINE—CARS OF PIPE FOR JOB ARE PILING UP

The War Emergency Pipe Line Corporation pressed today for action on construction of the pipe line in Scott County, where virtually no work has been done since Thursday. The American Federation of Labor effort to get closed-shop agreements for the pipe-stringing force, the Dunn Trucking & Construction Co., of Dallas, and the laying crew, the Oil States Construction Co., of Tulsa, has resulted in the tie-up.

No general conference on the differences materialized this week end, although some on-the-side meetings were conducted in Cape Girardeau.

Two Federal conciliators were here and in Scott County working on the case in an effort to iron out the trouble and get the war job moving.

The Bolz Construction Co. job, laying of pipe under the river at Grays Point, also was still idle.

STATE INVESTIGATION

At the same time it was said Adjt. Gen. Clifford W. Gaylord, head of the Missouri State Guard, is having an investigation made of the situation, particularly the fight on Friday at Ilimo, when 3 men were injured and sent to a hospital. Display and use of firearms and clubs was reported in the mix-up, when about 40 or 50 unidentified men went to the railroad yards and engaged in a fight with 7 Dunn Co. workers who had declined to secure union cards.

C. Hobsen Dunn, now in Cape Girardeau, received a message Sunday from the Emergency Pipeline Corporation, directing him to proceed to unload and string pipe.

The telegram signed by Assistant Traffic Manager C. W Cromley, said:

"Now 27 cars pipe at Morley, Mo., none unloaded since April 27, total of 70 cars there and en route. When will these cars be released? Must have action."

WORKER IN HOSPITAL

It was learned that demurrage charges, which become $8 daily per car on the third day, are in effect. Today was the third day since most of the cars arrived at Morley, it was said Morley is about 3 miles east of the pipe line right-of-way, the line running near Oran, from the northeast.

O. B. Young, a Texas worker, remained at St. Francis Hospital today, recovering from serious head wounds. Two others, also hurt in a fight at Ilimo on Friday morning, have been dismissed from the hospital. The men are employees of the Dunn Trucking & Transportation Co., of Dallas.

AFTERMATH OF THE LABOR BRAWL

Later developments of the brawl pulled off in a Cape Girardeau hotel by labor manipulators indicate that what happened to Herrin, Ill., a few years ago, as related in this column last Saturday, may be closer at hand than many suspect. Latest reports are like this:

Two pipe-line men who are listed with the workmen who are not members of a labor union and who have refused to pay high cash tribute to the racketeers, registered at the hotel. They went about their affairs as usual, they say, and when they went back to their room for the evening they discovered their grips open and the contents scattered around the room. Evidently the door had been opened with a skeleton key, or in some manner that did not affect the lock. From the grips, the men say, two revolvers, a gold watch, and some personal trinkets were taken.

It was after this discovery that the two men went to the dining room where the brawl took place. They contend they were attacked.

In the brawl windows were broken out, tables and chairs smashed, bottles and dishes were thrown, men were knocked down, and so on. A dinner party was in progress in an adjoining room. Men and women were seated in other parts of the dining room. Fortunately all escaped in a rush without injury.

But what would have happened had the two pipe-line men had their guns in their pockets? What would have happened to the hotel guests in the other rooms had there been pistol shooting? Likely all that saved innocent persons from being killed or wounded was the fact that the two pistols were stolen.

So a burglary has been added to the brawl and possibly in a few more days other unknown details of the affair will come out.

Policemen appeared on the scene and the participants of the brawl were taken to the police station. A remarkable procedure took place, if current reports are true.

The men were booked by a police clerk and then, it is reported, each man was asked to give bond for his future appearance in police court. The report is that each man was permitted to sign his own bond in the amount of $25. No money was put up, no assurance was given that the men would ever be seen again. So they walked out probably feeling that the community had decorated them for being big shots who had put on a show of unusual importance.

A personal bond of $25 indicates a fine of perhaps $1 to $5. Had these several men been local citizens owning their homes here their bond likely would have been higher, or they would have been put in jail to await the action of the court. Cases of this kind are known.

If the racketeering of a leading hotel, filled with people at the dinner hour, is of such little importance in Cape Girardeau as to draw not event a slap on the wrist, how long will it be before other similar characters come here?

This question is being asked by many citizens and they will continue asking it until they are assured that hoodlums will not be glorified in Cape Girardeau.

And since the city has failed to show conclusively that this is no place for hoodlums and racketeers, it is now up to the State authorities.

Where is the prosecuting attorney?

If this case isn't entitled to a thorough investigation by a grand jury right away and the stern attention of the circuit court, then what will things come to in this community?

A grand jury is needed and every person who had a hand in the brawl, or the burglary of the hotel room, should be questioned thoroughly. There are many other rumors going the rounds—of money being handed out promiscuously by strangers and of services being asked for—that might also lead to something important.

The time to show hoodlums that Cape Girardeau is no place for them is right now while the iron is hot.

Every day press dispatches are appearing in the newspapers of the Nation presumably from Cape Girardeau reporting the status of the labor racketeering on the oil pipe line that means so much to the eastern section and the Nation as a whole. From headquarters in Cincinnati, in Washington, and Dallas, reports are given out daily on conditions in Cape Girardeau, while the fact is that no labor trouble has broken out here. But the racketeers have made their headquarters here and so our town gets the credit.

What happened to Herrin a few years ago is now being credited, in a way at least, to Cape Girardeau and unless prompt action is taken the good name of our city will be blasted.

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the twelfth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. In considering the records of the proceedings of the monetary convention presented in this installment of Senator Cockrell's speech, in view of the proposal for the establishment, in the near future, of an international commission to control a form of international credit money as a means of stabilizing international exchange, this review of the record of the past negotiations in which our Government has taken part is enlightening and is of extreme importance for our consideration in shaping the program of the monetary convention soon to be undertaken.

The twelfth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

Now, I want to repeat to the Senate, here was an international bimetallic union composed of France, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, Greece, and Rumania, maintaining a bimetallic standard at the ratio of 15½ to 1, and that ratio had been maintained from October 1785 down to that date by France with slight cooperation from the other governments, notwithstanding the overflow of gold from California and Australia from 1850 to 1860. These Nations had agreed upon a bimetallic system, and France, the great Nation of Europe which had aided us in securing our independence, had sent us a formal and cordial invitation to come and become a member of that international bimetallic union; we sent Hon. Samuel B. Ruggles as a representative there to represent us; and the distinguished Senator from Ohio was there, not authorized by the Government, but introduced and presented as the chairman of the Committee on Finance in the United States Senate; and they discarded and rejected every overture of bimetallism presented and demanded the single gold standard and that silver should be stricken down.

We now see the germination and the budding of the monetary policy produced by the distinguished Senator from Ohio and Mr. Ruggles, which is now throughout the world aggressive and brutal. It is a single gold standard, the only money of ultimate redemption, with silver and all other money and coin and paper merely subsidiary and redeemable in gold. The only time that has ever occurred in the history of the world where an international bimetallic agreement could have been made was when France offered to us that bimetallic system, and the Senator from Ohio more than any one man is responsible for its rejection.

But now let us trace out this determination to have a single gold standard.

On January 6, 1868, Senator Sherman introduced S. 217, in relation to gold and silver coinage. Referred to Finance Committee

On June 9, 1868, Senator Sherman, from that committee, reported the bill back to the Senate with proposed amendments, reducing the weight of the gold coins, and also of the silver half dollar, quarter, and dime, and making such silver coins a legal tender for $10, and prohibiting the coinage of the standard silver dollar.

This was in 1868 and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Sherman] then proposed to strike down the standard silver dollar and coin only half dollars, quarter dollars, and dimes of less intrinsic and coining value and make them a legal tender for only a small sum, comparatively.

He made a written report to accompany that bill. I have the report here before me. There was a majority and minority report, Senate Report 117, Fortieth Congress, second session, the majority report made by Senator Sherman and the views of the minority submitted by Senator Morgan of New York. Now listen to the report of the majority:

"The United States is the great gold-producing country of the world, now producing more than all other nations combined, and with a capacity for future production almost without limit. (See reports of Mr. Ruggles and J. Ross Browne.) Gold with us is, like cotton, a raw product. Its production here affects and regulates its value throughout the world.

"The United States is a new Nation, and therefore a debtor Nation. By placing ourselves in harmony with the money units of creditor nations we promote the easy borrowing of money and payment of debts without the loss of recoinage or exchange, always paid by the debtor."

He then endorsed the recommendations of the Paris International Monetary Conference of 1867, and said:

"The single standard of gold is an American idea, yielded reluctantly by France and other countries where silver is the chief standard of value.

"All the provisions of the plan proposed are in harmony with the American system of coinage. They are either already adopted or may be without inconvenience.

"France, whose standard is adopted, makes a new coin similar to our half eagle. She yields to our demand for the sole standard of gold."

Here we have conclusive proof of the endorsement of the highly exaggerated statements of the productions of the precious metals in our own country made broadcast in Europe by Mr. Ruggles in 1863 and 1867, and our other officials from 1862 to 1868, and the world is told that we demanded the single gold standard, and to secure it were ready and willing to debase and reduce the value of our gold dollar 3½ cents. Why? For the honorable, noble, and unselfish reason that our country was the great gold-producing country, and would deluge the world with gold, and, being a creditor nation, could pay our debts more easily in such debased, reduced coinage.

The Latin Union coined gold pieces of 5, 10, 20, 50, and 100 francs, and silver 5 francs, ratio 15½ to 1, or about 400 grains of standard silver in each 5 francs.

Upon this bimetallism we were asked to unite with the states of the Latin Union.

We answered through Senator Sherman and Mr. Ruggles by proposing to reduce the gold in our dollar 3½ cents to correspond with the 5-franc gold piece, and peremptorily refused to consider even recognition of silver as full legal tender, when, if we had agreed to reduce the silver in our dollar, then worth 3 cents more than the gold dollar and more when the gold was reduced 3½ cents, we would have had bimetallism at the ratio of 15½ to 1. Our bimetallist-now Senator, would not consent, and bimetallism failed and he is the responsible party.

Now, Mr. President, I want to put this matter beyond any doubt. I continue the proofs to sustain the proposition.

On April 25, 1870, the Secretary of the Treasury transmitted to Senator Sherman "A bill revising the laws relative to the Mint, assay offices, and coinage of the United States," with a lengthy report of John Jay Knox, Deputy Comptroller of the Currency, explaining the bill and the reasons for it, published in Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 132, Forty-first Congress, second session.

In this report, with a draft of a coinage law, Mr. Knox says:

"Silver dollar—its discontinuance as a standard

"The coinage of the silver dollar piece * * * is discontinued in the proposed bill. It is by law the dollar unit, and assuming the value of gold to be fifteen and one-half times that of silver, being about the mean ratio for the past 6 years, is worth in gold a premium of about 3 percent (its value being $1.0312), and intrinsically more than 7 percent premium in our other silver coins, its value thus being $1.0742. The present laws consequently authorize both a gold-dollar unit and a silver-dollar unit, differing from each other in intrinsic value. The present gold dollar is made the dollar unit in the proposed bill, and the silver-dollar piece is discontinued."

On June 25, 1870, in response to a House resolution of June 4, the Secretary of the Treasury transmitted to the Speaker a report of Mr. Knox, giving copies of a voluminous correspondence between the Department and officers of the different mints, assay offices, and other persons, touching the bill and report submitted April 25, 1870. In this correspondence some favored and others opposed the proposed discontinuance of the silver dollar.

The Government of Sweden and Norway instituted a commission known as the Swedish Commission on Coinage, and in July 1870, our Minister there submitted to this commission copies of a letter from our Secretary of State, of June 13, 1870, "on the subject of promoting a common unit and standard of international coinage."

This commission in 1870 submitted their report containing about 300 pages, and in it discussed, with great particularity as to dates, names, etc., every step then taken in regard to a universal coinage, referring to the statements and reports of Mr. Ruggles, Senator Sherman's letter to Ruggles, his report, and bill in 1868, to which I have just referred, and the proposal of our Government, and rejected it. But the next year they adopted it. Germany, which had adopted the single silver standard in 1857, over a scare produced by the overflow of gold from California and Australia, December 4, 1871, then flushed with her victories over France and the indemnity of $1,000,000,000 and the consolidation and unification of all her different provinces into one grand empire, desiring to unify the coinage, introduced a new coinage of gold based upon gold, the mark as the unit, and that single gold standard was perfected in 1873.

Denmark, Norway, and Sweden in pursuance of the convention of Sweden and Norway discarded their single silver and adopted a gold standard. In connection with the acts of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Germany, the United States the 12th of February 1873 remonetized the standard silver dollar. These things occurring in rapid succession the nations of the Latin Union had to limit the amount of pieces to be coined by each, and another convention was held in 1875 and a limited coinage continued, and finally the mints of the Latin Union were closed to the coinage of silver. In 1876 Russia changed to a silver standard; that is, she stopped the coinage of silver on private account and only allowed it to be coined for export to China

Now, here are these data. They show cause and effect. The exaggerated statements and misrepresentations of our own officers and representatives in regard to the production of gold, and our own determination to honor and magnify gold, establish the single standard, debate and degrade silver, caused the legal discrimination to be enacted by other nations.

How ridiculous some of these misrepresentations are I will illustrate by our monetary commission of 1876, of which the senior Senator from Nevada, Mr. Jones, was a member.

Among the witnesses whose testimony was taken and reported was Hon. Edward Atkinson, who testified in regard to the yield of silver, and said:

"I should question the evidence as to the total production of silver, partly on the ground of what I saw in the centennial exhibition from Mexico."

Remember, Mr. President, that the world was to be deluged with gold and silver, with from $200,000,000 to $400,000,000 annually. These exaggerated falsehoods and misrepresentations were continued until when? Until the nations had come to a single gold standard, until good monometallism had been established in the United States and the friends of silver began efforts for its rehabilitation. From that time on to this there has been no talk of any overflow from gold, no flooding of the world with gold, but the flooding of the world with silver. The talk has all been directed to silver.

Mr. Atkinson says in reply to the question as to what he had seen at the centennial in Philadelphia:

"A very curious mass of silver, thick in the center and thin at the edge, as if it had been cast in an earthen pan. It was afterward explained to me how it was obtained: That there were cliffs containing veins of metals, against which piles of combustible materials were placed and set on fire and the production was collected in what might be called an earthen pan, and this was alleged to be a rough production by this process. I at once inferred in relation to silver production that statistics might be fallacious."

This is the statement of a distinguished statistician, which has been published all over the world, of mountains of silver and the silver so soft that a pile of combustible material set up against the side of it and set on fire causes it to pour down in a stream.

Mr. President, I have thus traced, in as consecutive chronological order as possible the facts and figures in regard to the fabulous, mythical exaggerations of the probable production of gold and silver in the United States in such amounts as to literally flood, deluge the world and seriously impair the currency value of these metals, especially of gold; and in regard to the representations and efforts of Senator Sherman, Ruggles, and other officials and representatives of our Government, made to secure the single gold standard in this country, and their gold proposal to the nations of the world to debase and reduce our gold dollar 3½ cents in value because of the excessive production of gold and its depreciation; and then in regard to the actions and legislation of European governments changing their coinage and their discrimination in favor of gold and against silver, in order that we might correctly see the producing causes and the resulting effects.

Beyond question in my mind, the statements and actions of the representatives of our country, which I have shown, caused, forced the discriminating legislation of European nations in favor of gold and against silver, and all combined have caused the change in the ratio of gold to silver.

The actions and legislation which I have stated, abandoning the single silver standard and adopting the single gold standard, and abandoning the double standard by adopting the single gold standard, and by stopping the coinage of full legal-tender silver and continuing the unlimited coinage of gold with full tender, have necessarily and unavoidably caused an enhanced demand for gold and thrown upon the markets of the world an enhanced supply of silver, and very largely decreased the demand for silver, and have broken the connecting link forged and maintained by law for so many years previously at a fixed ratio with very slight changes, and have stricken down silver as a money metal of the world and debased it from money to a mere commodity, a mere metal, like nickel and copper, in the markets, and consequently, when measured by the full legal-tender gold metal, silver has fallen in value.

In further support of my propositions I will quote from the final report of the Royal Commission of Great Britain—appointed in 1886 to inquire into the recent changes in the relative values of the precious metals—made in 1888. This commission examined fully into

all the facts, and in their unanimous report say:

"189. Looking then to the vast changes which occurred prior to 1873 in the relative production of the two metals without any corresponding disturbance in their market value, it appears to us difficult to resist the conclusion that some influence was then at work tending to steady the price of silver and to keep the ratio which it bore to gold approximately stable.

"190. There is another fact to which we have already drawn attention, pointing decidedly in the same direction. Prior to 1873 the fluctuations in the price of silver were gradual in their character and ranged within narrow limits.

* * * * *

"192. * * * Now undoubtedly the date which forms the dividing line between an epoch of approximate affinity in the relative value of gold and silver and one of marked instability is the year when the bimetallic system which had previously been in force in the Latin Union ceased to be in full operation; and we are irresistibly led to the conclusion that the operation of that system, established as it was in countries the population and commerce of which were considerable, exerted a material influence upon the relative value of the two metals. So long as that system was in force we think that, notwithstanding the changes in the production and use of the precious metals, it kept the market price of silver approximately steady at the ratio fixed by law between them, namely, 15½ to 1.

"193. Nor does it appear to us a priori unreasonable to suppose that the existence in the Latin Union of a bimetallic system with a ratio of 15½ to 1, fixed between the two metals should have been capable of keeping the market price of silver steady at approximately that ratio.

"The view that it could only affect the market price to the extent to which there was a demand for it for currency purposes in the Latin Union, or to which it was actually taken to the mints of those countries, is, we think, fallacious.

"The fact that the owner of silver could, in the last resort, take it to those mints and have it converted into coin, which would purchase commodities at the ratio of 15½ of silver to 1 of gold, would, in our opinion, be likely to affect the price of silver in the markets generally, whoever the purchaser and for whatever country it was destined. It would enable the seller to stand out for a price approximating to the legal ratio, and would tend to keep the market steady at about that point.

* * * * *

"193. To sum up our conclusions on this part of the case, we are of opinion that the true explanation of the phenomena which we are directed to investigate is to be found in a combination of causes, and cannot be attributed to any one cause alone. The action of the Latin Union in 1873 broke the link between silver and gold, which had kept the price of the former, as measured by the latter, constant at about the legal ratio; and when this link was broken the silver market was open to the influence of all the factors which go to affect the price of a commodity. These factors happen since 1873 to have operated in the direction of a fall in the gold price of that metal, and the frequent fluctuations in its value are accounted for by the fact that the market has become fully sensitive to the other influences, to which we have called attention above."

Remember, Mr. President, that these are the conclusions, after a thorough investigation, of gold monometallist Englishmen. Suppose, now, that all this discriminating legislation had been against gold and in favor of silver, where would gold be today compared with silver? It would be much less valuable, measured by silver, than silver is today measured by gold.

Can any sane man doubt that, if we had agreed to the bimetallic system of the Latin Union in 1867, as we were invited to do, that the market value of silver throughout the world would be today equal to gold at the ratio of 15½ to 1, or that the European nations would not have adopted the discriminating legislation in favor of gold and against silver, which I have shown.

Certainly they would not. Can any sane man, can even the Senator from Ohio, doubt today that his own actions and representations, coupled with the exaggerated statements and misrepresentations of Mr. Ruggles and our own Government officials as to the enormous yield of gold from our auriferous regions and their refusal to enter the Latin Union for bimetallism, and their demand for the single gold standard—the American idea—have caused the European nations to enact the discriminating legislation against silver and the depreciation in the relative value of silver as a metal measured by gold as money, and have practically made international bimetallism now an impossibility?

In my judgment there can be no question of it. I think I have conclusively proved the propositions I asserted. But to make assurance doubly sure and to remove any lingering doubt in any man's mind we will trace the record further.

As soon as the discriminating legislation referred to had been secured in Europe and the United States enthroning gold, the idol, and demonetizing and degrading silver to the condition of a mere commodity, the necessary inevitable result the depreciation of silver as a metal, a commodity measured by gold as money followed.

Then our bimetallist friends insisted upon international agreements. Oh, yes, after international agreements were made impossible, then the opponents of silver, whenever any legislative effort has been made for its rehabilitation, have interposed some project for international bimetallism. When the Bland bill of November 1877, for the free and unlimited coinage of silver was passed by the Democratic House of Representatives and came to the Senate, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Allison] insisted upon limiting the coinage and inviting the governments of Europe to an international monetary conference at Paris, to be held in August 1678.

It was doubtless hoped by him and those who agreed with him, that European governments might agree to some bimetallic system. I do not intend to cast any reflection upon the honesty and sincerity of any one who then held or who may now hold to the possibility of such a chimera or delusion. They were then, as now, mistaken in my judgment, and the very measure of limiting the coinage instead of unlimited coinage was a hindrance and an obstacle to the possibility of such a project.

Messrs. Fenton, Groesbeck, and Walker were our delegates, with Mr. Horton as secretary. The principal nations of Europe, except Germany, were represented. Germany declined to send any delegate.

At the first meeting on August 10, 1878, Dr. Broch, of Sweden and Norway, laid before the conference certain tables, from which I read, on page 11:

"Mr. Sherman, as Senator of the United States, proposed as an international coin a piece of gold of 125⅘ troy grains nine-tenths fine; it will weigh 8.135868 grams, and will contain 7.322281 grams of fine gold.

"It will be in fact the English sovereign recoined at the fineness of nine-tenths; it will only differ from it by one three-hundredths of an English penny.

"Mr. Sherman proposes to accept it as $5, although, in comparison with the American eagle of $10, it is only worth $4.8665."

This showing that they had before them all the documents which we have published in regard to coinage.

Address of Hon. Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, at Unveiling of Portrait of Thomas Wilson Dorr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 6 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], May 4, 1943, on the occasion of the unveiling of a portrait of Thomas Wilson Dorr in the Rhode Island State House in Providence.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your Excellency, distinguished guests, my fellow Rhode Island citizens, we are met here in this State capitol today, May 4, to celebrate a significant anniversary in the history of our State.

The early days of the month of May have been, somehow, particularly propitious for political upheavals. If here in this State we have had nothing so extensive as the internationally celebrated May Day of world revolutionists, we have nonetheless had May events of equal liveliness and perhaps more specific consequence.

Today, of course, we celebrate as usual that May 4, 1776, on which our small State cockily declared its independence of Great Britain 2 months in advance of the rest of the Colonies. We celebrate, also, and uniquely, the centennial of our present State constitution, and in connection therewith we honor Rhode Island's greatest citizen since colonial times—the man around whom those events took place that marked the early days of May a century ago—Thomas Wilson Dorr.

It is a curious coincidence and a cause of pleasant satisfaction, which I know you will understand, and which therefore I trust you will pardon my mentioning, that the drafter and mover of that declaration of independence was my great-great-grandfather, Dr. Jonathan Arnold, and that the closest friend and legal defender of Dorr was my grandfather, Judge Walter S. Burges.

It was on May 3, in 1842, that Dorr was formally, if illegally, inaugurated here in Providence as the first popularly elected Governor of Rhode Island, together with his "people's government" legislature, and on the next day, May 4, the first arrests were made among these "people's government" legislators—arrests that marked the beginning of the dissolution of Dorr's attempted rule.

On that same day, 101 years ago, the so-called "legal assembly," elected under the State's old charter, convened at Newport

and declared a state of insurrection existed in Rhode Island—and called for Federal assistance to put it down.

Yet on the following May 2, 1843, just 100 years ago this past Sunday, the State adopted a new and far more liberal constitution. What had occurred in that period of 1 year to explain this extraordinary reversal? All of it is explained and summed up in the activities of Thomas Wilson Dorr.

Furthermore it was on still another day in early May a year later—on May 6, 1844—that the Supreme Court of this State sentenced the man who was the cause and the occasion of this change in our fundamental law—the patriot and statesman Dorr—to life imprisonment for treason.

To comprehend these contradictions, it is well to remind ourselves that though revolutionary Rhode Island was a jump ahead of its fellow colonies in declaring its independence, it later lagged far behind the others in forming a new government. While the other colonies wrote new State constitutions, Rhode Island still continued to be governed by the charter granted it by King Charles II of England in 1663.

It seems astonishing now. Yet the cause of this failure in democracy was simple—not to say barefaced enough. In essential terms, it meant no more than the unassailable rule of an entrenched minority. Nobody could vote in Rhode Island except male property owners and their eldest sons, and this continued to be true for 180 years, through the first 43 years of the nineteenth century.

Of course there was a good deal of agitation against this. It could not be otherwise with changing conditions and customs. Business was growing. Agriculture and commerce gave way to manufacture. Population increased—especially the working population. That class upon which the growing manufacturing wealth was founded, rettled more and more rapidly here, particularly in the nonfarming, northern portion of the State.

But this agitation was sporadic. It lacked firm or continual leadership. It was easily and often insultingly snubbed. The fact we must always bear in mind in considering Dorr's rebellion and the events leading up to it is this: That the one official way, the only so-called "legal way" of changing the government of Rhode Island was to request it to change itself. Those in control of the government had no intention whatsoever of letting the majority rule a century ago—any more than they have any such intention now.

That is why, when at last a true leader emerged he finally concluded the only possible thing was to attempt the change by force. But it was force based squarely on what Dorr and his confederates honestly believed to be the true will of the true majority of the people. This force emanated from genuine democracy. As long as he was able, Dorr tried to carry out what he deemed the people's will. He quit only when convinced that will had been beaten down by the excessively severe penalties the old form of government in desperation enacted.

In Dorr's time the only choice lay between persuasion on the one hand and force on the other.

Now we have a third choice which is preferable to both. Until my second term as Governor, the supreme court of the State was assumed to have decided that it was unconstitutional to hold a constitutional convention. Mindful of Dorr, I requested of that court, then newly constituted, an opinion on this question and received its epoch-making opinion that such a convention can be held. I believe that the time is approaching when a constitutional convention should be held to revise that aged instrument to meet the needs of modern society. The revision should be based on American belief in the rule of the majority and not of a minority, and in the welfare of all the people and not of any special class. Such was Dorr's unfulfilled purpose.

In some respects Door's leadership was similar to that of Thomas Jefferson, the bicentenary of whose birth we have just been celebrating. In both instances it is interesting and heartening to note that when this leadership came, it came, not from the downtrodden nonvoting masses, but from the powerful, land-owning voting class itself. Not only then but nowadays we have seen in politics more than one man lashed as a "class traitor," because he refused to let his luck of birth, or family, or race, or wealth be defined as his true birthright, and because, however temporarily favorable to him the existing political or social or economic conditions might be, he refused to defend them as the be-all and end-all of society, but instead strove to better the conditions of those less fortunate than himself. Well, Thomas Dorr was branded a class traitor in his time.

He came from a wealthy family. He was a brilliant and rising young lawyer. He held prominent positions in the political and cultural circles of Providence. He sat in the Rhode Island General Assembly, and there were many who predicted for him a political future that might carry him to any office in the United States. He could have gone on, could have gotten those predicted glories, but only by compromising his principles and abandoning his ideals. That was a thing he would never do; he was incapable of compromise of principle. In that lay both the tragedy of his defeat then, and the glory of his triumph now.

When I was Governor, I succeeded, after some vain efforts, in convincing our good neighbor, Massachusetts, to revoke the edict of banishment of Roger Williams, the founder of this colony. I bearded the lion (or shall I say codfish) in his den, and told it this should be done, not for the sake of Rhode Island since we were grateful for the result, and not for the sake of Roger Williams, since his glory had long before effaced the ignominy of his banishment, but for the sake of Massachusetts itself, to show to the world that it now realized it had done a wrong and stupid act. So 7 years ago, on this very spot, the Governor of Massachusetts presented to me, as Governor of Rhode Island, a certificate of the passage of the resolution revoking that edict of banishment passed 300 years before.

Today the State of Rhode Island, not for the sake of the voters of the State who enjoy the franchise which Dorr devoted his life to obtain for them, not for the sake of Dorr himself who no longer needs vindication, but for the reputation of the State itself, this ceremony takes place. As chairman of the committee appointed under vote of the general assembly to obtain and have hung in this state house a portrait of Thomas Wilson Dorr, I now present this portrait of him as the first elected "peoples' Governor," to be hung with the portraits of the other Governors duly elected according to established form.

This portrait was painted by a talented Rhode Island artist—the painter, Wilfred Duphiney—and I cannot do better than close my remarks by quoting from another Rhode Island artist, the poet Winfield Scott, who in his recent incisive poem about Dorr entitled "The Sword on the Table" makes him say "The right of freedom is the people's right." Let us hope and resolve that at home and abroad in this hour of world turmoil we may possess as fervent a zeal in the cause of freedom as was that of Thomas Wilson Dorr.

All Must Join In To Win the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent and well-considered article appearing in the Boston Post of April 4, 1943, written by Robert L. Norton:

ALL MUST JOIN IN TO WIN WAR—MANPOWER QUESTION DEPENDENT ON MILITARY NEEDS IN DESPERATE CRISIS—NO TIME FOR TEMPORIZING

(By Robert L. Norton)

If compulsory mobilization of manpower and womanpower does finally become necessary, the blame will rest with the administration and the war agencies which have temporized with the problem from the beginning. The fact of the matter is that manpower has been and still is being badly manhandled from Washington.

For months the administration has put off a show-down, relying on indirect measures of compulsion, mainly effective only as regards men of draft age.

Today the country is suffering from a scare over the prospects of a food shortage due to the belated introduction of the rationing system. Actually, however, people are more scared than hurt.

The highly unfortunate result of the failure to balance our resources and our economy to the desperate requirements of an all-out war is the open insistence of some groups in Congress that first, we do not need armed forces totaling 11,000,000 by 1944, and second, that in any event, the induction of so many millions of fighting men would damage our home front and thus our effectiveness in ultimate victory.

PROLONG WAR IF ARMY'S SIZE IS CUT

This is an admission of the lack of determination to make any dislocation necessary to support and equip the number of men in our armed forces which are judged necessary for victory by our military leaders.

It may further indicate a lack of disposition to make the necessary sacrifices, or a weakening of confidence in our resources and power as a nation.

It does not seem reasonable to assume that the United States with a population of more than 135,000,000 persons, fighting a war for its very existence, cannot mobilize 11,000,000, or only 8 percent of our population, for this purpose, when Germany has mobilized 12 percent and Great Britain 10 percent.

Those who now propose to reduce the size of the Army miss these vital points: That we are engaged in a total war of survival; that total war by its very nature strains the civilian economy to its limits; and that our strategic plans call for an early and conclusive termination of this war by doing all that we can as soon as we can.

If we are not willing to mobilize our manpower this year so as to build the essential army while producing the essential materials and food, if we sacrifice one essential of early victory to another, we inevitably prolong the war. This means additional hardships and sacrifices for all of us, and above all unnecessary bloodshed for our troops.

MUST DO OUR FULL FIGHTING DUTY

There are some publicists and Members of Congress who calmly affirm that time is on our side, but this is not the fact. The war might well end in a stalemate if we were satisfied to make it a war of attrition. This would give the two greatest military powers the world has ever seen, Germany and Japan, the opportunity to consolidate and utilize their vast conquests. We must take the offensive.

Certainly we must retain the confidence of our allies if victory is to be accomplished, and above all we must keep the faith with our own fighting men who are battling all over the globe today.

There are critics of the Army program who ask, "Why should we fight? Why not give more supplies to the British, the Chinese, and the Russians and let them fight for us?"

Surely this country has not come to the pass where it expects our allies to do our fighting for us.

Subjected to savage aerial assaults the British have approached the full-time war employment of every man, woman, and child in their country. For over 5 years the Chinese have made an heroic resistance and the Russians have fought with indomitable courage and skill. And during this period we have been given time to prepare.

CAN'T AVOID GRIM REALITIES

We would be facing an extremely tough outlook if Russia and Britain had succumbed. This is our war just as much as it is the war of the British, the Russians, and the Chinese. We are sending supplies to the utmost of our ability to these and the other United Nations and will continue to do so.

But it should never be forgotten that, in the final showdown, victory can only be won by our superior striking power in the air and with the aid of our ground forces.

"Elemental truths are often the most difficult to grasp," says Under Secretary of War Patterson. "Throughout all ages people have tried to avoid facing up to the reality that war is a grim business; have longed for an easy war and have hoped that, somehow, some way, victory could be gained, without risking too much or without experiencing the stark unpleasantness of the conflict. But all the wishing in the world does not change the nature of war and its impacts upon all people engaged in it, whether in battle lines or at home.

"FIGURE OF 11,000,000 BASICALLY SOUND

"The hour for realism has arrived for every American. We must brace ourselves for mounting casualty lists and reverses on the battle fronts and for more arduous labors and sacrifices on the home front.

"Realism must extend from fox holes and the pill boxes on the firing lines to the factories and homes of America. When our country is at war, none of us can escape the responsibility of viewing the routine, as well as the emergency duties of life, in the light of their bearing on the final result—unconditional surrender by our enemies.

"We cannot solve our manpower problems by whittling down the size of our armed forces, by permitting one special group after another to obtain blanket deferment. The problem must be tackled at its source. Everyone wants to do his or her share to help win the war and must serve where he or she can render the best service. The decision cannot be based upon personal desire."

Secretary Patterson points out that the figure of 11,000,000 for our armed forces is not something that was pulled out of a hat. It is the requirement determined by those charged with the heavy responsibility of winning this war.

DIFFICULT AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

No reasonable American would question the judgment of General Marshall when he says that we need so many planes and so many tanks to win the war. And neither would any American question the judgment of Admiral King that we need so many escort ships and destroyers to beat the Axis. And this being the case, why should anyone question their judgment as to the number of men that they need to use these weapons and man these ships?

There is, of course, no doubt but that we are faced with a very difficult agricultural situation. Last year agriculture lost approximately 694,000 men to the armed forces, while the lure of high wages drew 1,000,000 workers to the industries.

Practical farm leaders are not very optimistic that the situation can be alleviated by the President's proposal for a "land army." They say that what is needed most are men who know something about farming.

Mr. Roosevelt states that by the end of 1943, in addition to the 550,000 farm workers between the ages of 18 and 37 who have already been deferred, some 3,000,000 more agricultural laborers will have been excused from military service.

FARM LABOR MUST BE SKILLED

It is to be doubted, however, if the flow of farm workers to industry can be stopped by such indirect methods. But the implication is that farm workers will not be released from military service except under agreement to return to their employment, and that there will be supervision and checks upon their activities by local selective service boards.

The advocates of the universal Selective Service Act, or compulsory direction of manpower, for the most part believe irreparable harm has already been done. There is certain to be a serious shortage of farm machinery this year which will be reflected in the 1943 food production.

It is pointed out that farm labor in these times is skilled labor and anyone not trained in the handling of modern farm equipment and lacking a knowledge of scientific food production is of not much value to the farm owner. It is regarded as more or less absurd to think that we can get maximum food production by taking men from the cities, inexperienced in agriculture, or that women and children can qualify as farm labor except in helping to harvest certain crops.

The doubt is therefor expressed that a further drain of labor from the farms can be stopped unless through the adoption of some such law as adopted in England and Canada, mobilizing manpower so that its maximum efficient utilization is made available to winning the war.

Many agree with Paul V. McNutt, head of the Manpower Commission, who has repeatedly said compulsory national service was ultimately inevitable. Mr. McNutt should know what he is talking about, since a large group in Congress blame him for the failure adequately to meet the manpower problem. Although the inconsistency of this attitude lies in the fact that while criticizing Mr. McNutt, Congress has denied him any real authority in handling the situation, either in agriculture or industry.

Except as a last resort, Congress has not been disposed to act favorably upon a compulsory manpower bill such as that introduced jointly by Senator AUSTIN, of Vermont, and Representative WADSWORTH, of New York.

The labor unions are opposed to this measure because they know that compulsory selective service would weaken their position. If drafted workers are not forced to join the unions that would create serious internal union difficulties. It would undoubtedly also bring increased public pressure for effective Federal regulations of unions.

LIMIT TO RESOURCES OF UNITED STATES

However, if anything like a complete breakdown in food production does take place, Congress will be called upon to face a decision in both the matter of enforced industrial and agricultural employment. And the outlook is none too favorable in any case.

Those Members who would hold down the size of the Army are greatly influenced by the views of former President Hoover. "We urgently need to determine what we can do within our strength of manpower, materials, shops, and agriculture, and the bottlenecks with which we must contend. We need to determine which of our tasks come first.

"And, if we determine rightly, we will place agriculture in the first rank of the war effort, alongside of planes and ships. Our imperative necessity is the maximum food production. The American farmer will do it if he is given a chance. And the fate of the world may depend upon it."

Mr. Hoover contends that time runs in our favor. We have undertaken a far larger task than Germany. "But there is a limit even to the resources of America. We have undertaken a job far greater than any other nation in history.

CALLS HOOVER'S VIEWPOINT "DEFEATIST"

"Germany does not have to build merchant ships to transport much of her armies overseas. She is not building much of a navy, except submarines. We must fight a war at 3,000 to 8,000 miles from our shores. We must furnish vast quantities of food and munitions to our allies. We must finance our allies. We must build a host of merchant ships and a larger navy. But we may run so fast that we get out of breath. Trying to do too much too fast may delay the inevitable Axis defeat."

Sharply disagreeing with the ex-President, Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, says: "These proponents who favor drastically cutting down the size of the Army and following Mr. Hoover, take a defeatist viewpoint. They say that no way can be found to mobilize the country's resources of men, food, and other materials to support an army of the size determined necessary by our military leaders. They mean that no way can be found without reorganizing agriculture as we are reorganizing industry, without men and women on the farms and in the towns working harder and sweating more, and without the people generally tightening their belts and submitting to the rationing of many more things.

FIVE IMPORTANT POINTS

"And so these critics propose to take the easiest way out now, no matter what the future risks may be. This is the easiest way to solve the problem. It is also the easiest way to lose the war.

"I appreciate the fact that we are face to face with a very difficult agricultural situation, resulting from men leaving the farms at an alarming rate. But the proposed plan of cutting down the Army ignores five important points:

"1. This problem will not be solved by reducing the size of the Army. More men have left the farms to go into industry than to join the Army. High-paid war industry will still draw labor from the farms.

"2. Reducing the Army will lengthen the war.

"3. Lengthening the war will mean more bloodshed for our sons, brothers, and husbands and more sacrifices for us all in the long run.

"4. We can produce the necessary food and build the necessary Army at the same time, if

we do the job of mobilizing our manpower and rationing our food comparable with what our allies are doing.

"5. Until everything else has first been done to make the most efficient use of all available labor, the whole conduct of the war and the safety of the country must not be jeopardized by cutting the size of the Army."

And so runs this great controversy which finally must be settled by Congress.

Probably nothing would give the enemy greater aid and comfort at this juncture of the war than a reduction in our Army.

Livestock Improvement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following thought-provoking editorial by Samuel R. Guard, which appeared in the Breeder's Gazette for May 1943. This paper, which reaches 175,000 of the leading livestock farming families in the country, is conducting a campaign for the establishment of livestock improvement associations in every county or district in the Nation.

To make these associations effective, Mr. Guard suggests the appointment of assistant county agents, thoroughly trained in animal husbandry, to devote their full attention to livestock and serve as secretaries of the associations.

Mr. Guard has made a challenging suggestion which deserves the careful consideration of both State and Federal agricultural agencies. Now is the time to think about these problems and organize a constructive program for after the war. Every Member of this body should give serious attention to Mr. Guard's proposal.

LOOK AHEAD

In the midst of war, prepare for peace. We ought to be thinking of the state of our animal industry after these insatiable war demands have slackened. We are certainly going to be called upon to restock the world with efficient producers of meat and milk, eggs, wool, and horsepower. We must continue to grease the wheels of the world with animals fats, and to stoke the furnaces of humanity with animal proteins. We must clothe the world warmly. We must do this economically, and at a profit to those who breed and feed. Are we prepared to meet this challenge to us as herdsmen and flockmasters? Yes, we are, if we will but organize our herd and flock resources. And I mean organize—a definite, working county organization of breeders. A county breeders' club. If the county is poor livestock country, which few are, then two or more counties can combine and have a district livestock-improvement association. What each county or district needs first is a livestock agent, a full-time animal husbandman paid a good salary, to develop the livestock resources of his territory. Is it not so?

BY STATE TAX?

Now how are we going to get a livestock agent for each county? Are we not standing at about the same place where agricultural extension stood before the Smith-Lever Act was passed to give us the county-agent system? The other night at the banquet of the Fulton County Purebred Livestock Breeders Association, of which Bob Moore, Rochester, Ind., is president, I broached this idea. Well, they already have a mighty good livestock man in Martin Huxley, the county agent, whose father bred Perfection Fairfax. They suggested that an assistant county agent could devote his time to livestock and act as secretary of the association. Then I told them about Sam R. Morrison down at Como, Miss., who serves 2 counties, Panola and Tate, as the commissioner of animal husbandry by virtue of the State law. He has remade cotton country into a cow pasture where they sell purebred Polled Herefords for $7,500 at auction and average $1,500 on 50 head, and still produce record cotton yields. I like the State angle very much. The county breeders' clubs would want to affiliate into State breeders' clubs, which would be powerful influences for the advancement of the commonwealth.

WILL YOU HELP?

"But here," said a Holstein breeder, who harvested wheat during the Civil War and who got a medal of gold for 119.2 bushels of corn per acre in 1942, "why don't we do both? Let's get State laws for the organization of country breeders' clubs. Then let's get a Federal law so that any State which meets the requirements can have a grant-in-aid, the money to be mingled just as are State and Federal moneys for the county agricultural agent, club agent, or even the county welfare department? This livestock agent should act as the full-time paid secretary of the local livestock-improvement association, to which every local breeder and feeder would belong."

What do you think about it? Would you be willing to help organize a livestock improvement association in your county? Write me your ideas about it, will you please?

Very earnestly,

SAMUEL R. GUARD.

Textiles—In War as in Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

TEXTILES—IN WAR AS IN PEACE

Yes; man is dependent upon textiles from the cradle to the grave—in peace and in war. In peace man demands comfort and beauty. In war he must have comfort and protection. The textile industry is coming up to these expectations. It is developing hundreds of special fabrics for special purposes. It has created clothing for wear, miles high in the stratosphere and fathoms deep under the sea, clothing to meet the daytime heat of the desert and the bitter cold of its nights, clothing for the tropics and the Arctic, the swamps and mountains—for every climate and every condition.

Modern scientific warfare has forced the development of textiles that were not even thought of a year or two ago: Camouflage nets; parachutes and parachute shrouds; self-sealing gas tanks; panzer hangars; cartridge and powder-bag cloths; helmet linings; gas masks; fuses; canvas tops; windshield fabrics and seat upholstery for jeeps, trucks and other motorized equipment; uniforms for all armed services and for nurses, WAAC's, WAVES, SPARS, and MCWRS. Then there are windbreakers, raincoats, ski-troop uniforms and other items too numerous to mention. The Star-Spangled Banner itself is a textile.

The Quartermaster Corps alone has issued specifications for over 300 different fabrics. Add to this the requirements of the Navy, the Air Forces, the various civilian defenses, the Red Cross and lend-lease and the sum total of textiles required for military and allied uses is approximately 70 percent of the total produced before the war to meet civilian requirements.

How the textile industry has been able to meet this unprecedented war demand, superimposed upon the industrial and essential civilian needs, is an inspiring story.

First, it stepped up its production to an all-time high. It is noteworthy that this was accomplished mainly with existing equipment.

Second, the textile industry did a job of plant conversion which was a masterpiece of intraindustry cooperation and idea sharing.

Third, its technicians developed new and superior fabrics and finishes. Its engineers and production men increased the speed and the efficiency of the entire production machine.

Maj. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, Quartermaster General of the United States Army, in special statements prepared for Textile World, and in addresses before textile groups, has stated that the cooperation of the textile industry has been outstanding and that the industry has kept ahead of schedule on all the major types of fabrics required.

General Gregory recently pointed out that of the approximately 234,000,000 yards of combed twill produced in this country in 1942, the Army took about 87 percent, the Navy 10 percent, leaving 3 percent for nonmilitary purposes.

Col. Robert T. Stevens, of the Quartermaster Corps, in a recent address, referred to the output of duck. Production of that vital military fabric was twice doubled in 6 months, between January and July 1942, he said, and an annual capacity of 600,000,000 yards of all types of duck was made available. "The current rate of production of cotton duck is five times normal," said Col. Stevens.

The production man can indeed take pride in this record, and behind the production man, the textile technician has been working tirelessly. Mildewproofing and waterproofing, so vital in a world at war, are in a new stage of effectiveness. A new process for waterproofing fabrics employs vinyl acetal plastic in place of precious rubber. Textiles that glow in the dark have been perfected for black-outs and other applications. American genius is solving problems many of which seemed insurmountable. Silk, for example, was something the Japanese thought we could never duplicate. A new synthetic textile filament that weighs but one-eighth of the finest silk filament threatens to put the Japanese silkworm out of business after the war so far as we are concerned. The post-war possibilities of this development challenge the imagination.

The immediate significance of all this is its importance in the winning of the war. There is, however, a post-war implication which is important to the future of America. A mass production textile industry will serve civilians after the war more effectively than ever before, and will put new standards within the reach of millions. The tempo of such changes has been accelerated tremendously. The oldest industry in the world, now one of America's largest, is showing a youth and vigor that promise much for the future * * * nationally and internationally.

Fair Play for Union Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include therein a letter which I have received from John Fitzpatrick, president, and Joseph D. Keenan, secretary, of the Chicago Federation of Labor:

CHICAGO FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Chicago, April 22, 1943.

Hon. WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Much activity is now being carried on in connection with labor laws. Those unfriendly and antagonistic to organized labor are using a great deal of energy to repeal some laws that are favorable and to enact laws that would be inimical to labor.

The opponents of organized labor seem to be taking advantage of the war to bring about the results they desire and are utilizing it to influence the fair-minded, to see the necessity for making the changes they advocate.

Every available means and methods are being resorted to in order to make the public believe that unions are detrimental to the successful prosecution of the war. The newspapers and the radio are kept continually publicizing the faults of the unions, but scarcely ever do we hear of any good accomplished by them.

Fair-minded people need not be told of the benefits brought about by organized labor. It is not alone the organized workers that benefit by it, but the unorganized as well.

Fair employers would not want to have labor unorganized. Organized workers, as a whole, are better employees than are those not organized. But the unfair, autocratic employers will not see anything but their own selfish ideas. Whether for their own or the general welfare, they will not assimilate the thought of anyone questioning their business methods or policies. They do not give labor even a secondary consideration. They do not believe that but for labor, capital would never exist. They do not believe that capital is the stored-up product of labor. They seem to think that capital is supplied by Divine Providence for the benefit of those who are privileged to have it. Their blindness to the rights of labor is such that it is the cause of the unrest in economic conditions which continuously foster turmoil and strife, when there would be amicable relations, if only the autocratic employers would see the light.

What is the purpose of having unions submit financial periodic reports? Are they to be for publication? If so, why? Who would benefit by publication or submission of those reports? The members of the unions know their own circumstances. It is said as one reason for those reports that the corporations submit reports to various agencies and that unions should also. Yes; corporations submit reports to authorized agencies, because the public must be protected from purchasing stocks and bonds that are not up to the required standards. But unions have no stocks for sale.

Labor-baiting and labor-hating scribes and commentators are very diligent in promoting the ideas of their mentors and sponsors. They are well paid for their labors. But they are unscrupulous in their efforts to prevent unions from trying to raise the standard of living for their members and their families. Those stooges and their unfair employers never try to learn of the millions of dollars that are given each year to the beneficiaries of members of organized labor, in death, disability, old-age, and sick benefits.

The good that organized labor does is not mentioned by those people. They magnify its faults. We do not claim that all officers of labor organizations are right in their behavior but we can compare them favorably with executives of most other organizations.

Members of Congress and States' legislatures, who are elected to represent all their constituents, should be very circumspect in their deliberations when enacting or repealing laws, so that one class would not be discriminated against nor obtain special privileges to the detriment of others.

Millions of Americans are now absent from their homes. They are on the battle fronts, in the training camps, and supplying and carrying the materials with which to prosecute the war. This is no time to take advantage of their absence and legislate against their welfare when they return. The great preponderant majority of those who are away on those hazardous tasks are of labor and their interests are entitled to protection, the ballyhooing of labor's enemies to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is our earnest hope that the legislators who are elected to promote the people's welfare will bear those things in mind and not crucify the workers in order that unfair labor baiters might be successful in their efforts.

Enclosed you will find a copy of resolution adopted by unanimous vote of our regular meeting held April 18, 1943.

Very truly yours,
CHICAGO FEDERATION OF LABOR,
JOHN FITZPATRICK, *President*,
JOSEPH D. KEENAN, *Secretary*.

Civilian Defense Vindicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT CROSSER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of May 1, 1943:

CIVILIAN DEFENSE VINDICATED

Cleveland's civilian defense organization was faced with two real emergencies in as many days this week, and met them both in a manner to increase greatly the community's confidence in its ability to take care of itself in a major disaster.

Conditions approximating to a considerable extent those which would follow an air raid were created in large sections of the city by Tuesday night's tornado. Air raid wardens and other civilian defense volunteers did splendid work in cooperation with the regular police forces and the Red Cross in protecting lives and organizing relief.

A second emergency arose when the city transit workers went on strike Wednesday night and left the city and its war industries almost entirely dependent on automobiles all day Thursday. This time the share-the-ride program of the Cleveland War Transportation Committee, a branch of the civilian defense organization, helped save the day. Moreover, had the strike continued the transportation committee was prepared to organize all the community's private transportation facilities on a wide scale.

We have had a first-class demonstration this week therefore, of the value of civil mobilization for war emergency. No longer will it be necessary to explain to the more cynical that despite the small chances of air raids we must be prepared for the worst. Other things, we now realize, can happen to throw the community's war program out of gear.

Allotments and Allowances for Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from News Commentary Program, of Ian Ross MacFarlane, originating from the studios of WCAE, Pittsburgh, Pa., through the Mutual Broadcasting System network, March 19, 1943:

Yesterday, when I was in Cleveland, I visited a certain office of the Government, and now I find myself in the very delightful position of not knowing which one I like better. Isn't that a happy situation to find oneself in? Instead of it being the unfortunate duty of most of us these past many years always to choose between the lesser of two evils or the lesser of two busy jobs, but now I find myself torn between two fires. Did I prefer the Office of Dependency Benefits—that section of the Adjutant General's of the War Department which deals with those family allowances and allotments to you wives and mothers and other dependents of our boys in the armed services—that is, in the Army? Or did I like its equivalent in the Navy—the Family Allowance Section of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, or perhaps of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts? Well, I'll just say I liked them both. You know what I think about the Office of Dependency Benefits in Newark and of the wonderful humanitarian job they are doing? Well, yesterday when I visited the equivalent of the Navy Department in Cleveland I was really stunned. Never before in all my life have I seen such brilliant examples of efficiency.

Now I mean this—in that I think that after the war is over some great, big business corporation will come along and take the Chief of this Division and all his personnel and sweep them right into private enterprise, because they are the most efficient working outfit I have ever seen in my life.

Now just let me give you a few facts and figures—not confusing, I hope. A force of approximately 500 people—just 500 dealing with family allowances, family allowance checks, sent to dependents of men in the Navy, that is, to wives and children. This department sends out, or did send out last month 275,000 checks—a force of 500. But here is the most startling thing of all—they don't start to print one of these checks until 3 days before the last day of the month. Do you know why? Just another one of those examples of foresight and forethought of Uncle Sam towards you people who are dependent

upon the wages, or the allotment or allowance made to you by your boys—by your husbands—in the service. They want to hold it up until the very last minute, so that should there be any change of address or anything else that might jeopardize or postpone your receiving your check on time, they hold up this job until 3 days before the end of the month and then in the last 3 days of the month they prepare, print, and send out 275,000 checks—a force of only 500. And not only that, they don't even mail the checks until after 6 o'clock on the last day of the month, and then, just as another example of their forethought, they are even now bagging the mail individually according to States, in order to expedite it so that the Post Office Department will not have that terrific job of handling 275,000 different envelopes going all over the United States. This section—this field branch of the Bureau of Supply and Accounts, does this job, too, and you know, they are enthusiastic about it, every man Jack and every girl Jill, if one might put it that way, is in there pitching, thinking of you as an individual—same here as with the Office of Dependency Benefits in Newark. You are an individual human case.

I was particularly struck yesterday when I watched a colored girl, incidentally, a college graduate, whose duty it was to take the stencil on which your name is printed—you who are a dependent—and print this stencil on the check. Now, incidentally, in doing this it gives her an opportunity of comparing certain information which should be the same on the stencil as on the printed check. Now she doesn't have to do this, but her heart is so much in her job that she follows this very very closely, and if she sees the slightest error, or even something that might lead to an error and therefore cause your check to be lost or held up, she checks that, puts it aside, and checks it later on. For example, in the printing, one of those thin 4's may become a little blurred and perhaps look like a 1, and that would make a great deal of difference, and she puts that aside and checks and sees whether it turns out later to be a 1 or a 4.

And that is the type of work they are doing there; and this is only the Family Allowance Section. Now, there are over 300,000 checks sent out over the Allotment Section. This is carried on by a force of 700. This branch, of course, of the Navy has been moved from Washington to Cleveland because of the shortage of labor in Washington, and they are mighty happy in Cleveland because Cleveland's giving them a swell deal. From all corners enlisted men, officers and women working in this branch, I heard nothing but praise for the hospitality of Cleveland. Of course, that is the way it should be, because no hospitality is too great for these men and women in uniform who are doing such a grand job. And the personnel—you think that perhaps they are just hard-bitten civil-service employees, or ordinary people just working for their weekly salary.

Well, you know on Christmas Eve this outfit worked until 2 o'clock on Christmas morning, and they came back to work at 10 o'clock on Christmas Day; and they did the same thing on New Year's Eve; that's where their New Year's Eve party was, just so that you would have your checks on time. And who are some of these people? Well, there was a lady there yesterday working for this outfit who had just lost a son at Guadalcanal. There was another girl whose fiancé is missing in action in north Africa. I know I could keep on telling you of scores of people in the branch of government in a similar situation. Do you think they are going to be cold and callous about your checks? They have your interest at heart because they understand—they are living in the same world as you. And the enthusiasm of the officers in charge; that is what got me. Just because they have three or four gold stripes on their arm or two and one-half gold stripes on their arm—they don't just strut around; they are in there pitching all the time, conscientiously observing their duties, and they don't like publicity; that's typical of the old conservative Navy, isn't it?

But I think a pat on the back for those swell fellows in blue who are doing such a wonderful job is most deserving. Flaws may take place—yes, that's true, and if they do they want to be advised of them—so keep on advising them, and before long they'll be just as perfect as it's humanly possible for any organization to be.

Spanish-American War Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made by Congressman CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, chairman of the House Pensions Committee, on April 17. The address was delivered at the annual Muster Day dinner of the Greater New York executive council, United Spanish War Veterans' Concourse, Plaza Hotel, New York City:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, members of the executive council, and friends, I am deeply grateful for your kind invitation to attend this annual muster dinner of the Greater New York Executive Council, United Spanish War Veterans. I pray and hope that we may enjoy the pleasure of attending many more in the future, and with the further prayer that at our next assemblage a victorious peace will have been declared.

The House of Representatives at this session of Congress honored me with the designation as chairman of the Committee on Pensions. It was with deep regret that we learned that my colleague, Congressman Martin F. Smith, of the State of Washington, was not to continue the splendid work which he was performing. He was really the champion of your rights in Congress. I shall try to continue his good work and be worthy of your confidence.

I have been consulted by a delegation of your membership with regard to the introduction of a bill in Congress to liberalize the service pension laws for pensioners of the Spanish-American War and their dependents. I have introduced a bill, H. R. 2350, which would increase the $60 monthly rate of pension payable for total disability and the $60 monthly rate of pension payable to veterans reaching the age of 65 years to $75. It would also increase the widow's rates from the $30 monthly pension to $40 per month when the age of 65 is attained, and increase from $30 to $50 monthly the pension rate for the widow who was the wife of the serviceman during his period of service. Another provision in the bill would make a widow eligible, if otherwise entitled to a pension, if she married the serviceman on or before January 1, 1938, instead of the present provision of September 1, 1922. I realize that with the increased cost of food, clothing, rent, medicine, fuel, taxes, and the general cost of living that the present rates create a hardship on many of the pensioners. However, you are well aware of the moratorium on pending legislation for the duration of the war emergency, and I am awaiting a complete report from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on this measure so that I may be apprised as to the present attitude of the administration with regard to this type of legislation. You may rest assured that I will do all I can to help the veterans of the Spanish-American War and related activities.

Today we are again passing through another great war. America did not want war. War was thrust upon us. Now we are fighting for our very existence and the principles of civilization. We need the efforts of a united people. The present is full of problems which can and must be solved.

Forty-five years ago another great war was waged. You gentlemen participated in that conflict. The Nation owes to you a great debt of gratitude and it is fitting that I say a few words about you heroes of that great war. You did not have the fine equipment that our soldiers possess today. You fought well. The food you received did not come up to the standard that our boys are receiving today. You fought in the swamp-infested countries of Cuba, the Philippines, and China. When the great President, your then Commander in Chief, William McKinley, called for volunteers, 400,000 or to be accurate 392,000 of you came to the colors, ready to lay down your lives, if necessary, in defense of our country. Some 10,000 made the supreme sacrifice. I am informed that there are living today 192,000 veterans of that war. Well does history recall the great leaders of that time, Admirals Dewey, Sampson, and Schley; Generals Shafter, Miles, and Lawton; Fighting Joe Wheeler, Teddy Roosevelt, and many others. We are proud of every one of them. Many of you have fought with some of these whose names I have mentioned.

Many of you thought that this country would never again be faced with the tragedy of war, that mothers would not again see their sons go off to the battle front, but that we would live in peace which God had intended we do. But, in 1917, we again became participants in World War No. 1. The United States again fought bravely and victoriously.

We had hoped that never again would war and its attendant suffering reach our people. But here we are in this world-wide conflict where every family in the land is or will be affected.

We are meeting tonight in this hotel which is located in the congressional district which I represent. This district is populated by a cross-section of all peoples. There are Jews, Catholics, Protestants. We have Italians, Poles, French, German, Russian, English, Greek, Negroes, and others. Hitler has tried to array one human against another. He has tried to create such a condition in this wonderful country of ours. He has tried to turn Jew against Christian, Christian against Jew, white against black and black against white. He would turn labor against employer and employer against labor. His objective is to divide us, weaken us, and if possible, destroy us. He would want us to believe that our leaders and those of the United Nations are incompetent. However, we are wise to his methods, and we will not permit in our ranks any fifth columnists, whether they be Nazis, Fascists, or Communists.

In our district these people live alongside each other and happily. They are all Americans, they built America, they fought for America in every war, they are fighting for America in this war, and no bigots shall destory that unity as long as you and I believe in freedom, justice, the Constitution, the Holy Bible, and Almighty God.

Congress has seen fit to make provision for the carrying out of a successful war. It has taken and will take every step to see to it that the health, the safety, and the welfare of our fighting men are provided for. Our industries are today moving at top speed to produce the guns, tanks, boats, airplanes, and ammunition, so that we shall destroy the monster as soon as possible. Our farms will do their share in producing the necessary food supply to feed our Army, our allies, and the people on the home front. In the civilian services we have men and women doing all they can to provide safety for those who remain behind.

Women are today doing their part, not alone in the armed services but also in industry, in agriculture, and in civilian defense.

Yes, Germany, Japan, and Italy may have been preparing for many years for this war, but American initiative and effort will soon outrank them to their surprise and destruction. In this war we have heroic people fighting for the principles of freedom as against slavery.

Our allies are not to be criticized, but should be heartened in their efforts. Great Britain, China, Russia, Free France, and the other allies will help destroy the Axis.

Our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and merchant marine are doing their part to see to it that victory is assured. Yes, our boys fought valiantly at Bataan, on Guadalcanal, in the South Pacific, and are showing their mettle in North Africa. They will continue their bombings of Germany, Italy, and pretty soon Japan, so that Hitler and his satellites will remember that force can be duplicated by even people who believe in a democratic world.

The turning point has been reached. Of course, we have not earned yet the right to be overoptimistic; we must not underestimate the strength of our enemies, and the problems still to be solved. Many dark days may still lie ahead of us.

This Nation and the world is signally blessed that God has devised for mankind that great humane leader, our Commander in Chief, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who has earned our loyalty and unswerving support. He had the vision and courage to fight for an adequate preparedness for this country, and we see that this vision and judgment were wise and correct. Today that great man in the White House is moving heaven and earth to see to it that this war is brought to an early and successful end. Our President has assumed the leadership of the United Nations, and we are confident that the United Nations will attain the unconditional surrender of the Axis forces.

This war will determine the fate of the future generations of America and the world. You and I will stand by that President, our Commander in Chief, and by those of authority in Government, who are in charge of this war, with the confidence that their decisions will be for the best interests of all concerned. This war is not to be fought for the enrichment of a few. It is fought for the principle of the right of man to live in peace and happiness. It is fought for the precious right of the human being to the freedom of worshipping the Almighty God according to the dictates of one's own conscience, and freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

We on the home front will do what we can. We will deny ourselves, we will pay taxes, we will buy bonds, and perform any and all duties we are called upon to do. What are these sacrifices compared with those of our men on the fighting fronts?

We hope and pray that there shall be an early victory, an early peace and an early return to their homes by the men and women who are bravely fighting the cause of victory.

New York Marches On—Part III, It's Leadership in Design

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of May 7, 1943, entitled "New York Marches On: Part III, It's Leadership in Design":

NEW YORK MARCHES ON

III. IT'S LEADERSHIP IN DESIGN

New York, notwithstanding the huge volume of its industrial output, is a city of relatively small units of enterprise devoted normally to the supply of individual needs. It is also the country's cultural center, its arbiter of style and design. For the long pull, the combination is ideal.

The list of these products is endless. They range from grand pianos to costume jewelry; from the editing and publishing of books and magazines to the decoration of interiors and the design of everything that is worn, from hats and shoes to dresses. In sum they form the background of American life; they are, in literal fact, a design for living. And style is the core of their interest and value. The brains of the whole country are represented in the city's many high-grade skills and crafts. The taste of the whole country plays its part in forming the styles through its purchases in the metropolitan market. The leadership of the city in design is the result.

Take the dress industry as a case in point. Consisting of approximately 2,000 separate manufacturing units, it is, in the aggregate, New York's largest manual-labor industry, employing more than 65,000 workers within the city. This industry, New York's most typical, produced last year 83,000,000 dresses in 125,000 different styles, indicating how essential to it is its intimate tie-up with the style center of the continent. And that tie-up largely accounts for the fact that, of the country's output of dresses, New York's share is 80 percent.

A cognate reason is the presence here of an immense reservoir of skilled craftsmen trained in the dress industry. A similar supply feeds and anchors here the thousand-and-one other trades whose products demand style and design and an appreciative patronage. And again we would stress the interplay of the city's cultural advantages with its economy. New York is a magnet for this type of worker because here he finds a congenial atmosphere plus the greatest of all discriminating markets.

It is a huge center of higher education. Its own annual harvest of university graduates is unmatched elsewhere, and so is its attraction for such youngsters from outside. The effect of their impact is greatly to quicken its intellectual life and its taste in everything that contributes grace and gayety to human existence. Its museums, beyond compare on this side of the Atlantic in number, size, and variety, comprise a vast storehouse of art to stimulate the impulse to fine craftsmanship and the demand for it. Also exerting their profound influence in the same direction are its theaters, its opera, its concerts, even its night clubs—the fact, in short, that New York is the world's headquarters for entertainment.

We would not minimize the industrial disadvantages from which the city suffers with respect to mass production and heavy industry, which may be summed up, for the most part, in the high cost of certain types of production. No doubt some of these disadvantages can and will be eliminated, but many of them are inherent in the very size and character of the city.

New York's great opportunity in the circumstances, it seems to us, lies in increased emphasis on the attributes of its enormous strength. These attributes have been analyzed in some detail. But they are all interrelated, and it is the fusion of them all which deserves to be stressed. Its leadership in style could never have come to pass save for its wealth of artistic resources. Business management would never have centered here save for the great opportunities which the port and its business and cultural leadership afforded the new industry as it developed. Underlying the appeal of the city and fundamental to its continuing growth is the fact that it is on its way to becoming the best of all cities for the discriminating to inhabit, whether for work or for play.

In the first two articles of this series we have spoken of the rapid and continued growth here of the huge industry of business management and its significance. Complementing this development should be the constant attraction of those manual industries whose concentration on style, design, and quality makes this their logical home. Their inducement to settle here can and should be accelerated. The leadership of the city as the creator of style for the whole country and as a national market for everything in which distinction of design matters is already an established fact.

Civilian Defense in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Akron (Ohio) Beacon-Journal of April 29, 1943:

CIVILIAN DEFENSE IN ACTION

No better answer can be given to those who have scoffed at the need and importance of Akron's civilian-defense organization than the test in action in Tuesday's tornado. Civilian defense responded immediately with hundreds of men and women, already trained for their jobs, and proved by deeds how great an asset to Akron the wartime organization really is.

Now the reason for test black-outs, test mobilizations, and long courses of study is apparent. These auxiliary policemen, auxiliary firemen, nurses, drivers, and air-raid wardens did not wait for orders. They went to work at once, at appointed stations, with the efficiency of a well-organized machine. Today all Akron has just cause to admire and praise their work.

There have been some who have been blind to the need of civilian defense. You've heard

them: "Akron will never have an air raid. You won't catch me running around with a white helmet or an arm band. And all this test black-out stuff. What are they doing, keeping the boys in practice?"

The families in the path of the storm will tell you about civilian defense today; how even before the call went out from headquarters, at the height of the storm, squad leaders organized their staffs, halted and detoured traffic, guarded live wires until the electric company employees could shut off current; how air-raid wardens calmed frantic neighbors, how the medical corps reported for duty at hospitals, and how the motor corps provided transportation home for the injured after they had received treatment.

The merchants and home owners whose stocks and possessions are safe because Office of Civilian Defense policemen acted to curb looting, are not scoffing today. And the first-aiders—they've taken a lot of razzing—showed how important it is to know how to handle injured persons correctly, how to treat minor cuts and bruises.

In all, 1,500 civilian defense workers were mobilized and 800 worked most of the night. Others stood by ready if they were needed. Auxiliary policemen were still on duty Wednesday helping direct traffic.

It was nature's air raid, not Germany's nor Japan's. But it proved that if the Axis does send bombers, Akron is ready. It is a mighty comforting feeling to know that we have an efficient civilian army defending the home front.

Price Control or Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station KMPC, California, on May 8, 1943:

The news from our many foreign battle fronts has been encouraging for the past few weeks. The recent forays of our planes from Australia and the Aleutian Islands have brought death and destruction to the units of the Japanese Navy and air force in every encounter. When we turn to the North African battle front, the success of the United Nations has been even more pronounced, and we are proud of the contribution of our American soldiers in driving the Axis army of General Rommel into the sea.

Although the German submarines continue to take a terrific toll of our shipping vessels, a recent statement by Secretary Knox brings us the good news that our construction of ships is exceeding our losses. So in analyzing the military status we have reason to be encouraged—not to the point of silly optimism but to the point of calm and considered confidence. We are not satisfied. We do not intend to relax. We know that the main job lies ahead, and we do not wish to leave undone anything that will contribute to the over-all job of winning this war.

And it is in this spirit of self-analysis that we turn from the hopeful progress of our military forces to the domestic battle front. Here we find a very complicated situation; and the casual observer, the careless critic, and the indifferent citizen will loudly proclaim that we are hopelessly confused and that we are losing the war on the home front. If we delve no further than the contradicting headlines of our newspapers; if we tried to harmonize the divergent statements of our departmental executives; and if we tried to justify the mistakes that are being made on the home front, I confess that we might become bewildered and surrender. All of this confusion and contradiction, however, is like unto the slag and impurities that come to the top of a great caldron of boiling steel, and as the fires of democracy burn brighter beneath the caldron the hissing of bubbles and bursting and splashing of impurities on the open hearth will continue.

The thing that counts is not the noise and confusion, but the shining molten metal underneath the surface. The strength of which shall be forged into weapons of victory on the home front—for the fulfillment of our destiny.

We cannot secure this strength without effort, without differences of opinion; without criticism, honest, constructive criticism. Our country needs today, as never before, men who are strong and honest, men who dare to criticize mistakes on the home front in order that the pitiless light of publicity may expose for correction the fallacies and errors of our leaders. This is the test of democracy. This is the strength of our way of life. When honest, constructive criticism is no longer allowed, then the liberties we fight for will have vanished and democracy will have perished.

The battle against ruinous inflation on our home front is second in importance only to our military battles. Unless this battle is won, it will imperil the war abroad and throw this Nation into economic slavery for centuries to come.

What is inflation? Briefly, simply, it is the rapid and exorbitant rise in prices of the necessities of life, accompaned by the decreased purchasing power of our dollar.

What is the cause of inflation? Briefly and simply again—an abundance of purchasing power (dollars) and a corresponding scarcity of prime necessities of life.

Is the stage set for inflation? Yes. It is estimated that our purchasing power for 1943 will be approximately $130,000,000,000 and our purchasable domestic goods will be around seventy billion. This provides an abnormal surplus of $60,000,000,000, the most stupendous inflationary force in our Nation's history. If this tremendous purchasing power is allowed to enter the market place and compete for the available goods, the most dangerous inflationary rise of prices ever known will take place.

If this increase in purchasing power was distributed proportionately to all our people, we could afford to let prices rise, but this is far from being true. Millions of our people in the so-called middle class have received either a very small increase or no increase at all. An unrestrained inflationary increase would simply destroy their standard of living and reduce them to starvation and desperation. Our war effort depends on the full-hearted cooperation of every man, woman, and child in America. In order to succeed we must achieve equality of sacrifice as nearly as possible. Therefore, inflation must be stopped.

There are several fronts in this battle against inflation:

1. Tax heavily and hold profits down.
2. Stabilize wages and farm prices.
3. Increase individual savings by purchasing Victory bonds for your post-war nest egg.
4. Ration all essential commodities that are scarce—a fair share for all, regardless of monetary status.
5. Freeze the prices of the prime necessities of life (rent or shelter—clothing and food).

A failure on any of these five great fronts will enable the pressure of inflation to explode and we on the home front will be defeated. That defeat will endanger the military front, so you will agree with me that inflation must be stopped at all costs.

My time is limited. I cannot cover the five great fronts I have listed, and I have chosen to devote the balance of my time to a brief consideration of the fifth front—price control.

Price control of living costs has been adopted by every member of the United Nations as a vital part of the war effort. In most instances these nations preceded us in starting their program. In practically every instance their controls are more rigid and severe because their scarcities are greater. An ideal time to have started price control would have been August 1939, but we were not at war and our people would not have seen the necessity for control. Although the National Defense Advisory Commission was established in May 1940 by the President and Leon Henderson was appointed to develop a price control program. No legislation setting up procedure and giving proper authority was passed until April 28, 1942.

This was 32 months after August 1939, when prices were considered normal and 5 months after we declared war. During this 32-month interval the cost of living index had risen an average of 15 percent. Individual articles had risen much higher.

It is my opinion that a roll back of prices of all factors in the cost of living index to August 1939 would have been the wise procedure. There was a fairer relation at that time between wages, rents, food and all the other necessities of life than there has been since. This procedure was not taken. The freeze was partial. It did not include all factors involved and its date of enforcement was May 15, 1942.

Because the freeze order was not total and because of its date, many unfair conditions have occurred. This is one of the penalties of war. The blame cannot be placed on any individual or department of Government such as the Office of Price Administration. The blame rests upon the collective wisdom or lack of wisdom of our people—legislators and citizens. The selfishness of the great industrialists who refused 6-percent profit limitation on their war contracts. The farm bloc who wanted higher prices, and the labor bloc who demanded higher wages. The few men of vision who warned us of the impending crisis were branded as warmongers and visionaries and their voices were lost in the tumult of increasing prosperity.

We now have price control with its blessings and its evils. "Better late than never"—I am sure is the proper attitude to take. We must make it work by retaining all its good points and eliminating or adjusting its evils. Price control has its blessings. In the first 6 months of its operation, it saved the American people $6,000,000,000 in living costs and it saved the Government (and this means you and me) $25,000,000,000 in costs of munitions and war construction by stopping the inflationary spiral already operating. The savings will grow in proportion to our expenditures and the length of time necessary to win this war.

World War No. 1 cost us $31,000,000,000 for military supplies. It has been estimated that one-third of this was due to uncontrolled price rises. We have already appropriated $240,000,000,000 in this war, and if prices had not been partially controlled, our military bill would be another $100,000,000,000 today.

Due to uncontrolled prices in World War No. 1 and the attendant speculation in farm lands and stock-exchange securities, we laid the basis for the crash of 1921 and the postponed depression of 1929. During the boom of 1916 to 1921 in some locations, prices of farm lands advanced from $40 per acre to $160 per acre. Price of sugar from 4 cents a pound to 26 cents a pound; a suit of men's clothes from $35 to $85, and other prices accordingly. Do we want to see this condition again? Only the speculator and the

greedy war profiteer would welcome this condition. Yet this is what we face unless we win the battle against inflation.

Do we want to face a tremendous economic collapse after this war—a collapse that will make former depressions seem mild by comparison? I say to you in all sincerity, now is the time to prevent post-war economic collapse. We must "hold the line." What does this mean? It means that we are working against time. It means that we must correct the mistakes and evils in the price-control program. I advocate the following corrections:

1. Key prices on the necessities of life must be rolled back where they have advanced over 15 percent since the freezing of wages under the Little Steel formula.

2. Regulations must be passed immediately to provide quality designation for clothing and grade labeling for canned food, in order that point rationing be justified and that ceiling prices may reflect uniform values. Without this consumer protection, price ceiling and point rationing is deceiving.

3. Wages of workers must be frozen where they now are, providing their present rate has been advanced in proportion to the rise in the cost of living.

4. The President's right to limit high salaries during wartime should be restored.

5. Retail prices of all food and clothing should be frozen on a sound basis of the cost of production plus a reasonable margin of profit for each productive factor.

6. Acceleration of War bond purchases, through a compulsory saving plan if necessary.

7. The profit must be taken out of war through continuous renegotiation of war contracts and the collection of excess-profit taxes.

If the price-control program is strengthened through these corrections we can control the rising tide of inflation and be victors on the home front, while our boys are winning on the battle front.

Apples in Domestic and Foreign Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the apple is the most important single fruit food raised in our country. There are from one hundred to one hundred and twenty-five million bushels of commercial apples produced each year. The leading apple States of the United States are Washington, producing 28,000,000 bushels annually; New York, producing 17,000,000 bushels; Virginia, producing 11,000,000 bushels; California, producing 7,000,000 bushels; Michigan, producing 7,000,000 bushels; and Ohio, producing 5,000,000 bushels. These six States produce considerably over half the apples produced in the country; and one State alone, Washington, produced about 25 percent of the commercial apples of the entire Nation.

We have been on a net exporting basis for this crop for many, many years. The percentage of our total national production that are reported has ranged as high as 16.9 percent in 1930 down to seven-tenths of 1 percent in 1941. There were small exports from 1919 to 1923, representing less than 4 percent of our domestic production, but from 1933 to 1939, inclusive, the exports averaged 14,000,000 bushels, or less than a tenth of our production. The net exports for apples from 1937 to 1940, inclusive, averaged less than 8 percent of the national production.

The imports of apples have been comparatively small in relation to our national production. The duty on apples under the Tariff Act of 1930 was 25 cents per bushel, and this was reduced on January 1, 1936, in the first Canadian treaty, to 15 cents per bushel. In 1939, imports increased, and by 1940 we imported over 588,000 bushels. These large imports resulted in an agreement with Canada, according to the United States Department of Agriculture, which agreement put a quota on imports, but the demand in Canada has been so greatly increased by the war that there is not much indication that even the quota will be filled during the war.

While the sale of apples represents 1 percent or less of our national farm income, it is an important farm commodity to some areas.

TABLE 279.—*Apples, commercial crop:*[1] *Production (average 1934–39) and season average price per bushel received by farmers, by States, annual 1940 and 1941*

Area and State	Production[2]			Price for crop of—	
	Average 1934–39	1940	1941[3]	1940	1941[3]
EASTERN STATES					
North Atlantic:	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
Maine	651	752	787	0.95	1.10
New Hampshire	764	125	817	1.00	1.10
Vermont	467	413	616	1.11	1.10
Massachusetts	2,318	2,174	2,174	1.04	1.20
Rhode Island	281	267	278	1.06	1.20
Connecticut	1,295	1,210	1,267	1.09	1.15
New York	17,211	12,936	16,120	.86	.90
New Jersey	3,750	3,296	3,150	.93	1.00
Pennsylvania	9,317	9,100	9,313	.82	.90
Total	36,054	31,073	34,522	.89	.95
South Atlantic:					
Delaware	1,611	1,909	1,794	.79	.85
Maryland	1,996	2,077	2,070	.67	.90
Virginia	10,366	10,660	11,505	.73	.75
West Virginia	4,796	4,868	5,024	.70	.80
North Carolina	966	962	1,365	.75	.75
Georgia	443	485	600	.84	.95
Total	20,177	20,961	22,358	.73	.79
Total Eastern States	56,231	52,034	56,880	.82	.89
CENTRAL STATES					
North Central:					
Ohio	5,374	5,074	7,064	.85	.80
Indiana	1,566	1,225	2,230	.94	.75
Illinois	3,007	1,876	3,509	1.08	.90
Michigan	7,695	5,967	7,520	.87	.75
Wisconsin	610	595	724	.83	.90
Minnesota	249	314	272	.82	.90
Iowa	321	559	48	.88	1.20
Missouri	1,525	1,616	1,708	.90	.85
Nebraska	254	326	44	.88	1.05
Kansas	774	1,296	486	.92	1.10
Total	21,375	18,848	23,605	.89	.81
South Central:					
Kentucky	310	358	664	.82	.65
Tennessee	225	166	367	.88	.85
Arkansas	771	765	1,035	.75	.75
Total	1,306	1,289	2,056	.79	.74
Total Central States	22,681	20,137	25,661	.89	.80
WESTERN STATES					
Montana	342	236	328	.80	.95
Idaho	3,458	[4] 2,160	1,998	.71	.95
Colorado	1,441	[4] 1,564	1,265	.72	.75
New Mexico	666	700	570	.85	.90
Utah	362	[4] 330	359	.83	.95
Washington	28,843	[4] 27,469	28,350	.80	1.10
Oregon	3,368	3,263	2,673	.73	1.00
California	7,918	6,498	7,992	.42	.60
Total	46,398	42,220	43,535	.73	.98
Total, 36 States	125,310	114,391	126,076	.80	.90

[1] Estimates of the commercial crop refer to the production of apples in the commercial apple areas of each State and include fruit produced for sale to commercial processors as well as for sale for fresh consumption.

[2] For some States in certain years, production includes some quantities unharvested on account of market conditions. In 1940 and 1941 estimates of such quantities were as follows (1,000 bushels): 1940—North Carolina, 58; Nebraska, 14; Montana, 43; Idaho, 200; Colorado, 69; New Mexico, 35; Utah, 19; Washington, 549; Oregon, 98; California, 600; 1941—California, 300. Prices apply only to the harvested portion of the crop.

[3] Preliminary.

[4] Includes the following quantities harvested but not utilized due to excessive cullage (1,000 bushels): Idaho, 216; Colorado, 50; Utah, 24; Washington, 1,280.

Agricultural Marketing Service.

TABLE 278.—*Apples: Production, value, carlot shipments, and foreign trade, United States, 1919–41*

Year	Apples, total crop			Apples, commercial crop [2]			Production of dried and canned apples in terms of fresh fruit		Foreign trade, year beginning July [3] [4]					
									Domestic exports			Imports, fresh and dried, in terms of fresh	Net exports [5]	
	Production [1]	Season average price per bushel received by farmers	Farm value	Production [1]	Season average price per bushel received by farmers	Farm value	Dried	Canned	Fresh [6]	Dried, in terms of fresh [7]	Canned, in terms of fresh		Total	Percentage of production
	1,000 bushels	*Dollars*	*1,000 dollars*	*1,000 bushels*	*Dollars*	*1,000 dollars*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*Percent*
1919	*156,561*													
1919	140,632	1.75	245,968				8,604	4,955	3,152	1,724		889	3,987	2.8
1920	206,688	1.22	252,967				5,979	3,791	7,995	2,633		162	10,466	5.1
1921	95,638	1.64	156,628				4,025	4,742	3,282	1,813		1,410	3,686	3.9
1922	189,425	1.02	194,138				7,292	3,998	5,269	1,869		195	6,943	3.7
1923	180,915	1.13	204,402				5,717	4,595	12,295	4,435	191	131	16,789	9.3
1924	*152,567*													
1924	160,457	1.21	193,305				7,000	5,769	9,604	2,804	562	106	12,863	8.0
1925	152,424	1.25	190,678				6,125	7,492	11,015	3,621	538	74	15,101	9.9
1926	229,656	.89	198,355				7,263	7,329	21,292	4,764	675	85	26,647	11.6
1927	115,708	1.40	161,783				5,133	6,357	9,430	3,165	573	155	13,013	11.2
1928	177,813	1.08	192,523				9,946	10,152	21,042	7,295	1,151	117	29,372	16.5
1929	*196,483*													
1929	135,092	1.39	187,338				7,379	6,636	10,279	3,466	836	312	14,269	10.6
1930	156,617	1.02	160,101				7,671	6,268	20,340	5,559	640	103	26,437	16.9
1931	205,403	.66	133,278				6,563	4,464	18,030	4,602	695	82	23,246	11.3
1932	146,849	.60	85,801				6,869	4,888	13,754	5,690	748	6	20,186	13.7
1933	148,657	.78	112,657				7,525	6,092	12,261	6,297	439	[8] 13	18,985	12.8
1934	*124,257*													
1934	125,719	.89	112,400	103,691	0.88	91,687	5,688	6,368	8,062	3,571	561	28	12,166	11.7
1935	177,916	.72	125,406	140,503	.71	99,369	7,525	5,867	12,239	5,032	900	5	18,166	12.9
1936	117,506	1.05	123,366	98,608	1.04	103,065	6,038	7,010	6,755	3,343	503	36	10,564	10.9
1937	210,783	.67	133,428	156,376	.65	101,430	7,438	8,040	10,958	4,062	497	5	15,511	9.9
1938	132,354	.83	105,725	109,595	.82	85,991	5,833	4,671	12,071	5,112	625	47	17,761	16.2
1939				143,085	.64	84,054	7,408	8,236	3,216	2,490	538	107	6,137	4.3
1940				114,391	.80	89,181	3,792	6,973	867	514	29	588	822	.7
1941 [9]				126,076	.90	113,621	5,250	12,318						

[1] Includes the following quantities unharvested on account of market conditions and/or not utilized due to excessive cullage (1,000 bushels): Total production, 1924—300; 1926—7,388; 1931—2,100; 1932—4,220; 1933—4,600; 1934—50; 1935—4,000; 1937—12,526; 1938—4,985; commercial production, 1938—4,638; 1939—11,982; 1940—3,255; 1941—300. Price and value apply only to the harvested portion of the crop.

[2] Estimates of the commercial crop refer to the production of apples in the commercial apple areas of each State and include fruit produced for sale to commercial processors, as well as for sale for fresh consumption.

[3] Compiled from Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce of the United States June issues, 1919–26; January and June issues, 1927–40; and official records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

[4] Dried and canned are converted to terms of fresh apples on following basis: 1 pound of dried is equivalent to about 7 pounds fresh; 1 pound of canned is equivalent to about 2 pounds fresh; 48 pounds fresh equal 1 bushel. No reexports reported.

[5] Total exports (domestic plus foreign) minus imports. Beginning 1933 domestic exports minus imports for consumption.

[6] Excludes apple waste.

[7] Beginning January 1933, includes apple waste, not separately reported prior to this date.

[8] Beginning 1933–34, imports for consumption.

[9] Preliminary.

Agricultural Marketing Service and Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Italic figures are census returns. Production of dried apples as reported by Giannini Foundation, Berkeley, Calif. Production of canned apples as reported by trade sources. 1 case 6/10's of canned apples weighs 36 pounds; 1 case 24/2's of canned apple sauce, 30 pounds.

The following table from the Commodities Credit Corporation shows that while apples are supposed to be on an export basis funds obtained from the 30 percent of the customs receipts as provided in section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act have been used to purchase these apples for domestic distribution. The livestock and dairy interests realize that their product has been on an import basis, much of it, for 30 years and that the duties on livestock have been reduced by 50 percent or all the law allows and thus invite imports. The import duties thus secured are then used to purchase a crop like apples, a very minor crop representing about 1 percent of the national farm income and a crop that is supposed to be on an export basis. It is readily seen how the growers of apples might be kept interested in the domestic and foreign commerce policy of the present administration as long as they continue to have their domestic sales subsidized by funds derived from duties on products that are on an import basis. In fairness it should be pointed out that in 1 year nearly $90,000 was obtained from customs receipts and 30 percent would be $27,000, or a small part of the $6,621,000 used for free distribution of apples that year.

I am not discussing the wisdom of distributing the free apples. I wish to point out the how, when, and where the funds come for doing it. I wish also to call your attention to this situation so that you can appreciate the attitudes that are evident in connection with our domestic and foreign agricultural commerce. It is questionable fairness to further lower the duty on livestock and livestock products that are already on an import basis, take the 30 percent of the custom receipts and domestically subsidize a crop like apples, and other crops that are and have been on an export basis for years.

The official bushels purchased and the amounts of money used are as follows:

Purchases of fresh apples

Fiscal year	Bushels	Cost [1]
1939	555,584	$413,601
1940	9,057,803	6,523,649
1941	7,402,774	5,946,872
1942	5,778,810	6,621,401
1943 [2]	2,462,892	2,158,747
Total	25,317,863	22,664,270

[1] Money obtained from funds provided by 30 percent of customs receipts of section 32 of Agricultural Adjustment Act

[2] Purchases completed for 1943.

Source: Commodity Credit Corporation.

Purchases of dried apples include 2,035,960 bushels, at a cost of $183,588, purchased from State of New York in 1940.

Quantity and cost of apples purchased by U. S. Department of Agriculture, fiscal years 1938–43, pursuant to sec. 32, Public, 320, 74th Cong.

	1938–39		1939–40		1940–41		1941–42		1942–43	
	Bushel	Cost	Bushel	Cost	Bushel	Cost	Bushel	Cost	Bushel	Cost
Fresh apples:										
California			263,001	$143,952	246,618	$103,228				
Connecticut	193,000	$144,055	72,386	51,565	16,385	11,837	23,626	$22,872	87,271	$109,089
Delaware			69,764	48,804	103,383	76,760	173,507	149,071	92,796	115,995
Georgia			1,274	893			577	533		
Idaho			385,401	239,945	404,921	312,625	139,704	152,754		
Illinois			11,052	7,315			5,232	5,232		
Indiana			98,031	66,417			83,808	82,144		
Kentucky							32,001	31,998	3,648	4,560
Maine	6,196	4,647	68,901	47,469	25,122	17,866	10,218	9,219	55,167	68,959

Quantity and cost of apples purchased by U. S. Department of Agriculture, fiscal years 1938–43, pursuant to sec. 32, Public, 320, 74th Cong.—Continued

	1938–39		1939–40		1940–41		1941–42		1942–43	
	Bushel	Cost	Bushel	Cost	Bushel	Cost	Bushel	Cost	Bushel	Cost
Fresh apples—Continued.										
Maryland			178, 891	$125, 308	287, 422	$218, 048	172, 717	$169, 495	100, 902	$126, 128
Massachusetts	321, 215	$238, 794	326, 694	227, 270	67, 458	49, 028	49, 620	44, 794	275, 807	344, 759
Michigan			632, 552	443, 760	170, 342	124, 153	263, 011	245, 006	151, 452	189, 315
Montana			45, 360	28, 952	5, 957	4, 468	70, 224	66, 713		
Nebraska					4, 740	3, 555				
New Hampshire	17, 883	12, 976	61, 468	43, 384	21, 430	15, 388	6, 654	6, 164	78, 854	98, 568
New Jersey			186, 911	130, 841	105, 526	77, 693	164, 191	151, 990	126, 459	158, 074
New York			2, 369, 813	1, 718, 106	516, 081	409, 616	752, 825	768, 854	156, 688	195, 860
North Carolina							516	774	528	660
Ohio			850, 328	600, 098	311, 071	232, 914	723, 604	736, 354	340, 068	425, 085
Oregon			147, 420	110, 189	518, 616	439, 224	65, 436	105, 248	39, 519	63, 678
Pennsylvania			736, 123	550, 814	618, 632	498, 391	345, 840	333, 807	206, 161	257, 701
Rhode Island	15, 126	11, 281	725	521					2, 902	3, 628
Utah			53, 992	39, 677	21, 120	15, 840	95, 700	95, 015	26, 400	33, 000
Vermont	2, 464	1, 848	99, 044	70, 029			8, 604	8, 344	16, 480	20, 600
Virginia			842, 674	635, 851	1, 310, 006	1, 036, 568	968, 300	969, 415	369, 671	463, 892
Washington			1, 239, 282	960, 696	2, 168, 208	1, 850, 477	1, 215, 334	2, 096, 406	152, 836	254, 859
West Virginia			316, 716	231, 793	539, 736	446, 193	407, 561	399, 200	179, 283	224, 137
Total	555, 584	413, 601	9, 057, 803	6, 523, 649	7, 462, 774	5, 943, 872	5, 778, 810	6, 621, 401	2, 462, 892	3, 158, 547
			Pounds							
Dried apples: New York			2, 035, 960	183, 588						

Total bushels purchased: Virginia, 3,490,651; Washington, 4,775,660. Grand total, 25,317,863 bushels purchased at a cost of $22,661,070.

Taxes on Margarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Westbrook Pegler:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, April 26.—I have collected some more information on the subject of margarine and the restrictive taxes thereon, State and Federal, and, while the case seems not to contain the ingredients that crusades are made of, it plainly amounts to a grade B outrage and calls for relief.

As I told you sometime ago, the Federal Government collects a tax of one-fourth a cent a pound on margarine at the factory and a license tax of $6 a year from each dealer in the uncolored product, which looks like lard and is unappetizing to the eye, and 19 States have various taxes, some as high as 15 cents a pound. That is the rate in Wisconsin, which is a dairy State and was the source of much of the strength of the lobby against margarine many years ago. In addition, Wisconsin taxes the manufacturer of margarine within her borders $1,000 a year and the wholesaler and retailer $500 and $25, respectively.

And the Federal Government collects 10 cents a pound on margarine colored before sale to the consumer and a license tax of $58 from retailers of precolored marge. This tax on precoloring has an obvious purpose. The idea is to make margarine unsightly and discourage people from using it.

There would be just as good reason to forbid the coloring of butter because natural butter most of the year is very pallid and that rich golden complexion is a cosmetic effect achieved by the use of the same kind of vegetable dye that is provided for margarine. The insincerity of the law in this respect is plain in the fact that when you buy uncolored margarine you can get a little shot of that yellow dope with it without having to pay the extra tax.

If you color your own you may do so free, and this means that Congress and the State legislatures were not worried about the people's health but about the dairymen's profits. These dairymen are not little two-cow farmers whose wives churn up a small crock of butter and take it down to the store to trade for soda crackers and calico. They are big business, like the packers and other processors who make the margarine, but right now they are just millions of pounds behind the requirements for our own fighting forces and civilians and lend-lease and so on. They have all the business they can handle but still, for their benefit and for no other reason, the people have to pay a tax on a necessity which in some cases is proportionately as heavy as the taxes on whisky and cigarettes.

There was a bill in the Wisconsin Legislature a week or two ago which would have reduced the tax per pound from 15 cents to 8 and the manufacturer's, wholesaler's, and retailer's license taxes to $300, $100, and $5, respectively. I don't know what happened to it, but I wouldn't give such a bill more than a prayer in Wisconsin.

As to the food values of margarine and butter you can pick a fight with a margarine man or a dairyman any time. However, the margarine people are proudly publicizing a report on butter substitutes by the committee on public-health relations of the New York Academy of Medicine which claims that margarine, fortified with vitamin A, is nutritionally equal to butter and recommending that all restrictive Federal and State laws be suspended for the duration of the butter crisis, meaning, no doubt the duration of the war.

"Since it is cheaper than butter," the report says, "fortified margarine continues a good vehicle for the distribution of vitamin A and fats to low-income groups and therefore should be made available to them."

A man who says he spent 6 years campaigning for margarine says I have a national scandal by the tail in reporting as I did sometime ago that the Federal Government has been buying margarine for the Army because says he, for years and years the dairy lobby has stuck into every War Department appropriation bill a rider forbidding the use of any funds so appropriated for the purchase of oleo.

Well, just the same, Thomas E. Wilson, president of the Wilson Co., packers, told me in Chicago a few weeks ago that he had delivered 25 carloads to the Army in the last week and that the Government was expecting to buy from 100,000,000 to 110,000,000 pounds for all purposes this year. Moreover, he said his company could supply only about one-fourth of the margarine orders available.

Well, and then an advertising man who represents two of the butter accounts in the country says the trouble with the margarine people is that they have always tried to represent margarine as a substitute for butter, which he says, it isn't. He can take that up with the academy of medicine, because if the term "nutritionally equal" doesn't mean that margarine is a substitute, I don't know my words.

He also complains that the margarine people imitate butter by coloring it yellow and asks why they don't color it red. Well, why do the butter people imitate by coloring it yellow? Why don't they use red?

The Revenue Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, unable to be present when the revenue bill was considered, I use the RECORD to briefly express my views. Had I been able to vote, I would have supported the committee bill and opposed the Carlson amendment, which advocated in part the so-called Ruml proposal. A parliamentary situation developed when the Carlson amendment was adopted in the Committee of the Whole and later defeated on a roll call in the House. Following that roll call on the motion to recommit by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], the so-called Robertson-Forand bill was substituted for the committee bill.

The Robertson-Forand bill, in my opinion, was likewise too liberal in forgiving the 1942 taxes, but at that it was about halfway between the committee bill and the Carlson bill. On the final vote there was no alternative—one must either vote for a bill in which he was not in full sympathy or defeat the effort to enact a revenue measure with a pay-as-you-go plan entirely. I would have voted for this bill on final passage, but at the same time I hope the Senate will not be so generous.

A Fair Sample of Our Government Master Minding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FADJO CRAVENS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including some revealing observations of Mr. Max Hampton, editor of the Booneville Democrat, which appeared in that paper under date of April 22, 1943, as follows:

A FAIR SAMPLE OF OUR GOVERNMENT MASTER MINDING

Lying before us as we write is a package of newspaper mats which we received the other day from the Government, and which we presume from the looks of them we are supposed to sell our merchants on the idea of running these in the Booneville Democrat over their business signatures.

A newspaper mat, it should be understood by the layman, is a composition similar to cardboard, on which type and picture impressions are made, and which when placed in a machine made for the purpose hot metal is poured on them and produces a plate that can be used in printing.

The only drawback to these mats—there are two of them—is they are just about 5½ inches too wide and 3 inches too long for our casting machine, which is a standard size used in most print shops over the country. And they are also 3½ inches too wide for our newspaper page and about a half inch too long for the page without any signature on them. And this in spite of the fact that there are several nationally distributed advertising rate books issued each year that carry our page size and the size mat we can handle.

Just what the Government paid for these useless mats—because they are useless so far as we are concerned—we don't know, but we do know that when we buy them from a syndicate for our merchants, they cost us around 50 cents apiece or a dollar for the two. And since the mats we buy are used by hundreds of newspapers, we imagine we get almost if not as good a price as the Government did. This being the case, and if a package of these mats went to every newspaper in Arkansas (there are 161 of them, according to our records), they pitched between $150 and $175 out the window besides the transportation costs. Multiply this by the 45 States, and, as Bob Burns once said, "that ain't hay," even to a government who can't think except by billions.

Oh, yes; we forgot to tell you the mats are something about share the ride and save tires—but there won't be any tires saved by these mats or any rides shared.

Labor's Right To Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Westbrook Pegler from the Washington Daily News of May 6, 1943:

FAIR ENOUGH

(By Westbrook Pegler)

TUCSON, ARIZ., May 6.—So much capital has been made of the famous promise of the big unions to waive labor's right to strike for the duration of the war that the facts and the record should be examined.

This pledge has been violated not once but a hundred times in war plants large and small by unions of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and notoriously by the United Mine Workers. Like most union undertakings, it was worthless in the first place, because unions have no personality or entity and thus no responsibility. The unions were granted certain advantages and special consideration in return for the promise not to strike, and the record of strikes in violation of the pledge puts them in the position of having obtained such favors by fraud.

Under our laws, however, no penalty may be exacted from any union for striking, nor may any individual be punished for calling a strike, even though the stoppage be caused by the arbitrary order of one man or a committee and without a vote of the rank and file.

I am not arguing that in all cases the employers were in the right and that the workers had no grievance. But I do point out that under the labor policy of the Government an employer may be quickly and firmly called to account and compelled to adjust the problem. The same policy almost invariably pleads with and placates the union bosses even though a referendum to the rank and file might show that the workers would like to repudiate these officers.

* * * * *

It has been only by good luck and public decorum that we have escaped some dreadful experiences on the home front since Pearl Harbor. President Roosevelt, in his radio address on the strike of John L. Lewis' coal miners, a strike contrived by a devious little scheme, referred to expressions which he had received from men wounded in the war and returned home. I do not know whether such sentiments are a recent development in his fan mail but I do know that for more than a year I have been receiving angry letters from fighting men and from the parents and wives of fighters, some of whom are so bitter against all unionism now that they would endorse capital punishment for unioneers who order strikes in war industries. All of them are indignant that Green, Philip Murray, the president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and Lewis should be accorded such importance.

Congress seems to be the only hope for unionism, and the very proposals which the unioneers and the administration condemn as antilabor bills would save labor from the consequences of the folly, stupidity, and incompetence of the national leadership of the unions.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I enclose an article by F. P. Kenkel, of St. Louis, from the May issue of Social Justice Review, a monthly magazine that has been published for over 50 years.

Mr. Kenkel is nationally known. In 1930 he received the Laetare medal, awarded annually by Notre Dame University.

The article follows:

AN EARNEST OF GOOD WILL

It will ever redound to the honor of Secretary of State Hull that he should have inaugurated a policy directed at mitigating the results of economic nationalism, of the self-sufficiency proclaimed even by President Hoover, at a time when his own party dared not propose tariff reform in accordance with the dogma it had so long professed. Alfred E. Smith, as a candidate for the Presidency, kept the question very much in the background. A substantial number of people were indeed convinced that there was no need of sharing our rich plum pudding with any other nation.

The few warning voices, one of which was Barron's were not heeded. Even the farmers, as a class, thought a high tariff wall would prove advantageous to them. But this financial weekly, in the issue of March 18, 1929, spoke of the "absurd tax proposed on vegetable oils" insisted on by the farm groups in Washington, while an editorial on Tariff Follies, published on June 10 of the same year stated: "A duty on hardwood logs as imported from tropical forests, in order to protect something with which they do not really compete, the almost completely cut-over lumber of our own forests, is one of the absurdities of the tariff now before the United States Senate."

In the end, the Smoot-Hawley tariff was adopted; it is held responsible, in part, for the present world war. As recently as March 6, the Statist, of London, declared:

"For this country, the United States, and Russia, that is to say the three great Allied Governments, to have had to face two major wars within the space of little more than a quarter century, seems to suggest that there is something radically wrong somewhere. None of the three governments sought war although the policy of the United States and ourselves in making life difficult for the poorer countries may be said, in a sense, to have been a contributory cause."

By what means the two peoples have made life hard for smaller nations, the article had previously made clear by the statement: "These tariffs are admitted in the United States, as well as regarded elsewhere, as one of the causes which have led to these terrible wars." At the same time the well-informed editor of the Nebraska Union Farmer, Mr. L. S. Herron, wrote:

"The United States did help to make matters worse in Europe by two disastrous increases in our tariffs—one in 1922 and one in 1930. These tariff increases very largely closed our markets to European goods and European markets to our farm products. The result was a scourge of retaliatory tariffs and embargoes that intensified hunger and privation and created explosive unrest. Our tariff policy, not our refusal to ratify a bad treaty, was our sin of isolationism."

Adopting a purely obstructionist attitude, certain members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House attacked Mr. Hull at a hearing intended to shed light on the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Flying in the face of figures and facts, his opponents attempted to create the impression that the trade agreements now in force were injurious to American producers, particularly farmers. But the opinions on the subject expressed by some of the leading newspapers of our country 4 years ago are still valid. And what could we hope for from the future if Congress, at a time when humanity looks to us for peace and security, were to jeopardize a policy which is fundamental to the new world order men hope for?

It is well to remember, in this connection, the opinion expressed in the New York Times editorial, A Policy of Peace, published on December 19, 1939, under circumstances such as those now prevailing:

"The trade treaties are more than a series of bargains for the mutual reduction of tariff rates; they are more than measures for reopening the channels of commerce. In their emphasis on nondiscrimination, on equality of treatment for all nations to the greatest extent possible, they embody the essential principles of any durable peace. To strike at the trade-agreement policy will be to strike a blow at peace and international cooperation. To renew the policy will be to reassert our faith that nations are not mere competitors in a ruthless struggle for markets, but mutual customers, dependent on each other and able to supply one another's essential needs in a spirit of equality and good will."

Those who with us hope for a better day, who believe in what appeared true to a pagan emperor, Marcus Aurelius, that the world is a city including all humanity, and in which states are the houses must wish for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as proposed by Secretary of State Hull.

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the thirteenth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. In this installment of Senator Cockrell's speech he presents the most interesting record of the continued efforts of the Governments of the world to standardize their coinage and stabilize international exchange—a plan in which it seems that selfish influence, the money changers, were continually successful in preventing and finally disrupting.

The thirteenth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

At the second meeting this same Dr. Broch laid before the conference the views of the delegates of Norway, Denmark, and Sweden, that they could enter into no agreement which would be binding.

Mr. Groesbeck, as our representative, on page 20, addressing the conference, said:

"Mr. Groesbeck then directed attention to an error—a prejudice—which it appeared had found its way to many minds. It was said that the United States had taken the initiative in the conference because they were a silver-producing country, and that they had as a state peculiar interest in the monetary question. This was not correct. The United States as a state had no interest in the working either of silver or of gold mines."

Now you see the effect of the falsehood stated in the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office and the Secretary of the Interior about these public mines and the levying of a tax upon them, which would yield dividends enough at 8 percent to pay the interest on the national debt, thus connecting the whole matter link by link. All these things were known to them.

"And besides, were the United States, he asked, as great producers of silver as had been represented? Here was another error which he also desired to rectify. In the last quarter of a century the yield of gold mines in the United States had been four times as great as that of the silver mines. The yield of the gold mines had, it was true, decreased, and that of the silver mines increased in enormous proportions. But it was well that it should be understood that in the great Comstock lode, which was the most productive of all, such a depth had now been reached that the time was near when the working would have to be suspended, unless it should be extremely remunerative.

* * * * *

"The remonetization of silver is therefore in no sense an enterprise undertaken by the United States selfishly with a view to private profit; nor is it a new undertaking. They have been in the use of the two metals from the time the Government was organized. It is no new system which they propose to establish; it is the old system, that under which they have long lived and prospered, to which they are returning. From 1792 to the day when, by a sort of inadvertence, in 1873, the silver standard was suppressed not a merchant, not a banker, not a manufacturer, not an establishment nor an interest of any kind could be cited as having raised any objection to the simultaneous use of the two metals. Bimetallism is therefore in the United States not only a tradition of the law but has entered deeply into the habits of the people."

Here was another error which he also desired to rectify. Why were these errors there? Why did not Mr. Groesbeck, in a manly way, tell them, "Yes, our representatives made misrepresentations when they came here in 1863, 1865, and 1867, and represented to you and to the nations of the world that we were about to produce from $200,000,000 to $400,000,000 of the precious metals and would flood the world with them; they have made untruthful statements, they were mistaken"? Why did he not do that? These misrepresentations and unfounded statements have been thrown in our teeth in every monetary conference that has been held.

But here is something amusing. Mr. Groesbeck said:

"In 1873, in a law which did not very accurately carry out its purpose, silver was made to disappear through inadvertence, rather than intentionally, by an omission to say anything about it."

That is a very elegant description of the crime of 1873. But did they swallow that explanation? Was it satisfactory? We shall see. I quote now from Mr. Feer-Herzog, of Switzerland. He remarked that—

"Long before the law of 1873 silver had disappeared from circulation in the United States. The actual circulation consisted of gold and paper money."

Gold and paper in 1873.

"During the long period of time of which Mr. Groesback spoke, from 1792 to 1873, there had been only coined about 8,000,000 silver dollars—"

How much like the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Sherman] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Morrill] that sounds. They are the same things that we have been hearing ever since 1878, thrown back in our faces. Mr. Feer-Herzog continued:

"while in the 3 or 4 months that had succeeded the passage of the Bland bill an equal amount of these dollars had been coined.

"As to what Mr. Groesbeck had said of the 'inadvertence' in consequence of which the law of 1873 had been passed, and of the surprise which the effects of this law were supposed to have provoked in consequence, Mr. Feer-Herzog laid upon the table documents relating to the preliminary preparation of that law—documents published by the Government of the United States. It appeared, he said, from these documents, that it was not by a mere accidental oversight, but voluntarily and with reflection, that the suppression of the silver standard was determined upon. It was expressly stated that gold was to be in the future the sole monetary standard of the United States, and that silver should cease to be a standard. (Exhibit D, second session.)

"It is, therefore, said Mr. Feer-Herzog, difficult to admit that there was any inadvertence."

No, no. There was not any inadvertence upon the part of Senator Sherman and probably 2 or 3 in the Senate—not more than that—and I do not believe there were 3 who understood exactly what was in that bill of 1873.

Now, as I said in regard to the views of Senator Allison, insisting upon the limit of coinage and with limited coinage operating against the possibility of bimetallism, I quote from the remarks of Mr. Say, president of this monetary conference:

"Mr. Say insisted upon the question which he had stated at the opening of the conference, namely, why did not the United States in the restoring the double standard permit the unlimited coinage of silver as well as that of gold?"

Why did it not? Continuing, he said:

"It has been said by the Honorable Mr. Groesbeck that the restriction of the coinage of silver by the Latin Union had supplied a motive for the restriction in the United States, but this view did not seem to be well founded. It was by an amendment of the law that a limit was fixed to the coinage of silver dollars, and Mr. Say felt constrained to believe that this amendment was a mode of agreement, a compromise by means of which a majority could be obtained. The influence of the Latin Union seemed to have counted for so little in the resolution adopted by Congress on this occasion that it does not appear that there was, even for a moment, any question of conforming the American system to that of the Latin Union by the adoption of the relation of 1 to 15½."

Mr. Feer-Herzog supported the observations of the President, by calling attention to the fact that the bill in its original form permitted the coinage of silver without limit.

I read from the reply of Mr. Horton:

"Mr. Horton, in reply to the points raised by the president of the conference, called attention to the fact that the majority report of the Commission appointed by Congress in 1876 to investigate the silver question had recommended the adoption by the United States of the ratio of 1 to 15½ because it was the ratio of the Latin Union. The bill known as the Bland bill had been proposed in Congress in the summer of 1876. Between that time and the passage of the law in pursuance of which the conference met, the whole question had been thoroughly discussed in the United States in all its phases. In this discussion the situation of the Latin Union had not been lost sight of, but had been made the subject of special attention."

Mr. President, what was the attitude there of foreign nations?

"The delegates of the European states represented in the conference desire to express their sincere thanks to the Government of the United States for having procured an international exchange of opinion upon a subject of so much importance as the monetary question.

"Having maturely considered the proposals of the representatives of the United States, they recognize:

1. That it is necessary to maintain in the world the monetary functions of silver as well as those of gold, but that the selection for use of one or the other of the two metals, or of both simultaneously, should be governed by the special position of each state or group of states.

"2. That the question of the restriction of the coinage of silver should equally be left to the discretion of each state or group of states, according to the particular circumstances in which they may find themselves placed; and the more so, in that the disturbance produced during the recent years in the silver market has variously affected the monetary situation of the several countries

"3. That the differences of opinion which have appeared and the fact that even some of the states which have the double standard find it impossible to enter into a mutual engagement with regard to the free coinage of silver, exclude the discussion of the adoption of a common ratio between the two metals."

After the bimetallic union had been formed and we had been earnestly invited to become a member of it and had refused, no wonder then after the European nations had, each for itself, adopted its own standard, that they have rejected all overtures made by us.

Our commissioners submitted their report, but I will only read a few lines from it:

"The states which had, in the past, performed this grand service to the world appeared in the conference of 1878 with a divided opinion; and it is, we think, to the delicate relations, political and financial, of the Latin Union, that the failure of the conference to adopt any positive measures is primarily to be referred.

"Switzerland appeared as the uncomprising advocate of gold monometallism for Europe.

"The delegation from Belgium also was unfavorable.

* * * * *

"France, the leading state of the Union, declared through her finance minister, the president of the conference, that, in suspending the coinage of silver, she did not incline to the single gold standard, but, on the contrary, she occupied a position in which she might await the favorable moment to reenter upon the system of the double standard.

* * * * *

"The United States appeared at the conference at a disadvantage by reason of the belief, quite commonly entertained in Europe, that the action of Congress had been mainly determined by the consideration that the United States are largely producers of silver. This opinion exhibited not a little vitality, and your Commissioners found it necessary to combat it. They showed that not only has the Government of the United States no royalty on the production of the mines of the precious metals but that, through the absence of any accumulated stock, it has in fact far less of special interest in the question under consideration than many or even most of the states represented in the conference; that the effect of a given decline in silver had been, and would continue to be, a more serious loss to the accumulated wealth of France, Belgium, Holland, and especially Great Britain, through its Indian dominions, than to the United States; that as a branch of industry the production of silver is but one of many occupations to which our available labor and capital have hitherto been inadequate; and that even as a debtor, the United States, a country of vast undeveloped resources, could better bear the weight which would be added to its debts by a diminution of the money supply of the world than could other states with less recuperative power and a narrower margin for future growth.

"Your Commissioners have reason to think that these views, during the course of the conference, prevailed over the opinion referred to respecting the motives which had actuated the United States in the recent legislation respecting silver. They believe that the European delegates came to fully recognize the preponderating motive of that legislation as springing from a general interest in an undiminished money supply and not from the wish to support a particular branch of American industry."

The record of that entire conference was that the nations refused to agree to international bimetallism. How could you have expected them to agree to it?

But in 1869, after the monetary conference of 1867, England and France made a little effort at international bimetallism. France appealed to England, as the United States had rejected her overtures, and was willing to join England in abandoning the silver standard, as the United States had refused to recognize bimetallism. But the distinguished bimetallist of the Senate, Mr. Sherman, had something to do with this monetary conference of 1878. He was then Secretary of the Treasury, and wrote a letter to Mr. Groesbeck, dated July 15, 1878. A letter, you will remember, turned up from him, addressed to the Paris Monetary Conference, which destroyed the possibility of international bimetallism at that convention. He says in this letter:

"During the monetary conference in Paris, when silver in our country was excluded from circulation by being undervalued, I was strongly in favor of the single standard of gold, and wrote a letter, which you will find in the proceedings of that conference, stating briefly my view. At that time the wisest among us did not anticipate the sudden fall of silver or the rise of gold that has occurred. This uncertainty of the relation between the two metals is one of the chief arguments in favor of a monometallic system, but other arguments, showing the dangerous effect upon industry by dropping one of the precious metals from the standard of value, outweigh in my mind all theoretical objections to the bimetallic system. I am thoroughly convinced that if it were possible for the leading commercial nations to fix by agreement an arbitrary relation between silver and gold, even though the market value might vary somewhat from time to time, it would be a measure of the greatest good to all nations. My earnest desire is that you may succeed in doing this."

No one anticipated, said he, that there would be any fall in the price of silver, or any rise in the price of gold. Why? Because his financial views are based upon the idea that law had nothing to do with the values of the two metals, gold and silver. That has been the theory. It is the theory of many that law does not give to gold coin a value as money over and above its metallic value. Senator Sherman in his wisdom then proposed that the United States and other nations should come together and agree to demonetize silver, and it would not affect the market value of silver; that demonetizing silver and throwing all the demand for money upon gold would not increase the purchasing power of gold or cause a rise in the value of gold.

The various delegates to this international convention declared that they were not ready to abandon the systems which they then had. That looks to me like a statement which ought to have been sufficient to satisfy us that there was no earthly chance of international bimetallism, but it was not.

In 1881, under a provision in the appropriation law for the sundry civil expenses of the Government, approved March 3, 1881, the President was authorized to appoint, and did appoint, "three commissioners to represent the United States at a conference to be called to adopt a common ratio between gold and silver for the purpose of establishing internationally the use of bimetallic money and securing fixity of relative value between those two metals," namely, Hon. William M. Evarts, Hon. Timothy O. Howe, and Hon. Allen G. Thurman, with Hon. Dana Horton as secretary. This conference met at Paris, April 19, 1881.

I shall not consume the time of the Senate in reading all these extracts. I will simply refer to them in the proceedings of the International Monetary Conference of 1881.

The first is the declaration of Germany on page 29. I read this to show that those governments peremptorily refused to change their standards and said they were satisfied with them, and that they simply met us out of politeness through our invitation. That was practically the whole thing.

I read from pages 28 and 29 in regard to Germany; from page 31 in regard to England; page 31 in regard to the British Empire; page 32 in regard to Denmark; from page 32 in regard to Portugal; from page 33 in regard to Russia; from page 34 in regard to Greece; from page 35 in regard to Denmark, Norway, and Sweden; from pages 36 and 39 from Mr. Cernuschi, and France from pages 38 and 39:

"DECLARATION OF THE GERMAN DELEGATES

"It is generally agreed to attribute this fall less to the sales of silver made by Germany than to the measure adopted by our Government of taking from silver its quality of legal tender, an action which led the states of the Latin union to put a stop to their coinage of silver.

It cannot be denied that this latter measure, by doing away with the compensating effect which, until then, had maintained within narrow limits the oscillations in the price of silver, removed all obstacles to a progressive and limitless fall; it is, on the other hand, but just to admit that the fear of finding themselves compelled to receive a half milliard of marks of German silver, which could not fail to depreciate in a very considerable degree their own circulation, had no little influence in the decision taken by the Latin Union.

"The fall of silver would, nevertheless, not have reached the point it did if, at the same time, the production of that metal had not considerably augmented in America, while the demand in Asia was diminishing.

"In view of these combined circumstances, the Imperial Government, in the month of May 1879, resolved to suspend its sales of silver, and they have not since been resumed. This action, by giving firmness to the metal market, tended to facilitate the initiative of those powers which were interested in the rehabilitation of silver. It also had the effect of diminishing the demand for gold, a fact the more important in that the decreasing production of the latter metal, in the face of a constantly growing demand, had, within the last few years, caused a certain degree of tension in the market.

"We recognize, without reserve, that a rehabilitation of silver is to be desired, and that it might be attained by the reestablishment of the free coinage of silver in a certain number of the most populous states represented at this conference, if these states, to this end, should adopt as a basis a fixed relation between the value of gold and that of silver. Nevertheless, Germany, whose monetary reform is already so far advanced, and whose general monetary situation does not seem to call for a change of system so vast in scope, does not find herself in a position, so far as she is concerned, to concede the free coinage of silver.

"Her delegates are, therefore, not able to subscribe to a proposition looking to such action.

"The Imperial Government is, on the other hand, entirely disposed to do its best to second the efforts of other powers which might wish to unite, with a view to the rehabilitation of silver by means of the free coinage of this metal. In order to reach this end, and to guarantee these powers against the afflux of the German silver, which they seem to fear, the Imperial Government would voluntarily impose upon itself the following restrictions:

"During a period of some years, it would abstain from all sales of silver, and, during another period of a certain duration, it would pledge itself to sell annually only a limited quantity, so small in amount that the general market would not be glutted thereby.

"The duration of these periods and the quantity of silver to be sold yearly during the second period would form the subject of ulterior negotiations. Such an arrangement would efficiently protect the mints of the bimetallic states against the unlimited outflow of German thalers drawn from the national fund. Private individuals or the Imperial Bank (which is a private bank under special control of the Government), would not be able, on the other hand, to cause thalers to flow to the mints of the bimetallic union, except in the case of the balance of trade being against Germany, or unless the relation of 1 to 15½, established by the bimetallic union, should undergo a considerable modification in favor of silver. This last contingency appears, however, but slightly probable (pp. 28, 29).

"DECLARATIONS OF THE DELEGATE OF GREAT BRITAIN

"Now, gentlemen, the monetary system of the United Kingdom since 1816, that is to say, for more than 60 years, has rested on gold as a single standard, and this system has satisfied all the needs of the country without giving rise to those disadvantages which have shown themselves elsewhere, and under other monetary regulations; and for these reasons it has been accepted by the governments of all parties and by the nation. The Government of Her Majesty could not, therefore, take part in a conference as supporting the principle of the double standard, and its answer to the invitation of France and the United States necessarily set forth the reasons which prevented it from taking part in the reunion which had been proposed (p. 31).

"DECLARATION OF THE DELEGATES OF BRITISH INDIA—READ BY LORD REAY

"Mr. President and gentlemen, the Government of British India, in sending delegates to the conference, is not to be regarded as having, by this fact, admitted the adoption of the principle of bimetallism in the British Indies; and in order that it may be free from responsibility for the conclusions which might be reached by the conference, its delegates are not authorized to take part in the votes of that body.

"Although the secretary of state, as well as the council of British India, do not believe it possible to nourish the hope, in the present circumstances, of a radical reform of the monetary system of India, they are ready to take into consideration such measures as might be proposed for introduction into India with the object of restoring the value of silver.

"I have no need to assure Your Excellency and you gentlemen that the Government of India will follow with the greatest interest your deliberations and your resolutions, which may exert so powerful an influence upon the destinies of the empire of British India.

"DECLARATION OF THE DELEGATE OF DENMARK

"As the Danish Government has no intention of abandoning the single gold standard introduced into the country a few years ago, I have received instructions on the part of my Government to abstain from all discussion of the manner (quo modo) by which the bimetallic system could be regulated.

"DECLARATION OF THE DELEGATE OF PORTUGAL

"Mr. President and gentlemen of the conference, the Portuguese Government, in accepting the cordial invitation of the Governments of France and of the United States of America, represented at this conference, desired, while fulfilling a duty of international courtesy, to give to these two Governments a proof, in all respects deserved, of consideration and deference; but it frankly stated to them that the Portuguese monetary system now in force would not allow of its entry into the bimetallic union now contemplated (p. 32).

"But, at the same time, the Russian Government reserves to itself entirely its right of opinion upon this whole matter, and in nothing renounces its liberty of action by reason of any resolutions of the conference (p. 33).

"DECLARATION OF THE DELEGATE OF GREECE

"The delegates of Greece, in presence of the declarations made by the honorable delegates of England, of Russia, of Portugal, and so forth, considers it his duty also to declare that, in his capacity of representative of a state which has adopted monometallism, he would not be able to join in any measure which might lead to a change in this system. He will be most happy to take part in the labors of the conference, and he will, while reserving to it full liberty of action, most willingly report to his government upon any other question which may be proposed and discussed (p. 34).

"DECLARATION OF THE DELEGATE OF NORWAY

"You are aware, gentlemen, that the Scandinavian countries have a monetary union based upon the single standard of gold; my government reserves all its rights, but has given me entire freedom to take part in the discussions, saving only my obligation to report to it finally (p. 35)."

Mr. Hull's False Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann, from the New York Herald Tribune of April 27, 1943:

MR. HULL'S FALSE START

(By Walter Lippmann)

Secretary Hull has persuaded the administration leaders in Congress to take the position that congressional action on the trade agreements act should be made the test case of American foreign policy in the post-war world. There are excellent and compelling reasons for the extension of the act. But the effort to inflate its importance to a point where the fate of the world hangs upon whether Congress may pass on Mr. Hull's agreements is, surely, a grave error.

For it is not true that the vote on the amendment proposed by Senator MCNARY is or can be made the test of our general policy. To say that it is the test, to ask the rest of the world to regard it as the test, is to make much too much out of comparatively little and to have lost our sense of proportion. It is to make the question whether Congress shall have a chance to pass on tariff schedules the crucial question of our own future and of the world's peace. This is not the crucial question, and no good can come of pretending that it is.

The imprudence of posing the biggest issues on a test of this small issue is evident when we remember that if Congress extends this act unamended for two or three years, no Congressman is thereby committed to vote favorably on any treaty or any other measure which may come before him. But if Congress amends the act—say by providing, as Senator MCNARY asks, that Congress may within 60 days by majority vote in both Houses disapprove an agreement—if Mr. Hull is defeated on this question, then Mr. Hull will spend the rest of the war explaining to this country and to foreign governments that Congress did not really repudiate him and that he still has the power to negotiate. Mr. Hull has, in fact, asked for a vote of confidence on a question where he cannot win, in the sense that he has made sure of the future support of Congress, and where he may suffer a disastrous defeat.

Moreover, by identifying the future of American foreign policy with the very subordinate question of the power of the Executive to alter tariff schedules, Mr. Hull is making it excessively difficult for himself to conduct our foreign relations. Why should the great question of American security be identified with the notion that Congress shall have no voice in making international trade agreements? Why should Congressmen be told that they must decide the issues of peace and war on whether they have a say or do not have a say about the price of cattle, wool, and peanuts?

What sense is there in inaugurating the great decisions on the American future by saying to Congress: "By your vote on whether the Executive alone may alter tariff schedules, you are committing yourselves on whether the United Nations are to remain united and are to organize the peace of the world; and we shall tell the world that if you insist on having something to say about tariff schedules, then America will not take part in safeguarding its own vital interests by organizing the peace."

There are, I believe, practical reasons why reciprocal trade agreements are best made by Executive action, though in principle the right of Congress to pass upon them can hardly be disputed, and ought not to be denied. But these reasons are peculiar to the tariff. In Congress the making of tariffs has almost always been a local issue affected by pressure groups, and therefore never planned and carried out in the general national interest. But this very special reason, which alone could justify Mr. Hull's position on the trade agreements, disappears when we come to the larger agreements for security and reconstruction. These will require continuing congressional majorities to sustain them year after year. Our foreign policy will require authorizations, appropriations, and legislation to make it effective; it cannot possibly be settled by one grand debate and one dramatic vote.

It is a false start, therefore, to inaugurate our post-war foreign policy by a measure which, instead of including Congress in the complex operation, excludes it. It is probably desirable that Congress should not fuss too much with the trade agreements. But Congress will have to participate in the much more important agreements that are to come, and, therefore, the present procedure for trade agreements is not, and should not, be treated as the precedent for the future.

Senator MCNARY's proposal is in fact a much better precedent for the future. It gives the Executive the initiative unless majorities in both Houses disapprove within a specified

time. This is a liberal and flexible procedure, admirably suited to the real problems which lie ahead. For it enables and induces Congress to participate continually in the formation of foreign policy. And unless Congress does participate, unless there are developed dependable congressional majorities to support American foreign policy, we shall not be able to have a foreign policy.

Once we take this view, we shall see, I think, that the basic issue is not whether Congress or the Executive shall decide foreign policy. Mr Hull has made a serious mistake in posing this issue. The basic issue is whether foreign policy shall be formed and sustained by the President and a majority in both Houses of Congress, as Senator MCNARY proposes, or whether one-third of the membership of one House shall have the veto over the will of the majority.

The veto power of one-third of the Senate is the real obstacle to the conduct of American foreign relations. Under this power a Senator who is against a treaty has two votes, whereas a Senator who votes yes has only one vote. No Representative has any vote. Thirty-three Senators, therefore, count more than 63 Senators and 435 Representatives. Thus, as Alexander Hamilton put it, "a pertinacious minority can control the opinion of a majority * * * and * * * the sense of the smaller number will overrule that of the greater."

It is here, and not over the Executive's sole power to make trade agreements, that the issue will have to be joined. That is where it will be joined if the State Department is making proper preparations for the coming peace. The issue will be joined by following the well-established American precedent of negotiating agreements which come before Congress in a form where they require the approval of majorities in both Houses, or come into effect unless disapproved by majorities in both Houses.

Few, if any, of the agreements will, we may hope, come before Congress in the antiquated form of treaties which are subject to the veto of one-third of one House.

The method of majority rule rather than minority veto has an ample, ancient, constitutional foundation. It will, no doubt, be attacked by a few Senators as an infringement of their special, peculiar prerogatives. But the issue will not be seriously in doubt if the people and if Congress as a whole are asked to choose between the prerogatives of a minority and the rights of the majority to rule.

Europe's Fate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared a remarkably vivid and moving description of the terrible forces against which the United Nations are fighting. It was written by the eminent Russian author, Ilya Ehrenburg, and was published in the information bulletin issued by the Embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It is such a persuasive and compelling argument in my judgment it should be made available to the members of the armed forces and American civilians generally so that they may comprehend the gravity and immensity of the task. If already in the armed services they will be inspired and moved by the reading of this article thus the more earnestly and deeply to embark upon their task at the very outset and to continue their glorious crusade. This article is eloquent in its description of the aggregation of Fascists against whom we are arrayed. It justifies the President's Casablanca pronouncement when he categorically decreed that the war will not end until we secure the unconditional surrender of our diabolically vindictive and merciless foes.

The article is as follows:

EUROPE'S FATE

(By Ilya Ehrenburg)

Recently I visited Gzhatsk district, liberated from the Germans. The word "desert" is inadequate to convey the spectacle of the cataclysm, the terrible catastrophe, that meets the eye when you reach this place, where the Germans ruled for 17 months.

Gzhatsk was once a cheerful, rich, and thriving district. Milk from its pedigreed cows was sent to Moscow; its tailors and seamstresses, past masters of their craft, came to the capital. In our country the ancient and the modern were curiously intermingled; side by side with Gzhatsk's old cathedral of the Kazan Virgin, and squat wooden houses, rose the spacious new buildings of schools, clubs, and hospitals, molded with light. There were dark alleys and there were lads who dreamed of flight to the stratosphere.

Now in the place where the town stood there is only an unsightly pile of broken iron girders, smoke-blackened stone, and crushed pebbles. Gzhatsk is still marked on the map, still marked in human hearts, but it is gone from the face of the earth. The vandals of our day have destroyed the town by what was the last word in modern technical methods. They blew up nurseries and churches with dynamite; bursting into houses they smashed the windows, poured gasoline over the walls, and were delighted with this species of Bengal lights they had created. Gzhatsk was burned. Half the villages in the district were also burned. Only those survived from which the Germans had to take to their heels under the pressure of the advancing Red Army.

Few people remained, for the Germans had driven 6,000 Russians from Gzhatsk to Germany. Visions of the dark ages of the dawn of man's history arise in the mind's eye. Vainly did mothers strive to hide their children from the German slave traders. Mothers buried their boys in snow—they froze to death. Mothers hid their little girls in hay, but the Germans plunged their bayonets into the stacks. Through the streets of the town lads of 12 and 13 years of age were driven by German rifle butts—the Germans were sending the children into slavery. Sometimes they drove whole families, whole villages, and the rural district was soon deserted.

Hunger, typhus, diphtheria, and Gestapo torture cells did their work. But more terrible even than this physical extermination is the moral suppression of human dignity. When you enter a town liberated from the Germans, what frightens you is not only ruins and corpses, but human eyes in which all light seems to have been burned out. People talk in whispers, start at every footfall, recoil from every shadow. That is what I saw in Gzhatsk this March. That is what I saw in Kursk in February.

At the outbreak of the war the newspapers talked of what fascism was bringing to the world; now we see what fascism has brought to the regions captured by the Germans. The word "death" belongs too much to life—it is out of place here; better to say extinction or abyss. The old peasant woman was right when she told me sadly that the Germans were "worse than death."

Looking westward you see frightful scenes: Somewhere far away there is another Kursk and another Gzhatsk—and they are called at first by familiar names—Minsk, Chernigov. Then the names change. That charred pile was the French city called Arras; those people who were shot were brought from the Czech town of Tabor. The extreme western part of the Brittany Cape of Europe, jutting out toward the New World, is called by the French the Latin name of Finisterre—end of the earth; and now, from Gzhatsk to Brest to Finisterre, one can see the same night, the same desolation, the same scenes of ghastly mockery, slaughter, and barbarity. The great European night has stretched to "the end of the earth."

We are passionately attached to our land, our sources, our history. We are proud of our Slavonic Hellas—Kiev; the Russian grace of St. Sophia's Cathedral; Yaroslavna's Lament; Andrei Rublev's classic, clear-cut quality; Novgorod's civic liberties; and the military exploits of Alexander Nevsky and Dmitri Donskoi. But we have never drawn a dividing line between our culture and the European, for it is not wires and railways that link us but a system of blood vessels and brain convolutions. We were not only diligent pupils but teachers of Europe.

Only an ignoramus would present Russia as a child admitted 200 years ago to the school of culture. The testament of ancient Greece, cradle of Europe's consciousness, reached us not through the Rome of conquerors and legislators, but through the Byzantium of philosophers and ascetics. We have only to compare Andrei Rublev's paintings with the frescoes of the early Renaissance—Cimabue or Giotto—to realize how much closer old Russia was to the spirit of Hellas with its clearness and gaiety.

When in the nineteenth century Russia astounded the world with her loftiness of thought and word, it was not birth, it was maturity. Who shall say which moved Pushkin more—Byron's verses or the fairy tales told by his old nurse, Arina? The progressive minds of the last century in Russia's felt Europe's passions, hopes, and griefs, and contributed to the European consciousness the strong Russian emotions of truthfulness and humanity.

In Belinsky's vehemence, Chernyshevsky's asceticism, and the heroism of the Russian revolutionaries, we see more than gifts from the West, the heritage of humanism and the French Revolution: we feel the search for truth that was the historic path of Russian culture—the seekers of the city. That is why Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, Tchaikovsky, and Moussorgsky enriched any cultured European, and gave profundity and breadth to Europe's every conception. That is why Lenin lives as Russia's example and state genius, the peak of European and human thought.

Not alone because we have our Gzhatsk, Kharkov, and Minsk do we understand France's woe, but also because the fate of European culture is infinitely dear to us. We remember that the Decembrists were inspired by the Declaration of Rights, because Turgenev was the friend and inspirer of France's finest writers. We are not bystanders at Europe's tragedy.

For a thousand days the Germans have been tramping upon the European countries they conquered. I repeat—a thousand days. A Continent until a little while ago flourishing and so varied, has become a place of horror. Death is monotonous. The sight of Voronezh, Vyazma, and Istra is sufficient to convey the idea of many European cities.

Neither the Germans nor their henchmen can restore what has been destroyed. All their efforts are directed toward further destruction. Therefore to this day Spanish Guernica is a charred ruin; Almeria's streets, rubbish heaps. In all these 5 years General Franco has not been able to build a new Barcelona or Madrid. The Spanish cannot put their house in order; they are obliged to wait upon the German administrative service and to die outside Leningrad for Berlin.

Rotterdam's ruins are the twins of Belgrade's ruins. Northern France, once reminiscent of an anthill, where the streets of one town led into the streets of another, has become a stony desert. The towns on the Atlantic seaboard are shattered and burned.

What has become of the people? A Gzhatsk woman whose four children had been carried away by the Germans and her home burned, said to me, "Houses can be found—but you can't go on living without children." The Germans encroached not only upon Europe's ancient stones; they trampled her body, her youth, her children. The people have been deprived of the most elementary right, the right to live in their native country. Voix du Nord, a French paper published illegally, informs us that in Lille and Valenciennes professors from Kiev University and students from Kharkov and Minsk are doing penal labor. And in the towns of Zaporozhye French engineers and workers brought from Paris by the Germans are pining in the munitions works. Hitler does a driving trade in slaves. He has sent Poles to the Finnish forests and Slovenes as navvies for the earthworks in Poland. Alsatians are sent to Ukraine to build German roads. Belgian lacemakers are digging Lithuanian ground. Germans carry out street raids in French towns, seize all the able-bodied and drive them eastward into slavery. Ten thousand captives are carried away daily from France.

The lament of the Gzhatsk mother sounds as an echo in Lyons—but it is not an echo—it is the mothers of Lyons weeping. "Our times can only be compared to the years of plague and murrain in the Middle Ages," wrote the Journal de Geneve. A French king once expressed the wish that every subject should have a chicken in the pot. Before the Germans came there were 37,000 fowls in Gzhatsk, now there are only 110. Recently I read a very detailed article in a German economic magazine on the disappearance of eggs in Europe. The Herr Doctor analyzed the position occupied by eggs in international trade, and concluded gloomily that "new exports must be found for Denmark, France, and the protectorate." They have been found, these exports. They are slaves. It is worth while noting, however, that in considering the causes of the disappearance of eggs from Europe, the German "scholar" neglected to mention one—the chicken-eating German soldier.

What have the people of Europe to eat these days? The French have eaten all the stocks of fodder and turnips, have eaten the crows and sparrows. The southerners eat grass, which they call salad Laval. The northerners subsist on acorns and tree bark ground fine. Maddened by starvation, the Greeks are devouring shrubs. Phantoms rove the streets of Athens—wraithlike figures of scientists, workers, artists, and artisans. They are not given work because they have not sufficient strength to lift a spade. So they beg, and the German soldiers kick them away. There are no more dogs. They have all been eaten.

Deadly diseases strike down those whom the slave-owners have left in their native country for like plague-bearing rats the Germans have brought infection with them. In well-fed, rosy-cheeked Holland, the country of Van Houten's Cocoa, tuberculosis has spread on a truly formidable scale. In The Hague alone, 17,000 cases of an acute form of tuberculosis were recorded in the first 9 months of 1942.

In France, according to figures in the controlled newspaper Sept Jours, there are 1,000,000 persons suffering from an acute form of tuberculosis. The number of those suffering from syphilis has increased by 12 times; of those affected with skin diseases, by 30 times. Soap, medicines, and bread are not to be found. One-third of the population of Greece has been swept away by hunger and epidemics. Diphtheria has attacked Poland and Czechoslovakia. There is no inoculation, and the mortality among children reaches 60 percent.

But more terrible still is the life of the Europeans uprooted by the Germans. A half-million French slaves have died in Germany; 2,000,000 are awaiting death. "We are living in a horrible barracks among human excrement and lice. We are given only a broth brewed of potato peelings to eat. They beat us across our backs with sticks," a Frenchman who escaped from Germany writes in Le Document. A Frenchman who recently escaped from the German Danziger Forposten reported that two Serbs had been sentenced to imprisonment for what was called a barbarous act: They had eaten a kitten belonging to a Danzig resident.

Europe is swarming with street waifs. A correspondent of the Nazional Zeitung writes that in France he encountered "a mob of wild children who fled shrieking whenever anyone approached them." In the Salpétrière Hospital in Paris there are 286 girls between the ages of 9 and 14 suffering from syphilis. Two boys of 8 and 11 years of age were arrested on a murder charge in Marseilles. These waifs roam the streets of Serbia in groups of 20 to 30. Instances of cannibalism were noted among the street waifs in Greece.

Is it necessary to speak of the lapse of culture into savagery? Schools and universities are either closed or turned into hotbeds of Hitlerite ignorance. In the newspaper Marseillaise there is a description of lectures given by a professor of the Collège de France. He explained at some length that "when the chin was not clear-cut and the line of the oval somewhat wavy, it was a sign of race impurity." This in an auditorium where the mathematician Poincaré, the chemist Perrin, the physicist Langevin, once lectured. Depeche de Toulouse remarks ruefully, "Among the young men who pass graduation examinations the standard of education is extremely low."

After the Hitlerite burning of the Czech libraries, the stocks of books were reduced by 70 percent. I have seen some books published in France during the German occupation; of the ideas they contained I shall not speak—even books on philosophy are full of the cattle-breeding sentiment which is inevitable in "Neo-Europe." I am speaking of something else: these books were written by savages. Every French schoolboy used to express himself ably and well. Now even writers in France are unable to express themselves.

A thousand days isn't such a short time—in a thousand days you can learn a great deal and you can unlearn a great deal. Living with wolves, Europe has forgotten how to speak articulately and has taken to howling like a wolf.

The institution of the system of hostages, the spectacle of executions and tortures, deform weak souls. Children see gallows; adolescents are bullied—"Betray your father and you will receive a tin of food and a bottle of wine. Refuse and we take you to the Gestapo, where they know how to drive pins under your nails." Terror deforms people and some grow cowardly, some pathologically cruel. Behavior standards disappear, the foundations of any social life are shaken.

Europe is thus exposed to infection, ready for the corruption of tissues to set in, ready for anarchy. Europe does not want to die. Spilling their blood freely, the partisans of France and Yugoslavia fight on. There are still many sound and healthy cells. Red corpuscles are struggling against white. The heritage of centuries, Europe's splendid past, resist the brown plague's onslaught.

Europe can be saved—but time does not wait. It is naive to think that the peoples who have stood for a thousand days can endure for another thousand. This spring the defenders of the life and culture of all peoples fighting against Fascist death are confronted with the portentous word: Time! No one doubts the final victory of the anti-Hitler coalition. Stalingrad has been its brilliant forerunner. The Red Army and the country supporting it displayed their spiritual strength and resolution. We know that jointly with the Allies we shall deal a final blow to the Hitlerite war machine.

But the sleeping beauty must be set free from thrall before she becomes a dead beauty. I speak of Europe, held in Fascist thrall. It is not enough to win. We must save the living forces of Europe. We must preserve those forces that will enable Burgundy's wine-growers to plant their grapes again; Norway's fishermen to cast their nets again; Europe's stonemasons to rebuild cities; scientists and scholars to hand the half-extinguished torch of knowledge to the new generation. Bitter indeed will be the dearly won victory if there are neither doctors, artists, wine distillers, or electricians left in France.

In the Smolensk, Orel, and Kursk regions I have seen villages that survived because the Germans did not have time to burn them. The Red Army has saved many precious things from destruction. It has saved millions from physical and moral death.

The armies of the anti-Hitlerite coalition could save Europe, her people, her culture, her soul; in Europe there is something dear to all of fascism's enemies. The scholars of Oxford and Kiev know what the Sorbonne or the Pasteur Institute mean to them. Capek's plays are liked in London, but without Prague alive and free there can be no Capek. Without a free France, Americans can never again see the pictures of Matisse or Marquet.

No matter how this or that statesman conceives the future of the European States, it can rest only on culture, on the rules of common existence, on human dignity. Houses of widely differing architectural styles may be built of stone. But there is no stone in the desert—there is only sand, and nothing can be built of sand.

Never before has springtime wrought so strongly in the blood of old Europe. The spring of 1943 comes to Europe not only as a change of season, but also as the flood-tide of cosmic life. Springtime comes like the summons to a last decisive conflict—like the dawn of resurrection.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from the hearings before the Ways and Means

Committee on the resolution to extend the reciprocal trade agreements:

STATEMENT OF F. E. MOLLIN, DENVER, COLO., EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

Mr. MOLLIN. Mr. Chairman, of course, I think we all agree on one thing, and that is, the first thing we are all interested in is in winning the war; and then, in planning for after the war, it seems to me that we all have a great responsibility, and I think that one of the most important things that this commitee and this Congress can do is to be looking ahead to the position that we will be in after the war.

I want to call your attention to the fact that we have a tremendous expansion in agriculture. I think that agriculture generally, including the livestock industry, is making a perfectly heroic effort to supply the food to win the war, and that they are doing so without any regard to the position that they will be left in when the war is over.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that we produced in this country in 1940 18.9 billion pounds of meat; in 1941 we set a new record with 19.5 billion pounds of meat; and in 1942 we set a new record with 21.7 billion pounds of meat. Although maybe some of you people here in Washington who had difficulty in getting it wondered where it went, it went into domestic consumption, except for that which went to our Army, and certainly no one begrudges that. Less than 1 percent of the beef produced in 1942 went to lend-lease. In fact, I think it was less than one-half of 1 percent, and the estimate for this year, 1943, is that we again will expand our meat production in this country to a total of 1½ billion pounds more than the record production of last year. That is the Department's preliminary figure at the present time.

In building up that tremendous meat production we have increased our cattle herds to more than 78,000,000 cattle. In 1917, when we had the previous record, we had a little over 73,000,000 cattle. We now have 5,000,000 more cattle than we had at about the conclusion of the previous war, and everything indicates that at the end of this year we are liable to go well over the 80,000,000 mark in cattle numbers.

We have on hand the greatest number of hogs ever in this country, and the record indicates that again at the end of this year we are going to have substantially more hogs than we had at the beginning. In sheep I think we touched the peak a year ago, but they are up near a record production. So we have tremendous production of cattle, hogs, and sheep.

There is one thing about the livestock industry unlike some of the manufacturing industries. When this is all over and the demand tapers off, we can't just lock up the plant. It goes on for several years. Hogs can be tapered off quicker; with cattle it takes several years to make any important change, either up or down in the production. It is going to take us years, under ordinary conditions, to liquidate the surplus we are building up in cattle today.

I want to confine my discussion largely to the things of special interest to our own industry, but I do want to make just a few brief general comments on the situation. In the talk that I have heard, and I have listened in more or less during the past week, most of the discussion has been on the basis that either you were an isolationist or a high-tariff man, that there wasn't any possible middle ground. Well, now, I would like to call your attention to the fact that under the rates that were prescribed for our products in the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill we were not isolationists and we can show you that on many of the items in which the tariff has since been cut that the imports under the Hawley-Smoot rates were very substantial.

Personally, I don't believe in a tariff of exclusion. I think that we should have rates on products such as cattle which can't be stepped up or down in 2 or 3 months' time. We should have rates that will give our industry protection when production is very heavy and the price trend is downward, and on the other hand, when we reached the other point and cycle, I think we should have rates that will give the consumer protection and that will allow imports to come in here without damage to our industry when our own production is light. That is the kind of tariff I believe in, and I have never yet seen anyone successfully show that that wasn't the kind of tariff we had in the rates in the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, because we did not exclude the products of our neighbors, Canada or Mexico, or the products from South America that were eligible to come into this country.

So, with us it is a question of how best to reach that kind of tariff, whether it is through these reciprocal trade agreements or whether it is some other way, and based on the experience we have had and on our study of the problem, we cannot believe that we are being adequately protected in the method of making reciprocal trade agreements.

The time that we really need a tariff, of course, is when we are going to have a low level of prices, and unfortunately as we approach the time when this vast production might dam up on us we find that our tariff rates have been substantially reduced. We had a taste of what will happen, in 1936, when the Canadian trade agreement was made effective and we had very heavy imports of Canadian cattle at certain of the northern markets in the United States. Incidentally, in the discussion this morning, if I understood Mr. Robertson correctly, he suggested to Mr. Crowther that in the Canadian trade agreement 900 reductions were made in tariff rates. I have here an official statement put out by the Tariff Commission which shows that Canada made 175 reductions in tariff, not 900.

I want to discuss with you briefly the method of making these trade agreements as it applies to our industry. The method, of course, has been discussed here from time to time, but we don't believe there is any provision there that does give the assurance to domestic industry that they are going to be given adequate protection. By the time the notice is sent out—the official notice of intention to negotiate a trade agreement—it is our understanding that the Trade Agreements Division has already had several weeks of negotiation with representatives of the foreign government, and that by the time they publish that list they have in effect agreed with the foreign government that they will consider and negotiate reductions in the tariff on the items published.

We don't have that opportunity to confer. We don't know anything about it until that notice is published. You will recall that incident of the sugar tariff, when Colonel Batista went home and proudly told his people that he had negotiated a 15-percent reduction in the tariff on sugar and I attended a hearing in the Senate Finance Committee room when Secretary Hull explained that matter to some of the Senators from the sugar States, and he admitted in that discussion that they had to have something to work on with these foreign countries, and in effect he said just what I have stated—that by the time the notice went out they had agreed that they would negotiate a reduction in the tariff. I don't say that they do come through and reduce every single tariff that is published. There are exceptions. But in the main—in the schedules that apply to us—once they have notified us that they intend to negotiate such an agreement, we find that every one of those items has been covered by tariff reductions. It does not seem to me it gives us anywhere near the chance that the representatives of the foreign governments have.

Then we come down and make our case before the Committee for Reciprocity Information and some other committee writes the trade agreements. That is a roundabout way. We would rather come before a committee like this, even though you have divergent views as to what the tariff should be, and make our case to people who are responsible to the folks back home, and take what we get out of it, than to have to go through that procedure that I have just detailed.

I want to give you a few examples of how it affects us. In the case of hides the trade agreement says that whenever the President finds it is a fact that the existing rate is a barrier to trade he can reduce the duty up to 50 percent. Well, now, we had a 10-percent ad valorem rate on hides. It was a nominal duty, about 1 cent per pound or less, under ordinary conditions. They reduced that rate in the Argentine agreement as much as they could, so that now it is 5 percent instead of 10 percent. No possible finding of fact could have been made that that tariff of 10 percent ad valorem was a barrier to trade. We always get large imports of hides from South America. They are coming in today.

After that agreement was made, after the ceilings were put on American hides, domestic hides, of 15 cents a pound and then raised to 15½ cents a pound a few months later, a year ago last fall that raise was made, they actually allowed Argentine hides to come into this country and sell for as much as 4 or 5 cents a pound above the ceiling price on domestic hides. I am glad to say they remedied that, but that is an example of the way things work.

Then, on canned beef, we had a tariff of 6 cents a pound, not less than 20 percent ad valorem, and no one can say that that tariff was a barrier to trade, because the record will show we had imports of eighty to ninety million pounds of canned beef for several years prior to the enactment of the Argentine trade agreement. It was not a barrier to trade. We were taking their canned beef in large quantities; yet the rate was reduced the full 50 percent, to 3 cents a pound.

In the case of Mexican cattle, they reduced the tariff on cattle, of course, in the Canadian agreements, first on calves weighing less than 175 pounds, later in the second agreement that was raised to less than 200 pounds, and on cattle weighing more than 700 pounds, but there was a gap between the calves weighing 175 to 200 pounds and the cattle weighing 700 pounds, and that was covered in the Mexican agreement.

Almost immediately after that agreement went into effect on January 30—I believe the date was mentioned a few minutes ago—of this year the Mexicans increased the export duty. I should not say they increased the duty. They increased the valuation on which they figured the duty, which amounts to the same thing, and on the basis of that increase in valuation they immediately took up 80 percent of the reduction, so that the net effect of that was, so far as we are concerned, that it nullified the spirit and intent of the Reciprocal Trade Act, and they transferred from Uncle Sam's Treasury to the Mexican Treasury 80 percent of the amount of the duty that was forgiven under that trade agreement.

I talked to a gentleman over in the Department who is interested in this matter, and he told me that they did not get into the Mexican agreement a restriction that they could not perform in that fashion. That should have been put in there. It would have been put in there if this Congress had had some-

thing to say about arriving at such duties. Incidentally I also asked this gentleman about the reduction in the tariff on hides that I just referred to, and he was very frank about it. He said this: The only reason for reducing the tariff on hides was because the Argentineans wanted it reduced.

But there is one better example than any of these that I can call to your attention, and that is the example of the Argentine Sanitary Convention. In 1936 the State Department negotiated a treaty with Argentina which is known as the Argentine Sanitary Convention, and which would have nullified the provisions of section 306 (a) of the tariff act with regard to the embargo against imports of live animals or dressed meats from countries where foot-and-mouth disease exists. Fortunately that was handled as a treaty. But if the State Department had had the authority to handle that as a trade agreement, that shows where we would have been today. We would have had Argentine beef in this country, and we would have had foot-and-mouth disease beyond the shadow of a doubt.

I secured from Dr. Mohler the other day fresh information as to disease conditions in that country. This is in a letter dated April 12, over the signaure of Dr. Mohler, and he shows me that in February of 1942, beginning in February of 1942, Argentina had one of the worst outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in the history of the country. They had 208 outbreaks in that month. In March they had 332 outbreaks; in April, 342; in May they had 264; in June, 445; July, 378; August, 412; September, 30. The run was over.

Very interestingly we find that England last year also had very much more trouble with foot-and-mouth disease than for many years past, and we find that about 60 days following these big outbreaks in Argentina, they had the outbreaks in England, and we think we can trace now more definitely than at any times in the past the fact that England does get foot-and-mouth disease from Argentina, because they are not getting any meat from any other country that has foot-and-mouth disease except from South America. All their other imports are coming from this country, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, where there is no foot-and-mouth disease. So we have that complete record of heavy outbreaks down there in 1942, followed by heavy outbreaks in England, yet if the State Department had had the authority and had followed their inclination, despite all the promises Mr. Sayre made about how considerate they were of the interests of domestic producers, that Argentine Sanitary Convention would be in effect today and we would be having experiences such as they are having over in England right now.

I want to call your attention to a little matter. Here is a clipping from a paper. There was a good deal of publicity a few weeks ago about the killing of a fine herd of Shorthorn cattle in northern Scotland, and here is the headline which accompanied that paper. The big type says, "Collapsed when his £100,000 cattle herd was burnt." This fine old Scotsman that had this wonderful herd of cattle, 80 years old, collapsed and was in very serious condition when the authorities killed that fine herd of cattle, that according to the headline was worth £100,000.

We hear a lot of broadcasters take the air and tell us, "Oh, if we didn't just have this little bunch of selfish cattlemen out West we would have all the cheap meat we want from Argentina." And we would have foot-and-mouth disease, too.

Besides that, they haven't any meat to spare. Under the allied council plan, England buys all the meat from South America, and we buy a little canned beef, and we don't want to take any more of that than we have to. I have that information from the authorities.

There has also been an assumption in discussing these trade matters that if an industry has to have tariff protection it is therefore automatically a weak industry. For the cattle industry I want to say we are not a weak industry. I don't know of any industry that has stood up throughout this depression and asked for less help from Uncle Sam than has the cattle industry. I am sure Congressman WEST will bear me out in that statement, with one exception; in the drought of 1934, when Uncle Sam did come to the rescue of the livestock industry and spent a lot of money to buy livestock and prevent their dying in the drought, we have stood on our own feet. We didn't ask for the range A. A. A. program; it was given to us, but we didn't ask for it, and we accepted it rather reluctantly. But in 1934 Uncle Sam spent $100,000,000 in buying cattle, and out of that he secured 800,000,000 pounds of canned beef, so that wasn't wasted.

Some reference was made the other day in the discussion talking about turkeys. You have had a lot of fun about turkeys. But Mr. ROBERTSON said that the reason they didn't reduce the tariff on turkeys was because the cost of production in Argentina was so much below the cost in Virginia.

The cost of producing beef down there is similarly lower. We have the same thing exactly. The same thing is true with Mexico. You all know their costs of production are entirely different from ours. And the fact of the matter is that the cost of production in this country is largely beyond the control of the industry producer, whether he is a cattle producer or what it may be. The tax structure is built up; he has very little to do with it. And more than that today there is the cost of labor. We have an administration that has deliberately put up labor so that out on the ranches today we are paying from 50 to 100 percent more for our ranch hands than we were a year or a little over a year ago. We can't do anything about it if we are going to keep in production. We have to hire those men and pay the wages. But that doesn't make a weak industry out of us. Still we do have to have protection if we want to keep up this meat supply in this country, and not let ourselves be placed in the condition of England, who have to go all the way to Argentina through the subinfested waters to keep their life line of food going.

I want to call your attention again to the situation we will face at the end of this war, with these greatly overexpanded industries. I want to show you that in 1919 Canada, with free trade on cattle, dumped into this country 450,000 cattle. During the war period we had been getting around 150,000 a year. But when the war was over they dumped 450,000. Why? Because they had been holding back a supply for their own use. When the emergency was over they put them into this relatively high market. The same year, the year ending June 30, 1919, the imports of canned beef jumped from nothing to 127,000,000 pounds, and that is a lot of cattle put into cans. And we will have just exactly that same thing again when this war is over. We will have every country in the world that has any surpluses of any kind coming to this market because it is the best market on earth, and if you gentlemen don't begin to think now about how you are going to protect against that contingency, in my opinion we are going to repeat the experience we had following the last World War, when we had to have the Emergency Tariff Act of 1922.

If the act is extended, we would lik to see Congress reserve to itself the power of ratifying whatever trade agreements are made. I can assure you that the country is very much heartened by the fact that Congress is beginning to take back some of the powers that it granted the Executive during the emergency, and we think here is another instance where you ought to restore those powers to yourselves.

We would like to see bilateral agreements rather than unilateral agreements. You will remember the instance I gave you of the reduction in tariff on Mexican cattle. Of course, you can say that so long as they raised the export duty you weren't particularly hurt. But Canada got the benefit of that reduction in tariff, although she had nothing to do with the agreement with Mexico, and it is that policy that has to do with the whole world that I think the country generally dislikes. We would like to see a restriction in the law that would make it very definite that the Executive does not have the power to amend sanitary provisions of existing law. There is nothing like that so far today. If we were to have an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease, with this great number of livestock and with the transportation difficulties we have, it is very doubtful whether we could get it under control, as we always have succeeded in controlling such outbreaks in the past.

If the act is extended, we believe its time should be limited, whether it is to 1 year or 2 years, but not more than 2 years, so that whatever party is in power after the election a year from next fall they will have a voice in fixing the tariff rates.

I think at that time it is certain that we are going to have a reexamination of this whole tariff structure of this country, and it just seems reasonable that this law should not be extended beyond the time of whoever comes into power in the fall of next year.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL R. LEWIS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Congress is shortly to consider a bill for the extension of the so-called Trade Agreements Act. This act, conferring authority upon the President to enter into trade agreements with foreign countries, is due to expire on June 12, 1943. This authority was first granted the President by the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of June 12, 1934, and has been twice extended since—once in 1937 and once in 1940—for additional periods of 3 years each. Shortly, we are to be asked to extend this extraordinary authority to the President a third time. Manifestly, this proposed third extension of power calls for a reexamination of the promises upon which the original grant of authority was based, and the manner in which that authority has been used, and the results obtained therefrom.

1. THE PREMISES UPON WHICH THE ACT WAS BASED

It should be recalled that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act first became a law on June 12, 1934, in the midst of a profound, world-wide depression. It

was claimed in Congress, in support of the bill, that the depression was due, in large part, to the shrinkage of world trade, which, in turn, was due to the almost universal existence of high trade-barriers, and, if prosperity was to be regained, these so-called trade-barriers must be broken down and the Nation must expand its exports. Or, to state the matter in a different way, it was claimed that the so-called reciprocal trade agreements program provided a method by which the United States was to bargain its way into the markets of the world and thus expand American exports.

In this connection, it should be remembered that the export trade of the United States has never, at any time, represented more than 10 percent of the total commerce of the country. It should also be remembered that there were other and more potent factors responsible for the world-wide depression. But at the time, the importance of a revival of international trade was overemphasized, and we embarked upon the so-called reciprocal trade agreements policy as America's contribution to the panacea for the ills of the world.

It was pointed out at that time that a lowering of United States tariffs and admitting more imports into the United States from abroad would not lead to an appreciable expansion of American exports for two reasons: First, that foreign countries will still buy in the cheapest market and, unless we can sell our products at world prices, we cannot compete for their business; and, second, that the mere fact that the United States buys more from a particular country is no guaranty that that country will buy more from us.

But these sound and true reasons were overridden and the United States embarked upon a policy of tariff reduction by enacting the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

In this connection, it should be observed that the foreign-trade policy of the United States has, since shortly after the adoption of the Constitution, been based upon protectionism; that is, our consistent policy has been to protect the markets of this country from the ruinous competition of cheaper foreign products by means of a protective tariff. That policy has grown out of the recognition of the fact that, if we are to maintain American standards of wages and living, we can only do so by protecting the products of American labor and industry in the markets of their own country and this policy was stated in simple but profound logic, by the great Lincoln in the following language, said he:

> I know little about the protective tariff; but I know that, if we buy a ton of steel rails from England, we get the rails and England gets the money; but if we buy those rails in America, we have both the rails and the money.

This is the essence of the protectionists theory of trade, and, consequently, it has always seemed to me that the only sound basis for international trade is an interchange between nations of those articles or products which the receiving nation needs and does not produce for itself or produces in insufficient quantities for its own needs. Certainly, no one can justify international trade based upon the transfer of goods to any nation which produces those same goods in quantities sufficient for its own needs. This elemental truth is most aptly expressed in that old English maxim used to express utter futility, namely, "carrying coals to Newcastle."

2. MANNER IN WHICH THE AUTHORITY HAS BEEN USED

It would thus seem that the proponents of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act ignore these fundamentals of any sound and economically justifiable international trade and, indeed, deny their validity, as shown by the manner in which the authority conferred upon the President by this act has been used.

All told, we have entered into 30 different trade agreements with 25 different countries since the first enactment of this act in 1934. In those 30 agreements, we have lowered the tariff on 1,180 different items. Fully 63 percent of all dutiable imports have been affected by this program and the average reduction in rate of duty has been about 43 percent of a maximum permitted under the act of 50 percent.

In contrast to this lowering of American tariffs, it has been shown that foreign concessions to the United States in these 30 different agreements were few and far between, nominal in extent, and, in most cases, merely agreed not to increase discrimination against exports from the United States. See testimony of Dr. John Lee Coulter, Washington, D. C., former member of the Tariff Commission and appointed by President Wilson to make a world study of international trade, page 510 of the hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee, under House Joint Resolution 111. Such being the nature of most of these trade agreements, it is small wonder that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has failed in the purpose for which it was originally enacted; namely, as a means of increasing the exports of the United States. This is conclusively shown by the following facts derived from the statistics presented by the United States Tariff Commission, based upon the records of the Department of Commerce of the United States. These statistics exclude the nations which were at war and whose exports and imports were thrown out of all normal balance and greatly decreased by that fact. Excluding from consideration the 5 warring nations at that time, our exports to all the other nations of the world increased, from 1934 to and including 1938, 58 percent with those nations with which we had made trade agreements under the authority of this act. But our exports to the remaining nations of the world with whom we had made no trade agreements under this act increased, from 1934 to 1938 inclusive, by 62 percent. Thus showing that, so far as our sales to nations with whom we had made trade agreements were concerned, our increase in exports actually did not keep pace with those to the rest of the world.

But when we come to consider imports from the nations with whom we had made trade agreements, we find that, in the same period, from 1934 to 1938, inclusive, our imports from those nations increased 23 percent, while our imports from nations with whom we had no trade agreements increased but 21 percent.

These facts show how futile the trade agreements have been as a means of increasing international trade, and these facts show how unsound were the premises upon which the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was enacted originally and how incorrect the original diagnosis of its proponents as to the causes of the world-wide depression of the early 1930's.

3. RESULTS OBTAINED THEREFROM

But the authority granted the President under the Trade Agreements Act has been used in ways that are positively harmful to the people of this country. America has spent, or is spending, approximately $1,000,000,000 for the construction and development of synthetic rubber plants, yet all of that vast investment has been sabotaged and rendered a complete economic loss, before the synthetic-rubber program has even gotten started, by means of a trade agreement concluded on May 7, 1942, with Peru, and another concluded on December 23, 1942 with Mexico, both of which agreements provide that natural rubber shall remain on the free list—that is, shall be imported duty-free into the United States.

Natural rubber has been delivered in New York and San Francisco at less than 2 cents per pound, while the least price that anyone has estimated for synthetic rubber is 10 cents per pound. This will mean that after the war, when the rubber-producing nations of the world, all of whom get the benefits of the Peruvian and Mexican treaties, begin to import natural rubber into the United States, they will undersell our synthetic product here in our own markets and compel the scrapping of our synthetic plants, built at a cost to the American taxpayer of approximately $1,000,000,000.

This is not all.

We have but three watch-making plants now operating in the United States. All of the rest of our demand for watches is supplied by importations from Switzerland under a trade agreement made with that country. But, according to Milo Perkins, Executive Director of the Board of Economic Warfare, it is his opinion, based as he says on reliable reports, that the steel and brass being used by the Swiss watch industry are derived from current imports from Germany. In other words, Americans, through the purchase of Swiss watches, imported under the trade agreement with Switzerland, are helping Hitler to finance his war.

All of these considerations seem to require either a complete refusal to extend the power to make trade agreements or to so guard the exercise of the authority thereby conferred as to prevent the dangers above pointed out and many others which time does not permit me now to enumerate.

I therefore suggest that, first, an amendment be inserted in the bill, forbidding the lowering of any duty on any competitive foreign products which will result in the entry of such competitive foreign products into the domestic market at prices which are less than the cost of production of like or similar domestic products. Second, that no foreign trade agreement shall be made which reduces the existing United States tariff duty on any competitive foreign agricultural product when the average wholesale price of the comparable domestic product is less than the parity price therefor, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. Third, that no trade agreement shall become effective before the expiration of 60 legislative days after the date of its submission to Congress and shall not thereafter become effective if, during such period, either branch of the Congress shall have adopted a resolution stating its disapproval of any such agreement.

These safeguards, I believe to be absolutely essential to the safety of our American workers and our American industries.

The American Farmer Disillusioned—The Answer to Mr. Gore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, while reading Collier's magazine of April 24, 1943, I came upon an article by our good friend and colleague, the Honorable ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, entitled "Two-Way Trade and Peace." I realize that Collier's publishes many excellent articles of fiction, and that was the thought in my mind as I read this article. I would not have given it further consideration if it had not been that it was placed in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A1953, by Majority Leader Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK. This, at least, gave it the appearance of having administration blessings.

The entire article is a mass or mess of glittering generalities. It draws conclusions that do not present the picture as it really exists. This article should be read by every Member. If the Reciprocal Trade Treaties have not any more to recommend them than is shown in this article—and they have not—they surely should not be renewed. This is not a partisan matter. A member of the present minority party may soon be Secretary of State.

To approach this subject justly, one must consider the domestic agricultural program along with the foreign agricultural program. They are so intertwined that they must be considered together. Now, the over-all picture of agricultural exports shows that as a part of our total national exports, they have been becoming less and less. Although agricultural exports amounted to over 40 percent of our total exports from 1920 to 1925 and over 30 percent of our total exports from 1926 to 1936, these same agricultural exports have been less than 30 percent of our total exports every year under the Reciprocal Trade Treaties and were down to 12 percent of our total exports by 1940. The American farmer has been sold down the river and he knows it. Domestic subsidies have been used to help carry him along. The New Deal borrows the money from him and gives some of it back to him. The imports of agricultural products have been over 50 percent of our total imports every year of the New Deal so there has been no slackening up of the agricultural imports. The gentleman from Tennesse [Mr. GORE] says:

Let's take 1937 as typical New Deal Reciprocal Trade Treaty year.

Well, let us take 1937: According to United States Department of Agriculture, 1942 agricultural statistics, page 100, table 136, there was produced in the United States in 1937 a total of 18,946,000 bales of cotton. There were exported 5,976,000 bales or 31.5 pecent. There were also imported 166,000 bales.

In the first, the 1937 followed the most disastrous drought year in our history, practically every farm crop and product was below parity. This might suit some people, but it did not please the American farmer.

In 1937 we imported $868,000,000 worth of competitive agricultural products which could and should have been produced by the farmers of America; we imported $711,000,000 worth of farm commodities, like bananas, and coffee, on which there is no duty. There was a total of $1,579,000,000 in agricultural imports. Our agricultural exports in 1937, including reexports, mind you, were valued at only $797,000,000, or less than the $868,000,000 worth of competitive agricultural products imported the same year. In fact, the agricultural imports were nearly twice the exports. Does this look like a healthy foreign business for agriculture?

Mr. GORE says something about the wheat product exported. Do you want the facts on wheat? The following statistics from the 1942 agricultural statistics will give them to you:

Wheat: Acreage, production, value, and foreign trade, United States, 1899–1941 [1]

Year	Acreage harvested	Foreign trade, including flour, year beginning July			
		Domestic exports [2]	Imports [3]	Net exports [4]	
				Total	Percentage of production
	1,000 acres	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*1,000 bushels*	*Percent*
1899	*52,589*				
1899	52,242	190,772	320	190,749	29.1
1900	49,203	220,653	603	220,723	36.8
1901	50,847	239,212	121	239,137	31.4
1902	46,244	207,835	1,080	208,016	30.3
1903	48,456	124,577	229	124,926	18.8
1904	43,155	46,319	2,296	43,612	7.8
1905	46,306	101,089	273	100,849	14.3
1906	46,230	150,597	602	150,594	20.3
1907	44,139	166,525	530	166,304	26.4
1908	45,102	116,373	475	115,901	18.0
1909	*44,263*				
1909	44,262	89,173	845	88,465	12.9
1910	45,793	71,338	1,175	70,164	11.2
1911	49,894	81,891	3,445	78,447	12.7
1912	48,413	145,159	1,304	143,938	19.7
1913	52,012	147,955	2,402	146,306	19.5
1914	55,613	335,702	728	335,162	37.3
1915	60,303	246,221	7,254	239,591	23.8
1916	53,510	205,962	24,960	181,067	28.5
1917	46,787	132,579	31,215	102,775	16.6
1918	61,068	287,402	11,289	276,615	30.6
1919	*75,099*				
1919	73,700	222,030	5,511	216,671	22.8
1920	62,358	369,313	57,682	312,625	37.1
1921	64,566	282,566	17,375	265,590	32.4
1922	61,397	224,900	20,031	205,079	24.2
1923	56,920	159,880	28,079	131,892	17.4
1924	*60,868*				
1924	52,463	260,803	6,201	254,695	30.3
1925	52,443	108,035	15,679	92,669	13.8
1926	56,616	219,160	13,264	205,994	24.8
1927	59,628	206,259	15,734	190,578	21.8
1928	59,226	163,687	21,442	142,301	15.6
1929	*62,000*				
1929	63,332	153,245	12,956	140,361	17.0
1930	62,614	131,475	19,059	112,435	12.7
1931	57,681	135,797	12,886	123,774	13.1
1932	57,839	41,211	9,382	32,284	4.3
1933	49,438	37,002	11,494	25,508	4.6
1934	*41,943*				
1934	43,400	21,532	25,134	[5] 3,602	
1935	51,229	15,929	46,638	[5] 30,709	
1936	48,863	21,584	47,924	[5] 26,340	
1937	64,422	107,194	3,561	103,633	11.8
1938	69,869	[6] 115,784	9,623	106,161	11.4
1939	53,482	[7] 54,274	10,430	43,844	5.8
1940	52,980	[8] 40,557	[9] 11,024	29,533	3.6

[1] Compiled from Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1899–1917; Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, 1918; Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce of the United States, June issues, 1919–26, January and June issues, 1927–date. Wheat flour converted to terms of grain on the following basis: 1899–1908, 4.75; 1909–17, 4.7; 1918 and 1919, 4.5; 1920, 4.6; 1921–date, 4.7 bushels of grain per barrel of flour.

[2] Includes flour milled from imported wheat.

[3] Includes wheat imported for milling in bond and export.

[4] Total exports (domestic plus foreign) minus total imports; beginning 1933, net figures are domestic exports minus imports for consumption.

[5] Net imports: i. e., imports for consumption minus domestic exports.

[6] 83,000,000 bushels of the total exported were sold with the assistance of payments available through wheat and wheat-flour export programs.

[7] 41,000,000 bushels of the total exported were sold with the assistance of export payments; 10,000,000 of this 41,000,000 bushels had been sold in the preceding year.

[8] 22,000,000 bushels of the total exported were sold with the assistance of export payments; 4,000,000 of this 22,000,000 bushels had been sold in the preceding year.

[9] Import quotas were established in accordance with Sec. 22, Public Law No. 320, and limited imports after May 28, 1941.

Agricultural Marketing Service and Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Italic figures are census returns. For earlier years, see Agricultural Statistics, 1941, table 1.

What does this table show? First, it shows that wheat exports have gradually become less. It shows that the reason

for the ever-normal granary was that we had lost our exports. If we had exported as much wheat during the 10 years of the New Deal as the 10 years before the New Deal we would not have had a kernel in the ever-normal granary.

What else does this table show? It shows that during 1934, 1935, and 1936 we were on a wheat-importing basis. Now, here is another fact which may be of interest to the future generations of taxpayers. During the 3 years, 1934, 1935, and 1936, when we were importing wheat each year, the New Deal paid the wheat farmer of America over a quarter of a billion dollars for not raising wheat, and if he did raise it and did not get enough for it in the market place, he received another check from the borrowings for future generations to pay. The official payments taken from a table found in the April 10 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are as follows:

Payments under Agricultural Adjustment, agricultural commodity, and parity programs, by program years, 1933–42

Commodity	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942
Wheat:										
Adjustment or conservation	$93,806,000	$105,554,000	$114,988,000	$43,389,000		$50,126,000	$83,941,000	$47,754,000	$49,127,000	$57,235,000
Parity							53,614,000	55,884,000	58,226,000	76,242,000
Total	93,806,000	105,554,000	114,988,000	43,389,000		50,126,000	137,555,000	103,638,000	107,353,000	133,477,000

This is a total subsidy from 1933 to 1942 for this one crop of over $889,886,000.

You may have thought you paid for your daily bread when you bought it at the market place but you will note that even in 1942 there were $133,000,000, or $1 per person, added onto the public debt for future generations to pay because the New Deal refused to let wheat bring its market price in the market place.

In addition to this direct domestic subsidy for wheat other subsidies, like loans and insurance, were put in operation. By 1939 the whole domestic and foreign agricultural program of the New Deal was a mess. It had broken down. The following table shows this fact:

Average prices received by farmers for specified farm products, Aug. 15, 1939, and their percentage of parity price

Commodity	Average price, Aug. 15, 1939	Percentage average price is of parity price
Wheat, per bushel	54.5 cents	49
Corn, per bushel	45.7 cents	57
Oats, per bushel	25.4 cents	51
Barley, per bushel	34.5 cents	45
Rye, per bushel	34.2 cents	38
Buckwheat, per bushel	54.8 cents	60
Flaxseed per bushel	$1.35	64
Rice (rough), per bushel	57.9 cents	57
Cotton, per pound	8.70 cents	56
Cottonseed, per ton	$16.24	58
Potatoes, per bushel	69.0 cents	[1] 81
Sweetpotatoes, per bushel	90.7 cents	83
Peanuts, per pound	3.39 cents	56
Apples, per bushel	66.0 cents	55
Butterfat, per pound	22.4 cents	[2] 73
Eggs, per dozen	17.5 cents	[2] 75
Hogs, per 100 pounds	$5.47	61

Footnotes at end of table.

Average prices received by farmers for specified farm products, Aug. 15, 1939, and their percentage of parity price—Continued

Commodity	Average price, Aug. 15, 1939	Percentage average price is of parity price
Veal calves, per 100 pounds	$8.13	96
Lambs, per 100 pounds	$6.94	95
Tobacco, per pound	16.6 cents	
Flue-cured		[1] 92
Maryland		118
Hay, per ton	$6.77	46

[1] Base prices are averages for the crop years, 1919–28. Taxes and interest not considered in determination of parity prices of commodities when using post-war base.
[2] Adjusted for seasonal variation.

Source: Midmonth price report, Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Aug. 29 1939.

This official table also shows that corn, cotton and wheat even after millions of subsidies was only 49 to 56 percent of parity in 1939.

We were using public funds for subsidizing wheat exports. The farmers' price was as low as 54 cents per bushel in 1939. There was an export subsidy of 27 cents per bushel. This left 27 cents to the American farmer the lowest net price of wheat since Queen Elizabeth's time. In addition to the subsidies for not growing wheat; for growing it; for not getting enough in the market place when the New Deal would not allow it; for insurance; for loans; for export bounties; lo and behold, we find that on May 29, 1941 by Presidential proclamation, an import quota of 800,000 bushels of wheat and 4,000,000 pounds of flour was placed on wheat and wheat products. Just think of it; After all the talk about the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act.

The 42 cents per bushel duty of that act was retained and had to be implemented by the New Deal's issuing of a quota that was practically an embargo. The quota is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the domestic production. Do you think you have a good-neighbor policy by placing embargoes? Was the Smoot-Hawley duty of 42 cents per bushel too high when the New Deal had to implement it with an embargo? And do you believe in using funds secured by taking 30 percent of the customs receipts under section 32 of the A. A. A., and funds obtained largely as a result of imports of livestock and livestock products, and then turn around and use them to make forced exports of another farm crop? This is especially cockeyed when you realize the subsidy was half the price the farmer received for the wheat. What a mess. Why more of it? When we see duties reduced by 50 percent on livestock, or all the law allows, and then see the duties collected and used to subsidize cotton and other crops, it is time someone did some thinking and acting.

It is always amusing to see someone so anxious to give someone else's market away. But how about tobacco grown in Tennessee? Has not this had domestic subsidies and has not this crop had loan support and lend-lease support? Here are the official facts as to adjustments and price subsidies:

Payments under Agricultural Adjustment, agricultural commodity, and parity programs, by program years, 1933–42

Commodity	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942
Tobacco:										
Adjustment	$2,059,000	$43,930,000	$16,020,000	$15,380,000	$11,471,000	$10,622,000	$7,476,000	$12,573,000	$11,687,000	$7,936,000
Parity									4,580,000	603,000
Total	2,059,000	43,930,000	16,020,000	15,380,000	11,471,000	10,622,000	7,476,000	12,573,000	16,267,000	8,539,000

Note the total subsidy has been $145,837,000 in the 10 years the crop was worth only $224,670,000 for 1 year.

Note that in 1934 the subsidy was $43,930,000. The farm value of the crop was only $224,699,000. This subsidy was 18 percent of the farm value of the tobacco crop. Here is a crop that for years has been on an export basis. But even in 1942, you will note that tobacco farmers received $8,539,000 for adjusting their acreage and because it did not bring enough in the market place. The American people did not even pay for their smokes in 1942. Would or could you believe this? Do you know how much lease-lend funds have also been used for supporting tobacco?

It is not surprising that a Representative from a State that has a crop which is on an export basis and can get up to 18 percent domestic subsidy would be satisfied with most any foreign agricultural trade policy as long as the domestic agricultural policy made up the difference.

I really like to take up cotton—that is a honey. Following are the largest subsidies received by this crop:

Payments under Agricultural Adjustment, agricultural commodity, and parity programs, by program years, 1933–42

Commodity	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942
Cotton:										
Adjustment or conservation	$181,025,000	$115,226,000	$120,451,000	$86,884,000	$68,742,000	$142,595,000	$118,817,000	$102,564,000	$97,251,000	$78,833,000
Parity				39,771,000		123,000,000	96,195,000	95,752,000	87,706,000	
Total	181,025,000	115,226,000	120,451,000	126,655,000	68,742,000	265,595,000	215,012,000	198,316,000	184,957,000	78,833,000

You will note this crop has had a total subsidy of over $1,544,812,000.

They grow this in Tennessee, too. I will not enumerate all the domestic subsidies for this crop. It will take too long. Some of the subsidies are as follows: as high as 2½ cents per pound, or $12.50 per bale, paid for export bounty; this export bounty as much as $37,000,000 in one year; insurance of crop; uses for distribution of pillows and mattresses just before elections; selling stored cotton for a little over half its value for making insulation material—this is a new one—and, oh yes, loans, loans, and loans. Remember these are all a part of the foreign agricultural policy as they use the funds collected from imports largely from livestock and its products to put this cotton in foreign trade.

The article by Mr. GORE further states that "if we produced at home all the wool, hides, and skins we need, we would normally have large surpluses of meat." Now, is not that something to worry about? Would not it be terrible to have livestock products to export, especially when we are appropriating five to seven million dollars a year to promote soil-depleting crops like cotton, tobacco, and other basic crops. You can see these cash crop subsidy obtainers are allergic to livestock and livestock farming.

I note the article mentions fox imports. Here are the facts about this livestock product:

Fox-pelt exports

Total fox-pelt imports:	
1929	654
1931	2,001
1933	1,205
1936	15,789
1937	25,994
1938	16,468
1939	133,125

This shows over eight times as many imported in 1939 as in 1938. Also shipments were coming from a foreign country that was subsidizing fox-pelt production. Here we had an infant industry, just getting started, nearly ruined temporarily by a 50-percent reduction in the duty. Of course, tobacco was receiving from ten to forty million dollars domestic subsidy, so no doubt the tobacco farmers in Tennessee would not be so critical of the duty reduction as the fox breeder who was having his market ruined and without the blessings of a New Deal subsidy for future generations to pay. They asked only a chance at the American market. If they had had a crop which had been on an export basis and if they had had a total domestic subsidy of $43,950,000 and received as high as 18 percent of the value of their crop in dollars, like tobacco did in one year, as a subsidy out of the United States Treasury for future generations to pay, possibly nothing would have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to disturb our colleague. Foxes evidently are raised in the wrong place geographically, though climatically it is necessary to grow them in the North.

The article says that we exported over 10 percent of our automobiles in 1937. The official facts are that we produced 3,884,223 cars and chassis in 1937 and exported only 229,436, or less than 6 percent. The auto manufacturer will have to export all the cars he has been selling the American farmer if they continue to give the farmers' market away. Here are the facts:

Motor vehicles: United States production and exports, 1937

Passenger cars and chassis:	
Production:	
Number	3,884,223
Value	$2,309,215,091
Exports of new vehicles:	
Number	229,486
Value	$134,814,725

Source: Tariff Commission

If the reciprocal trade treaties are so wonderful, why do not their proponents hew a little closer to the line in their discussions.

I am tired of listening to and reading about the wonders of the reciprocal trade treaties. We all know the State Department is allergic to customhouses. We also know that Mr. Hull has been in a strategic position during the past few years to put his own free-trade plans into operation—the same plans he could not sell his colleagues the 25 years he was a Member of Congress. It has cost the livestock farmers of America millions of dollars.

Let us have answers to some of these questions:

First. If the Tariff Act of 1930 is so nefarious, why does not the New Deal repeal it? Certainly there have been enough rubber-stamp Congresses to do it. Why criticize it and still keep it? Why?

Second. Why do you keep a 7 cents per pound duty on peanuts, which is twice the normal cost of production and more than any peanut crop has been worth the past 20 years? Are only livestock and livestock products to see a reduction in duty to fill New Deal aims while they spend billions on soil-depleting crops like cotton and tobacco? Why such a high tariff on peanuts and then subsidize it in addition by a domestic program? If lowering of duty is desirable what excuse have you to offer for not lowering this one?

Third. If lower duties are desirable, why did not the New Deal lower the duty on cotton cloth and cotton yarns by 50 percent like they did on much of the livestock?

Fourth. Why did the New Deal raise the duty on crab meat? Is it produced in the right section politically? Or why?

Fifth. Why not tell the people that a large percentage of the commodities already come into this country duty free? Isn't it nearly 40 percent?

Sixth. Why continually try to tell the farmer how much the treaties do for them when you should be telling them what they have done to them.

Seventh. Why is it necessary to subsidize some States from 25 to 30 percent of the total annual value of their crops?

Eighth. If the New Deal foreign and domestic agricultural program is so wonderful, why did butter average less than 26 cents per pound and cheese only 13 cents per pound the first 10 years this administration had control of Congress? Why did butter average 39.9 cents per pound and cheese 20.2 cents per pound the 10-year period before the New Deal?

Ninth. How do you suppose the American farmer ever produced the billion-bushel wheat crop in 1915 before he had even ever heard about the New Deal? He has not since.

Mr. GORE talks about two-way trade. Under the New Deal it is one-way trade as far as agriculture is concerned. We have agricultural products coming in but few going out; we have few dollars coming into the United States Treasury but many going out. If the New Deal in its domestic and foreign agricultural commerce ends up by following huge domestic subsidies by an embargo on imports, can much be said for the efficacy as an instrument to maintain or encourage a good-neighbor policy?

Senator Chandler and His Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE B. BATES

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Kentucky Irish-American:

SENATOR CHANDLER AND HIS CRITICS

Despite the continued attacks of the Courier-Journal, Senator "HAPPY" CHANDLER continues to win public esteem and his course

in the farm bloc legislation was just another exhibition of courage on the part of our junior Senator. The President intimated that some of the legislators "passed the buck" in dodging a direct vote on the farm bloc veto. Not so, Senator CHANDLER. He stated publicly that he thought the farm bill was a bad bill, and although he came from a farming State, he would oppose its passage.

The Courier-Journal omitted mention of "HAPPY'S" courageous stand on the farm bill veto, but attacked him viciously for supporting the McKellar bill, which provides that Senate confirmation be necessary for appointees whose salaries are $4,500 or more. Here again, the public will applaud the Chandler position as the Government departments have been overcrowded with a lot of crackpot professors and efficiency experts, who manage to sneak into some fat-salaried job and give out the statement that they are "making a sacrifice of their time to win the war."

President Roosevelt and Cabinet members are blamed for these "phonies" who get these so-called civil-service and merit appointments from some crackpot university college professor, who has managed to become a department head at Washington. The "phonies" come from every college or university, Louisville furnishing a few, and it is from this class of crackpots that we receive regulations of the "don't-slice-the-bread" pattern. Senator MCKELLAR and Senator CHANDLER are on the right track. Let the Senate investigate how and why the "traveling professors" are put on the public pay roll.

In the attempt to discredit Senator CHANDLER, the poor old overworked League of Women Bolters was called into session to draft resolutions censuring the Senator for his support of this sensible bill. The League of Women Bolters are stooges for the traveling professors and reds, who address the league at the regular meetings—and stay for lunch. The newspaper dictators sound the alarm when they want Senator CHANDLER or some other public official criticized, and like old fire horses, the League of Women Bolters responds to the alarm. "Happy" need not worry over the league criticism as no one takes the members seriously and their political strength is on a par with their coaches—the newspaper dictators.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD KNUTSON

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, on April 23, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] appeared before the Ways and Means Committee at which time he discussed reciprocal trade pacts at some length. His remarks showed a grasp of the subject that was truly impressive. They were doubly helpful because what he had to say, and the suggestions Mr. KLEBERG made were based on personal experience and observation. His tribute to the case is a gem that should be made a part of the permanent record and it was for that purpose that I asked the House on yesterday for permission to have Mr. KLEBERG's statement inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend its reading to every reader of the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD M. KLEBERG, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

I do not want to take very much of your time. The matters which I desire to call to your attention are matters which have to do with certain facts which apparently heretofore have played no very important part in the development of the so-called reciprocal trade treaties or agreements.

In the first place, in order to present what I have in mind, I think it wise to call the committee's attention to the fact that 2 major elements over which man has no control and which cannot be affected by legislation have more to do with human beings and their ability to produce than anything else; those are climate and soil.

Now, I speak with particular reference to trade agreements insofar as they affect this hemisphere. When you analyze the situation involved in this hemisphere, you find that you have two major zones to deal with: the Temperate Zone, which is divided into two parts; we occupy the northern part of it, and the southern part of South America. We do not have anything to do with the Frigid Zone as yet. And there is a large area lying in between known as the tropic zone, beginning in the southern part of Mexico, including Central America and Brazil, down to where the coffee zone in Brazil comes to an end. It can be best delineated by drawing a line across Brazil from east to west, just south of Sao Paulo, including, of course, the great State of Rio Grande do Sul in Brazil, and carrying straight on through to the Pacific Ocean.

In that central area, the Tropical Zone, the vast majority of the production of that zone is complementary to our economy and what we produce, and we have need for it. It is probably the least developed area today of the truly productive part not only of this hemisphere but of this world; in rubber, bananas, cocoa, quinine, silk, essential oils, mandioca, and all those products which fit into our economy here.

For several reasons there has been what might be stated as merely a natural development. There has been no real application of scientific endeavor nor effort to develop the productivity of those countries.

Brazil, in the main, could, without much effort, but with some essential aid, be the greatest rubber- and silk-producing country in this world; and you gentlemen know that we need rubber and silk.

Now, for a moment, let us look to the other end of it and deal, for purposes of exemplification and clarity, with the facts havings to do with the most productive country in the Southern Temperate Zone, Argentina. In the Argentine, you find a highly productive belt, something over 1,000 miles long and several hundred miles wide and, by comparison, we have no such area of production in this country, in our zone.

I know whereof I speak. At the present time, in Argentina, they are confronted with a terrific cataclysm. They are having a very severe drought, probably the worst one in their history. For the first time, Argentina is not even close to par in the production of things which she produces: Beef, corn, wheat, rice; all of those things that are highly competitive to our economy.

Part of the Temperate Zone that is in Latin America is in the part which I did not mention, in Mexico. Mexico is potentially a great power in the production of livestock. Mexico, for many years, due to internal troubles, has never done anything more than what might be termed as piddling. They piddled with the livestock business. They do not have many cattle in Mexico now. But they have more than they have had heretofore.

So, when you take that picture and look at what you have to deal with, from the standpoint of climate and soil and productivity without man's effort, you find that in the Tropical Zone you have a complementary economy, and in the Temperate Zone, in South America, you have a highly competitive economy; competitive not only because of soil and climate, but because of history; the customs, the habits, the actual economic state of the peoples that inhabit those countries.

In Argentina, you have no high industrial development. The beef-cattle industry is the principal industry in Argentina. The hides from Argentina are shipped to Europe and are tanned and reshipped back to Argentina, where they are converted into shoes and leather goods.

That is one of the major industries in Argentina at present, the making of leather goods out of hides that have been shipped across the ocean and tanned and shipped back.

You know what happens to their corn? I am not going to go into that. Members of this committee are thoroughly conversant with the way things are going down there.

Now, it occurs to me that the object of these reciprocal-trade agreements is to develop to the utmost of our ability the recreation of proper relationships among the peoples of this hemisphere. You cannot do that, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, in the case of the Argentine by extending to them a paternalistic, though friendly, hand. It cannot be done.

The people of the Argentine are just as highly educated as the people of these United States and, in the main, more highly educated. They are a very proud; they are a very sensitive people; and they are essentially of Latin extraction.

The Italian element is the largest element in the Argentine, without taking into consideration the Spanish, which is the background; there is more Spanish blood in the Argentine, of course, than all the rest put together. But in the case of the Italian group, those people migrated to the Argentine through the years, and they came from a crowded country—Italy. The German immigration was from a crowded country. Upon their arrival in that country, a land of open spaces, blessed immeasurably with productive power, and coming, as I say, from a crowded area into a country where the people were willing to accept them, they immediately, rapidly, willingly, and enthusiastically became a part of those people.

They stayed there. They became a part not only of the social life, but of the business life, and finally a part of the political life. Both Italy and Germany have exerted a major effort; partly it was a deliberate effort, in recent years, but in the past it was more or less a kind of natural result of what was going on.

The trade that Argentina has had heretofore has been primarily and objectively with the old country. Why? That is very patent. The products of the Argentine: wheat, corn, wool—the things that we deal in here—they were commodities that were needed in Europe and they were not needed here.

Add to that this great influx of people to the Argentine to which I have referred. One-fifth of the people of the Argentine, approximately, are of Italian extraction. There is a very high percentage of Germans; not of the Nazi German—do not misunderstand me. I am talking about the old-type German, who was highly industrious, highly thrifty, highly educated; who spoke several languages,

and, coming out of his crowded country, he enthusiastically did his best to become a good citizen of the Argentine.

The trade of the Argentine has historically been trade with the old country, a condition with reference to the Argentine which we should welcome to a certain degree. And I suggest to you that there is a way to do a good-neighbor part, a constructive part, with reference to the Argentine, by making concessions, if concessions are to be made, in providing Argentina with ways and means of getting her production over to Europe; assisting her as a friend, and as a clearing house to develop the ability to transport her enormous production in a service which must be done in the rehabilitation of war-torn Europe, Asia, and Africa.

With reference to the other countries, in the consideration of reciprocal trade agreements, it seems to me that the Congress heretofore has not had quite enough to do, Mr. Chairman, with the proposition of seeing to it that this Government, through its representations, at least accords with and operates under the expressed intention of the Congress of the United States.

Policy making for the Government of the United States in foreign affairs is historically and constitutionally a function of the executive branch. But in the case of treaties, treaties of major importance, unilateral treaties, to say the least, have been treaties in which the Congress of the United States has participated at least to the extent of requiring Senate ratification.

There is no reason on this earth, Mr. Chairman, in the development of this great program which we have assumed—not because of a desire to do so but because of the power which gave us what we have, our life, our liberty, and our reason; that particular Deity whom we worship has ordained apparently that this Nation through its development, under the exercise of friendly reason and enterprise, into a nation upon which the eyes of the world are directed—I say there is no reason why, in the development of this great program, certain things cannot be done first.

In the war effort we are saddled unquestionably and inescapably with the job of doing our part toward the rehabilitation of the world. We ought to do that soundly, not as a Santa Claus. I am speaking earnestly, Mr. Chairman. We ought to do it with a knowledge of the facts. We ought to do it in a manner which would be appreciated and which would add to the respect to which this Nation is entitled, for the part which it has been forced to play in looking forward into the future, to the operation of these treaties.

The acceptance by a country of help, as a mendicant, as one who needs and must have alms and charity, and having the hand of opportunity extended to it—those are two different things. Feelings between countries, after all, Mr. Chairman, are merely a translation through their respective governments of the actual feelings of people in those two countries, or more countries, toward each other.

Mr. Chairman, I made two trips to South America. This is the first statement I have ever made on this matter. I made reports to the responsible agencies of the Government that were interested, of what I had found, and had numbers of conferences with them.

But, despite that, the recommendations which I am going to boil down for you gentlemen here have not yet been undertaken.

I think it highly proper for the Congress of the United States, if it is to act upon the proposition of extending reciprocal trade agreements, to indicate, within certain limitations, its desire, as representative of the people of the United States, as to just what lines of endeavor should be undertaken by the executive branch in bringing about these reciprocal trade agreements.

I believe there should be some limitation upon the exercise, if you please, Mr. Chairman, of possibly too charitable an attitude on the part of those who represent this Government and are empowered to make these agreements.

You know, charity is a funny thing. It works at its origin, at its inception, sometimes in a political way. But in the long run, finally the money you spend, if it has been spent strictly as charity and with a superior attitude which this Government has heretofore adopted with reference to some of these other countries, finally becomes translated into realities, and it becomes, instead of a friend maker, an enemy maker.

We had a gentleman testifying here a moment ago who has represented the dairy industry for a number of years. I do not know whether it occurred to him or not, but the United States, in addition to being the arsenal of democracy, and in addition to being the agency which produces the things upon which those nations who are striving to regain liberty, and others to save their liberty and respect, have to depend, the United States has become an international milk cow, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has become what?

Mr. KLEBERG. An international milk cow. She is being milked by too many milkers. I do not want the United States to be looked at by people who have every right to be our friends, and who want to be our friends—I do not want he to be looked at as a bovine.

I want the people of Argentina, I want the people of Mexico, to continue to look at the United States of America for what the United States of America is—a strong, a dependable ally and friend, but one that demands and is entitled to respect.

The outcome of the operation of a properly worked out set of reciprocal trade agreements between those countries is not in doubt, if you go at it on a business basis. That is, if you go at it with an objective, and a set of limitations which you able gentlemen can write into the proposed extension, that with reference to those operations, for instance, in the Temperate Zone every effort be made to complement our economy, through cooperation, by aiding them in doing their part, as Christians and as humanitarian people, in rehabilitating through their great productive enterprise the nations that are in need on the other side in Europe. And when they fall short, if there is anything we can add to it, we shall; but only until they have done their part will we go into that field.

And we should tell them the reasons, the true reasons, and not sidetrack the question, as to why, for instance, we feel that it would be inimical to the best interests of both Argentina and of the United States to permit Argentina to come in, for instance, with her cattle, her livestock, her abundance of corn and feed and stuff of that sort.

I do not want to take too much time, but I think it is important for you gentlemen to have a slant on the diversity that exists between the status occupied by the cows in Argentina and that of the cows in the United States, and of certain pertinent facts that will be here until certain things happen, which I will describe briefly in just a moment.

In the United States of America, the cow is probably the greatest agent and adjunct to a continuity of freeman's government that we have.

The cow is the greatest friend to the capitalistic system; which, by the way, gentlemen, is the only system under the sun where men can retain their freedom and can function to the fullest extent of their God-given reason, in its application to free enterprise and the building of a great country.

That is why this country occupies the position that it does occupy. Now, why is the cow of the United States different from the cow of the Argentine?

In the first place, if you will take the average acreage necessary in the United States of America to produce a cow, and then take that same acreage to the Argentine, you will find that they can produce four cows on it.

Add to that that they can produce four cows on it simply because of a different status between Mrs. Argentine Cow and Mrs. United States Cow.

You can start in the woods in Maine; in the Pacific Northwest, on a crisp, cold morning, when the loggers are out in the field to cut trees, and in your own minds visualize the manpower-hours that are expended in felling the trees; the manpower-hours in moving those trees down streams or on slides or whichever you will, to great sawmills; the manpower-hours employed in those sawmills in converting those great trees into usable lumber that goes into the building of farmhouses and barns that attend Mrs. United States Cow. Then take the manpower and labor that is necessary to throw those barns and those houses together; the fences, the rails, the corrals, the great stockyards, the stock cars that cover this country; the raw material and the manpower required to convert it into a usable and finally finished article that only the cow of the United States has to have because of the status that she occupies.

Let us look at the other side of the picture. Take the manpower-hours of the miners that produce the product to provide the system of rails and spikes and clamps and hinges——

Mr. KNUTSON. And stanchions——

Mr. KLEBERG. And stanchions and chassis, and things that go into automobiles—trucks and freight cars, over this country, that haul only cows and the products of the cow; the great refrigerator cars that are used to transport the products of the American dairy industry.

Take the amount of man-hours that go into the development of the original materials that go into the great creameries of this country; their separators and their great churns; in their bottling plants. And take your butcher knives and forks and other articles of that kind. Well, I am not going to go through the whole list. But let us look at the cornfields and the manpower-hours used in raising corn; the manpower-hours used to raise wheat; the manpower-hours used to raise cottonseed and to convert that cottonseed into cake and meal.

When you really go into it you see that Mrs. United States Cow, because of the difference in the situation in this country, is not only the agent of capitalism, and one of the things that keeps us free, but at the same time, without her as a foster mother in this country, we would not be in very hot shape, would we?

Let us look at the facts, and let us look at them in the face rather than beat around the bush.

In the Argentine they do not have big barns. In the Argentine, the industrialization of the beef and dairy cattle industry is in its infancy. The byproducts down there are a bagatelle compared with what we produce.

Out there they broadcast maize; on a field, during a dormant period; on a pasture after a regular growth of alfalfa. And you see cattle walking on those ranges without barns, feeding on hard grain feed, and there is not a finer balanced feed on this earth.

They do not require any troughs. They do not require any labor to feed them. God, and what He gave them, feeds them.

You bring in these immense herds and they look like they stepped out of a show barn. The cow down there does not work for the people; the people work for the cow.

Mr. KNUTSON. Are they white faces, most of them?

Mr. KLEBERG. They have the finest Herefords, the finest Shorthorns, the finest Angus

cattle, taken in bulk, in my opinion, that can be found in big countries anywhere in the world.

Mr. DINGELL. Why do we not have them here?

Mr. KLEBERG. We do have them here.

Mr. DINGELL. I mean to approach what they have.

Mr. KLEBERG. We do not have the climate and we do not have the soil.

Mr. DINGELL. We started with scrubs, whereas they started with thoroughbreds, when they did start.

Mr. KLEBERG. Of course, all of their economy, I repeat, was based on the influx of people from the old country. That is one of the major reasons. So far as the cattle industry is concerned, beef cattle all came from England and Scotland, and the types made during the years when that great industry was being built still exist.

Mr. REED. They had nothing but scrub cattle for about four centuries.

Mr. KLEBERG. That is right, Mr. Chairman; I do not want to go on at too great length, but I do feel, Mr. Chairman, when you look at the two cows, Mrs. Argentine Cow and Mrs. United States Cow, I think I have made out a case to show you a definite and distinct difference between the two.

Let us say something else about it. Mrs. Cow, in addition to being what I have described her to be, is something else in this country. She forms one of the most important stones in sustaining the credit structure upon which this country of ours depends.

Of the one-billion-nine-hundred-million-odd acres in continental United States, 74 percent of that real property is used by Mrs. Cow, and whenever the earning power of real property, as you gentlemen know so well, gets below its valuation for taxable purposes and as collateral for debt, you have not got very good credit. Let us not forget that.

About 57 percent of the cash return from all the products of what we term the fields is converted into cash through Mrs. Cow, leaving the rest of the livestock out. I am giving you statistics that will bear inspection.

When you indulge in debate or discussion of a proposition of endangering such an agency to the point of destruction by, for instance, the abrogation of the sanitary regulations that are being discussed over here in the Senate—that would not help Argentina and it would not help mutual understanding.

Take the hoof-and-mouth disease in the Argentine. The average death rate from that disease, due to the combined conditions of climate and soil, runs from 6 to 11 percent; that is, 6 percent at the low and 11 percent at the top

In the four outbreaks that we have had here it has run between 98 and 100 percent in the infected herds. Now, some will ask, Why? It is the same germ. I guess it is. Nobody has discovered that germ. Nobody has isolated it. Consequently, there is no immunizing agent, no serum, and no cure for it.

But here is why. Eleven months out of the year in Argentina on the cattle ranges there is available succulent green feed, soft feed which a cow with a sore mouth can eat. And in the Argentine Mrs. Cow does not walk, at the outside, quite three-quarters of a mile to water over the whole country.

In the United States of America Mrs. Cow walks over 2 miles, and she walks on hard ground, and for only 2 months of the year does she have available—that is, in the average year, in this country—green food to eat.

Now, a cow with a sore mouth cannot eat hard, dry food. And a cow with sore feet cannot walk 2 miles.

I am reducing this down to the practical facts.

Now, to permit a repetition of what has happened before and what we know will happen again is something that is silly. This matter that I am talking to you about has been presented to prominent men in the Argentine beef cattle industry. They understand it, and accept it.

We would have no more trouble down there about their insistent demand on shipping us either live or chilled beef; not one bit. That is, if we did so both in understanding and a willingness to aid them in their problem as they are willing to aid us.

They are not going to bother us if we treat them right; I can tell you that now. But the only way you can treat them right is to fix it so, in the limitations granted under which reciprocal trade agreements can be drawn so that they will not be mistreated by a lot of folks who do not know anything about their background, their customs, their habits, or any other darn thing, and whose acts and activities and dealings breed disrespect for the United States, and unfriendliness rather than friendliness.

I wish I had more time, Mr. Chairman. But there is a little pamphlet that was drafted, as a result of the combined conferences that we had, during a trip that the writer of this report made through the South and Central American countries, and I think it would be well for you to include those in your hearings. I am going to leave a copy of it here.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be made a part of the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Bulletin of the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, fourth series, vol. 13, March 1, 1942, No. 3]

"THE AGRICULTURAL ECONOMY OF CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

"(By E. J. Kyle, dean, school of agriculture, the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, College Station, Tex.)

"This tour was sponsored by Nelson Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs; with the Standard Oil Co., and Anderson, Clayton & Co., cooperating.

"The primary purposes of the tour were—

"I. To study the agricultural economy of the countries visited.

"II. To study their agricultural educational systems.

"III. To promote better relations.

"Mileage traveled: The tour required the traveling of 19,812 miles in regular flight by plane which, together with detours made on account of unfavorable weather, totaled over 20,000 miles; over 2,000 miles were traveled by automobile; and about 1,000 miles by train.

"The principal countries visited: Mexico, Costa Rica, Venezuela, Trinidad, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Peru, and Panama.

"Reports prepared as a result of this tour include: To Nelson Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs: The Agricultural Economy of Central and South America; Agricultural Education in Central and South America; Personnel, Press, and Public Announcements Relating to the Tour.

"To the Standard Oil Co.: A Study of the Agricultural Economy of Venezuela.

"To Anderson, Clayton & Co.: Analysis of the Cotton Industry in Brazil.

"PART I

"The influence of climate and soil

"The two factors that have exerted the most profound influence throughout the centuries upon man, upon animals, and upon plants in all parts of the world have been climate and soil. These factors are fundamental; that is to say, they cannot be changed by man, especially over wide areas. The effects of these factors are demonstrated abundantly in a study of the agricultural economy of Central and South America.

"There are two other factors that have had a strong influence over man in Central and South America. These are the Catholic religion and the topography of the country. These two factors are not so fundamental as climate and soil, especially in other sections of the world, but in the Central and South American countries they have exerted, and are destined to continue to exert, a powerful influence for many years to come.

"The people of Central and South America and our relations with them

"In order to secure a broad and comprehensive understanding of the agricultural economy of Central and South America and then be able to analyze it and properly coordinate it with our own economy, it is necessary to know first the peoples and their customs.

"I found the people of Central and South America to be kind, friendly, and exceedingly gracious. They are generally of two classes, the wealthy and the low-income groups. The wealthy group is Spanish and Portuguese, especially in Brazil. The low-income group is made up principally of Spaniards, Indians, and Negroes, and a mixture of the three. A large percentage of the people living in most of the Central and South American countries belong to the low-income group.

"In the southern countries, especially in southern Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, and Chile, there are large numbers of comparatively recent immigrants. These have come primarily from Italy, Spain, Portugal, and Germany. It is highly important for us to understand and evaluate properly the ability of these people to coordinate themselves with the people of their adopted country as compared to the way our own countrymen fit into the situation.

"A few of our countrymen in Latin America are not there with the thought of making permanent homes. This means that they are not subject to the same restraint in their conduct that they would be if they were among people whom they expected to have as neighbors for the rest of their lives. It also means that in many cases they are not interested primarily in building up a position or business for an indefinite future, but rather in making, as soon as possible, a stake with which to return to this country. As a result they are likely to be less considerate of the nationals than would be expected of an average North American. They are there to take rather than to contribute. Some of our citizens, however, are exerting a fine influence in both their business and social contacts.

"I had an opportunity to study carefully the operations of the Standard Oil Co.; Anderson, Clayton & Co.; and the General Electric Co. in most of the countries where they operate. They are doing many constructive things for the governments and for the people in the countries in which they are located. Their influence is wholesome.

"The failure of some of our people to fit into the situation seems to be the case in equal or slightly less degree with the British, a shade less with the Germans, and much less in the case of the south Europeans. These are logical differences when we consider that there is no overcrowding in this country, that the Englishman typically dislikes separation from his own island, that Germany is a little more overcrowded than England, and that the southern European countries are all overcrowded and poor. The south Europeans, of course, find less change of customs and culture, since the Catholic Church has been the principal artificial influence from the Colonial days until this time.

"These obstacles and handicaps, as compared to those of the Europeans, cannot be entirely overcome, since they spring from real causes—our wealth and ample space here versus overcrowding and poverty in Europe and the community of Catholic and Latin culture which we do not share. This difficulty, however, can be mitigated and partly overcome by national policies which will pro-

mote more generous contributions from our people to the development of Latin American resources and human advancement. It is certain that much good can be done by the increase of proper contacts and understanding and sympathy through educational exchanges, awarding of scholarships, and promotion of the right kind of tourism.

"I see no reason to expect that the source of immigration to Latin America will change materially. Certainly there will be no flood of immigration to Latin America from our own still undeveloped country. I believe, on the other hand, that a steady flow of immigrants will continue to come from continental Europe and undoubtedly will be speeded up as an aftermath of this war. Artificial efforts, to be sure, may be made to curb this immigration, but I believe that forces actuating it will be too powerful to be greatly checked. The more the south Europeans move in, the more firmly southern Europe will influence the nature and culture of Latin America.

"It is entirely unrealistic to dream that the commercial relations of temperate South America will turn under normal conditions toward this continent and away from Europe, because climate and soil make them our competitors and make their economy naturally complementary to the economy of Europe. The coffee zone in Brazil is the southernmost zone which is in any important respect complementary to our agricultural economy.

"I think, therefore, that efforts to promote an economy complementary to ours can be directed with a strong chance of success chiefly toward the tropical countries. I believe, too, that it is impellingly important to direct them there. I do not believe there is a more pitifully unscratched part of the world than Central and South America, north of 20 degrees south. It is surprising that some of the temperate countries which are hungry for materials have not already fought their way into those countries, and it seems to me a kind of natural law that sooner or later they will do this unless the United States cooperates with its neighbors to develop them in the common interest of humanity

"It seems to me that the key to closer relations with the people of temperate South America, as of tropical America, is to recognize that our common destiny can be achieved only if we cooperate in developing our countries and in encouraging and protecting each other. This would mean a division between them and us of the prerogative and responsibility for the development of the whole Hemisphere and an alliance by which we would assure them protection against aggression from outside their continent.

"We must go much further than this. When we have won this war, which we most assuredly will do, we must be prepared to use the full force of our wealth and influence in aiding them in the further development of their natural resources and in so placing their surplus products on the markets of the world that there will be no disastrous competition between them and us.

The agricultural zones of Central and South America

"There are two great agricultural zones lying within the Central and South American countries. They are the Tropical and Temperate Zones. Climate and soil have made them immutable; that is, unchangeable. Man, animals, and plants are dominated by them. It is absolutely essential that we understand and therefore place ourselves in harmony with the natural laws that govern these zones if our work is to be constructive in the development of a program that will be mutually beneficial to them and to us.

"1. The Tropical Zone: The Tropical Zone includes practically all the Central American countries and that part of South America lying north of the coffee zone in southern Brazil. These countries, with the exception of Brazil, are limited in areas and have small populations. A large percentage of the people are of the poorer class. Their natural resources, however, are potentially great as well as important, but they have never been developed properly. These countries are in great need of financial assistance, such as only the United States is capable of providing. This financing should be provided on a strictly business basis and should be administered with wisdom, fairness, and justice.

"The agricultural economy of the Tropical Zone is almost wholly complementary to our own; that is, there is no serious conflict between what the people of those countries produce and desire to sell to us and to the world and that which we produce.

"The chief agricultural products of the Tropical Zone are coffee, rubber, bananas, cocoa, sugar, quinine, pineapples, coconuts, silk, essential oils, mandioca or yuca, beans, corn, and many, many other products. Some of these could be made of great economic value to those countries and are of vital importance to our own economy. This is true of such important commodities as coffee, rubber, silk, and quinine. We should make every possible effort to assist all these countries in the development and marketing of these complementary products, because in doing so we will not only be rendering a valuable service to them but will be greatly strengthening our own public welfare.

2. The Temperate Zone: The Temperate Zone includes all that region of South America south of the coffee zone. The country is more thickly populated and better developed than in the Tropical Zone. The principal agricultural products of this section parallel, to a considerable extent, the main agricultural products that make up our own commercial agricultural economy. I have reference particularly to commodities such as corn, wheat, beef, cotton, flax, and wool.

"These products can be produced in those countries considerably cheaper than they can in our own country, by reason of a more favorable soil and climate, and cheaper labor.

"Conflict of interests: It is vitally important that this country avoid disastrous competition with the countries of the Temperate Zone in marketing our agricultural commodities. I believe that this harmful conflict can be avoided by proper planning ahead.

"The case of Brazil: Brazil probably has more and a greater variety of natural resources than any other country in the world. Many of these are agricultural and almost wholly undeveloped There are vast stretches of Brazil that have hardly been visited by civilized man. Most of the agricultural products of Brazil are complementary to our own economy. We should assist her to the limit in the development of these products and in placing them on the markets of the world, including our own

"Many of these products—for example, coffee, rubber, silk, and quinine—are of tremendous importance to the economic welfare of this country. Brazilian climate and soil and the labor situation seem to be ideal for the production of these important commodities. I am convinced that, with the proper encouragement and financial assistance, Brazil can become the leading producing country in the world, especially of rubber and silk.

"The people of Brazil are kind and friendly and easy to get acquainted with. They give an immediate and favorable response to a sympathetic and understanding approach from a citizen of the United States. All classes of their citizens know and greatly admire President Roosevelt and Cordell Hull.

"By making the right approach it would be an easy matter to secure, to even a greater extent than prevails now the full and sincere friendship and cooperation of the people and Government of Brazil.

"In my judgment, it is impossible to overestimate the importance of the friendship of Brazil. In many respects it is the key country among all of the South American countries in guarding against an invasion of the United States from the south. Brazil stretches from the Atlantic Ocean on the east almost to the Andes Mountains on the west. It would be practically impossible for any country to invade us from the south as long as Brazil remains friendly.

"c. The Case of Argentina: Argentina is easily our most difficult problem among all the countries of Central and South America. It is not, however, in my judgment, our most important and vital problem.

"Our people and our Government have made many mistakes in dealing with the people and government of Argentina. These mistakes have been made either through a misunderstanding on our part of their social, economic, and political position, or our refusal to face the real facts and deal with the situation in a just and businesslike way.

"The people of Argentina on the other hand have not understood us or our agricultural economy and for this reason have sorely misjudged our intentions.

"Here are the factors that must be given full and careful consideration before we can hope to arrive at a solution that will be fair and just to both sides in the settlement of this embarrassing situation:

"1. The people of Argentina are principally of Spanish origin. These people are proud, sensitive, individualistic, and exceedingly ambitious. They are well educated and intelligent. The standard of education is high throughout all of Argentina. These are all admirable traits and accomplishments.

"2. There are many immigrants in Argentina. They have come mostly from southern Europe. Nearly one-fifth of her people are Italians. There are also many Germans and Japanese. The Germans have trained the army. All of the immigrants, especially the Italians and those from Spain, have fitted into the religious, social, and economic life of their adopted country better than the North Americans.

"3. Agriculture is the pride and glory of Argentina. The climate and soil of this great agricultural region is similar in many respects to that of our Corn Belt and the southwestern section of the United States.

"4. The Agricultural Belt of Argentina lies in the center of the country. It is over one thousand miles in length and several hundred miles in width. It is level in topography with scarcely any waste land. The soil is fertile and easily worked. There is scarcely any erosion problem. The country has a supply of cheap labor and is traversed by good railways and highways which lead to the chief ports. It is undoubtedly one of the most favored agricultural regions of the world. The chief agricultural products of this highly favored region are, named somewhat in the order of their importance, beef, corn, flax, wheat, wool, and cotton. Many other commodities can be produced economically and in abundance, such as pork, soybeans, dairy and poultry products.

"5. All of these commodities can be produced in Argentina and prepared for the world markets at considerably less cost than similar products grown in the United States, due to a more favorable climate, soil, internal transportation, and cheap labor. The farmers and ranchmen are intelligent, progressive, and highly efficient. This, combined with the fact that they are operating in one of the world's most favored agricultural regions, puts them in a class almost to themselves as producers of the world's great staple foods and raiment.

"6. The difficult task of solving the agricultural problem of Argentina will therefore never be taken care of by opening to her the markets of the United States. Our markets are already overcrowded with identical products produced in this country. This would not be an advantage to Argentina in the long run, and certainly would not be to our advantage. It would simply place the two countries on a deadly competitive basis, in which we would have the advantage in planes and ships or means of transportation and they would have an advantage of cheaper production. This could only result in intense competition and keen rivalry which are the natural forerunners of misunderstandings, jealousy, and enmity.

"7. I am convinced that a plan can be developed which when put into effect will enable the United States to work and cooperate in peace and harmony not only with Argentina, but with all of the other Central and South American countries. Such a plan can be constructed only after a complete and full understanding of each other's social and political institutions and, above all, a thorough understanding of each other's economy, more especially agricultural economy. With these things in mind, I submit herewith—

Suggestions and recommendations on establishing and maintaining a sound and more lasting basis of friendship and cooperation with Central and South America by cooperating in marketing our agricultural products

"1. This war is going to be cruel and devastating in the extreme. It may last for years. Finally it may come to a life and death struggle between Germany and the United States, but we are going to win this war. No nation or combination of nations can defeat the United States.

"When this war closes, it is going to leave many of what were once the most powerful nations in the world completely paralyzed politically, socially, and economically. World commerce will be completely disrupted and broken. All fundamental organizations for the development and promotion of the agencies for the civilization of mankind will have been greatly weakened or perhaps totally destroyed. There will arise, therefore, from this world catastrophe an appealing and urgent opportunity for some nation to hold aloft the light of civilization, and point and lead the way back to a sane, sound, and just plan of life for all nations, even those whose treachery and barbarity have brought civilization to its lowest ebb in many centuries.

"When we win this war, we are going to be that nation. Yes; we are going to be the most powerful nation that has ever existed. We will be powerful in many ways, but chiefly in the number of planes and ships we will own, and the food and raiment we will have at our disposal.

"We should use these planes and ships and this food and raiment in feeding and clothing the peoples of the world and in restoring world commerce as it has never been before. We should go into the peace conference and suggest to all nations that:

"(a) The United States is going to deal henceforth with all nations on a strictly business basis. We are going to be firm, but just and fair.

"(b) We shall never permit another nation to rearm for invasion purposes.

"(c) Every nation will be free to choose its own religion, its own social order, and its own form of government.

"(d) No nation shall be deprived of the right to live economically, not even the conquered nations.

"(e) We propose to assist every nation with our planes and our ships in restoring world commerce and in feeding and clothing the prostrate countries.

"(f) We propose especially to assist Central and South America, first, in developing their natural esources to the utmost and, second, in placing exportable products on all the markets of the world.

"2. This program can be placed upon a practical and working basis by:

"(a) Setting up a commission of highly intelligent and well-qualified persons representing each country participating to work out a cooperative agreement.

"(b) A majority of this commission both from the United States and the countries participating should be practical and successful farmers and livestock men.

"(c) The members of this commission should first visit and carefully study the agricultural economy of each of the countries concerned.

"(d) They should then meet in convenient territory, say in Rio de Janeiro, and formulate their plans.

"(e) When completed, these plans should be submitted to each government for ratification.

"What this country sorely needs and will never reach its greatest prosperity without is a carefully selected group of intelligent and well-trained world traders who know their own people and their economy and the peoples and the economy of all other lands.

"3. As soon as this program is ratified by the different governments and the members of this commission have a thorough understanding of the economy of the Western Hemisphere, they should submit definite plans for exchanging their products with all other nations. A program should then be formulated so as to use our planes and ships in placing the agricultural commodities of the Western Hemisphere on all the markets of the world in a way that will avoid disastrous competition on our own markets as well as all others.

"4. There is much that we can do to improve the marketing conditions in the Western Hemisphere. We should be careful to purchase practically all of our noncompetitive products, including rubber and silk, from our neighbors. Our planes and ships should enable the Central and South American countries to trade more with each other to their mutual advantage.

"A striking illustration of how this might be done can be found in the case of Argentina on the one hand and Venezuela, Peru, and Ecuador on the other hand. Argentina produces beef, corn, wheat, and flax economically and in abundance. Under normal world conditions she has great difficulty in disposing of her surpluses in these products. Last year she burned in her furnaces over 8,000,000 tons of corn. She needs to dispose of her surpluses in these products on a reasonable basis. Argentina, however, produces petroleum products in small quantities.

"Venezuela, Peru, and Ecuador on the other hand are important petroleum-producing countries. They, however, have great difficulty in producing sufficient beef, wheat, and corn for their own needs. The living costs in Venezuela, for instance, are among the highest in the world, and the difficulty revolves principally around her inability to produce these three basic foods economically and in abundance. Venezuela, Peru, and Ecuador need to feed out or finish on grain the livestock they produce. There are, therefore, many reasons why they should sell their petroleum products to Argentina and take in return beef, wheat, and corn.

"Many more illustrations could be given showing the failure of these countries to take advantage of favorable opportunities for trade with each other.

"Aid in solving transportation problems

"We should contribute to the limit of our ability in strengthening the inland and coastwise transportation between the Central and South American countries. The topography of nearly all those countries makes it extremely difficult to transport, either by highway or railway, heavy and bulky freight north and south within each country and especially between countries. It would be practical, at the close of this war, however, to transport products of this nature on rivers and on railroads through mountain passes to the ports and then make delivery by boats and planes.

"No one has the vision at this time to comprehend fully and appreciate the part that planes are going to play in the commerce of the world following this war. The development of the plane is going to have a very important bearing on commerce all over the world and more especially in Central and South America where mountains and broad stretches of tropical country make land transportation impractical if not impossible.

"We, no doubt, have some difficult problems to work out and smooth over before we can hope to set up a practical and workable program for world commerce with the Central and South American countries that will benefit all concerned. I can see no good reason, however, why it cannot be done so as to include every nation in the Western Hemisphere.

"A suggested colonization plan

"Colonies from several of the European countries and Japan have settled on agricultural lands in some of the Central and Southern American countries. It is highly probable that some of these, if not all, have been subsidized by their home governments.

"It is my understanding that in nearly every instance the members of these colonies have become citizens of their adopted country. I received the impression that these colonies generally have been successful.

"Soon after the close of the Civil War several groups of our people left the United States and established colonies in different parts of Brazil. Some of the original members of these colonies are still living. I met and talked with some of them.

"These people have almost invariably made good citizens of their adopted country. They underwent severe hardships in the early days but most of them have been fairly successful. It might be advisable for the Government of the United States to undertake to send one or more colonies to certain of the Central and South American countries. I would suggest that the first location be made in Brazil.

"If we should make an attempt to establish any colonies, I would make the following sugestions:

"1. That the members of the colonies be selected with the greatest care.

"2. That young married farmers from the southwestern section of this country who have been members of 4-H and Future Farmer Clubs be selected.

"3. That each location be selected in advance by a competent committee from the United States working in cooperation with a similar committee representing the country where the colony is to be located.

"4. That each colony be subsidized by our Government for a certain period of years, which should not be less than 5 years.

"Student scholarships as a means for promoting better understanding and a more lasting basis of friendship between the United States and Central and South America

"We should at the earliest possible moment propose to the Central and South American countries:

"That, in order to secure a better and more permanent basis of friendship, and at the same time give them aid in the development of their resources, we are willing to establish 500 scholarships, at the value of $600 each, whereby their brightest and most deserving young men can come to this country and prepare themselves in our colleges and universities for leadership in agriculture and engineering and in veterinary medicine.

"In the countries I visited I explained this scholarship plan, and it was received with enthusiasm. Everyone thought it would do more than anything we could possibly do to bring about a more complete understanding and a more permanent bond of friendship.

"I am attaching a letter just received from a young man, a native of Venezuela, who was graduated last summer from the A. and M. College. This shows very clearly what may be accomplished by giving a young man an education in one of our colleges:

"'DEAN E. J. KYLE,
"'*The School of Agriculture,*
"'*Texas A. and M. College,*
"'*College Station, Tex.*

"'MY DEAR DEAN KYLE: Thinking that by this time you may be back from your tour through some of the South American countries, I have decided to write you this letter, my wishes being that you still be the same good and successful educator, a great builder of good characters. I hope that you consider my words as coming from deep into my heart and not as earthly manifestations of someone who may be speaking with the only purpose of pleasing an important man. I want you to know that I am highly indebted to you for all the considerations and signs of appreciation that you showed toward me.

"'Dean Kyle, I consider Texas A. and M. College as being my second home, and I am really proud of feeling that way. That school gave me so much—education, character, friends—that very, very often I feel homesick for it even in my own home. I really miss Aggieland, the sorrow of my heart being very many times converted into a few tears.

"'Indeed, I am grateful to the United States of America in general, to Texas A. and M. College in particular, and to you, affectionately. This is why in the present state of war between Japan and the United States (my second country) I wish that we could destroy the Japanese Empire and reduce it to ashes, even if I had to give my own life in order to achieve such a glorious and beautiful end. My heart spoke there also, I truthfully say.

"'Father and the rest of the family told me they had met you, and every one of them thinks you are a fine man—a character worth knowing.

"'Do you know how Anthony, my brother at Allen Academy, is doing? I hope that you take interest in the boy and consider him as your own son in any emergency case, such as those which this war may bring forth. You will take care of him whenever the case arises, will you not, Dean Kyle?

"'Very truly yours,
"'RALPH URDANETA,
"'*Villa Carmen No. 160, Bella Vista,*
"'*Maracaibo, Venezuela.*

"'DECEMBER 8, 1941.'"

Mr. KLEBERG. This is a study made on the economics affecting the United States, Central and South America, and made by one of our most eminent authorities in things agricultural and livestock probably in the United States, Dean E. J. Kyle, of the Agricultural and Mechanical College.

In addition to being a highly educated man, he has been a farmer. He was raised a ranch boy, and he is a student who has no ax to grind on this earth except that which serves the commonwealth of this country. I think it would be well worth the while of this committee to have this little pamphlet in the hearings because he has some very succinct suggestions there.

I do not agree with all the suggestions he makes, but I am positive that this committee should draft limitations as to differences in respective areas with reference to how far people should go in undertaking to make what are termed reciprocal-trade treaties.

Now, in the Central or Tropical Zone, the development and extensions of credit to aid those fellows to develop production that is complementary to our economy is fine. In the other, the Temperate Zone, a complete understanding of the situation and our willingness to turn over to them at very, very reasonable rates the surplus bottoms that we will have after this war for the distribution of their beef and aid them, too, in the development of their industrialization looking to the utilization of the entire carcass, the entire product of the Argentine cow—that, too, is fine. If I were to go into the business of making trade agreements with them, that is the way I would work. And I would work on the basis that we can help each other by making our economies entirely cooperative and noncompetitive. I would not look to charity or to the reactions which come from the extension of charity, which they do not want.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WEST. Mr. Chairman, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert a telegram in the record, following Mr. KLEBERG'S main statement, addressed to F. E. Mollin and signed by Claude McCan, president of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the matter referred to will be put in the record at this point.

The matter referred to is as follows:

VICTORIA, TEX., *April 19, 1943.*

F. E. MOLLIN,
Washington Hotel:

Would appreciate your representing the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association at hearing on the reciprocal treaties. Our attitude is expressed in a resolution passed by the convention last month as follows: "This association is strongly opposed to a further departure from established American principles and laws in the making of treaties or other agreement with foreign countries and protest against further extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act and protest against any treaty or agreement being made without the consent and concurrence of the Senate of the United States.

CLAUDE MCCAN,
President, Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. KLEBERG a question or two, to clear up in my own mind the intent and purpose of his discourse here today. As regards Brazil and Argentina, of course, I think the relationship between Brazil and the United States is particularly cordial and lends itself to a rather easy solution of the problems affecting both Nations, especially because the United States is in the Temperate Zone and Brazil is in the Tropics or the Torrid Zone.

But we are not so favorably situated with respect to the Argentine. I do not know that it is the fault of the United States, and yet I do not know that I want to blame it on the people of the Argentine, but one reason for it is the fact that the Argentineans, due possibly to the Italian and German influence in that country, have excluded themselves from the field of cooperation between the United States and the other American republics. But I think that is a matter that can be very easily ironed out.

There is a great sentiment, as you say, Mr. KLEBERG, in Argentina, which is intensely pro-United Nations and violently anti-Nazi. But what I want to clear up in my own mind is your intention with regard to these two nations and the reciprocal trade agreements of the future.

It is your purpose, as I take it, to try and stimulate, as far as it is possible, the production of rubber and silk and coffee and such products as we do not produce in this country, in the Republic of Brazil?

Mr. KLEBERG. In the tropics generally; not confining it entirely to Brazil, because there are a number of those other countries that likewise produce rubber and are great potential rubber and silk-producing areas.

Mr. DINGELL. But, on the other hand, as regards the exportable products of the Argentine, which, of course, parallel our production and are competitive with our Mrs. Cow, and our corn production, and the like, it is your purpose, I take it, that in the formulation and the consummation of any reciprocal-trade agreement with Argentina, rather than to try and arrange for any absorption of corn or cattle from that country into the United States, it might be better that they ship their exportable surpluses to Europe?

Mr. KLEBERG. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. Which, of course, is all right. Of course, those shipments now are interrupted.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will you allow me to interrupt right there? I do not want to make any recommendations as to what this great committee should do in drafting laws. But at the outset, insofar as any limitations are concerned, if you apply them as limitations respecting the tropical zone and clearly demark that zone, then the trade treaties which would affect areas, countries, and nations within the Temperate Zone could not hurt anybody's feelings, because you are dealing with a strict latitudinal division of the zones, to start with. That is point No. 1.

The other point is this. Take the Argentine situation. Are you dealing with that on the basis of fact? I make so bold here to state my feeling, on my responsibility as a Member of this House, that in the next election in the Argentine, the difficulty of the United States with reference to Argentina maintaining a relationship with the Axis Powers and her continuing to be what might be termed a "neutral" will come to an end. I think within 4½ months we will have a definite change in that situation. Certainly it would be pointless at this time to aim any barbed shaft at the Argentine whose people—and I went over it from one end to the other and criss-cross, and I talked with them in every walk of life; and I tell you, gentlemen, 90 percent of the people of the Argentine are solidly behind the United Nations. Our whole problem is political and has to do primarily with the influence of one man within the official executive branch of the Argentine Government; and that is the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, or the Secretary of State, of Argentina.

Mr. DINGELL. I am sure the members of this committee fully appreciate your position and recognize you as an expert in Latin-American affairs. Moreover, I think it is generally known in the Congress and elsewhere, where your name is known, when it comes to discussing cattle and the problems affecting the producers of cattle, without the question of a doubt, that you are an authority. But the reason I asked you the question was in order to clarify the matter in my own mind.

Mr. KLEBERG. I appreciate your asking me questions, and I am willing to answer them to the best of my ability.

Mr. DINGELL. I wanted to make clear what your purpose was. Incidentally, I want to say this for myself, that I take no umbrage at the present official attitude of the Argentine Government because I have some limited understanding of the fine feeling of those people down there. I do feel disappointed that they are not with the other 20 republics, but I am glad to hear you say, and make the prediction, that in the course of a few short months, Argentina will be on the side of the United Nations.

Mr. KLEBERG. I believe it firmly.

Mr. DINGELL. I think that is where her bread and butter lies. I think that is where her friends are in the majority. And I also believe that the present official attitude of

the Argentine Government does not reflect the opinions and the feelings of the rank and file of the people of that country.

Mr. KLEBERG. I think you will find, gentlemen, that by the development of the opportunity, which the United States alone can promote—which Argentina may avail herself of to go ahead as a business nation; not only to develop, but to utilize its production in aiding us in this problem; and we need them more than any other nation in this hemisphere—to aid us in this problem of making our economies cooperative rather than competitive, and to open the door of opportunity to Argentina to develop within herself the ability to transport her great production, because she produces not only food but the fiber which Europe is in need of—I say, by the development of that opportunity, we will be helping ourselves.

Everybody knows that in war-torn Europe today, the male of the species bovine is going to be so decimated that the rehabilitation of the cattle population in the areas where war has gone on, and in the countries where war is going forward, is going to be a major problem.

The great advantage which we will have, coming out of this great struggle, in solving that problem, will be in the development of rapid transit, in the curtailment of distances, in our concept of distances in hours rather than miles, through the use of the air.

You gentlemen will see, both from Argentina and from the United States, that in the field of artificial insemination, we will be able to do our best job, and that will have to be handled by air.

And I think you will find in the countries abroad a happy welcome to the suggestion or the idea of our willingness to aid them, at reasonable rates, in the rehabilitation of their herds.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to compliment you particularly on your attitude, as evidenced in your remarks before the committee, where you refer to the Latin-American people, the people of South America generally, as being a fine, a proud, and an intelligent and cultured people.

Mr. KLEBERG. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. Altogether too frequently people in the United States have made the serious and the sinful mistake of looking down upon those people, because they did not speak the English language.

Mr. KLEBERG. Of course, and they resented it.

Mr. DINGELL. It is a reflection, not upon them, but upon ourselves, and it has been one of the principal barriers between the peoples of the South American countries and ourselves. It was reflected in our trade balances. Many of our people who went down there looked down upon Latin Americans, right in their own countries. That has been very detrimental to our own business.

Mr. KLEBERG. You are correct. May I, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, make this observation, and it is prompted by what the distinguished gentleman, Mr. DINGELL, has just said: First, in order for us to do a sound and constructive job in working out reciprocal-trade agreements that will be of mutual benefit to the countries involved, it is necessary that the people on our side who formulate and work out these treaties be conversant with the habits, the customs, and the way of life of the people of those countries.

It is equally important to the people of those countries who make those trades to know our customs and habits, and our way of life in this country, and to understand it.

There is only one way, in my candid opinion, by which reciprocal-trade agreements can be worked out, so that they will maintain a high degree of mutual respect upon which real and lasting friendship and proper international relationships can be built. And that is this: I am going to make the recommendation, with reference to reciprocal-trade treaties, that there be selected in this country, and that other countries be invited to select, a not too cumbersome group of men who will be called upon first, pending the final working out of these agreements in the future, to make extended visits to and studies of these various countries; and to make recommendations, in the United States, to the State Department, if you please, as to what they should do along these lines. Otherwise you do not have the information.

Mr. KNUTSON. First of all I want to compliment you, Mr. KLEBERG, upon having made one of the finest statements ever presented to this committee in the time that I have been a member of it. And if you have no objection, I am going to put your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I want to send it out to my people.

Mr. KLEBERG. Thank you, sir.

Mr. KNUTSON. I have come to the conclusion that you and I hold about the same kind of views on reciprocity. But in order to satisfy myself, I would like to ask you this: Can you see any sense in our giving preferential treatment to the products of other countries, of which products we have an exportable surplus in this country?

Mr. KLEBERG. Well, as a matter of fact, I have never understood it. May I put it that way?

Mr. KNUTSON. You have never understood why.

Mr. KLEBERG. I have never understood why.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is it not pretty much—building up a commerce on that kind of a basis—like making our living by taking in each other's washing?

Mr. KLEBERG. I do not know that I would care to make any comment like that. The gentleman will excuse me from making such comments.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, I am making them, and you may take issue with that statement if you wish.

Let me see if you and I agree on this: Our great President, William McKinley, said, speaking on reciprocity:

"The end in view is always to be the opening of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and cannot produce ourselves, and which do not involve any loss of labor to our own people, but tend rather to increase their employment."

Do you agree with that?

Mr. KLEBERG. There is nothing unsound in that statement, but that does not cover it all.

Mr. KNUTSON. I agree; it does not cover it all.

Mr. KLEBERG. Not by a whole lot.

Mr. KNUTSON. In a few words, to quote the mayor's wife to the Queen of Belgium, it says a mouthful.

Mr. KLEBERG. President McKinley was a brilliant man, but I do not think it would take a very brilliant man, honestly, to figure that proposition out.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not, either.

Mr. KLEBERG. As a part of the deal. But, on the other hand, with reference to your first question, at the outset of this great world conflagration, with respect to some of the reciprocal trade agreements that are included in the group that you referred to, where we have given concessions in price, and so forth, to countries that were producing commodities of which we had a surplus in this country—as to that, I would like to say this, that at first, when they had no market and had to dispose of their stuff, it was highly appreciated. But speaking as one who has talked to men from countries that have had such agreements made with them, they became offended. That was unquestionably a charitable act at the outset. But it suddenly occurred to these people that, "By George, if we are going to be the objects of charity, then we had better be looking at this." They say, "This sort of thing is hurting our pride; it is hurting our respect; it is hurting our feeling toward ourselves." They do not like it. They would rather have it worked out on a different basis.

Mr. KNUTSON. In effect, it is trying to buy good will.

Mr. KLEBERG. You cannot buy friendship and good will, and keep it on that basis.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course not. Unfortunately there are those who think that good will is a marketable product.

Mr. KLEBERG. I do not think that among what might be termed "forms of life that reason"—human beings—you can purchase friendship. I am sincere in that statement. I believe that good will will come in this way. When a man is in desperate need and you help him, you give him something and tell him, "I have more of this than I need; you take it, it will keep you alive"; there you build good will. But when you set it up on a basis of a continuation of a combination of paternalism and charitable impulse, it finally takes hold in the mind of a reasoning person. The mistake that we made was to think, from the peon in Mexico to the highly qualified, highly educated people in Mexico, that there was a single one of them possessed of normal reasoning that was not proud that he was a Mexican. And they finally resent the idea that they are the objects of charity. Many of the approaches that the United States makes are well-intentioned, I am sure, but sometimes they have bad results, and bring about a break-down of the respect which those people have for the United States of America.

No man can have a friend in a person whom he disrespects. That cannot be had. I lay down as axiomatic the proposition that the destruction of respect is the final, absolute, and eternal defeat of the development of friendship or of a relationship between nations that is worth while.

Mr. KNUTSON. Do you see any objection to the committee writing into this measure certain restrictions, one of which would limit the negotiations to products that we do not ourselves produce and that we must have?

Mr. KLEBERG. I can foresee possible embarrassment during this period of the war that might arise from a limitation of that sort, even though we have exportable surpluses in some commodities, when you apply the theory of exportable surpluses to peacetimes. But there is a great question in my mind if at this time there should be such a restriction as would bar us from acquiring extra goods which we might need either for ourselves, for our own purposes, or for the purpose of immediate transmission to some of our allies.

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me ask you this. As a peacetime proposition, would you see any objection to it?

Mr. KLEBERG. No; I would see no objection to it. But, as a matter of fact, I think the time to discuss that particular limitation would be then.

Let me add this, to finish my answer. I think what this committee should do, and I make so bold as to suggest it, is that in the drafting of the general set of phrases that make up the proposal to extend these treaties, it is well within the power of Congress, and I deem it to be a part of the congressional duty to write an intelligible policy to be channeled into the minds of those men who are charged with the responsible task of drawing these treaties, stating the intention of Congress, in no uncertain terms, as to what they should do.

As a matter of fact, you cannot expect a man in whom you have no confidence to have any confidence in you.

Mr. Chairman, this is no time to indulge in internal or internecine strife. But we defeat our most effective objectives in the performance of our duty by promoting and keeping up strife between those in high places in other branches of the Government and

Members of Congress, which strife originates out of some of those petty differences with which mankind is cursed.

There are things that go on today, scraps that occur between men in high places, that are both undignified and destructive.

I would like to see this committee write a firm but sound policy with reference to limiting the operation of the treaty-making power within certain bounds, for the sake of attaining the objective. That is my opinion.

If you permit the continued abuse by charitable impulse, if you want to put it that way, of the intelligence of the people with whom we deal, and the wounding of their self-respect and their pride, whether justified or not, we defeat our objectives.

Mr. KNUTSON. The following countries need legislative ratification of any treaty or trade agreement that they may make with this country: Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Italy, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Sweden, Uruguay.

Why should we not have some sort of legislative review?

Mr. KLEBERG. As a matter of fact, the question answers itself.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will you elaborate on that just a little?

Mr. KLEBERG. I can see nothing that would be objectionable in the Congress of the United States, empowering an agency of the Government to make a treaty or an agreement retaining the right to look it over, as an axiomatic principle of government.

Whenever you develop within a nation such tremendous jealousy, fear, and lack of confidence as has at times been developed between different branches of government, I repeat, it is destructive.

If the State Department doesn't think that Congress should know what is going on, well and good; but frankly, I can see the only objection to congressional ratification or consideration or review of these treatics in the vicicus impact of what might be termed intemperate publicity. In the Congress of the United States it is manifest that one cannot review a treaty or an agreement without considerable talk on the subject if some Member of either of the two branches decides to take issue with what the treaty has to do with. I would be perfectly willing to have the Ways and Means Committee of the House bring a recommendation onto the floor of the House as to any changes that they saw fit to make in any treaties under process of development, but I think there might be some danger at this particular time, when men's feelings are pretty close to their sleeves here and elsewhere, and I think probably we would have a lot of thwarted purposes if, in wartime, we would indulge in too close scrutiny, and thereby evidence too little confidence, in the treaty-making power.

I believe that the rules of the House could be so amended so that executive sessions of committee meetings can be held between honorable, respected, and worthy men. I see no reason in the world to prevent the State Department from presenting its treaties, but I do see some danger in bringing the thing out in the open on the floor of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. KLEBERG.

In response to a question of my good colleague on my left, I believe you said a nation could not buy good will, and I concur in that statement.

Mr. KLEBERG. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. But is it not a fact that a nation or an individual, either, can by its attitude create good will and friendship?

Mr. KLEBERG. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. And, conversely, create ill will and lack of friendship by its actions?

Mr. KLEBERG. Exactly. Why, of course. That is the basis of this thing.

The CHAIRMAN. You can create good will and friendship as individuals or as nations?

Mr. KLEBERG. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. And you can create ill will or lose friendship by your attitudes as individual nations?

Mr. KLEBERG. May I add to what my good friend the chairman is thinking? I don't believe you can make friends with anybody, a single individual or a nation, by remaining aloof and indifferent to their welfare or state. Unless you show concern by active, overt evidence that you desire to participate in those things that lead in a beneficent way to their welfare, you can't make friends of them. That is why I am for the extension of the reciprocal trade agreements.

The CHAIRMAN. You have made a most interesting statement. We are confronted with the problem of whether or not the reciprocal trade agreements shall be extended before they expire, which is some time in June; the 26th, I believe. Your most interesting statement appeals to me very much, but I am wondering if it isn't such a long-range proposition that we would hardly have time to go into it and reach an intelligent decision in the short time we have to deal with it now.

Mr. KLEBERG. The only difference I would take to my friend's statement is that I can see no difficulty for a great committee like this writing in very short, terse language a certain policy under which the extended trade agreements were to be carried on; and I believe, Mr. Chairman, with all humility, that that is a wise course, because the way things are going, there has developed within the United States considerable evidence of loss of confidence in trade treaties because of some that have been, as I candidly say, as a continuing proposition, ill advised, both in their impact on the people of other countries with whom they are made and in their impact on citizens of the United States.

Citizens of the United States have been injured by ill-advised provisions within some of these treaties, and you can make no mistake about it. They have a right to feel that something ought to be done about it, and I think it is little enough to confine, in a well-established policy written by this committee, contained in the resolution to extend these treaties, the ways and means of bringing about their continuation over the long period during which they must be continued, in my belief, following the war.

I desire, Mr. Chairman, to earnestly thank this committee for the wonderful attention they have given me and for granting me the opportunity. This is my first offense against its time, peace, and dignity.

Mr. REED. Mr. KLEBERG, I want to repeat what I said at the start of the cross-examination. I think you have made one of the finest and one of the most constructive statements that has been made here on the subject to which you have addressed yourself. It is a most informative statement and highly valuable, and I particularly agree with your last statement that you just made here, and that is, that it is important at this particular time in this Nation's history that we should follow a policy in which the people themselves have the fullest possible confidence.

Mr. KLEBERG. That is correct.

Mr. REED. Otherwise we are going to aid those who wish to destroy and revamp and remake this Nation, although they had mighy little to do with the building up of it. And I would love to question you further on some of your statements.

On one other I want to agree with you wholeheartedly, and that is this, that going back through history, it can be safely said that the civilizations have been built upon the cattle industry.

Mr. KLEBERG. That is correct.

Mr. REED. Starting away back in the land of Ur in the Bible.

Mr. KLEBERG. Thank you very much.

Mr. WOODRUFF. For many years I have been somewhat despondent about this Nation ever being able to bring about cordial relations between the republics to the south of us, and particularly Argentina, and this country. I have in mind at all times the fact that the commodities they produce there are largely the same as we produce here, and our interests would seem to be antagonistic, each to the other.

I have also been able fully to understand Argentina's reluctance to cut all lines of communications between that country and Germany, for instance, because as a matter of fact Germany necessarily looks to Argentina for many of the things she needs and has over a great period of years, and during that time when that trade has been in existence there has naturally grown up a feeling of confidence, one in the other, and as a matter of fact a feeling of dependence which you can't wipe out in a moment, and I want to congratulate you upon having given to this committee the only sane approach to the solution of that problem. I can't tell you how much I have been interested in your remarks. I can't tell you how completely I agree with you. Again I want to say that I congratulate you for having contributed something of great moment to this committee.

Mr. KLEBERG. Thank you very much, Mr. WOODRUFF.

Mr. WEST. Mr. KLEBERG, we are very much limited for time, so in order to save time, I wish that in your main statement you would extend your remarks and include therein the difference of cost of production of cattle and other things between the United States and Mexico.

Mr. KLEBERG. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. KLEBERG, won't you state a little more definitely the declaration of policy that you would include in the bill?

Mr. KLEBERG. Yes; it is my belief that in the extension of the trade agreements there should be contained in the resolution extending them a statement that it shall be the policy of the United States of America to consider trade agreements based upon establishing a cooperative rather than a competitive economy, and that because of the peculiar climatic and soil conditions as between the United States and countries to the south of us we should take into consideration the development of outlets of trade in which we will assist, concerning production which is essentially competitive with ours, and the development of production complementary to ours in those countries, by aiding in every way possible, and divided into the Tropic and Temperate Zones, in suitable language. It is pretty quick, right off the bat, for me to state it. I am giving you the idea, because I would not suggest to this committee that has been dealing with this problem far longer than I have the language to put in it. That is the idea.

Mr. DISNEY. In view of the fact that we are now in a war, would you do that now or would you do that in the next extension?

Mr. KLEBERG. I see no reason at all, Mr. DISNEY, to not setting up the policy as an objective looking toward the continuity of relations and trade between these countries at the present time. The policy within the bill would not be more than an indication to the treaty-making powers. It would be in no wise binding in emergent cases, and language could be used to fit those cases.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. KLEBERG, I want to pay my tribute to you as well. I think the reason we have appreciated your statement more than that of some of the others who have come here to advocate extension is that you have approached the problem from a far more practical standpoint. Most of those who have come here have come to discuss such ideals as peace, and of course we are all for peace; the good-neighbor policy, and of course we are all for neighborliness. I think that most of this committee would like to work out something along the lines you are thinking

of. Certainly I would, as one who has been for reciprocity between nations not only with respect to trade but with respect to every other relationship.

I think we want to get along in some better way. I do not know how we can. The State Department has appeared and commanded that we extend it without the dotting of an "i" or crossing of a "t," and they say that if we put in any amendments at all we will cause doubts to arise in the minds of other nations with whom we are now associated in the prosecution of this war as to what our intentions will be after the war is ended—if we make any changes at all.

You speak of making agreements to the mutual advantage of the countries that are parties to them. How can we make these bilateral treaties mutually advantageous if the State Department is immediately going to apply unconditionally the principle of most-favored-nation treatment? How can it be done?

Mr. KLEBERG. I didn't get what you said as to the State Department's reply.

Mr. GEARHART. If the State Department is immediately going to apply to the bilateral agreement the principle of the most-favored-nation treatment. If we make a mutually advantageous agreement with a South American country, instantly, because of the policies which are being pursued by the State Department, every concession we make to that country is immediately generalized to every other nation on the face of the earth. Therefore, the advantages that were peculiar to the signatories to the agreement are immediately lessened in importance to her because she is left in a position of having acquired nothing which has not been extended to every other nation on the face of the earth.

Mr. KLEBERG. Might I say this in answer to you, sir, and I say this as a colleague: I don't think there has ever been a time in the history of this country, gentlemen, when the exercise of truly prudent jealousy was as important as it is today. I don't think that there should be any difficulty simply because the State Department doesn't agree with the views, for instance, that this committee might express, or for this committee to be particularly worried about that, because there have been times when the views of this committee have not been agreed with by the State Department. I wouldn't let that worry you gentlemen at all. As a matter of fact, the job that Congress has to do is one not only as highly responsible as the duties which devolve upon the State Department, but, in my candid opinion, infinitely more responsible and definitely more widespread and more vital to the welfare, not only of this country but of the countries with whom we are forced to live in a rapidly shrinking world.

Does that answer your question?

Mr. GEARHART. Yes; it does.

I think that we ought to have some amendment in this bill limiting the application of the unconditional most-favored-nation clause so that the agreements can be mutually advantageous. That would be substituting cooperative attitudes for competitive attitudes, as you recommend I would even go one step further and suggest that we set aside both cooperative and competitive as terms and recommend that we enter into agreements complementary to each other, favoring that which they can supply to us which we need but cannot produce ourselves, and asking that they favor, in their markets, the other countries' markets, the things which they need and which we can supply and which they cannot supply. Then you have a complementary economy developed which is not going to promote rivalry but is going to promote a solid friendship which will be lasting down through the years.

Mr. KLEBERG. Of course, my distinguished friend knows that there is nothing in the treaties, as I understand them, that would prevent that being done.

Mr. GEARHART. Oh, yes; there is. The application of the unconditional most-favored-nation clause makes it utterly impossible to make a mutually advantageous agreement. It reduces the procedure to an agreement in form, and utterly destroys any opportunity of establishing reciprocity.

Mr. KLEBERG. Might I say that I didn't complete my statement. There is nothing in the situation which precludes the final working out of the continued operation of reciprocal trade agreements on a practical and mutually advantageous basis, but there is a question at the present moment, considering. I repeat, the nerves which affect every people on this globe, and it would be my suggestion that there be prudence in the development of a program as vital as I conceive the continuation of proper trade agreements between the United States and other countries in this hemisphere and elsewhere. If there is a time which is more advantageous, indicated by prudent judgment, than at this juncture, so as to not embroil the entire situation with the confusion of misunderstandings as to the motives on the part of the United States, I think it would be well enough for this committee to confine itself to a brief statement of guiding policy which should restrict, if it is put in language which commands respect, the continuation of ill-advised practices on the part of some of those who have made some of the phases of some of these treaties. That is my opinion.

Mr. GEARHART. That is very good.

There is just one more point, and I am still disturbed about the application of this principle of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment, because it has made this situation possible. We have made 30 agreements. I think 27 are still in operation, with, say 27 countries. Those concessions that we have made to each one of those 27 countries have been, with the application of this principle, generalized to every country on the face of the earth, many of whom or some of whom were our potential enemies in this war, some of whom are nations like Japan, which steadfastly refused to enter into negotiations with us for reciprocal trade agreements but preferred to stand by and assume immediately, as we may assume things, all the benefits which occurred, and gave us no benefits in return. Likewise Italy; likewise other countries that are now at war with us. They prefer not to make an agreement with us, knowing that as soon as we make agreements with any other countries they are going to get all the benefits.

I think that comes within the classification of international relationships which expose us to the contempt and ridicule of these countries.

Mr. KLEBERG. The gentleman can't confuse my original statement with reference to confining these treaties to a basis which would command respect, and of course I have the proposition that the gentleman is discussing in mind when I make that statement. As a matter of fact, there is no person on this committee, on either side, who would wed himself to the continuation of as untenable a position as that would be in time of peace if we expect to have peace. As a matter of fact, anybody knows that the times when that particular principle was adopted were different times from these. As a matter of fact, too, the consideration given to the problem was given to it without the knowledge and understanding which we today possess on the part of those who made the treaties.

I am not going to attempt to defend the proposition, because it defeats itself in the field of reason in the mind of any person that will think about the situation for just a brief period. You can't, if you put yourself in the position of any other nation other than the most favored in the group, fail to feel the immediate impact upon your desire to maintain a legitimate self-respect. You can't do that.

Mr. GEARHART. I think philosophically you and I are very close together.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you for your appearance.

War Bond Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the following message was received by the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, from Honolulu, concerning the results of the April War bond drive:

MAY 5, 1943.

JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
Delegate to Congress from Hawaii,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Hawaii went far over the top in the April War bond drive. With a quota of $16,700,000, receipts exceeded $18,500,000.

The result is a truly magnificent demonstration of enthusiastic solidarity by all elements of the Hawaiian population for support of the Nation at war. The entire drive was marked by harmonious cooperation between civilians, Army, and Navy. Contributions of war workers totaled a large amount.

Thus Hawaii maintains her unique record of being the only State or Territory uninterruptedly exceeding War bond quotas.

The Hawaiian Pineapple Co was the largest single investor in the April drive, Henry A. White, president of the company, placing purchase orders totaling $3,500,000.

RILEY H. ALLEN.

The National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, this House will soon be called upon to make a decision regarding the continuance of one of the most important of all our administrative agencies, the National Youth Administration. It is essential, therefore, that we take stock of the work that it has done—that we evaluate its progress to date in order that our decision be a just one.

The work of any agency today must necessarily be judged in terms of its contributions to the war effort, and the National Youth Administration meets this acid test. Originally placing emphasis upon its school and college program, even before Pearl Harbor the N. Y. A. had turned its major attention

to preparing our youth for defense-industry jobs; by December 7, 1941, each month saw some 85,000 young men and women trained in some capacity to take their places in the all-out defense effort. At the present time the entire program of this agency is directed toward this sole end, and each day it is turning out in excess of 1,000 youths, of whom approximately 700 are going into industry, mainly direct defense work.

The types of training activity illustrate vividly the importance of this program in our war effort: machine work, arc welding, radio, industrial sewing, gas welding, aircraft sheet metal, aircraft mechanics, pattern-making, are only a few of the training courses conducted by the N. Y. A.

No only is the N. Y. A. training these young men and women; it is also placing great numbers of them directly in vital defense plants. I have in my files dozens of letters from such firms attesting to the skill and the excellent work of these N. Y. A. graduates:

All of the girls who came to us from your center are doing an excellent job—

States the supervisor of personnel at an important aircraft factory. From the Alabama Drydock & Shipbuilding Co. at Mobile comes this illuminating statement regarding some 309 welders secured in 3 months from the N. Y. A.:

We consider them better trained and more thoroughly familiar with what they are supposed to do after they get into the shipyard. We trust that you will continue to give us the service that you have in the past.

A Hoboken company states:

We feel that the National Youth Administration is the best source of supply that we know of and we hope to be able to rely on them for future requirements.

This list of testimonials to the effective training program of the National Youth Administration could be prolonged indefinitely, but these three examples illustrate well the tenor of most of the letters received. They illustrate, too, the tremendously important part that the N. Y. A. is playing in our national war effort.

In my own State of California this agency has been doing its usual effective job. At the present time 705 work stations are being conducted, all in training for war work, and others are contemplated. After their training, the youth go into such plants as the Kaiser Shipyards, Douglas Aircraft Corporation, North American Aviation, Consolidated Aircraft, Pacific Bridge Co., Moore Drydocks, and similar plants. At the present time the Hunters Point Navy Yard in San Francisco has been given priority for trainees in the Bay area, the yard having requested the N. Y. A. to supply 200 youths a month. It is interesting to note that certain types of youth, such as Mexican-American, the handicapped, and others have obtained war work after N. Y. A. training, whereas without such training they probably would not have been so engaged.

With our increasing shortage of manpower it is essential that we utilize every conceivable source of supply. The National Youth Administration is of great benefit to the country in this connection. It deserves not only our commendation and congratulations; it also deserves our full support in providing for the continuation of its program.

A Tribute to Hon. George D. O'Brien of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in order that there may be recorded for all time the devotion of a Member of Congress to the employees of the Postal Service, I have asked for permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On Saturday, May 8, 1943, there will be presented to my colleague from Michigan, the Honorable GEORGE D. O'BRIEN, a leather booklet, autographed by all of the post-office employees of Detroit, numbering about 4,200, in appreciation of his splendid efforts in connection with the postal employees' salary-increase bill.

The presentation of the booklet will take place in the office of the Honorable Roscoe B. Huston, postmaster at Detroit. The committee in charge of the affair is composed of the presidents of the nine organizations in the Detroit post office. The postmaster has rightfully been delegated to make the presentation.

Appropriately, the cover of this booklet is inscribed:

To Congressman GEORGE D. O'BRIEN, father of H. R. 1366, champion of the postal worker, from the employees of the Detroit post office.

The letter on the inside page is as follows:

MAY 8, 1943.

SIR: Detroit's postal employees wish to express to you their appreciation of your efforts in their behalf.

Although subject to the same economic conditions as others, our every effort to improve our condition is circumscribed by law and we must look to Congress for relief.

It is indeed fortunate for us that many in that body have recognized our plight and have, by legislation, in a measure remedied the inadequacy of the postal workers' pay.

Although we share with others the benefits of this legislation we take no small amount of satisfaction in the fact that our own Congressman sponsored this bill and led the fight which resulted in its being enacted into law. The tremendous effort which you put forth is evidenced by the favorable vote which the measure received.

All of us, collectively and individually, wish to convey to you our sincere appreciation of your action in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

THE POSTAL EMPLOYEES OF DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. Speaker, may I say in conclusion that my own reactions to this splendid tribute are summed up in these words: "Honor to whom honor is due."

Address of Commander in Chief of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States at Americanization Day Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 2, the annual Americanization Day exercises were conducted in Jersey City under the auspices of Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. These exercises have come to be looked forward to by thousands of citizens of Jersey City and Hudson County, and have become an integral part of the community life. They were inaugurated under the auspices of the Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post and have continued now for many years, under the complete supervision of that organization.

It is estimated that 25,000 persons marched in the parade past more than 100,000 spectators. The parade terminated in Pershing Field, where at least 10,000 others were gathered to hear the addresses delivered on this occasion and to witness the spectacular massing of the colors which marks its climax. Preparations for the great day were made largely by the same group of indefatigable veterans, members of Captain Clinton E. Fisk Post, V. F. W., who have been in charge of the exercises since their inception.

Those who addressed the large audience at Pershing Field prior to the arrival of the parade were Mr. Robert T. Merrill, of Montana, national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Hon. Frank Hague, mayor of Jersey City, who has always given every possible encouragement to those under whose auspices these exercises have been annually conducted, and myself. Some of the other guests present were: Hon. Frank H. Eggers, Hon. Arthur Potterton, Hon. Joseph Colford, Hon. Daniel Casey, all members of the city commission of Jersey City; Hon. I. Grant Scott, senator from Cape May, N. J.; Mr. William J. Dodd, national senior vice commander, Disabled American Veterans; Mr. Howard Bean, State commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars; and Mrs. Mary Davenport, State president of the Ladies' Auxiliary, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

A very stirring address was delivered to his hearers by Commander in Chief Merrill, which I am pleased to append hereto:

FACTS VERSUS FABLES

It is most fitting and proper that we who compose the membership of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States should stimulate discussions of those basic issues which confront the American people in the present crisis.

As America's overseas veterans of World War No. 1, and as the fathers of sons who

are serving in our Armed Forces in World War No. 2, our viewpoints on the subject of war and peace have wide range. They cover a span of more than 25 years, during which time we have been intimately associated with the fundamental problems which confront those in uniform, in time of war, and their post-war welfare. Because of our peculiar relationship to the question of veteran welfare—we have reached certain conclusions which we advocate as an organization today.

There are those who say we should talk now of only those things which pertain to the accomplishment of an early victory over our enemies. They insist that any discussion of the kind of world we want, after the victory is won, is premature—and will interfere with our effort to win the war.

We differ vigorously from this reactionary point of view. We veterans of other wars want to be assured—and reassured—that our armed forces are fighting today to accomplish in reality those things which we failed to gain when the Armistice was signed on November 11, 1918.

We further insist that our boys on the front lines should be told today in plain, simple language that when they come home America will be the kind of country they will want to preserve in the future. They want to know that they will be greeted not only with cheers and bands—but with jobs and the opportunity to build a decent future for themselves. That's what post-war planning means and that's why such discussions are not premature at this time. Permit me to add that the mothers of America—the women who are giving their husbands and their sons to the cause of victory, will find their grief much easier to bear if we promise them now that America will cooperate with the world at large in the establishment of a world society that will be pledged to preserve our peace in the future.

The understandings which we can reach among ourselves through these discussions are certain to produce a greater degree of unity and cooperation among our own people on the home front—a greater willingness to accept the discomforts of war restrictions, high taxes, and food shortages. All in all, we believe these discussions will improve the general morale in a way that will help us win the victory for which we pray so earnestly.

We veterans are prepared to take a realistic view of world affairs by recognizing the vital importance of mutual confidence among those countries which compose the United Nations. If we want our allies to sacrifice to the utmost in this struggle against the Axis dictators, we must let them know that America will never let them down by accepting a false peace when the victory is won. They will give their last drop of blood to help us whip the enemies of world democracy if we will convince them today that America will never compromise with fascism in the creation of a new world order.

Trying to follow the war these days has turned most of us into breakfast-table map readers. The strange places we find ourselves discovering all over the world these days are bewildering enough. But they aren't nearly so bewildering as the fact that these seemingly remote outposts in Africa, Australia, and the Pacific, which look so comfortably far away, seem to have suddenly moved out of their own hemisphere into ours. It is hard for us to realize that all the crisscross lines indicating latitude and longitude, which look like pretty safe fences on paper, can be erased by a plane in a few hours. The legend of a map—the little chart in the corner that tells you how to figure the number of miles between one place and another—doesn't really serve any practical purpose, since distances are no longer measured in miles, but in hours. Indeed, as far as we're concerned, the whole map of the world is like a legend. It represents the legend of security that all of us believed in so implicitly before Pearl Harbor.

It was 53 years ago when Nellie Bly electrified the world by making the first trip around the globe from east to west. On January 25, 1890, she wound up in New York—72 days, 6 hours, and 11 minutes after she had started. And it was only 34 years ago on January 23, 1909, that Jack Burns, a wireless operator on the White Star liner *Republic* sent out the first S O S—thereby saving the lives of 444 passengers on a stricken ship. Yes, the miracles of transportation and communication are so new that many of us can still remember when they first appeared.

Today, a bomber—flying at 330 miles an hour—can make Nellie Bly's 72-day trip in about 45 flying hours. An S O S that only a few scattered stations could pick up in 1909 can now be heard by every ship at sea, and relayed around the world by radio, in the twinkling of an eye. The miracles of yesterday have become the facts we must now reckon with—and the facts that used to govern us are the fables of today.

Unfortunately, a great many people would much rather go on believing in fables than face the inconvenient facts of modern geography. Even more unfortunately, the longer people cling to these fables the better it suits the ends of certain modern Nazi politicians. The whole elaborate strategy developed by the geopoliticians of the Axis is based on the assumption that few people really see that our old ideas of geography are outdated. It is their purpose, therefore, to take advantage of our outdated ideas to advance their own political schemes. As long as people do not understand—or don't want to understand, which amounts to the same thing—that the natural barriers of deserts, jungles, mountain ranges, and so-called protective oceans of the earth, are no longer barriers at all, except in the minds of those who cannot grasp the real meaning of the airplane and the radio—the bandits of the world are left free to rob and plunder their neighbors.

This is precisely what has happened to our world of today. Here in America, we sat serenely behind that great protective barrier—the Pacific Ocean—while the Japs seized Manchuria and then forged ahead into China. We sat in stubborn silence behind another great protective barrier—the Atlantic—while the Nazis and the Fascists of Italy seized Ethiopia and Austria, and then forged ahead into 14 nations. We continued to sit, with our hands over our ears, while the victims cried for help, and while one country after another was conquered and plundered, while millions of innocent people were murdered. "They're so far away," we said, "it has nothing to do with us." Each time we talked about how far away these things were—each time we soothed ourselves with the same old security story, the Nazis and the Japs reached out with their airplanes, over a few more protective mountains, and grabbed another country.

We are forced to confess that the very Nation that led the world in scientific achievement was the last to understand what science had achieved. The Nation that flew the first plane, the Nation that has since built the most, the fastest, and the biggest planes in the world, never woke up to what the airplane meant until early one morning, not long ago, when Japanese bombs came out of the sky, and the Pacific suddenly disappeared.

All of this sounds almost fantastic now. It hardly seems we could have let ourselves be fooled—not only by our own pipe dreams of security, but also by the Axis fairy tales we listened to. Remember how righteously indignant the Nazis were at the suggestion they would ever want to harm the United States of America? Remember how they let it be known that Germany would be much too busy running her conquered countries in Europe, to send her armies anywhere else? It turned out that the Nazi idea of running a country was to steal all the food, so the people would just quietly starve—or else to murder them outright, which takes much less time. Remember how some Americans kept on assuring us that Japan was tied up in China—and that the Japanese air force was so pathetically weak that poor Japan couldn't possibly hope to attack us even if she ever had any such notion?

Yes, we listened—almost too long—to those fables. It never seemed to occur to us that each new fairy tale was based on the same idea; that the Axis tyrants were so busy abusing their victims, they wouldn't ever be able to get after us. Or, in other words, that what they were doing to other people was none of our business—and, since those people were so far away, there was no need to worry that the terrible things that were happening to them might ever happen to us.

This idea is the crux of the whole Axis strategy. Let each man look out for himself and the Devil take the hindmost. The Nazis won control of Germany simply by hammering away at this one idea. They told every group in Germany that their own interests came first, and that the Nazis were out to protect those interests—which were presumably being threatened by some other group. They told the industrialists that organized labor was out to get them—and at the same time warned labor to beware of big business. They told the farmers to watch out for the workers, and so on, until parents were afraid to trust their own children. When every group in the country was finally so busy looking out for itself—that no one thought his own rights had any connection with protecting the rights of anyone else—the Nazi devils proceeded to take the hindmost—and that meant the whole country except themselves.

This idea worked so successfully in Germany that the Axis dictators made it the basis of their plan of world conquest. Every country they planned to invade was first destroyed from within by a careful propaganda campaign to divide the people. Playing on every prejudice, the Axis propagandists fooled the people into thinking that their own individual interest, as a section, class, religion, or political party, had no relation to the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Every time another country fell before this strategy of divide and conquer, the Axis hastened to point out that what happened to that country couldn't possibly affect the people on the other side of the mountain range, the river, or the channel that stood between them and the most recent Axis victims.

By pointing to these natural barriers, which science had reduced to no barriers at all, the Axis tried to keep the democratic nations from raising the one barrier that could threaten the Axis advance. Their one objective was to keep the free people of the world from building a wall of unity against the Axis.

Unity of purpose among the fighting free—this was the one obstacle the Axis feared. And now, at last, they find that blackmail and bigotry, religious prejudice, and political perjury, falsehood and fear—all the evil forces that they once summoned for the purpose of corruption, have been powerless to prevent the awakening of freemen to their common task. Now, at last, the Axis agitators face the one thing they have always feared—the strength of united opposition.

Now at last the three-quarters of the world that still is free has awakened to the facts about our world: The fact that no corner of the earth is safe while tyranny has a foothold anywhere; the fact that people are no longer separated from each other by any barrier of nature, and that dividing lines which men attempt to draw—the lines of those who prey upon the rights of man. These facts,

once understood, can never be forgotten. They govern the men of the United Nations, battling to regain the world today—and they will guide the men who govern the United Nations of the world, tomorrow.

What's Holding Back the Truth of the Army Airplane Crashes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, looming behind the alarming number of service air crashes is the making of one of the major scandals of this war.

The Truman committee of the Senate is sitting on the lid of a scandal far greater than the diabolical Carnegie Steel case, more outrageous than the Anaconda Wire & Cable indictment.

Why are innocent American citizens, fathers and mothers of our brave and courageous soldiers, kept in the dark as to the true causes of the startling number of plane crashes?

Why are incompetent, blundering, and ridiculous officials allowed to remain in command?

If it takes a calamity to arouse the intelligence of this Congress to assume its responsibility on this matter, then such a catastrophe is already here. For almost 2 years there has been but a single voice crying for a thorough investigation of these plane accidents. Today in the hands of the Truman committee rests the answer to a most fiendish kind of sabotage. Thousands upon thousands of fine American boys lie in their untimely graves. Yet, the perpetrators of this mass murder are free, still active, protected by high Government officials.

These are serious charges. These are startling allegations. But you will find confirmation of these charges in the hands of the Truman committee. Why has not the findings of the Truman committee been made public? It has taken a long time to arouse Congress to act. Why has not the truth been told? Why have not all the guilty been brought to trial? Why have not there been some courts martial?

Now, allow me to read a story that appeared in the New York Newspaper PM, dated April 16, 1943:

Cleveland firm sued by the United States of America over defective war-plane parts.

The National Bronze & Aluminum Co., world's largest producer of sand and aluminum mold castings, has been accused of supplying defective parts for war planes.

The charge was made in a damage suit filed by the Federal Government, which seeks an award twice the amount of dollar damages.

Meanwhile, a Federal grand jury was hearing testimony from workers at the plant who previously had been questioned by agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The damage suit named three company officers, charging that they conspired to make false bills and claims to the Packard Motor Co., which used National bronze castings in Rolls Royce Merlin engines for combat planes.

Last year this company sold $8,000,000 of war materials and is now reported to have $13,000,000 of war contracts on hand. The only reason that the Government rushed into this suit was to forestall the filing of a public informers suit, which was being contemplated.

Mr. Speaker, why have petty and helpless individuals been quickly punished and yet this Government, on several occasions, has refused to touch powerful and rich persons equally as guilty of subversive acts? There is something ominous about the fact that certain individuals have been granted leniency, others promptly condemned.

But months have passed since the devilish Carnegie fraud and the incomprehensible Anaconda episode was published, still those mostly responsible are at large. The record proves that it does make a lot of difference whether sabotage is committed by a billionaire corporation or by a penniless misled and stupid laborer.

Why is such a situation tolerated by this Congress?

I have already placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 5 and 13 some serious charges relative to plane crashes. I now desire to inform the Congress of another matter.

I wish to discuss the Flying Safety Bureau of the Army Air Corps, the agency responsible for the reduction of plane accidents.

Soon after a demand was made to investigate Army crashes the War Department attempted to head off a congressional investigation by setting up a Flying Safety Bureau.

How was this done? Where did the personnel come from?

Well, the War Department followed the road of least resistance. It lifted the Flying Safety Bureau from under the hands of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, almost bodily, and commissioned its investigators as captains, majors, and colonels.

The amazing thing about this is that there is unimpeachable evidence in the files of a certain Senate committee proving beyond doubt that these men were utterly incompetent for the grave task that confronted them. In one instance these men who are now running the War Department's accident prevention set-up accepted a certain air-line company's report of one of its sensational accidents and inserted it in the C. A. A.'s official records without even bothering to change a comma or to make an investigation of their own. Naturally, that company exonerated itself of all responsibility for the crash.

That is the caliber of the men whose responsibility it is to reduce Army accidents to a minimum. Needless to say, these men are whitewashers of the highest degree.

Col. James N. Peyton, Director of Flying Safety heads the list. It was Colonel Peyton and Col. Warren Carey who attempted to cover up the cause of the collision in California of an Army bomber and an air-line transport plane that cost the lives of 12 persons.

It took a congressional committee to pry the facts open.

Even the pro-administration Chicago Sun on October 30, 1942, criticized the Air Corps in an editorial entitled "A Belated Admission" relative to the mid-air crash. Said the editorial, in part:

We can all imagine the embarrassment officers experienced when they learned the facts. We submit, however, that embarrassment and pride of service never warrant suppression of facts. * * * We cannot avoid wondering whether the public ever would have learned the cause of the crash had the Congress not investigated. "Military security," as we understand it, is not to be confused with security of the military from feelings of embarrassment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refresh the memory of this Congress on another point concerning the history of the membership of the Air Corps Flying Safety Bureau.

Up until June 1940 the Flying Safety Bureau of the C. A. A. was under the capable direction of Tom Hardin. It was independent of the C. A. A. and the Department of Commerce. Its functions were a great success and widely heralded throughout the Nation.

But in the Government reorganization plan, the Flying Safety Bureau was demoted and placed under the thumbs of the C. A. A. Exactly 1 month later civilian crashes occurred frequently. This is a matter of public record.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I make this reference is because the numerous crashes occurred while the men who are now in charge of the Air Corps accident prevention set-up were then in control of the C. A. A. Flying Safety Division.

I demand a thorough investigation. I demand that the Truman committee publish its sensational findings.

I demand that Congress take cognizance of the alarming number of Army crash accidents.

Mr. Speaker, are the lives of our boys so unimportant, so cheap, that we should ignore this scandalous situation? I certainly hope not.

We'd Best Watch Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein an editorial entitled "We'd Best Watch Him" from the News Sentinel, Fort Wayne, Ind., issue of May 4, 1943:

WE'D BEST WATCH HIM

The globalist and Willkieite Gary Post-Tribune (alias the Steel Trust Advocate) makes the following comment: "Russia is our ally, and * * * even if the Polish officers were murdered by Russia, we must have her help to win against Germany."

Perhaps—but, since when did the Poles become our enemies? When did Poland cease to

have the status of "our ally" also? And what reason, if any, can the Gary paper think up for kicking the Poles in the face?

Probably its nearest approach to a reason is found in the fact (acknowledged even by the Post-Tribune) that "Russia wants and intends to have a section of what was Poland."

All this, however, is lightly passed by as having "nothing to do with winning the war."

The Gary paper might be surprised about that. God still frowns on murder and burglary.

The Gary paper is constantly saying that the United States must "help to keep world peace." But on what terms? In accordance with what code of morals or ethics? At what price? According to what standards? In conformity to what specifications, and by whom are the specifications to be dictated?

It is true that we have had Russian help against Germany. But it is also true that we have had the help of the Poles. And it is quite importantly true that this war started out in the first place because both Germany and Russia manifested an "intention to have a section of what was Poland."

Decent people rightly branded that as evil aggression, and subsequently succeeded in weaning Stalin away from Hitler and inducing him to sign a treaty of friendship and mutual assistance with Poland's Premier Sikorski.

Did somebody know from the beginning that that treaty was not worth the paper on which it was written? Did Churchill, in 1941, make a secret deal with Stalin, offering him part of Poland and three or four other little countries as a price for getting Russia onto the British side of the scrap with Germany?

Maybe not—but maybe so. And if so, what happened, then and there, to the casus belli—the reason for the war in the first place?

We must, of course, agree with the Cary paper when it says that "we do not decide issues by refusing to face them." But what fundamental issue is it facing?

In the space of 10 years, Russia has been on the side of the Allies, a friend of Poland, an enemy of Hitler, a friend of Hitler, an enemy of Poland, a friend of Poland, an enemy of Great Britain, an ally of Great Britain, an enemy of Japan, a friendly neutral toward Japan. What next?

Even if Stalin is giving substantial aid to our mortal foe, Japan, he happens also to be (for the present, at least) giving us substantial aid against another mortal foe, Nazi Germany. As long as he fights Hitler, we may, perhaps, appropriately continue to give him assistance for that struggle.

But we've got to keep him under careful surveillance. For, as one commentator has pointed out: "He can't be trusted beyond the demands and opportunities of his self-interest. Nothing else counts with him; and if we form any illusions about him or disregard any of his characteristics, it will be at our own risk."

Poland's plight clearly illustrates the fellow's enormous capacity for brutal rascality.

A Glimpse of the Post-War World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an address given by me before the National Catholic Welfare Conference on Industrial Problems at Wheeling, W. Va., March 22, 1943. It well might be captioned "A Glimpse of the Post-War World":

It is a certainty that the post-war world will be a different world economically and socially than was the pre-war world. What kind of a world will it be? Will it be better or will it be worse? These are difficult questions to answer, nevertheless we are deeply concerned about them.

Many factors enter into the making of this new world, some of which might be controlled, others cannot be. At this moment we are assured of nothing except that the peoples of America and England are conscious of the necessity for immediate initiation of post-war planning as indicated by the Beveridge plan, and the plan of the National Resources Planning Board.

Some Congressmen have been alert to the necessity of a post-war program. Two years ago the Voorhis resolution was introduced which would establish a commission to study and devise a plan for the post-war period. This resolution was comprehensive. It was to include support from all interested groups outside of the Government, such as labor, industry, agriculture, finance, religion, education, etc.

The National Resources Planning Board, after several years of study, has given to us an outline of things to come. A plan to control the factors which will change our world. How far the advocate or supporters of the National Resources Planning Board can succeed in establishing the pattern, depends upon the strength of the enemies, reactionaries, and envious groups who have their own plans. We cannot any longer afford to be the victims of economic forces, but we must endeavor somehow to affect some control over our economic and social destinies. Those who laugh and sneer at such planners as the Beveridges and the Wallaces are those who would have the clocks turned back, so that the exploiters would again roam unchallenged in a world of free enterprise, where aristocracy of wealth could demand obeisance from the poor and underprivileged. Democracy, today, has too much strength. Liberalism is in the ascendancy. Away with the reactionaries, who would reverse the clock, who look not forward, but backward. Peace, happiness, and security cannot be promoted by them or with them.

We have a glimpse of the post-war world as designed by the planners and envisioned by the hopeful, the poor, and the underprivileged. The war interrupted changes which had already begun. The war will teach us some things we can do and other things which we cannot do. We are called upon to guard faithfully and vigilantly the rights and benefits which we have acquired during the last decade. The war effort has put tremendous pressure to sweep aside many hard-won rights and benefits.

The preworld war saw the initiation of higher taxes to feed and nourish the jobless, and to provide public works for them. But this procedure was challenged by the corporations and by the well-to-do. They both raised the cry that business would be ruined, that the Nation would become bankrupt, and that the poor and jobless were being debased. We now see clearly that nothing like these predictions came true. Moreover, we have seen the war effort raise taxes immeasurably higher than heretofore, and perhaps never to be reduced to the level of 1940. The war brought prosperity of a kind. Governmental expenses for war purposes has done it. Now, the people have had shown to them that Government funds expended for peace purposes could also produce prosperity, and the taxes required would not need to be above those of 1942.

The economic forces must be controlled following the war, or else some constraint must be applied to shape our economy to prevent want, to provide security, and to give opportunity for work and education. This must be done. If the capitalistic system is to prevail, and we want it to, these objectives must be reached. We believe that under the capitalistic system all of the jobless and underprivileged can be adequately provided for, and that the capitalistic system can be made to give a full measure of security and opportunity for all citizens of America. The profits may not be as bountiful, but they will be more enduring.

So, the glimpse which we have now of the post-war, shows a plan which goes far beyond and expands the pre-war program, so that it will encompass all groups of heretofore neglected people, and will make great provisions for social security for all groups.

Government, which is now a partner in many business concerns, which was brought about by rapid expansion for production, will likely continue to be a partner after the war, and thereby have a voice in the management. Businessmen will oppose this partnership arrangement and will endeavor to separate themselves from such partnership, as soon as the war is finished. It is doubtful if business will be able to succeed in this. The exigencies of war brought about this dual partnership, and it seems to me that much of it, at least, will be permanent. This partnership will be far-reaching because the influence of the Government will be felt in the management. Whether it will be for the best interest of the Nation remains to be seen.

One effect of the higher tax program will be the redistribution of income. It will lower the high incomes and raise the level of the low incomes. It appears that this might be the ultimate aim or purpose of the future tax programs. However, the tax program at present was not motivated by this idea, but it was a natural result brought about by the war taxation. Such a plan would undoubtedly promote consumption.

Production for use will be emphasized more and more as time goes on, influenced by the reforms just mentioned. It seems to me quite clear that the war has discouraged, at least to some extent, the profit motive, and has given our economy something that we can never get entirely rid of.

Returning soldiers will come home and will vote. Their terrible experiences will be imprinted upon them just as were the experiences of the last World War upon those soldiers. Their contacts this time will be global and the influence of the cultures to which they will be exposed will be far different and more encompassing than were those contacts of the first World War. Hence, the ideas acquired from these contacts, experiences and influences will be very far reaching, and will undoubtedly be registered upon the entire American people. These soldiers will demand work and greater social security. It is quite doubtful that such demands would be confined to America alone. It appears to me that other nations engaged in this war will face the same problems, and that their returning soldiers will request the same attention and consideration from their nations that our soldiers will from us.

These are but few of the problems which confront us, and will grow daily more important as time goes on. The war has but accentuated them. They had their beginnings immediately after the First World War. Many far-seeing people are deeply concerned about them. Out of these problems arise other problems, until the whole becomes very complex. One is not encouraged to think that we can guide or control all of the economic forces, which will be let loose when the war is ended, but by adopting some plan

for the future, we might be able to help control our economic life, and thus not permit ourselves to become enmeshed in a lot of economic difficulties. If we procrastinate, we will have lost our chance to control.

The time for this planning is now—now because we are all conscious of the need, and because we are conscious of the neglect of these matters following the last war. The war has made us think deeply about this. Sacrifice and suffering has brought this to our attention. Suffering always impells us to free ourselves from those things which bring about our unhappiness and discomfort. After the war it may be too late to effectuate any control, or even to promote a plan, because we would then be relieved from our anxieties and apprehensions of the war, and be thrust into new anxieties and apprehensions.

I repeat, again, that we must use our intelligence and our ingenuity to bring about some degree of control over our social and economic destinies. We owe it to posterity. We cannot avoid responsibility.

Why Large Millers May Want the Domestic and Foreign Agricultural Policy for Wheat Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in reading the hearings held before the Ways and Means Committee on the renewal of the reciprocal trade treaties, I noted testimony that advocated the extension of these trade treaties evidently without the constitutional requirement of Senate ratification.

First, the following statement came to my attention:

Officers of the Pillsbury Flour Mills Co. of Minneapolis have also expressed themselves in favor of extending the powers granted the President under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act.

I also find:

Our export departments—

And General Mills is the largest flour and grain products concern in the whole Northwest—

are the ones who know about these matters and who feel the effects of them if they are adverse. I thought it worth while to indicate to you that our experience under the treaties thus far negotiated has been quite satisfactory.

To begin with, a program could be of value to the large flour mills but not necessarily too good for the producers and the general public. You will note that according to the above that at least one big business concern is willing to transfer the legislative duties of the Ways and Means Committee to the executive branch of our Government, at least as long as it is advantageous for them to do so. Big business may talk about the capitalistic system, free enterprise, individual initiative of life, but they do not want it too badly if they support any measure that delegates the powers of the people from the legislative branch of our Government to the executive branch of our Government.

Second, here are some questions I would like to ask. Do you suppose that since wheat was 94 cents per bushel to the farmer from 1923 to 1933 and only 73 cents per bushel from 1933 to 1941 and only 54.6 cents per bushel in 1939, after 6 years of the more abundant life, all of which provided an ample supply of cheap wheat for milling purposes would influence decisions? Since wheat exports have been reduced to 3 percent of our national production and export subsidies have been paid on what little wheat was exported as well as on flour this may throw some light on this subject.

Do you suppose the fact that the exports of flour have been subsidized by taking money from the United States Treasury would influence this position in any way? The following paragraph from a letter from the Commodity Credit Corporation gives the amounts and nature of these subsidies:

The total sales from the beginning of fiscal year 1938, through April 29, 1943, made in connection with this program, consist of 16,829,849 barrels of flour and 106,695,803 bushels of wheat upon which Government payments amoun ing to $20,019,891 and $27,464,212, respectively, have been committed. All such payments have been made from funds provided under section 32, Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress.

No doubt the large flour mills would favor this program long after the livestock and dairy people on Minnesota had caught on to the happenings. It happens that recently the great Land O' Lakes Creamery, Inc., of Minnesota, through Mr. Charles W. Holman, was one of the strongest witnesses heard in giving the picture of world agricultural commerce.

I am sure the livestock and dairy interests of the great State of Minnesota would not ask anyone to give their approval of the duty reductions that have been extended to the livestock business. These reductions in duty were, many times, 50 percent, or all that the law would allow.

As long as the administration has an embargo against imports of flour from other countries—quota of only 4,000,000 pounds can be imported into the United States in 1 year; as long as the domestic United States market is held practically 100 percent by the large American mills; as long as Federal money is obtained by 30 percent of the custom receipts under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to continue subsidizing flour exports of 17,919,156 barrels that cost the American taxpayer already over $20,489,000, no doubt these large mills will continue to be in favor of such a program. They may not even protest the delegation of power from the legislative to the executive branch of our Government. This does not change the responsibility we have to protect the rights of the people who elected us.

Polish Hostages Appeal to the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which I received from the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent, Inc., 105 East Twenty-second Street, New York, N. Y., entitled "A Million Polish Hostages Appeal to the Conscience of the American People":

A MILLION POLISH HOSTAGES APPEAL TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

In January 1939 Hitler proposed to Poland that she join Germany in an attack on Soviet Russia and divide the spoils. Poland refused.

Seven months later Hitler proposed to Soviet Russia that she join Germany in an attack on Poland and divide the spoils. Russia accepted.

THIS WAS THE ORIGIN OF THIS WAR

By her decision to fight against two totalitarian powers—35,000,000 peaceful and unmobilized people against 250,000,000 spiritually and materially prepared for ruthless warfare—relying only on her agreement of mutual aid with England, Poland gained through the total self-sacrifice of her people 9 precious months for her unprepared allies. It is idle speculation to contemplate what would have happened if, on September 1, 1939, Germany had attacked France and England instead of Poland.

During those 9 months Soviet Russia, in the process of dividing the spoils with Germany, violated every human law and the entire code of Christian ethics in her treatment of the people of Poland, who saved her life by refusing to combine against her with Germany.

About 2,000,000 people, including children and aged women, were deported as slaves to be tortured under inhuman conditions of enforced labor without adequate clothing, food, and shelter.

Over half a million have already died. Barely 125,000 were permitted to leave. The rest, above a million, have been deprived of the last vestige of their identity—namely, their citizenship, taken away from them January 16 of this year. Now these unhappy victims are held as hostages to be used as pressure in enforcing Soviet Russia's unjust territorial demand on Poland—on her and our ally

The severance of relations between Soviet Russia and Poland has deprived these victims of the last hope they had—their own Government's feeble protection.

These hostages thus become the charges of the United Nations, especially the British and American people. Three and a half long, tortuous years of extermination by foe and ally alike have not broken the backbone of the proud people of Poland. They have anchored their faith to the American principle of justice and fair play. They, and Europe with them, will endure as long as this anchor holds.

All Europe looks to us through the eyes of this million hostages. All Europe's faith hinges on what we do now to save them from disaster. Unlike the unfortunate victims of Hitler in Germany, these people in

Soviet Russia are accessible. If millions of dollars of American lend-lease goods can go into Russia daily—these innocent victims can and must come out of Russia before it is too late, before the stigma of guilt blots our conscience.

Regardless of the outcome of the present crisis, let us save this million hostages and thereby remove this immediate cause of discord between our two allies and thus serve the war effort.

Let us hold the moral line of this war.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF
AMERICANS OF POLISH DESCENT,
New York, N. Y.

Pay-As-You-Go Tax Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED NORMAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter by Mr. Albert S. Goss, master, the National Grange, which was published in the New York Times April 21, 1943.

Since pay-as-you-go taxation is such an important and timely subject at present, I recommend Mr. Goss' letter for study by Congress and the country.

The letter follows:

APRIL 15, 1943.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The New York Times is to be congratulated on its outstanding leadership in presenting the merits of the pay-as-you-go tax question so forcefully. It is particularly timely because the enactment of such a tax has a direct bearing on staying inflation. The chief cause for inflation today is the pressure of $35,000,000,000 of excess income against a diminishing supply of goods. Any tax system that will reach this income as earned, as opposed to a system that allows much of it to be spent before tax payment is made, will help to relieve this tremendous pressure.

There were three things which contributed to the defeat of the pay-as-you-go tax measure in the House recently:

First was political pressure.

Second was a campaign which led people to believe that the plan would result in abatement or forgiveness of taxes.

Third was the fear of Congressmen that they would be charged with voting to forgive 1 year's taxes on their own salaries and that this would be used against them in their campaign for reelection.

With an overwhelming majority of the voters desiring a pay-as-you-go tax plan, those exerting the political pressure are beginning to find they have made a mistake and can no longer hold the line against such a sound proposal. There is still considerable misunderstanding over the false charge that the proposal is an abatement or forgiveness of taxes. When this is cleared up there should be no fear of election reprisals. To understand the exact nature of the proposal, one should understand the background of the income tax.

One of the basic principles underlying any sound tax system is that taxes should be levied in proportion to ability to pay. The Federal Constitution was amended in 1913 to make it possible for Congress to enact an income-tax law because income was considered the best measuring stick for determining ability to pay.

When the first law was passed Congress selected the previous year's income as the best measure of the taxpayer's ability to pay. It provided for an annual tax measured by that income. Now it has become apparent that current income is a more accurate measure, and it is proposed to substitute the current income for last year's income as the measure of the tax. The tax will be levied annually, just as before, but measured by current income rather than past income.

Many people confuse an income tax with a property tax. Property taxes are a lien on property, but an income tax is not a lien on any particular item of income. It is a potential lien upon all the assets the taxpayer may have, and income is merely the measuring stick to determine the amount of the tax. The real problem is to determine the factors which will most accurately measure the taxpayer's ability to pay. Modification or change in the measuring stick is in no sense an abatement or forgiveness of taxes.

By changing the measuring stick it is inevitable that some may have had larger incomes last year than this year. The young man who gave up a $4,000 job last year to take a $600 job in the Army will find it tough to pay a tax of $670 measured by last year's income, which is already spent. A tax of $670 payable out of a total income of $600 certainly would not be in accord with the principle of ability to pay.

On the other hand, let us suppose that John Doe made $100,000 last year and $10,000 this year. Certainly an income of $100,000 denotes a very large ability to pay, and it is reasonable to assume that a large part of it, beyond ordinary living expenses, is available for tax payment. In the year of transition from the old measuring stick to the new, such a windfall contingency can easily be met by a provision that if the taxpayer's income tax should be greater than $2,000 in either the last year or the current year, his tax would be measured by whichever income is the greater. Such a levy would be in proportion to ability to pay.

Where income is collected monthly, the tax should be payable monthly or quarterly. Where the income is seasonal or irregular, the collection date should be adjusted to meet the circumstances. Here, again, the principle of ability to pay is observed. We are very sure the people do not want any double taxation. Under the high rates which are now in effect, very few would be able to pay more than 1 year's taxes at a time. People want to pay their income tax in the year it is earned, as far as possible, thus protecting both the Government and the taxpayer from levies which cannot be met, because the income is spent.

Yours sincerely,

ALBERT S. GOSS,
Master, the National Grange.

Louisiana Potato Growers Enraged by Injustice of O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the potato farmers of Louisiana are raising hell and I do not blame them. If there ever was a case of injustice and unreasonableness as practiced by Washington bureaucrats on any group, it is the $2.50 ceiling price that has been put on the potato growers of Louisiana. In the neighboring State of Texas the ceiling price on the same potatoes, grown in practically the same dirt, is $3.75.

When the O. P. A. officials were asked about this, they said the Texas potatoes were dug a little sooner and for that reason there is that variation in the price. There is no logic nor sense to that sort of reasoning. Potatoes are a very flexible commodity. I have seen the price of potatoes in the depths of depression go up as high as $5 a hundred there in Louisiana during the season, and drop lower than $2.50 per hundred. But, notwithstanding the fact, year in and year out the price more or less evened up and balanced itself. To arbitrarily fix the price at $2.50 at this time, when farm labor is scarce, when farm machinery is not obtainable, when fertilizer is expensive, when the cost of farming is higher than it has ever been, is nothing short of rank injustice to the farmers.

Perhaps the most amazing thing is the seemingly utter lack of interest in the farmers, or the contempt of the farmers, as shown by the O. P. A. in this ceiling price of $2.50 per hundred. Take for example the city of New Orleans, which is a big market. The farmer brings his potatoes to market there in the city. He has had to either buy or keep seed potatoes, planted those seed potatoes, cultivated them. When the potatoes had matured he had to dig them, wash them, grade them, put them in sacks, and haul them many miles to the market in the city of New Orleans. For that he received only $2.50.

Yet, let us see what the jobber gets. He takes the potatoes off the truck, puts them on the sidewalk and sells them to the retailer, who drives by. What does that jobber get? Under the O. P. A. ruling, he has a right to charge $5 per hundred pounds for those potatoes, and thereby make a profit of $2.50. In other words, for taking that hundred-pound sack of potatoes off the farmer's truck and placing it on the sidewalk in front of the jobber's place of business, and loading that sack of potatoes back on a retailer's truck, that jobber gets as much as the farmer receives for several months work in the creating, producing, and hauling to town of those potatoes. There is nothing but rank injustice in that.

Potatoes today are wholesaling in Washington in the black market for $11 per hundred. The cost of transportation from New Orleans to Washington for those same potatoes is exactly 73 cents per hundred. In other words, those potatoes, delivered from Louisiana to Washington, D. C., cost delivered in Washington, according to the O. P. A. ceiling price and transportation charges, $3.23, and yet the wholesaler is selling those potatoes on the black market at $11 per hundred, or more than 14 times as much as the cost and transportation of those potatoes from New Orleans to Washing-

ton. Why that tremendous spread from the grower to the consumer? Who made that possible? The O. P. A. Certainly that could not have been made on any common-sense reasoning. Either there is an ulterior motive behind this whole thing or it is based upon gross incompetence. Both are disastrous as far as the farmer is concerned.

I have written letters until I am blue in the face. I have talked this over with officials until I am sick at my stomach. I have received letters of complaint from the people of my district until I never want to see another letter with the name potato in it. And yet I can do nothing. I can get nothing. Boiled down, to those people back home I am Congressman JAMES H. MORRISON, in Washington, and they think that if I do not do something for them that I am lying down on my job. It is not because I have not tried and the fault does not lie with my efforts. The fault lies solely and squarely on the shoulders of the O. P. A. All we hear from the O. P. A., the Agriculture Department, the McNutt department, from the Ickes department, and even from the President of the United States, Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, is "we want the farmers of America to raise more food. If they do not grow more food men in the armed forces are going to suffer, people in neighboring countries are going to suffer, and folks back home are going to suffer." And yet, with those noble words coming out of many megaphones, the ceiling price of $2.50, which is unreasonable on potatoes, comes out of the O. P. A. megaphone, which is in the hands of the O. P. A.

Does that make sense? Of course it does not. It makes the farmer, instead of wanting to help win the war, wanting to do his duty, and he is just as patriotic as any group on earth, think one of two things, either that the bureaucrats in Washington think he is a fool or they think he is an ignorant man, because if they did not think he was a fool or an ignorant man, they would not treat him that way.

I have here a document from the Agricultural Division of one of the largest universities in America, the Louisiana State Agricultural and Mechanical College at Baton Rouge, La. It starts off by saying that the Irish potato situation in Louisiana shows that the O. P. A. ceiling price of $2.50 is not high enough to bring forth the production of early potatoes for harvest in 1944.

And to interrupt at this point, I happened to read in a New York newspaper that New York City is without potatoes. I went to a restaurant 3 days ago in Washington and asked for some potatoes and they told me they did not have any potatoes. And yet there are tons and tons and tons of potatoes right there in the ground in Louisiana that may never be dug. Why? Because they have a ridiculous ceiling price of $2.50.

Now I have said a lot about the ceiling price of $2.50. One might ask what the ceiling price should be. My answer is that if potatoes are wholesaling in Washington for 11 cents per pound, the ceiling price to the grower in Louisiana should be at least 4 cents per pound, or $4 a hundred, instead of $2.50. But even a ceiling price of $3.50 would be a whole lot better than a ceiling price of $2.50, which now exists.

This survey I have just referred to says that the lowest ceiling price should be $3.22 and that, fellow Members of Congress, I assure you is the most conservative figure that could ever be arrived at as far as Louisiana potatoes are concerned. According to all the information that I have been able to compile, and according to the farmers' figures, according to the experts' figures, according to leading agriculturalists' figures, the actual cost of producing Louisiana potatoes at the present time, which includes the planting, growing, harvesting, and hauling to market of United States No. 1's is $2.38. Thus the potato grower under the O. P. A. ceiling price of $2.50 gets 12 cents for every hundred pounds of potatoes he produces and hauls into market, whereas the jobber, who does not gamble one thin dime, who does not produce one potato, takes those potatoes and instead of making 12 cents per hundred pounds, he makes $2.50 per hundred pounds. In Washington, on the black market, he makes much more. What is the result? Don't ask me. You know as well as I do. It just does not make sense.

Personally, when Prentiss Brown first took over that conglomerate monstrosity known as the O. P. A., I thought he was going to try to do the right thing. However, he is beginning to change my mind when he allows his assistants to treat the Louisiana potato growers in such a shameful manner with an unfair and unjust ceiling price of $2.50.

I have been told about all the Harvard dream boys, these theorists who sit behind a big mahogany desk here in Washington with a slide rule and work out such miracles as postponing lambing season, taking off the horse's shoes at night and putting them back on in the morning, but I had my doubts that Prentiss Brown would let them operate in his department. However, with such rulings as have been made on Louisiana potatoes at $2.50, I have become convinced that all these slide-rule dreaming autocratic Harvard theorists are not in other departments exclusively, but that many of them are still in the O. P. A.

Whenever the agricultural bill is asked for, whenever the appropriation bill for the O. P. A. is asked for, these heads of these so-called departments come running and say, "You loyal boys of Congress help bail us out. We are in serious difficulty and the newspapers are giving us hell." Well, I, for one, and I believe there are plenty of other Congressmen who agree with me, am not in favor of helping any department, and especially the O. P. A., until they get someone in the various departments who has enough common sense, logic, decency, fairness, and determination to see that the farmer, as well as everyone else, gets a square deal.

Now, Mr. Brown, you have been a Senator. You know what it is to face the people. You know what it means to have them down on you, perhaps better than I do, and I want to say that unless you do something to help out the potato growers, not only of Louisiana but the potato growers throughout the South, and the farmers throughout the rest of America, you are not only going to destroy yourself politically forever but you are going to bring a lot of Congressmen and United Senators right on down to the political trash heap with you.

The irony of the whole situation boils itself down to this: While the people in Washington and New York and other cities cannot get potatoes, which are perhaps one of the easiest agricultural products to produce, and due to that extreme scarcity, as created by the O. P. A., the black market which operates in most cities, and, for example, here in Washington, due to this synthetic scarcity, is whosesaling potatoes at $11 per hundred, while tons and tons of potatoes remain in the ground in Louisiana because the farmers are not getting a price sufficient to pay their cost to dig them and haul them to market. If this ceiling price of $2.50 is not changed, I predict that thousands and thousands of tons of potatoes will rot in the ground, while black markets in the cities will flourish and consumers will thereby be deprived of one of the most staple and necessary foods of all, namely, the spud.

There is no use of my talking any further about this matter at this time. The time has come for action, and, as I promised those farmers down home when I was running for election, that not a bone in my body would rest nor a muscle in my body stay still until I saw that they got a square deal. The same thing goes now more than before, and while some of these Harvard boys and slide-rule theoretical geniuses are putting off lambing season and like actions, and sleeping at night, I assure you I will be staying up figuring out some way in my small capacity as a Congressman to try to give those farmers a little relief that they are entitled to.

Still Living in 1919

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of Friday, March 19, 1943:

STILL LIVING IN 1919

To those whose hair has turned gray, the quotation below will sound familiar. Surely, it must come somewhere from out of the files of 1919 or 1920, when the Lodges, the Borahs, the Hi Johnsons and the Chicago Tribunes, big and little, were riddling Woodrow Wilson's efforts to unite the nations in

an effort to keep the peace. This is the quotation:

"A supergovernment is to be created to which the United States will be subservient. The primary purpose is described as the keeping of the peace after this war.

"How is this to be done? By placing the men and wealth of this country at the disposal of the supergovernment. The choice in future between war and peace is to be made not by the representatives of the American people in Congress but by a supergovernment to which the war-making power is to be entrusted. Once the decision has been made for us, we are to have no choice but to send our sons and brothers to fight wherever they are desired."

This is from the Chicago Tribune of March 16, 1943, commenting on a proposal introduced in the Senate to pledge America to such international cooperation as will minimize war By some quirk of fate or of typography, it was dated at the top of the editorial column "1942." Anyway, it appeared last Tuesday. It should have been dated "1919" or "1920."

So here we have it again—the same old effort to frighten, the same old myopic "isolationism." Those nationalists who betrayed the hopes of our people after the last war are already trying to pull this country out of world affairs after this one, to have us retire into our shells and await the time when another crop of dictators and aggressionists fix it so our sons once more will have to march into world conflict.

The Lodges, the Borahs, and the Tribunes had their way last time This Nation didn't even make an effort to curb wars. Men had died believing that something would be tried. We picked up our marbles and quit. And while we sat on this side the Atlantic, drugged with the doctrine of these isolationists, the Hitlers and the Mussolinis grew strong. Japan overran China and grew strong enough to challenge us at Pearl Harbor. Did the isolationist course save our sons when the storm struck in Hawaii? Did their plan keep us out of this war?

Just how much choice did our representatives in Congress have after that December Sunday when the Japanese arm of the Axis struck?

Martinique, the Great Mystery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask these questions:

Is Martinique a hot potato or a wet baby? Why do some people become so alarmed when the very name Martinique is mentioned? A few days ago Secretary of State Cordell Hull turned to the Navy and said, "Martinique is your baby now." Why is the State Department so anxious to get out from under Martinique at this late date?

On March 1 I took the floor in the House of Representatives and said that America was sending approximately $1,000,000 worth of food to the island of Martinique. I even revealed that one ship, the *Guadeloupe,* loaded with food and supplies, and headed for Martinique, was in New Orleans at that time, detained due to a strike of the crew. Immediately the State Department stopped the shipment of food to Martinique. I also revealed at that time that 2 months prior to Pearl Harbor the Navy decided to take over Martinique, but the State Department turned thumbs down and nothing was done.

A few days ago I announced on the floor of the House that I had definite information to the effect that German submarines had been refueled of late at the island of Martinique, and that Secretary of State Cordell Hull had abruptly cut off negotiations with Admiral Robert, of Martinique recently.

Today the United States is in an embarrassing position. With $650,000,000 in gold on the island, six oil tankers, an aircraft carrier, several warships, and many merchant ships, which we need desperately, and which could fall into enemy hands, yet at this late date the State Department throws up its hands and says, "This is a hot potato. It is exclusively the property of the Navy."

Why did not Secretary of State Cordell Hull take this position 2 months before Pearl Harbor when the marines were loaded on United States warships to take over Martinique? Why has the Department of State been so timid about this whole matter? How do we know that the gold is even still there? Are we going to let our enemies think that we are afraid of Admiral Robert and his handful of soldiers on Martinique? Is not it a reflection on us that with Martinique so close to Panama we not only do not have possession of the island, but our enemies seem to be using it to refuel their own submarines?

If the State Department says it is hands off today, why the lateness of the hour? Why did they not say 2 months before Pearl Harbor "Hands off?" What the people of America are entitled to know is this: Is Martinique a hot potato or a wet baby? If so, who does it belong to? The State Department says today that it is the property of the Navy. The Navy has remained silent.

Maj. Kenneth McCullar

REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday the people of Mississippi joined at Batesville, Panola County, Miss., in memorial services honoring the memory of Maj. Kenneth McCullar, one of the outstanding heroes of the present war.

In July 1942 Major McCullar was assigned to the Southwest Pacific theater and it was here that in a short time he sank one light cruiser, one destroyer, four cargo vessels, damaged another light cruiser, two destroyers, and six cargo ships, all with 500-pound bombs. It was here that Kenneth McCullar was commissioned a major on February 1, 1943, at the age of 24 years, every step from second lieutenant to major having been earned by this young hero in the heat and fury of combat amid the planes and shells of the enemy.

Kenneth Dalton McCullar was born on the 30th day of November 1918, the son of Dalton W. McCullar and Pauline Walters McCullar, in Panola County, Miss. He lived in the little cross-roads community of Eureka, attended the local school at Pope, Miss., where he graduated with honors at the age of 15. He entered Mississippi College in 1934 and graduated from that institution in 1938.

For 1 year thereafter he taught school and coached athletics at Forest, Miss. He entered the armed services of the United States in August 1939 and received his commission as second lieutenant on May 11, 1940. His advancement was rapid. He became a first lieutenant October 1, 1941, a captain on March 1, 1942, and a major on February 1, 1943.

The manner of his death once again makes us realize that the will of Divine Providence is beyond the understanding of man. After 68 missions against the Japs, where every conceivable danger of combat was faced, and from which they escaped untouched, Major McCullar and his crew were killed when a little brush kangaroo got in front of his speeding bomber as it roared to the take-off on a night bombing expedition, breaking a line which resulted in the big bomber being enveloped in flames.

Maj. Kenneth McCullar was possessed of unlimited courage. A natural leader, he was placed in the forefront of the battle. There by his leadership, his application to his task, and his unfailing courage, he was instrumental in developing one of the greatest offensive tactics of this war, skip bombing, proclaimed by General Arnold, Commander of the United States Air Forces as one of the greatest aids to the success of the United States and allied forces that has been developed since the war began. We must remember that this development was made in the face of great danger with the utmost risk to Major McCullar and his force. Much of the ultimate success of the allied forces in this Second World War may well be attributed to the daring of this young man, product of a typical cross-roads American community, who in a few short years through his devotion to duty and his ability made such a great contribution to the whole world and we are glad to know that world leaders stopped to pay tribute and homage to the memory of this young man from Eureka, Panola County, Miss.

Panola County has had many distinguished men in its history both in war and in civil life. It was from its McIvor Creek and Union School House that my forefathers left for service in the Civil War. In the First World War, many of the Panola County boys distinguished themselves in combat. It was from Panola County that Honest John Kyle

came, one of my distinguished predecessors, who served in this House before your day and mine, and who refused renomination to Congress rather than compromise his convictions and thereby became known for the rest of his life as Honest John.

Yet none of the long list of Panola County's distinguished sons in war or in civil life has brought more honor to her than this young man who died at the age of 24 years.

Today we know that millions of other young men and their families are contributing their part to this all-out war. We know many of them, too, will pay with their lives in some foxhole on some battle front, unheralded and unsung. But we know that they, too, would take pride in the recognition of Maj. Kenneth McCullar, who died for his country, for America where the cross-road community can and does produce men who rise to the heights, a young man who gave his all that others may live.

What we say means so little, but what he did will live for the ages. In his few short years, Maj. Kenneth McCullar contributed more than will many who live to be a hundred. May God rest his soul and bless the cause for which he gave his all.

Provide for a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSF OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include House Joint Resolution 25 of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, adopted by the house of representatives of said assembly on April 21, and concurred therein by the senate of said assembly on April 28, 1943, urging the Congress to make provision for a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army. I submit the following resolution for the consideration of the Congress:

House Joint Resolution 35

Whereas House Resolution 7432, introduced in the Congress of the United States, provides for a pharmacy corps in the United States Army; and

Whereas the enactment of such resolution would give the soldiers of the United States Army the protection of a well-coordinated pharmaceutical service, would make available large unused resources of skill and knowledge, and would effect the release of many physicians now performing tasks which could be performed by pharmacists: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact House Resolution 7432, which provides for a pharmacy corps in the United States Army; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, April 21, 1943.

ELMER J. SCHNACKENBERG,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
R. R. RANDOLPH,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the senate April 28, 1943.

HUGH W. CROSS,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD H. ALEXANDER,
Secretary of the Senate.

The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Time magazine of May 10, 1943:

STEPSISTER CORPS

The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps will be a year old next week. It has been a hard year because it was the first, with the administrative aches and growing pains of any big, new organization. Director Oveta Culp Hobby announced that enrollment had reached 58,100 by mid-April. That unvarnished figure meant, at first sight, that the corps had achieved little more than a third of its quota (150,000) at the three-quarter mark of its authorized enrollment term ending July 1.

But this same 58,000 was more than double the initial mark of 25,000, upped sixfold after the Army had discovered the usefulness of its women auxiliaries. And every woman Jill of them was a volunteer, who had endured the cheap jokes and poor public reactions of the WAAC's early weeks. WAAC's were sure that if enrollment had not proceeded according to plan the fault lay with the plan—and with United States women and kinfolk.

SLOW RETREAT

The trouble with the WAAC has been the trouble with the people, a slow retreat from apathy and prejudice—in the home and in the Army—toward the necessity and importance of women in the war.

The Army has learned the desirability of its soldiers in skirts, not merely as ersatz men, but for their own sakes and skills. The four specific jobs (communications, administrative specialists, motor transport, cooks, and bakers) for which the WAAC's were first enrolled have grown to more than 140. Examples: Code clerk, toolroom keeper, truckmaster, and cartographer.

SLOW ASSIGNMENT

Requests on file from commanding officers for WAAC's to replace men total 500,000 (375,000 from air forces alone). Generals of overseas theaters of operations have asked for 18,810 to date. But only a few WAAC's have the thrill of copying secret orders in a general's office; only a few hundred have gone overseas. Of the rest, most have been busy at routine but necessary jobs, training other WAAC's to train more WAAC's.

The Army welcomed them when they showed what they could do—one replacement group of 56 replaced 128 men in post office, personnel, and records work. But the Army was not ready for even a 58,000 enrollment. There are WAAC's, duly sworn in, who still wear civilian clothes because they have no uniforms By June 1, however, the Army expects to turn out every woman in full kit.

For a while half the WAAC's grew restive in the training camps, bottlenecked by inadequate facilities in the Army's special schools. Then the Army speeded up its training program, has opened up seven new schools in the past 4 months. Recruits are coming out of training at the rate of 1,000 a week, and there are about 15,000 now in the field.

Stepsisters to the Army, the WAAC's do not have the privileges of the women of other services which are integral parts of Navy, Coast Guard, or Marine Corps. They get no dependency allotments, no Government life insurance, or retirement pay for disability incurred in line of duty. They cannot write "free" on the corner of their letters home.

SLOW LAW

The Rogers bill, long delayed but due soon for a vote, will make the WAAC's full-blooded members of the Army, give the girls their rights. No law is needed to give the girls one Army privilege they have been quick to grab: the WAAC's can gripe like veterans.

Biggest difficulty of the WAAC's, which affects recruiting the most, is one neither Congress nor the Corps can cure. That is the attitude of the public, which has stopped thinking of Japs as funny little fellows, but which still fails to take seriously the need for women in war. To help change a public opinion clouded by a poor press, by mistaken glamor and misplaced publicity, the WAAC's a fortnight ago picked a new advertising agency.

Preliminary studies showed that the main resistance to WAAC's recruiting is not among women, but among the men in every woman's life—American men are notoriously softheaded about their women. WAAC's remembered Britain's ordeal before women warriors were recognized, wondered if anything less than the hard urgency of military necessity could break this sentimental slavery.

Shipbuilding in World War No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the address delivered by Rear Admiral Howard L. Vickery, U. S. N., vice chairman, United States Maritime Commission and Deputy Administrator, War Shipping Administration, before the New York Electrical Society and the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, March 25, 1943, on the subject of shipbuilding in World War No. 2 presents valuable information that should be preserved for the future. Omitting the reference to illuminating graphs and slides, the speech was as follows:

Upon returning from an overseas inspection trip, Lieutenant General Somervell, Chief of the Army Service Forces, recently remarked that he was surer than ever that this is now a war of transportation. "The war has entered a new phase," he said. "First it was a battle of production. Now that has passed and it is a battle of distribution."

He should know. And you may be sure that the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration also are well aware of what the war requires in the way of transportation.

In the 3½ years since this war began, a number of nations have been obliterated by our enemies while others have survived by a slim margin. If the tables are being turned on our enemies—and they are—it is the maintenance of sea communications—shipping—more than any other physical factor, which has made it possible. Just as human courage has kept the flame of freedom burning, so ships have supplied the fuel.

And now that assurances have been given of a second front on the continent of Europe, it is still primarily shipping which will time the blow—and perhaps already has timed it. After the camps have trained and the factories produced, it is ships that put the "over" in "over there."

In World War No. 2 there are many "Over Theres." For some day the Allies are going back to Manila, to Shanghai, and Singapore. Yes, and we're going on to Tokyo. But how far could we hope to get without ships? Military operations, wherever undertaken, depend upon men, equipment, supplies—and transportation for all three. Truly, ships are the keystone of the arch.

Shipping was a crucial factor during the last war, too, but then the principal task was the maintenance of a ferry service to France. The problem today is incomparably more difficult. United Nations' battle fronts and outposts are many and far-flung. America cannot rely upon her allies to equip her soldiers this time; indeed, she must help equip and supply theirs. Thin as the merchant tonnage of the United Nations has had to be spread, however, I can tell you the goods are being delivered!

As additional offensives are undertaken in the future, we must expect the shipping task of the United Nations to grow more and more difficult. A vast fleet was required, as you know, to land our expeditionary forces on the shores of north Africa. Even yet, and for a long time to come, a considerable tonnage of merchant ships must remain earmarked to supply our forces in that theater. Landings on the continent of Europe will involve combined operations—and that means ships—on a far greater scale than the north African campaign. And after those landings have been effected, many vessels must remain allocated to the supply routes which will support the allied forces on the continent. A similar situation will arise with every new offensive undertaken. We must be prepared to supply the necessary shipping or forego the offensive—and I assure you that we intend to lose no opportunity to smash the enemy.

There are several aspects to the problem of providing ocean transportation. Naturally, the effectiveness with which existing tonnage is utilized is as important as the amount of tonnage available. It is not my intention this evening to comment on the problem of operations and maintenance, except to say that, in my opinion, the job is being well done.

Secondly, we must protect such ships as we have from destruction by the enemy. This involves not only active measures against enemy submarines, aircraft, and surface vessels—the Navy's job—but also the equipment and characteristics of the ships themselves. The modern merchant vessel, for example, is equipped with devices for protection against magnetic mines. Frequently, too, there are provided various other defense features concerning which it is sufficient to say that the inventive talents of America and her allies are not being neglected when it comes to the protection of their merchant shipping. What is more, today's merchant ship has the wherewithal for striking back.

However efficiently existing merchant fleets may be utilized, and no matter how successful measures for their protection against enemy action may be, it is the shipyards of America and her allies to which we must look for the enormous amount of additional tonnage which victory is expected to require. Ships can be used effectively or ineffectively; they can be kept afloat or they can be sunk; but there is only one way to get more of them. The third phase in the solution of the shipping problem, therefore, is the building of more ships.

This at once introduces the question of the speed of merchant vessels. It is obvious that a fast ship stands a better chance of evading attack than a slower one and that, because of more frequent turn-round, it can move more cargo. It is so obvious that I sometimes wonder how anyone can imagine that we build relatively slow vessels, like the Liberty ships, because we prefer to. Before the war, as you probably know, the Maritime Commission was engaged in a long-range program for the rehabilitation of the American merchant marine through the construction of the so-called C-type vessels—the finest ships afloat. Both for economic reasons and to insure maximum possible utility in the time of war, these vessels were designed for sustained high-speed operation. Our first move when war threatened was to accelerate the construction of such ships and to build as many as the availability of machinery would permit. Today, one of our primary objectives still is to build as many of these fast ships as possible. We have expanded to the limit the manufacturing capacity for the necessary propulsion machinery and auxiliaries. As a result, the speedy ships of the Commission's long-range program are being built in far greater numbers than ever before. Designed under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 for ready conversion to naval and military auxiliaries, today many of them are serving the armed forces as fleet oilers, as troop ships, as aircraft carriers, and in various other special capacities.

Tonnage requirements, however, have far exceeded the potentialities of the long-range program. When the supply of high-powered machinery had been completely earmarked, any additional ships constructed either had to be slower ships, or empty hulls without engines. Given that choice, and faced with the urgency of greatly increasing ship output, in 1941 the Maritime Commission decided upon the design of the Liberty ship, which is driven by a triple expansion steam engine of 2,500 indicated horsepower. We have been able to procure many such engines where we could not have obtained turbines and, as a result, there have been delivered into service as of this date, some 780 of these highly useful cargo ships which never would have gone to sea had the Maritime Commission decided to build high-speed vessels only.

Even so, the Commission while building the Liberty ship has been seeking ways and means to increase its speed without sacrificing the mass output characteristics of the design. As the outcome of these efforts, a special type compound steam engine having more than twice the power of the present engine will, before long, be available in quantities. In effect the Liberty ship has been redesigned for the greatly increased speed which the new engine will make possible. The Victory ship—for so we have named it—has slightly more beam than the present emergency design, and is somewhat longer with finer lines. Among other refinements, the engine room has been so laid out that it will be possible to install turbines or Diesel engines in lieu of the steam engines when circumstances may permit. Still in a sense an emergency ship, built for a wartime job, the Victory ship will be much better adapted than its predecessor to the competitive conditions of peacetime ocean commerce.

Insofar as current construction is concerned, however, the high and still increasing rate of output from merchant shipyards has resulted from acceleration as well as from expansion. Gigantic as the problem has become, it remains fluid. Many means have had to be utilized to prevent delays and speed construction. Foremost among these has been standardization, as exemplified by the Liberty ship itself, which is now being built in some 15 different shipyards on three coasts. Not only is the basic design of this ship standardized, but the principal components as manufactured in different plants are interchangeable. The ship and its various parts are characterized by simplicity, eliminating many of the nonessential refinements of peacetime vessels, while retaining the features necessary for seaworthiness and reliable operation. In adopting the Liberty ship design, the Commission intended to obtain and has, I believe, succeeded in obtaining, the maximum possible new shipping tonnage from the available resources of materials, manufacturing capacity, and manpower.

Since, in 1941, existing merchant shipyards not already converted to naval building were overloaded by the acceleration of the Commission's long-range program, it was necessary to build new yards for the construction of the Liberty ship. Starting from scratch, it was possible to design these facilities primarily for high rates of output. In the development of the shipyard lay-outs, the Commission and the shipbuilders drew upon lessons learned in the ship-construction program of the last war, upon experience gained in the revival of the industry during the past 5 years, and as well on the latest advancements of manufacturing and construction methods in other fields. As production in these new shipyards has increased, other lessons learned have been embodied in improvements until today the construction of Liberty ships on the east, west, and Gulf coasts has broken record after record with respect to both building time and tonnage output.

Some idea of the immensity of a ship and the enormous number of component parts is necessary if the proportions of the shipbuilding program are to be appreciated. A ship is one of the largest structures built by man, and it is by far the largest which is capable of motion. When consideration is given to what a dollar represents in materials and man-hours, it is apparent that the building of a ship costing a million, or millions, of dollars in the space of a few weeks is no mean feat. The steel for one ship would be a capacity load for scores of freight cars. The power plant equals that of a town or city; the accommodations and utilities are those of a hotel. There are thousands of items and many hundreds of suppliers, located in nearly every State of the Union. You can see, therefore, that the shipyards are but the final assembly lines of a Nation-wide shipbuilding plant.

This great industry is largely a converted one. Many of the manufacturers are supplying products quite foreign to their peacetime business. A stove factory, for example, is building lifeboats; a showcase supplier is building cowl ventilators; and a famous manufacturer of toy electric trains now furnishes compasses. Other plants are manufacturing products with which they are more or less familiar, but meeting special marine requirements for the first time. Wherever possible, the Commission has endeavored to make use of idle plants, and of facilities which could be converted from peacetime activities. In fact, the Commission was among the pioneers in distributing war work among numerous small enterprises. Nevertheless, a considerable direct expansion of industrial capacity also has been necessary in connection with merchant shipbuilding.

Prior to the war, there were eight factories in the United States manufacturing steam-propulsion machinery for large ocean-going ships. These plants built steam turbines,

and the manufacture of marine steam engines was almost a lost art. Today, however, some 13 factories are making steam turbine propulsion machinery, and, in addition, 11 others are building steam engines for Liberty ships. Moreover, in numbers of propulsion units, the peacetime capacity of each of the original plants is dwarfed by its present output and, in most instances, by the production of each of the engine builders.

The procurement of materials, machinery, and equipment for the Liberty-ship program was centralized in the Commission, together with planning, scheduling, and allocation, in order to realize the advantages of standardization and interchangeability. It is obvious that scheduling the production of this Nation-wide industry is a most intricate task as well as an extremely vital one.

In the shipbuilding industry prior to the war, interchangeability between comparable items of different manufacture was generally nonexistent. As a result of unbalances in production, which can never be entirely eliminated, it was quite conceivable that a ship at one yard could be delayed by late delivery of an engine while boilers might be on hand beyond immediate requirements; at the same time, extra engines would be available at another yard and yet a ship there would be held up for boilers. Many variations of this situation have, in fact, occurred and often little could be done about them. As applied, however, to the Liberty-ship program, main engines are manufactured in a number of different plants, but always from the same plans. Engines from any of these factories may be installed in Liberty ships built in any yard. The resultant flexibility has made it possible to obtain a steady and ever-increasing output of Liberty ships despite innumerable variations in the production schedules of individual manufacturers. Under this system, a delay in production at any factory generally affects ship deliveries only to the extent that the Nation-wide over-all output of the particular item is affected.

The Liberty-ship program, of course, was readily standardized because it was started from scratch as an emergency undertaking. Under peacetime conditions, such as those which attended the start of the long-range program, competing manufacturers could not be expected to utilize identical designs for their products. Manufacturers brought into the marine field today, however, can use designs already developed and in production at older plants. Insofar as established suppliers are concerned, it is also possible to effect some standardization of mounting dimensions, connections, terminals, and the like. The Commission is working along these lines with respect to its long-range shipbuilding program, and the benefits of these efforts already have been felt in the elimination of threatened delays in ship completion.

Assembly-line principles have been applied to lay-outs of shipyards for the building of Liberty ships. The lines of material flow are very definite and represent planning, scheduling, and control of materials and operations comparable in scope to the control techniques which characterized such mass-production industries as automobile manufacturing. Typical of the Liberty shipyards is the spaciousness of the areas provided for prefabrication and storage, and the ample coverage of those areas by cranes and other material-handling facilities. Incidentally, the Commission awarded contracts for the construction of a shipyard and for a specified number of vessels to Marineship Corporation, Sausalito, Calif., one of the latest six-way yards, on March 12, 1942. Today, little more than a year later, although the yard has not yet achieved peak production, 12 ships already have been delivered into service.

Prefabrication is not new in shipbuilding. Its principles were understood in the last war and, in some instances, were utilized to a considerable extent. Modern developments in electric welding, however, coupled with advances in material handling facilities and methods, have permitted the potentialities of prefabrication to be exploited to a degree previously unthought of in shipbuilding. Generalizing somewhat, it is the peacetime custom to bring all the individual component parts of a ship to the ways, and there assemble and erect them. With such methods, the work of assembly and erection is confined to the limited space on the ways and in and about the hull. This is no particular handicap when the pace of construction is relatively unhurried, but it distinctly limits the number of men and the amount of equipment which can be brought to bear effectively. High-speed shipbuilding is naturally a matter of rapid expenditure and effective utilization of both man-hours and machine-hours. Since the work of assembly and prefabrication is performed at many points, the working area and amount of construction equipment can be expanded to almost any desired proportions. In practice, it is the usual aim to prefabricate to the extent resulting in the most rapid over-all rate of converting materials into ships. It has been demonstrated that a ship can be prefabricated to such a degree that it can be assembled on the ways and launched in 4 days. It has been impracticable, however, to provide sufficient facilities, or to obtain the backlogs of materials, which would be necessary for regular construction on such a schedule.

The most spectacular result of prefabrication and other modern shipbuilding methods has been the reduction in building time. When the Liberty ship program was inaugurated, a construction period of 6 months from keel-laying to delivery was the contractual basis. Following Pearl Harbor, however, a tremendous expansion of the program necessitated, not only additional shipbuilding facilities, but also the further acceleration of construction rates in existing yards. Accordingly, schedules drawn up early in 1942 reduced building time for Liberty ships to 105 days from keel-laying to delivery. This provoked a chorus of "It can't be done." The first vessels delivered were, to be sure, built rather slowly, but by May 1942, while the average building time was still nearly 60 percent longer than the 150-day objective, one ship had already been delivered within 60 days from keel-laying. The average construction time for all Liberty ships delivered in July approached the 105-day objective, and in August, bogey time was beaten by a wide margin. As you can see, however, the reduction in building time did not stop here, but continued, until in January 1943, the 79 emergency cargo ships delivered by the various yards averaged only 52.6 days from keel-laying to delivery. In January, severe winter weather caused a temporary suspension of outside work in certain yards, and the resultant delays raised the February average keel-laying to delivery time for Liberty ships to 62 days. Continuing reduction in yards not so affected, however, points toward the breaking of the January record average in the future.

It is to be expected, of course, that the second ship built on a new way would require less time than the first, and similarly that the third would require less than the second. The extent of the reduction, however, and the number of succeeding cycles of the ways in which that reduction has continued are worth noting. The original 105-day keel laying to delivery schedule contemplated 60 days on the ways. Therefore, the sole fact that only some 40 days, on the average, are now required represents a 50-percent increase in shipbuilding capacity from a given number of ways.

What reduction in building time has meant in one yard may be seen from a comparison of the Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, Portland, Oreg., building Liberty ships, with Hog Island, the largest and most famous of the World War yards. The ships built at Hog Island were generally comparable to the present day Liberty ship, although they were considerably smaller. Hog Island had 50 ways and cost roughly $67,000,000; Oregon has 11 ways and cost little more than a quarter as much. During the first year after the first keel was laid in each yard, however, Oregon delivered 30 ships; Hog Island 5. During the second, Hog Island completed 66, and during the third year, 51. But Oregon, with nearly 2 months of its second year yet to go, has delivered a total of some 150 ships, representing 23 percent more ships and 75 percent more tonnage than Hog Island built in the entire 3 years it was in production.

The great disparity between the accomplishments of the two yards is not difficult to understand when you examine the average building time at Hog Island and at Oregon. The fastest average building time for the vessels delivered during any one month at Hog Island was 225.8 days from keel laying to delivery, and 6 was the greatest number of ships delivered in a single month. Oregon, by contrast, delivered 12 Liberty ships in January, from only 11 ways, and they averaged from keel laying to delivery just 32.5 days.

During 1939, when the original 50-ship-a-year long-range program was just getting started, 28 vessels were delivered, an average of a ship every 13 days. In 1940, the total of deliveries was 53, or a ship every 7 days. By 1941, the stimulated growth of merchant-ship building resulted in the completion of 103 vessels, corresponding to a ship every 3½ days. By 1942, however, the picture had changed materially. In the month of April, the rate of ship deliveries reached 1 a day. By June, only 60 days later, it was 2 a day. Three ships a day became an accomplished fact in September. And in December the average rate of deliveries was 4 ships a day. In 1 year, 746 ships were delivered into service. And, although we stated in January that by May you could expect nothing less than 5 ships a day, I am proud to be able to announce tonight that the merchant-ship building program is so ahead of schedule now—in March—that the rate of 5 ships a day is here.

For some 20 years the shipbuilding program of the last war stood as the world's most outstanding performance of mass shipbuilding. Not so long ago, there were many who put forth plausible reasons why the achievement of that program could not be repeated under present conditions.

Last year was our year of getting started on the present program, but during 1942 merchant shipyards delivered tonnage exceeding the total steel ship output of American yards during not only the best year, but the best 2 years of 1917 to 1922 shipbuilding effort. Even more significant, however, is the fact that the shipyards of the last war did not attain large-scale production until after the war was over, whereas the ships we are building today are helping to win this war.

The vessels we are building now, moreover, are better ships than their predecessors of the last war. At the same time, shipyard labor today is paid higher rates than those paid the workers who built the ships of the World War program and, in addition, overtime pay now starts after a 40-hour work-week, as compared with the 48-hour base work-week which applied during the 1917-1922 period. Notwithstanding this, today's ships cost less per ton of cargo-carrying capacity.

Outstanding as the accomplishments of American merchant shipyards were during 1942, this year they will really hit their

stride. Deliveries during January 1943 alone equalled those of the first three and a half months of 1942. Moreover, by the end of last month, the second month of the year, American merchant shipyards had already delivered into service during 1943 as much tonnage as they had built last year by the middle of June—the sixth month.

The Maritime Commission has known for some time that merchant shipyard capacity is sufficient to build 20,000,000 tons this year, provided the necessary materials are available as required. Recently, the President directed that approximately 19,000,000 tons of merchant ships be built during 1943. A good start has been made toward fulfilling the Commander in Chief's objective. Presented in 1942 with a task of unprecedented magnitude, American shipyard labor and management delivered the goods despite great obstacles. I am confident that they will do a no less creditable job in meeting the doubly difficult requirements of 1943.

The tonnage delivered by American merchant shipyards during 1942, together with that scheduled to be delivered during 1943, is the equivalent of nearly half of all the tonnage estimated to be afloat last year.

There is, of course, no end to the comparisons which could be made. Those made should suffice to show two things very clearly: First, that merchant shipbuilding in America has become one of the most gigantic undertakings in all history, and, second, that labor and management in the shipyards and in the industries supplying them have been doing a bang-up job.

Naturally, the many technological developments of recent years have contributed much to the present shipbuilding program. I think it is also true that shipbuilding, in turn, has contributed to many of those developments. Welding is an outstanding example. It has speeded ship construction, both through facilitating prefabrication and by simplifying many tasks which formerly were difficult and time consuming. The welded ship is lighter than its predecessor and, under comparable conditions, costs less to build. Its ability to withstand damage from bombs and torpedoes is remarkable. The vast majority of today's shipyard workers had to be trained for their jobs in a hurry, and welding has proven splendidly adapted to the rapid training of a new generation of shipbuilders. It is no exaggeration to say that many ships now in service would still be under construction if the shipbuilding industry had not recognized and exploited the potentialities of welding. At the same time, it seems entirely probable that shipbuilding has become one of the greatest single factors in advancing both the application and the techniques of electric arc-welding.

In the construction of the vessels of the long-range program, the Commission has endeavored to be liberal in its engineering policy, making practical use of many modern developments, such as extensive electrification of auxiliaries, and the use of high pressures and temperatures in steam machinery. Wartime conditions, of course, often control the extent to which refinements can be applied. In connection with the Liberty ship program, for example, limitations in supply, similar to those which dictated the use of reciprocating engines, also required the adoption of steam-driven winches, pumps, and other auxiliaries.

Likewise, restrictions in the use of alloy steels have necessitated moderate steam pressures and temperatures in the Liberty ships and various other vessels of an emergency character. And yet, even the use of substitute materials for more and more applications is contributing experience which will add much to America's engineering resources.

But the continuing task of building increasing numbers of ships is not without its problems. While the capacity of the merchant shipyards to build 20,000,000 tons of shipping in 1943 is clearly indicated, the actual utilization of that capacity is currently dependent upon materials. Then, too, there are problems in connection with manpower, and related to them are considerations with respect to food, housing, and transportation. And yet problems are nothing new in shipbuilding; I can assure you that many had to be solved before the 8,000,000-ton objective of 1942 was successfully accomplished.

The new tonnage built by American shipyards since the war began has reinforced the United Nations' merchant fleet at a critical point in the battle of shipping. Personally, I believe it is truly saving the day. But the millions of tons of new construction have far more than a wartime significance. The problems which are certain to confront American shipping in the future will be many and varied. Our success in solving those problems depends upon the clarity with which we are able to view them, the energy with which we attack them, and, above all, the degree of cooperation which those of you who represent private industry, and we, who represent the Government, are able to achieve.

After the war is won, shipping undoubtedly will play an indispensable role in making victory permanent. In not many more months, the American merchant marine will be the largest in the world and will present us with a post-war responsibility of great magnitude. The end of the last war's building program likewise found us with a vast merchant fleet largely composed of ships of emergency construction. What happened to that fleet is a sad story. When this war is over, therefore, we must not again rest on our oars until our merchant marine threatens to become an economic Achilles' heel. If victory is to outlast the ships we are building, we must resolve to maintain in peace a first-class merchant marine and, as an essential corollary, a healthy shipbuilding industry.

Not only will we have the ships, second to none, for a post-war merchant marine, but, in addition we will have an unexcelled seagoing personnel to man them. The present War Shipping Administration training program, which is an outgrowth of the peacetime training activities of the Maritime Commission, today is supplying officers, seamen, and specialists in the great numbers needed for the rapidly expanding merchant fleet. The skill and experience which these men are acquiring for use in helping to smash the Nazi and the Jap will be equally indispensable in time of peace, for the finest ships we can build will be no better than the men who sail them. And at this point I might say that there is no brighter chapter in the story of the war at sea than the courage and perseverance of those gallant men who operate our merchant ships.

Given then the men and ships, what, in addition, will our merchant marine require so that it may be enabled to maintain a position on the sea lanes of the world befitting that of a great nation?

In the main it will need patronage. A half-filled ship is a liability and exporters and importers, and voyagers as well, must be encouraged to ship and travel American. Moreover, it must have the continuing support of the Nation as a whole; it must be brought home to everyone just what an American merchant marine means to them. They must know that such a fleet insures against possible dependence upon the ships of others for the movement abroad of the products of our farms and factories.

Let us resolve, therefore, to do all that is necessary to make the Stars and Stripes a proud and familiar sight in every port and on every ocean.

United States of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Clarence K. Streit, which appeared in the Detroit Free Press on March 14, 1943.

This Congress or its successor will have to write the peace and reconstruct the world, and I feel it is incumbent upon us here in Congress to see that the people of the United States are thoroughly familiar with all legitimate proposals which are offered for this purpose.

UNITED STATES FEDERAL UNION IS PROPOSED AS MODEL FOR WORLD ORGANIZATION

(By Clarence K. Streit, president, Federal Union, Inc.)

We must model our plans for international organization on something. Why then continue to model it on failures, on the League of Nations, and the old European system of coalitions, alliances, diplomacy, balance of power? Why not try at least for once to model it on the greatest success in history—our own American federal union?

How can we follow now this United States way to win both war and peace? Here are the main outlines, as we of Federal Union, Inc., see them. Recognize:

1. That our first and basic problem in making peace is to make sure that we and our friends will remain united after the victory.

2. That the best time to unite with them is now, before victory, while the pressure to unite is strongest.

3. That the most effective way to unite nations is the federal union way.

What then? Obviously, we can't hope to unite, in our American kind of federal union, with all the United Nations at the start. It was just as impossible for the 13 States to form their kind of union with the French Bourbon monarchy. It was hard enough for them to form a Federal union on a free-trade basis even among themselves.

It will be hard enough for us to form a union like the United States of America even with a dozen of the democracies that have the highest political and living standards or even with the British and French whom the war forces us to work with the most now.

But though we cannot expect to achieve universal federal union in our generation, we can found the nucleus of it now; we can make a good beginning. That is the United States way to do, and it also calls on us to begin by setting up at the same time two different types of organizations, both destined to grow gradually toward our final goal. Here is the United States way to begin, as I see it:

1. Unite with other democracies to form a full-fledged federal union of the free, now, in wartime.

2. Set up, now in wartime, another, more general type of world organization composed of this union of democracies, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, and other members of the United Nations with whom full federal union is not practically attainable at present, or so urgently necessary

3. After the war, call conventions to reorganize both these necessarily provisional wartime structures on a permanent basis

with a view to their bringing the neutrals and Germany, Italy, and Japan, into one or the other, and evolving eventually into a universal federal union.

The third point is around the corner; it need not concern us now. The second point is already well on the way to the assembly line. There is still much to be done, but the outlook is relatively promising, for the United Nations already exist, and there seems wide agreement that they should be organized more definitely.

The first point is the one that most needs attention, particularly by Americans and all those who are fighting above all for the free democratic way of life, for it is the real key to peace and prosperity. What should we do in this regard, if we would follow the tested United States way to win? Here is the program, as I see it.

Invite the Atlantic democracies beside whom we are actually fighting to join with us in establishing an intercontinental congress on a federal union basis to make war and peace for them all. Have this Congress declare in resounding terms the free principles for which we make this world United States.

Have it made clear that the founders have thus federated so as to win the war sooner for all the United Nations, by breaking the Axis between two powerful unions—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the east and the union of democracies on the west—instead of continuing the present strategy of more hammer than anvil.

Have this declaration make still clearer that we aim at no exclusive union, but are establishing one that is willing to admit other nations to it as states are admitted to the United States, and that our eventual goal is to see all the world peacefully united in full federal union.

Have this intercontinental congress set up a unified command for the fronts, such as north Africa, where the democracies must do the fighting. Have it name the George Washington we and the British and French and other democrats are thirsting for.

Begin this union now, and nothing on earth can long resist the invincible argument of this great accomplished fact. Give our free way of life once more the prestige of world-shaking, world-building achievement, and we give democracy an irresistible impetus in Soviet Russia—which has gained so much prestige by its achievements—and everywhere else, in Europe, China, India, and here at home.

Prove that our way of free press, free choice, and free enterprise is the way that meets this searching test of war better than any other, and there can be no doubt which way the world will go. That means proving that the freest men are not only the world's finest fighters, but the bravest world builders. This last responsibility is the one that faces all of us at home today.

This United States way to win both peace and war is summed up beautifully by our flag itself. Have you noticed how different our flag is from others? The Star-Spangled Banner stands for something unique—for dynamic free principles of human organization, of interstate and international government, of federal union.

There are 13 stripes to represent equally the 13 founder democracies. There is no way to tell which stripe stands for Virginia and which for Delaware. They are all equal—as are the people in them. And that is one of our basic American federal union principles.

There are 13 stripes to represent the small nucleus with which federal union began—and then there is the blue field to represent the universe, the principle of growth, of free and equal and gradual extension of these principles of federal union to others. At first only 13 stars, and then 14, 15, 20, 30, 40, now 48. All the stars are equal, nothing to catch the eye that puts any State above another, whether it be Massachusetts, or Michigan, or New Mexico, whether it be one of the founders or one of the last to enter the Union.

There is the Star-Spangled Banner, a beautiful picture of free political principles, and a record of brave, expanding achievement. Let us remember that it stands not for isolating and keeping apart men and States and nations, but for uniting them. Let us remember that when we pledge allegiance to the flag we pledge allegiance to the principles of expanding human freedom through extending federal union. That is the great pioneering mission of America.

Pay-as-You-Go Tax Legislation on a Fair Basis Now a Certainty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, nothing is settled permanently until it is settled right. This old saying, so full of meaning, might well be applied to the tax situation. Thanks to those of us who had the stamina to stand against the injustices and "windfalls" of the original Carlson bill and who at the same time fought with unyielding determination for the pay-as-you-go principle, the tax problem is going to be settled right.

The judgment of those of us who voted to send the tax bill back to the Ways and Means Committee to do a better job has now been completely vindicated. It has had one especially notable effect. It has caused the proponents of the so-called Carlson-Ruml bill to revise their bill so as to eliminate the "windfalls." That, of course, is an admission of the fault of their original bill, against which I and others voted.

Those who criticized us so roundly for opposing the Carlson bill on account of the windfalls which the proponents of the bill have now acknowledged and eliminated, did so quite innocently, I am sure, because they did not understand the injustices which the bill would have perpetrated in its original form. Tax legislation, at best, is complicated and hard to understand. They contended that the proposed switch to a pay-as-you-go basis was simply a bookkeeping transaction and no injustices would be done by all-inclusive forgiveness of the 1942 taxes.

That simply was not so. Every instance where a taxpayer made a huge profit in 1942 and little or no profit in 1943 would have meant an enormous and unjustified windfall to the taxpayer under this reckless plan of "forgiveness." The year 1942 was notable as a year of fat war contracts. As an example let us take the case of a contractor who made a profit of $5,000,000 on a Government contract in 1942 and who had no such Government contract in 1943. The income tax on his $5,000,000 under 1942 rates would have been about $4,500,000. If forgiven that tax the contractor could have invested his $4,500,000 of "forgiveness" in Government bonds, at say 3 percent, and during all of his life he could have received an annuity from the Government of $135,000 on money he owed to the Government! At his death he would leave to his heirs a princely estate derived from forgiveness of money he owed the Government in taxes! And yet I was roundly criticized for voting against that sort of thing. Under this original Carlson bill, I as a Member of Congress, with no income except my salary, would have received $2,152 in "forgiveness." Knowing that every dollar "forgiven" must be made up by another dollar from the sweat and toil of the taxpayers of this country, I could not conscientiously vote to hand such a present to myself.

Happily, the proponents of the Carlson bill have at last recognized the error of windfalls and have corrected their bill until it is a very acceptable measure, as I understand it. Whether in the final milling through Congress the amended Carlson bill, or the Robertson-Forand bill, becomes the law of the land does not matter a great deal, as either measure, without allowing windfalls and excessive gratuities, would place the country on a pay-as-you-go basis, which is very important. The essential facts about the Robertson-Forand bill, which we passed through the House yesterday, are:

First. It would not increase taxes in any instance.

Second. It would not double taxes in any instance.

Third. It would apply to all taxpayers the same measure of forgiveness, namely, the basic tax of 6 percent and the first surtax of 13 percent, or 19 percent in all.

Surely everybody must agree that these are democratic principles of taxation.

The wisdom of the action taken by the House when it voted down the first Carlson bill and recommitted the tax problem to the Ways and Means Committee for reconsideration has now been fully demonstrated.

As a result of this action, we are now happily permitted to pass a tax bill that will achieve the primary objective of putting taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis that will be fair and equitable to all, and without large windfalls to rich contractors, who do not need windfalls, and who should not have windfalls at the expense of the taxpayers in general of the United States.

Those of us who voted against the Carlson bill and for recommital took the position that this great deliberative legislative body should not be stampeded even under scorching criticism in the name of pay-as-you-go legislation into passing a bill that was full of loopholes, windfalls, and special privilege. We contended that a better bill could and should be brought out based on the Jeffersonian principle of equal rights to

all and special privilege to no one. This has been done and we have the opportunity of passing a measure that preserves the highest and best standards of American democracy, which shows what a little foresight and patience will do.

The history of tax legislation will show that those who voted to send the tax bill back to the committee to be redrafted rendered a service of high patriotic value to the Nation.

In my public service I try to help rich and poor alike in every worthy cause in which my assistance is sought, and I believe in protecting both human rights and property rights, but I do not see how anyone steeped in the philosophy of American equality and democracy could support legislation that would create large private fortunes for favored individuals under the guise of taxation.

The kind of tax forgiveness I am primarily interested in is the kind that will aid the poor and middle-class people of our country, and not the kind that makes millionaires. It is a commonly accepted statement that World War No. 1 made 22,000 millionaires. Let us see to it that this is not repeated in World War No. 2. Under the compromise tax legislation all of our taxpayers—rich and poor alike—will profit, but in equal degree, and this is as it should be.

I am immensely pleased that we are to inaugurate a pay-as-you-go tax system. I have been for it from the beginning, and as far back as February 11, 1943, I introduced a pay-as-you-go tax bill of my own. It is a sound, sensible principle of taxation. Without it, under the heavy tax levies now and to be imposed thousands, if not millions, of our taxpayers would face taxpaying time in the sad plight of not being able to raise the means of discharging their tax liability.

By unanimous consent of the House, I include in my remarks a speech I made in the House on Monday, April 12, 1943, and certain letters, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1943]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I am not a prophet, but I would almost be willing to stake every dollar I have or can raise that there will be no adjournment of Congress next Saturday unless meanwhile a pay-as-you-go tax bill has passed this House of Representatives. The people of the country are sick and tired of the tax muddle in Congress. Rightly or wrongly, they believe the tax problem is being unreasonably delayed and mishandled and they are demanding that the bungling shall cease and there is iron in the voices of the people on this subject. The rising pressure will before long get too hot for comfort and that is going to happen real soon, in my opinion, if Congress shows further signs of procrastination. If arrangements are to be made for a withholding tax by July 1 no time can be lost. In this House there is a substantial majority that approves the Robertson-Forand bill as the best measure that has been offered and if that majority sentiment can be crystallized into action the problem will be solved. Why not forget all differences and do what the people want done? The sensible thing to do is to get together and report out and pass this reasonable compromise bill early this week. Then we can adjourn Saturday and go home with a feeling that we have earned the benedictions of our people. On the first day of the week let us approach this vital matter in the spirit of compromise, to the end that before the week closes we may be able to see our duty and do it.

APRIL 12, 1943.

EDITOR, THE INDIANAPOLIS TIMES,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR SIR: I am glad the Times published a letter I wrote on December 9 (I assume I wrote it, for I wrote many just like it) endorsing the principle of the Ruml pay-as-you-go tax plan, as this gives me an opportunity to clear up some misunderstandings which appear to have arisen in regard to my position on tax legislation. The headline over the article was "Ludlow repudiates Ludlow in vote against Ruml plan."

I do not doubt for a moment that the headline referred to was written in perfect good faith and without any intention to misrepresent me, but it is not a correct statement of fact.

From the moment I first heard of the Ruml pay-as-you-go tax idea I have been for it, and I am for it now 100 percent and I expect to continue to battle for it. I thought so much of it that on February 11 I introduced a pay-as-you-go bill of my own, embodying the Ruml idea with some modifications which the discussion of the plan that had been going on for 2 months seemed to demonstrate were advisable.

The fundamental error of the criticism of me in the headline is in assuming that the Ruml plan and the Carlson bill are one and the same thing. It was the Carlson bill that was voted on.

The Ruml pay-as-you-go idea is a perfectly sound and workable principle which ought to appeal to the judgment of all straight-thinking, intelligent persons.

The Carlson bill, on the other hand, is an adaptation of the Ruml plan, so muddled in its provisions, so shot full of favoritism, special privilege and windfalls, that I could not conscientiously vote for it, so I took the position that it ought to be sent back with the other proposals to the committee and made a sounder measure, while at the same time preserving the pay-as-you-go principle. Was that inconsistent? Let us suppose that there was no law on the statute books against automobile banditry and that the need of such a law should become a matter of public agitation, and that I should write a letter declaring my opinion to be that there ought to be such a law, surely there would be no inconsistency or change of position on my part if later I should decline to vote for a bill applying the death penalty to a person who steals an automobile. When I am trying to make up my mind how I should vote on any given measure I look a little deeper than the label. I try to study and analyze the contents and to measure the contents by the standards of right and justice, as I understand those standards.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee I am deeply concerned, and I think properly so, in the effect which the Carlson bill, with its sweeping provisions and far-reaching implications, might have on the future financing of the Government and I know that other thoughtful members of our committee, who are fearful of the economic security of our country felt the same way about it, as was indicated by their votes on the bill. "What may this lead to?" was the questions in their minds. But neither were the inequities of the measure overlooked by me.

The author of the Carlson bill changed his mind frequently and introduced three separate bills, to my knowledge, all different. The result was a hodge-podge but none of the bills eliminated the element of favoritism. The year 1942 was a year notable for its fat war contracts. Under the Carlson bill a contractor on one of the big contracts could take his forgiven profits and by investing in Government bonds the money he would otherwise have had to pay in taxes, he could provide himself a handsome annual lifetime income from the Government on money he owes to the Government. Surely that ought not to happen. The forgiveness to which I, a Member of Congress, with no income except my salary, would be entitled under the Carlson bill would be $2,152. Knowing that for every dollar forgiven the taxpayers of America would have to make up by sweat and toil a dollar in taxes, it did not seem to me that I should vote myself a present of $2,152 at the expense of the taxpayers. It just didn't seem right. I appreciate the fact that there probably must be some forgiveness of taxes in order to transfer taxpaying to a current basis, but this should be accomplished by some such moderate and equitable plan as is proposed in the so-called Robertson-Forand bill. We should bear in mind that our country is passing through dark and gloomy days and should recognize that this tragic time should be a time of mutual burdens and sacrifices without windfalls and special privileges to anyone.

My opposition to the Carlson bill is that it goes entirely too far in forgiveness. When the American people realize the enormous amounts that would be forgiven some persons while our men are fighting and dying on the battle fronts at a paltry and insignificant salary there would be widespread resentment.

I am sure that the Times and I have a common objective, and that is the passage of a pay-as-you-go tax bill that will be fair and equitable to everybody. We in the House of Representatives would have passed such a bill if it had not been that a parliamentary snarl suddenly developed which made it impossible, for the time being, to get a vote on the Robertson-Forand bill, or some similar measure. In sending the legislation back to the Ways and Means Committee—a move in which all of the Members from Indiana joined—we had no idea of killing pay-as-you-go tax legislation, but we recommitted the bill as a method necessary to get the snarl straightened out and to get a bill reported characterized by such fairness and justice that I hope we all can support it. My name is the first signature on a petition filed with the Ways and Means Committee urging expeditious action in preparing and reporting such a bill, and as one Member I intend to oppose with every ounce of my energy any attempt to recess Congress until such a bill is reported and passed. The need of pay-as-you-go legislation is imperative. Without it, under the heavy tax levies which must be imposed in the future, thousands, if not millions, of our people would face tax-paying time without the means of discharging their tax liability. The sensible thing to do, the right thing to do, is to bring in and pass a reasonable pay-as-you-go bill, and to that end I shall dedicate all of my efforts.

In conclusion, let me say that the Indianapolis Times, whose editorial management you so ably direct, is my newspaper alma mater. When I think of the Times I think also of my old friend and brilliant coworker, Roy Howard, whose hair now has in it nearly as much silver as mine, who wrote to me the other day the comforting message that my pay-as-you-go tax bill is a good bill, but not as good as the Ruml bill, and to that I will not dissent. But it is a whole lot better than the Carlson bill.

My only desire is that I may serve our district and our country efficiently and well. I respect and value your criticism and will be appreciative if you will let me know whenever you think I am going wrong.

With best wishes,

Very sincerely,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

APRIL 22, 1943.

EDITOR, THE INDIANAPOLIS TIMES,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR SIR: I am obliged to you for your very courteous letter of April 12. I am sure we want the same thing, which is an honest-to-goodness workable pay-as-you-go tax plan that will be fair and equitable to everybody. I have faith to believe that we are going to get such a plan, or one that approximates it.

I just cannot agree with your view that there was no tax "forgiveness" in the Carlson bill, which is the bill we voted on, or with your statement:

"It is only a bookkeeping change and does not actually forgive anybody anything."

At first I thought exactly as you do in that respect and I approached the subject with that conviction in mind, but the idea that no "forgiveness" was involved left me when I got below the surface and down into the facts.

The year 1942 was notable for its many fat war contracts. There were literally thousands of them, and profits ran into big figures. Let us consider the case of a man who made $5,000,000 on a Government contract in that particular year, who never made over $25,000 the year before, and who never will make over $25,000 in any year again. There were many in circumstances similar to that. His tax, at 1942 rates, would have been about $4,500,000. Under the original Carlson bill (the later Carlson bills were more restrictive) that contractor could have taken the $4,500,000 paid to him by the Government and invest it in Government bonds at, say, 3 percent, and with his "forgiveness" money he could have provided himself with an annual lifetime income of $135,000 from the Government on money he owed to the Government! That surely would not have been a "mere bookkeeping transaction." That would have been a windfall, and a big one, but not exceptional, for there would have been many more like it. The fact that the proposed new Carlson bill should correct situations like this to a certain extent is a recognition of the faults of the original Carlson legislation. In other words, progress is being made toward a just bill.

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

APRIL 6, 1943.

MR. WALLACE O. LEE,
Vice President, Indianapolis Power & Light Co., Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MR. LEE: Replying to your inquiry in regard to tax legislation, it seems that I have been much misunderstood and much misrepresented, but that is all right. Those things will happen. No man in the whole country is more strongly in favor of pay-as-you-go tax legislation than I am. I introduced a bill of that kind last February. To Mr. Ruml is due the credit of originating the pay-as-you-go idea, which I think is fundamentally sound and which, in my opinion, must ultimately be adopted.

The Ruml plan was not before the House, but in its place there was offered a hodgepodge Carlson plan which I could not support. In fact, Mr. CARLSON'S views changed frequently and he offered three different bills to my knowledge, all different from the Ruml plan. The Carlson bill which came to a vote was as full of faults as a sieve is of holes.

The main vice of the Carlson bill was that it allowed too many "windfalls" which were not at all necessary. The year 1942 was notable as a year of many fat war contracts. Under the Carlson bill a contractor could take his "forgiven" profits and invest in Government bonds the money he would otherwise have had to pay in taxes, and provide himself a handsome annual income from the Government on money he owes to the Government. I am sure you will agree with me that ought not to be done. I could not vote for such a bill. I will not vote for something I believe is wrong.

I was not satisfied with either the Carlson bill or the Ways and Means Committee bill, and I voted to turn back the problem to the Ways and Means Committee to do a better job.

The Ways and Means Committee bill was even worse than the Carlson bill. It was unthinkable. At the heavy rates prevailing people cannot pay 2 years' taxes in 1 year, and to give those who can a special discount certainly would be favoring the rich. In times like these burdens and sacrifices should be distributed equally and there should be no special privilege.

The bill is now back in committee for reconsideration. As stated above, I am strongly in favor of some form of a pay-as-you-go method and of forgiving some taxes, if necessary, to accomplish it, but I am not going to be hurried into doing something wrong when there is a right way, and it is my wish to do everything within my power to help to bring about a righteous compromise plan.

Ever since I have been in Congress I have worked day in and day out to trim every nonessential expenditure to the bone. On the other hand, I have voted for the gigantic appropriations to win the war. If this country is to remain a free country and a solvent country, the taxpayers must pay taxes such as they have never known during a time when they are making more money, as a whole, than they have ever made. In order to give hope for the future of this country, it is my belief that we must begin to assume this heavy load now, and it will entail self-denial and hardship on everyone. As an American who realizes what the young men of our country are doing by way of sacrifice, and as a legislator who tries to recognize his responsibility to preserve America as we have known it, I am willing and anxious to find a compromise tax-collection program which will fairly meet the situation as it actually exists. I am optimistic that some such plan will be passed by Congress in the reasonably near future.

With much appreciation of your friendship,

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

Money—The Most Important Issue Before the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the fourteenth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. The review of the declared policies of the world governments concerning the use of gold and silver as money presented in this and the preceding installment of Senator Cockrell's speech, in light of the record of subsequent cycles of prosperity and depression, will be of great assistance in formulating our Government's future program to provide a workable monetary system as means of stabilizing international exchange.

Such a plan was adopted 22 years later as the policy of our Government under the provisions of section 311 of the United States Code—a law that was enacted in 1893 which is reprinted here:

SEC. 311. Policy of United States as to bimetallism. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts. (Nov. 1, 1893, ch. 8, 28 Stat. 4.)

The fourteenth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

"DECLARATION OF FRANCE

"Mr. Cernuschi, delegate of France, desired, in the first place, to convey to the conference the impression which had been made upon him by the declarations just read, notably those of the honorable delegates of Germany and of Great Britain. The conference could not fail to note the very considerable importance of these declarations.

"Upon what condition, in reality, did the success of the work depend upon which the assembly was entering today? Upon the concord of the four great metallic powers of the globe, France, the United States, Germany, and Great Britain. The understanding between France and the United States was already an accomplished fact, of which the meeting of the present conference, called as it had been by the two Republics, might be considered the official confirmation. The success of the conference, and the fate of bimetallism, then only depended upon Germany and England. If [continued Mr. Cernuschi] these two join France and the United States, bimetallism becomes the monetary law of the whole world; if one of them should join, it would still be possible; if both should refuse their cooperation, it would be condemned to remain impracticable.

"Now, what is the purport of the declarations which have just been read to the conference? It is, in the first place, that the concurrence of Great Britain is, for the time being, refused (pp. 36, 37).

"Germany was the first to go into the experiment of gold monometallism, at a time when that monetary system was the object of a universal infatuation amounting almost to a craze. In 1869, the chancellor of the exchequer, Mr. Lowe, was able to declare in full Parliament, on the occasion of the propositions for monetary unification made by France, that he would never treat with a country which retained bimetallism; but he expressed himself as disposed to reduce by 1 grain the weight of the pound sterling, in order to bring it nearer to the international piece of 25 francs, but only upon the absolute condition that France should give up the coinage of silver; and he was able to add, without being contradicted, that the French Government was inclined to subscribe to such an arrangement. At the same time, on this side of the channel, a vast

monetary investigation was being carried on with éclat before the superior council of agriculture and commerce, the conclusions of which examination were favorable to the adoption of gold monometallism. An international conference, called upon the occasion of the Universal Exhibition of 1867, had already pronounced in favor of the same views; and it may be said that everything seemed to presage the early triumph of monometallism.

"Immediately following upon these significant facts came Germany's proceeding in the reform of her monetary system; and it was natural enough that she took the course that seemed open to her. She did not wish by becoming a bimetallic power to run the risk of being used as a stepping stone by the other states, which were nearly all moving toward monometallism; she did not wish to aid her neighbors to adopt gold monometallism, so that they might be able thereafter to use it against herself. Such conduct, save the error upon which it was based, seemed rational enough, but it is none the less certain that if in 1871 Germany had not felt this fear, she would have preferred bimetallism, which she acknowledges today to be logical and legitimate from a scientific point of view. She would thus have saved 96,000,000 marks, which the other states have gained at her expense.

"In the present condition of affairs, what is the proper thing to do? We must, so to speak, blot out from history these last 10 years, and return to the status quo which obtained before the monetary war; in a word, we must liquidate the disastrous experiment attempted by Germany."

I call special attention to Mr. Cernuschi, delegate for France who makes the statement I have read:

"Germany was the first to go into the experiment of gold monometallism at a time when that monetary system was the object of a universal infatuation amounting to almost a craze."

Why? Because of the wonderful fairy tales and unfounded exaggerations and representations of the officers and representatives of the United States in Europe that we had an auriferous and argentiferous region extending from Mexico clear up to Alaska, a region which was mountainous and filled with the precious metals which would yield annually from $200,000,000 to $400,000,000; and that the world was to be flooded. They became wild. Europe had seen the deluge that came from California and Australia, and here was another which was to be fourfold that which came from California and Australia, more gold than they ever produced annually, to continue for all time to come. These were the representations. As Germany had been scared in 1857 into establishing a single silver standard because of the surplus of gold, no wonder she was made to change from that single silver standard to a single gold standard, in 1871-73 by reason of these misrepresentations and exaggerations.

We see now the effect of the misstatements and misrepresentations of Mr. Ruggles and Senator Sherman. I now quote from that part relating to India, on pages 266 and 267:

"As to India, the great wish of the financial authorities in that country has been, if possible, to have a common monetary system with England.

"Silver being impossible, on account of the English system, they must choose between bimetallism or gold, and although for the present the latter solution would be too difficult, it is certain that if the depreciation of silver continues, and if by reason of the discovery of fresh deposits of gold, or from some other cause, the opportunity should offer itself, we should only be too ready to seize it, and to return to the proposals of the commission which sat at Calcutta in 1868, and to enter, though much against our wish, into the struggle which is about to commence between the nations of the earth for the sole metal which will be left to us as the solid basis of an international currency."

Then the effects of the representations of Senator Sherman and Mr. Ruggles were disclosed in the remarks made by Mr. Horton, on page 305. What does he say?

"The fact was thus recalled to me that a great deal had been written and said in various quarters about the United States, and about the reasons which had led my country to interest itself in the silver question, and that the press had largely reproduced these observations.

"I cannot say that it surprises me to observe a certain confusion of ideas with reference to the monetary policy of my country. This is the fourth time that I have come to Europe since my entry, in 1876, into monetary controversy as an apostle or advocate, in my way, of a bimetallic monetary union, and each time I have been able to recognize the same phenomenon: it is all very natural; the New World is a long way off."

And exaggerations, as a matter of course, are firmly established in the mind.

Mr. President, in this conference every one of the nations refused. They attended out of deference to the United States, and it would seem that that was sufficient to settle forever the fact that we could not have an international agreement upon that question.

I also quote from Mr. Evarts' speech, on pages 322 and 323:

"Mr. Evarts, chief delegate of the United States, then addressed the conference (in English) as follows:

"Mr. President and gentlemen of the conference, the first disturbance in what was a satisfactory condition in the working of the money market of the world becomes so by either a fortuitous or a circumspect consent which had obtained between the nations theretofore; the first disturbance in that condition of things grew out of the debates, and came as a sequel of a conference that really had no function or duty in the matter which we now discuss. The conference of 1867, meeting for and undertaking to treat that important consideration of convenience and utility, the unification of the coins used in the computations and transactions of the world, naturally, under a scientific, a mathematical, a symmetrical consideration of the subject, felt as if there were but one metal money in the world, it would be easier to have a universal system of coinage. Bent, with the zeal of their work, upon accomplishing that secondary result, and finding that the reduplicated impediments grew out, both of the use of the two metals, and of the great diversity of coinage in the two, they thought that the way to get at a unit of coinage was to have but one metal in the service of the world for its money. This was a clear subordination of the end to the means; this was a sacrifice of money that could not be spared in its volume and in its force, in order that the symmetry of the mintage might be more conveniently attained. This was in the nature of a sacrifice of the great and manifold transactions of an open commerce to the convenience and the simplicity of the bookkeeping which records it.

"Unluckily, this scientific appreciation fell upon two great countries under circumstances which hid, perhaps, from their eyes the mischiefs, and made of less consideration the responsibilities of an effort toward the demonetization of silver. Germany, interested in its own unification, the great political transaction of our age, found political reasons why the unity of money in Germany was of great importance to the unity of society and of the state. Then this unhappy idea that, as the diversity was most in the silver, and the habits, antagonisms, and preferences of the people were most involved with the silver, if you would unify the money by having only the gold, the empire with its golden currency would easily master the suppression of the diversities of the inferior coinage. In the United States these ideas of the conference of 1867 reached us when we were using neither silver nor gold, and when the public mind was inattentive to the consideration of so intimate, so comprehensive, so universal an influence upon all the interests of a state as a change in their money might exert. In the presence, then, of the fact that neither silver nor gold was the practical and present money in our daily use, the money in which we, to the common apprehension, had to accommodate our relations to the other nations of the world, the movement took place by the act of 1873, a coinage act, as I understand it to have been; which, under this unlucky incident of regulating coin, has seemed to suppress one-half the intrinsic money of the state."

Now, I want to put the matter still further beyond doubt. I know some of my bimetallic monometallists will not believe anything that occurs unless it comes filtered through certain channels. I shall now read from President Cleveland's message of December 8, 1885, and I know you will believe him. In listening to the same kind of a message in behalf of the repeal of the Bland bill and picturing the consequences flowing from it, it would be very difficult for a practiced ear to distinguish between the parts of that message referring to the Bland Act and the present message referring to the Sherman Act. You would think they were about the same subject matter and referring to the same time. The same evil is predicted and the same result. But I am quoting him now in regard to the possibility of an international bimetallic agreement, because that is the dernier ressort of the opponents of silver, and has been all the way through this fight.

He had sent delegates over there of his own choice and selection—Mr. Manton Marble, Mr. Edward Atkinson—who saw this pile of silver that had flowed out of the mountainside, and others. Mr. Cleveland says:

"It may be said, in brief, as the result of these efforts, that the attitude of the leading powers remains substantially unchanged since the monetary conference of 1881, nor is it to be questioned that the views of these governments are in each instance supported by the weight of public opinion.

"The steps thus taken have therefore only more fully demonstrated the uselessness of further attempts at present to arrive at any agreement on the subject with other nations."

Unions Demand Suspension of National Labor Relations Act During the War

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for many months the A. F. of L. boasted that the N. L. R. A. was labor's Magna Carta. At times it claimed to be the sponsor of that act. There was, and there is, evidence that the act was drawn for the purpose of strangling independent unions then in existence, of preventing the organizing of labor except as it came under A. F. of L. domination. Later, the C. I. O. challenged A. F. of L. supremacy. Still later, the President of the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O., its chief rival, branded the interpretation and the administra-

tion of the act by the N. L. R. B. as being biased and unfair.

To remedy obvious defects the whole act was rewritten by me after months of research, but the bill as introduced was pigeon-holed, and I was denounced as being antilabor.

On May 3, to my desk came a letter from John P. Frey, president, metal trades department, American Federation of Labor, calling for the suspension of the Wagner Act for the period of the war. If the act was ever of any value in peacetime, it should be more valuable in wartime. The act should be drastically amended, fairly interpreted, and impartially administered.

That admission that the act as written has done more harm than good is as follows:

To the Members of the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives:

To you, the legislative branch of our Government, we respectfully present an urgent request:

The present administrators of the National Labor Relations Act are now doing far-reaching, destructive injury to the war-production industries, including shipbuilding, through the policy they have applied in the case of the Kaiser shipyards at Portland, Oreg., and their official statements of the policy they will apply in other cases coming before them.

This general policy has already resulted in encouraging and stimulating widespread raiding among organized workmen at present working under trade-union agreements with their employers, raiding by other organizations whose desire is to prevail upon these workmen to change their membership.

In peacetimes such raiding of another labor organization's membership would be at best questionable and in many cases a dishonorable activity. During wartime such raiding is as reprehensible as it is unpatriotic. During peacetimes we could and would settle the issue through the application of our economic power. During wartimes we are pledged to withhold the strike weapon. It should be prevented through voluntary agreement between labor organizations. When they fail to recognize their wartime obligations to our country, then those charged with the Nation's war effort should assert their authority. But at present the administrators of the National Labor Relations Act are encouraging such raiding tactics by their misapplication of the National Labor Relations Act—raiding which would immediately come to a complete end if the National Labor Relations Board would declare that it would cease its present unjustified and highly dangerous policy during the period of the war.

The National Labor Relations Act was intended to guarantee and enforce labor's right to organization and also to foster collective bargaining between employers and their organized employees. Most assuredly it was not intended to assist employers or others to disorganize workmen already organized or to directly or indirectly make collective bargaining more difficult.

The agreement which the Kaiser Co. signed with the Metal Trades Council, of Portland, Oreg., in May 1941 was the master agreement covering the shipyards and shipyard workers members of American Federation of Labor unions. Some of this master agreement's terms of employment were approved and authorized by the Federal agencies participating in the conference who were striving to establish stabilization in the shipbuilding industry. Some of the conditions of labor were negotiated by management and labor without official participation by the Federal agencies. But both the terms of employment and the conditions of labor were consummated with the full knowledge of the Federal agencies present during negotiations and also by highest authorities in Washington, D. C.

When the master agreement was submitted to the shipyard workers of the Pacific coast for their acceptance or rejection, the President of the United States, through his personal spokesman, said in part on April 19, 1941:

"In the interests of the shipbuilding program as a whole, the President hopes that this stabilization agreement will be ratified, because it seems to be a step in the right direction for speeding up the entire building program."

Afterward, when the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., of San Francisco, Calif., refused to sign the master agreement they were advised by the National Defense Mediation Board that it was their duty to sign the agreement in the interests of more satisfactory shipyard production. The Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co. then signed the agreement, as had already been done by the major shipyards of Los Angeles, Calif., and all shipyards northward on the Pacific coast to the Canadian line.

The Bethlehem Shipbuilding Co., of San Francisco, signed the agreement which the President of the United States had approved—the agreement which the Kaiser Co. signed in Portland, Oreg., and for which it is now being tried by the National Labor Relations Board, charged with unfair labor practices under the National Labor Relations Act.

The present members of the National Labor Relations Board are engaged in a national disservice. Their policy as now being applied is retarding instead of stimulating production for war purposes. They either have lost their perspective and sense of direction or are incapable of appreciating the realties of wartime necessities. Their present policy is stimulating discord and dissension among workmen. They are encouraging a condition of civil war between labor organizations. Their policy has become nationally harmful, destructive, and as contrary to practical common sense as it is devoid of practical intelligent understanding.

For these essential reasons we are convinced that the National Labor Relations Act should be suspended for the duration of the war and that responsibility for the adjust ent of labor problems should be placed in some other Federal agency. As relief from the mismanagement and maladministration of the National Labor Relations Act can be given only by Congress itself, we must earnestly and patriotically urge Congress to immediately take such action as will bring to an immediate end the national menace created by the policy which has been adopted by the administrators of the National Labor Relations Act.

This urgent request for relief from a condition rapidly becoming destructive to stability and cooperative production in the industries producing for war purposes was unanimously approved and adopted by the Pacific Coast Conference held in Portland, Oreg., April 21, 1943, by 255 delegates representing the International Unions, American Federation of Labor, with members employed in war industries, the State federations of labor, chartered by the American Federation of Labor, of California, Oregon, and Washington, the Central Labor Councils chartered by the American Federation of Labor in these 3 States, the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council and the local Metal Trades Councils chartered by the metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor, and the local unions of the 3 States.

Our War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it may be all very well to send our men, our munitions of war, to aid Britain to fight in Europe, but we should not forget that, on the 26th day of December 1941, Churchill, addressing Congress, among other things, said:

If the United States has been found at a disadvantage at various points in the Pacific Ocean, we know well that it is to no small extent because of the aid which you have been giving to us in munitions for the defense of the British Isles and for the Libyan campaign, and, above all, because of your help in the battle of the Atlantic, upon which all depends.

We have sent our men to Australia, to Guadalcanal, all over the Southwest Pacific, and there is, and there will be, no excuse if we let them die in vain all over those far-off battle fronts.

The folks in the Middle West are fully aware of the situation.

An editorial typical of that thought is that which will appear in the May 5 issue of the Ogle County Reporter, Oregon, Ill., written by its publisher, Frank R. Robinson. That editorial is as follows:

A statement given currency Wednesday night in San Francisco, by Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, disclosed information contained in a cablegram received from Chiang Kai-shek, Generalissimo of the Chinese forces. It was to this effect:

"After they had been caught unawares by the falling of American bombs on Tokyo, the Japanse troops attacked the coastal areas of China where many of the American flyers had landed. These Japanese troops slaughtered every man, woman, and child in those areas—let me repeat—these Japanese troops slaughtered every man, woman, and child in those areas, reproducing on a wholesale scale the horrors which the world had seen at Lidice, but about which people have been uninformed in these instances."

Let me repeat.

Those hapless people; "every man, woman and child," who paid in torture with their lives, for having given refuge to American flyers—part and parcel of the Chinese people, who during harrowing months, lapsing into years, were shattered with bomb fragments, fabricated from scrap iron that an American administration permitted to be exported from this country to Japan, with the motive probably of "babying" the Japanese, to salve the Churchill-Roosevelt entregent.

The Chinese, our loyal allies in combating the Jap menace, deprived of war equipment and munitions, while men, guns, planes, tanks, ships, and food supplies are lavished upon Britain; war material of every sort is delivered to Russia; subsidies in terms of billions thrown at Mexico and South America—Chinese sheltering American aviation refugees at the price of benefactors' lives—all—"men, women, and children."

Let me repeat.

Resolutions Adopted at Twelfth Annual Encampment, Department of Massachusetts, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Parker House, Boston, April 18, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the Twelfth Annual Encampment, Department of Massachusetts, Jewish War Veterans of the United States:

I. THE WAR AND OUR SERVICEMEN

1. We pledge to our President, as Commander in Chief, and to all our servicemen and servicewomen our complete and undivided support in the prosecution of the war and command the loyalty, devotion, and effort of the American people in the present crisis.

2. We ask all the people to demonstrate the same service and sacrifice that is being evidenced by the service of our armed forces on the battle fronts of the world and to that end we believe:

(a) To win this total war—labor and industry, agriculture and Government, and all civilians on the home front must make complete contributions and sacrifices.

(b) Persons, groups, and organizations must not be permitted to profit financially from this war and that war profits should be regulated and restricted.

(c) We condemn religious prejudices, racial or national antagonisms as weapons of our enemies.

3. Strengthen veteran preference laws of Federal and State Governments, and extend veteran preference to all positions where Federal or State funds are used in whole or in part.

4. For an adequate vocational rehabilitation training program.

5. We reaffirm our faith and confidence in the "four freedoms" for America as well as for the rest of the world.

II. THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE JEW

6. We urge the Congress of the United States to find ways and means of mitigating the lot of the conquered peoples in Nazi-occupied lands, and protesting the barbarism of Nazi Germany in its announced plan of annihilating the Jews in occupied countries. We are grateful to the New Jersey State Legislature for adopting a memorial to Congress to that end.

7. Subject to the maintenance of national security, Great Britain should be asked to provide for receiving a reasonable quota of the victims escaping from Nazi-occupied territories and to provide for their accommodation for the duration.

8. We urge all the United Nations to modify such administrative regulations that now make immigration under the law extremely difficult and to endeavor under existing immigration law to find temporary havens of refuge for an agreed number of refugees.

III. FOR THE NATIONAL FRONT

9. For the preservation of our democracy and our American way of life, we should strengthen our Federal Bureau of Investigation and we commend its untiring efforts in whittling down the subversive elements at the home front.

10. We commend the President of the United States and the Congress for their post-war planning and for the security of the veteran on his return home from the battlefields of the world, and to that end, we ask the Congress of the United States to give careful study and consideration of the so-called cradle-to-the-grave message of our President.

11. That the postal laws be strengthened and enforced barring various, un-American literature from our mails.

12. We recommend the naming of a United States destroyer after Haym Salomon, for his assistance to General Washington in the founding of our country.

IV. WINNING THE WAR AND WINNING THE PEACE

13. A united people, with a single purpose, standing steadfast with absolute confidence in the efficiency and might of our armed forces, and the valor and integrity of our Allies, assures a spirit for victory which will win this titantic struggle for the survival of our way of life.

14. As a nation we are committed to a program, world-wide in scope, which means leadership is needed now as never before in world affairs. Our own future destiny as a free people depends on the kind of world order we build following the war. It is to our interest and the interest of posterity that the world be organized for peace and that we make our appropriate contribution toward such a world order. If this war is won and the peace is lost, the sacrifices will all have been in vain. Another generation will have to face another war on a vaster scale. We must highly resolve that those who die in this war shall not have died in vain. American public opinion must support the Government in winning the peace as well as the war. The responsibility rests upon every citizen who values his heritage of freedom and who wants his children to be free from war and fear of war.

15. We favor the establishment of a sound procedure and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations; to provide for the assembly and maintenance of a united nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt of military aggression by any nation.

V. OUR OWN ORGANIZATION

16. We favor our so-called service membership and support our national commander's efforts to raise $100,000 in helping service members, in enlarging our organization, and to accommodate service members during and after the war.

17. We invite all men and women in uniform to come to us for aid, for legal and other assistance as we may best render and to them we offer our sincere desire to help them and extend to them our hands of friendship and of assistance.

BERNARD GINSBURG,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee, National Deputy Judge Advocate, Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

Controlling War Profits Through Renegotiation of Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks, I am including informative letters from Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, and Hon. James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, reporting as of April 28, 1943, the first anniversary of the date of the enactment of the renegotiation law, on readjustments by the War Department Price Adjustment Board and the Navy Price Adjustment Board, respectively, in the reduction of excess profits in war contracts.

The renegotiation statute has already more than justified its enactment, as evidenced in these letters, by the saving to the United States in the first year of its application of more than two and a half billion dollars.

This saving will be vastly increased under the operation of the statute as the war continues, and reflects credit on the able manner in which it is being administered by the two Departments.

The letters are as follows:

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, April 28, 1943.

DEAR MR. CANNON: A year ago today the statutory authority to renegotiate contracts became law. On this anniversary you might like to know what the Navy has accomplished under the legislation.

The Navy Price Adjustment Board, acting under the renegotiation law, has been able to reduce by more than $1,000,000,000 the cost to the Government of contracts which it has renegotiated. The figures for the entire year ending today are not available yet, but through the end of March price reductions and cash refunds arranged by the Navy Price Adjustment Board already had amounted to more than $950,000,000. This total does not take into consideration the very substantial amount which will be saved through the lower prices which will prevail on future business. Furthermore, as you know, other reductions and refunds have been negotiated by the War Department and the Maritime Commission boards.

These price reductions and cash refunds have all been agreed to voluntarily by the contractors in recognition of the fact that without these adjustments their companies would have realized excessive profits. These contract reductions have not injured business. On the contrary, they have, in general, left the companies with a dollar amount of profits, both before and after taxes, which compares very favorably with earnings during peacetime.

The Navy estimates that it will be called upon to renegotiate about $35,000,000,000 of contracts. By the end of March proceedings had already been started with companies holding almost $29,000,000,000 of contracts, showing that the work is well advanced. Furthermore, the companies who have already completed renegotiation or who are in the final stages of renegotiating held contracts amounting to $13,000,000,000 or more than one-third of the total anticipated volume. I think there is no doubt about the ability of the Navy to complete its task under the law. Incidentally, you might be interested in knowing that the Navy has told 240 contractors, whose contracts amount to about $500,000,000, that their profits are not excessive and need not be renegotiated.

In my opinion, one of the most significant facts about the first year's operation of renegotiation is that all agreements have been reached voluntarily. I think this accomplishment is due to the good fortune of the Navy and other departments in assembling what the Truman committee called "an unusual group of able, conscientious, and patriotic lawyers, accountants, and businessmen as administrators of renegotiation." In other words, the law which you sponsored has been used by farsighted businessmen, both within the Government and outside, in order to

handle the explosive problem of war profits in a manner mutually satisfactory to private business and to the public interest. I think you can be justly proud of your support of this measure.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1943.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CANNON: Because of your active interest in the problem of controlling war profits, leading to your support of the renegotiation statute which became law April 28, 1942, I am writing to you now to tell you of the results of the first full year of renegotiation by the War Department.

Data for the month of April will not be available for several weeks, but from April 28, 1942, when the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, containing the section providing for war-contract renegotiation was signed, to March 31, 1943, price reductions and cash refunds of $1,527,000,000 were effected by the War Department. Price reductions were $967,000,000 and cash refunds were $560,000,000.

These reductions and refunds resulted from renegotiations by the War Department Price Adjustment Board and sections and by the contracting officers of the Supply Services and Army Air Forces, Matériel Command. The existence of the statute providing for renegotiation has also been responsible for closer pricing on new contracts awarded since the date of its enactment, and particularly in the last few months, but no reasonably accurate estimate can be made of this effect.

War contractors are cooperating more fully with the War Department Price Adjustment Board and sections, and better understanding of the purposes, principles, policies, and interpretations of the Renegotiation Act is resulting in rapid acceleration of the work of opening renegotiation and of reaching final settlements.

Operation of the renegotiation statute is contributing to the execution of the President's hold-the-line order. It is providing a means of fighting the war economically. It is helping to guard the system of free enterprise in this country against the charge of war profiteering. The American people owe you gratitude for your active interest in this problem of the control of war profits.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

Mother's Day Address of Hon. David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Mother's Day address delivered by me last night at Taunton, Mass.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This day is set aside for reverential recognition of the debt we owe our mothers, and to openly express to them our profound gratitude.

Naturally, today, our thoughts turn to our own mothers, whether living or dead. We recall their loving care, their sufferings, their sacrifices, and their tireless devotion to us through all the trials of our life. No words can adequately describe the blessing bestowed upon us by mother's love. Only the silent tear can fittingly give expression to the sentiments that swell up in our hearts as we think of our mothers and the unpayable debt we owe them.

Mother signifies love—unselfish love. Mothers exemplify the most precious and noblest of the natural virtues of the human heart—affection, courage, devotion, and patience. There is something about the very thought of our mothers that lifts us above the sordid things of life, the ceaseless struggle for place and power and monetary sufficiency—something that reaches into the spiritual domain. We associate with mothers the things that give us a glimpse of the bliss and joy of heaven.

In this present day world, reeking with blood and the horrors of war, and where brute force has apparently stamped out every other influence and power in life, our thoughts turn today to the millions of war mothers bearing the sufferings and crosses of the present war; and we turn particularly to the war mothers of our own country whose sons so unselfishly are giving their blood and their lives in the defense of our country.

We have some conception, through personal contact, of the sufferings and trials of mothers in the ordinary pursuits of life, but war mothers are forced to make a sacrifice and to render a service and to undergo an ordeal that is unnatural, one that man, in defiance of the Creator who never intended mothers to endure these trials, has forced upon them.

Tonight mankind is being subjected to the most inhuman, beastly, and apalling atrocities that the world has ever known. In this dark hour the mothers of the world are compelled to endure in silent suffering additional and heart-bleeding sacrifices, the scope of which is almost beyond human measure. The silent sufferings of the mothers of the world today have possibly never been equaled in history. Every conceivable method that science has developed is being employed to break, maim, and kill millions of men, regardless of race, all of whom are some mothers' sons. The millions of starving and hungry war children throughout the world of every race are some mothers' children.

Consoling it is, indeed, to turn our thoughts for a day at least, from the two irreconcilable forces pitted against each other throughout the world in a struggle to the death; from the sinister forces of tyranny and aggression loosened upon the world, to commemorate the spirit of patient sacrifice, thoughtful care, and undying love, which are inherent in motherhood. But, as we look about, we are deeply touched and grieved to find few indications that the powers of peace and love which have typified this day throughout the years still abide in the world.

When all our country's men are cheering our youths on to the battle front, when the feel of war is burning in every heart, and when we are surrounded by passionate appeals of patriotism, it is not especially difficult to play the patriot's part, nor hard to don the uniform and go out to serve country and flag. This latter is, to many, an easy task of patriotism.

But in homes, however, humble or stately, where mothers live, then begin the pain and anxiety, the battle which mothers wage with the horrifying thoughts of the seamy side of war. Then commence the dark and dreary days that try the souls of mothers and test their undying courage and unfaltering fidelity. The harassing thoughts of danger, the hellishness of war, and the long and lonely hours of watching, waiting, and praying begin. Is there any grief more heartbreaking? The very realization of a mother that she cannot be at the side of her son to comfort him grieves her as she envisages the battlefield, the death and disease atmosphere of the camp, the smoke and stench of the battle, the fever of the hospital. Her sorrow is borne alone with the smiling face and brave spirit which she must display in a thoughtless and often unsympathetic world. This is the loftiest form of sacrifice and service—one of the noblest tests of patriotism. This mother's service is being daily performed amid the silence and pathos in the homes of millions of mothers. Tonight especially we salute the silent women who wait amid confusion and consternation for news from the front, wondering what further message of sorrow it will bring to them. The story of the French mother who gave her five sons to the service of France in the previous World War illustrates the courage and bravery of other mothers. Meeting the telegraph messenger from the war front at the door of her peasant cottage, she cried out, "Which one?" "Which one?"

Today as our sympathies go out to those millions of mothers we pray that out of this turmoil there shall come order; out of this fury there shall come peace; out of this hatred there shall come love.

Though at this hour the world is dark and the hearts of mothers are heavy, we must not despair. We must cherish and look forward with hope for the light of a new day; a day upon which no night again—such as that which we are now witnessing—shall ever enshroud the human race.

Where shall mothers turn for comfort and solace? Much of the sacrifice mothers are called upon to make will be mitigated if, and only if, the eternal light of justice follows the dark and dreary days that the human family is now passing through.

Yes, peace will come, but it must be a peace based upon principles of charity and justice, that shall liberate motherhood from slavery, that shall utterly destroy the forces of tyranny and barbarism—a peace that will give mothers an opportunity to enjoy for themselves and their children some of the frugal comforts that the God of nations has bestowed so bounteously upon this world.

Again I ask, where shall mothers turn for comfort and solace? To the Mother of Solace, the Morning Star, to the Mother of God. Through her intercession we can confidently look forward to an Easter morn.

Thank God for faith. It is softening the blow for our mothers. It is keeping them from discouragement and despair. Yet, sad to relate, today the attack on the Christian way of life is the most formidable in history. It does not come as in past ages from barbarians and the illiterate. The attack today comes from a totalitarian group, inspired by ruthless desire to obtain power through force. Totalitarians are found in every part of the world, often disguised under different labels. Religion is the greatest enemy to their diabolic philosophy, their pagan view of life.

We cannot view these attacks lightly, but neither must we despair. We must realize that we are engaged in the age-long struggle between justice and injustice.

Mother's Day takes us back to the real life, the usual activities and spiritual significance of mothers. We recognize the fact that our country needs women war workers and that the sacrifice must be made; but in this new and abnormal atmosphere in which womanhood is being placed, there must be a determined and conscientious holding fast to the ideals of womanhood that are or ought to be enshrined on Mother's Day.

War may cast woman in these strange and unmotherly roles, but we should remember that the ideal woman is not to be catalogued in the low level of many of the positions where war effort requires their labor. The ideal woman is the woman consecrated to love, service, sacrifice, and home.

In the little burial ground near Versailles a crumbling stone marks the resting place of a mother who in life rejoiced in a large family of sons and daughters. Across the face of the stone is carved her name, date of her birth, and of her death. The last line is reserved for her eulogy, brief but comprehensive: "She stayed at home." She never made a speech, wrote a book, or held an office. She was too busy making a home—that indispensable unit upon which society has and must always depend. In taking care of their bodies, in teaching baby minds to turn to God, and in providing for her husband, she was so fully occupied that she had no time for responsibilities that did not have to do with home and family life. She was loyal to God and to her home.

"She stayed at home." Surely no more touching or affecting tribute could be paid a mother than this. It embraces all that one might say, however eloquently gifted, of her duty, sacrifice, suffering, and loneliness.

I know of no higher or nobler way on this Mother's Day to honor our mothers than to bring this war to a speedy victory in order to rescue the mothers and sons of mothers from the horrors of war that are now being borne by them. May the Prince of Peace speedily spare the mothers of the world the dark and dreary days, the nights of pain and suffering, which mothers everywhere are experiencing at this hour.

In concluding this message I bring to you, let me, in addition, inspire in you a spirit of renewed love and reverence for our mothers, remind you of the great contribution and service they have given and must continue to give to our beloved country. Mothers are home builders. The home is the foundation stone of the Nation. The greatness of America has been achieved in large part by the development of character which has taken place in the home, through the mother instilled into the children, who are, in time of peace, the Nation's citizens and leaders and in time of war her soldiers. The mothers of America must continue to provide our beloved country with good homes and patriotically trained children, both of which are the future hope of church and state. For, without good homes, the decay and ultimate destruction of civilization are inevitable.

Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, because of the controversy which has arisen about the value of the Farm Security Administration to the Nation's farmers, I call attention to some pertinent facts which show what F. S. A. is doing in my congressional district, and I request that these facts be placed in the RECORD. The organization is of great importance and it should be preserved:

REPORT ON FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM AS OF NOVEMBER 30, 1942, THIRD DISTRICT, FLORIDA

Farm Security Administration borrowers in the Third District of Florida have made considerable increases in the production of essential agricultural commodities. A sample survey shows that the 4,312 active Farm Security Administration borrowers in the district made the following increases in production in 1942:

Product	Increase in 1942 over 1941	Percent increase
Chickens (pounds, live weight)	125,830	55
Milk (gallons)	268,393	28
Eggs (dozen)	305,388	67
Pork (pounds, live weight)	787,594	40
Beef (pounds, live weight)	208,614	(1)
Peanuts (bushels)	824,373	14

[1] No production listed in 1941.

Under the rural rehabilitation loan program as of November 30, 1942, in the Third District $3,512,515 had been advanced to 5,317 farm families for loans for operating goods since the inception of the program in 1935.

Under the farm-ownership program as of November 30, 1942, $349,374 had been lent to 98 tenants, hired men, and small operators to enable them to purchase and improve family type farms under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. Collections amounted to $17,176 of which $7,997 represents repayment of principal. The total collections of principal and interest amounted to 95 percent of maturities of principal and interest.

In addition to making, servicing, and supervising these loans, the Farm Security Administration has brought about the establishment of 61 community and cooperative services which make available the use of purebred sires, machinery, and other facilities to some 1,290 farm families who otherwise would lack them.

The total number of all farms listed in the 1940 census for the district is 16,345, of which 80 percent had a gross farm income under $600 in 1939.

1. Total number of low-income farm families that have received rural rehabilitation loans, as of June 30, 1942		5,317
2. Total amount of money that has been loaned to these families. Include project occupants, as of June 30, 1942		$3,512,515
3. Total amount of matured principal and accrued interest on these loans, as of Dec. 31, 1942		$1,839,113
4. Total amount of collections on these loans, as of Feb. 28, 1943:		
Principal	$1,210,455	
Interest	199,721	
		$1,410,176
5. Collections as a percent of matured principal and accrued interest		76.6
6. Total number of farm tenants that have received farm ownership loans to buy family-type farms, as of June 30, 1942		98
7. Total amount of money that has been loaned to these families to purchase and improve farms, as of June 30, 1942		$349,374
8. Total amount of matured principal and accrued interest on these loans, as of June 30, 1942		$17,995
9. Total amount of collections on these loans, as of Feb. 28, 1943:		
Principal	$25,189	
Interest	16,045	
		$41,234
10. Collections as a percent of matured principal and accrued interest		229.1
11. Total number of farms in district according to the 1940 Census		16,345
12. Total farms with products in 1939 valued at less than $600:		
Number		13,007
Percent of all farms		79.6
13. Total farmers who were tenants in 1940:		
Number		6,635
Percent of all farmers		40.6
14. Number of community and cooperative services established by low-income farmers with Farm Security Administration assistance, as of June 30, 1942:		
Purebred sires	26	
Heavy farm machinery	28	
Others	7	
		61
15. Total number of participants in these services		1,290
16. Number of families receiving rural rehabilitation loans during the fiscal year 1942		3,054
17. Amount of money lent to farmers for rehabilitation purposes during the fiscal year 1942		$649,805
18. Approximate average size of original rehabilitation loan in the fiscal year 1942		$314
19. Approximate average size of original rehabilitation loan in the fiscal year 1941		$323

Standard rural rehabilitation loan as of Nov. 30, 1942, Congressional District No. 3, Florida

Name of county	Active standard borrowers	Total number standard borrowers
Bay	32	88
Calhoun	52	65
Escambia	281	400
Franklin	0	0
Gadsden	260	307
Gulf	7	9
Holmes	708	830
Jackson	433	479
Jefferson	204	253
Leon	235	295
Liberty	0	0
Okaloosa	421	488
Santa Rosa	361	429
Wakulla	0	0
Walton	513	571
Washington	707	840
Total	4,214	5,009

Service Enrollment From the Sacred Heart Croatian Roman Catholic Church, Chicago, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, 13

percent of its entire membership in the fighting forces of the United States, on land, at sea, and in the air, represented on practically every battlefield on which American forces are fighting; three families contributing five members each, and four families, each giving a quartet to the service, five commissioned officers and a number of its young women in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps—this is the record of the Sacred Heart Croatian Roman Catholic Church, Ninety-sixth Street and Escanaba Avenue, Chicago, in the Second Congressional District of Illinois. This unusual achievement of a church in the heart of the great industrial and steel section of Chicago was revealed at the unveiling of a plaque in honor of the servicemen and women of the Sacred Heart Church at the parish hall on Sunday, May 9.

The chairman of the advisory board, Selective Service System, tenth ward of Chicago, in which the church is located, made the very significant statement that the average service enrollment from churches and groups throughout the United States is approximately 5 percent. He made this statement after exhaustive analysis in connection with selective service.

The Sacred Heart Church has a membership of 3,500 and there are at least 480 members of that congregation now in the service and probably a number of others who have not as yet been identified with the church. On that basis Sacred Heart Church has sent to the fighting forces of our Nation 13 percent of its membership. That is not all, however, because there is a reasonable certainty that within the next 6 months the number of persons in the service from this church will approximate 600. On that basis this church would send to all fronts approximately 17 percent of its entire membership.

Few, if any, churches in the United States can equal this record, and I am indeed proud to be the Representative of an area which contains not one but many churches with records almost comparable to that of the Sacred Heart Church in response to our country's call in this crucial hour of democracy.

The letter from Mr. Vincent L. Knaus, chairman of the advisory board, Selective Service System, Tenth Ward, and reemployment committeeman of local draft board No. 18, Chicago, gives a very interesting history of this church which, incidentally, is located in a portion of Chicago where, it is said, 62 dialects are spoken by the residents therein. The letter from Mr. Knaus follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In your absence from the city I know you will rejoice with me when I submit to you some facts concerning the achievements of the Sacred Heart Croatian Roman Catholic Church at Ninety-sixth Street and Escanaba Avenue, in the heart of your district, and its response to the call of our country for men and women to serve in the fighting forces.

Today (Sunday) we dedicated a plaque in honor of the servicemen and women of the parish of the Sacred Heart Church. The membership of this parish is 3,500 and we have the names of 480 members on our plaque. Doubtless there are some that we have not obtained as yet, but the minimum number is 480 and that is approximately 13 percent of the membership of the church. Studies I have made recently in connection with Selective Service and enrollment of men and women in the armed forces of the United States indicate that the average percentage of members of churches serving in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps throughout the United States is about 5 percent. You can readily see the accomplishment of the Sacred Heart parish by comparison with these general percentage figures. What is more interesting is the fact that it is indicated the enrollment from the Sacred Heart Church will reach 600 within the next 6 months. That would mean an average of 17 percent of its members fighting the war for democracy under the flag of the United States. These figures, I believe, are of interest not only to the people of your district and the city of Chicago, but to the Nation. I doubt if any other church in the United States can excel the average of Sacred Heart Church.

It might also interest you to know that the following five members of the church are officers in the United States armed forces: Paul J. Starcevich, captain, United States Marine Corps; John V. Knaus, lieutenant, United States Army Air Corps; John C. Radosevich, lieutenant, junior grade, United States Navy; Matt Radoesvich, second lieutenant, United States Army Air Corps; John Radosevich, second lieutenant, United States Army.

The church also boasts of 6 members in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. On practically every battle front where American forces are located are some of these 480 members. A preliminary check-up discloses the following:

In England: John Poropat and Frank Batusic; in North Africa: Jack Matijevich and Matt Lulich; in Hawaii: John Majhan, Anthony Knaus, Edward Zagar; in Guadalcanal: Emil Sabljak and Steve Marino; in New Caledonia: Edward Luich; in Iran: George Bandera: in Australia: John Loncar; in Africa and the Pacific: Charles Markusic, Joseph Markusic, and Leo Brunski.

Three families each have five members in the service, four families each have given four members, and other families have two and three members in the service.

You know as well as anyone in the community the part of the people of Croatian extraction have played in the development of this great south Chicago steel mill center. It is a known fact that in Croatian families in this area the percentage is approximately two-thirds male and one-third female and undoubtedly Providence has contributed this amount of manpower because in the long history of the wars in Europe they have battled the Turks and it is a known fact that the Croatians never fought an aggressive war except against the Bulgars to free the Serbs. There is ample reason for giving Croatia autonomy in post-war planning and recognition as a nation.

The Croatians came to south Chicago several years after the territory began to blossom forth as the great iron and steel producing center of the city of Chicago. Prior to 1890 the first group settled in that district. In 1903 the people of Slovenian lineage established St. George's parish at Ninety-sixth Street and Ewing Avenue, and Sacred Heart Church was organized in 1913 by the Reverend John A. Stipanovich and has continued to develop ever since. The present pastor is Rev. Spiro Andrijanich, O. F. M., assisted by the Reverend Silvius Grubisch, and the parochial school is conducted by the sisters of St. Francis. The parish is composed of Croats from Yugoslavia and the provinces of the old empire of Austria-Hungary as follows: Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, Istria, Bosnia-Hercegovina.

During the several years I have been engaged on local board under selective service I have studied the manner in which men have been inducted into the service from various communities and also have made a comparison of the percentages. From my studies I am convinced that there is no other church in the United States that can equal the record of the Sacred Heart Croatian Roman Catholic Church of South Chicago. If there are any comparable figures I would indeed like to receive them as well as proper evidence of their authenticity.

I know, Mr. Congressman, that you are proud of your district and of the Sacred Heart congregation, and I was happy to convey to this assembly your manifestation of pride in what your constituency is doing for the United States and for world democracy in this colossal struggle which we hope will be brought to an early and successful termination. I have also expressed my appreciation to the members of the committee who helped me arrange this affair and collected the names and data. They are Nickolas Savalina, Peter Brunski, Peter Rupcich, and Anna Yovanovich.

Yours very truly,

VINCENT L. KNAUS,
Chairman, Advisory Board, Selective Service System, Tenth Ward, Chicago, Ill.

Suggested Modification of Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERTRAND W. GEARHART
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an amendment which I intend to offer to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) extending for an additional period of 3 years the power of the President to enter into foreign trade agreements. The amendment is as follows:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Strike out everything after the resolving clause and insert:

"That section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 350 (a) For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States, the President, whenever the United States Tariff Commission finds as a fact that any existing duties (which it shall specify in its findings) or other import restrictions (similarly specified) of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose above declared will be promoted by the means hereinafter specified without impairing the American standard of living, without causing a reduction in the price of any agricultural commodity below the parity price therefor, without resulting in the lowering of any wage levels in the United States, and without permitting the delivery in the principal competing markets of the United States of foreign articles at a cost below the cost of production of competing domestic articles (plus transportation charges to such markets), is authorized from time to time—

"'(1) To enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof; and

"'(2) To proclaim such modifications of the existing duties and other import restrictions so specified, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article covered by foreign trade agreements, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder. No proclamation shall be made increasing or decreasing by more than 50 per centum any existing rate of duty or transferring any article between the dutiable and free lists. The proclaimed duties and other import restrictions shall apply to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of all foreign countries, whether imported directly, or indirectly: *Provided*, That the President shall suspend the application to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of any country which does not grant to the United States unconditional most-favored nation treatment or which is performing or pursuing other acts or policies which in his opinion constitute discriminatory treatment of American commerce or tend to defeat the purposes set forth in this section; and the proclaimed duties and other import restrictions shall be in effect from and after such time as is specified in the proclamation but not before the date upon which the foreign trade agreement covering such duties and restrictions takes effect under this section. The President may at any time terminate any such proclamation in whole or in part.

"'(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the application, with respect to rates of duty established under this section pursuant to agreements with countries other than Cuba, of the provisions of the treaty of commercial reciprocity concluded between the United States and the Republic of Cuba on December 11, 1902, or to preclude giving effect to an exclusive agreement with Cuba concluded under this section, modifying the existing preferential customs treatment of any article the growth, produce, or manufacture of Cuba: *Provided*, That the duties payable on such an article shall in no case be increased or decreased by more than 50 per centum of the duties now payable thereon.

"'(c) Each foreign-trade agreement entered into under this section shall specify the existing duties and other import restrictions the modification of which is required or appropriate to carry out the agreement and shall also specify the extent of the modification so required or appropriate.

"'(d) Each foreign-trade agreement entered into under this section shall be transmitted to the Congress (bearing an identifying number). The delivery to both Houses shall be made on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session.

"'(e) No foreign-trade agreement entered into under this section shall take effect until after the enactment of a joint resolution stating in substance that the Congress approves such trade agreement.

"'(f) As used in this section, the term "duties and other import restrictions" includes (1) rate and form of import duties and classification of articles, and (2) limitations, prohibitions, charges, and exactions other than duties, imposed on importation or imposed for the regulation of imports.'

"SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 2 (a) of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930,' approved June 12, 1934 is amended to read as follows: 'The provisions of section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930 shall not apply to any article with respect to the importation of which into the United States a foreign-trade agreement has been concluded pursuant to this act, or to any provision of any such agreement.'

"SEC. 3. Section 2 (c) of such act of June 12, 1934, is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) The authority of the President to enter into foreign-trade agreement under section 1 of this act shall terminate on June 12, 1947.'

"SEC. 4. (a) The following subsections of this section are enacted by the Congress adopting the principles set forth in section 21 of the Reorganization Act of 1939 as if they were incorporated in this section and made applicable to subsections (b) and (c) of this section.

"(b) Sections 23 to 27, both inclusive, of the Reorganization Act of 1939 shall be applicable to the procedure to be followed in the case of joint resolutions approving foreign-trade agreements, with the following modifications:

"(1) Such sections shall, for such purpose, be read as if the words 'reorganization plan' and 'plan' were stricken out wherever occurring and the words 'foreign-trade agreement' substituted therefor.

"(2) In lieu of the 10 calendar days provided in section 24 (a) for committee consideration periods of 45 calendar days shall be substituted.

"(c) As used in this section and in sections 23 to 27, both inclusive, of the Reorganization Act of 1939, as applied to joint resolutions approving foreign-trade agreements, the term "resolution" means only a joint resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which reads as follows: 'That the Congress approves the foreign-trade agreement concluded with the country of ---------, numbered -----, transmitted to Congress by the President on ----------, 19----,' the blank spaces being appropriately filled, and does not include a joint resolution which specifies more than one foreign-trade agreement.

"SEC. 5. In the case of any foreign-trade agreement entered into prior to the enactment of this joint resolution pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, the President is directed to cause the termination of such agreement on the earliest date upon which such agreement can be terminated without violating such agreement, and all modifications of existing duties or other import restrictions proclaimed by the President as required or appropriate to carry out such agreement shall terminate on the date of termination of such agreement.

"SEC. 6. The amendments made by sections 1 and 2 shall not apply in respect of any foreign-trade agreement entered into under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 prior to the enactment of this act."

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

The above amendment changes existing law with respect to the authority to enter into trade agreements in the following particulars:

1. Under existing law the President is authorized to enter into foreign trade agreements whenever he finds that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose of the Trade Agreement Act would be promoted by the making of an agreement. Under the amendment this finding must be made by the United States Tariff Commission, the Commission must specify the existing duties or other import restrictions in question, and must further find that the making of a trade agreement will not impair the American standard of living, cause a reduction in the price of any agricultural commodity below the parity price therefor, result in the lowering of any wage levels in the United States, or permit the delivery in the principal competing markets of the United States of foreign articles at a cost below the cost of production or competing domestic articles, plus transportation charges on the domestic articles to such markets.

2. Under existing law the modifications in the duties and other import restrictions which are proclaimed by the President to carry out trade agreements apply to articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of all foreign countries, and the President is authorized, but not required, to suspend the application to articles from any country the acts or policies of which in the opinion of the President constitute discriminatory treatment of American commerce or tend to defeat the purposes of the trade-agreement act. Under the amendment the modified duties and other import restrictions proclaimed by the President to carry out foreign trade agreements are also to apply to articles from all foreign countries, with the exception that the President is required to suspend the application to articles from any country which does not grant to the United States unconditional most-favored treatment or which is performing or pursuing other acts or policies which in the opinion of the President constitute discriminatory treatment of American commerce or tend to defeat the purposes of the Trade Agreement Act.

3. Under the amendment each foreign trade agreement must specify the existing duties and other import restrictions the modification of which is required or appropriate to carry out the agreement, and must also specify the extent of any proposed modification. There is no similar requirement in existing law.

4. The amendment requires each foreign trade agreement entered into to be transmitted to the Congress and provides that no such agreement shall take effect until after it has been approved by the Congress by joint resolution. Under existing law the Congress can exercise no control over the contents of foreign trade agreements.

5. Under existing law the right of an American producer to have court review by the customs court of the classification of merchandise does not apply to any article with respect to the importation of which into the United States a foreign trade agreement has been concluded. Under the amendment this right of court review is restored to the American producer.

6. The amendment prescribes the rules which are to be followed in the two Houses of Congress for the consideration of joint resolutions to approve trade agreements. These rules are substantially the same as those applicable to resolutions approving reorganization plans under the Reorganization Act of 1939 and are designed to provide for expeditious consideration of any joint resolution introduced to approve a foreign trade agreement.

7. Under the amendment the President is directed to cause the termination of existing foreign trade agreements on the earliest date upon which they can be terminated without violating such agreements, and all modifications of duties or other import restrictions proclaimed as required to carry out such agreements are to terminate on the date of termination of the agreements. This provision is necessary inasmuch as the other restrictions and safeguards can obviously have no application to existing agreements and thus it is essential, if the amendment is to have its beneficial effects, to provide for the termination of existing agreements as quickly as possible.

A Republican Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an illuminating address by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] at a meeting of the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations, Columbus, Ohio, May 7, 1943. The subject of the address was A Republican Program.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Republican women of Ohio, it is a real pleasure to get away a day from the excitement and confusion of Washington, and have an opportunity to meet so many old friends who are carrying on with the war effort in the greatest productive State in the Union. All morning I have enjoyed meeting our old Republican friends who struggled through the hard political days of the thirties, working for a return to sound American principles of government. Now that you have secured these here in Columbus, you are on the march to a national victory in 1944. Many men are in the Army. Many others are engaged in direct Government work, which takes them out of politics. So we look to you women and your organization to lead the way in the great campaign of 1944. In that Republican campaign Ohio women will take the lead and supply the leader. I have stated several times during the past months my personal view that that leader should be our great Governor, John W. Bricker.

We are beginning now to see the broad outlines of the campaign of 1944 and the issues which we will then face. Already there is an active and determined movement among the inside New Dealers to nominate President Roosevelt for a fourth term, in violation of the principle which for a hundred and fifty years has protected this country from the dangers of personal power and dictatorship. If he is nominated, his record is made. He stands or falls on that record. I have little doubt that if the election were held today, that record would not be acceptable to the people of the United States. But the Republican Party cannot appeal to the people for responsibility in the midst of a great war without a comprehensive and forward-looking program to meet the conditions which exist. That program cannot be formulated in detail for another year. But in spite of the shortness of time, I wish to state briefly this afternoon my idea of the broad outlines of a Republican program.

1. The first aim of a victory ticket, supported by the Republican Party, and I believe by many Democrats and independents, must be to win the war as completely and as quickly as possible. Regardless of differences as to the wisdom of the President's prewar policy of active participation in the European war, and if I had my part to play over again in the days of neutrality legislation and lend-lease, I would do exactly as I did then—there can be no difference now on the necessity of complete and overwhelming victory in the war. My belief is that the United States went to war because our people believed that the aggression of Germany in Europe and Japan in Asia was so dangerous and so likely to be successful that our own safety was threatened. Whether that opinion was right or wrong is unimportant, because certainly now unless we win this war we will be subjected for all time to come to insult, harassment, and attack. We are fighting, therefore, in order that this country and its people may enjoy peace after the war and in the generations to come; in order that we may be left free to work out the destiny of the American Republic. We did not go to war to establish freedom or freedoms throughout the world, except as such a world condition might affect our own liberty. But such freedom will be an inevitable result, at least for a time, of the victory of the liberty-loving nations. We are fighting the war, therefore, to punish and prevent aggression, and more than half of that task is accomplished by the mere winning of the war, by showing that in this world the aggression of power-mad dictators cannot be successful. Whatever post-war arrangements are worked out, victory in this war will assure peace for a good many years to come, and it will be long before any other nation goes on a rampage. Post-war is, of course, important, but victory is more than half the whole task. Furthermore, unless we do win the war and win it completely, we will have little to say about post-war plans.

8. Our second policy is a necessary corollary of the first. We are in favor of every step necessary or helpful in the winning of the war. In Congress we have granted all the money and all the powers related to such a victory, and we will continue to do so. It is not an easy task to discriminate, because this administration does not hesitate to use the war as an excuse for demanding powers and appropriations remotely related, if at all, to the war effort. It does not hesitate to use the war to promote New Deal purposes. Republicans in Congress—and we have much more power than we had a year ago—have the duty of drawing the line, of criticizing the requests which are made, of refusing those which are not related directly to the war. We must give the Executive the benefit of the doubt. But, after all, we are fighting to assure our liberties in the future; we should not surrender any such liberties at home except to the extent that is absolutely necessary. For that reason I am opposed to the Austin-Wadsworth bill for the drafting of every man and every woman in the United States, and that bill is only an example of the kind of thing which the extremists are constantly urging.

In the military field I believe we must follow, except under extraordinary circumstances, the advice of our military officers. I am inclined to favor, therefore, the induction of 10,800,000 men into the armed forces because they regard it as necessary for the job of winning the war, and I believe we can still carry on with the civilians who remain. But there is a point at which a further draft of men may seriously conflict with the efficient operation of the civilian machine at home and Congress will have the responsibility of deciding when that point is reached. The operation of that machine is equally important as the operation of the Army and Navy. This machine of 125,000,000 people must produce all the food and all the munitions and all the supplies for our armed forces and for those of our allies, for our civilians, and for many allied peoples. It is a machine infinitely more complicated and difficult to operate, and more likely to stall than the Army. Thirty million families throughout the United States cannot be effectively subjected to military discipline. Compulsion is not the way to get necessary production. There is a point at which we can no longer operate successfully this machine of manpower and supplies, although I do not think we have yet reached that point.

We have had to give power over civilians to fix prices, to control priorities, to ration, and to regulate. We have tried to prescribe proper limitations to those powers, but in the long run the character of the control is determined by the executive departments. In my opinion the executives have been too much inspired by the compulsion theory. They have assumed powers even beyond those granted. Instead of appeals for voluntary action, the theorists in Washington have relied on threats and crack-down. The Office of Price Administration, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Manpower Commission are full of theorists who don't know how an American community thinks or lives. In the World War the Food Administration secured results by voluntary appeal, with never more than 3,000 men and a total expense of $7,000,000. The Office of Price Administration alone has 60,000 employees, and is spending $120,000,000 a year. The Manpower Commission is building a vast bureaucracy all over the United States. So long as the New Deal controls the executive departments, and its action is inspired by the principles of a planned economy in which every step is regulated by the Government, there is nothing we can do in Congress to prevent the misuse of necessary war powers except criticize and hammer against the worst examples of bureaucratic regulation. The only solution is to change the Executive.

3. And this leads to my third plank. The Republican Party proposes after the war to go forward to a better and stronger America under the American constitutional system with just as much liberty and freedom from Government regulation as is possible. The New Deal plan after the war is already written in the reports of the National Resources Planning Board. It provides for continued Government regulation, for Government ownership of railroads, and the operation of many industries by the Government or by corporations in which the Government is a partner. It proposes the restoration of all the New Deal agencies, the Public Works Administration, the Work Projects Administration, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, except that all of them are to be on a bigger and more elaborate scale and there are to be a few extra. And underlying the entire plan is the theory of unlimited Government spending, the theory that deficits are a blessing in disguise. In all these vast reports of the National Resources Planning Board there is not a word said as to how the programs are to be paid for. The argument is used that Government spending has restored prosperity during the war, without any mention of the fact that we are increasing the debt at the rate of $60,000,000,000 a year.

The Republican program is to return to the operation of private enterprise; to let the businessmen run their businesses and the farmers run their farms; to let labor work out its own problems with its employers by collective bargaining. The Republican Party is convinced that the system of free industry can restore prosperity. We are convinced that intelligent planning (not along New Deal lines) can prevent depressions and unemployment and provide reasonable farm prices, without attempting to regulate every individual and every farmer. We are convinced that unfair competition and monopoly can be prevented without sending Government controllers into every store and every plant to regulate profits and direct operations. We are convinced that democracy itself cannot continue to exist unless we permit the States and the cities and schools to run their own affairs. We are convinced that Government funds can't be passed out to

every group in the population and every State and every school without destroying the independence and the initiative and the morality of our people. The program of the Republican Party is one of progress under the fundamental principles on which American democracy is based—regulation by law and not by the fiats of boards and czars; opportunity to individuals to make a success of their own lives without Government interference; State and local control of every matter which can be controlled without National assistance.

4. The Republican Party believes in the principles of social security. We propose to go forward with an improved plan of old-age pensions. We propose an extension of the principles of unemployment insurance, but under State control, not federalized under a Washington bureau. I believe we should work out a State-Federal plan to deal with direct relief and work relief, with Federal financial assistance but administration in control of the States and localities. I believe we should develop a housing program based as largely as possible on construction by private enterprise, but with such extension of public housing as is necessary to provide good housing in those fields of low-income people where private enterprise cannot undertake the job without loss. I believe that we should study the extension of Federal aid to health and medical care without bossing the job or socializing medicine.

But a social welfare program must recognize two principles: In the long run only those who are working today can support those who are not working today, and Government assistance of any kind must come out of the earnings and the standard of living of the workers of the country. Unless we are going to remove all incentive to work, and endanger the whole principle of reward for ability and hard work and education, the burden of the social welfare program cannot go beyond a reasonable expense. Furthermore, if we are going to put a floor under wages, a floor under housing, and a floor under medical care, for those who are unable to earn an adequate sum, we must see that the people who do work, who do save, who do provide their own homes and their own doctors, are better off than the Government beneficiaries; otherwise we will remove every incentive to work. We cannot exaggerate the importance of that incentive. On it is based all the progress we have made. On it is based all the difference between the United States and India or China. On it is based the difference between a free democracy and socialism. If we are going to give a man who has never worked a pension of $40 a month when he is 65, then we should give practically the same pension to the man who has worked and saved enough money to build himself a home or provide his family with a small income. Whatever our program of social security, it must not destroy the relative position acquired throughout a lifetime of labor by men of varying ability and character and intelligence.

5. The Republican Party is in favor of post-war planning in the international field as well as in the United States. We are preparing to meet the problems which will inevitably face this Nation after the war, but we don't like the plans which are being made by the National Resources Planning Board and the global thinkers like HENRY WALLACE. When the war is won we will be one of the victors. We cannot escape the tremendous responsibility of rebuilding the world. Whatever guaranties we assume or do not assume, we certainly should aid in establishing a world in which war is outlawed as far as humanly possible. Undoubtedly we look forward to a few years of post-war policing before reasonably peace-loving and democratic governments can be set up in the Axis countries. We must deal with tremendously complicated racial problems and economic problems. At Versailles economic problems were almost ignored, and Europe was divided into a great number of small states wholly unable to support themselves. This time we must study the needs of different nations, and see that there are available markets for their exports, and places where they can secure, at reasonable prices, their necessary imports. We must play our own part in international trade.

But the Republican Party believes in protection. We are not free-traders. It is self-evident to me that a general policy of free trade would destroy the standards of living in America. Whether free trade would raise the average of the world as a whole I doubt, but it certainly would drag down our own wage level and our own standard of living in this country. Today it is easy for anyone to transport machinery and set up plants in Russia or China or India, and compete with us on a mass-production basis, paying wages one-tenth of what our workmen are accustomed to receive. I do not agree with the view that a foreign market for our manufactured goods, except in a few cases, is any essential to American prosperity. I cannot see the use of destroying the shoe industry in Columbus in order that we may build more automobiles for export from Detroit. Certainly that export trade is not worth while if we must lend to others the money to enable them to buy our goods. Certainly we do not wish to establish an international Works Projects Administration. Our people cannot afford to produce gratis in order to scatter freedom from want throughout the entire world. We cannot permit the unrestricted importation of agricultural products without reducing our farmers to prices which would mean poverty and hardship.

We should not have prohibitory tariffs. The level of tariffs should be reasonable, permitting the importation of foreign goods, but compensating for the difference in wage levels and other costs of production. The new dealers are committed in theory to the lowest possible tariffs. Many of their leaders believe in complete free trade. They find a powerful support in the city of New York, natural because that city has been built up and thrived largely on foreign trade. I believe that we can do far better by assisting other countries to build up their own industries and their own prosperity rather than to operate on the theory that by hook or crook we are going to export American goods to all sections of the world. No outside nation can insure India or China freedom from want. They have never had it, and they probably never will. But we can render them friendly assistance in meeting their own economic problems. They are the only ones who can solve these problems. They cannot solve them by any handout from us. The international trade which will finally result from a reasonable tariff policy is likely to be larger in the end than any we can obtain by the establishment of free trade. Our international trade has never been as high as in the late twenties, when tariffs were higher than they ever were before or have been since.

6. Finally, the Republican Party proposes to cooperate with other nations in trying to work out a system which will insure peace in the future as far as it can be insured. But I believe we must approach such a plan with care. I do not think that the United States should agree to any international state in which we have only a fractional representation. I don't believe that we will stand for any permanent international police force greater than our own military forces and under the control of some international body of which we are a small minority. We should work toward an organization of the nations banded together to prevent by military, naval, and air action any aggression determined to be aggression by some form of international decision. I should prefer that any obligation to use our armed forces in any continent but our own, and perhaps in the Far East, be only a secondary obligation after the region itself declares its inability to keep the peace. But I would condition our membership on at least three conditions: First, the territorial settlement and the other terms of the peace treaty must be fair to all nations so that we can wholeheartedly stand behind them. Second, the economic arrangement must be such as to assure a fair deal to every country and a chance to improve the condition of its people. Third, the form of the machinery devised must be one which gives a reasonable chance of practical success in assuring world peace. On these conditions I believe that the American people would approve our joining an organization of nations.

The program that I have proposed is a mere outline. It is subject to infinite revision and the filling in of numerous details, but I believe it offers a basis on which to work. The Republican Party is going forward during the next year confident that the people will turn to it to win the war and establish in the United States the freedoms for which the war is being fought. We are confident of success in the 1944 election because the people know today that a complete reorganization of the Government and the infusion of a new spirit will bring the war more quickly to overwhelming victory. We are confident of that success because we stand for those eternal American principles which are woven into the life and the thoughts and the dreams of 90 percent of the people who live in the United States.

Freedom From Economic Aggression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address on the subject Freedom From Economic Aggression, delivered by Hon. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, at the Toledo Forum on Peace Problems, sponsored by the Toledo Committee for the Study of the Organization of Peace and the University of Toledo, on Saturday last, May 8, 1943, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I welcome the opportunity you have afforded me of speaking on the subject of Freedom From Economic Aggression.

This subject lies within a field of thought and action to which everyone of us should give his most heart-searching study. It plays a vital part in the determination of a problem which, next to the winning of this war, must be ever present in the thoughts of all of us. The achievement of freedom from economic aggression is an integral and essential part of the task to which humanity must dedicate its collective wisdom and endeavor. The creation of an enduring peace when this war is won.

No other subject on earth lays such a claim upon the capacity of all of us as the eradication of war, a scourge which reaches into every home, bringing death and sorrow to

all it touches, destroying so much which is beyond price and which has taken the patient toil of centuries to create, and wasting on a stupendous scale the wealth and the resources that could have so greatly enhanced the welfare and happiness of mankind.

It is for this generation, with the bitter experience of two wars and a frustrated peace fresh in our minds, to do what past generations of men have never succeeded in doing, to realize for future generations the greatest aspiration of mankind—the chance for the people of this world to live out their lives in security and peace, and free from fear.

Economic considerations lie close to the heart of this great problem for the reason that they engage so closely the thought and fundamental interest of nations and of peoples, and affect so profundly their attitude toward each other and the relations between them.

It is inevitable that this should be so, for economic considerations vitally affect the daily lives of all of us. The things that to a great extent preoccupy the mind of the average man are the holding of his job, or making his farm or business pay; the provision of food and shelter for his family; the education of his children; and the hope of providing for a reasonably comfortable and self-respecting old age. The economic acts or policies of governments which affect these basic interests touch the very fabric of human existence, the things which mean joy or sorrow, health or sickness, happiness or misery.

Acts and policies of economic aggression may spring from shortsighted and unintelligent selfishness. They may not be, and usually are not, inspired by any feeling of hostility toward other peoples, or by any conscious design to dominate or injure. But they may in some instances be inspired by the same cruel design to conquer and to dominate and to exploit as that which inspires military aggression and conquest.

In some instances economic aggression may indeed be only a means to these more ambitious ends. It may be part and parcel of a master plan, a plan that has in view the political and military domination of other peoples. In such a setting economic aggression does not seek economic advantage as an end in itself. It may not even have in view the promotion of the prosperity and happiness of the individual citizens of the country guilty of it. It is employed as an adjunct to military and political domination and is designed primarily to serve these sinister objectives. The commercial policy of Germany during the past decade is the outstanding example of economic aggression of this kind.

I think it is desirable to make perfectly clear this distinction between the ruthless barbarity which strikes without mercy with every weapon at its command, and the acts and policies which result from ignorant selfishness rather than from the evil ambition of international domination. It is true that the effects on foreign peoples may be similar no matter what the underlying motives may be. But there is an important distinction nevertheless. For when policies that are injurious to other peoples are the result of short-sighted selfishness, their modification is possible. If they are born of viciousness, there is no hope of such reform.

We and Great Britain and nearly every other country have been guilty of economic aggression of the selfish and unenlightened kind. But the effects of such policies have been realized and their trend has been reversed in the direction of economic coperation. German economic aggression, on the other hand, was inspired by different motives and has been steadily intensified up to the outbreak of the war and, for that matter, up to this very moment.

The German concept of a totalitarian state is that the total complex of human relationships—religion, politics, economics, labor unions, schools, athletic clubs, and even the institution of the family—all must be integrated with the sole objective of creating a total state, a mechanism responsible neither to the laws of God—because in the eyes of the criminal racketeers who have created the Hitlerite Frankenstein there is no God—nor to the laws of man, because the basic precepts of these laws—honesty, truth, justice—are incompatible with the activities and objectives of this modern monster.

Nazi Germany discarded the idea that economic activity should be directed toward raising the standard of living of German citizens. Instead it was proclaimed that the welfare of individuals should be subordinated to the objective of making the state strong. In all its relations this was the end that Germany sought. Germany sought to obtain from other countries not those materials which would contribute to the health or happiness of the German people but materials which were designed to be used in building up her war machine. Even in the period when other nations were endeavoring to work out means of international cooperation, Germany had deliberately and with malice aforethought chosen guns instead of butter.

It is not, therefore, surprising that the economic policies of Germany prior to the war represented the ultimate in unbridled, ruthless and merciless aggression against every State that lacked the economic strength to defend itself, and particularly against all states that Germany sought to dominate politically. German commercial policy was designed to pave the way for conquest, to soften up a country as a prelude to political domination, and to promote disruption and confusion in the relations of nations in those areas where the hope of political domination was more remote.

That policy sought to reorient the economic structure of central and southeastern Europe with the purpose of making Germany the industrial center of the area, supplied with raw materials and foodstuffs by European "colonies." Through that policy Germany endeavored wherever practicable to shift from overseas areas to other European states, where lines of communication could be better controlled in the event of war, her sources of imports of raw materials and semi-finished products and foodstuffs. She sought to obtain from other countries those articles which would make Germany strong both in an economic and a military sense.

All this was accomplished by incredibly devious and intricate devices. In essence the German scheme was to prevent the conversion into other currencies of funds accumulated in marks from the sale of goods to Germany. Countries which depended largely on the German market for the sale of their export products found themselves in an almost inextricable maze. To obtain the imported goods they needed, they were virtually forced to buy German goods, no matter how poor in quality they might be or how high in price. The only alternative was to allow the revenues created by their exports to Germany to accumulate, to allow the sums created by the toil of their people to lie sterile and useless. In many cases these countries, in order to make use of such blocked balances, could only resign themselves to accept from Germany products that Germany chose to supply them but which were not suited to their essentially agricultural economies and relatively low standards of living. For example, it is said that Yugoslavia purchased from Germany a 10-year supply of aspirin, and that a Greek firm acquired hundreds of thousands of mouth organs, in order to utilize the funds that were blocked in Germany.

The very essence of German commercial policy was that trade relations with foreign countries should serve only Germany's needs and ambitions. The problems and needs of other countries did not count.

Someone has said that the essence of every artificial and unwarranted protective tariff is that it should "injure the country against which protection is desired." In the period between the wars virtually every country was guilty of economic aggression of this kind. The whole history of British Empire preferences is a history of economic aggression in the sense in which I am now using the term. Under a system of this kind other countries found their markets throughout the vast reaches of the Empire restricted, and the prosperity of their people correspondingly impaired. Such a system is adopted to protect the people within the country employing it, but it strikes at the interests of other peoples as surely as if this were its object, and makes more difficult of solution their problem of getting a living.

The successive increases in our tariff following the last war struck at the livelihood of other peoples with the same force as if our conscious motive had been to injure them.

The acts of each country compelled other countries to take similar action. Economic attacks and counterattacks characterized this period. The resulting destruction to international trade finally brought the world to the verge of economic collapse and contributed greatly to the general state of international anarchy and noncooperation which proved a fertile field for the growth of another world war.

We, all of us, recognize, however, that whatever the shortcomings of the commercial policies of the United States and the majority of the other countries may have been during that period, the injuries they inflicted on other peoples were heedless rather than calculated. They were not, like Germany's, designed to weaken victims of intended aggression. They were not used as an adjunct of conquest, and, above all, their faults were finally recognized and steps were taken to change them for the better and to lay out a saner course for the future.

I am profoundly thankful that it was the United States, during the present administration, that began in 1934 with the adoption of the Trade Agreements Act to lead the way toward international economic sanity. The agreements authorized by and negotiated under this act provided for the reciprocal reduction of barriers to international trade. Such agreements have been concluded with 27 countries. These agreements are, so to speak, economic nonaggression pacts. Among the countries with which such agreements have been concluded are the United Kingdom and Canada, both of which undertook to reduce their tariffs, and to reduce, and in some instances to eliminate, the Empire preferences to which I have referred. In the trade agreements concluded under this act the United States has reduced excessive tariffs that were imposed after the last war.

It is worthy of note that most of the nations that are allied or associated with us in the present struggle against the Axis have entered into such agreements with us, thereby signifying a willingness to join with us in repudiating the doctrine of economic aggression. I should also like to call attention to the fact that most of the United Nations have concluded mutual-aid agreements with us. The mutual-aid agreements set forth as one of their objectives the removal of trade discriminations and the reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade. The agreements lay down the economic objectives to be sought as part of the effort to create an enduring peace when this war is over. To this end the countries signing them have agreed that further steps should be taken to mitigate acts of economic aggression that have been committed in the past and that they should refrain from committing them in the future.

The economic policies of the United States, and of the other United Nations, seriously

defective though they were during the earlier part of the period between the wars, stand in striking contrast to the predatory policies of Germany. The Germans have sought to justify aggression by saying that they were being encircled. On a recent occasion this even found an echo in our own country in the amazing allegation that our trade-agreements program, which is the very antithesis of economic aggression, had the effect of encircling Germany.

The facts are that Hitler had drawn his blueprints of aggression long before the Trade Agreements Act began to operate. His plans had been underwritten by German capitalists long before our trade agreements program was inaugurated, and those plans had been endorsed by the German people. As a step in preparation for political and military aggression, Hitler renounced the principle of most-favored-nation treatment. At the very instant that the United States was undertaking the first steps to establish world trade on a freer, a more diverse, and a more rational basis, he denounced the most-favored-nation provisions of our commercial treaty of 1923 with Germany, and embarked upon a system of bilateral trade based on barter, "blocked" and "compensation" marks, and political pressure. Under a system of international barter, the Third Reich obtained much of its imports by promises to pay with exported merchandise. These unfulfilled promises made in cynical bad faith are worthless today, and serve only as a reminder of the state to which victimized nations must have been reduced when they accepted such terms.

Admittedly the United States had by its increased tariffs helped to create conditions in Germany and elsewhere which led to the more ready acceptance of Hitler and his gang of criminal racketeers who term themselves the Government of Germany. But our trade agreements program was an implicit recognition of our former shortsightedness, and evidenced an honest desire to reestablish greater opportunity in foreign trade for all nations, including Germany.

Our trade agreements with European countries, instead of encircling Germany, may have helped to some extent to ease the situation of some countries toward which Hitler directed his economic and political aggression. They may have helped to prevent some from falling completely within the German orbit. They may in some degree have helped to prevent Hitler from drawing within his own encircling power some of the countries that he hoped to absorb. But far from restricting or encircling Germany, the trade agreements program by its very philosophy and techniques opened new vistas of a legitimate and peaceful economic "lebensraum" for Germany if Hitler had chosen to make that country one of the family of nations which were honestly seeking to remedy past mistakes and safeguard peace.

I have discussed the economic policies of Germany at some length, with the hope of emphasizing the importance of economic relations by showing the potency of economic aggression when carried to extremes. I do not suggest that a country that uses economic aggression as a deliberate adjunct of criminal military and political conquest can be dissuaded from its course by appeals to reason. I do suggest that the great majority of the peoples of this earth want peace, and that if they will cooperate in such a manner as to make future aggression impossible, they can have peace. But, on the basis of past experience, cooperation of even peaceful-minded nations in such an undertaking will be difficult to achieve, and if they should persist in the use of economic measures that strike at each other's vital interests, such cooperation will be impossible.

The question before this country and the Congress of the United States at this moment is whether we shall continue to throw the weight of our great influence in the direction of economic peace or in the direction of trade war; whether we shall orient our policy in the direction of measures of economic aggression such as we adopted in the Tariff Acts of 1922 and 1930; or whether we shall continue to adhere to the policy of economic cooperation laid down in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and the economic nonaggression pacts concluded under that authority. For this decision will be made when Congress acts on the legislation for the usual 3-year extension of the trade-agreement authority which is now under consideration by the legislative branch of our Government.

It would be unfortunate, and might even prove tragic, if thoughtless people should confuse or becloud this issue. Let us not be deceived into thinking that since trade agreements are mainly instruments of peacetime trade and we are now engaged in war, the question is not of first importance.

Let me give you my soberest judgment on this point, and it is one to which I have devoted much thought.

Let me speak solely as one citizen of this country, a citizen who, like all other citizens, has a crucial personal stake in all that pertains to the momentous question of creating an enduring peace, and hence is vitally concerned that our thinking should be straight and our perspectives true.

Let me say most earnestly and with all the force at my command that the decision we make on this question is of crucial importance to all living Americans and to generations yet unborn.

The greatest man whom India has produced in modern times, and I do not refer to Mr. Gandhi, not long ago stated a profound truth. He said, "The experience of the last 10 years ought to have taught the United Nations that in internal and foreign politics alike, the most dangerous and costly solution is to do nothing about an acute problem." I believe that nothing would be more costly to the people of the United States than to avoid taking at this time the steps necessary to insure them in the future against the evils of international economic aggression.

I speak thus strongly on the subject, not because these trade agreements, these economic nonaggression pacts, can of themselves, remake the world, not because they can guarantee the future prosperity of the United States, although they most certainly have made and can make a very substantial contribution to it. I speak so strongly on this subject because I know that if our country repudiates the doctrine of economic nonaggression, every other country will repudiate it, and we will drift back into the conditions of trade warfare which brought all countries to the verge of ruin in the early thirties, into conditions under which international cooperation cannot survive. Let it always be remembered that the fullest international cooperation in all fields is essential if peace, once it is again established, is to be maintained.

Two weeks ago as I was passing through this great State of yours on the train on my way back to Washington from Mexico, I talked for a while to a young corporal who had been ordered to an eastern camp. He told me that he came from a State in the Middle West where he had left a good job to enlist after Pearl Harbor. He said that he was married and had a son 3 years old.

I asked him what he most wanted to see done after our victory was won.

His reply was that when that moment came he wished to get back to his family and his job, and he wanted then to do everything he could to see to it that all of the influence and the power of the United States should be exercised thereafter, through cooperation with the other United Nations, in making sure that the peace of the world was maintained so that his son when he grew up should not be forced into war as he himself had been.

It is my confident belief that that today is the ideal and the objective of the overwhelming majority of the people of this country. If that objective is to be attained the people of the United States must assume their full share of responsibility for the creation of that kind of world in which men and women in the years to come can, as a basic part of their essential security, in very truth be free from the fear, as well as from the fateful consequences, of economic aggression.

Let there be no mistake on this point. Let there be no belittling of this issue. If the United States repudiates the Trade Agreements Act, either outright or by crippling amendments, if it thus repudiates the idea of economic nonaggression, it will have destroyed the stuff of which peace is made, it will have struck a heavy blow at the hopes of mankind for ridding this world of the scourge of war, and for creating a just, a workable, and a lasting peace.

1943 Crop Production Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report made by the Honorable Chester C. Davis, Administrator of War Food Administration, with reference to mobilization of farm labor, farm equipment, and farm supplies, for meeting 1943 crop production goals. The report has been made public by the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

James F. Byrnes, Director of Economic Stabilization, today made public a report from Chester C. Davis, Administrator of the War Food Administration, with reference to the mobilization of farm labor, farm equipment, and farm supplies for meeting 1943 crop-production goals.

The report was in the form of a letter to Director Byrnes who had requested Mr. Davis soon after he took office as Food Administrator, to give his immediate attention to the problem of supplying farmers with sufficient labor, machinery, and supplies to carry out the Government's crop-production program.

"A current appraisal of the farm-labor situation indicates there is an available labor supply sufficient to produce and harvest a 1943 crop up to the levels of the announced goals," Mr. Davis said.

As to farm machinery for 1943, Mr. Davis said this was not entirely satisfactory in view of the high production goals, but that steps had been taken which would improve the situation.

The Food Administrator pointed out that the War Production Board had agreed to an increase in farm machinery production in 1943 from 23 percent of the 1940 level to 40 percent, and farm machinery parts had been increased 160 percent of the average production during 1940 and 1941. He said with few exceptions this would meet the needs for repair parts.

Steps are being taken, Mr. Davis said, to manufacture 9,530 additional combines, 4,460 corn pickers, and 2,000 pick-up balers for delivery in time to relieve the farm labor problem in this fall's harvest.

The War Food Administration has asked the War Production Board to authorize for 1944, 80 percent of the 1940 production of farm implements and place no limit on the manufacture of parts.

Mr. Davis said control over manufacture and use of fertilizer assures 100-percent requirements for essential war crops and 75 percent of normal requirements for other crops, including corn and cotton.

The report also covered nails, staples, hay bale ties, rope, twine, home-canning supplies, bags and bale covers, gasoline and oil for food production, rubber for farm machinery, insecticides, and fungicides.

Mr. Davis' letter to Justice Byrnes in full follows:

"The outlook for mobilization of farm labor and farm equipment and supplies to meet the heavy demands of the 1943 crop continues to show some improvement. The following progress report touches on both fields.

"A current appraisal of the farm labor situation indicates there is an available labor supply sufficient to produce and harvest a 1943 crop up to the levels of the announced goals. If the potential is fully used, farm production need not suffer from lack of labor in 1943.

"This conclusion follows four regional farm-labor conferences just completed, participated in by the United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service from the 48 States, the United States Employment Service, the War Manpower Commission, the Farm Security Administration, the Office of Civilian Defense, and the Office of Education. These conferences included one in New York City on April 21 and 22 for the 13 Northeastern States, in Chicago on April 23 and 24 for the 12 Midwestern States, in Memphis on April 26 and 27 for the 12 Southern States, and in Salt Lake City on April 30 and May 1 for the 11 Intermountain and Coastal States.

"Reports indicate that a sufficient nucleus of experienced farm workers will remain on farms as a result of agricultural deferment by the selective service, the President's order prohibiting farm labor to leave the farm for more pay elsewhere, and the War Manpower Commission appeal to employers not to recruit farm people from the farm. In addition, Government provisions for return to farms by men with farm experience not now in essential industry, and release from the Army of such men over 38 will add to this skilled labor supply.

"In addition, a comprehensive national program is under way for recruiting and placing new workers; mobilizing the United States Crop Corps of 3,500,000 workers, including town and city men, women, and youths for full time or seasonal work; and such training, transportation, shelter, and supervision as may be necessary. Progress already made locally within the States and counties and communities by the United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service, United States Employment Service, War Manpower Commission, Farm Security Administration, and other agencies promises successful completion of this mobilization effort.

"The War Food Administration's farm labor program contemplates continuing by these same agencies, wherever possible, the plans already in successful operation, as in Oregon, Iowa, and various other States. The success of these local programs last year in recruiting labor to handle the record 1942 crop indicates a similar success this year.

"It is believed that, except in a few areas of highly seasonal fruit and vegetable production, most of the additional labor needed will be found locally through local efforts. This labor supply includes townspeople, college and high school students, women, elderly people and part time workers. Preliminary recruitment surveys indicate that this labor will be available in adequate supply as needed. Reports from all areas show that it rose fully to the occasion last year when the emergencies appeared, and last year's experience in recruiting and placing should make it still more likely to develop this year when the need arises.

"Farmers this year will be more receptive to inexperienced labor because of its proved value and surprising efficiency last year. Farmers will also increase the per capita production of themselves and their families as they did under stress last year. This additional effort by 6 million farm families is the equivalent of many thousands of additional workers.

"Workers from Mexico, Bahama and Jamaica, brought to the United States under agreement with their respective governments, will provide a small additional supply of labor that will be highly useful in areas of seasonal labor demand. The agreement with Mexico calls for 50,000 laborers, and about 7,000 are arriving each month for work chiefly in the critical fruit and vegetable labor areas in California and Arizona. About 10,000 Jamaicans are expected, for use in the Northeast and Atlantic coast areas, and 2,000 Bahamans are already working in the Southeast.

"The efficiency of power farming is another addition to the farm labor potential. In some 2,700 counties, or 90 percent of the 3,000 farm counties, power farming enables a substantial release of farm labor. In these counties the tractor's effect has not yet been fully discounted nor the maximum per capita production fully reached.

"None of these factors in the farm labor supply will alone solve the farm labor problem, but the combination of all these indicates an adequate labor supply to meet the 1943 farm production goals.

"FARM MACHINERY OUTLOOK

"Although the farm machinery and supplies situation for 1943 is not an entirely satisfactory one in view of the high food production goals, it has recently been improved. The War Production Board has agreed to an increase in farm machinery production from 23 percent of the 1940 level to 40 percent, and farm machinery repair parts production has been increased to 160 percent of the average production during 1940 and 1941. With few exceptions this will meet the needs for repair parts.

"The War Food Administration has requested the War Production Board to authorize production of 9,530 additional combines, 4,460 corn pickers, and 2,000 pick-up balers for delivery in time to relieve the farm labor problem in this fall's harvest. The War Production Board has tried to locate steel for this purpose and, after canvassing the farm implement manufacturers, has assurance that they, by exchanging steel in inventory, will produce these machines for use this fall provided component parts are available. The War Production Board is following this up.

"Based on preliminary estimates, we have asked the War Production Board to authorize for 1944, 80 percent of the 1940 production of farm implements. Estimates of minimum requirements from each of the 48 States are now being tabulated and the adjusted statement of needs will be filed with the War Production Board soon. We have recommended that the War Production Board place no limit on the manufacture of repair parts in 1944, and have been assured that the Board concurs.

"The limiting factor for 1944 production is the steel supply, and the question, whether the amounts and kinds of steel tentatively allocated to farm implements will be enough to meet the 80-percent minimum need, is still being discussed between the Food Administration and the War Production Board.

"An organized effort is being directed by the War Food Administration to promote the fullest and most economical use of existing farm machinery through equipment pools, custom tillage and harvesting agencies, and other cooperative devices. A program calling for the requisition of idle farm machinery and its resale for productive use, has been submitted to the War Production Board with our recommendation and plans for putting it into effect.

"COMMERCIAL FERTILIZER

"The total tonnage of fertilizers available for 1943 will exceed the amounts used in either 1941 or 1942. The increase is accounted for by about 10 percent additional phosphate and 17 percent additional potash as compared with last year, while a slightly smaller supply of nitrogen will be available. Control over manufacture and use of fertilizer assures 100 percent of requirements for essential war crops, including principal vegetables, long-staple cotton, soybeans, peanuts, and certain fruits for drying. The quantity available for other crops, including corn and cotton, will possibly equal 75 percent of normal requirements based on historical use. Some future improvement in the nitrogen supply is expected.

"MERCHANT STEEL PRODUCTS

"Nails, staples, and hay-bale ties are now being produced in sufficient volume to meet urgent needs, although the production of farm fence has been below requirements. A War Production Board order is now in process which, if approved, will permit jobbers to maintain a workable inventory to supply farmers' essential needs for valves, fittings, pipe, small electrical motors and other incidentals required for repair of milking machines, domestic water systems, and other farm plumbing repairs which are currently difficult for farmers to obtain.

"This conclusion follows four regional farm-labor conferences just completed, participated in by the United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service from the 48 States, the United States Employment Service, the War Manpower Commission, the Farm Security Administration, the Office of Civilian Defense, and the Office of Education. These conferences included one in New York City on April 21 and 22 for the 13 Northeastern States, in Chicago on April 23 and 24 for the 12 Midwestern States, in Memphis on April 26 and 27 for the 12 Southern States, and in Salt Lake City on April 30 and May 1 for the 11 Intermountain and Coastal States.

"Reports indicate that a sufficient nucleus of experienced farm workers will remain on farms as a result of agricultural deferment by the selective service, the President's order prohibiting farm labor to leave the farm for more pay elsewhere, and the War Manpower Commission appeal to employers not to recruit farm people from the farm. In addition, Government provisions for return to farms by men with farm experience not now in essential industry, and release from the Army of such men over 38 will add to this skilled-labor supply.

"In addition, a comprehensive national program is under way for recruiting and placing new workers; mobilizing the United States Crop Corps of three and one-half million workers, including town and city men, women, and youths for full-time or seasonal work; and such training, transportation, shelter, and supervision as may be necessary. Progress already made locally within the States and counties and communities by the United States Department of Agriculture Extension Service, United States Employment Service, War Manpower Commission, Farm Security Administration, and other agencies

promises successful completion of this mobilization effort.

"The War Food Administration's farm-labor program contemplates continuing by these same agencies, wherever possible, the plans already in successful operation, as in Oregon, Iowa, and various other States. The success of these local programs last year in recruiting labor to handle the record 1942 crop indicates a similar success this year.

"It is believed that, except in a few areas of highly seasonal fruit and vegetable production, most of the additional labor needed will be found locally through local efforts. This labor supply includes townspeople, college and high-school students, women, elderly people, and part-time workers. Preliminary recruitment surveys indicate that this labor will be available in adequate supply as needed. Reports from all areas show that it rose fully to the occasion last year, when the emergencies appeared, and last year's experience in recruiting and placing should make it still more likely to develop this year when the need arises.

"Farmers this year will be more receptive to inexperienced labor because of its proved value and surprising efficiency last year. Farmers will also increase the per capita production of themselves and their families as they did under stress last year. This additional effort by 6,000,000 farm families is the equivalent of many thousands of additional workers.

"Workers from Mexico, Bahama, and Jamaica, brought to the United States under agreement with their respective governments, will provide a small additional supply of labor that will be highly useful in areas of seasonal labor demand The agreement with Mexico calls for 50,000 laborers, and about 7,000 are arriving each month for work chiefly in the critical fruit and vegetable labor areas in California and Arizona. About 10,000 Jamaicans are expected for use in the Northeast and Atlantic coast areas, and 2,000 Bahamans are already working in the Southeast.

"The efficiency of power farming is another addition to the farm labor potential. In some 2,700 counties, or 90 percent of the 3,000 farm counties, power farming enables a substantial release of farm labor. In these counties the tractor's effect has not yet been fully discounted nor the maximum per capita production fully reached.

"ROPE AND TWINE

"Rope from jute and jute scrap, a recent importation from Mexico of henequen rope, the carry-over of manila and sisal rope, plus the 1943 manufacture will total approximately the 5,000,000 pounds needed this year. The supply of binder twine, also, appears adequate.

"HOME CANNING SUPPLIES

"Programs are under way to provide tin cans, glass jars, and seals for approximately 5,000,000,000 jars of home-processed foods. Can sealers, both motor driven and hand-operated types, will be manufactured in limited quantities. The manufacture of 150,000 pressure cookers has been approved and provided for.

"BAGS AND BALE COVERS

"Although the cotton and burlap bag supply is not adequate, some relief will be afforded by withdrawals from Government stock piles. Producers may help the situation by making more extensive use of used bags, paper bags when practical, and bulk shipments. The estimated production of cotton bale covers should be ample for the estimated cotton crop The supply of bale ties and buckles from new steel will be limited, but the 1942 carry-over, together with orders requiring the salvage and reworking of bale tie strips 2 feet or longer, plus the Office of Price Administration ceiling encouraging the use of reworked ties, will provide adequate baling for the anticipated cotton crop.

"GASOLINE AND OIL

"The Petroleum Administration pledges a full supply of gasoline for food production even though further cuts in civilian supplies should become necessary. The production of kerosene is limited but farm uses are being protected, subject to distribution difficulties.

"RUBBER

"Reworked rubber is a bottleneck because of limited processing capacity, although some relief is due as synthetic comes into production. The outlook is good for putting 1944 tractors, combines, corn pickers, and balers on rubber tires, although this is not assured.

"INSECTICIDES AND FUNGICIDES

"Adequate facilities are available to manufacture and to distribute all the insecticides and fungicides needed in food production. Sufficient arsenic has been assured to provide for 60,000,000 pounds of lead arsenate and 90,000,000 to 95,000,000 pounds of calcium arsenate, which should be sufficient to provide control for food and fiber crops. The supplies of copper sulfate have been increased from 85,000,000 to 100,000,000 pounds to care for increased production of potatoes and other crops. It is expected that adequate supplies of small packaged insecticides and fungicides will be available for home and victory gardens."

The foregoing report gives only some of the high spots of a situation that seems to be showing improved promise.

A New Day and Freedom From Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me a very interesting letter entitled "A New Day," written by Mr. Harry Daniels, of 1509 Sixteenth Street NE., Washington, D. C., under date of April 24 1943, and a letter by Mr. Daniels entitled "Freedom From Want." dated April 25, 1943. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW DAY

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 24, 1943.*

As there is nothing in a name, I believe, in all earnestness, that the flourishing ghastly economic difficulties throughout the civilized world cannot be changed for the better, certainly not by name calling, a very old custom which is to be despised.

In a sense, I am from Missouri. The world is a wilderness of promises dying for want of one green acre of performance. It is easy to promise. He who promises without building his promises upon the pillars of justice and holiness has, history will bear me out, no idea of respecting, nor keeping his promises, which were made to deceive. To call one man a despot, another a democrat, is, to my humble way of thinking, purely and simply loud alley-cat language. Concerning the comfort and security of mankind, Hitler, together with his disciples of evil and corruption, have made many luscious promises, all of which amount to nothing more than alley-cat talk.

There is something, however, I have learned, which makes some men capable of saddling the common people, though, appearing, not as despots, but as gentle human creatures of honesty and good, a something which makes them succeed in chaining the common people to their selfish interests and, strangely enough, may even make those people grateful.

I am a commoner and am interested in creating a new estate for underprivileged peoples. To restore freedom, opportunity, and dignity to the common people would place all the Fascists, Communists, and even democratic despots at a great disadvantage because it would be absolutely necessary for the enslavers to give up their selfish aims and do exactly what they purport to do—not the opposite.

The whole world is burning, peoples are crying and dying for the promised right to become equal before God and the law. Everyone, everywhere in the bloody conflict of battle is fighting for the promised right to speak and to worship as he chooses. Our fighting men, the true sons of freedom, are fighting, suffering, and dying—not for any selfish cause. Already charts are being drawn up to capitalize, after victory, on human suffering and anguish. The common peoples everywhere—may God have mercy on those who think otherwise—are fighting for a new day. That new day, to be a new day, must give to all, regardless of color or creed, positive opportunity and not, as in the past, negative assurance against want. Out of bitter human suffering, death, and destruction on the fighting front, as well as on the home front, a path must be made to lead from want.

The common people believe in their leaders who, not only have promised them deliverance from the evils of want, but restoration of human dignity to include the right to pursue individual good as long as that way does not hinder, nor deprive others.

So, while the world burns, it would be wise, as well as healthy, if political leaders drew up a course to follow which leads away from want, poverty, and fear. Otherwise, after victory, the common people might get the idea that their leaders, like Nero, only fiddled while they suffered and died for false promises only.

HARRY DANIELS.

FREEDOM FROM WANT

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 25, 1943.*

I never wish to see the world return to peace not as long as there remains one free agent of avarice to hold mankind in the throes of vice, poverty, and misery. It is by far more human and decent to fight and die in every corner of the earth, without counting the cost in sweat, blood, and tears, if we are sure that we fight and die as true reformers, as true remakers of what evil men have made, and, not least though last, as restorers of truth and good so that mankind, everywhere, every day can live free from fear of being tread in the mire, or swept into the bottomless pit of poverty and want.

It was not the Almighty God who made poverty and hunger upon His earth, for He, even a blind man can see, showers upon us His gifts—more than enough for all. I cannot but despise those pious hypocrites who would shift to the shoulders of the Creator the shame of avarice, who alone are responsible for the vice and misery that fester amid our civilization. The blame for poverty and want must be placed upon those responsible for it. Throughout the ages the vice of misery and poverty has been imposed on each generation methodically by those who were inspired not by God but by the black magic of greed. Greed, more so than guns, tanks, and planes of war, has inflicted the greatest suffering upon human hearts.

Greed must be disposed of to save the present as well as future generations the

pain and suffering of being driven, like swine, under a false peace to scramble for food and raiment. Unless the whole of our social structure is revised to give all men a decent living free from fear, then it is more honorable and decent by far to fight and die until such time as humanity is sure of a peace which will deliver it from the driving powers of the mighty.

I would rather be found cold in death on the field of honor for the sake of justice than to be, by the mighty, held captive in a human economic arena to tear and rend in vein my fellow man.

HARRY DANIELS.

To Win the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a portion of an address delivered before the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in its recent annual meeting in New York by Alfred E. Mallon, vice president and treasurer of the Pillsbury Flour Mills Co., located in my district in Minneapolis, Minn.

Mr. Mallon's description of the causes and stages of the world economic disintegration that followed the last war seems to me most penetrating and illuminating. Equally so I believe are his analysis of our present situation and his recommendations for sound reconstruction of world trade:

The incessant thunder of artillery, the whine and crash of high explosive shells, the rat-tat-tat of machine guns gradually slackened, slowed down to occasional sputters, then stopped. A deathly silence prevailed along the front. It was November 11, 1918. After a time, rumor spread that an armistice had been signed. The war was over. Victors and vanquished could now return home to their families, their loved ones—away from war, they hoped, for ever and ever.

Many of us were there. Many were elsewhere—each doing his bit for the victory. The peace meant nothing to us so long as the war was won. We would leave the rest to the diplomats. We were sick of Europe and its jealousies and hates, its rivalries and intrigues. Let the Europeans settle their own mess. It was no affair of ours. We had no territorial ambitions. We just wanted to go home and forget it.

President Wilson undertook to establish the basis of the peace before the Armistice. He submitted the basic principles and an international organization designed to maintain peace. The Senate opposed. When he took the League issue to the people on the trip which was to cost him his life, President Wilson stated in St. Paul, in September 1919. "This war was a war to make similar wars impossible. Merely to win this war and to stop at that, is to make it certain that we shall have to fight another." The Senate, supported by an apathetic people, sank the Treaty of Versailles by their reservations to the League of Nations Covenant in early 1920. Later we made a separate peace with the Central Powers. Thus we deliberately upset the victors' solid front, as important in peace as in war. We shrank from the responsibility of maintaining world peace. This was mistake No. 1.

By failing to collaborate and by abandoning as a nation many of the objectives for which the war was fought, we failed to use a great and active asset: The confidence of the world in us. That was mistake No. 2.

On the economic front we attempted to maintain a so-called favorable balance of trade after the United States had changed from a debtor nation of $3,000,000,000 before the war to a creditor nation of more than $20,000,000,000. We thought we could have our cake and eat it, too. The Emergency Tariff Act was passed in 1921, followed by the general Tariff Act of 1922. This was mistake No. 3.

To force exports while restricting imports, we floated huge foreign loans in this country, which only postponed the inevitable collapse. The foreigner bought goods with this credit from our humming factories. Our success was phenomenal. We thought we had discovered the secret of permanent prosperity even though defying economic law. But by failing to open the door for repayment, we lost our money. That was mistake No. 4.

The close of the war found economic affairs in Europe in chaos. International trade was disrupted. Public finances and national currencies were in disorder. Production was disorganized. War debts and reparations, in unheard of sums, hung like a vast pall over the whole scene. France, frightened by the withdrawal of the United States from the peace treaty, tried to exact a guarantee of protection from Britain in case of a German attack. Britain, foreseeing the possibilities of trade with Germany, declined, lest such a promise smother incipient commercial relations. France, alone and jittery alongside her bigger neighbor, invaded the Ruhr, giving further impetus to European nationalism and self-sufficiency.

By the middle of the twenties, with Germany released from the restrictions upon her tariff automonomy in the Versailles Treaty, the movement toward higher tariffs and trade controls expanded. A world economic conference in 1927 admitted the dangers inherent in the rapid rise of trade barriers, and sought to institute measures to halt the trend. But, in general, these measures were unsuccessful. Almost everywhere the upward trend continued. In the United States it was manifested in the months of public hearings and debate, inaugurated long before the beginning of the depression, which culminated in the highest tariff of our history—the Hawley-Smoot Act. That was mistake No. 5.

Foreign loans declined rapidly. Business slowed down. The stock market crashed. The great depression began. Japan invaded China. Britain went off the gold standard. Hitler came to power in Germany. Among all Hitler's lies, he stated one outstanding truth when he shouted, "Germany must export or die." Under the peace treaty, Germany was expected to pay reparations while the other countries closed their doors to the goods which were the only means by which Germany could make payment.

Foreign countries adversely affected by our tariff immediately retaliated. Our agricultural products were among the first to suffer. With foreign markets reduced, supplies of agricultural products backed up in this country. Farm prices declined. The farmer couldn't buy. Industry, with so large a market lost in this country, to say nothing of abroad, reduced operations. Unemployment followed, and widespread economic distress. The funeral dirge of the capitalistic system was widely sung. It was antiquated, they said. Some new political systems—socialism, communism, any kind of system but capitalism—were freely discussed. Frightened business leaders tried every conceivable argument to popularize the system of free enterprise. Long years of uncertainty followed. Anybody with a crackpot idea was given the keys of the city. Some laws were enacted that farsighted business should have put on the books years ago. Some laws were enacted that never should have been on the books. Tinkering with one problem produced a dozen new ones. Everything was doctored but the cause.

There was nothing wrong with the capitalistic system. There was nothing wrong with the gold standard. The free-enterprise system had not failed. We had just taken them for granted and forgotten how and why they functioned.

Never has the futility and folly of attempting to deal with an international problem by purely nationalistic measures been better demonstrated. In frantic efforts to protect monetary stability and financial solvency, many nations adopted prohibitive and discriminatory tariffs, quotas, exchange controls, clearing and compensation agreements, or other forms of bilateralism and many other devices to force exports and restrict imports. There began a period of economic warfare of almost savage intensity. Retaliation and counterretaliation set up a vicious circle of trade annihilation. Prosperity vanished and living standards went into a tail spin. It was a clear example within our own generation of economic warfare becoming so intense that it finally burst into armed conflict.

For decades unilateral tariff legislation had been practiced in this country. For a debtor nation developing natural infant industries, it has certain advantages. For creditor nations with a highly developed industrial system, it has quite the reverse effect. Congress-made tariffs have traditionally been based upon logrolling, partisan politics, and group pressures rather than upon sound economic considerations for the welfare of the whole country. Such tariff legislation provides no direct bargaining power to obtain from foreign countries definite improvements in their treatment of imports from the United States. It gives no consideration to external effects or foreign repercussions. Tariffs made by Congress tend to rise higher and higher under the accumulated impacts of group and regional pressures until the inevitable break-down occurs.

Bilateral trade agreements are inherently discriminatory. They are the device which the Nazis employed with such ruthlessness and vigor. They are probably the most effective weapon for cut-throat trading, economic oppression, and stifling of commerce which the ingenuity of man has yet devised. The abolition of bilateralism is an indispensable condition to the economic reconstruction of the world. It has shortsighted attraction for countries with import balances and faced with balance-of-payment problems. In the end it leads to disaster for all.

The world situation was out of control when Mr Hull proposed the method now incorporated in the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, whereby, since Congress cannot negotiate, it specifies the policies, principles, objectives, limitations, and delegates authority to modify our tariff rates in order to obtain from foreign countries reciprocal advantages for American trade. Under the most-favored-nation provision written into the agreement, the same rate of duty applies to like articles imported from any friendly country, whether such tariff is fixed by statute or is established pursuant to a trade agreement. Similarly, products of the United States receive all concessions which the other country may have made, or which it may make in the future, to the same products, when they are imported from a third country. Equally valuable has been the effect of the generalization of trade-agreement benefits to third countries in restraining them from discriminating against United States trade. Nearly

all countries have practiced discriminatory trade policies of one type or another. But, because they desired to benefit in their trade with the United States from the concessions which this country has made in trade agreements, they have in practically all cases refrained from applying higher tariffs to products of the United States that those applicable to the same products coming from some other country.

The mechanism provided by the Trade Agreements Act and the nonpolitical, professionally qualified, interdepartmental organization which utilizes the services of all available experts, built up to administer it, has definitely proved its effectiveness. It is free of congressional log-rolling and partisan politics, and should definitely be so maintained. With reference to the negotiating of such agreements, a former President of the American Tariff League (a strong opponent) stated: "I will also stress the fact that in carrying out the trade agreement policy by Mr. Hull, great credit should be given to the fact that there has been no suspicion of political influence regarding the reduction in duties on any article placed on the reciprocal trading list. I believe that everyone who has had occasion to contact the staff that makes up the schedules must admit that regardless of whether we approve of the policy or not, the agreements are prepared solely from the viewpoint of endeavoring to increase foreign trade with the least injury to domestic industries."

The Trade Agreements Act offers a means of incerasing needed imports without serious injury to any reasonably efficient domestic industry. It permits the negotiating of mutually advantageous concessions, the establishment of stable trading conditions, and the harmonious handling of international trade relations and problems. It was the one constructive step taken by our Government in the interwar period to promote peace, but the enactment came too late to extinguish the flames of economic war all over the globe. It was the one ray of light in a world economic black-out.

When the act came up for renewal in 1937 and again in 1940, it was opposed by some interests which seek to benefit from high protective tariffs. The manufacturer who denies the right of government to control his business is often the very man who demands that the Government control the competition of foreign goods that might limit his profits. He does not realize that restriction of imports by high tariffs may easily lead to regimentation in the export industries and related economic activities—the very result he seeks to avoid. He forgets that free enterprise cannot function well where selfish or unsound economic advantages are possessed by certain individual economic groups to the detriment of other groups, whether within or without the limits of the United States. He does not understand that economic freedom is the basis of all freedoms, none of which can long survive its destruction. He fails to realize in requesting approval by Congress that it is as impossible for Congress to negotiate trade agreements as for the board of directors to approve each individual sale by a large corporation. He fails to see that this act leaves it entirely to free enterprise to take advantage of the opportunities created, without direct governmental intervention in foreign trade of any kind. Yet he has resisted virtually every reduction in the trade agreements that have been negotiated.

The attitude of these interests, supported, sheep-like, by a large part of our people, is due primarily to a misunderstanding of how foreign trade is conducted. Because we live in a large free-trade area with a common currency we are prone to conclude that foreign trade has no more financial problems or limitations than the domestic. Foreign trade, however, must be basically barter. It must be an exchange of goods from one country for that of another, with a view to mutual profit. No exchange of money is involved. It would be useless to ship bales of paper money from China, for instance, to this country to pay debts or buy goods. It would buy nothing here. It is of value only in China. But Chinese goods can be sold here, and the value converted to American dollars. Should the trade become unbalanced, gold shipments may be made to balance it, but not until the exchange of the country on the short side has declined to the point where its imports are curtailed and exports increased. So long as trade is not restricted by artificial barriers, an unbalanced trade situation automatically corrects itself.

Basically, then, foreign trade is an exchange of goods. Anything that affects that sensitive barometer of trade directly affects the prosperity of the countries concerned and the rest of the world. The rise of trade barriers in the twenties contributed to the world depression at the end of the twenties. The rapid multiplication of these barriers in the thirties aggravated and prolonged the depression, and contributed directly to World War No. 2. As has been so aptly said, international trade must move across international boundary lines, or armies will.

The practicability of American isolation ended with the close of World War No. 1. Neither from the point of view of military defense, nor of economic prosperity, could we continue our previous philosophy. Yet, as if an act of Congress could turn back the pages of history or defy economic law, our Government, with the support of the great majority of the people, both unaware of the far-reaching effects of the action, deliberately returned to prewar customs and policies in the hope that because they had been previously satisfactory, they would again be found so, even under the changed post-war conditions. The people did not stop to think what would happen to living standards in America if people in one State could not do business with people in another State. World thinking always lags behind the march of events.

There are indications that many of our people are thinking today in the pattern, though not the details, of 1919.

Eighteen months ago many Americans believed America was a self-contained unit which could fight off the whole world. Today we are short of rubber, tin, copper, petroleum, meat, coffee, sugar, many foods, and other strategic materials. Our disrupted domestic economy will become worse. With all our great resources, our boasted self-sufficiency disappears in 1 brief year. And don't let anybody tell you lend-lease is to blame.

Our long reliance on our inexhaustible resources is due for a rude awakening. In my own State of Minnesota high-grade Superior iron ore (50 percent or better iron content) is disappearing so rapidly that at the present rate of drain it will be exhausted in 3 to 5 years' time. America's copper reserves are estimated at not to exceed 10 years, and lead 5 years. Zinc and mercury reserves are critically short. Our present self-sufficiency in aluminum is at the expense of exhausting our bauxite resources in 2 to 3 years. We have always been dependent on foreign sources for nickel and tin. No new major oil fields have been discovered. The older fields are steadily being depleted and have now an estimated life of only 14 years. Our enormous resources are rapidly being shot away, used up, and sunk as each day rolls by. The bottom of our natural stock piles is now becoming visible. Surely, it must be evident that in a few years' time we will be so dependent on foreign sources of supply for many more vitally essential war materials that we could not fight a third world war successfully without those foreign sources of supply.

The terrific destruction of modern warfare, the increasing menaces to our national security, the direct effect of foreign relations on our domestic economy—all mean that the United States must become internationalistic-minded to preserve its own existence.

In determining our country's future foreign policy we must subordinate all narrow considerations to the broad policies of our national well being and security. Political parties will differ on domestic issues, but to merit the confidence and support of the voters, to establish the foundation for an enduring peace, all parties must face the world with a solid front on one foreign policy for America. The extension of the Trade Agreements Act in its present form by a large nonpartisan majority is No. 1 on the American must list for winning the peace. Its renewal will demonstrate to an anxious waiting world that we will collaborate with other nations in constructing the post-war world. It is useless to talk international cooperation unless we continue the machinery to implement it.

Civil Aviation Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a list of questions which are today engaging the attention of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and in which I am sure every Member of the Senate is interested.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF IMPORTANT CIVIL AVIATION QUESTIONS

Important long-range problems in the field of civil aviation must be resolved by the Federal Government. The Government desires to secure intelligent advice and informed opinions from qualified persons on these problems.

A statement of important aviation questions appears below. They are being circulated by the Civil Aeronautics Board after consultation with the Interdepartmental Committee on International Aviation.

If you wish to comment on the issues raised by any or all of these questions your comments should be sent on or before June 1, 1943, to Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D. C.

1. What international air routes are of major commercial importance for post-war United States operations?

(A complete map recording a judgment as to the routes most desirable on the basis of commercial considerations and operating factors would be helpful. The map might well be accompanied by an analytical commentary on the relative importance of the routes for early operation, the trading centers at which commercial rights are most desired, and technical operating factors in relation to existing and prospective types of flying equipment.)

2. Should there be a reciprocal exchange with other countries of general rights of air passage, together with the right to land for refueling and other technical purposes, in international air transport?

(Rights of transit for commercial aircraft are to be distinguished here from commercial air rights, i. e., to engage in trade. The rights of transit referred to in the question are those which would permit the air-carrier operations of one country to traverse the territory of another without the right to pick up or discharge traffic within that country. The acquisition of a general right of freedom of transit in this sense might be sufficiently advantageous to justify the United States in generally granting on a basis of reciprocity similar transit rights to foreign operations over its territories. On the other hand, if there is no general reciprocal exchange of such rights of transit, presumably such rights would be acquired and granted by the United States only in connection with negotiations respecting specific transport services.)

3. In the event rights of transit through United States territory of the character covered by question No. 2 are granted to foreign carriers, should their operations be restricted to a designated small number of airports and airways, or be permitted to use any airport or airway available for general civil use?

4. Should those foreign operations authorized to pick up and discharge international traffic within United States territory be permitted to do so only at a few points on or near our coast or borders, or, on the other hand, be permitted to do so at points well into the interior?

(Customs, immigration, and public health problems have an important bearing on questions Nos. 3 and 4. It must be kept in mind also that if a restrictive position is taken by the United States on questions Nos. 3 and 4, it will be likely to be followed by other countries with respect to United States flag operations to their territories.)

5. Would international commercial aviation be assisted appreciably by the establishment of free zones in States located on important international routes wherein cargo could be unloaded and stored, repair facilities maintained, staff members housed, and the like?

(Landlocked States have benefited considerably from the establishment of free zones located in ports through which their commerce had to pass. If air freight develops as some expect, free zones for such traffic may have a similar importance for States dependent upon routes crossing the territory of other States.)

6. Assuming that many foreign governments will be willing to enter into agreements with respect to commercial air rights only on some basis of reciprocity, what type of agreement would seem most likely to meet the standard of reciprocity without retarding the development of air transportation?

(For example, are directly competitive routes to be established by two countries, or, on the other hand, should an effort be made to place in effect a division of different routes between the nations concerned so as to avoid direct paralleling of services? If this is done, there will be some good routes from which the United States will be excluded in exchange for the privilege of enjoying others exclusively. In commenting, it should be remembered that more than one foreign nation's carriers may seek to operate on the same route. Another phase of this question is suggested by the tendency in pre-war negotiations to put limits on total volume of operations which were very low, very rigid, and not easily revised. Should future agreements continue to impose limits on frequency of service and similar matters?)

7. What operating and commercial rights, not specified in response to other questions, will be needed for international airline operations?

(This covers problems which present special difficulties, such as rights to maintain communication service, meteorological service, to keep American personnel stationed in the territory of other states and the like. Consideration also should be given to the length of time for which agreements should be negotiated.)

8. Should United States air carriers negotiate directly with foreign governments to secure international air transport operating rights, and, if so, to what extent and under what conditions?

(It should be noted that this is not a matter entirely for determination by this country; governments frequently refuse to negotiate on air rights except through diplomatic channels.)

9. To what extent and under what conditions should United States air carriers engage in both domestic and international air transportation?

(This question involves, among other things, the prospective economic magnitude of the foreign air commerce of the United States in relation to domestic air commerce. It raises the question whether carriers engaged in domestic operations should be permitted to extend their operations into the international field. Conversely, it brings forward the question of whether American air carriers engaged in foreign air transportation should be permitted to have terminals in the interior of the United States when such terminals are major points of origin or destination of trade and travel, as well as whether such carriers should be permitted to engage in domestic air transportation on appropriate extensions of their foreign routes into the United States.)

10. Should the United States develop foreign air transportation mainly through one company or should there be regional companies (perhaps with competition in those regions where traffic warrants), and, if so, what should the regions be?

11. If the foreign air commerce of the United States is mainly carried on through a single company or through regional monopolies, to what extent, if any, should such a company or companies be governmentally owned, financed, managed, or otherwise regulated?

(Other countries have seen fit for various reasons to subject their international air transport enterprises to a substantial amount of government control through ownership and otherwise.)

12. Should international air-transport operations be conducted in whole or in part through internationally owned and controlled Government corporations; and if so, to what extent?

(In addition to other possible far-reaching implications of this question, it would include the possibility of utilizing such international government corporations for providing service on thin-traffic routes and in the territories of the vanquished countries.)

13. Should a permanent international organization be established to (1) formulate international safety standards with respect to flight rules, traffic control, operational procedures, navigation facilities, certification of aircraft airworthiness, or certification of airman competency; (2) control economic matters such as passenger and cargo rates or methods of competition; or (3) establish and operate international airways, international airports, and aids to international air navigation? If such an organization is established, how should it be constituted?

(Obviously there would be advantages both for international trade in aircraft and for the assurance of at least an adequate minimum of safety in all international air transportation if airworthiness requirements and safety regulations could be uniform all over the world. On the other hand, there are great practical disadvantages in reconciling a multitude of national and individual views to secure such uniformity, and the process of amendment might become intolerably slow and complicated. Comments are desired upon the degree of desirability of uniformity of practice as to safety standards, either in the whole field or with respect to certain basic features, and as to the machinery through which the matter might best be treated. The regulation of rates and other competitive factors presents special difficulties in the international field, illustrated by the history of shipping as well as of aviation.)

14. If an international organization of the kind referred to in question No. 13 is not established: (1) Should conditions be imposed on foreign airmen with respect to compliance with United States safety standards? (2) should conditions be imposed on foreign aircraft with respect to United States airworthiness requirements? and (3) should controls be exercised by the United States over the passenger and cargo rates, competitive practices, and other economic phases of operations of foreign carriers?

(In considering this problem it should be kept in mind that other nations probably would impose on United States airmen, aircraft, and air carriers conditions similar to those imposed by the United States on foreign nationals.)

15. What disposition should be made of surplus aircraft owned by the government, suitable or convertible for civil use, and through what governmental machinery?

(This question looks mainly to the end of the war and would include consideration of the possibility of making such surplus aircraft available to air carriers for commercial use, of their possible sale in part to foreign carriers, or to any other methods of disposal that may appear appropriate.)

16. In general, what steps should be taken by government and the industry to facilitate the conversion of aircraft manufacturing to a peace-time basis when the time comes?

(As in the case of other questions, the answer to this one may become more clear at a later date. Any recommendations which can be made at this time will be welcome.)

17. What other problems and recommendations in relation to international air transportation should receive the active consideration of this Government?

(Suggestions and recommendations concerning other problems not specifically listed will be most welcome.)

Tribute to the Late Grover Bond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday May 3), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a beautiful and most unusual tribute to the late Grover Bond, one of the most beloved churchmen of Charlotte, N. C., who died suddenly the day before Christmas. This editorial

was written by Mr. Tom P. Jimison, noted lawyer, minister, and journalist, whose series of articles entitled "Out of the Night at Morganton" for the first time brought to the attention of the people of North Carolina the conditions of this State institution for the mentally ill, resulting in a most exhaustive investigation brought about at the instance of Governor Broughton and quickly remedied by adequate appropriations made by the recent North Carolina Legislature. This tribute appeared in the Charlotte News, April 6, 1943, and, as this newspaper states, is fit to rank with the best of uniformly fine Jimison work.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AULD LANG SYNE—REMEMBERING GROVER BOND

(By Tom P. Jimison)

(The late Grover Bond, one of Charlotte's most beloved churchmen, died suddenly the day before Christmas. For hundreds, his death was a great shock and a deep loss. It was thus to Tom Jimison, an old, admiring, loving friend. We think this tribute, inspired by that long friendship between the two men, is fit to rank with the best of uniformly fine Jimison work—Editors, the News.)

T'other day I had to go up to the Great Smokies to attend the funeral of a kinsman, and I came back through Charlotte to say howdy to the old burg. But it wasn't all there.

Yes, the tall buildings were there, and I saw a whole passel of my old friends. There was Marion Davis, the merchant, and Tom Leak, the colored barber. I saw Word Wood and Jim Armstrong, Emmett Kerr, and Tom Moore, Marvin Ritch, and John Porter, the brethren at Mellon's and the boys at the News. But sump'n had gone wrong since I sojourned in the Mecklenburg metropolis. Sump'n was missin' that left an empty place in my heart and a lonesome place against the sky. It was Grover Bond.

You see Grover and I joined Holston conference together when we were but callow youths. We served adjoining pastorates in the Virginia Cumberlands away back yander when a silver dollar was as big as a wagon wheel and a paper one looked like a blanket. We got paid every 3 months, iffen our members happened to have the money and happened to be in the notion, and they called it "quarterage." But, shucks, we were not interested in money. We were going to save the world. We tramped over the hills and preached in lonely little school houses and shabby, unpainted churches where the people had no organs nor songbooks, but we saw the glory of the Lord shine on dingy walls and heard His stately tramp on uncarpeted floors as He spoke peace and pardon to troubled old wayfarers. Such was our reward.

In later years we served adjoining pastorates in Montana, in Tennessee, and in North Carolina, and we kept up a sort of desultory correspondence as long as Grover Bond lived. I fell from grace, not once, but many times, but it made no never mind to Grover Bond. He kept going ahead until he filled the pulpits of great churches and became a presiding elder. But he continued to love me, jes' kept on a-overlookin' my divigations and obliquities, and kept on a-prayin' for me. When I say that he was a good man I mean that he really was.

He thought good things about his fellow humans, said good things about them, and never was quite so happy as when he could give somebody a lift who was having a hard time in his battle with the Old Scratch. He loved people, and I reckon that is the greatest thing that can be said of most any man.

If there are in Heaven any angels with broken pinions, or any little angels who are sorter afeared to fly very high, I bet Grover is hobnobbing around with them, a-tryin' to mend broken wings, or encouraging the little fellers to fly a leetle mite higher. He'd show 'em some good safe places to light and have a big time sorter helping around.

But I need my old comrade of the Cross down here in this sinful old world. It never seemed able to get hold of him like it could me. He was spiritually heavier than I ever was and its gravitating pull its devilish magnetism couldn't draw him into its miasmic marshes and mess and momix him up. And it could do all that to me.

Grover, if you read this up in Heaven, I want you to know that Charlotte ain't like it used to be, not to me. I think I like Rockingham better. But I got one more little favor I crave at your hands. It can't be many years until I shall come blundering in up there, and I wish you'd sorter hang around the side entrance and get one of your cronies among the angels to keep an eye on the back gate, for I fear me that I'm a-goin' to need a little help about getting in. I shall want you to speak a word or so in my behalf, and, Grover, I know you will be glad to do it. And may the earth lie lightly upon your mortal remains down here till the morning breaks and the darkness flees away.

Subsidizing Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Subsidizing Inflation," from the New York Times of May 10. This is an editorial which deserves the attention of every Member of Congress, and of every other citizen.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBSIDIZING INFLATION

At the same time as it has published dollars-and-cents ceilings on retail food prices to go into effect today, the Office of Price Administration has announced another policy of the first importance. It will roll back by an average of 10 percent, effective June 1, the price to the consumer of beef, veal, pork, lamb, mutton, coffee, and butter; and it will do this with the aid of subsidies.

This policy seems primarily a political response to the recent demands of John L. Lewis, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the American Federation of Labor. Union leaders have sought to give the impression that living costs have been racing ahead while wages alone have been held stationary, frozen under the "Little Steel" formula. This picture is a false one. Even if we take as our standard the extremely high wage levels of January 1941 we find that the average hourly earnings of all wage-earners in 25 manufacturing industries rose in February for the thirty-first consecutive month of rises, according to the National Industrial Conference Board figures, to 29.4 percent above the January 1941 level. And, in spite of an 18.4 percent increase in living costs in this period, the purchasing power of the manufacturing wage-earner's weekly income was 21.2 percent greater last February than it had been in January 1941. For a further comparison the actual purchasing power of the manufacturing wage-earner's weekly wage was 51.2 percent higher last February than in 1929. This does not look like unbearable sacrifice in wartime. But, in spit of this state of affairs, union leaders have been demanding both a roll-back of prices and a further roll-forward of wages.

Public officials and others who have not troubled to inform themselves closely on the actual state of affairs are supporting these demands. In order to achieve (at least temporarily) a result that would otherwise be impossible, these groups have been advocating the payment of Government subsidies to support producers or processors who would otherwise be forced to sell at a loss. The administration has now announced the adoption of this device in the field of food.

Whether we consider the policy wise or not, it is undoubtedly true that the payment of moderate governmental subsidies for certain special purposes is capable of playing a secondary and minor role in the battle against inflation. But even on the most favorable view, it is absurd to talk of Government subsidies, as some ardent advocates have talked of them, as if they represented a primary weapon against inflation. They do not in the least deal with basic causes. They are like cleaning a room by sweeping the dirt under the bed, or postponing a flood by raising the height of the dam.

There is only one fundamental way to combat inflation. That is either to prevent the pumping out of excess purchasing power, or to siphon off such excess purchasing power, before it has had an opportunity to produce its effects, by drastic taxation. The administration has lacked the political courage to pursue either course. Congress has not held down farm prices, the President has not held down industrial wages, and neither has yet been willing on a broad enough scale to substitute mass taxation for class taxation.

The great political and economic danger of governmental subsidies is that they postpone the appearance of inflation while building up the reality. They permit (for a time) high wages with comparatively low living costs. They mean (for a time) high prices for producers with low prices for consumers. This is the politician's paradise. It is not difficult to see why the policy of subsidies seems at the moment the political path of least resistance.

But these fair-seeming immediate results are precisely what make the policy so dangerous. If inflation is not being reflected immediately in rising prices, it is nonetheless surely being built up in even greater strength behind the dam that conceals it. The Federal deficit, as a result of the policy, becomes even greater than otherwise. The national debt mounts even faster than otherwise. Even more excess purchasing power is pumped out through the subsidies, to exert its inevitable ultimate effect. By keeping down prices artificially through subsidies, the Government encourages the consumption of scarce items instead of discouraging it. The effect of the policy is the reverse of that of a sales tax. Subsidies lower prices instead of raising them, and mean increased Government expenditures instead of increased Government revenues.

Not the least danger of the subsidy policy is that of increased political control over producers and processors of all sorts. The producer's solvency and economic life depend

not on what he gets for his goods in the market but on his Government subsidy. Once this dependence is established, then the Government can tell the producer that his subsidy will not be continued unless he does this or that or the other. It is another step toward authoritarian control. In being deeply suspicious of it, farm groups have shown a sound instinct.

The subsidy policy increases the opportunities for public scandals. If it is used simply to keep marginal producers producing, it leads to the paradoxical result that the more inefficient a producer is, the more the Government pays him. How does the Government determine his costs for purposes of the subsidy? How does the Government secure any efficiency when it thus removes the normal penalty for inefficiency? How do we avoid scandal on the one hand or complete Government management on the other? If a flat subsidy for each unit sold is paid to all producers in a given time, how do we determine, without breeding new armies of pressure groups, how large the subsidy should be and why one group of producers should be selected rather than another?

Those responsible for the new subsidy plan estimate that it will cost (presumably each year) from $300,000,000 to $500,000,000. If it does, then it will be a comparatively minor measure in its effect on production or inflation. But it is chimerical to imagine that subsidies are so magical that $300,000,000 of them will plug an inflationary gap of the order of $30,000,000,000. This is to expect every dollar somehow to do the work of a hundred. The probability is that once the policy of subsidies is embarked upon it will grow in all directions.

Congress has been repeatedly asked to authorize the type of food subsidy that the Administration is now announcing. It has repeatedly refused to do so. In now adopting the policy through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the President is bypassing Congress. He is once more doing, in brief, substantially what he was rebuked for doing in the case of his $25,000 net salary limitation order. No domestic policy of such vital importance, even if one could grant that it was above criticism on economic grounds, ought to be adopted without securing the express consent of the people's representative in Congress.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a signed statement of the National Farm Committee meeting in Washington, relating to the agricultural problem.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MAY 6, 1943.

Officials of the National Farm Committee meeting in Washington adopted the following statement:

"1. High prices for food, scarcity of food, and black markets are due to low-ceiling prices on farm commodities and limited production as charged here today by the National Farm Committee.

"2. The necessity for ceilings and rationing has grown out of shortage of production. The Agricultural Adjustment Administration limits on production and Office of Price Administration ceilings are steadily reducing production; and unless the Congress reasserts its power and gives affirmative relief at once, stark famine and want of food will be abroad in the United States.

"3. The farmers of the United States have never asked for and do not now ask for profits on farm operations in time of war and national peril. The farmers of the United States have realized for many months that they could not produce sufficient food and fiber under the handicaps imposed on agriculture by the Federal administration and the hundreds of planners in the many Federal bureaus.

"4. The national administration is well aware of all these facts. These facts have been repeatedly called to the attention of the President, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the Office of Price Administration, and Works Progress Administration, and all other governmental agencies. The seriousness of the existing situation is readily admitted by all of them. These planners on account of their determination to force the people of the United States into an international planned economy would rather see our people hungry, our armed forces endangered, and risk defeat in the war and destruction of American liberties than to abandon their pet theories of world-wide planned economy.

"5. The national administration, the boards and bureaus and their fellow travelers—some of whom are heard on many radios, newspaper editorials, and columns—have consistently carried out a campaign to smear the American farmer. They have tried to create in the minds of city dwellers the idea that the farmer is organized, that he is a high-pressure group in the Halls of Congress. This is an utterly false and baseless accusation against the patriotic farmers of America. The national administration and all its bureau planners know it. This has been a cruel deliberate plan to prejudice the rank and file of Americans against the farmers of the Nation.

"6. The farmers have less to worry out as to food than any other group. The farmer has been repeatedly told that he did not need as large an income as other groups because he, the farmer, could stay at home and eat his own food. The farmer can do this and will do so if forced to do so. The farmers do not want to be selfish. The farmers want above all else to be allowed to produce for all the people, but the farmer can be forced and is being forced to fall back on the first law of nature, which is self-preservation.

"7. The advanced costs of living and wages have affected the farmer the same that they have affected people engaged in other lines of industry. The industrial wage scale today is approximately 400 percent of the 1909–14 base, while parity as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture on farm products is 169 percent. This is entirely out of balance; and the policy of the administration has made it impossible for the farmers to produce food and fiber and is thus responsible for the present shortage of food and fiber, which are so essential to the winning of the war and the peace.

"8. One of the most dangerous policies today is the shifting of food production from the United States to other countries through operation of special trade agreements. These policies, if carried out, will be as dangerous as was shifting the rubber production entirely to the East Indies. At some future date food will be as scarce in the United States as rubber is today. Another grave danger facing the United States food front is attempting to direct the plantings of crops from Washington. Thomas Jefferson warned us against the day when our farmers would be told when to sow and when to reap. Today we see trained economists who are ignorant, uninformed, and impractical, and who lack practical farm knowledge attempting to force farmers to plant crops that they neither have the right types of soil for growing nor the facilitie for handling.

"9. We appeal to Congress and the President to let the farmers produce all food, feed, and fiber they can, unhampered to keep the wolf from our doors. We appeal to Congress and the President to provide no ceilings on farm products less than cost of production under war conditions. We believe that any ceiling placed on basic field crops of less than wheat $2, corn $1.50, cotton 30 cents will imperil adequate production.

"10. We recommend that Congress add an amendment to the Office of Price Administration appropriation bill which would make it impossible for Office of Price Administration to use any funds at any time if they attempted to evade the intent of the law. We further ask Congress to stipulate that no more than one-twelfth hof the Office of Price Administration funds shall be spent in any calendar month for the purpose of prohibiting them from employing an enormous number of useless political, defeated parasites to make unnecessary trips traveling by train and by plane, which is so needed in the war effort.

"11. We respectfully request that Congress pass the Thomas-Pace bill which includes the cost of all farm labor in computing parity, and also pass the Bankhead bill over the President's veto; or attach them as a rider to the first important measure that passes through Congress and circumvent the President's right to veto just as Congress did the $25,000 salary limitation."

TOM LINDER,
President.

J. E. MCDONALD,
Chairman of Board.

Attest:

RALPH W. MOORE,
Secretary.

America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me a communication directed to me under date of April 30, 1943, by Mr. Ralph Adimari, who lives at 939 H Street NW. The title of the communication is "What Is This Thing Called American?" I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 30, 1943.

Senator ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
of North Carolina:

What is this thing called American?

Surely it isn't a fish or a fowl nor is it an antique. It is first of all a youth in his teens or in his twenties. Happy is he, somewhat tall, believing all things and trusting his elders. He knows they will steer him clear. He thinks he's great pumpkins and he stands nonchalantly by the crossroads with wonder in his eyes. What is this thing called American? It is a little baby girl about 4 but not 6 without worldly wisdom showing. Oh, how the heart beats pit-a-pat as you observe her romping in the park with cute little dress and panty showing. Cuddle up to me little baby girl and sweeten the heavy heart. Or, it is the girl grown up in high school now or the coed learning Schopenhauer's pessimism or Karl Marx's drivel by the hour. My sweet, your form quite enhanced by a Lana Turner sweater is far too precious for that sad story. Why not read Emerson's Friendship and you'll find out, my sugar candy.

What is this thing called American? It is the farmer hoeing his fields in the heat of the day, returning home to busy wife and kids packed tightly around a full table with wholesome, well-cooked food. There's a happy gleam in his eye. He knows his day was not ill spent. Oh, happy me, he gives thanks to God at the table where the food aroma makes his weary body thrill.

What is this thing called American? It is the sweet mother and he brood. As she washes her dishes she observes them like a proud hen from the corner of her eye as they play and skip in the lawn in and around the clotheslines. Some are 4, some 8, some 11, some 12, some girls, some boys. Her big boy is away. She loves him the most and her heart aches at the thought. What a wonderful boy he is with that cocky walk. The setting sun sheds his rays upon the scene and casts from a tree a shadow there. The mother runs out and dispels it by a cry for no evil may ever come upon her precious chicks.

What is this thing called American? It is the ditch digger, the laborer with mud caked on his clothes, the miner up from the black coal pits full of dirt black as soot in eyes, nose, mouth, lungs, dying an early death and only asking his just due in payment for the sacrifice. It is the mechanic sure of hand and eye. It is the nurse with such a heavenly woman's touch to heal. It is the Congressman who must be jealous of his hive. It is the Negro working hard at various tasks and anxious to be home with his little children playing with pups or baseball in the lot. It is the office worker, both male and female, hurrying all the time and never knowing why.

What is this thing called American. It isn't a superman nor herrenvolk because God wants the perfect ones (they are in heaven). It is a humanly human being simple of heart and taking in all from foreign soil and never asking questions. That's why he isn't a superman or he'd ask more of them. He is wonderfully generous, the most free giver on earth. He is the fair and square fighter. He does't want to gang up on anybody neither does he want to fight with one hand tied behind his back. He is the Yankee of New England, the Hoosier, the Southerner dreaming of the promised land, the star Texan, the Californian, the diaryland man, the Mississippi-Missourian, the Ohioan, the poor Oakie (food is for those far away) the breezy Westerner coming in and getting a dagger in the heart. In short he is this thing called American. Proud, lovable, sentimental, strong of heart and limb, tough fighter boy, keen sensed against injustice. This is the thing called American, a youth.

RALPH ADIMARI.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to conceive that Congress will play politics with the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act at a time such as this, but from what I have read an effort will be made to require the President to submit to the Congress for approval such agreements as the Secretary of State reaches with other nations. I condemn the efforts being made along this line. Are we to disturb our friendly relations with our allies when we are engaged in war?

Even if we were not at war I would favor an extension of this act without restrictions. Failure to extend the law means we would eventually go back to the Smoot-Hawley Act, a law which contributed more toward bringing about the depression than anything else.

Years ago our Republican friends under their protection policy thought mainly of industry. Now they are exciting the farmer.

The question is whether or not we are to cease doing a commercial business with other countries of the world. Foreign trade will be a leading factor in postwar discussions. It would be dangerous for Congress to say now that this will be a party matter. I favor the legislation as reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

Celebration of Fete of Joan of Arc

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the French in France were prevented by the Germans from celebrating the fete of Joan of Arc, and a celebration was held in Independence Hall at Philadelphia at which the mayor of Philadelphia invited the Honorable William C. Bullitt to speak in French. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD his very notable address, and request that it be printed in French, together with the English translation.

There being no objection, the address in French and English was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM C. BULLITT AT INDEPENDENCE HALL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., ON JOAN OF ARC DAY, MAY 9, 1943

Ladies and gentlemen, the mayor has asked me to speak in French so that not only the French soldiers and sailors here present, but also the French in France who are prevented by the Germans from celebrating the fete of Joan of Arc, and forbidden to listen to American broadcasts but do listen at the risk of their lives, may understand the meaning of these ceremonies.

I shall try, therefore, to make myself the interpreter of the thoughts of all who have gathered here in this old square where Washington once walked and talked with Lafayette.

From this same spot in August of 1940, I told my fellow countrymen the terrible story of the destruction of the French Republic, and warned them that America wa in danger. Sixteen months later we were attacked by the forces of totalitarian darkness that had overwhelmed France. But our Republic was not destroyed. And today I shall tell the French of our deep joy that our flag and the French flag are again advancing side by side, and of our absolute confidence that they will advance side by side not only to Paris and to Berlin but also to Tokyo.

ADDRESS IN FRENCH

Mes amis Français: A vous, Généraux, Amiraux, soldats, marins Français qui m'entourez ici, au berceau de la liberté américaine où l'Independance américaine fût proclamée, à vous, mes amis qui n'entendez en Afrique où les soldats de la France chassent les Boches; à vous, mes chers amis, qui souffrez en France et qui m'écoutez au péril de voss vies; — je parle à vous tous, non comme je vous ai parlé à maintes reprises en qualité d'Ambassadeur des Etats-Unis en France, mais comme citoyen de la ville de Philadelphia qui célèbre aujourd'hui la Fête de Sainte Jeanne d'Arc, et témoigne ainsi sa joie la résurrection de la France.

Nous n'avons jamais douté de cette résurrection. Nous avons trop bien connu les français depuis les jours où Lafayette, Rochambeau et de Grasse venaient nous aider a conquerir notre liberté. Et quand des menteurs répétaient que le peuple français acceptait la tyrannie des Boches cachée sous le nom de collaboration, nous n'avons jamais oub"é que le peuple français a l'habitude d'écraser les tyrans et de marcher au son de la Marseillaise. Nous n'avons jamais douté du peuple français qui a su pendant son histoire séculaire se servir même de ses souffrances, avec la longue patience et l'éternel courage d'une race paysanne et ouvrière qui sait réparer tout vêtement, toute terre, et toute victoire déchirée.

Mais aprés l'armistice et l'abolition de la République, jour néfaste qui fût le dernier de ma mission en France, car j'ai quitté Vichy le jour même de l'abolition de la République, nous avons vu avec le plus grande tristesse des chefs qui faisant appel aux plus purs instincts de peuple français, pour le travail, la famille, et la réligion, oulialent la restauration de sa liberté.

Soit. Ceci est terminé. Les doigts des Boches sont toujours à la gorge du peuple français mais l'âme de la France s'est libérée. Elle s'est tournée vers d'autres chefs, et c'est le voeu de tout américain de voir ces chefs monter à la hauteur du grand peuple.

Ils ont déja donné des preuves de leurs vertus. Le Général de Gaulle en refusant d'accepter l'armistice et en continuant la lutte contre l'ennemi s'est fait le symbole de la résistance du peuple français à la tyrannie. Le Général Giraud en refusant d'accepter l'emprisonnement de son corps et de sa volonté a brisé les murs de sa prison et s'est mis à la tête de l'armée française d'Afrique du nord qu'il mène aujourd'hui à la victoire. Que les forces des deux Généraux, leurs forces militaires, intellectuelles et morale se joignent en une seule force française indivisible, cela constitue la prière de tout américain. Gaulliste et Giraudiste sont des titres d'honneur, mais il y a un titre plus noble, plus glorieux encore, c'est le simple titre de français.

Non seulement la France, mais le monde entier a besoin de cette unité française que

nous désirons tant. La France meurtrie, affamée, a soif de l'unité des forces de sa libération. La France en a besoin non seulement pour sa propre libération, mais aussi pour la défense des français sur toute la terre. Et nous autres, nous autres aussi, nous avons besoin d'entendre la voix de la France dans les conseils des nations. Cette grande voix du peuple français — de ce peuple à la tête si solide et au coeur si sensible — cette grande voix, pour la première fois depuis les jours de Jeanne d'Arc, est muette. La race humaine en a besoin. Et le premier pas vers la restauration de la France à son rôle de grande puissance devouée à la liberté, à la démocratie et à la paix, c'est l'unité fraternelle de tous les français prêts a verser leur sang au service de la patrie.

Les six mois qui viennent de s'écouler ont été lourds d'évenements, mais je crois qu'il n'y a que deux qui seront inscrits dans les manuels d'histoire des jeunes écoliers — l'un, c'est la défense heroique de Stalingrad, l'autre, c'est la résurrection de la France comme puissance militaire en Afrique du nord.

En Tunisie, les clairons de la Marne sonnent à nouveau. Le drapeau tricolore avance. Trois cents mille soldats français le suivent. Et nous savons bien qu'ils ne sont que l'avant-garde des millions qui les suivront — les suivront à Paris, à Metz, à Strasbourg et à Berlin.

Nous avons choisi la Fête de Jeanne d'Arc pour témoigner à ces soldats français notre foi que la force spirituelle de Jeanne d'Arc vit toujours dans le peuple français. Les voix qu'elle entendait, les voix qui lui conseillaient, le suprême sacrifice pour la patrie n'étaient pas entendues par les grads de la terre qui la questionnaient. C'est qu'ils ne savaient pas écouter. Elle savait écouter.

Il y a des sourds aujourd'hui qui ne savent pas écouter. Des sourds qui, dans leur lugubre pessimisme, prédisent que la France ne reprendra jamais son rang parmi les nations, que la paix en Europe s'organisera sans une France puissante et civilisatrice. S'ils savaient écouter ils entendraient autre chose. Ils entendraient les voix du monde entier disant qu'il n'y aura jamais de paix en Europe sans une France forte et grande continuant son travail séculaire de civilisation. Ils devraient se rappeler que le 1er mars 1942, le Gouvernement des Etats-Unis affirmait solennellement que sa politique etait basée "sur le maintien de l'intégrité de la France et de l'Empire français et sur la future restauration et l'indépendance complète de tous les territoires français." Ils devraient se rappeler que le 7 août 1940 M. Winston Churchill écrivait: "Le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté est décidé lorsque les Alliés auront obtenu la victoire à assurer la restauration intégrale de l'indépendance et de la grandeur de la France."

Ces sourds répètent encore le morne mensonge qu'il n'y a plus de français avec l'abnégation et l'amour de la patrie qui brulaient en Jeanne d'Arc. S'ils savaient écouter, ils entendraient la voix du sang français qui coule devant Bizerte comme il a coulé a Bir Machim. Ils entendraient la voix du sang français qui coule sur le sol même de la patrie où des hommes, bravant les pelotons d'exécution et les camps de la Gestapo, s'attaquent chaque jour et chaque nuit a l'envahisseur. Ils reconnaitraient alors la verité que la France, — la vieille France de Jeanne d'Arc; la France de Bouvines, de Valmy, de la Larne, — est en marche, et ne déposera pas ses armes avant la défaite absolue de toute tyrannie sur la terre. Que les autres disent ce qu'ils veulent: Pour ma part, je suis bien sûr que quoiqu'il advienne des autres Nations Unies, le drapeau tricolore avancera auv côtes du drapeau américain même jusqu'à Tokio.

Les fagots du bûcher de Jeanne d'Arc sont devenus les flambeaux de la France. Des souffrances les plus terribles est sortie la gloire de la France. Du sang de la blessure répandu aujourd'hui dans la bonne cause sortira la liberté de la France.

Le mot d'ordre d'aujourd'hui est un mot simple, vieux et bien français. C'est un mot qui traverse toutes les barrières et arrive a nos oreilles en Amérique de tout pays de France — Des marins de Saint Malo, de Brest et de Toulon, comme des cultivateurs de Provence et de Savoie, des atisans du Nord et de l'Est comme des vignerons du Bordelais, des ouvriers Parisiens comme de mes voisins à Chantilly, des prissoniers en Allemagne comme des hommes et femmes emprisonnés en France, des soldats en Afrique comme des marins sur toutes les mers — c'est le mot d'ordre de la France eternelle:

"Allons, enfants de la Patrie * * *
Marchons, Marchons."

Vive la France!

THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION

My French friends, to you, generals, admirals, soldiers, and sailors of France who surround me here at the cradle of American liberty where American independence was proclaimed; to you, my friends, who hear me in Africa where the soldiers of France are defeating the Germans; to you, my dear friends who suffer in France and listen to me at the risk of your lives, I speak to you all—not as I have spoken to you so often as Ambassador of the United States to France, but as a citizen of the city of Philadelphia which celebrates today the fete of Joan of Arc and thus bears testimony to its joy at the resurrection of France.

We have never doubted that this resurrection would come. We have known the French too well since the days when Lafayette, Rochambeau, and de Grasse helped us win our liberty. And when liars told us that the French people accepted German tyranny cloaked under the name of collaboration, we remembered that the people of France were in the habit of crushing tyrants and marching to the sound of the Marseillaise. We never lost confidence in the common people of France who, throughout their long history have known how to make use of even their sufferings, with the enduring patience and eternal courage of a race of farmers and workers who know how to repair patiently every torn bit of cloth or devastated land or mutilated victory.

But after the armistice and the abolition of the republic—that evil day which was the last of my mission in France—for I left Vichy the same day that the republic was abolished—we looked with the greatest distrust on the French leaders, who, appealing to the purest instincts of the French people—love of work, of the family, and of religion—forgot the restoration of liberty.

All that has passed. The fingers of the Germans are still at the throat of the French people but the soul of France is free. It has found new leaders, and it is the prayer of every American that these leaders may rise to the level of the simple people of France.

They have already given proofs of their qualities. General de Gaulle, by refusing to accept the armistice and by continuing the fight against the enemy has made himself the symbol of French resistance to tyranny. General Giraud, refusing to accept the imprisonment of his body and his will, broke out of his prison and placed himself at the head of the French Army of north Africa which he is leading today to victory. That the forces of these two generals—their military, intellectual, and spiritual forces—should unite in one single indivisible French force, is the prayer of all Americans. "Gaullist" and "Giraudist" are honorable names but there is a name more noble, and more glorious—the simple name of Frenchman.

Not only France but the entire world needs this French unity. France wounded, starving, is thirsty for the unity of the forces of liberation. France needs them not only for her own liberation but also for the defense of the French throughout the world. And we ourselves, we need again to hear the voice of France in the councils of the nations. That great voice of the French people—that people with so sound a head and so sensitive a heart—that great voice for the first time since the days of Joan of Arc is silent. The human race needs it. And the first step toward the restoration of France to her role of great power devoted to liberty, democracy and peace, is the fraternal unity of all Frenchmen who are ready to shed their blood in the service of their country.

The 6 months which have just passed have been charged with great events. But I think that there are only two which will be described in the history books of small children: The first is the heroic defense of Stalingrad, and the second is the resurrection of France as a military power in north Africa.

In Tunisia the bugles of the Marne are sounding again. The Tricolor is advancing. Three hundred thousand French soldiers are following it. And we know that they are only the advance guard of the millions who will follow them—who will follow them to Paris, to Metz, to Strasbourg, and to Berlin.

We have chosen the fete of Joan of Arc to testify to these French soliders our confidence that the spirit of Joan of Arc is still alive in the French. The voices which she heard, the voices which told her to make the supreme sacrifice for her country were not heard by the great of the earth who questioned her. They did not know how to listen. She knew how to listen.

Today again there are those who are deaf to the voices of truth: The deaf who in lugubrious pessimism predict that France will never again occupy her old rank among the nations, that peace in Europe will be organized without a strong and civilizing France. If they knew how to listen they would hear voices from the whole earth saying that there will never be peace in Europe without a strong and great France continuing her old labor of civilization. They should remember that on the first of March 1942 the Government of the United States solemnly affirmed:

"The policy of the United States Government has been based on the maintenance of the integrity of France and of the French Empire and on the future restoration of the complete independence of all French territories."

They should remember that on the 7th of August 1940 Mr. Winston Churchill wrote:

"I would take this opportunity of stating that it is the determination of His Majesty's Government when victory has been gained by the Allied arms to secure the full restoration of the independence and greatness of France."

The deaf are also repeating the dreary lie that there are no more French with the spirit of self-sacrifice and the love of country which burned in Joan of Arc. If they know how to listen, they would hear the voice of the French blood which is flowing before Bizerte, as it flowed at Bir Hachim. They would hear the voice of the French blood which is flowing on the soil of France, where men, risking the firing squads and the concentration camps of the Gestapo, are each day and each night attacking the invader. They would recognize then the truth that France, the old France of Joan of Arc, the France of Bouvines, of Valmy, of the Marne, is marching again and will not lay down her arms before the absolute defeat of all the tyrannies of the earth. Let others think what they will. For my part, I am sure that, whatever the other United Nations may do;

the French flag will advance beside the American flag even to Tokyo.

The blazing branches which consumed the body of Joan of Arc became the torches of France. Out of the most terrible sufferings soared the glory of France. From the blood that is being shed today in the good cause will come the liberty of France.

The order of the day is simple, old, and very French: It breaks through all barricades and comes to our ears in America from every corner of France—from the sailors of Saint Malo, Brest, and Toulon, as from the farmers of Provence and Savoy, from the workmen of the north and the east as from the wine growers of Bordeaux—from the workers of Paris as from my neighbors at Chantilly, from men and women imprisoned in France, from the soldiers in Africa as from the sailors on all seas—it is the order of the day of eternal France:

"Come, children of our country * * * March on, march on."

Long live France!

St. Louis' Great War Bond Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. COCHRAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 4, 1943. The editorial follows:

St. Louis is entitled to a feeling of patriotic pride as it looks over the returns on the war loan campaign, which ended at midnight Saturday.

In every phase of bond-buying, the city-county area went over the top in magnificent form. The quota for total sales was $93,540,000, and 3 weeks were allotted to realize it. Instead of 3 weeks, this enormous figure was reached and passed at the end of 5 days. Whether or not St. Louis was officially the first city to attain its quota, this was an inspiring performance.

But the campaign didn't stop with that. A second goal of $110,000,000 was set, and this was passed in 4 days. Then emphasis was turned to individual purchases, with a quota of 150,000 buyers. By the time the drive ended, this had been surpassed by 1,206. And the preliminary figure for total sales was $143,197,036, or 53.1 percent above the quota.

The scope of this achievement is emphasized by comparison with the national record. The goal for the whole country was 13 billions, and Secretary Morgenthau yesterday reported total sales of 17 billions, or 31 percent over the quota. St. Louis' showing was more than two-thirds better than the national average.

And who gets the credit for the city and county's superior performance? "The people did it," said Chapin S. Newhard, campaign chairman. Very true, but there had to be leadership, to present the vital importance of bond buying, to canvass the community, to provide opportunity for purchases, to show every citizen why he should invest every possible dollar in war bonds.

That leadership was provided by Mr. Newhard and his associates—Walter W. Head, general chairman of the Metropolitan St. Louis War Finance Committee, and Sam M. Ballard, director of promotion, together with their hard-working colleagues.

The three leaders of the campaign are busy men, who willingly sacrificed their time for the duration of the preliminary preparation and the drive itself. They kept up the pace throughout. When one goal was reached, they set a new one, and intensified the drive. They made of it a veritable crusade that piled up more than 143 millions from this area to help win the war.

A salute to the people of St. Louis, and to Messrs. Newhard, Head, and Ballard, who led them not only over the top but far beyond the objective.

Washington Post Editorial Comment of Truman Committee Report on War Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Post of this morning commenting upon and commending the latest Truman committee report.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR MANAGEMENT

The latest Truman committee report is an elementary lesson in administrative management. It says with telling effect what the press and hundreds of commentators have been saying for months—that officials directing the war effort are muddling through without any well-knit organization to keep them working together. "Energetic, aggressive men, striving to meet war needs," the committee says, "will tend to clash when their duties bring them into conflict. But destructive, wasteful feuding must be suppressed. * * * When necessary, heads must be knocked together." That is a simple statement of a basic truth which every successful administrator recognizes.

Senator TRUMAN and his colleagues wisely refrain from any attempt to iron out the dispute between the sponsors of the synthetic rubber, the 100-octane gasoline and the escort-vessel programs. Neither Congress nor the public can properly decide issues that are so intimately bound up with basic strategy. Indeed, many of the facts which should shape the decision must remain secret. But the administration certainly ought to employ some means of working out such disputes before officials begin hurling charges and epithets in public. The lack of any such means is mildly described by the Truman committee as a "basic weakness in the control of the war efforts."

No doubt a considerable share of the responsibility for this weakness falls on the War Production Board. Much of the sweeping power granted to Donald M. Nelson's agency has never been exercised. "Today," as the committee points out, "discussion of the overall legal authority of the War Production Board is mere pedantry." But that is by no means the whole story. Special segments of power have been carved out for little czars in various fields until the War Production Board probably doesn't know precisely where its authority begins and ends. And there is no war cabinet to resolve that confusion as specific conflicts arise.

Two recommendations are made by the committee: First, the strong, over-all authority of the War Production Board must be made a living reality; second, the War Production Board must be made to function as a board capable of shaping strategy on the home front. In other words, this Board, which includes the czars of production, manpower, transportation, price control, fuel, and economic warfare, the former czar of agriculture, and representatives of the armed services, could act as a sort of war cabinet, though it has not done so to date. It seems to us that it would be much better to call the group a war cabinet and to have it meet regularly under the direct guidance of the President. No mere board can take the top responsibility for directing the war effort unless it has the closest sort of relationship with the President, and with that relationship established we would have a war cabinet worthy of designation by its proper name.

Joseph Leib

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement regarding the activities of Joseph Leib which have contributed to the war effort.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Among Joseph's Leib's contributions to the war are work on four important and significant pieces of legislation, now enacted into law.

1. His work in connection with legislation dealing with war profiteering and fraud. On January 4, 1941, accompanied by a St. Louis newspaperman, he called upon Attorney General Robert Jackson, Wendell Berge, Assistant Attorney General and other Justice Department officials relative to the prosecution of a certain highly connected war profiteer. Other calls to the Department were made on January 9, 14, 15, 16, and 23. The story and background of this case has never been told and must remain anonymous until after the war. But it was this episode that inspired Leib to carry on a zealous campaign against war profiteering and fraud. Because of this case he urged the necessity for the suspension of the statutes of limitations covering such matters.

Over a period of time Leib demanded the appointment of a congressional defense investigation committee.

On February 13, 1941, Senator TRUMAN introduced a resolution to set up a defense investigating committee. This measure was approved on April 1.

On March 31, 1941, Representatives MAY and VINSON introduced their joint resolutions setting up a committee to investigate war

profiteers. This resolution has a direct bearing to the previous mentioned Justice Department interviews. This is all that can be said at this time.

It was the sensational disclosures brought out by the House investigating committees that brought on the demand for the renegotiation of war contracts. But renegotiation action did not come until April 4, 1942, when a clause permitting such action was inserted in the supplemental national defense appropriation bill of that year.

Unfortunately, none of these committees possessed punitive power other than to expose and publicly reprimand. They held no other authority. Prior to the introduction of these committee resolutions Leib pleaded for the suspension of the fraud statutes. In correspondence with many public officials he pointed out the fact that these statutes must be suspended to protect the Government's interest in the prosecution of war frauds. When the Truman and House investigating committees were set up he reminded Members of Congress that these committees were in many instances operating to the disadvantage of the Government insofar as the time elements of the statutes were concerned.

Several months later, on May 26, 1941, a bill was introduced to suspend the statutes. Because of this the Justice Department on February 5, 1942, created a Special Frauds Unit and Federal grand juries began hearings on July 15, 1942.

Approximately $3,000,000,000 have been saved because of this action. (Part of this story was related in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 12, 1942.)

2. Suspension of the statute of limitation on antitrust laws. This bill was intended to protect the little businessman from being destroyed through a combination on the part of selfish industrial tycoons who might attempt to take advantage of the war situation and resort to monopolistic tactics in restraint of trade. Power to prosecute such conspiracies are now possible.

3. Higher pay for servicemen. In July 1941 Leib conducted a survey among military attachés residing in leading Washington embassies concerning the respective pay of their soldiers. The result of this poll showed that the servicemen in the forces of the United States were receiving less than the soldiers of Canada and Australia. On August 12, 1941, Representative PLOESER passed this correspondence around on the floor of the House of Representatives and it was read during the intensive debate on the extension of the 1-year draft law. On August 13, 1941, full contents of the survey was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but unfortunately the House took no action on the pay of the soldiers at that time. Leib took the matter up with a number of Senators. Finally a bill was introduced by Senator EDWIN JOHNSON, first on September 3, then on October 27, 1941, and soon after the increase in pay was granted making American soldiers the highest paid in the world.

4. Investigation of service air crashes. On February 3, 1942, Leib appeared before the Senate Military Affairs Committee requesting an investigation of Army plane crashes. Five weeks later the Army Air Corps (April 23, 1942) announced that it was creating a Flying Safety Bureau. Leib, still not satisfied, again appeared before the Senate Military Affairs Committee demanding a thorough investigation. As a result General Arnold, Chief of the Air Corps, and other War Department officials were called upon to testify. Then Leib took the matter up with members of the Truman committee. They started to investigate. Leib furnished startling information relative to the alarming number of accidents. Today in the hands of the Truman committee rests the most sensational scandal of this war, greater and more ominous than the Carnegie steel fraud, more treacherous than the Anaconda wire indictment. Thousands of lives may be saved because of Leib's investigation, and untold millions of dollars may be saved in equipment.

The Senate Military Affairs Committee recently set up a committee to look into Army crashes.

Stop Inflation—Stop Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 6, 1943:

STOP INFLATION—STOP STRIKES

Quick passage of the amended Connally bill by the Senate undoubtedly expresses the strong feeling of the public as well as Congress about strikes in wartime. The firmer attitude it reflects should help the coal miners to think twice before staging another walk-out. It should help other groups to realize that no special interest can be placed ahead of the national purpose to win the war. Yet it would be well for the public—and particularly for Congress—to recognize that something more is required than just passing a law.

The Nazis keep their factories going by Gestapo methods, but even constant coercion does not obtain all-out production. Even if strikes were prevented by making them crimes, the main trouble, of which strikes are a most glaring symptom, would remain. That trouble is the failure to stop inflation in the United States. Antistrike legislation; pleas or bludgeons for the miners; Mr. Ickes' regulations to dole out coal; plans for a 48-hour week or other devices for hiding a pay increase—all these are merely papering the cracks.

Price Administrator Brown was talking in the right direction when he promised the miners to "roll back prices." But the promise risks dangerous illusions because the Government has not so far displayed any signs of being able to fulfill it. The Government is not "holding the line" against inflation, and has not taken some of the steps elementary to any effective program, such as adequate taxation to draw off surplus buying power. It has not moved to check farm-price increases by subsidies on the products most needed; instead Congress has pushed through bills to inflate prices on cotton and other supplies in which there are surpluses.

The Government's failure to halt inflation and the public distrust of its ability to halt mounting living costs places the Government in a bad position in dealing with strikes. This is not to say that strikes or other pressures of organized groups to obtain special consideration—certainly not such attitudes as Mr. Lewis', which refuses to use the machinery set up for adjusting wage disputes—are justified. Unorganized Americans have had few increases in income, many increases of outgo. It is time the Government gave them some protection by resisting the unions and the farm bloc.

But so long as the Government gives way to political pressures of either group, it is in a weak position against the other. Price ceilings and rationing may help check inflation, but so long as excess buying power is not drawn off, the tendency is to create black markets and chiseling. Mr. Lewis is not the whole cause of the mine strike; he could do little if the miners hadn't felt the increase in living costs. And other labor leaders will not hold back if he wins concessions.

The strikes are simply surface symptoms of the deeper failure to stop the rise in living costs. Every kind of action that will be effective must be taken to stop strikes. But action that stops inflation will come nearer to removing causes than will legislation to make them illegal.

John L. Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 6, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Business Men's Club of Walnut Ridge, Ark. The club asks that steps be taken to curb John L. Lewis and arrange for his internment.

If the bill, which I introduced last week is enacted into law, we would have ample statutory authority to subject him, and other satellites of his stripe, to punishment by imprisonment in the Federal penitentiary. H. R. 2642, which is now before the Judiciary Committee of the House, would amend the Criminal Code to provide that certain strikes and other concerted refusals to work shall constitute insurrection against the United States and be punishable as such. Among other things, it provides that "Whoever counsels, commands, induces, or procures any person to violate any of the provisions of subsection (a) shall upon conviction thereof be subject to the same punishment as in the case of persons convicted of inciting insurrection against the authority of the United States."

The resolution of the Walnut Ridge Business Men's Club follows:

Whereas, our Nation is now engaged in a world-wide struggle which threatens the freedom of all people of the earth; and

Whereas the unselfish, all-out effort of every individual and every group is required if we are to retain the freedom for which our forefathers fought and died; and

Whereas John L. Lewis ha taken a position which definitely shows a total lack of patriotism and which shows a strong ambition to be an American Hitler in that he is willing to sacrifice the Nation we love for his own personal and nefarious ambitions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Walnut Ridge Business Men's Club in regular session assembled this May 5, 1943, strongly condemn the said John L. Lewis for his actions in calling a strike in these crucial times and urge that effective legislation be speedily passed providing heavy punishment for such acts of sabotage, and the said John L. Lewis be interned if necessary for the duration as any other saboteur.

Resolution Looking Toward the Establishment of Peace on Earth and Good Will Toward Men Following the War in Which We Are Now Engaged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEX GREEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I call to the attention of the House Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5 of the Florida Legislature, 1943 session. The same was on April 21, 1943, approved by His Excellency, Spessard L. Holland, Governor of Florida. Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5 is a resolution looking toward the establishment of peace on earth and good will toward men in the world following the war in which we are now engaged. The substance of this resolution challenges the best thought and interest of every Member of Congress, and I commend it to your consideration and cooperation.

The resolution follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

Resolution looking toward the establishment of peace on earth and good will toward men in the world following the war in which we are now engaged

Whereas it is the hope of every American that out of the suffering, the destruction, and the horror of this war, there shall rise the foundations of a lasting peace, affording to all peoples of the world freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom from fear, and freedom from want, and to the minorities everywhere protection of those inalienable rights which should be the heritage of every human being; and

Whereas there can be no lasting peace unless rampant and unrestrained nationalism and economic and military aggression are forever eliminated from all the nations of the world; and

Whereas a lasting peace can only be established upon the foundation of the dignity of the spirit and soul of man, and to assure such requires the opportunity for a reasonable measure of prosperity and welfare for all people; and

Whereas such aims can be achieved only by an international organization of nations, wherein each will surrender some of its sovereignty in order that the protection and welfare of all may be secured: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida (the house of representatives concurring):

1. That it is hereby declared to be our profound conviction that an international organization of all nations to achieve these results must be an essential condition of the peace which is to come.

2. That we hereby memorialize the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to lend every effort to accomplish this end.

3. That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States elected from the State of Florida.

Approved by the Governor April 21, 1943.

Filed in office of secretary of state April 23, 1943.

Visit of Mr. Davies to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Helen Essary, a staff writer of the Washington Times-Herald of Washington, D. C., who writes daily under the head of "Dear Washington," Miss Essary writes most interestingly upon all subjects which she approaches, and this article is opportune, particularly at this time when there seems to be some rift between the Polish Government in exile and Mr. Stalin of Moscow. I ask that the article be published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR WASHINGTON

(By Helen Essary)

I have a letter I want Mr. Joseph E. Davies to take to Russia with him. Mr. Davies was United States Ambassador to the Soviet. His book Mission to Moscow has just been made into a film.

Mr. Davies, it is reported, is going to Russia soon for the purpose of conferring with Mr. Josef Stalin. Especially does he want to beg Mr. Stalin to see Mr. Roosevelt. The letter I want Mr. Davies to take to Russia is addressed to Mr. Stalin. It is a letter that deserves an answer—a straightforward answer.

Every man and woman in America would like to ask Mr. Stalin the questions I have put in my letter. So—

DEAR MR. STALIN: For weeks and months I've been wondering—why are you so mysterious? What is the meaning of this secrecy, this confusion about Russia's post-war plans? What is there to keep you from telling your allies what you mean to do after the Axis is defeated?

I feel that every citizen of the countries allied with Russia has a right to ask these questions. The bravery and the efficiency of the Russian troops is admired by the world. The Allies are grateful for your strength, for your superb cooperation. They realize that without you Germany might have been close to victory. They know you are doing most of the fighting. They accept your aid, with humility.

But why do you feel it necessary to continue to be so remote? Are you putting on an act? Or what have you got on your mind that you won't talk about?

Are you afraid to talk? Are your feelings hurt? Certainly you haven't got feelings? Not a great country like Russia. You're not a sensitive flower likely to wilt at the first cross word?

Yet whenever anybody asks you a straight question about your post-war world, you go into hiding. The words "What are your war aims?" sends the Russian Bear into hibernation in the thick of midsummer.

The other day you did give a hint of your future hopes. It was not a pretty hint. You said that Poland must be a strong neutral state. This meant of course that Poland must be a buffer state to protect you. Protect you against what?

And Finland—don't you think you've used Finland as a pawn? You know the American people who are your allies have an affection for Finland. You know the Finns do not share Germany's ideals. Then why should Finland be so terrified of Russia if your war aims are fit to be talked about?

I can't see why it is necessary to send Mr. Davies to persuade you to see Mr. Roosevelt. Why do you have to be persuaded to see the President of the United States? Don't you want us to know what you are thinking? Or, are you being elusive on purpose?

This is no time to be elusive. It's childish stuff. I'd also like to know why, when you were invited to the Roosevelt-Churchill conference at Casablanca, you declined to go? It is a shorter distance from Moscow to Casablanca than from Washington to Casablanca. Yet there you sat in Moscow, like a sulking bear with a sore tail.

You realize, don't you, that we really know very little about you and your country. We know only what you want us to know. Even Mr. Willkie was taken on a sort of Cook's Tour of the Soviet. He said in his book One World that you were short and stocky. He described your looks but he didn't say what was in your mind. We want to know what you have in your mind.

So you want more territory—after the war? Surely not. You've an area now of 8,000,000 square miles, a vast land over which your population cannot possibly spread. So it can't be Lebensraum that you need. That's an alibi for German and Japanese war making.

Do you know that whenever the word Russia is mentioned in this country listeners are apprehensive? Are you glad that we whisper, "After the war with the Axis is won, will we have to fight Russia?" That is what we do say. It isn't a nice thought. Not about an ally, a friend.

So, Mr. Stalin, you tell Mr. Davies in words of one syllable what you are brooding over. You've played poker with us too long. We're gamblers, too. But we get fed up with too much mystery. We weren't educated on Russian melodrama. Most of us never heard of Pushkin.

Lay your cards on the table, Mr. Stalin. Are you bluffing? Or have you got four of a kind to our full house?

New York Marches On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, Thursday, May 6, 1943, entitled "New York Marches On," and also editorial from New York Herald Tribune of May 8, 1943, entitled "New York Marches On—The Bright Prospect Ahead":

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 6, 1943]

NEW YORK MARCHES ON

II. WHY MANAGEMENT COMES HERE

The most important feature of New York City's economic horoscope is the fact that it has become the headquarters of the huge industry of business management. The identity of this industry has been obscured by the customary division of its great army of employees into various categories of so-called white-collar workers. The same confusion would result were we to think of the construction industry, the steel industry, or the

textile industry not as entities but in terms of the many manual crafts which each encompasses. Business management is as much an industry by itself as those mentioned, it is far greater than all combined, and the city's attraction for it is increasing and is bound to go on increasing. Let us review the reasons.

Historically considered, the first of these reasons was the city's pre-eminence as a seaport. The pioneers of business management who settled here were exporters whose concern it was to see that their products, manufactured elsewhere, reached foreign ports, principally Europe. They had to be in touch with shipping; also with the banks on whose familiarity with foreign exchange and many contacts abroad they could rely for financing their trade. As global trade increases in the wake of the present war this appeal seems certain to grow stronger and stronger in the future.

This phase of the city's development was followed by another which was ushered in with the stock mergers of the nineties and reached its peak with the great consolidations of the twenties. Then it was that Wall Street became the primary magnet, originally as the national market for securities subsequently because so many corporations passed under banker control. It was essential that their centralized managements be in daily and intimate contact with the institutions in charge of their financial fortunes.

The city's financial leadership still exerts a strong pull. The tremendous banking facilities available here offer an important service to American industry. True, ownership control by banks is a thing of the past. But the city's supply of liquid capital continues to render essential aid to growing concerns.

What other reasons are there for the undiminished movement of main offices to New York? For one thing, the city has become by far the greatest reservoir of business management talent. Does this sound like an academic argument? It isn't. Any industry requiring skilled operatives naturally seeks a location where such operatives abound. The industry of business management is no exception. It requires, besides office boys, clerks, stenographers, secretaries, and the other categories of office help, a surprising variety of highly trained technicians—draftsmen, chemists, engineers, designers, inventors, statisticians, to name but a few. The great laboratories alike of the city's universities and of commerce offer a technical service in research and invention without a parallel. Where else can management find in equal abundance such well-trained human material and such facilities? The opportunities in this great industry attract the graduates of colleges and technical schools; their presence here speeds the march of management to the city. The industry also requires able counsel versed in the intricacies, always multiplying, of the laws governing corporations. Again New York supplies the best; and, as the advertising center of the country (thanks to the size of its business-management industry) it offers the best brains in the advertising field.

Another compelling inducement is simply the industry's own established presence here. Great corporations deal with each other; their largest customers are right within the family; wherefore to foregather with their kind is a convenience, not to say a need of the first order. We have all observed how in any city businesses of different sorts tend to congregate in their own districts. The same gregarious instinct, founded on mutual advantage, has made New York the Nation's business-management district.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 8, 1943]

NEW YORK MARCHES ON

IV. THE BRIGHT PROSPECT AHEAD

The synthesis of the city's economy and its culture, both preeminent, insures its continued leadership as the great metropolis of the continent. In previous editorials of this series we have attempted to define business management as a separate industry in terms of its size and importance in comparison with other categories in the American economy. We have seen that after adding all the occupations within its scope—from office boy to president of the company—it looms up as the largest single entity among all industries. In New York City, for example, it accounts for more workers than there are engaged in the next 8 manual-labor industries combined. One-third of the local working population, or 1,600,000, has established New York City as the headquarters for America's industrial management.

New York's preeminence in the material and physical facilities so necessary for this industry has been well established. These, together with its cultural advantages, have accounted for the tremendous growth of our business-management population within the last 20 years.

The consequences of the war will add many compelling reasons for an even greater growth in the future.

When this war ends the United States will be the one great source of supply for the world, the one great industrial nation whose production facilities not only have escaped severe damage but in the interim have been enormously enhanced. A global trade, to dwarf anything of the kind in the country's history, is the corollary. And the corollary to that in turn is a tremendous concentration of commerce and industrial management in the port of New York. It seems certain to become by all odds the world's greatest seaport and busier than it ever dreamed of being.

The growth of air transport may well alter the current of some trade. But two reasons impel us to the belief that such competition will not be unduly serious. One is that with the sea lanes safe again the vast proportion of bulk cargo will continue to move in surface vessels for as long as anyone can foresee. The other has to do with the city's own claims to first place as an airport. The argosies of the air will seek its huge landing fields as those of the sea its unsurpassed harbors. The new Idlewild Airport, for example, will afford the greatest airplane terminal facilities the world has ever seen. Thanks to the imagination and energy of Mayor LaGuardia, the city is more than keeping pace with this new demand upon its enterprise.

Another consideration deserves attention. Through a steady increase in subcontracting, New York's small units of industry, its metal plants, woodworking shops, etc., are improving the city's share of war production while its garment trade is turning out a prodigious proportion of the uniforms required for the Nation's armed forces. But for reasons which we have endeavored to explain, it can hardly aspire to be a great armament center, to compete in this respect with cities like Detroit, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and Philadelphia. Nor should it make the effort. Its forte lies not in heavy industry and mass production but in the very diversification of its industrial output, catering, with superior style and design, to the individual needs of the civilian population. In this field its preeminence is unassailable.

New York is destined to be the gathering place for men and women of affairs in every walk of life from all over the world. As the foremost cosmopolitan city it is bound to occupy a place and an importance unrivaled in our time. As world awareness replaces national consciousness, American business management will establish headquarters in this city in ever-increasing numbers.

The leadership of American industry today is in the hands of enlightened and, for the most part, cultivated men. These men will need day-to-day contact with the minds that create the world pattern in art, science, politics, as well as economics. It will be natural for a great many companies, whose headquarters are now located in other cities, to continue their factories and plants close to the source of their raw materials and to move their management offices to New York City as the pivotal point of global economic influence.

Let us hasten to add that, although the prospect is assured, its full realization will need the cooperation of all loyal residents of the metropolitan area in an effort to make the town and its environs a better place to live in from any point of view. This effort should take the form of perpetuating enlightened and honest government, city planning on a comprehensive scale, including housing reform and a solution of the traffic problem, and, of course, an ever-accentuated program of port improvement, both by air and sea. Surely, also, labor and management, the city and State authorities, should attend seriously to the problem of wage and tax differentials with the object of braking the outward flow of manual industry seeking lower production costs.

But it has been the aim of this series to indicate that in providing for New York's future we should do so with all the optimism which the situation warrants and with our main emphasis on the strengthening of the city's unexcelled advantages. We must preserve the essential characteristics that provided the compelling reasons for the establishment of so much of America's industrial management here in the first place. Beyond that we must expand our planning to meet the requirements for leadership in the postwar world. New York's destiny as the world's greatest and most civilized capital must be fulfilled.

Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following column written by Bulkley Griffin. Mr. Griffin has been in our press gallery for a number of years, and I consider him to be a keen student of government. His observations are particularly timely right now, and I heartily concur in the thoughts he expresses in this column:

WASHINGTON

(By Bulkley Griffin)

This writer has been in the congressional press galleries quite a number of years and he seems to be undergoing a change of attitude toward Congress. Up until recently he has been inclined to harp, in his own mind anyway, upon the sundry demonstrations of idiocy and demagoguery selfishness and incompetence, that distinguish any such elective body.

In the last couple of years or so, however, he has detected a growing inclination to observe and dwell upon the fundamental soundness, plodding good sense, and laborious inclinations toward light and virtue of this always tiresome and always entertaining assemblage.

It is true that addition of years make for tolerance in the average individual but this is hardly the moment for the blossoming of time-made tolerance toward a group of folks who vote for pensions for themselves, take X cards, and contribute toward the company at the dubious red house at 2101 R Street. Maybe it is because the Roosevelt administration has long sought to belittle Congress and its place in the popular heart, even influencing Elmer Davis' Office of War Information and other Federal agencies to contribute to this dangerous campaign. This factor has no doubt been one cause for the writer's change of emphasis. Congress is the best functioning bet we have against a trend of dictatorship.

Anyway, the House during an important debate—and the Senate too—is a profitable study. Here you have the works, democracy in all its aspects. The crowd could never be mistaken for a chamber of commerce meeting; it is not sharp enough or sufficiently well dressed. It is more representative than any group gathering you could suggest. Through hundreds of years—for it is descended from the English House of Commons and that dodge of dispensing with the Speaker and meeting in Committee of the Whole, which the House employs every week, is copied from the ancient Commons' device for meeting free of the kingly prying of the Stuarts—the House has developed a mode of operations that exhibits much informality and give-and-take and undignified banter and laughter but that, in the last analysis, oils the machinery of efficient legislative production.

The House enjoys the angry incoherence of aged "MULEY" DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, chairman of Ways and Means, who has got so roiled over attacks upon the committee's inefficiency this year that the day before he said "hell" to the House and can't for the life of him talk slowly about his beloved and bedraggled tax bill. The Members laugh appreciatively at the futile efforts of the old-style, pompous, white-haired former Governor MORRISON of North Carolina to shout while the Chair has suspended business to rap for quiet. The House and its ways are the thing. Whatever the former honors of MORRISON, this is his first year in Congress and his grandiloquence doesn't go here. MORRISON and anyone else learns that Congress, accumulating character since its earliest ancestors, is a being and a law unto itself. The more you know it the more you understand it. It was not built in a day nor by an assembly line.

The Members laugh and talk while someone addresses them; they read newspapers and study reports; they walk up and down the aisles, chatting; they confer in groups on the floor and back of the brass rail that delimits the floor; they smoke back of the rail; and at one time the smiling Sergeant at Arms is sent to the "Members standing in the rear of the Chamber" to quiet them. Business is accomplished more slowly than by Executive order, yet the big businessmen who constitute the War Production Board are not less cowardly and vacillating in their verdicts. There is scheming in Congress and there is scheming in Executive orders and in all the Federal agencies downtown.

Freshmen and veterans work together and do manage to get results that keep the Nation moving forward. They operate through the latest capital of custom and native wit and they do achieve a working accommodation between contrasting ideas and clashing personalities. Here is the nationally selected heart of democracy—lumbering democracy—that backs and fills and pushes and hauls. But we can't spare it, today least of all.

Is It To Be Lives or Strikes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Milwaukee Journal in its May 8 issue asks a pertinent question: "Is it to be lives or strikes?" The men in uniform are asking that question. Loyal workmen are asking why are strikes necessary at this time? This editorial is very well written and deserves to be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am submitting same herewith:

IS IT TO BE LIVES OR STRIKES?

Senators will deceive no one else, and we hope they are not deceiving themselves by passing the Connally bill for the seizure of strike-crippled factories and mines.

The Senate is making a gesture; that is all. Why? Because the Connally bill gives to the President no more power to meet a strike emergency than he already has, or will assume as Commander in Chief if he believes it necessary. Do the Senators think this is meeting their obligation to the boys in Tunisia and on Guadalcanal?

The Connally bill to authorize seizure has been kicking around in the Senate since November 1941. It is just one of many measures that advocates of laws to prevent interference with war production have brought forward. Everyone has been defeated to date by the political power of labor.

There have been other gestures preceding this present gesture in the Senate, movements that could be interpreted as threats. The Connally bill was brought forward strongly on one other occasion when John L. Lewis was kicking up a fuss. The Lewis flare-up subsided, and the Senate threat subsided. The Senator could not get the bill back into the refrigerator quickly enough.

Every Senator, every Representative, and at least 120,000,000 Americans know what is needed. There should be a comprehensive labor code which defines the status of labor for the duration of the war, and the duration only, just as the status of everybody else is now defined by a comprehensive body of laws.

Jurisdictional squabbles—a plague if there ever was one—should be outlawed by the simple expedient of declaring the status quo during the war. Labor should not be denied its rights of appeal for grievances, but these rights should be subject to the arbitration of a Government agency properly constituted by Congress.

Today a manufacturer—and we have an instance now right in Milwaukee—can be guided only by what the Government says. Wherein is labor any better? But the men in this Milwaukee war-production plant can now do what they please.

The Connally bill as amended would give legal standing to the War Labor Board. That would be a gain. But it took a hard fight to get even that much.

There would be penalties, also, against labor leaders and agitators who fomented strikes or interfered with Government operation. Another gain. But sometimes it is the rank and file who do these things through wildcat movements. What about them?

Anyway what we need to do now is to prevent strikes, and the Connally bill is a thousand miles from touching that problem. When strikes come and seizures come, time is lost. And time is what we have to conserve for the sake of the boys at the front.

The plan of taking labor's pledge not to strike, adopted right after Pearl Harbor, has failed miserably John L. Lewis, one of those who gave the pledge, has now crawled out by a typical Lewis bit of reasoning. Neither William Green nor Philip Murray has been able to control all of his workers

Congress has not acted, of course, because of its fear of political punishment. Well, the time has come when Senators and Congressmen will have to decide whether they want to save votes or save the lives of boys in Tunisia, over Europe, and throughout the Pacific.

And we do not want gestures.

Congress Prepares for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address entitled "Congress Prepares for Peace," which I delivered in Chicago recently:

When the present session of Congress opened on January 6, I introduced two resolutions. The first of these is known as House Concurrent Resolution No. 2. It seeks to create a joint committee consisting of six Members of the Senate and six Members of the House of Representatives, to be known as the Joint Committee on Planning and Reconstruction. This committee would be equipped with engineers, experts, and technicians who are especially qualified to devise post-war plans and programs which deal with public works, highways, structures, housing, airports, community development, and other fields of endeavor.

Its purpose is quite obvious. When the war is over the young Americans who are today serving on the frontiers of freedom will return home. They'll want jobs. They'll want homes. They'll want to establish their own families. They'll want to resume the normal pursuits of a peaceful life. That, of course, means that our country must shift back from a war basis to a peace basis. Such a shift is attended with many problems. They cannot be solved overnight. They will require time, thought, and expert guidance. This resolution, therefore, undertakes to place the responsibility for planning in the Congress. It simply anticipates that some day 11,000,000 young men will be demobilized, that 10,000,000 or more will leave defense plants and must find other work, and that we should begin preparing now for that day.

The second resolution is known as House Concurrent Resolution 3. That resolution simply recognizes that some day the war will end. When the war ends, the tasks of peace begin. It recognizes that we as a people must be ready for those problems. It recognizes further that national policy is a matter for Congress to determine. To that end, the resolution proposes the creation of a joint committee of six Senators and six Representatives in Congress on peace preparation whose duty it would be to study and explore all peace plans and proposals and determine their effect upon our country. This committee would serve as a sort of fact-finding body and would have authority to hire experts to assist in these studies. It would make reports to Congress and the country and stimulate discussion of each peace proposal or every suggestion which might be advanced. It rec-

ognizes that victory is the final fruit of the toil, tears, and taxes of the people and that a durable peace must be a people's peace. This resolution recognizes also that when the victory is won there must be not only the preparation of a peace but preparation for peace. A quarter of a centry ago, this fact was ignored. After the peace had been signed by our representa ives at the peace conference and the time came to have it ratified, the peacemakers found that they had become the prisoners of public opinion. That should not happen again. Otherwise these ghastly sacrifices will have been in vain.

Now these two resolutions are still pending before the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives. No action has been taken thereon. But other things have happened.

In early February, when a Subcommittee on Appropriations of which I am a member was considering a Budget request for $1,400,000 for the National Resources Planning Board, I assisted in using the pruning knife on this item. As the appropriation bill finally passed the House, it contained no funds whatsoever for this planning agency. The bill is now pending in the Senate.

There was some reason for this action by the committee and by the House. Post-war planning to deal with problems of demobilization, the reconversion of industry from a war to a peace basis will require money. That money must be voted by Congress. Congress alone has the power to appropriate. Its Members are elected to office and owe a direct responsibility to the people. If there is to be post-war planning, it should be done under the direction of Congress rather than by a board of appointed experts, who owe no direct responsibility to the people.

Shortly after action was taken to abolish the National Resources Planning Board the President observed that if we did not provide money for the Board, Congress would have to assume responsibility for post-war planning. That is exactly right Congress should assume this responsibility

The Senate lost no time in acting. That body passed a resolution creating a committee of 10 Senators to handle post-war economic planning. The House should do likewise. Or there should be a joint committee such as I have proposed. In ary event, there is a growing consciousness that planning work must be done and that it should be supervised by the elected representatives of the people who have control of the purse strings and who are accountable to those whose taxes must be used for this purpose.

But something else has happened. On April 26 Representative MARTIN, Republican leader of the House of Representatives, appointed an informal committee of 33 Republican Congressmen from 19 different States to study post-war domestic problems Its broad purpose is to avoid national disaster after the war, keep the Nation solvent, preserve free private enterprise, and provide steady employment and a better life. Here is a definite recognition by the Republican leadership that these problems will arise and that solutions must be ready. I am happy to be designated as a member of that Republican committee.

Consider for a moment the post-war problem on the home front. Let's not call it planning. I don't particularly like the word. Let's call it preparation. For what must we prepare? For one thing, the boys in uniform will come home I came home from the last war in September of 1919. The war was over. Some of the glamour of the uniform was already gone. Jobs were not very plentiful. Unrest and ferment began. The veterans were disturbed in mind and spirit. Having done their duty for their country, there was no job. It didn't look like gratitude. Now, that shouldn't happen again. So we must prepare for it. Think of the millions of men and women in defense plants. Some will doubtless be absorbed in the production of peacetime goods. But not all. Take the hundreds of thousands of men and women in airplane factories as an example. When the military need for planes is over, work will taper off. Only a small percentage of the planes now being produced will be needed for civil transport. What about them? Here again, some preparation must be made to cushion the shock.

Now consider the reconversion of war plants. It's not an easy thing to make that change. If a factory has been making shells for several years and must now go back to making washing machines or refrigerators it will require materials, finances, change of assembly line, reestablishment of its sales organization, reestablishment of dealer contacts. There will be a lag in getting back to the production point where it left the washing machine business and began the manufacture of shells. We must prepare to handle that lag.

Consider the war plants which were built by Government. They represent an investment of $15,000,000,000. When the war is over, industry does not want Government competing with it. On the other hand, here is a huge investment of taxpayers' money in buildings and machinery. Can they be put to use? If so, how? That's a matter that requires study and preparation.

Now consider for a moment the controls under which we live. Critical materials like copper and steel are under priorities. Food is rationed. Salaries, wages, and prices are under stabilization. Should such controls be continued after the war?

Some of our economic doctors say yes. Only last week the assistant director of the Board of Economic Warfare expressed the opinion that a certain amount of control must continue. Other economic and political doctors have expressed themselves likewise. Even Leon Henderson of late Office of Price Administration memory so expressed himself. If we want to lift these controls and restrictions and resume the freedoms for which we are now fighting, then the thing to do is prepare for it now.

Several weeks ago the country was introduced to the American version of the Beveridge security plan. This program is the product of the National Resources Planning Board. It embraces many things. Among other things, it proposes national disability insurance and an extension of Social Security coverage and benefits. It calls for health and medical care. It suggests an increase in unemployment benefits and complete federalization of the unemployment benefit system, which now operates as a combination State-Federal system. It calls for enlarged access to educational opportunities and special benefits for the blind and the aged. It is a most elaborate program. It has not been widely discussed. That is partly due to its immensity and partly to the war. But in due time it will push forward for consideration. How far shall we go in this field? That's a big question and consequently there must be study and preparation

These are but some of the matters with which we will be confronted. We can drift along and ignore them or we can take cognizance of them and begin making preparation to meet them. There is a time for everything and a season for every purpose. I believe the time is now to prepare for these problems. They are inevitable and cannot be escaped The better part of wisdom therefore is to launch a thorough study of the matter and start preparing the blueprint for their solution.

It is an old axiom that "You can't beat something with nothing." If Congress has nothing to offer by way of a solution when the time comes, how can they well thrust aside the extreme plans which might be submitted by those perfervid economic doctors who would if possible completely remake the American scheme of life.

Here then is a field of preparation on the home front and I am genuinely happy that Republican leadership in Congress has recognized the opportunity for fruitful service in this field.

In those feverish months of 1940 and 1941, we heard much of the so-called M-day. It stands for mobilization day. It was that unknown day in the future when the Nation's resources would be marshalled for war. Back of M-day were years and years of preparation. The whole Nation was blueprinted. Military authorities knew exactly where to turn for guns and uniforms and gas masks. They knew the capacity of each factory. They knew the capacity of each railroad. They knew the load capacity of each bridge. They knew the usefulness of each highway. They knew exactly what they needed and where to get it.

That was preparation for war. Is it suggesting too much that in like manner we do a bit of preparing for peace and its problems on the home front?

When all is said and done, this business of making scientific advance, preparation to meet certain inevitable problems, is not so new. Of the 16,000 incorporated municipalities in the United States, 1,200 have planning boards. We have 92 cities with populations over 100,000, most of whom have planning boards. In addition, there are 670 other planning agencies in the Nation. In due time their plans and blueprints will be laid before some agency of the Federal Government. There will be requests for funds. Manifestly, there should be a pattern to follow The proposals of State and local agencies should be geared to the plans that business and industry may have. Full employment will be the true test. This pattern should be laid out by real, practical experts under the direction of Congress. All this is nothing more than prudence and common sense in getting ready for the gigantic problems which will flow out of the transition from war to peace, which in their essential character are not unlike the problems now before us as a result of the translation from peace to war.

Consider now our post-war policy with respect to other nations. Our first job is military victory. Then comes the question of what shall be done with victory. That's when the tasks of peace begin.

The general pattern of what is to follow is up to a point not very complicated. There may be an armistice or a conditional peace. Troops and war matériel will have to be evacuated. Frontiers will have to be fixed. There will have to be some agreement concerning the occupation of captured and enemy territory until a final peace is determined. There will be questions of limitation of air, land, and naval power on the enemy countries. The enemy will have to be disarmed. Prisoners and civilians who have been driven from their native lands must be returned. Food will have to be supplied to keep down the virus of revolution. There must be provision for reparations and for the trial of those who plunged the world into this awful conflict. There will be questions of intergovernmental debt and the stabilization of exchange. There will be questions of trade and raw materials.

Now, when all these things have been determined, the question then arises, "Where do we go from here?"

Having restored boundaries, sent the prisoners home, tried the arch culprits, fed the hungry, disarmed the enemy, and attended to the rest of the chores, what do we do about making certain that this thing won't happen again?

What do we do about a peace that will last?

Some may say that we shouldn't discuss that matter until the war is won. Well, that

was one of the slogans just 25 years ago, "Win the war first and discuss the peace afterward." How popular that slogan was, and did we win a lasting peace? The boys in uniform and the casualty lists furnish the answer.

If we don't get a lasting peace this time, it will be a reflection on our moral courage and our lack of leadership.

If we don't get a peace this time, it will make a mockery out of the grim sacrifices that are now taking place.

So we must search for a way. We must discuss these vital matters now.

Through the years we have done a lot of good things: We outlawed child labor; we instituted an 8-hour day; we provided social security; we provided for the welfare of mothers and children; we provided for the aged, the blind, the infirm; we outlawed the sale of impure and adulterated food; we outlawed the sale of misbranded drugs; we made provision for crippled children; we have schools, teachers, and school nurses.

All these are a kind of collective morality on the march. Surely a nation that can do all this for its people has the talent to provide the greatest blessing of all, and that is lasting peace.

What is needed for a lasting peace? In a single sentence, it must have an opportunity to last. Whether it shall have an opportunity to last depends on how determined we are to supply that opportunity and make it last.

Already the air is full catchwords and alluring phrases. Already there are labels and identification tags for one policy or another.

We hear of unions and alliances, of leagues and federations, of military police forces and regional groupings.

There are those who believe that the destiny of the world rests on free trade and those who believe we must seek a controlled world economy.

There are those who believe that a policy of intense nationalism is the only thing that will serve our own country as well as the world and those who string along with the idea of imperialism.

Let us forget all fancy phrases and catchwords for a moment and analyze the problem of peace. Let us simplify it even at the risk of oversimplification.

It is essentially a four-fold problem. First, there is the will for enduring peace. Secondly, there are the peace terms. Third, there is the machiery for making peace and finally, the machinery and the method for preserving peace.

A peace treaty may record but does not bring lasting peace. It requires something more durable than a piece of parchment. It requires the will and the determination that peace shall have a chance to last. This is the primary problem.

Either we affirm our faith in our own courage and capacity to bring about a better world or we must confess our belief that war is an inevitable form of political action.

Either we admit that we have come of age and have the talent and the ingenuity to adjust ourselves to a method for preserving peace or we must confess that death and destruction as a means of arbitrating international differences is an inevitable part of human nature.

Either we determine that we are content to drift along as we did a generation ago and await the evil day when the next war will strike, or we determine that lasting peace is worth a try and that we are willing to make that trial.

It is as plain as print that no peace will last unless we join with other nations in making it last. That means cooperation. Are we willing to try it?

That of course is for the people to say. It must be a people's peace.

It must be the people's business. Peace is the end product of victory. Victory is fruit of toil, tears, and taxes. The people must be abundantly informed on every aspect of the matter. They must be prepared by study and discussion. The full truth about our failure to achieve peace a generation ago must be told. The causes for failure must be analyzed. Wisdom comes from discussion and from that wisdom will come the decision as to whether we shall casually drift into the next conflict or whether we propose to assume a role of leadership and give peace a chance to last.

It is now more than a year ago that the Republican National Committee met in Chicago and among other things, approved a proposal toward this end. Paragraph 2 of the 12-point program which was adopted on April 20, 1942, reads as follows:

"We realize that after this war the responsibility of the Nation will not be circumscribed within the territorial limits of the United States; that our Nation has an obligation to assist in the bringing about of understanding, comity, and cooperation among the nations of the world in order that our own liberty may be preserved and that the blighting and destructive processes of war may not again be forced upon us and upon the free and peace-loving peoples of the earth."

That was a timely pronouncement in the spring of 1942 and becomes more so as the days go by.

That statement recognizes three fundamentals.

The first is that we do have a responsibility beyond our borders when this war ends.

The second is that we have an obligation to cooperate.

The third is that we must cooperate to prevent war from being thrust upon us again.

When the people determine to accept that responsibility and that obligation, the method or mechanism for cooperation and the preservation of peace will not be difficult.

I am not unmindful of what that responsibility and that obligation involves. In its wake comes the problem of disarmament and long-range trade relations with other lands. In its wake comes the question of how united power and force shall be constituted and applied to preserve the peace of the world. Yet for all these, the solution will be found when the will has been developed.

To be sure, it will take time. Such an undertaking on a world level will be of slow growth. It will take courage but we have the courage. It will take leadership but we have the strength, the power and the resource from which leadership stems. It will require some brutal truth that false and dangerous hopes will not be kindled. But we have the moral courage for that course. It will require a minimum of emotionalism. We are sufficiently realistic for that. It will require flexibility and restraint. Those do we have also.

And we have something more. We have the incentive for translating into terms of action, the course which was charted by the national committee of our party more than a year ago and which needs fulsome discussion. That incentive will be found in the casualty lists, the tax burdens and the economic restrictions which are the inheritances of this struggle.

Thousands of young Americans have already been bruised to eternal sleep on the battlefields of other continents. Is that not incentive enough? Thousands of mother hearts have been rent with the anguish of bereavement by battle. Is that not incentive enough? Before the year is out as many as 700,000 young soldiers and sailors from the State of Illinois will be in uniform. Many of these lives will be laid upon the altar of freedom before the fitful fever of war has spent itself. Many will be disabled and return home to claim just treatment from a generous republic. Is that not incentive enough for some method of cooperation that will give peace a chance to live and flourish?

Think also of the cost in toil and treasure. We are presently spending $241,000,000 daily for war. That means $10,000,000 every 60 minutes. Congress has authorized the expenditure of nearly $240,000,000,000 for war and defense purposes since the shadow of conflict came over us. This does not include authorizations that are being made by the present Congress. This means that war authorizations will soon equal $2,000 for every man, woman, and child in the land. Nobody begrudges this outlay. It is devoted to the preservation of liberty. But as we contemplate the immensity of this expenditure, does it not constitute an impelling incentive to find a feasible and practical way to preserve peace?

Reposing in the Federal Treasury are more than eleven billions in long-term notes, gathering dust and drawing interest. These notes represent amounts which other nations still owe the United States from the last war. It is a fair assumption that they never will be paid. Is this not an incentive to give peace an opportunity to last?

Under the terms of the Lease-Lend Act, Congress has authorized the use of nearly $36,000,000,000 for lease-lend purposes to the nations associated with us in the war effort. Much of this will never be repaid. It will be a part of the debt which the American taxpayer must pay in the form of heavy taxes in this and succeeding generations to pay the cost of war. Is this not an incentive for study and discussion to find durable and lasting peace?

Frequently one hears it said that when this war is over, we propose to mind our own business and let other nations mind theirs. We speak of the world's endless feuds and resolve to remain aloof from these involvements only to find that the American people must pay the bill.

The last World War was fought in Africa, Europe, and Asia and ended in the American pocketbook. The present war is being fought on the seven seas and three continents and will also end in the American pocketbook. For the sake of preserving our own economic structure and avoiding dislocations in the generations to come, what greater incentive do we need to find a way to preserve peace?

The incentive is there. We need but build the will and the determination to cooperate with other nations. We need but build confidence in our own powers. We need but the courage to assume the leadership, and we shall not fail to find a way to give peace an opportunity to last.

Recently a new organization has sprung into prominence. It is the War Dads. They are the fathers of young men in uniform who carry the torch of freedom. The organization has a four-point program. One of these is to aid the war effort, another to work for lasting peace. All power to the War Dads. They have a great stake in the present conflict. They will have a great stake in the fashioning of peace and in the preservation of peace. When the War Dads, the War Mothers, the taxpayers of the Nation decide that America has come of age and that a way must be found to preserve peace, we shall not fail.

So there lies before us the problem of preparing the economic blueprint of transition from war to peace at home, and the problem of finding a way to cooperate with other nations that peace might have a chance to endure.

And what is the key to this achievement? It is study and more study. It is discussion and more discussion. Study and discussion generate ideas and understanding. They give to the people a partnership in peace. Such discussions develop the literature of peace. They prepare the way for public support of the solutions which are finally proposed. They are the instruments by which an acceptable peace is fashioned. We can best

bring understanding to the fevered world if we ourselves thoroughly understand what we seek to do and how to do it.

Long ago Ecclesiastes, the preacher, wrote upon the parchment, "To everything there is a season and a time to every purpose under the heaven." At long last we have reached the time and season to give peace a chance to last.

Control for Civil Flying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, May 9, 1943:

CONTROL FOR CIVIL FLYING

Congress has before it the Lea-Bailey bill to modernize our legislation affecting civil aeronautics. It has many new and desirable features looking to a solid foundation for the development of civil aviation in all its phases—common-carrier operation, miscellaneous commercial operation and private flying. It provides for an enlarged airport development program, for encouraging aviation education and for other steps which have long been desirable. Of fundamental importance is a provision extending Federal jurisdiction to regulate air navigation and air commerce throughout the Nation.

There could be no more dramatic illustration of the need for a single legislative control than the major operation which had to be performed on our air transportation system about a year ago. Due to the peculiar relationship of the system to the national defense it became necessary suddenly to mobilize the industry, to reduce by nearly 50 percent the number of planes in common-carrier service, and to set up a Nation-wide and even world-wide network of special operations for the Army. This required a drastic readjustment in common-carrier schedules throughout the Nation, a change in routes, a reshuffling of stops, and even changes in rates. Yet it was accomplished smoothly and almost literally within a few days because the entire system was subject to only one law administered by only one agency.

In the case of air commerce, the economics of which are interstate and international, there can be no justification for differing local requirements. And the special value of aviation, speed and mobility would be impaired, if not destroyed, were varying State regulations ever to arise.

Mother—The Greatest Soldier of Them All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the American people paused to pay tribute to the American mother. While many of the mothers received beautiful bouquets and kind messages from their loved ones, the one message which gave the American mother the greatest joy was the glad news of the splendid victory won by our soldiers last week in Africa.

Yesterday I received a copy of the Wayne County Record, a local newspaper published in my home town. The paper stated that on Mother's Day Mrs. Lorene C. Neff, of Cisne, Wayne County, Ill., would be honored by five sons in the service and two more sons who would join the armed forces in a short time. On the front page of this paper appeared the picture of Mrs. Neff and her five sons now in the service. The editor says, "Here we present six great soldiers, five Neff brothers, and Mother, the greatest soldier of them all." In this I agree with the editor, for who makes a greater sacrifice and a greater contribution to the country than the mother who rears a nice family of children to become useful citizens and defenders of the Republic?

I join with the Wayne County Record in paying tribute to this true American family, and under leave to extend my remarks, I ask to include the following article taken from Friday's issue of this paper:

Mrs. Lorene C. Neff, of Cisne, is the mother of 10 children—9 boys and 1 girl; 5 of the sons are now seeing action in the Navy and Marine Corps; 2 of them, Raymond and Guy, were at Pearl Harbor on that fateful Sabbath morning of December 7, 1941. Raleigh was among those who met the yellow plague on Midway Island a few months later. He remained at Midway for 9 months, but was recently transferred to another area.

Samuel is somewhere in the South Pacific.

"That's about all I know about them," Mrs. Neff told a representative of the Record. "I don't know where any of them are." And then she continued with that expression peculiar to an anxious mother, "but I wish it was all over and they were at home."

Mrs. Neff is not different from the scores of other mothers who bring letters and pictures to the Record. Their faces lighten with pride as they tell of the record their sons are making in the service, but stifled tears and tightened lips reveal only too clearly the love and fear that overshadows the pride. Somehow, as American mothers dream of the achievements and success of their sons, they never include war in their scheme of things, but plan for him a life of peace and democracy. Consequently the cost of that smile that conceals the agony of the soul is the greatest price that is paid for war. No medal of honor can be awarded for their sacrifice, but in recognition of it Woodrow Wilson set aside the second Sunday in May as the day when all Americans should pay special honor and tribute to mother.

Two of the four sons not now in the armed forces expect to be called within the next few months. Harold, 26, is married, but has no dependents. He will probably be put in 1-A by the Selective Service order issued this week. Elmo, 18, was deferred for 2 months when examined about 5 weeks ago.

The other two sons are Billie, 15, and Cecil, 12.

This large family lived on a farm near Cisne until 1936, when the father died. The sons, choosing other work in preference to farming, moved the mother and younger children to Cisne and have since provided for the home.

Two of the sons, Raleigh A. and Raymond A., are twins.

A Farm-Food Message to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to quote an informative message by J. E. Bradley, president, Tractor Training Service, Portland, Oreg., which reads as follows:

Since the Congress of the United States—elected representatives of the people—is the final court of appeal for correcting vital conditions, it seems timely to bring to your attention in a constructive way some phases of the growing critical problem of food production that seem heading this Nation toward a food Pearl Harbor.

Rather than destructive criticism, it seems that advantage should be taken of all the gains that have, and are being made, and instead of tearing things to pieces, to remove in an orderly manner the stumbling blocks, by concrete constructive suggestions.

Our surveys on the United States food front show a rapidly rising confidence in the Congress, and its present activities, such as, the Truman and other committees, to correct mistakes in fundamental national policies before they can bring disaster. This food situation from farm to consumer is rapidly breeding mistrust, and building up lack of confidence in our Government, and its ability to wage a winning war.

During the past decade, two great advances had been made in farm equipment, which increased food production at less cost. They were:

1. The use of rubber tires on tractors and tractor-drawn farm machines.

2. The development of Diesel track-type tractors.

The wiping out of these two gains in farm production accounts for much of the difference between plenty of food and not enough. Diesel and air-tired tractors together lifted the farmer out of the depression red, and assured abundant and cheap food to this Nation between World Wars 1 and 2. Add the fact that the tooling up of the United States farm was behind schedule, because of the long depression and unprofitable prices until the outbreak of World War 2, scarcely 3 years ago, and we find the farm power and implement situation highly critical. The use of obsolete and worn-out tractors and machinery has meant the loss of about 25 percent in important operating time and repairs.

There is still so much confusion and misunderstanding regarding agriculture as to hamper, instead of help, the farmer reach his goal in food production because of red tape and lack of knowledge of this basic problem by Washington officials in authority. Agriculture is slipping backward, when it wants to go ahead.

May I, as head of our service covering the Nation, point out a few key changes or improvements, which are needed immediately as shown by surveys—basic principles so easily read, it is hard to account for their being overlooked.

1. Turn the farm and farming back to the farmer, who knows his problem better than anyone else. Let the farmers' own organizations run the war food program locally. Farm bureaus, granges, and so forth, which have been built up by, of, and for the farmer over the years, and can do the job locally better than any bureau in Washington. The

local farmers know and have full confidence in them.

2. Immediately start a program to double the farm tractor and tractor-powered tools and implements, if manufacturing facilities and materials can be allotted, to multiply each farm and farm worker's output to the limit. England started the war with a program of doubling its tractors and implements on farms, and has done it. Germany jumped its farm tractor power 260 percent. Both are in the best food producing position in their history, although it appears that they will still be short. Our farmers are losing the one big edge they have built up over the century—supremacy in mechanized farming.

3. Give the good farmers, on the good land, not only good tools, but trained labor, at least in the key positions. This is no time to experiment with marginal and submarginal land, management, and labor.

4. Competent labor skilled in tractor operation, and servicing in solving farm work is essential for highest production per man, woman, and child engaged. To balance the proposition, such trained workers should and can be paid wages comparable to other war industry. With new improved man- and time-saving machinery, which has been developed ready for manufacture, if placed in their hands under competent management, they will economically justify such wages, and remove the trend to leave the farm to seek higher wages in war industry. This is a point, which has apparently been overlooked. Leave one skilled farm owner or manager on each and every good farm with one key worker and sufficient trained machine men to handle the big operations; then fill out the crews with ordinary labor.

From the background of a lifetime in agriculture and a proven record in the training of skilled operators and technicians, to cut labor and unit costs while increasing food production, quantity and quality, I have no hesitancy in stating that if it were necessary 200,000 or more farm women, girls, boys, and older men could be quickly trained to fit into this war food program to meet any war demands.

A Concurrent Resolution To Continue Florida's Assistance to the United Nations in War Aims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEX GREEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I commend to your consideration House Concurrent Resolution No. 5 of the Florida Legislature, 1943 session, and as approved by the Governor of the State of Florida, Hon. Spessard L. Holland. It is a concurrent resolution to continue Florida's assistance to the United Nations in war aims.

This resolution well bespeaks the firm and abiding sentiment in Florida for cooperation to the United Nations in the present tragic world conflict. This resolution challenges the attention and approval of every Member of our honorable body. I commend it to you.

The resolution follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 5

Concurrent resolution to continue Florida's assistance to the United Nations in war aims

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida in session assembled:

Whereas the United States of America and its allies are now engaged in a fight to the finish against the foes of liberty, free speech and action, and religious tolerance; and

Whereas this great Nation of the United States must necessarily call upon all of its resources and upon all of its citizens to make sacrifices in order that World War II may be brought to an early victorious end; and

Whereas the sovereign State of Florida has given freely of its manpower and resources to further the victory aims of the United Nations and has provided the first American hero, Colin P. Kelly, and many other heroic sons who have willingly laid down their lives that we might enjoy liberty; and

Whereas the sovereign State of Florida is anxious and willing to further advance the war aims of the United Nations and of the American people by continuing to provide all of our manpower and our entire resources: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida in session assembled, That the Legislature of the State of Florida does hereby declare, resolve, and go on record to the end that the sovereign State of Florida and its people do continue the assistance in every way possible toward bringing the tyrants of the world and the forces of evil to their unholy ends, and that by this resolution does Florida and its patriotic citizens make known to the world their determination to dedicate their lives and property to the eradication of despotism until the Axis tyrants shall bow their unholy heads in unconditional surrender; Be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this legislative session, that a copy be sent to the President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and a copy also be sent to each United States Senator and Congressman of the State of Florida, and a copy furnished to the press.

Approved by the Governor April 27, 1943.

Renegotiation Digested for Busy Company Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously given, I place in the RECORD an intelligent analysis of the operations of the renegotiations statute that appeared in the April 19 number of What's Happening in Washington, published by Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, N. Y. I believe it will be generally useful and helpful to Members and their constituents. The article follows:

RENEGOTIATION DIGESTED FOR BUSY COMPANY PRESIDENTS

(Subordinates may be assigned the preparation of material for a renegotiation conference; but the top executive must have a working knowledge of a subject that may mean tremendous sums to his firm. This digest is written for him. Additional copies complimentary upon request while supply lasts.)

Why renegotiation? You will approach renegotiation with a more friendly spirit if you understand its need: First, many war matériel contracts have been excessively profitable because the savings from mass production could not be precisely predicted. Excessive profits[1] accrue to some contractors, not to others. Taxation, which must apply equally to all war and civilian businesses, is not sufficiently flexible.

Second, war industries lack the normal competitive incentive for low-cost, efficient operation. The Government must buy from every available source of supply, regardless of cost. Neither taxation nor any proposed profit limitation formula restores this incentive—in fact, most limitation formulas put a premium on high costs.

Third, war industry is extremely varied. Many plants operate with Government financing, substantially reducing private risks. Some contractors can continue their peacetime processes with little change; others must attempt unfamiliar and unexplored operations. Some operations permit a very rapid turn-over of the contractor's investment; others involve a very slow turnover. No formula for limiting profits can deal equitably with all these circumstances.

Renegotiation of contracts can do what taxation and flat formulas cannot—fit the profit to the facts; reduce excessive profits, leaving reasonable profits untouched; reward low-cost efficiency; distinguish between degrees of risk and venture. It is the only device flexible enough to fit the variety of war industries.

Which contracts are renegotiable? Any contract or subcontract for $100,000 or more with War, Navy, Treasury Departments, and Maritime Commission must include clause for renegotiation; such contracts for under $100,000 may be renegotiated. Congress may raise $100,000 to $500,000.

Exceptions: (a) Contracts and subcontracts where final payment was made prior to April 28, 1942; (b) certain contracts with Defense Supplies Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, Rubber Reserve Company, and Defense Plant Corporation; (c) contracts for certain raw materials; (d) where secretary or chairman specifically exempts contract from renegotiation (target or forward-pricing contracts, price-minus contracts, to be discussed in a future letter); (e) subcontracts for real property.

Manufacturers' agents: Some commission and compensation contracts are renegotiable because certain types of manufacturers' agents have been classified as subcontractors; others will be when bill recently approved unanimously by House committee soon becomes law.

By which agency? Renegotiating is by the agency which has the largest contracts with contractor; it acts for the other agencies.

Price adjustment boards, composed of distinguished, experienced businessmen, not New Dealers nor reformers, represent the four agencies (War, Navy, Treasury, and Maritime Commission) in renegotiation. Objective is to be fair to both Government and contractor. Survey shows 90 percent of contractors, after renegotiation, are fully satisfied; many write pleased letters to boards.

Proper representative: Contractor who knows his business fares best before renego-

[1] Keep in mind that "excessive" relates to profits subject to renegotiation. "Excess," to profits subject to special excess profits tax.

tiation board. Production manager who can explain history and operations of the company makes the best advocate.

Uniform principles have been agreed upon by the four agencies:

(A) Stimulation of quantity production is of primary importance.

(B) Reasonable profits are determined by the facts in each case without limitation by and fixed-profit formulas.

(C) Profits of contractor ordinarily will be determined on his war business as a whole for a fiscal period, rather than on specific contracts separately.

Fixed-price contracts (e. g., $1,000 per jeep) are negotiated separately from cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.

(D) As volume increases, profit margin should decrease, particularly where volume is abnormally large in relation to contractor's own investment.

(E) In determining fair profit margin, consider corresponding profits in pre-war base years of contractor and industry, especially where war products are substantially like pre-war products.

(F) Reasonableness of profits should be determined before provision for Federal income and excess-profits taxes.

(G) Contractor's right to a reasonable profit and his need for working capital should be distinguished. Contractor should not be allowed to earn excessive profits on war contracts merely because he lacks adequate working capital in relation to a greatly increased volume of business.

In determining fair margin, consider how contractor's operations compare with other contractors, including:

(a) Price reduction and comparative prices.

(b) Efficiency in reducing costs.

Example: Contracts are awarded to four firms for item A at $55,000 per unit. Three, whose cost is $40,000, are allowed profit of $5,000. Fourth, whose cost is $30,000, is rewarded with a profit of $10,000.

(c) Economy in the use of raw materials.

(d) Efficiency in use of facilities and conservation of manpower.

(e) Character and extent of subcontracting.

(f) Quality of production.

(g) Complexity of manufacturing technique.

(h) Rate of delivery and turn-over.

Example: Speed, in certain cases, is of prime importance. Ships being America's direst need, Maritime Commission conceivably might allow both extra costs and extra profits to contractors building ships the fastest.

(i) Inventive and developmental contribution with respect to important war products.

(j) Cooperation with the Government and with other contractors in developing and supplying technical assistance to alternative or competitive sources of supply and the effect thereof on the contractor's future peacetime business.

Consideration is given to possible increases in cost of materials, imminent wage increases, and risks assumed by contractor such as inexperience in new types of production, delays from inability to obtain materials, rejections, spoilage, "cut-backs" in quantities, and guaranties of quality and performance of the product.

Contractor whose contract price includes a comparatively reasonable profit is entitled to more favorable treatment than one whose price includes an unreasonable margin. Former contractor is subjected to the risks incident to the performance of a fixed-price contract, while latter has protected himself against such risks. Profit of latter should be adjusted in direction of the fee that might have been allowed under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for the production of similar articles.

When contractors sell their peacetime product to the Government the following factors are important:

(a) What were the profits and profit margins during 1936 through 1939, sometimes 1940? Abnormally bad year sometimes may be omitted.

Were profits during these years stationary, increasing, or decreasing? What was happening during those years to profit margins of other firms in the same industry?

From these factors what is the normal and proper margin of profit—before taxes, of course?

(b) Normal profit margins usually will be allowed on normal total volume. If contractor's normal volume was $5,000,000 and normal profit margin 10 percent, board probably would allow 10 percent on first $5,000,000 of wartime total volume (Government and civilian). But margin above that would be drastically reduced, perhaps to 5 percent, perhaps even lower.

(c) Sacrifice of civilian volume, especially if lost to competition, may be a reason for higher profit margin on war business. On the other hand, if facilities for producing civilian business are improved because of war orders, that may be grounds for a reduction.

MATERIAL NEEDED FOR RENEGOTIATION CONFERENCE

A. Profit and loss statements and balance sheets for years 1936 to 1942, inclusive. If 1942 not complete, bring estimate. Estimate for early months of 1943, helpful. Copy of certified public accountant audits, if any.

B. Figures showing proportion of sales renegotiable and not renegotiable. Segregate renegotiable into prime contracts and subcontracts. Segregate contracts with each of the four agencies. Break down Army business into branches. Segregate into fixed-price and cost-plus-a-fixed-fee business.

C. Allocation of expenses to renegotiable and nonrenegotiable business. Not necessarily proportionate to volume of Government and non-Government business. Civilian end may run itself. Government end may require installing new processes and new systems and training new help. On the other hand, if general overhead is largely for civilian business, only a small proportion should be charged to Government end.

D. Names of five companies making similar war products, for comparison purposes.

E. Information regarding other factors discussed in this letter.

F. Remember importance of psychological factors such as frankness, "knowing your stuff," willingness to cooperate.

Special costs to consider: (a) Depreciation: Only normal depreciation will be allowed, not the special 5-year amortization allowed for tax purposes. But difference will not necessarily be entirely disallowed; it will be considered in estimating value of plant contractor will have for postwar commercial purposes. (b) Losses from prior years may be considered if sustained from contracts subject to renegotiation. (c) Interest on borrowed capital is allowed providing proper allocation is made between volume of sales subject to renegotiation and other business. (d) Advertising: Reasonable advertising for institutional and postwar commercial purposes is allowed.

Salaries, wages, bonuses, and other compensation to officers and employees must be "reasonable." Nature of work, extent of responsibility and experience and effectiveness of officer or employee, and increases in compensation since January 1, 1939, will be considered; comparison will be made with compensation of officers or employees in similar positions in other companies of industry. (Be prepared to justify differences.) Weight is given to company's own determination of value of its officers.

Costs of postwar conversion disallowed "because nature, extent, and cost of reconversion is too conjectural to warrant present determination." But Congress is expected to pass law permitting reconversion reserves.

No responsibility for subcontractor: Contractor is under no obligation to withhold payments to a subcontractor until there has been an actual determination by the Government of the existence of excessive profits.

"Clearance": When a contractor or subcontractor has renegotiated in good faith, "agreement shall be final and conclusive according to its terms; and, except upon a showing of fraud or malfeasance or wilful misrepresentation of a material fact, such agreement shall not be reopened as to the matter agreed upon, and shall not be modified by any officer, employee, or agent of the United States."

FINAL NOTE

To expedite renegotiation, remember provision: Filing of all financial data nedeed for renegotiation (by mailing to "Assignment Office, Price Adjustment Boards," post-office box 2707, Washington, D. C.) requires Government to initiate renegotiation within a year of filing. If Government fails to request renegotiation within the year, any war contractor who has properly filed will be automatically cleared of obligation to submit to renegotiation.

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address made by me over station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on May 8, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Johnson City, Endicott, Binghamton, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, as you know, the time for my weekly talks to you folks has been changed from 8:30 to 7 o'clock. I hope that those who formerly listened in regularly on the previous time will be able to enjoy the new arrangement as well. I will be glad to obtain any comment you may have as to the evening in the week you prefer that I broadcast. The management of WNBF has very graciously asked me if I wanted to choose another evening than Saturday.

Personally, I feel that Saturday is an ideal time to speak to you in view of the fact that more and more of us are staying in nights, and that Saturday is an especially popular evening for radio.

The boys at the station seem to think that Saturday is a good time. They know what they're talking about because they live in radio. But I would be pleased to have my audience's reaction also. Let me know what you think about it.

At the outset of my discussion, I'm going to remind you once again of the large and varied supply of helpful books and informative pamphlets I have on a thousand subjects. These are yours for the asking. I have sent out so far this spring several thousands

of victory garden booklets. I also find the Victory Garden Handbooks very popular and have quite a few of these left, even after I supplied every faculty member of the Binghamton and Norwich school systems with at least one.

You will doubtless receive, if you have not already, an agriculture bulletin list with a brief letter from me, offering you five choices of pamphlets on this list. In my letter to you, please note my close contacts with the War and Navy Departments and with the other agencies of our Government. I urge you to get in touch with me if you have any difficulty with your problems. I have been most fortunate in obtaining quick action for wives, mothers, and children of servicemen in getting their allotment money for them or investigating and eliminating needless delays in their receiving these allotments. I am happy to tell you further of my occasional success in locating soldiers and sailors who have failed to receive their loved one's mail or whose own letters home have miscarried. It gives me the greatest satisfaction to perform these tasks for these dependents of our valiant fighting men.

Not long ago, the United States Marine Corps designed and printed a beautifully colored and well-written history of the American flag. This little volume is in great demand at this time due to the ever-increasing emphasis upon our wonderful national banner. In this volume is found information on the correct use of our flag, its history, and everything pertaining to it. I will be happy to make the book available to anyone who asks me for it. Be sure to specify by calling it the Marine Corps History of the American Flag.

In these days when the Stars and Stripes are more than ever symbolic of the Nation's greatness, it behooves us all to make ourselves more familiar with our flag's true meaning. There is no country on earth which possesses a flag, the beauty and strength of which can be compared to ours. We as Americans should know why that beauty and strength are so pronounced. We should interest ourselves in and study books like this one which the Marine Corps has given to us. I hope you will write me for this patriotic volume. I will be pleased to supply you with it

While we are talking about the American flag, it would be well to mention another great symbol of American hope and inspiration. I refer to the American's Creed, with which every school boy and girl in America is familiar.

A few months ago I lost one of the dearest friends I ever knew. He was the author of the American's Creed—the late William Tyler Page. He himself was a great American.

William Tyler Page was born in Maryland of a long line of patriots and came to the House of Representatives as a page boy at 13. Later he became Clerk of the House under Speaker Joe Cannon. Shortly before his recent death Mr. Page observed the sixtieth consecutive year of his service as an attaché of the House. During those 60 years Mr. Page had known intimately more than 2,000 Members of Congress and had seen the vast majority of these come and go.

His greatest accomplishment was in the writing of the American's Creed, for which he won Nation-wide acclaim and had his work accepted as the official American Creed I think it is most timely for me to read his masterpiece this evening. Although well known to everybody, I am sure you will welcome my repeating the familiar lines which William Tyler Page, great American, distinguished patriot, gave to his country:

"THE AMERICAN CREED

"I believe in the United States of America as a government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a republic; a sovereign nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its Constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies." (William Tyler Page.)

Probably by the time I speak to you the House will have passed some sort of tax bill. I think it is high time something was done. The people have been kept in suspense long enough. They have had no clue on which to base their budgets for 1943. They have not known what arrangements to make about 1942 taxes.

To me, all this confusion seems entirely unnecessary The people should be forewarned what provisions to make so that they will be kept solvent and be able to maintain reasonable financial stability. There is no point in taxing them so heavily they cannot continue with their part in the war effort. This would be disastrous to all concerned.

There are some who deliberately advocate loading tremendous tax burdens upon the people of America. I have heard them say, make every American feel the brunt of this war by crushing the low-income groups with excessive taxes. I do not agree with these people. There is a limit to which any government can go in imposing taxes After the burdens become too great, when too large a percentage is taken out of a man's income, he will inevitably throw up the sponge and say, What's the use? He will cease to struggle to maintain his home, or his job. And since most Americans' jobs are war jobs, that won't be so good.

Therefore, I cannot join with those who advocate placing too great a tax burden on the shoulders of the American wage earner or farmer or businessman. We must maintain our present economic system of free enterprise. We will fail to maintain this if all our income goes into taxes. We must be on the watch so the saturation point is not reached.

The remainder of my program this evening will be devoted to the subject of old-age pensions about which the people of my district are becoming more and more interested.

It might be well to say, first, that this terrible war has almost buried the subject of pensions of every description in Washington. Practically the only thing talked about is the war. Certainly all other subjects revolve about the war and are dependent upon it for their importance.

Nevertheless, back home there is an increased need for old-age pensions, and it is this need I am talking about tonight. The majority of elderly people have sons or relatives in the armed forces, They are serving valiantly on every battlefield America is fighting on.

Last week I mentioned I had introduced a bill to increase allotments for dependent mothers and fathers without taxing the serviceman's income further. I did so, because I have heard from many, many parents who don't know how they will get along without their sons who have been called to the colors.

This bill, however, will act only as a partial correction to the pension problem. Ever since I have been in public life, I have never hesitated to lay my cards on the table. I have always been on record for a reasonable pay-as-you-go-pension plan. I regret the war has partially eliminated this great issue from public discussion. On the other hand, the war has made the pension issue more real than ever before. We are faced at home with the spectacle of old people going without food and shelter. It is true that some of the older folks are working who were unemployed before the war boom started. But what of those countless thousands physically incapable of doing a day's work? What of the good people in my district who have worked unceasingly all their lives, raised their families, and now having arrived at the evening of life, find themselves in many cases unable to obtain any income whatsoever? The war's revival in employment has done nothing for these folks. They must be provided with a permanent old-age pension system which will sustain them in their last years. They deserve comfort, not poverty; consideration, not to be kicked around. I pledged my support to this pension fight long before I went to Congress, yes, even before I was councilman from Binghamton's fifth ward and had the chance to see the welfare situation at first hand in Binghamton. I learned a lot about the suffering our old people went through in those days and I have never forgotten them. This convinced me of the necessity of definite action for a universal pension system.

While I am talking about the pension issue, I feel that I ought to tell you I had a letter the other day from a friend in the Townsend organization of the district who invited me to come to speak before a conclave of clubs at Ross Park on Townsend Day. He went on to say that I hadn't missed an opening day at the park in 5 years and this was no year to begin missing this event. I wrote and told him I am planning to break away from the pressure of business in the Capital and will be on hand to speak to my dear friends on Sunday, June 6. This will be the first appearance I have made at home since the awarding of the Army-Navy E to the Stow Manufacturing Co. in February. It will certainly be marvelous to get back if only for Sunday, June 6, and have the opportunity to visit with the public at Ross Park. I look forward to seeing you.

In closing, want to pay a word of tribute to all the older folks of our section for the wonderful spirit they are maintaining, the fine patriotism they display on every hand and the courage, fortitude, and strength they are using for the winning of the war and the blessings of a just peace after victory is ours.

Japanese in Relocation Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 10 (legislative day of Monday, May 3), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Japanese-Americans," from the Washington Post of May 10, 1943, relating to the relocation camps where now may be found the Japanese who are in the United States.

The subject of the Japanese in relocation camps was gone into very carefully by the able junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], who is chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate. A few days ago, at the request of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from Kentucky appeared before the committee and presented a report of his findings, which, incidentally,

covers information gathered over a period of about 6 or 8 weeks. I wish to say that the report is one of the most interesting and one of the most perfect I have had the pleasure of listening to for many months. I should like to say also that there was a full meeting of the committee, and all the Senators present evidenced great interest in what the Senator from Kentucky had to say.

At the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator he made certain recommendations relative to these relocation camps, and his recommendations were concurred in by high officials of the Army who happened to be present, and several of whom accompanied the Senator on his trip, or met him at various points. I may add further that it is my recollection, and it was then my observation, that every member of the Committee on Military Affairs present at the time the report was made agreed with the recommendations of the Senator from Kentucky. Yesterday I read a number of editorial pages of American newspapers, and a large number of those I read concurred in the views expressed by the Senator from Kentucky.

I wish to take advantage of this occasion publicly to thank the Senator from Kentucky for the very fine work he has done in the Committee on Military Affairs, of which he is a most active member.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPANESE-AMERICANS

The Senate Military Affairs Committee has taken an important step toward recognizing the fundamental rights of American citizens of Japanese ancestry. Some 70,000 of these people, called Nisei, have been held since the early days of the war in relocation centers along with Japanese aliens. Loyal and disloyal individuals, citizens and noncitizens have been herded together, deprived of their liberty, forbidden to work or fight for the American cause

Now the Senate group has decided to recommend to President Roosevelt that the Selective Service law be applied to Japanese-Americans just as it is applied to all other citizens of the United States; that Japanese found to be disloyal be placed in internment camps; that loyal, able-bodied Japanese not of military age be allowed to go out to work "under proper supervision and at the earliest possible time" to areas where they will be "accepted" and where Army and Navy authorities consider it "safe" for them to go.

The Army already has a considerable number of Japanese-Americans in its ranks. They are counted as good and loyal soldiers, as eager to strike at the military dictators in the land of their forebears as are other Americans of German or Italian origin. They will play an important part in battles to come. Others like them, whose skills and energies are now being wholly wasted, should be given the same opportunity or should be allowed to contribute to the Nation's war effort on farms or in factories. We have need of all the loyal manpower at our disposal. It is folly to keep these men and women locked away in idleness.

It is worse than folly to confine them indiscriminately because of their race or color. The sifting of the loyal from the disloyal is not a task beyond our powers, and it is a matter of elementary justice. To regard any American citizens as guilty of treason, without any evidence against them and simply because of their racial background, is to accept the basic falsehood of blood and race preached by our archenemy. It does violence to the Constitution and to the most precious of American traditions. Already, through our heedless treatment of these people, we have permitted an ugly strain to seep into the pages of American history. The recommendations of the Senate Military Affairs Committee offer a safe and sensible way to expunge it.

The Mountain Labored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of Friday, May 7, 1943:

THE MOUNTAIN LABORED

A great deal more heat was worked up in the Senate over the revised Connally anti-strike bill than seems to us justified by its contents.

Senator CONNALLY first introduced his measure last session, when strikes were flaring up here and there, but both it, and the Smith bill in the House, were shelved when President Roosevelt undertook to handle the situation himself. All that the revised bill adopted Wednesday purports to do is to give the President power to seize strike-bound plants and mines vital to the war effort and to prohibit strikes against the Government.

Senator TAFT, among the best legal minds in Congress, says the President already has the power of seizure under the Second War Powers Act. Why, then, were 3 days wasted in bitter debate to give Mr. Roosevelt what he already possesses?

As for striking in a plant or mine that has been taken over by the Army or Navy or even by the Secretary of the Interior, with authority to call in troops if necessary, we have an idea that workers will not be deterred by fines.

The Senate's passage of the bill is important only as an expression of the temper into which John L. Lewis has put Congress and a foretaste of more extreme proposals if conditions warrant them.

The Taft-Danaher amendment giving the War Labor Board statutory status and the power of subpena falls in another category. That adds something new to the machinery for industrial peace. War Labor Board couldn't get Czar Lewis before it because it lacked the authority to compel him to appear. A few months ago Mayor LaGuardia similarly refused to appear before the Board, when it alleged jurisdiction in a controversy between the City of New York and a group of municipal employees.

With or without subpena power, however, War Labor Board will continue to take its instructions from President Roosevelt or Economic Stabilizer Byrnes, acting for him.

Wages, strikes, and all other phases of our war economy are still the concern of the President and Commander-in-Chief.

The hotly argued legislation strikes us as much ado about very little.

Price of Crude Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by me to Hon. Prentiss Brown, Price Administrator:

MAY 8, 1943.

Hon. PRENTISS BROWN,
Price Administrator, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: The people of my State are greatly concerned over the refusal on the part of the Office of Price Administration to grant an increased price as an incentive to secure additional crude to meet the demands in this all-out effort of America to win the war.

My State represents 11,000,000 people and now produces approximately 30 percent of all war materials and I might say that Pennsylvania has nearly one million men in the armed forces of the United States. So we do have a stake in this war effort and our contributions and opinions must be recognized.

The arbitrary ruling of the Office of Price Administration on a price increase on oil is not satisfactory to us. The attitude of Mr. Sumner Pike has been prejudiced against a price increase before he even read the recommendation of the Petroleum Administrator for War, while it is quite evident that the Petroleum Administrator for War is approaching the matter from the standpoint of reality. They, Secretary Ickes' department, are interested in obtaining the necessary oil to run the war machines, and it appears that Mr. Pike feels that no increase in the price of crude oil should be posted at this time no matter how pressing the need until the farm price and the bituminous coal situation is out of the way.

It becomes increasingly evident that the next great bottleneck in America will be oil and those who are charged with the grave responsibility of thwarting this effort to increase our production face a very serious charge.

Let us assume that the Petroleum Administrator for War is primarily interested in producing the materials essential to winning the war. Let us assume on the other hand that the Office of Price Administration is concerned in restricting prices so as to prevent injurious inflation. We recognize that both have their places in the picture. However, I think that it will be agreed that there has been no inflation in the price of crude oil heretofore, and the small amount of increase in the price of the refined products that would be required to take care of an average of 50 cents a barrel on oil certainly would not produce dangerous inflation.

The first consideration in the entire picture is the winning of the war. This is of primary importance because without oil we cannot operate the mechanized equipment to fight the war.

After talking with Mr. Pike and after listening to his testimony I cannot help but feel that this situation is a repetition of the continuous position of the Office of Price Administration taken over the past several months.

Mr. Pike speaks about the importance of this matter, that it requires careful consideration and that nothing hasty should be done.

The question of an increased price on oil has been before the Office of Price Administration since the fall of 1941 and now is going on to 2 years. Meeting after meeting has been held with representatives of the Office of Price Administration. Facts, figures, and briefs have been filed by the various oil associations in their efforts to be of assistance and substantiate their contentions that a price increase was necessary as an incentive to increase production. The Government itself through Secretary Ickes of the Petroleum Administration for War made definite recommendations.

The whole situation has been threshed out time and time again by the staff of the Office of Price Administration. Their dilatory tactics have been exposed. Dr. J. K. Galbraith, who was Deputy Administrator previous to Mr. Sumner Pike taking charge, has delayed this matter month after month. At no time has the Office of Price Administration offered any facts, figures, or information as to why a price increase should not be granted except to say it would be inadvisable at this time.

It is quite evident from the course of events that the position taken by Dr. Galbraith was to afford all those who presented testimony a courteous hearing and then endeavored to find facts and information that would support the Office of Price Administration's position and then kick the petitioners out.

All during these hearings held over many months the applicants were given to understand that the matter was being given careful consideration. To me Dr. Galbraith represents the personification of hypocrisy, because I doubt very much if he gave any consideration to anything other than to his own social reform ideas which he constantly insists on jamming down the throats of industry even when we are fighting a war and good American boys are losing their lives every day.

The Office of Price Administration's position as evidenced by Mr. Pike and Dr. Galbraith is one of "fiddling while Rome burns."

I want to state to you, as the Price Administrator, that I am very much concerned about this very critical situation. It will be a terrible catastrophe and responsibility that I would not care to be charged with if in 6 months from now by reason of the short-sighted policy of the Office of Price Administration, the dilatory let 'em go to hell indifferent attitude of dreaming visionary Dr. J. K. Galbraith, the prejudiced attitude of Mr. Sumner Pike—we find ourselves without sufficient oil to fully man the machines of war.

There will be no satisfaction on my part in saying I told you so. This will not help the situation and it looks, with our rapidly depleting reserves, our decrease in production, our increased war demands, increased material and labor costs, and our scarcity of manpower, that when the Office of Price Administration gets around to granting this price increase it may not be of much material assistance in getting the increased crude supply that we need so badly to fight this war

Everyone in the Congress agrees that an increase should be granted. Secretary Ickes' Petroleum Administration for War is of the opinion that an immediate increase on the price of crude should be granted in order to secure a supply sufficient for all the purposes of war.

I cannot see why you, as Price Administrator, do not recognize the seriousness of this situation and increase the price without further hesitancy. The Members of Congress are particularly anxious to cooperate with you to the fullest extent of their ability to do so and immediate action on your part would indicate to us that you have the courage of your convictions and that it is your intention of running the Office of Price Administration as it should be run and not operated by a group of wonderland impractical theorists who, instead of determining the issue presented to them, are constantly trying to inject their social reform ideas. For the sake of America let's get down to common sense and business.

I am of the opinion that Dr. J. K. Galbraith and Mr. Sumner Pike haven't the experience or ability to qualify them to intelligently pass upon this important matter.

Sufficient evidence has been submitted to you by Petroleum Administrator Ickes to indicate that this price increase should be granted, and I sincerely hope that you will give this matter your immediate consideration and grant this price increase without further delay.

I await your further reply.

Sincerely yours,

L. H. GAVIN.

Dumbel Jones and a Brindle Cow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a short article that I am sure will prove to be interesting reading not only to the Members of Congress but to the public—those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

DUMBEL JONES AND A BRINDLE COW

Dumbel Jones was an Illinois farmer. On Friday, March 12, he was requested by Earl C. Smith, president of the Illinois Farm Bureau, to come to Springfield to attend a conference. This flattered Jones' vanity and ego to be permitted to sit in the same room with that great leader Smith. Dumbel was told that a Democratic Congressman by the name of PACE, from Georgia, had introduced a bill to make it mandatory for the Price Administrator to include the labor costs in setting the ceiling on farm prices.

Smith told Dumbel and 1,799 other farmers that since you never had been paid for your labor, I dont believe you ever should be paid, and I am ordering you to write to Congressman LEO ALLEN and EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, who are my spokesmen in Congress, and tell them I have decided that you don't want any pay for producing food, without which we can't win the war.

One farmer asked, that if we labor in the fields and get our wives and children to aid us without any pay, won't we be in the same category that the Negroes were in Georgia before the Civil War. He was told to quit thinking and leave all the thinking to be done by Earl C. Smith, who knows how to think.

Dumbel went home and did as he was ordered, and then picked up a pail that he had bought that included in the price all the elements of cost, including labor, plus a profit to everyone who had anything to do with the pail before Dumbel bought it. He sat down under Brindle and started to pull her teats, telling her how he had been honored by Earl C. Smith and what they intended to do, about eliminating all labor costs from farm prices.

Brindle was standing in a barn that Dumbel had paid all costs, including labor, to get built. It was insured in the Farm Bureau Fire Insurance Co. at a rate that included all costs, plus a salary for its president, Earl C. Smith. Jones poured the milk in a can that had all costs included in its sales price, and placed the can in a truck that the producer had added all costs, including labor, plus a profit. The truck was insured in the Farm Bureau Auto Insurance Co., whose rate included all costs, plus a salary for Earl C. Smith, its president. It was filled with Farm Bureau gas and oil that Mr. Smith said had paid his company $25,000,000 profit in the past decade, and Mr. Smith got a salary as president of the Illinois Farm Supply Co.

Dumbel took the butterfat to the Producers Creamery Co. who, after adding all costs and a salary to Earl C. Smith, its president, sold the butter back to Dumbel for a profit.

Brindle, the old cow, had been doing a little thinking on her own hook, and decided she had not been getting any pay either except her feed, while Dumbel had been paying Earl C. Smith $15 a year for the privilege of belonging to Mr Smith's Farm Bureau, so it made Brindle sick, and she gave Dumbel as large a pile of fertilizer as Mr. Smith had.

When Dumbel saw Brindle was sick, fearing she might die, he shipped her to the Producers Commission Co. at Peoria, who, after having subtracted all cost, sent Dumbel back the balance, less Mr. Earl C. Smith's salary as president. Brindle wound up in a butcher shop where Dumbel went to get a rump steak. On his way home with a piece of Brindle's rump, he stopped at the bank where Mr. Earl C. Smith was president and paid off the mortgage the bank had on Brindle. In computing the interest, the bank included all cost, plus a salary to Earl C. Smith, its president.

On his way home Dumbel Jones decided while he had killed his pigs and was fined for sowing wheat by the advice of Earl C. Smith, he had been honest but perhaps he was a little dumb, to pay Mr. Smith for that kind of leadership and then vote for DIRKSEN to make laws to divide the wealth that he, Jones himself, had produced and he had not been permitted to have a word to say about the price he should get for it.

Moral—The United Farmers of Illinois believe that the farmers are entitled to cost of production for their products, plus a reasonable return for their labor for feeding Earl C. Smith and others, who toil not, neither do they spin, but see how they grow.

UNITED FARMERS OF ILLINOIS,
CHARLES SHEPPELMAN,
President, Colfax, Ill.
ARTHUR C. HELLEMAN,
Vice President, Tremont, Ill.
ARTHUR H. BOOTH,
Secretary-Treasurer, Mason City, Ill.

Procedure for Recovering Damages Inflicted Upon Land Structures by Watercraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEX GREEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I call the attention of the House to House Memorial No. 6, passed by trhe Florida Legislature, 1943 session, and approved by Hon. Spessard L. Holland, Governor of Florida, on April 27, 1943. The memorial is "Relating to procedure for recovering damages inflicted upon land structures by watercraft."

This memorial is of the utmost importance and petitions your honorable body for cooperation and relief in the premises. I commend it to your consideration and its purposes to your cooperation. The memorial follows:

House Memorial 6

House memorial relating to procedure for recovering damages inflicted upon land structures by watercraft

Whereas the present remedies afforded in law courts for recovery of damages from owners of tugs, barges, vessels, and other watercraft inflicting damage or injury to bridges, trestles, and other land structures within or abutting upon navigable waters are inadequate, inconvenient, and expensive, and in many instances owners of such watercraft who are nonresidents of the State in which such damage or injury is inflicted can only be served with process and sued in the State where they reside at considerable expense and inconvenience to the residents of other States whose property is damaged, and even when judgment is recovered at law there is no assurance that satisfaction thereof can be realized; and

Whereas there is at present no appropriate Federal regulation or provision of Federal law requiring immediate reports by masters of such watercraft to the United States engineers or other responsible Federal officer or officers of damage inflicted by such watercraft upon such land structures with further requirement that such reports be promptly brought to the attention of the owners of such land structures so damaged, which results in many owners of watercraft escaping detection and suit for damages for such injuries inflicted by their craft; and

Whereas the American Bar Association, at its fifty-eighth annual meeting in July 1935, recommended to the Congress of the United States the enactment of remedial legislation to extend admiralty and maritime jurisdiction to cases where watercraft inflict damage upon land structures, which recommendation appears in the Reports of American Bar Association, volume 60, pages 241 to 244, inclusive; but such recommendation has never been put into effect by act of Congress; and

Whereas appropriate Federal legislation to remedy the conditions above described should now be enacted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Florida and the Senate of the State of Florida do respectfully memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation to provide: (1) That the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States shall extend to and include all cases of damage or injury to property caused by a vessel or other watercraft on navigable waters, notwithstanding that such damage or injury be done or consummated on land structures; (2) That masters of watercraft be required to make immediate and comprehensive reports of any such injury or damage inflicted by their watercraft upon any private or public land structure to the United States Engineers' Office having jurisdiction of the navigable waters on or near which such land structure is situated, and that the United States Engineers be directed to make such reports immediately available to owners of such land structures; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state provide copies of this resolution, suitably prepared as a memorial, and respectfully present such copies to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Florida.

Approved by the Governor April 27, 1943.

The Necessity for Youth Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the Very Reverend Edward R. Moore, which appeared in the New York Times of May 2, 1943. Father Moore is pastor of St. Peter's Church, New York, a charter member of the advisory committee of the National Youth Administration, a member of the National Institute of Social Sciences, and holder of various awards for distinguished service in the field of youth work in this country.

Because of Father Moore's knowledge and experience he is well qualified to comment on the subject of youth training:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Should the National Youth Administration be abolished? The question was formally posed to the American people—or, more immediately, to their elected representatives in Congress—by Senator MCKELLAR upward of a year ago when he presented a bill calling for the elimination of the Administration. The bill never came out of committee, but the controversy which it started still goes on.

The National Youth Administration was established by Executive order of the President on June 26, 1935, to help unemployed young people. I think it is safe to say of the National Youth Administration that, from 1935 to 1940, it was at least one of the most popular of all the emergency-created governmental agencies. Then suddenly, during the last Congress, hue and cry: away with it.

ORGANIZATION ADJUSTED

The application of an all too simple formula had brought the National Youth Administration into the purview of the Byrd committee. This committee had been set up to do a highly praiseworthy job—to search out and recommend to Congress all possible economies in nonwar governmental expenditures. Said the committee, in effect: "The National Youth Administration was created to relieve unemployment among youth. But there is no longer any unemployment among youth. Therefore there is no longer any need for the National Youth Administration."

What apparently did not occur to the committee, however, was the fact that not only had the national picture changed completely but so had the National Youth Administration. With a flexibility and an adaptability so rare in governmental agencies as to give Senator BYRD and his associates some excuse for their failure to realize what had happened, the National Youth Administration had adjusted itself to changing conditions, and by the time the McKellar bill for its abolition as a relief agency had been introduced it was no longer a relief agency at all, but a war-training agency.

Back in the spring of 1940—long before Pearl Harbor—the National Youth Administration, with truly singular vision and foresight, had begun to change over its projects from those of a type best suited to meet the relief needs of youth in their own communities to those which would serve the Nation as a whole in its defense program. So successful was it in this endeavor that at the hearings on the McKellar bill before the Senate Education and Labor Committee, Mr. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator, was able to testify that the National Youth Administration was the greatest single producer of trained war workers. Sidney Hillman, Labor Director of the War Production Board, told the committee that the National Youth Administration had furnished "an appreciable part of our trained manpower," and that it was a "going concern" that should not be abandoned. And, finally, the President himself addressed a letter to the committee, which he concluded by saying: "In view of the above * * * you are advised that S. 2295 (the McKellar bill) does not meet with my approval."

SHOP TRAINING PROVIDED

As of January 27 the National Youth Administration had 1,567 units, of which 1,498 provided training in shop activities. These units are strategically placed in 658 different locations through the country and comprise in all 38,070 work stations. Again, as of January 27, 55,277 youths were receiving training in the shop units. A month later that number had increased to approximately 60,000 and is now climbing at the rate of about 1,000 a week as more and more youth come to realize the value of the opportunity offered. The saturation point, so far as present available funds are concerned, will be reached in a few more weeks if the current rate of increase continues.

In the 5 months from July 1 through November 30, 1942, a total of 98,103 youths left National Youth Administration to take private or public employment. Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, is quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 26 as saying, reading from a letter of a former colleague, "It seems to me only fair that those who would abolish it (the National Youth Administration) must prove that they can provide the additional 1,700 workers trained in the unit skills needed for war production who are now being furnished daily by the National Youth Administration and at less cost to the Government. There is no evidence that they can do it."

VISITS PROVE RECORD

I heartily endorse that sentiment. Moreover, I feel personally qualified to do so, because in this letter I am not merely quoting from the record. I have gone around from shop to shop and from resident center to resident center and watched the process. And here is what impressed me: At these miniature industrial West Points the youngsters are being taught under realistic working conditions. They are actually making something as they learn, a tremendous psychological help. They are being given a certain amount of related training, the principle behind a machine as they learn to operate it. And they are being paid a small wage, an average of 15 cents an hour, while they learn, another important psychological lift and, indeed, in many cases, small as the amount is, the thing that makes it possible for them to enroll as National Youth Administration trainees.

These four factors, plus still another, the realization that is brought home to them in these shops that they are learning something that will make them useful not only to themselves but to their war-ridden country, contribute to the seriousness of demeanor that characterizes National Youth Administration trainees everywhere. I should like to lay special emphasis upon this point and I repeat that I am doing so from personal observation.

There is no laissez-faire schoolroomish atmosphere about the National Youth Administration work centers—it is serious business these young people are about. They have a job to do for themselves and for their

country, and they must do it. I have more than once been rebuffed by these earnest young learners of welding, machine shop work, aircraft mechanics, and the like as I walked through their shops—they were too busy to answer questions as to what they were doing—they were doing it.

COST NOT HIGH

What of the cost of this National Youth Administration training? Is it not excessive? At the present time National Youth Administration training costs $65.86 a month for each trainee, of which $52.63 is for trainee wages, subsistence and cost of direct training, and $13.23 is for supervision and administrative overhead.

This marks the National Youth Administration program as one of the least expensive forms of preemployment training. The average wage of trainees is 15 cents an hour. In comparison with this rate, the average wage paid to industrial in-plant trainees is about 60 cents an hour; the average wage paid to trainees employed by industry and assigned to training courses under the sponsorship of the United States Office of Education is 55 cents an hour, and ranges from 28 cents an hour to $1 an hour.

On an average, that is to say, National Youth Administration trainees are paid at least 75 percent an hour less than persons employed by industry and assigned to Office of Education training programs. Many of the trainees who are close to the completion of their National Youth Administration training have acquired a large measure of skill; but even so, their National Youth Administration wage averages 74 percent less an hour than unskilled workers are paid in the war industries and 69 percent less than unskilled workers, on an average, in nonwar industries.

As to the effectiveness of the National Youth Administration training, let me quote from the formal written testimony of large firms engaged in war production that have used National Youth Administration-trained young people:

The Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, reporting that it expects an acute labor shortage in the immediate future, goes on to say: "We have hired and are continuing to hire a large number of young women who have been trained by the National Youth Administration and feel that this is one of our best sources of supply."

WORK APPRECIATED

The Kaiser Shipbuilding Corporation wrote: "This is to advise you that the Richmond shipyards will employ all the sheet metal, coppersmith, machinist, and welder trainees you can train. These shipyards appreciate the work your organiaztion has been doing in the past and thank you for your continued cooperation."

The Aluminum Co. of America writes: "Your organization has done a wonderful job * * * in securing qualified workers to meet our needs."

I have quoted these letters as typical of many others. At this writing I have before me a list of 92 outstanding war-production firms that have expressed approval of National Youth Administration training. I wish that it were possible to include this whole list here. It contains such names as General Vultee Aircraft, Remington Arms, Westinghouse Electrical Center, Ford Instrument Co., Worthington Pump & Machinery Co., Ford Motor Co., General Electric, Western Electric, Sun Shipbuilding & Drydock Co.

In addition, many letters of appreciation concerning the quality of National Youth Administration trainees have been received from the military services.

These who have read the program will, I think and hope, have received a different view of the National Youth Administration than may have been acquired from some of the singularly uninspired debates on the subject in the Senate, and from the equally uninspired and almost equally reprehensible comment in some other quarters. At least the issue will have been clarified and the National Youth Administration will no longer be regarded by thoughtful people in terms of a relief agency.

The Very Reverend EDWARD R. MOORE.
NEW YORK, *April 29, 1943.*

Merchant Marine of the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Army and Navy Journal of May 8, 1943:

One of the fundamentals of an alert national defense in the air world upon which we have entered is the capacity for instant air-borne mobilization of key forces to be directed at any spot on the globe where trouble may threaten. It is the American practice to depend heavily upon privately owned and operated civilian facilities, built during peacetime, in order to assure our armed forces the necessary mobility and materials when war breaks out. This we have done in the case of our civilian air lines, and the role they have played so ably in the current war shows the essential soundness of the policy. But in wars to come, or the threats of wars, we must have a greatly enlarged air-line and air-trucking system if it is to serve effectively as a powerful merchant marine of the air, ready for instantaneous mobilization and military cooperation. To develop such a system, there must be exclusive Federal regulation of air commerce. A bill for this purpose is pending in Congress. Its passage is being obstructed by State agencies, particularly those representing State railroad and public utility commissions, which are arguing that the legislation would create a dangerous precedent for other transportation regulation. Obviously, unless all our air commerce is under a single set of regulations, the air-transport system can be neither built up nor be capable of instant mobilization for the performance of its special task. There must be uniform operating standards, uniform sets of specifications for aircraft manufacture, uniform qualifications for men and machines, so that there can be prompt concentration and operation as a unit, application of the lesson of interchangeable parts, and, especially, complete Nation-wide mobility. To fulfill these and other important needs, State regulation is not only inappropriate but would be actually harmful to our defense. If there is one thing this war should have taught us it is that America cannot gain its rightful place in the air by tying aviation down with the controls and the methods we apply to rails and trucks. The President truly said that civil aviation is a "special problem requiring special treatment." His admonition should be heeded by Congress and the bill establishing Federal regulation of air commerce enacted without delay.

Address of Justice Wiley Rutledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of Mr. Justice Wiley Rutledge before the Federal Bar Association at the Mayflower Hotel April 29, 1943:

It is fitting that the Federal Bar Association do honor to its members in the armed services. I join in your salute. They stand in unique place. For in them are united presently the Nation's two most necessary functions.

The man of law is an artisan of peace. His work is imperative negative to war. It is the antithesis of force. The lawyer knows not the ways of arms. His are the tools of reason and the implements of judgment. His weapons are ideas, not guns or swords. Nor has he chosen them inadvisedly. It is the foundation premise of our profession that men shall live together, not by power of brute strength, but through the rule of adjudication. It was not a lawyer who said, but his saying was true: "Venerable justice herself began by wild justice; all law is as a tamed furrow field, slowly worked out, and rendered arable, from the waste jungle of club law."

Today the world is choosing between venerable justice and wild justice. The issue is whether the earth shall become again a "waste jungle of club law."

The decision is not, in the first place, for the lawyer to make. Once perhaps he could have made it. He allowed his chance to go by, some not knowing it was there. The soldier, not the lawyer, now has the outcome in his hands. We throw behind him all our energy and resources. We surrender, so far as is required, the lawyer's accustomed authority. In subordinate place we serve, in our peculiar capacity, to mobilize the Nation's power for the soldier's use. We also give over from our ranks to his our choicest men, that they may leave off being lawyers and become warriors for the time required.

They, and we, do this, not because we believe in force. Nor because they may find high adventure in war. The old glory in war for war's sake has gone. That idea is now the insane delusion of our enemies. And our comrades' way is the other way. They do not fight for glory or renown. Theirs is a more permanent aim, a less ephemeral satisfaction sought. Their object now in battle was their object in peace. It is to establish law as the framework of life, wherever men will have it, and beyond the reach of harm from men who will not have it. They want no jungle again. They fight to subdue club law. Their purpose is to establish venerable justice throughout the earth. If that be not done, if wild justice be not caged and tamed, their fight is false and their sacrifice will be in vain.

The men we honor cannot now see the building of a structure of peace. But they will want no mere armistice. They do not fight that their sons may fight again in 20 years. They fight in order that their children and their children's children may not be called to repeat their sacrifice. They want no repetition of Versailles. Nor do we. If that is all that shall come from this war, one may doubt it is worth the fighting.

There will be work, therefore, for the lawyer to do. There is work now for the lawyer to do. We cannot begin too soon to avoid the mistakes we made before. And we must not lose the larger aim in division over smaller method, the necessary end in conflict over means.

What comes after this war will not be the soldier's task, if it is worth winning. It will be essentially the lawyer's task. I do not mean it will be for him alone. God forbid. But his are the ways of organizing peace under law and of protecting it from assault by force. These things are of his special competence. His share in them must be large. If he will but have the vision and the wisdom, he can accomplish the further task the soldier cannot perform. And thereby he can become blessed to his own generation and posterity.

I give you therefore the lawyer in uniform, your comrade in the service. He lays aside his law book to save it for another day. He draws the sword, to sheathe it for ages to come. He offers his blood, that the work of his heart may live. He gives his life, that his sons may have liberty under law, and that law may vanquish force throughout the world. He wears the uniform of his country, and buckles her sword at his side. The uniform covers the soldier. But it clothes also the lawyer, fighting that law may live. He is therefore in himself a trinity—citizen, soldier, lawyer, three in one, one in three. Of these we need not, after the manner of Saint Paul, determine the greatest. For all are great, and without one the others would be nothing.

It was old Thomas Carlyle, crabbed of lawyers as of others, who said:

"It is because there is yet in venerable-wigged justice some wisdom, amid such mountains of wiggeries and folly, that men have not cast her into the river * * * and then in the innermost corner, visible at last, in size as a hazlenut, a real fraction of God's justice, perhaps not yet attainable to some, surely still indispensable to all, * * * Lawyers were not all pedants, voluminous, voracious persons; lawyers too were poets, were heroes, or their law had been past the Nore long before this time.

Il Duce Uneasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 7, 1943:

IL DUCE UNEASY—D'ALESANDRO

WASHINGTON, May 7.—Mussolini's shuffling of important officials is a reflection of the uneasiness of Il Duce over the threatened invasion and the probable desertion of the Italian people, Representative THOMAS D'ALESANDRO (Democrat, Third Maryland) declared last night in an Office of War Information broadcast to Italy.

Speaking in Italian, Representative D'ALESANDRO said:

"Mussolini's appointment of 15 relatively newcomers to important posts is another sign of the Duce's uneasiness over Fascist Party morale and his desire to surround himself with squadristas of the type of Scorza.

TERRORIZED ITALIAN PEOPLE

"It is public knowledge in Italy that Carol Scorza, recently named secretary general of the Fascist Party, was involved in the murders of Giacomo Matteotti and Giovanni Amendole, early opponents of Mussolini's regime. The squadristas also were Fascist direct-action groups who terrorized the Italian people in the early days of the party's power.

BEAMED TO ITALY

"The new appointments indicate Mussolini is again resorting to this method of keeping himself in power.

"The significant thing about the new appointees is that only 3 of the 21 former secretaries retained their posts, and only 3 others have heretofore been prominent in Fascist circles. Fifteen are newcomers. The Duce no doubt counts on their ruthless loyalty in critical days to come when the Italian people—already uneasy over Hitler's policy of making Italy a battleground and no man's land—may take more active steps to prevent Mussolini from sacrificing Italy at the German command."

The speech was beamed by short wave to the Italian peninsula.

Common Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Air Line Pilot of March 1943:

COMMON SENSE

While it is true that the matter of States' rights versus Federal jurisdiction has always been a ticklish subject, it is a reasonable and common-sense deduction that there should be no conflict on this question relative to these rights respecting air line transportation and air commerce generally.

Simultaneously with the arising of any question in Congress that deals even remotely with the subject of States' rights versus Federal jurisdiction, there is always the hue and cry from States' rights advocates that Congress is engaged in some sort of scheming attempt to take over or submerge the rights of the States and encroach upon their Constitution given sovereignty and autonomy.

It is quite true that States' rights must, insofar as is consistent with good government, be protected, but when States' rights and Federal jurisdiction are in conflict, common-sense principles must govern in the decisions made or the best interests of all the people of the whole Nation cannot be served. In other words, first, what is the nature of the problem which has injected a conflict as to whether the States shall govern or whether the Federal Government shall have the balance of power to govern and regulate? In this instance, we are talking about the fastest and most potential mode of travel in the world—air transportation—and air commerce generally. Whether the laws governing and regulating it should lean toward interstate or intrastate control—that is the question.

When air transportation was first introduced on a regularly scheduled air-carrier basis during the twenties, 100 miles per hour was about the average speed, and now it is pushing 250 miles per hour with the ever-moving finger of tomorrow pointing strongly at 300 and 400 miles per hour. Air commerce has emerged from piddling operations that occasionally crossed a State line to operations that now flash across many State lines on a single trip, and global intercontinental flying is fast becoming routine.

In other words, the problem we are dealing with is not intrastate, it is primarily interstate and intercontinental. Therein lies the common horse-sense reasoning why, in the best interests of all of the people of all the States, certain statutory and regulatory prerogatives must be vested in the Federal Government. This doesn't mean that the Federal Government regulatory agency for commercial flying and air transportation should be allowed to become bureaucratic, arbitrary, and be prone to indulge in perfunctory hearings and then glibly tell parties in interest when it decides a question in accordance with its own versions and, possibly, interests—"Sorry, but that is the way it is going to be. Period." The development of such Federal air dictatorship should be carefully guarded against by the Congress of the United States, the Members of which come from all of the States of the United States. This in itself is a potent safeguard against the development of Federal bureaucracies. In short, if the quasi-judicial prerogative that Congress vests in the Federal regulatory agency for air are abused, such prerogatives and abuses can be checked quickly and effectively by Congress.

Let us further weigh and analyze in a rather homespun way the question of States rights versus Federal jurisdiction in the regulating of commercial aviation: First, would it be better to vest the balance of power of regulation and control of commercial flying and air transportation with the States or with the Federal Government? The answer is obviously on the side of the Federal Government. Second, would it be worse to place the jurisdiction with the States or with the Federal Government? Obviously, the lesser of the two evils would be to place it with the Federal Government.

Brushing aside all of the pros and cons of this question for a moment and facing it squarely, neither the proponents nor the opponents could conscientiously and wholeheartedly deny that nothing could be more deadly and more crippling to the best interests of the Nation's aviation than to have a separate set of laws and regulations to govern air commerce and air transportation in each of the 48 States, all of which would, very likely, be different. Stop and think—48 separate sets of laws and regulations governing what will soon be 300 to 400 miles per hour travel. The business is already strapped and laced, and, to use a rather common term, "hog tied" by regulations, mandates, limitations, and stipulations, and if to all this are added 48 separate sets of intrastate laws and regulations, the air-line pilots frankly despair of the future of the greatest of all modes of fast travel.

In Congressman CLARENCE F. LEA'S bill, H. R. 1012, there appears section 802, which reads:

"SEC. 802 (a) The regulation of air commerce is declared to be a matter of special national interest. No State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or subdivision thereof, shall regulate air commerce nor shall it impose or enforce any regulation in a manner which hinders, burdens, or interferes with the free flow of such commerce or substantially impairs uniformity in the conditions pursuant to which such commerce is conducted throughout the United States."

The air line pilots are not prone to quibble about the wordage of laws, but they are thoroughly convinced that the longer this interstate versus federal civil air commerce regulatory jurisdiction question remains open, the more difficult its solving will become.

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, headed by veteran transportation legislator, CLARENCE F. LEA, of California, and its aviation subcommittee, of which veteran lawmaker, A. L. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina, is chairman, and in fact, all the members of these committees, deserve much credit for attacking a most difficult and knotty problem that has long been before the nation defying a solution.

All persons and groups who have the best interests of air commerce and air transportation at heart should communicate to Representatives LEA and BULWINKLE, and in fact, to all the members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in Washington, their feelings in an endorsement of section 802 (a) in H. R. 1012 as being the proper legislative trend for air commerce and the Nation's aviation generally. It can always be assumed that the States' rights advocates are very much on the job, many of whom are perfectly sincere, but there are also the politically-tinged States' rights magpies, and it is the latter which shriek the loudest. Let's not lose this fight by reason of nonappearance, nonparticipation, disinterest, and inaction—and to be brutally brief—too little, too late.

This is a critical situation on which all must take a broad-gage common-sense view and realize that if a wrong trend is pursued it will lead to chaos. Persons who stop to think, not only of the detrimental effect, but also the scope of such effect to our Nation's aviation both nationally and internationally resulting from 48 separate State statutory and regulatory set-ups, all in conflict, should say with one voice—unmistakably clear, "Let's not let it happen here."

DAVID L. BEHNCKE.

The Late Commander Howard Walter Gilmore

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, there was not a dry eye in the Nation that read the Navy release in the papers last week end telling the story of the last command given by Commander Howard Gilmore as he went out in a blaze of glory. Every spine straightened, every head of an American patriot was held more erect, every heart thrilled, and every soul raised its spiritual hand in salute of another Navy immortal.

Commander Howard Gilmore was not only the first American submarine commander to win in naval combat the Congressional Medal of Honor in this War, but he was the first in the history of our Nation. There have doubtless been others who deserved it, but his submarine and her crew, thanks to him, came back to tell the tale of his heroism. So his name is the first on this roll of honor. When the true saga of our submarine fleet shall have been told, it will constitute a proud addition to the glorious tradition of the American Navy. But no other name can surpass in luster of pure heroism the name of this intrepid and skillful commander who, in selfless devotion to duty, saved his ship and crew by his order: "Take her down!"

It was a tribute to him that his command was instantly obeyed, though it meant the leaving of their beloved skipper to a lonely death.

"Take her down!" takes its rightful place with the cry of the stricken Lawrence: "Don't give up the ship!", and with the reply of Capt. John Paul Jones: "Surrender? I have not yet begun to fight!"

As we meditate upon this immortal incident, all of us must remember the divine wisdom: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

Alabama proudly shares the reflected glory which is hers as the State of his nativity and first home, with her sister States, Mississippi, Texas, and Louisiana, that successively became his home later. But he grew too great to be claimed exclusively by any State or section. He loved and served the United States and "gave the last full measure of devotion" that all men might be free.

How natural it is, then, that his praise should be sung in every State.

The following telegram comes from a distinguished citizen of Ohio, a Navy man whose father, another native of Selma, Ala., was the hero of the great Samoan hurricane and who was the officer of the watch the night the battleship *Maine* was sunk in Habana Harbor:

AKRON, OHIO, *May 8, 1943.*

Representative SAM HOBBS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Press reports just released give cause for our country to pay reverent homage to the name of Alabama's illustrious son, Commander Gilmore of our Navy. His heroism, patriotism, and devotion to duty in giving his life to save his shipmates and ship are in line with our Navy's finest traditions. Commander Gilmore's last words: "Take her down," will go down in American history alongside of Commodore Perry's message quoting the immortal words of Captain Lawrence: "Don't give up the ship." My kinship to Alabama and particularly to Selma gives me a special sense of pride in Commander Gilmore's action. May I ask you to convey my feelings to Commander Gilmore's family and friends.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. BLANDIN.

In the Nation's Capital, the Washington Post of May 9, 1943, carried the following editorial:

"TAKE HER DOWN!"

There are probably very few Americans who could read without great emotion and pride the story of Comdr. Howard W. Gilmore, United States Navy, who has been posthumously awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. In a night encounter with a Japanese gunboat somewhere in Pacific waters, Commander Gilmore was felled on the bridge of his submarine by a burst of machine-gun fire. As he lay there mortally wounded, the skipper gave his last command, "Take her down!" In the crash dive that followed this order the dying officer was washed into the sea. The submarine returned safely to its base.

Is not this, in essence, the story of Lawrence all over again? The relatively young submarine service has now a tradition to match the finest in naval history. Yet it is no disparagement to say that Commander Gilmore's act of sacrifice was by no means the first such incident of this war nor will it be the last. We know about it because in this case the sacrifice availed. His ship was saved, his crew returned to tell of him. But probably every branch of the fighting services affords many equally gallant instances of sacrifice—of gunners for example, who perished to cover the escape of comrades, of pilots who remained at the controls of blazing bombers while ordering their crews to jump. Our first popular hero of this war, Capt. Colin Kelly, belongs in this category.

Every war abounds in heroic self-immolations. But in the nature of things only a few of them become celebrated and fewer still become embalmed in the history books. Valor and glory are not always synonymous, and it was through a sound instinct that after the last war the nations raised their noblest memorials not to their known but to their unknown heroes. In this is recognition of the fact that heroism is not the rarest but among the commonest of human qualities. Just as the history of these recent years has taught us anew of the human capacity for evil, so is it reminding us of the grandeurs of which the human spirit is also capable.

The Anniston Star of Anniston, Ala., carried the following Associated Press dispatch of May 7, 1943:

SELMA SUB COMMANDER GIVES LIFE TO SAVE CREW AND SHIP

(By John M. Hightower)

WASHINGTON, May 7.—A submarine skipper whose last gallant order, "take her down," sealed his own death sentence was credited by the Navy today with successful attacks on three Japanese ships, the last of which the sub rammed in a dramatic night fight for life.

It was in this final action somewhere in the distant Pacific that the officer rode the conning tower of his submerging submarine to his death rather than expose the craft or crew to enemy gunfire.

He had been wounded a few moments before and knew that the time required to get him safely into the submarine might mean the sub's destruction.

NATIVE OF SELMA

For this sacrifice, Commander Howard W. Gilmore, 40, of New Orleans, La., a native of Selma, Ala., has been awarded posthumously the Congressional Medal of Honor by President Roosevelt.

The story was told by the Navy today, partly in a communiqué and partly in an accompanying account of the final fight.

The communiqué, which also reported American air raids against Japanese positions in the central Solomon Islands, listed the three last ships attacked successfully by the submarine under Gilmore's command as a medium cargo ship, sunk; a gunboat, damaged and probably sunk; a medium cargo ship, damaged.

"Commander Gilmore gave his life in the action against the gunboat listed above," the communiqué said.

The gallant commander, first submarine officer to win the medal of honor in this war, was on his fourth war patrol against the Japanese.

Previously his submarine had been credited with sinking a total of 25,946 tons of enemy shipping and in addition with having struck boldly into an enemy harbor and at-

tacked three enemy destroyers caught unaware there, sinking two and damaging one.

OCCURRED EARLY THIS YEAR

Gilmore's last action occurred, the Navy said, "early this year."

Gilmore's submarine was underway on the surface, searching the sea lanes for enemy ships.

Suddenly a Japanese gunboat spotted the undersea raider and dashed in to ram it. Ramming is a favorite method used against U-boats and Gilmore was in a tight spot.

He skillfully evaded the on-rushing gunboat and his sub pulled aside just in time. Then it was Gilmore's turn—a turn which he could have used to crash dive and get away as quickly as possible. But that was not his choice.

He ordered a maneuver which placed the submarine in position to ram the gunboat and at a speed of 17 knots drove his powerful craft into the Japanese ship, ripping its hull plates and apparently settling its fate.

The gunboat and sub pulled apart and the former began to sink. At that moment its crew opened fire with heavy machine guns and Gilmore was struck by the hail of bullets. Members of his crew sought to carry him below.

ORDERED SHIP SUBMERGED

He realized, the Navy account said, that the delay inevitable in taking a wounded man below deck might cost the submarine, or at least the lives of men. So, in his final moments he gave his last order to the officer of the deck:

"Take her down."

The submarine dived. As she plunged under the surface, the wounded skipper still riding the bridge, the Japanese gunboat was settling deeper into the sea and apparently it sank. The sinking could not be definitely claimed, however.

The Navy release is, in part:

CONGRESSIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR AWARDED POSTHUMOUSLY TO SUBMARINE COMMANDER

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
May 7, 1943.

A United States submarine commander who gallantly sacrificed his life to save his boat and crew during a night surface engagement in which he rammed and probably sank a Japanese patrol vessel has been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously by the President of the United States.

He was Commander Howard W. Gilmore, 40, of 5315 South Liberty Street, New Orleans, La., who, though mortally wounded by machine-gun fire from the enemy ship, refused safety for himself and calmly gave the order to clear the bridge and submerge while he remained topside.

Crew members attempted to carry their skipper below but he declined their aid rather than expose the submarine and its company to further gunfire. Damaged when she rammed her adversary, the underseas craft, nevertheless, was still under control and was taken to port by the executive officer, Lt. Comdr. Arnold F. Schade, 31, of 4504 Voltaire Street, San Diego, Calif.

The engagement, reported today in Navy Department Communiqué No. 369, occurred early this year, while Commander Gilmore's boat was underway on the surface, searching the sea lanes for enemy ships.

A Japanese gunboat spotted the submarine and dashed in to ram it. Skillfully evading the patrol vessel's rush, Commander Gilmore daringly maneuvered into position and at a speed of 17 knots rammed the attacker instead, ripping into her port side and opening a gaping wound in her hull plates.

As the gunboat settled and began to sink, her crew opened fire with heavy machine guns and Commander Gilmore was struck by the hail of bullets.

Members of the submarine's crew sought to carry him below, but realizing delay might cost the submarine and the lives of men in exposed positions topside, Commander Gilmore ordered all hands below.

In his final living moments he gave his last order to the Officer of the Deck:

"Take her down!"

The submarine dived without her "skipper."

Her adversary was still settling when the submarine submerged, and it is believed the gunboat sank.

The Congressional Medal of Honor was the third decoration conferred upon Commander Gilmore, whose widow, Mrs. Hilda St. Raymond Gilmore, lives at the New Orleans address.

He was awarded the Navy Cross for one patrol during which he took the submarine into an enemy-controlled harbor and attacked three 1,700-ton Japanese destroyers at anchor there, sinking two and damaging the third.

He won the Gold Star in lieu of a second Navy Cross by sinking a total of 25,946 tons of enemy merchant shipping.

These successes have been previously announced in Navy Department communiqués.

The patrol on which Commander Gilmore won the Congressional Medal of Honor was his submarine's fourth since the outbreak of hostilities with Japan. Prior to the engagement which cost his life he sank one Japanese freighter and damaged another on the same patrol.

COMMANDER HOWARD WALTER GILMORE, U. S. N.

Commander Gilmore was born in Selma, Ala., September 29, 1902. His parents were Walter M. Gilmore and Vernon Howard Gilmore. He attended the Meridian High School, Meridian, Miss., and the Ball High School, Galveston, Tex. He was an enlisted man in the Navy, yeoman second class, and received appointment at large from the Secretary of the Navy in open competitive examination. He was honorably discharged from the Navy to accept appointment to Annapolis. He entered the Naval Academy from Louisiana in 1922, and was graduated in 1926. He was a "Star" student, graduating with distinction. He went back to the Academy following graduation for post-graduate work in Ordnance.

He served for 3 years on the battleship *Mississippi*, 6 months on the destroyer *Perry*, and in January 1931, he reported to the submarine school, New London, Conn., for instruction. Upon completion of that course in June 1931, he proceeded to the Canal Zone where he had duty on the U. S. submarine *S–48* until June 1932.

On June 28, 1932, he married Miss Hilda St. Raymond, of New Orleans, at New Orleans. Of this marriage there are two children, Howard W. Gilmore, Jr., and Vernon Jeanne Gilmore.

Commander Gilmore had postgraduate instruction in ordnance engineering at the Naval Academy and the Navy Yard, Washington, D. C., from July 1932 until May 1935. He assisted with fitting out the U. S. submarine *Shark* at the Electric Boat Co., Groton, Conn., in 1935–36, and went aboard when she was commissioned June 25, 1936. He served as her executive officer and navigator until November 1937, when he joined the U. S. submarine *Dolphin*. He had a tour of shore duty at the Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Va., from May 1939 until January 1941, when he returned to sea in command of the U. S. submarine *S–48*. He was detached from that duty December 2, 1941, and after fitting out a submarine he assumed command when she was commissioned.

He was promoted to the rank of Commander, August 15, 1942.

He was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously. Previously he had received the Navy Cross and a Gold Star in lieu of a second Navy Cross.

As far as Navy records show, he is the only submarine commander to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor for action.

Citations for these awards follow:

THE MEDAL OF HONOR

For distinguished gallantry and valor above and beyond the call of duty as commanding officer of a United States submarine during her fourth war patrol in the southwest Pacific. Boldly striking at the enemy Commander Gilmore sank one Japanese freighter and damaged another by torpedo fire. In the darkness of night, an enemy Japanese gunboat closed range and prepared to ram the submarine. Commander Gilmore daringly maneuvered to avoid the crash and rammed the attacker instead, ripping into her port side at 17 knots and bursting wide her plates. In the terrific fire of the sinking gunboat's heavy machine guns, Commander Gilmore calmly gave the order to clear the bridge, and refusing safety for himself, remained on deck while his men preceded him below. Struck down by the fusillade of bullets and having done his utmost against the enemy, in his final living moments Commander Gilmore gave his last order to the officer of the deck, "Take her down." The submarine dived, damaged but under control, she was brought safely to port by her well-trained crew inspired by the courageous fighting spirit of their dead captain.

NAVY CROSS

"For extraordinary heroism and outstanding devotion to duty as commanding officer of a United States submarine on offensive war patrol. During 9 days in enemy-controlled waters, Lieutenant Commander Gilmore, by expert maneuvering, boldly brought his submarine into an enemy-controlled harbor where men of war had been sighted and, in rapid succession, attacked three anchored 1,700-ton Japanese destroyers with the result that the submarine sank two of these vessels and seriously damaged the third. By skillful handling of his ship he was able to bring his ship home with only minor damages. Lieutenant Commander Gilmore's courage, determination, and fine seamanship throughout these operations were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States naval service."

GOLD STAR IN LIEU OF A SECOND NAVY CROSS

"For extraordinary heroism as commanding officer of a United States submarine during an aggressive and successful submarine war patrol. Taking advantage of every favorable attack with alert skill and courageous efficiency, Commander Gilmore succeeded in sinking a total of 25,946 tons of enemy merchant shipping. By expert maneuvering he brought his ship safely through without material damage and his crew home without injury or loss of life. His gallant leadership and resourceful command were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States naval service."

He also had the American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp.

After Victory—What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to address the annual banquet at the national convention of the American Road Builders' Association in Chicago at the Edgewater Beach Hotel, Thursday evening, May 6. Attending the post-war conferences and participating with discussion speeches were Senators McCLELLAN and CHAVEZ, and Representatives ROBINSON, chairman of the House Roads Committee; MOTT; WOLCOTT; and STEFAN. A part of my address is herewith included:

America at war is a nation fighting for peace. We do not seek the empty fruit of military conquest or the cruel subjugation and exploitation of weaker peoples. We are fighting to make this world a better place in which to live, to make peace and security possible for every nation of the earth, and, above all, to make certain that our own country will always be a land of freedom, abundance, and opportunity.

Our war will not be won on the day when some gallant American doughboy throws a leg over Hirohito's throne. Nor will we win it on the inevitable day of unconditional surrender of the Axis, not even when the last cringing criminal has been tried and punished. Victory will be ours only when we have achieved the objectives for which we are battling when the giant factories now producing munitions of war are humming with peaceful production, when our returning soldiers have been demobilized and given good employment on our farms and in our factories, when there is a job for every man who desires to work, and the dignity and liberty of every person are secure.

We are told that this is no time for post-war planning; that we must gain the military victory first and then think of peace; that it is impossible to make post-war plans today because we do not know how long the struggle will last; that planning is futile when we do not know how long the struggle will last; that planning is futile when we do not know what nations, in post-war alinement, will be friend or foe. To these well-meaning but misguided critics I reply:

The most critical period confronting us today is the period of transition from total war to the paths of peace. Whether the war lasts for 1 or 10 years, whether the conference table leaves us surrounded by friends or alone in a jealous world, our major problems will be the same. Factories representing the investment of many billions must be converted from war to peace; 20,000,000 war workers must be placed in peacetime pursuits, a transition which may require the mass migration of millions of people; 10,000,000 returning soldiers must be absorbed by our civilian economy; several million casualties will require care and rehabilitation; war-broken homes will call for restoration; disrupted channels of distribution must be replaced or restored; balance must be maintained between the cancelation of billions in war contracts and the pent-up demand for new homes and radios and other products of peace which are no longer being manufactured. If we fail in this transition, if inadequate planning brings us collapse and chaos, if we lose those precious human values for which our men and women are fighting and dying, we shall have lost the war just as surely as though Tojo made good his fantastic boast and dictated peace in the White House. It is imperative, therefore, as a vitally important part of our war effort, that we consider today the post-war world which is waiting for us in the tremendous future, and that we be ready for the final battle of civilization, the battle which will begin in earnest on the day the cannon cease to fire.

You gentlemen assembled here tonight, you who are builders of highways and of airports, are the vital link in the chain of post-war progress. The story of civilization is a story of transportation and communication. Ancient cultures grew and prospered as men learned to sail ships, build roads, and organize caravans. The Appian Way is more closely associated in our minds with the glories of Rome than are Caesar's legions. Collapse of transportation and communication brought on the Dark Ages through which Europe floundered for nearly a thousand years. Then came a rebirth of travel and the Renaissance, the discovery of America, circumnavigation of the globe, clipper ships, steamboats, and railroads, each adding to the pace of man's industrial and social progress.

Today I read an article by a thinking industrialist, Commander E. F. McDonald, Jr., president of the Zenith Radio Corporation of Chicago. He was writing about his own great industry and its importance in war, but turned his eyes to the future to predict that the four industries which would lead us through the post-war world were aviation, chemistry, automotive and radionics. Note that two of these are in the realm of transportation. He links a third by prophesying:

"Radionics will revolutionize and speed the great new form of transportation aviation. Radio has never been necessary to autos and trains except as entertainment. To ships it has been a great aid, but has not been absolutely essential. But today, and for the future in that great new universal transportation that is forming itself, preening its wings for what will be known as the era of aviation, radio is as essential as the airplane engine itself."

Yes, gentlemen, the future of mankind lies with the future of transportation and communication, and the future of transportation is in your hands.

Stripped to its bare essentials, the problem of transportation is really very simple. All that we need to do is provide means of transporting men and merchandise swiftly, safely, and economically from any point in the country to any other point, and this presupposes adequate sea and air connections with the rest of the globe. We have four important avenues of transportation—waterways, railways, highways, and airways. Each has its own special advantages and value. Waterways have long since fallen from the reigning position they held a century ago, and the arrogant supremacy of the railroad has been successfully challenged by an alert motor transport. Air transport of the future will, I predict, quickly assume first place in transportation, but the value of the others will continue unimpaired.

What we need now is a long-range program of developing an integrated system of transportation which will utilize all four systems to best advantage, and in such a manner that one can substitute for another in case of failure. Perhaps our future world will be filled with enemies. Should one attack and destroy a number of railway bridges, for example, the blow will lose much of its effectiveness if we have adequate highways, airways, and waterways.

We should never be afraid of over-building. The important factor is to have enough in the way of transportation facilities, particularly of roads and airports.

It is the history of our highway system that we have never had quite enough capacity; new building programs have seldom progressed as rapidly as the need for them increased. We entered this war with little or no margin of safety in capacity, and have paid for it by a sharp curtailment of civilian transport as an alternative to crippling our military requirements. We are faced with even more drastic reduction in months to come as our overtaxed railroad equipment begins to fail, and our highways continue crumbling under the incessant pounding of heavy military traffic.

Let us consider the basic requirements of an adequate highway system. First we need a vast expansion of local and "feeder" roads to handle the steadily increasing volume of trucks and passenger cars. Then we will require a Nation-wide network of superspeed highways comparable to the Pennsylvania Turnpike between Pittsburgh and Harrisburg which has been such a sensational success from the day it was opened. It is only 160 miles in length, but it is so straight and free from grades that it has cut normal motoring time between the two cities by 2½ hours.

I have a bill pending in Congress, H. R. 776, providing for the installation of such a system. Over a period of the past 6 years I have consistently introduced this legislation looking toward the construction of superhighways connecting New England and Florida, Florida to the southern tip of California, California to Vancouver Island, San Francisco to New England, the Great Lakes region to Florida, and the Canadian border at some point in Minnesota to Laredo, Tex., where it will connect with the Pan-American Highway. This is only a starter, but what a help such a highway system would be in the present crisis. Just suppose that we had a highway comparable to the Pennsylvania Turnpike running from Texas to Argentina; we would have less difficulty fulfilling our commitments to South America and would have less trouble with coffee rationing.

These roads will contain many innovations which will add to their utility and safety. Consider, for example, the airplane crashes which will be prevented by using them as emergency landing strips. On the Pennsylvania Turnpike are many tangents 6,000 to 7,500 feet in length with grades of less than one-half of 1 percent. These are clear of all obstruction. Recently one of these strips made an ideal runway for the take-off of a Douglas bomber which had made an emergency landing in a nearby field. More than 65 airplanes, I am told, have staved off the disaster of crash landings in the mountains by using stretches of the turnpike. Suppose the highway were equipped with some radionic device, such as a series of electric eyes, which would control traffic lights when a plane came in to land and clear a portion of the road This would automatically make of it a safe emergency landing field. Let us think, also, in terms of interceptor planes being stationed at intervals across the Nation, adjacent to the highway, coming from camouflaged or underground hangars.

Under a pending proposal, H. R. 2615, which I recently introduced in Congress, the United States Public Roads Administration is directed to make an immediate survey of the need for express highways, their possible locations, and the approximate cost. A similar bill H. R. 2661, has been presented by me dealing with the necessity now for an airport survey of the country. We need 20,000 airports, landing fields, and highway flight strips in this Nation. Military aviation plus a vastly expanded commercial and private flying post-war era means this planning must be in the near future.

With the equipment now available, it is possible for one to enter a plane in Chicago

and within 60 hours reach any inhabited spot on the globe. Fully loaded aircraft are spanning the Atlantic Ocean in little more than 6 hours. We, here at the Edgewater Beach Hotel, are only 14 hours from South America, and 40 hours from Africa. Man, with his genius, is shrinking the world.

Don't Get the Pan Hot Until You Have Caught Your Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, taking their cue from the administration's post-war planners, who would establish a world-wide W. P. A., with the American taxpayers and the farmers furnishing the food for the New Deal cow, which is to give the milk to the world's population, folks throughout the country, actuated by the most praiseworthy motives, are discussing post-war plans.

My thought that we should devote our energies to the winning of the war before we decide what we are going to do with what we have at the end of the war is so well expressed in an editorial from the May 6 issue of the News-Palladium, Benton Harbor, Mich., that it is printed herewith:

The post-war planners are at it, "tooth and toenail." Over the country so-called local forums are holding public meetings at which the home-town citizenry is invited to participate in the discussions. One was held here, at the Young Men's Christian Association, last Monday evening and for the next 3 Monday nights the discussions will be continued. The program generally appears to be under the Federated Council of Churches.

For good, clean indoor sport along debative lines these public forums are commendable. Perhaps, too, some good may come out of them, for after all every-day folks can and do come up with some excellent suggestions which have the quality of genuine statecraft.

We do hope, however, that the good folk who, unable to do much toward achieving the military victory but who would help plot the resultant peace, don't overlook the practical realities involved in the program of post-war peace and reconstruction. Uncle Sam won't be the only delegate sitting around the peace table. He may be—and for which we have grave misgivings—the most idealistic player in this poker game of power politics. But there'll be others Mr. Churchill, for instance, is going to be there. And Mr. Churchill, taking a forthright British attitude toward all post-war aims and ambitions, has said quite plainly and emphatically that he didn't become the king's first minister to liquidate the British Empire. And Joe Stalin will be there, or some other Moscow comrade who will be taking orders direct from Joe's desk in the Kremlin at Moscow. Comrade Stalin has made it quite plain—in fact he overemphasized it the other day when he suddenly broke with the so-called Polish Government in exile, that he doesn't propose to give up any Polish frontier territory which the Allies took away from him 25 years ago. Not only that, Comrade Stalin proposes to do something about the Baltic country, where an exposed Russian flank doesn't mean too much military security for the Soviets.

There'll be other allies, too, at the peace table, as they were before, with no end of territorial and other claims to present; all of them, we dare say, too, will have large bills of damages, which Germany won't escape this time, while the cry for vengeance from numerous despoiled and outraged lands now under the heel of Hitler's mass murderers and plunderers will be loud and insistent. President Roosevelt has warned Germany, as well as Japan, that retributive justice will be exacted, so unless the world clamor for the actual trial and punishment of guilty German and Japanese leaders is defeated, as it was after the last war, it looks as though the firing squads of the United Nations will be busy for sometime when and if we crush Hitler's armies and then polish off the Japs. Such is the general picture of hazards and problems that will be present when the Allies come to write the peace.

If in these home forums of post-war discussion there is any general assumption that this country is going to embark upon some grand, idealistic scheme that will impose upon American participation a costly outlay of money and a large involvement of military responsibility that will keep a million or two Americans keeping permanent watch at every strategical outpost in the world, we fear it is founded upon wishful thinking. We'll bet our last dollar that the American taxpayer never will consent to create a world-wide new deal, for unless we're greatly mistaken Americans have had all of that which they can take; and as for those boys now in the service, when this military adventure is over, if 99.9 percent of them don't insist upon coming home, then something has happened to American character.

This is not saying that Americans are so isolationist that they will be content to refuse to participate in some international effort to prevent another world war in another generation. We believe there is a majority opinion in favor of some allied military arrangement to keep Germany from going mad again—and the Japs, too. But out of our experience in two world wars we now know that if conflicting European, Asiatic, and other interests can't be synchronized to a will to peace on the part of our allies we alone can't underwrite and guarantee the permanent peace of the world.

Woodrow Wilson in his sponsorship of his League of Nations overlooked this essential factor 25 years ago. He had a formula for world peace which had many, many virtues. But he persisted in ignoring the practical realities that furnished so many obstacles to League acceptance. The League didn't fail, as we are so often told, because we refused to join it. It would have failed even if we had joined it. It failed because the European powers lacked that will to peace which must be the underlying and pulsating motive of any international mechanism that will enforce and maintain peace.

Mr. Speaker, before we commit ourselves irrevocably to the policing of the world, to the feeding and the clothing of the world, all at the expense of the American taxpayer, and to the pledge that we intend to compel all the people of the world, by force if necessary, to accept our interpretation of the "four freedoms," let us defeat our enemies. Instead of planning before the war is over to create after the war is over jobs as policemen for the men who are now fighting our battle, let us plan, if we must make post-war plans, to retain here in America a government and conditions which will put the returning soldiers, as nearly as possible, in a situation better than that which they left when inducted into the service.

Need of Pharmacy Corps in Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEX GREEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, I call the attention of the House to House Memorial No. 2 as passed by the 1943 Florida Legislature and approved on April 21, 1943, by Hon. Spessard L. Holland, Governor of Florida. It memorializes the Congress to pass the pharmacy corps bill. This legislation is now pending before the House Military Affairs Committee, and would provide, if enacted, for a pharmacy corps in the Army. This would give an opportunity for service in the capacity in which they are best qualified for members of the pharmacy profession.

During the last Congress I introduced a bill which would have directed the Army officials to utilize the services of qualified pharmacists only in the preparation of all medicines administered to members of the armed forces. Such policy was adopted by the offices of the armed forces, and thus obviated the necessity of passage of the legislation. The pending bill for the creation of a pharmacy corps is, however, by the pharmacy profession deemed in the best interest of the profession and also for the health and welfare of the members of the armed forces.

The substance of this resolution and the legislation for the establishment of the pharmacy corps has the strong approval and endorsement of the Florida State Pharmaceutical Association. This is better evidenced by the following letter received by me from Dr. R. Q. Richards, secretary-manager of this association, of Fort Myers, Fla. On April 29, 1943, he communicated with me as follows:

FLORIDA STATE PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION,
Fort Myers, Fla., April 29, 1943.

Hon. LEX GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: I am enclosing herewith a copy of a resolution that has been passed by the Florida Legislature. I thought that you would like to have a copy of this resolution, as it shows the sentiment of our people with regard to the pharmacy corps bill now pending in Congress.

I can assure you that we appreciate everything that you have done and are doing in having this vital piece of legislation passed.

I am sending copies of the resolution to the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the Secretary of War,

the Surgeon General of the United States Army, and to all Florida Members of Congress.

Again assuring you of our appreciation and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

R. Q. RICHARDS,
Secretary-Manager.

I have, from time to time, conferred with members of the House Military Affairs Committee, urging favorable consideration by the committee of H. R. 997, a bill to be entitled:

To amend certain provisions of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, relating to the Medical Department of the Regular Army.

The following is copy of letter which I have addressed to the chairman and each member of the House Committee on Military Affairs:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 6, 1943.

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JACK: I strongly urge that your committee give favorable consideration to H. R. 997.

This bill is of the utmost importance not only to the members of the pharmacy profession but also is of interest and importance to each member of the armed forces. This bill, when enacted, will enable pharmacists to serve as such with our armed forces and will give to them appropriate recognition and standing, insofar as the Army is concerned, with the members of other professions. It will nearer assure performance with the armed forces of pharmaceutical duties by trained and experienced members of this splendid profession.

I shall appreciate it, also, if I may be given an opportunity to appear before your committee in behalf of this worthy legislation.

With very kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEX GREEN.

This legislation is of the utmost importance, is of extreme merit, and should have the support of every Member of Congress.

The memorial follows:

House Memorial 2

House memorial memorializing Congress to pass pharmacy corps bill

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Florida in session assembled:

Whereas the experience of every civilized country in the world as exemplified by the laws on their statute books governing the practice of pharmacy, including those on the statute books of all of the states of our own country, requires that a pharmacist shall have at least 4 years of professional training in a college of pharmacy to make him a safe person to be entrusted with the responsibility of handling the many dangerous drugs and medicines prescribed by physicians, such as strychnine, morphine, sulfanilamide, bichloride of mercury, serums and vaccines, etc.; and

Whereas correspondingly competent pharmaceutical service is not now afforded the men serving in the Army and is not comparable to that received by our civilian population such services being performed in the Army in many cases by men with only 90 days of emergency training and in other cases by those who have had no pharmaceutical training whatsoever, thus jeopardizing the health and welfare of our soldiers; and

Whereas the men in the Army should be afforded pharmaceutical service of at least the same competence and efficiency as that afforded the civilian population; and

Whereas this can only be accomplished by creating a pharmacy corps in the Army, which will have the authority required and the personnel of which will be adequately educated and trained for the purchase, selection, manufacture, standardization, storage, and dispensing of medicines and for such other pharmaceutical and administrative duties as their education and training qualifies them to perform: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Florida State Legislature now in session goes on record as urgently requesting the Congress of the United States to pass legislation without delay to establish a pharmacy corps within the Army; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Surgeon General of the United States Army, and to the Florida Members of Congress.

Approved by the Governor April 21, 1943.

Shipping Requirements for Military Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am glad to discuss for a few minutes the subject of the magnitude of our military operations from the standpoint of shipping and from the standpoint of expense.

Estimates as to the shipping facilities required to land and supply an invading army vary widely. On November 10, 1942, Lieutenant General Somervell said before the Academy of Political Science:

Between 5 and 12 tons of equipment must be landed with every soldier sent overseas. Another 10 must be shipped to him each month in food, clothing, and ammunition.

November 12, 1942, Under Secretary of War Patterson is quoted as follows:

In the North African expedition, 7 tons of shipping per man were required for the necessary initial equipment. And 1½ shiptons per man per month will be required to maintain the supply of this force.

As a basis for calculations it is probably safe to presume that on original landing 7 to 10 tons of equipment are required for each member of an expeditionary force and that the weight of supplies thereafter may vary from 3 to 8 tons per month, depending on locale and conditions of combat.

The delivery of the large tonnages involved for an expeditionary force of any size is obviously a tremendous undertaking. The estimated time required with loading and unloading for round-trip voyages, under convoy, to various important destinations is as follows:

	Estimate of months involved in round trip voyages	Probable average time
England	1½–2½	2
Murmansk	2 –3	2½
Australia	3 –4	3½
Middle East via the Cape of Good Hope	4½–5½	5
Other	2½–3½	"

Because of shorter lines of travel, England's requirements for ship tonnages are probably one-third or less of those of the United States for the same size army and the same tonnage of equipment and supply.

In addition to the problems of supplying our own expeditionary forces, large tonnages of shipping are required for the transportation of lend-lease material to our allies. During the period from March 1941 through December 31, 1942, the total value of such aid shipped to various countries amounted to $8,252,733,000. Actual tonnage of this lend-lease aid excluding ship repairs and similar services probably amounted to from 15,000,000 to 25,000,000 tons of goods or matériel.

Based on the foregoing facts and assumptions, and assuming that the expeditionary forces of the United States are increased to 3,000,000 men divided equally between the South Pacific and across the Atlantic, the ship tonnages required by the United Nations would be as follows:

Estimate of ship tonnages required

	Number of ships, 10,000 dead-weight tons	Aggregate dead-weight tonnages
United States to supply expeditionary forces aggregating 3,000,000	2, 500–6, 500	25, 000, 000–65, 000, 000
Lend-Lease aid	200– 350	2, 000, 000– 3, 500, 000
Great Britain	800–2, 000	8, 000, 000–20, 000, 000
Total	3, 500–8, 850	35, 000, 000–88, 500, 000

It is estimated that as of December 31, 1942, the United Nations had available approximately 44,450,000 dead-weight tons of shipping facilities. It is contemplated that during 1943 the United States, England, and Canada will complete new vessels amounting to 19,000,000 dead-weight tons. Adding this tonnage to the estimate of existing tonnage as of December 31, 1942, and deducting probable future losses from sinking or otherwise, it is estimated that the total allied shipping facilities at the end of 1943 may be in the neighborhood of 55,000,000 dead-weight tons.

This estimated tonnage will fall considerably short of the indicated maxi-

mum requirement for the support of 3,000,000 of our troops abroad, plus lend-lease requirements and British shipping needs, though it is in excess of the minimum estimated requirements.

It is significant that the fuel requirements for a mechanized fast-moving force on land, sea, and in the air are estimated to range from slightly less than one-half to as much as two-thirds of the total weight of all supplies. While aggregate ship tonnages may be sufficient for the indicated task, it is possible that the available number of tankers or other specialized vessels may further limit the number of troops which can be supplied abroad by the shipping facilities of the United Nations. Of the 8,090,800 deadweight tons of merchant vessels built in the United States in 1942, 997,900 deadweight tons or slightly more than 12 percent were tankers.

The Big Red House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Norwich (N. Y.) Sun of May 7, 1943:

THE BIG RED HOUSE

Not for many years has Washington buzzed with a social predicament on the scale of that growing out of the dinners at the big red house on R Street. Top officials in Washington this week have been hastening to explain their reasons for partaking of the delicious southern fried chicken or to emphasize that they had refused all invitations.

Secretary Knox asserts that he went to the big red house so he might spend an evening with his old friend Senator BRIDGES. Major General Campbell, Army Chief of Ordnance, says he went twice, once at the invitation of a member of his staff and again to meet a few newspaper men.

A series of circumstances have combined to bring notoriety to the house. Guests have included big names. Archduke Otto, pretender to the Austrian throne, has been a frequent visitor. But there would be nothing unusual in all this if it were not for the mystery surrounding the host and the manner in which the chicken dinners came to public attention.

A House subcommittee investigating war contracts took up a trail leading to John Monroe, who lives in the house on R Street. When he and his hostess, Mrs. Eula Smith, were summoned before the committee, both refused to testify. The Federal Bureau of Investigation then revealed that it had been investigating Monroe for several months.

The veiled implications growing out of these circumstances constitute more than social embarrassment. The congressional committee owes it to all parties involved to conclude promptly the investigation of Monroe's activities and make a full public report.

Air Mail Pick-Up System Proves Tremendous Success; More Than 1,400 Communities Request Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, the Air Mail Service will have its twenty-fifth anniversary. A significant phase in this development occurs today. It is the birthday of the air-mail pick-up.

Four years ago on May 12 at Morgantown, W. Va., this unique postal facility, by which mail is picked up and delivered by airplanes in flight, began regular scheduled service over two experimental routes established by the Post Office Department pursuant to an act of Congress, authorizing the Department to experiment with the pick-up and other new methods for the transportation of air mail.

SERVICE STARTED WITH 58 COMMUNITIES

Those experimental routes covered 58 communities in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, and Delaware, most of them located in the Alleghenies which, in the early days of the air mail, was known as Hell's Stretch. The experimental operation lasted a year. Shortly thereafter the service was placed on a permanent basis. All American Aviation which operated the experimental lines, received a certificate of convenience and necessity from the Civil Aeronautics Board for an expanded system embracing five routes running through the States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, New York, and Delaware. The system now serves 115 communities in this area on from two to four schedules a day, and it has become an integral part of our domestic air transportation structure.

Although there has been much talk for years in the aviation industry about the development of short-haul or feeder lines, the trend has been in exactly the opposite direction. The reason is that the swift, modern transport plane apparently cannot operate either efficiently or profitably on short routes making frequent stops. The air-mail pick-up operation was the first real effort made to cultivate the feeder field. The purpose of this service is to bridge by air the gap between air-line cities and off-line points, giving them direct air-mail and air-express service and eliminating ground haul which makes air transportation largely meaningless to these sections.

MANY DOUBTS FIRST SET FORTH

The pick-up service was begun 4 years ago amid considerable skepticism in the aviation industry. There were some who said that fast schedules could not be maintained over a route where the intermediate points were so close together. Some believed that the type of flying involved was neither safe nor practical with single-engine equipment. Others thought that the communities served by the lines would never generate enough mail to pay for the cost of the service to the Post Office Department. They predicted that the experiment would be an expensive luxury to the Government.

The record in 4 years of operation has completely confounded the skeptics. The service has completed nearly 2,700,000 miles of flying, during which 225,000 pick-ups and deliveries have been made without injury to personnel and without serious mishap to aircraft or cargo. Although all flying is contact and the pick-up planes cannot go over the top to avoid adverse weather, the system in this period has completed an average of nearly 93 percent of schedules.

Let us consider the economic aspects of the service. Air-mail volume has increased steadily since the program started. Last year the increase amounted to about 210 percent as compared with the national average of 40 percent. The increase in April was 166 percent over April a year ago. The express traffic also is increasing and the loads are taxing the capacity of the single-engine airplanes. The service is definitely on a self-sustaining basis. It has reached this point in less than 4 years, where it took the main-line system 20 years to reach it. In April, communities served by the air pick-up lines outside of their major terminals—Pittsburgh and Philadelphia — generated postal revenues which were approximately $34,469.41 in excess of the payments made by the Post Office Department to the carrier. This figure does not include the mail transferred to All American from the other air lines at Pittsburgh and Philadelphia for delivery along the air-mail pick-up lines. The success of these operations has demonstrated adequately the need for feeder transportation and proved it can be made self-sustaining on postal receipts alone.

STOPS ARE WITHIN 17 MILES OF ONE ANOTHER

The population of the communities on the air pick-up routes, outside of the terminal cities, ranges from 500 to 120,000. They are an average distance of 17 miles apart. Some are only 5 miles. Most of them have no airports and of those that have, only a few could accommodate a modern air liner. The area served by the air pick-up routes lies chiefly in the Appalachian mountain region where some of the worst and most variable flying weather in the country is encountered. Schedules are maintained at an average speed of 110 miles an hour. Although a pick-up plane on a regular run must always fly contact or within sight of the ground and it can never fly high because of the proximity of the ground stations, the system has consistently completed from 90 to 95 percent of the schedules in the years it has operated. Here we have a performance record that compares favorably with that of the regular transport liners which can go "over the top" when the weather turns bad. Government officials

have described this record as unprecedented for a new operation. From a trickle, air-mail volume on the lines has increased to a point where the postal revenues are more than paying for the cost of the service. It took the trunk lines nearly 20 years to reach this position.

The success of the system has indicated that short-haul air routes are practical and can pay their own way even though they can at this time carry only mail and cargo. At present there are pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board applications in 29 States for new pick-up routes which would add 25,000 miles to the air-line system and extend direct air service to 1,437 additional communities. These prospective routes have only scratched the surface of the opportunity in this country for the establishment of additional operations. Undoubtedly, there must be a great postwar expansion in this direction. I believe firmly that within 5 years after war is ended we will have 3,500 communities served by the pick-up device.

MILITARY USES ARE EXPANDED

In the past year great progress has been made in adapting the air pick-up system for military purposes in picking up troop and cargo gliders, which has materially increased the tactical value of these motorless aircraft which the enemy so successfully employed in Norway and Crete. Use of the system in this manner has simplified the problem of taking gliders off the ground, particularly from small airports. It also makes it possible to easily retrieve military gliders that are landed in limited areas where ordinarily it would be necessary to dismantle them in order to remove them. Cognizance of the significance of this important development to the future of commercial air transportation was taken by Postmaster General Frank C. Walker in an official announcement in which he said:

These successful tests of the new glider-launching technique which the War Department has said contemplates its application to the Army Air Forces' heaviest transport gliders, and, similarly, which may eventually be adapted to the pick-up of large commercial freight and passenger glider trains, is evidence of the value of the pick-up service not only to the air-mail postal facilities but also to the armed forces as a modern instrumentality of aerial warfare.

Recently Richard C. du Pont, president of All American Aviation since it began air-mail pick-up operations, was called to become special assistant to the commanding general of the Army Air Forces in charge of the glider program. He is one of the country's glider pioneers and once held the distance and altitude records for soaring. Technical improvements that have been made in the device since its invention by Dr. L. S. Adams, and its application to military purposes, have been largely due to the untiring efforts of this young man and the small but able staff which he selected.

The increase in air-mail patronage in the cities and towns served by the pick-up routes since the service was established has been almost phenomenal. I append a list of these communities showing their population and how air-mail pick-up dispatch has grown in the past 3 years. These figures vindicate the judgment of Congress. Every Member of the House and Senate should study these figures thoughtfully because this new method of air transportation offers the facility by which he can economically provide his own district or State with the benefits of direct air service:

Air-mail letters dispatched via air pick-up

City	Population	April 1941	April 1942	April 1943 [1]
Phillipi, W. Va	1,700	813	2,674	3,252
Pitcairn, Pa	6,317	192	469	2,988
Pittsburgh, Pa	671,659	101,370	9,040	340,912
Point Pleasant, W. Va	3,301	300	1,827	4,045
Pomeroy, Ohio	3,563	541	1,302	6,118
Portage, Pa	4,432	[2]	1,038	3,417
Portsmouth, Ohio	40,474	874	783	18,589
Punxsutawney, Pa	9,266	1,128	4,194	11,764
Ravenswood, W. Va	1,200	389	1,215	3,994
St. Albans, W. Va	3,254	225	1,030	1,913
St. Marys, W. Va	2,100	429	948	2,606
Scottdale, Pa	6,714	377	1,111	3,386
Shippensburg, Pa	5,244	[2]	1,210	4,889
Sistersville, Pa	3,072	685	1,622	4,087
Slipperyrock, Pa	1,100	[2]	476	2,013
South Charleston W. Va	10,324	315	85	381
Spencer, W. Va	2,400	737	507	3,849
State College, Pa	4,450	1,796	2,604	7,553
Steubenville, Ohio	35,442	1,865	4,042	10,589
Tarentum, Pa	9,551	460	1,044	4,415
Titusville, Pa	8,055	954	1,603	4,040
Uniontown, Pa	21,794	2,229	6,939	22,333
Vandergrift, Pa	10,699	583	1,199	5,409
Warren, Pa	14,863	2,314	4,109	13,566
Washington, Pa	26,078	949	2,417	6,780
Weirton, W. Va	13,291	813	2,676	5,902
Jamestown, N. Y	42,562	4,799	7,327	20,708
Jeannette, Pa	16,313	502	1,789	7,068
Jersey Shore, Pa	5,781	339	588	2,635
Johnstown, Pa	66,610	2,840	7,899	23,578
Lancaster, Pa	61,284	1,555	4,833	11,741
Latrobe, Pa	11,086	451	1,920	7,511
Leechburg, Pa	4,489	237	572	4,032
Lewistown, Pa	13,017	[2]	1,072	6,313
Lock Haven, Pa	10,799	862	1,193	7,147
Marcus Hook, Pa	4,867	475	1,032	2,672
Marietta, Ohio	14,514	1,377	3,865	10,276
Martins Ferry, Ohio	14,366	1,106	2,870	5,916
Masontown, Pa	3,873	[2]	1,796	4,026
Milton, W. Va	1,300	156	506	1,122
Montoursville, Pa	2,710	108	287	1,653
Morgantown, W. Va	16,656	2,942	9,198	11,817
Moundsville, W. Va	14,163	695	2,677	8,292
Mount Pleasant, Pa	5,869	634	1,203	3,030
Mount Union, Pa	4,893	376	948	4,174
Natrone, Pa	7,000	455	814	2,639
New Kensington, Pa	53,984	1,844	1,238	4,869
New Martinsville, W. Va	2,814	481	2,114	7,389
Nitro, W. Va	3,000	257	739	1,588
Oil City, Pa	20,251	2,668	4,943	10,828
Parkersburg, W. Va	30,088	3,671	10,221	33,204
Philadelphia, Pa	1,931,334	40,110	37,890	33,204
Philipsburg, Pa	3,600	701	1,736	6,068
Duncansville, Pa	1,000	71	531	1,971
Elkins, W. Va	7,345	1,500	5,235	9,711
Fairmont, W. Va	23,035	2,684	8,064	19,665
Franklin, Pa	10,254	3,013	4,037	8,349
Gallipolis, Ohio	7,106	619	2,018	6,754
Gettysburg, Pa	5,584	975	1,364	3,800
Glendale	1,000	62	315	815
Glenville, W. Va	588	725	1,394	3,107
Grafton, W. Va	7,737	792	3,264	6,404
Grantsville, W. Va	1,000	462	3,264	2,715
Greensburg, Pa	16,679	1,287	1,936	11,589
Greenup, Ky	1,100	186	563	1,607
Grove City, Pa	6,156	960	2,143	7,573
Hanover, Pa	13,390	1,450	2,993	11,785
Harrisburg, Pa	83,893	1,574	4,359	66,948
Hollidaysburg, Pa	5,969	229	734	2,916
Hollidays Cove, W. Va	4,480	400	1,175	2,782
Huntingdon, Pa	7,558	537	1,466	4,403
Huntington, W. Va	78,781	9,810	13,852	59,703
Hurricane, W. Va	1,300	125	402	719
Indiana, Pa	10,036	1,543	3,919	14,369
Ironton, Ohio	15,840	1,011	2,692	9,941
Irwin, Pa	3,443	520	1,240	3,790
Jackson, Ohio	5,922	549	1,336	3,788
Altoona, Pa	80,071	1,790	2,987	18,997
Ashland, Ky	29,526	1,026	3,737	7,613
Belington, W. Va	1,700	261	689	1,444
Bellefonte, Pa	4,804	537	1,196	1,181
Blairsville, Pa	5,296	[2]	1,505	4,698
Brackenridge, Pa	6,250	329	935	1,821
Bridgeport, Ohio	4,853	[2]	[2]	5,879
Bridgeport, W. Va	2,000	70	319	704
Buckhannon, W. Va	4,374	812	1,995	9,053
Butler, Pa	24,448	2,231	5,591	17,808
Canonsburg, Pa	12,501	285	852	2,278
Carlisle, Pa	13,984	[2]	3,808	11,014
Chambersburg, Pa	15,003	1,800	2,796	10,981
Charleston, W. Va	67,282	3,012	9,378	37,913
Chester, Pa	59,278	1,323	4,111	9,467
Clarksburg, W. Va	30,453	1,520	8,614	11,175
Claymont, Del	3,860	411	766	1,392
Clearfield, Pa	9,221	837	2,035	7,649

[1] April 1943 figures estimated.
[2] Air-mail pick-up service not established.

Air-mail letters dispatched via air pick-up—Continued

City	Population	April 1941	April 1942	April 1943 [1]
Coatesville, Pa.	13,989	303	341	4,266
Columbia, Pa.	11,544	214	668	2,226
Connellsville, Pa.	13,532	808	2,393	12,480
Corry, Pa.	7,152	497	1,673	5,545
Du Bois, Pa.	12,059	2,319	3,850	10,058
Dunbar, Pa.	1,300	121	418	2,850
Dunbar, W. Va.	4,189	120	813	2,172
Wellsburg, W. Va.	6,398	704	1,998	5,012
Wellston, Ohio	5,319	442	1,083	3,144
West Chester, Pa.	13,187	972	1,904	3,988
West Newton, Pa.	2,953	[2]	682	2,539
Weston, W. Va.	8,646	791	2,714	5,066
Wheeling, W. Va.	61,007	4,285	14,923	34,982
Williamsburg, Pa.	1,898	[2]	378	1,453
Williamsport, Pa.	44,262	1,771	3,768	18,073
Wilmington, Del.	112,504	5,064	10,150	22,935
York, Pa.	56,666	2,443	1,263	16,886
Youngsville, Pa.	1,907	[2]	194	686
Total	4,329,858	275,219	469,946	1,244,418

[1] April 1943 figures estimated. [2] Air-mail-pick-up service not established.

Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of May 10, 1943:

DANGEROUS AMENDMENTS

Passage of a bill to extend the life of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is virtually conceded. However, there are more ways of killing a cat than choking it to death with cream, and it is possible to nullify the Trade Agreements Act by amendment. Former opponents of the act are proposing a series of amendments. They have come around to the position that it is all right to continue the law in effect—but there must be a veto power placed in the hands of Congress on all these trade agreements And there must be authority to take provisions of these reciprocal trade agreements into the courts, if any one is injured or believes he is injured.

The bill, extending for a 3-year period the life of the Trade Agreements Act, is now before the House. It successfully ran the gantlet of the Ways and Means Committee without amendment, despite the efforts of the Republicans and one Democratic member of the committee to insert them. With the political division in the House almost equal, it is easy to see what may happen if the Republicans stand solidly for amendments to the bill, and a few, a very few, Democrats join with them.

It will be unfortunate both from the point of view of the country and of the Republican Party if the Grand Old Party forces in the House are able to rally enough strength to force these amendments into the bill. In the first place, these amendments would only serve to hamper the operation of the Trade Agreements Act. In the second place, such amendments, which obviously would be considered by the rest of the world as a definite withdrawal from the principle of negotiated reciprocal trade agreement, would give an impression that the United States was inclined once more to withdraw into its shell, turtlelike

The interpretation would be that this country was turning isolationist again. This would discourage those nations which hope for international cooperation after the war.

More particularly, however, would such action be taken to mean that the Republican Party clings to isolationism. Whether this is good politics or not time alone will tell. The hope of a great many Americans, including Republicans, Democrats, and independents, is that isolationism as a policy for this country is out.

It is argued that good reasons exist why Congress should have a veto power over these trade agreements. Why should the representatives of the people be denied this power? One reason is that there would be presented an excellent opportunity for logrolling, the cooperative action of special groups to get the terms they desire when tariff duties are fixed. These groups, under a you-scratch-my-back-and-I'll-scratch-yours policy would be in a position to veto, or hold up for a long time, reciprocal trade agreements between the United States and friendly nations.

As the law now stands, it must be revived every 3 years. If there is any abuse Congress can either repeal it or refuse to reenact it at the end of a 3-year period. That is where the Representatives of the people exercise their control.

Good Luck, Fighting Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, how many Joe Currans, how many Lewis Merrills are in this country? If you do not know who they are, Westbrook Pegler introduces them to you:

LOS ANGELES, May 11.—Well, so long, sport. Take care of yourself. It is tough to be leaving the little woman and your good job. You certainly show the American spirit, you two kids, only 3 years married and with all your plans and dreams.

You will be in good company, anyway, in the Army and when she goes to work in the war factory she will find a lot of other fine girls in the same fix—husbands away, homes broken. There are a couple of fine, upstanding, patriotic Americans that you probably won't be meeting in the Army, though. Not if they can help it.

One is Joe Curran, president of the National Maritime Union. That boy is American through and through, like Earl Browder, and nobody in this land is more eager to send you walking up some beach along the channel coast through shells and machine-gun fire to open up a second front against the aggressors.

But Joe can't get away to join you. He will be with you in spirit, you understand, but not in the flesh, because he has to stay in New York to run his union and help Harry Bridges and his Communist fifth column capture the east coast while you are away.

Joe passed his physical, but the poor guy is essential. It broke his heart to get deferred, but he had to do it. He is one of the few Americans who can write their own tickets before the draft boards. Unioneers get very special treatment under orders from the New Deal. Much better treatment than ordinary saps like you, sport.

When a patriotic unioneer like Curran wants deferment, the unions asks for it. But he is the union. So Joe Curran, the union, asks for deferment of Joe Curran, the bloodthirsty second-fronter, and gets it. Then Joe clenches his fists and shakes them at Hitler and yells: "You louse, I wish I could get away to slaughter you on that second front."

He didn't always hate Hitler, though. They used to be pals. His union used to say that this was an imperialist war and picket the White House under the slogan, "The Yanks aren't coming." This hatred for Hitler and aggressors came over Joe's union all of a sudden on June 22, 1941, the day Hitler attacked that beautiful democracy of Joe Stalin.

When you come back, sport—if you do come back—Joe Curran will be down the bay to meet your ship with a glad hand. Not you, but your ship. He will be down to grab some of that $100 a week and up that his union grabbed from the Government for mess boys and other civilian sailors while you and the Navy gunners aboard the same ships are doing your stuff for a base pay of $50 a month

Yes; Joe has been deferred for 6 months. He comes up again in September, but he will still be Joe Curran, the one-man union, and more indispensable that ever, even though that second front that he has been yelling for may be going to beat all hell.

Another who will be with you in spirit but otherwise absent from that second front is the president of the United Office and Professional Workers of America. They call him Lewis Merrill. He got deferred for another month on April 30, although he was classified I-A back in February. This is another of those one-man unions and another of those "Yanks aren't coming" outfits that turned against aggression when Adolf took a sock at Uncle Joe.

Last February, when his number was up, his union paper said the union had decided to appeal for deferment. That meant, of course, that Merrill, as they call him, in his role of unioneer, decided to appeal for deferment for Merrill, as they call him, the verbal commander. It is just a little scraggly union but very important in the war effort, because it is so close to the Communist Party.

Under the New Deal's magna carta for labor, the Wagner Act, it can plant clerical workers in Government offices and private business houses and then, if they pick up any confidential information and report it where it will do the most good from the standpoint of the Communist Party, that is helping the war effort. I told you, didn't I, about the member who planted herself in an office in New York and tipped off confidential information and brought down a raid of Communist-front goons on the premises of her employer. Sure, she was a member of this union, so essential to the war effort.

In that February issue of his paper announcing that Merrill, as they call him, was going to get deferred, there was a little item announcing that he was going to make a radio speech entitled "Wake Up, America." He was bugling reveille to get you up in time to kiss your wife good-by, sport, and shove off for that second front that he is so crazy about.

So long, sport, and when you get to Boulogne or Calais or climb up the cliff at Cape Gris Nez, go to the picture post-card shop and send greetings to Joe and Lewis, as they call him, and to good old second-front Charlie Chaplin, the internationalist, who is sitting out his second war in the United States and yelling to you to tear into Hitler, for him.

You may be deeply indebted to these boys. But for their ferocious speeches, there might be no second front for you to fight on.

Money—The Most Important Issue Before the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the fifteenth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money.

Mr. President, I desire to read a little more of what was said in 1885. The President himself now refers to international agreement just as if there were a possibility of such a thing. I quote now from Senate Executive Document No. 29, Forty-ninth Congress, first session, being a message of the President of the United States, transmitting, in response to Senate resolution of December 9, 1885, a report of the Secretary of State, with information relative to the gold and silver coinage of Europe. This is the report of the Secretary of State transmitting letters to Mr. Manton Marble from the Secretary of State to Mr. Phelps, our Minister to Great Britain, and to Mr. McLane, our Minister to France, etc. They were instructed to make full inquiry. Mr. Phelps says to Mr. Bayard (No. 4, p. 5):

"From these, as well as other sources, I am satisfied that the British Government will inflexibly"—

Now, listen, Mr. President—

"From these, as well as other sources, I am satisfied that the British Government will inflexibly adhere to their past and present policy in respect to coinage; that they will not depart from the gold standard now and so long established; that they will not become party to any international arrangement or union for the creation of a bimetallic standard or of a common ratio between gold and silver for the purpose of making both an unlimited legal tender, nor adopt such double standard or common ratio in Great Britain. On this point both political parties quite concur, and I believe that if either were to attempt to introduce such a departure from the existing money standard it would be driven out of power by the force of public opinion."

Now, I quote from McLane to Secretary Bayard:

"Referring to my separate dispatch under date September 11, I have to renew the opinion therein expressed, that while France would gladly receive the intelligence that the United States would adopt the French ratio of 15½ of silver to 1 of gold, no consideration of future consequences, whether for good or evil, could induce her to adopt the American ratio of 16 to 1; still less would she adopt any higher ratio to assimilate the present commercial or market value of silver with the value of gold, nor would she consent at any ratio now to permit an unrestricted or even a limited coinage of silver at her mints, the present opinion and purpose of her Government and people being to maintain, if possible, the two metals at their present ratio of 15½ to 1 in domestic circulation and international exchange."

Now I read from Hon. George H. Pendleton to Mr. Bayard, on page 9:

"The adhesion of Germany to an international bimetallic union, such as was proposed by the United States and France in 1881, can scarcely be expected, it seems to me, within any limit of time now to be predicted.

"The cooperation of Germany in an international bimetallic union may be sought with fair hopes of success whenever it becomes possible to include in such a union England and Russia, the former of which seems to cleave tenaciously to her gold monometallism, while the latter staggers under the evils of a depreciated and largely fluctuating paper money The adhesion of England at least is certainly now, and would probably for an indefinite period be, regarded by Germany as a sine qua non."

I will read a few more extracts from this document. There was an international monetary conference of the Latin Union held in Paris in 1885 among European nations only, at some exposition there, and Mr. George Walker was delegated by President Cleveland to represent the United States. I wish to read a few lines to show the financial standing of the administration at that time. Mr. Walker was consul-general there, and this is his observation addressed to the delegates of the Latin monetary union assembled in conference at Paris July 20, 1885:

"I am instructed to say to you that the policy of the new American Government, in respect to the continuance of silver coinage, does not differ from that of its predecessors. The newly elected President, Mr. Cleveland, on the 24th of February last, in reply to a letter addressed to him by certain members of the House of Representatives, before his assumption of office, declared his opinions very frankly on the silver question, and showed himself to be in perfect accord with the Presidents who have preceded him, on the essential question now under discussion in the United States—namely, the continuance of silver coinage under the Bland bill. He did not hesitate to avow that it was, in his opinion, the duty of Congress to suspend further coinage.

"He declared that a disastrous crisis was close at hand in which gold is likely to disappear from circulation and when we shall be reduced to silver alone; that under the operation of the silver coinage law the flow of gold into the Federal Treasury had been steadily diminished, and that silver and silver certificates had displaced, and were then displacing gold in the Treasury, and that the sum of gold available for the payment of the gold obligations of the United States, and for the redemption of the circulating notes called greenbacks, if not already encroached upon, was perilously near such an encroachment.

"These being the facts of our present condition, our danger, and our duty to avert the danger seemed to the President to be plain. To maintain and to continue in use the mass of our gold coin is possible by a present suspension of the purchase and coinage of silver, and the President affirmed that he was not aware that by any other method it is possible."

That is a beautiful message to convey to bimetallists in Europe in 1885, that this country was going to destruction, that our gold was being driven out of the country and out of our Treasury, and that we would not have gold enough left to redeem the greenbacks. These dire disasters are repeated as the predictions of our President in 1885, and that there was no difference between his position on the finances and the position of his Republican predecessors. I thought there was some difference. I may have been mistaken.

It does seem to me that these things show beyond any question whatever the impossibility of international bimetallism, Mr. Cleveland's own agents and representatives sent there have demonstrated the fact.

I wish to settle this matter beyond any possibility of doubt. Hon. Edward Atkinson was sent as a representative of this Government by Mr. Bayard in 1887. His report is found in the reports of the United States consuls, October 1887, volume 24. I will read just enough to give an idea of his views. Remember, this is the same gentleman who had the exaggerated idea in his mind of mountains of silver in Mexico, and how the silver metal could be melted away from it and produced in an open hearth, as it were. Mr. Atkinson's report is dated October 1, 1887. He says:

"I have further stated that if the principal commercial and manufacturing states of Europe had no immediate intention of changing from the present status of a limited coinage of silver for subsidiary use, the standard of full legal tender being limited in practice to gold coin only, then it might become the true policy of the United States to take action to maintain the gold dollar as the unit of value according to the present statute, and for the Executive to recommend to Congress suitable measures, if any further action is necessary, to maintain permanently the present interchangeable quality or convertibility of our currency into gold coin on demand, whether consisting of notes, silver coin, or silver certificates."

A magnificent representative of bimetallism in the United States, going to Europe as representing President Cleveland's first administration, and telling them that he wanted to know what they were doing, and if they did not do something it might become necessary for the United States "to maintain the gold dollar as the unit of value according to the present statute, and for the Executive to recommend to Congress suitable measures, if any further recognition is necessary, to maintain permanently the present interchangeable quality or convertibility of our currency into gold coin on demand, whether consisting of notes, silver coin, or silver certificates." This is remarkable language for a delegate of the United States in a foreign country attempting to establish bimetallism. Permit me to say that too often in our efforts for international bimetallism have we been represented in the same way, beginning at the statistical congress in 1863, and the monetary conference of 1865, and so on. But he says:

"I have reason to believe that my efforts in this direction may have partly removed the dread of a prospective avalanche of silver, as it is sometimes called, from the Continent of North America, especially from the United States, and that this fear, which has been perhaps the most potent cause of the unwillingness even to consider the question of bimetallism, may be wholly removed by the further investigation as to the relative production of silver and gold which may ensue. Another dread may also have been removed, to wit, that of a sudden change of policy in the United States leading to the cessation of silver coinage and also to the possible attempt to dispose of a considerable part of the present stock of silver coin."

Oh, yes; he has disabused the mind of that, and yet told them that we would do it. What is his belief? Here is the point that I wish specially to bring out:

"1. There is no prospect of any change in the present monetary system of European states which can modify or influence the financial policy of the United States at the present time.

"2. There are no indications of any change in the policy of the financial authorities of the several states visited by me which warrant any expectation that the subject of a bimetallic treaty for a common legal tender, coupled with the free coinage of silver, will be seriously considered at the present time by them.

"3. There is no indication that the subject of bimetallism has received any intelligent or serious consideration outside of a small circle in each country named, as a probable or possible remedy for the existing causes of alleged depression in trade.

"4. There is no considerable politically organized body of influential persons in either country with whom a combination could be made, if such a combination or cooperation were desirable on the part of a similar body in the United States for promoting any definite or practicable measures of legislation to bring about the adoption of the bimetallic theory according to the commonly accepted meaning of that term. The discussion is as yet almost wholly personal, and without concentration of purpose or the presentation of any well-devised measure capable of being acted upon."

Mr. President, it does seem to me that this ought to be sufficient to satisfy anyone that bimetallism by international agreement is an impossibility. It is useless for us to waste time in trying to get foreign nations to agree upon international bimetallism with us.

The quotation I have just read is a graphic, painful, and yet, doubtless, truthful statement of the views and opinions generally prevalent in Europe in regard to the motives and purposes of our Government. Their origin is easily traced, and Mr. Atkinson is in part responsible for their existence.

The financiers, statisticians, and businessmen of Europe read and believed all the exaggerations, to use a very mild term, in regard to the certain deluge of the world with the precious metals, and the statements made in our efforts to establish the single gold standard and the resulting action and legislation of our own and their own governments, discriminating in favor of gold and against silver, and then as soon as gold had been enthroned as the only money, the changed hue and cry raised by the gold monometallists in this country as to the excessive production of silver, and then the bitter denunciations poured out against every effort made in this country to restore silver as a money metal and the unfounded statements as to the production of silver and the refusal of our own people to use the silver dollars as money, and very naturally came to entertain the views, opinions, and feelings so forcibly stated by Mr. Atkinson.

Post-War Road Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. ROBINSON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me at the American Road Convention in Chicago on May 6, 1943:

I want to take this opportunity to thank the officers of this organization for the many courtesies that have been extended to me and for this invitation to meet with you and take part in your program. I fully realize that in this group we have many of the men whose ingenuity and engineering skill are responsible for the development of the world's greatest system of roads and highways—men in whose foresight and ability we must soon invest a considerable portion of our hopes for the post-war period.

In my 10 years as a Member of Congress and a member of the House Committee on Roads, I have come to look forward to these annual meetings—or reunions—in anticipation of the pleasant associations and the highly instructive discussions of road problems by the foremost experts in the field. We in Congress, and especially the members of the Roads Committee, have confidence in your officials and this association. We appreciate the cooperation we have received in connection with legislation affecting the Federal highway program.

I am particularly grateful for the sincere interest you are displaying in post-war conditions. The interchange of ideas here in progress, coupled with the comprehensive research of which you men are capable, cannot avoid being one of the most important factors in bridging the gap between war and peace. Your own initiative has launched your post-war efforts. For me to urge you to keep up the excellent work would be useless and idle talk. Winning the peace is not a job we can postpone until the war is won. It is how we work and how we plan while winning the war that will spell victory or defeat in the battle for a worth-while peace.

Seventeen months ago the very bottom seemed to drop out of civilization as we had come to know it. We were confronted overnight with what would have been certain and immediate disaster but for the failure of the enemy to capitalize on our complete unpreparedness. We are just now beginning to meet the requirements of total war. Our peacetime economy has been changed beyond recognition. But there must come a time when the war will end. And its coming may be even more unexpected. When that time comes, if we allow it to catch us off guard, more than half the adult population of the Nation, whose efforts are wholly or partially devoted to winning the war, will be caught holding the proverbial bag, full of a peace that was not worth a fraction of the sacrifice.

Each time we have engaged in war it has taken us many miserable years to climb back onto our feet. But this is a war that surpasses our wildest nightmares. This time we must meet the peace and remain on our feet, or we may stay down forever. To have doubted the inevitability of war was unfortunate, but a common fault, and our lack of preparation was understandable. But to deny that the war will end, and to fail to make plans for that day is inexcusable folly.

And when I say plans, I mean a fully worked out program, complete with specifications, cost estimates, and other preliminary details. I mean plans so complete that the first pinch of war industry lay-offs can be relieved without doing injury; so complete that materials can be absorbed as soon as industry can convert to peacetime production. Much of this work must be done by the road builders. Your place in the post-war picture cannot be overemphasized.

It is not my desire to waste your time with a discourse on the evils of war, the blessings of peace, and the economic difficulty of spanning the space between. I'm here as chairman of the House Roads Committee, and as such I hope to point out the post-war road problems from the legislative point of view.

The best guaranty we can have of post-war prosperity is to prepare a backlog of public projects sufficiently large to absorb the men and materials to be released at the cessation of hostilities. As road builders, you men well know that we need not look for projects. The planning of roads in the past has too often ignored the future. Obsolescence has often been noticed creeping in before the surface was dry. We have an interregional system of highways some 27,000 miles in length, a large portion of which became obsolete along with the horse and buggy. These roads are not safe. They are not efficient. To bring them up to date will cost in excess of $5,000,000,000.

A typical example of the type of projects that have been forced to wait for better times is pointed out in a recent report on highway conditions in the State of Maryland. The report listed 6,000 sharp curves around which it is unsafe to drive at normal speed; 1,500 steep grades which delay the free movement of passenger vehicles because of slow-moving trucks; 6,000 locations where obstructions limit sight distances and produce traffic hazards; more than 400 inadequate bridges; excessive mileage of low-type surfacing which requires heavy maintenance expenditure; many miles of deteriorated surfaces; inadequate transcity connections; inadequate rights-of-way, and pavements much too narrow for safe travel.

This is the type of work that awaits us. And the conditions in Maryland speak for the entire United States. We don't have to look for it. It meets us at every corner, in every stretch of highway. The job is unlimited.

The House Committee on Roads is now preparing to consider two bills designed to meet present and post-war problems. We sincerely hope to have the legislative machinery thoroughly set up, greased, and ready to move forward when the present conflict comes to an end.

Most urgent on our program is the bill H. R. 2113, which would take care of present needs, and start the ball rolling for a planned future.

In January 1943 the total balances in the Federal road fund apportioned to the various States for projects amounted to about $175,000,000. Were it not for present restrictions, brought about by our being at war, this money would now be at work on projects which were deemed essential before the war began. The need for these projects has been multiplied by war traffic, yet, under present law, all unexpended Federal-aid balances in the road funds of the individual States will revert to the Federal Government on June 30—the end of the present fiscal year. Since some States have used a larger percentage of their funds than others, and since a great many of the projects were already under way before the war, it seems imperative that legislation should be passed suspending the provisions requiring the reversion and reallocation of these funds. This is the main purpose of H. R. 2113.

In addition, this bill has the further purpose of making the existing funds available for use by the Public Roads Administration in cooperation with the State highway departments for the purchase of rights-of-way and for the making of surveys and plans for highway projects to be constructed in the post-war period. Since the acquisition of rights-of-way is one of the most serious delaying factors in road construction, legislation should be enacted immediately enabling the States and the Public Roads Administration to begin negotiations now for rights-of-way that will be required when the war ends. The Roads Committee is now awaiting the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget before proceeding with short hearings on this bill. All indications seem to point toward the early enactment of this legislation in substantially its present form.

With the groundwork of a post-war program laid in the enactment of H. R. 2113, the Roads Committee will focus its attention upon more comprehensive legislation designed to meet the problems that will soon confront us. The bill that would form the basis for a solution to these problems, H. R. 2426, is now in its preliminary stages in Congress. It has been endorsed wholeheartedly

and unanimously by the State highway officials. Exhaustive public hearings on the provisions of this bill, and a thorough investigation by the House Roads Committee of the entire road problem will be under way in a few weeks.

As this bill is now written, it authorizes an appropriation by the Federal Government of $3,000,000,000 which would become available at the rate of $1,000,000,000 each year for 3 years, beginning immediately upon the termination of the present emergency. Apportionment of this money among the various States would begin within 30 days after the passage of the act. With such a guaranty of Federal funds for the post-war use by highways departments of the various States, the States will be willing and anxious to proceed with the necessary planning and acquisition of rights-of-way. Without this assurance little in the way of State planning can be expected. The Commissioner of Public Roads would be authorized to enter into agreements with the various States—binding the Federal Government contractually to meet its share of the burden when the construction is commenced.

The bill would also provide a new formula for the allocation of funds. The present formula is based one-third on State area, one-third on population, and one-third on post-road mileage. In drafting the proposed legislation, we have done so with the full realization that by far the greater proportion of highway traffic is in and around the urban centers. We have realized that our major job in the future will be to provide adequate belt routes around and adequate arterial highways into and through these centers—and, in doing the job, to provide the off-street parking facilities within the cities necessary to make the plan workable. We also anticipate that the labor and unemployment problems will be most acute in the thickly populated areas. With this in mind, the bill as now drawn proposes a new formula based one-half on population, one-fourth on area, and one-fourth on post-road mileage. Along with this provision, in order to make certain that funds will be distributed equitably within the States, we have inserted the further provision that one-half of all the money apportioned in a given year will be earmarked for Federal-aid highways and the remainder will be divided between urban and rural areas in the proportion which the population within each of these areas bears to the total population of the State, and the Commissioner of Public Roads would be authorized to cooperate with the States in the location, development, and construction of off-street parking facilities and the construction of highway facilities to give access to and between transportation terminals within cities. Under the terms of the bill the Federal Government's share of the expense would be fixed at 75 percent.

The bill further provides for an interregional highway system not exceeding 40,000 miles, so located as to connect all the principal municipal and industrial centers with each other and to meet at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico

I believe this bill represents a start in the right direction. As I have stated, lengthy hearings are planned and, what is now but a rough beginning, will, we hope, become a polished piece of legislation that will adequately take care of our post-war highway needs. In the course of the hearings we expect to exhaust every possibility—to explore every reasonable prediction of future transportation needs.

In our consideration of the post-war problem, we may well find that the present system of allocation to the States calls for radical revision. It has been suggested with considerable force that individual cities and counties possessing adequate engineering departments should be treated separately by the Roads Administration. Since many of the most urgently needed improvements are centered in urban areas, it may be that such a plan has sufficient merit to warrant its inclusion in the Highway Act. This problem will unquestionably be considered by the committee.

It should also be pointed out that the legislation now before Congress concerns post-war problems that can reasonably be anticipated in the light of our past and present customs and habits in transportation. It may well be that the coming readjustment will bring with it a completely new set of transportation habits and requirements. We have become air conscious, and we can expect to leave this conflict with a tremendous potential supply of air-transport facilities. In the retooling of industry we must expect drastic changes in all types of transportation. The highway will gain in its importance to the Nation. It must not only keep pace with coming developments in a reborn automotive industry It must be prepared to work hand in hand with the airways and railways of a new economy. Road builders must take on the added responsibility of maintaining and constructing airports, airport access roads, and terminal facilities.

Whatever the future role of roads will be, it is our hope to anticipate it and be prepared for it—to do everything possible, in the legislative sense, to meet the challenge.

The transposition from war to peace will take the best we have in us. The men at the battle front and in the war plants are depending on us to make the victory worth the fight. We at home must not let them down.

The Contribution of Americans of Czechoslovak Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast:

At this time the Voice of America brings you a news commentary in Czech from the United States. This program will be broadcast simultaneously by the Blue Network of the British Broadcasting Corporation, in London, England.

This is America calling Czechoslovakia. This is New York.

VOICE. We, in the United States, do not miss an opportunity to tell the public of your bravery in the struggle against the German invader. American poets mourn the fate of Lidice and a powerful film was shown throughout the country called We Shall Not Die. Just now our people are flocking by the thousands to see a new film called Hangmen Also Die. It tells of the men who killed Heydrich and the whole film is an excellent picture of the courage of your underground workers. It also gives a stark picture of German barbarism, of which the American public needs constant reminders. Czechoslovakia and your fighters at home hold a place of honor in the hearts of Americans.

VOICE. Today we wish to tell you something about how your compatriots in this country fight for America and work for the common cause.

VOICE. American Czechs in Chicago subscribed over $2,000,000 this month toward the cost of a new cruiser for our Navy to replace the *Chicago* which was lost at Guadalcanal. This record places your compatriots at the head of the nationality groups in the country. Americans of Czechoslovak descent have always played an important part in our national life, and in the present war are showing the way to others in their contributions for the defense of America and the reliberation of Czechoslovakia from the yoke of the barbarians.

VOICE. Congressman JOHN MURPHY, of Pennsylvania, just the other day paid tribute to their efforts in a public address. Mr. MURPHY has said:

VOICE. "Americans of Czechoslovak descent who recently presented the United States Government with $31,000 to buy three training planes for cadets, were demonstrating in a concrete way loyalty which they feel to their New World home. Throughout the United States these citizens are giving their time, labor, and money to defend the cause for which the United Nations fight. We know for instance, that in the city of Cleveland Americans of Czechoslovak descent subscribed more than $1,000,000 for war bonds in the month of December. In Pittsburgh they subscribed one-half million dollars, and an equal amount in Baltimore, just after Pearl Harbor; in the small town of Whitting, Ind., $600,000, and the 500 Czech inhabitants of Lidice, Ill., $17,000. The Union of Slovak Women in America has already raised $700,000 to pay for three heavy bombers."

VOICE. This is New York—America—one of the United Nations.

VOICE. Congressman MURPHY then emphasized that in addition to these contributions in dollars, American Czechoslovaks have willingly sacrificed their lifeblood for the common cause, which is as dear to them as their own lives. Many thousands of them are serving in the American Army, Navy, and Air Force.

VOICE. "Among them is plenty of the stuff from which heroes are made. A list too long to enumerate, but here are a few examples. For instance Master Sgt. Anthony Holub received the Distinguished Service Cross for heroism in the Philippines. Jan Liska shot down seven Japanese planes in the South Pacific. Colonel Pazdral, of the United States Air Forces, Sgt. Frank Krajci, who routed a Japanese patrol on Guadalcanal, Karel Ozuku, who flew with General Doolittle in the raid on Tokyo, Sgt. Josef Laza, who won the Air Cross for bravery. I could go on indefinitely naming American heroes of Czech descent: Valach, Bartek, Sech, Petak, Plach, Kment, Kabat, Jurca, Baranik, Urban, Turansky, Jehlik. Those are only a few of the thousands who are fighting for the cause they know is just."

VOICE. At the close of his address Congressman MURPHY mentioned the qualities characteristic of American Czechoslovaks—especially their diligence and intelligence. Among them are doctors, lawyers, judges, authors, as well as workingmen, farmers, and miners. Many of them have taken part in our public life and attained high office. They are among our most loyal citizens, determined to defend the freedom of America and also to free Czechoslovakia.

VOICE. Such words by Congressman MURPHY are fine recognition for your compatriots in this country. Let us add that 60,000 to 70,000 of them now serve in the American Army, Navy, and Air Force. Many of them have won high rank, including 5 generals, 2 admirals, and many other officers. On the home front, American Czechoslovaks have won their place especially in our steel and mining industries—also on our farms.

VOICE. You will be interested to know that the plans for two of the most remarkable bridges in America—Queensboro Bridge and Hell Gate Bridge—were drawn and also car-

ried out by an engineer named Gustav Lidenthal. He was born in Czechoslovakia and educated in the Brno Technic. Czechoslovaks have also won recognition in American cultural life. One could hardly find an orchestra without Czech musicians. The compositions of Antonin Dvorak, especially his New World Symphony, are played daily in our concert halls and radio programs. We hear frequently the modern compositions of Bohuslav Martinu, who is now in New York and winning popularity. Rudolf Firkusny has already won his place in American music. There is any number of Czechoslovak professors in our universities, and we must not forget the Czech Mayor of Chicago, Antonin Cermak, and Louis D. Brandeis, Justice of our Supreme Court.

VOICE. The newspapers in Detroit have just told the story of one of your compatriots, John Kovalcik, a worker in one of our war industries He has five sons in the American Army and two others about to be inducted. Father Kovalcik says that he is too old to fight but is glad that his sons have gone to help rid the world of oppression and want—the same oppression and want from which he fled Europe 33 years ago. He knows the slavery that would be riveted on Europe if Hitler wins this war, and his only thought is to make any necessary sacrifice to prevent America being subject to the same slavery.

VOICE. We told you a moment ago that 500 Czechs and Slovaks in the little town of Lidice, Ill., subscribed $17,000 in War bonds. That was their answer to Hitler's crime. Berlin announced that Lidice, near Kladno, was razed from the face of the earth, and has attempted to erase Czechoslovakia also. That was a mistake, because American Czechoslovaks are now fighting side by side with you in the homeland to build a new world in which the crime of Lidice can never be repeated.

VOICE. When the citizens of the little Illinois town of Stern Park Gardens decided to rename their village Lidice, President Roosevelt sent them this message: "The name of Lidice was to be blotted out of history. Instead of being killed, however, Lidice has come to life again in the broad valley of the Mississippi The name now becomes an everlasting reminder to us that Nazi force cannot destroy either the love of human freedom or the courage to defend it."

West Coast Forest Fires Could Screen Jap Attacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED NORMAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter which my Washington State colleagues, Mr. HORAN and Mr. HOLMES, and myself have recently sent to the Senate Appropriations Committee urging that it at least triple the funds presently provided in the Agriculture Department appropriations bill for forest-fire protection during the next fiscal year.

I urge the Members of this House to take the time to glance over this letter, because we three Washington Members feel that it points up a problem that, during this coming summer, may become one of the most serious problems which ever faced a nation at war. Anyone familiar with the west coast realizes the horrible danger of forest fires raging up and down the vast expanse of big woods which now are playing so vital a part in our war effort. On the west coast, too, they realize that the Japs would like nothing better than a chance to spread thousands of incendiary bombs through thi precious timber during the summer dry season. And also, among other things, I believe they realize that under the cover of the smoke and confusion resulting from a coastwise forest fire the Japs might find their long-sought opportunity to attack in force upon our home shores.

The letter follows:

MAY 5, 1943.

Hon. CARTER GLASS, *Chairman,*
Senate Appropriations Committee,
United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, the three Republican Representatives from the State of Washington, do hereby respectfully urge your committee to increase the agricultural appropriations bill item for forest-fire protection from the present amount of some $2,500,000 to at least the total appropriated for last year, or some $8,500,000.

We believe that the menace of forest fires, especially because of the strong possibility—even probability—that the Japs will attempt to incendiary bomb our forests this summer, is to be feared much more this year than last year. We know that the west coast generally shares our fear of this. Yet, despite such fears, the appropriation for this vital protection is currently set at less than one-third the total appropriated in and for the fiscal year ending this June.

As you know, the Budget Bureau this year recommended that some $4,000,000 be included in the agricultural appropriations bill for fighting forest fires cooperatively with the several States. However, the House Appropriations Committee slashed this sum by $1,500,000. We believe that this $4,000,000 item for cooperative forest-fire fighting should be fully restored to the bill by your committee.

In addition, as you know, the House bill failed to include any funds for emergency forest fire protection. The Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942 carried $4,551,000 for such fire protection. These funds will be exhausted by June 30 of this year. Thus far, there has been no action looking to restoration of this sum for emergency forest fire protection in 1943. We believe that the $4,551,000 should be added to the Agricultural Appropriations bill now before your committee to insure adequate emergency protection of our forests, and therefore respectfully urge that your committee do include this sum in the bill.

As the bill now stands, only about $2,500,000 is included for fighting forest fires. We believe that adequate protection of our forests this year will require at least three times this amount.

In urging this increase, we would like to point out that, despite the efforts of our armed forces to date, the Japs still are on the islands of Attu and Kiska, and according to reports, have been able to expand and consolidate their holdings.

They are extending an airfield from which it is conceivable, and even probable, that their bombers can fly over the forests of Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska, and British Columbia. We ask you to visualize the terrible conflagration which might result if these Jap bombers, during the height of the forest fire season this coming summer, should spread a trail of incendiary bombs through the vast wooded stretches of our Pacific coast. The very mention of such a possibility is dreadful enough to horrify the Nation.

We would like to emphasize that unless adequate forest fire fighting funds are made available very soon, these Jap incendiaries, borne from Kiska and Attu and possibly even from carriers off our north Pacific coast, may "burn out" the previous forests, may seriously hamper our entire war effort, and may even provide a literal smoke screen for enemy attacks in force on our continent.

We respectfully assert that this Nation cannot afford to take any changes with its forests this summer—that we cannot afford to gamble on whether the possibilities outlined above may become terrible reality when the woods of the west coast become tinder dry this summer. We believe it is the duty of the Congress, and of your committee, to immediately insure adequate forest fire protection.

Unless that is done, we may soon see the dreadful day when a smoke pall, greater and more dense than ever visualized before, darkens the sky the length and breadth of our west coast States—a blanket so thick and wide as to blind our defending air force to attack attempts of the enemy.

And we may see whole cities destroyed or abandoned because of this conflagration; we may see thousands made homeless, and many killed; we may see our great west coast war plants crippled and stilled; and, worst of all, we may hear, as the direct result of such a coastwise fire, the tramp of yellow invaders on our home soil.

Considering these possibilities, we feel your committee cannot and should not do otherwise than at least triple the forest fire fighting funds for 1943.

Respectfully yours,

HON. WALT HORAN,
Fifth Washington District.
HON. HAL HOLMES,
Fourth Washington District.
HON. FRED NORMAN,
Third Washington District.

The Reciprocal Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of April 27, 1943:

THE RECIPROCAL TREATIES

A storm brews in the United States Senate over the extension of reciprocal trade treaties. Existing authority for the treaties expires on June 12. Nor will the issue be whether the authority for the treaties shall be extended but whether the Senate shall have veto authority.

Some extravagant things are being said on both sides. On the administration side, for instance, that not to lodge in the administration full authority for the effectuating of the treaties will be construed by the United Nations as a weakening of American support of the war. On the Senate side, that the demand of the administration to handle the trade treaties without back-reference to the Senate is a symbol of absolutism and an evidence of the substitution of bureaucracy for democracy.

But there is no reason why the controversy should not be resolved into reality. The simple and literal question is whether the Senate ought to retain control in the detail of administrative operation. Reciprocal trade treaties are not treaties so much as working agreements. The setting of the policy that permits these working agreements is a proper congressional function. To retain a veto authority over details would greatly enlarge the privileges of political interference and, by creating unsureness of final results, practically nullify the effectiveness of the State Department in negotiating the trade agreements.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM M. RUSSELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, on the 27th day of January 1943 I introduced a bill, which is No. 1548, to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to our men in the armed forces. In introducing that bill I was sincere and felt that for the best interest of the men who are giving their all, we should give them this protection.

The mothers and fathers of the boys who are fighting on every battle front for democracy, decency, honesty, and civilization have been solemnly promised that every moral shield of protection would be thrown around them in their service to our country. Yet, even up to this date nothing has been done, or is being done, about it.

It is a sad spectacle when you can see men in the uniform of our country upon the streets, on the trains, in the cafes and hotels, and in other public places under the influence of intoxicating liquors. They are disgracing the uniform they wear, and we do nothing about it. On the other hand, we have encouraged it by legalizing and permitting the sale of these damnable products to these fine, young Americans.

All the other countries who are engaged in this total war have taken some steps to prohibit the sale and use of intoxicating liquors as a beverage, still we remain in the rear and permit King Booze to win its battle over our forces. Our responsibility is grave on this matter, and we, as a Christian Nation, cannot allow these young men who have been taken away from their Christian homes, most of whom have been drafted into the service of our country, to be surrounded by a vicious and demoralizing environment, nor can we leave anything undone which will protect them from unhealthy and immoral influences and other forms of temptations.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels, in 1917, in discussing a law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors to our soldiers, made this statement:

There lies upon us morally, to a degree far outreaching any technical responsibility, the duty of leaving nothing undone to protect our young men from that contamination of their bodies which will not only impair their military efficiency, but will blast their lives for the future and return them to their homes a source of danger to their families and to the community at large.

Mr. Speaker, since introducing my bill I have received petitions signed by thousands of the best citizens of our country asking that this bill be made a law. It is a law that President Woodrow Wilson advocated and immediately procured in World War No. 1, in the year 1917. One of these petitions is signed by Mr. M. M. Logan and 44 others of Dublin, Tex. Another is signed by Mr. J. Fred Cole and 52 other 100-percent American citizens of El Paso, Tex. I also received a petition which is signed by Mr. L. L. Evans and 140 other citizens of El Paso, and still another petition from that same city, signed by Mr. Andrew Byers and 26 other El Paso citizens. I have also received thousands of letters from people living in Maine to California, from Canada to Texas, and from Washington to Florida, advocating and petitioning that this Congress pass a law that will have the same effect as H. R. 1548.

It is my hope and my desire that this Congress soon will realize the seriousness of this situation and arouse to pass this very much needed legislation in the protection of our boys, in the protection of our country, and in the protection of our homes.

Stalin's Sweet Note

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New World of New York, entitled "Stalin's Sweet Note," which appeared Friday, May 7, 1943:

STALIN'S SWEET NOTE

Stalin's billet doux to Ralph Parker, of the New York Times, and his assertion that he "unquestionably" desires to see a strong and independent Poland, on the foundation of solid good neighborly relations and mutual respect, eventually on a mutual alliance of assistance against the Germans, reminds us of a striking similarity between Stalin's and Hitler's methods.

Hitler is used to abrogate treaties at will—so does Stalin.

Hitler invaded his neighbors without warning or the formality of a declaration of war—so did Stalin.

Hitler conducted plebiscites in conquered lands—so did Stalin.

Hitler wants a new order in Europe—so does Stalin.

Hitler wants nothing but lebensraum—so does Stalin; just lebensraum.

Hitler's right is his army, his military power, and ruthlessness—so is Stalin's.

Hitler exterminates those who oppose him—so does Stalin.

Hitler desires to be the patron of other nations, by force and threat—so does Stalin.

Hitler wants nazi-ism as an international religion—Stalin wants the religion of communism.

Hitler's social and political platform is based on hatred—so is Stalin's.

Hitler fights and murders to conquer but claims to want peace—so does Stalin. Nothing but peace.

OUR ALLY AND OTHER ALLIES

We have stated before that Russia's note to Poland was a challenge not only to Poland but to all the Allied Nations.

Today we are adding: To the neutrals and satellites of Hitler as well.

While Rumania, Hungary, Slovakia, and other countries were until now reluctant to aid Hitler against Russia, while Turkey and Sweden, or Spain and Portugal were biding their time, because the sentiment and hopes of the people were for the Allies, today the sentiment and hopes of these peoples have changed since they see not an Allied victory but a Russian domination of Europe, which is not a very attractive substitute.

WHAT HAS RUSSIA TO OFFER?

It is no secret that the Communist blessing amounts to starvation and death of millions and to prisons and concentration camps filled with victims of oppression.

Not one of the four or other freedoms exists there—neither freedom of religion, the press or assembly, or from want or fear.

What does Russia offer that should be attractive to any people in Europe?

Military might. That is the only argument, the only reason.

But Europe is far from pinning her hopes and future on the might of arms. Quite the opposite is true.

A PEACE OFFENSIVE?

Joe Stalin reminds us today of old John D. Rockefeller, who used to distribute shining dimes to the children of his neighbors.

After refusing to cooperate with her allies, after having built a second front in England and America, after refusing to join our President and Churchill at Casablanca, after using the "second front" propaganda to turn the peoples against their governments and toward the Kremlin, after having accused America and England of deserting Russia and compelling her to fight without assistance, after having accused Poland of cooperation with Hitler, after ignoring the existence of allies and conducting a preparatory policy of inside destruction in Poland, Yugoslavia, France, etc.—Stalin praised America and England, like old John D. Rockefeller, distributing freely compliments. American and English journalists almost choked with joy. Hear ye, hear ye. Stalin praised us.

THE SWEET NOTE

Now comes a sweet note given to the correspondent of the New York Times.

It says that Stalin wants an independent Poland.

How nice, how gracious.

A strong one, too. One-half will be strong under Stalin's rule, the other will be very strong—provided. Yes, conditional surrender. It has to be under the influence, protection and guidance of Stalin's democracy. To share the physical and spiritual misery of millions who suffer unspeakably under the regime of the Red Gestapo.

TWO STYLES

There are evidently two styles in Stalin's arsenal of communism: one as displayed in the note to Poland, the other used in his correspondence with the representative of the Times.

Neither will fool all the people all the time.

Nor will the fact that anti-Nazi films here gave way to Mission to Moscow, nor will the condescending hoped for acceptance of Stalin of an invitation to meet the President.

OUR REPLY

1. The relationship between Poland and Russia will depend on the will of both peoples—not of Stalin or Sikorski.

2. The relationship between all the peoples in Europe and over the world will be a matter of a deep moral evolution and of the ultimate victory of democracy over dictatorships of any kind. It will depend on the course of events and the shape of the world around them after the war.

3. The victory of all the Allies will finally and forever remove the German threat to the peace and happiness of the world. This will be and is the job and purpose of all the Allies. Fear of Germany will destroy all reasons and arguments for "strategic safety" to be gained by the subjugation of neighboring countries by "powers."

4. Europe will not submit to Russian or Anglo-Russian domination. Neither England nor Russia have given good accounts of themselves as protectors.

5. Russia is a very recent and accidental ally in our common fight against Germany. She is entitled to receive all the military and economic assistance but that does in no way establish Russia as a dictating ally.

6. The wave of idolatry and the penetration of Communist, well organized, units into every factory, office, and instrument of public opinion here is as harmful as the German fifth column was in Europe.

7. The successful war waged by Russia against Germany is welcome and deserves all the recognition it gets—but exaggerated ballyhoo and false claims that it is conducted solely to save the lives of American boys is as destructive and harmful as the propaganda for a second front conducted by Stalinites in America.

8. A tacit admission that we must flatter Russia out of fear that she may yet make peace with Hitler or Hirohito equals the whipping of public opinion, of American dignity and realism into a Munich fever which undermines the morale and consciousness of Americans.

9. The propagated fear to criticise anything that Stalin does has created a temperature of hyprocrisy and submission which may prove to be more harmful than it is apparent.

10. Russia should be helped—but should be informed now that she is only one of many elements of an allied commonwealth, equal and not ruling, interdependent and not isolated, responsible to the democratic world and not irresponsible.

We hope that the Polish Government will properly react to the new bait in rejecting faith in Stalin's words but in demanding her share of rights from all the other allies as an equal—if not most deserving—partner.

P. P. YOLLES.

Politics and Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Portland (Maine) Press-Herald of April 27, 1943:

POLITICS AND TRADE

The demand of some of the Republicans in the Congress that the administration accept a partisan amendment to the reciprocal-trade agreement legislation as the price of congressional approval is shrewd trading. In our opinion it is not good sense. It is political finagling; an effort to crowd down upon the administration in an attempt to force restoration of the power of the Congress.

Senator MCNARY suggests that immediate ratification of Secretary Hull's trade pacts will be forthcoming if the Congress is given the veto power over any one of them to which it now or subsequently may find objection.

The danger in this proposal is manifest. It tosses into the political cauldron every agreement made with a foreign country; it warns every country in advance that any agreement which it is disposed to make in good faith with our Government may without warning be brought up for hostile review at the behest of any Republican (or Democratic) irreconcilable; it thus precludes the possibility of entering into a contract of validity, and destroys confidence in its value while at the same time it whittles down the influence and prestige of the Department of State.

It is admitted by fair-minded students of government and economics that the old tariff-wall days are and ought to be a thing of the past. The old high protection is now recognized as part and parcel of a discredited isolationism. The answer, it is rather generally conceded, is to give tariff protection only where it is really needed, and only in return for trade advantage that will benefit us as well as the giver. That is all that Mr. Hull's trade agreements have sought to do. They have for the most part worked well. They will be more necessary henceforth than in the past.

Obviously, a trade pact that can be brought up for examination by the Congress after it has been written is not a pact at all. Equally obvious, this power of reexamination could be invoked by or in behalf of some infant industry; and inasmuch as one trade agreement may be written to supplement another in a nicely balanced harmony of economics, disturbance of one agreement could disrupt the entire plexus of agreements upon which our international trade is founded.

As to how Senator MCNARY would review the trade agreements, if ever, there might be no complaint. But there is no dodging the plain fact that this proposal introduces domestic politics into foreign relations. This has always been dangerous as a procedure. In the winning of the war and in post-war trade it could be menacing, permitting the United States to cut the throat of a foreign nation with one hand while it smoothed its brow with the other.

Secretary Hull has labored diligently, and for the most part successfully, to bring order and propriety into our economic relations with other countries. To permit him to continue along a well-marked and successful course only upon conditions that anything he does may within a month or two be upset is about as unwise a proposal as has yet been offered. No private business could survive if its contractual power were made thus susceptible to challenge and to destruction. No more could the Federal business of contracting for trade advantage survive. To adopt Senator MCNARY'S proposal seems to us like a first step, and a big one, back into an isolationism that is hopelessly discredited.

Real Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard many, many times on the floor of this House words of righteous indignation against unwarranted strikes and stoppages. Too seldom do we have brought to our attention the acts of real patriotism by the many thousands of real honest-to-God Americans composing the ranks of labor as a whole. I am more than proud to call to the attention of the House the great contribution of a small group of men and women composing the operatives of our bus system in my city of Charleston, S. C. I would to God there were many more men and women constituted as they are. They had it in their power to disrupt the transportation of over 26,000 navy-yard workers. They had it in their power to disrupt and delay the tranquil operation of as many other war plants in my part of the country. They elected not to exercise this power. They had a contract that expired. They had a contract which hardly paid them a living wage. Their company wanted to pay them more, and realized it was only fair to do so. They had no promise of any increase in wages. They were turned down by the War Labor Board. They were turned down by an Executive order of the President. They had every reason to feel that they were not receiving a fair deal from their Government. Above all, they had a leader and a membership of real Americans. Their leader, W. M. Eubanks, has grown with Charleston and with his company. His colleagues have faith in him. He has faith in his country. He advised his people to keep faith with his country. His people followed him. He is my friend. His colleagues are my friends. Today my heart is proud that I can tell the Nation of the great debt I and my whole State and Nation owe to so few. My daily paper, the News and Courier, has written an editorial to the fine spirit of these bus operatives. I am proud to enclose it herewith for the Nation to read. It is a tribute to real American labor:

BUSMEN STAY ON THE JOB

The loyalty and restraint exhibited by the bus drivers of the South Carolina Power Co. in the negotiations for a new wage scale are in such contrast with labor relations in some other parts of the country as to merit a special word of commendation.

Instead of attempting to force a decision when the terms of a new contract were held up by the Government, the bus drivers remained on the job and submitted their case to orderly and legal channels. As a result, transportation for the Charleston Navy Yard, the port of embarkation, and other military installations, not to mention ordinary civilian service, was not interrupted, except for a slight delay one morning when a meeting lasted longer than anticipated and the drivers were late returning to the job.

The contract between the local union and the power company expired January 31, and representatives of the two groups reached a mutually satisfactory agreement on February 4. It called for an increase in base pay for experienced drivers (employed for a year or more) of 15 cents an hour, from 65 to 80 cents. The terms were forwarded to the Columbia wage and hour office, and from there to the War Labor Board office in Atlanta.

No word was received until April 26, when a War Labor Board order reached Charleston dated April 7 (1 day before the President's hold-the-line directive). The War Labor Board granted only a 10-cent raise, fixing the top hourly rate at 75 cents, which was not satisfactory to the bus drivers. They telegraphed Washington urging a quick review of the case, with the endorsement of the power company, which was ready and willing to pay the higher wage.

W. F. Ponder, Labor Department conciliator, came here and the drivers agreed to continue working temporarily on the 75-cent wage while their petition for review is pending.

The 175 bus drivers, of whom about 40 are women, showed by their actions that they appreciate the importance of continuing service in this busy war-production area, and made no move that might jeopardize the steady flow of business. They are submitting to the established rules of labor negotiation. Like everybody else in total war, they have a job to do, and they are doing it.

The Case for the Coal Miner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, we have been reading a great deal and everyone has been talking about the present coal situation. Certain individuals have seen fit to question the loyalty and patriotism of the coal miners.

This, Mr. Speaker, is not the truth.

I am not claiming that I have ever worked in the coal mines, but I was born on top of the mines in a coal-mining section, and I know and grew up among the miners of western Maryland. Our coal miners are of English, Welsh, Irish, German, Italian, and Scotch descent, and a great many of them are of the second and third generation. The coal miner of today is the veteran of World War No. 1. His sons and the members of his family are going willingly to war in defense of their country.

The coal miner is a patriotic, law-abiding citizen and he wants to help the United States, his country, to win the war. All he asks of his country and his employer is that he be given the right to earn a living to support his family, and receive a fair compensation for the work he is willing and only too glad to do.

The miner agreed to work 6 days a week in order to bring up the production of coal, but it is rare that they get a 5-day week the year around. Late last fall, Mr. Ickes found he needed increased coal production, and asked the miners to agree to a 6-day week. They did, with time and a half for the sixth day.

The operators agreed with the proviso that the O. P. A. lift the ceiling price on coal to cover the increased labor costs. This was done, adding 13.5 cents per ton to the consumer's price in some of the coal districts. Should not the miner get his share?

In one instance of which I know, the coal operator has been working his mines 6 days a week but the individual miner has been working only on the average of 4 days a week. When the operator was asked why he did not work the miners 6 days, he said he was staggering them in order to give everyone employment. Now, in this particular instance, this operator is actually hoarding labor. He admits that he has too many miners, but, being selfish, he will not release 20 or 25 percent of the men and let them seek employment elsewhere.

Consequently the miner, being frozen in his job by Executive order, must content himself by working 4 days a week and being idle 3 days. The same miner would be willing and only too glad to serve his country and work the full week.

If given his release, the miner could seek employment in some other defense industry and give the full 6 days in producing war essentials.

In attempting to place the blame for the recent discussion, let us get the true facts before we condemn a hard-working, patriotic American citizen.

Let us remember that the War Labor Board—the operator—and every one in authority knew the wage agreement would expire on March 31, and the miner had a right to expect that he would be given an equitable contract.

All the coal miner asks is what every other citizen has a right to ask—the right to work to support his family, the right to produce and receive a fair day's wage for his effort.

Farmers and Consumers Left on the Outside Looking In

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMPTON P. FULMER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that the days will not be many before I, along with the members of my committee, may be permitted to appear before the House Rules Committee for the purpose of securing favorable consideration of House Joint Resolution 38, which has for its purpose a thorough investigation of the marketing and distributing of farm products.

It is my purpose to make a thorough investigation in the various areas from every angle from the producer to the ultimate consumer, with the hope of getting a real picture of the serious situation not only confronting farmers and consumers but the operations of the price-fixing outfit during the duration.

As a matter of fact, this is really the major problem confronting farmers as well as consumers.

The manner in which farm products are marketed and distributed is not only wasteful and expensive both to farmers and consumers, but it is going to be impossible for the O. P. A. to administer price fixing properly under the present wasteful and expensive marketing system.

I am inserting herewith copy of letter addressed to Hon. Chester Davis, Food Administrator, signed by Mr. C. A. Hawkins, who operates a farm in California, which clearly indicates what is happening and the seriousness of the situation at this time, when an increased production of food is so necessary, not only in winning the war, but in winning a world peace:

APRIL 25, 1943.

Hon. CHESTER DAVIS,
Food Administrator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing chambers of commerce at Washington, New York, Boston, Detroit, Minneapolis, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Columbus as per copy enclosed.

Apparently associations of vegetable dealers and brokers controlling markets by collusive methods will only take vegetables on consignment, which they sell at auction or to each other, netting the farmers less than production costs with present high-priced, inefficient larbor, while consumers pay high prices.

After shipping this carload, I invited the public to pick remaining 400 acres free. See enclosed newspaper clipping. Thousands responded and tramped down what they did not pick. I am now plowing in the vines with about one-half the crop unpicked.

The carload en route cost me $4 a hamper f. o. b. Fresno.

Thousands of vegetable farmers are in a similar situation. They need basement prices, including all costs and some profit.

Suggest investigation middlemen's methods. The efforts of the Attorney General to control those methods have been ineffective.

Factory laborers now enjoying two to three hundred percent wage increases, with only about 25 percent increase in living costs, and threatening to strike if farm prices are made adequate, will go hungry along with the rest of the country unless food production is maintained by adequate prices to the growers.

Very truly yours,

C. A. HAWKINS.

Mr. Speaker, I am also inserting a copy of letter just addressed to Hon. Prentiss Brown giving the real facts in connection with the operations of the price-fixing outfit, which should prove to be of deep interest to Members of Congress, as well as the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am wondering how long those in authority propose to take care of everyone with fixed prices, including profits at the expense of the farmers and consumers of this country.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1943.

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Director, Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BROWN: The operation of your administration, along with practically every other agency connected with our war effort, is very interesting when it comes to the deep interest on the part of those con-

nected with your organization in working out ceiling prices.

I notice, on May 4, you issued a specific dollar-and-cents ceiling price on pulpwood produced in South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida. The f. o. b. car or barge price on Southern Pine is $6.80 per cord. However, nothing has been done to break up the hog-tied, monopolistic purchasing program on the part of the pulp and paper mills wherein they are permitted to designate areas and contract with an agent for the purchase of pulpwood from each of these areas. These agents proceed to make contracts with subcontractors, and after everybody connected therewith has been taken care of, the independent landowner and farmer secures for his pulpwood, sold on a unit basis of 160 cubic feet, whatever is left.

The thing that I am deeply interested in is that those connected with your outfit do not operate this way when it affects those who are engaged in business other than the operating of a farm. For instance, at this time farmers operating as individuals have to accept, in practically all cases, whatever they are offered for their farm products. However, after these products pass out of the hands of the farmers, every type of middleman is taken care of by a definite fixed price with a profit. To take care of all of these middlemen, many of whom do not produce a living thing, so as to be able to cut the extremely high price to the ultimate consumer, brought about because of the manner in which farm products are marketed and distributed, you are now proposing to pay subsidies to everybody except farmers, so that, as stated, each handler of the product will "get his."

Some time ago I received a letter from Mr. Henderson, who was at the head of the Office of Price Administration at that time, concerning the price of cottonseed and the products manufactured out of cottonseed. The ceiling price placed on cottonseed oil, including the cost of crushing cottonseed, which was actually and definitely fixed for the cottonseed-oil crushing mills, was supposed to give to farmers an opportunity of selling their cottonseed at $50 per ton. However, as usual, they were left out in the open without a definite fixed price and cottonseed last fall sold anywhere from $35 to $47 per ton, with the cottonseed buyer's commission actually fixed.

Now, when it comes to the cottonseed-oil crushing mills selling cottonseed meal, let's see what happened. The mills had a fixed price including a profit, and there was a fixed price for everyone handling cottonseed meal between the cottonseed crushing mill and the actual farmer who either purchased this meal for fertilizer or for feeding livestock. I am quoting from the price bulletin:

	Carload lots	Less-than-carload lots
Oil mill's maximum price under Commodity Credit Corporation contract of not more than	$35.50	$38.50
And if bagged, not to exceed, additional	3.50	3.50
To which the wholesaler can add his maximum margin of	2.50	2.50
And the jobber could add his maximum margin of	.50	.50
And the retailer add his maximum margin of	5.50	5.50
Totaling	[1] 47.50	[1] 50.50

[1] Plus freight.

Or, if the retailer buys direct from the processor, under the present language of Office of Price Administration's amendment 81, conceivably he might add his own margin ($5.50) as well as that of the wholesaler ($2.50) and the jobbers (50 cents), totaling $8.50 plus freight, and not to exceed $3.50 for bags.

What I would like to know is: Was there any arrangement made whereby farmers would be able to sell their pulpwood direct to the pulp and paper mills at $6.80 free on board cars, and whether or not pulp and paper mills will accept shipment from farmers at this price?

Production of food and fiber has to come from the farmer, and it would appear to me that because of the serious situation confronting the country as well as our war effort at this time, which is growing worse as the days go by, that those in authority and those who are responsible for the administration of the various war agencies should come to the conclusion that the only way to get the proper amount of raw material, food, and fiber during this great emergency is to definitely fix farm prices as a bottom price in fixing price ceilings, with proper differentials from the bottom on up with the various groups connected therewith. If this is not done, I can assure you that we are not going to get proper production, proper distribution, and a successful operation of the Office of Price Administration.

With all good wishes, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

H. P. FULMER,
Chairman.

Rulings of the National War Labor Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in order to call the attention of my colleagues in the House to what is happening to American industry as a direct result of the rulings of the National War Labor Board, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of a letter that paints the picture of what is happening much more clearly than I can paint it. I recommend your serious consideration of the facts contained in this letter because they plainly prove the need for legislative action to prevent such restrictions being forced upon American industry at a time when its entire strength and energy is needed in the war effort. The letter follows:

JOHNS-MANVILLE CORPORATION,
New York, N. Y., April 29, 1943.

Mr. WILLIAM H. DAVIS,
Chairman, National War Labor Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: The manager of the Johns-Manville factory at Waukegan, Ill., has received telegrams dated April 22 and 23 from Mr. Henry Meyer, of the National War Labor Board, which indicate that you will order the company to grant, at this plant, a general wage increase of 2½ cents per hour, retroactive to September 5, 1942, and will also order a maintenance of union membership, together with the voluntary check off of union dues.

The order itself has not been received, but on the basis of the facts set forth in the telegrams, I feel it necessary to reiterate to the Board the company's position and to present my patriotic reaction to this whole affair.

We will, of course, put through promptly the pay increases to our employees if the Board's order coincides with the preliminary notification just received. Our main concern is not wit' the payment of $100,000 called for by the retroactive order, or the $150,000 annual increase to the pay roll of this plant. The danger here is to the public, because four-fifths of these sums will be taken out of what we now pay in taxes and must therefore be made up out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the country.

Our fear of such an order is that it would be another step toward the certain ruin of inflation. Our position in opposing the increase has been based entirely on our sincere attempts to cooperate with the Government in its efforts to head off inflation. In so doing we have felt that we have been performing a service for the Nation and for the future of our employees. As you know, it is most difficult for any group of individuals to understand why an immediate increase in pay is not to their ultimate advantage.

As a matter of background, I believe the Board is acquainted with the company's consistent efforts over a period of years to encourage wholesome employer-employee relations. We have long practiced collective bargaining. Our policy on this subject was clearly stated in writing almost 5 years ago and sent to all of our employees.

The records show that at the Waukegan plant, the Federal Labor Union, No. 19508, American Federation of Labor, and the company have been for a number of years handling their problems in an orderly manner around the conference table without resort to drastic action on the part of either side.

The present matters at issue were raised in May 1942, almost a year ago, under the terms of our labor agreement.

You have the record and therefore are familiar with the course of the case at the Waukegan plant. There have been more than 11 months of meetings, conferences, and hearings with Commissioners of Conciliation, panels, War Labor Board mediators, and others. During this entire period, the positions of the company and the union have remained unmodified.

The major issues, as you know, are these:

The union wishes a general wage increase and a form of the closed shop.

As to the wage question:

Sometime after President Roosevelt first appealed to the Nation to hold wages and prices in line to prevent inflation, and in order to assist the country in its efforts to stop inflation, I instituted a company policy that we would not make general price increases nor would we make general wage increases, unless ordered to do so by the Government. On June 15, 1942, in a letter setting forth our policy, I said:

"Because the free American system is no longer functioning under this planned economy made necessary by war, it is not possible for us to pursue our normal course of action in running the business. In addition, we cannot take any action that is not in line with Government policy. If we act independently of others in changing wages, for instance, we may start a wave of increases which is really against the interest of all the people of America who want to prevent inflation and further increases in the cost of living. In the end if prices continue to rise, every citizen will have to pay the added costs in taxes."

Average straight time wage rates at our Waukegan plant have been increased 23 percent in the period specified by the National War Labor Board Little Steel yardstick, which sets 15 percent as the standard limit.

Average weekly earnings or "take home" are about $41 per week, an increase of more than 46 percent in the same period.

Wages are not substandard and are in line with other comparable industries in Waukegan, Ill.

In the face of these facts, as stated in considerable detail to representatives of your Board on numerous occasions; in the face of the War Labor Board mediator's recommendation that no increase in wages is warranted; and in the face of President Roosevelt's most recent order issued on April 8, to hold the line against inflation, I can only draw the conclusion from your telegram dated April 22 that you have determined to relinquish the fight against inflation by breaking through your own formula. Since such seems to be the case, I believe the country

at large should be informed that you have determined to scrap the Little Steel formula, and that it is no longer in effect.

This matter is too vital to the welfare of the country to go unpublished. Johns-Manville, for example, has 9 other cases involving similar issues pending before your Board and many other industries, as well as the public, must prepare to fortify themselves against the advance of inflation that would result from the general application of such a decision.

If you seek to justify this indicated decision on the basis of correcting an inequality, inflation will be given a most uncontrollable impetus. Facts can be sought out for almost any case to indicate inequalities and after such changes have been made, additional inequalities are created. There can be no way to hold the line against inflation on this basis and the people of the country should know this.

This particular instance will have no effect on our policy of not asking for general price increases above the present ceilings. It must be emphasized, however, that a continuation and extension of the Board's indicated policy on wages may compel us to abandon what I consider a patriotic position which would be impossible to maintain.

As to the issue involving the closed shop:

I believe you are acquainted with the company's consistent policy of opposition to the closed shop and check-off or any form of these measures of compulsory unionism. Our policy was first published for the benefit of employees almost 10 years ago and events since that time have not given us any reason to relax from our position, but rather to adhere more strongly to it. In a booklet directed to employees, I stated:

"The closed shop does not involve wages, hours of work, or working conditions. But it does force an employee to belong to a particular union and be certified by the union office as a union employee in good standing to keep his job and requires us to discharge him if he quits that particular union or if the union cancels his membership.

"It should not be Johns-Manville's or any other employer's business to make that decision for an employee."

The maintenance of membership provisions include the basic principles of the closed shop.

Johns-Manville is working at capacity to produce goods for the war effort and will continue to do so under any circumstances and to the best of our ability.

If, as the telegrams we have received indicate, maintenance of membership is ordered, I wish you to know that we accept it only as a dictatorial war measure imposed upon us, and one to which we will submit only under the disciplines of war and will regard as applicable only for the period of war.

Yours very truly,

LEWIS H. BROWN,
President.

Rhode Island General Assembly Endorses the Declaration of the Federation of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include the following joint resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island at its January session, A. D., 1943, and approved by the Governor on April 22, 1943:

House Joint Resolution 857

Joint resolution providing for a declaration of the federation of the world

Whereas it is necessary at the present juncture of human affairs to enlarge the bases of organized society by establishing a government for the community of nations, in order to preserve civilization and enable mankind to live in peace and be free, the following principles and objectives are hereby enunciated in the declaration of the federation of the world.

Man, the source of all political authority, is a manifold political being. He is a citizen of several communities: the city, the state, the nation, and the world. To each of these communities he owes inalienable obligations and from each he receives enduring benefits.

Communities may exist for a time without being incorporated, but, under the stress of adversity, they disintegrate unless legally organized. Slowly but purposefully through the centuries civilization has united the world, integrating its diverse local interests and creating an international community that now embraces every region and every person on the globe. This community has no government, and communities without governments perish. Either this community must succumb to anarchy or submit to the restraints of law and order.

Governments can only be established through the deliberate efforts of men. At this hour two elemental forces are struggling to organize the international community: totalitarianism and democracy. The former, a recent version of repudiated militarism and tyranny, is predicated upon the principle of compulsion, rules through dictatorship and enslaves men; the latter, a proved bulwark of the rights of man as a human being and as a citizen, derives its authority from the consent of the governed, embodies the will of freemen and renders their collective judgments supreme in human affairs. The corner stone of totalitarianism is the ethnographic state, whose restricted interests define the scope of its favors; the foundation of democracy is man, whose integrity is inviolable and whose welfare is its primary concern. The motivating power of the former is violence; of the latter, freedom. One feeds upon unscrupulous ambition; the other upon an enlightened sense of obligation.

One or the other of these forces will now triumph and govern mankind. The present conflict is irrepressible and decisive. It is the challenge of the ages to the generation of today, and represents those spiritually cosmic forces which visit the world at critical periods in human history to shape the destinies of men. This world cannot remain half slave, half free; half totalitarian, half democratic. The laws of civilized society prevent intercourse between slaves and freemen from being either congenial or profitable. If totalitarianism wins this conflict, the world will be rules and tyrants, and individuals will be slaves. If democracy wins, the nations of the earth will be united in a commonwealth of free peoples, and individuals, wherever found, will be the sovereign units of the new world order.

Man has struggled from time immemorial to endow the individual with certain fundamental rights whose very existence is now imperiled. Among those rights is man's freedom to worship, speak, write, assemble, and vote without arbitrary interference. To safeguard these liberties as a heritage for the human race, governments were instituted among men, with constitutional guaranties against the despotic exercise of political authority, such as provided by elected parliaments, trial by jury, habeas corpus, and due process of law. Man must now either consolidate his historic rights or lose them for generations to come.

The ceaseless changes wrought in human society by science, industry, and economics, as well as by the spiritual, social, and intellectual forces which impregnate all cultures, make political and geographical isolation of nations hereafter impossible. The organic life of the human race is at last indissolubly unified and can never be severed, but it must be politically ordained and made subject to law. Only a government capable of discharging all the functions of sovereignty in the executive, legislative, and judicial spheres can accomplish such a task. Civilization now requires laws, in the place of treaties, as instruments to regulate commerce between peoples. The intricate conditions of modern life have rendered treaties ineffectual and obsolete, and made laws essential and inevitable. The age of treaties is dead; the age of laws is here.

Governments, limited in their jurisdiction to local geographical areas, can no longer satisfy the needs or fulfill the obligations of the human race. Just as feudalism served its purpose in human history and was superseded by nationalism, so has nationalism reached its apogee in this generation and yielded its hegemony in the body politic to internationalism. The first duty of government is to protect life and property, and when governments cease to perform this function, they capitulate on the fundamental principle of their raison d'etre. Nationalism, moreover, is no longer able to preserve the political independence or the territorial integrity of nations, as recent history so tragically confirms. Sovereignty is an ideological concept without geographical barriers. It is better for the world to be ruled by an international sovereignty of reason, social justice, and peace than by diverse national sovereignties organically incapable of preventing their own dissolution by conquest. Mankind must pool its resources of defense if civilization is to endure.

History has revealed but one principle by which free peoples, inhabiting extensive territories, can unite under one government without impairing their local autonomy. That principle is federation, whose virtue preserves the whole without destroying its parts and strengthens its parts without jeopardizing the whole. Federation vitalizes all nations by endowing them with security and freedom to develop their respective cultures without menace of foreign domination. It regards as sacrosanct man's personality, his rights as an individual and as a citizen, and his role as a partner with all other men in the common enterprise of building civilization for the benefit of mankind. It suppresses the crime of war by reducing to the ultimate minimum the possibility of its occurrence. It renders unnecessary the further paralyzing expenditure of wealth for belligerent activity, and cancels through the ages the mortgages of war against the fortunes and services of men. It releases the full energies, intelligence, and assets and society for creative, ameliorative, and redemptive work on behalf of humanity. It recognizes man's morning vision of his destiny as an authentic potentiality. It apprehends the entire human race as one family, human beings everywhere as brothers, and all nations as component parts of an indivisible community.

There is no alternative to the federation of all nations except endless war. No substitute for the federation of the world can organize the international community on the basis of freedom and permanent peace. Even if continental, regional, or ideological federations were attempted, the governments of these federations, in an effort to make impregnable their separate defenses, would be obliged to maintain stupendously competitive armies and navies, thereby condemning humanity indefinitely to exhaustive taxa-

tion, compulsory military service, and ultimate carnage, which history reveals to be not only criminally futile but positively avoidable through judicious foresight in federating all nations. No nation should be excluded from membership in the federation of the world that is willing to suppress its military, naval, and air forces, retaining only a constabulary sufficient to police its territory and to maintain order within its jurisdiction, provided that the eligible voters of that nation are permitted the free expression of their opinions at the poll.

It being our profound and irrevocable conviction:

That man should be forever free and that his historic rights as an individual and as a citizen should be protected by all the safeguards sanctioned by political wisdom and experience.

That governments are essential to the existence of communities and that the absence of government is anarchy.

That there exists an international community, encompassing the entire world, which has no government and which is destined, as a consequence of the present war, either to be ruthlessly dominated and exploited by totalitarianism or to be federated by democracy upon the principle of freedom for all nations and individuals.

That all human beings are citizens of this world community, which requires laws and not treaties for its government.

That the present conflict will determine the survival of free institutions throughout the world, and that it is morally incumbent upon this generation, as one of the declared objectives of the current war, to federate the nations, in order to make secure, and hereafter unchallenged, freedom for all peoples everywhere, and in order to impart to those who are called to give their lives and fortunes for the triumph of democracy the positive assurance of the incorruptible utility of their sacrifice.

That world federation is the keystone in the arch of civilization, humanity's charger of liberty for all peoples, and the signet authenticating at last the union of the nations in freedom and peace.

That the universal ordeal, through which mankind is now passing, marks the birth of a new epoch that will affirm for all time the indestructible solidarity of civilization and the abiding unity of the human race.

That there are supreme moments in history when nations are summoned, as trustees of civilization, to defend the heritage of the ages and to create institutions essential for human progress. In the Providence of God, such a crisis is this hour, compelling in duty and unprecedented in responsibility—a fateful moment when men meet destiny for the fulfillment of historic tasks: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of Rhode Island does hereby solemnly declare that all peoples of the earth should now be united in a commonwealth of nations to be known as the federation of the world and to that end it hereby endorses the declaration of the federation of the world as is specifically set forth in the preamble hereof, and makes said declaration a part of this resolution in the same manner as if same were recited herein, and requests the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Rhode Island to support and vote for a resolution in the Congress of the United States, approving the principle of world federation and requesting the President of the United States to initiate the procedure necessary to formulate a constitution for the federation of the world, which shall be submitted to each nation for its ratification; and be it further

Resolved, That there be selected a territory for the seat of government for the federation of the world, and that the nation in which the said territory is located be requested to withdraw its jurisdiction over this area and cede it to the federation of the world for its capital, with all the prerogatives and attributes of sovereignty, in order that there might be built in this area a city symbolic of world unity, adequate for the needs of the nations and worthy of the aspirations and destiny of mankind; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Rhode Island; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be in full force and effect upon and after its ratification.

Mother's Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable James A. Farley at the Nineteenth Annual Mother's Day Services, Amphitheater, Arlington Cemetery, Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, Sunday, May 9, 1943:

To the mothers of America and particularly American war mothers, this is the month of May, the month which, traditionally, in the Christian world, is dedicated to the honor of Mary, the Mother of Christ. Today is the second Sunday, that day in May when America by Presidential proclamation pays its respects to the mothers of our Nation. And so on this day the American war mothers are appropriately gathered here at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

We are here today not just to recognize the debt we owe to the mothers of our soldiers, but more important, to call the attention of this great Nation to the too often forgotten truth that a man does not expose his life for a mere occasional cause. Deep in his soul, the man in uniform justifies his sacrifice by the conviction that he is fighting for those ideals his mother instilled in him as a child.

On such an occasion as this, I consider it a privilege to be the vehicle of expression. I thank you for asking me.

In these days of the Nation's peril we can well pause to make a silent prayer that Divine Providence will guide our Government, will sustain our armed forces, and will continue to strengthen our Commander in Chief, to the end that our unity of effort will speedily achieve the inevitable defeat of our common enemies and culminate in a just and lasting peace.

Just before she died, the mother of Andrew Jackson gave this advice:

"Andrew, if I should not see you again, I wish you to remember and treasure up some things I have already said to you: In this world you will have to make your own way. To do that you must have friends. You can make friends by being honest, and you can keep them by being steadfast. You must keep in mind that friends worth having will in the long run expect as much from you as they give to you. To forget an obligation or be ungrateful for a kindness is a base crime—not merely a fault or a sin, but an actual crime. Men guilty of it sooner or later must suffer the penalty. In personal conduct be always polite but never obsequious. None will respect you more than you respect yourself. Avoid quarrels as long as you can without yielding to imposition. But sustain your manhood always. Never bring a suit in law for assault and battery or for defamation. The law affords no remedy for such outrages that can satisfy the feelings of a true man. Never wound the feelings of others. Never brook wanton outrage upon your own feelings. If you ever have to vindicate your feelings or defend your honor, do it calmly. If angry at first, wait till your wrath cools before you proceed."

These words were repeated by General Jackson on his birthday, March 15, 1815, at New Orleans, to three members of his military family, Maj. John H. Eaton, Maj. William V. Lewis, and Capt. W. W. Butler. "Gentlemen," said General Jackson, "I wish she could have lived to see this day. There never was a woman like her. She was gentle as a dove and as brave as a lioness. Her last words have been the law of my life."

Mothers are instinctively—and we instinctively expect them to be—a fount of virtue and inspiration to their children. As a daughter, as a sister, or as a wife, a woman represents only herself; but as a mother she is an institution, a living source of man's beginning, a living symbol of mankind's destiny. A man may be steeped in cynicism and despair, but still his mother's words will be for him a source of strength and a fortress of hope.

Many a man's wife who took the oath with solemn voice has withdrawn her support, but a mother always is constant in her support "for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, until death do us part."

That oath imposed in the marriage ceremony implies the expectation that those made one before the law will be one in spirit, too. Though often only a hope between spouses, it is a fact between mother and son. No solemn soundings are needed to bind a mother to her son "for better, for worse unto death." Nature herself forges the undying bond, for it takes her into the shadow of the valley of death to give him life at the risk of her own. Affection thus born is surely not a mere sentiment or an accident. It is a profound manifestation of nature and shows that though we may turn to our cholars for the answers to technical problems, we would do better to turn to our American mothers when we seek fundamentals.

Long before the dawn of the Christian era, the reliability of a mother's instinct was recognized in all ages and places. The best known story goes back thousands of years to the time of Solomon. You recall, I am sure, the story of the two women who claimed the same child. As it is told in the Scriptures, one said to Solomon, "O my lord, give her the living child, and in no wise slay it." But the other said, "Let it be neither mine nor thine, but divide it." Then the king, turning to the first woman said, "Give her the living child and in no wise slay it; she is the mother thereof." How easy it was for him to be sure which of the two was the true mother.

In the Christian tradition, of course, the mother has always been the voice of virtue and the living star of truth. Dignity and honor have been hers, and her material welfare has been the proper concern of every self-respecting son.

Most mothers live obscure lives and die obscure deaths, their grace and inspiration enhancing the lives only of their offspring. It is significant, therefore, of the genius of motherhood as an institution that mothers as a class are so widely heralded throughout all literature.

Our own Washington Irving states simply but well: "The love of a mother is never exhausted, it never changes, it never tires."

A father may turn his back on his child, brothers and sisters become inveterate enemies, husbands may desert their wives, or wives their husbands. But a mother's love endures through all; in good repute, in bad repute, in the face of the world's condemnation, a mother still loves on, and still hopes that her child may turn from his evil ways and repent; still she remembers the infant smiles that once filled her bosom with rapture, the merry laugh, the joyful shout of his childhood, the opening promise of his youth; and she can never be brought to think him all unworthy.

The life of Augustine shows how sound such a mother's faith can be. Augustine—contemptible before the world—was to his mother the soul of beauty and honor. She tirelessly pursued him, determined to convert him to the Christian life of which she knew he was worthy. When at last she had "lifted him out of the mire and set him among princes," she knew and said her life was done, and she was happy to pass on to her place in eternity—the great St. Monica.

Some writers have gone very far in their portrayals of the function of motherhood. The English novelist Dickens wrote, "I think it must somewhere be written that the virtues of the mothers shall be visited on their children, as well as the sins of their fathers."

The philosopher Michelet: "It is the general rule that all superior men inherit the elements of their superiority from their mothers."

And our own Ralph Waldo Emerson contributes the concise remark: "Men are what their mothers make them."

It is almost trite to repeat that our boys are working and fighting for liberty and the "four freedoms" but in substance doesn't that mean that they are fighting for the sanctity, the security, and the importance of the home? And what is home without a mother? As James Russell Lowell said, "Many make a household but only one the home."

These are thoughts it should not be necessary to dwell upon and you may well ask why it is desirable to cite testimony to such a well-accepted truth. Precisely because it is not so well accepted as we may blindly believe. While the overwhelming majority of the mothers of this Nation—and of the fathers too—are busy doing their duty to help crush a system which would make of mothers mere instruments of propagation for military conquest, there are abroad within our midst, groups and individuals who conspire for the success of their peculiar brands of philosophy which would make a mockery of the values upon which we have bred. The honest average citizens of this land work hard at home and in shop to make a living and to serve their country. When their day's work is done they quietly, and in good faith, turn their minds to the peaceful enjoyment of family life. They have little or no time for political activity. They can only have faith that their efforts and the efforts of their neighbors are expended in behalf of the fundamental principles which they understand to be the essence of our constitutional Government.

There seems to be a spirit growing among some in this country that is alien to our institutions. I have an uneasy feeling that the belief is spreading that the people are not capable of governing themselves, that the problems of today are so complex that the citizen at large must of necessity be detached from his own difficulties. The concept of the political elite is growing.

Just the other day I noticed the publication of a new volume in the reviews. It was widely discussed in book circles and given serious consideration. The author believed that mankind can be divided into a small class of the "ruler type" and a large class of the "ruled type." "Political action," the author contends, "is confined for the most part to a small minority of men; the majority is and remains, whatever else happens, the ruled." This writer even dares to suggest that Machiavelli is an excellent sample of the elite.

We see clearly what this "intellectual" believes. He believes that the hard-working masses of this great Nation were meant to be just hard working—and were not intended to bother about the solution of their own problems, but were meant to leave them to be determined by a small group of "know-it-alls."

We have always had the social snobs who have no respect in any sense for persons of crude though honest habits, and we have always had the intellectual snobs who think an individual becomes an individual only after he has acquired certain facts or theories; who refuse to recognize that the individual has merit unto himself and in himself.

Mothers have always been an antidote to the influence of social and intellectual snobbery in our society because mothers by nature appreciate that a child has a basic dignity equal to or greater than an adult's. The substance of human nature is there; later social or intellectual attainments are mere accidents.

We have got to realize that 150 years of liberty do not assure us an eternity in its enjoyment. We have got to rid ourselves of the fixed idea that liberty is imperishable in America. The American schoolboy's knowledge of history, limited as it has been, is concerned primarily with America. The numberless centuries of human bondage and exploitation, and the vast areas of despotism in the past are virtually concealed from the American schoolboy in his most impressionable years. References to eternal vigilance as the price of liberty are but amusingly hollow words in his ears because they have been unnecessary in a land where liberty without vigilance has been a free commodity. Perhaps our time has come. We can learn the price of liberty by alertness. If the choice is given to us of liberty or security, we must scorn the latter with the proper contempt of free men and the sound judgment of wise men who know that liberty and security are not incompatible in the lives of honest men.

It is upon the mothers of America that this Nation depends to protect its institutions while their sons are guarding its sovereignty. The enemy is "fore and aft," and we must mount our guns in bow and stern. The mothers are the repository of the fundamental principles of our national structure. Should these principles be subverted, the sacrifices of our patriots, present and past, will seem minor compared with the sacrifices of future generations to bring about the resurrection of those freedoms which have made America great.

The good people of America must learn and learn well that 150 years are swift and brief. America is but a thin stream of light in the long black history of human bondage and the illusion of permanence abiding in the hearts of so many proud Americans is a disarming perspective. The warm, enlightening flame of liberty must be kept alive with the twin fuels of intelligence and courage.

I cannot believe we have talked the meaning out of words that now, trite with use, bear no message to inspire our populace. Liberty and freedom as words become trite only at a price. I will not believe that Americans must suffer their loss to learn their value. The tragedy is that the process of rediscovery of their value seldom involves a recovery of their enjoyment.

We are being measured and we will perform. I have full faith that just as certainly as we and our allies are slowly but surely grinding Hitler and his coconspirators into the dust, never again to impose their ugly power and perverted theories upon innocent and honest people, alien philosophies at home will be crushed under the heels of free Americans, and a prosperous democracy of the United States of America will go forward to greater accomplishments.

The titanic efforts and the copious bloodshed that went into the making of America, the sacrifices of Valley Forge, Bull Run, and the Marne are matters of meaning, full and deep in this day of new trial. In years of peace and complacency we have heard their recital with pleased but semiconscious ears. We must now grasp their full import to be equal to the threat before us.

The American War Mothers will do their part, I know; and it makes me happy to think that you are organized and alert. You who offered your own lives that your sons might live and who have offered those sons' lives that your country might live—you are purged souls of this society, and it is into your hands and the ideals that guide them that we willingly and with faith entrust the future of our beloved Nation.

Keep Prices Down

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, Congress and the administration must assume full responsibility for failure to enact a program to stabilize the cost of living. In glancing through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I find about $13,000 worth of words, words of oratory, yes, but prices cannot be stabilized by words alone. We in this Congress, and the administration, have failed to analyze correctly the elemental facts of the problem. On the one hand, we establish a Little Steel formula to hold wage rates in line. On the other hand, we let living costs run away with the result that the humblest workman knows that wage rates can be held only if the workers are guaranteed their rations of food and other necessities at the official promised prices. Months ago Mr. Murray, of the C. I. O., and Mr. Green, of the A. F. of L., warned us that labor was more concerned with stabilizing the cost of living rather than in increased wages. With a ceiling set on wages, there must be a corresponding ceiling on prices or there is certain to be a collapse of the program. And that is just what has occurred in America. The Nation is in sympathy with the miners and their wage demands although everyone may not be in sympathy with the tactics of John L. Lewis. At least I as a friend of labor do not approve of his policy of challenging the President and the Government in this critical hour, nor do I approve of his refusal to agree to conciliation and arbitration in the American way.

Let us look at prices since the beginning of the war in 1939. The wholesale price of food and tobacco has risen over 100 percent. Let me enumerate a few items: In April 1942 potatoes sold at 43 cents, in April 1943 at 84 cents; onions from 3 cents to 7 cents, lettuce from 10

cents to 20 cents, peas from 14 cents to 25–29 cents, celery from 10–15 cents to 25–29 cents, oranges from 24 cents to 53 cents. This will soon result in a wave of increased wage demands throughout the country, with strikes certain and a fall-off in production unless this Congress rises to its responsibility. There are several solutions. Whatever solution Congress adopts—and we must adopt one of them—one thing is clear: wages are an inherent part of the price structure in holding a line against inflation. We cannot continue to apply one formula for prices and another formula for wages. Finally, all our efforts will fail if we forget even for a moment that in trying to fix maximum prices and wages we are dealing merely with the symptoms of inflations and not with the basic cause of the disease. The real problem is to prevent the growth of an excess purchasing power, to siphon it away before it has begun to exert its pressure. Only if we do this will the problem of affixing maximum prices and wages prove at all manageable.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEISS. Yes.

Mr. CASE. It occurs to me that those prices the gentleman quoted are the result of increases in wages, and the increases and profits there referred to are not realized by the farmers at all.

Mr. WEISS. Not at all.

An excellent solution is that offered by Walter Lippmann, noted columnist, and I quote him: "We must realize that there is to be one set of prices for the producer and another set for the consumer, and that the spread between the two sets of prices has to be regulated by Government subsidies and Government purchasing. The British in the United Kingdom have operated price control with conspicuous success. This is universally admitted by all sections of British opinion."

I am in hearty accord with the above statement of Walter Lippmann. The only way the British have conquered price control is not by our present method of over-all ceilings on everything and a general freezing of everything supported by threatening words of prosecution, but by Government subsidies. With this in mind, I have this day introduced a joint resolution to stabilize prices and provide for Government subsidies. I feel certain that with skillful and shrewd application this Government can stabilize wages by stabilizing the cost of living. It will provide for the use of Government funds to insulate retail prices against the upward pressure of wholesale prices. We can avoid a national catastrophe from within and help the morale of labor of America by enacting this legislation into law.

The joint resolution follows:

Joint resolution providing food and clothing to purchasers at fair and reasonable prices and guaranteeing farmers fair and reasonable prices for their crops

Whereas wages cannot and should not be held in line if workers are not guaranteed food and other necessities at fair prices; and

Whereas it is possible to guarantee the farmers a fair price for their products and to guarantee the consumers food and necessities at a fair price by proper application of subsidies and purchases by the Government in the open market: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Office of Price Administration is authorized and directed to establish maximum retail prices for: (a) all basic foods including, but not limited to: (1) wheat flour, macaroni, wheat cereal, corn meal, corn flakes, rice, and rolled oats; (2) white, whole wheat, and rye breads, vanilla cookies and soda crackers; (3) round steak, rib roast, chuck roast, veal cutlets, pork chops, bacon, ham, salt pork, lamb legs and chops; (4) butter, cheese, milk, fresh and evaporated, eggs; (5) apples, bananas, oranges, grapefruit, green beans, cabbage, carrots, lettuce, onions, potatoes, sweet potatoes, spinach; (6) canned peaches, pineapple, grapefruit juice, green beans, corn, peas, and tomatoes; (7) dried prunes and navy beans; (8) coffee, tea, and cocoa; (9) lard, shortening other than lard, salad dressings, oleomargarine, peanut butter; and (10) sugar, corn sirup, and molasses; and (b) all essential wearing apparel, including but not limited to men's suits, overcoats, shirts (other than silk), shoes, underwear, socks, hats, ties, women's dresses, coats, shoes, underwear, stockings.

SEC. 2. The Office of Price Administration in establishing prices under the authority and directive of section 1 shall provide that on and after no person shall sell, offer to sell, deliver, or transfer price-regulated goods of the same kind, grade, or quality at a price in excess of the highest price at which the seller sold such goods in a similar amount to a similar purchaser on Decembere 7, 1941: *Provided*, That if the maximum price cannot be determined in the foregoing manner it shall be the price at which such price-regulated goods of the same kind, grade, or quality in a similar amount to a similar purchaser was sold in the nearest market on December 7, 1941, making adjustments for the customary differential between such market and the locality of sale.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to pay to farmers an amount equal to the difference between the amount received for their crops and the amount they would have received for their crops if they had been sold at the average price for such crops for the years 1914 to 1929, or as an alternate method of relieving the farmers from the effects of price fixing, the Secretary is authorized to purchase in the open market all of each price-regulated crop offered for sale by the producers at the average price of each such crop for the years 1914 to 1929, which crops he may sell to retailers at a price that will permit them to sell at a profit at the fixed price.

SEC. 4. Any person who shall sell, agree to sell, or offer to sell, any price-regulated goods in the course of any business at a price in excess of the maximum price set under authority of this act shall, for the first offense be punished by a fine of $100 to $10,000 and/or imprisonment for a term of 60 days to 1 year, and for subsequent offenses shall be punished by imprisonment from 1 to 3 years.

Resolution of Wisconsin American Cheese Advisory Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask to include therein a letter from Wisconsin's committee of agriculture and also resolutions of the Wisconsin American cheese advisory committee of the Wisconsin department of agriculture:

HON. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Wisconsin law empowers the State department of agriculture to set up industry advisory committees. Several such committees have been set up, among them an American cheese advisory committee, comprised of farmers and plant operators.

This committee met last Wednesday, the 5th, with representatives of the foreign type cheese industry and others. After consulting with the foreign-type representatives the committee passed the enclosed resolutions.

Very truly yours,

STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
MILTON A. BURTON, *Director.*

Wisconsin produces over one half the cheddar cheese of America. The production of 1943 is already 23 percent below that of 1942. If the O. P. A. and other agencies do not change their attitude, a further reduction can be expected. The resolutions are as follows:

I

We are opposed to the incentive or subsidy payments as a means to encourage production or to hold down consumer prices.

If it is the administrative policy to continue these programs then they should be called by their right name, consumer's subsidy.

The subsidy payment is based on monthly deliveries, the set aside on production, and the ration reporting period can fit with either but not both.

These reporting periods can all be for the same period. The unnecessary volume of reports required of factories to comply with these programs because they cover different periods is confusing, resented by producers and makers and lowers production morale.

We, therefore, request the Wisconsin Board of Agriculture that they demand the subsidy, set aside, and ration reporting periods all be on a production basis.

II

Resolved, That the State board of agriculture urge the Office of Price Administration to give immediate and favorable consideration to increasing the price of small styles of cheddar cheese (daisies, longhorns, young Americas, square prints, and family twins) by one-half cent per pound and natural loaf (5 pounds or less) by three-fourths cent per pound. This increase is necessary to cover the extra costs of making small styles as compared with larger cheddar cheese. The output of small styles has dropped from over 30 percent to less than 15 percent of the total and will continue to drop unless an adjustment is made. An adjustment in the price of small styles of natural cheese is necessary to maintain a balance between the quantity of natural and processed cheddar cheese.

III

Whereas the rationing of cheese has disrupted the sale and consumption of cheese and caused the backing up of cheese inventories;

Whereas a continuation of present sales under rationing will seriously disrupt the marketing and consumption of cheese for civilian use; and

Whereas the heavy production season is at hand and some styles of cheese do not permit extended storage: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin State Board of Agriculture do everything within its power to bring about an immediate review of the present system of rationing cheese and that adjustments be made for the different types of cheese such as cheddar, brick, Italian, muenster, and Swiss to the end that normal sales will be maintained as far as possible and so that there will be a minimum spoilage. Consideration should be given to both an adjustment in rationing points and to a possible complete removal of some types from consumer rationing for limited periods.

IV

Resolved, That the Wisconsin State Board of Agriculture be asked to recommend to the United States Department of Agriculture that the Federal Government make all of its purchases of cheddar cheese on a grade basis with a differential in price between grades; be it further

Resolved, That the Department urge the Office of Price Administration to permit a premium for special quality cheese over and above present ceiling prices applicable to all grades.

V

We recommend that the Wisconsin State Board of Agriculture take up the foregoing resolutions with the proper departments at Washington, D C., and enlist the help of Senators and Congressmen to accomplish the purpose of the resolutions.

Present Aspect of the Coal Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a recent radio address by Miss Dorothy Thompson on the plight of the coal miners. It is regrettable that so little is known about their condition. Their very dangerous and difficult work is little appreciated, as well as the great contribution which they have made in the matter of production.

Their condition is aggravated by a lack of the substantial and sustaining foods needed for their extreme physical exertions.

The radio address follows:

Good evening. Almost the first thing I can remember from my childhood were stories my father told me about coal miners. My father was not a coal miner, he was a preacher. But in his youth, when he was still in England, he had been a circuit-riding preacher in Durham and in Wales, among the coal miners in what was called the Black Country, and afterward the depressed area. As he talked, I could see in my mind's eye, the grimy villages, and the pits into which men marched day after day. He told me of the funerals, at which he had sometimes officiated—mass funerals when men were brought up out of the pits, crushed, because their picks had struck the wrong vein and the wall had caved, or downed, or asphyxiated, or killed in an explosion of accumulated gases.

Then the funeral would be held, and every miner and his wife and children would come, and stand stooped and mourning, and it was as though they mourned for comrades fallen in battle, somber, and stoic, in their bleak little church, in their bleak little town. He would read the burial service: "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me shall never die."

He told me of the home life of the coal miner. The ritual of coming home; the hot water and the strong yellow soap prepared by the wife; the putting on of the clean clothes; the eating of the hot, heavy meal. Among the miners, the man is the unquestioned head of the family. That is because he does a man's work, skilful and dangerous. Coal miners, he told me, are usually religious; the way soldiers are religious, and all men are who face danger continually.

Afterward, when I was grown up, and had never seen England, I went there. And I went, not to see Westminster Abbey, but to see the Black Country of Durham from where my folks came. And it was as my father had told me.

The last time I was there was during this war. It looked so poor, and so bleak. I knew that for years before the war this territory had been the worst in England. At one time 80 percent were unemployed. Hunger stared people in the face, and hunger marchers descended on London. I asked John Lawson, for years head of the miners' union: "Tell me, what do your people fight for? What has England ever done for them?" And he said: 'We fight for hope. That's all. We know if we lose the war, we haven't even hope. And if we win it—why we can keep on working for a decent world for coal miners."

I have been in many mining communities in this country—in Pennsylvania and Kentucky. They are about the same as they are in England. There are the same bleak little company towns; the same sort of home life; the same dirt and the same danger. Do you know, perhaps, that nearly 1,500 coal miners were killed last year, and 70,000 injured? And there are the same evangelical religions. Here as there, the depression was blackest among coal miners. Even in normal times there was the same problem of working enough days a year to make ends meet; the same comradeship amongst the miners themselves; the same passionate loyalty to the union. And the same pride in their work, a man's work, that not everyone can do. For that is the other thing about miners. I don't know why they like their work, day after day in the bowels of the earth, in the damp and cold, where the lights flicker, and work is heavy and hard, shut away from the sun. But they do. They don't leave it often to look for easier jobs. The coal miners' world is a community, with a sense of solidarity, and a sense of sharing. They have pride in their work and support amongst each other.

Now, this is why I can't think of this coal dispute in the terms in which it is being presented. Just now the the news has come that Mr. Lewis and Mr. Ickes have agreed upon a truce. The miners are going back to the mines tomorrow. But this has never been a quarrel between John L. Lewis and the President, the operators and the War Labor Board. I am no partisan of Mr. Lewis. I think he is a vain man, and often overreaches himself. But what he asks for is what the coal miners demand; not what he tells them to demand. They say they can't live decently on their present wage. They say the prices of food and clothing are not stabilized, therefore the War Labor Board Little Steel formula no longer holds good, and they won't accept a stone in place of bread.

They are not on strike, in any usual sense of the word. They want a contract, and they are waiting for one, and when they get one they will go back to work. Mr. Lewis says he is willing to bargain, but not willing to submit the case to the Government's arbitration proceedings, as set up in the War Labor Board, because the War Labor Board will rule according to the Little Steel formula, which doesn't hold good any longer, because prices have not been stabilized. Mr. Lewis has not urged the miners to strike. He simply says nothing, and that is enough.

Now, everybody—the Government and the operators—have known for months that the miners would not work without a contract. Mr. Lewis presented his demands to the operators weeks ago, and they were refused in toto. The operators said, "Go to the War Labor Board." And they knew perfectly well that Mr. Lewis wouldn't go to the War Labor Board. The Department of Labor then attempted a conciliation. They sent Dr. John Steelman to the parties, and he suggested a compromise on a 6-day week with time and a half for the sixth day, and work for 52 weeks in the year. Mr. Lewis accepted that. Actually that is how they are working now, and the only thing new in it is the guarantee of its continuity. And even on that question Mr. Lewis was willing to make some concessions. But the operators again said "No." And so no contract could be concluded.

Now, the result of this was to force the President to take over, and the issue now is not between the miners and the operators but between the miners and the Government of the United States. And this makes it very much more serious. For now it is not a normal quarrel between workers and employers, but the resistance of the workers against the Government—or, the resistance of the Government against the workers. There may be some who get a considerable satisfaction at seeing a prolabor Government at war with labor. I am not one of them. I feel very unhappy.

We cannot live unless coal is mined. In these last 24 hours we have suddenly realized that unless these half a million miners go down into their pits, not a train can run, or a factory wheel turn. Some shout, "Make them work." Some cry, "Arrest their leaders."

Now, listen: They have been working. Since the war began they have upped production enormously. They have sent 75,000 of their sons into the Army and Navy.

It is not a good idea to call them traitors. Suddenly we realize that our lives depend on them, and so far they have never let us down. One can say of the coal miners as Churchill said of the Royal Air Force: "Seldom in history have so many owed so much to so few." And if our lives depend on them, we owe them something, don't we?

And is there any justice in their claims? Has the cost of living gone up? Are prices stabilized?

The President says that an investigation is going to be made on this subject. A hundred and thirty-two million Americans, including you and me, have already made that investigation. We know that the cost of living is going up—from our grocery bills.

Mr. Prentiss Brown, head of Office of Price Administration, says it hasn't risen as much as wages have risen. He admits, however, that prices rose previous to the Stabilization Act, that meat, vegetables, coffee, etc., have gotten out of hand, and that the black market has wrought havoc. He says that if everyone of us refuses to pay anything but the legal price, he can stabilize prices. Meanwhile, however, we all must eat. We can't all go on hunger strike in order to make things easier for the Office of Price Administration.

The fact of the matter, as Walter Lippmann pointed out yesterday, is that the administration and the Congress don't have a program for stabilizing the cost of living. They are plaintively telling it to be stable, and that's just like King Canute telling the ocean tides not to rise. Canada has stabilized the cost of living; Britain has stabilized the cost of living. But they haven't done it the way the Office of Price Administration is trying to do—by yelling "stop" and appealing to the public. They have done it by a very simple method, not a complicated one. They haven't put over-all ceilings on everything and tried to freeze everything, but have done it by

various forms of skillful subsidies. They have allowed the producers to produce at an economic price, seen that the distributor got enough to assure that supplies would move, and fixed the price of all rationed foods for the consumer. And the deficit they have made up out of the taxes. And it has not been anything exorbitant.

My friends, we cannot settle our internal questions, questions which involve facts, questions which require intelligence, questions which have to do with justice, by force. The coal miners have a case. That case has got to be settled in justice, not with bayonets. You can't settle it with bayonets. We will have a disastrous inflation, and demands for wage increases all over the place unless we really stabilize prices. And that is a job, which the Office of Price Administration has not yet fulfilled. We must have peace in America if we are going to make successful war on our enemies. You don't get peace by war. And in this case we want peace with justice, and peace without victory. I hope this isn't a face-saving competition between two men.

As for the coal miners, we are relieved that they have gone back to work, not because they have been proved wrong in their claims, but because they are probably right. And being right, they can rest their case with the people of the Nation, for the people, when the smoke clears, are just.

Protest Against Findings and Conclusions of the Kerr Subcommittee on Appropriations in Regard to the Goodwin B. Watson Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, 1943, I voted against the continuation of the Dies committee and inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date my reasons therefor. In that list of reasons, I stated that the Dies committee had "prostituted every decent law of evidence and procedure in its investigative actions and has usurped the functions of investigation, trial, condemnation, and punishment, which is contrary to the American principles of civil liberties toward the accused."

I have no desire to withdraw the statement above quoted. I feel very deeply that in these times of war hysteria, the Members of Congress should set an example of consideration and mature judgment in regard to the preservation of civil liberties. If we bow to this hysteria or yield to the passions of hate and persecution, we have become the "blind leaders of the blind" and we cease to act as the guardians of our Constitutional liberties and, by the sins of omission and commission, we betray those principles we have sworn to uphold. At a time when constitutional Government as exemplified by our democracy is on trial before the searching, critical eyes of the world, it behooves us to be doubly sure in our daily actions.

At this time I wish to bring to the attention of this body the findings of the Kerr subcommittee in regard to the fitness of Goodwin B. Watson and William E. Dodd, Jr., to continue in their present Federal employment.

I do not castigate or criticize the Members of this subcommittee as being other than honest, conscientious Members of the House. My regard and admiration for these Members personally is great, but I feel sincerely that they have made a mistake in both their methods of investigation procedure and conclusion. I also believe that their conclusions, as announced, have been reached through incomplete testimony, partial investigative reports and they have relied on public opinion as sufficient basis for punitive legislation directed toward the denial of the civil rights of these two men, Goodwin Watson and William E. Dodd, Jr., without due process of law.

I do not believe that it is the function or duty of Congress to include riders on appropriation bills which are designed to either reward or punish specific individuals. I feel that our legislation should be broad and general in its scope and that while there may be legal basis for such riders, I deem it as a partial encroachment on the executive branch of the Government. The responsibility of the fitness of these men clearly rests with the head of the Federal Communications Commission, whose appointment rests with the President.

The Members of this Congress have affirmed their independence on this floor many times recently and have denounced in no uncertain terms every attempt by either the judicial or executive branch to arrogate the privileges and functions of the legislative branch. I certainly concur in this attitude of my colleagues. But in all frankness, may I ask, are we to become guilty of quasi Executive encroachment?

Part of the profound philosophy which brought our Constitution into being was the concept that the separation of the powers of the Government into legislative, executive, and judicial branches of equal authority is, by James Madison's definition, an "essential precaution in favor of liberty."

As we are jealous of the prerogatives of our legislative branch, let us then in all equity be respectful of the prerogatives and responsibilities of the executive branch.

If these men who have been, in my opinion, so unfairly tried and condemned by the Kerr subcommittee, be guilty of moral turpitude or treasonable guilt, let them be charged with specific crimes or derelictions of duty. Let them be charged before the proper civil or Federal courts. Give them an opportunity to prepare their defense. Allow them their day in court and the privilege of trial by jury of their peers. If they be found guilty by due process of law, enforce the penalty prescribed by law against them. If their accusers fail to convince a fair jury of their crimes, then I say in justice to those constitutional rights, whose mantle of protection covers and protects every citizen of this democracy, let us free them from this odium. In so doing, the protection we give them today in this time of war hysteria will return to bless your children and my children in the days to come, and democracy can hold up its head proudly before the critical eyes of our totalitarian critics both here and abroad.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include certain biographical and historical data to support Mr. Goodwin B. Watson's plea for a fair trial:

SOME FACTS ABOUT GOODWIN WATSON

1. Born, 1899, Whitewater, Wis., tenth generation of American ancestry.

2. Education: State Teachers College, Whitewater, Wis.; University of Wisconsin (bachelor of arts); Columbia University (master of arts, doctor of philosophy); Union Theological Seminary.

3. Enlisted, United States Navy, 1918; served until honorably discharged after end of war.

4. Ordained minister, Methodist Church. Director of religious education in Denver, Colo., and in New York City. Director of research, national council, Young Men's Christian Association.

5. Professor at Teachers College, Columbia University, for 18 years; now on leave of absence.

6. Did not seek present Government post; finally yielded to urgent invitation, accepting position as patriotic service in November 1941, at less than his university salary.

7. Politically independent; supported Republican, Democratic, American Labor Party. Never a Communist.

8. Not a fellow traveler; worked for militant defense and American participation in 1940–41 while Soviet Union in nonaggression pact and fellow travelers attacked the war.

9. Organizations: Phi Beta Kappa, Delta Sigma Rho (forensic), Phi Delta Kappa (education), Kappa Delta Pi (education), Pi Gamma Mu (social science), Methodist Church, Young Men's Christian Association, National Education Association (life member), American Psychological Association, American Sociological Society, American Political Science Association, American Society for Public Administration, American Planning Association, Progressive Education Association, American Association for the Advancement of Science (fellow), Committee for National Morale (executive committee).

10. Relation to organizations listed by Dies and Kerr reports:

(a) American League for Peace and Democracy: Never a member or official. Never attended meeting or contributed a cent. Endorsed one Congress for Peace and Democracy to be held in Washington, January 6, 1939. Many prominent conservative Americans did likewise.

(b) American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom: Never a member or official. Never attended a meeting or contributed a cent. Sponsored a cititzens' rally to answer the attack on public education, to be held at Carnegie Hall, April 13, 1940. Speakers were to be: Dean Ned Dearborn, New York University; Rev. H. Norman Sibley, University Heights Presbyterian Church; Newbold Morris, president of City Council of New York.

(c) American Student Union: At time of its organization, as a union of students of all political parties for discussion of current issues, he agreed to serve on an advisory board. Ex-President Alexander Meiklejohn and other educators did likewise. No one sought advice; no meetings were held; his connection with this organization ceased.

(d) American Youth Congress: Never a member or official. Endorsed the American Youth Act, a bill supported in Congress by Representatives Amlie, Benson, Dunn, Scott, Voorhis, and Young, to provide education and employment for young people. Led a discussion at one meeting under auspices American Youth Congress, on improving college education.

(e) Conference on Pan-American Democracy: Was invited, summer 1939, join delegation sponsored and financed by Government of Mexico, as expert on education. Others in delegation: Justice Wolfe, Supreme Court, Utah; Prof Justin Nixon, University of Missouri; George Seldes, journalist; Maury Maverick, mayor of San Antonio (detained by official duties). His pamphlet, Education and Social Welfare in Mexico, reports findings. Spoke once about this study under auspices Conference on Pan-American Democracy and his name appears as sponsor of one meeting, along with such distinguished Americans as: Charlotte Carr, Hull House, Chicago; Paul H. Douglas, University of Chicago; Henry Pratt Fairchild, New York University; Irving Fisher, Yale University; Sidney Hillman, Amalgamated Clothing Workers; Rabbi Stephen S. Wise; Quincy Howe, radio commentator; Rev. John Haynes Holmes, Community Church, New York; John Lovejoy Elliott, Ethical Culture Society.

(f) Consumers Union: Member and director. An organization for research and counseling consumers on best buys. Eighty thousand members; no evidence of any subversive activity.

(g) North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy: Supported Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo, and enrolled as one of the endorsing psychologists. Bishop Francis J. McConnell of the Methodist Church was chairman of the North American Committee; Dr. Herman F. Reissig, the secretary. Hundreds of distinguished Americans in many professions cooperated with this movement. Two-thirds of Americans polled by Gallup favored lifting that embargo which aided Hitler and Mussolini. The wisdom of that course is even more apparent today.

(h) Descendants of the American Revolution: For direct descendants of men and women who fought in American Revolution, and intended to express ideals of our Declaration of Independence and Constitution in modern world. Member along with Sherwood Eddy of the Y. M. C. A.; Stuart Chase, author; John Chamberlain of the New York Times; Prof. Harry Overstreet of the College of the City of New York; George Soule, of the New Republic; Stark Young, playwright. Attended one or two meetings; then dropped out. Organization struggled along a few years; believe it now extinct.

(i) International Workers Order: Never a member or official, never attended a meeting or contributed a cent. Agreed once to sponsor a contest on plays for children. A cosponsor, Elizabeth Irwin, principal of an excellent New York public school. No further contact.

(j) League of American Writers: Never a member or official, never attended a meeting or contributed a cent. Wrote a statement against anti-Semitism for a pamphlet entitled "We Hold These Truths," sponsored by this league. Other contributors to same pamphlet: Henry A. Wallace, Robert H. Jackson, Harold Ickes, Dorothy Thompson, William Green, Thomas E. Dewey.

(k) National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights: Never a member or official, never attended a meeting or contributed a cent. Signed a letter of protest against the Dies committee circulated by this organization in May 1940. The letter was signed by 148 American educators, churchmen, scientists, and civic leaders

11. Writings: Not a single passage from Watson's 10 books or monographs has been questioned. They deal with religious education, psychology, and public education. All stress the democratic way of life.

Passages challenged come from an unrepresentative handful among his 400 articles and speeches, and do show dissatisfaction with our economic system during early years of the depression and urge great changes. By autumn of 1938 he became convinced that (1) initiative, competition, and the free market must be preserved; (2) concentration of economic power in the state is dangerous; (3) gradual progress toward better functioning of our business system is probable and desirable.

Never at any time did he advocate change by any except educational, peaceful, legal, and constitutional methods.

Never at any time did he advocate overthrow of our Government or its Constitution of political democracy.

Some articles suggest that we can learn some things from other countries, but add that no other country has given men so great an opportunity as the United States. Some articles frankly point out the failure of socialism in Austria, and criticize Russia for its low standard of living, pseudo-democracy, rigid education, censorship, totalitarian culture, and for putting new policies into operation wholesale, with persecution of dissenters.

12. Record in office: 19 months of service; whole-hearted support of staff and superiors; several hundred reports issued to State Department, Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, Office of Strategic Services, Office of War Information, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. Much praise—never a single criticism of radical or reactionary bias. Incidentally, this work of analyzing foreign propaganda is relatively new; the half dozen men who have been working at it since before Pearl Harbor are the only persons in the United States with detailed knowledge which is indispensable for the best further war service.

13. Letters of support from Dean William F. Russell, head of Teachers College; Dr. George F. Zook, president of American Council on Education; Mark May, director, Institute of Human Relations, Yale University; Frederick L. Redefer, secretary, Progressive Education Association; Jay A. Urice, associate general secretary, Young Men's Christian Association; Arthur L. Swift, Jr., Union Theological Seminary; G. Derwood Baker, superintendent of schools, Boulder, Colo.; Carleton Washburn, superintendent of schools, Winnetka, Ill.; Carson Ryan, dean of School of Education, University of North Carolina; William H. Lemmel, superintendent of schools, Wilmington, Del.; Dr. Walter E. Hager, president, Wilson Teachers College, Washington, D. C.; Thomas E. Benner, dean of College of Education, University of Illinois; Mrs. A. W. Clevenger, president, Illinois State Association of University Women; Ralph [illegible]ton Perry, Harvard Defense Unit; Cha[illegible]E. Hendry, director of research, Boy Scou[illegible] America; and many others. Resolutions of support passed by Eastern Sociological Society and also by Eastern Psychological Association. Fifty-seven professors at Teachers College, Columbia University, most of whom have known Watson over many years, sent in a letter of support. Another document came from 188 men and women from 40 States who were graduate students at Teachers College. Most remarkable were 50 letters and telegrams from leading psychologists representing almost all the major universities. These and other influential cititzens believe that the proposed congressional ouster is an unjustified witch hunt, unworthy of responsible legislators. It is significant that not one person among his many hundreds of colleagues in the Young Men's Christian Association, in Columbia University, in the profession of social psychology, or in his present war work has joined in the attack on Watson's Americanism.

Editorial and comment in opposition to the proposed ouster has been noted in the Providence (R. I.) Bulletin, the Portland Oregonian, the Anniston (Ala.) Star, PM (New York), the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, and the Chicago Sun. Other influential newspapers and radio commentators have indicated their intention to discuss this issue.

He Gave His Life To Save His Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the American youth of today, true to the tradition so heroically exemplified by our forefathers, are rendering a glorious account of themselves in every part of the world. They are giving unstintingly all that they have, even their lives, that the enemy might be crushed and that the freedom and liberty which we have known in the past may be preserved as a heritage for the generations that are to follow us.

Every day we read of outstanding feats of heroism. No community has a monopoly on patriotism or heroism. The heroes of this war come from all sections of the country. From the big cities, from the towns, and from remote hamlets.

We of the First Congressional District of Rhode Island, and particularly from the city of Pawtucket, are proud, indeed, of our outstanding hero, Capt. Elwood J. Euart, a 28-year-old soldier who, by lashing himself to the low end of a rope, was able to hold it tight enough for his men to climb to safety, even though their ship, the *President Coolidge*, which had struck a mine in the Pacific, was listing badly. He so exhausted himself that when, after getting all his men out, he tried to get out himself he was unable to do so and went down with the ship.

The memory of such an heroic deed, Mr. Speaker, should be kept alive in the hearts of our countrymen and for that reason I have today introduced a bill to provide for the erection, at a suitable location in Arlington National Cemetery, of a monument in memory of Capt. Elwood Joseph Euart.

Ira Wolfert, a war correspondent, who happened to be flying over the *President Coolidge* at the time she struck the mine, described Captain Euart's heroism in the following words:

> The one Army officer (Captain Euart) who died had withdrawn to a hold with his men.
>
> By the time their turn came to leave, the only way out was hand-over-hand on a rope. This officer was the last to go, and when he tried, he discovered he was too exhausted to pull himself up. He started to call for help.
>
> His voice was not a strong one, and there was a lot of noise as the last men aboard were scrambling off. But his lifelong friend, Capt. Warren K. Covill, United States Army (of East Providence, R. I.), who had been searching for him and hoping he had got away, heard him and came sliding down to the res-

cue along with a warrant officer and a defense worker who happened to be on board.

The three men stood on the edge of the hold and tried to haul up the officer who was trapped below by his own exhaustion. The last rescue boat was bobbing up and down uneasily alongside the vessel, its occupants shouting to the three men it could see to hurry and warning them there was not a moment to waste. But the three could not bring themselves to abandon the trapped officer.

Then the rescue boat, realizing that it would be dragged down in the last suction of the ship, gave a last despairing warning. The three men did not even turn around.

Captain Covill said he heard all the warnings clearly and that they all heard all the warnings but felt that abandoning the captain was more than they could do.

The rescue boat pulled away hastily with a clanging of the coxswain's bell and a churning and putt-put of the exhaust. From where I [Ira Wolfert] was I could see the three small, dark figures turn for a moment and watch it go off and then turn back to the hold. Hundreds of men were watching the scene in silence from safe vantage points, and it filled their eyes and filled their hearts to the breaking point.

An extra rope had been found somewhere in the hold and the captain down below there had tied it around his waist and was trying to splice it to the rope held by his would-be rescuers and get pulled up that way when the *Coolidge* went down.

Captain Covill and the two men with him were sucked down with the ship and somewhere down toward the bottom they were thrown to the surface where they could swim to safety.

The captain down in the hold, trapped by his own weariness, died down there.

The biography of this gallant fighter, taken from the records of the War Department, follows:

ELWOOD JOSEPH EUART

Elwood J. Euart was born on January 28, 1914, in Providence, R. I. He was graduated from the Rhode Island State College, with a Bachelor of Science degree, in 1939. On June 12, 1939, he was commissioned a second lieutenant, Infantry Reserve. He was commissioned a second lieutenant, Field Artillery, Rhode Island National Guard, on July 16, 1940.

He was appointed a second lieutenant, Field Artillery National Guard in the Army of the United States, on January 3, 1941. He attended the Sixty-eighth Field Artillery Brigade Officers School at Providence, R. I., from January 27 to February 23, 1941.

On February 24, 1941, he was inducted into Federal service and proceeded to Camp Blanding, Fla., to join the One Hundred and Third Field Artillery. On September 6, 1941, he was promoted to first lieutenant (temporary), Field Artillery. In January 1942 he entered the Field Artillery School, Fort Sill, Okla. Upon the completion of this course in April 1942 he was transferred with his regiment to Camp Shelby, Miss. On July 20, 1942, he was promoted to captain (temporary). In October 1942 he was given an unannounced assignment overseas, and on the twenty-sixth of that month was drowned at sea on the occasion of the sinking of the United States Army transport *President Coolidge*.

He was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross posthumously with the following citation:

"For extraordinary heroism, on the occasion of the sinking of the United States Army transport *President Coolidge* at sea, on October 26, 1942, Captain Euart, troop mess officer on duty in the enlisted men's mess hall, personally checked the clearing of that area upon the alarm. Having safely reached his abandon-ship station he learned of men trapped in the hold and went there. By lashing himself to the low end of a rope he was able to hold it tight enough for men to climb up it to safety, even though the ship was badly listing. Finally, as he attempted to climb up, almost vertically by that moment, with the help of a few men at the other end of the line, the ship careened and sank very quickly. Captain Euart exhausted himself assisting many others, whose lives were thus undoubtedly spared at the expense of his own."

Fire Prevention in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IVOR D. FENTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, the following excellent address on Fire Prevention in Wartime was delivered at the Wartime Fire Protection Forum in Chicago, Ill., on May 10, 1943, by Dr. David J. Price, president of the National Fire Protection Association and member of the Advisory Committee to the Fire Defense Section, United States Office of Civilian Defense.

It represents the thoughts of a very capable expert in this field and I believe it is very timely:

WARTIME FIRE PROTECTION FORUM

The forty-seventh annual meeting of the National Fire Protection Association at such a critical period in our Nation's history can very appropriately be called a Wartime Fire Protection Forum.

The association was organized in 1896 to promote the science and improve the methods of fire protection and fire prevention, to obtain and circulate information on these subjects and to secure the cooperation of its members in establishing proper safeguards against loss of life and property by fire.

We meet this year under circumstances calling for the utmost contribution on the part of every individual and every organization to bring about ultimate victory in the gigantic struggle in which we and our valiant allies are now engaged.

It is very timely therefore to direct attention to both the significance of fire prevention in the war program and to the very direct part our association is taking in the development and application of measures for the effective prevention and control of disastrous fires and explosions that are vitally affecting the war effort.

GENERAL FIRE LOSS SITUATION IN UNITED STATES AND CANADA

This meeting is an appropriate time and place to make some comments about the general fire loss situation in the United States and Canada. The 1942 total fire loss in the United States was less than in 1941, which, in a period of war, is indeed very gratifying. This loss for 1942, according to the National Board of Fire Underwriters, has been estimated at $314,849,000, while in 1941 the figure was $322,357,000. These figures are based upon notices of incurred loss received by insurance companies, members of the board, plus an allowance for unreported losses.

There are some significant facts revealed by an analysis of the 1942 fire losses. For instance, there appears to be a reversal in the trend of losses in that fire losses in dwellings and in rural and farm areas are evidently on the decline, while, on the other hand, losses in industrial plants are on the increase. It appears that in 1942 there were more big losses by fire in industrial plants than in any other similar period in a long, long time. To some extent that may be inevitable because of factors which operate to encourage such a situation.

From information available it appears reasonable to believe that the fire experience in Canada has been similar to that in the United States. The figures for fire losses in 1942 in Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa are not yet available.

It might be of interest to analyze the underlying reasons for this apparent reversal of trend in the 1942 fire losses. The favorable factors which might be considered are the greater public concern with fire because of the war, the training of millions of people through the Office of Civilian Defense and other cooperating agencies, the conservation and salvage programs, and the lack of moral hazard. These factors might well be grouped under one general heading of a greater fire consciousness on the part of the general public in their desire to cooperate in the war effort. This renewed effort is showing definite results in the reduction of fires in dwellings in our towns and cities and in the rural and farm areas.

Some of the unfavorable factors which are operating to increase industrial fire losses are the great increase in values, additional hours of work, speeding up of industrial processes with increased production, untrained workers, and perhaps most of all what might be termed a "war psychology of taking chances."

LARGE NUMBER OF INDUSTRIAL FIRES

The National Fire Protection Association in the pamphlet, Fires in One Year of War (December 7, 1941, to December 7, 1942), listed 299 fires in the United States and Canada and stated: "These fires have directly hampered the war effort by destroying war-production facilities, critical materials, finished goods, and military property." The April 1943 News Letter lists 153 important fires from December 7, 1942, to March 7, 1943—a period of 3 months—and contains this significant statement: "In this list have been included large fires destroying foodstuffs and various large-loss fires in addition to those destroying vital war supplies, delaying production in defense plants or damaging finished products. Practically every fire hinders the war effort directly or indirectly." According to the records of our executive office, there were about as many big industrial fires in the first 4 months of 1943 as occurred during the entire year of 1942.

An analysis of these 452 fires listed in the first 15 months of the war—and it must be understood that this is not intended as a complete record, as there have doubtless been hundreds of other similar fires in the United States and Canada that have not been reported to the National Fire Protection Association—would show in a very convincing manner that these fires must be considered as vitally affecting our war effort. On the other hand, it must also be recognized that very effective results are being accomplished by the inspection services of the War Department and other agencies in the reduction of fire losses in industries producing war materials.

PROTECTION OF FOOD-PRODUCING INDUSTRIES

The question might well be raised, however, as to whether or not we are providing adequate fire and explosion protection to our food and grain industries that are producing

vitally needed food materials. The destruction of a valuable starch plant with an estimated loss of $700,000; an egg-products plant with a loss of $450,000; a food-products plant engaged in the manufacture of powdered and condensed milk; a potato dehydrating plant; a plant engaged in processing soybeans with a loss of $500,000; a warehouse at a packing plant containing large stocks of canned goods with an estimated loss of $100,000; a grain elevator with a loss of $1,350,000, destroying sufficient bread rations to feed an army of 700,000 men for an entire year; another grain elevator with an estimated loss of $1,000,000 destroying valuable food rations, and a large flour-milling plant with an estimated loss of more than $5,000,000 destroying large quantities of grain and foodstuffs sufficient to make bread rations for a large-sized army of men—these are just a few of the examples that might be cited where serious losses have been experienced in food-producing industries.

In two of these recent food-plant fires and explosions, we are told the losses represented the annual productive capacity of approximately 2,000 grain farmers. These losses represented the production of over 150,000 acres of wheat land. The loss of equipment was sufficient to process and store cereal foodstuffs for millions of civilians. Despite these extensive food losses from fires, how many Americans have even realized that these fires have occurred.

We must realize that food will win this war and that that food must come from the United States and Canada. We must have that food, and having produced it, we must see that it is not destroyed by fire.

PUBLICITY SERVICE RENDERED BY NATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION

The National Fire Protection Association has been giving a great deal of publicity to these fires in important war-producing industries to hammer home the disastrous effect that fires are having on the war effort. This has been done through the News Letter, special reports on fires that have been issued, and special picture bulletins on National Defense fires that have been prepared and widely distributed. A very substantial distribution of this information to important federal officials, industrial leaders and other interested agencies has been made.

This contribution which the National Fire Protection Association is making, in my opinion, is very worthwhile and one that no other agency has attempted in a similar manner. It has focused attention on the importance of the application of effective fire-prevention measures at a time when we cannot afford to destroy vitally-needed production facilities.

STAFF CONTRIBUTIONS TO FEDERAL WAR AGENCIES

Another valuable contribution to the war effort is the assistance that the technical staff of the association has been giving to various Federal agencies during the past year. Since last October, General Manager Bugbee has been serving as chairman of the advisory council on fire prevention to the War Department, is also a member of the industrial protection council of the Office of Civilian Defense and has been quite active in contacts with the Federal Public Housing Authority. Technical Secretary Moulton is special consultant to the War Production Board and in that capacity has developed storage regulations for critical materials. Chief Engineer Bond has been extremely active in a consulting capacity to the Office of Civilian Defense and last fall made a trip with the chief of the fire defense section to their regional offices, and more recently was sent to England as a special fire protection consultant to the Office of Civilian Defense. Messrs. Bugbee, Moulton, and Bond are all consultants to the National Defense Research Committee, and have also maintained contacts with the Navy Department, Coast Guard, and other Federal agencies having fire protection problems.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO WAR EFFORT BY NATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION MEMBERS

In addition to the assistance being given by the technical staff, members of our association are making valuable contributions to the war effort in many different capacities. Several of the members of our fire marshal's section are serving as State or Provincial defense coordinators and are actively associated with civilian fire defense activities. Many of our members have been stationed in Washington and vicinity, rendering valuable service on fire prevention matters to Federal agencies. Last October the executive office arranged a conference in Washington for the purpose of assembling some of our members engaged in war fire prevention. About 40 men in key positions associated with the following Federal agencies were present and this is a good cross section of the type of service our members are rendering:

1. Internal Security Division, Office of Provost Marshal General, and Fire Prevention Division and Construction Division, Office of Chief of Engineers—War Department.
2. Bureau of Yards and Docks, and Bureau of Ships—Navy Department.
3. Security Division and Training School—Coast Guard.
4. Safety and Technical Supply Division, Stock Pile Protection and Storage Facilities Branch, and Fire Equipment Branch—War Production Board.
5. Fire Defense Section—Office of Civilian Defense.
6. Federal Public Housing Authority.
7. Civil Aeronautics Administration.
8. Safety Division, National Park Service.
9. Division of Fire Control, Forest Service.
10. Fire Resistance Section National Bureau of Standards.
11. Facilities Security Branch, Bureau of Mines.
12. National Bureau of Industrial Protection.

NATIONAL FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION IN POST-WAR PLANNING

It can well be seen that our association is playing a very prominent part in the national war effort. We can also be expected to play an equally prominent part in the post-war planning in fire-prevention matters. It is highly logical for our association to at least have the framework so that some thought and study can be given to the problems we are bound to face after the war.

It is my recommendation that the National Fire Protection Association take leadership in this matter and that steps be taken to set up a committee on post-war planning. This committee should include in its personnel some of our long-time members with broad outlook and varied industrial experiences. This group might well exchange ideas and perhaps gradually begin to formulate some of the problems and steps that might be taken to meet them. It does not seem wise to your president to expect the executive staff to do all the planning and thinking about post-war problems, because it requires a broader vision than any one group of people would be expected to have.

Now as to the post-war problems that we must face and that should be given some continuous thought and study, probably no one person would select the same list, but the things your president has in mind might be set down as follows:

1. The restoration of prewar fire protection standards which have been lowered during the war emergency.
2. Fire department manpower and equipment problems after the war.
3. Proper fire protection measures for post-war housing developments. Coupled with this, thought should be given to the protection of areas of the country against future possible wars and bombing attacks and the possible decentralization of cities and industries.
4. If elaborate projects are undertaken by Federal and State agencies to relieve post-war employment situations, the relation of such work to fire-protection projects should be considered.
5. What should be done with the buildings of huge area and inferior construction after the war?
6. Could the association be helpful in making places for the men interested in fire-protection work from the Army, Navy, and other Federal agencies that may be cut down after the war?

These are some of the things that might well be given a good deal of thought by the National Fire Protection Association in the post-war planning program.

MEMBERSHIP INCREASE

The increasing growth in the membership of our association should be a source of gratification. During the year we have broken all membership records. In the month of March we received applications from 208 new members. The membership has passed the 7,000 mark which is by far the largest in our history and is increasing at a healthy rate.

Of course, in considering this remarkable growth in membership it is only natural to state that the activities of our extremely loyal and faithful chairman of our membership committee, H. E. C. Rainey, of Washington, D. C., have been largely responsible for this accomplishment. Your president is in a position to observe at first hand the tremendous amount of interest Mr. Rainey has taken in the development of the membership campaign and the vast amount of work he has done to bring about this result. He has developed an efficiently organized system which is functioning under his leadership to a very high degree. The association owes him a very great debt of gratitude for his untiring efforts and faithful service. This remarkable growth in membership qualifies the association for further valuable service in fire prevention in the days ahead.

PROGRAM FOR WARTIME CONFERENCE

The program for the forty-seventh annual meeting very appropriately provides for a wartime conference on fire prevention problems. In addition to the technical committee reports, provision has been made for several important features dealing with war-fire problems.

A forum on municipal fire protection and civilian defense under the leadership of past president George W. Elliott will consider such matters as civilian fire-protection activities, problems of fire department operations, manpower affecting the fire service, and fighting airplane-crash fires.

A new feature will be provided for the first time in the war industry fire prevention clinic to enable our members having specific problems in war industries to consult the chairmen and members of our technical committees. In this fire prevention clinic any association member is free to discuss his individual problems and if desired, make suggestions for future consideration of the several committees. This new feature should prove exceedingly helpful and instructive.

The new technical and educational fire protection films developed during the past year under the leadership of Vice President Richard E. Vernor, chairman of our committee on visual education, will again be one of the high spots of this conference.

The inspectors' forum under the guidance of Curtis W. Pierce will provide a channel for an informal discussion of practical problems met by inspectors in their field work. All insurance, fire department, industrial, and other inspectors are invited to contribute their experience in this forum.

The Army and Navy fire-protection forum, in which officers from the War Department, Navy Department, and Coast Guard will participate, will consider such important war matters as internal-security protection, fire prevention in the Army Air Forces, new types of incendiary bombs, explosion prevention in ordnance plants, training the Navy to fight fires, Coast Guard fire safety, and safeguarding the Navy's shore establishments.

This will prove to be an important historical meeting concerned with the welfare of our Nation. I am sure it can be said with definite assurance that every member in attendance will make a definite contribution. Your presence at this trying and extremely busy period guarantees it.

The National Fire Protection Association is meeting the challenge in a great national crisis by rendering valuable service in reducing fire losses in the war effort. The association will continue this service to our National Government during the present war crisis and will go forward confident in the assurance that when victory is attained—as it assuredly will be—our association will willingly and faithfully continue to render similar service in making this a better world in which to fully enjoy "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Can Our Food Dealers Survive?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we have often been told that food will win the war and the peace that is to follow. Lawrence Sullivan writes that "food is the human fuel which keeps every other war production line going." It is tragically true, as he writes, that "when the food lines jam, the whole war effort is threatened."

What has happened to our sympathy for our system of free enterprise, under which our system of food distribution advanced to the point where it was the envy of the world?

Can our men on the battle fronts and our men and women on the home front be fed under a system planned by dreamers and reformers?

Lawrence Sullivan, writing in the May issue of Nation's Business presents a very searching analysis of the confusion which today attends this vital problem. The article follows:

CAN OUR FOOD DEALERS SURVIVE?

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

(A year ago this month we opened the discussion of a possible food shortage with an article by Mr. Sullivan, Plans May Deny Us Food. The confusion he predicted then has led to conditions described here.)

Some weeks ago Paul S. Willis, president of the Grocery Manufacturers of America, warned of a food shortage, "so severe that it may lead to riots in several war-production areas."

Today Government controls threaten a break-down of food distribution throughout the United States. In the past year some 50,000 retail food stores have closed their doors—principally because they could not keep up with the added clerical work necessitated by price controls, rationing and inventory questionnaires from Washington. Labor is scarce, operating costs are mounting, but selling prices are frozen under Office of Price Administration ceilings. In the first quarter of 1943, grocers and butchers went out of business at the rate of 5,000 a month. Many remote communities now have no grocery stores; entire States have been inadequately supplied with such basic commodities as meat, butter, lard, or potatoes for 2 months in a stretch.

Trade surveys disclose five principal food-distribution difficulties:

1. Shortage of manpower.
2. Uncertain supplies.
3. Badly adjusted price ceilings.
4. Restricted transportation by boat, rail, and truck.
5. Burdensome accounting connected with ration banking and Government-controlled inventories.

Food handlers, wholesale and retail, never have been classified as essential war workers. Experienced manpower has been swept out of the industry at an alarming rate. Some large grocery chains are experiencing a labor turnover of 10 percent every week. This means a whole new working force five times a year. The normal peacetime turnover in this industry is about 10 percent a year. Thus it now requires about 50 times the normal rate of hiring to keep stores manned. Women have been employed successfully in all retail grocery functions, but every store still must have at least 1 man for heavy lifting. The War Manpower Commission has denied even that minimum.

A study of time consumed in ration accounting, special inventories, and questionnaires from the Government, plus ration banking, revealed that such work required, in equivalent man-hours, the services of one full-time employee for each store—an average of 7 hours and 20 minutes each day. This added work calls for a new labor force of approximately 30,000 persons in the chain stores alone, and perhaps 50,000 more in the larger independent groceries.

In most smaller stores, the business volume does not support an additional clerk for this work. The burden falls on the proprietor, after store hours. Unable to keep up with it, a Michigan grocer closed his business after 40 successful years:

"For the past 6 months I have been behind the counter 10 hours a day, then up half the night filling in Government forms. Sunday is required for inventory reports, ration accounts, or some new application for coffee, sugar, or canned goods."

SHOPPING TAKES HOURS

A stop-watch study in Illinois disclosed that, with point rationing of canned goods, an average of 11 minutes was required to clear each customer through the checker at the cash register. This means an average of 44 customers for each checker in an 8-hour day. Before rationing, the checkers could clear about 25 customers an hour, or 175 a day. With point rationing of meat, the checker lines are further slowed down. But even before meat stamps had to be collected, grocers needed 4 times their normal force of cashiers to handle the same number of customers. This would require 240,000 additional checkers in the chains alone.

Current grocery closings are not usually reflected in the monthly reports on bankruptcies, because the shopkeepers do not actually wait for insolvency. They are not business failures. They simply find themselves facing overwhelming demands from the Federal bureaus.

In ordinary times the grocer sends his orders to the wholesaler perhaps a month in advance. He is reasonably certain the goods will be delivered before they are needed. Today, he cannot know what will be delivered until the truck arrives at his door. From day to day, he must take what he can get. He must juggle point values in his buying so that his ration bank account will not be overdrawn. If certain perishable items do not move because their point values are too high, he must apply to his local ration board for permission to reduce the point value to avoid spoilage. He then must report in detail the point value of the goods sold at reduced ration rates, and must apply on the proper forms for new tickets to make up the difference in his allowable rationed inventory. But such "bargains" never may exceed 2 percent of his total rationed inventory for any 1 month.

Counting different brands of the same staple, many grocers carry as many as 300 rationed items. Every retailer must post the point value of each item in stock. An official change in point values requires a re-marking of every can or package.

Dollars-and-cents ceiling prices also must be posted for each item and any change in these ceilings likewise requires a re-marking of the stock.

The storekeeper must show in his monthly reports, not only the volume of purchases in each item, but also must give "the name and address of his seller, and the points he gave up for each purchase." Any failure to conform to the letter of these orders runs into this make-'em-like-it language from the Office of Price Administration regulations:

"Persons violating any provision of this regulation are subject to criminal penalties, civil enforcement actions, suits for treble damages, and proceedings for suspension of licenses." Section 20 of Office of Price Administration regulations provides that, without trial or hearing, Washington may suspend either a wholesale or retail license for such period as, in the judgment of the Administrator, is necessary or appropriate in the public interest.

When uniform ceiling prices were established for all markets, truckers and shippers of fruits and fresh vegetables began to divert their supplies to the smaller cities closer to the farms, thus saving freight and drayage. Within 10 days these diversions reduced New York City's receipts of farm produce by approximately half. On 1 day in March, for example, the New York State Retail Merchants Association recorded arrivals of 62 carloads of potatoes, as compared with 143 carloads on the same day of the previous year. Oranges were 10 carloads, against 21 a year earlier. Total cars of all fruits and vegetables on track in the New York market that day were 292, against 554 a year earlier.

PARALYSIS, NOT SHORTAGE

Chicago reported 55 carloads of potatoes one day, against a normal arrival of 150 to 175 cars. Said the president of the Carlot Potato Association, of Chicago:

"The price ceilings developed in Washington are unworkable, and they have disrupted the orderly distribution of potatoes throughout the entire country. There is an adequate supply of potatoes, but the distribution system has been paralyzed."

Price ceilings on dressed meat at wholesale were fixed before livestock prices were frozen. As live prices advanced the meat packers were squeezed against their earlier ceilings. At present live values, the packer shows a deficit of approximately 4½ cents a pound for every beef carcass slaughtered. This price pinch has already closed several hundred small slaughtering houses. One small packer told how his average daily slaughter had been cut from 175 to 50 animals.

"We've been here ever since the Civil War, but I don't see how we can stay in business under the present squeeze. I pay 18 cents a pound for livestock, and I get only 22 cents a

pound for it dressed under Office of Price Administration ceilings. I lose 40 percent of the live weight in dressing. * * * If the Office of Price Administration lawyers had consulted someone in the packing or slaughtering business when they were writing their meat laws, we wouldn't be in this jam."

By the same sort of official miscalculation, stock feeds were priced in relation to parity for wheat and grains, rather than in relation to meat ceilings. This formula made feeding costs so high there was no incentive to stockmen to increase their herds. Indeed, many curtailed their feeding programs. In all, this venture in managed economy produced a diminishing supply of meat in the face of a sharply increasing demand. Meat rationing then became inescapable, adding further to the costs of both slaughter and distribution

In pricing dressed hogs, the Office of Price Administration set the figure at a level which made it more profitable to sell lard in the form of meat, instead of rendered. Dressed pork began to come into the butcher shops weighing about 10 pounds more than normal per carcass. This extra 10 pounds of meat represented 10 pounds of potential lard. Under the Government ceilings, however, the lard was worth $14.55 a hundred pounds, Chicago, while, sold as meat, the fat brought $26.50 wholesale. Could any packer be expected to sell his pork fat as lard at 15 cents a pound after the Government itself had set a price of 26 cents for the same fat in pork loins? By this piece of bungling approximately 1,000,000,000 pounds of lard went to the butcher shops instead of the rendering vats. That's the principal reason why there is now a shortage of animal fats.

In its search for substitute vegetable oils, the Board of Economic Warfare created a special business association, chartered under the laws of New York, to bring in foreign oils. The results are a military secret, but this agency did achieve the ultimate in alphabetical designations, the EGFVOFOBM—The Emergency Group for Foreign Vegetable Oils, Fats and Oil-Bearing Materials.

During 1942 the grocery manufacturers of America maintained almost daily contact with no less than 21 Federal agencies—certificates, amendments, special orders, interpretations, from O. P. A., W P. B., F. S. A., F. D. A., F. W. A., O. C. D., B. L. S., F. C. A., O. L. L. A. (Office of Lend-Lease Administration), U. S. I. S., and O. D. H. W. S. (Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services) among others.

Representative HATTON W. SUMNERS, of Dallas, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, blames bureaucratic mismanagement for our critical food situation.

"Crops are not being raised in Washington," he told the House. "They cannot be produced on paper. We are already far advanced in the crop year. People to raise these crops are not in the fields. Cows to produce this milk are on the way to the slaughterhouse."

REGULATIONS EVERYWHERE

In addition to the Office of Price Administration regulations, the grocers and butchers must keep abreast of War Production Board, which regulates the production and distribution of shop equipment, refrigeration machinery, tools, and appliances. They must regulate their delivery services in accordance with the rules promulgated by the Office of Defense Transportation; they must conform to the packaging and labeling standards fixed by the Food and Drug Administration; their paper is governed by War Production Board, and their tea quotas fixed every quarter by the Food Distribution Administration of the Department of Agriculture. Wages and hours are controlled in part by the Department of Labor and in part by the War Manpower Commission.

During the last week of March Washington orders touching grocers and butchers numbered 47, or about 8 every working day.

The mere text of this week's order made about 60 mimeographed pages, and the brief condensation offered by the trade associations required 22 typewritten pages when single-spaced. To read and digest the orders of the week would require the full-time services of an attorney in every corner grocery.

What, for example, is cheddar cheese? Here is the definition as set forth in amendment No. 3 to MPR 289—OPA:

"A clean, pleasant, mild aroma, a pleasing nutty flavor, a mellow, silk, meaty body, and a close, solid, uniformly colored interior."

That makes it official. If you get anything less, you are entitled theoretically to take it back. It's not cheddar unless it has the Office of Price Administration's "nutty flavor."

Meat for sausage and processed luncheon specialties also has vanished under ceiling prices. Instead of selling such meat at bargain differentials to the sausage makers, packers now dress it for the direct market. The records of the House Small Business Committee disclose that local distributors and processors normally handled about 40 percent of the country's total meat tonnage. Under the present program, most of them have become what one Office of Production Administration official described as "necessary war casualties." The liquidation of this group of businessmen has left many smaller cities with no organized system of meat distribution, said a protest from the Pennsylvania Grocers' Association.

PUZZLE OF THE BEES

The National Association of Retail Meat Dealers, representing some 20,000 shops, has charged publicly that the meat price ceilings and distribution quotas "were worked out by classroom theorists without practical knowledge of the meat industry."

Under the law agricultural commodities may not be put under price ceilings lower than 110 percent of parity. When the time came to price honey, the Office of Price Administration discovered that the Department of Agriculture never had determined "parity" for that item. What to do? The dilemma was solved by an interpretive ruling which declared extracted honey to be a processed food, subject to a price ceiling, whether sold by retailer, wholesaler, importer, bottler, or beekeeper. The same order, however, ruled comb honey to be an agricultural commodity, beyond the scope of the Office of Price Administration's price-fixing authority. The result was a ceiling price on strained honey, no ceiling on comb honey.

Or consider the once simple routine of importing coffee. The importer must file qualifying papers with the Board of Economic Warfare (Form PD-561). He then is assigned a quota for the next quarter. This quota is presented to the War Production Board, where a shipping authorization is issued for each consignment. Then the Board of Economic Warfare assigns shipping space, as available. The importer next goes to the Commodity Credit Corporation, where he files another form applying to be designated a temporary import agent of the Commodity Credit Corporation, subject to the Inter-American Coffee Quota Agreement.

"This application," says the official instruction sheet, "will be reviewed by the War Production Board and the Board of Economic Warfare, and, if approved, the importer then will receive from the Commodity Credit Corporation an agency appointment to contract for a specified amount of coffee."

When the coffee arrives, it is the property of the United States Government, but the Commodity Credit Corporation at once sells it to its agent-importer. Each contract thus made then is subject to Office of Price Administration price ceilings, and details of every consignment must be filed with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

When customs entry is made, the importer also must file, in duplicate, Form PD-222-B, with the collector of customs.

As a part of the meat-rationing program, the Office of Price Administration distributed a 20-page booklet telling butchers precisely how to cut each carcass.

"These instructions require us to cut meat in a way it never has been cut before," said a Seattle wholesaler. "A man who has cut meat for 50 years is naturally indignant over these impractical orders, but he has to follow the regulations. Men of experience in this business are completely at a loss, because their practical knowledge is useless."

When the Truman committee launched a Senate investigation of the food muddle, late in March, the testimony presented by experienced operators in every phase of distribution centered on five immediate steps to release once more the drives and energies of the American enterprise system.

1. Adequate manpower must be made available to wholesalers, jobbers, and retailers.

2. Price ceilings must be fixed at the production level, on a basis calculated to stimulate, rather than discourage, expansion; and the whole structure of price controls must be simplified to eliminate unduly burdensome bookkeeping and accounting.

3. Rationing easily could be relaxed or abandoned in many items once production and processing has been stimulated by a sound and profitable price structure.

4. Existing machinery must be utilized for the wholesale and jobber functions. Starry-eyed reform programs designed to eliminate the wholesale segment of distribution must be abandoned. Many of the Office of Price Administration's 2,700 lawyers well could be replaced by experienced food men.

5. Price controls should be directed, not to the elimination of profits or other socialistic objectives, but toward the movement of an ever greater volume of goods.

Food is the human fuel which keeps every other war-production line going. When the food lines jam, the whole war effort is threatened. Our American food industry, stimulated by the competitive impulses of free enterprise, has built up over the years the most marvelous distribution system the world ever has known. No people approaches us in the variety and quality of foods normally available to even the remotest towns and villages. Nowhere have the normal profit margins of processors and distributors been kept so low.

But, during the past 2 years, all the experience and genius which developed this magnificent system have been ignored or flouted. Practical men have been hobbled with the chains of planners, reformers, and crackpots Says Representative EUGENE E. COX, of Georgia, a veteran of 25 years' service in the House:

"The people of this country are beginning to resent what they believe to be the fact—that their Government has, in large part, been delivered into the keeping of an alien and alien-minded group, wholly unfit for the work they have been assigned to do, and for the offices to which they have been appointed."

Reciprocal Trade Agreement Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on

reciprocal trade agreements recently issued by the Business Advisory Council for the Department of Commerce; composed of 60 eminent American businessmen and executives of both national parties.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—REPORT ON RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

The Business Advisory Council believes that failure to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act at this time would be most unfortunate since such action would be interpreted by the world as an indication of the intention of the American people to return to isolationism. To allow the trade-agreement policy to lapse now would convince our allies that either we are not sincere when we speak of the reconstruction of the world through the restoration of private trade and enterprise, or that we have reached the conclusion that government barter through bilateral agreements and a controlled economy is the best method of protecting our national interest in the post-war world.

Should the act, which expires on June 12 next, not be extended, no new agreements could be made thereafter and none now in effect could be amended.

Thirty agreements have been made and are now in effect with 25 countries. These agreements have been carefully negotiated under the direction of Secretary of State Hull during the last 9 years, and constitute a network of tangible, friendly trade relationships as opposed to the system of controlled trade and forced barter which contributed to the present war.

The council is convinced that the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should not be made a political issue to be decided upon the grounds of congressional versus Executive power. It already incorporates numerous safeguards for the protection of the national interest in the negotiation of the agreements themselves by requiring public hearings, following a finding by the President that existing duties or other restrictions on either side are "unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States."

The act also specifically provides: (1) That existing duties may be reduced by not more than 50 percent of the existing rates; (2) that no dutiable article may be transferred to the free list or from the free list to the dutiable list; (3) that the President in giving public notice of his intention to negotiate an agreement must designate the products that may possibly be affected; and (4) that before concluding an agreement the President must seek information and advice from the Tariff Commission, and the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, and from such other sources as may be deemed appropriate. The act may be repealed at any time by Congress; it regularly comes up for modification or continuation.

To attempt to make reciprocal adjustments of tariffs at this juncture, either through the Tariff Commission alone or by specific approval of Congress, would, it is believed, destroy the purpose of the act. To apply log-rolling methods in negotiating reciprocal agreements or to provide that such agreements may be made effective only by a two-thirds vote of the Senate would be tantamount to defeating the whole objective of the legislation in advance.

To assume our role as a creditor nation in world reconstruction in the post-war period our tariff policy will require delicate adjustment to the relationships between States and to the separate and distinct interest of the Nation, while at the same time providing for generalizing the benefits of our entry into other markets and of access to our own, within the limits of the most-favored-nation clause. This combination of individual negotiations with broad general provisions to prevent the development of mere bilateral agreements between nations forms the essence of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The history of the act thus far has shown no serious injury to any American interest. If serious injury does develop, the council is assured that proper steps will be taken to remedy such condition at the first feasible opportunity.

The difficulty of initiating a policy of reciprocity is demonstrated by the fact that only three such treaties have ever been ratified by the Senate or approved by Congress. One was the Canadian Treaty of 1854, which lapsed with the Civil War in the United States. One was a minor treaty with Hawaii in 1875 and a third with Cuba in 1903. The reciprocity section of the Dingley Tariff of 1897 permitted the negotiation of such treaties subject to Senate ratification. All such treaties, however, died in committee despite the urgent pressure of President McKinley.

Until the principles of article VII of the Anglo-American Mutual Aid Agreement, dated February 23, 1942 (and agreements of similar nature that have been made with other United Nations), can be implemented, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is the only tangible assurance that we have that the United States will go into the post-war period with a constructive policy on which sound international trade relations may be built. It is the one guaranty for the future that we are not disposed to adopt policies that will force other nations down the road to extreme nationalism and trade barter. Our earlier tariff policy was undoubtedly one factor that led the British Commonwealth of Nations to set up the Ottawa Agreements, which tended to close the markets of the British Empire to the rest of the world.

The Business Advisory Council can assure the manufacturers of the United States and its businessmen generally that as Under Secretary Welles stated in a recent magazine article, no responsible statesman believes that so-called free trade, or anything approximating it, would be wise or possible for the United States at any time in the measurable future, and that there is no intention on the part of the present administration to use the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act along with the most-favored-nation clause in commercial treaties, to bring about such a result. The governmental bodies charged with final authority in the negotiation of such agreements state that the economic effect of the most-favored-nation clause in respect to other countries is always given careful consideration in establishing rates in any given reciprocal trade agreement. The council heartily approves such procedure and is assured that if the act is extended this policy will be continued.

In layman's language the unconditional most-favored-nation principle simply means the principle of nondiscriminatory treatment of the trade of all friendly nations. Nevertheless, the fact that the reciprocal trade agreements are made in compliance with this principle has given rise to considerable misunderstanding and even to the assertion that the United States is thus required to "generalize" to all nations the concessions it gives to specific nations in specific agreements, without obtaining any advantages in return.

This assertion is not accurate. The agreements themselves, of course, provide that the United States and the other party to the agreement will, in all trade matters, accord to all of each other's products treatment which is as favorable as that which they give to similar products imported from any other country. This is something for something, as every foreign trader knows. As between the United States and countries with which it has not concluded reciprocal trade agreements, the "unconditional most-favored-nation principle" actually means, in simple language, that the United States applies trade-agreement tariff reductions to products covered by such reductions when imported from any country that does not place American export trade at a disadvantage; that is, to any country which, in return, accords to our trade-customs treatment at least as favorable as the treatment accorded to similar products of any other country. This, too, is something for something, as every foreign trader knows.

Germany, in 1935, terminated the most-favored-nation provision of the commercial treaty between that country and the United States and entered into discriminatory bilateral trade agreements and otherwise discriminated harmfully against our trade. For that reason the products of Germany, and later of German-occupied territories, were denied the benefits of concessions made under trade agreements. For a time, because of flagrant discriminations against United States trade, the application of trade-agreement reductions to Australian products was withheld. Although our trade-agreement reductions were of relatively small interest to Australia, since they did not relate to Australia's principal export products, that country ended these discriminations and thereupon we again applied our trade-agreement rates to such minor Australian products as came within the description of articles subject to reduced rates of duty in trade agreements with other countries.

The nondiscriminatory principle works both ways. The United States gives a pledge against discrimination and receives a similar pledge in return. All our international trade benefits by this policy.

The United States does not throw away bargaining power by this policy. It is the general rule in negotiating with a given country to grant concessions only on products of which that country is our principal supplier. Thus, the trade agreement with Argentina grants concessions on certain low grades of wool of which Argentina is the chief supplier but which do not apply to the finer wools imported from Australia. That leaves bargaining power for a trade agreement with Australia.

A contrary policy of discriminations might use up valuable bargaining power in the process of getting rid of foreign discriminations resulting from our own discriminations.

Discriminations by one country breed retaliatory discriminations in other countries. The result is harmful both to trade and to general relations between countries. The nondiscriminatory principle, like that of reciprocity, is the property of no one party. It is an old principle. In the case of the United States, it dates in practice from the days of George Washington. It was adopted by us formally, as the "unconditional most-favored-nation principle" in 1923, when the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes was Secretary of State. It is a thoroughly sound principle, of immeasurable value to American foreign trade and to our friendly relations with other countries, which should be retained.

Although the several agreements heretofore negotiated embody protective clauses covering all or at least most of the following points, the Business Advisory Council earnestly recommends that every reciprocal agreement stipulate definitely that the interests of the United States will be protected against abnormal changes in foreign exchange, and that its benefits will be denied to any country which may block in a discriminatory manner exchange transactions with the United States after agreements are made, or which subsequently confiscates American property. Protection should also be given American industry, labor and agriculture from dumping, forced labor, export subsidies, etc.

The Business Advisory Council moreover earnestly recommends that administrative agencies of government should move promptly to enforce the protective provisions of all reciprocal trade agreements, whenever such provisions may be violated by the countries concerned.

PAST HISTORY OF COUNCIL ACTION

The previous recommendations of the council supporting the act are to be found in the report of January 12, 1940, on reciprocal trade-agreements program, a copy of which is attached. All the reasons advanced in this cogent document remain valid and they may be summarized as follows:

1. The act is a safeguard to our national welfare and to American standards of living.

2. The results of the trade agreements should be tested in terms of their effect on the national economy as a whole and not solely in terms of any particular pressure group of limited economic interest in labor, agriculture, or industry.

3. The international economic interests of American citizens are quite as valid subjects of national policy as the activities of American citizens at home; and that in this respect trade and investment in foreign countries are essential to maximum national prosperity.

4. The act provides for consideration of the specific and practical commercial considerations of vital importance to large sections of our industry and agriculture and therefore the council urged active and constructive cooperation with all interests involved. The recommendations with respect to these considerations were later implemented by hearings under the Trade Agreements Act intended to do what the council report recommended, namely, to assure decisions which are calculated to conserve and foster enterprise to the benefit of the broadest interests of our economy.

After the review of the entire program of the trade agreements as against other alternatives, and in the light of such statistics as were available, the council advocated the continuation of the reciprocal trade agreements as the most practical means available of adjusting tariff barriers so as to augment the exchange of manufactured goods, products of the soil, and of minerals, with the object of maintaining high standards of living at home and of promoting American foreign trade and international good will. The council was specifically concerned to see that the most-favored-nation principle should be continued as the basis for negotiating trade agreements with due consideration of its effect on domestic industry and agriculture and American investments abroad.

PRESENT RECOMMENDATIONS

The Business Advisory Council urges that, in addition to these points, the present state of the world requires support of the trade-agreements program on five grounds:

1. The passage of this act at this time is a primary means of promoting a policy by government that relies upon increasing trade through private enterprise rather than through public barter and management of international trade. This is, of course, of vital importance to the whole free-enterprise system in which this council is basically concerned.

2. It stands as the one substantial contribution that this country can now make to an assurance of a return to trade practices which will permit the restoration of an international gold standard for clearing trade balances in the post-war world. This country has a very substantial stake in this matter, too well-known to require comment.

3. It is claimed by those opposed to the program that the reciprocal trade-agreements policy is primarily put into the hands of the executive department, and thus escapes control by Congress. This is a misleading claim, both in the light of (a) present practice and (b) the alternatives to the present program:

(a) The renewal of the act every 3 years permits a review of trade-agreement policy and congressional control in terms of the actual workings of the act. The hearings which are held under the act permit substantially the same representation of interests as is secured in congressional tariff acts and on a much more balanced basis of evaluation.

(b) The alternatives to this policy are in all probability a return to rigid tariff policy through cumbersome congressional action, or an extension of Executive control through the fiscal agencies of the Government, which, under post-war pressures, might readily be warped into the most extreme form of Executive domination, comparable to the necessary war measures of control which now exist. Congress, in countering this type of action, would have either to destroy the fiscal agencies concerned or to bring them under a type of pressure, the results of which can be easily foreseen.

4. The scope of the agreements is strictly limited in the act and is subject to reasonable congressional scrutiny and review. On strictly constitutional grounds there can be no question that Congress always has the power through legislative action to override any agreement made if the necessary support is forthcoming. The virtue of making trade agreements by this method, however, is that a period of stability is assured for a sufficient number of years to permit a real test of tariff policy. Any interference by Congress within this period should be taken only on extraordinary and unusual grounds.

5. Above all, the council recommends the continuation of the act as a symbolic declaration to the entire world that in the post-war period we intend to favor economic intercourse between nations on a liberal and flexible basis rather than by extension of war controls or by reliance upon protecting our economic interests by policing the world through force.

The council is convinced that the alternatives to the trade-agreements policy all lie down the road toward totalitarianism, either through a relapse into international anarchy in trade relations, as was the case toward the end of the 1920's and the early 1930's, or alternatively to set up imperialistic standards of world domination through national socialistic economies and direct military control. There is no middle ground between these extremes that does not require the use of trade agreements along the lines of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

Free Enterprise in the Post-War Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the annual convention of the American Roadbuilders' Association, at the Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, May 6, 1943. The subject of the address was free enterprise in the post-war era.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When we boast or speak with justifiable pride and say "I am an American," by strong implication, if not by direct expression, we pay tribute to and reassert our faith in and our devotion to the fundamentals, ideals, and principles upon which the structure of our society and Government rest. By such expressions we acknowledge approvingly that these have been potent factors in the building, growth, and development of this new world on the American continent.

The amazing progress and matchless achievements of our people, and the preeminence of our Nation as a world power, did not occur by accident. The founding of our Republic was inspired in the hearts of men who accepted the scriptural concepts of creation that man was created free, with individual dignity and the inherent right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. With high resolve and noble purpose our founding fathers declared their independence and established a human society under a representative form of government. Among the many sacred liberties guaranteed under the Constitution, the rights of property are respected and protected, and the labor and enterprise of the citizen is intended to be rewarded in accordance with his individual talent, ingenuity, and industry. The love of freedom was the dynamic force and power that gave hope, stimulated faith, and inspired and sustained them in making the sacrifices that were exacted in the hard and bitter struggle that followed and was crowned with success and victory.

The world was astounded at our phenomenal growth. It still marvels at the high standard of living we have attained and at the industrial development achieved by the pioneering spirit of men free to choose their own way of life and to serve and operate their government through established democratic processes.

In the present catastrophic conflagration with world conquest as the objective of those who make war against all the free peoples of the earth, again it is America, as it was in 1918, that has the great reservoir of industrial strength to give the democracies the balance of power and assure ultimate triumph in the mighty conflict in which we are now engaged. The great material power and might of our Nation, supported and fortified by the spiritual ideals of its people who love God and country, provide the final barrier to the enslavement of the human race.

The power and capacity for mass production that now exists in America are unquestionably the fruits of free enterprise. It is this productive power converted into the "arsenal of democracy" that makes it possible for our brave sons and our allied troops to subdue the mighty forces of tyranny and evil that have been unleashed upon the world, and that will bring about the utter destruction of Hitlerism and imperialistic Japan.

Today, within less than a year and a half of the time our country was forced to take up arms, our production of weapons and armaments greatly excels that of all of our enemies and practically equals that of the rest of the entire world. We have not yet reached the limits of probability nor begun to tax seriously the extent of our possibilities. In this extreme and desperate hour of world crisis, this stupendous accomplishment is a brilliant and glorious testimonial to the soundness, virtue, and wisdom of the American system of free competitive enterprise.

The totalitarian enemies we fight have, in contrast to our free American system, a state-managed, politically controlled and directed industry, manned and operated by virtual slave labor. Their philosophy, their system, and ours with respect to enterprise, industry, and production, are just as definitely engaged in a contest for supremacy as are their armies and ours on the field of battle. If they could possibly win the battle of production in superior quality and greater quantity of armaments, then certain defeat would be our un-

happy fate. Since we are winning and still gaining on the assembly lines, none among us have so little faith as to doubt our ultimate and decisive victory. Then how can any citizen with good conscience and in good faith insist that free enterprise in America has failed, that it is no longer to be desired and should be destroyed, or that it should be replaced by a state-managed and controlled system of production and economy?

In spite of this record and the tremendous reservoir of power and strength free enterprise gives us in the present world crisis, some maintain that it has served its usefulness, that it is now antiquated and will not be equal to the challenge of reconstruction in the post-war era. They would supplant it with a planned program of Government control, ownership and direction, with many of our major industries operated by some bureau or agency created by the State and financed by the Federal Treasury. That there are those in our midst who are definitely planning such a radical change in our economy arouses great concern among those of us who want to preserve the fundamentals of our democracy.

We plan the strategy of war. Our brave soldiers, by their heroism and sacrifices, translate that strategy into victory on the battle fronts. We plan for a peace that will last and endure, in the hope that mankind may be free and live without fear of recurring wars, of death and destruction. When the military victory shall have been won, the statesmanship of the world, supported by all peace-loving people, will endeavor in good faith to translate into deeds and reality the four great freedoms announced in the Atlantic Charter. Next to these supreme objectives, it is imperative that we take some thought of tomorrow with respect to our domestic economy and the rehabilitation of our people here on the homeland. Wise planning for reconstruction here at home is second in importance only to the achievement of the objectives of winning the war and the establishing of permanent peace. Such planning and any program for post-war reconstruction as may be evolved and adopted should not contemplate or involve the changing of the fundamental processes of our democracy and present system of government. Free competitive enterprise is one of the stalwart pillars of strength in our national structure. If we abandon or destroy it, we cannot be free from want nor free from fear, for free enterprise constitutes one of the basic freedoms of the American way of life.

Can private enterprise meet the challenge that reconstruction will bring in the post-war era? Will there be an unemployment crisis following the war? Will it be necessary, and, if so, to what extent, to have Government work-made programs when peace comes again? These questions present some of the serious problems with which we must be concerned and must be prepared to solve at the end of the war.

Those who are purposely bent and determined on trying to work a change in our system of government will take every advantage of the opportunity reconstruction affords for the spending of multiplied billions of Federal funds to create relief work of most any character. They will be little concerned about its nature or value and the contribution or lack of contribution that it will make to the wealth and security of our Nation. Those of that school of thought, and who have designs to enlarge and expand bureaucracy in our Government, will insist that there is no other remedy or adequate solution. We can, therefore, well expect that much pressure will be applied on Congress for the enactment of laws creating a tremendous work projects program, financed almost exclusively from the Federal Treasury. According to my best judgment and conviction, this should not be resorted to on a broad scale until and unless there are such developments as to show conclusively that private enterprise is incapable of meeting the challenge.

I am convinced that if government will cooperate with, instead of pursuing policies that definitely hinder and obstruct private enterprise, reconstruction can be attained in a normal American way and without unduly burdening the Federal economy with a further tremendous increase of the public debt.

It is reasonably and possibly conservatively anticipated that there will be potentially some 20,000,000 of people, now serving in our armed forces and employed in war industries, who will need to be rehabilitated into peacetime pursuits and employment. It is also recognized that there will be an interim of several months when our industries will be in transition from war production back to the production of peacetime goods. But once our plants are reconverted to the manufacturing of implements of peacetime industry I can foresee that consumer demands will, in all probability, be substantially equal to our present production capacity. In the automobile industry alone from six to seven millions of new passenger cars annually will be required for a period of 4 or 5 years, and possibly longer. The demand will also be great for radios, refrigerators, farm machinery, household furnishings, and many, many other necessities and luxuries that cannot be and are not now being supplied or made available with the country at war. I believe that private industry will be able, if given the opportunity, to meet these demands and thus provide employment for millions who will seek and need work following the war.

Not only will demands for consumer goods arise from our own American needs, but practically the whole world must be rehabilitated. The devastated occupied countries will have to be rebuilt. If a wise statesmanship leads this Nation in the formulation of foreign policies and in the development and negotiation of trade agreements with other countries, there can and there will be a tremendous outlet for American products in foreign markets. If we are to help alleviate human suffering in the countries devastated by war, agricultural production will need to be tremendously increased and thus many now in defense plants and in the armed forces of the country will have opportunities to return to agricultural pursuits, either as farm owners or laborers in the fields of agriculture.

According to authoritative reports, we have now bank deposits totaling more than $100,000,000,000, and this amount is rapidly increasing and may well reach more than one hundred and twenty-five billions before the war ends. Obviously this is a great reservoir of private wealth and financial resources. If invested it will not only support the continuation but will insure the expansion of private enterprise on a scale and at a tempo never before witnessed in the history of our Nation. Of these great reserves of individual wealth, easily from twenty-five to forty billions of dollars should be readily available and invested in new construction and production enterprises.

In addition to this source of money power, the American people have already purchased more than sixteen billions of dollars in War bonds of our Government and will continue to invest in these securities. Although the money is, in effect, loaned to the Government, it still represents wealth in the hands of individuals. Will this great reservoir of wealth and financial strength be employed in support and for the expansion of private enterprise? The answer, I think depends largely upon the attitude and action of our Government in the formulation of policies and the enactment of laws.

Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, in a recent address asserted that dependable post-war planing begins and all but ends within the four corners of our Federal revenue laws. He is eminently correct. We can tax industry and private enterprise out of existence. When the profit motif is eliminated, private initiative in industry cannot and will not function. Incentive will be destroyed. Our whole economic structure will collapse. There will then be no other course—no alternative except a state-managed and controlled economy. Private enterprise under such a burden would then be unable to provide employment and meet the challenge of post-war construction. Huge Government expenditures for work-made projects will, under such circumstances, become an imperative necessity. We cannot impose taxation to a degree that confiscation of property and reasonable profits results without destroying one of the basic freedoms that has made our Nation great and strong.

The taxing power of the Government, if used and so abused that those who have accumulated something above their living needs will not and cannot afford to invest in business, then under such a changed economy, our Government will become the employer and our people will be regimented into a condition of relative servitude to a stupendous national governmental bureaucracy.

We all admit that taxes must be high, but there are limits to which a democracy can go and survive. When and if taxes are increased to the point of diminishing returns, then free enterprise is doomed.

A wise course for our Government to pursue will be to stabilize our revenue laws on a sound basis, protect the profit motif, and provide incentive for private investments. It is likewise imperative that we undertake to control Federal expenditures and keep them within reasonable limits of the Government's income. We hear a great deal now about pay-as-you-go taxes. This goal, I believe, will ultimately be attained. Following the war, if we are to preserve and perpetuate our system of free enterprise, we shall need and should strive to attain a pay-as-we-go policy with respect to expenditures of the Federal Government.

We cannot enjoy or expect prosperity in the post-war era unless people are employed nor unless the great farming population of our country is able to get cost of production plus a living profit for agricultural products. Those are the two things that are indispensably essential to providing purchasing power, and purchasing power determines prosperity.

It is true that Government subsidies provide a temporary stimulant to business. In some cases, and under some circumstances, they can be justified but largely on the basis of a temporary expedient. But, generally and as a permanent policy, they cannot be justified. Subsidies necessitate and carry with them a measure of control by the Government over the business or enterprise that is the recipient of such assistance. The business, the industry, or the enterprise that accepts a Federal subsidy to some extent, and often to a great extent, must surrender a measure of its liberty and its freedom. This is also true in the case of individuals, and I believe that Government subsidies to business and industry should be the exception rather than the rule.

My remarks thus far have been primarily addressed to free enterprise and the adequacy of its capacity and ability to meet the expected demands and requirements of our Nation in the post-war era. By nothing I have said have I intended to imply that the Federal Government has no responsibility or duty to perform in this connection. In no way do I discount or minimize the need and importance of some Government spending and of its adoption of a post-war construction program. There are certain types of public projects and improvements that are primarily and essentially the obligations of the Federal Government, the several States, and municipalities. With respect to these certain types of projects and improvements, the

Federal Government and the States have always been charged with the duty of planning, financing, and execution. I shall only refer to one type or character—that in which all of you, as members of the American Road Builders' Association, are peculiarly interested, and the public has great concern—namely: The construction of public highways. The need for more and better highways and what we term "farm to market" roads is recognized as vital and essential to the continuing progress and the growth of our Nation. Facilities for aiding and expanding transportation must be provided as a part of reconstruction. A vast program of highway building will be in order and will have, I believe, the enthusiastic support of the American public and command the endorsement of the Congress by appropriate legislation and adequate appropriations.

I shall unreservedly favor such a program. Plans for it should be formulated now, with everything made ready for beginning it immediately at the termination of hostilities. There is no better way for the Federal Government to spend money on work projects. Money so expended will be spread through every State in the Union and will find its way into the channels of labor in thousands of communities where unemployment may be a serious problem. Also the benefits, advantages, and improvement of transportation facilities will be reasonably and equitably spread among the several political subdivisions of the Nation. The improved highways are never liabilities. Without exception, they are national assets, greatly enhancing the wealth and stimplating and accelerating social and economic progress.

I am not an expert and would not risk my judgment entirely, but it is my considered opinion that a national-highway construction program of approximately $3,000,000,000 annually, beginning at the end of the war and continuing over a period of possibly 5 years cannot only be justified by the needs for highway reconstruction and expansion but it affords one of the best methods, most effective means, and based on soundest economy for governmental assistance in solving the post-war unemployment problem.

I am not fully advised as to the needs of other States, but in my State alone, Arkansas, a $100,000,000 5-year road-construction program following the war can easily be justified as conservatively needed and necessary to meet the expected demands of traffic and transportation.

We should bear in mind, too, that such a road-building program, if carried out under the contract system, will in no way detract from or hinder private enterprise, but instead it will greatly support and stimulate it. It has been fully demonstrated that the contract method of construction is far the most practical and economical.

We cannot expect such a program to materialize just as a matter of course. Public sentiment will need to be aroused. Plans should be made in advance and be ready, and all agencies and all public interest, affected through their proper representatives should work diligently to see that these plans are made and ready so that work can begin when our soldiers start returning and unemployment begins.

I congratulate this association for its great work and the valuable contribution that it has made in the past to the development and construction of our system of wonderful highways throughout the Nation. Your work is not yet done. You still have great opportunities for service, both in the planning and obtaining of further programs to see that road building keeps apace with the progress and prosperity of our country, and further, that such construction shall be done, insofar as possible, by methods and means that preserve rather than impair or weaken one of our cherished basic freedoms—that of free enterprise.

In conclusion, I still believe that "We, the people," can have in America the kind of government we want. If, through lack of diligence, or if from indifference, we do not make the choice and do not work and fight and strive to continue and perpetuate the ideals of our democracy, then we can expect others to plan some very basic changes in the American way of life that will bring more regimentation and bureaucratic control of our lives, our fortunes, and our destiny.

Why Congress Should Act Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement made by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], opening the discussion on the program entitled "United Nations Today and Tomorrow Discussion Series," held at Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C., May 10, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American people are haunted by a memory of the past. In 1917 the American people united themselves in a world-wide effort to make the world a better place to live in. Unity, enthusiasm, and ultimate victory under idealistic leadership produced a plan which received the acclaim of the thoughtful of the whole world. Then our people beat a hasty retreat, an attempted retreat into self-sufficiency, finding security and prosperity for themselves, and assuming that they could let the rest of the world go hang. The thoughtful in our country knew that the world was a small unit, that there was only one world, and that war anywhere was a concern to all. Attempts were made to control the aggressor by moral suasion and by sanctions, to settle disputes by judicial procedure; but a glorious cynicism settled upon us and caused us to lose faith in our own ideals and to turn our backs upon history. This was not to be unexpected, for since the days of the Greek dramatists it has been known that men unite for war and destruction but divide for peace and construction. Through a misconception in our own Government about who had the last word we put into trial an absurd conclusion of what is termed in our Government a check and balance system, attempting to show that the last word in Government is fixed in a single institution. Men argued as if there were three governments in the United States and not just one. In an earlier day our Union might have been destroyed.

Under the American scheme, it is the people who have the last word. Under the American scheme the people's representatives are the policy-forming branch of our Government. It is for this reason, plus the reasons of uncertainty caused by what has happened in the past, that makes it necessary today that Congress speak. Another vital reason why Congress should speak is that this war we are now fighting is fast becoming a war between peoples, not a war between states. The old notion that men would divide for war on the basis of race, or religion, or neighborly interest has fallen by the wayside. Men today are dividing on the war on the basis of the principle of freedom and liberty of the individual. If what we in America have stood for, fought for, established, and maintained is good, that which would break down our institutions is bad. Therefore, the war today has become a war between good and evil—a war on our part in very deed against wickedness. Thus, we fight for the freedom of men's souls.

For the American people through its Congress not to say that the success obtained in the war shall be continued in the peace would be the turning of our backs upon the things we cherish the most. That would almost be traitorous in its nature, if not suicidal.

Congress must speak, speak in accordance with the theories that are ours. We will not turn our backs upon the dreams of the founding fathers. Liberty will become attainable for all people. The right to aspire, the right to worship, the right to go and come, and the right to have and hold shall become rights of all. Not to be willing to create in an international sense that which we ourselves have created and kept functioning for 150 years in a national sense would be turning our backs upon the dreams, the aspirations of the founding fathers, and the men and women who are giving their all at the front and sacrificing so much at home. The American Congress should speak in no uncertain terms to assure the American people and the world that we will support world organization to maintain peace; that we are not afraid of giving this organization force and power enough to see that the United Nations have a peace force; that the aggressor anywhere will be put down; that institutions will be established which will make possible the peaceful settlement of disputes; and that nations regardless of size will be protected in their internal rights.

Highways to Inter-American Unity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Highways to Inter-American Unity," delivered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] before the meeting of the American Road Builders Association, Chicago, Ill., May 6, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the outset of my remarks to you this afternoon I should like to make a declaration of those intentions which prompt me to take an active interest in the development of an effective system of highways throughout the Western Hemisphere. Impelled by past experience, and particularly by the experiences which the world undergoes at this very moment, I firmly believe in the need for inter-American unity, today and in the post-war period. This belief is the cornerstone of my concern for the spiritual, political and economic intercourse of the great nations of the new world.

I have long held to the conviction that the best method by which the peoples of the different nations can come to understand and appreciate each other is by means of accessible and efficient arteries of communication. Taking the United States as an example (and ours is a tremendous country), first-class highways both State and Federal, have rendered possible in large degree the erasing of sectionalism, misunderstanding, and ill will. It is mainly among those North Americans who have never traveled beyond the borders of their native State, and what is still more negative, those who have not ventured without the confines of their own community, where we find those hide-bound provincials who ill-advisedly divide our great country into sections to suit their particular prejudices. Those of us who have been fortunate enough to travel the highways and byways of these United States know full well that the regions encompassed by the States of Maine and California, North Dakota, and Texas, are inhabited by people who are very, very much alike. When we do find variations of temperament or point of view, these departures from our own way of thinking please, rather than disturb our American sensibilities, for the ideological gap is seldom of a serious proportion. These diminishing regional differences bring to mind, and emphasize, those marvelous processes of a political and social nature which have been in operation since the founding of the Republic, and which are slowly but surely grinding out a human type which we can point to with pride and say, here is an American. In similar fashion, well-conditioned and properly located avenues of communication also bring about better spiritual and cultural relations between the peoples of independent nations.

It does appear that I would not be inviting argument to observe that there is not another medium which would bring about more economic progress to the various republics of the Americas, to its cities, its towns, its villages, and, therefore, to its citizens, than the development of a sound system of inter-American highways. You are all familiar with the progress being made on the series of connecting highways from Buenos Aires to our southern border. I should like to call your attention at this time to what is perhaps the finest section of that series. It is with a full measure of satisfaction that I recall the labors of such great Mexicans as General Cardenas, General Mujica, and the Engineer Cortez Herrero, who dreamed of and effected the construction of a first-class highway from Laredo to Mexico City. In the face of innumerable obstacles, these men made it possible for thousands of North Americans to travel between these cities, thereby becoming familiar with Monterrey, Linares, Victoria, El Mante, Valles, Tamazunchale, Jacala, Zimapan, Pachuca, and the Capital. This is not even mentioning the countless hamlets and villages along the way, wherein live the common folk of Mexico, who, like our own common people constitute the life stream of our great southern friend. Beyond contributing to the economic welfare of the localities mentioned, these thousands of tourists added something else still more beneficial to the two countries: Our citizens saw Mexico and her people, and came back with informed ideas based on personal observations and experience, and as a result were in a position to appreciate and value the good people of Mexico and their way of life. All this was made possible by the Laredo-Mexico City Highway.

I consider it both a privilege and an honor to have represented the Senate of the United States on the occasion of the dedication of the highway of which I speak, traveling in the delightful company of Ambassador Daniels, Vice President Garner, Senators Connally and McAdoo, and Representatives Bunham, Cartwright, Thomason, and Mr. Charles M. Upham, engineer director of the American Road Builders' Association, besides about 50 other American officials and representatives of indust . We were met at the border by Gen. Eduardo Hay, then Minister of Foreign Affairs, heading a delegation of distinguished Mexican officials. It was indeed a grand experience, from which both the United States and Mexico profited. At the time, General Mujica was Secretary of Communications and Public Works. I called on him at his office with reference to Mexican Highway 189, which extends from Ciudad Juarez, through Chihuahua, and on to Mexico City, following the old "camino real" which the colonial Spaniards utilized to travel from Mexico City, through Queretaro, Aguas Calientes, Zacatecas, Durango, Chihuahua, what is today El Paso, Santa Fe (N. Mex.), Kansas City, and St. Louis. I found the Mexican Communications Administration sympathetic, and most anxious to cooperate in the construction of a modern highway along this same route. It might be of interest to you to know that I am at the present time making every effort to effect the determination of his project. Its economic importance lies beyond the needs of special emphasis, and its potential contributions to the field of inter-American commerce, in ideas as well as commodities, would be most significant.

The construction and development of a network of inter-American highways at the present time is a matter of salient import and necessity. With a single unfortunate exception, the nations of Latin America are cooperating to the utmost with the United States in the war effort. The fields, hills, mountains, and valleys of Latin America are pregnant with materials of every description which are badly needed by the United Nations in order to carry the war to an early and successful conclusion. Had we the network of highways of which we dream, we could afford to make faces at the submarine menace, insofar as inter-American commerce would be concerned.

The discourses and discussions of diplomacy, and the conferences of restricted interests have served in some stead to foster international good will and understanding. These procedures, however, are as outmoded, it seems to me, as the pony express. In order to deliver the mail of mutual respect, understanding, and good will among nations, we must utilize the most natural media of communications, that is, personal observations and experience. In our good old American way of life, you have all taken the steps incident to knowing a new neighbor. First we hear opinions pro and con, and are sometimes foolish enough to form our own ideas on these bases. It is not until we have spent an evening "gabbing" over the back fence, or in our neighbor's basement indulging in homely conversation, that we come to find out exactly what sort of chap he is; and more often than not we determine that he is a pretty good scout, like most people.

This is what I should like to see transpire in the field of inter-American relations: Let's stop reading the articles and books of "experts" with a 2-week background, some of whom do not even speak the language of the people they endeavor to explain; let's not take too much stock in the high-sounding rhetoric of the enthusiast, who is too often more native than the native; instead, let us board the old jalopy, travel into the land of our southern neighbors, chat with the gasoline-station attendant, the shopkeeper, the restaurant owner, the waiters (and the waitresses), the street vendor, the businessmen, in fine, the long and never-ending procession of men and women who form the active and indicative elements of any society; let us eat of their foods, drink of their beverages, sit in on their entertainments, listen to their music, dance their dances, walk their streets—then, and only then, shall we be able to express an opinion worthy of an audience. We shall come to appreciate and value our neighbors, and they will come to know and prize our ways, and through mutual respect, consideration, and tolerance we shall all be better able to cooperate toward the larger task of a full realization of inter-American solidarity, not only in the dark days of want and crisis, but also in the mellow evening of prosperity and peace.

The Party of Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "The Party of Tomorrow," made by me at Columbus, Ohio, May 7, last, before the spring conference of the Ohio Federation of Republican Women's Organizations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PARTY OF TOMORROW

The party that meets the needs of tomorrow is the party that lives, grows, and wins. The primary needs of tomorrow are four: Victory, peace, freedom, prosperity.

Each should be the subject of specific action.

We must have victory before we can have peace. We must have peace before we can have freedom and prosperity. Yet to meet the needs of our time we must have all four. I shall speak of victory and peace.

VICTORY AND PEACE

In America we face these great issues of victory and peace with a new force deeply interested in both. This is the first war and the first peace since the women of America have had the opportunity and responsibility of sharing in the ballot. This is an important asset. I am confident the Republican Party is awakening to the opportunity it provides.

With more men in our armed forces than ever before in our history, it is important to realize that at least through the women relatives and friends of these men, they will have a greater opportunity to give effect to their views than has been the case in previous wars. The relatives and friends of these men share deeply in their loyalties and their views. When these men return from the war they will reenter civilian life in greater numbers and with more effective strength than ever before and their views on certain fundamentals will be united and effective. Any political party that deals realistically with the needs of tomorrow will do well to steer a course that will fairly reflect the high loyalty and spirit of service of these men and their families. They are fighting for an America of opportunity and an America that can rely on the continuance of a just and lasting peace.

REPUBLICAN OPPORTUNITY

The Republican Party by its history of devotion to the national welfare, coupled with the strong and realistic foreign policies

of James G. Blaine, William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, John Hay, Elihu Root, and Charles Evans Hughes, is the natural party to develop a strong and realistic program in support of victory, peace, freedom, and prosperity that will take full account of both our national and international responsibilities and opportunities. It is fitted to be the constructive party of tomorrow. It should become the party of the young men and women who are fighting this war in the front lines. These young people, after the fighting is over, will face on the one hand: Restriction of output, depression, regimentation, internal conflict, chaotic government, and international friction. On the other hand, there will be open to them, through productive effort, the great new wealth made possible by recent scientific advances. If turned to peacetime uses this new wealth will make individual freedom and prosperity possible. To develop this new wealth calls for a general willingness to work, unity of national policy dedicated to the interests of the Nation as a whole rather than the special interests of any group or bloc within the Nation, as opposed to the national interests. It will call also for the orderly development of our constitutional structure based upon faith in the Government by the people as their own masters. It will call for international cooperation based upon an orderly development of the economic opportunities of the world through a fair development and use of the markets and resources of the world. This in turn will call for a fixed determination that the continuance of the peace which will have been won in this war shall be guaranteed by the same forces that shall have won it.

VICTORY PROGRAM

What can we do as a party, as well as individuals, to hasten the difficult complete victory needed in both hemispheres? This is our first obligation to the men and women in uniform. In this total war everyone of us has a vital part in winning it. I suggest the following lines of thought and action: Every issue affecting the war, whether involving legislation or personalities, must, as a party policy, be determined promptly and aggressively in the interest of winning the war and supporting the men and women fighting it. This means that not only on military issues but on economic, social, and political issues our policy as a war party must be to decide regularly in favor of the general welfare of the Nation rather than the special welfare of any one group or bloc where there may be a conflict between the two.

ON THE FIRING LINE

On the firing line, this is our Nation's policy. General MacArthur stated it in response to his welcome to Australia. He said: "I have come as a soldier in a great crusade for personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. * * * There can be no compromise. We shall win or we shall die. To that end I pledge the full resources of all the mighty power of my country and all the blood of my countrymen."

ON THE PRODUCTION LINE

On the production line, we must produce and transport the improved equipment needed to overwhelm our enemies in both hemispheres, by land, by sea, and by air. We must produce the food needed by our armed forces, by our people at home, and as far as we can the food needed by our handicapped and stricken allies nearer the front than ourselves. Food is a vital weapon in the war. We must not reduce or handicap the manpower of our armed forces estimated by our chosen and responsible military and naval leaders at nearly 11,000,000 men and women in uniform by the end of this year. I believe we do not need to handicap our firing lines by any restriction of these estimates. As a matter of governmental, party, and individual policy we should see to it that the civilian employees of our National, State, and local Governments are reduced to a minimum and that those able to serve in the armed forces do so. We should retain on the farms those qualified by experience and training to produce the essential crops of our food program. We should aid these farmers in every way possible in securing not only manpower, but farm machinery, equipment, fertilizer, and other needs that contribute to the greatest possible production. In our industries we should develop through the cooperation of management and labor, the greatest possible production per man per month. Every interruption of production by absenteeism, strike, or unnecessary shut-down should be eliminated. In the harvest season organized units of our armed forces or men on furlough should help to harvest the crops. Grain is as essential as bullets to winning the war.

ON THE INFLATION FRONT

On the financial and inflation front, we should foster a pay-as-you-earn system of taxation. We should pay for as much of the war as possible as we go. We should approach as nearly as we can the carrying of 50 percent of the cost of the war by taxation rather than only 30 percent as has been the case. We should support the stabilization of industrial prices, farm prices, and wages. This means an insistence upon retaining substantially the present levels of prices and wages with only the adjustment of individual inequities where they may be demonstrated. We should welcome and support as simple and equitable conservation and rationing programs as possible. We should personally and officially combat black markets of every kind. We should purchase War bonds to the limit of our individual incomes and savings. We should eliminate extended credit. Most of all we should not only preach but practice at every oportunity in Federal, State, and local governments a determined party policy of economy in public expenditures. If our taxpayers are to pay increased taxes and purchase more bonds they are entiled to increased assurance that every dollar of their hard-earned contributions is put to the best possible use in winning the war.

ON THE HOME FRONT

Finally, on the home front, it is for us to encourage at every point sound homes, teamwork in industry, and unity of action. This means the abandonment of all personal and partisan selfishness in favor of the principles for which we fight.

It is the boast of the totalitarian nations that a self-governing nation cannot sufficiently discipline itself to win a total war and that therefore we shall fail on the production, financial, and home fronts. These are the fronts for which we as civilians are especially responsible. It is here that our party must prove the enemy to be wrong. It is here that we can and should lead the way to victory on the civilian as well as the military fronts.

PEACE PROGRAM

It has been well said by Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson in their excellent book, The Problems of Lasting Peace, "Nations can blunder into war. They cannot blunder into peace. * * * We went to the peace conference in 1919 animated by the loftiest and most disinterested ideals, but we were totally unprepared for the specific problems that had to be met at the peace table. We secured neither peace, freedom, nor prosperity. * * * We are in a gigantic war. Our first task is to win it. Having set our hand to the task, we cannot stop until lasting peace has been made. Only from a lasting peace can we hope to save our civilization."

They said: "Having set our hand to the task, we cannot stop until lasting peace has been made." We won the last war on the battlefield but it did not stay won. We fought it as a war to end war, only to find ourselves now in a war ten times greater than the last.

Certainly the men and women in the armed forces and the women of America, in general, are determined to do better this time. It is an essential governmental policy and an essential policy of any party that is to live tomorrow that America shall dedicate herself to securing a just and lasting peace. "Having set our hand to the task, we cannot stop until lasting peace has been made." There is no sharp division between war and post war. It is a continuing transition of events.

It is necessary to approach the problems of lasting peace with the same calmness, thoroughness, common sense and forethought as we approach each battle in the war that leads us to victory on the battlefield. There are three important roads to lasting peace. Each of them requires work upon its foundations now. On some of them, more should be done now than on others. The roads are those to internal stability, regional stability, and world-wide stability.

INTERNAL STABILITY

The road to internal stability within the United States should command our vigorous attention. We know now substantially what facts and what people will be involved. We have the responsibility of meeting the problem of internal stability in a way which not only will be worthy of the efforts of the men on the firing line but in a way that will set an example that will encourage the world to have faith in free self-government.

When the fighting has ended we hope to pass from the governmentally controlled and financed economy of war to a far freer economy of individual enterprise. While recognizing the need for governmental guidance, help and regulation, we must set our course unalterably by the fixed star of America's faith in individual enterprise and initiative. We must not yield our hard-won freedom for the farmer, the laborer, the small and the large businessman in favor of the dictation of any totalitarian state by whatever name it may be called. The postwar demand for goods of all kinds will be so great that it will underwrite the production of them.

There is an unlimited new wealth available in the scientific advances of our age. If these resources are guided into paths of peaceful production coupled with opportunities for individual initiative, the world of tomorrow can be far richer, healthier, and happier than that of yesterday. The successful party of tomorrow will emphasize the need tomorrow for the preservation in America of full opportunity for individual initiative and sufficient assurance of lasting peace and of encouragement of private enterprise that private capital again will be attracted into private industry.

REGIONAL STABILITY

The second road to lasting peace is that of regional stability. In our case this means stability in the Western Hemisphere. Here again we know the facts and the people concerned. It is the responsibility of the Americas to show how to maintain mutually helpful regional relationships here without interfering with appropriate spheres of national sovereignty. On both of these roads there can be no question of our obligation to proceed now.

WORLD-WIDE STABILITY

The third and most difficult road is that to world-wide stability. Here there are certain problems which call for more immediate attention than others. Demobilization, feeding the hungry, reestablishment of homes, farms, and factories in recovered territories, and the establishment of temporary administrations

in recovered territories are among these emergency problems. These emergencies will confront us as surely as one battle follows another. To meet these emergencies, we must make progress along these lines now through United Nations conferences and through our combined military staffs. Action will be inevitable. Its soundness and its success will depend upon our foresight and preparation.

Beyond these emergency problems on the road toward any lasting peace and calling for international cooperation are others of longer range. These are the problems of military, economic, social, and political world-wide stability. One of these can be separated from the others. On the day of military victory, the United Nations will have established military stability in the world in the face of the most powerful and destructive attempt in all history to enslave the world. On that day, the United Nations will dominate the air and we, together with our allies, must see to it that having thus won the war and established the opportunity for peace that we do not allow this domination of the air and this military stability to slip away from the United Nations. If those nations fall apart from one another, they may even become a threat to the stability of one another.

The unity of military action developed through this war is a military asset of tremendous value to the United Nations. Through a continuance of it through some form of united military force, the United Nations will have the best available assurance for the return of as many as possible of their men from war to peaceful production. On this, I believe that the men and women in our armed forces are and will be thoroughly agreed, and on this I believe that any political party that is to meet its responsibility to the coming generations must also be agreed.

On the other hand, long-term programs leading toward economic, social, and political stability of the world are typical of those problems which require joint action and calm deliberation, not only on our part, but on the part of the other United Nations. In many cases the people concerned with them are not yet in a position to deal authoritatively with them It is appropriate and important, however, that each of the United Nations, including ourselves, provide for the joint and mutually helpful consideration of these problems in the interest of lasting peace. It is important that each of the United Nations shall know that this is our attitude and the attitude of each of the others of the United Nations.

The interesting suggestion that regional associations may intervene to deal with a part of the world's international relations on a regional rather than on a world-wide basis introduces an important consideration that will require time for its development. Such decentralizing of the responsibility for the solution of some of the problems of the world can be helpful if there be cooperation among the nations thus made responsible for the problems in their immediate regions. The present need is not for blueprints and not for detailed plans. The present need is for foundations. It calls for an agreement among the United Nations to work together on the several questions incidental to the war that represent current emergencies. It also calls upon the United Nations to retain the military stability that is enabling them to win this war. It calls upon the United Nations to agree upon procedures that will insure as far as possible the establishment of a just and lasting peace worthy of the immeasurable sacrifices being made in order that such a peace shall be possible.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROCEDURE

The Constitution of the United States presents an exceptional problem by its requirement that our international treaties require the approval not only of the Chief Executive but of two-thirds of the Senators present. Our Senate is a continuing body. Its personnel changes but slowly. It therefore provides a valuable guaranty of stability of action if it determines upon a course of action. The requirement of concurrence of two-thirds of its Members present in ratifying treaties makes it necessary that the fundamentals of those treaties be lifted out of the realms of partisan competition. Neither party has now or is likely to have in the near future a two-thirds control of the Senate. Therefore, the party that is to meet the responsibilities of tomorrow should, as one of its principles, determine that the securing of a just and lasting peace rises above partisan consideration. Such party also should be prepared to support as a policy beyond controversy the policy that steps be taken through the Senate to secure a peace that shall be just and lasting. It should be pledged thus to use its efforts to see to it that this war not only is won but that it shall stay won.

To secure this end our party may well insist that in the negotiation of all questions leading to world-wide stability and the consideration of international treaties that the administration shall regularly bring into those conferences representatives of the Senate from both parties.

STOP WORLD WAR NO. 3 NOW

Having set our hand to the task of winning the war we must not stop until lasting peace has been made.

Let us win World War No. 2 now. Let us stop World War No. 3 now.

The Bermuda Conference

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Bermuda Conference has come and gone, and with it, the hopes of millions of people. Not even the pessimists among us expected such sterility of a conference which met to discuss a problem so vital, so urgent, so demanding of solution. The turn of events forces me to appeal to Congress and to the people of this great country for some action.

Freedom-loving people the world over applauded the announcement of a refugee conference. After witnessing a decade of tyranny and wholesale persecution in Europe, two great countries, England and the United States, finally officially recognized their duties and responsibilities toward a driven and helpless people. Hopes were reawakened that, through the strength and resourcefulness of these two nations, steps would be taken to release the victims of Nazi oppression.

Then, 1 week before the conference started, it was revealed in both countries that it was to be "exploratory" only. Exploratory. Think of it—exploratory.

Was it to "explore" the plight of refugees and their inability to remain where they were? Was it to "explore" whether it is worth while saving human lives?

The attention of the House has repeatedly been called to the fact that Hitler has not hesitated to flaunt his policy of death to those whom he does not wish to tolerate within his Nazi "lebensraum." He has stated that torture, destruction, and death will be the fate of every non-Aryan in Europe. Hitler does not flinch from the facts. He has told us how many Jews are still alive and how he is systematically wiping them off the face of the earth. Our State Department has confirmed the validity of his statements and the effectiveness of his program of destruction. What is there left to explore?

The conference was originally called to work out a concrete plan of action. Our representatives, however, proceeded to the conference without adequate plans or ideas. Barred from the conference were representatives of the proper congressional committees, of the press, of the American people, and of those groups most familiar with and experienced in dealing with refugee problems.

The conferees of both countries conferred. And what they accomplished is a very deep, dark secret. So deep and dark indeed that we know only what they failed to accomplish. The Americans failed to offer admittance to refugees under the existing immigration laws. They could have done so by pooling the unused quotas of the last 5 years. As Alexander H. Uhl, who attended the conference, states in a story written for PM:

> What lies behind Bermuda * * * lies within the American people themselves. Are we really as charitable and generous as we like to think we are? Are we willing really to make sacrifices, real sacrifices—not merely the generous tossing of a dollar bill into some fund or other—to bring help to those who are starving and are doomed?
>
> From the record of Bermuda, I'm not so sure.
>
> Bermuda was a conference of undercurrents. Those undercurrents weren't expressed, of course, in concrete terms. You had to feel them, to sense them and they all came back to plain, ordinary national selfishness far stronger than national humanitarianism.

The British delegates, like the American, came with a long list of their past good deeds but with closed minds toward present or future plans. To quote Mr. Uhl again:

> It was on Britain's insistence that the conference was held at all. And that was in response to strong British public pressure that something be done. But even then, that pressure wasn't strong enough to make the British Government throw open the doors of Palestine to large-scale Jewish immigration. The British delegation came with its mind closed on Palestine. You could tell that when they said ever so curtly: "There will be no change in the white paper."

Palestine in November 1917 was declared a national homeland of the Jewish people. Now, more than ever, the Jews need their homeland. Under the terms of the British mandate, immigration is limited only by the physical capacity of the land to maintain the people. Neither legally nor morally has Britain the right to prohibit this immigration. For over 20 years Jewish refugees have brought their skills, their energies, and

their capital to Palestine. They have drained the swamps, cultivated the soil, built cities, and developed industry. They have raised the whole cultural level of the Near East by developing Palestine as a cultural center. They have established a university; they have organized a great symphony orchestra; they have built a world-famous medical center.

Palestine is a land where refugees of all nations have found a home. Because of its proximity to central Europe, it is but natural that the peoples from the occupied countries should seek refuge there. Having themselves been victims of intolerance so often, the Jews of Palestine have extended a hearty welcome to all who sought to escape the Fascists. Greeks, Serbs, and Poles live peacefully side by side with Jewish pioneers.

Palestine has created a modern agricultural communitly, has developed modern industries, established scientific institutions, and built a sturdy and progressive people. The British Government refused to allow the organization of a Jewish army, claiming that it could not provide the necessary equipment. But the real nature of its opposition was soon apparent. Britain seems to be afraid that a Jewish army would antagonize the Arabs. May I remind our British allies that impartial observers in Palestine have attributed Arab-Jewish antagonism almost entirely to the British policy of divide and rule rather than to inherent differences between these two peoples.

The creation of a Jewish army of stateless and Palestinian Jews could convert the millions of Fascist victims into millions of anti-Fascist fighters. They have but one life to forfeit. Give them the right to forfeit their lives on the altar of freedom, not as the passive victims of oppression.

Yet Palestine plays an important part in the war effort. Denied the right to organize an independent army, the Jews of Palestine have joined the fighting forces of the English in the Near East and north Africa. Thirty thousand Palestinian Jews, thus far, have enlisted in the army, navy, and air forces. Women have joined the auxiliary forces.

It appears inconceivable that the British Government will continue to enforce the White Paper arbitrarily limiting immigration into Palestine. May I remind Winston Churchill what he himself told the House of Commons in 1939, as a member of that body? He vigorously criticized the Government when he said:

> I feel bound to vote against the proposals of His Majesty's Government. As one intimately and responsibly concerned in the earlier stages of our Palestine policy, I could not stand by and see solemn engagements into which Britain has entered before the world, set aside for reasons of administrative convenience or—and it will be a vain hope—for the sake of a quiet life. I should feel personally embarrassed in the most acute manner if I lent myself, by silence or inaction, to what I must regard as an act of repudiation. I was from the beginning a sincere advocate of the Balfour Declaration, and I have made repeated public statements to that effect.
>
> There is much in this White Paper which is alien to the spirit of the Balfour Declaration, but I will not trouble about that. I select the one point upon which there is plainly a breach and repudiation of the Balfour Declaration—the provision that Jewish immigration can be stopped in 5 years' time by the decision of Arab majority. What is that but the destruction of the Balfour Declaration? What is that but a breach of faith? What is it but one-sided enunciation—what is called in the jargon of the present time, a unilateral denunciation of an engagement?
>
> Is our condition so parlous and our state so poor that we must, in our weakness, make this sacrifice of our declared purpose? Although I have been very anxious that we should strengthen our armaments and spread our alliances and so increase the force of our position, I must say that I have not taken such a low view of the strength of the British Empire or of the very many powerful countries who desire to walk in association with us, but if the Government, with their superior knowledge of the deficiencies in our armaments which have arisen during their stewardship, really feel that we are too weak to carry out our obligations and wish to file a petition in moral and physical bankruptcy, that is an argument which, however ignominous, should certainly weigh with the House in these dangerous times. But is it true? I do not believe it is true. I cannot believe that the task to which we set our hand 20 years ago in Palestine is beyond our strength, or that faithful perseverance will not in the end bring that task through to a glorious success. I am sure of this, that to cast the plan aside and show yourselves infirm of will and unable to pursue a long, clear, and considered purpose, bending and twisting under the crush and pressure of events—I am sure that that is going to do us a most serious and grave injury at a time like this.
>
> What will the world think about it? What will our friends say? What will be the opinion of the United States of America? What will our potential enemies think? What will those who have been stirring up these Arab agitators think? Will they not be encouraged by our confession of recoil? Will they not be tempted to say, "They're on the run again. This is another Munich," and be the more stimulated in their aggression?
>
> It is hoped to obtain 5 years of easement in Palestine by this proposal, surely the consequences will be entirely the opposite. A sense of moral weakness in the mandatory power, whose many years of vacillation and uncertainty have largely provoked the evils from which we suffer, will rouse all the violent elements in Palestine to the utmost degree. What about these 5 years? Who shall say where we are going to be 5 years from now? Europe is more than two-thirds mobilized tonight. The ruinous race of armaments now carries whole populations into the military machine. That cannot possibly continue for 5 years, nor for 4, nor for 3 years. It may be that it will not continue beyond the present year. Long before those 5 years are past, either there will be a Britain which knows how to keep its word on the Balfour Declaration and is not afraid to do so, or believe me, we shall find ourselves relieved of many oversea responsibilities other than those comprised within the Palestine mandate.

Thus Churchill recognized the necessity for maintaining an open-door policy in Palestine so that a persecuted people might find a haven and be given the opportunity to develop normally to make their contribution to the cause of world freedom and world peace. He recognized the necessity then and he should recognize the necessity now.

These are the facts. These are the facts which we must face. And these are the facts which the Bermuda conferees cast aside.

We have tried appeasement and have failed miserably. We are paying dearly for that experiment and should at least have learned our lesson. Our political and social principles have been challenged. There can be no rationalizations, no compromises. We are either fighting fascism and all it stands for or we are not. The people in our country and the people in occupied territories are entitled to know. We have been feeding them pretty phrases. It is about time we show them action in support of the phrases.

Absenteeism Denied

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, as my remarks, I submit the letter I received from the Executive Secretary of District Council, No. 6, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, together with the statistics on absenteeism released by the Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Co. in East Pittsburgh, Pa., on April 28, 1943. These statistics conclusively refute the attacks made on labor unions on the matter of absenteeism.

DISTRICT COUNCIL NO. 6,
UNITED ELECTRICAL, RADIO, AND
MACHINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Pittsburgh, Pa., May 6, 1943.

Hon. SAMUEL A. WEISS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SAMMY: Enclosed you will find some figures on the absenteeism problem, released by the Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., in East Pittsburgh, on April 28, 1943. In our opinion these figures for this tremendous industrial plant gives the lie to the attack on labor unions for the absenteeism problem, and show how small voluntary absenteeism is in a plant where a strong and reliable union is in operation. We believe it might be of value and interest if this information were placed in the Congressional Record. We would appreciate hearing from you on this question.

With all best wishes, I am looking forward to your making good use of this material.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM N. CHAMBERS,
Executive Secretary.

Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., East Pittsburgh, absenteeism (hourly-rated employees)

Week ending—	Number of employees	Normal hours	Voluntary absence hours	Percent	Illness and injury hours	Percent	Vacation hours	Percent	Furlough hours	Percent	Other	Percent	Total percent
Apr. 4, 1943	20,442	817,680	12,939	1.58	16,942	2.07	9,996	1.22	2,333	0.29	2,410	0.29	5.46
Apr. 11, 1943	20,498	817,920	13,048	1.60	18,167	2.22	10,511	1.29	1,395	.17	2,018	.25	5.52
Apr. 18, 1943	20,570	822,800	12,488	1.51	17,570	2.14	11,804	1.43	1,452	.18	1,570	.19	5.45

Rural Roads to Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address delivered by me at the American Roadbuilders' Association annual meeting, Chicago, May 5–7, 1943:

When you invite a Representative of an agricultural State like Nebraska to a highway meeting, you've got to expect some remarks about farm-to-market roads. I am glad to know, though, that I am not the only congressional apostle of better rural roads here. My good friend and colleague, WILL ROBINSON, chairman of the Committee on Roads of the United States House of Representatives, has already planted some very effective seed along those lines, and I hope that he will reap a rich harvest.

It is impossible to say too much about the importance of America's secondary road system. I believe that it is no exaggeration to say that it is the backbone of our economic and social structure. This is true whether you are dealing with a national war emergency such as we are now undergoing, a post-war era that presents its own special problems with which we must now prepare to cope or a normal peacetime period.

Supporting this claim to wartime significance, I have the statement of a famous fellow Nebraskan. General Pershing said, "The country road will be of tremendous value in time of war. The roads must be relied upon to obtain needed food supplies." Its truth is further brought home to us every time we surrender a ration stamp or encounter a meatless day at our favorite restaurant. "Food will win the war and write the peace" is the watchword of the Department of Agriculture. The role of the United States as the food arsenal of democracy will be reemphasized in Hot Springs this month when delegates of the United Nations meet for a food conference. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the farmer driving to market with a truckload of food products is as truly a contributor to victory as the soldier riding a tank into battle.

With this spotlight on farming, the Nation's farm-to-market roads are assuming increasingly great significance. These secondary rural routes are frequently called feeder roads because they link the farms with the main highways. This name is particularly appropriate today, when these roads are called upon to feed not only the Nation but the world.

It is common knowledge that virtually 100 percent of most crops make their initial off-the-farm movement by highway. Here are a few more facts, selected at random, to fill in the picture of transportation from farm to market via the highway. During the 1941–42 season, trucks carried 1,664,094 sacks of potatoes from Maine. In 1940 Chicago received 3,297,000 cases of eggs by truck. In 1941, 64 percent of the livestock received at 17 of the country's larger stockyards, moved over highways. Twenty large cities now receive 100 percent of their milk supply by highway. Roads carry from farm to consuming centers virtually the entire lettuce crop of New Jersey, Virginia, and Pennsylvania, and about three-fourths of the lettuce grown in North Carolina, South Carolina, Washington, Colorada, and New York. In other words, no matter what you have for dinner tonight, the chances are that it made at least part of its journey to you over rural roadways.

In spite of gasoline rationing, rubber shortage, and other wartime handicaps, the demands being made upon highway transportation this year exceed by more than 19,000,000 tons the average annual movement of products from the farm during the 1936–40 period. In fact, the United States Army alone now purchases approximately 57,000 tons of food a day.

At the present time, the highway program, like every other form of construction, is concentrated on one main goal—victory. The reduced volume of manpower and materials that can now be applied to road building must be concentrated on roads of strategic military importance. Much badly needed construction that would have been carried on in normal times, must be postponed. Because of this, road maintenance is particularly vital. Roads that cannot now be rebuilt must be kept in serviceable condition for vital wartime transportation and the Nation's investment in highways must be protected.

After the war, there will be a gigantic job of rehabilitation in Europe. Many experts point out that American grain, meats, and other products will have a prominent part to play in consolidating the peace, solidifying the friendship of European peoples and stabilizing economic conditions abroad. If this plan is followed, our rural areas will continue in the spotlight for a long time to come. Then, more than ever, it will be necessary to correct the prewar status of our secondary road system.

Furthermore, as soon as the war is won, our manpower situation will be completely reversed. Instead of a shortage of men, there will be a shortage of jobs. The major problem then will be that of providing productive employment for the men released from the armed forces and war industries. A long-range highway construction program will be essential to prevent widespread unemployment and depression, such as followed the first World War. An important part of the answer to this need can be found in the farm-to-market road system.

It seems to me that rural-road improvement represents the most important segment of the over-all post-war construction picture. In the first place, there is the all-important problem of distribution. Men will be returning from war plants and battlefields to every city, town, and hamlet in the country. The unemployment problem, therefore, will be Nation-wide. Consequently, the jobs provided must also be in all sections of the country. The best way to accomplish this is through rural-road improvement, since these rural roads penetrate into every locality and there are in each locality, roads whose reconstruction or improvement are economically justified.

There are 1,703,644 miles of road under the jurisdiction of the Nation's approximately 3,000 counties. Of these, 690,564 miles, or about 40 percent, are totally unimproved. More than 40 percent of the rest, or 744,553 miles, are low-type construction. This means that less than 20 percent of the Nation's county-road system can be considered in any way adequate for the demands made upon it. The American farmer is today dependent to a large degree on dirt roads that are unsuitable for any but the "horse and buggy" traffic for which they were constructed many years ago. The obsolescence and inadequacy of these roads is indicated by the startling fact that in 1 pre-war year more than 27,000 of the 39,500 traffic-accident deaths occurred on rural highways.

Here, then, is a giant reserve of essential highway projects which should be constructed after the war. Here, too, is a fertile source of post-war jobs which fill the double requirement of such employment. First, they are available in any section where unemployment becomes a problem and, second, highway construction provides more employment per dollar expended than any other class of public works.

Direct employment in highway construction is not the only solution which these rural roads can provide to our post-war economic problems. Indirectly, this work will contribute substantially to the welfare of the Nation as a whole, since the prosperity of our agricultural communities is intrinsically related to the national prosperity. Good roads for rural America will get the farmer out of the mud, give him and his truck a lift to market, raise his standard of living, and increase the prosperity of everyone he patronizes.

Back roads are the main streets of more than 30,000,000 farm people. All too often they are the only means of communication between the farmer and the outside world. They are the roads that are depended on to carry the farmer's produce to market, to make possible the daily rural free delivery of mail, to bring the doctor in case of illness, to speed the arrival of modern fire apparatus to save a burning barn or home, and to safely take the farm children to and from the consolidated district school by bus.

The prosperity of the farmer and his family is closely allied with the condition of the road on which he lives. Where good roads are found, there also will be found prosperous farms and good living conditions. The farmer is a salesman of perishable products. When muddy roads keep him from taking his butter, his eggs, or his vegetables to market, his produce becomes worthless in a short time. Another important economic benefit to the farmer that results from the construction of a good road past his farm is the increase in the value of his property. I have seen land of relatively low value sold for a good price merely because of a rumor that a new road would be built that would connect it with the main highway.

Greater prosperity for the farmer inevitably means greater prosperity for the persons he patronizes—the country doctor, the crossroads merchant, the farm implement and machinery distributor in the town nearby, as well as the furniture store, the hardware store, the department store where he and his family buy new clothes, and the local automobile and truck agency.

A post-war rural road-construction program will, therefore, have far-reaching effects on the entire national economy. The prosperous farmer-customer will stimulate employment in manufacturing, distributing, and sales, in addition to the vast scale of local employment on road building. The decade after the war, therefore, should bring the American farm population a Nation-wide system of modern all-weather secondary roads. That is the best way in which we can guarantee prosperity to the farmers who are now doing yeoman service in feeding our soldiers and civilians, as well as post-war employment to their sons, who are now fighting on battlefronts throughout the world.

Subsidies—A Fake Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the proposed payment of subsidies to the producer or processor of food presents to the Congress the most

fundamental issue considered by Congress since the Court-packing bill was proposed by the President.

If the executive branch of our Government can adopt and put into effect a plan of subsidy payments amounting to as much as $2,000,000,000, without coming to Congress for the needed money then certainly Congress has lost control of the purse strings.

If Congress permits the President or anyone else to take from the Congress its constitutional control of the purse strings the American people will see the end of the form of government under which we have prospered and grown great.

The Hartford Courant on May 10 published an editorial entitled "Subsidies—A Fake Cure." I agree wholeheartedly with the thought expressed in this editorial.

The editorial follows:

SUBSIDIES—A FAKE CURE

The Office of Price Administration has launched a double-barreled popgun attack on inflation, or measures to support the hold-the-line order of the President. It is accepted as the administration's answer to organized labor's demand to cut the cost of living.

The first of these is the price ceilings effective this week in 130 cities and metropolitan areas. The order applies to 294 articles, including 22 foods. The Office of Price Administration plans to extend the policy throughout the Nation. It is definitely a freeze order without respect to cost of production or the ability of the consumer to pay. In some instances the order reduces prices. One wonders how effective this move will be in view of the failure to eliminate the black market in rationed foods. Of the giving of many orders by Office of Price Administration there appears no end; their effective enforcement has been quite a different matter. Now Office of Price Administration Director Brown says enforcement is up to the consumer. We wonder about a nation of snoopers.

The second part of this attack can properly be termed subsidizing inflation. The Government's money—your money, to speak accurately—is to buy cheaper living. Beginning June 1 the processors of beef, veal, pork, lamb, mutton, coffee, and butter are to be paid by the Government for reducing prices. This is part of the roll-back of prices demanded by the labor-union leaders. The whole country is asked to share in the expense—when the bill is paid at some future date.

What justification is there for this demand? The answer is a matter of comparative figures. Since January 1941, the industrial wage earners' weekly income has increased 21.2 percent while the cost of living in that period has advanced 18.4 percent, according to the National Industrial Conference Board. This hardly substantiates the claim that living costs have rushed ahead faster than wages. The subsidy plan looks like a more to scuttle the Little Steel wage formula, so frequently attacked in the last few weeks by organized labor, and especially by John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers.

Where does the money, estimated at from $300,000,000 to $500,000,000, to start the program, come from? Eventually out of the taxpayers For the present it is to be furnished by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation because—and note this well—Congress has so far refused to appropriate money for subsidizing the cost of food. This is another bypassing of Congress on a par with the Executive order on net salaries of not more than $25,000. If the comments of many Congressmen on this latest circumventing of legislative power over the purse is any indication of future action, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will have a difficult time when it again asks Congress to replenish its funds.

But neither the amount nor the method of getting the money equals in importance the principle of this subsidy. Instead of fighting inflation the subsidy only feeds the causes of inflation. If it successfully lowers food costs, that means two things: Increased national debt and increased spending power damned back and ever rising. These are basic conditions for inflation. The control of inflation is an idle and deceptive phrase so long as the excess of purchasing power over goods exists and continues to mount. The subsidy plan is the reverse of an attack upon inflation and its causes—it is in itself an inflationary measure. We increase the debt, to decrease living costs, to increase purchasing power for goods we can't buy. That's hardly sound economics.

We might enumerate other arguments against the plan—such as the cost of administration, the possibility of political scandals, the danger to liberty of a government-controlled system of prices over every necessity of life, the failure to take care of the producers rather than the processors of goods, and the fantastic idea that some $300,000,000 of our money will appreciably affect a thirty-billion economy. This initial figure is "peanuts," to quote George Meaney, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor, who already attacks the plan as not inclusive enough and wants prices rolled back to the level of May 1942, without wages being cut to that level. Then, too, the farmers who ought to know something about the cost of producing food, do not favor a subsidy; they ask only for a fair price.

One aspect of this subsidy deserves special mention. Where and when would it ever end? It is argued that the Government already is subsidizing coal production and a few minor items to the extent of half a billion dollars. There is the give-away. Since we have one subsidy, why not another, then another, and so on until we have a completely subsidized cost of living that can end only in some form of state socialism.

Put the whole matter tersely this way: Subsidized industries are insolvent industries. That is the only justification for a subsidy. How long can we go on as a nation with an insolvent economy—one that Government taxes must finance? To ask the question is to answer it. A subsidized economy can't pay taxes to subsidize itself. The cure offered is just another economic fake.

Help the Forest Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have already called the attention of the Congress to the serious situation in which the Forest Service may find itself due to lack of funds. Speaking from personal experience with this old and well-established agency I strongly urge that we do all in our power to strengthen the arm of this organization. The proof of its worth lies in its record to date. At the present time it is contributing to the war effort through the use of its research facilities and has made many important contributions to the armed forces as well as to civilian industry engaged in war work. The areas under its control are capable of, and are, furnishing much needed timber at this time and the personnel of the Forest Service are of the highest and best types of Americans. They love their country, are devoted to their service, and can be depended upon to do their jobs to the best of their abilities. Let us reconsider our action in reducing its appropriation and allocate to this old and very necessary Service the funds it must have to continue its work in behalf of all of us. It is false economy to sacrific. our natural resources at a time like this.

MISSOULA, MONT., *May 1, 1943.*

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Your speech to the House as printed on page 3489 of the RECORD of April 16 was a real contribution to a congressional understanding of the forest protection situation. Our forest resources have all too few voices speaking up in their behalf. It is therefore a real pleasure to know that western Montana's Representative in Congress has the interest of those resources at heart.

Your facts concerning the forest-fire problem are entirely correct. Your conclusion that the back-of-the-coast areas will be greatly weakened this year is particularly to the point.

That part of the national forest protection job which falls in this region is normally the heaviest in the Nation. The combination of dense coniferous timber types and our difficult terrain, with the usually dry summer weather, has on the average during the past 35 years produced heavier fire losses than in any other region.

Only during the past 10 years of better planned and organized fire protection have we begun to feel reasonably sure of protecting timber stands through to useful maturity During the first 25 years of protection over 6,000,000 acres burned in Montana, northern Idaho, and in the northeastern two counties of Washington. This amounted to an average of a million and a quarter acres each half decade. During the past half decade acreage burned dropped to 95,000 acres, or only 7 percent of the previous average. We are now losing less than one-tenth of 1 percent per year, which is considered an acceptable figure. It was the belief of foresters that this improvement in fire protection had to be accomplished if there was to be a secure future in this land where timber and water for irrigation and power mean so much.

The roads, trails, telephone lines, lookout houses, radios, trucks, airplanes, are all vital and have helped greatly in attaining better fire protection. However, trained manpower was and is the key to successful and economical forest protection.

Before the Civilian Conservation Corps we used to have forest road and trail crews ready to fight the fires that escaped from the guard organizations. Additionally, plenty of men could be hired in a few hours on the local labor markets. This was not efficient, but we could at least get a crew out on the fire even though there was considerable delay.

The availability of the Civilian Conservation Corps after 1933 was a most important step forward. During the late thirties, costs dropped and there was a most essential reduction in acreage burned. The growing of timber became a fairly safe venture, which it had not been before even though a continued and growing timber supply was a national necessity.

With the outbreak of war, the Civilian Conservation Corps was dropped. We were left with virtually no crews of any sort. There was no labor standing on the street to be hired after the fires occurred. The local people were busy on their own urgent farming or industrial jobs. Further, rising costs reduced the number of guards and lookouts that could be hired for a given number of dollars.

Areas strategic to the war became important. Mining areas and structures, power lines in forest areas, railroad facilities, logging operations, and military establishments suddenly required examination for hazards and special measures to protect them.

I think you know of much of the wartime program of 1942 made possible by last year's congressional appropriation. To summarize: (1) Special squads were trained and organized for antisabotage work in collaboration with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2) Thirty crews, each consisting of four boys and one experienced man were strategically placed for the protection of the areas or facilities of the region especially vital to the war. (3) Two special mobile crews each composed of 100 students were intensively trained, capably led and transported to larger fires either by planes or bus. (4) Plans were made for the Army and Navy at 9 bases for protection of military facilities against grass and forest fires. (5) Selected military groups were given training at each base in fighting grass and forest fires. (6) Over 200 experienced trainers of the Forest Service gave some training to each of nearly 10,000 volunteer forest and grass fire fighters who became very valuable in meeting a large percentage of local emergencies. (7) A portion of the increased costs of operation—not otherwise provided for—were paid, thus permitting the maintenance of a fairly satisfactory part of the primary fire organization of lookouts and guards.

The five-man crews in strategic areas more than paid their way. Seventy-eight fires definitely threatening the railroads, power lines, etc., were suppressed by them at small size, whereas the alternative action of calling out logging or railroad crews would have introduced disastrous delays and disrupted the war work.

The two 100-man student fire crews actually fought fire 43 percent of their summer season. We flew them to South Idaho, Yellowstone, the Gallatin, Salmon River. We moved them by bus several trips when total time of travel was nearly equal to plane time. These boys had been trained and drilled until the green youngsters became valuable members of the organized crews. The agencies to whom we loaned them universally favored the plan of organization and have urged our continuance. I am certain the 1942 program saved money and timber in addition to critical man-hours. The boys trained and drilled by our foreman are useful only after training. The type of fellow recruited is usually not one the farmer or lumberman wants—until after he is trained. This year we are going to recruit only the boys the farmers don't want. We can train them.

With the reductions now in sight, and which you ably protested, all of the above activities will be impossible next fiscal year. Since a very large majority of the lookouts will be women and youngsters of 16 and 17, we will be somewhat weaker than the reduction in money would indicate. Normally the lookouts controlled, at very small size, 95 percent of the fires in their areas of responsibility. The other 5 percent that escaped required crew action.

With inexperienced youngsters and women on the lookouts, a larger but unknown percentage will escape and require crew action. This crews that can be trained and led by experienced men, become more important than ever.

From the detailed material I have presented here, you will understand the depth of my appreciation for your statement in the House. Trees have to live and grow through an average of five wars to be useful to the successful conduct of the sixth, and between wars our liberties are meaningless unless we have those resources so essential to our form of civilization.

If I have left blank places in the picture, I will be only too glad to give you additional data.

With best personal regards, I remain.

MISSOULA, MONT., *May 3, 1943.*

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Board of directors of Missoula Chamber of Commerce respectfully urge that you give serious consideration to the vital importance of approval of appropriations for forest-fire control and forest research as originally provided in agriculture appropriation by Budget Bureau. These Forest Service activities extremely important to both war and post-war efforts.

MISSOULA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

Tribute to Elbridge W. Palmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, at Kingsport, Tenn., there is located the world's largest book manufacturing plant. The timber, growing on Tennessee's hills, is cut, sawed, made into pulp, paper, and turned out into finished books at a rate of 5,000,000 books per month at this plant, the Kingsport Press, Inc. Since June 1925 Elbridge W. Palmer has been president of the company. During the past 2 years, Mr. Palmer has been loaned to the War Production Board as Deputy Director of the Printing and Publishing Division. On May 25 he will report to active duty as a colonel in The Adjutant General's Office.

During the time Mr. Palmer has been with the W. P. B., he has worked in close harmony with the Congressional Joint Committee on Printing. In line with Mr. Nelson's policy, established in the early days of S. P. A. B., to the effect that no additional plant facilities should be created where there were adequate commercial facilities to do the job, Mr. Palmer, shortly after Pearl Harbor, called a meeting of the interested Committees of Congress, Bureau of the Budget, Army, Navy and independent agencies to discuss the printing problem. At this meeting, a sound policy was established that there would be no more field printing plants authorized for the Army, Navy, and other Government agencies when adequate commercial facilities were available, except in those instances where the printing to be accomplished was of a secret and confidential nature. On July 6, 1942, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], as chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, issued a pamphlet completely outlining the policy and covering the progress made as a result of the meeting in February. Copies of the pamphlet were distributed to all Members of Congress and to all departments, independent offices and establishments.

Back of Mr. Palmer's program lay the knowledge that there were 43,000 large and small printers in this country; that there was no desire on the part of the armed services to assume, in addition to tactical matters, the headaches attendant upon the printing business; that the steel and other critical materials used in the manufacture of printing equipment were the same steel and critical materials needed for the production of guns, ships, tanks, and planes; that the commercial facilities of the country were more than adequate; and that last, but not least, the printing manufacturers, 168 in number, were in the first line of factories converted to the production of direct war matériel; and that the placing of orders for printing equipment in these converted plants necessarily would interfere with direct war production.

Colonel Palmer takes with him to the War Department a long and successful business record. Born at Meredith, N. H., December 4, 1886, his parents moved to Norwood, Mass., in 1888, where he graduated from high school in 1905, and immediately entered the book manufacturing industry in his home town. By successive steps through plant departments he received training in the technique of bookmaking, moving to New York City in 1909 to accept a managerial position with another firm in the same line of endeavor. There he became general manager in 1920, and president in 1923. It was in June 1925 he moved to Kingsport, Tenn., assuming the presidency of the Kingsport Press, Inc.

For many years Colonel Palmer has been actively interested in and is president of the National Society for Crippled Children and the Tennessee Society. He is a trustee of the George Peabody College for Teachers at Nashville, Tenn., and the Virginia-Intermont—Women's—College, at Bristol, Va.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement showing his activities be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Palmer Elbridge W. (born 1886, Meredith, N. H., F. & A. M., Shrine; IOOF). President and director, Kingsport Press, Inc., Kingsport, Tenn., and 1 East Fifty-Seventh Street, New York City; Kingsport Press Sales Agency, Inc., chairman of board and director; Kingsport Building & Loan Association, director; Nashville Branch, Federal Reserve Board of Atlanta, director; Nashville RFC Advisory Board, member; Tennessee Paper Mills, Inc., director; Tennessee Manufacturers Association, director; Southern States Industrial Council, vice president; Kingsport Federal Savings & Loan Association, director; Holston Valley Community Hospital, member of executive committee and director; National Society for Crippled Children, president; and Tennessee State Society for Crippled Children, president.

ROTARY RECORD

1925, January–June: Rotary Club of Queens Borough, New York City.

1925, June: Admitted to Kingsport, Tenn., club.

1926–27: President, Kingsport club.
1930–31: District governor fifty-second district (present one hundred sixty-second district)
1936–37: District governor (from December to June, for Clarence P. Daniel, resigned).
1937–38: Member, magazine committee of Rotary International.
1938–39: Chairman, magazine committee.
1925–38: Attended all but two district assemblies, all district conferences, and the Denver, Chicago, Atlantic City, and Boston conventions of Rotary International.
1925–38: Addressed conferences, assemblies, intercity and club meetings on Rotary topics (including extension and club service visits).
1939–40: Director.
1941–43: Chairman Foundation Campaign Committee.

CIVIC ACTIVITIES

1929–43: Chairman, board of trustees, Kingsport Public Library.
1934–43: Director and member executive committee, Holston Valley Community Hospital.
1935–37: Chairman, Airport Commission.
1935–39: President, Kingsport Community Chest, Inc.
1936–39: Member, Salvation Army Advisory Board (administering relief).
1933–34: President, Sequoyah Council, Boy Scouts of America. (Since 1936 member executive board).
1928–38: Vice president and director, First National Bank, Kingsport.
1938–39: Director, Sullivan County Tuberculosis Association.
1932–33: President, Kingsport Shrine Club.
1936–39: Director, Sullivan County Social Work Committee.
1933–43: Senior Warden, St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Kingsport.

AUTHORSHIP

"A Course in Bookbinding for Vocational Training"; "Classified Production Records for Book Manufacturing Plants"; associate editor, Merriam Webster's Dictionary; contributor to Encyclopedia Britannica, Collier's Encyclopedia, Quarrie's World Book, Richard's Cyclopedia, Lincoln Library of Essential Information, Production Year Book, etc., etc.

OFFICIAL POSITIONS

President, Kingsport Press, Inc.; past president, Book Manufacturers Institute, Inc., New York; president, Tennessee Society for Crippled Children, Inc.; president, National Society for Crippled Children, Inc.; vice president, Southern States Industrial Council; director, Tennessee Manufacturers Association; director, Kingsport Federal Savings & Loan Association; member, Tri-city airport commission; member, Tennessee State Planning Commission; member, Nashville Advisory Board of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, member Nashville Branch of the Federal Reserve Board of Atlanta; trustee and chairman, endowment committee, Milligan College; chairman, Research Development Advisory Council, Tennessee Valley Authority; member, National Executive Council Boy Scouts of America, chairman Region 5 Executive Board, chairman, Interracial Committee, member Division of Operations, Personnel and Publications Committees, past president, Episcopal Laymen's League, Diocese of Tennessee; past member, Bishop and Council, Episcopal Diocese of Tennessee; past chairman, Tennessee Industrial Personnel Conference; member, American Society Mechanical Engineers, Society for Advancement of Management, Reserve Officers Association, Ben Franklin Society, etc.

Mr: LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber when the junior Senator from Tennessee (Mr. STEWART) made a statement regarding Elbridge W. Palmer. I merely wish to add that during a portion of the time when Mr. Palmer was assisting the Government I was a member of the Committee on Printing, on the Republican side, and I join in everything the junior Senator from Tennessee has said in behalf of Mr. Palmer. I believe that he rendered very distinguished and able service to our Government, and that the country owes him a vote of thanks.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the amendment before the House is a classic example of Republican "Yes, but," philosophy.

That a great party should rely on such hypocritical tactics is beyond me.

Generally speaking the Republican Party is all out for victory, all out for a better post-war world, but, while loudly proclaiming this liberal and far-sighted policy, here in the House, under the cover of the protection afforded by non-recorded votes in the Committee of the Whole, they seek by plausible amendments to hamstring and hog-tie any and all measures honestly designed to lay the foundations for a post-war world that has for its objective a firm and lasting peace.

Let me say to the Republican leadership, gentlemen, if you for one moment believe that you can fool the people of this country with that kind of partisan hokum, you are mistaken.

Foxlike strategy may now and then succeed in filching an occasional chicken from the coops of the unwary, but if the fox comes back too often he gets caught.

Take heed, my friends, you are engaged in a hazardous enterprise, its success would mean disaster in the end; disaster, not to you only, but disaster to a troubled and war-disrupted world.

Pay-As-You-Go Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and lucid explanation of the Finance Committee report on the tax bill, particularly as to the pay-as-you-go features, delivered last evening over the radio by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. and Mrs. Taxpayer of these United States, at the outset of these remarks, I want to stress to all of my listeners on the air that the withholding and pay-as-you-go tax plan, adopted by the majority of the members of the Finance Committee of the Senate, is strictly an economic issue and not a partisan one.

Millions of taxpayers have been waiting patiently for the Congress to determine this issue once and for all. The Senate Committee has acted with unusual speed and dispatch, and on tomorrow Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Committee on Finance, will move to take up the bill for debate in the Senate.

My friends, as a member of the Committee on Finance, I am supporting the pay-as-you-go tax plan. We reported out this substitute for the legislation which was passed by the House of Representatives.

From the time the pay-as-you-go plan was suggested, it has been the subject of extensive study and debate throughout our country. The basic principle involved is rather simple. It provides that the taxpayers will pay their current tax bills during the year, just like they pay all other obligations. That principle has been adopted in the present Senate bill. To me, this is all-important. If we are to adopt this new measure in the taxing field, there should be no discrimination in placing all taxpayers, large and small, on a current pay-as-you-go plan. The bill passed by the House ignores this fundamental proposition. Some 4,000,000 taxpayers are not made fully current by the House bill. If the latter should become the law of the land, these taxpayers would continue to file their income-tax returns in the same way and at the same time each year as they have done in the past with respect to a large part of their income-tax liability. All other taxpayers are placed on a current basis. This discrimination is not in accord with the American doctrine that we know about, entitled "Equality before the law," or stated more simply—the doctrine of fair play.

The Senate bill, my friends, plays no favorites. We have placed every taxpayer on a current basis. That is what the taxpayer in America wants. How is this done? First, we say all taxpayers with a taxable income in 1942 and 1943 shall pay whatever is the higher ta. of the 2 years regardless of income.

Example: If you have a tax of $800 in 1942 and a tax of $1,000 in 1943, you will be required to pay the 1943 tax. You will become a pay-as-you-go taxpayer on July 1 this year, if the Senate bill should become the law. That portion of the bill I have been explaining briefly is known as the first windfall provision. It is not difficult to understand. Experts estimate that the effect of this windfall provision will bring into the Treasury $1,000,000,000 over what was provided in the House bill.

Second: It was felt, however, that the first windfall provision without some modification would somewhat threaten the financial integrity of the Government in that it would permit those who have large and abnormal incomes through war contracts to profit unduly through a year's forgiveness. Therefore, the committee wrote into the bill a provision that will compel the big taxpayers of the country to pay a substantial tax upon both their 1942 and 1943 incomes. This is known as the second windfall provision in the bill.

Let me give you an actual example of how this provision works:

The committee decided that the years 1938, 1939, and 1940 were normal years

insofar as income is concerned. With respect to the tax liability during the years 1942 and 1943 we permit the taxpayer to select in the years 1938, 1939, and 1940 his highest income and add thereto the sum of $10,000 as the total amount that can be used as an exemption insofar as his 1942 or 1943 income tax is concerned. For example: Let us say that the highest income of A in the base period was $8,000. In 1942 he earned $40,000, in 1943 he earned $50,000. We do not forgive the tax on the entire $40,000 income in 1942. We forgive A on the basis of the tax difference between the $40,000 and the $18,000 which would make him owe to the Government for the 1942 tax $13,622. He would still owe for his 1943 tax, on the basis of $50,000 income, which under the present rate is $28,075.

The bill provides that the 1942 tax can be spread out in payments over a period of 4 years if the taxpayer so desired. This last provision may seem somewhat complicated, but the committee felt that it was the best method that we could employ in order to compel those who are making abnormal profits in the war to pay their just portion of taxes.

It is well to state here that a special windfall provision has been made for soldiers whose income in 1942 was larger than in 1943. While I am speaking of the benefits provided to soldiers, let me say that under the bill all members of the armed forces will have a total exemption of $2,000 for single persons and $2,700 for married persons, plus the allowance of $350 for dependents. This is much more than is allowed civilians.

I should also like to say something with respect to the withholding system to be inaugurated under this measure with respect to wages and salaries only. Where taxpayers are subject both to the income tax and the Victory tax, the withholding will be at the rate of 20 percent. This 20 percent will apply to the wages and salaries above the following withholding exemptions: $624 in the case of single persons; $1,248 in the case of married persons; $312 in the case of each dependent.

It must be remembered that in 1940 there were slightly more than 4,000,000 taxpayers. In 1943 it is estimated that there will be 44,000,000. Most of these new taxpayers are in the small or middle brackets and are doing defense work of some kind. It is absolutely essential for efficiency and economy in Government that these new taxpayers be placed under the withholding and pay-as-you-go plan. They will be freed of debt anxiety in the future when the war is over and we revert back to peaceful days. In my opinion, it will save, over a long period of time, more money than will be lost by the forgiveness provisions in this legislation. I am confident that the Senate will adopt this much-needed legislation with all convenient speed.

A Victory Essential—Freedom of the Printed Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech I delivered at the auditorium in Milwaukee on May 10, 1943, at a meeting arranged by the Graphic Arts Association of Milwaukee. The subject of the speech was A Victory Essential—Freedom of the Printed Word.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, speaking to you this evening is both an honor and a challenge.

It is an honor because this group includes many outstanding organizations and splendid leadership—a leadership that is constructive, realistic, idealistic—a leadership of builders.

It is a challenge because our subject A Victory Essential—Freedom of the Printed Word deals with one of the great ideals for which we fight. It is an ideal which has been obliterated in other lands—and that presents a challenge to us as to how we can best use—and how we can most effectively strengthen—our free press.

In a world of change we must ever be on guard—on guard against aught that would sap our vitality and vision as a people and destroy our birthright. Righteousness exalteth the Nation; eternal vigilance preserves it.

We must see to it that those powers of evil like intolerance, class hatred, race hatred, graft in government, and sabotage of our great freedoms—including freedom of the press—shall not gain ascendancy in our land.

Therefore, in the midst of war we pause to discuss our obligations as Americans to preserve the freedom of the printed word as a victory essential. By their fruits we know the nature and character of the Axis Powers. We want none of their fruits.

Two weeks ago we celebrated Easter. On Easter morning 20 centuries ago, the women who went to the tomb of the Master found a new hope which lightened their very souls. Why? Because they were told that "He is not here, for He is arisen."

With sorrow and anxiety and doubt and fear, they approach the tomb, but after these words had been spoken all of these things disappeared.

It wasn't dark in their souls any more. The bright light of a new day had come.

We have known since September 1939 when Hitler invaded Poland, many days of darkness. The world is dark still, but a new day seems to be approaching and something ignoble is dying. Are we permitting our doubts and fears to interfere with our beholding and taking part in making a better world?

Easter and the Ascension bring to the Christian world the proof that there is a kind of life that cannot be destroyed. Easter to us this year speaks of the birth, yes, the resurrection of a new world, and we, you and I, are privileged to have a part in that work.

In the Easter picture, there is no hatred, intolerance, selfishness, and no death. If in the world that we are to shape tomorrow, we follow the pattern of Easter and its meaning, we may have the solution for which we are looking.

In the political world we are dealing with mighty matters in which many differing minds are working and many differing opinions are involved. We seek the solution which will benefit all concerned.

We have a goodly heritage. We must preserve it, and part of that heritage is the freedom of the printed word—yes, and the spoken word—a vital force for straight thinking.

Freedom of the written word is of course a broader term than freedom of the press. The issue of free speech which is involved in any unwarranted curtailment of the written or spoken word is even a larger issue than the issue of the free press.

The public press, and, in fact, all of the products of the printing press enable all citizens to be informed, to express their views, and to present their cases for public consideration. The coal strike is a recent illustration of how miners, operators, Government, and private individuals have been able to express their views before the public.

In the search, we must rid ourselves of those human forces, pride and egotism, which tend to separate instead of work out an amicable solution. The tendency too often manifested in each of us is that of passing judgment on others, as if we were infallible. This makes for division instead of union.

Great barriers, great problems, great accomplishments are up ahead for America. Our enemies are diabolically alert and using all of the weapons of evil. "They have sown the wind, but shall reap the whirlwind." We of the United Nations must use all of the physical, moral, and spiritual force we possess to bring about the defeat of our enemies. It is a time for sacrifice, for unity, for good will between all of the United Nations and peoples.

We have a goodly heritage. We must preserve it—and part of that heritage is the freedom of the printed word, a virtual portal for straight thinking.

This group has a dual stake in a free press.

This group shares with all freemen the fervent conviction that free speech and a free press are vital to the survival of freedom. In addition, however, this group—embracing service organizations and many of the technicians allied with a free press—this group also has a close concern with the day-to-day happenings which may constitute an erosion of our free press.

Freedom of the press can be evaluated today, first, as it affects the war effort; and secondly, as it affects the long-range pattern of American life.

Freedom of the press today more than at any period in world history must be considered both as a right and as a challenge to use this right wisely in the best interests of our country.

In recent months we have heard a great many comments concerning—

1. The curtailment of news pulp for newspapers.

2. The censorship and propaganda policies of the Government.

3. The licensing authority and controls over radio.

4. The Government use of the press and radio.

5. The invasion of Government into the publishing business.

6. The confusion of censorship, publishing and news dissemination policies of Government along with the lack of a clearly defined psychological warfare.

Now, I don't propose to discuss all of these subjects in detail tonight, but I do think it is well for use to realize at the outset that all of these matters are interrelated and that all of them are bound up with the question of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. The most recent controversy concerning freedom of the press relates to the United Nations Food Conference at Hot Springs.

I don't like the idea of a hush-hush food conference. I don't like the idea of backdoor diplomacy, and I don't like the idea of star-chamber secret covenants.

Spokesmen for the administration are reported as saying that the exclusion of the press from the food conference has nothing to do with the issue of freedom of the press.

In other words, the exclusion of the press was not to prevent anyone from saying what he pleases about the conference but merely to prevent him from knowing what he is talking about.

That, unfortunately, is a condition which is already too prevalent both in and out of Government. There are a great many things to talk about nowadays, but there isn't always a great deal of information. The Government controls all of the avenues of information and it can let us know as much or as little as it wishes.

It cannot be denied that on a great many issues today, there is extreme confusion. Fortunately, there is a unity on certain very basic issues. We must win the war. We must devote all our wisdom, energy and resources, to see if we can find the answer to war.

It cannot be denied that there is a growing distrust of a great many news sources. It is generally agreed that there must be an official control of information on military matters. To a certain extent, that is dangerous, but unfortunately, necessary.

However, it cannot be denied that official control of information can be extended and has been extended to some matters which can hardly be considered as military matters.

The connection between the Hot Springs conference and a peace program is a very obvious one, and if we are not to repeat the mistakes of the past, it is essential that these conferences be made available to the press.

The argument that suppression and delays in news and hand-outs from Government agencies are sound public policy is usually based on the claim that they prevent "disunity."

It is specious to believe that an intelligent people, however uninformed, can be "sold down the river" to a unity resulting solely from ignorance.

We have unity in this land and we have it because of common ideals. We could lose that unity, however, if we destroy any one of the ideals which serves as a bond between us. We could lose our unity if we destroy a basic part of our system—our democracy in a Republic.

This brings us to the Office of War Information. Just a few weeks ago there were wholesale resignations in that office. It was said that the resignations were due to a clash of personalities. The writers themselves, however, said that the principle of honest, factual reporting was at stake.

If that is true, it is indeed a basic issue. Any agency presuming to speak for the American people must be completely honest.

The Office of War Information has had a very complex and difficult assignment. One of the roots of its assignment is perhaps to give the American people an understanding of the grave problems which must be met if we are to win the war and the peace.

The American people do not ask for ballyhoo. They want facts. It should be said incidentally that along with some dubious publications the Office of War Information has issued some excellent factual publications and surveys.

The Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, has proposed a study of the policies, methods, and practices concerning the dissemination of war information and the text of the resolution covers any Government agency handling war information. This committee has already had Mr. Davis before us in open session and in executive session and will continue to be concerned with this problem.

It cannot be denied that when we are engaged in a total war, all channels of information must be kept free. We can rely on the judgment of the people if they have the facts. Dante's statement, "Give light and the people will find the way," is very applicable.

The aggressor nations have suppressed information and controlled its sources and its direction—and the lights have gone out.

The head of the Office of War Information is a man of outstanding reputation, but it is well to scrutinize the agency itself so that Congress can have a definite understanding of the methods by which the Office of War Information functions in its issuance of information to the people of this country.

In a democracy functioning in a republic, public decisions must be based upon complete public information. That doesn't mean that matters of high strategy should be spread abroad.

It is obvious that many decisions must be made in exe utive session but the methods by which any agency of Government operates should be clearly indicated to Congress.

In Germany the press law of May 7, 1874, recognized the principle of freedom of the press.

In 1919 the Republican Constitution in Germany included a definite statement on the freedom of publication from unwarranted censorship.

Germany, I repeat, started with a press law which recognized the principle of freedom of the press. Germany had a constitutional provision which provided for freedom of publication. The control was extended wherever it was deemed necessary to safeguard the public welfare. Then the National Socialist Party began to fight "conscious political lies and dissemination thereof through the press." Then Hitler began to express his doctrine that the press must be "put into the service of the state and nation."

Then there was a broadening of the definitions against newspapers which injure the public welfare, then a decree to permit police measures against publications endangering public security. Then there was a presidential decree that printed matter could be seized and withdrawn by the police. Then there was further censorship, and finally there was created a ministry for public enlightenment and propaganda. The authority of this agency was extended over press, radio, art, theater, and films. Then gradually certain publications were banned and some newspapers were reorganized. Finally newspaper representatives were told by the propaganda ministry what they could print, and there was created a news agency—an official news agency—which began to be a means of controlling the news at its source. Finally there was control of nonperiodical literature, and ultimately there was investigation as to whether or not writers were politically reliable.

That is the history of Nazi press and radio control.

It is not my purpose to find any disastrous parallel in our Nation, nor is it my purpose to contend that writers in this country who are not politically reliable are scrutinized very sharply by the administration. I merely present this very brief summary of Nazi press and radio control in Germany as a document which I believe warrants study by every thinking American who is concerned with the maintenance of the "four freedoms."

In Japan the net result of press control is the same. The basic difference is that in Japan the press and radio met with government difficulties almost from their earliest existence in 1861. From the very inception of the press, it was used to serve imperialistic interests and for administration propaganda.

Most of the newspapers were founded by government officials. Publications which did not champion one of the government departments found themselves subject to severe punishment. There was almost no labor press.

The Japanese have their own Dr. Goebbels and have their own propaganda ministry and their own merger of news agencies and their own control of international telecommunications.

In Italy the story of the press is the story of a political party, and a political leader who permitted no criticism and who divided all newspaper writers into classifications according to the degree of their loyalty to the leader and to his party. It is the story of a leader who was intolerant of those who, in their writing or in their verbal utterances disagreed with him or his party.

All newspapermen in Italy were divided into four classes:

1. Fascist Party members.
2. Nonparty members with a clean past.
3. Former anti-Fascists who had repented.
4. The unredeemed.

I might add that there are very rigid Italian regulations for broadcasting and the penalty for violation of the Italian code is extremely severe.

I repeat, I am not trying to find a disastrous parallel between these attitudes and anything which exists in this country. I merely outline these facts so that we may be vigilant, on our toes. The disaster at Pearl Harbor occurred because we were not alert. We want no Pearl Harbors on the home front, on any front.

In this Nation the First and Second War Powers Act contain provisions relating to the utilization of vital war information.

We are all familiar with the sweeping Executive orders which clapped secrecy and censorship rules on hundreds of commercial plants and we know that in 1939 as this Nation observed the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Bill of Rights, there was apprehension over the fate of some parts of our charter of liberty in the event that we should be drawn into war.

When the foremost editors of the Nation gathered in Washington for their annual conference on April 17, 1941, the biggest problem confronting them was Government news censorship. At that time the President sent a message in which he went all out for a free press.

It was evident, however, that in a democratic country which was technically at peace, it was impossible to keep the lid on military secrets.

The Chief Executive made a good start toward the right kind of censorship. He picked out a good man to be the Director of Censorship when he picked Mr. Byron Price, of the Associated Press, and the cooperation of the fourth estate was complete and enthusiastic.

Three months after our entry into the global war our military censorship over news was more stringent than ever before in our history. There was some public confusion in March of 1942 because there had been a suppression of facts already known to the enemy and a number of editorial writers throughout the Nation began to talk about the incompetency and the blundering of our press-relations policy.

By April of 1942 it was evident that freedom of the press was on trial. It was also evident that we were standing at the crossroads between voluntary censorship and compulsory censorship, and the newspaper industry was facing a supreme crisis. There was some apprehension by May of last year that the administration was attempting to cripple newspapers and suppress criticism of its policies.

By the latter part of September of last year there were grave issues as to what information endangered the security of the United States, and whether military censorship was being used to conceal nonmilitary news. Capital correspondents began to call for a showdown on censorship policies and there were a number of protests on the way silence was imposed under the voluntary code. There was a continual expression of concern over the creeping suppression which many people felt was a threat to a free press in wartime.

The Office of War Information, originally intended to coordinate and control the release of war information, was helpless when the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Petroleum Administration battled over the wording of a press release on the suspension of gasoline-rationing cards in the East. We are told that as a consequence,

news of the suspension leaked out prematurely. The same kind of muddling occurred on the announcement of canned goods rationing more recently.

By the 5th of February, the Office of Censorship had issued new and consolidated regulations governing all communications entering and leaving this country. There was a great deal of comment concerning the Allied censorship in north Africa early this year.

My own feeling is that our censorship of news must not be permitted to destroy the faith of the people in their Government. There is no excuse for the muddling of administration announcements concerning recent rationing policies. Today press and radio are regulated as to what they can tell the public, and we have a pretty definite organization to see that voluntary censorship is followed.

Now let us briefly consider Government propaganda. At the present time, old-line Government departments like the Department of Labor, the Treasury, and the others, maintain their own publicity organizations, as does every agency. It has been said that there were more than 30,000 press agents and publicity aides on the pay roll. How many million dollars a year that costs it is hard to say.

I believe that the American press has retained a remarkable degree of freedom in a world war of rigid restrictions, and I believe that the American press has done an outstanding job of self-government. I have no quarrel with the general censorship provision though I do believe it is apparent that we need a further clarification of policy and a definite coordination of all activities relating to press and radio. It is obvious that even our present system offers possibilities for potential abuse. Against these possibilities we must constantly be on the alert.

Along with the censorship policies of Government, I think we must be aware of certain mechanical limitations which have been posed upon the press. I think it is apparent that some of the attempts of Government to put press associations under the power of Congress to regulate commerce had in them the germ of rigid Government control.

The restrictions on news pulp also have in them the germ of rigid Government control. American newspapers began rationing newsprint with the new year and our rationing has been on the basis of 1941 usage. The rationing of newsprint may be a necessary step, but it is certainly inconsistent with the extended publication activities of Government itself, and with the fact that Government itself is utilizing more and more space in American newspapers, which leaves less and less space available for a free American press.

During the last war, when there were shortages, the Government laid the facts before the representatives of all the industries involved. The plans were drafted and put into effect on a voluntary basis. These were cooperative restrictions, and they were by and large successful. That policy has not been followed effectively in the present war.

The amount of print paper which big publishers may use during the present year has also been cut by a pattern similar to that which was applied to newspaper and magazine publishers. It is apparent that this curtailment order could seriously threaten the press of the Nation.

Perhaps the best evidence of any need for curtailment in the amount of news pulp available to newspapers should be given by Government itself. In Washington the Government issues a snowstorm of news releases which are apparently still considered as essential. It has been said that the Public Printer in Washington is estimating a 50-percent increase in the use of paper in 1943 over 1942.

There are tens of millions of posters issued by the Office of War Information.

The Office of War Information maintains a publications and graphic bureau, and some of their publications run to almost 3,000,000 copies. Their pamphlets range from 16 to 32 pages. Some of them are simple, pocket-size numbers, and some of them are profusely illustrated publications.

Some of the volume of Government publicity was cut late last year, but we still have not stopped the torrent of Government publications, and it cannot be denied that some of the Office of War Information publications have reflected party politics. I must confess also that I am alarmed by the statement recently attributed to the Office of War Information to the effect that it was going to take over all Government farm news.

I am alarmed also by the statement that the Office of War Information would take over the control of almost all Government news agencies.

I refuse, however, to believe that this administration is contemplating the publication of a Government-owned daily newspaper published at the taxpayers' expense.

I said at the beginning of our discussion tonight that freedom of the press brings with it an obligation to use that freedom wisely.

There are undoubtedly times where that freedom has been abused, but it has also been used for great constructive purposes.

The press has continually endeavored to expose any bureaucratic and brass-hat incompetency. The press has made the American people aware of the menace of inflation. The press has made gasoline rationing possible. The press made the scrap drive successful. The press has donated nearly $100,000,000 in space for war purposes.

The press made it possible for Henry Kaiser to do a job in the face of mossback opposition.

The press made it possible to secure a clarification of the rubber issue. The press exposed the early fan-dancer defects in the Office of Civilian Defense. The press has continually pounded away on the issue of one-man control over war production.

Yes; the press has done a job, and I don't blame our great journalists when they blew the lid off the issue of censorship. One of them aptly wrote about the creeping paralysis of that censorship.

Fellow Americans, I believe certain decisions must be made in connection with the foregoing:

1. The administration must clearly define its permanent policy with respect to censorship.

2. The administration must clearly define its permanent policy with respect to the publication activities of the Government.

3. The publication activities of government must be scrutinized closely and all ballyhoo must be eliminated in favor of factual presentations.

4. The behind-the-scenes conflicts between the Office of War Information and the Office of Strategic Services must be definitely and permanently settled.

5. The administration must define a definite program of psychological warfare. At the outset of 1943, as far as we know, we still had no agreed policy or coordinated program for psychological warfare. We still had no completely unified effort and there must be no conflicts in this field.

6. We must separate our propaganda and censorship activities or else correlate them so that they do not create confusion.

7. If the Office of War Information is to present a picture of this country to other lands, it is imperative that its staff represent a cross section of America. That means that the staff of the Office of War Information must have some representation from the Middle West in its working organization. I am aware of the fact that several of the key men in the Office of War Information are middle western men, but I believe that there should be some middle western thinking in the working level of this organization.

8. I believe that it is the obligation of the administration to define all of the activities and the scope of any of its agencies concerned with censorship or propaganda so that the representatives of the people may have this information.

9. I believe that the so-called propaganda agencies should maintain some kind of a liaison with the representatives of the people. I don't believe that these agencies of government can work in airtight compartments entirely isolated from the elected representatives of the people, nor do I believe that they can function effectively without the confidence of the people, which in turn means taking the people into their confidence on everything except extremely secret matters.

10. In our governmental thinking, official administration recognition must be given to the vital part which advertising has placed not only in our war effort but in the part that it will play in the post-war era.

I should like to comment briefly on this last point. During the past decade there has been some evidence of Government antagonism to advertising.

No one holds any brief for false or misleading advertisers and reputable publications have long practiced a policy of voluntary censorship.

I cannot agree with those social planners who may be inclined to seize upon the war as a vehicle to annihilate all advertising.

Long before this Nation entered the war Canadian advertisers had embarked on an all-out campaign to aid Canada's war effort.

The Canadian Government itself spent huge sums to tell its story to the public. Canadian advertisers diverted their sales advertising into national savings campaigns.

Advertising proved its value in times of national crisis. War savings stamp and war bonds sales are an illustration. Since the outbreak of the war, American advertising has been dedicated wholeheartedly to the effective furtherance of the war effort. It is impossible to accurately estimate the lift which advertising has given to our production but experts believe that it has been a very potent factor in the rising production curve.

Advertising is also a part of our concept of free enterprise and is allied to our concept of a free press.

We know that advertising printing working with the press as a powerful dynamic force has constantly accelerated our war effort. We know that the printed word has materially aided in financing the Red Cross, in filling America's blood bank, and in carrying the story of war equipment to the men who will use that equipment so that it may be assembled and maintained.

We know that the printed word has helped to arrest absenteeism and has helped to build employee morale, has helped to curb accidents and to decrease spoilage.

This tremendous force must be maintained and it must be maintained in accordance with our traditional freedoms.

We have not always had freedom of speech or freedom of the press in this country.

As a matter of fact freedom of speech and freedom of press came only after a hard battle and there is still today a need for vigilance against any threat to this freedom.

Fellow Americans, in other lands we have seen the ercsion of a free and untrammeled expression of public opinion. We have seen how the German authority, the Italy authority, and the Japanese authority control all forms of social communication. Gcebbels in Germany has said German newspapers are "sharp instruments of expression ready to be played on like a piano." The first freedoms to be lost by any people who are controlled by dictators were the freedoms of expression and the press.

The encroachments on a free and untrammeled expression of public opinion elsewhere have sometimes been very gradual. They usually begin as propaganda for a particular administration of a particular leader and they usually end in complete control of all forms of social communication.

The tremendous increase in the publicity and informational activities of the Federal Government—the tremendous increase in material publicizing government activities carries with it a distinct menace for the future and that is not a comment merely for this administration but for any administration.

The Federal Communications Commission has a life-and-death power which it can wield over every radio station in the land and the Chief Executive has authority to seize any or all radio apparatus and equipment.

The twin threat of censorship and propaganda led France down the long road from which there was no turning to ultimate disaster.

Today we are rightly concerned with the constructive achievements of the press in advancing every phase of our war effort.

Today when the great freedoms are dying in other lands, the continued existence of freedom in this country is a great challenge to use that freedom for constructive purposes. Beyond the reportorial obligation of the newspaper, every American newspaper today is a leader of public opinion. In winnowing and sifting the news of the day, it lives up to its obligation to present only the truth. I believe that the greatest safeguard against dictatorial government is a conscientious, intelligent, constructive, unshackled, free press.

Fellow Americans, in these trying days we need constructive leadership from the press and we need constructive leadership from groups such as these.

I don't believe that freedom of the press will ever be annihilated in this land. I don't believe that we will lose our great freedoms. An enlightened people and a vigilant Congress will never permit that to happen. No man and no party could be so blind as to eliminate a free press as a great safeguard for the perpetuation of freedom.

This must never happen in this land, and it never will as long as socially minded, civic-minded leaders such as are gathered here tonight voluntarily give of themselves and their time to worth-while projects which would be impossible in any land except one where all of the freedoms are maintained.

In a dilapidated attic room in Paris some years ago a great painting—a lost masterpiece—was discovered. The story goes that when the searcher saw this painting it was daubed over with many blotches. It had no appeal—but something told him to erase the dust and paint. The original had been entirely covered with a new crude scene. He took this canvas down and diligently worked on it with solvents getting rid of the accumulated pigments and, behold, a masterpiece that had been lost for centuries was regained for the race.

This war is bringing to most of us an appreciation of the great value of American citizenship. Most of us were born Americans. We were handed at birth this thing called American citizenship. We never did anything for it; we didn't appreciate it; it cost us nothing; but now we know that eternal vigilance will be the price of our retaining it and our children's retaining it. Its beauty is coming to light

You and I are rediscovering America in our souls. There are many ills yet to be corrected. We must, with the acid of faith and good will and brotherhood, clean away these ills of class hatred, race hatred, intolerance, so that the great beauty and privilege of being an American constantly remains with us.

May it never be said of this Nation, as was said of another back in the days of the prophet, "She that was great among the nations * * * how is she become tributary?"

America is the El Dorado of all nations, for here freedom lives—here good will obtains. Here we are the composite of the best bloodstreams of the Old World—a new breed called the American.

I am but one generation off from Europe, but when my parents came here they dug their roots down deep in the soil and became Americans. And now five or more bloodstreams flow in my grandchildren.

We have great values in America. May it be said of us—of this generation who have a tremendous job to do—"They (meaning you and I) were alert; they were on guard; and they transmitted to the coming generations the freedoms of America, unimpaired."

Censorship of the News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial dealing with Government censorship of the news, published in the Miles City (Mont.) Daily Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS IT NOT RIDICULOUS?

This business of censoring the news has gotten to the point where it is fast becoming a disease. Everybody connected with the Government, from the President on down to the forty-sixth operative of the umpty-steen office of the umpty-steen district is trying to tell the newspapers what they shall and what they shall not publish. The entire situation is becoming a farce. The Office of War Information, which dishes out our governmental news these days, is the laughing stock of the Nation. The fact that it has otherwise able newspapermen directing it does not add anything to its stature. Two of the latest events in Office of War Information activities bring out these points. On the one hand we have the Office of War Information issuing a statement on the synthetic-rubber situation and the rubber czar, Mr. Jeffers, accusing them of not knowing what they are talking about. Next, we have the national commander of the American Legion on his return from North Africa declaring that we have not yet been advised of the American casualties of that campaign, and the Office of War Information saying that Mr. Waring had misinterpreted what he saw.

The following incident brings home to us a local way the ridiculousness of the censorship that has been clamped on the press of the United States. Recently the President started out on a trip through certain parts of the country. Immediately the newspapers and radio were warned that they could not publish anything about the movements of the President; that the sole authority for the release of any information regarding the trip would be the White House; in other words, the President. The trip emerged from the cloak of obscurity in the revelation of the meeting of the two Presidents of the United States and Mexico first in Monterrey and then in Corpus Christi. Then the hush, hush blanket was thrown over things again.

On April 28 a member of the Star staff was stopped on the street of this small town by a lady who has a son in the Army at Lowry Field, Colo. She told him that the son had written her that the President had been there on Saturday, April 24, or 4 days previously. We have been twitted on other occasions about not publishing the news, especially the time the President made his secret trip through the Northwest and turned his dog Falla out for exercise on all the station platforms where the train happened to stop. Everybody at the depot in Glendive, for instance, knew that the President and his entourage was aboard the special train when it stopped there; it was a matter of a later public press story that Falla was recognized and petted on the station platform at Billings. But that information could not be passed along to you and Bill Smith and Pete Brown and John Jones who are the real Government of these United States.

In this latest case, we thought we were at least entitled to find out whether news was traveling faster these days (under Office of War Information guidance) by 3 cents letters than by telegraph, telephone, or radio, so we addressed a simple inquiry to the Associated Press at Denver. In it we asked "Was President in Denver last Saturday?" Please remember that this inquiry was made 4 days after the reported time of said visit. Apparently Mr. Smart Aleck was at the receiving desk of the Associated Press when our inquiry was received because we got this reply slapped back at us:

"Sorry, but cannot make any answer to such a question one way or another without violating censorship code. Such a message should not be sent. Please refer to code."

The following day, if you please, the news wires of the Associated Press were plastered with a story as long as a well rope about the President's trip, after he left Corpus Christi. Looming up right in the middle of all of it was the information that Mr. Roosevelt had been in Denver and at Lowry Field on Saturday, April 24. On the day that we made our inquiry he was somewhere between Evansville, Ind. and Washington—almost a thousand miles away from the place we inquired about.

We are not blaming the Associated Press for their attitude, except to say that they might try and get the hired help (even in these war boom times) to be a little more civil in their treatment of the cash customers. But we do blame the silly, ridiculous system of censorship that has been clamped on the newspapers of the country in dissemination of the most ordinary news. We would like to have any of the draft deferred Government pay-roll sitters in Washington tell us what possible harm there could be in passing along information as to where the President has been, 4 days after he had been there, and 1 day before he poured forth the whole fancy story, himself.

We repeat that this whole system of censorship of news by Government bureaucracy is a disease. While we are fighting in all four corners of the world for high-sounding platitudes, we are coming mightly close to losing our freedom at home, especially so when the President's dog can take himself for a walk on all the railway station platforms of the country and the common people who are footing the bill for this war, can't even hear the slightest whisper of even the "dog walk."

Orientalization of World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a very interesting and I believe timely article entitled "Orientalization of World," by Col. Robert R. McCormick, which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of May 2. I ask unanimous consent to have it published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORIENTALIZATION OF WORLD

(By Col. Robert R. McCormick)

Week before last, I reread the histories of Europe and Asia, ancient and modern, to trace the courses of conquest. I continued my reading all last week because I had surprised myself with a discovery which has undoubtedly been made elsewhere and published, but which has not come to my attention, and which is the topic of tonight's address, The Orientalization of the World.

The peoples of western Europe were all originally self-governing, with high regard for the rights of individuals. The people of Asia were always monarchial, looking upon their monarch not only as their ruler but as their god. The Greeks were so individualistic that they never could unite even a majority of their people in a common government by agreement or force. Their republican principles were subject to corrosion in contact with the Orient

The Roman republic not only developed a solidarity unknown to the Greeks, but a tolerance which permitted it to take conquered or allied peoples into citizenship.

The original Roman expansion was north to the Alps, south to the African desert, and west to the Atlantic, including Spain. Her first wars to the east were in alliance with and to protect free republics. About the year 100 B. C., Roman forces came into close, if hostile, relations with the East in the person of King Mithridates. From them Catulus and Pompey returned to Rome affecting oriental pomp.

After Caesar conquered Gaul, the civil war took him to Greece, whence he went to Egypt.

In Gaul he had exterminated the leaders of his enemies, but he married bigamously the queen of Egypt, Cleopatra. As we know, when he was assassinated, he had already sent his nephew and heir, Octavian, to the east to school.

The ensuing civil war was fought largely in the East and left Octavian in command of a victorious army and navy with a thorough comprehension of oriental despotism.

Many of the old Roman families had been killed in the civil war or had been murdered in the proscription. To prevent political opposition, Octavian devised the theory of constructive treason, whereby the death penalty could be inflicted for anything anyone did, or anything anyone said, or even anything anyone thought. With the prosecutors and courts under his control, Octavian stifled all opposition.

By the simple process of delegating all its powers to him, the senate made him in effect an oriental monarch, gave him the title of Augustus, and named a month for him.

The republic never recovered. Emperor succeeded emperor, some better, some worse—all absolute monarchs.

It became customary to erect statues to the Roman emperor. He became not only lawmaker, but the supreme court who instructed the judges how to construe the law.

This law was the law of a conqueror imposed upon the conquered—the law of the dictator imposed upon his subjects.

The oriental monarchy finally sapped the energies of the once free Roman people, and Rome fell.

The tribes that succeeded the Roman rule throughout Europe were largely self-governing. The chiefs were elected and swore to uphold the customs of the people, sometimes called folk law, sometimes called common law.

In the eighth century Charlemagne recreated the empire and since his death the idea of empire has never disappeared in Europe. There was the old empire with an elective emperor. There was the Holy Roman Empire, an hereditary monarchy, Napoleon's empire, the Austrian Empire, the German Empire. Mussolini and Hitler are trying to form empires.

In the Crusades, the peoples of Europe again came into contact with the east and brought back ideas of pomp and monarchy leading to the theory of the divine right of kings.

The Renaissance, beginning shall we say in the fifteenth century, spread Italian culture throughout Europe and with it the Roman law. Trial by jury struggled in France for a while, but was defeated in the end.

In Germany the rights of citizens fell so low that, in our time, it was customary for army officers to force women to walk in the street and to dispossess citizens from restaurant tables. That is what Roman law did to continental Europe.

A combination of circumstances preserved the liberties of Englishmen. England never was in any of the empires. None of her kings was ever emperor, interested in introducing the civil law. Her Norman kings were often more concerned with affairs on the continent than on the island. Then civil wars in which the crown was the stake inclined the contestants to cater to the public.

Magna Carta remained and remains a written document reciting the rights of men. The Inns of Court, being schools of the common law, upheld the common law against the assaults of the civil law.

Throughout the ages the asylums of self-government were the cities which were granted certain rights in charters. The colonies in America were established under similar instruments.

King James I caused the charter of Virginia to be forfeited, and King Charles II did the same with the charter of Massachusetts. The same King Charles II, controlling his courts, succeeded in forfeiting all of the charters of the English cities, when, fortunately, he died before destroying the liberties of England.

In an age when the powers of the king were still great, England benefited by the constant exhaustion of the royal strain. William III, for instance, a king quite capable of establishing a complete monarchy, was childless and had no incentive to do so.

Thereafter there was no English-born king until George III. This king attempted to make his office that of emperor and probably would have succeeded but for the successful revolt of the American colonies which broke down the power he had established at home.

In this country we think of the age of discovery only as the discovery of America. We ignore the fact that the east, with its despotic governments, was reached on the north by Archangel, and on the south around the Cape of Good Hope. With the opening of the Suez canal and the building of railroads, Europe and Asia came more and more in contact.

We have heard much of the occidentalizing of the orient, but we have ignored the orientalizing of the occident. With the exception of Spain, the conquering and trading nations were interested only in profit. They played ball with any oriental despot who would play ball with them.

During the years that American principles were entering Europe from the west, oriental ideas were seeping in from the east. Men who spent their lives in contact with tsars, sultans, pashas, and rajahs had little respect for the doctrines of Jefferson, Mason, Locke, or Rousseau, just as Americans who have lived much abroad, for business, pleasure, or on official missions, have lost their Americanism.

Oriental ideas prevailed over the occidental ones.

The first country in Europe to be orientalized was Portugal.

We have ignored the fact that the method which Mussolini used to become duce of Italy was the exact copy of the method used by Caesar Augustus nearly 2,000 years before—the delegation to him of the authority of the Italian Parliament.

We also forget that just as Hitler was coming into power and long before self-government in England was abolished, an effort was made to change our Republic into an empire by the acts of Congress establishing the National Recovery Administration and the National Industrial Recovery Act. These acts attempted to delegate to the Executive the powers of Congress, just as was done in Rome and has been done in the other countries I have named.

COURT DECISION CITED

These abdications were restrained only by the Supreme Court of the United States in a decision saying, in part:

"The Constitution established a National Government with powers deemed to be adequate, as they have proved to be both in war and peace, but these powers of the National Government are limited by the constitutional grants.

"Such assertions of extra constitutional authority were anticipated and precluded by the explicit terms of the tenth Amendment—'The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, or prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.'

"The Congress is authorized 'to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution' its general powers. The Congress is not permitted to abdicate or to transfer to others the essential functions with which it is thus vested. * * *

"But we said that the constant recognition of the necessity and validity of such provisions, and the wide range of administrative authority which has been developed by means of them, cannot be allowed to obscure the limitations of the authority to delegate, if our constitutional system is to be maintained. * * *

"Such a sweeping delegation of legislative power finds no support in the decisions upon which the Government especially relies."

QUOTES JUSTICE CARDOZO

Mr. Justice Cardozo concurring, said:

"The delegated power of legislation which has found expression in this code is not canalized within banks that keep it from overflowing. It is unconfined and vagrant.

"The extension becomes as wide as the field of industrial regulation. If that conception shall prevail, anything that Congress may do within the limits of the commerce clause may be done by the President upon the recommendation of a trade association by calling it a code. This is delegation running riot. No such plenitude of power is susceptible of transfer."

Unlike all of the other countries in the world, we still retain our liberties because we have a written Constitution and a perspicacious and courageous Supreme Court. We also are continuing to have elections and registration in this country, also due to our written Constitution.

Death of Lt. Gen. Frank M. Andrews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the death of Lt. Gen. Frank M. Andrews, when his airplane crashed recently in Iceland, cast a pall not only over the Nation, but particularly over the State of Tennessee. General Andrews was a native of Tennessee, and of the city of Nashville, where he received his early education. He was a great American, and a stalwart and able soldier. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Andrews—a Loss Indeed," published in the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of May 5, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANDREWS—A LOSS INDEED

The Nation rejoiced—and Nashville, whose son he was, rejoiced—when Lt. Gen. Frank M. Andrews was named to command all United States forces in the European war theater. The unanimity of that rejoicing was an earnest of his Nation's confidence that the right man had been found for a job demanding the utmost in daring, courage, and skill.

There is today a comparable unanimity of shock and sorrow. The death of General Andrews in an Iceland plane crash is a blow that none will deny. A terrible loss has been sustained; a loss to leadership; a loss to his Nation.

It is a loss that will require on the part of every leader a redoubled vigor, and the determination of those who had collaborated with him in perfecting the plans of ultimate victory to carry out to the letter the policies and strategy worked out by him to assure that victory on the continent. The genius of his organizational activities will best be shown by the manner in which his men continue to carry on. When he left the Caribbean command to take over in the Middle East, he did that safely because his spadework enabled his successors to follow through. When he left the Middle East to assume command in the European theater, it was a smooth transition eased by what he had accomplished there by way of preparation and organization. Unquestionably, in preparing for the intensified invasion to come, he has followed that same principle, and those left to carry on will build well on the foundations laid by him.

America's debt to Frank M. Andrews can never be paid. He was a leader in building the framework of a great air force, a pioneer in military aviation who had the vision—and refused to be dissuaded from it—of national strength and consequent security through air power second to none. His faith in this belief was manifested by his attainment of personal pilot skill and his continued efforts to mold to perfection that branch of service. His strategy of victory over the Axis was demonstrated in his language when he assumed command in Europe; the promise that the air raids in Germany would be stepped up until the Axis was blasted into surrender.

Truly the war comes home more strongly every day. Nashville has counted in recent days the growing number of Nashvillians who have joined the list of heroes who have laid down their lives for their country. Among its war pilots three recently have been announced as dead or missing * * * and now Frank Andrews.

It is a blow indeed; its proportions are not exaggerated. It remains for those to whom the torch is passed to carry on no less energetically, capably, and heroically. His was an inspiring example of service to country, not lost, certainly, on a nation fighting for its life.

A Department of Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over Congressional Record on the Air of station WHN, New York City, May 11, 1943:

Congressional Record on the Air! From Washington, D. C., ladies and gentlemen, WHN brings you the twenty-fifth weekly program in a public service series featuring outstanding leaders of the United States Congress. Tonight, we're privileged to have as our guest the Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY, of New York. Congressman KENNEDY, a top ranking member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and a New York City businessman, has made a special study of business problems. Last week, on the basis of these studies, Mr. KENNEDY introduced a bill in the House of Representatives, the enactment of which is of prime importance to industry. At this time WHN presents Congressman KENNEDY in his first public discussion of this measure. Mr. KENNEDY.

ADDRESS OF HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY, OF NEW YORK

A NEW POST IN THE CABINET

For some years, I have felt that industry should be dignified by representation in the Cabinet of the United States. Therefore, on May 5, I introduced two bills and a resolution, in the House of Representatives. All three of these documents have to do with the creation of a Department of Industry, the eleventh in a series of departments whose ranking officers make up the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

For several reasons, the need for this proposed Department is especially acute today. We hear much discussion of the friction that exists within and between the many agencies of Government having to do with the activities of industry in the present emergency—a friction which hampers, if not wholly wastes, the energies and the accomplishments of those agencies. Such friction is most frequently due to misunderstanding and to lack of cooperation, and sometimes to the misinterpretation which seems bound to arise whenever and wherever the multiplication of data bids fair to run away with the very purpose it is created to serve. A Department of Industry would serve as the moderator in such misunderstandings; it would bring about the vital coordination which no number of individual officials, directors, and administrators can accomplish.

At all times, and particularly in times of war, a Department of Industry is needed to act for business as a buffer between, on the one hand, the possible excesses of labor, which we have seen recently, in the matter of the coal strikes—as yet unsettled—and, on the other hand, the assumption of too paternal an authority by the Government.

Agriculture has its department, and so have commerce and labor. But industry, which by its very dictionary definition, is the cooperation of capital and labor in the useful and gainful pursuit of any art, occupation or business, is farmed out, as it were, to have its problems settled somewhere in a mythical mid-region of labor and commerce, and this mid-region is often mythical indeed, if neither labor nor commerce feel impelled to fight for the rights of industry.

Congress is constantly passing bills affecting industry. When those bills come to the President for his consideration, there is no Cabinet officer charged with the particular duty of presenting industry's viewpoint before the President takes action upon the legislation. Instead of discussing the problems of industry with the Secretary of Industry and his departmental aides, as matters now stand the President can only receive opinions from this or that company executive or factory operator, each with his individual problems and grievances. No one is assigned to study the picture as a whole and to resolve these problems and grievances into our total needs and plans and purposes. The current situation is disadvantageous to the President, to industry, and, indeed, to our entire country.

Let us pause for a moment to examine the 10 existing Departments, the Secretaries of which make up the Cabinet of the President. The first post to be filled was that of the Secretary of State, who has charge of all foreign relations. This Department was created on July 27, 1789, just about a year after the Constitution of the United States was ratified by the first 11 States, and so became a Government in form as well as in deed. During the following 2 months—that is to say, August and September of that year—4 more Departments were created, and a Secretary of War, a Secretary of the Treasury, a Postmaster General, and an Attorney General were appointed. These 5 men, with President Washington, comprised the small, hard-headed, and great-hearted staff which accomplished the difficult and dangerous ordeal incidental to the birth of our Nation.

In 1798 it seemed wise to create a Secretary of the Navy, since every farseeing statesman realized that the young country of the United States could survive only by virtue of naval as well as land strength.

Fifty-one years passed before territorial expansion and the development of our natural resources called for a Department of the Interior, to deal with various subjects, such as pensions, Indian affairs, education, and so on, not properly included under any other department. The Department of the Interior came into being on March 3, 1849.

Forty years later, the Department of Agriculture was established, in 1889, after the country was sufficiently grown up to have come through that battle of brothers which was the Civil War, and to realize that economic panics can be precipitated through cotton and wheat and cattle as well as through manipulated inflation and the vagaries of foreign credit.

The Departments of Commerce and Labor, which, as I have indicated, constitute the groups between which industry falls, were created much later, and within the living memory of most of us. The Department of Commerce was set up in 1903, under the original title of the Department of Commerce and Labor, and was intended to deal with the Patent Office, and the Bureaus of Weather, of the Census, and of Standards. Tonight, it includes such Government activities as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Defense Plant Corporation, the Defense Supplies Corporation, the Metals Reserve Company, the Rubber Reserve Company, The RFC Mortgage Company, the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and the War Dam-

age Corporation, as well as the care of the seal herds of the Pribilof Islands in Alaska, and the lighthouses in the Gulf of Mexico. Each and every one of these is directly concerned with industry; and they have absolutely nothing to do with the original intention that foreign and domestic commerce, patents and standards should have a representative at the President's table, in the form of a departmental secretary.

Thirty years ago, in 1913, the Department of Labor was declared a separate entity from that of Commerce. It consisted, at its inception, of three labor bureaus. The Department of Labor sprang not so much through creation as through the fissure which develops because of natural growth. The Secretary of Labor has under her immediate jurisdiction the United States Conciliation Service, the Division of Labor Standards, the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, the Children's Bureau, and the Women's Bureau—but not one person assigned to represent industry. And, as a matter of fact, no legislative definition of labor itself, within the Department, has ever been made, up to this very minute.

But there is a definition of a secretary of a department. He is an officer of state whose duty it is "to superintend and manage" the affairs of a particular department of Government. As the needs for new departments have come along, the departments have been created, for the purpose of handling matters which are not properly included under any existing department. It is plain to see that the affairs of industry have outgrown the attentions of any existing department under which they could possibly have found themselves in earlier days, and should now be given the required specialized and sympathetic attention they deserve, in a Department of Industry.

It is not the intention of my legislative proposal to place a dictator over industry The secretary of industry should act as a spokesman for industry in the Government. There will be no conflict or duplication of authority, either with the Department of Labor or the Department of Commerce. The purpose of the office would be for the compromise of any misunderstanding. Because I feel industry to be such a vital part of our democratic scheme of life, I hope to provide the impetus toward giving industry the opportunity of equal—mind you, equal, not greater—voice, along with labor and commerce.

The post of Secretary of Industry would provide an intelligent and analytical contact between industry and the President himself, for the purpose of studying and reporting the problems of industry all over the country.

The word "industry" has given its name to the time in which we live; we speak of the industrial age. And indeed it is just that. For the war we are waging, the war upon the successful outcome of which depends our very existence as a free country and a free people—that war is a war not only of men, but—perhaps even more—of machines; of industrial ingenuity and skill and production and power.

The Secretary of Industry must be a man of ability, practical experience, sound judgment, and great courage. It is fortunate that men with these qualifications are now available. I suggest one of the following: Bernard Baruch; Ellsworth Bunker, president of the National Sugar Refining Co.; John A. Coleman of the New York Stock Exchange; Frank Gannett, newspaper publisher; Basil Harris, president of the United States Lines; Frederick E. Hasler, president of the New York State Chamber of Commerce; Noel Becker, president of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York; William Jeffers, rubber czar; Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce; Henry J. Kaiser, shipbuilder extraordinary; Donald Nelson, of the War Production Board; and Frederick Williamson, president of the New York Central Railroad.

I have not attempted, in my bills, to set up the jurisdiction of the department, because I believe that a standing committee of the House can make a better study of this matter than could any one Member. The committee would clearly establish the functions and duties of this new department.

I shall read the text of one of my bills, that one which directly asks for the creation of the department:

"A bill creating the Department of Industry

"Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created a Department of Industry, with powers to administer such laws as the President may direct pending the passage of an act of Congress giving such department specific powers.

"SEC. 2. That the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a secretary as the head of such Department with full status of a cabinet officer."

This bill, and its accompanying bill and resolution, both of which deal with the procedure of setting up the office, are now pending before the House of Representatives. It is my earnest hope that they be given early and profound consideration, for the benefit of industry and of our great country.

Thank you, station WHN, for the opportunity of telling these facts to my people—and your people—over the Congressional Record on the Air.

Job Well Done

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, Mr. E. W. Palmer, a distinguished Tennessean, will relinquish his duties as Deputy Director of the Printing and Publishing Division of the War Production Board to report for active duty in the office of The Adjutant General.

In making this transfer from W. P. B. to the War Department, Mr. Palmer will leave one job, which in my opinion has been exceedingly well done, and take up other duties for which he is exceptionally well qualified.

His departure from the Printing and Publishing Division of the War Production Board in a sense is to be regretted.

As president of the largest book manufacturing plant in the world at Kingsport, Tenn., Mr. Palmer brought to the War Production Board an experience that covered every problem of printing. At his Kingsport plant timber is cut from the tops of the surrounding hills, made into pulp and then into paper, and finally comes out in books at the rate of 5,000,000 volumes per month.

But in addition to that valuable practical experience Mr. Palmer also brought a comprehensive understanding of the national picture as it relates to printing, and an appreciation of the importance of cooperation with congressional committees and executive agencies. Throughout his tenure in that position he has worked in close harmony with the Congressional Joint Committee on Printing.

It may be recalled in this connection that Mr. Palmer called a meeting of interested congressional committees, the War and Navy Departments, the Bureau of the Budget, and other agencies soon after Pearl Harbor to develop a printing program.

As a result of that conference a policy was established which in effect meant that no additional field printing plants for the Army and Navy would be built so long as there were adequate commercial facilities available, or unless the printing required was of a highly confidential nature.

Such a policy not only has proved to be sound from the Government's standpoint, but it resulted in spreading the printing job to thousands of firms, many of them small, which otherwise might have been forced to close.

Moreover, because of this fixed policy adopted early in the course of the war, it was possible to convert quickly a large number of plants engaged in the manufacture of printing equipment, to the direct production of war materials. Both the policy and the practice are worthy of our applause and commendation.

Whatever may be the nature of his new duties with the War Department, we may rest assured that Mr. Palmer will discharge them as efficiently as he has discharged others during 2 years with the War Production Board.

Mr. Palmer was born in Meredith, N. H., December 4, 1886. He entered into the book-manufacturing business immediately after his graduation from high school in 1905.

By successive steps through plant departments he received training in the technique of bookmaking, moving to New York City in 1909 to accept a managerial position with another firm in the same line of endeavor. There he became general manager in 1920 and president in 1923. It was in June 1925 he moved to Kingsport, Tennessee, assuming the presidency of the Kingsport Press, Inc.

For many years Colonel Palmer has been actively interested in and is President of the National Society for Crippled Children and the Tennessee Society. He is a trustee of the George Peabody College for Teachers at Nashville, Tenn., and the Virginia-Intermont (Women's) College, Bristol, Va.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. I want to add a word in behalf of Mr. Palmer, whom I have known for a good many years. He has done an outstanding and creditable job as director of the printing and publishing division of the War Production Board.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. May I say that Mr. Palmer does an outstanding job in any position he fills.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman is quite correct.

State Laws Regulating Voting Hours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced a bill which was appropriately referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The bill would fix the polling hours for voting in Federal elections from 6 o'clock a. m. to 9 o'clock p. m.

Since I introduced the bill I have caused to be prepared a digest of the laws of the various States regulating the hours for voting. It is extremely interesting, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the digest was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE LAWS REGULATING VOTING HOURS

(Unless otherwise indicated, it may be assumed that hours apply to general elections and to primaries in States where primaries are held. Special provisions applicable solely to local elections are not included.)

Alabama: Between 8 a. m. and 9 a. m. to 5 p. m.; in towns over 5,000 inhabitants, to 6 p. m. (Code (1940), title 17, sec. 172).

Arizona: 6 a. m. to 6 p. m. An elector who is in the polling place at the moment of closing must be allowed 10 minutes in which to vote (Code Ann. (1939), sec. 55–501). General election laws apply to primaries (ibid., sec. 55–1010).

Arkansas: 8 a. m. to 6:30 p. m. (Dig. Stat. (Pope, 1937), sec. 4768). Apparently general election laws apply to primaries (ibid., sec. 4748).

California: 6 a. m. to 7 p. m. By resolution adopted prior to the publication of notice of an election, the election board of any city may fix the hours at 7 a. m. to 8 p. m. A voter who is in the voting place or in line at the door at the time of closing the polls must be allowed time to vote. Provisions apply to any election, including any primary election (Laws 1939, ch. 26, secs. 5556, 5557, 5734).

Colorado: 7 a. m. to 7 p. m., "provided * * * that if a full board of judges of elections shall not attend at * * * 7 o'clock in the morning, and it shall be necessary for the electors present to appoint judges to conduct the election * * * the election may in that event commence at any hour before the time for closing the polls shall arrive, as the case may require." (Stat. Ann. (Michie, 1935), c. 59, sec. 209.) Provisions in relation to general elections apply to primaries (ibid. sec. 52)

Connecticut: 6 a. m. to 6 p. m., but any town, city, or borough may by ordinance or bylaw provide that the polls shall open not later than 9 a. m. and close not earlier than 5 p. m. at State and National elections and not earlier than 2 p. m. at town elections (Gen. Stat. (1930), secs. 390, 604). "The town clerk or assistant town clerk of each town, except as otherwise provided by law, shall warn the electors therein to meet on the Tuesday following the first Monday in November 1930, and biennially thereafter, unless otherwise specially provided by law, or by them otherwise previously ordered, at 9 o'clock a. m." (ibid. sec. 595).

Delaware: Outside the city of Wilmington, between 8 a. m. and 9 a. m. to 6 p. m., in the city of Wilmington, between 7 a. m. and 7:30 a. m. to 6 p. m., for general elections (Rev. Code (1935), secs. 1845, 1863), 1 p. m. to 7 p. m. for primaries (ibid. sec. 1780).

Florida: 7 a. m. until sundown, time to be regulated by customary time in standard use in the locality. Applicable to general, special, and primary elections (laws 1941, ch. 20409).

Georgia: 7 a. m. to 6 p. m. at county courthouses; 8 a. m. to 3 p. m. at precincts. In incorporated cities and towns containing more than one election precinct all of the precincts shall be kept open from 7 a. m. to 6 p. m.; when there are in such incorporated towns or cities precincts other than the courthouse precinct, the elections in such precincts shall be kept open for the same hours as elections at the courthouse. In any case where the foregoing provides for opening the polls at 8 a. m. and closing them at 3 p. m., the ordinary may, upon petition of any voters, and after hearing, fix the opening and closing hours of the polls between 7 a. m. and 6 p. m., or for some other hour of the day, so as to provide for continuous balloting for a period of not less than 7 hours between 7 a. m. and 6 p. m., any order to that effect to be posted at the courthouse ground and at three other public places in the precinct, and also published once a week for 4 weeks in a newspaper in which sheriff's advertisements are published, and not to go into effect until 30 days after the publication of the last of the weekly notices and the posting of the public notices (laws 1941, p. 321–323). Primaries are held at the time and place and under regulations prescribed by party rules (Code (1933), sec. 34–3210).

Idaho: 8 a. m. to 7 p. m. for general elections, but if the regularly appointed judges of the election and the distributing clerk are not present at 8 a. m. the polls shall not be opened until 9 a. m., unless a majority of the regularly appointed judges are present (Code Ann. (1932), sec. 33–902). In nominating elections, 12 noon to 8 p. m. (Code Ann. (Supp. 1940), sec. 33–615).

Illinois: 6 a. m. to 5 p. m., but if the judges do not attend at 6 a. m. or if it shall be necessary for the electors present to appoint judges to conduct the election the polls may be opened at any hour before the time for closing them arrives (Rev. Stat. (Bar Ass'n Ed., 1939), ch. 46, sec. 48). Six a. m. to 5 p. m., specifically with reference to primaries (ibid., sec. 370).

Indiana: 6 a. m. to 4 p. m., after which the board may close the election at any time when all electors have voted or when 15 minutes have passed without a vote having been tendered, but in no case after 6 p. m., and between 4 p. m. and 6 p. m. only by the unanimous consent of all members of the election board (Stat. Ann. (Burns, 1933), sec. 29–1103). In primary elections, 6 a. m. to 6 p. m. (ibid., sec. 29–520).

Iowa: 8 a. m. to 8 p. m., in all elections, except that in cities where registration is required the polls shall open at 7 a. m., or in any case as soon after the prescribed opening hour as vacancies in the places of judges or clerks of election have been filled. All persons entitled to vote at the election who are within the polling places, at closing time shall be permitted to vote (Code (Reichmann, 1939) secs. 791–791.1).

Kansas: 8 a. m. to 6 p. m., at all general, primary, city, and special elections, except in cities of the first and second class, in which the hours shall be from 6 a. m. to 7 p. m., provided, as to the latter hours in second-class cities, that the governing body of the cities shall have provided for such hours by ordinance. In any precinct lying outside of an incorporated city of the first or second class the opening hour may be fixed at not before 6 a. m. and the closing hour at not later than 7 p. m., by order of the county commissioners, upon written application of the township board of the township wherein the precinct is located (laws 1941, ch. 224.)

Kentucky: 6 a. m. to 4 p. m. (Stat. Ann. (Carroll, 1936) sec. 1469). Same hours at primaries (ibid. secs. 1550–1553).

Louisiana: 6 a. m. to 7 p. m. (Gen. Stat. Ann. (Dart, Supp. Dec. 1941) sec. 2787.8). Same hours for primaries (ibid. sec. 2682.57).

Maine: Between 6 and 10 a. m. to 7 p. m., for meetings for the election of State and county officers and for the election of municipal officers in cities, except that in towns of 300 inhabitants or less the towns shall have the option of closing the polls at 5 p. m. Notice of the time of opening and closing shall be given in the warrant calling the meeting (laws 1933, ch. 48). Similar hours in primaries (ibid, ch 27).

Maryland: Six a. m. to 6 p. m. in city of Baltimore; 7 a. m. to 7 p. m in counties, except that in certain specified counties, the opening hour is 6 a. m. and in two other specified counties it is 8 a. m. (Ann. Code (Flack, 1939), art. 33, sec. 105). Regulations applicable to general elections apply to primaries (ibid., sec. 232).

Massachusetts: Time of opening and closing the polls for State and city elections and for election of town officers in towns where official ballots are used shall be specified in notices or warrants for elections. The polls shall in no case be kept open after 8 p. m. In cities the polls may be opened at any time between 5:45 and 10 a. m., and must be kept open at least 6 hours; in towns at the election of State and town officers they may be opened at any time between 5:45 a. m. and 12 noon, and must be kept open at least 4 hours and until the time specified in the warrant; in towns not voting by precincts they may be kept open for such longer time as the meeting shall direct (gen. laws (1932), ch. 54 sec. 64, amended by laws 1934, ch. 39, sec. 5). In primaries, polls shall be open during such hours, not less than 9 in cities or 2 in towns, as may be designated by the aldermen in cities, and in towns by bylaw or vote, or in default of such bylaw or vote, by the selectmen; in no case shall they be kept open after 8 p. m. (laws 1937, ch. 201).

Michigan: 7 a. m. to 8 p. m. Every qualified voter present and in line at the polls at the hour prescribed for closing shall be allowed to vote (laws 1943, No. 72). Unless otherwise specified, eastern standard time governs (Comp. Laws (Mason, Supp. 1940), sec. 3094).

Minnesota: 7 a. m. to 8 p. m. In cities, villages, and boroughs of less than 1,000 inhabitants the governing body may, by resolution adopted 30 days prior to any election, fix an opening hour, not later than 9 a. m. The foregoing hours apply to all elections except annual town meetings. Voters who at the time of closing the polls are either in the polling place or in line at the door thereof and have not been able to vote shall be entitled to do so (laws 1941, ch. 293).

Mississippi: 8 a. m. to 6 p. m.; in cities having 1,000 or more registered voters, 7 a. m. to 6 p. m. (Code Ann. (1930), sec. 6238). Same hours for primaries (Code Ann. (Supp. 1939), sec. 2040).

Missouri: 6 a. m. to 7 p. m., unless the sun shall set after 7 p. m., when the polls shall be kept open until sunset, except in cities of 25,000 inhabitants or upward, when the hours shall be from 6 a. m. to 6 p. m. (Rev. Stat. (1939), sec. 11487).

Montana: 8 a. m. to 6 p. m.; in precincts having less than 100 registered electors, 1 p. m. to 6 p. m., except that when all registered voters in any precinct have voted the

polls shall be immediately closed (Rev. Codes Ann. (Anderson & McFarland, 1935), sec. 689). In primaries, according to form of notice suggested by the statute, 12 o'clock noon to 7 p. m. (ibid., sec. 633).

Nebraska: 8 a. m. to 8 p. m., but if the judges and clerks shall not attend at 8 a. m., or if it shall be necessary for the electors present to appoint judges and clerks, the polls may be opened at any time before closing time (Comp. Laws (Dorsey, 1929), sec. 32-601). Similar provisions as to primaries, with additional requirement that if at the hour of closing there are qualified electors in the polling place or in line at the door desiring to vote, who have not been able to do so since appearing at the polling place, the polls shall be kept open reasonably long enough after the hour for closing to allow those present at that hour to register and vote. No one arriving after 8 p. m. shall be entitled to register and vote because the poll may not actually be closed when he arrives (ibid., sec. 32-1141).

Nevada: 8 a. m. to 6 p. m. If at the hour of closing there are any voters in the polling place, or in line at the door, who are qualified to vote and have not been able to do so since appearing, the polls shall be kept open a sufficient time to enable them to vote, but no one who shall arrive at the polling place after 6 o'clock in the afternoon shall be entitled to vote (Comp. Laws (Hillyer, 1929), sec. 2444). Same hours for primaries with provision which permits temporary recess while taking meals or for the purpose of other necessary delay (ibid., sec. 2422).

New Hampshire: Not later than 10 a. m. to not earlier than 3 p. m., for biennial elections and primaries. Town selectmen, in warrants for biennial elections, and town clerks, in notices for primaries, may prescribe a later closing hour than 3 p. m., but not an earlier hour (laws 1941, ch. 130).

New Jersey: 7 a. m. to 8 p. m. After the hour fixed for closing the polls voters already within the place or room or in line shall be permitted to vote (Rev. Stat. (1937), sec. 19: 15-2, sec. 19: 15-9). Same hours for primaries (ibid., sec. 19: 23-40).

New Mexico: 9 a. m. to 6 p. m. (Stat. Ann. (Courtright, Supp. 1938), sec. 41-324).

New York: 6 a. m. to 6 p. m. for general elections, special elections called by the Governor, and for all other elections except primaries, except as otherwise provided by law; for primaries, 12 o'clock noon to 9 p. m., except in New York City, where hours for primaries are 3 p. m. to 10 p. m. (election law, sec. 191 (2) (Thompson, 1939)). Electors entitled to vote who are in the polling place at or before the time fixed by law for the closing of the polls shall be allowed to vote (ibid., sec. 207 (4)).

North Carolina: 6:30 a. m. to 6:30 p. m., in all primary and general elections, including all local and municipal elections (laws 1941, ch. 222).

North Dakota: 9 a. m. to 7 p. m., at all elections, general and primary (Comp. Laws Ann. (supp. 1925), secs. 868, 983).

Ohio: 6:30 a. m. to 6:30 p. m., unless there are voters waiting in line to cast their ballots, in which case the polls shall be kept open until the waiting voters have voted (Code Ann. (Throckmorton, 1940), sec. 4785-123). Same hours for primaries (ibid., sec. 4785-67).

Oklahoma: All elections, 8 a. m. to 6 p. m.; in first-class cities and in all precincts surrounding, bounding, or adjoining them, 8 a. m. to 7 p. m. (stat. (Harlow, Supp. 1940), sec. 5726). Notice of primary must state hours of opening and closing the polls (stat. (Harlow, 1931), sec. 5757).

Oregon: 8 a. m. to 8 p. m. in all general, special, and Presidential elections (Comp. Laws Ann. (1940), sec. 81-1604). General election laws applicable to primaries (ibid., sec. 81-301).

Pennsylvania: 7 a. m. to 8 p. m., in all primaries and elections. At the hour of closing the polls, all qualified electors who have already qualified, and are inside the enclosed space, shall be permitted to vote, and in addition thereto, not more than 10 qualified voters who are in the polling place outside the enclosed space waiting to vote, if found qualified (laws 1937, No. 320 (election law), secs. 1205, 1220 (e)).

Rhode Island: Specific hours for opening and closing the polls in each of 39 cities and towns are prescribed by the statute. Opening hours range from 5:30 a. m. to 10 p. m.; closing hours from 5 p. m. to 10 p. m. (Gen. Laws Ann. 1938), secs. 10-11).

South Carolina: 8 a. m. to 4 p. m.; in cities of Charleston and Columbia, 8 a. m. to 6 p. m., in general elections. (Laws 1940 No. 900). Same hours for primaries, with a number of specific exceptions in favor of the 6 p. m. closing hour (Code (Michie, 1932, supps. 1934, 1936, 1938), sec. 2365).

South Dakota: 8 a. m. to 5 p. m., in general elections (code (1939), sec. 16.1201). Same hours in primaries (ibid., secs. 16.0202, 16.0222).

Tennessee: 9 a. m. to 4 p. m.; in cities with a population of 15,000 and over, 9 a. m. to 7 p. m. (Code (Williams, Shannon, Harsh, 1932), sec. 2090). Same hours specifically for primaries (laws 1937, 1st Ex., No. 2, sec. 2, No. 3, sec. 3).

Texas: 7 a. m. to 7 p. m. in counties having a population of 150,000 or more; 8 a. m. to 7 p. m. in other counties. Applicable to all elections, general, special, or primary (Stat. (Vernon, 1936) art 2930).

Utah: 7 a. m. to 7 p. m., but if the full board of elections shall not attend and it shall be necessary for the electors present to appoint judges to conduct the election as provided by law, the election may commence at any hour before the time for closing the polls shall arrive (Rev. Stat. Ann. (1933), sec. 25-1-13). In primaries, 7 a. m. to 7 p. m., with provision permitting temporary recess for taking meals or for other purposes, provided that no more than one judge shall at any time be absent from the polling place (Rev. Stat. Ann. (Supp. 1939), sec. 25-4-33).

Vermont: 10 a. m. to 6 p. m., but towns may, at annual March meeting, vote to call meeting at 6 a. m. For primary elections, 10 a. m. to 6 p. m., but if at the closing hour there are any qualified voters at the polling place desiring to vote who have not been able to do so, the polls shall be kept open long enough to allow those present a reasonable opportunity to vote (laws 1935, No. 8, amended by Laws 1939, Nos. 4, 8).

Virginia: Sunrise to sunset, at "all elections" (Code Ann. (Michie & Sublett, 1936) sec. 152).

Washington: 8 a. m. to 8 p. m., at all elections where national, State, county or municipal officers are elected (Code Ann. (Pierce, 1933) sec. 2209). Same hours for primaries. If at the hour of closing there are any electors in the polling place desiring to vote, and who are qualified to do so, and who have not been able to do so since appearing at the polling place, the polls shall be kept open reasonably long enough after the hour of closing to allow such persons to vote (ibid. sec. 2239).

West Virginia: 6:30 a. m. to 7:30 p. m., at every primary, general or special election (laws 1941 ch. 44 sec. 16).

Wisconsin: 6 a. m. to 8 p. m. at general election, in all cities of 10,000 inhabitants or more, except in first-class cities; in any second- or third-class city the governing body may by ordinance fix the hours between 7 a. m. and 7 p. m.; in first-class cities, 7 a. m. to 8 p. m.; in fourth-class cities and villages, 9 a. m. to 5:30 p. m. Any voter awaiting his turn to vote, whether within the polling booth or in the line outside the booth at the time of the closing of the polls, shall be permitted to vote. In cities of the fourth class and in villages the city council or village board may extend the time during which the polls shall remain open to an hour not earlier than 6 a. m. nor later than 6 p. m., but public notice must be given of such change. In towns, the hours shall be from 9 a. m. to 5:30 p. m., except that the town board may extend the time to an hour not earlier than 6 a. m. and not later than 8 p. m., notice to be given of any such extension at least 30 days before the election by publication in a newspaper if there be one in the town, city, or village once a week for 3 successive weeks, and if there be none, by posting such notice in three public places therein (Stat. (1941), sec. 6.35). In all cities where voting is done exclusively by the use of voting machines, 6 a. m. to 8 p. m. (ibid., sec. 11.07). Notice of primary shall state hours at which polls shall be opened and closed in the precinct where the notice is posted (ibid., sec. 5.04).

Wyoming: As soon as possible after 9 a. m. to 7 p. m., at all general and primary elections (Rev. Stat. Ann. (Courtright, Supp 1940), sec. 36-616, sec. 36-1314).

Voting by War Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George Gallup, entitled "Low Voting Turn-out of War Workers Poses Serious Problem for Democrats."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GALLUP POLL—LOW VOTING TURN-OUT OF WAR WORKERS POSES SERIOUS PROBLEM FOR DEMOCRATS

(By George Gallup, Director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., May 11.—One of the biggest problems facing the Democrats in the 1944 election is how to get the workers in the country's defense factories to vote.

Last November the Democratic Party suffered from an absenteeism at the polls far more acute than industry suffers at the work benches. War workers stayed away from the voting booths to a greater extent than the average for the country outside the South, which is one reason why the Democrats lost 48 seats in the House in the congressional elections.

FIFTY-EIGHT PERCENT DID NOT VOTE

On the basis of a series of institute surveys among war workers culminating last week in an intensive study of five main war-production areas—Detroit, Buffalo-Cleveland, Philadelphia-Baltimore, New England, and California—it is possible to estimate the 1942 turnout among war workers as follows:

Voting turn-out among war workers:		
Voted in 1942	percent	42
Did not vote in 1942	do	58

New Deal strength is so heavily concentrated in the working classes that nonvoting among those classes could have the most serious consequences for Democratic candidates if it persists to the same degree in 1944 as it did in 1942.

The extent to which labor unions themselves are becoming aware of the turn-out problem among their ranks is revealed in the recent action of the American Federation of Labor in Iowa.

Labor leaders in that State are reported to have developed and approved a plan by which

union dues would be increased 5 or 10 cents a month, and the money used to pay bonuses to members if they vote on election days.

Among defense workers the evidence shows that those who stayed away from the polls in 1942 included a much higher percentage of Democrats than those who actually voted. That is why the Democratic Party will undoubtedly make every possible effort to see that defense workers, particularly those who did not vote last time, get to the polls in 1944.

SIXTY-THREE PERCENT FAVOR DEMOCRATS

Of those who voted last November, 63 percent say they plan to vote Democratic next year. Of those who failed to vote last November, a much higher proportion—74 percent—favor the Democrats for 1944.

This is shown in tabular form as follows:

	Percent
Present party preference of war workers who voted in 1942:	
Democratic	63
Republican	37
Present party preference of war workers who did not vote in 1942:	
Democratic	74
Republican	26

There were a number of reasons to account for the nonvoting in 1942. Workers in industry were in many cases too busy to get to the polls, and many who had migrated to defense centers after Pearl Harbor were ineligible to vote in the new community because of residential qualifications for voting.

Whereas approximately 50,000,000 persons throughout the country voted for President in 1940, the total vote cast only 2 years later in the 1942 congressional elections was only 28,000,000.

How Long Will Our Corn Last?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. WAYLAND BROOKS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I submit an article by Russ Cunningham entitled "How Long Will Our Corn Last?", published in the Prairie Farmer of Illinois, the issue of April 17, 1943, and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW LONG WILL OUR CORN LAST?—WE'RE USING 7 BUSHELS FOR EVERY 5 WE RAISE

(By Russ Cunningham)

Corn supplies are disappearing so rapidly that an acute feed crisis looms ahead. We are using corn far more rapidly than we can produce it—using 7 bushels for every 5 we produce.

Farmers are beginning to ask, "How long will our corn last?"

A Prairie Farmer survey reveals some farmers already are out of corn. Others expect to buy heavily during the next few months. Corn-importing districts of Indiana and southern Illinois, as well as Michigan and Wisconsin, will face a crisis long before our new 1943 crop is ready. The same is true of other districts which depend on the surplus corn areas of Illinois and Iowa. Shortage of protein feeds to supplement corn is causing corn to disappear more rapidly.

Prairie Farmer's survey further reveals that considerable corn still is stored on farms in the cash corn area. But this corn is not moving and will not move to market under present prices. The huge Commodity Credit Corporation reserve stocks are nearly exhausted. Many Illinois counties have no Commodity Credit Corporation corn left in their steel bins. Only a little over 5,000,000 bushels remain in Illinois.

ANALYZE WHOLE SITUATION

In conducting the survey, Prairie Farmer first analyzed our national corn stocks and supplies, rate of corn consumption, and the feed situation in general. Last year we had the greatest corn crop in history, the huge total of 3,175,000,000 bushels. Last October 1, our carry-over of old stocks was 423,000,000 bushels.

Our biggest carry-over was in 1939, when we had 550,000,000 bushels. Since that time the number of livestock has increased so that each year the carry-over has dwindled. In spite of last year's tremendous crop, statisticians believe our carry-over October 1 will be less than 400,000,000 bushels.

That 400,000,000-bushel carry-over looks like a lot of corn, but actually it represents only about a 5-week supply at our present rate of consumption. In October, November, and December last year we used more than 1,000,000,000 bushels of corn—an average of 350,000,000 bushels a month. Spread out over a monthly basis, our huge crop of 1942 will only average 265,000,000 bushels a month.

With these figures representing our national feeding picture, Prairie Farmer turned to our own corn and hog farmers in Indiana and Illinois to find out exactly what local conditions existed. Three separate surveys were taken. One covered surplus corn producers and included farmers who each year market corn. Another included Illinois hog producers who farm in the surplus-corn area, and who each year market hogs. The third covered Indiana hog producers where many need to import corn. In addition, elevator men were contacted and asked for comments in the cash-corn area. All men are average farmers. The survey is, as far as possible, a fair and accurate cross-section.

Here's what these surveys reveal:

SURPLUS CORN FARMERS

These farmers still have considerable corn on their farms. Some will be moved this summer, but not much. The percentage will be far less than usual because many of them plan to substantially expand their feeding operations. Most of this group will hold their corn until they are assured a 1943 crop.

Nearly all of them are dissatisfied with present local prices—from 91 to 94 cents a bushel as compared to the Chicago ceiling price of $1.02 for No. 2 yellow corn. They know they can transfer this corn into pork by feeding it to hogs and get $1.50 a bushel. Their financial condition is sound, and there will be little distressed selling.

The first 100 farmers report they usually market an average of 3,738 bushels each. They now have an average of 2,255 bushels on each farm. Sixty-three expressed a willingness to sell all or most of their corn, but they want a farm parity price; 14 are rather determined to hold until prices are stronger.

Answering the question, "At what price will you sell?" some said, "Ceiling prices this summer." Several mentioned $1. On an average, they wanted $1.02 a bushel.

Fifty said they would feed part of their surplus to hogs, and 23 plan to include cattle. They'll buy feeders, will have sows for summer farrow, or already have substantially increased their livestock.

ILLINOIS HOG PRODUCERS

As a group, Illinois' hog producers will need to buy corn before their new crop is ready. They don't expect a feed crisis because they'll buy from their neighbors. They also have expanded their feeding operations. They plan to plant an average of 104 acres of corn this year as compared to 90 acres last year.

Of the 81 farmers who answered the survey, 23 usually have to buy corn to tide them over, 28 break even on their corn supplies and the remaining 30 will have 62,800 bushels of corn to sell. The 23 who usually have to buy corn, plus 6 more who increased their livestock above their normal feeding balance, will have to buy 68,800 bushels. Thus this group will not have enough corn.

INDIANA HOG PRODUCERS

This group can be considered representative of feeders of other States who depend on Illinois' and Iowa's big surplus corn area for a large share of their feed. Some of these, too, depend on hominy feed or other processed corn byproducts for a large part of their feed supplies.

This group is rapidly becoming conscious of the feed situation, as is shown in their plans to increase their corn acreage 12 percent, in addition to increases in other special crops, such as soybeans, tomatoes, and peas. (The State Agricultural Adjustment Agency survey made more than a month ago shows they intend to increase their corn acreage 10 percent.) Indiana's hog producers, believing that our huge national corn crop last year would supply them with ample feed, boosted their number of sows to farrow to 36 percent over last spring.

Of the 163 farmers who reported to Bill Renshaw, Indiana field editor, 57 normally produce enough corn, but 106 normally have to buy corn or a substitute to tide them over until the new crop comes on.

Only 3 of the 106 says they already have bought enough feed supplies. The remaining 103 estimate they will need an average of 3,270 bushels of corn before October 1. Last year 112 had to buy corn before October 1.

These 163 farmers had about 80 acres of corn each. This year they intend to plant about 92 acres each. Last spring they had an average of 19.5 sows and this spring they're having 26.5 sows to farrow.

A good share of the 125,000,000 bushels of Commodity Credit Corporation feed wheat went to Indiana feeders, and they will be heavy buyers of the additional 100,000,000 bushels recently released. Most of the Indiana hog feeders are willing to feed wheat to help supplement corn; however, 18 said they would not feed wheat.

In round figures we had a billion bushels of wheat on hand January 1. Canada had half as much. Just how much of this will be available for feeders, of course, is not known.

No immediate hope can be found in the protein feed situation. The newly organized Feed Industry Council estimates our protein feed needs for the year at 11,000,000 tons, and the available supply at 9,000,000 tons, or a shortage of 2,000,000 tons.

Yet, livestock feeding has become so specialized that proteins are vitally important in balancing feed programs. Most feeders know that an ample supply of proteins, particularly animal proteins, will cut their corn consumption in half. Thus, as protein supplies diminish, corn consumption will increase in proportion.

Increased Price of Oil Demanded To Aid in Effective Prosecution of War and To Prevent Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today the following resolu-

tion, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

House Resolution 233

Whereas oil is one of the principal weapons of warfare and the success of a modern army depends as much on oil as on food. Sixty percent of all cargoes going to foreign battle fronts is oil. The amount of oil and oil products shipped to war fronts during the first 12 months of this war equals 80 times the amount of oil and oil products shipped to war fronts the first 12 months of World War No. 1; and

Whereas it has recently come to our attention that war planes have been grounded by reason of the lack of 100-octane gas; it takes 4 barrels of crude oil to make 1 barrel of 100-octane aviation gasoline, whereas less than 2 barrels of crude are required to make 1 barrel of ordinary commercial motor gasoline that is normally used in automobiles and trucks. In order to have sufficient oil for the running of the war and a diminished civilian supply, it will be necessary for 1 major oil field to be discovered each week, a field that will produce 30,000,000 barrels of oil, as it will require 30,000,000 barrels to supply requirements of the United States war and civilian economy for 1 week; and

Whereas discoveries in recent years have produced less oil than the average previous periods. As example, in 1939–41 wildcat wells were drilled in Texas (46 percent of the oil produced in the United States is produced in Texas) for an increase of 30 percent in the 2,263 exploration efforts of the 3 preceding years, but the amount of oil added to the Nation's known store was 73 percent less in 1939–41 than in the 1936–38 period because the average volume of new oil per well was 216,000 barrels in 1939–41 whereas it was 806,000 barrels per well in 1936–38; and

Whereas we must drill 4 times as many wildcat wells as we have in the past to even keep pace with ordinary demands. War demands may amount to as much as 1,000,000 barrels a day, considering our allies and lend-lease aid to them in the form of oil and oil products. In the United States there should be 7,500 wildcat wells drilled this year and equal numbers in 1944 and 1945, and in order to get more oil in 1945 we must increase the price now and start the process that takes 2 or 3 years to bring results; and

Whereas the price of oil today governs the rate of discoveries 2 or 3 years hence. Every flying plane requires 50 gallons of gasoline per hour per motor. A 4-motor plane requires 200 gallons per hour. Some of the recent raids on Germany required over 1,000,000 gallons of high-octane aviation gasoline for each raid. The average production of oil wells is 14 barrels per day; there are 400,000 oil wells in the United States. It requires the production of 14 average oil wells to keep one 4-motor bomber flying 10 hours per day; and

Whereas if the present policy of the Government on the price of oil is not changed quickly, production of oil will continue to be greatly slowed down, which will not only deprive our civilian population of oil for essential requirements but will probably cause a national disaster, in that such failure to increase production of oil will jeopardize our entire war effort; in addition, if the price of oil is not increased, a few major oil companies will in the near future own practically all of the oil business in the United States; testimony before the Committee on Small Business of the House disclosed recently that a few companies during the past 2 years have greatly increased their holdings and now own and control 71 percent of the entire oil business in the United States; and

Whereas the President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, did on May 27, 1941, declare:

"One of the essential requirements of the national-defense program which must be made on the basis of our petroleum defense policy in the unlimited national emergency declared on May 27, 1941, is the development and utilization with maximum efficiency of our petroleum resources and our facilities, present and future, for making petroleum products available, adequately and continuously, in the proper forms, at the proper places, and at reasonable prices to meet military and civilian needs;" and

Whereas the President further stated on May 27, 1941:

"Some of the problems with which we are now confronted and which require immediate action are: The proper development, production, and utilization of those reserves of crude oils and natural gas that are of strategic importance both in quality and location; elimination of reduction of cross hauling of petroleum and its products and the development of transportation facilities and of methods by which more efficient use can be made of existing transportation and store facilities; balancing refining operations to secure the maximum yields of specific products with full consideration for requirements, the most economical use of the raw materials and efficiency of production and distribution, and the elimination of the drilling of unnecessary wells in proven fields and of other unnecessary activities and equipment;" and

Whereas the President did on May 27, 1941, appoint the Honorable Harold L. Ickes Petroleum Coordinator for National Defense and on December 2, 1942, the President, by Executive order, made the Honorable Harold L. Ickes Petroleum Administrator for War and charged him with the duty of recommending policies that would assure an adequate supply of petroleum for military or other essential uses; and

Whereas the Honorable Harold L. Ickes did on April 7, 1943, in a letter to Price Administrator, Hon. Prentiss M. Brown, make a recommendation that the price of crude oil be increased in order to assure adequate production, stating:

"I do not know what you will consider to be the effect upon other prices of a rise in crude oil prices which, when translated into products, will amount to less than 1 cent per gallon. That is a matter which has been entrusted to your judgment rather than mine. So far as the consumers of petroleum products are concerned, I am sure that they prefer moderate prices and adequate supplies for the long pull rather than to be compelled to pay for artificially low prices now with ridiculously high prices and scarcity a very little later. Measured in terms of our oil supply—the task entrusted to me—I am not prepared to assume the responsibility of risking a repetition of what occurred at the close of the last war, when after crude-oil prices had been rigidly frozen and our reserves depleted, crude-oil prices rose to $3.50 and even $4.30 per barrel and untaxed gasoline to 25 or 30 cents per gallon. Moreover, had that war lasted but a little longer, the oil shortage might then have made it difficult to supply the armed forces with enough oil. The possibility of such difficulty in this war, if it be long protracted, is a risk that should be carefully considered.

"Actually, it is relatively unimportant whether presently known reserves total 20,000,000,000 barrels as the industry recently has estimated, or somewhat more, as our surveys show. Neither amount can be produced in toto in less than half a century. Neither amount is capable of sustaining withdrawals at the rate of 1,400,000,000 barrels annually much beyond the present year. What is worse, if it becomes necessary to produce existing fields in excess of efficient engineering rates, ultimately recoverable reserves will have to be 'corrected' downward as they have been 'corrected' upward.

"You may ask how much of a price increase is required to rectify these conditions. I do not know exactly and I am quite certain no one else knows. If anyone knew with mathematical exactitude, finding and producing oil would not involve such enormous risks. But this I do know—an increase in price makes it economically possible to increase recoverable reserves (1) by postponing the date of abandonment of thousands of pumping wells, (2) by the installation of more and better secondary recovery equipment, (3) by drilling edge properties and so-called marginal locations, and (4) by attracting venture capital from both within and without the petroleum industry to undertake that greatest risk of all, exploring for new fields. Of course, material, labor, and other costs have risen in the producing branch of the oil industry. With the introduction of overtime, necessitated by the 48-hour week, labor costs will rise still further. Such factors as these can be more or less exactly measured. But none of these items of added cost, however much they can and do justify some increase in crude-oil prices, is as important as the hard, cold facts of declining rates of discovery and increasing demands.

"My present recommendation of an increase in the price ceilings for crude oil may be too little, but strictly from an oil standpoint, I am confident that it is not too much. * * * Accordingly, in order the better to solve the problems of local shortages arising from the disruption of normal methods of transportation, it would seem desirable for some crudes in some areas to be advanced more than 35 cents per barrel, and in other cases less. Here actual differentials based on reasonable exact formulas can be worked out between our respective offices with the aid and assistance of industry"; and

Whereas the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown, Price Administrator, has declined to accept the recommendation of the Petroleum Administrator for War and increase the price of oil, giving as one of his reasons that such a price increase would violate the spirit of the President's "hold the line" order on prices which was issued April 8, 1943; and

Whereas the Second Price Control Act, approved October 2, 1942, Public Law No. 729, Seventy-seventh Congress, provides: "The President may, except as otherwise provided in this act, thereafter provide for making adjustments with respect to prices, wages, and salaries to the extent that he finds necessary to aid in the effective prosecution of the war or to correct gross inequities"; and

Whereas the Committee on Small Business of the House did on the 20th day of April 1943, after thoroughly investigating the oil situation, make the following report to the Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN:

"That increased effort is needed immediately in order to forestall the serious problem of petroleum shortage now evident.

"That the present price of crude petroleum is too low to maintain our present rate of production or to stimulate further effort to find and produce new and additional oil; that price ceilings should be lifted immediately.

"That subsidies and bonuses are untried in this industry and unworkable and undesirable for the general purposes now needed.

"That the confusion among Federal Government agencies with authority over petroleum problems is proving a serious detriment to the successful operation of this industry.

"That insufficient effort has been made by those in authority to insure to the petroleum industry necessary prices, necessary materials with which to operate, and essential manpower to maintain the petroleum industry in a healthy condition"; and

Whereas the testimony before the Committee on Small Business of the House recently disclosed that in order for oil to be at a parity price it should be increased an average of 58 cents per barrel: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the President in pursuance of his power to raise prices to aid in the effective prosecution of the war, and the Federal agencies having control of price ceilings should take immediate action to raise the ceiling price of oil to at least an average of 35 cents per barrel as recommended by Petroleum Administrator for War, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, and then further, if necessary, to such higher price as will be instrumental in promoting oil exploration, development, discoveries, and production of sufficient oil to aid in the effective prosecution of the war as well as the necessary domestic needs of our people.

Congressman: A Case History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from Fortune magazine.

It is a well-written account of the functioning of Congress, and a well-merited recognition of the labors and the contributions made by one of its ablest Members.

The article follows:

CONGRESSMAN: A CASE HISTORY—A REPORT ON HOW CONGRESS WORKS, AND HOW IT MIGHT BE MADE TO WORK BETTER

One afternoon last October a hefty, tousle-haired Congressman from Illinois stood up on the floor of the United States House, strode forward to the blue-carpeted well in front of the Speaker's rostrum, and turned to give his colleagues some hard-hitting advice. For months the American people and press had been lashing the Seventy-seventh Congress with abuse and ridicule for its attempted "pension grab," its farm-bloc greediness, its subservience to the administration on the issue of labor regulation, its general record of fumbling inaction on the war. Leaders of Congress, notably Speaker SAM RAYBURN, had fought back with assertions that the criticism was wholly unjustified. But now a Congressman was standing up in Congress to say that the criticism was merited.

He was a Republican, but he had not a word of blame to lay against the Democratic leadership. His shafts were directed against Congress itself as a working body, its organization and its methods. His thesis: "I have not heard one but a thousand lamentations in the Well of this House over the years relative to the growing power of the Executive and the growing power of the governmental bureaus, but is it not a fact that we are slavishly dependent upon those bureaus today for information, for data, for advice, for guidance, for the very good reason that the Congress has no instrumentality or weapon of its own for such information. * * *

"On the 7th of September the President said: 'You do it or I will.'

"He may say that on other days in the future and if he has the instrumentalities at his command and we do not, then there must be a constant growth of the Executive power and a diminution of the legislative power until that thing is corrected. That in my judgment is what is wrong with Congress today."

The name of the speaker was EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN. The trend that he was discussing got its latest and greatest impetus just 10 years ago, when he and Franklin Roosevelt were respectively entering Congress and the White House. The swing of the political pendulum has carried Executive dominance over the legislative branch of the Federal Government further than ever before. The trend has been world-wide. While the United States Congress has never come near sinking to the puppetry of the German Reichstag or the decay of the French Parliament, the trend has nonetheless been unmistakable in America, and deeply alarming to all lovers of representative government.

Since the Republican gains in the last elections, the pendulum has begun to swing back. Congress gladly follows the President's war leadership. But it has stubbornly opposed him in domestic matters, notably the Flynn appointment and his $25,000 salary-limit fiat. And it is in open revolt against the President's swollen bureaucracy. The new Congress was barely begun when movements got under way to check on administrative spending, efficiency, and unauthorized exercise of power.

It has been customary to blame the United States governmental trend of the past decade on: (1) an overambitious President and administration; (2) rubber-stamp legislators willing to trade their votes for easy rides to reelection on the coattails of a popular President; (3) the crisis of depression. The purpose of this article is to explore the possibility that much of the fault may lie not with the men of either branch but with the governmental system, specifically with the internal organization and working habits of Congress.

Though the inquiry concerns Congress as a whole, it is, for the sake of clarity and color, presented almost wholly in terms of the life, the activities, the problems, and the ideas of Representative DIRKSEN. This does not mean that Mr. DIRKSEN is being offered as an "average" Congressman. He is, in fact, well above the congressional average in ability and industry. Only by examining the bafflements that hinder an extraordinarily able and hard-working Congressman can evidence be found that the shortcomings of Congress spring from the inadequacies of its organization as well as of its membership. But neither, on the other hand, is DIRKSEN a genius or eccentric; he is not unrepresentative of his colleagues. He is a big, tough, shrewd, and hearty fellow who loves his job and is very good at it.

THE MAKING OF A CONGRESSMAN

Reformers who complain because the Nation's "best" citizens do not go to Congress forget that the peculiar traits and talents of the much-abused politician are indispensable to the working of our political system. These traits and talents—of tact, compromise, give and take, persuasiveness, aggressiveness, gregariousness, sensitivity to the public mood—by no means go always, if often, in combination with the ability to build a great business, or write a great judicial decision, or perform a great laboratory experiment. And, as is illustrated by the curious, roundabout road that took EVERETT DIRKSEN to Congress, political talents may turn up in most unlikely places, far from the beaten paths of Who's Who in America.

Son of a painter and decorator who died when the boy was five, Dirksen was reared on a little edge-of-town farm in Pekin, Ill. (population 19,000). After high school he put in a year on a 13-hour night shift at a local factory to get money to go to college. At the University of Minnesota, he worked variously as clerk in a newspaper office (5 hours a night, 29 nights a month), as a lawyer's assistant, and in a railroad office. On January 4, 1918, his 22d birthday, after finishing 2 years of undergraduate study and 3 semesters of law, he decided to join the Army. He was mustered out 2 years later, having risen from private to second lieutenant and served 17 months overseas.

So far Dirksen's career had been strictly in the ambitious, up-from-poverty American tradition. But now he seemed unable to find himself. He was groping toward his real vocation without knowing what it was. First he tried his hand at manufacturing washing machines, but he couldn't get the materials and so gave it up. Next he spent 3 years working for a drainage contractor. Then he went into the wholesale bakery business with two brothers, one his twin. He was still in that business, taking his turn at kneading the dough and driving the truck, when in 1932, aged thirty-six, he ran successfully for Congress.

Republican DIRKSEN carried his district in that Democratic landslide year by almost precisely the same plurality (23,000) as did Franklin Roosevelt. He had laid solid foundations for his victory; already he had discovered what he was meant to be. Fluent and mellow-voiced, he had been busy making a name as a speaker. Though he went to work in the bakery at 4 o'clock every morning except Sunday, he never missed a chance to speak at any kind of lodge, church, school, or club affair. He had been chosen district commander of the American Legion. And he had also got himself elected to a 4-year part-time job as finance commissioner of his home town.

A CONGRESSMAN'S DAY

The habit of long, hard work that he acquired in his earlier years has stood DIRKSEN in good stead since coming to Congress. During the 10 years he has been in Washington, the Congressman's job has become one of the most grueling in the world. The spectacular spurt in the growth of Government that began in 1933 has increased the Congressman's burdens in two ways. It has brought him more and more cries for help from constituents ensnarled in the meshes of National Recovery Administration or Agricultural Adjustment Agency or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the National Labor Relations Board or Office of Price Administration or War Production Board, et al. And it has confronted him with a greater and greater range of complex problems that he must study at length if he is to legislate intelligently.

DIRKSEN, quick-learning, quick-thinking, quick-acting, has found that he can get through his work only by taking almost no time out from it except for sleep. Mrs. Dirksen and their 14-year-old daughter, Joy, spend much of the year back home in Pekin. DIRKSEN likes good company and good whisky as well as the next man. But his social life consists almost wholly of dinners (e. g., with the National Cooperative Milk Producers, the Illinois Federation of Retail Associations) and receptions (e. g., for new Congressmen, Mme. Chiang) in the line of duty. These average 2 nights per week. Other nights, when the Congressman finishes his work on the Hill (usually around 6:30 p. m.), he repairs to his suite in the Mayflower Hotel with a brief case bulging with bills, reports of hearings, and other documents to be read before bedtime. An actual record of one of his days will be given below. But first, by way of necessary background, a brief description of his district.

Consisting of six central Illinois counties, the Sixteenth Illinois district is as diversified as any in the land, being about half urban and half rural. Its metropolis is Peoria (population 105,000), the Nation's distilling capital (Hiram Walker, Penn-Maryland, United States Industrial Alcohol, et al.), and one of its leading transportation centers (14 railroads and the Illinois Waterway's river and rail terminal). Agriculturally, it is in the heart of the Corn-Hog Belt and is a big soy-

bean-producing region. It has two small colleges.

This is the way, in the service of his constituents and of the Nation, Congressman DIRKSEN spent a day last month.

Up at 6:15 a. m., he walked to the Carlton Hotel for a 7:15 breakfast date with the head of the industrial-relations department of an Illinois railroad. Mainly as a post-war project, the road hopes to get a lot of new industries established in the Peoria district and has made a thorough survey of its resources. Fortunately this visitor already knew a good many other interested Government officials, so the Congressman did not have to take time to arrange a string of interviews for him.

Delayed by the long breakfast session, DIRKSEN arrived at his office in the Old House Office Building at 8:45, three-quarters of an hour behind his usual time. His first visitor, after a less-experienced Congressman seeking advice, was a Chicago businessman. Chicago is outside DIRKSEN's district, but people often feel free to call on anyone in their State's congressional delegation. This one wanted to talk about home-loan financing (DIRKSEN is trying to kill the Home Owners' Loan Corporation) and also about rent control on commercial properties in connection with a bill pending before the House Banking Committee. DIRKSEN pledged "sustained attention" to these matters.

On the heels of the banker came a distillers' representative, worried about the recent newspaper story that liquor consumption was to be cut 99 percent for the duration. DIRKSEN promptly called Economic Czar Jimmy Byrnes, with whom he is on first-name terms. Byrnes laughed, said there was nothing to the report, and promised that a denial would be issued.

Meantime conversation, as always, was being continually interrupted by the ringing of the telephone. One after another, four other Congressmen called about items in pending bills under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee, of which DIRKSEN is one of the most influential members. Between-times throughout the day DIRKSEN made numerous telephone calls of his own, among them: (1) to the New York Times about an article it wanted him to write; (2) to the Civil Service Commission to get advance information for a constituent on her rating in a recent examination; (3) to a fellow member of the District of Columbia Committee about a pending bill that would permit Washington's charitable institutions to use oleomargarine instead of butter (DIRKSEN was against it); (4) to the Library of Congress for some data on public power that he could expect to receive in about 2 weeks.

Next visitor was a college trustee worried about what would happen to the college unless the Army or Navy selected it for one of their training programs. Could the Congressman help? The Congressman would try. After the trustee came a farm-organization representative concerned with price ceilings on farm commodities, who wanted to talk with Jimmy Byrnes, another official of the Economic Stabilization Board, and somebody in the Office of Price Administration. The Congressman arranged the appointments.

Normally, DIRKSEN spends the first hour in his office reading and answering his mail. But having lost the earlier hour, he turned now to this task and kept at it until 12:15 p. m. Then, in the outer office where secretary and stenographer work and visitors wait, he picked up two postwar planners and took them over to the Capitol for a quick lunch in the House restaurant.

The daily session of the House, which normally begins at noon, had been under way for an hour when DIRKSEN arrived on the floor. Debate on a merger of Western Union and Postal Telegraph was in progress. DIRKSEN's attendance was sporadic—the normal thing in Congress—for he was repeatedly called off the floor by visitors and telephone calls. In the course of a couple of hours messengers summoned him five times. Once was for a visitor, another college official with the same worries as the first. Two of the phone calls were from Illinois, one to announce that a college president would arrive next morning, another from a banker who wanted an appointment with Leo Crowley, of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. A third call was from an official of a steel company in his district, come to Washington to protest against his lend-lease quota of ingots and billets. A fourth took him to Union Station, where an entraining Work Projects Administration official had a post-war project that he was impatient to discuss. In addition, the Congressman had to drop in at a meeting of the Appropriations Committee, return to his office for a little talk to a visiting college class in political science.

The telegraph debate was succeeded by a fiery one on renewing the Dies committee for another 2 years. DIRKSEN, not much interested in hearing last year's arguments repeated, occasionally improved his time by retiring to the cloakroom to go over papers in his briefcase. After the DIES roll call, in which he voted yea, he went back to the Office Building and stopped by briefly at the office of another Congressman from Illinois who was giving a little farewell party honoring his secretary's departure for the Army.

Back in his own office, DIRKSEN cleared up details of dictating, letter signing, and telephoning, then packed his briefcase with his evening's reading. He reached the Mayflower at 7. As usual, several people were waiting to buttonhole him in the lobby. One was still another college trustee, two more were Navy officers on confidential business. He also stopped for a chat with the new chairman of the Republican National Committee, Harrison Spangler, about liaison between the committee and the G. O. P. contingent in Congress. Fed, he rolled up his sleeves, hooked on his spectacles, and settled down to read a file on the independent offices appropriation bill. After a brisk walk and look at the evening papers, he turned out the lights at 11:20—17 hours after he had turned them on. Except for dinner and his stop-off at the farewell party he had been working all the time.

For busyness, this is a fair sample of DIRKSEN's days. But it falls far short of covering the whole range of his activities and problems. Like all Congressmen, he goes most mornings to a meeting of one of his committees, beginning at 10. (As do other major committees, Appropriations—probably the hardest working of the lot—also meets frequently in the afternoons.) On an average of 30 times a month he goes along in person to introduce a constituent to some government official and help thrash out the problem. In demand as a Republican speaker, he makes a good many appearances every year both in Illinois and around the country. He also spends time investigating Washington's municipal affairs as a member of the District of Columbia Committee.

Here, to round out the picture, are a few things that Congressman DIRKSEN did in 3 days preceding the day described above:

Received an unofficial visitor with information about the Maritime Commission's buying and selling practices, useful to a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Invited Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, by telephone, to address the annual dinner of a Peoria club, and got a polite declination. Last year, in an hour's face-to-face talk, he persuaded Leon Henderson to speak in Peoria.

At the request of a representative of a powdered and compressed food organization, important in his district, conferred with War Production Board about getting more steel for dehydration machinery.

Inquired at the War Department for news of a young constituent reported missing in action.

Joined the rest of the Illinois congressional delegation, at the office of one of them, in receiving the American Legion rehabilitation committee from their State. This is an annual affair. This year the Legionnaires, whose veterans' lobby has long been rated one of the wiliest and greediest, were almost wholly concerned with providing adequate care for the physical and mental casualties of this war. The session consisted of brief speeches, sober questions, and answers. There were drinks, but they were provided by the Congressman who played host to the gathering, not by the lobbying Legionnaires.

Wrote his weekly, the Congressional Front: Beginning the first week he entered Congress, and never having missed a week while Congress was in session, Congressman DIRKSEN has written a chatty, nonpolitical memorandum of two or three mimeographed pages consisting of brief paragraphs on topics of the day. The city newspapers in his district use it on occasion, but 145 smaller ones throughout Illinois print it faithfully.

Telephoned the Review Board of the Judge Advocate General's office to put in a word for a constituent who had been court-martialed and had received a stiff sentence.

Telephoned to War Production Board about restrictions on fireworks manufacture and embodied the information received in a letter to a patriotic society at home that wanted to hold a celebration.

Joined the other six members of a subcommittee in presenting, explaining, and defending this year's independent offices appropriation bill to the full Appropriations Committee.

Spoke several times on the floor of the House during debate on the Treasury-Post Office appropriations bill, and offered two amendments to it, one rejected, the other adopted.

LETTERS FROM HOME

Mail, delivered five times daily in the House and Senate Office Buildings, bulks large in every Congressman's life. DIRKSEN normally gets 50 to 100 letters a day, though when the public is aroused, as over Neutrality Act repeal or the Supreme Court packing plan, he has received as high as 1,500 a day. Some Congressmen consider their mail a time-wasting nuisance and discourage correspondence by sending curt answers. DIRKSEN enjoys his mail and thinks it important. He likes to know what his constituents are thinking.

Congressional mail falls into 6 classes: (1) Letters asking for help in getting a job or military commission or in dealing with some Government agency; (2) those asking for information; (3) those asking the Congressman to vote for or against a specific bill; (4) those offering the writer's opinions on various aspects of current affairs; (5) those asking for a donation to some organization or cause; (6) handouts from Government and social agencies. "Inspired" mail, organized by some high-pressure lobby and aimed at affecting the Congressman's vote, can be recognized at a glance. DIRKSEN, who once got 92 postcards all identically worded and all with the same word misspelled, pays no heed to this kind.

Here are some samples of Congressman DIRKSEN's mail received during the few days chronicled above. The letters were from:

The relatives of a Navy man recently killed in action, asking if the Congressman could run over to Annapolis to be present at the opening of the sailor's safe-deposit box and sign an affidavit on its contents. (He sent his secretary.)

A judge asking DIRKSEN to help get a 42-year-old constituent out of the Army. "The C——— brothers would much appreciate your placing these facts before the proper

authorities, and they think it would mean that attention would be given the case if the matter is presented by a Congressman."

A woman announcing: "We are in need of information concerning production in the world." This request, staggering at first glance, was easily satisfied by sending a copy of the Statistical Abstract.

A newspaper inviting the Congressman to have his name listed, at a cost of only $4, in a full-page benefit advertisement for the Boy Scouts. DIRKSEN averages one such request per day to contribute to some district charity or endeavor. His donations average about $100 per month.

A constituent wanting a job as guard in one of the Government buildings.

A proud Peorian who requested the Congressman to see if he could get a United States warship named "Peoria."

A constituent who wrote concerning a neighbor who had been accepted by the Army in March 1941, discharged a year later with tuberculosis. The Veterans' Bureau refused his application for pension on the grounds that his illness was not service connected. DIRKSEN will follow this case through, up to the Veterans' Bureau Board of Appeals if it is necessary.

A town that wanted help in getting a priority for cast-iron pipe for its water system.

A farm woman whose two sons had been drafted "I am writing to tell you what many think of the unjust laws of exempting some farmers and sending the best and most skilled as cannon fodder. Also about crooked draft boards."

A neighbor. "So Everett, as an individual and a delegation of one but in the interest of many who are too ignorant and too indifferent to write their Congressman, I ask you, will you not again please take immediate action to avoid our having a food shortage. Another phase that trouble me is the Russian one for of course, at present, they deserve all the glory they are getting. But, Everett, I am afraid of them, expressly so, after the war."

An oil distributor offering thanks for the Congressman's help in getting him a new truck trailer. When his old trailer's tires wore thin he applied to his local rationing board for new ones and was turned down on the ground that he had been overloading the vehicle. Then he applied to War Production Board for a new trailer and was turned down on the ground that what he needed was not a new trailer but new tires. In despair he turned to Dirksen, who managed to get a priority from War Production Board.

THE PEOPLE'S FRIENDS AT COURT

This record of DIRKSEN's activities and mail makes clear one of the principal but least-publicized functions of a Congress. For years one of the commonest complaints of political thinkers both in and out of Congress has been that constituents make errand boys out of their Congressmen, using up so much of their time that they do not have enough left to legislate wisely. It is true, of course, that the errand-boy business can be overdone. A Congressman who makes himself too common by calling too often in person at the various agencies and dealing with underlings soon loses influence. And an efficient secretary can take much of this burden from his employer's shoulders. DIRKSEN is fortunate in having an exceptionally able and experienced secretary, amiable Wendell E. (Jack) Cable, whose wisdom in the ways of Washington gained from a quarter-century on Capitol Hill has made "Ask Jack Cable" the standard advice given to less experienced congressional employees whenever a problem stumps them. Even so, there are many errands that the Congressman must run himself, especially those that involve dealing with the higher-ups in the bureaucracy.

Is that bad? Should the practice somehow be abolished? The quick and obvious answer is yes. Yet if it were, who then would be the people's friends at court? As the Federal Government reaches out to regulate more and more concerns of the people's lives, as the bureaucracy grows ever bigger and more complex and centralized, this function of Congressmen becomes steadily more important. They are the men and women who humanize big government, who temper the edicts issuing from the vast, impersonal bureaucracy in Washington to the needs and problems of individual citizens. Nobody else, no special group sent to Washington for the sole purpose, could do the job, for the simple reason that the Congressman's legislative power over the bureaus is what gives his word weight with their officials.

If this is true, then the common arguments against Congress' sectionalism and the cumbersome size of the House are seriously weakened. True it is that, as presently elected, Congressmen frequently promote their local interests at the cost of the national interest (the Silver Purchase Act is the most outrageous current example), and that the House is too big for effective debate. Idealistic reformers have proposed to cut House membership drastically, to abolish the constitutional provision that members of Congress must be residents of the State from which they are elected, and the almost unbroken political custom that requires a House candidate to live in the congressional district he aims to represent. But the very essence of the Congressman as friend at court is that he is a neighbor, one who knows and is known by his constituents and understands their problems. And 96 Senators and 435 Representatives do not seem like too many friendly mediators for 132,000,000 people to have in Washington. The petty legislative localism that results from this situation might be remedied if the Senate, with its broader base of representation, could be inspired to a steadily statesmanlike view of the national interest.

Under this system a conscientious Congressman will go on having a very hard job indeed. But that is not what bothers Everett Dirksen. What he is after for himself and the rest of Congress is not less but better work.

THE OLD MEN ARE SATISFIED

DIRKSEN is by no means the only Congressman clamoring for congressional reform. But the first fact that any investigator discovers is that the clamor comes almost wholly from the younger Members. The old men who run Congress, the official leaders, and the chairmen of the powerful committees are quite happy with things as they are. Why not? The system gives them power and prestige. Why change it? This is the great road block in the path of congressional reform. It is the fact that makes most reform proposals academic.

The rule of seniority by which a committee's chairmanship goes not to its ablest or most popular member but automatically to that one of the majority party (usually from a "safe district") who has managed to get himself reelected for the most consecutive terms represents a vested interest of the leaders of Congress. It is the foundation of their old-man leadership.

The same obstacle of vested interest stands in the way of reorganization of the committees themselves, in which most of the real legislative work is done. The system's faults are obvious. House and Senate together have 80 standing and numerous special committees. They are organized on no plan, all having sprung up individually and haphazardly over the years. The committees inevitably overlap, duplicate each other's work, wrangle among themselves for jurisdiction. Manpower is wasted. Less than a dozen committees in each Chamber do most of the work, thus overburdening their members and leaving the rest in comparative idleness. Time, both of Congressmen and administrators, is wasted. More than 20 different committees, for example, have looked into the affairs of the War Production Board and summoned its officials to testify before them.

A more serious result is one that Roland Young, political scientist and one time clerk of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, expressed in his recent book, This Is Congress, as follows: "Congress is not organized as a thinking body." Its scatteration makes it impossible for it to form coherent plans and policies as can the well-coordinated executive. That is why, when action is demanded and the President has a plan and Congress has none, the President usually gets his way. Author Young proposes to cut the number of committees in each chamber to 10, with their chairmen forming a supercommittee to formulate over-all congressional policy. One reason why any such sense-making move is most unlikely to be made is that it would leave sixty-odd present committee chairmen stripped of their jobs, and of the headlines and power and prestige that go with them.

INFORMATION AND INDEPENDENCE

There are some useful reforms, however, that would cost no Congressman a jot of rank or power, and go far toward restoring a balance between the executive and legislative branches. A better formal liaison between them could be established. Some observers have proposed a joint executive-legislative policy-making committee. Others have suggested that Cabinet members participate in congressional debates and submit to questioning. Still others think the President himself should do so, as Britain's Prime Minister does, or at least report to some regular congressional committee.

Another worthy proposal is the much-derided congressional pension plan. Congress blundered in the manner and timing of its move toward that goal last year. But there is a sound case to be made for the value of the independence that the assurance of a pension would give to the Congressman who now, having cut himself off from his business or profession, spends much of his time worrying and scheming and campaigning for reelection.

But, thinks EVERETT DIRKSEN and many another Congressman, what Congress needs far more than pensions to restore its strength and independence is information—independent information supplied by its own experts. He takes very seriously the policing and supervisory function of Congress, its duty to see that the laws it passes are well and justly administered. As a minority member of the Appropriations Committee, he is especially eager to know whether the money that the agencies ask for is really needed and whether it is well spent. But now, as he pointed out in the speech quoted at the beginning of this article, Congress is almost wholly dependent for its facts on the spenders and administrators.

"There is nothing so discouraging," he says, "as an appropriations subcommittee hearing, with the committee members on one side of the table and the agency heads and their experts lined up on the other. They have all the facts at their fingertips, but all they need to tell us is what they want us to know. We have no way of checking up on them. We don't ever know enough to ask the right questions. It's a sort of combination quiz program and fishing expedition. It's like attempting to try a case in court without witnesses and without evidence. The defendant gives the only testimony.

"As it is, we haven't time to investigate even one agency thoroughly, let alone all the hundreds we have to appropriate for. We ought to have men of our own that we could

send out into the fields to actually see what's going on; whether, for instance, some agency is using a hundred men for a job that fifty could do. And when an agency comes into a committee meeting to ask for an appropriation, we ought to have at our elbow a man who had spent a year in that agency and found out all about it. He could be counsel to the committee, cross-examine, analyze the testimony expertly. Then we'd have a chance of finding out what really goes on.

"Here we are demanding the elimination of nonessential functions of Government. But the people who come to ask for appropriations are the very ones who are running those functions, and they can think of nine thousand reasons why they're absolutely indispensable to the war effort."

Lack of information as well as faulty organization is at the base of Congress' failure to plan. To implement his proposal for the use of congressional experts, DIRKSEN has stuffed the House hopper with bills to create planning committees complete with brain trusts—committees on postwar planning and reconstruction, on economy and efficiency, on peace preparation. (Among his other bills is one for a committee on congressional reorganization.) Plainly there are few fields in which the counsel of Congress' own scholars and field investigators could not be useful in forming legislative policy as well as checking on administrative performance.

SENTINELS OF LIBERTY

DIRKSEN'S great idea is not revolutionary or even novel. Since 1926 the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has maintained a staff of experts who have given invaluable service to the two congressional tax committees, House Ways and Means and Senate Finance, in just the ways DIRKSEN suggests. They draw up independent tax measures, criticize Treasury proposals, cross-examine Treasury experts. A later example is the Truman war investigating committee, with its brilliant record of uncovering inefficiency and speeding action in the war program. Senator TRUMAN is the first to concede that his efforts would have fallen far short of present results if he had been forced to depend on the usual congressional technique of trying to drag testimony from the unwilling lips of people under investigation. He has a staff of four lawyers and four trained investigators to go out and dig up facts first-hand

The Dirksen plan is an outstanding solution of the problem of congressional reform, but no one solution is enough. If the American people want representative government at its best, they must continue to give serious thought to the reforms of seniority and committee organization here dismissed as immediately impracticable of accomplishment, as well as to such others as a Presidential item veto of appropriation bills, a merger of Congressional taxing and appropriating committees, and even the more radical proposal that one chamber of the Congress be elected on economic instead of geographical lines. In the long history of government, even the most seemingly immutable institutions have yielded to the slow, steady process of education and mounting public pressure. Meantime, what bars America from the immediate benefits of DIRKSEN'S scheme?

He thinks the chief obstacle to the wider use of congressional experts is that Congress, supersensitive to public opinion, dreads the criticism it always gets when it spends money on itself. Another reason may be that for too long too many Congressmen, whether out of complacency or of submissiveness to the White House, have failed to take the high view of their office expressed by a great United States Senator more than a century ago. "The business of Congress," one Congressman has said, "is to pass laws and appropriate money, and that's all." But in 1834, in a speech of protest against an act by which the Senate held that President Andrew Jackson had exceeded his authority, Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, declared: "We have been taught to regard a representative of the people as a sentinel on the watchtower of liberty."

Some Effects of Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARLE D. WILLEY

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and supporting tables with respect to effects resulting from apparent failure to protect the interests of the United States when trade agreements are made under the present law. In this particular instance the interested parties had no hearing, no opportunity to present facts, and in fact, no knowledge, until the agreements were completely made:

TILE CONTRACTORS' ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.,
Washington, D. C., May 12, 1943.

Congressman EARLE D. WILLEY,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I hope this picture I am about to present will give you an illustration of how reciprocal trade agreements made by the State Department and foreign governments operate to the detriment of American industry.

Some time ago the State Department entered into a new trade agreement with Mexico. In this agreement there was no mention whatsoever of a number of clay products and particularly floor and wall tile with which I am interested. A decree of the Mexican Government published in the Official News of March 27, 1943, to take effect 30 days after its publication, raised the duty on floor and wall tile to such an extent that it means an absolute embargo on the products of American manufacturers.

I am enclosing two tables; one showing the new duties imposed and the old duties in terms of kilograms which is the unit of weight measure used in this official decree. The second table shows the translation from kilograms into square-feet prices and what the cost of tile will be to Mexicans under the new duties. I have not taken into consideration transportation costs, etc., which, of course, would be extra.

You can see from this rough picture that the Mexican Government, through reciprocal trade agreement with the United States, has very effectively barred all American floor and wall-tile manufacturers from selling any material whatsoever to Mexico.

Very truly yours,

H. R. COLE, *Director.*

JOSE GOY,
Mexico, D. F.

The decree of the Mexican Government published in the Official News of March 27, 1943, to take effect 30 days after its publication.

TABLE 1

	Duty, gross kilogram	
	Now	Before
Wall tile, white, matte, or bright when same weighs up to 150 grams	$0.35	$0.08
Same tile when it weighs over 250 grams	.30	.08
Wall tile, plain colors, weighing up to 250 grams, matte or bright not including white	.42	.08
Same tile when weighing over 250 grams	.37	.08
Inserts up to 250 grams	.80	.08

Plus 3-percent municipal tax.

TABLE 2

	Old duty	New duty
	Per sq. ft.	*Per sq. ft.*
White tile	$0.12	$0.52½
Colored tile	.12	.63

ACTUAL COST TO MEXICAN USER

	Old cost plus duty	New cost plus duty
	Per sq. ft.	*Per sq. ft.*
White wall tile	$0.32	$0.72½
Colored tile	.35	.85

The above table is not exactly correct in that it did not make the transposition from kilograms to pounds to the exact decimal point; however, these prices are so near to being correct that they will give an accurate picture.

Work Permits Smell of Graft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for 5 years or more the practice of certain unions of selling work permits has been protested by me as not only un-American but unlawful. From the well of the House day after day has attention been called to the extortion practiced by some unions in demanding that all those seeking work in defense plants and in many industries pay tribute before exercising the right to work.

Because that practice was branded as unlawful and un-American, I have been charged by labor leaders and by labor publications as being antilabor.

Now comes Daniel J. Tobin, whose unions have practiced that extortion, and admits that the selling of work permits smells to high heaven. Read what the converted Daniel J. Tobin had to say on that subject in the May 1943 issue of the International Teamster:

WORK PERMITS ARE PROHIBITED—THEY SMELL OF GRAFT

(By Daniel J. Tobin)

Work permits of any kind are not allowed. This is the standing law and rule of our international union. Some may argue that we

have let the bars down slightly since the war began. That's true.

We permit women to become members of our union in certain light employments where it was absolutely impossible to get men as a result of thousands of our members being called to the service.

The general executive board also made a decision relative to temporary Government jobs, and we requested local unions not to insist on high initiation fees on temporary contract jobs and not to have more than $2 dues.

Such individuals should not be entitled to benefits within the union until they decide to follow up our trade permanently after the completion of the Government contract job, when they then would pay regular fees.

But in those cases there was no permit system and the men had to become members, with certain qualifications on the membership, which is recognized as only temporary membership.

As soon as the emergency is over female members can be given withdrawal cards; and the same is true of men employed on large contract jobs in isolated places where the Government has undertaken such work.

BREWERY WORKERS USE IT

But issuing permits is entirely a different thing. The individual never becomes a member under the permit system. He simply pays so much for the use of a card called a permit in order to be allowed to work on a union job.

This permit system in the early days smelled of nothing but graft—not in our union, but in some unions that employed the permit system.

It is true that we have unions that have use for quite a number of men in the summer to work in breweries and soft drink establishments. The Brewery Workers' Union had, and have, the permit system, as they take on quite a few extra people in summer. We are observing and carrying out the contracts of the brewery unions that came over to us, but when their contracts expire they will have to comply with our laws, and abolish the permit system.

We have unions that have benefits and they want to build a wall around their membership, so they use the excuse that they won't admit to membership certain drivers who have lately taken up our employment.

They also state that they are saving the places for the men who are away in the service. All this is wrong. If men are fit to drive trucks and are able to stay at our work, then they should be entitled to full membership.

GOVERNMENT WATCHING UNIONS

When they are out of work and go into some other employment they shall be given withdrawal cards. The old excuse that they are entitled to some consideration on the benefits because they have been dues-paying members is not upheld by the courts.

Even if a lower court, with a prejudiced judge, upheld it, we have reason to believe it would not be upheld by the higher courts because our constitution clearly states that when an individual ceases to work at our craft he must be given a withdrawal card, and our constitution has been upheld by the courts. No law can prevail within the local union that is contrary to the International law.

Therefore, if there are any local unions that employ the permit system in any of its forms, we now request that in order to save themselves from violating the International law and perhaps the laws of the land, they change over from the permit system and use the regular membership system, as they are bound to do by the constitution of the International union.

I have had to blush more than once for some of the happenings under the permit system that prevail in other unions outside of our International.

It must also be distinctly understood by our local unions and their officers that conditions are not as they used to be; that the State governments and Federal Government are looking into every act of the local unions and even into the private lives of the officers of the local unions.

Selfishness of members in a union sometimes prevails. Those inside sometimes want the union for themselves. The fellow who is inside and a member for many years argues for a high initiation fee and low dues.

He wants to make it as tough as he can for the fellow on the outside, and as cheap as he can for himself on the inside.

We are happy and pleased that there are only a few of this type of member, who says—"Why should he come in here now at a low initiation? We made this union. We built it up from the bottom. We fought all the way through, and now he enjoys the high wage scale and other conditions we have established."

That is pure, unadulterated narrow-mindedness and selfishness, based on prejudice and ignorance. That is just the same as a fellow who has insurance saying "I have been paying on this accident insurance for 20 years and have never collected anything."

He never realizes it was fortunate for him he didn't collect by having himself broken up in an accident.

Another fellow will say "I have been paying for 30 years into this fraternal organization and I must die in order to collect the death benefit." He doesn't realize that he has been living and that he has been lucky not to have collected.

But in the case of a union, in my own particular case, I became a member of a union when we were getting $10 a week driving a two-horse truck for 12 hours a day and no overtime. On our first wage scale, brought about by a strike with the loss of only 2 days, we gained $2 a week increase in wages.

That union is now enjoying $35 or $38 a week and overtime, for a short work week. There are few left who were with me in those days but if they are still able to work, every man that came after us got twenty times as much out of the union as he paid into it.

Those selfish men who say, "Let him pay a high initiation fee and build up the treasury, but let us have low dues; we built the union up," should stop and think that their wages have gone up year after year, until now they are receiving very fine, substantial wages.

They live in good homes. They get paid for overtime and in many instances they get a week's vacation with pay and innumerable other benefits which we do not desire to mention—amongst those benefits the right to hold their heads up and assert themselves and not be afraid to say they are members of a union. We had to hide our membership for months, and if we were discovered as union men, we would be discharged.

Keep this in mind, fellow members: That what you pay in dues is insurance for bettering conditions and for holding the conditions you now enjoy. Every man you bring into the union adds to the strength of your union and that same man will carry on the battle when you and I have passed away.

Instead of making it difficult for a man to come into a union, make it as easy as you can, and then when he is in, both you and he should pay in accordance with the benefits you receive.

But cut out the permit. It smells in most cases and it is positively forbidden by the international laws, and you helped to make those laws and made each general executive board member raise his right hand and faithfully promise to enforce those laws.

Shipbuilding Record for 1943

REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the urgent need for ships and still more ships is being met by the Maritime Commission, the American shipbuilding plants, and the workers in those plants. They are delivering telling blows for victory. How well they are doing their work is told more eloquently by their deeds than by words. During the month of April all previous world records for ship production were broken by American yards delivering into service 157 ships totaling 1,606,600 tons deadweight. When we recall that our record for 1939 was 28 ships of 342,032 deadweight tonnage; 1940, 53 ships of 619,506 deadweight tons; 1941, 103 ships of 1,137,163 tons; and 1942, 746 ships of 8,088,732 deadweight tons, the most skeptical of our citizens must concede that the Maritime Commission, our shipbuilding plants, and our shipyard workers deserve the undying gratitude of the American people for the splendid work they are doing.

The shipbuilding records for April show the third consecutive month this year in which the output by American shipbuilders exceeded that achieved during the preceding month.

The April record brings the total thus far in 1943 to 536 ships aggregating 5,370,200 tons, an aggregate which more than equals the total tonnage constructed during the first 9 months of 1942, which was in itself a record-breaking year.

If the April construction is maintained, as appears highly probable from present indications and past performances, the approximate goal of 19,000,000 tons deadweight will be met and may be exceeded. Delivery continues at the rate of five merchant ships a day. An all-time high for the number of merchant ships and total tonnage delivered during any 1 month was established but, in addition, the California Shipbuilding Corporation at Wilmington, Calif., under McCone-Bechtel management, broke all previous records for a single yard by delivering 19 Liberty ships. The Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation of Portland, Oreg., another west coast shipyard, under Kaiser management, was second with delivery of 17 Liberty ships while third honors went to the Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard at Baltimore, Md., which delivered 16 Liberty ships into service.

The Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation continues to lead in the greatest productivity per way. That yard delivered 17 ships from 11 ways while California Shipbuilding Corporation at Wilmington, Calif., produced 19 Liberty ships on 14 ways and Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard at Baltimore, Md., produced 16 Liberty ships on 16 ways.

The complete list of shipyards and the number and types of vessels delivered by each in April is as follows:

Shipyard	Number of vessels	Type of vessel
Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala.	1	Tanker.
Avondale Marine Ways, Inc., Westwego, La.	2	Seagoing tugs.
Barnes-Duluth Shipbuilding Co., Duluth, Minn.	1	Coastal tanker.
Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., Baltimore, Md.	16	EC-2 cargo.
Bethlehem-Sparrows Point Shipyard, Inc., Sparrows Point, Md.	2	Tankers.
California Shipbuilding Corporation, Wilmington, Calif.	19	EC-2 cargo.
Concrete Ship Constructors, National City, Calif.	3	Concrete barges.
Consolidated Steel Corporation, Ltd., Wilmington, Calif	5 1	C-1 cargo. Special type.
Delta Shipbuilding Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.	6	EC-2 cargo.
East Coast Shipyards, Inc., Bayonne, N. J.	2	Coastal tankers.
Froemming Bros., Inc., Milwaukee, Wis.	1	Seagoing tug.
Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, Mobile, Ala.	2	C-2 cargo.
Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, Houston, Tex.	6	EC-2 cargo.
Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation, Pascagoula, Miss.	2	C-3 cargo.
J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc., Panama City, Fla.	2	EC-2 cargo.
Kaiser Co., Inc., Swan Island, Portland, Oreg.	3	Tankers.
Leathem D. Smith Shipbuilding Co., Sturgeon Bay, Wis.	3	Coastal cargo.
Marinship Corporation, Sausalito, Calif.	1	EC-2 cargo.
Moore Dry Dock Co., Oakland, Calif.	2	C-2 cargo.
New England Shipbuilding Co. (formerly South Portland), South Portland, Maine.	8	EC-2 cargo
North Carolina Shipbuilding Co., Wilmington, N. C.	10	Do.
Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, Portland, Oreg.	17	Do.
Pacific Bridge Co., San Francisco, Calif.	1	Coastal cargo.
Pennsylvania Shipyards, Inc., Beaumont, Tex.	2	C-1 cargo.
Piercy & Jones Corporation, Wilmington, Del.	1	Do.
Permanente Metals Corporation (Richmond shipyard No. 1), Richmond, Calif.	7	EC-2 cargo.
Permanente Metals Corporation (Richmond shipyard No. 2), Richmond, Calif.	13	Do.
Kaiser Co., Inc. (Richmond shipyard No. 3A), Richmond, Calif.	4	Special type.
St. Johns River Shipbuilding Co., Jacksonville, Fla.	1	EC-2 cargo.
Southeastern Shipbuilding Corporation, Savannah, Ga.	3	Do.
Sun Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa.	6	Tankers.
Walsh-Kaiser Co., Inc. (formerly Rheem), Providence, R. I.	1	EC-2 cargo.
Welding Engineers, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa	1	Tanker.
Western Pipe & Steel Co., San Francisco, Calif.	2	C-3 cargo.
Total	157	

The following letter of Admiral Vickery reveals the great work the Commission, the American shipyards and their workers are doing:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, May 6, 1943.

The Honorable S. O. BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives.

DEAR JUDGE BLAND: Believing it may be of interest to you, I am enclosing a chart showing tonnage deliveries to date under the Commission's program.

United States merchant shipyards again broke all records for volume of output by delivering into service during the month of April 157 vessels of 1,606,600 tons deadweight. Whereas 8,090,000 tons were built during 1942, last month's deliveries correspond to a rate of more than 19,000,000 tons a year. Moreover, at the end of April deliveries for the first four months of the current year more than exceeded the total tonnage delivered for the first 9 months of 1942. Although there are too many variable factors involved to permit an official prediction, it is my personal expectation that May will be an even bigger month in merchant shipbuilding.

Besides an all-time record for total tonnage delivered, other records were established. For example, 1 yard, the California Shipbuilding Corporation, delivered 19 Liberty ships. Another, the Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, completed 17 Liberty ships in the average time of 27.5 days from keel laying to delivery. In addition, I believe you will be encouraged to know that the New England Shipbuilding Corporation, the successor to South Portland and Todd-Bath, delivered 8 ships, the average time of which was 79 days from keel laying to completion. The over-all average for the 110 Liberty ships delivered in April was 57.2 days, and as the newer yards gain more experience and become more efficient, this average time, in my opinion, will be substantially reduced.

While April's production record undoubtedly will soon be eclipsed, the month was a milestone in another respect, since it witnessed the formal inauguration of the Victory ship program. Culminating the Commission's efforts over the past 2 years to provide an adequate supply of the necessary high-power machinery, the first construction contracts for Victory ships were awarded last month. As you can so well appreciate, the conversion from the Liberty ship to its fast successor will not only help to hasten a triumphant conclusion to the war, but will greatly enhance the post-war position of the American merchant marine in which the interests of your committee and the Maritime Commission are so closely affiliated.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

H. L. VICKERY,
Commissioner.

Effects of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph S. Kaufman from the Lynn (Mass.) Telegram:

THE WEEKLY ROUND TABLE

(By Joseph S. Kaufman)

This is a war of ideas as well as tanks, guns, planes, and ships. As the Battle of Tunisia is coming to a successful climax and the invasion of Europe is about to begin, people ask themselves over and over again the question as to just what effect this war will have on people in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Near East, particularly right here in the good old United States of America. Signs of this restless thoughtfulness appeared this week in the form of two interesting articles and a book—one article by James B. Conant, president of Harvard University, another by Drew Middleton in the New York Times, and Wendell Willkie's book, One World. What these thinkers, writers, and leaders are trying to express is what everybody is concerned about. Is this muddled world of ours going to continue to muddle? Or is there something better in store for suffering humanity now engaged in this titanic global war? If a new and better world is to be built just what must be done, now? And most especially what are we in America thinking, saying, and doing to make sure that the sweat, blood, and tears may not be in vain? To get any picture of the prevailing opinions in the United States it is necessary, of course, to listen to the expression of people in the light of their accustomed thought.

Mr. ISOLATIONIST. I have been reading Wendell Willkie's book One World, and it looks to me that he is making a bid for the Republican nomination for President. Knowing the confused world situation is bothering a lot of people in this country, he is trying to convince them in this book that he really learned a lot about the different countries he visited, and so people can rely on him to pick the right foreign policy. He says in effect: "Nominate and elect me as your President and I will lead you, good citizens, to the promised land of milk and honey. I shall be the knight in shining armor for the whole world to follow, so that Manhattan Murphy beds, bath tubs, sanitary plumbing and glueless flypaper will be as common in Khartoum, Bagdad, and Teheran as in New York." Well, what need is a man for President who will tell us how he proposes to find jobs for the 10,000,000 boys and girls in uniform when they come marching home and who can stop Roosevelt before he talks us into a fourth term.

Mr. NEW DEALER. Our President is not going to talk anyone into a fourth term any more than he talked us into a third term. Is there a man or woman who will deny Franklin D. Roosevelt's able leadership in this war, who will deny that he saw the whole thing clearly long before anyone else did and who will deny that he prepared us for it in spite of the isolationists and totalitarian minded Americans? If it is the wish of his people that he lead them in peace as in war, the President will reluctantly fulfill his duty to his Nation then as now.

Mr. CONSERVATIVE. Let's not get into any stump oratory prematurely. It may be neither Willkie nor Roosevelt in 1944. But Willkie's book raises many serious questions for us to think about. I think he is right in saying that the filth, poverty, and degradation he found on his trip around the world is as much the reason for this war as the murder, loot, and godlessness of the German Nazis and the Italian Fascists. I am a strong nationalist, I want to see that we make the United States a better place to live in; that we wipe out some of the evils right here at home first, but I have learned one thing from this war and that is this: If this war is to be a crusade and not a curse which will breed new wars, America cannot stand alone but must work with England, Russia, China, and the other Allied nations. And we must lay the foundations for that economic order here at home that will take care of the men and women in uniform when they return. But I don't think New Deal bureaucracy will accomplish this. On the contrary, it will leave us in a maze of confusion, jealousies, and fights for power between the agencies to the destruction of our constitutional rights.

Mr. LIBERAL. In the attempt to find out the kind of America, the kind of world we are going to live in after this war, let us see what Willkie and other thoughtful men have to say about it. I think this paragraph in Willkie's book One World is worth quoting:

"For, however important the role of bayonets and guns have been in the development of mankind, the role of ideas has been vastly more important, and in the long run, more conclusive. In historical times, at any rate, men have often fought merely for the joy of killing each other. They have fought for a purpose. Sometimes that purpose has not been very inspiring. Sometimes it has been quite selfish. But a war won without a purpose is a war won without victory."

Mr. Willkie believes that our purpose should include not only the liberation of enslaved nations, but it should also include the "giving to all peoples freedom to govern themselves as soon as they are able, and the economic freedom on which all lasting self-government inevitably rests." Mr. Willkie hopes that we guard well our liberties at home while we help spread our conception of freedom to the world. But Harvard's President Conant, in an article in Atlantic Monthly for June, says:

"Until we settle within the United States our approach to such difficult questions as the relations of management and labor and the control and ownership of the tools of production; until we square away on a course that will make us both prosperous and free we shall be irresolute in deciding upon our foreign policy."

Not only does President Conant want domestic problems settled first, but he calls for the development of American radicals, that is, a kind of new-thinking Americans who will try to streamline such old ideas as States' rights to suit modern conditions, insist on decentralization of government, and place more emphasis on local responsibility. But while this kind of American radical will seek to reestablish the old philosophy of our democratic system of Government, nevertheless, he will not place a higher value on property rights than on human rights. The American radical will be different. Says President Conant:

"He springs from American soil, firm in the belief that every man is as good as his neighbor, if not better, and is entitled to a real chance for a decent living * * * He will be ready to invoke even the Federal Government in the interests of maintaining real freedom among the masses. But unlike the European radical, he will never cease to hope that such remedies may be only passing sins."

In talking of this new type of thinking American, this American radical, it is interesting to read what Drew Middleton, a war correspondent who talked with thousands of our men in uniform serving across the Atlantic, says in his article in the New York Times. He finds nearly all of them eager to finish the job and go home. "Whatever the price, you can be sure they will push resolutely to victory. It is in the organization of the world after the victory that they are not interested." These soldiers talk about some sort of international cooperation and world policy after the war but the responsibility of all this does not interest them. They can see a better reason for fighting Japan than the danger to our way of life from Nazi or Fascist ideologies. They show no interest in the possible cutthroat competition in the field of international aviation which may result in another war. "Pilots will tell you," says Middleton, "Why, hell, the air's free, just as the ocean should be." They do not understand Russia's position in the war any more than they understand her revised communism. However, they are reconciled to fight alongside Russia as an ally for the simple reason the Russians are killing Germans.

With all this disinterested, confused and provincial state of mind on the part of our fighting forces who will make up a great deal of American thinking after the war, the prospect of building a better world—a better America—seems too remote and unattainable. It is a disillusioning picture. Unless men like President Roosevelt, Willkie and Conant can arouse the interest and enthusiasm of this generation now fighting the war to think of the United States as part of the world in which she must assume her full leadership and responsibility after the war—unless this generation's thinking is changed radically from its past and present longing for the good old days which shall never return, then it shall have paid a priceless sacrifice in a war won without victory.

Fair Play for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Il Progresso Italo-Americano for May 2, 1943.

FAIR PLAY FOR ALL

Various peoples, creeds, races, and tongues have been welded into the American Nation. This is the secret and source of its strength. Here are the roots of its tremendous growth. Into the make-up and greatness of our land have been integrated the countless common folk from all over the world who suffered economic hardships, religious intolerance, and political persecution. Looking forward to the blessings of political freedom and social security, these common people have streamed to our shores and helped build our mighty Republic. Italian, Irish, Jewish, Scandinavian, and Slavic blood have been intermingled to produce America's true national unity and unrivaled progress.

It is many months since President Roosevelt, great humanitarian that he is, denounced all discriminatory practices and demanded their discontinuance. However, there are still institutions and men who discriminate against individuals because of their foreign-sounding names, their faith, or the color of their skin. When jobs are barred to such workers, our national unity, our war potential, and highest welfare are gravely imperiled. Such discriminatory policies are a boon to our mortal enemies and a blow to our best national interests.

We are Americans by choice. We are not Italians in America, but are Americans of Italian origin who have chosen the United States as our country, as the one and only country to which we give our devotion and loyalty. Hence, we must speak frankly. All too often, Americans (who happen to be of Italian extraction) are being denied their full rights as Americans. Discrimination is frequently evidenced against Americans (bearing Italian names or born abroad) especially in the economic, political, and social fields of endeavor. A mechanic with an Italian-sounding name tends to find it harder to get a job in a defense plant. There is no earthly reason why even the slightest hesitation should be displayed in according full recognition to Americans of Italian extraction in all branches of our armed services.

No one can with honesty question the patriotism, courage, and sacrifices which the Americans of Italian birth or parentage have manifested and made in our great wars. Their voluntary purchases of many millions and millions of dollars of Defense bonds and War bonds are convincing proof of that fact. Il Progreso itself, through its readers, is responsible for the sale of over $10,000,000 worth of bonds. More than 300,000 Americans of Italian descent served in the American Expeditionary Force of World War No. 1. More than half a million are serving in our armed forces today. Americans of Italian origin led all others in the seven volunteer quotas for the New York area even before Pearl Harbor. The number of Americans of Italian descent cited for valor and heroism on every sector of our far-flung battle front is greater than their general proportion in the armed services.

The great mass of Americans of Italian birth, the common people in our midst, resent every form of discrimination. This resentment is not allayed when some outstanding American, bearing an Italian name, is appointed to public office. Nor does the policy of occasionally giving one of the common folks a minor job meet the issue. It is true that individual Americans of Italian extraction, men of ability and integrity, have been elevated to positions of high public trust, but this recognition of the few is no substitution for the realization of the hopes and needs of the many.

The blot of discrimination must be eradicated from the glorious pages of American democracy. The elimination of all prejudices and discrimination will foster and fortify our national unity as the first prerequisite for America's victory in the war and the peace to come. This would be the most powerful answer to the Mussolinis, Hitlers, and Tojos who hypocritically seek to exploit these shortcomings in our national life.

We are Americans all. All Americans, regardless of their national or racial origin, regardless of the creed they embrace, are entitled to and must get their full rights as Americans. This is basic and inviolable. It is inherent in the ideals of freedom and democracy—in the cause to which our country is now dedicated.

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter, with accompanying resolutions, written by Charles E. Pew, Esq., attorney at law of Helena, Mont., to the National Commander of the American Legion:

HELENA, MONT., *April 26, 1943.*

ROANE WARING, Esq.,
National Commander, American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MR. WARING: I enclose copy of some resolutions passed by the Area E Conference of the American Legion Rehabilitation Committee held at Salt Lake City, April 14 and 15, 1943.

You don't know me, so I will give you a brief sketch of my background.

I was at the St. Louis caucus in May 1919, at which time the American Legion was organized in the United States; attended every convention but one up to 1923, and helped frame the World War Veterans' Act of June 1924; was first department commander of the Legion in Montana; served for years on the State and National Rehabilitation Committees, resigning upon entering the military service in May 1942; served as executive member of the Montana Veterans'

Welfare Commission from March 1919 to April 30, 1942, and was reappointed on that commission upon my discharge from the Army this spring. I have never taken a dollar for any service I may have rendered the disabled men.

I mention these things merely to show that I probably know what I am talking about, and have no mercenary motives.

Discussing some of the resolutions mentioned:

PRESUMPTION OF SOUNDNESS

When a man is passed by the Selective Service medical staff and by the military medical officers, found fit for military service, and inducted, the Government, and not the man, is responsible for the correctness of this determination. Defects and deficiencies may be noted, but when the man is inducted the books should be closed and the finding of soundness for service made conclusive upon the Government.

The present so-called presumption is no presumption at all. A mere suggestion of something that might be found in any man's history is enough to rebut this presumption. Evidence which would scarcely be considered in the man's favor is sufficient to support a finding of "existed prior to service."

In one case I have in mind, the Bureau, as a basis for denying a claim, made a finding of tuberculosis existing prior to service upon evidence which would not have begun to establish such a finding in the man's favor.

Undoubtedly, many men who went through Pearl Harbor without a visible traumatic injury were discharged with the notation "existed prior to service."

This war started with Dunquerque, so far as the boys who have come in since October 16, 1940, are concerned. Every such man is entitled to such presumption.

We had this conclusive presumption in the law until it was wiped out by the piece of iniquity politely referred to as the "Economy Act."

PRESUMPTION OF ORIGIN OF DISEASE

Until the Economy Act, we had a 5-year presumption of the service origin of tuberculosis and other enumerated diseases of such subtle character that exact proof of their origin is practically impossible.

This 5-year presumption was fixed after elaborate hearings, and was based upon the opinions and experience of some of the most eminent physicians in the United States. We had also the benefit of the clinical study of the cases of thousands of veterans in Bureau hospitals.

This presumption is as direct evidence as would be the testimony of these same medical men if heard in each case. This presumption is simply an appraisal of the probative value of such testimony, and has the same effect as would such evidence if produced in each case.

The presumption also guarantees uniformity. Instead of varied findings, dependent upon the varying views of different medical sections, they are all bound to a uniform rule.

Furthermore, for the reasons just outlined, the so-called presumptive cases should receive the full amount of compensation instead of the 75 percent as at present. The presumption is as direct evidence as would be the testimony of the doctors who helped establish it.

This war will be productive of a greater variety of diseases of a subtle character, difficult of diagnosis and difficult of proof, than any war we ever had. The presumption should be so framed as to provide for new diseases which can be specifically provided for in subsequent legislation.

MENTAL CASES

We have an opportunity now to save the boys of today from the conditions which surround our mental cases in 1919 and subsequent years. There will undoubtedly be several times as many of these cases as we had after World War No. 1; in fact they may be so numerous as to build up a public opinion which will compel their proper treatment.

The mild and incipient cases should be isolated from the more severe, instead of being thrown in promiscuously with all kinds of cases. A man with a simple nervous disturbance (hyperthyroidism, for example) is usually fearful that he will become insane, and it is not conducive to his recovery to keep him in daily and hourly view of the condition he fears may be his some day.

In 1919 there were thousands of men in insane asylums, in county hospitals, or at large, practically all without treatment. There is no excuse for the existence of such conditions now or after this war.

GENERAL HOSPITALIZATION

We find that we are going to be far short of hospital facilities even before general demobilization. Thousands of men will be discharged from time to time from our military services. What is the Veterans' Administration going to do with them?

The Army and Navy will not be able to release beds until the cessation of hostilities and until the flow of men into the Army and Navy hospitals from the battle fronts shall have ceased.

It may be that this problem is being studied, but speedy and drastic action should be taken immediately.

IN GENERAL

Why are we so tardy in extending the benefits of all existing legislation to the men in the present war emergency, who are taking more than the men were called upon to take in 1918?

It is the primary duty of the American Legion to devote its energies to this big problem, the care of the young men who are suffering injury or other disability in this war. I found that the boys in the service generally have a great respect for the Legion, and look to it for help in the post-war problems they know they will face.

We cannot evade this high responsibility. We have a definite duty to perform; and the manner in which we perform that duty will make its impress upon the future of this Commonwealth.

No organization can exert more influence in obtaining the enactment of needed legislation than can the American Legion, but the Legion must approach these questions with the rights of these new veterans in view, and without bias from past or present practices of the Veterans' Administration or from erroneous legislation which may now be harmless as to the veterans of a war now nearly 25 years gone.

The presumptions served their purpose many years ago as far as the proof of service origin of disability is concerned.

We are now confronted with the work of proving service connection in thousands of new cases, and the need for these presumptions is immediate and urgent.

With kindest regards, I am

Yours very truly,

C. E. PEW.

Be it resolved, That this conference urges that the national organization take immediate steps to bring about the enactment by Congress of appropriate legislation:

1. Creating a conclusive presumption of physical and mental soundness and mental capacity at the time of entry into service except as to defects and deficiencies noted at time of such entry and when disability in addition to those so noted shall result from such noted defects or deficiencies, aggravation shall be presumed; such provision to be made effective as of October 16, 1940;

2. According to men and women in the present war, the same benefits now enjoyed by veterans of the First World War and such additional benefits as may be warranted;

3. Providing the same presumptions of service origin of diseases as was in effect prior to the enactment of the Economy Act, in the case of veterans of World War No. 1, with the addition of now known tropical and other diseases to which men and women in service in this war may be exposed and provisions for diseases not now known;

4. That adequate hospital facilities for the treatment of neuro-psychiatric cases be provided as rapidly as possible and that provision be made for the complete segregation of the incipient or mild cases from those of an advanced or violent character, to the end that the mental balance of as many of these cases may be restored as possible;

5. That the work of providing adequate hospital facilities by the Veterans' Bureau be speeded up so as to provide adequate hospitalization as rapidly as possible;

6. That the Veterans' Bureau be completely divorced from the Army and Navy and kept on an independent basis subject only to the control of Congress and the President of the United States and responsive to the desires of a grateful people.

Cases of Armstrong Cork Co. Before War Labor Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ROLAND KINZER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

PRESENTATION IN BEHALF OF ARMSTRONG CORK CO. BEFORE THE WAR LABOR BOARD IN RESPECT TO SIX PENDING CASES SUBMITTED BY THE UNIONS AT THE COMPANY'S PLANTS AT MILLVILLE, GLOUCESTER CITY, AND CAMDEN, N. J.; PITTSBURGH AND BEAVER FALLS, PA.; AND SOUTH BRAINTREE, MASS.

(By H. W. Prentis, Jr., president of the company, Washington, D. C., April 20, 1943)

As general background in your consideration of these 6 cases, a brief statement regarding the Armstrong Cork Co. will be, I believe, of some interest and value. The company was founded in Pittsburgh in 1860. It operates 16 factories in this country and a number abroad—in Spain, Algeria, Tunisia, French Morocco, Great Britain, and Canada. It produces approximately 360 different products in times of peace. At present about 50 percent of the output of such products is required for military or essential civilian use. The company has 15,300 employees in the United States.

Since the company is not a metalworking organization, it was impossible to convert any of its major facilities to the production of munitions. Transformation was necessary. To that end the company organized a munitions division early in 1941 and is now producing a varied line of military supplies, including shells of many calibers, armor-piercing shot, cartridge cases, magnesium bombs, plastic turret covers for airplanes, bomb racks of several varieties, camouflage, coating of army duck, tarpaulins and camouflage nets, and airplane wing tips and subassemblies. Its contribution to the national war effort is demonstrated by the sharp increase in its

billings of war products not previously manufactured:

Five hundred and eighty thousand dollars in 1941.

Ten million, two hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars in 1942.

Estimated at $35,000,000 in 1943.

Its sales for the past 6 years have risen from $42,759,000 in 1937 to $82,700,000 in 1942.

1937	$42,759,000
1938	37,297,000
1939	50,713,000
1940	57,300,000
1941	78,600,000
1942	82,700,000

Profits, as shown in the following table, have decreased from $4,855,000 in 1937 to $2,964,000 in 1942:

1937	$4,855,000
1938	992,000
1939	4,440,000
1940	4,154,000
1941	4,241,000
1942	2,964,000

The profit this past year represents a return of 3.6 percent on sales and 5 percent on invested capital.

The average annual earnings of employees in the United States have shown a steadily upward trend from $1,671 in 1937 to $2,225 in 1942.

1937	$1,671
1938	1,715
1939	1,773
1940	1,792
1941	1,959
1942	2,225

The company's friendly attitude toward its employees and toward collective negotiation is indicated by the fact that—

A. There have been unions at some of its plants for over 50 years and employee committees in others for more than 25 years.

B. The company has never put obstacles in the way of employee elections to determine bargaining agencies. In the Pittsburgh plant the Congress of Industrial Organizations union was accepted as the bargaining agent without an election. In the other five plants presently concerned, the bargaining agents were selected by National Labor Relations Board consent elections.

C. It has a long record of peaceful labor relations.

a. Pittsburgh factory: No strike in the 49 years prior to 1938.

b. Millville factory: No strike for more than 50 years prior to 1940. It was acquired in 1938.

c. Beaver Falls factory: No strike since plant was started 41 years ago.

d. Camden factory: No strike since its acquisition 39 years ago.

e. Gloucester City factory: No strike for 18 years after purchase—until 1941.

f. South Braintree factory: No strike in over 25 years before 1941. It was acquired in 1936.

D. The company has voluntarily extended its programs for helping employees cope with the four specters that all human beings face—sickness, unemployment, old age, and death—giving full recognition of previous years of service to all employees in factories acquired by purchase.

1. To cope with sickness, there is group disability insurance.

2. To cope with unemployment, there are company-paid benefits covering the waiting period required under public unemployment compensation laws; and a guaranteed income each year to all employees with 5 years or more service through loans at no interest, cancelable in case of death.

3. To cope with old age, there is a contributory insured pension system for service rendered after June 1937, plus old-age allowances paid entirely by the company for service prior to that date—supplementing Federal pensions and State old-age assistance.

4. To cope with death, there is group life insurance.

E. Vacations with pay for all employees were extended to all plants in 1937.

F. The public addresses of its president and other officers for years past have been sympathetic to collective negotiation. For example, in a public address in Pittsburgh in 1940 I said:

"Leadership in industry is exercised not only by management but also by labor through the organizations it has formed. Labor is not an interest outside industry but one of the several interests engaged in industry—in fact, the major interest. Satisfactory employment relations have been maintained for many years in industries where there are strong and well-seasoned labor unions with national affiliations; also where there are unions independent of such connections; and where there are no unions at all. Collective bargaining between employees and management, wherever employees wish to engage in it and where equal responsibility is assumed by both sides, is a sound and proper method of procedure. In the last analysis, however, employer- employee relations do not depend on the form of organization used but on the spirit of genuine cooperation and understanding that prevails."

These facts in respect to the attitude of the company toward its employees are not presented with the idea that they are exceptional—a host of other business organizations have taken a similar position—but only to indicate that we come before you with a sound record of labor relations behind us and with a sincere sense of the company's social responsibility in the highly organized industrial world in which we live. We have long recognized that the keystone of liberty is the voluntary acceptance of social obligations and we have tried—within the limits of our ability as fallible human beings—to apply that principle in all our relations with employees, stockholders, customers, suppliers of raw materials, and government.

In view of this recital, it is not surprising that the cases before you, involving six of our factories, are not concerned primarily with wages or working conditions. In fact, at only one of these plants, namely, at Millville, is the company not willing to pay equally as great or even higher wages than the panel and the referee have now recommended. Since the negotiations in question began—more than a year ago in some of these cases—conditions have changed in a number of the communities involved and in simple fairness to our workers and in order to maintain the forces necessary to execute the contracts that we have taken for military supplies, certain further wage adjustments are now essential, although I realize the limitations under which the Board is currently working.

At Pittsburgh and Beaver Falls, Pa.: Offered 5 cents an hour; referee cemommended 3 cents an hour; 6 cents an hour now needed to keep rates in line with local conditions.

Camden, N. J.: Offered nothing; referee recommended nothing; 5 cents an hour now needed to keep rates in line with increases at local shipyards.

Gloucester City, N. J.: Offered nothing; referee recommended nothing; 5 cents an hour now needed to keep rates in line with local shipyards.

South Braintree, Mass.: Offered nothing; panel recommendation is not known; 4 cents per hour now needed to meet current average rates in eastern rubber industry.

Millville, N. J.: Offered nothing; referee recommended 7½ cents per hour for male packers of glassware; 5 cents per hour needed for both men and women packers.

Women are being gradually substituted for male packers in accordance with the understanding with the union in order to meet the existing competitive situation in the glass container industry.

Thus the fundamental questions involved in all of these cases are maintenance of membership—recommended in all six cases, and the check-off—recommended in every instance save at Millville.

Maintenance of membership and the check-off have been argued before this board on so many occasions that I naturally approach the subject with considerable temerity. However, as an American citizen who is gravely concerned about the principles on which the perpetuation of our Republic depends, I cannot remain silent and keep my self-respect. I have repeatedly asserted to the businessmen of this country that we are indeed unworthy of our heritage of freedom if we are afraid to be articulate in its defense here on the home front. So I am grateful, both in behalf of the company and myself, for the Board's courtesy in giving me this opportunity to present my deep convictions regarding the dangers involved in any type of governmental coercion affecting a man's right to work freely at a lawful vocation of his own choosing.

I think I am correct in stating that the major reason advanced by this Board for authorizing maintenance of membership is to further the successful prosecution of the war. Another objective is to prevent the weakening of the union-labor movement under the impact of war conditions. With Dean Morse's statement on this point I am certainly in hearty agreement: "The war must not be allowed to provide labor with an opportunity to invade and take over the rights of management any more than it should be permitted to provide employers with the opportunity to break or injure organized labor."

Naturally the first question that arises in connection with these cases of ours is, Would maintenance of membership help our company's war effort? Our experience so far indicates just the contrary. At our main plant in Lancaster, Pa. (which is not involved in these cases), where the greater portion of our munitions business is being handled, negotiations were opened with the union on March 11, 1942, and concluded on March 18, 1942, resulting in an increase in the base labor rate from 67 cents to 72 cents an hour. Three thousand three hundred and seventy-five wage earners were then employed as compared with 5,977 employees at the same plant in March 1943. There have been no work stoppages whatever despite the fact that half a dozen new lines of activities have been in process of development, and that many novel problems have had to be solved. The union officers have been consulted constantly and the most satisfactory relations have been preserved without maintenance of membership or any form of closed or union shop

Contrast this situation with our plant in Pittsburgh, whose case is before you today. Negotiations were begun with the Pittsburgh union—involving 895 employees—on April 7, 1942. On June 9, 1942, the company offered an increase of 5 cents an hour in wages, but the demands for a union shop and check-off prevented an agreement being reached and the case was carried to you for adjudication. Since June 22, 1942, there have been 7 work stoppages at this plant. The last 2 namely, on October 7, 1942, and March 16, 1943, were strikes in protest against the delay of this Board in reaching a decision. Shells and plastic turrets for airplanes are among the war products made at this plant. Ten thousand four hundred and forty-three man-hours were lost in the last 2 strikes alone. In fairness, let it be said that the union lead-

ers disclaim responsibility for all 7 of these work stoppages, but nevertheless they supported the walk-outs after they had been called by taking up the cudgels in behalf of the strikers. In this case, an early agreement could have been reached in respect to wage rates, had not maintenance of membership and the check-off through appeal to this Board been the primary goal of the leadership of the union in question. Would it not have been more patriotic to have effected a prompt agreement with respect to wages and other minor points at issue, thus avoiding the 7 work stoppages which ensued? The record in Pittsburgh speaks for itself. The union there has certainly not demonstrated that sense of responsibility that might reasonably be expected of it under war conditions.

It is also argued that maintenance of membership prevents interunion strife. I think that is probably true. But in the six cases before you, only one plant presents any such problem. At the glass factory in Millville, N. J., which our company purchased 5 years ago, an American Federation of Labor union makes the bottles and a Congress of Industrial Organizations union inspects and packs them. Here we inherited the union-shop agreements which for many years had existed with the bottle blowers, mold makers, and machinists. And I regret to say that our experience has demonstrated that even the union shop has not made for either labor peace or manufacturing efficiency. For example, in August 1942 the bottle blowers struck against the investigation of work analysis procedures, although there had been 8 months of prior explanatory discussion with the union's local and national officials. The difficulty is not yet fully resolved, even though the plant is still losing money and despite the fact that the company has put more than $1,500,000 into improved tools and facilities during the past 3 years to the end that the excellent group of workers available might use their skills to better advantage.

At a second plant where we also inherited the union shop, we had another disheartening experience, when in the spring of 1941 the employees struck in violation of their signed contract. In this case the company at the behest of the union was compelled to discharge two workers who refused to picket in what they considered, and which was in actuality, an unlawful strike May I ask the public members of the board how they would feel if they were put in the position in which I was placed, of having to authorize the discharge of two efficient workers who had done only what their consciences and their contract demanded? As I have pondered this whole question of coercive union membership, backed by threat of discharge from employment, I have often wondered what the reaction of the American Association of University Professors, which has done such valiant work in behalf of academic freedom and tenure of office, would be if their members were compelled to remain in good standing with the association on penalty of losing their professorial positions.

On certain occasions during the processes of collective bargaining, it has been hinted to us in years gone by that if the company were only willing to grant the union shop and the check-off, we could write our own ticket, so to speak, on wages and other points at issue. I could not, nor could any of you gentlemen on this board, reconcile my conscience with the acceptance of such hints which, in effect, would make me a coconspirator against my fellow company workers. How persistence on the union shop on the part of union leadership has militated against the current financial welfare of union members is demonstrated by the chain of evidence in certain of the instant cases.

Maintenance of membership is justified in some of your decisions on the ground that it prevents the weakening of established unions in wartime. This argument does not, it seems to me, carry much weight in the cases before you at the moment, because in every instance the union leaders concerned have asserted before both panel and referee that the great majority of employees in the several plants involved are members of their respective unions. As previously stated, there is no interunion strife problem involved except at the Millville plant. The cooperative attitude of the company toward collective negotiation in general is another factor which indicates that satisfactory working relationships could be maintained in all these cases without compulsory membership in any form.

It is asserted also that through maintenance of membership the union leaders are freed of the task of building up their membership rolls and can therefore assist management in accelerating war production. No one believes in the principle of management from the bottom up as well as from the top down any more fervently than I. Without intelligent understanding and sympathetic cooperation at every level of an industrial institution, there cannot be efficiency or happiness. Such objectives have been sedulously encouraged in our own organization for years through constant consultation with union officers and committees, and groups of our workers, through semiannual operating reports to employees, through a company magazine, and through a well-established suggestion system. It may interest you to know that in the year 1942 no less than 3,920 suggestions were received, of which 1,248 were paid for and adopted. Let me say unequivocally that we welcome every bit of assistance we can secure from any source in meeting our manifold production problems. It can at least be questioned, however, how much practical help labor leaders outside our own institution can give, which is not already available from workers of long experience who have grown up with us.

It is argued, moreover, that without union security in some form union leaders have to take up and present many grievances from employees that they know are not justified, in order to hold their members in line. Is such procedure sound and honest? What would be thought of corporation managers who indulged in sharp practices in order to hold the goodwill of stockholders? If a union cannot continue to exist without its leaders supporting unwarranted grievances, is that not prima facie evidence that working conditions and company policies are fair and equitable? Therefore, regardless of maintenance of membership or any other form of union security, should not farsighted union leaders brush aside all unjustified complaints and as a patriotic duty apply themselves to preserving peaceful labor relations in the interest of increased war production?

On the day when any group of workers follow the democratic practice of deciding, in a free election, to vest their bargaining power in certain union officials, then those officials can be accepted as speaking the voice of their constituency. But as time goes on free men may change their minds. Furthermore, as new men join the group their differing opinions may shift the balance of majority feeling. That last consideration is a very important one today. With the rate of turnover in most factories, and with great increases in employment, the group of individuals who constituted a majority today may well be only a small minority a few months later.

Take, for example, the actual situation at our Beaver Falls factory. In April 1942, at a consent election held by the National Labor Relations Board, 277 employees out of 382 eligible selected the union in the present case as their collective-bargaining agency. One year later, in April 1943, only 267 of the 382 who voted the year before were left in the company's employ. Meanwhile, however, total employment at this plant had risen to 654. So, assuming that all of the 262 remaining of the original group voted for the union, they actually constitute far less than a majority of the present 654. Is it wise or fair to stabilize a minority situation such as this by maintenance of membership or any other form of union security?

The fundamental problem involved here is as old as representative democratic government. The solution has been well demonstrated. In the first place, there must be some fixed tenure of office so that elected representatives will not be subject to every changing whim of their constituencies. That provides the necessary stability and is, if I judge correctly, what this board has had in mind as one objective of maintenance of membership.

On the other hand, in all democratic systems it is well recognized that there must be checks and balances to guarantee that stability shall not mean slavery or despotism. One of those checks and balances lies in guaranteeing frequent elections and in further providing that prior to the time of those elections, there must continue to exist the freeman's privilege of stating and cultivating minority opinion. That last point is vital. Let me ask you to consider what would happen to our American democracy if a situation prevailed where the elected officials of one of our cities had the power, immediately upon hearing of any citizen who opposed any action or who seemed likely to oppose any action, to take away from that citizen the power to vote—or to kick him out of the city, lock, stock, and barrel. You know as well as I do what would happen. Those officials, their heirs and assigns would remain perpetually in power, and the only people who would continue to live in the city would be those who were forced, through having no alternative, to knuckle under to this self-perpetuating dictatorial power.

Now please do not misunderstand me. I am not making the accusation that there is a complete parallel between that fictitious situation and what may happen in our labor communities under maintenance of membership, but I do think that there is ample foundation for asking whether you have not gone far enough for the present in the direction of maintenance of membership, until you have assured yourselves that the condition you hoped it would correct is really being corrected—and, at the same time, that maintenance of membership is not giving rise to a second problem that is more serious than the one it was designed to remedy. If it be true that the price of what has been termed "union security" will result in the loss of the free voice of the workers, then that price, I think, is too great to pay.

That term I just used—union security—is one that I notice has been rather widely accepted in your opinions as the proper name for such a plan as we are discussing. I do not want to quibble about words and I think I know what is meant, but if there is any tendency to think of "union security" along the lines of perpetually stabilizing some group of union officials, rather than stabilizing the free voice of the workers, then I am sure you will agree that we are on the wrong track. If we are forcing workers into a position where once having bestowed power, there is virtually no recourse for the recapture of that power, then what is being done is indefensibly un-American.

Now to return again to my thesis, I gather from the opinions I have read, that the Board has at least tentatively accepted the premise that maintenance of membership clears the way for a free expression of the individual worker's voice—by eliminating the need for union officials to occupy themselves with jurisdictional disputes and interunion competition, thus giving them more

time to listen to the legitimate grievances of individual union members and to prosecute those demands more actively.

Once again there need be no quarrel about the objectives, but once again I think we must go beyond the plan to see whether it really works out that way. I maintain that it does not. The greatest incentive that any elected representative can possibly have to take prompt care of his constituency is the thought of an impending election. Even the most tightly entrenched political leader recognizes that his power derives directly from his constituency and that he must serve the individual to hold that individual's vote. By contrast, the union official backed by maintenance of membership—extended from year to year—is in a very different position.

There is, of course, always the possibility of another employee election being called, but what has to happen to make that possibility a reality ? A substantial percentage of the workers—in certain instances as many as 40 percent—must petition for that election. But how much chance would there be for any opposition to get to the point where it could convince anywhere near 40 percent of the workers that they should risk dismissal by signing a petition that might be interpreted by the current incumbents as an act against their interests? You know as well as I do that the loss of his means of livelihood is so serious a threat to hold against a man, that theer are few indeed who would dare run that risk. "Power over a man's support is power over his will," the Federalist Papers crisply asserted in 1789.

Now, lest I be misunderstood, please let me say that I am not casting slurs on the character of union officials. All I am saying is that they are human beings like the rest of us, and that if for a long enough period you give to any group of men the power to eliminate virtually every vestige of opposition that might ever arise against them—every threat to the maintenance of their jobs and their positions of authority—then at least some of those men will take advantage of that situation, particularly since this Board has deemed it unwise to assume responsibility for labor union practices, initiation fees, dues, membership requirements, etc.

Now let us attack this question from a little different angle. There is, I know, the possibility of advancing the argument that the restriction of the free voice of the workers is a necessary war measure. But let us think that through. More and more men are being frozen in their jobs by governmental action. Witness Mr McNutt's order, dated April 18. In any case, where essential war work is involved, the necessity of securing a release has had a strong influence in that direction. And, in the case of hundreds of thousands of patriotic and conscientious workers, there is the feeling that they are morally obligated to stick to the job in which they can make their most substantial contribution to the war effort.

Therefore, is it not true, that when men are forced to stay and work where they are; when either decree or conscience prevents them from solving their personal problems by seeking new jobs; that then there is a greater necessity than ever before that those men have a free voice to speak their minds; that the full rights of the minority be preserved for them; that healthy opposition be kept alive; in short, that men having sacrificed a part of their economic liberty, shall not be placed in a position where they are forced to sacrifice all of it?

Hence, although we protest against ordering maintenance of membership or the check-off in any of these six cases, the type of maintenance of membership granted in the Allis-Chalmers case, which requires affirmative action by each worker, is infinitely preferable to the so-called standard maintenance of membership clause embodied in the Norma-Hoffman decision. The former has the great advantage of providing a definitive record as to which union members are actually in good standing when the agreement is signed, which record cannot later be called in question. The Allis-Chalmers provision, however, should be supplemented by granting the right to any member to resign from the union at any time without losing his job, provided he meets his signed financial obligation to the union for the term of the union contract—as was provided by this Board in the Federal Shipbuilding case. Such an arrangement would recognize the financial responsibility of the individual to the union for the life of the agreement of which he was beneficiary and at the same time provide a definite means by which he could express his disapproval of any union policy with which he might find himself in disagreement. I hate to think what abuses might develop in corporate management if stockholders could not register their dissatisfaction by selling a company's stock, or customers theirs, by refusing to buy a company's product.

The right to work freely at a lawful vocation of one's own choosing was regarded as so obvious and undebatable by our forefathers as not even to require specific mention in the Bill of Rights they attched to the Federal Constitution. In the Turgot Edict of 1776 in France—which was well known to them—by which the industries of France were emancipated from the previcus State monopolies, we find this affirmation: "God, in creating man with necessities, has compelled him to resort to labor, and has made the right to labor the first, most imprescriptible right of man." And a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States in an early decision stated, "There is no more sacred right of citizenship than the right to pursue unmolested a lawful employment in a lawful manner." Yet I know of no right that is being so thoroughly circumscribed by statutory enactments, by extra-legal methods employed under the cloak of law, and by executive fiat, than the right to work.

A Presidential commission appointed by Theodore Roosevelt years ago declared:

"The right to remain at work where others have ceased to work, or to engage anew in work which others have abandoned, is part of the personal liberty of a citizen that can never be surrendered, and every infringement thereof merits and should receive the stern denouncement of the law. * * * The assertion of the right seems trite and commonplace, but that land is blessed where the maxims of liberty are commonplace."

The patriotism and self-sacrifice of this Board—public members, employee members, and employer members—cannot be called in question. They deserve the thanks of every citizen. The Board, of course, is not a part of the legislative arm of government. It does not have the constitutional power of Congress to make laws, and yet in actual practice every decision made by this Board has the force of law. A very special and peculiar responsibility, therefore, must be felt, I am sure, by every Member of this body to ponder not only the immediate result of each of its decisions during wartime but the ultimate impact of such decisions on the whole structure of American liberty.

In the background of every action taken by the War Labor Board is necessarily the National Labor Relations Act, which grants wellnigh unlimited authority to labor leadership. Every unfair practice listed in it is unfair only if practiced by employers. Nothing is unfair if done by unions. It is illegal for an employer even to tell his employees the given facts about any union, but it is not illegal for the labor organizer to encourage membership or discourage nonmembership even by intimidation and physical violence. The prohibition of such actions in this Board's standard maintenance-of-membership clause is, therefore, in many instances likely to be hollow mockery so far as the individual worker is concerned. The individual who dares to assert his right to refrain from membership may be interfered with or ostracized. Even his family may at times be made to suffer. For union organizations are not even compelled to come before the National Labor Relations Board with clean hands; consequently, no matter how unscrupulous a union may be, it has full access to all the Federal machinery provided for union elections and complaints. The employer, in turn, is bound by Labor Board elections but the defeated union is not. The courts have held, moreover, that labor unions are exempt even from the antitrust laws of the Nation unless they conspire with nonlabor groups to violate them. The legal right to boycott and ruin an employer was granted one union because the employer allegedly committed a crime in dealing with another union certified by the National Labor Relations Board. The courts apparently have also decided that unions have the legal right to conspire to keep more efficient methods of production from being applied in any given State in which they object to having such methods made effective. Such is the harvest we will always reap when our statutes and administrative rulings violate the fundamental principle of requiring any person or group that wishes to exercise authority to assume commensurate responsibility in the eyes of the law. The late Justice Brandeis hit the nail on the head when he said:

"Industrial liberty, like civil liberty, must rest upon the solid foundation of law. Disregard the law in either, however good your motives, and you have anarchy. The plea of the trade-unions for immunity, be it from injunction or from liability for damages, is as fallacious as the plea for lynchers."

In the face of a labor-relations law which is manifestly biased, I ask, therefore, is it wise for the War Labor Board to help build up still more power for labor leaders when it does not compel them to assume commensurate legal and social responsibility for all their acts?

Majority rule, we should keep in mind, is only one phase of our form of popular self-government. Under our system the rights of the individual and of minorities are sedulously protected by a written constitution which can only be altered by a long and tedious process. Yet I fail to find any deep concern over the growing tendency to disregard individual and minority rights in labor-union activities. There is no system of checks and balances to protect minorities in the National Labor Relations Act paralleling those set up in the Federal Constitution. The case for maintenance of membership or any other form of governmental compulsion relating to labor-union membership would be far stronger if the National Labor Relations law, for example, had given protection to individuals and minorities by providing for a three-fourths vote of all employees concerned in the determination of strikes and other vital questions of common concern. It might well have gone so far as to require the separate consent of long-service employees as against short-service employees on important issues. Certainly the wage earner who has been employed for 5 years or more has more personal responsibilities and more at stake usually than the young man who has been on his job for only 2 or 3 months. Yet under the requirements of the present law 51 percent of newcomers with no long attachment to their jobs can force 49 percent of older men to do their bidding. Does

that reflect the historic American concept of the sacredness of the individual? We have gone to great legal lengths to protect the minority stockholder. Why should not this Board do its utmost to protect the minority job holder, too?

Those of us in industry, moreover, who, like myself, believe in the humanitarian objectives of organized labor, are deeply concerned over what effect the present appeal by union leadership to Government to guarantee its membership, may eventually have on the whole American labor movement. As Mr. William M. Leiserson said before the American Academy of Political and Social Science last November:

"When a labor movement begins to distrust the representative institutions of a democratic country and, as is the case today, looks to the executive departments for the ends it seeks, it is time to take thought. Similar sentiment in some European labor movements had led to disastrous results. In the fact of a critical Congress, and in spite of the urgency of the war program, organized labor has concentrated its forces on the executive branch and has made demands with little restraint. Indeed, organized labor now moves in a vicious circle; as it resorts more and more to political action to achieve its objectives, it tends to divide its members and to disrupt its organization; then it must appeal to the Government to use its coercive powers to force workers into the unions or to prevent members from resigning. * * *

"In its concentrated efforts to win its demands through the War Labor Board, organized labor seems to be unaware that it may be undermining its own processes of collective bargaining. The solid strength of labor organizations is built on the arduous negotiation of collective-bargaining agreements and on the skill with which they are afterwards administered. If the strength of its collective-bargaining machinery is weakened, security imposed by Government may well prove to be a quicksand."

As you well know, in neither England nor Sweden has the labor movement ever resorted to the union shop or to compulsory membership under governmental edict. Its leaders have been wise enough to know that "he who pays the piper calls the tune," and that in the long run governmental subsidies, whether in money or grants of power, are inevitably followed by governmental control. Mr. Matthew Woll of the American Federation of Labor hit a high note in labor statesmanship some time ago when he said: "American labor wants no traffic with European despotism which has destroyed free trade unionism and free private enterprise and has destroyed any voluntary form of collective effort in social, religious, and economic fields." Manufacturers like myself are much opposed to the control of labor by government as they are opposed to government control of business. Hence, I am keenly concerned over the present tendency of labor leadership under guise of the emergency created by war to seek the aid of public authority in attaining ends which can only safely and solidly be won by the slow processes of sound collective negotiation, by the fair administration of all gains achieved, and by the gradual creation of favorable public opinion.

Despite any contrary interpretation that may be given to my remarks today, let me say again that I am in hearty sympathy with the humanitarian objectives of organized labor. I believe in collective negotiation where there is equal responsibility on both sides. Strongly opposed as I am to maintenance of membership and the check-off, the course of future events will prove to me to have been a constructive—not a hostile—critic of present labor policies in pointing out the dangers of compelling union suport by governmental edict. Finally, may I say that whatever the decision of this Board may be, it will have my complete support for I want to be first, last, and always a good American citizen.

Contributions to the War Effort by Americans of Slovak Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

HOW AMERICANS OF SLOVAK DESCENT EXPRESS THEIR APPRECIATION FOR THE FREEDOMS ENJOYED AND HOW THEY CONSTANTLY HELP TO FURTHER THE WAR EFFORT IN THIS, THEIR ADOPTED LAND

In the office of Assistant Secretary of War for Air Robert A. Lovett, on April 15, 1943, in the presence of Hon. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, Senator from Pennsylvania; Hon. JOHN W. MURPHY, Congressman from Scranton, Pa., and a number of departmental officials, Frank and Michael J. Bosak, Jr., presented two certified checks, totaling $31,231.06.

These checks represented the outright gifts made by more than 16,000 readers in 37 of the United States of America, to a fund which originated more than a year ago at the suggestion of one of the readers of Slovenska Obrana, a semiweekly newspaper published in the Slovak language, by Obrana Press, Inc., of Scranton, Pa.

This reader, deeply aware of the blessings, privileges, and opportunities he and his people enjoyed in the land of their adoption, wrote an inspiring appeal to his people, urging them to unite their efforts to purchase a bomber which would be given to the War Department by Americans of Slovak descent.

His suggestion and his offer to contribute a day's pay to such a fund met with immediate acceptance by many readers of the paper, and from this spontaneous beginning, the bomber fund developed into a national effort. Not satisfied merely to give according to their means, many readers of the paper took the responsibility of visiting their friends and acquaintances, Americans of Slovak descent, in their homes, in offices, factories, in mills and mines. Enthusiastically they told the story of the bomber fund and solicited subscriptions.

Everywhere the same sentiments were expressed:

"America has given us more than our ancestors could ever hope to enjoy in the land of their birth. We are proud that America finds so many of our sons and brothers acceptable for her Army and Navy.

"As true American citizens, we try to do everything we can to obey the laws, to live in peace with our fellow citizens, to respect and support our Government and to make this, the land of our adoption, a greater and a better America.

"Unfortunately, our means are not large, but what we have we give gladly. We welcome this opportunity to prove by our united efforts that we, Americans of Slovak descent, are sincerely thankful for what America has done and meant for us."

Little did the writer, Ladislaw Baranovich, of 282 Lincoln Avenue, North Vandergrift, Pa., realize when he penned that letter, that he was sounding a call to arms that would be heeded so promptly and enthusiastically by so many Americans of Slovak descent. Steadily and rapidly they sent in their contributions until the Obrana Bomber Fund reached a total of $28,180.93.

But the bomber fund by no means represents the full extent of the efforts of Americans of Slovak descent. Thoroughly aroused, encouraged with the success they were meeting, and realizing that as a group they might render further assistance to America, other patriotic movements were undertaken.

Following the suggestion of Slovenska Obrana, the publishers of a Diocesan Slovak newspaper in Chicago, Osdane Hlasy, began a bomber fund which resulted in the collection of $3,050.13, the contributions made by more than 1,600 subscribers and friends. A check for this amount was presented to Secretary Lovett with the Obrana check.

In Pittsburgh, on February 25, 1943, the bomber "The American Slovak" was christened, following the actions of Americans of Slovak descent in Allegheny county in subscribing more than $700,000 for the purchase of war bonds and stamps. This was more than double the amount of the quota which they had been assigned to reach, to have a bomber named after their group.

In Cleveland, in a period of 10 days, Americans of Slovak descent, through their churches and societies, subscribed more than $1,150,000 for the purchase of war bonds, last December. In recognition of their efforts, the bomber, "The Greater Cleveland Slovaks" has been christened, and now they are working industriously to exceed their quota of $1,900,000 in the second war bond drive, to have a Liberty cargo ship named after their group.

Americans of Slovak descent in Bridgeport, Conn., have provided the funds for the purchase of one Standard Army ambulance; members of the Slovak Catholic Sokol, as a result of their drive for funds, will present two Standard Army ambulances, in Passaic, N. J., on May 30.

Members of the Ladies Auxiliary of the National Slovak League, in Chicago, contributed $3,000 to the Red Cross drive and $1,000 to the United Service Organizations.

Aside from their contribution of $5,000 to the Red Cross drive, members of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies' Union have raised funds for the purchase of 10 mobile chapel units and equipment for Catholic Army chaplains.

These are all voluntary and independent actions on the part of Americans of Slovak descent, in addition to their individual purchases of War bonds and stamps; activities in the Red Cross, their participation in community and national campaigns to assist the war effort.

Americans of Slovak descent survey with pride the record of what they have been able to accomplish in a little more than a year's time. They are pleased that they have had these opportunities to prove that as loyal and true Americans they appreciate the advantages and the freedom that America has given them.

But, even greater than their pride, is their determination that in all ways and at all times, they will do their utmost to be worthy of the name: American citizens.

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the sixteenth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money.

In this installment of Senator Cockrell's speech we learn of the sustained effort of the sound-money advocates to secure the remonetization of silver and the stabilization of international exchange by international agreement only to meet with insurmountable opposition.

The membership of the monetary commission appointed by President Harrison included some of the most illustrious monetary experts of all time—Senator Jones, of Nevada, who drafted the report of the monetary commission of 1878, a treatise on money that embodied the true philosophy of money and the principles of economic law; E. Benjamin Andrews, president of Brown University, subsequently summarily removed for openly espousing the cause of bimetallism in the Presidential campaign of 1896; Senator Allison, author of the Allison amendment to the Bland silver remonetization bill that originated the Government policy of putting silver on a commodity basis.

It is interesting to note that the German delegation to the monetary convention of that day was headed by a member of the great banking family of Rothschilds.

The sixteenth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

It is therefore useless to make any further efforts for any international agreement to restore silver as a money metal to its old equality and par with gold.

But, Mr. President, we were not satisfied with what was done in 1885, 1886, and 1887; and when the Presidential election was to be held in 1892 the sundry civil appropriation law contained a provision for an international monetary conference and the delegates were appointed by President Harrison to met, I think, in November, 1892. They were Senators Allison of Iowa, and John P. Jones of Nevada, and Representative James B. McCreary, and Messrs. Henry W. Cannon, E. Benjamin Andrews, and Edwin H. Terrell.

Mr. ALLISON. I think the Senator should state in this connection that the President of the United States had already invited the nations in conference before the clause was inserted in the appropriation act to which he refers.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think that was done in pursuance of a former provision for that object.

Mr. ALLISON. The invitation had already been extended to those governments before the item to which the Senator alludes was inserted in the appropriation act.

Mr. COCKRELL. I understand that, but I say it was in pursuance of some existing provision of law. I hold in my hand the report of the International Monetary Conference at Brussels. I will not consume the time of the Senate in reading it, but at page 50 the delegate of Germany gave his views to show that they did not want to make any change, and at pages 69 and 70 Mr. Rothschild said:

"Apart from other considerations, it seems to me impossible to come to an universal arrangement in respect to a general currency question, as no two countries are alike as regards their individual wealth, resources, and expenditure."

Now look at pages 203, 205, and 206, and we will see the position of France:

"France, under present circumstances, has no cause to complain of her monetary situation, and she does not complain.

"She has attempted at various times, and notably in 1881, to come to an agreement with the United States, and it was thus that the way was paved for the conference of 1881, which was only a continuation of that of 1878."

Then on page 205:

"If France and the Latin Union—I believe that for the moment I may speak in its name—should alone open their mints to the free coinage of silver, all the surplus silver of the United States and Mexico would go to France, to Italy, to Belgium. And where would these countries be able to use it? Nowhere, since in the rest of Europe none wish to admit it as legal tender.

"I should never advise such a measure to the Government which I have the honor to represent.

"If, on the contrary, other European powers, such as England, the German Empire, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Scandinavian states, and others, would consent to open their mints to the free coinage of silver, then the aspect of the question would be changed. But have we reached that point?"

And then on page 206:

"Since the first day we have heard upon this point declarations which were perfectly frank and sincere, declarations for which I, on my part, am grateful to their authors, because it is well to know upon what we may rely. We have heard the minister of Germany, and the minister of Austria-Hungary, and then Sir Rivers Wilson declare that neither Germany nor Austria-Hungary nor England had any intention of modifying their monetary systems, with which they declared themselves satisfied. Under these conditions we evidently cannot reestablish free coinage, and I have not the vanity to believe that I should succeed in pursuading the governments of these great countries and their eminent representatives that they are mistaken, that they have taken the wrong road, and that they are in error in remaining attached to monometallism.

"I consider, therefore, until some change takes place, that the question of free coinage is decided so far as we are concerned."

On page 361 of this same report is other evidence to the same effect. I will not quote that, nor ask to have it printed, because it is simply the declaration of Mr. Currie as to what England would do, and of Mr. Wilson, both of them saying that England would under no circumstances agree to it. So it does seem to me that each nation, as each individual, must work out its own destiny. International bimetallism is impossible.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. HAWLEY. Do I understand him to claim that the nations generally are opposed to an international agreement?

Mr. COCKRELL. I have not yet found one solitary nation, in all the international conferences, that was willing to give up its monetary system for any other one that was proposed.

Mr. HAWLEY. Let me call the Senator's attention to the somewhat famous debate in the House of Commons last March, in which several members said substantially that Great Britain alone is in the way of an international agreement. If the Senator will look at the document from which he has just been reading he will find in one of which I may call the minority reports the statement of Mr. Leonard Courtney, as follows:

"I am myself drawn to the conclusion that the home government is the greatest obstacle, perhaps the only substantial obstacle, to the establishment of an international agreement for the use of silver as money, which, without attempting to restore the position of 20 years since, would relieve India from the anxiety of a further depreciation of its revenue in relation to its liabilities.'

"I think it is the understanding of the bimetallists of Great Britain that it is only their government, and perhaps only the existing ministry, that stands in the way."

Mr. COCKRELL. I understand; but you may read quotations from the remarks of this distinguished citizen and all the others and you will find even in the Brussels conference that one of the English delegates differed from the others. But I wish to read what Mr. Edward Atkinson said in regard to those cases:

"There is no considerable politically organized body of influential persons in either country with whom a combination could be made, if such a combination or cooperation were desirable on the part of a similar body in the United States for promoting any definite or practicable measures of legislation to bring about the adoption of the bimetallic theory according to the commonly accepted meaning of that term. The discussion is as yet almost wholly personal, and without concentration of purpose or the presentation of any well-devised measure capable of being acted upon."

That is the point I make. You can find distinguished Englishmen, and Germans, and Frenchmen, and others who are advocating bimetallism; and we all know that as England commenced the movement for a gold standard and established it she has determined to maintain it ever since, and that she will not change under any conditions until her Government is overthrown, until the power that rules there is overthrown. It will take a cabinet, it will take a House of Commons entirely changed from the present complexion of all the political parties there. The time may come, and I hope it will, but it will only come by open and free discussion before the people of England. It will not come by any measures of the aristocratic and plutocratic class that control the administration of the Government.

International bimetallism is a mere dream. Look at it a moment. You had just as well seek an international language. International bimetallism was prevented when the language of the world was confused at the Tower of Babel and the people were scattered, forming independent nations, each nation to take care of itself and work out its own destiny. We have been trying to get an international agreement upon weights and measures ever since our Government was organized and yet we have not obtained it.

Mr. President, it is not necessary, it is not essential. Every government establishes its own system. It has its own constitution; it has its own laws; it has its own distinctive features peculiar to its own people; its own traditions, its own ancestral memories and cherished antiquities. They will adhere to them; they will not give them up easily. England will not give up her pound sterling. The people of the United States will not give up their dollar.

Mr. HAWLEY. By the way, Mr. President, the Senator will allow me to observe that it happens to be the old Spanish coin, and we borrowed it from another country. The Senator says there is no international relation between our Government and others in the matter of currency. We founded our dollar upon the Spanish dollar.

Mr. COCKRELL. We were scarcely anybody; a few citizens of other countries re-

siding upon this soil under the dominion of England. As a matter of course we had nothing of our own, separate and distinct from other people. But we were rebellious. We rebelled. We established our rebellion into revolution and patriotism, and we established our Government, and then we established dollars and cents as the money of account, not pounds, shillings, and pence, not francs, but dollars and cents; and we made the silver dollar which was in circulation amongst us a Spanish coined dollar, because we had no mints, we had no coinage, we had no silver produced in this country to coin if we wanted it, so that we had to take a foreign coin and have it made into our standard dollar. We adopted that, and we have maintained it. Then we were only about three and a half million in population, I believe, but we did not consult the King of England, we did not bow the knee to His Majesty, and ask him what kind of a financial system we should establish. We did not bow to France and ask her to cooperate with us in establishing a financial system for our youthful Republic. We had some confidence in our own individuality and some self-reliance, and some determination to maintain our independence and our nationality and our principles and our policies in the face of the world.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator allow me, for a moment, to call his attention to the fact that we adopted as nearly as we could their system and the ratio which we supposed they maintained between the two metals?

Mr. COCKRELL. That who maintained?

Mr. ALLISON. England and France. We did not adopt the Spanish ratio. We adopted as nearly as we could the ratio which was then supposed to exist in continental Europe and in England.

Mr. COCKRELL. We adopted what was believed to be the weight of the money current in our country, and you will find it on a critical examination made of the Spanish dollar and the number of grains it was supposed to contain, and then we made it to correspond with that.

Mr. ALLISON. That is very true; but when we did that we also adopted a ratio between that and gold which should make both metals, as was supposed, circulate freely in our own country as they were then circulating, but for war, in all Europe.

Mr. COCKRELL. I beg pardon; in 1785 France had established the bimetallic system at the ratio of 15½ to 1. It was in the law. It was not done in 1803. Then, when our Constitution was formed and when we came to the mint question in 1792 we had the record of France before us establishing her standard of 15¼ to 1, and we did not establish it.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will allow me a moment, I will state that the ratio adopted in 1785 in France was not then a practical ratio as to coinage.

Mr. COCKRELL. Why not a practical ratio?

Mr. ALLISON. Because very soon after it was adopted they went to the system of paper money and had neither gold nor silver.

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, they did have gold and silver.

Mr. ALLISON. They did not have it in circulation.

Mr. COCKRELL. I beg pardon; it was the lawful ratio, the legal ratio, I understand.

Mr. ALLISON. I agree with that.

Mr. COCKRELL. And it prescribed it exactly. Now, in our act of 1792 establishing the mint we established a system of 15 to 1. That was not the system of France at that time; it was not the system of England.

Mr. ALLISON. Fifteen and two hundred and eleven one-thousandths, or very near that, was the system.

Mr. COCKRELL. Fifteen and two-tenths was that of England. Ours was not the system of any other nation; and as I understand it was ascertained from the reports that were then made by the officers to whom reference was made, and especially with the Spanish dollars.

Mr. HARRIS. A thousand Spanish milled dollars were taken.

Mr. COCKRELL. A thousand milled dollars were taken and assayed, and from their assay we established our ratio.

But, Mr. President, we must present after a century of existence a wonderful spectacle to foreign nations. Think of it. After we had rejected international bimetallism in 1865–67 and then went on and established our single gold standard, we did not ask other nations to agree with us there. The Senator from Ohio, when he led the gold monometallic hosts of this country, unknown among the masses of the people, unrecognized, and thereby secured the law of February 12, 1873, did not go and consult other countries. He did not even reduce the gold in the gold dollar 3½ cents, as he promised to do in France, in order to make them abandon silver. No, no; but the very moment the friends of silver, the true bimetallists, make an effort to restore silver in this country, then we hear the plea for international conferences and international agreements.

European nations, suspicious and jealous of this great Republic, the greatest and most powerful nation today in all the essential elements of an independent nationality, cannot believe our efforts to secure international bimetallism to be pure and disinterested and unselfish. They know what we have told them heretofore; they think something is concealed; they look with wonder, admiration, and astonishment at our remarkable career as a young nation, our unparalleled development and progress. They beheld us only a few years ago engaged in the most fearful fratricidal war ever waged on earth. They saw us emerge from that war an indissoluble union of indestructible States, with our financial resources apparently exhausted, with an enormous debt—a debt on August 31, 1865, of $2,845,907,626.56, and wondered how we could ever liquidate it. They have watched our progress more closely than we imagine. They have seen us raise the revenues and pay in discharge of that vast debt the enormous sums of $1,701,590,978.80 of the principal, and $2,370,616,966.70 of the interest, aggregating $4,072,207,945.50 up to August 31, 1893, in principal and interest paid on our national debt.

In addition, they have seen us collect from our revenues $6,953,990,881, paid out in defraying the ordinary expenses of our National Government, making a total expenditure of $11,036,198,837 from August 31, 1865, up to August 31, 1893—an amazing result, never before in the history of the world achieved by any other nation.

The nations of the world stand aghast at our hesitation, our refusal, our timidity to establish, independently of them, our own monetary system and policy. They cannot understand why we are time after time beseeching them to meet in international conferences to agree upon the policy we shall pursue. Out of mere deference to us as a Nation they generally accept our invitations and meet with our delegates, and then tell them, and through them tell us and the world, that they each have their own systems and policies and are content and do not desire to change.

Great Britain tells us that her gold monometallism is satisfactory and she does not desire a change. Prussia told us in the conference of 1867 that she was content with her single silver standard adopted in 1857; yet she did not deign to consult us or any other nation when she changed to the single gold standard in 1871 and 1873, nor did Russia, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, Austria-Hungary, or any other European nation.

France in 1867 held out to us the willing hand of a true bimetallic system and we knocked it back in her face by peremptorily refusing to recognize silver and demanding the single gold standard as the American idea, of which great feat of statesmanship the distinguished Senator from Ohio boasted in his report quoted. They met us in friendly conference in 1878, and very politely recalled to us our own exaggerations and statements, and our conduct in the statistical congress of 1863, and the monetary conference of 1867, and reminded our delegates that we had not done what we were urging them to do, that the Bland bill as passed by the House was for the free and unlimited coinage of the standard dollar, and was subsequently changed to a limited coinage measure, and only the minimum coined. They have placed us on the defensive in every convention. They know as well as we do that our representatives deceived and misled them by the unfounded and exaggerated statements of our auriferous and argentiferous productions, made in 1863, and again in 1867, and upon which and under the belief of the truth of which they made the changes in their monetary standards I have shown.

They ever since have viewed, and now view, with suspicion and doubt the real facts we show them from official records, the truth as it is.

Shall we longer plead with them our dependence, our inability to establish and maintain our own national monetary system, such a one as we desire?

Let us take an exact review of the relative conditions existing in the past and at present between silver and gold, in order to determine our line of duty and interest now.

According to the tables published in the report of the Director of the Mint, showing the ratio of silver to gold each year since 1687, we find the ratio in 1687 was 14.94 silver to 1 of gold, or 14.94 to 1; and in 1871 was 15.57 to 1, and that the two greatest divergencies from this ratio were in 1760, when the ratio was 14.14 to 1, and in 1813, when the ratio was 16.25 to 1; but in the next year, 1814, it was 15.04 to 1.

The average ratios during these 185 years, 1687–1872, was about 15.5 to 1, showing a remarkable steadiness in the relative values. The ratio in 1872 was 15.63 to 1; in 1873, 15.92 to 1; in 1874, 16.17 to 1; in 1875, 16.59 to 1; in 1876, 17.88 to 1; in 1888, 21.99 to 1; and in 1889, 22.10 to 1; in 1890, 19.76 to 1; in 1891, 20.92 to 1; 1892, 23.72 to 1; 1893, 28.52 to 1.

These ratios are taken from 1687 to 1832, from tables by Dr. Soetbeer from quotations of such prices at Hamburg; and from 1833 to 1878 from Pixley & Abell's tables of quotations in the London market; and since 1878 from the daily telegrams from London to our Mint Bureau.

London for many years has been the great market for the world in fixing the price of silver as a metal by the gold standard.

We see here a remarkable stability in the ratios from 1687 to and including 1872, at or about the average of 15.5 to 1.

We see a wide divergence in their ratios since 1873. What caused this divergence?

I assert that it was not caused by any excessive production of silver over gold throughout the world.

Post-War Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I include the following article by Joseph S. Kaufman, from the Lynn (Mass.) Telegram:

THE WEEKLY ROUND TABLE

(By Joseph S. Kaufman)

Following the celebrated Beveridge report on social insurance in England, our National Resources Planning Board announced its "cradle to grave" social-security plan in January. Since then little has been heard about it. Although both of these reports offer important reforms, nevertheless, they are not identical. Sir William Beveridge's report is confined solely to the social-insurance system as it exists in Great Britain. The British principle is that social insurance should be paid for jointly by the employer, the employee, and the state—all contributions and benefits paid to be equal regardless of income. Under our Social Security Administration benefits paid are contingent on many factors, and they are not necessarily equal. Neither does our system of social security provide as broad protection as the British. However, the National Resources Planning Board suggestions would extend the benefits to many classes of citizens not now included in our social-security legislation, and it would provide benefits not now available to several under-privileged groups. Nevertheless, Congress has shelved this National Resources Planning Board report, and it now awaits public demand for action. That it is bound to be an important issue in the national election next year, there can be no doubt. It will be interesting to watch the platforms of both major parties when they are announced in their respective conventions next summer.

Mr. NEW DEALER. Not long ago we were reading about the new social security from the cradle to the grave. We had our hopes raised high that a new day is dawning, that we were ging to abolish one of man's greatest evils—poverty, and that everyone was to be guaranteed the right to live a normal life without fear of want. That guarantee was to be provided by our Government in the form of a broad social security for all. For once the forgotten man was to be recognized in his struggle for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The words of our Constitution were to be given concrete meaning. The Congress created by this Constitution and given the power to provide for the national defense was to be called upon to exercise its additional powers, namely, to provide for the general welfare as well. Then there followed complete silence. The whole program of a broader social security was enveloped in a complete and total blackout. Why? What happened to cause the papers and magazines to stop writing about it? And the people rarely speak about it.

Mr. CONSERVATIVE. Let's not talk about castles in the air. Platitudes will not yield potatoes. The hard reality of life today demands winning the war first. Social orders which will provide two chickens in every pot, or even an extra spare tire, are worthless when we still have rationing of the little there is available. What good did it do the Russians to set up their new economic order which was supposed to bring about a Utopia when it could not defend this new order without help from her Allies. Unless there is political unity within nations and collective security between the nations of the world any attempt to set up broad social security systems is just wishful thinking.

Mr. LIBERAL. I like to hear such talk from you conservatives. You are finally awake to the necessity of collective security between nations to safeguard the social order we have. It is a good sign when conservatives are willing to get out of their nationalism shell and see the need for cooperation between the nations of the world. But in looking at the future of the world, protected by a system of collective security against ruthless nations seeking to loot and murder for their own gain, let us not forget that it is important to plan for the future. It is important to plan the future to eliminate the forces of evil in our midst—to provide each and every man, woman, and child with necessities of life; in short, a social security "from-the-cradle-to-the-grave." This planning must be initiated by the Government. As Vice President WALLACE has said on many occasions:

"Government can and must accept the major responsibility for filling in whatever gaps business leaves."

Mr. ISOLATIONIST. You liberals talk like preachers. But, then, I can take it from you. When I hear such stuff as the conservatives dish out—selective security between nations—I wonder whether we are really getting soft. Every time Europe gets too small for the crowd there we get mixed up on one pretext or another. That's bad enough. But at least it's temporary. We help clean the mess up and we are through. But to suggest that we ought to be mixed up permanently, that's too much. I say, let's stick to the good old United States of America. America, first, last, and all the time. Then we will not pick up such complicated ideas as "social security from-the-cradle-to-the-grave" as Sir William Beveridge worked out. Judging from Churchill's speeches, it is even too much for England to swallow. If things are straightened out in this country, so that a working man can get a fair day's pay for a fair day's work, and a job when a man wants one, the rest will take care of itself.

Mr. LIBERAL. The rest will not take care of itself. That's just what the trouble is, and that is why we need planning for a broader social security in an economic democracy. And it is too bad the people stopped talking about it now while the whole problem is still fresh in our minds and while the bitter depression years have not faded altogether from our memories. The truth is, however, that the real reason why the "cradle to grave" social benefits proposed in the recent National Resources Planning Board's report have been shunted aside is because the large insurance companies have raised a howl against them. In a speech in Boston a week ago, Edward H. O'Connor, of Chicago, executive director of the Insurance Economic Society, denounced this report as ill conceived and as a threat to the insurance industry. The insurance companies are worried that if your Government should undertake to protect you against the calamities of an uncertain future, you will stop buying life and accident insurance. And so they will lose money. Mr. O'Connor characterized this plan as a "slow drift to socialism." And to top it off, our own insurance commissioner, Charles F. J. Harrington, connected with one of the largest insurance brokerage houses in Boston, termed the plan as a "catchword and panacea." Well, our public school system when it was first conceived was also attacked as socialistic, but we know better now.

The reason why the insurance companies oppose the National Resources Planning Board report and the proposed benefits is plain to everyone. They will lose some of their profits, which they can well afford to lose. Only this week the financial pages of your newspapers contained advertisements about the money to be made in insurance stocks. One such ad read: "Average annual return from 70 fire and casualty stocks over past 9 years 23.9 percent." I know you are as surprised to hear this as I was—23.9 percent profit on insurance stocks over the past 9 years—depression years, too. Do not blame the insurance companies for not wanting a government plan of insurance—that's what social securtiy really is—to cut into their profits? They take a short-sighted view of conditions generally. Ostrich-like they want to hide from the social problems which must be solved in our generation. Fortunately, however, not all of big business take this attitude. The more enlightened among them agree in principle, at least, to the program of the National Resources Planning Board, which provides as follows:

1. To include the 30,000,000 farmers, farm hands, domestic workers, and others not now eligible for old-age and survivors' insurance.

2. To add to the existing benefits under our Social Security Administration such benefits as hospital payments, maternity and burial insurance.

3 To provide for a long-range public works program, designed to keep the United States at a permanent level of practically full employment and to end the unemployment problem.

4. To increase public assistance grants for dependent children, the unemployed and disabled.

5. To set up a youth program similar to the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration, which would assure every child in the country a chance for health and education.

Ratification of Peace Treaties by Majority Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. NEWSOME

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama:

Senate Joint Resolution 5

Whereas our country is now engaged in the greatest struggle for freedom it has ever known; and

Whereas the Senate of Alabama (the House of Representatives concurring) recognizes that every energy of the people of Alabama and of the Nation should be bent toward the winning of the war and toward the defeat of the Axis Powers; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States occupies and fills a most important place in the affairs not only of this Nation, but of the world; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has the power at the present time to declare war on any nation by a simple majority vote of the Members; and

Whereas the Constitution of the United States, the fundamental law of the land, makes it necessary that Congress approve any peace treaty submitted to the Congress by the President of the United States by a two-thirds majority of the Members; and

Whereas the Senate of Alabama (the house of representatives concurring) believes it to be the best and highest interest of the Nation that Congress have the power to ratify any peace treaty submitted by the President of the United States by a simple majority of its Members, the same majority that can declare war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Alabama (the house of representatives concurring), That we do now call upon our Senators and Representatives in the National Congress from Alabama to seriously consider the advisability of having Congress submit to the several States of this Union a constitutional amendment embodying the provision that Congress shall have the right to ratify any

peace treaty submitted to it by a simple majority vote of the Members rather than by a two-thirds majority as now required by law; be it

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be immediately forwarded jointly by the secretary of the senate and the clerk of the House of Representatives of Alabama to the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Alabama.

Control of the Airways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph S. Kaufman, from the Lynn (Mass.) Telegram of May 12, 1943:

THE WEEKLY ROUND TABLE

(By Joseph S. Kaufman)

The struggle for the control of the airways of the world has stirred up such controversy between Britain and the United States that in both our Congress and in Parliament speeches denouncing the competition for these airways bristle with very sharp language. From a civilian as well as military point of view, because of our experience in this war, air power has become an important problem in international politics. Although the subject is highly technical and the factors involved are beyond the comprehension of the man on the street, nevertheless public interest is aroused because of the consequence which may result from the possible cutthroat competition for these airways between the major powers.

Mr. LIBERAL. It is a pity that long before one war is finished the ground work for the next is already being prepared. Congresswoman CLARE LUCE, of Connecticut, let the cat out of the bag when she revealed in her first speech on the floor of the House of Representatives the open competition which is developing between the United States and Great Britain for the control of the airways of the world. It has often been said that the First World War was fought for the control of world markets; the present world struggle is for the control of the airways of the world. If we fail to work out a fair and equitable basis of use of the world airways and airfields, we may be called up to fight another war, perhaps in a couple of decades.

Mr. NEW DEALER. It is unfortunate that Representative LUCE failed to sense the Republican plot to embarrass the administration by raising this controversy. The fact is that Republican National Committeeman Sam Pryor, who is also vice president of Pan American Airways, stirred up this question, because the British applied for a license to fly from Rio de Janeiro to Miami in direct opposition to Pan American's control over the area. The British, having been refused any rights except for emergency landing at important air bases, such as the airfield at Dakar, controlled by Pan American, established themselves in the Canton, Phoenix, Hull, and Sidney Islands in the Pacific much to the chagrin and disappointment of Pan America. Having created this distasteful situation, this Republican national committeeman procured Representative LUCE to pull Pan American's air chestnuts out of the fire. And there you have it. The ill feeling which has been let loose between American and British air transportation companies threatens to involve their Governments in a dispute which could be settled in conference.

Mr. CONSERVATIVE. We are now in the air age, not the iron age. It is important to change our thinking accordingly. An aircraft manufacturer recently advertised that "no spot on earth is more than 60 hours from your local airport." We must either dominate or be dominated in the air, and now is the time to make up our minds about it. After the war every citizen will demand the right to air transportatior for himself and his wares as cheaply as possible. If we are to have the right to fly everywhere, we must have landing fields everywhere. Are we to go into a mental blackout on this problem while competitors acquire toeholds on every island in the Pacific, in South America, or in Africa? Let us remember that we are giving away billions of lease-lend material; the least we can expect are certain vital air bases in return. Representative LUCE is right when she says: "Our far-sighted British cousins have already clearly seen the vision of the air world of tomorrow. They have seen that the masters of the air will be the masters of the planet, for as aviation dominates all military effort today, so will it dominate and influence all peacetime effort tomorrow."

Mr. ISOLATIONIST. If we build the most powerful air fleet in the world, there will be no need of sending our armies and navies to the far corners of the world to preserve our rights. If it is true as the interventionists claim that we can no longer find security within our boundaries, what better protection do we want than an air fleet second to none?

Mr. LIBERAL. This new type of imperialism—sky imperialism—which you are both advocating will not help to establish the peace our boys are fighting for. World trade based upon a fair division of the available raw materials is one of the principles of the Atlantic Charter. Without it peace cannot long endure. This world trade will depend as much upon the airways as on the sea lanes. All nations should have access to them under reasonable safeguards. But if we persist in our present attitude of grabbing every vital airport on the face of the globe ahead of England, then she is justified in accusing us of entering into a cutthroat competition. England concentrated on fighting planes during the battle for Britain.

The battle for Britain, won principally by Royal Air Force fighter planes, was a victory for continental America as well. Are we now to take advantage of England because during all that time we were able to build huge transports and bombers capable of being transformed into transports after the war? That's not the fair play we Americans are noted for. And let us remember also that the war is not over yet. If England is to switch from the manufacture of light fighter planes to heavy transport planes it may result in an unbalanced air fleet with disastrous result.

The wise suggestion of Baron Davies gives us the assurance of England's willingness to cooperate. He says:

"By mutual agreement we can constitute an international authority at the conclusion of the war. We can insist upon freedom of air, subject to such laws and regulations as may be agreed upon by the members of the authority."

This war, if it taught us anything, it is the necessity for international cooperation. If at the end of this terrible struggle we launch upon a race for military air bases and planes in the manner the world powers launched the armament race at the end of the First World War, then we have learned nothing from the curse of war.

Civil Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include an article entitled "Civil Service Wonderland" written by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] and published in the May 15 issue of Collier's magazine.

This article by the majority whip and the chairman of the House Committee on Civil Service follows:

CIVIL SERVICE WONDERLAND

(By ROBERT RAMSPECK, Member of Congress from Georgia, chairman of the House Civil Service Committee)

WHILE THE SQUEEZE IN MANPOWER GROWS STEADILY MORE ACUTE, MANY GOVERNMENT WORKERS HAVE NOTHING TO DO—AND THE CIVIL SERVANTS THEMSELVES LIKE IT LEAST OF ALL

As chairman of the House Civil Service Committee, it is my job to look into this "chaos of bureaucratic Washington" you've been hearing about—to accumulate evidence about it and to suggest ways to make our Government more efficient.

I hadn't gone far with the accumulation-of-evidence part of the job before some fantastic situations began coming to light. For example:

An official in an important agency in Washington recently reorganized his office, cutting his personnel from 23 to 6, and his annual budget from $800,000 to $200,000. He simultaneously increased the efficiency of his staff. He was told by one of his superiors, however, that if he shaved off any more employees, it would indicate that his work wasn't very important and he would have his own salary cut.

One skilled punch-card-machine operator says her entire group of experienced workers was suddenly set down at desks several weeks ago.

"We are still sitting there," she says, "while they train new girls to operate the machines."

The War Production Board decided awhile ago to fire 100 relatively low-grade employees. They had been recruited in a hurry for a special job, and had finished it. The Committee on Fair Employment Practices challenged the dismissals. So did an employees' union. The last time I checked, the idle hundred were still on the Federal pay roll at $1,260 and $1,440 a year.

If these cases were exceptional, there would be no cause for alarm, but there are hundreds of similar cases involving thousands of workers.

Our Government is probably the biggest single employer in the world. Its paid workers, exclusive of those in uniform, totaled 2,327,932 as of last July, or nearly three times the 917,760 employed at the wartime peak in 1918.

The great bulk of men and women who run our Government work hard, conscientiously, and ably. Of course, no such gigantic pyramid of bureaus could possibly be thrown together in such extreme haste without some friction, some inefficiency, some waste, and a certain inescapable percentage of deadheads. But excuses don't win wars, and there is mounting evidence that governmental chaos,

particularly in Washington, has reached the point where action is called for.

Big agencies which have outlived their usefulness should certainly be eliminated, but every agency should be obliged to pull itself into the tightest, most cohesive organization possible. There should not be one single person drawing taxpayers' money who isn't essential to the war and the Government. If the agencies won't voluntarily strip themselves of deadwood—and we have little reason to hope they will—then Congress will have to do the job. Our investigation is planned to furnish the basic information necessary to such streamlining, regardless of who does it.

My committee's files hold an abundance of charges of waste and unnecessary employees and inefficiency. The charges are contained in letters from outraged citizens and from Federal employees themselves, who are patriotically unhappy over their plight. Some of these charges I have verified, others I have not, but all have a ring of authenticity.

Many employees say they don't earn their salaries. "Once or twice a month," one young girl in the War Department wrote, "we are told to look busy because the general is making an inspection." Dozens of notes tell of manufactured work, of deliberate delays so that work will be piled up when officials come through. These are from people in the War and Navy Departments and the War Production Board, where speed and efficiency are essential.

Here is a typical letter:

"Foolishly, I was talked into going to the War Production Board. In the 1 month I was there, I took no more than five memos from the Chief of the Bureau and 2 days' dictation from his assistant. The rest of my time was spent sitting, sitting, and sitting, and reading and writing personal letters, talking to other idle employees, and sneaking out for a cigarette. I went nuts. I begged for work, but 'the boss' was never there, it seemed. He may have been doing something quite constructive for the war effort, for all I know. I never saw him. But the fact remains that I was just 1 of more than 100 employees in that office, some of them being paid $6,000 and $8,000 a year, all sitting idle as I was. Actually, I didn't earn $5 of my salary. Yet on the walls were slogans, 'Every Minute Counts,' 'Give It Your Best,' and so on."

A group of 100 employees in one unit of the War Department protested they had no work from March to October 24. Another unit figured up that its average salary was $4,000 a year, then confessed, "We are overpaid and underworked."

Overlapping of effort sometimes reaches hilarious proportions. Eight different agencies, for example, are collecting figures on labor requirements and supply. The Employment Service of the War Manpower Commission has a full force of labor economists, analysts, and other experts finding out how much labor will be needed and how much is available. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has a similar force doing exactly the same thing. The Office of Civilian Defense also has something to do with labor estimates, and the War Department has a War Manpower Division which is an exact organic duplicate of the original War Manpower Commission. Each of these can, of course, explain why its particular function is distinct and why it must be kept separate from all the others. But the layman can't help wondering.

Fourteen different agencies are working on post-war planning, and it is sometimes hard to see just where one ends and another begins.

EFFICEINCY STRICTLY PROHIBITED

I have a better idea of what we mean by poor fish since learning that the affairs of American fish are settled by more than 23 different Federal agencies. The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Interior Department is merely one. Our fishing industry is watched over by everybody from the Office of Price Administration to the Coast Guard. And the Indian Service had a record of 12,500 employees to take care of 364,000 Indians—29 Indians per employee.

I recall also the case of the man who was declared ineligible to take a particular civil-service examination because he lacked the necessary qualifications, but was later asked to help correct the examination papers on the grounds that he was an expert in the subject.

One letter tells me of an agency in which the night shift arrives at 4 in the afternoon, but the day shift doesn't quit until 4:30, resulting in chaos when the shifts change. Several have told me they work in units whose principal function is to review the work of reviewers.

Another letter told of a section which had gone through a reorganization every 7 months since it was set up 3 years ago. Morale now is so bad that the men lock the doors of their offices when they can and swing into lusty crap games on their mahogany desks. A girl supervisor told me of a rush job in which hundreds of copies were made of a form letter. The letter then went to a Federal lawyer for review, one sentence was changed, and the whole job was done over again.

Several letters I've received elaborate on the fine old Federal habit of making numerous copies of everything. Carbon copies are done on papers of various colors. "Three whites, two greens, and a yellow" is the motto of one division in the Office of Price Administration. Theoretically, the different colors go to different files, but one secretary confessed she makes the eight required copies, staples them together, and throws them in the wastebasket. So far, nobody has missed them.

From all of this, it would appear that the Government is not making the best possible use of its manpower at a time when manpower is one of our great war problems.

Several reasonable explanations have been put out. This is a complicated war, and our economic system is more intricate than those of the dictators. Further, we have fewer men in uniform doing civilian tasks than we had before.

Administration is sure to be weak unless we strain to make it strong. We haven't done any such straining. The Federal Government should develop methods and means of training supervisory people, instead of relying on chance, politics, friendship, or seniority to choose its executives. Several plans have been proposed but none have been adopted. I hope my committee will turn up enough information to permit Congress to take effective steps.

Actually the civil service has needed overhauling for a long time. For example, Government supervisors are, in many cases, paid according to the number of employees they have under them. The head of a stenographic pool with only 10 employees will inevitably be considered to have less important duties than the supervisor of another pool which has 200 stenographers.

The Civil Service Commission has been trying, within the limits of the law, to correct the situation but it's still bad, and the strain of war has made the flaws more glaring.

In one case, the chief of a filing room organized her system so well that she was able to run it with 12 employees. Her boss then requested a raise. The Civil Service Commission experts decided that she would not rate the raise until she had 55 employees. It took her a little over a month to make her filing sufficiently inefficient to require the extra 43 employees and get her raise.

That seems to be the basic structure of our Federal personnel system, and it should be drastically redesigned for the sake of the country and the young men who are fighting for it.

B'nai B'rith Way Is the American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. SCANLON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding Jewish organization in the world is the B'nai B'rith. My colleague, Congressman SAMUEL A. WEISS, of Pennsylvania, is a prominent member of this organization; he is vice chairman of its national war service committee; and he is a member of the supreme advisory council of the A. Z. A., which is a branch of the B'nai B'rith. I am happy to include in my remarks a revealing record of B'nai B'rith's war service efforts to date:

[From the B'nai B'rith News of May 1943]

STATISTICAL RECORD OF B'NAI B'RITH'S WAR SERVICE EFFORTS IS BROUGHT UP TO DATE

The concrete results of B'nai B'rith's war service efforts to date are summarized in the following statistical résumé. These figures were contained in the report submitted to the meeting of the National War Service Committee by Robert Lurie, director of B'nai B'rith war service activities, and were compiled by the editor of the B'nai B'rith News:

Sixteen thousand members of B'nai B'rith, Aleph Zadik Aleph and the Hillel Foundations are in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and merchant marine.

Twenty-nine thousand B'nai B'rith men and women, and Aleph Zadik Aleph gave blood to the Red Cross.

Forty-eight thousand members of B'nai B'rith men and women, and Aleph Zadik-Aleph are actively engaged in civilian defense volunteer services.

One thousand three hundred and sixty-nine members of B'nai B'rith, in 35 States, are serving in the Home Guard, State Militia, or Home Defense Corps.

Fifty-two million two hundred thousand dollars in war bonds sold by B'nai B'rith lodges, auxiliaries, and Aleph Zadik Aleph chapters.

Four hundred and fifty thousand dollars of B'nai B'rith and Aleph Zadik Aleph funds invested in War bonds.

One hundred and seventy-nine permanent War bond booths manned and sponsored by B'nai B'rith lodges and auxiliaries.

One million servicemen entertained at parties, dances, shows, picnics, holiday services, and other forms of hospitality sponsored by B'nai B'rith and Aleph Zadik Aleph groups and Hillel Foundations throughout the country.

Three hundred and thirty-six recreation facilities, including company, squadron, and battalion rooms, lounges, game and card rooms, libraries, canteens, induction centers, chapel reading rooms and hospital solaria have been equipped at military and naval installations throughout the country.

Sixteen naval vessels are being serviced or about to be serviced through the national serve-a-ship program.

One hundred and ten thousand service and comfort kits and holiday gift packages for men in uniform provided by B'nai B'rith lodges and auxiliaries.

Ten million pounds of scrap metal and rubber collected by B'nai B'rith and Aleph Zadik Aleph salvage units.

Seventeen thousand one hundred and twenty-six B'nai B'rith women and B'nai B'rith girls serving in 251 B'nai B'rith-sponsored Red Cross sewing, knitting, and bandage-rolling production units.

Two million three hundred thousand surgical dressings and 185,000 sewn and knitted garments turned out by Red Cross production units of B'nai B'rith women.

Six hundred and fifty thousand dollars contributed to the Red Cross and other war relief agencies by the B'nai B'rith war service fund and the individual lodges, auxiliaries, and Aleph Zadik Aleph chapters since September 1939.

Thirty-four pieces of mobile equipment presented to the Red Cross by B'nai B'rith units, including canteens, station wagons, ambulances, and blood-donor wagons.

Seventy-two members of B'nai B'rith Aleph Zadik Aleph and Hillel have been killed in action or in the line of duty, or are missing in action, while nine are prisoners of war.

Forty-two members of B'nai B'rith Aleph Zadik Aleph and Hillel decorated or cited for bravery.

Two B'nai B'rith youth houses for community war service opened by Aleph Zadik Aleph in Cleveland and The Bronx, with funds from national war service fund.

Sixty thousand dollars spent for national war service projects from war service fund contributed by membership.

Two thousand five hundred copies of B'nai B'rith's National Jewish Monthly distributed monthly to servicemen's libraries, United Service Organizations clubhouses and company day rooms, in addition to 10,000 sent every month to B'nai B'rith members in the armed forces.

Eighty thousand youth and adults given wartime job information by B'nai B'rith group vocational counselors.

One hundred forty thousand copies of B'nai B'rith's wartime job journal. The Career News, distributed.

Eleven B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation directors became Army and Navy chaplains.

Six thousand two hundred and forty-three dollars contributed from B'nai B'rith's war service fund to Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital to provide expanded facilities for war workers in Hot Springs area.

Thirty servicemen's recreation rooms furnished for Canadian troops by Canadian B'nai B'rith, in addition to soldiers' educational building at Camp Borden and servicemen's hostel in Toronto.

One hundred thousand United Nations troops entertained by traveling theatrical units sponsored by Canadian B'nai B'rith

One hundred and twenty thousand gift boxes and holiday packages for servicemen contributed by Canadian B'nai B'rith men's and women's units.

Nine thousand six hundred and eighty B'nai B'rith women and B'nai B'rith girls serving as hostesses, chaperons, dancing partners at servicemen's canteens, lounges, and clubs.

Seven hundred and twenty-five thousand books and games contributed to the armed forces by Aleph Zadik Aleph and B'nai B'rith groups.

One hundred and sixty Torah Scrolls obtained for use in Jewish religious services at Army chapels, where 69 have already been dedicated, the rest awaiting calls.

Two million packs of cigarettes contributed by B'nai B'rith groups to the men in the service.

Polish Constitution Day Resolutions at Buffalo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH MRUK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. MRUK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include these resolutions adopted at a mass meeting held in Humboldt Park, Buffalo, N. Y., Sunday, May 2, 1943, under the auspices of the United Polish Societies of Buffalo and in celebration of the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791:

Whereas we solemnly observe today the one hundred and fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the world-famous constitution of May 3 by the Polish Diet in Warsaw in 1791; and

Whereas in common with our allies, we treasure to this day the meaning of freedom as defined in the opening paragraph of the constitution of May 3, "valuing more than life and personal happiness, the political existence, external independence, and internal freedom of the nation." This is aptly restated by our President Roosevelt in the "four freedoms" and confirmed by him later in the eight points of the Atlantic Charter and the unconditional surrender conference at Casablanca; and

Whereas Poland, the oldest member of the active cobelligerent powers—since Poland was the first to resist Nazi aggression—now occupies the fifth place numerically on the basis of her fighting strength in the United Nations camp; and

Whereas public opinion is being dangerously swayed today by alarming threats and misleading information about the eastern frontier of Poland, only recently reconsecrated by the blood of her heroic defenders; and

Whereas a strong and an independent Poland constitutes the best bulwark of security and peace for Europe against any German aggression in future years; and

Whereas in spite of concentration camps and mass executions, underground Poland courageously carries on Spartanlike resistance by waging guerilla warfare, and large-scale sabotage in reply to all barbaric tyranny, thus maintaining unbroken integrity in her loyal service to the cause of freedom for all oppressed nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this assembly of thousands of American citizens of Polish descent, That we pledge to the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, our Commander in Chief, undivided and loyal support in the prosecution of the war—as evidenced in our city by the overwhelming success in the recent sale of Victory bonds on Polish Day; and be it further

Resolved, That we renew our faith in freedom as worthy heirs of the spirit of the Constitution of May 3 by seeking the attainment of the noble objectives set forth in the Atlantic Charter; and be it further

Resolved, That in keeping with the recent declaration of policy on April 28, 1943, by the Polish Government we appeal to the President of the United States to give General Sikorski, Prime Minister of Poland, representing the true democratic spirit of the "four freedoms," all aid, help, and assistance necessary to secure to Poland the safeguard of her rights and her privileges as a free, independent, and self-governing nation and the integrity of her territory; and be it further

Resolved, That whereas no traitor has been found by the invader among the Polish nation, to make a deal or collaborate with the enemy thus proving that the Polish Government in London, headed by General Sikorski is not only the legal one but representing de jure and de facto the entire Polish nation—we do solemnly protest against any foreign attempt to diminish, discredit or question the exclusive authority of the said government to govern and represent the Polish nation as a whole, we further protest against any attempt by a foreign power to question the composition or influence any act of the said government by threat of using force or by the threat of forming or sponsoring a puppet government composed of irresponsible elements on a foreign territory; and be it further

Resolved, That our sympathies are with the legitimate endeavor of Polish citizens regardless of their creed—exiles in Soviet Russia—to leave the said country as free Polish citizens or to have relief sent from this country with the collaboration of the United States Government—administered and distributed through the offices of the Polish representation in Soviet Russia, and be it further

Resolved, That we pay tribute to Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski under whose leadership Poles in their occupied homeland and elsewhere are fighting for the cause of freedom. We extend our praise to the Polish Army and Navy, to the thousands of pilots and ground crews in the Polish Air Force, to the Polish exiles in Russia, fighting bravely for the preservation of their nationality and religion and to all those who fight and suffer for Poland.

We pray to God for our dear sons and brothers in the United States Armed Forces for their final victory and their safe return home. We also pray for the homeless women and children in occupied countries, for the underground workers risking daily their lives and for all those who fight for justice and freedom; and be it

Resolved, That these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Polish Republic, to the United States Secretary of State, to Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, and to the Members of the Congress of the United States of America.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. ALEXANDER PITASS,
Dr. FRANCIS E. FRONCZAK,
MARTA MAZUROWSKA, *Secretary,*
Committee on Resolutions.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram

just received from the President of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union in Massachusetts:

BOSTON, MASS., *May 11, 1942.*

Hon. RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH,

House of Representatives:

On behalf of thousands of shoe workers affiliated with American Federation of Labor, we urge Congress to oppose renewal of any reciprocal trade treaties which may reduce rates on competitive products of foreign countries entering into competition with products of American workers in American markets at total landed costs below our costs of production. This measure of vital importance to many shoe workers employed and living in your district as they are interested in retaining their job opportunities and are opposed to any attempts to force them to accept wages and working conditions comparable to those which exist in the foreign countries.

JOHN J. MARA,
President, Boot and Shoe Workers Union.

The Way of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER A. RAMEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial written by that distinguished journalist and public spirited citizen, Grove Patterson, editor of the Toledo Blade, on May 10, 1943. It is needless to say that I concur with the sentiments of this editorial and I do not believe that anything pertaining to the welfare of our Government should be kept secret from the people's greatest public benefactor, the American press.

THE WAY OF THE WORLD

(By Grove Patterson)

My Government, your Government, our Government, has bowed to the Axis. You may have read a few days ago in the public prints concerning the coming food conference in Hot Springs, Va., as follows:

"The management of the resort already has been notified by the State Department that no reporters are to be permitted in the hotel, under any circumstances, when the conference meets on May 18, except when they are herded in for the perefunctory opening and closing sessions.

"Arrangements are being made to establish news headquarters in a small dance casino on the grounds, where the reporters will be allowed to trip the light fantastic mentally concerning the plans that are being made to control the production and distribution of food after the war.

"As a special concession to the public, the chairmen of the various committees established by the conference will be brought down to the casino from time to time to give the newsmen an official report of the proceedings.

"Armed guards, however, will prevent the reporters from finding out anything for themselves in the hotel or on the grounds. There is no town in Hot Springs and no restaurant outside the hotel."

Save the war itself, there is no issue now confronting the American people so profound and significant as this decision on the part of the administration to keep the people, as far as possible, uninformed about the present food situation in the world and the food situation which can be expected after the war.

To have armed guards to keep reporters out of the hotel where these momentous sessions are to be held is a vicious and despicable departure from the established policy of freedom of expression laid down by the Constitution of the United States.

Of course, the newspapers will manage to get the news. Be sure of that. But that our Government should, in complete pattern of Germany and Italy, seek to prevent the public from knowing exactly what is going on, is a studied and basic insult. It is the adoption of the Goebbels technique which few of us ever expected to see copied in the United States, even by President Roosevelt.

In my opinion, this is the final straw. This is going too far and the people will not stand for it.

The National Interest in Freight Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 12), 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject The National Interest in Freight Rates delivered by C. E. Childe, member of the Transportation Board of Investigation and Research, on May 6, 1943, before a meeting of the Southern Policy Association.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public concern about transportation seems to rise and fall, as needs for transportation service or burdens of rates and charges seem relatively acute or remote. But that concern has been with us continuously from the beginning of our national life, because transportation service and transportation costs enter into the production and marketing of everything we make and use. We are an industrious people with vast natural resources scattered all over a whole continent, and we require more transportation per capita than any other country to convert these articles to our use. The industrial activity which provides our living tends to establish itself and thrive where transportation conditions are favorable, and languishes where conditions are unfavorable for profitable operation.

There can be no question that the kind of transportation service we have and what we pay for it have an important influence on the kind of country we live in, where we live, what work we do, and what rewards we get, in terms of food, shelter, health, comfort, recreation, education, and all the material advantages we want for ourselves, our families, and our communities.

Freight rates and rate relationships are at the heart of our transportation problems because, only by maintaining rates which yield the carriers adequate profits, can adequate transportation service be maintained in a private enterprise system, and only by maintaining rates that will encourage the development of our resources in all parts of the country can we achieve that national prosperity and well-being to which we all aspire.

You have heard of some of the peculiarities and inequalities in our freight-rate structure, how the country is divided into separate rate-making regions, or territories, how rates are divided into class rates and commodity rates, how the class rate levels of the South and West are higher than those in eastern, or official, territory, how the commodity rates in and between each of the territories vary widely, without any consistent relationship of rate levels in one territory to those of another. You may wonder why our freight-rate structure has become such a complicated maze of technicalities and discriminations as to baffle the understanding of the layman, and, I am afraid, also of the so-called expert.

It is my opinion, after studying the freight-rate structure most of my working life, that these complications are in large part as unnecessary as they are illogical and incomprehensible; that the discriminations of present freight-rate structure are harmful to the development of the whole country, including the carriers as well as the rest of us.

How our freight-rate structure became what it is today is an interesting story which I can touch upon only briefly at this time. The carriers, particularly the railroads, have established their rates with little knowledge or concern about the cost of rendering particular services. Rather, they have followed the practice of charging whatever rates they thought the traffic would bear, considering the commercial conditions and the competition encountered from other carriers, and hoping to come out with some profit on their entire transactions at the end of the year. Competitive relationships have been shaped by the regional and more or less haphazard development of our transportation agencies and facilities, and complicated by the fact that some of these facilities have been provided by the public, as public property for public use, and these compete with other agencies built at private expense for private profit.

When the discriminations and inequalities which resulted from unrestricted competitive methods of rate making became intolerable to the public, Congress attempted to regulate the railroads through the Interstate Commerce Commission, under general directions that all rates should be published and open to all shippers, and that they shall be just, reasonable, and free from unjust discriminations. It was left to the Commission and the courts to determine what would be just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory, but the purpose of the act was declared to be equality of opportunity for all. As construed over the years, however, the rates initiated by the railroads on the basis of what the traffic would bear were presumed to be just and reasonable, unless they were proved to be unlawful. The test of reasonableness or unreasonableness of rates came to be chiefly comparisons with other rates; discriminations were held to be lawful if they were founded on differences in competitive conditions, or beyond the control of the particular carrier hauling the traffic. Under the operation of these rules, relief from rate inequalities became a highly technical, difficult, expensive, slow, and uncertain process. Under our system of regulation, many inequalities, it is true, have been modified or corrected; but many others have been allowed to continue, and regulation even requires carriers to maintain some inequalities they would like to remove.

The doctrine of equality of opportunity—equal rates for equal services—has thus been largely defeated by the doctrine of charging what the traffic is supposed to be able to bear—that is, letting competition fix the rates. We cannot expect regulation to follow indefinitely these conflicting policies. We must decide either to adopt the principle of equal opportunity to all as our national transportation policy, and establish definite rules and machinery for making that policy

effective, or we must accept rate inequalities conforming to individual needs and competitive stresses as inevitable.

I personally am an advocate of the policy of equality of opportunity. I think rates should as nearly as possible reflect equal charges to all shippers for equal services in relation to the cost of the service rendered by the carrier. I believe that has been the purpose of Congress in all of the transportation legislation enacted, from the original Interstate Commerce Act of 1887 to the present time. But I do not think that purpose has been accomplished, or that it can be accomplished until we have a better general understanding of the facts and until we adopt additional legislation to achieve our desired objective.

When I speak of the need for a clearer understanding of the facts, I don't have in mind so much the technical understanding which is the stock in trade of the specialist—although there is great need of more complete and accurate technical information—but a common-sense general understanding which the layman, the businessman, the Government official, and the legislator should have in order to deal with the problem effectively.

The controversy over interterritorial freight rates of the South and the West versus the East is a typical example of how good and earnest people can violently disagree because they don't have a full understanding of the facts. It is generally known that the class rates of the South and the West are much higher than the class rates of the East. It is admitted that these differences are much higher than any differences in the cost of transporting the freight would justify. But that is about as far as understanding and agreement go. Floods of statistics and arguments are issued in support of conflicting views; whether much or little traffic is affected by these rates; whether the differences cause much or little advantage or disadvantage; whether the disadvantages of high class rates are offset by advantages of low commodity rates; whether reductions in the one kind of rates will force increases in the other kind of rates; whether, and how much, the costs of transportation are higher or lower in one section than in another; and so on without end.

The motives of the conflicting interests are easily understood. The railroads oppose reductions in rates because they fear it will reduce their revenues; shippers and communities, State officials and organizations advocate reductions which they think will promote the interests they represent, and they oppose reductions they think would cause the loss of advantages they now enjoy. The difficulty on the part of those who wish to determine and protect their best interests—above all, those who have in mind the whole interest of the public—is that there is too much speculation and not enough real knowledge about the underlying facts. Nobody yet knows accurately what the transportation costs are, in the separate territories, on the separate railroads, or on the separate commodities. Nobody knows accurately how the differing rate levels compare with the cost of rendering the service. The flow of the traffic, from source to market, has not been determined. It is not known with any accuracy what rates are paid from the source of the raw material to the destination of the finished product. Consequently, no one can say with certainty what rates would fairly compensate the carriers, what effect the existing rates have upon commerce and industry of each region, or what rates would be fair for the multitude of individual commodities, shippers, and communities involved.

But, in all the welter of argument and uncertainty, a few facts stand forth clearly. The shipper in the South or in the West, who has not been provided with a special commodity rate, must stand the burden of the higher class rates which are charged in the South and the West; thus placing him at a disadvantage against competitors in the East, where the class rates are much lower, also at a disadvantage with competitors in the South and West who may enjoy lower special commodity rates. Such special commodity rates are generally established only after the traffic has developed. High-class rates tend to penalize the small shipper trying to establish a new industry and the small locality, which has not built up a large amount of competitive traffic. Such discriminations in rates discourage the spreading and diversification of industries whose products are subject to the payment of high class rates. These handicaps should be removed if the policy of equality of opportunity is to be followed.

So long as the rates on manufactured products of old-established industrial areas are given advantages over the rates of newly established areas, diffusion of population and industry will be retarded, the densly populated industrial centers will become still more congested, and the areas in need of more population and more industry will be retarded.

The South and West are relatively poor in industry and wealth, although they are rich in natural resources. Inequalities in freight rates are one of the handicaps which are holding them back. This is detrimental not only to the South and West, but to the whole Nation. We are one country. One part cannot be injured without harming the whole. Conversely, a greater development of our resources, a greater diffusion of industry, and higher standards of living in the retarded sections will increase the prosperity of the whole country.

Since 1900, and especially since the end of the First World War, there has been a marked drift of our population from the country to the city, from the interior sections to the larger cities of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and Great Lakes areas. This has caused tremendous concentrations of population in a few spots, mostly located on navigable water where freight rates are low by both rail and water, and a lag or positive decline in growth elsewhere. The reason for this is, of course, jobs. Jobs are found where industry grows; industry grows where conditions, including freight rates, are favorable. It is not a mere coincidence that the gains are largely in the areas where freight rates on manufactured products are low and that the losses are where such freight rates are high. The number one economic problem of the country is not merely the South; it is all the backward parts of our country which need a fair chance to grow and prosper.

There has been too much speculation and argument and not enough accurate knowledge of the economic effect of freight rates. Relatively high freight rates can never be helpful to commerce and industry. The revenues of the carriers must be adequate, but if high rates retard the movement of traffic, even the revenues of the carriers are hurt.

It has been contended that the figures of the last census show a phenomenal growth of population in the South and Far West, and relative losses in the North and East; therefore, it is said that the South and West cannot have been held back by freight-rate handicaps. Analysis by the Board of Investigation and Research of the population movement in the 10-year period, by States and counties shows, however, that, after allowing for births and deaths in each area, the shift of population has continued from the interior to the coastal areas, and that, on the whole, the South and West lost population, while the East and Pacific coast gained.

The statement is also made that newly established war industries of the South and West are improving their relationships. The facts do not bear this out. There has been, of course, an enlargement of war industries, and it is gratifying that some of these industries have been established in new areas. A recent study by the Bureau of the Census of the migration of civilian population, by States, April 1, 1940, to May 1, 1942, gives us a good index of the changes which have been brought about by war industries. This study shows that the States which have gained are along the Atlantic coast, Great Lakes, Gulf of Mexico, and Pacific coast. With minor exceptions, all of the interior states have lost population in this 2-year period. All of the Great Lakes States have gained; New York, Pennsylvania, and four of the New England States have lost, but Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia, along the north Atlantic coast, have gained. Official territory, as a whole, has gained. Southern territory, as a whole, has lost, although gains have been recorded in the Gulf States of Florida, Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas, and Tennessee and South Carolina have slightly more than held their own. In the West, California has gained more than any other State; Washington has gained slightly, as have Nevada and Utah. All the other States west of the Mississippi River have lost. Obviously, the war has brought no significant change in the former trends of industry and population. The East and Pacific coast are forging ahead in population and industry, and the South and the West, as a whole, are slipping farther behind.

The question also arises, What will happen to all these newly built factories after the war? Which are more likely to survive; those in the highly developed industrial areas, or those where industry did not exist before the war. It would seem to go without saying that any industries which have to struggle against adverse freight rates will have less chance of survival than those located where freight rates are favorable. The time is ripe, therefore, for Congress to declare whether the Nation shall follow the policy of equality of opportunity in freight rates or continue the policy of favoritism for competitive traffic.

The Board of Investigation and Research has recently transmitted to the President and Congress its summary report on interterritorial freight rates, in which a definite plan is recommended for bringing about such uniformity in class-rate levels throughout the country as may be justified. The report recommends that Congress amend the Interstate Commerce Act declaring that a uniform classification of freight and a uniform scale of class rates is desirable for application throughout the United States, except where departures may clearly be shown to be required. It is recommended that the Interstate Commerce Commission be given the task of establishing such uniform classification and rates within a period of 3 years.

I believe that the action recommended by the Board would be the greatest step that can be taken at this time toward uniformity and that such a step is highly desirable.

Much more remains to be done, however, if a policy of equality of opportunity in rate making is to be carried out fully. Class rates, while they are important, affect only a small proportion of the tonnage transported. Most of the country's freight moves on special commodity rates. Are these commodity rates fairly adjusted to provide adequate revenues for the carriers, promote the most efficient transportation service, and encourage the greatest possible growth of industry and commerce throughout the United States? These questions can be answered only by painstaking, exhaustive, and impartial research. It is too big a job for any individual group or section of the country. In my opinion, it

should be undertaken by the Federal Government through a qualified agency, created by and responsible to Congress, reporting to the President and to Congress.

There is crying need for reliable information on the transportation needs of our country, for peace and war, and how to get and maintain the facilities for supplying those needs, the types of transportation which will be the best and cheapest, the rates which should fairly be charged for their services. We need full information as to the volume and flow of traffic, where, and in what quantities and by what means, it comes and goes; what happens to it, from the raw material to the time it reaches the consumer; to what extent the flow is obstructed or retarded, and by what transportation rates and service it can best be promoted.

The cost of transportation, by all types of carriers, for all types of service, must be studied—not only present and past costs, but costs obtainable through economical management and wise governmental policies. The possibilities and effects of integration of carriers must be investigated. Economical transportation must be promoted and wasteful, extravagant, and unnecessary transportation services should be discouraged. Our processes of regulation need to be overhauled, so that carriers will not be handicapped by undue interference with their operations and their growth. Rates and charges must be in keeping with the ever-changing needs of commerce. Shippers should be relieved from the present slow, expensive, and uncertain procedures of seeking changes in freight rates and transportation service. The way should be made easier for settlement of these questions by direct negotiation between shippers and carriers, with only such supervision as may be required to maintain fair play. Resort to the Interstate Commerce Commission or other regulatory bodies must be made easier, quicker, and less expensive.

Congress has recognized the need for research and advice on transportation subjects by setting up, on numerous occasions in the past, temporary committees or offices to make investigations and reports to it. The Board of Investigation and Research, of which I am a member, is such a temporary agency, created by the Transportation Act of 1940. The Federal Coordinator of Transportation was another such agency, which was in existence from 1933 to 1936. Some studies along the lines I have indicated were made by the Federal Coordinator. Such studies are now being made by the Board of Investigation and Research.

Our studies include, in addition to our investigation of interterritorial freight rates, a study of the Nation's traffic—its flow, trends, and needs; studies of public aids to transportation; carrier taxation; transportation costs and efficiency; unification and integration of carriers; the effects of regulatory policies upon transportation; and other studies of the relative economy and fitness of carriers and methods which should be adopted for an adequate national transportation system. We hope to give you, within the span of our existence—which will be until September 1944, unless Congress sees fit to terminate it sooner—much more light on these questions that has heretofore been available.

The subject is of such vast magnitude and importance, and conditions change so rapidly, that no temporary body can, by intermittent effort, inform Congress completely, or keep that information current and up to date. We shall submit further reports dealing with national transportation policies for the future and the governmental machinery which we think will be best adapted to keep our Government and people continuously and adequately advised for the future about its transportation requirements and how they may best be met.

War Production and Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8 (legislative day of Tuesday, April 6, 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, recently in Springfield, Mass., L. Metcalfe Walling, formerly industrial commissioner of Rhode Island and now Administrator of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions of the United States Department of Labor, spoke before a group of business and labor leaders. In his speech he said many things that needed saying. In the light of the knowledge he has gained from many years of impartial administration of laws pertaining to labor in my State and in the Federal Government, Mr. Walling discussed several of the popular misconceptions about the current war production and labor. A report of the speech was carried in the daily press from coast to coast, but in the belief that many will want to read it, I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American industry, management, and labor together have done a stupendous job in this war. We have to do better. We have to have more production and still more production. But in getting it, in setting ourselves to the stern task of getting still more production, there is no reason we should blind ourselves to the really splendid job we have done to date.

* * * * *

As I read the newspapers, however, it sometimes seems to me as if a good many of them feel as if all our toil so far on the home front had been a flat failure. I see denunciations of American labor. Sometimes I see denunciations of American management. Now I say to you that neither of these furthers better production. I say to you that these gentlemen of the press and these gentlemen who use the press had better try to remember that it is Hitler and Tojo they ought to be fighting, not training their sights on fellow Americans.

Our enemies thought we would get to fighting among ourselves; and some of our current controversialists in the press seem to be doing their best to fulfill their fondest hopes. I say to them, let's have just one war at a time; let's save their private war, if they have one, until after the victory.

* * * * *

Let's look at the record of the last war and compare it with what we are doing today. You know what you are doing here in Springfield. You have read, above the tumult and the attacks on labor or on management, what the rest of the country is doing; how our war materials are supplying our allies in all the corners of the earth and how we produced four and one-third times more tanks and guns and planes and ammunition last November than we had produced in the month before Pearl Harbor.

Sometime ago I had occasion to look back at the old newspapers of 25 years ago, the newspapers for early 1918 when the World War had been in progress 3½ years, about the same length of time as the present war. We ourselves had been in the war just a little less than a year. I wish you yourselves would sometime go to a library and go back and look at the headlines in those newspapers. You would find it a heartening experience, and you would find it made you proud of the war effort on the home front that you have been able to contribute to today.

Twenty-five years ago, the day I happened to look, all industry east of the Mississippi River had been ordered shut down for 5 days and for 9 subsequent Mondays—14 days out of production altogether—to save fuel for railroads and homes and for ships to carry abroad the munitions desperately needed by our allies to withstand the coming German spring drive.

This was the coldest winter in the history of New England. The coal famine had become steadily worse since before New Year's Day, the second coldest day ever recorded, which had found many cities with less than a day's supply of fuel.

On that day, incidentally, the papers had reported the Chief of Ordnance testifying, "That within 10 days there will be enough rifles for every man in camp" if they could only be transported where they were needed.

The headlines told of a scorching reply by President Wilson to the Democratic chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, * * * who was using congressional investigations of the war effort to try to force a war cabinet on the President, and who charged that "the Military Establishment of America has broken down" because of "inefficiency in every bureau and every department of the United States Government."

The day after that your headlines were to tell you that a Republican Senator, the most powerful political boss in the country, "Sees a halt in blanket authority—Suggests, now that President has raised issue, Congress will hold up extraordinary powers."

Six weeks would pass before Food Administrator Herbert C. Hoover was to announce that temporarily people could forget about the meatless meal a day and porkless Saturday. He asked the people to abstain from beef and pork only on Tuesdays thereafter, but to continue wheatless Mondays and Wednesdays and one wheatless meal with no bread all other days in the week, as they had been doing.

Does any of this sound reminiscent to you? Does it sound more orderly than the present? Do you think reading of their own files would lead newspaper editorial writers really to want to go back to that halcyon last war?

If you go back to the newspapers of 25 years ago, you will read of the waves of strikes in 1918, the millions of man-days of lost production. Twenty-five years ago the War Labor Policies Board of that war had not yet even been appointed. After it got going, to end the labor dislocations, labor pirating, and stoppages that were hampering war production, it recommended a change-over in the midst of battle to a universal 8-hour day, with time and a half for overtime. The war was over before this could be put into effect.

After the last war Gen. Smedley Butler recorded "that not one plane or motor out of the billion dollars' worth ordered ever got into the battle in France." You will remember that of this country's war production not a single artillery piece ever got into the battle of France. Years later the Brookings Institution estimated that the year 1918 saw a total expansion of only 15 percent in productivity although it judged that "the effort of this period" represented a greater degree of physical exertion and mental and social strain than our people would permanently tolerate.

That is something that the people ought to remember, the people who are sniping at American labor and American management.

While these are bending their backs to the most amazing production job in history, that is something these critics ought to remember.

I want to talk to you about unnecessary absences from the job. That is something that we must all fight and I want to say at the outset that I know no group that is fighting it so hard or so effectively as the labor unions themselves.

Wherever good records are kept—and you would be surprised to know how few real records there are on a subject so vigorously discussed—you are likely to find that the great bulk of absences for unnecessary personal reasons is confined to a relatively few members of the working force. Those are the people to put the pressure on. Social pressure, union pressure, management pressure, and, if necessary, draft-board pressure. But there are other steps to be taken that are equally important. In communities like Pittsburgh where steel workers have been adjusting their lives for generations to working around the clock, where there is nothing unusual in a night shift because the whole community is accustomed to it, we find that absences are not a particularly serious problem and have not been increasing either.

In such communities social life, stores, banks, even churches have adjusted their hours to the needs of the workers, and it is surprising how effective this proves in cutting down improper absences. For the black sheep, for the repeater who just will not listen to reason, a personal follow-up by labor-management committees can also prove mighty effective in all but the tiniest percentage of worthless cases.

Unfortunately, the work of such committees, the whole job of building morale, of helping the man at the machine feel the importance, the dreadful importance, of the bullets, the planes, the rifles he is making * * * has been jeopardized in the last few weeks by the few people who don't care whether what they say increases absences or not, who are anxious only to push their private grudges, and who use what they call absenteeism as a club to beat labor with.

You have read that absenteeism costs more in production than strikes. * * * Naturally, the better the record on strikes, the more that would be true. That simply puts labor in the position of the man who was asked if he had left off beating his wife.

Strikes have represented less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our total war production. You must separate out the unavoidable absences before the figure can be fairly used as a condemnation of anybody. Accidents, mostly preventable, result in the costly loss of millions of man-hours a year. We must remember that we have drawn into our labor force in this gigantic productive effort many people who have not ordinarily in the past considered themselves in the labor market, women with family responsibilities, for instance. It is most important that community facilities, stores, banks, and so forth, adjust their hours so these workers do not have to be absent from the job to conduct their necessary business.

Constructive work to cut down unnecessary absences must go on, is going on, and must become increasingly effective. But the method, most certainly, is not cut down on incentives for the worker. I am always amazed at the people who in one breath bemoan the wartime limit on incomes above $67,200 before payment of Federal taxes, because they say this will end incentive, while in the next breath they demand that the overtime incentive to greater production for the worker be abolished.

I have said that there are some people who use what they call "absenteeism" as a stick to beat labor with. A year ago they were crying out about strikes, and exaggerating them. Later they were campaigning against the basic structure of American wages, which for years has included a premium for overtime work. First they tried to create the impression that the Fair Labor Standards Act somehow forbade work of more than 40 hours. They could not succeed at that, because too many people knew of factories working right around the clock and had brothers and sisters and fathers working up to 50 and 60 hours a week.

Then the attack shifted. They were against the overtime premium, they said, because of inflation, even though they could easily have checked and found out that the overtime premium actually represents only about 5 percent of total factory pay rolls, only something over 1 percent of total consumer income.

So from week to week and month to month a campaign to smear labor has changed its whole basis so as to present a moving target and a difficult one for the truth to catch up with. You read the story 5 weeks ago—the trumped-up story, made of whole cloth, that some newspapers spread on their front pages—of a supposed ship strike at Guadalcanal in which the workers were supposed to have refused to unload desperately needed supplies on a Sunday. Admiral Halsey himself gave the lie to that one and said that "in no instance did merchant marine seamen refuse to discharge cargo" at Guadalcanal or anywhere else in that area. To their honor it must be recorded that some newspapers did give prominence to Admiral Halsey's denial, but the great majority buried it.

I bring this story up again at this time only because it was a particularly brutal lie against our seamen, whose record of heroism under fire is worthy to stand at the very top of our civilian war effort and in instances beside the heroism of our armed forces themselves—a record that has cost the seamen a sacrifice of 3,200 men dead or missing—nearly 4 percent of their total number.

I think all of us pay tribute to heroism wherever we find it, but does anyone for a moment think that the heroism of the thousands of merchant seamen who have drifted for days in open boats in icy seas—that this experience qualifies them to come back and denounce a whole segment of the American people? No; no one would for a minute think that this qualified them for a smear against the laws of the United States, duly passed by the Congress of the United States, and against a whole section of the American people.

I want to take up here just one misrepresentation of the Fair Labor Standards Act that was made in a recent speech before the New York State Legislature in Albany. I have the honor and the duty of administering the Fair Labor Standards Act and I have the duty to scotch this misrepresentation here and now. The statement was made that "Experience has proved that manufacturers in many industries who are operating on the incentive plan are showing an increase in production per manpower-hour of at least 33⅓ percent over those operating under the wages-and-hours law."

There then followed a calculation with some astronomical figures intended to indicate how this would free so and so many workers. Now, this is pure hokum. The fact is that thousands upon thousands of employers use incentive plans under the Fair Labor Standards Act and there is nothing whatsoever in the act that stops the use of incentive plans. All the incentive plans that are in operation in this country in the manufacture of goods for interstate commerce are of necessity under the Fair Labor Standards Act and I tell you this simple fact that anyone who states or implies in a public forum that incentive plans are not working under the Fair Labor Standards Act is either recklessly ignorant or deliberately hoping to confuse.

Throughout the harrowing days in the open raft, days of heroic battle against the elements and against despair that this speaker went through—and sufficient praise canont be paid to the grit and courage that saw him and the others through—during those harrowing days there were in the rafts with this speaker two union men, one a member of the Airline Pilots Association of the American Federation of Labor and one of the Textile Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations.

It would be interesting to know what these two men, qualified by the same experience, the same victory in a heroic struggle against death, feel on the subjects that are now being so widely discussed, discussed in a way that I sincerely believe regrettably injures the very war production that we are all striving so hard and must strive more effectively to increase. Not that such an experience qualifies a person to speak authoritatively on labor relations, but since the issue has been raised in a national sense, it would be interesting to know what other heroes, who went through the identical experience, think about this subject.

Now, actually, the wage-and-hour law's overtime provisions represent a most effective force in keeping down absences in industry. * * *

If you work 8 hours a day at $1 an hour, you get $40 for 5 days of work in a week, and it is a big inducement to work 6 days a week, or 48 hours, because you get paid $1.50 an hour for all hours over 40. If you are absent for any 1 day out of those 6 you lose, not just a day's pay but a day and a half.

At a time, therefore, when we are trying to combat absences it would be extremely shortsighted and foolish to do away with one of the best incentives of all to an employee to work a 48-hour week, or more—namely, time and one-half for overtime. Take away time and one-half for overtime and you encourage absences; take away time and one-half and you do away with a means of penalizing extra heavily those workers who absent themselves from their work. The absent worker is penalized, not just a day at straight time but a day for which he gets a premium payment. Time and one-half rewards extra well the worker who stays on the job and penalizes extra severely the worker who absents himself from the job. It is entirely inconsistent to denounce absences and at the same time to denounce the method which common sense and years of practice have proven to be the best method of doing away with absences and inducing an employee to work longer hours.

The Trade Pacts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. ELMER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1943

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the trade pacts in any form, unless agreed upon in advance by the treaty-making power of this country. Even then I am not going to crucify the farmers of my country for the benefit of other industries no matter how important they may be. No nation will trade with us from unselfish motives. International commerce is not based on christianity or similar principles. They

will trade for gain. They are fools if they do not. The idea advanced of international good will, unselfishness and good neighborliness in commercial relations with nations is about as realistic as Europe's love for Jews. When we trade our manufactured goods for say, South American products it is not of like goods we receive but something we cannot produce here or products like we produce and which must be sold here in direct competition with our home products. The products we import and do not produce are of a most limited character namely tea, coffee, tropical fruits, a few woods, minerals, and metals. These items are always cited and held up as matters of exchange to hide the real purposes of the deal. We know the great body of the exports are to be manufactured goods such as automobiles, radios, farm machinery, textiles, and so forth, things which they need and cannot produce. The great body of the imports are to be farm products, which they produce in abundance and which they must trade to us to pay for the manufactured goods or not trade at all. There would be no sense in exchanging farm products or manufactured goods common to both trading parties. We must take what they produce and dispose of it here. We trade them our surplus products and receive back other products of which we have also a surplus and we throw them into direct competition with our most basic industry—farming.

At the present time the war acts as a high tariff wall and barrier to the disastrous results that will follow in peacetime. If such a course does not ruin the farm industry, then it is as well founded as the finances of the United States Government, which has withstood the assaults of the New Deal expenditures in peace and war to the extent of billions upon billions of dollars since 1933.

I am for any amendment that may be offered because any amendment is bound to help the bill. A time-limiting amendment will help but it will do damage when it lives. An amendment retaining control over the treaties by Congress will help, but Congress will still be a party to the murder of the farmers and eventually American labor.

Who says these treaties are for the peace of the world? Is it the nations with whom we made them? If so, where are the ones we made with the Axis Powers? Why does not Argentina recognize their wonders and come in on our side of the war? If they produce peace, why are we urging every trade-pact country to go to war on our side? Why did they not keep Japan from attacking us? Japan got more out of this than any other country and we got nothing but a lot of "Jim crack" toys that fell to pieces. We are pouring our money into any nation we can get to accept a gift from us. They take the money, water systems, light plants, and city business blocks, but no one hears of them clamoring for extensions on the grounds of eternal peace or friendship for us. Friends bought will resell to a higher bidder.

The cry comes from free traders and importers and those whose products are to be traded to the second party. From those who want to police the world with our soldiers and destroy our form of government by internationalism. They want to destroy the patriotic nationalism that is the basis of a policy that has made us the greatest nation of them all and whose markets have always been coveted by outsiders. These proponents are floundering around with no definite idea of what they want nor how to get it, but walk in simple trust all the United Nations will treat us right and will not take advantage of our faith in them. Of course, they will abide faithful and true. France did when we jumped into World War No. 2 to help save her the second time and she is now against us. Finland, who honestly paid us a few millions of debt, was faithful, too, when she joined with Germany. Russia was true when she took over Poland, for whom England declared war. England was true when she said it was England's and Russia's sphere to control Europe and sidestepped the India question.

Not a Member of this House would risk his reputation as a prophet to forecast the international happenings for the next 10 days, but many stand for some kind of a plan for world peace and commerce whose foundation and superstructure are as permanent as the morning fog.

How, then, can anyone forecast the events when peace comes? There are some certain things we can rely upon, and that is Stalin will be for Russia, Churchill for England, Germany for Germany, and the Generalissimo for China, the South American republics each for itself. That has been and will continue to be the universal rule of history. All of these governments put their own interests paramount, but in this country the citizen who puts his country, people, and flag first is ridiculed and denounced as an isolationist—as if to be one was a crime.

I am a nationalist. I put the United States of America and our flag above all nations and flags. I am not an internationalist. Not one jot or tittle of our sovereignty would I surrender to any aggregation of nations. I do not want to represent on this floor a district composed of Americans and internationalists. I cannot serve two masters—God and mammon. I do not intend to do so. I will not bend my knee to any foreign baal, nor do I want my country to fall to that low estate. Since when has it been so reproachful to be an isolationist?

Who decreed this ultra-Americanism to be outside the pale of political and governmental life? Who passes upon his loyalty and finds it wanting? Is it the internationalist who visions a supergovernment of world nations to override our Constitution and usurp our sovereignty? Is it some who put their own interests and that of other nations above the welfare of their own country? Is it those wild-eyed reformers who think everything old is wrong and everything new is right? Is it those dreamers who hear voices in the air and see visions? Is it those whose energy and egotism impels them on excursions around the world for a fleeting glimpse of old countries whose civilizations are so set they have remained stationary for a thousand years and then write books and draw the wrong conclusions from the facts stated? If it is not these self-serving influences which so vehemently denounce isolationism and declare it dead, dead, dead, why so bitter an attitude?

If isolationism in this country is dead, why throw stones at its funeral procession? Why denounce a corpse? Why laugh at a funeral? I have heard it said here a thousand times, "Isolationism is dead." Why the babble? If it is dead, let it rest in peace. Those who make this hue and cry realize full well the people of this country are yet to speak. They are afraid of the people at home, and when the soldier boys return from a hundred foreign lands, they are afraid of their intense Americanism that will arise to crush out all other "isms" and "schisms." The great political parties and most of the minor ones have ever been isolationists since this country was founded. None of them have ever dared to date to declare for internationalism. None of them will. The last Democratic national platform said:

> We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. We favor and shall rigorously enforce and defend the Monroe Doctrine.
>
> The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been, and will continue to be, the security and defense of our own land and the maintenance of its peace.

And:

> The Republican Party gives its promises to the farmer and its allegiance to those who exploit him.

The last Republican national platform said:

> The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war. * * * The Republican Party stands for Americanism, preparedness, and peace * * * and also to efficiently uphold in war the Monroe Doctrine.

And:

> The farmer is entitled to a profit price for his products.

No internationalism in these declarations.

On these two platforms were nominated two miracle men; one has been 'in," the other one "out." The "out" has been trying ever since to get "in." Both are trying to outdo each other on matters violative of the platforms. Even the farmer has received the promises, been exploited and denied the profit price promised. This age is just one of destruction. Just an overturning of sanity. Even the old League of Nations, whose advocates rocked the foundations of this country from coast to coast 25 years ago, Woodrow Wilson, his 14 points, are dead as isolationism. They are too conservative. They are obsolete. In the new order of things they have no place. There was no bridge expert to frame articles 10 and 16. "Behold old things have passed away; all things have become new."

The idea of permanent eternal peace is a myth. There shall be wars and rumors of wars as long as the world stands. In

the last 4,000 years of known world history there has been only 27 years when the world was free from wars and wholly at peace. Most of the wars of the modern world have been caused by international trade. President Wilson said World War No. 1 was a commercial war. Now it is proposed to establish trade pacts among the nations, disarm those not accepting our viewpoint of commerce and government, police with armed forces those nations we feel who do not agree with our ideas. In other words, we are to have perpetual war in order to have permanent peace.

The trade pacts ruined the sugar industry of our country. We agreed to buy from foreign producers 70 percent of our home consumption. We produce 30 percent. The result with us was decreased acreage of cane and beets, closed refineries, general stagnation of the industry, and rationed sugar. The war came along and saved the industry to some extent. Today the main protection the American farmer has against the loss of our home markets is the German U-boat. Its menace acts as a tariff wall and a bar to importations of a disastrous character. Even the convoyed train from here to England of gift goods could not carry farm products away fast enough to offset the market gluttony. It is a travesty on American diplomacy that our farmers are protected against ruination by our enemy's military successes.

Distinguished Members of long service here urge us to lay aside partisanship and support these trade pacts for the sake of peace. If they are in the right, no such appeal is necessary. I cannot square my patriotic Americanism, as I have known it and under which we have prospered so long, with a surrender of our sovereignty as a nation, or with the abandonment of our system of coordinated government. I cannot square the sacrifice of a great element of our national life to aid selfish sections to extend their international trade. This is my honest conviction, and it has to be my guide.

Our country has now and has always had the best formula for commerce, war, and peace. It was laid down by our founding fathers. I know some now regard them as fossils; their principles worn out; that the world is in a new era and needs new governments. But a compass is still used on the modern ship and its needle points to the North Star; an anchor is still used to hold the ship steady; a loyal crew is necessary to insure a safe voyage; the well-known and tried routes are the safest. We know who laid the keel of our ship and we know the material of which it is built. I am not in favor of sabotaging it to embark in a new boat built by unknown workmen without plan or design, with no compass or anchor, with a mixed crew of jabbering internationalists on a strange sea and on untried routes with a lot of coowner nations who have heretofore, if not now, been international pirates, schemers, oppressors, and exploiters of weak people. The Bible says, "Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set." That is good advice to us as a nation.

Our fathers laid this charter for us: A government upon our own land, by our own people, for our own people. Then to prepare for defense as a most effectual means of preserving peace. To avoid overgrown military establishments which are hostile to republican form of government. To confine the departments within their respective spheres. To cherish public credit; avoid the accumulation of debt. To observe good faith and justice toward all nations, cultivate peace and harmony with all, who can doubt that in the course of time and things the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by steady adherence to it? Can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The nation which indulges toward another a habitual hatred or a habitual fondness is, in some degree, a slave to its animosity or affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and interest, betray it into a participation in the quarrels and wars without adequate inducement or justification, and against the insidious wiles of foreign influences the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible; it is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the world. Harmony and a liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by policy and interest, neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences, constantly keeping in view that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character.

These thoughts above are from the Farewell Address of Washington to the American people. He spent 4 years writing that letter; submitted it to, and it was approved by, Adams, Jefferson, Franklin, Paine, Madison, Hamilton, and all the patriots of his association. It is true. It is part of our great American bible. These principles set forth in that letter have been the guiding rule of our national conduct for over 150 years. We have prospered, grown great, and most of our life been at peace. It is not the continuous observance of those traditions that has brought us into wars but their violations. Following them and the Monroe Doctrine is our best guarantee of unity and power, international cooperation and commerce, friendly relations and world peace.

In the same spirit that prompted my opposing colleagues I appeal to them to lay aside partisan politics and help save our common country. In making this appeal I am not asking them to embark upon a new, untried, experimental national course but to keep on the true beam which we have all traveled so long before there came about this confusion of tongues. Our country is worth saving. It will be saved. Neither friend nor foe can wreck it. Lincoln said in his first inaugural address:

> Why cannot there be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world?

Grand and noble words by a grand and noble man. I know that storm clouds have gathered around our national life and the lightning is flashing from horizon to horizon, the thunder is reverberating from mountaintop to mountaintop, and the cyclone of war winds are tearing away at our national foundations. Many are confused. Many are afraid. Many are sick at heart and grieved. Many have lost hope. But we have seen storms gather in years past, spend their fury, and pass on. The lightning and thunder will cease, the clouds will roll away; there shall return to us a confidence in the ultimate justice of the people that will usher in a new hope in ourselves; the sun of a new day shall arise in greater brightness and splendor than ever before and shine down upon our country as still God's chosen nation.

Fine Care Our Navy Takes of the War Casualties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the latest figures received and compiled by the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery show that the mortality rate for wounded in the Navy and Marine Corps is 2.6 percent. That is to say, for every 1,000 officers and men who have become casualties between December 7, 1941, and March 31, 1943, and who were not killed outright, there were only 26 deaths.

This compares with a death rate of 7 percent in World War No. 1—a figure almost three times as great as today's.

As of the last of March, 53 percent of all Navy and marine wounded for whom reports had been received had been restored to duty, with 43.5 percent still undergoing treatment. It had been necessary to invalid from the service less than 1 percent.

The story behind these figures is one that is as warming as mere statistics are cold. It is a story blended of heroic self-sacrifice and painstaking research, of foresight and split-second decisions, devotion to duty, and just plain perspiration.

It is the story of medical preparedness in having launched the mobile hospital program in time to reap rich dividends—in lives saved—on the very day the Japs

sneak attacked at Pearl Harbor. Playing their roles, too, are swift transfer of the wounded by airplane, hospital ship, and evacuation transport to hospitals far in the rear where convalescence may be hastened; wonder-working sulfa drugs that combat infection; an unsung but most effective system of preventive medicine which strives to keep our fighting men at the peak of physical efficiency; the blood substitutes—chiefly plasma—that restore the warmth and color of life to ashen cheeks on battlefield and quarterdeck.

The stout planes and gallant men of the South Pacific Combat Air Transport Command, recently commended by Admiral William F. Halsey, Jr., for their work in carrying supplies into the Solomons and transporting wounded on outbound trips, comprise an important factor in the Navy's medical achievements since Pearl Harbor. Nor must one forget the workers in industry who are producing the equipment and supplies which are essential to maximum efficiency.

The story is that of a medical officer whose ministration to a wounded bluejacket was not interrupted even when a Japanese shell plowed into the battle dressing station and buried itself in a bulkhead a few feet from the operating table; of the dental officer aboard one of our cruisers who repeatedly risked his life to rescue men wounded below decks; of the scores of hospital corpsmen killed by snipers' bullets as they knelt over Marines to give first aid; of nurses braving rigorous routines at advance base hospitals scattered over the world.

Any attempt to account for the favorable medical situation in the Navy must take cognizance, also, of the high caliber performance of thousands of Reserve physicians and dentists. They have cleared most successfully the gap between civilian and military practice.

Many lives have been lost in this war and the toll of dead will grow as the months go by. But many who feel the enemy's wrath in lead, steel, and flame will live—are alive—who would surely have died but for the quality and adequate measure of medical care, transportation, and hospitalization which are available to our armed forces today.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the average dollar-a-year man costs the Government $3,600.

Fabrics are so scarce that they are taking them out of women's hats.

The country is waiting to see who had the greater punch, John L. Lewis or John L. Sullivan.

The I Am An American Day will be celebrated this year by about every organization save the Little German Band.

Did Churchill hop over on these seadromes? Are the two planning the continental invasion, or how to see Joe in person?

The Legion is planning an extensive program of Americanism after the war. After the war may be too late. Why not shoot the works now?

The House Military Affairs Committee was wise in substituting the Smith bill for the Senate Connally bill. HOWARD SMITH's heart is in the right place and has been.

The Johns-Manville Roofing Co. employees have been granted a raise in wages. Possibly that is to keep the farm ceilings dry but certainly not intended to hold freezings.

Today the House renewed for 2 years the reciprocal trade treaties in the South American way. Rather interesting to see so many of our Hawley-Smoot New England friends lead the rhumba.

If Representative BURDICK's argument is true that the war makes it necessary to extend the trade treaties, then there is not much argument against a fourth term. Sixty-five voted "no" on this fourth term.

HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT was on the floor of the House yesterday, functioning as the minority whip, and today he is gone. He was an able and agreeable gentleman and will be sincerely missed.

Milton Eisenhower goes to the head of the Kansas State College July 1, his alma mater. Milton is young, handsome, smart, fluent, sound, and experienced. At present he is the wise owl of the O. W. I.

H. R. 2701

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Japanese and other alien issues are presently causing considerable alarm throughout the Nation and specifically on the Pacific coast.

On May 7, Senator A. B. CHANDLER, of Kentucky, heading a special investigating committee of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, rendered a report to the committee relative to their findings and recommendations on the Japanese question. We have also at this time a special committee of which the Honorable JOHN COSTELLO is the chairman that has been investigating the Japanese issue, and this committee has also made recommendations as of May 12, resulting from their findings.

Quoting from the Chandler committee report:

There are approximately 135,430 Japanese in the continental United States as of Apr. 9, 1943.

(a) In the 10 war relocation centers	105,750
(b) On indefinite-group or short-term leave	6,238
(c) Residents outside of the military (Pacific coast) areas	14,807
(d) Residents within such military areas, but leaving voluntarily before the evacuation order became effective, approximately	5,000
(e) Moab, Utah, War Relocation Authority internment	34
Total	131,829
(f) In Army internment camps	2,020
(g) In Department of Justice alien detention stations	32
(h) In Department of Justice alien detention camps	1,549
Grand total	135,430

No. 8 Chandler committee findings:

That the registration by the War Department has been completed, and that out of the 105,750 internees in the 10 relocation centers, 19,963 Japanese male citizens of military age (17–37) were registered. Six percent or 1,181 volunteered, for military service, and 24 percent or 4,783 answered no to the loyalty question. (Question asked was No. 28 of questionnaire submitted by Army and reads as follows: "Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America and faithfully defend the United States from any or all attack by foreign or domestic forces, and forswear any form of allegiance or obedience to the Japanese Emperor, or any other foreign government, power, or organization?"). The percentage answering no was highest at Manzanar (just above 50 percent) and the lowest at Minidoka, Calif. (approximately 2 percent). The percentage of volunteers was highest at Minidoka, Calif. (20 percent), and the lowest at Heart Mountain, Wyo. (2½ percent).

That approximately 67 percent of evacuees in the 10 relocation centers (71,000) are American-born citizens of the United States, with 33 percent (34,750) citizens of Japan. It is estimated that of the 71,000, approximately 8 percent (5,680) are Kebei (educated in Japan), and 92 percent (65,320) are Nisei (educated in this country).

It should be noted that in the Chandler investigation of 19,963 Japanese male citizens of military age—17 to 37—only 6 percent volunteered and 24 percent or 4,783 answered no to the loyalty question; consequently, it is only reasonable to assume that the percentage of the remaining 51,037 that are not of military age would at least respond in the same proportion to the military question of loyalty as those of military age who did respond, answering no.

In order to give legal authority to the proper agency of government, I have, this date, filed a bill which reads as follows:

H. R. 2701

A bill to provide for the expatriation of certain nationals of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter LV of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, subch. IV; Supp. I, title 8, subch. IV), is amended by inserting after section 401 thereof a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 401a. (a) A national of the United States, whether by birth or naturalization, shall lose his nationality if he is convicted, under subsection (b) of this section, of knowingly and intentionally expressing, either orally or in writing, loyalty to a foreign state.

"(b) (1) Upon affidavit showing good cause therefor, it shall be the duty of the United States district attorney for any judicial district to institute proceedings in any court specified in section 301 (a) in such district against any person residing in such district for the purpose of expatriating such person on the ground that he has knowingly and intentionally expressed, either orally or in writing, his loyalty to a foreign state. Such person shall have 60 days' personal notice in which to make answer to the petition of the United States; and if such person be absent from the United States or from the judicial district in which such person last had his residence, such notice shall be given by publication in the manner provided for the service of summons by publication or upon absentees by the laws of the State or the place where such suit is brought.

"(2) When a person shall be convicted under this subsection of knowingly and intentionally expressing, either orally or in writing, his loyalty to a foreign state, he shall cease to be a national of the United States. In case such person was a naturalized citizen, the court shall declare the certificate of naturalization of such person to be canceled and shall order such certificate to be surrendered to the Commission."

At this point I want to call your attention to a portion of the Chandler committee report titled:

JAPANESE NATIONALITY IN CASES OF PERSONS BORN IN THE UNITED STATES TO JAPANESE PARENTS

A Japanese domiciled in the United States but born in Japan is referred to in Japanese as an "Isei" (first generation); a Japanese born in the United States of parents born in Japan is referred to as a "Nisei" (second generation); and a Japanese born and resident in the United States but educated in Japan is referred to as a "Kibei" (returned to America).

The pertinent portions of Japanese law governing nationality in cases of persons born in the United States to Japanese parents are quoted below:

Japanese Law No. 66 of March 1899. As revised by law No. 27 of March 1916, and by law No. 19 of July 1924, effective from December 1, 1924.

Article 1: A child is regarded as a Japanese if its father is at the time of its birth a Japanese. The same applies if the father who died before the child's birth was at the time of his death Japanese.

Article 20: A person who acquires foreign nationality voluntarily loses Japanese nationality.

Article 20 (2): A Japanese who, by reason of having been born in a foreign country designated by imperial ordinance, has acquired the nationality of that country, and who does not as laid down by order express his intention of retaining Japanese nationality, loses his Japanese nationality retroactively from his birth.

Persons who have retained Japanese nationality in accordance with the provisions of the preceding paragraph, or Japanese subjects who, by reason of having been born in a designated foreign country before its designation in accordance with the provisions of the preceding paragraph, have acquired the nationality of that country, may, when they are in possession of the nationality of the country concerned and in possession of a domicile in that country, renounce Japanese nationality if they desire to do so.

Persons who shall have renounced their nationality in accordance with the provisions of the preceding paragraph lose Japanese nationality.

Article 24: Notwithstanding the provisions of article 19, article 20, and the preceding three articles, a male of full 17 years of age or upward does not lose Japanese nationality, unless he has completed active service in the Army or Navy, or unless he is under no obligation to serve.

A person who actually occupies an official post, civil or military, does not lose Japanese nationality notwithstanding the provisions of the preceding eight articles until after he or she has lost such official post.

Article 26: If a person who has lost Japanese nationality in accordance with the provisions of article 20 to article 21, inclusive, is domiciled in Japan, he or she may, with the permission of the Minister of the Interior, recover Japanese nationality. But this rule does not apply to cases in which the persons mentioned in article 16 have lost Japanese nationality.

It is understood that the expression of intention of retaining Japanese nationality, provided for in article 20 (2) must be made by the parent within 2 weeks after the birth of the child, if the child is to retain the Japanese nationality acquired at birth under article 1. In this connection reference may be made to the provisions of article 2 of the Japanese regulations (Ordinance No. 26) of November 17, 1942, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

"Article 2: Those desiring to preserve their nationality in accordance with the provisions of clause 1 of article 20 (2) of the nationality law, and being those who are required to submit a report of birth by clause 1 or clause 2 of article 72 of the census domicile law, shall file a report to that effect, together with a report of birth, within the period set forth in article 69 of the census domicile law."

The period for the registration by the parent of the birth of a child, provided in article 69 of the census domicile law, is 14 days.

From the foregoing provisions it would appear that a person of Japanese parentage born in the United States is regarded as a Japanese subject only if he has been declared a Japanese subject by his parents within 14 days of his birth.

While it might appear that the provisions of article 24 would preclude any Japanese male from divesting himself of Japanese nationality unless he has completed military service or has no obligation to serve, and while this provision is expressly applicable to article 20, the Department has been informed that it is not applicable to article 20 (2), which is regarded as a separate article.

I sincerely request the cooperation of the membership of the House in expediting the enactment of this legislative proposal in order that this unsavory situation may be clarified.

America's Accomplishments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 12), 1943

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the victory of the Allies in the north African campaign is most significant and gratifying to all Americans. America's attitude of "Peace on earth; good will toward men," of course, prevented this Nation from being immediately prepared for Japan's dastardly attack and our participation in the war. For the short time we have been in the war we have much for which to be thankful. When we look about and see the privations and distress in other parts of the world, we can give thanks that we have a democracy that is functioning on the home front.

I suggest at this time for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article written by the able senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, on the accomplishments of our Nation. The article, entitled "Consider America's Accomplishments," is from the Women's Democratic Digest, and I feel it is a contribution to our war literature.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSIDER AMERICA'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

(By ELBERT D. THOMAS, chairman, Senate Committee on Labor)

We have now been at war for nearly a year and a half. We have been working in a defense effort for over 2 years. America has found herself for the first time in her history attempting through necessity to restrict the free activities of most of the American people. In other words, we have adjusted from a free society to a rigid one in less than a year's time.

Let me explain what I mean. Could any of you 2 years ago have imagined an employer's coming to Washington to plead for the privilege of raising the pay of his employees? Did any of you a couple of years ago, and especially 8 or 10 years ago when oil and gasoline were being wasted and we tried to curb the waste, conceive of not being allowed to drive your car because gasoline was scarce?

When I brought up in the Senate the strategic-materials bill, one great Senator said that it was wholly unnecessary and turned to me and pointedly said, "The Senator from Utah knows that as long as the American Navy complements the British Navy there will be in America no critical and hardly any shortage of strategic materials." I might cite more reminders, but I need not. The fact remains, one hundred thirty-odd million people have been forced to change their habits almost overnight.

CHANGES OFTEN BRING STRUGGLE

Some persons have been bitter in their denunciations of their fellow citizens because all of those changes have not come without some sort of struggle. We have spent over a year of our time bemoaning the exceptional cases rather than thinking of our achievements. My mail shows that a number of persons have been made unhappy because a neighbor who had been at best a fair-weather worker through his life has been able to find a job paying him $10 to $12 a day. On second thought, we should be happy that such a person is making good at last rather than being mad at government and angry at conditions.

Those of us in Congress who are responsible for the health, the education, and labor laws—that is, the laws that protect our great social activities—have been surprised to see downright selfishness when we have attempted to put schools and hospitals in places where people have been brought together to work. Some people protest the housing efforts, yet hundreds of our citizens are not doing effective work because of the lack of housing.

WE'RE MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK

Let us look at what we have accomplished instead of pointing out where some advantage-takers seem to be interfering. We have

the greatest production in the history of our country; we have more people working than have ever worked before. We have people working at better wages than they have ever received. With the exception of some universities, business and professional colleges, as many people are in schools as have ever been before. There is no great want in our country. American democracy is functioning and is strong in the war effort.

Let me point out what is probably the most remarkable accomplishment in the whole history of our industrial labor relations. In discussing strikes and lock-outs and reviewing the history of these unhappy incidents in almost every part of our country, it was the conclusion of all thoughtful persons that if these interruptions could be overcome and employers and employees would settle their troubles by peaceful means our society would be very much better off. The industrial labor conference of December 1941 accepted my simple motion that there should be no strikes or lock-outs and that all disputes should be settled by peaceful means. In the main, this agreement has worked. Since the Government has taken over the coal mines, the strike question there is a dead issue. No one can strike against the Government of the United States.

THERE WILL ALWAYS BE DIFFERENCES

We have not an age of bliss in our country, but whoever expected that? There will always be differences, but if we can settle differences by peaceful means, we have made it possible for women and children to miss some of the hazards of the strike and lockout. Litigation is not a perfect arrangement, but litigation and the processes of law are both better than direct action. We have not perfection in our society, but we have established institutions that make it possible for the average man and woman to live with less concern.

We are fighting this war, not to bring about a millenium of glorious peace, but to bring about a condition where men can settle their differences, run their governments, and organize themselves by the processes of discussion and deliberation. Government by law, not by caprice. Government by and for the many, not government just in accordance with a single will. But we must not assume that the society under a government by the many will be free from clash; however, it can be free from bloodshed and brutality.

Consider America's accomplishments, and be proud. Don't judge 135,000,000 American people by the actions of a selfish few. Look around at your neighbors, see how they are working, how they are sacrificing, how they are putting their whole hearts into the war effort. Take courage and know that they are the ones who count—not the few who refuse to see and live up to the blessings of a free government.

Marfleet Lectures at the University of Toronto by Hon. Claude Pepper, of Florida

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 12), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in February of last year I had the honor to deliver the Marfleet lectures at the University of Toronto. The subject of my discussion was The World War and the Post-War World. The discussion was divided into two lectures, one on the 26th of February, the second on the 27th. I ask unanimous consent that the two lectures be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the lectures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD WAR AND THE POST-WAR WORLD

(Address of Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, at Toronto University, Toronto, Canada, on February 26, 1942)

When one has been so highly honored as I have been today to be taken note of by this illustrous university and admitted into the great fraternity of those who have, or shall have, moved with bettered minds, gladdened hearts, and richer lives through its mellowed and mellowing halls, he hardly knows how to express the gratitude and the sense of deep obligation which fills his heart.

Of course, one privately always has his fears that some peculiar affection which he might somehow have given rise to, or a moment of weakness which comes now and then to all good and great men might have moved such usually discriminating and sound men as Dr. Cody, Sir William Mulock, and their distinguished associates more than any merit that he might possess to make him beneficiary of so great an honor as this. Since I have known from the delightful story he has told me from his own lips of how Sir William Mulock has visited my own State of Florida, I am particularly afraid that it might have been, insofar as he was responsible, an honor which he thought due my State which he happily has thought I might be the bearer of.

You will always know, however, that this is another one of those enduring ties which shall hold ever closer and closer together the hands and the hearts of the two great peoples of your country and mine.

You have given me the greatest of honor and satisfaction in calling me to deliver the Marfleet Lectures on this campus. These lectures, made possible by the initiative of Mrs. Marfleet, were devoted, from the first, to the discussion of the national problems of our two countries, the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America. Established in memory of an American citizen who devoted constant thought to the public welfare of both our countries, these lectures are symbolic, in a way, of the intimate bonds of common devotion to freedom, to peace, and to progress which link us on both sides of the boundary.

Additional distinction was conferred upon these lectures, with the passing of years, by the remarkable personalities who have been invited to speak under these auspices. The first two lecturers were outstanding leaders of their nations—William Howard Taft, the only man ever to combine in his person the two great functions of President of the United States and of Chief Justice, and Sir Robert Borden, a great Prime Minister of Canada. They and the two distinguished scholars who followed them, Judge John Bassett Moore, an authority in the field of international law, and Prof. William Barnett Munro, on whose books a whole generation of young Americans, and many Canadians, too, I understand, were brought up to understand the involved science of government, dealt with the grave questions of the internal institutions of the United States and Canada. My immediate predecessor, that courageous pioneer of international cooperation, Prof. James Thomas Shotwell, went farther afield and in true appreciation of the overwhelming importance of foreign affairs in this world of ours discussed from this tribune the problem of our foreign relations.

See, then, how I am situated when admittedly a Senator is not enough of a statesman to fit in with ex-Presidents and Prime Ministers, and not enough of a student to be comfortable in the company of great professors and scholars.

Yet I could never come at a time when it was more appropriate for us all to counsel together and to try to see our way through this all-engulfing world war and that dismal but challenging era, the post-war world.

Adolf Hitler is right. Two worlds are in conflict. One must fall asunder. One shall fall asunder, and if God and good men shall continue to help us, it shall be the hellish Hitler world.

For the first time in its history, a whole world trembles under the fearful impact of total war. Like a great fire, its prongs lick and burn every continent and country and people. In every sea it reaches. The battle front is the surface and the circumference of the globe. Already 26 nations are declared belligerents with us, making altogether three-quarters of the human race, with whom we march while powerful nations of the earth are arrayed against us. Even those nations who are not formally in the conflict themselves admit that the tide of battle moves over their own lands and they are a very real part of and vitally affected by this fight to the death by these two clashing orders of men. It is seen every day as we read the newspapers and listen over the radio to the ebb and flow of the battle in all the oceans and in all the hemispheres and the continents how vastly broader is the scale of this struggle than that terrible conflagration in which so many nations threw the very limit of their strength in Europe in that war which we call the World War, and now has become merely the First World War.

In that war, 5 Central Powers, with an aggregate area of 1,228,000 square miles and a population of 147,000,000 found themselves opposed nominally by 24 Allied and Associated Powers covering an area of about 32,000,000 square miles with about 1,200,000,000 inhabitants, but over a large extent of these vast territories, the impact of the war was hardly felt. Countries such as China, Siam, various Latin-American republics were belligerents in name only.

How different the struggle of today. This is a world war indeed. It never even started in Europe. It started in China 10 years ago. It then continued in African Ethiopia 5 years ago; it spread to central Europe, successively engulfing Austria, Czechoslovakia, Albania. Frantically, desperately, perhaps blindly, the rest of the world tried to stay clear of the war, to isolate itself from the war. To no avail. Today the war is in full conflagration, with about 7,800,000 square miles of territory and nearly 700,000,000 human beings under direct or indirect Axis control, with about 41,000,000 square miles and 1,300,000,000 human beings actively opposing the Axis, or acting under a policy of solidarity with the United Nations. The countries that still cling to a precarious neutrality are few. They include Afghanistan, Ireland, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and Yeman. All told, about 2,660,000 square miles and 97,000,000 inhabitants; not five percent of the earth's population and area are neutral in this war.

One of the intriguing subjects of history is the way ideals and aspirations grip the minds of men and women and give rise to sweeping movements which, like mighty tides, rise to engulf everything round about. Sometimes we will see such great surges of thought and feeling overrunning a large part of the earth, overcoming all which stands in the way, pushing back every barrier. Then we will see the tide ebb, pushed back by some countervailing force from all those areas where it once lay in full flood. I am thinking of that dynamic spirit which we

have come to call democracy which burst cut upon the earth so dramatically and in the American Revolution and which, receiving new fervor and impetus from the French Revolution, inundated by the end of the World War almost every land of the earth. Indeed, at the end of that mighty contest of clashing sentiments and force, President Wilson was able to say that the world had been made safe for democracy. But what happened? It is now possible to see how for one reason or another the mighty tide was forced back by those same impelling forces which had so majestically moved it even to the highlands of the world.

First, in Russia is to be seen a new order taking on a peculiar form for the world of that day. It was not strange that what came out of that fierce volcanic upheaval should be an untamed and threatening force. It was the antithesis of democracy though it overturned an odious system of monarchy and darkness and cruelty. In many respects it added to the vices of the old system, but in one way sharply contrasted with the old system and that was that it was a dynamic and not a dying order. It was a strange blend of tyranny and emancipation. It established a rigid unchallengeable dictatorship of power, but unquestionably it was a power to be used to better the lot of the vastly larger number of the people according to their old conditions. It had a definite appeal, therefore of virtue to offset the wicked vice which exuded from every pore. Born in violence it was a movement which made violence its handmaiden, and even its good things it wrought definitely by force and not persuasion.

Soon this hydraheaded creature was followed by another of like character, if of slightly dissimilar features, in Italy. Shortly a yet greater monster of a viler species fought its way to the mastery of Germany. Always imitative Japan needed little more than such examples to become a jungle creature of more hideous mein and vicious character than before.

Like beings and orders burst to view in lesser states all about the globe. It was to be noticed that all these Frankenstein states had a similar ancestry, a similar pattern, and a similar purpose. They were born out of the chaos and turmoil which followed the break-down of the older orders. They reestablished in a personal leader the old absolutism of absolute monarchy. They dethroned old controlling classes and based their power upon force and benefit to the masses. Naturally born in violence, they were destined to live or die by violence. They all found a class to persecute, both as a means of acquiring loot and of buttressing their claims to an especial mastery.

As an incident to their premise that the whole number of the people—the state—was everything and the individual nothing, they all disdained individual rights or immunities, and ruthlessly cut up the parts to feed the whole. It is only fair to say, however, that as a part of their taking all reins of power into their hands, they turned the means of production more to the general advantage and more effectively provided for the ordinary person than had any previous system in such areas. Hence, while not being able to obscure the ugly masks of usurpation which they wore, yet they were unmistakably able to exact a certain support and a measure of gratitude from the masses whom they took pains to show solicitude for, and to impregnate with something like a conscience that they were a part of some mighty new force which both gratified their sense of pride and held in store big things for their future.

Most significant of all, these systems forging mighty nations into a throbbing force which could be hurled in one direction or another by the simple whim or unbridled caprice of a single power maniac made them most threatening and dangerous members of the family of nations. Especially so since they turned every wheel, every factory, and farm, every man's labor and genius toward building a war machine to further their ambitions of conquest around the globe.

So here, when so many had died to make the world safe for democracy and democracies; just when the race thought it had choked and squelched forever these monsters of tyranny and hate and war, here they were back again, breathing new and violent flames from their dilated nostrils, threatening literally to lay waste, or to master all the earth. The race was back again then at the same place at which it fought so gallantly and with thrilling victories for that insatiable hunger for liberty and freedom of the body, the mind, and the spirit. The old war had to be fought all over again to determine whether the state should be the master or the servant of the citizen; whether force or justice should be the order of the earth; whether the end of man should be the glorious pursuits of peace or the bloody triumphs of war.

The point at which the historian will pause so long in his effort to understand it is the long period of the failure of peoples and their governments to understand the true nature of these new creatures born to conquer or die. Why men could not see what their eyes saw, or hear what their ears heard, or understand what their minds perceived and their souls sensed—that will be the most difficult of the historian's explanations of this tumultuous era.

At last, however, the most sluggish has been rudely awakened, and there is beginning to be seen everywhere on the part of those who stand against these new devils that same desperation and determination with which the attack has been waged from the first. Now, everyone understands that it is conquer or die for both sides. Lucifer shall reign over Heaven or he shall be hurled back to the bottomless pit of his hell.

The tide of battle runs badly against us. Those nations and peoples who have sacrificed butter for guns are now reaping their martial rewards. Those nations which have been willing to pour their wisdom and their toil into the mouth of the greedy monster of war have nurtured a beast so gigantic that he is nearly lord of the field. They who have let the distillate of hate gnaw out the ordinary cords of sympathy and justice and humanity in the human heart have by the great compulsion of that acid performed colossal feats of arms. They who have been willing to forfeit the respect of all decent men to gain by deception and betrayal their wicked ends have gained an advantage which, though we know it cannot last, yet strikes deep concern into the heart of every sensible person.

One after another throughout the world have fallen those bastions which we thought impregnable. One sacred area and another have been profaned by daring encroachments of the enemy. Our foes fighting from the center to the circumference and by their strategic location stretching the battle line around the globe have made us all spread our strength so thin that it cannot, until adequately reinforced, be dominant.

But as President Roosevelt said last fall, it is not who fires the first shot that counts so much in the end, but who fires the last shot.

Though these triumphs by the enemy rend our hearts, no one would claim that they have dismayed us, let alone broken our spirit. They have merely put us on our mettle and jolted us out of a dangerous complacency and shocked us, we all hope, to the stern consciousness that we fight for our lands, our loves, and our lives. They have made us realize the sober fact that we can lose this war and in losing it, lose all. We know that the enemy is deadly and ruthless and gambles all he has, or all he ever hopes to be, upon a very short time; that he hopes to strike us down before we can gird on our armor and put our shield before us.

We in this hemisphere have at last realized that the flames of war have been taking their toll upon our very coasts. Even we, your neighbors in this hemisphere, know now beyond any doubt, what you recognized at the very beginning of this struggle, that neither the oceans, nor the great spaces of the air, could keep the enemy's clutch from our throats, but that only our friends and our own strength and courage could defend us.

But all of us have had our dark hours before. Again and again all of us who stand together in all parts of the world have seen fortune turn her back upon us, and we have not quit nor faltered. We are not afraid, therefore, now because we know how great our strength is, how righteous is our cause, and that God is with us. For it is for both God and man we fight and for whom at last, we shall win the victory.

The only real shortcomings we have had is in our thinking, in our unwillingness to face the facts, in our sense of values. We have too often assumed that we had accomplished all possible or worth achieving. We had too often lost that spirit of militancy in our thinking and in our policy which has made us what we are. There was too much truth in the scorn of the dictators that we had become fat and complacent. Willingness to sacrifice, to submit to any kind of discipline, or even to acknowledge any sort of discipline as unworthy of us, were too prevalent. Unmistakably, democracy and democracies have lost dangerously of their zeal. No one would expect a dying order to stand up against a dynamic order. The hope of democracies, therefore, lies in the rejuvenation of democracy, in the revitalization of its character, a rededication of its spirit to the high purposes of liberty, equality, fraternity. We must feel the exaltation of our democracy so much that, like a joyous faith, we want to give it to all men.

We still have amongst us too many who have little concern about their fellow men, too many who ridicule as frills and furbelows those measures designed to give help, education, housing, jobs, and homes, not to speak of a bit of recreation to the ordinary man and his family. In fact, in all of our countries there have been unmistakable tendencies in all too many places which smack of the spirit and sometimes even of the method of the totalitarian states. Likewise, some have abused their privilege of democracy lamentably. That list,—and I speak, of course, only of my own country—definitely includes some elements of labor and some elements of the press, and there are other groups which could be mentioned. Down in my part of the country one still finds the old-fashioned religious revival in the churches, when, under great admonitions, a great many people get religion, which is deeply sincere. What we all need to do is to "get religion" in democracy.

In this critical battle only that system will survive which has the vitality to pull through and to conquer. No system or group ever faced so deadly a system and so dynamic a group as we face today. They have everything that we lack in fervor, willingness to sacrifice, zeal, complete oneness, hope of gain. There is something unmistakably the spirit of the crusader in their struggle. They are determined to give their order to the earth as the zealots who came out of the French Revolution were determined to spread their gospel to other men.

The gage of battle, therefore, is thrown down. It cannot be avoided. We can only conquer or die.

None of us would want to make odious comparisons, but it is worth noting that the

one country which has been pushing back upon the field of battle all of Hitler's devilish legions has been Russia where there is to be found a fervor about their system which alone of the United Nations equals that of the Nazis.

I venture to disclose my own humble opinion that if we do not go through a complete emotional revival with respect to democracy we are going to lose this war and with it all that we have cherished, all that we had hoped to have.

But what thrilling power is ours if our hearts are in the cause as they ought to be!

As the eye spans all this great hemisphere with its peoples and its great resources, which has turned its many forces almost with unanimity toward our foes, as we see your determined quality and the mighty British peoples, as we see towering Russia, colossal China, and all those other nations, great and small, who in one way or another are hand in hand with us, making together all but a quarter of the world's peoples, and about as much of the world's surface, with the resources, the skills, the strength, and the courage which we possess, it is apparent we have nothing to fear, except that we may somehow not do our best, or not do it in time.

We are encouraged by our cooperation to ask: Was there ever such unity among allies and friends in a struggle as there is among us of the United Nations now? Did good faith and confidence ever more clearly characterize our straining to do our best and to help one another in every possible way as now? Long ago, what each had and could give a hard-pressed friend, whether of money or materials, it gave it without stint. We are not thinking of getting back, but only of getting new weapons and added strength to those valiant peoples who so heroically defend, not only their homes and their ancient lands, but the common cause for which we all fight. The machinery for carrying on the war in unison is fast being perfected, while all that we do, even at home, is fast being made to fit into the pattern which is cut for all of us who fight together.

But more than anything else, what holds us so firmly together, what makes us so sure that we shall all give ourselves without thought of stint to this cause and fight it through and gain the victory, is that we know for what we fight. The issue stands in such bold relief that it meets the eye like a mighty mountain range. We all know what we fight against, but more important, we all are now seeing what we fight for.

Of course, we fight against the hated foe who has run amuck in the earth, killing and looting and raping—every fair thing he can lay his foul hand upon. Yes, we shall hurl him back, and if we do what we ought, the master monsters and the chief perpetrators of their crimes, those who have slaughtered millions, yes, even those who have butchered only a few, even one, we shall hang higher than Haman. Thus, like the vigilantes of our frontier days, not so far away that even some here remember them, we could break up that kind of crime and make the world a lawful and peaceful community. But we shall not be satisfied when we have done all this. We shall then only have gained the chance to build in peace upon the wreckage of the past and the hope of the future.

We must first bind up the wounds of those who have lived to suffer and make them as near whole as skill and care and prayer can make them. The dead we must honorably bury, and their monuments we must build. Then, we must set about the most challenging business of all, the reordering of the good earth, the readjustment of the earth's mighty forces, the bringing together in harmony of all the peoples of the earth, and opening unto them the doors of equal opportunity so near as may be; the strong nurturing the weak, and all restraining the strong; harnessing the machines of the earth to serve the needs of men, women, and children; a healthy, prosperous, peaceful, happy world.

We are determined upon a new order, but it is an order of which the Bible is the Atlantic Charter, the Bill of Rights, the brotherhood of man, and the fatherhood of God. Its aim is not tyranny but justice, not only among men but among nations, and its aspiration is to serve, not only states, but men, women, and children—ordinary, average, humble human beings. I think we will all agree that there has never in human history, in the midst of universal war and sad reverses, been so much and such confident talk of peace. Indeed, not a single nation in our great unity but has indicated in one way or another that peace was hardly less important than victory. We now know that victory is only a passing fancy if we do not win the peace as well. In my country we are drinking the bitter dregs of the peace we lost after the victory we all won a quarter of a century ago. We have learned now that to win the war and to win the peace are one and inseparable objectives.

Today we know that destructive ideas cross borders with appalling swiftness and threaten to destroy our democratic way of life. Physical aggression is a direct and imminent threat to every inhabitant of territories far removed from the center of power politics. South America, India, and South Africa are directly menaced, while the coasts of Canada, the United States, the Caribbean, and Australia have already been the scene of intense hostile activity.

But it is not only the scope of war that has increased as a result of modern conditions. Its destructiveness, the destructiveness of the doctrines taught by the aggressors of today, and the intensity with which their doctrines are taught and spread, are all increased as a result of the same conditions. Technical science is an impartial servant. Its discoveries and inventions stand ready to serve the cause of death as much as they are ready to serve the cause of peaceful progress. War has become total, hatred has become total, and never before was there as total a mobilization of evil forces as the one we witness today. It is a total, an all-inclusive danger we are threatened with, and our means of salvation should be no less all inclusive.

It is against this background of technical advancement that we must consider the dangers to the peace and the future of the world—that is, to our own peace and future. We should also consider the fact that mere reliance on the humanizing influences of religion, morality, and civilization proved insufficient. In our own case, such humanizing influences have shown their value. The long neighborly relations between our two countries are the most encouraging sign of all. And the body of well-meaning, well-informed enlightened opinion has grown throughout the world. But a sufficient residue of evil men and evil doctrines has existed in the world at all times. The gigantic strength these elements of evil are able to muster in our days shows that mere good will on the part of the great majority of mankind is no protection. Within a city, within a state, within a federal commonwealth, we do not rely on mere good will on the part of the majority. Taking this good will as a basis, we organize all men of good will and utilize their organization to keep down occasional wrongdoers, by threats of punishment if possible, by actual punishment if necessary.

Now that the perpetration of evil has assumed world-wide dimensions, I submit we see that its only adequate counterpart—an effective organization of peaceful humanity, complete with institutions for maintaining peace, for settling disputes, for introducing necessary changes, and for repressing evil—must be equally world-wide. War has become universal. Therefore, peace, too, must become universal. Either this, or the forces of good will not be adequate to cope with the forces of evil.

War, tragic as it is, is not the only menace to our way of life. In peace, our world has come to be integrated, its parts dependent on one another. In former days, each country, even each village, was self-sustaining as to essentials. Foreign trade was a convenience, not a necessity. Not so now. The very nature of our economy is linked with a continued flow of world trade. The grain grown in one country, the livestock raised in another, the cotton and wool coming from a third, the metal ores and coal from a fourth, the oil found in a fifth, the rubber extracted in a sixth, the machinery produced in a seventh—they create an all-embracing cycle of universal exchange of goods. It is a cycle the untrammeled continuation of which is essential to the maintenance of our standards of life, of the balance of our employment, of the stability of our occupations, and even of the cultural and spiritual values which our world is gradually reaching.

And just as the exchange of goods across thousands of miles has become part and parcel of modern life, so has the no less intense movement of persons and ideas. Profiting by the unprecedented facilities of the railroad, the steamship, the automobile, and the airplane, people have come to move across the face of the planet with unprecedented velocity and in unprecedented numbers. The modern printing press, the radio, and, last but not least, the motion pictures, have equipped humanity with means to transfer thoughts, ideas, and stimuli from country to country, from people to people, and to create for them a world-wide market, a world-wide audience.

In war and in peace, in matters spiritual and in matters material, the world has become a single entity, with an increasing uniformity of response to stimuli, with an increasing intensity of mutual contacts, of mutual dependence. The problem we face today resembles somewhat the problem encountered in a modern highway where traffic abounds. The few and far between contacts formerly existing between countries resembled the slow-moving flow of traffic on a country lane of bygone years. It was possible to deal with both in haphazard fashion, and no major catastrophe would have ensued. But the modern world, highly integrated, highly sensitive to disruptive influences and exposed to quick changes inherent in our dynamic civilization, just as the modern highway, cannot be adequately coped with without a well-synchronized system of traffic control. Either this, or a chaos as great as the volume of traffic that has been disrupted.

Indeed, what I am saying today is felt by most thinking individuals on earth—that out of this war there will come either a better world or a far worse one. The alternative we face is chaos, a spiritual and economic breakdown such as will cause us to lose the power that sustains our culture and our standards of life, that is, our whole civilization. A world civilization will be doomed to disappear and will be replaced by small, poverty-stricken units limited to their own local resources and tied down by a narrow parochial outlook. It will be a world where every group and locality will envy its neighbors, where civil wars, disease, and strife will spread, and the Dark Ages will descend upon us once more.

It is that spirit which distinguishes this struggle from any other in modern history. Who would not agree that that spirit, however strong it is, must be strengthened until in no part of the earth, in no human heart, can there be any doubt about our determination to build a better world, when we have

hurled over the precipice of a just retribution those who would destroy the world we have?

I dare say, an instance which came to my attention in Washington last week is not an unusual one. Examining a bibliography of books on the post-war period, the library assistant said: "But I could not get you any of them, for they are all out. Everybody is interested in the post-war period." In Washington President Roosevelt has designated the National Resources Planning Board as an agency to devote its full effort to post-war planning. By an Executive order he has set up other administrative agencies to work especially upon post-war problems.

The Congress is undoubtedly about to create special committees of its own to engage continuously in such studies. We are making arrangements to have even the plans and specifications all ready for approval, public work projects, and even legal obstacles, so far as possible, removed so that when the fateful day of the war's end shall come, a public program, if appropriate, can literally be put into beginning overnight throughout the nation. Private industry has its special research staffs working without ceasing upon new projects and plans. While I have mentioned only some of the things we are doing, it all has, at least, its counterpart here, and indeed with all our friends.

We are also trying to remove those obstacles which might lie in the way of our friendly action in meeting these post-war problems. You do not have such a situation here, but I might illustrate a case which has very real meaning to some of us at home. As you know, our Constitution requires a two-thirds majority of the Senate to ratify a treaty, even a treaty of peace to terminate a war, which a majority of both Houses, with the President, may begin. In the opinion of some of us such a provision gives too much and too fearful a power to so small a minority of even so responsible a body as our Senate. For many of us remember that both the League of Nations and the World Court had a majority of the Senate, although they could not muster the necessary two-thirds. It seems well that a provision, which is said to have been inserted in the Constitution by the New England members of the Constitutional Convention in 1787 who feared some infringement of their fishing rights by the new government, should not remain in this day to shackle the power of the people's representatives by a majority which represents the preponderant point of view to get on as best it can see with the world's work.

The lively interest which is everywhere to be found in the post-war world cannot be better evidenced than by the many proposals now current as to what form of world organization we should set up. Union now between the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States, regional organization of the work, a restoration of the League of Nations, a Permanent World Congress are a few of the suggestions upon which opinion is being formed. The encouraging thing is the well-nigh universal admission that the present form of things is not enough, that the machinery must be designed and built which can serve man's needs, politically, economically, culturally, and spiritually. And the challenging task is to devise and improvise such machinery. Hardly less satisfying is the evidence we have seen everywhere that nations and peoples realize that they must give up something which they now have, if they are to get these great things which they so much want and so badly need and do not have. I would call it, therefore, an enlightened spirit of self-denial which is to be found among those forces, nearly all who now see that the world is one, that these distances and spaces have been destroyed by man's own genius and they no longer protect him against abuses of his own unguarded power. They see that the old principle of the brotherhood of man like the newer one of honesty being the best policy is founded upon a pragmatic test. They see no doubt what the Teacher of Galilee saw when He said: "He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for My sake, shall find it."

While, therefore, we are fighting and giving up, and many are giving themselves, while we mobilize every shred of our strength and put all our fate and might against the implacable foe, let us keep in mind that he guards only the foothills of the mountains and beyond him there is a great distance to be covered, many rugged places to be mastered, many great feats yet to be performed, much courage, great vision yet demanded before we meet the rising sun upon the top of the hill.

THE WORLD WAR AND THE POST-WAR WORLD

(The second of the Marfleet lectures delivered by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, at the University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, February 27, 1942)

Your friend and our President Roosevelt in his first address to the Nation after Pearl Harbor said, "We are going to win the war, and we are going to win the peace that follows." Earlier the President had said, "The cooperation which we seek is the cooperation of free countries working together in a friendly, civilized society."

In addressing the American Congress in December you remember those pathetic and prophetic words of that great soldier of freedom, Prime Minister Churchill: "If we had kept together after the last war, if we had taken common measures for our safety, this renewal of the curse need never have fallen upon us. Do we not owe it to ourselves, to our children, to tormented mankind to make sure that these catastrophes do not engulf us for the third time? * * * Duty and prudence alike command that the germ centers of hatred and revenge should be constantly and vigilantly curbed and treated in good time and that an adequate organization should be set up to make sure that the pestilence can be controlled at its earliest beginning before it spreads and rages throughout the entire earth."

The whole world was thrilled by those declarations made, no doubt, close to your country, and we have some satisfaction in saying, in the new world, known as the Atlantic Charter, even in the dark summer of 1941. It is worthy of note that whereas the 14 points of another great prophet and soldier of freedom and democracy, President Wilson, spoke of nations and peoples principally, the Atlantic Charter left no doubt that the emphasis of its authors was upon the safety and the welfare of individual men, women, and children as well. Where in any other such document have you seen so much concern for ordinary men having jobs, ordinary families having homes, ordinary children having an education, ordinary old people having security, ordinary people having freedom of movement, speech, press, thought, conscience?

Where was there ever such a document as that drawn up in Washington on the 1st day of this momentous year by the 26 United Nations, coming from every hemisphere and continent, representing altogether three-quarters of the people of the earth, where the Atlantic Charter was definitely adopted and all the resources of those mighty peoples dedicated to the unhorsing of tyranny and the triumph of men, even over man's inhumanity to man?

Pope Pius XII, in pleading for a peace which would be just, in December of 1940, saw the necessity of every state insuring "the proper standards of living for its own citizens of every rank." Everyone will recall an earlier utterance of President Roosevelt laying down the "four freedoms" for which we must, without ceasing, strive: Freedom of speech and expression, everywhere in the world; freedom of worship, everywhere in the world; freedom from want, everywhere in the world; freedom from fear, everywhere in the world.

In the 10 proposals for peace which were drawn up by the highest authorities of the Anglican Roman Catholic and Free Churches in England in 1940, it was declared that "a peace settlement must be dictated by a sense of acute responsibility"; "that extreme inequality of wealth should be abolished"; and that "the resources of the earth should be used as God's gift to the whole human race and used with due consideration for the present and future generations."

Another statement from England adopted at the Malvern conference representing liberal Church of England clergy and laymen in January 1941, supported the 10 proposals for peace and made additional recommendations. "The only true end of production," asserted this conference, "is the satisfaction of human needs." Lord Halifax has said that the system to follow the war must "bring some real security into the daily life of our humblest citizen."

It is interesting to note that Mr. Brian Fenton, able editor of the Sidney Daily Telegraph of Australia, has said that after the war "something must be done to rescue nine tenths of the human race from the bread line." "Social justice at home depends upon social justice abroad."

These are just a few of those sentiments which in your own country everywhere are finding vigorous expression as to what kind of an order there must be in the post-war world. It is from the sources of such sentiments that are being drawn out so many plans and so much planning for that world which we must rescue from the holocaust of war.

That is the thing that makes this war endurable, that and the conviction that we can and shall make these dreams come true. Ours is a much sadder and wiser world than was that easy-going world which found itself suddenly plunged into the maelstrom of war in 1914. That war started as this one started, as all recent major wars in Europe have started, by ruthless German assault.

The motive behind those who fought against the Hitlerism of that day was first to hurl back the criminal attack, to regain that security and independence which had been snatched away. But before that struggle ended at least (Whatever the critics or the cynics may say) it was to the people of my country just what our President, who saw so far, said it was—a war to make the world safe for democracy.

At the end of that war President Wilson could say, as he did say, that the world had been made safe for democracy. But what a price had been paid! Our freedom so dearly bought should have been cherished and nurtured and guarded. Rather into the camp of those who had gained the victory came confusion in aim and purpose. We were not on guard enough against the temptation, natural enough to believe that the victory having been won, the enemy defeated, the danger avoided, God was in his heaven and all was well with the world.

My country morally, as we Baptists say, "fell from grace." It lapsed back into what was called normalcy, but was, in fact, moral apathy. We tired of restraint, shunned the call of duty, spurned obligations afar off, and pretty well fell to—

"The good old rule,
The simple plan,
That they should take, who have the power,
And they should keep who can."

among ourselves. In public and in private life moral standards fell sadly low. Almost

repenting of our crusade, we retreated into what we believed to be the impregnable fastness of our oceanic isolation. A few brave spirits, of course, did keep alive the flame of those great days, but few of the multitude, passing with the abandon of a circus crowd, cared to notice. We sowed the wind. We are reaping the whirlwind.

The fault, of course, is not all ours. There were others who "saw as through a glass darkly." The world had not learned to know itself well enough. It did not realize that the industrial revolution, science, business, transportation, commerce, travel had woven a tight web around the whole earth and made it all one. We had not learned that there was a practical basis also for the moral principle of brotherhood, and that well-being anywhere was directly related to well-being everywhere. It was too soon in the history of man for those who ordered the earth in that day to see that fate had given them an opportunity to build better than men had ever built before; each people to have its part in building a magnificent edifice in the city of man, bearing its own craftsman's mark.

I remember hearing Dr. Brüening, formerly German Chancelor, say that Hitler came to power for three principal reasons:

First, the failure of the people of Europe to keep their governments in power long enough to solve the challenging post-war problems.

Second, the inability of the governments of Europe to remove the obstructions of trade barriers so that there might have been in Europe that exchange of goods and services which would have brought stability, maybe prosperity.

Third, the failure of the governments of Europe to solve the problem of currency stabilization, without which there could be no economic stability.

But nations asking the old question: "What have I to do with this nation?" failed to appreciate that the dictate of necessity was the assured well-being of all other peoples in a world so interdependent. It was too soon for nations to understand that nations, like individuals, had to curb their rights, to exercise less than their whole power to live as good citizens in the world community. For example, my country in 1930 took full advantage of its legal prerogative in passing a tariff act. Only later did we see that we had drawn a noose around our own neck, and that the principal of live and let live is just as good business as it is ethics. Of course, hard-pressed nations would seek the temporary advantage of currency devaluation when there was no more substantial alternative. Hence, hindsight now reveals that the peace after the First World War was destined to collapse because the structure which was designed to support it had too few pillars. Without a solid economic foundation there could be no stable world system.

But who of us is not proud that it was our own generation that saw the culmination of a long and uphill trail in the creation of the League of Nations, to which, at one time or another, almost every country but my own had belonged. It was a magnificent beginning. To me and to many in my country it will be an enduring satisfaction which shall partially obscure, we hope, our abandonment of this child, that we once nobly gave it birth. Do not underestimate the League. The pages of history set apart for its records will be far from blank. There were some great years during which the heart and the hope of mankind were centered upon the League. On the shores of the crystal-pure waters of the Lake of Geneva there stands an edifice in the chambers of which there were once men and women from 56 nations of many tongues, many colors, many creeds, all working for a better world, former friend and foe together. Not in all history was there a counterpart. The world, one might have hoped, had shrunk to a community. It seemed that we were at last in the presence of a courthouse and a sheriff.

Lest we might too much despair over the eclipse of this majestic dream and that we might view the panorama of man's struggle toward an ordered world, let us look back over the records.

In the dim past of western civilization, those great prophets of the Old Testament, Isaiah and Micah, set the goal of a world united in peace, justice, and the fear of God. Ever since, by slow stages, thinkers have been preparing blue prints of a world wholly or in part organized, and governments, from time to time, have been experimenting with certain forms of international organization.

In the world of ancient Greece, from the seventh to the fourth centuries B. C., Amphictyonic leagues and other stable confederations attempted to bring together several sovereign states, organizing them for peaceful cooperation. Most significant among them were the Achaean League of some 12 city-states, based on perfect equality of the member states, without domination of one over the others; and the great Delphic Amphictyony, which, supported by the authority of common worship, brought together almost the entire Greek race.

Even in ancient Italy, before Rome began its ascent toward world empire, there existed, in the seventh to fourth centuries B. C., the Latin League of about 30 city-states, with whom Rome, too, was associated, and which functioned as a true federation.

After centuries of peace imposed by force upon a large part of the western world by the Roman Empire, that power broke asunder, and for a long time people lost touch with one another, restricted within their local units. Gradually, western and central Europe awoke from stupor. Though divided in innumerable units, the people of that part of the world were aware of their spiritual unity symbolized by the Roman Catholic Church, and developed a pull after temporal unity as well. Pope and Emperor—an Emperor usually chosen by vote of princes representing different countries—assured a kind of international organization from the eighth till the fifteenth century.

But this vague organization did not suffice to the best minds of Europe, still nurturing Isaiah's ancient dream, and we find Pierre Dubois, a French scholar, proposing in 1305 that all Christian powers ally themselves for the maintenance of peace and institute a permanent court of arbitration.

Even more interesting was the plan suggested in 1461 by King Podiebrad of Bohemia, a precursor of the Czechoslovaks (noble ideas of a Masaryk and a Benes) in our days, to organize a Federal union composed of all Christian states, with a permanent council in the city of Basle as the supreme body.

When Reformation disrupted the former unity of the western world, reducing in consequence the part played by Pope and Emperor as centers of a precarious international order, individuals and governments were driven to feel doubly the need for a world union. Individuals, some of them heads of states and responsible statesmen, indulged freely in far-reaching projects of a full-fledged federation of Europe or even of the world.

First in point of time and most amazing in many respects was the plan submitted in 1603 by King Henry IV of France and his minister, Sully, to other governments with a view to establishing a European federation composed of 15 member states of equal strength and equal status, with a general council to administer the federation's affairs.

There followed in 1623 the project of Emeric Crucé, a learned Frenchman, of a world union of states. With a broad-mindedness far in advance of his time, Crucé wanted to include the non-Christian states into the world union on an equal footing with the states professing various Christian creeds, and proposed the city of Venice as seat of the general council of the union.

There followed in quick succession the projects of the German philosopher Leibnitz in 1676; of the Count of Hesse-Rheinfels in 1673; of Charles Duke of Lorraine, in 1683; of one of America's earliest and greatest statesmen, William Penn, in 1693; of the English Quaker, John Bellers, in 1710; of the French Abbé de St. Pierre in 1712 (with his Abrégé published in 1729); of Cardinal Alberoni in 1735, of the Frenchman D'Argenson in the 1740's; of Jeremy Bentham, of England, in 1789; of the German Schlettwein in 1791; of the philosopher Kant in 1795; and of the Frenchman St. Simon and Thierry, in 1814. This array of names includes only the most outstanding ones belonging to many nations. It indicates that courageous and inquisitive minds could not rest while the world remained an arena of selfish strife. In a way, Kant's contribution will interest us more particularly. This great German inspired by the French Revolution was one of the first who insisted that the world union could not be securely built unless it is based on democratic principles, representing a union of peoples rather than a union of rulers.

After 1814, the idea of organizing the world made rapid progress. With pride I may point out the leadership of my countrymen in this movement. Peace societies were founded in 1815 in Massachusetts, New York, and Ohio. Similar societies in other States followed, and in 1828 they consolidated in the American Peace Society, led by that apostle of world peace, William Ladd. The Advocate of Peace, the organ of this movement, started appearing in 1834, and still continues its good work.

A similar movement of peace societies developed in England beginning 1816. The English economists, Cobden and Richard, were among its leaders. It spread to other countries, and international peace congresses were held annually between 1848 and 1853. After a brief interval, further international peace congresses were held in Switzerland under the auspices of another international group, the "League de la paix et de la liberté," founded by the Frenchman Charles Lemonnier. This peace movement of the nineteenth century, while mainly pacifist in character, went beyond propaganda for disarmament and arbitration. A volume published in 1840 and edited by William Ladd dealt with the core of the problem—it was a collection of essays on a congress of nations. The "League de la paix et de la liberté" raised prominently the issue of a united states of Europe. Victor Hugo presided over the peace congress of 1849 in Paris; Garibaldi took active part in the peace congress of 1867 in Geneva; and the English-speaking world was stirred in 1842 by Tennyson's inspired vision, in his Locksley Hall:

"For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see.
Saw the vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;
Saw the heaven fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rain'd a ghastly dew
From the nation's airy navies grappling in the central blu ;
Far along the world-wide whisper of the south wind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples plunging thro' the thunderstorm;
Till the war drum throbb'd no longer, and the battle flags were furl'd
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world.
There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law."

In the meantime, preparatory work was being accomplished in many directions. Pacifists led by Baroness Bertha von Suttner led the struggle for disarmament. Lawyers, combining in the "Institut de droit international" and the "international law association", began laying the foundations of a future universal law. Two of Europe's lawyers, the Scot Lorimer and the Swiss Bluntschli, came out with proposals of an international federation. Members of legislatures from many countries formed the Interparliamentary Union and strongly urged the substitution of arbitration for war. The best and most enlightened elements of the world's public opinion were getting ready, by stages, for the great idea of an international federation. On May 5, 1910, Theodore Roosevelt, former President of the United States, in an address before the Nobel Committee in Christiania, Norway, bluntly declared as goal "the establishment of some sort of international, police power, competent and willing to prevent violence as between nations." The United States Congress added its authoritative voice of approval. On April 5, 1910, a resolution was introduced into the House of Representatives of the United States by Representative Bartholdt, of Missouri, "to authorize the appointment of a commission to draft articles of international-federation, and for other purposes." The resolution, as modified by a proposal by Representative Bennett, of New York, authorized "a commission of five members * * * to consider the expedience * * * of constituting the combined navies of the world an international force for the preservation of universal peace."

The resolution in this form was adopted—unanimously, mark you—by the House on June 20, 1910, by the Senate on June 24, 1910, and became law the next day as Public Resolution No. 47, Sixty-first Congress. It can be found, a monument to the real sentiments of America, in Volume 36 of the United States Statutes at Large, on page 885.

While far-reaching projects were thus being prepared by individuals, groups, and single countries, the governments of the world, too, were driven to recognize the unsatisfactory state of a divided and disorganized world. Clinging jealously to their cherished independence they were afraid to adopt with determination a world federation scheme and relied for preservation of peace on the inadequate instrument of defensive alliances and the artificial device of balance of power. But the methods were plainly insufficient, and time after time the great powers of the world—those with most stakes in the affairs of the world—had to invent some machinery for organizing this planet. To do this, they resorted to international congresses and conferences which decided at least the most urgent questions of the time, leaving other questions in abeyance. This conference method had numerous drawbacks; it lacked permanence; it depended on a sufficient number of great powers being willing to resort to it; it required unanimity and therefore could always be broken up by any power sufficiently obstinate; it placed the decisions on the fate of countries and nations in the hands of a group of great powers which were free to invite other, smaller countries to the conference table or not.

In spite of all these drawbacks, it is most significant that the decisive powers of the world, at critical times in history, after wars and at important points in times of peace, again and again assembled in conference to obviate at least temporarily the deplorable lack of the sorely needed permanent organization of mankind.

To name but the most important ones of these international congresses, we have the Congress of Westphalia in 1648, the Congress of Utrecht in 1713, the Congress of Aix-La-Chapelle in 1748, the Congress of Vienna in 1814, in which was born the semi-permanent organization of the "Concert of Europe"—including England, France, Prussia, Russia, Autria-Hungary, with Italy later added—and the smaller and briefer "Holy Alliance." The next important congresses of the "Concert of Europe" were the Congress of Paris in 1856, and the two congresses of Berlin in 1878 and 1885.

In addition to these occasional political congresses, piecemeal organization of the world was progressing since the middle of the last century. International conferences, more or less universal in character, were convened to deal with the treatment of prisoners, with communications, with various technical and humanitarian questions. Conventions were drafted and international bodies were set up to administer the agreed rules. It was a mesh which bound the countries of the world together, always closer and closer, but a mesh made of thin and weak threads, with every government retaining the right to kick out, start a war and destroy—for a time, at least—all the patient work that was built up so carefully.

But both the great political congresses and the international administrative conventions demonstrated the universally felt need of a thorough federalization of the world, and the trend toward this federalization was unmistakable.

The dawn of the future rose in 1899 when an almost universal conference assembled at The Hague to consider disarmament and the substitution of arbitration and conciliation for war. Neither the first nor the Second Hague Conference, in 1907 succeeded in these tasks, and on the eve of the third conference the war of 1914 broke out.

But in 1919 the world was determined to continue pulling the long up-hill trail toward world organization. The Paris Peace Conference, an assembly of many nations, wrote five peace treaties—Versailles, St. Germain, Trianor, Neuilly, Seives—not particularly good nor particularly bad they were, as peace treaties go—and left a conference of ambassadors, representing the major allies, to supervise the carrying out of the treaty provisions. But the eyes of the world were glued with hope on the other child of the Peace Conference—the League of Nations, with its two associated bodies of the World Court and the International Labor Organization.

An attempt was made in 1924 to strengthen the League by the Geneva protocol. Here, then, are the footprints of our faltering course up the long trail. What of the path ahead? What sort of an order shall we set up when at last the joyous bells of peace shall ring out? I wonder if we appreciate just what we are doing now; I mean those of us who are members of the United Nations in working together.

Remember that three-fourths of the human race are together against tyranny in this war. There is already much planning together, working together, fighting together. The controls are becoming more effective, tighter and more completely in harmony all over our vast lands. This process will so much grow we all hope, I know, that by the time we hit our stride we shall all who are together in this fight, move each in its orbit with precision and sureness. Or to put it another way, let us like the many elements of a modern army, move each in its appointed manner, with complete unison and efficiency. What valuable experience in working together that will afford and at a time when the serious issue is life and death, too? What understanding will it give us all of one another? What confidence and trustworthiness can it give rise to?

How mightily may it allay those suspicions which rise in the minds of nations as in the minds of men? What lessons will it teach us in helping one another to help the whole cause? What may it do to teach us that we gain by giving? Surely we will have learned what each has to give and what each lacks and what there is may be distributed all around where it is needed. Can you imagine anything more valuable than the lessons we already know and will know much better before it is over of how little the question of money matters? We see now how it is just another one of the essential materials to be shifted around where the front demands it. We who are a people addicted to sports know especially what it means to have played on a team with some other fellows and to have been battered in hard games against bitter rivals.

Out of the long experience, therefore, which we will get from the conduct of this war, we shall already have rubbed off the rough edges of one another and got to getting along smoothly as men do who depend upon each other for life.

These are very real reasons why the utmost of collaboration among us all in the conduct of this war is so very essential besides winning the war. If we are doing that, it should not be so difficult to keep on doing it when the war is over. Indeed, the necessity then will hardly be less than it is now, for those, too, will be hard days. Peace will not bring the end of famine and disease and poverty and wounds and disorder and confusion. It will not automatically solve anything. All it will do is to release the mighty energies of man for the wholesome work of building up instead of tearing down.

It may strike you as strange to hear me say, "I hope the end of the war will bring no immediate peace." I mean, of course, I want to see no peace arranged of the sort we think of as ending wars, when the wounds of war are yet open and running and it is too early to see what the whole course of treatment must be. When hostilities actually stop, when the enemy has been forced into the corner of his own land, when his weapons have been stricken from his hands and he is powerless to go on fighting, then our first task is to be sure that there is a guard over him, that he cannot strike at us while our backs are turned. Our next task is to get things straightened out; to get our soldiers and sailors and airmen home.

Then we must size up the situation, examine the state of things, see what there is to be done. And then just keep on working together to get it done; continue the same coordination and cooperation among the United Nations which made them win the war. Supplies will still be needed to be transferred across the oceans and the lands to where they are most needed. Surely, in the other hemisphere they must have food everywhere, and there must be money, money to bind up the wounds of the injured, to house the weak, to provide homes for the homeless, to rebuild every kind of edifice, to restore the harvests, and to bring light into the dark places where hope is dormant.

Of course, there will be adjustments and understandings and give and take, and at times gentle suggestions will accompany responses as in our own time we have seen freedom of religion the handmaiden of lend-lease. The personnel of the conferences will, of course, change, but politicians must not be the only ones to displace the generals and the admirals. In fact there must be fewer politicians—maybe no politicians at all: rather those who are statesmen in economics, in health, in jobs, in housing, in working conditions, in a world currency, in world trade, in world freedom, in a world bill of rights, in a world order.

With the fighting stopped it will be possible for the planners to meet at a convenient place and to meet constantly there and to have adequate facilities for their convenience and comfort and for their work. I do not know of any building better adapted for such meeting than those spacious buildings at

Geneva which were once so well used. And a lot of people who have once worked there and have had a great experience in getting along with people from all over the world and handling things which come in from everywhere and speaking different languages could well be brought back there to serve new masters.

If all of the representatives of the United Nations fighting the war of reconstruction together should choose to have their meetings there and call themselves, or if it should be arranged that they should be called the continuing Congress of the United Nations, it would let people everywhere see that we were determined to stand together for peace as we had stood together for war. And to this Congress would be at once invited all nations whether they had been active or not in the war, whether they had been friend or foe. Obviously if the mistakes of the past are not to be repeated, the work of reconstruction must go on in the vanquished nations as well as in the hurt lands of the victors. Those who shall have fallen have their honorable part to play in the scheme of the world.

Arrangements will be made effectively to disarm those whose record of lawlessness has made them always suspect. There must be no possible chance left that any such disturber of the world's peace, or any other who might do so, shall have the power to run amuck again.

Yet, by continuing concert of action by all working together for the common world good, by intelligent and enlightened economic planning and collaboration, by assuring all nations and peoples a square deal in access to raw materials, to markets, to money, to skills, by a new spirit on the part of many like ourselves who have been singularly blessed, much can be done to break down the impulse for any nation to burn brigand.

In this collaboration stage certain techniques will be adopted for handling international problems, and hence institutions will naturally arise to meet varying world demands. For example, international banks will arise in which will be housed, no doubt, for the stabilization of world currency, the major part of the world gold, which is now in the United States. There will be an institution for the settlement of international disputes which are juridical in nature. Certain boards and commissions will be provided which will effectuate the policy of the Congress with respect to all those multiple factors which enter into a healthy world economy. Committees will be constantly at work unearthing facts, accumulating knowledge, working out solutions, harmonizing differences, carrying on the work of a workaday world.

Of course, there will be assurances on the part of those who participate that they will enter into no arrangements privately with any other power affecting any matter of world concern without bringing the matter fully to the attention of the Congress and obtaining its approval. But in the stage of which I am thinking membership in the Congress should not be compulsory, or in any formal way, binding. One does not have to rope and drag traders to the market place. They come there eagerly to do business. There is gain in being there. That is because no doubt each trader feels he has a fair chance and that he will get fair treatment.

It is essential that such a congress be so constituted that it shall be truly representative of those peoples whom it joins together, not only of their governments, and each country must have a feeling that it has fair hearing. It will probably be further necessary, therefore, to have a bicameral body with such a compromise as we have in the United States, where representation, according to population, is the rule in the House and equality the rule in the Senate. Of course, the chambers of the congress will be an open forum which can reach the world's ear, and, it is to be hoped, the world's mind.

These suggestions have grown largely out of the working of your commonwealth system and our pan-American system, and in anticipation of what our experience in international collaboration will have been by the end of the war. It seems to me the most natural beginning, the easiest order to set up since it is essentially only a variation of the method of conferring together about common problems and toward common ends in which we shall have engaged in winning the war.

Of course, this is only the antechamber of a structure we all visualize and work for. This makeshift arrangement would impress everybody with its inadequacy and the common judgment of the world would sooner or later demand the building of an edifice which would adequately house the machinery which alone can reasonably and safely order all the world.

I have referred to the struggles and dreams toward a world system. I have mentioned the intimacy of the contact being experienced day by day by the members of the United Nations. I wonder if we are fully aware of just what remarkable cohesion and unity has already been attained in putting together the peoples of our earth.

In the United States one hundred and thirty millions of people live under the same government, the same laws, and the same flag, of many races, colors, religions, even languages, and yet they are a nation with a body, mind, and soul.

Look at your case—a great nation and a vast land, inhabited by men and women of many lands, and springing in the main from two great civilizations—the English-speaking civilization and the civilization of France. In wise appreciation of these historical differences, you have not attempted to submerge them through artificial centralization. But neither have you decided to sow the seeds of future discord by complete separation along linguistic or religious lines—as so many groups in Europe have been separating. You have adopted a federal system, you have given full self-government to your provinces, you have assured the survival of French culture among the descendants of French colonists, and the survival of British culture among those who hail from Britain, but you stand as a united family facing together common problems and external dangers, working jointly for a better future.

We in my country are a part of a Pan American Union which is a functioning organization which embraces in a very effective way all of that immeasurable land and those many people to the South of us in this whole hemisphere. That Pan American Union has a magnificent edifice in Washington which houses its work and its workers. It has a structure which is very definite and real. It has background, specially defined objectives, diligent functioning committees, truly a spirit. It is one of the very real and dynamic forces of the world, speaking altogether for nearly an eighth of the world's people. In spite of the divergence in language, original conditions, cultural and economic interests, this great union has grown greater and every part more interdependent upon each other part until it is beginning to be the realization of Simon Bolivar's dream for this hemisphere one and a quarter centuries ago.

You likewise are a part of a vast commonwealth of nations, stretching around the world. A part of a total system one-quarter of all the world's people. In your great commonwealth constellation each moves in its own orbit, while maintaining to the outside world a marvelous harmony. You, too, are one from many. You, of that commonwealth, are not bound together by force, or the pull of any power save the affinity of a common origin, or common interest and common ends. Such attraction is stronger than the pull of a magnet on steel, or the swaying of the tides by the silvery moon.

Look at Russia—so vast a land that it challenges the imagination. It has 60 nationalities and 140 languages, multiplicitous varieties in its whole pattern, yet all of its parts find their place in one of the 11 autonomous republics under their constitutional system. Each of these republics has by the constitution its own power and prerogatives which even includes the right of secession. Yet all of these vast lands, all these many peoples, all this colossal power move in an invariable unity and today these heroic people like a legion of angry giants, are hurling back the Frankensteins of Hitler. These nearly two hundred millions of people are opening their eyes to the light of a new day and to new and fuller lives, which bodes so much good for themselves and the world.

And see great China aroused from its long sleep, today catching the passion of a new life, 400,000,000 of people, from vast areas, divergent experiences, and what appear to be unbridgeable gulfs between them now finding a new unity, a new power, and a new destiny. There are other vast areas and many other great peoples who have honorable places in the family of United Nations. We see then that neither mountains nor rivers nor oceans nor distances nor differences can keep apart men of good will who would work together.

Now all these mighty systems and many others equally worthy are interwoven with one another, working, fighting, and dying together, again out of common interest and for common ends. All these great unities, except my country, have been members of the League of Nations, have had to do with its experience, seen the occasion of its failure, and no doubt is sadder and wiser than ever before. Is there not good reason then to be confident about the future? And we must not forget that we still have the very real force and pattern of the League of Nations, the World Court, the International Labor Office, and many units of the League functioning when the war will let them against traffic in women and narcotics and in alleviating economic and social conditions.

Compare what our generation has accomplished or bids fair to gain for a world order and world justice with anything in the past from the Amphictyony League through the Hague Conventions, and you will see that we have much to console us and to give us hope.

It is suggested that we might start by some sort of regional arrangement our post-war collaboration with the hope that thereafter the regional units might be put together into a larger frame. I do not favor this approach, although family unity, of course, never prevented any separate members of the family from being very close together. My view is enforced by the feeling that the problems with which we are struggling today are not regional problems but world problems, and they must all be approached with a world perspective. We are today collaborating upon a world basis; even our people think in terms of world affairs. We look at world maps and fight around the world. If the world is to be saved, it is to be saved together. If it sinks, it will sink not in parts but as a whole. We will all admit that the day when nations may build up a colossal armament and threatening power like the day of pistol "toting" in most of our countries must go. There must be effective disarmament and a force centrally directed which can put down lawlessness in any part of the world community. There must be an adequate machinery for the adjustment of con-

flicts, in a judicial atmosphere. There must be a forum in which a claimant may be heard and in which just redress may be afforded. There must be encouraged and established everywhere a bill of rights to insure to all men in all lands those safeguards and privileges to which man has a natural right and which will make where he lives less important as to the kind of life he can live.

There must be the pushing down of those barriers which break the natural and necessary flow of goods and services among the peoples of the earth. No one will be expected to give up his country any more than in your country one is expected to give up his province, or in mine, his state, but we will all understand what we determined in my country by a sad Civil War, that one's whole allegiance is not to the immediate place of his birth, or his residence.

The lines of national boundaries will be softened and lose their sharpness. As the economic level rises in all the world, there will be more travel and hence better understanding amongst people. The means of travel will exceed anything we now can think of. Methods of communication even will be vastly improved. We will all be rubbing elbows most all of the time. And each nation will be enriched by more intimate contact with the culture of every other people, while under a universal urge science, always akin everywhere, will gain a new unity and greater achievement.

Of course, some of us are going to have to take the initiative in getting things going and in keeping them going, just as men of good will and vision have had to do in every movement. There must be some whose faith never falters, who keep steadily ahead toward the goal. There must be some who will stand steadfast together, no matter what comes. There must be some to bear the brunt and shock of discouragement, or even failure. That is our role—the role primarily of your people and mine. Everyone expects us to assume that role. We are richly endowed for it. We can succeed.

One of the peculiarities of our civilization is our way of plodding along by trial and error, by improvisation, by devising instruments adapted to the occasion. I have preferred to rely upon that genius of our people rather than to make a blueprint of what we should do. Here again I draw upon the analogy of my country in the formation of its Federal Constitution. The prime impulse from that Constitution came from George Washington, who brought a small group together, as you remember, at Mount Vernon, ostensibly to sign a compact for the regulation of a river between Virginia and Maryland. Shortly, Pennsylvania and Delaware were brought in because of relevant interests. Then the Legislature of Virginia, beginning to get a vision, suggested a general convention of commissioners from the several States to consider the trade of the Union and "how far a uniform system in their commercial relations may be necessary to their common interests and as a matter of harmony." This led to a convention at Annapolis in 1786, attended by five States. One State, New Jersey, it was noted in the report of the convention made by Alexander Hamilton to the legislatures of the States represented and to the Congress, had authorized its delegates to consider not only commercial regulations but "other important matters" necessary to the common interest and permanent harmony of the several States. This report also suggested the calling of another convention with larger powers because, said the report, framed by the far-seeing Hamilton, the "power of regulating trade is of such comprehensive extent, and will enter so far into the general system of the Federal Government, that to give it efficacy, and to obviate questions and doubts concerning its precise nature and limitation, may require a corresponding adjustment of other parts of the Federal System."

This report moved the Federal Congress in February of 1787 to resolve that there should be a convention to consider the means of "establishing in these states a firm national government," and to "render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of the government and the preservation of the Union."

I have dwelt upon this well-known history of the formation of the Federal Union in the United States for two reasons.

First, the cloth was woven upon the loom of commerce and the concept of an adequate government was thought of as inevitably necessary to provide satisfactory commercial conditions.

Secondly, it illustrates our characteristic method of approach to such problems for the delegates to the Constitutional Convention went there with no particular plan, pattern, or precedent. Out of necessity and broad experience and we believe divine guidance they evolved a system which has endured with some strength for more than a century and a half and its greatest days may lie ahead.

We know that men of good will in the world can still build magnificent mansions and dream great dreams. We shall feel and find our way on up the hill, moved, as were the framers of our Constitution, by the necessity of preserving what we have gained, of atonement to those who have died that others might live, and under that divine guidance which is ever man's strength and hope.

Control of Food Prices and Wages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 12), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, by request, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the broadcast of Raymond Gram Swing on Tuesday, May 4, 1943.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This country has been going through certain definite stages of education about economic matters. It has learned by now that it does not want inflation. It has learned that if food prices rise wages are bound to rise, and that if wages rise food prices are bound to rise. It has learned that if food prices and wages both rise they start in pursuit of each other, and that this case goes up the spiral of inflation. Inflation defeats both the rise in food prices and the rise in wages, and any struggle at this time between one section of the community to benefit at the expense of another section threatens to bring down the community and all its sections. The country knows this. It is against inflation.

But now another lesson has to be learned. If prices and wages are to be held in leash, they must be controlled. Wages can be controlled more easily than prices, because they can be controlled through collective consent. But the collective consent will not come easily unless the control of prices is genuine. And the new lesson to be learned is that prices cannot be controlled simply by a decree fixing prices in retail stores. Prices do not rise because men are evil. Retail prices, as a rule, rise because demand exceeds supply. In this war, food prices would be bound to rise so long as there is less food than the public or the Government wish to buy.

So the control of food prices is a problem, first of all, of obtaining all the production possible. Since food prices cannot rise without being followed by a rise in wages, some other provision must be made for stimulating food production, even though the products are to be sold at fixed retail prices. If production is not stimulated, the kinds of food needed will not be produced in the maximum quantity. So far the spokesmen of the agricultural interests in and out of Congress have demanded that the one stimulus to production should be that of higher prices. That was sound capitalism so long as there was a free market. But now we have no free market, we cannot operate in the habitual capitalist way. If food prices rise, wages will rise, and we shall be threatened with inflation. So there must be some other stimulus to production. Those farmers who are not able to produce at capacity must be helped financially to do so. Many small farmers need the help of credit. Whether this is offered through the Farm Security Administration or some other agency is beside the point. The point is that the technique of the Farm Security Administration will have to be used if the farmers who cannot produce now, because they need credit to buy machinery and tools and equipment and seeds, are made capable of producing.

Then there is another technique which is just as vitally necessary to stimulate production. That is subsidies. A subsidy is an addition to a price, paid by the Government, and ultimately borne by the taxpayer. The consumer does not pay it as a consumer. As a consumer he continues to buy at the fixed price. But later on he pays for it, as taxes are paid in a democracy, according to his ability to pay. This saves the price level, and hence the wage level. And it helps to increase the kind of production needed.

Look for a moment at the way the British deal with the problem of prices. They are not fixing ceilings on everything the way we are doing it, but their aim is the same. They may realize that the price of this or that food may have to go up to obtain the production needed. If so, they bring down the cost of living in some other way, say by subsidizing the manufacture of certain kinds of clothing, and bringing down the price of clothing. They pick and choose which prices shall be allowed to rise and which made to fall. But they have the same purpose, of keeping the level of the cost of living steady. But without subsidies, the British could not manipulate prices. And in this country, where we are committed to price ceilings, we cannot function without subsidies either. So far Congress has steadfastly refused to vote subsidies in the sums needed. Congress so far is acting as though there were a free market when there is none. And if this philosophy were to prevail we should not be able to escape the threat of inflation.

To bring this back to the miners, you will not need to be reminded that the Bankhead and Pace bills were kept from becoming laws because they would have increased food prices, and that would have justified a demand for the increase of wage rates by the miners. The two segments of the problem, prices and wages, were dealt with one at a time. The Bankhead and Pace bills were sidetracked so that a rise in wage rates would not be inevitable in the mine fields. For if miners had been granted higher rates, then other workers would be entitled to higher rates too. Now the other segment of that conflict—the wage segment—is awaiting settlement. There is a little confusion at this point, because the miners are to have a 6-day

week, and will get overtime for the sixth day. That overtime for the same amount of work on one day is inflationary. But in the main, the issue is not over the amount the miners get, but the rate they get. For rates of wages in one industry affect rates in other industries.

The administration now has promised to reduce certain prices and to hold all other prices. And workers are now waiting to see whether the Government can fulfill that promise. If it can they are committed not to press for an increase in wage rates. But the administration cannot keep the promise simply by fixing retail prices. It can only do it if at the same time that it holds retail prices it increases production, first by aiding farmers with needed credit, and then by the wise use of subsidies. But the administration is not able to do either without the collaboration of Congress. Congress so far refuses to grant either kind of power. It withholds subsidies, and it rejects plans to advance credits to small farmers. It insists on living as though a price economy were still possible.

In other words, we are trying to prevent inflation without the action it takes to prevent it in the present kind of economy. The Office of Price Administration can shout at prices until it is hoarse. The Department of Justice can send black marketers to prison. But that will not produce the quantity of food we need, nor will it stimulate this and that special kind of food production. If a price economy is gone, control alone can take its place. It can be police control, which doesn't grow much food, or it can be economic control, which does. The only control that will avert inflation is economic control. And that the Government cannot exercise without the authority of Congress. If Congress continues to deny the authority, then incentives cannot be offered to obtain the required results. It is true that we have had to forego some of the techniques of capitalism because of the war. But it is all the more true that we do and must retain the technique of an incentive economy. And if that is not all there is to the capitalist system it is what matters most to a society whose citizens want to be free.

Opposes the Return of the Japanese to the Pacific Coast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD a letter from a very prominent businessman in California who has been associated in a business way with the Japanese for many years. I think he has a better knowledge of their thinking and actions than any of the theorists handling this problem:

TORLEY'S,
Los Angeles, Calif., May 10, 1943.

Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POULSON: I notice that you are taking an active part in opposing the return of the Japanese to the Pacific coast for the duration of the war. I want to concur with you in your fight and also to point out a few reasons why this is very important to us on the Pacific coast.

I have had considerable experience in dealing with the Japanese for the past 20 years in my business; I have done millions of dollars worth of business with them. I think I am well qualified to pass on their general mentality—in fact, far better than many of these so-called intellectuals who are with the War Relocation Board, when they suggest they have a method of determining whether a Japanese is loyal or disloyal.

In all of my business dealings, I have found the Japanese not only shrewd and cunning as many other tradesmen, but you never know what is going on in their minds. So many times they say one thing and do the other. Their pleasant and smiling manners are merely a smoke screen.

I believe there are loyal Japanese, and like all Americans, I feel they should be treated as loyal Americans, but I certainly question the ability of anyone to determine who is loyal and who is disloyal. Being born in America is not the test. Therefore, I think it advisable not to return these Japanese to the Pacific coast for the duration. After the war is another problem, which I will not discuss at this time.

I think you and the other Representatives from California, who are taking this stand, are really performing a worth-while service for your country.

Very truly yours,

J. M. TORLEY,
President.

Fourth Presidential Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 12), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an 8-minute address delivered by Hon. Matthew M. Neely, Governor of West Virginia, on the 29th of April, in support of the affirmative of the question Should the President of the United States Have a Fourth Term?

The debate was sponsored by America's Town Meeting of the Air, and was broadcast over the Blue Network from my home town of Pittsburgh.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Moderator, ladies and gentleman of America's Town Meeting of the Air, please do not consider it an unpardonable sin for me to observe that in this fashionable Schenley section of Pittsburgh, Pa.—which, judging from the audience, has been favored with "all that wealth and all that beauty ever gave"—enthusiasm for a fourth term for President Roosevelt is presumably just as near fever heat as the demand in the heart of Texas is for a second term for former President Hoover.

But since the State of Virginia, of which mine was formerly a part, once caused her illustrious son George Washington and his soldiers to come here and save your ancestors from the tomahawks, the scalping knives and the fagots of the Indian warriors, who were then as numerous as the trees in your primeval forests, entire fairness from the audience to a West Virginian is assured, regardless of the devotion of the congregation to Republican principles, or its lack of love for a Democratic President.

With this sincere compliment to your worldly wealth, your beautiful women, and your praiseworthy impartiality, we proceed to the oral battle which my eminent friend, Senator Bridges, like the war horse in the Book of Job, impatiently "smelleth afar off."

Except the worship of our Heavenly Father and the salvation of our immortal souls, the most momentous of our indispensabilities, duties, or desires is the prompt and decisive winning of the appalling war that is menacing civilization, murdering millions in cold blood, and spreading desolation from the English Channel to the heart of China, and from the Tropic of Capricorn to the Arctic Circle. Everything that tends to prevent or hinder this consummation should be promptly banished to limbo for the duration of the crisis.

Upon these premises and the assumption that the war will not have ended, or at least that the treaty of peace commemorating its results will not have been ratified before the next general election, please let me earnestly advocate the affirmative of the question:

"Should the President of the United States have a fourth term?"

For many reasons—none of which brevity of time will permit me to amplify—it is my sincere belief that in existing circumstances the Presidency of Franklin Roosevelt is as indispensable to the welfare of America and the freedom of the world as a fire department is to a city that is wrapped in the flames of its own combustion and shrouded with the smoke of its own conflagration.

Agreeable with the suggestion of the management, the question will be debated under four interrogatories.

First, "Would a change in Presidents constitute a danger to the successful prosecution of the war and the formulation of a just and enduring peace?"

Emphatically "yes." Because it would necessarily result in changes in the plans which the President and the strategists of our allies have spent years in preparing—plans by virtue of which democracy is winning the war on every front.

An improving patient who would substitute a novice for the skilled physician who was saving his life would be considered the personification of folly. In this case the life of only one would be endangered. The substitution of any other for the President during the war would endanger the life of the Nation and the liberty of mankind, because no one else possesses the President's mastery of the details of this stupendous struggle, his ability to coordinate Allied efforts, or his qualifications to help establish a just and lasting peace.

The disaster of a change of political policy in time of war was suffered when President Wilson lost the Congress in 1918, and democracy later lost the treaty of peace. Largely because of these results, atrocious aggressors are once more drenching the world with blood.

As dispensing with Hitler's leadership would certainly demoralize the Axis minions and hasten their destruction, so dispensing with the President's leadership would demoralize the Allied forces and furnish our enemies more aid than a hundred legions of soldiers could supply them.

Second, "Would a fourth term create national disunity and constitute a danger to our two-party system?"

No. During the first 2 years of the President's vigorously opposed third term the Republican Party, according to last year's election returns, increased its membership as it never increased it in any similar period before.

By deduction from this—the only relevant, factual premise—a fourth term for the President would prosper the minority's cause and encourage its hope that the White House will again be occupied by a Republican in some very sweet though distant by and by.

Third. "Would a fourth term load the public pay rolls with administration favorites?"

No. Obviously, the danger of pay-roll loading is not peculiar to a fourth term. During every term, administration favorites are placed upon the pay roll. Every future President, regardless of the number of his terms, will doubtless appoint to the service of which he is the chief the favorites of his party who are in sympathy with its policies. Otherwise, it would be as impossible to achieve concord of purpose or concert of action in governmental affairs as it would be "to bring forth Mazzaroth in his season or guide Arcturus with his sons."

The Congress may be trusted to restrain the loading of the Federal pay rolls by refusing appropriations with which to pay the salaries of unnecessary appointees.

Fourth. Would a fourth term lead to dictatorship?

Emphatically no. Throughout the last Presidential campaign it was cried aloud from countless political housetops and proclaimed by innumerable hostile newspapers that a dictatorship would be the result of the President's election for a third term. History demonstrates that all the prophets of this dire evil were as wrong as Ahab and as false as Ananias. American honesty will never doubt, and political decency will never deny that Franklin Roosevelt's life proves that a dictatorship is as abhorrent to him as it was to Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt when they were mendaciously charged with promoting it or desiring it.

These patriotic former Presidents made dictatorship impossible in their days, just as another patriotic President is making it impossible in ours.

Dictatorships are the progeny of governmental oppression, political indifference, or economic collapse. These will not plague this Nation as long as the wise, humanitarian Roosevelt policies prevail and the favor-hunting, privilege-seeking forces of greed and reaction are prevented from making or administering the laws of the land.

After long debate the authors of the Constitution refused to limit the length of Presidential service or the number of Presidential terms. Jefferson, though opposed to a third term, expressed his inclination to accept it, if necessary to prevent a monarchist's election. Washington's refusal of a third term was prompted largely by his decline in health, weariness of officials burdens, and desire for rest. He wrote to Lafayette:

"I can see no propriety in precluding ourselves from the service of any man, who, on some great emergency, should be deemed, universally, most capable of serving the public."

Jefferson said:

"The only question concerning a candidate shall be: Is he honest? Is he capable? Is he faithful to the Constitution?"

For 10 momentous years the President has daily and hourly demonstrated his possession of all these qualifications by service so extraordinary and satisfactory that it has won him the supreme designation "first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen."

The following are a few of the numberless items in Franklin Roosevelt's title deeds to a continuation of the gratitude, affection, and faith of the American people:

When he first became President, the Nation's house was on fire; he put it out.

Confidence was lost; he found it and infused it into the hearts of the people.

Factories were closed; he opened them.

Industrial workers were without jobs; he supplied them.

Professional men and women were without employment; he provided it.

Business was dead; he brought it to life.

Commerce was buried; he resurrected it.

Prosperity was banished; he restored it.

Distress tramped every highway; he relieved it.

Want waited on every corner; he satisfied it.

Millions were idle; he employed them.

Millions were homeless; he housed them.

Millions were half naked; he clothed them.

Millions were hungry; he fed them.

The country was defenseless and seething with unrest; revolution was just around the corner. He has made the United States the arsenal of democracy, the fortress of liberty, the haven of happiness, and the home of content.

In 19 centuries no other born of woman has ever rendered as much service to the hosts of toil, underprivilege, affliction, and distress as he has rendered them during the last 10 years.

Regardless of his wishes, he will be drafted for a fourth term. His retirement before the war is won would increase the peril of 10,000,000 American boys in uniform—including yours and mine; it might mean vacant chairs in 10,000,000 American homes; it might hang crepe on 10,000,000 American doors.

The continuation of Franklin Roosevelt as President until after the winning of the war and the achievement of peace for the world is now fervently desired and soon will be imperatively demanded by all the eager, militant, progressive millions who love him and follow him, and cherish him as the shadow of a mighty rock in a weary land that will surely shelter them in time of stress and storm.

With unfaltering fidelity, unlimited hope, and triumphant faith, we nominate Franklin Roosevelt for President—

"Till the war drum throbs no longer,
And the battle flags are furled;
In the parliament of man,
The federation of the world."

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Pact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT B. CHANDLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 12), 1943

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials dealing with the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. One of the editorials was published in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post, and I wish to quote a few words from it, as follows:

The plan devised by Mr. Hull, veteran of many a weary hour of political logrolling under the old scheme, has the merit of having worked.

The other editorial was published in the Washington Daily News of May 13, and also deals with a renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements, as advocated by Mr. Hull, our illustrious Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Evening Post]

KEEP THE TARIFF AWAY FROM THE LOGROLLERS

The debate in Congress over the renewal of the President's power to make reciprocal trade agreements with other countries may seem, at first glance, academic. Lend-lease operations, plus the shipping and air-transport crisis, plus priorities on domestic production, plus wartime export-import controls, have reduced the flow of normal foreign commerce to a mere trickle over tightly closed sluice gates.

Nevertheless, it is important to preserve a policy and a technique which have gone far toward taking the tariff out of politics. Whether peace brings a return to something like the status quo ante, or whether it is to usher in a new order, trade must continue to move under the best conditions possible—that is, to the mutual advantage of all concerned.

The program for reciprocal international agreements is not free trade or anything like it. Under its terms the authority of the executive branch is strictly limited. The basic tariff law is still the Hawley-Smoot Act of 1930, as amended in 1934, to give the President the following powers:

1. He may lower or raise rates by not more than 50 percent of the 1930 schedules.

2. He may bind existing rates against increase.

3. He may guarantee the continuance of the free listing of any product. But he may not transfer any commodity from the dutiable to the free list.

4. He may suspend concessions to any country found to be using discriminatory trade practices—quotas, onerous exchange regulations, and so on—against the United States.

Now, let us look at what the President cannot do. He cannot change rates except under a trade agreement. He cannot act except after consulting with the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, as well as the Tariff Commission and other appropriate agencies. Finally, all interested persons must have due public notice of all products on which the United States Government proposes to grant tariff concessions.

Just as in the days of general tariff legislation by Congress, American producers may present their case at public hearings, the difference being that they argue before permanent officials rather than elected Representatives and Senators. Some critics profess to see a grave danger in this, but in practice complaints have been very few, and demonstration of actual damage to American interests almost nonexistent. The plan devised by Mr. Hull, veteran of many a weary hour of political logrolling under the old scheme, has the merit of having worked. Of course, there have been some protests by some groups of agricultural producers, but by and large they have not differed very much from similar complaints made by similar groups before congressional committees charged with tariff making. What is lacking from the trade-agreement procedure is the "your sugar for my gloves" dickering which characterized the conventional system.

In any case, Congress retains supervision and control, since the law limits the authority granted to a term of 3 years. First passed in 1934, the powers were extended in 1937, with useful modifications, and in 1940 without change. On each occasion Congress had full opportunity to review the workings of the reciprocal trade agreements program. The ordinary citizen, reading through the committee reports of 1937 and 1940, and following the testimony so far this year, can find no real

evidence of Executive usurpation, and every indication that here is a sensible, workable substitute for general tariff revisions on the old plan.

Almost anyone would agree these days that the debate between absolute free trade and absolute protection is as dead as mutton, from any practical point of view. As long ago as 1897 a Republican President, McKinley, attempted to install a system of reciprocal trade treaties. His proposal broke down because the requirement of ratification by the Senate threw the whole question back into politics. Now that a rational method has proved its value by the experience of 9 years, it would seem the part of good sense to retain it—at least until the nations see the necessity of extending their exchange of goods and services still farther.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 13, 1943]

LET REPUBLICANS REMEMBER

Before Republicans in the House try to wreck the Hull reciprocal trade program as a partisan issue, let them remember that—

The last Grand Old Party tariff monstrosity started an international economic war of trade barriers, precipitated the worse depression in American history, and defeated the Republican Party.

President McKinley Grand Old Party tariff mentor and convert to reciprocity, proved how impossible it is for a President to make effective trade agreements when a logrolling congressional lobby can veto them—as desired by present Hull opponents.

Renewal of the Hull law is favored by many Grand Old Party leaders outside Congress, including Alf Landon and Republican National Chairman Spangler. Republicans voted for its extension in 1937 and in 1940. So the House minority effort to justify opposition as a matter of party policy is an absurd affront to party intelligence.

Before these obstructionists count their unhatched chickens for a 1944 Republican election victory, they should ponder the overwhelming popular demand for renewal of the Trade Agreement Law as voiced by representatives of—

The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations,

The National Manufacturers Association, the National Foreign Trade Council, the United States Chamber of Commerce,

The National League of Women Voters, and other women's organizations,

And nearly 90 percent of the press of the country.

Rarely has any economic measure ever received such support, cutting across all party and class and group lines. But that is not surprising in view of the lamentable record of tariff legislation before this reform. The country learned its lesson when it paid for the Hawley-Smoot folly—the voters have no desire to repeat that.

Nor will the people be fooled by the proposed Republican amendments to emasculate the Hull law. Politicians who think otherwise are outsmarting themselves.

It Makes Us Very Ill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an editorial taken from the Las Vegas Evening Review-Journal, which contains some very pertinent remarks concerning the release of Japanese from the relocation centers. We, Representatives from the Pacific coast, are quite alarmed at the apparent softening attitude of our War Department. Certainly, there has been no evidence to convince us that Japan is not a dangerous enemy. When 90 percent of the people of the Pacific coast realize this, surely those in high authority in the War Department should take cognizance of that fact. These Japanese have been living among us for many years. We know of their ability and likewise the potential danger of allowing them to return to the Pacific coast. The following editorial certainly brings out the leniency of the War Department:

IT MAKES US VERY ILL

Yesterday afternoon, two carloads of Japanese passed through Las Vegas on the Union Pacific railroad headed east.

There were no guards of any kind accompanying the group—no one appearing to be at all responsible for their continuance to their destination.

But to be sure they enjoyed the trip and knew where they were at all times; they were provided with maps—not the ordinary maps used in school to teach young America the country's geography, nor the maps used by railroad companies in timetables to show the various stations en route and time of arrival and departure.

These maps were superdeluxe, designed especially for the Japanese travelers. Marked on every map in colored ink so it couldn't possibly be missed or mistaken was every military, naval, and air force reservation in the United States.

Of course, the purpose was undoubtedly to show the Japs the places they're supposed to stay away from. But they could be used for other purposes as well. There's no way to be sure they won't be so used.

And it's also probable that if the Japs wanted to compile such maps they could do so on their own. Nobody would stop them.

But why on earth should the Government of the United States hand over unlimited numbers to known Japanese and place them on their honor to stay away from the military reservations marked thereon?

Since when did a Jap have any honor? Haven't we learned yet there is no such thing as an honorable Jap? Just how much more must we find out before we understand that?

Nothing quite so amazing has come our way in all our big-brother dealings with the Japanese since the outbreak of the war.

We were thoroughly disgusted to learn the other day that there's no rationing in the Japanese relocation camps—that they're fully stocked with all the food Americans are going without on the theory we can't feed our armed forces and our allies without making sacrifices ourselves. But we can feed our Jap internees all they want.

And we were shocked to learn from reputable Moapa Valley residents that there's no pretense of supervision over the Japs imported there to work on the farms. They have the run of the valley at all hours of the day and night and are quite often found snooping around in the wee small hours of the morning, for what purpose they only know.

And we were astounded to learn that a Japanese language newspaper published in Salt Lake City virtually spit in the face of the American people with a tirade against General Charles L. DeWitt, commanding officer of the west coast area because of his stand against allowing the Japs to return to California. And this newspaper is being circulated in all the Japanese relocation camps in the intermountain country.

What in the world are we afraid of? Has Tokyo got us bluffed because she holds Americans prisoners (military and civilian) as virtual hostages and we're afraid to protect our own interests here lest they be tortured or put to death? Would these Americans want us to kiss the shirt-tails of the Japs in this contry on any such score as that?

There are a lot more Japanese in this country and Hawaii—a hundred or more to one—than there are Americans in Japan.

These Japs we're kowtowing to are blood relations and for the most part are in full sympathy with the Japs who sneaked the attack on Pearl Harbor while negotiating for a peaceful settlement of our difficulties—the Japs who murdered American prisoners of war—who wiped out the entire population of many Chinese towns because American flyers were aided there following the Tokyo raid.

And they're not deserving of any consideration at all. Certainly not to the silly extremes we're discovering every day.

When, oh when, will we get tough—tough enough to show Tokyo we mean business? Washington better, muy pronto, or the people of the West are very likely to do the job themselves.

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the seventeenth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money.

In this installment reference is made to the now famous prophecy of the noted Englishman, Sir Ernest Seyd, and the German economist, Count Wolowski which foretold with remarkable accuracy the disturbing effect of the demonitization of silver on trade and business throughout the world.

The seventeenth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech follows:

In proof of this I give the following statements of the average percentage in the value of gold to silver in the productions of the world, in the periods of years indicated:

Statement of the production of gold and silver in the world since the discovery of America

From 1493 to 1885 is from table of averages for certain periods compiled by Dr. Adolph Soetbeer. For the years 1886-92 the production is the annual estimate of the Bureau of the Mint]

Period	Total value of gold for the period	Total coining value of silver for the period	Percentage of production			
			By weight		By value	
			Gold	Silver	Gold	Silver
1493–1520	$107,931,000	$54,703,000	11.0	89.0	66.4	33.6
1521–1544	114,205,000	89,986,000	7.4	92.6	55.9	44.1
1545–1560	90,492,000	207,240,000	2.7	97.3	30.4	69.6
1561–1580	90,917,000	248,990,000	2.2	97.8	26.7	73.3
1581–1600	98,095,000	348,254,000	1.7	98.3	22.0	78.0

Statement of the production of gold and silver in the world since the discovery of America—Continued

Period	Total value of gold for the period	Total coining value of silver for the period	Percentage of production			
			By weight		By value	
			Gold	Silver	Gold	Silver
1601-1620	$113,248,000	$351,579,000	2.0	98.0	24.4	75.6
1621-1640	110,324,000	327,221,000	2.1	97.9	25.2	74.8
1641-1660	116,571,000	304,525,000	2.3	97.7	27.7	72.3
1661-1680	123,084,000	280,166,000	2.7	97.3	30.5	69.5
1681-1700	113,088,000	284,240,000	3.1	96.9	33.5	66.5
1701-1720	170,403,000	295,629,000	3.5	96.5	36.6	63.4
1721-1740	253,611,000	358,480,000	4.2	95.8	41.4	58.6
1741-1760	327,116,000	443,232,000	4.4	95.6	42.5	57.5
1761-1780	275,211,000	542,658,000	3.1	96.9	33.7	66.3
1781-1800	236,464,000	730,810,000	2.0	98.0	24.4	75.6
1801-1810	118,152,000	371,677,000	1.9	98.1	24.1	75.9
1811-1830	76,093,000	224,786,000	2.1	97.9	25.3	74.7
1821-1830	94,479,000	191,444,000	3.0	97.0	33.0	67.0
1831-1840	134,841,000	247,930,000	3.3	96.7	35.2	64.8
1841-1850	763,928,000	324,400,000	6.6	93.4	52.9	47.1
1851-1855	662,566,000	184,169,000	18.4	81.6	78.3	21.7
1856-1860	670,418,000	188,092,000	18.2	81.8	78.1	21.9
1861-1865	614,944,000	228,861,000	14.4	85.6	72.9	27.1
1866-1870	648,071,000	278,313,000	12.7	87.3	70.0	30.0
1871-1875	577,083,000	409,322,000	8.1	91.9	58.6	41.4
1876-1880	572,931,000	509,256,000	6.6	93.4	53.0	47.0
1881-1885	495,582,000	594,773,000	5.0	95.0	45.5	54.5
1886	106,000,000	120,000,000	5.2	94.8	46.8	53.2
1887	105,302,000	124,366,000	5.0	95.0	45.9	54.1
1888	109,900,000	142,107,000	4.6	95.4	43.6	56.4
1889	118,800,000	162,690,000	4.4	95.6	42.2	57.8
1890	113,150,000	172,215,000	4.0	96.0	39.7	60.3
1891	120,519,000	186,738,000	3.9	96.1	39.2	60.8
1892	130,817,000	196,605,000	4.0	96.0	40.0	60.0
Total	8,204,303,000	9,726,072,000	5.0	95.0	45.8	54.2

The average percentage for the whole period is 45.8 to 54.2.

From the discovery of America in 1492 to this date, 400 years, of every dollar of the world's aggregate product of both gold and silver, 45.8 cents were gold and 54.2 cents were silver.

The information available for estimates of the world's production of gold and silver prior to 1687 is not considered definite or reliable by Dr. A. Soetbeer, of Germany, now deceased, who in my opinion was the most impartial and accurate of statisticians, and was a single gold standard advocate.

The estimates of the ratios of silver to gold throughout the world prior to 1687 are uncertain and unreliable, as little is known with certainty as to the fineness of the gold or silver in the coins.

From the reports of the Director of the Mint, I have compiled some data.

In the years 1801 to 1810, inclusive, of the world's production of gold and silver, the proportion or percentage of gold to silver was 24.1 dollars or 24.1 cents of gold to 75.9 dollars or cents of silver. Notwithstanding this large difference in the product, there was great stability in the ratios or relative values.

In the 10 years, 1852–61, inclusive, the world produced $1,724,750,000 of gold and silver, of which the gold was $1,314,150,000, or 76.2 percent, while the silver produced was only $410,600,000, or 23.8 percent, and yet there was no very great divergence in their ratios or relative values. The cause of this remarkable stability in ratio or value was the fact that the mints of the United States were open to the free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1. And the mints of France from October 30, 1785, were open to like coinage at the ratio of 15½ to 1.

There was a scare in this period of 1852–61 in regard to an overflow, a deluge of gold from California and Australia, very similar to the scare since that date in regard first to an overflow, a deluge, of both metals, and then when gold was enthroned as the single standard, as I have shown—then as to an overflow—a deluge of silver—which still exists in the vain imaginations of our gold monometallist bimetallic friends.

Have these doctrinaire prophets, Mr. Ruggles, Senator Sherman, and others realized the falsity of their predictions and the true facts as to the production of gold and silver? Please recall their fairy tales of the production from our own mines of from 200 to 400 millions annually, so persistently proclaimed in Europe in 1863 to 1868, and then hear the truth as shown by the records.

In the 10 years, 1862–71, inclusive, the production of gold and silver in the entire world was only $1,616,200,000, an annual average of only $161,620,000 of both metals. Think of it. Mr. Ruggles and Mr. Sherman told them we were going to produce from $200,000,000 to $400,000,000 a year in the United States alone, and yet the world produced in that time only an annual average of $161,620,000 of both metals, gold and silver.

In this period the gold product alone was $1,102,825,000, or 68.24 percent of the aggregate product of both metals, while the silver product was only $513,375,000, or only 31.76 percent of the aggregate product.

During the entire period, when these sages and doctrinaire statesmen were enthroning gold and demanding the single gold standard, refusing to agree with the nations of the Latin Union to free and unlimited bimetallic coinage, and practically driving them to join in degrading, depreciating, and demonetizing silver and destroying nearly one-half of the world's money, the world was producing 68.24 dollars of gold to 31.76 dollars of silver.

These facts throw an arc electric light upon the unreliability and the falsity of the judgment, opinions, and predictions of such leaders. If so egregiously mistaken then, may not they be mistaken now, and their prophetic warnings prove a delusion, a snare, a will-o'-the-wisp?

Take the entire period, 1862–92, inclusive, 31 years, and the world's product of gold and silver has been $6,284,666,000, an annual average of only $202,731,161.

During this period the gold product has been $3,359,422,000, or 53.45 percent of the aggregate of both metals, while the silver product has been only $2,925,144,000, or 46.55 percent of the aggregate.

If every nation had had at the beginning of this period of 31 years an adequate supply of gold and silver for all monetary purposes, then this annual average product of both metals, after deducting the demands for such metals for industrial purposes and the loss by wear and tear and abrasion, would have been barely sufficient to maintain the average per capita circulation required by the increase of population and to meet the increasing demands for money in the rapidly expanding commerce of the nations of the earth, domestic and foreign.

What has been the product of gold and silver in the United States? In the 12 years, 1862 to 1873, inclusive, the aggregate product of gold and silver in the United States was $733,000,000, an annual average product of only $61,083,333,33⅓. The gold product was $546,750,000, an annual average of $45,562,500, or 74.60 percent of the aggregate, while the silver product was only $186,250,000, an annual average of $15,520,833, or only 25.40 percent of the aggregate—about one-third.

These figures, in juxtaposition with the deliberate, carefully prepared statements of our distinguished representatives and officials, published by them to the nations of the world in 1863 and since, should bring crimson to their cheeks. I do not give them to the Senate as a pattern to imitate, but as an example to deter.

The largest yield of gold in any one year in the United States was $65,000,000 in the calendar year 1853. The largest yields since 1862 were $53,500,000 in 1866, $53,225,000 in 1865, and $51,725,000 in 1867, while our annual average yield of gold in the 12 years, 1881–92, inclusive, was only $32,733,000. These facts seem to me to prove conclusively that the depreciation of silver has not been caused by any excessive production relatively to gold.

The conclusion seems to me irresistible that the depreciation has been caused almost entirely by the legislation of the various nations discriminating against silver and in favor of gold, closing their mints against the free and unlimited coinage of silver, making it a mere commodity—merchandise, and keeping their mints open to gold, and making gold, in bullion as well as in coin, money with full legal tender, and thereby appreciating and increasing the value of gold.

I cannot forbear at this point to prove this beyond a reasonable doubt by the solemn declarations of the senior Senator from Ohio:

I quote from Senator Sherman's speech in the Senate on April 11, 1876. He said:

"The enormous effect of this law in Germany—"

Referring to the demonetization of silver there—

"The enormous effect of this law in Germany, and as a consequence the partial demonetization of silver coins, I suppose is felt by every man, woman, and child who buys or sells anything. I suppose there is no act of any parliament that has so wide-reaching effect as this act of the German Parliament. The amount of coin in the world is estimated by Mr. Seyd and other technical writers at $3,200,000,000 silver and $3,500,000,000 in gold So the effect of the act of Germany, aided no doubt somewhat by the large supply of silver by our mines, has been to reduce the purchasing power of the whole of this enormous sum of $3,200,000,000 of silver fully 10 percent. The fall of the silver trade dollar in this country has been from 103 to 91.

"This effect extended itself to what is called the Latin League, who feared that German silver would be carried rapidly into Italy, France, and the nations of the league, for coinage purposes, and they interfered at once and stopped the coinage of silver. It also created an impression in India; so that, for the first time for 200 years, the current flow of silver into China and India was arrested, but only for a short time, however. It is one of the remarkable currents of trade in the history of mankind that with the silver that has been coined in the world the greater part flows in a continuous stream into these Oriental countries; and for 3 or 4 months a feeling of alarm was created there lest that which they cherish as the measure of all their values should become valueless to them. It created a partial panic but that panic has passed, and now the stream goes on; silver flows into India and China and all the Asiatic countries as heretofore.

That was not the worst of it. A struggle for the possession of gold at once arose between all the great nations, because everybody could see that if $3,200,000,000 of silver coin were demonetized and $3,500,000,000 of gold coin made the sole standard it would enormously add to the value of gold, and the Bank of France, the Bank of England, and the Imperial Bank of Germany at once commenced grasping for gold in whatever form. Therefore what we have observed recently is not so much a fall of silver as it is a rise of gold, the inevitable effect of a fear of the demonetization of silver; and now the Bank of France has in its vaults the enormous amount of $300,000,000 of gold in coin and bullion; the Bank of England has $170,000,000, and the Imperial Bank of Germany, has $125,000,000. So in these three depositories there is over $600,000,000 of gold, or nearly one-fifth of the supply of the world."

Then in the same speech the Senator from Ohio said:

"The demonetizing of silver tends to add to the value of gold, and though its relative value changes it is more stable compared to gold than any other metal or production.

This was the Senator from Ohio in 1876, who was then apparently perfectly unconscious of having himself done anything to contribute to the action of Germany in the change from a single silver standard to a single gold standard, perfectly unconscious that anybody paid any attention to his refusal there in France as a Senator of the United States and chairman of the Finance Committee, to join Mr. Ruggles in agreeing upon the bimetallic system of the Latin Union in 1867, which was offered to us.

A bird's-eye view of all these actions will only occupy a few moments.

In 1870 the mints of all Europe, except Great Britain, Portugal, and Turkey, were open to the free and unlimited coinage of silver into full legal-tender money, the same as gold, at the ratio of 15½ to 1, and the mints of the United States, in the same condition, at the ratio of 16 to 1; and silver as metal and money at such ratio was the full equal of gold, and there was a greater demand for silver for monetary purposes than there was a supply.

In July 1870 the Government of Sweden and Norway created the monetary commission, joined by Denmark in 1872, and the result was the abandonment of their single silver standard and the adoption of the single gold standard.

In 1871 Germany instituted her change from a single silver standard to the single gold standard, and completed the same July 9, 1873.

The United States, by the coinage act of February 12, 1873, prohibited the coinage of the standard silver dollar and established the single gold standard.

On January 30, 1874, the nations of the Latin Union by a supplementary treaty denied free coinage of silver to individuals, limited their coinage and finally, in 1877, suspended further coinage of full legal-tender silver.

In 1875–76 the Netherlands changed from the single silver standard to a single gold standard and stopped the free coinage of silver.

In 1876 Russia suspended the free coinage of silver.

Look at these unprecedented changes. What is the inevitable result? An immense mass, many hundreds of millions of coined silver money made a mere metal commodity, like iron, and thrown upon the markets for sale as such

This mass of demonetized silver coins made an abnormal addition to the current production of silver, created for the time grave apprehensions as to its future use as money, and destroyed largely the demand for its monetary use, and at the same time created an abnormal and unprecedented demand for an amount of gold to supply its place for money far beyond the sufficiency of the existing stock of gold then in the world and the current production to supply it.

The natural and inevitable result followed: The depreciation of silver measured by gold as money, and a rapid increase or appreciation in the value of gold not only as compared with silver, but also as compared with the staple products of the world, produced by the sweat and toil of the great masses of the people.

Not only did these great evils result, but the stable foundations of the monetary system of the world were grieviously shaken by destruction, ruthlessly made, of one of the two foundations and pillars upon which they rested.

Gold monometallists, in their idolatrous devotion to and worship of the golden calf, were blind to the inevitable consequences. They feared no danger, no calamity, no evil, no impoverishment, no financial disturbances.

The true friends of silver and gold, the true bimetallists, alone foresaw the consequences and predicted them in unmistakable terms.

To prove this beyond cavil, I read the prophecies of Messrs. Seyd and Wolowski, republished in the United States in 1880 by Henry Carey Baird & Co., Philadelphia, in a small volume entitled "The Gold Standard; its Causes, its Effects, and its Future," from the German of Baron William von Kardorf-Wabnitz, who served more than 10 years in the German Reichstag.

This is one of the most wonderful predictions in regard to financial matters which has ever been made in the world. It has been literally fulfilled, and is being fulfilled today:

"Count Wolowski and Mr. Seyd published the following theses in 1868, the year in which the agitation for the introduction of the gold standard began in Paris."

This was in 1868, the very year that the Senator from Ohio introduced the bill in the United States Senate and made his famous report in favor of demonetizing silver and establishing the single gold standard in the United States. They say:

"The demonetization of silver, they predicted, by any great civilized nation, must produce the following results:

"1. The international trade of the world will instantly show signs of decline, to the special injury of countries having the largest international trade.

"2. The spirit of public enterprise, in railroads and other useful undertakings, will be immediately checked, and consequently the general progress of civilization will suffer.

"3. The decline in prices will compel countries internationally indebted to depart more and more from the principles of free trade toward a policy of protection.

"4. The nations of the world will be divided into two groups—the one trading in gold, the other in silver—and this condition will render commerce between them unsafe and precarious.

"5. Throughout the world a decline in prices will follow, injurious alike to owners of real property and the laboring classes, and advantageous only—and unjustly so—to the holders of State bonds and similar securities.

"6. One of the principal difficulties in this period of general depression will be that people will look for its causes in all possible directions. The advocates of the gold standard will offer all possible groundless and fantastic excuses or reasons of a secondary nature only, and the real cause, the demonetization of silver, will be overlooked until the perspicuity of the phenomena and dire necessity shall force thinking men to point it out."

That is a remarkable and wonderful prophecy, and it has been carried out.

I now quote from Lord Beaconsfield, of England, in the same volume. The Senator from Ohio, as I shall quote hereafter, stated that nobody could anticipate such a thing. I want to show that there were some statesmen who did, even if he did not apprehend anything:

"The views of Messrs. Seyd and Wolowski were also held by the distinguished statesman who is now the head of the British Cabinet, Lord Beaconsfield, who, in 1873, foresaw the coming and the obstinancy of the recent great commercial crisis, and in his above-cited speech said:

"'I attribute the great monetary disturbance that has occurred, and is now to a certain degree acting very injuriously to trade—I attribute it to the great changes which the governments in Europe are making with reference to their standards of value.'

"And again:

"'It is quite evident we must prepare ourselves for great convulsions in the money market, not occasioned by speculation or any old cause, as has been alleged, but by a new cause with which we are not sufficiently acquainted, and the consequences of which are very embarrassing.'

"And finally:

"'Convulsions must come, and no one will be able to form an adequate idea of the monetary derangement of the time in which he lives if he omits from his consideration the important subject to which I have called your attention.'"

Ideals and Purposes of the Southeastern States Prison Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM STEWART

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 12), 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on Ideals and Purposes of the Southeastern State Prison Association, delivered by Thomas P. Gore, warden of the penitentiary of the State of Tennessee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Southeastern States Prison Association was organized for the purpose of trying to improve prison conditions and institute realistic prison reforms in the prisons of the Southeastern States. The association is composed of prison officials and other interested parties from Alabama, Florida, Arkansas, Georgia, North Carolina, Mississippi, Kentucky, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

The idea of forming an association of prison officials and others interested in improvements and reforms in the operations of prisons in the Southeastern States was first discussed by a group of Alabama and Tennessee officials in 1940. At this time is was decided that a movement should be started immediately with this general thought in mind. Prison officials and other interested persons in the Southeastern States were contacted and there was general interest in this movement. Following this a meeting was called for the purpose of organizing the association, and a large number of officials from these States responded. The organization meeting was held in Nashville, Tenn., in April of 1941.

The objectives and ideals of the organization as set forth in the constitution are as follows:

1. Improve State and local prison conditions, including housing, labor, hospital facilities, medical services, discipline and food.

2. Setting up a receiving and classification bureau with competent personnel.

3. Further segregation of prisoners in State and local institutions.

4. Competent psychiatrical and social service for each State prison.

5. A full-time chaplain and program of religious and personal service for each State prison.

6. Improvement of prison educational program with particular emphasis on trade and vocational training.

7. Higher qualifications for prison guards and other officials in both State and local institutions.

8 Adequate salaries and compensation for injuries, tenure, and retirement for prison guards and other prison officials.

9. A program of training for prison guards before they are assigned to duty.

10. Study of techniques and procedures for in-service training of personnel.

11. Closer cooperation between State and local prisons and the United States Prison Bureau and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the American Prison Congress.

12. Consider steps for improving county jails.

13. Expansion of prison industries to meet the demands for manufacturing merchandise for State, city, and county use.

14. Closer cooperation between the penal institutions and the educational institutions.

15. Review and study all laws relating to penal institutions, penal procedure, prison industries.

16. Encouragement of study of Criminal Code and the administration of criminal justice.

17. The perfection of a Southeastern States association which would permit the exchange of opinion and information between prison officials.

18. The perfection of a uniform record system and study the treatment of tuberculosis and unusual diseases such as cancer, etc.

19. Consider the matter of reciprocal agreements and the exchange of prison-production commodities.

Much progress has been made since the Southeastern States Prison Association was formed. It serves the dual purpose of educating prison officials as well as the general public. Advancement and progress in improving prison conditions and prison reforms can only be made when supported by the general public. Prison officials can go no faster in pursuance of these ideals and objectives than the general public wants them to go. After all, prisons are supported by the taxpayers and the taxpayers have the final word in what the tax dollar should be spent for. When prison officials are capable and intelligent enough to convince the public that certain reforms are essential and will prove beneficial to the taxpayer, usually he has no objection to paying the bill. It is up to the prison officials to lead the way in prison reforms and if their policies are sound, they need have little fear that the public will approve them.

Since this organization was formed, there has been considerable progress made in these efforts in the Southeastern States. Believing that the ideals and purposes of the association are sound, prison officials have taken the lead and are cautiously but surely putting these reforms into effect. There has been no criticism from the public so far as we know and there has been considerable encouragement from the public, the press, and the radio.

Many of the southeastern States have set up classification bureaus, which is a most progressive step; there has been a continued successful effort in properly and effectively segregating prisoners of different types, ages, and crimes; there has been a good deal of improvement in housing, hospital facilities, medical services, discipline, and food. Improved educational facilities have been made available. Emphasis on trade and vocational training has been made. On account of the war, it has been difficult to obtain competent prison guards, however, in some institutions, guards' salaries have been increased. There has been little, if any, progress made towards putting prison officials on a civil-service or merit basis; there has been some progress in the training of guards and other employees.

Closer cooperation between Federal and State prisons, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the American Prison Congress is in evidence.

There has been little improvement in the county jails of the country. There are rare exceptions, of course, but generally speaking, they are a stench in the public nostrils and a disgrace to our civilization. We all know that the average county jail is a disease infested, bug ridden den of iniquity, too filthy for human habitation; we know that in the average county jail, there is little thought given to the most rudimentary requirements of segregation; we know that in the average county jail that the food is often unfit for human consumption and we know that the average county jail is a crime school. Generally, and I speak from some close observation, vicious habitual criminals of the most wicked and low character are put in cells with young first offenders; the sick and those suffering with syphilis and other contagious diseases are put in cells with the healthy. Men are often put in cells in plain view of the women and vice versa. There is too often little or no privacy. Kangaroo courts are still permitted in many county jails.

The county jail as an institution should be reformed or abolished. District jails or workhouses, supervised by the State, might be an improvement. Jails can be regulated, but they will not be as long as they are left in control of local politicians—as we have evidence of two centuries on this question.

The South is not alone guilty on this county jail question. All America is guilty. There are some well-known exceptions, but the general rule stands.

There has been some improvement in the cooperation of State penal institutions and State educational institutions and recent legislatures have enacted some liberal laws in regard to the handling of prisoners. There should be a continued study of ways and means of improving the laws applicable to the operation of penal institutions, penal procedure, and penal industries, as well as laws generally applicable to the administration of criminal justice.

Some progress has been made in the perfection of a uniform record system, the study and treatment of tuberculosis and other diseases. We look forward after the war to more progress in these matters.

There has been some improvement in the operation of prison industries. More prisoners are employed now than ever before. This is brought about largely by reason of the fact that the Federal Government has relaxed its regulations and now permits State prison industries to sell merchandise to the Army, Navy, and other Federal agencies. Also, State, county, and city institutions find it difficult these days to buy their supplies on the open market and are more willingly going to State prison industries for them.

If the public, through education, becomes aware of the needs of our prisons and the value in dollars and cents of our efforts to reform and rehabilitate the prisoner while he is serving his sentence, the more progress we will make in our effort to carry into effect the ideals and purposes of the Southeastern States Prison Association.

Father Hildner, Missouri's "Fighting Priest"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 12), 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in last Sunday's St. Louis Globe-Democrat, entitled "For God and Country," being a tribute to the outstanding public service, particularly during the war, of Father George Hildner, of Gildehaus, Mo., known nationally as Missouri's "Fighting Priest."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"FOR GOD AND COUNTRY"—FATHER 'ALFALFA GEORGE' HILDNER FINDS NEW FIELDS TO CONQUER AFTER 28 YEARS AS MISSOURI'S 'FIGHTING PRIEST'

(By Justin L. Faherty)

At 54, Father George Hildner—the city boy who made good in the country—would have liked to settle down to the quiet life of a rural pastor.

Behind him were 19 years of fighting the devil and Ol' Man River from behind the levees he had worked for and worked on along the Mississippi River in Perry County, Mo.

Now he had been set up on a rocky hill in Franklin County, Mo., where the cedar trees sighed in the constant breezes, where he had an old established parish—instituted in the days before St. Louis had its second Catholic church—where the aid and the people and the rolling country spoke of peaceful devotion to the simple job of the shepherding of souls.

Father Hildner began to plant tulips and clematis and climbing roses around the shrines, the lawns, the fences. He brought shrubbery and flowers into the century-old graveyard and prayed forgiveness if he molested the ancient bones with his digging.

But, as he worked at these simple tasks, back in 1934 the "Levee Priest," the "Fighting Priest," the "Alfalfa George" of the clergy couldn't get his eyes off the electric wires strung along the road that fronts the ancient buildings of St. John's Church, Gildehaus.

These wires sung with the current they were carrying over the hills to Washington, several miles to the northwest.

It wouldn't be a bad idea, the quiet shepherd thought, to have some of that electricity siphoned into the church property, into the homes and the farms of the good people of the surrounding community, Gildehaus. It would be a dandy idea.

The Union Electric Co. thought differently. There were 33,000 volts in those wires, just enough for the folk up at the end of the line. There was no inclination to add more.

That was the spark which electrified the quiet pastor into the "Fighting Priest" once more. To St. Louis, 45 miles to the east, he came and straight to the executive offices of the utility company.

"Gentlemen," he said, "there are two ways we can get this electricity in Gildehaus—the easy way or the hard way. Personally, I don't care which way it has to be."

Two weeks later, when the electric lights began twinkling in Gildehause, Father Hildner telephoned his thanks to the company.

"And to show you my heart's in the right place," he said, "I'm going to run up an electric bill for you."

So Father Hildner strung floodlights on poles and in trees along the roads surrounding the parish buildings and through the grounds and, on religious and social occasions, he turns night into day on that secluded hill in Franklin County.

"I knew then," he said, "that a country pastor can't sew himself up in a cocoon. He can't be smugly complacent behind his sermons and his religious duties. He has to be a farmer, like his parishioners—and just a little bit smarter one."

In Claryville, Perry County, where he had labored for 19 years, the city boy had studied farm literature voraciously. He had taken the fruits of his study into the community and showed, by example, what could be done. He raised his own chickens, won prizes with them at the fairs year after year. He had taken cattle and hogs to an island in the Mississippi, raised them, and come out with a neat profit.

The floods of 1922, which forced him from a Good Friday service, into the swirling, muddy waters, to help evacuate the residents of the neighborhood, started him on a campaign for a levee.

The Federal Government finally agreed on a $3,000,000 project if the farmers would raise $450,000. A levee district was organized, a bond issue voted and Father Hildner called in salesmen from the leading bond houses in the Midwest to join him at an old-fashioned chicken dinner.

It was a tremendous dinner and when it was all over, Father Hildner began auctioning the bonds. The financiers calmly picked their teeth and bid 90 cents on the dollar. The "Levee Priest" turned on the full force of his persuasive oratory and when the last bond was gone the average price paid was about $1.03 and, besides the $450,000, the levee district had an additional $1,650.

A senior partner of one of the largest financial houses took the priest by the arm as he came off the platform.

"Father," he said, "I don't know what they pay you for the job you're doing now, but you can name your own salary if you'll come to work for me."

"It seems," said the priest, patting his would-be employer on the back, "that I have a lifetime contract on my present job."

And so Father Hildner carried out 19 years of hard work as agriculturalist (not farmer), as financier, as engineer, and as religious director of two communities.

Each Sunday for those 19 years he traveled the 15 miles between his parishes—by wagon, by horse, often pumping the distance on a railroad handcar when the mud was too deep, later by auto—saying mass, administering the sacraments, preaching the gospel, and eating breakfast at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

It was no great wonder, then, that when his superior, Archbishop Glennon, transferred him to that century-old parish on the hill in Franklin County that Father Hildner might have considered a retirement behind the complacency of sermons and religious duties.

But that electric deal sent him into high gear again. He noticed that the nearby hills were gutted and gnarled with erosion gullies. The farmers stuck to wheat growing year after year in that rocky, hilly soil.

Father Hildner had to study farming all over again. He had to turn from his background of marshy, black river-bottom soil to a study of the red clay of the hills.

Dairying was the answer to the problem of the farmer, erosion control was the answer to the problems of the soil. He swung his oratory into action and converted the people into dairy farmers and persuaded the Government to create a soil conservation demonstration area in his parish.

The gullied slopes turned to smoother, greener pastures and the scattered milk cows grew into dairy herds.

In the midst of this rebirth St. Louis enacted its standard milk ordinance, setting up strict regulations for dairymen, which called for buildings and accessories that faced the farmers with costs ranging to $1,000 and $1,500, a terrific burden on such short notice.

All over again, Father Hildner had to sell the idea of dairying to these disgusted farmers, the while he wrangled with the city health commissioner to give them time to reestablish themselves.

Dr. Joseph Bredeck, the health commissioner, was an old friend of the priest's, a sodality leader at Holy Trinity Church in North St. Louis, when Father Hildner was stationed there for 10 years after his ordination.

"Joe was, is, and always will be a tough man to deal with," says the priest, "because he sticks to what he thinks is right. But he's fair, and we got along with him."

After that first black disappointment, the farmers rallied to form their own unit of the Sanitary Milk Producers and now Franklin County is the leading Missouri county in inspected-milk production in the St. Louis milkshed, and fourth among the 60 counties in Missouri and Illinois, which ship 75 percent of the product that St. Louis uses.

With the change-over to dairy farming and the rebirth of the land, Father Hildner's job was only begun. Now he had to learn the complicated systems of bargaining between farmer and city dairy and carry the battles of his people into St. Louis.

Before city administration committees, and at a dozen Federal milk hearings, he has been lawyer, orator, representative, and good-will ambassador of the dairy farmers of Franklin County. He has matched legal talk and wits with some of the city's most able and experienced attorneys—and they have all found they have a fight on their hands when Father Hildner comes to town.

By constant pleading, at one time, he got a group of farmers to work out and maintain a set of books, showing the cost of everything that went into their enterprises, from shingle nails to cows, and listing such items unknown in the country as man-hours and time schedules. Then, before a startled commission, he presented these books to show, for the first time, the break-down of farm production costs. When dairy attorneys attempted to have the books tossed out of the hearing, Father Hildner pulled, from his pocket, proxies to prove that he and the books were legally representing the farmers back home.

Another time, as he argued with attorneys over production costs, he threatened to go home and bring back a cow to demonstrate the entire and complicated procedure necessary, under regulations of the sanitary code, to produce 20 cents worth of milk.

"We're still not too well off out here," said Father Hildner last week. "We're getting only about 5 cents a quart, delivered right to the dairy, while the dairies get the other 10 or 11 cents that you city folks pay. But we're a whole lot better off than when the farmers worked independently shipping it in for what they could get."

Thus, the "Levee Priest" and "Alfalfa George" is now becoming an authority on milk problems.

Gone are the days when he fought for the roads through the mire of his Perry County parish; gone are the years of toil and battle on the levees along the Mississippi. No more does he have to be an engineer, a bond salesman and a scientific hen, hog, and cattle raiser. Gone are the days of fighting to keep moisture in the red, rocky hills of Franklin County; gone are the days of talking the stolid citizen farmers of those hills into changing from unproductive wheat to flourishing dairy farms. The Government's erosion control project is finished and the farmers have learned how to keep their rolling acres smooth and green. Their milk producers' association is flourishing and fighting.

What's left for Father Hildner to tackle as he slips through his sixty-third year?

Well, there's the war. Father Hildner has tackled it. And so has Franklin County, in a big way. The priest is director of civilian defense and chairman of most of the ration boards in his county and that, for the time being, is a big enough war job to suit even the "fighting priest's" vast energies.

"I just graduated a whole corps of forest fire fighters last week," he says proudly. And, in strict keeping with his motto of "God and Country' he handled the fire fighters' classes in church.

"We worked through Lent," he explains. "I set the Lenten services for Wednesday nights, early, then followed them up with the civilian-defense classes. I told the folks we'll fight the fires of hell from 7:30 to 8:30 p. m., and from 8:30 to 10 p. m. we'll learn how to fight a hell of a fire."

Civilian-defense activities under Father Hildner stay strictly close to fundamentals.

"We've got nothing fancy out here in the hills," he says. "There's no motor corps to rush us around with flags flying. We've got no uniforms. We don't call our units by any fancy names. But, if the time ever comes, we'll be able to put out a fire or smother a bomb or bandage up the wounded in jig time and without too much fuss."

Father Hildner was given $600 to handle civilian defense over a span of a year and a half, but he turned back $300 of the appropriation. His sun parlor is Office of Civilian Defense headquarters and his own car is the motor corps. He had a volunteer secretary, but the ration board work, which she handled, too, got so heavy, that he put her strictly on that. He has two telephones on the parlor wall and they are ringing much of the time.

"They've got this civilian-defense bill down at Jefferson City," he brings out, "and one of the main things the legislature objects to, as I see it, is a big appropriation that's asked for. Well, that was put there to take care of any possible damages, as I understand it. Now then, they've gone and dragged my name in, in fighting the bill, telling about how I handled civilian defense up here for 18 months on $300. Well, if you don't get fancy with your organization there's no trick to that. Everybody's willing ot work. It's important that we do work. And the only costs are printing and stationery. Where can you spend more than $300?"

Besides civilian defense, Father Hildner is an active (as in whirlwind) member of the chambers of commerce of one or two Franklin County towns, the Elks, Moose, Rotary, Kiwanis, Knights of Columbus, and what have you.

And now, to top it off, he has just been made a director of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, which he helped to organize back in 1923. Father Hildner hasn't been a s active as the would like in this work in recent years, but, now that his other "babies" are rearing themselves nicely and he hasn't too much else to do, he is going to get back into this work in a bigger way.

The question has arisen, "When does he find time for his religious duties?"

Authorities on religion could take the statistics on Father Hildner's work in Perry County and Franklin County and present them as the picture of a priest who can be the "savior of souls" as well as of soil.

But the answer probably lies best and briefly in the fact that last November Father Hildner was honored for his work in religion—not in conservation, or dam building, or dairy farming—by the spiritual director of the Catholic Archdiocese of St. Louis, Archbishop Glennon.

"Alfalfa George" was made "The Very Reverend George J. Hildner, Vicar Foraine." By that title he became, in the eyes of his church, one of the 11 deans in rural Missouri.

The amazing thing about Father Hildner's work is the fact that he was a city boy, reared in South St. Louis, the son and the grandson of members of the metropolitan police force.

"I didn't know any more about hay than a rabbit knows about Sunday when I was sent to Claryville," he puts it. "But I couldn't just talk religion to those farmers. I had to be one of them."

So he subscribed to every farm journal printed and read just about every book and pamphlet that came out of the Department of Agriculture. What's more, he dug his hands and his feet deep in the soil and added experience to his book learning. From this contact developed his love of the soil and his fervent desire to conserve it.

"There are no more free lands in America," he says. "What we have we must preserve—and conserve. If our land grows sour and infertile how are we going to live? If it constantly gives back less than we put into it, how are we going to keep the rising generations at this work?

"They must be made happy there. Farming must be kept as modern as life in the city beyond, or there will be constant movement from the land to the city."

In this respect Father Hildner's modernization work has paid dividends. Until the war, not one of his young parishioners had ever left the country for a city job.

"In America," he says, "farming has always been a manner of living rather than an industry. Now that the trend has turned to regarding food growing as a business, there is a howl against the farm bloc in our Legislature. They say we are outrageous in our demands that the cost of production be added to the market price of the produce we sell.

"For the first time the farmer is presenting the picture of what it costs him to stay in business. In the past parity prices have always meant prices at which the farmer could sell and come out about even. If it costs him $1,000 to run a farm for a year and he gets $1,000 for his produce, he's doing well. Would a businessman take the same risk? Why, he wouldn't touch a business like that.

"And think of the way a farmer has to operate. He puts seed in the ground, then, while he sweats over that ground for months, he prays to God that there won't be too much rain or too little rain. He watches the crop grow to harvesting time. Then, by a whim of nature, he may get a grade 3 product from the same seeds, the same labor, the same sun and rain that gave him a grade 1 crop the year before.

"They say the farmer is selling out when he accepts Government allotments. Well, the farmer doesn't like these bonuses, these incentives, at all. He wants to run his business without being subsidized. But, to say that he should receive no help from the Government whatever is laughable.

"The railroads are regulated by the Government, they're built on rights-of-way mostly that was handed out by the Government. Our maritime enterprises are subsidized. Industry is subsidized in that the Government provides its protective tariff walls. And the farmer shouldn't be represented in our legislative chambers? Nonsense.

"We're all made of the same common clay, the farmer, the union laborer, the industrialist, the office worker, the teacher—yes, the priest, too. None of us is perfect, none of us utterly despicable. There is no place for an all-labor government—the big man in Washington is finding that our from his friend, Mr. Lewis, right now—there is no place for a farm government, no place for a Big Business government. You have to grab the wheel at the center, not by the spokes, to keep it on an even keel."

The desk in Father Hildner's study, usually reserved for the overflow of farm journals, is piling high with mail these days from those who read the story about him that appears in this month's edition of Reader's Digest.

A woman in Georgia wants him to give her pointers on starting a goat farm; a gentleman in Utah believes he might be able to work some sort of magic on the erosion and gullies there, and suggests a visit; a chap in Iowa merely wants a complete treatise on soil conservation "done in a simple style for use as a handbook in teaching children."

But the fellow in Indiana really caught the priest's fancy. He sent him a letter which declared excitedly: "You and I can make a fortune. Just let me add your name to my work, and we're set for life."

To which Father Hildner replied:

"All right, Mac. What's the gyp?"

Back by first-class mail—postage C. O. D.—came the script of a "novel to end the troubles of the world by all manner of means, including a special chapter I've just written on soil erosion so you can be the coauthor."

"I read the first paragraph," said the priest, "then asked the good sisters at the school to do me the favor of going over the rest. They were neither scandalized nor impressed, so I feel rather sure I am not passing up the chance to put my name on the great American novel."

Recently Father Hildner was picked as one of four men throughout Missouri who were designated master conservationists for their work in that field. He proudly wears a lapel pin so designating him.

"Someone suggested," the priest says with a twinkle in his eye, "that mine should have read 'master conversationalist.'"

But there's one thing you must say about Father Hildner: Despite the length and the breadth of his homely but persuasive oratory, his actions have spoken louder than his words.

Wartime Oil Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copy of a telegram I have received from Shelby, Mont., in the names of James W. Johnson and Lon Crumley, who are deeply interested in the oil industry. This telegram is typical of what the people who are trying to produce oil think about the supervision of the present O. P. A. staff. They think that the O. P. A. policy will wreck the industry and maybe stop production of oil:

SHELBY, MONT., *May 12, 1943.*

Congressman JAMES F. O'CONNOR,
House Office Building:

If the oil industry is forced to endure the immature, prejudiced, ignorant, and reform-minded interference and supervision of the present Office of Price Administration staff nothing but disaster to the Nation as a whole and monopoly within the industry can result. We, in the industry, have lost all confidence in the honesty, integrity, and intelligence of the Office of Price Administration staff concerned with the handling of our war-time oil problems and feel that the time has come to appeal to you and the other Members of Congress to rescue us from their domination in the interest of maintaining an adequate supply of oil to the Nation's war effort and in the preservation of the independent oil industry. We would appreciate it if you would contact Senator ED MOORE, of Oklahoma, who is introducing this matter to the attention of the Senate, and Congressman PLOESER, of Missouri, who is doing the same in the House, and do everything in your power to further the effort that is to be made to transfer all authority concerning the entire oil industry from the Office of Price Administration into the authority of the Petroleum Administrator for War, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes. The Petroleum Administrator is charged with the responsibility of providing the Nation with an ample supply and reserve of petroleum and has at his command the hearty cooperation of the entire oil industry, together with engineering and economic data, necessary for his intelligent administration of this task, but he and the industry will fail if we are forced to continue with the handicap of the Office of Price Administration. You may secure all pertinent data from the records of the Lee and Patman Small Business Committee hearings and reports and we urgently request that you give every aid possible to the correction of this problem.

JAMES W. JOHNSON.
LON CRUMLEY.

Clear Thinking on Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I include the following thoughtful letter on current tax proposals by one of the country's foremost teachers in public finance:

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS,
Evanston, Ill., May 2, 1943.

Hon. FRANCIS H. CASE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANCIS: I am responding to your invitation to comment on the various tax proposals, made when you were going through Chicago the other day. I wish we might have had a longer talk about them at that time.

The withholding method of tax collection is unquestionably desirable when applied to wages and salaries, but the determination of the percentage withheld raises complicated problems. The cancelation of taxes under $60; the doubling up of tax collection over a 3-year period forcing higher taxes in the unforgiven brackets; the temporary freezing of income-tax rates in times like these; the application of pay-as-you-go to the farmer, and the relation of withholding and forgiveness to the control of inflation are distinct problems. The rush to get a bill effective July 1 seems to be producing some

confusion in tax thought on this compromise bill.

THE CANCELATION PROBLEM

Under the Ruml plan tax liabilities for 1942 would be entirely canceled; under the proposed bill cancelation applies to tax bills of less than $60, and partial cancelation is applied to the higher brackets.

It is important that the more obnoxious, but more accurate term, "cancelation" replace the idea of "forgiveness." It is very difficult to imagine Alexander Hamilton recommending cancelation at a time when the Federal Government needs $108,000,000,000 out of the $140,000,000,000 of national income this year. But Congress now confronts the dilemma not whether there should or should not be cancelation of 1942 taxes, but what portion should be canceled.

This creates for the future a still more complex problem of finding the $16,000,000,000 sought by the President in his Budget message last January.

The cessation of hostilities has always been accompanied by a demand for tax reduction, and the 7,000,000 taxpayers whose tax bills for 1942 are canceled, together with their friends, can be depended upon to institute a demand for tax cancelation in the post-war period, based upon the precedent of 1943. Congress must protect the Treasury against such future embarassment, and must protect those patriotic citizens buying Federal bonds today. Cancelation, whether complete or partial is, notwithstanding, cancelation.

THE REVENUE PROBLEM

This bill contains the paradox of canceling taxes and at the same time raising revenue estimated at $3,000,000,000. One evil is used to offset another.

The double use of the ability-to-pay theory destroys its validity. First, it is applied to determine tax rates after July 1; and second, it is used to determine the rate of regressivity of forgiveness and the result is a capital levy in the higher brackets.

Ricardo over a century ago pointed out that calling an income tax a tax on income did not make it such, because it was the rate and not the name that was important. This bill, therefore, imposes an income tax in the lower brackets and a capital levy in the higher brackets.

Just as this bill lays the ground work for future tax cancelation, so, too, it lays the foundations for a future capital levy. Moreover, this capital levy is not made for 1 year, but for 3 years. The fact that the well-to-do may borrow from banks to extinguish the claim makes the interest paid to the bank a secondary tax and must be considered along with the discount privilege for advance payment.

At best, any proposed schedule of tax forgiveness must be arbitrary, but how can anyone justify a difference of three-tenths of 1 percent between the taxpayer paying $32,000, who is forgiven 18.8 percent, and the taxpayer paying $200,000, who is forgiven 18.5 percent? This schedule of partial forgiveness converts the compromise bill into a soak-the-rich tax bill.

The legal and effective tax rates must be clearly presented, bracket by bracket, in order that this doubling up on taxes be clearly comprehended.

THE INFLEXIBLE RATE PROBLEM

There is a current report that Congress will agree not to change tax rates during the 3-year catching-up period. Least of all in times like these, Congress can ill afford to bind future sessions, and the parliamentary right of future sessions must not be impaired.

At a time when flexible rates are most necessary to combat the dangers of inflation and to raise necessary revenue by taxation rather than by Federal borrowing, Congress should make no commitment that will freeze the existing normal or surtax rate structure of the income tax, merely to secure passage of this proposed bill.

THE FARM INCOME PROBLEM

The Ruml plan was designed for the certainty of income for the Treasury and for the tax convenience of those recipients of wages and salaries.

The quarterly estimates now proposed as the tax base for the farmer are complicated by hog cholera, chinch bugs, boll weevil, grasshoppers, hot winds, floods, drought, and other woes. Despite the cognizance of this fact the bill places a penalty upon farmers by binding them by December 15, and final tax settlement in March 15 following.

In the Corn Belt farm-crop storage is common until spring prospects become more certain so the farmer should be permitted to extend his final tax settlement and refund date to June 15 following.

Since the compromise plan anticipates that tax payments will be made on the basis of estimates, there is a danger that farmers be forced to sell to meet taxes, thus driving down prices, enhancing market storage costs since farm storage costs are somewhat lower.

If all farmers confront this situation their lower prices become a kind of secondary tax that cannot be shifted to the exchanges or commission men or livestock buyers.

Ultimate consumers must bear part of the higher costs of market storage. On the other hand, if he borrows from the bank to complete tax settlements, then the added interest becomes a secondary tax; while if he builds up cash balances to meet tax obligations by March 15 his loss of interest becomes a secondary tax.

Consideration of the tax convenience of the farmer would permit him to go to his own post office right after he deposits at his bank a check from the elevator or commission house, or stock buyer, and to make a postal deposit which he regards as a reasonable offset to his income tax due for final settlement June 15. These postal-deposit receipts could be sent along with his check to complete his income-tax payments. Such a policy would look to the farmers tax payment convenience.

Why try to fit the farmer into a scheme essentially designed to collect taxes from the recipients of wages and salaries?

THE WITHHOLDING PROBLEM

Withholding is not a tax; it is a method of tax collection. The revenue consists in a doubling up of 1942 unforgiven taxes plus the 1943 taxes on current income. The $3,000,000,000 added revenue is an added draft on 1943 incomes, but falls far short of the $16,000,000,000 sought by the President in his January Budget message. The revenue is partly the result of a change in the income-tax base from 1942 to 1943 incomes, and partly the result of a change in the method of tax collection.

Whether this method of tax collection is desirable is one distinct problem. Whether it is desirable to shift from a 1942 to a 1943 income base is another distinct problem. Failure to clarify these distinctions has resulted in confused tax thinking both inside and outside of Congress.

Withholding is not untried as a method of tax collection. In 1913 it was called collection at the source. It went into effect November 1, 1913, and was repealed by the War Revenue Act of October 3, 1917. The repeal was based chiefly on the following considerations:

(i) Corporate costs of collection were estimated to have raised operating costs 10 to 20 percent.

(ii) Treasury administration became complicated and costly.

(iii) The method did not permit full operation of progressive rates, since incomes were derived from various companies.

(iv) Some taxes were collected from those not subject to the tax.

(v) It became impossible to apply the method to income from foreign investments; payment at the source became the method of tax collection applied to incomes of nonresident aliens.

(vi) Substantial amounts of income were not subject to collection at the source because it remained where it arose, on the farm, in business, and in the professions.

(vii) It postponed the development of highly progressive tax rates, and when progression became a fiscal necessity it was abandoned.

(viii) It changed the incidence of the tax on income from bonds by placing the tax on the corporation by contractual arrangements.

(ix) Less than one-fourth of the income-tax revenue was collected in this manner.

(x) Information at the source was deemed to be an adequate substitute as a means of enforcement and collection.

(xi) It was considered inequitable since a stockholder whose entire income was derived from dividends, say $2,000, received his check for $1,760—tax being 12 percent—while another taxpayer with a $2,000 income was not subject to such heavy rates.

(xii) The tax was collected before being due. This difficulty is avoided by shifting the measure of tax liability from last year's income to current income.

In short, the arguments against the withholding of taxes on wages and salaries today are not the same as during the last war. But the nature of dividends, interest, and rent has not changed in the meantime, and for these types of income information at the source may be logically used to supplement the taxpayers' quarterly estimates contemplated in this bill.

In other words, instead of an annual report by the corporations on wages and salaries paid, the quarterly returns may be employed, or better still, some combination worked out through the social-security tax and the income tax.

THE RELATION OF WITHHOLDING AND INFLATION

During the hearings on the price control bill before the House Banking and Currency Committee, the "recapture theory of taxation" was suggested as a fiscal device to facilitate price control. Representatives of the Treasury responded before the Ways and Means Committee with a proposal of a withholding tax. Withholding, however, is not a tax, it is a means of collection of a tax. It was evident that if purchasing power released by Federal spending were withheld from the market that a check could be placed upon inflation.

In the meantime, many still think in terms of the percentage of income withheld as the anti-inflationary device. It is assumed that a 30-percent withholding would be more anti-inflationary than a 20-percent rate. What is not generally comprehended is that the percentage withheld must be related to the percentage increase in purchasing power. Thus if purchasing power in a certain tax bracket rises, say 100 percent in 2 years, and the rate of increase expands more rapidly than the rate of increase in tax rates of withheld income, inflationary forces are at work that makes the problems of the Stabilization Director more and more acute.

No doubt the Treasury is prepared to show the expansion of purchasing power in various tax brackets. If the proposed bill seeks revenue the recommendation of the Treasury as to the most desirable withholding rates should be requested, in order to tie together fiscal and price-control policies.

FORGIVENESS AND INFLATION PROBLEM

It is doubtful if the proposed forgiveness schedule contained in the bill has been constructed with price control in mind. Withholding is deflationary; forgiveness is inflationary. The forgiveness rate schedule has been developed with regressivity that corresponds roughly to ability to pay, but the consumers demand of the 7,000,000 whose 1942 taxes are to be forgiven constitutes a distinctly inflationary factor.

The Forand proposal to forgive that part of the 1942 tax liability to which normal and first surtax rates apply does not seem to me adequately to relate forgiveness and inflation. The Knutson plan to forgive 75 percent of 1942 tax liabilities on the first $5,000 incomes and whatever added incomes up to $20,000 are earned, plus 50 percent forgiveness on incomes over $20,000 seems to be to take cognizance of this problem. The Carlson plan must make up in withholdings what it loses by forgiveness.

In brief, then, this bill creates a new set of problems for the Stabilization Director, and for the Price Administrator.

Withholding is desirable, but the anti-inflationary effect will depend upon the relation of the withholding to the distribution of expanding purchasing power. Thoroughly inadequate consideration has been given to the relation of forgiveness of tax liability to inflation.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST H. HAHNE,
Professor of Economics.

The Call to Sacrifice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, the topic which is uppermost in all public discussions today is that of sacrifice. We hear the call to sacrifice directed to the laborer, the housewife, the man in public office, in fact it is directed to all. It is often difficult for the individual to measure the degree of sacrifice which he is able to make, and for this reason many of us believe we are making actual sacrifices—to the limit of our ability—when in fact we are falling far short of the sacrifices being made by others.

Everyone knows that the greatest contribution to the safety and the future of America is being made by those boys who offer up their lives for this great cause. They also serve, who only stand and wait. In this connection I want to call your attention to the contribution being made by Mr. and Mrs. William H. Martin, of 104 Dexter Street, Providence, R. I., and their six sons, who are in the fighting forces of the United States of America.

In addition to having six sons serving the colors, Mr. Martin is a guard at a textile plant in Providence.

This record of service was made complete when the youngest boy, Edward G. Martin, was mustered into the service at Camp Devens on March 23.

His brother, Staff Sgt. Almanzor H. Martin, 24, is in the regular Army and for 27 months has been serving in the Hawaiian Islands. Recently he was ordered back to the continent for duty in a California training camp.

Fernando L. Martin, 33, is a private first class, in the military police at Fort Edwards.

Gabriel A. Martin, 29, is a corporal in service in North Africa.

Pvt. (1st cl.) Gerard V. Martin, 27, is in the Medical Corps, stationed at the Spokane air-base hospital.

The family is represented in the Navy by Rudolph E. Martin, 28, seaman first class, who is stationed in California at Mare Island Navy Yard.

The Jewish Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor this afternoon to speak on one of the more pressing problems of this cruel era in which we live, the Jewish problem. This problem is separate and distinct from the world refugee problem, which has been caused by the outbreak of war. The specific Jewish problem has had many causes, ancient and modern. Every historian seems to find a different set of reasons why the Jews are always made to suffer. It is not new; it has been inherited from antiquity. The war has only aggravated it. Hitler is bringing it to a most unhappy, uncivilized, and un-Christian solution.

Germany officially declared war against the Jewish people in 1933. Jews were decitizenized, degraded to an inferior position. Jewish children were not permitted to attend schools. Jews were thrown into concentration camps and their fortunes and properties confiscated by the State and used to build up that terrible war machine which our sons are facing today. Synagogs were pillaged and burnt, and their worshippers tortured and degraded. Christianity cried out in amazement. Decent men and women the world over raised mighty voices of denunciation and condemnation. But the democratic governments of the world, which alone could have stopped this uncivilized, undemocratic, cruel, and sadistic conduct, remained silent.

"We must not interfere with the internal affairs of a friendly country." "Friendly country," indeed, just as Japan was a friendly country when she was sold oil and scrap iron with which to bash the heads and crush the bodies of innocent Chinese men, women, and children, and which is now being used against our own sons and fathers.

Came 1935. The black hand of Germany was extended over the Rhineland, and the happy Jews there were made as unhappy as their brethren in the Reich itself.

Came 1937. And the Jews of Austria fell under the hammer of German sadism.

Came 1939. And the free, happy Jews of Czechoslovakia bravely faced their doom.

"Peace in our time" was the slogan of a great part of the civilized world, while the suffering of the Jew in Europe was made sharper by that feeling of loneliness and despair which comes even to the strongest of men when they are forced to realize that they have been abandoned by their friends in a moment in which they were helplessly facing superior forces bent on their destruction.

But the Lord moves in His own inscrutable way, for He "hardened the heart of Pharaoh," and Hitler marched into Poland.

The war had begun.

Suffering, persecution, oppression, and confiscation of property, were followed by a policy of complete extermination; and the greatest slaughter history has ever known began. A slaughter which until now has taken the lives of millions of men, women, and children, who by accident of birth or the will of God were born Jews.

Civilization girded its loins and began to exercise its powerful muscles in order to face the onslaught of its despoilers, but the Jews of Europe were still the forgotten people.

Yet human beings are basically decent, honest, and courageous.

And, as is always the case in times of need, a few groups, whose conscience would not let them rest, came forward and began to decry this cruel silence. This group of energetic people worked hard, and long, and persistently, until they were heard.

I, as well as many of my colleagues, applauded them and lent my name to their humanitarian appeal.

They said, and rightly so, that the United Nations should immediately set up an agency whose job it would be to effectuate a stern and realistic policy of action which would save the remaining Jews of Europe, and suggested that this United Nations agency should seek all possible ways and means of getting as many Jews as possible out of Nazi-occupied Europe.

They repeatedly dinned this suggestion into the ears of the American and British public and officials.

The people of England responded.

The people of that "island fortress" who so stoically withstood the shattering might of the German Luftwaffe raised their voices in powerful protest.

A Gallup poll of British public opinion showed that 40 percent of the British public were in favor of opening their own homes to all those Jews of Europe that the Government could save. Only 10 percent opposed it; the others having no opinion. The British Government, being a democracy, gave answer to the clamor of its people demanding the salvation of the remnants of the ancient Jewish people of Europe.

A note was addressed to our own Government which led to an exchange of

messages and views resulting in the calling of a conference to be held in Ottawa, Canada. The place of the conference was later changed to that lovely and inviting island, Bermuda. Why this change was made, I cannot say, but I do have my own ideas about it. Now, Mr. Speaker, this conference at Bermuda was not called for the purpose of finding ways and means of saving the remaining 5,000,000 Jews of Europe who have been marked for slaughter. This was merely an exploratory conference where three delegates representing Great Britain and three delegates representing our own Government were to discuss the world refugee problem, report their findings, and make suggestions to the Intergovernmental Refugee Commission, which has been existing since 1938 and which has accomplished little more than nothing.

May I repeat for the sake of the record that the Bermuda conference was not convened to find a solution to the Jewish problem of Europe. It was to deal with the world refugee problem which was caused by the war, the problem of the Spanish Loyalists in north Africa, and so forth.

I do not know any of the findings of the conference. I am convinced that the American delegation represented the interests of our State Department as well as any three Americans could have done, but they were sent as American delegates to an exploratory conference to discuss the world refugee problem.

The conference did not have the power or the authority to take any action other than to advise their respective governments of their "explorations." They could not do anything "now" toward alleviating the terrible plight of the millions of Jews facing destruction in the immediate future. They could not do anything "now" about feeding the millions of starving Jews in the ghettos of Europe. Nor could they do anything "now" about bringing out of the hellhole of Nazi-occupied Europe, some of the thousands of young and innocent children whose lives could still be saved, and who could still be rehabilitated.

Meanwhile, it was whispered around to those humanitarian groups and individuals who have been arousing public opinion in behalf of the remaining Jews of Europe, facing imminent death, that they hold up their activities until the Bermuda Conference would take place. From the time the conference was announced, until it convened, 2 months elapsed—60 days in which death continued to run amuck in the Hitler-made ghettos of Europe. They met for 11 days and now we are told that the report will be forthcoming at some future date, when it can no longer be of any benefit to our enemies.

All this about a conference whose apparent purpose it was not even to discuss this Jewish dilemma, a conference which in its official communiqués did not even mention the word "Jew."

The time for complacency if, since the advent of Hitler, it should ever have existed, is gone. An entire people are being systematically slaughtered and destroyed. Public opinion should be aroused to such an extent that some immediate action will be instituted by our Government in conjunction with our allies to save the lives of these remaining unfortunate Jews, who are destined to be murdered like cattle unless some forthright evidence of official indignation is forthcoming.

If, while Mr. Churchill is here in Washington, a joint statement were issued by our great President and the great Prime Minister of England, condemning these atrocities, and stating that official action would soon be instituted, it would not only give heart to those of us here at home who are so vitally interested, but would revive the hope and faith of those poor suffering people who are so hopeless at present. It would also serve notice on the Nazi brutes that the civilized peoples of the world will not condone or forgive their brutal action toward an innocent minority, and that retribution will surely follow. Some such official action will, I am sure, have a startling and salutary effect in easing the situation somewhat, so that final plans for the evacuation of, at least, some of these unfortunates, may be made.

To sum up, I should like to quote from Hitler's Massacre of Europe's Jews by James Waterman Wise.

HITLER'S MASSACRE OF EUROPE'S JEWS

(By James Waterman Wise)

Not mine the flaming pen, the accusing voice
Which should indite these anguished lines of woe;
For I am next of kin, and have no choice
But to bemoan the death my brothers know.

Here is a burning theme for poets' muse,
Milton or Lowell would have found a tongue.
Shelley and Hugo knew not to refuse
Such innocents, nor leave their fate unsung.

If then I speak, who silently should weep
While others pillory the tyrant's shame,
And bid mankind to join me in the deep
Sanctification of the Holy Name—

This be my plea: Some garment must be rent,
Some savage indignation as of old,
Must seize and sear our moral firmament
For Israel's Lidice—a thousandfold.

Senate Military Affairs Committee Again Investigates Army Airplane Crashes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that either due to my efforts in the demand for a showing of the scandal involving Army airplane crashes, or for other reasons, the Senate Military Affairs Committee has decided to again investigate the alarming number of airplane crashes in the United States.

It is recalled that on October 12, 1942, the leadership of this committee announced they had completed a 6 months' investigation of the accident and evidently gave the War Department a clean bill of health. Now the committee is again looking into the matter. It has been rumored that the Army asked the committee to lay hands off the matter so that it could be covered up. While I do not make this charge personally, it is my firm belief that the committee should make a full report to the public in order to stop such rumors.

On March 4, 1943, the Truman committee began to make its own investigation of the crashes. Evidently there was no sidetracking of them by the Army and from information I have received, their findings are both sensational and startling. It is recalled that Senator WALLGREN, chairman of the Truman subcommittee investigating airplane crashes, stated in an interview in Seattle that the cause of these crashes was startling. What the people want is for Senator TRUMAN to make the report public. Senator TRUMAN, I understand, admitted several days ago that his committee had plenty of information on these crashes.

Senator TRUMAN, in a press release, stated that I, Congressman MORRISON, was talking through my hat. However, it is my understanding that he told several reporters off the record that MORRISON was correct, but that he did not want to reveal the information at this time.

The three Senators who have been appointed on the new subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee to investigate air crashes are Senators HILL, O'MAHONEY, and GURNEY. In a newspaper report Senator GURNEY was charged with helping to whitewash the previous investigation. Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, a member of the old committee who publicly demanded a thorough investigation, was not reappointed.

The following is a concise record of part of what has happened in regard to these air crashes:

LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS, UNITED STATES SENATE, DECEMBER 31, 1942

(Page 97)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
February 7, 1942.

Mr. JOE LEIB,
National Press Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LEIB: Enclosed herewith you will find copy of hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs in reference to aviation losses, a very interesting subject which you so kindly brought to my attention, and concerning which I appointed a subcommittee of one for attention. The subcommittee consists of Senator KILGORE, and I might suggest that you call upon the Senator in pursuance to this very interesting subject pertaining to aviation losses.

With assurances of my esteem, and thanks for your fine patriotic cooperation, I beg to remain,

Very sincerely yours,
ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman.

Senate Resolution 234, by Mr. KILGORE, April 1, 1942: Investigation of all crashes of United States Army airplanes which have occurred within the continental United States since September 8, 1939, or which may hereafter occur therein during the present war; to Audit and Control Committee

April 3, 1942: Referred to this committee. (February 3, 1942: Senator KILGORE was designated a subcommittee to study airplane crashes. March 31, 1942.—Senators EDWIN C. JOHNSON and CHAN GURNEY were added to the subcommittee, and all were so advised.)

April 7, 1942: Subcommittee met, with Senators JOHNSON and GURNEY present. (Senator KILGORE was absent on account of illness.) Persons heard: Mr. George P. Baker, Mr. Jerome Lederer, and Mr. Robert Hoyt of the Civil Aeronautics Board; Lt. Col. S. R. Harris of the Air Corps; Capt. C. T. Durgin and Ensign J. F. Grindle of the Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department.

April 23, 1942: Army Air Corps announces the establishment of Flying Safety Bureau.

May 5, 1942: Mr. Joseph Leib was heard by Senators KILGORE and GURNEY.

September 25, 1942: Upon request of Mr. Bridges, there was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. 7473) a petition to the United States Senate and other material presented by Mr. Leib.

October 8, 1942: Considered by committee. It was agreed that a special meeting of the committee should be called to determine whether or not the subcommittee should continue its work.

October 12, 1942: Considered by committee. After hearing Lt. Gen. Henry H. Arnold and Col. S. R. Harris, a statement was issued to the press.

October 13, 1942: Senator KILGORE explained to the Senate that Senate Resolution 234 regarding investigation of airplane accidents was not introduced and reported to the Senate on April 1, 1942, as a result of committee action, that it was introduced only in order that the subcommittee of which he was chairman might hold hearings and determine what disposition should be made of the matter, that hearings were held and the subject of airplane accidents carefully studied, and that the matter was considered by the full committee on October 12, 1942, after which the following statement was released to the press:

"For over 6 months this committee has been considering airplane accidents.

"From the confidential information previously given the committee by experts in the field of Army aviation, all of which has been confirmed by General Arnold today, this committee is of the opinion that the investigations of airplane accidents have been and are now being conducted thoroughly and expeditiously by Army Air Force experts, and that the causes of accidents developed by investigations are being disseminated to all activities concerned in training and production with a view of obviating similar accidents as far as practicable.

"This committee is assured that the accident rate is smaller than we had a reason to believe it would be, due to the tremendous increase in flying hours. We were further convinced on evidence presented that in no accidents has there been proven evidence of sabotage."

If there is no scandal involved in the air crash situation then why is the Senate Military Affairs Committee investigating the matter again?

Yes, Mr. Speaker; why? Why not let the people know the whole truth?

[From the Woonsocket Call of May 7, 1943]

NATIONAL WHIRLIGIG—NEWS BEHIND THE NEWS

WASHINGTON

(By Ray Tucker)

Haste

The Truman committee has uncovered sensational evidence that many plane crack-ups and some cargo boat losses resulted from structural defects which should have been caught by inspectors at the plant or in the shipyard. In some instances the facts are so startling and disturbing that the senatorial investigators have agreed not to make them public.

It is estimated by the legislators that at least one-third of the aerial accidents inside the United States are traceable to imperfect motors and that some smash-ups overseas could have been avoided by more rigid tests at the factory. Senators have talked with pilots, engineers, and mechanics throughout the country and learned that certain types have a bad name in the industry, as some horses are known as bad actors to jockeys and trainers.

The models known to be susceptible to unexplained misfortune will not be given on the open record for fear of the psychological reaction on flyers abroad. But the data has been turned over to the Army and Navy and officials in those agencies have promised to take immediate steps to correct the situation.

Approximately 15 percent of our merchant marine mishaps are listed as "unaccounted for," in which category are a number of freighters which failed because of poor materials or improper welding. The balance of the casualties is laid to subs, gunfire, bombardment from the air, and known sea hazards.

Anniversary of the Polish Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted at a mass meeting held on Sunday, May 2, 1943, at Humboldt Park in Buffalo, N. Y., at the anniversary celebration of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791:

Whereas we solemnly observe today the one hundred fifty-second anniversary of the adoption of the world famous constitution of May 3 by the Polish Diet in Warsaw in 1791; and

Whereas in common with our allies, we treasure to this day the meaning of freedom as defined in the opening paragraph of the constitution of May 3, "valuing more than life and personal happiness, the political existence, external independence, and internal freedom of the nation." This is aptly restated by our President Roosevelt in the Four Freedoms and confirmed by him later in the eight points of the Atlantic Charter and the Unconditional Surrender Conference at Casablanca; and

Whereas Poland, the oldest member of the active cobelligerent powers—since Poland was the first to resist Nazi aggression—now occupies the fifth place numerically on the basis of her fighting strength in the United Nations camps; and

Whereas public opinion is being dangerously swayed today by alarming threats and misleading information about the eastern frontier of Poland, only recently reconsecrated by the blood of her heroic defenders; and

Whereas a strong and an independent Poland constitutes the best bulwark of security and peace for Europe against any German aggression in future years; and

Whereas, in spite of concentration camps and mass executions, underground Poland courageously carries on Spartan-like resistance by waging guerilla warfare, and large scale sabotage in reply to all barbaric tyranny, thus maintaining unbroken integrity in her loyal service to the cause of freedom for all oppressed nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this assembly of thousands of American citizens of Polish descent, That we pledge to the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, our Commander in Chief, undivided and loyal support in the prosecution of the war—as evidenced in our city by the overwhelming success in the recent sale of Victory bonds on Polish Day; and be it further

Resolved, That we renew our faith in freedom as worthy heirs of the spirit of the Constitution of May 3 by seeking the attainment of the noble objectives set forth in the Atlantic Charter; and be it further

Resolved, That in keeping with the recent declaration of policy on April 28, 1943, by the Polish government we appeal to the President of the United States to give General Sikorski, Prime Minister of Poland, representing the true democratic spirit of the "four freedoms," all aid, help, and assistance necessary to secure to Poland the safeguard of her rights and her privileges as a free, independent and self-governing nation and the integrity of her territory; and be it further

Resolved, That whereas no traitor has been found by the invader among the Polish Nation, to make a deal or collaborate with the enemy thus proving that the Polish Government in London, headed by General Sikorsky is not only the legal one but representing de jure and de facto the entire Polish Nation—we do solemnly protest against any foreign attempt to diminish, discredit, or question the exclusive authority of the said Government to govern and represent the Polish Nation as a whole, we further protest against any attempt by a foreign power to question the composition or influence any act of the said Government by threat of using force or by the threat of forming or sponsoring a puppet government composed of irresponsible elements on a foreign territory; and be it further

Resolved, That our sympathies are with the legitimate endeavor of Polish citizens regardless of their creed—exiles in Soviet Russia—to leave the said country as free Polish citizens or to have relief sent from this country with the collaboration of the U. S. Government—administered and distributed through the offices of the Polish representation in Soviet Russia; and be it further

Resolved, That we pay tribute to Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski under whose leadership Poles in their occupied homeland and elsewhere are fighting for the cause of freedom. We extend our praise to the Polish Army and Navy, to the thousands of pilots and ground crews in the Polish Air Force, to the Polish

exiles in Russia, fighting bravely for the preservation of their nationality and religion and to all those who fight and suffer for Poland.

We pray to God for our dear sons and brothers in the United States armed forces for their final victory and their safe return home. We also pray for the homeless women and children in occupied countries, for the underground workers risking daily their lives and for all those who fight for justice and freedom; and be it

Resolved, That these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Polish Republic, to the United States Secretary of State, to Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, and to the Members of the Congress of the United States of America.

RT. REV. MSGR. ALEXANDER PITASS,
DR. FRANCIS E. FRONCZAK,
MARTA MAZUROWSKA, *Secretary*,
Committee on Resolutions.

Bill to Change the Obnoxious Name "Skimmed Milk" to a Name Not Obnoxious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House on yesterday reported favorably a bill that does not impress one who is unfamiliar with the subject matter as being very important, but which is, in effect, one of the most important bills pending in this Congress. The dry-milk business has become very large and when this war is over it will be one of our outstanding industries. Skimmed milk is a very fine food product, but the name "skimmed milk" indicates an inferior or obnoxious product. The Pure Food and Health Department has refused to change the name. Therefore it was necessary to introduce a bill proposing that the name be changed by law.

The bill as reported by the committee is as follows:

H. R. 149

A bill to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 26, 1938 (ch. 675, sec. 1, 52 Stat. 1040), nonfat dry milk solids or defatted milk solids is the product resulting from the removal of fat and water from milk, and contains the lactose, milk proteins, and milk minerals in the same relative proportions as in the fresh milk from which made. It contains not over 5 percent by weight of moisture. The fat content is not over 1½ percent by weight unless otherwise indicated.

The term "milk," when used herein, means sweet milk of cows.

Mr. Speaker, we are hoping that the Rules Committee will grant a rule for early consideration and that the bill will be passed at an early date.

German Catholic Bishops' Protest Against Oppression of Church by Nazis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of May 13, 1943.

Because the trumpet blast of the Catholic bishops in Germany takes up the courageous challenge of Pastor Niemoller, and because their heroic stand, in the very teeth of the Nazi terror, inspires hope in the regeneration of Germany after our victory and our peace, I consider it worthy of the attention of every serious-minded American.

The article follows:

GERMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS' PROTEST AGAINST OPPRESSION OF CHURCH BY NAZIS

WASHINGTON, May 12.—The text of the German Catholic bishops' memorial to the German Government, copies of which were sent on December 18, 1942, to the German Minister for Church Affairs and German Minister for the Interior and the Chief of the Chancellery, follows (the text was released here by the Office of War Information):

"MEMORIAL OF THE BISHOPS OF THE DIOCESES OF GERMANY, ASSEMBLED AT THE FULDA CONFERENCE OF BISHOPS, SUBMITTED ON DECEMBER 18, 1942

"The German bishops assembled at the Fulda Conference of Bishops have already submitted several times their earnest complaints on measures of officials of the party and their government which are directed against the church and against Christianity. During the past year they have submitted a memorial to the government of the Reich, which pointed out in numerous details the conduct of many officers of the party and the government toward priests and believers, contrary to the provisions of law and the promises of the government, as well as toward the work of caring for souls and the establishments of the church.

"We have asked for relief, not only because of religious interests but also from love for the Fatherland. The government of the Reich did not give us any answer. The evils complained of continue to exist; some, in fact, have grown worse.

"Therefore, our demand is all the more urgent, that relief be provided from the measures complained of in our memorial of December 10, 1941, which profoundly injure the rights of the church and church life.

"NEW TERRITORIES AFFECTED

"This plea of ours extends—and that is the ground for this new petition—with the same urgency to the vital interests of the Catholic Church and the free practice of the religion of Catholic Christians in the territories that recently have come to Germany. The vital religious interests of the Catholics of these territories are not alien to us, as we are connected most intimately with the Catholics in those regions by Christianity and German racial qualities; nor is the fear to be put aside that the bad conditions created in the new territories may not remain without influence on church life in the old Reich; it is also cherished in our recollection that for decades the dioceses of those territories were united with us in all church cares at our joint bishops' conferences.

"We cannot shut our eyes to the great misery of these German people, and we must also lift our voices for the sake of the respect for the name of German. It is incomprehensible that now, in the midst of this hard war, German people who have come to the Reich with great confidence and with the expectation raised to a high pitch are forced back by Germany, embittered to the depths of their souls. Around Germany, in all the occupied territories, a rampart of bitterness and enmity is being erected, which has arisen in large part because of the ruthless interference of the officers of the party and the civil administration with freedom of conscience and the religious life of the population.

"DIRECT INVESTIGATION BARRED

"Although it is not possible for us to investigate in detail all the facts mentioned in this document—rather we are prevented by difficulties placed in the way of personal examination on the spot—the reports on which our complaints are based appear so absolutely trustworthy that we need for fear the reproach of casual acceptance thereof, particularly as confirmation by the government authorities is easily possible, and as for the most part the occurrences involved are entirely evident—nay, more—are to be designated as notorious.

"We refer in particular to Alsace-Lorraine, which has returned to the Reich after 20 years of foreign rule. The populace received the arriving German troops with great enthusiasm in May 1940 because it felt German, thought in a German way, and expected more justice from the German administration than from the French. However, the German Government has enforced in a much more rigorous form the anti-church laws which, in 1919, the French Government did not venture to carry over from France itself to Alsace-Lorraine.

"We do not intend to cite details, which are much better known to the Government than to us. But such incisive, ruthlessly executed measures as, for example, the expulsion of approximately 50 percent of all pastoral priests from the diocese of Metz, the dissolution of all church organizations, congregations, endowments, and the confiscation of the property even of the charitable endowments, the seizure of the buildings of the orders for men, and of the ascetic orders for women or the expropriation of all the hospitals, boarding schools, and homes for old people belonging to the church or to orders and their transfer to city or state ownership have struck the love of the deeply religious Lorraine people for the German fatherland in a most sensitive spot.

"LUXEMBURGERS HOSTILE

"Even worse is the hostile rejection of all Germans which has grown up in Luxemburg. The population of Luxemburg also received the German troops in a friendly way, and this good frame of mind would have been maintained if the German civil administration had tactfully spared the native religious and cultural life. But the liking of the Luxemburgers for us has been alienated by the ruthlessly executed closing of the monasteries and the sharp measures for restricting the work of the cure of souls of the clergy and the strengthening of the faithful in their religion, the numerous banishments of priests and members of orders, and the placing of numerous respected Luxemburg citizens in concentration camps, which frequently resulted in the death of the person placed there within a short time.

"Even more cheerless than in the west is the religious situation in the newly attached

eastern territories. With disgust and indignation, numerous Reich Germans, who have been settled there or have been sent there as officials report on the treatment of the local population by the administrative and police authorities and the situation for the Catholic Church resulting therefrom. Except for a very few houses of God, all churches in the dioceses of Posen and Litzmannstadt have been withdrawn from use for worship and have been used for profane purposes or have been officially sealed. Part of them are warehouses of some kind. One church in Posen has been degraded to a riding school.

"A very large number of the churches have been robbed of their equipment for worship, altar cloths and sacerdotal garments; the furnishings have been destroyed. The tabernacles have been broken open in many cases and the most holy sacrament desecrated in the vilest way. In so doing, not even the churches of parishes of German race have been spared. We call attention to the shocking occurrences that transpired, according to reports received, at the time of the plundering and desecration of the churches of German parishes, for example, at Lissa Samter, Tiefenbach (Kreis Schrimm) and Reisen in November 1941. In the territory of the diocese of Litzmannstadt almost all crosses and images of saints on public roads and streets have been destroyed. All that can only be taken by the population as the expression of a senseless hatred directed against everything Christian.

"Orderly care of souls is no longer possible in all of the Warthegau. Almost all of the Polish clergy of the dioceses of Posen and Litzmannstadt has been arrested and placed in concentration camps or in the general government. This fate has been suffered even by those clergymen who stood up for the German population under Polish rule and had maintained divine worship in the German language for it.

"It meant a bitter disappointment to German Catholics when any further work was prohibited and rendered impossible for even those Polish clergymen who had shown themselves to be absolutely friendly to the Germans by race. We hear the complaint again and again from the Germans that what they had fought for so hard under the former Polish state has been taken from them by officials of the German Government, and that today they have not even been granted the rights which had been allowed them by the Poles

"CHURCH RIGHTS DENIED

"Besides, the plea of the Germans by race that at least German Catholic priests from the Reich be admitted to the Warthegau for the care of souls has scarcely been heeded. The Catholic Church is entirely without rights in the Warthegau, for even the few German priests who are left there to care for souls had to accept the degrading decree of the Governor under the Reich, of May 27, 1941, that divine worship may be held only by consent of the competent state police authorities.

"In practice, the state police have taken over the administration of the churches for the whole Warthegau, even for internal questions. All government orders and regulations that concern the church are made known to the clergymen by the secret state police. This is properly felt by these clergymen as seriously insulting mistrust, particularly as these priests have exercised the care of souls of their German fellow countrymen for years, making sacrifices that were not slight, and by their work have contributed toward maintaining the German character of the German Catholics, which was endangered by the efforts at Polonization. Several of them were interned on that account and had to participate in the internment march to Kutno. Now these men are treated as public enemies and placed under surveillance of the state police.

"It would take us too long to sketch even in outline a picture of the state of the church in the Warthegau and of the treatment of believing Christians. A detailed examination of all measures fateful for the existence of the Catholic Church and church life in the Warthegau region and their effects would be possible for us only if impartial observers were allowed to travel through the parishes of the Warthegau and to report openly the conscientiously on everything experienced, which, if we are correctly informed, is not permitted even to the Papal Nuncio or dependable Catholic laymen.

"OFFICIALS ALIENATE PUBLIC

"It is absolutely incomprehensible the way that officials and State police authorities in the Warthegau take upon themselves the reproach or open religious hostility of the people in connection with the performance of their work of organization. Their highest duty evidently ought to be, of course, to draw the Germans by race to the Reich and to keep the settlers there from any dissatisfaction. Instead, they are driving these people into the greatest agony of conscience and forcing them away from Germany.

"The religious situation is similar in the regions which have returned to the Reich after belonging to Yugoslavia for 20 years. There, too, almost all the lay priests and members of orders have been forced out, entirely without means, into lower Ukrainia, occupied by Italians, or Croatia, or have been placed in concentration camps. On July 10, 1941, all church property was confiscated, even insofar as it was encumbered under endowments.

"This treatment of the Slovenes, deeply believing and zealous in religion, has caused the enthusiasm for Germany that existed in 90 percent of the population, according to the judgment of persons acquainted with the country, to turn into hatred of the Germans. A special contributing factor in this was also the removal of numerous Slovenes to other areas, as well as placing them in concentration camps. Thus guerrilla warfare has come about there, which in turn has brought about bloody countermeasures, which are driving to despair the portion of the population that is still quiet.

"CONQUEROR'S WORST ERROR

"It is an experience that has been acquired at all periods in the history of the world that nothing has a more irritating effect, nothing rouses stronger embitterment and more glowing enmity than when a conquering nation strives to take away from the conquered his religion.

"In deep anxiety for the good name and the welfare of the fatherland and in deep responsibility for our brothers in the faith in the occupied territories, we beg the Government of the Reich to put a stop to the unrestricted antireligious agitation of party officers and to the destructive measures against church and Christianity, which are unwise politically and display scorn of all mankind. One cannot expect to win hard-working and upright people for Germany and at the same time destroy the happiness of their heart and the source of their strength. One cannot undertake to build a new and fairer Europe and to destroy Christianity at the same time. The West is inseparably associated with Christianity. If Christianity is destroyed a real substitute for it can never be created.

"We therefore beg and conjure the Government of the Reich to give directions to have an end finally put to the measures hostile to the church, in this solemn hour, when it is important to collect all strength for the welfare of the Fatherland.

"Breslau, December 18, 1942."

In the name of the bishops of the dioceses of Germany, assembled in the Fulda Conference of Bishops.

ADOLPH CARDINAL BERTRAM,
Archbishop of Breslau.

The Labor Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR
OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of Wednesday, April 28, I heard the most sensible, most logical, most statesmanlike approach to the then and now serious labor situation, which situation calls for some lasting adjustment if capital and labor are to successfully survive this war, and not just another patch on the quilt as is done every time a problem comes up.

The way was pointed out by that genial commentator and news analyst whose voice is as convincing and sauve as the Kreml Shampoo he broadcasts for—Gabriel Heatter.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that part of his broadcast dealing with the labor situation in the RECORD:

The coal strike at 9 o'clock eastern war time tonight is where nearly everybody knew it would be—in President Roosevelt's lap. Sixty thousand miners are out. Another 400,000 go out Friday midnight. Steel manufacturing for war weapons will feel it 1 week later—officials claim 20 percent of war steel production would be affected within a week. It promises to be a most unusual strike.

No one is calling it. No one is ordering anyone to walk out. Mine leaders are apparently preparing to say "We have no right on company property except under a contract of employment. That contract expires Friday midnight. We'd be trespassing on mine property if we crossed it Saturday morning."

A strike no one is calling—yet as serious a threat to war production as we have ever had.

Mr. Roosevelt may make his appeal to the men tomorrow. Or he may take a more direct approach—order troops to protect any man willing to continue. That would possibly provide a test to show how many men are willing to walk out.

One group of mine operators in Illinois has offered to negotiate immediately for a new contract. That may show whether or not any individuals unions are ready to break away from John Lewis. Some people want Mr. Roosevelt to take over the United Mine Workers as he would take over a war plant where the management refused to cooperate.

Other men say the rank and file would stand by Lewis. War Labor Board officials practically admit Lewis' defiance of Labor Board authority has made any more hearing hopeless. Frankly admitting any exception made for Lewis would wreck all Labor Board machinery.

It would be a mistake to call it a battle between Roosevelt and J. L. Lewis. It would be a mistake to say the miners are the only ones making demands or to say it's all a question of wages. Philip Murray has just called a meeting of his executive board declaring the President's anti-inflation order isn't being carried out—criticizing certain Government bureaus and agencies almost as vigorously as Lewis is fighting the War Labor Board.

We are living under troubled skies.

England had its days of coal trouble, too—but not after Churchill came in. His very first move, you remember, was to call in Bevin, Atlee, Morrison, and other important labor leaders. He gave labor an active voice in the war management—by that very recognition

he put a responsibility on these men to avoid break-downs in production.

No one labor leader in our own country occupies a place in the war machinery comparable to Bevins in Britain. What we seem to need is at least one powerful figure to represent labor—not necessarily a leader now caught in labor's bitter factional quarrels—but a man whom millions of laboring men would accept as representing their interests, not merely as workers, but consumers.

There were many emergency moves made recently. Manpower moves. Office of Price Administration price moves. Moves affecting wages and things wages had to buy. It might have been a good idea if some man of Bevins' caliber had played a part in those decisions. That was Churchill's policy. It worked. It was easier, of course, to work it out in England.

Hitler was 20 miles away. But it is surprising to find no one dominating labor figure is in the war machine here as British labor leaders are in their country. We'll have to find a man who will be the Bevin of American labor.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial by Mr. C. F. Byrns, of Fort Smith, Ark., which appeared in the Fort Smith Times-Record on May 8, 1943, as follows:

OFF THE RECORD

(By C. F. Byrns)

The Ruml plan is apparently on its way to final victory. The powerful Senate Finance Committee Friday afternoon approved full abatement of 1942 Federal income taxes, in order to put all individual income-tax payers on a current basis this year.

With all Republican Members and five Democrats approving, the Ruml plan was approved 13 to 6.

The House bill, passed early this week, was laid aside. If the Senate passes the bill which the Senate committee will probably report in by Monday, there is strong probability that the House will agree. The Ruml plan lost in the House by only 4 votes.

It seems to me the Democrats muffed the most popular tax proposal in years and let the Republicans run with the ball.

From the moment it was proposed, the Ruml plan has had a wide popular appeal. Everybody resents being a year behind in his income taxes. Everybody resents the idea of owing the Government a year's income taxes when and if his income stops or is seriously reduced. Everybody resents a tax debt hanging over the estate of a man who has died and whose income has therefore ceased.

The simplicity of the thing and the almost universal appeal of paying taxes out of current income made it a natural. But for some reason, which is still more or less obscure, the Democratic Party leadership and the Treasury Department have fought it with everything they could lay hands on.

The Ruml plan was beaten down without much of a test last fall, chiefly because the Treasury opposed it. It bobbed up again in the House in this session, and was beaten by a narrow margin several weeks ago. The whole matter was then referred to the House Ways and Means Committee, which had stood firm by a majority vote against any abatement of 1942 taxes.

But the pressure for the Ruml plan would not ease up. Republicans saw an opportunity to win a popular issue. Most Democrats still refused to see the obvious merit of the thing.

On the test this week the Ruml plan, or a modified bill very much like it, was beaten by only 4 votes on a roll call—208 to 204. Then the House approved a proposal to wipe out the first 19 percent of the income tax levy for 1942. That meant complete abatement for about 90 percent of the taxpayers, whose taxable incomes are $2,000 a year or less, after deducting personal exemptions, dependents, and allowable deductions. Taxpayers with more than $2,000 taxable income after all deductions would still be liable for the increased surtax rates on higher brackets—3 percent on the second $2,000 of taxable income and higher rates as the income goes on up.

The House proposal is not logical. Either 1942 taxes should be wiped out for everybody alike, or they should not be wiped out at all. If we want to get on a current basis—and everybody does—then the logical thing to do is abate all of 1942 taxes on individuals, and let all payments made in 1943 apply on taxes on 1943 incomes. If we are not going to a current basis, then there is no point in changing the present system. The only reason for playing favorites, giving an abatement to one group of taxpayers and continuing to collect a hang-over of debt from others, is a political reason, completely unsound.

The Senate Finance Committee vote for the Ruml plan, which abates all of 1942 taxes on all individuals, will contain provisions to tax "windfalls." If fairly done those provisions are completely logical. If a man had a "windfall" in 1942 and took in much more income than his normal before that time or his income for 1943, then he should pay a reasonable tax on that extra income. Details of those provisions are to be worked out before the bill is sent to the Senate for a vote.

If the Senate passes the Ruml plan and the House approves, as now seems likely, it will be a victory for common sense and insistent public opinion.

Hull Has To Be Diplomatic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of April 20, 1943:

HULL HAS TO BE DIPLOMATIC

Congressman GEARHART, California Republican, charged that the administration's reciprocal trade agreements had been used to "encircle" Germany and thus forced that country into war. Secretary Hull retorts that if GEARHART were not a Member of Congress he would say the charge was 100-percent piffle.

The State Department has to do business with Congress. We don't. We are free, therefore, to say what Secretary Hull obviously would like to have said, that GEARHART's charge is utter rot, inside Congress or outside it.

Resolutions of the Isaak Walton League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC LANDS

Whereas the public lands of the West provide a valuable reservoir and habitat for all sorts of wildlife and are indispensable for the protection and management of these natural resources; and

Whereas these public lands are under the management of numerous Federal and State agencies and departments, with divergent and occasionally conflicting management policies; and

Whereas many of these public lands are being used by privately owned domestic stock at grazing fees far below the cost of production of the same kinds of domestic animals on privately owned lands; and

Whereas this discrimination in production costs on public, as compared with privately owned lands, amounts to a subsidy to the private user of such public lands and brings him into competition with other public values of these lands, such as the protection and conservation of the wildlife resources of these areas; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Government be requested to make an investigation of the inequalities mentioned, aimed at finding a fair and equitable adjustment of grazing fees for domestic stock on all public lands where such use is permitted, in fairness to other public values of the range, such as preserving the habitat and protection and prevention of soil erosion.

Adopted by twenty-first annual convention, Izaak Walton League of America, March 27, 1943.

PROTECTING PUBLIC WATER VALUES

Whereas in the name of public water conservation existing aquatic values and the public's right to their enjoyment have been commonly ignored in the development of new values in large dam construction programs at variance with the plain intent and spirit of the Coordination Act: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we oppose any further authorizations or appropriations for engineering surveys or resurveys of our inland waters unless such surveys include aquatic biologists and other scientists on an equal basis with the engineers assuring that all values be given adequate consideration and that the reports of such surveys be made public.

Adopted by twenty-first annual convention Izaak Walton League of America, March 27, 1943.

WATER POLLUTION

Whereas the methods of satisfactory treatment for municipal sewage have long been well known; and

Whereas many municipalities pleading a lack of funds have failed to accord proper and, in many cases, any treatment of municipal sewage, while at the same time accepting under various public works plans over a period of years Federal funds far in excess of those needed for sewage treatment, applying them to less essential or luxury projects, while leaving their own sewage problems unsolved as a menace to public health and a menace to downstream communities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in our planning for any post-war public works program that the fol-

lowing principle be adopted with respect to all municipal works and all public institutions involving Federal or State participation or aid; namely, that unless and until a municipality or public institution having a water sewer system either has adequate sewage treatment facilities or bona fide plans for acquiring such facilities it shall not be eligible for Federal or State funds for any other purpose.

Adopted by twenty-first annual convention, Izaak Walton League of America, March 27, 1943.

Politics and MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Detroit Free Press of April 20, 1943:

POLITICS AND MAC ARTHUR

Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG in a letter to the Free Press explains his opposition to the War Department's order against servicemen mixing in politics, for which this newspaper criticized him.

"My complaint, very specifically," he says, "was solely against the fact that the order has recently been broadened to prohibit even the ultimate 'acceptance' of an elected position to which a serviceman might be drafted, without any prior participation on his part. Of course, the 'acceptance' would require his military resignation. * * * If the American people wish to draft and elect a great general of the armies as President of the United States—wholly involuntarily on his part—it would be a restraint upon their electoral freedom to attempt to say they shall be denied this privilege."

We cannot agree with the senior Senator, as a wartime proposition. "The great general" to whom the Senator refers is Gen. Douglas MacArthur, as his name was freely used in the discussion at Washington. We think that very case, as currently presented in the newspapers, reveals the fallacy of Mr. VANDENBERG'S position.

The Free Press concedes that General MacArthur is one of the greatest military leaders of the age, the only possible living rival of Winston Churchill as a phrase maker, a hero greatly beloved and admired by all America. Now he is engaged in a desperate struggle in the South Pacific.

Instead of letting him conduct himself as a soldier at war, a large and vociferous section of the American press, eager to find a candidate to match popularity with that of Franklin D. Roosevelt and disliking the nonconformist Wendell Willkie, is ballyhooing General MacArthur and using a critical war situation for their ballyhoo purposes.

We need hold no brief for Mr. Roosevelt in saying that we believe he is as anxious for victory as any American. We think that this drumming up of a pretended fued between the President and the general for the sole end of glorifying the general and making the President appear as one who would stoop so low as to risk defeat for political purposes is downright vicious, does irreparable harm to the war effort, and does a distinct disservice to the reputation of General MacArthur as a soldier, a gentleman, and a patriot.

MacArthur's request for help is immediately twisted by the enemies of Roosevelt into a picture wherein the general and the President must play the opposing roles of hero and villain. With such trickery, there immediately looms the altogether unwarranted suspicion that MacArthur is a part of the scheme. This injures him as a commander, hurts the war effort and helps destroy faith in the entire general command of the Army, which is headed by General Marshall as Chief of Staff, who is as completely nonpolitical as was Gen. John J. Pershing.

If General MacArthur needs more planes, tanks, troops, and other forces his rightful demands are weakened in the eyes of the people by the strident promotion of him as a political figure. Freed of that suspicion he can speak solely as a soldier—and this he has protested is all that he desires to be.

If the Republicans have to wreck the war effort and spoil the magnificent achievements of a great general to find a candidate, then the party has indeed fallen upon sorry days of blind political selfishness.

National Federation of the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

Whereas organized labor is always anxious to assist any handicapped or underprivileged group of our fellow citizens; and

Whereas organized labor naturally appreciates and approves any movement of any such group to better its own conditions; and

Whereas it appears that the National Federation of the Blind is an organization of blind men and women for mutual aid and common action: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Louisiana State Federation of Labor, That we express our general approval of the National Federation of the Blind; and be it further

Resolved, That we request our executive council and all other committees and bodies of organized labor to give careful and sympathetic consideration to all matters of legislation sponsored by said National Federation of the Blind, and that all councils and constituent unions affiliated with the Louisiana State Federation of Labor welcome bona fide representatives of the National Federation of the Blind who may desire to address such councils and such unions; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the National Federation of the Blind.

American Automobile Association Condemns the Federal Use Tax as Unsound and Discriminatory and Urges Its Repeal.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, among the many letters received favoring H. R. 2010, providing for repeal of the Federal use tax of $5 on motor vehicles, I am particularly pleased that I have the assurance of the support of the American Automobile Association. Since the levying of the use tax, the A. A. A. has waged a lone battle in an endeavor to awaken the Nation to this unjustified and unsound method of taxation.

The American Automobile Association comprises over 725 motor clubs and State associations, with a membership in excess of 1,000,000. It is peculiarly qualified, through its national headquarters, to speak from experience in the automotive field on matters pertaining to the welfare of the motoring public.

The A. A. A. conducts extensive research in every field of motor activity and hence is qualified to speak on behalf of the motorists of America.

The following letter, dated April 9, 1943, from Mr. Russell E. Singer, general manager, American Automobile Association, outlines the views of that organization toward the repeal of the Federal use tax, as provided for by H. R. 2010.

Mr. Singer's letter is as follows:

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., April 9, 1943.

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VAN ZANDT: With reference to our correspondence regarding your bill (H. R. 2010) calling for the repeal of the Federal use tax on motor vehicles and boats, will advise you that we are wholeheartedly in accord with this measure.

As you know, the use tax was originally imposed in lieu of an increase in the Federal gasoline tax and before there were drastic limitations on automobile use. From the very first, we have believed that this tax was unsound. It has become a particularly unsound levy in view of the wartime restrictions now imposed upon automobile use.

At our thirty-ninth annual convention in 1941, the following resolution was adopted:

"Although the American Automobile Association has for the time being withdrawn its active public opposition to Federal excise taxes on the motor vehicle, it is convinced that the new so-called use tax of $5 annually on every motor vehicle registered in the United States is unsound, unscientific, inequitable, and thoroughly unjustifiable; accordingly, the American Automobile Association urges that this tax be repealed forthwith."

This convention action was reaffirmed at a meeting of our executive committee here in Washington in 1942 and again at a meeting of the executive committee in March. The levy now costs passenger-car owners around $35,000,000 annually and is imposed, as I have said, at a time when automobile use is drastically restricted.

This tax has always been extremely difficult to administer. Stamps are sold at post offices, but there is little or no enforcement to see that all motorists purchase stamps. They are comparatively easy to remove from vehicles and there have always been a number of complaints from persons that their use-tax stamps had been stolen. There is absolutely no way that stolen stamps can be checked and when a person has his stamp stolen, his only redress is to purchase another stamp or convince a collector of internal revenue of the theft and secure a statement confirming the theft. In fact, the Treasury was at one time strongly opposed to the levy because of the administrative difficulties, but

the need for wartime revenue brought a surprisingly high degree of response from motorists. We fully anticipate that the tax will become more difficult to collect each year.

We have noted with a great deal of interest that a report on intergovernmental fiscal relations, made at the instance of the Treasury and recently submitted to the President, Congress and State Governors, recommended repeal of the use tax or, if it is retained, require receipt as a condition for obtaining a State license. We concur in the recommendation that the tax be repealed. But we are strongly convinced that purchase of a Federal use-tax stamp as a prerequisite to secure a State automobile license would present a very serious problem. The Federal use tax is collectible for the year beginning July 1. By that time of the year, all States have issued license plates. Thus, it would be necessary to change the date of issuance of Federal use-tax stamps to secure State cooperation and, even then, we do not believe that it would be forthcoming. We believe that the States would very strongly oppose any program of using their facilities to force payment of Federal tax.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL E. SINGER,
General Manager.

Pledging Support of War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

PLEDGING SUPPORT OF WAR EFFORT

Whereas our Nation and the other United Nations are waging a war against the aggression of the Axis Powers, and which war was commenced by a treacherous and dastardly sneak attack at Pearl Harbor at a time when our President was attempting to maintain this country at peace; and

Whereas the members of organized labor believe as trade unionists, that in order to maintain free labor and free government we must dedicate our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor in this hour of our Nation's peril; and

Whereas we are in this fight to a finish and we are determined to wage relentless warfare until our enemies are decisively defeated, and in so doing there can be no compromise with the hateful forces who oppose us and no bartering with their leaders, and only unconditional surrender can be accepted, and if necessary our unconquerable troops must fight their way into Berlin and Tokyo to enforce it, and neither the appeasers at home nor the aggressors abroad should be permitted to place us in a position of wasting our sacrifice and our efforts through compromise or surrender of our principles: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Louisiana State Federation of Labor, in its annual convention, assembled at Shreveport, La., April 5, 1943, That we pledge our united strength to our Commander in Chief, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and to our gallant armed forces of the Army, Navy, marines, and air service, to achieve a smashing and final victory for free men and women everywhere.

House Share in Treaty Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. O. BURGIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from a former Member of Congress to the editor of the Evening Star in Washington, D. C.:

FORMER REPRESENTATIVE LEWIS CONTENDS FOR HOUSE SHARE IN TREATY MAKING

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STAR:

In your issue of April 13, Senator BURTON, of Ohio is quoted as saying that the peace treaty "must not be a party measure"—(amen, I say, indeed)—"but must be jointly formulated by Republicans and Democrats if it is to obtain the two-thirds Senate vote required by the Constitution." And continuing, he is quoted again as saying, "We've got to meet the two-thirds rule—it's up to the people and Senate to make it work."

If the esteemed Senator means by this that the Senate possesses a legislative monopoly over the approval of a peace agreement or agreements, he is most happily and most certainly mistaken. He can accept this assurance as sponsored to him by an illustrious predecessor, Senator Theodore Burton of of Ohio, who, having gone back to the House of Representatives and having made a thorough investigation of the subject as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, stated to the House:

"I have set forth in my report that we could pass a resolution initiated in this House in which if the Senate concurred, it would be binding. On several occasions the Congress has done that. We annexed Texas by resolution originating in the House after a treaty had failed. We annexed Hawaii by a resolution in this House and passed in the Senate after a treaty had failed. We, the House, took the initiative for peace with Germany in the Sixty-eighth Congress, second session. Volume 66, part No. 5, page 5405, March 3, 1925.

In his report for the committee Representative Burton refers to about 100 precedents for such action by congressional procedure taking the place of action that also might have been taken by the treaty method. It is a mistake to assume, as some writers are doing, that the treaty form alone may be employed in affecting agreements with other nations. The Supreme Court itself frequently has declared that the President can enter into "international understandings," "compacts," "conventions" which possess the same validity as treaties if they have or receive the approval of Congress, although lacking ratification as treaties by the Senate under the two-thirds rule. * * * See United States versus Curtis (299 U. S. Reports, p. 306, 5, 6).

The treaty method is not the only method available. It is an error to say so; as much error as to say that you can only go to Baltimore by walking there, thus ignoring the railways, the automobile or, mayhap, the air. Since the very beginning of the Government, the alternative method of an agreement approved by Congress has been employed, there being some 1,500 such executive agreements," as compared with about 800 formal treaties. Only born recalcitrants could wish it to be otherwise.

Said President Taylor in presenting the joint resolution admitting Texas to the Union, after a treaty for that purpose had been defeated in the Senate: "The power of Congress is fully competent in some other form of proceeding to accomplish everything that a formal ratification of the treaty could have accomplished."

I challenge any student or publicist doubting the soundness of President Taylor's statement to examine the subject and then reply.

It is unthinkable that the State Department, after the three repeated failures of its peace treaties by veto of Senate minorities under the two-thirds rule should fail to submit any future peace understanding with other nations to the two Houses of Congress for approval by the method of democratic majorities, rather than to one House only of the two Houses.

God spare the world from the calamity of another such veto.

DAVID J. LEWIS.

United States Coast and Geodetic Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Alaska realize the value of the work done by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey. This is the easier to understand because the coast line of Alaska is considerably longer than the entire coast line of the 48 States, including the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts.

Moreover, Alaska is now a theater of war, and accurate charts of our coast line are not only desirable but necessary for the effective prosecution of the war in that area. There is plenty of evidence to indicate that as to most of the Aleutian Islands, the Japanese at the outbreak of the war had much more accurate knowledge of the coast line and the coastal indentations than we possessed. From motives of mistaken economy, sufficient money was not appropriated during the years of peace to enable the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey to survey and chart most of the Aleutian Islands and a considerable extent of the Alaska coast line outside the Aleutian Islands. In justice, it must be said that the officers of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey did all within their power to speed up the survey of the vital parts of the Alaska coast, but the necessary funds were not provided, and so the work could not be done. In some parts of Alaska we are still dependent upon the rough and inaccurate survey—some little better than intelligent guesses—made by the early explorers. I am told that as to one particular part of the coast of Alaska we are still dependent upon the reports of Capt. James Cook, who sailed in Alaska waters in the year 1778, and for whom Cook Inlet was named.

Rear Admiral L. O. Colbert, the present able Director of the Survey, recently gave

an address outlining the history of the Survey. That address is so interesting that I here present it:

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The recent dedication of the memorial to Thomas Jefferson has recalled to the public mind his achievements outside of the political world. Members of the Coast and Geodetic Survey do not need any reminder of the scientific and engineering interests of Thomas Jefferson, because it was due to his vision and under his direct proposal that the Congress on February 10, 1807, passed the basic act under which we perform our present duties. That law authorized the President to "cause a survey to be made of the whole coast, of harbors, and of adjacent ocean shoals."

Through the American Philosophical Society, of which President Jefferson was a member, and by a circular letter issued by the Secretary of the Treasury, Albert Gallatin, a request was made for suggestions and plans for the accomplishment of the survey. The plan considered most acceptable was that submitted by Mr. Ferdinand R. Hassler, a native of Switzerland, who at that time was professor of mathematics and natural philosophy at the Military Academy at West Point. After several months of correspondence the condition of external affairs, due to political unrest in Europe, caused postponement of any further work on the plan until 1811. In that year Mr. Hassler, at the request of Secretary Gallatin, undertook a mission to London to arrange for the construction of the necessary instruments.

The correspondence shows that Mr. Hassler had made drawings to full scale of the instruments needed. He mentioned a theodolite with a 24" diameter circle, a repeating circle of 12" diameter and a base measuring apparatus among other instruments. For the next four years Mr. Hassler was in Europe on this misssion. He arrived in Washington for the first time on December 31, 1815, and in the following year took up the survey of the coast in the vicinity of New York. He had selected this important area as being most favorable in principle for the start of the great project which he proposed.

In the early history of our country, land was plentiful. Descriptions of boundaries gave only rough approximation of their limit and the area. Surveying was done in a crude form. Considering the circumstances of those early days it is remarkable that the first superintendent of the Coast Survey should have been able to obtain approval of his proposal for such an unprecedented program as the survey of the entire coast, (to be done piecemeal, it is true,) but executed with an accuracy and continuity which should hold fixed a framework of such precision that every part would fit exactly into each adjacent part. It was to be a survey which would stand the test of time and later permit its extension under the same rigid principles to cover a vast area extending into the west to the distant Pacific Coast.

The work was suspended in 1818 by an Act of the Congress which permitted only Army and Navy personnel to be employed in surveying the coasts. Some detached surveys of rivers and harbors were made and some hydrographic reconnaissance was performed but, no general or connected survey of the coast was attempted.

In 1832 the Congress revived the act of 1807, appropriated $20,000 and extended the work to provide for the survey of the coasts of Florida. Mr. Hassler was reappointed superintendent by President Andrew Jackson and the renaissance of the Coast Survey was begun under the guidance of these two strong personalities. In 1843 a reorganization of the survey was effected under a plan which provided that the scientific methods laid down by Ferdinand R. Hassler should be taken as a basis of the reorganization and be followed in the further execution of the survey of the coast. In addition to the methods for procedure, the plan provided for the participation of the Army, the Navy and civilian engineers and scientists; the personnel for hydrographic work was to be nominated from the Navy Department, and for topographic details from the Army. The operations were to be directed by a civilian superintendent under the Secretary of the Treasury.

In 1871 the scope of the Bureau was enlarged for the purpose of extending inland the geodetic control surveys which had previously been executed only in the coastal regions. In 1878 the designation of the Bureau was changed to the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The Bureau was transferred in 1903 from the Treasury to the Department of Commerce and Labor, and in 1913 to the Department of Commerce. Because its ultimate purpose is the advancement of commerce and the safety of those who navigate on the sea and in the air, in commercial ships and planes, it is logical that the Bureau should be in this department.

The major wars of this country have had important effects upon the operations of the Bureau and the development of its organization. The War of 1812 and the events leading up to it caused postponement of the inauguration of the survey. At the start of the Civil War the Army officials who had been detailed for topographic work were withdrawn and since that time no officers from the Army have been assigned. At the start of the Spanish-American War all naval officers on duty on Coast and Geodetic Survey vessels were relieved and the operation of the ships was taken over by Survey officers. In 1917, with the advent of the World War, the officers operating the Survey ships and those in charge of field work were commissioned in order to facilitate arrangements for the transfer of these specially trained officers to duty under the War or Navy Departments with equivalent rank.

Since the beginning of the present war nearly 500 members of the Survey have entered the armed services. Some of these were in the Survey a comparatively short period, but they had received basic training in the work of the Bureau. Many are now performing military engineering duties for which their previous training had especially qualified them. The present work of the Bureau is devoted entirely to the war effort. One of the objects of this series of lectures is to show the connection between the work we are doing and the prosecution of the war.

In closing this brief historical account I would like to note that each of us has a part in the current operations of our Bureau just as did the members of the Survey who made its history in earlier days. A responsibility rests with us under the same initial standards adopted to meet the high concept of fidelity and integrity which has since been scrupulously adhered to through all vicissitudes. In his annual report for 1931 Rear Admiral Patton made a statement in this regard which I think is well worth repeating:

"Throughout the years the Bureau has held steadfastly to that ideal. That which has been done at all has been done thoroughly. If sacrifices have been required, they have been made in the volume of results accomplished, not in the quality of that which was done. On the other hand, in the practical, day-by-day application of an ideal which might be carried to extremes, the Bureau has kept its standards sane and reasonable.

The profit to be derived from this review is obvious. The Coast and Geodetic Survey, in spite of its age, is young and vigorous today because throughout the years it has kept before its mind's eye a vision of useful service to be performed; a vision so inspiring as to exact from one generation after another the best which each could give. Preservation of that vision undimmed is essential to equal usefulness in the years to come."

Sworn Opponents of a Superstate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of May 11, 1943:

SWORN OPPONENTS OF A SUPERSTATE

Attention has been called in these columns to the certainty that a world government, a supergovernment, a Union Now or any other such device for subordinating the United States to a higher authority would destroy the Constitution of the United States. The enumerated powers of the Federal Government would have to be transferred to the new government. The change could not be made by a few amendments of the Constitution and certainly not by a treaty. The whole document, with all that it guarantees of liberty and progress, would have to be junked.

Congress could no longer have the power to make war, raise an army, regulate commerce, legislate concerning patents, bankruptcy, the currency, and so on. All these spheres of authority and all the administrative responsibilities in connection with them that the President bears would be taken away from our Federal Government and transferred to the higher one. The Constitution would no longer be the supreme law of the land and that would work a revolution in the judicial branch of Government.

It is wishful thinking to pretend that effective world government could leave our Constitution as a living force.

Every public official in the United States from the highest to the lowest is sworn to defend the Constitution. Every one of them is therefore sworn to oppose the schemes of the internationalists. The President, upon entering office, takes his solemn oath "to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States." That is the very essence of his pledge to the people. If he strives for supergovernment, he violates his oath.

These are not idle words. How much they meant to Lincoln is revealed in his first inaugural address when, speaking to those who were threatening armed rebellion, he said:

"You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the government while I shall have the most solemn one to 'preserve, protect, and defend it.'"

Every Congressman takes an oath which is no less specific. He solemnly swears to "support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic" and to "bear true faith and allegiance to the same." He "takes this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion," and he calls on God to witness his promise.

The same oath is taken by every other official of the Government, by every officer of the Army and Navy, and by every naturalized immigrant. The young men who have entered the Army at West Point or the Navy at Annapolis swear, in addition, to "bear true allegiance to the National Government" and

"to maintain and defend the sovereignty of the United States paramount to any and all allegiance, sovereignty, or fealty I may owe to any State, county, or country whatsoever." The naturalized immigrant swears, in addition, to "renounce and abjure all allegiance to any foreign state or sovereignty."

Every civil and military official, every legislator, every judge is sworn to defend the Constitution of the United States. Every one of these men and women is therefore sworn to oppose the imposition of a supergovernment on the people of the United States.

What Can Congress Do Now To Help Win the Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I gave at a United Nations Today and Tomorrow meeting in Constitution Hall, May 10, 1943:

After that profound exposition by Senator THOMAS, I think all of us will agree that if we are to win the peace, if we are to prevent a repetition of the egregious mistake of 1919-20, Congress must act now.

To do nothing as we did in 1920 will be a decision in favor of international anarchy. All the world is watching us for signs that American willingness to help win a lasting peace will match American determination to win a total victory. All of our experience indicates that it is absolutely necessary that some positive, affirmative action be taken before the fighting is over, if we are to achieve anything of lasting value from this war.

I think that we are also agreed that the only thing of lasting value we can obtain from this war is some assurance of peace in the world of the future. The principal question for us is, therefore, what kind of action, designed to accomplish this purpose, is the Congress most likely to take now.

In view of the historic caution and timidity of our illustrious Senate with regard to foreign affairs, it is important that it be not frightened with an esoteric or complicated proposal. The House of Representatives is presently so grossly overburdened with wartime legislation, in addition to the usual domestic measures, and is so distracted by the struggle for political power in anticipation of 1944, that the members have neither the serenity nor the inclination, carefully, to analyze and to formulate at this time a detailed plan for international cooperation.

As a matter of fact, in the field of foreign relations, the proper function of the legislative power is to express the broad fundamental policy of the nation. The executive power is better equipped to, and properly should, develop the details of all agreements within the outlines of the fundamental policy, as expressed by the representatives of the people.

For these reasons I think it is highly desirable that any proposal submitted to the Congress at this time should be reduced to the simplest possible terms.

Of all the resolutions so far introduced, I believe House Resolution 200 is the least controversial and the most likely to be acceptable to the Congress now. It consists of only five lines, which I should like to read to you:

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby expresses itself as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to prevent future aggression and to maintain lasting peace and as favoring participation by the United States therein."

I submit that this simple statement is a positive disavowal of the isolationist policy and a definite commitment that this Nation desires to cooperate with the other nations of the world in an effort to create an organization designed to prevent aggressive warfare.

It has been said that this resolution is so general, so innocent, that no rational person can oppose it, but that it really doesn't mean anything. If, in truth, it is so innocent that it is acceptable to the Congress, then it meets the primary requirement of getting action now.

With regard to its significance, I believe that it clearly contains the indispensable minimum upon which our foreign policy must be based. Our immediate and primary purpose is to declare to the world that henceforth this Nation intends to bear its share of the responsibility of bringing order into the hitherto chaotic international arena. In short, that we recognize the impossibility, the futility of withdrawing into an illusory shell of isolationism.

The words "appropriate international machinery" provide for all the commonly accepted governmental institutions—executive, legislative, and judicial—which are essential to the control of force and the maintenance of order.

To attempt to specify the exact composition of these institutions, at this time, would be unwise. There is no such thing as a perfect plan in which laws or constitutions are self-executing. Our ultimate reliance for success must be upon the spirit and intelligence of the people who are responsible for the operation of the institutions of law and order and not upon the mechanical perfection of those institutions. To fill in the details at this time would tend to freeze the pattern and to prevent orderly development in accordance with experience. The initial machinery itself should be organized by the Executive, only after prolonged study and discussion with the other nations. Even then it should not be frozen so that orderly evolutionary change and progress is prevented. In a new undertaking such as this will be, and with limited experience to guide us, great flexibility with regard to details is highly desirable.

The words "power adequate to prevent future aggresson" not only envisage some kind of world police force, which is so frightening to 32 of our Senators, but it also includes the power to control the productive capacity of instruments of war. As a matter of fact, the control of the existing personnel and weapons of warfare is not sufficient to prevent the development of powerful armaments. If we boggle over the words "police force," we may well be wasting our time on idle words. The essential element is the supervision, not merely of existing force, but of the productive capacity of heavy armaments, of chemical processes, or of any techniques essential to the production of instruments of aggressive war. It is obvious that the supervision of the latter will be a most difficult task and I think it is impossible to specify at this time how it can be accomplished. Yet, I am convinced that, if the same ingenuity is employed in supervision that was used after the last war in the evasion of restrictions, our end can be accomplished. However difficult these problems may be, this resolution contemplates the control of the sources of aggressive force in all its phases.

If, in spite of the innocent appearance of this resolution, it is objected that it is too broad, too far-reaching, this should not be a serious objection. After all, this is not a grant of power to the Executive; it is simply an expression by our people that we intend to participate. If such a resolution is adopted, the Executive can then negotiate as to the details of the machinery with the assurance that the people are willing to support any reasonable system of collective security. But, as the various components of the system are agreed upon by the different governments, they still must be approved by legislation in the nature of treaties or by joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives. If our Executive is unable to develop an organization satisfactory to our legislative body, no damage will have been done and we will have acquired experience of great value in case we have a third opportunity to create a sensible world.

I think that the words "to prevent future aggression and to maintain lasting peace" are restrictive in their meaning. They should be interpreted as a limitation on the purposes of the international machinery, to the control of aggressive force. It is true that dividing lines involving functions and jurisdiction are among the most difficult governmental questions and it is virtually impossible to anticipate and prejudge all the problems that may arise. In any case I do not think that this resolution can fairly be said to contemplate, without further authorization from the Congress, any infringement upon this Nation's independence or sovereignty (whatever that may be) except insofar as it relates to the control of armed force by the cooperative international organization.

The real significance of the action which we want from the Congress now is the assurance that this country desires to make a genuine and honest effort in cooperation with other nations, to put an end to aggressive warfare. This assurance is absolutely essential before our executive can negotiate effectively with other nations. This is not a final acceptance now of any kind of agreements that may be evolved. Even if nothing acceptable results from these negotiations, nevertheless we will have the satisfaction of having tried and cannot in any respect be any worse off than we will be if we do nothing. As Mme. Chiang Kai-shek so wisely said to our Congress: "It is the better part of wisdom not to accept failure ignominiously, but to risk it gloriously."

My principal objection to most of the resolutions so far intfoduced is not so much to their substance as to their form. Personally, I approve of the objectives of most of them, but I doubt that they can be passed presently or in the immediate future. It is a well-known fact that much of the opposition to any type of legislation centers around details, often trivial, which are offensive to any one of the 531 Senators and Congressmen. With so many diverse interests and characters represented in the Congress, anything short of the Lord's Prayer will arouse some opposition.

The decisive consideration in favor of the simple, but positive resolution, is that it is more likely than any other to be adopted now, without undue delay and controversy. Every word and comma in any measure before the Congress presents a point of attack to the opposition. Therefore, the fewer the words the less vulnerable the bill. I believe that House Resolution 200 will definitely reassure the world that our future course is toward genuine cooperation. If we get less than this, we get nothing. If we ask for more specific provisions, we run the risk of complete failure in obtaining any action because of haggling and misunderstandings over insignificant details.

Let us not forget that it was just such haggling and misunderstandings by the Senate in 1920, over reservations and restric-

tions, many of them of little importance, that led to our renunciation of any responsibility for world order, and in a very real sense prepared the way for the savage total war of today.

Price Control of Used Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks now the O. P. A. organization has been considering extending price control to used automobiles. It would seem that the automobile dealers of the Nation from the beginning of the war have already taken more than their share of punishment from this organization. Thousands of them have been put out of business by the severe ruling placed upon them, thousands of them have been driven to the brink of financial ruin, yet many of them have redoubled their efforts and have been able to keep their doors open by rendering repair services and receiving some benefits from their sale and trade of used cars. The Government through the O. P. A. now is about to give them further annoyance and make their lot harder to carry on in business.

How the traffic and trade in used automobiles can encourage inflation is more than I can understand. I cannot conceive a reason based on sound economy and common sense why the O. P. A. should want to place a ceiling on used cars, or how they can place a proper scale value ceiling price on the various lines of used cars because in attempting to do so the real value of every used car must be determined not on age alone but on the care and condition it has had, the use it has been put to and the mileage imposed in its use.

Yet the O. P. A., after holding a few regional meetings in New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and St. Louis, will attempt shortly to set a price ceiling and if they run true to form they will doubtless turn a deaf ear to the National Automobile Dealers' Association which has appealed to the O. P. A. that the services of such a committee be called upon to assist the O. P. A. in fixing a price ceiling on used cars if and when such organization decides to make such a move.

In this connection, for the benefit of the Members of Congress, I want to insert a copy of a telegram I received from I. A. Pfeffer, of Centralia, Ill., this morning from a special committee representing automobile dealers of 20 Midwestern States. This telegram was also sent to the President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Joseph B. Eastman, Prentiss M. Brown, Clyde L. Herring, James L. Byrnes, Donald M. Nelson, and other high Government officials:

On May 6, at a St. Louis meeting of automobile dealers from 20 Midwestern States called by Office of Price Administration, representatives of that Bureau presented a proposed formula for the establishment of a ceiling price on used cars. After study and discussion by all dealers present it was unanimously resolved that the plan submitted by Office of Price Administration would be destructive to the efforts of the automobile dealers of America in carrying out their responsibility to the war effort protecting the transportation facilities as represented by approximately 27,000,000 motorcars now in the hands of the public. The plan is further destructive as in the judgment of the dealers based on many years of experience it would result in a governmental promoted black market throughout the country that would be destructive to the best interests of the public and threaten the economic life of automobile dealers. It would be in the judgment of all of the dealers present a direct attack on small business. It was the unanimous decision of all dealers present that the plan submitted by Office of Price Administration was incompetent in that it reflected a glaring lack of knowledge of the marketing of individual motor transportation and could neither contribute to the war effort or strengthen the economic structure of the home front or be an effective defense against possible inflation. We respectfully call on you to represent the best interests of the Nation to become interested in the plans formulated by Office of Price Administration pertaining to the establishment of a price ceiling on used cars and use your good office to persuade them to accept the services of a committee to be appointed by the National Automobile Dealers Association, such committee to be made up of men rich in experience who would formulate a plan to be submitted to Office of Price Administration within a reasonable period of time which plan would be conceived for the purpose of protecting the public against destructive inflation and protect the economic life of the dealers of America so that they may carry out their responsibility in the war effort by employing the facilities and personnel toward the maintenance of the civilian car population and thereby alleviate the acute transportation problem that faces our Nation.

Respectfully,
L. M. STEWART, *St. Louis, Mo.*,
L. C. CARGILE, *Texarkana, Ark.*,
HORACE HULL, *Memphis, Tenn.*,
BEN T. WRIGHT, *Chicago, Ill.*,
Special Committee Representing Automobile Dealers of Twenty Midwestern States.

Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER C. PLOESER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, the following telegram from the Secretary of the St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association is typical, I believe, of the general feeling on the matter of subsidies. This is their reply to the new ruling of the O. P. A. concerning their attempt to roll back prices:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *May 11, 1943.*
Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER,
House Office Building:

The Office of Price Administration openly charged with continued willful failure to eliminate price squeeze in total disregard of fair margins profit clause specifically decreed in Public Law 729 now proposed subsidies. It is deliberately planned to use public funds in an abortive attempt to correct maladjustments. As stern realism compels admission that ceiling prices on meat products and on live animals must run concurrently, they must be applied to both or to neither. Subsidies are abhorrent to American concept of free enterprises. They are a monetary misapplied palliative and not remedy. They are disguised inflation. We vigorously oppose subsidies and earnestly solicit your aid to require Office of Price Administration to cease experimenting with meat products affecting our armed forces, our allies, and our own civilian needs, and to apply instead the explicit provision of existing statutory law.

A. F. VERSEN,
Secretary, St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association.

Bill of Attainder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. OUTLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

BILL OF ATTAINDER

The House Appropriations Committee has urged upon Congress a procedure fraught with the gravest danger to American institutions. It has recommended attachment to the next convenient appropriation bill of an amendment providing that "no part of this or any other appropriation shall be used to pay the salaries of Goodwin B. Watson and William E. Dodd, Jr." If Congress follows such a course, it will be guilty at once of legislation in the nature of a bill of attainder and of a gross usurpation of executive authority.

The two men named in this curious provision are employees of the Federal Communications Commission. Responsibility for determining their qualification for public office rests with the Federal Communications Commission. Under the law no Government agency may employ any person who advocates or has "membership in any political party or organization which advocates the overthrow of our constitutional form of government in the United States." Neither of these men has been found guilty of, or has even been charged with, such advocacy or such membership. They have merely been accused, through the star-chamber proceedings of a congressional committee, of something vaguely termed "subversive activity." The methods pursued by this committee were a travesty on the judicial processes which have enabled Americans to think of themselves as freemen.

Congress may properly write into law standards for the employment of Government personnel. It may properly hold any Federal agency accountable for adherence to such standards. But the proposed amendment goes far beyond such powers. It would dismiss from Government serevice individual employees on shadowy grounds which have never been enacted into law. This is not the first attempt of its kind. Some months ago the House threatened to deny salary

payments to a Treasury Department employee, Dean Pickens, on the basis of similarly tenuous charges by the Dies committee. Happily a regard for civil rights prevailed. Several years ago the National Labor Relations Board was specifically forbidden to pay any of its funds to a particular staff member. The present provision goes to even more fantastic lengths. It declares that no part of any appropriation may be used to pay salaries to these individuals who have incurred congressional displeasure. In other words, this rider may be pasted onto the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior or for the Navy and yet strike at two employees of the Federal Communications Commission.

But the injustice threatened to these individuals is transcended in importance by the threat which such action raises against the tripartite basis of the American system of Government. If Congress removes these men from office through the disingenuous procedure recommended by the House Appropriations Committee, it will be acting at once as legislature, executive, and judiciary. The Constitution vests appointive power in the President. The corollary of this power, authority to remove Federal officials, as the Supreme Court clearly held in the case of Myers versus the United States, also rests in the Executive. Only through the well-defined impeachment proceedings established by the Constitution may Congress properly remove from office a member of the executive branch of the Government.

This is elementary to the separation of powers which the founding fathers considered essential to liberty. If Congress can oust executive officers at will, then we are subject to nothing short of legislative despotism. Conceivably, by a simple majority vote, the legislature could refuse to appropriate funds for the payment of a salary to members of the Cabinet, or even to the President himself. Its rule would become absolute. The Members of Congress would do well to remember that dictatorship is no less dictorial and no less alien to American traditions when exercised by many men when exercised by one man alone.

Another Job That "Couldn't Be Done"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following open letter from Brig. Gen. J. A. O'Connor to the personnel of the Northwest Service Command is, I believe, an inspiring document. Apparently, according to German propaganda the Alaskan Highway could not possibly be built. But it was. And in a shorter time than anyone believed possible.

NORTHWEST SERVICE COMMAND,
Whitehorse, Y. T., Canada, April 28, 1943.

To the Personnel of the Northwest Service Command:

Within the past few days there has been called to my attention an article which recently appeared in the propaganda magazine Signal, published by the German Government. This article was headlined: "Roosevelt's grosser plan—der eisweg durch Alaska."

Translated, this means: "Roosevelt's great plan—the ice road through Alaska."

The article then goes on to ridicule any possibility of a successful land route from the United States to Alaska. "Who could build such a road," the German magazine asks. "Who could take care of it? And who could keep it open for traffic? In all Alaska you would not find enough Indians and Eskimos to clear the road from snow every morning."

Signal declares: "We estimate that the construction of the road will take at least 10 years."

A cartoon accompanying the article shows American soldiers starting out on the road to Alaska and arriving 10 years later as bearded old men. The caption under the cartoon says: "In 10 years the first truck with the promised help arrives. It comes at a time when the guns have been silent again for a long time and after the present war has paved the way for a new world order in which there is no longer any need for war materials."

I am calling this German propaganda to the attention of the officers and men of the Northwest Service Command for two reasons. In the first place, it demonstrates that ours is an undertaking of which the enemy has taken cognizance. Secondly, it shows that the enemy believes we cannot accomplish the job successfully.

There would be no transcontinental railroads in America, our pioneer forefathers would never have crossed the plains, Washington would never have crossed the Delaware River if cries of "It can't be done" had been heeded.

Northwest Service Command motto: "You can't stumble sitting down."

J. A. O'CONNOR,
Brigadier General, United States Army, Commanding.

Hon. Michael J. Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. FAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article which appeared in the New York Evening Sun under date of April 19, 1943, concerning our former colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable Michael J. Kennedy, leader of the Democratic Party in New York County.

As chairman of the executive committee of the New York County Democratic Party, I wish to state that this expresses the feeling of the members of our executive committee in their high regard for the leader of our organization.

The article follows:

WHO'S NEWS TODAY

TAMMANY'S NEW CHIEF MAY RESTORE HALL TO ITS OLD POSITION

(By Delos W. Lovelace)

Michael J. Kennedy, happily in step with the New Deal, sets out on his second year as leader of Tammany Hall and sharp observers insist that the Nation's oldest political organization is on the road to power once more. If they are right, a historic cycle is being completed also: Mooney to Murphy to Mooney (and virtue) again.

When William Mooney called friends into his upholstery shop 155 years ago to organize the Society of St. Tammany he planned to cut a piece of something truly democratic in principle and action.

"Calm, thinking villains * * * of crooked counsels and daily politics" turned his plan inside out. And under Tweed, Kelly, and Croker—under Murphy, too—the Tiger achieved power aplenty, but even more obloquy.

Murphy was the last great boss. After him the fumblers took over 19 years back and when Kennedy, a year ago this month, was elected head of the New York County Democratic Committee, which means chief of the hall, he found a pretty sick cat.

He looks now just the nurse that was needed. As he starts his second tour of duty, his enemies worry more than they have worried in a long spell. The day when the patient's roar will be full throated again may be nearer than they like to think.

It will be, in that case, a different roar. Kennedy has done more to change the political philosophy of Tammany than any other leader of his century. He follows the modern trend in politics. He means to make his cat respectable. Tweed, Kelly, Croker met the boys in the back room and dealt from the bottom of the deck. Kennedy sits out in front with pictures of his family all around and deals only from the top.

He has fixed things, too, with the administration. He is as free of the White House as Jim Farley once was. The recognized New Deal leader, he has patronage to pass out again.

Kennedy was born in the old West Side political hotbed, and bounced from it early to join and survive the battles of the Murphy era and the whither-are-we-drifting times of Olvaney, Curry, and Dooling. Forty-five now, he is as hard as nails in a show-down, but he manages to seem always good-natured, smiling.

The smile is on the level. He likes living, fun. He likes golf, although he never gets under the high nineties. In the days when steaks were in every butcher shop he liked to broil a juicy 4-inch cut for a few friends at his country place near Peekskill.

Like most political leaders he has a business outside politics. His is insurance. He has been married 15 years.

When Kennedy took over Tammany a musing editorial writer remarked: "The prime essential of the new boss is that he shall have had experience as a night watchman in a mausoleum," and wondered if he was really the right one.

The longer Kennedy sticks, the less dead Tammany Hall looks. There is, it is true, a rumor that the society may sell the hall to the International Ladies' Garment Workers for a union center. But even so Kennedy will see that the cat he has nursed back to health continues to thrive in a new, though smaller, den.

Legitimate Business Has a Right to Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the short article which I am including in my extension of remarks from the Durango (Colo.) Herald-Democrat expresses clearly a trend that has grown in this Nation over the last decade. If it continues, we might well expect that free

enterprise, the incentive and initiative of the individual will be something of the past.

Let every American remember that the Nation's strength and greatness was founded on the sound principle of freedom, the right of the individual to progress in proportion to his talents, ambition, and ability and that private and free enterprise has been the bulwark of American strength and progress. To preserve it at home is as much the objective of this conflict as fighting to maintain it in some foreign country. What may it profit America if the lamp of freedom is extinguished among us while the flower of American manhood is battling to preserve it in some foreign land?

I include the short articles mentioned:

LEGITIMATE BUSINESS HAS A RIGHT TO LIVE

Bureaumen from various agencies of the Chief Executive have broadly hinted from time to time since war began that some businesses will not survive, and as bureaumen have thrust their hands ever deeper into control of business these hints have grown. Why?

There seems to be in the very core of the executive branch of our Government a deep-seated passion to control the life of every citizen. This passion was born a decade before the war and has waxed stronger, ever stronger through the years. And now while the Nation is at war that passion has reached white heat. Even the slaves of that passion admit there will be casualties among our best class of people—the businessmen and the farmers.

It is time, Americans, even though we be at war, to smash that passion to control before it burns the liberties we fight for. Every honorable business and enterprise, be it as small as a shoeshine stand, or a truck garden and a cow—or as big as General Motors Corporation—has a right to live. If this right be taken from us, a victory at arms will be empty.

Let Republicans Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Daily News:

LET REPUBLICANS REMEMBER

Before Republicans in the House try to wreck the Hull reciprocal trade program as a partisan issue, let them remember that—

The last Grand Old Party tariff monstrosity started an international economic war of trade barriers, precipitated the worst depression in American history, and defeated the Republican Party.

President McKinley, Grand Old Party tariff mentor and convert to reciprocity, proved how impossible it is for a President to make effective trade agreements when a logrolling congressional lobby can veto them—as desired by present Hull opponents.

Renewal of the Hull law is favored by many Grand Old Party leaders outside Congress, including Alf Landon and Republican National Chairman Spangler. Republicans voted for its extension in 1937 and in 1940. So the House minority effort to justify opposition as a matter of party policy is an absurd affront to party intelligence.

Before these obstructionists count their unhatched chickens for a 1944 Republican election victory, they should ponder the overwhelming popular demand for renewal of the trade agreement law as voiced by representatives of—

The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations;

The National Manufacturers Association, the National Foreign Trade Council, the United States Chamber of Commerce;

The National League of Women Voters, and other women's organizations;

And nearly 90 percent of the press of the country.

Rarely has any economic measure ever received such support, cutting across all party and class and group lines. But that is not surprising in view of the lamentable record of tariff legislation before this reform. The country learned its lesson when it paid for the Hawley-Smoot folly—the voters have no desire to repeat that.

Nor will the people be fooled by the proposed Republican amendments to emasculate the Hull law. Politicians who think otherwise are outsmarting themselves.

The Philosophy, Aims, and Resources of the Japanese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 12), 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on May 5, last, before the members of Barrister's Lodge, No. 48, F. A. A. M., I was privileged to deliver an address on the subject The Philosophy, Aims, and Resources of the Japanese. The address was taken down by a member of the lodge. I have the transcript before me, and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator THOMAS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, introductions always make me feel very humble, because they remind one who is honest of his shortcomings.

In my studies and teaching in the Far East I have been a sort of pioneer in the educational field in America. It is because I have been at it so long. You see, I was very much of a youngster when I went to Japan. I got over there in time for the last Kwampachi, which was the great celebration after the Russian-Japanese War. The great Japanese with whom I became acquainted were such men as General Nogi and Admiral Togo. I taught English to the instructors at the Japanese Military College which corresponds to our War College. The men who are now the generals and running the war were then undoubtedly captains and majors, and students. I go far enough back to have become acquainted with the remnants of the Russian prisoners who were still in Japan, giving me an opportunity to understand the worth of Russia better than most other Americans had the opportunity of doing. You realize that the Slavonic Russians did not come to America. The Russians who came to America were nearly all Jewish, principally out of Poland, back in the early days.

In my study and teaching of history I start with the Orient and I end with the Orient. That puts me out of harmony with most of the history departments of American institutions, because most of our history teaching, as you know, deals with extreme western Europe and America. The rest of the world we let go hang; and we today are suffering the consequences.

I did what was probably a foolish thing as a young man. I had graduated from college, and I had read a few books on the Orient. After going to the Orient I learned almost immediately the mistaken deductions many writers of those books had made. So all the time I was in Japan I made up my mind not to read an English book on Japan or on China. Therefore, I obtained my information slowly, and the hard way, but a way which has kept me somewhat by myself in my ideas about the Orient.

In talking about the war and Orient in general, there are two facts which you must constantly keep in mind, or else you become extremely lopsided in any of the deductions you make. When I say that, I say that practically every writer is lopsided, because he fails to realize or fails to pay attention to these two great facts, which you cannot dodge, no matter how hard you try.

The great fact about this war is that the culmination of the three greatest social, political, and economic revolutions the world has ever seen will come with the peacetime. Those tremendously great revolutions, involving peoples running into the hundreds of millions, will be a dominating influence upon the world, and will probably be the decisive expression about what kind of new world we are going to have. You cannot beat young, virile, enthusiastic, newly-freed peoples, no matter what you try to do. That spirit will not be downed. The greatest fact of the Russian revolution is that it turned a people who had been illiterate, poor, downtrodden, and frightened, into a people who have seen the light, who are young and vigorous, reading for the first time, talking for the first time, and thinking for the first time, with the greatest economic resources that any people ever had, with youth and women free. So the 200,000,000 Russians are going to be very, very powerful in the new world.

In China, due primarily to a reorientation of outlook, the Chinese revolution has been caused to take on all the aspects of the American revolution in its theory. It has released a people who have always been backward-looking; a people who could not conceive of progress, and never did; a people who thought in terms of cycles whose deadening effect gave them a philosophy which means, in translation, "There is no help for it. There is nothing you can do about it"—not the fatalism of the Near East, but a fatalism, nevertheless, which means that you must submit and take things as they are and never question them. In a group no larger than this I can take credit for just one little change of outlook.

One of the outstanding of the Chinese classics, Confucius Grand Course, has always been interpreted as describing a time that was in the past, just as practically all our great thinkers have assumed that the golden days are in the past. Every commentator for 2,000 years has written upon the Grand Course as if it were something in the past.

I braved the Chinese and English scholars that I could get in touch with, and pointed out that since the Chinese character is the same, whether you say "was," "is," or "will be," it was perfectly proper, in the Chinese language, to translate the Grand Course as

something that was to come in the future. I started by asking, "Did the Grand Course ever occur?" "Oh, no; it did not happen." "Well, then, it is something that is going to happen." I tried it on Chinese. I tried it on Japanese. Finally I got one Russian student of Chinese who was willing to go along with me, so I took a chance; and in my Chinese book I translated the Grand Course as something in the future. We turned Confucius from a historian into a Utopian writer.

That does not seem very important; but today all of China accepts the theory which motivated our founding fathers, which gave George Washington his zeal, and made Thomas Jefferson's philosophy a lasting thing—the notion that the world can be made better, and that progress is a concept which can live. You men, probably more than any other group of men in America, pin your faith and your hopes upon the zeal of the founding fathers and the concept of progress which they accepted. That means that the Chinese revolution is going to be as vigorous, strong, and virile as the American Revolution was; and the effects of the American Revolution are still in the world today.

In the Indian revolution we have something of the same sort occurring. All of those peoples—Indian, Russian, and Chinese—are primarily peoples who have had to face starvation every year, peoples who expected some of their population to die for lack of food, peoples who knew nothing about the problems of economic life or the successes which come as the result of decent transportation, peoples 80 percent of whom were small agriculturists, tremendously illiterate; those statements no longer are wholly true. The curse of India is its poverty. Ghandi's struggle is a struggle against poverty. When we announced as one of our four great freedoms the freedom from want, we not only confirmed but we set on fire with more vigor than ever the Indian revolution, which has again shown itself to be extremely strong.

Therefore, I say that you can never lose sight of the fact that the culmination of revolutions representing half the people of the world is the greatest factor with which we shall have to deal in the making of a new world, and in the struggle with the problems of peace. How to do that, I am not going to try—even if I could—to point out tonight.

The next great fact about the war, especially in the East, is that due to the way in which the general staffs of the United Nations have decided to fight this war—knocking out Hitler first and leaving the Far East war until the last—we have deliberately gone about making the eastern war last—in my mind, at least—1 full year, or probably 2 full years, longer than it needed to last. That is not a criticism. Perhaps in the long run we shall save lives. Perhaps in the long run we shall bring about the type of defeat which will result in a repentance on the part of certain wrongdoers. When I first heard of the plan, which everyone knows, to concentrate on Europe first and leave Asia to the end, I was extremely critical because I realized how strong Japan can become it left alone to reorganize her gains.

This fact about the Japanese Empire today, we must never lose sight of: Japan has within her control the greatest source of raw material and resource wealth that any nation in the world has. She has the greatest source of manpower that the world knows. That does not mean that we are fighting an easy war. She has all the advantage from the standpoint of the actual battle itself, because she fights on shorter lines. Her sources of supply are widely separated, so that she can make China her foundational base and still have plenty of men and resources, or she can make Japan proper her foundational base. She can make the Dutch East Indies or the Philippines her foundational base. In any case, she is extremely strong.

Japan, like France, has always been conscious of her weakness from a defense standpoint. Therefore, Japan has always insisted upon having control of the Shimonoseki Strait, and control of Korea. Her Government has been unitary; and the center of her governmental activities has been between Tokyo and Osaka. Japan and France have always recognized their weaknesses, and they have always carried on their negotiations and diplomacy in recognition of those weaknesses. But that is not the case with the Japanese Empire today. She has raw material. She has resources; and she is no longer a single city center, as France was. If Paris went out, the French Empire went out; and if Tokyo and Osaka went out, the old Japanese Empire fell.

One of our greatest statesmen remarked the other day that of all the colonial administrators probably Japan was the worst. Of all the colonial administrators I would say that Japan is the best. If you read the autobiography of Li Hung Chang, you will find how he laughed, and how bright he thought he was when he gave Japan Formosa, because Formosa had been such a problem and such a headache to China for three or four hundred years. The way to make Japan weak was to let her tackle that problem. Japan, as an administrator, made a success of the administration of Formosa; and Formosa was the base which counted more than anything else in Japan's successful onslaught on the Philippines. Japan has succeeded in doing one of the most remarkable bits of control of backward peoples—who are not backward at all—in Manchukuo, Manchuria. This is the story. Listen to the odds and then discount her ability if you can.

In 1905, after the Russian-Japanese War, when Japan moved into south Manchuria, there were about 5,000,000 people in Manchuria—800,000 Chinese, some few thousand Russians, some few thousand Japanese, and some few thousand Koreans; the rest Manchurians and Mongolians. From that time until today one of the greatest migrations ever carried on in the history of the world has taken place. The Japanese have done everything that could possibly be done to get their own people to go to Manchuria, but the Japanese will not live there. They say it is not Seishi. That is, it is not the right kind of a physical atmosphere for Japanese. For one thing, there are no old trees there. One cannot see the cherry blossoms or the plum blossoms, and therefore one could not write poetry. That means much to the Japanese. The Japanese Government has offered to the Japanese people subsidies of almost every kind to go there and settle. They have offered free land and railway fare; but up to date they have succeeded in getting something like 1,000,000 Japanese nationals, which includes half a million Koreans, to go into Manchuria and settle. In the meantime, more than 25,000,000 Chinese have gone in of their own free will. The odds against the Japanese in Manchuria today are 25 to 1; but the Chinese, even at war, have not been able to rush the 1,000,000 out.

The Japanese do not know it, but the joke is on them. Two or three years ago a little Japanese adviser came in to show me pictures of Manchuria. He said, "Look at one of these banks which we have established. It is a very fine bank. It his all these directors." There were 30 directors—29 fine, big fat Chinese and 1 little Japanese. He is the adviser. I said to him, "Of course, this one Japanese runs all these other fellows." "Oh, yes; that is the way it is done." Of course, we know that is not the way it is done. The Chinese are too wise for that. But we must not discount the ability of the Japanese.

Another thing that we must learn and keep in mind all the time with respect to these occupied places is that the Japanese know about the Orient, and we will not study about it. Down in Dutch East India, for example, the Hollanders have been pretty successful administrators, primarily because they have remained aloof and let the ordinary run of the millions of people run their own affairs. They have been interested in letting them mind their own business. The Japanese know how to do that. Strange to relate, those people are just as happy today under Japanese control as they were under Dutch control, just as the people in the Malay States were not sad when they were relieved of British control. The people in Siam, or the people in Cochin China, or Indochina, were not sad when the French were rushed out.

The Japanese know how to spread their propaganda; and there is no threatened uprising against them anywhere. In fact, even in China there are factions of Chinese who are associating with the Japanese and who like the Japnese money. The Japanese know how to spread money. They know the worth of it.

I mention these things primarily because the attitude of the average American has always been that we have nothing to fear. In that connection, there is one editorial of which I am very proud. It was published in a newspaper which is not friendly to me. It was written on the 26th of November 1941. I was interviewed, and I was asked why I was trying so hard to keep the war in the Pacific from happening, when every authority, every great Army or Navy officer said that we could wipe the Japanese out in 3 weeks. That is the way it was quoted. Of course, everyone has forgotten that that was what was said. I said "I do not want war to come in the Pacific, because it would be a terrible thing. If it does come, we shall be shocked as we have never been shocked in our whole national history."

The editorial went on to point out that "this fellow THOMAS is all alone in the world. He is telling us that we will all be shocked, when all the authorities who know about such things tell us that we can lick the Japanese in 3 or 4 weeks."

I like that editorial today. I did not like it when it made fun of me in November 1941.

How is it that Japan has become so strong? The answer is simple, although to some it sounds like a fairy tale. Japan is the inventor of the technique of national solidarity, total economic endeavor. How has she been able to work to a purpose and unite herself in a great plan? In a series of lectures given at the University of California in 1935, dealing with the leading countries of the world, I started with Japan, because I said that the history of the modern world should start with Japan, because Japan was the first to bring about this unity of national endeavor which is so much on the minds of all of us today because various plans have been put into effect by Italy, Russia, and Germany.

Japan started on that scheme in the last century. She became a student nation. She was brought out of her seclusion against her will, in 1853, when Perry knocked at the door. Perry went over prepared to blast the Japanese into civilization, and into being part of the world. He had too much sense to do it. Therefore he succeeded even better than he expected; but it took more than a generation, so far as Japan was concerned, to bring about the conversion that was necessary to start Japan on her westward course and make her one of the nations of the world.

There was a rebellion against that movement—a rebellion carried on against the then Japanese Government by one of the greatest generals, who brought about the restoration of the Emperor in 1868. That was the Satsuma rebellion, and it was unsuccessful. The leader of that rebellion is still a national hero among the Japanese. He is responsible, to a great extent, for the reverence which the modern Japanese people have for their Emperor. The modern political notion about the Japanese Emperor is western. It

is not Japanese. Let me review this march of history.

In 1868 there was the restoration, then a study period. Delegations were sent all over the world. The constitution was built upon a western notion, but not wholly western always keeping something Japanese to dominate the situation. I notice that there are many military men here tonight. For example, when Prince Ito announced the constitution he said, "Japan will never make the mistake of allowing a general in the field to be commanded by a political agency at home. He will always have command." Hence the troubles we have had with Japanese generals and admirals. But that is a part of the constitional system, and much strength comes from it. Much of their military success is due to that fundamental fact.

Five years after the promulgation of the constitution came the war with China; after that the war with Russia; and 5 years after that the annexation of Korea, which, of course, is the stepping stone into Asia. In the meantime Ito was assassinated. Ten years after the Russian war came the war against Germany, and Japan moved into Shantung, and almost overnight Japan became one of the five big nations of the world—still a student nation, a Nation which had made few mistakes, because she kept her student attitude. Then the war was over, and the Washington Conference came; and America, England, Canada, and especially Australia, became suspicious of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, and it was renounced.

That was the first great mistake we made. We took away from Japan her teacher, her instructor, and we put Japan on her own. From that time to this she has made mistakes which will ultimately bring about her downfall; but it is because she has not had an instructor at her elbow. Still, it was a wise Japanese who saved the peace of the world when Italy went crazy over the Corfu affair. We did not have the genius, the League of Nations did not have the ability, the Council of Ambassadors did not have the strength; but the Undersecretary of the League of Nations, Nitobi, had the ability and sense, and saved a world war at that time.

Just a word about the leadership in Japan at the present time, and then I should be through. This is a tremendously big subject. Probably I am dealing too much with fundamentals, and that tires you.

Who are the leaders of modern Japan? Men who have become disgusted with the white man's control of the world. Matsuoka is probably the best example. How did he get that way? He came to America. He had been exposed to Christian missionaries and western thought. He found that Christian democracy and equality could not bridge the racial line, and did not. He discovered that there was no equality for Japanese in America. He was proud, and became angry. Then he was sent into Manchuria, and directed the South Manchurian Railway. He, with the groups of the secret society element in the army, started to gain control of Japan. They taught themselves a philosophy which said, "Japan got along by herself for 250 years. We will either rule Asia and thereby rule the world (because to them Asia is the world) or we will go back to the days of Tokugawa Shogunate and isolate ourselves again. That is a gamble. Let us accept the result." They are fighting with that kind of desperation—perfectly willing to sacrifice all that has become great in Japan since 1853 to become rulers of half the world. Those are big stakes and desperate odds; and they are a rather desperate people to attempt it.

I am sure that ultimately those people will not have much to do with planning the new world, either for Japan or for anyone else. I am sure that when the Japanese people realize what these leaders have done to them, to their civilization, and to their people, there will be no problem about their punishment or their control.

But we must not make a mistake when peacetime comes. It is said that we must not deal with the war lords of Japan, as we refused to and that we would not negotiate with the imperialistic German government, after the last war, thereby encouraging the overthrow of that government in Germany, and bringing about a situation which made present-day Germany almost inevitable. The German soldiers went home and started killing their own people. They went home with their arms and organized the Steel Helmets. They maintained that they were never defeated by the enemy, but by the people back home.

That is not the way to bring about an unconditional surrender. The armistice was an unconditional surrender, but none of the German soldiers thought they were defeated. We cannot take that stand again. The next time it is the war lords who are to sign the peace terms. They must do what Washington insisted upon being done at Yorktown. The commanding general must hand over his sword. The man in command of troops must recognize the defeat, rather than the civilian committee which comes to negotiate with the conquerors. Our peace must be a military peace. Not only must there be an unconditional surrender, but the men who are responsible for the war must, by their own act, acknowledge their defeat, and thereby show that they are sorry for what they have done.

This war has taken on the aspect of a war between right and wrong. I can say that because you men know that the fundamental concept behind the American revolution is a concept based upon right—freedom of the individual; freedom to think; freedom to aspire; freedom to have and hold; and freedom to act. Those who oppose those ideas are representatives of evil influences. Therefore the war has become a war against wickedness. It is a war between right and wrong. You cannot negotiate with a wrongdoer. It simply cannot be done successfully.

So in spite of the fact that Japan now has the greatest source of raw material, the greatest source of manpower, and the greatest source of empire in the world, we must fight her to the bitter end before this world can become in any way decent, because that which she represents is evil, just as the Hitlerian theories and Mussolini's theories, which destroy men and make of them creatures, are also evil.

That is our task. It is a hard one. It will not be easy. After we shall have whipped Hitler we shall still have the hardest kind of a world war on our hands, and the sooner we realize it the better. There will never be a collapse in the Far East now for lack of food. There will never be a collapse in the Far East now for lack of manpower. There will never be a collapse in the Far East for lack of raw materials or resources. The philosophy laid down by Colonel House when he made his pronouncement after the last war was that the next war would come between the "have nots" and the "haves" among the nations. That philosophy was wrong. It was fallacious, and it did much harm, because it made us self-contented, thinking that we were a part of the "haves."

On the day I made the motion to take up the strategic-materials bill, a man who had been honored by being called the greatest United States Senator, and who was at that time the dean of the Senate, rose and said, "May I ask the Senator from Utah a question? Is this bill the bill which suggests building up stock piles and conserving or gathering together what the Senator from Utah calls strategic and critical materials?" I replied, "Yes; this is the bill." He said, "I will have nothing to do with it. It is unnecessary; and the Senator from Utah knows that it is unnecessary, because he knows that as long as the American Navy complements the British Navy, there is no such thing as a critical material for us, and there is hardly a strategic material."

Read the rest of the debate If any of you have the idea that our country was full of wise men who knew what to do, read that debate and find out, and then read the history of what happened afterward. No; we were blind, and the blind were leading the blind. We are still blind, because we underestimate fundamental strength.

It is a pleasure to be with you. Thank you for listening to me. [Prolonged applause, the audience rising.]

THE FOLLOWING QUESTION WAS SUBMITTED FROM THE AUDIENCE

Do you believe that there has been any real difference in resistance or in the attitude of the people who have now been overrun by the Japanese throughout the Far East, and, if so, what is the reason for it? For example, the people of the Malay States contrasted with the Filipinos, or the people of the Dutch East Indies, Java, or other places.

Senator THOMAS. Of course, all the Oriental people realize that the white man has been in the Orient for purposes of exploitation. It is not difficult for the Japanese to turn those people against the white man. The Japanese comes in as a big brother who is willing to work with them, and he uses propaganda in a very skillful way. The test will be in the Philippines. I do not know what headway the Japanese are making there. The Filipinos, of all the Asiatic peoples, are more loyal to us than the people anywhere else. I believe they are more loyal because, while our record in the Philippines has not been perfect, and has not been without mistake, we have recognized a fundamental of liberty, and that fundamental is, the more you give the more you get. The Filipinos have fought side by side with our men. I think that when the story of our men who have been lost in the Philippines comes out, we shall discover that scores, if not hundreds, of our men have been able to get to the woods and are still alive, being taken care of by the natives.

I do not think you will find that to be the case with very many French people in Indochina. I do not think you will find it to be the case with very many English people in Burma, or in the Malay States. I am sure that you will not find it to be the case with many of the British who might be wandering around, even in China. On the other hand, I do know that if a man can make himself known as an American, he will be all right.

May I take just a minute to tell you about one personal incident? When the Spanish-American War broke out my father, who had a store, got a lot of little flag stickers, and on every package he put an American flag. There is a law against it now, but there was not then. I put one of those flags in the watch which my father gave me—a big gold watch with a lid which came up. My wife and little baby and I were caught in the midst of one of the worst boycotts and mob uprisings in the history of Hong Kong. We found curselves completely surrounded by a Chinese mob. It required pretty swift thinking to get out. I realized that if I could get across the idea that I was an American and not an Englishman, I would be all right; but I did not know how to do it. I did not know how to talk Chinese. Then I thought I would take a chance. I said to myself, "If I show this watch some one will grab it," but I took out my watch and slowly opened the lid. The American flag showed up, and we had no trouble. The word spread through

the crowd that we were Americans, and we were allowed to go on our way.

I have learned to love my country in a number of ways. I think that anyone who has been a vagabond in the world as long as I have been appreciates the Stars and Stripes, and appreciates America. I never appreciated it any more than I did that night. [Prolonged applause, the audience rising.]

Labor Situation in the Canning Industry

REMARKS

OF

HON. P. W. GRIFFITHS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to discuss a matter in which my district and the whole country is interested. I refer to the problem that confronts the vegetable canners and growers. It certainly is of no earthly use to grow the vegetables and then let them rot because of a labor situation confronting the canners of this country. This is all the more serious when it is realized that all that needs to be done is to classify the workers in the processing plants as agricultural workers and this one thing is refused by those governmental agencies dealing with the problem. Last season Mexican laborers were used in Ohio to help harvest the crop and these earned as much as $8.00 per day and they will undoubtedly be used again this year but yet the canners cannot go above 50 cents an hour for laborers in the canning factories. Many of these canning factories are situated adjacent to plants manufacturing war materials and these pay a minimum of 85 cents an hour so how and where in the name of common sense is the labor going to be secured to process these vegetables?

It certainly is high time if we are to feed our armed forces, let alone the civilian population of this country, that this unsatisfactory situation be cleared up.

I am attaching a copy of a letter from Mr. George S. Wenger, president of the Ohio Canners' Association, to Mellville Ehrlich, of the Food Price Division of the O. P. A., which is self-explanatory:

MAY 10, 1943.

MELVILLE EHRLICH,
Head of Fruit and Vegetable Section, Food Price Division, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of April 28th, written to Mr. Buckles, vice president of Quality Foods at Bradford, Ohio, in reply to his letter of April 24.

For your information, such letters like the type you wrote Buckles is giving me more work and worry than my own business. We have repeatedly stated to your department that the tomato situation in Ohio is deplorable. I have a letter from Mr. Buckles today in which he stated that his acreage will be 50 percent. We know all about the subsidy. What in hell is the need of writing a letter like that when the man wants to know how he can operate his business under the present restrictions of no labor increases and no increased prices over 1942? The tomato subsidy is a growers' subsidy. Why in hell make it out that it is a canners' subsidy?—and that type of a letter was radioed and papered to the four corners of the world. Do you think we are all as dumb as you are, when you write and tell us about the tomato subsidy when it has been crammed down our necks?

What I want to know from you is: How can our Ohio canners operate under the lowest wage scale of any industry operating in the United States today, secure labor, and get their money back? Answer that question.

For your information, I am a small canner. I have 400 acres contracted. I have an approval by the War Production Board to my contracts. Because of the wage condition I am unable now to get enough men to ship my Government orders. Personally, I am strapping cases because I have no help and cannot hire them for 50 cents an hour. I haven't done any manual work in 10 years. I am 54 years old. I have blisters on my hands from actually strapping cases and leaving the executive work go. I cannot jeopardize my farmer's crop or my banker's money by putting out 400 acres of tomatoes. Unless we get some relief, I shall put out 200 acres of tomatoes, and if we cannot get any labor and, incidentally, the United States Employment Service says that it will be impossible to supply the canners with labor at 50 cents per hour, I shall let the product set in the field and the loss will be attributable to the Office of Price Administration. Don't think I am antagonistic. I am just mad.

Sincerely yours,

THE OHIO CANNERS' ASSOCIATION,
GEO. S. WENGER, *President.*

California Potato Crop

REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED J. ELLIOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a telegram from Mr. Loren H. Voth, director of the Wasco (Calif.) Farm Center.

Those patriotic people in their efforts to move a very large potato crop to market to relieve the critical shortage now generally prevalent throughout the country are going ahead regardless of the interference and below cost of handling charges placed upon them by the Office of Price Administration.

The telegram follows:

WASCO, CALIF., *May 13, 1943.*

A. E. ELLIOT,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The potato growers of the Wasco area, faced with the problem of harvesting their 1943 crop under Office of Price Administration regulations covering commercial digging and hauling costs frozen at the March 1942 level, submit the following resolution:

Whereas the growers in the Wasco area propose to follow the same harvesting procedure followed previous years; and

Whereas this proceedure is the most economical and the only way these potatoes can be harvested;

Whereas the growers are participating in the increased production goals set up by the Department of Agriculture;

Whereas labor costs have approximately doubled over the level prevailing March 1943;

Whereas the upkeep costs on equipment including war tires, repairs, and replacements have increased approximately 25 percent;

Whereas the majority of the individual growers are small producers who do not have their own diggers, trucks, or warehouses;

Whereas these growers must hire this digging and field hauling equipment from the local enterprises whose usual functions are the operation of such utilities;

Whereas the potato crop can only be harvested economically through complete use of existing facilities following the identical procedure of previous years;

Whereas the high temperatures prevailing at harvest time prohibit any deviation from previous practice; and

Whereas the ultimate result of the increased cost of digging and field hauling is borne by the producer rather than the consumer: Now, therefore, the Wasco potato growers are

Resolved, To fulfill their obligation to the increased production goals and to the war effort by proceeding with the customary methods of harvesting the crop and voluntarily bearing the increased cost of digging and field hauling.

Sincerely,

LOREN H. VOTH,
Director, Wasco Farm Center.

Price of Crude Oil

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed several days ago, and I am sure the Members of this House were, when Price Administrator Prentiss Brown gave out a statement to the press that he had rejected the recommendation of Petroleum Administrator Harold L. Ickes requesting an average price raise of 35 cents per barrel on crude oil. The oil industry of the Nation doubtless was stunned with this unfortunate decision due to the fact that the cost of producing a barrel of oil had raised to over 50 cents a barrel during the past 2 years.

Worse than this price decision, which will disturb morale and retard the production of oil so much needed, was the unexpected and unthought-of policy, announced by Mr. Brown, of the Government going into oil production through the subsidy route. In his statement he said, and I quote:

> In my opinion, one of the most economic and effective means of stimulating wildcat operations and of assuring funds for the use of the operator is through Government participation in financing the proposed wells.

In substance Mr. Brown proposes that the Government would furnish capital for wildcat operations and, in return for such an investment, the Government would receive one-fourth override in any well proving to be a commercial producer; if the well proved to be a dry hole,

the override interest would be worthless and the Government would write off such funds expended as a loss; if the well proved to be a producer, the Government would stay in as a partner unless the operator would take over the Government's interest by paying $7 to the Government for every dollar invested. The Government would furnish up to two-thirds of the capital, the balance to be furnished by the operator.

It is difficult to believe that a man who has served as a United States Senator from the State of Michigan, who knows the temper of the people against further Government subsidy and the temper of the United States Congress against such subsidy, would endorse such a policy on his own volition or would proclaim it. This policy is an expansion of the wild-eyed New Deal theories of the past. It is more communistic than it is American. It sounds like the eerie dreams of Tugwell and the planners of a few years back who wasted millions of dollars of the people's money on collectivist community projects. The idea of the Government subsidizing wildcat drilling, when the proper remedy is to leave the operator free and give him a profit for his work, is one of the most asinine and dangerous policies yet advocated by any bureaucrat department.

When you have added to the debts of this Nation the money wasted in subsidizing oil development, the countless millions that will be wasted in subsidizing, the rolling back of prices which is another scheme that should never be adopted, you are piling a debt not only on the future of the civilians of America but you are piling an unwise and an unfair debt upon the 10,000,000 men in service whose debt they will have to help to pay in sweat and taxes after they have won the war. This, to me, is doing an unthinkable injustice to the young men who have been taken out of civilian life to defend our liberties.

If this Congress has enough power left, the best brains in it should organize and make a fight in an effort to bring better business ideas and a more common sense and American viewpoint in the direction of the policies of the O. P. A. The leaders of this Congress could not render their Nation a greater service than to set up some sort of definite, fearless organization within its membership for the purpose of helping to give congressional direction to the O. P. A. and to help force such direction in the interest of the people in this country who in the last analysis are the power, the force, the ideals, and the Government of the United States.

I want to close my remarks by giving you the viewpoint of a practical operator from southern Illinois who has written to me the following letter; it is worthy of your careful scrutiny:

ELDORADO, ILL., *May 6, 1943.*

Mr. C. W. VURSELL,
Representative, Twenty-third Illinois Congressional District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VURSELL: Your attention undoubtedly will have been called to the action Price Administrator Brown took in refusing to grant the 35-cent minimum increase in the price of crude oil which has been recommended by the Petroleum Administrator for War, Mr. Harold Ickes.

This is just another case of a man totally ignorant of the business being given the power of life and death over it. This official with no responsibility to the voters being given more responsibility than Congress is or has been allowed to exercise. Mr. Brown unquestionably has a million problems. It is impossible for him to know very much about very many of them. His advisers are the same socialistic crowd who advised Mr. Leon Henderson.

These bureaucrats are going to run the armed forces of the United States short of petroleum just as surely as they are allowed to manage the industry.

Very seldom do any of these bureaus know anything about the problems they so gaily undertake to solve. May I point out that Mr. Wallace's Department of Agriculture, with longer and larger experience than any of the other bureaus, was unable to see the food shortage until 2 or 3 months after it was upon us. I have a farm in Gallatin County. I got my check for not planting things about the 20th of April. Two months before the Department of Agriculture paid me this money they had speakers on every radio in the country begging the farmers to plant every square foot and raise every kernel that they could raise. It is less than a crop-year ago that they were strictly limiting the planting of many things. They were caught flat-footed, short-sighted, without imagination, and have proved conclusively that they did not know much about the food problem which has been their particular problem for 40 years. It is only natural that this should be so, because this is an enormous country—entirely too big to be directed in every detail from one desk in Washington.

If the Department of Agriculture with all its experience including Mr. Wallace, who has given a lifetime to agricultural problems, was unable to foresee by 90 days the shortage of food and food products how can it be expected that Mr. Brown will understand or appreciate in the slightest degree the impending shortage of crude oil and all of its products. Wildcatting in the past three or four years has dropped from 5 to 4 to less than 3. In another 2 years at the same rate wildcatting will be less than one-fifth than what it was in 1937. Our demand for petroleum products with all our rationing is going to be greater than it ever has been before.

I hope I can impress upon you that it is necessary to take some action now in order to provide a supply 1 year, 2 years, 3 years hence.

May I also point out that the military have never estimated their consumption as high as it turned out to be. I believe the demand for oil by the armed forces will be much greater than anyone has so far estimated. Underestimation as to rubber has just demonstrated this point.

The Office of Price Administration has ruled against us probably without the intention of depriving our troops of a sufficient supply of petroleum products. We, in the business, know that they are wrong; tragically and terribly wrong. An increase of 50 cents per barrel today will do more to assure a supply in 1944 and 1945 than an increase of $2 per barrel in 1944 or 1945. Moreover the larger increase will be made after it is too late.

You are from an oil district and a mining district. No matter what committee you are on I believe you should make it your business to expose the short-sightedness of a governmental policy which, on the one hand, tries to make the oil business operate on a price basis 33⅓ percent below the per price indices, and on the other hand rewards every striker with a handsome bonus.

Illinois production is less than one-half what is was 2 years ago. I hope you will have a meeting with other Congressmen in Illinois who represent oil-producing counties. If you should need statistics or figures I hope you will call on Mr. Russell Brown, secretary of the Independent Petroleum Association of America in the Investment Building, Washington, D. C. He will be able to give you broader and better statistics than I can and will certainly help you in every way possible.

You have shown a cooperative spirit in the past. I hope that this has impressed you with the importance of aggressive action to head off the shortage of petroleum products which is already dangerously near us. Mr. Prentiss Brown simply does not know anything about the situation. He will be ready to lock the door after the horse has been stolen. He is fiddling while Rome burns. He is neglecting to take the stitch in time. He is going to be the cause of $3 or $4 oil in 1945 if he has his way, and the pity of it will be that even that price will not bring the oil until a year too late.

Respectfully yours,

J. H. STEINMESCH.

Social Security

REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today to speak in behalf of a resolution I introduced on April 13, which has been referred to the Committee on Rules. I desire to invite the interest of both sides of the House in House Resolution 208, because nothing in it can be construed as partisan.

All of us are interested in the establishment of a truly sound system of social security or security insurance as soon as possible. The feeling on this is universal in the Congress—there is no partisanship on this issue. Some, it is true, do not agree with the recent recommendations of the National Resources Planning Board report, but the method of getting the most equitable form of social security is for us to work together and make our own plans for the future.

In my opinion the Congress should have its own program ready for introduction and passage at the earliest possible moment; such a program will be feasible. We should have a committee at work now studying the strong points and weaknesses of our present social-security system, studying the systems of other nations and studying the needs of our own citizens. We have been neglectful of this important subject within the past year, for it has a direct bearing on the war effort, and on the peace of America to follow.

I have therefore asked that a committee of five Members of the House be detailed to make a thorough study of the whole problem of social security.

Recently, I have been making a very careful study of the situation of our elderly citizens who are receiving old-age assistance, and I have available reports on hundreds of cases in every State in the Union.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, it is not a pretty picture. It is in fact a picture of hundreds of citizens—a majority of them former property owners in the United States—who are in practical starvation. I cannot emphasize this point too strongly; these people on old-age assistance are almost starving at a time when there is more money in the hands of the people than in many, many years.

A check of some of the old-age recipients in my own State indicates that they are able to spend on an avera. of only $3.65 each week for food. I believe, if I were able to make a survey of every case in the State of Florida, the amount would be much less than that. A survey of about 200 cases in Indiana indicates that pensioners there have an average of only $2.62 per week that they can spend for food. That is only 37 cents per day, gentlemen.

No man in this House, Mr. Speaker, can live on 37 cents per day without gradually starving himself to death. Especially is this true today when food costs have risen over 42 percent above prices before Pearl Harbor. Milk in Washington costs 15 cents a quart today. Butter is around 60 cents a pound. Ordinary meat cuts are above 37 cents a pound. White beans, a main diet of people with below subsistence incomes, are hard to find. Potatoes, also a main part of the diet of these people, are practically unobtainable.

Many will probably be amazed and astounded, Mr. Speaker, to find that many of these old-age pensioners have been important people in their communities during their lives. I found, for example, that in a group of 69 cases checked, there were 4 college graduates and some 30 high-school graduates; there were physicians, nurses, farmers, teachers, and ministers in this group; 52 of these 69 had been real-estate taxpayers during their lives, yet today 21 pensioners are living in 1-room shacks.

Even from the limited survey which I have been able to make, I am convinced that a committee of the House should make a full investigation of this very bad situation.

We are too often aware of the hardships of people in foreign lands. We sometimes are prone to overlook poverty, misery, and hardship right here in our own America. These people are our own mothers and fathers, our neighbors, and the folks who built America for us. How pathetic are these white-haired and pale grandmothers and grandfathers whom we have cast aside.

An interesting side light on these people, Mr. Speaker, is the recent report of a former member of the staff of the Social Security Board that more than 75 percent of the people past the age of 65 are, and under the present system will be, dependent upon relatives or private or public charity.

Is this to be my fate when I reach old age? Is this to be the fate of many of us here in the House of Representatives?

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the whole House to give my resolution consideration. I appeal, as well, to the members of the Committee on Rules to report this resolution to the floor. The resolution permits us to make a thorough study of the present condition of people on old-age assistance, to make a careful study of social security, and to review in detail not only the numerous pension proposals now before the Congress, but the programs of all other nations.

As a body this investigation will help us in many ways. We will be conversant with the National Resources Planning Board report, with the Beveridge plan of Great Britain, with the highly regarded New Zealand system, and with all the suggested proposals which have been introduced in the Congress. Out of the committee crucible we will be able to give the Congress what we believe to be the best possible program, and we will be in position to report to you fairly and impartially on the present old-age assistance situation. Let us not wait, Mr. Speaker, let us go after this problem at once.

Is It To Be Lives or Strikes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Milwaukee Journal of May 7, 1943, comes the following:

IS IT TO BE LIVES OR STRIKES?

Senators will deceive no one else, and we hope they are not deceiving themselves, by passing the Connally bill for the seizure of strike-crippled factories and mines.

The Senate is making a gesture—that is all. Why? Because the Connally bill gives to the President no more power to meet a strike emergency than he already has, or will assume as Commander in Chief if he believes it necessary. Do the Senators think this is meeting their obligation to the boys in Tunisia and on Guadalcanal?

The Connally bill to authorize seizure has been kicking around in the Senate since November 1941. It is just one of many measures that advocates of laws to prevent interference with war production have brought forward. Every one has been defeated to date by the political power of labor.

There have been other gestures preceding this present gesture in the Senate—movements that could be interpreted as threats. The Connally bill was brought forward strongly on one other occasion when John L. Lewis was kicking up a fuss. The Lewis flare-up subsided and the Senate threat subsided. The Senators could not get the bill back into the refrigerator quickly enough.

Every Senator, every Representative, and at least 120,000,000 Americans know what is needed. There should be a comprehensive labor code which defines the status of labor for the duration of the war, and the duration only, just as the status of everybody else is now defined by a comprehensive body of laws.

Jurisdictional squabbles—a plague if there ever was one—should be outlawed by the simple expedient of declaring the status quo during the war. Labor should not be denied its rights of appeal for grievances, but these rights should be subject to the arbitration of a government agency properly constituted by Congress.

Today a manufacturer—and we have an instance now right in Milwaukee—can be guided only by what the Government says. Wherein is labor any better? But the men in this Milwaukee war production plant can now do what they please.

The Connally bill as amended would give legal standing to the War Labor Board. That would be a gain. But it took a hard fight to get even that much.

There would be penalties, also, against labor leaders and agitators who fomented strikes or interfered with government operation. Another gain. But sometimes it is the rank and file who do these things through wildcat movements. What about them?

Anyway, what we need to do now is to prevent strikes, and the Connally bill is a thousand miles from touching that problem. When strikes come and seizures come, time is lost. And time is what we have to conserve for the sake of the boys at the front.

The plan of taking labor's pledge not to strike, adopted right after Pearl Harbor, has failed miserably. John L. Lewis, one of those who gave the pledge, has now crawled out by a typical Lewis bit of reasoning. Neither William Green nor Philip Murray has been able to control all of his workers.

Congress has not acted, of course, because of its fear of political punishment. Well, the time has come when Senators and Congressmen will have to decide whether they want to save votes or save the lives of boys in Tunisia, over Europe, and throughout the Pacific.

And we do not want gestures.

If Congress does not act the people will catch up with it.

The Late Honorable Harry Lane Englebright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, Horace C. Carlisle has been serving the Nation for almost 20 years. He is in the office of the Architect of the Capitol. Mr. Carlisle has expressed in verse his admiration for our late colleague, HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT. The poem is another testimonial of the sincere devotion all held for our friend.

CONGRESSMAN ENGLEBRIGHT

When HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT heard the last call,
To the Eternal Beyond,
From the still voice from the Father of all,
He was prepared to respond,
Without delay, for he'd fought the good fight—
Yes, he had finished his course—
Hence, he passed on to the Mansions of Light,
Where love abides in full force.

When HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT heard the last call,
He did not tell us goodbye,
But slipped away, unawares to us all,
To meet his God in the sky—
God must have needed, for some special cause,
Such an exemplary man,
As HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT happily was,
To fit into some great plan.

When HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT heard the last call,
To him 'twas no great surprise—
Though to his own 'twas the worst shock of all—
For what God does must be wise.
As he drew softly his last parting breath,
He reached aloft for God's hand,
And was helped over the Chasm of Death
Into the Beautiful Land.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Brig. Gen. Clayton S. Adams Delivers Interesting Address at West Chester, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, an address was recently delivered by Brig. Gen. Clayton S. Adams at a graduation class exercise of the Adjutant General's School at West Chester, Pa., which is very interesting, as it relates to the Army Postal Service, one of the most important branches of the Army.

General Adams is director of the Army Postal Service, and has just recently returned from a trip to active war theaters. He cannot, of course, make public most of the information that he received while inspecting the different fronts, but his address gives a good picture of how the Army Postal Service operates.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this address in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks for the information of the Congress.

Associated with General Adams in this vital phase of the war program are many able postal officials. Col. W. A. Kenyon and Col. C. C. Garner, Deputy Directors of the Army Postal Service are men of long postal experience. Branch chiefs include Lt. Col. H. F. Ambrose, Lt. Col. D. D. Duggan, Lt. Col. S. G. Schwartz, Lt. Col. E. R. Rhoades, and Maj. E. A. Simpson. These men and their able assistants direct one of the most far-reaching activities of the whole war. Col. G. E. Isaacs is the executive officer.

The address of General Adams follows:

At the outset I want to congratulate you upon the successful completion of your postal training course.

Today is a significant occasion—the marking of a milestone—in your Army careers.

Having finished the prescribed course of the Army Administration School's Enlisted Branch No. 9, you are now ready for duty with the Army Postal Service.

It is about the Army Postal Service and the role in this organization which you will be expected to play that I propose to talk to you today.

It was by reason of your previous training and experience in the United States Postal Service that you were selected to attend this school which you are now about to leave.

You are experienced in the moving, handling and dispatching of the mails, but unless you enter the Army Postal Service with a high concept of the importance of this branch of the Army and of the vital nature of the duties and responsibilities which will be yours as Army postal personnel all the experience, all the training, and all the knowledge which you have more recently gained here on this campus will have been in vain.

For only when a soldier is imbued with the importance and utter necessity of the task to which he is assigned can he do an outstanding job. This is true in every branch of the Army—throughout the Ground Forces, the Air Forces, and the Army Service Forces. It is particularly true with respect to the Army Postal Service.

It is no overstatement for me to tell you that there is no other branch of the Army which comes into such close, intimate, and personal touch with the soldier during his Army career than does the Army Postal Service. Likewise, it is the Army Postal Service which is equally close to the soldiers' family, relatives, and friends back home.

From the standpoint of the latter and civilians generally their only opportunity of passing judgment directly on the Army is by their appraisal of the Army Postal Service. True, it is that they read and hear about the more spectacular operations of the Air Forces, the large-scale advances of the Infantry, the behind-the-lines forays of parachute troops, the daring feats of the engineers, but in the final analysis it is the Army Postal Service which comes into their very homes.

With the current conflict being waged on a global scale necessitating the sending of American troops to overseas areas thousands of miles from American shores—thousands of miles further than was necessary in the last war—it is more important than ever that the American soldier be accorded a communications link for personal correspondence to and from home.

With American soldiers the best clothed, best fed, and best equipped in the world, there remains only the problem of maintaining their morale at the highest possible level. Inasmuch as the great majority of our American troops have been in the Army only a short time and many of them are thousands of miles away from home for the first time in their lives, it is vitally important that they be permitted to maintain that human bond with home through the medium of the Army Postal Service.

It is with a view to supplying this mental ammunition to our American troops in the field that the War Department and the Army generally is exerting every effort and energy at its command to provide the best possible mail service to our American soldiers regardless of where they may be serving. This enlisted postal school here at West Chester offers concrete evidence of the wisdom and foresight of the Army in training experienced, enlisted personnel for Army postal assignments.

All of you have come out of the civil postal system in this country, which has been held up before the world as a model in postal efficiency. As individuals you reflect the high degree of perfection which is to be found in United States Postal Service.

There is one great and striking contrast, however, between the civil postal service and the Army Postal Service. That has to do with the routine manner of operations. In the case of the former, it represents the outgrowth of a postal organization which has functioned and developed since the days of the Colonies, when post-route riders maintained postal communications from Maine to Georgia. Its great efficiency today can be traced to the experience, the traditions, and the knowledge gained in handling the American mails for more than two centuries.

Today its operations are routine, its schedules are fixed, and the respective assignments of its personnel are for the most part specialized ones.

In the case of the Army Postal Service this is not now and will not for the duration of the war hold true. We in the Army Postal Service are conducting a world-wide postal system under the most trying circumstances of total war with all the risks, the hazards, and the uncertainties which that entails.

The problems of the Army Postal Service are those which "try men's souls."

All the elements of total war on land, on sea, and in the air become an integral phase of the Army postal operation. Irregularity and infrequency of schedules, enemy action on the high seas, combat conditions in overseas theaters, millions of pieces of misaddressed mail, local, often primitive, quarters for Army post offices, constantly changing troops, censorship and impounding of the mails for reasons of security and secrecy—all of these are but a few of the obstacles which are ever present in the handling of the Army mails.

Recently I returned from a 35,000-mile inspection trip by air of overseas Army post-office installations in Africa, the Middle East, and India, and I came back to the United States with a keen appreciation of the spirit and ingenuity of our Army postal personnel in those areas.

I was particularly impressed by what I saw at one advanced Army post office in the north African combat zone. This Army post office was located underground at an air base that was being pounded incessantly by the enemy. For 3 months the Army postal crew at this Army post office had no relief. They lived under wretched conditions, and they handled the mail in cramped underground quarters. When I arrived at this point I suggested that these men be moved to the rear for a rest. To this suggestion they turned a deaf ear. They had a job to do in handling those front-line mails, and they were determined to do it. So insistent were they that they stay on the job that I finally agreed that to move them back might be a serious blow to their morale.

These men at this Army post office are typical of what I found throughout my trip and I can honestly state that no men in the Army, at the front, or elsewhere, have a higher spirit and sense of duty than have our Army postal personnel, both officers and enlisted men.

My overseas inspection trip has convinced me more than ever that the greatest need of Army postal personnel is ingenuity and resourcefulness.

Your ingenuity will be taxed—your resourcefulness challenged—and you, as postal experts, will be constantly called upon to meet problems with which you were never confronted in the post offices in which you served as civilians.

This is the challenge you have accepted in completing this course. This is the challenge the Army Postal Service expects you to meet. By so doing you will be making a definite and outstanding contribution to the maintenance of the all-important Army postal link.

In the larger sense you will be making a singular contribution to the soldiers whose mail you are handling—a contribution which will be reflected in their fighting qualities and in the achieving of total victory.

Polish-Russian Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an article written by Dr. Charles Wachtl, editor of the Polish Star, published in Philadelphia, Pa., on Polish-Russian relations:

ANENT POLISH-RUSSIAN RELATIONS

The American press devotes now a great number of articles and dissertations relative to the misunderstanding developed between

Poland and Russia on the future boundary line of these neighboring countries. The friction was started by Russia who promulgates her claims to territories which during the Czar's regimes belonged to her; of course, they belonged to her not because of their own volition but because of conquest and usurpating seizure. These countries never had nor have now any Russian population; their peoples are ethnically different from the Russians; they are the nationalities of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Finland, the so-called Baltic republics to the north, and Bessarabia with Rumanian majority to the south. Evidently Russia wishes to add Poland also to her communistic protection and this is the source of her claims to Polish eastern provinces.

The whole story would not perhaps assume such sharp accents if the discussion was left in its entirety to properly qualified and responsible agencies, and before all, to the respective governments themselves who are competent to shape and settle such controversies. Unfortunately, all kinds of agitators butt into the matter and exploit it to their chauvinistic advantage. A certain Mr. Korneiczuk, a member of the Ukrainian Soviet Council and of the general Russian Soviet, took advantage of this discussion in order to attack Poland because of her assertion that she would not relinquish her eastern provinces.

His article was, no doubt, inspired by certain Moscovite circles, as it was eagerly reprinted by the Pravda, the official organ of the Soviets of Moscow, and this newspaper's writings were echoed in the American and Polish press. This, briefly told, is the genesis of the controversy which especially now is so out of place that it assuredly must cause a great deal of satisfaction to the Nazis.

All these quarrels are, in our opinion, groundless and untimely to say the least. Ukrainian and Russian elucubrations are absolutely improper, practically senseless, for they are, before anything else premature: Victory in this global war appears to be still distant; even the Russians, in reconquering their lost provinces, are still very far off from these quarreled for Polish borders. The only sensible and practical aspect in this matter is, in our opinion, to cooperate harmoniously and in all sincerity to attain victory; let us finish this war first, and finish it well.

We must win this war, and this is, for now, and for the immediate future, the essential, the only important thing. And after this is accomplished, we will then have to combine all our resources in order to regulate, to normalize conditions of men and people, of countries and nations; and when the day of peace dawns, when conditions and settlements will be framed and concluded, we should keep in mind the fundamental necessity of establishing such a peace that no malcontentations, no pretensions, claims, or injustice would remain anywhere, as they would only create new causes for future conflicts, and again endanger the peace, so dearly, so bloodily paid for.

A popular Russian proverb says: "Let's work together to gather crops on one big pile, and when through with this, we will divide what is due to each of us." That is the thing. Let us first by commune and sincere efforts overthrow and destroy the Nazi monster, let us victoriously finish this war; having this done, we heartily hope that there somehow will be found an honest way to decide the destiny of all delivered lands and nations.

As to Poland, it might not be out of place to remind your readers that her territories, coveted by Russia, are originally and historically Polish; they belonged to Poland for hundreds of years up to the end of the eighteenth century, when they were, in the felonious partitions, forcibly taken and incorporated into Russia; but this usurpating act of Czarist imperialistic Russia should certainly not receive corroboration and repetition on the side of free, democratic Russia of present days, especially if Poland herself gave up a greater part of her previous domains to Russia in the pact of Riga of 1923.

The utterances of the Polish Government, the opinions and expectations of all sensible and impartial men, are now based on the Atlantic Charter which defines all claims, all ideals for which we are fighting. It decrees that all men, all nations will be given absolute and complete freedom and liberty, free of duress and outside influence, to declare and create their future social and political status of self-sustaining existence. Poland adheres to these principles; such ideals are assuring and satisfying to her; for these she battles and perseveres amidst all the sufferings of recent years. Trusting in these principles, we declare all opposition, all protestations, and so forth, as superfluous, as detrimental and decidedly harmful to America's war effort and to Poland's future. Americans of Polish extraction have complete confidence in the country of their adoption that our Government will see that there will be no injustice left in the world after victory is attained.

CHARLES H. WACHTL, PH. D.,
Editor of the Polish Star, Philadelphia.

The Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpts from telegrams and letters recently received by me, chiefly from residents of my district:

Farm Security Administration has served Conway County well. Help save it for us.
OLEN FULLERTON,
County Judge, Morrilton.

I am hoping that you will use your influence for the continuance of Farm Security Administration as it is the only real friend the little farmer ever had. Please help us.
S. S. DEAN *Wright.*

I sincerely hope that something can still be done to continue the constructive work which has been and is being done by Farm Security Administration. It is true, mistakes have been made by Farm Security Administration, but this is true of any one of our Government organizations. The principles of Farm Security Administration, I believe, are fundamentally sound and really constructive.
MOST REV. ALBERT L. FLETCHER, D. D.,
Auxiliary Bishop of Little Rock.

In regards of the Farm Security Administration works we certainly can give them the praise of putting us on our feet.
Mr. and Mrs. IRA ANDREWS,
Conway.

It is my sincere hope that Congress will not destroy the Farm Security Administration. I am not saying that no changes should be made, but I do hope that the cardinal principle of the Farm Security Administration will be preserved intact.
J. G. MOORE,
Municipal Judge, Morrilton.

I am hoping that you will do all you can to keep the Federal Security Administration, in order that the small farmer might survive, and keep his high standard of living.
CLOID YARBROUGH, *Wright.*

I thought it my duty to write you a few lines in behalf of myself and thousands of others borrowing money from the Federal Security Administration which enables us to answer our country's call to produce more food.
STEVE D. LINDSEY, *Mountain Top.*

It is my belief that if the Farm Security Administration were abolished now in the midst of this war that would cause as many as two hundred of our farm families in Yell County to leave the farm. It would, at this time, be disastrous, I think, to this section of the State to abolish it.
J. E. CHAMBERS,
Chancellor Fourteenth District,
Danville, Ark.

The Farm Security Administration has helped some people. It has its faults the same as any other organization but seems the good it has done and can do has been forgotten. It helped us when we needed help and know it is helping a lot of other folks who would otherwise be unable to carry on.
Mr. and Mrs. F. R. WILSON,
Clarksville.

In regard to the Farm Security Administration they are trying to stop. I don't know how farmers like we are will go ahead if it is stopped.
Mr. and Mrs. RAYMOND ADDY,
Jethro.

I want to say that I started out with one yoke of steers and hauling wood to the town of Atkins and selling it at $1 a load. I got connected with the Farm Security in 1938 and I have done fine on it. I have seven cows and heifers, one good team of mules, a good brood sow, and a shoat, and have a small 40-acre hill farm which is paid for, and I hate to see the Farm Security done away with as it has helped me more than any organization I could possibly got connected with. Please do all you can to keep it for us poor farmers.
J. C. MAXWELL, *Atkins.*

This program needs to be continued for years to come. Keep it alive and active.
R. C. CHILDRESS,
State Department of Education.

Before I got help from the Farm Security Administration, I was unable to get help anywhere else. I just had 1 cow, 1 mule, 1 brood sow, and a few chickens. I couldn't farm but about 8 or 10 acres of upland. There were seven in my family. I got my first loan in 1940 to get a mule, feed, seed, fruit jars, and 100 chicks with. This year I am farming 80 acres. I have 2 teams, 5 milk cows, 4 small heifers, 75 laying hens, 200 small chicks, 2 brood sows, 7 shoats, plenty of meat, lard, canned fruits, beans, peas, sirup, and lots of farming tools. I am going to raise beans, peas, corn, peanuts for oil, tomatoes, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, cane for sirup; if it hadn't been for the Farm Security Administration I just don't see how we would of got by. The Farm Administra-

tion is one of the most wonderful things the Government ever did for the farmers.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN WOOD,
Altus.

Please stand as strongly as possible for the work of Farm Security Administration, our hope for increased food production.

Rev. SAM FREEMAN, *Little Rock.*

The National Catholic Rural Life Conference, of which I am general chairman for the State of Arkansas, is vitally interested in the continuation of the Farm Security Administration.

Rev. ANTHONY LACKOWSKY, *Conway.*

I think the Farm Security Administration is worth more to our section of the country than any other one Government agency, and that is the opinion of the people in general here.

ROBERT JORDAN, *Russellville.*

We think this is a wonderful program for low income farm families. When we first borrowed from the Farm Security Administration in 1939 we had scarcely anything. We borrowed money to buy cows, mares, and brood sow. We paid off our loan in 1942 and had our cattle and other livestock in the clear. We sincerely hope and pray that the Farm Security Administration program be made a permanent part of the agricultural program, so that other low-income farm families will be given the same opportunity that we have.

Mr. and Mrs. DENVER L. KEATHLEY,
Belleville.

During this year I believe I have had not less than 50 of these mortgagors appear before me, as notary public, to execute their mortgages, and a majority of them discussed the plan and I believe 95 percent of them were happy over it, and not burdened by the payments.

LYNN WILSON,
Attorney at Law, Danville.

Be it resolved that we are in favor of the continuance of the Farm Security Administration and earnestly request your support of it.

WOMEN'S SOCIETY OF CHRISTIAN SERVICE OF WINFIELD CHURCH,
Little Rock.

Mrs. ALLEN MULKEY,
Corresponding Secretary.

The Farm Security Administration is the most important organization in existence in Yell County. * * * These farmers are receiving the best information on farming practices. They are producing the essential oil and food crops. We have more boys and girls going to school from this low bracket than ever before.

BOSS MITCHELL,
Danville Vocational Agricultural Institute.

Urge that Farm Security Administration be maintained and extended so that it may continue speeding production among low-income farmers working to increase food production.

Mrs. J. L. MONTGOMERY,
Legislative Chapter, Arkansas Congress of Parents and Teachers.

I've never been a Farm Security Administration client, but I feel that it has helped my neighbors. I know of many industrious and hard-working families who would never have gotten the start they deserve had it not been for the Farm Security Administration.

TOMMIE LANE,
Havana, Ark.

Please fight hard for Farm Security Administration.

TOM TRAWEEK, *Lutherville.*

We are opposed to the abolition of Farm Security Administration.

AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE,
CONWAY KIWANIS CLUB.

The Farm Security Administration is one governmental agency that should be continued and encouraged.

LOUIS W. REPS,
Springfield (Mo.) Chamber of Commerce.

In behalf of the Farm Security Administration: In any county and State we think it will be disastrous to low-income farmers for this to be done away with.

B. S. MATTHEWS, *Enola.*

We, the undersigned, citizens and taxpayers of the county of Faulkner, State of Arkansas, respectfully request that you use your best efforts to keep in force the Farm Security Administration bill whereby the United States Government lends its aid to the poor and unfortunate farmers who are eligible to become clients of the Farm Security Administration. We heartily endorse the principles now in force and think that it is to the best interest, not only to the farmers themselves, but to the country at large.

GEORGE F. HARTJE, *Attorney,*
(And 41 other citizens of Conway, Ark.)

We and hundreds of others have greatly appreciated the help we have received from this program, and we feel that to abolish this, or even to combine it with any other agency, would kill many small farmers.

Mr. and Mrs. W. L. TURNER,
Clarksville.

The American Farmer and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted to me by the House, I am including herewith copy of resolutions adopted by the Agricultural Producers Association, of Geary County, Kans., on April 10, 1943:

We urge that you give these resolutions your immediate study and consideration and that they be spread upon the RECORD:

"I. AMERICAN FARMER AND THE WAR

"Winning the war is our supreme task for the present. To this accomplishment the Agricultural Producers' Association of Geary County, Kans., pledges its maximum resources both as an organization and through the individual efforts of its entire membership.

"II. REPEAL THE A. A. A.

"We oppose the regimentation, restriction, penalization, and oppression made possible under the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and urge its immediate repeal.

"III. MAXIMUM FOOD PRODUCTION

"1. We believe in the maximum production of all food and fiber products necessary for the conduct of the war and the feeding and maintaining of our civilian and armed forces.

"2. We urge all crop restrictions be abolished immediately.

"3. We urge that immediate steps be taken to increase the amounts of farm machinery and equipment available to all farmers.

"4. If rationing of farm machinery is necessary we urge a nonpartisan board divorced from the A. A. A.

"5. Transportation equipment and freedom to use it are vital to efficient farm operation, farm marketing, and food distribution.

"6. Rationing does not produce food.

"7. The synthetic rubber program should go forward as rapidly as possible.

"IV. MANPOWER

"1. We are forced with a manpower shortage.

"2. Send the men engaged in the administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act back to the farm to produce food.

"3. Cut all red tape and paper work.

"4. Millions of unnecessary trips to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency and ration offices consume precious time and energy and gas and waste rubber.

"5. We urge efficiency, waste cut.

"V. SUBSIDIES

"1. We oppose subsidies and incentive payments in any form.

"2. As a substitute for fair prices, farm subsidies are wrong in principle and deceptive in operation.

"3. Subsidies promote inefficiency, destroy self-reliance, and make possible political abuses.

"4. Subsidies cause excessive expenditures under the guise of holding down consumer prices.

"VI. FAIR PRICES

"We believe in fair prices for all farmers in an open fair market.

"VII. PRESERVATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

"1. We reaffirm our faith in the constitutional, representative form of government as best for the United States of America.

"2. Unnecessary centralization of government undermines democracy and threatens the very foundation of our Nation.

"3. The legislative branch of our Government must maintain its strength as a part of our representative government.

"4. While our armed forces are fighting on the battle fronts of the world, all freedom-loving citizens must be alert and active to preserve our form of constitutional representative government."

THE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION OF GEARY COUNTY, KANS.,
By ROY STEVENS, *President.*
Mrs. PEARL M. GARNETT.
Secretary-Treasurer.

Farm Security Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. STEVENSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following letter:

RICHLAND CENTER, WIS., *May 10, 1943.*
Hon. WM. STEVENSON,
Member of the House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: I am writing this letter after the news broadcasts and newspaper articles telling us that the Farm Security Administration will be abolished after June 30.

I have been with the Farm Security Administration for the past 8 years and have found it to be one of the most helpful programs in which I have ever worked. During this time we have had approximately 500 farm families who have purchased farming equipment and livestock to operate their own farms. Approximately 280 have paid their loans in full, with interests, and the majority of them are actively engaged in farming. Always we were urged to take those people who had no other source of credit, and in response to this urging and to the requests of this type of family our case load was built up. This past year we have been fortunate in seeing the better families in Farm Security pay out. Some of them have saved enough money in addition to their Farm Security repayments to make a down payment on a small farm, thus tying this family permanently to the land.

This past loaning season we were again urged to keep farms in production and because of the large demand for help in defense plants we were forced to take some families on the roll who otherwise would be doing small day jobs through the county. This type of family needs close supervision in order to carry on and operate the farm to the maximum of production.

I wish that you might go with us to some of the farms where these families have been set up and see the zeal and ardor with which they are attempting to make their farms produce to maximum capacity. It would please you, I am sure, to see how anxious the family is to do their share in helping to feed the soldiers and how enthusiastic they are for the help that has been given them through the Farm Security Administration. If there is any possible way in which some of these farmers could continue to be given maximum supervision, either through Farm Security or some other similar agency, I hope something will be worked out. Many of these families have a morale partially established and if support is taken away at this time they will again fall back into that relief attitude from which they are attempting to emerge.

Surely in the programs set up in Washington there must be a place where farmers of this kind can obtain help.

Perhaps you would be interested in knowing about a few of these cases which are typical of the type of work which is being done in Richland County and undoubtedly this same kind of work has been carried on in the other counties of the States.

A mother and her two grown children were referred to Farm Security by the case worker from the relief office. The referral came to her through the town chairman who felt that the family was worthy of assistance, but who were loath to take any type of relief since they had never known what it meant to receive help. The father had died during the winter, leaving the family with three cows in production, some young stock, and approximately $1,500 worth of debts, varying from $225 to as little as $3. The first day that I called on the family they had about half a cup of coffee, one-fourth pound of lard, and about that much sugar. They had milk and eggs from the farm. Other than this, the house had no food in it of any kind. I suggested to them that they might get some help through the Farm Security Administration and immediately the mother informed me that they had never been on relief and did not care to take any relief at the present time, that they would manage somehow. Their physical fitness was rapidly being depreciated both from lack of quantity of food and quality. I assured them that we had nothing to give them, but they would have to work and repay anything that Farm Security did for them. As a result, this family will have 18 cows in production by the end of 1943, they will have paid up all of the outstanding obligations of the parents by debt adjustment, and their basement each fall is like a food commissary. Last year they had about 700 quarts of food canned, besides almost 60 bushels of vegetables, including seed potatoes which are being sold at the present time. The program of farming other than of a subsistence nature had always been foreign to this family until they came to Farm Security and at the present time they are making every effort to do their part in producing some of the world's food.

Another case is that of a young man and his wife and two children who were unable to obtain any farm labor in 1939. They took over one of our loans which the borrower had abandoned. They have built up the stock and added to this loan until this year one of the old established residents came to the Farm Security office to ask if we would help this family in the purchase of a farm. This lady had absolute confidence in the administration of the Farm Security program as it had operated in the case of this borrower, and a plan was set up whereby the borrower could purchase the farm by depositing a portion of his income in a supervised bank account, out of which the payment on the farm, his loan, and taxes could come. There was no other way in which this man might purchase this farm or any farm in the county, since his Farm Security loan was not paid in full and he had no security to offer. Today the family are landowners with a definite purpose, that of owning their own home, in mind.

Other borrowers have been on the verge of losing the farm, because they did not have adequate stock to operate the same. Farm Security had aided in placing the necessary operation equipment on these farms so that the family could carry on and continue to be landowners.

There are so many different instances and methods of treatment, but we do not want to weary you with many of these cases.

If only some method can be devised whereby these families can continue to be self-supporting and eventually take their places in the world as self-respecting, taxpaying citizens, they will be a credit to the country sponsoring them.

Kindest regards to you and Mrs. Stevenson from John and myself.

Sincerely yours,
EDNA H. PUTTKAMMER,
Home Management Supervisor, Richland County, Wis.

Harry Lane Englebright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, when late yesterday afternoon we were shocked by news of the death of our good friend and esteemed colleague, HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, I could not trust myself to say anything, or to try to pay the tribute to his memory, so justly deserved.

Like a young child who to his mother's door
  Runs eager for the welcoming embrace,
And finds the door shut, and with troubled face
  Calls and through sobbing calls, and o'er and o'er
Calling, storms at the panel—: so before
  A door that will not open, sick and numb,
I listen for a word that will not come,
  And know, at last, I may not enter more.
Silence! And through the silence and the dark
  By that closed door, the distant sob of tears
Beats on my spirit, as on fairy shores
  The spectral sea; and through the sobbing, hark!
Down the fair-chambered corridor of years,
  The quiet shutting, one by one, of doors.

When first I came to Congress, it was my privilege to renew an old acquaintance with one whose father sat side by side with mine in the Sixty-first Congress; that was long ago. The acquaintanceship, so renewed, has grown into the strongest of friendships, over the years, which hereafter will be a never-to-be-forgotten memory.

There is no word in the language which properly measures the value of such an association and friendship as it has been my privilege to enjoy.

Nothing that I can say today, or that anybody may say, can mitigate our grief or minimize the loss which is ours, as we extend our sympathy to his bereaved family; recognizing that such loss is shared by the State, the Congress, and the country; only perhaps to say, that to have had the confidence of such a man, and to have profited by his friendship is one of the things which makes life worth living.

When I consider life and its few years—
  A wisp of fog betwixt us and the sun;
A call to battle, and the battle done
  Ere the last echo dies within our ears;
A rose choked in the grass; an hour of fears;
  The gusts that past a darkening shore do beat;
The burst of music down an unlistening street—
  I wonder at the idleness of tears.
—*Charles A. Plumley.*

Should Congress Explore the Peace Terms?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address entitled "Should Congress Explore the Peace Terms?" delivered by me Thursday, February 4, 1943, over the Columbia Broadcasting System network:

About a month ago I was a second lieutenant in the Tank Destroyer Center at Camp Hood, Tex. I left the Tank Destroyers to come to Washington to take my seat in this

Congress because, under a Presidential directive, no Member of Congress can remain on active duty with the Army.

I originally ran for Congress because I hoped, believed, and prayed that this would be the Congress which would sign the peace terms. To me it was desperately important that Congress did not again repeat the mistakes of 1920. I did not want another war 25 years after this one. I wanted this war to be the last. I did not want us to again let the peace go by default. I wanted America to correct its error of 25 years ago and this time to take an active part in the operation of the peace.

That is why I ran for Congress—to win the war and to win the peace. So to this question, "Should Congress explore the peace terms?", I feel definitely that it should. It should to the fullest extent that it is permitted by law. I feel that every American should explore the peace terms. I feel that only by an enlightened and active public opinion can we this time make a major effort to solve the problems of reconstruction after total war.

I use the phrase "Win the war and win the peace" because the peace must be fought for. We might as well face it now. In order to get a lasting working world order, the United States will have to make concessions. It will cost us money. We will have to give up things. It is too much to hope that the men who were so greedy that they would not pay for the setting up of a democratic Europe the last time, will suddenly become so generous that they will make the necessary concessions to guarantee a strong, democratic world this time.

A good case can be built up for Miss Pearl Buck's statement "We shall have to fight another war." Everyone has been educated to the idea that war demands sacrifices. The idea that peace demands sacrifices has not been pointed out. Nor is it being pointed out. That, to me, is the most disheartening thing we have to face.

In this country there seems to be two great undercurrents of thought. There are those who want us to participate in world affairs as little as possible, and those who want us to participate as much as possible; those who want us to jealously guard our high standard of living with high tariff walls, and those who feel we can no longer just "sell" to the world, from now on we shall have to "trade" with the world. There are those who fear the outside world, and those who welcome it. There are the internationalist-minded and the isolationist-minded.

After the last war, the peace was written with the idea that America was to unite with other nations in working out the world's problems. In Congress, that idea was defeated. Men so hated President Wilson that they fought tooth and nail to defeat every plan he proposed.

But, deeper than this, most Americans at that time had the idea that the minute the war was won, everything was over. No one wanted any more restrictions. No one wanted to make any concessions. We wanted to sell the world, but we didn't want them to sell anything to us. We wanted to settle down and return to normalcy. Give anything to Europe? Certainly not! We might be induced to lend them some money, but at 6-percent interest. Us to help rehabilitate Europe? Certainly not! We had done our part, hadn't we? Let Europe worry about it. Let them sweat it out. So we went chasing the rainbow of prosperity and forgot that, until the world was stabilized, prosperity was temporary.

So we lost the peace last time, not only because of political hate toward a President by a "band of willful men," but also by the unpreparedness of the country to give up anything for the peace. We refused to throw any part of our wealth or any part of our sovereignty into any sort of general pool or general league. We wanted all the advantages of a world order, but we would contribute nothing toward it. We would pray for peace; but we would not pay for it. The same factors are at work this time. They are at work in Congress, and they are at work in the country. Then, as now, we have a group of men in Congress who, through hate toward a President, could torpedo a peace. I have been a Member of the House of Representatives for only about 4 weeks, but I tell you, that the vigor and hate of our isolationists is a thing to behold. President Roosevelt has been called a Judas. He has been attacked through his family, through his sons now fighting overseas.

If some of the remarks which have been made in the House of Representatives were made in my tank-destroyer battalion, someone would have had his face punched in, right then and there.

Oh, yes. This time, as last, we have our "band of willful men," quite willing, through hatred, to torpedo the peace. No doubt about that.

In my opinion, the country has not been prepared for the idea that peace demands sacrifice. Just as we have to pay for war and for destruction, so will we have to pay for reconstruction. Although, as time goes on, what we shall have to pay to maintain peace should become less and less.

Americans are not prepared to face this fact: The reconstruction of friendly areas at our own expense is just as important to the preservation of the American way of life as is the destruction of enemy areas—which we do at our own expense.

The price we shall have to pay for war, that is, the amount of money which we shall simply have to give or throw away and expect no return, will not end with the stopping of hostilities. We pay $75 for a shell, which is fired at the enemy and misses. It is so much waste money. We will not get that money back. Over a period of years, people have been educated to the wastage of war. They do not expect to be paid back for the shells that miss.

But after the war, if we repair a bridge and it costs us $75, we expect to be paid back that money. Furthermore, we expect to be paid back by the very people who, for years, will be least able to pay back, and those are the people who have had their land and their bridges destroyed.

We are simply going to have to learn that, in order to get a lasting peace, America will have to lose money for several years after the war is over—just as she has been losing money for the 2 years that the war has been in operation. If it is good business to build up a strong army so we can destroy our enemies, then it is good business for us to make a little investment in reconstruction of the world, even though we may never get all of that reconstruction money back.

Now, some people are not going to agree with that. Some people are going to protest long and loudly against America becoming generous—this in spite of the fact that it was our dog-in-the-manger attitude last time which set the conditions for this war. It is against the blind, ungiving people of America that we are going to have to fight in order to win the peace.

In my opinion, it is only through Congress exploring the peace, discussing it in full, public debate, that we can sufficiently inform ourselves as to just what a real, lasting world peace means.

As a matter of fact, in the broader sense, Congress is already exploring, not necessarily the peace terms, but certainly different things which may come up as peace methods.

I am a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. We meet in one of those big, high-ceilinged rooms of the Capitol. Spreading the length of the room is a large, oval table with 25 places around it. We, the members of this committee, sit at this table, hear witnesses, take notes, ask questions. And, after we have exhausted a matter, we vote on it, aye or nay.

And around that table an interesting story has been developing in the last few days—the story of a new method of international trade. We have been holding hearings on the extension of the lend-lease bill, and through that hearing the possibility of lend-lease, and lend-lease in reverse becoming a method of post-war reconstruction is laid open for discussion.

That is not a function of our committee. We are not concerned with theoretical post-war problems. But our investigation, thorough and complete, will lay the basis of facts for others to speculate upon.

And this is what we are learning about lend-lease and lend-lease in reverse. It is not a one-way process, but a two-way trade. It is the pooling together of the resources of nations for their mutual good. It is awakening the spirit of cooperation among countries.

For example, we are furnishing the British with certain war materials and food supplies under lend-lease. Under lend-lease in reverse, they are supplying our troops in Britain with everything which they want or need and which the British have. Under lend-lease in reverse, the British furnish our air forces with bombs—all free, of course—on 12 hours' notice. All the American commander has to do is pick up the phone and ask for them.

When we were organizing for North Africa, our Army decided that it needed a new type of radio equipment. The British completely stripped their island of that equipment, giving us, free, every single bit of it they had.

Because of a severe coal shortage, the British minimum for heating Army barracks is 60° Fahrenheit. However, American Army standards require that barracks be heated to 65° Fahrenheit. Without hesitating, the British have supplied us with the extra fuel so that our barracks can be more comfortable than their barracks or homes.

A supply officer in the American Army can requisition whatever he wants from a British quartermaster and, providing it has been okayed by his own command, the British quartermaster will furnish it to our supply officer free. All that will pass hands is a piece of paper. Now, that is really something, as I, who have recently been a supply officer, can tell you.

When one nation gives to another as it would to its own, with no haggling and a minimum of paper work, this represents a true advance in international relations.

I mention lend-lease and lend-lease in reverse, because here is an example of generosity that pays. When we send tanks to Russia and planes to China, even though we pay for them and they never return the money to us, we are helping ourselves. Remember the howl that went up, during the original lend-lease hearings, about us giving away anything? Well, it is a good thing we were generous, for by giving we may have saved our country.

If, after the war, we continue to do the same thing for a period of time, we shall be making ourselves and our way of life still more secure. That might have been a difficult point to explain to the American people

the RECORD, I include the following letter:

RICHLAND CENTER, WIS., *May 10, 1943.*
Hon. WM. STEVENSON,
Member of the House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STEVENSON: I am writing this letter after the news broadcasts and newspaper articles telling us that the Farm Security Administration will be abolished after June 30.

I have been with the Farm Security Administration for the past 8 years and have found it to be one of the most helpful programs in which I have ever worked. During this time we have had approximately 500 farm families who have purchased farming equipment and livestock to operate their own farms. Approximately 280 have paid their loans in full, with interests, and the majority of them are actively engaged in farming. Always we were urged to take those people who had no other source of credit, and in response to this urging and to the requests of this type of family our case load was built up. This past year we have been fortunate in seeing the better families in Farm Security pay out. Some of them have saved enough money in addition to their Farm Security repayments to make a down payment on a small farm, thus tying this family permanently to the land.

This past loaning season we were again urged to keep farms in production and because of the large demand for help in defense plants we were forced to take some families on the roll who otherwise would be doing small day jobs through the county. This type of family needs close supervision in order to carry on and operate the farm to the maximum of production.

I wish that you might go with us to some of the farms where these families have been set up and see the zeal and ardor with which they are attempting to make their farms produce to maximum capacity. It would please you, I am sure, to see how anxious the family is to do their share in helping to feed the soldiers and how enthusiastic they are for the help that has been given them through the Farm Security Administration. If there is any possible way in which some of these farmers could continue to be given maximum supervision, either through Farm Security or some other similar agency, I hope something will be worked out. Many of these families have a morale partially established and if support is taken away at this time they will again fall back into that relief attitude from which they are attempting to emerge.

Surely in the programs set up in Washington there must be a place where farmers of this kind can obtain help.

Perhaps you would be interested in knowing about a few of these cases which are typical of the type of work which is being done in Richland County and undoubtedly this same kind of work has been carried on in the other counties of the States.

A mother and her two grown children were referred to Farm Security by the case worker from the relief office. The referral came to her through the town chairman who felt that the family was worthy of assistance, but who were loath to take any type of relief since they had never known what it meant to receive help. The father had died during the winter, leaving the family with three cows in production, some young stock, and approximately $1,500 worth of debts, varying from $225 to as little as $3. The first day that I called on the family they had about half a cup of coffee, one-fourth pound of lard, and about that much sugar. They had milk and eggs from the farm. Other than this, the house had no food in it of any kind. I suggested to them that they might get some help through the Farm Security Administration and immediately the mother informed me that they had never been on relief and did not care to take any relief at the present time, that they would manage somehow. Their physical fitness was rapidly being depreciated both from lack of quantity of food and quality. I assured them that we had nothing to give them, but they would have to work and repay anything that Farm Security did for them. As a result, this family will have 18 cows in production by the end of 1943, they will have paid up all of the outstanding obligations of the parents by debt adjustment, and their basement each fall is like a food commissary. Last year they had about 700 quarts of food canned, besides almost 60 bushels of vegetables, including seed potatoes which are being sold at the present time. The program of farming other than of a subsistence nature had always been foreign to this family until they came to Farm Security and at the present time they are making every effort to do their part in producing some of the world's food.

Another case is that of a young man and his wife and two children who were unable to obtain any farm labor in 1939. They took over one of our loans which the borrower had abandoned. They have built up the stock and added to this loan until this year one of the old established residents came to the Farm Security office to ask if we would help this family in the purchase of a farm. This lady had absolute confidence in the administration of the Farm Security program as it had operated in the case of this borrower, and a plan was set up whereby the borrower could purchase the farm by depositing a portion of his income in a supervised bank account, out of which the payment on the farm, his loan, and taxes could come. There was no other way in which this man might purchase this farm or any farm in the county, since his Farm Security loan was not paid in full and he had no security to offer. Today the family are landowners with a definite purpose, that of owning their own home, in mind.

Other borrowers have been on the verge of losing the farm, because they did not have adequate stock to operate the same. Farm Security had aided in placing the necessary operation equipment on these farms so that the family could carry on and continue to be landowners.

There are so many different instances and methods of treatment, but we do not want to weary you with many of these cases.

If only some method can be devised whereby these families can continue to be self-supporting and eventually take their places in the world as self-respecting, taxpaying citizens, they will be a credit to the country sponsoring them.

Kindest regards to you and Mrs. Stevenson from John and myself.

Sincerely yours,
EDNA H. PUTTKAMMER,
Home Management Supervisor, Richland County, Wis.

Harry Lane Englebright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, when late yesterday afternoon we were shocked by news of the death of our good friend and esteemed colleague, HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, I could not trust myself to say anything, or to try to pay the tribute to his memory, so justly deserved.

Like a young child who to his mother's door
Runs eager for the welcoming embrace,
And finds the door shut, and with troubled face
Calls and through sobbing calls, and o'er and o'er
Calling, storms at the panel—: so before
A door that will not open, sick and numb,
I listen for a word that will not come,
And know, at last, I may not enter more.
Silence! And through the silence and the dark
By that closed door, the distant sob of tears
Beats on my spirit, as on fairy shores
The spectral sea; and through the sobbing, hark!
Down the fair-chambered corridor of years,
The quiet shutting, one by one, of doors.

When first I came to Congress, it was my privilege to renew an old acquaintance with one whose father sat side by side with mine in the Sixty-first Congress; that was long ago. The acquaintanceship, so renewed, has grown into the strongest of friendships, over the years, which hereafter will be a never-to-be-forgotten memory.

There is no word in the language which properly measures the value of such an association and friendship as it has been my privilege to enjoy.

Nothing that I can say today, or that anybody may say, can mitigate our grief or minimize the loss which is ours, as we extend our sympathy to his bereaved family; recognizing that such loss is shared by the State, the Congress, and the country; only perhaps to say, that to have had the confidence of such a man, and to have profited by his friendship is one of the things which makes life worth living.

When I consider life and its few years—
A wisp of fog betwixt us and the sun;
A call to battle, and the battle done
Ere the last echo dies within our ears;
A rose choked in the grass; an hour of fears;
The gusts that past a darkening shore do beat;
The burst of music down an unlistening street—
I wonder at the idleness of tears.
—*Charles A. Plumley.*

Should Congress Explore the Peace Terms?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address entitled "Should Congress Explore the Peace Terms?" delivered by me Thursday, February 4, 1943, over the Columbia Broadcasting System network:

About a month ago I was a second lieutenant in the Tank Destroyer Center at Camp Hood, Tex. I left the Tank Destroyers to come to Washington to take my seat in this

Congress because, under a Presidential directive, no Member of Congress can remain on active duty with the Army.

I originally ran for Congress because I hoped, believed, and prayed that this would be the Congress which would sign the peace terms. To me it was desperately important that Congress did not again repeat the mistakes of 1920. I did not want another war 25 years after this one. I wanted this war to be the last. I did not want us to again let the peace go by default. I wanted America to correct its error of 25 years ago and this time to take an active part in the operation of the peace.

That is why I ran for Congress—to win the war and to win the peace. So to this question, "Should Congress explore the peace terms?", I feel definitely that it should. It should to the fullest extent that it is permitted by law. I feel that every American should explore the peace terms. I feel that only by an enlightened and active public opinion can we this time make a major effort to solve the problems of reconstruction after total war.

I use the phrase "Win the war and win the peace" because the peace must be fought for. We might as well face it now. In order to get a lasting working world order, the United States will have to make concessions. It will cost us money. We will have to give up things. It is too much to hope that the men who were so greedy that they would not pay for the setting up of a democratic Europe the last time, will suddenly become so generous that they will make the necessary concessions to guarantee a strong, democratic world this time.

A good case can be built up for Miss Pearl Buck's statement "We shall have to fight another war." Everyone has been educated to the idea that war demands sacrifices. The idea that peace demands sacrifices has not been pointed out. Nor is it being pointed out. That, to me, is the most disheartening thing we have to face.

In this country there seems to be two great undercurrents of thought. There are those who want us to participate in world affairs as little as possible, and those who want us to participate as much as possible; those who want us to jealously guard our high standard of living with high tariff walls, and those who feel we can no longer just "sell" to the world, from now on we shall have to "trade" with the world. There are those who fear the outside world, and those who welcome it. There are the internationalist-minded and the isolationist-minded.

After the last war, the peace was written with the idea that America was to unite with other nations in working out the world's problems. In Congress, that idea was defeated. Men so hated President Wilson that they fought tooth and nail to defeat every plan he proposed.

But, deeper than this, most Americans at that time had the idea that the minute the war was won, everything was over. No one wanted any more restrictions. No one wanted to make any concessions. We wanted to sell the world, but we didn't want them to sell anything to us. We wanted to settle down and return to normalcy. Give anything to Europe? Certainly not! We might be induced to lend them some money, but at 6-percent interest. Us to help rehabilitate Europe? Certainly not! We had done our part, hadn't we? Let Europe worry about it. Let them sweat it out. So we went chasing the rainbow of prosperity and forgot that, until the world was stabilized, prosperity was temporary.

So we lost the peace last time, not only because of political hate toward a President by a "band of willful men," but also by the unpreparedness of the country to give up anything for the peace. We refused to throw any part of our wealth or any part of our sovereignty into any sort of general pool or general league. We wanted all the advantages of a world order, but we would contribute nothing toward it. We would pray for peace; but we would not pay for it. The same factors are at work this time. They are at work in Congress, and they are at work in the country. Then, as now, we have a group of men in Congress who, through hate toward a President, could torpedo a peace. I have been a Member of the House of Representatives for only about 4 weeks, but I tell you, that the vigor and hate of our isolationists is a thing to behold. President Roosevelt has been called a Judas. He has been attacked through his family, through his sons now fighting overseas.

If some of the remarks which have been made in the House of Representatives were made in my tank-destroyer battalion, someone would have had his face punched in, right then and there.

Oh, yes. This time, as last, we have our "band of willful men," quite willing, through hatred, to torpedo the peace. No doubt about that.

In my opinion, the country has not been prepared for the idea that peace demands sacrifice. Just as we have to pay for war and for destruction, so will we have to pay for reconstruction. Although, as time goes on, what we shall have to pay to maintain peace should become less and less.

Americans are not prepared to face this fact: The reconstruction of friendly areas at our own expense is just as important to the preservation of the American way of life as is the destruction of enemy areas—which we do at our own expense.

The price we shall have to pay for war, that is, the amount of money which we shall simply have to give or throw away and expect no return, will not end with the stopping of hostilities. We pay $75 for a shell, which is fired at the enemy and misses. It is so much waste money. We will not get that money back. Over a period of years, people have been educated to the wastage of war. They do not expect to be paid back for the shells that miss.

But after the war, if we repair a bridge and it costs us $75, we expect to be paid back that money. Furthermore, we expect to be paid back by the very people who, for years, will be least able to pay back, and those are the people who have had their land and their bridges destroyed.

We are simply going to have to learn that, in order to get a lasting peace, America will have to lose money for several years after the war is over—just as she has been losing money for the 2 years that the war has been in operation. If it is good business to build up a strong army so we can destroy our enemies, then it is good business for us to make a little investment in reconstruction of the world, even though we may never get all of that reconstruction money back.

Now, some people are not going to agree with that. Some people are going to protest long and loudly against America becoming generous—this in spite of the fact that it was our dog-in-the-manger attitude last time which set the conditions for this war. It is against the blind, ungiving people of America that we are going to have to fight in order to win the peace.

In my opinion, it is only through Congress exploring the peace, discussing it in full, public debate, that we can sufficiently inform ourselves as to just what a real, lasting world peace means.

As a matter of fact, in the broader sense, Congress is already exploring, not necessarily the peace terms, but certainly different things which may come up as peace methods.

I am a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. We meet in one of those big, high-ceilinged rooms of the Capitol. Spreading the length of the room is a large, oval table with 25 places around it. We, the members of this committee, sit at this table, hear witnesses, take notes, ask questions. And, after we have exhausted a matter, we vote on it, aye or nay.

And around that table an interesting story has been developing in the last few days—the story of a new method of international trade. We have been holding hearings on the extension of the lend-lease bill, and through that hearing the possibility of lend-lease, and lend-lease in reverse becoming a method of post-war reconstruction is laid open for discussion.

That is not a function of our committee. We are not concerned with theoretical post-war problems. But our investigation, thorough and complete, will lay the basis of facts for others to speculate upon.

And this is what we are learning about lend-lease and lend-lease in reverse. It is not a one-way process, but a two-way trade. It is the pooling together of the resources of nations for their mutual good. It is awakening the spirit of cooperation among countries.

For example, we are furnishing the British with certain war materials and food supplies under lend-lease. Under lend-lease in reverse, they are supplying our troops in Britain with everything which they want or need and which the British have. Under lend-lease in reverse, the British furnish our air forces with bombs—all free, of course—on 12 hours' notice. All the American commander has to do is pick up the phone and ask for them.

When we were organizing for North Africa, our Army decided that it needed a new type of radio equipment. The British completely stripped their island of that equipment, giving us, free, every single bit of it they had.

Because of a severe coal shortage, the British minimum for heating Army barracks is 60° Fahrenheit. However, American Army standards require that barracks be heated to 65° Fahrenheit. Without hesitating, the British have supplied us with the extra fuel so that our barracks can be more comfortable than their barracks or homes.

A supply officer in the American Army can requisition whatever he wants from a British quartermaster and, providing it has been okayed by his own command, the British quartermaster will furnish it to our supply officer free. All that will pass hands is a piece of paper. Now, that is really something, as I, who have recently been a supply officer, can tell you.

When one nation gives to another as it would to its own, with no haggling and a minimum of paper work, this represents a true advance in international relations.

I mention lend-lease and lend-lease in reverse, because here is an example of generosity that pays. When we send tanks to Russia and planes to China, even though we pay for them and they never return the money to us, we are helping ourselves. Remember the howl that went up, during the original lend-lease hearings, about us giving away anything? Well, it is a good thing we were generous, for by giving we may have saved our country.

If, after the war, we continue to do the same thing for a period of time, we shall be making ourselves and our way of life still more secure. That might have been a difficult point to explain to the American people

25 years ago. Today, when we have seen the failure of selfishness and the success of generosity, it should be easier to get across.

I came to Congress to try to make this war the last one. I find here in Congress the same attitudes which defeated a workable peace the last time. I want Congress and the people to participate fully in the working, planning, discussing, and exploring of this peace. I believe that only by so doing can we defeat the "band of willful men"; only by so doing can we educate Americans to a spirit of generosity equal to the generosity which they display in war time.

Let's make this the last war—even if we have to spend several billion dollars on the peace. It will be a great deal cheaper than spending several hundred billions of dollars on another war 25 years from now.

American Weeklies and the War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a very significant letter I have received from Mr. Maurice L. Jones, publisher of the Johnson City (Ill.) Progress:

Hon. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR RUNT: You get the Progress each week, but for fear that you may have overlooked our contribution to the war effort, I am sending six marked copies picked at random from our files.

In the six issues there are 792 inches in stories, publicity, and advertising pertaining to the war. This is an average of 132 inches an issue and is equal to $39.60 in advertising space per issue. You probably realize that other country weeklies in your district, as well as throughout Illinois and the Nation, are contributing as much or more.

The radio networks have been given official Nation-wide recognition for the fine job they are doing. But so far similar recognition has not been given to the country press. I think I can understand why. A Nation-wide broadcast by the four networks is a 4-ton "communications" block buster, while the thousands of weekly newspapers telling their millions of home-town readers about ration point values, selective-service rulings, community War bond quotas, printing Government press releases compares only to rifle fire—but it takes both rifle fire and block busters to wage a successful war.

Personally, I do not feel that the Government owes my paper or my organization a thing for anything done to help win this war. I feel it is our patriotic duty. But since it is a policy of governmental agencies to give recognition to radio networks and other organizations, I feel that the country press is due similar consideration, and I hope that at every opportunity you will be able to put in a good word for the country press.

Sincerely,

MAURICE L. JONES,
Publisher, Johnson City Progress.

I Am An American Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as Sunday, May 16, is I Am An American Day, I wish to extend my remarks upon the reasons why we should be thankful that we are Americans.

You will remember that Congress designated the third Sunday in May of each year as I Am An American Day. The observance of this particular day finds the United States engaged in a great global war, with more than 6,000,000 of our fine American boys in the Army, more than 1,300,000 in the Navy, and more than 500,000 in the Marine Corps and Coast Guard. With this military strength of 8,000,000 men, approximately 2,000,000 of whom are now serving in more than 100 military and naval bases throughout the world, this particular day should have more significance to us than at any other time in our history. No American homes today are unaffected by the conflict in which we are now engaged. Nearly every American home has a son or relative in service, sworn to observe the Constitution of the United States and imbued with the patrioti desire to insure the perpetuity of our own country and guarantee the blessings of liberty so far as possible throughout the world.

I have long been a student of the history of my country and I am impressed with the fact that a Divine Providence guided the destinies of our Nation during the period of its infancy. We have just celebrated the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, one of the great galaxy of statesmen who were instrumental in building the foundation of our Government. His contribution to constitutional government makes a priceless heritage with which every American citizen should become familiar. Thomas Jefferson was not only the author of the Declaration of Independence, but held high governmental positions in the Republic, from that of Governor of a State to that of Presidency of the Nation. He was author of the immortal words embodied in the Declaration of Independence:

> We hold these facts to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights and that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Those words embodied the philosophy, not only of our forefathers, but have become invaluable to our Nation through all its history.

When our forefathers convened in the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787, they built the American Constitution founded upon the principles largely enunciated by Washington and Jefferson. This Constitution, which has existed for more than 150 years, still stands as the greatest political document ever made by man. Calvin Coolidge, during his Presidency, aptly and patriotically said:

> The Constitution represents a government of law. There is only one other form of authority and that is a government of force. Americans must make their choice between these two. One signifies justice and liberty; the other, tyranny and oppression. To live under the American Constitution is the greatest political privilege that was ever accorded to the human race.

During the time that the Continental Congress was formulating the Declaration of Independence, in 1776, and our constitutional forefathers were convening in Philadelphia in 1787 to formulate a new constitution, the American flag, symbolizing the new America, was created. In 1775 the Continental Congress adopted the stripes as part of the design of the flag, and in 1777 added 13 stars. Finally Congress, on June 14, 1777, adopted for the Nation the flag designed by Washington, Morris, and Ross and made by Betsy Ross, in the following language:

> *Resolved*, That the flag of the 13 United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the Union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation.

And finally, in 1818, Congress passed an act providing that the flag be composed of 13 stripes representing the Original Thirteen States and that new stars should be added on the July 4 following the admission of additional States.

I have mentioned the flag, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution on this I Am An American Day, because they are symbolic of our Nation itself. The flag represents our country in its perpetuity, and the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution represent the basic principle and the basic law underlying our country. Under this Constitution, America has grown from 13 scattered States along the Atlantic seaboard, with a population of 3,000,000, to a Nation of 48 States, with a population of 135,000,000. Every loyal American citizen should, therefore, this day turn back in his mind to the principles of the Declaration of Independence and reread the provisions of the Constitution, and thank God that he is an American.

Another reason why this day should mean so much to us is because in our country Congress can make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. Under our American system, each one has the right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience. Here in America, we have full choice in our freedom of worship, whether we are Protestant or Catholic, Jew or Gentile, we are protected under our constitutional provisions. The right to worship God according to the dictates of our conscience is inherently an American right,

and many other countries throughout the world are deprived of that privilege. We, therefore, on this particular day, should give thanks that this great privilege has been extended to us and that this great right has been preserved for us through constitutional processes for more than 150 years.

Another reason why the celebration of this day should mean so much to us is that under our Constitution, education of the youth of our land has become general throughout our country. In the early days of our Republic, education was more or less private, but as the years went by, the men and women, in State and Nation, knew that the welfare of this Nation depended upon an educated citizenry, and so the public schools of our land have become our pride and joy. Fortunately, it has been left to each State to determine in general its educational structure. While the Federal Government may have a general supervisory control as to certain educational provisions, yet each State is given the responsibility of furthering the cause of education. Education and the Constitution have gone hand in hand. You may remember that in the ordinance creating the Northwest Territory in 1787, it was provided, "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

Michigan has been one of the great pioneers in the cause of education. Long before any other State had conceived a broad program of education, Michigan was on it way, pioneering its educational system until it became the admiration of our whole country.

There is one other reason why we should celebrate I Am An American Day. The American home has constituted, and still constitutes, the bulwark of American life. Under our Constitution, the American home has been protected. It is here in America that fathers and mothers, with boys and girls, meet in the home life, imbibing the American spirit and enjoying without interference those constitutional provisions which were made to protect the home, the schools, the church, and our country. We should be especially thankful on this day that the home life still remains, and while many homes are saddened on this Sunday because of the absence of their boys in service, yet we know definitely and clearly that it is in the American home that our boys and girls learned the true precepts of citizenship, and the time must never come when the American home is lowered in dignity and loked upon with disrespect.

So, on this I Am An American Day, let us be thankful that our heritage includes the flag, our Declaration of Independence, and our Constitution; that here, in America, we have the right of freedom of worship, the right to maintain our public schools, and the right to preserve the sanctity of the American home. No government is self-perpetuating. If it is to survive, it will be because it has support—active support, not passive. The Constitution of the United States is the final refuge of every right that is enjoyed by any American citizen.

Let us give thinks now that we are Americans, with our hearts and souls dedicated to the perpetuity of this government, and that whatever sacrifices may be necessary, we will make them as Americans, because of our love of freedom and our love of country.

Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include therein a letter from Mrs. Mary Cain, editor and owner of th Summit Sun, a newspaper published in the town of Summit, Miss. Permit me to say that Mrs. Cain is one of the most dynamic women writers of our country. She has the courage to speak and write her convictions, whether on national issues and problems, local and civic, or moral and religious. No influence can deter her and her outspoken convictions on the problems that are confronting us today.

All who know Mrs. Cain admire her and respect her honesty of purpose, whether agreeing with her or not; hence, I think this letter, which is addressed to the two branches of the Congress is very appropriate at the present time. Her letter is as follows:

To Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

GENTLEMEN: My voice, I realize, is a small one, crying from the deep South, but with the life and deeds of the immortal Thomas Jefferson so poignantly before us today, I cannot be silent.

I know you have been earnestly striving, for many months now, to bring some measure of order out of the chaos that has divided our great Nation into sections and factions, fighting against each other at a time when every gesture should be one of unity. You have made some measure of progress, but not enough. We are still in danger on the home front.

I do not belong to that school of thought which believes Congress should or could, overnight, work miracles. I know that it was the voice of the people which caused you to give away powers that were rightfully yours, and now the masses do not understand that, despite their cry to take your powers back again, it is not so easy to regain lost ground. But some of us know, and we watch your fight with unflagging interest. We do not expect miracles. To be honest, we have an intense hatred for the overnight miracles wrought in Washington. Most of us know that your legislation is the result of much thought and effort, much discussion, and is consequently slow in formation, which is as it should be in a true democracy, even when the Nation is at war.

I have not been impatient with all the discussion of the best tax plan, but I wonder if you have thought of the pay-as-you-go plan (regardless of sponsorship) as one which would force American citizens, already sick to death of government forms and questionnaires and tax returns, to file 12 or 13 income tax forms instead of the one now filled out? Have you realized that such a plan would increase the tax burden, too, if merely through the matter of increased tax-collection personnel and the enormous amount of printing involved? Have you any conception of how the average man hates even the annual form? Do you think they will take kindly to the filing of monthly forms and an annual form which must attempt to reconcile 12 chaotic months? They can only assume, you know, that you gentlemen have some special love for auditors and tax experts because you compel the average citizen, completely at a loss to understand the complicated forms, to hire an "expert" to fill them out.

Why do you steer clear of any talk of a general sales tax? Such a tax could be clearly ear-marked "For the Duration Only," and you have no idea how the people would welcome a plan that involved no complicated form-filling and one that had an end in sight. We have learned, you know, that once a tax is imposed, we are never rid of it. And we don't want income taxes to keep climbing. The sales tax is fair. If a man wants to save for the purchase of a home he can deny himself certain purchases and eventually own it. Under the income tax ruling he has no alternative but to pay.

It doesn't leave much for a saving account, you must admit.

I implore you, gentlemen, have some pity for the American people. We know your power over us, however temperary, and we fear it. But we have not forgotten that we once dumped some tea. Yes, we know that our tax-rate structure has not climbed to the dizzy height it has in England but if you know anything about American people you should know that we have no desire to emulate England in any respect, least of all that of taxation.

I notice that when matters dealing with appropriations are before you, the matter is discussed from every angle save one. Never yet have I found one of you asking the one question which should ring through the Congress anent every appropriation: "Can't we do without this?" You say "economize," and that means lopping off several millions of dollars here and there, but such legislation isn't enough. Gentlemen, we Americans are a burdened people now. You must ask, "Is this absolutely necessary?" And if it isn't, kill it.

Do you know, gentlemen, that a vast number of the small businessmen of this Nation who have been forced out of their places of business by the demand that all must function either in the armed forces or in defense plants, have vowed they will never return to business for themselves simply because there are so many forms to be filled out for the Government and so many taxes to be paid? What are you doing about this, gentlemen? Do you want a completely socialized America, with the Government owning and operating everything? God help us as a Nation of free people, if you do!

Gentlemen, when Thomas Jefferson said the sum of good government included a wise and frugal government he did not speak lightly. A wise government does, as he said, recognize the fact that it should not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. I commend you, gentlemen, to the words of Jefferson, the immortal. As Representative SCOTT of Pennsylvania said recently, "This, then, is our act of faith on the two-hundredth anniversary of his birth: That we recall his precepts with full knowledge that we are engaged in a bitter struggle to

preserve the very principles to which he dedicated his life. In the days of victory to come we must not forget. He did not fail his people. We must not fail him."

Cordially yours,

MARY D. CAIN,
Editor-Publisher, the Summit (Miss.) Sun.

Mr. Churchill's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 12), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Churchill Here Again" from the Times-Herald of this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. CHURCHILL HERE AGAIN

From the World War No. 2 speeches of Prime Minister Winston Churchill:

"I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat." (May 13, 1940.)

"Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few." (August 21, 1940—referring to the extraordinary work of the Royal Air Force.)

"When I survey and compute the power of the United States and its vast resources and feel that they are now in it with us, with the British Commonwealth of Nations, all together, however long it last, till death or victory, I cannot believe there is any other fact in the whole world which can compare with that. That is what I have dreamed of, aimed at and worked for, and now it has come to pass." (February 15, 1942.)

"I have not become the King's first minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." (November 10, 1942.)

The above-quoted Churchillisms will be quoted and requoted for a long time to come, we believe. Mr. Churchill, in addition to his other talents, has a faculty for making intense epigrams which go crashing through people's brains and stick in their memories.

Mr. Churchill has now arrived in Washington for his fifth meeting with President Roosevelt. He brought with him a considerable staff of military and naval experts. The occasion of the visit is obviously the North African Allied victory now being salted away.

Also on a visit to Washington is Lord Beaverbrook, who as chief of British aircraft production in the days of the big blitz on England, had the good judgment to concentrate on turning out fighter planes to beat off Goering's bombers. Interestingly enough, it is now rumored that the Germans are concentrating on fighter-plane production in hope of beating off more Allied bombers than they have yet been able to do.

TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION

There is plenty for Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt to discuss in this fifth conference of theirs.

One item will be the future control of North Africa, now that Egypt and the Suez Canal are safe for the British.

Our chief hope under this head is that Mr. Churchill will not persuade President Roosevent to undertake any part of North African control. The British ought to have Libya if they want it, as they probably will, to give Egypt a long desert hinterland for defense purposes. If France is resurrected as a strong nation, French North Africa might well be restored to France. Whatever happens, the United States ought to content itself with having helped to liberate North Africa, and should not try to police and uplift any part of it after the war.

Also up for discussion, no doubt, will be the Allies' next moves against the Axis by sea, land, and air. We're all at liberty to form our own guesses on this subject, and time will show who guessed right.

We surmise, too, that Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill will do some prayerful deliberating on the rift between Soviet Russia and the Polish exile government. Perhaps Marshal Stalin will be piped by wireless telephone into this part of the discussion, as logically he would be.

Poland has for centuries been a ticklish question and continues so. Its next boundaries, however, will most likely depend on who does the most to rescue Poland from the clutches of the Germans; and at this writing it looks as if that person will be Stalin—who then will most likely draw Poland's borders where he pleases, with nobody in position to tell him to stand back.

These Roosevelt-Churchill deliberations may then lead into another and also ticklish subject; namely, the conflict between their promises (Mr. Churchill's, at least) to bring some kind of world superstate into being after this war.

If the two rulers can settle this seemingly flat, irreconcilable contradiction, they will perform something close to a miracle.

Well, we hope Mr. Churchill has a pleasant, effective and efficient get-together with the President; and Mr. Churchill himself is always as welcome as the flowers that bloom in the spring, tra-la.

Statehood for Puerto Rico—Speech of Hon. Emilio del Toro, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am presenting copy of a cablegram from Puerto Rico, which is self-explanatory. Also I insert copy of the opening address delivered by Hon. Emilio del Toro, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, before the Statehood Congress, held in San Juan, Puerto Rico, on May 2, 1943:

SAN JUAN, P. R., *May 2, 1943.*

BOLÍVAR PAGÁN,
National Resident Commissioner,
Washington, D. C.

Pro-statehood congress assembled today desires to convey to the President of the United States, our National Congress, and the American people, the intense pride of Puerto Rico in the fact that sons of this island together with their continental fellow citizens are participating as armed soldiers of the United Nations in the noble struggle against the Axis Powers in defense of the democratic principles that must prevail in the world for the preservation of liberty, dignity, and human happiness.

MARCELINO ROMANY,
Chairman.

ADDRESS OF HON. EMILIO DEL TORO

Fellow citizens, this Congress has been convened in order that we may avail ourselves of the opportunity to study in all its aspects the problem of our final status as one of the States of the Nation of which we are citizens. By this study and the resolutions adopted as a consequence thereof, we shall be in a position to define conclusively our aims and convictions, thus orienting our people in their conscientious struggle, a struggle that must be carried on until we achieve the great destiny reserved for us by Providence in the political development of the Western Hemisphere.

Geographically, we are part of America; we are one of the Greater Antilles discovered by Columbus—Puerto Rico, the Borinquen of Indian lore. Politically, we have known two sovereignties, Spain for more than 4 centuries, and the United States, since 1898.

Under Spanish rule we became an overseas province, our relations reaching a climax, toward the end of that regime, with the granting of self-government which gave us direct participation in local matters while preserving that exercised by us in national policies through our representatives at the Cortes or Spanish Parliament.

Our island was ceded to the United States as a consequence of a war, with the stipulation that our civil rights and political status would be determined by the Congress of the United States.[1]

The military government established in the island during the war continued in force until the United States Congress, by virtue of the act of April 12, 1900, organized a temporary civil government to take its place, providing—article 7 of the act—that all the inhabitants that continued to reside in Puerto Rico who were Spanish subjects on the 11th of April 1899, and their children, born thereafter on the island, would be held to be citizens of Puerto Rico, and as such entitled to the protection of the United States; and that, together with the resident American citizens, they would constitute a body politic under the name of the people of Puerto Rico.

That organic act was in effect until 1917 when a law was approved by the Congress providing a civil government, still operative, containing a bill of rights consecrating the highest conquests of civilization in the matter, organizing a republican form of government determining well-defined spheres of action for its three branches—executive, legislative, and judicial—and proclaiming as citizens of the United States all the citizens of Puerto Rico, with a proviso that all those who wished to retain their status as citizens of Puerto Rico could do so by filing a declaration to that effect in the district court of their residential districts. Very few Puerto Ricans made such a declaration, and almost all of those who did subsequently filed in the United States district court petitions for naturalization as American citizens which were granted.

With more or less success, our body politic has been developing in a realistic way, constantly active, and at times achieving veritable social revolutions through changes in the Government accomplished by means of elections held in accordance with law.

[1] Articles 2 and 9 of the treaty of peace between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain, signed at Paris, December 10, 1898. Proclaimed, Washington, April 11, 1899.

It is true that poverty and ignorance survive among certain quarters of our population and our duty in this field has not been completely fulfilled; it is true that there are deficiencies in our system of government that clamor for correction, and it is true that we are still far from the goal of our ambitions, but it cannot be denied that in the last 40 years our material and spiritual wealth have developed in unprecedented and extraordinary ways; that thousands of kilometers of highways, hundreds of churches and thousands of schools have been built; that the professional classes have grown not alone in number but in their efficiency and initiative; that new industries have taken root among us or are in the process of so doing and growing; that commerce has been modernized and has expanded; that there has been improvement in agriculture through intensive cultivation; that the benefits from our scientific research have spread throughout the world; that journalism has developed independent enterprises not even dreamed of in the past; that public opinion is becoming a reality; that we do worship God and speak and write freely, without fear of reprisals by the Government, and that government in its three branches is developing vigorously and intelligently; that the number of official publications—reports, laws, decisions—and the reports, pamphlets, and books issued by individuals and institutions, semipublic and private, reveal in themselves our intensive progress in all walks of life, and that the dignity of the citizen has been strengthened and made secure; liberty has been a fact, equality before the law has been recognized, and a more ample practice of fraternity has been achieved. Therefore, we have not failed. Our life of association has been possible and triumphant, putting to one side natural shortcomings, failures, impatiences, and misunderstandings. The progress might have been still greater, but such as it is, it does exist. It is an undeniable reality.

And when all this has happened, in the midst of the crisis caused by a war of colossal proportions and transcending consequences, exactly at the moment in which thousands of islanders are serving in the Army, in the Navy, in the aviation, in the auxiliary corps, and in war industries—many of whom have sealed their pact of loyalty with their blood and lives—a bill[2] is introduced in Congress which tends to divide the Puerto Rican family and to swerve her from what should be the course of her ideal—her only aim in these fateful moments—to win the war—placing at the service of the cause all her strength, her life and her wealth, her honor and faith, her manpower and her mind, without any mental reservations, in an exalted manner, heroically.

Indeed, he who thus poses does not love us truly.

I have such faith in the honor and spirit of responsibility and of justice of the Representatives of the American people in Congress that I do not consider it possible that the bill may ever become a law unless such Representatives should be convinced that that and no other was the wish of the Puerto Rican community, and we all know that such wish does not exist.

With the exception of a few intelligent, active, and aggressive persons who, because of various reasons, entertain a determined purpose of separating Puerto Rico from the United States and who disseminate noisily and by every means their ideas, and a great number of youngsters and grown-ups who cannot or have not had the opportunity to penetrate into the reality of the facts and what it really means to our present and even more to our future to become a State of the Union—that is, one of the republics that form the great Republic of the North—the immense majority of Puerto Ricans, either openly or in the depths of their consciences, recognize the fact that our present citizenship is a treasure of incalculable value and that to be a State of the United States of America is in itself the greatest blessing to which may aspire any people on earth that love liberty regulated by law.

Attempts have been made to intimate that the granting of so-called independence to Puerto Rico by the bill just introduced in Congress is in harmony with the good-neighbor policy which is being so successfully pursued by the present administration.

Not by any means. I can assure you that I had at Buenos Aires and at Lima the opportunity of coming into contact with many leaders of Latin-American opinion and the greater the intelligence, the better balanced the mind, and the nobler the character of the leader whom I contacted, the more clearly he appraised Puerto Rico's problem in her relations with the United States and the good to be derived by our island as a consequence of such relations. There should not be the least apprehension in the United States that considered opinion in Latin America is prone to misjudge her actions in our island. Criticism can only come and does come from adverse material interests and from high-strung mediocre spirits or from beings full of hatred or ill-informed persons and entities, but criticism originating in such sources must not and can never be the decisive factor in a matter of such high import.

What would certainly provoke an adverse reaction to the good-neighbor policy would be the approval of the bill in question, for searching its depths, we find that an attempt has been made to conceal—under the cloak of justice and liberalism—contempt for a people and a race deemed inferiors and unworthy of admittance into the American family. An independence conditioned on the retention of military bases would tell Latin America that the desired lands are thus kept and the undesirable people who inhabit them are cast aside. It is not justice, I repeat it, what the bill embodies; it is contempt.

Let us not, however, permit resentment to becloud our minds. I have made these remarks because I consider it my duty to remove the veil of the false that I may fathom the true, for truth is the only rock upon which we may build permanently.

But even though this were not the case and the bill were a measure inspired in the highest aims, it would be our duty as citizens, after thanking the author for his kindness, to tell him emphatically that his bill is contrary to our aspirations and therefore, if he does love us, what he ought to do is to withdraw it and devote his time, his intelligence, and his influence to preparing and adopting measures for accelerating our progress and in that way help us reach the high body to which he belongs, so that we may join with him in promoting the welfare of the Nation and the island.

Let us strive in such a way that good may emerge from evil. It seems as though we had been asleep. We have been heedless. Let us hope that the signal that has been given may not only awaken us but that it may exert us to exercise the rights and fulfill the duties of our citizenship in such a decorous and efficient way that it may carry us to the conquest of our ideal.

That this is not possible? A short time ago, while Madame Chiang Kai-shek, the First Lady of China and of the world, addressed the House of Representatives of the United States, emphasizing the fact that, in speaking to the House she was appealing to the American people, said:

"America is not only the caldron of democracy but the incubator of democratic principles. At some of the places I visited I met the crews of your air bases. There I found first-generation Germans, Italians, Frenchmen, Poles, Czechoslovakians, and other nationals. * * * But there they were—all Americans. * * * No suspicion or rivalry existed between them. This increased my belief and faith that devotion to common principles eliminates differences in race and that identity of ideals is the strongest possible solvent of racial dissimilarities." And Life's editorialist added: "Thomas Jefferson could hardly have excelled the clarity of that expression."[3]

We are descendants of a different race from that which predominated in the United States at the time it became a republic, and that condition still exists, but we were and are united to them by the love of democratic principles, sometimes neither well understood nor wholly practiced, although they always stir our souls and are the polar star of our earnest longings. That union has made possible our life of association and the success achieved, and that union shall conduct us into closer relationship until we attain our incorporation as a State of the Union.

It is not an easy task. The problem is complicated. We have to take a leap and we all know that nature does not normally walk by leaps, but we all equally know that when a great good is at stake, other than ordinary means must be employed. Then the mightiest efforts are justified.

To become politically what California or Massachusetts is in the bosom of the most powerful nation, materially and spiritually, is to assure for us and our offspring the blessings of ordered liberty and, therefore, the constant progress of individual dignity and the well-being of the community; this is to tread directly toward the kingdom of heaven on earth.

By virtue of this Congress Puerto Rican public opinion will manifest itself in a manner so clear and grave that the evil which has sprung up at this moment will be eliminated. It is not composed merely of the partisans of one group alone, nor of militant politicians only, but of Puerto Ricans who love their island and their citizenship and wish to preserve and increase the substantial institutional wealth which they possess. Hence, their strength of opinion. Hence our assurance that the resolutions and measures that they may approve will have great weight in the thought and actions of our continental brothers who represent the Nation in both chambers of Congress.

But in a sense the attainment of that goal would be in itself only an ephemeral endeavor. We must go further. Let us not lose this opportunity. We must avail ourselves of it to speak the truth to our people. Let it be a profound self-examination from which we may devise a plan of action leading to the pursuit of our ideals.

Let us conceal nothing. Let us consider all the factors involved in the matter. In order to attain incorporation it is not enough to say that we are good American citizens. It is necessary that we show it in practice.

Intensive patriotic work is demanded from us. In the first place, let us turn our eyes toward the boys in the armed forces. By all means, let us arouse their enthusiasm, their loyalty, their heroism. Each one of them who complie. with his mission to the fullest, not only will he win honor and glory for himself but for his country, showing that this land can produce men capable of defending its institutions on the battlefields.

And let us not look at our combatant forces only but at our civil population as well, beginning with ourselves. Let us sow

[2] 78th Cong., 1st sess., S. 952, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS on April 2, 1943.

[3] Life, March 1, 1943; editorial, p. 26.

our field and our city gardens until we can do no more. Let us live sober, self-sacrificing lives, giving every saving to the war effort. Let us drown our complaints. Let us sharpen our wits so that we may help, cooperate, serve. Let us rejoice in suffering if suffering does come. With that attitude we shall not only receive the immense benefit of self-improvement but we shall inspire the respect of our fellow citizens from the North.

Let us work incessantly, so that those of our countrymen who have formed large groups in certain cities of the continent conduct themselves as honorable citizens. It is true that it has not been possible to eliminate completely crime and immorality from any people, but when a country's honest men do not work vigorously for its elimination they thus reveal that there is not in them the necessary moral civilizing energy and they are thought to be incapable and inferior to the task of living a higher collective life, notwithstanding their individual worth.

A spirit of constant striving in all of life's ordered and useful activities and in the performance of all the duties of citizenship is the best argument within our reach, perhaps the only one that will carry us to victory.

Every legislator, every judge, every Puerto Rican executive official who commits any criminal or immoral deed, is not only harming himself but the prestige and future of his own people.

Let our motto be: To the conquest of statehood through our own efforts; to the Nation, to make it greater.

Baseless pride? Vanity? Empty dream? many may believe so. I am not with them. A race and a land that gave birth to a Eugenio María de Hostos and to a Román Baldorioty de Castro may well have faith in her destiny. Whether in the Senate or in the House of Representatives of the United States they would not be inferior to the greatest leaders of those august bodies, and they would be equal to the task of deciding at any crucial moment the most difficult national or international question, so that there would be no stagnation in the process of civilization but continued progress straight ahead.

I know as well as anyone that we have many faults. I know as well as anyone our own limitations. But I have absolute faith that there is pure gold in the marrow of our people—kindness, sympathy, intelligence, virtue.

Fate brought us into union with North America. Let us fulfill that destiny completely. We know by experience what that union means in the matter of order, prestige, education, opportunities.

All beginnings are always difficult. Let us refrain from the crime of placing obstacles in the road to union. The voice that resounds powerfully today among the peoples is not independence but interdependence. Let us smooth down roughnesses. Let us suffer in silence our own personal disillusionments. Let us overcome our own passions. Let us harness our inclination for personal rule. Let us penetrate the greatness of a collective life. In area we are a small people, densely populated, earning our daily bread from land-tilling and producing the same products as nearby countries of great size. To isolate ourselves would be to condemn ourselves to a life of minimum influence, in fact always a dependency, perhaps threatened by extreme poverty. No new association that could be devised would be like the one we now have with the United States. Sometimes they do not understand us, other times they seem to us blunt and arrogant as though they were desirous of demonstrating that we are their inferiors. That is not so. They are tremendously human, generous, incapable of cruelty. What happens is that on certain occasions there speak for them men who are not themselves, small or mediocre minds, incapable of detecting and revealing the noble spirit of the land in which they were fortunate enough to see for the first time the light of day.

Fellow citizens, let us through this Congress—a sincere revelation of Puerto Rican opinion against the bill in question—not only prevent a serious discussion of the bill in the United States Congress but also use it to open new avenues leading to a better understanding and solidarity between the continent and the island, and let it be the beginning of a crusade to improve the condition of our people through integral education and the practice of a government of law, to the point that will permit them to join the fraternity of American union with honor and an outlook of mutual usefulness. Such is my fervent wish, such is the basic thought which has inspired my words.

Longer Voting Hours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 12), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Longer Voting Hours" from the Washington Evening Star of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONGER VOTING HOURS

Although constitutionally it has the power to do so, Congress has never up to this time undertaken to fix the time of voting in elections of President, Vice President, and Members of Congress. It has by law fixed the day on which Presidential electors are to be chosen, and the day on which Members of the Senate and House are elected. The day is identical—the Tuesday after the first Monday in November. Only the State of Maine is out of line, and even it varies only in the day for the Senators and Representatives who are elected in September. It chooses its Presidential electors in November along with the rest of the States.

Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, has introduced a bill which provides specifically that the polls in all the States shall be open from 6 a. m. until 9 p. m. on election day. The purpose of the bill is to give greater opportunity to the voters to go to the polls. In his own State of Illinois the polls open at 6 a. m. but close at 5 p. m. Mr. LUCAS points out that this early closing hour makes it impossible for many of the men and women working long hours in war plants, and traveling long distances to and from their work, to cast their ballots. It becomes necessary for them to take time off from their work if they are to vote. This means lessening production. It also may mean reduction in the earnings of the voters.

In many of the States the closing hour for voting in these elections runs from 6 p. m. to 7 p. m., and even to 8 p. m. All of these hours have been fixed by State law, and they vary with the customs and habits of the people. The enactment of a Federal law for uniformity of hours of voting for Federal officers would necessarily conflict with these State laws. However, the Constitution has given Congress authority to alter by law the regulations adopted by the individual States.

For years emphasis has been laid upon the duty of the people to vote in National and State elections. Only by the fullest exercise of the franchise can the people give direction to their government and protect themselves in their rights. In the last presidential election approximately 50,000,000 ballots were cast. But in 1942 only 28,000,000 persons voted for Senators and Representatives and State officers. Several causes have been given for this shrinkage of the vote. There is always greater interest and more strenuous campaigning in a presidential election. But the principal factors contributing to the small vote in 1942 were the absence of many men in the armed forces and the employment of many more men and women in war plants for long hours. Senator LUCAS' bill seeks to remedy the situation created in many States by long working hours, which prevent the workers from going to the polls.

The Lucas bill deserves serious consideration. The election of 1944 promises to be of very great importance, at a critical time in the history of the Republic. Every man and woman eligible to vote should cast a ballot—after gaining as thorough a knowledge of the issues involved as possible.

Big Business Is Running War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 12), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able editorial written by William Allen White, of Kansas, for his newspaper, the Emporia Gazette, and reprinted by Labor of Washington, D. C., a well-known champion of labor organizations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

William Allen White, noted editor of the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette, recently came to Washington to learn first-hand how the war is getting on. After sizing up the situation he wrote his impressions for his paper.

"One cannot move about Washington," he said, "without bumping into the fact that we are running two wars—a foreign war and a domestic war.

"The domestic war front is in the various war boards. Every great commodity industry in this country is organized nationally and many of them, perhaps most of them, are parts of great national organizations, cartels, agreements, which function on both sides of the battle front."

UNCHECKED BY GOD OR MAN

"Here in Washington every industry is interested in saving its own self. It wants to come out of the war with a whole hide and with its organization unimpaired, legally or illegally.

"One is surprised to find men representing great commodity trusts or agreements or syndicates planted in the various war boards.

"It is silly to say New Dealers run this show. It's run largely by absentee owners of amalgamated industrial wealth, men who either directly or through their employers control small minority blocks, closely organ-

ized, that manipulate the physical plants of these trusts.

"For the most part, these managerial magnates are decent, patriotic Americans. They have great talents. If you touch them in nine relations of life out of ten, they are kindly, courteous, Christian gentlemen.

"But in the tenth relation, where it touches their own organization, they are stark mad, ruthless, unchecked by God or man, paranoiacs, in fact, as evil in their design as Hitler."

FIGHT FOR STOCKHOLDERS

"They are determined to come out of this war victors for their own stockholders—which is not surprising. It is understandable also for Hitler to desire to come out of this war, at any cost, victor for the German people.

"But this attitude of the men who control the great commodity industries, and who propose to run them according to their own judgment and their own morals, do not make a pretty picture for the welfare of the common man.

"These international combinations of industrial capital are fierce troglodyte animals with tremendous power and no social brains. They hover like an old silurian reptile about our decent, more or less Christian civilization—like great dragons in this modern day when dragons are supposed to be dead."

The Cause for Which We Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 12), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address I delivered at the Jewish Relief Rally, in the Public Hall, Cleveland, Ohio, May 12, 1943, attended by 9,000 people. The subject of the address was The Cause for Which We Fight.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are at war. This is no time for sham. This is no time for delay. It is time to face the facts. It is time to act.

We stand face to face with the wholesale and retail, heartless and unjust persecutions, deportations, and apparent efforts to exterminate thousands upon thousands of people of our own generation. We are bound closely to these unfortunate people by the everlasting bonds of the common fatherhood of God, brotherhood of man, and our common cause fighting the battles for humanity.

Many, many of those who are suffering are Jews, persecuted as such, and we are met tonight to help them, just as we meet to help our other groups of allies. We need to think at the same time of the Chinese, the Russians, the English, Poles, Greeks, Dutch, Norwegians, Belgians, Danes, French, Yugoslavs, Czechoslovaks, Filipinos, Australians, and many others whom we might well name and whose omission from this list implies no forgetfulness of them or lack of interest in their critical condition. And, in this consideration of the critical condition of our allies on the firing line or nearer to it than we, we may well realize that we on the American continent are free at the moment from this persecution and attack only because of the distances and the strength of arms that have made it possible to keep the enemy from us and to carry the fight to them in other lands. We are fighting for our native land and for the Americas, from Greenland, Canada, and Alaska, down through the United States, Mexico, Central and South America, as well as we are fighting for those whose homes are on the battlefields or in territory occupied by the enemy today.

The people of the United Nations can draw no lines of race, or color, or creed in this great battle for life, and faith, and hope. We are met tonight among other things so that we may more clearly see how we in Cleveland can better do our share for all who need our help.

We stand in this trial by battle face to face with our God and our consciences. It is our clear duty to preserve, at all costs, the sacred life, faith, and hope that has been entrusted to our generation and then to hand it on to the world of tomorrow stronger because of our service today.

The question is not "Shall we do something?" The question is "What shall we do?" The answer is "Fight, fight, fight—day and night—fight, fight, fight." We should not be at this meeting except as it helps us to fight the better. I am here as part of my service in our Senate of the United States to help determine with you how each of us may fight the better and where.

What are the first rules of successful warfare? They are to keep cool, think straight, remember that it is the final victor that wins the war, hit hard, do your share, and, whenever possible, do something more beyond the line of duty, don't complain except to improve, never forget that for which we fight, and never stop fighting until victory is complete.

The special power of the forces of freedom is in the great willingness of those who serve to volunteer their all and serve together knowing that in their union is their strength, that as each contributes all he can to the other, so he receives in return all that the other can contribute to him. This calls for unrestricted individual dedication to the cause. The best way to teach this is to set the best example. Let us spend but little time thinking about what someone else should do for us, but let us make sure that we are doing our own full share for the others. The results of doing so will repay us many times.

Before speaking of the organized fronts upon which we must fight, I repeat that on every front the question starts with the individual. It starts with each of us. The strength of the Allies, the salvation of our cause, and the relief of those in need and suffering depends upon each of us making sure that he is doing his part for the cause as a whole. If you or I have been complaining more than we have been contributing, our first step must be to change our attitude at once and completely. Complaints will not win but faith and common effort will win. It is action we need, not words. The road to victory is the road to relief.

To describe our several fronts, they are: First, the firing line; next, the production line; third, the financial or inflation front, and finally, the home front.

1. The spirit of the firing line is best stated in the response made by Gen. Douglas MacArthur to his welcome in Australia. He said: "I have come as a soldier in a great crusade of personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. * * * There can be no compromise. We shall win or we shall die, and to this end, I pledge you the full resources of all the mighty power of my country and all the blood of my countrymen."

There is no doubt that the men and women on the firing line will meet this standard. It is for us to be sure that we maintain an equal standard.

2. The production line is the source of the equipment, ammunition, and food which is as vital a part of the armed forces as is manpower itself. It is for us to be sure that before we handicap the manpower in the firing lines in order to increase the manpower on the production lines that we first are serving as well per man and per month on the production lines as our soldiers and sailors are serving per man per month on the firing lines. We must contribute to the firing lines and the essential production lines every man and woman who can be spared from the Federal, State, and local civilian rolls of governmental employment.

We must convert as many nonessential activities as possible to those which are essential to winning the war. We must encourage production on our farms and in our industrial plants to the point that makes the greatest possible contribution to winning the war.

3. The financial or inflation front includes us all. It has been the boast of our enemies that self-governing people cannot so discipline themselves as to win the battle against the forces of inflation. To win this battle calls for deep faith in the character of the individual citizen and it calls for a full response worthy of that faith. I believe thoroughly that with an understanding of the issues and a clear definition of policies, we can win this battle against inflation more effectively than can any totalitarian state.

This calls for successful action on many fronts. It calls for victory on each of them. A loss on one may make it impossible to hold the gains on others. Outstanding among these fronts are those of taxation, industrial prices, farm prices, wages, purchase of Government bonds, conservation and rationing of supplies, restriction of extended credit and economy in governmental expenditures.

4. Back of the other fronts is the all-important home front. This is just another name for the spirit of the people at home. The vigor and dedication of this spirit at home is the foundation and inspiration of the spirit on each of the other lines of battle. In addition to maintaining that spirit, one of the greatest personal obligations of each of us is to commmunicate the strength and encouragement of it individually by mail and otherwise to everyone who may be separated from home and especially to those on the distant firing lines. Appreciation is their greatest reward.

For what do we fight? We fight for freedom and opportunity. We fight again for the very principles of our first War of Independence. The purposes and ideals are the same; only the outposts, the battlefields, and the weapons are different. Those who made the freedoms of America possible fought under the inspiration and with the message of the Declaration of Independence ringing in their ears. They had come to America seeking freedom. They succeeded better than they knew in winning that freedom. Not only did they win it for their generation but they lit the light of liberty in the hearts of every human being. They lifted the hope and faith of every living soul. However humble, however persecuted, this new pillar of smoke by day and of fire by night was seen by all. The great crusade of liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery took up the march to the long promised land of the freedom of the soul.

Our responsibility today is to do as well. It is fitting therefore that the Liberty Bell of 1776, in the very words inscribed upon it, again "proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." This time it is not only the embattled farmers of the Atlantic coast who are united in the cause but the freedom-loving people of all the

world. The bell of liberty echoes now around the world. It is heard in every valley and on every mountaintop, in every hut and in every palace. The heartstrings of the world take up its note. It proclaims, "There is no one too humble to be free." Let us, therefore, read again the guiding principles of the Declaration of Independence as a proclamation to our fellow men, everywhere. This is the faith upon which our Nation is founded, this is that for which we fight: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: That all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that, among these, are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." That is the statement of our faith. Following this, there comes the first commandment of democracy: "That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Finally, the declaration concludes: "for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." That is our everlasting dedication to our cause.

In the spirit of this great call to the cause of God and man and to the protection of our Stars and Stripes, let us fit ourselves to the pledge of the men on the firing line, let us say: "We have come as soldiers in a great crusade of personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. * * * There can be no compromise. We shall win or we shall die, and, to that end, we mutually pledge to each other the full resources of all the mighty power of our country and all the blood, devotion, strength, and faith of our hearts and souls as loyal citizens of the United States of America, the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Youth Fights for Its Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include an essay entitled "Youth Fights for Its Heritage."

This essay, which won first place in a city-wide contest among high-school students in Nashville, Tenn., was written by Miss Nelson Fisher, a senior in East Nashville High School.

The citizenship-essay contest in which it was entered among hundreds of others, was sponsored by the Civitan Club of Nashville, and is an annual activity of that club.

The essay follows:

I am an American youth. Next week I will become 18 years old, and you know what that means. My birthday present will be a round of examinations, innoculations, tests, and questioning. I will become a full-fledged soldier. I will learn how to creep up on my enemy and strangle him before he can give an alarm. I will spend hours on kitchen police, on guard duty, on 17-mile hikes. I will give up for a time all hope for education, for a career, or for normal home life. I am like any 18-year-old boy the world over. I am going to fight in the war.

Last Sunday my minister preached a sermon on the failure of the people at home to back up the men at the front. He said, "Where would we be if the boys overseas suddenly decided that America is not worth fighting for?"

Before I enter the Army I am going to find out what America is worth to me. I will be sacrificing my job, my education, my friends, my family, and perhaps my life. After this month I may never hear Mother call to me on Sunday morning, "Get up, lazy, we've got waffles for breakfast." After this month I may never again see the girl with whom I wish to spend my future life. There will be no more of the homely hum-drum scenes or the snatches of eternal beauty that have been my life until this moment. Has America given me enough to make up for my personal loss? Has she passed to me a heritage that is worth fighting for?

Suppose I take a clean sheet of paper, draw a line down its center, and call one side debit, the other credit.

Security at home is America's gift to me. This is the first item in my debit column. My mother has never felt the nagging bitterness of poverty nor the gaunt pinch of hunger. My grandmother has never been forced to scrub filth from the floors of a Government building. My brothers go each morning to a school instead of to a factory where they would be forced to manufacture weapons meant for the destruction of their former allies. My friends have never been imprisoned because of their criticisms of Republican isolationism or the Democratic third term. My neighbors have never been crowded into a huddle, doused with kerosene, and cremated alive. I know that if I leave home my family will be safe from any act of my Government. No harm can come to my people from within America, but America's security has fired many tepid Americans to a white-hot patriotism. America has given me safety, but that is not the only item in my debit column for which I fight.

I fight for the opportunity that America has included in my heritage. Here an atheist may receive an education; a Negro may obtain technical training; a newsboy may secure government office. Race, sex, religious beliefs, and position of the social ladder cannot hinder me or block my climb to success. In America success is meted out only for industry and ability.

From America I have inherited freedom—freedom of mind and freedom of action. If I choose to worship any or no God it is my privilege. If I crave adventure, I may travel wherever I wish. If I elect to spend my days in study and solitude, no rule of my country may force me to do physical labor. Freedom is the most valuable item of my entire debit column. It is the sire of tolerance, independence, and democracy. It is the foundation of the American system of government. The American way of living depends upon tolerance, independence, and democracy.

My American heritage has added the valuable item of fearlessness to my debit column. Security, opportunity, and freedom have contributed toward fostering this quality. I am courageous without being foolhardy. I am hopeful without false optimism. In my fearlessness I am not like the child who, ignorant of a cat's claws, valiantly pulls at its tail. I enter the fight with eyes open to the difficulties that I face, to the possibility of defeat, and to the certainty of confusing post-war problems. I am aware of America's faults and weaknesses. Fearlessness will give me the power to correct and strengthen them.

Faith is the remaining entry in my debit column. I believe that these words which I write are true and unshakable. I am no cynic. Although the word "America" encompasses many wrongs, covers many vices, and hides a multitude of weaknesses, I believe that it still stands for justice, honesty, and strength. My faith will see me through the dark days ahead.

That is my debit column. It is, in reality, America's heritage which she bestows upon her young people. In the past my heritage was founded by struggle; now it is maintained by sacrifice. It will be preserved for future generations by vigilance. The hardship of bleeding feet at Valley Forge gave it birth. The courage of an unknown Indian fighter at New Orleans gave it fame. The grief of Gettysburg gave it stamina. The sacrifice of shrapnel-torn bodies in the shadows of Argonne Forest gave it glory.

My debit column shows the value received; my credit column, the value given. My debit column is filled with priceless entries—America's gifts to me. My credit column is almost bare. Being young in years, learning, and experience, I have been able to make only one entry in paying my debt.

That entry is the commonplace patriotism of an average young boy. Always I have removed my hat when the flag passed in a parade. I have read and have listened intelligently to news articles and radio messages concerning my Government. Sometimes I have even felt my voice choke when a crowd of plain people in a darkened theater sang, "—what so proudly we hailed in the twilight's last gleaming."

I realize that patriotic intentions and sentiments alone are not enough to cancel my debt. Each past generation has scratched its name from the debtor list by increasing the meaning of its inheritance through the addition of some priceless quality. My debt to America must be paid in the same way. Tenacious determination of youth on the battlefield and in peace conference will give up my American heritage the quality of permanence.

Although I am willing to give my life, I realize that neither a maimed body nor death can buy permanence for America's heritage. I cannot buy it through a mere willingness to be a sniper's target or a fragment of flesh in a shell crater. The price for preserving America's heritage requires more than suffering with the assurance of sympathy, or death with the certainty of glowing tribute. It requires death and suffering, plus the drudgery, self-sacrifice, and disappointment of a long struggle.

My life is so dedicated to the country that has given its youth such a heritage of security, opportunity, freedom, fearlessness, and faith. For this reason I am going to war.

Thank you, God, that I have a chance to pay my debt. Thank you for making me firm of chin, clear of eye, straight of body, and strong of mind. Thank you for giving me a steadfast purpose, a critical awareness of my country's wrongs, and a willing determination to pay my debt with ready service. Thank you, God, for making me American youth.

Money—the Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the eighteenth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money.

In this part of Senator Cockrell's speech we learn that the demonitization of silver was followed by a series of financial depressions and that during

the ensuing period there was a continued downward trend of the commodity price level throughout the country.

The eighteenth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

I also refer to a quotation from Mr. Goschen, found at pages 51 and 52 of the conference of 1878. He said:

"England had plainly stated her intention of maintaining her gold standard; Norway had said so, too Germany was of the same opinion; while the Latin Union was not disposed at present to resume the free coinage of silver, or depart from the ratio of 1 to 15½, by which they are now bound. Very little, therefore, could result from the conference, because most of the states had decided beforehand on a particular policy. Austria, Italy, and Russia might vote for the proposition as a theoretical question, but having a forced currency they could not give practical support.

"A theoretical discussion of the double standard, or of the advantages of the single standard, would accordingly, in his judgment, be a waste of time. Of what avail would it be to discuss theories out of which it was known beforehand no practical result could arise, and thus to lay down principles which one was not about to follow If the question of the double standard, however, were set aside, another question might fairly be put to the conference, and one of a most practical and useful character. Assuming that the universal double standard preferred by the United States be not adopted, what will be the future of silver? And toward what end ought all states to work, as far as practicable? The aim, he thought, should be to maintain silver as the ally of gold in all parts of the world where this could be done. A campaign against silver would be extremely dangerous, even for countries with a gold standard.

* * * * *

"The Indian Government had suffered a great loss; the merchants had suffered from fluctuations in value, and public functionaries had suffered from the depreciation, but England had given proof of her faith in regard to silver by waiting to see whether it would not recover its former value. Had the example of other countries been followed in India, and precautions taken by limiting the mintage or introducing gold, silver might have fallen an additional 10 or 15 percent. The laissez faire policy in India had done more than anything else to keep up the value of silver. If, however, other states were to carry on a propaganda in favor of a gold standard and of the demonetization of silver, the Indian Government would be obliged to reconsider its position, and might be forced by events to take measures similar to those taken elsewhere. In that case the scramble to get rid of silver might provoke one of the gravest crises ever undergone by commerce. One or two states might demonetize silver without serious results, but if all demonetized, there would be no buyers, and silver would fall in alarming proportions. Thus all or nearly all states were interested in silver. He would not enter on the situation of France, but take the case of Belgium. Belgium had coined a large quantity of 5-franc pieces, and if the Latin Union came to an end, these coins would necessarily flow back to Belgium, which country would then not escape the general embarrassment.

"If all States should resolve on the adoption of a gold standard, the question arose, would there be sufficient gold for the purpose without a tremendous crisis? There would be a fear, on the one hand, of a depreciation of silver, and one, on the other, of a rise in the value of gold and a corresponding fall in the prices of all commodities.

"Again, there was a further important question. Italy, Russia, and Austria, whenever they resumed specie payments, would require metal, and if all other States went in the direction of a gold standard, these countries, too, would be forced to take gold. Resumption on their part would be facilitated by the maintenance of silver as a part of the legal tender of the world. The American proposal for a universal double standard seemed impossible of realization, a veritable Utopia, but the theory of a universal gold standard was equally Utopian, and, indeed, involved a false Utopia. It was better for the world at large that the two metals should continue in circulation than that one should be universally substituted for the other.

"The conference could not adopt the American proposition, but an attempt might be made, perhaps, elsewhere, to overcome the temporary and abnormal difficulties created by the German stock of £15,000,000 of silver. At present there was a vicious circle; States were afraid of employing silver on account of the depreciation, and the depreciation continued because States refusal to employ it. As long as this sum of £15,000,000 of silver was in the market, an expectant attitude must be maintained."

Mr. Mees, another delegate to that conference, said:

"Mr. Mees stated that he had no instructions which would permit him to vote for the propositions of the United States. It is the opinion, he said, of the Government of the Netherlands that so long as England and Germany shall retain the system of the single gold standard, it will remain impossible for Holland to adopt another system. Not only she cannot bind herself internationally in this matter, but she could not even adopt separately any other than her present system. Such was the sole declaration which the delegate of the Netherlands was authorized to make in the name of his Government.

* * * * *

"Mr. Mees added that if the universal double standard was a Utopia, the single gold standard was also a Utopia, and one that would be very dangerous, if by some impossible combination of circumstances it should come to be realized. The general demonetization of silver undertaken everywhere at once would have the most fatal consequences. It would bring in its train an enormous depreciation in the value of that metal, and would occasion crises alarming in their economic effects. What would be better for everybody would be that the two metals should continue to serve simultaneously and, as Mr. Goschen had said, lend each other a mutual support."

"Have these prophecies been fulfilled? Mr. President, no such prophets have ever made predictions in behalf of the gold standard and had them fulfilled. Here we have pointed out for successive years exactly what would result from the demonetization of silver. Here we have prophecies as to what it would be. What was the general result, all over the world, of this demonetization of silver? The general result, Mr. President, was a fall in the market value of all the great staple products of the world. I quote from Dr. A. Soetbeer, who made a thorough examination and a statement. He says:

"Taking the whole 100 articles together, we find that the general level of prices was higher in 1886 than in 1847–50 by 4.96 percent. The case is very different if we compare the average prices of 1886 with those of the period of 1871–75. This becomes plain if we compare the prices of different groups in 1871–75 and in 1886. Taking 100 as the prices in 1871–75, we find that a fall in prices had taken place, as follows:

	Percent
"Group I. Agricultural products	31
"Group II. Animal products	23
"Group III. Southern products	7
"Group IV. Tropical products	12
"Group V. Minerals and metals	40
"Group VI. Textile material	24
"Group VII. Miscellaneous	32

"For all the 100 articles the comparative prices show a fall in 1886 compared to 1871–75 of 22 percent."

Mr. President, I will read a short extract from this same work, Gold Standard, from page 31:

"If we observe the commencement of the great crisis in the commerce and trade of the world coincides precisely with the demonetization of silver in North America and Germany, we shall easily perceive the connection of causes between that fact and these phenomena, and see that the mischievous results of the demonetization of silver must, from year to year, become more apparent."

But what was the result in England? England demonetized silver in 1816, and at that time England had depreciated paper money.

"The immense resources—"

I am reading from Gold Standard again, pages 16 and 17—

"The immense resources of the British Empire; its supremacy in the commerce of the world; the rapid development of these astonishing industries, resting upon its natural treasures of iron and coal, which the inventions of Watt and Arkwright had called into life; the ceaseless influx of the wealth of India into the British Islands—all this could not prevent the fearful crises which the several rapidly changing phases of the British finance and banking policy necessarily brought on.

"First, following out the doctrines of the prevailing financial school, there was a strong contraction of the note circulation in order to force the resumption of specie payments, in consequence of which a business and financial crisis occurred whose severity has not been exceeded by any in our times. Then inflation, great increase in the issue of notes, and, in consequence of this apparent prosperity, apparent rapid growth of the national interests; then a second contraction of the currency and consequent return of the crisis; and so on until ultimately the present bank act came into existence, the note circulation acquired a certain stability, and the inexhaustible resources of British prosperity were able, undisturbed by human folly, to enrich the country."

What was the condition in Germany, Mr. President? The same result occurred after the demonetization of silver in Germany. The same author, a German author, speaking of the demonetization of silver by Germany, says:

"The fact that a number of smaller states would be forced to follow the example of Germany; that the embarrassments of countries having depreciated standards, as Austria and Russia, would be increased by our proceeding; that France would be compelled to stop its coinage of silver—all this was then considered as unimportant and even as desirable. Even the question whether a general depreciation of silver would follow appeared important only insofar as lower sales of silver would cause greater losses to Germany."

* * * * *

"The adoption of the gold standard by the German Empire was the signal for the immense commercial collapse the deplorable effects of which have not yet been effaced. The like action by the North American Union by later legislation would have remained isolated, and could hardly have produced similar results. There was in that country no large stock of silver which, like that of Germany, had to be placed on the market; there the greenbacks—the national paper money—still formed the basis of circulation. If under these circumstances the United States alone had adopted the gold standard, and Germany retained the silver standard with subsidiary gold coinage, the United States would probably have experienced difficulties and embarrassments, but the acute and general depreciation of silver which resulted from the change in the German standard would never have occurred.

"The introduction of the gold standard in Germany caused no decrease in the circulation of metallic money, as not only the withdrawn German silver and gold coins, but also the not inconsiderable amount of foreign gold circulating in Germany (Napoleons, 10 guldens, 5 francs, Austrian thalers, and guldens), were amply replaced; indeed, the minute calculations by Soetbeer suggests that, including the changes in note circulation caused by the German bank law, the amount of circulating medium has been increased. This, according to the scholastic theory, should have resulted in advanced prices of all commodities and in an export of money. But the higher gold prices, in conjunction with the introduction of free-trade practices in our commercial policy, produced the opposite result, namely, a perceptible increased purchasing power of money, and a decrease in the price of all commodities. The wild chase after gold, in which all countries immediately joined, enhanced the price of gold, and thus caused an unprecedented depreciation of the value of land and commodities. The imperial board was obliged to exercise all circumspection and caution to secure to the country its share of gold by a timely increase in the rate of discount, not to the advantage of production."

Now, Mr. President, what was the result in the United States of the demonetization of silver? It was the coinage act of February 12, 1873, and in the following September such a panic as this country never before experienced shook it from center to circumference, a financial depression which brought hundreds and thousands of citizens of the country into bankruptcy and ruin. So that in every country where it has been adopted the result has been a crisis, a commercial depression, bankruptcy, and ruin.

Sir W. Houldsworth, a delegate of Great Britain, said, at the Brussels Conference, in 1892:

"In the first place, I am, from my position and antecedents, more peculiarly identified with industrial and commercial life than any of my honorable colleagues, and I need scarcely stay to remark that it is industry and commerce in their widest aspects which are most vitally interested in and will be most profoundly affected by the decisions at which this conference arrives. In the second place, I have had the honor and the responsibility of sitting upon both of those important commissions in England, which were appointed specially to examine into questions intimately connected with that which we are called upon to discuss here. I refer to the royal commission on the depression of trade, which sat in 1885, and the gold and silver commission, which sat in 1887-88.

"Now, with regard to the first of these commissions, without going into details, I feel bound to bring before this conference certain conclusions which appear in the reports. The origin of the commission was the widespread feeling in Great Britain, even so far back as 15 years ago, that a deep and abnormal depression of trade had set in, which, unlike previous depressions, showed no signs of recovery. All available statistics were brought before us, and a large body of evidence was taken. Conflicting opinions were expressed both as to the extent and as to the causes of the depression; but at last these five definite conclusions were arrived at:

"1. That the depression dated from the year 1873 or thereabouts.

"2. That it extended to nearly every branch of industry, including agriculture, manufactures, and mining, and that it was not confined to England, but had been experienced to a greater or less degree in all the industrial countries of the world.

"3. That it appeared to be closely connected with the serious fall in general prices, which even then was most observable, though it has since been more strongly marked, resulting in the diminution—in some cases even the total loss—of profit, and consequent irregularity of employment to the wage-earners.

"4. That the duration of the depression has been most unusual and abnormal.

"5. That no adequate cause for this state of things was discoverable, unless it could be found in some general dislocation of values caused by currency changes, and which would be capable of affecting an area equal to that which the depression of trade covered.

"It was in consequence of this report, and at the express recommendation of the depression of trade commissioners themselves, that the gold and silver royal commission was appointed to examine into the 'recent changes in the relative values of the precious metals.' I will not dwell on the report of that second commission, as I feel sure its main conclusions are within the knowledge of most if not all the delegates at this conference. It will be enough to say that it confirmed the findings of the previous commission as to the date of the disturbance, as to the fall in prices, as to the effect of such fall upon all industries; and, in addition, it revealed the serious consequences which had resulted from the destruction of that par of exchange between silver and gold at about 15½ to 1 which had practically existed uninterruptedly for 70 years before 1873, the disruption of which had dislocated, embarrassed, and to some extent destroyed the trade between silver-using and gold-using countries, and turned legitimate commerce into little better than gambling."

In further substantiation of what I have said I quote from the speech of Sir Guilford L. Molesworth, delegate of British India, at the Brussels Monetary Conference:

"Now, this state of things was clearly predicted by Ernest Seyd in 1871, when the severance of the link between gold and silver was first contemplated. His prediction has been so remarkably fulfilled that I must quote his words:

"'It is a great mistake to suppose that the adoption of the gold valuation by other states besides England will be beneficial. It will only lead to the destruction of the monetary equilibrium hitherto existing and cause a fall in the value of silver, from which England's trade and the Indian silver valuation will suffer more than all other interests, grievous as the general decline of prosperity all over the world will be.

"'The strong doctrinarianism existing in England as regards the gold valuation is so blind that when the time of depression sets in there will be this special feature: the economical authorities of the country will refuse to listen to the cause here foreshadowed, every possible attempt will be made to prove that the decline of commerce is due to all sorts of causes and irreconcilable matters; the workman and his strikes will be the first convenient target; then speculation and overtrading will have their turn. * * * Many other allegations will be made totally irrelevant to the real issue, but satisfactory to the moralizing tendency of financial writers. The great danger of the time will be that among all this confusion and strife England's supremacy in commerce and manufactures may go backward to an extent which cannot be redressed when the real cause becomes recognized and the natural remedy is applied.'

"In fulfillment of this prediction, we find that the difficulties under which we labor have been attributed to all sorts of irreconcilable causes. It has been necessary to invent a theory that progress in manufactures, in improved transport, inventions, and banking have caused a species of economic revolution, which has created a new state in the conditions of trade and commerce differing from that which previously existed But they overlook the fact that the alleged causes have been in active operation during the greater portion of the century (and when compared with the previous progress, they were far more pronounced during the middle of the century than at present.)

"It is obvious, therefore, that such a revolution, if it existed, should have arisen at an earlier period, and that it should have developed gradually, instead of setting in suddenly at the exact moment when the link was broken between gold and silver. Moreover, this theory involves another irreconcilable position. It is absurd to suppose that a revolution of this character could have affected gold prices so seriously, and yet should have left silver prices unaffected. Silver is the standard of value of more than half the world, yet silver prices have remained stable, whilst gold prices have fallen from 40 to 50 percent. Whilst shutting their eyes to these facts, the advocates of such a theory are also blind to the following facts:

"1. That the depression which has occurred as a necessary consequence to the suspension of free coinage of silver in France was predicted, and the prediction has been fulfilled to the letter.

"2. That since 1871 the population demanding gold has quadrupled, and the foreign trade demanding gold has trebled.

"3. That the demonetization of silver for international monetary purposes in Europe has caused gold to perform, single-handed, the work previously done by gold and silver combined.

"4. That the annual supply of gold scarcely exceeds the amount required for industrial purposes.

"It follows, as necessary consequences of these facts, that with the increased demand for gold its value must rise, or, in other words, gold prices must fall.

"The judicial blindness must be great which, ignoring this strong evidence of facts, seeks an explanation in irreconcilable theories.

"A very distinguished member of this conference has likened silver to a sick man whose state has been but aggravated by medicines which have been administered to cure him; but I think that this is not surprising, inasmuch as the physicians have not merely mistaken the character of the illness but they have mistaken the invalid. It is gold who is the sick man, not silver. They have mistaken the bloated condition of gold for a symptom of health, whereas it is the symptom of a dangerous disease which now threatens to develop into a fearful crisis, which, as Mr. Rothschild says, 'would be frightful to contemplate.'

"I am not one of those who believe in the efficacy of simple purchases of silver to relieve the situation. I have, for years past, publicly expressed the opinion that the purchases of silver under the Bland Act and similar bills were opposed to the first principles of monetary science, and must, unless the true remedy be eventually applied, end in disaster, from which, if the United States has up to the present escaped, it is because of the great expansion of their population and industry."

I could go on indefinitely quoting authorities and facts, conclusively establishing what I have asserted.

Chinese Exclusion Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 12), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have before me a letter from Mr. James L.

Wilmeth, national secretary of the National Council of the Junior Order, United American Mechanics, which reads as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL, JUNIOR ORDER
UNITED AMERICAN MECHANICS,
Philadelphia, May 11, 1943.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: I have been advised by the clerk of the House Immigration Committee that hearings will be held on H. R. 2428 and H. R. 2429 on May 19 and 20. These two bills call for the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws and the abrogation of the treaty with China on which our exclusion laws are based.

It will be appreciated if the brief, or statement, that I sent you on this subject, could appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to the hearings on the 19th and 20th.

Appreciating your many courtesies and with assurances of my kind fraternal regards, I am

Very sincerely yours,
JAMES L. WILMETH,
National Secretary.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD the brief pertaining to the Chinese exclusion laws referred to in the letter just read.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE YELLOW PERIL—CHINESE EXCLUSION LAWS

(Statement by James L. Wilmeth, national secretary, Junior Order United American Mechanics)

Asiatic immigration brought a new problem from immigration conditions of earlier generations. Immigration had been very largely confined to the Eastern States and to those States where the Government offered public lands to settlers. The first immigration which came to the western part of the United States was largely Chinese. The Japanese began to appear in that section of the country following the close of the Civil War. The first reaction of the western people to immigrants of the yellow race was favorable. The Japanese who came first were students and scholars who were anxious to learn about western civilization. There was, naturally, a welcome hand extended to the Japanese, because of the opening up of the hermit empire in 1856 under American influence. In the course of time immigrants from the yellow race increased tremendously, and they were mostly of the coolie class, classified as Chinese laborers.

The eastern part of the United States was able to absorb and amalgamate large numbers of European immigrants because they came from the same kind of parents or ancestors as we did. These European peoples readily amalgamated, and, in the great melting pot, they soon became an important part and parcel of the American people. It was soon found that the Asiatics, or yellow race, were so different in racial qualities, habits, and customs that it was practically impossible to make American citizens out of them.

As has been said, "This was the beginning of our Asiatic problem." While there were then many political and economic leaders who wanted to welcome all immigrants, as they had done before, there were others who argued that the yellow race would always remain aliens among us, "undigested," an obstacle to our Government and to our social organization. To the majority it seemed that it would be utter folly for the American people to accept wholesale Chinese laborer immigration, thus creating the yellow-race problem, which would be difficult.

Again, it was soon ascertained that there was a danger in Asiatic immigration, which was quickly seen by organized labor. It was that these oriental people had been brought up in a civilization with much lower standards of living than we were accustomed to here in America, willing to work long hours for small pay. Their method of living and the cheap foods which they consumed put them in position so that they could afford to work for prices at which the average American citizen would starve.

To compete with vast hordes of Chinese laborer immigration would have a strong tendency to lower our citizenship to the oriental way of living. When these conditions became imminent and alarming there was a great hue and cry from the Pacific States to curb Chinese labor immigration. So vigorous was this fight carried on by the people in our western States that in the course of time the people of the Nation adopted their viewpoint and supported their contention by the enactment of the Chinese exclusion law, approved May 6, 1882 (22 Stat. L. 58), which suspended the immigration of Chinese laborers to the United States for a period of 10 years, and provided penalties for violation of the act.

This exclusion law was based upon the treaty between the United States and China concerning immigration (22 Stat. L. 826) concluded and signed November 17, 1880; ratification advised by Senate, May 5, 1881; ratified by the President, May 9, 1881; ratifications exchanged July 19, 1881; proclaimed by the President of the United States, October 5, 1881.

The act of July 5, 1884 (23 Stat. L. 115), styled, "An act to amend the act of May 6, 1882," continued the suspension of Chinese laborers for 10 years, and prescribed penalties for violation; laid heavy responsibilities upon masters of vessels against bringing Chinese into the United States illegally. This act contained many of the provisions of the former act, such as keeping a list, identification of Chinese who were entitled to remain in the United States; prevented Chinese from entering into United States by land; and imposed the same restrictions as required of Chinese persons seeking to land from a vessel. Authorized the removal of any Chinese person found unlawfully in the United States to the country whence he came, after being brought before some justice or judge or commission and found to be illegally in the United States.

The act of September 13, 1888 (25 Stat. 476) was an act to prohibit the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States. It permitted Chinese officials, teachers, students, merchants, or travelers for pleasure to enter the United States, provided they obtained the permission of the Chinese Government, under proper certification. This act, like the previous one, applied to all persons of Chinese race, whether subjects of China, or any other foreign power, excepting Chinese diplomatic or consular officers, and their attendants. The words "Chinese laborers" means both skilled and unskilled laborers, and Chinese employed in mining. Prohibited Chinese that had been in the United States as laborers, returning here, after having left the United States, with certain exceptions. Required returning Chinese to reenter at the port from which he had departed, with certain exceptions. Called for arrest of Chinese laborers unlawfully in the United States, and their trial; also provided for appeals, and provided penalties for persons aiding or abetting Chinese laborers.

An act, approved May 5, 1892 (27 Stat. L. 25) extended Chinese exclusion for a period of 10 years; provided for the removal of Chinese illegally in the United States; called for the securing of certificates of eligibility to remain in the United States.

Act approved November 3, 1893 (28 Stat. L. 7) amended the act of May 5, 1892; required Chinese laborers to obtain certificate of residence within 6 months after the passage of this act. Provided for trial of those unlawfully within the United States; defined "laborers" to be both skilled and unskilled manual laborers, including Chinese employed in mining, fishing, huckstering, laundering, peddling; those engaged in packing, drying preserved shell fish or other fish, for home consumption or exportation.

Act approved July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. L. 750–1) being a joint resolution, to provide for annexing of Hawaiian Islands to the United States. It contained the following:

"There shall be no further immigration of Chinese into the Hawaiian Islands; except upon such conditions as are now, or may hereafter be allowed by the laws of the United States. No Chinese, by reason of anything herein contained shall be allowed to enter the United States from the Hawaiian Islands."

Appropriation Act of June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. L. 588–611), for the Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, carried an appropriation for the enforcement of the Chinese Exclusion Act, to prevent the unlawful entry of Chinese into the United States by the appointment of suitable officers to enforce the laws in relation thereto, etc.

An act, approved April 29, 1902 (32 Stat. L. pt. 1–176), was an act which, by its express terms, stated that all laws in force, prescribing and regulating the coming of Chinese persons, and persons of Chinese descent, into the United States, and the residence of such persons therein, including sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 14 of the act entitled "An act to prohibit the coming of Chinese laborers into the United States," approved September 13, 1888, be, and the same are hereby reenacted, extended, and continued, so far as the same are consistent with treaty obligations, until otherwise provided by law.

Act approved April 27, 1904 (33 Stat. L. 394–42), this act amended an act of Congress, approved April 29, 1902, being an act prohibiting the coming into, and to regulate residence within the United States and its territories, of all persons of Chinese descent. This continued the provisions of the previous act in the following words, "The same are hereby reenacted, extended, continued without modification, limitation, or condition; the said laws shall also apply to the island territory under the jurisdiction of the United States.

Appropriation Act, August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 417, 476), for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, contained an item, under the Immigration Service, for preventing the unlawful entry of Chinese into the United States, by appointment of suitable officers to enforce the laws in relation thereto, and the expense of returning to China, all Chinese persons found to be unlawfully in the United States, including the cost of imprisonment and actual expense of conveyance of Chinese persons to the frontier or seaport for deportation.

A similar provision appears under the Appropriation Act June 23, 1913 (38 Stat. L. 4, 65), for the Treasury Department, Immigration Service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

The Japanese fared better than the Chinese because Japanese immigration was not excluded until 1924. It is generally conceded that the Chinese people are more peaceable and less warlike than the Japanese. It is a well-known fact that Japanese aliens in this country prospered under the new liberties and freedoms which they enjoyed in the United States. Nevertheless, they were never accepted with welcome, and especially by citizens of California, where, as early as 1913, a law was passed by the legislature of that State forbidding them to purchase and own land. It was, however, not very difficult for

them to evade the main purposes of the anti-landowning laws. Under the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the child or children of any alien, born here in the United States, is a full-fledged American citizen. Through a system of trusteeship, land could be and was purchased and held in trust for these young American-citizen infants, born of Japanese parents. In this connection it may not be amiss to say that a system of dual citizenship has flourished among the Japanese people on the west coast of our country from the fact that they are American citizens when born here, while, under the laws of the Empire of Japan, they still remain citizens of that country.

Shortly after the unwarranted, dastardly, treacherous attack at Pearl Harbor, by the war lords of the Japanese Empire on the United States, which plunged us into war with Japan, approximately 130,000 Japanese, who lived in the western part of the country, were moved inland, under Executive order of the President, by the Secretary of War. This was done in the interest of public safety. It is estimated that fully half, if not more, of these Japanese people so moved were citizens of the United States, by reason of having been born here in this country of alien, unnaturalizable Japanese parents. Notwithstanding these salient facts, the Government did not shirk its duty, in causing these people to be moved inland, at tremendous expense, and with continuing expense for their maintenance and support.

We are finding no fault with our Government for handling this yellow-race problem so quickly and so expeditiously. As a matter of fact, at or about the time the Executive order was issued by the President of the United States, to move the Japanese people inland, for the safety of America and its citizens, a bill was introduced in the Senate of the United States authorizing doing the very thing which the President carried out by Executive order.

It is unfortunate that the Japanese were not excluded with the Chinese, as both classes are of the yellow race, and are unassimilable. Probably the reason why such an act of exclusion against the Japanese was not passed was because of the small number here at that time, and of the rather high type of Japanese people who first came to our shores. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the Japanese people are as unassimilable as are the Chinese, and are unsuitable to become American citizens.

Years ago, we heard of the "Yellow Peril," which subsided following the exclusion laws of both the Chinese and Japanese.

Bills have been introduced in the Congress to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws. We submit that there is just as much reason today for people of the yellow race to be prohibited from coming into this country as immigrants, as there was in 1882, when the first Chinese Exclusion Act was passed, and in 1924, when Japanese immigration was stopped. If there are any extenuating circumstances today, it is that China is an ally of the United States, in the war against Japan. With the Chinese, this is a case of one branch of the yellow race being at war with another branch of the same race. We submit that the fact of the United States being allied with China in this war affords no sound reason or excuse to repeal the exclusion laws, which kept Chinese hordes out of this country. These exclusion laws gave valued support and protection to American labor. We submit that it would be ruinous to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws. It would bring back the same situation which existed 60 years ago on the west coast, when the people demanded relief from cheap Chinese labor, which was so disastrous in its competition with our American working people. The Chinese laborers' standards of living, the long hours they are willing to work, and the low wages they are willing to receive would bring disaster and ruin to our working people. Such competition could not be endured. It would be just as bad now as it was then.

Some argue that, in addition to being an ally of China at the present time, the recent good-will tour of the wife of the general of the Chinese Republic has opened up new fields of thought, and new avenues of sentiment, which should cause us, as a people to throw open our doors to Chinese people, and extend our arms to receive them. We can scarcely conceive of a more deceptive line of argument. The same fundamentals apply to the Chinese people today as did 60 years ago. We submit that this fair and accomplished woman, who was accorded the high privilege of addressing both Houses of Congress, and who merits our respect and admiration, is not a fair representative of the rank and file of the Chinese laboring people.

The American people are doing their full share, and making wonderful sacrifices to feed and clothe the people of Europe and of China, and to assist them in winning the war and in getting back into their normal way of life. Notwithstanding our help and our sympathy for these allies, both in Europe and in China, we should not break down immigration barriers, and permit people to come here by the millions, to the detriment of our own domestic economy, which will be subjected to a terrific strain as soon as this war is over and the millions of American men and women who are now fighting on the far-flung battle lines of the world come back home, seeking places to work.

We submit that the manpower and womanpower shortage in this Republic today has not reached the acute stage where we need to let people come in such numbers as they choose, to work in jobs which, to say the least, will be temporary, and which will be required by our returning soldiers.

We admitted more than 38,000,000 of people here in 20 years, following 1820. These people were needed at that time to help develop the country. That need does not exist today as it did then, when we had some of the choicest stock of immigrants from all countries of Europe.

Under existing quotas, 150,000 is the limit of people who can come to our shores in any one year. These are divided among the nations of the earth, based upon a percentage of the 1890 census. The basis of immigration restriction today is on a better regulated and more scientific basis than it has ever been before in the history of our country. That restriction of immigration is drastic cannot be denied. It should be. The protection of our American working people demands restrictive laws rigidly enforced. We submit that immigration restriction is now a fixed policy, which has the support of an overwhelming majority of the American people. This is as it should be. It must not be destroyed or scrapped.

H. R. 2428 and H. R. 2429, introduced into Congress recently, for the repeal of Chinese exclusion laws, should be defeated. It would be ruinous to our domestic economy to pass those two bills; it would subject American labor to competition which would be blighting and disastrous; it would renew a stream of yellow people, unfitted and unsuited for American citizenship, and would foist upon us a race problem that, in the end, would probably give us more serious trouble than we have experienced from the Japanese, whom we now have interned, and under military control, in order to secure the safety of our people and our country.

The preamble to the treaty hereinbefore referred to recited that constantly increasing immigration of Chinese laborers to the Territory of the United States was embarrassing; in article I of said treaty, reference is made that if the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States or their residence therein affects or threatens to affect the interest of that country, or to endanger the good order of the said country or any locality or territory thereof, then, in that event, the immigration of Chinese laborers may be regulated, limited, or suspended.

Pursuant to these treaty provisions, the United States did, through the Congress, take action to exclude, regulate, and limit Chinese immigration, because of the embarrassment consequent thereto; that such immigration seriously affected the best interest of the United States. We have no token or reason now why this very same condition would not occur again, if the Chinese exclusion laws were repealed, as proposed in H. R. 2428 and H. R. 2429.

We are of the opinion that if the Chinese exclusion laws were repealed, the same situation would soon follow, as the conditions which made it necessary, in the opinion of Congress, to exclude the Chinese people from coming into the country. The experiment of Chinese immigration, which was indulged in for so many years, was most unsatisfactory. We submit that the same conditions would follow, if these Chinese exclusion laws should be repealed.

The national council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, through its national board of officers, councils, and members, is of the opinion that the best interest of the people of United States will be served by continuing the treaty with China, concerning immigration, in full force and effect, and the laws made in pursuance thereof to be not repealed.

The Failure of the Bermuda Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me Saturday, May 15, 1943, over the Blue Network station WJZ:

On December 17, last, as a result of an aroused public opinion, the United Nations issued a declaration denouncing the crimes of the Nazis in murdering and decimating the Jews and other minority peoples in Axis controlled countries. On all sides arose importunities and even demands that something be done to save the Jews from complete annihilation. Hitler had vowed that he would make Europe Judenrein (free of Jews).

More than 4 months elapsed before there was called the British-American Conference on the refugee problem in Bermuda. In those more than 4 months of waiting, thousands of hapless victims had perished.

With the conference announcement we thought, in common parlance, we were "getting somewhere," but, alas, the proclamation issued by our venerable and estimable Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, setting up the conference so narrowed the framework of the agenda for discussion at Bermuda as to dash our hopes to the ground. All refugees shall be considered, it was declared, as one group without regard to race, religion, or political belief. In addition thereto, areas for refuge shall be sought as near as possible to the homeland to permit the return of the victims upon cessation of hostilities. It is quite obvious to even the most casual observer of the European scene that the needs of one oppressed group differ from another

or a third. The urgencies of rescue differ in degree if not in kind. It most certainly cannot be solved in lumping all groups together. To rephrase an old adage, sauce for the goose may be poison for the gander. Let us view the other limitation through the simple expedient of glancing at the map of Europe. Victims abound in Poland, Roumania, Germany, France, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Holland, and Hungary. Talking about establishing areas of rescue and haven near homelands is a bit of euphony without relation to existing facts.

Another body blow was struck with the announcement of the names of the delegates selected to represent the two nations. Those selected had never displayed any real understanding of the horrors faced by the defenseless victims; the attendant problems had been alien to them from the start. Prior to or even at the conference, not one had displayed a driving and directed interest in the mass murders, the blutbaden. The facts were present. What was conspicuous by its absence was the will to action.

Despite the fact that life and death were involved for hundreds of thousands of innocent men, women and children, apparently, the diplomatic protocol and punctilios were to be scrupulously observed.

Though the press was practically excluded except for the members of the Associated Press, the United States and the International News Service, and a few others, and despite the fact that uttermost secrecy surrounded the activities of the conferees, information seeped through by way of the grapevine and clearly indicated that the accusations of nonfeasance directed against the delegates were amply justified.

The delegates met and have departed and with their departure have gone all our hopes for real and genuine relief.

Those of us who have followed the proceedings at Bermuda at first with a belied optimism replaced by despair find ourselves puzzled by the obvious. Why was it that organizations like the Quakers and Joint Distribution Committee, long familiar with the problems of rescue, were barred? Such organizations might have given concrete, practicable suggestions resulting in the surcease of the tribulations and travail of the stateless Jews and persecuted Catholics and Protestants. Chairman Dodd stated at the conference, "The cooperation of others must be solicited." Again, we are puzzled by the obvious. Why weren't Canada, Brazil, British South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Mexico, Portugal, Spain, and Turkey invited to the conference in the first instance? The neutral countries will inevitably have to be contacted, either singly or at another conference. More precious time will elapse, more complications unearthed until there just won't be any left to rescue.

Victory, the spokesmen said, is the only solution. In the meantime, let the millions guilty of no wrongdoing be trampled to death, their lives snuffed out by lethal gases and guns, the women outraged and the children mangled. After victory, disembodied spirits will not present so difficult a problem; the dead no longer need food, drink, and asylum.

From what I can judge, the world in general is not callous to those subjected to Hitler's bloodlust and to those hundreds of thousands in Hitler's slaughter pits and asphyxiation chambers. But, apparently, some in high authority in our State Department and in the British Foreign Office have preferred to indulge in a sort of diplomatic tight-rope walking rather than to pointing and finding a way for immediate relief. They are those, it would seem, who have bent their knees to the hush-hush policy and who likewise fear to wound the sensibilities of one or more of our Allied Nations.

Agitation and protest do have a decided influence upon the acts of mankind. We know that Spain, as a result of mass protest, has become more markedly hospitable to the Jewish refugees coming out of occupied Europe over the Pyrenees. We have some evidence of the broadening of the opportunity for liberation for the Jews in Italy. She has grown much softer and more receptive to the world's condemnation of brutalities directed against a helpless race. Italy has clearly changed her attitude toward the Jews and is according them better treatment and greater freedom. This is so, the statement by one of our own delegates to the Bermuda conference that nothing is accomplished by such protest meetings as was held in Madison Square Garden notwithstanding.

The whole difficulty can be summed up with the much abused word "appeasement." It should be clear by now that such a policy got us nowhere. It failed in Japan, in Martinique. It has forced us to keep on the Spanish Morocco border thousands of troops which might have been engaged elsewhere. Appeasement of Moslems actually caused some well-intentioned but woefully informed American officials to applaud the abrogation by General Giraud of the Cremieux Decree, which abrogation has deprived more than 100,000 Jews of their right to French citizenship, a right which they have enjoyed since 1870. This negation of a prized privilege and right was done to appease the fascists, the colonials and the Arabs and other pressure groups that have undoubtedly been importuning General Giraud.

It is hard for Americans to understand the abrogation of the Cremieux decree. The best way to do so would be to ask what would be the reaction of American public opinion if it were to discover that American citizens of two or three generations' standing, with a record of having heroically served on the battlefields of Artois and Argonne and who had quickened the industrial, scientific, and artistic life of the Nation had suddenly been deprived of their American citizenship. That is the situation that confronts the Jews of Algeria today. It really means that the "four freedoms" which we are to bring to peoples of Axis dominated countries will be permitted to run down the drain pipe.

Apparently, this policy of appeasement is the same that controlled the Bermuda Conference.

I am of the opinion that the benefits from this Anglo-American conference can fit into a tiny capsule.

The delegates seemed primarily concerned with saving those who have already been saved, that is, the thirty or forty thousand who were lucky enough to escape Hitler's Festung Europa into Spain, Portugal, or Turkey. There was no need to waste 10 days of precious time on the lovely island of Bermuda in order to find havens in other places.

Of course, the final report will contain pious protestations against Nazi atrocities. The delegates, figuratively, will raise their hands high to Heaven and in most dignified and solemn ways express sympathy. The time is past for sympathy; we want action; we want immediate action; we want long-term action—not only for the sake of the innocent victims of brutality, but for our own sakes.

History's finger of scorn will be pointed directly at us if we do anything less.

Doubtlessly, one of the recommendations of the Bermuda conference will be an enlarged intergovernmental committee on refugees. This committee stems from the Evian conference in 1938, at which 31 countries participated. The Bermuda conference will recommend inclusion of delegates from Spain, Portugal, and Turkey, and probably from other countries. There will be set up an executive committee of this intergovernmental committee on refugees and, in all likelihood, paid administrators will be employed. To this executive committee would be entrusted the task of putting into effect the few concrete proposals for aiding the refugees.

The fact that time is of the essence apparently did not appear to be pertinent to the problem. In the meantime, 10,000 victims are killed daily by the Nazi Vernichtungkolonnen and 10,000 more are daily made homeless. Hitler's hangmen do not wait for any Bermuda.

In the midst of this unwarranted procrastination, we are informed that a new wave of anti-semitism is being launched by the German press under the skillful guidance of Herr Goebbels, who uncompromisingly proclaims annihilation of the Jews as the Nazis' goal and asserts that the Third Reich is prepared to go to any extreme in the use of horrifying measures to attain that end and further proclaims that mercy and sentiment have no place in the solution of the Jewish problem.

The propagandistic success of Dr. Goebbel's "Katyn incident"—the alleged killing of Polish officers in Russia—appears to have encouraged German publicity to undertake a similar barrage along anti-Semitic lines on the assumption that such a campaign would gain a reaction in anti-Jewish sentiment in Britain and the United States. The propaganda minister writes as follows: "Healthy public instincts are beginning to assert themselves in enemy countries. Hostility to Jews is everywhere becoming more apparent."

In a paucity of reports, we are informed that the delegates considered as insurmountable obstacles the lack of transportation facilities and likewise feared that whatever food might be supplied to the unfortunate victims of the Nazi scourge would be pilfered by the enemy. It is passing strange that Swedish ships are going to Greece to feed the starving there. Why could not Swedish vessels and other vessels of neutral countries be pressed into service to bring food, medicine, and succor to those in other Axis controlled countries. I am informed there are available ships. Where there is a will there is always a way. When the United Nations wished to ease the blockade when it was necessary to feed the Greek people, they did so. Why should it not be applicable to the Jews in the polish ghettos? Should there be evidence that the Nazis are stealing this food, the giving thereof should be stopped summarily.

Suggestions must have been made that the International Red Cross be implemented to make suitable arrangements, but we are informed that the door was closed to such well-known and often-tried vehicle of succor.

At the conclusion of the conference, the participants blandly stated that there was no immediate prospect of escape for the potential refugees in the Axis grip.

Some of the Jews to be aided are in Bulgaria and Roumania, but the Bermuda conference can claim no credit for their rescue. Arrangements had previously been made for their transfer to Palestine. I cannot reconcile such a plan with the conclusion of the conferees that there should be no negotiations with Hitler, directly or indirectly, and that therefore no possibilities exist for aiding potential refugees. If negotiations can be held with King Boris in Bulgaria, Horthy in Hungary, Antonescu in Roumania, Mussert in Holland, and Quisling in Norway, we must seize upon that opportunity. But to say at the outset, without trial and frustration, that a rapprochement should not be initiated with the enemy or enemy lickspittle is tragic, indeed.

We deal with the enemy constantly in the matter of exchange of prisoners. Switzerland stands ready at all times as diplomatic

agent to represent us in all matters. They would be willing to consider questions involving refugees, food, clothing, and medicine, and the like to be sent to those bludgeoned, tortured, and starved by Hitler.

And what about the Vatican? It, most assuredly, considering its most liberal and humane pronouncements, I am sure, stands ready to convey terms and conditions of relief and rescue to the enemy.

And what about Palestine? In the most cruel manner imaginable, the British Foreign Office proclaims that the MacDonald White Paper of 1939 shall not be amended.

I remember the words of the present Prime Minister of England when the House of Commons considered the MacDonald White Paper.

"There is much," he said, "in this white paper which is alien to the spirit of the Balfour Declaration, but I will not trouble about that. I select the one point upon which there is plainly a breach and repudiation of the Balfour Declaration—the provision that Jewish immigration can be stopped in 5 years' time by the decision of an Arab majority. What is that but a breach of faith?"

With the white paper there will soon be a complete stoppage of immigration to the Jewish homeland. The MacDonald White Paper permits the entrance of 75,000 Jews in a 5-year period. Of those 75,000 only 29,000 certificates of entrance remain unused. Yet, Chaim Weizmann states there is room in Palestine for 400,000 families, making a total of 2,000,000 souls. I remind the American delegates that by solemn act of Congress, we approved and embraced the Balfour Declaration. We are in duty bound to protest its repudiation by Great Britain. Did any of our American delegates remonstrate against the denial of this declaration?

The sole purpose of the white paper was to appease the Arabs. Again, we have the failure of appeasement as in Iraq and Iran. In the past few years, it has been shown that the attitude of the Arabs was inimical to Great Britain. So do illustrations of the failure of appeasement add up to show its futility.

Sad to relate, as far as we know, on both sides of the Atlantic, not one of the delegates had the fortitude to protest. Is it possible that these delegates were pledged in advance as to what to do or not to do? I don't want to believe that.

Look at the map of the globe and you will see spread everywhere British commonwealth dominions, colonies, protectorates, condominiums and mandated territories, all under the aegis of the British Empire. They include: Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, Union of South Africa, South-West Africa, Northern and Southern Rhodesia, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, Uganda, Kenya, Canada, Labrador, Newfoundland, the Bahama Islands, Bermuda, etc., Palestine, Transjordan, Nigeria, Gambia, Sierra Leone, British Guiana, Windward Islands, Leeward Islands, Falkland Islands, South Georgia, and so forth. Every one of these far-flung regions covering more than 3 times the size of the United States is hermetically sealed to immigration by virtue of the adamant action of the Bermuda Conference.

In and out of Nazi-controlled countries, refugees frantically beseech help and succor.

There are still other territories that could be considered. What about Madagascar and other French colonies, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, Lower California, Soviet Russia?

We are a party to this catastrophe. To say that opening up of any of these lands would interfere with the conduct of the war as has been said by the delegates is just balderdash. Did the delegates canvass the possibilities of Egypt, of Libya, Morocco? Algeria and Tunisia were not at that time freed of the Nazi pincers, but now with North Africa cleared of the Nazi vermin, there should be plenty of room for refugees. There can be carved out a bigger and better homeland for the victims of Axis tyranny.

To the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees must be sent men with courage, understanding, sympathy and vision, men who are not under the thumb of the protocol. Men of experience must be chosen as delegates, those who have been to devastated regions and know from personal observations how best the refugees and potential refugees can be served, how the obstacles can be surmounted, men who will not talk in terms of difficulties that cannot be solved, but who will bring the pressure of personality and profound compassion to bear upon the conclave so that something will be done—done in the neutral countries, in the areas of the United States and Great Britain, in Palestine.

And, finally, since time is running against us, that Intergovernmental Committee should be summoned with all possible dispatch.

The grim Nazi reapers of death, desolation and destruction will not wait. We dare not wait until Hitler carries out his schemes of brutality which Herr Goebbels has set forth in the following language: "If the day should ever come," Goebbels wrote some time ago in his weekly Das Reich, "when we must go, if some day we are compelled to leave the scene of history, we will slam the door so hard that the universe will shake and mankind will stand back in stupefaction."

The Bermuda Conference has adjourned but the problem has not adjourned. It cries for immediate solution and not for excuses.

There are 28 nations fighting Hitler and yet not one including England and the United States has said, "We will take Hitler's victims."

We as humans have the right to ask the United Nations to rise to action to aid Hitler's oppressed and persecuted. We have the right as humans to ask that they not sink into a morass of more words, more discussions, more meandering plans, lest we forget what we are fighting for.

Excerpts From Addresses of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JED JOHNSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, when China's first lady, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, addressed a joint assembly of the Congress of the United States a few weeks ago, at which time she delivered one of the most impressive and effective addresses ever made in or to the Congress, those of us who saw and heard her realized that we were in the presence of one of the greaest women in all the world. In fact, she has been referred to as the first lady of the world. Certainly she has no peer as an effective public speaker. Her English, rhetoric, enunciation, and stage poise were superb.

More important by far, however, than all of that, the little American-educated Chinese woman impressed those of us who saw her as being absolutely sincere, with an abiding faith in the justness of her cause. Members of Congress, as well as the millions who listened intently to her over the radio, were impressed and deeply moved as she pled for her beloved country.

From the moment Mme. Chiang began speaking to the Congress, the eyes of every listener were focused on her and a hushed stillness settled over that body, as well as over the crowded galleries. One knew that she was desperately in earnest. She talked to the Congress as if she realized the result of her address meant life or death for her beloved China.

It will be remembered that her father, Dr. Soong, was educated by a humble American missionary in China. That marked a new day in the history of the Chinese people. Dr. Soong not only accepted the Christian faith, but his three American-educated daughters are devout and active Christians. We are told that more Bibles have been distributed in China during the past quarter of a century than during the previous thousand years. The influence of that Book of Books, the Bible, backed by the simple Christian faith and beautiful life of his helpmate and other members of her family, including her Christian mother, so profoundly impressed her famous husband, the Generalissimo, who was reared a Buddhist, that he, too, accepted the Christian religion many years ago and today is a faithful follower of the lowly Nazarene.

Under permission granted me, I am including as a part of my remarks, some short quotations from some of her recent addresses made in the United States, including her masterly effort before the joint assembly of the Congress. Remembering that Sunday is Mother's Day, I am also quoting from a beautiful tribute to Madam Chiang's mother by the famous and brilliant little Chinese woman. It is fortunate that these addresses have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They will be good reading in the post-war days, or a thousand years hence. Here are some excerpts referred to—spoken before the Congress—February 18, 1943, page 1108, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The American people have every right to be proud of their fighting men in so many parts of the world.

True patriotism lies in possessing the morale and physical stamina to perform faithfully and conscientiously the daily tasks so that in the sum total the weakest link is the strongest.

Your soldiers have shown conclusively that they are able stoically to endure homesickness, the glaring dryness, and scorching heat of the Tropics, and keep themselves fit and in excellent fighting trim. They are amongst the unsung heroes of this war, and everything possible to lighten their tedium and buoy up their morale should be done. That sacred duty is yours. The American Army is better fed than any army in the world.

America is not only the cauldron of democracy, but the incubator of democratic principles. At some of the places I visited, I met the crews of your air bases. There I found first generation Germans, Italians, Frenchmen, Poles, Czechoslovaks, and other nationals. Some of them had accents so thick that, if such a thing were possible, one could not cut them with a butter knife. But there they were—all Americans, all devoted to the

same ideals, all working for the same cause and united by the same high purpose.

You, as representatives of the American people, have before you the glorious opportunity of carrying on the pioneer work of your ancestors, beyond the frontiers of physical and geographical limitations. Their brawn and thews braved undauntedly almost unbelievable hardships to open up a new continent. The modern world lauds them for their vigor and intensity of purpose and for their accomplishment. You have today before you the immeasurably greater opportunity to implement these same ideals and to help bring about the liberation of man's spirit in every part of the world.

We of this generation who are privileged to help make a better world for ourselves and for posterity should remember that, while we must not be visionary, we must have vision so that peace should not be punitive in spirit and should not be provincial or nationalistic or even continental in concept, but universal in scope and humanitarian in action, for modern science has so annihilated distance that what affects one people must of necessity affect all other peoples.

When the Seventy-seventh Congress declared war against Japan, Germany, and Italy, Congress for the moment had done its work. It now remains for you, the present representatives of the American people, to point the way to win the war, to help construct a world in which all peoples may henceforth live in harmony and peace.

May I not hope that it is the resolve of Congress to devote itself to the creation of the post-war world? To dedicate itself to the preparation for the brighter future that a stricken world so eagerly awaits?

At Madison Square Garden, March 3, 1943:

We live in the present, we dream of the future, but we learn eternal truths from the past. It would be just as irrational for a man to claim that he was self-made as for a nation to believe that it could be self-sufficient. Nations and individuals are but links between the past and the future. It would be interesting and valuable, therefore, for us to consider the deep meaning which lies behind the Chinese proverb: "Watch the cart ahead," in our endeavor to avoid the pitfalls in which former civilization, dynasties, and systems have fallen.

Those pitfalls are many, but one of the deepest and most omnivorous is pride. That pitfall has swallowed many whose arrogance led them to think that they could safely and permanently defy mankind's deep-rooted sense of justice and right-dealing. Figuratively speaking, it was only yesterday that Herr Hitler said: "No human power can ever oust the Germans from Stalingrad." Where are those Germans today?

Without necessarily possessing a very profound knowledge of the history of the world, we can take warning from the fate of the Roman and Persian Empires and the ephemeral system established by Napoleon. We ask ourselves why is it that the ancient Persian Empire only remained at its comparative zenith for a few centuries, while the high tide of the Napoleonic era only lasted for a few decades?

We read that Sapor, the Persian Emperor, after defeating the Romans, used the neck of Valerian, the Roman Emperor, as a footstool for mounting his horse. Was it this cruelty and arrogance of the conqueror toward the conquered which contributed to the fall of the dictatorships whose leaders strutted about in a frenzy of exhibitionism during their short day as invincible conquerors and masters?

The Axis Powers have shown that they have no respect for anything but brute force, and such being the case, they logically hold that conquered peoples should become shackled slaves. They lack the imagination to visualize the fact that a man may be enslaved physically but cannot be controlled in his thoughts and in his innate desire to be free. Nor do they recognize that, if people are deprived of responsibility, there can be no real discipline, for indubitably the highest kind of government is maintained through self-discipline.

All nations, great and small, must have equal opportunity of development. Those who are stronger and more advanced should consider their strength as a trust to be used to help the weaker nations to fit themselves for full self-government and not to exploit them. Exploitation is spiritually as degrading to the exploiter as to the exploited.

Then, too, there must be no bitterness in the reconstructed world. No matter what we have undergone and suffered, we must try to forgive those who injured us and remember only the lesson gained thereby.

The teachings of Christ radiate ideas for the elevation of souls and intellectual capacities far above the common passions of hate and degradation. He taught us to help our less fortunate fellow beings, to work and strive for their betterment without ever deceiving ourselves and others by pretending that tragedy and ugliness do not exist. He taught us to hate the evil in men, but not men themselves.

Selfishness and complacency in the past have made us pay dearly in terms of human misery and suffering. While it may be difficult for us not to feel bitterness for the injuries we have suffered at the hands of the aggressors, let us remember that recrimination and hatred will lead us nowhere. We should use our energy to better purpose so that every nation will be enabled to use its native genius and energy for the reconstruction of a permanently progressive world with all nations participating on an equitable and just basis. The goal of our common struggle at the conclusion of this war should be to shape the future so that "this whole world must be thought of as one great state common to gods and men."

The following excerpts are taken from an article written by Mme. Chiang Kai-shek under the caption "I confess my faith":

By nature I am not a religious person. At least not in the common acceptance of that term. I am not by nature a mystic. I am practical-minded. Mundane things have meant much to me, perhaps too much.

I used to think faith, belief, immortality were more or less imaginary. I believe in the world seen, not the world unseen I could not accept things just because they had always been accepted.

I knew my mother lived very close to God. I recognized something great in her. And I believe that my childhood training influenced me greatly, even though I was more or less rebellious at the time. It must often have grieved my beloved mother that I found family prayers tiresome and frequently found myself conveniently thirsty at the moment, so that I had to slip out of the room.

Like my brothers and sisters, I always had to go to church and I hated the long sermons. But today I feel that this church-going habit established something, a kind of stability, for which I am grateful to my parents

My mother was not a sentimental parent. In many ways she was a Spartan. But one of my strongest childhood impressions is of mother going to a room she kept for the purpose on the third floor to pray. She spent hours in prayer, often beginning before dawn. When we asked her advice about anything, she would say, "I must ask God first."

During the last 7 years I have suffered much. I have gone through deep waters because of the chaotic conditions in China; the lopping off of our richest provinces, the death of my saintly mother, flood, famine, and the intrigues of those who should have been helping to unify the country.

All of these things have made me see my own inadequacy. More than that, all human insufficiency. To try to do anything for the country seemed like trying to put out a great conflagration with a cup of water.

As I see it now, it is the will of God. But to know His will, and do it, calls for absolute sincerity, absolute honesty with one's self, and it means using one's mind to the best of one's ability.

I used to pray that God would do this or that. Now I pray only that God will make His will known to me.

God speaks to me in prayer. Prayer is not self-hypnotism. It is more than meditation. The Buddhist priests spends days in meditating. In meditation, the source of strength is one's self. But when one prays he goes to a source of strength greater than his own. I wait to feel His leading, and His guidance means certainty.

What I do want to make clear is that whether we get guidance or not, it's there. It's like tuning in on the radio. There's music in the air, whether we tune in or not. By learning to tune in, one can understand.

In conclusion, with me religion is a very simple thing. It means to try with all my heart and soul and strength and mind to do the will of God.

The Record of the House of Representatives on Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, frequently Members of the House receive letters saying, "Why does not Congress do something to prevent strikes in war plants?" In this morning's issue of the Washington Post, Mark Sullivan has written an interesting article reviewing the history of labor legislation in Congress and placing the responsibility for inaction directly upon President Roosevelt and his exercise of control over the Senate. Mr. Speaker, the public is entitled to the facts on all matters of public policy and for that reason I am incorporating Mr. Sullivan's revealing article as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As Mr. Sullivan points out, the House of Representatives passed effective labor legislation on December 3, 1941—4 days before Pearl Harbor. In the accompanying article, Mr. Sullivan records just what happened to that legislation and the manner in which it was precluded from becoming law. No other correspondent or columnist in America is a better student or analyst of Congressional activities than is Mark Sullivan. For that reason, it is important that the country have the record of facts which he

sets forth so clearly in the following report:

LABOR DISPUTES

(By Mark Sullivan)

CONGRESS' RECORD

The labor bill Congress is about to act upon is called the Connally-Smith bill. This is a union of two bills. Both are nearly 18 months old. Both were headed for enactment in December 1941. Both were prevented from enactment by President Roosevelt.

The Smith bill was passed by the House December 3, 1941. It was passed by a vote of 252 to 136. It was supported by more than half the President's party—129 Democrats voted for it to 108 against. These figures show the strength the bill had in Congress—especially considering that the President was known to oppose it. The figures show likewise the widespread public support the bill had.

The Smith bill went to the Senate. There it was referred to the Senate Committee on Labor. To that body came four members of the administration—including Secretary of Labor Perkins, and labor leader Mr. Sidney Hillman, then labor head of the old Office of Production Management. They asked the Senate committee to suspend action on the Smith bill, and on all other labor measures. They put their request on the ground that the President had a plan of his own for handling labor matters.

The Connally bill has a similar history. It was introduced in November 1941. The following month it was suspended, in deference to the administration's request that all labor measures be suspended. On later occasions when Senator CONNALLY resumed motions to push his bill he was requested to refrain, the request being made by Mr. Roosevelt in person.

Mr. Roosevelt's successful prevention of legislation on labor by Congress was achieved mainly by influence exerted upon a small number of Senators, close to him, who happened to be in key positions. There is little reason to doubt that had the Smith, Connally and similar bills been permitted to go before the Senate as a whole, they would have passed that body by majorities comparable to that which the Smith bill had in the House.

The President pushed his resistance to a point which suggested the strength of the wish of himself and those about him to prevent Congress from legislating about labor, to keep labor matters in his own hands. On one occasion he went so far as to endanger a measure he wished and needed in the field of foreign affairs. When the final modification of the neutrality bill was before Congress, party leaders told the President that some Democrats were so provoked by his opposition to labor legislation that they would not vote for his neutrality measure unless he consented to action by Congress on labor.

Part of the demand of Congress for legislation about labor had the same cause as today. Mr. John L. Lewis had called a strike of the United Mine Workers in September 1941, demanding a closed shop. He kept his demand firm until late December 1941, when he won the closed shop. This coal strike, with other strikes in other industries caused Congress to be eager to pass legislation dealing with strikes during wartime, and with other aspects of labor.

The country, not fully aware of why labor legislation did not pass, blamed Congress. The public outcry against Congress was put in words by Mr. Westbrook Pegler in a classic indictment including: "You have impaired * * * your own prestige and with it the American form of government, which understands that the National Legislature has a solemn duty to enact our laws, subject to no man's permission or forbiddance."

Labor leaders of a thoughtful mind felt the President was making a mistake. So did observers generally. Their point of view was phrased by Mr. Walter Lippman, in November 1941:

"There can be no doubt any longer that * * * it will be a fatal mistake for the President not to invite Congress to express its will on the subject of labor disputes * * * Congress has the right and the duty to declare a national policy on the duty of labor unions as it has already done on the duty of property owners, in times like these. The President should not carry upon his own shoulders the burden of relations between labor unions and the national defense. In the realm of foreign affairs and in the realm of the strategical command, the President must take the initiative and bear the responsibility. But in the realm of the relations of Americans to one another, of labor unions to employers, and to the Government, he should welcome rather than shrink from coordinate action by Congress."

Nevertheless, the President maintained his opposition to action by Congress to the present day.

Army Finds WAAC's Competent Beyond Hopes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, one of the principal WAAC Training Centers is located at Fort Oglethorpe, Ga., which is a few miles from Chattanooga. The people of Chattanooga are delighted to have the WAAC's in this section and are proud of the part they are playing in the armed forces of our country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written by Dick Thornburg, which recently appeared in the Washington News:

The Army has one complaint against the WAAC's—there aren't enough of them.

A year ago, when the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps was started, the Army thought WAAC's could be trained to handle four jobs—communications (telephones), motor transport (chauffeurs for light cars), secretaries, cooks, and bakers.

But the WAAC's went at army life with their sleeves rolled up. The list of jobs they can handle—better than men in lots of cases—has grown to more than 140, and the end is not in sight.

Today there are about 60,000 WAAC's, which is 90,000 short of their authorized strength. On file in Director Oveta Culp Hobby's office are requests for 500,000 more from impatient Army commanders, who have tried out WAAC's and found them wanting only in numbers.

4,000 IN TRAINING

Here at Ft. Oglethorpe, the third WAAC training center, about 4,000 are in training—4 weeks of basic training and 4 to 8 weeks more for specialist training.

The top administrative jobs on the post are filled by 17 Army officers, but otherwise WAAC's handle every job in the training center. Those Army officers swear by the WAAC's.

"If I can't have overseas duty, I'd rather stay right here," said one Army officer. "These girls are quick to learn, eager to do a job, ready to tackle anything. They've got it all over the men."

It is an impressive sight to see the WAAC's parade. Twenty-four companies of 150 to 170 each assembled in the shade of stately old elms near the borders of the parade ground, where men have trained since '98. While they waited for the review to start, the WAAC's whiled away the time by singing. A verse of the G. I. (Government issue) songs goes:

"Once her Mommy made her bed,
Cleaned her clothes and buttered her bread,
And her favorite dress was red,
Oh, me; oh, my;
That ain't G. I."

Then across the grounds, where the bass voices of so many men have shouted their orders, the contralto voice of Capt. Albina Shimkus rolled out, loud and clear:

"P-a-s-s i-n r-e-v-i-e-www."

With the precision of the Rockettes, the 4,000 WAAC's swung down the drill grounds, marching to the music of their own band. Past the reviewing stand the ranks filed, straight as a plumb line.

"Do you think 4,000 men with 1 to 4 weeks' training could march like that?" one of the Army officers asked; and then answered his own question, "Well, I know they couldn't because I've tried to teach 'em."

THEY HAVE DISCIPLINE

WAAC officers refuted the stories of lack of discipline by citing figures. Only 1 girl out of every 200 trained ever has run afoul of a WAAC M. P.

The closest things to a weapon on the post are the flashlights with which the WAAC M. P.'s are armed. No strong-arm work is necessary, but just as a precaution the M. P.'s are trained in judo. Discipline is enforced by withdrawal of privileges and by fines.

The basic training course includes instruction in map reading, safeguarding military information, military sanitation, first aid, company administration, mess management, current history, physical training, guard duties, property responsibility, and related subjects.

After basic training the girls enroll in specialist schools, officer candidate schools, or are assigned to duty in the field at an Army post. Those below the rank of commissioned officers are paid from $50 to $133 a month. WAAC officers receive the same scale as men officers.

So far only 1 company has been sent abroad, although there are requests for 18,000 more WAAC's. About 90 percent of the WAAC's have asked for foreign duty.

We Are All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an inspiring address by the Vice President entitled "We Are All Americans," delivered at a rally in Central Park, New York City, yesterday afternoon in celebration of I Am An American Day. The address was de-

livered for a crowd estimated at more than 1,000,000 New Yorkers, of every race, creed, and color.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Before me, gathered here in Central Park, I see many thousands who are proud and humble. They are proud to be citizens of this Nation, which stands for truth and justice and man's responsibility to man. They are humble in the knowledge that only through the spirit of selflessness and sacrifice can these sacred values be preserved.

Over the last several years, as we have witnessed the cruelty and destruction in other parts of the world, most of us have begun to appreciate what it really means to be an American, what it really means to enjoy the blessings of freedom and democracy. It took a terrible war and a dastardly attack to wake us up. Now our Nation has dedicated itself anew to the age-old fight to keep the fires of freedom burning. It is a time for greatness—and we must measure up.

American boys, fighting shoulder to shoulder with their United Nations' comrades in arms, have again proved their mettle—this time in Tunisia. Africa has been won. The fortress of Europe lies ahead.

But in this war the heroes are not all on one front. There are many fronts. Americans today are riding the bullet-riddled air over Germany, daring the submarine-infested waters of the Atlantic, stalking hidden danger in the jungles of far-off Pacific islands. Here at home Americans are doing their duty, too. In factories, on farms, in homes and hospitals and offices—in countless ways that never can be told—millions are taking their full part. In this people's war the fighters and the workers on every front have what it takes to win.

Here in the United States, I hope we do not forget that we possess no monopoly on the name, "American." I have just come back from visiting Americans in seven different countries—in Costa Rica, Panama, Chile, Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador, and Colombia. These Spanish-speaking Americans are just as patriotic citizens of the New World as any of us who speak English.

For centuries, the New World like a magnet has been drawing to itself those who in the Old World were defrauded of one or more of the "four freedoms." Again and again the New World has given refuge to the thousands fleeing from the hangman and the despot.

From Canada to Chile, we are glad we are Americans. Nowhere in all my trip did I find greater pride in democracy than in Chile. Chile is a Catholic country, but it also contains a higher percentage of Communists than almost any other country except Russia. The Radical Party, which is quite distinct from the Communist Party, is in power. There are also a large number of Socialists, Liberals, and Conservatives. Personally I believe in the two-party system, but who can deny that in Chile they have a genuine democracy which gives every shade of opinion a chance to express itself? The interesting thing to me was to find all these varied groups from extreme left to extreme right so friendly to the United States, so eager to serve the cause of world-wide democracy, so anxious to produce results in field, mine, and factory.

The picture which stands out most clearly in my mind from my experiences in Chile is of an evening meeting of miners in the open air where two or three labor leaders had paid their "respects" in very vigorous language to Hitler and the other enemies of democracy. The alcalde, or mayor, had given his formal speech. The meeting was breaking up when a little girl of 14, obviously the daughter of one of the miners, came up on the platform holding her 2-year-old brother by one hand and with the other gave me a bouquet of flowers as she said very proudly, "In the name of Chile."

I received hundreds of floral gifts in other parts of Latin America, where flowers grow in riotous profusion, but in this particular part of northern Chile the mining camp was surrounded by many miles of waterless desert, where there is not a single plant or animal except those supported by water piped in from a long distance. The miners have tiny plots of ground, perhaps 8 by 10 feet, which they can water if they so desire, to grow a few vegetables or flowers. This proud little Chilean girl, taking care of her baby brother, had planned for weeks in advance how on her very own to demonstrate the attitude of Chile, and especially the working people of Chile, toward the United States.

Those American miners in Chile have worked without sparing themselves in producing copper, which is absolutely essential to the effort of the United States in this war. I am hoping that when the peace comes, and they need our help, we Americans in the United States will not forget them.

In every country I visited are millions of Americans wholeheartedly at work in the service of the common cause. I think of the Bolivian tin miners working in some of the highest mines in the world, 14,000 feet above the sea. Their wages are pitiably low according to standards in this country. I think of the Bolivian Indians toiling on their farms. By comparison with them, the miners are well off. I say the Bolivian tin miners and the Bolivian farmers, even though they may be of Indian blood and may speak only Quechua or Aymara, are Americans, that they are doing their part to win the war, and that we should not forget them when peace comes.

I vision the Mosquito bombers—the speediest bombers in the world—with which England torments Germany night after night so effectively, and then I think of the balsa logs, lighter than cork, which are used in their construction. I can see the Quayas River in Ecuador floating these logs down to the sawmills at Guayaquil. I can see the logs being jerked out of the water by half-naked men, cheerfully working day after day under hot, humid, disagreeable conditions. The speed and skill of their operations mean a lot to every English-speaking American who has a boy at the front.

I see in my mind's eye the men gathering rubber and quinine bark in the hot, steamy jungles of Peru, Colombia, Bolivia, Costa Rica, and Panama. Don't let anyone tell you that we don't need this rubber which these Americans are getting for us. Synthetic rubber will do some things by itself, but if we are going to have really good combat tires for the boys at the fighting front, we need some natural rubber to go along with the synthetic. Consider the risks and hardships which these rubber gatherers must undergo. Some of them are working in places where the contraction of malaria is almost a certainty and the probability of death within 2 years is almost 50–50.

We English-speaking Americans are only half the Americans of the New World. The other half, whether they speak Spanish, Portuguese, or French; whether they speak Quechua, Aymara, Guarani, Azteca, Mayan, Tarascan, or any other Indian tongue—whichever they speak, they are all good Americans, too. Many of them have a longer and prouder lineage than you or I. Some are descended from the last Inca, some are descended from Cervantes.

But all true Americans know that the hope and glory of America is in the future and not in the past. We can all look hopefully to the da when the American of the future will apply the "four freedoms" to bring about complete productivity of labor in terms of better living conditions. In the lands to the south this means drainage of swamps, production of cheap quinine, and the building of roads, airports, and hospitals. If such projects are carried out, the Latin-American child of the year 2000 need have no fear of malaria or hookworm or the undernutrition which produces tuberculosis. Americans were meant to be free from disease and hunger. This is one of the main jobs of the post-war period. We can do that job if we look upward and outward toward the future, and put our backs into the hard, practical work which lies ahead.

And all true Americans know that, in that future New World and Old World cannot live apart from each other. The airplane and the radio have indubitably made them one.

Since the epoch-making voyage of Columbus, currents of culture and of immigration have flowed from the Old World to the New. In both North and South America, whether we now speak English or French or Spanish or Portuguese, we are the blending of many national and racial streams. Our ideas and ideals have come originally from the Old World, which has been the fountainhead of our populations.

Now, here is this hemisphere, these various national streams are producing a new race, with a new culture, and new ideas and ideals. In this war, the young men of the New World are making their contribution to the cause of humanity in the whole world. They are giving their splendid health and energy, and even their lives, in that cause.

When the victory is won, another opportunity will open up before the people of the Western Hemisphere. Then it is that our ideals of democracy and peace and tolerance and good neighborliness can be an example, an inspiration to the people overseas. We have faith that some day these ideals will become the guiding stars of nations everywhere on this globe. Then, and then only, can we be sure that the sacrifices of today have not been made in vain. Today, we say with pride and humility that we are Americans, knowing in our hearts that Americanism in its deepest meaning stands for the freedom and the welfare and the brotherhood of the plain people of the world, wherever they may be.

Money—The Most Important Issue Before the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House, there is presented herewith the nineteenth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money:

Cast your eyes over the world's history since 1873 and see the wrecks, financial crises, panics, failures, depreciation of the prices of the world's products, the constant rise in the purchasing power of gold, the shrinkage in the market values of bonds and stocks, entailing losses to the amount of billions of dollars, all graphically foretold by the friends of bimetallism; the gold monometallists in the meantime, just as Seyd and Wolowski predicted, attributing these dire results to every imaginable cause except the true one,

the striking down by discriminating laws one-half of the metallic money of the world and establishing gold only as money.

Our own country has not escaped. We had the panic of 1873, and several severe financial crises prior to the present one. Yet our gold-standard financiers and doctrinaires attribute the causes not to the true one, the demonetization of silver in the United States in 1873 and throughout the world, but to our legislation for the rehabilitation of silver.

Now, the so-called Sherman law is made the scapegoat and must be unceremoniously and unconditionally driven into the wilderness, and with its banishment halcyon days of financial prosperity and restored confidence are to be ushered in.

The so-called Sherman law has had no influence whatever on the exports of gold, to which reference has been made. In the fiscal year 1889 our exports of gold were $49,607,427 in excess of our imports. In 1890 they were $4,331,149; in 1891, $68,130,087; in 1892, $495,873; in 1893, $87,506,463. Think of sane men undertaking to make other sane men believe that the Sherman law drove this gold out of the country! It is ridiculous.

I wish to quote here from the speech of my distinguished friend from Kentucky, Mr. Blackburn, in regard to whether the Sherman law drove gold out of the country or not. I quote from his speech on page 2215 of the RECORD, and I doubt not he has verified it:

"The records of the country show that for days and weeks, beginning in the latter part of April, and it is more noticeably true in the month of May, for days and weeks gold left this country at the rate of five millions a week, until thirty-eight millions had gone, until a panic had been produced, until values had been upset and unsettled, until the business of the country had been disturbed. At the rate of five millions a week your gold was shipped out of the country, when never in 1 day nor 1 hour nor 1 instant had foreign exchange been above the rate I have named.

"It is plain on the face of paper that one of two things was true, either the shipper was paying ocean freights at a loss out of his pocket or else he was receiving a commission from someone upon every dollar that was shipped. Who shipped this gold? I do not charge that all of the bankers of New York or Wall Street were engaged in it. There are bankers there whose character stands too high for me to believe that they were guilty of such a combination; but I know that there are bankers there who represent the Rothschilds, who did ship—Heidelbach, Ikleheimer & Co. and Lazarus Frères & Co. These were the exporters of your gold. They were shipping it when the rate of exchange proved beyond controversy that they were shipping it at a loss; they were either paying the ocean freights out of their pockets or receiving a commission."

It was fictitious, it was planned to order. There is no doubt of this, and I quote this to show exactly what was the reason. If the Sherman law sent gold out, it brought it back very quickly.

The financial collapse in the Argentine Republic occurred in 1890, and was followed in the year 1891 by the failure of the English banking house of Baring Bros., when it is charged that England's investors lost $1,000,000,000. Gold was demanded and taken from us, as stated. Failures in Australia to the amount of many millions have occurred, and gold monometallic England was again shaken to the center. These exports of gold were no more caused by the Sherman law than by an evening zephyr. The present crisis was plainly predicted by Mr. Alfred de Rothschild, delegate from Great Britain to the Brussels Conference. This is a very remarkable prediction. He said:

"Gentlemen, I need hardly remind you that the stock of silver in the world is estimated at some thousands of millions, and if this conference were to break up without arriving at any definite result, there would be a depreciation in the value of that commodity which it would be frightful to contemplate and out of which a monetary panic would ensue, the far-spreading effects of which it would be impossible to foretell."

There it is as plain as A B C, in the Brussels Conference, predicted just as it has come to pass, and the cause stated, and yet none of these gold monometallic doctrinaires will believe anything about it. They will shut their eyes to all these things. You could not make my friend from New Jersey (Mr. McPherson) read that and comprehend it. He would think it was something else, although it is the opinion of one of his own monometallic friends.

From this same report I have quoted from Sir G. Molesworth, representing India, to show that he predicted that India would change to a single gold standard if that monetary conference adjourned without any agreement.

There was in that monetary conference a Mr. Currie, who was also on the Indian currency commission to settle the gnancial question in India.

Mr. PLATT. On the Herschell commission?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes, sir; Mr. Currie was a delegate to the Brussels Conference, and at the same time he was a member of the Indian commission. Our commissioners unwittingly told him what we were going to do, or what they thought we were going to do, without any authority to say so. I read from page 118 of the Brussels Conference. I do not want to do any injustice to any distinguished gentleman who represented us in that body, but I want to show what they said and how we were represented. We have a right to know that.

Governor McCreary, of Kentucky, a representative of the Government of the United States, made an address before that conference, in which he went on to speak in behalf of silver, and then told about the election and about the Democratic platform, which he quoted, and then said:

"Speaking for myself only, I express the opinion that the silver law known as the act of 1890 now in force in my country will be repealed. It is possible this will be done at the present session of Congress—"

That is, at the last session of the last Congress.

"If not this session, I believe it will certainly be repealed at the next session of Congress."

Oh, yes; we are going to repeal. "You had better get scared now and come to an international agreement because we shall repeal this law." What did Mr. Cannon, another delegate, say at that conference?

"The United States has seriously taken into consideration the idea of repealing the silver purchase act of 1890; the two political parties as well as the great bankers of New York have advised this repeal, and if during this conference some arrangement is not attained, it is more than probable that America will not continue disposed to buy annually 54,000,000 ounces of silver at the market price."

Yes, we by our delegates told that monetary conference we were going to drop it, silver, and that they had better come to some agreement. The conference adjourned, and was to have met last spring, I believe, was it not?

Mr. ALLISON. It was to have met on the 30th of May.

Mr. COCKRELL. I believe that Indian currency commission just held back long enough to get ahead of us and strike down silver first, and let us bear the brunt of it if we repeal the existing law. We told them what we were going to do. We have always told them in advance we were going to do something to strike at silver, with the expectation of scaring them. There never has been but one time, Mr. President, that the agents and representatives of the United States have ever been able to scare Europe into changing its monetary system, and that was in 1863 to 1865 and in 1873, when we told them that we would flood the world with gold and silver and depreciate the purchasing power of their invested securities. We told them that we were the great gold-producing country, as the Senator from Ohio said, and the gold system had to be established; and we went on and established it, and they were foolish enough to believe that what we said was true, and they changed their whole system to a single gold standard.

The Indian currency commission was appointed October 21, 1892. As predicted by Sir Molesworth, in anticipation of the repeal of the Sherman law by us, India has closed her mints to the free coinage of silver, and the crisis predicted is upon us, intensified by many other combinations and causes, and silver has fallen most fearfully in value measured by the gold standard, just as expected by India and England. And we are now called upon to repeal the Sherman law unconditionally, reestablish the gold standard, and practically close the mints of the whole world to the free and unlimited coinage of silver and make silver everywhere a mere commodity, a mere ordinary metal without any monetary functions by the laws of any nation, and still further depreciate it, lessen its value, etc.

Think of the ridiculousness of the proposition that we must demonetize silver and destroy value in order to make Europe come to international agreement. It is perfectly absurd upon its face. We destroy its value or make it the world over a mere commodity, and what greater harm will be done to Europe than to us? What greater losses will they suffer than we shall? We are producing more silver, and gold, too, than any other nation. Would not we be the greatest sufferers in the depreciation in prices? Yet it is pretended that we should be in some way or other the beneficiary. There was never such sophistry proclaimed to intelligent free men in the world.

Then truly we would have throughout the world the idealistic doctrinaire single gold standard, which would entail for ages to come upon the tolling masses of every country in the world untold and inconceivable sufferings, losses, financial disturbances, and crises, depressions of all kinds of business, a rapid increase in the purchasing power of gold, and a still greater fall in the prices of the world's products.

This Utopian single gold standard. This is what we are coming to, if unconditional repeal is carried.

News and Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a bulletin entitled "News and Views":

WILLIAMS COLLEGE SENDS ANOTHER DELEGATE TO CHICAGOLAND

PROF. MAX LERNER IS FOLLOWED BY PROF. F. L. SCHUMAN

In a recent issue of News and Views brief reference was made to the speaking activities, in this section, of one Max Lerner. Max, it was explained, was born in Russia about 20 years ago. In New York he became editor

of the Nation, that journalistic piece de resistance of the pinkish intelligentsia, and was lifted from there by Williams College to teach Government.

Attention was also called to an advertisement in The Nation announcing Lerner's new book and citing a testimonial by Harold Laski, English Communist, in which he called the Lerner book a great manifesto for those who understood "the time had come to choose." In The Nation also appeared an article by Laski entitled "Why I Am a Marxist."

SHOWERED WITH ATTENTION, NOW COMES PROFESSOR SCHUMAN

Hardly had the dust cleared away from Professor Lerner's speaking activities hereabouts when Prof. F. L. Schuman, also on the staff of Williams College, appeared in our midst to deliver himself of several discoursive Philippics. We report this, not because of any specific persons or institutions, but because the wide-range activities of these two professors are significant and typical of certain instrumentalities now operative in a new and subtle effort to achieve a functional transilience in the American way of life.

Before we refer to his address, delivered before the Evanston School of Foreign Affairs January 29 let us briefly introduce Professor Schuman. We find, by referring to records, that he achieved quite a reputation as a professor at the University of Chicago for his liberal and political activities. In 1932 the record shows that he was listed as a lecturer for the Communist Chicago Workers School, of which the announcement stated: "Its object is to train leaders for the growing mass struggle against capitalistic offensive and for the revolutionary way out of the crisis of capitalism."

Consulting the record again, we find that in 1932 Professor Schuman signed, along with a group of well-known radicals, a letter endorsing the Communist candidates, Foster and Ford, which read in part: "As responsible intellectual workers, we have alined curselves with the frankly revolutionary Communist Party. * * * We call upon all men and women, especially workers in the professions and arts to join in the revolutionary struggle against capitalism, under the leadership of the Communist Party." In 1932 Prof. Schuman was on the reception committee for James W. Ford, the Negro Communist candidate for Vice President that year. In 1932 Professor Schuman was one of the official faculty sponsors for the Student Congress Against War, at the University of Chicago, at which were such speakers as Communist Earl Browder, Socialist Scott Nearing, Communist (Fellow Traveler) J. B. Matthews, Joseph Freeman, editor of the Communist paper The Masses, and others.

In 1932, according to the record, Professor Schuman endorsed the Communist Vladimir R. Janowicz, when he ran for alderman. In 1933 Professor Schuman was leader of a tour to Soviet Russia for the American Society for Cultural Relations with Russia, and Intourist, Inc. (Soviet tourist agency). Professor Schuman's name was listed as one of the sponsors (along with Scott Nearing and other radicals) of the Chicago Workers Theater. The Workers Voice (radical paper) said (January 21, 1933)—"The Workers Theater, of Chicago, a revolutionary group and the first of its kind in the city, was launched by the John Reed Club which took the lead in its formation and which regarded the step as a potent weapon of the toiling masses in their struggle agains capitalism. * * * Leading players from the universities, Lincoln Center, and the Jewish Peoples Institute crowded John Reed Club headquarters on a bitterly cold night to discuss plans for the theater." Professor Schuman has also been a contributor to Soviet Russia Today, a magazine published by friends of Soviet Russia in this country.

In a recent issue of the Nation there appeared an article signed by Professor Schuman entitled "The Tory Dialectic." From that article we quote: "In the terminology of Marx ruling classes threatened with expropriation create and employ instruments of violence which are intended to protect the power and privileges accruing from their established control of the instruments of production."

RABBIT PUNCHES

The above quotation sounds bad. What does it mean? Exactly nothing—without the remainder of the article. Why is it quoted? Merely to expose, by example, a type of forensic legerdemain frequently employed by propagandists who have little respect for Queensbury rules.

* * * * *

It is well known, however, that Congressman CHURCH'S economic and political philosophy is anathema to the intellectual pinksters, the Communists, and the "spend and elect" New Dealers.

ALL IS NOT GOLD THAT GLITTERS

It is an amazing thing how easy it is for radical propagandists to become platform attractions in our quaint old United States of America. Only recently Communist Earl Browder required the Chicago Stadium to house his audience. It is even more amazing how cleverly and subtly our so-called liberal propagandists are able to hide their fangs and sugarcoat the virus of their doctrinal inoculations, not only painless but even fascinating and delightful.

A vast group of our "better" citizens in this country have been maneuvered into a position where they consider it an intellectual and social duty to indulge in all the latest pink and red propagandistic concoctions being served in the academic cocktail lounges.

But getting back to Professor Schuman's address on America's Role in the World of Tomorrow, we were particularly impressed with how little a title can mean. After preening himself with some choice verbosities in an attempt to describe the biological and psychological nature of man he proceeded to build up a defense for Russia and Spain by excoriating the Fascist Caesars. He referred somewhat reverently to that "great country" whose destiny was linked with the future of Europe and Asia, but whose name he "did not dare mention for fear it might get back to the Dies committee." In referring to this great country, however, he likewise omitted the name of its iron ruler, Mr. Stalin, and failed to mention anything about Mr. Stalin's great penchant for exterminating quickly and relentlessly all those whose minds do not go along with his.

THE LEFTISTS DO NOT LIKE MR. CHAMBERLAIN

One gathers from Professor Schuman's talks and writings that he does not like the way certain English statesmen, particularly Chamberlain, Simon, and Hoare, have dealt with the Manchukuo affair, the Spanish problem, and the Czechoslovakian crisis.

Mr. Chamberlain, forced to deal with grave and enormous problems, has sought, we believe, to avert another bloody war with all its sacrifice and futility. No informed observer will question, however, that the fear of communism has played a major role in English diplomacy during the last few years. This, of course, has brought Mr. Chamberlain in for much criticism and abuse at the hands of leftist partisans.

One familiar with the editorial policy of the Daily Worker, the Daily Record, and other Communist publications would not fail to notice how similarly Professor Schuman's reasoning followed the plaint of these mediums. Was this mere coincidence?

Those who espouse communism (either openly or surreptitiously) fail ever to note that fascism came into the world as the natural and inevitable opposition to communism. Both are malignantly dreadful; both are tyrannical and murderous; both are completely destructive of human rights.

THE THREAT TO AMERICA

There is one thing for us to bear well in mind in this country. As we drift further to the left (and the left is now in the ascendancy) the danger of fascism grows in equal ratio. If the leftist movement (through its well advanced and coordinated united front) keeps on growing, aided and abetted by our indifference and goody-goody hospitality, we may wake up some day, not far away, to be confronted by a real Communist peril. Businessmen and others, suddenly and thoroughly frightened, may rally round some Fascist-minded leader who promises to save them. That happened in Italy, in Germany, and now in Spain. Shall we let it happen here? That depends upon how willing we are to let some of our problem children "play with fire."

Returning again to the scintillating lucubrations of Professor Schuman. He, unlike Lerner, who is mellow, confidential, and persuasive, is the cold, hard-driving, brutal type who attacks by combining innuendo with invective and uses his sweeping command of words to awe and conquer his audience. It is difficult to imagine that any youth could submit himself to the class lectures of Professor Schuman and escape indoctrination from such positive views and forensic brilliancy.

We find his arguments have changed somewhat since 1932. In those days it was a terrible thing for the Government to give any protection to capitalistic Standard Oil tankers in foreign ports. But today with the Fascist specter looming in the distance it becomes quite proper for the Government to protect its foreign trade by opposing what he is pleased to call the Fascist Internationale. If there is anything that releases torrential invectve on the part of our "liberals," it is the Fascist specter.

Our advice to the so-called liberals is that the best way to keep Fascism out of this country is to quit helping Communism to grow. As Communism becomes a peril—so will Fascism. Now is the time to check the whole business. There are three avenues of far-reaching influence through which new doctrines are particularly infiltrating our American life. These avenues are some of our churches—some of our colleges and universities—and some of the labor unions. "It's later than you think"—and time to wake up.

Labor Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 17, 1943:

LABOR STATESMANSHIP

The reasonable and responsible labor leaders of the country have been the prime victims of John L. Lewis' conduct in the coal dispute. They, and the members of their unions, will suffer if Congress should go beyond the Connally bill and pass unnecessarily restrictive legislation because of its

anger against Lewis. And any success that the United Mine Workers chief may seem to gain through his rough-and-tumble tactics will make it more difficult for the other leaders to impose restraints upon their followers.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the executive board of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, meeting in Cleveland last week denounced John Lewis in terms quite as vigorous as any that might have been applied to him by an employers' association. This body, over which he once presided, accused Lewis of jeopardizing the just demands of his union "by exploiting the injustices in the mining industry in furtherance of his personal vendetta against the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief." The indictment does not seem too strong. Coming from men whose allegiance to labor interests cannot be questioned, it may have a healthy effect upon the restless rank and file.

But condemnation of Lewis by men who are essentially his rivals can only boomerang against them if he should be successful in his defiance of the Government. "In times of emotional stress," declared the Congress of Industrial Organizations board, "the labor movement of this country must be particularly wary of any person or element which seeks to substitute for sane and democratic processes willful and revengeful dictation. Labor's rights must be protected—vigorously protected—but they must be protected within the framework of rational procedure."

Here is a satisfactory working definition of the essential distinction between statesmanship and demagoguery in the sphere of labor relations. Members of the Congress of Industrial Organizations can be expected to support the principle laid down by their leaders, however, only if they are convinced that their interests will not suffer because of it. Whatever benefits the United Mine Workers may receive in the negotiations with their employers to be resumed today, it is of the utmost importance that they receive them through the established machinery of the War Labor Board. John Lewis has chosen to make a fresh attack on the War Labor Board. But no matter how much Lewis rants about it, the authority of the Board must be upheld. If he can figure out a way of saving face, well and good. But what matters a great deal more is that his face-saving must not involve loss of face for the men who have shown a greater sense of responsibility or for the Government itself.

The Market! The Market! The Market!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE HENDRICKS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Dr. Francis E. Townsend:

THE MARKET! THE MARKET! THE MARKET!

(By Dr. Francis E. Townsend)

I wish I had a loud speaker that would drown out all other sounds as I shouted these words so compellingly that the whole world of human beings could be shocked into a listening attitude. It is the key word to the attainment by humanity of all useful and needful things.

There has been a market ever since the first rude exchanges of commodities began, and as civilization advanced the markets of the world also expanded until in this, our modern age of easy and swift production of goods, the market has become the biggest thing in human affairs that man has ever created.

And yet, its very bigness and commonness seem to have made its importance to the world appear of little consequence in the general scheme of things. The thing which we must all use every day, if we are making a living, is given so little consideration that all we hear said about it is, "the market is good," or "the market is bad."

The building and maintenance of the most important thing in our civilization has received no scientific attention. Its growth and expansion has been entirely haphazard, subject only to control through the vagaries of supply and demand.

Why men have not long ago realized that the market by which we all live is a thing to be taken in hand and controlled and directed is one of those phenomena of oversight that characterizes the human race. I suppose that man lived upon the earth for countless years before he learned that fire was something he could utilize and control to his own benefit. The public market is not as old as fire, but it is certainly old enough and has been used by man long enough that one might expect him to have thought somewhat about it.

Our lawmakers in Washington are just now engaged in a great head-scratching, speculating over the matter of raising the money to pay for the immense appropriations they have made these last years. Every item of commerce and every industry has been canvassed in the hope that something may be found that will stand an increase of taxation.

That nothing is going to be found is evidenced by the fact that they are talking of adding more taxes on gasoline and tobacco and little items of luxury that are already taxed from 50 to 100 percent. Everything mentionable has already been taxed until it is becoming apparent that to add more taxes to these already overburdened articles is almost sure to restrict the consumption of them and kill the little geese that lay the golden eggs.

I wonder who was the first man that secured the attention of our primitive ancestors and persuaded them that fire could be controlled and made useful. I wonder what means he employed to convince them that they had been overlooking the greatest thing in their lives. Did he go about yelling, "Fire is good," until he convinced them of the fact?

We Townsendites have been yelling at our lawmakers for several years now, "The market, gentlemen. The market. Tax the market. The greatest source of revenue in all the world lies right at hand."

Say to everybody, "The market belongs to everybody, so everybody may be justly required to pay for the use he makes of the market. Everybody must use the market if he makes a living. Everybody, earning a living, must sell something in the market. So, we will charge a small percentage of the price he gets for his goods or labor or services and use the aggregate of all money paid to conduct and pay for the functions of government, and to renew the market continuously by a judicious distribution of buying power."

Just now, when the Government is engaging in the greatest effort ever undertaken by mankind, it behooves us to secure the greatest revenue for the use of government with the least harm to our population. By all means let us tax the market. Let us make everyone pay at the same rate on the entire gross income he enjoys. No exemptions.

Take a certain percentage of all sales made for the Government, collecting from the sellers at regular intervals—we suggest once a month. And then tell the Government what it must do with the money. Send a goodly portion of the money collected back into the channels of trade at once in the form of pensions to the aged and physically disabled and use the rest to build our defenses, remembering always that our first line of defense is in the welfare of our own citizens, who create the market.

Nuts

REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday May 17, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the subject matter that I am calling to the attention of the Congress this cheerful, bright day is on nuts. The species I am going to speak about, according to the Department of Agriculture, is called Juglans Regia, or English walnuts. But there is a species of "nuts" here in Washington doing the planning in the Surplus Foods Commodities Corporation and in the Office of Price Administration, a name for whom, I am of the opinion, would have to be determined by a psychiatrist.

However, here is a little editorial in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick concerning an Associated Press dispatch appearing under a Syracuse headline:

NUTS

Our old friend, A. S. Turner, of Canandaigua, N. Y., sends the Derrick the following clipping from the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle:

"SYRACUSE.—Officials of Onondaga County Home and Onondaga Sanatorium are going 'nuts.'

"It all began yesterday when, unannounced, a shipment of 2,000 pounds of English walnut meats arrived for use at the institutions.

"The county hadn't ordered them. The shipment was from the Federal Bureau of Surplus Commodities—a gift from Uncle Sam. Even freight charges had been paid.

"'I didn't even have to say "thank you,"' commented Manager Earl Hall, of the county home.

"Chefs began skimming through cookbooks and immediately stirred up a big batch of nut bread.

"From now on it will be nut puddings, nut cakes, nut rolls, nut salads, and just plain nuts until they are used up.

"The irony of the situation is that stocks of walnuts in city stores are scant and the meats sell from $1.15 to $1.50 a pound."

Editorial comments state, "Day by day the truth comes home to us that this country of ours has gone 'nuts' in a big way."

Now, I might add that we in the Congress should see to the immediate elimination from the various departments of the O. P. A., and they seem to be the principal offenders, this disturbing group of socialistic dream boys who are tearing the heart out of the economic life of the Nation, destroying the farmer, the dairyman, the cattle raiser, and the small retail businessman of America with but one motive back of their well-planned program, and that is to completely recast every aspect of the Nation's economic life to bring about the destruction of our system of private enterprise.

It is incredible that such "nutty" procedures as I have called to your attention could actually happen here in the United States where common sense in the distribution of our food supply has been for years the order of the day.

Incidents of this kind, I presume, give the planning bureaucrats great glee, even with a drastic food shortage facing America.

I call upon the Members of this Congress to rise up and demand that these keymen in Agriculture and the O. P. A. who are responsible for the confusion, conflict, and chaos existing which is impeding and slowing up our war effort be thrown out. Their plans call for the indoctrination of the American governmental and economic life with socialistic principles along such lines so as to permit them a greater freedom to work out their crackpot, Utopian ideas to regiment the people of America into what they term an "administrative democracy."

Today this Nation of ours should stand united, working together, striving together, and fighting together to bring this war to a rapid and early conclusion to save the lives of our American boys on the fighting fronts. These boys are doing a great job and we are proud of our boys on the land, on the sea, and in the air. A well coordinated, smooth working, fighting machine, the Army, the Navy, the marines, the Air Corps, turning in great victories. We should be on our knees with profound gratitude to God who gave us these great victories and to the American boys who paid for them with their lives.

On the home front what do we have because of these socialistic bureaucratic planners who are out to destroy our American way of life? We have bickering, petty differences, personalities, discriminations, social-reform-planning dreams, limitation orders and directive orders and what not until the economic and industrial life of the Nation on the home front is in a damnable mess.

I warn the Congress that the American people have reached a point of utter exhaustion, enraged beyond words and are demanding action and relief.

The committees of Congress empowered and authorized to act should find out who these key men are and kick them out without any further ceremony. Let us put aside these social-reform plannings until a later date and get down to the all important job of winning this war.

Norway

REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, May 17 should recall to our minds the struggle of a great people for liberty. It was on the 17th of May in 1814 that the Norwegian people adopted a constitution framed upon the American Constitution and that of France following the revolution. This constitution launched them as an independent nation in the democratic tradition and determined their course among the people of the world. For over a century and a quarter since then, these people in their striving for ever more freedom of thought and action have exercised an influence over the people of the world out of all proportion to their number, which has never exceeded 3,000,000. Norwegian scientists, musicians, explorers, and writers have been universally recognized. Out of this land have come Ole Bulls and Edvard Griegs, Ibsens and Bjornsens, Johan Bojers, Sigrid Undsets, Roald Amundsens, and Fridjof Nansens. The high level of culture among the Norwegian people is recognized throughout the world.

During these years Norway has grown into a great peace-loving nation. She has always welcomed to her shores people from every part of the globe and in turn has contributed many of her own people to other countries, principally to the United States of America. The Norwegian immigrants brought with them the spirit of independence, the spirit of Christianity, the spirit of adventure, and the spirit of justice. These immigrants have contributed to our national growth and to our national integrity throughout the world, and sons of Norway today hold the highest positions of honor and trust in this the greatest democracy on earth.

On April 9, 1940, Norway was surrendered by unsuspected traitors to the gansterism of Europe headed by the insane Hitler. She was betrayed by some of her own sons, and today she lies crushed beneath the feet of despotism and depraved cruelty. Yet the heart of Norway still lives, and her sons, now in shackles, await the hour when the forces of freedom shall release them from their bonds and permit them to right the wrongs that have spelled disaster for their country. The heart of Norway is no more subdued, no more subservient to the will of Quislings than it was before its body was struck down.

The military power of a nation may be measured in guns and resources, but to win more than that is required. It takes the heart to fight, the will to fight, and the willingness to make sacrifices for your country's honor. While the Norwegians have been stripped of their guns and their resources, the will to fight and the willingness to sacrifice are at the highest pitch of any time in the country's history.

The day is not far distant when the power of the United Nations will release the people of Norway to fight for freedom. What a fight that will be when the opportunity arrives. The spiritual power of Norway will be released in full sway to contribute to the fight for freedom of all people throughout the world.

The Norway that we once knew will live again. Her rise from bondage will be sudden and sublime. Her people will again direct their constitutional government. Freedom of speech and of the press and the right to live in liberty and happiness will bloom again more gloriously than in any other country which has not undergone the barbarous torture of Nazi domination.

My message to all Norwegians this day is to endure for a little longer the suffering surreptitiously forced upon a proud and free people. When the time comes to strike the enemies of freedom, strike with the spiritual power, strike with the unconquerable courage of the Vikings of old. Give the enemy no advantage. Suffer yet longer, to the end that the power when once released will carry the people of Norway back to freedom and contribute to the "four freedoms" of the world.

Office of Price Administration

REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, once more I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to what is taking place in the O. P. A. outfit. A few days ago one of my colleagues on the Agricultural Committee, Hon. ANTON J. JOHNSON, of Illinois, showed me a letter he had received from Mr. H. A. Ruehe, executive secretary of the American Butter Institute. The letter stated, in part, as follows:

> Members of the American Butter Institute certainly are surprised to learn that the United States Department of Agriculture is taking such active steps to destroy the butter industry and to promote the use of oleomargarine.
>
> The creamery butter industry of the United States produced approximately $800,000,000 worth of butter in 1942. The creamery butter produced in Illinois was estimated to be worth about $34,000,000 in the same year. I am certain that the dairy industry in your State resents attempts of Federal agencies to destroy such an important part of their market.

I am also in receipt of the following copy of a letter written by the Flynn Dairy Co., of Des Moines, Iowa:

> THE FLYNN DAIRY CO.,
> *Des Moines, May 4, 1943.*
>
> Col. B. V. CASTLE,
> *President, Milk Industry Foundation,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR COLONEL: What I am about to convey to you is really not in your department, but I think you should know about it.
>
> United States Department of Agriculture sent to Des Moines a man by the name of Edward Sard who has been lecturing in the public schools on the value of oleomargarine as a substitute for butter. He makes the definite statement that oleomargarine contains all and perhaps more vitamins than butter, that it is cheaper, and therefore, people should use oleomargarine instead of

butter, and he says this in the second largest butter-producing State in the Union.

My attention was directed to this by Frank Barker, of the State department of agriculture. I immediately got in touch with Newell McComb, superintendent of schools, who knew nothing about the topic of Sard's lectures, assuming, of course, they must be O. K. if he were sent there by the department of agriculture. Mr. McComb has stopped these lectures, but unfortunately the damage has been done.

Mr. Barker also directed my attention to O. H. Brownlee, who was sent to Iowa State College of Agriculture, and who, while there, prepared and had issued pamphlet No. 5, which deals entirely with oleomargarine as a substitute for butter. I think this also will be stopped.

I think you will agree there is no substitute for butter. Oleomargarine may be used in the place of butter, but it is no substitute. It is no more of a substitute for butter than coumarin is a substitute for vanilla.

From what I can gather the United States is shipping butter to Russia and trying to educate the American people to use oleomargarine. Why should Russia have butter when they never have had butter, and why should Russia not have oleomargarine instead of butter?

Certain groups of farmers here think the administration is punishing Iowa because it voted Republican in the last election, and they are mad.

At its annual meeting held last week, the Iowa State Medical Association was requested to pass a resolution approving oleomargarine as a substitute for butter. Wisely the Medical Association steered away from any such resolution.

I thought you would be interested in having this information.

Very truly yours,

THE FLYNN DAIRY CO.,
PAUL BEER.

Personally, I did not believe that the United States Department of Agriculture would be a party to such an unwise procedure. I called the Department and found that no one knew of an Edward Sard. Upon contacting the United States Civil Service Commission, however, I learned that Mr. Sard was with the O. P. A. I then called the O. P. A. and was informed that he was with the Office of Information in the O. P. A., in the branch devoted to education in secondary schools and that he was a boy from Brooklyn, 29 years old, had an A. B. degree from Cornell. He had attended Columbia University and had been employed in the O. P. A. since December 29, 1942.

Now, this is not a question of oleo versus butter, or butter versus oleo. The questions involved are, Why in the name of common sense is the O. P. A. using public funds at this time to promote any particular or controversial food product? Why, with the manpower shortage devote any time to such a program at this time? Why carry on this propaganda at the same time that increased production of dairy products is being asked of the dairymen of our country and when enormous sums of money are being appropriated to increase this dairy production?

The Shawano (Wis.) Evening Leader of May 13 contained an Associated Press article from Washington which stated, in part, as follows:

Further restrictions of dairy products appeared to be in the cards today as Government dairy authorities expressed discouragement over 1943 milk production prospects.

The facts are that less milk is being produced than a year ago. Butter production is below last year's production and the trend of production is downward. Cheddar cheese production is 24 percent below 1942 production. Some sections of the United States are showing as much as 63 percent less Cheddar cheese produced than a year ago, and Wisconsin, producing a little over half of it, showed a 19 percent less production than a year ago. The Farm Distributing Administration has already increased its procurement from 50 percent to 70 percent of the Cheddar cheese production for the Army and lease-lend.

Should money be appropriated to increase the production of dairy products and money wasted in telling the people that some other product is superior at the same time? This just does not make sense. There is not much use of appropriating money for the Agricultural Department for increasing food production as long as the O. P. A. is not only preventing maximum food production but is also rendering a disservice to the war effort.

How much longer is the majority going to sit idly by and see this outfit violate the spirit as well as the word of the Price Control Act? These O. P. A.'ers will have the people facing starvation unless there is a change of attitude and it is time for this House to act. Is there any Member of this House who supported this legislation who thought the O. P. A. was going to assume the powers it has when the legislation was passed? Is not it about time the Banking and Currency Committee bring in legislation to correct the abuses that have sprung up as a result of their brainchild, known as the Price Control Act?

The Late John B. Townley

REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 12, 1943, at Pittsburgh, Mr. John B. Townley passed away. Mr. Townley was political writer of the Pittsburgh Press for 42 years, and was regarded as the dean of Pennsylvania political writers.

Not only was he acquainted with every dominant figure in western Pennsylvania officialdom during this century, but he was known personally to many of the prominent officials throughout the country. In the past 40 years he attended every national convention of both the Republican and Democratic Parties with the exception of two.

He was born on April 17, 1875, in Meadville, Pa.

His unfailing courtesy, his kindliness of heart, and his keenness of intellect caused him to be respected and loved by all who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith two short editorials, one from the Pittsburgh Press of May 13, 1943, and one from the Pittsburgh Sun Telegraph of May 14, 1943:

[From the Pittsburgh Press]

JOHN B. TOWNLEY

The Pittsburgh Press especially and the newspaper profession as a whole have lost a devoted servant.

John B. Townley, who died last night, for more than 40 years was a diligent and respected member of the Press editorial staff.

To the public, he was Pennsylvania's most widely known newspaperman, dean of all the political writers, a man whose acquaintanceship sources of information and knowledge were excelled by none.

On the staff of this newspaper, and among newspapermen generally, John Townley was an institution, a tradition and an example. Younger men looked to him for counsel and guidance, all looked upon him as an example and a leader.

In recent years, when his health had compelled him to forsake at times the news beat which meant so much to him, he kept up his lively interest in news and in "what's doing at the office."

He was a man of rare honor and good taste, and in his passing we of the Press feel that we have lost an associate who had long been a source of professional inspiration and a beloved personal friend.

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph]

TRIBUTE TO MR. TOWNLEY

John B. Townley, of the Pittsburgh Press, who died yesterday, belonged to the whole newspaper profession. Any newspaper would have been proud to have had him on its staff.

Having "covered" politics in Pittsburgh for 42 years, Mr. Townley had become virtually a public figure. Add to that the facts that he was an honorable gentleman of exemplary character, highly regarded by public men of every party and faction; that he was an exceptionally able newspaperman—a real ornament to the profession, and that as a citizen he had high ideals—and you get some notion of what Pittsburgh has lost in his death.

We grieve that we are to see his friendly face and hear his friendly voice and feel his friendly handclasp no more, and that we are no longer to have the privilege of reading his shrewd and honest and well-informed articles.

Gasoline Rationing

REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, members of the Georgia delegation have repeatedly made protest to the proper authorities against the present system of rationing gasoline in the State of Georgia and other States along the Atlantic seaboard, to no avail. This is unfair to these States and the local governments.

We feel that whatever sacrifice is necessary and required to furnish the allies with sufficient gasoline should be uniform throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a resolution adopted by the War Conference of County Commissioners of the State of Georgia on May 12, 1943:

Whereas the present system of rationing gasoline in the States along the Atlantic seaboard, which includes the State of Georgia, is inequitable and imposes an unfair burden on the State and also the local government in the States affected; and

Whereas, despite the desire on the part of every Georgian to submit to any sacrifice or to do any service which will further the prosecution of the war, it is felt that sacrifices required should be uniform throughout the Nation and not restricted to any section or area: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Association of County Commissioners of Georgia, That we join with the Governor of Georgia in his protest against the present inequitable system of rationing gasoline in the States along the Atlantic seaboard and we urge the Senators and Representatives in the National Congress from Georgia take immediate steps to correct these inequalities; be it further

Resolved, That we affirm our willingness to abandon the use of automobiles entirely if necessary and to do any other acts which will further the war effort provided the requirements are uniform throughout the Nation and the unfair and unjust discrimination against Georgia and the other States along the Atlantic seabcard are eliminated; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives from Georgia in the National Congress and that a copy be sent to the Governor of Georgia.

C. W. MATTHEWS,
J. A. MCCURDY,
T. G. REEVES,
Resolutions Committee.

Adopted May 12, 1943, Atlanta, Ga.

Rumors of Racial Strife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Washington Post and the Washington Daily News of May 12, 1943:

[From the Washington Post of May 12, 1943]

DANGEROUS RUMORS

For a fortnight this town has been filled with ugly rumors of racial strife. These rumors themselves propagate discord, lead to distorted interpretations of commonplace incidents, promote fear, and put a chip on the shoulders of ordinary, peaceful citizens. They spread from person to person as contagiously as smallpox, and they are just about as healthy. There is no proof that these germs of dissension were planted by enemy agents, but it is indisputable that they do the enemy's work.

To be specific about it, rumors threatened to breed serious trouble out of an otherwise innocuous situation last Friday night. Washington Negroes held a mass meeting to protest against certain employment practices involving racial discrimination. They had every constitutional right to assemble peaceably and to petition for a redress of their grievances. The methods they pursued to press for fair employment opportunities were of a kind long accepted as thoroughly legitimate in labor disputes.

But rumormongers insisted on forecasting their peaceful picketing and their mass meeting as the preamble to a riot. Fortunately the District authorities, particularly the superintendent of police, Maj. Edward J. Kelly, and Commissioner John Russell Young, met the problem with sound common sense. They knew that the rumors were without foundation. Instead of attempting to ban the meeting, they gave it the encouragement and sanction of their presence. They marched with the protestants. The evening passed without the slightest disorder.

Praise is due equally to the Negro leaders of Washington. They knew, too, that the rumors were viciously untrue and that no violence had been planned. In this they behaved with a good deal more wisdom than many of their white fellow citizens. They saw to it that the meeting and the parade were conducted with restraint and in entire accordance with the law. Major Kelly observed: "I should like to praise the conduct of the Negro people throughout this week. They were exemplary, and conducted all their picketing and other demonstrations in a quiet manner."

Like any other war-swollen community where whites and Negroes live side by side, Washington has a certain amount of racial tension. Careless talking, rumormongering, can only exacerbate it. In these times of stress, there is greater need than ever before for level-headed checking of facts, for patience and tolerance in all our human relationships. You will do a service to your city if you refuse to become infected by these poisonous rumors of racial trouble and refuse to pass them on to anybody else.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 12, 1943]

THESE RUMORS ARE LIES

Washington has been beset with an increasing horde of rumors of race riots and race antagonism. Every one of these rumors has been investigated by the police and by newspaper reporters. Every one of these rumors has been proved to be utterly without foundation.

This includes all the rumors of up-ended street cars, upturned busses, shootings, mass fights in the Pentagon Building, and so on. The police have scurried all over town answering fake riot calls and every one of these reports investigated by this newspaper and other newspapers has proved to be a lie.

There have been two events of a controversial race nature. One was the picketing several days ago of a restaurant in the U Street area by Negroes. The other was the parade and meeting to listen to Representative MARCANTONIO discuss equal job opportunities, particularly as it relates to the transportation companies here.

Both of these events were perfectly orderly. There was no violence of any kind.

Most of the rumormongering has been by phone. The Federal Bureau of Investigation and the local police see no indication that it is inspired by Hitler's agents. Whether or not it is, to help spread these false rumors is certainly doing Hitler's work for him.

Washingtonians of both races are to be congratulated that the rumormongering has not upset their equilibrium. But we can all help to kill the rumors. The next time you hear one of these reports, ask your informant, "Were you there?" It will help scotch 99 percent of this wild talk.

Reports of this nature are supposed to be touchy subjects for newspapers to handle. But to ignore them at this point would be doing our town a disservice. Frankly stating that these rumors are lies will help to kill them.

The O. P. A. and the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARION T. BENNETT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the O. P. A. has done some peculiar things in its time and there are a good many people in this country who think that the agricultural experts in Washington are city slickers who would not know a farm if they saw one. Suspicion in that regard is fostered by such rulings of the O. P. A. as one which came to my attention today. The O. P. A. has just held that an agricultural establishment is not an agricultural establishment. Not even the New Deal Supreme Court has done anything that absurd. I commend the following letter to the attention of Members of the Congress for consideration in connection with the next appropriation bill we handle for O. P. A. salaries. This discrimination by the administration against the farmer and his interests must stop.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. CLYDE A. MORWOOD,
Springfield, Mo.

DEAR MR. MORWOOD: We are in receipt of your statement of appeal, together with your entire record which was forwarded to us by the regional administrator of region V.

We have given our consideration to your appeal and it appears that you are the chief bookkeeper and auditor for the Missouri Farmers' Association and that your duties require you to travel to the various cooperative associations located throughout Missouri and affiliated with the Missouri Farmers Association. The local board found you were ineligible for preferred mileage and this action was affirmed by the then State director on the 23d of January, 1943. The appeal from this decision, which was filed on March 29, 1943, was dismissed by the regional administrator because of not having been filed within the necessary 30 days.

It is the opinion of this office that the regional administrator acted correctly in dismissing your appeal for preferred mileage. Although your appeal was properly dismissed so that this office does not now have jurisdiction to handle your case on its merits, may we state for your information that we have already held that "cooperative farm exchanges engaged in the distribution of farm products and sale of farm supplies are not agricultural establishments." We affirm the decision of the regional administrator and the appeal is denied.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL M. O'LEARY,
Deputy Administrator,
in Charge of Rationing.

Analysis of Principal Provisions of Senate Pay-as-You-Go Tax Bill as Compared With the Carlson Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am presenting a clarifying analysis of the main issue involved in the Carlson bill as defeated in the House and the similar proposal that now comes to us from the Senate.

On May 4, the House, by the narrow margin of 202 to 206, failed to approve the Carlson substitute for the Ways and Means Committee bill. A motion was then made to adopt the so-called Robertson-Forand plan in order to defeat the unacceptable committee bill and at the same time get the proposed pay-as-you-go legislation over to the Senate for consideration. The Senate has stricken out all after the enacting clause of the House bill, and by a vote of 49 to 30 has substituted a pay-as-you-go plan based largely on the Carlson substitute.

Under the Carlson substitute, as voted on by the House on May 4, all taxpayers would have been placed on a current basis in their income-tax payments this year. In order to avoid any doubling up as a result of the proposed transition to a current pay-as-you-go basis, the 1942 income-tax liability would have been abated for practically all taxpayers.

However, in order to prevent any so-called windfalls as a result of the abatement of the 1942 liability, the Carlson substitute included two antiwindfall provisions.

Under the first of these provisions, taxpayers with more than $5,000 taxable income in 1942 whose 1942 income was greater than their 1943 income would have had to pay in 1943, in addition to their current tax, an amount equal to the difference between the 1942 tax liability and the 1943 tax liability. The net effect of this provision was to base the current 1943 liability on the higher income of the 2 years, and to abate the liability on the lower income of the 2 years.

Under the second antiwindfall provision, which was designed to prevent the escape of war profits from their just share of taxation, it was provided in effect that the abatement of 1 year's tax liability should be limited to normal income. For the purposes of this provision, the normal income was deemed to be the 1940 income plus $5,000. Any excess income in the year which would otherwise be abated was to be taxed at the regular normal and surtax rates.

Under the Senate bill, the basic provisions of the Carlson substitute are retained. The only major changes are in these so-called windfall provisions.

The Senate bill, as in the case of the Carlson substitute, provides that all taxpayers shall be placed on a current basis in 1943—that is, that the 1943 tax liability shall be paid in 1943 out of current income. In general, the 1942 liability is canceled so as to avoid any doubling up. However, it is provided under the Senate bill that if the 1942 tax would have been higher than the 1943 current tax, the 1943 tax shall be increased by the difference. That is, if the taxpayer's 1943 liability is $100, and his 1942 liability was $120, the current 1943 tax is increased by the $20 difference, and becomes $120 instead of $100. The effect of this provision is to base the 1943 tax on the higher income of the 2 years, 1942 and 1943, and to abate the tax liability of the lower of the 2 years. Under the Carlson substitute, this provision was limited to taxpayers with more than $5,000 taxable income, but under the Senate amendment it applies to all taxpayers.

The Senate bill further provides that if the income in the lower of the two years represents swollen war profits, the abatement shall not apply to the abnormal portion of such income. This is the same provision as was in the Carlson substitute, except that a change is made in the "yardstick" for measuring such abnormal income. Under the Carlson substitute, income was considered abnormal to the extent that it exceeded the 1940 income plus $5,000. Under the Senate bill, it is considered abnormal to the extent that it exceeds the highest income of any one of the years 1938, 1939, or 1940, plus $10,000. Such abnormal portion of the income would be taxed at the full normal and surtax rates, as under the Carlson substitute. Thus, if the taxpayer had an income of $50,000 in 1942, and $100,000 in 1943, his current tax would be on the $100,000 1943 income, and his 1942 income would be subject to tax only to the extent that is abnormal as herein defined. Assuming that his highest income in the years 1938, 1939, and 1940 was $10,000, then this amount, plus $10,000, would be the normal income and the difference between this total of $20,000 and the $50,000 1942 income would be considered to represent abnormal war income. This $30,000 difference would be subject to the regular normal and surtax rates, and the special tax thus computed would be payable in addition to the tax on the current 1943 income. An additional time could be obtained for its payment in hardship cases.

The Senate bill also makes an important change in the withholding-tax provisions. Under the Carlson substitute, the Ways and Means Committee bill, and the Robertson-Forand bill, 2 sets of exemptions were provided under the withholding tax. The 3-percent Victory-tax withholding applied to that portion of the income in excess of $624 annually, and the 17-percent income-tax withholding applied to that portion of the income in excess of $550 annually in the case of single persons, and $1,320 annually in the case of married persons, plus $385 for each dependent. In order to simplify the collection machinery, the Senate amendment provides for only 1 set of exemptions, namely, $624 for single persons, $1,248 for married persons, and $312 for each dependent. This change makes it possible to use only 5 withholding-tax tables instead of 25, as in the several House bills. It does not affect the ultimate liability of the taxpayer for either the Victory tax or the income tax, as computed on the regular return.

Austrians, America, and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me over station WEVD Friday, May 14, 1943:

"Self determination" and "open covenants openly arrived at" were magic words during the ascendancy of President Wilson. The Versailles Treaty seemed to have destroyed them, but like Phoenix they are now arising from their ashes. They mean much for the future of Austria. They are integrated and insolubly cemented in the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms. Public opinion in America today, which is our real ruler, demands that Austria shall be for the Austrians and the Austrians only shall determine their own government. Those determinations shall be not in secret but in the open, under the pitiless light of "open covenants openly arrived at."

I am sure that Austrians in this country and Americans of Austrian descent are loyal to the Allied Nations' cause. I am of the opinion that many of the Austrians within Hitler's "Festung Europe" are likewise opposed to Prussian and Axis domination. They have suffered immeasurably. Fully 400,000 sons of Austria have gone through the valley of the shadow. Austria's villages are deserted. Its populace has been decimated. The dead and crippled are on all sides. Every Austrian family is in mourning. Hunger stalks the land. Death, desolation, rapine, and plunder, the instruments of Hitler, abound everywhere in Austria. The people of Austria are no longer gay and free and frolicsome, for Hitler has brought them naught but slavery and travail. Funeral dirges—not the Strauss waltzes—are the music of the day.

Only in an Allied victory will Austria find surcease from her suffering. Only after Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, and their stooges shall have been gibbeted or guillotined or destroyed by lethal gases—the Nazi way of punishment—shall Austrians again breathe freely—shall Austria be endowed with the "four freedoms," particularly freedom from want and freedom from fear. Then the freedom-loving people of Austria will be enabled to rid themselves of the Nazi bandits and their treacherous Altreich jackals who have sold Austria down the river. Then the Austrians will no longer be the tools and cannon fodder of the Prussian Junkers.

Austria has contributed much to science, philosophy, engineering, and music. Time will not permit a detailed statement of her prowess and glory. I have but to mention the names of Mozart, Schubert, and Haydn, who have always sung of freedom for Austria. Austria, indeed, is entitled to a place in the sun, and she shall have it, and this, despite the noisy and loathsome cafe-society tactics of the Hapsburg family. Otto von Hapsburg, the papier-mâché pretender to the Aus-

tro-Hungarian throne; his mother, Empress Zita, and their entourage of social satellites and lickspittles are constantly stirring up among Austrians disunity. They would drive wedges between Austria and its neighbors—the Czechs, the Yugoslavs, the Poles, and others struggling for liberation. Their motto is the despicable one of "divide and conquer."

Despite the machinations of this antiliberal group, who would restore the feudal Hapsburg yoke to central Europe, the cause of Austria has won complete recognition throughout the United States and Great Britain. President Roosevelt has referred to Austria as the first victim of Nazi aggression, and many prominent in our Government now declare that Austria shall not be deemed part of the German Reich.

Austria was forced into the Anschluss by treason from within and invasion from without. As proof positive of our kindness and friendliness to Austria, we have exempted Austrians from the status of enemy aliens. There has not been placed upon them the bar sinister of "enemies" as is the case of nationals of the German Reich.

Likewise in Great Britain, Prime Minister Winston Churchill declared, "the people of Great Britain will never desert the cause of freedom of Austria—and in the victory of the Allies, Austria shall find her honored place."

Despite the Hapsburgs and their attempt to hold mock court in Washington, in New York, and elsewhere, despite their un-American bestowal of the Orders of Leopold and the Golden Fleece upon misguided Americans, despite the despicable political activities of this "chocolate soldier," Otto von Hapsburg, America guarantees a free Austria in a free world.

Finally it is refreshing to note the recent statement of the Soviet Premier Joseph Stalin, who wants "friendly neighbors" in Central Europe. Russia wants to treat Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the others near and in juxtaposition to her as friends. She wants them to be independent, strong, and virile nations. There are those, however, who would set up a sort of combination like that of the old Austria-Hungary Empire as a bulwark against Russia. They wish to set up a sort of "sanitaire cordon" against Russia. Such a contemptible approach to peace is unthinkable and those who hold out such hopes to my mind are faithless to the tenets of the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter. They would deny the purposes for which we are carrying on the war and for which we are giving up so much treasure and blood.

Can the Postal Personnel Stand a Cut?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly surprised when I read in the papers that the Director of the Budget, for whose ability I have the highest regard, has decided that the personnel of the Postal Service should be reduced nearly 20,000.

No one in the entire country is more anxious than I am to reduce Government personnel wherever it can be done without impairing vital activities and I will go as far as anyone in that direction, but my intimate acquaintanceship with the Postal Service convinces me that it is undermanned, rather than overmanned. In some branches it is tragically undermanned. I tried to figure out where cuts in postal personnel could be made in conformity with the suggestion of the Director of the Budget and to save my life I could not find the answer.

The selective service already has sapped that personnel to the extent that more than 28,000 postal employees have gone into the armed forces. In framing the Post Office appropriation bill for the next fiscal year we purposely fixed the appropriations for the great postal groups, clerks and carriers, below what we know will be the real requirements, anticipating that the Department will have to appoint thousands of additional clerks and carriers during the year and secure funds to pay them in deficiency appropriations. In such circumstances a reduction in the present number of clerks and carriers is unthinkable if the mail service is to continue to function.

If there is anything in this picture to indicate that the postal personnel can stand a cut of 20,000, I fail to see it. The upsurge of postal business continues at a dazzling rate. Postal receipts for April 1943, for instance, show an increase of 16 percent over April of last year. It is axiomatic that the mails have to be moved, and personnel must be provided to move it.

It occurred to me that the views of Postmaster General Walker in reference to the proposed cut in personnel would be interesting. Knowing him to be economy minded as well as a fine business executive, I wrote to him asking him for his views, and I conclude my remarks by presenting to the House the correspondence between the Postmaster General and myself, as follows:

APRIL 15, 1943.

Hon. FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WALKER: I see by the papers that the Director of the Budget has ordered a very large cut in the personnel of the Postal Establishment. While no one favors economy more than I do, and I would like to see cuts made in various overstaffed agencies I might name, my observation from close association with your Department makes me wonder how the Postal Service can stand such a large cut in personnel in the face of vastly expanding activities and an ever-increasing burden of work. If you can see your way clear to advise me I will be appreciative if you will inform me how you expect to apply the cut. I know, of course, that you have a large turnover and I assume that most of it will have to be met by not filling vacancies, that is to say, by the equivalent of the abolishment of positions, but I wonder how you can carry on by abolishing so many positions. I know that I need not assure you that I have the best interests of the Service in mind in making this inquiry.

With high esteem, I am,
Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., May 12, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Chairman, Treasury and Post Office Subcommittee,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: This letter is in response to your request of April 15, 1943, for information concerning newspaper statements that the Director of the Budget has ordered a large cut in postal personnel. You express wonder as to how this can be done in the face of vastly expanded activities and an ever-increasing burden of work.

First, permit me to express my appreciation of your sincere interest in the welfare of the Post Office Department which prompted you, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Post Office Appropriations, to write me.

I am pleased to state there are not now, nor have there been for a number of years, any surplus or unnecessary employees in the Post Office Department. There has not been and there will not be any necessity to make a cut in the number of our clerks and carriers to meet the quota set by the Director of the Budget.

It is understood that in our comparatively small number of custodial employees, some who are used as guards are to be placed on the rolls of the Federal Works Agency to do the same work that they are now doing. Any reduction in the number of other custodial employees who, as a rule, would not be used in any war activities, will be at the expense of cleanliness and sanitation. These employees, as you know, are all in the lower-wage brackets.

I think it well to state at this point that it is well known that because of the vast and rapid fluctuations in postal work, the Post Office Department could not be governed by a fixed quota of employees. The number of employees must change with the work.

The Post Office Department is proud of its efficiency, and naturally its entire personnel is distressed over the alleged testimony of the Director of the Budget. This, broadcast throughout the country, was to the effect that there were found to be some 41,000 persons unnecessarily employed in the Government service and of these, some 20,000, or nearly one-half, were in the Post Office Department. It is a serious reflection on an efficient organization, and most harmful to the morale of our personnel.

I am unable to understand how such an erroneous conclusion could be reached from any information submitted by this Department. I do realize the Director was given a difficult job to do under Senate Joint Resolution 170, and a very limited time in which to do it. He may have been misquoted, or he may have based his conclusions on data which were interpreted inaccurately or not understood. In any event, the quotas of employees set by him are not such as will bring about a permanent saving in manpower or warrant a reduction in appropriations unless it is desired to reduce the one covering our custodial forces with resultant effects on cleanliness and sanitation.

So far as I know, the proposed reduction in Government forces is based upon the establishment of a 48-hour week which became effective in most agencies about January 1, 1943. As the Post Office Field Service had, to a great extent, been working 48 hours or more a week since April 1, 1942, the establishment of a general 48-hour week did not affect the Postal Service to any appreciable extent.

You will recall that shortly after the outbreak of the war, I asked Congress for legislation authorizing the payment of overtime for Saturday work in the Postal Service. This was for the purpose of conserving our manpower, we having anticipated a shortage because of war activities, as well as a greatly increased volume of work. The Congress recognized promptly the advisability of this legislation, and the necessary funds were provided. From that time on our work-week was extended, and the legislation has proved most helpful. Senate Joint Resolution 170, effective December 1, 1942, conferred no benefits on the Postal Service so far as a lengthened workweek is concerned; on the contrary,

it has caused us endless difficulties in administration.

However, the Post Office Department was notified on December 24, 1942, by the Director of the Budget, that:

"The Congress, in Senate Joint Resolution 170, approved December 22, 1942 * * * requires the heads of departments and agencies to submit information justifying the number of employees in their respective departments and agencies to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The Director is instructed to order such reduction in personnel as he finds to be in excess of the minimum requirements."

The Post Office Department, as stated, had in large part been under a 48-hour week for some months, and replied to this letter on January 21, 1943, submitting a justification and explanation for the number of employees on the rolls both in Washington and in the field.

The next action taken was through a letter dated March 26, 1943, when the Post Office Department was ordered by the Director of the Budget to reduce within 30 days its authorized forces to meet a quota determined by him.

The Director also stated in this letter that, in addition to the reduction ordered by him, it was proposed to reduce the city carriers by an additional 4,420 men after April 30, 1943. Such a reduction, I assume, should be based upon a policy as to whether collection and delivery service to the public is to be curtailed. Nearly a year ago I tried this out. We have had and are having some real experience with such curtailments, and they are made as public policy and service needs permit. I shall keep you informed concerning this proposed additional reduction.

As we did not know the reason or basis for the Director's action, and had not been offered any suggestions as to how any reductions could be made, and as there had been no comment or criticism concerning our justification, an opportunity to discuss the problem was requested.

This request was granted with the result that a proposed reduction in the departmental forces was practically eliminated. In the field service a modification was made in the number of railway postal clerks and the motor vehicle forces to be reduced making it unnecessary to dispense with any of these employees. No modification was made, however, in the number of post-office clerks and city carriers or the custodial forces to be reduced, except that clerks and carriers were permitted to be considered as one item.

The following table shows the number of man-years work, overtime excluded, as taken from our February 1943 reports; the number of actual employees approved by the Director of the Budget in his letter of March 26, 1943; the revised figures shown in his letter of April 6, 1943; and the number of actual employees on April 1, 1943, as established by a postmasters' and superintendents' count which was received and compiled in the Department within the last few days:

	Man-years work, overtime excluded, February 1943 reports	Actual employees approved by Budget, Mar. 26, 1943	Actual employees approved by Budget, Apr. 6, 1943	Actual employees by postmasters' count, Apr. 1, 1943	Reductions in actual employees
Clerks	117,664	110,000	179,420	178,610	----------
City carriers	73,112	69,420			
Railway mail	24,391	22,315	23,029	22,839	----------
Motor vehicle	4,810	4,253	4,575	4,520	----------
Custodial	20,314	18,200	18,200	19,918	1,718

It will be seen from this table that there have been no savings whatever effected by the Director of the Budget in the Post Office Department in clerks and carriers, either in manpower or in money, through the establishment of a minimum quota of postal employees.

There is shown, however, an apparent saving of 1,718 employees in the custodial service. A number of these who are acting as guards are to be placed, it is understood, on the rolls of the Federal Works Agency doing the same work. We are unable to say what, if any, savings will be made. The reduction of any other employees in this group, as stated, will be at the expense of cleanliness and sanitation. These faithful women and men are in our lowest wage brackets and, as a rule, could not be used in other lines of work. Neither are they eligible for overtime wages but are given compensatory time for such work, a condition which does not concern manpower.

The actual man-years of work shown in column 1 in the foregoing table are based on a 48-hour week and are not necessarily regular employees working 8 hours daily, 6 days a week. The nature of post-office work, which is on a 24-hour basis with peak periods lasting from 2 to 4 hours, require the employment of a large part-time force. This number of employees fluctuates by thousands not only from hour to hour but from day to day. Seasonal business, mail campaigns, and religious and other holidays, with large numbers of employees requesting leave of absence to observe such holidays, increases the difficulty of determining the exact number of employees we have on any one day or week. A large number of classified substitute employees are required, as well as a larger number of temporary employees. These are employed on an hourly basis and released when not needed.

For instance, on April 1, 1943, we had a total of 22,623 temporary employees. Of these 17,873 were used as clerks, 4,254 as carriers, and 496 as laborers. We had on the same date 9,942 classified substitute clerks, 7,126 classified substitute carriers, and 365 classified substitute watchmen, messengers, and laborers. These employees, temporary and substitute, are engaged on an hourly basis. On certain days and in certain seasons all of them are employed a full 8 hours or more daily; on other days for only a few hours, and on other days not at all.

These conditions have made it difficult without going to some expense to give exact figures on a specified date of our field personnel. This does not mean that there is a lack of protection against wrongdoing. We have found that selective checks, made from time to time, prevent and secure us against falsification of pay rolls. For instance, shortly after assuming office as Postmaster General, I directed that during the inspections of our larger offices an actual count be made of each individual employee and his actual employment checked with the pay roll. We have, in addition, what is believed to be a pay-roll system with time records that is proof against padding. I am arranging, however, to have actual counts and exact spot records of the total number of our temporary employees, to the end that we may establish a perpetual inventory of our personnel in all its various classifications. It will entail expense, a matter in which we always endeavor to exercise great care, but we shall endeavor to arrange it so as to serve needful statistical purposes in our Department; and if these objects are not accomplished it will be discontinued. It also is hoped it will permit the Congress and Bureau of the Budget to estimate more accurately our manpower needs, though I think it will be agreed that there have not been any surplus employees in the Post Office Department since the early 1930's when business conditions were bad, and there was a decided decrease in the volume of work. At that time the Department took prompt action and furloughed employees, and permitted the retirement of a large number of others who were eligible.

I want to give you some reasons which I believe show conclusively that the problem confronting the Post Office Department is not one of reducing forces but one of recruiting necessary men and women to conduct necessary postal operations satisfactorily.

Man-years at present in the Post Office Department are not the same kind of man-years, so far as production is concerned, as existed in the Postal Service before the war. The inexperience, age, and physical condition of our recruits bring their effectiveness, in the opinion of many, down to 50 to 70 percent of the persons they have replaced.

You are familiar with the fact that some 28,622 of our experienced regular employees are now in the armed services and that we have not, up to this time, asked for any deferments whatever except for a very few among the small force of 750 post-office inspectors. These 28,000 people have been replaced by inexperienced personnel. Our civil-service registers are depleted and in many places it is impossible to secure satisfactory eligibles for appointment as clerks and carriers, as private industry with higher wages and priority rights because of war work, is a preferred employer.

You will note that our classified substitutes do not meet by far the number we are authorized to have by law—that is, 1 substitute for every 6 clerks or carriers. Where we should have 20,960 substitute clerks and carriers, we have but 17,068. This is but one of our difficulties in personnel matters. It has become necessary to employ large numbers of women and these, with younger and older men than we have found it advisable to employ in ordinary times, complicate our problems. Such men and women, inexperienced to begin with, have not the physical stamina and do not produce at the most, more than 50 to 70 percent of the work of experienced and physically fit personnel.

In addition to this condition and because of inability to recruit personnel, our experienced employees, both regular and substitute, are working in a number of instances unconscionable hours. Our records for March 1943 for the entire country show that 178,610 clerks and carriers performed the work which would have been done by 188,000 clerks and carriers on a 48-hour week. These 178,610 employees worked an average of 51 hours a week. In many instances it was found that clerks were working 12 to 14 hours a day 7 days a week because of the inability to secure adequate help due to local conditions.

Permit me to detail some of the increases in postal business to which you refer in your letter, and in the face of which we were directed, mistakenly, I believe, to reduce our forces in the number of 20,691.

I assumed the office of Postmaster General September 11, 1940, during the first quarter of the fiscal year 1941. The increase in revenues, postal expenses, and the decrease in the postal deficiency are shown in parallel columns in the following table by

fiscal years and also for the first 9 months of the current fiscal year 1943:

Fiscal year	Audited postal revenues	Accrued postal expenditures	Accrued postal deficit
1940	$706,948,026.74	$808,421,110.24	$41,472,483.50
1941	812,827,755.71	837,142,188.70	24,314,432.99
1942	859,817,420.88	871,642,676.79	11,825,185.91
1943	716,386,019.00	1712,170,545.00	

1 Unaudited figures for 9 months indicating a surplus of $4,167,474. The expenditures include the cost of the overtime pay bills.

The rate of increase in our postal revenues is growing constantly and amounted to 9.25 percent for the first 9 months of this fiscal year over the same period in 1942. The postal revenues at 187 of our largest offices for the month of March 1943 totaled $51,458,258, an increase of $6,354,702, or 15.37 percent over March 1942. It appears that our postal revenues for the fiscal year 1943 will be $940,000,000, an increase of $80,000,000; or 9.3 percent over the fiscal year 1942, which is by far the greatest increase ever in the history of the Postal Service.

In addition to the large increase in the amount of postal revenues, we are now handling approximately 3,500,000,000 pieces of free soldier and penalty mail. It is now estimated that 1 out of every 8 or 9 pieces of our some 32,000,000,000 pieces of mail handled annually is handled free of postage charges.

The following table shows the increase in transactions in our special services for the 9 months July to March 1943 inclusive over the 9 months in the previous fiscal year:

	1942	1943	Percent of increase
Money orders issued	71,079,520	84,837,762	19.36
Special-delivery mail	55,606,959	63,441,439	14.09
Registered mail (paid)	26,089,855	49,542,202	89.89
Insured mail	38,473,653	52,509,797	36.48
C. O. D. mail	23,998,602	26,522,484	10.52
Postal-savings deposits	$157,254,371	$191,347,651	21.68

It is believed that anyone who cares to look into it will agree that for many years the Postal Service has been conducted without waste or extravagance and that it has provided an excellent service to the public. Its operations, and its expenditures, and its personnel have been watched carefully by the Congress, as may be seen in the printed testimony of the hearings before the committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate over which yourself and Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR preside. The care exercised in the administration of the Post Office Department and the care with which the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House scrutinize its every operation, are reflected in our constantly decreasing deficits, which are being reduced notwithstanding the stupendous increases in the free-mail privilege for our armed forces, in the penalty mail for departments and agencies, in the services performed for other departments in the sale of bonds and stamps, and the well-merited increases in salaries of postal employees which were granted by the Congress after careful study.

In closing, permit me to again thank you for writing me. I wish to assure you that I am always pleased to be held personally to strict accountability by your committee for every phase of the administration of the Post Office Department.

Sincerely,

FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General.

Battle Against Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of today entitled "Has the Administration an Anti-Inflation Policy?" This is an excellent editorial, and should interest all.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAS THE ADMINISTRATION AN ANTI-INFLATION POLICY?

The Administration cannot hope to win the battle against inflation unless it does three things. It must frame a basic, well-considered anti-inflation policy. To know whether that policy is or is not being put into effect it must at all times keep informed on the actual statistical position of affairs, the incidence of its policies on different income groups. Finally, it must show the political courage to carry through its basic policy regardless of the howls of particular pressure groups.

Unfortunately it is not yet clear that the Administration has a basic philosophy for combating inflation, or that it has troubled to find and make clear what the actual situation is at any given time, or that it has the courage to battle for an impartial program against the political demands of special interests. As a result, what is the situation today? Organized industrial labor has comparatively, done very well. Since August, 1939, immediately before the outbreak of war in Europe, the cost of living, according to calculations of the National Industrial Conference Board, had risen 21.2 percent by February of this year. In the same period average hourly earnings of workers in 25 manufacturing industries had risen 36.4 percent. The weekly earnings of these workers in the same period had risen an average of 60.9 percent. The bituminous coal miners under Mr. Lewis have done particularly well. From May, 1933, to December, 1942, though the cost of living had risen 33 percent, the hourly earnings of the soft coal miners rose 140 percent. The situation for soft coal miners has been still further improved this year by the introduction of the 6-day, 42-hour week. This has meant a further 30 percent increase in weekly wages.

Let us contrast this with another figure. Recently the Director of the Office of Civilian Supply gave out figures indicating that the goods left over for civilian consumption would have to be cut by the war program to not more than 68 percent of that of 1941. The pie that the civilian population would have to divide, in other words, would then be only two-thirds as large as the 1941 pie.

But the figures just cited do not show that industrial labor is now taking, or is about to take, only two-thirds as much of the pie as it had in 1941. If the purchasing power of the wages of industrial labor had remained unchanged, it would mean (apart from any tax program) that it had as much pie as ever. This in itself would be possible only if other elements in the population were getting considerably less than before. But the purchasing power of industrial labor is not only as great as in 1941 but substantially greater. It has been calculated that the purchasing power of the manufacturing wage-earners' weekly income, after living costs are allowed for, was 21.2 percent greater last February than it had been in January 1941. If such a relative situation were even maintained, this would mean that industrial labor, in spite of the fact that there was a smaller pie to be shared by everybody, had not only increased its relative slice of that pie but had increased it to such an extent that it was actually consuming more than in the pre-war period, and this is only another way of saying that the rest of the population, considered as a unit, was taking much more than a proportional cut in its living standards. It is, in fact, in large part the white-collar group that has been relatively most hurt by the rise in the cost of living.

The irony of the situation is that it is the leaders of organized industrial labor, who have already secured most for their followers at the expense of other elements of the population, who are now complaining the most about the intolerable hardships imposed upon them by the President's hold-the-line order. And their pressure threatens to be successful precisely because the administration has not made clear to the country (and probably not even to itself) what the present situation actually is.

Any intelligent attack upon inflation would be integrated with the tax program. It would determine the relative and absolute amounts of income of different income groups and would decide how much of the burden of the war each group would or could be made to carry. There is no evidence whatever that any such fundamental study has been made or attempted. There has never been any public statement by the administration regarding its major policy in this direction.

Recently there came to light in a casual manner a study of Civilian Spending and Saving in 1941 and 1942, published by a division of the Office of Price Administration. How dependable these statistics are we do not know. Even if we take them at their face value they indicate a lopsided taxation program, wholly inadequate to combat inflation. This study shows that in 1942 there were slightly over 41,000,000 civilian spending units, consisting, roughly, of 33,000,000 families of two or more persons and 8,000,000 civilians. The study shows that spending units with an income of $10,000 and over, representing less than 2 percent of the population and less than 16 percent of the money income of the country, were nevertheless paying more than 72 percent of the taxes. This is another way of saying that 83 percent of the population of the country, representing more than 84 percent of its income, were paying less than 28 percent of the taxes.

The Office of Price Administration study declares: "It is clear that, in general, consumers with income below $1,500 and possibly even of those above $2,000, are already at as low a real standard of living as is compatible with the war effort and its stated objectives. * * * Current tax and fiscal discussion, as well as rationing proposals, must clearly keep considerations of this character to the forefront." Is this the official policy of the administration? Do the authors of this statement know what it is that they are saying? Their own figures show that families and single consumers with income of $2,000 and less actually form more than 55 percent of the population of the country. What they are saying is that 55 percent of the population of the country should not be obliged to make any sacrifices on account of the war, apart from their indicated 1942 contribution of less than 3 percent of the entire war-tax burden. This is another way of saying that practically the entire burden of war sacrifices must fall on the remaining 45 percent of the population. Can the

entire cut of a third in the standard of living fall solely on 45 percent of the population?

No responsible person who has given thought to the matter would recommend that an exactly proportional sacrifice because of the war should fall on all elements of the population. Sacrifices must be graduated, with those at the bottom of the income scale bearing the smallest and those at the top bearing the largest. That part of the population which is really at or below a minimum subsistence level should, if possible, be exempted from sacrifice. But the larger the group we exempt from sacrifice, the heavier must be the sacrifices imposed on all the rest of us. To exempt the majority of the country from sacrifices would be a reductio ad absurdum. To give persons who are already getting more than the average income still larger incomes is an even greater absurdity. But these are the absurdities now seriously advocated. They are possible only because the administration has no integrated anti-inflation policy, and has not made clear to the country or to itself the relative gains already made precisely by the groups who are now most vociferously demanding further gains.

Military Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post there appears a most interesting article entitled "Military Decisions," by Mark Sullivan, the great writer, in which he specifically states that military decisions should be left to military men. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY DECISIONS

(By Mark Sullivan)

CRITICISM TABOO

The common assumption in Washington is that President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and their respective staffs are deciding the next move against the Axis; and, following that, laying down the pattern of future moves. About the decisions, one thing is sure. They are for the high commands alone to make; the public cannot have information about them, because such information would be valuable to the enemy. Because the public cannot have information, it cannot have judgment. This is illustrated by something that went on throughout most of last year.

Beginning early last year there was popular clamor for a second front in Europe—that is, for an invasion of the European Continent, and an attack upon Germany by a British and American force. The clamor continued in England and America throughout the summer. While some of it was inspired by Communists, a great deal was spontaneous and reflected a genuine popular wish. Toward this popular demand the attitude of the British and American Governments was one of diplomatic stalling. They knew that a second front in Europe in sufficient force to be at once formidable and safe, was impossible. But to say that would have been to give valuable information to Hitler. Moreover, continuance of the demand for a second front provided the British and American Governments with camouflage for what they were really about to do. Beginning about last June, British and Americans knew they would undertake to occupy north Africa. That was as much as they were able to do under the conditions existing last year.

LEARN OF U-BOAT TOLL

What last year's conditions were became known to the public a few weeks ago. By a report of the Truman committee of the Senate, followed by statements from Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, it became known that throughout last year enemy submarines were sinking a larger tonnage of Allied ships than the number of new ships being built. The excess of destruction by the enemy was such that at the end of 1942 the Allies had about a million tons less shipping than they had had at the beginning. In that condition of diminishing tonnage, a second front in Europe was impossible. This the Allied high commands knew. The public did not.

Another experience of last year is useful to apply now. When American Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower set out to occupy French North Africa, he expected that the territory would be delivered to him by a French general named Henri Honore Giraud. For this purpose, General Giraud was sent secretly to north Africa by submarine. It turned out, however, that the French Army in north Africa would not take orders from General Giraud.

To General Eisenhower this was extremely embarrassing. It looked as if he might have to fight and conquer the French Army in north Africa before he could even begin to fight the Axis. Actually, there was some fighting between the American and French Armies, with material loss of life.

PACT MADE WITH DARLAN

It happened however, that there was in north Africa a representative of the Vichy French Government, Admiral Jean Darlan. Darlan offered to order the French Army to cease firing on the Americans and further to join the Americans in fighting the Axis. General Eisenhower accepted the offer, of course.

This decision of General Eisenhower, ended the fighting between the Americans and French, saved many French and American lives, and hastened our occupation of north Africa, according to an estimate made by President Roosevelt at the time, by "a month or two."

Nevertheless, as soon as General Eisenhower's arrangement with Darlan became known in America, there was outcry there, chiefly from liberals and radicals. Their outcry was, mainly, that American military authorities ought not to enter into any arrangement with any official of the Vichy French government—no matter how valuable the arrangement was in a military sense. Those who took this view kept up for many months a din of criticism against President Roosevelt, Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, and Cordell Hull, Secretary of State.

This Eisenhower-Darlan incident is here told very briefly. It had many ramifications. For some of the opposition to the arrangement, there were appealing reasons.

But the fundamental lesson is plain. Military decisions should be left to military men. When a military high command, or a military leader in the field, has made a decision for a military purpose, for the purpose of bringing the war to an end in the shortest possible time with the least loss of life—when such a decision has been made by a military commander, he should be free from criticism from those who may deplore the decision on grounds of ideology. This lesson is more important to remember because, when as we invade Europe, scores of situations will arise similar to the Eisenhower-Darlan one in north Africa.

The Cremieux Decree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League at the Hotel Pennsylvania, May 16, 1943:

We all applaud the recent statement of our estimable Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, that we must have a world in which Jews, like all others, "are free to abide in peace and in honor."

We are naturally heartened by such pronouncements, but we are far more interested in the actual carrying out or lack of carrying out of such principles. The abrogation of the so-called Cremieux decree is an abrogation of the high-sounding principles contained in Secretary Hull's statement, because with the abrogation of that decree, Jews in Algeria cannot abide in peace, much less in honor.

Henry Torres, writing in the Free World, has stated with reference to the unjust act of General Giraud, "What would be the reaction of American public opinion if it were to discover that American citizens of two or three generations' standing, with a record of having heroically carried their country's flag on the battlefields of Artois and Argonne and contributed at least their share to the civilization of their motherland through their accomplishments in art and science, had been suddenly stripped of their American citizenship? Would it accept as valid the excuse offered by the perpetrator of this arbitrary decision that such a step, directed against a single category of citizens, had been taken to appease Indians and Negroes, and to resolve political problems which concerned them?"

The comparison made involves no exaggeration. Jews who have lived for three generations in Algeria and who have been endowed with the precious right of citizenship since 1870 have now had that right ruthlessly filched from them.

The United States has a stake in Africa, a powerful one. We have a direct responsibility; we cannot shirk it. We cannot toss aside the question with a mere wave of the hand—state brusquely that it is the concern only of the French. It is our concern as well. We have proclaimed that wherever we have pried open the Nazi pinchers and freed the victims of the Nazi yoke that we shall bring in the sunlight of the "four freedoms," embracing the freedom from want and the freedom from fear. Today 100,000 Jews in Algeria who have been there for centuries live in deadly fear. The French have pandered to the Arabs. They have sought to appease them, and in our development of the principle of appeasement, we seek to appease the French ruling aristocracy and French military caste who in turn seek to appease the Arabs. We are in an appeasement circle like the dog chasing its tail and thinking we are getting somewhere.

William Shirer has stated:

"While their armies slash into the Continent, they must soften the hard military road by a common policy of true liberation for Europe. * * * It is a way to win the war quickly by turning 150,000,000 enslaved people into the most valuable allies we have ever had. The times call not only for great military decisions, but for great and imag-

inative decisions. Our armies, victorious in north Africa and in Russia are on the move. Today our armies are ready for their task. But are our statesmen? If the Axis fortress were to crack tomorrow, would the British and American armies pouring into Europe bring real liberation or merely confused changes of regime based on temporary expediency, which in the end would lead not to a decent and enduring peace but merely to civil war and more bloodshed?"

The abrogation of the Cremieux decree augurs ill for the future. It points in the wrong direction.

I want to be practical. But there is a limit to expediency. Sometimes it is necessary to walk with the devil to cross a bridge. But what after the bridge is crossed? We must not continue to walk with the devil.

Gen. Henri Giraud in his momentous address of March 14, 1943, sought to justify the abrogation of the Cremieux decree by throwing a smoke screen of unrelenting condemnation of Vichy. The sting of his speech, however, was the claim that the Cremieux decree created racial discrimination which he seeks to avoid. Since, as he said, the Cremieux decree creates differences between native Moslems and Jews, he appealed to the principle of equality to support the flagrant wrong he was committing. Imagine one justifying his so-called application of equality by denying citizenship to 100,000 people with one stroke of the pen.

He sought to bring down Jews to the political level of the Arabs, rather than to lift the Arabs to the political level of the Jews. He justifies equality by injustice.

When Adolph Cremieux as Minister of Justice decreed, "The native Jews of the departments of Algeria are declared French citizens. Therefore, dating from the promulgation of the present decree, their real status and personal status will be governed by French law; all rights acquired up to this day remain inviolable," he did so in recognition of the fact that the Jews were regarded as the only trustworthy part of the Algerian population. Thus it was in 1870 and never has this loyalty wavered to the present time.

Because General Giraud bases the abrogation of the decree on a special plea of removal of racial discrimination, it is well to examine on what foundation this special pleading rests. The Arab can, upon request, be admitted to French citizenship, but in this event he must be governed by the civil and political laws of France. It has been so since 1865 and yet the records show that only an average of 30 Moslems per year have been naturalized since then. It must be remembered that the special status of the Arabs includes polygamy, unilateral repudiation of a wife by a husband, forced marriage and succession of the male line only. The Moslems were unwilling to submit to French civil and political law and depart from the mores of their ancestors. The Arab lost caste with his fellow Moslems upon embracing French citizenship. To tie up the problems of Arab citizenship with those of Jewish citizenship is absurd. This obeisance to nazi-ism, this knee-bending to French colonials, this perverted ukase uttered in seemingly solemn tribute to equality is a challenge to man's clarity of vision, to his realization of a truth ungarnished by mouth-filling but mind-clouding phrase.

If General Giraud instead of abolishing the Cremieux decree had extended French citizenship to all natives prepared to accept French civil law and to renounce personal status, he would have created unbounded benefits to all in Algeria. He would have acted according to the highest standard of traditional French colonial policy and he would have put into effect a law which has been favorably discussed time and again before the French Parliament. On the other hand, by abrogating the Cremieux decree, he put into effect that which had been denounced in the French Parliament for over 40 years.

Gen. Charles De Gaulle, representative of the Free French, has indicated his uttermost dissatisfaction with General Giraud's decision. He said, "We have seen in north Africa a period in which racial laws have been solemnly condemned, while the regime applied to the Jews there has become at the same time more rigorous than before." It was not General Giraud who won the cheers of the French in the liberated city but De Gaulle. In fact, according to Drew Middleton, who entered the capital with the victorious troops, Giraud is almost unknown in Tunis, while the Fighting French leader is everywhere hailed as the symbol of resistance.

Let us turn aside from questions of racial discrimination, equality, the human equation, and glance at the legal effect of such abrogation upon the structure of French law. The abrogation of the Cremieux decree was a violation and cancelation of the French law of nationality of 1927. That law provides that children of Frenchmen, born on French soil, and children of foreigners, born on French soil and not opting at their majority for any other citizenship, are French citizens. The 44,000 descendants of the beneficiaries of the Cremieux decree, the grandchildren and great-grandchildren of the native Algerian Jews of 1870 who were collectively naturalized, are today French, not because of the effect of this naturalization but by all that is signified by "born of French parents in France" in the nationality act of 1927. The shameless illegality of the abrogation of the Cremieux decree and the resulting violation of the nationality act goes further than that. A cornerstone of all jurisprudence in every civilized country that has sought to protect its people from the ill-considered whims of legislators has been the concept that no law shall operate retroactively. Yet here we have, as plain as Goering's girth, a retroactive law wresting French citizenship from Frenchmen of two, three, or four generations' standing, establishing a dangerous precedent in a world seeking to restore order out of chaos, and the triumph of justice over brute force.

Today we celebrate "I Am an American" Day—a celebration primarily for those newly arrived at citizenship. We encourage that citizenship to the *n*th degree. It is a prized possession. Yet today we, by silence in high places, are guilty of striking at the grand and glorious institution of citizenship for those we liberate from the Nazi scourge. In Algeria today, I presume, they celebrate "Citizenship Cancelation" Day.

Moreover, I should like to know what manner of back patting is this? The Arabs have not been too loyal to the Allied cause. They always wanted to play the winning side. When Marshal Rommel and the Afrika Korps were rolling up its victories against the English, the Arabs were jubilant. They felt certain that Hitler would be victorious. They fawned upon Hitler, his satellites, and quislings. They felt that the Wehrmacht could bowl over the British and American battalions and they backed up the Iraqi coup d'état of Rachid Alial-Gallani. They felt that Britain was finished and listened attentively to Goebbels. They followed the ravings of the exiled Mufti of Jerusalem. They even fell for the story that Hitler was a descendant of the Prophet Allah.

What were the Jews in the meantime doing? They supported wholeheartedly with "blood, sweat, and tears" the Allied effort. Loyal Frenchman are thus twice betrayed. Thus, General Giraud awards treachery.

The success of the Allied guns, tanks, and airplanes have now caused the Moslems to sing a different tune. Unfortunately, by the abrogation of the Cremieux decree, they are led to believe that their double-dealing game has borne goodly fruit. That their practical benefits are nil apparently is relatively unimportant. It appears that General Giraud loved not the Arabs more but that he liked the Jews less.

Mr. Welles, our respected Under Secretary of State, in these past few years has come to the forefront as a man profoundly devoted to the principles of our Government as set forth in our Constitution and in our Bill of Rights, a champion of the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms. His letter to Baron de Rothschild shows that the criticism of the abrogation of the Cremieux decree troubled him; for immediately upon the baron having issued a protest as to General Giraud's abrogation of the Cremieux decree, Mr. Welles communicated with north Africa. It seems to show that Mr. Welles has been made to believe that General Giraud's position deserves the support of the Government of the United States. Mr. Welles declares in his letter "that French citizenship is retained by Jews born in France or descendants of parents born in France." But it seems plain that Mr. Welles could not have had it made clear to him by the representatives of our Government located in Algeria what is in fact the catastrophic effect of General Giraud's announcement. Mr. Welles says in his letter that "only native Algerian Jews were affected by Cremieux decree. The decree is abrogated but in the near future a procedure will be established whereby native Algerian Jews who desire to become citizens may acquire citizenship." It is on this ground that Mr. Welles has been persuaded, it would seem, to defend Giraud.

But what does this mean? Suppose that in the United States all members of labor unions, or Baptists, or all Catholics, or all tycoons, or all Jews, were suddenly deprived of citizenship? Would it be an answer to them to say that they were protected because later a procedure would be established whereby they might again become citizens? This is to say: I deprive you of the ballot, but I give you the right to apply to have your right to vote restored. Hence you are not harmed. The consequence of such a course needs no elaboration.

But over and beyond that the ironic point Mr. Welles missed was that General Giraud has suspended all application for citizenship for the duration and mayhap even after.

Forget, if you will, the Jews of Algeria who have been deprived of their rights of citizenship. What of the Government of the United States? What of the bedrock principles upon which this country was founded and for which this war is being waged?

The disfranchisement of Algerian Jews is the first instance in the present era in which an antitotalitarian government has acquiesced in the acts of totalitarianism. It is the first time that our Government, dedicated to democracy and diametrically opposed to totalitarianism, has approved one of those very totalitarian acts which brought on this world war.

Ominous indeed is the precedent this carries with it for the future. It is hoped that the Tunisian campaign will swiftly be followed by an invasion of Europe. Will a Giraud or a Giraudlike regime rise in metropolitan France as Giraud has done in north Africa? What is the Giraud precedent to mean throughout the other countries of Europe, in many of which nazi-ism had had far greater influence than in France? It is urged that unless this Giraud action in north Africa is promptly rescinded, and this can be done in the main only by American pressure, the worst evils of nazi-ism, namely, the persecution of minority groups, will inevitably develop and increase throughout Europe. And who in this country is not a member of a minority group, be he a laborer, a manager, a stockholder, a white-collar man, a

farmer, a professor, a banker, a lawyer, or a publisher?

Certainly we can toss aside the glib excuse of expediency that might have been advanced for the abrogation of the decree. The cover-up screen of military necessity no longer applies. We have gained control of north Africa. Is it to be merely a physical victory?

American Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, last evening Watson B. Miller, Assistant Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, delivered a very timely and interesting address before the Americanization School Association of the District of Columbia. The subject of the address was "American Citizenship," and I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The heritage of American citizenship is so rich that no one person could possibly explore all of its treasures. The proud statement, "I Am an American," carries with it as many shades of meaning as there are citizens of this great Nation.

The humanitarian exults in one of the basic tenets of our Government—the equality of all men under God. The jurist thinks first, perhaps, of our constitutional rights providing justice for all. The person who may have escaped from oppression in other lands is filled with gratitude for the freedom he finds here. Churchmen bless the land where every person may worship God in his own way. The workingman and the businessman draw strength from the knowledge of opportunities for advancement and improvement.

Each of us shares a common pride in all of these blessings, yet each interprets his American citizenship in terms of his own ideals. Our very freedom, each to follow his own particular bent, is bone and marrow of the democratic way of life for which America stands.

It is true, of course, that citizens of other countries have their own loyalty to their native lands. But our love of country is a far different thing from, for instance, as we look at it now, a German's loyalty must be to his Nazi Government. We are not slaves serving a government which is our master—demanding the last ounce of obeisance. We do not bend the knee to an overlord whom we must worship. And we do not base our pride in our citizenship upon a government's expressed intention of ruling the rest of the world. No; our Government expresses the ideals and principles of its people. Our satisfaction derives from being a part of a united people who have faith in, and want to nurture, the innate dignity and decency of man.

It is not vainglory to attribute to ourselves, as a Nation, these high motives. We have recently had proof that our record before the world bears them out. Eyewitnesses to the recent surrender in Africa report that some of the soldiers of the enemy showed relief in quitting the fight—that they displayed no apprehension in placing themselves in the hands of the Allied armies. Subjects of a régime that glorifies brutality and despotism, they knew these qualities would not be manifested in our treatment of them as prisoners. Whether or not it came from the fighting front, I do not know. But there is a story going about currently which seems to express the attitude of the enemies' soldiers in surrendering to the Allies. A member of the Italian forces was being taken prisoner by one of our officers. He is said to have swaggered a bit over his good fortune in comparison with the lot of the American. He explained that the American officer now had to go on to Italy, but that he was going to America.

The high opinion of our integrity and adherence to our principles displayed by our enemies' soldiers, who have been taught to despise us, only serves to point up our responsibilities in the defense of liberty. Our first war on this continent was fought to establish each individual's right to freedom from oppression. This war, which we hope will be our last, is being fought to defend the right of every nation to its own free place in the world.

It is eminently appropriate that this Nation should fight for the cause of freedom for every nation, because all nations are represented in our population and have contributed to our heritage.

I should like to quote here from the Ballad for Americans which I am sure you have all heard Paul Robeson sing either over the radio or on a phonograph record. The song asks "Am I an American?" and answers in the following words: "I'm just an Irish, Negro, Jewish, Italian, French and English, Spanish, Russian, Chinese, Polish, Scotch, Hungarian, Litvak, Swedish, Finnish, Canadian, Greek and Turk, the Czech and double Czech American.—And that ain't all—I was baptized Baptist, Methodist, Congregationalist, Lutheran, Roman Catholic, Orthodox Jewish, Presbyterian, Seventh-day Adventist, Mormon, Quaker, Christian Scientist, and lots more!"

The beliefs and accomplishments of all races and creeds have gone into the development of our institutions and our culture. United in one nation, these peoples from all lands have enriched our heritage. Together we have demonstrated that our common love of freedom can overcome our racial and religious differences. We have learned to live together in peace.

From the process of welding together into a nation the vast assembly of minority groups that sought haven on this continent, we today derive our unified strength.

A century and a half after a Genoese admiral gave to the world a new continent, a little band of heroic souls set out upon the hazardous enterprise of establishing in this land a place where men would, throughout countless generations, live in freedom.

Since that historic episode, countless thousands have joined them from every nation in the world, bringing with them the finest traditions of their own culture, but bringing always in their souls passion to be free.

Under the banner of freedom our forefathers established a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. They wrote our Constitution and our Bill of Rights—humanity's answer to countless cries coming down across the centuries from that freedom of spirit and mind and body that finds its realization only in a truly democratic society. These formed the blueprint of our liberties. They were bought and paid for dearly by our forefathers. The lives and sacrifices and dreams of many heroes, before and since, have gone into the creation of the way of life that was charted then.

America, since its beginning, has been the point of fusion for all the races of men who were not content to live in chains. Here lives the spirit of the barons at Runnymede, striking against the oppression of kings; of Lafayette, inspired by America's heroic example and the spirit of the Bastile, fighting valiantly for the rights of man; of Garibaldi, the dream of Italian liberty searing his unconquerable soul, battling tyranny with his little band of courageous patriots and his own indomitable will.

Ours, we admit, is not a perfect society. Nor is the history of our Nation without its dark pages. But we have, in our land, neither tyrant nor victim; neither lord nor vassal. The rains fall and the sun shines on all alike and all men are equal before the law. No man can be deprived of his liberty here at the caprice or whim of another. He is faced by his accusers and tried by his peers. If he is able he must bear arms for his country when an enemy strikes. But the burden, if it is a burden, falls equally upon the rich and the poor, the humble and the well-born.

We thought, in 1918, that we had won forever the battle for freedom. That we had once and for all time made the world a place where men could live in decency, in dignity, and in peace.

And yet, we have learned again the inescapable fact that neither freedom nor tyranny is inevitable. No generation can be completely free until it has won, by its own efforts and sacrifices, the title to that freedom and the right to retain it.

Today, as in the past, the liberties of free men are challenged. Today, as in the past, the maintenance of those liberties depends upon the courage, the valor, and the determination with which we confront the forces arrayed against us. Furious and savage winds are howling across the earth.

History is repeating, in fantastic overtones, and once again two completely incompatible views of life have brought us to Armageddon. We have witnessed the constant spread of a conflagration which has caught the whole world in its flames. We have seen the valiant but futile efforts of those who would preserve the peace of the world. We have observed the relentless fury of the one man and the one government which was determined to destroy it. We have seen freedom crushed throughout much of the earth, and we have seen the suffering and the misery which has accompanied its loss.

Whole nations have been obliterated. Entire populations enslaved. Great cities devastated. Fertile fields laid waste. Worse, perhaps, than all this physical suffering, we have witnessed the spiritual collapse of once noble nations. And we have witnessed the birth of a philosophy and the growth of an ideology which glorifies force, which approves violence and which despises human liberty, holding in contempt the deepest yearnings of the human spirit.

And yet, throughout it all, we have maintained here a firm and unshakable faith in the validity and the destiny of the civilization founded on these shores 300 years ago.

We accept today our obligation and our privilege to protect the way of life so nobly defended by those who have gone before us.

We are, all of us, fighting to preserve that civilization. We are working feverishly against time—in the front lines of battle, in factories, on farms, and on the home front. We Americans—natives of all the world: English, Greek, and Italian; Czech, Scandinavian and Pole; Aryan and Oriental; Negro and Slav; Catholic, Protestant, Gentile, and Jew—are at our battle stations.

We are producing ships and planes and tanks and guns faster than was ever thought possible. We are producing more food than ever before in our history. We are working 'round the clock, 7 days a week, for Victory.

Yes; we are working for a cause that we know we shall win. For here are two completely incompatible moral systems locked in a death struggle. Two equally exclusive views of right and wrong, of life and death,

of doom and destiny. There can be no compromise between them. If totalitarianism prevails, democracy is condemned to death.

But from a long view of history, we know that totalitarianism will not prevail. It is a false view that out of the agny and violence of aggression, anything enduring can come.

You cannot build good out of evil. Life cannot come from death. Nor can a reign of bloodshed and destruction be the means of constructing a world order of peace and justice. A stable society cannot be based upon tyranny and repression.

All over Europe, smouldering beneath the Gestapo, is a fierce love of liberty—a deep desire which may soon flare forth in an eruption so violent as to shake the very foundations of the earth.

Desperate men somehow find guns. The everlasting will to be free can never be banished from their souls. Even though the light sputters feebly elsewhere, the flame is kept burning here, and men in all lands can see.

Whenever I think of the enslaved masses in Europe; whenever I think of our own boys dying for the cause of freedom, I think of Lincoln's words at Gettysburg: "* * * we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom * * *"

We have resolved to push back the wave of destruction and devastation which threatens to overrun the world. For we know that if Hitler wins no one anywhere can be really free. Even if he would not or could not invade the United States, what kind of civilization would be possible here? It would spell an end to the kind of life we have spent a century and a half to build. That life would be gone forever.

If we are to build now so that our future generations can say "I am an American" with pride equal to ours this evening, then we must be ready to follow up our victory with plans for a world in which peace can endure.

We must be ready to turn this war which was forced upon us into a springboard for advancing the cause of freedom all over the world. We must begin to think in global terms and recognize the interdependence of ourselves and our Nation and all other people and nations.

We did not elect to take up arms and engage in a second World War. We had no other choice. But we are in the war; and when victory comes we shall be in a position to have a great deal to say about the terms of peace.

Then will come the real test and the great opportunity for this generation of American citizens. It is one thing to glory in our own favored position among the nations—in our heritage of freedom and oportunity. It is inevitable that we should fight to preserve that heritage. But if we are to prove worthy of it, we must be wise enough and far-seeing enough and sufficiently devoted to the cause of freedom for all mankind to refuse to let any part of the world again become a place where despotism and slavery can get a foothold because of the misery of men.

Winning the peace is a far greater undertaking than winning the war. Many of the hurdles even seem insurmountable. But we did not realize until we began to see our actual accomplishments, the prodigious potentialities of our production system and the full capacity of our manpower.

With the prosecution of the African campaign we have seen the results of our facilities for international negotiations, united effort, and strategic planning. Suppose the human energy, the material resources, the intelligent planning, and the indomitable spirit which went into that campaign were turned to the purpose of developing livable conditions all over the world. Think of the powerful force of human effort and material wealth being spent on destruction on all the other battle fronts.

Imagine all of this power and zeal and human ability turned into constructive channels. Do this, and winning the peace does not seem so Herculean a task.

It remains then for us to set our hearts on the building of a free and better world in which we recognize the brotherhood of man. As American citizens let us pledge ourselves to that cause. And let us bequeath to those who follow us this new kinship with all people of the earth. Let us add this new meaning to the proud statement, "I am an American."

The Tax Bill

REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the tax bill is with us again. As I understand the issue, we have three alternatives: Namely, no pay-as-you-go tax legislation, the Senate bill accepted as is, or to refer the Senate bill to a conference committee.

There is surely no one among us who would openly admit that he did not want some form of pay-as-you-go tax legislation. Whether we realize it or not we are liable to be in that very position unless we proceed with caution in our actions. To send this bill back to the conference committee, where there are members who have expressed themselves as unalterably opposed to both the House and Senate bills, might result in a stalemate, which would seriously reflect against the entire Congress.

Personally, I am on record as opposed to all of these bills, because I do not approve of the forgiveness principle. I voted against the Carlson bill and the Forand-Robertson amendment, but I did vote to send a bill to the Senate, because I am wholeheartedly in favor of pay-as-you-go tax legislation. In previous speeches, which are in the RECORD, I advocated straight amortization of the 1942 tax, but my personal views should not interfere with the will of the Senate, House, and the people, if it means that my opposition would prohibit legislation on this subject. Therefore, I find myself in the position of selecting between the Senate bill and the House bill. That selection is very easy, from my way of thinking, and simply on the basis of the lesser of two evils. I find the House bill absolutely unreasonable, and I would like to quote from page 4446 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where that eminent tax authority, Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, in talking on the Bankhead amendment, which, in effect, substituted the House bill for the Senate bill, stated:

Mr. President, I do not rise to argue the amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama. I rise to thank him for presenting the issue in this shape, because it enables me to record the vote which I am, under my conscience, compelled to record. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it is really the bill as passed by the House.

No principle of equity of tax treatment is involved in the amendment, because our taxes are levied on a progressive system and on a progressively ascending and rapidly ascending scale. If we are to cut off anything, the cut should be made through all the brackets, so as to leave all on a basis of equality.

More than that, Mr. President, referring to the much-controverted questions of forgiveness and of how the Treasury is to be treated, the proposal would cancel within $900,000,000 of the amount which would be canceled by the Senate Finance Committee plan—by the Ruml plan, if you please, with the two windfall provisions; and for the next fiscal year it would bring into the Treasury $1,989,000,000 less than would the Ruml plan, as embraced in the Senate Finance Committee proposal.

Mr. President, the Government can be unjust, through discrimination in conferring benefits upon its citizens, as well as through its decision to impose unequal burdens upon citizens. I do not believe in injustice, and I do not want to treat the American taxpayers in that way.

The Bankhead amendment or House bill was defeated 52 to 27.

The George amendment, using the Senate bill, except for the 75-percent forgiveness, was defeated.

A straight withholding bill was defeated 50 to 29.

A substitute similar to the Doughton bill was defeated by about the same majority, which all goes to prove the impossibility of the committee in conference finding a bill which can be passed.

Time seems to be another important factor in this tax problem. We are told by the Treasury Department that in order to set up the tax-collection machinery for the operation of the pay-as-you-go tax plan, we must pass this bill immediately if we want to start this plan as of July 1, 1943. Delaying the bill too long will postpone the starting point to at least October 1, 1943, if not January 1, 1944. This delay is not advisable in view of the threat of rising inflation, because the collection at source will help avert further inflation.

Much as I hate to use this vehicle, namely, the Ruml plan or Senate bill, to obtain the goal of a pay-as-you-go tax plan, I believe that the many advantages to be received by all from a pay-as-you-go tax plan will more than offset the inequities to which I have heretofore objected.

I, therefore, will subjugate my personal views to accomplish the needed legislation, pay-as-you-go-tax legislation, and vote to accept the Senate bill as is.

Help for "Lost" Voters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, last week I introduced a bill, which was referred

to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, extending the time during which voters might vote at a general election. The Chicago Times has published a very interesting editorial on the bill, entitled "Help for 'Lost' Voters," which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELP FOR "LOST" VOTERS

Looking forward into next year, and remembering last year's polling-place absentee problem that may have contributed to the Republican gains in Congress, Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, has introduced a bill to lengthen the hours of voting on election day.

Senator LUCAS told the Senate that many war workers drive long distances to their jobs, some of them rising before daylight and arriving home after sunset. He proposed that Congress establish Nation-wide voting hours from 6 a. m. to 9 p. m. in elections for President, Senators, and Representatives.

In Illinois the voting hours are from 6 a. m. to 5 p. m., so the change would give 4 more hours of voting. In many industrial centers, where workers are on the job in shifts around the clock, many readjustments have become increasingly necessary. Stores remain open at night so that employees may shop. Some absenteeism from production lines has been traced to the needs of working wives for time to get in the family groceries. In the recreation and entertainment fields, hours have been shifted for benefit of night workers—by the operators of bowling alleys and movie houses.

National election day comes only once in 2 years. The extent of absenteeism from the polling place where a chief duty of citizenry is performed did not become apparent until last November. There has been only slight attention to the accommodation of the war worker who wants to do his job as a wide-awake, voting citizen, but doesn't want to miss all or part of a working day as a soldier of production. In New York, voting hours are from 7:30 a. m. to 7 p. m.; in Pennsylvania, from 7 a. m. to 7 p. m.; in Indiana, from 6 a. m. to 6 p. m.; in California, from 7 a. m. to 7 p. m.; and in Michigan, from 7 a. m. to 6 p. m.

In Detroit, a heavy war-industry center, local authorities have apparently recognized the need for time to vote—the hours are from 6 a. m. to 8 p. m.

Senator LUCAS proposes the trial of a Nation-wide plan to reduce absenteeism at the ballot box. In the November election there were 8,000,000 fewer votes cast in congressional districts than in the last comparable off-year election of 1938. The 1942 election was the smallest in nearly 20 years, especially in urban centers, which contain more than half the country's population. One out of 5 persons who voted in 1938 didn't vote in 1942. Although there were about 6,000,000 persons in the armed forces, a good percentage of these probably were not old enough to have voted in 1938.

STAY-AWAYS, 21,700,000 IN 1942

Just how serious was this absenteeism from the polling place, the forge of democracy, is shown by further comparison. In 1936, 45,600,000 persons voted for President. In 1938, 9,400,000 fewer citizens voted for Congressmen. This might be termed a "normal" off-year vote. In 1940, 49,600,000 cast ballots at the important third-term election. Last November the vote dropped by 21,700,000. They were lost in the "no-man's land" of war production.

Coinciding with this failure of a large part of the citizenry to assume their share in running the Government machinery, there was a corresponding rise in the number of persons vigorously turning out the machinery of war. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that 9,505,000 persons were employed in manufacturing in November of 1940. Last November the figure had jumped by 5,000,000 to 13,267,000. Last month it had increased another half million.

President Roosevelt beat Wendell Willkie by just 5,000,000 votes in 1940. Next year's election may be won or lost by the stay-away vote, especially if the stay-away vote comes from one particular class—the war workers who are backing the boys at the front by producing tools of war, but who may find it inconvenient to participate in the democracy for which the lads are fighting.

The Give a Garand Rifle Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask to have a statement which I have prepared inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. This statement relates to an interesting project, of national significance, which has come from the State of Florida. I refer to the Give a Garand Rifle Campaign, which has been undertaken as a State-wide project by the Florida Junior Chambers of Commerce, at their State War Conference at Miami Beach, May 8, 1943.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Briefly, the "Give a Garand" idea involves the donating by private citizens and organizations within the United States of Garand rifles, by sending in to the War Department checks for $80, made out to the Treasurer of the United States. In due time, a Certificate of Citation is issued by the War Department, thanking the donor for his generous gift, and giving him the serial number of the Garand rifles purchased by his money. A special block of Garand rifle serial numbers has been set aside by the War Department for this purpose.

Donors of the rifles thus purchased have the hope that after the war, when our soldiers return from the far-flung battle fronts of the world, they will check with Washington, and find out the name of the citizen who donated the Garand rifles they used. Then, circumstances permitting, they will be able to give the Garand donor a history of what the gun went through.

Now, the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce have voted unanimously to have each organization present a Garand rifle to the Government, and to promote the gifts of other rifles by organizations and individuals in their own communities.

This campaign is just beginning. It originated at Drew Field, large Air Base near Tampa, Fla., commanded by Col. Melvin P. Asp. Lieut. A. G. Thompson, Assistant Public Relations Officer of Drew Field, noticed a press release from the War Department in Washington, announcing that a block of Garand serial numbers had been set aside for that purpose. A picture was taken of a Drew sergeant in full battle equipment, posed with a Garand rifle, and a story published in the Tampa Tribune advising the public that any individual interested in giving a rifle could do so. The response was immediate, and a large number of checks for Garand rifles have filtered through Drew Field to Washington.

At the request of enthusiastic citizens of Tampa and surrounding communities, the Public Relations Office has allowed Pvt. (1st cl.) Harold R. Bradley to demonstrate and describe the Garand rifle to civilian audiences, ranging from 50 to 1,200 people. In every such gathering there has been great enthusiasm over the idea of giving a Garand rifle to the Government.

At one gathering in Lake Alfred, a small town with a population of only 900, 28 rifles, totaling $2,300 in cash, were donated at one time. The mayor, the postmaster, the local farmers, and the laborers in the orange groves and packing houses, donated rifles. Mr. J. G. Arbuthnot, 79-year-old farmer, who presided at the mass meeting, said: "What we civilians need is a little more sacrifice. I want to have a personal part in this war effort. I want to have my rifle fighting for me, and for our boys. I want to sacrifice more. That's why I'm giving this gun to the Government."

Another drive for rifles was led by Glenn Litscher, 100 percent disabled veteran of World War No. 1, whose nephew was taken prisoner at Bataan. He was so enthused over the "Give a Garand" idea, that he persuaded 11 fellow residents of the Sarasota Trailer Camp to donate a rifle each to the Government.

Rifles have been donated from people in every walk of life, and from every part of Florida. One old man, dressed in shabby clothing, walked in with $80 in worn dollar bills, and said: "I was born in Germany, and am still a German citizen. But I am an American through and through. I am giving this gun because I want to help end this war, and rid the world of Hitler." Another man, Mr. Roy C. J. Holmes, a post-office clerk in St. Petersburg, wrote that "I am 55 years old today. I am sending this check for $100 for the purchase of one Garand rifle as a birthday present from me to the Government. I do this in grateful thanks for 55 happy years in this country of ours."

From every part of Florida has come this spirit of self-sacrifice—this wish to take a more personal part in this war. The Give a Garand idea permits people to do this, and benefits the country at the same time to the value of the cash donation.

I want to take this opportunity to commend Col. Melvin B. Asp, Lt. A. G Thompson, and Pvt. (1st cl.) Harold R. Bradley of Drew Field, for their part in developing the Give a Garand program, and giving it an appreciable start.

I further wish to commend the far-sighted Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce, and particularly Mr. George Hall, president of the Tampa Junior Chamber of Commerce, for the impetus they have given a movement likely to be of great national significance. I understand that it is the intention of the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce to introduce this Give a Garand drive as a national Junior Chamber of Commerce project, at the National War Conference to be held in Chicago in June.

Knowing, from personal experience, the success which is sure to attend any national project undertaken by this fine group of forward looking young men—and knowing from personal experience many of the fine projects they have carried out since their organization in St. Louis in 1920, I predict that the "Give a Garand" campaign which they are now sponsoring will be a splendid builder of both civilian and military morale for the entire country.

I am sure that there are millions of American citizens who would like to take a more personal part in the war effort by giving a Garand.

Transportation: A Vital War Factor—The Effectiveness of Our Armed Forces and Civilians Alike Depends on the Efficiency of Our Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article appearing in the May issue of the McGraw-Hill publications. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I am deeply interested in our national transportation problem. I feel that Director Eastman, of the O. D. T., has done a splendid job. I likewise feel that the railroads, busses, and trucks, water and air carriers have demonstrated, and are demonstrating, that the confidence reposed in them by this Congress has been more than justified. Our fine system of transportation, privately operated, but supervised and aided by the Congress of the United States, has proven superior to anything that the Nazis or the Axis powers have had to offer. Transportation will win this war, and I could not refrain from incorporating the splendid information contained in the McGraw-Hill article on transportation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so as to make this information available to the other Members of Congress, and to the public generally. I wish to compliment the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. upon this splendid article:

TRANSPORTATION: A VITAL WAR FACTOR—THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OUR ARMED FORCES AND CIVILIANS ALIKE DEPENDS ON THE EFFICIENCY OF OUR TRANSPORTATION

As the Battle of Tunisia entered its final phases, with the British and American forces joining hands to crowd Rommel into his last fox hole, Hitler and Mussolini held their twelfth wartime meeting.

One important purpose of this meeting, according to the Berlin radio, was the study of a specially prepared survey of continental reserves. Topping this list of resources is the item of transportation.

Hitler has a great many headaches these days, but according to no less an authority than the Reich Ministry of Economics, "the central problem of the whole German war effort is transportation." It is, in fact, the Achilles' heel of Germany's war machine.

The Nazis have become soberly conscious of its crucial importance and Mr. Hitler must wince when he recalls the gigantic miscalculations which led him to neglect his railways.

He counted on a short war, not a long wear-and-tear war, and Germany's transportation crisis is getting more critical by the hour. It will play a vital part in its defeat.

This is a war of movement—on land, on sea, and in the air. Russia's 2,000-mile battle line, Royal Air Force's 700-mile bombing raids, General Montgomery's 1,500-mile advance last November, and the vast area that constitutes the theater of war in the Pacific make this fairly obvious.

Peace will come when one side gets control over the world's supply of fuel, oil, and rubber, for on these three critical materials depend all the vehicles of war, as well as of peace.

An army used to travel on its stomach. Today it travels on its fuel tank.

On the home front, transportation is no less vital. Here it is essential in getting the war workers, their raw materials, and their products, to and from the mines, mills, and factories that supply our armed forces and those of our allies. Transportation is a major factor in the Nation's ability to outproduce its enemies. Every known method, every type of vehicle becomes essential, for no single group of carriers, freight or passenger, can meet all our needs.

The railroads opened the vast resources of our Nation and continue to be the backbone of our transportation system. Today they are doing the greatest job in their history. They are hauling more tons of freight more miles than ever before—33 percent more than in 1941, and 55 percent more than in 1918, peak year of the First World War. They are carrying more passengers more miles than ever before—80 percent more than in 1941, and 24 percent more than in 1918. They are getting more work out of each car, each engine, and each mile of track than ever before. Private operation of railroads is proving far more effective and efficient in this war than did Government operation in the last war.

In contrast to Hitler's Germany, the managers of the American railroads have not neglected their plant except where Government priorities forced them to do so. They are turning in an unprecedented performance despite the long starvation period to which they were subjected. During the First World War the total investment in the American railroad plant was about $18,600,000,000. Since then $12,000,000,000 have been spent on improvements and after deductions for scrapped facilities the net increase has been $8,000,000,000. Since the present war in Europe began the railroads have invested about $1,650,000,000 in further improvements, many of them to meet special war needs.

Convincing evidence of the railroads' flexibility in meeting the special needs of all-out war is their performance in coping with the movement of oil to the east coast. In January 1942, 1 month following Pearl Harbor, the railroads delivered to the east coast by tank car less than 100,000 barrels daily. By December they had stepped this up to more than 740,000 barrels and during the week ended April 3, 1943, they averaged more than 900,000 barrels per day. By the end of this year they are shooting for the goal of 1,000,000 barrels a day.

Unlike Germany we have not attempted to control the development and growth of motor transportation according to the intuitions of one man but have wisely left it in the hands of experienced competition. That is how our highway transportation system came into being. Growing public acceptance has made it an essential part of our national economy.

The motor vehicle, its limitations set only by the improved highway and the supply of fuel and rubber, has developed to undreamed-of proportions. Up to a year ago private automobiles consistently moved more people more miles than all public carriers combined. Busses have become an accepted means of mass transportation. Local electric and interurban railways in many cases were converted to bus lines and trucks took over the local freight services. Under these improved operating conditions traffic volume increased. When the war in the Pacific made it necessary for us to conserve our supply of rubber and the U-boat depredations in the Atlantic throttled the flow of gasoline to the eastern seaboard, our motor transport was forced to grapple with the toughest problem that ever had confronted it since it became so vital a factor in the every-day transportation.

The share-the-ride idea recognizes the need of conserving gas, oil, and rubber. This particularly applies to busses, for wherever groups can be assembled for a common destination busses can be used most effectively. The intercity bus performs for the rural areas the same service that the local bus renders for the residential areas of our cities.

Reorganization of railroad schedules, adaptation of motor transport, rearrangement of working hours, all have contributed to provide a flexible transportation service for men and materials to meet the critical needs of the war effort. Twenty thousand intercity busses are handling 635,000,000 passengers a year, which is 69 percent more than in 1941. The fact that these busses carry a relatively larger percentage of the total coach passenger business than their seating capacity would indicate suggests that here, too, we are getting a more efficient use of these vehicles in terms of passenger loads carried. It is fortunate to note that the geographic location of most intercity bus lines does not coincide with that of the railroads but rather supplements it.

The contribution which the urban transport industry is making to the war effort becomes apparent when we consider that busses, trolley busses, and streetcars today carry passengers at a rate which promises to exceed the impressive total of 21,000,000,000, as compared with 18,000,000,000 in 1942 and an average of thirteen and one-half billions for the period 1936 to 1941. And this the industry is accomplishing with a minimum of added equipment and despite a serious drain on its manpower.

The truck lines, too, are setting all-time records. They have rearranged their schedules, eliminated circuitous routes, and coordinated their services with those of other carriers. As this is written, contract truckers with the cooperation of the Office of Defense Transportation are trying to eliminate the empty return trip.

The transportation industry as a whole is face to face with the biggest job in its history. Increasing traffic loads, with little if any new equipment, difficulty in obtaining essential maintenance materials and a growing shortage of manpower, combine to make it that. While Federal authorities, acting through the Office of Defense Transportation, took prompt cognizance of this condition, froze equipment and otherwise acted to conserve the vehicles then in service, it was not possible to add sufficient vehicles to keep pace with the increased traffic demand. However, the Office of Defense Transportation did lend impetus to the movement for staggering hours of work thereby spreading the peak loads and thus increasing the carrying power of existing fleets of vehicles in city service.

As we review the problems involved in meeting our transportation needs it is evident that we cannot depend upon new equipment alone for their solution. Lend-lease is taking a considerable share of our much needed output of transportation equipment. The immediate job is up to the rank and file of the transportation industries. It is up to their resourcefulness and devotion to their job. The operating men out on the road, the men in the shops who keep the equipment going, who make the most of the metals and other materials they can have, who salvage, conserve, and economize; these are the men who must bear the burden of our war load.

Theirs is a dramatic story, a story of cooperation and coordination, of ever-increasing capacity on a shoestring allowance of new equipment.

For this is a war of movement. According to Joseph B. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation, both the passenger and the freight traffic on the railroads is to a large extent war traffic—the transportation of troops and civilians on war business, the movement of food, raw materials, and finished products required for the prosecution of the

war. As Mr. Eastman put it, delayed arrival of troops at embarkation ports, delayed delivery of vital war materials could even conceivably mean the loss of men at the fighting front. And what Director Eastman says of the railroads applies to all forms of transportation. Transportation by bus, by streetcar, by truck, by train, by ship, and by plane—all play a vital part in the achievement of victory—on the home front and on the fighting front which relies upon it.

JAMES H. MCGRAW, JR.,
President, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.

The Shipshaw Power Development and French-Canadian Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced a resolution—House Resolution 212—dealing with the Shipshaw power development in Quebec and pointing out the superior treatment given the Shipshaw project by the War Production Board in connection with priorities as compared to great Federal publicly owned or private power developments in the United States. At a preliminary hearing before the House Rules Committee the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER], and myself showed how power developments in the United States were denied priorities or given inferior priorities in comparison to the great Shipshaw development in Canada. The Shipshaw project is an undertaking of the Aluminum Co. of Canada, Ltd., a subsidiary of the Aluminum Trust of the United States. Nearly $70,000,000 have been advanced by the United States Government to this branch of the trust without interest so that a great hydroelectric dam and development can be had at Shipshaw for the purpose of manufacturing aluminum. The dam was built under great difficulties through the use largely of French-Canadian labor. An article in the Commonweal of April 9, 1943, discusses labor and the Shipshaw project extensively. The Commonweal is one of the leading Catholic publications of the United States.

The article is as follows:

ECONOMIC INJUSTICE IN QUEBEC—THE PROBLEMS OF FRENCH CANADIAN WORKERS IN INDUSTRY

(By Burton Le Doux)

In the last 25 years British-Canadian (and American) control of the economic life of Canada has degenerated into dictatorship, the cumulative and brutal effects of which fall upon the French Canadian masses, not upon the British-Canadian masses. Beginning in 1763, there have always been Britishers who have denounced the realities of the Canadian scene; today, many are supporting the determination of French-Canadians to put an end to these conditions. But because of cultural, ethical, and religious feeling between French and British in Canada, always exacerbated in time of war, the country is now split wide open, more seriously than ever before in its history.

Maxime Raymond has become the foremost leader among French-Canadians largely because, in the decade preceding this war, he stripped the conflict between French and British in Canada to its basic structure by exposing the directors of Montreal Cottons and Dominion Textiles, head and forefront of the textile monopoly in Canada. These men are part of one of the wealthiest combines among British-Canadians, and draw their enormous pecuniary gains from the textile, banking, and public utility worlds in a fashion that would make some of our own students of interlocking directorates and acrobatic bookkeeping sit up and take notice.

Dominion Textiles, for instance, started operations with $500,000 capital in 1905. Fortified by special privileges granted by Parliament, by exemptions from taxation, and by an exorbitantly high tariff, this company up to 1926 had paid $15,000,000 in dividends; its stock was valued at another fifteen millions. This does not include profit not appearing in the balance sheet, estimated at a million dollars yearly since 1926, and charged off in the vague manner so well known to corporation experts; nor does it include the high salaries and bonuses paid yearly to its officers and directors. For years, while this was going on, the average wage paid to workers was $5 to $5.60 per week, day or night shift, shifts from 12 to 13 hours, not 8 or 10. Wages went up slightly in 1914–18, a dollar or two per week. But there are still many employees who have been on the job for years and who have never been paid more than $12 for 15 days work. In 1926 the company paid dividends of 150 percent on its original capital stock, while it reduced wages 10 to 20 percent.

These famine wages, motivated by greed and by greed alone, are paid to fathers of families who must support a wife and 4, 5, and up to 8 and more children. Amidst sanctimonious British-Canadian accounts of the ignorance of the French-Canadian people, their poverty, and their physical afflictions, and with the cry of "priest-ridden people exploited by the Catholic Church" ringing in their ears, children are pulled out of school and shifted into the mills in a desperate attempt to save the family from starvation.

This pitiful wage is handed the worker after he has come out of the stifling atmosphere of the mills and waited for hours without shelter in the rain, snow, or cold. With the money a small piece of paper is passed out to him; this indicates date of payment and amount; no indication whatsoever as to rate and method of payment, and no back talk allowed. This is a fair sample of working conditions—though the surface forms may vary—inflicted upon French Canadians by industrialists working in close alliance with politicians. Tuberculosis, infantile mortality, diphtheria, nutritional diseases in general are going up among French Canadians; they are going down among British Canadians where these conditions are not imposed upon them by British-Canadian employers—in many cases the same employers who fasten them upon French Canadians.

Conditions at Montreal Cottons and Dominion Textiles today are no better; wage increases of the last few years have been inadequate to meet the rising costs of living in that time, let alone to rectify the original abuses. Meanwhile, war measures have assured the directors of an ample labor supply and freedom from strikes.

ALCOA

Exploitation in Quebec is illustrated by the 1941 strike at the Arvida plant of the Canadian Aluminum Co. And it is here that enter American ideas, American money, and Americans in person to support British Canadian policies. The strike lasted five days, resulting in a loss of production of 32 million pounds of aluminum. The vast majority of the workers are French Canadian. The Federal Minister of Munitions (American-born C. D. Howe) greeted the strike by declaiming wildly about enemy (presumably Nazi) attempts to disrupt production, and by charging French Canadians with sabotage and disloyalty. The whole British-Canadian press picked up the charges, adding lurid embellishments of its own. Amidst great excitement, Canadian troops were rushed to the town.

Discontent mong the workers at Arvida had existed for years; many were their grievances. The Catholic Workers' Syndicate had been unable to obtain redress, its repeated demands for arbitration of the issues having been ignored by the company. The strike exploded spontaneously, without authorization from syndicate leaders, in what American aluminum workers call the knock-out department. (This is where a worker lasts not much more than 3 years, devices to protect his health being totally inadequate; in this country only Americans most desperately in need of a job will undertake this work.) Matters came to a head during a hot spell in July; workers had been finding their pay increasingly clipped by one special war tax after another, by various operations designed to insure purchase of war stamps and social security—all this not adequately explained, but arbitrarily imposed—and by a lowering of their earnings because of power failures blamable upon the company itself. Daily, dozens of workers had been carted out unconscious. The company did not pay the knocked-out workmen for lost time, and since it required the remaining workmen to service the aluminum pots of the unconscious without additional compensation it turned in a handsome profit for itself out of blood, sweat, and tears.

The final provocation leading to the strike was the circulation among the employees of information concerning the wages paid by the Aluminum Co. in the United States; this showed that the American workman was paid at almost twice the rate established for the French-Canadian worker.

There was no sabotage, no destruction of property, no fighting or violence of any kind during the strike; this was confirmed afterward by a royal commission.

It is a matter beyond dispute that the French Canadian worker is paid much less for the same work than is his fellow in Ontario or in the United States. Yet there are many British Canadian and American corporations operating plants in two or even three of these regions. This wage differential is explained by the British Canadian and American operators concerned somewhat as follows: The lower wage scale in Quebec is normal. Because of the greater wealth of the United States, and of its greater industrial activity, the United States can support a higher wage scale and a higher standard of living than can Canada, limited as it is by a smaller population and a smaller market. Little is said about the higher scale in Ontario; the explanation is offered on the basis of comparison between Quebec and the United States.

French Canadians reject this as "baby talk." They know that the aluminum industry in North America is a monopoly controlled by the Aluminum Co. of America, that this corporation and its affiliates in oil, coke, steel, etc., are in effect a world empire of fabulous wealth and power beyond the dreams of Alexander—and like him seeking new worlds to conquer. French Canadians are not interested in such technicalities as the United States court decision which has temporarily cleared the Aluminum Co. of America of violation of our own antitrust laws, nor in the virtual suspension of our Sherman Act for the

duration. They know that the ownership and management of both the Canadian and the American companies rest in the same hands, that financial control of the Canadian company by the American company enables the latter to control production and price of aluminum in North America, that the Canadian company is the world's largest exporter of this metal, that the Canadian company does not compete in our domestic market with the American company, and that, as established in a United States court, the Canadian company sells all the raw aluminum coming into the United States to the American company at special low prices.

French Canadians dismiss the transfer of raw aluminum from the Canadian company to the American company as an intercorporation juggling act; this to them is the other side of a picture which in its entirety shows these two companies swapping aluminum ore in South America for reasons of convenience and profit to themselves alone. They are also aware that these companies dig up bauxite more cheaply in South America by using peon labor than it can be dug up here in the United States, where we have plenty of bauxite of our own. French Canadians know that the cost of producing aluminum in Canada is lower than in the United States because of an unwarranted wage differential, behind which this corporation takes shelter, and that what is saved by paying lower wages to the Quebec aluminum workers provides just so much extra cream for the operators, while it imposes the celebrated low living standard on Quebec.

In view of the charges of sabotage and disloyalty brought against them when they attempted to remedy these conditions, French Canadians were interested in the statements made in the United States Senate by Senator LA FOLLETTE only last July. He asserted that the Aluminum Co. of America had deliberately delayed capacity production in order to protect its post-war business operations, that the war production program's oldest bottleneck was created by this corporation with our own Government officials in key posts serving either as innocent dupes or as conscious aids in a perfect monopoly. He continued by pointing out the intimate and dangerous ties between the Aluminum Co. and I. G. Farben, the Nazi Government's principal stooge in the business world outside Germany. The Aluminum Co. became a part of an international cartel in 1931, the details of which have never been made public. This much, however, is known: The cartel played into Hitler's hands and exerted an important adverse influence upon our own aluminum and magnesium production.

The Canadian Aluminum Co. also became a member of the cartel in 1931. This cartel was broken up in April 1942, 5 months after Pearl Harbor, and then only after a long investigation by our Justice Department, and a Federal grand jury indictment. It is significant that the Aluminum Co. did not defend itself in court; it accepted a consent decree; this is old practice with this company when brought to book. French Canadians feel that to raise the cry of sabotage and disloyalty against the workers is a case of the wolf bleating among the sheep.

The latest Alexander-like coup of the Mellon aluminum interest in Quebec has just been glorified in the American press. To Americans familiar with the rise of the Mellon fortune out of World War No. 1, its subsequent operations in Mexican and South American oil and the repercussions there, and with our own efforts to keep Mellon et al. within the bounds of decency, it will come somewhat as a shock to learn that this group has now secured a strangle hold on what is the largest electrical power production area in the world, and that this coup was financed by money loaned to the Aluminum Co. by the American Government. The Shipshaw Power Development in Quebec was begun in October 1941; it is now nearly completed, the work having been carried on under incredible hardships which killed 60 men on the job; night and day the work went on, regardless of temperatures ranging down to 30 degrees below zero. The project cost $105,000,000 as against $205,000,000 for Boulder Dam. It will produce more power than does Boulder Dam. By far most of the workers were French Canadian; at the peak some 10,500 were employed; this number is now below 3,000, with more workmen being discharged daily. The Canadian Aluminum Co. did not invest a dollar of its own money in this enterprise; title and ownership will rest in its hands after it has fulfilled its contracts—the sale of aluminum to the United States—and if the gentle reader should feel that such sales alone are an inadequate reward for the managers and owners of the aluminum companies, which should be supplemented by a bonus equivalent to more than the potential value of Boulder Dam, let him study the balance sheets of the American and the Canadian companies over the last 25 years.

Meanwhile, the electrical industry, in Quebec operates without any effective supervision by the central government, and electrical current is sold to the Quebecois at three times the rate prevailing elsewhere. The Shipshaw development is the latest grab of Quebec water power by British Canadian and American interests, and French Canadians are rising en masse, rallying behind the cry, "Here is a whole people that is being oppressed and pauperized." There are too many families now left like those of the 60 workmen killed on this job, too many French Canadians turned into migrants in their own country and totally at the mercy of industrialists who gather unto themselves all the profit, all the social and political power, all the benefits and all the prestige associated with patriotism.

French Canadians are indignant at the trail of destruction the influences described here are leaving in French Canada. The few plums which have fallen to them through philantrophy and charity from these sources are looked upon disdainfully by the more articulate and uncorrupted leaders, and by the masses as bribery. It is folly to expect this people to support the war effort wholeheartedly. Throughout French Canada, and in the cities especially, the people are in a sullen and dangerous mood. In Montreal the atmosphere is charged with emotion, grim, and oppressive, presaging a storm. Eighty-five percent of their voters refused last year to release the Mackenzie King government of its promise not to send conscripts overseas. This is clear indication to disregard the pronouncements of the few French Canadians associated with sinecures either in academic life or in the political flesh-pots of Canada, and of the few French Canadian industrialists who themselves, urged on by the spectacle of the financial success of British Canadians and Americans operating in Quebec, and unable or unwilling to remedy the conditions described here, exploit their own people no less than do the British Canadian and American employers.

IN SUMMARY

French Canadians have seen the control of raw materials in Quebec and the means of their manufacture and distribution increasingly monopolized by British Canadians and Americans; they have seen the concentration of wealth producing a situation where 85 percent of the tenants in Toronto are proprietors while but 12 percent of the Montreal tenants own their own lodgings, a large part of the remainder living under conditions far from conducive to family and individual health and morality; in all the economic activities making for strength as a people, in the type of social organization they are compelled to live in, they admit having lost ground. But there is another side to this picture. Constructive action to alter this situation radically has been slowly taking form; progress has already been made, with all the signs pointing to action that will shake the House Divided. It is beyond the scope of this article to enumerate these; they belong to a chronicle of the future. To Americans wishing to be informed of these events as they develop, a study of the writings and actions of Bourrassa, Pelletier, Groulx, Minville, Phillipe Hamel, Raymond, Paul Gouin, Heroux, to mention but a few, and of what is probably the most brilliant generation French Canada has ever produced, is recommended.

In the meantime, while the full force of the alliance between state power and money power is falling upon them, French Canadians are holding desperately to the processes of democracy to disengage themselves from servitude, believing all the while with Aristotle that "an unbridled democracy is exactly similar to a tyranny." First and foremost, this is a Christian people; religion is a living force among them; they reject the communist dictum "Religion is the opiate of the people," and are proceeding consciously in the basic Christian tradition, with the idea that this provides a more satisfactory solution of the problems of peoples living together than the outside world seems to afford.

Refusal of Permission to William Phillips to Visit Indian Leaders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a communication addressed to the New York Times and published in that newspaper in the issue of April 23, 1943. It is of sufficient interest to the general public that it should be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICEROY'S ACTION QUESTIONED—REFUSAL TO PERMIT PHILLIPS TO VISIT INDIAN LEADERS VIEWED AS ERROR

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The Viceroy's refusal to grant William Phillips, President Roosevelt's special envoy to India, permisison to see Gandhi and Nehru before returning to submit his report to his chief will inevitably destroy the lingering hope for a political settlement that has persisted in spite of many repeated setbacks.

Of course, such permission had already been denied to such men as Rajagopalacharia, the ex-Premier of Madras and the man who did not subscribe to Gandhi's latest civil disobedience; to Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, the eminent liberal held in high esteem by all the Indian and the British parties. And the pleas of numerous representative groups in India and the repeated warnings of prominent Englishmen and of distinguished liberal journals, as The Manchester Guardian, the New Statesman and Nation, have already been ignored.

FINAL POLICY SEEN

Yet, in spite of all that, there survived an undercurrent of hope among many that if

the President's personal envoy were to ask, permission would be granted, and that some tangible change in the Indian scene would follow. That permission has been denied and the Viceroy's refusal has stamped Britain's Indian policy with a finality that it seemed to lack before.

No purpose can be served now by exonerating or assailing the conduct either of the Viceroy or of Gandhi since the Cripps offer to India. But it is significant to note that whereas desire in India for a settlement has been steadily growing, the Viceroy's attitude has become increasingly inflexible. He will not move his finger unless Gandhi would recant and capitulate completely and unconditionally. This demand can be sustained, if at all, only on the assumption that Gandhi's guilt was beyond doubt and the Viceroy's policy beyond reproach.

DECISION HELD IGNORED

But that assumption has been rendered untenable, in view of the fact that the highest judicial tribunal of India, set up by the British Government itself and presided over by an Englishman, has recently declared that the Defense of India Act, under which Gandhi and his colleagues have been held prisoners for over 8 months without any trial, went beyond the powers which the legislature thought fit to confer upon the central government. If Britain were to follow the same high standards of constitutionality in India she follows at home, and for which standards she has always been looked up to by freemen everywhere, Gandhi and other prisoners should have been set free immediately following that decision, even if it involved rearresting them under new or revised provision of the Defense Act. Instead of that, her representatives in India have decided to ignore the judicial decision, to revise the act, to hold the prisoners, and to let no one even see them.

According to a United Press dispatch of April 25, quoted in the New York Times of April 26, the informed circles in London justified the Viceroy's refusal on the ground that the Phillips interview "would have caused great speculation and excitement throughout India and would have led to rumors and wrong conclusions." A strange justification in such a momentous issue. What could have been lost by stirring up some speculation and excitement when the move would also have stirred up simultaneously a little hope and created a little good will among embittered people? And Indian people will draw not the wrong conclusion, but to them the inescapable and the only conclusion—that the Viceroy has been deliberately hamstringing all moves for a compromise and discouraging even an impartial appraisal of the Indian situation. And what will be gained by accentuating already widespread bitterness, as accentuated it will be by this move?

INCOMPLETE INFORMATION

Herbert Matthews of the New York Times stated in his New Delhi dispatch of April 25 that though Mr. Phillips did not meet Gandhi, he did talk to a number of persons who had seen Gandhi during his fast. But meeting others can hardly be the same thing as meeting personally and directly Gandhi and Nehru, the two men who mold the congress policy and who can be relied upon to be able to deliver the goods. And without meeting them Mr. Phillips is returning with incomplete data in spite of his tireless efforts to gather them from all other sources.

Of course, the United Nations are marching to victory, slowly but surely, and Britain can afford to ignore Gandhi and Nehru and their followers. But what of the coming peace? How will Britain and India fit into that peace? The gulf between them is widening dangerously. The good will of India's millions is largely if not completely lost already. To refuse even President Roosevelt's envoy permission to see India's greatest leaders is certainly not the way to regain it. Nothing can possibly be gained by the Viceroy's refusal. Something might have been gained by his permission to Mr. Phillips.

All those who are concerned about the deeper purposes of this war, about the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter, will be greatly disturbed by such acts by our great ally Britain that have been deemed to have gone beyond their original intent even by her own judiciary.

Of course, the Viceroy has unlimited power to cope with any situation at his discretion, but that discretion can just as easily be exercised for a compromise as to legalize arrests by retroaction.

FRANCES GUNTHER.
ROGER BALDWIN.
ANUP SINGH.

NEW YORK, *April 26, 1943.*

Strategic Alaska Looks Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, it is more important now than ever before that the people of our Nation know something about the great Territory of Alaska. Alaska is the first soil of the North American Continent to feel the invaders' heavy tread. It is the American soil nearest to our enemies in Japan. It is the most strategic point in our entire hemisphere.

A valuable contribution to our understanding of Alaska has been made by that Territory's forward-looking Governor, Ernest H. Gruening. In the September 1942 issue of the National Geographic Magazine he published an article entitled "Strategic Alaska Looks Ahead." This article not only emphasizes the vital military significance of Alaska, but also underscores the future possibilities of this vast frontier.

My part of the country, Mr. Speaker, which is the Pacific Northwest, is looking ahead with Alaska—ahead to victory and to the time when our frontiers can be developed in peace. I ask that Governor Gruening's splendid article be included in the Appendix of the RECORD as part of my remarks. The article by the Governor follows:

STRATEGIC ALASKA LOOKS AHEAD—OUR VAST TERRITORY, NOW BEING MORE CLOSELY LINKED TO US BY ROAD AND RAIL, EMBODIES THE AMERICAN EPIC OF FREEDOM, ADVENTURE, AND THE PIONEER SPIRIT

(By Ernest H. Gruening, Governor of Alaska)

When I first visited Alaska in the spring of 1936 I had reached the age of 49 and had seen many interesting and beautiful places in Europe and the Americas. But no region ever gave me quite the profound thrill that did Alaska, then far away. No longer is it a far country, thanks to regular airplane service, established 2 years ago.

Entering Alaska by boat up the Inside Passage, more than 1,000 miles long, I could sense the joy of discovery that must have filled the early explorers. For virgin forest still vests the mountains as it did when Bering and Chirikof, Cook and Vancouver, La Pérouse, and the Spaniards sailed through those uncharted waters.

The same rugged peaks, green-meadowed above the dark spruces and hemlocks, raise their jagged summits into the eternal snows. From them, from the high-hanging glaciers—numerous and nameless then as now—pluming cascades pour thousands of feet into the clear blue waters of the Pacific's myriad bays and inlets.

Between tremendously high, steep banks, fiords cut deep into the coast. The inlet which divides Alaska from British Columbia on the south is called Portland Canal, so long, so regular, so apparently purposeful are its parallel shores, its high lining cliffs.

Everywhere the wilderness rises sharply from the water's edge. The settlements to come in the explorers' wake were to find their location as precarious as an eagle's eyrie.

Later, to locate an airport site would be harder still. Wooded islands, thousands of them, hills forested to where altitude and latitude combine to shrivel and gnarl the evergreens—these form a tumultuous panorama.

Northward the mountain walls loom higher, the fiords steeper. From deep-cut recesses glaciers pour their luminous loads, tumbling immense blue-white crystals into the sparkling and placid waters. From the peaks thrust huge rock pinnacles—Devils Thumb, Kates Needle, the four-pronged Devils Paw—sentinels which mark the otherwise invisible Canadian-American boundary.

For over a thousand miles we sailed in sheltered seas from Puget Sound to Glacier Bay. The last big terminal fiord, Lynn Canal, cuts straight north and deep into the continent, the wild, jumbled Chilkats walling it in on the west.

SHINING PEAKS SOAR FROM THE SEA

As the long Inside Passage finally led through Icy Strait, past Cape Spencer, into the North Pacific, a tableau more sensational than any yet seen beckoned to the great Alaska which lay beyond. Ahead, soaring far aloft, a mighty range glistening in the sunlight lifted in Gothic pinnacles and spires, tier on tier, to a central apex—Fairweather, 15,300 feet above the sea.

Here was the witness that we had indeed come to a cosmic country.

As our eyes lifted to the shining splendor and followed it along the coast, far to the west, a still higher cone rocketed skyward—18,008-foot Mount St. Elias. Surrounding its southern base is Malaspina Glacier, one of the largest single icefields on the continent.

Just behind loomed the Brobdingnagian bulk of Logan, 19,850 feet, a massive truncated mountain mammoth.

Here, but for Mount McKinley, 400 miles farther northwest, are the highest peaks in North America.[1] Against these eternal escarpments the restless North Pacific dashes its 20-foot tides.

It was not merely the breath-taking scenic grandeur that exalted me, as almost invariably it does those who see this awesome spectacle of nature's prodigality for the first time. Here was a primeval country, a frontier land, in which by some strange atavism the newcomer feels himself the pioneer.

PEOPLED WITH PRESENT-DAY PIONEERS

First impressions are often truest and most enduring. I remember the thrill of sensing that somehow here in Alaska one was in effect reliving the great American epic. I felt as if I were stepping back into American

[1] See, in the National Geographic Magazine, Conquest of Mount Crillon (Alaska), March 1935; Exploring Yukon's Glacial Stronghold, June 1936; and Over the Roof of Our Continent (Mount McKinley), July 1938, all by Bradford Washburn.

history, seeing, let us say, the Oregon and Washington of the seventies and eighties.

First there was—there is—the emptiness of the land. One travels for miles, rounding capes, passing deep bays and forested islands, without seeing habitations. The last census showed Alaska had but 1 inhabitant to about 8 square miles, compared to the United States' 44 per square mile

Air and sea have a cleanness and freshness found only remote from industry and crowds. Wildlife abounds. Eagles soar aloft and deer browse placidly on the beaches. Occasionally around a bend appears a totem pole or two.

The few towns and villages appear to be rough-hewn from the wilderness, their construction almost wholly of wood; even the streets are planked. In recent years some main thoroughfares have been paved and a handsome stone or concrete Federal building rises above the town.

More significant are Alaska's people. Theirs is a friendliness and a forthrightness which the frontier breeds. Where all are new or recent comers, informality, mutual helpfulness, hospitality, are the instinctive reactions of a people not yet grown old with the land.

Frontiersmen have never been much interested in where you came from, in what you had been, in what wealth or position your family had. It is what you are, here, on the new ground, in the pioneer struggle to wrest a stake from earth or sea; it is what you can do in these new surroundings that counts.

Here everybody works. And in a new country where mining and fishing are the dominant activities, physical labor is universal and not looked down upon.

More or less everybody knows everyone else. It is a long way from Ketchikan to Kotzebue. But persons and performance throughout the Territory are common knowledge.

Chiefly this is because Seattle has long been the funnel for all Alaska activity. Virtually all shipping to Alaska starts there, and one is in effect in Alaska when one steps on board in Seattle.

THEY CATCH AND CAN AT KETCHIKAN

Except for the Bering Sea traffic, steamers follow a coastwise port-to-port course.

Ketchikan, calling itself the first city, is one of the world's chief salmon-canning towns. It hugs for 4 miles a narrow beach between Tongass Narrows and the steep forested hills of Revillagigedo Island

Then come Wrangell and Petersburg, picturesque fishing towns. Most of the people of Petersburg, a shrimp center, are sturdy sons and daughters of Norway.

Unofficial greeter at Juneau, the capital, is the famous Alaska Juneau gold mine, whose shafts go upward into Roberts Mountain. The mine's brilliantly lighted mill, reflected at night in Gastineau Channel, is often mistaken by first-comers for a palatial hotel.

Across the channel lies Douglas, once, in the heyday of the now defunct Treadwell gold mine, bigger than Juneau. Though it has a foundry and cannery, Douglas survives chiefly as a residential suburb linked to the capital by a fine steel bridge, product of early Public Works Administration construction. It now provides the late night life for the two towns.

Sitka, the old Russian capital, richly rewards a side trip toward the outer edge of the Alexander Archipelago. It lies on the west coast of Baranof Island, named after the city's founder and the greatest figure in the century and a quarter of Tsarist rule. In an island-studded bay surrounded by steep saw-toothed peaks nestles this delightful town, in which the fragrance of the past still pleasantly lingers.

A century and a quarter ago Sitka was the busiest and gayest port on the west coast of North America. Here sovereignty was transferred from Russia to the United States in 1867, and the town remained the American capital of the territory until 1906. It has one of the finest Russian cathedrals in the Western Hemisphere; the green cupola and graceful spire, surmounted by the characteristic cross, still dominate the old town.

Appropriately, the Pioneers' Home, that unique Alaskan institution where the Territory's old-timers spend their last years retelling the tales of prospectors' adventure, is here in Alaska's citadel of romance.

Now Sitka again teems with new life and faces a new adventure.

Skagway, indelibly associated with the days of ninety-eight and with the Territory's most famous outlaw, "Soapy" Smith, is on some American steamer schedules and is the northern terminal port of all the Canadian vessels.

From Skagway and from the nearby ghost town of Dyea thousands of hopeful prospectors in gold-rush days started over the steep mountain passes to the headwaters of the Yukon and the Klondike. Today the journey is comfortably made on the White Pass & Yukon Railroad and continued in summer down Alaska's mightiest river, sung in verse by Robert W. Service.

The tang of that robust era persists in Skagway. Harriet Pullen, herself one of the pioneers, still stalwart in her eighties, preserves its unique mementos in her museum and hotel, and revives those glamorous days in vivid reminiscence.

At nearby Haines 3 scant years ago stood the only military establishment in the Territory, Chilkoot Barracks, with an ancient harbor tug as its only transport. The town is the port of another famous route to the interior, over the Chilkoot Pass and the old Jack Dalton Trail.

KLUKWAN CLINGS TO ITS TOTEM POLES

A 42-mile road now leads to the British Columbia boundary, past the old Indian village of Klukwan, which has some of the finest totem poles in America. Its inhabitants have steadily refused the blandishments of collectors and museum scouts.

For these outstanding relics of Tlingit culture, Klukwan has been called a Chichen Itzá of the North, since they rival in wood the architectural massiveness of the Maya Temple carvings in stone in southern Mexico. Klukwan's people—fewer than a hundred today—deserve high praise for remaining firm in their unacquisitive faith.

The inside passage ended, the journey swings westward across the Gulf of Alaska. An occasional boat stops at Yakutat, Indian village, cannery site, and terminus of one of the shortest of the world's railroads, the Yakutat Southern, whose chief claim to distinction would seem to be the privilege of its officials to swap passes with longer railroad systems in the United States.

Scenic Yakutat Bay receives the icebergs from some of the continent's most active glaciers, those of the St. Elias Range.

The route now swings toward another great region of fiords, glaciers, and fisheries—Prince William Sound. Its principal port is Cordova, for 30 years—until 4 years ago—the ocean terminus of the sensational Copper River & Northwestern Railroad, which carried to the sea the rich copper ores from the famous and now defunct Kennecott mine. Cordova, refusing to become a ghost town, survives stubbornly as a crab, clam, and salmon cannery port.

Next is Valdez, where the Richardson Highway starts toward the interior. It boasts—and justly—that it is our farthest-north, all-year-round ice-free port.

Finally the journey ends at Seward, set deep in the fiord called Resurrection Bay, and the terminus for Alaska's principal land route, the 470-mile Alaska Railroad to Fairbanks.

From that Golden Heart of the North scatter the miners and traders, up and down the Yukon and its tributaries, into the vast, still partly unexplored and unmapped sections of Alaska, into the headwaters and placer creeks of the Kuskokwim, the Koyukuk, the Kobuk, the Noatak, the Porcupine.

NEWS TRAVELS BY "MUKLUK WIRELESS"

Here they work till the soothing sun freezes the running waters which wash the golden "pay dirt" into the sluice boxes. Then the spring trek is reversed, and like sun and birds they begin the southward journey.

On their way "outside," miners, traders, cannerymen stop for a few hours in each port as the boat stops, or skip a sailing to visit their friends en route. Thus all Alaska is closely in touch with affairs in all other parts through constant personal contact and through that mysterious Alaskan network, the "mukluk wireless."[2]

This seasonal migration—based primarily on Alaska's latitude, which in turn makes its two great pursuits, placer gold mining and salmon fishing, summer occupations—is distinctive of the Territory. It affects its economy, social customs, and politics, distinguishing it from all other earlier American frontiers.

The West was not settled by folk who went back East every fall. Nor did they expect to go back East to spend their accumulated wealth and declining years. They loved the abundant country to which they had come and were prepared to found homes there for their children and their children's children. Alaska's history has been different.

It falls into three periods and a fourth is about to unfold. First was the period of Russian sovereignty following the explorations of Bering, who discovered St. Lawrence Island in 1728 and the Alaska mainland in 1741. The first permanent settlement established by Shelikof at Three Saints Bay, on the southeastern coast of Kodiak, did not come till 1784, so that the actual settlement of Alaska by Russia, which never penetrated far inland, lasted only 83 years.

The second period, from the purchase by Seward in 1867 to the gold discoveries of the late nineties, was an era of abandonment and governmental neglect. The Territory, chiefly inhabited by fishing, trapping, and hunting natives, lay empty, dormant. The American people were too busy opening up the West to concern themselves with their vast unknown northern empire.

HISTORY TOLD IN PLACE NAMES

The Klondike gold strike, opening the third period, changed all that overnight. A rush of prospectors to the Territory doubled the population—and many of the newcomers were hardy pioneers. They were of the stuff that had crossed the uncharted Atlantic wastes and pushed the American frontier to the Pacific.

The chapter which they added, as indeed the earlier history of Alaska, is graphically told in its place names.

The aboriginal names, Indian and Eskimo, such as Ketchikan and Nunivak; the names given by the Russian discoverers and settlers—St. Michael, Chichagof, Shishmaref, Golovin; by the British explorers—Dixon, Chatham, Salisbury, Hinchinbrook; by the Spanish—Chacon, Muzon, Bartolome, Valdez, Cordova—were outnumbered by myriads of simpler, homelier, ready-made tags, which testify to the coming of the miner and fisherman.

They were men of action and few words. Their imagination expressed itself in deeds

[2] Mukluks are high-topped fur boots.

and scarcely in their choice of names, which reflected their new environment.

There are in Alaska 5 Bear Bays, 1 Bear Cove, 2 Bear Capes, 18 Bear Creeks, 2 Bear Gulches, 1 Bear Harbor, 2 Bear Islands, 1 Bear Lake, 3 Bear Mountains, 2 Bear Rivers, 1 Bear Slough—a total of 38.

With its giant brown bears and other species, Alaska was and is the greatest bear country in the world. Four times I have seen bears on the Glacier Highway only a few miles out of Juneau.

Similarly, there are 14 Moose Creeks and 13 Sheep Creeks (mountain sheep, mind you). On May 23 of this year, traveling northward from the coast in a "speeder" on the Alaska Railroad with Lt. Col. Hobart Murphy, the provost marshal of the Alaska Defense Command, I saw 6 moose and 9 mountain sheep in the 30 miles between Seward and Moose Pass.

There are eight Grouse, seven Trout, and seven Goose Creeks. Of Beaver, Porcupine, Ptarmigan, and Salmon Creeks there are six each. The early comers could scarcely be expected to worry about the problems of later geographers.

Alaska's trees have contributed 15 Willow, 12 Alder, 6 Spruce, 4 Birch Creeks.

Prospectors named 19 Quartz Creeks, 11 Gold Creeks, 8 Bonanza, and 7 each of Eldorado and Eureka Creeks.

LIAR ROCK AND BIG HURRAH CREEK

The hopes and disappointments of both mariner and miner are engraved imperishably on the future's maps: Disenchantment Bay, Deception Point, No Thorofare Bay, False Pass, Turnagain Arm, Lucky Cove, Goodnews Bay, Goodhope Bay, Liar Rock, Graveyard Cape, and Grubstake Gulch, Last Chance Creek (five of these), Goodenough Creek, Lucky Creek, Lucky Gulch, Lucky Strike Creek, Big Hurrah Creek, Big Skookum Creek.

Ten creeks named Dewey indicate the year and its hero. Near one of them are also Sampson and Schley Creeks.

Of course these pioneers had no thought of staying in Alaska. It was an unknown wilderness to them, and they braved its hardships uncomplainingly in the hope of reward and the prospect of an easier life back home. This was Alaska's third period.

Many struck it rich and went "out." Others stayed, ever hopeful of a strike next year.

Modern methods of mining replaced the pan, rocker, and cradle. Mining became a bigger business. Methods of canning salmon improved correspondingly. Camps and canneries sprang up. Some were abandoned—ghost camps and ghost canneries are found everywhere in Alaska. But others sprouted, grew, and communities developed.

The earlier pioneers rarely brought their women, though they often named the creeks after the girl back home: Essie, Esther, Etta, Hazel, Helen—or maybe after the girl nearby.

But later, having stayed on, they married—and a new generation of Alaska-born children is reaching maturity. They have no sentimental ties with the "outside." They know only Alaska, love it, and want to stay there. A fourth period, the period of permanence, is in the making.

Perhaps the greatest single contribution to the permanence of Alaska is the Territory's excellent university, America's farthest-north institution of higher learning.

It owes its founding and growth chiefly to its president, Charles E. Bunnell. Coming to the Territory as a young man and serving successively as a school teacher and Federal judge, he realized that few of Alaska's youngsters would ever acquire a higher education unless the opportunity were offered them at home.

The first unit opened as the Alaska Agricultural and Mechanical College in 1922 with 6 students. The institution has grown steadily, attracting boys and girls from many States of the Union, chiefly because of the excellence of its mining curriculum.

The university's unpretentious but wholly practical whitewashed frame and concrete buildings cluster around the summit of a birch-covered hill overlooking the wide Tanana Valley, 3 miles west of Fairbanks.

The boys and girls, both white and Indian, come from modest surroundings and most of them either wholly or partly work their way through. In this effort they are assisted by Dr. Bunnell, who, by prodigious energy and untiring devotion, makes it possible for those who want to help themselves to do so.

No country-club college this, but a unique institution where hard work and earnest effort are the watchwords. Here is the Territory's truest example of pioneering in a wilderness long haunted by skepticism and indifference.

BASEBALL BY LIGHT OF MIDNIGHT SUN

My first visit to the Territory and the university was in May. I was keenly enjoying the absence of night. The long days merged into a brief twilight, and one lost count of hours. On June 21 every year Fairbanks stages a midnight baseball game, and for 2 or 3 weeks it is possible to read a newspaper out of doors all night.

Coming north from Anchorage to Fairbanks on Col. Otto F. Ohlson's "dodgemobile," a steering-wheel-less auto adapted to the rails—pausing once to avoid bumping a moose cow and calf off the tracks—I witnessed the, to me unprecedented, spectacle of a sunrise and sunset displaying themselves simultaneously in the northern sky.

But the charm of unending day and its interesting impact on local habits raised a question or two.

"This is wonderful," I said as, shortly before midnight, from the porch of President Bunnell's cottage I watched the sunset glow on Mounts Hayes and Deborah, 90 miles to the southeast, and on Mount McKinley, 160 miles southwest. "But how is living here in the winter? Don't the long, dark nights get on your nerves?"

"What long, dark nights?" Dr. Bunnell asked me in turn. "We have no dark nights," he continued. "Up here the stars are so clear and shine so on the snow-covered ground that there is no darkness even when there is no moon. And then 2 or 3 nights every week we have the aurora borealis."

I was slightly skeptical. The president, I thought, is painting too bright a picture. Yet after my first winter in Alaska I found he had spoken truly.

SPLENDOR CAUGHT BY LAURENCE OF ALASKA

The winter days are short, the nights long, but in the interior, except when the skies are deeply overcast, there is no darkness. And the northern lights supply a brilliance and a mysterious beauty to which the written word can scarcely do justice.

They are, however, admirably interpreted, in another medium by Alaska's great painter, Sydney Laurence, who died 2 years ago. His canvases hang in the home of many an Alaskan and are its most prized possession.

Laurence was an extraordinarily versatile and prolific painter. He did marine scenes as well as landscapes and depicted both the scenic background and the people—Indians, trappers, miners—in their daily pursuits.

His favorite subject was Mount McKinley, which he painted more than 250 times, with but one exception always from the south side, which he considered much more interesting. Apart from their power and beauty, Laurence's paintings of the "Monarch of the North" are important because they alone adequately convey, as no photograph has yet done, the height and depth of old Denali.

Alaska is a painter's paradise not merely because of its incredible beauty but because Sydney Laurence has made its people appreciative of painting.

The university has promoted important work in special fields. It is now engaged in physical research dealing with the ionosphere, of high importance to radio transmission and of particular usefulness in the present war—so important indeed that its details cannot be divulged.

For years the excellent Department of Anthropology has been engaging in archeological and paleontological excavations.

Not far from the college the Fairbanks Exploration Co., a subsidiary of the United States Smelting, Refining, and Mining Co., is "hydraulicking"—washing down the accumulated muck of centuries to reach the gravel beds below, where the gold is to be dredged. High-pressure streams from big nozzles in the hands of skilled operators wear away the frozen earth cover often to a depth of 50 or 60 feet.

Long before the bottom is reached, this black muck yields a treasure more precious in the eyes of science than the glittering gold which has played so potent a part in Alaska's history. Imbedded in the muck, preserved by its icy sterility, is the biological history of Alaska for several hundred thousand years.

Out of it are extracted—fortunately uninjured by the use of pick or shovel—the bones of mammoth, of mastodon, of prehistoric bison, of the pygmy horse and the saber-toothed cat, which, long before the coming of man, roamed the now subarctic plains.

The university's scientists have made good use of this treasure, extracting it, classifying it, assembling it with care, and sharing the collections with the museums of the world.

MAMMOTH MOLAR WEIGHS 11 POUNDS

In these diggings my son Peter and I spent a summer afternoon with Archeologist Otto William Geist, of the university. Peter found a mastodon's thighbone more than half as big as he was, and my treasure was a mammoth molar weighing 11 pounds.

Throughout Alaska, along the shores of Bering Sea and in adjacent islands, the university has engaged in valuable archeological and ethnological research. Five different vanished Eskimo cultures have been studied.

The transcendent discovery, however, was made not long ago by Dr. Froelich G. Rainey, the university's young professor of anthropology. Far in the north on Point Hope, a big sand bar thrust into the Arctic Ocean, he uncovered an older and far more advanced Arctic culture than any yet known. It is described in "Discovering Alaska's Oldest Arctic Town," by Dr. Rainey, on page 319 of this issue [of the National Geographic].

The Eskimos, who live along the Arctic Ocean, Bering Sea and some of their tributary rivers, constitute an important part of Alaska's population. Nearly half of the natives—about 15 570—are Eskimos.

They are a hardy race and, except in a few of the larger towns, are little touched by the white man's civilization. At the same time they are aided by it through the acquisition of reindeer and assistance in marketing their handiwork: ivory carvings and fur garments. Especially sought are the Eskimo-made parkas and the admirable high moccasins, or mukluks, which alone give adequate foot protection against the bitter cold of Arctic winters.

Eskimos are a friendly and a jolly people. Last summer, when our amphibian stuck on a sand bar while taxying across a lagoon back of the village of Kivalina, the entire male population turned out under the leadership of their devoted Office of Indian Affairs school teacher. Standing knee and waist deep in the icy water, they helped push, rock, and pull the plane loose.

"STRONG LIKE WHALE, BUT NO BLUBBER"

They had never seen an amphibian before; indeed they had never had such intimate con-

tact with any plane. When at last it took off with a roar and a rush, they were much impressed with its power.

"Strong like beluga." Strong like two belugas," were the comments.

"Not so good," said a third. "Strong like beluga, but no muktuk." (Muktuk is the savory Eskimo food staple, whale blubber.)

Hardy, cheerful, maintaining their own culture vigorously, our farthest-north citizens have already played a useful part in supplying our Army in Alaska with hand-made fur garments which could not have been procured without their skill and experience.

They will be further valuable in the protection of our west and northwest Alaska coast, to which they are thoroughly acclimated, and where their endurance and adaptability to savage weather conditions on land and sea are far superior to the white man's. Accompany the Eskimos on a walrus or whale hunt in the skin boats and you will forever be a willing witness to their hardiness and endurance.

Hunting and fishing—the primeval means of getting a livelihood—still support half the population of Alaska. For the others, whether with gun or camera or rod and reel, they provide a royal sport.

AMERICA'S BIGGEST GAME ROAMS HERE

Alaska is the greatest game preserve in the Western Hemisphere. Even the casual visitor seldom fails to see bears—black, grizzly, or brown. The great brown bear of the Alaska Peninsula and his cousin of Kodiak Island are the biggest carnivorous land animals in the world. The largest specimens weigh 1,500 pounds and when reared upright they stand about 9 feet high.

Where else can one see the big herds of caribou in migration across the rolling grasslands, the mountain sheep along the lofty crags, the wild goat on heights near the sea, or the great moose, largest of his species?

So plentiful are moose that Colonel Ohlson, the efficient general manager of the Alaska Railroad, wagering with skeptical passengers that he will show them at least one moose from the car window, almost always wins. (Invariably he refuses to collect.)

As for fishing, it is the fate of Alaskans, telling the truth about their catches, to be disbelieved unless they can show visible proof But where can one hook as many salmon as on the Territory's Pacific coast, or land trout—rainbows, cutthroats, Dolly Vardens—that are considered small at 20 inches? Trout abound in rivers from the Kenai to the Kuskokwim and run to 36 inches.

I got my first strike—a 25-pound king salmon—fifteen minutes after fishing began, in Auke Bay, 12 miles out on the highway northwest from Juneau. I was not a fisherman; Alaska fishing is foolproof.

My son Peter and two others, with two lines for the 3 of them, fished for 2½ hours in the Naknek River at the head of Bristol Bay. Result: 33 rainbows, the shortest 22 inches long, the larger ones running up to 32 inches.

Maj. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr., the able commanding officer of the Alaska Defense Forces, himself an enthusiastic sportsman, once remarked to me that Alaskans were in one respect unique among Americans: "They never lie about their fishing. They don't need to; the truth is unbelievable."

Alaska flora is no less abundant. For 3 years I have watched the wild flowers bloom each week in the meadows along the Mendenhall River, less than 10 miles from Juneau, with the lofty glacier and the sharp peaks as a back drop.

First comes the big, yellow, callalike bear cabbage—known as skunk cabbage in the United States—lining the rills and moist edges of the forest. Then, almost simultaneously, come the violets and the pink shooting star, or bird's bill, sufficient to tint wide patches of ground.

Most gorgeous is the light-blue lupine, which likewise gives its color to whole meadows. Along the shores of Kenai Lake, 20 miles north of Seward, I have seen the darker blue aconite, or monkshood, turn the fields into its glorious color.

The climax of the summer hues, however, comes with the common fireweed, which in the United States sends a few stragglers off a back-lot dump but in Alaska becomes whole fields of massed pink, coloring meadows and mountainsides with its brilliance.

The blue forget-me-not, Alaska's official flower, grows luxuriantly along a hundred thousand creeks, and in the Arctic it forms, with its dwarfed stems, an enamel-like carpet on the tundra.

Alaska indeed is a land of blue, in its skies, inlets, bays, rivers, and lakes, in its glaciers; but above all in its eternal mountain vistas, where distance and sunlight turn them cobalt, purple, lavender, violet, and horizon blue.

Incidentally, we also swim in Alaska, believe it or not. The lakes, of course, warm up under the magic of 18 to 20 hours of May, June, and July sunlight. Even the ocean is not so bad. I have seen youngsters dashing into the surf from the gold-bearing sand beach of Nome; Ketchikan, and Douglas have popular bathing beaches.

My favorite spot is the Eagle River Delta, which has formed a magnificent beach on the shores of Lynn Canal, with the Chilkats to the west and the unnamed peaks back of the Eagle and Herbert Glaciers to the east. That idyllic spot lies a half hour's walk through woods and meadows at the end of the Glacier Highway, 29 miles out of Juneau.

Glacier Bay swimming is a bit colder, but very bracing. Peter and I tried that, too, and liked it.

BOYS FROM BACK HOME COME TO STAY

Alaska is entering a new era, its fourth period. It is not merely that its Alaska-born are beginning to come of age. World events have brought defense on a grand scale to Alaska. They are bringing a highway from the United States; also a railroad. These will speed a transformation already beginning.

Within the Territory airports and highways long dreamed of by the pioneer flyers and trail blazers are under construction.[2]

Twenty-five years ago the dog team still remained the one method of transportation in interior Alaska when winter had paralyzed the rivers.

Then came the earlier aviators, who until a year or two ago flew without navigational aids, guessed at the weather, alighted on incredibly small clearings, on beaches, on river sand bars. (I have landed on bars in the Koyukuk and the Chitina.) They alighted on lakes and coastal waters with pontoons, on frozen lakes with skis.

They have written a chapter in the winning of the air which will always be memorable in the history of intrepidity, daring, and skill.

Now war has brought men to Alaska: engineers, construction workers, and many more in the uniform of the armed forces of the United States—boys from back home.

"I have a girl back in Wisconsin. We were in high school together," an apple-cheeked, curly-blond youngster in a private's uniform informed me as I overtook him on one of the roads north of Fort Richardson at Anchorage.

"I like this country. After the war we're going to get married, and I'll bring her up here."

There are thousands like him. They have come to keep free the freest part of all America, to keep it free with the rest.

To Alaska, remnant of a world which fulfills the American dream and may play a still greater part in fulfilling our destiny, they have come. Many of them, their task completed, will stay. They will homestead. They will hew log cabins from the wilderness. And the love of adventure that is in the American's heart will hold them there.

[2] See Our Air Frontier in Alaska, by Maj. Gen. H. H. Arnold, National Geographic Magazine, October 1940.

Address of Governor Schoeppel, of Kansas, at Dedication of Pratt Army Air Base

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech delivered by Gov. Andrew Schoeppel, of Kansas, at the dedication of the Pratt Army Air Base, at Pratt, Kans., May 2, 1943.

Governor Schoeppel's address on this occasion, dealing with the individual responsibility of every American citizen to put aside all selfish personal interests and all selfish group interests, in the interest of winning the war and preparing for the peace, is very much to the point, and I commend it to the Senate.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Into the service of America and the Allied Nations, Kansas proudly places this afternoon, in a formal way, one of the vital training centers of a great global war.

The significance of that which we are recognizing here today will eventually be felt by the enemy on every front around the world. It will be felt as certainly as the bombs of Jimmy Doolittle were felt in Tokyo, since it is from training fields like this that every air offensive against the Germans and Japs must have its real beginning.

To Col. John F. Nelson, commanding officer of the Pratt Army Air Base, to the officers and men who serve with him, to F. F. Swinson, chairman of the Pratt aviation committee, and to all who have had a part in making this day and all that it means possible, I extend congratulations on behalf of every Kansan.

The opening of a new unit in the chain of military and naval establishments now being developed in Kansas gives this community a modern sequel to its historic background. Here at this field will be taught lessons adapted to the needs of the most scientific and widespread conflict experienced since the beginning of time. Here men will be schooled in those practical methods of warfare required for the preservation of our way of government, our way of life, and everything we have and hold dear for the future.

It is eminently fitting that Pratt and community should have an important role in this present-day task of defending the Government under which we live, and all that it means to us.

This section and the surrounding territory has had a deep interest in governmental affairs since the first settlers came here to establish homes and help develop the country. At one time, I am told, rivalry over the country seat grew so strong that, as three communities vied for places of leadership, it

was necessary to appeal to the State militia to preserve order.

It is also characteristic of this section that, after Pratt was chosen as the county seat through a spirited election, the will of the majority was observed, and the county went forward in harmony to develop its agriculture, its railroads, and all of the assets which now distinguish its daily activity.

I mention these early days only to indicate that the Pratt Army air base is not only in capable military hands, but that it has been constructed in an atmosphere traditionally sound from the American viewpoint.

Colonel Nelson and his men may feel assured that the people of this section and of Kansas as a whole are ready at all times to give whatever aid he may require. The interest in free government is today as strongly rooted in the minds of our people as it was in pioneer times, when the location of a county seat was a matter of personal concern to every citizen. And the willingness to abide by the decision of the majority to work together for the good of all is still a Kansas characteristic.

At a ceremony of this nature it is natural for us to think back to the days when America was trying to keep out of the war; then to review for a moment that period during which we thought and acted in terms of defense, and finally to consider the part our State is playing in an all-out armed drive for victory.

Not so long ago we were hoping desperately that it would not again be necessary to send the finest of our manhood overseas. We hoped that the old, old troubles of Europe could be kept over there, and that somehow we could go our way in peace, without becoming involved.

Those hopes faded as Hitler marched from country to country, killing and pillaging and laying waste beneath his panzer divisions and planes the hopes of others who had prayed that they would be spared.

America began the grim task of preparing to defend herself against possible invasion. Especially along the seacoasts defense centers were constructed, and our military and naval components began to grow. Even then this peaceful Nation of ours clung to its desire for peace. Even after our course veered into the production of certain supplies for those opposing Hitler—even then we sought to avoid direct combat.

Inevitable as America's entry into the war seemed to be, it was clear that we needed more time to prepare. Our Army and Navy were woefully inadequate. Our war plants had not yet hit the long, certain strides required for victory. We were unprepared militarily, materially, and mentally.

But the war did not wait. Pearl Harbor came, with its sickening suddenness, and—unprepared as we were—we had to go to war or yield to a sneaking, treacherous foe bent on wiping out the white man's world.

There was no choice, no alternative. Out of the holocaust of Pearl Harbor rose an unprepared America determined to answer that foul attack by whatever means were available We had to fight with what we had, and prepare with all possible speed for more fighting in the future.

We are still doing that today. Our Army and Navy, and the other branches, have grown tremendously. Our men are stationed on more than 60 fighting fronts of the world. Our ships are in every sea, and our planes fly above every continent. In less than 18 months since Pearl Harbor, we have achieved a high point reached by Germany and Japan only after 20 years or more of preparation.

In this swift development of striking power against the Axis, Kansas has a position of importance increasing every hour and day.

Our conversion from a State known chiefly for its agriculture to a State of military and industrial war production is one of the marvels of this generation.

Nowhere in this Nation is any State contributing to America's victory drive with more efficiency, with more versatility, or with more patriotism than Kansas.

Here in Kansas, which was a battle ground in freedom's cause in the time of Lincoln, our people are once more fighting for liberty—this time for the liberty of all mankind.

The cattle trails of our early settlers are now highways of commerce—of commerce dedicated to victory. The broad acres on which Kansans first began to make a living for themselves now supply an important share of all of the food required by the American people and the United Nations. Some of the small trading posts of earlier years have developed into cities, and those cities into war plant centers and training areas.

In the small tasks as well as the large, Kansas is faithful to her duty. Our people buy War bonds, collect scrap, join in civilian defense, and meet in a magnificent way every obligation of patriotic citizenship.

From our homes have gone men and women to military camps and to the far outposts of freedom's forces all over the world. Into war plants here and in other States have gone Kansans by the thousands, lending their skill and their strength to industrial production for war. On our farms labor thousands more. Others have their indispensable places in our mines, our oil fields, our places of business—everywhere manpower and womanpower can be translated into fighting power.

There is perhaps little need to discuss the crucial situation with respect to farm labor. Kansans have always lived in a farm atmosphere, and understand the importance of raising food and the necessity of ample manpower and machinery to produce and market crops. It is also well understood that a critical farm-labor shortage exists and that steps must be taken to overcome that shortage to assure our full measure of potential production.

As to industrial production, Kansas is unusually fortunate. For many years this State has enjoyed peaceful relations between management and labor. Kansans have always been loyal, in the ranks of labor as well as elsewhere. They are loyal now. They will continue to be loyal in the future. Of that I am certain.

At the same time we must realize that America's great war plants, many of which have been established in Kansas, are part of a national network. They dovetail together in many respects, like component parts of a huge machine. If one cog in the machinery is stopped or slowed down, the others are almost certain to be affected.

Let us suppose, for example, that a Kansas factory is assembling parts for airplane radios. Let us further suppose that a factory making one such part, located in another State, closes down because of a strike. The immediate effect upon the Kansas factory is to halt the assembling work.

We Kansans therefore have a direct and intimate interest in war production all over the Nation—an interest which is in addition to our primary concern as to keeping all production, everywhere, going at top speed.

As Kansans, but most of all as sacrificing Americans willing to do our full share for victory, we cannot condone any halting or slowing down of war production wherever it may be.

Whether it be the fault of management, the fault of labor, or the fault of Government, we cannot accept any sabotaging of our victory drive.

We Kansans put our Nation's interest above our personal interest. We have a full right to expect all other Americans to do the same.

With every means at our disposal, we shall continue to insist upon keeping our steel mills in production, upon keeping all war production going at maximum speed.

No leader or so-called leader in this land, be he the head of a unit of Government, of labor, of agriculture, or of any group or interest, has the right to put a single stumbling block in the way of our men in uniform who are daily giving their lives for America.

It is not an agreeable matter to admit weaknesses in your war effort.

I would like to be able to say that every single American is dedicating himself wholeheartedly to the solemn task we have of achieving the victory.

I would like to be able to say that every official and every department of our National Government is in complete harmony with every other.

I would like to be able to say that there are no petty quarrels, no jealousies, no misunderstandings, no duplications of effort.

I would like to be able to say that no one in authority is swayed by personal or political ambition, and that every American—officially and in private life—is on the same plane of self-sacrifice with every other American.

But those things are not true. We know they are not true. And we also know that, until they approach the truth, lives will be needlessly lost, our victory will be delayed, and the suffering of all our people will be prolonged.

I have an abiding faith in intelligence and the loyalty of the American people, and I have full confidence that every challenge against our people, from within as well as from without, will be met and overcome.

Here at the Pratt Army Air Base we have an example of what cooperation and devotion to America's welfare can achieve.

Into the building of this training center have gone the dollars of our people everywhere. More importantly, the hearts of all true Americans are here—expressed in men representative of our national determination to win this war at whatever cost in blood and tragedy may be demanded. Back of those trained here will stand all the loyal people of this Nation, and with them will stand our allies around the earth.

In its way, the Pratt Army Air Base will be as important in the war effort as our outposts in the Aleutians, our defense lines in Australia, our patrols throughout the Pacific, and our advancing forces in Africa.

The real base for a drive on Berlin and an assault against Tokyo is here at home, at training fields such as this.

Americans will some day gain control of the air over Germany, and with this control will come swift victory. Americans will some day pound Japan into submission, perhaps by attacks from the sea, perhaps by landing forces. Whatever the final situation, we must first rule the air. To gain that supremacy, we must equip our men here at home, and give them here at home the initial training they must have for combat over other lands.

Into the Kansas sky, and above many states in this country, we must put more and more training ships. We must build, build, and build still greater air fleets—until the shadows of their wings spread to every land held by the foe, until the enemy is beaten, until we dictate the peace.

Our great air raids of the future will depend for success upon what we do here at home, now and tomorrow, and in the months and perhaps years to come.

Upon the success of those raids may depend the entire course of the war. Air supremacy must be achieved. We cannot fail to attain it.

My conception of this war is that it is a great partnership of Americans, each individual with his assigned duty, each bound by every code of patriotism to do his best, without stinting and without thought of personal gain, for the good of the whole.

We are all marching in the ranks together—those who till the soil, those who work in plants and factories, those who manage and those who govern and those who cheerfully obey orders in both civilian and military life.

Last month, I had the privilege of seeing the full range of leadership in our war effort, from the Commander in Chief of all our armed forces down to privates, and noncommissioned officers, and officers of almost every rank. It impressed me tremendously. I was struck with the realization that every single man has a job in this war, and every woman, too. While there must, of necessity, be varying positions of leadership, we are all in this war together. Our victory depends upon all of us, wherever we may be, and whatever we may do.

Today our minds are centered upon the Pratt Army Air Base. We experience an abiding satisfaction in the meaning of this day in terms of future accomplishment.

Our minds leap ahead to the future, and we have a vision of training planes and combat planes of all sizes and types, working with every other branch of the armed forces. They call some of these American ships "queens of the air," for they fly with dignity and beauty. And they say that these queens "die proudly," when they fall.

Inevitable as battle casualties are, and realizing as we do that we have many tragedies ahead, we are dedicating this base today to the peaceful years of the future—the prize for which our men, and materials, and money are now being expended.

We look to the goal which lies beyond the war, to the time when the ships which fly the air will be on missions of commerce and pleasure, and not on missions of death and destruction. Our thoughts, energies, and ambitions in time of war are directed to the further objectives of peace.

Our battle fleets of the air must continue to fight until victory is won. And until that day, as our "queens die proudly" in combat, we must suffer and endure and press on. But always, even in war, we have our eyes upon the horizon of a better day—of a day when our airplanes can fly in freedom in any sky, when our ships can travel in any sea, when our people can pursue life, liberty, and the happiness God intended for all mankind upon this earth.

To that day, for ourselves and for the generations which will come after us, we dedicate the Pratt Army Air Base, and welcome it officially as it takes its place in the life of Kansas and of America.

To the men who are here, and those who will come here to train in the future, we pledge our full resources and support and rededicate ourselves to the cause for which they are willing to give everything, for which we must have equal devotion.

Tennessee Valley Authority Celebrates 10 Years of Outstanding Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report released by the Tennessee Valley Authority on May 16 which gives a modest summary of the remarkable achievement of T. V. A. during its 10 years of activity:

The Tennessee Valley Authority will observe its tenth anniversary on May 18 with workers completely occupied in full-scale war production. Tennessee Valley Authority's transition from peacetime development to full-time war action was effortless, since all its previous work had centered around maximum development and use of the region's resources—a vital necessity in a global war. For instance, its dam construction program, designed to capture the tremendous energy of the Tennessee River and its tributaries, came in time to make possible great industrial expansion for war and provided 600 miles of navigable river channel to relieve overburdened transportation systems. Likewise, Tennessee Valley Authority's phosphatic fertilizer plant, around which its soil rehabilitation program centered, turned to the production of elemental phosphorus—a vital munition.

Much of what Tennessee Valley Authority has accomplished, both for war and peace, and what it has come to represent in contemporary American life, cannot easily be interpreted by statistical tables and summary paragraphs. Precise columns of figures cannot evaluate the practical idea of an integrated regional development, in which all the varied facets of valley economy are weighed and treated as related parts of a whole. Nor can they measure the impact of the regional development program outside the valley, both in America and abroad, as perhaps suggesting the approach to the solution of problems of other regions.

Enumeration of the 300-odd contracts and agreements by which the Tennessee Valley Authority maintains contact with Valley States, departments of government, institutions, localities, and people gives an indication of its identification with the life of the region.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was established by act of Congress approved by President Roosevelt on May 18, 1933. It was given charge of the nitrate plants and the Wilson Dam and hydro and steam power plants at Muscle Shoals as a nucleus for a region-wide development in the national interest. The development was to include a system of multiple-purpose dams on the Tennessee River system to provide a navigation channel, storage for flood control affecting the Tennessee, lower Ohio, and Mississippi Rivers, and generation of large amounts of power; experimental production and use of fertilizers in a broad agricultural program; reforestation, industrial development; research in the utilization of resources of minerals, forests, soil, and energy; broad powers of planning; and close cooperation with other agencies and with the people and organizations of the Valley.

Tennessee Valley Authority was given broad responsibilities for the national defense, for which the Muscle Shoals properties originally were constructed, and in the past 3 years its activities have been almost wholly devoted to war. In addition to the normal momentum of the program gained in the passage of years, the war has speeded progress so that the bulk of construction has been accomplished in the last 3 years, and almost one-third the total amount of power was produced in the last year.

Since 1933, with gathering momentum, Tennessee Valley Authority has made much progress which can be measured in statistics of material accomplishments. It has built 13 large dams, created 385 miles of 9-foot navigation channel for commerce, provided more than 8,000,000 acre-feet of flood-control storage, produced nearly 30,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy, marked up nearly $100,000,000 in revenues, provided 150,000,000 seedlings for reforestation, manufactured half a million tons of phosphatic fertilizers. It has developed new machines and new processes and has opened the way to use of latent resources of water, soil, forests, and minerals.

Following is a summary of partial Tennessee Valley Authority accomplishments in the past 10 years:

EXPANSION OF SYSTEM

Dams constructed, 13 (Pickwick Landing, Wheeler, Guntersville, Chickamauga, Watts Bar, Norris, Hiwassee, Cherokee, Douglas, Apalachia, Ocoee No. 3, Chatuga, Nottely).

Steam plants constructed, 1 (Watts Bar).

Dams acquired, 6 (Wilson, Hales Bar, Ocoee No. 1, Ocoee No. 2, Blue Ridge, Great Falls).

Fuel plants acquired, 4 (Hales Bar, Nashville, Parksville, Sheffield).

Fuel plants leased, 1 (Memphis).

Dams under construction, 3 (Kentucky, Fontana, Fort Loudon).

Total storage provided, 12,691,320 acre-feet.

Flood-control storage provided, 8,086,090 acre-feet.

Area of lakes, 666 square miles.

Established year-around navigation from Paducah, Ky., to Loudon, Tenn., with assured 9-foot channel upriver from Pickwick Landing Dam.

Installed capacity constructed, 1,098,900 kilowatts.

Installed capacity acquired, 536,740 kilowatts.

Present system installed capacity, 1,635,640 kilowatts.

Installed capacity now under construction, 453,200 kilowatts.

CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

Concrete placed, 7,613,800 cubic yards.

Earth and rock fill placed, 19,962,100 cubic yards.

Land acquired, 890,127 acres in fee; flowage easements on 82,311 acres.

Reservoir land cleared, 168,966 acres.

Highways relocated, 875.2 miles (including 110.9 miles of access highway).

Railways relocated, 97.2 miles (including 41.7 miles of access railways).

Families relocated, 11,469.

River freight terminals under construction, 3 (Chattanooga, Tenn.; Decatur and Guntersville, Ala.); terminals projected, 1 (Knoxville).

Planimetric mapping, 41,420 square miles (entire valley basin).

Topographic mapping, 30,115 square miles (including 12,388 square miles for the War Department).

POWER OPERATIONS

Power generated, 10-year period:

Fiscal year:	*Kilowatt-hours*
1933 (June only)	15,688,000
1934	406,836,720
1935	122,611,940
1936	467,697,720
1937	786,926,100
1938	773,458,500
1939	1,733,458,500
1940	4,113,229,253
1941	5,639,841,612
1942	6,136,906,789
1943 (estimated)	9,100,000,000
Total	29,296,705,414

Gross power revenues, $89,393,000 (to December 31, 1942).

Payments in lieu of taxes, $6,358,418.

Provisions for depreciation, $21,683,000.

Net income from power operations, $22,319,000.

Cash returned to Federal Treasury for reinvestment in program (depreciation plus net income), $44,000,000.

Wholesale customers served, municipal, 83; cooperative, 45; large industrial, 11.

Ultimate consumers served by municipalities and cooperatives:

Residential	448,000
Commercial	76,000
Industrial	3,100
Street lighting, other	600
Total	527,700

Annual savings to power consumers under Tennessee Valley Authority rates, $10,000,000.

Average rate per kilowatt-hour for residential service, 2 cents, as compared to national average of 3.68 cents.

Average use per residential customer: 1,543 kilowatt-hours, as compared with 1,022 kilowatt-hours national average.

Rural consumers: 131,700, including 78,900 farmers.

Transmission lines in service, 5,760 miles.

Transmission lines constructed, 2,956 miles.

Transmission lines acquired, 2,804 miles.

Interconnections: 13, linking Tennessee Valley Authority with all major surrounding electric power systems.

At least 75 percent of Tennessee Valley Authority power, it is estimated, goes into war production at the present time. At the current rate of power generation, the Tennessee Valley Authority ranks second among the major power systems of the United States.

INCREASED USE OF RIVER CHANNEL

River traffic in 1933, 32,658,951 ton-miles.

River traffic in 1941, 138,396,296 ton-miles.

River traffic in 1942, 161,469,344 ton-miles.

WAR MANUFACTURING

Tennessee Valley Authority has rehabilitated and placed in operation the Muscle Shoals ammonium nitrate plant constructed in 1918, and has constructed a new ammonia plant. Ammonium nitrate production is above the rated capacity of the plant when new in 1918. As a result of research in electric furnace production of elemental phosphorus, Tennessee Valley Authority is one of the largest producers of phosphorus for military use in incendiary bombs, smoke screens, tracer bullets, etc. It is also a large producer of calcium carbide for use in production of synthetic rubber.

PRODUCTION AND USE OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FERTILIZERS

Concentrated fertilizers produced:

Triple-superphosphate (47-percent plant food), 475,412 tons.

Calcium metaphosphate (60 to 65 percent plant food), 43,324 tons.

Fused phosphate rock (30 percent plant food), 3,054 tons.

Total fertilizer materials, 521,790 tons.

Provided for test-demonstration farm program:

Triple-superphosphate, 159,505 tons.

Calcium metaphosphate, 39,327 tons.

Fused phosphate rock, 2,101 tons.

Total fertilizer materials, 200,933 tons.

Provided for Agricultural Adjustment Administration:

Triple-superphosphate, 240,213 tons.

Provided for lend-lease shipment abroad:

Triple-superphosphate, 59,224 tons.

Calcium metaphosphate, 3,801 tons.

Total for lend-lease, 63,025 tons.

Total number of test-demonstration farms, 43,000.

Test-demonstration farms now active, 29,000.

Number of States having test demonstrations, 28.

Acreage in test-demonstration farms, 6,375,000.

Extent of experiment-station testing, 47 States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

Soil inventory completed, 23,700 square miles (one-half of the Valley area).

DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN RESERVOIRS

Demonstration parks established: 5, comprising 10,807 acres.

State parks leased from Tennessee Valley Authority: 3, comprising 2,480 acres.

County parks on Tennessee Valley Authority leased lands: 5, comprising 498 acres.

Municipal parks on Tennessee Valley Authority leased lands: 6, comprising 380 acres.

Total parks: 19, comprising 14,165 acres.

Quasi-public group camps on Tennessee Valley Authority lands: 9, comprising 453 acres.

Boat docks on Tennessee Valley Authority reservoirs, 50.

Timber harvested from Tennessee Valley Authority lands: 9,386,000 board-feet of sawtimber and 10,972 cords of cordwood.

Agricultural land licensed: 63,309 acres.

Forest experimental areas established: 14, totaling 7,430 acres.

Reservoir woodlands transferred to United States Forest Service: 30,000 acres.

Fishing waters created: 450,000 acres.

Annual yield: 6,000,000 pounds of edible fish.

Lands and waters in State game refuges: 15,000 acres.

Wildlife refuges established: 1, comprising 44,000 acres.

Fish hatcheries established, 2.

Fish populations in main-river reservoirs are estimated to have increased tenfold to fifteenfold, and in tributary reservoirs, fortyfold. Increasing numbers of waterfowl use Tennessee River reservoirs in annual spring and fall migrations.

FORESTRY AND EROSION CONTROL

Total acres reforested, 117,000.

Seedlings planted, 150,000,000.

Engineering projects (check dams, etc.) for erosion control, 11,500.

Total lands treated for erosion control, 136,000 acres.

Forest fire-control area operated, 410,000 acres, Tennessee Valley Authority and adjacent lands.

Other forestry activities

An intensive forest inventory covering 14,000,000 acres of woodlands has been completed. An industrial survey of more than 5,000 sawmills and wood-using industries has been made. Tennessee Valley Authority foresters, as agents of the Census Bureau, collect data on production of lumber and timber products for the War Production Board. Organized fire control has been extended to 1,500,000 acres of forest land in the valley; Tennessee Valley Authority has assisted States in construction of 13 fire towers, 87 miles of telephone line, 20 miles of truck trail, preparation of 97 visible-area maps, and 9 local fire plans. Demonstrations to introduce planting of tree-crop species have totaled 2,170.

MINERALS RESEARCH

A process for producing alumina from clay has been developed and is ready to be put into commercial production when needed.

A process for extracting magnesium from olivine has been developed on a small pilot plant scale. Deposits of olivine rock totaling 2,000,000 tons have been surveyed.

Surveys and research on native kaolins have resulted in increased commercial use by the United States chinaware industry.

Use of vermiculite has been increased as a result of research on mining, uses, etc., particularly in vermiculite-concrete slabs used for insulation and incendiary bomb protection of war plants.

Special limestone has been located for use in manufacture by Tennessee Valley Authority of calcium carbide for synthetic rubber.

AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY AND PROCESSES

The following machines have been developed experimentally by Tennessee Valley Authority and State institutions in the valley: Trailer-threshers for small, hilly farms, are being manufactured by a private concern, and are in use on 4,500 farms totaling 50,000 acres. They are in use in South America and Britain.

A barn hay drier, economical of construction, has been placed in use in 13 States, a total of 53 installations.

A low-cost furrow seeder is being manufactured for use in the valley and the Midwest.

Thirty-two installations of improved cottonseed-processing machinery have been made in 12 mills in 6 Southern States and in 1 foreign country.

A food-processing pilot plant for quick-freezing and dehydration of quality crops has been developed. A cooperative association is operating its own processing plants in the area as a result of the demonstration.

Other developments are improved irrigation methods using electric and other pumps, saving many crops during the drought years; a method of curing sweetpotatoes more uniformly with electric heat; a small feed grinder with automatic feeding device and control; a home-made electric brooder; and an improved legume seed scarifier.

A Tennessee Valley Authority-developed castor bean huller will be used throughout the United States on the 1943 crop.

Pilot plants are in operation to produce flax fiber for textile and war uses and to make laminated flooring and truck body panels from cordwood and cull timber.

Tennessee Valley Authority helped organize production of 7,000,000 pounds of strawberries packed by a sulfur dioxide method for lend-lease shipment to Britain in 1942; technical assistance is being given six plants in 1943.

GENERAL ACTIVITIES

Three Tennessee Valley Authority reports on the regionalized freight-rate barrier to industrial development in the South and West have been submitted to the President and the Congress. Tennessee Valley Authority presented economic testimony at length at the Interstate Commerce Commission hearings on interregional class rates.

Tennessee Valley Authority, under the requirements of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, has established a strict system of employment and promotion on the basis of merit and efficiency.

Tennessee Valley Authority has developed, in cooperation with organized employees, a program of employee relations, including collective bargaining in accordance with a general agreement with 15 trades and labor unions on wages, hours, conditions of work, etc.

The constitutionality of Tennessee Valley Authority has been twice upheld by the United States Supreme Court, once in the so-called Ashwander case, decided in 1936, and again in the 18 Companies case.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

The safety program of the Tennessee Valley Authority has resulted in a reduction of accident frequency (number of lost-time accidents per million man-hours) from 55.7 in the first year to 12.4 in the tenth, or 78 percent.

Accident severity rate (number of days lost per thousand man-hours) has been reduced from 5.06 in the first year to 2.67 in the tenth, or 47 percent.

In 1941, Tennessee Valley Authority was given 13 first, second, or third places in the annual rankings of the National Safety Council on accident frequency or severity on construction projects.

Cooperative working arrangements have been made with 31 local health departments serving 40 counties in 5 Tennessee Valley States.

Forty medical units have been established in construction or other areas where Tennessee Valley Authority employees are concentrated, 14 are now in operation.

Tennessee Valley Authority has developed a malaria-control program of national importance; during the last malaria season, the United States Army detailed medical officers to Tennessee Valley Authority for periods of intensive training and observation.

HOUSING RESEARCH

Incident to providing houses for employees on construction, projects and in defense industrial areas, Tennessee Valley Authority has developed a prefabricated demountable house of a unique cellular type. They are constructed by factory methods with electric, plumbing, and other utilities installed and

can be moved from site to site and erected with minimum labor and time. A one-bedroom adaptation of this house, built in two sections light enough for transportation by trailer behind a car or light truck, was developed by Tennessee Valley Authority and manufactured for Tennessee Valley Authority by a private concern. The houses are installed at the Fontana Dam project. Tennessee Valley Authority demountable house plans were used by other Government housing agencies to provide dwellings for war workers.

Development of Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Strange World Ahead," written by Miss Mary Hornaday, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WIDE HORIZON

THE STRANGE WORLD AHEAD

(By Mary Hornaday)

Maybe it is too early to talk much about a post-war world. Maybe we should be quiet until we know more about the strange new world in which we are to live.

Most of us, including Congress, still talk about Collective Security versus Isolationism as an issue, with little regard to the almost incomprehensible technical developments that have been going on behind the cloak of military secrecy.

Once in a while a hint leaks out about the shape of things to come.

"The technical developments of aviation will be so great in the next 5 years that never again in our history will England or any other nation be able to act as a buffer for us and hold off an aggressor until we get our production machinery rolling," says Col. Arthur W. S. Herrington, American industrialist and military expert, in the current issue of Army Ordnance.

"In the future," he warns, "our national security demands that we must ever be prepared to meet an attack from any direction at any time."

How can we talk—as Representative CLARE BOOTHE LUCE recently did in Congress—about whether the air shall be free when planes will be climbing above the air into the lower strastosphere and perhaps the stratosphere itself? Such planes, it is said by Waldermar Kaempfert, will climb at the rate of 4 miles a minute out of sight of ocean and land.

Breakfast in New York and tea in Southampton will be an ordinary event. Just the other day a British ferry pilot set a new trans-Atlantic speed record, flying a fully loaded bomber from Newfoundland to Britain in 6 hours and 12 minutes.

Aviation experts estimate that today the most distant point in the world is only 60 hours away from any other point by air. Most places are only 40 hours apart. Wendell Willkie went around the world in less than 7 days' flying time.

American planes are roaming the skies from the Arctic to the sands of the Sahara. Transport routes now flown by American military planes are already twice the length of all international pre-war aviation routes.

Only recently military authorities have been giving strong hints as to great new wartime developments in radio. Such a powerful wartime weapon is radar, that the Army only recently lifted its restriction against printing any news about it. Those who understand the electronics behind it predict it will bring greater changes than the radio.

David Sarnoff, president of the Radio Corporation of America, recently told his stockholders: "The radio direction finder, which heretofore had only an ear, now also has an eye. The safety of aviation will be greatly enhanced, for the aviator will be able to see the ground through clouds or darkness. By the scientific application of the radio echo, the radio 'eye' will avert collisions, while the radio altimeter will measure the altitude and warn of mountains ahead or structure below."

Mr. Herrington throws in the intriguing hint that "all sorts of labor-saving controls will come from the ultimate commercial development" of electronics, developed in the search for a means of locating the enemy approaching by air or water.

"The electron microscope is daily increasing our knowledge of the physical structure of matter," he says.

Every once in a while someone in the aviation industry gets a little frightened over the great destiny that seems to enshroud the airplane in the world of tomorrow.

It is true that if the war were to suddenly end tomorrow the industry would be thrown into confusion and depression. Just the other day, C. Bedell Monroe, president of Pennsylvania-Central Airlines, speaking to the National Aeronautic Association in Washington, sought to disabuse Americans of the rosy dreams of "an airplane on every roof" and to jog the industry into doing some post-war planning of its own. The recent flood of thinking on post-war air expansion that already envisions American air lines flying across the seven seas was likened by Mr. Monroe to "quarreling over the scraps before the dinner has been brought to the table."

President Roosevelt has his own committee on international aviation policy which meets three times a week in Washington, but has not yet brought forth any tangible proposals. The picture changes so from day to day that the committee has not even felt it wise to call a United Nations conference on the two most immediate post-war aviation problems—a flying police force and a mercy relief squad.

Human thinking the world over needs to take some big leaps ahead if it is going to be able to keep up with the strange new world that the war has forced us into.

Tax Receipts and the Ballot Box

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 11, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the night of the Boston Tea Party to the present day, tax bills and tax receipts have had great influence in determining our national policies. They have been reflected in the markings on election ballots. I believe they will be reflected even more directly in the coming decade—that taxation will have more effect on national elections in the next 10 years than any other factor except the war.

The men who threw the tea into Boston Harbor were revolting against the imposition of an unjust and unnecessary tax. The coming years will see revolts by the taxpayers of this generation, revolts expressed at polling places throughout America; revolts in which, not tea, but money-wasting officeholders will be tossed overboard into the waters of political oblivion. And when such a revolt by ballot comes, make no mistake about it, the taxpayers can and will remove extravagant officials from office. For the first time since colonial days, the number of direct Federal taxpayers exceeds the probable number of men and women who will vote in the next Presidential election.

The war has forced us greatly to expand the number of direct Federal taxpayers, of course. But Federal extravagance must take its share of the blame—and it is that extravagance the taxpayers will not readily forgive. On March 16 an estimated 52,800,000 persons were paying the Victory tax. In the last Presidential election the voters numbered 49,815,312. For the first time since the adoption of the Constitution we face a political situation in which direct Federal taxpayers will outnumber Federal voters. Moreover, some 44,000,000 men and women are also paying Federal income taxes this year and at the highest rates in American history.

It is more than probable that we in this Congress, if we wish to stay here during the next 10 years, will have to listen carefully to the taxpayers. It is possible the Federal income taxpayers, whose number has increased from 4,041,000 in 1940 to 44,000,000 this year, will become a political force for economy and efficiency in Government stronger and more powerful than all the spending lobbies put together.

In other words, the cost of the $250,000,000,000 war, plus the wage bill for $2,750,000 Federal jobholders, when fully realized by the 52,800,000 Federal taxpaying voters, are bound to arouse the reactions of those who pay the bills. Therefore, it is not only good politics but good patriotism as well for us of the Seventy-eighth Congress to prepare for the financial storms of peace which will follow the storms of war. We must sharpen our pencils, admit the financial folly of many of our ways, and begin to run this Government like a business instead of like a race track. We, as Members of the Congress, have a mandate for economy from the voters—a mandate we had better not ignore.

Public opinion is at last catching up with our Federal bureaucracy. There are many signs in the political skies. One of them is the recent sweeping indictment of administrative inefficiency and mismanagement published in the journal of the National Federation of Federal Employees. Another is the wide attention given by the press to the

work of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures. Another is the large number of bills introduced at this session for the purpose of modernizing congressional procedures. Still another is the increasing attention given to Federal finance by the nationwide taxpayer association movement. And still another is the growing volume of resolutions passed by citizen organizations demanding efficiency and economy in Federal administration.

These developments are straws in the wind which indicate the changing direction of the Nation's temper concerning our financial antics here in the Congress. Let us not delude ourselves with the thought that the secrecy attending war expenditures and the fragmentary nature of the President's budget and the big blank checks we have granted to him, can absolve this Congress and its committees from responsibility to protect and conserve the people's money in the sharpest financial crisis our people have ever encountered.

My colleagues, for the first time we are called upon to finance a world-wide war of men and machines, while at home we are in the midst of revolutionary social-economic changes of unprecedented magnitude. To handle this perilous situation, many bills have been introduced which if passed, would strengthen our capacity to keep informed concerning what the executive agencies are doing and spending, and to enable us better to control their policies and programs. But new committees and new authority will do us no great good unless we follow the dictates of public opinion and define and vigorously prosecute a strict wartime policy with reference to peacetime bureaucracy. We must first break through the secrecy which veils the President's 1944 budget and there get the truth about the wartime worth of various agencies and bureaus. We must separate and clearly see their wartime values and their peacetime values. We must, for instance, know how much of F.C.C., F.S.A., F.W.A., R.F.C., P.W.A., and so on, is genuine, vital war work, and how much may be a secret effort to maintain personnel and pay rolls under the false guise of war necessity. If we once get at the truth and pass it on to the press, I have full confidence that public opinion—and especially the opinion of the taxpaying voters—will compel the Congress to reduce bureaucracy, not in any nominal amount, but in an amount that will be felt and seen in the voters' tax bills.

Every Member of Congress motivated by patriotism and a due regard for the economical use of the people's money will support every sane effort to eliminate the unnecessary expenses of Government; and every Member of Congress with a due regard to what the ballot box can do to his further tenure in office—a ballot box which will be dominated in the future by those who pay direct Federal taxes—will also lend a very attentive ear to the demands for efficiency and economy which the tax-paying voters are beginning insistently and more insistently to voice.

An Income-Tax Suggestion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARDIN PETERSON
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the tax bill may be written in conference, and under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of the Congress to the following editorial from the Sarasota Herald-Tribune, April 7, 1943:

AN INCOME-TAX SUGGESTION

We are neither a statesman nor the son of a statesman and it may be presumptuous on our part to venture a suggestion as to the way to proceed in the collection of income taxes without foregiveness. Inasmuch, however, as the wise men in the Congress and the experts in the Treasury Department have not succeeded very well in arriving at an acceptable solution of the tax problem, a failure on our part to produce a workable and satisfactory formula ought not to subject us to any serious criticism. This is still a free country and it is still the privilege of American citizens to make suggestions about matters of government.

In order to place the collection of income taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis, a method which has practically universal approval, we suggest a dissolving view procedure which would involve only a little additional taxes each year and in 10 years place the collection of taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis. By this plan the 1942 taxes, upon which reports were made on or before March 15, 1943, would be collected this year and, in addition to the 1942 taxes, there would be collected, on a pay-as-you-go basis, 10 percent of the taxes accruing in the year 1943.

When 1944 rolls around, 10 percent of the 1943 taxes will have been collected, leaving only 90 percent to be collected in 1944. But, on the taxes accruing in 1944, there should be a collection of 20 percent, resulting, as in the preceding year, in the collection of 10 percent of additional taxes. In the year 1945, 80 percent of the taxes in 1944 would be collected and 40 percent of the accruing 1945 taxes also, yielding an additional 10 percent for the Treasury. If this method were to be pursued for 10 years, each year the amount collected being reduced 10 percent on the taxes of the preceding year and increased 10 percent on the taxes of the current year, at the end of the 10-year period there would remain no taxes to be collected on the preceding year and the full amount of the taxes on the current year would be collected on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Doubtless there would be some losses in the course of 10 years in tax payments, but there would also be some compensating gains and at the end of the 10 years the Government probably would be neither in nor out any considerable amount of tax money. Should there be any accumulation of assets of large taxpayers, the inheritance tax, coming along a little later, would take care of that. At the end of the 10 years the Government would have gathered into its Treasury practically all the taxes which it would have collected under its present system and in addition the full amount of taxes due in the tenth year would be collected on a pay-as-you-go basis.

There may be some kinks in the proposition, but we do not think there are any beyond the wisdom and ability of the tax experts of the Treasury Department to straighten out. It is very obvious that the present system is not without difficulties and it has become evident that the Ways and Means Committee of the House is badly balled up in its attempt to make any improvement on it.

Tributes to the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following tribute was paid the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps by President Roosevelt on May 15:

One year ago today a new page was written into the military history of our Nation. With the organization of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps the women of our Nation were given an opportunity they long had hoped for. They were to share with men the greatest privilege of an American citizen—the right to serve in the defense of our country.

The WAAC's, as we have come to know them, are 1 year old, and in the brief span of these past 12 months they have justified magnificently the trust that was placed in them.

There were many in the beginning who smiled and some who violently opposed the thought of women serving with our armed forces. Today those of us who have seen and know the work they are doing throughout the military establishments of our country and in our foreign stations have only admiration and respect for the spirit, the dignity, and the courage they have shown.

The course they marked out for themselves was a modest one. They asked only that they might serve in the limited fields of Army operations where their skills and training would be of value. Their mission was to release for combat duty men who were engaged in tasks that could be performed by women. They did, and they proved their capabilities in the doing of their tasks.

At this first milestone in their service, I congratulate the WAAC's and express the gratitude of our Nation for a task well commenced. The fine achievements during their first year of service vindicate the judgment of those who were the pioneers in the movement and give every hope of greater accomplishments in the strenuous weeks and months that lie ahead.

The following are excerpts from statement by the director, WAAC, on May 16, 1943. First anniversary of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps:

On May 14 of last year the bill was signed creating the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, and on May 16 the director of the corps was appointed. Today there are some 62,500 of us. Between these dates there lies a year of challenge, of partial fulfillment, and of great promise. Its challenge is to be found in the newness of the organization in our country's history; its fulfillment may be measured in the light of growth and accomplishment to date; its promise is yet unmeasured, nor do we wish to limit it.

Just as the initial concept of the WAAC came into being as the result of military

necessity, so each forward step in its development has been ordained and dictated by our Army's real and urgent need. This need has, from the beginning, far exceeded the potential supply of WAAC personnel.

Today WAAC units are at work in 120 posts within the United States; from many of these stations came immediate requests for more, with the result that some posts have several companies of them. Recently WAAC's have arrived in England. Since January of this year 200 WAAC's have been on duty at General Eisenhower's headquarters in North Africa. There they are working at switchboards and teletypes; they are operating staff cars and trucks, doing office work, and handling the soldiers' mail—the priceless letters which travel to and from the battle fronts.

Ever since the WAAC companies have been on duty in the field, gratifying reports of their work have been received. Many of the commanders and officers at the posts to which they have gone, have taken the time to write me, expressing their appreciation of the WAAC's, and of the efficiency, devotion, and purposeful resolution that is theirs. Such messages provide added incentive and further challenge.

The corps now has five training centers throughout the country. It is necessary to see one of the training centers to appreciate the WAAC, its life, and its spirit. They have been the proving ground for the belief that women could take Army discipline—the proving ground for the American woman, herself, who has been regarded as the most pampered of all creatures. It is in the basic training period that the first and most difficult adjustment must be made. Women from many and varied surroundings learn to live the Army's way. From the first, the WAAC's have been eager to prove that they require no quarter in discipline, no special comforts, no concessions to chivalry. This selflessness had its root in their united determination to be good soldiers—its fruition is the WAAC esprit de corps.

Upon the thousands of auxiliaries who make up the great body of the corps rests the weight of the work to be done. Whatever her work may be, the auxiliary knows the Army is depending on her to do it faithfully and well. If our artillerymen who were at Bataan could cling for so long to the barren, exploding rocks of that desolated isle, cannot the woman soldier stay patient at her typewriter, if need be, from dawn to darkness, to get her job done? If our infantrymen in the jungles of Guadalcanal could make their way, single file, through thickets and swamps where every step was peril, to dig out and destroy each invisible sniper, man by man, cannot the woman soldier remain at her telegraph key, sending and receiving the messages so vital to the final translation of plan into action? If our tank crews fighting in north Africa could stick by their guns in blazing tanks to make every ounce of ammunition count, cannot the woman soldier turn all her strength and zeal to the task required of her? That is the ultimate challenge—the motivation and the will to serve.

The freedom of man is once again at stake. Every man and every woman throughout our land has a personal share in that stake. They all are needed, in some way, to protect it. We of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps know the part that we must take. We do the things which otherwise would be done by men—thousands of men from the fighting ranks—men whose presence in the battle line may mean the victory—men whose absence might mean defeat. The women of the corps have taken their stand, for freedom.

Our Foreign Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, May 12), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask that the address entitled "Our Foreign Relations," delivered by former Governor Alf M. Landon, of Kansas, at the meeting of the Six O'Clock Dinner Club, Minneapolis, Minn., on May 13, 1943, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The estimate of the Government Printing Office indicates that the address will take two and one-half pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $112.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With increasing signs of a divided Democratic Party and of a change in administration as a result of the election next year, the attitude of the Republican Party on foreign affairs takes on new and greater importance. The time has come to clarify that policy into harmony with the long and creditable record of past Republican administrations in foreign affairs.

First—let me say right now that there is no division between parties on the question of prosecuting the war. No administration can make this a partisan war. This is a national war. It must be fought right on to a victorious finish. We must win. No partisan can create any issue between the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, the New Deal Party, or any other party on the firm determination to crush our enemies. We must not allow our attention to be diverted from that job by counting our chickens before they are hatched.

Since every party that comes before the electorate must submit to an examination of its past record in foreign affairs, it is important that the record of the Republican Party be examined fairly. It is of especial importance since there are those who claim that in the twenties a Republican administration led us to break away from the world and that such a policy was the cause of the present war.

Let us look at the record on that point. Whatever the origin of the present war, certainly it did not arise from the American foreign policy in the twenties.

The Versailles Treaty rested upon an imperfect and outworn balance of power in Europe. It set up a circle of nations around Germany without reference at all to the greatest power in eastern Europe, Russia. It rested that false system of security upon France. But France crumbled. It attempted to maintain that rickety balance of power while at the same time it permitted Germany—the arch aggressor—to grow powerful under its very eyes.

The Versailles Treaty gave the Japanese a mandate over the Caroline and Marshall Islands. We were warned at the time that this would make it difficult to defend the Philippines against the predatory designs of the Japanese. The treaty also recognized the Japanese theft of the great Chinese province of Shantung. It thereby gave a kind of moral sanction to the whole policy of Japanese aggression in Asia. It gave Japan an area two-thirds the size of the United States with 25,000,000 people.

On the European front, wise economists pointed out that the economic policies of the treaty planted the seeds of war. The treaty was made in an atmosphere darkened by rumors concerning secret treaties which were the negation of the basic principle of Woodrow Wilson's fourteen points.

For those reasons and many others, the Senate of the United States, by a bipartisan vote, rejected the Treaty of Versailles and along with the League of Nations.

If we are to secure the best judgment and backing of the American people on a foreign policy best fitted for the Nation and the world we must meet each other frankly and discuss candidly all questions.

Kent Cooper points out the dire effects of constant propaganda by Government-controlled foreign news agencies. That policy kept the truth from the people and permitted the stirring of rancor, race, and economic hatreds which led directly to the present war. God save the United States from a centralized Government-dominated source of news, especially of Government activities. Already the international food conference in Virginia and the refugee conference in the Bermudas are following the dangerous pattern of a Government control of news in nonmilitary activities. The consequence is that decisions of a nonmilitary meeting on questions affecting many lives will be imparted to us without any opportunity for a thoroughgoing scrutiny by the people of what is being done.

The greater danger is that these pow-wows may set the precedent for all international conferences that will be held preparing for peace.

The patriotic citizens of America do not question responsible censorship by the United Nations.

But to accept secret covenants secretly arrived at is to permit a handful of men and women "to make decisions affecting the lives and futures of more than two billions without affording to these any opportunity to judge the wisdom and righteousness of what was done."

That is the greatest blow to the building and uniting of a good and friendly world in a fair and durable understanding based on confidence.

The bipartisan purge attempted by the world supergovernment group and repudiated at the ballot box last November does not mean a victory for isolationism. On the definition of isolationism there is confusion. Many, like Mr. Hoover, were called "isolationists." But Mr. Hoover, in 1932, was vigorously denounced by his Democratic opponents as an "internationalist." He was even denounced as pro-British. Great confusion exists not only here at home, but among our allies, because of the "shotgun" classification so glibly pronounced by those who have set their sights so high and so far forward that they are satisfied with nothing less than a post-war world supergovernment.

The issue now is not between isolationism and a fair and practical collaboration of the United States in efforts to create a more secure post-war world. The issue is between those who think clearly in terms of a balanced participation in international affairs and a fair and proper protection of the fundamental interest of the United States on the one hand and those who have their sights of world collaboration set so high and so far forward—on the other—that they endanger the entire peace program.

It is only fair to ask those who speak of collaboration exactly what they mean. Do they favor a world settlement through centralization of power at Geneva? Do they

favor giving a world organization the authority to override our immigration laws as has been suggested?

If they propose to regulate the treatment of minorities among the United Nations, do they favor an equal authority by international power over minorities in this country? On the other hand, do they agree with Mr. Churchill that the ultimate settlement of the world should be on a regional basis, with various degrees of participation by the United States in such regional councils? Do they mean a peace imposed on the rest of the world by two or three imperial powers? Do they mean collaboration of two or more dominant nations to maintain peace among subservient nations? Do they mean permanently subsidizing all of the nations of the world through a permanent lend-lease? The Nation is entitled to an answer on these questions, which have neither been clearly defined nor adequately answered.

The Republican Party has been a vigorous proponent of active international cooperation by this country in pursuit of peace and stability. In 1910 Theodore Roosevelt, in accepting the Nobel peace prize, said, "It would be a master stroke if these great powers, honestly bent on peace, would form a league of peace, not only to keep the peace among themselves, but to prevent, by force if necessary, its being broken by others." It was another former Republican President, Taft, who headed during the war the nonpartisan League to Enforce Peace. The work of this league gave Wilson the backing which moved him to plan a league among the ultimate objectives of the First World War.

But the Republican Party was not responsible for the Treaty of Versailles. The responsible leaders of the minority were not permitted to participate in the negotiations out of which that dangerous and unstable treaty arose. Nor were they permitted to place reasonable interpretations and reservations upon American acceptance of the treaty and League. The rejection of the League came only after reasonable suggestions were peremptorily rejected, and its defeat in the Senate was achieved by both Democrats and Republicans.

Are we not repeating the same mistake in the preliminary conferences of the United Nations in Virginia and the Bermudas when this administration denies representation to congressional representatives of a responsible minority.

Under the Wilson administration this Government proposed some 25 fundamental points of American policy for lasting peace and European statesmen rejected or defeated all except 5 of them. Is it not, therefore, a more reasonable statement to say that it was not the United States that ran out on Europe but rather Europe which ran out on the United States? In fact, it was precisely the failure to implement those 20 points which brought on this war. There can be no doubt that imperialistic seizures of territory, the continued spirit of hate, distrust, and revenge, the failure to disarm, the continuance of the old balance of power policies, which were inherent in the League of Nations, prepared the seedbed in which the present war germinated.

Under Mr Hughes, a great Republican Secretary of State, the new administration worked for international cooperation. With a darkening shadow over our relations with Japan and war freely predicted within 2 years, the new administration called the Washington Conference, and under the leadership of Mr. Hughes brought about an agreement on naval strength that successfully prevented a crisis for many years. And whatever else may be said of this conference it broke the alliance between Japan and England.

Let me select from the record a few of the positive actions taken by the Republicans to help insure a peaceful world: The Harding administration brought about the Nine-Power Treaty and the Four-Power Treaty which were intended to restore the independence of China. Since the Treaty of Versailles had failed to secure any disarmament, except in Germany, Mr. Harding, in 1922, and Mr. Hoover, in 1930, successfully negotiated the two treaties of naval limitation.

All these Republican Presidents strove to bring about land disarmament, as well as more far-reaching naval disarmament, but were thwarted by the nations of Europe. It was under Mr. Hoover's leadership that the long postponed League of Nations conference on land disarmament was held. America offered definite, constructive proposals, which were under discussion when the Republicans went out of office in 1933, and were promptly discarded or forgotten by the New Deal administration. It was Mr. Coolidge who set up the Kellogg Pact renouncing war as an instrument of national policy. And it was Mr. Hoover who expanded it into the great peace doctrine of the nonrecognition of territory acquired by force. The cornerstone of the good-neighbor policy was established by Hoover in Latin America when he sharply reversed Woodrow Wilson's policy of military interference with those countries. Every Republican President urged adherence to the World Court, but they were no more successful in securing confirmation than Mr. Roosevelt, who had an all-time record-breaking majority in the United States Senate behind him. It was Mr. Hoover who tried specifically to strengthen the German Republic to a point where it could withstand the attacks of its internal enemies, but he was again thwarted by the nations of Europe. The result was the destruction of the German Republic and the advent of Hitler. The Hoover administration cooperated with every League of Nations measure to relieve China from Japanese aggression, and when the Republicans went out of office they still refused to admit that Manchuria was no longer a part of China. But the Roosevelt administration discontinued our insistence on the evacuation of Manchuria by Japan. Finally, it was the Hoover administration that set up the World Economic Conference at London in 1933.

Now what were the Democrats doing all this time? Let's stick to the record. Did the Democrats in the Senate after 1920 ever propose reconsideration and ratification of the Treaty of Versailles? Did they urge adherence to the World Court? When they came into power in 1933 did either they or Mr. Roosevelt ever seriously propose to join the League of Nations? Were they not, when the New Deal came into power, completely apathetic about the League Disarmament Conference, which Mr. Hoover forced, and did not they discontinue all efforts at land disarmament or to renew and strengthen the Naval Limitations Treaty? To pile error on error, did they not actually reduce the annual expenditure of the Hoover administration upon the Army and Navy? And later the Roosevelt administration failed to support Republican proposals for increasing our own armed strength. Did it not pass the Mandatory Neutrality Acts which inevitably encouraged Hitler to believe that England's control of the seas would be no benefit to her in obtaining supplies from the United States—and which, in reality, presented Hitler with a blank check for aggression?

The domestic policies of the New Deal, from the first, have been the height of totalitarian nationalism. Let's look again at the record.

The 6,000,000 little pigs destroyed, the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, with its plowing under of cotton and wheat; the National Recovery Administration, the whole idea of raising the cost of production and the destruction of surpluses erected an economic isolation wall such as no high-tariff advocate ever dreamed. Under New Deal economic isolationism and the world depression, our foreign trade practically disappeared.

The principal reason for the complete fiasco of the London Economic Conference, to quote Harold Hinton's Biography of Secretary Hull, "was the unwillingness of the United States to discontinue the nationalistic practice condemned in others."

That was Roosevelt's first venture into international collaboration and cooperation. And where did it end? He torpedoed the conference, thus crushing the last hope that the peaceful nations of the world had of establishing world stability. The fact is that while the Administration is sounding new trumpet calls for international collaboration to restore the world to "new high levels of permanent recovery," it shows no indication of abandoning the economic isolationist domestic policies which contradict its uncertain foreign policy, and the attempts of Secretary Hull to lower trade barriers.

Therefore, the first decision in laying the foundation for a stable world must be made by the President. He must put his own contradictory and confusing policies in order.

World collaboration requires the abandonment of the totalitarian domestic pattern toward which the dominant branch of the New Deal is building. World imperialism does not. Which is it to be?

A totalitarian economy endangers world peace wherever it exists. There is no limit to the spread of a totalitarian government once that way is accepted. Therefore, the domestic policies of the New Deal work against and not for world peace.

But whatever confusion there may be, there are no disagreements as to the immediate necessity of the winning of the war. I have been fearful heretofore that a detailed discussion of our foreign policies might create a rift in that temporary coalition called the United Nations. That it is at the present only temporary is clearly indicated by Premier Stalin's position.

Tragic misunderstandings between ourselves and our allies as to the future are beginning to develop. Their continued growth will threaten the Allied victory which, come what may, means so much to Christian civilization. But these questions are being thrust to the fore by those who insist on planning post-war settlement now. One basic fault of our foreign policy over the years has been the hallelujah approach that ignored disagreeable facts and responsibilities involved. Russia has already let it be known that she has no intention of restoring eastern European boundaries or even European governments who are members of the United Nations to their pre-war status.

Mr. Churchill and others have also served notice that Great Britain is not going to liquidate her empire and that the French and the Dutch Empires are to be restored. How does this fit in with Under Secretary of State Welles' statement that "the age of imperialism is ended"? The Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" will probably be hailed by everyone, just as were Woodrow Wilson's fourteen points, but each nation will interpret the meaning of these vague aspirations to suit its own meaning. This is not to say that we should engage in controversy with our allies at this time; it is merely to suggest that we temper our promises until we clearly understand the kind of situations which we shall be called upon to guarantee. Certainly the fact that other nations are looking at their own necessities in a realistic way should warn us that our foreign policy must be conducted with the same realistic vision. Otherwise we will find that we must either go back on our own promises and earn the ill will of other nations or meekly give away everything we have in order to create and maintain a world federation built on an unsound basis.

It is not helping any to have public officials and citizens of this country making the glib statement that we alone are responsible for the kind of world government that has been or will be established. Any

such rash statements interfere with intelligent and far-reaching peace planning just as secret international conferences interfere with the mutual confidence necessary to successful peace planning. Their only consequence is to lead us to repeat the blunders of the past.

Pope Pius XII has bade this point well. I quite him:

"History teaches that treaties of peace stipulated in a spirit and with conditions opposed both to the dictates of morality and to genuine political wisdom have had but a wretched and short-lived existence, and so have revealed and testified to an error of calculation, human indeed, but fatal nonetheless."

The attempt to build collective security on the very narrow isolation of the New Deal economy or, on the other hand, of world imperialism does not offer much promise of a more satisfactory world. The sooner we face these basic facts the more chance we have of answering the hopes and prayers of mankind for a lasting peace.

The world is at a turning point. I do not believe we should retreat from our historic foreign policy of supporting the rights of minorities and the independence of small nations. It is essential that the peace that is to come have the advantage of the inspiration and idealism of the United States.

I believe we should do what we can to help to establish a new high and ethical system of justice But we cannot approach this peace without calm thought. We must understand and understand now what we can achieve and what we can afford to give.

The problems of peace are solvable. They present a challenge which we can and must meet. The fact is that the problem of racial hatred in Europe, which goes back to the Dark Ages, has largely been solved here in this country, where warring racial groups have learned to work together for the good of America. Is it not possible that the minorities here may help the peacemakers through their influence in the lands from which they come?

Let us approach the coming peace with realistic and practical outlines of cooperation which, so far as possible, will avoid conflicting views and purposes among the United Nations and which will preserve the independence of the United States.

As we do so we must avoid two dangers. Our republican tradition is based upon the solid rock of uncompromising devotion to the independence and interests of the Republic. Its heart beats to the impulses of the Union. It stands by the Nation and the flag, and it cannot surrender that freedom of action which is the life blood of a free people.

It cannot, at this moment when the swaying tide of war makes it impossible to see clearly the outlines of the post-victory world, bind itself to the precise details of peace arrangements. At a moment when the relations of the United Nations themselves are still in need of the most careful and friendly adjustment, the clashing details of international differences must not be allowed to raise their heads.

But we can give notice of our intentions to take the part in international affairs which our humanitarian instincts require, in a way that our strength warrants and our interests demands. I do not see how we can properly commit ourselves further than that especially in view of the announced position of some of our allies.

Let us, then, try to help build and to support an orderly and stable world, conscious of our own strength and of our own vast resources. Let us support this world unselfishly, not as an exploiting nation but emphatically Also, not as a "meddlesome Matty" emotionally concerned about the detailed settlement of every minority problem. Let us put aside forever the old style imperialism that fooled its citizens into believing that reparations and new territories paid for wars; or the New Deal style of nonsense, that Lease-Lend means any monetary return.

Mr. Hoover has made known the broad propositions on which he believes the Nation might well organize its post-war objectives. To that end I suggest a few such propositions avoiding now the drawing of blueprints, which can be drafted only after the war has entered its final phase. But these, I believe, indicate the broad outlines without which the effort and blood and cost of this war would be meaningless and futile.

1. Because of the magnitude of the immediate problems growing out of the war, there will of necessity be a period, perhaps a few years in duration, when representatives of the United Nations will sit as an interim world council. The functions of this United Nations council will consist of such problems as the just punishment of the guilty, the disarmament of the enemy powers, the conditional restoration of trade relations, the relief of famine, the supervision of the creation in the enemy countries of responsible and representative governments, and the setting up of commissions to consider and report to the United Nations for consideration plans for the solution of international economic problems and relations, for the appointment of temporary international forces to prevent chaos, for the establishment of machinery to preserve lasting peace, for the government of backward people, for genuine world disarmament, for international recognition of the principle of religious liberty and for the autonomy of nations.

2. While it is too early now to see the practicable forms of international cooperation that should follow this period of conditional peace, it is not too early to indicate that the United States recognizes the desirability of some form or forms of permanent international organization.

3. Such an organization of nations may well recognize, in line with Prime Minister Churchill's recent proposal, the fact that some international concerns may best be done on a regional basis. We have, in the Western Hemisphere, already laid the groundwork for such organization in our frequent Pan American conferences. A world organization might in this way be reserved for the discussion and formulation of broad principles and far-reaching objectives.

4. World or regional organizations perhaps should be vested with more immediate responsibilities through which conflicts between States may be prevented. These arrangements may well vary from region to region.

5. The American people will always be suspicious of a world superorganization. They will suspect, and with reason, that world organization may be dominated by a bloc of European states and that periodically the rest of the world will be drawn into conflicts beginning in Europe. A recognition of regional responsibilities will allay much of that fear and emphasize our paramount concern with this hemisphere. But for many and increasing purposes, a world council can be used to develop the habits and customs of peace and the general recognition of the principles of justice and right.

Such principles as these are fully in keeping with the diplomatic traditions of this Nation. They are likewise in harmony wth the long and splendidly constructive work of Republican administrations They carry the promise of a better world to those who are giving so much. And they preserve for us and our posterity the blessing of liberty at home.

Just as this Nation has turned the tide of war, I pray that we will not miss the great opportunity that will come to us of serving in peace We must be awake to every opportunity of expanding the frontiers of freedom and justice. That cannot be done hastily, intolerantly, or by unjust suspicions of the integrity of others. It requires the most thoughtful and enlightened leadership. A leadership which knows the full and true spiritual meaning of our flag and all that it symbolizes. In such leadership is the hope of America and our Christian civilization.

North Florida Farmer One-Man Food Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to call attention to the fine work being done by a Florida farmer, R. L. Dancy, of Holmes County, who has the unique distinction of growing all he can eat and canning all he cannot. The story of Mr. Dancy's farm activities was written by J. Francis Cooper, editor, Florida Agricultural Extension Service, and it appeared in the Florida Grower:

NORTH FLORIDA FARMER ONE-MAN FOOD INDUSTRY—GROWING ALL HE CAN EAT AND CANNING ALL HE CAN'T—GIVES HOLMES COUNTY PRODUCER UNIQUE DISTINCTION

(By J. Francis Cooper, editor, Florida Agricultural Extension Service)

The people of Holmes County, Fla., don't have to ship in so many canned vegetables from the outside because R. L. Dancy, who farms up in the north end of the county, cans enough to supply a major part of their wants. This is especially valuable to them since the amount of canned goods for sale has been rationed and purchasers limited in the number of cans they can procure.

Mr. Dancy operates a small canning plant right on his farm—well, in fact, it's a sort of family affair. His brother, sister, father, and mother also have a hand in operating it, to say nothing of the hired help! The father, 82-year-old John W. Dancy, is the fireman. In operation for 4 years, the canning plant has gradually increased in size and equipment, but still is inadequate. Mr Dancy hopes to build a larger, more modern, and more satisfactory plant as soon as materials are again on the market.

Holmes is a county of magnificent distances, so County Agent Arnold Hutchinson and I drove for a good many miles over country roads before we finally arrived at the Dancy place, which is nearer to Geneva, Ala., its post office, than it is to Bonifay, Fla., the county seat. When County Agent Hutchinson introduced me to Mr. Dancy and said I was looking for some material for a story, Mr. Dancy immediately queried:

"Are you going to write it for Florida Grower?"

It developed that he is a regular reader of the Grower, and likes it very much.

For home use the Dancys can tomatoes, butter beans, peaches, peanut butter, soup stock, figs, and peas. And they should certainly never go hungry—rationing or no rationing—because they can copious quantities every year. For marketing in Bonifay, he cans peas, string beans, and turnip greens—thus spreading the work over as long a time as possible.

For canning, he likes purple-hull cowpeas, a kind which I had never seen before and one with which workers at the Agricultural Experiment station are not familiar. Mr. Dancy obtained his original planting seed from a grower in Alabama.

Mr. Dancy not only grows these purple-hull peas on his own 173-acre farm but also contracts for them to be grown by many of the neighbors. A visit to that community during July or August would certainly give one the impression that he had, in reality, come to Pea Ridge.

With a potent and profitable flair for mechanics, Mr. Dancy has developed many of the handy devices used in his home-built commercial canning plant. A boiler just outside of the building provides steam for canning and scalding operations. An overhead conveyor system inside, made of a barn-door roller and a quarter-ton hoist chain, is useful for lowering baskets of cans into the hot vats or kettles and lifting them out again. Mr. Dancy made a bean cutter out of a poplar log and hacksaw blades. The log is grooved and rolls the beans into the blades. The outfit is operated by a ¼-horsepower electric motor, supplied with energy by a Rural Electrification Administration line from Graceville. He also has an electric pea sheller which whies the peas through in a hurry, but certainly does a good job of the shelling.

Attractive printed labels adorn his canned products, and he finds a ready market for all he can process. So carefully is the work done in preparing the materials for canning, and in the actual canning operation, that spoilage amounts to less than 1 percent.

Additional cash crops on the Dancy farm consist of Poland China hogs and cattle, and the eggs produced by 200 laying Leghorn hens. Feed for the hogs, cows, and chickens is grown on the place. I noticed a number of mules when I was there, but Mr. Dancy also has a tractor and combine—using the latter to harvest his fine Nortex oats.

Mr Dancy is a firm believer in blue lupine, the new winter legume recently introduced into northern Florida by the North Florida Experiment Station at Quincy He was the first one in Holmes County to grow this new crop, and has gradually increased his acreage. He sells seed each fall.

In fact, Mr. Dancy generally manages to try something new each year. He has found that the edible soybean sets seed well out there. And he grows African squash for eating and feeding to his hogs. He says it produces four or five tons to the acre, which is better than sweetpotatoes.

Yes, Mr Dancy keeps on his toes, and finds that it pays. Back in the good old days before gasoline rationing he usually visited the North Florida Experiment Station once or twice a year, finding something new and worth while each time. And he keeps in close touch with his county agent, not only to learn about new Agricultural Adjustment Administration programs and regulations but also to ascertain anything of interest or value which he can utilize on his place. He is both alert and industrious—the type of farmer of which both his community and Florida are proud.

What Follows This War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Christian Advocate of May 6, 1943:

Our Nation today faces a tragic and threatening situation.

Almost a year and a half after we were plunged into war, but we have still failed to create an official group charged with developing a program of foreign and domestic policy after the war.

We are failing to prepare for peace. If the war were to end tomorrow, we would be more seriously unprepared for the peace table than we were for the battlefield on December 7, 1941.

Before Pearl Harbor, America had two schools of foreign policy whose disciples were called, for want of better terms, interventionists and isolationists. Today America has no clear-cut foreign policy; indeed, no clear division on policy, because, in the extreme sense, there are no more interventionists and no more isolationists.

That is to say, there are no isolationists, if the term implies a desire to hold back in the war, to settle for less than victory, to deprive our fighting forces of anything they need to finish the job. And there are no interventionists if that term implies desire for a program of perpetual involvement in foreign wars or constant fighting by armies of mercenary soldiers to support expanding imperialistic, financial, or ideological American interests.

Americans all want to see war banned from the earth. They want to make sure that this time all the sacrifices shall not have been in vain. They want the blessings of a fair chance for a free people to be extended to all who have the desire and ability to develop systems of genuine self-government protecting the weak against the wicked.

So neither insolationism nor interventionism longer has value as a term to define bases of realistic foreign policy for America. And so we live in a dangerous void—the void created by absence of an accepted and acknowledged foreign policy. We have not drawn our lines and defined our terms sufficiently for intelligent discussion.

Of course, many post-war proposals have been offered by individuals and groups without official status. Some are the dreams of private citizens, some the creation of individual members of the executive department, or the Congress, some the proposals of associations or organizations. But thus far no one plan has the support of any considerable group of the public officials who, in the final analysis, will approve or disapprove what is to follow this war.

Furthermore, a brief examination of most of these proposals indicated at once the need to analyze and harmonize post-war proposals from two standpoints—our domestic affairs and our foreign attitudes. Neither is independent. Domestic policy must be shaped as a part of foreign policy; foreign policy must be geared to domestic affairs, both economic and political. To attempt a post-war program for America without considering domestic and foreign aspects simultaneously is to doom the program to failure at the start.

To achieve the need for planning, and to assure an unprejudiced approach, I propose in House Joint Resolution 28, introduced the opening day of the new Congress, establishment of a Post-War Planning Commission to develop a program of post-war policy at home and abroad.

I proposed that 8 of the commission's 32 members should be selected by Secretary of State Hull and 8 by former President Herbert Hoover, the 16 to be from the best brains in America, in or out of the Government, with at least 2 each chosen from the fields of agriculture, labor, business, and the professions, and that the remaining 16 be selected from the legislative branch of the Government as follows: Four chosen by the majority and 4 by the minority leaders of the Senate, 4 by the Speaker and 4 by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

Thus, 32 leaders would be gathered from the general public, the executive department, and Congress. Their selection would be on a bipartisan basis so that both great political parties—and none can say which party will be in control when the war ends—can join in developing recommendations in a field of activity where party animosities and personal ambitions must be absent.

We must not waste time in our preparations for the problems of peace. Unless a commission such as that proposed does the job, we shall once again find partisanship and prejudice seated at the peace table and encamped in the councils of the mighty.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER H. GROSS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the reciprocal trade agreements which have been in effect for the last 7 years under our trade-agreement program, have been detrimental to the American farmer and the American laborer, and have not at all served the purpose for which they were created.

During this period our Government, under the A. A. A., spent several billions of dollars in payments to farmers to decrease their production. During these years the President drastically reduced the duties on surplus farm products, thereby inviting foreign farmers to produce more of these same products for shipment to the United States. During the 5-year period from 1936 to 1940 our food imports averaged nearly 250 percent of our food exports.

If the agreements are to be continued then they should be amended very drastically and unless they are amended I shall be compelled to vote against the act.

By amendments I mean we should have congressional approval. This authority should not be delegated to the Chief Executive. I have in mind that 14 countries with which these treaties have been made they are subject to approval by the legislative bodies, and certainly we should have the same privilege here.

The act should be amended to provide that no product should be admitted under the agreement at less than the American cost of production. It should be further amended that the treaties can only be effective with the nations with which the treaties are made. This would mean the elimination of the most-favored-nation clause.

I am now thinking of the benefits Japan derived under the most-favored-nation clause when during the period from 1936 to 1940 she purchased over 15,000,000 tons of metal scrap of all kinds together with about 5,000,000 bales of cotton, $220,000,000 worth of petroleum products, $19,000,000 worth of aircraft parts, as well as $37,000,000 worth of machine tools which made it possible not only for her to murder the Chinese as we then thought, but to wage war on us.

The act should be further amended so that aggrieved persons or corporations may go into the court of customs for redress.

The amendments I refer to are mandatory under the Constitution. Therefore, I see no justifiable reason why the bill should not be accordingly amended, and if not, how I can discharge my congressional responsibility without voting against the bill.

It is a fine thing to talk about Americans dealing fairly and honorably with all other nations, but these treaties have proved to be lopsided and have created only one-way traffic. In fact, we have been poor horse traders.

The argument presented that because we are in war it is doubly important that these treaties be renewed cannot be proven by the action of Argentina. During the first 5 years of this agreement we imported $12,379,944,000 worth of agriculture products and substitutes. This means $2,063 for every one of our 6,000,000 farm families. During the same 5 years we imported 2,335,273 head of cattle and 758,466,496 pounds of meat and meat products. A great portion of these imports came from Argentina which is now one of the poorest cooperators we have in this war.

For Congress to delegate to the Chief Executive the authority granted him under these treaties is simply deserting the people in this hour of need. This Congress has been asserting itself pretty well to the satisfaction of the country and I do not believe that we should step aside now in this matter. People generally do not understand that when we make a treaty with another country that under the favored-nation clause those trade rights are extended to every other country. If they did understand there would be universal opposition to this measure and I believe that we must take these things into consideration and safeguard their interests.

Italian-Pagan Nazi Tie-Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 13, 1943:

ITALIAN-PAGAN NAZI TIE-UP DECRIED BY D'ALESANDRO—CONGRESSMAN SPEAKS ON SHORT WAVE OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION BROADCAST BEAMED OVERSEAS—QUOTES REPORT OF BISHOPS

WASHINGTON, May 15.—Quoting from the recent report of the German bishops on religious persecution in Germany, Representative THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, of Maryland, told the Italian people in an Office of War Information short-wave broadcast last night that Italy is allied with a pagan government which intends to destroy all religion.

Americans of Italian descent, said Mr. D'ALESANDRO in an Italian-language address, are horrified at the association of the devout of Italy with ruthless enemies of religion.

BEAMED TO CATHOLICS

"The report of the German bishops just made public tells in detail how the pagan officials of Germany are constantly taking steps to prevent Catholics from practicing their religion," Mr. D'ALESANDRO told the Catholic listeners to whom the broadcast was beamed.

"It is a matter of great sorrow to us to know that our brothers in blood, the people of Italy, who have always upheld the faith of Christ, are now associated with these ruthless Teutons, a people facing the enmity of the entire world because of disregard of Christian principles.

HORRIFIED AT PERSECUTION

"We Americans of Italian descent are horrified at the ruthless persecution of Catholic clergy and laity in Luxemburg, Poland, and Yugoslavia.

"The prelates tell of the ruthless interference of the officers of the Nazi party with freedom of conscience and the religious life of the population in Luxemburg, where monasteries have been closed and priests banished.

"With few exceptions, churches in the Diocese of Posen and Litzmannstadt have been withdrawn from use for worship and are now being used for profane purposes.

"Part of them are warehouses, in the exact language of the report. One church in Posen has been degraded to a riding school. A very large number have been robbed of their equipment for worship, altar cloths and sacerdotal garments. The tabernacles have been broken open in many cases and the Most Holy Sacrament desecrated in the vilest way. Not even the parishes of the German race have been spared. All that can only be taken as the expression of a senseless hatred directed against everything Christian. So says the report of the German bishops."

CITES ALLIED OBJECTIVE

Mr. D'ALESANDRO said that freedom of worship is one of the fundamental liberties for which the United Nations fight.

"The great ideals of Christianity, in which the dignity of the human individual is upheld, will be furthered in all of the occupied nations with the victory of the Allies," he promised the Italians.

CALLED PAGAN ATTACK

Sacking of churches and confiscation of church property in Yugoslavia and Poland was cited from the report of the German bishops, and Mr. D'ALESANDRO said:

"It is clear that these are not just the severe measures of a cruel police force persecuting unarmed and defeated people in a foreign land, but a direct pagan attack on the religious faith of their own people. We Americans of Italian descent resent that the people of Italy are forced to bear the hatred of all the Christian people of Europe, a hatred directed toward the Nazi and Fascist chieftains who, while occasionally paying lip service to God and the church, are depriving the Christian people of Europe of the right to worship God.

"But these Christian people are waiting and working toward the day when they can aid the liberating forces of all the United Nations, for they will never submit to the attempt to make them prefer 'Ave Hitler' to 'Ave Maria,' the mother who guards and strengthens the faith of all Christians."

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on May 15, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, before I begin my discussion tonight, I desire to make the following clear: I have received so many requests lately from wives, mothers, and fathers of our boys in the armed forces, it is just humanly impossible to answer your letters promptly. The work of my office is steadily mounting in connection with this function.

Do not get the impression that I am discouraging you in contacting me. On the contrary, I am most anxious to have you write me at any time. Your letters are always welcome. But I don't want you to get the idea I'm neglecting you if you send me a message and you fail to hear from me for a few days.

The bulk of my mail, of course, comes from the Triple Cities and from Broome County. But I receive a lot from Chenango County; I am sure that my weekly talks go far up into Chenango because I have letters from Smithville Flats, Greene, Oxford, etc., indicating they listen regularly to WNBF.

A substantial percentage of my letters are requests for me to help dependent wives and parents get their allotment money. This is one of the most important subjects before the country at the present time. Scarcely a family in my district is without a service flag in its window, proudly displaying the evidence of the greatest possible contribution to the war effort. To each one of these patriotic families must go an allotment if it is needed. Their boys who are fighting will never forgive us if we do not take every step necessary to adequately provide for those they leave behind.

On two separate occasions, realizing the great need for proper adjustments in the amounts received by dependents, I have asked Congress to double allotments for children of servicemen and to increase those for dependent parents. I believe these proposals will win the hearty approval of the fathers whom General Hershey indicated he will call up for the draft in August. I have urged upon Congress haste in enacting legislation of this kind for the benefit of those countless little children throughout my district and America for that matter who are going hungry on $10-a-month allotments. These children whose fathers will soon be in the armed forces of their country must be cared for. Shame upon the Government which fails to provide sufficient income to maintain them while their daddies fight for Uncle Sam.

You parents who are dependent upon your soldier sons will be in the same boat. There is no reason under heaven why you should be forced into the poorhouse or on the county farm or on local public charity the minute your sons are drafted. What is going to become of you mothers and fathers if Congress does not allow you sufficient means to carry

on? My answer is, you deserve just as much consideration as anybody else.

Didn't you raise that boy you are sending away? Didn't you work and scrape and sweat while he was growing up? Of course you did. Then, your Government owes this much to you. It must look after you while Jack or Bill or Tom are away fighting Japs and Nazis. Let Congress adopt the Hall dependency increase bills which provide for a square deal to all families of servicemen and all will be well.

Yes; my mail is very heavy in regard to these allotment matters. But I am happy that God Almighty has given me strength to serve you. I am grateful to Him for putting this opportunity in my way to do a little good for the children and the parents the soldier boy loves so well. Remember, if you have encountered any trouble or delay with your allotment, let me know. I will help you because I have helped many of your neighbors.

Letters from home are also coming in ever-increasing numbers, asking me to find out about soldiers, sailors, and marines reported missing or who have failed to write home. These incidents have caused a lot of misery and worry for wives and mothers and families. Here again, I have helped many hundreds. I have intervened in their behalf with the proper authorities and requested all available information about their boys. I hope you will write to me if I can do the same for you.

So after this description of only a small part of the job you folks elected me to perform, I know you will bear with me when I say that there just aren't hours enough in the day to get everything done. This accounts for my replies to your requests sometimes being several days late. I hope you will forgive me but I am doing the best I can in attending to it all. In the event you don't receive an answer in a reasonable length of time, be sure to write again or visit my Binghamton office and ask my secretary, Miss Mary Jean Miller, to tell me about it. My home office, you know, is located in room 302, Federal Post Office Building, on Henry Street, in Binghamton. It is open every morning except Saturday from 8 o'clock until 12 o'clock noon. Whenever I am home, I will be glad to meet with you there but as you know, this war is keeping us all pretty well tied up here in Washington. Nevertheless, you are welcome to visit my Binghamton office and you will be cordially received by Miss Miller who has been my secretary for many years.

A few days ago I received a letter from my good friend, Mr. Frank Gannett of Rochester, president of Gannett newspapers which, as you know, cover up-State New York pretty thoroughly. Mr. Gannett has taken considerable interest in the present food crisis and has collected a cross section of the Nation's opinion which he combines in a single article. It follows in part:

"'Food production is the No. 1 problem in this country and lack of experienced farm labor is the great barrier to that production', Frank Gannett, publisher, said today announcing the findings of a Nation-wide survey.

"The survey recorded the opinions of more than 5,000 farmers and farm leaders and was followed by another addressed to newspaper editors and publishers.

"Handicaps to greater production were listed thus by farmers:

	"Percent
"Lack of experienced help	89 8
Too much regulation from Washington	88 8
Misunderstanding of farm problem in Washington	85 9
Need for profit-insuring prices	82 9
Lack of machinery	78 8

"More than half the farmers questioned expect a decrease in production this year and their estimates of that decline range from 5 to 30 percent. Only 15 percent believe production will increase.

"Half the farmers feel that regulations from Washington have hampered their business. Twenty percent of them said the agricultural policies of the administration had been helpful.

"Only 7 percent felt the fixing of prices would not affect acreages this year. They were outvoted by the 82 percent who see it as a discouraging factor.

"How farm labor has been affected by the rush to industries was reflected in the statement of 96 percent who said they could not hope to compete for labor at factory prices and factory hours. Many of them argued that hours for factories and farms should be evened off, asserting the war production would increase tremendously if farm hours were enforced.

"City folks feeling the urge to volunteer for farm work might be discouraged by the fact that 85 percent of the farmers think such aid useless. They put emphasis on the need of experienced help, saying it takes 2 years to train a farm worker.

"'I hold this survey to be of utmost importance,' said Mr. Gannett. 'For the first time the farmers had a chance to answer a questionnaire without feeling that someone in authority was standing over them. Side remarks were most illuminating.

"'One reading those comments could not question the patriotism of the men who are in a most distressing position. They wish to produce the food but find themselves tied down by lack of proper help and tools and by the prospect that their financial return will not equal expense.

"'The majority are opposed to such control and such bungling as has occurred under the New Deal. Their time is being wasted in many ways and they are discouraged by the obstacles placed in their way.

"'One farmer wrote that "we will try to do our best but I don't see anything except decreased production." Many pleaded for a better understanding of farm problems by the consumer and by the theorists in Washington.

"'Lack of feed for livestock is a matter that comes up continually. Everywhere there were complaints of shortages in protein foods. This was something which they felt cannot be remedied without a change in conditions. Most of them emphasized the need of quick action if this year's production of food is to be aided.'

"The pool of newspaper executives was representative of the whole country. The farm survey evoked responses from 47 States, although the heaviest returns were from the Northeast.

"Newspapermen conceded food to be the great problem of the year and were nearly unanimous in selecting trained help shortage at the great lack. They disagreed sharply with farmers as to the possibility of increased supplies, 40.6 percent predicting heavier crops in their areas.

"As for factors threatening a shortage they listed lack of machines as next to lack of trained help and mentioned the difficulty of obtaining needed supplies such as fertilizer, seeds, gasoline, and feeds.

"Almost 60 percent said food pinches were observed in their territories and found that the product most dangerously curtailed now is milk.

"Newspapermen were freer in discussing the political sides of the production problem and assailed Washington's part in it. Their suggestions dealt for the most part with the possibility of lighter regulation, changes in drafting of farm workers, freeing of machinery and parts and encouraging the planting of Victory gardens.

"Mother's Day for Mrs. Frank M. Marrer, 616 Elm Street, Endicott, who has five sons serving in the armed forces, was lonesome. To comfort her, however, she received a poem written by one of her sons, Tech. Sgt. Robert Eugene Marrer, 19, who, according to the Binghamton Sun, is believed to be a prisoner of the Germans." I wish to take the remaining time allotted to me to read the sergeant's lines:

"Still laugh, I say, while I'm away,
And gather all the flowers of May.
Still keep my room, the pictures all
That I have loved, on the wall,
For I shall want them, every one,
The moment that this war is won.
Still play the records, dance and sing,
And spread no fears for sorrowing.
Be happy every time you can,
For victory, work and play and plan,
For I shall want you looking well
When we have fired the final shell.

"Still bake the pies as it might be
That I were coming home for tea.
Still plant the gardens round about,
Still grub the sturdy thistles out,
And stake the blue delphinium
As if the struggle shall be long,
At home, there must be mirth and song,
Since these are what we fight to keep.
So hide away, Mom, when you must weep,
And be at home as brave as we
Who fight in sky, on land, on sea.
Keep your chin up, Mom."

The John Browns of 1925 and 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an article written by Carl Sandburg, which appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, May 16, 1943, entitled "The John Browns of 1925 and 1943":

THE JOHN BROWNS OF 1925 AND 1943

(By Carl Sandburg)

Two biographies of Billy Mitchell are before us now. And as we go through them we can see that his case for air-power is now well proven. He foresaw what was to happen, from the Aleutians to Tunisia. If he could come back alive for a few minutes to look at what is now happening and to realize that some of the best of it stems from the headstrong agitation he carried on, he might wish to soften the remark he made 7 years ago on his deathbed to Col. Homer Berry, a good flyer with whom he had common memories:

"Homer, the American people will regret the day I was crucified by politics and bureaucracy."

If there is a Valhalla, then from some window or outlook there early this May of 1943 Billy Mitchell's face must have lighted to see 300 new-made American fighter planes together in a flight across the Atlantic, losing only one plane crew, in the greatest mass flight of aircraft thus to cross an ocean. And earlier he would have felt that perhaps his contribution was slight but definite when United States Army planes alone wiped out a

Japanese fleet of 22 ships, leaving reporters mentally mixed on whether it could be correctly termed a naval battle.

"Has the Army got the guts to kick him out?" queried the columnist Frank Kent, while the verdict of the court-martial board was awaited. Kent fearing that Colonel Mitchell "had created a condition that makes his dismissal inexpedient and which will compel a compromise verdict," Kent then as now favoring the past and hoping the future would be the same, flying like the auk which flies backward so as to see where it's been.

Mitchell's court-martial legal counsel, Congressman Frank Reid, after the conviction and sentence, remarked:

"Col. William Mitchell is a 1925 John Brown. They may think they have silenced him, but his ideas will go marching on, and those who crucified him will be the first to put his aviation suggestions into use."

Of course, the verb "crucified" here doesn't make the required picture because Mitchell lived on for 11 years, went everywhere in America and Europe, got his message across to the country, had the sane and simple Will Rogers with him, and made a name as a bitter and crying crusader, though his smiling lips and beaming warm eyes were those of no "croaker" or "scurpuss."

ANOTHER STAND OUT

And now what? Out of the present turmoil what names of what men are to stand out 10 years from now for the warnings, forecasts, they speak now?

Quite likely this fellow Eric A. Johnston, the Seattle businessman, now elected to a second term as president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, will in time be shown as not just another odd number. Did he stand on the White House steps one day last summer and actually permit himself to be photographed alongside of those two eminent heathens, William Green and Philip Murray, heads of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations? He did.

And did several members of the chamber, who have paid a lot of good money in backing the chamber, write in that they were through and couldn't go along with Johnston's "truckling" to organized labor? They did. Later, however, they came back. But their fingers are crossed.

TONES PROPHETIC

"We must all work together," says Johnston. "We are bound to have our differences over the right ways of reaching our goals, but we must learn to settle these differences by sitting down together. They can't be settled by name-calling in the press or over the radio."

Now, before the war ends, Johnston warns, is the time for anxiety and plans against the dangers of unemployment after the war.

In prophet tones he tells business America:

"Only the willfully blind can fail to see that the old-style capitalism of a primitive, free-shooting period is gone forever.

"The capitalism which thrived on low wages and maximum profits for minimum turnover, which rejected collective bargaining and fought against justified public regulation of the competitive system, is a thing of the past."

What Johnston is telling business America, financial and industrial America, is as radical as what Billy Mitchell told the Army and Navy about sea power.

To go back to pre-war capitalism is to be sunk. A new approach is demanded. Johnston is worth listening to. He has broken from the past.

Future Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following greetings of the Future Farmers of Hawaii to the Future Farmers of the mainland extended by me in a radio broadcast over the blue network, on May 8.

The program was the One-hundred and forty-fourth Nation-wide broadcast to the Future Farmers of America, and carried out under the direction of Mr. S. C. Hulslander, acting national executive secretary of the Future Farmers of America. It included a record of the contribution to the war effort of Hawaii's Future Farmers as follows:

Hawaii's Future Farmers of America, living on United States soil in an active theater of war, send aloha to their fellow Americans on the mainland and proudly report on their contribution to the war effort.

While smoke still hung black over Pearl Harbor following the Japanese attack of December 7, 1941, Hawaii's Future Farmers of America, 1,800 strong, went to work on the biggest job they had ever undertaken. Youthful farmers by choice and training, they set out to increase the supply of domestically produced food in the islands. Hawaii, beset by the enemy from the west and separated from the mainland by 2,200 miles of ocean to the east, is a place where food production takes on an immediate urgency.

The Future Farmers of America in Hawaii has not limited itself, however, to a substantial contribution to the food supply. Its per capita purchase of War bonds is the highest among all Future Farmers of America chapters in the United States.

Vegetable growing plays an important but by no means exclusive part in the program. Hawaii's Future Farmers are raising livestock, poultry, and rabbits to augment the food supply. They have sponsored a widespread program to immunize swine against cholera. They are producing livestock feeds, conducting extensive insecticide campaigns in community gardens, and are working on sugar and pineapple plantations as replacements for men called by the armed services to work on emergency construction projects.

Income from gardening and work on plantations has been invested in War bonds and stamps.

Efforts of the Future Farmers of America in Hawaii have had decidedly practical results. The boys in one chapter on the island of Oahu propagated and distributed 130,000 seedling plants between October of last year and February of this year. They will distribute a quarter of a million seedlings this year for vegetable gardens.

The chapter on Molokai cultivates a highly productive 10-acre farm. Members have sponsored an island-wide program to immunize swine against cholera, have produced home-grown feed for livestock, have taught the people how to utilize feeds available locally and thereby reduce importations from the mainland at a time when shipping space is precious.

Throughout the territory the Future Farmers of America have performed a substantial service in food production, in educational work, and in other ways, such as acting as block air raid wardens, building air raid shelters and serving as messengers during air raids, and donating blood to the island blood banks.

The Hawaiian Association of the Future Farmers of America pledges itself to continuance of its all-out effort in the war program and in the period which will follow the Allied victory.

Regarding Our WAVES

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter I recently received from the Governor of my State regarding the motives behind the enlistment of our womanhood in the WAVES.

The letter follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE, STATE HOUSE,
Phoenix, Ariz., May 4, 1943.

Hon. RICHARD F. HARLESS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR DICK: I am writing you this time on a matter of both personal and public concern. I believe you will agree with me on this matter, and if so I shall be glad to have you transmit my sentiments to the Members of the House of Representatives along with your own.

The press reports recent remarks on the floor of the House of Representatives which I consider extremely detrimental to the war effort. I refer to the discussion on a measure involving that branch of service known as the WAVES. It seems to me that a strong public statement in defense of the WAVES is in order after the insinuations on the floor of the House about the "glorifying of a few glamorous girls that are seeking to get in the limelight through the provisions of the bill we passed last July."

My daughter, Marjorie, is a member of the WAVES. I feel strongly the indignation she must feel at these entirely unjustified and criminally harmful remarks. I am sure that every woman in every branch of the service must feel the same way. To let such remarks pass unanswered seems to me to be damaging in the extreme.

Nearly every woman who enlists with the WAVES or the WAAC's does so with the same unselfish desire to serve her country that is shared by enlisted men in all our services. They have never worked harder on any job, nor been more devoted to their duty. Any girl who enters these important services with any other thought in mind is set on the right track on the very first day of her service.

The women of America have responded nobly to their country's call. Whether they serve in the armed forces, in war industries, or in the essential civilian activities, they are releasing men badly needed at the front. This is no time to ridicule their unselfish devotion. Rather it seems to me we should express our profound appreciation for their

willingness to sacrifice the many privileges and the comfortable living to which so many women of peacetime America were accustomed.

Often it is necessary for women in the services and in industry to travel far from their homes, to sever family ties, to forsake friends, and sometimes to give their all for their country. These sacrifices are not easy. They are not even required. They are voluntarily and gladly given by more and more women of America who are answering the call.

I would say—more power to them—let's cheer them on—let's welcome them into every branch—let's treat them as equals—and in doing this we shall be helping to meet our country's urgent need for manpower in every field essential to winning the war.

I am writing you this way because I feel so strongly on the subject, and because I think you will agree with me.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

SIDNEY P. OSBORN.

Mr. Speaker, since there have apparently been some disparaging remarks made on the floor of the House regarding the women's activities in the war effort, I would like to add a few personal observations. Although there may be exceptions, it is my belief that the women who are enlisting in the WAVES as well as in the other branches of the service which have been opened to them are doing so with the highest patriotic motives. Many of these women have menfolk in the service and they, too, wish to contribute to the war effort in the most effective way by releasing men for active service in the field.

It is most unfortunate that in all walks of life the actions of a few may not be of the highest order and that such actions often reflect on an entire body. I know that, given the opportunity, the women of our country will do themselves proud.

We all know that the women of England and Russia have already contributed much in the defense of their countries. They have even manned the guns in defense of their homelands, and many of our women have urged that they be allowed to do what their men are doing. While there may be no need for our women to assume the dangerous roles that have been assumed by their sisters in England and Russia, who can say that their offer to share the dangers of battle is other than an unselfish desire to give their lives if need be? Therefore, we should appreciate and not belittle their efforts.

The Price Incentive in the Production of Petroleum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 14, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Walter S. Hallanan at Independent Petroleum Association of America directors' meeting in St. Louis, Mo., May 8, 1943:

You have assigned me the subject "The Price Incentive in the Production of Petroleum." As I have mingled here with the members of the Independent Petroleum Association, the men who since the industry was born almost a hundred years ago have been its Argonauts, the men who have blazed the trails to the new fields which have made us the greatest oil-producing Nation in the world, I have been impressed—and I am again impressed as I look into your faces this morning—that not one of you would be engaged in the extremely hazardous oil business had it not been for the incentive of a price that would justify your efforts and the risking of your capital.

There is nothing exclusive about price incentive. It is not restricted to the oil business. It is so broad as to take in every field of human endeavor. There is some kind of incentive behind every upward movement of the individual, the group, and civilization as a whole. By the same token, whenever and wherever incentive has been lacking there has been retrogression instead of progress. It was the incentive of material reward that transformed the trackless prairies and impenetrable forests of America into the greatest productive Nation on the face of the earth. It was this incentive that gave birth to the oil industry in Pennsylvania almost a hundred years ago, and it was the same incentive that sent the probing bit of the Austrian prospector, Lucas, into the dome at Spindletop—the same incentive that has been back of every drill that opened up a new oil field anywhere in the world.

Incentive is not even restricted to material things. Many of us eat things that we do not like and do not eat other things that we crave because a doctor holds out to us the incentive of good health if we follow his regimen. We go to church and deny ourselves many worldly pleasures because there is held out to us the incentive of immortality and spiritual reward. Now, oil men are no different from other human beings. They were cast in the same mold as their fellows and they respond to the same impulses and emotions.

There was a time when the price incentive in the production of petroleum was solely a problem of the oil industry. At that time we enjoyed a free-price structure that was controlled by the law of supply and demand. The great potentials of the industry, represented by proven reserves that were being replenished each year as rapidly and even more rapidly than they were being drawn upon, served to keep the price of petroleum and its products from advancing in line with those of other commodities. There was not only a plentiful supply of oil to meet every need of the Nation, but these seemingly inexhaustible potentials gave assurance that this supply would be continued indefinitely.

That situation no longer exists. The once free price has been frozen by governmental decree, and the point of its freezing was the lowest in the last 6 years. If the price structure stood alone and had no bearing upon the maintenance of our reserves, the problem still would be one that affected the industry alone. But, unhappily for the country in this critical hour, the price structure is indissolubly bound to the rate of discovery of new reserves. This is no longer a problem of the oil industry alone, and the time has passed for us to discuss it within the limited and perhaps prejudiced sphere of its effect upon the industry.

It is now a great national and international problem that seriously threatens the effective prosecution of the war and holds grave consequences for our domestic economy. As such a problem, we approach it as American citizens and not as oil men, because we are concerned first of all with winning this war and with preserving for all our citizens the liberty of thought and action under which private enterprise has built this great Nation.

It is therefore as an American citizen that I speak to you today and not primarily as an oil man. But while I speak as a citizen, I expect to use some of the expressive and straightforward terminology of the oil fields. It is no time to pull punches when our country is imperiled. It is no time to be concerned about ruffled feelings of some governmental bureaucrats or to be fearful of reprisals from Washington. The time for conciliation has passed. It is time to put on our fighting clothes.

I am going to speak plainly and I am going to talk in the practical and earthly terms of cold and stark realism, leaving to Mr. WALLACE and the other intellectual "doodlebugs" those journeys into the nebular hypotheses where, like the man on the flying trapeze, they soar through limitless and uncharted space with the greatest of ease. This is a down-to-earth problem and it cannot be discussed in the terminology of the stratosphere. I may even have occasion to use such an earthly word as "money." I know that the starry-eyed dreamers in Washington regard this as a sordid term, but they have not yet devised any synthetic substitute which can be used by oil men to pay lease rentals and drilling costs. I realize that the word is offensive to some of them, especially if the money happens to be in the other fellow's pocket. Heaven knows it is not in the independent oil man's pocket today.

You know better than any group in America the perilous situation which faces our country because of the rapid consumption of our oil reserves. The great potentials which operated to hold down the price of oil in the days when we enjoyed a free price structure no longer exist. The tide which was coming in then is going out now. The problem is made more acute by the fact that as the potentials go down, the demand is going up, and as this war continues that demand will increase from month to month and year to year. Oil is the one indispensable commodity in the waging of modern mechanized war. Unlike other essentials, no synthetic substitutes for it have yet been developed in the laboratories of the world. Without it our Army and Navy would today be immobilized. In the last World War you recall the phrase that the Allies floated on a sea of oil, and we need a much larger sea of oil to float the Allied cause in the war in which we are now engaged.

The oil industry is today in the position of a merchant who is rapidly emptying his shelves of merchandise, meets difficulty in replenishing them, and is faced with an ever-increasing demand for goods. Unless he can find a method of replenishing his stock he will inevitably be forced out of business, and the community which he serves will be unable to obtain the merchandise which is indispensable to its welfare. Stated in terms that can be understood by everyone, the industry is in the position of an individual who is checking out of his bank account five times as much as he deposits. If you have ever tried that, you know that it is just a matter of time until the banker calls you up on the telephone and tells you that your account is overdrawn and demands that the overdraft be covered by a deposit. Unless the present situation is remedied immediately and effectively, there can be no deposit forthcoming from the industry when its bank account is finally exhausted.

There is just one remedy for the present situation. That remedy is an increase in the price to a point where men will be justified in producing stripper wells and in risking their capital in the hazardous wildcatting that is

necessary to restore our potentials at least to parity with consumption. The Petroleum Administrator, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, has forcefully and courageously pointed the way to a solution of this problem. In recommending to the Office of Price Administration an average increase of 35 cents a barrel in the price of crude oil, he has clearly pointed out the dangers to our war effort and our domestic economy in the continuation of the present situation. I am certain that the increase recommended by Mr. Ickes will not be sufficient to produce the desired result, but it is a step in the right direction. It will have the effect of reversing the present trend, and it will hold out hope to the independent oil producer that the Government has at long last recognized his plight. I believe that this encouragement alone will go a long way toward initiating exploratory operations. Both the oil industry and the country have reason to be grateful to Mr. Ickes for the intelligent and decisive manner in which he has approached this problem.

We cannot meet an oil shortage as the country has met shortages in other critical materials. When the Japanese conquest of the Indies threatened total exhaustion of our natural rubber stocks, there was a substitute in the form of synthetic rubber to take its place and by the mere appropriation of money and the construction of plant facilities the rubber stocks could be and are being replaced. Unfortunately, oil stocks cannot be replaced so simply. You cannot obtain oil by appropriating money and building a factory. Oil has to be discovered and this discovery is a long and hazardous undertaking filled with every conceivable kind of difficulty and heartache. Cold experience has demonstrated that it takes at least 2 years for a discovery program to bear fruit. You cannot raise the price of oil today and expect this incentive to produce new reserves next month, or even next year. It takes time to do geological and geophysical work, assemble acreage, and drill wells. In other words, if we are to avoid a serious oil shortage in 1945—a shortage which might well lead to national disaster—the incentive to replenish our stocks must be provided now.

Mr. Sumner Pike, of the Office of Price Administration, has testified before a committee of the House of Representatives that this would be "a pretty bad time" to increase oil prices The time will never get any better. It will grow progressively worse from day to day and from month to month until at last, when the country stands on the brink of disaster, those in authority may get around to providing the inevitable "too little and too late." I am inclined to agree with Mr. Pike that this is "a pretty bad time" to do that which should have been done more than a year ago. It is "a pretty bad time" to talk about price increase after small producers throughout the country have been compelled to shut down thousands of producing wells, after the exploratory drilling necessary to replenishment of our reserves has been seriously crippled, and in some sections brought to a complete halt, and after the industry in general has been brought face to face with a situation approaching chaos. It is always "a pretty bad time" to lock the stable door after the horse has been stolen.

The oil industry and the country face a condition and not a theory. There have been some of the college professors in Washington, who, by arbitrarily adjusting our reserves upward, have been able to delude themselves about our situation, but as the Petroleum Administrator aptly pointed out in his letter to Price Administrator Brown recommending an increase in oil prices, we need to discover oil with the drill and not with the pencil. I am certain that the oil which those fellows discover with the pencil in their complicated charts and graphs would not satisfactorily propel our battleships and tanks and airplanes.

There are so many fellows in Washington, many of them in positions exercising control over oil policies, who think that all of our reserves are available at will and can be obtained in any quantity wanted at any given time by the simple expedient of turning a valve. They think that because the 20,000,000,000 barrels of reserves are estimated to last 12 or 13 years that they could be produced within that period. The Petroleum Administrator, whose feet are on the ground, demolished that crackpot theory when he pointed out that which is known to every practical oil man—that the total of these reserves could not possibly be produced in less than 50 years. He said that our reserves were not capable of sustaining withdrawals at the present rate much beyond the present year, and he said further—and this is the important point—that if it should become necessary to produce existing fields in excess of efficient engineering rates, ultimately recoverable reserves will have to be corrected downward as they have been corrected upward.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating and the proof of the relationship between the price incentive and the discovery of new petroleum reserves lies in the incontrovertible fact that the rate of discovery has always been controlled by the price factor. That has been true since the Drake well was drilled almost a century ago and it will be true as long as human attributes exist as they are today. This relationship between price and discovery is something that has been determined by the cold test of experience. It is a practical, down-to-earth proposition and it cannot and will not be changed by any directives, edicts, or ukases from any governmental czar.

The cold, hard fact is that stripper wells, which have necessarily been closed down because their owners were being starved to death under the Office of Price Administration's inflexible price structure, will not be brought back into production and men will not risk their capital in the extremely hazardous business of wildcatting unless and until they are given the incentive of a price that will justify their undertaking. All the pontifical pronouncements and high-sounding phrases of the college professors will not change that fact.

If the oil industry stood alone in presenting the facts of this perilous situation and in pointing out that the only remedy lies in a price increase, the public might be justified in some degree of suspicion that we were motivated by selfish interests, or that we were seeing things under the bed. But we do not stand alone. The stark and appalling realism of the oil situation has been forcefully pointed out by the Petroleum Administrator for War, the one man charged by the President of the United States with the responsibility for maintaining a sufficient supply of petroleum and petroleum products for the prosecution of the war and for our domestic needs. It has been pointed out time and again by committees of Congress, by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, by Governors and other public officials of oil-producing States, and by any number of other disinterested persons.

Despite this widespread recognition of the peril to the Nation unless our oil reserves are replenished, the Office of Price Administration, which is the only agency of the Government possessing the power to give relief, has permitted this condition to drag along month after month, ignoring the facts and displaying an amazing unconcern over the tragic possibilities of its inaction. Even now we read in the newspapers that this agency of the Government will turn its back upon the recommendation of the Petroleum Administrator on the grounds that to grant a price increase might possibly contribute to an inflationary spiral. This is just plain, unadulterated bunk. If an industry whose price index is pegged at 60, while food prices stand at 110, farm prices at 106, and metal prices at 103, can be accused of contributing anything toward inflation, then I don't know the meaning of that word.

But for the sake of argument, supposing that the increase recommended by the Petroleum Administrator did prove inflationary in some small degree, what would it profit to hold the line against inflation and perhaps lose the war as a result, or at least prolong it at a terrible cost in the blood of American youth. Hundreds of boys were killed and maimed in the last 24 hours of the First World War and personally, I would rather have a little touch of inflation than to shed one unnecessary drop of American blood.

Another activity of the Administration in Washington that has served as a check rein upon exploratory work has been the repeated and persistent efforts of the Treasury Department to eliminate the statutory depletion allowance which has been the underlying dependence of oil producers as a means of returning the capital invested in pioneering activities. The possibility that the Treasury might eventually be successful in destroying this principle, which has been on the statute books for 24 years and approved by overwhelming majorities in Congress time and again, has hung like the sword of Damocles over the head of the producer.

It is an unhappy and unfortunate circumstance, not only for the industry but for the country, that the Treasury Department persists in its efforts to destroy this sound and basic principle at this particular time when the Nation's oil reserves are dwindling and when other agencies of the Government, directly charged with the responsibility for maintaining those reserves, are calling upon the industry to redouble its efforts to discover and develop new fields. The industry is thus placed in the position of being damned if it does and being damned if it doesn't. If the depletion allowance was sound in principle and essential to the maintenance of the oil industry's capital structure in peacetime, as one Congress after another has determined that it was for more than 20 years, then it is certainly far more essential that it be maintained during this period when we are engaged in an all-out effort with oil as one of the indispensable products necessary to the prosecution of that effort.

It has been charged many times by Members of both Houses of Congress and by innumerable other responsible persons that the economic planners in Washington were using the war emergency as a screen behind which to carry out their destructive policies. I hold in my hand a booklet published by the Office of War Information entitled "Battle Stations For All." Millions of these booklets have been published and distributed at a staggering cost to the taxpayers under the guise that they promote the war effort and stimulate public morale. This booklet contains nothing but pure, unadulterated propaganda for the economic theories of the administration.

Ten pages are devoted to propagandizing the various tax proposals which have been advanced by the Treasury Department from time to time and which have been rejected by the overwhelming vote of both Houses of Congress. On page 38 you will find the specious and unsound argument of Mr. Morgenthau in support of his demand for elimination of the depletion allowance. The authors of the booklet use that same old specious and repudiated argument of Mr. Morgenthau, that oil companies should be limited to the same

depreciation that is permitted manufacturing companies. The booklet points out that a manufacturer depreciates his buildings and machinery 10 percent a year and that at the end of 10 years he has thereby recaptured his capital expenditure and he can then erect new buildings and buy new machines.

The argument is that the oil companies could depreciate their investment in the same manner and at the end of the 10 years go out and find new oil reserves to replace those which had been exhausted. This argument would not do credit to a grade school pupil and yet your Government spends millions of dollars to publicize and propagandize it, and, what is more indefensible, it is done in the name of aiding the war effort. This illustrates the extreme lengths to which the bureaucrats will go in the studied purpose to destroy every independent oil operator in this country.

It is the independents who have been the real sufferers because of the determination of the Office of Price Administration and the Treasury Department to shackle and hamper the oil industry. In the face of the handicaps and threats imposed by these agencies of the Government the ordinary man would have long since thrown up his hands in despair and quit the business. But the oil man is not a quitter. It is to his everlasting credit that with his profits gone, his capital being dissipated, and with the ever-constant threat that his depletion allowance will be eliminated, he has carried on because his country was at war and, like a good soldier, he didn't desert just because the inexcusable blunders of his commanding officers led him into slaughter.

It is tragic when we think that the tens of thousands of small independent operators who have discovered 75 percent of the oil in this country, whose trails are marked by more casualties than any other business enterprise under the sun—that you are being liquidated along with our reserves. You are being crucified upon a cross of governmental stubbornness and incompetence. You are being crucified by men whose experience in the oil business is so limited that they probably associate a grobbin with a red-breasted bird which appears in early spring—by men who are more concerned with coining smart and catchy phrases than with taking the action demanded by our critical situation.

If any man doubts what is happening to the independent oil operator he has only to read the incontrovertible figures which show that whereas 17 major oil companies controlled only 43 percent of our known oil reserves 2 years ago, today they control 71 percent of those reserves. This trend toward a monopoly, which will have dangerous economic repercussions, is being accelerated daily. There has hardly been a day in recent weeks that some independent has not been compelled to dispose of his properties to a major company. This trend is the direct result of the policy of the Government. These are facts and if it be treason to state them let the professorial bureaucrats make the most of it.

The cards are stacked against the oil industry in the Office of Price Administration. We might as well face that situation realistically. The "no pass" sign is there for the oil industry. No relief will come to us from that agency so long as it is directed by the type of bureaucrats who run it now. Further and conclusive evidence of this fact is given by the monstrosity which emanated from that agency of Government on Tuesday of this week in the form of a program for socialization of the industry. If there were such a thing as a Nobel prize for fantasy, this proposal from the Office of Price Administration would be a sure winner for 1943.

Instead of a decision of the price question which was clearly and forcefully presented by the Petroleum Administrator, the starry-eyed dreamers have given us a half-baked subsidy plan that would put the Government into the oil business and lead the way to its eventual control of our industry. We asked for bread and have been given a stone. A Government subsidy for the production of oil is repugnant to everyone who wants to see our job done. It is obvious to any practical man, as pointed out by Mr. Ickes, that a subsidy program for wild-catting will result in men drilling for the subsidy and not for the oil. The cost to the taxpayer and the waste of critical materials would be staggering. The road to governmental regimentation is paved with subsidies. The oil industry is not consciously and willingly going down that road. The oilman has never asked for handcuts from anybody. He has stood upon his own feet and he is not going to surrender his independence without a fight. We are not going to take this lying down.

The only remedy for this intolerable situation is to place the price-fixing power on petroleum and petroleum products in the hands of the Petroleum Administrator. The Administrator has control over the production, processing, and distribution of crude oil and its products and he is charged with the responsibility for maintaining a sufficient supply of this indispensable product. It is illogical and inconsistent to give him the responsibility and to deprive him of the power necessary to discharge that responsibility. The Petroleum Administrator also happens to be the Coordinator of Solid Fuels, which includes coal, the principal competitor of petroleum products. He has the power to fix the price of coal and he has wisely and properly used that power to adjust those prices upward to meet rising production costs and to prevent small coal operators from being destroyed as independent oil operators are being destroyed today by the Office of Price Administration.

What the Office of Price Administration proposes is to take us on a new and untried economic venture which has as its ultimate destination Government operation of the oil industry. That is the real objective of those who are directing the policies of the Office of Price Administration.

The Office of Price Administration has deliberately evaded and ignored the intent of Congress in setting up that agency of the Government. The Office of Price Administration was properly given power to regulate price but it has improperly and illegally used that power to regulate profits. It has consistently measured the profits of the oil industry by the yardstick of a few large major companies without regard to the situation of thousands of small producers, refiners, and marketers who are daily being forced to the wall as so-called war casualties.

The one man who sets himself up as a barrier in the path of the oil industry's effort to carry out its part of the war effort, who contemptuously overrides the recommendations of the Petroleum Administrator, of the Petroleum Industry War Council, of the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives, of the Cole committee, of every committee and official who knows anything about the situation—that one man is Mr. Sumner Pike, who is adviser to the Price Administrator on all matters affecting the oil industry. Mr. Pike was borrowed from the Securities and Exchange Commission for that purpose by the former Price Administrator, Mr. Leon Henderson. I think the time has come for the Office of Price Administration to pay its debts. If it borrowed something from the Securities and Exchange Commission, I think it ought to pay it back, and so far as I am concerned, when they repay the loan they can throw in Dr. Galbraith as an interest payment.

It cannot be said by those in authority that the oil industry has waited until the last minute to call attention to the seriousness of the situation and to ask for remedial action. The facts are that as far back as almost 2 years ago those in Washington were warned that a serious oil shortage was impending and in the summer of 1941 an attempt was made by the industry itself to meet that situation. One of the large mid-continent operators advanced the price of crude 25 cents a barrel at that time but this advance was set aside by the OPA and that action has been used as an all-out barrier against consideration of any increase in the price of oil. The story from that day has been one of delay after delay, studies and reports, and all the while the Nation's most precious and vital material resource was being dissipated. I have said before—and I repeat here today—that with our whole war effort depending upon a sufficient supply of petroleum and petroleum products, this has been little short of criminal negligence.

The time has come to fight not only for the existence of the independent operator, not only for the existence of the industry, but for our national existence. We have tried conciliation and we have been met with contempt and scorn. We have no other course left open but to take our case to the people of the country, conscious of the justice and righteousness of our cause. We do that with full confidence that right will prevail and that our country may be saved from the appalling disaster of insufficient petroleum to carry on this war.

First Anniversary of Women's Army Auxiliary Corps—Address Delivered by Col. Oveta Culp Hobby, Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an address delivered yesterday, May 16, 1943, by Col. Oveta Culp Hobby before a breakfast given by the Texas State Society of Washington, D. C. It is as follows:

I am glad to be among my friends on a day that has a special significance for the Nation, and, incidentally, for me. On May 14 of last year the bill was signed creating the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, and on May 16 the director of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps was appointed. Today there are some 62,500 of us. Between these dates there lies a year of challenge, of partial fulfillment, and of great promise. Its challenge is to be found in the newness of the organization in our country's history; its fulfillment may be measured in the light of growth and accomplishment to date; its promise is yet unmeasured, nor do we wish to limit it.

Just as the initial concept of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps came into being as the result of military necessity, so each forward step in its development has been ordained, dictated by our Army's real and urgent need. This need has, from the beginning, far exceeded the potential supply of Women's Army Auxiliary Corps personnel.

Today Women's Army Auxiliary Corps units are at work in 120 posts within the United States; from many of these stations came immediate requests for more, with the result that some posts have several companies of them. Recently WAAC's have arrived in England, where they were warmly welcomed. Since January of this year, 200 WAAC's have been on duty at General Eisenhower's head-

quarters in North Africa. There they are working at switchboards and teletypes, they are operating cars and trucks, doing office work, and handling the soldiers' mail—the priceless letters which travel to and from the battle fronts.

Ever since the WAAC companies have been on duty in the field, gratifying reports of their work have been received. Many of the commanders and officers at the posts to which they have gone, have taken the time to write us, expressing their appreciation of the WAAC's, and of the efficiency, devotion, and purposeful resolution that is theirs. Such messages provide added incentive and further challenge.

The corps now has five training centers throughout the country. There is the first, at Fort Des Moines, Iowa; the second, at Daytona Beach, Fla.; the third, Fort Oglethorpe, Ga.; fourth, Fort Devens, Mass.; and the fifth, in three sections, with headquarters at Ruston, La. It is necessary to see one of these training centers to appreciate the WAAC, its life, and its spirit.

The training centers have been the proving ground for the belief that women could take Army discipline—the proving ground for the American woman, herself, who has been regarded as the most pampered of all creatures. It is in the basic training period that the first and most difficult adjustment must be made. Women from many and varied surroundings learn to live, the Army's way. From the first, the WAACs have been eager to prove that they required no quarter in discipline, no special comforts, no concessions to chivalry. This selflessness had its root in their united determination to be good soldiers—its fruition is the WAAC esprit de corps.

Upon the thousands of auxiliaries who make up the great body of the corps rests the weight of the work to be done. Whatever her work may be, the auxiliary knows the Army is depending on her to do it faithfully and well. If our artillerymen who were at Bataan could cling for so long to the barren, exploding rocks of that desolated isle, while shells burst about them faster than they could count, cannot the woman soldier stay patient at her typewriter if need be, from dawn to darkness, to get her job done? If our infantrymen in the jungles of Guadalcanal could make their way, single file, through thickets and swamps where every step was peril, to dig out and destroy each invisible sniper, man by man—cannot the woman soldier remain at her telegraph key, sending and receiving the messages so vital to the final translation of plan into action? If our tank crews fighting in North Africa could stick by their guns in blazing tanks to make every ounce of ammunition count, cannot the woman soldier turn all her strength and zeal to the task required of her, whatever it may be? That is the ultimate challenge—the motivation and the will to serve.

This common motivation is something we all know and understand. But it is not the only issue to be recognized. There is another—the desperate fact of urgency—the fleetness of the time. This war is being fought today. Today our men are fighting in the fox holes of far-away continents. Today they seek out and destroy the cruelest packs of submarines the world has ever known. Today they lead the bombing raids which are beginning over the Mediterranean and which will find their end only over Berlin and Tokyo. It is today that the fate of the peoples of the world is being decided.

The more strongly our people as a whole recognize and respond to this sustaining force—the will to serve—and serve today, the less our country's toll in lives will be. There is no need to stress that point among a group of Texans. Scores of brave and glorious Texans have already nobly illustrated the will to serve to all the world. There were those at Bataan, and the Texan does not live who can forget that sublime band of Aggies whose chorused "The Eyes of Texas" was heard around the world on San Jacinto Day, 1942. They were represented in force among the immortal Flying Tigers of China—and in their commander, now Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault. They numbered among the hundreds on board the cruiser *Houston* all the while it fought, and when it went down in the Java Sea, the Navy's foremost Texan is Admiral Chester Nimitz, commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet. I dare say there is not one among us here who does not await hopeful news of some Texas boy from the turbulent African front. And all the United Nations share Texas' pride in the leadership and accomplishments of her own Gen. Dwight Eisenhower.

We all know the beauty that is Texas. We have driven through the tall, dark pine forests along the eastern edge which rise out of the reddest soil on earth—we have been in that other forest of the oil fields, where gas flares come brilliantly alive by night, and black, thick churning smoke can be seen for miles by day. We know the mellow fragrant citrus land of the Rio Grande Valley, and again, we know the wild mesquite and cactus country in the west.

We know well the majestic cities, yet we do not forget the little Texas towns and their townspeople. Something of the spirit of pioneer Texas is borne forever in the hearts of all her folk. To a Texan, the open spaces of the range connote the very sense of freedom itself. For a thing so precious, it is little wonder that the Texan wills to serve, to fight—to die. It was this same freedom for which a solemn little group of men took their stand at the Alamo, and became immortal. The time when Colonel Travis drew his sword and traced a line upon the floor, and said, "I now want every man who is determined to stay here and die with me to come across this line." We remember what they gave for freedom.

The freedom of man is once again at stake. Every man, and every woman throughout our land has a personal share in that stake. They all are needed, in some way, to protect it. We of the Woman's Army Auxiliary Corps know the part that we must take. We do the things which otherwise would be done by men—thousands of men from the fighting ranks—men whose presence in the battle line may mean the victory—men whose absence might mean defeat. I say to every American woman who is available and eligible to serve with us, if she will come forward and cross this line, together we shall take our stand, for freedom.

The War Against Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, as one who has consistently been advocating more action on the Japanese front or the Pacific war, and the serious threat of the Japanese, I would like to place the following editorials in the Record for the benefit of Members of Congress:

[From the New York Daily Mirror]

JAPAN—AMERICA'S MOST DANGEROUS ENEMY—EMPIRE LACKS BUT TIME TO HIT FULL STRENGTH

(The Mirror has long believed that this Nation has been lacking in understanding of Japan, her motives, and the deadliness of her menace. As our contribution toward clearing up the national misunderstanding we have asked a number of famous correspondents, men who have worked and lived with the Japanese, to tell about their motives and strengths and weaknesses. First contributor to the series is Robert Bellaire, for 5 years China manager of the United Press in Shanghai, and for 2 years head of that news service in Tokyo. He was imprisoned there at the outbreak of the war, returned to this country in the exchange of diplomatic and other hostages.)

(By Robert Bellaire, former United Press manager in Japan and China)

Japan is our most dangerous enemy because militarily she is becoming stronger each day, and she is threatening, more seriously than any other of our enemies, to move within striking distance of our own shores.

Nazi Germany, it would appear, has reached or passed the peak of her potential military power. She will become no stronger. She undoubtedly will be far more difficult to defeat than some of us imagine. But time is playing against Hitler. He is falling back upon defensive frontiers within which the German armies again can successfully be blockaded into near-submission. Little likelihood is there that she ever will threaten to invade our shores during this war.

GROWING STRONGER

But Japan is today the weakest we shall ever know her so long as we continue to fight her with the little finger of our left hand. Each day we are permitting her to become stronger. Within her present defensive frontiers she cannot be seriously weakened by blockade. Each day the price we eventually must pay for victory in the Pacific becomes higher in blood and treasure.

Because time is playing against us in the Pacific.

The Japs are building and consolidating much faster than we are destroying. Unpleasant as that thought may be, and therefore difficult for us Americans to believe, it happens to be the truth. And the Japs have not yet begun to reach the peak of their new potential military strength.

The facts are these:

Japan has occupied hundreds of thousands of square miles of the world's richest territory.

She is in position to conquer almost half the population of the earth.

These conquered natives, including more Chinese than is generally realized here, are as willing to work for the Japs as they were to work for their former foreign masters—the British, Dutch, French, and Americans. Their choice is to work or starve. They choose to live.

The Japs are ruthlessly exploiting these now conquests with the feverish speed and energy which is characteristic of their race. They are driving the conquered natives like slaves, and they themselves are working an 85- to 90-hour week.

CLEVER AND ABLE

The Japs may look like apes to us, but there is more sinister cleverness and ability in them than we are yet humble enough to admit. They usually have not only outfought us but have out-thought us as well. And they know us and our weaknesses, while we cannot yet pretend to know them.

This does not imply that our effort in the Pacific has thus far been insignificant. We have had glorious and vital victories. But most of these victories have been defensive victories—usually against comparatively minor forces of the enemy—as any of our men engaged in them will tell you.

After more than a year of war, the Japs today remain in control of more than 99 percent of the fabulously rich territory they seized after Pearl Harbor. Their war factories are untouched. And our nearest front to Japan's

main strength—her armies in China, Manchuria, and the Japanese islands—is more than 1,000 miles.

SHIPPING IS PROBLEM

Certainly Japan has her problems. And the most serious of these problems is shipping. We have inflicted serious losses upon her fleet, especially in aircraft carriers. And every Jap transport sent to the bottom upsets to some extent Japan's plans for exploiting her new potential strength.

But we should remember this:

The Japs have often felt the loss of several carriers was a very cheap price to pay for the occupation of a dozen strategic islands. These islands have become unsinkable carriers on which speedy landplanes can be based.

We taught the Japs at Midway how costly a campaign against such unsinkable carriers can be. We learned this lesson ourselves at Guadalcanal, and we begin to understand that more than fog is keeping the Japs on Kiska.

And under the shipping category, let us not forget that Japan is still building ships as well as losing them. She started the war because she felt she was ready for us. Her shipyards did not close on Pearl Harbor day, and they have not been bombed.

LAND TRANSPORT GOOD

Japan also is developing a system of overland communications on the continent—railways, airways, highways, and waterways which at present are virtually immune to United Nations attack. These communications routes rush raw materials from the south Pacific to the factories of Japan and finished weapons to the front.

Comforting is the theory that it matters little how the war goes now in the Pacific because eventually we will establish bases for decisive, all-out incendiary bombings of the once highly inflammable Japanese cities. But here again, time is playing against us.

The Japs have been working like beavers for several years to decentralize their vital war industries and bury them beneath the ground. The more time we give them, the less effective will be our bombing attacks when they do come.

BLOCKADE GERMANY?

I would not venture to criticize the strategy of the United Nations' high command—because I am not sure we know what that strategy really is. We assume they intend to defeat Hitler first, but actually they have not said so. Perhaps our real policy is to open a number of "holding fronts" against Germany and then blockade her until she is weakened to the point where the "final blow" would be far less costly to us than a mass assault on the continent would be at this time. Once those holding fronts are established perhaps we will then surprise the Japs by demonstrating that we are not so stupid after all as to give them the one thing more they want of us—time.

I hope that surprise is in store for us, and for Tojo.

HOW JAPAN GOT READY FOR US, WITH OUR HELP

(By James R. Young, for 13 years Far East director of International News Service with headquarters in Tokyo)

Five international treaties which were designed for peace and world disarmament and a leveling off of unequal trade and food supplies, gave to Japan her leverage for springing a trap on us in 1941.

Those commitments were signed by other nations in good faith. Japan signed with a bold stroke of the brush, while mentally she planned to use the treaties as scraps of paper to set fire to our house of diplomacy. We almost lost the house, while we were dealing with the well-prepared Japs. We had counted on our "impregnable" position at Hawaii and in the Philippines.

The Japs will be hard to beat, but when all the players are on the United Nations teams, the Japanese will never have the ball again, never see, and never have an opportunity of playing in our games. I have a positive hunch that Dutch flyers will score many goals for our side.

Long before the treacherous attack, the wily Japanese had obtained American oil well drilling machinery to rebuild the wells in the Dutch East Indies. Japan had acquired hundreds of thousands of tons of shipping by chartering in world markets. Shipyards of Japan, however, were busy building tankers, secretly, to acquire a fleet of 55 ships which move at 18 to 22 knots an hour. The Japs took over the Kailan mines in North China to obtain coking coal for her steel industry in Manchuria and in western Japan. The Japs had exchanged soybeans (she's the second largest producer in the world) for German industrial machinery, particularly steam and thermal generating plants.

Large factories were established in Korea, Formosa, about which we know so little, is a combination Gibraltar, Malta and Singapore. For 35 years the Japs developed this island, formerly belonging to the Chinese, as a major base for their southward attack.

In the South Pacific the Japs are entrenched in the mandated islands, which were granted to Japan on the condition that they not be fortified. However, the Japs, since 1933, fortified the islands, deepened the harbors, sent 50,000 of their people to settle there, built subterranean fuel storage tanks, and leveled air fields.

DIPLOMATS SAID NO

Our Navy Department wanted to investigate, but our State Department fence straddlers said no.

In the north the Japs entered the Aleutians in 1933 and 1934 on a scientific expedition, aided by our State Department men who, with a Bureau of Fisheries head, refused to be excited.

The Navy wanted the Japs driven or ordered out, but our diplomats thought our Navy belligerent. Meantime, the sneaky and smart Japs got themselves in there, and in 1943, at this writing, we are still trying to blast them out!

Worse, the Japs are fighting us on the best oil and gasoline in the world, which our muddled thinking diplomats let them have in great quantities along with scrap steel and iron.

Thus, factually, we built for Japan a powerful military machine, and, with greater power, we must go back there and knock it out. Our losses already are close to 88,000 in dead, injured, and missing.

The figure will be greater as we near Japan, for Japan has an enormous navy, large numbers of Diesel-engined fishing boats for patrol purposes, and she has lost but 14 percent of her shipping. She has her weaknesses, but she remains a bulwark strength of the Pacific.

After Africa, after Tunisia, after New Guinea, and after Rangoon, we may then expect some changes, but it's a long haul to Japan.

In time of peace she prepared for war.

DEFEAT ONLY ANSWER

Our second greatest handicap in defeating Japan is an element in the United States, now hard at work, which thinks we might be able to deal with liberals in Japan.

Nonsense.

Japanese liberals are liberal for Japan alone.

Japan is dangerous because of her long-prepared military and material plans. She's dangerous, too, because in time of peace she propagandized our students, teachers, garden clubs, social groups, and good-will delegations until they became saturated with the idea that there are some nice Japs with whom we can make a deal.

Such people still exist in this country. I think some of them believe in the Emperor of Japan as a deity. Their ilk should be dropped by parachute over Japan.

Price Ceiling on Used Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Office of Price Administration is considering the placing of a ceiling on the price of used automobiles which will have such a tremendous effect upon transportation, I am taking the liberty of inserting in the RECORD a letter with reference to such price ceilings from Mr. John Langenfeld, proprietor of the West Side Motor Co., of Centralia, Ill.

Mr. Langenfeld, prominent businessman and for years one of the pioneers in the retail automobile business in southern Illinois, brings out some facts approaching price ceilings which I thought should be called to the attention of the Members of Congress and the O. P. A. administrators:

WEST SIDE MOTOR CO.,
Centralia, Ill., May 8, 1943.

Hon. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VURSELL: I wish to discuss with you a matter which is of vital importance to me and also has a national significance in its bearing on the war effort. On May 6 at the Hotel DeSoto in St. Louis, Mo., a group of representatives of the Office of Price Administration presented to the Midwest automobile dealers a plan for establishing a ceiling price on used cars. I do not object to the principle of placing a ceiling price on used cars if the Government officials deem it is necessary. I do, however, object strenuously to the plan as outlined at the St. Louis meeting. It was a rather simple proposition to place a ceiling price on new cars because all new cars were handled through dealers. It is a vastly different proposition to place ceiling prices on some 27,000,000 used cars in the hands of almost that many owners.

Recently a ceiling price was placed on used trucks. The prices were placed very low and it has had the effect of almost completely stopping the flow of used trucks to essential users. Virtually the only transactions that are being made are what may be termed black-market transactions at higher than the ceiling prices. The plan for establishing a ceiling price on used cars is very similar to the one which established ceiling prices on used trucks and I believe it will have the same results. I believe the automobile dealers are performing a worth-while service in channeling used cars to essential users. The proposed plan would effectively stop this process.

Furthermore, very few automobile dealers are able to maintain their establishments on service work alone. If dealers are unable to sell used cars, I feel that a great many of them will be forced to close their doors and I am sure that this would tend to cripple the

automotive transportation system of this country.

The National Automobile Dealers Association has asked for permission to appoint a committee to be made up of men rich in experience to formulate a feasible and workable plan for establishing a price ceiling. This certainly is not too much to ask.

I respectfully request that you take a personal interest in this matter and that you do everything you can to prevent the Office of Price Administration from establishing a price ceiling on the basis they have proposed without further consulting with the National Automobile Dealers Association whose main office is in Washington, D. C. I will greatly appreciate anything you can do in this regard.

Sincerely yours,

WEST SIDE MOTOR CO.,
JOHN LANGENFELD.

Organized Labor Opposes Being Frozen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. COFFEE
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the very intelligent and splendid affiliates of the A. F. of L. in my home State of Washington, is the Tacoma Association of Technical Engineers, Architects and Draftsmen's Local No. 70, American Federation of Labor. The secretary of this organization is my warm friend, Doug Morris, whom I have known for years and whose father is one of the finest citizens of our State, a sound and true liberal—a splendid public servant. The technical engineers and architects feel very strongly that the present labor-freezing policy of the War Manpower Commission is inimical to the principles of democracy, is contrary to the traditions of our beloved country, and is wholly incompatible with a policy of vouchsafing to corporations immense profits. I feel that this organization is entitled a very respectful hearing on its complaint. Certainly we should do everything in our power to increase labor morale; but let the letter and resolution of this organization speak for itself. Here it is:

TACOMA ASSOCIATION OF
TECHNICAL ENGINEERS AND
ARCHITECTS, LOCAL NO. 70,
Tacoma, Wash., May 6, 1943.

Hon. JOHN M. COFFEE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COFFEE: The Tacoma Association of Technical Engineers, Architects & Draftsmen's Local No. 70, Tacoma, Wash., affiliated with the Metal Trades Council of Tacoma and vicinity, which comprises 30,000 members who are second to none in loyalty to our Government, unanimously approves the following resolution and respectfully requests that you give it your full consideration:

"*Resolved*, That this conference of Pacific coast metal trades representatives express their vigorous disapproval of the present labor-freezing policy of the War Manpower Commission as being repugnant to our ideals of Americanism in that it introduces a form of involuntary servitude and freezes free labor against its will to jobs in private industry, whereas industry is permitted to amass profits while workers are compelled to accept substandard wages, thus discriminating against the great army of loyal wage earners. Moreover, it is our considered opinion, based upon our knowledge of the spirit of American workers, that so much resentment will result from this policy that production will be reduced instead of increased and the war effort will suffer accordingly; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this, our deliberate conviction as loyal and patriotic American citizens, aroused over this unjustified invasion of our essential American liberties, be transmitted to the President of the United States, Chairman Paul V. McNutt, of the War Manpower Commission, and the Members of the Congress of the United States.

"Approved by the unanimous vote of the representatives of the Pacific Coast District Metal Trades Council in coastwise session in Portland, Oreg., Thursday, April 22, 1943."

Yours very truly,

DOUGLAS MORRIS
Secretary

Dangerous Rumors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 12, 1943:

DANGEROUS RUMORS

For a fortnight this town has been filled with ugly rumors of racial strife. These rumors themselves propagate discord, lead to distorted interpretations of commonplace incidents, promote fear, and put a chip on the shoulders of ordinary, peaceful citizens. They spread from person to person as contagiously as smallpox, and they are just about as healthy. There is no proof that these germs of dissension were planted by enemy agents, but it is indisputable that they do the enemy's work.

To be specific about it, rumors threatened to breed serious trouble out of an otherwise innocuous situation last Friday night. Washington Negroes held a mass meeting to protest against certain employment practices involving racial discrimination. They had every constitutional right to assemble peaceably and to petition for a redress of their grievances. The methods they pursued to press for fair employment opportunities were of a kind long accepted as thoroughly legitimate in labor disputes.

But rumormongers insisted on forecasting their peaceful picketing and their mass meeting as the preamble to a riot. Fortunately the District authorities, particularly the superintendent of police, Maj. Edward J. Kelly, and Commissioner John Russell Young, met the problem with sound common sense. They knew that the rumors were without foundation. Instead of attempting to ban the meeting, they gave it the encouragement and sanction of their presence. They marched with the protestants. The evening passed without the slightest disorder.

Praise is due equally to the Negro leaders of Washington. They knew, too, that the rumors were viciously untrue and that no violence had been planned. In this they behaved with a good deal more wisdom than many of their white fellow citizens. They saw to it that the meeting and the parade were conducted with restraint and in entire accordance with the law. Major Kelly observed: "I should like to praise the conduct of the Negro people throughout this week. They were exemplary, and conducted all their picketing and other demonstrations in a quiet manner."

Like any other war-swollen community where whites and Negroes live side by side, Washington has a certain amount of racial tension. Careless talking, rumormongering, can only exacerbate it. In these times of stress, there is greater need than ever before for level-headed checking of facts, for patience and tolerance in all our human relationships. You will do a service to your city if you refuse to become infected by these poisonous rumors of racial trouble and refuse to pass them on to anybody else.

A Patriotic Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the last 7 years it has been my privilege and honor to represent the Sixth Congressional District of Michigan, consisting of the counties of Genesee, Ingham, and Livingston. During that time I have received hundreds of thoroughly loyal and patriotic letters expressing the desire of the writers to be of assistance to the Government in some way or other.

Just recently I received a letter from the Houghton Elevator, per Fred M. Houghton, of Clio, Mich., containing a certified check of $900 as a contribution to the War Department from Houghton Elevator and employees. Fred M. Houghton has long been a prominent businessman of my home town of Clio, Mich. He has always been energetic, thoroughly patriotic and generous in his contributions. On December 8, 1941, he wired me to offer to the Government his fully equipped grain elevator and bean processing plant with full personnel for Government use in any capacity deemed necessary. This certainly was a generous offer.

The certified check of $900 was not for the purchase of bonds, but was an outright gift to the War Department for the purchase of a jeep to aid our men in service. It is a fine thought to know, that scattered throughout the length and breadth of, not only my district and my State of Michigan, but also the United States, there are thousands of men and women and children who have made contributions to their Government to aid the war effort. The best test of the soundness of our Government is the willingness of our citizens to come to their

country's aid. Our Nation since its inception has consisted of thoroughgoing, patriotic men and women and their loyalty and patriotism has made the United States the leader of the world. The hope of the future of our country rests in our patriotic citizenry back home.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the letter written by the Houghton Elevator and employees, tendering to the Government as an outright gift to the war effort their certified check of $900:

MAY 12, 1943.

To the Honorable WM. W. BLACKNEY,
Member of Congress, Sixth District of Genesee County, Mich.

DEAR FRIEND BILL: On December 8, 1941, we wired you to kindly inform the proper department that our fully equipped grain elevator and bean processing plant with a full personnel is herewith tendered to the Government to be used in any capacity deemed necessary—signed, Houghton Elevator and employees.

Since that date we have all worked long and hard to accomplish our objective against the common foe. Again we wish to offer our contribution to assist in the termination of this great conflict. It is our desire that yourself, Mr. WM. W. BLACKNEY, Member of Congress from our Sixth District of Genesee County, Mich., accept and deliver to the War Department of our United States of America, the enclosed certified check for $900 to be used for the purchase of a jeep to aid our men in service.

This is a direct personal contribution from Houghton Elevator and employees, of Clio, Mich. As soon as possible we shall render further assistance besides keeping up our regular bond purchases. Please return to us the proper display flag or emblem or proof, that our employees may realize that their money has reached the proper channel.

Very respectfully,

Houghton Elevator and employees: Fred M. Houghton, Richard L. Houghton, Verna E. Lembach, Lawrence Pace, Floyd Pace, Eugene Miller, Leonard Verus, and August Yaester.

The Late Honorable Harry Lane Englebright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I join with the many others in paying my tribute to the memory of the late HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT, a Representative from my State, and whip of my party.

Beautiful words in my estimation cannot express his true character as well as this little illustration:

As whip of the House, he naturally contacted me in reference to my vote on the Carlson bill. When I told him of my firm convictions, he said, "Norris, if you have those firm convictions I certainly do not ask you to change them."

It grieves all of us to lose a real friend.

Will Government Be Master Instead of Servant?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared the following editorial in the Clawson-Troy News, edited by Mr. Floyd McGriff, for May 13, and circulated within the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, and which I insert as a part of my remarks.

This editorial presents a challenge to the American people and sets forth in a few words what is happening to the long-established principles of freedom and opportunity in America. That there is a trend toward world socialism and a leveling of opportunity cannot be denied.

During the last decade a deliberate policy of setting up class hatred and hatred for those who have been prudent and thrifty is known by everyone who will read. The life's earnings and savings of people are now being confiscated by taxation to be distributed among those who never earned it nor made any effort to provide for themselves. The demand for continued subsidies to farmers in order to control them, politically and otherwise, is evidenced on every hand. The result of an attempt to control agriculture during the last 10 years has increased instead of decreased the plight of those who till the soil.

I commend the reading of this editorial to you, my colleagues in the House of Representatives, and urge that we all ponder and consider what is happening in this land of professed freedom, liberty, and opportunity.

Unless we stop the ambitious efforts of those who have no sympathy with our form of government, as established by "the fathers," we may lose, under the guise of war, every sacred fundamental principle of justice and liberty for which the flower of American manhood is now bleeding and dying on foreign battlefields.

WILL GOVERNMENT BE MASTER INSTEAD OF SERVANT?

After advocating full public ownership of land as well as control of the issue of credit, the Archbishop of Canterbury, according to a London cable in the New York Times, says: "If I view the situation rightly, the question of ownership is becoming steadily less important compared with that of direction and management."

When considering socialization of basic industries "for the common good," there is nothing more basic than farming. Federal socialization fo the electric power industry in the United States is now well advanced and is being steadily pushed forward by a small, powerful group of public officials. Electric power, however, is but a minor issue compared to food. It is merely an entering wedge which is being driven into a private enterprise economy before the people become aware of the dangers involved. It builds up to the Archbishop's suggestion.

We in America have felt that the individual ownership of land and business, resting in the hands of the people, developed responsibility and pride in accomplishment which was the strength of the Nation. Children in school have been taught that private opportunity in America offered any man or woman with incentive and ambition a chance to rise from the poorest beginnings to the highest places in industry or government. Saving was fostered; the acquisition of property was something to be proud of; the average man strove by hard work and sound management to accumulate some form of inheritance to leave to his family.

We have believed that the sole reason for the existence of government in a democracy was to protect the weak, to see that justice was based on equality and that the needy, the incompetent and the helpless were properly cared for. It has never been our idea that government should compete with its own people in business.

A new world trend toward socialization and the leveling of opportunity is reaching out to engulf us. Hatred for the thrifty is being promoted, and accumulated savings are for redistribution to others. These are hard, cold facts stripped of glamorous words.

The Archbishop of Canterbury proposes the only logical step that can follow is socialization of basic industry. Conditions may be somewhat different in England, but the principle and the effect on the people remain the same. He can be thanked by the people of this country for warning them of things to come.

It is not pleasant for an American farm owner to contemplate becoming a tenant on a piece of publicly owned land, with no opportunity to own it or leave it to his family.

Neither has it been pleasant for the owners of electric companies in the United States to contemplate being kicked off of properties which they (stockholders) have worked and saved to develop. But the socialization process knows no limit once it is established, for government then becomes the master, not the servant.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 15, 1943:

RUML PLAN: A TREASURY AID

Prompt Senate action in approving its Finance Committee's version of the Ruml plan comes as a welcome climax in the long struggle over a pay-as-you-go income tax plan. It is to be hoped the House will forthrightly concur in this approval, and there is basis for this hope in the narrow margin (206 to 202) by which the House defeated the proposal earlier this month.

Whether the White House will take advantage of the relatively close votes in the House and Senate by vetoing the measure depends, we assume, largely on what attitude the Treasury takes. Mr. Randolph Paul declined

to answer a direct question put to him the other day as to whether the Treasury would prefer the Ruml plan to no pay-as-you-go whatsoever. Judging from the situation in Congress, that is the choice.

The debate in the Senate in recent days should aid the Treasury in seeing how greatly the Ruml Plan can aid its revenue-raising aspirations. Under any of the partial cancelation plans that the Treasury has approved in the past a certain portion of one year's tax debt would have been spread over future years. These "catch-up-a-year" payments would have had to be made in addition to regular tax payments, and Congress in writing subsequent tax measures would have had to bear them in thought when considering how heavy a levy to impose. These catching-up payments would have militated—as some of the Congressmen frankly admitted—against tax bills that might have raised anything approaching the Treasury's $16,000,000,000 goal.

The Ruml Plan clears the slate, removes inequities, and provides for collection while wage earners still have it in their pockets. The Treasury should enthusiastically support it, and use it to collect the really effective revenue-raising and inflation-combating tax bill that Congress must now hasten to pass.

Radio Broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ROCKWELL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1943

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, Fulton Lewis, Jr., is doing a great service to the people of our Nation. He goes into all sections of the country and learns of the problems confronting the people at first hand, especially the many difficulties which have arisen as a result of the war. By reporting his findings to his large radio audience over the United States, he helps not only the people in varied walks of life but brings the story home to Washington and its bureaucracy as well.

Last week he spent a short time in my rather segregated district of western Colorado. Excerpts from his radio address, which expresses briefly and so well some of our local problems that must be solved if that great area continues to produce the sheep and cattle that it has in the past, are given below:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, this is Fulton Lewis, Jr., speaking to you from radio station KFXJ, Grand Junction, Colo.

This is very beautiful country, ladies and gentlemen, this land of western Colorado from which I am broadcasting to you this evening, a high plateau just across the Continental Divide, with the famous mesas all around in the distance. Those mesas are flat, table-top mountains, some of them tremendous in their breadth. The largest is the famous Grand Mesa, the largest in the world, the flat top of which covers 600 square miles, and all through this country the great enterprise is sheep and cattle raising. This is where a very large part of the animals which provide the beef and lamb which you listeners in the cities would like to buy at the corner grocery store at home, if there were enough of it for you, are raised, and therefore the cattle and sheep situation here ought to be of direct immediate interest to you.

I spent a number of hours here today talking with representative livestock growers and farm experts and responsible leaders of the community and the county, trying to find out what conditions are, and in general the story is that the crop of calves and lambs has been good this spring. Aside from a lack of rain, which has done the grazing lands no good, weather conditions have been favorable, and the loss of new-born animals has been small.

They tell me that the number of cattle on hand here is just about the same this year as it was last year. The number of sheep probably is a little under last year, due to the fact that the ranchers sold off a lot of ewes last fall because the ranchers were jittery about Office of Price Administration price ceilings on meat and animals and what might happen if they carried all of those animals over the winter. It is not a serious drop, however, and nothing to be alarmed about.

The one really critical situation still is the shortage of manpower, and I hope Mr. Paul McNutt in Washington is listening, because I am reporting this from strictly a constructive standpoint, not a critical one, merely having the hope that maybe something can be done about it if he knows what the situation is, and I don't think it would be very difficult to correct. These cattlemen and sheep growers here say that since the War Manpower Commission's orders went into effect exempting farm workers, which includes cattlemen, of course, from the draft, the situation has improved considerably, to the extent that the cow hands and sheep herders who still are on the job here are remaining on the job, but the trouble is that so many of them have been drafted into the Army and so many of them left to get better-paying jobs in war plants before that step was taken that the problem still is very critical, and these new orders are not getting any of the cow hands and herders back on the job, the ones who did leave.

They explain here that this is one line above all others in which it is impossible to train men overnight to do the job. It takes a minimum of 5 years to train a cow hand or sheep herder, so it is out of the question to talk about breaking in high-school boys and girls or women to try to train new hands to help out in the present emergency.

These men cited to me here today a typical example, and this has been repeated time and time again all over this range country. A rancher had about 1,200 head of cattle and his son had about 300, ranching together. The Army drafted the son; the father had to sell off a very large part of his herd because he couldn't take care of them alone; the son now is in an Army camp in Florida as a camp cook, cooking beans, which he never did before in his life. The rancher can get a young, inexperienced man and begin to train him now to fill the son's place and that young man will be deferred from the draft, but he is no good to the rancher for years to come, whereas he would be just as good as a cooker of beans in a Florida camp as the rancher's son is, the rancher's son being highly valuable here. Their argument is—and I think Mr. McNutt will see the logic and soundness of this—that the inexperienced boy here should be inducted into the Army and given the cook's job and the experienced rancher in the Army should be sent back here so that he can do the job at which he really is competent—raise cattle for the Army and Navy and civilian population.

The answer might be that the experienced cowman there in the Florida camp can get a release from the Army if he will make application and establish the fact that he is really needed here at home on the ranch. That looks all right on paper and it sounds all right in theory. The truth is that there is a quirk of human nature which prevents it from working out in real practice, it would seem. Men in uniform, if they are good red-blooded Americans, don't want to make application to be relieved from service, no matter how much they are needed at home, and they are very loath to go into any business of establishing the fact that they are needed at home once they have made application. In fact, one of the major forces that has caused many of these farm and ranch boys to leave and go into the Army is the embarrassment they feel when all of their friends are in uniform and they are still in farm clothes. They feel like slackers and they feel that the rest of the world thinks they are slackers, even if they are not, and out in this western country where people are frank and straightforward, two-fisted in their thinking and talking and approach, the boys in uniform have on many occasions been very open in their sarcasm about the ones who are still out-of-uniform civilians.

It is a problem of human nature, of course, but you cannot cure problems of human nature by regulations. It could be that a proper campaign of education of the public to the vital importance of keeping the experienced farm workers where they are for the good of the whole war effort might help, but even that's not enough to get that experienced cowman in the Florida camp back here to Colorado where he belongs and replace him with the inexperienced young man here who can do the camp cooking just as well. It would seem that is really needed and the only thing that is going to do any real good is for draft boards or commanding officers in the Army or for some Government source to take the initiative on the part of the Government and to find out what men have been drafted who are experienced in these lines and who are needed, and then not merely give them permission to go back to the farms and ranches if they want to go—that's not enough; it is going to be necessary apparently to actually order them back to the farms and to the ranches as a vital necessity to the prosecution of the war on the ground that they are of more military value producing meat if they know how to produce meat than they are carrying a gun in the armed services.

There are more interesting problems of this country. There is one more rather pungent problem in the manpower problem here, too, and this is one that I am hereby directing at this moment particularly to Mr. Prentiss Brown, head of the Office of Price Administration, and his assistants, Mr. Clyde Herring, and Mr. Lew Maxon, because this is in their department. This is a problem, and this one point is something that actually is threatening to cause real difficulties even with the labor that now is available here. You see, these sheep that I have talked about are grazed in the wintertime on the desert west of here, running over into Utah. The desert is green in the wintertime; there is plenty of available forage for them. But about this time of year the desert dries up, the grass in the forest is burned out by the hot sun, and the sheep and lambs and cattle and calves are taken up to the high altitude range lands 10 to 12 thousand feet above sea level. The desert is only about 4,400 feet above sea level. One sheep herder will take a thousand to twelve hundred head of sheep up into those highlands at this time and he will be gone for 3 months or more. He may come down to civilization only once or twice in that whole 3 months' period, because those summer grazing lands are frequently 150 to 200 miles from the desert. And here is the point in which the Office of Price Administration is involved.

While the herder is up in those high altitudes with his sheep he has to have food, and the only thing that he can use is canned goods. It is scientifically impossible for him to do normal cooking up there because of the extremely high altitude and the fact that water boils at such a very low temperature. You can boil beans, for example, forever up there on those highlands and never get them cooked at all. It is almost impossible to boil an egg, even if the herder had time from his flock to do all that fancy cooking.

So if he is to do the job at all, it is necessary for him to have canned goods and plenty of canned goods, a lot more than the Office of Price Administration ration books for normal civilians allow, and he has to have those canned goods all at once at the beginning of the season when he goes up there, and not in little driblets every couple of weeks throughout the summer. That way it would mean repeated trips and tremendous waste of rubber tires and gasoline, taking small quantities to him each time. Office of Price Administration officials here say that the regulations from Washington are too inflexible to permit them to make allowances for that particular situation, that peculiar problem. That is the reason I am reporting this by radio tonight, to bring it to the personal attention of Mr. Brown, Mr. Herring, and Mr. Maxon, of the Office of Price Administration, in the hope that maybe we can get something done about it. It is not difficult to cure, after all, but a cure is needed.

I might mention, if you don't know it, that this immediate section of Colorado is one of the most vitally important peach-raising areas of the Nation. There are more than 7,000 acres of irrigated peach orchards in this immediate area, ripening in a 10-day period beginning late in August, and all within that 10-day period the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad, which serves this area and which I can personally testify is one of the most beautiful scenic routes in the world—all within that 10-day period the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad has to move out to the market of the Nation some 2,000 refrigerated carloads of fresh peaches. During that 10 days, 80 percent of the fresh peaches on sale in the entire United States come from this immediate vicinity.

Massachusetts' Warning to O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include two articles from the Boston Herald of May 15, 1943, one of which contains a review of the milk situation in Massachusetts by Louis A. Webster, commissioner of agriculture. The articles follow:

DANGER SEEN IN MILK CUT—HALF-CENT REDUCTION EFFECTIVE TOMORROW

(By Will S. Rising)

A grave warning to the Office of Price Administration that the half-cent-a-quart reduction in family milk price, which goes into effect in Massachusetts tomorrow, actually is contrary to the consumers' best interests, and that the worst milk shortage in the State's history is in prospect for July and August, was sounded last night by Commissioner of Agriculture Louis A. Webster.

The commissioner has been openly opposed to any reduction of milk prices, declaring that instead a 2-cent increase in price is needed to keep the dairy farmers solvent and the supply up.

"These producers must be kept in business; they are vital to winning the war," he declared. "Even now the producer is getting back only 89 percent of the cost of production."

BUTTERFAT QUESTION

While appeasing consumer demands for a milk price reduction, the Office of Price Administration has said little about its willingness to see the butterfat content of milk reduced from its present Boston standard of percent to 3.7 percent, Webster declared. He questioned the wisdom of reducing butterfat content of milk at this time when families are on reduced rations of butter.

Webster, in an exclusive review of the situation, said:

"The Office of Price Administration's announced intention to cut family milk prices one-half cent a quart, effective Sunday, has several angles contrary to the best interests of the consuming public over the long haul which have not been previously publicized.

"Whether the public realizes it or not, Massachusetts over the past 10 to 15 years has been accustomed to the best quality milk of any large area in the country, both from the points of sanitation and nutritional value.

FINE HERDS NECESSARY

We are now faced with the problem of keeping those high standards. Boston milk, since mid-depression days, due to the highly competitive market and demands for quality milk by the consumers, has had a 4-percent butterfat content, which is six-tenths of 1 percent above the Massachusetts legal butterfat content. This difference over the legal butterfat content doesn't appear to be great to the untutored consumer, but six-tenths of 1 percent of additional butterfat content is actually three-fourths of 1 cent in additional milk value per quart.

In order to produce this quality of milk, it has been necessary in the past 15 years for New England producers to build up the very best herds in the country of Guernseys and Jerseys, the high butterfat content producers. These cows produce a butterfat content of about 3.5. This is a cost factor that does not appear to the average person when the question of reducing milk prices is brought up.

LAW ALSO INVOLVED

"The Office of Price Administration has agreed to a ½-cent milk price reduction, but it has not informed the public as to its views on butterfat content of milk. The Office of Price Administration has informed me that it has no objection to seeing the butterfat content of Boston milk lowered. I question that a lowering of butterfat content, even to the legal Massachusetts minimum is a wise policy at the present time when families are able to get much less butter than they previously consumed.

"Reducing suddenly the butterfat content of milk presents a problem for the producer that is not easily solved. Low butter-fat producing cows that would produce 3.7 milk in large quantities and at a lower price than Guernseys and Jerseys are just not available. This leaves the only method for lowering the butter fat to a system called "standardization downward." This system consists of removing a part of the cream from the milk. This is definitely a violation of Massachusetts law. The butterfat content also could be reduced by dumping skim milk into the product, but this also is a violation of Massachusetts law.

QUESTION OF SUPPLY

"Large distributors could conceivably import sufficient quantities of low butterfat milk for blending, which would produce a 3.7 milk, but the cost would be great and small distributors could not meet this competition.

"The future of milk supply in Massachusetts, for next fall and next winter, should be considered in this question of reducing prices. Sooner or later, every reduction has always come back to penalize the farmer. Massachusetts State College statistics show that, even now, the producer is getting back only 89 percent of the cost of production. These producers must be kept in business; they are vital to winning the war.

"The slicing still further of the farmers' return holds a grave danger for the consumer. Farmers at this time need an additional incentive to remain in production. We should hesitate in doing anything at this time which would further heighten the danger of a grave milk shortage, which even now threatens in July and August to be of the worst proportions in Massachusetts history."

MILK DEALERS PROTEST CUT—STILL EXPRESS HOPE FOR CHANGE IN ORDER

Boston milk distributors are ready to place in effect tomorrow the price cut from 16 to 15½ cents a quart for family-grade milk, but they have not relinquished hope of a reversal of the Office of Price Administration reduction order, a spokesman for the industry declared last night.

The cut reduces to 5.9 cents the distributors' spread between the price paid producers and that charged the public. This spread a year ago was 6.6 cents.

A flood of protests against the price cut were wired to Washington yesterday, demanding action by Congressmen to have the order rescinded as being dangerous to the milk industry as a whole.

The distributors' spokesman cited figures for five other major cities showing that Boston had the lowest spread of any of them. They are New York City, 8.6; Detroit, 7.6; Washington and St. Louis, 6.8; and Los Angeles, 6.5.

"It should be remembered," the spokesman pointed out, "that out of this 5.9-cent spread must come all the costs and expenses of the distributor. Wages take up 60 percent of the figure.

"We are definitely conforming to this price cut under protest. We do not intend to stop fighting for a reversal of the order."

Has the Administration an Anti-Inflation Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of yesterday:

HAS THE ADMINISTRATION AN ANTI-INFLATION POLICY?

The administration cannot hope to win the battle against inflation unless it does three things: It must frame a basic, well-considered anti-inflation policy. To know whether that policy is or is not being put into effect it must at all times keep informed on the actual statistical position of affairs, the incidence of its policies on different income groups. Finally, it must show the political courage to carry through its basic policy regardless of the howls of particular pressure groups.

Unfortunately it is not yet clear that the administration has a basic philosophy for

combating inflation, or that it has troubled to find and make clear what the actual situation is at any given time, or that it has the courage to battle for an impartial program against the political demands of special interests. As a result, what is the situation today? Organized industrial labor has, comparatively, done very well. Since August 1939, immediately before the outbreak of war in Europe, the cost of living, according to calculations of the National Industrial Conference Board, had risen 21.2 percent by February of this year. In the same period average hourly earnings of workers in 25 manufacturing industries had risen 36.4 percent. The weekly earnings of these workers in the same period had risen an average of 60.9 percent. The bituminous-coal miners under Mr. Lewis have done particularly well. From May 1933 to December 1942, though the cost of living had risen 33 percent, the hourly earnings of the soft-coal miners rose 140 percent. The situation for soft-coal miners has been still further improved this year by the introduction of the 6-day, 42-hour week. This has meant a further 30 percent increase in weekly wages.

Let us contrast this with another figure. Recently the Director of the Office of Civilian Supply gave out figures indicating that the goods left over for civilian consumption would have to be cut by the war program to not more than 68 percent of that of 1941. The pie that the civilian population would have to divide, in other words, would then be only two-thirds as large as the 1941 pie.

But the figures just cited do not show that industrial labor is now taking, or is about to take, only two-thirds as much of the pie as it had in 1941. If the purchasing power of the wages of industrial labor had remained unchanged, it would mean (apart from any tax program) that it had as much pie as ever. This in itself would be possible only if other elements in the population were getting considerably less than before. But the purchasing power of industrial labor is not only as great as in 1941 but substantially greater. It has been calculated that the purchasing power of the manufacturing wage earners' weekly income, after living costs are allowed for, was 21.2 percent greater last February than it had been in January 1941. If such a relative situation were even maintained, this would mean that industrial labor, in spite of the fact that there was a smaller pie to be shared by everybody, had not only increased its relative slice of that pie but had increased it to such an extent that it was actually consuming more than in the prewar period. And this is only another way of saying that the rest of the population, considered as a unit, was taking much more than a proportional cut in its living standards. It is, in fact, in large part the white-collar group that has been relatively most hurt by the rise in the cost of living.

The irony of the situation is that it is the leaders of organized industrial labor, who have already secured most for their followers at the expense of other elements of the population, who are now complaining the most about the intolerable hardships imposed upon them by the President's hold-the-line order. And their pressure threatens to be successful precisely because the administration has not made clear to the country (and probably not even to itself) what the present situation actually is.

Any intelligent attack upon inflation would be integrated with the tax program. It would determine the relative and absolute amounts of income of different income groups, and would decide how much of the burden of the war each group would or could be made to carry. There is no evidence whatever that any such fundamental study has been made or attempted. There has never been any public statement by the administration regarding its major policy in this direction.

Recently there came to light in a casual manner a study of Civilian Spending and Saving in 1941 and 1942, published by a division of the Office of Price Administration. How dependable these statistics are we do not know. Even if we take them at their face value they indicate a lopsided taxation program, wholly inadequate to combat inflation. This study shows that in 1942 there were slightly over 41,000,000 civilian "spending units," consisting, roughly, of 33,000,000 families of 2 or more persons and 8,000,000 civilians. The study shows that spending units with an income of $10,000 and over, representing less than 2 percent of the population and less than 16 percent of the money income of the country, were nevertheless paying more than 72 percent of the taxes. This is another way of saying that 98 percent of the population of the country, representing more than 84 percent of its income, were paying less than 28 percent of the taxes.

The Office of Price Administration study declares: "It is clear that, in general, consumers with income below $1,500 and possibly even of those above $2,000, are already at as low a real standard of living as is compatible with the war effort and its stated objectives. * * * Current tax and fiscal discussion, as well as rationing proposals, must clearly keep considerations of this character to the forefront." Is this the official policy of the administration? Do the authors of this statement know what it is that they are saying? Their own figures show that families and single consumers with income of $2,000 and less actually form more than 55 percent of the population of the country. What they are saying is that 55 percent of the population of the country should not be obliged to make any sacrifices on account of the war, apart from their indicated 1942 contribution of less than 3 percent of the entire war-tax burden. This is another way of saying that practically the entire burden of war sacrifices must fall on the remaining 45 percent of the population. Can the entire cut of a third in the standard of living fall solely on 45 percent of the population?

No responsible person who has given thought to the matter would recommend that an exactly proportional sacrifice because of the war should fall on all elements of the population. Sacrifices must be graduated, with those at the bottom of the income scale bearing the smallest and those at the top bearing the largest. That part of the population which is really at or below a minimum subsistence level should if possible be exempted from sacrifice. But the larger the group we exempt from sacrifice, the heavier must be the sacrifices imposed on all the rest of us. To exempt the majority of the country from sacrifices would be a reduction ad absurdum. To give persons who are already getting more than the average income still larger incomes is an even greater absurdity. But these are the absurdities now seriously advocated. They are possible only because the administration has no integrated anti-inflation policy, and has not made clear to the country or to itself the relative gains already made precisely by the groups who are now most vociferously demanding further gains.

Government Control of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1943

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, looking through the RECORD for the past 4 months one will find innumerable statements by Members of this body bringing to our attention the disastrous results to our war effort brought about by the Department of Agriculture, the O. P. A., and other Government agencies. It is an established fact that these vital matters are yet being handled by inexperienced and incompetent men, and our people are looking to this Congress for relief. One is reluctant to say that these men are deliberately planning the economic destruction of our country, but there is an abundance of evidence to substantiate the statement that that is evidently their objective.

All of you are familiar with the plight of the canners, the retailer, the farmer, and all other small business. Today Government control actually threatens the break-down of production and distribution of food in the United States. The past year has seen the doors of 5,000 dealers closed. In the first quarter of 1943, grocers and butchers went out of business at the rate of 5,000 per month. I am quoting here letters from loyal citizens of my State which, to me, are tragic and unbelievable, as it may seem these good citizens are being driven to bankruptcy and prevented from aiding in the war effort by the Government itself.

I am submitting the following letters written by Mr. L. O. Griffith, president of the Griffith Lumber Co., Huntington, W. Va., and Mr. George W. King, executive secretary of the West Virginia Association of Retail Grocers of Charleston, W. Va. Also a copy of a telegram sent to Mr. Prentiss Brown by Mr. J. A. Thackston, Jr., president of the Automobile Dealers Association of West Virginia:

GRIFFITH LUMBER CO.,
Huntington, W. Va., May 10, 1943.

Hon. HUBERT ELLIS,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUBE: I am enclosing herewith a letter from the Southern States Industrial Council, which I believe it will pay you to read in its entirety. When you have finished with it, send it on to any of our other Congressmen or Senators you think should have it. I am also sending you a copy of a reprint put out by the National Small Businessmen's Association, which I think is quite interesting. I am sending all of the Congressmen this one.

The lumber situation continues to get worse every day. We were told in Cincinnati last Friday by Colonel Sherill, representing the Central Procurement Office of the United States Engineers, that unless more lumber can be produced in the future than is being produced at present, shipment of men and supplies to Europe must be immediately drastically curtailed. He held an auction at Cincinnati, at which he wanted to purchase 50,000,000 feet of lumber for truck bodies, and he was only able to buy 6,000,000 feet.

We told him our troubles and he said these were well known by all of the authorities, but so far as he could see nothing was being done about it. He suggested that a vertical and separate organization for the lumber industries, taking it entirely out from under all the other Government bureaus, would probably solve the problem, but how soon this could be accomplished he had no idea.

Just to give you an example of the situation as it exists, here are a few things that have happened to us just recently. Selective Service Board No. 7, in Charleston, has refused to defer a single man for us and has

taken all of our truck drivers and other young and able-bodied men who are necessary for the operation of a logging and lumber job. We barely have enough men to get along with, and these are entirely inexperienced. As things stand we cannot operate loading crews on the yard when we are running the sawmill. We simply do not have enough men to carry on both types of work at the same time.

We have a truck and driver idle at Wayland, Ky., awaiting on a broken axle, which we have been unable to obtain as yet from any repair-part supply depots of General Motors. This truck driver's pay goes on just the same and the truck does no work. We have a tractor almost new, which cost us $8,000, laying idle at the present time with a stripped bull gear at one of our mills in Pike County, Ky., and this tractor is in the middle of our haul road, which prevents us from getting logs out by any other method to supply this mill, so it is shut down. We have another part on the way which had to be made up before we could get it and as a result we have lost several days' time at great expense at this point.

We have spent in man-hours of our overhead organization several hundred dollars' worth of time in trying to get parts for these two machines when they should normally be carried in stock at garages located within 10 miles of where each machine is at present. All of these additional expenses have increased our cost by 50 percent without raising wages or salaries one single dime, still the Office of Price Administration refuses to grant the lumber industry a single increase in price for its product in order to encourage more production, on the ground that they are not interested in increasing production, but only in establishing fair prices. It, according to the Office of Price Administration, is the job of the War Production Board to take care of war production. This is the statement made by Mr. Stone, of the Lumber Division of the Office of Price Administration, and quoted in the current issue of the Southern Lumbermen, dated May 1. In other words, according to him, his department is not obligated at all to work toward the winning of the war. It would seem to me that it would be in order for Congress to immediately pass an amendment to the statute under which the Office of Price Administration functions, very stringently limiting their activities and restricting their price fixing to a few basic commodities which might get out of hand if some price control were not exercised over them. Of course, lumber should come under this category, but it should not be in the price strait-jacket that it is at the present time.

If something is not done immediately, which is favorable to the management of the lumber industry, you are going to find the war program severely handicapped and no one to blame but the Government agencies themselves.

Sincerely,

LUTHER.

WEST VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF RETAIL GROCERS,
Charleston, W. Va., May 15, 1943.

HON. HUBERT S. ELLIS,
Congressional Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ELLIS: I am enclosing copy of my letter to Prentiss M. Brown, which is self-explanatory. This new dollar-and-cents pricing of grocers is the most outrageous, the most unfair, and the most asinine piece of business that the New Deal bureaucrats have had the audacity to perpetrate upon an innocent little grocer.

This new regulation will spell the doom of the entire independent grocery industry. The large chain stores can, if necessary, lose a few million dollars until after the independents have gone broke. They will then be entrenched, and will be able to control practically all the retail grocery business in the United States.

It is naturally assumed that the chain stores' legal department wrote or dictated this new regulation which is designed to sound the death knell to independent retailers. Independent retailers cannot operate on present mark-up and unless they get relief at once will either close their stores or ignore all Office of Price Administration regulations. West Virginia independent grocers are indignant and will as a whole take the matter in their own hands if these new regulations are not rescinded.

We trust that you'll contact the Office of Price Administration at once and get us some relief so that we can remain in business, feed and clothe our families, and continue to be patriotic by buying a few Victory bonds and stamps to help our sons, brothers, husbands, and sweethearts win this war as soon as possible, so this Government can again be run by and for all the people of this United States.

Your help will be greatly appreciated and an early reply is sincerely expected.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE W. KING,
Executive Secretary.

APRIL 28, 1943.

PRENTISS BROWN,
Office of Price Administrator,
Washington, D. C.:

West Virginia dealers appreciate your past consideration of their many problems. Likewise, we realize the magnitude of your task to control inflation. Conservatively, 40 to 50 percent of all used-vehicle sales are made by individuals now and, with ceilings on prices, private sales will increase. You can't police sales by individuals, so the net result will be increased dealer failures. We are trying sincerely to keep essential vehicles on the road, but don't know how we can continue if you take away the last means of meeting overhead. You know our problems and you know, too, that most auto dealers have patriotically complied with all regulations. We hope you will weigh these facts carefully and abandon the idea of ceiling prices on used cars.

J. A. THACKSTON, Jr.,
President, Automobile Dealers
Association of West Virginia.

A Letter From the Wilds of Nowhere, the Land of Death and Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1943

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Alabama Baptist of May 13, 1943:

A LETTER FROM THE WILDS OF NOWHERE, THE LAND OF DEATH AND DESTRUCTION

(Here follows a letter from a lieutenant in the United States Army on some far-away battle front written to his sister, the original of which is in possession of Rev. L. B. White, of Zorefoth, N. J.)

(Sent to the Alabama Baptist by Mrs. Lois Sewell, Muscadine, Ala.)

In writing this letter to you, I don't know where to start first. So many things have happened since I last wrote. Well, to begin with, I have escaped death at the hand of an enemy in a way so amazing I am still in a daze. You remember I told you when I knew I was going over, I was going over armed with the Bible? That Bible is the reason I am still here and able to write this letter to all America.

Here is the story: My buddy and I were sent out on duty with our unit, equipped in the work I told you before was our job. We had just received information—the most important in weeks. When we were discovered by the enemy, I gave my buddy the information we had collected, told him to beat it with it and prepared myself to face them. It was the first time I'd been faced with the necessity of pointing my gun at a man and blasting the life from his miserable body. I thought fast; then I said, Lord, it's your responsibility now. My buddy had not obeyed my order. He had no such scruples. As I reached for my carbine, a shot from one of them struck me in the breast and blasted me down. Thinking I was dead, my pal jumped for me, grabbed my carbine as well as his own, stood astride my body, blasting away with both guns. He was blasted too—his knees with three bullet wounds. But when he finished, there was not one of them left. He was amazed when I rolled over and tried to get up. The force of the bullet had stunned me. Dazedly, I wondered why I pulled that little Bible out of my pocket and in utter muteness looked at the ugly hole in the cover. It had ripped through Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, on through the Pentateuch, on through the other books, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, and kept going. Where do you think it stopped? In the middle of Psalm 91, pointing like a finger at these verses, "A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee. Only with thine eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of the wicked."

Sis, when I read that verse it raised me 3 feet off the ground. I did not know there was such a verse in the Bible. I'd been reading mostly in the New Testament. I read the rest of that chapter—the first part that ripped apart. In utter humility I said, "Thank you, precious God," and felt like a little boy that had escaped the mouth of an enemy of prey.

When I got my buddy back to the post he said, "Lute" (he calls me Lute), "I've had enough. This convinces me. Come on—I want to get right with God, starting right now." He wouldn't let them tend his wounds. He said, "Nothing matters now but this." He stayed on his knees 16 hours with 3 wounds. His body became numb; he couldn't move it, but he wouldn't give up. When the Lord finally came in he moved. That soldier went crazy for God. He jumped over chairs (I mean boxes). He jumped over bunks. He even ran outside and shouted to the whole camp.

Since I've given my heart to God, and talked with the boys, holding meetings, and prayed with them, God has given me 25 souls. Twenty-five of my buddies have prayed through and come out for God. God even gave me my general. It took a long time. He was so dignified. But God told me to go after him.

I stuck on his trail until he was grounded and came through. The Spirit of God hovered over that tent with a sort of glimmering golden haze. I tell you, Sis, prayer is going to win this, not guns alone. Fervent agonizing prayer I know is. God is bringing them in one by one. The whole company will be a company of praying men. God has promised them to me—given me the assurance. Think of it—120 praying men and 1 general in 1 regiment. When that happens this unit will be unconquerable. Pray, Sis, pray as you have never prayed

before. Tell everyone to pray. Tell all America to go on its knees.

Before each decisive victory anywhere over here, sometimes for hours, sometimes for days, there has been a feeling of praying far away. The feeling is so strong, you can hear many of the men, the most stubborn of them, say in the stillness of the night that it is so strong you can hear it. One said, sounded like people praying from some distant place. Must be hearing things in this dead place.

So pray everyone. It will have to come from afar off. No one prays in this land of utter desolation. God has turned His face away from the horror and destruction man has brought on himself.

Again I plead, tell America to pray. This war will not end until nations and people have paid in blood and tears for thrusting God out of their hearts, out of their nations, out of their lands. And tell them for God's sake to send Bibles, and more Bibles, and more Bibles. A Bible will give him that confidence that God is with him. I'd like to have this letter broadcast from every radio station in America. Try to get it on the air, in the papers, in anything that is printed. Make copies of it. Send it from coast to coast. Tell them the Army wants prayers and Bibles.

I could go on, but I am so tired, so weary, but in all so happy to see them coming to God one by one. So tell them to pray, atone for sin, and keep praying. And when you send things to your boys, send Bibles. They want Bibles.

Canal Across New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. EATON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1943

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the mayor and Board of Aldermen of the Town of Morristown, N. J.:

Whereas a bill is now pending in the Congress of the United States for the construction of a canal with a 27-foot draft connecting the Raritan River near the Raritan Bay with the Delaware River at Bordentown, N. J., for the purpose of transporting oil and freight between these two points; and

Whereas this canal, if constructed, would work irreparable injury to the State of New Jersey and would use vast quantities of water in its operation which are now held in reserve for a potable water supply for the metropolitan district; and

Whereas this proposed canal would not be completed within a period of 4 years and could not, therefore, serve any useful purpose in the prosecution of the war, and on the other hand would interfere with the war effort by the use of both materials and manpower now needed for the war effort; and

Whereas the experience of the State of New Jersey with the Delaware and Raritan Canal connecting these two points demonstrated that it could not be made a financial success and it became necessary for New Jersey to abandon the existing Delaware and Raritan Canal because of the competition of more modern methods of transportation; and

Whereas it is the opinion of this board that the proposed canal is a wasteful expenditure of public funds and would impose a new tax upon a people already overburdened with war taxes, and for a project which at the outset is doomed to failure: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this board desires to go on record with Congress as opposed to this wasteful expenditure of public funds, and the clerk is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to our congressman, the Honorable CHARLES A. EATON and the other Congressmen representing New Jersey and to the two Senators representing the State of New Jersey, namely, the Honorable W. WARREN BARBOUR and the Honorable ALBERT W. HAWKES as representing the view of the governing board of the town of Morristown.

Prophecy: Before Daybreak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. MURPHY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1943

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Scranton (Pa.) Times of May 13, 1943:

PROPHECY: BEFORE DAYBREAK

Should they be compelled to abandon Greece because of an Allied invasion the Nazis now in occupation of that heroic little country tell Turkish persons of position they will destroy Greece ere they give way. If it is intended to deter the United Nations, the threat will fail.

Greece presents the paradox of a country of little and yet great people. She has suffered frightfulness in the extreme.

And yet how lovely in thine age of woe,
Land of lost gods, and Godlike men, art thou!

The words of Byron, penned long ago, apply to the Greece of today, notwithstanding the country's defilement by the Nazi barbarians.

Greece may still be worse pillaged, its people more grievously injured and her cities reduced to rubble, but that which is the kernel of Greece—its heart and soul and the intangibles generally—cannot be done to death.

Warm is the heart of the world that beats for Greece, powerful its men of arms and irresistible its weapons. The glory of Greece will not die but the grandeur of the Rome of Mussolini will be even more tarnished than now, beginning with the day that the valiant men of Greece and those on the way to her rescue join forces. And on Hitler's shield will be the dullness of defeat.

In verity, the spring, with its promise of new life, greets Greece; but for the Hun, the winter of retreat preliminary to disaster knocks upon the door. The gods on Olympus grind slowly, but they grind exceeding fine.

With fortitude and fidelity, the Greeks wait the moment. For them, whatever worse travail the Hun may impose, it is ante lucem or that moment before the daybreak that brings the glory of the sun, dispersing what is frowning, ugly, and black as the devil's pitch.

Greece! Sadly bruised and pathetically mutilated, will be healed and live again!

Mother

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an excellent editorial on Mother appearing in the Fort Devens Digest, written by Sgt. Philip G. Cashman, of Lynn, Mass., who, before his entry into the service, was State director of special class education in Massachusetts. The significant sentiments contained in this editorial are, I think, worthy of our attention:

MOTHER'S DAY

Sometimes in the hush of the evening hour,
When shadows creep from the west,
I often think of the songs you sang,
And the boy that you lulled to rest.
That dear little boy with the tousled hair,
That long, long ago was thine,
I wonder if sometimes you think of that boy,
Oh little mother of mine.

But now he has grown into man's estate,
Grown stalwart in body and strong.
You'd hardly think that he was the lad,
You lulled with your slumber song.
Though years have altered the form and the life,
The heart is unchanged by time,
And still I am your little boy as of old,
Oh little mother of mine.

—*Rudyard Kipling.*

Next Sunday is mother's day.

It is the one day set aside during the course of the year on which we as a nation pay loving tribute to God's most precious gift to man—a devoted mother.

It is the one day in the year that we as a nation give tangible evidence, publicly as well as privately, of our love for and devotion to our mothers.

It is the one day in the year that we as a nation gather around the hearth, if such is humanly possible, and once again as in days of yore dedicate ourselves to those beautiful philosophies which were inculcated within our hearts and souls by Time's most patient teacher.

It is the one day in the year on which we rise most nearly to the sublime purpose of life itself and unselfishly give manifestations of our gratitude to those whose devotion and sacrifice have long since been a source of inspiration.

It is the one day in the year on which we are given the grand opportunity to prove to a chaotic world that we in America have not lost sight of the true and noble and enduring values of life.

In every village, town, and hamlet within the confines of our great Nation men and women, boys and girls, of every race and color and creed will gather, and with hearts that pulsate with appreciation and reverence pay their respects to their mothers.

Let us as soldiers of a great Nation that makes possible the observance of such a glorious day be not unmindful of both our privilege and sacred duty.

Let us, in whatever manner is most appropriate play our part in this drama of love. A gift, a letter, a card, or, to those who are fortunate enough, a visit.

But whatever medium that is at our disposal let us by our actions say in the words of the poet, with all their beautiful connotations and implications, "Still I am your little boy as of old, oh, little mother of mine."

SGT. PHIL CASHMAN.

Proposed Amendments to Peacetime Sedition Act To Conform to Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMILTON FISH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1943

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 17, 1943, the largest and most widely read newspaper in America. At the top of the editorial is a quotation from Thomas Jefferson, as follows:

Were it left for me to decide whether we should have a Government without newspapers or a newspaper without a Government, I should not hesitate to prefer the latter.

Fair-minded Americans, regardless of party affiliations, will never remain silent and permit freedom of speech or a free press—without which free America ceases to exist—to be curbed and gagged, or opponents of the foreign policies of President Roosevelt prior to Pearl Harbor—who numbered 100,000,000—sent to jail through bold distortion of the peacetime sedition law and the intent of Congress. This issue is so important that it far transcends all party lines. It is a great American issue, involving the most fundamental and precious of all American rights and liberties—that of freedom of speech. No sacrifice is too great to safeguard freedom of speech and of the press, symbols of freedom in America. We are told that we are fighting a war all over the world for these very principles, and must not permit them to be destroyed here at home.

I commend the reading of the following Chicago Tribune editorial entitled "Clear and Present Danger":

CLEAR AND PRESENT DANGER

Congressman FISH, of New York, has introduced a measure in Congress that is intended to provide a much-needed clarification of the law of sedition. He, like Senators TAFT and WHEELER, Professor Chafee, of Harvard, and a great number of others who are concerned for the preservation of civil liberties, has been alarmed by recent actions of the Department of Justice in its proceedings under the alien registration law of 1940. Mr. FISH'S bill takes the form of an amendment to that misnamed statute.

In effect, Mr. FISH'S proposal is to incorporate in the statutory law the late Justice Holmes' doctrine of clear and present danger. Mr. FISH seeks to distinguish between the grave crime of promoting unrest or mutiny in the Army and Navy on the one hand and opposition to the Government's policies and conduct on the other. For some time it has been plain that the administration wishes to use the present law to intimidate citizens and thus deprive them of their constitutional right to discuss public questions. Mr. FISH'S carefully drawn amendment is intended to end all such abuses of power.

He starts out by a clear statement that fomenting indiscipline in the military forces is a crime and that this crime can be committed by speech or writing "which advises, counsels, or urges disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty." It is made equally clear, however, that nothing in the act can be construed to deny or abridge the rights of free discussion of public questions guaranteed under the first amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. FISH has set forth the intent of Congress in the following language:

"The purpose * * * is solely to protect the armed forces from unpatriotic and subversive agitation and to guard free speech. It is not meant to deprive soldiers and sailors of a free exercise of speech or from hearing and reading legitimate political discussions and criticisms of men and measures, which is the only way a republic has of eliminating evils in administration and thus of surviving internally. One may speak freely to soldiers and sailors, but they must not be advised to mutiny."

In view of the actions already taken by the Department of Justice in so-called sedition cases, other safeguards are added. The bill would forbid the Government to transport defendants for trial. Further than that, the Government would be required in its indictment to state "every essential fact connected with the alleged crime as to time, place, participants, and circumstances." When conspiracy was charged, the indictment must describe "a criminal overt act on the part of each of the alleged conspirators, showing direct contact with the military or naval forces."

Americans who have not followed the recent actions of the Department of Justice will wonder whether such legislation is really needed. They will find it hard to believe that the limitations set forth in the amendments are required. The fact, of course, is that the Attorney General has been ruthless and tyrannical in his efforts to intimidate and that experience has shown that unless such an amendment of the law as Mr. FISH has proposed is enacted, the Justice Department will continue to terrorize critics of the administration's policies.

An Open Letter to the Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1943

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I extend my remarks by including An Open Letter to the Farmers of America, by W. G. Skelly, a great patriotic American, who is doing his part on the home front toward the winning of the war. Mr. Skelly has set a splendid example which all defenders of America might well emulate.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE FARMERS OF AMERICA

MY DEAR FRIENDS: Well-deserved praise has been given the members and branches of our fighting forces for distinguished service on the far-flung battle fronts of this global war.

Defense plant workers in all parts of the United States have been cited for outstanding contributions in the battle of production.

Business, too, has received honorable mention for putting national welfare ahead of private gain.

All of this is entirely fitting and proper.

But what about the American farmer?

It is my feeling that no group of citizens has responded more generously or more magnificently to this Nation's call for increased production than American farmers. You have done what was asked of you, quietly, without fanfare—and in spite of increasing shortages of labor and equipment.

I feel that due recognition of your achievements should be made. Because of my many years of close association with farmers in the Midwest, I would like the privilege of sponsoring recognition of superior achievement in agriculture.

Starting as soon as possible, therefore, we will honor, each week, a Midwest farmer, farm wife, farm family, 4-H Club member, Future Farmer of America, or member of some other farm organization for notable contribution to the war effort in the production of food. A committee of recognized authorities on agriculture will select one outstanding person or family for each week's award on a basis of accomplishment, such as record crops, record production of poultry, livestock, etc.

The name of the person or family selected for citation each week will be announced on Skelly Oil Co.'s radio program over the National Broadcasting Co. network, and the accomplishment will be told in detail, so that other farmers may profit thereby.

To each person or family thus cited for superior achievement in agriculture, we will award a $100 United States War bond, and the Skelly S pennant for superior achievement in agriculture, along with other distinguishing and identifying insignia.

Presentation of these awards for superior achievement in agriculture will be made at appropriate ceremonies in the city or town nearest the recipient's residence.

I hope and trust that this step will encourage you to hasten victory with ever-increasing production of food.

Sincerely yours,

W. G. SKELLY.

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the twentieth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money.

In this instalment Senator Cockrell presents a fundamental principle of economic law—the principle that any money system to provide a monetary unit of stable value must increase evenly in volume with the growth of population and commerce, a law of economics that must be adhered to by the government of any people if they are to maintain a stable national economy.

The twentieth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

Mr. President, let us examine this single gold standard—this American idea, so

called—boasted of by the senior Senator from Ohio.

I assert that there is not only not a sufficient amount of gold in the world to answer the demands of the world's commerce and business for monetary purposes, but not enough gold and silver combined to meet the monetary wants and demands of the nations.

The estimate of Dr. A. Soetbeer, of Germany, from 1493 to 1885, and since that date of our Mint Bureau, places the world's production of gold and silver for that period, 1493 to 1892, inclusive—400 years—as follows: Gold, $8,204,303,000, and silver, $9,726,072,000, being in the proportion of $45.80 of gold to $54.20 of silver, making an aggregate amount of $17,930,375,000.

If this vast amount were all in existence today, it would only be a fraction over $14.81 per capita of the world's population, estimated at 1,210,000,000.

What has become of this vast sum of the precious metals, and what proportion can be found in all the nations of the world? It has been subjected to all the multitudinous mutations, strifes, and contentions of the peoples of the world during these 400 years to losses, abrasions, wear and tear, and to all the uses for industrial purposes.

The losses by abrasion are estimated annually for gold about $500,000 and for silver, including subsidiary coins, about $2,000,000.

Now, search and examine the treasuries of the nations the world over for the existing gold and silver, and from the most reliable data available, our Mint Bureau, we can only find $3,582,605,000 of gold coin and bullion and $3,469,100,000 of full legal-tender silver coins, aggregating $7,051,705,000.

The percentage or proportion of gold to silver is 50.8 gold to 49.2 silver, nearly equal in value. This aggregate of gold coin and bullion and silver coins in the world gives for gold $2.96 per capita and for silver $2.86 per capita, and, combined, only a fraction over $5.82 per capita to the population of the world, a wholly inadequate and insufficient supply for monetary purposes.

The conclusive proof of this is found in the fact that according to statistics of our Mint Bureau there is today in existence among the nations of the world an immense mass of irredeemable or uncovered paper money, without any metallic basis for redemption, aggregating the sum of $2,635,873,000, including $600,000,000 in South America, $500,000,000 in Russia, $163,000,000 in Italy, $100,000,000 in Spain, $260,000,000 in Austria-Hungary, which latter adopted the single gold standard in August 1892. Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Italy, as well as other nations, having such uncovered paper money, are grabbing for gold in every direction in order to resume specie redemption on a gold basis. India has in this year closed her mints to the coinage of silver and adopted the gold standard, and entered on the scramble for gold.

This scramble, this grabbing for gold, will more distinctly appear from a careful consideration of the estimates by our Mint Bureau of the world's production and coinage of gold and silver.

I applied to the Director of the Mint for an estimate as far back as the statistics accessible enable him to make, and he furnished me the statement published in Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 34, present session, giving the production and coinage for 1873-91, inclusive, as follows:

"World's product of gold, $2,080,144,579, and coinage $2,752,927,456. The excess of the coinage in these 19 years over the gross product is $672,782,877.

Silver product	$2,204,155,349
Silver coinage	2,309,962,273
Coinage excess	105,806,924"

To see still more distinctly the shifting of gold from one nation to another, and its recoinage, first by one and then by another nation, and so on, let us consider the varied consumption of gold and silver for industrial uses, in industry, manufactures, and fine arts.

The two principal demands or uses for gold and silver are for coinage—monetary purposes—and for industrial uses. The eminent statistician, Dr. A. Soetbeer, in his "materials toward the elucidation of the economic conditions affecting the precious metals," prepared October 1, 1886, estimates for the 3 recent years an average net annual consumption of the precious metals for "industrial uses" in civilized nations as follows: Of gold, 90,000 kilograms, $59,814,000 (the kilogram being $664.60), and of silver (515,000 kilograms), $21,403,400 (the kilogram being $41.56). In giving these figures he says:

"Surprising as the enormous extent of the estimated annual consumption of gold for ornaments and other purposes in the arts may seem, any doubt as to the probable correctness of the estimate will disappear on consideration of the increasing use of gold for ornament and for industrial purposes with the growth of population and wealth" (volume 24, Consular Reports, p. 5134.)

In the 10 years, 1876-85, inclusive, just preceding the date of this estimate, the world's product of gold was, according to our Mint Bureau, $1,067,721,842, and the consumption in industrial uses, according to Dr. Soetbeer's estimate of $59,814,000 annually, being 56 percent, was $598,140,000, which left for coinage only $469,581,842. And the actual coinage was $1,372,407,272, being an excess of coinage of $902,825,430.

This was an enormous excess of coinage in these 10 years over the balance of the total production of gold left after deducting the amount consumed in industrial uses. Now, this balance of $469,581,842, left for monetary uses throughout the world in the period of 1876 to 1885, inclusive, was only 46.95 cents par capita of the world's population, estimated at 1,000,000,000 people, a low estimate, and 4,695 cents per capita of population for each year during the 10 years, to be added to the stock of money in existence to meet the wants and demands of the world's increase of population, commerce, and business.

In this same period of 10 years, from 1876 to 1885, inclusive, the world's product of silver, according to our Mint Bureau, was $1,016,586,116, and the consumption in industrial uses, according to Dr. Soetbeer's estimate of $21,403,400 annually, being 21 percent, was $214,034,000, which left for monetary uses for coinage $802,552,116, while the actual coinage was $1,103,371,395, which shows an excess of silver coinage in these 10 years of $300,819,279.

This balance of $802,552,116 left for monetary uses in the world in these 10 years was only 80.25 cents per capita of population, and only a fraction over 8 cents per capita for each of the 10 years to meet the wants and demands of the world's increase of population, commerce, and business.

Take the world's product of both gold and silver during this 10-year period, and deduct therefrom the amounts consumed in industrial uses, according to Dr. Soetbeer, and the balance left for monetary uses was only $1.272 per capita of the world's population, and for each of the 10 years was only 12.72 cents per capita of population, a wholly inadequate sum to meet the wants and demands of the increase of population, commerce, and business.

In confirmation of the correctness of these estimates as to the world's consumption of gold and silver for industrial uses, I now state the estimates of our Mint Bureau as to the product and such consumption of gold and silver in the United States for the 5 years from 1888 to 1892, inclusive.

Year	Gold product	Industrial consumption	Percentage	Silver product	Industrial consumption	Percentage
1888	$33,175,000	$16,500,000	49.4	$59,195,000	$5,280,000	8.9
1889	32,800,000	16,697,000	50.8	64,646,000	8,766,000	13.5
1890	32,845,000	18,105,901	55.1	70,464,000	9,231,178	13.1
1891	33,175,000	19,700,000	59.3	75,417,000	9,630,000	12.7
1892	33,000,000	19,329,000	58.6	73,697,000	9,301,000	12.6
Total	164,995,000	90,331,901	[1]55.0	343,419,000	42,208,178	[1]12.2

[1] Average.

Consider the vast significance of these figures.

The world's stock of gold coin and bullion is $2.96 per capita of the world's population, and of full legal tender, silver coins only $2.86 per capita.

Since 1857, the largest annual product of gold in the world was $130,817,000 in the year 1892, equal to only the insignificant sum of 10.81 cents per capita of the world's population. With this momentous increase annually to the gold money of the world to meet the increase of population and of the world's commerce and business, it is imperiously demanded of us to vote for the pending measure, unconditionally repealing the Sherman law and restoring the single gold standard of the coinage act of February 12, 1873, a beautiful basis to ask for such a vote

But examining a little more critically we find that of the annual product of gold in the world of $130,817,000 in 1892, we produced in the United States $33,000,000, or a fraction over 25.22 percent, and of our product we consumed for industrial uses about 58.6 percent, equal to $19,329,000, leaving us only $13,671,000, or only 20.40 cents per capita, estimating our population at the close of 1892 at 67,000,000 people.

A still more critical examination, according to the estimate of Dr. Soetbeer, of an average annual net consumption of 56 percent of the world's gold product in industrial uses, shows $73,257,520 of the $130,817,000 of gold produced in the world in 1892, used for such industrial purposes, and leaves for monetary purposes in the wide world $57,559,480—equal to 4.75 cents per capita of the world's population.

In the name of reason, of ordinary common sense, I ask is this 4¾ cents per capita increase of the gold money of the world sufficient to meet the wants, the demands of the increasing population, commerce, and business of the world? Is not gold monometallism not only a utopia, but also a ruinously false utopia—a mere doctrinaire's summer dream.

And we are urged to repeal the existing Sherman law, without any amendment or substitute of any kind whatever, and thereby restore and leave in full force and operation the Sherman coinage law of February 12, 1873, establishing the single gold standard, this utopia, and wipe from our laws every vestige of legislation recognizing the true democratic bimetallic monetary system.

No alternative is offered us. Wheresoever we seek refuge, relief, we must fall in the embraces of Sherman legislation, an audacious demand. We want no more of it. Neither the present Sherman law nor the Sherman law of 1873, but the restoration of the constitutional bimetallic system, maintained by successive Democratic administrations for over half a century.

[At this point the honorable Senator yielded for an executive session.]

(Wednesday, October 11, 1893)

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, why not restore true bimetallism? Why not restore silver to all the monetary functions given by our laws to gold as coin and money? Why not make them the equals in every respect by proper legislation now by amendments to the pending bill?

According to professions all of us on both sides of this Chamber, as well as the Executive, are the friends of silver.

If friends, then why not give some tangible evidence of our friendship for silver by proper legislative recognition now?

Now is the accepted opportunity. Procrastination is the thief of time.

The President, in the proper exercise of his constitutional prerogative "from time to time to give to the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient," and "on extraordinary occasions, to convene both Houses or either of them," has convened this extraordinary session of both Houses and submitted to them his views of the state of the Union, and recommended to their consideration such measures as he judges necessary and expedient. We have his message, his views of the existing conditions, and his recommendation.

I quote his recommendation—the only one in his message. He says:

"I earnestly recommend the prompt repeal of the provisions of the act passed July 14, 1890, authorizing the purchase of silver bullion, and that other legislative action may put beyond all doubt or mistake the intention and the ability of the Government to fulfill its pecuniary obligations in money universally recognized by all civilized countries."

This recommendation, the only one given to this Congress, is all in one sentence and all one recommendation—the repeal of the purchasing provisions of the act of July 14, 1890, and other legislative action putting beyond doubt or mistake the intention and ability of the Government to fulfill its pecuniary obligations in money universally recognized by all civilized countries. As a personal and political friend of the President, I stand ready and anxious to carry out by appropriate legislation on the pending bill the recommendation, the only recommendation made by the President.

I See That—

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks and insert an editorial, I am offering here to be reprinted a splendid production by Clif Stratton, furnished for the Topeka Daily Capital of Sunday, May 16, 1943. It is typical of New Deal thinking as he expresses it here.

I SEE THAT—

If Will Shakespeare were a Washington correspondent he probably would have written it, "Politics makes cowards of them all."

New Deal motto, as per usual: "Buy now, pay later—if ever."

The big propaganda drive to "sell" the idea of using subsidies to hold down food prices is just starting.

Essentially, it is simple enough. Increasing food prices are used as reasons for increases in wages. Therefore, hold down food prices.

But production costs are up; more important still, from the price viewpoint, food demands are up, food supplies are down.

Remedy: Borrow money and subsidize producers and/or distributors (actually the consumers, who get the cheaper food prices).

The borrowed money can be charged up against the children, as they grow up and become taxpayers.

This last statement is denied by astute new dealers. These have coined a phrase, which they state as an axiom—that saves having to prove it.

The phrase is:

"It is impossible for one generation to pass on its debts to a succeeding generation."

If you had to prove this statement, you can do it very easily.

Father owns a property. He mortgages it, using the funds for his living expenses. Father dies, with the mortgage not paid off, and the fund borrowed spent.

Even the simplest economist knows that the mortgage is a liability against the property, not against the children of the deceased who mortgaged it. Therefore the deceased did not pass on his debt to the children. Not at all.

Of course, if the children want to continue to operate the property, they will have to take over the mortgage liability, too, pay interest, etc.

The axiom doesn't make sense.

If it is true, the $300,000,000,000 national debt we will possess by the end of the war will not be a debt at all—it will just be the basis for the national credit.

You may think that sounds dotty, but the same New Deal economists who proclaim that no generation can pass on its deb to succeeding generations also will maintain that the national debt, when it gets big (and was due to New Deal spending programs), is not a debt at all but the basis of the national credit.

The beauty of this way of looking at it is that it makes you feel grander and bigger and more affluent. They used to call it delusions of grandeur.

Just think of it. The basis of the national credit, instead of the measly little $16,000,000,000 it was in 1930, long before 1950 will be $300,000,000,000.

Watch the basis of our national credit grow, folks.

And remember, get away from calling it a debt. Just call it the basis of the national credit. Sounds better, doesn't it? Makes you feel as if the New Deal is a financial as well as a political success.

And the propaganda campaign also will make you like it.

Post-War Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAPMAN REVERCOMB

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 19, 1943

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, last evening the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] spoke over the radio on what is known as the Voice of Congress, discussing post-war planning. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We hear a great deal about post-war planning and the effect on our allies or foreign nations if we do this or do that, or if we don't do this or that, or if we judge great issues primarily on a basis of what is best for America.

We are told by the State Department and other administration officials that any amendments or opposition to the granting of further continued powers to the President to negotiate new reciprocal trade treaties will have a disastrous effect on the general relationship and cooperation of our allied nations now and in the "war to peace" transition period. That is New Deal political propaganda. The nations of the world must know that the New Deal administration has no corner on Americanism and that many people in this country question the New Deal brand of Americanism. Ten years of the New Deal in the United States has brought the country near to internal chaos, and 10 years of the New Deal administration has shown the people that it is a political machine, making Tammany Hall look like a mere piker—a political machine that today exists for the sole purpose of keeping in office a gang of office-hungry parasites.

With the great majority of the people of the Nation today, I favor the encouragement of reciprocal trade with friendly nations. This is a long-standing Republican program. Our vast manufacturing plant production demands a greater outlet than we can supply domestically in normal times. Such treaties must be made within the bounds of the Constitution. I have a great respect for Mr. Cordell Hull, our Secretary of State, and know that he is actuated by the highest motives, but we must rescind, or at least curtail, powers granted to the President rather than grant further powers. I believe the American people want just that.

In 1936, 1940, and 1942 the people of this country were told that any opposition to President Roosevelt and his New Deal planners would be disastrous. The 1942 election called this bluff. Having failed in 1942, they now seek an international issue for 1944. It is the same old bogey man. The people are being told that from an international viewpoint failure to support the New Deal would be construed as refusing to support the Allied causes and that when hostilities cease the United States, under any other administration than the New Deal, would withdraw from all world affairs, put a high protective tariff wall around the country, and let the rest of the world go to hell.

We in this country know that 10-year-old political claptrap. We know that in 1942 the jury of the American people found the New Deal administration guilty on a number of counts: Guilty of failure to stop the flow of oil, gas, and scrap iron to Japan; guilty of failure to tackle the war-food problem in a sensible manner; guilty of selling out to selfish labor leaders against the best interest of American workmen; guilty of holding back information of serious naval reverses when that information was well known to the enemy; guilty of giving false information regarding the Doolittle raid on Tokyo; guilty of creating, in the Office of Price Administration, an instrument to regiment rather than serve the people; guilty of bureaucratic incompetence; guilty of conveying to our allies an impression that the people of the United States, other than the present administration, are opposed to post-war cooperation; guilty of conveying an impression to our allies that the post-war period will be a world Work Projects Administration, with the

United States of America pouring out money to every nation; guilty on all counts in the indictment.

In November 1944, the judge—that is, the people of the United States of America—will pass sentence. We in the United States know what that sentence will be. It is a mandatory sentence for the crime committed. Extermination and political death for the New Deal and all its conglomerate predatory gang.

The cry of this New Deal machine is "don't swap horses in the middle of the stream." Coming from the West, I can tell you that when a horse bogs down or becomes balky in the middle of the stream, we know how to handle him. We take him out of harness and turn him out to pasture, and that is just what we have to do with these New Deal bureaucrats—turn them out to pasture.

It is time our allies and the world should know the truth, and that truth is, that the present administration does not have the confidence or the support of the people of this country. They have lost it by playing politics with the war. Our allies should know that the people of this country have no intention of permitting the United States to be sold down the creek. Our allies should know that there are three political parties in the United States today. The New Deal Party of Roosevelt, Hopkins, Flynn, Hague, and Kelly. The Republican Party of Lincoln and the Democratic Party of Jefferson. Our allies and the world must know that the sole object of the New Deal Party of Roosevelt, Hopkins, Flynn, Hague, and Kelly is to hold office, to convey an impression that any change in administration at this time would be disastrous.

I suspect that Mr. Churchill, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and Premier Stalin already know that in November 1944 this un-American aggregation, which no longer reflects the thoughts, opinions, or wishes of the American people, will probably be defeated at the polls, and that in January 1945 a new administration will take office. That new administration, while officially Republican, will be the result of the combined efforts of the Republicans and Jeffersonian Democrats.

In the United States Senate I enjoy the great privilege and pleasure of sitting next to a great gentleman—Senator E. H. MOORE, of Oklahoma—a life-long registered Jeffersonian Democrat, who was elected to the United States Senate on the Republican ticket, and who defeated by a large majority an incumbent New Deal Senator, who, after his rejection by the people of his own State, was appointed to a high administrative office by the President.

At this time I feel perfectly safe in saying a new administration will take office in January 1945. That administration will be truly American. The main object will be to win this war—to defeat not only Germany but also Japan. It will retain every function existing today to attain that end. It will discard, eliminate, and scrap every abnormal function of government that does not contribute to this end. It will eliminate politics from the war effort.

On December 7, 1941, this war became an American war. On that date we joined our allies in a determination to crush for all time those forces of evil which seek to dominate the world. The new government which will take office in the first week of January 1945 will represent the determination of the people to clean this mess up, once and for all, to see that the children of our brave boys who are fighting our battles for us do not have to cross the waters again 20, 30, or 40 years hence and fight another war. We owe this to them, and we will fail in our obligation if we do not, in conjunction with our allies, end war for all time. I don't know if my words as a United States Senator will reach our allies. I hope they do. It is time that they know that Americanism is symbolized by the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, and not by the "four freedoms" or any other slick advertising slogan invented at the White House. It is time our allies know that the American people will fulfill their world obligations, but that the American people do not view that obligation as a world new deal, with the United States playing the part of Santa Claus and the American people supplying the candy.

We have just completed a "peace-to-war" transition period. When hostilities cease, all nations, both Allied and Axis, have to go through a "war-to-peace" change-over period. The United States, Britain, Russia, and China should form the nucleus of a body to bring about that "war-to-peace" transition throughout the world. When such "war-to-peace" change-over is completed, and the world is again operating on a peacetime basis, then is the time for the nations of the world to get together and formulate a permanent peace policy—a permanent world-peace policy.

The great majority of the people of this country favor the United States taking her proper place in such peace policy-making body, and assisting in carrying out well-coordinated plans which will eliminate war for many decades—and we hope for all time.

We favor world peace, but we oppose a world Work Projects Administration. We support world cooperation and stand upon the constitutional principles that treaties—trade or political—are made by the President, by and with the consent and approval of the United States Senate. I am definitely opposed to anything which might sacrifice the independence or the sovereignty of the United States.

The United States, Britain, Russia, and China will have to maintain sizable armed forces to preserve the peace of the world. I am not prepared to agree to the use of the United States armed forces anywhere at any time except by and with the approval of the United States Senate, and marching under the Stars and Stripes.

America today has assumed the role of the arsenal of democracy because as a free and independent people we have become a strong and productive Nation. To fulfill our world obligations in the future we must remain strong, free, and independent.

Nero Fiddled While Rome Burned

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 7, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it must come as a sad shock to our boys from the Southern States who are now fighting and dying for this country on every battle front in the world to learn that 218 Members of this House have joined in making war on the white people of the Southern States by signing a petition to bring up for passage the so-called anti-poll-tax bill for the sole purpose of stirring up race trouble for the people of the South.

It is said that Nero fiddled while Rome burned, but there is no evidence that Nero applied the torch himself; nor did he do his fiddling at a time when his country was at war with a foreign power. If our southern men in the armed forces of the Nation should turn and attack their comrades in arms, as the Members who signed this petition are attacking their people at home, our war efforts would immediately collapse on every battle front, and America would suffer the most humiliating, ignominious, and disastrous defeat the Nation has ever known.

Why do they continue to yield to this communistic pressure to invade the rights of the States when they know they are only stirring up strife among our own people at a time when the Nation is fighting for its very existence?

Why do they sign such a petition when they know they are flouting the Constitution and inviting the Federal Government through its growing bureaucracy to invade their own States and take over the supervision of their own elections?

It is ominously significant that a vast majority of the Members who signed this petition, which appears on page 4092 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, May 6, also voted to keep on the Federal pay roll at $5,600 a year a Negro bureaucrat whom the Dies committee had found to be a Communist and to have made Communist speeches all over this country, as well as in Mexico and Europe, and to have belonged to 21 subversive organizations. Yet they voted to keep him on the pay roll with white women from their own States compelled to work under him. That was roll call No. 8, page 757, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, February 9, 1943.

They not only signed this petition under the pressure of an organization which the F. B. I. will tell you is honeycombed with Japanese fifth columnists, some of whom are members of the Black Dragon Society, the most vicious and dangerous Japanese organization on earth, but many of them cast that vote on February 9 under the same pressure. On February 8, the day before that vote was cast, that communistic organization sent a long telegram to Members of Congress in behalf of this Negro bureaucrat, whom the Dies committee had found to be guilty of subversive activities, in which it denounced the Dies committee for "character assassination, professional lynching, and intimidation of public officials," because of the patriotic efforts Mr. DIES and the other members of his committee have put forth to protect this Nation against subversive activities at home while our men in the armed forces are fighting to defend it against similar influences all over the world.

In that telegram this organization which is pushing this anti-poll-tax bill, served notice that "no Member of Congress who gives aid or support to Dies shall be reelected."

Is it not passing strange that so many members would fear a communistic outfit like that more than they do the righteous wrath of the patriotic white Americans back in their own districts, whom they are supposed to represent?

It seems to me that patrictic Members of Congress would realize that we have our hands full in this struggle for our national existence, without their making

war on the white people of the Southern States, whose sons are now fighting and dying all over the world in order that this Nation may survive.

If this petition reflects the standard of statesmanship of this Congress, then God save the Republic.

N. Y. A. War Production Training Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. FAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1943

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following digest of N. Y. A. War Production training program statistical reports for February 1943:

EMPLOYMENT

During the month of February 1943, 26,550 new trainees were assigned to the National Youth Administration war-production training program, and 3,549 youth, previously terminated from the training program, returned to continue their industrial training.

The representation of female youth in National Youth Administration shops continues to grow. Forty-five and one-tenth percent of the youth commencing their National Youth Administration training as of February 1943 were female. A total of 34,344 female youth, representing 43.7 percent of the different youth assigned, were trained during the month.

A total of 78,648 different youth were given war-production experience in National Youth Administration work shops during February 1943—almost 10,000 more than the number trained during the previous month (68,856).

Number of different youth employed on the National Youth Administration war production training program, February 1943 and January 1943

Region	February 1943	January 1943	Difference
Total	78,648	68,856	+9,792
I	7,249	6,380	+869
III	9,735	8,064	+1,671
IV	8,277	7,589	+688
V	10,204	8,912	+1,292
VI	10,259	8,560	+1,699
VII	10,023	8,899	+1,124
VIII	4,560	3,919	+641
IX	8,304	7,431	+873
X	6,402	5,593	+809
XI	1,714	1,758	−44
XII	1,921	1,751	+170

TRAINEE WAGES

Forty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty-seven youth, compared to 36,297 in January 1943, attended National Youth Administration training classes within commuting distances of their homes and were paid an average monthly wage of $13.11. Five thousand nine hundred and forty nine youth who lived a considerable distance from National Youth Administration work locations, received transportation and/or hot lunches, and earned an average net wage of $11.03; in January only 5,372 youth received such partial subsistence. Thirty thousand seven hundred and forty-two youth, compared to 27,187 in January, were lodged in National Youth Administration resident centers; the average net wage earned by resident youth during the month of February was $6.12. As of February 1943, more than 39 percent of the youth being trained by National Youth Administration were in residence in more than 240 strategically located subsistence units.

AVERAGE EMPLOYMENT

The average weekly employment on the war production training program during February was 59,287.

Average number of youth under active assignment, February 1943

Region and State	Total			Percent female of total
	Total	Male	Female	
Grand total	59,287	33,073	26,214	44.2
Region I, total	5,505	3,424	2,081	37.8
Connecticut	388	165	223	57.5
Maine	750	589	161	21.5
Massachusetts	883	469	414	46.9
New Hampshire	140	63	87	58.0
Rhode Island	28	13	15	53.6
Vermont	173	59	114	65.9
New York	3,133	2,066	1,067	34.1
Region III, total	7,892	4,210	3,682	46.7
Delaware	62	31	31	50.0
New Jersey	811	496	315	38.8
Pennsylvania	7,019	3,683	3,336	47.5
Region IV, total	6,221	3,400	2,821	45.3
District of Columbia	281	75	206	73.3
Maryland	487	208	279	57.3
North Carolina	2,244	1,062	1,182	52.7
Virginia	1,225	760	465	38.0
West Virginia	1,984	1,295	689	34.7
Region V, total	7,912	4,467	3,445	43.5
Kentucky	2,438	1,411	1,027	42.1
Michigan	2,484	1,593	891	35.9
Ohio	2,990	1,463	1,527	51.1
Region VI, total	8,216	4,326	3,890	47.3
Illinois	4,418	2,288	2,130	48.2
Indiana	1,556	818	783	47.4
Wisconsin	2,242	1,220	1,022	45.6
Region VII, total	7,005	4,219	2,786	39.8
Alabama	1,272	753	519	40.8
Florida	1,091	675	416	38.1
Georgia	1,902	1,234	668	35.1
Mississippi	1,049	599	450	42.9
South Carolina	769	426	343	44.6
Tennessee	922	532	390	42.3
Region VIII, total	3,462	2,020	1,442	41.6
Iowa	955	556	399	41.8
Minnesota	1,439	779	660	45.9
Nebraska	308	187	121	39.3
North Dakota	339	212	127	37.5
South Dakota	421	286	135	32.1
Region IX, total	6,252	3,343	2,909	46.5
Arkansas	1,604	874	730	45.5
Kansas	888	409	479	53.9
Missouri	1,555	825	730	46.9
Oklahoma	2,205	1,235	970	44.0
Region X, total	4,333	1,840	2,493	57.5
Louisiana	1,025	534	491	47.9
New Mexico	195	70	125	64.1
Texas	3,113	1,236	1,877	60.3
Region XI, total	1,285	881	404	31.3
Colorado	297	149	148	49.8
Idaho	448	354	94	21.0
Montana	155	121	34	21.9
Utah	293	231	62	21.2
Wyoming	92	26	66	71.7
Region XII, total	1,204	943	261	21.7
Arizona	147	88	59	40.1
California	623	510	113	18.1
Nevada				
Oregon	222	198	24	10.8
Washington	212	147	65	30.7

NEGRO TRAINEES

Approximately 19 percent of the youth under active assignment during February were Negro. The proportion of female trainees among Negro youth is much greater than it is for white youth; as of February, 53.8 percent of the Negro trainees were female; 40.9 percent of white trainees were female. The 11,000 Negro youth trained by the National Youth Administration during the month of February were assigned to projects in all sections of the country, and as of February 17, 1943, more than 25 percent of the youth being trained by the National Youth Administration in regions IV and VII were Negro.

TRAINING ACTIVITIES

Ninety-three percent of the National Youth Administration youth are being trained in the operation of machine tools, welding operations, sheet-metal fabrication, radio, industrial sewing, automotive and aircraft mechanics, general woodwork, and clerical skills. In addition to the foregoing, youth are being trained in mechanical drafting, foundry work, joinery and aircraft woodwork, aircraft engine mechanics, and electrical assembly.

Average number of youth under active assignment, by type of work training activity, national summary, February 1943

Type of work-training activity	Average number of youth		
	Total	Male	Female
Grand total	59,287	33,073	26,214
Shop activities, total	57,473	32,064	25,409
Machine	18,869	11,196	7,673
Aircraft sheet metal	1,081	411	670
Other sheet metal	7,461	2,313	4,148
Arc welding	11,420	8,733	2,687
Gas welding	1,844	1,044	800
Aircraft welding	439	136	303
Foundry	731	278	453
Forge	331	252	79
Radio	4,594	2,802	1,792
Electrical	397	275	122
Automotive mechanics	1,501	1,152	349
Aircraft mechanics	1,105	797	308
Aircraft engine mechanics	475	435	40
Patternmaking	447	320	127
Joinery	162	131	31
Aircraft woodwork	756	282	474
General woodwork	1,955	864	1,091
Industrial sewing	2,112	49	3,063
Mechanical drafting	723	393	330
Other shop activities	70	11	59
Clerical activities, total	1,763	58	1,705
Other activities, total	51	51	

Changing the Constitution by Statute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 19, 1943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article entitled "Changing the Constitution by Statute" by Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times of May 18.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION BY STATUTE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 17.—A long and uninterrupted line of Supreme Court decisions is

challenged by the antipoll tax bill which has been petitioned out of the House Judiciary Committee and is about to become once more a focus of controversy. If the measure should become law and is upheld on a test of its constitutionality, the present Supreme Court will be obliged to reverse John Marshall and other eminent justices.

A majority of the Court may find legal language with which to do that, for the Constitution is what the judges say it is. But if Congress attempts this fundamental change in the American governing system, and the Court approves, then the writers of the Constitution, Jefferson notable among them, and their explanation of the principle of the separation of powers must be overriden at the same time.

This is a celebrant year in the Capital for Jefferson insofar as words and marble memorials are concerned. But perhaps if he could return and be offered his choice he would prefer devotion to his theory of American democratic government and his interpretation of the national charter. Jefferson was abroad when the body of the Constitution was written, but largely on his insistence the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights—were added. So he may be quoted as an authority.

JEFFERSON ON STATE POWERS

The following excerpts from his writings on the powers reserved to the States are pertinent to the forthcoming debate on the anti-poll-tax bill and are not (as in the instances of some other views of Jefferson) modified by anything he wrote before or after:

"It is of immense consequence that the State retain as complete authority as possible over their own citizens. The way to have good and safe government is not to trust it all to one (Washington) but to divide it among the many, distributing to everyone exactly the functions he is competent to perform. Let the National Government be entrusted with the defense of the Nation, and its foreign and Federal relations; the State government with the civil rights, laws, police, and administration of what concerns the States generally.

"Every State retained (in the Constitution) its self-government in domestic matters, as better qualified to direct them to the good and satisfaction of its citizens than a general government so distant from its remoter citizens and so little familiar with the local peculiarities of the different parts."

Two principal arguments have been made against the imposition of the poll tax by certain States as a qualification for voting on candidates for national as well as for State offices. One is that if a State can fix a poll tax of $1.50 it can fix a poll tax of $1,500 or more. The other is that, though the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax bill is doubtful, it is better to legislate the doubt favorably and leave the decision to the courts.

The answer to the first point is that no State government could put a confiscatory tax through the legislature; the processes of democracy themselves prevent such extremes, since only the few are wealthy or prosperous. The answer to the second point is that, when the President in 1935 asked the House to overlook doubts of the constitutionality of the first Guffey bill and pass it regardless, the request was pretty generally attacked as unbefitting one sworn to uphold the laws.

AN UNCHANGING DICTUM

But if the legal records, such testimony as Jefferson's, and other documentation are a guide, there is no doubt at all that the anti-poll-tax bill is unconstitutional. From 1633 onward the right of States to fix electoral qualifications for all offices, national as well as local, has been sustained. The courts have held repeatedly that admission to suffrage is not a right but a privilege within the powers of the States to bestow on terms not inconsistent with the Constitution. And the Constitution forbids a State to deny suffrage to citizens on the bases of race, color, previous condition of servitude, or sex only.

The poll tax has kept many poor southern whites and more Negroes from the ballot box. But the courts have said constantly that where an effect is incidental, and not on its face prescribed, the States are within the rights specifically reserved to them in the Constitution.

In *Barron* v. *Baltimore*, Chief Justice Marshall held that the Bill of Rights "contains no expression indicating an intention to apply it to the State governments," and in 1875 the Court said it was too late to question the truth of that. In *U. S.* v. *Cruickshank* (1876), the Supreme Court ruled that the right to vote in the States comes from the States, but that the right of exemption from discrimination for race, color, etc., comes from the Constitution. The Court also found that the fourteenth and nineteenth amendments do not necessarily confer the right of suffrage.

By constitutional amendment the poll tax can be legally abolished, but, on the record's face, not by statute. And, in view of the fourth-term drive and the New Deal's trend to centralization, every new Federal grab of rights reserved to the States is a new peril to the American democratic system.

Answer It Yourself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the News-Palladium, of Benton Harbor, Berrien County, Mich., carries this caption, "Why isn't General MacArthur there?"

Not only those with relatives in the South Pacific are asking that question, but our people generally would like to know.

This is no time to play politics as the administration is doing because it sees a political mirage with General MacArthur as a popular candidate for the Presidency. All MacArthur asked is the privilege to serve his country as a soldier. Nothing is gained by trying to mete out to him the same fate which befell Lindbergh and Rickenbacker.

The editorial reads as follows:

WHY ISN'T GENERAL MACARTHUR THERE?

Prime Minister Winston Churchill is in Washington. Accompanied by a group of ranking British Army and Navy and air commanders, the British statesman has arrived for what the Washington correspondents say is a "momentous conference" with President Roosevelt. It's generally understood that the two Commanders in Chief are discussing in further detail plans for the coming invasion of Europe, now that the Axis has been defeated in Tunisia and the north African campaign is over. It is also hinted that the Roosevelt-Churchill discussions will include consideration of a Japanese offensive, a surmise that was born of the fact that accompanying Mr. Churchill was Field Marshal Sir Archibald P. Wavell, commanding the British forces in India. Incidentally, two other leading commanders in the Pacific theater of war, Lt. Gen. Joseph C. Stillwell, American commander in India and Maj. Gen. Clare Chennault, the heroic and hard-driving American commander of our scant air forces in China, are also in Washington and have been there for a fortnight, discussing the Far East situation with the President and other military leaders and experts.

If Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt and their military advisers are discussing a Japanese offensive—something which General MacArthur has been calling for for months—even an amateur arm-chair strategist can't help but wonder why General MacArthur hasn't been called to Washington to discuss this piece of strategy. Certainly no other American commander, or British, is as well qualified to participate in the present discussions as the hero of the Philippines. MacArthur has fought and licked the Japs; he knows all the fighting qualities and tricks of the Nips. With much too little and often almost too late because of his pathetically small forces and armament, MacArthur, first in the Philippines and then later from his headquarters in Australia, has met and defeated overwhelming forces of the enemy.

Despite this well-known fact, MacArthur has never been called to Washington for a discussion of the Pacific situation. Other high commanders, those of our own and those of our allies, have been called to Washington at various times to report on their respective situations. But not MacArthur. True, only recently some of MacArthur's assistants flew home from Australia to press their general's plea for more support to meet continuing Japanese thrusts and to emphasize the general's well-grounded fears that unless the Pacific situation was taken more seriously in Washington, a new and even stronger offensive by the Japs against Australia might well develop into something disastrous to our positions in the southwest Pacific. But General MacArthur himself didn't come home to report personally and to argue with those persuasive powers with which he is so abundantly gifted, the need of making the Pacific war something more than a mere sideshow to the European performance.

General MacArthur is not only the best-qualified man to discuss Pacific strategy with the master minds now in Washington but he also possesses the ability and the experience to add sound words of counsel as regards the European situation. The Boche is no stranger to him. His World War record as one of Pershing's dependables qualifies him as an expert to sit in with the experts in plotting the strategy to deal the death blow to Hitler's continental armies. As one of the commanding generals of the victorious American Expeditionary Force of 25 years ago, General MacArthur abundantly demonstrated that he possesses those rare qualities of command and courage which, as he later was to demonstrate in the Philippines, is so essential to military victory.

Undoubtedly many good Americans believe that General MacArthur is not to be given the chance that he should be given in this war because of the possibility of his being drawn into the political arena in 1944. Speaking for himself, General MacArthur has stoutly disclaimed any political ambitions. H suffered too much, and still suffers too much, from his Philippines experience—and he is too great a soldier—not to want to go back to Manila, as he promised, at the head of a conquering army. It is unfortunate that this outstanding military ace, because of the enthusiasm of a nation for his superb soldierly qualities, had to be projected into the

political picture. But it is even more unfortunate that he seems to be held at arm's length by the President. If there is any military leader who, by reason of his experience, his proven ability, his intimate knowledge of the enemy—both Japs and Germans—deserves to be sitting in at that Washington conference today it is this ace of America's military heroes.

Insurance in Wartime—Guardian Life Insurance Co. of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 17, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the directors of the Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co. have just elected President William Montgomery directing head of the company for the fiftieth consecutive time, it was announced recently. At the same time the directors paid high tribute to the inspiration, vision, courage, and energy responsible for the unparalleled growth of Acacia during the 50 years of his leadership.

In President Montgomery's seventy-third annual report, March 2, 1942, he made a very interesting observation about insurance in wartime. This observation coincides with the views that I have had all along that the private life insurance companies should have carried the insurance on the servicemen in this war. Before the war commenced I prepared a bill which would have permitted the Government to underwrite the excessive mortality due solely to war and which for a commensurate premium would have permitted the private life insurance companies to carry the risk. I do not believe that the Government would have been out a penny on such a program because I think the rates are sufficiently high under the American Experience Table of Mortality Rates to take care of the expected losses in this war. But in order to make doubly sure and to induce the private life insurance companies to write this business instead of permitting the Government to engage in it, I suggested that the Government pay any undue mortality resulting from war. Due to the fact that after sending this proposed bill to a large number of people who should have been interested that I received so little encouragement, the bill was not introduced.

The excerpt from Mr. Montgomery's speech referred to is as follows:

Somehow I feel the life-insurance companies lost a great opportunity during the past year. About 100 years ago, when life insurance was in its infancy in this country, there was no reliable mortality table upon which the companies might base their premium rates, and they began the system of charging higher premiums than necessary in order to provide for fluctuations in mortality that might be caused by epidemics or other emergencies, and this system has been continued. After the deduction of certain expenses a part of the excess premium is returned to the policyholders labeled a dividend, and the balance is added to the surplus or emergency fund of the company to be used for unforeseen contingencies. This surplus to policyholders, as it is generally called, now amounts to approximately $2,000,000,000 and is increasing yearly. During the year 1940, the last year for which figures are available, this fund increased by practically $100,000,000.

Last year, through the war, there arose a real emergency, the greatest the world has ever seen and we hope ever will see, but, as I view it, the companies did not rise to the occasion. In September 1940 the present selective-service law was enacted. The following month the Government formed a new insurance organization called National Service Life Insurance in which the men going into the service can get up to $10,000 insurance at rates lower than those for which any private company could furnish it, because the Government pays the expenses of management. Naturally, therefore, a man who was going to take insurance up to this amount would take it with the Government, so the only war risk the companies would have to carry would be on those men who took insurance with the companies in lieu of or in addition to the amount offered by the Government. You have already received instructions to advise every man who is going into the service to take the limit of insurance the Government offers before applying for insurance with Acacia or any other private company. Under such conditions naturally there could not be very much of a loss arising from the extra mortality caused by war service. Therefore, as I view it, the life insurance companies, instead of putting a war clause on their policies, should have proclaimed to the world, "We have these emergency funds, the emergency is upon us, our duty is to help our land by every means in our power, the Government needs every man and institution to wholeheartedly do their full duty to help win this war, we will not penalize the men who are going into the service, we will use these emergency funds to pay for any extra mortality we are occasioned by the war, thus not only doing our duty but improving morale and increasing the patriotism of the men who are going out to die, if need be, to save our country."

There was much discussion among the companies generally, and many specious arguments were used, as to the possibility that the extra mortality occasioned by the war might put a strain on the companies to the point where it might affect their safety and endanger the system of life insurance; also that it was not fair that the present policyholders should have to bear this extra mortality. So a war clause in one form or another was adopted by them. We cannot see eye to eye with them in this position because, as we view it, neither past experience nor present conditions justify it. In mutual companies the surplus funds belong to the policyholders, they have been accumulated for just such an emergency, and if they are not going to be used at this time to help take care of this emergency, for what purpose have they been accumulated and when and under what conditions are they going to be used? The men who are going out to fight and save our land are the sons and brothers and husbands and fathers of our present policyholders. Do you believe for a moment that the policyholders of this country would not wholeheartedly and overwhelmingly approve the use of any part of these funds that might be necessary in this emergency, instead of having a war clause put on the policies of their loved ones?

Aside from the year of the influenza epidemic practically every company has had an annual savings in mortality covering a long period of years. Therefore, there could be no danger to the companies until the actual mortality became equal to the expected mortality on which their premium rates were based, and then of course they would have the emergency funds for any additional mortality. Take our own company for an example. We have had a substantial savings in mortality every year, including the year of the influenza. Under these conditions it is difficult for us to see what danger there could be to the companies.

For these, and other reasons that might be mentioned, I feel that the life insurance companies missed an opportunity to further prove their usefulness and stability and their service to their policyholders and the entire people of the land.

During the recent Temporary National Economic Committee investigation, much was said about its ultimate purpose. There seemed to be a feeling extant that the Government would sooner or later try to enter the life insurance field either through the issuance of insurance direct by a Government bureau or through the control and management of the life insurance companies, and that this might be the real purpose of the investigation. We believe the people of this land as a whole are convinced that the Government could not conduct the life insurance business as efficiently or economically, or render the same service to the policyholders, as is done by the private companies. This conviction, in my opinion, would have been greatly strengthened and the popularity of the companies increased had they refused to adopt a war clause and used the surplus funds in this emergency if necessary.

You naturally say, "Why did Acacia not stand out alone and refuse to put a war clause in its policies?" The answer is that there was really no other course left open to us because if we stood out alone and had not adopted a war clause we would have gotten so much of the war business that the company might have had an extra mortality from it that might have exhausted its surplus funds. I say to you now, however, that if any reasonable number of the companies, particularly the larger ones, would eliminate the war clause, Acacia would be delighted to be among the first to abolish it. The war clause adopted by our board of directors yesterday is the most liberal that we could use under the circumstances.

Life insurance flourishes only in democracies. The records of all the countries show this. One of the surprising things, and one of the very encouraging things, is that the sales of life insurance have increased in England and Canada during this war. Another of the surprising things is that according to recent statistics the mortality from military activities has not materially increased the average mortality of the companies in the democracies at war.

Mr. Speaker, in President Montgomery's seventy-fourth annual report to his company, the Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Washington, D. C., March 1, 1943, he made the following observations about war clauses:

In our last annual report we advised you of our position in regard to the elimination of a war clause in life-insurance policies, stating that if any reasonable number of the companies, particularly the larger ones, would join us in our position, we would be glad to eliminate the war clause in our policies. I am sorry to advise that no company joined in our position. In that report we gave the reasons why we believed the companies could safely eliminate the war clause and nothing has occurred during the past year to change our judgment as to the soundness of our position. Under these circumstances, however, there was nothing left for us to do but to continue to use the war clause our board of directors adopted last

year, which is the most liberal clause we feel we were justified in using and which is more liberal to the policyholder than the clauses now being used by most of the companies. Notwithstanding all the arguments that have been made against it, we still feel, for the reasons stated in our last report, that if any reasonable number of the companies, particularly the larger ones, would agree to eliminate the war clause, it could be done with safety to the companies, in fairness to the policyholders in the armed services, and that the policyholders of this country generally would wholeheartedly approve such action.

The home is the bulwark of the Nation and life insurance is the bulwark of the home. Our service men are making heroic sacrifices and giving their all if need be to save the American home and the American way of life, and if they should fail there would be no need for life insurance. That they will win is, I feel, as sure as tomorrow's sunrise. When they come back the companies will be urging them to buy additional insurance. I am afraid they will not find an enthusiastic response. The men may ask, and properly so, "What help and assistance did you render to us; what did you do for us when we were making such sacrifices and were willing to give our all, if need be, for you?" and especially so when this could have been safely done and with all fairness to our present policyholders.

The policyholders see the cost of their insurance increasing through increased expenses, increased taxes, decreased earnings on investments and decreased dividends. At the same time they see the companies continue to pile up surplus on the theory it is to be used in case of emergency, yet they see the companies refuse to use any part of this surplus in the present emergency, and they naturally ask, "What is it being accumulated for—what is the ultimate purpose of it?"

Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that the United States Government during World War No. 1 did not lose any money on Government life insurance. The premiums were sufficient to take care of the normal and war losses in compliance with the terms and conditions stipulated in the policies of insurance issued by the United States Government.

Texas enacted in 1907 what has been known as the Robertson insurance law which requires life insurance companies to make certain deposits and certain investments within the State in order to be qualified to do business in Texas. About the same time Texas enacted some very rigid insurance laws relating to life insurance companies. By reason of the passage of these laws and the close supervision given the companies operating under these laws, persons holding policies issued by life insurance companies operating under these laws which require a legal reserve, have not suffered the loss of one penny.

One old line legal reserve company in Texas has an outstanding record on writing insurance on Government military personnel. This company is the Guardian Life Insurance Co. of Texas, Dallas, Tex. It has never placed a war clause in a policy for $1,000. The company, however, does not write insurance on military personnel exceeding $1,000 in amount per person, but on the $1,000 no war clause has ever been inserted by this company, which is probably the only company in the United States that has this continuous record without a war clause or restriction in its life insurance policy contract.

The officials of this company gave me the greatest encouragement in the preparation of the bill heretofore referred to which would have kept the life insurance business on military personnel in the private companies and would have rendered unnecessary the Government's engaging in that type of business. Their views, however, although greatly corroborated by convincing information and evidence, were not recommended by the largest companies of the country.

New York Times Urges Passage of Anti-Poll-Tax Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith an editorial published in the New York Times for Sunday, May 16, 1943, urging immediate passage of anti-poll-tax legislation by Congress:

THE POLL-TAX ISSUE

Extracted from an unwilling Judiciary Committee by a petition signed by 218 Members, a bill forbidding the poll-tax requirement "as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers" will come before the House of Representatives on Monday, May 24. This measure, or one similar to it, has been kicking around Capitol Hill for some years. Two arguments have been brought against it. Some critics believe that it is unconstitutional. Others, like Representative MANASCO, of Alabama, maintain that it would destroy "the Democratic Party in the South" and "sound the death knell" of States' rights.

Arguments like those of Mr. MANASCO do not take long to answer. If the removal of a restriction which keeps many thousands of citizens in the poll-tax States from voting will injure any political party, then it must still be said that popular sentiment should prevail. If States' rights can be stretched to limit the suffrage to any degree, what about national rights? Federal officials represent all of us and act for all of us. Is it just that Vermont, New York, or Florida be legislated for or their Federal interests be administered by officials elected on an undemocratic franchise?

The constitutional argument merits consideration. Yet it seems obvious that if a State can impose a poll-tax requirement of two or three dollars, it can impose one of several hundred dollars or even several thousand, and that at some stage the Federal power must intervene to protect the "republican form of government" guaranteed by the Constitution. The Supreme Court seemed to accept this view in the case of *United States* v. *Classic*, decided in May 1941. The history of the modern poll tax indicates that it was adopted to curtail voting, and therefore to impair democracy. The present would be a good time to determine whether any State can constitutionally continue to run counter to the American tradition in this manner.

A Real Contribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by the Honorable Herbert Pell, former United States Minister to Portugal and Hungary, at the Portuguese-American War-bond rally held Sunday, May 16, 1943, in the Narragansett Hotel Providence, R. I.

War bonds sold at this rally amounted to $345,750. Mr. Pell himself, I am informed, gave encouragement to the bond purchase to the tune of $15,000.

His address follows:

It is almost exactly 6 years ago that the telephone rang in my house at Newport. I was being called up by Washington. My friend at the Capital asked me if I would go to Portugal. I said, "I have always wanted to visit the country, but what do you want me to do there?" He said, "To be Minister—will you accept?" Without a moment's hesitation I said, "Yes."

The first foreign ground on which I ever put my foot was the Portuguese island of Madeira, way back in 1895, but I had never visited Lisbon. For years I had known and observed Portuguese settlers in the United States, and I knew that any country which sent such intelligent and industrious people to foreign parts, where they make such valuable citizens, must have a lot of pretty fine ones at home. When I arrived in Portugal I found that I was right.

For 4 years I represented the United States in Lisbon. During the first year there was very little to do. Our only communications with the United States was by two Italian ships, the *Vulcania* and the *Saturnia*, which touched at Lisbon on their voyages between Trieste and New York. During the entire first year I was pretty free to do as I wanted. There was almost no diplomatic work. I took the occasion to travel all over the country from Viana del Castelo to the Algarve. I received the honor of election to the Institute of the University of Coimbra.

In the summer of 1938, I spent about 2 weeks in the Azores. In all my travels I have found no country that better repays the student or the casual traveler. I know of no drives more varied than those of Portugal. It is almost impossible to go 50 miles without finding a different, but equally beautiful, type of country. The cities are interesting, picturesque and artistic. The Azores are almost like fairyland. I know of nothing in Europe or this country more beautiful than the Sete Cidades on San Miguel. The rich soil, magnificent vegetation, and soft climate put these islands among the most beautiful places in the world.

Far more than by the lavish gifts of nature, or by the magnificent embellishments of art, I was impressed by the character of the Portuguese people.

I have, fortunately, been able to make friends and pleasant acquaintances in most of the countries which I have visited, but I know of none in which the general population is more genuinely friendly than in Portugal. I remember at the beginning of my time there, I was at Alcobaca. It was a very hot summer day, rather late in the afternoon. With Governor Cushing, of Massachusetts, my son, and a friend of his, I had driven all the way from Oporto. We went

in to visit the church and I expressed a desire to see the famous abbey kitchens. It appears they were being repaired and were locked up. The key was in the architect's pocket. In most countries that would have been the end of it, but not in Portugal A young gentleman ran across the square to the architect's house and, when he found that he was out, he and a group of friends scatte ed and combed the town, which is a small one. Eventually one of them found him, brought him up and showed us what we wanted to see. None of these people knew who we were. My car, with "Ministro" written on the front of it, was parked at some distance, so they could not have seen it. All they knew was that here was a group of foreigners desirous of seeing their city, and they intended to make that enjoyment as perfect as possible. This is only an illustration of the universal kindness that I received from the Portuguese people.

After I had been in Portugal for 2 years the war broke out, and Lisbon, from having been one of the quietest ports of Europe, became the busiest. After the fall of France, it was the only open door to the Continent of Europe. People of all sorts, of every nation, race, and religion flocked to Portugal as to a haven of refuge. The country was suddenly presented with an extremely difficult problem which was handled by the Portuguese Government and people with exemplary skill and kindness. The inflowing mass was canalized in such a way that there were no crowded bottlenecks. Americans from both North and South America and those who had visas permitting them to go to any part of the American Continent, were received but were not allowed to stay more than a few weeks in Portugal. The permanent visas were reserved for Poles, Belgians, Danes, Norwegians, and other unfortunate people who could find security nowhere but under the Portuguese flag. They were not allowed to crowd Lisbon beyond its accommodation, although these accommodations were continuously strained. Every resort hotel in the country was filled with refugees, and the Portuguese people may well be proud of the fact that not one hotel in their entire country raised its price by a single copper centavo. The refugees were not exploited.

The Portuguese Red Cross worked actively for the sufferers of all countries. Its officials most efficiently helped my son when he drove a truckload of Christmas cheer to Switzerland from whence it was distributed to British prisoners of war.

The achievements of Portugal in history have been magnificent, but many of them have been so quietly successful that they have had little mention. We all know of the great time of the Portuguese explorations, but the world at large knows too little of the Portuguese Colonial Empire. That Empire is in extent only exceeded by that of Great Britain and that of France. There is hardly an inch of the present Portuguese Empire that was not under the crown of Portugal more than 200 years before the final conquest of Canada, which is the oldest of the British self-governing dominions. From the fifteen hundreds to this day there has never been a serious rebellion against Portuguese rule. The greatest Portuguese colony was, of course, Brazil. When the colonial relation became manifestly impossible Brazil was set up as an independent empire by Portugal more than a hundred years before the creation of the British self-governing dominions. The result is that the history of Brazil, unlike that of every one of the other 22 independent American republics, does not begin with a war against the mother country, the source of its civilization.

Portugal during this war has occupied a precarious position. The majority of the people are faithful to their connection with England, the oldest alliance in the world. They are, however, and must be, acutely conscious of the danger which may come from Spain supported by the Nazis and inspired by what they call pan-Iberianism, which, in plain words, means the conquest of Portugal and the exploitation by Spain of the whole Portuguese Colonial Empire, in place of the enormous colonies which Spain has lost. Few Portuguese forget the terrible 80 years of Spanish domination which cost Portugal so enormously in territory and in wealth.

I am not here, however, to speak to you of the country of your origin. You, as well as I, are American citizens, but I should think less of you as fellow citizens if you did not, along with the virtues of the Portuguese people, preserve an affectionate memory for the land of your own youth or that of your fathers.

We in the United States are engaged in a terrible war which will result in freedom and security for all men. This great Nation to which you have come, and in which I was born, is engaged in a struggle which will affect the life of every human being born in this world from the North Pole to the South. For 20 generations your remotest descendant will be happier because of our success and because of the sacrifice which we in this country are now making.

The enemies whom we are opposing, and whom we will overthrow, are tremendously strong. I observed the development of fascism in Italy and of the Nazi Party in Germany long before I entered the public service of the United States. Back in the 1920's, when I was Democratic State chairman of New York, I did what I could to arouse the American people to a sense of danger. It was very little that we could do at that time. Even as late as 1937 you may remember the great quarantine speech made by President Roosevelt at Chicago, which was attacked on all sides in this country.

Even after the war started, there was very little realization here of its inevitable menace. It was really not until we were attacked with savage brutality, in violation of the recognized rules guiding the intercourse of civilized nations, that the American people began to understand the forces which were opposed to them.

Make no mistake, there can be no possibility of reconciliation between these two systems of government. As long as there is a spot of fascism on earth it will be a threat to freedom, and the continued existence of even the smallest group of freemen will always be a menace to the fascist principle. Our opponents know this quite as well as we do. They know that there can be no compromise of principle, no peace that will be more than a temporary truce.

I have seen with my own eyes the fate of great nations overrun by the Nazi war machine, and I have seen what happens to countries when their governments are seduced or bludgeoned into alliances or compromise, and I do not intend that any such destiny shall be that of the United States. I have seen the great and rich Republic of France shattered and broken, its people starved and enslaved, given just enough food to enable them to stagger through long hours in the Nazi chain gang.

Except that their country has not been made a battlefield, the same fate has overtaken the peoples of Italy and of Hungary. I have seen German domination paralyzing and making impotent the civilization of a thousand years. The destruction and slaughter of whole populations have gone beyond the wildest dreams of the lowest savages.

Remember that every German believes, and I think rightly, that the consequences of defeat will be utter ruin for himself and for his country. I do not anticipate an early or a rapid victory. To preserve this civilization, which you have sought and in which I was born, will need every effort and every sacrifice that can be made by each one of us.

There can be no holding back. Fundamentally the justification and the success of democracy will come from the fact that free men will freely give more and better than any tyrant can compel from slaves. This is our belief, this is our hope, this is our justification.

We cannot think in shades of importance. Everything is necessary. If we are only able to make a little sacrifice we must make it to produce a little good, but every single thing counts. Waste in our homes is a misuse of national resources; a lessened production is, as far as it goes, a betrayal of our soldiers in the field. The spreading of discouraging rumors, for any reason, can only add to the poison which the Axis is too eager to inject in our veins. The divergence of energy and intelligence to party politics, the desire to spread criticism of our Government and of its methods, merely for the sake of promoting personal or party advantages, is, to say the least, a diversion of power which could be much better used.

The American people have performed a miracle. I was representing the United States in Hungary when Hitler declared war on us. No one, friend nor enemy—and in Hungary as in Italy and in every other country overrun or dominated by Germany, we have many friends—no one, I say, believed that the United States could in so short a time develop half the armed forces that it has, or produce a third of the material. This has been a miracle of which we can well be proud, but it can only be continued, through harder and harder days to ultimate victory, by the continuance of a united front.

When the war broke out in 1939 I was in the United States beginning my first long leave as Minister to Portugal. I returned immediately by way of London and Paris, in each of which I spent some time. Conditions in France horrified me. The mass of the people hated war, even more intensely than war was hated in the United States, but they were undoubtedly ready to carry the thing through and make another war finally impossible. At the top I saw much of what I see here today. The rich, with their newspapers and subservient politicians, felt that the Army was strong enough to protect them from invasion, and that there was no safer amusement than conspiring for their own profit to undermine the confidence of the people in their Government. They succeeded in doing so and you know the result. I remember one man telling me that Hitler could not be worse than Blum, but he found out later that he could.

In every country there is a group of influential people, by no means conscious traitors, whose first interest is their own position in the nation rather than their nation's position in the world. This group brought France to chaos, and it brought England to the edge of the precipice. Such a spirit is the justification of fascism, and in other countries is its great resource.

The Germans knew the strength of the United States better than did the people of any other state of Europe, but they overestimated the weakness of our Government in the face of class selfishness. They counted on personal selfish interest to paralyze our resources. So far their belief has been unjustified. The American people have shown a miraculous unity in the prosecution of this war, and we must continue. The sacrifices of next year will be greater than the sacrifices of today; bit by bit we must all resign ourselves to an austerity of life to which we have not been accustomed for generations. No American is free from this obligation. Each in his way, and to the extent of his power, must work for the common interest.

Victory must mean something beside the military defeat of our present enemies. We, in this generation, must, after the last German and the last Japanese have been disarmed, see to it that such a menace shall not arise again in the time of our children, or in our old age.

Our civilization cannot stand a third world war. We must protect ourselves from it as we would protect ourselves from an epidemic or from a flood. This we did not do last time when the opportunity was presented to us.

War is not an isolated, fortuitous phenomenon. I suggest an analogy from this State. In the autumn of 1938 death, destruction, and hardship came to Rhode Island in a great cyclone. The results of that visitation are still to be seen. Of those who rebuilt their shattered barns and houses, there was no one who built a cyclone cellar, because we all realize that, however terrible such a storm may be, it is a thing which comes only once every two or three centuries, which we can safely disregard.

On the other hand, let us suppose a village continuously afflicted with typhoid fever. In such a place neither the rich nor the poor would complain of taxes levied to put the village in reach of unpolluted water. Typhoid is a thing which may come any time, the cause of which is reasonably known and which, with a little effort, can be stamped out. If the village merely waited to open extemporized hospitals every time there was an epidemic, you would say that the people were extremely stupid.

International war is a phenomenon of the typhoid class, not like the hurricane. Its prevention will cost money and will require considerable sacrifice—nevertheless, it is well worth it. Nearly 25 years ago I remember making an address in which I said, "I do not deny the costs and the danger of cooperation. All I say is that the costs and danger of cooperation will be less than those of isolation." Was I right, or was I wrong?

The United States is the richest Nation in the world, our manufacturing plant is by far the biggest and best organized, our standard of living is higher than that of any other country in the world. Just as a rich man in a small community has a greater interest in the maintenance of proper police and fire protection, if only because he is a more obvious target for burglarious efforts, so the United States has the greatest interest in the maintenance of world order.

During our colonial history we took a part in the great European conflicts. The War of 1812 was not a thing we desired on our own account, but was an unwilling involvement in the wars of Napoleon. From 1815 to 1914 there was no great threat against the system of world order. During those years the United States was occupied in settling a continent, carrying civilization to the wilderness, and took very little interest in the affairs of other countries. We felt ourselves a long distance off, we considered our problems entirely alone—practically unconnected with those of Europe.

In 1914 came the beginning of the First World War. During its early months we regarded it almost as a spectacle. As the threat became greater, it became more and more clear that against our will we would be involved, which we were. After the final victory the majority of the American people, in my opinion, as frequently expressed at the time, mistakenly assumed that the war had been a phenomenon like the cyclone here, which, although it had undoubtedly occurred, was not likely to be repeated. Therefore, we withdrew from the councils of the world and left the task of maintaining order to other nations, which, of course, were much less powerful than they would have been with the open assistance and backing of the United States.

When order was once more attacked in 1939, our ultimate involvement became necessary, this time not by the deliberate act of the United States, as in 1917, but by the acts of our enemies.

It must be apparent to anybody that with our interest in world order we must eventually keep our strength at the disposal of the nations leading the world in the way of order. Whatever we may say or do, both the enemies and friends of international order will know this.

The only real question before the American people at the end of this war will be whether or not we are going to take part in the maintenance of peace and justice throughout the world, and probably take the leading position in that maintenance, or if we are going to allow our cards to be played by some other nation. Some nation must lead. Which shall it be? I am for America.

War at the Turning Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an article from the Chicago Daily Times featuring an address by Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States, made at a joint luncheon of the Chicago Association of Commerce an the Council of Foreign Relations, at the Sherman Hotel:

WAR AT TURNING POINT—HALIFAX

Events in Africa have brought the turning point in the war, Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States, declared today.

"And there will be no stop," he said, "until nazi-ism has been destroyed; until China, rearmed and reinforced by you and by us, has driven the Japanese invader from her soil; until the aggressor, east and west, has been forced to disgorge his spoils; until peace and sanity, dignity and decency have been restored to this world."

Addressing a joint luncheon of the Chicago Association of Commerce and the Council of Foreign Relations in the Sherman Hotel, Lord Halifax thanked Chicago for mighty progress in the production of war material for the united fronts, the United States for its aid in Great Britain's darkest hours, and reviewed Nazi brutalities in conquered lands.

A PLEDGE TO POLAND

"One of our darkest days," he said, "was in September 1939, when the mechanized might of Germany was hurled by land and air on Poland. There was little we could do to help Poland. But we had given them our word. We did not go back upon it, and we are not going back on it now. We can hope for no secure or settled peace until Poland has been reborn.

"Since then, we have seen almost unbelievable brutalities inflicted upon a gallant people.

"Latest estimates show that whereas 150,000 Poles fell in actual fighting, probably 400,000 Poles and 1,500,000 Polish Jews have since died by execution or maltreatment, 2,000,000 have been sent to forced labor in Germany, 3,000,000 more have been driven from their homes, and 1,000,000 more are in concentration camps or prisons.

"In other words, out of a peacetime population of 35,000,000, more than 8,000,000 men and women have suffered barbarous punishment or death. But figures tell us little of the human agony that lies behind every single life or death of each man, woman, or child in that ghastly total."

DEPLORES RUSS RIFT

With Polish forces now fighting with the Allies, and with the Polish Government on British soil, he deplored the rift between Poland and Russia and blamed it on Nazi propaganda.

"We know with what regularity the Nazi propaganda machine has produced the evidence that it needs at the moment that it needs it most. This latest tale (of the slaying of 15,000 Polish officers by the Russians) appears at a most convenient moment for the Nazis. It comes straight from Dr. Goebbels, and I think we can assess it at its true value."

Britain's darkest hour, he continued, was in 1940, after the fall of the Low Countries, France, and the Dunkerque retreat.

"We left our equipment in Dunkerque, and we did not have in England more than one complete armored division. Our people were working 70 to 80 hours a week, our vastly outnumbered air forces were giving their all, and we practically stood alone.

A HISTORIC DECISION

"But despite our peril, Prime Minister Churchill sent our only armored division into the Middle East. To many it seemed an insane act of optimism. But it proved to be of the highest wisdom, for the men and equipment sent at that time enabled us to beat off the Italian attack and begin that long series of operations which have finally brought our armies into Bizerte and Tunis.

"In time to come Churchill's decision, made while our backs were to the wall, will take its place among the great events of history.

"I have said that in 1940 we stood alone. But that is not the whole truth. You gave us sympathy and sent us help, because you know that our cause was yours.

"You knew that Hitler had a timetable and that the United States was on it, even though low down on the list. You knew that with Europe and England under the swastika he would give his undivided attention to the Western Hemisphere.

"We made good use of your help, while Hitler encouraged the treachery of Japan. He chose finally to fight us and Russia and the United States at the same time. And in so doing he sealed his fate.

"Lease-lend," he said, "is working two ways, with England feeding and equipping a large part of our forces on her soil and in Australia.

"The same cooperation will continue when we come to peace. What we have found in the war we shall surely keep."

AFRICA A SPRINGBOARD

At a press conference prior to the luncheon Lord Halifax said:

"The most striking thing of our victory in Africa is the perfect timing and cooperation under our combined leaders, headed by General Eisenhower.

"It has brought the turning point in the war and is a foretaste of what the Axis has to look forward to. But I do not mean that we haven't tough times ahead. We have plenty of them. Remember what Churchill said—that 'Africa is a springboard, not a seat.' What will spring from it and where it will land is Hitler's greatest concern."

Indiana's Veteran Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, recently there came to my attention an

outline of Indiana's laws affecting veterans, their wives, their widows, their children, their orphans, and their organizations, compiled by Mr. Omer Stevens, national service officer and department adjutant of the Disabled American Veterans, who has his offices at 327 Lemcke Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

Most of the potential beneficiaries under these State laws are not aware of the valuable rights, privileges, exemptions, and benefits available to them under certain circumstances, and, therefore, I am hopeful that this résumé of Indiana's veteran laws will come to their attention.

Incidentally, may I commend the high service standards pursued by the D. A. V. in Indiana. Its service-giving activities have made me proud to be one of the life members of this association of America's disabled defenders.

The outline prepared by Comrade Stevens is as follows:

INDIANA'S VETERAN LAWS

ADOPTION

Children may be adopted out of the Knightstown Soldiers and Sailors Children's Home.

AMERICANISM

Any party which advocates the destruction of our Government by force shall not be permitted to have its name on the Indiana election ballots.

ARMISTICE DAY

Armistice Day, November 11, is a State holiday; the Governor shall issue a proclamation annually, setting apart and designating the 11th day of November as Armistice Day and suitable exercises shall be held in public schools of the State. Appropriate exercises shall also be held throughout the State in commemoration of the historical event associated with Armistice Day.

BURIAL ALLOWANCES AND ALLIED BENEFITS

A sum not exceeding $75 will be allowed by the board of commissioners of any county for burial of any veteran, or the wife or widow of such veteran, other than the inmates of the Indiana State Soldiers' Home, and, if from actual necessity a burial place was purchased for such veteran, or his wife or widow, an additional allowance of $25 will be made.

Grave care and registration: A division of grave registration provides for permanent registry of war veterans' graves. War service information is required on burial permits. It is the duty of the township trustee to care for the burial plots of veterans.

Headstones and markers: Cemetery authorities may not prohibit the setting up of markers for graves of veterans, provided such markers conform to standard markers furnished by the United States.

CLAIMS: ASSISTANCE IN OBTAINING BENEFITS

Appropriations: Annual appropriations are made to the State departments of the Disabled American Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the maintenance of service set-ups.

Notary services: Clerks of circuit court, county auditors, and recorders are required to execute papers in connection with the claims for pension, bounty, back pay, or prize money for veterans, their widows or orphans, free of charge. The fee to anyone authorized to administer oaths for administering an oath or giving an official certificate to a veteran, his widow, orphan child, or legal representative, for use in connection with a claim for pension, bounty, prize money, back pay, compensation, or gratuity, is limited to 25 cents.

PUBLIC RECORD CERTIFICATION

Public record certification: Free copies of public records are available for wards of the United States Veterans Administration under the Uniform Guardianship Act.

Recording of discharges: Discharge papers are recorded free of charge.

COUNTY WORLD WAR HISTORY

The board of commissioners in every county in the State is authorized to provide for payment of not to exceed $1,000 for the purpose of printing and binding any history of the activities of such county in and during the World War.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS

The soldiers' and sailors' section of the State's free employment service is to cooperate with the Federal Board for Vocational Education, and the division for rehabilitation of crippled soldiers and sailors. Veterans' welfare associations are authorized to maintain schools for the education of needy veterans, their widows, and orphans. World War veterans who have taken Federal vocational training courses, are entitled to a special examination for high-school diploma.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS FOR CHILDREN OF VETERANS

Aid is granted to resident children of veterans who died or were disabled while serving in the armed forces of the United States between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921, or as a result thereof, with free tuition in Indiana University, Purdue University, Indiana State Teachers College, and Ball State Teachers College.

EMPLOYMENT PREFERENCES, PRIVILEGES, ETC.

Preferences to be given veterans, their wives and widows for employment in State service under the State Personnel Act. Five points are added to the earned rating of any war veteran on a civil-service examination, and 10 points as to service-connected disabled veterans or their wives, and to the widows of veterans. Preference is extended to veterans, their wives, widows, sons, and daughters, and to former pupils, in appointment to or employment in any office or place in the State soldiers and sailors children's home.

A free State employment office for soldiers and sailors was established to cooperate with the Federal Board of Vocational Education in the rehabilitation of disabled veterans after World War No. 1.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF BENEFITS

All rights and privileges previously extended to Civil War veterans and their widows and orphans are also extended to those of the World War, the War with Spain, the War in the Philippines, and the Mexican border service.

GUARDIANSHIP

The Uniform Guardianship Act provides greater safeguards around the federally received funds of disabled veterans and their dependents, and provides for the appointment of a guardian of an incompetent or the minor child of a veteran to receive certain benefits on behalf of such ward.

HOMES

Orphans and children of veterans and deceased soldiers are admissible to the soldiers and sailors children's home.

Veterans and their wives or widows are admissible to the State soldiers' home.

HOSPITAL BENEFITS

An incompetent veteran may be committed to a Federal hospital.

INDIANA STATE SOLDIERS' HOME

Veterans of all wars are eligible for admission to the State soldiers' home.

MEETING PLACES

Accommodations for war veterans may be provided for in any memorial building erected by a county containing a city of the second class.

MEMORIALS IN EACH COUNTY

The board of commissioners in any county is authorized to construct and maintain memorial tablets containing the names of all soldiers, sailors, marines, and nurses who served in the World War from such county.

Memorial trees: The State highway commission shall plant trees along public highways and dedicate them to certain Army companies, regiments, and divisions.

PATRIOTIC HOLIDAYS

Counties, townships, cities, and towns are authorized to make annual appropriations to veterans organizations for the proper observance of Memorial Day.

PROHIBITING DISPLAY OF BANNERS

It is unlawful to display or exhibit at any meeting, gathering, or parade, either public or private, any flag, banner, or emblem intended to symbolize a purpose to overthrow the Government of the United States.

RECORDS, RELICS, ETC.

County commissioners are authorized to expend not more than $1,000 in the publication of county World War histories.

RELIEF

Veterans' welfare associations are authorized to provide care, protection, and general welfare for indigent and helpless soldiers, sailors, and marines.

TAX EXEMPTION

Any honorably discharged soldier, sailor, marine, or nurse, who shall have served 90 days or more in the military or naval forces of the United States, who is totally disabled, or the widow of such soldier, sailor, or marine, may have the amount of $1,000 deducted from his or her taxable property provided the amount of taxable property, as shown by the tax duplicates, shall not exceed $5,000, provided that the age of 62 shall constitute the basis of total disability for any pensioner. Persons desiring to avail themselves of this act may make application to the auditor of the county in which he resides.

Any honorably discharged soldier, sailor, marine, or nurse, who shall have served in the military or naval forces of the United States, between the date of April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, and who was disabled with service-connected disability of 10 percent or more, as evidenced by a letter or certificate from the Veterans' Administration, or its successor, and the widow of any such soldier, sailor, or marine shall have the amount of $1,000 deducted from his or her taxable property: *Provided*, That this said exemption shall not bar recipient thereof from receiving benefits from any other exemption or exemptions which he or she may be entitled to under the laws of the State of Indiana. Any person desiring to avail himself or herself of the provisions of this act shall, between the first day of March and the first Monday in May, inclusive, of each year, file with the county auditor of the county wherein he or she is resident, a sworn statement that he or she is entitled to the provisions of this act. At the same time, the applicant for this exemption shall submit to the county auditor's inspection his or her letter, or certificate, from the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That where the person entitled to the benefits of this act shall be under guardianship, the guardian shall file such sworn statements as herein provided.

Game license: Veterans may obtain free permits to hunt and fish.

Poll tax: Veterans receiving service connected disability compensation are exempt from poll tax.

Peddlers' license: Certain veterans are exempt from fee for license to vend, hawk, and peddle goods, wares, fruits, and merchandise.

Memorial associations: The stock and property of certain soldiers' and sailors' memorial associations is exempt from taxation.

Military organizations: The real and personal property owned by any military organization of any war, and which is occupied and used exclusively for the purpose and objects of such military organizations, shall be exempt from taxation.

National home: The national home for disabled volunteer soldiers is exempt from taxation so long as it remains the property of the United States. (Jurisdiction over the home was subsequently ceded by Congress to the State of Indiana.)

Veterans' organizations: The property of veterans' organizations is exempt from taxation.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Insignia: The unauthorized wearing or use of the insignia of certain veterans' organizations is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not less than $10, and not more than $50.

Meeting places: Annual appropriations are made to the United Spanish War Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans to assist in payment of expenses of annual encampments.

Meeting places, etc.: State, county, and city World War memorial buildings can be used by veterans' organizations as meeting places.

Patriotic holiday observance: Local units are authorized to make annual appropriations to veterans' organizations for the observance of Memorial Day.

Service activities: Annual appropriations are made to the Disabled American Veterans and to the Veterans of Foreign Wars for maintenance of a department headquarters and of a State service set-up.

Tax exemptions: The property of certain veterans' organizations is exempt from taxation.

VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION OF SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES

Any number of veterans, not less than 3, who served during the war may associate themselves together for the purpose of owning and conducting homes or schools for the care, protection, education, and general welfare of indigent and helpless soldiers, sailors, and marines, and nurses who served in the military and naval forces of the United States, or their widows, orphans, or other soldiers, sailors, and marines.

WORLD WAR NURSES

Nurses of the World War have the same status, rights, and benefits as are accorded to male veterans in Indiana.

"To My Son"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. BURCHILL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1943

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to me by Mr. Boyd Knell, of Chicago, Ill., and the tribute "To My Son" to which he refers:

CHICAGO, *May 17, 1943.*

Congressman THOMAS F. BURCHILL,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Several days after you wrote regarding the tribute "To My Son," which was illustrated with a picture of an infant's hand placed in the palm of his father's hand, we had a letter from Mr. Joseph Love, of Joseph Love, Inc.

He said that he was in the company of Congressman BURCHILL when the tribute "To My Son" was first passed around. Mr. Love was impressed with this tribute as you were and, at his request, we arranged for permission to be given so he could run it as an advertisement in the Women's Wear Daily, a publication reaching some 45,000 retail stores.

It printed up beautifully in this paper and has brought a response from all corners of the country. The Atlanta Journal has asked permission to run it as a full-page "ad" in conjunction with War bond sales. The Courier, of Ottawa, Canada, has made the same request. It also will be used in the form of full-page advertisements in Portland, Oreg., Oakland, Calif., and elsewhere—all as a result of the appearance which it had when sponsored by Mr. Love.

This publicity, of course, is in addition to the wide publicity that it has already received when sent out originally by Mr. Frank J. Allen, of the Bay State Milling Co., Winona, Minn., for whom the tribute was written and in whose name it was copyrighted.

This tribute, as you will remember, was written in honor of Mr. Allen's 18-year-old son, who is now stationed in Texas.

A large radio station in Dallas put it on the air last Sunday and was thoughtful enough to notify Mr. Allen in time, so that his son could listen in.

The Dominion Life Insurance Co. sponsored the tribute as an advertisement in Canada to help sell their Canadian war loan.

These are only a few of the instances of its wide use and you can understand how happy we are that it has brought consolation and hope to the thousands who have read it.

In keeping with your proposal to incorporate it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we know you will want to send copies to Mr. Allen and to me for our files. It will make us very happy and we shall value these copies truly.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

BOYD KNELL

TO MY SON

Eighteen years ago your trust was in me—today I put my trust in you.

Eighteen years ago your baby fingers clung to my hand for assurance—today I cling to you for assurance.

When you first started to crawl, you became an adventurer—life has been an adventure to you ever since.

At 6 we watched you trudge off to school—at night listened to your excited stories of new experiences, new friends, new things to do.

In quick, successive years you grew from babyhood to boyhood. Your life was a life of marbles, tops, kites, baseball, soldiers—tin soldiers, then.

Etched deep in my memory are recollections of the loud shirts you wore—baggy corduroy pants—the hearty slam of the door when you entered—your whistle as you worked over airplane models at your bench. Uncertain boyish fingers learning skill—gaining confidence in your own abilities as you grew farther from the need of our protective care.

At 12 you pleaded for a shotgun, striking fear to your mother's heart. We waited until you were 14—then you and I went hunting through the corn rows in the fall of the year, through the swamp, adventures in duck blinds. A marksman you became, with clear, keen eye, firm finger. You tasted the sweet cup of self-reliance. You were a good shot—a good companion to your father, who worshiped you then as he does now.

Then one day you waved good-bye as your train pulled out—you were off to school, away from home for the first time. How we missed you. The parting was hard—your mother and I little knew then what partings were to come.

You wrote home sketchily—short letters, requests for money, tales of your newly made friends, and of your work.

At holiday time when you came home the silent house lived again. You brought in your friends. They seemed more a part of you than we—and we tried not to show how hard it was to relinquish you to them.

The day of the big game your mother wore a large yellow chrysanthemum you bought for her.

We watched you lead your team to victory. We were proud of you as we saw unfold the pattern of your life, achieving at every turn what you set out to do.

The unflinching decisions you made for your team on the football field was a portent of the decision we knew you must make as the hood of war crowded down—we prayed that you would make the right decision, and you made it.

In 18 years your cycle has run from babyhood to boyhood—boyhood to manhood; no longer can we protect you with the warm blanket of our love—to you we now turn for our protection.

In your hands is the might to win victory, the right to bring peace. Until then I pray for you, my son, and wait, and wait, and wait for your joyous, safe return.

State Homestead Lien Laws on Old-Age Pensions Should Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Leonard Eriksson, a prominent attorney of Fergus Falls, Minn., in my congressional district of Minnesota.

His article is of wide interest to those who feel that State government liens on the homes of the aged, as a requirement for old-age pension or old-age assistance, is neither just nor democratic.

This article was prepared by Mr. Eriksson and presented to the committee on public welfare of the Minnesota Legislature, in St. Paul, Minn., on February 25 at a public hearing on a proposal to abolish the Minnesota pension lien law.

The people of some other States are confronted with this same problem, and this article by Mr. Eriksson will be of substantial interest to them.

Mr. Eriksson's statement follows:

THE LIEN LAW SHOULD BE REPEALED

To the honorable members of the committee on public welfare, house of representatives:

This claim will be considered under the following heads:

1. THE PROVIDING OF OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE IS AN APPROPRIATE FUNCTION OF THE STATE

Old-age assistance payments by the State represent a special duty, long practiced in many countries, notably in Sweden, in Norway and Denmark before Hitler, and in Australia.

Theodore Roosevelt said: "Old age should be provided for. * * * It is abnormal for industry to throw back upon the community the human wreckage due to its wear and tear, due to sickness, accident, and to involuntary unemployment."

The great English statesman, Lloyd George, said: "A workingman who has contributed his health and strength, vigor and skill to the creation of wealth by which taxation is made possible, has made his contribution already to the fund which is to give him a pension when he is no longer fit to create wealth."

The toiler, for over a quarter of a century past, has no capital other than his health, strength, and body. These are all consumed in a comparatively short span of years. When consumed he has no capital, for all his capital has been invested in his work for the common good.

To illustrate: A man obtained, let us say, a job when he was 21, at a fair rate of pay, with the Minneapolis water works. He is now 65 years old. His investment consisted of his physical strength. His only return on his investment is his wage.

In the meantime, what has Minneapolis to show for that man's invested labor? It has a vastly better and larger waterworks system which serves and yields income and comforts to the new and next generations. Its value has at least quadrupled during those 44 years.

This illustration applies with equal force and aptness to privately owned works. Consider the case of a laborer working, for example, for a cooperative creamery.

The laboring man has indeed "made his contribution to the wealth of the State" to justify, and make inevitable, a return to him when he no longer has a usable capital in our complex system of social economy.

This brief statement justifies the claim that this kind of assistance should not be treated as an "Indian gift," to be repaid by security on a man's most sacred possession—his homestead.

2. HOW DID THIS OLD-AGE-ASSISTANCE LAW COME ABOUT? DID THE PEOPLE HAVE A CHANCE TO BE HEARD BEFORE IT WAS ENACTED?

No candidate for the legislature at the 1938 elections informed his constituents that, if elected, he intended to secure a law forcing a lien on the homes of those who were found in need of assistance from the State. The candidates for Governor did not advocate in their campaigns or platforms any such proposal. No newspaper has been found and no organization is known to have publicly advocated such a law. On the contrary, all candidates advocated improvements in the then-existing old-age pension or assistance law. The average voter in that election cannot be fairly held to have favored this law by voting for the successful candidates in that campaign. Therefore, this enactment represents a law for which the great multitude of the voters were unprepared.

This is proved by the history of its enactment.

No bill can be introduced within 20 days of the adjournment of the legislature unless it has the Governor's consent.

The bill which became the old-age-assistance law is known as S. F. 1393 of the 1939 session. It was introduced in the senate, with the Governor's consent, on March 29, 1939.

On that same day, March 29, 1939, rules were suspended and the bill was given its second reading by the senate.

Two days later, March 31, 1939, the bill was reported back to the senate by the committee with the recommendation that that bill be passed.

On April 4, 1939, this bill was considered in committee of the whole and recommended to pass.

Between March 29 and April 4, 1939, the committee approved an amendment which made the lien apply both to past and future assistance payments.

On April 6, 1939, the bill as amended was passed by the senate.

The house received this senate bill on April 10, 1939, and referred it to the committee.

On April 13, 1939, the house recalled the senate bill from the committee to which it had been referred and substituted it for the house bill, H. F. 1165.

On that same date, April 13, 1939, the senate bill was placed on the special calendar of the house.

After a limited debate and after effecting minor amendments, the house on that same date, April 13, 1939, passed the senate bill.

Those minor amendments required the return of the bill to the senate either for concurrence or action of a conference committee from the two houses.

On April 17, 1939, the senate agreed to the house amendments and repassed the bill as amended.

The Governor approved the bill on April 18, 1939.

Thus this highly important and controversial bill was prepared by somebody outside of the legislature, introduced in both branches, referred to committees, amended, passed by both branches of the legislature, and approved by the Governor—all within a space of 20 days of the last weeks of th session. The great mass of the people had no chance to be heard before this bill had become a law.

On April 12, 1939, the Governor offered this argument as a justification for the bill to be voted on the next day:

"A lien provision is placed in the law that has this effect: First, it does not take away from the old-age pensioners themselves during their lives a single thing. But it does take away from the relatives of the pensioners any chance to profit by the pension that was given, and provided, in effect, a lien on the pensioner's property effective after death, which becomes a lien for the benefit of other old-age pensioners who will be drawing these pensions in the years that are to come.

"In other words, we are taking away from the children and other relatives of pensioners, who still have the opportunity to support themselves, and giving to the other old-age pensioners who are in need of the assistance in the years that are to come."

On May 31, 1939, he made an additional explanation, and the meat of it is this:

"It was absolutely necessary in order to continue our pensions on a sound and just basis. * * * If we had not corrected our law, the children would have continued to step in and take over the property, and in a few years' time the entire pension system would have broken down and those thousands of our aged men and women who are in need would have suffered the consequences.

"These are some of the examples of the situations we had to correct:

"One pensioner had a son in New York making $6,000 a year, who refused to furnish any assistance, but who yet could have stepped in and sold and pocketed the money from the homestead if this new law was not passed, after the death of the pensioner.

"Another pensioner had two sons-in-law earning $3,000 a year, and one $6,000 a year, located in various States, and they refused to contribute any, yet if the new law was not passed, the children could step in after death and take the property."

These claims are not true. Those statements were and are misleading; an appeal to the passions and prejudices of those who are not eligible for old-age assistance. Those appeals rest on the fact that every one of us is a potential Laban whose "flocks" should be justifiably increased by the kind of bargains made by Laban and Jacob.

That propaganda was not true because—

1. The lien does take away "from the old-age pensioners themselves during their lives" the security of ownership. This lien does not take effect "after death," but immediately.

2. Every citizen of ordinary intelligence and common sense will realize on reflection that taking the property of Pensioner Jones to give it "to the other old-age pensioners who are in need of the assistance in the years to come" is an unwarranted double tax on the few and the poorest for the benefit of a limited class.

3. This law was not absolutely necessary. If any additional funds should be needed, they could, as they should, have been drawn on the fund which the old people had piled up while working.

4. The pension law before the amendatory lien law was adopted provided by section 16 (ch. 95, Extra Session Laws, 1935) that if any child or children of a recipient were found "reasonably able to contribute to the necessary care and support of such recipient," but refuses "to contribute according to his ability," such child "after notice" from the agency was subject to a suit for the recovery of "such amount of assistance furnished under this act subsequent to such notice" to be brought by the county attorney.

Therefore, if there actually was a son of a pensioner in New York "making $6,000 a year" who refused to furnish assistance "to his pensioned father and mother," he coud not "have stepped in and sold and pocketed the money from the homestead" unless the State and county agencies failed in their duties. The lien law does not cure official neglect or incompetency.

But this illustration, though only half true, appealed, as it appears was the intention, to the well-to-do but uninformed constituents of a surprised and busy legislature.

5. The second illustration was equally devoid of candor. The original law and the law as amended does obligate sons-in-law to contribute to the support of the parents of their wives, as every legislature knows full well. Where a man marries his girl he does not marry her debts, nor does he undertake to support her needy parents.

3. THE LIEN LAW IS ANTISOCIAL BECAUSE IT IS ARBITRARY CLASS LEGISLATION

These assistance payments differ from annuity payments due from, say, a bank or an insurance company. The assistance is paid to remove need and to enable the recipient to live for reasons of interest to the State. This assistance may be discontinued at the pleasure of the legislature.

Not so in the case of annuities. The assistance payments are authorized only because they are made for the good of the State. They are a part of the total cost of government. To that cost of government each recipient who owns a home contributes his proportionate part by paying his tax as determined by the public authorities.

Notwithstanding this fact, a recipient, though he pays his full share to the cost of his government, is required to recognize a lien on his home in order that his needy neighbors may receive his home instead of his children.

But section 8340, Mason's Minnesota Statutes, provides that mortgages and liens on homesteads shall be invalid unless both husband and wife give their written consent.

This lien law, regardless of the wishes of the spouse, and in defiance of section 8340, creates two classes of spouses:

(a) Those whose homestead rights are subjected to a lien because the State furnishes assistance to the spouse in whose name the title happens to be; and

(b) all other spouses.

As to the (a) class of spouses, the homestead is subjected to a lien under chapter 315 without their consent. As to the class (b) the homestead cannot be subjected to a lien without their written or affirmative consent. Is this law fair which arbitrarily imposes a lien on the homestead of the poor merely because the husband, owning the home, gets aid from the State, while another wife has her homestead rights protected by another law?

This lien law also changes the law of descent as to this relatively small class of citizens. Section 8992-27, Mason's Minnesota Statutes, provides that homesteads shall descend free from any debts, etc., to which the spouse shall not have consented in writing. But under this law, if the owner has received assistance from the State the homestead does not descend to the surviving spouse free from the lien even though the surviving spouse never consented to it.

Consequently the law is arbitrary class legislation which the legislature ought not to tolerate.

4-5. THIS LAW VIOLATES PUBLIC POLICY

This assistance is paid to the aged in need and is paid by check. When the check is received it must be endorsed to get the money. When the check is mailed a notarized notice is filed in the probate court and the office of the register. No agreement is obtained or negotiated from the recipient and his or her spouse. This notice, together with the endorsement, is the giving of the lien on the recipient's home.

Clearly this is a violation of due process of law. In need, the recipient endorses the check out of fear for his life.

6. THIS LAW HAS THE EFFECT OF DISFRANCHISING THOSE HOME OWNERS OF THE STATE WHO NEED ITS HELP

This is obviously true. These old home owners know that if their mortgaged home is lost, or the payments stop, their shelter is taken from them.

Their home, forcibly mortgaged to the State, is looked after by agents of the State. These investigators enter these homes under real or assumed authority. They let the unfortunate recipients understand their authority. They are told, not once but often, that if the home or the assistance money, or both, are misused they will be cut off from the rolls. What "misuse" means is left largely to the investigators.

The result of all this and more is that these old people give up.

Therefore, this lien, plus the fears instilled by these investigators, leave these oldsters disfranchised because, by not voting and by no participation in the affairs of state, they feel that their chance to keep their shelter for life is improved.

7. THIS LAW IS UNJUST AND INEQUITABLE

The charitably inclined who give gifts do so without any expectation of the return of those gifts. Those who do otherwise are derisively referred to as Indian givers.

While our Supreme Court held in the *John and Rosalia Dimke case* (295 N. W., p. 75) that the legislature had the constitutional authority to enact this kind of a law, that Court recognized also that "It is the State's duty to promote the general welfare. In so doing, it is proper that it grant assistance to the aged."

Consequently this lien law represents a legislative policy, which converts the homes of these old-age pensioners into so many poorhouses over which the investigators have a fear-producing jurisdiction.

8. THE LAW DEFEATS ITS ANNOUNCED JUSTIFICATIONS

It was argued in 1939 that this law was necessary for the maintenance of the pension fund. This claim is just so much baloney. The Government pays one-half and asks no lien on homesteads.

But that aside, the fact remains that what is recaptured by the State from these old properties is, at least, no more than the cost of administering this law, if that cost is correctly allocated. Count the cost of maintaining the investigators, the cost of necessary bookkeeping, the depreciation, and the loss of taxes and then compare that sum with the recoveries and it will be found that no profit is shown.

But this is not all the cost. There is also the indirect cost to business.

Hence, this law does not pay. It is an expense to business and commerce of the State.

CONCLUSION

The right to homestead exemption has been imbedded in our constitution since the beginning of our State. Article I, section 12, provides: "A reasonable amount of property shall be exempt from seizure or sale for the payment of any debt or liability." This constitutional provision is not confined to some debts but to all debts.

Our court has recognized the spirit behind this constitutional provision by declaring repeatedly that the homestead right should not be rendered valueless "when its protection is most needed," and that the homestead is a refuge from misfortune for the children as well as for the parents, because the whole theory of the homestead law "is based upon the idea that as a matter of public policy * * * it is proper that he, the citizen, should have a home where his family may be sheltered and live beyond reach of financial misfortune," even at the sacrifice of just demands, because "the preservation of the home is deemed of paramount importance."

For reasons herein expressed or outlined, it seems to me and to the friends of the old folks in Minnesota that the 1943 legislature should abandon the experiment and return to the policy that has characterized the dealings of the State of Minnesota for 75 years.

"It is when the great mass of our people own no property that we are in danger. It is only in misery and distress that people turn to communism. When a man leans up against the forks of his own apple tree, you cannot persuade him to plan the destruction of his own country." (Senator Josh Lee.)

The sons and the grandsons of our old folks in need as well as those who are not in need, are offering their lives for our country in the terrible war which now threatens the existence of our country. Is it too much to expect that our legislature will repeal this law, and by thus repealing it, recognize the worth of humanity?

Respectfully submitted.

LEONARD ERIKSSON,
Fergus Falls, Minn.

Dated FEBRUARY 23, 1943.

Utilization of Manpower of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, from March 25 to May 7 of this year the House Military Affairs Committee on 23 separate days has held hearings or executive sessions on bills concerning the full utilization of the manpower of the United States during our present supreme war effort. The printed copies of these hearings disclose that the committee had under consideration four separate bills—H. R. 2239, H. R. 1742, H. R. 1728, and H. R. 992. These bills raised issues of tremendous importance. One of them was the so-called Austin-Wadsworth bill, and another, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman SMITH, seeking to prohibit persons holding supervisory positions of employment from joining major unions. At no time was direct attention given to the issues raised by the so-called Smith bill, which passed the House in the Seventy-seventh Congress but failed of action in the Senate.

Likewise, no witnesses were called to testify directly on S. 796, the so-called Connally antistrike bill, which was passed by the Senate on May 5, 1943. According to newspaper reports, which apparently are based on the facts, S. 796 was first taken up for consideration by the House Committee on Military Affairs at a meeting of a special subcommittee on May 10 last. This subcommittee assembled a combination of the Smith bill of the Seventy-seventh Congress and S. 796 of the present Congress. All of us know of the serious situation in the coal-mining industry of our country at the present time. We know how vital it is that coal production shall not cease. When the committee commenced consideration of the recently drafted committee version of the Connally bill, it seemed evident to me that the proposed legislation went far beyond the issues raised by the four manpower bills on which the committee had been holding hearings. It included many sections which were not immediately necessary for the proper conduct of the coal mines if a strike was declared on May 18, which marked the termination of the 15-day truce entered into between the miners and the Government. Because the proposed legislation might affect every employer and employee in the United States ultimately and would necessarily affect several million Americans immediately upon passage, I believed that representatives of the union, as well as other interested parties, should be permitted to testify, particularly as several Members, including myself, had been requested by union representatives to ask for hearings at which they could testify.

We are now engaged in a remarkably successful campaign of war production in industry. It was so stated by Prime Minister Churchill in his speech to us in this Chamber this afternoon. If legislation should be passed at once dealing with strikes in Government-operated plants a bill limited to that issue should be presented. If the emergency is upon us, hearings perhaps would not be possible, but this bill goes so far beyond that particular issue that I asked in the committee that witnesses be heard. While my motion received more support from Republicans than from Democrats, it was defeated.

I believe that this legislation should be considered in the light of its effect upon present industrial relations between the Government, the unions, and the employers of labor during the present war period. That other persons holding very responsible positions in our Government feel the same way is shown by the enclosed letter to Speaker RAYBURN from the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Labor, the head of the United States Maritime Commission, an Assistant Secretary of War, the head of the War Production Board, the head of the National Labor Relations Board, and the four

public members of the National War Labor Board. I believe that many Members, after reading this letter, will feel that there are serious defects in S. 796 even if a person desires to support such legislation. I believe they will also agree with me that this legislation cannot properly be amended or rewritten on the floor of the House.

I hope, therefore, that by unanimous consent of the House the rule which has been granted for consideration of this bill may be returned to the Rules Committee and that the bill itself may be sent back to the Committee on Military Affairs for full consideration.

Yesterday Chairman MAY attempted unsuccessfully to insert this letter with other important data in the records of the House. He was prevented from so doing by the objection of another Member. I hope that all Members will not only read this letter but will also consider the other data which has been given to the committee on this subject. If legislation is necessary at this time on this subject, then I feel certain that the committee, after hearing the views of these heads of our very important departments, together with the representatives of employers and employees and of the general public, will be able to report a better bill for your consideration.

The letter is as follows:

MAY 15, 1943.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We are writing to express certain views with respect to the amended version of S. 796, a bill relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense, which was reported by the Committee on Military Affairs to the House on May 11, 1943.

The War Department, the Navy Department, the United States Maritime Commission, and the War Production Board, being the agencies primarily responsible for the production and procurement of war materials, are unanimous in their judgment that some sections in the bill as presently drawn would tend to interfere with such production and procurement by stimulating industrial unrest. The Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board, and the four public members of the National War Labor Board, these being the Federal agencies primarily concerned with the maintenance of orderly industrial relations, concur in this view and believe that the bill, as it stands, would impair the effectiveness of the existing machinery for the orderly settlement of labor disputes.

The committee bill proposes drastic and far-reaching changes in the over-all machinery and principles established by statute, Executive order, and mutual agreement, for dealing with labor relations in the war period. According to the committee report, these changes are imperative because of the emergency which may arise from the current dispute in the coal industry. But the bill in its terms is not limited to that industry and therefore must be appraised with respect to its impact upon the whole field of industrial production.

While recognizing the gravity of the coal-mining situation, and without attempting to suggest here what specific steps should be taken in dealing with that situation, we note that, since the Government has taken possession of the coal mines, only a few sections of the bill have any bearing upon that particular dispute. The bill relates to American industry generally and to the whole problem of maintaining industrial peace in time of war. It is accordingly felt that in evaluating the bill our judgment should not be obscured by the exception presented by the coal-mining situation to an otherwise unprecedented record of industrial peace since Pearl Harbor. Although a number of strikes have occurred since the declaration of war, they have, with very few exceptions, been unauthorized stoppages of short duration opposed by the responsible leadership of organized labor, and the total man-days lost have been less than at any other time in our industrial history.

The bill contains numerous coercive provisions, including injunctions and criminal penalties. At the same time it impliedly recognizes the propriety of strikes after a 30-day notice and a secret ballot. In both these respects the bill runs squarely counter to the national policy embodied in the voluntary and unconditional no-strike agreement entered into by industry and labor with the President immediately after Pearl Harbor. This agreement, which represents the cornerstone of our wartime industrial relations structure, has been supplemented in a number of industries by written agreements outlawing strikes and lock-outs for the period of the war. This nationally accepted arrangement, whereby strikes and lock-outs have been outlawed by voluntary action, has proven by experience so satisfactory that a change in the arrangement should be approached with greatest caution. It would seem unwise in time of war to experiment with an untried substitute for a policy whose worth is already demonstrated.

The absence of any comment in this letter on the other features of the bill does not necessarily imply approval of those features. The shortage of time has prevented the preparation and submission of any joint detailed analysis. Some of the undersigned agencies, however, will submit additional comment on certain sections of the bill bearing on problems respecting which they have special knowledge and experience.

Sincerely yours,

JN. J. MCCLOY, War Department; FRANK KNOX, Navy Department; FRANCES PERKINS, Labor Department; E. S. LAND, United States Maritime Commission; H. A. MILLIS, National Labor Relations Board; D. M. NELSON, War Production Board; WILLIAM H. DAVIS, GEORGE W. TAYLOR, WAYNE L. MORSE, FRANK P. GRAHAM, the four public members of the National War Labor Board.

Jewish Needs and Christian Deeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1943

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. Karl M. Chworowsky. This article, written for the Independent Jewish Press Service, Inc., challenges the Christian churches to force Christian conduct upon their governments. Dr. Karl M. Chworowsky, fighting Unitarian preacher and president of the New York Liberal Ministers' League, says the Jews will not be helped until their Christian fellow men wake up to the implications of their indifference.

The article follows:

JEWISH NEEDS AND CHRISTIAN DEEDS

(By Dr. Karl M. Chworowsky)

The obvious needs of our Jewish fellowmen are being daily magnified and dramatized by the pressure of cruel and barbarous treatment. It is time, high time indeed, that these Jewish needs touch and touch deeply the conscience of Christian peoples and nations. The tragedy of Jewry is no new chapter in the history of western civilization. This tragedy has unfolded its grim and bloody scenes again and again before the eyes of a so-called Christian world. The very fact that this sad drama of suffering and persecution has run so long a course indicates that the obvious needs of the protagonist of this tragedy have been hardly, if at all, recognized and certainly never effectively met by a non-Jewish world. For it is the non-Jewish world, more specifically the Christian world, which furnishes the backdrop as well as the properties for this drama of the ages. Not until this Christian world recognizes its implication in this tragedy and its responsibilities toward the Jewish people will the word Judaism be associated with peace, justice, and security instead of persecution, discrimination and injustice.

We Christians are challenged to acquaint ourselves intimately and frankly with the extent and nature of those Jewish needs that not only Hitler's inhumanity but our own inhumanity of indifference and callousness as well have so inevitably created. These needs may briefly be summed up as threefold; relief, rescue, and security.

The first need is for immediate and effective relief of those who in ghettos, labor camps, concentration camps and prisons are starving or slowly being tortured to death. To say that nothing can be done for them is to give the lie to every human impulse, to deny that fundamental quality of brotherhood and human sympathy which sees in a difficult situation a challenge for supreme effort, not an excuse for defeatism and indifference.

The second need is for the rescue of those, especially children, who, according to reliable authority, can still be removed from the reach of Nazi terror and destruction. Here again is a situation which may well baffle and confound the imagination; but that something can be done about it is conceded by those who have investigated the possibilities of such rescue, and even today are finding ways and means of making escape and emigration possible.

The third need is for the wise planning of a post-war world in which that security which is being held out for the peoples of the world may be, by the logic of human rights and the authority of the laws of God and man, not only extended to but assured to the Jew wherever he may choose to make his home.

The second and third needs eloquently demand an intelligent and responsible appraisal of the program of Zionism and a committal to the proposition that Palestine must be opened as a homeland for those Jews who wish to settle there. This is, to me, a fundamental aspect of the whole scene of "Jewish needs."

THE CHRISTIAN RECORD

What, in view of these needs, has been the record of Christian deeds? Not a very impressive one, I fear. Even if we think only in terms of the past 25 years, the record is a shameful one. True, there is the Balfour declaration of 1917 and the hope it raised among Jews everywhere that at long last their dream of a homeland in Palestine had come true. There is the unanimous action of the American Congress in 1922 voicing this country's interest in the program of Zionism. But

then came the British White Paper of 1939, which, with its arbitrary limitation on Jewish immigration into Palestine, practically made a dead letter of the Balfour declaration. Then there was Evian and finally Bermuda with their records of futility and ineffectiveness.

If it be argued, as it will be, that these were actions of governments for which the churches cannot be held responsible, it must be pointed out that these governments have always proudly called themselves Christian governments as well as democratic governments, and it is the nature of democratic governments to be sensitive to public opinion. Will anyone deny that if Christian public opinion of both Great Britain and America had asserted itself, not only the Balfour Declaration might have had a happier issue than that of a disgraceful white paper, but that both Evian and Bermuda would have produced more than a sirocco of diplomatic palaver? As it is, we may say of the Balfour Declaration that it has joined the questionable company of "scraps of paper," and of Evian and Bermuda that "the mountain labored and brought forth a ridiculous mouse."

In view of these fiascos of Christian governments, is there not something that the churches as the organized spiritual and ethical power of Christianity can do? Of course, there is: to deny this would be giving the lie to every high ethical ideal professed, preached, and allegedly practiced by the followers of the Nazarene. If I had to choose a text for this article, I would select the famous parable of the Good Samaritan, that great classic of Christian sacred literature whose primary truth is the simple proposition that the good man will follow the impulse of his heart to help his fellow man irrespective of the race or religion of that fellow human and entirely indifferent to the difficulties that may be involved in his act of charity and good will.

In view of the supreme need of our Jewish brothers today, only the supreme deed of the good Samaritan will suffice. To become good Samaritans we Christians must gird our loins now and today. We must insist with every means of persuasion and mass action that the Christian nations stop their piddling measures in dealing with a tragedy that involves millions of human lives. We must raise our voices in protest; we must clamor and shout that pity and compassion, that resolutions and declarations, that prayers and mass demonstrations of indignation, not even sermons and special services are enough. We must make our strength as citizens and voters, as champions of high morality and of ethical religion, felt to the point where our governments recognize that we, the churches, are determined that something be done, and done at once, to rescue and relieve, to save and to reassure those missions of Jews whose fate grows worse from day to day.

We must insist that the United Nations use all means still available for the relief of those who can still be relieved, for the rescue of those to whom all avenues of rescue and emigration have thus far not been closed. We must take a determined stand to the effect that any post-war plan that does not secure Israel's status among the nations of the world on a basis of complete and actual, not only theoretical and de jure, equality constitutes a denial of human and democratic principles and a certain defeat of those purposes for which today millions are giving their lives. Finally, we must begin to enlighten the Christian world as to the meaning of Zionism as a concept without which a just and peaceful new world cannot be imagined. We must make clear to a non-Jewish world what the dream of a homeland in Palestine means to homeless and harassed Jews.

If we show this spirit, we will have accomplished a great deal toward softening the blows now beating upon European Jews and toward preventing a recurrence of the tragedy that now engulfs millions of our Jewish friends. May we prove that the spirit of the good Samaritan still lives in the church and that the mind of him who said "Go and do thou likewise" is still in those who call themselves Christians.

The Anti-Poll-Tax Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETE JARMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1943

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan:

ANTI-POLL-TAX DRIVE DESCRIBED AS MOVE AGAINST STATES' RIGHTS

(By Mark Sullivan)

This article deals with something which, about 10 days from now, will boil in bitter controversy. But to understand the controversy ahead look back 23 years.

Preceding 1920 many States had a certain qualification for voting. The qualification was that no person was allowed to vote unless such person had hair on the face, or the equivalent thereof; that is, only males were allowed to vote—women could not.

To many this sex qualification seemed arbitrary and unfair to half the human race. They set about abolishing it. They took the method prescribed by the Constitution; that is, by amendment to the Constitution.

AMENDMENT PASSED

They went through the necessary steps. They introduced the proposed amendment in Congress, and it passed both Houses by the necessary two-thirds vote.

Then they laid the amendment before the State legislatures, and the necessary three-fourths of the States ratified it. By that the amendment was adopted, and since then hair on the face is no longer a qualification for voting in any State.

So much for history. Turn now to the controversy ahead of us, which will come to climax in Congress next week. Turn to the poll tax, and the movement to end it.

The poll tax is a qualification for voting. Like the old sex qualification, it exists in some States, not in others. In seven States persons cannot vote unless they have paid a poll tax, varying in the States from $1 to $3.

Now, certain persons do not think the poll tax ought to exist. They want to abolish the poll tax as a qualification for voting for President, Members of Congress, and other Federal offices. They have organized what they call the National Committee To Abolish the Poll Tax.

They have pushed their movement so vigorously that it is scheduled for action in Congress on May 24.

But do these persons take the method by which the sex qualification was abolished—the method of amendment to the Constitution? They do not. The method by which these persons undertake to end the poll tax is by a simple act of Congress.

Why do they try to do it this way? Why do they put their attempt in the form of a simple act of Congress? Undoubtedly they have reasons. Without attempting to judge their reasons, we can judge very clearly the effect of the method they are taking.

MORE FEDERAL POWER

If Congress passes an act abolishing the poll tax, and assuming the Supreme Court should uphold it, then an immense step would be taken toward an ominous end. The result would establish a precedent and a principle. The precedent would be this—that voting qualifications in the States can be changed by the Federal Government at Washington.

Once this precedent were established voting qualifications now existing in any or all the States could be abolished by the Federal Government. New voting qualifications, binding on the States, could be set up by the Federal Government.

POWER CENTRALIZATION

There is going on in America a broad movement tending toward a revolutionary effect. The effect is, mainly, centralization of power. The movement follows three broad lines—transfer of power from the States to the Federal Government, transfer of power from Congress to the executive branch of Government, loss by the individual citizen of rights previously possessed by him but now taken from him by the Federal Government.

This whole movement toward centralization would be greatly furthered by taking away from the States their present exclusive function of fixing the qualifications for voting.

Money—The Most Important Issue Before the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the twenty-first installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money.

In this installment reference is made to the language of the act of 1830, a law that is still on our statute books, section 311. That law maintains the value of our monetary unit, the dollar, of whatever material it may be composed—gold, silver, or paper.

The twenty-first installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

Why do the Senators on each side of this Chamber, under the leadership of the senior Senators from Indiana and New Jersey, and from Ohio and Rhode Island, claiming to represent the administration, insist upon and urge the passage of the pending bill without any amendment, simply repealing the purchasing clauses of the Sherman law, and wholly ignoring the most vital and essential part of the President's single and only recommendation?—

"Other legislative action putting beyond all doubt the intention and ability of the Government to fulfill its pecuniary obligations in money universally recognized by all civilized countries."

This is by far the most important part of this one recommendation of the President.

The charge is iterated and reiterated, day by day and week by week, that the Senators opposing the passage of the pending bill for simple unconditional repeal are obstructionists—are filibustering, whatever that may mean—and are opposing the wise and judicious recommendation of legislation by the

President. This is a false and unfounded charge. If there be obstructionists, it can only be those Senators who insist upon ignoring the most essential and necessary legislation recommended to our consideration.

I believe I am justified in saying, in behalf of the Senators opposing the pending bill, that we stand ready today, and will so stand throughout this struggle, ready and anxious to pass this bill with amendments, with "legislation putting beyond all mistake the intention and the ability of our Government to fulfill every one of its pecuniary obligations in money universally recognized by all civilized countries." We are not repudiationists. There is not one in this Senate, so far as I know. We are not inflationists. We do not believe in fiat money.

We advocate "honest money—the strict maintenance of the public faith—consisting of gold and silver and paper convertible into coin on demand," in the words of the national Democratic platform of 1880.

Again, Mr. President, "we believe in honest money, the gold and silver coinage of the Constitution, and a circulating medium convertible into such money without loss," as declared in the national Democratic platform of 1884, upon which the present President was first elected, and which was readopted in the platform of 1888.

We favor now legislation on this bill, not mere idle promises, "to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money, and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value," and we want now "to secure such equality by such safeguards of legislation," to be enacted now, and not merely promised, as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts."

We are now steadily, persistently, and consistently directing—not merely promising to direct—"the efforts of the Government and of this Senate to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States in the markets and in the payment of debts."

We want to engraft on the pending bill, not these idle promises contained in the bill, but the legislation therein promised and recommended by the President.

Is this obstruction? Is this filibustering? We are ready, waiting, to join the advocates of this bill in appropriate legislation to carry out and redeem the promises set forth in it.

We favor legislative action, not legislative promises. You may ask by what legislative action do we propose "to put beyond all doubt or mistake the intention and the ability of the Government to fulfill its pecuniary obligations in money universally recognized by all civilized countries"?

According to the American Yankee idea, I answer by propounding to you, What legislation do you propose? You are occupying the affirmative, you are promising legislation. The country and the Senate want to know what that legislation is. What does the President propose? We have his message. He has exercised his constitutional prerogative, and we know what it is. Is there anything there? That other legislation, which I have just quoted, to make manifest the intention of the Government to redeem all its pecuniary obligations in money recognized by all civilized countries.

We stand ready to carry out that kind of legislation; but the friends of this bill and the President have failed to tell the country what legislation they want. They are as dumb and as silent as oysters.

Mr. PALMER. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me to say a word?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. COCKRELL. With pleasure.

Mr. PALMER. The Executive has asked us to pass the pending bill. There is no silence about that.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is that a financial plan?

Mr. PALMER. Yes, sir; that is part of it.

Mr. COCKRELL. That, then, according to the Senator from Illinois, is the financial plan of the National Democratic Party of the United States, simply a patchwork to repeal the Sherman law.

Mr. PALMER. It required 6 days to create the world. This is one step in the direction of a financial policy.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then it is not a policy?

Mr. PALMER. It is not a policy.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is a step, a miserable, pitiful step on a broken leg. We want a system, a policy. What is this?

Mr. PALMER. May I be allowed to ask the Senator from Missouri, Will he present his plan? I understood the Senator to claim——

Mr. WOLCOTT. We cannot hear the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. It is impossible to hear the remarks of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PALMER. The Senator from Missouri claims that this is no plan. This is to remove an obstruction out of the way of a plan, but the Senators who complain of the silence of the supporters of this bill ought kindly to present a plan of their own, that the two may be contrasted; but, above all, Senators who have plans should come forward to the rescue and put their plans in comprehensible shape—something more than mere declamation for free silver. I submit that as an answer to the question.

Mr. COCKRELL. I submit that it is no answer at all. The President of the United States has convened the Congress in extraordinary session because of our financial condition. That is the expressed subject submitted to us and it is simply proposed, according to this bill, to repeal the power given in the Sherman law to purchase 4,500,000 ounces of silver per month, and stop there.

Mr. PALMER. The Senator is right. The bill proposes no more and no less than that; but it is an essential part of any financial or any monetary measure——

Mr. COCKRELL. And that leaves us upon the Sherman law of 1873, establishing the single gold standard, and giving to gold only the right of coinage.

Mr. PALMER. I will say frankly to the Senator that it leaves all laws in force other than the one repealed.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is the only law on the subject in force. The Senator cannot evade that.

Mr. PALMER. That is a matter of judgment for the Senator himself.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Senator to show any other law on the subject that would be in force.

Mr. PALMER. Whatever other provisions the law makes are in force. The silver dollars are left by law a legal tender.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no doubt about that; I stated that. But what law is there recognizing the right of silver to coinage?

Mr. PALMER. Oh!

Mr. COCKRELL. What law is there that does not make gold the single standard in this country and the only metal that is admitted to coinage?

Mr. PALMER. This bill only does what it professes to do. That is all.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes; and we are not going to permit you to evade the issue. This bill, if passed, places the United States Government on the single gold standard.

Mr. PALMER. The Senator will pardon me for saying one word more. He has argued elaborately that that was done by the act of 1873.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then this bill puts the act of 1873 in force again.

Mr. PALMER. I think not.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no question about that. I think if the Senator will look over the law he will see that that is the case.

Mr. PALMER. I understand the law which makes a silver dollar a legal tender is unrepealed.

Mr. COCKRELL. Everybody knows that; but is there any law authorizing the coinage of a solitary silver dollar after this bill is passed? Is there any law authorizing any coinage except gold coinage?

Mr. PALMER. None, I think, except the discretionary power contained in the act itself.

Mr. COCKRELL. To coin the bullion on hand, and no further and no more than that.

Mr. PALMER. There is none that I know of.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is right. Now we understand each other. This bill does not give any additional power, not a particle.

Mr. VOORHEES. I do not intend to interfere in the debate. My attention was called yesterday by the senior Senator from Ohio, Mr. Sherman, to a continuing provision of law, of which I was not aware the other day when I was on the floor, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase bullion for subsidiary coin.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no doubt about that; I do not dispute that.

Mr. VOORHEES. I am not interfering in the debate. I merely wanted to contribute that fact to the general knowledge upon this subject.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. VOORHEES. That is a large discretion which might extend to $100,000,000. We have seventy-seven millions of subsidiary coin now, and it is generally understood that it ought to be more.

I did not rise as I said, however, for the purpose of interfering in the debate, but merely to contribute that fact, that future silver coinage is provided for by a general and continuing law making such coinage a legal tender for $10.

Mr. COCKRELL. For $10?

Mr. VOORHEES. Yes.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no question in the world about the power to coin the subsidiary silver, which is a legal tender for five or ten dollars, as I believe it is now.

Mr. VOORHEES. Yes.

Mr. COCKRELL. It was increased to $10. That law is continued. Nobody denies that. That is a class distinction between the toiling masses. We provide a subsidiary silver coin, half and quarter dollars, dimes and half dimes, a legal tender for $10, for the laboring and toiling millions; but for the millionaires, the aristocrats, and the plutocrats, we only furnish gold, the precious gold. We do not degrade them by making them carry around silver, which is a legal tender for only $10. I am opposed to class legislation on money or on anything else.

I will answer the question I asked. What do you propose? In order to do so, however, we must see what are the existing pecuniary obligations of our Government, and in what kind of money they are payable according to the terms of the obligations, and the laws existing when created and when payable.

It can be safely said that every civilized country, every nation in the world, claims and recognizes that its pecuniary obligations can be and must be equitably and fully paid in the money called for and specified in the obligations, etc., which was a full legal tender for such payment when the obligations were created and when they are to be paid. That is a sound principle of law, national and international.

If the obligations specify the kind or character of money or currency in which they are to be paid, then they can only be paid in such specified money. If the obligations do not specify the kind of money and only specify the amount, then they can be lawfully and equitably paid in any full legal-tender money. If the coin or paper money was a full legal tender at the time the obligation was created,

and is such full legal tender when it matures, then no question of equity or good faith can ever arise.

The demand for any other coin or paper money would be in direct violation of the obligation and open practical repudiation and dishonesty.

The existing pecuniary obligations of our Government are as follows:

Funded loan of 1891, issued under law of July 14, 1870, 2 percent	$25,364,500.00
Funded loan of 1907, issued under law of July 14, 1870, 4 percent	559,605,700.00
Refunding certificates, issued under law of Feb. 26, 1879, 4 percent	67,390.00
Total interest-bearing bonds	585,037,590.00
Old matured debt, not presented for payment; interest ceased	1,984,770.26
United States notes, legal tenders, or greenbacks	346,681,016.00
Old demand notes, national-bank notes, redemption fund, and fractional currency	27,643,243.37
Gold certificates	79,756,819.00
Silver certificates	330,864,504.00
Certificates of depcsit under act June 8, 1872, in exchange for greenbacks	8,285,000.00
Treasury notes of 1890	151,319,040.00
Pacific Railroad bonds	64,623,512.00

The funded loans of 1891 and 1907 are Government pecuniary obligations issued under the law of July 14, 1870, which required that the bonds should be "redeemable in coin of the present standard value." * * * "And the said bonds shall have set forth and expressed upon their face the above specified conditions." Each one of those bonds specifies the law under which isued, and then has in plain English upon its face set forth and expressed, "is redeemable in coin of the standard value of the United States on said July 14, 1870, with interest in such coin."

The senior Senator from Ohio doubtless had charge of this refunding law in its passage, and was determined to protect the interests of the purchasers and holders of such bonds and maintain unsullied the public faith. Hence the requirements of the law and the language of the bonds, about which there can be no question of good faith or honesty. They are payable at the option of the Government, by the recognized laws of every civilized nation, in coin money of the standard value of the United States on said July 14, 1870. And no man living can truthfully say or pretend that the coin of the standard value on said day and now was other than the silver dollar of 412½ grains, 9 parts fine, and the gold dollar of 25.8 grains, 9 parts fine. They were the coin money specified in the law and on the face of the bonds. They can be just as equitably and legally paid in the standard silver dollar, then and now a full legal tender in all payments, as in the gold dollar, without the least particle of tarnishing the public honor or breaking the public faith.

As to the refunding certificates and certificates of deposit, they were issued in exchange for lawful money and are payable in any full legal-tender money.

The old matured debt can be paid in honesty and good faith in the standard silver dollar.

The United States notes or greenbacks, the old demand notes, national-bank notes, and fractional currency can also be paid in honesty and good faith in standard silver dollars.

But, Mr. President, it seems that there is some dispute about the right to pay silver or redeem the greenbacks in standard silver dollars. It seems that the administration has some scruples about redeeming greenbacks, United States legal-tender notes, in the standard silver dollars. Can they be honestly and justly paid in the standard silver dollar? Let me read what the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio said. You know he is not a greenbacker, nor a populist, nor a repudiationist. I quote from the speech of the senior Senator from Ohio, on the 11th day of April, 1876, on a bill then pending in the Senate in regard to fractional currency and silver coinage. That Senator then said:

"But the vital question presented by the amendments of the committee is the restoration of the silver dollar. Why restore the silver dollar when it is now so depreciated by the events that I have named? Well, sir, the answer is that we have a large amount, some $400,000,000 of United States notes, which now are a legal tender for all purposes, and the time has arrived when we can redeem them all with the old dollar of the United States. We do not create a dollar; we simply provide for its issue. The law was, I have shown you, up to 1873, that this old silver dollar could be tendered for the payment of all debts; but it was simply not coined because the silver dollar was worth more than the gold dollar. Does that prevent us from coining it? Not in the least."

* * * * *

"The silver dollar was, it is true, a legal tender until 1873, and, in strict law, might be restored to its former position as a standard of value without a violation of the legal contract between the United States and the bondholder."

Mr. President, is not that pretty good authority? But I wish to put this question still further beyond the possibility of a doubt. We all remember with great pleasure our late distinguished associate and colleague from the State of Vermont, one of the ablest jurists in the United States. I refer to ex-Senator Edmunds. Ex-Senator Edmunds, in 1886, said what I shall quote. I quoted Senator Sherman in 1876, before the passage of the Bland law. I now quote Senator Edmunds in 1886, after we had had the silver dollar in circulation for 8 years:

"Mr. EDMUNDS. It may be that I should agree with the Senator from Kentucky—I certainly agree with him that the silver coin of the United States is just as good a legal tender for every bond and debt of the United States that does not say gold coin exclusively, if there be such a one, as the gold is—and so far and to that extent I am just as strong a silver man as my friend from Kentucky is."

Is there a doubting Thomas now left in the Senate Chamber?

Mr. GRAY. Doubting as to what?

Mr. COCKRELL. That the standard silver dollar can equitably and justly be paid in the redemption of the greenback and of the funded loan of 1891 and 1907.

Mr. GRAY. I never heard anyone express a doubt that it could be legally so used.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then I am gratified that we have other distinguished jurists who confirm everything that I have said, and confirm what the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Vermont stated.

How Long?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission granted me, I include a timely editorial from the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot, which is as follows:

HOW LONG?

Because the Chrysler Corporation refused to supply coveralls to 19 welders, 2,000 workers refused to continue to supply guns and tanks to American fighting men. That doesn't make sense. But it seems to be a fact.

Because the War Labor Board has not acted on a petition for wage increases, bus drivers in Lansing refused to take workers to plants which are making munitions needed by our Army and Navy.

Because the demands of the United Mine Workers have not been met by the War Labor Board, a half million miners threaten to strike next week, when John L. Lewis' period of "truce" expires.

And we are at war! We are surrounded by powerful, vicious enemies. Secretary Stimson says our losses in Tunisia were heavy. American bombers attacking Europe are brought down daily with their brave crews by enemy planes. Many American boys are giving their lives in bleak Attu just as others perished on fever-scourged Guadalcanal.

The enemy has not been conquered. The Axis is still powerful and still resourceful. It has not yet been challenged where it is strongest—in Europe and in Asia.

But in this country Americans are quarreling over small things which have no relation to life or death.

Americans, praying for victory, praying for the survival of their sons, praying for the safety of democracy, well may ask, "How long, O Lord, how long?"

Some will indict workers and their leaders. But is that entirely fair? The men and women who work in munitions plants are patriotic. They want to win this war. They want to protect their own boys who are fighting. They are good Americans. The fault is in Washington.

Faced with troubles abroad, our Government is strong and purposeful; but faced with perplexities at home, our Government lacks courage or determination. Admittedly the situation is not easy. Mr. Roosevelt has temporized so long with John L. Lewis and others who flout his wartime leadership that his course now is beset by menace.

But the people are becoming impatient. They want to get along with the business of victory. Few will join Virginia's powerful newspaper, the Richmond News Leader, in demanding that "if the President does not go the absolute limit in dealing with these [coal] strikers he should be impeached." But many will share the hope that Mr. Roosevelt and his administration will conclude to abandon compromise and dilly-dallying and refuse to tolerate further sabotage of production.

Let inequities be adjusted where they actually exist. But let no interest, whether the interes' of employer or employee, union or individual, transcend the interest of the Nation in its fight for survival.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Manufacturer Shows Nation Pattern for Meeting Problems of Manpower Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am hereby

calling attention to a highly successful plan which has been worked out by Max L. Rysdon, president of the Sioux Steel Co., for meeting the increasingly serious problem of manpower shortages. The Sioux Steel Co. is one of the large manufacturers of farm equipment such as grain bins, brooder houses, and hog troughs. Equipment of this type is of vital importance to midwestern farmers trying to increase their food production to meet the needs of the United Nations and the initiative and success of this company in making almost a complete conversion from manpower to womanpower sets a pattern for all America and establishes a record which deserves high commendation.

The following article from the Daily Argus Leader, of Sioux Falls, in its Sunday edition of May 16 gives a detailed report of this inspiring experiment:

HAVING MANPOWER TROUBLE?—GALS "TAKE OVER" AT SIOUX STEEL—45 WOMEN, 16 MEN NOW EMPLOYED BY COMPANY

(By Bob Jones)

For a man whose pet theory has been blasted, Max Rysdon, president of the Sioux Steel Co., in Sioux Falls, is mighty happy these days.

As recently as last December he would have placed a bet on his belief that there was no place for women employees in his plant. The work involved in manufacturing agricultural equipment from sheet metal was too heavy and too exacting for any but strong, experienced men, he thought.

Under the impact of war and the manpower shortage, however, that picture has changed radically. Rysdon is now employing 45 women, capable of handling nearly every step in the production system, and only 16 men, largely in a supervisory capacity.

"It became a question of taking the best from a large reservoir of womanpower or hiring every man that came along, regardless of his qualifications," Rysdon says.

The women are satisfied with the arrangement—under Government order they draw equal pay for equal work along with the men.

And the men have come to admit, somewhat grudgingly, of course, that the women are turning out the work in a satisfactory manner.

Rysdon is the authority for the statement that this for-the-duration revolution is really working. In some lines of work calling for sharp eyes and steady fingers, production has zoomed. He is convinced that there will be a place for women in the plant after the war.

Success of the Sioux Steel conversion to womanpower has been hailed by Government officials as outstanding in the Northwest, especially by selective-service representatives who have been warning employers to train replacements for all able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 45, regardless of dependency.

COULD BE COPIED

And to W. L. Mull, War Manpower Commission representative for this area, the Sioux Steel experiment is a model that could well be followed by every industrial concern.

While extending employment of women to the present high level, Rysdon learned many things—some to be expected, others anything but self-evident.

For example, it came as a distinct shock to him to discover how readily inexperienced women employees could adapt themselves to routine tasks so necessary in a plant where teamwork is all-important in achieving production results.

Women workers have proved exceptionally adept in jobs requiring unvarying repetition of movements and manual dexterity.

"It's a funny thing," Rysdon said. "If you show a woman a specific way to do a job, she will follow it as closely as she can. A man, on the other hand, is inclined to experiment a little, to see if he can't work out a better system."

On the debit side, Rysdon found that a woman employee will usually complete an assignment task, then wait for further instructions, while a man is likely to look around for something else to do and needs less supervision.

TEMPERAMENT PROBLEM

Then there is the question of temperament. When a dispute flares among women immediate attention of a masterful abitrator is needed. And because women are exceedingly conscientious they are more resentful of criticism than thick-skinned men.

On the other hand, a word of praise for a job well done works wonders for production.

Surprising has been the absence of industrial accidents, although a great majority of the women had no previous factory experience. Special guards now cover moving parts of heavy machinery, of course, but women appear to be more cautious than inexperienced men.

PRODUCTION PLAN CHANGED

With the introduction of women workers it became necessary to revise the entire production set-up at Sioux Steel.

The 16 men, all old hands at the plant, were placed in responsible, supervisory positions, where they check all operations at regular intervals, make all adjustments of machinery, and set the dies for each new task.

When women take over their assignments are worked out in detail, with nothing left to chance. Men are also charged with the responsibility for machinery maintenance, something not necessary when nearly every employee was a mechanic.

When the experiment was begun last December a few women were employed to do light work. The range of tasks was extended as the manpower shortage became more critical, and now women load trucks with steel and do similar heavy work.

Two of the women regularly work all day at a job which requires them to lift 35-pound sheets of steel onto a power shears.

When women moved in at the plant, some of the men felt obligated to assist them with the more difficult work. A supervisor prepared to lend a hand with a heavy load of steel one day, when the object of his chivalry turned and said, "Listen, you blankety-blank-blank, don't you think I can do a day's work?" He has never touched a load of steel since.

Sioux Steel has required no special training for women employees, finding it better to train them in a specific operation at the plant. None of them hold supervisory positions at the present time, but Rysdon considers it entirely possible that with a few years of experience, some of the women will be capable of holding such jobs.

PRODUCTION RAISED

As an example of a task that women do unusually well, Rysdon called attention to the manufacture of adjustable furnace pipe elbows. The item must be processed exactly right—if sections fit too loosely, they fall apart; if they are too tight they are not adjustable.

Previously the most skilled workmen handled the operation, but 8 women are now making excellent elbows, and have boosted production some 20 percent above the highest level ever attained by men.

Similarly, inexperienced women were tried at the soldering process.

Because of natural neatness and attention to detail, they soon achieved proficiency at turning out smooth jobs.

Industrial magazines had carried the information that members of the "weaker" sex are physically incapable of operations requiring a circular swinging motion, such as hammering, but Rysdon has found that some women can use a hammer as readily as any carpenter.

The problem of absenteeism, high among women who are also trying to maintain a home, was met by hiring more employees than were actually needed at any one time. It was necessary to rule, however, that any employee absent without advance notice or a good excuse would be eliminated from the organization.

"Those that stood the test now seem to realize the importance of teamwork," Rysdon said. "It was necessary to drop about 10 women who were not dependable, but you would probably find the same thing in a group of 60 men, selected more or less at random."

LESS DISCIPLINE

Discipline at the plant has been relaxed somewhat, however. Men would work from 8 a. m. until noon without a break, but if a woman decides she wants a sandwich or coffee at 10 a. m., she'll have it, no matter what the boss says or thinks.

"Employment of women has meant a big job of reorganization," Rysdon declared. "But we're satisfied down here—the work is going out on schedule."

Mission to Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 19, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the movie, Mission to Moscow, based upon the book written by Ambassador Joseph E. Davies, is now being shown in theaters all over this country. The movie distorts the truth and gives a wrong impression to the people of America concerning Russia and its people. As Dorothy Thompson said in her review of the picture:

> The film is phony; the characters are phony; the history is phony; and the understanding of our people after seeing the picture will be distorted rather than clarified. * * * The picture is full of fiction presented as fact.

I personally consider this film as the greatest propaganda effort ever put out with the approval and sanction of our Government officials. It purports to be the truth about Russia but it is anything but the truth. According to this film one would be led to believe that the Soviet Union is the only blameless, honest, kind, and really peace-loving government in the world. According to this film the United States, Great Britain, and France forced Stalin, much against his will, to embrace Hitler by signing a nonaggression pact early in the war. According to this film Russian aggression against Finland was justified. According to this film the British and Polish Ambassadors were either clowns or fools. According to this film the United States Senate is composed of isolationists and idiots. Why, oh why, should such a misrepresentation be sanctioned and approved by our public officials and put over on the American people? Why

cannot the truth about the war; its causes, its progress, its objectives, be told the American people? Is it because the truth might set us free, and the "four freedoms" do not embrace the real freedom that comes as a result of knowing the truth?

The following editorial from the Daily Post-Tribune of La Salle, Ill., one of the leading newspapers of my district, gives such an excellent review of this propaganda film Mission to Moscow that I recommend it as required reading for my colleagues in the House:

MISSION TO MOSCOW

The eminent liberal philosopher, John Dewey, and Suzanne, of the Wisconsin La Follettes, have taken the trouble to check the film Mission to Moscow against former Ambassador Joseph E. Davies' book of the same name, on which the picture supposedly is based.

Their research confirms what many who have seen the film and read the book felt, without exerting themselves to verify their suspicions. The picture plays fast and loose with the book.

This might be of no particular consequence if the picture were designed as a romance, a drama, a musical—anything in the pure entertainment field. Such criticism would be picayunish if the departures were technical—such as often are required to satisfy screen demands for continuity, cohesion, and coherence.

But that is not the case. All the changes tend toward one obvious objective, which is achieved by them. They make the film what the book was not—in the words of Professor Dewey and Miss La Follette, "totalitarian propaganda for mass production—a propaganda which falsifies history through distortion, omission, or pure invention of facts."

To mention only a few of the discrepancies uncovered by the two critics:

The film, but not the book, shows Marshal Tukhachevsky being tried and condemned as a conspirator. The marshal, in fact, was executed secretly, without trial, more than a year before the film purports to have him in court.

The film shows Ambassaador Davies accepting instantly the guilt of the purge-trial victims, though the book records his concern because they were denied the elements of what Americans consider a fair trial.

The picture shows Moscow as gay, festive, and happy. But the book records "horrifying" terror, with no household but lived in fear of "a nocturnal raid by the secret police."

The picture shows Stalin driven to his pact with Hitler by Anglo-American appeasement, with no reference to our desperate efforts to conclude a defensive alliance with Moscow.

Mr. Davies, back in the United States, is shown touring the country, ignoring his poor health, fighting isolationism. The fact is that the ex-Ambassador's swing around the circuit was made after Pearl Harbor, when the Nation already was united in support of the war that had been forced upon us.

There appears nowhere in the film any mention that it was Communist organizations, under orders from Moscow, which interfered in every way possible with our defense preparations and that VITO MARCANTONIO, consistent "Red fronter," cast one of the few congressional votes against conscription.

Ridiculously distorted efforts are made in the film—but not in the book—to create an impression that Russia is our ally against Japan, ignoring the fact that only this year Moscow renewed her nonaggression pact with Tokyo.

The obvious purpose of the film is to promote American friendship toward Russia by hiding and distorting facts.

It is essential that the United States and Britain work in close harmony with Russia in this war and in the peace to come. It is not essential that the American people be lulled to sleep, making us do all the cooperating while Russia makes the rules.

Conceding the good intentions of the picture makers, we think they have done a real disservice to the cause of democracy.

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of a statement by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] before the Senate Finance Committee on May 19, 1943, on the extension of the reciprocal-trade agreements.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The legislative power never stood in greater jeopardy in this country than it does at this moment. The conflict between the Congress and the bureaucracy reaches its crisis in this bill to extend the Trade Agreements Act without the right of legislative review. If it is passed in this form, the Executive power will have won a decisive victory over the legislative power from which Congress will find it difficult to recover.

The issue involved is not whether international trade is good or bad, whether it should be encouraged, nor, indeed, whether tariff rates should in normal times be worked out by experts of the Tariff Commission and other Government agencies without reference to Congress. It is simply whether in the greatest international crisis in which this country has ever been engaged the Congress of the United States should voluntarily abdicate its power over international economic reorganization.

This committee on March 2 unanimously reported to the Senate the resolution introduced by its chairman providing for the organization of a special committee "to investigate all matters relating to post-war economic reorganization and problems." That resolution was adopted. The committee was appointed and it is now in existence under the specific instructions of the Senate "to make accessible to the Congress the most complete information respecting post-war economic policy and post-war problems that is available, to the end that Congress may be advised respecting those problems and in a position to formulate solutions with respect to them which will result in the greatest contribution by the Congress to the achievement of a stable economy and a just peace."

It is inconceivable to me that a committee of the United States Senate which has such a concept of the power and responsibilities of the Congress should now, within less than 3 months, give its approval, without amendment, to a measure which in effect completely delegates to the Executive all legislative power with respect to post-war economic policy.

There is no authority in this country which can strip Congress of its power to serve the people except the Congress itself. If this measure passes without retaining some form or semblance of congressional supervision over the arrangements that are to be made during the next 2 or 3 years to shape international economic policies, Congress will have reduced itself to a position of impotence in the very field in which it owes to the people of the United States its ablest and most unremitting endeavors.

For fully 20 years the Executive has been building itself up at the expense of Congress, which, unfortunately, has been too ready to acquiesce in the transfer of its constitutional powers to the constantly multiplying boards, commissions, and bureaus. Nowhere has the diminution of congressional power been more manifest than in the field of international relations. Whereas in the early history of our country most international compacts were in the form of treaties, the last several decades have seen a complete reversal of the method of international arrangement. We now have more Executive agreements by far than we have treaties. Indeed there have been more Executive agreements during the last 25 years than during the entire previous history of the Government.

There has been a growing tendency in the State Department to regard the executive as more significant and important than the legislative branch of the Government. Nowhere I think has this new view of the comparative importance of these two branches of government been more clearly, and also more naively, expressed than by Hon. Francis B. Sayre, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, in his testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee on April 14.

He was asked to say how many of the reciprocal-trade agreements into which this country has already entered required legislative approval in the countries with which they have been made. It is a shocking thing to consider that while the Congress of the United States has nonchalantly surrendered its right to review these agreements on behalf of the people whom they represent, in only 4 of the 26 countries with which we have made these agreements does the legislative branch have nothing to say about the approval of the pacts. In the remaining 22 countries the legislative power of review is retained.

Explaining this contrast which reflects so sadly on our devotion to the principles of popular government as compared with the countries with which we have negotiated, Mr. Sayre said:

"I would like to add that with respect to many of these, they are agreements with countries under the parliamentary system of government. By that, of course, you realize the executive is in control of legislative action. So long as the executive, the prime minister, remains in power, he can command the action of the legislative so that an agreement entered into, agreed by the executive, sanctioned by the prime minister, practically is assured of legislative support. That is, in those countries one does not have the distinction, the separation, I mean, between legislative and executive functions."

It would be difficult to imagine a stranger or more unwarranted distortion of the realities of the parliamentary system. Under a parliamentary government the executive is not in control of legislative action, as Mr. Sayre so blandly asserts. The legislative power is at all times in complete control of executive action, and when the prime minister acts, he acts with the understanding that his policy must be the policy of the legislative arm at the peril of his own political existence.

The truth of the matter, however, is that Mr. Sayre's conception of the superiority of the executive to the legislative power is shared by his associates in the Department of State, as evidenced by the recently published book on International Executive Agreements, by Mr. Wallace McClure, of the State Department

staff. Let me quote from Mr. McClure (p. 252 of his book):

"It is believed that the President has, and was intended to have, under the Constitution, all the powers and functions of the head of a fully recognized member of the society of nations; that he has, accordingly, the authority to enter into any manner of international act, on any subject, that is entered into by other states of the world; and that, while this power must be exercised without violation of the Constitution and in accommodation with other possibly conflicting powers granted by the Constitution, notably, the powers of the legislature, an Executive agreement not in contravention of the Constitution and not in conflict with any act of Congress (best shown by positive congressional confirmation either before or after signature) is binding on all of the Executive and all the law-enforcing agencies of the Government and is the equivalent of law."

Again from page 363 I quote the following:

"The President can do by Executive agreement anything that he can do by treaty, providing Congress by law cooperates and there is a very wide field of action in which the cooperation of Congress is not necessary: indeed, where Congress possesses no constitutional authority to dissent."

Surely in the light of this it is unnecessary to argue that if the Congress passes this bill in its present form it will voluntarily eliminate itself from all Executive participation in post-war reorganization.

Already we are being told that it will be unnecessary to end this war by a treaty of peace. Indeed, it has been suggested that it would be preferable to have no definitive treaty, but to allow the executive arm of the Government, through its military and diplomatic branches, to conduct post-war reconstruction. If this policy be coupled with the policy set forth in this bill by which the Congress is effectively bypassed, then, obviously, the elected representatives of the people of the United States will be without voice in the reorganization of the new world.

It is said that we do not dare to reassert the legislative power of the people of the United States through the Congress lest the other countries of the world gain the notion that we are to be too jealous of the rights and advantages of our own people. Mr. Sayre's testimony that 22 of the 26 nations with which we have already negotiated reciprocal trade agreements preserve the right of legislative review is, of course, a complete answer to this argument. The Parliament of Great Britain has not surrendered its authority to review trade agreements. The legislators of Canada have not surrendered their power. We are already talking of four great united nations who are to dominate the new world that is to arise after the war. With two of these, Russia and China, we have as yet no reciprocal trade agreement. What is to be done by way of trade with these powers will shape the economic destiny of the world. Poor China has been buffeted around so much by the great powers in the past that it may not as yet have developed a national consciousness strong enough to resist the will of its allies, but surely no one will say that Russia will abandon its policy of enlightened self-interest, as it sees it, for fear of being misunderstood by the other nations of the world. Only in the United States are the representatives of the people expected to put blinders on their eyes and gags in their mouths lest their purposes be misunderstood.

If the Congress of the United States, at the threshold of this great crisis, voluntarily eliminates itself from an active part in reviewing the international economic arrangements that are to be made, then it, and it alone, will be to blame if, in the reorganization that is to come, the people of this country will be forced to play the role of Santa Claus for the entire world, while other and more realistic nations protect the interests of their populations.

Let no one imagine that this is not a real danger. We delude ourselves if we think that the international trade of this era is to be compared with that of previous generations. As Mr. Sayre said in his testimony to the House committee:

"It is quite clear that no figures since then (1939) could throw any further light upon the issues, for the world has been at war, and trade has been dominated by war supply and war blockade, the submarine campaign, the incursions of the enemy, the strategic use of scarce shipping, and the necessities of military operations."

The picture is more unreal as compared with the traditional world trade than even Mr. Sayre's description, for trade in our time is no longer a matter of the exchange of goods and commodities by individual producers and traders, it is a matter of Government loans, Government finance, and international cartels. In all the testimony which has been given in support of these agreements, little or nothing has been said about Government purchases of gold, the devaluation of the dollar, and the operations of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, testifying to the House Ways and Means Committee on April 13, spoke of the "health restoration of our inter-American trade from the perilously low level of $472,000,000 in 1932 to $961,000,000 in 1939." No reference is made to the commitments and authorizations of the Export-Import Bank of Washington to Latin America, which amount, as of May 17 of this year, to $757,134,014.79.

There is respectable conservative financial authority for the statement that in international trade one must never expect all debts to be paid, that trade must be kept alive by systems of credit which do not necessarily involve either exchange of commodities or eventual payment of debt. At this moment the Government of Great Britain has submitted to us the Keynes plan to provide international credit after the war and, incidentally, to neutralize our gold supply. The Department of the Treasury has its experts working on another plan of international credit to be carried on by bookkeeping manipulation of symbols. The whole purpose of both Governments is to maintain markets without trade.

It is not for me to discuss this phase of the problem. Suffice it to say that it is an integral part of the problem of international trade. It is an integral part of the reciprocal trade program. It is an integral part of economic reconstruction after the war. Obviously, if we delegate to the executive arm of the Government the control over international trade embodied in this bill, we shall be withdrawing from the people of the United States the power to supervise the program to which we are to be committed. That is a surrender of the principles of popular government to which I cannot give adherence.

O. P. A. and Small Business

REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today representatives of small businessmen throughout the Nation are appealing, some of them to the Congress, most of them to the Office of Price Administration, and some organizations direct to the President, for relief from arbitrary controls of their businesses that are rapidly retarding distribution as well as the production of food and many of the industrial necessities for the use of the civilian population. The leaders of many such organizations have branded the policies of the O. P. A. as "economic murder." Mr. Rowland Jones, Jr., Washington representative of the National Association of Retail Druggists, speaking, he said, for the 28,000 independent retail druggists, charged that "the real purpose of O. P. A. is the establishment of a socialistic system," and added that the present policies of the O. P. A. lead in that direction.

The voice of the smaller businessmen, who are the backbone of this Nation and who are carrying the greatest financial load of any segment of our people in financing this war, must be heard and acted upon by this Congress. Fortunately for the smaller businessmen, the Members of this body who have waited patiently for improvement in methods of price control on the O. P. A., are becoming impatient to the point of drastic action. Soon the power of Congress must be brought to bear unless better judgment speedily takes the place of untried theory in this department.

At this point I want to place in the RECORD a letter from Hoffman Clothiers, Centralia, Ill., one of the really great retail clothing houses in the southern part of the State. The men who own this store helped to win the First World War in active service, and like thousands of smaller businessmen in your various districts are contributing greatly to the community and civic life of this Nation. They, like your businessmen, are doing a great service toward winning the war on the home front. They are leading the bond drives and buying bonds to finance the war. I hope every Member takes the time to read Mr. Hoffman's letter, which I am now inserting in the RECORD:

CENTRALIA, ILL., *May 15, 1943.*

Congressman CHARLES VURSELL,
Twenty-third District, Illinois,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Having established a most successful retail business whose volume now exceeds $175,000 annually, we are quite concerned about recent Office of Price Administration Regulations, M. P. R. 339 and M. P. R., Amendment 3.

We are thoroughly convinced that the very future of our business is seriously threatened by the regulations referred to. Inasmuch as it has been our policy to always feature standard merchandise of a higher quality and nationally known and advertised, it causes no little alarm to see the very foundation of our success seriously threatened by these new Office of Price Administration regulations.

Our business was founded in 1899 on the soundest of principles, high-standard merchandise of known quality at the lowest possible cost to the consumer. The business has grown with this established policy so that today a most enviable position in the retail field is enjoyed in this area.

We feature such outstanding merchandise as Hart Schaffner & Marx clothing, Manhattan shirts, Interwoven hose, Nunn-Bush shoes, Dobbs and Mallory hats, Hickok belts,

Hartmann luggage, Cheney neckwear, Oshkosh overalls, Fownes gloves, and lines of similar character To destroy the identity of the merchandise just mentioned would be equivalent to the abolishing of free speech with no necessity for radios, newspapers, or magazines. The consumer, too, would suffer by this change of policy inasmuch as he would be at the mercy of unscrupulous distributors, compelled to pay whatever the seller chose to charge him and he'd never be sure of the quality.

We are soliciting your aid in our behalf to defeat, if possible, the threat to our very retail existence. Your broad knowledge and your extreme fairness will enable you to realize the unfairness of the present policy of the Office of Price Administration.

Your wholehearted help at this critical time will certainly be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

HOFFMAN CLOTHIERS,
NORMAN HOFFMAN.

"The Anti-Poll-Tax Bill"

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. NEWSOME

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, I was elected to Congress under the laws, the rules, and the regulations set up by the people of Alabama covering such elections.

These laws are written in our State constitution and are in keeping with our rights under the basic law of the Federal Constitution.

Anything to the contrary is in violation of the law.

Having been elected under the laws, rules, and regulations set up by my people makes me truly their Representative in Congress.

Accountable to no authority on this earth but them, my conscience, and the national welfare, I have accepted this responsibility and I will account to them for my actions.

Legislation as covered in H. R. 7, the anti-poll-tax bill, is clearly unconstitutional, for if the Congress has the power to set aside by simple legislation any constitutional provision of any State, then this power is the beginning of the end of local self-government.

By action such as this, the Congress is creating a definite tension in our southern attitude, tending toward disunity and bitterness. It is an act against the basis of race relationship as it exists in the South.

The South likes the real Negro, and if you really have his welfare at heart, you will not change the relationship which now exists.

There is no limit to the friendly and generous cooperation which can normally be expected, but if the southern Negro is to be made ashamed of his race and his specialized racial distinctions by the effort, and in the hope that by legislation, he can immediately assume a position of social equality, then the real Negro, as well as the people of the Nation, are in for an unhappy time.

I believe that it is essential that the friends of the Negro attempt to restore to him pride in his own race and in his belief in southern friendship and cooperation.

So long as he is surly and discontented and a defeatist as a Negro, so long will he invite hostility and lack of cooperation.

A falsely generated lack of pride in his race stock and distrust and lack of understanding of the distinct assets of his race result in a hopeless complex of defeatism and a cruel desire to be something he is not.

If it were not for the Negro's extraordinary capacity for happiness and freedom from worry, this complex would have an ominous result upon the Negro himself.

The South is now in a condition of vast turmoil. Huge plants for numerous war purposes are being located in this area, with reckless waste and revolutionary methods of employment. These plants are frequently operated by organizations from other States, indifferent to the permanent adverse effects on the local area, or to the post-war economics of that area.

Wage policies and union organizations, struggling for dues, members, and power are carrying the wage scales for white and black to levels which private industry and a solvent economy cannot possibly sustain. Migration, always the curse of skill and craftsmanship, is the order of the day. The Negro, as a result of this high pressure, is receiving real wages beyond anything in the experience of the race, and the Negro rarely looks ahead.

In this situation, there is, of course, no justification whatever for efforts to instill in the Negro's mind the idea that he is abused, and that the southerner does not like him, and that he will never get his rights until he gets a free and unconditional right to vote, can attend school and church with the whites and would not be sent to the penitentiary if he persuaded some white woman of the alleys to marry him. There has never been discrimination in this area as to employment of Negroes. They have the full population ratio or more in substantially every heavy industry, such as mines, foundries, pipe shops, car-building plants, and so forth. They are, therefore, realizing their full share of the huge increases in wages paid by public works and enforced generally by Federal authority.

The effort to convince the Negro that he is abused and must lay down his terms now is, for the most part, based strictly on hostility to the South, and on an effort to gain the Negro vote in the North and East.

This is not a sincere move in the interest of the development of the Negro, but is a struggle for political power.

The poll tax, levied necessarily without discrimination, and therefore within the law of the land, is not oppressive or discriminatory against the Negro.

The reason for this anti-poll-tax legislation is entirely political, even though it is clothed in a humanitarian guise.

The South's firm, but kindly, insistence on segregation and on laws against miscenegation is not resented by the genuine Negro of the South. Those immutable laws, applicable to both races, are based on sound and nondiscriminatory custom and legislation, and are for the furtherance of helpful association and cooperation.

They are, in fact, the only basis on which association and cooperation is possible.

Legislation such as this comes about because the emotional reformers and the professional agitators and those seeking power find it easier to simplify the interracial problem by mongrelizing it rather than by facing it.

Traditions and customs, based on the course of centuries, cannot be repealed by simple legislative action.

The specialized characteristics of the Negro, however admirable and fitted to long-range destiny, have never developed along lines that would suggest that they should be merged with the white man to absorb and dilute the racial characteristics of both races.

We of the South, having long since adopted segregation as a basic principle of local self-government, have not concerned ourselves with documenting that principle.

In meeting the organized drive against its racial attitude, the people of the South have had few spokesmen. We would not embarrass our colored people by criticism of their characteristics or their philosophy. We hesitate to embarrass our people by debating publicly the necessity for a kindly but imperative segregation.

That determination is both obvious and instinctive and need not be rationalized to meet the propaganda now directed against it.

The reaction of the senses and the instinctive sense of difference obviously points to the fact that the South's conclusion finds a racial basis among students of genetics, and, therefore, may legitimately be adopted on that ground alone by a self-governing people as a basis for custom or for law.

That law of genetics which holds good in every stock bulletin, and on every farm cannot be "prejudice" when it reaches toward the most sensitive of all human relationships, that of marriage, with its inexpressible intimacy.

There is not involved in this argument any academic question of superiority. It is a certainty as to the differences and specialization to which the respective races are entitled and which, as a natural right, should be maintained.

There are few of us in the South whose first and earliest memories do not attest to the kindness and unique qualities of the Negro, and, like all races, they have among them many of the most guileless and honorable characters that I have ever known.

Believing, as I do, in the constantly improving destiny of the Negro, I believe that he has those qualities which qualify him for an enlarging place of

dignity and usefulness in society, and that this can be best achieved by characteristic developments along racial lines. We believe that he should have pride in his race and in his racial integrity, and confidence in his destiny within that race.

To restore that pride in his race is one of our primary requirements. We should strive to free him from the false sense of shame pressed upon him by those who do not know him and do not like him because of his color and who, through false and unscrupulous leadership, have amalgamation in mind.

My own idea continues to be that if the carpetbaggers leave the southern Negro and the southern whites alone, and those who are engaged "professionally" in the business of racial relations will pay more attention to racial parallels rather than racial mixing, we will continue to get along very well.

Any other course will promote strife, bitterness, and disunity at a time when our need is obviously for the greatest possible unity and cooperation.

Ten Years of T. V. A.

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago today the Tennessee Valley Authority was created, an agency that has wrought one of the greatest developments of ancient or modern times.

As co-author with Senator Norris of the bill creating the T. V. A., I am more than proud of the record it has made.

It has done more for the American people than any other undertaking of its kind this Government has ever assumed.

Up to date, it has built 13 huge dams on the Tennessee River, and has three more under construction.

It has conquered and harnessed that mighty stream, provided 600 miles of navigation and protected the entire valley from devastating floods.

It has built thousands of miles of heavy transmission lines, and electrified tens of thousands of farm homes that otherwise would not have had electric lights during this generation.

It has furnished a yardstick to show the American people what electricity should cost and in that way has helped to reduce the cost of electric lights and power to the consumers of the Nation by something like a billion dollars a year.

It has aided our farmers and taught them how to conserve and rebuild their soil in order that our great agricultural sections might not follow in the impoverished wake of the eroded areas of the Old World.

It pioneered the path and blazed the way for our rural electrification program that has already lighted more than a million farm homes—taking to them light and hope and comfort and relief from those drudgeries under which humanity had struggled since the beginning of time.

It has lightened the load of the businessman, stimulated industry, and is now supplying the energy to operate those vast machines for manufacturing the necessary implements of war.

Indeed, the T. V. A. is one of America's greatest and most permanent assets.

If I might be permitted to paraphrase that familiar expression relative to the Father of our Country, I would say that as a national asset the T. V. A. is first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of the light and power consumers of our great and growing country.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the tax bill and the threatened coal strike continue to be the unfinished business.

Churchill says Singapore was Great Britain's major defeat of their whole history, their largest.

A little sally in one of the great Signal Corps laboratories is: You don't have to be crazy to be a good radio operator, but it helps.

My colleague, ED REES, says they denied Mr. John Q. Public admittance to Hot Springs, but sent John Barleycorn an engraved invitation.

The head of our delegation to the world food conference at Hot Springs was chairman of the Agriculture Committee that gave us scarcity by statute.

A headline last Sunday says, "Rehabilitation of Tunisia falls to the United States." We will probably have a series of these windfalls.

Mr. Beveridge, with a colored, wrinkled shirt and unpressed clothes, sitting separate among House Members and conversing freely, gave evidence of a sincere, humble soul.

As Wally and Windsor took the front row in the diplomatic gallery, they raised the House. The duke bowed gently and finally told Wally to do likewise. Their modesty was charming.

The presence of a son of Lord Halifax, khaki-clad and legless, in a wheel chair, gave a pathetic touch to the House—a scene of English color. The father pushed the chair.

Churchill was forceful without seeming ponderous; was humorous without being the smart aleck; was not confined to his manuscript; had nothing to say about the Atlantic Charter nor post-war planning. There was nothing of the subterfuge about him. Tragedy with hope and courage, he personified.

"For in ashes they must surely lie before peace comes back to the world." Expressions like this help to make permanent peace an iridescent dream. For a thousand years smoldering hate has flamed anew from ashes. We have more hope in a Gandhi or a David Starr Jordan.

Interior Department Appropriation Bill for the Fiscal Year 1944

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the question was raised today in connection with consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill, as to whether the chairman of the subcommittee or the clerk of the subcommittee gave appropriate notice to all Members of the House desiring to be heard before the subcommittee I would like to insert in the RECORD a copy of the schedule of hearings of the committee giving a list of the names of Members who, as is the custom, were advised by the clerk a day or two in advance, by telephone, when they would be heard in connection with the appropriation bill. The clerk of that subcommittee, Mr. Duvall, has served with the Appropriations Committee for 16 years and has proved to be faithful and accurate, and he has advised me that due notice was given each person on the schedule. All persons on the list, other than the gentleman from Oklahoma, appeared and were heard by the committee.

The schedule I have referred to is as follows:

HEARINGS ON INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1944—AFTERNOON SCHEDULE, MONDAY, APRIL 12, 1943

2 p. m.: Hon. Paul Stewart; Indian schools: Antlers, St. Elizabeths; Durant, St. Agnes.

2:10 p. m.: Hon. Karl Mundt; Indian school, Stephen, S. Dak.

2:15 p. m.: Hon. Hal Holmes; gravity-feed canal, Roza division, Yakima project, Washington.

2:20 p. m.: Hon. Clarence E. Kilburn, rodent control.

2:30 p. m.: Hon. William S. Hill; Colorado-Big Thompson project.

2:35 p. m.: Hon. Richard Welch; Central Valley project.

2:40 p. m.: Hon. Frank A. Barrett; accelerated program for reclamation.

2:50 p. m.: Hon. A. B. Kelly; exploration for iron ore deposits in Pennsylvania.

3 p. m.: Hon. William Lemke, Hon. Usher L. Burdick; North Dakota water utility and conservation projects; Mr. John Haw, Mr. Frederickson. Mr. Haw is also interested in Roza Division, Yakima project.

3:05 p. m.: Hon. Harry Englebright; Central Valley project.

3:10 p. m.: Hon. J. Leroy Johnson; Central Valley project.

3:20 p. m.: Mr. Edward Hyatt, Water Project Authority of California. Mr. Northutt Ely, general counsel, water project authority. Mr. Ray Matthew, supervising hydraulic engineer, Water Project Authority of California. Mr. Roland Curran, Central Valley Project Association.

3:30 p. m.: Mr. F. O. Hagie, secretary, National Reclamation Association.

3:50 p. m.: Mr. E. W. Rising; Idaho irrigators.

Problems of the Small Meat Packers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas, Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Small Businessmen's Committee, with Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN as chairman, Thursday, May 20, at 10:30 a. m. The meeting was called on behalf of and at the request of the small meat packers of the United States:

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the chairman and members of the Small Businessmen's Committee for conducting a hearing on the problems of the small meat packers and butchers of the Nation. This is a problem that should have the immediate and serious consideration of Congress.

In visiting with a number of the packers assembled here this morning I find that they are going to discuss the effect of the Office of Price Administration price ceilings on the sale of meat products. It is not my intention to go into this phase of the problem, but I want to discuss it from another angle.

Last week it was my privilege to spend a day in Salina, Kans., and meet with various committees representing that community in regard to their meat problems. While there I visited with representatives of the J. C. Banfield Packing Co. and the Beverly Wholesale Meat Co. There is a real meat shortage in Salina and the Food Distribution Administration is cooperating in every way they can to solve this problem. On the other hand I find that we have two meat-packing companies that are unable to operate, except on a very limited scale. The J. C. Banfield Packing Co. has a slaughter capacity of about 45 head of cattle per day. I find their quota for the remainder of this quarter is limited to 4.6 head of cattle per day. This means that this approved plant which has a butchering capacity of over 300 head per week is given a quota of around 30 head. The Beverly Wholesale Meat Co. slaughtered over a million pounds of livestock in 1941, and approximately one and a half million pounds in 1942. They have been completely shut down by the quota restrictions of the Office of Price Administration.

It seems most unfortunate to me that these small packing concerns are not allowed to operate at capacity in a community and territory which is greatly in need of additional meat supplies. It seems absurd to think that the farmers and livestock producers of this area should be forced to ship their live cattle to Kansas City, Omaha, or Denver, a distance of several hundred miles, when there are local facilities to handle a portion of the slaughter. More than that, the processed meat must then be transported back to the consuming centers in this area. It seems to me this is a waste of transportation and manpower at a time when our Nation is trying to conserve both.

The reduction in the slaughter quota has materially affected the price that the farmers receive for livestock, as most of the stock purchased for these packing houses was purchased through large community sales in that territory. Farmers advise me the reduction has been at least 50 cents to $1 per hundredweight.

This committee has an opportunity to render real service to this group of small businessmen in our Nation, and I sincerely hope they will make recommendations to Congress immediately. It is my opinion that this problem has been poorly handled and should be corrected at once. It is practically impossible to explain the closing of small packing houses all over the Nation at a time when we are giving much lip service to the protection of small businessmen. Let's have immediate action in order to save transportation, manpower, furnish a better market for the producer, and assist this branch of the industry.

Sgt. Barney Ross—A Real Champion

REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I keenly regret that I was absent last Tuesday when my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG] addressed the House on sports in wartime. There is no one better able to address the House on this subject than the gentleman from Wisconsin. I hope his remarks will have an effect upon the leaders in the War Department in changing their attitude about sports.

It was my distinct privilege to meet Sgt. Barney Ross, former lightweight and welterweight champion of the world and marine hero at Guadalcanal, when he visited Pittsburgh last week. Sgt. Barney Ross is a real champion. He is one of America's outstanding heroes of Guadalcanal and now is on tour of defense plants throughout the country. He typifies the real American fighting spirit. Sergeant Ross is an immigrant Jewish lad who fought his way to two world boxing championships—how well I recall his great come-back fight after a bad start against Jimmy McLarnin. Sergeant Ross was among the first to enlist in the United States Marines after Pearl Harbor, and his heroic deeds in the fox holes of Guadalcanal—he is credited with killing 22 Japs—will long live in the annals of American history. But Sergeant Ross in his modest manner gives full credit to his pals, the United States marines, whom he called "America's champs." Pittsburgh salutes a real hero and a real champion—Sgt. Barney Ross.

As part of my remarks, I am happy to include an article written about Sergeant Ross by Al Abrams, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette sports writer, wherein Sergeant Ross says that servicemen love sports and that even with death facing them in the fox holes at Guadalcanal they talked about sports:

SERVICE MEN LIKE THEIR SPORTS—BOYS ARGUED FOOTBALL, FIGHTS IN FOXHOLES, SAYS SERGEANT ROSS—MARINE HERO SAYS ATHLETICS HAVE TERRIFIC HOLD ON FIGHTING MEN; RECALLS ONLY FISTIC BATTLE IN PITTSBURGH WITH JOHNNY DATTO

(By Al Abrams)

It is strange the things some men do when their lives are in danger.

Take for instance the night of November 19, 1942, one of the nights Sgt. Barney Ross will always have seared in his memory. The former holder of the lightweight and welterweight championships, here for a 5-day tour of local war plants, was talking sports among other things yesterday when he recalled the night of November 19.

"That night, and things I saw and heard at other times, proved to me what a terrific hold athletics have on the men in the service," the Guadalcanal marine hero said.

ARGUE ABOUT FOOTBALL

"It was raining like hell as we huddled in a fox hole—marines and soldiers, trying to fight back the heavy fire of a Jap machine gun. There was the water pouring down our necks, slimy rats running between our feet and slimy rats shooting at us. And, what do you think the boys were talking about?

"Well, one of them, a boy from Michigan, was saying to me: 'Michigan has the best football team in the country this year.'

"He no sooner said that than a marine pops off: 'Yeah, but wait until Ohio State gets hold of them this year.' Then someone brought in Minnesota, and before you knew it, everyone was arguing football, meanwhile taking pot shots at whatever Japs we could see."

Football was not the only sport the boys argued about. Baseball and boxing were among the favorite subjects, and as Barney had one of the four radios in all of Guadalcanal, he was certain to have a large group of listeners when sports results were being broadcast. He also told how the marines used to bet on fights and baseball games with Jap souvenirs put up as prizes.

"We kept up right with the news on sports, and, boy, how they loved it," Barney said with emphasis. "Sports will live as long as there are men around to compete, and I think they should continue. Everyone on the battle front will agree with me."

Naturally, Sergeant Ross liked to talk about his favorite sport, boxing, the game which first brought him fame and two world championships.

RECALLS FIGHT HERE

"Boxing has a better chance to survive than most sports, because it only takes two to make a match," he commented. "The grade of fighters around today may not be up to pre-war standards, but the people like to see fights and will turn out for any good bout."

He recalled his only fistic battle here. "I'll never forget that one, either," he rubbed his jaw reflectively. "That Johnny Datto hit me the hardest punch I ever felt and I went down. I didn't know what hit me, but I managed to get up and knock him out in the second round."

Barney had a good word to say about Pittsburgh and its fighters. "It's one of the best fight towns in the country and look at the good ones it has produced. There's Harry Greb, Frank Klaus, Johnny Ray, Billy Conn, and the Zivic brothers.

"And, say how about that Fritzie Zivic? He looks like as if he'll last 10 more years."

At this point a naval officer interrupted Sergeant Ross to ask: "Have you seen any good fights lately?"

Still quick on the trigger, Barney replied with a smile, "Yes; at Guadalcanal."

Politics Needs Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER T. BONE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the May 1943 issue of The Woman's Digest. The article is entitled "Politics Needs Women" and was written by Eve Garrette.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS NEEDS WOMEN

(By Eve Garrette)

No one feels more strongly about keeping the home fires burning until our boys come back than the American women. Never in the history of this country have we been more eager to pull our full weight; never more alert to duty on the home front while our men are fighting on the world's battle fronts. For these are sober, soul-searching times. We constantly ask ourselves, "What else can I do?"

I asked myself that question the other day, only to find an answer of which I was ashamed. It is not pleasant to face the fact that one has been dodging the most solemn obligation of citizenship and engaging in all the privileges of freedom without getting out and earning those privileges. Yet I have been doing just that.

Oh, I've voted, and been very superior about it, since I know women, as I'm sure you do too, who don't bother to. But I also know that the business of casting a vote for candidates already selected with no help from me, is just not good enough.

A democratic way of life is a participating way of life as former President Hoover once wisely said. Nevertheless, I have held myself aloof from the hurly-burly of political conflict, assumed no responsibility for the myriad of mediocre, incompetent and plain racketeer folk whose names have insulted every ballot I have ever received. And why was I assuming no responsibility?

To put it baldly, the preservation of the America born out of man's eternal struggle to be free, the form of government Lincoln called "the last best hope of earth," the Government for which our boys are sacrificing their very lives, was not my personal affair. Shocking, isn't it? I agree and hasten to state that those days are over.

Now the reason America has continued to be "the last best hope of earth" is because of the wisdom of the founding fathers. They prescribed that ours be a government through political parties, since democracy cannot function without party government. The founding fathers not only were avid students of the history of government (including Plato) but they were also possessed of sympathetic understanding of human frailty. They were appreciative of the basic truth that, unless checked and double checked, the strong seem ever impelled to exploit the weak. That is the fundamental blindspot of followers of the gospel according to Marx.

The communistic system is a one-party system. But we of the United States have political parties. They exist for the excellent purpose of educating all voters on public issues and problems of government, including reform, and the election of proper public officials. They also act as town crier for the sins of the party in power. The proper conduct of political parties is a public service of the highest order. And the better the quality and character of party membership the better the service of that party. Here you and I, as women, come in.

Let's have a look at the record of our sex, since we won the vote 20 years ago. Great were the expectations then that women would accomplish many much-needed reforms in local, State, and National Government, do a thoroughgoing job of political housecleaning among the what's-in-it-for-me boys instead of what's-in-it-for-America boys. Have we?

You know the answer to that. Women were to become a powerful force in Washington—we have today, out of a total of 435 Members of the House of Representatives, 7 Congresswomen, and out of a total of 96 Members of the Senate, 1 woman Senator.

Women were to build a better, finer political world. Did we? We know that women haven't made a dent in the political life of this Nation, to say nothing of our small towns. (For, like charity, politics begins at home.) We have been ladies, we are not interested in politics or too busy.

Neither the women of Germany nor those of France were politically minded, and look at the mess they are in today. Being too busy is a stock excuse upon which women have always leaned heavily. Now, while the men are off to war, every woman must know that what goes on politically in her home town is as vital a part of her home-front job as what goes on in the schools and churches. "I'm too busy" is just a confession of sheer inefficiency.

Every woman knows, especially every housewife, that to manage her house well is to be a good organizer. The woman who is a good organizer of her time and energy is never too busy, for she clocks her day effectively; she makes every minute count; she takes every duty in the order of its importance. Why not, by way of acid test, sit down with paper and pencil and make a calendar of how you spent your time yesterday? If you are shocked to find that 1 or 2 hours were spent gossiping, don't be. It simply means that you have a natural talent for politics. In a way, politics is gossip on a higher plane. If you have the gift for finding out what goes on in the smoke-filled backrooms of your city hall, for informing yourself regarding the doings of the powers-that-be, for tracking down truth about local public servants (not half truths or mistruths), you can be a constructive force in your community by passing on that true information to others. You can perform a patriotic duty in your community by putting wholesome fear in the hearts of officeholders who have been getting away with murder because nobody cared. You can cleanse your town of them, and that is as vital as to cleanse it of spies and saboteurs.

Remember however, that it is as important to tell the world about the honest officials and the good deeds done around you. Many of our public servants hide their light under a bushel. Why not spread their light?

If the fact of having children is your excuse for having no time for politics, you offer the precise reason for being in it up to your ears. You are watchdog over church and school for your children's sake, aren't you? What is the good of bringing them up properly, when you do nothing about making a better America for them to live in? Let's face the fact that the modern mother who does not include among the duties of her motherhood the duty of good citizenship and good government today, is, in effect, tossing her children to the wolves tomorrow.

So let's say we women see as one the importance of getting on the job, politically speaking. Then arises the question of selecting the political party with which we propose to identify ourselves. Men, bless their dear, conservative hearts, generally take the position that because their fathers and fathers' fathers were Republicans, they're Republicans, too. The same goes for the sacred Democratic inheritance.

Women are no such creatures of habit, because, by their very biological nature, they have a larger view of life than men. Therefore they may confidently be expected to make a free choice of party, thereby lending vitality to that party. They will even make that free choice in the face of pressure because they are by temperament the daring sex—I say this despite loud, anguished cries of "heresy." It is my experience that 9 women in 10 have no idea what potentialities they possess—until given a crisis, when they rise to the heights.

The crisis is here, today. So we're off to enter the political world.

Jesse H. Jones on Air Mail and Civil Aviation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I submit herewith the remarks of Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, made at the banquet of the National Aeronautic Association of the United States of America in celebration of the establishment of the United States air mail and the development of commercial aviation, Washington, D. C., May 15, 1943:

Gentlemen, aviation is the biggest industry in the world today.

Forty years ago the Wright brothers made the first heavier-than-air flight.

Twenty-five years ago air transport and commercial aviation were inaugurated through the air mail.

This year $20,000,000,000 will be spent in the United States alone for all forms of aviation.

What this development means has been well expressed by our Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, in a letter to you and me, which I will now read:

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It was my privilege to be present 25 years ago today, when another war President, Woodrow Wilson, dispatched the first air mail from Potomac Park in Washington.

"Those of us who were there hoped that the development of air mail would also mean the development of commercial aviation, but none of us imagined that either the air-mail service or commercial aviation would develop as fast as it has.

"It is difficult to visualize the rapid expansion which has resulted from that initial air-mail flight. The growth of air transport before the war was phenomenal, and it has become a necessary adjunct of our war effort. The science of communication has developed in many ways, but the ability to move men and materials to any part of the world in hours, rather than weeks and months, is vital to our military strategy.

"It has enabled the Allied Nations to keep the closest sort of personal contact among the commanders of armies thousands of miles apart. It has speeded the delivery, both at home and abroad, of essential war materials.

"Commercial aviation has surrendered many of its peacetime rights to the necessity of war and in doing so has made a great national contribution.

"With the dawn of peace, commercial aviation will have new and greater opportunities for which it will be all the better prepared by reason of the training and experience it is now getting.

"Will you and the Postmaster General please be good enough to express to the industry on this observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the air mail the appreciation of all the people of the United States for a job well done.

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

I am glad to give you this message from the President, with which I heartily agree, for commercial aviation has done magnificently.

It is therefore fitting that the Nation should be joined together by radio tonight to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the United States Air Mail Service and the development of commercial aviation. For that service was the cradle of American air-carrier operations which now encircle the globe. The deeds of the skilled and daring pilots of the Army Air Transport Command, the Naval Air Transport Service, and our domestic and international commercial air lines will be one of the most exciting and significant chapters when the full story of the war comes to be told.

Flights across the Atlantic and Pacific have become routine business. Our transport planes are carrying everything from jeeps to medical supplies, from road machinery to Presidents and Prime Ministers. They are delivering these things wherever they are critically needed.

The story begins on that May morning 25 years ago when two Curtiss "Jennies"—one in Washington and one in New York—each with 300 pounds of mail—took to the skies—but that is Postmaster General Frank Walker's story.

I do want to tell you that Charles I. Stanton, the Civil Aeronautics Administration Administrator, became an air-mail pilot December 18, 1918, the day after he left the Army.

It falls to me to indicate briefly how civilian air transport has grown since the early air mail days. Let me outline the story in terms of work done by the Civil Aeronautics Administration of the Department of Commerce.

Civil Aeronautics Administration has five war jobs. Every pilot—Army or Navy—today begins his flight training under Civil Aeronautics Administration auspices. All civilian planes and pilots are licensed by Civil Aeronautics Administration. Civil Aeronautics Administration runs the Federal airways. It builds and improves civilian airports for war purposes. And it promotes aviation and ground school instruction in the Nation's high schools.

In the old days, there were no adequate airports, no beacons, no airways radio communications of any kind. Pilots had to depend entirely upon their skill, knowledge, and intuition, with now and again a fervent prayer for just plain luck. There was nothing like the great Civil Aeronautics Administration Washington National Airport here at Gravelly Point.

There was nothing remotely resembling Civil Aeronautics Administration's present 35,000-mile Federal Airways System of radio beams, beacons, and landing fields.

We did not then have, as we do now, adequate tests and licensing for pilots and planes.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has contributed these services to our air transport leadership.

With our planes and pilots, both transport and combat, performing feats of skill and valor the world over, we face the future with assurance that, come what may, we shall do well.

Religious Leadership in America Appeals for Passage of Anti-Poll-Tax Legislation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VITO MARCANTONIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 5, 1943

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith an appeal for passage of anti-poll-tax legislation by Congress, issued by the United Christian Council for Democracy and signed by 476 religious leaders in the United States. The council has as its chairman, the Reverend Dale DeWitt, and as its executive secretary, the Reverend Richard Morford. The signers of the appeal include outstanding spokesmen of the church from 44 States, including church leaders from every poll-tax State and nearly every denomination. I include the names and affiliations of these leaders in order that the Members of this House may see how unanimous is the feeling of religious leadership in America on this vital issue.

To Members of our Congress:

We, American churchmen of many communions throughout the Nation, urge the passage of anti-poll-tax legislation (House Resolution 7) at once. Where is the democracy we proclaim when approximately 10,000,000 of our citizens are denied the right of free ballot which the rest of us enjoy? We shall be in much stronger moral position to be the champions of freedom and democracy among the nations if this injustice in our own country is corrected at once. We call upon you, the Members of Congress, for prompt action.

We are pledged to labor in our communities for the Nation-wide enforcement of the basic right of all American citizens to a free ballot. We must expect that in the name of democracy you will fight for it.

The following have signed the appeal as individuals (Churches and institutions are listed for identification only):

Rt. Rev. H. P. Almon Abbott, bishop of Lexington (Episcopal), Lexington, Ky.; Rev. Oscar M. Adam, University Methodist Church, Madison, Wis.; Rev. Leon M. Adkins, Methodist, Schenectady, N. Y.; Rev. T. Barton Akeley, Unitarian, Olivet, Mich.; Rev. Gross W. Alexander, Methodist, Lyndhurst, N. J.; Rev. Wilbur C. Allen, Ebenezer Presbyterian Church, Kimball, W. Va.; Rev. Albert Allinger, Methodist, Pearl River, N. Y.; Rev. Elmer F. Ansley, Evangelical and Reformed, Kimmswick, Mo.; Rev. Benjamin V. Andrews, Presbyterian, Indianapolis, Ind.; Rev. B. K. Apelian, Church in Radburn, Fairlawn, N. J.; Rev. Waldemar Argow, Eliot Unitarian Church, South Natick, Mass.; Rev. Robert G. Armstrong, Congregational-Christian, Concord, N. H.; Rev. J. F. Atkins, Community Christian Church, Hinton, W. Va.; Rev. Bertram deH. Atwood, Church of the Covenant (Reformed Church in America), Paterson, N. J.; Rev. Eugene M. Austin, Tioga Baptist Church, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Jule Ayers, Presbyterian, Ossining, N. Y.; Rev. E. Burdette Backus, Unitarian, Indianapolis, Ind.; Rev. Robert W. Bagnall, St. Thomas Episcopal Church, Philadelphia, Pa.; Miss Lorene A. Bahn, Evangelical and Reformed Council for Social Reconstruction, St. Louis, Mo.; Rev. Everett Moore Baker, First Unitarian Church, Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. F. Raymond Baker, Second Baptist Church, Wilmington, Del.; Rev. Richard T. Baker, Methodist, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Archey D. Ball, Methodist, Hackensack, N. J.; Rev. Joseph Barth, First Unitarian Church, Miami, Fla.; Rev. John L. Barton, Baptist, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Rev. R. J. Baumann, Bethlehem Evangelical and Reformed Church, Evansville, Ind.; Rev. King D. Beach, Trinity Methodist Church, Kansas City, Mo.; Rev. H. W. Becker, Missouri Council of Churches, Kirkwood, Mo.; Rev. Paul E. Becker, Bethany Christian Church, Lincoln, Nebr.; Rev. Archie B. Bedford, Danforth United Church, Syracuse, N. Y.; Bishop W. Y. Bell, Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, Cordele, Ga.; Prof. John C. Bennett, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif.; Rev. Carl Edward Berges, Evangelical and Reformed, Buffalo, N. Y.; Rev. H. D. Berlew, Methodist, Orono, Maine.

Rev. Carl Bihldorff, First Parish in Brookline (Unitarian), Brookline, Mass.; Rev. L. M. Birkhead, Friends of Democracy, Inc., New York, N. Y.; Rev. Edward W. Blakeman, Methodist, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Rev. Edward H. Bonsall, Jr., Episcopal Diocese of Iowa, Fairfield, Iowa; Rev. Lester L. Boobar, First Methodist Church, Bangor, Maine; Rev. John Nicholls Booth, All Souls' Unitarian Church, Evanston, Ill.; Dr. R. W. Bowden, Crosby Presbyterian Church, Deerwood, Minn.; Prof. W. Russell Bowie, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Dwight J. Bradley, Council for Social Action (Congregational-Christian), New York, N. Y.; Rev. Raymond B. Bragg, First Unitarian Church, Minneapolis, Minn.; Rev. Gordon E. Brant, Church of the Advent (Episcopal), Chicago, Ill.; Rev. David Braun, Presbyterian, Swarthmore, Pa.; Rev. James A Bray, Fraternal Council of Negro Churches in America, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Charles Bridges, Kenwood Park Presbyterian Church, Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Rev. John W. Brigham, First Parish in Billerica (Unitarian), Billerica, Mass.; Prof. Edgar S. Brightman, Methodist, Boston University, Newton Center, Mass.; Rev. James E. Bristol, Grace Lutheran Church, Camden, N. J.; Rev. Edwin L. Brock, Methodist, Tennille, Ga.; Rev. H. N. Brockway, Fair Oaks Presbyterian Church, Oak Park, Ill.; Rev. John Brogden, Unitarian, Urbana, Ill.; Rev. Robert D Brodt, Congregational-Christian Church, Eureka, Kans.; Rev. Oliver Hart Bronson, Bethany Presbyterian Church, Summerland, Santa Barbara, Calif.; Rev Francis T. Brown, Episcopal, Tucson, Ariz.; Rev. Hugh Elmer Brown, First Congregational Church, Evanston, Ill.; Rev. Robert Evans Browning, Episcopal, Hyattsville, Md.; Rev Orville Brummer, Evangelical and Reformed, Wood River, Ill.; Rev. Albert W. Buck, Tabor Evangelical and Reformed Church, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. George Walker Buckner, Jr., editor of World Call, Disciples of Christ, Indianapolis, Ind.; Rev. C. D. Bullock, Wesley Methodist Church, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Rev. J. George Butler, Summerfield Methodist Church, New Haven, Conn.; Rev. Fred I. Cairns, Pilgram Church, El Paso, Tex.; Rev. Raymond Calkins, First Church in Cambridge, Congregational, Cambridge, Mass.

Rev. J. Henry Carpenter, Presbyterian, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. Harold F. Carr, Lakewood Methodist Church, Lakewood, Ohio; Rev. John Lyon Caughey, Presbyterian, Glens Falls, N. Y.; Rev. Allen Knight Chalmers, Broadway Tabernacle Church (Congregational), New York, N. Y.; Rev. J. Russell Chandler, Olmstead Ave. Presbyterian Church, Bronx, N. Y.; Rev. Don M. Chase, Methodist, Redding, Calif.; Rev. C. A. Choate, Methodist, Halstead, Kans.; Rev. C. W. Christman, Jr., Methodist, Valhalla, N. Y.; Rev. Karl M. Chworowsky, Flatbush Unitarian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. Arthur T. Clark, First Methodist Church, Evanston, Ill.; Rev. Merrill F. Clarke, the Congregational Church, New Canaan, Conn.; Rev. Wilbur T.

Clemens, New York State Council of Churches, Albany, N. Y.; Rev. Dow Strang Clute, Methodist, Scotia, N. Y.; President Henry Sloane Coffin, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Walton E Cole, Second Church in Boston (Unitarian), Chestnut Hill, Mass.; Rev. G. L. Collins, Baptist, Madison, Wis.; Rev. Keith Conning, Grandale Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Mich.; Rev. J. Raymond Cope, Unitarian Society of Salt Lake City, Utah; Rev. Roland H. Cortright, Methodist, Daytona Beach, Fla.; Rev. David M. Cory, Cuyler Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. C. E. Craik, Jr., Emmanuel Episcopal Church, Louisville, Ky.; Rev. B. F. Crawford, Methodist, Carnegie, Pa.; Rev. Francis B. Creamer, Christ Episcopal Church, Grosse Pointe, Mich.; Rev. Arnold Crompton, First Unitarian Church, Erie, Pa.; Rev. Clark Walker Cummings, Church Federation, St. Louis, Mo.; Rev. John M. Currie, Presbyterian, Hollis, N. Y.; Rev. H. Lewis Cutler, Calvary Presbyterian Church, Wyncote, Pa.; Rev. Malcolm G. Dade, Episcopal, Detroit, Mich.; Prof. George Dahl, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.; Rev. Nelson Dalenberg, Warren Ave. Church, Saginaw, Mich.; Rev. E. LeRoy Dakin, Baptist, Milwaukee, Wis.; Rev. John Irving Daniel, Highland Ave. Congregational Church, Orange, N. J.; Rev. Edwin Daniels, Presbyterian, Fulton, N. Y.; Rev. W. L. Darby, Presbyterian, Washington City Bible Society, Washington, D. C.

Rev. E. F. Daugherty, Jackson Street Christian Church, Muncie, Ind.; Rev. W. Ellis Davies, Unitarian Society, Wollaston, Mass.; Rev. Ernest E. Davis, First Methodist Church, Bradford, Pa.; Rev Lewis H. Davis, Methodist, Seymour, Conn.; Rev. Mark A. Dawber, Methodist, New York, N. Y.; Rev. J. M. Dawson, First Baptist Church, Waco, Tex.; Rev. Albert Edward Day, the First Methodist Church, Pasadena, Calif.; Rev. Gardiner M. Day, Episcopal, Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. John Warren Day, dean of Grace Cathedral (Episcopal), Topeka, Kans.; Rev. W W. Deal, Southside Boulevard Community Church (Methodist), Nampa, Idaho; Rev. F G. Detweiler, Baptist, Granville, Ohio; Rev Dale De Witt, Unitarian, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Edwards H. Dickinson, Congregational-Christian, Rio Grande, Ohio; Rev. John H. Dietrich, Unitarian, Berkeley, Calif.; Rev. John Dillingham, Faith Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Caxton Doggett, First Methodist Church, Mount Dora, Fla.; Dr. James A. Dombrowski, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Nashville Tenn.; Rev. Francis A. Drake, Congregational-Christian, North Hadley, Mass.; Rev. Robert L. Duckworth, Methodist, St. Louis, Mo.; Rev. H. N. Dukes, First Congregational Church, Jackson, Mich.; Prof. David Dunn, Evangelical and Reformed Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa; Rev. Paul Eisen, Evangelical and Reformed, New Palestine, Ind.; Rev. Frederick May Eliot, American Unitarian Association, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Samuel A. Eliot Arlington Street Church (Unitarian), Boston, Mass.; Rev. Phillips P. Elliott, First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. Edward G. Ernst, Congregational Church, Troy, N. H.; Archbishop William Ernst, the African Orthodox Church, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Thomas D. Ewing, Windemere Presbyterian Church, East Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. James A. Fairley, White Plains Community Church (Emeritus), Westport, Conn.; Rev. George C. Fetter, University Baptist Church, Minneapolis, Minn.; Rev. Judson E. Fiebiger, South Congregational Church, Utica, N. Y.; Rev. Elliot Field, the Presbyterian Church of Dover, Del.; Rev. John W. Findley, University Presbyterian Church, West Lafayette, Ind.; Rev. Alfred G. Fisk, Howard Presbyterian Church, San Francisco, Calif.; Prof. D. J. Fleming, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.; Dean Joseph F Fletcher, Episcopal, Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. Norman D. Fletcher, Unitarian, Montclair, N. J.; Rev. Arthur Foote, Unitarian, Stockton, Calif.; Rev. Sam H. Franklin, Jr., Presbyterian, Cruger, Miss.; Rev. Robert M. Frehse, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Detroit, dich.; Rev. Stephen H Fritchman, editor, the Christian Register (Unitarian), Boston, Mass.; Miss Dorothy B. Fritz, Presbyterian Fellowship for Social Action, Albany, N. Y.

Rev. G. Shubert Frye, Presbyterian, Syracuse, N. Y.; Rev. John Gabrielson, Methodist, Venice, Calif.; President Buell G. Gallagher, Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.; Rev. and Mrs. J. Harold Gamble, First Baptist Church, Ames, Iowa; Rev. John Gass, Episcopal, Troy, N. Y.; Rev. Leo Alvin Gates, South Presbyterian Church, Buffalo, N. Y.; Rev. Herbert George, Humboldt Park Methodist Church, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. George M. Gibson, United Church of Hyde Park, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Roy Gieselmann, Evangelical and Reformed Church, Corpus Christi, Texas; Rev. Aaron S. Gilmartin, Church of our Father (Unitarian), Newburgh, N. Y.; Rev. Charles G Girelius, Unitarian, Barneveld, N. Y.; Rev. Hobart F. Goewey, Harvard-Epworth Methodist Church, Cambridge, Mass.; Prof. Leland J. Gordon, Denison University, Granville, Ohio; Rev. Richard Paul Graebel, First Presbyterian Church, Ottumwa, Iowa; Rev. John C. Granbery, editor of the Emanicipator, San Antonio, Tex.; Rev. Joseph W. Gray, Jr., Presbyterian, Huron, S. Dak.; Rev. Dana McLean Greeley, Arlington Street Church (Unitarian), Boston, Mass.; Rev. Theodore Ainsworth Greene, Congregational, New Britain, Conn.; Bishop John A. Gregg, African Methodist Episcopal, Kansas City, Kans.; Rev. Philip E. Gregory, First Congregational Church, Minneapolis, Minn.; Rev. Clayton T. Griswold, Presbyterian, Summit, N. J.; Rev. Leon E. Grubaugh, superintendent, Colorado Congregational-Christian Conference, Denver, Colo.; Rev. Alexander J. J. Gruetter, St. Andrews Episcopal Church, Toledo, Ohio; Rev. Armand Guerrero, Mayfair Methodist Church, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Stanley F. Gutelius, Brick Presbyterian Church, Rochester, N. Y.; Rev. Ernest Graham Guthrie, Congregational, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. W. Bruce Hadley, the Council of United Churches of St. Joseph County, South Bend, Ind.; Rev. John R. Hahn, Bausman Memorial Church (Evangelical and Reformed), Wyomissing, Pa.; Rev. Fred L Hall, Ohio Conference of Congregational-Christian Churches, Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. Frank A. Hamilton, Methodist, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Prof. Samuel L. Hamilton, Methodist, New York University, Newark, N. J.; Rev. Bernie H. Hampton, Methodist, Elizabethton, Tenn.; Rev. Charles P. Harder, Methodist, Greenville, N. Y.; Prof. S. Ralph Harlow, Congregational Smith College, Northampton, Mass.; Rev. Donald Harrington, People's Liberal Church (Unitarian), Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Pierson P. Harris, Central Church in Worcester (Congregational), Worcester, Mass.; Rev. Martin L. Harvey, A. M. E. Zion Church, Clark College, Atlanta, Ga.; Rev. Edler G. Hawkins, St. Augustine Presbyterian Church, New York, N. Y.; Rev. A. A. Heist, the Methodist Church, Santa Maria, Calif.; Rev. G. Theodore Hempelmann, Clifton Unitarian Church, Louisville, Ky.; Rev. D. W. Henry, Tindley Temple Methodist Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

Rev. Carl Hille, First Evangelical and Reformed Church, Olney, Ill.; Rev. Charles A. Hill, Baptist, Detroit, Mich.; Rev. Clifford W. Hilliker, North Congregational Church, Middletown, N. Y.; Rev. Randall S. Hilton, Unitarian, Alton, Ill.; Rev. Robert S. Hoagland, Unitarian, Fort Wayne, Ind.; Rt. Rev. Henry W. Hobson, bishop of southern Ohio (Episcopal), Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. Elmer H. Hoefer, St. Paul's Evangelical and Reformed Church, Rochester, N. Y.; Rev. Chester E. Hodgson, Centenary Methodist Church, Newark, N. J.; Rev. John Haynes Holmes, the Community Church, New York, N. Y.; Prof. Myron T. Hopper, Disciples of Christ, Lexington, Ky.; Rev. Oliver C. Horsman, First Baptist Church, Morristown, N. J.; Rev. Charles H. S. Houk, Presbyterian, Nashville, Tenn.; Rev. George G. Howard, Hackensack Unitarian Church, Teaneck, N. J.; Rev. Lee A. Howe, Jr., Baptist, Oneida, N. Y.; Rev. Duncan Howlett, Unitarian, New Bedford, Mass.; Rev. Walter M. Howlett, Greater New York Federation of Churches, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Herbert B. Hudnut, Presbyterian, Detroit, Mich.; Rev. William H. Hudnut, Jr., First Presbyterian Church, Springfield, Ill.; Rev. Paul F. Huebner, Methodist, Phoenix, Ariz.; Rev. Frank A. Huff, Reformed Church in America, Paterson, N. J.; Rev. Theodore C. Hume, Claremont Congregational Church, Claremont, Calif.; Bishop J. K. Humphrey, U. S. D. A. Church, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Graham C. Hunter, Presbyterian, Fullerton, Calif.; Rev. Joseph B. Hunter, Disciples of Christ, McGehee, Ark.; Rev. Stanley A. Hunter, Presbyterian, Berkeley, Calif.; Rev. George P. Huntington, Episcopal, Tiverton, R. I.; Rev. Alfred W. Hurst, Pilgrim Congregational Church, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Rev. Robert Inglis, Plymouth Congregational Church, Oakland, Calif.; Rev. Allen L. Irwin, Bethel Congregational Church, Nanticoke, Pa.; Rev. Edar S. Jackson, Methodist, Bridgeport, Conn.; Prof. Fleming James, Episcopal, Sewanee, Tenn.; Prof. M. Stephen James, Theological Seminary (Reformed Church in America), New Brunswick, N. J.; Rev. William P. Jenkins, Unitarian, Walpole, N. H.; Rev. Ray Freeman Jenney, Bryn Mawr Community Church, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Ralph H. Jennings, First Presbyterian Church, Kansas City, Kans.; Rev. Rector W. Johnson, First Methodist Church, San Jose, Calif.; Rev. J. Donald Johnston, Unitarian, Flushing, N. Y.; Rev. James R. Johnson, Jr., Ebenezer A. M. E. Church, Roanoke, Va.; Rev. Walt N. Johnson, Baptist, Mars Hill, N. C.; President David D. Jones, Bennett College, Greensboro, N. C.; Rev. Henry D. Jones, Dodge Community House, Detroit, Mich.; Rev. Lowell D. Jones, First Methodist Church, Central City, Nebr.

Prof. Orville C. Jones, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio; Rev. John Page Jones, Baptist, Lynchburg Va.; Rev. John Paul Jones, the Union Church of Bay Ridge, Brooklyn, N. Y; Rev. Charles R. Joy, Unitarian, Newton Highlands, Mass.; Rev. Richard W. Jungfer, Evangelical and Reformed, Bloomfield, N. J.; Rev. J. Merion Kadyz, Presbyterian, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. S. W. Keck, Congregational, Huron, S. Dak.; Rev. Wendell P. Keeler, First Presbyterian Church, Yonkers, N. Y.; Rev. David O. Kendall, Presbyterian, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.; Rev. Norman F. Kinzie, Episcopal, Detroit, Mich.; Rev Huber F. Klemme, Grace Evangelical and Reformed Church, Grosse Pointe Park, Mich.; Rev. Fred W. Knickrehm, Chestnut Street Methodist Church, Portland, Maine; Rev. Henry C. Koch, Evangelical and Reformed, Louisville, Ky.; Rev. William E. Kroll, Arlington Avenue Presbyterian Church, East Orange, N. J.; Rev. Harry H. Kruener, First Baptist Church, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Ernest W. Kuebler, director division of education, American Unitarian Association, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Alfred M. Lambert, St. Monica's Church (Episcopal), Hartford, Conn.; Rev. William E. Lampe, secretary of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev Herrick J. Lane, Olivet Presbyterian Church, San Francisco, Calif.; Rev. William C. Laube, Presbyterian, Dubuque, Iowa; Rev. Dubois Le Fevre, the First Unitarian Church, Youngstown, Ohio; Rev. G. Merrill Lenox, Baptist, Ridgewood, N. J.; Rev. A. C. Lichtenberger, Church League for Industrial Democracy (Episcopal), Newark, N. J.; Rev. W. E. Longstreth, Methodist, Memphis, Mo.; Rev. A. Ritchie Low, the United Church of Johnson, Vt.; Rev. Edgar A. Lowther, Temple Methodist Church, San Francisco, Calif.; Rev. Harold L. Lunger, Austin Boulevard Christian Church, Oak Park, Ill.; Rev. Charles H. Lyttle, Unitarian Church of Geneva, Ill.; Rev. G. Leonard McCoin, Pres-

byterian, Boonton, N. J.; Rev. J. A. MacCallum, Presbyterian, Philadelphia, Pa.; Bishop Francis J. McConnell, the Methodist Church, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Ralph I. McConnell, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Erie, Pa.; Mr. Frank W. McCulloch, Council for Social Action (Congregational-Christian), Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Bruce H. McDonald, Presbyterian, Baltimore, Md.; Rev. Paul S. McElroy, Congregational, Danvers, Mass.; Rev. D. P. McGeachy, Presbyterian, Decatur, Ga.; Rev. Hugh F. McGlasson, Trinity Methodist Church, South Bend, Ind.; Rev. Howard D. McGrath, the Methodist Church, Walden, N. Y.; Rev. Claude Allen McKay, First Congregational Church, Binghamton, N. Y.; Rev. Donald C. McMillan, Unitarian Church of Orange, N. J.

Rev. Charles F. MacLennan, director, Religion and Labor Center of Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. B. W. Marble, Trinity Methodist Church, Denver, Colo.; Rev. J. H. Marion, Jr., Grace Covenant Presbyterian Church, Richmond, Va.; Rev. H. P. Marley, Unitarian, Dayton, Ohio; Rev. Richard B. Martin, Episcopal, Sumter, S. C.; Rev. Willis D. Mathias, Emmanuel Evangelical and Reformed Church, Allentown, Pa.; Mrs. Cecelia P. Matthews, Christ Church (Episcopal), Glendale, Ohio; Rev. Norman A. Maunz, Evangelical and Reformed Church, New Orleans, La.; Rev. Oscar E. Maurer, Congregational-Christian, New Haven, Conn.; Rev. O. Clay Maxwell, Mount Olivet Baptist Church, New York, N. Y.; Rev. George N. Mayhew, Disciples of Christ, Nashville, Tenn.; Dr. Thornton W. Merriam, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.; Rev. Payson Miller, Unitarian Congregational Society of Hartford, Conn.; Rev. U. S. Mitchell, First Baptist Church, Berkeley, Calif.; Prof. A. T. Mollegen, Theological Seminary (Episcopal), Alexandria, Va.; Rev. William E. Montgomery, Presbyterian Church, Glens Fall, N. Y.; Rev. David W. Moody, Presbyterian, Williamson, N. Y.; Rev. Richard Morford, United Christian Council for Democracy, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Garfield Morgan, Central Congregational Church, Lynn, Mass.; Rev. Arthur C. Moore, St. Cyprian's and St. Monica's (Episcopal), Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Harvey K. Mousley, St. Paul's Methodist Church, Newport, R. I.; Rev. Harry C. Munro, Disciples of Christ, Lockport, Ill.; Rev. Irving R. Murray, Ministry to Students (Unitarian), Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. Roy H. Murray, Methodist, Kendrick, Idaho; Rev. James Myers, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Norman B. Nash, Episcopal, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H.; Rev. John Oliver Nelson, Presbyterian, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. J. Pierce Newell, Methodist, Rice Lake, Wis.; Rev. G. S. Nichols, Methodist, Ames, Iowa; Prof. Robert Hastings Nichols, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.; Prof. Reinhold Niebuhr, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Charles C. Noble, First Methodist Church, Syracuse, N. Y.; Rev. Hubert C. Noble, First Presbyterian Church, Downey, Calif.; Rev. Victor Obenhaus, Congregational-Christian, Pleasant Hill, Tenn.; Rev. Delos O'Brian, First Unitarian Church, Wilmington, Del.; Rev. Urban L. Ogden, Disciples of Christ, Anderson, Ind.; Rev. M. V. Oggel, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Lincoln, Nebr.; Rev. Edward Whitefield Ohrenstein, All Souls Church (Unitarian), Greenfield, Mass.; Rev. Edmund A. Opitz, Unitarian, Harrisburg, Pa.; Rev. Howard B. Osborne, Presbyterian, Sidney, Nebr.; Rev. John Paul Pack, Disciples of Christ, Chattanooga, Tenn.; President Albert W. Palmer, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

Rev. Edwin C. Palmer, People's Church, Unitarian, Kalamazoo, Mich.; Rev. George Lawrence Parker, First Parish (Unitarian), Duxbury, Mass.; Rev. Albert B. Parrett, Methodist, Rupert, Iowa; Rt. Rev. Edward L. Parsons, Bishop of California—Episcopal (retired), San Francisco, Calif.; Rev. David Paton, Methodist, Johnstown, N. Y.; Rev. George P. Payson, Congregational-Christian, White Plains, N. Y.; Rev. Thornton B. Penfield, Jr., First Presbyterian Church, Yonkers, N. Y.; Rev. Leslie T. Pennington, First Church in Cambridge (Unitarian), Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. Jason Noble Pierce, First Congregational Church, San Francisco, Calif.; Rev. Harry R. Pine, Methodist, West Long Branch, N. J.; Rev. Homer K. Pitman, Trinity Presbyterian Church, San Francisco, Calif.; Rev. Laurance R. Plank, Unitarian, St. Louis, Mo.; Rev. P. Hewison Pollock, First Presbyterian Church, Bozeman, Mont.; Rev. Paul Reid Pontius, Evangelical and Reformed Church, Greensburg, Pa.;; Rev. Frederick G. Poole, Methodist, Detroit, Mich.; Prof. Liston Pope, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.; Rev. Edwin McNeil Poteat, Euclid Avenue Baptist Church, Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., Abysinian Baptist Church, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Robert Murray Pratt, Unitarian, Quincy, Ill.; Rev. S. D. Press, Evangelical and Reformed, St. Louis, Mo.; Rev. D. F. Putman, Lutheran, Gettysburg, Pa.; Prof. Harris Franklin Rall, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.; Rev. Howard W. Rash, Methodist, Memphis, Tenn.; Rev. William R. Reed, Memorial Methodist Church, Appomattox, Va.; Rev. Curtis W. Reese, Abraham Lincoln Center, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Kenneth Reeves, Presbyterian, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Ensworth Reisner, Richmond Avenue Methodist Church, Buffalo, N. Y.; Rev. F. E. Reissig, Washington Federation of Churches, Washington, D. C.; Rev. and Mrs. E. K. Resler, Yates Center, Kans.; Rev. L. Willard Reynolds, Society of Friends, Clintondale, N. Y.; Rev. G. Barrett Rich, Third, First United Church, Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. James A. Richards, Community Church (Congregational), Mount Dora, Fla.; Rev. Frederick W. Ringe, First Evangelical and Reformed Church, Tamms, Ill.; Rev. Lloyd H. Rising, First Methodist Church, Lincoln, Nebr.; Rev. Wallace W. Robbins, Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, St. Paul, Minn.; Rev. Allyn F. Robinson, Jr., United Church, Raleigh, N. C.; Rev. Alson H. Robinson, First Unitarian Church, Plainfield, N. J.; Rev. Edward J. Robinson, Evangelical and Reformed, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Henry Lee Robinson, Jr., Methodist, Richmond, Va.; Rev. James H. Robinson, Church of the Master (Presbyterian), New York, N. Y.; Rev. Morris C. Robinson, Grace Presbyterian Church, Minneapolis, Minn.

Rev. Charles D. Rockel, Evangelical and Reformed, Royersford, Pa.; Rev. Robert E. Romig, Unitarian, Syracure, N. Y.; Rev. E. Tallmadge Root, Congregational, Somerville, Mass.; Rev. William F. Rothenberger, Third Christian Church, Indianapolis, Ind.; Rev. Henry Ruark, Trinity Methodist Church, Red Springs, N. C.; Rev. William K. Russell, St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; Rev. Peter H. Samson, All Souls Church, Unitarian-Universalist, Riverside, Calif.; Rev. Carl M. Sangree, Congregational-Christian, Cummington, Mass.; Rev. Theodore F. Savage, Presbyterian, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Robert H. Schacht, Jr., First Congregational Church (Unitarian), Providence, R. I.; Rev. Charles E. Schaeffer, Evangelical and Reformed, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. A. J. Scherer, Trinity Evangelical and Reformed Church, New Orleans, La.; Rev. Edward L. Schlingman, Evangelical and Reformed, Boyerstown, Pa.; Rev. Benjamin F. Schwartz, Methodist, Lincoln, Nebr.; Rev. Alfred F. Schroeder, Evangelical and Reformed, Oakland, Calif.; Rev. E. H. Schwengel, Evangelical and Reformed, Marion, Tex.; Rev. Gale Seaman, Baptist, San Gabriel, Calif.; Rev. Richard W. Seebode, Westminster Unitarian Church, Providence, R. I.; Rev. LeRoy I. Setziol, Evangelical and Reformed, Attica, N. Y.; Rev. John W. Shackford, Methodist, Greenville, S. C., Rev. Waitstill H. Sharp, Unitarian, Wellesley, Mass.; Rev. D. R. Sharpe, Baptist, Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. Homer Lewis Sheffer, Unitarian Society of Ridgewood, N. J.; Rev. Frank M. Sheldon, Grand Avenue Congregational Church, Milwaukee, Wis.; Rev. Lee C. Sheppard, Baptist, Raleigh, N. C.; Rev. Guy Emery Shipler, editor, The Churchman, New York, N. Y.; Rev. H. Norman Sibley, University Heights Presbyterian Church, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Gottlieb Siegenthaler, Evangelical and Reformed, Baltimore, Md.; Prof. Walter W. Sikes, Disciples, Berea, Ky.; Rev. Vincent B. Silliman, Unitarian, Hollis, N. Y.; Rev. George P. Simmonds, Presbyterian Belvedere Mission, Los Angeles, Calif.; Rev. Dewees F. Singley, Evangelical and Reformed, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. Robert D. Smith, Episcopal, Trenton, N. J.; Rev. Charles E. Snyder, The Unitarian Church, Davenport, Iowa; Rev. Paul J. Snyder, Methodist, Fergus Falls, Minn.; Rev. John Sommerlatte, Evangelical and Reformed, Lakewood, Ohio; Rev. Walter B. Spaulding, Methodist, Missoula, Mont.; Rev. Frederick Spence, First Methodist Church, Jackson, Mich.

Rev. W. B. Spofford, Church League for Industrial Democracy (Episcopal), New York, N. Y.; Rev. Glenn Sanford, Methodist, Conway, Ark.; Rev. Clifford L. Stanley, St. Peter's Episcopal Church, St. Louis, Mo.; Rev. Donald H. Stewart, Central Presbyterian Church, Houston, Tex.; Rev. George Stewart, Presbyterian, Stamford, Conn.; Rev. Arthur O. Stockbridge, Presbyterian, Windham, N. Y.; Rev. Alden L. Stone, Baptist, Rankin, Pa.; Rev. G. Paul Stowell, New England Congregational Church, Aurora, Ill.; Rev. Ronald M. Strauss, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Syracuse, N. Y.; Rev. Paul Streich, Evangelical and Reformed Church, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Charles M. Styron, First Parish in Lincoln, Mass.; Rev. Walter Carl Subke, Seventh Avenue Presbyterian Church, San Francisco, Calif.; Rev. Alfred W. Swan, First Congregational Church, Madison, Wis.; Rev. Herald C. Swezy, Holy Apostles Church (Episcopal), Brooklyn, N. Y.; Rev. Eric M. Tasman, Episcopal, South Orange, N. J.; Rev. Alva W. Taylor, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Nashville, Tenn.; Rev. George Oliver Taylor, Disciple of Christ, St. Louis, Mo.; Rev. John H. Taylor, First Parish of Westwood, Mass.; Rev. Lloyd B. Thomas, St. James Episcopal Church, Paso Robles, Calif.; Rev. A. B. Thompson, Methodist, Plymouth, N. H.; Rev. Joseph W. Thompson, Arch Street Methodist Church, Hannibal, Mo.; Rev. Roger E. Thompson, Methodist, Franklin, N. H.; Rev. Wofford C. Timmons, Congregational, New Britain, Conn.; Rev. Jacob Trapp, First Unitarian Church of Denver, Colo.; Rev. Robert Leonard Tucker, Wesley Foundation, Columbus, Ohio.; Rev. Roy Tucker, Methodist, Kingman, Ariz.; Rev. Ernest C. Tuthill, St. James Episcopal Church, Sonora, Calif.; Dr. Willard Uphaus, National Religion and Labor Foundation, New Haven, Conn.; President Harry Lee Upperman, Baxter Seminary, Baxter, Tenn.; Rev. Morgan W. Van Tassell, Oak Grove Community Church, Buffalo, N. Y.; Prof. David D. Vaughan, Methodist, Boston, Mass.; Rev. C. E. Vermilya, Methodist; New Berlin, N. Y.; Rev. John M. Versteeg, Methodist, Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. Carl Hermann Voss, Smithfield Congregational Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Rev. O. Walter Wagner, Evangelical and Reformed, Jackson, Mich.; Rev. Kenneth C. Walker, Unitarian, Delmar, N. Y.; Rev. J. Barnard Walton, Society of Friends, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. O. M. Walton, Cleveland Church Federation, Cleveland, Ohio.

Prof. Harry F. Ward, Methodist, Palisade, N. J.; Rev. George R. Warren, Methodist, Sturgeon Bay, Wis.; Rev. Gerald F. Weary, Unitarian, Bloomington, Ill.; Rev. Arthur L. Weatherly, Unitarian, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Charles C. Webber, Methodist Federation for Social Service, New York, N. Y.; Rev. Carl L. Weist, Community Church, Mount Vernon, N. Y.; Rev. Melvin L. Welke, Unitarian, Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. Charles P. Wellman, Channing Church of Dorchester, Mass.; Rev Howard M. Wells, Presbyterian, East Cleveland, Ohio; Rev. Fred D. Wentzel, Evangelical and

Reformed, Philadelphia, Pa.; Rev. W. A. Werth, Evangelical and Reformed, Fairmont, Minn.; Rev. Robert Whitaker, Baptist, Los Gatos, Calif.; Prof. Lynn T. White, Presbyterian, San Francisco, Calif.; Rev. Holmes Whitmore, Episcopal, Milwaukee, Wis.; Rev. Hazen G. Werner, Grace Methodist Church, Dayton, Ohio; Rev. Robert Weston Unitarian, Lexington, Mass.; Rev. Hugh Vernon White, American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Boston, Mass.; Rev. Wayne White, Methodist, New York, N. Y.; Rev. F. S. C. Wicks, Unitarian, Indianapolis, Ind.; Rev. Philip M. Widenhouse, Central Congregational Church, Atlanta, Ga.; Rev. M. J. Wilcox, Methodist, Laurel, Mont.; Rev. Harold Wilke, Council for Social Reconstruction, Evangelical and Reformed Church, Columbia, Mo.; Rev. John P. Wilkins, Episcopal, Bristol, Conn.; Rev. C. Lawson Willard, Jr., Episcopal, New Haven, Conn.; Rev. Alfred E. Willett, Methodist, Paterson, N. J; Rev. David Rhys Williams, Unitarian, Rochester, N. Y.; Rev. Morgan Williams, Methodist, Kankakee, Ill.; Rev. Arthur E. Wilson, Unitarian, Fall River, Mass.; Rev. Charles C. Wilson, Episcopal, Kirksville, Mo.; Rev. Lawrence A. Wilson, Congregational, Pasadena, Calif.; Rev. L. Elbert Wilson, Methodist, Lewisburg, Pa.; Rev. George H. Wilson, Disciples, Kansas City, Mo.; Rev. Roy E. Wilson, Methodist, Porterville, Calif.; Rev. Marshall Wingfield, First Congregational Church, Memphis, Tenn.; Rev. Alexander Winston, Unitarian, Jamaica Plain, Mass.; Rev. Evans A. Worthley, Unitarian, Iowa City, Iowa; Rev. A. Paul Wright, Presbyterian, Auburn, N. Y.; President William Lindsay Young, Park College, Parkville, Mo.

Since preparation of the printed list, the following signatories have been added to the endorsement of anti-poll-tax legislation, House Resolution 7.

Grand total of names, with these additions, stands now at 476, and the number of States represented has been increased to 44.

Rev. Albert E. Barnett, Scarritt College, Nashville, Tenn.; Rev. Samuel N. Baxter, Jr., Episcopal, Springfield, Pa.; Rev. Robert T. Caldwell, Presbyterian, Cheyenne, Wyo.; Rev. A. F. Corn, Methodist, Holland, Tex.; Rev. Theodore H. Evans, Episcopal, Cleveland Heights, Ohio; Rev. G. W. Hummel, Methodist, Bowling Green, Ky.; Rev. J. Clyde Keegan, Methodist, Cody, Wyo.; Bishop Paul B. Kern, The Methodist Church, Nashville, Tenn.; Rev Robert Burns McAulay, Presbyterian, Orange, Calif.; Rev. George Albert Pollard, Congressional, Portland, Oreg.; Rev. Edward T. Ramsdell, Methodist, Nashville, Tenn.; Rev. Leo Rippy, Jr., Methodist, Nashville, Tenn.; Rev Glenn Sanford, Methodist, Conway, Ark.; Rev. Fred W. Shorter, Church of the People, Seattle, Wash.

UNITED CHRISTIAN COUNCIL
FOR DEMOCRACY,
New York City.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the First Air-Mail Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYLE H. BOREN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from President Roosevelt to the Honorable Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the first air-mail flight:

MAY 15, 1943.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It was my privilege to be present 25 years ago today when another war President, Woodrow Wilson, dispatched the first air mail from Potomac Park in Washington.

Those of us who were there hoped that the development of air mail would also mean the development of commercial aviation, but none of us imagined that either the air mail service or commercial aviation would develop as fast as it has.

It is difficult to visualize the rapid expansion which has resulted from that initial air mail flight. The growth of air transport before the war was phenomenal, and it has become a necessary adjunct of our war effort. The science of communication has developed in many ways, but the ability to move men and materials to any part of the world in hours, rather than weeks and months, is vital to our military strategy.

It has enabled the Allied Nations to keep the closest sort of personal contact among the commanders of armies thousands of miles apart. It has speeded the delivery, both at home and abroad, of essential war materials.

Commercial aviation has surrendered many of its peacetime rights to the necessity of war, and in doing so has made a great national contribution.

With the dawn of peace, commercial aviation will have new and greater opportunities for which it will be all the better prepared by reason of the training and experience it is now getting.

Will you be, and the Postmaster General please be, good enough to express to the industry on this observance of the 25th Anniversary of the Air Mail the appreciation of all the people of the United States for a job well done.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Food and the Farm Equipment Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

FOOD AND THE FARM EQUIPMENT SHORTAGE

(A report to the farmer, by Fowler McCormick, president, International Harvester Co.)

We have learned with surprise that in some parts of the country farm equipment manufacturers are being charged with responsibility for the inadequate supply of farm equipment now available.

The statement has been made that farm equipment manufacturers are more interested in producing war materials than in producing farm equipment.

Certainly our industry is interested in producing war materials. No one would want us to be otherwise. But we have never forgotten that to enable the farmer to meet wartime food production goals we must build farm equipment, and we have constantly urged upon the Government the need for greater amounts of farm equipment, a view which has now been acknowledged to be correct. Our operations, with respect to both war production and farm equipment production, have at all times been governed by the decisions and actions of the Government.

The statement has also been made that our industry cannot make enough farm equipment because its plants have been converted too largely to war production.

It is true that International Harvester Co. is engaged on a very large program of war production, but it is also true that we have always had facilities available for the production of farm equipment.

We want farmers and the public generally to understand the facts about the farm machinery situation, which is of vital importance in determining whether the United States can do the food production job.

1. WHAT IS NECESSARY TO SUPPLY FARM MACHINES?

To supply farm machines and replacement parts today, a manufacturer must have five things: First, plants and facilities; second, men and women to operate the plants; third, authority from the Government to build a certain amount of machinery and replacement parts; fourth, materials out of which to make the machinery and replacement parts; fifth, an adequate system for timely distribution of these products.

Our company and other farm equipment manufacturers have the plants and facilities. We have, or can speedily train, the men and women needed. We have a large and capable distribution organization which, left to itself, can do that job properly. But both authority to manufacture and materials for manufacture can be provided only by the Government. And at present the distribution of farm machinery is also completely controlled by the Government.

The Government has never asked us to convert all our facilities to war work and we have never considered doing so. The Government knew, and we knew, that farm equipment production, up to some limit, would prove as vital to the war effort as production of guns and shells. Throughout the war, our farm equipment factories have continued to produce new farm machines in the limited amounts allowed by the Government, and we have regularly produced a large volume of replacement parts, which are made on the same equipment and by the same employees as parts which are assembled into completed farm machines.

Our war work is largely of a kind which requires the automotive type of buildings and facilities and is being carried on principally in our plants of that nature. War work also has been placed in a number of the large warehouses which are characteristic of the farm-equipment business. Although most of our farm-equipment manufacturing capacity is not adaptable to war production, we do have some war production in every plant of the company.

For all these reasons, the great bulk of our farm-equipment production facilities is available now, and has been available at all times throughout the war. Those facilities are capable of turning out many times the amounts that they are now producing.

2. CAN MORE MACHINES BE BUILT IN TIME FOR 1943 USE?

The War Production Board's 1943 farm-equipment program, which provided for production of only 23 percent of the amount of new farm equipment that had been built in 1940, was too small to meet farmers' needs. This has now been publicly recognized by official Washington, and the Government has recently announced that it was granting authority for increased 1943 production of some farm machines. This recognition, however, comes too late in this year for the situation to be more than partially corrected.

Included on the Government's list of increased machines were such items as tractors,

which are useful at any season of the year, and harvesting machinery, which in most sections of the country and for most crops is used relatively late in the year. Production of these machines can still be increased in time to help in 1943.

But production cannot be increased overnight and this authority to manufacture will be useless unless it is accompanied at once by the necessary materials.

Undoubtedly many farmers—and probably some county rationing committees—have expected increased numbers of machines to appear immediately after Government announcements of increased authority to manufacture. It must be remembered that after authority has been granted, from 60 to 120 days are required to get steel and other materials, time is required to turn these materials into finished machines, and additional time is required to get them to the places where the Government orders the manufacturer to send them. Most farm machines cannot be shipped by the manufacturer until they have been tagged by order of the Department of Agriculture for the particular county of the United States where the Government has decided they are to go.

The Government has recently increased somewhat its allotment of steel to farm-equipment production, but farm machines cannot be built of steel alone. Other critical component parts are required.

If these components are provided at once, the output of tractors and harvesting machinery for 1943 delivery can still be increased.

3. WILL THERE BE ENOUGH MACHINERY IN 1944?

Yes, if the Government draws up its farm equipment production program for 1944 in accordance with the needs of American farmers, and if the Government makes that program definite and effective in the immediate future, and if distribution down to the retail level is fitted to the needs of the food program and carried on by experienced and tested manufacturers and retail dealers' service organizations, in cooperation with the Government, and if, above all, the Government will provide the needed materials regularly and on time, then the farm equipment industry will certainly build the machines to do the job.

FOWLER MCCORMICK,
President.

Office of Price Administration

REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of my colleague [M. MCWILLIAMS] who just preceded me. On my desk this morning there were placed two telegrams. One of them is a protest against a proposed order by the Office of Price Administration, which puts ice refrigerator ceilings, with one price for retail stores and a lower price for ice companies. I know something about the proposed order. It is unjust. It is illogical. It is unsound.

The other telegram is from the president of the National Coffee Association and relates to the plan of the Office of Price Administration to include coffee under the subsidy roll-back plan. From what information I can get, this proposed subsidy will not only injure the coffee industry but will do the consumers of this country no good. I think the time has come—in fact, it has long since passed—when the Congress should assert itself and should abolish the Office of Price Administration.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 19, 1943.*
Hon. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The National Coffee Association, representing the importing and distributing branches of the coffee industry of the United States, seeks to enlist your interest in what we believe to be the unwarranted inclusion of coffee with commodities listed under the proposed subsidy roll-back plan.

Irrespective of the merits of the general plan, we believe that there are specific reasons why coffee should be excluded.

This plan will solve no production problem, since in the case of coffee no production problem exists. It will seriously handicap normal distribution by creating costly and cumbersome administrative problems involving both the Government and the industry.

In the case of the other commodities named in connection with the plan, the apparent aim is to roll back prices to those in effect in September or May 1942. Whereas with coffee it is a matter of record that manufacturers' prices were frozen by the Office of Price Administration in May 1942 and actually rolled back to levels existing in March 1942.

Obviously the proposed roll back cannot affect the cost of living in any material way. Under the present basis of coffee rationing the total saving could not in any case exceed 31½ cents per coffee consumer per year. Even this saving would be at the expense of every taxpayer in the United States whether he be coffee consumer or not.

Finally, the plan as applied to our industry creates the alarming prospect of there coming into being within our industry for promiscuous circulation a new currency in the form of coffee ration stamps with a fixed and specific monetary value.

Our membership will greatly appreciate your interest and help. We are confident that you will recognize the pressing urgency of this situation as it relates to the protection of the public interest.

GEORGE C. THIEREACH,
National Coffee Association, New York City.

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the twenty-second installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money.

In this installment Senator Cockrell deals with the proposal of that day to redeem silver money with gold and makes reference to the act of 1890 which provided for the purchase of silver by the issuance of Treasury notes—currency that was later redeemed in gold instead of buying silver with silver certificates redeemable in silver dollars—a plan that was used to embarrass the Government and discredit silver.

The twenty-second installment of Senator Cockrell's speech follows:

Now, Mr. President, I will go to the next point.

The silver certificates are issued on the deposit of silver dollars, and are only promises to pay silver dollars. Their language is: "This certifies there have been deposited in the Treasury of the United States five silver dollars, payable to the bearer on demand." It would be a breach of faith to offer to return to the bearer anything other than the silver dollars named.

The gold certificates are issued on deposit of gold coin or bullion, and are payable only in gold. No one seeks to pay them otherwise. The gold is simply housed in the Treasury, to be delivered back to the holder of the certificate on demand or presentation.

Mr. PLATT. Will the Senator from Missouri allow a question?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT. He is making a most thorough examination of the law and practice, and I wish he would state for the information of Senators, if he knows, who it is that deposits the silver dollars in the Treasury under the practice of the Treasury Department at the present time?

Mr. COCKRELL. Any holder of them, I presume. The most of them are deposited there by banks and mercantile establishments, in all probability. I have never investigated that particular point.

Mr. PLATT. Do they not go in some mysterious way directly from the mint to the Treasury, and the only issue of money when they are coined is really the silver certificate?

Mr. COCKRELL. I expect that is the truth of the matter, as to a part of them. I have no doubt of that. When they are coined they are placed in the Treasury, and everybody prefers the certificate to the coin, and then instead of issuing the dollar the silver certificate is issued.

Now I come to the United States Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, in payment of silver bullion purchased under that act. In my opinion, it was clearly the purpose of the law to have them redeemed in silver dollars coined from the silver bullion purchased and paid for by them. I have already fully discussed their payment in another place.

The Pacific Railroad bonds are currency bonds issued in aid of the construction of those several roads, and are payable as well in greenbacks as in silver dollars. Everybody knows they are payable in anything that is a legal tender.

We have now considered every pecuniary obligation of the United States and see in what kind of money universally recognized by all civilized countries, by every nation, each kind of obligation can be paid. We do not propose to pay the gold certificates or the silver certificates, or to redeem the greenbacks or the Treasury notes, or to pay the interest-bearing bonds in the legal-tender money of foreign nations—China or Japan, Russia or England—but only in the standard money of the United States, our own full legal-tender money called for and specified in them, and in which, by our laws, the only laws creating them or any obligation to pay them, they can be honestly, legally, and equitably paid; in short, only in such money as every self-respecting, civilized country or nation issuing and creating them would pay

in pursuance of the law and the terms of the obligation. What more can anyone ask or demand?

Does anyone now claim that we must redeem the silver certificate or the legal-tender notes only in gold? I am exceedingly anxious to ascertain whether there be one or more Senators who now so claim.

I will pause for a reply. I want to know if there is any pretense that the silver certificate calling for silver dollars must only be redeemed in gold, or that the United States greenbacks, legal tenders, must only be redeemed in gold.

But it may be said, and has probably been said, that the President meant in recommending other legislative action putting beyond all doubt or mistake the intention and the ability of the Government to fulfill its pecuniary obligations in money universally recognized by all civilized countries—only gold money; and that gold money is the only money universally recognized by all civilized countries.

Now, let us see if this claim be correct. Is gold the only metal recognized by all civilized countries? The latest authorities I know upon this question giving us an idea of what the money ofthe world is, is the Indian currency commission report. It is a report of Lord Herschell and others of England. It was made in the present year. It was the report upon which India went to a gold standard practically, or suspended the coinage of the silver rupee. It gives a description of the money of the world, the financial conditions, the financial policies of the different nations of the world. I wish to read some from that report. I read now from page 28:

"United Kingdom."

That is Great Britain. As a matter of course we all know that they have—

"(1) The standard coin to be of one metal, gold.

* * * * *

"Gold is the standard or measure, but for the most part not the medium itself. Though, however, in wholesale transactions, and in a great many retail purchases, gold is no longer the medium of exchange, the use of gold coins is probably greater in the United Kingdom than in most other countries."

In India the silver rupee, at the rate of 15½ to 1, is a full legal tender in the payment of all debts. It is not now allowed free mintage or unlimited mintage. It is coined upon account of the Government.

I go then to Canada, our neighbor. The standard is gold, but they have no mint. There is no Canadian gold coin, and little or no gold in circulation. Silver is not convertible into gold.

"The American silver dollar circulates at par, at the ratio of 16 to 1, although a Government proclamation was issued in 1870 declaring it to be legal tender up to the amount of $10, but only at 80 cents per dollar.

"Silver is not convertible into gold.

"This is a very remarkable case, since, without any gold currency, and without even a mint for gold, dollar notes and silver dollars circulate at the United States gold-dollar value."

That is right here in our neighboring country, and look how our gold monometallists begin to tremble when a few million dollars of gold leave this country.

I now go to the West Indies:

"All the West Indian Islands and British Guiana have adopted the English currency, gold being the standard, but silver being the legal tender without limit."

They have a nominal standard of gold, with silver a full legal tender.

"This is an instance of a gold standard without gold and a silver token currency circulating to an unlimited extent at a value based on that gold standard.

I go now to Germany. Germany adopted the single gold standard in 1871–73 and closed her mints to silver, and they say:

"The peculiarity of the case of Germany is that £20,000,000 worth of old silver thalers are retained in circulation at a ratio of 15½ to 1, and are legal tender to an unlimited extent."

I go to the Scandinavian countries:

"The standard has been gold since 1873, and the mints appear to be open to gold, but there is little gold in circulation. Bank notes convertible into gold are the ordinary currency."

I go to the Latin Union now—France. What do they say? Now I read from it:

"The mints are open to gold.

"Silver coinage, except of subsidiary coins, has since 1878 been and is now prohibited under the rules of the Latin Union.

"There is a large quantity of gold coin in actual circulation.

"The peculiarity of the French currency is the large amount of 5-franc pieces, which circulate at the old ratio of 15½ to 1. They are legal tender to any amount, and are accepted as freely as gold coin. They are not legally convertible into gold."

That is what the Herschell Commission says, notwithstanding the views of my distinguished friend from Louisiana, Mr. White.

I now go to Belgium. The same condition exists precisely as in France, the Latin Union embracing France, Belgium, Italy, Switzerland, and Greece. Italy is the same way.

"The rules as to 5-franc pieces, as to the ratio between gold and silver, and as to legal tender are the same as in France.

"There is very little metallic coin in actual circulation; the paper is at a discount, and the exchange below par."

I go now to Holland and the Dutch East Indies. They had the single silver standard for a long time, and then they changed to the single gold standard "at a ratio of 15⅝ to 1, and the Dutch mint was opened to gold, whilst the coinage of silver, except of subsidiary token coins, was prohibited, and remains so at the present time. Silver florins, at the gold value, were legal tender to any amount, and, with paper florin notes, which were also at a gold value, formed the internal circulation of the country."

I go now to Austria-Hungary. They had the silver standard for a long time. They took steps in 1891 to go to the single gold standard and adopted it in August, 1892. They have no coin, practically, in circulation. They have a large amount of irredeemable paper, and their silver was coined at a ratio, I believe, of 15½ to 1, but they have changed the ratio since.

I go to Brazil:

"The case of Brazil is perhaps the most remarkable of all, as showing that a paper currency without a metallic basis may, if the credit of the country is good, be maintained at a high and fairly steady exchange, although it is absolutely inconvertible and has been increased by the act of the Government out of all proportion to the growth of the population and of its foreign trade."

They sum up this on page 35, but I will not consume the time of the Senate in reading it. It is just what I have read. They give a summary:

"RESULTS OF EXAMINATION OF DIFFERENT SYSTEMS OF CURRENCY

"93. It is impossible thus to review foreign systems of currency without feeling that, however admirable may be the precautions of our own currency system, other nations have adopted different systems which appear to have worked without difficulty, and have enabled them to maintain for their respective currencies a gold standard and a substantial parity of exchange with the gold-using countries of the world, which has, unfortunately, not been the case with India. This has been effected under all the following conditions, viz:

"(a) With a little or no gold coin, as in Scandinavia, Holland, and Canada;

"(b) Without a mint or gold coinage, as in Canada and the Dutch East Indies;

"(c) With a circulation consisting partly of gold, partly of overvalued and inconvertible silver, which is legal tender to an unlimited amount, as in France and other countries of the Latin union, in the United States, and also in Germany, though there the proportion of overvalued silver is more limited, the mints in all these countries being freely open to gold, but not to silver, and in some of them the silver coinage having ceased;

"(d) With a system under which the banks part with gold freely for export, as in Holland, or refuse it for export, as in France;

"(e) With mints closed against private coinage of both silver and gold, and with a currency of inconvertible paper, as has been temporarily the case in Austria;

"(f) With a circulation based on gold, but consisting of token silver, which, however, is legal tender to an unlimited extent, as in the West Indies.

"The case of Holland and Java is very remarkable, since in that case the gold standard has been maintained without difficulty in both countries, although there is no mint in the Dutch East Indies, no stock of gold there, and a moderate stock of gold in Holland; whilst the currency consists of silver and paper legally and practically inconvertible into gold, except of purposes of export. The case of Canada, which maintains a gold standard without a gold coinage, is also very remarkable.

We see, Mr. President, what other civilized countries treat as money, that silver as money is recognized by nearly every civilized country. Suppose England or Germany should adopt platinum instead of gold and should change their standard, I suppose then the United States must hasten to pay all its pecuniary obligations in platinum, the only money universally recognized by all civilized countries. You might just as well make that contention as to contend that under the language of the President you must redeem them all in gold.

I do not know what the President meant except by simply taking his language as I find it, and I say that according to his own language silver dollars are full legal tender, the equal of gold, irredeemable in anything on earth, above it, or beneath it, the money universally recognized by all civilized countries, in which the pecuniary obligations of the Government can all be paid, except only the gold certificates.

WHY NOT RESTORE SILVER MONEY?

Mr. President, we are told of the fearful financial crisis now pending and the deadly paralysis of business, and that all results from our legislation in regard to silver.

These are only the same old prophecies we have heard ding-dong ever since 1877, the same old scare, and the same old trembling apprehension of dire consequences from the restoration of silver to its equal monetary functions with gold. What do they really portend? What is the ulterior object of these predictions? To what monetary system are they intended to bring us? These are vital questions to every American freeman, every patriot, regardless of politics.

I assert that the ulterior object, the final end sought to be attained, is the single gold standard for the United States, with free and unlimited coinage and full legal tender, and all other kinds of money, silver and paper currency, to be redeemable in gold, limited in legal tender and mere subsidiary money.

The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] has certainly had more to do in shaping our financial legislation and establishing the single gold standard by the coinage law of February 12, 1873, than any one man in the United States. He certainly understood clearly the objects sought to be secured.

Now, Mr. President, I am going to show you what is to become of all these predictions and pretensions. I take the finance report of 1877, when the Senator from Ohio was Secretary of the Treasury and was making his recommendations to Congress. I read from page 21:

"The question of the issue of a silver dollar for circulation as money has been much discussed and carefully examined by a commission organized by Congress, which has recommended the coinage of the old silver dollar. With such legislative provision as will maintain its current value at par with gold, its issue is respectfully recommended. A gold coin of the denomination of one dollar is too small for convenient circulation, while such a coin in silver would be convenient for a multitude of daily transactions, and is in a form to satisfy the natural instinct of hoarding.

"Of the metals, silver is of most general use for coinage It is a part of every system of coinage even in countries where gold is the sole legal standard. It best measures the common wants of life, but, from its weight and bulk, is not a convenient medium in the larger exchanges of commerce. Its production is reasonably steady in amount. The relative market value of silver and gold is far more stable than that of any other two commodities—still, it does vary. It is not in the power of human law to prevent the variation. This inherent difficulty has compelled all nations to adopt one or the other as the sole standard of value, or to authorize an alternative standard of either, or to coin both metals at an arbitrary standard, and to maintain one at par with the other by limiting its amount and legal-tender quality, and receiving or redeeming it at par with the other.

"It has been the careful study of statesmen for many years to secure a bimetallic currency not subject to the changes of market value, and so adjusted that both kinds can be kept in circulation together, not alternating with each other. The growing tendency has been to adopt for coins, the principle of "redeemability" applied to different forms of paper money. By limiting tokens, silver, and paper money to the amount needed for business, and promptly receiving or redeeming all that may at any time be in excess, all these forms of money can be kept in circulation in large amounts, at par with gold. In this way, tokens of inferior intrinsic value are readily circulated, but do not depreciate below the paper money into which they are convertible. The fractional silver coin now in circulation, though the silver of which it is composed is of less market value than the paper money, passes readily among all classes of people and answers all the purposes for which it was designed. And so the silver dollar, if restored to our coinage, would greatly add to the convenience of the people. But this coin should be subject to the same rule, as to issue and convertibility, as other forms of money."

There you have it, a silver dollar redeemable in gold Now I read from page 23:

"Much complaint has been made that this was done with the design"—

Referring to the demonetization of silver—

"Much complaint has been made that this was done with the design of depriving the people of the privilege of paying their debts in a cheaper money than gold, but it is manifest that this is an error. No one then did or could foresee the subsequent fall in the market value of silver."

That is remarkable for a financier, a statesman for years and years at the head of the Finance Committee, and who presented himself in Paris to give financial instruction to the assembled delegates of the world in a monetary conference, that no one could conceive of any possibility of the fall in the price of silver by its demonetization, when in 1868, 5 years before the demonetization of silver, Wolowski and Seyd had published to the world, as many other writers had done, exactly what would occur if silver was demonetized by the world and the mints opened for gold only. Yet Secretary Sherman says nobody could possibly have conceived of such a thing. Now I read from pages 24 and 25:

"The Secretary believes that all the beneficial results hoped for from a liberal issue of silver coin can be secured by issuing this coin, in pursuance of the general policy of the act of 1853, in exchange for United States notes, coined from bullion purchased in the open market by the United States, and maintaining it by redemption or otherwise."

Mr. President, you see exactly what the Senator from Ohio wants. He wants a silver dollar redeemable in gold. I go to the finance report of 1878, page 17, to the same effect. It is to the same effect as the extract I have just read.

"And the Secretary respectfully recommends that he be authorized to discontinue the coinage of the silver dollar when the amount outstanding shall exceed $50,000,000.

"The Secretary deems it proper to state that in the meantime, in the execution of the law as it now stands, he will feel it to be his duty to redeem all United States notes presented on and after January 1, next, at the office of the Assistant Treasurer of the United States in the city of New York, in sums of not less than $50, with either gold or silver coin, as desired by the holder, but reserving the legal option of the Government; and to pay out United States notes for all other demands on the Treasury, except when coin is demanded on coin liabilities."

Now, I take the finance report of 1880, also made by Secretary Sherman. It is to the same effect:

"1. It is too bulky for large transactions, and its use is confined mainly to payments for manual labor and for market purposes or for change. The amount needed for these purposes is already in excess of the probable demand.

"2. It is known to contain a quantity of silver of less market value than the gold in gold coin. This fact would not impair the circulation of such limited amount as experience shows to be convenient for use, but it does prevent its being held or hoarded as reserves, or exported, and pushes it into active circulation, until it returns to the Treasury, as the least valuable and desirable money in use.

"For these reasons the Secretary respectfully but earnestly recommends that the further compulsory coinage of the silver dollar be suspended."

Now, I will refer to what I have already stated, and that is Senate bill 217 and Senate report made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Sherman], June 9, 1868, establishing the gold standard with free coinage and unlimited legal tender, and section 2 provides for silver coinage in these words:

"The weight of the half dollar shall be 179 grains, equivalent to 116 decigrams; and the lesser coins shall be in due proportion. But the coinage of silver pieces of $1, 5 cents, and 3 cents shall be discontinued."

Section 3 provided:

"And the silver coins shall be a legal tender to an amount not exceeding $10 in any one payment."

Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on yesterday the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] appeared before the Senate Finance Committee, which was considering the extension of the reciprocal-trade agreements, and made a statement which I consider of such great value that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I understand that on Monday the Senate will begin consideration of the trade-treaty-extension proposal, and I sincerely hope that all Senators will afford themselves the pleasure of reading the statement made by the Senator from Wyoming before the Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator O'MAHONEY I believe the issue which is presented to the committee is one of the most fundamental importance. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that the Congress of the United States, as a legislative body exercising the constitutional authority which was given to it by the Constitution, now stands on the brink of oblivion and is about to jump off.

For more than 20 years there has been a constant growth of executive power at the expense of the legislative power.

We see that growth in every avenue of government. It would not have been possible if it had not been for the fact that Congress has nonchalantly acquiesced in the delegation of the legislative power to the executive. I am profoundly convinced, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, that by the action of the Congress upon this measure with respect to whether or not it shall retain for Congress some degree of supervision over the action of the Executive power will depend the future ability of the people of the United States to control the action of their Government through the Congress.

MARKS CRISIS OF STRUGGLE

This is the crisis of the struggle between the Congress and bureaucracy. I do not need to tell the members of this committee that such a struggle has been going on. We see it on every hand.

Members of the executive are interested enough to pay lip service to Congress, to its functions, to its duty and responsibility, but it is only lip service.

If it is necessary for some bureau head to get the confirmation of the Senate before he may exercise his powers, every Member of the Senate will be besieged by his friends until the confirmation is secured, and then when the confirmation is secured, as likely as not you will find such a person saying, "Congress is calling me up before its committees too often. Why don't they let me alone to do my work?"

We have had examples of that.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to come here this morning to thresh old wheat. I am not going to make the old argument about the constitutionality of trade agreements,

the distinction between treaties and trade agreements, I am not going to discuss the question as to whether or not this is an exercise of the taxing power, I mean in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act which, under the Constitution, belongs to the Congress, and which should be initiated in the House of Representatives; I am not going to discuss the question of whether or not this is a regulation of commerce. Of course, it is all of those things. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act does invade the field of treaties, it does invade the field of revenue legislation, it does invade the field of regulation of commerce.

What I want to point out to you first of all, is the Constitution says that in international arrangements which assume the dignity of treaties the Senate is part of the Executive power.

In the matter of revenue legislation, the Constitution said that revenue bills shall initiate in the House. It was the traditional view of the framers of the Constitution that the power of the purse is the very essence of democratic government, so the framers of the Constitution were careful to preserve the power of the purse for the elected representatives of the people.

Now, for 10 years we have been delegating that power to the Executive arm of government. The Constitution says in words that cannot be misunderstood Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States, the Indian tribes, etc.

The power to regulate commerce under our system is a congressional power.

CONGRESS MUST NOT BE IGNORED

Why should I indulge in legalistic argument on whether or not this power should be delegated and may be delegated, whether or not the Trade Agreements Act sets forth a standard?

Every lawyer on this committee knows that the courts have invariably held that Congress cannot delegate its legislative power unless it prescribes a standard which is intelligible and capable of being followed.

I am not going to urge upon this committee what I know and what I have said before that there is no standard here. I am talking to you now about the elimination of the voice of Congress from the reorganization of the world when this war is over, that is what we are talking about and let nobody make any mistake about it.

I am saying to you gentlemen there is no power under heaven that can strip the Congress of the United States of its authority to act for the people of the United States except the Congress itself, and we are doing it so fast that it appalls me.

SENATE STUDIES POST-WAR PROBLEMS

This committee on the 2d of March unanimously recommended to the Senate the enactment of a resolution setting up a special committee to study post-war economic policies.

This committee asked the Senate of the United States to appoint 10 Members of the Senate to study the problems of the post-war world, and to make a report to Congress. Let me read that resolution to you:

"*Resolved*, That there is hereby established—

"(a) A special committee to be known as the Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning (hereinafter referred to as the special committee).

"(b) The special committee shall be composed of 10 Members of the Senate, 6 from the majority and 4 from the minority, appointed by the President of the Senate.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the special committee to investigate all matters relating to post-war economic policy and problems; to gather information, plans, and suggestions from informed sources with respect to such problems; to study the plans and suggestions received; to report to the Congress from time to time the results of findings made and conclusions reached. It is the sense and purpose of this resolution to make accessible to the Congress, through the special committee, the most complete information respecting post-war economic policy and post-war problems that is available, to the end that Congress may be advised respecting those problems and in a position to formulate solutions with respect to them which will result in the greatest contribution by the Congress to achievement of a stable economy and a just peace. It is intended that full authority to accomplish this general purpose shall be granted by this resolution.

"HEARINGS, SUBPENAS, DISBURSEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 2. The special committee, or any subcommittee thereof, sha" have power to hold hearings and to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable, not exceeding the sum of $50,000. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of said committee, and shall be served by any person designated by him. Amounts appropriated for the expenses of the committee shall be disbursed by the chairman.

"OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES: APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION

"SEC. 3. The special committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation fixed under sections 661-663, 664-673, and 674 of title 5 of the United States Code for comparable duties. Officers and employees of the Government shall be detailed to the service of the special committee on its request, without additional compensation, and such officers and employees shall be paid from the appropriations regularly available for their salaries."

CONGRESS MUST RETAIN ITS POWER

Gentlemen of the committee, how can the Senate of the United States, or this special committee, or this committee, make any contribution to the solution of these post-war problems if we blithely surrender to the Executive the complete and absolute power contained in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without review to regulate international trade?

Sometimes when I think about this problem, I am impressed by the thought that many of us, in discussing it in the past and in thinking about it now, are guided by habit of thought. We still imagine that international trade and commerce is the exchange of goods and services among individuals, among the representatives of free enterprise, whereas if we know a thing about what has been happening in the world for the last 20 years, we know that international trade is now governed by Government action and by the action of international cartels.

MUST THINK IN POST-WAR TERMS

When we think of trade and commerce in the terms of 50 years ago, we are thinking of an old, old world. I should like to see the Congress of the United States begin to think in terms of the world that is to be after this war.

What brought on the collapse? Those who have advocated the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act have said that it was brought about by an increase of nationalism, it was brought about by high tariffs. Why, gentlemen, that is just a superficial view. What happened was that the lending power of banks and of Government failed.

For 20 years we have been building up markets by lending money to the purchasers, hoping that somehow or another trade would be gotten back on its old basis.

We are talking about synthetic rubber today. What about that question of synthetic rubber?

Don't we know that the British Government and Dutch Government had an international cartel which controlled the price of rubber?

Don't we know that that was not a matter of the exchange of goods and services among the people? The rubber trade was controlled by the governments. It was a government act.

When we think of steel and copper, when we think of tungsten and the General Electric, can we close our minds to the fact that the international cartel, the combination of I. G. Farben Industrie and Krupp in Germany, with some of our own great industrial organizations like the General Electric, dominated the trade?

CARTEL MAKE OWN TRADE AGREEMENTS

They entered into the international agreement without so much as a "by your leave" of the Senate of the United States.

They made their reciprocal-trade agreements. Congress had nothing in the world to say about them, and the people whom the Congress represents were the victims of these trades.

Is it going to be any correction of that system to transfer this power completely to the executive branch of the Government?

Now some gentlemen may think that this is a mere figment of the imagination.

I say to you gentlemen of the committee that you are dealing with the most fundamental question that has arisen in the American political and constitutional scene in 100 years.

LEGISLATIVE BODIES LEFT WITH POWER

I want to call your attention to the testimony of the Honorable Francis B. Sayre before the House committee. He was asked to explain the fact that of the 26 countries with which we have negotiated trade agreements only 4 have placed the legislative body in the position of impotence, that the Congress of the United States has done for itself.

"How does it come," Assistant Secretary Sayre was asked, "that of all these countries 22 retain in some form or another the legislative power to approve these trade agreements?"

Now just listen to his answer. I am reading from page 164 of the House hearings. This testimony was given on April 14. He was asked about the list of countries.

"Who issued this list?" Mr. KNUTSON, of the House committee asked.

"Mr. SAYRE. I am not sure whether it is the Tariff Commission or the Department of State. I can't say offhand, sir; I am not sure which. The agreements not requiring subsequent foreign legislative action are those made with Belgium and Luxemburg, with Cuba, with Ecuador, and with Peru."

I interrupt long enough to point out that the trade agreement with Belgium and Luxemburg was in fact a treaty, because it modified a previously made treaty.

No matter what you may say about regulation of commerce, or what you may desire to say about the taxing power, that trade agreement did, in fact, modify a treaty which had previously been modified by the Senate of the United States in accordance with the Constitution.

Then returning to Mr. Sayre:

"These agreements put into effect provisionally, subject to eventual foreign legislative action, are Argentina, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Netherlands, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, Venezuela.

"Those agreements which did not become effective until after foreign legislative action are Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, El Salvador, Finland, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Sweden, and Uruguay."

I shall refrain from making the comment which comes to mind in this connection.

In order that I may lay before this committee the seriously distorted and naive opinion of Mr. Sayre with respect to the Executive and legislative power, Mr. Sayre was cognizant of the fact that this list which he had just given of little republics in Latin America showed greater loyalty to the principle of legislative representation of the people than the Congress of the United States, and so he wanted to explain it away.

MR. SAYRE'S EXPLANATION

Listen to the explanation:

"I would like to add that with respect to many of these they are agreements with countries under the parliamentary system of government. By that, of course, as you realize, the executive is in control of legislative action."

Can anybody imagine a more complete reversion of the facts?

He goes on:

"So long as the executive, the prime minister, remains in power, he can command the action of the legislature, so that an agreement entered into, agreed to by the executive, sanctioned by the prime minister, practically is assured of legislative support; that is, in those countries one does not have the distinction—the separation, I mean—between legislative and executive functions."

BUT UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION DOES MAKE SEPARATION OF POWERS

Oh, Mr. Chairman, we have that distinction in the United States. The framers of the Constitution were careful to say the Executive shall not be free of the legislative power, and we representatives of the people blithely walk up to the bar of history and say, "Despite everything that has happened in our past, we desire to surrender to the Executive this power which the framers of the Constitution said belongs to the people through their representatives."

Senator BAILEY. Senator, it is not so much a desire as incapacity. I would like to have you address yourself to that.

You are very eloquent in expressing it. How can we go about it? What is your suggestion?

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I come to that in just a moment?

I want to finish the analysis of what Mr. Sayre has said.

"So long as the executive," he says, "the prime minister, remains in power, he can command the action of the legislature."

PRIME MINISTER SUBJECT TO WILL OF PARLIAMENT

Now, we all know perfectly well that the prime minister in a parliamentary government holds his position at the will of the parliament. He cannot command the parliament. The moment that he takes an action which is out of harmony with the will of the parliament, that moment he loses his political head. But in this country, when the legislative surrenders its power of supervision over the Executive, then, indeed, the Executive becomes all-powerful—then, indeed, do we find that the executive power of the Government is being built up at the expense of the legislative.

Oh, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there never was a time in all the history of this Government when it was of greater importance that the elected representatives of the people should stand, without trembling or taking a single backward step, for the preservation, complete and unadulterated, of legislative power.

CONGRESS SHOULD HAVE OWN STAFF OF EXPERTS

Now I come to the question asked by the Senator from North Carolina.

All that is necessary, I will say to the Senator, is for the Congress to equip itself with its own experts, to equip itself with a sufficient staff to do the work which ought to be done and which must be done.

Of course, the life of this age is much more complicated than the life of 50 years ago, or 100 years ago, but we create these expert executive bureaus now under the aegis of the Executive and then we surrender the power and practice of supervision over them. Indeed, if we do try to exercise any supervision, then the cry goes out, "What is the Congress interfering with the Executive for?"

They say we are interfering with the efficiency of Government. And yet there is not a Member of the Senate or a Member of the House who cannot point out innumerable instances of the inefficiency of the bureaus, the incompetence of the bureaus to do the work which has been delegated to them.

Senator DANAHER. Senator, may I ask you a question?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Let me add just this word: Take this Committee on Finance, now for the fourth time dealing with this problem of reciprocal-trade agreement.

We have been content through all this period of 10 years to invite spokesmen from various parts of the country, representatives of interested organizations, to come here and give their testimony, and then we dismiss them. What effort has been made by the Ways and Means Committee of the House and by the Finance Committee of the Senate to enter into all of the problems that affect this question of international trade?

TRADE AGREEMENTS AND THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Let us take, for example, trade with the Latin-American countries. How much testimony is there before this committee or before the Ways and Means Committee about the loans of the Export-Import Bank in Latin America? Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller was testifying before the House committee and he is the Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs, and he was attributing to the reciprocal trade program the increase of trade with Latin-America and he said—I have forgotten the figures—trade has increased from $462,000,000 in 1932 to $960,000,000, let us say, in 1939.

I want to call your attention to the fact that as of May 17, 1943, the authorizations and commitments of the Export-Import Bank of Washington to Latin-American countries amounted to $757,134,014.79. Does anybody imagine that that has nothing to do with this trade? That is the action of a Government body. It is not the reciprocal trade agreements that are building up the trade with Latin America.

What about the purchase of gold? The Executive buying gold in south Africa, digging it up from the ground there, transporting it across the seas, and burying it in the ground here in order to increase trade.

WOULD BYPASS CONGRESS

Senator LODGE. Will the Senator permit a question?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Surely.

Senator LODGE. When the Senator says Congress stands on the brink of oblivion I do not think he exaggerates at all. It seems to me that this procedure in this resolution can be followed in a way so as to bypass Congress entirely.

Senator O'MAHONEY. I am going to show that that is precisely the intent.

TRADE AGREEMENTS AND TREATIES

Senator LODGE. Let me ask the Senator when is an agreement between nations a treaty and when isn't it?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Well, as I said at the beginning, it had not been my intention to go into that old argument. That was all presented very lucidly by Senator Pittman in 1940. In the course of that argument at that time the same question arose: What is the difference between a trade agreement and a treaty? I will say to the Senator, as I see it, and I think a study of all the international agreements will bear it out, a treaty is an international agreement which states a course of policy affecting the public welfare over a period, whereas an Executive agreement is an international compact or convention to carry out a policy which has already been determined by the proper legislative authority of the Government.

Now, in the course of the discussion, when Senator Pittman was speaking—I am reading from page 3322 of the RECORD of March 25, 1940—I interrupted him in order to read into the record some material that had been presented, mistakenly I thought, by Congressman ROBERTSON of Virginia to show that there is no distinction between treaties and trade agreements. The then chairman of this committee, Senator Harrison, inserted it into the record, and I thought that the record of the Senate should contain it.

Mr. WILLIS ROBERTSON was quoting from the opinion of Chief Justice Taney in the case of *Hames* v. *Jannison* (14 Pet. 540, p. 571). Now the virtue of this quotation, of course, is that it is the authority cited by the principal advocate of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in the House of Representatives and the Ways and Means Committee. This evidently was the very best authority he could find. I am quoting now from Chief Justice Taney as quoted by Mr. ROBERTSON:

"In the very next clause of the Constitution the States are forbidden to enter into any 'agreement' or 'compact' with a foreign nation, and as these words could not have been idly or superfluously used by the framers of the Constitution they cannot be construed to mean the same thing with the word 'treaty.'"

CHIEF JUSTICE TANEY'S OPINION

Now, there is no need of disagreeing over that. A trade agreement and treaty are different things.

"A few extracts from an eminent writer," the Chief Justice went on, "on the laws of nations, showing the manner in which these different words have been used, and the different meanings sometimes attached to them will, perhaps, contribute to explain the reason for using them all in the Constitution and will prove that the most comprehensive terms were employed in prohibiting to the States all intercourse with foreign nations."

Chief Justice Taney is saying that when the Constitution prohibited the States from making an agreement or compact with foreign nations the Constitution was prohibiting all international intercourse, and I assume nobody will debate that.

"Vattel"—now he is quoting an authority—"page 192, section 152, says: 'A treaty, in Latin foedus, is a compact made with a view to the public welfare, by the superior power, either for perpetuity or for a considerable time.'"

Then section 153:

"The compacts which have temporary matters for their object are called agreements, conventions, and pactions. They are accomplished by one single act and not by repeated acts. These compacts are perfected in their

execution once for all; treaties receive a successive execution, whose duration equals that of the treaty."

That is the end of the quotation from the authority made by Chief Justice Taney.

Senator LODGE. Isn't it true that the decision as to whether a certain international understanding is or is not a treaty must rest with the executive branch of the Government?

Senator O'MAHONEY. No; not at all. There is no provision of the Constitution anywhere that says the executive branch of the Government should decide which is a treaty and which is not.

Senator LODGE. What is the practical matter?

Senator O'MAHONEY. The practical matter is this—and this is the concluding phase of my talk here—that for 20 years there has been a conscious effort in the State Department to build up the trade agreements—not the trade agreements, the Executive agreement at the expense of the treaty-making power.

Senator BAILEY. The St. Lawrence treaty was negotiated by three Presidents. The last time the thing came down it came down as an agreement. The fact we had agreed to these trade agreements was cited as authority and precedent for us to acquiesce in the St. Lawrence treaty.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Exactly.

Senator LODGE. That is just my point. In that particular case the executive branch of the Government, as Senator BAILEY mentioned, decided it was not a treaty, that it was an agreement. Why cannot they do it again, and, in that case, what is Congress going to say about it?

UNITED STATES SENATE TODAY LAST BARRIER TO EXECUTIVE DOMINATION

Senator O'MAHONEY. The Senate of the United States at this moment is the last barrier between complete Executive domination of the Government of the United States and a loss of legislative power. We can write this into the law now. We can say in words that nobody shall misunderstand that these agreements, before they become effective, must have the approval of the people's representatives. I say to you gentlemen of the committee, unless you do it, your power to share in the reorganization after the war has been won will have been wiped out. There is a conscious effort to destroy the treaty-making power of the Senate.

I recommend to the reading of every member of this committee before action is taken on this agreement or on this resolution——

Senator BAILEY (interposing). I think that effort is manifest in the resolution in the Senate, is it not?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Thank you. I am glad the Senator says that.

I want to call your attention to the book on International Executive Agreements, published in 1941 by Mr. Wallace McClure, a civil-service employee of the State Department, who has prepared a very exhaustive and able analysis of trade agreements, Executive agreements, and treaties. The whole purpose of it is to say that the ratification of treaties in the constitutional method is undemocratic and should be done away with, and that in its place there ought to be the Executive agreement. We are already told that it is not necessary and probably undesirable to have a definitive treaty of peace for the termination of the war. We are told that the Executive arm of the Government, through the military power and through the power of international trade, shall govern these countries which are to be conquered.

Why, gentlemen, if that be the plan, on the very threshhold of the greatest crisis in democratic reorganization in the history of the world, the legislative body of the United States, the Congress, surrenders its power, then the Senate need not worry about treaties or post-war agreements.

Let me read what Mr. McClure's argument is. I am reading from page 251.

"The factual basis of the present thesis may now be regarded as complete.

"Effort was made in part 1 to demonstrate in comprehensive fashion the extent of the actual use of the Executive agreement as an instrument of national procedure and policy. In both variety and numerical preponderance the Executive agreement system was shown to be a worthy teammate of the treaty system in the development and maintenance of American international relations."

Now the statistics which he presents show that the year 1920 represents what he calls the median point. Before 1920, throughout the history of the United States, there were fewer Executive agreements than treaties. Since 1920 there have been more Executive agreements than through the entire history of the United States prior to 1920. Gradually the Executive power has been built up.

Senator BAILEY. Most of those were under this Reciprocity Act, were they not?

Senator O'MAHONEY. No; there were only 30 of those.

Senator BAILEY. How many others were there?

Senator O'MAHONEY. I can turn to the exact page here.

Senator BAILEY. Don't trouble. We can get it.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Well, it is important. On page 4 of this volume Mr. McClure says:

INVASION OF LEGISLATIVE POWERS ON INCREASE

"The numbers of treaties and Executive agreements have increased with the vast expansion of world affairs, reflecting the growing participation of the United States. During the first 50 years of government under the Constitution the President is known to have entered into some 27 international acts without invoking the consent of the Senate, while 60 became law as treaties; for the second half century the figures appear to be 238 Executive agreements and 215 treaties; and for the third similar period 917 Executive agreements and 524 treaties. For treaties the midway point of the enumeration coincides rather closely with the advent of the Twentieth century (beginning of 1903); for the Executive agreement listed the median year is 1920."

Now, returning to the argument which was presented on page 251, Mr. McClure goes on:

"That the making of Executive international agreements is authorized by a constitutional usage and that the Constitution of the United States, like that of every other country, consists not merely of a particular charter or similar instrument of government but also largely of institutionalized habits or customs—usages—was the theme of part 2. The parallel course of constitutions with a core of what is regarded as in a special sense superlaw, and the English Constitution, which lacks one, was indicated, and outstanding American usages like judicial review and the employment of Executive agents were the subject of discussion."

He is asking his readers to adhere to his theory that the Constitution, even in the vital matter of the ratification of treaties, may be amended by usage, and the effort is made to show that gradually there has been an invasion of the field of the treaty by the executive agreement and because of that invasion we ought now to consent to it.

Senator CLARK. Senator, there is a very essential and vital difference, is there not, between Executive agreements negotiated under such a resolution, the extension of which we now have before us, by specific authority of Congress, and any Executive agreements that were not authorized by Congress?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; certainly.

Senator CLARK. Executive agreements negotiated under the old Postal Convention law is one thing, but there is certainly no precedent for such an instance of Executive agreement as Senator BAILEY referred to a moment ago.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Senator CLARK. I do not believe that they are on all fours with cases where Congress has specifically authorized the negotiation of such Executive agreements.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Missouri, like myself, has been a lifelong advocate of the principles of Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson believed in the strict construction of the Constitution in order to preserve the power of the people in their States and in their localities. He was against the broad construction of the Constitution which was designed, as he saw, to build up the Executive at the expense of the people, and so throughout his history you will find that golden thread defending the rights of the people in their local communities against the central power—and now we are asked to reverse that.

I say that this constitutional debate over the construction of the Constitution is more important today than it was in the time of Jefferson, because now the world is toppling before the advance of the totalitarian regimes, and we in the Senate of the United States are asked to give our aid and comfort to the advance of the totalitarian theory in the United States of America.

Senator MILLIKIN. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Millikin.

Senator MILLIKIN. Senator O'MAHONEY, will you let me interject for just a moment?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Surely.

Senator MILLIKIN. I want to invite your attention to article I, section 7, of the Constitution that puts in Congress the power "to make all laws which will be necessary and proper to carry into execution the foregoing powers," referring to congressional powers, "and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

Senator O'MAHONEY. Yes; of course.

Senator MILLIKIN. I think that has the most pertinent relevancy to these agreements that we have been talking about.

WOULD SURRENDER POWER TO WIN THE PEACE

Senator O'MAHONEY. The whole question here is whether or not Congress is going to abdicate its power and I say to you if in this crisis we permit this act of abdication we shall find it difficult indeed to regain the people's power which we have so blithely tossed aside.

We are now passing upon trade agreements in abnormal times. This is not the situation that existed in 1934 or in 1937; it is scarcely that which existed in 1940, although 1940 was much more identical. In the argument in that year I pointed out that the world was at war that trade agreements could not be made for the purpose of building up international trade. Mr. Sayre proves my statement now in his testimony by saying that international trade since 1939 has been merely the act of government affected by the war, by submarine campaigns, by shipping shortages, by supply and demand. Why, government has assumed complete authority, and necessarily so, of course, to win the war, but what I am pointing out is that we are surrendering the power to win the peace, and I am showing you that a responsible employee of the Department of State has laid down the formula. Let me read a few more words.

Senator DANAHER. How do you need any better illustration of the points you are making than the agreement concluded between Mr. Sumner Welles and Mr. Churchill in February 1942, which purports to be an Executive agreement?

Senator O'MAHONEY. The Executive is advancing steadily into the field of the legislative. I do not pretend to say that Congress is without blame; of course it is to be blamed, Congress has not done its job, Congress has not worked hard enough. We appropriated $29,000,000——

Senator BAILEY. Billion.

Senator O'MAHONEY. No; $29,000,000. I am talking about the appropriation for the expenses of the Congress, of the Senate and House, to pay the salaries of all Members, to pay the salaries of all clerks, to pay all the expenses. We have appropriated annually less for the Congress than we appropriate for the publicity bureaus of the departments. How can it be said that Congress is doing its job?

Senator VANDENBERG. Will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion to him?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Senator VANDENBERG. The Senator is presenting the argument that usage is constantly being played as a progressive reason to further invade the congressional authority. I call his attention to what I think is the most important contemporary exhibit to prove that the Senator is not dealing in a merely imaginary hazard. I call his attention to article VII in the master agreement made under the Lend-Lease Act which spells out the precise purpose that the Senator now discusses, and by way of conciliation and hope I remind him of what happened before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, without regard to party, when it reported the extension of the lend-lease agreements bill, article VII, and notified the world that we would have no responsibility.

MUST MAKE THE FIGHT NOW

Senator O'MAHONEY. I say to you gentlemen of the committee, make your fight here and now. If you do not do it you will have lost your power.

I know that the members of the committee are anxious to get to the Senate, and I will hurry along, reading one or two more extracts. Now listen to this, please. This is from page 252:

"While through citation of judicial decisions and otherwise there has heretofore been no hesitation to invoke the terms of stated law, hereafter, in part 3, strictly legal reasoning will hold the center of the discourse. It is believed that the President has, and was intended to have, under the Constitution, all the powers and the functions of the head of a fully recognized member of the society of nations; that he has, accordingly, the authority to enter into any manner of international act, on any subject, that is entered into by other states of the world."

Is it any wonder that Mr. Sayre, in explaining the attitude of the backward nations of Latin America in preserving the legislative power, has said that in some of these countries the parliament system is under the control of the executive? That is what they want, Mr. Chairman and gentlement of the committee. And bear in mind it is a matter of growth. It has been growing, as Mr. McClure has pointed out, not in this administration alone, but in previous administrations as well.

The tendency to use power to extend power is clearly manifested here, as it has been everywhere else, but are we to say in the Finance Committee of the United States Senate as Mr. McClure says, that it was the intention of the Constitution that the President should have all the powers and the functions of the head of a fully recognized member of the society of nations? Why, that is perfect and complete nonsense. The intention of the framers of the Constitution was that the people should control the Government.

Senator MILLIKIN. The Constitution, Senator O'MAHONEY, says otherwise in explicit language.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You mean otherwise than what Mr. McClure says?

Senator MILLIKIN. Yes, exactly.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The Constitution says in explicit language what the respective powers are.

Senator MILLIKIN. Exactly.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Of course, the point is, I will say to the Senator from Colorado, that these executive experts under civil service are impatient of Congress, they are impatient of the politicians who are elected by the people and give some concern to popular wishes. They are impatient to logrolling, they say. They do not want to be impeded in the exercise of their wise judgment in doing what ought to be done.

CONSTITUTION NOT OUTMODED

But, gentlemen of the committee, democracy was not established for the purpose of efficiency, it was established for the purpose of liberty and freedom. There are not enough executive experts in all of Washington to exercise wisdom and power that is greater than the power of the people through their legislative Representatives.

The Constitution is not outmoded. They will tell you it is. If the Constitution is turned into scrap and a new world is reorganized by Executive decree, then totalitarianism has come to America.

I will read just one more word, gentlemen, and then I will ask leave to put the rest in the record. May I read this from page 363?

"The President can do by Executive agreement anything that he can do by treaty, provided Congress by law cooperates. And there is a very wide field of action in which the cooperation of Congress is not necessary; indeed, where Congress possesses no constitutional authority to dissent."

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen may argue themselves into the belief that because a reduction in tariff duties may be beneficial it should be done in an extra-constitutional way. Gentlemen may argue themselves into the belief that efficiency requires the increased power of the Executive, but when they do this they are arguing against the fundamental principle of our Government, which is that the people shall control.

For my part, I am not ready to take this step of abdication.

TEXT OF AMENDMENT

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me ask that there may be printed in the record at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the amendment which I have already presented on the floor of the Senate, and which is the same as the one which I offered in 1940.

The amendment referred to is as follows:

"House Joint Resolution 111

"76th Cong., 1st sess., in the Senate of the United States

"Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. O'MAHONEY to the bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

"On page —, line —, insert the following:

"'No foreign-trade agreement hereafter entered into under the authority delegated to the President by such section 350, as amended, no amendatory or supplementary agreement hereaft r entered into under such section, and no duties and other import restrictions specified in a proclamation issued by the President to carry out any such foreign-trade agreement or any such amendatory or supplementary agreement, shall take effect until the Congress by law has specifically approved such agreement and the duties and other import restrictions so specified to carry out such agreement.'"

Senator O'MAHONEY. I also would like to insert in the RECORD another amendment. I have drafted this amendment merely for the purpose of drawing a contrast between those countries which still are loyal to the legislative principle. It reads as follows:

"At the end of the joint resolution insert the following section:

"'SEC. —. No foreign-trade agreement or amendatory or supplementary agreement hereafter entered into under such section, which is subject to the approval of the legislative authority of the foreign government with which such agreement is made, shall become effective until it shall have been approved by the Congress in the same manner as that in which it is required to be approved by the legislative authority of such foreign government.'"

Now, there is just one other thing——

Senator VANDENBERG. Before you leave that, Senator, let me be sure I understand you. The language in your amendment is "until the Congress by law has specifically approved such agreement"; is that right?

Senator O'MAHONEY. That is the printed amendment.

Senator VANDENBERG. You are not referring to the ratification of a trade treaty by two-thirds of the Senate?

Senator O'MAHONEY. No. I understand Senator MALONEY is offering such an amendment.

Senator VANDENBERG. This language means a vote of both Houses?

Senator O'MAHONEY. This language means a vote of both Houses; yes.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK LOANS

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at the conclusions of my remarks the daily summary of loans of the Export-Import Bank of Washington as of May 17, 1943. This shows the loans and authorizations for Latin America, for China, and for other countries, and the total.

Senator VANDENBERG. Does that include the commitments made by Mr. WALLACE the last time?

Senator O'MAHONEY. This does not include anything that has been done by the Board of Economic Warfare. That is another field into which this committee ought to go before it decides to abdicate the legislative power.

The table referred to is as follows:

Daily summary of loans, Export-Import Bank of Washington, May 17, 1943

	Latin America	China	Other	Total
Authorizations	$757, 134, 014. 79	$138, 943, 329. 99	$246, 789, 614. 86	$1, 142, 866, 959. 64
Cancelations and expirations	199, 635, 012. 46	1, 526, 800. 00	102, 295, 308. 21	303, 457, 120. 67
Disbursements	184, 705, 707. 74	114, 978, 314. 56	93, 773, 114. 23	393, 457, 136. 53
Repayments	91, 789, 896. 11	49, 811, 361. 49	62, 764, 917. 46	204, 366, 175. 06
Outstanding loans	92, 915, 811. 63	65, 166, 953. 07	31, 008, 196. 77	189, 090, 961. 47
Undisbursed commitments	378, 444, 045. 40	22, 438, 215. 43	50, 863, 278. 91	451, 745, 539. 74
Total undisbursed commitments plus outstanding loans	471, 359, 857. 03	87, 605, 168. 50	81, 871, 475. 68	640, 836, 501. 21

Work, Peace, and Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a talk delivered by our distinguished Vice President at an American Labor Party dinner held at the Commodore Hotel, New York City, on Sunday evening, May 16, 1943. His subject was Work, Peace, and Health.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This afternoon, addressing a gathering in Central Park, I said that personally I believe in the two-party system. But I pointed out that in Chile, where there are several parties, there is a genuine democracy and that every shade of opinion has a chance to express itself. And so tonight, I wish to repeat this view. While I myself am affiliated with one of the two older parties, I respect the right of every group to choose its own way of taking part in democracy. I especially respect the sincerity and sense of social responsibility which animate the faithful adherents of the American Labor Party. It is very appropriate that within the few short years of its existence, this party has seen fit on several occasions to chart its course parallel to that of the Democratic Party under the leadership of President Roosevelt.

Concerning one objective in particular the American Labor Party and the Democratic Party have a common point of view. That is the aim of maintaining full employment in the period after this war.

On my recent visit to seven countries of Central and South America, I found this problem of post-war employment uppermost in the minds of many people. In every country I met with the leaders of union labor, the farmers, the businessmen, and the high officials of government. The representatives of labor were especially concerned about post-war problems. They said they feared that after the war the United States and England would not take such large quantities of their products and therefore they would be faced with serious unemployment. After talking over the matter, we all agreed that probably the most important contribution that could be made to the prosperity of the workingman of South America would be full employment in the United States and England.

On various occasions I was asked to give extemporaneous talks to workers in factories or just outside of factories. In these talks I found myself taking as my theme the slogan, "Trabajo, paz, salud"—in other words, "work, peace and health." From time to time I developed the theme that the great success of Russia made it inevitable that the capitalistic democracies would be forced to work out programs for full employment after the war. With full employment, there is no reason why any of the western democracies should fear communism. With unemployment, it would be impossible for Stalin himself, no matter how hard he tried, to prevent the rapid growth of communism. I recognized that it would be difficult if not impossible for Latin Americans to prevent unemployment in their own countries, if there were serious unemployment in the United States or England. Therefore I said that these neighbors to the south should have a tremendous interest in seeing that the United States and England shouldered their full responsibility with regard to post-war employment.

In South America I did not go into details, but I am glad to say here that the National Resources Planning Board, in cooperation with the Federal Works Administration and other governmental agencies and as part of its broader function, is working out a program for the billions of dolars of pubic works which will be needed in the future. It is important to have these all ready to be started when the economic shock of peace comes, if private employment is not adequate to face the shock alone.

My own opinion is that while governmental preparedness of this sort is an essential safeguard against unemployment, our first thought should be to preserve the dynamic character of our economy. For example, if we are to maintain full employment in the post-war period, it is important, at the right time and in the right way, to revise our taxation system sufficiently to place an incentive on the investment of capital which furnishes private jobs in the production of needed goods and services. As one of my business friends puts it, a businessman ought to be able to get his "risk money" back before he has to pay too much in the way of taxation. Otherwise, how can any new private enterprise employ anybody? In the post-war period, if we are to create the maximum number of jobs for labor, it is important that rapidly-growing enterprises which are in the social interest should be encouraged by government policy to expand, especially when they start small. Enterprising young men, eager to serve the general welfare, should not be forced to look on the Government as the only outlet for their energies. Big established concerns should not be so favored by our taxation system that they can keep out new, small, growing enterprises for all time to come.

The only alternative to communism which has any prospect of survival in the modern world is capitalistic democracy. Most of us in the United States believe that capitalistic democracy, if it is to stand up against communism, must be strengthened so as to make sure of continuous full employment. Any modifications in our system ought to furnish incentive for both private initiative and Government to follow those policies which maintain the maximum of employment.

It is not my intention to enter into a full discussion of the various ways in which our financial and fiscal system can be modified to assure the maximum of employment, or at least employment of the 55,000,000 which Senator GEORGE mentions as the working force of the United States for which jobs must be provided after the war. Suffice it to say that I am certain that men of good will and intelligence can manage our financial problems in such a way as to increase employment rather than decrease it. This is especially true if all of us realize that in the long run there is only one type of deficit that is utterly and terribly crippling and indefensible and that is the deficit that comes from unemployment. We must act to prevent unbalanced budgets from leading to uncontrolled inflation, which in turn could lead to an economic collapse. But any attempt to balance the Federal Budget in ways which lead to industrial and commercial unemployment will lead to an economic collapse which would be equally devastating.

To have the flow of capital without which full employment would be impossible, there must be an assurance of world-wide peace. There must be an international authority based on law and provided with power to enforce that law. We know as a result of our experience with air power that it is possible for the first time in the world's history to establish efficiently and at low cost an international peace force. Without the rule of law there will be the constant threat of war, and business will feel the same sense of insecurity which it felt because of the war clouds which so often hung low during the years leading up to 1939. Those who may oppose effective international action for peace will be laying the groundwork for unemployment in the post-war period.

With airplanes moving freely over the entire world, we shall all of us realize more promptly than hitherto the importance of good health everyhere over the world. Disease germs do not respect international boundaries. We in the United States will find it to our interest to cooperate with other nations in promoting health. On the average the working people of the world today are probably less than half as efficient as they might be, as a result of lack of food, bad water, and disease. I know the situation can be changed enormously in a single generation.

There are a few who feel that if the working men and corporations in the United States take an interest in this big problem they will be building up competition for themselves. This is not true. We in the United States prosper as the world prospers. Full employment in the United States and England is of great help to the working men of Latin America. In like manner, strong, healthy, well-nourished, well-trained working men and women in Latin America will increase their own productivity and purchasing power, and therefore the prosperity of every working man and woman in this country. United States corporations operating in Latin-American countries have a great opportunity to lead the way in policies looking toward better working conditions there. It is not merely that the principles of Christianity are morally right—only by employing them can we attain full prosperity here and help toward prosperity elsewhere.

Neither Christianity nor ethics can justify the action of certain corporations in Latin America which feel that they have become more powerful than the countries in which they are operated. Some of these giant concerns, while selling at very reasonable prices, run their company stores in such a way as to dominate the daily lives of the workers. There is a strong feeling among many of the workers in some of the countries I visited that this control over the retail purchases of the workers is being used as a club to prevent any type of effective organization, and therefore to enforce wages which are deplorably low. I am glad to say that, thanks to the constructive attitude of one government, that of Bolivia, it has been possible for a commission from the United States, after studying the situation in Bolivia, to make recommendations looking toward a change which should be helpful to the workers and the Government, and also in the long run to the corporations themselves.

The interest of Latin-American people, I found, was not focused on post-war problems to the exclusion of thought about winning the war. Everywhere I went I found on the part of all classes the desire to cooperate to the utmost toward victory. This desire seemed to be fully as strong as in the United States.

I have an uneasy feeling that many of us in the United States are now beginning to look on victory as a foregone conclusion—to feel that we can win without sacrifice. The truth of the matter is that we are just entering the phase of the war in which casualties will become heavier and heavier. Here at home, as we approach the maximum war effort, we shall be pouring materials and services into the war machine at the rate of $100,000,000,000 a year. This represents an amount substantially above the total national income in 1929, which was the largest income in our history up to the outbreak of the present war. We can supply this quantity of stuff only by increasing our produc-

tion tremendously or by cutting our consumption, or both. As a matter of fact, we have doubled our industrial production since 1939. At the beginning of 1941 only 15 percent of our industrial production was for war purposes, but now 65 percent of this production is for war. Further increase of war production can come only out of sacrifice: that is, out of reduced consumption.

There are many persons in the United States who are receiving a bigger income than they have ever had before in their lives and who feel that their income ought to be still bigger because the cost of living has gone up nearly one-quarter since 1939. Both farm income and labor income have gone up. Many farmers believe that the workers are unconscionable profiteers. This is not true. Many people in the cities look on the farmers as greedy and eager to take advantage of the Nation in time of need. This also is not true. Both farmers and workers look on the manufacturers of war munitions as rolling in wealth. Some of them are making very large profits, even after paying taxes, but there are many others who today are serving the Nation splendidly who will be lucky a few years hence if they are not in bankruptcy. There are many thousands, both in union labor and in white-collar jobs, who are getting an income which will buy much less than their income did in 1939. There are thousands of small businessmen who have been ruined. There are thousands of farmers, especially in the dairy business, who not only are getting no return for their labor but are losing money month after month. The whole point of what I am trying to say is that if we are to pour 100 billion dollars' worth of materials and services into the war effort, there must be greater sacrifice on the part of those whose income will buy more than it bought in 1939.

Those who point the finger of scorn solely at labor are doing no service to the general welfare. The same applies to those who criticize only farmers and businessmen. Too many of us are trying during the war to cash in on the needs of the world. Insofar as farmers, workers, and businessmen succeed in taking advantage of the world in this time of need, they are storing up wrath for themselves in the days to come. If the greedy ones in all three classes have their way, the devils of inflation will chase themselves round and round in an ever-ascending spiral until the roof blows off. But we don't have to let the inflation monsters loose. We can chain them up. We can prevent unemployment, business bankruptcy, and the ruin of farmers later on. We can save ourselves untold misery in the days to come, if the rank and file in labor, agriculture, and business will control the extremists who are blinded by their own selfishness from the fact that they are plunging straight toward disastrous inflation.

It is possible to put a large part of the financial burden of the $100,000,000,000 over on another generation, but the real burden that cannot be put on anybody but ourselves is the burden of the sacrifice of materials which must be sent abroad right now if we are to win the victory. Those materials have to come out of our consumption—out of our stomachs, or off our backs, or out of our amusements. We may produce, as we did last year, 25 percent more agricultural products than usual, but when we are shipping more than 6,000,000,000 pounds of food a year abroad to feed our soldiers and our allies and the hungry and starving, the net effect is that we have less to eat here at home of many of the kinds of food we are accustomed to. We are not going hungry as a result, but we do have to put up with inconvenience. The only way we can do our job in the world today is to deny ourselves and to produce to the utmost. We will do our best, and that, I am happy to say, is what the vast majority of workers and farmers, as well as most businessmen, are doing. Most farmers, workers, and businessmen are patriotic. If we go down the road together in this spirit, putting everything we've got into the common cause in the same spirit as the magnificent Russians and our other splendid allies, I feel confident that we shall win everything but the final clean-up on the western front in this year of 1943.

Roads to Lasting Peace and the Resolution to Win the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the Columbus Town Meeting, in Columbus, Ohio, April 19, 1943, on the subject Roads to Lasting Peace and the Resolution to Win the Peace. The address was broadcast from station WCOL.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been well said, "Nations can blunder into war. They cannot blunder into peace." It is doubly true that they cannot blunder into a just and lasting peace.

We are fighting for peace and freedom. We must win the fight completely in both hemispheres. We must also do more.

The suffering and sacrifice in this war compels us, as civilians, to make an effort worthy of it. It is our duty to make it as sure as we can that when this war is won it shall stay won. It is our duty to win the peace as well as the war.

Any failure to see or to do our full duty in this sector in this crisis could never be excused.

The need is for calm, thorough, well-balanced, vigorous, and sustained action comparable to that used in fighting the war itself. The need is for careful analysis, commonsense planning, and preliminary action in locating and building the foundation for the essential roads to lasting peace. Senate Resolution 114, introduced in the United States Senate by Senators BALL, HATCH, HILL, and myself deals with the foundations for one of these roads. I shall explain its relation to the whole, then briefly discuss its terms and its purpose.

Our first task is to fight our way across the one-way bridge to military victory. What we do as to plans for action beyond the bridge must be so done as to strengthen our attack on the bridge itself. Discussions held or studies made must pull ourselves and our allies together rather than apart.

At the same time someone must plan our course beyond the bridge. There are at least three roads to be located and built: (1) The road to internal stability, (2) the road to regional stability, and (3) the road to world-wide stability.

The road to internal stability within the United States is one which should command our vigorous personal attention. We know now substantially what factors and what people will be involved. The United States has a responsibility to meet this problem in a way which not only will be worthy of the efforts of those who are giving their full measure of devotion to the country in fighting the war but also will set an example that will encourage the world to have faith in free self-government.

We must pass from the governmentally controlled and financed economy of war to a far freer economy of individual enterprise. While recognizing the need for governmental guidance, help and regulation, we must set our course unalterably by the fixed star of faith in individual enterprise and initiative. We must not yield our hard-won freedom of individual opportunity for the farmer, the laborer, or for small as well as large, private business in favor of the dictation of a totalitarian state of any kind, by whatever name it may be called. The post-war demand for goods of all kinds will be so great that it will underwrite the production of them. There is unlimited new wealth available. If these resources are guided into paths of peaceful production, coupled with devotion by the Government to the interests of the individual, the world of tomorrow can be far richer, healthier, and happier than that of yesterday. Emphasis will be needed upon the development of productive capacity and the opportunity for advancement of the individual who earns it.

The Senate has named a committee to study the economic problems of internal post-war planning.

The second road to lasting peace is that to regional stability which, in our case, means stability in the Western Hemisphere. Here again, we know the factors and the people concerned. It is a direct responsibility of the Americas to show how to maintain mutually helpful regional relationships without interfering with appropriate spheres of national sovereignty.

The third and most difficult road is that to world-wide stability. Here there are certain problems which call for and permit of more immediate attention than others. Among these are post-war demobilization, feeding the hungry, reestablishment of homes, farms, and factories in recovered territories, and the establishment of temporary administrations in recovered territories until such time as permanent governments can be established. These are practical problems which will continue to confront us as surely as one battle follows another in the war. We must prepare to meet these problems with the same competency, forethought, and international cooperation as our military leaders prepare for their next military steps. We must make progress along these lines now through international conferences and through the work of our combined military staffs. There can be no question as to the advisability and necessity of this.

Beyond these emergency problems come those of longer range. These are the problems of military, economic, social, and political world-wide stability. Here again at least one problem can be separated from the others. On the day of military victory the United Nations will have established military stability in the world in the face of the most powerful and destructive attempt in all history to enslave the world. On that day the United Nations will also dominate the air, and we must see to it that, having won the war, we do not allow this domination of the air and military stability to slip from the United Nations. If the United Nations were to fall apart from one another, they might even become a threat to one another. The unity of military action developed through the war is a military asset of tremendous world-wide importance. Through continuance of it in some form the United Nations will have the best assurance each can get for the return of its men from war to production, retaining such a combined force as

shall be necessary to maintain the stability of the world against military aggression.

The long-term programs leading toward economic, social, and political stability are typical examples of those problems which require joint action and calm deliberation, not only on our part, but on the part of the other United Nations. The parties concerned in many cases are not in a position to deal authoritatively with these issues now. It is important and appropriate, however, that each of the United Nations, including ourselves, give constructive thought to developing a joint and mutually helpful, rather than a mutually antagonistic, solution of these problems in the interests of peace and of fairness to one another.

The suggestion that regional organizations may be established to deal with international relationships that have a regional rather than a world-wide significance introduces an important consideration which will require substantial time for its development.

The present need in this field is not for blueprints or detailed plans, but rather for an agreement to seek mutually helpful results, to establish collective security, and to follow specified procedures by which these issues shall receive prompt, orderly, and thoughtful consideration.

Recognizing these conditions and the special constitutional responsibility of the United States Senate in the ratification of any treaty establishing permanent post-war international relationships, Senators BALL, HATCH, HILL, and I have introduced what is known as Senate Resolution 114, to win the peace. It seeks neither to prescribe blueprints of the post-war world, nor to give blank checks to anyone to bind us to post-war policies. It seeks in a common-sense way to recognize the responsibility of the Senate for ultimate action. It proposes that meetings of representatives of the United Nations be called to seek to agree with the essentials in several fields of post-war responsibility and then submit such recommendations to the Senate for ratification. What could be more direct and valuable?

The entire resolution of 214 words reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority—

"(1) To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis.

"(2) To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.

"(3) To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces.

"(4) To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

"(5) To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

"That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for the admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement."

The special appeal of this resolution is its relation to the United States Senate.

Our Constitution states that the President shall have the power to make treaties only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. This gives a right of veto to any minority of the Senate that exceeds one-third of those present.

Our generation has the special obligation to make this provision work successfully and to obtain through it a constructive foreign policy that will make possible a just and lasting peace.

It is clear that this issue must be lifted above partisanship and personalities. Neither party has two-thirds of the Senate and the issue is not a suitable one for a party division in any event. It is for this reason that Senator BALL, a Republican from Minnesota; Senator HATCH, a Democrat from New Mexico; Senator HILL, a Democrat from Alabama, and I, a Republican from Ohio, acted jointly in introducing this resolution.

If the two-thirds rule is permitted to cause friction, delay, or inaction, it may deprive us of the very peace and prosperity our soldiers and sailors have a right to expect from their hard-won victory. On the other hand, if the Senate and the President proceed smoothly, promptly, and vigorously in the best interests of the Nation, this constitutional requirement of substantially united action by the Senate may prove beneficial. It should result in representatives of the Senate taking part in the conferences leading up to the treaty. It should thus bring our people closer to the making of the terms of the treaty and should increase both their satisfaction with it and their determination to find the way to make it a lasting peace.

Senate Resolution 114 opens a road to progress, and provides a medium through which the people of America and the Members of the Senate may unite in the performance of their duty and in meeting their great opportunity to help establish a just, a living, and a lasting peace.

The practical way for the public to proceed is to use this resolution as a vehicle for the expression of their views. Letters based on this resolution and written to any United States Senator and especially to members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations are a natural use of the citizen's constitutional right of petition.

The Senate is the natural agency through which to work for a just and lasting peace and this resolution is a natural conservative vehicle adapted to the needs of the time.

Mr. Churchill's Pledge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, yesterday the Congress and the country heard the magnificent address of Winston Churchill. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an illuminating editorial on the address, printed in the New York Times of this morning, May 20.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. CHURCHILL'S PLEDGE

With a brilliance and an eloquence characteristic of his greatest moments, Prime Minister Churchill laid before the Congress of the United States yesterday a balanced account of the war which was full of pride of achievement, but which also contained a solemn warning and an equally solemn pledge. There was pride in the joint victory of British, American, and French forces in north Africa which equaled that of Stalingrad and gave the lie to Nazi and Fascist talk that parliamentary democracies are incapable of waging effective war. There was a warning that while there is no doubt of the outcome of the war, as there was no doubt of the outcome of the American Civil War after Gettysburg, nevertheless the heavy work is still ahead of us because the enemy is still "proud and powerful," and that the greatest danger now is an undue prolongation of the war which might tire out or split the democracies. The pledge, based on both the above considerations, was that Great Britain will take her place beside the United States in an "unstinting and relentless war against Japan while there is breath in our bodies and while blood flows through our veins."

This pledge was obviously a direct answer to the charges raised in America, and voiced even in Congress, that after Hitler has been beaten the United States will be left to fight the war against Japan alone, and that therefore America should revise her whole strategy and concentrate on beating Japan first. And while Senator CHANDLER, the chief exponent of this thesis in Congress, remained unconvinced, the thunderous applause which greeted Mr. Churchill's pledge and the expressions of other Senators make it clear that this particular issue has been pretty well removed as a division factor between America and Great Britain.

How could it be otherwise? As Mr. Churchill pointed out, Great Britain has greater interests in the Far East which must be retrieved and has suffered greater injuries which must be repaid than any other nation. How could she withdraw from the Pacific struggle and still retain India and Australia as self-governing commonwealths within the empire? Already, Mr. Churchill said, large armies and air and naval forces have been marshaled by Great Britain on the eastern frontiers of India, and the opening up of the Mediterranean permits increased aid to these forces as well as to China. In fact, the presence of Field Marshal Wavell and other commanders in chief at the Washington conference proves that things are moving in that direction. And Mr. Churchill solemnly promised that at the earliest possible moment British airmen will join in an air offensive against the Japanese homeland until its cities and munition centers are laid in ashes, as "in ashes they must lie before peace can come back to the world." The American people will accept these words at their full face value.

But Mr. Churchill also pointed out that as already decided at the conference between himself and President Roosevelt in January 1942, the defeat of Japan would not mean the defeat of Germany, while the defeat of Germany would infallibly mean the ruin of Japan. He indicated that this decision still stands. Yet he was extremely cautious about the next steps to implement it. There was nothing in his speech about an immediate invasion of Europe. In fact, while he promised further examples of democratic military prowess, he suggested that Russia bears and might continue to bear for a while the main burden of the war on land. And though he decared that "we must do everything in our power that is sensible and practicable to take more of the weight off Russia in 1943," he left the inference that for the present the main Anglo-American contribution might be made on the sea in combating the U-boat and from the air in blasting Germany's war industries.

In part, this reticence is, of course, a matter of military secrecy. But Mr. Churchill also suggested another reason—namely, the lack of close and continuing consultations between Russia and the rest of the United Nations. Total war, he declared, requires such consultation among the heads of the Allied Governments familiar not only with the military but also with the political and economic forces at work. And he pointed out that while he and President Roosevelt consulted frequently, a meeting with Stalin, "which we have so long sought," still remains a hope. Inevitable inference is that a meeting is now needed to shape the future strategy of all the United Nations.

United Nations Food Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials, one from the New York Times and the other from the Washington Evening News, dealing with the United Nations Food Conference now being held at Hot Springs, Va.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The New York Times of May 18, 1943]

THE HOT SPRINGS BLUNDER

Every human being in the United Nations, not to speak of those in the neutral and enemy lands, has a concern in the food conference which begins today at Hot Springs, Va. The questions, when do we eat, and what, have a universay application. Moreover, whatever food program is adopted will depend for its success on popular understanding and consent. There is not power enough in our Government, or in any other democratic government, to make it work without those essentials.

President Roosevelt and the State Department might have found in this meeting a magnificent opportunity to educate the American public, which gladly limits its diet now in order that there may be plenty for the men in uniform, and which would gladly continue doing so for a period after the war if it were convinced that lasting peace and security would thereby be promoted. They might have gone out of their way to bring out the dramatic qualities in a subject which is necessarily full of technical details. They might have rallied America to look some years into the future. They might have reinforced that morale on which some Government agencies have expended so many tons of paper and such an ocean of ink. It might have been a hard task to keep post-war food problems on the front page. Still, by intelligent and enthusiastic effort, they might have done it.

Instead, they have pushed restrictions on the reporting of the conference to the point of absurdity. Newspaper writers are to be permitted to attend two or possibly more general sessions. At other times they are to be kept out of the Homestead Hotel and away from the delegates as thought a free press were, like smallpox, a catching disease. Two hundred soldiers, or about two-fifths of a soldier for each delegate, secretary, and clerk, bar the press as they bar spies, saboteurs, and cranks. The press, indeed, has certain privileges denied to these latter gentry. It can telephone to the delegates, who can emerge from the hotel if they are so inclined. In general, however, it is as definitely interned outside the hotel as the Axis diplomats were interned inside it after Pearl Harbor.

One effect of these restrictions is to make news of such items as what the delegates had for dinner last night and what, as members of the "Homestead Club," they are getting to drink. But this sort of provender will not hold the public interest indefinitely. We may hope that many delegates will realize what the President and the State Department seemingly do not, that the public has a right to know the facts about the conference, and that they will take pains to see that it is informed. If any such facts are judged of possible aid and comfort to the enemy they will not be published. But how many such facts can there be in this conference? Let common sense answer.

No newspaper protests the Hot Springs situation out of narrow self-interest. Newspapers do protest, as 32 New England publishers and editors did yesterday, because they believe that "a press free to report on matters of public importance is necessary to the preservation of American freedom." The authorities in Washington should bear in mind that they are the trustees of this freedom, not the owners of it.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 18, 1943]

PRESS BAN AT HOT SPRINGS

Tonight the United Nations Food Conference on the Roosevelt plan for world freedom from want will open under Roosevelt orders to deny American freedom of information. The issue is whether the people's business is the people's business.

Public, press, and congressional reaction to the original ban on news coverage of the Hot Springs meeting was bitter and vigorous. But all that, plus such Presidential advisers as Secretary Hull, Elmer Davis of Office of War Information, and Chairman Jones of the American food delegation, moved Mr. Roosevelt only a fraction of an inch.

As a concession, correspondents now are to be allowed in an isolated press room on the hotel grounds, but on the wrong side of the line of soldiers who guard the 500 delegates and aides from the correspondents and other undesirables. Aside from the sop of press attendance at an occasional staged session, news will be of the official canned variety, with public interviews by delegates if and as the authorities permit. There will be no free coverage.

The press wants no special privileges. It does not want to attend executive and secret sessions. It demands only the same long-recognized rights accorded it in Washington and at all nonmilitary conferences everywhere—the rights to talk privately with any delegates willing, and otherwise to give the normal, legitimate news coverage of public affairs expected by the public in this democracy.

The question of military information is not involved. Press cooperation with war censorship has been praised repeatedly by the administration. This is not a military conference. It concerns only post-war food planning. Since the press operates under censorship anyway, nothing could possibly be published of military benefit to the enemy.

We do not know why the President wants to destroy a free press in this case, or why he persists in such a dangerous course in defiance of ancient American liberties against the warning of his highest advisers.

But we do know he has made this conference suspect by Congress and the public before it even starts. He is jeopardizing the success of future United Nations conferences by this secrecy precedent. This public-be-damned policy will not work in the United States.

Will the States Stand Against Federal Power?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Will the States Stand Against Federal Power?", written by J. N. Heiskell, editor of the Arkansas Gazette, in reference to a speech made in the State of Arkansas by Hon. George Morris, one of the leading newspapermen of the Midwest.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL THE STATES STAND AGAINST FEDERAL POWER

A Washington observer and writer of long experience, George Morris, brought the Arkansas Utilities Association meeting a picture of growing Federal power that should be impressive, if not alarming, but the question is whether any protest or opposition can stop the movement toward a far-flung and more powerful and dominating Federal bureaucracy.

This former Memphis editor declared that the farmer is being subsidized for complete permanent regimentation; that blank privileges are being granted to Government bureaus; that so many political jobs have been created; that centralized power has become almost invincible; that with few exceptions there are no bureaucrats in Washington who were ever elected to office or were not repudiated by the electorate; that regimentation and control of business are all but complete, and that big business is being built up because it will be easier to take over a few big businesses than thousands of small ones; that spokesmen for the Government have said that regimentation, rationing, and price control are here to stay.

But when the States are said to be the last line of defense of democracy against dictatorship it must be asked whether the States will hold the line or surrender to Federal money. State political organizations may be tied in with political forces that rule in the national field. Great groups of people in the States, who consider themselves true to democracy and would even be ready to die for democracy, would at the same time break down the power and importance of the States by seeking money from Washington for use in the States. It is inevitable that more Federal money will mean increased Federal control. It is inevitable that greater Federal taxes for greater expenditure of money in the States will restrict the revenue resources of the States and thus leave them more and more dependent on the Federal Government.

Second Army Maneuvers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT B. CHANDLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to the Second Army, published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal for Sunday, May 2, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY ARE AN INSPIRATION

It has recently been our privilege to see some of Second Army's divisions in the maneuver area and regret that every American could not have seen them, too. They are an inspiration—tough, strong, happy.

We saw them at the end of a day on which their first hard problem had ended, headed for bivouacs or moving into new positions. They were dirty and they must have been tired, but they were singing, and that told a story with a terrific punch.

They are well equipped and well cared for. That means they are well led and well officered. Their home folks should know that. They are tanned to a brown leather color, and they had their heads high in the air.

They had dogs and other pets along. One division, the old Eighty-first (the Wildcat), has a live and mean wildcat as a mascot. Those pets are one of the surest signs the American soldier is his same old, grand self. They were doing the usual amount of grousing and that's an even better sign that all's well with them.

We talked to a lot of them. They aren't worrying about themselves; they're worrying about whether or not the folks at home are going to measure up to their standards. We didn't have the answer and could merely express a hope. They decidedly do not like the coal strike and have their own soldierly opinions as to what should be done with whom. And they'd like to do it. On that subject they are profanely eloquent.

Second Army divisions are a cross section of the whole country. After seeing them in realistic maneuver action we think they're good fighting men. They don't think, they know it. And they're proud of themselves and their "outfits," and that kind of pride helps win battles.

After seeing them, their behavior, their handling of weapons; after hearing them sing, we personally quit worrying about a lot of things. If they are what we believe them to be, a typical example of American combat teams, everything is going to be all right, no matter what it is on foreign front or home front.

The Ruml Tax Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials—one from the New York Times and the other from the Washington (D. C.) News—dealing with the defeat of the Ruml plan, and the responsibility of those who brought it about.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 19, 1943]

THE COST OF "BEATING RUML"

The President's eleventh-hour letter to Senator GEORGE and Representative DOUGHTON had its desired effect. Enough votes were apparently influenced by the belief that the President would veto the Senate bill to cause the House to reject the full pay-as-you-go plan. The whole question of wartime taxation is once more thrown into uncertainty.

The President's letter is an extraordinary document. Once more he declares that he is "eager, as I am sure the whole country is eager, to see our taxes put on a pay-as-you-go basis at the earliest possible moment." But once more he opposes the only fair and simple method by which this can be accomplished.

His letter is a rehearsal of arguments against the Ruml plan that have long since been discredited. The Senate bill, he declares, "would give to a man with an income of $2,000 a year a cancelation of taxes equaling less than 4 weeks' income after taxes; a man with an income of $100,000 would receive a cancelation equaling 20 months' income after taxes." If this sort of calculation has any validity whatever, it would apply to every plan involving any cancelation at all, including the plans that have had the tacit approval of the Treasury. It would apply to Senator GEORGE's plan of 75 percent forgiveness of taxes. It would apply to the Forand-Robertson plan passed by the House.

The kind of result pictured by the President is inevitable under any progressive tax system. Our income-tax system takes a far larger percentage of the income of the rich than of persons of moderate incomes. It may take 10 months of a rich man's income for a full year, while it takes only a few weeks' income of many of those in the lower brackets. Any reduction or cancelation of taxes whatever will, therefore, have an effect similar to that described by the President. If our income tax already took $99,000 of a $100,000 income, then any cancelation of a year's taxes, no matter how technical, would amount to a cancelation equaling 99 years' income for that man after taxes. This sort of calculation proves nothing except that those with higher incomes already pay a far larger proportion of their incomes in taxes than those with lower incomes. The more heavily the higher incomes are taxed, the more generous a gift can any reduction of the taxes on them be made to seem. The administration now talks as if it were making an actual present to the taxpayer of any part of his earnings that it neglects to take from him.

The President admits by implication that the Treasury does not lose any revenue currently as a result of the Senate bill. He fails to point out that the bill would in fact greatly increase current revenue. He again speaks, moreover, of the enrichment of the upper income groups as a result of that bill. He does not explain that this enrichment can come to the taxpayer only in the event of one of two disasters: either he must die, or his income must shrink or disappear. In that event he or his estate may be said to be enriched compared with what would have happened without the Senate bill. But in a period of rising incomes the Treasury does not lose but gain income by a transfer to a pay-as-you-go system.

The President makes the significant statement that "tax rates for taxpayers in the upper income groups are already so high that substantial additional taxation cannot be imposed upon these groups." He goes on to say, "The effect of the remission of taxes contained in the Senate bill would therefore be a transfer of a substantial part of the cost of the war from the upper income to the middle and lower income groups upon whom tax increases must be chiefly imposed." The President neglects to add that this result is inevitable no matter what pay-as-you-go system is adopted. A recent Office of Price Administration study shows that families and individuals with an income of $10,000 and over, representing less than 2 percent of the population and less than 16 percent of the money income of the country, were nevertheless paying in 1942 more than 72 percent of the taxes. This is another way of saying that 98 percent of the population of the country, representing more than 84 percent of its income, were paying less than 28 percent of the taxes. It is impossible to raise the enormous revenues demanded by total war while continuing to place comparatively so light a burden on the mass of the country's income.

The administration's opposition to the Ruml plan has already been responsible for a delay of several months in putting the withholding tax into effect. The President's letter, and the consequent action of the House, now threaten to delay a withholding tax beyond even July 1. In reaching for the shadow the administration has been losing the substance. It seems to hate the Ruml plan, not because it would reduce current revenues for the Treasury, for it would not, but because it would give satisfaction to a handful of large as well as millions of small taxpayers, who would feel that they were at last caught up.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 18, 1943]

THE PRESIDENT'S "YES—BUT"

What kind of a tax bill does President Roosevelt want?

He says he wants pay-as-you-go income taxation; in fact, he's eager for it. Yes; but—he doesn't like the Ruml bill the Senate has passed. He has "not insisted upon any particular formula for transition to a pay-as-you-go basis." Indeed, 5 months ago he said it was up to Congress to work out the details. Yes; but—the measure which the Senate approved after turning down a couple dozen substitute plans, and on which the House is to vote today, is wholly objectionable to the President. He says now, at this late hour, that he wants some other kind of a bill—one "that I can sign."

He wants more revenue for the Treasury. Yes; but—not this bill, which would boost revenues $4,500,000,000 in the next 12 months at the present rate structure. He thinks taxpayers should make sacrifices in wartime. Yes; but—he doesn't approved this bill taxing 1942 or 1943 incomes, whichever is higher, under which no taxpayer would pay less and many would pay more. He thinks people enriched by war profits should pay through the nose. Yes; but—he doesn't approve the antiwindfall provisions designed to recapture such bonanza incomes, because they might also penalize persons who are enriched "not because of the war."

The President's arguments, it seems to us—if we may borrow a paraphrase—is too little, too late, and too light.

If it were possible in the few hours remaining for Congress to agree on a bill which would mollify the President—one to which he would give his sanction—then it might be logical to suggest adoption of the sensible compromise proposed by Senator GEORGE. That compromise would accomplish 75 percent of what the Senate bill would accom-

plish; it would require each taxpayer to pay not only a full year's tax, but also 25 percent of the "skipped" year's tax, to get on a pay-as-you-go basis. In effect, it would increase everybody's tax by 12½ percent a year for 2 years.

That would be a fair middle ground which Congress could take without doing violence to its principles. It would be another way of treating all taxpayers alike. Yet, there's the rub. Equality of treatment is precisely what the President finds most offensive in the Senate bill. Apparently he thinks that while it may be all right for lower-income taxpayers to skip a year's tax to get on pay as you go, those in the higher-income groups, in addition to paying the steeper graduated rates, should also be doubly taxed, as a sort of special penalty for pulling their incomes up above the lowest bracket.

The same class-angled arguments which the President uses against the Senate bill—we wonder who sold him that fallacy, demagoguery and misrepresentation, anyway—could be used the George plan. So why should Congress even try to compromise?

The President says he will not sign the Senate bill. (He has not said he would veto it; other tax bills have become law without the President's signature.) There is no assurance that he will sign any other bill that Congress could pass.

The Constitution gives Congress the sole power to "lay and collect taxes." It gives the President the power to veto, sign, or refuse to sign any bill Congress passes. Let's get on with the legislation.

The Role of the Steamship Owners and Operators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. O'LEARY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. O'LEARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Marine News of May 1943 entitled "The Role of the Steamship Owners and "Operators," by Frank J. Taylor, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute of New York:

THE ROLE OF THE STEAMSHIP OWNERS AND OPERATORS

(By Frank J. Taylor, President, American Merchant Marine Institute)

The role that American steamship owners and operators are playing in transporting materials of war to all points of the globe remains one of the unsung accomplishments of this entire conflict.

The public gives generous and due credits to the fabulous job the shipbuilders have done. Likewise, the public rightfully applauds the remarkable performance of the aircraft industry which now is turning out more planes a month than it did in a year of prewar production. The automobile industry has been roundly credited for its herculean task of retooling for the manufacture of tanks and guns.

Because of publicity and other circumstances, the plane companies, the shipbuilders, and the automobile manufacturers are able to enjoy the applause when their products actually enter the conflict.

The steamship owners and operators are not precisely in that position and it is thus that their monumental task is achieved in silence and without fanfare.

To trace back a bit, the Nation's shipyards turn out five vessels in a single day. The 1942 building program surpasses anything in the history of this country.

But what happens to the five ships delivered every day and what has happened to the millions of tons put in service in 1942? So far as the public knows, they slip into utter obscurity and complete anonymity, even after they have been sunk.

That anonymity seems to be shared by shipowners and operators, save when some unpleasant charges are made against them.

But now, in anticipation of Maritime Day, celebrated throughout the Nation on May 22 of each year, it might be well to pay due credit to the operators and the management of the steamship companies.

The American steamship owners and operators did not shut up shop for the duration of the war as many laymen seem to believe. They did close down their much-publicized passenger departments which symbolize the steamship business to most people.

As compared with that, however, their shore staffs and their shore facilities were increased many fold. Their duties became the heaviest of any industry in the world. They were charged with transporting a whole segment of our civilization to distant parts of the world. They were also charged with transporting materials for our vast and far-flung armies, and given the duty of keeping them supplied with all the materials of war and all the materials of living.

Furthermore, they were engaged upon the duties of carrying supplies to our allies, from Murmansk to Auckland, New Zealand.

WHAT SHORE ORGANIZATION MEANT

That is what became of those five ships a day, and naturally it was incumbent upon the best men in the country to undertake the gigantic task. Those men were the steamship operators who, through the years, had built up shore organizations capable of meeting the demand for wartime expansion.

In peacetime, the operators had slowly and carefully organized every detail of their business. They had established definite sailing dates and schedules. They had managed a definite number of ships. Their well-knit shore staffs at home and in foreign ports had precise, unvarying duties.

The operators were generally certain of the amount and the type of cargo to be carried over any given year and on any given route. They knew comparatively well just how the books would read on December 31.

But then the war came to Europe with the inevitable dislocations that must be suffered by too many types of business. The steamship industry was hit first. It effectively became an integral part of any grand strategy and as such naturally came within close contact with the Army, Navy, and other governmental agencies.

WAR'S PROBLEMS HIT HARD

As war approached closer and closer, the steamship operators were taxed heavier and heavier to carry the burdens imposed upon them. The accelerated building program necessitated the operation of more and more ships.

Most of the ships were requisitioned for use by the War Shipping Administration and turned back to the owners for operations. Other ships were purchased outright for conversion into auxiliaries.

It was not unusual for a company which operated 25 ships in peacetime to find itself a few years later, directly or indirectly, handling the operation of 300 ships.

Nor was it unlikely to find a company that formerly handled cargoes consisting only of coffee and fruit shifting suddenly to the transportation of munitions over strange routes, destined for strange ports under the most hazardous circumstances.

Thus, when we speak of the operators being first hit by war, we can point only to the high lights of the herculean job they have tackled.

To add further high lights we might review some of the circumstances following the declaration of war in Europe. Immediately after the first days of September 1939, American ships were steadily ruled off a good portion of their normal trade waters and often they were forced to abandon routes which had been built up over a long period of years.

In most cases the American shipping men transferred their tonnage, sometimes to routes which never before had been of any great importance in world commerce. Likewise, they developed shipping contacts which they never had before and which served them well when our own national emergency became acute.

AND THEN LEND-LEASE

Then, with passage of the lend-lease bill, American shippers found that they were carrying materials of war into the most hazardous zones. They found it advisable immediately to start expansion of shore and seagoing personnel.

It was then that American owners and operators learned to handle war cargoes; that they tasted submarine warfare, met up with surface raiders, and felt the impact of aerial bombs.

It was a grim experience, but it paid dividends to our global strategy when the time came. The American operators had a good estimate of what to expect when war actually broke over the United States.

Their solid ground work of management over the few years immediately preceding the war and over the many years of the past decades were to serve well. The operators in effect had time for a dress rehearsal which was unwittingly given them because by the nature of the steamship business theirs was the first industry tangibly affected. As a result, the transformation from peacetime to wartime activities was made with no apparent shock to the industry as a whole and practically no confusion.

THE TRANSFORMATION WAS MADE

The disruptions that occurred were essentially minor in character. As was expected, some of the best steamship executives were immediately enlisted to serve with the War Shipping Administration or with the armed services as technical supervisors under the unprecedented shipping program.

The lower brackets of personnel were lost in considerable numbers to the various services of the country. The engineering staffs were particularly difficult to replace and the highly important stevedoring departments were increasingly pressed by the bulk of tonnage and cargo imposed on the lines.

The strain of war was obvious and apparent through the entire organization of each and every American steamship company. Aside from personnel problems, it had to concern itself with the uncertainties of sailing dates, transit time, unloading time and conditions, return cargo to be picked up, arrival time, and disposition of cargoes. Furthermore, it has to deal with the arrival of cargo in ports strained to capacity; it has to worry about docking space and the problem of seagoing personnel is naturally greater than ever.

THE ARITHMETIC OF CHANGE

The immensity of the task the operators have undertaken and are undertaking may be reduced to simple arithmetic. The private companies owned and operated about one thousand ships when war broke out. Our shipyards turned out almost seven hundred and fifty merchant vessels in 1942 alone and 1943 will see the yards turning out double that number.

The steamship operators have found themselves flexible enough to absorb that 75-percent increase in duties. They'll find themselves competent to manage a total increase

of 225 percent in our peacetime fleet when this year's construction is completed.

Thus, when you notice that five ships have been delivered in a single day, you may well count that the steamship owners and operators of America are assuming just that much more of a burden and that they are acquitting themselves well, behind the veil of imposed silence. They are "Keeping Them Sailing."

Contribution of American Industry to Victory in North Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, with the avalanche of criticism and condemnation of labor, it is refreshing to find that there are people in high places in the war effort who take time out to bestow credit upon what labor has done to make possible the recent glorious victory of the Allied armies.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, in a United Press dispatch published in the Chicago Times, pays tribute to American industry, labor, and management, for their contribution to the most spectacular triumph of the fighting forces of the United Nations in North Africa.

The dispatch, under date of May 15, follows:

EISENHOWER TRIBUTE TO WAR WORKERS

WASHINGTON, May 15.—Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower sent a message today from his African headquarters to the men and women of American industry, commending them for their help in winning the battle of Tunisia.

"Our fighting men, standing shoulder to shoulder with our gallant allies, the British and French, have driven the enemy out of North Africa," he said. "In this victory the munitions made by American industry, labor, and management played a very important role. There is glory for us all in this achievement."

Resolution of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. BARRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD a copy of a resolution sent to me by the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America. In so doing I wish to go on record as favoring justice for Poland when the war ends. There is evidently an inclination or determination on the part of Soviet Russia to lay claims to large sections of Poland.

It must be remembered by all of us that England and France declared war on Germany when the Nazis invaded Poland. If it was wrong for he Germans to seize Polish territory, then by the same token it is wrong for Soviet Russia, or any other nation, to seize Poland's territory. If we Americans fail to uphold the rights of Poland, then we will have made a mockery out of the Atlantic Charter.

I, for one, will not subscribe to any post-war settlement that will not be a just one. Any settlement that does not give Poland its rightful territory will result only in establishing a breeding place for future wars.

CHICAGO, ILL., *April 12, 1943.*

The following appeal was adopted at the plenary meeting of the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Unior of America, duly held on April 12, 1943, in Chicago, Ill., all national officers being present:

"Whereas the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America fully considered the following sad and grevious facts: That—

"The Government of Soviet Russia lays baseless claims to large sections of Poland, wherein are situated the old Polish cities of Lwow, Tarnopol, Stanislawow, Wilno, Bialystok, Nowogrodek, and the lands of Polesia;

"The Soviet Government unjustifiedly denies Polish citizenship to millions of Poles forcibly transported from Poland into the interior of Russia and to Siberia.

"About two and a half million Poles were transported to Russia. Among these were 800,000 Polish children, of whom 400,000 have perished and the remainder will soon suffer thi same fate unless immediate aid is extendec to them.

"The German forces in Poland consistently and continually conduct mass murders of Poles and systematically make use of the most vile and bestial means, unknown up to now by the civilized world, for the designed purpose of the complete extermination of the Polish Nation: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America has concluded that the stand of the Soviet Government and the communistic press in the United States, for the annexation of lands of sovereign and independent nations, creates disunity and impedes the concerted effort of the Allied Nations to defeat Germany, Japan, and Italy, and that the brutal and savage conduct of the Nazis transgresses all Christian principles and degrades all mankind; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America express its unswerving faith in the actions, wisdom, and justice of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the consummation of the aims and principles laid down by him in the Atlantic Charter.

"We express the hope that the United States, together with England and all other Allied nations, will check and forestall the ambitions and plans of its enemies or allies, who now or in the future may desire or attempt to seize the lands of sovereign and independent states and thus selfishly cause discord and war among the nations.

"We hereby state that our membership of more than 150,000 has at all times fully cooperated with President Roosevelt and our Government, has unceasingly strived in aiding the war effort of our country, and promises to continue to exert its utmost effort in service to our country.

"The executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America appeals to the Members of Congress, the press, and radio commentators, that in considering and commenting on post-war solutions they insist that no injustice be done to Poland, which first dared to oppose the Nazis and which at all times during her long and glorious history fought valiantly for her liberty and the liberty of the nations of Europe.

"We call on the Government of the United States to halt the mass murders of Poles by the Nazis and to materially and morally aid the destitute and suffering Polish men, women, and children in Soviet Russia.

"We ask our Congressmen and Senators to consider the interests of tortured Poland and express our gratitude to the Members of Congress, who have fought for justice for the enslaved and oppressed nations.

"We call to our membership to purchase United States War Bonds to the limit of its ability and to be generous in the contributions for relief of the Polish civilian population in Soviet Russia and other countries.

"We express our gratitude to the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States for its generous contributions for relief of Polish War victims and ask continued support of this cause.

"We beseech Almighty God to grant an early victory to the Allied Nations and to establish a just and permanent peace for all nations."

For the executive board and directorate of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America:

JOHN J. OLEJNICZAK,
President.

STEPHEN S. GRABOWSKI,
Secretary General.

H. R. 2082

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just filed certain petitions received from many of the States of the Nation endorsing H. R. 2082.

From time to time I have received hundreds of letters and scores of petitions now aggregating some 22,019 names.

The fact that so many people throughout the country are interested in this important piece of legislation, dealing with the subject of alcohol as it relates to our war effort should certainly call for some action on the part of the Congress.

Copernicus and Hitler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS S. GORDON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Daily Times entitled "Copernicus and Hitler":

COPERNICUS AND HITLER

Four centuries ago an astronomy professor at the University of Cracow discovered which way the world goes around.

He was Copernicus—or Mikolaj Kopernik. He taught astronomy, theology, mathematics, economy, and art, and he was a good general doctor besides. But most important of all his work was his theory—the "heliocentric theory"—that the sun does not circle the earth, but that the earth and stars travel around the sun.

PROUD TO BE A POLE

His parents were Polish. He was proud to be a Pole. Except for years of study in Italy, he lived and taught in Poland all his life. The memory of Mikolaj Kopernik was as much a part of the University of Cracow as the books in its libraries, or the irreplaceable relics in its museums.

Copernicus died 400 years ago this month. Here in Chicago, in the exiled Polish Government in London, in the Middle East, or Scotland, or wherever there are Poles, his name will be remembered and honored. A people is held together by memories of its great men.

Such memories have been the special target of the Nazis. Since Hitler's military juggernaut rolled across the Polish border on September 1, 1939, the Germans have had this aim: To reduce Poland to a "model" slave state, first, by destroying or confiscating everything material; second, by killing or imprisoning its leaders; and last, by stamping out the intangible things, the traditions, the spirit, which belonged to the Poles as a free people and which might one day make them free again.

NAZI SPIES AS "PROFESSORS"

Like every other free institution in Poland, the University of Cracow was to be crushed. The campaign was merciless. Ever since 1918 German professors had been attending science conventions at Cracow, or studying there as "exchange professors" while Polish scholars took their places in Germany. By the time Hitler was ready to march into Poland the spies among these "professors" were able to present him with complete lists of the university's treasures, its museum pieces and ancient books, the exact whereabouts and value of its finest research instruments. With so complete a catalog the Nazis found it easy to strip Cracow to the walls.

Then the Polish professors—the men through whom the nation's culture and tradition might live on—were as systematically rounded up and confiscated. In October 1939 there were all invited to attend a lecture on the attitude of the German authorities to science and teaching. When they had gathered Gestapo agents took them to waiting police cars and drove them off to prison. Of the 185 men arrested, only 7, who were either very old or seriously ill, were released. Some were executed outright. Many more have died of overexposure and starvation.

Thus Cracow University, the alma mater of Copernicus, was closed down for the first time in 575 years. But that wasn't all. Having destroyed the university—or rather that part of it which they could see or burn or kill—the Nazis turned systematically to its traditions. They decided that Mikolaj Kopernik was not Polish at all.

A CRAZY NAZI LAW

Though his parents were Polish and natives of Cracow, they were living in Prussian Poland when Copernicus was born. Under a crazy Nazi law a Pole with a German great-grandmother is German; Copernicus was, therefore, a "volksdeutsche," a racial German.

The Germans will have a hard time finding anyone but themselves to take their warped and destruction-hungry theory seriously. They have not made a German out of Mikolaj Kopernik any more than they have destroyed the University of Cracow, the Polish people, or their spirit of freedom.

A Letter to the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following attached letter:

MAY 19, 1943.

The VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE,
Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIRS: Recently it has been the privilege of the Members of Congress, and of the people as a whole, through the facilities of radio, to hear several speakers who number among the powerful world figures of today. Last June, and again today, we welcomed Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister of Great Britain. We have heard from the brilliant and beautiful Madame Chiang Kai-shek, from President Benes of Czechoslovakia, King George II of Greece, Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands, King Peter of Yugoslavia, President Quezon of the Philippines, and the presidents of several of our friendly and cooperative South American neighbors, including Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, and Cuba. In addition to these speakers, we have enjoyed meeting the King and Queen of England, and the President of Colombia, at informal receptions in the halls of Congress.

Every one of these distinguished visitors to our shores has contributed greatly to our necessary knowledge of world conditions, through his or her sympathetic analysis of world problems in the present crisis as they affect and are influenced by the country and people thus represented. And I can truthfully say that every word they have spoken in these halls has been deeply and sincerely appreciated and pondered by each Member of Congress. I only hope that in future all foreign countries will continue to send dignified and statesmanlike representatives, more and more often, to talk to us and to exchange views with our leaders. Such ideal conferences as that held by President Roosevelt and President Comacho of Mexico cannot be too frequent or too highly praised.

As a means of further cementing Anglo-American relationships, may I suggest that our Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, address the Houses of Parliament someday soon—preferably on a day such as July Fourth, which is vitally significant in our own national life—to carry our greetings in person, as it were, to the British Government and the British people, and to present our views as a sister nation? Such a visit would be the beginning of a series of constructive meetings which would not only be a matter of reciprocal courtesy and comment, but which would make for realistic and informed understanding between ourselves and the Houses of Parliament, and the governing bodies of the rest of the world as well.

By this suggestion I am not holding a brief for any sort of international federation; I intend only neighborliness, better understanding, and closer cooperation between countries. By the grace of God, even future international conflict resulting in the bloodshed of the world might be avoided, through the vital instrumentality of such conferences.

We owe a vote of gratitude to Mr. Churchill for his inspiring and confident talk of today; we owe that talk our undivided attention and study.

Cordially yours,

MARTIN J. KENNEDY.

The Late Reid Monfort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINDER R. HARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the newspaper profession, of which I am proud to be an alumnus, this week lost one of its finest members in the untimely death of Mr. Reid Monfort, chief of the Associated Press Bureau in Charlotte, N. C.

Mr. Monfort, who died unexpectedly at his home in Charlotte on Tuesday, at the age of 46, had spent practically all of his adult life in newspaper work, the last 10 years as head of the Charlotte office which serves the Associated Press membership in the two Carolinas.

It was my privilege to know him first when he was a member of the staff of the Richmond, Va., Associated Press Bureau, while I was managing editor of the Norfolk, Va., Virginian-Pilot, and when I served as president of the Virginia Associated Press Association.

Later he came to the Washington bureau as feature editor and in 1933 he was assigned to head the Charlotte office.

In my association with Mr. Monfort I not only came to know his high professional qualifications, which excited my great admiration of him as an outstanding press correspondent of the highest and most desirable type, but I was drawn to him in sincere friendship by his lovable human qualities as well. The affection in which he was held by his associates and friends also was shared by those with whom he dealt in his newspaper work. He was a man who quickly won the confidence and esteem of all with whom he came in contact. He exemplified all that is wholesome and fine in journalism. He earned and held the respect of the highest executives in official life, as well as the younger persons who were employed under his managerial authority.

There is one other tribute I would like to pay to my friend, Reid Monfort. Too often it is the case, in these days of modernism in newspapering, that reporters and correspondents, more particularly in the cases of those who are without seasoning experience and training, look not for, or overlook, the constructive and the informative in the events they are covering, and are on the alert for the sensational, the controversial, the scandalous, and devote the limited space which is available on the wires and in the

papers for their stories to an overemphasis on those less important phases of the news. When we stop to contemplate that the formation of public sentiment in a great democracy such as the United States largely is the result of the information the people gain through reading the newspapers, we easily can comprehend the vital need for wholesome, constructive journalism.

Reid Monfort was the kind of newspaperman who always was fully conscious of the seriousness of his profession and thoroughly inbued with an appreciation of the importance of giving to the people of the Nation, through his reports of news events, an understanding, accurate, and balanced coverage, and a fair interpretation of the happenings of the day and of the principals participating therein. He was a wholesome and constructive reporter indeed.

The newspaper profession, especially in these grave and critical times, needs more men of his type and character. Reid Monfort will be sorely missed.

The Ruml Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence, from the Washington Evening Star of May 19, 1943:

INCOME TAX BEGAN WITH EXTRA YEAR—SYSTEM OF AUDITING BLAMED FOR OPPOSITION TO RUML PLAN

(By David Lawrence)

President Roosevelt is a busy man, busy with Prime Minister Churchill and military strategy and a dozen other important problems of the war, so it would not be surprising if he found little, if any, time to study such a question as is involved in the Ruml plan.

The chances are that the President received a draft of a proposed statement, together with some one-sided advice from those who opposed the Ruml plan, and that he issued the statement without really looking into the matter or finding out what the sentiment of the country or of Congress really is on the subject.

For when the President says there is a cancelation or forgiveness of 1942 taxes, is he really stating the case as it has developed over the years? When the Ruml plan is referred to, for instance, as a skip-a-year plan, the question may well be asked, "What year is being skipped?"

The fact is that the present income-tax system started in 1913. The amendment to the Federal Constitution was adopted in 1913, and the law was passed in October 1913. An examination of the debates at that time will reveal that some Members of Congress raised the point that it was unfair to put a tax on income for the year 1913 since most of the year had passed and there was no opportunity for the taxpayer to accumulate the taxes out of 1913 earnings.

YARDSTICK FOR 1914

The answer was made in the debate that taxes were not really being paid on the year 1913 but that 1913 was being used as a yardstick to measure 1914 income taxes. If that reasoning had been followed thereafter in the wording of tax legislation, the controversy over the Ruml plan today would be academic. Actually, if the payments on the years from 1913 through 1942 were properly audited in accordance with the reasoning of the Members of Congress at the time the first law was passed, there would be no problem of cancelation or forgiveness.

If there is any forgiving to be done, it should be directed to the Federal Government which has all along committed the error of charging the citizens an extra year of taxes The Ruml plan would presumably remedy the error and put the citizens on a current basis as originally intended.

NOT A WINDFALL

What has been called a windfall through cancelation is really the opposite. If the Government finally by law determines that 1943 payments already made apply to 1943 incomes, then the citizen is really being permitted to retain his own property or that portion of it to which the Treasury was never morally entitled.

Many of those who argue against the Ruml plan speak of it as giving a windfall to taxpayers who have big incomes. The assumption is that taxpayers have laid aside ahead of time out of their 1942 incomes all of the tax money they are supposed to pay throughout 1943, when, as a matter of fact, most people pay 1942 taxes out of earnings received currently throughout the year 1943. That's how the income-tax system developed beginning in 1913. If taxpayers with big incomes have actually saved out of their 1942 incomes enough for 1943 taxes the administration by its plan really intends to confiscate that property by means of a capital levy.

Countries hard-pressed for funds and usually on the verge of bankruptcy find it necessary to resort to confiscation of capital known as a capital levy. There is no such need in America today. In fact, the Senate bill referred to as a modification of the Ruml-Carlson bill actually brings into the Treasury during 1943, $2,000,000,000 more cash than would otherwise be collected.

DOUBLE TAX APPARENT GOAL

The President is apparently holding out for a bill that would bring on double taxation and cause a vast number of taxpayers to pay out of their 1943 incomes not only the current 1943 obligation but a substantial portion of the taxes allegedly due for 1942.

Mr. Roosevelt has not thought through the implications ofthe statement in which he says that there would be a cancelation of taxes. Any citizen who pays his 1942 tax bill out of 1943 earnings will not find that he has skipped a year or gotten any cancelation. But if Mr. Roosevelt has his way the withholding tax will double up the taxes on many taxpayers and put their personal finances into a chaotic condition in the midst of war.

The only explanation for the President's program is that it is the advice of his lieutenants who feel that it would be politically popular to soak the successful and talented citizens of the country—another example of the class legislation which has been the theme of the New Deal for 10 years.

O. P. A. Control of Retail Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED E. BUSBEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made before the House Committee on Small Business:

In Illinois we have an organization known as the Illinois Federation of Retail Associations. It is sound, constructive, loyal. This federation represents more than 40,000 merchants, and their secretary, Mr. Joe Meek, should be here today to talk to you. If this organization was duplicated in the 47 other States of this Union retailing would have the punch to have prevented thoughtless, theoretical, scarcity-producing, harassing regulations which have called this committee into being.

Unfortunately, Mr. Meek cannot be present. He is in our Illinois State capitol, trying, even there, to gain recognition for the essential qualities of distribution, trying desperately hard to make all legislators see that the death of one single retailer through needless sacrifice is not simply an individual catastrophe—it is the cumulative death of the greatest single influence we have left in this country for the preservation of the system of free enterprise for which our American boys are fighting and dying.

But I believe I know how Illinois retailers feel. I am sure that Congressman DIRKSEN knows, for he has just returned from an intensive trip through Illinois to get first-hand information on how things are going. He addressed 500 merchants, representing nearly 100 Illinois towns, at a meeting in Springfield the other day. Do you want to know what single statement he made that received the most applause—a prolonged applause of minutes duration? He said: "What is needed to put the Office of Price Administration on a sound basis is to remove the top 100 professors."

I subscribe to Mr. DIRKSEN'S beliefs, but I want to point out the most important fact—that the merchants of my State were enthusiastically "all out" for the idea. These merchants are not rebels. They are not unpatriotic. They are law-abiding citizens.

But they are harassed and disgusted because of the impracticalities with which they—as hard-headed businessmen—must deal. It would be well for we Members of Congress to know better how our folks back home are feeling; to know how many communities have acted as did the grocers of West Frankfort, who flatly advised the Office of Price Administration that they could not master the new pricing formulas recently imposed upon them.

I went back to my district around Easter time, to find out some things, to stop, look, and listen. My people are representative people, with fine records for cooperation, for War bond and stamp buying and selling, with sons and daughters in the service, with a keen desire to preserve for these sons and daughters more than a semblance of the things for which they are fighting.

I had an opportunity while there to meet with several groups of merchants, and found out that all are of the belief that the only way to make price control work at the retail level is to permit individual merchants to make their customary individual mark-ups based on the history of that store and that item. They don't care what base period is used, but they are confident that proper and sane control at the wholesale and manufacturing levels will do the job properly—that competition and customer selectivity will do the rest.

They believe that in this way, and this way only, can they secure that "cost plus" basis which permits them to cover themselves for rising labor and commodity costs, which rose because stronger pressure groups held out longer.

These merchants believe that such drivel as MPR 339, the rayon hosiery order, is impossible. They are resentful that their practical proposals have met with such short shrift. They are equally resentful over the fact that the retail profession is given little

or no consideration before orders are issued. Is it too much to expect, for them, the same treatment that is given to others who happen to be a bit more vocal, a bit more politically powerful?

Retailers advocate postponement of any further orders until such time as what they want is at least given fair consideration by practical people, who have gained their experience and wisdom, not in cloistered halls but in over-the-counter transactions. They want exactly what all America wants—control of inflation.

Retailers do not want a subsidy. They believe all America would prefer to pay a bit more at the point of sale than to be taxed unbearably under the guise of subsidies. They believe that manufacturers of civilian goods must be given an incentive to produce, that the "squeeze" they are in must be given adequate recognition; and that they, too, must operate on a sound cost-plus basis. They do not favor a philosophy of subsidy and scarcity which lowers quality, discourages production, and brings about elimination of lines which encourage black-market operations.

They do not see how the Smaller War Plants Corporation will get anywhere with its efforts until such time as manufacturers are given an incentive to make these goods. They believe that the refusal to recognize such incentives stems from lack of practical experience by Government officials who, drunk with power, refuse to take advice from anyone.

And certainly our retailers want no rules such as the grocery, meat, work clothing, and rayon hosiery orders, which provide for fixed price control without regard for fundamental operating procedure and expense; no rules that put the United States Government in the position of telling people it is cheaper to buy in big stores than in little stores. And don't let anybody tell you they don't do so through this classification program. Look at your newspaper headlines and judge for yourselves.

They want no grading program which destroys quality, promotes scarcity, and eliminates good will that has been built up over many years.

Retailers want recognition. They want to be recognized for just what they are—essential—and they are essential. They know, and you know, that if they do not move the goods to the millions of our people engaged in war work, through regular channels of retail trade, that some other, utterly new and untried system of distribution of a socialistic tendency will be the result. They know that the pulling of employees away from vital retail establishments to vital war plants is a costly process, hurting both war production and distribution.

Retailers want to be considered, and I am appreciative of this opportunity to speak for them. They want no drunken power. They want common-sense cooperation and are ready for it.

You may ask why retailers must be considered? Aside from the fundamental economic reasons of adequate civilian supply, potential taxing sources, and the good citizenry of that group, may I second what your distinguished chairman, Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN, has so ably said:

"That the small merchant is the keystone of democracy; the last vital bulwark of our system of free enterprise; the last defense against cold steel heartless precision that is so utterly un-American."

Is it testimony you want? Read of the Chicago butcher who stabbed himself nine times, and before he died said: "The Office of Price Administration man came in, we talked it over; I couldn't see the use of trying any more and so I did this."

Read the letters in the files of any retailers' association. Read the wires and letters we of the Congress have received. I quote from just one, received in my own office from the pastor of a large church in my district:

"Here is a matter of grave importance. With the different hardships of rationing, the small neighborhood grocers have difficulties of such a nature that four in this locality have recently closed, leaving only two who serve my people, and these are talking of closing. Then the householders will be forced to trade in town, a distance of a mile and a half or more. * * * I believe this aspect should be considered, as also the loss of investment in business, which had been built up and in property value."

Read again of the action of those Illinois merchants—the finest in the world—in applauding Congressman DIRKSEN'S suggestion about "firing the 100 top professors." Go back to your home town, go up and down Main Street—you will find the testimony there, a living, breathing protest against unsympathetic, nonunderstanding bureaucracy, which refuses practical advice, which asks for subsidy, scarcity, and "decent burials."

In behalf of these small merchants, "the keystones of our democracy, the last vital bulwark of our free enterprise," I am willing now to legislate simple pricing formulas by congressional action if the bureaus won't do it. I suggest that this committee draw up legislation putting pricing on the basis of an "individual store mark-up on individual items," and thus getting it over with—and down to the business of winning the war. I suggest congressional refusal of subsidy grants, while the philosophy of scarcity and of subsidy instead of incentive is the ruling voice.

On May 10, I wrote the Honorable Prentiss M. Brown, protesting to him against the Rayon Hosiery Order MPR 339 going into effect on the 15th day of this month, emphasizing my own opinion that the order should be rescinded entirely, but at least the effective date postponed.

Yesterday morning I received a three-page letter from Mr. Brown in reply, setting up his defense of Order MPR 339, which became effective as of May 15, and also received a four-page dissertation in defense of objections raised to the order, copy of which doubtless reached all Members.

According to the release, "Administrator Brown took the position that 'this regulation is more the beginning of a joint undertaking than its final conclusion.'"

How in the world can our hosiery manufacturers expect to know just what their limitations will ever be when they realize that this new regulation is susceptible to change at the whim of the Office of Price Administration?

The Office of Price Administration admits the possible effect: "The impact of this regulation on all levels of production and distribution will require continual reexamination."

If programs like this continue, how are we ever going to win the war?

I am ready, for the sake of my people, and for the sake of those American boys who are expecting us to save for them that which they are fighting for, to take drastic action to eliminate a lot of this silly, impractical, socialistic planning that is fast doing away with our free enterprise system of doing business.

I plead with this committee, in the name of the retailers of Illinois, and throughout the country, that you recommend to the Congress that they take the necessary steps immediately, as their contribution toward saving this Republic of ours before it is too late.

Distribution of Gasoline in the Southern States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, several days ago I addressed a letter to the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator, at the Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C., in reference to the distribution of gasoline in the Southern States. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter I addressed to the Petroleum Administrator, and also an advertisement which appeared in the Sunday, May 16, 1943, issue of the Greensboro Daily News, of Greensboro, N. C.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I simply want to mention the fact that the advertisement referred to by the Senator from North Carolina appeared in many newspapers throughout the Carolinas. In view of the fact that the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina has had the advertisement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, I shall not ask to have copies of similar advertisements which appeared in South Carolina newspapers also printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and advertisement presented by Mr. REYNOLDS were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 20, 1943.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Administrator,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: For the past several days I have received a tremendous volume of mail from all sections of North Carolina, with many of which are enclosed full page advertisements which have appeared in numerous of the North Carolina daily newspapers, entitled "Are we being sabotaged by a stupid system of gasoline distribution and management?"

I am taking the liberty of enclosing one of these full-page ads taken from the Asheville Citizen-Times of Asheville, N. C.

Some of the letters I have received are extremely caustic and bitter in their denunciation and criticism of what they claim to be discrimination and unfair treatment made of the distribution of gasoline in North Carolina, in which criticisms I concur.

You will note that the charge is made that certain transport trucks in February hauled gasoline from Charlotte to Wilmington, where the bills of lading were changed and the same gasoline transported in the same trucks back to Charlotte for unloading; that gasoline transport trucks are regularly transporting gasoline from Spartanburg to Charleston, S. C., turning right around and bringing the gasoline back for delivery in Spartanburg County; that this stupid transporting of gasoline around the country is done by some oil companies for the purpose of adding costs to their product and restricting competition; that the pipe-line terminals are not being

operated to full capacity; that many gasoline transport truckers work only a part of each week for lack of consumer outlet; that gasoline is being transported from the Carolinas into Tennessee, that this gasoline is billed to some North Carolina point but that it ultimately reaches Tennessee; that the current unit value of gasoline rationing coupons in the Carolinas does not permit consumption of the gasoline allotted oil companies for distribution, forcing some of them to carry over a surplus each month; that approximately 10,000 barrels of gasoline are pumped daily off the Plantation pipe line coming into the Carolinas—from a spur line at Bremen, Ga., to Knoxville, Tenn., and for this reason part of the capacity of the pipe line coming into the Carolinas is diverted to Tennessee where gasoline rationing coupons have a unit value of 4 gallons as compared to 1½ gallons which is allowed in North Carolina.

I cannot answer these charges, Mr. Secretary, but my constituents are demanding that someone advise them as to the truth or falsity of the aforementioned charges.

If these charges are true, then they are demanding that the proper governmental agency, which is the Office of the Petroleum Administrator, take immediate steps to see that this maladministration of the gasoline distribution is stopped.

Knowing North Carolinians as I do, I am very frank to tell you that they, like all other Americans, want to do their part and will be 100 percent behind any move the Administration fosters which will tend to aid in the war effort. However, by the same token of patriotism, they are now demanding through their duly elected representatives in Congress that if an investigation by your Office discloses that there is discrimination as a result of the existing methods of distribution, and that injustices are being perpetrated on the businessmen, professional men, and others who are daily called upon to use their automobiles and trucks, as well as gasoline-driven farm implements, that I respectfully request and direct that your Office take immediate steps to bring to an end any of the practices which are now being so vehemently protested against in the matter of the distribution of gasoline in the State of North Carolina.

I shall look forward with keen interest to hearing from you concerning just what your reaction is to the charges which are now being given such State-wide publicity in North Carolina relative to the distribution of gasoline in that State, and I trust you will be able to favor me with an immediate response, so that I in turn will be able to pass this information on to those hundreds of persons who have addressed me relative to this all-important subject.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senator.

[From the Greensboro Daily News of May 16, 1943]

ARE WE BEING SABOTAGED BY A STUPID SYSTEM OF GASOLINE DISTRIBUTION AND MANAGEMENT?—THE CAROLINA MOTOR CLUB DEMANDS ACTION

The following information, we believe, substantiates our claims that the gasoline situation in the Carolinas is deplorable and deserves an investigation by responsible Government officials together with private Carolina citizens:

1. On February 12, 13, and 14 certain transport trucks hauled gasoline from Charlotte to Wilmington, there the bills of lading were changed, and the same transport trucks loaded with the same gasoline were brought back to Charlotte for unloading.

2. During the same period, we are informed that gasoline was hauled from Spartanburg to Wilmington, and thence to Asheville before unloading.

3. During this same period we understand a transport truck loaded with gasoline was hauled from Charlotte to Wilmington and from Wilmington to Newton, before unloading.

4. It is reported to us from high authority in South Carolina that gasoline transport trucks are regularly transporting gasoline from Spartanburg to Charleston, turning right around and bringing the same gasoline back for delivery in Spartanburg County.

5. The same authority advises us that gasoline transport trucks are regularly transporting gasoline from Belton, S. C., to Charleston and back to the vicinity of Belton.

6. We understand this stupid manipulation of transporting gasoline around the country is done by some oil companies for the purpose of adding cost to their product and restricting competition. If this is true, it seems it would be nothing less than a gross act of sabotage, and proper authorities should take action now.

7. April 29 and 30, and May 1 and 2 certain loaded petroleum transport trucks and railroad tank cars were idle because there was no place to unload the gasoline.

8. On Wednesday, May 5, a certain oil company had a consignment of gasoline coming in on the pipe line, and because their storage plants were filled they had no place to store it.

9. We understand that a gasoline dealer in Newport, Tenn., after having served a customer with a Charlotte City license plate on his car told this customer that he was taking the gasoline right back to where it came from.

10. The pipe-line terminals are not being operated to full capacity, according to information given by two persons who are in position to know but are not officially connected with the pipe-line company.

11. We understand that many gasoline transport truckers work only a part of each week for lack of consumer outlet.

12. The completion of the plantation pipe line, extending from Greensboro to Richmond, will release, we are told, approximately 6,000 railway tank cars for transportation of petroleum products.

13. One oil distributor who formerly operated five trucks now operates one for lack of consumer outlet.

14. One transport company, serving roughly a radius of 200 miles of Charlotte, operated 12 trucks prior to May 1, but since that date 5 of these trucks have been taken out of operation because there was no demand for them, and the other 7 are idle approximately 3 days out of each week.

15. Many of the gasoline transport trucks, which formerly serviced the Carolinas, have been sold in Texas and the Midwest because rationing has not curtailed their use in that area.

16. It is reported to us in many roundabout ways that gasoline is being transported from the Carolinas into Tennessee. We understand that the gasoline is billed to some North Carolina point, but that it ultimately reaches Tennessee.

17. The current unit value of gasoline ration coupons in the Carolinas does not permit consumption of the gasoline allotted oil companies for distribution, forcing some of them to carry over a surplus each month.

18. We understand that about 10,000 barrels of gasoline are pumped daily off of the plantation pipe line coming into the Carolinas—from a spur line at Bremen, Ga., to Knoxville, Tenn. Therefore, part of the capacity of the pipe line coming into the Carolinas is diverted to Tennessee where gas ration coupons have a unit value of 4 gallons compared to our 1½ gallons. Tennessee is also served by railroad tank cars.

19. Not being clothed with the power and authority it is not possible for a civic organization, such as the Carolina Motor Club, to obtain authentic information from official sources. We have reason to believe that the facts given here are accurate.

We are asking for an investigation to verify or disprove the information which we here present, and give the public an explanation why gasoline is transported to Wilmington and back to Charlotte before being unloaded. This consumes great quantities of gasoline and burns many hundreds of thousands of miles of tires.

The citizens of the Carolinas have a right to know why this stupid system of gasoline distribution and management is tolerated.

The Carolina Motor Club, speaking for its members throughout the two Carolinas, has repeatedly requested the Government to make this investigation, and to this date no satisfactory response has been received.

GOVERNOR JOHNSTON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, SPEAKS

APRIL 30, 1943.

Mr. C. W. ROBERTS,
Carolina Motor Club, Charlotte, N. C.

DEAR MR. ROBERTS: I appreciate your letter of April 28 concerning the gasoline rationing program.

I wish to assure you that I am using every means possible to bring about a fair distribution for the Carolinas.

I have written the Office of Price Administration and have told them that it is not hearsay that gasoline shipped into South Carolina is being carried to Tennessee, but I have witnessed this with my own eyes, and I trust that at some time soon we shall get some action concerning this matter.

If I can be of further service to you, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Governor.

Governor Johnston saw the bill of lading and the transport truck consigned from South Carolina to Spruce Pine, N. C., from which point it is understood the gasoline is distributed into Tennessee.

RELAXING OF RATIONING SCHEDULE POSSIBLE

Under date of May 4, Mr. Walter Hochuli, Director of Marketing of the Petroleum Administration for War, writes the Carolina Motor Club at length concerning the situation, of which we quote the following paragraph:

"The situation in North Carolina and those States south is currently under study in this office. If we find that any increase in demand for gasoline will not jeopardize the supply of gasoline or other petroleum products such as fuel oil to those areas where a greater shortage exists, we then will give further consideration to relaxing the present degree of curtailment."

You will note from the paragraph that our claims are being studied, and there is a possibility of having the present degree of curtailment relaxed.

CAR OWNERS, DEMAND ACTION FROM YOUR SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN

Do something yourself by writing your Senators and Congressmen. Send them a copy of this page and ask them to do something.

We have received nice cooperative letters from some of them who want to do something—and we have some nice, sweet letters from others that are, well, just nice, sweet, harmless letters.

We want action. We want an investigation—an official investigation clothed with authority and power to obtain the facts. This investigative body should include private citizens and not be made up entirely of Government officials or Government employees and gasoline distributors.

WHAT ARE WE FIGHTING FOR—IF NOT FREEDOM AND EQUAL RIGHTS?

The history of the Carolinas is a history of patriotic, fighting men and women. Nowhere

in the Nation will a more loyal citizenship be found than in the Carolinas.

For generations Carolinians have fought and died for our country, and they are doing it again today—fighting for freedom and equal rights for all.

It is important to keep our private cars operating. Our transportation facilities will be wrecked if the unit value of coupons in the 17 seaboard States continue to remain the same as today.

It is just as necessary to keep the private cars in this territory in good operating condition as it is in the 31 sister States.

The present unit value is not enough to justify owners in keeping cars in operating condition.

This argument would not be presented if we did not feel, on the basis of information in hand, that the gasoline is available, or can be made available. Our people should be given equal rights with the citizens of our neighboring State of Tennessee, and 30 others, a right guaranteed to all people of the United States by our Constitution.

Let's win the war together.

MR. BROWN! WE WANT ACTION

MAY 8, 1943.

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN, Administrator,
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: To substantiate our claims that the gasoline situation in the Carolinas deserves attention, we present the following information:

* * * * *

People of the Carolinas have just recently oversubscribed their quota in the war loan drive.

You will find our people ever ready and willing to make every sacrifice necessary, or helpful, to speed the winning of the war, but we cannot understand why the unit value of our gasoline-rationing coupons should be so much less than our sister State of Tennessee.

Neither do we understand the reason for the roundabout distributing system in effect in the Carolinas unless it is for the benefit of some special interest.

There is something wrong. May we have some action?

Yours truly,

C. W. ROBERTS,
President, Carolina Motor Club.

Since 1812, Through Cash Bounties, Our Government Has Assisted Servicemen To Adjust Themselves to Peacetime Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in all post-war discussions the necessity of assisting the members of our armed forces to return to peacetime pursuits becomes increasingly evident. Delay in giving serious consideration to this important problem constitutes a breach of faith to our servicemen and women and tends to place millions of young patriots at the mercy of political opportunists. At the same time the economic condition of our returning servicemen at the close of the First World War has provided us with a pattern outlining the conditions with which we may expect to be confronted when hostilities cease.

If we have the foresight to take advantage of the lesson learned following the First World War we will lose no time in charting a course of action that will serve as a cushion to the economic shock that is bound to occur when demobilization of our armed forces becomes a reality.

One of the oldest and soundest plans is to provide financial assistance over a reasonable period of time following the signing of the peace treaty and discharge from the service.

Since 1812 it has been the policy of our Government to pay a cash bounty to the members of our armed forces as a means of assisting them in their return to civilian life.

Thus when I proposed a bill during the early days of the Seventy-seventh Congress to continue the base pay of the members of our armed forces for a period of 6 months following discharge and the close of the war I knew from my study of the subject that such action was not without precedent.

As proof of the truth of this statement my study and research discloses that from the year 1812 to 1919 various cash bounties were authorized by law in an effort to assist the veterans of all wars in meeting the need for adjustment occasioned by their return to peacetime vocations.

I have prepared a brief legislative summary disclosing the action taken which justifies my assertion that the legislation I have proposed is not without precedent. The following statutes were enacted since 1812:

CASH BOUNTIES TO SOLDIERS ON DISCHARGE AFTER WAR SERVICE

Act of January 11, 1812 (2 Stat. 672, sec. 12): Three months' additional pay to noncommissioned officers and soldiers honorably discharged (or to heirs, if killed in action), in addition to 160 acres of land.

Act of March 5, 1816 (3 Stat. 257, sec. 3): Three months' additional pay to all United States citizens who, being inhabitants of Canada at the outbreak of the war (of 1812) had joined the armies of the United States and served until death in service or honorable discharge; included all ranks from colonel down.

Act of February 11, 1847 (9 Stat. 125, sec. 9): Treasury scrip for $100 to enlisted men serving 12 months or more during Mexican War; $25 to those serving less than 12 months—as an alternative to bounty lands.

Act of July 19, 1848 (9 Stat. 248, sec. 5): Three months' additional pay to all officers and men honorably discharged after actual military service during war with Mexico.

Act of July 28, 1866 (14 Stat. 322, secs. 12, 13). Additional bounty to enlisted men honorably discharged after Civil War service: $100 in case of 3-year enlistments, $50 after 2-year enlistments, payable to widow, etc., in case of death in service.

NOTE.—Provision had already been made on July 22, 1861, for a $100 bounty to volunteers discharged after serving for 2 years or the duration of the war (12 Stat. 270, secs. 5, 6). An act of March 3, 1863 (12 Stat. 734, sec. 18) provided bounties for reenlistment payable partly on such reenlistment and partly on discharge ($50 for 1-year enlistment, divided $25 and $25, and $100 for a 2-year enlistment, divided $25 and $75). Similar provision was made by act of July 4, 1864 (13 Stat. 379, sec. 1), bounties of $100 to $300 for 1- to 3-year enlistments, payable equally at beginning and middle of term and on discharge.

Act of January 12, 1899 (30 Stat. 784). Two months' extra pay to officers and men of United States Volunteers on muster out, after service "beyond the limits of the United States"; 1 month's pay, after service within the United States; all to be "in lieu of granting leaves of absence and furloughs." Made payable to heirs, etc., of men dying in the service, by act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1074).

Extended by act of May 26, 1900 (31 Stat. 217) to certain volunteer staff officers, and to persons honorably discharged without furlough, or because of disability incurred in service, etc., or on their own application before date of mustering out of their organizations.

Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1073). Similar provision to that in act of January 12, 1899, in favor of enlisted men of the Regular Army.

Act of February 24, 1919 (40 Stat. 1151, sec. 1406): Payment of $60 to "all persons serving in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war" on honorable discharge or being placed on inactive duty. Not payable to persons who had not actually reported for duty by November 11, 1918, or who had received 1 month's pay upon discharge for incapacity, etc. (act of May 18, 1917), or who were entitled to retired pay, or to heirs, etc., of persons entitled but dying before payment received. Made applicable to enlisted men discharged for the purpose of reenlisting (but only one payment to be made to any one person) by resolution of September 29, 1919 (40 Stat. 291 c. 70) and act of June 4, 1920 (40 Stat. 836, sec. 6).

Mr. Speaker, the above statutory awards proved of great assistance in meeting the perplexing problems of the aftermath of war. In like manner, my legislative proposal reintroduced in the present Congress and known as H. R. 923, will prove an invaluable aid to millions of our service men and women.

I am hopeful that we will recognize the urgent necessity for such legislation and take favorable action on this bill in justice to the patriotic men and women who are now serving their country at a tremendous personal sacrifice.

Yes, We Have No Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an advertisement which appeared in the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C., for Wednesday, May 19, 1943. The advertisement is entitled "Yes, We Have No Potatoes." It was paid for and

inserted by the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (U. A. W.-C. I. O.). I ask unanimous consent to have the advertisement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the advertisement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YES, WE HAVE NO POTATOES

POTATOES ARE NOT THE ONLY FOOD OUT OF REACH

Within the last year, white flour has gone up 24 percent; butter 41 percent; carrots 39 percent; cabbage 119 percent; lamb 45 percent; potatoes 100 percent.

It boils down to this:

We have no Office of Price Administration that deserves to be called a price control agency.

The American game of baseball gives you three strikes before you're out. Three strikes have now been called on the do-nothing policies of Office of Price Administration.

Three times Office of Price Administration has failed to carry out promises to stabilize the cost of living. In April 1942, we got the President's 7-point stabilization program; in September 1942, we got an order absolutely fixing prices; on April 8, 1943, we got a new "hold-the-line" order.

What are the results?

A store-by-store check in Detroit shows average living costs have gone up 28 percent in the last year. Detroit is typical of the Nation.

The store-by-store check in Detroit shows that 47 percent of chain stores and supermarkets, and 65 percent of independent stores, are violating ceiling prices. This situation also is typical of the entire Nation.

Headlines these days tell of new Office of Price Administration "efforts" to reduce the cost of living. Unfortunately you can't serve headlines at the dinner table.

Current Office of Price Administration moves—if enforced—actually will mean only the slightest reduction in your food costs.

The new ceilings are not lower ceilings. There is not even any claim that they are lower, only that they may make prices easier to understand. Some ceilings are actually higher.

The new ceilings will not protect you from paying top ceiling prices for grade B or grade C commodities. Profiteers' influence in Office of Price Administration has defeated demands for grade labeling.

The "10-percent roll back" on meats, coffee, and butter for which Office of Price Administration is patting itself on the back, will—if enforced—amount to just this:

Average food costs may be "rolled back" 3 percent. Promised "roll backs" on cabbage and lettuce will still leave prices of these foods, at the farm, three times as high as they were a year ago. There is no promise of even a small "roll back" on potatoes.

If current promises are enforced, the cost of living will still be about 25 percent higher than a year ago.

These are some of the reasons why millions of American consumers are saying, "Yes; we have no Office of Price Administration."

HERE IS OUR PLAN FOR PRACTICAL, COMMON-SENSE ECONOMIC STABILIZATION

1. The cost of living must be rolled back at once to May 15, 1942, when wages were frozen by the Little Steel formula; ceiling prices must be vigorously enforced; Government subsidies should be extended, where necessary, to food producers; excessive profits on food should be recaptured by the Government.

2. To insure adequate food production, our Government should extend long-term credits to the small working farmers, assuring them an adequate supply of seed, fertilizer, fencing, land, labor, machinery, and other essentials.

3. To achieve the fullest war production, the utmost utilization of manpower, and to guarantee war workers and their families a minimum income, all war plants should be required to operate 48 hours a week, or guarantee 48 hours' pay. (The guaranteed work-week in British war industries has increased production, boosted labor morale and minimized industrial problems. If England can do it, why not the United States of America?)

4. To enable wages to keep abreast of living costs, the War Labor Board must have authority to make all necessary adjustments; the War Labor Board should abandon its piecemeal, patchwork methods of handling wage cases and should institute, without delay, industry-wide stabilization conferences to apply the sound and fair economic principle of equal pay for equal work.

5. Free labor can defeat the Axis. Arbitrary job freezing, compelling John Smith to work for 20 or 30 cents an hour less than Harry Jones, for identical work, should be ended. Labor should be given equal representation in the War Manpower Commission. All manpower stabilization agreements should be reached through voluntary negotiations of government, labor and management.

THIS IS THE UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS—CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

Nine hundred seventy-nine thousand two hundred and sixty-seven members—war workers all (supporting 4,000,000 women and children).

Two hundred thousand additional members in the armed forces.

Three hundred seven million dollars in War bonds yearly.

Four million two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to Red Cross and war relief.

Four hundred thousand blood donors, men and women.

Will you join with us in seeking the adoption of our program? Write at once to President Roosevelt, to your Congressman, to the Office of Economic Stabilization, to the Office of Price Administration and to the War Labor Board urging immediate enactment.

UNITED AUTOMOBILE AIRCRAFT AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA—(UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS—CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS)

Civil Aviation Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYLE H. BOREN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the following scheduled air lines: All American Aviation, Inc., American Airlines, Inc., American Export Airlines, Inc., Braniff Airways, Inc., Chicago & Southern Air Lines, Inc., Colonial Airlines, Inc., Continental Air Lines, Inc., Delta Air Lines, Eastern Air Lines, Inc., Inland Air Lines, Inc., Mid-Continent Airlines, Inc., National Airlines, Inc., Northeast Airlines, Inc., Northwest Airlines, Inc., Pennsylvania-Central Airlines Corporation, Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., United Air Lines Transport Corporation, and Western Air Lines, Inc.

The above-mentioned 18 air lines have had under discussion a joint reply to the statement of important civil aviation questions released by the Civil Aeronautics Board on May 4, 1943, and announce that they have reached agreement on a reply—copy attached—which has been forwarded to the Board. In approaching the important problems raised by the questionnaire, these air lines have sought to arrive at a policy which would be in the best interests of the United States in the development of its foreign air transportation. While many of the air lines naturally desire to operate abroad, or to extend their foreign commercial operations, they recognize that the decision as to which air lines fly abroad and the routes to be flown rests with the proper authorities of the Federal Government and should be decided in the national interest and not from the point of view of their self-interest.

Certain definite decisions are announced by these air lines as to policies which they believe desirable in the national interest. First and foremost of these is the desirability of this Government working out immediately a reciprocal exchange with other countries of the general right of innocent flight—nonmilitary—together with the right to land for refueling and other technical purposes, in international air transport. This right, the right of innocent transit, is basic to the development of international air transportation and leaves open for later negotiation and agreement the question of the right to engage in commerce by air. The air lines feel such a policy will afford to this country the greatest opportunities for full development of international air transportation.

Finally, the air lines announce their vigorous objection to any form of government participation in the management or ownership of American flag air carriers and to the creation of international air transport operations conducted in whole or in part through internationally owned and controlled government corporations. Past performance has demonstrated that private management and initiative are capable of successfully upholding the role of the United States in post-war international air transportation. These air lines have offered their assistance and cooperation to all interested Government agencies and are making further studies of some of the problems presented.

REPLY TO STATEMENT OF IMPORTANT CIVIL AVIATION QUESTIONS

1. Question: What international air routes are of major commercial importance for post-war United States operations?

Answer: What air routes are of major commercial importance after the war will depend to a large extent upon the terms of the peace treaty and other considerations that cannot now be determined. Clearly the agencies of the Federal Government concerned with foreign trade and commerce are in an advantageous position to determine which routes will be of major commercial importance immediately after the war. Air travel between points will of itself create commercial ties to nations and places not now of significance. Furthermore, technological developments in

flying will require a constant readjustment of such routes even assuming that the commercial centers remain the same. It is obvious and essential that the United States should have the shortest possible air routes to all countries of recognized or potential commercial importance.

2. Question: Should there be a reciprocal exchange with other countries of general rights of air passage, together with the right to land for refueling and other technical purposes, in international air transport?

Answer: Yes. A clear distinction must be maintained at all times between the right of innocent flight as distinguished from the right to engage in commerce by air.

3. Question: In the event rights of transit through United States territory of the character covered by question No. 2 are granted to foreign carriers, should their operations be restricted to a designated small number of airports and airways, or be permitted to use any airport or airway available for general civil use?

Answer: Such operations of foreign carriers should not be restricted to a designated small number of airports and airways nor be wholly unlimited. Rather, they should be determined in each particular case in the light of operational requirements and military security.

4. Question: Should those foreign operations authorized to pick up and discharge international traffic within United States territory be permitted to do so only at a few points on or near our coast or borders, or, on the other hand, be permitted to do so at points well into the interior?

Answer: Wherever adequate domestic service exists, foreign operations should not be permitted to pick up or discharge international traffic except at recognized ports of entry near our coast or borders. Cabotage rights should not be sought by the United States if on a reciprocal basis.

5. Question. Would international commercial aviation be assisted appreciably by the establishment of free zones in states located on important international routes wherein cargo could be unloaded and stored, repair facilities maintained, staff members housed, and the like?

Answer. Yes, insofar as such free zones pertain to air transportation and can be established on a basis not inconsistent with national security. Other functions of a free zone will require further study. It is particularly important that many airports and bases throughout the world which have been financed in whole or in part with United States funds be made available to American flag air carriers on a nonexclusive basis It is felt that such zones are necessary to implement the concept of the right of innocent flight discussed under question No. 2 above and may aid in meeting post-war military policing problems.

6. Question. Assuming that many foreign governments will be willing to enter into agreements with respect to commercial air rights only on some basis of reciprocity, what type of agreement would seem most likely to meet the standard of reciprocity without retarding the development of air transportation?

Answer: Such agreements should place no limit upon the number of schedules or the number of carriers operating between points, nor should paralleling necessarily be disapproved. As far as the United States is concerned, it is felt the nature of our operations can best be determined by considerations of the public interest. The United States should have no particular reason or desire to control the vehicle through which foreign countries choose to perform air transport services. It is implicit from the foregoing that United States air carriers believe that given adequate Government support they are capable of maintaining this country's competitive position.

7. Question: What operating and commercial rights, not specified in response to other questions, will be needed for international air-line operations?

Answer: The operating and commercial rights required will differ in each country and past experience may not necessarily be a guide to the future. The United States should seek all operating and commercial rights necessary to trade on an equal basis with other countries, including the right of American flag carriers to maintain communication services, meteorological services, keep American personnel stationed in the territory of other states, and the like. It is recognized that some degree of international cooperation, particularly in the field of communications, will be necessary and inevitable.

8. Question: Should United States air carriers negotiate directly with foreign governments to secure international air transport operating rights, and, if so, to what extent and under what conditions?

Answer: The United States Government should and must conduct many negotiations with foreign governments for the purpose of securing international air transport operating rights. Private companies should conclude such basic negotiations only with the consent and knowledge of the Government. Naturally, once the basic rights are secured, negotiation for incidental collateral rights may be left to private management.

9. Question: To what extent and under what conditions should United States air carriers engage in both domestic and international air transportation?

Answer: This question must be decided in terms of individual air carriers on the basis of public convenience and necessity and consistent with the policies and standards established by the Civil Aeronautics Act. Subject to these qualifications, the policy should be definitely established that any United States air carrier may be permitted to engage both in domestic and foreign air transportation.

10. Question: Should the United States develop foreign air transportation mainly through one company or should there be regional companies (perhaps with competition in those regions where traffic warrants), and, if so, what should the regions be?

Answer: No rule or policy should be predetermined that foreign air transportation be developed through one company, through regional companies, or through any other chosen instrumentality. Foreign air transportation should be developed upon the basis of public convenience and necessity and consistent with the policies and standards established by the Civil Aeronautics Act.

11. Question: If the foreign air commerce of the United States is carried on mainly through a single company or through regional monopolies, to what extent, if any, should such a company or companies be governmentally owned, financed, managed, or otherwise regulated?

Answer: Government participation in the ownership or management of American flag air carriers is undesirable regardless of whether one company, regional companies or other special instrumentalities are chosen to develop international air transport. Regulation should generally be in accordance with principles established by the Civil Aeronautics Act.

12. Question: Should international air-transport operations be conducted in whole or in part through internationally owned and controlled Government corporations, and, if so, to what extent?

Answer: No.

13. Question: Should a permanent international organization be established to (1) formulate international safety standards with respect to flight rules, traffic control, operational procedures, navigation facilities, certification of aircraft airworthiness, or certification of airman competency; (2) control economic matters such as passenger and cargo rates or methods of competition; or (3) establish and operate international airways, international airports, and aids to international air navigation? If such an organization is established, how should it be constituted?

14. Question: If an international organization of the kind referred to in question No. 13 is not established: (1) Should conditions be imposed on foreign airmen with respect to compliance with United States safety standards? (2) Should conditions be imposed on foreign aircraft with respect to United States airworthiness requirements? (3) Should controls be exercised by the United States over the passenger and cargo rates, competitive practices, and other economic phases of operations of foreign carriers?

Answer to 13 and 14: It is clear that some uniform "rules of the road" for the airways must from time to time be established through international agreement. To the fullest extent possible, however, air carriers should be permitted to deal with the problems discussed under this question through private understandings reached among themselves subject to appropriate Government supervision. Many of the problems suggested by this question will not be of immediate pressing concern after the war and solutions should be permitted to develop gradually in the light of existing circumstances.

15. Question: What disposition should be made of surplus aircraft owned by the Government, suitable or convertible for civil use, and through what governmental machinery?

Answer: Surplus military transport aircraft, capable of conversion for temporary peacetime use, should not be made available upon the cessation of utilities for unrestricted sale or use which might adversely affect the development by the United States of its own domestic and foreign air transportation and national security. This matter admittedly requires careful study.

16. Question: In general, what steps should be taken by Government and the industry to facilitate the conversion of aircraft manufacturing to a peacetime basis when the time comes?

Answer: Subject always to the demands of the war effort and its efficient and successful prosecution, aircraft manufacturers should be authorized to prepare all plans and fabricate parts for the conversion of military transport aircraft and to prepare plans for future civil and commercial aircraft. In this manner, and at the strategic time in relation to military requirements, aircraft manufacturers can and should commence actual construction thereby effecting a more gradual and efficient conversion of their plants from a wartime to a peacetime production basis.

17. Question: What other problems and recommendations in relation to international air transportation should receive the active consideration of this Government?

Answer: It is contemplated that air lines may individually submit additional points for consideration as suggested by this question.

Eastern Air Lines, Pennsylvania-Central Airlines Corporation, Chicago and Southern Air Lines, Inc., Continental Airlines, Inc., American Airlines, Inc., All American Aviation, Inc., National Airlines, Inc., Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., American Export Airlines, Inc., Northeast Airlines, Inc., Northwest Airlines, Inc., Braniff Airways, Inc., Delta Air Lines, Colonial Airlines, Inc., Inland Air Lines, Inc., Mid-Continent Airlines, Inc., Western Air Lines, Inc., United Air Lines Transport Corporation.

MAY 13, 1943.

Conduct of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter dated April 28, 1943, which comes to me from Mrs. Louise H. Merritt, of Mount Holly Road, Charlotte, N. C. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLOTTE, N. C., *April 28, 1943.*
The Honorable ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: In the years you have been representing the people of North Carolina, I followed with a great deal of interest the stands you have seen fit to take from time to time. There have been instances when I disagreed, but as a sum total, you have reperesented us well, and our confidence has not been misplaced. Now, I am asking that you enlist your efforts as the representative of North Carolina in Washington in view of the following:

This letter is the first of its kind I have ever written. It does not spring from an event, but a series of incidents which have been shaped in Washington. I believe I speak for scores of people when I ask "Why are the American people not told the truth in regard to the struggle that is before them?" Do you and your constituents realize that complacency in being bred and rapidly? Recent newspaper articles have told us that Cecil Brown, overseas correspondent, who survived two torpedoings, is now in the States, rebuffed, and told to keep his information to himself, because he tried to "wake the people up at home." Also, Al Schmidt, credited with killing 200 Japanese, now blind, says "if I could only do something to wake the people at home." We want to know what we need to be awakened to. Another rumor is that General MacArthur will be left in the Pacific with few supplies, few men until January 1944, when he will be forced to retire because of his age—before we launch any offensive of importance against Japan. These rumors are gaining momentum. The people are saying that Japan is strictly our enemy, and we are going to fight her—alone. Yet, we are placing military might in view of the German threat. Just how much truth is in the implication of these rumors is not known. These things are leading us to wonder if things are not being kept from us. The faith of the people in the men who play such all-important roles in our immediate future is being undermined. The faith in our representatives as our chief informers and advisers is being undermined. We can appreciate the fact that some news of necessity must be withheld, the news which would be of military value to our enemies. But I do not have reference to that type of news—but rather the news which might be devastating in its effect because it would let us know that some of our highest officials are—using the well-worn phrase—playing politics. Articles are braving the storm occasionally and mentioning names—names of men who hold great reins of power in their hands. They are implying they are serving their own interest in a political manner rather than the interest of Mr. and Mrs. America. I realize that truth must be given in small doses, all too often, but the situation calls for action and—now. We are anxious to fight the enemy—we don't like to think that some of our officials would retard our progress for reasons of their own.

There are two things that need clarification: What lies behind the phrase "Wake the people up at home"? What is General MacArthur's predicament in the Pacific—a second Pearl Harbor will not be as easy to explain as the first one. (It is rumored that the general's friends in Washington fear him as a presidential threat, therefore, will not give him any striking force in the Pacific.)

One other situation I would like to mention briefly—the manpower situation. This is only one angle, and I am aware there are many more. Government offices are overstaffed throughout the country with women. Discourage overstaffing of office personnel throughout the nation from civil service recruiting. The manpower problem will be with us long as we are at war, and it will be wise now to curb Government employing of more than is actually needed, thereby relieving the situation in other vital industries, as the women will seek employment there.

In summary, what we want to do now—is fight the enemy and win the victory and peace, and that right soon, with the help of God. Expedite every law, every restriction upon the home front that will hasten us toward the day that victory and peace shall be ours—with the help of God.

Incidentally, I am proud of my husband, Lt. (jg) W. W. Merritt, who is on duty with the United States Navy in the Pacific. The job at hand now is winning the war—the people need to be awakened to the seriousness of the job we have at hand. You, as a Member of the United States Senate, can greatly help in this task.

Respectfully yours,
(MRS.) LOUISE H. MERRITT.

Unreal Tax Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, thousands of dollars' worth of useless verbiage has flooded the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the tax bill. Partisanship outmaneuvered statesmanship. Although I once favored the idea of the Ruml plan, I have since found it to be too vulnerable. The Republicans refused to recede from their support of the Ruml plan; they refused to compromise under any circumstances.

I urge every Member of this House, and especially my Republican colleagues, to read Walter Lippmann's column, Today and Tomorrow, on the subject The Unreal Tax Issue, which appears in today's Washington Post, Thursday, May 20, 1943. Walter Lippmann is one of the Nation's outstanding columnists, and in view of the Nation-wide confusion on the tax issue his statements are very timely. As part of my remarks, I am pleased to include Mr. Lippmann's article, The Unreal Tax Issue:

THE UNREAL TAX ISSUE
(By Walter Lippmann)

Not much more time ought to be spent arguing about how much taxes are to be abated. The question is eminently one that can be compromised and adjusted. The continuing agitation about the abatement of taxes is softening up the taxpayers, is obstructing the establishment of an efficient system of tax collection, and is postponing and making more difficult the levying of the new taxes and the compulsory savings which are imperative if the inflation is to be controlled.

The dispute about how to collect taxes should be settled quickly so that we may address ourselves to the question of collecting more taxes and of impounding the excess inflationary money.

Advocates of the Ruml plan have performed a useful service in making it plain that in order to make the taxpayers current there must be some relief from the need to pay 2 years' taxes in 1 year. They have, it now appears, educated the Treasury on this point. But their enthusiasm has carried them too far. By arguing that nothing will do except the total cancellation of the 1942 tax liability they have fallen into a dilemma; either they are conferring a very special benefit on one group of taxpayers, or they are misleading this group of taxpayers into thinking that they are going to have a special benefit.

The taxpayers involved are the salaried and professional men who are earning net incomes over $25,000 a year. Under the present laws these men, assuming them to be self-made and without inherited wealth, find it very difficult to retire and live at their accustomed standard on the income from their savings. For in the year after they cease to earn, they owe the Government anywhere from one-third to two-thirds of a year's earnings. The Ruml plan enables them to retire without making this payment. This would mean for most of them the difference between being able to live on their savings and not being able to live on them at their expected standard of living. Thus it is not true that the Ruml plan makes no difference to any taxpayer until he dies. It makes a tremendous difference to the successful self-made man when he retires, or for reasons of health is no longer able to earn a large salary or large professional fees.

A very strong case can be made for the Ruml plan as a measure of social reform. Under the pre-war tax laws the most successful self-made men (as measured by their earnings), business executives, lawyers, doctors, engineers, inventors, artists, were under a severe handicap. In the few years out of their active lives in which they were able to earn large incomes, it was made increasingly difficult for them, as tax rates were raised, to accumulate money for their old age. Those who had inherited wealth, and those who had acquired it before the tax rates became severe, were in a far better position. Yet by and large it is true that the dynamic initiative of our social order resides in the salaried and professional men who, because of character and of special gifts and unusually hard work, command for a time large salaries or fees. In a capitalistic democracy they ought to be encouraged, and the ability to save enough out of a short period of large earnings in order to retire comfortably is undoubtedly a potent incentive to them.

The popularity of the Ruml plan is that it recognizes this defect of the pre-war tax laws, and corrects it.

But this is wartime. Because it is wartime it is almost certainly impossible to carry out this otherwise desirable social reform. For if the Senate's version of the Ruml plan were adopted, can it be denied

that in the next tax bill the rates would have to be raised very considerably on incomes over $25,000? Is it conceivable that taxes can be raised against the millions of new taxpayers with their lower incomes in the same year when the men who have large earnings obtain relief amounting to anywhere from one-third to two-thirds of a year's taxes?

It is not conceivable, and many of the advocates of the Ruml plan have recognized the fact by saying that once Congress has made the old taxpayers current, some portion of the forgiven taxes can be recovered by raising the rates. Their argument has been that the orderly procedure is first to make everyone current, and then to raise tax rates.

They have been right in principle. But have the taxpayers understood that the principle is theoretical, and academic; that out of what is forgiven by adopting the Ruml plan, a substantial portion will still be taxed out of them anyway? I fear they have not understood this, and that the heat would go out of the dispute if they did.

Yet it is clear that the wartime issue has been narrowed down to this: Shall Congress forgive the 1942 taxes 100 percent, and then collect part of them anyway by rising tax rates say 20 to 30 percent? Or shall Congress forgive only 70 to 80 percent, and then admit that not a great deal more can be extracted from the larger incomes?

This is not a choice over which anyone, least of all the taxpayers concerned, need die on the barricades. It is obviously a question of practical administrative expediency to be compromised by the application of common sense.

Legislative Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the New York Times under the date of May 19, 1943:

LEGISLATIVE RESPONSIBILITY—HOUSE MEMBER UPHOLDS REPRESENTATIVE CHARACTER OF CONGRESS

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Arthur Krock's column of May 7 revives a discussion of the basic questions raised by the highly provocative editorial Congress and the President, which led the editorial page of the New York Times for March 15. This editorial has since called forth so much discussion, not only over the friendly conversational dinner table, but in public speech and public print, that I should like to bring a few of its well-taken points under scrutiny.

When the President declared that complete responsibility for post-war prosperity and security rested upon the legislative branch alone, I cannot agree that he was taking a position not only unsound in itself but inconsistent with his own past leadership on economic and social measures.

The legislative branch, elected by the common and popular vote, cognizant of the regional and section wishes and needs of the people in every corner of our vast country, is the only body sufficiently informed and sufficiently empowered to deal with post-war prosperity and security. To use a much-worn phrase, we of the legislature have our fingers on the pulse of the Nation. We are brought here by the voting majority, and even if for a moment we should be drawn away from our regional plans and purposes, and our regional responsibilities and ways of thinking, we would be daily reminded of them by the hundreds of letters from our constituents, most of whom have had, in one way or another, some personal contact with us.

ELECTED BY PEOPLE

I cannot believe that to the voting public we are merely names on a ballot. We were brought to Congress for good and sufficient reasons by people who have heard us speak, either at public gatherings or over the radio, by people who live near us and have reasons to entrust to us the zealous representation of their rights and privileges; by people who know us personally and have exchanged views with us, either orally or by letter.

Therefore, coming, as we do, from every part of the Union and bringing with us the plans and purposes and desires of our constituents, keeping these plans and purposes and desires constantly in our hearts and minds, and judging them with new and wide perspective in the light of the whole national good, who else could be better qualified than we of Congress for post-war planning?

This does not mean that we shall not need and, indeed, invite the opinions and advice of outside experts. No one man can be a Pliny in these modern times, since the realms of knowledge are grown too vast and too complicated.

The fact remains that the President has received virtually all he has asked from Congress. It is the very basis of our American democracy to discuss, to disagree, and to resolve our problems for the common good. A certain amount of grumbling and criticism, whether it be about point rationing or taxation or the conduct of the war, is only a healthy sign. One might may that to criticize is American, but to sulk, un-American. As long as criticism and discussion are brought out into the open all is well. Never in our history were there more despair, more defeatism and more bitter onslaughts of vituperation than during the first 25 years of the birth pangs of our Nation, and yet we look back now upon those years as the very bedrock of democracy.

AN ANCIENT PROBLEM

The matter of selection of Congressmen for committees is an old problem and a difficult one. Under our present system it has been solved by selection of seniority. Selection by ability, as proposed by the editorial in the New York Times, would be well-nigh impossible. Who would be set up as judge of the ability of a Congressman?

Each Member has been elected by his own people as an adequate representative of his people's rights, as their guardian, and champion. Is he to be judged fit to serve on committees by a jury of his peers within the House? Must he be acceptable to the Chief Executive, thus quickly achieving the undesirable end of "complete subservience of the legislative body to the President?" Shall we revert to the outworn and unsatisfactory practice in existence up to 1909, by which the Speaker of the House made all committee assignments and was the virtual czar of the activities of the House? Or shall we admit some highly impractical, albeit idealistic, scheme which would allow any self-seeking and aggressive newcomer who happens to be endowed with the gift of gab, a photogenic physiognomy and a susceptible press to become influential far out of proportion to the stature of office and so be tyrant as well as tyro?

Selection by seniority is a simple, uncontroversial and, in the main, fair method of procedure. Men who are reelected over and over to Congress unquestionably represent the will of their constituents. Even if they belong to the congressional minority and their votes on various measures often come to naught, they serve their people constantly and usefully. Should their party become in future elections the majority, their long years of service would not go unrecognized or unrewarded.

As things stand we, and the Nation, are doing very well. Idealism is a necessary part of our thinking, but idealism can take wings off the feet of progress and place shackles there instead. Most of the schemes to better mankind in one way or another, from Plato to Karl Marx, are entirely and sincerely idealistic; but they lack one vital element, the human quotient, and therefore they are doomed to failure. The philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi is purely idealistic, but when Gandhi says, as he did the other day, that should Japanese bombers fly over one of the great sprawling and unprotected cities of India he would stand out in the center of an airfield and, by making peaceful gestures, invite the invaders to come down to talk things over, we have idealism reduced to a fanatical absurdity.

I cannot feel that we in this country have much to fear from our duly elected executive and legislative bodies. What we do have to fear are the people who, as Macaulay so aptly said of some of the French gentry during the revolution, are "ignorant of their own interests though considerate of nothing else."

Let us turn our attention, rather, to the necessary task of converting the grumblers and whiners, the chiselers of income-tax blanks and ration books and war profits, all those of little faith, all those of loose thinking and hyperemotional ideals, to the belief that after the war a whole new scheme of life must be planned for the economic and social good of every American citizen.

We cannot go on in the so-called good old way. Let us together, we who are placed in Congress and every thinking American who helped to place us here, plan for the common welfare and for the glorious new vistas of progress that shall open up before us.

MARTIN J. KENNEDY.

WASHINGTON, May 13, 1943.

A California Labor Leader Speaks His Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, in the Aviation News of May 5, 1943, appeared the column of Chuck McDonald entitled "Timm Tidings," in which there was included a letter from R. M. Ashby, labor leader in the aircraft industry, though he humbly deprecates his own importance. Because the letter expresses well the viewpoint entertained by millions of members of organized labor, I am requesting unanimous consent for its insertion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is time that the American people were made aware of the fact that in a war we have to spend enormous sums of money, and that in view of that situation it is illogical and unfair that a small minority of executives are permitted to draw down huge salaries while, at the same time, insisting that the wages of the workers be frozen. Recently, Congress refused to accord the President the right to limit net incomes to a top of $25,000 per annum. Yet the same group who would nullify the President's power in that regard, with entire lack of logic and rationale, fulminates against labor and demands loudly that labor receive no increased compensation but be frozen in its present position. The same conservative gentlemen who want the sky to be the limit for the wealthy insist that labor be given no overtime pay after 40 or 48 hours, and insist that labor should work on holidays and Sundays at straight time.

The crowd who want the wages of workers to be frozen and to deny the farmers payment of the cost of production, either in the form of subsidies or price changes, are the ones who advocate the adoption of the Ruml plan, which would cancel the tax liability of the richest citizens in America for 1 year, probably 1942, even though that was the greatest year of earnings for the wealthy in America's history.

But let the article speak for itself:

TIMM TIDINGS

(By Chuck McDonald)

To start the ball rolling this week, may I present for your assimilation, or otherwise, the following letter received recently by this reporter? It does not represent the opinion of the paper or of the Timm Aircraft Corporation, but is, as the writer points out, "the humble opinion of a free American worker." It is newsworthy and noteworthy in that it represents an opinion of a topic Nation-wide in scope and deserves recognition for its display of "rugged individualism," if nothing more.

Mr. CHUCK MCDONALD,

DEAR CHUCK: A thought occurred to me the other evening as I read my evening paper. It preyed on my mind so much that I finally decided to write this letter in the hope that you would publish it, and in that way relieve my conscience. This is my own opinion, the humble opinion of a free American worker who still believes in the inalienable rights of the common man.

I realize, of course, that we are in the midst of a great world war, and that many drastic measures must be taken to obtain the ultimate victory. Nevertheless, this individual wonders why it is that salaries of $67,000 per year ($25,000 net after taxes) can't be frozen, but a worker is liable to trial and fine or imprisonment or both, if he accepts more than 15 percent above his wages of a certain date. Maybe there's a reason or good explanation, but if there is I'd like to hear it.

Of course, there is one very good reason for this discrimination and that is that the workingman cannot afford to take his argument to the higher courts as his richer brothers and sisters can. One example of this was shown recently when a foreign-born actress who wasn't satisfied with a salary of $25,000 yearly, took her case to a high court which ruled in her favor. The average man or woman must be satisfied with what they have, while a select few may grasp for more at their own discretion.

Is this according to the American way of equality for all? If the common man protests or strikes against this rule it is considered as treason. I can't help but wonder about this situation. Will you help me wonder?

Thoughtfully yours,

R. M. ASHBY.

America's Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I include herein a speech recently made entitled "America's Tomorrow," by my former colleague, Hon. William L. Nelson, of Missouri, who was recognized by those of us who were fortunate to serve with him as one of the ablest and soundest Members of the House of Representatives during his years of service:

America's tomorrow is in the making. With the war being won, we do well to consider what is to come, to plan for peace.

Mighty, as moves machinery, has been mobilization. Demobilization will be different—demobilization of 10,000,000 men in our armed forces and thirty to forty millions in war factories.

What of America of tomorrow? What is to happen when the boys come home—but the boys will not come back. They will be men, the men of tomorrow. It is for us to see that they and the workers representing half the manpower of the Nation are not lost in a financial fog such as too often follows the order "Cease firing." This calls for patriotism, planning, appropriations—yes, and prayer. If there are no infidels in fox holes or on rubber rafts, there should be none among our representatives who sit at peace council tables.

Demobilization, covering both arms and industry, will mean such moving days as never before known—a thousand firsts of March merged, a hundred Cherokee Strip runs rolled into one. As populations shift, many beehives of industry, born of war, will become ghost towns, this despite every effort to change to peacetime production.

Fortunate is it that thought is being given to demobilization days. Thousands of thinking men and women are saying that if the chaos and confusion which characterized the post-war period of more than a quarter century ago are to be avoided, employment, either by the Federal Government or private capital, or both, must be provided.

Paths for decent living need to be laid out in advance. No "back to normalcy"; no returning through the black tunnel of reaction.

Looking to the future, there is now a National Planning Board—a voluntary group of 50 men, representing business, labor, and agriculture. In a memorandum to President Roosevelt the Board says, "The first goal of post-war planning should be a foundation for better living through a provision for enough jobs and lasting jobs."

As to the farmer, who is never without a job—an everlasting job—I go further: Short of help and machinery and long on floods, he and his household are diligently working to produce the food, more than ever before, required to feed our fighting forces, our civilian population, sparing great stores for our allies, and ultimately to save other millions from starvation. So all post-war planning must include the producer.

This is a people's war, and there should be written a people's peace. The fruits of victory, paid for in sweat, blood, tears, and precious human lives, must not be lost.

Just because we cannot make an accurate blueprint of tomorrow, we should not fail to consider our country's course. We cannot set up signboards for ourselves. Those who go ahead do this for us.

Woodrow Wilson died a broken-hearted man, but he did not live in vain. His plans to promote world peace may not have been perfect. Mistakes may have been made on both sides. It is generally so. But that great wartime President spoke as a patriot and as a prophet. His utterances should serve as signboards now. Speaking to great throngs in St. Louis, here in Kansas City, and elsewhere, Mr. Wilson plead for some effective peace plan. Said he, "The arrangements of the present peace cannot stand a generation unless they are guaranteed by the United Nations of the civilized world."

Surely the 28 Allied Nations should, with each giving up some things and each assuming some responsibility, be able to get together on a program to make sure that the sons of each generation shall not be sent to slaughter.

You, noticing that repeatedly I place the soldier first, may ask why I do not speak of the cost of war as measured in money, as well as in men. Ask the anxious mothers and fathers who wait, and often must weep, at home. Of course, wars cost billions of dollars, cost more to lose than to win, but no financial burden of the taxpayer at home can compare with the hardships of the soldier in the field.

What of the men of the present war? Is a forgetful country to see the hero of today forced to become the hobo of tomorrow? Must veterans of World War No. 2 sell apples on the streets of Washington as did veterans of World War No. 1? Are these men of America, should they in after years visit the Capital of their country—key city of the world—as did the veterans of 1917–18, to be driven out by armed forces under orders of an after-war President?

But as to the peace for which we pray, first our own house must needs be set in order, but this alone will not insure safety. It is disease, not health, that is contagious. No place on earth is now far from any other place. The world, whether we like it or not, is our near neighbor. So our country's future is closely connected with every clime and continent.

We must play our part in the family of friendly nations, see to it that the germs from festering sores—too deep for sulfa drugs—sores remaining from the present global struggle, do not spread and so start another war.

Safety measures mean United States participation in a world police force to preserve peace; mean punishment for the arch criminals who are responsible for war; mean, from the offending and conquered countries, reparations, but, as applies to the civilian population, without revenge; mean that preparations for another war on the part of the Axis Powers must be made impossible.

In all this we need to be guided by signboards along a road which proved not to be passable. Again failure must follow if we demand of our own people the impossible in forgiving and of the beaten enemy the impossible in giving. High tariff walls, such as were blindly built a few years after the first World War, do more than stop the payment of full reparations. They breed national hatreds.

Let it be remembered that wars are waged not alone with guns, planes, ships, and tanks, but with ideas and ideals. Let not the views of the vanquished conquer the conquerors. While determined never again to be found unprepared in a military way, we do well to avoid militarism as the Old World knows it. America must still be America.

Why do I speak of peace while at this hour armies are engaged in stupendous struggles or are poised to strike? My answer is that even now it cannot be said, as when dawned that Easter day, "It is yet early." Unless we hasten, we may do too little and do that too late.

Flames kindled on countless battle fronts have not seared the selfishness out of all souls. There are signs that many are planning to cast the future in the mold of the past. How can this be prevented? First, by an aroused public opinion. The sleeping citizen may imperil national safety as does the sleeping sentry.

Should the unconditional surrender of the Axis forces come soon, no peace terms will be agreed upon until after the 1944 election. Upon that election may depend the future of America. As men and women—and I am glad to have had a part in extending suffrage to mothers, wives and all women, greatest of war sufferers at home—go to the polls in 1944, or fail to go as did so many in 1942, vital issues will be determined. On that election day, with a President, one-third of the Senate, and the entire House of Representatives to be chosen, our country will proceed along the way that leads to other wars or to peace.

The next Congress, and I include House as well as Senate, for views and voices in the House will bear weight second only to votes in the Senate, will represent us, vote for us. Washington will vote, but first we are privileged to vote. Furthermore, voting is the duty of every man who this week, a week ushered in by a day set apart, proudly says, "I Am an American." Surely a country worth fighting for is worth voting for. We owe our ballots to our boys.

Finally, America's tomorrow should be no day of doubt and negation, but a day of hope and promise as we, people of all parties, creeds, and classes, together press toward the goal of lasting peace.

Plumley Not a Candidate for Minority Whip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement I made on May 20 to the press in response to inquiries with regard to my possible candidacy for the position of whip for the minority:

Representative PLUMLEY, of Vermont, for 9 years deputy minority whip of the House, has announced that under no circumstances or conditions would he be a candidate for minority whip.

"I know," he said, "the price a man must pay in order to do this man-killing job right. We must have an organization the responsibility for which rests on the whip, who must sacrifice his State, his district, his committees, his time, and his energy to perfect it.

"As the sole Member from Vermont, I could not do this if I would, despite all the assurances of support and with full appreciation of the urgent requests that have been made on me to carry on. I owe my first duty to Vermont and to my committees. No man can serve two masters.

"I do not feel called upon to make the sacrifices which the assumption of this job would necessitate."

Billions for Foreigners—Nothing for Home Disasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, as time goes on I am learning more and more of the dissipation of our money and resources to all parts of the world and the sad neglect of our own people and our own properties. A few days ago we passed an appropriation bill of $29,000,000,000 without a dissenting vote. This $29,000,000,000 will be dissipated in all parts of the world for destructive purposes. Today we are going to vote an appropriation of $7,000,000,000 more for so-called lend-lease. Next Monday we shall appropriate $71,000,000,000 more for dissipation throughout the world.

I want to call the membership's attention to our dissipation of more than $100,000,000,000 of our money and our natural resources in less than a week. We give this money without asking any questions and a large part of this money is needed to prosecute the war effectively and speedily. But our trouble is that we have become so blind to these give-away appropriations that we are totally neglecting our own problems at home and our own disasters here in America.

In the 5 months that I have been here our Nation has suffered from three major floods. During these three major floods we have had untold suffering and misery among human beings. We have had an inestimable amount of property damaged. Hundreds of thousands of our own people in our own country are going to be impoverished for the rest of their lives as a result of damage by this act of God.

The point that I am driving at is this, that while we are playing the part of Santa Claus to the rest of the world with our hundreds of billions of dollars, and we appropriate it without batting an eye, we close our minds and we close our eyes, and we close our hearts to this misery and suffering here in America. I am going to give you a specific example. In my district less than a year ago at this time a flood almost completely washed out the city of Bayfield, Wis. Almost the entire town was left homeless and their business places were destroyed. The officials of that city appealed to our Federal Government time and again for aid. And they were told each time that no such aid was available. They finally appealed to one of the useless agencies of our Government known as Disaster Loan Corporation. This agency contains several high-paid men whose contribution to flood control in this country amounts to nil; that agency has no more use in our Federal Government than there is a man in the moon.

When the city of Bayfield appealed to this agency for aid or relief, they were asked to submit proof of their credit standing. This agency said to the officials of the city of Bayfield who were washed out by a flood, "Surely, we will loan you some money if your credit is any good." Imagine an agency asking a town that was wiped out by a flood what their credit rating was. The very idea of asking such a question after such a disaster proves the incompetency and the foolishness of ever having such an agency in the first place in Washington. In the last week we appropriated more than $100,000,000,000. We are going to give this $100,000,000,000 to this country, to that country, and to another country. And not once do we ask if the credit standing of those countries is any good. Not once do we ask if we will ever get any of this money back. Yet when our own people in our own country ask for aid during time of disaster, the first question our Government officials ask them is if their credit is any good and if they can pay the relief money back. We in America had better wake up and prepare an agency and prepare an appropriation that will take care of these national emergencies. If we can diddle away a hundred billion dollars without batting an eye, why can we not prepare a fund of at least $1,000,000,000 to take care of our own people during the national emergency of a flood? Until some of us wake up around here to pressing needs of our own people, I, for one, cannot see how we can go back into our districts and look our people squarely in the eye. Billions for foreigners but not one cent to our people in time of national disaster. That seems to be our present motto.

The War in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

March 16, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I must point a warning finger at our apparent readiness to largely ignore the gravity of the

war in the Far East. While we focus our attention upon the European theater, Japan is desperately racing to convert to its own war industry the vast resources acquired by conquest. I fear that our military strategists are putting too much dependence on the hope that the Japs cannot utilize the riches at their disposal effectively within the time we require to knock Germany out of the war. If that hope is a forlorn one, and there are indications that it is, we shall pay a fearful price for our mistake.

Let us be practical. We discounted the Japs before Pearl Harbor, but on December 7, 1941, we learned the full measure of their cunning and treachery. Since then we have learned much of their ability to accomplish superhuman tasks. They are working desperately, and we may as well face the fact that they are rapidly converting their conquered riches to their war industry. Every day that the Japs are left alone to fortify their conquered possessions and to strengthen their war industry with captured loot means more lives lost, more blood shed, and more cost for the United Nations before the Japs can be forced to their knees.

Our present tactics are causing the Japs no particular concern. They have had things pretty much their own way in the Pacific. We have won some naval engagements. We have taken Guadalcanal and parts of Java. We established bases on a few small islands. In comparison with the size of the job yet ahead, this is not much. But we have done remarkably well with the small amount of material which has been allocated for the Asiatic theater. We have got the men and the spirit to do a real job in the Pacific, but we will have to give them something to fight with. MacArthur and Halsey and Kenney and Chennault will see the task through if they have a chance.

I can readily see the tremendous difficulties of equipping and operating great armies in many quarters of the globe. I am not seeking a quarrel with our military strategists, for theirs is a huge responsibility. But I do say that time works against us in the Pacific. We must find ways to concentrate more ships and men and weapons in that theater of war, even if it means lesser concentrations in the European theater. Were our European operations certain to be of short duration, I could understand the emphasis now being laid upon supplies for Europe. But to me, Hitler and Hirohito are equally obnoxious and equally dangerous to the American way of life. And of the two, I believe that Hirohito will grow stronger with the passage of time.

There is another thing, Mr. Speaker. There is an unpaid debt out there in the Pacific, and the American people want the scales balanced. I am talking about Bataan and its gallant lads who are now behind barbed wire in Jap prison camps. That is reason enough for me to want more activity in the Pacific.

America at War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am including a newspaper clipping from the Washington Post of Tuesday, May 18, entitled "America at War," written by Selden Menefee:

AMERICA AT WAR

(By Selden Menefee)

YANKEE SPIRIT

New England is living intimately with the war. The huge shipyards at Boston and Portland, the Army and Navy encampments at Camp Edwards, Providence, and other places, boom conditions throughout business and industry, urban oil crises and rural gas shortages affect everyone's way of life.

Even the small college towns are drawn into this maelstrom of activity. Staid old Northampton, for example, is occupied by 900 WAVES and SPARS. The old residents heartily approve of them. Smith College itself is so short of staff and funds that the girl students are contributing an hour each day to college chores. During the summer they are urged to sign up for work on New England's farms.

But fundamentally New England has remained a tight little region of picturesque towns and villages, neat white houses, close-clipped lawns, and a well-established social hierarchy that has hardly been touched by this war. To a westerner the strength of the Yankee tradition comes as something of a shock. Here is a caste on a scale unparalleled in America except in the white-Negro relationship of the South. The combined conservatism of the Puritan's descendants and of the Irish Catholics results in a rock-ribbed resistance to change.

IRISH-AMERICANS

At the top of the social structure are the original Yankee families, now outnumbered by Americans of more recent vintage. Next are the Irish-Americans, who have risen to political power in Boston and who predominate among skilled workers in most of the industrial cities.

At the base of the pyramid are the French Canadians in Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, and industrial sections of Massachusetts and Rhode Island. In Boston and other cities of southern New England the Italians, Poles, Slavs, and others who came over in the 1890's or later, fill the same role. These, like the Irish, are of conservative Catholic stock.

Where the Yankee strain is least diluted—as in Vermont—the war spirit is strongest, for there are no disruptive group antagonisms to mar the picture. Here also the extreme conservatism of the Yankee is most in evidence.

These up-country Yankees oppose the New Deal and its reforms on general principle. They have never liked the 40-hour-week law because most Vermont farmers work longer. They think President Roosevelt is too pro-labor. They dislike unions. One small town editor went so far as to say, "John L. Lewis had better not come up this way or some farmer might just take a shot at him."

What the farmers want, according to the county agent of one prosperous county in Vermont, is an end to price control over farm products. They look back to World War No. 1 as a sort of Utopian era, when wages and farm prices both soared.

In this war they feel that labor is getting the gravy. I was shown statistics from the New York State College of Agriculture, to prove that in February factory earnings stood at 362 percent of the 1910 to 1914 level, while the corresponding index of farm prices was only 182. Such figures make Vermonters angry. They point out that, although New England produces less food than she consumes, what she does produce is bulky and perishable, so that it is essential to maintain production here.

SOCIAL BARRIERS

In the cities, Yankee conservatism often expresses itself in terms of social barriers against those of recent immigrant stock. Often the bigoted are themselves the children of northern European immigrants; they identify themselves with the original Yankees, and overcorrect for their lack of background by "taking it out" on other immigrant groups—the Italians and eastern Europeans.

This feeling extends in wartime even to American migrants to New England's industrial areas. I heard one Bridgeport Scandinavian deliver a long diatribe against the "Pennsylvania cowboys" from Scranton and other depressed areas, who have filled up all of the city's available houses.

The conservatism of New England has been constructive, however, in its insistence on the conservation of manpower. Local labor resources are being utilized as far as possible, to prevent excess migration and overexpansion. In upstate Massachusetts nine-tenths of the farmers are said to be doing some industrial work, full or part-time.

Greenfield, a thriving tool-and-die-making center, has only a thousand more people than in 1940, although one plant there has increased its working staff by about 3,000. Farmers and former unemployed townspeople commute to Greenfield from as far away as southern Vermont; a thousand women are employed in the biggest plant, and white-collar workers spend their evenings in the factory office. Such arrangements should greatly ease the inevitable post-war readjustment.

In Defense of Leesville

REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, before the rearmament program was started, Leesville, La., was a town of about 3,500 or 4,000 population. Since Camp Polk was placed near Leesville, the town has grown into a considerable city of many thousands. Camp Polk is probably the largest armored camp in the Nation today, and, in addition to that, tens of thousands of soldiers from all over the Nation have maneuvered in that section of the State, and Leesville has suddenly found itself in the midst of one of the greatest military areas in the Nation. We have had a half million men maneuvering at one time in the

central part of Louisiana. Also thousands of civilians have flocked there from all over the Nation.

The people of Leesville and the surrounding country are as fine citizens as our Nation affords. They are law-abiding, patriotic, and hard-working people, just as we have throughout Louisiana. Their sons are on all the battle fronts of the world where American troops are stationed. They are endeavoring to meet the tremendous problems which have been thrust upon them as a result of the war. They have been faced with the same problems, but probably in a greater degree, that all other boom towns and cities have had to face during this war. A few days ago Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, of Washington, visited Leesville, La., and was shown every courtesy and hospitality by the officials and citizens of that city. While this person was enjoying every kindness which these fine southern people could show her, she was at that very time writing an article which was published in the Washington Post on Sunday, April 18, 1943, and which seriously reflected upon the town of Leesville and its citizens. If one is looking for evils, I wonder why it is necessary to leave Washington to find them.

Mr. Speaker, the article in question did the good people of Leesville a great injustice. Soon after the mayor of the town, Hon. Oscar E. Morris, was informed of this scurrilous article, he wrote the editor of the Washington Post a statement for publication in the Post. I have not seen the mayor's letter in the Post and it is my understanding that the Post will not carry the letter. In order that the people may have the facts, I include in my remarks a copy of the letter from the mayor to the Washington Post. I have also received a letter from the State Board of Health of Louisiana, written by Dr. David E. Brown, State health officer, after he had made an inspection of Leesville immediately following the visit of Mrs. Meyer. Dr. Brown is an outstanding Louisiana physician of many years experience and I extend his letter as part of my remarks. I have also received a letter numerously signed by school men, officials, ministers, businessmen, Legionnaires, doctors, bankers, and other public-spirited citizens, which I also incorporate in my remarks. I also incorporate in my remarks a statement of the expenditures made by Leesville and Vernon Parish in connection with Camp Polk. These expenditures may not look large to you Members of Congress who have been appropriating money by the billions of dollars, but I can assure you that they were large to the people of Leesville and Vernon Parish and they constituted a real sacrifice on the part of those good people. I also include in my remarks a statement by the Honorable Sam J. Murphy, president of The Vernon Bank, Leesville, La., and a statement of the Honorable E. D. Boone, president of the Merchants & Farmers Bank & Trust Co., Leesville, La., and who I am sorry to say I have just been informed died this week. I also include in my remarks a statement by the Reverend Alton A. McKnight, pastor of the First Methodist Church of Leesville; a statement by the Reverend J. Z. Spears, pastor of the Apostolic Church of Leesville, and also a statement by the Reverend E. E. Fields, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Leesville.

Mr. Speaker, while these statements are lengthy, I hope that the Members of Congress who read the statement which appeared in the Washington Post will also read the statements which I have just referred to and included in my remarks because these several statements constitute a vindication for Leesville, La.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the statements herein referred to as follows:

MAYOR O. E. MORRIS ANSWERS ARTICLE IN WASHINGTON POST

LEESVILLE, LA., *May 3, 1943.*

EDITOR, WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your scurrilous article appearing in the issue of Sunday, April 18, 1943, under the headlines "Army town rots under layers of vice and greed," in which the reporter took occasion to hold the city of Leesville up to national ridicule.

The sensational and fantastic introduction of her story was so absurd, being based on her ability to judge the virtue of a woman on the arrangement of her hairdo while driving by in an automobile, and was too ridiculous to mention except for the fact that it gives color to her whole fabrication.

The luncheon meeting arranged for the benefit of your reporter was in no sense a chamber of commerce affair, but was arranged to include representatives from all of the organizations of the city, including civic clubs, religious bodies, city, parish, and State officials, and welfare workers. This luncheon was arranged after receipt of letters from your reporter, notifying various organizations that she would be in Leesville and wanted to see them, leaving them with the impression that she had something to discuss of civic interest that might be of benefit to the town. Her sacrilegious insinuation was in very poor taste as there was no prayer offered. Instead the meeting followed the usual Christian custom of giving thanks in recognition of a God and His sovereign power before meals.

Another example of blatant misrepresentation is found in her report on the number of hard-liquor stores in Leesville. Her question was directed to me, and was: "How many hard-liquor stores do you have in Leesville?" To this I gave the reply "25," which is the correct number. The total revenue from these is less than $20,000 per annum, instead of several hundred thousands of dollars as stated by her. I, personally, resent her flippant insinuation that I misrepresented the facts, and I now challenge her to disprove the facts or withdraw her libelous insinuation that I lied.

Also, a fair investigation would reveal the fact that Leesville has a modern sewerage system adequate to serve the needs of a city three times the size of Leesville. This plant was in operation before the visit of your reporter.

Still another example of her innuendo and vicious insinuation is found in her charge that public sentiment in Leesville is wholly absent on matters of prostitution and vice. We are reliably informed that the venereal disease rate in Camp Polk is below the average compared with other camps and is considered very satisfactory.

The housing situation in Leesville is definitely acute, which fact is easily understandable, considering that the population of this city has increased over 600 percent in the past 2 years, but the statement that a barn in Leesville produces $1,600 per month in rents, is absurd and positively untrue. A recent investigation of this bunk house discloses that it has only six tenants, who pay $3.50 per week, and which produces less than $100 gross, per month, against your reporter's grossly exaggerated report of $1,600.

We have no defense for the condition of the Vernon Parish jail, except to say that the conditions existing there were brought on by the necessary use of this lone penal institution by city, parish, State, and military police which condition is thoroughly known and plans are definitely under way for its remedy. Humorously, a sample of her observation is reflected in the fact that some inmate had scribbled his name "Jimmie" on the door of one of the compartments, and your reporter misread it as the "Juvenile" section.

How could a sane person expect any good to come from such a malicious and misleading attack? What satisfaction could you, or anyone else, expect to realize from adding more sleepless nights and deeper anxiety to the already heavy hearts of 50,000 mothers and fathers of enlisted men, stationed at Camp Polk, except to satisfy a sadistic complex for the underworld? Could it be that your ingenious dissertation could have been inspired by an ulterior motive of bringing a cleavage between the cooperative and friendly communities of Camp Polk and Leesville?

What explanation or justification can possibly be given for swooping down upon a community like Leesville with a diabolical tirade of obstruction and destruction? If your reporter's visit was for the purpose of investigating conditions in the community, why was it that she was unable to see that the town of Leesville had a street-paving project in progress and had just completed building some new churches? She certainly should have been able to find the addition known as Lee Hills, where the businessmen and citizens of the town had erected approximately 500 modern residences, primarily for the use of officers connected with Camp Polk.

Truly the poisoned pen is more dangerous than the sword. The morbidly unhealthy undertone of your graphic portrayal of mythical vice and greed is very bad for American youth, civilian and military, but no doubt very pleasing to Hitler and Doktor Goebbels.

Your publication might be interested to know that letters and clippings have been voluntarily sent to Leesville by individuals, officials, and organizations in different States in protest and revolt against such unjust, unreasonable, and unfounded stories.

The citizenship of Leesville is shocked and justifiably indignant at the flamboyant melodrama and guttersniping journalism employed by your reporter in her shameful attack upon the character of a community struggling with colossal problems.

I trust that you will be fair-minded enough to give this statement a prominent place in your publication.

Respectfully,

O. E. MORRIS, *Mayor.*

APRIL 30, 1943.

Hon. LEONARD ALLEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR LEONARD: After reading the report on Leesville, made by Mrs. Eugene Meyer, of the Washington Post, I made a special visit to Leesville, and made a very careful personal investigation of the general conditions

there, and inspected every place mentioned in her report, having all places pointed out to me by prominent and responsible persons of the city.

With one or two exceptions her report is a gross exaggeration of the conditions, as I found them, and one of these exceptions is the Vernon Parish jail, as I fully agree with her on what she said concerning this jail as it is the most unsanitary jail that I ever visited, and if it is not properly cleansed and repaired within a reasonable time it should and will be closed, as no human being should be confined in such an unsanitary and filthy place.

The housing situation is not what we would like for it to be as many of the houses are naturally substandard as will be found in all small towns and communities of this section of the country, and especially in all boom towns everywhere.

As you know, Leesville was a small town of about 3,000 population when Camp Polk was located near the town and when thousands of workmen came in to construct the camp there was not sufficient housing accommodations to take care of the increase in population, and as a result there were numerous small houses constructed to take care of these laborers who were engaged in constructing the camp, and when the camp was completed and the laborers moved on, these small houses and shacks naturally remained.

As thousands of soldiers moved into the camp, and many of them had families that came with them or followed later, finding houses very scarce, they naturally have been forced to locate in many of the small houses, which are not altogether desirable for people to live in, but as a result of the war situation being as it is, and not having the materials to construct new homes, we naturally have many unsatisfactory situations to meet in conditions of this kind.

She complained of the high rents being charged by the city fathers, or allowed to be charged by them, and cited several places to substantiate her claims. One house that she mentioned, in which there were 60 people located, and they were paying $32 per month each, and thereby giving the landlord an income of around $1,600 per month; and, as a matter of fact, when I visited this house some 2 days after her visit, I found only 6 persons living in the house and they were paying $3.50 per week. I mention this one instance to show how she actually distorted the facts with reference to the housing situation in and around the town. It is a well-known fact that the matter of rents is in the hands of the Office of Price Administration and not controlled by the so-called city fathers.

She left the impression that the disposal plant was nothing more than a borrowed pump, and I found a nice new plant just completed that will serve twice as many people as are in Leesville, and I know of no town the size of this one that has a better plant than this one.

She makes quite a statement regarding the number of saloon and beer joints in and around the town and anyone reading the statement would infer that there were hundreds of such places, when as a matter of fact I found 24 in town and some 6 or 7 around the outside, and she says that hundreds of thousands of dollars are paid out in this section for the liquor license, which is not true.

She says the first thing she saw when approaching Leesville was a prostitute walking down the road in the noonday sun; I would like to know how she could detect a prostitute by passing a woman on the road in a moving automobile.

I visited many sections of the town both good and bad and made careful inquiry as to prostitution and I am frank to say that I found the conditions much better, in this respect, than I really expected to find them.

She had much to say in regard to greed and profiteering going on in this town and I visited several of the restaurants and purchased sweet milk which was grade A, pasteurized, and I paid 5 cents per glass and I also purchased good coffee for a nickel per cup and I have paid a dime for both coffee and milk in many other towns and cities of this and other States. I mention this to show that many of the statements made do not represent facts.

Having visited many Army camps in Louisiana and other States, it is my opinion that general conditions in and around Leesville compare favorably with other sections of the country, and I am only sorry that any such report was made as to lead to the belief that we in Louisiana would allow such conditions to exist in our camps where our boys and boys from other States must live while training to go to the four corners of the world to fight for liberty and freedom for all the world. I want to say to the fathers and mothers of the boys who come to Louisiana the State department of health will do everything within its power to see that their health is protected.

Leonard, I am making this brief in order that you may know the true conditions as they are in your congressional district. I am sure that you know me well enough to depend on what I tell you regarding conditions as I see them, and I will do everything within my power as State health officer to safeguard the health and lives of our boys in the armed forces, and I will say that it is my department that is operating the Leesville quarantine hospital for the isolation and treatment of women infected with venereal diseases.

If I can be of any assistance to you at any time, feel free to call on me.

With best wishes and personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

DAVID E. BROWN, M. D.,
State Health Officer.

PARISH OF VERNON,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
Leesville, La., May 11, 1943.

Hon. A. LEONARD ALLEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is not our purpose to write an article in answer to the tirade against Leesville which appeared recently in the Washington Post. That article has been ably answered by Mr. O. E. Morris, mayor of Leesville, and Dr. David E. Brown, president of the State board of health, but rather to prove that Leesville is civic-minded and that our citizens are progressive.

The coming of Camp Polk found Leesville a quiet town of 3,500 population. Suddenly this town, nestled among the hills, became a hustling, crowded city of 18,000 people, who flocked to this place from every point of the compass. Many of these newcomers were employed in the building of Camp Polk, others to ply various trades. Some of these occupations were not legitimate and helped to create problems difficult to properly control.

When the construction of Camp Polk began, Leesville had a police force of three men—the marshal and two who worked on the night shift. Within a few weeks this force was increased to 20. While North Camp Polk was being built, 11 were employed by the city. At present, 6 are working on the police force.

According to Mrs. Meyer, we would be led to believe that Leesville annually collects hundreds of thousands of dollars. As a matter of record, during 1942 the city collected from all sources $53,221.58.

Since January the city has let contracts amounting to $35,000 for the paving of streets and building sidewalks. This work was in operation when Mrs. Meyer made her visit here.

The schools have felt the influx of people to our city. The enrollment of students has doubled since 1941. As a result, our schools have been overcrowded during the present session, but a new building costing $95,000 is in process of construction and will be ready for occupancy at the opening of the fall term of school.

The churches of Leesville have not been idle during the "boom" days. Our ministers of all denominations are able, consecrated men who will compare favorably with the ministers of many of our larger cities. All are doing a fine work in developing the spiritual interests of the city.

The Christian Church has added five Sunday-school rooms; beautified the site at a cost of $2,000. In addition, two Camp Fire groups have been organized and a strong Boy Scout troop is sponsored by this church.

For work in the Apostolic, the Baptist, and the Methodist Churches separate reports have been filed which are made part of this letter.

The other churches in the city whose pastors we have been unable to contact have made substantial additions and repairs to their plants.

The Leesville hospital, which is privately owned, has spent $8,000 for additional rooms, repairs, furniture, and equipment.

A report on the Lee Hills addition to the town of Leesville is made a part of this letter.

Among the fraternal organizations in Leesville are the Masons, Royal Arch Masons, Order of the Eastern Star, and the Woodmen of the World. The Rotary Club, Lions, and the chamber of commerce are active and flourishing.

The reports of the Merchants & Farmers Bank & Trust Co. and the Vernon Bank are made parts of this letter.

The Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co. has erected a modern home for the telephone exchange and installed the dial system in Leesville. A dormitory to house the company's employees is in process of construction. Before the coming of Camp Polk the company employed 9 persons; now 42 persons are employed as office help, manager, and operators. Telephones increased from 333 to 2,387.

The Western Union has increased its force from 1 to 31 employees, doubled its office space, added 15 machines, tripled its wiring facilities, and has installed the latest telegraphic equipment.

The Leesville of other days is no more. The new Leesville is active and making progress in lines leading to a better day.

Let us extend to you our thanks and appreciation for your interest and efforts in behalf of Leesville.

Yours very truly,

A. H. Nanney, principal, Leesville High School; T. L. Harvey, superintendent, parish schools; Laura Lynch, supervisor, parish schools; William Gordy, parish treasurer; A. L. Temple, principal, elementary school; Charles I. Davis, deputy sheriff; Ariel B. Cavanaugh, parish assessor; L. Roy Williams, registrar of voters; P. G. Pye; E. D. Boone, president, Merchants & Farmers Bank & Trust Co.; Robert D. Schaefer, School Board member, Ward 1, Vernon Parish; John J. Hicks, real estate; O. Quinnault, G. B. Mooneyham, Bill Adams, State police; Lewis Brown, Vernon Grocery; John Mansinger, J. M. King, Richard Pollard, W. H. Pollard, F. E. Hernandez, hardware; Dr. I. O. Winfree, Dr. M. W. Talbot, Rev.

E. E. Fields, Joe L. Hurch, S. A. Hicks, assistant principal, Leesville High School; R. S. Copeland, State representative; H. R. Scobee; Dennis Cook, manager, Cain Motor Co., Inc.; M. A. Beaver, Jack Hadnot, clerk of court; A. D. Self, city marshal; Curry Ford, publisher, Leesville Leader; O. E. Morris, mayor, town of Leesville; J. R. Ferguson, assistant district attorney; J. C. Terrell, commander, American Legion Post; Dr. Leroy Pinchback, Sam Murphy, president, the Vernon Bank; G. W. McNaughton, Rev. H. Hempel, minister, First Christian Church; D. A. Taylor, manager, Phoenix Drug Store; J. O. Bush, R. B. Colvin, H. F. Rector, Jr., Alfred Stephens, T. L. Berry, manager, West Department Store; Julien R. Stevens, Service Grocery; Jake Knight, manager, Jitney Jungle No. 2; Rev. Alton A. M. Knight, pastor, Methodist Church.

EXPENDITURES OF LEESVILLE AND VERNON PARISH IN CONNECTION WITH CAMP POLK

1. Purchased 200 acres of land in camp site proper so that construction could be begun before appropriations were made. These were small farms upon which people lived and who had to move quickly. About one-fourth of the cost of this land was later repaid.

2. Purchased the railroad right-of-way from Pickering to the camp since no public funds were available and the quartermaster and contractors were all here and tied up. None of this expenditure was recovered.

3. Purchased 20 acres as a site for sewerage plant at Camp Polk since no site was available on ground owned by the Government. Purchase price of this land was recovered less the expenses incurred in going to court to explain the value. (Probably one-half the purchase price was lost in court expenses.)

4. Secured 200 feet right-of-way for entrance road to Camp Polk. Most of this right-of-way was donated, but what was purchased and expenses incurred was never repaid.

5. Spent approximately $700 to purchase options from families in the Camp Polk training area. This was done both to assist the Army and the people involved so that they might borrow funds to move. The money and efforts were completely lost since the options got lost in the red tape of Washington and the land was later taken by condemnation.

LEESVILLE PROPER

6. Voted $100,000 sewer bond to supplement a Federal grant to build a modern sewerage system including a sewage-treatment plant. Total cost of this project was $424,596. This was the maximum bond issue permitted under the constitution of Louisiana. In fact it was over the limit since a small bond issue had been voted a couple of years previous, and it was necessary to make a friendly test suit through the supreme court before the bonds could be sold. This money was ready and available by the time the Lanham Act had passed.

TRUCKS ARE NOW HERE AND IN USE

7. Voted a bond issue to buy two new fire trucks and necessary hose and equipment, $10,000.

8. Voted a bond issue to buy fire hydrants and water system to supplement improvements by local privately owned public utilities (under the utility franchise the town had to furnish pipe and other equipment where water was used for fire fighting only), $10,000.

9. Built and now has under construction, $182,000 worth of street work, of which the town is furnishing $42,750.

10. Made application to Federal Works Agency for assistance to build a $35,000 health center, for which a lot had been purchased and donated to the Federal Government. This application was appproved but nothing has ever been done. In the meantime spent $1,500 building temporary quarters for the health center which now appears to be permanent. Lots cost $800.

11. Purchased 5 acres of land as a public park upon which the United Service Organizations was to be built with sufficient grounds for improvements and possible expansions. This site was not acceptable to the Federal Security Agency, although highly recommended by the Army and was not used. The ground has now been [1] to the Army for a military police headquarters and detention camp. The United Service Organizations was built in the so-called inferno of wood construction contrary to the building code of the town of Leesville and was the first major break in the type of building within the restricted zone.

12. Prepared plans and made application for four modern comfort and shower stations the cost to be about $35,000, which was approved by the Federal Works Agency. Nothing has been done. Because of the military and floating population these were considered very necessary. Five hundred dollars on plans and location.

13. Prepared plans and made application to Federal Works Agency for assistance in building an incinerator which was not approved.

14. Prepared plans and made application to Federal Works Agency for jail extensions and improvements which was not approved.

15. Prepared plans and made application for improvements to the school in Leesville which is now under construction and nearing completion at a cost of $95,000.

16. Made improvements to the Pickering School at a cost of approximately $20,000.

17. Worked out with camp authorities plans for the quarantine hospital and had the quarters held available for health authorities until they made up their detailed plans.

18. Organized a corporation composed of some 150 local citizens, purchased 350 acres of land, plotted the same, took in the city limits, and with the aid of several Federal agencies built 435 modern homes at a cost of $1,600,000, for the use of the families connected with Camp Polk. In this project the lights, gas, water, and telephone lines were all constructed by private utility companies so that the total cost of the project exceeded $2,000,000. The rents for these houses were worked out with the officials and the Army and are below figures recommended by the Army board. This project was worked out entirely by private individuals. The area is restricted as to types and kind of construction by rigid Federal Housing Administration standards, which have not been violated.

19. The water company dug several new wells so that an ample supply of water could be supplied at all times as well as made some 8 or 10 miles of extensions to their lines. Natural gas was piped into the town, a distribution system built throughout the town. The telephone company changed their system to dial telephones and built a local exchange which cost thousands of dollars and is probably as modern as any in this area. It was built for twice the capacity expected and is now being enlarged to take care of additional expansions. The bus company now has under construction a modern bus terminal which has been delayed for months because of priorities, etc.

20. The Federal Works Agency completely financed and built 175 units at a cost of approximately $600,000. These units are completely controlled and used for personnel of Camp Polk.

21. Application was made to Federal Works Agency and to State health authorities for assistance in constructing and operating a hospital which we understood was set up in the Lanham Act for this community. We understand this application was rejected because the United States Public Health Service would not certify to the need.

22. At the request and assistance of the local authorities a troop of State police was organized with headquarters here early in 1941 and has been manned since that time with about 20 patrolmen, together with necessary cars, motorcycles, and a local police radio station.

23. The city police was increased from the customary 2 to an average of 20; from $300 to $2,500 per month.

24. Ahead of the freeze and in anticipation of the expected increase in need the town purchased a new caterpillar tractor and grader and a new dump truck, $4,500.

These expenditures may seem small, but in reality are not, since the income of the town for general governmental functions in 1940 was less than $10,000 per year, and in order to accomplish the things that were done most of the money had to be subscribed by subscriptions solicited from local citizens and legal and engineering services had to be either donated or worked out on credit.

[1] Leased without compensation.

STATEMENT OF SAM J. MURPHY, PRESIDENT OF THE VERNON BANK

THE VERNON BANK,
Leesville, La., May 11, 1943.

At the beginning of 1941 the above bank was operating with 3 employees, and the total resources were around $900,000. Early in the year the construction of Camp Polk started, and with this large pay roll and the increase in the population of Leesville the above institution began to grow by leaps and bounds and, of course, we had to add to our personnel to take care of the increase in business. In 6 months we had added 4 additional clerks, working full-time hours, and about 3 nights a week until 10 o'clock. Then in 1942 came the new Camp Polk, which was around a $20,000,000 job, and, of course, this brought a lot more business to Leesville and the bank's business continued to increase and we had to keep adding more clerks to take care of the situation. In a period of 24 months the above bank increased their employees from 3 to 13, and our resources increased from around $900,000 to $2,376,675.08.

SAM J. MURPHY,
President.

LETTER OF E. D. BOONE, PRESIDENT OF MERCHANTS & FARMERS BANK & TRUST CO.

MERCHANTS & FARMERS BANK & TRUST CO.,
Leesville, La., May 11, 1943.

MR. A. H. NANNEY,
Principal, Leesville High School,
Leesville, La.

DEAR MR. NANNEY: In response to your inquiry regarding my observation of conditions in Leesville for the period immediately preceding, during construction, and after occupancy of Camp Polk.

It is a matter of common knowledge that Leesville, prior to construction of Camp Polk, was a very small town with very limited facilities of every nature to take care of the tremendous influx of workers necessary for the construction of so large a project, and this influx of workers naturally attracted an equally large or larger group of "boom town" prospectors whose sole purpose in being here was to get some of the easy money. This caused the town and surrounding vicinity to have a siege of shacks to spring up, each of which housed, it was generally assumed but hardly substantiated, some form of vice or corruption.

You will recall when it was thought that we were to have some kind of military camp here that the local citizens, business and professional men gathered and subscribed funds for the purchase of lands for the camp and adjacent acreage for utilities, etc., and money

was also donated to lease and otherwise secure rights-of-way for highways and railroad spurs to the camp site. You will also recall that never at any time did the Army give this group of citizens any advance information that a camp would definitely be built, what kind of camp it would be nor the approximate time it would be tenanted if built, and we were placed at a distinct disadvantage, as no time was given us to make proper preparation for, pass regulatory ordinances or obtain necessary sanitary facilities for the congestion which was to follow.

Since actual construction was started before it was realized what facilities would be needed, and as the construction of the camp required the services of all skilled workers, it was almost impossible to then get any work done; however, the utilities did expand their facilities. Natural gas was piped to Leesville. A modern and up-to-date sewerage gathering and disposal system has been built. The Lee Hills project of the Leesville Improvement Corporation, a stock company, owned by citizens of Leesville, and comprising 435 units of housing for Army personnel, has been built. The First Baptist Church has just completed its magnificent church building and parsonage. Numerous private residences, which would be considered an asset to any town twice the size of Leesville, have been built. The Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co. installed dial telephones, rebuilt its transmission lines in the city, and spent approximately $65,000 for a building and equipment in Leesville. This bank, at the outset of activity, spent in the vicinity of $15,000 for modernization and expansion of its facilities, and every other business has made similar improvements. All this has been done without any assurance from the Army as to the permanence of Camp Polk, and it is my sincere belief that if it were definitely known that the camp would be permanent there would be an unlimited amount of capital immediately available to finance any amount of construction necessary for the physical, cultural, and moral requirements of the community; however, until such assurance is given there will always be the element of doubt which will cause the cautious investor to await more definite information before investing his capital in some venture which might not pay itself out.

The school system in Leesville and Vernon Parish has been able, by establishment of small auxiliary schools at New Llano and Lee Hills, to meet the extreme strain on its facilities, which strain will be considerably lessened in the 1943–44 term of school by completion of a modern 16-classroom school on the campus of the present Leesville High School and plans for a permanent grammar school at New Llano.

In conclusion, I will say that under the circumstances I feel that all has been done, or is definitely being attempted, to alleviate every undesirable condition which has existed through these turbulent times, and to unreservedly state that whenever some definite assurance comes from the Army relative to the permanency of Camp Polk that every needed facility and improvement will be provided.

Yours very truly,

E. D. BOONE, *President.*

STATEMENT OF REV. ALTON A. MCKNIGHT, PASTOR OF FIRST METHODIST CHURCH

FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
Leesville, La., May 11, 1943.

In the latter part of 1941, the Methodist Church made some extensive repairs to the church building and enlargement of its educational facilities. We also erected a nice $7,000 pastor's home.

At a recent meeting of the official board, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas our church has become entirely too small to care for the regular attendance; and

"Whereas at our services on Easter Sunday a number of the members of this board and their families were unable to obtain seats, and also about 50 percent of the congregation were unable to attend services on this date, due to our inability to accommodate them: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the members of this board,* That we go on record of making preparations toward enlarging our church building to a sufficient size to comfortably care for our congregation, when, and as soon as, the critical materials needed for such building be less critically needed for the successful prosecution of the war by our Government and Allies."

We are appreciative of the number of fine young men and women moving into our town because of the Army being stationed here. We are glad to see them finding their places in the church as was their custom at home. We also rejoice in having so many of our soldiers and their wives, living in our town, attending our services. We hope it will soon be possible for us to increase our church plant to adequately care for them.

ALTON A. MCKNIGHT,
Pastor.

STATEMENT BY REV. J. Z. SPEARS, PASTOR, CENTRAL APOSTOLIC CHURCH

We came to Leesville in November 1939 to take up the work as pastor of the Central Apostolic Church, and on our arrival we found a very nice band of church people to work with for our congregation, as faithful as we have ever been privileged to pastor; and also we found a group of churches here in this little city all working together for the betterment of the community. We have now organized a ministerial association of all the ministers of Vernon Parish who meet at the First Methodist Church each third Monday working for the benefit of our people in general. Our slogan is "Unity and fellowship." Since coming here we have erected an 8-room parsonage on the church lot equipped with modern conveniences; have also built four additional Sunday school rooms to our church, also installing gas heat in the entire church building; have also purchased an additional lot joining our church property for the purpose of tent or open-air revivals. We have also found a group of business and professional men, and also our city officials, as friendly and as ready to lend a helping hand to church work as in any other place we have ever worked.

Very sincerely yours,

REV. J. Z. SPEARS,
Pastor, Central Apostolic Church of Leesville, La.

STATEMENT BY REV. E. E. FIELDS, PASTOR, FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
Leesville, La., May 11, 1943.

In January 1941 the First Baptist Church found itself without adequate equipment to meet the fast-growing need because of the increase in population of our city. We immediately begun the plans to enlarge our original building plans in order to meet as much as possible this unusual situation which had been thrust upon us by the coming of Camp Polk. With a sincere desire to keep the moral and spiritual standards high in an Army town, we started. There was no money in our treasury, but we had faith in our Heavenly Father, our fellowman, and in our future.

On May 2 we entered the front doors of a beautiful structure on the corner of Fifth and Lee Streets for the purpose of worship. This building, which is the best building in town, was erected at a cost of $55,000 (including fixtures and furniture), of which about $27,000 has already been raised. This building has a seating capacity in the main auditorium of 600, and educational capacity of about 650. It has 48 rooms in it, with a secondary auditorium in the basement. We not only offer the facilities of our church to our servicemen and their families but we go out in a special effort to reach them for our services, that we might better serve them.

The First Baptist Church, along with the other churches in our city, wish to keep the spiritual morale high among our people, and are not only happy to turn over to our soldiers and officers and their families our own homes to share with us but are active in helping to place them in decent places to live. With the evil influences thrown about us—which are here for the men's pay day—this task is quite difficult, but we are proud to find our place here, and to fill that place in serving our men and our country.

E. E. FIELDS,
Pastor.

Chicago District Supplies 13 Percent of Second War Loan Funds

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Chicago Sun of May 19, 1943:

CHICAGO DISTRICT SUPPLIES 13 PERCENT OF SECOND WAR LOAN FUNDS—NONBANK BUYERS IN METROPOLITAN AREA ALMOST DOUBLE QUOTA, FINAL FIGURES REVEAL

(By O. M. Smucker)

Final figures on participation of the Chicago district in the Second War Loan were made public yesterday by C. S. Young, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago and chairman of the bond-selling drive in this area.

The seventh district, which embraces most of the five States of Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Indiana, turned in subscriptions totaling $2,368,036,000, or nearly 13 percent of the national aggregate of $18,533,000,000. These purchases came from all classes of buyers, including the commercial banks.

Bank buying in the Chicago district amounted to $646,000,000, compared with the national total of $5,100,000,000. These purchases embraced the seven-eighths of 1 percent 1-year Treasury certificates and the 2 percent 9-year Treasury bonds.

NONBANK QUOTA TOPPED

Of the grand total, $1,722,036,000 of securities were taken by buyers other than commercial banks during the April drive. The amount was 164 percent of the nonbank quota of $1,050,000,000 established for the district.

This contrasts with a national nonbank aggregate of $13,433,000,000, or 168 percent of the $8,000,000,000 goal set by the Treasury Department.

In this area, the Metropolitan Chicago district, comprising Cook, Lake, and Du Page Counties, made the best showing, with nonbank buying totaling $705,129,000, or 190 percent of the $370,000,000 quota.

Figured by States, honors went to Indiana, buying there reaching $184,199,000, which was 167 percent of the established goal of $110,000,000. Michigan came next, with its aggregate of $341,833,000, amounting to 155 percent of its $220,000,000 quota.

WISCONSIN RANKS THIRD

Wisconsin, with purchases of $224,677,000, or 140 percent of its $160,000,000 quota, was

in third place, and Iowa, with total buying of $135,989,000, or 135 percent of its $100,000,000 goal, ran fourth.

Despite the showing of the metropolitan Chicago area, Illinois trailed the 5-State procession, both in total buying and quota ratio. Its purchases of $108,365,000 amounted to 120 percent of its established goal of $90,000,000.

Series E War Savings bonds represented $256,806,000 of all the sales in the district. During the April selling campaign 5,197,546 individual bonds of this issue were sold. In money value, the Chicago district exceeded all the other 11 Federal Reserve districts in E bond sales last month, Mr. Young revealed.

FOURTEEN THOUSAND BUY 2½'S

The number of orders and dollar volume of sales of the six other classes of securities in the Second War Loan Drive to nonbank buyers were:

Two-and-one-half-percent Treasury bonds, 14,309 and $243,331,000; 2-percent Treasury bonds, 13,029 and $241,168,000; ⅞-percent certificates, 4,813 and $546,602,000; F Savings bonds, 15,274 and $28,354,000; G savings bonds, 48,121 and $83,823,000, and C tax savings notes, 7,104 and $321,952,000.

Of the total of $705,129,000 subscribed in the metropolitan Chicago area, the six large downtown banks—Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co., First National, Harris Trust & Savings, Northern Trust, City National, and American National—turned in subscriptions aggregating $585,000,000. Of this total, $441,000,000 originated from the two larger banks, Continental and First National.

Hon. Sam Hobbs' Constitutional Argument Applauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of May 21 which highly commends the splendid argument of the gentleman from Alabama, Hon. SAM HOBBS, in connection with the Kerr amendment:

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE

Before passing the Kerr committee amendment barring salary payments to three Federal employees, the House devoted the better part of 2 days to debate upon it. The outstanding contribution to this debate, in our judgment, was made by Congressman HOBBS, of Alabama. Avoiding any reference to personalities, he set forth simply, starkly, and compellingly the constitutional issues which are at stake. The amendment, declared Judge HOBBS, "not only violates the constitutional mandate against bills of attainder but it also violates the doctrine—implicit throughout the Constitution—of separation of powers, and the explicit creation of a government composed of three separate but coordinate branches—legislative, executive, and judicial." These are precisely the considerations which impelled this newspaper to protest against the Kerr proposal.

It is not easy to understand how Members of the House, if they listened to Judge HOBBS, could override his clear, incisive reasoning. Yet few seemed swayed by him. The amendment was passed by a vote of 318 to 62. Curiously enough, most of the Kerr committee members took pains to express their distaste for the investigation in which they had engaged. Representative POWERS, for example, referred to it as "one of the most unpleasant and distasteful tasks I have ever undertaken." And many of the Congressmen who spoke in support of the amendment seemed principally intent upon indicating their friendship for and loyalty to Congressman KERR and his fellow committeemen. The good intentions of the Kerr committee were scarcely the main issue. But this is not the only situation in which the House has shown that camaraderie among colleagues transcends real questions of principle.

When the Senate takes up the Kerr proposal, it need not be motivated by these personal loyalties. This is perhaps one of the real virtues of a bicameral legislature. The amenities, as far as Congressman KERR is concerned, have now been observed. The Senators are free to consider the amenities as they affect the three Federal employees in question and as they affect the far more important issue of constitutional government. If the Senate wishes to judge this case on its merits, it can do no better than to study the arguments and the legal citations advanced by Judge HOBBS.

This Road Has No Ending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the House had before it a short time ago the question of voting to deny appropriations for the payment of salaries to certain individuals on the Government pay roll. The vote which I cast against this proposition represented no reflection upon the membership of the Kerr committee. I believe that committee has been conscientious and earnest and I do not share the criticism that has been made of it.

My "no" vote was cast because of a profound conviction upon my part that, unless the persons involved are shown to be disloyal to their country—a thing which in my judgment was not shown—the Congress is embarking upon a course in enacting legislation of this character which is ill-advised, dangerous, and in conflict with the basic principles of our Government. The fact that action of this character has never been taken in all the history of the Congress up until about 2 years ago is surely a consideration of great importance. And I believe the reason no such action ever was taken for 150 years of our history has been due to the realization by previous Congresses that the possible consequences of such a course are to make every employee of the Federal Government against whom any Member of Congress sees fit to prefer charges liable to and in danger of similar action. Such a situation would obviously mean that the Congress would be assuming responsibility for the personnel of the executive department of the Government, a thing never intended in our Government, and a task that clearly the Congress is by no means equipped to undertake.

I am not an expert in constitutional law but even aside from the serious question of whether Congress is within its proper constitutional sphere in enacting legislation of this kind the precedent set thereby is one which can lead to very serious consequences indeed.

It is unquestionably within the power of Congress to pass general legislation setting up standards for the employment of Federal personnel. The Congress has done that, and has established a general prohibition against the employment of people who are Communists, Nazis, or Fascists by the Government.

Were a showing made to the effect that any Federal employee fell within any of those categories, I should be prepared to vote to strike him from the pay roll. But in such a case, the action would be taken under the authority under general legislation. This was not the case with the three men proscribed by the action of the House in this instance.

There are two possible logical positions for the Congress to take with regard to this whole question. The one is that Congress has a right to strike from the Federal pay roll anyone that happens to displease the Congress without even attaching to such action any particular charges except only that the Congress does not choose to continue to pay the salary of a certain person. Some Members of the House have boldly contended that the Congress has the right to take this position. With their contention, I disagree with all the vigor at my command. And if we are not to take that view then if Congress votes to strike down an employee it must do so upon the basis of accusation against him.

To justify such action it must, if we are to be on defensible ground, be demonstrated that the employee of the Federal Government is either debarred from holding a Federal position under some general statute passed by Congress or can be shown to be disloyal to this country and hence subject to something resembling impeachment. For otherwise the action will always be taken on the very questionable and constantly shifting ground that the employee in question holds views or has held or expressed opinions which the Congress just does not like. So that conservative Congresses would be debarring people because they were too far to the left and progressive Congresses would be debarring them because they were too far to the right.

The function of Congress is to pass laws, including laws setting up standards for Federal employment. But it is not a proper function of the Congress to attempt to set itself up as an agency to be judge and jury in the absence of any applicable law as to the fitness for office of each individual among the hundreds of thousands of employees of the Federal Government.

Address of Hon. Frank E. Gannett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Frank E. Gannett before the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, Washington, D. C., May 19, 1943:

Food is the paramount national problem for 1943.

Recently I sent out a questionnaire throughout the country, to editors, publishers, farm leaders, and farmers. More than a thousand editors and 5,000 farmers replied. Ninety-nine percent of them agreed that food is our paramount problem.

Furthermore I predict that food will be one of the great campaign issues in 1944 because the food problem has been handled in an abominable way by the administration.

We cannot win this war without food. In fact food may win the war. That was the slogan in 1917. Food is as important as tanks, planes, ships, and guns. When the war broke out the Government failed us miserably for it did not give as much attention to food as it gave to the production of other war matériel.

The public should get this straight. It is not a question of helping the farmer. The question we face is how to get the food we must have and what, at this late hour, can be done to improve the situation.

Those who live in our cities, those employed in war work and other factories, should cease to worry about prices they may have to pay for food. They should instead be concerned about getting enough food to eat. That question is far more serious than the question of price.

Fixing a lower price for any product—beef, for instance—doesn't do any good if you can't get any beef.

We face an enormous decrease in food production, despite all of the misleading statements put out by our Government officials. In my survey, 62 percent of the 5,000 farmers who replied and who know what they and their neighbors expect in production this year, said there would be a decrease in the amount of food produced. The greatest handicaps to production, in their opinion, were these: 90 percent said lack of trained help was the farmer's biggest problem; 89 percent blamed the Government's interference for decreased production; 83 percent said price ceilings were too low; 79 percent said lack of machinery and repairs hindered production most.

Last year we had a record crop. There is no probability that we shall equal it. If, however, we should have unfavorable weather for farming, we may have a tremendous drop in production—a real scarcity of food. It is possible, indeed, that we face a great national disaster.

This expected and likely decrease in our food production comes in the face of increased demand for food. Men in uniform eat one-third more than civilians. We must feed our allies and feed the people rescued from Nazi rule. And again, much of the food we ship abroad is sunk on the way and cannot be replaced. Furthermore, because of high wages in industry, people have increased purchasing power and thus naturally are trying to get more food that they may like.

With a possible decrease in production and this increase in demand for food, someone must go hungry. Contrary to public belief, as a matter of fact, in every year since 1922, our imports of food have exceeded our exports. We have not had too much food.

It is also pertinent to note that in the last 25 years the population of the United States has increased 30 percent while food production increased only 15 percent. In other words, even if we were producing more than ever before, we could not fulfill the tremendous demands made upon us.

A year from now, unless vigorous action is taken, we here in this supposed land of plenty, will not have enough food.

What can be done about it?

Unfortunately it is getting rather late to increase production this year, but there is still time to help with some crops.

First, we must give the farmer an incentive to produce more. He is not going to do it at a loss and no one who is engaged in other work should expect him to take a loss.

This means that ceilings on farm products which have been too low and have discouraged production must be raised.

Next, there must be no delay in getting to the manufacturers of farm machinery plenty of steel and other materials they need. There are little plants all over the country now idle that could, under proper direction and arrangements with the big farm machinery people, do much to step up the production of farm machinery.

It is too late now for making planting equipment that could be used this year, but there is still time to make harvesting equipment. Because there is a shortage of labor, harvesting machinery will be more necessary than ever before.

The harvesting machinery that may be on hand or be produced should be supplied to the far South first, for in only a few weeks harvesting will be under way there. Shipments of later production should follow northward as crops ripen. Much farm machinery, particularly small tractors, are not efficient except on rubber. Steel rims now being shipped should be supplanted by rubber tires and there should be allocation of enough rubber for this great need.

On April 15, the Office of War Information reported that between the beginning of the defense program and the 1st day of January 1943, some 3,000,000 workers left the farms and went to serve in the armed forces or to work in city industries. Office of War Information further stated the men and women who left the farm were overwhelmingly in the 18- to 40-year range and were skilled farm workers.

There are approximately 6,000,000 farms. The loss of 3,000,000 workers means an average of 1 skilled worker off every other farm in America. Investigation shows that the average age of farmers left on the farms is well above the middle fifties, or putting it another way, old men are today carrying the responsibility of the biggest job of food production the world has ever seen.

Many draft boards are still taking skilled farm help. Technically the draft boards have the authority to defer farmers, but in practice they are given huge quotas to fill and feel that they must fill them at any cost.

Of course the biggest pull on farm labor has been to industry. Because of faulty Government schemes, farm prices have been such that the farmer could not compete with city industries in holding his help. Another difficulty is the fact that little or no effort has been made to impress young farmers that they are serving their country by staying on the farm. Fearing to be called slackers, they have refused to ask for deferment, or have gone into the munition plants.

Much of the work on farms must be carried on every day in the year. Occasional help is no good and unskilled help is worse than useless. There has been a lot of misleading nonsense about getting substitute help for farmers. There is no substitute for skilled farm labor. It takes years to learn farming. Unskilled help either in the poultry plant or in the dairy barn can throw production off permanently in a short time. Unskilled labor, of course, can be used in the harvesting of some crops.

1. To help farm production, the drafting of skilled farm labor must be stopped absolutely.

2. We should put on a great national campaign to impress farmers and farm boys that they are serving America and helping to win the war right where they are, in raising food.

3. It may be necessary to furlough skilled farm men now in the armed forces on a long-time basis and get them back into agricultural production. This can easily be done. The Army could keep control of these men and call them back after the harvesting.

Price ceilings have confused and discouraged farmers. The black market is the worst it has been in our history and the blame for it, for the most part, does not rest on those who violate the price rules and regulations, but on those who fix prices that won't work. The law of supply and demand cannot be repealed any more than can the law of gravitation. If the ceiling is set under natural demand all the bureaucrats in the world cannot enforce that ceiling. If you make your ceiling regulations complicated and confusing, the whole economic community will violate those ceilings, the majority not even realizing that they are doing so.

The absurd complicated price ceilings on poultry are an example. Few farmers are able to figure out the regulations so as to sell their live poultry without violating the ceiling.

I am fearful that the effort to regulate prices has been disastrous all along the line and has resulted in upsetting our whole economy. I doubt that there is anyone wise enough or powerful enough to control all our buying and selling in this vast country.

When you try to fix the price of one food you throw out of gear the production and price of a related product. Take, for instance, corn. The Office of Price Administration fixed a ceiling of $1.05 per bushel on corn. The farmer in the Midwest knows that by feeding corn to hogs he can get a return equal to $1.45 a bushel for his corn. Therefore, corn is not being shipped and livestock feeders, dairymen, and poultrymen find it almost impossible to buy enough corn to keep going from day to day. As corn is 60 percent of our livestock ration over the Nation as a whole, this situation is a threat to our livestock feeders, dairymen, and poultry producers. If this ceiling on corn is continued, it may ultimately deprive the great consuming eastern part of our country of eggs, milk, butter, cheese, and meats, except pork—foods most essential for maintenance of health.

Our present feed and food problem is shot through with maladjustments in prices which cause disturbances everywhere. The idea behind this attempt to fix prices on nearly everything is that in this way we can prevent inflation. As a matter of fact, we haven't prevented inflation, and we now have much greater inflation than the public realizes.

Government figures on the cost of living mean nothing because they are based on ceiling prices, which do not represent accurate market prices.

Inflation is an upward movement of prices in general. It is merely another way of saying that goods and services are now more valuable, in terms of dollars, than they formerly were. In wartime, however, we have greater use for goods and services than we have in peacetime. It is inevitable that their prices should rise. Never in wartime has it been possible to halt rising prices and it probably never will be possible.

We hear much about Germany's method of controlling prices, but we don't know what conditions are in that country. We do know they have black markets and that offenders are shot. In Britain it is said that price control is partially effective, but again, we don't know the real facts.

Moderate inflation will not ruin us. We had much inflation in the First World War. What we should fear most is wild inflation that comes when the Government starts the money printing presses as it did in Germany after the First World War.

Let me illustrate. The Government must pay for its tanks, planes and ships. It can get money for this purpose only by taxation and by borrowing from the public through the selling of bonds. We have about reached the limit in taxation. If the war continues long, we may reach the point where the public cannot lend the Government enough money for its war program. Then the Government will have to begin to print money and that, of course, leads to certain disastrous decrease in the value of money—wild inflation.

Some inflation is inevitable. Indeed, it can become necessary. Our national income is the total of our production of various things, multiplied by the price of those things, plus services. Half of our national income goes for food, clothing, and housing. Recently the United States Treasury announced that it would need $90,000,000,000 this year for its war program. Therefore, $90,000,000,000 for war purposes means that we must have a national income of $180,000,000,000 if people are going to have food, clothing, and shelter. Last year, with production at its peak, our national income was $135,000,000,000. It will be impossible to increase our production very much. Therefore, if we are to have a larger national income, it can come only from higher prices.

As prices rise, it is inevitable that we must increase wages. Otherwise it will be impossible for the millions of our toilers to buy the things they need.

This attempt to put a ceiling on all wages and all production is just another experiment which is doomed to fail. There is a general desire to see it work, but, in my opinion, it isn't working and its failures will constantly increase. All appeals to the public will not be powerful enough to suppress and control increasing demands and decreasing supplies.

To police the country's distribution machinery rigidly enough to maintain prices at fixed levels would take millions of men and billions of dollars. Such an expense would be extravagant in time of peace and prohibitive in time of war, because it would be a net deduction from our war effort.

The Nation believes that rising farm prices cause inflation. It would be as correct to say that a rising thermometer causes a warm day. What has happened is that the general level of all prices has risen and farm prices have risen with them.

Since the outbreak of the war, farm prices of food have risen 96 percent or more, but retail prices have risen only 40 percent. Farm prices respond more quickly to a general price change than do retail prices. In the depression, farm prices fell 68 percent while retail prices of food fell only 46 percent.

When we have a 10 percent rise in farm prices, that does not mean that we must have a 10 percent rise in retail costs. A 10 percent rise in farm prices in the past has resulted in only a 3 or 4 percent rise in retail prices of food. This is because many of the costs of distribution are fixed and these costs do not vary, no matter what may be the cost of the product handled.

Most of us don't realize the importance of price in our lives. No matter how it is phrased, price is the real issue for both producer and consumer. To agriculture as a whole, price virtually means income. To the consumer, the price of food determines how much money will be left for other things besides food that are desired.

Every price at which goods change hands is the result of a controversy, either mild or violent, between buyer and seller. The whole subject of price is controversial. Much of the present difficulty regarding farm and retail prices of food comes about because the farmer cannot see the viewpoint of the consumer, who, in turn, cannot understand the position of the farmer. Neither of them can understand the fundamental forces which establish food prices, either on the farm or in the city.

Under normal peacetime conditions, the tremendous task of adjusting complicated problems of supply was left to the price system. Production was wisely guided by price. Whether farmers produced cabbage or potatoes rested on a basis of price. Whether the farmer sold corn or turned it into pork was determined by price. Whether the range country produced cattle or sheep was determined in part by price. Public desire for more grapefruit and orange juice found expression in public willingness to pay high prices for these foods, or to buy more at the same price. This made it profitable for the farmers to increase the acreage of citrus fruits.

Through price, the Nation had told the farmers that more citrus fruits were wanted, and through the price system the farmers responded. When the horses on farms and in the cities were replaced with tractors and trucks, less hay was needed. The Nation paid less for hay. Farmers noted the falling prices and reduced their acreage.

With the improvement and cheapening of transportation, the price which could be obtained for potatoes in areas distant from market rose, and a part of the commercial production shifted from nearby areas to Maine and Idaho.

By the price system, the production of an article can be increased, decreased, or shifted from one area to another. Since time immemorial, high prices have encouraged the production of that food that was scarce and low prices have discouraged the production of that food which was in abundance.

The farmer's son determined whether society wanted him to be a farmer, coal miner, or doctor, largely on the basis of price. In fact, price always was the major criterion by which the producer could learn what society wanted. This principle is thoroughly ingrained in all producers.

Price affects supplies in many ways. A 25-cent rise in the price of hogs on Tuesday may increase the run of hogs on Thursday. A 1-cent drop in the price of eggs in Boston relative to the price in New York will divert large quantities of western eggs from Boston to New York. The Government's low ceiling prices on dry edible beans discouraged farmers so much that in New York it was estimated that the acreage would be decreased 15 percent. The Government's price policy regarding sugar may result in a contraction of sugar-beet acreage.

The effects of abnormally high prices for hogs may be felt for 2 or 3 years. The net results of changes in the price of beef cattle have their effect 7 to 8 years later.

Very few of the folks—the bureaucrats—who fix prices to prevent inflation realize the myriads of different effects that the fixed prices will have on production a week, a month, a year or a decade hence.

It is gradually dawning on some of our bureaucrats, however, that they cannot get food in the quantities desired at artificially low frozen prices.

Price has always been the primary force guiding goods through the channels of trade. Whether milk should be consumed in its natural state, churned into butter, pressed into cheese, evaporated, condensed, or dried, has been determined by price. Whether the butter moves to Chicago, Pittsburgh, or New York City has been determined by price.

Since the butter is not produced uniformly throughout the year, periods of feast and famine would occur if butter were eaten as soon as produced. In the periods of high production, prices fall very low and the distributive trades carry large quantities of the low-priced butter to the winter months when the price is high. This helps both the farmer and the consumer. It returns to the farmer a greater income than would otherwise be the case. The large spring-summer production multiplied by the somewhat higher price brings him more income. It also helps the consumer. In the winter months, when the production is low and the price rises, the out-of-storage movement of butter prevents consumer prices from rising unduly. It reduces the violence of the fluctuations of the consumer's prices, stabilizes his supplies, and raises the farmer's income.

Price very efficiently guides the flow of grain. The majority of farmers sell their grain shortly after harvest, while the consumers demand their bread in constant supply. Huge terminal elevators are built to store this grain. The movement of grain in and out of these elevators is largely determined by the relationship of the cash and future prices of wheat at Chicago. When the cash prices are low relative to the future prices, the elevators are encouraged to store grain. When the cash prices rise above the future prices, the elevators are encouraged to sell their holdings.

A small change in the relationship between cash and future prices tells the small country elevator and the large terminal elevator whether society wants grain withheld from consumption or forced into consumption. The Chicago Board of Trade, popularly believed to be a den of iniquity, was the place where the important but little-understood spread between cash and future prices automatically regulated the flow of grain to the consumer.

The housewife with the market basket on her arm chooses foods on the basis of price. Whether one should buy hamburger, rump roast, or T-bone steak is largely determined by price. Whether a person should buy peas, peaches, and pineapple by the case during the autumn sales, or whether to buy from hand to mouth, is largely determined by price. If the case-lot prices are sufficiently low, the frugal consumer hoards during the fall.

Consumers decrease the consumption of high-priced articles and increase the consumption of low-priced articles.

We would all like to eat porterhouse steaks and fresh strawberries, ride in Cadillac cars, and live in modern 10-room houses, but these products require so much human effort that it is not possible to produce enough for all. High prices eliminate from the market those buyers who want them least or are least able to pay for them, and the scarce supply is rationed by price to the remaining buyers.

Hens lay more eggs in the spring than at any other time. The price falls, thereby encouraging folks who would not otherwise buy eggs to enter the market and take up the large supply.

In years of short crops, prices of wheat are high. These high prices tend to limit consumption in the early part of the crop year so that enough wheat will be saved to last until the next harvest. When pork is scarce high prices of pork cause the consumer to shift to other types of food so that the diminishing supplies are not exhausted before production can be increased.

During the past few weeks the public has had an experience with its potato supply which proves the same point. On March 15, there were about 35,000,000 bushels of old

potatoes remaining. This was equivalent to about a quarter of a pound per person per day for the remainder of the spring season. The low ceiling prices for potatoes which are not rationed, and the rationing of processed vegetables, caused increasing consumption of potatoes and high prices. Potatoes became so scarce that large hospitals in potato areas of central New York have not served potatoes since the 20th of April. A large proportion of the armed forces in this country were without potatoes for several weeks. They were fed rice, spaghetti, parsnips, macaroni, hominy, and the like. It was difficult to get potatoes to provision out-going boats. In New York City potatoes brought as much as $10 per hundredweight sack in black markets.

The acute potato situation this spring indicates clearly that setting low ceiling prices in the hope of benefiting the consumer, does not always protect the consumer. Instead, it may prove disastrous for the consumer. The Government could hardly have set a more favorable stage for a rapid disposal of the potato crop. By the low ceiling prices unaccompanied by the rationing of potatoes, while other food generally was rationed, the Government told the people to eat the potatoes just as rapidly as possible. The 130,000,000 people did what the Government, through prices, told them to do. They ate up the potatoes.

During a famine in India, the government set the price at a low level, and most of the crop was consumed long before new crops were available. Little or no grain was shifted from other areas. One-third of the population died. During a later famine, the government did not fix prices and in fact encouraged speculation. Prices advanced immediately, and the pressure of shortage was spread equally over the year, and grain was brought from other areas.

In 1916, the world began to feel some shortage in food supplies. Prices promptly rose. This decreased the purchasing power of consumers and served to shift our consumption so that the war effort was not hampered by malnutrition or famine in the Allied countries. If prices had not risen and especially if crops had been poor or had failed in the later war years, the food supply for any one year would have been consumed long before the following harvest.

From all this you can easily see what an impossible task it is and how disastrous to do away with the automatic price system and substitute for it artificial regulation of supply and demand. I am afraid we shall find it just can't be done.

In this complex situation the farmer feels he should not be singled out as the goat in the so-called anti-inflation drive. The public has been led to believe that the farmer was a profiteer and a racketeer. It has been led to believe there were vast quantities of food.

When price ceilings have been proved too low, the Government proposes subsidies. But the farmer does not want subsidies and hand-outs with all the restrictions and controls that go with them. For one reason, he resents subsidies because consumers believe that food subsidies are raids on the Treasury by farmers. Subsidies really are consumer subsidies. They make it possible for the consumer to buy a product below the fair price it should command.

Our Government has failed in not having a definite, well-planned, over-all food program. With a crisis confronting us and the possibility that we may go hungry within a year, we must immediately develop a program that will give us sufficient food, without too much regard to price. Our Government instead of seeking to increase food production and to make the best use of our ability to produce food, has laid all the emphasis on an effort to keep consumer prices down and this too has failed.

In an over-all program, we should include these points:

1. Give the farmer prices that will encourage him to produce, with the knowledge that under present conditions he cannot produce too much.

2. Recognize that food is as important to winning the war as guns and munitions, planes and ships. Protect our armed forces, our allies and our home consumers by protecting their food production.

3. Recognize that our food reserves are dwindling rapidly and change our program accordingly. We know we can't feed America and Europe on pork; that we can feed four or five times as many people on cereals as on meat produced from the same amount of grain.

4. Protect our production of the vitally necessary protective foods—milk, eggs, and vegetables. Ceilings on corn must be raised so that dairymen will have feed. Otherwise our milk supply will suffer enormously.

5. Let us quit talking about helping the farmer and do something about protecting the consumers' food supplies.

6. Quit toying with disaster by allowing theorists and bureaucrats from a political, a short-sighted or a selfish angle, continually to bungle the food situation. We could close up half the governmental agencies dealing with agriculture, send hordes of employees home. The farmer would heave a sigh of relief and the consumer would never miss them. A sensible step was made in this direction when the Army lent to Chester Davis, Col. Jay Taylor to direct the farm labor program. Colonel Taylor immediately said that his idea was the program would be administered only 5 percent from Washington, and that from there on the Extension Service in each State would take over. This seems contrary to all New Deal theory.

7. Shape our food program on the basis of making best nutritional use of our productive ability. We have almost completely ignored this. We know we are going to change our eating habits, because the necessity of war is going to force us to do so whether or not we like it. The great problem is going to be how to maintain health and morale on a simpler diet. It is not enough to tell people to eat less meat and more cornmeal mush. We must balance diets. We must maintain health and vigor. We must show consumers how to do this.

We must help them avoid malnutrition and be reasonably happy on a palatable menu that is greatly different from that to which many of them have been accustomed. Both during the war and after the war, we want not a farm program, but a food and nutrition program for the benefit of all the people. Instead of an over-all food and nutrition program we have had a lot of theoretical tinkering by men who were not sure what they were trying to do. Only a beneficent Mother Nature has protected us so far, and before another year passes we may weep over the tragedy of it.

Let us begin to realize the full importance of the food problem and devote all our energies to solving it. Begin now plans to increase production next year. If we deal with our present and future food problems with courage and intelligence, with realism instead of theory, if we abandon the idea that the Government can successfully regulate everything and everybody, and if we get back to sound, horse-sense fundamentals, we can solve this problem.

Let me close by quoting what Jefferson had to say on this subject:

"Were we to be directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread."

Responsibility for a Sound Fiscal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, upon numerous occasions in recent months I have emphasized the failure of the administration, the Congress, and the people in demanding, designing, and administering a sound fiscal policy.

While the press has united its forces perhaps as never before in all history, in its demand for a Federal tax-cancelation scheme, seldom do we find an outstanding editorial supporting a sound fiscal-policy approach.

As I remarked on the floor last Wednesday of this week—page 4636 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—I am personally prepared to do my share as a Member of this House and in support of a sound fiscal program.

It is little short of bad faith for the Congress to permit May 21 to arrive and yet not even a new 1943 revenue bill has been introduced, to say nothing about having been considered.

The first 18 days of the current month the Treasury disbursed for war activities alone $3,906,000,000. The total gross debt and guaranteed obligations now stand at $138,757,000,000. This week we have approved a naval bill for in excess of $29,000,000,000. Today we shall probably approve a lend-lease bill in excess of an additional $6,000,000,000. It is my understanding that next week we shall be called upon to approve an Army bill for in excess of $70,000,000,000. If ever in the history of this country the Congress was charged with a responsibility which demands consecrated service to the perpetuation of our institutions, it is this hour. If we are guilty of playing politics in the least degree with these far-reaching issues and problems, then the blood is on our hands and we shall eventually have to pay through suffering the consequences. There is no way for us to escape the duties of this hour any more than there was an alley through which the forefathers of this country could shirk their responsibilities. Democrats and Republicans alike, if they principally have their eyes set on the 1944 election instead of upon the crucial problems which must now be considered and mastered, then God help the United States.

Under permission granted to me, I submit an editorial from the May 16 issue of the Chicago Tribune, and which supports these observations.

THE BUBBLE

The two top men in public finance in this country are Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau and Marriner Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

Morgenthau and Eccles disagreed last week about the second war loan drive, which recently ended. The Secretary thinks it was

a whale of a success and points to the fact that over $18,000,000,000 worth of securities were sold. He told his press conference on Thursday that he wouldn't let "any one individual take away the satisfaction that the American people have gotten from the success of this drive."

Mr. Morgenthau was referring to Mr. Eccles, the man with whom he shares the financial responsibilities at Washington. Eccles, appearing before the House Banking and Currency Committee the day before, had said that the success of the bond drives depends not upon the amount of money brought in but where it comes from. He and many other well-informed persons regard bond selling to individuals as of the greatest value in the fight against inflation. If that is the big purpose, the recent bond drive was a failure. Only a sixth of the bonds were sold to individuals. The biggest amounts went to the banks. That is the most inflationary kind of borrowing of all.

The problem can be simply stated. The national income, continuing to increase, attained in March the rate of $135,000,000,000 a year. It seems certain that the estimate of one hundred and forty billions per year for 1943 will be reached or exceeded. That figure would represent an increase of twenty-five billions over 1942, forty-eight billions over 1941, sixty-four billions over 1940, and sixty-nine billions over 1939.

What is going to be the consequence of the release of such an avalanche of money? More goods and services might absorb some of the increase in funds, but one Washington official after another tells of the curtailments which will have to be made in the supplies available for civilian consumption. The Government is determined to keep the vastly swollen incomes from boosting prices. Ceilings are being proclaimed beyond which it is illegal to charge. Some prices are actually going to be rolled back, with the Government absorbing the reductions through subsidies. But how will this help? If people have more money than is good for them at the prevailing price level, they will have still more if the price level is cut. The pressure on prices will be greater. The opportunity for black markets will expand.

The Government could relieve the situation with a carefully developed program for diverting to the Treasury the forty or fifty billions of income which cannot be spent without advancing prices, but the administration has no such program. The President in his annual budget message talked of $16,000,000,000 of additional revenue which ought to be raised. That much money wouldn't come anywhere near doing the job of draining off surplus incomes even if the taxes were voted and applied at the beginning of the year. It wouldn't take up as much as two-thirds of this year's increase in the national income, let alone pull the level down from the flood stage reached last year. Here it is, the middle of May, and the new tax levies have not yet even been proposed. The Treasury wants its way in tax matters, and Congress always waits to hear from it before acting, but if the Treasury Department has formulated plans for raising sixteen billions more it is keeping mighty quiet about it.

The other way to drain off surplus spending money is by selling bonds to the people. Sales to individuals in the second drive amounted to $3,000,000,000. Net sales of savings bonds are at the rate of a billion dollars a month. Mr. Eccles says this still leaves twenty-five billions which can cause trouble.

The Government is falling down miserably in the financial job which it has to do if inflation is to be averted. It is wasting precious time on petty things. It is not draining off the surplus cash by taxation or bond selling, and apparently has no plans to do so. Our national fiscal affairs are seriously in need of an overhauling.

Inspiring Example of Civil and Military Cooperation in a Time of Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FADJO CRAVENS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Southwest Times Record of Fort Smith, Ark., under date of May 16, 1943. This editorial not only expresses the feeling of appreciation of a grateful people for the most helpful aid of the Army and other public organizations in a time of grave disaster but also demonstrates what may be accomplished by cooperation of the civil and military despite overwhelming circumstances. Those in the Arkansas River Valley in Arkansas and Oklahoma have, and still are, suffering the greatest catastrophe in history as the result of an unprecedented flood. But for the untiring aid rendered by the above-mentioned organizations and a host of civilians the incalculable and untold damage this area has suffered would have been even greater and more widespread. With a grateful people I join in expressing sincere thanks.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

IN APPRECIATION

Thank God for the Army. And for thousands of civilians who have worked without rest in this flood disaster.

Everybody in Fort Smith, Van Buren, and all the country up and down the devastated Arkansas River Valley, people are saying that and thinking it.

There is abundant reason.

The Army has been a lifesaver for the people of the flood area. Our civilians have done all that was humanly possible. But the Army alone had the manpower, the equipment, the experience to do things our civilians simply could not do.

We have suffered terribly in this flood.

Without the Army, we should certainly have suffered much more.

We have come through with no known loss of life in Arkansas because of the flood. Without the Army, we should certainly have had a list of dead and missing.

We have had a tragic situation in our city water supply, with our main line from Lake Fort Smith cut by floodwaters. As this is written, it is expected a temporary water line will be in service Sunday morning across the wash-out area adjoining the Van Buren free bridge. Without the Army, no such connection would be possible so soon.

There is no way to overstate the gratitude of the people of this area to the Army, its officers and its men.

We have all liked the Army from the moment the first soldier set foot in Camp Chaffee. We have had the most pleasant relations with the Army's changing personnel. We have appreciated their attitude toward our people, and they have appreciated the friendly spirit they have found in Fort Smith. But it takes real trouble to make real friends. Real trouble has hit us in the past week and the Army has been right in there fighting for us with everything it has. We shall never forget it, and we can never repay it.

Our gratitude as a community is equally boundless toward a host of other agencies and individuals who have had grave responsibilities and have met them with courage and effectiveness.

A complete list of them is impossible.

In the hurry and pressure of flood disaster it is not possible to know of all the invaluable services which have been provided.

It is obvious that the agencies of Federal, State, county, and city governments have performed nobly in a difficult situation. The Arkansas State Guard has worked side by side with the Regular Army in rescue work and guard duty. The Civil Air Patrol has been the eyes of flood relief workers. The American Red Cross, accustomed to disaster and its problems, has been irreplaceable in this situation. The Salvation Army and a number of lesser known organizations of relief and helpfulness have been on the job without ceasing. Hosts of private groups and individuals have met fully all the responsibilities which came to them and have gone out looking for new services they could perform.

The public utilities have faced most difficult situations with ingenuity and fidelity to their obligations. Natural gas service has been maintained without interruption, in spite of the ravages of flood waters. The Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. service in Fort Smith has never been interrupted. The break in Van Buren was met with emergency service as soon as it was humanly possible. The Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., swamped with local and long distance calls and harassed by broken lines in the flooded areas, has done a marvelous job of maintaining and restoring service.

The railroads have been put out of service so far as Fort Smith is concerned, and some of them will be cut for days more. Under the gravest of difficulties, they have labored to restore service as rapidly as flood waters receded.

Bus lines, within the city and cross-country, have met the most trying situation and have done their best to maintain service. Busses, trucks, even airplanes have been used in the absence of the rails, to get the United States mails through.

If any man or woman or agency has been derelict in the city which the flood crisis has brought, we have not heard of it—and we hope we don't.

It is difficult for an entire community or an area as large as that crushed by this flood to express its collective sentiment. But in this situation we feel confident we speak what is in the hearts of every one of us. And we say our eternal gratitude goes out to every individual and every organization for every act of heroism, every response to a need, every word of kindness and good cheer to a flood sufferer in this our gravest community disaster.

Suffering Humanity in Nazi Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include a letter recently received from the Des Moines, Iowa,

chapter of Aleph Zadik Aleph, a branch of the B'nai B'rith:

ALEPH ZADIK ALEPH,
Des Moines, Iowa, May 11, 1943.

The Honorable PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
House Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: We are aware of the terrible plight of civilians in Nazi Europe, and especially of the Jewish people in those lands who are being ruthlessly, barbarously, and methodically murdered. Already 3,000,000 of them have been killed and 3,000,000 are expected to be killed. The problem is too great to be solved by any private agencies; therefore, there is hope only in action that can be taken by the governments of the United Nations.

It is the sacred duty of all those who believe in liberty and democracy to take every possible measure to rescue a remnant of these war sufferers. We, the members of the Des Moines Chapter of A. Z. A. soon to be among the voters of America, respectfully request that you use your influence and position to make effective the following program of action:

1. That the United States Government use its influence with the United Nations to make all arrangements with the United Nations for the removal of as many war sufferers from Hitler controlled lands as possible.
2. That havens of refuge be found in neutral and United Nations lands.
3. That the doors of Palestine be opened for unlimited immigration.
4. That the United Nations provide transportation and maintenance of these refugees during wartime.
5. That the United States relax its immigration restrictions to receive refugees.

Undoubtedly you are aware of an even fuller program of action. We strongly urge that you leave no stone unturned in making effective this humanitarian program.

Be assured that all such efforts on your part will be remembered by us and hundreds of thousands like us, who will regard you as a true lover of peace and democracy and a worthy representative of the American people.

Respectfully yours,
DES MOINES CHAPTER OF
ALEPH ZADIK ALEPH,
HARLAN HOCKENBERG,
Secretary.

Lt. Gen. Jacob L. Devers

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER H. GROSS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to bring to your attention a matter which as Representative of the Twenty-second Congressional District of Pennsylvania, makes me very proud. I refer to the recent appointment of Lt. Gen. Jacob L. Devers who was named early this month as commanding general of United States forces in the European theater of operations.

I am proud and my district is proud of this appointment, because General Devers was born at York, September 8, 1887. His background is a story of a man who, when he was 18, became a soldier because of a political squabble.

When he was graduated from York High School, Jakie, as the general was known at that time, made plans to become an engineer. He attended Lehigh University in nearby Bethlehem, and, in fact, had engaged his room when word came that because of a bitter political argument inside the Republican ranks, the son of a Democrat—the son being Jakie—was going to get Congressman Daniel Lafean's West Point appointment.

He entered the United States Military Academy in 1905 and was graduated in 1909; being a fairly diligent student, a most exceptional all-around athlete, and a very obvious leader of his fellow cadets. Upon graduation he was commissioned a second lieutenant of field artillery on June 11, 1909.

Jacob Loucks Devers was the son of Pennsylvania Dutch and Irish parents. From his Dutch mother he inherited the determination and, particularly, the silence that has made him something of a riddle—a man whom people like and trust instinctively, yet never know intimately.

From his Irish father he inherited a shrewd sense of humor and a quick mind; while from both parents and many ancestors must have come his inherent honesty. This is a dominant characteristic which is noted immediately by everyone who meets him.

PROMOTIONS

He was promoted to first lieutenant on April 1, 1916; to captain on May 15, 1917; to major, temporary, on August 5, 1917; to lieutenant colonel, temporary, on July 30, 1918; and to colonel, temporary, on October 24, 1918. He reverted to his permanent rank of captain on August 20, 1919, and was promoted to major on July 1, 1920; to lieutenant colonel on February 26, 1934; to colonel on July 1, 1938; to brigadier general on May 1, 1940; to major general, temporary, on October 1, 1940; to lieutenant general, temporary, on September 6, 1942.

SERVICE

He joined the Fourth Field Artillery at Vancouver Barracks, Wash., in September 1909 and served with that regiment at that post, at Fort D. A. Russell, now Fort Francis E. Warren, Wyo.; at San Antonio, Tex., and again at Fort D. A. Russell until December 1912. He was then ordered to the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y., as an instructor, in which capacity he served until August 1916 when he was ordered to the Hawaiian Islands for duty with the Ninth Field Artillery at Schofield Barracks.

Returning to the United States in December 1917, he was assigned to Fort Sill, Okla., where he served as an instructor and assistant director of the School of Fire until October 1918, as executive officer until March 1919, and as commanding officer of the First Field Artillery until May 1919.

He was then ordered to Europe, where he served in France and Germany until August 1919. Upon his return to the United States he was assigned to duty at the United States Military Academy as an instructor of field artillery tactics, in which capacity he served for 5 years. From September 1924 to June 1925 he was at the Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., from which he was graduated as a "distinguished graduate" in June 1926.

He was then ordered to Fort Sill, Okla., where he was assigned as director of the department of gunnery at the field artillery school until April 1928, when he assumed command of the First Field Artillery at the same post. He commanded that regiment until July 1929, when he was transferred to Washington, D. C., for duty in the office, Chief of Field Artillery. He remained in that office until August 1932, when he was ordered to the Army War College, Washington, D. C.

Upon graduation from the Army War College in June 1933, he was ordered to Fort Hoyle, Md., with the Sixth Field Artillery, and executive officer of the First Field Artillery Brigade until May 1934. He then served with the Sixteenth Field Artillery at Fort Myer, Va., until March 1936, when he was transferred to the United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y. He served at the headquarters of the academy until June 1936, when he became graduate manager of athletics.

In June 1939 he was transferred to the Panama Canal Department as Chief of Staff. He returned to the United States in July 1940 to assume command of the Washington Provisional Brigade with headquarters in Washington, D. C. On October 9, 1940, he was assigned to command the Ninth Division, Fort Bragg, N. C.

On July 17, 1941, he was assigned Chief of the Armored Force, Fort Knox, Ky. In May 1943 he was named commanding general of United States forces in the European theater of operations.

General Devers was appointed to succeed Lt. Gen. Frank M. Andrews who was killed in an Army plane crash in Iceland.

He is a recognized specialist in armored warfare and mobile artillery operations, and is well fitted for the European command at this time. With the Axis well taken care of in their defeat in north Africa, I was glad to note in the public press the other day that General Devers said that "you may be certain the war in this theater soon will be intensified."

A man of tremendous energy, of quick and sound judgment, an exceptional administrator, and, first and last, a soldier's soldier, Lieutenant General Devers is the type of leader who will give America and her allies the confidence, courage, and armies which will win this global war.

The Housewives of America Should Be Interested in This Man's Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the food problem in the United States is most serious. I believe a better solution to

that problem will be reached when the housewives of America and all the consumers get the viewpoint of the men and women who produce food.

I wish to extend my remarks by including a letter from a man living in my district, who is doing his best to produce meat for our soldiers, sailors, marines, our allies, and for you and me.

The letter is as follows:

DILLER, NEBR., *May 12, 1943.*

Hon. CARL T. CURTIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: Permit me to express my appreciation of your efforts to look after the interests of the farmers and stockmen.

Since November 1 last I have had 62 cattle on full feed and am now feeding $25 worth of corn per day to them. Figuring the cattle are putting on 2 pounds per day and that I will obtain no more than prevailing price of $15 per hundred, my cattle are costing me $25 per day for feed and increasing in value $18.60, or, in other words, I am losing $6.40 per day. Do you think the man asking us to produce feed really expects us to continue on this basis?

Do they expect me to feed as many next year with this facing me? Would it not be more profitable for me to quit farming and feeding cattle and go to work in a defense plant or a coal mine?

Sincerely yours,

HARRY AHRENDS.

The Kerr Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES F. O'CONNOR
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary procedure on what is known as the Kerr amendment limited sharply the time of debate and principally confined to members of the special committee, I was unable to secure time to participate in the debate before the vote was taken. Therefore, I take this means of giving my reasons for voting against this amendment.

I am unalterably opposed to the both bad and dangerous precedent we are establishing. Let us stop and reflect on what we are doing.

These men, none of whom I know, have been declared by the Kerr committee unfit to hold public office by virtue of their past associations, and their affiliations with subversive organizations. They now ask us to concur in their action without giving the Members a transcript of the evidence taken by them. The suppression of this evidence is highly irregular and not in accordance with accepted practice. For us to concur in the action of the committee on the little or no evidence they have presented as to the guilt of these men would be very un-American—we would simply be acting as prosecutor, judge, and jury, certainly not the American way of giving every man a hearing before a jury of his peers.

I had thought that the right to free speech was one of the things we were now fighting for. Apparently this has now been changed so that now anyone advocating ideas or ideals which ideas or ideals happen to be repugnant to the majority group can, without a trial guaranteed by the Constitution, be defamed and deprived of their means of sustenance. The Supreme Court decided only 2 weeks ago in the Jehovah's Witnesses case, that there still was such a thing as freedom of religion. Now I hold no brief for the philosophy of the Jehovah's Witnesses religion, nor do I hold any brief for these men accused of subversive activities; they may be as guilty as hell, but the way that is being attempted to prove does not prove it. It merely raises the question of their guilt.

I do not think even the committee holds the activities of these men subversive. When this matter was up for discussion on the floor of the House on Tuesday, I asked the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], the following question—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 18, 1943, page 4583:

Did the gentleman's committee find whether these men or any one of them are doing anything that, in the committee's judgment, would obstruct the winning of the war or interfere with it at the present time?

The answer to that question was:

Mr. KERR. We did not go into that phase of the question.

The question then arises, What phase of the question—as to their guilt of subversity—did the committee go into? The answer seems to be that the committee concerned itself only with the political philosophy of those men.

To grant Congress the right then to legislate political philosophy is what this amendment amounts to. I am opposed to it because I am opposed to the abolition of free speech. If these men are guilty of any activity against the welfare of the United States or the war effort, I think they should be prosecuted, and I know that the F. B. I. would prosecute them if such were the case, but I refuse to condemn them without trial as granted them under the Constitution—and the Constitution guarantees them a different kind of trial than the court of public opinion.

Opposition to the Puerto Rican Independence Bill—Letter of the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Harold L. Ickes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOLÍVAR PAGÁN
RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting copy of a letter of the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, addressed to Senator Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS, referring to the Puerto Rican independence bill. Anticipating further comments which I will make later regarding this important letter, let me state now that such letter is a document of high statesmanship which deserves the appreciation and gratitude of the Puerto Rican people.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, May 13, 1943.

Hon. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: I have your letter of April 3 requesting the views of this Department on S. 952, a bill to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Puerto Rico and for the recognition of its independence, and for other purposes.

I have heretofore expressed myself in favor of a policy which would grant to the people of Puerto Rico a constantly increasing measure of real control over their local affairs. I still advocate that policy. The President has stated that he favors a measure to give the Puerto Ricans the right to elect their Governor, and has appointed a committee to study necessary changes in the Organic Act related thereto with instructions to report to him so that he can transmit to the Congress recommendations for necessary legislation. I believe that greater autonomy should be limited to that step at this time.

The economic dislocations in Puerto Rico incident to the war are very serious. The readjustments not only in the Island but throughout the Caribbean which will take place when it ends may be very widespread. To enact a measure of this kind at this time, even after the most careful consideration of present conditions, might well turn out to have been a serious mistake both from the point of view of the United States and of Puerto Rico in the light of conditions existing after the war.

Furthermore the bill offers the Puerto Ricans only a narrowly restricted choice between independence and the maintenance of the present dependency status. Its provisions would not permit them to consider the further alternative of obtaining self-government while remaining under the American flag, through a grant of statehood or commonwealth rights. I strongly feel that whenever the time becomes opportune for permanent determination of the future status of Puerto Rico the people should be given a broader opportunity to express their desires than would be possible under S. 952.

This report has not been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget and therefore I have not been informed by that Bureau with respect to the relationship of the proposed legislation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES.
Secretary of the Interior.

Nothing Else Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. J. Raymond Schmidt:

NOTHING ELSE MATTERS

(By Dr. J. Raymond Schmidt, general superintendent, National Civic League)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—According to Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, "there is one and only one fundamental issue that faces the country now—the winning of the war. Every action taken by a governmental agency, every action on our part as individual citizens, should be determined by the searching question—will it promote the winning of the war? Nothing else matters."

Doubtless the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, Chief of Staff, and the Commander in Chief are in agreement with this declaration, otherwise it would not have been made. If these leaders really believe nothing else matters, why do they condone, if not openly encourage, the traffic in alcoholic beverages with its colossal waste of sugar, foodstuffs, and shipping space?

Since repeal became effective in 1933, beverage alcohol has had the green light in America. People may go without food, fuel, and clothing, and our armed forces without vital supplies, but, taking the past decade as a criterion, you may rest assured there will be food for converting into, and space for shipping, alcoholic beverages. One is forced to the conclusion that nothing else matters when there is a threat of reduced profits for the brewers and distillers, or the removal of the many special privileges and priorities enjoyed by the trade at the expense of public welfare and maybe success on the world-wide battle front.

"Priority" is a magic word these days. You are just out of luck if you can't get on a priority list. The brewers enjoy priority rights without limit. According to Drew Pearson, of the Washington Merry-Go-Round, they even get a share of the tin cans turned in as salvage from which to replenish their supply of bottle caps. This is not the kind of news to encourage American housewives in making further sacrifices requested of them.

BREWERS GET PLENTY OF SUGAR

The brewers get 70,000 tons of sugar per year while the housewives are denied the usual amount necessary for canning fruit. Who has ever heard of a beer drinker being told by the bartender that "there is no beer today"? When we do without sugar for making lemonade, and cannot get the customary amount of coffee, we are told that the shortage is due to lack of shipping.

Shipping space, however, seems available for alcoholic beverages. Witness the complaint of ANTHONY J. DIMOND, congressional delegate from Alaska, against the shipment of beer and wine valued at $60,000 on one vessel to Alaska, leaving only space for 1½ tons of food when 16 tons of space had been requested. "Scandalous" is the way Mr. DIMOND denounced this shipment of liquor, when the food left behind on the docks was so vitally needed in the territory.

We further learn from the United States News that ships recently discharged cargoes of whisky and textiles in Panama, where other supplies, such as food and machinery, were more urgently needed.

In testifying recently before the House Appropriations Committee, L. A. Wheeler, Chief of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, said that American ships returning from delivering war materials to Russia came back empty, while those returning from Great Britain bring plenty of Scotch whisky and small quantities of textiles. Intelligent, patriotic Americans are not deceived. They know that Scotch whisky will not help the war effort and that textiles are badly needed to replenish our diminishing stocks of woolen fabrics, which reports indicate may soon be rationed.

TANK CARS HAUL BEER AND WINE

People living in homes equipped with oil burners will get what comfort they can from the statement of Ray Tucker in his syndicated column, News Behind The News, which appeared during the recent winter and reads in part as follows:

"Continued use of key transportation facilities by wine and beer interests has precipitated severe criticism among Administration insiders and on Capitol Hill. For some reason Joseph B. Eastman, Jr., has been unable to check the grape magnates or the big brewers.

"Regardless of the shortage of oil and gasoline on the Atlantic seaboard, several hundred tank cars which could carry more important commodities arrive in this area weekly with full cargoes of the fermented stuff. The industry has turned over about 50 percent of its normal shipping equipment, but it is thought here that sacrifice should be total until the scarcity of fuel is relieved by the coming of milder weather.

"Prohibitionists have seized on this issue to renew demands for Nation-wide dryness. It is not a question of white-ribbonism at all—merely a common sense problem of revising methods of distribution. But unless these and similar evils connected with the trade are remedied quickly John Barleycorn may be sent to a concentration camp."

The same situation applies to the transportation of food, which experts say may be even harder to get before the year is over. When facing cold homes next winter and a shortage of food necessary to proper nourishment, an enraged public can be expected to demand that all shipping facilities be reserved for those commodities that really count. John Barleycorn cannot be interned any too soon for the Nation's welfare. Early passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) will do the trick.

Anti-Poll-Tax Bill Menaces State Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan, from the Washington Post of April 25, 1943:

ANTI-POLL-TAX BILL MENACES STATE RIGHTS

(By Mark Sullivan)

The so-called anti poll-tax bill is in Congress again. The poll-tax is a payment required from voters in seven Southern States as a qualification for registering and voting. The amount of the tax varies from $1 to $3. By the bill in Congress, States would be forbidden to keep this requirement as respects voting for candidates for Federal offices.

The drive to make Congress pass the anti-poll-tax bill is vigorous, ingenious, and wide-ranging. One device is to get State legislatures throughout the country to pass resolutions endorsing the bill. The legislature of New York last month passed this resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of New York respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to speedily enact H. R. 7 or any other similar or suitable legislation which effectively abolishes the payment of a poll-tax as a qualification for voting for candidates for office in the Federal Government."

That is the resolution of the New York Legislature.

WHAT IT INDORSES

Now look at the bill in Congress which the resolution indorses. The meat of the bill is:

"It shall be unlawful for any State, municipality, or other government or governmental subdivision to * * * (require) the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Member of the House of Representatives; and any such requirement shall be invalid and void."

To resolve about other States is easy. But in principle the New York Legislature was resolving about something closer home—it was resolving about its own State of New York.

For if Congress can forbid a voting requirement in one State, which happens to be the poll tax, Congress can by the same power forbid any other voting requirement in any other State.

Just as some Southern States have particular requirements for voting, so do all other States have particular requirements. New York, for example, has requirements that a new voter produce a high-school diploma or pass a literacy test; that a voter coming from another State to reside in New York do the same; that a foreign-born voter produce his final naturalization papers. New York and all other States have requirements that a voter must have resided in the State and voting precinct a certain length of time.

THE STATES' JOB

These requirements for voting—all requirements for voting—are at present an exclusive function of the States. They are an extremely important function—because nothing is more vital to the very existence of any government than the function of fixing the requirements for voting.

If this function is lost or impaired a government is no longer truly a government.

We are obliged to conclude that the State legislatures, such as New York's, that pass this form of resolution do not realize what they are doing.

Let us tell them what they are doing. The resolution of the New York State Legislature quoted above, if translated into terms which express its effect upon the State of New York itself, would read somewhat as follows:

"The Legislature of the State of New York, now possessing and exercising the exclusive function of fixing requirements for voting, and being desirous that some of this function be taken over and exercised by the Federal Government at Washington, hereby petitions the Congress to assert and exercise a superior power over voting requirements to the extent of making the poll tax illegal in all States, including New York, as a requirement for voting on candidates for Federal offices."

THREAT TO STATES

There has been under way for some years a trend toward taking powers and functions away from State governments and transferring them to the Federal Government at Washington. Everybody knows this movement exists. The danger in it is well recognized. In the furtherance of this trend nothing could be more far-reaching than for the State to let the Federal Government take over a major part of the function of fixing voting requirements.

The anti-poll-tax bill in Congress is a direct and serious threat to the rights of States—not merely the seven States that had poll taxes but all the States.

I Am an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN DIES
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following themes written by two high-school boys in my district:

I AM AN AMERICAN
(By Joe Baker Cauthen)

One hundred and thirty million strong! I am among this number that shapes the destiny of the greatest Nation in the world. After 167 years of struggle, I am free. My rights and privileges are expressed in the Bill of Rights, in the four freedoms, and in written law. Judge Baker said:

"There is no earthly possession of more value than that of being an American citizen."

However, these privileges are not given free of charge. As a citizen of a democracy, my responsibilities are greater than those of citizens of any other country. The American Creed lists these responsibilities as follows:

"I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it; to support its constitution; to obey its laws; to respect its flag; and to defend it against all enemies."

Yet, without an education I cannot vote wisely, understand the law, and be a good citizen or soldier; so America gives me this great educational system. Therefore, it is my duty to study and learn how to be a good citizen.

No group of people is able to live in harmony without law. I am guaranteed freedom, but this freedom can only exist insofar as I do not infringe upon the rights of someone else. Because of this I must learn and obey the law in order to keep from violating someone else's rights and to keep my rights from being violated.

Today I have even greater responsibilities as a citizen. In keeping with my pledge to defend America against her enemies, I may be called upon to fight, maybe to die, for my country. I am being called upon to pay higher taxes, to lend money to my Government, and to accept rationing willingly and ungrudgingly.

This is the test. Am I, and are my hundred and thirty million compatriots good citizens? Our answer will determine whether America will live or die.

I AM AN AMERICAN
(By Shannon Boatman)

I am an American who has many great privileges, rights, and duties not rendered to any other nation or group of people known to the world.

The right and privileges being that I may join any political party which my duty sees fit to direct me; vote in secret for any man or woman for any respective office that I desire; make any comments on any bills or duties performed by my Government; serve in any church or religious organization without opposition from anyone; personal rights if accused of crime such as the right of being presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond reasonable doubt.

This is America, where everything is done under the order of the preamble of the United States Constitution and the American Bill of Rights. I may take part in amending, repealing, or in the making of any law of my country.

I can proudly say that rather than my country be governed or ruled by one man's own earthly order that the American Government is governed by the Golden Rule and I may also say that our America is in existence for the good of the people and purposed according to the Declaration of Independence in the protection of "we the people" and our rights. My rights being guaranteed by both the State and National Constitutions.

I am an American and it is therefore my duty to, in all cases, such as this war, to perform any task asked of me by my Government to help preserve the America and keep the peace of heaven on earth and to do this I, as well as all, must be a real American.

O. P. A.

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. GRANT
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, this morning's paper says Price Administrator Prentiss Brown is going to discharge at least a half dozen high-ranking O. P. A. officials who have been spending only part of the time on the job. He is quoted as saying the O. P. A. has "no room for officials who look on O. P. A. as a hobby."

A housewife in the city of Goshen in my district has written me the following letter:

My husband instructs me to tell you, instead of him, what I think of the economic understanding of the buzzards who thought up the idea of limiting the length of women's hose to 29 inches. He says you can do more about it than he can.

Now, I don't pretend to know anything about the manufacture of hose and girdles—I just wear them; but I'll wager that the fellows who made the rulings do neither of these things. The idea is as impractical as one-pant suits. If they wanted to vaunt their practicality, why not three-pant suits, as our next door neighbor has always bought. Who ever heard of a man wearing out a suit coat?

Well, to return to the hose, I'm average size, maybe below—5 feet 4 inches, weight 120; wear size 14. If a 29-inch stocking doesn't fit me, how will it fit those who are 5 feet 6 inches or over; those weighing 130 to 170? To illustrate—

As it is, a 32-inch hose—as rayon hasn't the elasticity of nylon—barely meets the shortened hose supporters on a girdle. In fact, the strain is so great that a pair costing $1.35 lasted 6 wearings instead of 6 weeks or more. Is that good wartime economy? What will happen when I have to put on a pair of 29-inch ones? Shall I lengthen them at the top with checked gingham? Ask the hair-brained economists who conjured up such an idea.

Following the receipt of this letter, I called O. P. A. and, lo and behold, was supplied with a lengthy document of 13½ pages, regulating in minute detail the size, gage, and length of women's hose.

Mr. Speaker, the long-haired professors and consultants who thought up this one are a part of this hobby-lobby which could easily be dispensed with and both the war effort and the O. P. A. would be better off.

With the cost of living mounting day by day—with a war raging in every quarter of the globe—brave men down at O. P. A. sit around and waste their time debating about the flair and the calf and the length of women's hose.

It is high time we got rid of every one of them.

Acknowledgment of Applications by the Civil Service Commission

REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GILLIE
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the method now being used by the Civil Service Commission when they acknowledge receipt of an application or of an unassembled application for a position. This method of acknowledging was brought to my attention this week when one of my constituents, Mr. James Donel Jordan, of South Whitley, Ind., wrote me asking whether he was in fact on the eligible list of a social science position with the civil service. He stated that he "wished to know about obtaining the civil service position which I have been evidently accepted for."

The letter sent him by civil service first palavered about the applicant's patriotism, and second, expressed satisfaction that so many had made application; third, suggested that the applicant make no inquiries about his chances of obtaining a position, for his qualifications would be given careful attention, and finally, assured him that if an opening occurred, he would receive a direct communication from the agency having a vacancy.

Upon inquiry at the Civil Service Commission, the officials could not even guess what sort of application Mr. Jordan had made, and could not inform me whether he was likely to obtain a position. On the afternoon of the second day of their search they reported they had found his name, and the record that he was ineligible, although they could not tell me what he was ineligible for.

Now, my friend Don Jordan is a very high-class man. He was formerly the principal of schools in South Whitley, and he has a splendid record of achievement in whatever he has undertaken.

What I object to is that the civil service should not have some way of indicating the position applied for, or the eligibility of the applicant. Instead of that, the Civil Service Commission sends out literally thousands of misleading letters, with the obvious purpose of making the applicant think he is eligible and need only wait for an opening. They might, at least, use symbols to indicate the sort of examination they took.

I am told that the Commission uses this misleading letter "merely to acknowledge receipt of an application" and I think this type of acknowledgment is not a straightforward one. I believe the Commission should adopt more honest methods of writing to the citizens of our fair country.

Attached is a copy of the civil service mimeographed letter to which I object:

UNITED STATES CIVIL
SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 8, 1943.

Mr. JAMES DONEL JORDAN,
General Delivery,
South Whitley, Ind.:

We thank you for your application and appreciate the patriotic motives which prompted you to make your record available for consideration. You may be sure that your record will be carefully analyzed and that your application will be made readily available to Federal agencies having need for persons with your qualifications.

You will recognize that in these days thousands of records are being received from other patriotic citizens and that not all of them will be called upon to render service as Federal employees. However, it is necessary to have on hand a substantial number of records of persons with varied qualifications, often highly specialized in narrow fields, in order to meet the specific needs of the war agencies.

For the purposes of expediting war recruiting operations, the Commission necessarily has discontinued the individual answering of inquiries concerning such matters as status of applications, prospects of appointments, and related questions. However, we again wish to assure you that your qualifications will be given careful attention. In the event a need arises for the utilization of your particular qualifications, you will be contacted directly by the agency concerned.

Sincerly yours,

WM. C. HULL,
Executive Assistant.

Look Beyond the Soldiers at Hot Springs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a timely and pertinent editorial from the Daily Pantagraph of May 19, regarding the food conference now going on at Hot Springs, Va.:

LOOK BEYOND THE SOLDIERS AT HOT SPRINGS

An American newspaper editor, writing for American newspaper readers, finds himself at a disadvantage in writing about an international conference at which armed soldiers keep reporters away. It is particularly difficult when the subject is food and the newspaper, like The Pantagraph, is published in the midst of the world's greatest food-producing area.

But it is worth an effort. We must forget those soldiers for the time being. They are there through a colossal error in public relations. They fan suspicion, create doubts and strengthen the hand of those who will work against a good peace.

Whether soldiers cover the conferences with guns or whether reporters cover it with typewriters, what is its purpose?

First, it will not and cannot set up a world Agricultural Adjustment Administration or a world ever-normal granary complete with field agents, quotas, loan guarantees, etc. It has no power to act that way.

It consists of agricultural and nutrition experts. They represent 42 countries. They are going exploring. They hope to find a way to increase production and consumption of food. They will report back to their governments. They are technicians. They do not have the power to act on behalf of their governments.

Put a tag like "World Agricultural Adjustment Administration" or "world ever-normal granary" on this conference—the metropolitan newspapers like such easy catch phrases—and what effect does it have on the average American? He thinks of crop restrictions. Most farmers would react the same way.

Mr. WALLACE said many times that the New Deal farm program would restrict production only over the short run. But there is no denying that plowing under cotton, killing little pigs, and limiting corn acreage are what most people think of when Agricultural Adjustment Administration or ever-normal granary is mentioned.

The basic truth is that there is not now enough food to go around in the world and there never has been. In late years we have approached an era of plenty but only in theory. For the first time, we could now produce enough food for everyone. We could. That doesn't mean we have or that we will.

John Boyd Orr, a leading British nutrition expert, said recently in connection with the food conference that food supplies would have to be increased by 150 to 200 percent to maintain the world's population in good health.

Sir Richard Gregory, president of the British association, says provision of sufficient food after the war would be one of the foremost means of overcoming unemployment.

Reginald George Stapleton, professor of agriculture at University College of Wales, has said the crux of the post-war problem was to put the man who tills the soil on an equal basis with the skilled mechanic in the factory.

Colin Clark, Australian government economist, predicts in his searching Economics of 1960 that the nations who produce more food than they can use will find a greatly enlarged market after the war.

These statements are in line with the real truth about food. Give people the means to buy and who can say there are "too many farmers"—that favorite of the economic planner in this country? That is just another way of saying "too much food." We have never even fed our own people decently. Let's wait until we do before we say there are too many farmers or too much food.

This food conference will talk about the means of producing and distributing food. It will wrestle with the problem of food stored in bins while children's teeth rot for lack of proper nutrition.

It promises a great deal for American agriculture. But instead of dramatizing its possibilities, our Government allows loose talk about a world Agricultural Adjustment Agency to worry farmers. It orders soldiers to the conference and allows reporters to beat angrily against closed portals.

A more monumental error can hardly be conceived. Here was a chance to enlist the farmer in the interests of a world peace. Instead he has been made suspicious.

But the soldiers do not change the fundamental character of the conference. Out of it may come a better day for farming.

That is why we must look past the soldiers and try to see what may be done at Hot Springs.

The only real prosperity farming has known for 30 years has come from wars. If farming is put on its own feet in the post-war world, with prosperity equal to its services, conferences such as this one at Hot Springs must pave the way.

Harry L. Englebright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, for many years one of the most outstanding, earnest, and effective Members of the California delegation in the House of Representatives has been the Honorable HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT, from the Second District in our State.

Regardless of political party, he has had the love and respect of all who knew him, and particularly of Members from the State of California. He was devoted to the interest of the people he represented, sincerely and profoundly patriotic, and possessed of a most unusual knowledge and grasp of the problems of his State and region. He will be sorely missed both by his colleagues in the House and by the people in California.

Frederick August Larsen, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to note that one of my constituents from the Eleventh New Jersey District is to receive the award of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal.

Frederick August Larsen, Jr., junior third officer, 162 Central Avenue, Orange, N. J., will be the recipient of the award from President Roosevelt, who will be represented by Capt. Edward Macauley, member of the Maritime Commission, on the occasion of the observance of National Maritime Day tomorrow at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y. The citation is as follows:

For heroism above and beyond the call of duty.

His ship was a freighter carrying drums of high-octane gasoline, one of two American ships, in a small British convoy to Malta. Orders were to "get through at all costs." Heavily escorted, the convoy moved into the Mediter-

ranean, and before noon of that day the enemy's attack began. From then on the entire convoy was under constant attack from Axis planes and submarines. Assigned the command of an antiaircraft gun mounted on the bridge, Larsen contributed to the successful defense of his ship for 3 days. At 4 a. m. on the morning of the fourth day, torpedo boats succeeded in breaking through and two attacked from opposite sides. Sneaking in close under cover of the darkness, one opened point-blank fire with four .50-caliber machine guns, sweeping the bridge. The other fired a torpedo into the opposite side of the freighter. The explosion of the torpedo ignited the gasoline cargo and the American ship was engulfed in flames. Reluctantly, orders were given to abandon her. Two hours later, the survivors were picked up by a British destroyer, which then proceeded to take in tow a tanker that had been bombed and could not maneuver. After 5 hours' constant dive-bombing, the tanker was hit again—her crew abandoned her—and the destroyer was forced to cut her loose. But the cargo she carried was most important to the defense of Malta, and it had to get through.

The rescue destroyer and another destroyer steamed in, lashed themselves on either side of the stricken tanker, and dragged her along in a determined attempt to get her to port. The tanker's decks and superstructure had been almost completely wrecked by the incessant bombardment. But Larsen's anxiety to get into the fight caused him to take inventory of her armament. He found an antiaircraft gun mounted abaft the stack which needed only minor repairs to put it into action. The young cadet of his own ship, a British gunner's mate, and three of his men volunteered to help him. Though the ships were then constantly under fire, they boarded her, repaired the gun, and manned it, with Larsen taking the trainer's position and the gunner's mate and the cadet alternating as pointers. The shackled ships, inching along and making a perfect target, were assailed by concentrated enemy air power. All that day wave after wave of German and Italian bombers dived at them and were beaten off by a heavy barrage. Bombs straddled them, scoring near misses, but no direct hits were made until noon the next day, when the tanker finally received a bomb down her stock which blew out the bottom of her engine room. Though she continued to settle until her decks were awash, they fought her through until dusk that day brought them under the protection of the hard-fighting air force out of Malta. The magnificent courage of this young third officer constitutes a degree of heroism which will be an enduring inspiration to seamen of the United States merchant marine everywhere.

I wish to congratulate him in particular and all of the men of our Nation who, by their sacrifices and acts of heroism, have set an exemplary standard of American determination.

Money—The Most Important Issue Before the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the twenty-third installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. In reviewing the history of the financial legislation of that day and in considering the motive behind the contention of the opponents of silver money, the profits to be gained by the banks in the form of interest by replacing silver money with national bank currency should be borne in mind. A double income obtained—one from the interest on the government bonds left on deposit with the United States Treasury as security for the issuance of an equivalent amount of national bank notes and, two, the interest income from this national bank note currency loaned into circulation at current rates of interest.

The National Bank Act passed in 1863 during the Civil War and the invention of national bank currency proved to be a revolutionary monetary system.

The twenty-third installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

I have here a quotation from the finance report of December 1881, made by Secretary Folger. It simply says that they cannot circulate the silver dollars, that there are too many of them already issued, and that the Bland law must be suspended.

President Arthur, in his message of December 1881, indorsed Secretary Folger's recommendation. Secretary Folger in 1882 repeated his former recommendation for the suspension of the Bland law, and President Arthur, in 1882, reaffirmed his message of 1881 recommending the same thing. Secretary Folger, in 1883, referred to and reaffirmed his reports of 1881 and 1882, and so he did in his report of 1884. President Arthur, in December 1884, made sundry recommendations, and I will ask that they may be inserted. In his message of 1884, his last message, he said:

"I concur with the Secretary of the Treasury in recommending the immediate suspension of the coinage of silver dollars and of the issuance of silver certificates. This is a matter to which, in former communications, I have more than once invoked the attention of the National Legislature.

"It appears that annually for the past 6 years there have been coined, in compliance with the requirements of the act of February 28, 1878, more than 27,000,000 silver dollars. The number now outstanding is reported by the Secretary to be nearly 185,000,000, whereof but little more than 40,000,000, or less than 22 percent, are in actual circulation. The mere existence of this fact seems to me to furnish of itself a cogent argument for the repeal of the statute which has made such fact possible.

"But there are other and graver considerations that tend in the same direction.

"The Secretary avows his conviction that unless this coinage and the issuance of silver certificates be suspended, silver is likely at no distant day to become our sole metallic standard."

Mr. President, do they not somewhat remind us of the predictions of today. They sound very much just as the predictions of today—the dire calamities that then prevailed in 1885 and 1886. Now, let us examine and see their sameness. I have before me a letter written by President Cleveland before his inauguration in 1885.

"ALBANY, *February 24, 1885.*

"To the Honorable A. J. WARNER AND OTHERS,
Member of the Forty-eighth Congress:

In referring to their letter, he says:

"It is also fully justified by the nature of the financial crisis, which, under the operation of the act of Congress of February 28, 1878, is now close at hand. By a compliance with the requirements of that law, all the vaults of the Federal Treasury have been and are heaped full of silver coins, which are now worth less than 85 percent of the gold dollar prescribed as "the unit of value," in section 14 of the act of February 12, 1873, and which, with the silver certificates representing such coin, are receivable for all public dues. Being thus receivable, while also constantly increasing in quantity at the rate of $28,000,000 a year, it has followed, of necessity, that the flow of gold into the Treasury has been steadily diminished.

"Silver and silver certificates have displaced and are now displacing gold, and the sum of gold in the Federal Treasury now available for the payment of the gold obligations of the United States and for the redemption of the United States notes called greenbacks, if not already encroached upon, is perilously near such encroachment.

* * * * *

"These being the facts of our present condition, our danger and our duty to avert that danger would seem to be plain.

* * * * *

"From these impending calamities it is surely a most patriotic and grateful duty of the representatives of the people to deliver them."

That was February 24, 1885. You see where the country was predicted to be coming. Just upon the brink of a wonderful precipice. Now, let us see how long that continued, for these panics do not subside instanter, as a rule.

In December 1885 the financial report of Secretary Manning of the Treasury was submitted. The report gives at great length his views and recommends the repeal of the purchasing clause of the law of February 28, 1878, and the repeal of the law of May 31, 1878, forbidding the retirement of greenbacks and requiring their reissue; in short, to restore bimetallism, stop the coinage of silver, unconditionally repeal the purchasing clause of the Bland Act, retire and cancel greenbacks, and wait for an international agreement.

An international agreement! Now, I will read President Cleveland's message in 1885. The President says:

"The desire to utilize the silver product of the country should not lead to a misuse or the perversion of this power.

"The necessity for such an addition to the silver currency of the Nation as is compelled by the Silver-Coinage Act, is negatived by the fact that up to the present time only about fifty million of the silver dollars so coined have actually found their way into circulation, leaving more than one hundred million sixty-five thousand in the possession of the Government, the custody of which has entailed a considerable expense for the construction of vaults for its deposit. Against this latter amount there are outstanding silver certificates amounting to about $93,000,000.

"Every month two million of gold in the Public Treasury are paid out for two million or more of silver dollars, to be added to the idle mass already accumulated.

"If continued long enough, this operation will result in the substitution of silver for all the gold the Government owns applicable to its general purposes. It will not do to rely upon the customs receipts of the Government to make good this drain of gold, because the silver thus coined having been made legal tender for all debts and dues, public and private, at times during the last 6 months 58 percent of the receipts for duties has been in silver or silver certificates, while the average within that period has been 20 percent. The proportion of silver and its certificates received by the Government will probably increase as time goes on, for the reason that the nearer the period approaches when it will be obliged to offer silver in payment of its obligations, the greater inducement there will be to hoard gold against depreciation in the value of silver, or for the purpose of speculating.

"This hoarding of gold has already begun.

"When the time comes that gold has been withdrawn from circulation, then will be apparent the difference between the real value of the silver dollar and a dollar in gold, and the two coins will part company. Gold still the standard of value, and necessary in our dealings with other countries, will be at a premium over silver; banks which have substituted gold for the deposits of their customers may pay them with silver bought with such gold, thus making a handsome profit; rich speculators will sell their hoarded gold to their neighbors who need it to liquidate their foreign debts, at a ruinous premium over silver, and the laboring men and women of the land, most defenseless of all, will find that the dollar received for the wage of their toil has sadly shrunk in its purchasing power.

"It may be said that the latter result will be but temporary, and that ultimately the price of labor will be adjusted to the change; but even if this takes place the wage worker cannot possibly gain, but must inevitably lose, since the price he is compelled to pay for his living will not only be measured in a coin heavily depreciated, and fluctuating and uncertain in its value, but this uncertainty in the value of the purchasing medium will be made the pretext for an advance in prices beyond that justified by actual depreciation.

"The words uttered in 1834 by Daniel Webster in the Senate of the United States are true today: "The very man of all others who has the deepest interest in a sound currency, and who suffers most by mischievous legislation in money matters, is the man who earns his daily bread by his daily toil."

Mr. President, if you will read this message of 1885 on the Bland law, and read the late message you will find this quotation in both of them, and you will find the conditions predicted almost alike, the same conditions practically, which were predicted as existing in 1885 and 1886 under the Bland law.

When President Cleveland was first elected, and when he issued the celebrated letter from which I am quoting, and then in 1885 sent to Congress the message to which I have referred, urging and pleading for the repeal of the Bland law just as strongly as he asks now for the repeal of the Sherman law, it precipitated some discussion of what was going on in 1885, and what was causing the crisis which was then impending, and I want to examine it.

On July 14, 1886, in the House of Representatives—that was the first Congress assembled after President Cleveland's inauguration—the Forty-ninth Congress, first session, House Joint Resolution No. 126, directing payment of the surplus in the Treasury on the public debt was passed; yeas 207—144 Democrats, 61 Republicans, 2 Independents; nays 67—14 Democrats, 53 Republicans.

July 27, 1886, in the Senate, Mr. Allison reported it with a substitute, which was passed; yeas 42—13 Democrats, 29 Republicans; nays 20—14 Democrats, 6 Republicans. It was placed in conference, and the conference report was adopted in the House of Representatives August 3, 1886; yeas 120—73 Democrats, 47 Republicans; nays 63—34 Democrats, 23 Republicans, 1 Independent, and agreed to in the Senate August 4, 1886, without division.

The President would not sign it. It went to him on the last day of the session, and he killed it by what we call a pocket veto; that is, he refused to sign it. He made no return to Congress, so far as I have been able to ascertain, of his reasons for it; but in a very handsome book called State Papers of Grover Cleveland, which I possess, I find these remarks made in connection with that joint resolution:

"This resolution involves so much and is of such serious import, that I do not deem it best to discuss it at this time. It is not approved, because I believe it to be unnecessary, and because I am by no means convinced that its mere passage and approval at this time may not endanger and embarrass the successful and useful operations of the Treasury Department and impair the confidence which the people should have in the management of the finances of the Government."

That was not a very dangerous joint resolution. There was some question as to the right of the President to pay out certain amounts to redeem certain bonds, etc. The joint resolution, as it passed and as it was pocketed by the President, provided:

"That whenever the surplus or balance in the Treasury, including amount held for redemption of United States notes, shall exceed the sum of $100,000,000, it shall be, and is hereby made, the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to apply such excess, in sums not less than ten millions per month, during the existence of any such surplus or excess, to the payment of the interest-bearing indebtedness of the United States payable at the option of the Government.

* * * * *

"Provided, That no call shall be made under the provisions of this resolution until a sum equal to the call is in the Treasury over and above the reserve herein mentioned: *And provided further,* That the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion may have in the Treasury, over and above the foregoing sums, a working balance not exceeding $20,000,000."

One hundred million dollars of actual reserve and $20,000,000 of working balance. It is true that this joint resolution did not discriminate between silver dollars and gold dollars. It referred to the surplus in the Treasury, and I apprehend its terms would have embraced the silver dollars as well as the gold dollars; but the President did not sign it. That joint resolution was considerably discussed in the Senate, and the causes which had precipitated that panic were discussed; and now I want to read something of what was said in the discussion as to the causes of the panic. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 17, part 8, Forty-ninth Congress, July 29, 1886, page 7674, from the speech of Senator Beck:

"If I may be allowed to guess, I could guess that it has a very proper meaning. Last year the Secretary of the Treasury was induced to lock up money in the Treasury, as we all agree now, greatly beyond what the interest of the people required, and very much beyond what was needed for the wants or security of the Government, because of combinations of men of wealth and power in New York and elsewhere, many of whom held bonds as security for national-bank circulation. They did not want to have the bonds paid and the circulation based upon them withdrawn, and they determined that they would ruin the country rather than receive any part of their principal or interest in silver coin. They made earnest and successful efforts through their combinations to alarm our Treasury officials. They endeavored to make them believe that they would bring on a panic in regard to the finances of the country unless all the surplus money was held in the Treasury; and their demand for gold, and gold alone, was acceded to. I believe they alarmed the Secretary of the Treasury. I believe that much of the useless locking up of our money was because of that apprehension, and I do not speak of these things without authority. I have before me a very able review, though a somewhat bitter one, of the speech I made in the Senate last winter, by Hon. Horace White, of New York, a very well-informed man. In that review he said, among other things:

"A sort of panic ensued in the money market, and it came to my knowledge that Governor Tilden was one of a considerable number of persons who, without any concert of action, had bought large amounts of sterling exchange in order to protect themselves against loss in case silver should become our monetary standard. Sterling exchange means gold in London. Why was Governor Tilden buying sterling exchange? Because, happening to have on hand a certain number of dollars worth 100 cents each in gold and apprehending that if left in bank they would presently be worth only 90 or 80 or perhaps 75 cents each, he took the precaution to insure that they should continue to be worth 100 cents. He had only to write a few lines to his banker to insure this result. This was a typical case of the domineering 'organizations of wealth' that Mr. Beck has conjured up.

"And so on.

"A very able man, perhaps as able as Mr. White and as well informed, Mr. Abram Hewitt, of New York, made a speech very lately in which he said:

" 'I have reason to know when the present administration came into power its first and chiefest concern was to avoid the danger which had been predicted by the Republican Secretary in his official statement and in his private communications. The amount of gold in the Treasury on the 4th of March 1885 was $126,000,000. This was a much smaller sum than had usually been held in the Treasury in gold since the resumption of specie payment. It was steadily running down. The public confidence was gone. The hoarding of gold had begun—not by the mass of the people, not in stockings, not in secret hiding places, but by the masters of finance, the men whose business it is to handle millions and to prevent their deterioration; they began to prepare for the hour of danger and the collapse which they thought was impending.

" 'I know three of the greatest institutions in the city of New York—I shall not name them lest it might possibly bring down upon them the condemnation of those who are prejudiced against banks—but I know three institutions in the city of New York which had accumulated more than $25,000,000 of gold as a preparation for the collapse which they thought was coming.' "

Mr. CALL. Who was that?

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. Abram S. Hewitt, of New York, a gold monometallist. This was the predicament of President Cleveland in the beginning of his first administration. The whole administration was trembling and shaking with dread and trepidation for fear that the Treasury Department would be dishonored and degraded. Whence did they get

their information? From these masters of finance, the New York bankers, brokers, and option dealers.

I am quoting now from Senator Beck:

"These men were conspiring to break us down. It was a well-organized effort, no doubt. They sent their emissaries from one end of the land to the other, they held their conventions all over the country, seeking to alarm the laboring masses, and to make good their threats if we dared to say that silver and gold should stand upon an equality before the law and that they should be required to take either at the option of the Government, like other people. It was these combinations, whose power our executive officers knew, which actuated the Secretary of the Treasury to make, at their suggestion or demand, the miserable, abortive, absurd effort last summer to save the country from ruin by the exchange for gold of $10,000,000 of fractional currency."

Just think of the great Secretary going up there and bowing to these masters of finance, and begging them to let him have gold for subsidiary silver coinage!

"That abortion I need not do more than allude to, because it was too contemptible to deceive anybody and fell flat before it was consummated."

Suggested Reading for Southeast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I submit an able editorial from the pen of my friend, Willis M. Ball, of the Florida Times-Union, to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

SUGGESTED READING FOR SOUTHEAST

Everybody in the Southeast ought to read the article The Southeastern States in a War Economy, published in the weekly bulletin of April 29 of the Department of Commerce. The article, written by Roscoe Arant, regional business consultant of the Department, emphasizes what has been repeatedly said in these columns about opportunities of development and progress in the Southeast and South generally.

After reviewing the extent to which the Southeast has been drawn into the war economy, and the contribution this section is making to the war effort, the question of transition from wartime to peacetime activities is discussed. It is this to which we want to call particular attention.

Viewing the transition period in the Southeast with respect to its long-range aspects, Mr Arant cites certain major trends which appear to stand out.

The first is that of a sound industrial development which has been in progress for a number of years and which has been accentuated many times over as a result of the war. Conditions are now such as to place the process on a permanent and continuing basis among the prime reasons for which are the following:

1. There has been successful experimentation with a number of agricultural products which, together with the region's large capacities for the production of aluminum and other lightweight metals, its forestry possibilities, and its minerals, clays, and other resources from the ground, provide materials for industrial processing.

2. The location of important war industries in the South has given many thousands of its population experience in industrial processing and an opportunity to develop sk[illed] in quantity the region has never known before.

3. The large amount of electric energy which will be released for industrial use at the conclusion of the war, agumented by other known, but as yet undeveloped, potential supplies, will provide ample motive power.

4. Important industrial plant facilities built for the manufacture of war supplies should hold attractive possibilities for conversion to the production of peacetime requirements.

5. Large incomes more widely distributed should hold attractive market possibilities, both urban and rural, within the region.

6. The growing interest on the part of bankers and other businessmen of the region ir the opportunities and importance of local capital investments within the region will act as a stabilizer of public policy toward industry.

An important trend is also noticeable in agriculture, says the regional consultant. The movement which began a number of years ago and which has been accentuated under the impetus of war, appears to be definitely toward a better-balanced, better-rationalized, and more profitable system of agriculture predicated on a sound and sustaining basis.

After decades of overconcentration in cotton production, diversification and rotation of crops, and the appearance of new crops, greater attention to livestock, soil conservation, and other developments have given new impetus to farming in the Southeast. Millions of acres have passed into the production of peanuts, soybeans, potatoes, vegetables, and other food and feed crops, each of which has large potentialities in peacetime markets.

The large number of end products and the means of utilizing peanuts, soybeans, potatoes, and other crops as oils, paints, dyes, varnishes, plastics, and chemicals, in addition to their uses as food and feed, promise continuous and stabilized markets.

Many other important points are made in the article, but these suffice to show that in the Southeast a solid foundation is ready and waiting for a sound superstructure of development in both industrial and agricultural enterprises. Arguments presented by Mr. Arant to bear out this statement are enlightening and convincing, and should inspire all who read them to put forth greater efforts toward realizing the goal he holds up before the people of the Southeast.

Devastating Floods

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, while we are celebrating the tenth anniversary of the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, while the people along the streams of that valley are protected from devastating floods and are enjoying cheap electricity, as well as a new and splendid system of river navigation, we find that because of the failure to pursue that policy throughout the Nation and especially along the streams of the Middle West, devastating floods are destroying untold millions of dollars' worth of property and taking a terrible toll of human lives.

While that destruction is going on, there is also a loss of billions of kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power that should be generated for the use of the people in that great section of the country, on the Ohio, the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the White, the Arkansas, and all their tributaries. A wealth of hydroelectric power that is more valuable than the diamond mines of Golconda is going to waste.

What we have done on the Tennessee River should be done for every other watershed in America.

Highway Construction and Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Frank W. Herring, Assistant Director National Resources Planning Board, before the annual meeting of the American Road Builders' Association, Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Ill., Friday, May 7, 1943:

For 10 years before the war began, the central economic problem of the United States was persistent unemployment. But unemployment has now ceased to be our major national problem, and it is not likely that it will reappear until the war ends. In the meantime we are concerned—and most rightly so—that we be prepared to solve the problem when it does reappear.

In speaking to you today of the role of highway construction in the solution of the unemployment problem, I find I must make three basic assumptions, with which I am sure you will not quarrel:

First, as members of the American Road Builders' Association, I assume that you are interested in seeing that a steady and, if possible, an expanding volume of road-construction activity is carried on in the future. The more roads the Nation builds, the more business you will have.

Second, as consumers and taxpayers, I assume that you do not wish road-construction operations to become so large that they become an undue burden upon the Nation's ability to pay for them. As consumers, you want roads and other goods and services, you do not want the choice to be roads or other goods and services.

Third, as citizens of this great Nation, I assume that you are interested in assuring freedom from want among your fellow citizens. And we know that freedom from want cannot be achieved without full employment of those able to work and the discharge of

our collective responsibility to share the product of our industry with those who are unable to work because of health or age.

Obviously, the ideal situation from your own standpoint would be one under which the volume of road construction would be large and would grow progressively larger, but would not become so great as to be an undue burden upon your living standards and incomes, while at the same time freedom from want for all your fellow citizens would be assured.

My remarks this afternoon will be directed toward an examination of the circumstances under which this happy combination of events could occur.

Returning to our first assumption, then, the question is, Under what conditions can we look forward to a steady—and possibly expanding—volume of road construction after the war? It is clear that road improvements in an increasing volume will be needed if highway traffic increases; and traffic will increase if the motor vehicle continues to provide the most desirable mode of transport for the use to which it is put. If the war were to end this year, we might—upon the basis of past trends—easily expect within the next 10 years a 30-percent increase in motor-vehicle registrations and an even greater increase in highway traffic, provided—and this is the big unknown—that the airplane does not begin to assume a major role in interregional transportation, and that a reorganization of land-use patterns and of economic activities in our urban areas does not reduce the volume of necessary intra-urban travel.

The extent of the use of the airplane in the future is the great unknown quantity. Individual airplane ownership will depend largely upon the price at which manufacturers can produce and sell a low-priced and reasonably safe airplane. On the other hand, it is clear, I believe, that the use of the airplan can be greatly encouraged by the provision of abundant and accessible landing facilities along with proper aids for, and the simplification of, air navigation. In a large measure this is a governmental responsibility, just as the provision of roads has been. And it is, indeed, from your standpoint, a happy coincidence that the procedures of airport construction are not too dissimilar from those of road building.

There are, to be sure, great opportunities for complementary use of motor vehicles and airplanes, airplanes for intercity transportation and motor vehicles for short-run local travel. But such opportunities only throw into bolder relief the Nation's foremost road-building problem: getting motor vehicles into, out of, and around in our urban areas. And the increasing concentrations of war workers in our urban industrial centers today have only further served to underline our past failures to recognize the problem of building adequate urban highways. It is time to shift our emphasis from getting the traffic out of the mud to getting the traffic out of the muddle.

No unusual acuteness is needed to note that wartime gasoline and tire shortages have taught us, as nothing else could, that our modern American city is an uneconomic, if not almost an impossible, organization for daily living in the absence of a means of transportation that is as convenient and cheap as the automobile. Therefore, it is clear to me that we must provide urban highway systems that meet the demands of our urban auto traffic. But if we fail to provide the proper urban highways, we must either provide mass transportation facilities to replace the motor vehicle or prepare for a form of urban living quite different from what we have known it to be in the past.

It is true that a radical change in our urban life is already taking place. There has been a gradual dispersion of population within our urban regions. It has been said, with much truth, that the central cities—the cores of our urban regions—have been exploding. But the explosive force has been generated only in part by the difficulties of getting traffic into and out of the central business districts. Equally important has been the development of the far-flung distribution of electric power, which has cut the bonds that tied industry close to the steam engine; while the standardization of mass-production methods, together with the use of the motor truck, have made possible the decentralization of industry and the more rapid and cheaper distribution of industrial products.

Accordingly, our future urban highway needs cannot be judged solely in terms of access to the central area. We must think of the pattern of land use in the entire urban community, and of the way in which that pattern will influence and be influenced by the construction of highways. This puts a heavy responsibility upon the skill and foresight of highway builders and officials, particularly local Government officials. Each urban area will present a problem of its own. There is no simple formula that can be prescribed from Washington or from a State capitol that will solve the highway problem for every urban area.

Thus, insofar as my first assumption is concerned, it appears that future volumes of road construction may well depend upon three major turning points: First, the development and use of the airplane; second, the providing of facilities for the joint use of airplanes and motor vehicles; and third, the proper planning of traffic movement in our urban regions.

My second assumption involves an estimate of the size of our future highway construction programs in relation to our ability to pay for them.

With reasonably full employment and a national income of $110,000,000,000 a year—in terms of pre-war prices—after the war, it is probable that we could afford to spend about fourteen billions annually on all construction—both public and private—without unduly interfering with our demands for other goods and services. But this does not mean that we could spend fourteen billions annually for highways alone. If we did, we would have to do without new houses, schools, hospitals, electric-light systems, and all of the other kinds of private and public construction that we will need.

On the basis of our past experience, furthermore, with a national income of $110,000,000,000 there would be about two and one-half billion dollars expended annually for the construction of all transportation facilities. Of this amount about one and three-quarter billion dollars would be spent for highways, roads, and streets. If motor vehicles should continue to displace other forms of transport, we should spend more; if highway transport should be displaced by other forms we should spend less, but probably not less than one-half billion dollars a year. Expenditure of a smaller amount annually would mean that we would not be keeping up with the current necessary replacement in our systems.

It is true, of course, that during the war we are allowing road and street building to fall below what I have just estimated as a "minimum" level of one-half billion dollars annually, in order to use our resources and manpower for more direct war purposes. But road building is not the only war casualty in this respect. All other normal civilian construction operations are similarly being cut to the bone.

The main point is, however, that when the war ends, even with full employment and a national income of one hundred and ten billions, road building cannot have an exclusive claim on our construction resources—our construction labor, materials, and equipment. For example, we shall need houses no less than we shall need roads. To give one a disproportionate share of our national effort would mean that we should suffer for the lack of the other.

It is good that there are persons today who recognize the need for more and better roads and houses and schools and hospitals and all the other physical assets on which modern civilization depends. But if we add together all of these needed and worthy programs, they will total more than we can do, given our resources and manpower. I estimate that we should have to have a national income of between $150,000,000,000 and $175,000,000,000 a year for 10 years after the war in order to accomplish all of these proposed programs. To reach that level of income would require a tremendous increase—no less than 50 percent—in the productivity of our workers. Otherwise, and with an income level of only $110,000,000,000 a year, we should be trying to accomplish 50 percent more in the way of construction than we ought to do if we are not to cut our production of the other goods and services that we need equally as much.

Taking my second assumption then, it appears that with a high national income of one hundred and ten billions a year, we should anticipate about fourteen billions a year for all construction, private and public, of which about one and three-quarters billion dollars should be for the construction of highways, roads, and streets.

My third assumption deals with the question of your assuring freedom from want among your fellow citizens. First of all, let me define what I mean by freedom from want. It means this: All people, willing and able to work, must always be able to earn a living doing useful things. Their jobs must be in occupations for which they are fitted—or can be fitted—and which they can perform efficiently. The goods and services which they produce must be such that they can be exchanged for other goods and services produced by other people. And, finally, those people unable to work because of health or age must, until such time as they are able to work or until they die, share in the goods and services produced by those who are working.

As I said in the beginning, freedom from want cannot be achieved without full employment and a recognition of our collective responsibility to those less fortunate of our fellow men who are unable—because of health or age—to work.

We have already gone a long way in our struggle to assure this freedom. In our time we have recognized that society has a collective responsibility to the young, the sick, the aged, and the infirm. The next step in our struggle is to achieve and maintain full employment, a universal opportunity to earn a living. When the war ends, new jobs must be found for at least one out of every four men and women that comprise our war working force and our armed services. The magnitude of our national unemployment problem will not be any less than it was in 1933, and as one of our foremost news commentators, Mr. Walter Lippmann, has recently put it, "Nothing will ever persuade the American people after this war that unemployment is an act of God about which men can do nothing."

The question then is, What must be done to achieve full employment? In my judgment, the task is a fourfold one:

First, the healthy and aggressive development of private enterprise must be encouraged, for upon it rests the major responsi-

bility for assuring that opportunities for earning a living will be available.

Second, our expenditures on the maintenance and increase of our physical assets—our houses, our commercial buildings, our roads, our streets, our schools—must be kept in balance with our voluntary savings as a nation. This means that the more we save the more we must invest, if we are to keep our economy on an even keel. The Government can aid in maintaining this balance by providing those types of common facilities and improvements which encourage and induce private investment. For example, as you are aware, the tremendous public-highway expenditures of the past two decades facilitated the use, sale, and production of the automobile, and, consequently, the capital investment in automobile and tire-manufacturing facilities, and in gasoline distributing, refining, and extracting facilities. Also, as I have pointed out, a Nation-wide airport program would probably similarly encourage civilian flying and thus expand investments in airplane manufacturing and servicing facilities. Harnessing our unused water power to provide electric energy for our expanding electro-chemical industries encourages further investment in these industries. All of these provide ways by which government can encourage in a positive way more private investment and thus aid in maintaining the balance between the total of our national voluntary savings and our national expenditures for the maintenance and increase of our capital plant.

Third, we must assure the distribution of the goods and services that we produce. In the past our inventive genius has won the battle of production through our development of mass-production techniques. We can produce the goods—that is no longer a problem—but our exchange mechanism has frequently fallen far behind. If we are to have full employment, however, the exchange of the goods and services that are produced must take place continuously.

Fourth—and finally—we may conceivably find that even if we have done all of these things to try and achieve full employment, the goal has still not been reached. There may be periods of adjustment, such as will follow the end of the war, when workers may be disemployed through no fault of their own. During such temporary periods the Government must assure the exchange process through unemployment compensation, and aid in maintaining the savings-investment balance by expanding those construction and improvement activities which will, in turn, induce more private investment outlays. And, as General Fleming has pointed out in a statement earlier in this conference, the expansion of public construction and improvement activities cannot be achieved rapidly at such a time without the preparation in advance of the detailed plans and blueprints for the works and structures we will have to build.

The important point in this fourth and last part of our task is that our general policy must be such as to assure that public construction projects and programs will always be so selected as to provide the maximum service benefits and thus encourage the maximum of sound economic activity. In other words, work should not be undertaken just for work's sake, construction programs should not be undertaken merely to provide employment on construction. A policy of work for work's sake might easily lead us into a type of monumental road building program that produces broad strips of pavement that lead nowhere in particular and serve no transportation need worthy of mention. We might just as well build pyramids.

In the past, highways have been needed—almost any highways, so scarce has been our supply in relation to the demand. In the future we shall have to exercise greater discrimination to provide those highway facilities that will serve our Nation the most. Our need for highways in the future will be measured by the character of our transportation needs. To assume otherwise may indeed lead to an unfortunate and expensive error.

Give the Oil Operators a Fair Chance—They Will Produce the Necessary Oil Without Subsidy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the following resolution recently adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Tyler, Tex.:

Whereas the city of Tyler, Tex., is located in the center of the greatest oil-producing area in this Nation, and the interests of its citizens are closely allied with the oil industry; and

Whereas the recent action of Hon. Prentiss M. Brown, Price Administrator, in proposing a form of governmental subsidy for the drilling of wildcat wells is viewed with grave concern and alarm in this vicinity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Tyler, representing the businessmen of the city, including several hundred men actively engaged in the oil business, at a regular meeting held on Tuesday, May 11, 1943, That it unqualifiedly and emphatically opposes the plan as advocated by Price Administrator Prentiss M. Brown, for subsidizing the drilling of oil wells, for the following reasons:

1. The peculiar nature of the business of oil exploration, with its lack of uniformity in methods and process, its attendant risks and hazards, demands that it be conducted solely by private enterprise and independently of governmental affiliations.

2. The greatness of the oil industry in this country has been predicated upon the individual initiative, ingenuity, and ability of those who have pioneered in the development of new fields, and any form of governmental ownership or partnership is repugnant to the spirit of the industry.

3. A governmental subsidy would serve to deter future exploration by responsible operators, and would only encourage irresponsible and incompetent promoters. It would require a tremendous organization of specialists to pass on the merits of wildcat wells. These specialists would have to be taken from the present experienced personnel of the industry, and in so doing the shortage already being felt in all branches of the oil business would become more acute.

4. The proposed plan would retard rather than hasten much-needed drilling for the discovery of new oil reserves, because of the cumbersome procedure and the attendant delay inevitably associated with governmental bureaus.

5. The proposed plan would tend to subject the oil industry to the harmful influences of political manipulation and the baneful effects of the spoils system.

6. It is economically unsound to subsidize an industry at the expense of the taxpaying public when the payment of a fair price for the product of the industry by the consumers would solve the problem.

TYLER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
V. P. FITZHUGH,
General Manager.

The Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEX GREEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I strongly urge that each of you study and give favorable consideration to H. R. 1649. This is the Townsend plan bill for relief for the aged and for the benefit of our Nation in general. The hazards of the war crisis has augmented and made more imperative enactment of this legislation. There exists now a greater need than ever for enactment of this legislation, and I urge that each of you give it your thought, study, and support.

It is my purpose a little later to speak on the provisions of this bill and the imperativeness of its enactment at this time.

In the meantime, in this connection and for your special consideration, I submit to you a letter from Dr. Francis E. Townsend, the author of the plan, to southerners in the United States Congress, as follows:

To Southerners in United States Congress:

You have just tossed the god of war a multi-billion-dollar repast that he will assimilate in no time at all and be back to you for more, so do not be afraid of a request I shall make of you for a little donation to the goddess of peace; a donation that she will use over and over again for your benefit and the benefit of all of us, never destroying it, as will the god of war, creating happiness and comfort for all of us, instead of destruction, agony, and despair.

But before I proffer my request for the goddess of peace, let us do a little historical reviewing.

Ever since the carpet-bag era following the Civil War, you southern leaders have sat complacently by and watched the northern industrialists and banking fraternity suck you dry of your wealth as fast as it was created. They have had the juice of your industrial orange and you have had the bitter rind.

ADD TO POVERTY

Through Federal taxes imposed upon you and which you have paid without a murmur, you have contributed to your own poverty and to the poverty of the southern people. You paid no attention to what was done with those Federal taxes. You knew that the Federal Government collected those taxes but it did not seem to occur to you that much of that Federal tax money you sent to Washington was being paid in the form of pensions to northern soldiers. How many billions of dollars do you think the South has contributed to northern pensions in the past 75 years?

If you had been alert to the welfare of your own section of the United States, would

you not have devised some way whereby you could have at least profited to a like extent with the North in this matter of pensions? The North has mulcted you through taxes, interest, and profits on manufactured goods for three-quarters of a century and the results are to be seen throughout the South.

Poverty, hunger, and dirt has been the lot of the common people of the South. Your farmers are trying to compete with the mechanized farmers of the North. Last summer I saw farmers in Alabama plowing their run-down fields with a bony ox hitched to an old-fashioned shovel plow, trying to wrest a living from unfertilized fields in competition with farmers living on the most fertile land in the world and possessed with the implements and equipment to enable them to cultivate 20 times as much land per man.

REGION IS RICH

Do you think the poverty of the South is due to any inherent poverty of the land, or any shortage of natural resources? Your Southland is one of the richest regions on the earth. The South's poverty can be laid very largely to a dearth of statesmanship on the part of her leaders. And if this statesmanship cannot be improved; if Southern leaders cannot be made to see the imminence of the danger that is confronting this Nation and especially the danger that will face the South when a peace of exhaustion is forced upon the world—a peace that will leave millions starving throughout the world—then the outlook for the South is dark indeed.

Where shall the poor of the South turn for bread when those who are employing them scantily and paying them scantily are reduced to a like level of poverty through Federal imposition of confiscatory taxes following this destructive war?

Now, gentlemen, is the time to fortify your Southland against the day of disaster. Now is the time to build your fortifications against the wreckage that the god of war leaves in his wake. Build well if you would not see your young men destroyed, your fields untilled, your granaries empty.

CONSIDERED ORPHANS

Gentlemen, ours is a Government for all the people without discrimination or it is not a Government worth preserving. I maintain that the citizens of Arkansas and of Mississippi are children of the United States of America as much as are the citizens of New York or California. Yet, our National Government does not so consider them. Our Government discriminates against them. The Government says to the citizens of the South, "You are of inferior clay. Because you are impoverished, you should be punished. Your helpless old I will permit to exist, but the standard of living you deserve shall be measured by my contribution to you in the form of a pension, which shall be around $3.50 per month. The citizens of New York and California, however, having been enterprising and fruitful of taxes for my Treasury, I will reward when they grow old, with $20 per month. They are of superior clay." Gentlemen, if you see no injustice nor discrimination against the South in this attitude of your Government, there is something wrong with your mental vision.

Now let us right this wrong. Let us be logical. Let us plan our future intelligently. If the capitalistic form of government is to be preserved, it must be altered to permit everyone to have equal opportunity to shape his life toward ever higher standards of living. We must all be permitted to rise above poverty.

URGES DISTRIBUTION

In order to have more wealth for all, we must produce more wealth and see that it is equitably distributed. To produce more wealth, we must do more business, for the only way wealth is produced is through business. To do more business, we must have more customers who are able to buy. There should be no idle and useless classes of citizens. And here is the way to eliminate them:

Pension the old and physically disabled. Make important customers of them. When they are unable to produce directly, let them produce indirectly by becoming liberal buyers of the things that business and industry create. Let them be market builders. This thing we call the market is something that should be looked upon as a public possession. It takes all of us to create it. Everybody who makes a living has to use the public market in which to sell that through which he makes his living. Very well, let us say to everybody, by way of the law, "Since everybody uses the market, everybody must pay at a like rate for the uses he makes of it. The man who sells his labor in the labor market and who earns more than $100 each month must pay the public for the privilege; say, 3 cents on the dollar in excess of his $100-per-month exemption. The manufacturer who sells $8,000 worth of goods in a day must pay the public $240, and so on; each and every firm and individual contributing according to the income he enjoys under the protection of the Government."

ADDS PAY ROLL

If this were done and the tax money so raised distributed throughout the entire population monthly in the form of pensions to all unemployables on a pro rata basis and they were required to buy goods or services with all the money received each month as fast as they received it, each and every community in the land could have a monthly pay roll that would be the equivalent of having a factory move into the community—a factory that would employ about a tenth of the population at good wages.

This would start money moving in each community and keep it moving. Moving money would create business. Business would create new wealth. New wealth of goods and services, taxed as they were sold, would be vastly increased and would flow in a never-ending stream into every nook and corner of the land, for money would be there beckoning the goods to come.

Surely, surely, gentleman of the Southland, here is your opportunity to serve your own community and, at the same time, serve the entire country. Why do you hesitate? Is it merely that you have not seen this method of creating prosperity tried and are afraid of anything new? Gentlemen, you have less reason to fear new methods than you have to fear old, vicious, and discredited practices. These latter, if clung to and retained, will utterly destroy this civilization.

Dr. FRANCIS E. TOWNSEND.

Navy Night

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD three short addresses which were some of the special features of Navy Night held on May 10 last at the Maryland Historical Society in Baltimore.

Navy Night, on May 10, was one of a series of meetings held by the vigorous century-old Maryland Historical Society in the interest of varying phases of our war activities. The list of meetings held this spring by the Maryland Historical Society includes also, among others, those devoted to the Army, foreign relations, and post-war problems; and one on merchant marine will be held on June 7.

At Navy Night, many ship models, relics, pictures, and documents were on exhibition. Some of those were a part of the very large and valuable historical collection of the Maryland Historical Society, of which Society I am president. Other exhibits were loaned by Rear Admiral John R. Beardall, Superintendant of the United States Naval Academy, and by various other individuals.

The naval exhibits illustrated the very prominent role which Maryland has played in the naval history of the United States. We often think of the successful defense of Baltimore and of the writing of the Star-Spangled Banner as Maryland's outstanding contributions during the War of 1812. Maryland's participation in it was not only very large but also quite varied in scope. For instance, Maryland furnished an astonishingly large proportion of the total number of ships and seamen engaged in the War of 1812—in fact, about one-half of each. Not only Baltimore city but all the tidewater areas of the State made substantial contributions to our 1812 war activities.

The first address at Navy Night was by Mr. Hamilton Owens, who is the editor of the Baltimore Sun. He is an able editor and essayist, and also is an outstanding historian who has written numerous interesting and informative articles and books on the subject of Maryland history. Another address was by Hon. James V. Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, a most excellent type of financier and businessman who is devoting his time and his energies conscientiously and very effectively to the handling of our problems of the Navy. A third speech was by Rear Admiral W. H. P. Blandy, United States Navy, Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance, who has a highly constructive record of achievement in the Navy, especially in the solution of major problems regarding antiaircraft guns, armor plate torpedoes, and other features of modern naval warfare.

The three short speeches by Mr. Owens, Under Secretary Forrestal, and Admiral Blandy were so suggestive, so able, and so timely that it seems to be particularly appropriate at this time that they should be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that such action be taken. The estimate as to cost of insertion is $216.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY MR. HAMILTON OWENS, EDITOR OF THE BALTIMORE SUN

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, Mr. Forrestal and Admiral Blandy, I am sure, know that Baltimore, so far from the sea, has had from the very beginning a special concern with and for the Navy. Perhaps it is because we are so many miles from the coast that we cling all the more closely to our salt-water life line and emphasize more strongly than most cities that the sea is our heritage.

In any event, that is our practice. The list of our naval heroes and of the achievement in battle of our ships and men is a long one. Joshua Barney is our most picturesque naval figure. Stephen Decatur, Jr., is ours only by the accident of birth, but one of the ships he commanded was Baltimore built. That was, of course, the lucky little *Enterprise*. The old *Constellation*, in exile at Newport, is our most famous ship. The 30-hour bombardment of Fort McHenry is the best known of our battles, though, of course, we were land-fighting against a sea-borne force in that particular affair.

It occurred to me that, in all our history, there is no better proof of Baltimore's understanding of the need for a Navy and the true function of a naval force—which is to keep open the sea lanes—than is to be found in the tale of the Maryland ship of war *Defence* whose short but useful career began before the signing of the Declaration of Independence. The story is a familiar one to many in this audience but it is such a good yarn and has so many overtones, some of them not without humor, that I am going to risk outlining it once again.

When the Commonwealth of Maryland determined to join in the general resistance to British tyranny, one of its first decisions was to contribute two vessels to the national cause under congressional authorization. They were the sloop *Hornet*, Bermuda built, and the schooner *Wasp*, characteristic product of a Chesapeake yard. Barney, incidentally, got his first naval commission at this time. He was second lieutenant on the *Hornet*.

Both of these vessels went speedily to sea to joint the new Continental Fleet under Capt. Esek Hopkins. Baltimore itself was left with no ships of war to patrol the Chesapeake Bay and guard the approaches to the port. This meant, of course, that if the British decided to blockade and cut off the flour and tobacco trade they could do so at no cost to themselves. It also meant that if they decided to attack, they could land forces with impunity and march in the city's back door despite the several defenses set up to guard the harbor.

The town's leading citizens, wiser in matters of naval strategy than one would have thought, saw the situation as soon as the British did and hastily secured from the general assembly at Annapolis the right to commission their own ship of war to sail under the flag of Maryland. By the easy, informal methods of the time it was natural that two of the town's merchants should be appointed agents in the enterprise and given authority to use the State's funds—in bills of course—in payment therefor.

I will not bore you with all the details of the processes by which this first vessel in the Maryland navy was acquired. Because of the danger of the blockade, a number of ships were tied up in the harbor. Among them was a stout vessel, rather larger than the characteristic schooners of the time, which belonged to a merchant named John Smith. She was a full-rigged ship. She was about 85 feet long over-all, and her beam was about 25 feet. She was deep in the stern, like most Chesapeake vessels, and when fully loaded she drew 12½ feet. This means that compared to most of the Baltimore boats, she was commodious and able. Mr. Smith, although a patriot, was not averse to setting a good figure on her. The merchants, acting for the State, of course, agreed to pay him 1,350 pounds sterling as she stood.

The next thing was to find a commander. In those days, as in these, the Eastern Shore produced a special breed of sailors. Among the well-to-do families over there was one with the surname Nicholson, with many sons. The second of these was James Nicholson. He was a bright and engaging youth and his family had sent him to England for an education. While there he decided to make the sea his profession and, as a junior officer in the British navy, he was present at the siege of Havana in 1762. This gave him a reputation throughout the colony as a man experienced in naval affairs. He was something of a politician, too, and it was not surprising that he was chosen to command the new warship. He gave her the name *Defence* and set himself immediately to the task of fitting her out in accordance with the prestige of a soon-to-be sovereign State. He was given a stipend of 500 pounds sterling that he might live according to his station while the work was in progress.

When the ship was bought she had a complete set of sails, but Messrs. Lux and Bowley, who were her agents, and who probably chose Mr. Nicholson as commander, thought it well to see that she had a whole new outfit. Mr. Lux was a merchant and a rope-maker, one of the most important in the community. Lux is Latin for light and Light Street is named after him. Mr. Bowley was his father-in-law, also a merchant. He had built one of the town's chief wharfs, which is still called after him.

The order for the canvas for the new sails was given to the firm of S. & R. Purviance, a name which has long been noteworthy in the history of Baltimore. They provided 2,739 yards of sail cloth, for which the State paid something over 285 pounds sterling. New sails implied new rigging. Most of this was made in Mr. Lux's rope-walk on the edge of town. There were more than 11 tons of it and it cost 740 pounds sterling. The anchor and part of the cable were supplied by Mr. H. Young, for £105. Pig iron weighing 42½ tons was needed for ballast. It cost £371. One of the men interested in the smelting of pig iron at that time was Charles Carroll of Carrollton. It is probable that his company supplied at least part of this necessary ballast.

Above everything else, there was the question of guns and munitions. Captain Nicholson worked hard on this. On this little vessel he found space to mount 18 six-pounders on the main deck and 4 more of them on the quarter deck. Britchens and tackle as well as carriages had to be fashioned. The local foundries cast 1,600 round shot and 100 grape, each containing 10 9-ounce balls, the equivalent, perhaps, of modern shrapnel. There were 72 double-headed shot, useful to cut the rigging of an opponent.

One could go on with this sort of compilation. There were powder by the ton, hand grenades, boarding pikes, cutlasses, muskets, handspikes, and all the paraphernalia for the close fighting which was the practice in naval warfare at the time. There were navigation instruments, hourglasses, lead lines, speaking trumpets. There were ships' boats and captain's barges, all handsomely equipped. There were supplies of food—beef, cheese, potatoes, bread, and flour. Bedding for the crew cost £672.

One can imagine the boom along the waterfront as the merchants rushed in to bid for the right to supply the ship. One can imagine the carts hauling the supplies to the dockside, the craftsmen swarming over the ship trying to work amidst the confusion, the carpenters, joiners, and riggers applying for jobs and getting them perhaps at higher wages than they had ever received before. Nearly £2,000 was paid out for days' work actually done on the ship. One can imagine the haughty, handsome figure of Captain Nicholson standing on the quater-deck watching the orderly confusion of the scene below him and imagining himself, probably, as the presiding genius not only in the fitting of the ship but in the heroic battles she was soon to fight if all went well.

Today we talk a lot about the present war boom and what it has done for and to Baltimore. But I imagine that the excitements, the dislocations, the alarums, and excursions along the Baltimore water-front today are not one bit more tremendous, taking scale into consideration, than were the excitements and dislocations which attended the purchase and outfitting of the first Baltimore warship, *Defence*.

You will have noticed that nearly every merchant in the town participated in the business of supplying her and that they got good prices for what they had to sell. You may be tempted to call them profiteers. But before using that word, one ought to remember that this was a time of rapidly rising prices; the merchants, cut off by the non-importation agreements from England which was the usual source of almost all manufactured goods, had to improvise a defense industry. There was no Reconstruction Finance Corporation to finance them. They had to use their own capital. They foresaw a long war and perhaps declining trade. They didn't yet know how well they would be able to do in the business of privateering. They weren't even sure that the State would reimburse them for their outlays. What they knew was that they needed a navy and needed it quickly. They were determined to supply it regardless of cost. They got good prices on paper for what they supplied the Defence. Some of them made fortunes during the war—though they didn't know it until long afterwards. Some of them went bankrupt. But they outfitted the ship. The total cost, including the hull, was 11,272 pounds 18 shillings and 6 pence, or something more than $10 apiece for every man, woman and child in the community.

The *Defence* did not see much in the way of action. Few naval vessels do. They watch, they patrol. They are kept in a state of eternal preparedness. Sometimes they are called upon to act before they are ready. That is what happened to the *Defence*. She was lying at her pier, her decks still cluttered with her multifarious gear, when word came to Baltimore that a new British war vessel was proceeding up the bay to attack the city. This turned out to be H. M. S. *Otter*, a sloop-of-war of considerable power. The commander of the *Otter*, Captain Squire, had heard of the *Defence* and his job was to put her out of business. He had heard, also, that several schooners, loaded with flour, were about to sail from Baltimore and since the British fleet needed flour, he thought he would at one and the same time capture the *Defence* and supply the fleet with the needed bread. He announced to a messenger sent aboard that he was willing to pay for the flour but that he was determined to capture the *Defence*, which he called a privateer. This message he gave out overnight, while he was anchored just north of what we now call Gibson Island.

Next morning, Captain Squire sent a tender, which had accompained him, into the Patapsco River to take a schooner anchored there, loaded with flour and ready to depart for the West Indies. But the news had by this time reached Baltimore. Captain Nicholson, with an alacrity which he did not always display, got his crew aboard, made sail and proceeded down the river. The men on the tender saw him coming, abandoned their prize, and ran toward the protection of the *Otter*. The captain of the latter weighed anchor and prepared for battle. But at this point he fell into difficulty for, not knowing the channel, he struck on a shoal either—Bodkin Point or Seven Foot Knoll—and heeled over considerably, according to the account of a man who happended to be aboard. If the *Defence* had attacked him immediately, he would probably have been destroyed. But each vessel was a little fearful of the strength of the other. They did not come to an actual meeting and finally, as night fell, Nicholson put the *Defence* about and returned to Baltimore. The *Otter* likewise decided it was better not to

come to grips and came about on the rising tide and stood down the bay.

This may seem to us to have been an inconclusive affair but actually, it shows a navy doing precisely what it is supposed to do. During this meeting, in which not a shot was fired, several things happened. The first one, of course, was the recapture of the flour-laden schooner which the British tender had taken. The second was the display of strength by the *Defence*. This display served to convince the commander of the *Otter* that he had better keep his distance from Baltimore. But keeping a distance from Baltimore meant that the near approaches to the city were free, for quite a long time, from hostile forces, and that the flour-laden ships could come and go. When the Marylanders were able to add to the *Defence* and provide not one vessel merely, but a whole fleet, it meant that they could keep the bay almost completely free of British vessels.

During all save 1 or 2 of the long years of the Revolution, Baltimore maintained her trade with remarkably little interference. She had learned the value of a naval force. Later on, most of the burden was taken over in form at least, by the new Federal Government. Baltimore, then as now, was one of the chief shipbuilding centers of the country. And I like to think that, just as the merchants of Revolutionary days knew instinctively the value of a navy, so we, the descendants, know and appreciate the Navy in precisely the same way. They couldn't survive without it and we couldn't either.

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES V. FORRESTAL, UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

I propose to speak to you tonight on a subject which should have and I believe does have great interest to the citizens of Baltimore—the relation of merchant marine to sea power.

Its position at the head of the Chesapeake, midway on the Atlantic seaboard, has made Baltimore always aware of the need for a strong Navy and of adequate American-owned merchant shipping.

This port has witnessed many fluctuations in the fortunes of American shipping, in our sea commerce and in its parallel activity, the building of ships. It has seen wide swings in the barometer of our national interest in sea power.

A reading of American naval history shows a singularly constant pattern from the earliest days of the Republic. There have been periods of sporadic and vigorous interest in sea power and maritime trade, followed by long periods of neglect.

Just prior to and during every war the Nation awakens to the necessities of an adequate merchant marine. Even in the Mexican War this was true—a war fought within the limits of the continent of North America. But as a tragic commentary upon the short life of human experience and memory, after each cessation of hostilities there has invariably followed a sharp and drastic curtailment both of the Navy and of our merchant marine. This occurred four times: after the war of 1812, after the Civil War, for a brief period after 1898, and within our own time, after the World War of 1914-18.

I suppose the lessons of the past should teach us that we shall undergo the same transition of feeling after the conclusion of this struggle—that we shall again turn our minds and eyes to domestic problems, concluding that the purity of our own intentions is sufficient guaranty of our national security. I am just optimistic enough to believe, however, that if we now address ourselves to the task of public education on the relation of seapower and sea trade to our national interest, we may not necessarily go back to the bed of complacency from which we have so rudely dropped so often in the past.

Let me give you a few facts: In 1920, 2 years after the close of the last war, we had 10,000,000 tons of merchant shipping engaged in foreign trade. At the close of the war we had a Navy in being and building which was on the way to world supremacy. We had eight Navy yards capable of building large combatant vessels: About 200 private shipyards engaged in both naval work and work for the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

You are all familiar with the sorry record of subsequent history. At the risk of boring you with a repetition of that history I want to remind you that we all sat in smug satisfaction while the Disarmament Treaty of 1922 entailed upon us the destruction of nearly eight hundred thousand tons of combatant vessels. The merchant ships we had built with a speed that astonished the world were sent to inland harbors, tied together by the dozens and allowed to go into disuse. Against the 10,000,000 tons of merchant shipping in foreign trade in 1920, we had dropped in 1936 to 4,000,000. We had only 135 private shipyards. That was roughly the position of our merchant marine until the vigorous leadership of the Honorable Joseph P. Kennedy of the Maritime Commission began the revitalization of the American Shipping Industry.

The position which the war gave us in the freight and passenger trade on the world sea lanes was lost by inertia.

Possibly the tragic implications of this period can be more spectacularly pointed up by the statement that between 1933 and 1936 we caused to be destroyed or junked something on the order of 140 destroyers. We did this in the fulfillment of commitments taken by us in various treaties and naval limitation agreements a number of years earlier. I submit that the assistance of those destroyers today, even with the limitations of their design and armament, would lend considerable comfort in the current struggle we are waging against the Nazi U-boat in the Atlantic.

This war, waged as it is in in the far corners of the earth and over the seven seas, requires not only naval strength but merchant shipping to carry troops and munitions wherever we are forced to fight, and that fact I believe is self-evident to all of our citizens. Campaigns in north Africa and southwest Pacific cannot be waged without the assurance of continuous transport of men and munitions. Our allies could not have maintained their gallant defense against the scourage of the Nazis in Europe without the goods we have shipped. And we cannot win the clear and decisive victory that we must win without more and more of the ships necessary to transport those goods.

The Navy, which in peacetime we referred to as our first line of defense, has become our first line of offense. But neither defense nor offense can be sustained without the commercial bottoms that carry the means of making war. We have built and are building a splendid Navy but we cannot carry the war to an enemy without a merchant marine to complement it.

The tremendous potentialities of the airplane have caught our national imagination. After this struggle is over it will play a great part in the dynamics of the new and rebuilding world. As a means of swift transport the plane will undoubtedly be of primary importance but I believe that the great bulk of goods and men moving over the earth's seas will continue for many years to be transported by ships.

We must have an adequate Navy but we must also have an adequate merchant marine. We must have the shipbuilding industry to create and sustain them both. Admiral Land and his associates have achieved miracles in the building of ships to meet the exigencies of this war, but let us not depend too much on those miracles in the future, let us instead listen to the wise counsel of men like Jerry Land when the struggle is over and put the sound policies which he has fought so valiantly to create on a permanent basis.

Now I do not think that any speech of mine will insure a change in our national habit of going frantically to work to win a war which we had assumed could never come again and of comfortably slipping back into bed as soon as it is over. I do, however, hope to be able to press upon you my belief that the interest of a group such as this can have a profound effect upon the creation of a national policy as regards the Navy and merchant shipping.

How can we translate our interest and conviction into reality? The obvious channel is the Congress of the United States—the Senate and the House of Representatives. Those bodies are the focusing point for our national opinion and our national will.

At the risk of appearing for personal reasons to flatter those august bodies, I would like to say that as a newcomer to the machinery of Government I have found the men in the Senate and the House of Representatives a sincere, intelligent, and patriotic cross section of American life.

I had been told that I would find political self-interest to be the dominant factor in the conduct of its affairs by Congress. I have not found that to be the case. In my appearance before a fair number of committees in both Houses I have met with lively interest, intelligent patriotism, and courteous treatment.

It has been popular and still is to make Congress the resting place for all of our national faults and national sins of omission or commission. At times that tendency has gone to the edge of both burlesque and contempt.

Now I am not for becoming top heavy with reverence for those who make our laws. They are human beings with all of our own good qualities and limitations, but I would like to point out that to hold up to public scorn and ridicule the people who make our laws is in essence holding ourselves up to scorn and contempt. They are the men we elect. If we select them on the basis that they are buffoons, buffoons they may become. If we select them, however, with care and expect from them competence, patriotism and devotion to duty, I think we will get just about what we expect. Members of Congress are a reflection of ourselves. We cannot expect from Government more than we give.

The democratic process in time of war is subjected to severe strains, and one of them is the necessity for public debate of great issues that may affect the conduct of the war. I think the greatest tribute to the democratic process is the fact that both in the House of Commons and on the floor of the Congress there is open debate and criticism. I am reminded of a paraphrase of remarks of Lord Bryce in his American Commonwealth in which, drawing a contrast between dictatorship and democracy, he used a simile of the sea. He said in essence that dictatorship is like a swift and beautiful cruiser capable of running at high speed and reaching its destination with safety, provided it is handled by a competent skipper—if, however, that skipper suddenly goes crazy, this ship hits an iceberg or a reef, it sinks and is lost completely. Democracy is like being on a raft—your feet are always wet but the damn thing never sinks.

I say that in the Congress we have the instrument through which we can express our determination that the powerful war fleets which we are now building shall never be allowed to disintegrate and that the merchant ships which we need to conduct operations in the far corners of the globe shall not be allowed to rust in pathetic disuse in our inland harbors.

I sometimes think the mistake which the pirate nations—such as Japan, Germany, and Italy—make in judging American democracy is a byproduct of our own view of history. Our fortunate geographical position, plus lack of need for territorial expansion, plus our basic good will toward other nations, always has made it difficult for us to understand the philosophy of aggressive warfare.

It has been hard for us to believe that nations would deliberately provoke war or wantonly despoil the territory of their neighbors.

It seems to me we have looked at history as something that occurred on another planet. We have all been taught history, and yet as a nation we have been curiously indifferent to its lessons. The commentaries of Caesar, the stories of Hannibal's astonishing marches through the passes of the Alps, the feats of Napoleon's legions were alive to our imaginations and were fascinating to study. But we never applied them to our own international relationships. Even the events of 1914-18, 10 years afterward, seemed unreal—events that could never happen again.

For these reasons many sincere and honest people in our country believed that we were in no danger of aggression in this war and that we could never be exposed to attack. Because of the remoteness of the theaters where the war is being fought I believe it is still difficult for many fully to grasp its reality. War, like death itself, is a concept difficult for the human mind to grasp until we are in its presence.

That is why even today in the midst of war it is difficult for us thoroughly and deeply to understand the forces that are alined against us.

Admiral Blandy and I made a trip to the southwest Pacific last summer, where we skirted the edges of war, and I, as a noncombatant, got certain definite impressions of the enemy that we fight in that theater. I came back with the knowledge that we were opposed there by a brave, intelligent, and ruthless foe—whose collapse we cannot expect without the destruction of his fighting power at its heart. No information that has come to me since has done anything to alter my original impression.

The Japanese, like the Germans, are trained in war and have had driven into them a fanaticism which makes them ideal fodder for the military machine which their masters have created. In addition, those masters have succeeded in filling them with hatred and contempt for us, for our institutions, and our way of life.

This is a war between two concepts of life—the value of the individual, his life, his liberties, and his property on our side, and the complete submergence of the individual in a daemonic surrender to the state on their side.

It is as fundamental a struggle as that against the Hun invasion that swept into western Europe 15 centuries ago, or the march of the Saracens that ended in their defeat at Tours by Charles Martel in the eighth century. War as waged by the Japanese is not dissimilar to that which the hordes of Genghis Khan carried from eastern Asia into the plains of central Europe.

These periodic scourges cannot be met by passive resistance nor by the latent but undeveloped strength of even a nation so powerful as our own.

Good will alone is not sufficient protection against the fanatic frenzy of the maniac who molded the unhappy millions of Germany into a hammer to carry out his will.

Nor can any Maginot line, as a sad and tragic France has discovered, protect us. No wall, powerful as it may seem to be at the time, is a sufficient protection against the decay of the spirit that goes with the assumption of permanent security.

There is no such thing as security, and the word should be stricken from our dictionary. We should put in every school book the maxim that power, like wealth, must be either used or lost.

I want to remind you of what an officer of the United States Navy said at the end of the last war: "If the world is to have peace, the power to wage war must be lodged in the hands of the nations who hate war."

There must be police power and adequate strength for the men of good will to curb the ruffians of the world. We have the power now. We must resolve to keep it. We must have the will to use it, as we shall use it, not for conquest but to implement our faith in the gradual evolution of man's ability to live decently with his neighbors.

ADDRESS BY REAR ADMIRAL W. H. P. BLANDY, UNITED STATES NAVY

Research for war

Samuel Johnson once said: "It marvelously clarifies a man's mind to know he is to be hanged in a fortnight." It is amazing how certain things become clearer to us when we are at war. We begin to realize more clearly than when we are at peace, that a gun is a gun, an inanimate object with no moral status. We find that it is the ultimate purpose for which it is used, and not the thing itself, which is ethically important. We discover that a bomber in the hands of Hitler is a very different thing from a bomber in the hands of the people who resist him.

But that is a view we arrive at only when war is impending, when it is in many respects already too late. When a British airplane manufacturer, for example, contributed to Cambridge in 1935 the sum of £10,000 for aeronautical research, a storm of controversy arose as to whether this was a contribution for war research. The university authorities felt constrained to deny that it was. Such controversies were not arising in Germany at that time. The danger in pacifist feeling is that it never exists at the same level throughout the world. When war breaks out those nations which have exalted it disproportionately to others often pay bitterly for it, paying sometimes the supreme price of national existence and personal freedom.

Our objective in this war is—or should be—not merely to win the war but to win it with the minimum expenditure of blood and treasure. This can be accomplished only by rejecting the policy of a struggle of attrition—except in so far as our lack of preparation forces it upon us—and by striving to attain at the earliest possible moment a decisive superiority.

Superiority is achieved in many ways—through greater shrewdness in tactics and strategy, through superior morale, and through greater quantity and superior quality of men and weapons. Since I am an ordnance officer, I shall concern myself mainly with the quantity and quality of our weapons. In doing so I should like to emphasize especially the aspect of quality. We Americans, who take such pride in the tremendous productive capacity of our industrial plant, are apt to rely too much upon it to win our wars for us. We are of such vast strength and of such happy geographical position that we can afford more waste and error than is permitted to other nations which find themselves fighting for their existence.

But I think you will agree that we should not lean so heavily on sheer power and energy to pull us through, when the exercise of a little brain matter, particularly before the event, will save us from a lot of unnecessary loss. And that brings up the subject of research, particularly technological research in military weapons.

We in the Bureau of Ordnance are generally proud of the quality of our material. We think some of it is the best of its kind in the world. But, after all, why shouldn't it be? As a Nation we are second to none in industrial potential. We are generally recognized to be exceptionally resourceful, at least in mechanical things. The fact that our equipment is good is therefore no reason why we should be content with it. I could easily spend the time allotted to me telling you of the excellence of our guns and torpedoes and bomb sights and the like. But perhaps bureau chiefs are too much given to that sort of thing. It would be much more profitable to all of us if I pointed out instead how the things we have could be made better.

One way would be to give more attention to the matter in our educational institutions, both by peacetime research and development contracts between the War and Navy Departments and the laboratories of these institutions, and by including technological subjects bearing directly upon war, in their curricula. The scientific and engineering training offered in this country is in quality and availability unmatched in any other country. The thorough training offered in university departments of mechanical, electrical, civil, chemical, and metallurgical engineering, and particularly in more specialized fields like aeronautical engineering, gives to our young technologists a fund of techniques indispensable to what we might call war engineering. But on the other hand, there is a notable lack of courses actually specialized to that latter field—courses, for example, in interior and exterior ballistics, gun design, armor manufacture, and so on.

In this country during peacetime the burden of research and development of war material falls upon the relatively few engineers who are actually engaged in our armament industries and on the even smaller group of military officers who have the requisite technological training. Most of them are apt to be promptly burdened with specific tasks which obstruct a broad research outlook. What is conspicuously absent is a broad reservoir of scientists in our research and educational institutions who are trained to think along these problems. Such reservoirs exist behind most of our peacetime pursuits and are frequently responsible for the revolutionary ideas which are constantly transforming our material culture.

Of course, the requirements of secrecy usually obtrude upon the conduct of war research, but the great amount of military knowledge which is already generalized internationally is not now accessible to the average engineering student. The explanation is not entirely in the hitherto small industrial demand for workers in specialized fields, for we find whole departments in our universities devoted to the study of such subjects as seismology and astrophysics. The reason doubtless springs from a sense of moral values, from a conviction that institutions of learning should exist to increase man's knowledge of his world and to develop and impart techniques designed to improve and multiply the means for a better life—not to destroy them and life itself.

This conviction is an old one among scientists. Niccolo Tartaglia, founder of the science of ballistics, kept to himself the results of his experiments in 1531 because he had decided that "it was a thing blameworthy, shameful, and barbarous, worthy of severe punishment before God and man, to

wish to bring to perfection an art damageable to one's neighbor and destructive to the human race," and that to concern oneself with such matters was a "grave sin and shipwreck of the soul." When an invasion of Italy by the Turks became imminent, however, Tartaglia changed his mind. "Today," he wrote, "in the sight of the ferocious wolf preparing to set on our flock, and of our pastors united for the common defense, it does not seem to me any longer proper to hold these things hid, and I have resolved to publish them so that all should be in better state either to attack the common enemy or to defend themselves against him."

The antipathy of scientists to the "prostitution" of their efforts in the further development of war instruments does credit to their humanitarian sentiments, but it is bound to collapse under the realization that "destruction" engineering may become really "conservation" engineering in its most meaningful sense—engineering calculated to produce those weapons by which the things we hold most dear in our civilization and in our national existence may be defended against attack.

I hope you will not think that I am pleading for a system which would Spartanize our society or convert our colleges and universities to academies of war. There is not much point of fighting at all if we are not defending what we deem the good things of life, of which the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake and for the sake of progress in the arts of peace is one of the foremost. That such pursuits be displaced I would certainly not advocate. But it might be urged that studies specialized to the arts of war find some place alongside those specialized to the arts of peace. After all, war is a phenomenon long since invented and today very much with us.

Weapons by themselves have not produced war, nor is there any convincing evidence that battles have become more bloody, in proportion to the forces engaged, with the improvement of the instruments of war. When armies had nothing but the highly erratic smooth-bore musket they obligingly approached closer to each other and remained more exposed during combat. Naval engagements during the old days of wooden-walled sailing ships were probably more destructive to personnel in proportion to the number involved than are those encounters which occur under modern conditions. The relative primitiveness of the old guns should not obscure the extremely bloody character of the combats of those times, when dead and wounded on both sides would mount as high as a third or more of the total number engaged. Ships hung side by side pouring death into each other's holds until the amount of havoc on one side or the other was too great to be longer endured. In naval engagements today, we attempt to sink ships rather than kill men, and where ships survive battle the proportion of casualties is relatively small as compared to former times.

Though I am prone, because of my own job, to emphasize technological research for war, I would not leave you with the feeling that that is the only field in which research is necessary. There are many others. The Germans, who have perhaps too much initiative in such things, discovered long before anyone else that the economics of a nation at war or preparing for war was a very different thing from the economics of a country at peace. Only 1 year after Hitler came to power, a chair was set up at the University of Berlin for the study of war economics. That was followed by a tremendous outpouring of studies on the subject, and many acute observers have attributed much importance to that fact in explaining the phenomenal military power of the German nation in 1939 and 1940.

In our own country, on the other hand, economists are just beginning to discover that, in their beautifully conceived systems, war cannot be dismissed simply as an abnormal interruption. And political scientists are awakening to the fact that if they approach the subject of war with the technique of the medicine man rather than the physician, and strive to prescribe cures without troubling to study the disease, those cures are bound to be fantastic.

But this is a society of men and women interested in history, and I should like to say something particularly about the study of military history. Historians have long been aware that wars are the most intense of human dramas and that the course of history has been largely decided on the battlefield; but they are just coming to realize that their approach has been too episodic, lacking in the comprehensiveness that brings true understanding.

We Americans have been amazingly backward in that respect. Most Americans are profoundly ignorant of the military, and especially of the naval, history of their own country. A partial exception is the case of the War between the States. The heartache of defeat, the memory of brave and good men who gave their all in a lost cause, and the pride of locale have stimulated southern scholars especially to cull lovingly through the memoirs of those sad years. Every year we see a number of books published giving new insights into that conflict, and in the South they tend to become best sellers.

But most of the rest of our military history is badly neglected. How many Americans, for example, know that in the War of 1812 we were decisively defeated on the seas or know why we were defeated? We read only of our glorious frigate victories and think those victories won the war for us, when as a matter of fact they counted scarcely at all in the total picture. A people who knew that story would have a far better comprehension of the problems that face us today than our people in fact do. A people who were familiar with the dismally consistent manner in which we have always entered our wars unprepared would decide to do something about it. We have too often relied on Providence to continue smiling on this Republic and to give us time to forge our strength after the clash of arms had sounded. And people who knew something of the history of military technology would know that the weapon which is away out in front today will probably not have things all its own way tomorrow and would not be swept off its feet by extremists who proclaim that all is changed and that those who try to get some guidance from the past deserve only to be tarred and feathered.

I can give you an example which will illustrate several of these points. When the history of this war is written I believe it will appear that one of the great tactical revolutions which occurred during the course of the fight was the great increase in the effectiveness of naval antiaircraft armament. The antiaircraft defense of our present-day battleships against planes attacking at close range (which is at present the only really menacing form of attack) is about 100 times what it was at Pearl Harbor. We in the Bureau of Ordnance are very proud of that accomplishment, and yet it is bound to provoke certain embarrassing questions. Is it not true, for example, that such tremendous progress argues a gross inadequacy on December 7, 1941? The answer, in some respects at least, is flatly "Yes." We were not where we should have been at that time. And when one investigates why, one finds a long, dismal account of lack of funds, surely due, at least in part, to lack of interest on the part of the public. I am not trying to deny that many naval officers of high rank underestimated too long the menace to the surface ship contained in the aircraft. But I do deny that that underestimation was universal throughout the service.

In our Bureau files there are memoranda written as early as 1924 in which the whole antiaircraft problem is outlined with amazing insight and foresight. Yet almost invariably they contain the commentary that the public is interested in aircraft to the exclusion of any interest in defenses against them, and that the monies necessary for research and development are not being made available. And that biased thinking could not but be reflected to some degree in the efforts of our services.

Less than a year ago the prevailing popular attitude on the ability of the warship to defend itself against hostile aircraft was almost completely defeatist. The events of the day were not such as to favor a more balanced attitude, and on top of them certain books appeared written by exclusively airminded zealots and containing material distortions to fortify their theories. The man who did more than anyone else to restore some semblance of balance to public thinking was Captain Gatch, whose arguments poured forth from the muzzles of his guns rather than from the keys of a typewriter. The battleship he commanded shot down at least 32 attacking planes in about 30 minutes of combat without suffering any significant damage. Yet in his story of the battle, which incidentally is contained in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post, he makes a singular confession.

"As we steamed along at battle stations," he says, "aware that each moment brought us nearer the testing time, I wondered how much the agitation against the battleship might have penetrated into thinking of the crew. The battle wagon had become a sort of Cinderella of the fleet in outside opinion. Our stepsisters had so often proclaimed the battleship doomed to oblivion that even some of us battleship men were disposed to walk humbly in the presence of air power experts. These experts had read every lesson into the sinking of the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse* except the obvious one that those ships were not abreast of the air power they were forced to meet, and I could not be sure whether the fate of those vessels modified the confidence of our officers and crew."

If there was any lack of confidence in Captain Gatch's crew it was quickly cured and had no ill results. But naval officers and men are, after all, only human beings and cannot be expected to remain wholly unaffected by a general public clamor.

What is the point of all this? The point is simply that only a population educated to the realities of war can see that a pure cult of innovation may be just as wide of the mark as the dogma that there is nothing new under the sun. I would not have you think that I am attempting to discount in the slightest the enormous impact on naval warfare of the airplane. As chief of the bureau which is responsible for the design and production of all weapons for naval planes as well as naval ships, I am vitally concerned and actively engaged in improving the fighting power of aircraft. But the story is never a static one. When the shell gun was first introduced about a hundred years ago it was widely held that the large line-of-battleship was doomed. Then iron armor was adopted, and after the battle between the *Monitor* and the *Merrimac* many people, naval officers and laymen alike, asserted that now gunfire was useless, and the only way to sink an armored ship was with the ram or torpedo. But before the same war which saw that battle was over, gun projectiles were smashing the heaviest armor afloat. I submit that from here on out the story of air attack against ships and of defenses against it is likely to be comparable in many respects to the race between armor and gunpowder. One is away out in front for

a while, and then the pendulum begins to swing. Later it swings back. Meanwhile wholly new factors begin to appear and make the picture more complex than ever.

For better or for worse, the layman plays a great part in determining the military strategy of a nation. In a democracy during wartime he rightly insists on speaking his mind, and neither the military leaders nor the political authorities who are behind them can be immune to the pressure of his opinion. Prior to the outbreak of war, he elects to political office men whose policies may either further or hopelessly compromise the Nation's security. It is therefore a happier country whose citizens are educated to the realities of war, however repugnant the existence of war may be to their ideals.

And it should be remembered, too, that the layman in large measures determines what our universities will teach. Otherwise, how explain the great profusion of vocational courses in those institutions. The public should be made to realize that since our destiny as a nation is periodically at stake in war, at least the basic scientific research relevant to the military problem should be carried on in our centers of higher learning. And if our efforts to understand war help make the subject obsolete, so much the better. 'Tis a consummation devoutly to be wished. Admirals and generals, you must remember, have no vested interest in future wars. The future belongs to the younger generations, and they have already laid firm hands on the present.

Globalitis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND E. WILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Globalitis," delivered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] at a Republican rally held in the Crystal Ballroom, Morrison Hotel, Chicago, Ill., on Thursday evening, May 20, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It would seem that if only we could put ourselves, like certain others, in the proper frame of mind, we would find this the most wonderful world of all worlds. How differently wonderful from the world of just a few years or a few months ago. Employment for everyone. Oceans of money, more money than there are things to buy. Millions of American boys seeing hitherto unheard-of ends of the world. And, best of all, selfishness has completely vanished from this world. The one and exclusive purpose of the Chiang Kai-sheks, the Churchills, and the Stalins is precisely and exactly our own purpose. And here they all are at our very feet, begging America to show the world the right direction, pleading with us to just name the terms of peace and assuring us that they will go the full route with us on any terms we write, so appreciative are they of the little favors we have been tendering them. They are all against this war-breeding thing called nationalism. And every move they make each day clearly shows that they want and seek no advantage which they are not ready to share at once with others, all others. They want no new territory. They will even share the territory they already have with others who might show need for it. What a world. How different from the world of just so short a time ago.

THIS DREAM WORLD

All this, indeed, makes a lovely world for every mind that believes such facts to actually exist, believes them in spite of the contrary actuality with which we have to deal every day. This lovely world which some minds are ready to enjoy is fiction. Those who tie to opinion that ours is that world, with wholly unselfish leadership, that we Americans shall have the whole power to dictate the peace and maintain it, are simply living in a dream world. I am left wondering from whence comes the food—where is the black market that furnishes the food rich enough to cause such wild dreaming? Let's have a look at actuality.

Mr. Stalin declines to join in any pronouncements involving the Atlantic Charter. Which of the "four freedoms" he concurs in he keeps a deep, dark secret. Clearly Stalin wants some additional territory, and I don't know who we are to tell him he can't have it, so long as he continues the great job he is doing against the forces that have let themselves in for sharing of Adolf's crazy dreams of a new world dancing to his crazy music. And if there is any such thing as a Pacific charter (and surely if there is one for the Atlantic there ought to be one for the Pacific), then Stalin appears to have adopted one of his own (certainly a profitable one), for the charter seems to let him carry great shiploads of American supplies from America to Russia right straight across the Pacific, right around the coast of Japan, through the front yard of Japan and into Russia's door at Vladivostok. In addition to that, he gives these sneaky Japs fishing rights, and island rights, at Russia's very doors; and incidentally, at our doors, too. A fine charter, that Pacific charter, if it exists. A fine charter for Russia indeed. It even lets Russia get tons of the great essential called rubber, from Japanese-controlled areas while Russia's allies in this terrible war go scratching for ounces of rubber and substitutes for rubber. The great, unselfish antinationalist Stalin will not even meet with us at Casablanca to talk things over. He just stays at home and keeps sawing that wood we all, presumably, want him to saw. He does his part of beating the Axis, but refuses to say just what he might or might not do when this war is ended.

I suppose some will insist that these are all indications of the idealistic seed and ground so necessary to make ready for the launching by the United States of a mighty campaign to incorporate one world, destroy nationalistic selfishness, entrench democracy and a million freedoms, and, of course, kill off war for all time, except for those who will maintain and support an international policing force. But upon what meat must I feed in order to share in that kind of thought?

We are against gain from aggression for the mere sake of gain. We are dead set against the idea that empires shall control and dominate any part of the world. Shall we dare guess, while we live in this dream world occupied by some, shall we dare to guess now that Britain wants nothing in north Africa, and that Churchill is actually fighting this war to the end that the British Empire shall be liquidated after the war is won?

GLOBALISTICS AGAINST REALISM

It is not pleasurable to be saying and asking these things. I truly wish I might find myself in a world where there was no need to be realistic or to face embarrassing facts which do confront us and the world in this dark hour. But try as I will I just cannot somehow build my way into that dream world which some seem to occupy and so richly enjoy. I find myself having to deal with the world that is given us to deal with, not a dream world, not the kind of world we wish we might have. Present day globalistics are extremely difficult for me to comprehend, especially when our allies refuse to take part in the global exercises.

LOVE THY NEIGHBOR MORE THAN THYSELF

December 7, 1941, brought us a visitor causing abandonment for the duration, presumably, of any talk about foreign policy. To have quit talking foreign policy then did not necessarily mean that we who had been critical of foreign policy up to that time had abandoned our opinions or quit our theories one whit. It meant only that we were ready to concede that the Nation had its hands full with the winning of the war.

Unfortunately, not all people share this view that we had an ample task in the winning of the war. The smoke was still rolling over Pearl Harbor when certain of our interventionist following in the country undertook pursuit of a policy that was intended to destroy for all time one and all who had tied to the noninterventionist cause, the cause which some persist in terming "isolationism." But we were ready to ignore and did ignore these attacks and these smears in anticipation of an hour when all would be hewing to the single line of winning this war. We refrained from any I-told-you-so's. We did not seek to make life unpleasant for anyone by recalling the things we had asked to be done. But those interventionists who have now become globalists have persisted and have made the issue for Americans to a degree that cannot longer be tolerated or ignored. I have taken just so long as I can of this chant that we must love our neighbors better than the United States and that we must plan for these neighbors the world over rather than plan for our own country.

SILENCE MAY SEEM TO GIVE CONSENT

I have refrained for long months from expressions such as I make here tonight. I have tried to make every possible contribution to the end that we might win the continued good will of our allies in these hours when allies, whoever they might be, mean more to the future of the world and to my country than allies have ever meant before or will probably ever mean again. But when I find silence seeming to give Americans reason to believe that there must be complete unity behind the Willkies and the Roosevelts whose global thinking seems to be setting the stage for a tremendous degree of abandonment of American sovereignty, setting the stage for the American adoption of new and even impossible responsibilities to the whole world, when I find silence accepted as consent to all the crazy global thinking with which some of our own people, in conjunction with foreign people, are trying to indoctrinate us, then I know that we must speak out and speak out plainly, lest we permit American spirit, and spirit for America, to forever die. We need in America more of the kind of thinking Russians are affording Russia, and Britons are affording Britain.

TERROR IN AMERICAN THINKING

I have been terribly disturbed by an element that has been instilled in many American minds. It is an element of terror, in high places and low places, among the very rich and among the very poor. It is a terror that seems to include most classes of American citizenry. Men and women appear to stand in fear that if they dare to speak what is in their minds there will be retaliations of serious consequences. Men have seemed to adopt a brand of thinking which certain forces have been trying to instill for long, thinking to the effect that it is wrong to say

anything that is contrary to what was being said by those who appeared to be in Government leadership. This spirit has resolved itself into an order that dictates that all things American must be denied and ignored if those things interrupt in the slightest degree the alleged plans for the building of an alleged better world, "One World."

REPUBLICANS MUST ACCEPT CHALLENGE

Certain am I tonight of the spirit that prompts the call for this meeting. That spirit is nothing more, nothing less than an urge to demonstrate that the great bulk of Republican voters in this country are not following those few Republicans who have been trying to make it seem that the Republican Party is all-out for this abundance of baloney, or global thinking, that will have nothing to do with realism—global thinking that can exist only in a dream world. For my own part I rise here to say tonight that these are not responsible voices which pretend to speak for republicanism when they pledge us to the doing of things in an unseen, unknown world in which we do not yet fully know who our friends and enemies really are or might yet be. I rise to most emphatically challenge that sort of Republican voice.

AMERICAN RESPONSIBILITY TO THE WORLD

I believe I speak your sentiment when I say that we, all of us, want to contribute as fully as lies within our ability to the creation of a better world. We hope that our allies, whoever they may be when we sit down at the peace table and share the responsibility of writing the terms of peace, are going to entertain a mind quite different from that which seems to prevail with some of our allies now, and which certainly did prevail at Versailles when we, a people following great and pure ideals, were so rudely awakened to the discovery that our allies had not been fighting for the same things for which we thought we were fighting. I am sure that if that changed mind does prevail and we find a united Allied front behind unselfish ideals, we will want our country, and those who speak for it at the peace table, to work fully and completely for the creation of that better world foundation that could bring relief from the terrible pain of these recurrences of world wars. But I insist it isn't prejudice which prompts the millions of Americans today to doubt that there will exist so idealistic a mind at the peace table. Experience, and no better teacher has the world ever known, experience tells us what it is fair to expect at the next peace writing. There will be present there seeking service the most selfish kind of representations. We will find then that one world is really many little worlds with which we are going to have to find a way to live. Perhaps by example we shall be able to reduce the degree of selfishness and make it less the dictator of the next peace than it was the dictator of the last peace. Good, if that only can be true. But that unselfishness is by no means in evidence in any such degree at this stage as could let America feel secure in undertaking now to make forceful demands upon our allies concerning the things that they must agree to do when this war is ended.

PROD OUR ALLIES OUT OF THE WAR

To make such demands, to undertake to require Russia to promise certain things, to require Britain to agree to the ideals to which we give expression as causes, to demand of China emphatic agreement that she will not depart from us in our requirement for the dispensation of this, that, and the other freedom, and that she will join with us in toto in abandoning nationalism—to do these things now is to chance the loss of splendid allies fighting on the several fronts in this war. That fact ought to be obvious to anyone. Why would we deceive ourselves as to the facts? China fight for China today. Churchill has made it clear that Britain is fighting for the very life of Britain, and Stalin affords constant evidence of a first purpose in this war, the purpose of keeping Russia strong and destroying her immediate enemies. All other causes that enter the minds of the leaders of these three allies are of a mighty small order by comparison with this issue of self-preservation and nationalism. And why deceive ourselves by going on the theory that we are the only unselfish power on the Allied front when in turn we are on that front to defend ourselves because of a sneaky attack upon us and because of declarations of war against us by the Axis?

It is high time that we resolved ourselves to a dealing with facts and with realities instead of kidding ourselves into believing that our real purpose in this conflict is that of doing some such preposterous thing as delivering a quart of milk everyday to everybody upon the face of this earth, when in truth we haven't begun to be able to make such a delivery to a large part of even our own American people? HENRY WALLACE can make a million and one trips more to South America to lay out American milk routes, but he is not going to foc this world into believing that we are in this war for reasons other than that we were attacked and because violent enemies declared war upon us.

AMERICA DESIRES TO HELP ALL

I say again we all do want to take whatever advantage prevails when the world ends this madness, to build into this world foundation conditions and understandings that are going to make for a better world, for happier people throughout the world, and for a world freed from some of the most obvious causes which enter into the creation of these recurrent hostilities and wastes. No one with power to reason witnesses the dying and the inhuman suffering of American boys down in that pesthole called Guadalcanal; one does not feel and see the pain in millions of American homes occasioned by the momentary threat of mutilation, or loss of loved ones; one does not hear and know the awfulness visited upon the Jews in parts of the world, upon the Norwegians, the Danes, the Belgians, and the Holland fathers and mothers and children; one does not acknowledge the flow of human blood that has washed and is still washing the lands of western Russia and the soil of China without feeling within himself or herself the urge, the must, to do what can be done to write off the prospect of a repetition of this nightmare for future generations of the nations of the world.

FEEDING WORLD IS OUR GREATEST OPPORTUNITY

I like to think that there is hope in this terrible suffering in other portions of the world where hunger, distress, and starvation are daily companions, I like to think that there, even there, is hope and expectation that when this war shall end, there will be relief for them, there will be help for them, there will be easing of the pain and remedy for the ills, food for the hungry, help that is going to reestablish civilization. And I like to think that those poor souls who entertain these hopes are looking to the United States as their most likely source of help. There is something of a thrill in being an American when realizing that millions upon millions of souls do look to us as that source of help. God knows I would not deny fulfillment of those hopes. Everything within our power must be done and will be done to meet the human needs that the world of human beings presents today, and will present in a larger way, I fear, before this order is ended. Heaven grant that we shall not now throw away that which will stand us in good stead when the need for our help is greatest and when we shall be free of the bars which the war creates, to dispense that help. It can fairly be said in criticism of the planning in this day that we are overlooking our largest bet when we fail to extend every possible encouragement and help in the production of food in such abundance as will let us be largely armed when the peace bells shall ring, armed to carry that to the world which the world will need most of all. We shall fulfill the hopes of the world only to that extent that we prepare ourselves today with supplies and with surpluses that we can dip into without stint when the fighting shall cease.

I say again that I would not deny fulfillment of the human hopes of the world. And I know I speak for all of you when I say that we are ready to do everything within our power to meet human needs the world over, when we can carry our help to those who do so desperately need. But to do that does not require that we stick our united head up into the clouds and dream, dream, dream of doing for the world the kind of job we haven't even yet been able to do for ourselves and our own people. Our first cause in this hour, namely, that of winning this war and having a chance to say something about the peace when the war is ended, is going to be sorely jeopardized if certain Americans, both Republican and Democrat, including human chameleons, are going to insist upon compromising the American people in plans that cannot be created in the light which the world affords today and if those same people go on seeming to prod our allies into positions which obviously they will not take if they can avoid it. If there is genuine wish for a united front here at home and on the side of the allies, for heaven's sake let us be done with this silly unrealistic "Union Now," "One World" planning. Globalitis could be our undoing.

WHEN WE MISSED THE BOAT

Do not misunderstand me when I discuss the prevailing attitude of some of our allies, I am not the one to tell the Russians, the British, and Chinese that they must stop looking out for themselves, because after all, we Americans are going to be doing the same thing when comes the time to deal with the after-war responsibilities. But I wonder if by chance this fact that our allies will be looking out for themselves isn't in part responsible for a great deal of this present-day urge to try to nail down understandings of the peace now, even before the war is won. If that is the case I fear we are due for great disappointment. For we've nothing to bargain with. We've nothing to trade with, nothing to offer that our allies are not already getting from us. And these allies know that we are in this war to the end. They are not subject to any implication through any resolution we introduce or pass, through anything we say, that we are threatening to abandon the war or afford any action that might lessen the chance to win the war.

I hope that the story is entirely without foundation Within the last 24 hours I have been cheered by reasoning that runs contrary to the possibility of this condition existing. But if there is cause for this persistent and ugly rumor that Mr. Stalin is demanding Allied agreement respecting Russia's alleged right to Finland, Norway, Sweden, and the Bosphorus after this war is done, what can we do, what are we going to do about it other than appeal through diplomatic channels for the kind of reasoning that is going to permit a continued independence of these great little countries in north Europe? Would we threaten to quit the war unless Russia changed her demands? Would we threaten abandonment of our lend-lease aid to Russia and thus hasten a possible peace between Russia and Germany, with Germany probably happy to give Russia what she might want

and what Russia could not get from the allies?

Let's not be foolish about this sort of thing. First of all, the situation may not actually exist. I hope with all my heart that it does not. But if it does, or if any like situation arises, then it is for us to remember once and for all that we "missed the boat" on chance to really influence the action and the ambitions of our allies when we afforded them unqualified access to our help through the lend-lease arrangement. That was the time for us to have accomplished understandings respecting the shape of the world to follow this war. That was when we had better chance than we shall ever have again to really influence in a big way the peace that was to follow this war. Now we are only one of several allies, each with separate interests except for that one of national self-preservation. We've got to take our chance from here on in, along with the others of our allies. To pursue any other course is to seriously court disaster in the conduct of this war.

PEOPLE MUST MAKE SELVES HEARD

There is only one way to be done with this planning and scheming which is having a tendency to upset the primary purpose we ought to want served today. That is for the American people to cast aside that terror which has been planted in their minds, rise up in their places again and again and let themselves be heard in opposition to this scheming. Let the American people be plain-spoken as they will be, and as they are when they dare to speak in the light of the realism that they see day in and day out. Let us not longer let this scheming betray us into compromising positions which can be created when a people merely seem to give consent to the global thinkers and the global planners who have made this issue at a time when the issue ought to have been avoided in the interests of unity, in the interests of winning this war.

NO SURRENDER OF AMERICAN IDEALS

It has not been easy to stand aside and remain silent in these days that have followed Pearl Harbor and hear honest Americans who were serving the most honest of American purposes before Pearl Harbor by striving to avoid involvement of our country in this war, the cost of which no one dares think about, attacked and castigated as being responsible for this war, as being selfish nationalists, incapable of visioning a better world. Yet, stand by many of us have, refraining from answers that might provoke larger disunity than was prevalent, ready to wait for another time to talk, ready to wait for time to render a verdict concerning the merit of the American theories that were advanced through the days of arms embargo repeal and lend-leasing. But it is no longer possible to stand by when one sees his country blindfolded, being walked out on a plank, which, if accepted, could easily mean surrender of the things we want to preserve after this war more than anything else—American ways. American ideals, for the world if the world will have them, but for Americans at least.

WHY CONGRESS REMAINED SILENT

If there be those among you who assume that, because there has not been extended debate on the subject in Congress, it must follow that the talking of the globalists is reflective of common thought in the Congress, and that therefore there can be little or no use in fighting against what appeared to be the trends—if this be your assumption, then let me say to you that Congress has been silent on these things only because it felt that such talk could but jeopardize our chance to win this war. If there be those among you who feel that opposition to some of this global planning is going to be accepted by our allies as discouragement, let me say to you that our global thinkers are fooling themselves and fooling Americans much more largely than they are fooling the people of our Allied Nations. And so long as there is threat that unanswered global thinking is going to accomplish its purpose for want of opposition, then let me urge you again, speak up Americans, speak up Republicans! And if you will make yourselves heard in such force as you have power to make yourselves heard you will put a lot of silly thinking and planning to rout and hasten the day when there can be honest understanding among those allies who are going to have the responsibility of writing the peace which we have right to hope will be a peace with some endurance, more endurance by far than was the last peace.

RECOGNIZE THINGS THAT ARE

Just 100 years ago Tennyson was looking into the future, beholding and so beautifully giving expression to the ideals he saw being fulfilled in the world of brotherhood of man. He wrote lines which are thrilling, even today, those who would listen to what we should all like to see ahead. But that thrill vanishes so quickly when realism is brought into the picture of what might happen after this war, in light of what is taking place under our very eyes. When I dip into the future far as human eye can see, I behold a world as selfish, just as selfish as can be. Why shut our eyes to the things which our allies are making so clear to us every day respecting their first interests in the winning of this war? We have a right to dream, we have a duty upon ourselves to strive for that finer brotherhood of man. But it isn't a requirement that we shall be blind to what is before us in the way of tools of cooperation such as are going to be available when this terrible fire ends. Are we fair to ourselves if we do not recognize the things that are?

WHAT WILL ALLIES LET US DO?

If the ideals we would like to serve are not shared by our allies, it cannot be blamed upon us. We can nevertheless go on serving those ideals as best we know how, but the degree of freedoms that we bring to the world after this war will be wholly dependent, (why don't we acknowledge it?), wholly dependent upon what our own allies are ready to grant and help distribute to their own and to others.

Americans, let not our leadership be permitted to place itself out on the end of a limb as did that great American idealist, Woodrow Wilson. He dreamed. He dreamed what men thought were ideals within reach of this world. He labored day in and day out upon plans for the kind of peace that would give us a world free of those causes which brought repetition of terrible consequences. Americans applauded him because Americans, too, were dreaming of the possibility of getting something really good and fine out of that war, for ourselves, for the world, for posterity. When Wilson enunciated those 14 points we cheered, the world cheered, and the enemy said: "If that kind of peace is available then we'll end this war here and now." It did end. The arrival of Woodrow Wilson and the American delegation at Versailles was applauded. Prayers went up for the American delegation and for the idealism they carried to Versailles. Wilson and the American delegation labored intently, quite unselfishly at the peace table and in the conference rooms at Versailles. Then things happened.

LESSON NO. 1 AT VERSAILLES

It is so easily and glibly said today that if only the United States had joined the League of Nations this war of today could have been avoided.

Many there are who find it so easy to adopt the theory that our failure to join the League of Nations made this war, that isolationists in the Senate who fought American participation in the League of Nations, created this present war. Oh, thoughtless Americans! Go back to history. Go back to truth and to fact and acknowledge that truth and fact. It was not failure to join the League of Nations that brought on this war. I feel that had we joined the League of Nations this war would have come about much sooner than it did. No, it wasn't failure to join the League of Nations that brought on this war. What created this war was the failure of Woodrow Wilson to accomplish his plain simple purposes covered by his 14 points, at the peace table at Versailles. His ideals, his points, were whipped until they bled, and whipped by our own allies, largely the same allies who we are looking to after this war to write a sensible peace and to refrain from the selfishness which betrayed the ideology that America carried to the peace table at Versailles 25 years ago.

Has anything happened, is anything written, is anything apparent now that lets us conclude that our allies are going to be of a differing mind when next we gather with them at the peace table? I haven't seen it. You haven't seen it. We have, on the other hand, seen plenty to indicate that the world we are going to have to deal with now, and in the immediate years to come, is pretty much the same identical world that we worked with at Versailles after that last war.

TOLD WHAT WE CANNOT DO

What shall we do in light of all this realism? Shall we let ourselves be fooled again, deceiving ourselves and trying to deceive the world about conditions which must prevail when this war ends? It probably isn't the bright thing to say; but what I say is thought being entertained in millions of American minds, namely, that we will do well if we get out of this war and out of the next peace more fortunately than we got out of the last war and the attendant peace. If ever a nation was given enduring notice that it could not dominate the world, that it could not dominate its allies or dominate any part of its allies, it was that notice given at Versailles following the last war. Merciful heaven—let's read that lesson again. Not with a view to jeopardizing or lessening our effort in the winning of this present struggle, but alone with a view to getting to the peace table the next time with our eyes open, our feet on the ground, and our heads somewhere other than in a dream world where 130,000,000 people would presumably be destined to dictate, control, and dominate a world of 2,169,873,000 of people. After all, and I repeat, the peace following this war is going to be what we and our allies make it. We have only a single voice in the determination.

AMERICANS WILL GUARD THEIR RIGHTS

Were it not so serious as respects possible consequences, it would be laughable to observe how completely some global thinkers in our midst are ignoring and wanting to ignore basic considerations which are going to bind Americans just as materially as they have been binding Americans in the past. Surely those considerations are selfish. Quite selfish indeed. They are considerations involving American sovereignty and the right of America to determine her own way of life; to determine her own relationship with other parts of the world; to determine who shall and how many shall be permitted to come to us from other lands; to determine the extent to which we shall be parties in the task of policing the world; to determine how much of food and of wealth we shall make available to the world; to determine to what extent we shall indulge in free trade; to determine what shall be the living standards of our own people. Yet global thinkers would seem to

be ready to abandon this right of Americans to determine.

SOME QUESTIONS IGNORED BY GLOBALISTS

How many Americans do you presume are ready to let down the immigration bars which have played so large a part in American economy in the years gone by? How many Americans do you suppose there are who stand ready today to say that, in the interests of maintaining peace in the world we shall so conduct ourselves and so write and administer our import and export laws as to be ready to receive anything and everything that the rest of the world might offer us in exchange for such commodities as we had and they wanted? Since agricultural production is largely the only thing that many nations have to offer us on a trade basis, it seems to follow that a first essential in global thinking is that American agricultural interests will be completely surrendered, put on the block, so to speak.

TRADING FARMERS OUT OF EXISTENCE

Well, I see transpiring every day a course of action toward American farmers that would indicate that there was substantial ground and reason to believe that maybe global thinking is already being practiced in this particular field and that the American farmer is being put in a strait jacket which is supposed to hold him helpless to resist his being traded out of existence in this "one world" that some people are going to create.

HENRY WALLACE, for example, accepted as the great champion of the American farmer for years, has made it painfully plain that in his thinking we are going to have to be ready to surrender and abandon American agricultural interests in a measurable way. American farmers mustn't produce crops that would make rubber; that would only make for another war, he says. Does good neighborliness require that we ignore the interests of our own people?

How long after this war has ended do you suppose Americans are going to countenance a policy that includes furnishing commodities to the rest of the world that we desperately need ourselves to sustain health and strength?

How long do you suppose the American people would tolerate a policy that brings endless numbers of refugees from other lands to our shores to compete with our own, with wholly contrary standards to be served?

And how long do you suppose the American people, freed from any feeling that they might jeopardize our chance to win the war by speaking about it now—how long will they remain silent in the prospect of our undertaking the gigantic task of policing the world of 2,169,873,000 people? Let us just touch that more immediate challenge for a moment, the policing job.

UNCLE SAM, WORLD POLICEMAN

Of course there is a measure of policing to be done by the Allies when this war shall end. We had to do it after the last war. We shall have to do it again. But I venture the guess that the American people will never tolerate any such policing job as globalists seem to contemplate.

This international police force which is in some minds would appear to be an undertaking with Russia, China, Britain, and ourselves jointly affording the establishment of navy and of army necessary in attaining the full purpose of the policing job. Has it occurred that this international policeman isn't going to be the most popular fellow on earth? If it hasn't then put yourselves in the shoes—as Americans put yourselves in the shoes of those who are going to be policed. Your reaction in that instance is going to be no less severe than is your ultimate reaction to such questions as these:

If we have an international police force, who is going to command it? Who is going to furnish the ships? What flag will it fly? Who is going to furnish the men? Who is going to say where the police force shall be today, and tomorrow? Will it be an American? An Englishman? A Russian? Or a Chinaman? After all, on the basis of populations of these various countries, we are going to have no right to dictate finally who shall command this giant police force. And once the command is determined, doesn't it follow that every power upon earth that is not in immediate command of the policing establishment is going to have to provide a military establishment for itself of such strength as to meet any power or powers which might combine against it, with the chance of having to fight the international force, too? Then it follows, of course, that the kind of world policing that some global artists are visioning would invite an armament race of such magnitude as the world had never dreamed of prior to this engagement which has the economy of the world flowing into armament. Perhaps there would be some advantage in summoning an allied conference at the present time to determine the terms of peace, to the end that we could have quicker demonstration of the impossible situation that is going to prevail when that conference is confronted with the necessity of determining just who is going to command the international police force to be established. It would get about as far as the recent refugee conference got.

TOUGH TO HAVE TO DEAL WITH REALISM

Oh, but realism is a terrible thing, isn't it? How unfortunate that in a time like this, when we want to be so helpful, when we want to be so great, when we want to do so much for the world—how embarrassing is realism and knowledge of what we probably can and cannot do, however successful we might be, in league with our allies, in winning this war in a degree that is going to let us have the say about the peace that shall follow; realism kills these one-world dreams. But being realistic is a full obligation in this kind of an hour. And I think we ought not run from it. Certainly we ought not shirk from it in a degree that is going to permit the advancement of causes that can so easily undermine America and deprive Americans of the things that they have first, last, and all claim to. Wendell Willkie enjoys the privilege, if he wants to exercise it, of building a little world all of his own and living in this dream world if he chooses. But for my own part, I shall never forget that Wendell Willkie is never to be taken at his word. He indulges freely in words, not always prepared by himself. But he has also given Americans notice in so many words that however serious he may seem to be, in whatever serious undertaking he may seem to engage—he has made it clear that what he says and does may be just plain politics or "campaign oratory." But this is not the time for meaningless oratory or unobjective politics. Instead it is the time to be building cautiously and wisely for the future with a view to keeping what is good for America and Americans, maintaining a course of helpfulness to the world today and tomorrow that can afford liberties and freedoms for the world without jeopardizing one liberty or a single freedom enjoyed by Americans. Republicans will perform a service of enduring advantage to their country if they will come out of their corner swinging and clubbing against the kind of thinking and talking that would take America, I repeat, blindfolded, out on the global gangplank, for a plunge into seas which have long been charted by great Americans as seas of fire, seas of hate, seas of jealousy, seas of hopeless entanglement.

A TIME FOR EACH PURPOSE

By chance the world may, when this war has ended, come to share with America a view she has entertained for generations—the view that there is nothing in it for the common people to permit jealousies and hates to dominate the international course pursued by their leaders. In that event, then surely America will go the full route in joining with other nations in plain spoken and sincerely backed understandings. But when we are introduced to that kind of world will be ample time for us to determine what our country can and will do. In that event we can have the enjoyable advantage of seeing all the international cards on the table, face up, whereas those afflicted with "globalitis" now would deal the cards which possibly another generation of Americans would have to play without having had a chance to shuffle, cut, and deal them.

JOB NOW IS THAT OF WINNING WAR

As for now, with the world, including our allies, in so uncertain and noncommittal a frame of mind, we had best confine ourselves to the gigantic job given us to do, the job we are all trying to do, win this war, and win it as quickly as can be done and with as little cost in lives as is possible. Let's not get our allied fighting fronts in a battle of words over what shall be the division of spoils or over what our allies shall and shall not have. This is hardly the time to be telling Russia, Britain, and China that they must stop looking out for themselves and let us all have a hand in determining what they shall have and do after we've won the war.

I suppose this attitude of mine will be labeled by both the deep and shallow global thinkers as small-time isolationism, rank and thoughtless nationalism. Be that as it may, I'm something more than confident that these thoughts to which I have tried to give expression are the thoughts of enough Americans in Republican ranks to do a certain job if only those ranks will close in and make their voices and their choices count in electing spokesmen. That job to which I refer is the job of completely overwhelming and smothering the Willkie-Roosevelt-Carnegie Foundation kind of leadership, leadership that would deny the American people any choice in determining their own future if only they could. If fighting that sort of cause constitutes isolationism or nationalism, then I'm sure we are a nation of isolationists and nationalists in the large majority.

STILL POSSIBLE TO BE GOOD AMERICANS WHILE FIGHTING FOR WHAT IS BEST FOR AMERICA

Silence is a grand weapon in certain emergencies and up to a certain point. But with the one-world, one-party advocates using anything but silence, let me suggest to you, fellow Republicans, that we abandon silence and use such weapons as are at our command as Americans, and strike down this thing that insists we cannot be good Americans if we don't forget what is best for Americans, today and tomorrow.

Personnel of the American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, May 22, 1943, was National Maritime Day. The United States Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, shipbuildings plants in the United States,

shipyard workers, and personnel upon the ships, have performed heroic services which it is impossible now to appraise adequately.

The record is an outstanding one of which the country may be proud. The work that is being done in carrying the war to the enemy is expressed most graphically by the release from the Navy Department on May 10, 1943, of the eighth merchant marine casualty list. The list covers 31 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. This list brings the total of United States merchant marine casualties reported to next of kin during the period from September 27, 1941, to May 1, 1943, to a grand total of 4,555. This grand total is subdivided as follows:

Dead	569
Missing	3,986
Total	4,555

These men on the merchant marine have faced untold dangers. They are determined that the precious cargo they carry shall go through, and they are carrying that cargo to all parts of the world.

It is difficult to realize the terrible ordeals to which they are subjected and through which they pass. In There Go the Ships, Able Seaman Robert Carse tells the story of a voyage on the Murmansk supply route, and reveals a graphic picture of these merchant seamen fighting through one of the death traps through which these seamen pass carrying cargoes of tanks, planes, ammunition and tons of TNT. The incidents related by him are repeated many times on all the seas of the world.

Mr. Carse said:

The snow and the sleet squalls passed. Wednesday gave a clear cerulean sky, a blue and gleaming sea, very little horizon or zenith cloud. This was their day, the Nazi's, we knew. We dragged our ammunition cases closer to the guns; got ready as well as we could.

They came early: the Heinkels, the Messerschmitts, the Stukas, the Junkers 89's, and all told there were 105 of them over us during that day's fight that was to last 20 hours. They used everything: 1,100-pounders, 550's, 250's, aerial torpedoes, mines, their cannons, and their machine guns; while outside, always trying to get in, their submarines rushed our escort.

That was hell. There is no other word I know for it. Everywhere you looked aloft you saw them, crossing and recrossing us, hammering down and back, the bombs brown, sleek in the air, screaming to burst furiously white in the sea. All around us, as so slowly we kept on going, the pure blue of the sea was mottled blackish with the greasy patches of their bomb discharges. Our ship was missed closely time and again. We drew our breaths in a kind of gasping choke.

* * * * *

We were leaning far back, knees bent, hands hard on the rubber grips, fingers down on the triggers, eyes to the ring sights. We were no longer conscious of the empties clacketing out underfoot, of the cold, the trembling motion of the ship as the other bombs burst. Here was death, and we were throwing death back to meet it.

* * * * *

Sunday morning the Russian planes came, out from rocky and mountainous, pine-timbered shore we could now see. They were the fast Hurricanes the British had given their allies and a lot of the squat, little Russian Migs. "Red," with his powerful Navy long glass, sighted 17 of them in the cloudless sky when at 8 o'clock I went down off the wheel to breakfast.

The harried lot, those who adorned the 'midships deck, stared at me as I passed, and I told them to relax, start taking off their rubber suits, and getting themselves in shape for shore. There was Russia, and there were the Russian planes.

Juan had grapefruit and toast and scrambled eggs. Allen and I and "Jammy Boy," a very shaken, totally useless "Jammy Boy," were ducking into the grapefruit when right outside the messroom a 550-pounder hit. The chunk of grapefruit jumped off my spoon. Allen and I stared at each other, then shoved off for the deck and the guns.

But that was a Stuka squadron, and they were so fast they were gone by the time we got to the guns.

It was the last of them then for a while. We made the Kola Inlet and, ship following ship, set down it for Murmansk. The two Russian pilots who boarded us were submarine officers, just in off the duty. They were young men, serious, calm, very straight in their dark gray, smart uniforms.

That happened to be my trick on the wheel, and I gave it every bit of skill I had as we dropped down one reach after the other toward Murmansk. It was a long way, one hell of a long way from our home port, I thought. But we'd made it. Here were the tanks and the planes, the trucks, the metal, and explosive. We'd brought them in safe.

They are carrying them through. This ship came home.

This was the same ship sliding smoothly down the narrow river that had fought in the ice and snow and gales of the Barents Sea in the Arctic, fought for 55 days in the Russian River, fought back again off the North Cape, and of that terrible place of fog and heavy-rolling seas and death on the Icelandic coast. We'd brought her back—some of us would take her out again, or ships like her.

We didn't want much. We were glad to be alive, to be home.

That night, as Kovalsky had said, my wife's arms were around me, and everything was all right.

On last Friday the President of the United States expressed the gratitude of the American people for the splendid heroism of the men of the merchant marine in the following statement:

Tomorrow, May 22, is National Maritime Day. It is a day set aside each year upon which the people of the United States—and this year, the United Nations—pay tribute to the men who sail and build the ships of our merchant marine.

Last year Maritime Day was largely devoted to the men and women in the Nation's shipyards who build the ships which are carrying out troops, guns, planes, and tanks to the far-flung battle fronts of the great Allied offensive.

This year let us pay special tribute to the men who sail these ships. We should honor the men who by their courage and fortitude have won the everlasting gratitude of the people of the United Nations, the men on the battle front, and their fellow Americans on the home front.

Troops and equipment have been landed in the southwest Pacific. Our armed forces were landed in north Africa and have helped to conquer the foe there. Vast amounts of vital war supplies have been safely delivered overseas to Britain and Russia, sometimes at great hazard. Fighting Americans have been carried to the scenes of action. The men of our American merchant marine have pushed through despite the perils of the submarine, the dive bomber, and the surface raider. They have returned voluntarily to their jobs at sea again and again, because they realized that the life lines to our battle fronts would be broken if they did not carry out their vital part in this global war.

The traditions and history of our merchant marine have been handed down from generation to generation and never fail to inspire us.

The seamen of today are again writing heroic pages for the maritime history of our Nation. In their hands our vital supply lines are expanding. Their skill and determination will keep open the highway to victory and unconditional surrender.

In an address by Rear Admiral E. S. Land, United States Navy, retired, Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, and War Shipping Administrator, delivered at San Francisco on National Maritime Day—Admiral Land said:

This National Maritime Day, a part of our annual observance of Foreign Trade Week, finds us engaged in a different kind of foreign trade. We are trading punches with a group of foreign aggressor nations bent upon world domination.

How well those punches are being traded is told vividly by reports from the battle fronts. In that type of foreign trade our exports are now exceeding our imports. There is nothing reciprocal about our trade with Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo.

The entire maritime industry of our Nation has just cause to be proud of the part it is playing in this all-out struggle for the preservation of freedom, of civilization, and of Christianity. In the shipyards and on the high seas a most glorious chapter is being written by those who build and those who sail our ships. Nothing else in world history has ever approached their accomplishments.

Speaking at the National Maritime Day dinner, Copley-Plaza Hotel, Boston, Mass., Friday, May 21, 1943, Rear Admiral Howard L. Vickery, United States Navy, Vice Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, and Deputy Administrator, War Shipping Administration, said:

Even before Pearl Harbor, American seamen were under hostile fire from air and sea. Ever since then, the merchant marine as a whole has been constantly in action, meeting the enemy, day in and day out, from the Arctic to the south Pacific. There is no more heroic saga in the annals of man than the story of the courage and stamina of our merchant seamen, without whom we could not hope to be victorious.

Speaking before the Propeller Club of the United States at New York, N. Y., on May 22, 1943, Capt. Edward Macauley, United States Navy, retired, member of the Maritime Commission and Deputy War Shipping Administrator, said:

Each month about 75,000 seamen transport 10 tons of supplies for each soldier our country has fighting overseas, and bear in mind we are fighting on fronts as far apart as New Guinea and north Africa, as Iceland and the Solomons. Day after day, week after week, the ships ply steadily through storms and mine fields and the concentrated attack of the submarine wolf pack. Our protective technique is better than it was, but the casualties are the evidence that it must be further improved. Over 4,500 seamen, about 6 percent of those engaged, are dead or missing from enemy action, a greater number proportionately than the combined losses of our armed forces. That figure alone, however, does not give the full measure of the merchant seaman's courage. To the valorous deeds under fire must be added the tenacity with which they make the long, slow voyages with the grim knowledge that torment or death may strike at any moment. It takes

nerve to volunteer, not once, but each time he ships out.

Hon. Thomas M. Woodward, a member of the United States Maritime Commission, delivered an address on May 22, 1943, in Mobile, Ala., in which he said:

On Maritime Day it is fitting that we pay tribute to the skill and heroism of the merchant crews which today are carrying men and supplies to every part of the globe. To them the Nation and the entire anti-Axis world owes abiding gratitude. Today approximately 100,000 of our seamen citizens are on the high seas. By the end of the year the number will be greatly increased. Already in this war 4,500 of these men have sacrificed their lives in maintaining the vital life lines of the United Nations. The percentage of loss among them has to date been materially higher than that of our armed services. Torpedoed time and again, after days and weeks on lifeboats and rafts, enduring incredible hardship, the survivors again go back to the sea. And new men, all volunteers, heedless of the risks, come forward to take the places of those who are lost and to augment seamen battling on this front.

Hon. John M. Carmody, member of the United States Maritime Commission, delivered an address on May 20, 1943, in Chicago, before the Propeller Club, and in the course of his remarks he said:

And what of the men who man these ships, the men who in very truth, "go down to the sea" in this crisis? Words are weak when we attempt to appraise the heroism of these seamen. Thousands of them have been driven from their ships or thrown into burning seas by torpedoes. Hundreds have lost their lives. Every man who goes to sea faces that definite danger. And still they go back, old and young, old-timers and green sailors alike. I should like to make the observation that not the least of the contributing factors to this spirit lies in the greatly improved living conditions on the ships and the civilized labor relations arrangements that have grown up in seafaring during the past 10 years, fostered by the Congress of the United States, by the Maritime Labor Board, the ship owners, the national unions, and the Maritime Commission. Together they are proving that democracy really works.

On May 22, 1943, the Daily Press of Newport News, Va., contained the following editorial:

OUR MERCHANT SEAMEN

Little by little the magnificent service performed by the men who sail our merchant ships is becoming known to the American people. These unsung heroes are at last beginning to get a part of the recognition which they deserve.

For many months they were forced to sail without even a popgun with which to defend themselves. They sailed—and many of them died. But those who lived took other ships out. And today we have a bridge of ships carrying supplies to our fighting men and our allies. The War Labor Board recenty had the following to say concerning the work of these men:

"The war with all its revelations of heroism on all fronts has revealed no braver souls than the merchant seamen, who, with the largest proportion of American casualties in this war, man the ships which, in defiance of ice, storms, submarines, raiders, and dive bombers, carry the sinews of war where danger stretches it farthest and highest front on all the oceans of the world."

Only a few of these men wear a uniform. Dungarees, a shirt, shoes, and an old hat suffice. Some have more degrees than a college professor, but the majority of them have nothing but brawn, brains, and the spirit which made America great.

Today is National Maritime Day. The men who sail the ships are doing a great job, as the Daily Press has said before. All honor to them; more power to them.

These merchant sailors are proud of their record, and all good Americans salute them.

On May 22, 1943, the New York Times, New York, contained the following editorial:

MARITIME DAY

There will be celebrated today the one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary of the departure of the steamship *Savannah* from Savannah on the first successful transatlantic voyage under steam. Never before in its history has national Maritime Day had so deep a significance. The Bridge of Ships is essential to victory. In the past year that bridge has been built with a speed and in a mass which seems in retrospect almost incredible. In 1942, 719 vessels were built, a gross tonnage greater than that owned by Japan before the war, and seven and a half times the merchant tonnage produced in our yards in 1941. But the curve still is upward and in last April alone we produced 157 ships representing 1,606,000 deadweight tons. Mr. Churchill told Congress that the yards of the United States are already producing more tonnage than the combined losses of the United States and Britain.

Shipbuilders and shipping lines alike see before us an unparalled opportunity in the days to come to consolidate the position of the American merchant marine on the seas of the world. They believe this can best be accomplished by free private enterprise functioning in our traditional way both in the construction and operation of all types of ships. It is not too early now, when our victory depends on ships, to plan wisely and soundly for their future.

The spirit of the men of the merchant marine is the spirit of America. They deserve to win. They will win. May the motto of these men "Keep them sailing" be the motto of all industry in America.

Making Iron Without Coke Spells Freedom to Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement that forebodes both a crisis and an opportunity for our war production. Here are the highlights of a preliminary conference held in the city of Washington of some of the far-thinking minds of two States, under the helpful assistance of our able colleague from Alabama, the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN, as chairman of the Steel Shortage Investigating Committee.

The Governors of the two States—Minnesota and North Dakota—delegated these people to meet with Representatives of the Congress and to outline certain facts on the iron-ore crisis facing our war production. They also appraised the possibilities of using local labor for reducing our native iron ore into the metal, in operations located near the mines. They point out that even though coke is becoming dangerously scarce, we can continue to increase steel output if we are broad-minded on the monopoly question and if we permit independent small business people to participate in iron and steel production.

At a formal hearing soon to take place, the Congress will learn conclusively that not an equivalent but a superior grade of steel is made from these ores—and mind you—without the use of coke. By adapting the sponge iron process and using lignite coal, the Nation's existing steel furnaces can be crowded to greater tonnage output than even the recently reported boast of "102 percent of capacity."

The people of the vast area of North Dakota and Minnesota have a remarkable record to their credit, when an accounting is taken of sacrifices made in the war. In fact, a successful war could not be prosecuted without its bountiful resources of strategic raw materials. Somehow, this area was almost completely forgotten when the lucrative war contracts were being handed out to big business.

In the good spirit of offering the Nation an even greater output of iron, the master metal of war, I make available this hopeful statement for the RECORD:

NORTH DAKOTA-MINNESOTA CONFERENCE

Washington, D. C., May 14, 1943.

Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Chairman, the Steel Shortage Investigating Committee,
Congress of the United States.

SIR: The people of the Minnesota Iron Range and of North Dakota are grateful to you and your colleagues for the encouragement shown our proposal to make iron metal locally from native iron-ore deposits by the use of our own lignite coal. May I express the appreciation of the Governors of the two States for your invitation to be represented at the recent preliminary conference with the committee staff and for the patience, assistance, and courtesies.

"GHOST TOWNS" THREATEN THIS AREA

Since the steel monopoly has not permitted these areas to become employed in converting abundant local resources into the basic metal for war, tens of thousands of our population are actually being driven away from established homes, only to aggravate the more favored war production centers which are already overcongested. "Ghost towns" threaten this vast area.

Our practical offers to engage our own people locally for the war effort are repeatedly answered by the inane excuse that the steel shortage is still too serious to justify construction of facilities needed, even though in less than a month they would produce a tonnage greater than that of the steel required.

We look forward to the formal hearing before your honorable body, when the full situation will be outlined, as reported in the attached statement.

Respectfully yours,

FRED J. FREDRICKSON,
Conference Secretary.

STEEL SHORTAGE, THE SERIOUS ISSUE

The iron-ore crisis ahead and how to make the iron metal out of Minnesota iron ores by the use of North Dakota lignite instead of coking coal, was the subject of a 3-day conference of delegations representing the Governors of the two States with the Boykin

Steel Shortage Investigating Committee of the House of Representatives, which is considering ways to increase steel furnace output by the erection of small furnaces near the mines and markets.

A formal committee hearing has been requested and scheduled for June 9, 1943, when a completely coordinated program is to be submitted.

North Dakota's lignite coal deposits exceed 600,000,000,000 tons. They represent 60 percent of the Nation's total lignite, which is equivalent to 15 percent of the Nation's solid fuel reserves.

COKE SHORTAGE NO RETARDER TO STEEL OUTPUT

High quality hydrogen can now be economically made from lignite. Hydrogen has been proven an efficient agent for making iron ores into the quality of metallic iron that is required in making the better grades of steel and steel alloys. Several iron-producing plants are expected to be erected near both the iron ore and lignite mines, using the sponge-iron process. Many byproducts of strategic war value are also derived from the use of this neglected fuel source. These include plastics, tars, and liquid fuel of high efficiency to replenish the diminishing fuel-oil supply.

The memorandum on the iron ore crisis filed with the committee states: Billions of tons of rich iron ore will continue to be available for many years of war production, but only if progressive mining is introduced and special ore-processing plants are erected near the mines to improve the quality of Minnesota's vast deposits of low-grade ore.

Processing, or "beneficiating," the ores before they are shipped to the blast furnaces 1,200 to 1,800 miles away will result in a more efficient use of the Nation's rails, iron-making furnaces, and facilities. The raw ores without beneficiating contain around 50 percent to as low as 40 percent metallic iron. There are additional billions of tons whose quality runs near 30-percent metal. To so beneficiate or remove the clay and other foreign material before shipment the steel industry will save millions in wasted freight expenses from the mines to the furnaces.

ENCOURAGE THE PIONEERS, NOT MONOPOLY

Equally important is the fact that the beneficiating processes may be carried on continuously through the year of 12 months. This is contrasted to the present practice of making use of facilities and the local labor supply only during the 6 months when the Lakes are ice-free for water transportation.

The industry in this area is capable of three times its present output of this basic metal, but only if it puts into productive employment on a 50-weeks' basis the available local manpower and by permitting the use of ore processing methods known and used by progressive operators.

Representing Minnesota at these conferences are the following:

Fred A. Cina, executive secretary, Range Municipalities and Civic Association, Virginia, Minn.

R. E. Wilson, commissioner, Minnesota Iron Range Resources Board, State Office Building, St. Paul, Minn.

Dr. L. H. Reyerson, professor of chemistry, director of the Northwest Research Institute, School of Chemistry, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Prof. T. L. Joseph, head of the department of metallurgy, School of Mines, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Representing North Dakota:

Alex C. Burr, consulting engineer, Industrial Commission of North Dakota; member, American Institute of Chemical Engineers, American Chemical Society, etc., Jamestown, N. Dak.

Fred J. Fredrickson, executive secretary, North Dakota Resources Board, Valley City, N. Dak.

In Tunisia and Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, note the contrast as set forth in the Milwaukee Journal of May 7, 1943. The article reads:

IN TUNISIA—AND HERE

In Tunisia—"These bloody and bitter Tunisian battles * * *. A thin line of men. Four days and nights they have fought hard, eaten little, washed none, and slept hardly at all. Their nights have been violent with attack, fright, butchery, and their days sleepless and miserable with the crash of artillery."

In Milwaukee—Because of a jurisdictional dispute between members of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union (Congress of Industrial Organizations) and members of the United Leather Workers' Union (American Federation of Labor), 198 workers of the 250 employees on the first shift at the J. Laskin & Sons Corporation walked off the job Thursday, with more workers going out later. The company, an innocent third party, has appealed to the Government for guidance. The company, incidentally, has long been 100 percent in war production.

In Tunisia—"The men are walking. They are 50 feet apart, for dispersal. Their walk is slow, for they are dead weary. * * * Every line and sag of their bodies speaks their inhuman exhaustion."

In Jacksonville, Fla.—Several thousand shipyard workers were delayed in getting to their jobs; production in the yards and elsewhere was thrown out of gear, other war work in the city of 295,000 was disrupted. Why? Because the busses of the transit company (there are no streetcars) were stopped due to a strike—a strike growing out of a jurisdictional dispute between two American Federation of Labor affiliates, the International Association of Machinists and the Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric, and Motor Coach Employes.

In Tunisia—"The men dig in on the back slope of the hill before any rest begins. Everybody digs in. This is an inviolate rule of the commanding officers and nobody wants to disobey it. Every time you pause, even if you think you are dying of weariness, you dig yourself a hole before you sit down."

The labor racketeers are riding high, but, as the news of the death on the fighting front of the sons and brothers of the factory workers comes filtering home, there will be a day of reckoning and those who are responsible for these unjustifiable strikes will answer to the men of their unions.

The Senate Pay-as-You-Go Tax Bill

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 18, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in voting today for the revised and perfected Senate Ruml tax bill I believe I am reflecting the wishes of a large majority of the people of my district and State who are anxious that Congress shall cease muddling with the tax question and that our country shall get on a pay-as-you-go tax basis as soon as possible. I am afraid that if this bill is defeated we will lose our last chance of securing pay-as-you-go legislation. I am afraid that if the bill gets back into conference nothing will come out but the withholding tax.

I take my stand today with a sense of my responsibility as a Member of Congress.

Eight times I have raised my right hand in this Chamber and taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. That oath has sunk deeply into my consciousness and I have consistently opposed the abdication by Congress of its constitutional powers as tending to change the entire form and mold of our Government. The time is here when Congress, if it is true to the people, will move to recapture powers which it has ignobly surrendered. Congress alone should frame the tax bill, thus vindicating its dignity and its constitutional rights.

The duty of legislating rests upon the Congress and I would like to see the Congress rise to its responsibility as an independent branch of government under the Constitution.

I have always been for pay-as-you-go legislation and I believe that about 100 percent of the people I represent are in favor of it. Under the heavy tax levies we have now and those we are going to have in the future unless we change our tax system to the pay-as-you-go basis thousands, possibly millions, of our people will face tax-paying time without the means of discharging their tax liability.

Quick action is vitally necessary in order to make it possible to put the withholding provision into effect by the beginning of the fiscal year, the deadline of May 15 established by the Treasury experts already having been passed. To send the bill to conference would only delay matters when time is precious and would further exasperate the American people who are sick and tired of delays and postponements in handling the tax question.

I am pleased to say that the Senate rewrote the Ruml bill and adopted anti-windfall amendments that remove the objections which I and others urged against the measure when it was before the House. I feel that by our objections we have helped to make a better bill. These Senate anti-windfall amendments are definite and sweeping in their scope and in my opinion furnish ample protection against windfalls and unjust enrichment from war profits.

One of these Senate anti-windfall amendments is practically identical with a bill I introduced on February 11 last known as H. R. 1800 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, which provided that when a taxpayer's tax liability for 1942 is greater than for 1943 he must give a check to the United States Treasury covering the differential by which his 1942 taxes exceed his 1943 taxes. This

will effectively siphon vast war profits into the Federal Treasury.

To show how this provision will work I will cite a typical case of a war contractor who, we will say, made a profit of $5,000,000 on a war contract in 1942 and did not have a war contract in 1943. His tax on his 1942 profit at 1942 rates would be in round numbers $4,300,000. Under the original Carlson-Ruml bill, a complete forgiveness measure, he could invest his $4,300,000 of "forgiveness" in Government bonds at say 3 percent, and have a life annunity of $129,000 from the Government on money he owes to the Government. At his death he would leave a princely estate of "forgiveness" money to his heirs. Under the Senate bill these windfal's will be impossible.

There are some things about the Senate bill I do not like but no tax bill ever was perfect, especially one that inaugurates an entirely new tax system. The important thing is that this bill makes a clean-cut transfer from the old archaic system of tax arrears to a current basis. It places the United States definitely, once and for all, on a pay-as-you-go basis. Whatever defects and injustices there may be, can be ironed out by future amendments.

I do not think we need to worry for fear the rich will receive too much benefit from this bill. Our people, rich and poor alike, have hardly begun to feel the cost of this war compared with the way they are going to feel it. For every dollar the so-called rich receive in tax forgiveness in this bill, they will pay several dollars under new tax levies. I expect to have to vote to impose additional levies because the war must be won and we must raise the money to win it. In my opinion there will be few, if any, rich people in this country when peace comes and the period of reconstruction is ended. Some people think we may be lucky if we escape a capital levy before this war is over.

With the time element so pressing and with windfalls no longer possible under this new Senate measure I am not willing to send the bill to conference for another period of interminable wrangling and thus jeopardize the prospect of securing any pay-as-you-go tax legislation, and for these reasons I vote to instruct the conferees to recede and concur in the Senate bill.

Racial Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, occasionally we hear reports from some of our industries throughout the country with reference to discrimination against certain peoples because of their racial origin. I wish to denounce such discrimination, Mr. President, in emphatic terms. I really believe, and particularly at this time, we ought to be setting an example for the rest of the world to follow. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fair Play for All," published in Il Progresso Italo-Americano of May 2, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIR PLAY FOR ALL

Various peoples, creeds, races, and tongues have been welded into the American Nation. This is the secret and source of its strength. Here are the roots of its tremendous growth. Into the make-up and greatness of our land have been integrated the countless common folk from all over the world who suffered economic hardships, religious intolerance, and political persecution. Looking forward to the blessings of political freedom and social security, these common people have streamed to our shores and helped build our mighty Republic. Italian, Irish, Jewish, Scandinavian, and Slavic blood have been intermingled to produce America's true national unity and unrivaled progress.

It is many months since President Roosevelt, great humanitarian that he is, denounced all discriminatory practices and demanded their discontinuance. However, there are still institutions and men who discriminate against individuals because of their foreign-sounding names, their faith, or the color of their skin. When jobs are barred to such workers, our national untiy, our war potential and highest welfare are gravely imperiled. Such discriminatory policies are a boon to our mortal enemies and a blow to our best national interests.

We are Americans by choice. We are not Italians in America, but are Americans of Italian origin who have chosen the United States as our country, as the one and only country to which we give our devotion and loyalty. Hence, we must speak frankly. All too often, Americans (who happen to be of Italian extraction) are being denied their full rights as Americans. Discrimination is frequently evidenced against Americans (bearing Italian names or born abroad) especially in the economic, political, and social fields of endeavor. A mechanic with an Italian-sounding name tends to find it harder to get a job in a defense plant. There is no earthly reason why even the slightest hesitation should be displayed in according full recognition to Americans of Italian extraction in all branches of our armed services.

No one can with honesty question the patriotism, courage, and sacrifices which the Americans of Italian birth or parentage have manifested and made in our great wars. Their voluntary purchases of many millions and millions of dollars of Defense bonds and War bonds are convincing proof of that fact. Il Progresso itself, through its readers, is responsible for the sale of over $10,000,000 worth of bonds. More than 300,000 Americans of Italian descent served in the American Expeditionary Force of World War No. 1. More than half a million are serving in our armed forces today. Americans of Italian origin led all others in the seven volunteer quotas for the New York area even before Pearl Harbor. The number of Americans of Italian descent cited for valor and heroism on every sector of our far-flung battle fronts is greater than their general proportion in the armed services.

The great mass of Americans of Italian birth, the common people in our midst, resent every form of discrimination. This resentment is not allayed when some outstanding American, bearing an Italian name, is appointed to public office. Nor does the policy of occasionally giving one of the common folks a minor job meet the issue. It is true that individual Americans of Italian extraction, men of ability and integrity, have been elevated to positions of high public trust, but this recognition of the few is no substitution of the realization of the hopes and needs of the many.

The blot of discrimination must be eradicated from the glorious pages of American democracy. The elimination of all prejudices and discrimination will foster and fortify our national unity as the first prerequisite for America's victory in the war and the peace to come. This would be the most powerful answer to the Mussolinis, Hitlers, and Tojos who hypocritically seek to exploit these shortcomings in our national life.

We are Americans all. All Americans, regardless of their national or racial origin, regardless of the creed they embrace, are entitled to and must get their full rights as Americans. This is basic and inviolable. It is inherent in the ideals of freedom and democracy—in the cause to which our country is now dedicated.

Can America Do Business With Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, for nearly 2 years America has stood steadfastly by the Government and people of Russia, aiding them with vast supplies of war munitions, food, and other requirements essential to the defeat of their barbaric Nazi aggressors.

The Russian people have been making greater sacrifices than any other nation in the present titanic struggle against the Axis armies. With unyielding courage and heroic exploits they have held the line while the Allied Powers have been organizing their forces for the final blow which will end forever Hitler's rule of tyranny.

With victory in sight, it is time to think of the world of tomorrow. I was glad, therefore, to comply with the request of the editors of the magazine Scoop to write a short article dealing with our future business relations with Russia.

The article will appear in the forthcoming July issue, and I respectfully request unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator from Montana)

The question which you have asked me would have been difficult to answer were we now in 1918 and not in 1942. The Russia which had emerged after the First World War was looked upon with skepticism not alone by American business people, but by the rest of the world. Its very ability to survive was questioned; its business integrity was at a discount; its domestic and foreign policies were frightening to some. The new government had inherited an illiterate people, a backward economy, and very little industry. What the World War had failed to destroy, the civil war accomplished. What toll in human lives the two wars had failed to take, the famine completed. But as the years went on, our busi-

ness contacts multiplied and we discovered that our fears had been groundless, that the business dealings of the Russians were honorable, and that a great market was in the offing. Unfortunately, we were slow in learning this lesson. The German propagandists had been busy. They spread throughout the world the treacherous slander that the Russians were not to be trusted. This vilification had its deadly effect in England. The formation of the Cliveden set was one of the results. The Germans assured us that only they knew how to deal with the Russians and urged us to do our business through them. At the same time they were fully aware of the fact that the Russians often deprived themselves of food at home in order to secure foreign exchange with which to pay their commitments abroad on due date. The result was that they got the lion's share of the market. Germany gained a sort of strangle hold upon the Russian industrial development through the use of their equipment and replacements. It also helped the Germans to carry on espionage for their future war with the Soviet Union.

But despite the insurmountable obstacles, the financial difficulties, they forged ahead. They created one great industry after another; they purchased billions of dollars worth of goods and paid in cash. Right here in the United States they had purchased equipment and commodities running into the hundreds of millions of dollars. Not a single default is to be recorded. This is a real achievement. That speaks eloquently of their desire to do business fairly and honestly. It is an achievement which any nation could be proud of. At the same time it is an indication of what we may expect in the future under more favorable circumstances. When the present war is over there will be a huge task of reconstruction in the Soviet Union. Vast areas will have to be rebuilt. There is where American skill, American ingenuity and technique, could expedite the bringing of normal life back to the untold millions of Russians who are today suffering from the devastation brought to them by the Germans. In rendering such service, the bond of friendship and mutual respect will grow stronger. The Russia which, as Hon. Hugo L. Black, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, has said, "Has won for herself imperishable glory, and has gained for her people the undying gratitude of free peoples everywhere," will surely know that in inviting our people to help them with their reconstruction they will receive not only recognized talent but sincere friendship. The question is not, Can America do business with the Soviet Union after the war? That is an axiom. Rather, the question is, How can we organize ourselves to bring about the greatest benefits to both countries in the post-war period? With good will on both sides, that should be a relatively easy matter. I, for one, am looking forward to the blossoming of trade and friendship between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America.

Estimated Amounts of Tax Cancelations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, at my request, showing how the tax refunds and tax cancelations under the bill recently passed would affect the various States and Territories.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated amounts of tax cancelation [1] under Senate bill, H. R. 2570, distributed by States and Territories

	In thousands of dollars
Alabama	48,823
Alaska	3,549
Arizona	14,038
Arkansas	22,363
California	592,270
Colorado	56,175
Connecticut	283,029
Delaware	194,940
District of Columbia	101,926
Florida	174,129
Georgia	90,856
Hawaii	27,904
Idaho	7,221
Illinois	839,453
Indiana	152,328
Iowa	52,658
Kansas	33,147
Kentucky	57,708
Louisiana	71,396
Maine	35,502
Maryland	178,877
Massachusetts	425,507
Michigan	493,345
Minnesota	108,436
Missippi	18,192
Missouri	193,584
Montana	15,677
Nebraska	30,527
Nevada	19,812
New Hampshire	23,826
New Jersey	445,875
New Mexico	12,987
New York	1,996,108
North Carolina	88,184
North Dakota	4,811
Ohio	532,217
Oklahoma	53,154
Oregon	43,590
Pennsylvania	859,182
Rhode Island	78,842
South Carolina	23,323
South Dakota	5,192
Tennessee	84,763
Texas	255,393
Utah	12,319
Vermont	13,643
Virginia	131,945
Washington	79,261
West Virginia	46,919
Wisconsin	124,010
Wyoming	10,084
Total	9,274,000

[1] Includes tax reduction as a result of special treatment accorded to members of armed forces.

Estimated per capita amount of tax cancelation [1] under Senate bill, H. R. 2570, by States and Territories

	Per capita amount [2]
Alabama	$17
Alaska	49
Arizona	28
Arkansas	11
California	86
Colorado	50
Connecticut	166
Delaware	730
District of Columbia	154
Florida	92
Georgia	29
Hawaii	66
Idaho	$14
Illinois	106
Indiana	44
Iowa	21
Kansas	18
Kentucky	20
Louisiana	30
Maine	42
Maryland	98
Massachusetts	99
Michigan	94
Minnesota	39
Mississippi	8
Missouri	52
Montana	28
Nebraska	23
Nevada	180
New Hampshire	48
New Jersey	107
New Mexico	24
New York	148
North Carolina	25
North Dakota	7
Ohio	77
Oklahoma	23
Oregon	40
Pennsylvania	87
Rhode Island	111
South Carolina	12
South Dakota	8
Tennessee	29
Texas	40
Utah	22
Vermont	38
Virginia	49
Washington	46
West Virginia	25
Wisconsin	40
Wyoming	40
Total	70

[1] Includes tax reduction as a result of special treatment accorded to members of armed forces.

[2] Using population as of Apr. 1, 1940.

Citation for Heroism of Francis A. Dales, Cadet-Midshipman, United States Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the citation conveying the award of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Cadet-Midshipman Francis A. Dales, whose home address is 512 Telfair Street, Augusta, Ga. This medal was presented to Cadet Dales by Capt. Edward Macauley, a member of the Maritime Commission, at the United States Maritime Academy, Kings Point, N. Y., on National Maritime Day, last Saturday, May 22. I think that the heroic conduct of this young man in the martime service of the country is worthy of note, and I therefore ask that the citation be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION,
Washington, May 22, 1943.

The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Merchant Marine

Distinguished Service Medal to Francis A. Dales, cadet-midshipman (D).

CITATION

For heroism above and beyond the call of duty.

His ship was a freighter, carrying drums of high-octane gasoline, one of two American ships in a small British convoy to Malta. Orders were to "get through at all costs." Heavily escorted, the convoy moved into the Mediterranean, and before noon of that day the enemy's attack began. From then on the entire convoy was under constant attack from Axis planes and submarines. Assigned the command of an antiaircraft gun mounted on the bridge, Dales contributed to the successful defense of his ship for ? days. At 4 a. m. on the morning of the fourth day torpedo boats succeeded in breaking through and two attacked from opposite sides. Sneaking in close under cover of the darkness, one opened point-blank fire on Dales' position with four .50-caliber machine guns, sweeping the bridge and killing three of his gun crew in the first bursts. The other sent its deadly torpedo into the opposite side of the freighter. Neither the heavy fire from the first torpedo boat nor the torpedo from the second drove Dales and his crew from their gun. With only flashes to fire at in the darkness, he found the target and the first boat burst into flames and sank. But the torpedo launched by the other had done its deadly work. The high-test gasoline cargo ignited and the American ship was engulfed in flames. Reluctantly orders were given to abandon her. Two hours later the survivors were picked up by a British destroyer, which then proceeded to take in tow a tanker that had been bombed and could not maneuver. After 5 hours' constant dive bombing, the tanker was hit again, her crew abandoned her, and the destroyer was forced to cut her loose. But the cargo she carried was most important to the defense of Malta and it had to get through. The rescue destroyer and another destroyer steamed in, lashed themselves on either side of the stricken tanker, and dragged her along in a determined attempt to get her to port. Dales and four others volunteered to go aboard the tanker and man her guns in order to bring more fire power to their defense. The shackled ships, inching along and making a perfect target, were assailed by concentrated enemy airpower. All that day wave after wave of German and Italian bombers dived at them and were beaten off by a heavy barrage. Bombs straddled them, scoring near misses, but no direct hits were made until noon the next day, when the tanker finally received a bomb down her stack which blew out the bottom of her engine room. Though she continued to settle until her decks were awash, they fought her through until dusk that day brought them under the protection of the hard-fighting air force out of Malta.

The magnificent courage of this young cadet constitutes a degree of heroism which will be an enduring inspiration to seamen of the United States merchant marine everywhere.

For the President:

EMORY SCOTT LAND,
Chairman.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator VANDENBERG's 'Compromise,'" from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 21, 1943. The editorial relates to the reciprocal trade agreements.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR VANDENBERG'S COMPROMISE

Although warned by Secretary of State Hull against restrictive amendments to the Reciprocal Trade Act as approved by the House, the Republicans in the Finance Committee have succeeded in tacking to it the compromise plan pushed by Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan.

While confirming the State Department in its power to negotiate binding treaties for the time being, this would give Congress the right, 6 months after the end of the war, to abrogate any agreement in force for 3 years or longer.

Secretary Hull's objection to this is obvious. It amounts to serving notice on foreign powers—especially the United Nations—that Congress does not intend to rock the boat while hostilities are in progress, but that it certainly intends to take matters into its own hands as soon as they are over.

As we have said before, the chief value of reciprocal tariff agreements can be realized only after the war, when it will be necessary to reestablish trade relations on the freest basis possible. For the time being, lease-lend arrangements govern most of our commerce. So why should any of our allies—or any neutral power—undertake difficult negotiations when it knows that the result may be repudiated just as soon as it assumes importance?

Further, how can any power assume that we will do our fair share in post-war rehabilitation when we post such a warning?

Tribute to Mrs. Ballington Booth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting editorial from the Saturday Evening Post about Mrs. Ballington Booth and the wonderful work she has done in connection with the Volunteer Prison League, a division of the religious organization, the Volunteers of America, founded by Mrs. Booth 47 years ago.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUT SOME DON'T GO BACK

It is an unhappy fact that approximately 50 percent of the men and women in our prisons and reformatories have previously been in some kind of correctional institution. Says James V. Bennett, director of the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice: "I am confident that at least 85 percent of the men leaving the prison gates do so with the firm determination not to come back, and yet over half of them do return to prison within 5 years."

Bennett adds bluntly that the most important reason for this wholesale backsliding is that "society itself forces the ex-prisoner to return to crime by making it impossible for him to earn an honest living or associate with honest people." Illustrating his point, he quotes a prisoner who was returned to an institution after a short period of freedom. "Sure," the man said bitterly, "I was free. Free to be a bum, free to walk the streets cold and hungry, and to sleep in alleyways, free to go from one employment office to another, free indeed, but in a cruel, friendless world. You should ask why I'm back!"

There is in this country an organization which has been devoting itself to this and other prison problems for nearly a half century. It is the Volunteer Prison League, a division of the well-known and respected charitable and religious organization, The Volunteers of America. The Prison League was founded just 47 years ago this month by Mrs. Ballington Booth. Now a kindly, white-haired little lady of unbelievable energy, Mrs. Booth has spent much of her life trying to smooth the paths of our prison unfortunates and reclaim them when they emerge into an unfriendly world.

When Mrs. Booth and her Prison League began their work, conditions in most of our prisons were shocking. From the beginning she campaigned quietly but relentlessly, and in the places where it would do the most good, for improvement; and she has lived to see a remarkable change for the better in our houses of correction—a change for which she has been partly responsible.

Almost from the day the league was founded, Mrs. Booth has worked with men still within the walls— always at the invitation of the wardens and with their help—and has brought to them a measure of comfort and, to some, genuine repentance. At the same time, she and her league have assisted the wives and children of prisoners, giving both material and spiritual help to prison-shadowed homes. Other people and other organizations have, of course, participated in such work, but through the years Mrs. Booth has been one of its most tireless leaders.

The Prison League now has six special centers from which its people operate, sponsoring men who are due for parole, watching over them and providing them with jobs. The voluminous but unpublicized files of the league testify to the effectiveness of this effort. The touching letters of gratitude from ex-prisoners who have been rehabilitated must give deep satisfaction to the white-haired little founder of the league on its forty-seventh anniversary.

For obvious reasons, the league's work has received but little publicity. You can't call in the press to see a paroled prisoner start work on his new job. But we don't need newspaper clippings as evindence when we have the word of such men as Director Bennett, Warden Lawes, and Warden Johnston that Mrs. Booth and her league are welcomed and needed.

That so many men and women do return to prison after brief freedom is a reflection, not upon the league and its methods, but upon the rest of us who have not yet made possible a much greater expansion of this work.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the St. Tammany Farmer, pub-

lished in Covington, La., of the issue of Friday, May 21, 1943, entitled "Boys in New Guinea Want To Know 'What in Hell' Is the Matter Over Here."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOYS IN NEW GUINEA WANT TO KNOW "WHAT IN HELL" IS THE MATTER OVER HERE

About all we read in the newspapers is that John L. Lewis continually holds the threat over the heads of the Nation that unless the coal miners are given a hike in pay they will walk out and stop the flow of needed fuel to keep the wheels of production going in the war factories all over America. Just why the heads of the Government let this skunk sabotage production of fighting materials is more than the average American can understand and if it could be put up to the rank and file of Americans there would be thousands who would volunteer to stand John L. Lewis up against a brick wall and pump his rotten torso so full of lead it would take a 10-ton tank to drag it to the garbage pile.

And what do the boys who are in the actual bloody battles of the far-off Pacific think of us for letting Lewis and the miners get by with their activities? There are thousands of our boys over there who are wondering just what kind of people we are to permit these things to continue, and one of them who wrote to his father asks this question: "Say, what's wrong in America? The people don't seem to realize that they have troops in the south Pacific. Why can't they do something about the threatened coal strikes? They should take every d—— one of them and put them in the Army on private's pay or send them to the front. Why should we fight and die when the people in America don't give a d—— about us? We can't whip the Japs with our mess kits."

The Fourth Term

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Long Island Daily Press on the fourth Presidential term. I think the editorial ought to be read very generally.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOURTH TERM?—LET REPUBLICANS COMMIT THEMSELVES

In calling upon Postmaster General Walker as chairman of the Democratic National Committee to discuss the fourth-term question, Republican Chairman Harrison E. Spangler may be confronting the people of the country with a real political crisis.

Spangler wants a definite commitment from the President. He wants the President to say that he will not accept a nomination for a fourth term under any circumstances. The range of circumstances that may be upon us between the present date and the date of the party convention must be recognized as great. We are in the midst of the greatest war effort of history.

If our Government were, as the British Government, a parliamentary government, this crisis would not arise. The Government would remain in power for the duration if it were not able to command a parliamentary majority and the confidence of the people. In our Government no such flexible arrangement is possible. His term of office is fixed at 4 years, and it may be neither more nor less.

The President should not make a commitment against a fourth term unless he is absolutely certain in his own mind that no circumstance can arise to make him regret the commitment. It would not do to have an issue of bad faith arise to plague our country in the midst of war.

The Republican Party could and should act to make it easier for the President to make a decision. The President's third term was justified by him and by the voters by the contention that the Republican Party could not be trusted with the Nation's foreign policy. It would be helpful, therefore, if the Republican Party were to settle its stand on foreign policy now, and commit itself now to the nomination of a candidate whose record and views are consistent with the party's stand on foreign policy. The party should also commit itself to maintain some continuity of command in the conduct of the war effort.

If the Republican Party is unwilling to commit itself now as to platform and candidate, it should not ask the Democratic Party to commit itself now. If the Republican Party were to act to assure the Nation against defeatist or isolationist policies and candidate, the party would be earning the right to ask assurances against a fourth term of the Democrats.

The Republican Party has cooperated loyally in the war effort. There are, nevertheless, rabidly isolationist elements still powerful within the Republican Party. Would these elements become more vocal and more powerful if the President were to eliminate himself and thereby strengthen the likelihood of Republican victory in 1944?

The fourth-term prospect rests upon the fact that the President is not an unknown quality in world affairs. The Republicans should match that fact by binding themselves to a trustworthy policy and trustworthy candidates before asking the President and the people to trust them with completion of the war effort and the peace.

Poll Tax Dangers: Federal Usurpation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Poll Tax Dangers: Federal Usurpation," by the eminent columnist Mark Sullivan.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLL TAX DANGERS

FEDERAL USURPATION

(By Mark Sullivan)

This dispatch is about a bill scheduled to come before Congress this week, House Resolution No. 7. From the point of view of the structure of American government, this is by far the most important measure now pending. But before dealing with this measure in Congress, and in order to make this measure clear, turn for a moment away from the Government in Washington and consider something going on among State governments.

The State governments are alarmed—alarmed about their very existence. They are determined to save themselves. Preservation of the functions and integrity of the States as units of government is in the air. Not only is it a concern of the thoughtful; there is popular emotion behind it. Expressions of it emerge with increasing frequency and rising earnestness.

Last week, at Chicago, was held a meeting of a committee of the Council of State Governments. The spirit of the meeting was expressed in a speech by Gov. Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland. He said: "We must take every care that the Federal Government does not step in and take over functions and prerogatives that are essentially the functions and prerogatives of the States themselves."

And the week before at Albany, N. Y., Gov. Thomas E. Dewey spoke: "The time has come for a complete and searching reappraisal of the relations between the people of the United States and their various governments—local, State, and national. * * * For 10 years now the Federal Government has been absorbing the functions of the State; also, to some extent, the functions of the local communities. * * * All of this was the direct outgrowth of a mistaken political philosophy. * * * The day is at hand when the people are being compelled to call a halt and take stock."

Very well, the welkin has been sounded. We are going to guard the functions of the States, preserve them against encroachment.

Of all the functions of the States, the most fundamental is their fixing the qualifications of voters. This is at present an exclusive function of the States—the States alone say what qualifications a citizen must have in order to vote.

Now, we come to the bill in Congress, House Resolution 7. The purpose and effect of this measure is to take away from the States a part of their function of fixing qualifications for voters. This measure asserts that Congress has power to fix in every State the qualifications of voters for candidates for Federal offices. The measure proceeds to exercise this power as respects one qualification, which now exists in some States.

The meat of House Resolution No. 7 is: "It shall be unlawful for any State * * * to * * * [require] the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting or registering to vote in any primary or other election for President, Vice President, electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or member of the House of Representatives; and any such requirement shall be invalid and void."

Now, the reader may think this applies only to the States which have poll taxes—there are seven in the South. Carelessly thinking that accounts for much of the thoughtless support of the bill in Congress, or the indifference about it. But the fact is, this measure applies to every State. It applies to New York and Pennsylvania and Illinois and Iowa—to literally every State—just as it applies to seven Southern States.

Here again, the reader may think carelessly. If he is a New York reader, or an Illinois one, or an Iowa one, he may think: "We don't have a poll tax and we don't want one—so why worry?"

But if these States outside the South do not have the poll tax as a qualification for voting, they have other qualifications, which they cherish strongly. They have qualifications about length of residence, about citizenship, about naturalization.

And—here is the menace to all the States—if Congress can forbid one qualification, it can forbid any other qualification. By forbidding the poll tax as a qualification, Congress would set up a precedent and principle by which some future Congress could, if it

chooses, forbid qualifications about residence and citizenship.

If the Council of State Governments, if the 48 State Governors, and all the other persons and organizations concerned about loss of State functions have vigilance in proportion to their earnestness, if they have energy to act in behalf of what they believe—they will take steps at once against House Resolution No. 7. It is scheduled for action in the House this week, in the Senate later.

The G. O. P. Against Cordell Hull

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENNETT CHAMP CLARK

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "G. O. P. Against Cordell Hull," from the St. Louis Star-Times of May 22, 1943.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The G. O. P. v. Cordell Hull

In a meeting in Chicago 13 months ago, the Republican National Committee adopted a resolution recognizing the "responsibility" of the United States to other nations and the "obligation" to assist in bringing about an "understanding" in the interests of world peace. It is difficult to find, in the Republican record in Congress in regard to the Hull reciprocal-trade program, any evidence that this resolution was more than hot air.

The Grand Old Party delegation in the House, not daring to oppose the trade program directly, attempted collateral attacks. First the minority tried to insert a clause giving Congress the power to override the Department of State. Then they forced through an amendment to shorten the trade-agreement power from 3 years to 2 years so that the next Congress would have a chance to "reconsider."

In the Senate, Republican leaders have adopted similar tactics. They do not assail the reciprocal trade idea in principle, because they realize that we should not reverse our tariff policies in time of war. But they are seeking to modify, amend, and emasculate the Hull program. The Grand Old Party attitude is summed up in expressions from National Chairman Harrison Spangler and Representative JAMES W. WADSWORTH, who clearly indicate that they are supporting trade reciprocity solely because to oppose it would be temporarily indiscreet.

Are the American people to accept this shortsightedness, this nationalistic folly, as the doctrine of the Republican Party?

If that is the case, the people will face, in the Presidential election of 1944, an exceedingly limited choice. Either they may vote Republican and thus vote against United Nations cooperation in the post-war era, or they must vote Democratic.

The Hull trade-pact program was carefully planned and has been well executed, but it symbolizes far more than it specifically contains.

It represents a realistic acceptance of the fact that the United States is no longer a colonial debtor nation, which must rigidly protect its "infant industries," but a creditor nation, whose prosperity depends on foreign trade moving both in and out.

It represents a recognition of the economic independence of nations, including America, in time of peace as well as in time of war.

It champions the theory of economic cooperation with our allies and friendly nations, to the substantial benefit of all peoples, as opposed to the narrow, cynical, futile nationalism of the Hawley-Smoot tariff.

It encompasses, in short, a fundamental change in the American attitude toward foreign trade and tariff relationships—a change dictated by the transformation of America into a world power which has reached industrial maturity.

If the Republican Party cannot recognize this change, except narrowly and reluctantly, merely in order to avoid offending our present military allies, then the Grand Old Party has little to offer the country for the post-war era.

An American return to extreme economic nationalism would cut the foundation from under all efforts toward a stable world organization. Economic nationalism is the assertion of an American right to ship goods abroad without accepting, in return, the goods of other nations. That policy is contradictory and self-destroying, in the end, but its first effect would be to destroy the United Nations.

There are forces within the Republican Party who understand this; the guidance of Mr. Willkie here, as elsewhere, is far sounder than that of the Old Guard.

But it is in Congress that party policy is largely written, and Republican opposition to the Hull program is a sign that the Grand Old Party still embraces the tariff philosophy of 1890. It is a sign that its leadership has no clear insight into the complex and unavoidable problems of the modern interrelated world.

The Japanese "Our Particular Foe"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT B. CHANDLER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the Louisville (Ky.) Times of May 21, 1943, in which Lt. Col. James Roosevelt, son of the President, declares in an interview that the Japanese are "our particular foe" and that there is a hard fight ahead.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SON OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT CAUTIONS UNITED STATES — JAPS "PARTICULAR FOE" — "HARD FIGHT" AHEAD

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF., May 21.—Terming the Japanese "our particular foe," Lt. Col. James Roosevelt has warned that only a hard fight and complete victory, with forces now being assembled, can frustrate Nipponese dreams of empire.

The Marine Corps officer, recuperating at his home here from an illness contracted 6 weeks ago, recently returned from the Orient. He declared in an interview:

DISTANCES PROBLEM

"Our problem is still one of great distances in the Pacific area, but we are steadily gaining strength for the major battles of the future. Japan, on the other hand, has reached the point where she is consolidating her gains and building up a great defensive structure and reserve of material.

"Japan might be willing to rest on her accumulation of resources and not attempt to extend her conquests. In that case her strategic policy would be to wait until we had worn ourselves out with battles in Europe, and try to negotiate a favorable peace.

"Should such a peace be granted her, by any chance, her ambitions to enlarge her place as a world power would again doubtless inspire her to gain further territorial conquests. We would then face the problem anew of defeating her under far more difficult conditions.

YANKS WANT ACTION

"As much as any other, if not more, this island nation with its enormous aspirations for a world domination is our particular foe. On the Pacific Coast this is well understood. It is not always so soundly comprehended in other parts of the country."

Men in the Orient, Colonel Roosevelt reported, want a full-fledged offensive operation, and are fretting under necessarily tedious delays. This eagerness for the fray, "plus equipment and supplies that are on the way," will win the war in the Pacific, he asserted.

Address of Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, at Mass Meeting To Welcome President Benes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] at the mass meeting to welcome President Benes of Czechoslovakia in the Chicago Stadium yesterday.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a matter of personal appreciation for me to participate in this occasion when my fellow citizens of Chicago and Illinois gather to honor one of the world's leading citizens. In an era which has produced many of contemporary greatness and others whose names will long endure, one derives hope and renewed inspiration from the opportunity of joining in public acclaim for Eduard Benes, the President of our sister democracy, Czechoslovakia.

President Benes is important to us Americans not alone because his countrymen are the ancestors of men and women who helped build our city and country; not alone because we have a heartfelt sympathy for the horrible trials which his people have undergone by virtue of the sadistic cruelties of the intuitive Hitler; not alone because Czechoslovakia is one of the children of that first World War which we, in our naiveté, thought would bring a lasting democratic peace upon our planet. President Benes stands out now, and will continue to stand out in history, because he symbolizes the fight for freedom, because he personifies our own history perseverance at a cost of life and property to create and

maintain the democratic institutions which are the bulwark of our existence. President Benes is the token which reveals to us that in order to have democratic liberties we cannot sit still. We must fight for them. To be absolutely sure that no totalitarian poison will asphyxiate and overcome us, we must uproot the evils which generate those poisons wherever they may be, whether here or abroad. This is no idle statement. This is no platitude made in the heat of passion or vengeance. It is a truism that must be vigorously enforced after we have won a victory, if the civilization of freemen is to survive.

It is particularly fitting that the people of this State of Lincoln, Douglas, and Grant should express their respect and esteem for Dr. Benes, one of Europe's great apostles of liberty. As I have said, from Czechoslovakia have come many who, by dint of their diligent enterprise, their loyalty to the cause of democracy, and their culture, have added an ingredient of incalculable worth to the formula which ultimately produced this magnificent citadel of democratic achievement. We here know the value of that culture and that contribution to our own development, and thus we are eager to help make sure that no tyrant, surrounded by the hordes of intolerance and bigotry, shall be permitted to exterminate and destroy this worth-while segment of civilization.

The days through which we now are passing, highlighted as they are by glorious achievement in the cause of liberty, yet saddened by personal losses which cannot be replaced, reveal ever more sharply what we have long learned to know is true. Without liberty, without the right to worship as one wants, to be free from fear, to have all of those many intangible as well as tangible rights which are our inalienable right, there is only blackness and despair.

It is our fervent hope that the terrific price in anguish and in lives which is now being paid, and the payment which will continue, regrettably, over a long period of years, will be a final purchase price for civilized living. But we must not delude ourselves into believing that once the price is paid there is nothing we need do in order to assure ourselves henceforth of a democratic way of life.

On the contrary, we must maintain vigilance and active and alert enterprise in order to retain what we so devoutly fight for. The life story of President Benes demonstrates the truth of this. With the late great Masaryk, he began the fight for Czechoslovakian independence long before the first guns announced the assault upon civilization in 1914. Almost with their bare hands and their single voices Masaryk and Benes built up international interest and help so that when the nations sat down to draft the treaties following the war, the modern Czechoslovakia emerged a democratic nation among the independent nations of the world.

But that did not content the leaders of the new republic. They continued their efforts to strengthen the bonds of democracy between themselves and other democratic nations, and sought to develop the ideal and the philosophy of democracy among their neighbors. Their success in this free adventure was one of the reasons that Hitler tried upon three different occasions to make nonaggression pacts with Doctor Benes. But Doctor Benes knew Adolf Hitler as well as, or better than, any man in Europe. He had watched the development of this gangster and his Nazi ideologies when Hitler represented a very small minority in the Socialist Party of Germany. Doctor Benes knew that the Hitler theory of double-dealing, force, and despotism was in direct conflict with the concepts and principles of the free government of his own country. He refused to enter into any alliance with Hitler, and that was one of the prime reasons that Hitler and his mechanized forces overran this peaceful and democratic country. But even though this little nation succumbed to the power of Hitler, it did not keep Doctor Benes and his small loyal group from continuing their work in behalf of their people and the ideals they represent. Neither the machine guns, the bayonets, nor the torture chamber of the Nazi horror have served to frighten off these intrepid souls from the goal which they had once reached, and which they now seek again. They are now working harder than ever to reestablish their homeland.

Not only are the heroic Czechoslovakians sabotaging in every possible way the Nazis who have occupied their land; but many Slovaks, also, in the little puppet state which Hitler created and placed under the traitor, Bela Tuka, whom he took from prison, are likewise defying the Nazis. The Slovaks are vigorously opposing Hitler and their own puppet government, and helping the United Nations.

Their tyrannical rulers have made the term "Independent Slovakia" so repulsive that, according to reports of the puppet government, practically no Slovak youth attending the puppet university of the puppet state studies the Slovak language and literature.

The same puppet government reports that secret anti-Hitler societies are being organized throughout the whole country. Almost daily, in its press and over its radio, the puppet government complains that the people of Slovakia long for the good old times of the Czechoslovak Republic. And they do not merely long. They are working and fighting for the day of liberation.

The puppet government sent Slovak soldiers into distant Russia to fight against the armies of one of the most heroic of the United Nations. Many of these Slovaks have deserted. They have joined Russian forces fighting to free their land, and they have distinguished themselves as heroic guerilla fighters.

Besides these Slovaks, bravely helping the United Nations, are Czech legionnaires, under a Czech commander, fighting against the Nazis with unrestrained vehemence.

So, again, on the battlefield, free Czechoslovaks are fighting side by side with the forces of the United Nations.

Yes, my friends, it is just a question of time until Czechoslovakians will reestablish their freedom with the help of their indomitable spirit and the good will and the arms of the Allied Nations. It is well to say at this point that before Hitler took over Czechoslovakia in 1939 this little nation was a thriving, active, virile democracy, patterned much after our own United States. To the timid and prejudicial souls who have constant fear of Russia and communism, it might be of some relief to learn that Russia, under the realist Stalin, and Czechoslovakia, under the idealist Benes, lived side by side as neighbors and friends, and when the crists came in 1939 the best friend Czechoslovakia had in Europe was Russia.

Our meeting today is within a short distance from a little American community which out of respect and sympathy has named itself Lidice. The peace, the quiet, the civilized progress which this suburb of a great city enjoys is reminiscent of the peaceful quiet and the civilized living which the little town in Czechoslovakia enjoyed until that hateful, fateful day when a crazed beast in human form led his murderous hangmen through its streets and left nothing but ashes, despair, and death. But the suburb is symbolic of the new Lidice that must and shall grow in Czechoslovakia as a symbol to all the world that the aberrations of a master race, destructive as they may be, are not and cannot be permitted to be lasting influences in our world.

It is almost 2 years since Lidice, long just another community of homes and people, center of everyday happinesses and sorrows of men and women and children, became immortal. A shocked world beheld men, once possessors of a proud culture, but now enslaved and mesmerized by a lust for power and the delusion of a mission, burn and destroy this simple, dignified hamlet. Then proudly these despoilers of mankind boasted of their dastardly accomplishment. Lidice, they proclaimed, is wiped from the face of the earth.

But that was just another indication of their treacherous and false thinking. Lidice is now greater than it ever was before. Lidice is a symbol of a goal. The sympathies and, more important, the energies of mankind are directed toward the successful culmination of the Herculean task of making certain that there shall never again be a repetition of that which occurred in the little Czechoslovakian village.

The reports of the success of the arms of the United Nations in Africa, the growing success in north Pacific and in the south Pacific are encouraging beacons in the dismal half light in which the world now finds itself. The task which still needs to be done will take tremendous energies and consume huge resources. No matter, however, how great the cost, and no matter how long the struggle, we must not and we will not yield until that day comes when Nazi might and Fascist ideology meet the fate which these cancerous sores on mankind have sought to impose on the rest of the world.

I have no doubt as to the outcome. At the same time I know, too, the anguish that it will cost, but we have long learned that as to certain things, cost is not a factor. If we are not to live in constant dread of a recurrence of this plague which twice in half a century has seared the earth, then it is up to us to leave nothing undone no matter how painful, no matter how unpleasant, yes; no batter how nauseating. The plagues recorded in the medical histories which attacked and destroyed hundreds upon thousands of men, women, and children throughout the story of peoples required heroic measures to eradicate them. Requiring even greater heroism is the remedy which must be applied to the human plague in Nazi form which with maniacal cunning is striving to destroy everything that is decent and good.

We who are not on the firing line, we who are in the physical safety of our own United States, are not unaware of the great sacrifices which we are demanding of our young men and of our young women. In whatever way we can, we are making our contributions to this eminent and necessary cause. We keep before us the ideals consecrated by the heroic men and women of the Revolutionary War and of the Civil War, and of the First World War. "If all the world's a stage," then the role of the democracies is that of the hero, a hero who must be successful, for only abysmal and cataclysmic blackness remains if he does not succeed.

Periodically throughout history, men have risen who have thought themselves to be greater than the combined strength and will of their fellow men. Periodically they have sought to assert that false leadership. They have attempted to take arrogantly and despotically to themselves rulership. In every instance they have been defeated and destroyed. Our job is greater than that which has been the lot of our ancestors. Our job is to make sure that the interval between the absolute defeat of nazi-ism and fascism is so certain, so definite, and so final that our children and grandchildren will have no concern, no fear of its possible recurrence.

The fight in which we now are engaged must not be but one of a series. It must be the final one so that our generation and the generations that follow may live in amity with their neighbors, so that the ideals for which President Benes, President Rocsevelt,

and other good men are devoting their energies and their lives may prevail.

Out of the ashes of the holocaust that we are now fighting we must rebuild the Lidices, we must reconstruct the Czechoslovakias firmly and impregnably.

That is our task, and that we will do under the inspired leadership of men like Roosevelt, Benes, Churchill, Stalin, and Chiang Kai-shek. We dare not, we will not fail.

The Jewish People in Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 21, 1943

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, Hitler and his Nazi beasts have gone completely mad. Since our victory over the Axis in Tunisia and Africa, Hitler's rage knows no bounds. He immediately placed full blame upon the Jews and announced his determination to exterminate every Jew in Europe.

From the Polish Morning World, a New York daily Polish-language paper, comes information from the Polish Government in London telling of the new and terrible annihilation, extermination, and mass murder of thousands of Jews in the cities of Czestochowa, Kaluszu, Siedlcach, Wilna, Nowagrod, Lublin, Lukow, Parczew, Miedzyrzec, Wlodowa, Piaskow, Lubelski, Konska Wala, Izbica, Zaklikow, Bodzentyn, Suchedniow, Chmielnik, Rawa Ruska, Brzesc, Bialystok, Grajew, Brodno, Henbieszow, Zambrowa, Chelm, Andrychow, Cmielow, Biala Podlaska, Staszow, Zaklikow, Krosnik, Zawickost, Jedrzejow, Pinczow, Busko, Wislica, Sokolow, Wegrow, Seredyn, Kocz, and others.

This new outburst is most vicious, cruel, and brutal, and the frustrated madman of Europe is openly giving vent to his rage and is going to satisfy his lust for revenge upon those remaining bedraggled, hungry, and hounded Jews in Europe. Something must be done, and done immediately, to save at least some of these poor unfortunates.

Churchill is now here in Washington. Let this Congress appeal to him and President Roosevelt.

These recent reports of this new reign of terror should make every one of us shudder. The Nazis are combing the cities and Jews are shot down in the streets, or in their homes, or are slain in huge gas chambers. It is a campaign for complete annihilation and extermination. Surely something must be done to try to help these unfortunate and defenseless people.

Our military and diplomatic experts should be instructed and given full authority to act. They must effectuate a plan for action to save the remaining Jewish people in Europe. Without doubt Palestine offers the most practical haven of refuge. It can be reached through Turkey by train, bus, or ships. There these people refugees could be clothed, fed, and given the needed medical attention. There they could receive care, kindness, and protection from the Hebrew people of the colony.

The day Tunis and Bizerte fell, Goebbels proclaimed the annihilation of the Jews as the Nazis' supreme goal. This campaign for mass extermination is now a reality, from the reports that are just coming in.

Whatever agreement England may have with the Arabs, limiting the number of Jews in Palestine, must be lifted in this crisis. Time is of the essence. Let us think of the despair and helplessness of these poor terror-stricken victims! The gates of Palestine can be opened and must be opened! The public opinion—the opinion of the Members of this Congress—the opinion of every human being regardless of race, creed, or color—cries out for mercy. No human being can complacently watch this mass slaughter and do nothing about it. The great and glorious British people must feel the same same as we do. The voice and conscience of the great mass of American and British liberty loving people is crying out today to Mr. Churchill and President Roosevelt: "Do something—and please hurry!"

Money—The Most Important Issue Before the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the twenty-fourth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on Money. In reviewing the record of the long struggle over the use of silver as money after the invention of national bank paper money and the enactment of the National Bank Act of 1863, during the emergency of the Civil War, it is interesting to note that all the territory that was added to the continental United States was acquired when the money of our Government was on a bimetallic basis and the United States mints were open to the unlimited coinage of both gold and silver—namely, the Louisiana Purchase, the acquisition of Florida, Texas, California, and Alaska.

The twenty-fourth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

Mr. President, I shall not consume the time of the Senate by reading, but will introduce some extracts from pages 7675 and 7676:

"I am not going to say anything now about or against the $100,000,000 reserve; that will not be endangered by the House resolution. I never have believed there was any necessity for $50,000,000 of reserve; I do not believe it now. It becomes more and more absurd every day to hear about $100,000,000 guarding greenbacks. I do not believe the credit of this Government would be impaired one penny if we were today to take $50,000,000 or all of that reserve and pay off the 3 percent bonds with it.

"Whatever may have been thought to be prudent in 1879, when the resumption act was an experiment, 8 years of experience have shown that the greenback needs no protection. When we paid off $50,000,000 of 3 percent bonds between the 1st day of January and the 1st day of July last, nearly $40,000,000 of them were paid in greenbacks at the request of the men who held the bonds. When the character of money in which our customs dues were paid at the great port of New York during the month of June was looked into it was found that nearly 82 percent of all the taxes were paid in greenbacks, although the law requires coin, and coin alone, for customs dues. The greenbacks in the Treasury held for the redemption of national-bank notes have been increased in the last 5 months from $30,000,000 to $60,000,000. Everybody wants greenbacks; nobody wants to have them redeemed, so that there is no sense in holding or hoarding gold for their redemption, far less $100,000,000 that costs us $5,000,000 of interest annually, as we paid 5 percent for $6,000,000 of it and 4½ percent for the balance. But I am not going to argue that question now. It will be swept away some day along with the other rubbish.

"The 3 percent bonds provided for in the resolution will all be paid off long before it is possible for the surplus funds, backed by the monthly surplus, to come anywhere near low enough to interfere with this $100,000,000 so-called reserve. Mr. President, this question has been argued all the time as though the Treasury was a great bank and the people of the United States a great private banking corporation, and as though everybody connected with the Treasury or managing its operations had to keep as much reserve in the Treasury of the people as a private banker would have to keep in order to save himself from unforeseen reverses. There is no analogy between them. Whatever there may be in the theory, the common sense of the proposition is all against the comparison and the assumption. The Senator from Maryland (Mr. Gorman) and myself may be carrying on a bank in Baltimore. We may have the best men in Baltimore as our depositors; we bank on our deposits, of course; that is all we want them for.

"But these depositors, when they see that the Senator from Maryland and myself are making money as bankers, and are making it out of their deposits, may say: 'It is too good a thing to let Beck and Gorman have this; we will set up a bank of our own.' When they do they of course take away the money they deposited with us, and they take away the business of their friends, who are also our depositors. The two banks divide the profits. We must have a reserve to meet unexpected calls like that upon us. If our depositors who are left think that in Chicago, St. Paul, Minn., or somewhere else money can be loaned at 10 or 15 percent instead of 3 percent, which is all they make by depositing in our bank, they draw their money out. We must have a reserve to meet all these contingencies or fail.

"The United States have no such contingencies to guard against. The United States have no competitor in their financial affairs. The money derived from our customhouses and our internal-revenue offices and from our miscellaneous sources comes, as I said, with the certainty of death, and the more prosperous the country is the larger the receipts are. Nobody can divide with us or take from us any of our depositors.

"Mr. President, no condition of things can break the United States. When the reserve of a private man is gone he fails. When the reserve of the United States is gone the Congress of the United States imposes a '5 percent tax on all incomes over $5,000,' and $30,000,000 flows into the Treasury; or '5 cents a pound on tea; 10 cents a pound on coffee, double up the tax on whisky and tobacco,' and untold millions roll in. The world

knows that; the plain people of the country understand it; and to argue here that we are no better off than a private man who must keep a reserve because he has no other means of payment except his own property is to my mind preposterous. No man's credit can be compared with that of the United States, whose power of taxation extends over a continent and over all the wealth of 60,000,000 people.

"Everything every bank has can be called on and be required to come to the rescue of the credit of the United States at any moment when any deficiency is likely to occur. It is, therefore, an absurd proposition from a business standpoint to assume that we occupy the relation of private bankers, although that assumption has alarmed many people and made them believe that we were in danger of being broker down financially unless we keep this reserve intact. Even when at the end of each quarter when pensions and wages are paid, it is thought to be horrible to reduce that $100,000,000 reserve for a day, although it may be known that it will accumulate and be in large excess for 3 months thereafter, or until the next general quarterly pay day comes."

I will go, however, to another speech at the same time from the senior Senator from Maryland, Mr. Gorman. I quite now from page 7723:

"Mr. Hewitt states that he had that information from ex-Secretary McCulloch. But that is not all. The fact is that on the 7th day of February 1885, nearly 1 month before the expiration of his term and when the new administration was about to come into power, he (Mr. McCulloch) was so alarmed at the condition of affairs he saw that payments out of the Treasury of silver certificates were running rapidly back into the subtreasury in New York from customs and internal revenue, receipts in gold on those accounts diminishing, the gold coin and bullion balance was being rapidly reduced, he was compelled on that date, February 7, 1885, to instruct the subtreasurer at New York to withhold payment of gold and greenbacks in the ordinary transaction with the clearing house in New York. In other words, he issued an order which suspended the whole operations of the Treasury with the New York clearing house as they had been carried on since 1879."

Mr. President, I only read this to show what the panic was at that time:

"On the last day of February 1885, just before this administration came in, the balance, excluding the fractional silver coin, was $120,969,674, of which $42,093,056 were silver dollars, leaving a deficit, if all the obligations due in gold were paid, of $21,123,382. So it ran until July 1885, when the Treasury found itself in the condition of having $144,052,929, of which $66,627,842 were standard silver dollars, leaving them short $22,574,913 of gold if all obligations were paid."

How similar were those conditions in 1885 and 1886. Just as bad a panic as we have now practically, and gotten up to order by the same men and to have effect upon the President. The President tells us in almost the same language as the present message of the dire calamities that would befall the country. Suppose he had called an extra session of Congress to repeal the Bland act, does any Senator here suppose that it would have been repealed? No. What did we do upon his recommendation to repeal the Bland act? We simply ignored it, as we had a right to do, being an independent and coordinate branch of the Government. He exercised his full constitutional prerogative when he made his recommendation to us, and we recognized our constitutional prerogative in ignoring it. But, Mr. President, if they were all mistaken in 1885 and 1886, may they not be mistaken now?

Mr. President, I will ask to insert extracts from this very able and interesting report of Secretary Manning (1886), pages 37, 39, and 61, where he goes on to show precsiely what was the cause of the depreciation in silver—its demonetization by the principal nations of the world:

"CONSEQUENCES OF STOPPING SILVER PURCHASES

"To stop the purchase of silver will enable the Treasury, while the monetary system is restoring to its normal conditions, to maintain with certainty and greater ease the present stock of silver coin at par with gold in all our fiscal and local uses, to the great relief from distrust, of the owners and employers of capital, and so to the greater relief and increasing employment of labor—the first fruits of sound finance and the first condition of prosperity."

"To stop the purchase of silver of course will cause a new fall in the London market. Speedier and more assured will then be the day of its final restoration to its former place in the money of the world. It is the recent heavy fall which has opened eyes that were blind and ears that were deaf. But a fall of silver, if the expense and influx to the Treasury are stopped, will not enhance the trouble of the Treasury or increase the difficulty of the duty which the laws impose to keep the silver circulation at par with gold within our own jurisdiction. Of course, compulsory employment of a money temporarily and locally inferior, in funded-debt payments, or in daily expense of any sort, means compulsory acceptance, and would force the inferiority to appear, whereas its skillful employment and an optional acceptance, which the laws of Congress do not forbid, will prevent that inferiority from appearing in our domestic trade which nothing can disguise in our foreign exchanges.

* * * * *

"If the law were repealed which makes compulsory Treasury purchases of silver, and if that repeal were accompanied by the declaration of Congress that the United States now hold themselves in readiness to unite with France, Germany, and Great Britain in opening their mints to the free coinage of silver and gold at a ratio fixed by international agreement, it is the deliberate judgment of the undersigned that before the expiration of another fiscal year this international monetary dislocation might be corrected by such an international concurrence, the two monetary metals restored to their old and universal function as the one standard measure of prices for the world's commodities, the depression of trade and industry relieved, and a general prosperity renewed.

"I respectfully recommend to the wisdom of Congress the unconditional repeal of the act of February 28, 1878, accompanied by such a declaration."

Why did he want to stop the coinage? Upon what ground? Remember, he claimed to be a bimetallist. Upon what ground did he want the limited coinage of silver under the Bland law stopped? He wanted it stopped so that it would force England and other European nations to come to bimetallism. The favorite theory for years and years was that we could never secure bimetallism until we forced European nations to it; that we never can force European nations until we stop the coinage of silver and throw it upon the market, glut the market, and then they will come down and agree with us. That is the theory.

We have been talking about that theory ever since 1878, and yet what has been done right in our face? England has stopped the coinage of silver in India, and precipitated a crisis such as the world has not seen. Yet they tell us that if we would stop the coinage of silver, it would bring about an agreement. Are we to be fed upon such milk as that? Is there any strengthening power in such an argument and such presentations? Think of it. I want Senators to think of it. For years and years the principal argument for stopping the coinage of silver under the Bland law has been that we might get an international agreement. When they saw that we were not going to uphold silver, the idea was that then they would come down and agree with us. Yet, while we were doing that, England has gone on steadily and stopped the coinage of silver in India, stopped the mints to free coinage, without consulting us; and in the Brussels conference they even told us that they intended to do it. It was intimated to us strongly enough to put us on our guard, and then we told them we were going to do it.

So that the argument today that the stoppage of the coinage of silver or the purchase of silver under that law will tend to make foreign nations come to a bimetallic agreement with us is without foundation. They have taken the lead of us and closed their mints. We shall have to get something else in order to have a standing in any proper and fair argument.

Now, Mr. President, I will go on with this panic of 1885–86. In 1886 President Cleveland referred to the Secretary's message, and again recommended the suspension of the coinage of the standard silver dollar under the Bland Act. But that was still to the Forty-ninth Congress. Secretary Fairchild then comes in and makes his report in 1887, and I will insert extracts from that report from pages 47, 48, and 49. They are very interesting:

"STANDARD SILVER DOLLARS

"One of the most interesting facts shown by the foregoing statements is the decrease in the number of standard silver dollars owned by the Government and the increased use of the same money by the people in the form of silver certificates. The $5, $2, and $1 certificates furnish a convenient currency, and it is evident that the future use of the silver dollar will be almost exclusively in that form.

* * * * *

"If the Government held no funds save those needed for its daily expenses, it would perform no different function toward currency when it had once coined or printed it than does an individual who receives and pays out money; but the two great trust funds—that for the redemption of United States notes ($100,000,000), and that for the redemption of national bank notes, at present more than $100,000,000, and whatever surplus there may be from to time to time—form, as it were, a reservoir which takes and holds that kind of currency which the people reject. Were it not for this great Government reservoir a redundancy of any form of currency would be shown either by its exportation to countries where it was needed or by its depreciation here. The silver dollar cannot be exported because the silver of which it is made is worth less than 75 cents, and that would be its value for exportation."

Address of Hon. Francis Biddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following notes for speech by the Honorable Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States, before the Swedish Colonial Society, Philadelphia, Pa., Saturday, April 10, 1943:

President Melvin, ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States, who is himself a member of the Swedish Colonial Society, has asked me to extend to his fellow members, on this, the society's thirty-sixth anniversary, his best wishes for its continued success and influence; and to say in his behalf how appropriate it is that the society should be celebrating today the three hundredth anniversary of the establishment by Gov. Johan Printz of sovereignty in Pennsylvania and of the first law court, the first church and the first school—the three free institutions which today we are in so large measure defending.

America is a land of many races. A common ideal has drawn these races over the centuries to our shores. They were leaving the restraints of a civilization which they had outgrown to discover a civilization that they could freely create after their own longing. Into the web of the new country's strength went the differences of many nations—the sober English with their law of the common man, the Irish who would learn to live at peace under a government which was a part of them; Italians, with a sense of the richness of the earth; Germans, Greeks, Russians, the hardy Scandinavians, and earliest among them the Swedes.

In 1626 a trading company, sponsored by King Gustavus Adolphus, had been formed, and in 1638 two little Swedish ships, the *Kalmar Nyckel* and the *Fogel Grip*, sailed up the Delaware River, and the territory of New Sweden was founded. The land was rich and fruitful, as too were the settlers. One of them wrote that his cow had two calves, his ewe two lambs, and his wife twins—all in one night! And William Penn, reporting on "The Present State of His Majesty's Isles and Territories in America," in 1687, had this to say: "I must needs commend the Swedes respect to authority, and kind behavior to the English; they do not degenerate from the old friendship between both kingdoms. As they are people proper and strong of body, so they have fine children, and almost every house full; rare to find one of them without three or four boys, and as many girls; some six, seven, and eight sons; and I must do them that right, I see few young men more sober and laborious."

Henry Goddard Leach has spoken of the Swedish levnadslust—the "joy of life," expressing "the poise; the joyousness, the smiling intelligence, the rhythm of Swedish personality and living." In Pennsylvania, and later in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, with their simple habits of hard work and orderly living, and their Lutheran or Protestant religion, they were soon integrated into the new country. They found the country good, and they wrote home about it. "And I can tell you," one of them wrote to a friend, "that here we do not live frugally, but one has eggs and pancakes and canned fish and fresh fish, and fruit of all kinds, so it is different from you who have to sit and suck herring bones."

The Swedes loved the independence of the new land. "One thing I like about this country," one of the new immigrants wrote in 1903, "is that you do not have to be always taking off your hat to people. In Sweden you take off your hat to everybody you meet, and if you enter a store you take off your hat to the clerk. Another thing that makes me like this country is that you can share in the Government."

Out of Sweden, which today numbers but 6,000,000 inhabitants, more than 1,000,000 came to America in the years following 1850—skilled tradesmen, laborers, farmers, carpenters, painters, shoemakers, tailors, blacksmiths, watchmakers, gardeners. They were patient, steadfast, persistent. They supported Lincoln in 1860, and again in 1864. They furnished outstanding officers to the Union Army in the Civil War. General Ernst Mattais Peter von Vegesack, eager to serve under General McClellan, gave up his commission and enlisted as a private, serving at Yorktown and Williamsburg. Following the battle of Hanover Court House he became a major on McClellan's staff and, after Gaines Mill, where he covered General Porter's retreat, a colonel of the Twentieth New York. At Antietam he stormed Frederick Center, after it had been twice taken and lost. He held up the regimental banner when it had fallen, and led the charge in person. The next morning Lee's army broke up and moved south.

Another Swedish hero of the Civil War was Col. Ulric Dahlgren, who was born in Bucks County, Pa., in 1842, and joined the army at 19. He made a daring raid at Fredericksburg, and with one company held the town against a large force of Confederate cavalry. His leg was amputated because of a bullet wound in a minor engagement preceding the battle of Gettysburg, and he was retired. But he would not remain out of the fight. He was chosen to command a picked column of 500 cavalrymen to lead a hazardous expedition to liberate prisoners at Libby Prison and Belle Isle. Before the raid, in which he was killed, the boy wrote his father, Adm. John H. Dahlgren: "* * * There is a grand raid to be made and I am to have a very important command. * * * I may be captured or I may be tumbled over, but it is an undertaking that if I were not in, I should be ashamed to show my face again. * * *"

And then there is the glorious story of the *Monitor*, the Yankee "cheesebox on a raft."

John Ericsson was born in Sweden in 1803. In 1826 experts in London rejected his first invention, the caloric engine, based on the principle of expansion of gases under heat, on the ground that they saw no reason why it worked! He developed and perfected the screw propeller; and in 1837 launched a small ship, equipped with two independently acting propellors, which made successful trips on the Thames. Yet the Lords of Admiralty declared that it was impossible for his boat to steer, as the power was in the stern.

Ericsson went to America and became a citizen in 1848. He built a 600-ton iron frigate with a heavy gun and range finder for the Government, raced the *Great Western*, the finest boat afloat, and beat her. At the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853, Ericsson returned to some earlier plans for a turret warship. At that time a ship's guns were fired only from broadside, which made it necessary for the ship to carry a great many, and consequently for these to be light. Ericsson made a model of a revolving steel gun turret, sent it to Napoleon III, but got it back with the Emperor's compliments.

When the Civil War broke out Ericsson wrote to Lincoln on August 29, 1861, offering "to construct a vessel for the destruction of the rebel fleet at Norfolk and for scouring the southern rivers and inlets of all craft protected by rebel batteries. * * * In making this offer," he added, "I seek no private advantage or emolument of any kind. Attachment to the Union alone impels me to offer my services at this fearful crisis, my life if need be, in the great cause which Providence has called you to defend."

Within 100 days the *Monitor* was built. The Confederates had raised the United States frigate *Merrimac* from Norfolk harbor, and fitted her with an iron ram and iron plates. The new armored monster shot and rammed the *Congress* and the *Cumberland*, and drove the *Minnesota* aground, all wooden ships. Secretary of War Stanton was panic-stricken. He urged obstruction of the harbors by local authorities. "The *Merrimac*," he said, "will change the entire character of the war; she will destroy seriatim every naval vessel; she will lay all the cities on the seaboard under contribution. * * * I have no doubt that the monster is this minute on her way to Washington and not unlikely we shall have a shell or a cannon ball from one of her guns in the White House before we leave this room."

But the *Monitor* had reached Hampton Roads. Though condemned by all the older naval officers she had the enthusiastic support of Captain Scott, and, what was more, of Mr. Gideon Welles, the Secretary of the Navy. On March 9, 1862, the little *Monitor* forced the ironclad "monster" back into Norfolk, and the relief in Washington was immense. The Swedish Minister, Count Piper, was bursting with pride. For had not the son of a Swede invented the now world-famous *Monitor*? "At one stroke"—as the London Times said—she had "revolutionized naval warfare * * * rendered all then-existing navies obsolete." Many years later Admiral Stephen B. Luce wrote of her: "The *Monitor* was the crystallization of 40 centuries of thought on attack and defense, and exhibited in a singular manner the old Norse element of the American Navy; Ericsson (Swedish) built her; Dahlgren (Swedish) armed her; and Worden (Swedish) fought her. How the ancient skalds would have struck their wild harps on hearing such names in heroic verse. How they would have written them in immortal runes."

Lincoln had been assassinated, and the tragedy found a deep response in Swedish hearts across the ocean. "Why should the death of a man thousands of miles away," wrote Axel Johan Uggla in his diary, in Hallefors, Sweden, "lie so heavily on my heart and soul? * * * I feel that I not only knew him but that he was my friend. His simple greatness, earnestness, his sincerity and warm human understanding have made him dear * * *. * One day when men are ready to be honest he will be looked upon as the great American and one of the great men of all lands and all times * * *."

We in America tend to think sometimes that we alone have led the world in the formulation of democratic institutions. But democracy, like all human institutions, is a growing and changing organism, that tends to atrophy if ever it becomes static. In some of the smaller countries of Europe social experiments, largely unknown to us, have now for several years achieved practical results. I refer particularly to the great Swedish cooperative associations which have been used so successfully to resist the growth of monopolies, to keep prices down, and to enlist the interest of the people themselves in movements that so obviously affect their daily lives. The Swedes before the war had established a new relationship between the government and individual enterprise, particularly in the field of electrical utilities, in which not only the central government, but local communities were given the relation of partnership with private interests. Thus the problem of regulation was seen in terms of joint association of interests, a problem that so often in America was thought of as necessarily involving irreconcilable antagonisms.

This approach seems to me more creative, even more practical, than the older conception of government as the policeman of private initiative. The Government must learn to serve business, as well as to regulate it; and both should combine to render service to the public as a whole rather than continue the fruitless and often highly theoretic and therefore unreal struggle as to which is to control. As we approach post-war problems we should do well to consider what the Swedish experiment in these fields may contribute to our efforts toward their solution.

Today, for many years, there has been no such thing as a Swedish population in America. The Swedes are a very part of the

American frame, their strength is the very strength of our bone and sinew. And as I mention the Swedish names of a few of the heroes of this war, think of them as Americans only, with the proud memory of their Scandinavian backgrounds, remembering how much we owe to Sweden.

Capt. Frank P. Bostrom, of San Antonio, Tex., won the Distinguished Flying Cross for taking a B-17 Flying Fortress 1,500 miles from Australia to the Philippines to get Gen. Douglas MacArthur—"1,500 miles," as the citation reads, "of enemy-controlled air, over open seas, and through storm areas * * *." Captain Bostrom was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross a year ago for participating (I quote) "with great personal skill and cool daring in a bombing mission which resulted in heavy damage to installations in enemy hands at Nichols Field, P. I."

Staff Sgt. Donald T. Ostlund, of Dewey, Ill., was decorated with the Air Medal last November for his courage and determination in a bombing mission against two enemy transports escorted by two destroyers moving toward Buna, New Guinea. In the face of intense antiaircraft fire and interception by three Zeros, he strafed a destroyer and a transport, helped to repel attack of the fighters during three successful bombing runs, on the first of which his airplane was severely damaged and the rear gunner killed.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Frank E. Christofferson of the Navy comes from White Bear Lake, Minn. He is 24 years old. He has had three awards for gallantry in action—the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal, and the Silver Star Medal. Let me quote the first citation about his action against enemy Japanese in the Battle of Midway on June 6, 1942: "With utter disregard for his own personal safety, Lieutenant Christofferson took part in persistent bombing and stafing attacks against fleeing enemy forces in the face of tremendous antiaircraft fire."

We know today the threat of the Nazi shadow hanging over the country of Sweden. She has not, like her sister countries, been overrun and trampled to earth by the bloated international bully. And yet she is not free; nor can she be ever free until that terrible shadow of invasion is lifted from her cities and from her fields. So that her future, as the future of all freemen everywhere, depends upon the ultimate crushing of Germany, upon the final certain victory of the Allied free nations fighting for their common end.

Lend-Lease in North Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post there appeared an editorial entitled "Collateral Gains" with reference to the benefits accruing from the stimulus of lend-lease shipments to north Africa, and under leave granted I submit same herewith:

COLLATERAL GAINS

French North Africa is something more than a springboard to the soft underside of Hitler's European fortress. It is also a rich source of supplies. These once flowed across the Mediterranean to strengthen the Axis war machine. Now they move in other directions, providing vitally needed materials to the United Nations.

Under the stimulus of lend-lease shipments the productivity of north Africa is being developed and harnessed to Allied purposes. Already, according to a report by the Office of War Information, some 600,000 tons of medical supplies, food, fuel, clothing, and other necessities of life have been shipped from Great Britain and the United States to meet the urgent requirements of the civilian population in this French territory. The program calls for a steady stream of such materials from this country at the rate of about 30,000 tons each month. In addition, approximately 50,000 tons of coal will go there monthly from England.

The ships that carry these goods to north Africa will not return empty. So far, they have brought back with them more than 350,000 tons of strategic and critical raw materials needed for the British and American munitions and farm-production programs. Phosphates and iron ore to go to Britain, cobalt and manganese to the United States. The two allies will divide shipments of mahogany from French West Africa.

These are all products needed for our war industries. But they are needed much more desperately by the Germans. Phosphate rock from north Africa is an essential of the European economy. Agricultural production on the Continent is sure to suffer from the loss of this fertilizer. No less serious is the loss of north African fruits and vegetables which, during the armistice period, were exported to France and then, for the most part, requisitioned by the German Armistice Commission. "French north Africa," says the Office of War Information, "is the California of Europe." Without its produce, the diet of all Europeans will be still further impaired.

During the Vichy control of north and West Africa, the economy of these countries was allowed to deteriorate through lack of machinery, fuel, lubricants, and consumer goods. Under the friendly auspices of the United Nations, these lacks will be repaired and the productivity of these French regions restored. Lend-lease directed there can be counted upon to pay valuable and immediate dividends.

Resolutions of Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. NEWSOME

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. NEWSOME. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR PRESERVATION OF PEACE

Whereas it is becoming increasingly evident that only through positive and continuing cooperation between the United Nations both during and after the war can decisive victory and durable peace be secured; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs go on record as approving some form of International Organization including International Police, which shall be developed in conferences of representatives of the United Nations; and be it further

Resolved, The Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs urge the President of the United States and the Congress to lose no time in calling such conferences, believing that planning for the post-war world while the war is yet in progress is of vital importance not only in winning the war but in securing a lasting peace for the world.

Presented by resolutions committee:

Mrs. J. W. RUTLAND,
Mrs. NEIL WALLACE,
Mrs. E. O. SHIPMAN, *Chairman.*

Whereas the Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs believes that the women of this country are ready to make any sacrifice that will advance the cause of freedom and lead to more rapid winning of the war: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That should the appropriate Government agencies consider as vital to the war effort wider rationing, more drastic price control or compulsory saving, the Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs urges its representatives in Congress to give courageous support to such measures and pledges to them its fullest cooperation.

Presented by resolutions committee:

Mrs. J. W. RUTLAND.
Mrs. NEIL WALLACE,
Parliamentarian.
Mrs. E. O. SHIPMAN,
Chairman.

Whereas the freedom of the radio to broadcast music to the public at large has been and is being seriously threatened by the stand and actions of James Caesar Petrillo, president of the American Federation of Musicians, a union which composes practically all the musicians who are regularly heard over the radio by the public; and

Whereas this organization is opposed to any person or group of persons dictating to the public at large as to what music it can or shall be allowed to enjoy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs go on record as opposing the policies and practices of Mr. Petrillo, and that our membership be urged to individually and as an organization write letters to our Senators and Congressmen urging that legislation be enacted to curb the efforts of Mr. Petrillo to deprive the general public of their right to a free broadcasting system throughout this country.

Presented by:

Mrs. L. H. HOUSTON,
Chairman of Radio,
Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs.
Mrs. VIRD PALMER,
Mrs. J. W. RUTLAND,
Mrs. NEIL WALLACE,
Mrs. E. O. SHIPMAN,
Chairman of Resolutions,
Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs.

T. V. A. Fertilizers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following press release from the T. V. A.:

Ammonium nitrate fertilizer produced in Tennessee Valley Authority's nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals is being shipped this week to Tennessee Valley Authority test demonstration farms in 14 States. This new product

will be used on the same farms which have been treated with Tennessee Valley Authority phosphate. It will immediately assist farmers in meeting increased demands for wartime food production. This product will reinforce and intensify the test demonstration program.

Increased use of Tennessee Valley Authority concentrated phosphatic fertilizers during the past 8 years, stimulated by the test demonstration program, has enabled more than 42,000 test-demonstration farmers throughout the country to exceed their food production goals without loss of time in adjusting their farming operations. These farmers on the average have not only increased vital food items approximately 30 percent, but have been able to do this without an increase in manpower.

In addition to the effect the new Tennessee Valley Authority ammonium nitrate fertilizer will have on increased food production this year, the results obtained from its use on test-demonstration farms will furnish practical and scientific information upon which Tennessee Valley Authority, the extension services, and the farmers can base future plans for use of the product.

The scarcity of commercial nitrogen is materially handicapping the production of vitally needed protein food and feed; therefore, the quantity made available by Tennessee Valley Authority production for test-demonstration farms will be used in such a way as to accomplish maximum results. All of the production capacity of Muscle Shoals plant over and above that needed for munitions is now available to agriculture.

The skill gained in the use of phosphate places this group of farmers in position to use Tennessee Valley Authority ammonium nitrate fertilizer for doing an efficient job in food production. Likewise thousands of neighbors of test-demonstration farmers who have assisted with the planning and execution of the test-demonstration program and who, as a result, have purchased large quantities of phosphate, will be able to speed up food production. The shipments this week will be made to Kentucky, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Missouri, Wisconsin, and New York In addition shipments may also be made to Oregon, Vermont, Ohio, and New Mexico.

Tennessee Valley Authority has been instructed by the War Production Board to release to industry an additional amount of Tennessee Valley Authority ammonium nitrate fertilizer produced at Muscle Shoals in excess of military requirements. This will be available to industry for distribution to farmers under allocations determined by the War Production Board.

Hollywood and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, anyone who attends a motion-picture show these days is subjected to a lot of propaganda most of which is an insult to the patriotism and intelligence of good Americans. Hollywood in its usual extreme style has apparently lost its head and gone completely overboard in its attempt to make communism look good. I do not believe that Americans should be influenced by this propaganda. Our temporary military alliance with Russia must not cause us to forget that, except insofar as treatment of Jews is concerned, there is no difference between communism and nazi-ism as it affects the common man. Further, though Moscow now says it has dissolved the organization whose duty was to foster world-wide communistic revolutions, we would do well to remember that this organization has already sowed its evil seeds and there is no evidence the American Communist Party will be dissolved or will not continue to follow the party line originating in Moscow and often reflected on the silver screen.

I respectfully direct the attention of the Members of Congress to the following editorial from a recent issue of the Springfield (Mo.) Leader and Press:

MISSION TO MOSCOW

The eminent liberal philosopher, John Dewey, and Suzanne of the Wisconsin La Follettes, have taken the trouble to check the film Mission to Moscow against former Ambassador Joseph E. Davies' book of the same name, on which the picture supposedly is based.

Their research confirms what many who have seen the film and read the book felt, without exerting themselves to verify their suspicions. The picture plays fast and loose with the book.

This might be of no particular consequence if the picture were designed as a romance, a drama, a musical—anything in the pure entertainment field. Such criticism would be picayunish if the departures were technical—such as often are required to satisfy screen demands for continuity, cohesion, and coherence.

But that is not the case. All the changes tend toward one obvious objective, which is achieved by them. They make the film what the book was not—in the words of Professor Dewey and Miss La Follette "totalitarian propaganda for mass consumption—a propaganda which falsifies history through distortion, omission, or pure invention of facts."

To mention only a few of the discrepancies uncovered by the two critics:

The film, but not the book, shows Marshal Tukhachevsky being tried and condemned as a conspirator. The marshal, in fact, was executed secretly, without trial, more than a year before the film purports to have him in court.

The film shows Ambassador Davies accepting instantly the guilt of the purge-trial victims, though the book records his concern because they were denied the elements of what Americans consider a fair trial.

The picture shows Moscow as gay, festive, and happy. But the book records horrifying terror, with no household but lived in fear of a nocturnal raid by the secret police.

The picture shows Stalin driven to his pact with Hitler by Anglo-American appeasement, with no reference to our desperate efforts to conclude a defensive alliance with Moscow.

Mr. Davies, back in the United States, is shown touring the country, ignoring his poor health, fighting isolationism. The fact is that the ex-Ambassador's swing around the circuit was made after Pearl Harbor, when the Nation already was united in support of the war that had been forced upon us.

There appears nowhere in the film any mention that it was Communist organizations, under orders from Moscow, which interfered in every way possible with our defense preparations, and that VITO MARCANTONIO, consistent Red Fronter, cast one of the few congressional votes against conscription.

Ridiculously distorted efforts are made, in the film—but not in the book—to create an impression that Russia is our ally against Japan, ignoring the pact with Tokyo.

The obvious purpose of the film is to promote American friendship toward Russia by hiding and distorting facts.

It is essential that the United States and Britain work in close harmony with Russia in this war and in the peace to come. It is not essential that the American people be lulled to sleep, making us do all the cooperating while Russia makes the rules.

Conceding the good intentions of the picture makers, we think they have done a real disservice to the cause of democracy.

The Rural Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and timely editorial which appeared in the Beloit Daily News, of Beloit, Wis., on May 21, 1943:

THE RURAL SCENE

A quick glance at the rural scene—farm sale west of Beloit the other day. Tractor was bid in at more than $700. The owner bought it second-hand quite a while ago for $350. Who more than Uncle Sam—by curtailing production—contributed to that piece of inflation? Poultryman came to town to buy couple of sacks of protein balancer. Couldn't. Wasn't any. Feed dealer said manufacturer's plant closed 2 days a week for lack of ingredients and hard to get haulage of what remains. Production is going to fall off sharply in that poultryman's laying flock. Uncle Sam says he's got to have more eggs. Prentiss Brown has put a ceiling on 'em. There's going to be fewer eggs. For 6 months farmer has been begging to buy a corn sheller. Needs it badly. Using borrowed one and the owner wants it back. Implement dealers say there isn't a chance. They've tried. Can't find any. Aren't being made. Somebody down in Washington did that. Damphool idea, if you ask the farmer. Pump in the milkhouse was haywire. Needed servicing. Farmer called pumpman. No soap. Pumpman couldn't get any pipe anymore. Had to quit business. Working in a factory where the pay is regular and he doesn't have to worry. Farmer's pump still haywire.

Letters from county committeemen to farmers say plow more, plant more, grow more. Uncle Sam wants more milk, more beef, more chickens, more eggs. Farmers who haven't any help want to know what with, and how? County committeeman isn't very fast with an answer.

Farmer writes the draft board he'll have to sell livestock and plant fewer acres if the hired man is drafted. Draft board says the neighbors are talking. Hired man is drafted. Farmer sells the livestock. He couldn't find a hired man for love or money. Farmer (married, one child, aged 4 or 5) raises broilers for meat in large numbers. Raises crops and other things. Number is up. Asks draft board what to plan. Should he put in crops

or get measured for uniform? No answer. Can't find out a thing. Less hired help on the farm, and less machinery to do the work of the absent help. Farmers aren't very bright, but they are brighter than that. Isn't manufacturers' fault, either. They warned Uncle what would happen. Uncle still said "No, no." Musn't make.

So if you don't think things are a mess on the rural scene ask the next farmer you happen to meet. He'll tell you.

Things are a mess.

But the planners can still write the loveliest letters. Lots of 'em.

Memory Monday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill known as H. R. 2732 to provide for the observance of Monday of each week as Memory Monday in tribute to those members of the armed forces who have given their lives for their country. The bill provides that until the termination of all hostilities in the present war, Monday of each week shall be designated as "Memory Monday," and the President is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon officials of the Federal Government to display the flag of the United States at half-staff on all Federal buildings and reservations on each Memory Monday and is further requested to invite the Governors of the several States to participate in honoring those who have made the suprême sacrifice by bringing about the display of the flag at half-staff on all public buildings and other public property within the respective States on each Memory Monday.

This idea came to Judge Berry J. Sisk, of the municipal court of Sioux City, Iowa, in my congressional district, one morning as he was gazing out of his office window watching our flag flying over certain public buildings, and the thought struck him that we should honor and express our respect each week to our heroic dead in the armed services of our country.

It is true that Memorial Day is observed in many States, but this is only an annual observance. During the war, however, and at the very time our men are giving up their precious lives for us, we have not as a nation adopted a method to honor them within the time approximate to their sacrifice to their country.

The plan takes the title of "Memory Monday," because on that day in each week our flag will fly at half-staff in memory of those gallant fighters who died for the cause of freedom, somewhere, sometime, the preceding week. Our flag will thus symbolize our reverence for their memory and our profound respect for their devotion to the cause for which they gave up their lives. Within a week after they are killed in action, yes, even while the battles rage, we can and should give sentiment a place and pay homage for a day to those boys who can never come back. The loss of a fighter's life in his country's uniform merits this timely recognition and honor.

The plan is devoid of any profit motive and does not take the form of a holiday. Seeing the flag flying at half-mast on each Monday would cause our people to breathe a prayer for the boys that have gone beyond. Would not the workers in the defense plants be spurred on, and would not most of us buy more War bonds and become less selfish if this weekly memorial were seen flying from every flag staff in the country?

Judge Sisk has presented the plan to every Governor in the Union. The general tone of their comment is favorable. I am also advised that many organizations made up of veterans of prior wars have indicated that they favor the idea of a Memory Monday.

He who carries and fights for our flag today and who falls before the coming dawn should be honored unbelatedly on the next Memory Monday by that flag flying at half-staff over the Nation he died for, and I trust that this bill will receive favorable consideration by the Congress.

Thanks, Mr. Churchill, But We Know Britain Will Stick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Gazette, May 20, 1943:

THANKS, MR. CHURCHILL, BUT WE KNOW BRITAIN WILL STICK

That applause was especially impressive when Premier Churchill declared in his address to Congress that British forces will continue to fight side by side with America's forces until Japan's military power has been utterly crushed.

That declaration had its timeliness as constituting a pledge by the responsible head of the British Government that the United States will not be left alone to fight the war in the Pacific after Germany has been defeated. It represented an all-sufficient answer to statements by Senator CHANDLER, of Kentucky, that we have the right to ask ourselves now what help we can expect from Britain against Japan after the defeat of Germany.

But so far as assuring Congress and the public of Great Britain's steadfast cooperation in the Pacific war is concerned, Mr. Churchill's declaration simply was not necessary. For two good reasons, Americans do not believe that Great Britain would walk out before the victorious end.

In the first place, British interests in the Far East are as vital and substantial as American interests—perhaps more substantial in a material way.

In the second place, Americans are willing to concede British good faith. The Government and the people who, knowing the frightful cost, never hesitated to keep their pledge to Belgium in 1914 and their pledge to Poland in 1939, are not the kind of people who desert allies.

Home Dehydration Units Developed by T. V. A. in Cooperation With Agricultural Institutions of the States Will Be Available for Use This Summer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I rose to pay tribute to the T. V. A. for the benefits it had brought to my State and to the whole area affected by its operations. I emphasized the difference in its methods of administration from those traditionally employed by agencies of the Federal Government. I think those methods are responsible for the great accomplishments of the Authority and for the widespread approval of the program on the part of citizens of the Tennessee Valley.

I want to illustrate the theme of my remarks the other day by referring to an announcement in the press on Sunday. It appears that the War Production Board has agreed to release a small amount of steel and copper for the construction of dehydrators for home use. It is expected that 30,000 will be made available for use in the Southeastern States. These will be made according to a design developed and tested by T. V. A. in cooperation with the agricultural institutions of the States following a 5-year program of research. In one season's operation it is estimated that about 22,000 tons of fruits and vegetables can be preserved by these 30,000 units.

Other types of home dehydrators will be offered to other parts of the country, I am sure. The one which T. V. A. has designed is particularly suitable for use in the South.

This successful project is typical of the research work conducted by T. V. A. First it breaks down an economic barrier which would limit extension of the crops which ought to be encouraged, but which would be wasted without adequate means for preservation. It goes to the heart of a practical problem. Second, it has been carried out in cooperation with local institutions. No large Federal staff was built up or costly new laboratories erected to conduct this work. Third, the people have participated in a program of education to demonstrate the use of this new home equipment. For example, a series of training schools for home demonstration agents and other agricultural field workers was held by T. V. A. and the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, during February. County training schools followed, and in all 2,000 professional agricultural workers of State and

county have been educated in the operation of these units and the use of the products. One hundred and fifty thousand copies of a simple bulletin containing all necessary information to enable the housewife to use the unit successfully are now being distributed by the Extension Services in the 9 Southeastern States.

This unit will be used to conserve food. The experiment will not be wasted. The dehydrators will be manufactured by a private company. It is a simple affair. The unit consists of a fiberboard cabinet, light bulbs for heat, electric fans, and an inexpensive thermostat. It is a practical device that will enable the housewife to dehydrate food from the garden as successfully as by other home preservation methods. Before July 1, the first dehydrators are expected to be available. It is anticipated that several families will use each one. They will save canning equipment, conserve food that might otherwise be wasted, make a genuine contribution or an essential war-food program.

Republican Women and Others—Their Duty, Opportunity, Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted I include an address I delivered Saturday, May 22, to the women of the Republican County Committee of the County of New York at New York City:

Madam President, I made up my mind a year and a half ago that I would accept no more invitations from anybody to make political speeches outside by own district. I have stuck to it till now when I have exercised a woman's privilege and changed my mind. I am here today because I know the constituency of your group and am glad to be able to accept your invitation, mistaken as it was as you may find.

The page of history records repeatedly the large and important place that woman has occupied in the concerns of states and nations. Not only has she played a most conscicuous role in shaping the judgments and opinions of those in authority, not only has she been a dominant force in giving poise and direction to kings and rulers, but now and again she has occupied a more conspicuous place in governing and controlling directly the aims and actions of great nations.

Today we have a war on two fronts, abroad and at home; one a global war against the tyranny that would make us slaves; the other a struggle to preserve and conserve here at home the liberties we are fighting for.

I have supported the Commander in Chief 100 percent in his program, military and naval, to win the war, but I have opposed aggressively and shall continue to oppose the attempts of the New Deal and this administration to continue its internal programs and to lay the foundations, economically, for the establishment insidiously of a post-war international New Deal and the type of world government which they envisage.

I am unalterably opposed to the administration's attempt to take advantage of the war in order to establish itself in perpetuam while it sells us out and down the river and destroys our Democratic-Republican form of government. I am opposed to any form of patriarchial government.

THE PLANNING BOARD'S REPORT

As I have said before let me say to you that when I first read the report of the National Resources Planning Board I was shocked by its apparent and obviously deliberate but also insidiously covert attempt to destroy individualism, encourage federalization, advance socialization, and generally change our existing order.

John Curran said in 1790 that the condition on which God has given liberty to man is eternal vigilance. And Burke once said truly: "The people never give up their liberties except under some delusion." Are we crazy?

Do you realize that by this report in one fell swoop it is proposed to go back to the age of feudalism? State lines are wiped out with the mop of Federal supervision and gratuity. Industry and labor are regimented. The taxpayer is made a serf. The axiom is ages old that corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves.

No such danger from a foreign foe has ever confronted lovers of liberty, freedom, and the possible continuation and advancement of the interests of mankind as is found in this report which lays the ground work for an international New Deal as it starts us on the road to national and individual suicide, governmentally, to go the way of all those civilizations that have preceded us along the similar wide paths which have led to their destruction. "Only free people can hold their purpose and their honor to a common end."

In this country we have a liberty found in no other. Here we may think our own thoughts, and express them either by speech or press; or can we today? We may worship as we please. We may engage in any decent occupation of our choice, and we may acquire or own property. We may participate in Government through representatives whose arbitrary power is restricted by basic and statutory law. Yet we may be excluded from conferences by an autocrat. The United States has only 6 percent of the land area of the world, and 7 percent of the world's population, yet its percentage of worldly goods, its enjoyment of comforts, its usage of new inventions and achievements, are greater than in any other country. Our educational system, and our schools, which assure everyone a free education, are the envy of the world. Most workers in America are property owners, and as such may be called capitalists. Fourteen million families own their own homes. More than one-half of all the farmers own their own farms. As far as we know, there is no other plan of human relations which has produced, or is producing, a like result.

Generations of vigorous, industrious, and adventurous people have established this country and its institutions as they are today; or were. Only people of the same sort can recapture, safeguard, and maintain them. If we cherish this liberty, this equality, and this freedom, then we must get all of them back and defend them at all cost, and with all our might—the American ideal of Government.

The Republican Party is committed to the establishment and the perpetuation of that ideal.

May I say right here that the burden of saving civilization today is borne equally by the men and women who are fighting for it.

POPULAR GOVERNMENT

In America, under popular government, women have risen to the highest plane they have ever occupied in human history. This is not an accident. It didn't just happen. It is a byproduct of American civilization and of Republican administrations. America has given you opportunity; has given you the same freedom as men. It gives you substantially the same rights; it gives you the same voice in public affairs, and I tell you women this is your fight. You will have to carry your share of the burden if the battle is to be won either at home or world-wide, and you are doing it.

The plain people of this country; the women and men of this country; the great body of decent, hardworking Americans, who have no hope of being either famous or rich, but who love their homes, are proud of their families, and are anxious above all things that their children should make more of the opportunities our free competitive system affords, must wake up. We must wake up not only to the dangers from abroad but to realize what confronts us here at home. What we have had is being taken away from us. Listen:

It is not strange but very true that the place from which you look at things alters your view. Did you notice what Thurman Arnold, the trust buster for the New Deal, said after he got foot loose and free from bureaucratic dictation? He said: "We must get back to the old economics of opportunity, of taking a chance, which made America great, and I think this war is going to do it for us."

That is where the Republican Party stands today despite the attempts of Arnold's former associates to prevent such a return to opportunity for everybody.

Thurman Arnold probably agrees with the man who said his prayer was: "Lord, give me this day my daily opinion, and forgive me the one I had yesterday."

We do well to recall the wisdom of that New England intellect, Henry David Thoreau, who died during the Civil War. He once wrote, "There will never be a really free and enlightened state until the state itself comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power from which all its own power and authority are derived." Do not forget either, that Jefferson said: "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we would soon want bread."

In this connection it is not realized by a great many people that you women of the country have the first claim on most of the wealth of this country through insurance policies, savings accounts, public and private bonds, stock in corporations, and they are faced with the fear that the value of their property and income will be largely destroyed through the heavy taxation which has been recommended, and by the theories, crazy as they are, of redistribution of wealth and income, which characterize the New Deal.

Let me say to you here and now that every thinking man and woman knows that it is true that "today, everywhere, individual liberties are being curtailed and destroyed. That is not just talk. Democracy and self-government are scrapped if the New Deal theories prevail. Individuals are once more the pawns of arbitrary rulers whose policies are determined by nationalistic or internationalistic aims, with war as their ultimate and supreme weapon. Greater and greater rigidities undermine the flexibility and adaptiveness of economic systems. Planned and controlled economies "we planned it this way," emerge and all the fusty relics of medieval trade regulations, trade agreements, and the like, discredited through 500 years of theory and hard experience, are dragged out."

Despairing people, after the World War, turned away from the individual and his freedom to discover new gods, and in so doing, only disinterred ancient idols. Too many were too blind as not to be able to see

that it was the dead past they were asked to resurrect.

We have seen the Federal Government undertake to control production in agriculture, manufacturing, and mining. We have seen it attempt the regulation of prices, wages, and conditions of labor. We have seen it determine the volume of flow of credit. We have seen the arbitrary debasement of our currency. We have seen the Federal Government enter the field of private enterprise in competition with its own citizens. We have seen it usurp the prerogatives of the States. We have seen a rubber-stamp Congress delegate nondelegatable powers. We have seen a whole body of new legislation intended to establish a planned economy. We do not need President Roosevelt's declaration that he has created new instruments of public power—that the Federal Government is responsible for the solutions of the problems of the individual—to know that we are face to face with a new philosophy of government as antagonistic to our American ideas and ideals of a democracy, and as un-American in its conception and administration as it is destructive, dangerous, and devastating. Wake up.

It has been said, and truly, that the American people over the years have enjoyed a greater and progressive diffusion of wealth, greater comfort, greater security, greater educational opportunities, and a higher standard of living than average men and women, at any time, anywhere. Are you ready to lose it all? And these accomplishments are due, not to the wisdom of princes and rulers, but to the virtues, character, and energies of the people themselves, living under Republican administrations, for the most part, and therefore a system of government that brought unlimited opportunity to all men.

Because this is true, the Republican Party now opposes all changes in the form of our Government which would or will or can retard continuous progress and advancement. It stands for a return of a constitutional form of government of laws and not of man. It is unalterably opposed to the continuance of or the creation and concentration of bureaucratic despotism and experimentation in government in one family.

The Republican Party was born of a great liberal movement in behalf of human freedom; for over half a century, with only two brief intermissions, it governed the Nation throughout a period of unparalleled social and economic progress; and in spite of 25 years of apparent disintegration, through a strange combination of circumstances it is today the sole residuary legatee of the tradition in the United States that the individual man has rights independent of and prior in nature to government, and that no government may deny him these rights without arresting progress and making men slaves. It has made and saved the country and can and will do it again.

I am a Republican, because I believe in those things for which the Republican Party has stood, stands, and to which it adheres. The Republican Party believes, first, in the principle of private property; in the instruments of production, including land; private ownership, not Government ownership, nor control as such. It believes in free enterprise, individualism. Fundamentally it believes in competition, competition among the people, not by the Government with the people or against them. These are three fundamental principles of government in which the Republican Party believes. Each and all of them are attacked and violated by the socialistic, communistic, and collectivistic programs at every turn. Such a program has been opposed at every turn by the Republican Representatives in Congress. The record proves it.

A STRONG GOVERNMENT

The Republican Party has always recognized the fact that there must be a government, a strong government; that it must perform very important functions. But, on the other hand, it also believes that the least government we have in business, and the less obtrusive government is, everywhere and all the time, the better government we will have. It is not for autocracy, plutocracy, or aristocracy.

The Republican Party insists upon economy and efficiency in local, State, and Federal governmental administration—the elimination and avoidance of duplication of public services, a balancing of the Budget, and the protection of the taxpayer.

The Republican Party is opposed to the socialistic, communistic, collectivistic, totalitarian theories, and crazy programs of experimentation of the New Deal itself—dead as the Pharaohs—demonstrated to be futile and fully destructive of a democratic form of government aeons ago.

As a party, the Republicans stand for a democratic constitutional traditional form of government, in favor of legislation which will permit the progress of this country along that line, and opposed to those things contrary to democratic, constitutional, traditional American principles for which the New Deal stands.

As Chairman Spangler recently well said:

"The program of the Republican Party must be to restore government under constitutional, republican forms; to eradicate collectivism, totalitarianism, any scars of state socialism. It must be to assert and to maintain the freedom and the dignity of our citizens, to bring about equal opportunity for all, to ensure tranquillity and security by protecting the laborer in his just rights, the farmer in his independence, the manufacturer in his vision and his endeavor to create wealth—wealth to be justly shared and apportioned between investor, inventor, management, and labor.

"Only by creating wealth can we create security; only by creating security can we create that serenity of life, enjoyment of living, to which every citizen is entitled. It is not enough merely to create wealth, and equitably to divide what we have created. A sufficient amount of it must remain in the hands of the creators, the earners, the savers. It must not all be snatched and sequestered by the state. What we do, what we achieve, what we create is not for the benefit of some impersonal central government, but for the benefit of the men and women whom that government is created to serve. We must create a vast reservoir of private savings to be used for the building of our national future.

"The mission and the program of the Republican Party is to get the United States back on the tracks, to keep it on the tracks, and to see to it that no force, foreign or domestic, shall throw the switch."

ISOLATIONISM

I do not propose to discuss the policies of isolation or intervention, but I will say that we all know that our responsibility after the war will not be circumscribed within the territorial limits of the United States. We have so declared.

It may be said, however, that if the pre-Pearl Harbor isolationists could only forget their hate for England and Russia long enough to free themselves from their prejudices they would relieve their obfuscation.

As it is they do not change their spots and like "Judy O'Grady and the Colonel's lady" yesterday and today, "they are just the same under their skin."

They would be better off to forget the embarrassment they feel by reason of the futility of their opposition to defense measures. Nobody doubts their patriotism, but these days almost everybody questions their pre-Pearl Harbor judgment. It is time for them to stop making an issue out of their own mistaken policies and to really help, instead of hindering the effort to win the war by their loose talk.

NO POST-WAR BLUEPRINT NOW

In my often-expressed opinion it is not the time now to draw a blueprint for the terms of a peace so far distant as perforce of time and our situation it must be. To do that is ill-considered, useless, and more than unwise.

William Chamberlain hands out some very good advice when he suggests that if we should ever be so ill-advised as to try to force our will, our philosophy of government, or our standards of morality on other countries the effort will end in fiasco.

We will avoid many post-war disappointments if we examine the attitude of other countries realistically, if we recognize the limitations which geography imposes on our international influence, and if we engrave on our minds the slogan of healthy humility: "America is not God."

The trouble is, so long before there can be any peace, we have started out to make over the world of the future on the basis of an impossible situation. Charles A. Beard thinks it would be better to wait and study the configuration of things, and examine British continental policy before drawing up grand and detailed plans for ordering the affairs of vanquished nations.

Playing ducks and drakes with suppositious abstractions on hypothetical situations is in his opinion "a game for pedants and not for men."

Yet there are 28 groups which have been set up by the New Deal administration, within the administration, to make post-war plans—for what?—I ask you, and you think it over.

And this does not include the National Resources Planning Board's cradle-to-the-grave program, to which I have referred, drawn up largely by Dr. Evaline Burns, disciple of the gospel of socialism, gone wild, according to Laski of London and David Niles of the White House secretariat.

This program projects the New Deal plan and the philosophy of State socialism, which has nothing in it to attract the average farmer or businessman, but revives class distinction and hatred and makes a tremendous appeal to labor. Shame.

As Senator TAFT has well said: "This report paves the way for 100-percent Socialist economy." We want none of it.

It was filed at the time it was filed for purely partisan political purposes. When the day comes to call out the "fourth-term troopers" under its banner, it will be waved "high, wide and handsome" by the officers in command of the attempt to establish a Roosevelt patriarchy. Do not be fooled.

You will recall that the insistence of President Wilson that a definite program be accepted almost immediately after, or at the end of World War No. 1, resulted disastrously, both at Versailles and here in the United States. Can't we learn anything from experience. You wait, and watch, and weep.

PHILANTHROPIC FOOLISHNESS

It sounds very philanthropic, makes one look like a grandiose statesman to talk about a situation that is to be, concerning which one can know absolutely nothing. Or does it? It will not read well when one is eventually confronted with a situation lacking even the fundamentals of the premise on which some have undertaken to arrive at their conclusions so early.

Representative BOLTON, of Ohio, covered the situation pretty well, I thought, when she said:

"I believe we need to gather together and analyze our ideas of the post-war world. But as representatives of the people of the United States, we must be sure we are putting first things first. To do this must we not insist that all branches of our Government and all the selfishly quarreling groups of our people unite in this one purpose, to win the war?

"We have so much yet to expect to give us a commensurate understanding of the New World problems that anything which is a blueprint is unfortunate.

"There will be a period after the war which will be hideous, when everything that is unpleasant will come out. The peace must be kept forcibly—through armies of occupation or policing—until this is dissipated. Only then will the time be right for a peace which will perpetuate itself.

"We must not patronize the people nor pauperize them. We must plan now for the future, but the planning must not be such as to make the people look to the Federal Government for security. I don't believe we should mislead the people by the subtle use of words. There is no such thing as 'crade to the grave' security which a government can properly grant to the people. Any woman who has brought up children knows if she pampers them she weakens them. But we must find ways to give the people opportunity for health, work, and play."

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Then there is the matter of the trade agreements, so-called, which are not agreements but are treaties, which have been entered into deviously through bypassing the constitutional requirements. They are not reciprocal. They do not accomplish their purpose.

There was been altogether too much propaganda of an emotional sort spread all over the country begging every woman to be a good neighbor.

Good fences make good neighbors.

Do not be bamboozled into any course which you will regret.

The people have some rights. Every time Congress undertakes to recapture some of the powers and prerogatives it delegated under a rubber-stamp program, you people should applaud and help Congress to save you. "God helps those who help themselves."

THE O. P. A.

And briefly answering the question you asked, "What about the O. P. A.?"

It cannot operate as set-up. Henderson enjoyed his role as a bully and a bluffer, but the people would be neither bullied nor bluffed.

Then one of the ablest men in Congress for some years took over a thankless job and tried to mix reasonableness with the mess he had in the kettle. It wouldn't work, and it won't work. The trouble is fundamental and not found in futile fumbling and ill-conceived efforts, mismanagement, and misdirection by those who have undertaken to administer a law impossible of enforcement.

When the price-control bill setting up the Office of Price Administration was first before us I saw that if it should become a law it would be catastrophe, for as I said: "Without a ceiling on salaries and wages every increase in the rate of employee compensation necessitates a percentage increase in the cost of goods made or services rendered."

The Government cannot freeze prices without freezing wages.

If we wish, we can try again to sail head-on into the bitter wind of experience, but just as sure as fate we will be blown out of the water, wrecked, and economically sunk unless we realize that price control and wage control go hand in hand.

Price control as a remedy for the ills of the body politic is just as effective as a mustard plaster on a gas heater.

There can be no really effective price control without wage control and the other essential affiliates. You cannot sit on a three-legged stool from which one or two of the legs are missing.

That's what I said in part, so now I say: "I told you so."

PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS

The President has played politics to throw a sop to labor.

The responsibility for the situation which obtains today is clearly and almost wholly on his shoulders, despite all the White House generated fog and the smokescreen of propaganda to the contrary. Perhaps the people can be fooled some of the time, but not all of the time. What a miasma and mess!

After all is said and done, I have faith in the common people. They can be trusted when they are informed as to what is back of all that is being done to them. My statement is substantiated by the fact that, despite such temporary setbacks due to mismanagement and one thing and another which have affected our body politic, the American system of government has not failed and will not fail.

It is the greatest success from a governmental standpoint in the history of the world. Under this system, a weak nation has "mastered a continent and achieved a greater degree of progress in a hundred years than had been accomplished in the 2,000 years that had gone before."

The burden of the responsibility of the Republican Party is greater today than ever before.

I would like to emphasize the importance of the communication you have received from Marion Martin addressed to all women's groups asking them to check Government publications with a view to curbing propaganda to further the Roosevelt fourth-term campaign and the New Deal radical schemes. In this communication she says the Nation now knows that President Roosevelt is a candidate for a fourth term and perhaps for a permanent term of office.

She goes on to say that "there is widespread evidence that all agencies of government propaganda, many of them created by a trusting people to aid in winning the war, are being used to further the political ambitions of the New Deal.

"These political misuses of the Government are difficult to ferret out. Here in Washington they are often hidden by the Office of War Information under the cloak of military secrecy. They can only be discovered as they appear in various parts of the country."

Miss Martin says that the reason for the Democratic defeats in the last election is found in the fact of the zeal of the Republican Party workers. She urges that the zeal of the election period must not be permitted to bog down or lag. Instead it must be intensified. It must express unceasing devotion to the major responsibility of speeding the war effort; to the supplementary tasks of effecting efficient handling of domestic problems; and to the development of strong peace-making machinery. "'More zeal for the common weal' is an appropriate 1943 motto for the Republican worker."

It is our task to finish the job or to go down with all that has been accomplished blotted out in a complete black-out. What a picture!

We must go forward. We must turn our faces to the future, come what may. There must be no retreat.

True it is that "our knowledge is a torch of smoky pine that lights the pathway but one step ahead across a void of mystery and dread," but there must be no turning back! Everything we have, everything we have been and hope to be, depends upon the course we choose to follow. Our path leads onward.

We might as well, each and all of us, invoke the spirit of Tennyson's Ulysses, who said:

"Come my friends,
'Tis not too late to seek a newer world.
Push off, and sitting well in order smite
The sounding furrows: for my purpose holds
To sail beyond the sunset, and the baths
Of all the western stars until I die.

* * * * *

"To strive, to seek, to find—and not to yield."

There are certain ideas and ideals of the civilization for which we stand, the destruction and obliteration of which we as Americans will not tolerate wherever that road of determination may lead us.

The basic principles at stake are those on which this Nation was founded and for which our forebears fought and died in order that we might be free. Our heritage of democratic idealism is criticized and challenged today by totalitarian and authoritarian forces whose theories, ages old, have always been repugnant to us. They cannot coexist with our democratic theories and with our way of life.

The totalitarian countries do not want our kind of government, and experience teaches that democracy cannot be imposed by force.

No man knows what lies ahead of us as a nation or as individuals. We are pledged by all that is good and honorable and holy to maintain the ideals of democracy. We are committed to something more than keeping possible invaders from our shores.

As Republicans we are bound by our love of life and are on our sacred honor to keep alive in this Nation those ideals which have made America great. We should dedicate ourselves anew to an unending determination to make this country one in which all men shall have equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We should consecrate ourselves to the end that this government of ours shall continue to establish justice and make secure the blessings of liberty. We should highly resolve that this Government of ours shall not perish from the earth.

"To what new fates, my country, far
And unforeseen of foe or friend,
Beneath what unexpected star
Compelled to what unchosen end?

"Across the sea that knows no beach
The Admiral of Nations guides
Thy blind obedient keels to reach
The harbor where thy future rides!

"I do not know beneath what sky
Nor on what seas shall be thy fate,
I only know it shall be high:
I only know it shall be great."

I Am an American—A Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Chicago Herald American of May 17, 1943:

LEADERS STRIKE PATRIOTIC NOTE AT PAGEANT

(His Excellency, the Most Reverend Samuel A. Stritch, D. D., Roman Catholic archbishop of Chicago, delivered the following invocation at the I Am an American Day celebration yesterday.)

Lord God of Mercy, whom heaven and earth doth not encompass, this day we acknowledge our littleness and utter dependence on Thee. Not in the might of armies, or in the power of our inventive and productive genius, or in the fertility and riches of our land, or in our steadfast resolution, do we place all our hope and confidence, but to Thy loving mercy we look for victory and peace. Full well we know that Thy Blessed Providence does bring out of misery solace, out of tragedy triumph, and out of battles victory. Blessed be Thy Holy Name! Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. We are Thy creatures, redeemed in the Precious Blood of Thy Son, Jesus. In Thee, through Him, we place our trust.

Merciful Father! We pray for our soldiers and sailors. They have gone forth to do battle for us against mighty foes, who in contempt of Thy Name are seeking to shackle men and nations with chains of slavery and to rob us of our precious heritage of freedom which Thou didst give us.

Protect our armed forces with Thy might and give them a victory pleasing to Thee.

Bless and guide our Chief Executive, the President of the United States. Enlighten our Congress to enact wise, helpful laws for our instruction in virtue and strength in justice. Fortify our judiciary that it may interpret and defend our laws in the light and spirit of our free institutions. Be Thou our light and strength to endure hardships with patience, to be steadfast in our defense and safeguarding of our freedoms, and to be a beacon of hope to all nations and peoples. May the victory of our flag establish with Thy merciful help an enduring just peace in which men and nations everywhere will praise Thy Holy Name. Hear, we beseech Thee, O God of Light, our humble prayer, through Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

Irish Minister's Picture of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Irish Minister to the United States, at annual dinner of Eire Society of Boston at Copley Plaza, from the Boston Daily Globe of May 6, 1943:

IRISH MINISTER'S PICTURE OF IRELAND—TELLS BOSTONIANS HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND EXPLAINS WHY SHE IS STILL NEUTRAL

A few weeks ago an extraordinary scene was witnessed in Dublin. It had been announced that a lecture on an abstruse scientific subject was to be delivered at Trinity College by a Dr. Schrodinger. The organizers were amazed when people turned up in such numbers that thousands had to be turned away. The subject was, What Is Life? And the lecturer was the professor of mathematical physics in the new Institute of Higher Studies.

Writers in the Irish and American press expressed wonder that so many people should have turned up for such an event, and various reasons were put forward. I think the explanation was not any new-found interest in abstract science or indeed any marked desire to pay a compliment to the learned doctor, but that it arose from the popular urge to pay a tribute to the idea of the institute.

In founding this institute of higher learning a few years ago Mr. De Valera had voiced the hope that Ireland would once more become a leading light in European learning.

The knowledge of Ireland's glorious past in learning is dear to the hearts of all the Irish. In remote places throughout the land you will find poor people who might be labeled illiterate by strangers, who will recite for you long passages from the mythological cycle, and they will tell you that when St. Patrick came to Ireland he found not a horde of barbarous tribes, but a people who already had a self-conscious and well-organized culture. In the Seanchus Mor they had a codified system of laws as detailed and elaborate as those of Rome, which dealt out even-handed justice to rich and poor alike.

The Druids were an order of wise men who educated the sons of chieftains in history and law, in ethics and philosophical thought. St. Patrick did not banish the Druids. He wisely retained all that was best in the old civilization. The former ethical teaching of the Druids disappeared and they abandoned their magical practices. They became the historians, the poets, and the lawgivers, and they held equal rank with the King.

EARLY IRISH LITERATURE UNIQUE FOR ITS HISTORY

The hero tales of Ireland tell of the days extending back for 1,000 years before the coming of St Patrick. The vast literature in which they are contained has brought to Ireland's shores in our own day scholars from all over the world. This literature is not only beautiful in itself but it is unique in one respect. It is the only body of literature existing today which gives a picture of European life before the Roman conquest.

It reveals a pagan and aristocratic age with a well-defined polity which was common to the whole country, though there were many kingdoms. It describes the lives of kings and heroes of noble and beautiful women, of poets, physicians, harpers, pipers, jugglers, waiters, cooks, guardsmen, and swordsmen. It tells the story of Cuchullain, the greatest of the ancient heroes, of the Gael and of the Red Branch Knights, and of Fionn and the Fianna. It recounts the deathless story of Deirdre and the sons of Usna.

So strong is the hold of this last-mentioned tale on the Irish imagination that in every age for 2,000 years poets have written new songs about it, and in our own time Yeats, Synge, and AE have all produced beautiful plays about Deirdre. When the sons of Usna died, Deirdre made a lamentation over their graves. Yeats said that this lament, 2,000 years old, is one of the greatest lyric poems of the world.

There are two of these tales which bring in a game of chess with great dramatic effect, portraying in one case the sheer beauty of tragedy, and in the other the beguiling effect of tragi-comedy. The sons of Usna have been lured back to Ireland by the treacherous King Conor, who has promised them his protection. They are playing a game of chess in their tent when a friend comes to tell them that the king's men are on their way to murder them. They go on with the game of chess, though their doom is imminent. It is better to die undefended than to doubt the honor of a king.

STANDARD OF CHIVALRY HIGH IN EARLIEST DAYS

In the other tale, The Pursuit of Diarmuid and Grannia, the angry King Fionn with the Fianna are pursuing the lovers. The pursuit leads to the Quicken Tree, in the upper branches of which, unknown to the Fianna, Diarmuid and Grannia have taken refuge. Fionn and his companions seek the shade of the tree to protect them from the noonday sun. To beguile the time, Fionn and his poet son, Oisin, play a game of chess.

Diarmuid, whose life is at stake, watches the game from the tree. He is the only man of the Fianna who can beat the King at chess. He sees the game going against his friend, Oisin, and he also sees a move Oisin can make to turn the game against the King. He cannot resist the temptation to intervene, so he plucks a berry from a tree and, throwing it, strikes the piece which Oisin should move. The boy makes the required move and turns the game against the King.

They start another game with a like result, and then a third, when the same thing happens again. Then Fionn rises and says, "In all Ireland there is only one man who could have done this. Diarmuid is in the tree." So the Fianna attack Diarmuid in the tree and he is sorely pressed until Aengus, the god of love and music, comes to his assistance, and by magic enables the lovers to escape.

Throughout the tales there is observed a very high standard of chivalry, a consistent characterization of the people on the stage, a keen sense of humor and a love of the beauties of nature. Conall Cearnach refuses to fight a man wounded in the arm until his own arm is tied behind his back. Fionn's advice to MacLughaidh was, "Be quiet in the house and rough in the gap of danger. Do not tell tales or makes mischief. Do not make promises, but if you do, keep them. Do not trust in your courage and strength alone, but see your weapons are in order before you go into battle. Do not bully civilians or women or children. Do not have a miser for a friend, and do not refuse to share your food with anyone. Be faithful to your leader. Respect poets and men of learning. Waste no time arguing with fools."

The things that delighted Fionn and his poet son were "the call of the heron, the cry of the otter, the lowing of calves, the haze over lakes on a hot day, the soft sound of waves against a boat, the 'talk' of rushes in the wind, the smell of earth newly turned by a plow, and, more than all, the song of a blackbird of Doire Chairn."

LEARNING AND SANCTITY SPREAD FAME ABROAD

So the tradition of learning was there before St. Patrick came, but he turned it into a new mold. The school became a weapon of the church and the light of learning and sanctity blazed high on the hills of Ireland. The fame of her scholars spread throughout Europe, and students from all over the known world flocked to her shores to sit at the feet of scholars in the famous universities at Armagh, Kildare, Clonard, Clonmacnoise, Bangor, Monsterboice, Lismore, and many others.

There were at one time 7,000 students in Armagh school and 3,000 at Clonard. In these schools there was free shelter, free food, free tuition, and the willing pupil was supplied free with the priceless manuscript books of the time. The Englishman, Venerable Bede, records that he found in the Irish schools many of the nobility and lower classes of the English receiving free of charge instruction, books, food, and shelter, and the Saxon King, Alfred, has left a poem written in the Irish language of which the following is an extract:

"I found in Inis Fail the fair
In Ireland while in exile there,
Women of worth, both grave and gay men,
Many clerics and many laymen.

"I found in each great church moreo'er,
Whether on island or on shore,
Piety, learning, and fond affection,
Holy welcome and kind protection."

In the words of Dr. Samuel Johnson, Ireland became the "school of the West, the quiet home of the sanctity and literature."

After the downfall of Rome, the Irish went forth to succor a Europe threatened with darkness. The Irish monks, with no armor save their sacred books, brought learning and Christianity to all of Europe, so that in the words of Dom Louis Gougoud, "To this day the story of the saints of Ireland lives in the lands that are watered by the Marne, the Meuse, the Rhine, and the Danube."

IRELAND'S CONSTITUTION GREATEST IN THE WORLD

Now if we were dealing merely with the people in whom the passion for the learning had died out, it would still not be strange that they should take such a pride in the past, but here we have a people who have been guided by that passion through an incredible thousand years when their institutions overthrown, their land laid waste, their chieftans banished, their monasteries burned, their books banned, they still clung to that passion for learning. When there was

a price on the head of the schoolmaster, they risked life and limb to get that education they prized so dearly.

Is it any wonder that with this spirit, a writer in a great American paper can say today: "Ireland has given this generation its greatest poet, its greatest playwright, its most influential novelist and its greatest pamphleteer." And remember, the people of whom this is written number today only 4,250,000, less than one-thirtieth of the population of the United States.

Small wonder that the Irish people should manifest their joy that a native Irish Government would give them the lead by establishing a school of higher studies. It has been only 3 or 4 years in existence, but already it has attracted the attention of scholars all over the world.

I am certain that if the people got an opportunity they would register as much appreciation for the magnificent gesture of Mr. Henry L. Shattuck in making his princely gift to Harvard University of a chair of Celtic, thus paying an eloquent tribute to the glories of our literature.

It is not only in matters of the mind that the Irish are using their new-found powers to good purpose. They have inaugurated a constitution which has been described as the greatest in the world. The preamble to this document has often been quoted, but it is worth while quoting it again. That it came into being at a time when materialism and unbelief were rife throughout the world is in itself noteworthy. I heard an old priest describing it thus: "It is like feeling the sun and the wind in your face after coming out of a smoky room." Here is the preamble:

"In the name of the Most Holy Trinity, from whom is all authority and to whom, as our final end, all actions both of men and states must be referred,

"We, the people of Eire,

"Humbly acknowledging all our obligations to our Divine Lord, Jesus Christ, who sustained our fathers through centuries of trial,

"Gratefully remembering their heroic and unremitting struggle to regain the rightful independence of our nation,

"And seeking to promote the common good with due observance of prudence, justice, and charity, so that the dignity and freedom of the individual may be assured, true social order attained, the unity of our country restored, and concord established with other nations,

"Do hereby adopt, enact, and give to ourselves this constitution."

CONSTITUTION PRESUMES UNITY OF ALL IRELAND

Here are a few outstanding features of the constitution. The first three articles affirm the independence of Ireland and the sovereignty of the Irish Nation all over Irish territory, and they presume the ultimate reintegration of the six northeastern counties. The next series define the state, its name and flag, and affirm the democratic principle that all powers of government derive under God from the people, whose right to choose its government and to decide all questions of national policy is final.

All natural resources are the property of the state, subject to private interests already lawfully established. The president is elected directly by the people. He holds office for 7 years. All powers and functions conferred on him are exercisable only on the advice of the government. The national parliament consists of two houses, the Dail and the Senate, which must sit in public. Any person over 21 is eligible for membership of the Dail, which is elected on a franchise comprising every citizen over 21, the system being proportional representation.

When the Dail first meets it nominates a taoiseach, which is a post similar to that of a prime minister, who is then so appointed by the president. The taoiseach selects his cabinet from among the members of the Dail and Senate. The Senate consists of 60 members, 11 of whom are nominated by the taoiseach, the others being elected by the universities, and by vocational panels of voters representing literature, art, education, agriculture, labor, industry, commerce, and public administration.

The family is recognized as the natural primary and fundamental unit group of society, and as a moral institution possessing inalienable and imprescriptible rights antecedent to and superior to all positive law. The State guarantees to protect the family as the necessary basis of social order. Mothers shall not be obliged by economic necessity to engage in labor to the neglect of their duties in the home. Divorce is prohibited. Primary education is compulsory and free. Freedom of conscience and the free profession and practice of religion is guaranteed.

In Ireland almost all schools are, fortunately or unfortunately, dependent on the point of view, denominational; that is, there are schools for the Catholics, for the Protestants and for the Jews. The government builds and maintains the schools for all denominations, pays the teachers, and it even supplies free transportation for children, the schools of whose choice may be some distance off.

IRELAND BETTER FED THAN REST OF EUROPE

The principles of social policy are to promote the welfare of the whole people by securing a social order in which justice and charity shall prevail; to see that all citizens have the right to adequate means of livelihood; to insure that the ownership and control of material resources may be so distributed as best to serve the common good; that free competition will not result in the concentration of the ownership or control of essential commodities in a few individuals to the common detriment; that in the control of credit the aim shall be the welfare of the people as a whole; to establish as many people as possible on the land in economic holdings; to favor private initiative in industry and commerce; to insure reasonable efficiency in the production and distribution of goods so as to protect the public against exploitation; to protect the weaker sections amongst the people by contributing to the support of the infirm, the widow, the orphan, and the aged; to see that the health and strength of the worker and the tender age of children shall not be abused by being forced through economic necessity to do work unsuited to their sex, age, or strength.

Simultaneously with the drawing up of the constitution the government was busy on its own agricultural and industrial policy. Tillage was encouraged by guaranteeing prices for produce and by tax discrimination in favor of the farmer who tilled his land. The transfer of the ownership of the land from the landlord to the tenant was speeded up by compulsory sale. The big ranches were taken over and subdivided amongst the farmers. The other day I read a novel written by an American lady, the theme of which was the alleged confiscation of the landlords' interest in the land. There was no confiscation at all, but as I say, there was compulsory sale.

The landlords were given very generous terms. Instead of the often precarious rents, they were given 20 to 24 years' purchase, that is, 20 to 24 times the rental value of the land, and payment was made to them in land bonds which today are so valuable that they are selling at 17 points above par. Here I might say that so sound is our national economy that all our national stocks are above par, and have never gone below it. The ranches taken over were divided into 20- or 30-acre farms and the new owner repaid the purchase price in a system of decreasing annuities extending over 60 to 80 years, the annuity in the first year being equivalent to considerably less than one-half the former rental.

The tillage program has been a very great success. In one item alone it is phenomenal. The area under wheat in 1930 was 20,000 acres; today it is 600,000 acres, an increase of 3,000 percent. And thanks to this policy, Ireland today is better off in the matter of food, including beef, mutton, milk, butter, eggs, and sugar, than any other country in Europe. Indeed, such is the productive value of the land that last year we were able to export $150,000,000 worth of food.

When I was in Ireland last summer, I had occasion to see one aspect of the new development which impressed me very much. On a bog in the County Kildare, I traveled on a little railway for 5 miles over the surface of the bog which was strung with overhead electric power wires. There I saw huge machines digging out the turf to a depth of 16 or 20 feet, and extracting some 80 percent of the moisture. This turf was conveyed to all sections of the country, and to provide for the present emergency, when foreign coal is scarce, there are huge stacks of this turf in the public parks in every town.

ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR GREATLY MISREPRESENTED

The industrial policy was equally successful up to the time the war began. There were no fewer than 900 small industries started all over the country. The net output of native industry rose in value from £21,000,000 in 1931 to £35,000,000 in 1942. Salaries and wages for those engaged in turning out manufactured goods rose from £8,000,000 in 1931 to £14,000,000 in 1941.

Frederick T. Birchall, the European correspondent for the New York Times, in his book, The Storm Breaks, says:

"I toured Eire when the Free State was throwing off the last remnants of overlordship, and marveled at the progress which was being made there with scant resources and despite great obstacles. I talked with De Valera and his ministers, and their earnestness, their simplicity, and scorn of material reward were a revelation. This was a new type of statesmanship. Here were simple men building without fuss a stable regime on the ruins of one that had broken down. They sounded no trumpets, they kept no sort of state whatever, but they were making a country anew, without violence and without oppressing anybody, in a world in which such methods seem to have gone out of fashion."

Of course, the war has had a profound effect on our agricultural and industrial program, in the former case because of the difficulty in importing fertilizers, and in the latter owing to the difficulty of obtaining raw materials. The consequence is that we have had to go without many important articles.

With regard to our attitude to the war, there has been a great deal of misrepresentation. We are told it is founded on an ancient grudge. It is, of course, founded on nothing of the kind. It is perfectly true that we have not forgotten the past, but the old bitterness it used to evoke has very largely passed, and it would have passed altogether if our country had not been partitioned.

In considering this question of Ireland's neutrality, it must be remembered that ours is a very small country, with an area of 32,600 square miles in all, which is about two-thirds of the size of New York State, and with only 4,250,000 of people, which is less than the population of Massachusetts.

When the war first loomed on the horizon we had, of course, to take cognizance of it. Our people saw their country just emerging from a long and unequal struggle against foreign domination, which had reduced the population by one-half, ruined its industry, turned its farms into a pasturage, and split the country into two fragments by the erection of an unnatural barrier which deprived us of six of our fairest counties.

The Irish people decided that war was an enemy which would disrupt our national unity; that such disruption would leave us

at the mercy of the invader and that if such a catastrophe occurred as the visitation of war, the very existence of the last remnants of the race in the homeland was in jeopardy.

POLICY OF NEUTRALITY SUPPORTED 99.9 PERCENT

So they decided to remain neutral. The policy was supported by 99.9 percent of the people. All political parties and the people of every denomination, every leader of capital and labor and all the newspapers of the country were on the one word in this matter. The pro-British section were not less firm on this policy than were any of the others.

The Irish Times, which has always been pro-British, declared that no other policy was possible. Quite lately, as late as September 1942, the Irish Independent, which has always been a foremost critic of Mr. de Valera and his policies, had this to say of neutrality under the heading "Neutrality is not a party issue":

"All political parties in this state are of one mind on the question of neutrality. Nobody has the right to make it a party issue. A Fianna Fail Deputy is reported as having stated in a speech that it is wrong to say that the government has lost the confidence of the people, because to say that is to suggest that belligerents need no longer be concerned with Irish neutrality. This is just plain nonsense. It is in line with the statements so often made by shortsighted people that 'Mr. de Valera kept us out of the war.'

"No minister has any more right than the humblest citizen to claim that he kept us out of the war. It was the will of the Irish people which settled our neutrality, not the will of any political leader or of any political party. Neutrality is not Fianna Fail's monopoly. Fine Gael and Labour and the Farmers and countless other groups have been as punctilious and as insistent as Fianna Fail in the resolve to preserve our neutrality. It would be a gross misrepresentation of the national position, and a grave disservice to our cause abroad, to use words which might convey to outsiders that only one party in this country stands for the policy of preserving Eire from being involved in the war.

"Making use of neutrality as a weapon in internal politics is a dangerous game. However long this war lasts, and whatever are the fortunes of the political parties at the polls, neutrality shall continue to be the policy of the united people. If Fianna Fail were swept out of power in the morning, the country's attitude toward the war would remain unchanged; it would remain unchanged whether Fine Gael or Labour or the Farmers, or a coalition group formed the government; and it would remain unchanged if all the present political parties and their leaders were swept into oblivion.

"The country will not, we hope, stand for these growing attempts to make party capital out of something that is above and beyond all parties."

WHY IS IT SHAMEFUL FOR ERIE TO BE NEUTRAL?

When war broke out and the Government reaffirmed the policy of neutrality, the news was received with complacency everywhere. In England the only comment made was that it was something to be thankful for that at long last there was a genuinely neutral Ireland on England's flank. Some time later, however, when the war began to go badly for the Allies a scapegoat had to be found, and so they singled out Ireland.

Now, we are not dreamers, and we know it is only natural that people caught in the stress of a great calamity should view with envy, if not distaste, those who are not similarly caught, and so we understand when people say they do not like our attitude; but we do not understand, and we resent the fact that they account for our attitude by attributing to us motives which do not exist and by manufacturing malicious falsehoods which are invented merely to put Ireland in the wrong.

We have nothing to hide. Our country is an open book. When Mr. De Valera said that he was not going to allow anyone to use Ireland as a base to attack England, he meant just exactly that. And we have left nothing undone to see that no one can take advantage of Ireland's neutral status to the detriment of any other country.

People who criticize us frequently assume that this war was a crusade freely entered upon by a great group of nations. Of course this is not true. No country has entered until it was first attacked. This is not held their discredit. Why should it be otherwise with Ireland? Why should it be shameful for Ireland to remain out and meritorious for the other neutrals to do the same? Why, above all, should Ireland be expected to be more heroic than countries a hundred times her size and with a thousand times her resources?

We have never maintained such legions or commanded such might that we could go forth to overthrow dynasties or alter the shape of kingdoms. We have never desired such power. We think, however, we have made a contribution which is of greater ultimate importance. We did not cease 1,000 years ago to be a great missionary people, with a great spiritual message. Any time through those 1,000 years you would have found the Irish battling against ignorance and darkness, hatred and bigotry all over the known globe, never counting the cost, never hoping for material reward.

That is our contribution, and it will be there at the world's behest when this dread conflict is over, and God knows it will never have been so badly needed.

Poisonous Class Appeal Wins Tax Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Muskegon (Mich.) Chronicle:

POISONOUS CLASS APPEAL WINS TAX BATTLE

That President Roosevelt has won his single-handed victory over the proposed universal skip-a-year tax plan to bring taxpayers up-to-date in their account with the Government, through a last-ditch ultimatum that he would veto it, is less important than his poisonous appeal to class prejudice is regrettable.

Opinions differ legitimately on this so-called tax-forgiveness measure that would not have resulted in anybody paying less taxes than he is paying as it is, now or any time in his lifetime.

This statement is reiterated here, because descriptive terms such as "skip a year" and "tax forgiveness" have been seized on by careless public opinion to mean that somebody was to pay less taxes, to have something he owed the Government remitted. Reiterated correction in the public press has failed to remove it.

Opposition to the plan, or to any part of it, has been entirely legitimate. Its wisdom is a matter of opinion, although support for the proposed method of collecting the tax currently through pay-roll deduction has been so overwhelming almost nobody but stubborn old Chairman DOUGHTON of the House Ways and Means Committee has been opposing the principle.

The method of collecting is all there is of it. Everybody would continue to pay, this year and every other year, as much as he always has, save that the taxpayer whose income this year is larger than last year would pay more this year. If his income is less than last year's and he is in the so-called upper brackets he would pay on the basis of last year's income, instead.

The plan is airtight, so far as the possibility of anybody escaping paying his just share of taxes is concerned.

If there is something vicious, as Chairman DOUGHTON was insisting earlier, in the principle of forgiveness itself, then the whole idea is vicious, down to the lowest tax bracket. And nobody, including the President, is even suggesting that. Some modification of the plan will be enacted.

Nor were the revenues of the Government at stake, or endangered.

The Government will get, every year, as much from the taxpayers as it would under the present law. For a year like this, when the national income will be greater than last year, it will receive more, proportionately.

The added amount to be received from those in the upper income brackets, against whom the President insists we must discriminate, will be a mere drop in the bucket, compared to our total expenditures. That is because the comparatively few upper-bracket incomes received represent such an insignificant proportion of the total income of the Nation.

All of this, stated over and over, and regarding which there is no dispute, is here reiterated as a background against this poisonous sentence in President Roosevelt's letter, threatening veto, to the chairmen of the revenue-raising committees of Congress:

"I cannot acquiesce in the elimination of a whole year's tax burden on the upper income groups during a war period when I must call for an increase in taxes and savings from the mass of our people."

The poison is not so much in what the sentence says as in what that combination of unrelated statements means to the great mass of people in the United States who, as stated, persist in assuming somebody is being saved some tax payments by the plan.

That sentence, the most poisonous in the letter, was not directed to Chairman George or Chairman Doughton. To anybody who has taken the trouble to be informed on the pay-as-you-go plan, it is absolutely meaningless. It was directed to the misunderstanding people.

No taxes are being "eliminated" for the upper income group that are not being "eliminated" for everybody. The reason more is "eliminated" for them, if one insists on calling the skip-a-year plan elimination, is that they pay so much more in proportion to their total income than the mass of our people, as they rightfully should because of their greater ability to pay. They will also pay a higher proportion of the proposed increased taxes next year.

But that combination of phrases dovetails exactly in what it can be taken to infer with poisonous, class-hatred-surcharged propaganda being circulated against the skip-a-year plan. And that did not happen by accident.

Poisonous class hatred has been for years distilled in this Nation, for no other purpose but to destroy the foundations on which the American Republic rests, so that an alien system may be substituted.

No righteous cause ever has need for refuge to that kind of poison.

The unity of the American Nation never was more necessary than today. Striking at that unity for the sake of a class victory is striking at its foundations.

Presentation of American Flag to International Club of West Side High School, Green Bay, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, 1943, I provided the International Club of the West Side High School, Green Bay, Wis., with an American flag and letter to the students for the Pan American Day celebration.

Carlos Fallon, lieutenant commander, Colombian Navy, retired, who addressed the same group, representing South America, thanked me by letter for my contribution. I believe the thought expressed in his letter is worthy of my colleagues' attention.

Mr. Speaker, on leave granted me to extend my remarks, I wish to include the letters above referred to:

APRIL 14, 1943.

The INTERNATIONAL CLUB,
West High School, Green Bay, Wis.

MY DEAR STUDENTS: This flag of our country—this symbol of unity, glory, and freedom—has flown aloft the United States Capitol in your honor, and is presented to you in commemoration of Pan American Day.

This flag, then, becomes another link in the strength of our Nation, joining hands, as it were, with the spirit of our forefathers here in Washington, with our friends across the border, and with you young people back home—representative of the youth of the world—in a great pledge to ever keep alive in the hearts of Americans—both North and South Americans—the friendship which holds for us a peace which is not born of a victory gained by the clash of steel against steel.

Friendship is a bond between people which grows in common ground, which strengthens in the storms of adversity, and which flowers in the sunshine of pleasant associations. An individual needs and seeks friends to share his joys, and to share his sorrows, hopes, and ambitions. Likewise, a nation.

Friendship between nations is no less a realization of life than friendship between persons. It is, rather, an enlargement of the individual relationship. True friendship is lasting. Between nations, it is not born of a combined greed for a glittering goal, fulfilled by a cruel disregard for obstructions in the pathway of that goal, only to wither and die. On the contrary, it is cemented by a common striving after the things which cannot be weighed in gold, and lives and grows.

Our President has said, "The world order which we seek is the cooperation of free countries, working together in a friendly, civilized society."

It is friendship the Americas possess.
It is friendship we seek among all men.
Friendship is peace.

Sincerely yours,

LA VERN R. DILWEG,
Member of Congress.

CHICAGO, *May 19, 1943.*

The Honorable LAVERN R. DILWEG,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I had the honor to speak to the students of West High School, Green Bay, Wis., at the time when the American flag you sent was presented.

Your letter was read to the student body. If you had been there to see their reaction and hear their applause, you would have been well repaid for the thought and care you gave to writing that beautiful and inspiring letter and for the trouble you took in sending them a flag that had actually flown over the National Capitol.

The greatest treasure you North Americans have is in the children who are now going to high schools all over your country. They are the ones that are going to remake the world. They are going to remake it their way, and their way will include a very close fraternal cooperation between all the free peoples of the Americas.

In your letter you made the point that the Americas already possess friendship and that it is friendship we seek among all men. That is the most powerful argument the Western Hemisphere can bring at the peace table as an inducement to the other victorious nations to abandon the cat and dog existence of European powers for the principles of international morality and good will which already function effectively in the Western Hemisphere.

We don't have to talk to them about tentative experiments. We can show world peace in our half of the world. The machinery of the Pan American Union, gradually built up out of the fraternal relations among the American republics is a far better model for regional or world-wide organization than the League of Nations, a tragic failure in which small nations were browbeaten and humiliated while the entire august body of delegates smiled in tacit approval when "one of the boys" jumped on a weaker country.

Your letter was addressed to a club of school kids, yet it showed as much thought and consideration as though it were meant for a speech before Congress. You did not write down to them or underestimate their mentality or their ideals. Believe me, the kids noticed and appreciated that. I can see that you understand them and love them, otherwise you wouldn't have taken so much trouble for them.

Well, I love them too, so I thought I would let you know how they received your letter and your flag. They were thrilled, they were honored, and they were proud of their flag which had been sent to them by their Congressman.

Sincerely,

CARLOS FALLON,
Lieutenant Commander Colombian Navy, Retired; Private, United States Army.

The Press at Hot Springs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and timely editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal, of Milwaukee, Wis., on May 21, 1943:

THE PRESS AT HOT SPRINGS

Armed soldiers prevent members of the press from entering the hotel at Hot Springs where the International Food Conference is being held. When correspondents asked the President to comment on freer access to delegates, he wisecracked that they'd be asking for bleachers in his private office and then to see him take his bath.

This wasn't really funny. The President through 10 years has met correspondents, has told them when something was off the record, and has found that faith was kept with him. Since war has made many questions dangerous, the press has gone out of its way to cooperate with the President. When Mr. Roosevelt was out of Washington, plenty of newspapermen knew it, but in the interest of his personal safety the secret was kept.

The "freedom of the press," which newsmen at Hot Springs are asking for, is not some personal possession or perquisite of various concerns engaged in gathering and publishing news. It is the guaranty to the public that the people shall be kept informed about their affairs. The obstruction of news gathering carried to such extremes at Hot Springs inevitably raises the question: "What's going on that the public must not hear about?"

Bill of Attainder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I desire to incorporate in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of Thursday, May 20, in which action taken by my distinguished colleague, the Honorable JAMES O'CONNOR, of Montana, is commented on:

BILL OF ATTAINDER

One of the latest intended victims of the new congressional device of attaching attainder clauses to appropriation bills is Dr. Robert Morss Lovett, secretary of the Virgin Islands Government. Dr. Lovett is a distinguished teacher, author, and critic, serving his country in a tough job at the age of 72. Those who know him well cannot think of any act in his life inconsistent with the purest patriotism. He has, indeed, been a lifelong liberal. As such he has been severely critical of the Dies committee, which in some congressional eyes may be lèse majesté. But we don't believe he can have dreamed of doing anything so shockingly subversive of American traditions, and perhaps of the Constitution and the law, as 307 Members of the Lower House did on Tuesday when they voted for a rider to the deficiency appropriation bill forbidding the executive branch to pay any salary to him or to two others mentioned by name.

This action rests on accusations made by the Dies committee after investigations which were lacking in fair and orderly procedure, and on further inquiry by the appropriations subcommittee, under Chairman KERR. The following colloquy took place on the floor of the House:

"Representative O'CONNOR. Is there anything in their record to show that they did not perform able public service? Have they done anything whatever to hinder prosecution of the war?

"Chairman KERR. We didn't go into those matters. It would have required the taking of even more evidence than we took."

As a final touch, the evidence in question was not made available to the House. Yet that august body voted to deprive Dr. Lovett and his colleagues of their rights. One wonders what country this is in which such things

can take place. It doesn't sound like the United States. Perhaps the Senate, which has still to act in this matter, will reassert the ancient rights and decencies of which we have been so proud.

Letter From a Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Cross Country Times:

LETTER FROM A SOLDIER

Below is a letter from James Nettles, nephew of Mrs. A. T. Nettles, that he wrote to his father. Lots of people often wonder what the men in our armed forces think about. This will give a very good idea what one Southern boy in service thinks about and we think he has something there:

APRIL 8, 1943.

DEAR POP: I'm still at a rest camp with nothing much to do but lie around. However, we go back into combat area shortly and I've been doing some leisurely thinking. So I thought I would drop you a line and tell you some of my thoughts since there's no news at present.

I read an article in a 2-month-old magazine that discussed things back in the States. That's one thing that started me thinking. When we here read things and hear news about strikes and the like back home, it gives us sort of a sick feeling in the pits of our stomachs. I don't believe the average American knows what we're up against. The Japs are just as beastly, if not more so than painted. They're ruthless and cunning, not men but animals. When they shoot a Marine through the elbows and knees and leave him in the jungle for the insects to kill, then you have a small example of what they are capable of. The news, I know, sounds encouraging, but I'm here to tell you that this war isn't even beginning to be won. We've made steps in the right direction but it's going to take a lot more. I'll tell you this: We'll never, and I repeat never, win this war until every last American works and suffers plenty. We hate the Japs more than you can imagine and we'll beat hell out of them if the home folks back us up. I don't believe there's a man here who won't give his life, so it seems to me that the damn strikers and a few others would give up something. They think they're suffering hardships. Bull! One day out here would change some of that. We don't get fresh meat even three times a week. We get canned food—and fight on it. The very thought of the way some people in the States are eating burns me up. We should give those people to the damn Japs—and good riddance I'd say. I'm willing to fight and if necessary, die. But I'd like to know that I'd accomplished some object. We can't win without all-out effort at home. If I do get killed I'd like to know it wasn't in vain. So I say: Damn the slackers and sooner they're drafted and made to work, the better.

We had an incident out here that I'd like to tell you folks at home. We were in the combat area. We hadn't had fresh food for weeks, and the Japs had raided us some. A ship came into the harbor with supplies. Well, the seamen on the ship (men from civilian life and union members) refused to work overtime unloading. They quit promptly after an eight hour shift. Marines had to do the unloading. Marines worked all night—men that had slept in fox holes the night before—such sleep as they could get. Some of these men had seen the most terrible part of the fighting, and they made less than $100 per month. The seamen get much more, plus a juicy bonus, for sailing into the combat area. If that's not hell of a note, tell me what is.

Well, enough of this. I just wanted you to know a few of the things I'm thinking. Just remember this. I know the kind of family I have and I'll fight to the last to keep you safe. I'll do what little I can. All of these boys are the same way and we hate Japs.

Tell Aunt Rosa I'll send her some Jap teeth if I can. That's the only thing good about them.

We're all well and healthy.

Lots of love,

JAMES.

United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of the message from the President of the United States to the delegates of the food conference:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 14, 1943.

The Honorable MARVIN JONES,
The White House.

MY DEAR MARVIN: In your capacity as chairman of the United States delegation, and as temporary chairman of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, will you convey to the delegates assembled my heartfelt regret that I cannot be present in person to welcome them upon this historic occasion. Urgent matters in the prosecution of the war make it impossible for me to attend; and until we have won the unconditional surrender of our enemies, the achievement of victory must be pressed above all else.

Nevertheless, I hope that later I shall be able to meet the delegates and express to them personally my profound conviction of the importance of the task on which they are about to embark.

This is the first United Nations conference. Together, we are fighting a common enemy. Together, also, we are working to build a world in which men shall be free to live out their lives in peace, prosperity, and security.

The broad objectives for which we work have been stated in the Atlantic Charter, the Declaration of United Nations, and at the meeting of the 21 American Republics at Rio de Janeiro in January 1942. It is the purpose of this conference to consider how best to further these policies insofar as they concern the consumption, production, and distribution of food and other agricultural products in the post-war period.

We know that in the world for which we are fighting and working the four freedoms must be won for all men. We know, too, that each freedom is dependent upon the others; that freedom from fear, for example, cannot be secured without freedom from want. If we are to succeed, each nation individually, and all nations collectively, must undertake these responsibilities: They must take all necessary steps to develop world food production so that it will be adequate to meet the essential nutritional needs of the world population. And they must see to it that no hindrances, whether of international trade, of transportation or of internal distribution, be allowed to prevent any nation or group of citizens within a nation from obtaining the food necessary for health. Society must meet in full its obligation to make available to all its members at least the minimum adequate nutrition. The problems with which this conference will concern itself are the most fundamental of all human problems—for without food and clothing life itself is impossible.

In this and other United Nations conferences we shall be extending our collaboration from war problems into important new fields. Only by working together can we learn to work together, and work together we must and will.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MARVIN JONES AT THE OPENING PLENARY SESSION

In the name of the Government of the United States and on behalf of the people of the United States, I greet and welcome you to this the first conference of the United Nations and associated nations.

The fact that representatives of 44 nations, from every part of the earth, have traveled long distances under wartime difficulties to be here bespeaks your earnestness, and the importance of the subject we are to discuss. More important, it reflects a genuine desire on the part of all free peoples for a better understanding of our common problems and a united approach to their solution.

This conference has rightfully been referred to as a forerunner of other conferences which unquestionably will have a part in shaping the post-war world in which freedom will again rule.

It is indeed fitting that the first of these world conferences should deal with food because freedom means little to people with empty stomachs.

The subject matter, therefore, of this conference is of vital interest to all the world. Food and raiment are magic words in any language.

The world starts with food. Life cannot be sustained without it. Food is as essential as the air we breathe, and like the air we often do not realize its value until we are deprived of it.

Few of us as laymen realize how much disease and sickness flow from an inadequate or insufficient diet. Scarcity of food is the root of many of our social and economic troubles. Fabrics are almost as important. All agriculture is basic.

Naturally, the peoples of the world are interested in the marketing and distribution of the products that go into food and clothing. They have been the source of many problems, not only between nations but also within the boundaries of practically every country. The question of whether sufficient food of the right kind is available for consumption will always be of great importance both in war and in peace.

The facts of history reveal that in reality there has been no surplus of any edible commodity. If human wants had been satisfied, if human needs had been supplied, there would have been full use for all that has been produced and much more. Our countries have the facilities for expanded production of food and fiber. Mankind has need of them. That need should be supplied.

Thinking people everywhere now realize that what we have called surpluses are for the most part not surpluses at all, but are the results of accumulations caused by defects in the systems of distribution and the

inability of the masses to purchase the food they need. The peoples of the world have mastered the machinery of production to a far greater degree than they have mastered the machinery of distribution. What we have been pleased to call surpluses, therefore, are largely due to clogged channels of commerce arising from extreme trade barriers, upset economies and lack of purchasing power which prevents consumers from securing the things they should have to eat and to wear.

Bursting barns and hungry people, rotting surpluses and empty trade channels, starvation in the midst of a great plenty, either within or without the country of production, reflect no credit to a national or international economy. They just don't make sense.

Then, too, wasting surpluses frequently cause ruinously low prices to the producer which in turn bring periods of scarcity. The consequent extreme fluctuations in price are to the advantage of neither the producer nor the consumer. Stored reserves, a fair price and full use of commodities produced are to the advantage of both producer and consumer.

If by the exchange of views and a consideration of these questions, we can produce a better understanding and promote the flow of farm commodities and the articles produced therefrom into the markets of the world; if we can leave the peoples of the world freer and more able to produce and secure the things they need; if we can make it possible for surplus products to be distributed and used and thus prevent them from overloading and overwhelming the distribution machinery of the countries in which such surpluses have been backed up for lack of a market, we will not only have achieved a great world-wide humanitarian objective, but each of us will have helped to promote the economic and social betterment of his own country as well.

The furnishing of new channels and new outlets for the products of agriculture means as much to the nations producing the surpluses as to those who need the products. In addition, the freer flow of commodities in world trade will enable each nation to produce what it is best equipped and suited to produce.

It is recognized that these things look to a long-time program. In the meantime it may be necessary for the nations to deal on a temporary basis with gluts, geographic surpluses, and adjustments of production. Any of these temporary devices, however, should be geared to the long-range objective of fully utilizing the products of human skill and energy.

It must be remembered that the radio, the airplane and other physical devices are not progress in themselves, but are the outward manifestations of progress. True progress is of the mind and heart. The same materials go into the sewing machine that go into the machine gun. The same materials are used in making a plow that are used in manufacturing a cannon. It depends upon the attitude, upon the motives that lie behind the instruments that are thus fashioned. What a challenge to the purpose and to the genius of mankind:

Every nation should become vitally interested in the conservation of natural resources—soil, timber and minerals and the rebuilding of them where they have been depleted and are being wasted.

Closely linked to the soil is water as applied to the land in both the excess and deficiency areas. These problems are as old as history. Some countries have learned much in the use of land and water, but there is still much to learn.

Of the productive land of the world much has been intensively cultivated. Erosion by water and wind has seriously wasted the soil in many countries and greatly reduced its productive capacity. It is estimated that at least one-third of the tilled land of the earth has been seriously affected by erosion. Most of the nations have adopted some conservation measures, but by exchanging information as to methods and fitting them into our own economies we can all profit. Looking down the years this is of tremendous importance to all peoples. Nothing gives greater assurance to any country than productive land and available resources.

The thoughtful use of soil building and soil conserving crops and practices will do much for any country. Each nation must be the final judge of what is best suited to its conditions and needs, but a free exchange of information as to crops and methods of cultivation will help us all. We in the Americas greatly need the advice and suggestions of those peoples who have had longer experience in these vital problems. We hope that an exchange of ideas will be mutually helpful. There is so much for all to do that will promote the interests of all that our differences and conflicts seem puny when laid alongside the vast possibilities that are before us.

We hope the next 100 years will be the people's century in which the numerous governments of the earth will so shape their policies as to protect the welfare of all their citizens; that they may come to realize that in lending a neighborly hand to each other the best interests of all nations will be promoted; that many of our problems are mutual problems; that many of our interests are mutual interests, and that in helping build up each other we help to build ourselves; that what humanity wants is not charity, but a free opportunity—the chance to work and help to build.

The agenda of the conference is before you. We have undertaken to assemble some data and have outlined some suggestions which we hope may prove helpful, but we want you to know that they are merely suggestions. The exact scope of this conference, the progress it makes and the results it achieves, will be determined by the conference itself in which all the delegates from every country will have a part. We want to exchange views and information and to devote our best efforts to formulating a program that will be for the benefit of every nation.

We realize that certain things must wait until the conditions of the post-war world are more fully revealed. Certain specific subjects must be left to other conferences or later studies by committees of this conference, but there are major objectives on which we can agree and which will be a starting point for other work to follow. We shall not deal with the problems of relief which immediately follow the war and which will be handled on an emergency basis, but with the longer range rebuilding problems of agriculture which each nation must face.

We all, of course, realize this conference has been called to explore and assemble facts and to make recommendations to our respective governments and not for the purpose of negotiating treaties or entering into binding commitments.

The hope of the world lies in concord, not conflict; in the arts of peace rather than in the implements of war. I hope that this conference may lay the foundation for a happier relationship throughout the world. A better distribution of the products of the farm and field will materially aid in whatever provision is hereafter fashioned for maintaining the peace of the world. We all know that food is a powerful weapon of warfare. Food may be even more effective in helping to maintain peace.

When the dogs of war have been unleashed the suffering produced by their cruel fangs does not end when the conflict has ended. The gaunt specter of famine begins to stalk across the world before the smoke of battle has lifted. It is the prayer of all that after this war the peoples of the world will escape hunger and famine. But this cannot be taken for granted. That is why we are here tonight.

Too often we grow accustomed to the necessary things of life and they seem commonplace, even though they are our most precious possessions. Our daily food is often accepted as a matter of course. But when scarcity comes we soon know the tragedy of want. One needs only to look into the pinched faces of those who have been liberated from the ordered starvation of Nazi and Japanese oppression to realize its full meaning. The eager expression in their countenances at the first prospect of something to eat shows what a powerful weapon food has become.

Wars are costly. They not only are tragic in their cost of human life and human suffering but they are tremendously costly in upset economies, broken channels of trade, and lopsided distribution.

For thousands of years the earth has trembled beneath the tread of giant armies and mankind somewhere has been engaged in almost continual strife. Hope must spring eternal that this strife can be ended. Humanity should have learned through long years of bitter experience that the way to settle the rivalry between nations is for each to build up its own resources rather than tear down the neighboring commonwealth.

The contests of the future should be creative and constructive, not destructive. The white-winged carriers of commerce should weave their magic way across oceans and through the air carrying the products of man's work throughout the world and adding to the happiness of mankind.

When the peoples of the earth are better fed and in better health, when rotting surpluses are translated into food for hungry mouths, into clothing for protection, and into shelter for tired bodies, when the products of the inventive genius of mankind have been turned from destructive processes into the channels of construction, when the producer on the family-sized farming unit can plough his fields without fear and the smiling workman can fashion the tools of progress with the conscious knowledge that they will be used to bring happiness and not sorrow, when the sword of vengeance has fallen from the nerveless grasp of the tyrant and the hand of the good neighbor, rather than the mailed fist, has been extended across the world, then will be dawning a new day for humanity.

To this philosophy and to these objectives let us dedicate this conference.

Memorial of the State of New Hampshire: United Nations of the World

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a joint resolution approved by the State Legislature of New Hampshire on May 18, 1943. This resolution is relative to a United Nations of the World:

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened, That

the New Hampshire delegation in the Congress of the United States hereby is requested to exercise its influence to have the Congress expeditiously explore the action necessary to form a United Nations of the World with its organization and administration based upon law; and, as soon as expedient, initiate such action. The secretary of state is hereby instructed to forward to each Senator and Representative of this State in Congress a copy of this resolution.

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered over station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on May 22, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, once again it is a great pleasure to talk to you folks back home and to say I feel that victory is not so far away. A lot of the blood and sweat and tears is beginning to bear fruit. Things are happening so fast lately, it is difficult to obtain a comprehensive picture of the whole war situation. But one point is obvious and that is we will never again be on the defensive. For 2 years the United Nations have fought a delaying action, straining every sinew and fiber in a vastly outmatched struggle. Now, however, the picture is different.

The tremendous manpower which has gradually been drawn into our armed forces is making itself felt in combat throughout the entire world.

The complete transition of our industries with their limitless productive capacity is now effected and, according to those who should know, we are turning out more weapons of war than all the rest of the world put together.

Our home front is the very symbol of unity; on all sides comes the clamor to buy War bonds, to contribute in every conceivable way to the war effort, and to do all in our power to hasten the day of victory.

In appraising this optimistic turn of events, we must not overlook the ever-increasing participation of American womanhood to shoulder the burdens of war which their men have left behind. With 6,000,000 women now employed in the war effort, we can easily understand to what extent their activities in defense work go. The women of the Nation are deserving of the highest possible praise for their energy and patriotism.

When we consider the mighty task the United States has mastered, the obstacles overcome they said couldn't be pushed aside, the indomitable strength and courage of the American people, we conclude but one thing; Adolf Hitler and the yellow-bellied Japanese have no more chance of winning than a five-year-old boy against Joe Louis.

Until the collapse of the Axis armies in Tunisia, I had thought the war might be prolonged for years. If the enemy had given some evidence of real fight during the last few days, I would have concluded their morale to be high and their determination great. Victor Hugo tells an incident in his magnificent description of the battle of Waterloo during its last stages about a French captain in command of a small company of Bonapartist soldiers. They were entirely surrounded by British and Prussians who were pouring a terrible cannonade into their diminishing ranks.

Three times the British commander ceased firing to give the French captain a chance to surrender. Three times he refused, hurling a proud challenge back into the teeth of the victors. Seeing this Frenchman's determination to fight to the finish, the allies opened a withering fire and exterminated every man in the gallant company. Truly, this little group of heroes fought to the last man.

What a contrast between these followers of Napoleon Bonaparte and the Afrika Korps of Adolf Hitler! Nearly 200,000 of the latter gave up without a struggle when the ultimate result of the battle became apparent. The world expected to see a heroic defense, a stubborn siege of many months, a delaying retreat until the continent of Europe could be made formidable against our invasion. But the once brave Afrika Korps gave up without a murmur. Their defeat was ignominious and amazing when compared to the French captain and his handful of grenadiers in the closing hours of the Battle of Waterloo.

So I can only conclude that the remainder of the war will be considerably shortened. As General Arnold told me at the White House meeting several weeks ago, victory is only a matter of time. The Germans cannot begin to approach the enlarging production of airplanes in America. They are not even replacing their considerable losses, and we are shooting them down at the ratio of 2 to 1. From every source of information made available to me, I firmly believe an invasion of Europe from several points is imminent.

It looks to me as though the enemy is on the run. He is certainly being driven back and is everywhere on the defensive. On the other hand, the United Nations are closing the powerful rings they have forged about the Germans and the Japs. The Italians never really did want the war anyway. Unrest within Italy is doing the Fascist leaders no good.

We will take care of the Japs in a decisive fashion as soon as our production reaches its peak. Even now, the news dispatches indicate that these little brown men have been brought to a standstill. Their navies are decimated and they haven't the productive facilities to replace them. The United States, on the other hand, has just begun the battle of production. Under these circumstances, Tokyo and the Japanese Empire are as good as in flames this very minute.

Therefore I can look upon the outcome of this war in only an optimistic light. We have been mobilizing our men and materials, our resources and great strength for 3 years. Not one foot of our soil has been molested by an invader, which has allowed us to concentrate our entire effort upon preparing for victory. No nation on earth has ever approached the tremendous ability to organize, produce, and distribute the forces and weapons which America possesses to win the war.

By the hand and will of a just God the American people are being guided. They will never turn back, nor will they falter in their avowed mission until its goal of permanent freedom and equality of mankind has been assured by the unconditional surrender of the enemy.

At this time I want to say a few words about speaking engagements. I have received many invitations to address club, civic, and church gatherings. As you know, I have found it necessary to turn many of these down. This I regret doing because there is nothing I like better than coming back and talking to friends face to face. But during these dark days I know you people expect me to remain at my post of duty here in Washington. I know you prefer having me in the Capital to attend to your requests personally. Therefore, I am sure you will understand if I am forced to refuse to accept a speaking invitation. On the other hand, do not hesitate to ask me, because I may be able to arrange a speech for you, your group or organization, some time when I am home for a few days this summer. Don't be afraid to ask me, because you will want to hear about wartime Washington firsthand.

I had not planned to return home over Memorial Day week-end but several invitations to speak at different Decoration Day services came to me and so I suddenly decided to break away. I will do the same on the following week-end at Ross Park, Sunday, June 6, which, as you know, is the opening day and will be a great occasion. This will be the seventh annual Townsend Day observance and I cannot miss the pleasure of seeing so many dear old friends.

Please bear in mind what I said regarding the interesting book entitled "Our Flag" by the United States Marine Corps. I have a large supply of this patriotic volume and will be pleased to send it to you upon request. This book gives a complete résumé of the American flag, its use, respect, and display. It is a well written explicit story with a beautifully decorated exterior bearing a picture on the front of a marine color guard marching.

Much has been said about our glorious flag and I will read briefly from the Marine Corps book several points not often mentioned. I quote:

"General Washington, when the Star-Spangled Banner was first flown at the head of the Continental Army, described its symbolism as follows: 'We take the stars from heaven, the red from our mother country, separating it by white stripes, thus showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty.'

"Following the cessation of hostilities and the organization of the United States under the Constitution, the flag continued to be modified by the addition of a star and a stripe for each State coming into the Union. After the admission of Kentucky and Vermont, a resolution was adopted in January 1794, making the flag one of 15 stars and 15 stripes.

"Realizing that the flag would soon become unwieldy with the addition of a stripe for each State, Capt. Samuel C. Reid, United States Navy, commander of the armed brig *General Armstrong* during the War of 1812, presented to the Congress the suggestion that the stripes remain 13 in number as representing the Colonies which struggled to found the Nation, and that a star be added to the blue field for each additional State coming into the Union. This suggestion became the text of a resolution by Congress, effective on July 4, 1818.

"Following the War of 1812, a great wave of nationalistic spirit spread throughout the country; the infant Republic had successfully defied the might of an empire. As this spirit of nationalism spread, Old Glory began to take on the characteristics of a mighty symbol of sovereignty and the homage paid that banner is best expressed by what the gifted men of future generations wrote concerning it.

"The brilliant Henry Ward Beecher said: 'A thoughtful mind when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag, but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principles, the truths, the history that belong

to the nation that sets it forth. The American flag has been a symbol of liberty, and men rejoiced in it.

"'The stars upon it were like the bright morning stars of God, and the stripes upon it were beams of morning light. As at early dawn the stars shine forth even while it grows light, and then as the sun advances that light breaks into banks and streaming lines of color, the glowing red and intense white striving together and ribbing the horizon with bars effulgent, so, on the American flag, stars and beams of many-colored light shine out together. * * *'"

On the Endicott Johnson workers page of the Binghamton Sun, there appeared last week a fine tribute to the Mothers of America. I take the liberty of reciting the splendid lines written by Corp. Sidney J. Gyles, serving somewhere overseas, which he has entitled, "Dear Mother." His poem follows:

"You're a wonderful soul, my mother dear
And your heartful of love, that is mine
Is a gift that is holy and sacred to me
A treasure, forever, divine.

"You're a wonderful friend, my mother dear
Your actions, your words, and your love
Supply all the joys that make living worth while
My guardian, sent from above.

"You're a wonderful chum, my mother dear
And the things that you teach me to do,
I'll never forget, for they help me to be
Just a little bit more like you.

"And being like you, my mother dear
Is a goal that I'll try to attain,
To prove that your trials, and sacrifice
Shall never have been in vain.

"So today I am dreaming, my mother dear
And the vision is brilliant and true,
For all the gay pleasures my musings portray
Melt into a picture—of you."

War Department Civil Functions Appropriations — Teche-Vermilion-Mermentau Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, last session of the Congress the House had for consideration this same appropriation for the Teche-Vermilion-Mermentau flood-control project, and I have been told that due to the fact that these three important projects were included together with other projects that the appropriation was stricken out of the civil functions bill at that time.

Mr. Speaker, we all admit that it is essential that we have increased food production to win the war, and I can well say that the Government cannot make any appropriation which, in my opinion, will contribute more to increased food production than by the authorization of this appropriation. Besides cotton, corn, sugarcane, potatoes, hay, oats, soybeans, truck, and so forth, the particular area affected by this project is one of the largest production centers of rice, one of the finest and cheapest and most nutritious foods that can be produced. This area produces nearly 75 percent of the total production of rice in the State of Louisiana, and it is my opinion that when the work is completed to control the flood waters from this section as proposed by the United States engineers that it is possible to increase the production not only of rice, but nearly all other agricultural products in a most substantial way. Oil is also considered essential to the winning of the war, and as a great part of the production of oil is from the fields of south Louisiana, in the area that these streams overflow when on rampage, the enactment of this appropriation will make possible continued production in these fields by averting damages caused by floods.

As I testified at the committee hearing, millions of dollars of damage was done not only to the industries which I have named, but physical damage mounting in the millions was suffered by Crowley, the rice capital of America, Abbeville, and Gueyda, in Vermilion Parish, and other cities and towns in the Third and Seventh Congressional Districts, over which these streams spread their floodwaters.

The main highways of the State are also affected as a result of floods from these rivers. Route 90—the Old Spanish Trail—traverses the heart of this area, and when this section is flooded is out of commission. This is important at the time of war, as this is the main artery for our troop movements from east to west. These projects will not require any critical materials, as most of the work is dredging the channels of these rivers which have become closed by the accumulation of silt, and the most part will be that of dredging, and as I am informed there are United States Government dredges in the area which are now idle, the same are, and will be available in order that this work may be commenced immediately.

There is no question as to the economic justification for these projects, as the investment will return untold dividends in increased food production, make available thousands of acres of land for use which is not now cultivated, and remove the threat of millions of dollars of damage to physical property.

Senator OVERTON, of Louisiana, has labored long and hard on these projects, and has always had the full support and recommendation of the United States Engineers' in the plan contemplated in this appropriation, and too much credit cannot be given Senator OVERTON for his untiring efforts to bring this matter again for the consideration of this House, and I trust, Mr. Speaker, that my colleagues will appreciate the wisdom and fairness of our request, and will vote unanimously for this bill in order that we may obtain the relief from further catastrophes in my district.

In order that the Members of Congress may have more information pertaining to this important subject, I include the following article from the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune to be printed in the RECORD:

RIVERS PROJECT COVERS BIG AREA—TECHE-VERMILION-MERMENTAU WORK LONG SOUGHT

(By Richard H. Tate)

BATON ROGUE, LA., May 8.—Final clearance of the Teche-Vermilion and Mermentau Rivers projects in Washington this week brings to a climax work that was under way for years. The State department of public works has fostered the project all this time because it, in the words of a department official, "is a key to the whole problem of drainage in this part of Louisiana."

To properly visualize the area to be affected by the three-river program one should envisage a triangle of almost equilateral shape. The apex of the triangle being at a point about where the town of Alexandria is the southwest corner at the point where a line drawn through Alexandria southwestward through Iowa in Calcasieu parish ending at the Cameron coast on the Gulf. The east side of the triangle would be a line drawn southeastward from Alexandria, passing through Franklin and finally touching the Gulf on the shore of St. Mary parish.

In this area lie some 9,900 square miles and there live a total of almost 500,000 people scattered through the parishes of Jeff Davis, Cameron, Acadia, Vermilion Lafayette, St. Landry, St. Martin, and Iberia. The farm lands located in this area, according to officials, approach a total of 2,500,000 acres.

However, for years much of this farm land has been of questionable worth because of the matter of overflow. It is to correct this very evil that the tri-river program has been pushed so long by officials of the State, and now that it is a certainty, it is felt that not only will it afford much flood relief in itself but it opens the door to more complete local drainage programs for the various parishes themselves. Heretofore, much drainage work that might have been done has been rendered doubtful as to ultimate result because of the lack of proper outlets in this general sector.

BARRIER RAISED

Due to wave action along the Gulf coast a barrier and in effect a dam of several feet in height has been raised that has in many areas raised the level of the sea marshes to 2 and 3 feet above sea level, thus any attempt at drainage was tremendously handicapped by this fact. Only the Mermentau and the Vermilion Rivers afforded any kind of an outlet through this area due to the beach barrier and with the slow but steady silting up of the mouths of these two rivers the condition was steadily deteriorating.

According to a brief submitted to the Senate committee in Washington in regard to the program one of the chief arguments stressing the vital nature of the program hinged on the fact that in the past some $9,000,000 has been spent in this section on local drainage projects. Because of the lack of proper outlets, such as these now assured in the current projects, this expenditure was largely in vain.

This work, in the past, was conducted principally during the years 1900 to 1910, and by the early 1930's, when low prices on farm commodities prevailed, many of the districts in which this early work had been done defaulted on their bonds and interest, and, finally, many farms were lost due to nonpayment of taxes.

By 1939 and 1940, with farm prices everywhere improving, many of these farmers sought to rehabilitate themselves and their farms so that today, with an unprecedented increase in the demand for farm produce itself tacit assurance that these people will be able to pay for this rehabilitation, there is a definite demand throughout the entire area for adequate drainage.

LOCAL PROJECTS

Also there is in the offing additional work of this nature on a local basis and at least

four parishes in the affected area currently contemplate local drainage programs. These parishes are Vermilion, Iberia, St. Martin, and Lafayette, and with the federal program set, Director of the Department of Public Works Pyburn believes that it will encourage the people in this section to improve their own drainage facilities.

The total amount of money that may be spent in these local projects, Pyburn places at about $2,100,000. This, with the $2,360,000 Teche-Vermilion and Mermentau project brings the grand total likely to be spent on drainage in this part of the State to $4,460,000.

The department of public works has spent several years at intervals trying to justify the expenditure of Federal money on the lower outlet projects and now, as a result, Pyburn estimates that agricultural production in the affected sections will be increased on an over-all basis by as much as 50 percent. In some areas, however, it may go as high as 100 percent.

This, in Pyburn's opinion, was a vital factor in finally clearing the way for the actual work. As to when equipment is to really move in and work start, officials are unable to state, but all obstacles are now out of the way and it is not unreasonable to assume that further delays should be few.

In reconstructing the background of the Teche-Vermilion, Mermentau projects and the work that has gone into the proposition merely to get it approved and funds allocated for the work, Pyburn paid particular tribute to United States Senator JOHN OVERTON.

"OVERTON has worked harder than anyone on this project, and to him must naturally go a major share of the credit for its final clearance. It is a fact that without his help we could never have finally put it over."

In commenting on the long range as well as the immediate results of the program, Pyburn described it as "a basis for rehabilitation for the entire area as well as laying the groundwork for agricultural improvement as well as improvement along industrial lines.

"It will enable the people of this vast area to proceed with their local drainage problems and solutions with the knowledge that whatever programs they may work out will be served, and adequately served, by this drainage system. This is the key to their drainage problems."

Subsidy on Coffee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. MILLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram which I received from the Empire Coffee Co., of St. Louis, Mo.:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *May 21, 1943.*

Congressman LOUIS E. MILLER,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN: We protest the subsidy and roll-back of roasted-coffee prices proposed for June 1. This proposal looks like a slap in the face for the coffee industry, who have been petitioning the Office of Price Administration since March 1942 for price relief due to having frozen our selling prices when they were much below our replacement cost. So instead of help or relief we get saddled with this new political trade or grandstand gesture which does not help anyone. The proposed roll-back of 3 cents a pound to the consumers amounts to about 36 cents a year. To show this large saving up in its true light why not let the head of the family take it off of his income tax? I am sure that if the powers that be offered the public a saving in this manner they would see its true value and would not be fooled by the meager savings it affords. We believe the coffee industry as a whole is against subsidies of all kinds. Why try to fool the public by big talk and little returns? Last but not least, we are in favor of doing something for the coffee industry, something to keep it alive, not something to tear it down. Of all commodities purchased by the public today, coffee has advanced the least. In fact, is lower in price than it was a year ago. If in spite of anything we say the Office of Price Administration wants to put this over for its political effect, then we suggest that the retail grocer be permitted to take his coffee stamps to the post office and turn them in for a 3-cent stamp, because 3 cents a pound is the saving they have in mind, and by handling it through the post office it would save the banks and the coffee industry considerable clerical expense.

EMPIRE COFFEE CO.

The Story of America's Greatest War Loan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following story of America's greatest war loan, a report by H. Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, May 25, 1943:

During the 3 weeks between April 12 and May 1, the American people invested $18,500,000,000 in the future of their free country. This was the most tremendous financing task in the history of the world. I feel that the people should have the facts about this successful undertaking. It will make them proud—but more than that, it will give them a better understanding of the even greater tasks yet to be done in financing the most expensive war in history.

Before the war the Axis boasted that Democracy's armies would be weak, and flabby. Now they know better. And now the people on the home fronts all over the world realize what kind of people they are fighting. They know that you and I and all of our neighbors are in this war to the finish. The fact that we sold $18,500,000,000 in the Second War Loan is proof enough.

WHAT THIS PROVES

We exceeded by more than five billion the goal we set for ourselves. This is a measure of our enthusiasm and patriotism. The result proves many things. It proves that the American people stand solidly behind their Commander in Chief, that they recognize this as their war, and they are willing and eager to finance it.

It proves, also, that the American people are not going to sit back and wait for any forced savings plan in order to finance this most expensive war in all history. This, I might add, is vitally important to me.

I believe in the American people; I believe that they will go to the very limit of their capacity if only they understand the urgency of the situation.

From reports that have come to me from all over the country, and as a result of what I saw and heard on a 7,000-mile trip from which I recently returned, I have come to some definite conclusions as to the reasons for our success. It seems to me that the explanation is found in the spirit of the American people and their deep-rooted determination to fight this war through to victory.

THE WAR SPIRIT SELLS BONDS

When the people really become aflame with the war spirit, all the other problems seem to solve themselves. Labor and management get together; production rises to an all-time high; and bond sales go up automatically. That checks with what all our figures tell us.

War spirit, labor-management relations, production, and bond sales all go hand in hand.

Military terms to describe this Second War Loan victory—and it is a victory—are only partly appropriate. There can be no comparison between the self-denial needed to finance the war adequately and the suffering and death which our fighting men must face.

Yet, there is a close relationship, a very definite similarity between the war on the home front and the war on the fighting front. Neither is won in a single engagement. On both fronts the war must go on through a succession of gains until the final and complete victory is won. We can speak of this success in the Second War Loan drive only as a victory in a minor engagement. It is like the taking of a single fortified point while the main battlefield and the main forces of the enemy still lie ahead.

The real battle is still ahead of us. All that we learned in this Second War Loan Drive, all the enthusiasm that we gained, will be useful in the bigger job that we still have to do.

THERE IS NO EASY WAY

There is no automatic and easy process for winning battles on the home front any more than there is an automatic and easy process for winning battles in the field. The war must be won and the war must be financed by the voluntary, united effort of the whole American people.

What success in financing means to our fighters is illustrated by a conversation I had recently with the Chief of Staff. General Marshall came over to the Treasury to have lunch with me and, before he left, he said:

"Mr. Secretary, I want you to answer a question for me and to answer it with complete frankness. Can we military leaders plan to fight this war in an orderly way—in the surest and most effective manner—or must we take extraordinary risks for fear the money will not hold out?"

My answer was:

"General, the American people will take care of that. What they have done in this Second War Loan drive—the money they have produced and the spirit they have shown—is proof enough for me that they will not let our fighters suffer from lack of support until we achieve complete victory, no matter how long that may be, nor how much it may cost."

That was my answer to General Marshall. I know it is the answer of the American people.

HERE IS WHAT HAPPENED IN THE SECOND WAR LOAN

In the second war loan (as in the first, last December), some of the money was borrowed from commercial banks. We didn't give them all they wanted, but limited them to set amounts. Here are the banks' purchases:

Commercial banks:

First War Loan December 1942, $5,000,000,000.

Second War Loan April 1943, $5,000,000,000.

Much of the money for our bond drives comes from insurance companies and other corporations. They are looking for sound investments and they know that there is no sounder investment than a United States bond. Here is the record for these organizations:

Insurance companies and corporations:
Goal, $5,500,000,000.
First War Loan December 1942, $5,500,000,000.
Second War Loan April 1943:
Actual sales, $9,750,000,000.
(Excludes dealers and brokers.)

But the most important of all sources of funds is individuals. In selling War bonds to individuals we have made great progress, although, of course, much remains to be done. Here is a record of our sales to people in the December drive, compared to our goal and actual sales in the Second War Loan:

Individuals:
Goal, $2,500,000,000.
First War Loan December 1942, $1,500,000,000.
Second War Loan April 1943:
Actual sales, $3,250,000,000.

THE PEOPLE HAVE THE MONEY TO FINANCE THE WAR

When the Government buys war material, the money goes to the public in the wages, salaries and profits of the people who make and sell the war goods. In other words, when we spend billions on the war, the same billions become income to people and businesses.

The question is: Who gets the money—and how much of it can we expect to get for War bonds?

Some of it goes to corporations and some of it to individuals.

Our own economists and consulting economists point out that the bulk of the money which we must get in 1943 from individuals must come from those people earning less than $5,000 net. The average worker—the shipyard worker, the machinist, the woman war worker, the white-collar employee—these will have seven-eighths of the current income after taxes. As our drives continue, more and more of our money will have to come from these people, until every person receiving income above the barest subsistence level will have to pitch in.

Where the money is:

Workers under $5,000 a year, seven-eighths of all the income.

All other, one-eighth of all income.

We know that all the people who are making reasonable wages and salaries are putting a certain amount into life insurance, into savings bank deposits, and are paying off debts. Knowing how much of the total amount of savings is being invested this way, we can estimate the amount of savings which will be left in the hands of individuals.

This is the money, not used for the necessities of life, nor invested in life insurance, nor used for the payment of debts, that will supply the funds with which to buy War bonds.

We aimed to get 55 percent of the amount of this money accumulating in the first 4 months of this year (in place of the 47 percent which was so invested in the last half of 1942), but because of the success of the Second War Loan, we actually secured 60 percent. Our tentative program calls for aiming at 65 percent in the present 4 months and at 75 percent in the last 4 months of the year.

Look at the total incomes of the country and where the money goes in the chart below. You can see that savings are going

(Chart not shown.)

into War Bonds in growing amounts and that present goals call for further increases.

Although we are a long way from being able to say "The job is done," I think we should be proud of the fact that so many American people have bought War Bonds. If you count every person in the United States—the working people and the housewives, the children and infants, the lame, the halt and the blind—we can say that almost half the entire population of the country own at least one bond.

FIVE-SIXTHS OF ALL PEOPLE EMPLOYED HAVE BOUGHT BONDS

If you only consider the 60,000,000 people who have jobs, or who are in the armed services, you find that 5 out of every 6 are War bond holders.

DURING THE SECOND WAR LOAN 22,700,000 $25 BONDS WERE SOLD AND 4,600,000 $50 BONDS

The Second War Loan has been one of the most tremendous transactions in history. For one indication, look at the fact that 33,000,000 E bonds—people's bonds we call them—were sold. These can be purchased only by individuals, who are limited to a $3,750 investment in this particular bond during any one year. Of the 33,000,000 E bonds, nearly 27,000,000 were of $25 and $50 denomination.

How did all these bonds get distributed? Mostly by volunteer workers—workers who became bond salesmen and spent spare time, day and night, serving their country on the home front. In all, there were more than 1,000,000 people in the service for the drive. They have done an admirable job, and to them the Nation owes a great debt.

Ten out of every 1,000 men and women in the United States were voluntary bond salesmen during the second war loan drive.

A QUICK LOOK AHEAD—HOW WE MUST GET THE ONE HUNDRED BILLIONS NEEDED FOR WAR THIS YEAR

The armed forces know how much equipment and manpower it will take to beat back the Axis during 1943. Your Treasury also knows how much money will be required to supply the armed forces with equipment to feed and clothe the men, to take care of lend-lease requirements and other war expenses.

The Treasury also has a plan for getting the huge amounts of money that will be needed.

We will get thirty billions through taxes in 1943

Under the present tax laws, we know we will get at least $30,000,000,000. I have no doubt that we will need, before the year is out, to ask for new taxes, to increase the amount of money we will get this way. Devising taxes in wartime is a serious problem, because it is so difficult to deal equitably and justly with all the people. But I am sure that this can be done.

We have already borrowed $25,000,000,000 this year

Already during 1943 we have raised through the sale of War bonds about $25,000,000,000.

That means that we now know we can count on having $55,000,000,000 of the $100,000,000 000 we will need. That leaves $45,000,000,000 that will have to be raised, some of it through new taxes, the rest of it through the sale of war bonds.

We will also need to raise $45,000,000,000 more

Part of this $45,000,000,000 will come as a result of the regular purchases of war bonds, month by month, through pay-roll savings. Part of it will come from people who realize that we must not wait for drives to buy extra bonds. The rest of it we will need to secure through special drives. I am confident that the American people will continue to oversubscribe our war loans and make the voluntary way work. That will be one of the best ways we have of showing the Axis how wrong they were when they said that the American people could not stand up in a crisis, that our democratic ways would collapse when the going got tough.

FINANCING THE WAR IN 1943

The cost of the war during 1943 was $100,000,000,000.

Under present tax laws we will get $30,000,000,000 from taxes.

In the first 4 months of this year, we sold more than $25,000,000,000 of War bonds; $18,500,000,000 in the second war loan; $7,000,000,000 before the second war loan campaign.

Therefore we must still raise this year $45,000,000,000 in new taxes and additional sales of War bonds.

The second war loan brought 90 percent of the money raised during all drives in World War No. 1.

You may be interested to know how the second war loan compares to drives that were held during the First World War. There were five War bond drives between May 1917 and May 1919, and as a result a total of $21,000,000,000 was raised. These drives required 18 weeks of concentrated work.

In our 3-week second war loan we raised $18,500,000,000, or 90 percent as much as in the five drives of World War No. 1.

Amounts raised

World War No. 1, $21,000,000,000, five drives.
Second War Loan, $18,500,000,000.

Time to do it

World War No. 1, 5 drives, 18 weeks.
Second War Loan, 1 drive, 3 weeks.

Postal Service Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. BURCH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed and astonished when it was announced that the Bureau of the Budget had recommended the termination of the services of 19,124 postal employees.

It seems absurd to allege that the Post Office Department had that number of unnecessary employees. I was convinced that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget was in error and either lacked sufficient knowledge of the matter or had failed to conduct a thorough investigation of the personnel situation of the Postal Service.

I believe I have a fair knowledge and conception of the Postal Service and of the tremendous volume of work and the efficient manner in which the same is administered. The requirements of the military service have made heavy inroads upon the trained personnel of the Department. Although replacements have been made to some extent it takes considerable time to train the new appointees.

In my opinion it is entirely out of the question to reduce postal personnel under present conditions. The volume of work has greatly increased and the Department is constantly being called upon to render additional service in connec-

tion with the war. In addition to the varied duties and functions of the Postal Service it has now been called upon to handle Ration Book No. 3 to be issued by the Office of Price Administration.

The Postal Service is burdened with untold tons of penalty mail. In this connection it should be pointed out that in 1941 the cost of handling penalty mail was $40,000,000 annually and this item has now increased to $80,000,000 annually.

I include a copy of a letter I addressed to the Postmaster General and a copy of his reply.

A careful examination of the Postmaster General's letter will reveal the problems confronting the Department at this time and the absurdity of attempting to reduce the personnel of the Postal Service.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1943.

Hon. FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General,
Postoffice Department,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WALKER: It has been reported that the Bureau of the Budget has recommended a reduction of personnel in various department, and I am informed that the suggestion has been made that the services of 19,000 postal employees be terminated.

It will be very much appreciated if you will send me detailed information as to the extent to which such reductions, if made, would affect the Postal Service. If the Bureau of the Budget specified in what activities of the Postal Service the reductions should be made, I will be glad to have this information.

Please inform me as to the number of postal employees who have been lost to the Department since the Selective Service Act was enacted. Also advise to what extent the Department has been able to replace employees who have gone into the military service or have accepted other employment.

With kind regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

T. G. BURCH.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1943.

Hon. THOMAS G. BURCH,
Chairman, Committee on
Post Office and Post Roads,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BURCH: I have your letter of April 19 concerning reports that the Bureau of the Budget has recommended the termination of the services of 19,000 postal employees, and in which letter you request information as to the extent to which such reductions, if made, would affect the Postal Service. You also ask the number of employees who have been lost to the Department since the Selective Service Act was enacted, and to what extent the Department has been able to replace employees who have gone into the military service, or have accepted other employment.

Your interest in the problems of the Post Office Department, as chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, which caused you to write, is appreciated deeply. Happily it gives me an opportunity to defend the Post Office Department against published statements to the effect that the Postal Service had 19,124 unnecessary employees.

Other published statements under date of May 11 are to the effect that the Post Office Department did not comply with the directions of the Bureau of the Budget to reduce its forces and, therefore, according to the alleged testimony of the Director of the Budget, the Post Office Department might suffer in its appropriations.

I am pleased to state there are not now, nor have there been for a number of years, any surplus or unnecessary employees in the Post Office Department. There has not been and there will not be any necessity to make a cut in the number of our clerks and carriers to meet the quota set by the Director of the Budget.

It is understood that in our comparatively small number of custodial employees, some who are used as guards are to be placed on the rolls of the Federal Works Agency to do the same work that they are now doing. Any reduction in the number of other custodial employees who, as a rule, would not be used in any war activities, will be at the expense of cleanliness and sanitation. These employees, as you know, are all in the lower-wage brackets.

I think it well to state at this point that it is well known that because of the vast and rapid fluctuations in postal work, the Post Office Department could not be governed by a fixed quota of employees. The number of employees must change with the work.

The Post Office Department is proud of its efficiency, and naturally its entire personnel is distressed over the alleged testimony of the Director of the Budget. This, broadcast throughout the country, was to the effect that there were found to be some 41,000 persons unnecessarily employed in the Government service and of these some 20,000, or nearly one-half, were in the Post Office Department. It is a serious reflection on an efficient organization and most harmful to the morale of our personnel.

I am unable to understand how such an erroneous conclusion could be reached from any information submitted by this Department. I do realize the Director was given a difficult job to do under Senate Joint Resolution 170, and a very limited time in which to do it. He may have been misquoted, or he may have based his conclusions on data which were interpreted inaccurately or not understood. In any event, the quota of employees set by him is not such as will bring about a permanent saving in manpower or warrant a reduction in appropriations unless it is desired to reduce the one covering our custodial forces with resultant effects on cleanliness and sanitation.

So far as I know, the proposed reduction in Government forces is based upon the establishment of a 48-hour week which became effective in most agencies about January 1, 1943. As the Post Office field service had, to a great extent, been working 48 hours or more a week since April 1, 1942, the establishment of a general 48-hour week did not affect the Postal Service to any appreciable extent.

You will recall that shortly after the outbreak of the war I asked Congress for legislation authorizing the payment of overtime for Saturday work in the Postal Service. This was for the purpose of conserving our manpower, we having anticipated a shortage because of war activities, as well as a greatly increased volume of work. The Congress recognized promptly the advisability of this legislation, and the necessary funds were provided. From that time on our workweek was extended, and the legislation has proved most helpful. Senate Joint Resolution 170, effective December 1, 1942, conferred no benefits on the Postal Service so far as a lengthened workweek is concerned; on the contrary, it has caused us endless difficulties in administration.

However, the Post Office Department was notified on December 24, 1942, by the Director of the Budget, that:

"The Congress, in Senate Joint Resolution 170, approved December 22, 1942, * * * requires the heads of departments and agencies to submit information justifying the number of employees in their respective departments and agencies to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The Director is instructed to order such reduction in personnel as he finds to be in excess of the minimum requirements."

The Post Office Department, as stated, had in large part been under a 48-hour week for some months, and replied to this letter on January 21, 1943, submitting a justification and explanation for the number of employees on the rolls both in Washington and in the field. The next action taken was through a letter dated March 26, 1943, when the Post Office Department was ordered by the Director of the Budget to reduce within 30 days its authorized forces to meet a quota determined by him.

The Director also stated in this letter that in addition to the reduction ordered by him, it was proposed to reduce the city carriers by an additional 4,420 men after April 30, 1943. Such a reduction, I assume, should be based upon a policy as to whether collection and delivery service to the public is to be curtailed. Nearly a year ago I tried this out. We have had and are having some real experience with such curtailments, and they are made as public policy and service needs permit. I shall keep you informed concerning this proposed additional reduction.

As we did not know the reason or basis for the Director's action, and had not been offered any suggestions as to how any reductions could be made, and as there had been no comment or criticism concerning our justification an opportunity to discuss the problem was requested.

This request was granted with the result that a proposed reduction in the departmental forces was practically eliminated. In the field service a modification was made in the number of railway postal clerks and the motor-vehicle forces to be reduced making it unnecessary to dispense with any of these employees. No modification was made, however, in the number of post-office clerks and city carriers or the custodial forces to be reduced, except that clerks and carriers were permitted to be considered as one item.

The following table shows the number of man-years work, overtime excluded, as taken from our February 1943 reports; the number of actual employees approved by the Director of the Budget in his letter of March 26, 1943; the revised figures shown in his letter of April 6, 1943; and the number of actual employees on April 1, 1943, as established by a postmasters' and superintendents' count which was received and compiled in the Department within the last few days.

	Man-years work, overtime excluded, February 1943 reports	Actual employees approved by Budget Mar. 26, 1943	Actual employees approved by Budget Apr. 6, 1943	Actual employees by postmasters' count Apr. 1, 1943	Reductions in actual employees
Clerks	117,664	110,000	179,420	178,610	
City carriers	73,112	69,420			
Railway mail	24,391	22,315	23,020	22,839	
Motor vehicle	4,810	4,253	4,575	4,520	
Custodial	20,314	18,200	18,260	19,918	1,718

It will be seen from this table that there have been no savings whatever effected by the Director of the Budget in the Post Office Department in clerks and carriers, either in manpower or in money, through the establishment of a minimum quota of postal employees.

There is shown, however, an apparent saving of 1,718 employees in the custodial service. A number of these who are acting as guards are to be placed, it is understood, on the rolls of the Federal Works Agency doing the same work. We are unable to say what, if any, savings will be made. The reduction of any other employees in this group, as stated, will be at the expense of cleanliness and sanitation. These faithful women and men are in our lowest wage brackets and, as a rule, could not be used in other lines of work. Neither are they eligible for overtime wages, but are given compensatory time for such work, a condition which does not concern manpower.

The actual man-years of work shown in column 1 in the foregoing table are based on a 48-hour week and are not necessarily regular employees working 8 hours daily, 6 days a week. The nature of post-office work, which is on a 24-hour basis with peak periods lasting from 2 to 4 hours, requires the employment of a large part-time force. This number of employees fluctuates by thousands not only from hour to hour, but from day to day. Seasonal business, mail campaigns, and religious and other holidays, with large numbers of employees requesting leave of absence to observe such holidays, increases the difficulty of determining the exact number of employees we have on any 1 day or week. A large number of classified substitute employees are required, as well as a larger number of temporary employees. These are employed on an hourly basis and released when not needed.

For instance, on April 1, 1943, we had a total of 22,623 temporary employees. Of these 17,873 were used as clerks, 4,254 as carriers, and 496 as laborers. We had on the same date 9,942 classified substitute clerks, 7,126 classified substitute carriers, and 365 classified substitute watchmen, messengers, and laborers. These employees, temporary and substitute, are engaged on an hourly basis. On certain days and in certain seasons all of them are employed a full 8 hours or more daily, on other days for only a few hours, and on other days not at all.

These conditions have made it difficult without going to some expense to give exact figures on a specified date of our field personnel. This does not mean that there is a lack of protection against wrongdoing. We have found that selective checks, made from time to time, prevent and secure us against falsification of pay rolls. For instance, shortly after assuming office as Postmaster General, I directed that during the inspections of our larger offices an actual count be made of each individual employee and his actual employment checked with the pay roll. We have, in addition, what is believed to be a pay-roll system with time records that is proof against padding. I am arranging, however, to have actual counts and exact spot records of the total number of our temporary employees, to the end that we may establish a perpetual inventory of our personnel in all its various classifications. It will entail expense, a matter in which we always endeavor to exercise great care, but we shall endeavor to arrange it so as to serve needful statistical purposes in our Department; and if these objects are not accomplished it will be discontinued.

It also is hoped it will permit the Congress and Bureau of the Budget to estimate more accurately our manpower needs, though I think it will be agreed that there have not been any surplus employees in the Post Office Department since the early 1930's when business conditions were bad, and there was a decided decrease in the volume of work. At that time the Department took prompt action and furloughed employees, and permitted the retirement of a large number of others who were eligible.

I want to give you some reasons which I believe show conclusively that the problem confronting the Post Office Department is not one of reducing forces but one of recruiting necessary men and women to conduct necessary postal operations satisfactorily.

Man-years at present in the Post Office Department are not the same kind of man-years, so far as production is concerned, as existed in the Postal Service before the war. The inexperience, age, and physical condition of our recruits bring their effectiveness, in the opinion of many, down to 50 to 70 percent of the persons they have replaced.

You are familiar with the fact that some 28,622 of our experienced regular employees are now in the armed services and that we have not, up to this time, asked for any deferments whatever except for a very few among the small force of 750 post-office inspectors. These 28,000 people have been replaced by inexperienced personnel. Our civil-service registers are depleted and in many places it is impossible to secure satisfactory eligibles for appointment as clerks and carriers, as private industry with higher wages and priority rights because of war work, is a preferred employer.

You will note that our classified substitutes do not meet by far the number we are authorized to have by law; that is, one substitute for every 6 clerks or carriers. Where we should have 20,960 substitute clerks and carriers, we have but 17,068. This is but one of our difficulties in personnel matters. It has become necessary to employ large numbers of women and these, with younger and older men than we have found it advisable to employ in ordinary times, complicate our problems. Such men and women, inexperienced to begin with, have not the physical stamina and do not produce at the most, more than 50 to 70 percent of the work of experienced and physically fit personnel.

In addition to this condition, and because of inability to recruit personnel, our experienced employees, both regular and substitute, are working in a number of instances unconscionable hours. Our records for March 1943, for the entire country, show that 178,610 clerks and carriers performed the work which would have been done by 188,000 clerks and carriers on a 48-hour week. These 178,610 employees worked an average of 51 hours a week. In many instances it was found that clerks were working 12 to 14 hours a day 7 days a week because of the inability to secure adequate help due to local conditions.

Permit me to detail some of the increases in postal business and in the face of which we were directed, mistakenly I believe, to reduce our forces in the number of 20,691.

I assumed the office of Postmaster General September 11, 1940, during the first quarter of the fiscal year 1941. The increase in revenues, postal expenses, and the decrease in the postal deficiency are shown in parallel columns in the following table by fiscal years and also for the first 9 months of the current fiscal year 1943:

Fiscal Year	Audited postal revenues	Accrued postal expenditures	Accrued postal deficit
1940	$766,948,626.74	$808,421,110.24	$41,472,483.50
1941	812,827,735.71	837,142,188.70	24,314,452.99
1942	859,817,490.88	871,642,676.79	11,825,185.91
1943 [1]	[1] 716,336,019.00	[1] 712,170,545.00	

[1] Unaudited figures for 9 months indicating a surplus of $4,165,474. The expenditures include the cost of the overtime pay bills.

The rate of increase in our postal revenues is growing constantly and amounted to 9.25 percent for the first 9 months of this fiscal year over the same period in 1942. The postal revenues at 187 of our largest offices for the month of March 1943 total $51,458,226, an increase of $6,854,702, or 15.37 percent over March 1942. It appears that our postal revenues for the fiscal year 1943 will be $940,000,000, an increase of $80,000,000 or 9.3 over the fiscal year 1942, which is by far the greatest increase ever in the history of the postal service.

In addition to the large increase in the amount of postal revenues, we are now handling approximately 3,500,000,000 pieces of free soldier and penalty mail. It is now estimated that one out of every 8 or 9 pieces of our some 32,000,000,000 pieces of mail handled annually is handled free of postage charges.

The following table shows the increase in transactions in our special services for the 9 months July to March 1943 inclusive over the 9 months in the previous fiscal year.

	1942	1943	Percent of increase
Money orders issued	71,079,520	$84,837,702	19.36
Special delivery mail	55,606,959	63,441,439	14.09
Registered mail (paid)	26,089,855	49,342,202	89.16
Insured mail	38,473,653	52,709,797	36.98
C. O. D. mail	23,998,602	26,522,484	10.52
Amount, Postal Savings deposits	$157,254,371	$191,347,651	21.68

It is believed that anyone who cares to look into it will agree that for many years the postal service has been conducted without waste or extravagance and that it has provided an excellent service to the public. Its operations, and its expenditures, and its personnel have been watched carefully by the Congress, as may be seen in the printed testimony of the hearings before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and the Appropriation Committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate over which yourself, and Congressman LOUIS LUDLOW as Chairman of the Subcommittee, and Senator MCKELLAR preside. The care exercised in the administration of the Post Office Department and the care with which your committee and the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House scrutinize its every operation, are reflected in our constantly decreasing deficits, which are being reduced notwithstanding the stupendous increases in the free mail privilege for our armed forces, in the penalty mail for departments and agencies, in the services performed for other departments in the sale of bonds and stamps, and the well-merited increases in salaries of postal employees which were granted by the Congress after careful study.

In closing, permit me to thank you for writing me. I wish to assure you that I am always pleased to be held personally to strict accountability by your committee for every phase of the administration of the Post Office Department.

Sincerely,

FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General.

Dangerous, Approach With Care!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED E. BUSBEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Rec-

ORD. I include the following article by Frank C. Waldrop, from the Washington Times-Herald of today:

DANGEROUS, APPROACH WITH CARE

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

What may—or may not—have been a major shift in the tactics of world revolution occurred at Moscow, Russia, on Saturday, last. The Third (Communist) International announced its own death and passage from the world stage with the following resolution:

"In the countries against the Hitlerite coalition the sacred duty of the masses and primarily that of the vanguard of workers consists in all-out support of their government's war efforts in order to rout the Hitlerites as quickly as possible and secure friendly cooperation of nations on a basis of equality."

If that resolution means what it says and the various Communist parties of the world obey that death-bed injunction of the International, then they, too, will proceed to commit suicide, which would be a major contribution to peace in the world after Hitler, Hirohito, and Mussolini have been exterminated.

But caution, approach with care. When a gangster of many years' criminal activity suddenly puts down his gun and declares that he has reformed, everybody hopes he means what he says, but everybody is entitled to a little demonstration of works before making a heavy deposit of faith.

To understand something of what may or may not have happened at Moscow on Saturday you have to know a little Communist history.

Said history begins with the note that in 1848 two Germans, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, issued a Communist manifesto, calling on the workers of the world to unite and overthrow their national governments.

All people everywhere were then to band together under a "dictatorship of the proletariat," which would build a single world state governing all mankind with even-handed justice and delivering pie in the sky at high noon each day on schedule.

To carry out this scheme there was set up the First Socialist International, which proceeded to plunge itself into revolutions then blowing up in France, Germany, Italy, and the Austrian Empire. Of all these, only the French revolutionists had even partial success.

Marx and his crowd had to run for their lives. But the Social Democratic Party in Germany was revived and out of it grew the Second Socialist International, claiming a plan to develop world socialism.

This Second International was never able to show much muscle, but it did survive in a theoretical sort of way down to the period of World War of 1914–18 by taking in any and every sort of claimant to the ideal of world revolution.

In 1917, one of its members, a Russian Communist calling himself V. I. Lenin, was shipped from Switzerland to his native land by the German general staff and encouraged to make revolution against the Russian Government.

That he did, with unexpected success.

In March 1919 the idea of world revolution for the first time in history had behind it the single-minded power of a great nation. At that time, the Russian Communists formed the Third International. Its members were to be all Communists, no Socialists or Social Democrats tolerated; its headquarters, Moscow.

From March 1919 to May 1943 the Third International was officially revolution's general staff, training leaders of the various Communist parties of the world in the arts of trouble and overthrow of the nations which sheltered them.

But the Third International was also something else. It was headquarters of an international system of spying for the Russian Government. For more than a quarter of a century, every member of every Communist Party in the world has been organized and trained as an agent of Russia.

Two experts on communism, John L. Childs and George S. Counts, have just issued, for the American Federation of Teachers, a study of America, Russia, and the Communist Party, in which they state:

"The first essential to an understanding of the American Communist Party is to grasp the fact that it is an arm of the Communist International.

"This organization has headquarters at Moscow and is controlled by Moscow. In spite of its alleged international character, history has demonstrated that it (the International) does not and cannot operate independently of the policies formed by the All-Communist Party of the Soviet Union."

Considering all this, it is obvious that the disbanding of the International at Moscow means nothing by itself.

If this step is to be an effective one toward peace, the Communist Party in the United States naturally will not disband.

For 25 years the American Communists have worked through the Third International as Russian agents. If they are ever going to quit that and become decent American citizens, now is their chance.

Next, what do the Russians propose to do about communism in their own country? Are they going to end its career as a governing monopoly and reduce it to the standing of a political party competing with other parties for public favor and the right to power?

Until they do that, communism remains what it has always been, a threat to every form of free government in the world, just as another type of monopoly called fascism is also a threat to free government.

Dissolution of the International suggests great progress, if the obvious, logical consequences follow. If not—beware, this is not a major change. It is just another tactical maneuver.

Air Raid Bombing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, as the war progresses the importance of airpower increases daily. This war will be won by the combined power of air, land, and sea forces. The softening of Germany by air-raid bombing is succinctly told by William B. Ziff in an article as reported by the United Press in the Washington Daily News.

ZIFF FORECASTS WAR'S END IN 1944 BY SATURATION RAIDS

(By William B. Ziff)

Winston Churchill's promise to his old adversary, Hitler, to plaster the Reich from hell to breakfast means that in the short period of 17 months the United States and Britain have completely revised their concepts of strategy and weapons.

We are now preparing to besiege the enemy virtually in his home cities and industrial centers. This means we are placing our major stake in this war on air power.

We now have Germany in a squeeze play of epic dimensions from which she can never emerge whole if we follow our course to its logical conclusion. The key to the present United Nations strategy is saturation bombing of Germany.

BITTER END BATTLE

The Russian Ambassador, Maxim Litvinov, told me recently that in his opinion Germany will not collapse but will fight on to the final bitter end. In this event Germany will finally be reduced to an absolute wilderness, literally battered to a pulp.

However, I personally feel that cold, merciless Prussian logic will give up the struggle as hopeless by next spring. With adequate bases on the Asiatic mainland, the war with Japan should be over 6 months later.

Mr. Churchill's promise of utter destruction of Germany's war industry is no idle boast. It marks an epoch in war making whose revolutionary significance is not now fully understood.

As serious as the devastation already has been on the Reich, it is very little to what is coming. By fall a thousand heavy bombers will be roaring over the Reich day and night for periods of weeks on end, dropping up to 5,000 tons of death-dealing explosives each 24 hours.

There will be a gasoline problem to be solved and a few other bugs to be ironed out, but these problems are all being liquidated and Germany is being mapped out for systematic destruction by the British and American air fleets.

CHINA THE KEY

Most shrewd military thinkers today see Japan like a turtle, with a hard and impenetrable shell jutting out through the lower reaches of the Pacific and protecting the Nipponese islands themselves. The soft underside of this shell is the little fringe of land which Japan holds in Asia. Once Europe falls, unoccupied China is no more than a few hours from the principal cities and munitions centers of the Mikado's realm. Korea is only a matter of minutes away from the very heart of Jap industrial power.

By rolling our huge air power forward and basing it on the shores of the Yellow and East China seas, it would become the decisive factor as it was against the Germans in north Africa. All other forces would be auxiliary. The threat to lay Japan's cities and munitions centers "in ashes" can mean nothing less than this.

There is a quite understandable demand that we revamp our strategy for the purpose of taking a healthy swipe at Japan. It has even been advanced in Congress that we fortify our position in the European-African theater by taking the islands of Sardinia and Sicily and then transferring the bulk of our forces for an assault on Nippon. If Hitler could be satisfied that we could be relied on to adopt such a course as this, I am confident he would give up these two islands withhout a struggle.

America at War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I am including an editorial from the Washington Post of

Sunday, May 23, by Selden Menefee, on Fighting Vermont.

I wish you would read this. I wish more of you knew more about my State than you do. It is the Switzerland of America for scenery, and the home of the most independent group of constitutional Jeffersonian Democratic Republicans ever got together. Come up and visit us, and join us. It will do you good.

AMERICA AT WAR

(By Selden Menefee)

FIGHTING VERMONT

Vermont has been fighting this war since 3 months before Pearl Harbor. The legislature declared that a state of war existed against the Axis just after President Roosevelt's order to the Navy to "shoot on sight" at Nazi U-boats.

Strictly speaking, this was a technicality, designed to make possible the payment of the State bonus which had been promised to the Vermont National Guard in the event of wartime mobilization. But it expresses the willingness of Vermont's people to accept a state of war.

Brattleboro, Vt., is a village of some 10,000 people, living for the most part in large old-fashioned white frame houses with slate roofs and generous lawns. Sprawling along the west bank of the Connecticut River, the town looks across the broad, dammed-up waters at New Hampshire's hills.

This is no boom town; outwardly it seems remote from the war. Its woodworking industries are running on war contracts now, and a small new plant has been established to make goggle lenses for military purposes. But not enough new people have come in to take the place of the young men who have been drafted.

Yet the feeling is one of all-out war. From the old farmer loading feed down by the railroad station to the schoolgirl clerking in the corner drug store, all are participating in some way.

When Brattleboro had an air-raid drill in April the people took it seriously. Probable damage was computed, facilities were mobilized for picking up the wounded, and the State guard rounded up 19 boys and girls who were playing the part of parachutists.

PEOPLE WORK HARD

The people here are working harder, too, than in any place I have been—especially the farmers, who are short of hired hands. Twelve or fourteen hours of work a day is not unusual.

One farm family of three is looking after 105 milk cows. Another farmer, Herman Robb, milks 40 cows and delivers the milk himself.

Then there is Clint Howe, an orchard operator who drives a truck on the side. He gets up at 3 a. m. 5 days a week, drives 15 miles to pick up about 6 tons of milk, delivers it to Springfield, Mass. (a round trip of about 140 miles), and returns to work his farm.

In town I met Alfonse Ratte, a bank teller during the day who works 4 hours every night running a machine in one of the factories which are using part-time help. He is a veteran of the last war and wants to do all he can to win this one.

In his spare time Alfonse compiles the town's honor list of service men and women, which numbers close to 1,000 so far, or nearly 10 percent of the total population.

The ladies of Brattleboro are mobilized in the Red Cross. Four hundred of them are working regularly at turning out surgical dressings, 32 of them work in the local hospital 1 or more days each week, and others are enthusiastically making kit bags for soldiers and clothing for bombed-out British families.

Many Brattleboro families have returned to the old-time custom of keeping chickens, repairing long-deserted hen houses or adapting unused garages to this purpose. Nearly every family has its Victory garden; some are spading up their front lawns to grow vegetables.

The children of Brattleboro are working almost as hard as their parents. A tenth of the high school students have dropped out, and of those remaining more than three-quarters have regular jobs after school. The dime stores depend almost entirely on high school students for clerks. Rumor has it that soon these stores will not be able to open their doors until after school.

WORKERS COMMUTE

One group of Brattleboro men commutes by bus to Springfield, Vt., more than 30 miles away, where several large machine-tool plants are located There they work 11 hours a day, 6 days on and 2 off, turning out tools for Detroit's war industries.

Springfield had only 5,000 people in 1940. Now 1 plant alone employs about 7,500 workers. The labor supply apparently springs out of nowhere. "Springfield ran out of labor 3 years ago," says the Brattleboro Daily Reformer, "but the machine shops kept right on expanding."

The dairy farmers are having more trouble getting workers. They pay as much as $75 per month and keep, or twice the prewar rate; but they can't compete with the factories for labor. The farmers are getting better than 7 cents per quart for their milk, but they say they can't continue to operate unless they get 10 cents.

Nevertheless farm production is being maintained; Brattleboro's factories are fully manned; and in the recent War bond drive, the frugal citizens of Brattleboro and Vermont purchased double their quotas of Uncle Sam's I O U's.

The Four-hundredth Anniversary of the Death of Nicolaus Copernicus, the Great Polish Genius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention of the House to the fact that today is the four-hundredth anniversary of the death of Nicolaus Copernicus, the great Polish genius, of whose contribution to the field of astronomy it has been said, "he stopped the sun and set the earth in motion."

While this illustrious son of suffering Poland is known to most of us as the mathematician and astronomer who dethroned the earth as the center of the solar system, this was by no means his only contribution to civilization. He was a physician by training and predilection devoted to healing the physical and mental ills of his fellowmen; an economist who anticipated Sir Thomas Greshman who, through error in economic literature, got the credit for the monetary principle that bad money drives out the good. He was a churchman, a soldier, a statesman, a painter, and a poet.

Although a son of Poland, Copernicus has become a citizen of the world. Scholarship and learning have no nationality. Constructive thought for the betterment of mankind knows no geographic barriers. Copernicus belongs to all men who seek truth and understanding.

This four-hundredth anniversary of the death of Copernicus has special significance today. He is a reminder that closing of universities and the burning of books, no barbaric act the Nazis have or may commit, will destroy Polish culture. Copernicus died 400 years ago today, but he lives today as the star of hope to the Nation that nurtured him. He is the spirit that is Poland: unconquerable and indestructible. However hard the road she must travel and however great the suffering of her people, Poland will not die and in the not too distant future she will again be free.

Farm Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN PACE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture recently reported out, and the House will soon consider, a bill to extend the life of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation for an additional 2 years. This is the Corporation which was set up by Congress several years ago and authorized to make loans on farm lands generally referred to as Commissioner loans, for the purpose of negotiating loans at a higher percentage of the value of the land than the Federal land banks are permitted to make.

Unquestionably, these Commissioner loans have served a useful purpose, have saved the homes of many farmers, and will be needed in numerous cases in the future.

The question has been raised as to whether these Commissioner loans would have a tendency to create inflationary land values under existing conditions. In my study of this question I asked Governor Black of the Farm Credit Administration, to supply me with a statement as to what his policies and practices are and will be in the negotiation of loans by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. For the information of the Congress, I submit the following letter received from Governor Black:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1943.

Hon. STEPHEN PACE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PACE: Replying to your letter of May 18 relating to recent increases in land values and the possible inflationary influence of loans by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation up to 75 percent of appraised values, the consistent policy of the Farm Credit Ad-

ministration for the past several years has been to base appraisals and loans on normal values rather than to follow selling prices up or down. We feel that appraisals and loans made on the basis of average returns and average prices over a period of years can be made with much greater safety than if current market values are followed. Not only is the Farm Credit Administration following the policy of appraisals and loans on a normal-value basis during the present period of rising prices, but it has taken the lead in encouraging other institutional farm-mortgage lenders to follow the same course.

About a year and a half ago, on the initiative of the Farm Credit Administration, a conference of representatives of life-insurance companies, mortgage-loan companies, bankers' associations, and Federal agencies such as the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department, was held to consider means of preventing undue inflation in land values and a repetition of the distress that followed the First World War. Out of that conference grew the setting up of a representative national agricultural credit committee which has held quarterly meetings since. Much of the discussion in these meetings has related to the adoption of policies by large mortgage lenders which will tend to prevent inflationary tendencies in land values.

The experience of both the Federal land banks and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation during the past 2 years shows that farmers are taking advantage of current good returns for agricultural products to pay debts rather than to extend their holdings on a speculative basis. In the calendar year 1942, payments of principal on Federal land bank loans amounted to $196,893,000, and those on Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation (Commissioner) loans amounted to $106,113,000. Loans closed during the year by these agencies were $53,973,000 and $28,534,000, respectively. In the first 3 months of 1943, repayments on principal continued at an accelerated rate and new loans decreased. Payments of principal on land-bank loans in the quarter ending March 31, 1943, were $75,740,000, and those on Commissioner loans were $35,456,000, while new loans closed during the quarter were $16,671,000 and $7,933,000, respectively. These figures represent increases in repayments of 75 percent on land bank and nearly 50 percent on Commissioner loans over the corresponding quarter in 1942, while new loans were lower by 5 and 15 percent, respectively. During 1942, 102,856 loans were paid in full prior to maturity, while for the first 3 months in 1943, the number paid in full was 40,597.

These latter were about equally divided between land-bank and Commissioner loans, the numbers in both cases being more than double the number paid in the first quarter of 1942. Studies made by the Farm Credit Administration indicate that only a small percentage of the loans paid in full were paid through refinancing.

With current income from farm operations, many farmers who lost their farms during the long period of depression and many tenants are in position to make substantial payments on farms, which may, however, be insufficient to enable them to complete the financing of their purchases with land-bank loans, limited as they are to 50 percent of the appraised value. To aid these people in becoming owners of family-type farms, there is continuing need for the making of loans by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. With these loans continuing to be based on normal values, there would appear to be no danger that they will have an inflationary influence. As a matter of fact, the combined land-bank and Commissioner loans now being made are often at a lower rate per acre than first-mortgage loans being made by some other lenders in the same communities.

Sincerely yours,

A. G. BLACK,
Governor.

Labor Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following editorial from the Akron (Ohio) Beacon Journal of May 23, 1943.

THE NOTEBOOK

A nationally known professor of law writes a letter which reveals a prevalent attitude.

If it were written by an harassed industrialist or by a corporation lawyer, retained at so much a year to "view with alarm" such harassments, it could be discounted. Every editorial mail carries such communications by the dozen.

The idea is always "how to curb labor."

An impartial view suggests that there are two sides to the question. The employer's attitude must be considered as well as the worker's, in much the same way that the "child problem" includes not only the child but the parents.

This professor has merely fallen into the fallacy of seeing just one side.

What he is urging is the passage of a State law "for reasonable and beneficial control of labor." Such laws have already been passed in Colorado, South Dakota, Kansas, Idaho, and Texas. Similar bills were proposed in Ohio, Michigan, California, Massachusetts, and Connecticut.

Labor leaders charge that this is an effort to nullify the Federal law by State enactments. For the purposes of this essay we need not go into that.

The professor writes:

"When our fighters return from making the world safe for democracy, I am woefully afraid they will find that we have not kept American democracy safe for them.

"Democracy cannot long exist in the midst of governmental disorder. This is because disorder requires strength of control for its suppression and strength of control necessarily eventuates in dictatorship.

"Hitler and Mussolini both came to power through the governmental inefficiency and resultant disorder in their countries. Mussolini's rise, especially, is directly traceable to the chaos growing out of the unregulated and uncontrolled labor disputes. The Italian people as a whole were so disgusted with the ineffectiveness of King Log that they demanded and got King Stork. Everybody, including labor, lost thereby."

The plausibility of this argument does not lend it veracity.

Mussolini and Hitler were tough gangsters who took advantage of unsettled conditions to seize power. Their origins were outside the law just as were those of Al Capone when he became the virtual dictator of Chicago during the prohibition disorders.

In both Italy and Germany there was economic and governmental distress which affected all classes of society. Naturally this included labor, which is always the first to feel any economic maladjustments.

We had the same "chaos" in the United States with the collapse of the Coolidge credit inflation, which we mistook for prosperity. This disorder occurred when the labor unions were weakest and long before the New Deal was born. Who can forget the rioting of the farmers, the madness that seized our metropolitan areas, and the march of the bonus army? It was this situation that brought about the inevitable election of Mr. Roosevelt. The boys were tired of trying to sell apples.

The labor unions did not bring this condition upon us. It was this condition that brought about the tremendous growth of the labor movement, under the fresh raw aggressiveness of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Let us not put the cart before the horse.

The professor continues:

"If we are not to experience similar chaos in this country after the war—a chaos compared to which the situation in the sit-down strike era will seem like peace and order—we must have preventive measures now."

So he wants a State law passed.

That would fix everything up just fine and dandy—he thinks.

Everybody with a grievance, or a desire for reform, thinks that if he can only "pass a law," why, the job is done. And, of course, in any such thing as labor legislation, it must be sugar-coated to appear to the union members as "beneficial" to them.

We need not go into that argument, either. It has been threshed out before, millions of times. Workers are forced to join unions against their will. They are exploited. Some are not allowed to vote secretly. There is little question of the truth of many of these charges. At least enough evidence can be produced by such writers as Westbrook Pegler to give them considerable authenticity.

But by finding some black spots on a white cat you cannot call the cat black.

The great rank and file of the union men seem to like their unions. Up to the present writing they feel that they are getting something for the dues they are paying. I've talked to a good many of them and they do not take seriously the stories of those whose hearts bleed for them as victims of the union movement. And the more their leaders are damned the more they are for them.

Nor are they scared by the label "communism" because they can remember when Theodore Roosevelt was denounced as a Communist for demanding a square deal for the worker.

The problem is too vast to be solved by just calling names and pointing to obvious faults on either side.

Passing a State law will not solve it.

Passing more Federal laws will not solve it.

We have too many laws as it is.

We can no more solve the American industrial problem by passing laws than we could solve the liquor question by adopting the prohibition amendment.

A nonworkable law is worse than no law at all; and, a law in which the vast majority of the people do not believe is nonworkable—if we are to remain a democracy. The professor continues:

"The protection of the people as a whole depends upon the prevention of outright war between the union and the employer. In that type of civil struggle the noncombatant public suffers quite as much, even in more limited aspects, as the noncombatants during the present war."

Quite true. But the people in any such domestic strife are not noncombatants in the true sense of that word any more. Their interests are immediately involved. In this complicated modern civilization there can be no noncombatants. All of us suffer alike.

Consciousness of that is already crystallizing in the public mind—and the unions are as well aware of it as are the employers. It is a process of education and cannot be accelerated by the passing of more laws.

When the time comes that the great rank and file of the American people, unionists and nonunionists, have reached the conclusion that "something has got to be done about this matter," then, and not until then will we have any coherent action. And their enlightenment is going to come from their own experience and not from pronouncements by manufacturers' associations or by propaganda.

Right now this public mind is confused about domestic issues. It lacks leadership, not only from the administration at Washington but from the opposition to that administration. Bad as Roosevelt has been in organizing a program of action, his opponents have been worse.

If Mr. Roosevelt had placed a strong, vigorous, capable, and understanding man in his Cabinet as Secretary of Labor instead of the fussbudget Perkins, he would not have now visited upon his head all this confusion. If he had cracked down upon both employer and employee at the very beginning of the Wagner law and had remained a fair and impartial umpire in all such disputes, he might have both sides respecting his administration.

Instead he has vacillated, piling makeshift upon makeshift—until even those for whom he has fought, the union men, are bitterly complaining. Management has shown even less statesmanship.

There has been a grim determination that the whole union movement can somehow be beaten. Too many business leaders have refused to see that times have changed, that collective bargaining is a part of the law of the land and that it is here to stay.

Some are beginning to see the light. Young Eric Johnston, the new liberal head of the National Chamber of Commerce, is one of them. But the old guardsmen in blind hatred of Roosevelt have refused to accept the inevitable. They long for the time when another man is elected President and they can bring back "the good old days." What they refuse to see is that even a President of their own choosing would not now dare to run on a platform advocating the repeal of compulsory collective bargaining. The whole new philosophy is a part of the evolutionary process of our mass production age.

What we need is intelligence and fearless enforcement of the laws we have.

We need enlightenment of employers as well as of union leaders.

If the workers have lost faith in Roosevelt (and I do not contend they have) it is because of the manner in which he has mishandled their problems and not because of anything the employers have said about him or anything they have done to win the workers away from him.

As the American union movement matures it will develop strong and capable leadership, such as is to be found in Great Britain, generations older in handling industrial problems.

And, with his genius for adaptability, the American industrialist will reorient his attitude to meet the conditions of this changing world.

The workers are not fools and do not need any protection by law against their leaders for exploiting them. They do not need their opponents, the employers, to get laws passed for them.

As Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said: "The living law is not so much a matter of logic as it is experience." The movement is too young to have the backlog of experience. This whole new concept of management-labor relations has been manhandled and fumbled from the very beginning by all three sides, management, unions, and Government.

But the fourth party in the argument—the one that counts—the great American public, is slowly becoming conscious of the fundamentals of the row. When public opinion finally jells the demand will be not for more laws but for less law and more common sense.

In the long run and in the ultimate analysis, after emotions have died down and they are in possession of the facts, the people are never wrong. That is the essence of democracy. And that is why we need never fear what you have to offer, professor—a post-war Hitler or Mussolini.

This is America, not Europe.

MALCOLM W. BINGAY.

Your Call to Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, at the commencement exercises of Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., May 23, 1943:

My pleasure in participating in the graduation exercises of Rutgers University is exceeded only by my hopes for the future of the young men and women who find themselves on the threshold of their maturity. There is good reason for all graduates, their parents and friends, to be happy on occasions such as this. At the same time, we must be realistic. The future lies ahead. To it, we owe our allegiance, with the full knowledge that we are rooted to the past.

Graduates this year leave their classrooms to face a future which is grim and real. Our Nation is at war—the most horrible war in the travail of mankind. Remember we are engaged in a total war, and in it we all have our individual duties which we must do well in order to win this war as quickly as possible. Unless we are victorious, what is there in store for us? The Axis long ago determined to bring America, the citadel of democracy, to her knees in bondage and slavery.

Hitlerism and fascism must be wiped off the face of the earth. The enemies of freedom must be conquered so completely that they can rise no more to plague peace-loving peoples. No sacrifice is too great to preserve our freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom to work, and freedom to worship a merciful God. It is the first duty of every citizen to maintain alert and militant faith in his country.

What has this to do with your graduation? The answer is simple. The generation that has gone before you failed miserably in its duty to the future. It failed to face facts and reality. We have been a gullible people. We became soft. Pacifism swept the land. We foolishly helped our enemies to become strong. There was a time when short-sightedness caused us to overlook even the security of America.

In the sophistication of the past generation foundations were laid not only in America but in other countries upon false premises. The idolatry of materialism came close to transforming our land into a modern Sodom and Gomorrah. Fundamentals were ignored. And judging from recent surveys of the study of history in some of our educational institutions, we have come close to forgetting the experiences and identities of those who made this Nation great.

We have been called to an accounting for our slothfulness, for our indifference to the warning fate of others, and for our revolt against established standards of human decency and lawful behavior. We are called to account through the terrible trial of war for too much thought of self and not enough for others.

Upon the shoulders of graduates in 1943 rests the burden of our country's future. And if you are to avoid the pitfalls of the past generation, it would be well to face the facts of today. The drama of mankind in each past generation holds in store for you great and guiding lessons because it is the prologue to the present. It is a trying task to preserve the American way of life during the period of national emergency.

Men and women grow in understanding through knowledge of the experiences of others. There is little difference between individuals in the aggregate and nations. Nations, after all, are merely her peoples in the aggregate. The bloodshed of the present might well have been avoided through a more persevering quest of truth and reality by peoples of all creeds. The antecedents of wars are found in lawlessness and neglect of the rules that govern civilized nations.

I wonder what might have been the effect today had steps been taken to curb the crazy antics of the Austrian paperhanger 20 years ago. True, he was the product of his times—but so were Capone, Buchalter, Karpis, Dillinger, Touhy, and a host of other gangsters who almost seized control of whole communities. Through prompt and decisive action they no longer menace society, and the same might be said of Hitler and his gangster associates had other peoples faced the truth and then acted with certainty.

For years we blindly allowed plotting enemies to gain a foothold in America. The German-American Bund pretended it was a patriotic group made up of citizens, yet Nazi archives tell a different story. As early as 1925 they were at work organizing for the future. Walter Kappe and others were hard at work spreading the germ of national socialism just as they were hard at work in Germany a year ago in operating a school of sabotage to unleash its graduates to come to America to destroy with torch and bomb.

So it was with the Japanese; their sneaking spies had clear sailing because it was felt that to curb their devilish activities would be rude and impolite. Why spies or subverters should be treated with kid-gloved gentleness and consideration in wartime or peacetime is not understandable. Certainly they did not consider the liberty of America while we were engulfed in a smokescreen of prattle on the merits of pseudo-civil liberty. No doctor ever hesitated to save a life by attacking bacteria. We should not hesitate in endeavoring to save America to prosecute spies and subverters promptly and vigorously in courts of law.

Volumes can be written of the enemies of democracy who carried on their traitorous acts without fear until only a few years ago. These "ism" termites scoffed at our democracy and belittled the cherished freedom, liberty, and fair play that characterize America. They seemed to reason that America was weak in emergencies and powerless to act with fearless decision.

Our enemies have regarded Americans as fickle and unstable, subject to childish changes of opinion and spineless in the conduct of their affairs. They have proclaimed as fatal weaknesses our internal dissension, disrespect of law, break-down in discipline,

demagogic leaders, and the inclination to substitute for hallowed traditions will-o'-the-wisp nostrums. And, unfortunately, they were correct until we awoke to our dangers a few years ago. The Japanese will soon learn that we cannot be intimidated by their torturing and killing of prisoners of war while we extend to their nationals humane treatments. We will avenge their ruthlessness, however, in the American way, and never give up until their military machine, Black Dragon societies, and other shameless enemies of humanity have been destroyed.

It is in your hands to strengthen our democracy so that never again can we fall prey to international confidence men and gangsters. In this, we must be realistic. Tolerance is a virtue, to be sure, but the greatest crime of our age has been the toleration of wrong. In this, there is no middle ground. The events that made possible the emergence of a Hitler illustrate that people must follow some leader, no matter how base he is, no matter how clearly an opportunist he is. America, then, must be fully awake to her responsibility in developing and maintaining a leadership of the highest quality. It will call for a soul-searching leadership that will put God and country before the selfishness of self. Our own America was won through faith and toil and hardship and we must and shall preserve it at any cost.

The graduates of this year will inevitably produce their share of leaders in all fields of human endeavor. Let them determine to preserve the America of our forefathers by reviving the teaching of our country's history, uncontaminated by economic and social blundering, and "ism" inspired experimentation. The threat against the American people from within is not merely a Nazi threat. It is the insidious injection of other foreign "isms," creeping up the pillars of the Republic under the false guise of democracy. A country that has produced a Washington, a Jefferson, and a Lincoln is capable of standing on its own without infiltration or influence of alien philosophies and ways of life.

There is a challenging word in the Scriptures that is pertinent to our life as a people today. It is a solemn admonition that directs us to consider the basic principles and ideals upon which our Government is founded: "Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set."

It is a word of warning that should compel us to look away from the present to the things of the past—to think of our life in this time of grave danger, in the light of what the founding fathers wrought in the way of enduring principles.

The growth and development of America is a record of its people and their experience. On this experience, our laws and institutions have been built. If we are to improve and progress, we must study the record of those who have gone before—their ideals, sacrifices, achievements, and failures.

I have already said we have suffered when we forgot time-tested fundamentals. We have strayed from fundamentals because of a lack of realism and truth. I hope that every college graduate places a premium on good character. The basis of character is truth and honor.

Had the peoples of Germany, Japan, and Italy sought the truth, the world would not be torn and bleeding as it is today. Had the liberty-loving French sought the truth before it was too late, the Hitler puppet, Laval, would not be selling human beings into Nazi slavery. Had the thousands upon thousands who populate our prisons sought the truth, they would not be there today.

If you who graduate today seek the truth in all things, you can be assured of strong character; you will bulwark our country in the unseen years that lie ahead. We of the Federal Bureau of Investigation have the duty of dealing with a certain class of persons every day. Some have been motivated by ambitions for excessive fame. There have been authors who prostituted their gifts, lawyers who traded practice for it, orators who have sought only the applause of men. Others have ambitions for an unconscionable share of power and display. Call the roll and their names will be on the wrong side of the ledger. It is the stable and decent ambitions which count—they are based on the fundamental truths of life. Ambition can either be a lust that is never quenched or the spark that makes man struggle with destiny.

No man has ever found himself confronting circumstances so adverse as to make achievement impossible. The person who does not grow and thrive on adversity lacks the saving element of character and real ambition. Many a college graduate goes into the world of business with preconceived ideas and in many instances with an unjustified opinion of his own infallibility. He forgets that unless he starts at the bottom and works up he is deprived of a foundation of training and experience he can never acquire from books alone.

As you leave this institution of learning, I hope you will take with you a desire to cultivate the powers with which we are all endowed. The struggle for intellectual distinction is dignified by ennobling purpose and bestows its own worthy reward. Unfortunately, however, some people in the quest of intellectual distinction take flight from the realm of reality. As an example, a few such individuals have been quoted recently to the effect that now we are at war, crime is no longer a problem.

Again, I recall the pronouncements of another intellectual theorist who concluded that there really has been no increase in juvenile delinquency in spite of the fact that more persons 18 years of age are arrested than in any other age group. It is a tragic commentary when we see in the cases of boys under 21 years of age increases in arrests of 17 percent for assault, 26 percent for disorderly conduct, 30 percent for drunkenness, and 10 percent for rape. The increases in arrests of girls under 21 years of age are not only disgraceful but alarming. Last year witnessed increases in arrests of 29 percent for homicide, 27 percent for larceny, 64 percent for prostitution, 124 percent for vagrancy, 69 percent for disorderly conduct, and 39 percent for drunkenness.

The startling increase of crime among young people points again to your responsibility in the future. The situation did not come upon us overnight. It has been developing for years. The wartime spirit of abandon, the last fling philosophy, confusion, and unsettled home life have merely aggravated conditions. Again, a generation ahead of yours has failed.

I know that some theorists have manufactured high-sounding phrases and the one-two-three technique of listing the factors of crime causation. However, I think practical experience must not be overlooked. It has long been held that the basic institutions of America are the home, the school, and the church. At no period in our national life have they meant more than they mean today. The early formation of character is the responsibility of the parents in the home. Here the ground work is laid. Where the home fails, a grave handicap is placed upon the school and the church. The work of home and school must be supplemented by the work of the church. From each comes a vital and essential contribution to the character of the future citizen.

Unfortunately, in facing reality and the truth, we have seen a weakening of the cornerstones of character. The American home in all too many instances has become a mockery in name. It has ceased to be the institution of molding character that it once was. The church is challenged to hold its place in the lives of not only our adults but, more important, in those of our youth. Some schools today face the surge of an insidious and unsound educational quackery that would rule out all principles of discipline and control which, if carried to its illogical conclusion, would produce a generation of iconoclastic morons and criminals. This is not always the fault of teachers who on the whole are anxious to adhere to patriotic ideals, but who all too frequently are powerless to impart the teachings of rugged Americanism.

But these challenges can and will be met only through a rededication to those fundamentals of principles and ideals for which our forefathers strove. It will not suffice, however, merely to have an ideal in mind unless that ideal is translated into action. It will demand a fearless, strong-hearted devotion to that ideal. This requires the absolute necessity for a sincere and straightforward searching after the truth by men and women whose careers in life are marked by rugged honesty, austere simplicity, and loyalty to high ideals.

There is one more thought I would like to leave with you. The best ambitions are those which seek to benefit the world. True success, in the final analysis, is measured in terms of constructive service. The desire to serve is a stepping stone to material as well as spiritual success Without it life becomes a shallow dream. Real success does not depend upon eminence. Each of us has his work to do in his home and his community, and by doing it well we can make this Nation a better place in which to live.

The immortal Lincoln put in a few words in one of his early speeches all that I have tried to say. He, too, was seeking the truth when he said:

"Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap. Let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges. * * * Let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political religion of the Nation."

Conditions at Leesville, La.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, permission has been granted me to answer an attack made in the House on May 21, 1943, by one of my colleagues, the Honorable A. LEONARD ALLEN, upon Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer because of an article which appeared in the Washington Post of April 13, 1943, under her name, reporting conditions which she found when she visited Leesville, La., in the vicinity of Camp Polk.

Mrs. Meyer is a constituent of mine and has resided in Westchester County, N. Y., for many years. I have long had the pleasure and privilege of knowing her, and I know of the high regard in

which she is held by the people with whom she lives, throughout the State of New York, and the country who admire and respect her as a competent and experienced observer. Her 18 years' experience in recreational and social welfare work has brought her to the front in this field and under her chairmanship of the Westchester County Recreational Commission, that organization became a model not for New York State alone, but for the country as well. Mrs. Meyer is a vice president of the Community Chest of Washington, a member of the Council of Social Agencies, and the Washington representative of the Child Welfare League of America.

The article which has caused so much consternation and which formed the basis of my colleague's attack last week upon Mrs. Meyer, was one of a series written as a result of an inspection trip which she undertook because she is convinced that conditions on the social front are not only important to the military services but are the very foundation upon which a total war rests. She visited a number of northern industrial centers producing war materials. She inspected ship and navy yards as well as marine bases and Army camps on the west coast, in the Gulf Coast States, and throughout the South. Her report has had the effect of speeding up our social work and was made in an effort to give Washington the facts. In this work she had the complete cooperation of all departments of the Government. Several of the cities on which she has reported have endeavored to procure Mrs. Meyer's help to effect the improvements suggested by her. After her visit to Willow Run she reported conditions as she found them there. Stimulated by her article, the authorities of the Michigan city, contrary to the position taken by the people of Leesville, La., took immediate remedial steps recommended by Mrs. Meyer.

Since my colleague has seen fit to attack Mrs. Meyer on a factual statement, instead of the conditions in Leesville, which she criticized, I believe that justice requires that her reply to his charges be given the same publicity that was accorded the Congressman's speech and the letters included therein written by Mayor O. E. Morris, of Leesville, and Dr. David E. Brown, Louisiana's State health officer, and others, to the Washington Post, criticizing Mrs. Meyer's article. I know that under no condition would she knowingly or deliberately harm any community or its citizens. In this case she has reported the situation as she found it. Her letter to the citizens of Leesville is a perfect vindication of the article in question:

To the Citizens of Leesville, Vernon Parish, La.:

As your Congressman, Hon. A. LEONARD ALLEN, has introduced letters from your mayor, Mr. O. E. Morris, and from your State health officer, David E. Brown, M. D., in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD attacking my report on Leesville, it is my duty to answer them.

Mr. ALLEN is mistaken when he says that the Washington Post was unwilling to print these letters. We had deferred the matter, hoping your congressional Representative would have the good sense not to publish them. For the differences that exist between us are not matters of personal opinion but of public record. Files on the social conditions in Leesville exist, as your State health officer well knows, not only in several departments of your State government but in at least three departments of the Federal Government. To your mayor the Post replied at once that we would correct anything in my article which the United States Public Health Service, the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services under the Manpower Commission, or the United States Army officials found to be inaccurate. Not one of these departments has suggested corrections. The letter to the Government officials was sent on May 10.

Let me begin with one statement by your Congressman: "While this person was enjoying every kindness which these fine southern people could show her, she was at that very time writing an article which seriously reflected upon the town of Leesville and its citizens." Before I went to Leesville I had made my own arrangements to meet several of your State and city officials for consultation. When I arrived in Alexandria the secretary of your chamber of commerce was waiting for me and informed me that all of my own plans had been canceled without my permission and a wholly new schedule made for me. Every one of the officials I had invited to meet me had been told that I would be too late. I insisted upon stopping at the place where I had promised to attend this meeting only to find that nobody was there. I was obliged to follow the schedule that the secretary of the Leesville Chamber of Commerce had arranged for me. I had no choice. I spent the night as the guest of Major General Crittenberger at his kind invitation and was sent the next morning to DeRidder in Vernon Parish and to a model airfield nearby. At 12 o'clock I was permitted to return to Leesville to attend a luncheon that had also been arranged without any advance notification to me or any previous invitation. I left as soon as possible, and I know that this luncheon was as painful to many of the guests, who knew my object in coming to Leesville, as it was to me.

Your Congressman's statement that, because I had accepted this fine southern hospitality I was in honor bound not to reveal the shocking conditions I saw in Leesville may explain why the luncheon was given, but not why I should maintain silence on matters that I had been sent to report.

Now for the factual differences that exist between your officials and me. Both of them say that I have been inaccurate and then agree with me that your housing conditions, to use the words of Dr. Brown, "are substandard" and that the jail is "such an unsanitary and filthy place" that "no human being should be confined in it."

Your officials seek to invalidate all of my figures on the rents which are charged the soldiers' wives in your city by challenging one of my figures concerning the rents in a particularly disreputable barn, whose description was unmistakable, in which I saw beds which three people were expected to occupy. The rentals of $32 per month charged in this building, as in all the others, were taken down by me in the presence of many witnesses. They were given to me by the landlords on the premises or their representatives. Dr. Brown states that he appeared at this particular building the following week and found that the rent was $3.50 per week. If this disreputable establishment subsequently came down in its rentals as a result of my publicity, I have already accomplished something, but not enough. Like your jail, this building is also so unsanitary that no human being should be permitted to live in it at any price.

Dr. Brown also tries to invalidate my accuracy as to the greedy rentals by stating that he got a glass of milk for 5 cents. Rather than refute such logic I will quote the official report on Leesville of the United States Public Health Service made on May 13, 1943, a month after I was in your city: "Every building that is capable of providing a shelter is utilized for human habitation, and numerous instances of severe overcrowding, together with totally inadequate unsanitary facilities, exist. These conditions are aggravated by the fact that exorbitant prices are being charged for rent. The records of Camp Polk reveal that there are 160 married soldiers who are living off the reservation with their wives. It was definitely established that many of these men are living under deplorable conditions." Camp Polk would naturally speak only of the men. I was incensed for the women and their babies. Instead of trying to refute the irrefutable, the officials and the citizens of Leesville should rise to the defense of these innocent victims. What Leesville needs—and what one lumber merchant told me frankly he did not want—is housing built and controlled by the F. P. H. A. This would break the hold which the real-estate interests have upon Leesville and eliminate the substandard buildings now so generally in use.

Your officials claim that my description of the garbage that litters your streets is exaggerated, and your State health officer states that he is doing everything to safeguard the health of the community. In answer, I again quote from the United States Public Health Service report of May 13: "The alleys and back yards in the business section were generally in a littered and unkempt condition," and again: "Garbage collection and disposal is rather crude. The city does present a generally cluttered-up and unkempt appearance."

My account of the sewerage situation was termed unjust because I recorded the justifiable complaints of your officials that a pump is still needed. The mayor in his letter says the sewer system was in operation before I visited Leesville on April 12. The report of the United States Public Health Service, as of May 13, says of the sewer system: "This plant was recently placed in operation and was not quite up to designed capacity at the time of visit. The city has not yet accepted the plant or assumed responsibility for operation."

Your officials also challenge my statements concerning the number of liquor establishments in your town, although I gave no definite figure. The mayor reported the number as 24 before a large—and very silent—audience the day I was there, and now alters this figure to 25. Your State health officer still seems to think there are 24, but admits that there are "some six or seven around the outside." As every child in Leesville knows what the liquor conditions are, I submit those assertions to your own judgment without further comment.

Again, your officials challenge the veracity of my implications concerning the number of prostitutes that infest your city. I, too, reported what your mayor states, that the venereal disease rate at Camp Polk has been going down ever since Major General Crittenberger has been in charge of the post; but this is due entirely to the excellent educational program which he has conducted in that camp, to the fact that he has placed the liquor dives on the outskirts of your city out of bounds, and to the remarkable efficiency with which he conducts every one of his responsibilities connected with Camp Polk. The proof that he is doing a magnificent job in the face of most unfavorable conditions in the town, lies in the disgraceful venereal disease rate of Leesville itself.

The most reliable information on such matters is public record and has been obtained from the national serological tests of the first 2,000,000 Army selectees and volunteers. The data as it applies to Vernon Parish and Leesville is as follows:

Area	Rate per 1,000	
	First million	Second million
Total United States	45.2	48.9
Vernon Parish	113.0	178.3
Leesville	203.1	217.9
Vernon Parish, excluding Leesville	78.3	64.2

Your Congressman makes the statement: "If one is looking for evils, I wonder why it is necessary to leave Washington to find them," forgetting that the evils which exist in the Capital of this Nation are more a reflection upon the Congress than upon me.

But he made this statement because he did not understand the reason for my visit to your city. I came to Leesville because that city is notorious throughout the Nation as one example of the profiteering and vice that have sprung up around some of our military encampments. By describing in human terms the results of such moral disintegration, I hoped to stir the public imagination to take action against them, not only in Leesville but wherever they exist. The letters of gratitude which I have received from high Federal officials, from citizens of your own community, and from soldiers' wives living under conditions similar to those from which they suffer in your city, are proof that my purposes have not been wholly misunderstood.

Since the publication of this article, some people from DeRidder sent me an outline of the magnificent campaign by which they conquered difficulties very similar to your own and made their city a model community. If my article should help the citizens of Leesville to organize a similar campaign in your city, I should feel that I had done a service to you, to the armed forces, and to the Nation. What we are fighting for in this war is a better civilization. One of the best ways to achieve it is through the determination of our people to conduct their local affairs on the highest possible plane.

Very truly yours,

AGNES E. MEYER.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Meyer is a distinguished graduate of Barnard College in New York and is a highly educated and talented lady. She is an experienced and well-known newspaper writer, has a reputation in the world of journalism for her ability in research, analysis, and accuracy. Her articles recently appearing in the Post have been highly praised by the best reporters in the country and have been acknowledged as outstanding by the press generally. Many feel she is doing the best reporter writing job in this country at the present time. The series of which the Leesville article is one, is following closely upon those written after a recent trip to England and Scotland when the British Government made it possible for Mrs. Meyer to see at first hand war conditions in those countries. In an endeavor to improve conditions in her own country, closely allied to the war, Mrs. Meyer has reported what she has seen and made recommendations which she believes will aid in our all-out war effort.

Manager of the War Manpower Commission at Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on April 9 last in response to telegrams and letters from many Philadelphia civic leaders I expressed to Paul V. McNutt, chairman of the War Manpower Commission, my hope that any new regional manager of the War Manpower Commission at Philadelphia would be selected solely on the basis of ability and without regard to any political considerations whatever.

Mr. McNutt told me then that the responsibility was his and that if any changes were made they would not be for political reasons and any future appointee would be selected solely with an eye to his ability to perform the duties of regional director. He concluded a very pleasant conversation by saying:

I want the people of Philadelphia to trust me and to believe that my sole purpose is to see that our regional directors do the job for which they are appointed.

I take this opportunity to point out that Mr. McNutt's efforts are being undermined by the Stern-Greenfield crowd in Philadelphia. Albert M. Greenfield has been hawking around Philadelphia this extremely important office and has offered the position as regional manager to several persons, none of whom have had any experience which would qualify them to hold such a responsible position and all of whom have straight political backgrounds. Mr. Greenfield's effort to control the whole manpower problem in the Philadelphia area is purely political and would enable him to shift the population of Philadelphia around like pieces on a chessboard, once he has maneuvered the appointment of a regional manager of his personal selection. Mr. McNutt ought to be told what is going on and in order to assist him in his desire for a nonpolitical administration of the War Manpower Commission I am taking this opportunity to call the situation to his attention.

Among the distinguished citizens of Philadelphia who have expressed great indignation is Miss Ellen Gowen Hood, chairman of the Democratic Women's Luncheon Club of Philadelphia, who wrote me on May 10 and who on May 13 gave me full permission to use her letter. The letter from Miss Ellen Gowen Hood follows:

CHESTNUT HILL,
Philadelphia, Pa., May 10, 1943.

Hon. HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SCOTT: I am venturing to write you again with regard to the selection of the successor to Mr. Raycroft, former regional manager of the War Manpower Commission, which is giving us no little concern.

After Mr. McNutt's assurance that the appointment would be wholly nonpolitical, I am surprised that GUFFEY and Mr. Greenfield still feel it is within their province to select the man and continue to take the initiative in consulting various politicians as to their desire to be a candidate for the post.

It is a matter of common gossip in such circles that as soon as the newspaper publicity shall have died down, a man having the approval of the Democratic city committee will be appointed so I am hopeful that you will see that a full investigation is made of the qualifications and background of any person whose name is put forth for this most important position.

Sincerely yours,

ELLEN GOWEN HOOD.

Churchill Speaking From England's Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE STARNES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

CHURCHILL SPEAKING FROM ENGLAND'S HEART

In close concert of action,
In air, on sea and land,
Have England and America
Together dared to stand,
And fight a fearless tyranny
Whose bombs of hate are hurled,
In merciless barbarity,
Throughout our Father's world.

When Japan bombed Pearl Harbor,
With no just cause therefor,
And Germany and Italy
Declared a state of war
Against the great United States,
Old England breathed a sigh
Of real relief, for she had need
Of such a strong ally.

America and England
Must see this quarrel through,
Or freedom's friends will never see
Their dream of peace come true—
Throughout the long unfolding years
Their friedship must not cease—
Yea, they must set examples for
The world, in war and peace.

Old England's as relentless
In her war 'gainst Japan
As is the great United States,
Against whom she began
Her sieges of barbarities
When, without warning, she
Bombed brutally Pearl Harbor, on
The far side of the sea.

Mad Germany's surrender
Would not change England's plan
To fight on till the allies win
The war against Japan,
And stop her savageries against
Peace-loving China, where
She's made invasions, ruthlessly
Of which the world's aware.

Our high expert advisers
Think that Japan's defeat
Would not force Germany to fall,
Nor drop back in retreat;
But the defeat of Germany,
By whatsoever plan,
Would prove to be, undoubtedly,
The downfall of Japan.

United States and England
Join in one common prayer
To God on high to help them to
Each other's burdens bear—
Old England and United States
Must be trustworthy friends—
Yea, on their sacred honor for
World peace the world depends.

The Allies' force outnumbers
The forces in the air
Of Germany and Italy
And Japan, everywhere—
And skilled use of aerial force
Might bring on the collapse
Of Italy and Germany—
Then where would stand the Japs?

United States and England
And Russia have destroyed
Much of the great war industries
Where Germans were employed
In making instruments of war—
And they will never cease
To wreck the works of Germany
'Till she shall pray for peace.

When this World War is over,
It is the Allies' plan
That Germany and Italy
And, specially, Japan
Will find it quite impossible,
However they abhor
Their self-inflicted helplessness,
To start another war.

United States and England,
As soon as they well can,
Expect to battle from the air
The homelands of Japan—
God knows, Japan and Germany,
Deaf to the blast of bombs,
Most surely, must in ashes lie,
Before peace ever comes.

Altho the U-boat problem
Is one not fully solved,
Because of such obscurities
As in it are involved,
Upon its full solution we
Are nearer than they think—
We're building more warships today
Than submarines can sink.

We cannot wait for chances,
But, everywhere we can,
We must keep bombing Germany,
While striking down Japan,
And force them to burn out their strength,
However great it be,
With maximum rapidity,
In air, on land, and sea.

Our strength lies in our union,
Directed by the One
Who guides the planets in their paths
Around their central sun—
And these United Nations can
Not fail to win this war,
If they keep faith with Him who lights
The face of every star.

Although United Nations
May suffer greater loss
Than ever, as the war wears on,
They'll nail upon the cross
The over-lords of tyranny
Who'd crimsonize the sod,
Yea, with the blood of men made in
The image of their God.

While there have been reverses,
The victories, by far,
Of these United Nations, in
This worse than savage war,
Have over-topped the losses that
Have painfully been theirs,
Which they believe, assuredly, are
God's answers to their prayers.

One continent, forever,
Has now been cleansed and purged
Of Nazi-Fascist tyranny—
And now it's boldly urged
That all Eurasia fight and pray
That soon the last war gun
Shall fire the shot, heard round the world,
That lasting peace is won.

'Mongst these United Nations,
Are no great and no small—
The honors that they've jointly won
Are jointly for them all—
They're thankful to their Maker that
They have been wisely led,
And trust Him to direct them in
Whatever lies ahead.

America and England
Must not forget the fact
That all the German armies which
The Russians have attacked,
And overcome, meant vict'ry for
The Allies, just as tho
It were their own accomplishment
Against their common foe.

When Germany forced Russia
To fight in self-defense,
Her military strategy
Was void of common sense;
For Russia might have, otherwise,
Remained out of this war,
Which all peace-loving countries, in
The whole wide world, abhor.

When this war will be over
No one can tell, but in
The end, the Allies, under God,
Beyond a doubt, will win.
It's not by power nor by might,
With bomb or spear or sword,
Nor by man's strategy, but by
My spirit, sayeth the Lord.

The great United Nations
Should humbly search their hearts,
And counsel one another in
The doing of their parts,
Collectively and sep'rately,
In everything that's done,
And leave results to God alone—
And pray, "Thy will be done."

The undue prolongation
Of this disastrous war
Might make impossible the peace
That we are fighting for;
But, if we prosecute this war
According to God's plan,
We'll safeguard, in His righteous way,
The destiny of man.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Why Executive Sessions of Food Conference Are Secret

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by the Honorable Marvin Jones, chairman of the American delegation, at press conference at Hot Springs, May 22, 1943:

I have seen the statement which Congressman FRED SMITH made to the press last night.

I regret exceedingly that any Member of Congress should see fit to prejudge the work of this conference.

Two of my former colleagues have visited us. They have been extended every possible courtesy. They have met many of the delegates and talked with them. I have facilitated in every way their opportunity to do so. They, of course, do not attend the executive sessions of the committees.

I served many years in the House of Representatives. Every practical legislator knows that frequently in drafting the details of legislation it is necessary to have executive sessions of the committees in order to get the work done without interruption. As soon as a measure is reported to the House for approval or disapproval it is known to everyone. This is especially true in a conference of many nations. If visitors are admitted to the working sessions from one nation, they must be admitted from all and work would become totally impossible.

The step-by-step progress and any action by the conference will be made known as taken.

To get 44 nations in agreement is not an easy task. I have never seen a more earnest group of men. They are working without regard to hours in an effort to reach a common understanding on the reports and recommendations which will be referred to the governments represented.

The work of the conference will and should be judged by the governments and the public on its merits. I look forward with confidence to the results of this conference and to the judgments of the governments and peoples represented here.

The Tax Muddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the New York Times of Saturday, May 22, 1943, entitled "The Tax Muddle":

THE TAX MUDDLE

After more than 4 months of discussion and wrangling, Congress has still to pass a withholding tax or adopt a pay-as-you-go plan. The House and Senate conferees apparently have been unable to agree because they do not know precisely what plan would be acceptable to the President. The President has never publicly announced precisely what kind of pay-as-you-go plan he would permit to become law. Wholly apart from the merits of the final measure, the entire history of this bill is an instructive exhibit of irresponsible government.

Beardsley Ruml put his pay-as-you-go proposal before Treasury officials as early as March 1942. The Treasury did nothing. In July of that year Mr. Ruml put his proposal publicly before the Senate Finance Committee, which took no action. But public interest and approval increased so rapidly that by January of this year the prospects for its adoption seemed bright. The proposal was a simple one. The only real problem presented was that of framing a satisfactory withholding tax. But partly because of constitutional difficulties, and more because of traditions having nothing to do with the Constitution, the Senate had to wait upon action by the House; the House had to wait upon action by its Ways and Means Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee had to wait upon action by its chairman, Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. DOUGHTON took his time. He got around to hearings early in February.

On February 2 Randolph E. Paul testified on behalf of the Treasury. His testimony was ambiguous. The Treasury objected to the full Ruml plan. It brought forward fantastic arguments against it. It professed an ardent desire to put taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis. But it failed to tell Congress precisely what plan it would recommend or approve.

Irresponsibility was not confined to the executive branch. Congress failed to compel

the Treasury to take an explicit stand. And Congress was wedded to its disintegrated committee system and to its seniority system, both of which make for irresponsibility. Mr. DOUGHTON, whose tax views do not at all represent the views of the majority of the House, holds his great power purely by the rule of seniority. He has shown himself incompetent to exercise the tremendous responsibilities that his position imposes upon him.

Late in March the House threw back at the Ways and Means Committee the hodgepodge bill it had submitted. The Forand-Robertson plan existed at that time. It would undoubtedly have been voted for if Mr. DOUGHTON had then permitted it to come before the House. When Mr. DOUGHTON got his bill back, however, he blandly remarked that "we are going to let it rest a while." He expressed doubt whether the question "ever will come up again." This, of course, would have meant the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars to the Treasury through the delay of the withholding plan. At this point, fortunately, the House majority, as well as minority, leaders brought pressure on Mr. DOUGHTON to reconsider. After dallying another month the Ways and Means Committee brought in another bad bill, which the House rejected by the crushing roll-call vote of 230 to 120. The House then passed the Forand-Robertson bill, which it could have passed more than a month earlier if it had been granted the opportunity.

Meanwhile the Treasury continued to play a baffling role. Through Mr. DOUGHTON'S committee majority refused to accept even the broad type of pay-as-you-go plan that had been outlined by Mr. Paul on behalf of the Treasury. Secretary Morgenthau declared that "the administration is behind the committee bill 100 percent." He also expressed agreement with Mr. DOUGHTON that no pay-as-you-go legislation could be expected until the regular general revenue bill came up, which meant no final action earlier than the fall. On April 29, Mr. Morgenthau gave his unqualified approval to the second Ways and Means Committee bill, which canceled some 50 percent of the 1942 liability and spread the balance over 3 years.

When the Senate passed the full pay-as-you-go bill, there is little doubt that, with the prestige of this vote before it, the House would also have accepted it. A shift of only three votes would have turned the tables. It was at this point that the President sent his eleventh-hour letter, which resulted in the defeat of the Senate bill in the House. Yet when asked to comment on the Ruml plan on March 12 he had specifically said that he did not think he could, because taxation is rather squarely a congressional function. And this Tuesday, even after his letter killing the Ruml plan, he replied to a question regarding which pay-as-you-go bill he would favor now, that he had made it plain he was not drawing tax legislation.

The President's position is clearly self-contradictory. Either taxes are the responsibility of Congress alone, or the President shares that responsibility with Congress. If Congress alone is responsible for taxes, then the President should not interfere at all. But if he does share responsibility with Congress for tax legislation (and his possession of the veto power alone makes this inevitable, not to speak of his constitutional duty to recommend to Congress whatever measures "he shall judge necessary and expedient"), then it is the clear Executive duty of himself and his Treasury advisers to state explicitly what tax plan they do favor. He and the Treasury ought not continue to tell us what they are against without telling us what they are for. He cannot in consistency refuse to present a tax program and then reject Congress's tax program. The President ought not to wait until the congressional mind is made up, after 4 months of deliberation, then reject the result and still refuse to tell the country what his own plan is, or whether he has a plan.

The question now raised is larger than any pay-as-you-go plan. It is whether or not our Government is functioning responsibly.

Reduction in Size of Government Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. DEWEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, while the American people are willing to pay whatever taxes may be required of them to finance the war effort, they rightly look to us to eliminate all items of expenditure not essential. As the public debt continues to rise and the tax burden continues to increase, there is a growing disposition on the part of the people to scrutinize all Government expenditures and to insist that savings be made wherever possible. It is our duty to heed this public demand.

It will be recalled that in the period following the last war a public demand arose for a reduction of the public debt and a lowering of taxes. The administration then sought to meet that demand and a constructive program for economy was put into effect.

At that time it was my privilege to serve as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in which capacity I had, among other divisions of the Department, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing directly under my supervision. During the year 1925 the director of the Bureau, Mr. Alvin W. Hall, reported to me that because of the increased prosperity of the country resulting from the economy program and the constant reduction in taxes, a greater demand for United States paper currency had developed. He pointed out that this demand had developed to such an extent that the Bureau would no longer be able to satisfy the requirements unless it increased its mechanical printing apparatus by 50 percent, at an estimated cost of about $10,000,000.

In these days of astronomical expenditures, such a sum as $10,000,000 appears trivial. But at that time, in view of the economy program of the administration, it was almost impossible to obtain such an appropriation. I was directly informed by President Coolidge to think up some other method of increasing the currency output without the expenditure of public funds for additional printing machinery.

It had been the custom of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to print the current-sized paper money 8 at a time. In seeking to increase the output of the Bureau by 50 percent without the expenditure for more machinery, my associates and I devised the plan of reducing the size of the currency and of printing 12 bills on the same size plate that had been used to print only 8. By this simple expedient we increased the currency output of the Bureau by the 50 percent required.

The change-over gave us an opportunity to correct many defects in our paper currency, such as having several designs for the same denomination. The final result was that when the entire program was completed and the first new-sized currency was issued on July 10, 1929, it was found not only had we saved the original capital cost for new printing machinery, but the resulting saving in paper, ink, and weight of shipment of the currency produced an annual saving of over $2,000,000 each year. This saving increased as the amount of currency in circulation increased.

Mr. Speaker, I now offer a similar suggestion by which we can make a substantial saving. I suggest that the size of all savings certificates and other types of Government securities now being sold in such vast quantities be reduced in size to something nearer the size of our paper currency.

We have in circulation many pieces of currency in denominations of $20 to $500. This being the case, it seems to me quite proper and feasible to reduce the size of the savings certificates, most of which have a face value of only $25, to a size similar to that of the currency. It is my understanding that over 250,000,000 pieces per year of Government securities are now being printed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the greater percentage of these are in $25 denominations. There is really no good reason why these securities should not be reduced in size with the resultant increase in production and savings of ink, paper, and shipping costs.

I hope the Treasury Department will, if they have not already done so, give some thought to this suggestion. It will result in a saving of money. It behooves us to take advantage of everything, however small it may appear, to eliminate unnecessary expenditures. Pennies make dollars and millions make billions.

Ten Years of Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERRY VOORHIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of May 22, 1943:

TEN YEARS OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Ten years ago this week Congress created a new Federal agency, to improve the navigability and to provide for the flood control of the Tennessee River; to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley; to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of said valley; to provide for the national defense by the

creation of a corporation for the operation of government properties at and near Muscle Shoals in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes." The preamble of the act is worth quoting to this extent, for the Tennessee Valley Authority has done all the things it was told to do.

Its early years were confused by litigation and by controversy. The famous Tennessee Valley Authority "yardstick," which was to have been used to determine the cost of producing hydroelectric power, is now a museum piece. The allocations of costs to power, navigation, and flood control have lost much of their original importance. Tennesee Valley Authority is not so much a competitor of private power companies as it is an essential part of a great power network running from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, from the Mississippi to the Appalachians. It has created new phosphate fertilizers, has worked with local, State, and Federal agencies to improve standards of farming, has helped reclaim wasted land, has encouraged people in its vast domain to do things for themselves. It has produced chemicals for war and has sent power into essential war plants, notably the mighty aluminum factories.

The skeptics are not driven to admit that this example proves that all water power should be developed and distributed by the Federal Government. Most of them do admit that the present almost complete control of the Tennessee River, from the headwaters to its junction with the Ohio, was beyond the safe scope of any one private corporation. Within this framework of engineering control a great deal of new private industry has flourished, and there are signs of new confidence and renewed energy among the people of the valley.

The Late Bishop Adna Wright Leonard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently in an airplane crash in Iceland, a great churchman, Bishop Adna Leonard, was killed. At the time he was on a mission of visiting the various battle fronts of the world where American troops are placed. He was representing many of the Protestant churches in this mission. His death was a great loss to the cause in which he was working and to our country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Alabama Christian Advocate:

BISHOP LEONARD KILLED IN PLANE CRASH

Bishop Anda Wright Leonard, of the Methodist Church, who was representing 31 American Protestant denominations in a global tour of the United States military bases, was killed in an airplane crash somewhere in Iceland, Monday, May 3, it has been announced by the War Department in Washington.

A bishop of the Methodist Church since 1916, Bishop Leonard had charge of the Washington area, which includes the Baltimore, central Pennsylvania, and Wilmington conferences of his denomination.

Of impressive physical appearance and a convincing and interesting speaker, Bishop Leonard was in frequent demand for platform work in his own and other denominations. He was popular with young people.

He was president of the board of education of the Methodist Church and chairman of the commission on chaplains of the Methodist Church, and chairman of the general commission on Army and Navy chaplains.

Bishop Leonard was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, November 2, 1874. Education: New York University, A. B.; Drew Theological Seminary, B. D.; American School of Archaeology, Rome; Ohio Northern University, D. D.; College of Puget Sound, LL. D.; University of Southern California, LL. D.; Syracuse University, S. T. D.

Survivors: His widow; a son, Anda Wright, Jr.; daughter, Mrs. Phyllis Day Budd, of Ithaca, N. Y.; and his mother.

Bishop Leonard was ordained in the Methodist ministry in 1899. Pastorates: Green Village, N. J.; San Juan, P. R.; American Methodist Episcopal Church, Rome; Eiqua, Ohio; Springfield, Ohio; Seattle, Wash.

Since his election as bishop in 1916 he has served with episcopal residences in San Francisco, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, and Washington, D. C.

With his visitation endorsed by the Federal Council of Churches and representing, through the Servicemen's Christian League, the International Council of Religious Education and the World Christian Endeavor Union, Bishop Leonard was spokesman of virtually all Protestantism in assuring men and women in service that their churches at home had not forgotten them.

Invasion of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Baltimore Evening Sun of May 24, 1943:

UNITED STATES ITALIANS LOOK TO INVASION—PEOPLE STAND TOGETHER WITH UNITED NATIONS, SAYS REPRESENTATIVE D'ALESANDRO

WASHINGTON, May 24.—Americans of Italian antecedents are looking forward to the invasion of Italy as the means of freeing that land from the grip of the Fascist gangsters, Representative THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, of Maryland, declared today.

In a statement issued on behalf of Italian-American groups in Baltimore—social, religious, and fraternal—and distributed by the Office of War Information, Mr. D'ALESANDRO said:

"At this time, when the eyes of the world follow the march of Allied victories and when any day, any hour, may bring the invasion of Italy, the 6,000,000 Italian-Americans stand together with but one clear, unflinching purpose.

"That purpose is victory for the United Nations."

WILL FIGHT ON ITALIAN SOIL

"Some people may hate to fight men of their own race on the soil of their forefathers, but we will fight them if we must and on Italian soil, just as men of our race have successfully fought them in North Africa. Let no one doubt this. This we are determined to do to overcome the Fascist leaders who have brought Italy to its present sorrowful plight."

Americans of Italian descent are already in the war to the hilt, said Mr. D'ALESANDRO, citing 600,000 of Italian origin in the armed forces, with their number steadily growing.

"A large percentage," he added, "are volunteers, signifying the spontaneity of this Italian-American loyalty. In the New York area, for example, Italians led all the other nationality groups in voluntary enlistments at the outbreak of the war. American-Italians fight, are decorated, are wounded, and, if need be, die for the great cause of freedom."

ITALIANS' RECORD CITED

Since Bataan, the Congressman said, American soldiers with Italian backgrounds have set records for distinguished service. He mentioned the award of the Congressional Medal of Honor, highest award of the Nation, to Lt. Willibald C. Bianci, who, single-handed, silenced a Jap machine-gun nest with grenades on Bataan February 3, 1942, and Salvatore Battaglia, awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross posthumously for extraordinary heroism as a gunner in the Battle of Midway, June 4, 1942, when he participated in the first torpedo-bomber attack ever made by the United States Army.

"Already the list of Italian-American heroes of this war is too long for mention," said Mr. D'ALESANDRO.

"We Italian-Americans who are praying for the victory of America and the freedom of Italy know that the Italian people never wanted this war. They were forced into it by Mussolini and his Fascist gang. Now, with Italy exposed to imminent invasion, the Fascists will sacrifice their country in an effort to save themselves.

"Italian-Americans are heart and soul in this war for the freedom of all nations—Italy, too."

Establishment of a Permanent Medical Corps in the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill introduced by me:

A bill to provide for the establishment of a permanent medical corps in the Veterans' Administration

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, hereinafter referred to as the Administrator, is hereby authorized and directed to establish in the Veterans' Administration a permanent medical service to be known as the Veterans' Administration Medical Corps, and hereinafter referred to as the medical corps, which shall constitute a component part of the military forces of the United States, and service therein shall be deemed active military service for all purposes: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as giving any member of the medical corps any military control or authority over any office, officer, or member of any other military or naval force of the United States except by direction of the President.

SEC. 2. The functions of the medical corps shall be those of a medical or medical administrative nature, to be prescribed by the Administrator in connection with the ad-

ministration of the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 3. That the medical corps shall consist of the following members:

(a) Physicians and dentists: 1 surgeon general with the temporary rank of brigadier general, 132 with the rank of colonel, 201 with the rank of lieutenant colonel, 500 with the rank of major, 800 with the rank of captain, and 1,200 with the rank of first lieutenant;

(b) Nurses and other personnel: 1 Superintendent of nurses with the rank of lieutenant colonel, 15 officers with the rank of major, 125 officers with the rank of captain, 400 officers with the rank of first lieutenant, 5,000 officers with the rank of second lieutenant, and such other commissioned, noncommissioned, enlisted personnel, and civilian employees as may be deemed necessary by the Administrator.

SEC. 4. The Surgeon General shall be appointed by the President upon the recommendation of the Administrator for a term of 4 years, unless sooner removed by the President, and he shall be responsible to the Administrator for the medical service of the Veterans' Administration. The Surgeon General may be appointed for additional terms of 4 years in the discretion of the President upon the recommendation of the Administrator. During his term of office the Surgeon General may be promoted in the permanent ranks in the same manner as if not temporarily commissioned in a higher grade, due regard being given to the manner of promotion and the pay of members of the medical corps.

SEC. 5 The Medical Corps shall include such female professional and other female technical personnel as the Surgeon General with the approval of the Administrator shall deem practical.

SEC. 6. After the original appointment to the grade of Surgeon General, a vacancy occurring in that grade shall be filled by appointment from members of the Medical Corps who have served not less than 2 years in the grade of colonel or lieutenant colonel.

SEC. 7. No commissioned officer shall be appointed, or promoted to a higher grade or rank on the active list, until his physical, mental, moral, and professional fitness to perform all the duties of his assigned rank and grade have been established to the satisfaction of the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Administrator.

SEC. 8. The rates of pay and allowances, increase of pay, transportation of property, retirement benefits, and other gratuities and privileges for commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Medical Corps and Medical Reserve Corps shall be identical with those provided for personnel of the corresponding rank and status in the United States Army.

SEC. 9. Members of the medical corps may purchase quartermaster and commissary supplies in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps under the same conditions as are applicable to members of the Regular Establishments.

SEC. 10. The Surgeon General, with the approval of the Administrator, shall prescribe the rules and regulations governing the conduct of personnel and regulations respecting the internal administration of the medical corps.

SEC. 11. The Administrator shall establish and maintain a medical reserve corps of officers and enlisted personnel to which there shall be appointed physicians, dentists, pharmacists, technicians, nurses, dieticians, and such other personnel found qualified on examination in such numbers and ranks as are deemed necessary by the Administrator to fill any vacancies or meet any emergent conditions. Members of the medical reserve corps may be assigned to active duty whenever needed, and any member of the medical corps may be transferred to the reserve for any period during which his services on active duty are not required. Regulations may provide for longevity and other credits for service in the reserve as well as active service in the medical corps.

SEC. 12. The Surgeon General, under such regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe, shall from time to time appoint a board of not less than three or more than five officers of the medical corps, to determine charges of inaptitude, inefficiency, or misconduct of any member of the medical corps, and if such charge or charges are sustained shall recommend reduction in grade, retirement, or discharge from the medical corps of such member. Any member so discharged for inefficiency or inaptitude shall be entitled to 1 month's pay at the rate of pay in effect at the time of discharge for every completed year of service in the medical corps not in excess of 6 years, but no additional pay shall be allowed to a member discharged because of misconduct.

SEC. 13. Commissioned officers and enlisted personnel of the medical corps of the Veterans' Administration may be detailed for service with the medical services of the Army and Navy, and commissioned or enlisted medical personnel of the Army and Navy may be detailed for service with the medical corps of the Veterans' Administration, when such detail will promote the public interests without, however, in any wise impairing the efficiency of the service for the purpose of which the same was created and is maintained.

SEC. 14. The Administrator, in his discretion, may establish and continue a medical council composed of members of the medical and allied scientific professions, whose duties shall be to advise the Administrator and the Surgeon General relative to the care and treatment of disabled ex-service men and women. The number, terms of service, compensation, and allowances to members of such council shall be in accord with regulations prescribed by the Administrator.

SEC. 15. The expenses, except membership fees, of members of the medical corps detailed by the Surgeon General to attend meetings of associations for the promotion of medical science are hereby authorized.

SEC. 16. The Administrator, in his discretion, may grant members of the medical corps leave of absence for 30 days per annum without deduction of pay. Such leave may accumulate annually for a period not in excess of 3 months. In addition to such annual leave, members of the medical corps may be allowed a period of 20 days per annum on account of illness.

SEC. 17. The Administrator, upon recommendation of the Surgeon General, may employ medical and dental personnel in addition to commissioned or enlisted personnel of the Medical Corps, on a full time, part time, or fee basis at such rates of pay as he may prescribe.

SEC. 18. The Medical Corps shall be entitled to use the insignia of rank as provided by the Army and such insignia of service and use thereof as may be prescribed by the Administrator, and the appropriations of the Veterans' Administration shall be available for expenses deemed necessary and appropriate to carry out these and other provisions of this act. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to enter into agreements or contracts with the War Department for the purchase of uniforms, accouterments, equipment, and other supplies for the Medical Corps.

SEC. 19. All acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby modified accordingly.

The Progressive Farmer Appeals for World Peace Through Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter with enclosure from a constituent of mine, Mr. A. H. Camp, who is, as you will note, very much aware of the urgent need of maintaining the peace through an international organization. The article which Mr. Camp enclosed in his letter is from the Progressive Farmer of May 1943:

GREEN FOREST, ARK., *May 17, 1943.*

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am sending you a clipping from The Progressive Farmer of May 1943. "Them's my sentiments" and here are some more of them

Many of us remember the crime wave that followed the other war After a whole Nation had been taught to hate and murder and rob it was no easy matter to "unteach" us again. You don't need to look for better conditions this time unless we think, talk, and act for the brotherhood of man and the brotherhood of nations under the law. Some say it will lower our standard of living. War does lower our standard of living, clear down to the days of the savage!

I am very much opposed to capital punishment, but if every man jack of you who does not work for international law with teeth in it is called up before a firing squad, I don't think I would even object for I would consider you traitors to the boys who are dying on the battlefields of the world today for this very principle.

Yours truly,

A. H. CAMP.

TO SOUTHERN SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN—WE APPEAL NOW FOR YOUR LEADERSHIP IN PROMOTING WORLD PEACE THROUGH FEDERATION

To our Senators and Congressmen from Mississippi:

Hon. THEODORE G. BILBO, Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND, Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Hon. WILL M. WHITTINGTON, Hon. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Hon. W. A. WINSTEAD, Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER, Hon. DAN R. MCGEHEE.

To our Senators and Congressmen from Arkansas:

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Hon. HATTIE W. CARAWAY, Hon. E. C. GATHINGS, Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT, Hon. FADJO CRAVENS, Hon. BROOKS HAYS, Hon. W. F. NORRELL, Hon. OREN HARRIS.

To our Senators and Congressmen from Louisiana:

Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON, Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Hon. POUL H. MALONEY, Hon. JAMES DOMENGEAUX, Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, Hon. CHARLES MCKENZIE, Hon. JAMES H. MORRISON, Hon. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR., Hon. A. LEONARD ALLEN.

GENTLEMEN: Four years ago this month on this page the undersigned editors of The Progressive Farmer made an urgent appeal

to Congress. Our appeal was for speedy action in behalf of some world organization to preserve international peace. America's failure to support a world court and a league of nations, we even then declared, "has brought Europe to another war and may yet involve us in the wholesale butchery of human beings." Furthermore, as we then said:

"In a world as small as ours has become, there is no hope that America can have peace through isolation. Our one and only hope of peace is through cooperation with other nations. * * * After centuries of effort, the human race has found only one peaceful way to settle disputes between individuals—and that is by setting up courts with power to enforce their decrees. Nor can we ever hope to find any other effective and peaceful way to settle disputes between nations. * * * Somehow or other this ideal—a Supreme Court of Nations with power to enforce its decrees—must be set up."

SOUTHERNERS SHOULD LEAD

Not only did we appeal to Congress as a whole for action in this matter but declared that our southern Senators and Congressmen "may well take and keep the lead in the fight for world peace." Why? Because as we then said, "Not only are the lives of our young men at stake but in unusual degree the South's prosperity requires peaceful and prosperous foreign nations to provide markets for the South's cotton, tobacco, and other export crops."

On behalf of 1,000,000 southern rural families who read the Progressive Farmer every month, we are appealing to you to recognize your opportunity and respond to it. It is indeed, as Herbert Agar's book title puts it, A Time for Greatness. Just as southern statesmen a century and a half ago took the lead in establishing a continental federation of the United States of America, so should southern statesmen now take the lead in establishing a world federation—the United Nations.

THE REIGN OF LAW—OR ANARCHY?

The whole situation confronting America today is very simple: "In international affairs do we want the reign of law, * * * or do we want anarchy?" At present, cities and towns have laws, States have laws, nations have laws, but internationally there is no reign of law. There was no supreme court of nations to control outlaw nations or prevent them from plunging the world into a war in 1914–18, or since to check Italy from taking Abyssinia, Japan from taking Manchuria, or Hitler from taking Poland.

"Anarchist" is one of the world's vilest and most hated words. In all civilized cities, States, and nations law has replaced anarchy. But internationally we still live in a state of anarchy. Nor can we see any escape from the conclusion that all who deliberately favor the continuance and support of such a condition are in effect international anarchists.

THE UNITED STATES AS AN EXAMPLE

What is the way out? The answer is simple. It is the way so eloquently pointed out a few weeks ago by one distinguished southerner—former Gov. Pat M. Neff, of Texas, in an address Christian Patriots in a Chaotic World—that we prefer to quote his own words in concluding our appeal to you:

"In the organization of this world of tomorrow the United States is a perfect pattern. Each State in our Union lives its own individual life, makes and enforces its own laws, and no one State dictates to another. Yet the 48 States as a federated unit has its Congress to make laws, its Supreme Court to interpret them, and its police power to enforce them. With our Constitution as a blueprint, the 68 nations of the world should establish a commonwealth of nations with a lawmaking body, with a world court, and with sufficient police power on land and sea to preserve the liberty, the equality, and the unity of all the nations. * * * The world is now one small unit. Christian patriots should now make it a brotherhood. We are now citizens of the United States and the State in which we reside. We enjoy a duality of citizenship; there is no conflict. Add this federation of the nations to civilization and then we could say with Socrates of old, 'I am a citizen of the world.'"

To end the era of international anarchy, war, and bloodshed and set up instead the reign of law among nations based on the tried, tested, and successful experience and principles of our own United States, this is the paramount duty and opportunity of our American Congress today * * * and for our own southern Senators and Representatives we covet the leadership in this supreme crisis and opportunity. May you give it to us.

Respectfully submitted.

CLARENCE POE,
Chairman,
EUGENE BUTLER,
Vice Chairman,
W. C. LASSETTER,
ALEXANDER NUNN,
SALLIE F. HILL,
Editorial Board, the Progressive Farmer.

Ban on Pleasure Driving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Manchester Union, Manchester, N. H., May 24, 1943:

BAN ON PLEASURE DRIVING

The people of New England will recognize the urgency of the ban imposed on pleasure driving in the Eastern States. This ban is a military necessity to sustain the demand for gas and oil on the battle fronts.

The Eastern States suffer the disadvantage of being located on the Atlantic seaboard, in the vicinity of the points of shipment to European and African war fronts. The flow of gas and oil to these fronts must be maintained at any cost. Victory depends upon it. No true American will complain of disadvantage or sacrifice, if he knows that he is contributing to the progress of victory.

The demand for lubricants and gas for tanks and trucks, for bombers and fighter planes today is tremendous. Shortage of lubricants and fuel means the grounding of our bombers and fighter planes, the paralysis of our tanks, and the slowing down of our whole war machine.

But while New Englanders will recognize the ban on pleasure driving as a military necessity, they will want an answer to some questions to assure them that restrictions throughout the country are equitable. They will want to know, for instance, why States farther West should not share gas restrictions so as to enable a wider distribution of the gas available for use. They will want an answer to the statement that has been made that B and C cards have been more freely distributed by ration boards farther south than in New England.

People do not complain about sacrifices in the war if they believe that those sacrifices are necessary and are not due to incompetent management, and if they know that they are equitable. What burns them up is inequality in the application of restrictions, whereby some people or some sections of the country enjoy unfair advantages. Moreover, with the vacation season approaching, which sustains one of New England's profitable industries, New England will want to know that everything reasonable is being done to increase facilities for bringing gas and oil to the East so that the present ban will be as short-lived as possible.

Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday when the petition to discharge the Rules Committee from consideration of the bill H. R. 131—to abolish the payment of poll-taxes in several of the Southern States—was up for consideration I had the following brief remarks to make:

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish it were possible for me to say something in these brief 3 minutes that would appeal to your reason. I know your political sense has already been appealed to and I wish it were possible for me to make a reasonable appeal, an appeal based on reason which would influence you. Our boys from the poll-tax States, and the boys from other States, are fighting and dying in Guadalcanal, in Africa, in Attu, and on the seven seas. Here at a time when unity is the most prized thing that we seek, we find the sad and sorry spectacle of the House of Representatives, a branch of the National Congress, bringing up an issue that is calculated more than anything else to bring about disunity. I know that you have gotten your orders from John L. Lewis, from Earl Browder, from the Association for the Advancement of Colored People, from the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], and I know that you have gotten your orders from the First Lady of the land. I know that politically you feel you have to vote for this detestable thing, but in the name of the one objective of winning this war, for God's sake, one time let us rise above political expediency and vote to uphold the Constitution and the integrity of this Congress, and contribute to the national unity so necessary in winning this war.

I shall not take the time of the House today to discuss further this matter for I realize as everyone must that the bill will be passed and that there is no living human being in this House who could stop its passage. But for the sake of the record and those who are interested, I want to reiterate what I said last year when this same iniquitous bill was up for consideration. The remarks that I made then are just as pertinent today as they were a year ago. Those remarks were as follows:

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, this bill, which seeks to abolish one of the provisions or requirements for voting by congressional action in eight of the sovereign States of the Union,

is in my opinion one of the most unfortunate actions on the part of this House or of this Congress in the time that I have been a Member of this body. I realize fully the futility of any remarks that I shall make on this occasion. I realize that so far as this House is concerned it is purely a matter of getting around to the vote. The result is inevitable. A substantial majority of the membership of this body, actuated by motives best known to themselves, are in the attitude of the billy goat at the animal convention—they have already voted. The question of whether this legislation is constitutional or not does not seem to bother that majority. That this bill is clearly unconstitutional has already been convincingly shown by that distinguished jurist, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of this body and the sage of this House, as well as by the gentleman from Alabama, the gentleman from Maine, and others who have discussed that issue. Therefore, I shall not discuss that angle of the matter further.

The question of the sovereign right of the States to set up their own election machinery for the election of their Representatives and Senators and Presidential electors seems to be no concern of theirs. The patent evil effect of this legislation, should it be enacted into law, will have upon the future of this country seems to be of no moment to them. This majority—and I say it advisedly—seems to be bent upon the regulation of the primaries as well as the general elections in those States where the poll-tax system prevails. They apparently are indifferent to the wishes of the people of those States, while at the same time proclaiming their desire for democratic government. Mr. Chairman, I love the great majority of the membership of this body. Most of them are my personal friends, and I dislike to make these strong statements. I should prefer that they be left unsaid. But I feel so keenly about this matter that I feel justified in making them.

I have tried to analyze and have made some research and inquiry in an effort to obtain the motives which impel this majority to take this action in a matter in which they themselves are not vitally concerned. I have definitely come to the conclusion that this legislation is sponsored by two groups: First, the so-called leftist, or radically liberal, group in this country—that class of our citizens which wants to see a change in our present form of representative government—and, second, that group of reformers who are honest in their motives but misled into becoming the tools of the first group—that class which today is placing social reforms ahead of the task of winning this war. In the first group are the Communist and Socialist Parties. In the second group are the radicals, or left-wingers, both of the Democratic and Republican Parties. They are led on and encouraged in their efforts to take advantage of the present situation in which the country finds itself—confronted by enemies abroad and fighting for its very existence—to place social reforms before the war objective. Among those agitating this question of the repeal of the poll tax are, of course, the Congress of Industrial Organization, and the Society for the Advancement of Colored People. There are more Communists in these two groups than all other groups of people in this country. This being true, it might be asked, What is the objective sought? The answer is obvious. The Communist Party in this country has for years been preying upon the Negroes of the country and enlisting their membership in the Communist Party. Why not be honest and candid about the whole question? The direct object of this movement, of course, is to enfranchise the Negro in the South. Whether the Negro is qualified to vote or to administer this Government seems to be no concern of theirs. The idea is to appeal to the Negro on the theory that they are trying to be of assistance to him.

The evidence of the truth of these statements is borne out by the fact that every Member of this House has received an urgent appeal from the president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations to be here today to vote for this legislation. In that letter was a veiled threat of political repercussion if the Member failed to obey the mandate of the Congress of Industrial Organization. It is passing strange that the Congress of Industrial Organization, which requires annual dues aggregating many times the insignificant one- or two-dollar poll tax for the privilege of working, should be so concerned about the payment of this small amount for the privilege of voting.

As further evidence of the fact that the radical element and the Negro element are behind this legislation, I call to your attention the fact that the three gentlemen who are taking the leading part in advocating the passage of this legislation are: First, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAVAGAN], of antilynch fame, who represents the Harlem district; second, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO,] the lone Representative of the American Labor Party; and third, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKEOUGH], who has the distinction of representing the so-called Black Belt in the city of Chicago. While expressing much concern over the right of the franchise for the so-called poor white people of these Southern States, it is quite obvious wherein their real interest lies. It is really remarkable that these gentlemen should have the power to sway this House into this action which so many of the Members know in their hearts and inner consciousness is a blight upon the Constitution of our forefathers and a sin against a great section of this country.

Mr. Chairman, I hold no brief for the poll tax. It is a part of the system of the election machinery of the great State of Mississippi, as well as these other States where it operates. It may or may not be a wise provision. But, Mr. Chairman, I am most seriously concerned about the right, the constitutional right of the State of Mississippi to prescribe its own qualifications for the privilege of voting in its primaries. For it is apparent to all that if this Congress can by legislative action abolish the poll-tax requirement in the primaries of the State of Mississippi then it can also do away with the educational qualifications for the privilege of voting in the primaries of that State. And it is equally obvious that if this Congress can do away with the poll tax and the educational qualifications in the primaries then it can likewise abolish the requirement of registration.

And, Mr. Chairman, I here and now predict that should this diabolical effort to violate the Constitution succeed in passing both Houses of the Congress it will be signed by the President and upheld by the Supreme Court as now constituted. Moreover, I predict that the consummation of that action will be followed by the enactment of laws to abolish the educational qualifications and the qualification of registration, and that chaos and corruption of the worst type will prevail in the elections throughout this country. When all of these things have been done many of you gentlemen sitting there now in your seats will find that the chickens have come home to roost and that the South alone will not be the sufferer of this misguided legislative action. Similarly, I predict that we will have a repetition of the days following the Civil War when the bayonet was resorted to in order to enforce the so-called force bills.

And all of this, Mr. Chairman, is being attempted at a time when we need above everything else national unity—when this country is at death grip with the most powerful enemies by which it has ever been confronted. And, mind you, all of this is being attempted by these reformers under the guise of democracy. Democracy—when they attempt by force of the Federal bayonet to prescribe the manner and qualifications of elections within the confines of a sovereign State?

Mr. Chairman, I never thought that I would live to see the day when the Democratic Party, the party to which my forebears, have belonged for generations—the party which has been nourished, protected, and fathered by the South—would take the lead under its administration to force this type of action down the throat of its best friend. Since the Civil War the Democratic Party has been the beneficiary of everything the South had to offer. When the Democratic Party offered a candidate for President it knew that it had the support of the solid South. In that section it has been little short of treason for these many years to do other than vote the Democratic ticket.

In all these years the South has asked for little, and gotten less from that party. In fact, the only thing that it has ever gotten out of the Democratic Party when it was in power was the privilege of having representatives in the two branches of the Congress, which the Constitution guaranteed it. Prior to the Civil War that great section of this country furnished many, if not most, of the great, outstanding political figures of the country. It furnished its Washington, its Jefferson, its Patrick Henry, its Lee, its Davis, and its George. Today the caliber of its men has not decayed. It still provides the Nation with much of its leadership. But because of its political isolation it is denied the privilege of one of its sons becoming the nominee of its party for the exalted office of the Presidency. This is not because it does not have the men of Presidential caliber, but because that party realizes that it already has the votes of that section of the solid South; and always the nominee comes from some doubtful section.

When the party is in power the sweetest plums of political patronage and preference likewise go to other sections where political allegiance is not so constant. The only thing the South has ever asked, and the only reason it has been so constantly and consistently loyal to the Democratic Party, has been because it thought that that party offered it the privilege of handling its own domestic and internal affairs. Today we see the sorry spectacle of the ingratitude of that party, joining hands with the Republican Party; nay, more than that, taking the leadership in trying to pass another Force bill to compel a great people of a great section of this country to accept certain rules and regulations which will prevent the people of the Southland from even controlling their own election laws, their own State primaries, and meeting their own problems which are peculiar to that section.

It might be well in this connection, in passing, to point out to those beneficiaries of the Democratic Party in other sections of the country, those of you who are today becoming a party—an unwilling party, I grant you, but nevertheless a party—to forcing this legislation down our throats, that if you are going to deny our people the right to control these political and social matters which are so peculiarly their own, there is little, if anything, left to the South as grounds for a unified support of that party. Might they not well reason that if this last vestige of benefit which they receive from that solid support of the Democratic Party is to be removed by a Democratic administration, they might profitably seek another course and join the other States of the Union in frequent changes of their political affiliations? There is only one hope left to us—the hope that in the Senate, where the rules of procedure are different and where the time for debate is unlimited, this iniquitous and vicious attempt to violate the Constitution of our forefathers

may be stopped. I feel confident that there are sufficient courageous Members of that body who, like the Spartans of old, will say, "It shall not pass."

Mr. Chairman, I conclude where I began. I realize the futility of these remarks, but I thought it might be well to give my brethren some cold facts to consider as we progress further along the road, over which we are passing so rapidly these days, that leads to destruction of constitutional government. This ill-advised movement has added nothing to the unity of our cause, the solidarity of the Democratic Party in the South, or the paramount and all-important objective of winning the bloody struggle for existence in which we are now engaged. Mr. Chairman, again I repeat the warning which I have sounded from this floor at frequent intervals during the past year: This gigantic struggle for our very existence cannot be won as long as the social reformers who are so prevalent in high places in this Government place their far-reaching, and in some instances fantastic, reforms above the objective of winning the war.

Sports in Wartime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK L. SUNDSTROM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, sports have been one of the greatest assets in the development of the character of the American people, not only for the thousands who have participated in these sports, but also for the millions of Americans who have followed sports. Perseverance, team play, the will to succeed, the will to win, to be able to accept adversity without discouragement, that never-say-die spirit, are a few of the things sport has done for the youth of America. Today, as a result of the training received and the participation in sports, our soldiers all over the globe are living up to their reputation as the finest fighters in the world. It is through this medium that the youth of our country first learns the fundamentals of that competitive spirit and ambition that has made these United States great. Young men and women learn the principle that a single loss does not mean defeat, but that through the lesson learned in this loss, they can, by better application, win another time. "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again" is the principle that has won many a difficult battle, created some of the greatest inventions the world has ever known, and has made this a better universe in which to live.

Sports, organized and unorganized, are essential to the well-being of the human race. Today when so much is expected of workers at home, relaxation is necessary if their health, morale, and production capacity are to be upheld.

There has been some talk of the appointment by the President of a sports coordinator or a three-man committee to make recommendations on continuation or abandonment of certain organized sport. Such a committee, in my opinion, is unnecessary and uncalled for. The men who control these sports are American and I am sure would cooperate with our Government to the fullest extent. Sports are primarily local situations and should be approved and supervised by local authorities. Leave farming to the farmers, business to the businessmen, and sports to the sportsmen, who have performed real and substantial services in the development of the temperament, personality, and spirit of our Nation.

Pipe Lines Alone Will Not Do the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, before rationing was applied the consumption of oil and gasoline on the north Atlantic seaboard for civilian use was normally about 1,600,000 barrels per day, 95 percent of which was transported by ocean tank ships. Approximately one-third of these shipments consisted of gasoline and the other two-thirds of the heavier types, principally of crude oil. The major portion of the crude oil shipments went to the refining districts of Bayonne, Philadelphia, and Boston.

Under present conditions less than 1,000,000 barrels of oil and gasoline are now transported daily from the Southwest to the eastern seaboard, nearly all of which is by rail for all, or a portion, of the distance. The railroads are said to have 71,000 tank cars engaged in the oil movement, many of which are constantly in the repair shops. They also have allocation for 1,200,000 steel drums which they are hauling in common boxcars. The drums hold slightly less than one and one-fourth barrels each and are used principally for kerosene. Rationing, of course, will continue to be applied to hold consumption within the limits of the capacity of the rail lines.

Two large pipe lines, one of 24-inch, the other of 20-inch diameter, now under construction from Texas, are expected to be completed to the eastern seaboard, the one by July, the other by December, next. It is claimed that the 24-inch line will have a capacity of 300,000 barrels of crude oil per day, and the 20-inch line a capacity of 235,000 barrels of gasoline per day. Just how much of this total of 535,000 barrels will reach the eastern seaboard, no one can say. Major Parten, its principal promoter, stated before the Rivers and Harbors Committee that much of it might go to supply a great deficiency in the St. Louis and Chicago districts and intervening territory—Hearings, page 248.

Before the priorities were granted for the steel the large pipe line was represented as a temporary measure to relieve an acute situation on the eastern seaboard caused by the war. Major Parten, from the Office of the Oil Administrator, stated before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that when the war was over the movement of oil to the East would go back to the ocean tankers—hearings, page 247. Mr. Eastman made a similar statement before the Maloney committee—hearings, page 725. It was contended by Major Parten that the pipe line would not become obsolete at the end of the war, as it would then be utilized for natural gas and other purposes—hearings, page 248.

Now from others in authority, we hear a different story. The priorities have been granted, and the pipe lines are under construction. One line has been completed from Longview, Tex., to Norris City, Ill., and the other has been approved from Houston to Seymour, Ind., both to be ultimately extended to the eastern seaboard.

The manner proposed for the operation of these two huge pipe lines is not generally known, but it is fully described by Mr. George A. Wilson, Director of Transportation, Petroleum Administrator for War. Mr. Wilson with Dr. Elliott, Director of Stock Piling and Transportation Resources Division, War Production Board, appeared before the House Committee on Appropriations on March 16 last. The plan stated is set forth on page 197 of the hearings, as follows:

Mr. STARNES. How does the Defense Plant Corporation get any return? Is it by charging private parties for the use of the line?

Mr. WILSON. It operates in this way, sir. It leases the line to its other subsidiary, the Defense Supplies Corporation; and the Defense Supplies Corporation buys the oil at its source in Texas and delivers it at its easterly terminus and resells it there, plus a figure to reimburse it for its costs. In that way it reduces what it has to pay in the way of reimbursement for railroad transportation, by keeping it all in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation family.

Every dime that they save in purchasing this oil at the source and moving it through their own pipe line and getting it to the eastern destination without paying any other carrier, or by paying connecting carriers lesser amounts, they simply reduce by that precise saving their disbursement costs under the so-called subsidy to repay the railroads.

Mr. STARNES. From where does this subsidy come?

Mr. WILSON. The subsidy applies only to those shipments which continue to be made by rail.

You see as to each barrel which moves over either the 24-inch or the 20-inch line, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has that lesser barrelage to pay subsidies on. I do not like the use of the word; it has a different meaning here. The subsidy in each instance amounts to more than a dollar a barrel. So that on each barrel they ship over their own pipe line they have saved about $1.05, and, at the same time, they have paid the cost of operations and amortization of the new pipe lines that they are building.

Mr. STARNES. What about the Defense Supplies Corporation? Where does it get its money from with which to buy that oil down in Texas?

Mr. WILSON. It is from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. STARNES. Where does the Reconstruction Finance Corporation get its money?

Mr. WILSON. From Congress, by appropriation.

Mr. ENGEL. Who gets the 35 cents a barrel for transporting this oil from the Texas field to the seaboard?

Mr. WILSON. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. ENGEL. Does that amount pay the cost of transportation and also amortization costs?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ENGEL. What percentage do you figure it?

Mr. WILSON. On the 5-year basis, that will pay the entire cost of the facility.

From these statements it will be seen that these pipe lines are not to be operated as common carriers, but will only transport the oil and gasoline that the operators purchase in Texas, at prices satisfactory to themselves. They will then sell the oil and gasoline in the markets of the North and East at prices to cover the cost of transportation, plus a profit sufficient to amortize the cost of the pipe lines in a period of 5 years. They estimate that 35 cents per barrel will be sufficient for the purpose, provided that the lines can be operated to their full capacity of 535,000 barrels per day.

While the officials of the Oil Administration say that the cost of the pipe lines will be amortized in 5 years, they do not claim that the money will be actually collected and refunded to the Treasury. They say that the Government is now paying to the oil companies about $1.05 per barrel on all oil transported to the East by rail. The rail cost is estimated at about $1.40 per barrel while the cost of the movement through the large pipe lines is estimated at 35 cents per barrel. Therefore, if 535,000 barrels of the oil is daily transported through the pipe lines instead of by rail, the Government will be relieved of the payment of the subsidy of $1.05 per barrel on all the oil so moved.

This sophistry may catch a few of the unwary. The weakness of the proposition is that it does not relieve the Government of the payment of any portion of the subsidy now being paid to the oil companies to reimburse them for the excessive costs of the rail transportation of oil. The pipe lines do not diminish the rail hauls one iota. In fact, the pipe lines and rail lines together cannot possibly supply the East with their normal needs. The rail shipments have passed their peak of about 800,000 barrels, and the two pipe lines will transport only 535,000 barrels. Both together, are 265,000 barrels short of the requirements.

The Railway Commission of Texas has jurisdiction over all intrastate pipe-line operations in that State. On May 7, 1943, the following Associated Press dispatch was given out from the State capitol:

AUSTIN, May 7.—Chairman Jester, of the Texas Railroad Commission, disclosed that the Petroleum Administration for War will start purchasing 80,000 barrels of West Texas sour crudes daily next week for the "big inch" pipe line.

"The flow of sour crudes through the Longview to Norris City, Ill., line will be stepped up to 115,000 barrels a day within a short time," Jester said.

Jester asserted that the flow of sour crudes through the 24-inch outlet will be maintained as a definite policy.

"The crude will be handled by pipe line from west Texas to the coast, and then by reverse lines to the 'big inch' connections," Jester said.

In these circumstances it is plain to be seen that the plan of the officials of the P. A. W. is for the Government to remain permanently, or at least indefinitely, in the business of buying, selling, and transporting oil. Without specific authority from Congress, they have already committed us to that policy. If the plan had been offered as a war measure to remain in effect during the emergency, it would have been a different proposition. But here, they are fixing the price of transporting the oil from Texas to the East, which they say is 35 cents per barrel. They are building two transcontinental pipe lines to cost approximately $200,000,000. They say that at the end of 5 years the Government will have saved enough money to amortize the cost, and this is the policy, war or no war. They make no exception.

While the priorities for the steel for the pipe lines were granted by W. P. B. as a war measure, it seems clear from all the circumstances that the real purpose was for permanent post-war use, and possibly the war program has really been crippled on account of it. For the construction of the two large pipe lines, including necessary feeders, pumps, storage tanks, and so forth, 703,251 tons of steel have been allocated by the W. P. B. This amount of steel would have constructed 310 tanker ships of the average capacity of 85,000 barrels. Such ships are now our greatest possible war need. Our net losses of ships the past year exceed construction of all the Allied Powers combined by over 1,000,000 tons. Donald Nelson actually turned the allocation down twice. It seems that his first judgment has been ratified by subsequent events.

Next to ocean tankers, transportation of crude and fuel oils by barge will involve far less critical steel than by any other known method. If wooden barges are to be made use of during the emergency, the argument in favor of barges over pipe lines is unanswerable. But P. A. W. executives have told us in some of the hearings that crude oil cannot be transported in wooden barges. They have made the claim that nothing but the heavy residual oils can be so transported and that this type would only embrace about 10 percent of the total oil requirements of the eastern seaboard.

These P. A. W. officials have certainly been misled by some person. If they had gone to responsible and practical businessmen who have actually hauled millions of barrels of crude oil in wooden barges, they would not have made such statements.

Mr. W. A. Wansley, vice president and general manager of W. D. Haden Co., producers of shell, sand, and gravel, of Galveston, writes me as follows:

From 1908 to 1920 I was connected with Chas. Clark & Co. of Galveston, Tex., this company being engaged in jetty construction and the transportation of oil in barges along the Texas coast, and sometimes to Louisiana ports. During those years there were no intracoastal canals and all the transportation was coastwise and only wooden barges were used and only crude oil was transported in those barges.

When the Freeport Sulphur Co. opened at Freeport, Tex., Chas. Clarke & Co. transported the oil required for their operations until they constructed their own plant, and all this oil was transported from Beaumont and Port Arthur to Freeport in wooden barges. For many years they transported oil from Beaumont to Galveston and from the Goose Greek oil field to Port Arthur and Beaumont in wooden barges.

The firm of W. A. Guyton & Co. of Galveston, Tex., was also engaged in similar business and owned several wooden barges in which they transported oil as far as Florida ports during those years.

Capt. W. L. Jones, whose main office is in the Stewart Building, Houston, writes me as follows:

In reference to the transportation of crude oil in wooden barges, I beg to state that during a period between 1900 and 1923, practically all of the oil handled by barges was carried in wooden built barges, as very few steel barges were in use prior to that time, and from 1900 through 1910, there was an enormous amount of crude oil handled from the Spindle Top field near Beaumont, Tex. There were a number of companies towing oil during that period of time, which one of the largest companies was the Charles Clark Co. of Galveston, Tex. Higgens Towing Co., Beaumont, Tex., and Picton & Co. also handled a great deal of oil in barges, coastwise.

I also towed quite a good deal of oil from the Goose Creek field, from 1916 through 1923, which was all handled in wooden barges.

Mr. J. W. Hershey, of the Butcher-Arthur Co., chief office at 301 Broadway, Houston, advises me that the Barker Barge Co. is now hauling oil in both steel and wooden barges from New Iberia to New Orleans.

P. A. W. officials have also put statements in some of the hearings to the effect that barge transportation is not practical for long hauls. This was one of the arguments with which they hoped to kill the Florida barge channel.

I know of no traffic expert who has ever given an opinion to that effect. The Butcher-Arthur Co., of Houston, now have 24 tugboats and a large number of barges engaged in the oil trade. Their tows operate over the Gulf Intracoastal Canal from Houston to Carrabelle, Fla., and from Helena, Ark., and from Baton Rouge to Cincinnati. These distances range from about 1,000 to 2,000 miles.

Hon. Chester C. Thompson, president of the Inland Waterways Corporation, writes me as follows:

I am pleased to advise that the Federal Barge Lines, operated by this corporation, is now engaged in the transportation of a very substantial amount of bulk petroleum products, principally fuel and furnace oil, and commercial gasoline.

Generally, this traffic is moving from New Orleans, Plaquemine, and Baton Rouge, La., and Helena, Ark., to Cairo and Wood River, Ill., Minneapolis, and Winona, Minn., as well as to and from intermediate points. A large portion of the petroleum movement handled

by this enterprise is over a distance exceeding 1,000 miles, which I believe can be regarded as a long haul.

About 18 or 20 years ago, many of the dams on the Ohio having been completed, Jones & Laughlin Co. sent their first full tow of steel from Aliquippa to St. Louis. The trip was made in 14 days. Mr. A. B. Shepherd, their chief engineer, stated that they were already establishing terminals at St. Louis and at Memphis. I asked him if his company would use the Texas Intracoastal Canal in the event of its extension to the Mississippi. His reply was yes, that it was their policy to use water transportation as far as it was possible. That the economies in favor of water transportation were reflected in greater proportion in long than in short hauls. Mr. Shepherd, in charge of the barge operations of his company on the Ohio, Mississippi, and Monongahela, had a wider experience in barge traffic than any other man in the United States. Jones & Laughlin were the largest barge-line shippers in America, and Mr. Shepherd was the highest authority we had upon the subject.

Since the completion of the Gulf Intracoastal Canal into Texas from the Mississippi River, millions of tons of steel have been shipped there by barge. It has been of immense value in furnishing material for the building of thousands of highway bridges; thousands of derricks for oil explorations; and the laying of thousands of miles of pipe lines.

Russell Leroy Hultgren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with a profound feeling of humble pride, the reasons for which I shall not detail here, that I include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the following article from the Pasadena Star-News which tells of the remarkable record of Staff Sgt. Russell Hultgren, of La Verne, Calif., in the service of his country:

CALIFORNIA FLYER DECORATED FIVE TIMES IN DAY

ADVANCED AMERICAN BASE, SOUTH PACIFIC, May 10 (delayed).—Staff Sgt. Russell Hultgren, of La Verne, Calif., is one of the most decorated enlisted men in the United States Army, with six awards—five of which he received in 1 day.

Hultgren, radioman-gunner aboard a Flying Fortress, is credited with shooting down three Japanese planes. He was wounded at Pearl Harbor and won the Silver Star for a bombing raid on Wake Island.

The Army announced today that Hultgren received the following awards on April 29 in New Zealand: The Purple Heart award for a wound received during a bombing mission; an Air Medal for a bombing mission last October 12 on Buka Passage; the Distinguished Flying Cross for 6 months' action and more than 200 operational hours; the Oak Leaf Cluster in lieu of a second Air Medal for an additional 100 hours; the Oak Leaf Cluster in lieu of a third Air Medal for another 100 hours.

Hultgren once crash-landed off Bougainville Island of the Solomon group with Brig. Gen. Laverne G. Saunders.

"That was one time I was really scared," Hultgren said. "Maybe it was because there was a general aboard."

He accompanied the bombers that attacked Guadalcanal before the marines landed. Before enlisting in the Air Corps in 1939 he was a truck driver and merchant-marine sailor.

Statement of Hon. Marvin Jones

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Judge Marvin Jones, chairman of the delegation of the United States to the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture:

In view of the fact that there still seems to be some confusion in the public mind about the purpose of this conference, I want to make the following facts perfectly clear:

1. This conference has nothing whatever to do with the question of relief during or after the war. So far as this country is concerned, this matter is being handled by Governor Lehman's organization. The President has indicated very definitely that the matter of relief will be handled outside of this conference and in some other way.

2. This conference is a fact-finding body. It is composed of representatives from friendly countries all over the world who have made a special study of the problems of production and consumption and interchange of views of their agricultural commodities.

3. The conference exchanges views, endeavoring to ascertain facts and report findings as to what steps would be best calculated to secure a better method of production, fuller consumption and use, and a greater interchange of commodities. The several delegations will submit these findings and recommendations to their respective countries. No commitment of any kind will or can be made by this conference. Each government may take whatever action it deems wise in respect to any or all of these recommendations.

Dr. Robert Morss Lovett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. ROWAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the New York Times of May 19, 1943:

DR. LOVETT IS DEFENDED—SOCRATES PARALLEL SEEN IN CONGRESS ACTION AGAINST OFFICIAL

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Since July 1939 Dr. Robert Morss Lovett has served with distinction as Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands. During the present session of Congress, however, a small group of Representatives has capriciously charged—without adducing a shred of acceptable evidence—that Dr. Lovett is unfit for Government employment "by reason of association" at one time or another since 1922 "with organizations whose aims or purposes have been subversive to the Government of the United States." This group now seeks to have the House cut off Dr. Lovett's salary and thus dismiss him in disgrace from public office.

Those who know Dr. Lovett and who are familiar with his long and brilliant record as scholar and public servant can testify to his unimpeachable character and to his complete devotion to his country. If they bestir themselves on his behalf, he need not fall victim to as unfair a political attack as has been made in modern times.

As for the irresponsible legislators who have leveled this reckless charge against Dr. Lovett, they have a lesson to learn from ancient Athens. Socrates was condemned as a promoter of "subversive" thinking and was forced to drink the hemlock. When the Athenian community later realized and repented its error, those who had instigated the action against the great philosopher were reviled and forced to flee for their safety.

CYRUS EATON.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *May 18, 1943.*

United Nations Food Conference at Hot Springs, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED BRADLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, when I prepared the following remarks, I did not have the daily calendar before me and did not know, therefore, how many special orders were already on the docket. Consequently, in view of the lateness of the hour and pressure of work in my own office, I have asked and received unanimous consent to extend these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, after I finished speaking in the House yesterday on the subject of the Food Conference at Hot Springs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] launched into a very exhaustive and what sought to be an all-inclusive reply. It seems to me, however, that he intentionally or unintentionally misspoke on several occasions.

In the first place, he made mention of the fact that I sought entrance to the conference and to the sessions and executive sessions thereof without invitation. The whole purposes of my remarks yesterday were designed to retract my previous assurances to this House that Judge Jones had invited me and every

Member of Congress to come down to the conference and attend any and all sessions, including executive. According to Cannon's Procedure of the House of Representatives—stress upon which was laid by Mr. Jones in arriving at his final decision that we could not attend any executive committee meetings—Members of Congress are admitted into executive committee sessions upon invitation. Because of this fact and because of Mr. Jones' private invitation to me, as well as the fact that he publicized that invitation to attend any and all sessions, including executive, as noted in my remarks yesterday, I felt perfectly free in passing on that invitation to the Membership of this House on May 20, and it was for the purposes of clarifying the question and retracting the invitation that I took the floor yesterday.

Now the gentleman from Texas made several remarks to the effect that we Members of Congress should stay here in Washington and he even went so far as to say that we should not be permitted to draw our pay for those days we are absent from Washington. I want to ask the gentleman right now, in all sincerity and just as a matter of fairness, whether he will be good enough to inform me, and inform this House, whether he has always abided by that principle? In other words, I should like to know whether the gentleman from Texas has always refused to accept his pay or has returned to the Treasury his pay for those days on which he has been absent from his duties here in Washington for the purposes of making speeches in various parts of the country for which I have been informed reliably were on many occasions, if not all, for rather handsome honorariums, perhaps running into hundreds of dollars for individual speeches?

I tried to make it perfectly clear yesterday that I felt I was honestly discharging my duties to my constituents and to the country in attempting to ascertain for just what kind of a program or programs we might be called upon in the post-war world to authorize astronomical appropriations, in order to feed the peoples of the world. His answer was that we could call members of the executive branch before our committees and get a full answer at the proper time. Let me point out to you that it was made perfectly clear to me in my opening conference with Judge Jones that a number of these meetings down there in Hot Springs will be somewhat in the nature of round-table discussions at which no minutes will be taken and no records made thereof. And lest we forget—even the gentleman from Texas referred to this as "a private conference." Private? By whose authority?

There is another matter to which I made reference yesterday and to which I wish now to address myself by way of clarification. I refer to the hotel rate of $5 per day which I paid in Hot Springs for a very pleasant room and very fine meals. I did not make it clear that this is a uniform rate applying to all of the delegates and I believe to all of their advisers, clerks, stenographers in attendance, and so forth, from all countries, including our own, who are living at the Homestead Hotel during the conference. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], and myself are both willingly paying our own expenses. We are sponging on no one. We do not intend to submit any expense account to anyone or to any department. I doubt this is true of anyone else presently living at the Homestead Hotel.

I pointed out that ordinarily and during their resort season the Homestead Hotel charges $14 per day for that room and presumably similar meals. I assume the owners of the hotel feel this is necessary in order to make a reasonable profit and assuming, of course, that they are not always operating at full capacity. It is my understanding that the United States Government has contracted with the owners of the hotel for the entire use of their facilities and personnel during this conference, and the rate to which I refer is that presumably established by the Government. It is generally recognized that under the New Deal the Government seeks to make no profit on any of its transactions. Governments, perhaps, can thus survive, but private enterprise cannot survive without there are profits. With such a spread in the rates and despite the fact that the hotel facilities, including cottages, are jammed to capacity, it is but logical to assume that the Government is accepting some loss in the transaction; just how much loss per individual I do not know, but the fact remains that I paid, out of my own pocket, the bill presented to me.

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the twenty-fifth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. In this installment Senator Cockrell refers to the cause for the depreciation of the value of silver. This brings us to a fundamental principle of economic law, that "use creates demand and demand creates value."

One sure way to depreciate the value of silver is to decrease the use for the metal as money and one sure way to enhance the value of gold is to increase the demand for the metal in the form of money—a principle that was demonstrated during the period just prior to and by the passage of the Gold Revaluation Act.

The twenty-fifth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech follows:

"The foregoing tables show that during the 16 months ended November 1, 1887, this Department was able to pay out at par and keep in circulation $10,484,905 of the coined silver dollars, and $72,597,732 of their representatives, the certificates, in addition to the amounts of each in circulation July 1, 1886. If the Department had been able to print enough certificates, doubtless the whole of this increased use of silver would have been in the form of certificates, and few, if any, coined dollars would have been paid out. On the contrary, many of those out would have been returned and certificates taken in their place.

"There should always be in the Treasury enough silver beside that held against outstanding certificates to enable the Government to at once supply any demand for it on the part of the people; but all held in the Treasury in excess of that amount is absolutely useless for any purpose, and is in fact a menace to the silver which the people hold, and also to the United States notes and national-bank notes—to the whole circulating medium, except gold; therefore it would be the part of wisdom to prevent any accumulation of silver in the Treasury beyond a sufficient reserve needed to meet any demand which may be made for it. This can be done by fixing the amount of such reserve, and providing that when it is exceeded by, say, $5,000,000 the purchase of bullion shall cease until the amount held by the Government again equals such reserve.

"Another plan, somewhat similar to that recommended by my predecessor in his last annual report, would be to provide that when the reserve was exceeded, an amount of United States notes equal in value to such excess should be canceled, if enough of them were in the Treasury; but if not, then the purchase of bullion to cease until the maximum reserve should be reached. This would create a vacuum in the circulating medium which would be filled by silver. The amount of United States notes would be gradually reduced until the whole were extinguished; silver dollars or silver certificates would take the place of United States notes as they were retired. This plan would make our currency more uniform and as secure as now.

"Neither of these plans, if adopted, would diminish the actual or potential use of silver as currency by a dollar. In my judgment, it would be promoted thereby."

President Cleveland, in his third annual message of December 1887, makes no mention of the terrible crisis in which the country had been enveloped. That was in 1885. The clouds had cleared away, and the silver question was not so important.

Mr. President, has it ever occurred to the friends of unconditional repeal, when they bring before us the weighty power of the President's recommendation, that it is barely possible that the President may be mistaken now, as he has been so often mistaken heretofore?

I refer to Secretary Fairchild's report for 1888, page 29:

"SILVER COINAGE

"The ownership of silver by the Government again was largely decreased, in spite of the increase of the total stock of silver dollars in the country, by the coinage of 16 months. During the past few years the decrease of circulation caused by the cancelation of national-bank notes and by the deposit of money with the Treasurer by the banks to redeem their notes when presented for that purpose has been but little exceeded by the increased circulation of silver certificates and of standard silver dollars; thus silver seems to have filled the vacuum caused by the retirement of national bank circulation. The circulating medium in small denominations has been largely converted into silver certificates. And, finally, business has largely increased in the South and in portions of the

country where there are few banking facilities.

"All of these causes have cooperated to postpone any evil effects which might arise from a continued and excessive coinage of the silver dollar; but the danger still exists, and should be guarded against. This can be done by the adoption of the recommendation of my last report, viz, by fixing the maximum of silver which shall belong to the Government, and by providing that when it was exceeded by $5,000,000, the purchase of silver bullion should cease until the amount owned by the Government should be again reduced to such maximum, or by canceling United States notes to the amount of the excess over the maximum, provided the Government held the notes; if not, then by ceasing the purchase of bullion. Such plan, if adopted, would provide a safety valve which would be self-operative, and would assure the country against any possible danger from silver; for as soon as it exceeded the amount which could be absorbed in the business of the country, it would begin to flow into the Treasury in payment of taxes, and would be there held until business called for it, and when the Government's ownership fell below the maximum, the purchase of the bullion would again begin."

Now I quote President Cleveland's message of December 23, 1888, the last message, in which he says:

"The Secretary recommends the suspension of the further coinage of silver, and in such recommendation I earnestly concur. For further valuable information and timely recommendations I ask the careful attention of Congress to the Secretary's report."

We drift along a little further Mr. President, and I will insert extracts from President Harrison's message of December 3, 1889, in which he goes on to show how the lowering clouds of apprehension and danger had passed away and the country was in good condition:

"The evil anticipations which have accompanied the coinage and use of the silver dollar have not been realized. As a coin it has not had general use, and the public Treasury has been compelled to store it. But this is manifestly owing to the fact that its paper representative is more convenient. The general acceptance and use of the silver certificate show that silver has not been otherwise discredited. Some favorable conditions have contributed to maintain this practical equality, in their commercial use between the gold and silver dollars. But some of these are trade conditions that statutory enactments do not control, and of the continuance of which we can not be certain."

I refer now to his messages of 1890, 1891, and 1892, and to the finance reports.

President Harrison in his message of December 1, 1890, in referring to the Sherman law said:

"Some months of further trial will be necessary to determine the permanent effect of the recent legislation upon silver values, but it is gratifying to know that the increased circulation secured by the act has exerted and will continue to exert a most beneficial influence upon business and upon general values."

In his message of December 9, 1891, President Harrison says:

"I hope the depression in the price of silver is temporary, and that a further trial of this legislation will more favorably affect it. That the increased volume of currency thus supplied for the use of the people was needed, and that beneficial results upon trade and prices have followed this legislation I think must be very clear to everyone; nor should it be forgotten that for every dollar of these notes issued a full dollar's worth of silver bullion is at the time deposited in the Treasury as a security for its redemption.

* * * * *

"I am still of the opinion that the free coinage of silver under existing conditions would disastrously affect our business interests at home and abroad.

* * * * *

"The exports of gold to Europe which began in February last and continued until the close of July, aggregated over $70,000. The net loss of gold during the fiscal year was nearly $68,000,000. That no serious monetary disturbance resulted was most gratifying and gave to Europe fresh evidence of the strength and stability of our financial institutions. With the movement of crops the outflow of gold was speedily stopped, and a return set in. Up to December 1 we had recovered of our gold loss at the port of New York, $27,854,000, and it is confidently believed that during the winter and spring this aggregate will be steadily and largely increased."

It will be remembered that on the 14th of January 1891, the free and unlimited coinage amendment of my colleague [Mr. Vest] was passed by the Senate by 39 yeas—24 Democrats and 15 Republicans; to nays 27—1 Democrat and 26 Republicans; and was pending in the House of Representatives. What was done? The businessmen got up a banquet in New York and invited ex-President Cleveland—as he was then—to attend and address the meeting. I now hold in my hand the letter of Mr. Cleveland to Mr. Anderson, dated from 816 Madison Avenue, February 10, 1891, in which he says:

"I shall not be able to attend and address the meeting as you request, but I am glad the business interests of New York are at last to be heard on the subject."

The business interests of New York to be heard!

"It surely cannot be necessary for me to make formal expression of my argument to those who believe that the greatest peril would be initiated by the adoption of the scheme embraced in the measures now pending in Congress for an unlimited coinage of silver at our mints."

When that sentence was written, then he began to meditate, and then he puts in—

"If we have developed an unexpected capacity for the assimilation of a largely increased volume of currency, and even if we have demonstrated the usefulness of such increase, these conditions fall far short of insuring us against disaster if in the present situation we enter upon the dangerous and reckless experiment of free, unlimited, and independent silver coinage."

Yes, Mr. President, when he was writing that letter he began to think of the predictions he had made, beginning in 1885, and every solitary one of them not having been fulfilled, in whole or in part.

Mr. PLATT. What was the date of that letter?

Mr. COCKRELL. That was in 1891, February 10.

You see when he got into the middle of the letter he then began to reflect about the number of times he had made the same identical prediction, and every one of those predictions had failed. He then says:

"If we have developed an unexpected capacity for the assimilation of a largely increased volume of currency, and even if we have demonstrated the usefulness of such increase—"

Here is an open confession—"good for the soul"—to the world that the predictions he had made before had not resulted as he had anticipated, but that, on the contrary, the ignoring of them by us had been a blessing to the country.

But, Mr. President, why shall we not now, by amendment to this bill, establish such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States in the markets and in the payment of debts?

We have ample time; we have all the attainable data, all the information, facts, and figures necessary to enable us to prepare and legislate into existence a just, efficient, and sufficient monetary system, founded on the constitutional, old Democratic bimetallic principles.

The opponents of silver coinage answer in the doleful tone of their long and oft-repeated predictions and shuddering panicky apprehensions of dire consequences and untold evils to flow from the further coinage of silver. We are gravely and solemnly told—as we have been ever since 1878—that unless we stop all further coinage of silver dollars we will drive all the gold out of our country, and will have our country baptized with an overwhelming inflow of silver, and be driven to a single silver standard. They are the same old stereotyped prophecies. If there be any foundation for them in fact, there has been ample time since 1878 to prove them true or false.

Now we come to the cold facts and figures. Here we have had the predictions made ever since 1877 as to what was going to occur from year to year. Now let us take the cold recorded facts and figures, and see whether one solitary prediction ever has been fulfilled. Has gold been driven from our country out of circulation?

The finance report of Secretary Sherman of December 2, 1878, the first one made after the passage of the Bland silver law of February 28, 1878, shows (p. 9) that on April 11, 1878, he sold 50,000,000 4½-percent bonds, funded loan of 1891, at a premium of 1½ percent and accrued interest, less a commission of one-half of 1 percent, and that on November 23, 1878, there were in the Treasury, in excess of coin liabilities, $141,888,100 in gold.

Statement of gold coin and bullion and silver dollars and bullion in the Treasury and in circulation on the dates given

July 1—	Gold coin and bullion	Silver dollars and bullion
1879	$245,741,837	$41,276,350
1884	545,300,797	180,300,614
1885	588,097,050	208,538,967
1886	590,774,461	237,191,995
1888	705,818,855	310,196,450
1889	680,063,505	343,947,093
1890	695,563,029	380,083,304
1891	646,582,852	438,733,592
1892	664,275,335	401,057,518
1893	592,089,133	337,506,270

NOTE.—Gold coin and bullion in Treasury July 1, 1893, $188,555,433. Silver dollars coined, 419,232,450; out in circulation, 57,029,743; and in certificates, $330,957,504, leaving in Treasury only 31,345,203.

Oh, think of the conduct of these silver lunatics from 1878 to 1893. We have persistently ignored the recommendation of every President who has occupied the Executive chair. While every President and every Secretary of the Treasury has predicted that the country was going to destruction, that financial crises would envelop the whole country, we poor silver lunatics have stood and paid no attention to them, and yet the country has been prosperous and at rest. What would this country be today if you took the silver money, the coins and the certificates, out of it? Where would we have anything to circulate? We would not be in this crisis. No; but we would be in the deadly paralysis of a single gold standard, and the business of this country would be prostrate and shrivelled, tenfold worse than now. The silver lunatics said "No, we will not repeal it." And we did not. Had we obeyed their commands we would have brought ruin and disaster upon the country.

But now, Mr. President, if all these great statesmen and learned financiers—Secretary and ex-Senator (and now Senator) Sherman, ex-President Hayes, ex-President Arthur, Secretary Folger, Secretary McCulloch, President Cleveland, Secretary Manning, Samuel J. Tilden, the New York bankers who hoarded twenty-five millions of gold in 1885—if all and every one of these have, giving away to their fears and apprehensions,

made predictions which have not been fulfilled, and have every one of them been mistaken, as the records conclusively and beyond any reasonable doubt show, and all their predictions have been absolutely falsified by the record of subsequent events, is it, I ask, in common reason and sense, criminal, censurable, or improper in us plain, common people to suspect, to believe that they are now as much mistaken as then? Their predictions then were just as honestly and conscientiously made, with all the lights before them, as now. We do not question their honesty and sincerity, and their fears. They have up to this date been grievously mistaken in all their predictions. We just as honestly and sincerely believed then they were mistaken.

The facts and figures show we were correct and right in our views and judgments, and they were mistaken, wrong in theirs. Would it be wrong in us now to suggest to them our doubts of the correctness of their present apprehensions and predictions?

Misguided World Thinkers Peril America's Cause in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the cause of the Allies and our associates for which men are fighting gloriously and dying selflessly upon many fields in many continents is being gravely periled by misapplied thinking and misdirected activity by misguided world thinkers in this and the other capitals of our friendly powers.

Under the trite and meaningless shibboleth "we can win the war and lose the peace" there is being built up a monumental misconception which endangers what little unity exists among the United Nations.

In the interest of a pseudoidealism which totally disregards the practicalities of government and of international relationships we are creating a condition which will destroy the very things for which we are fighting—the right to live our own lives in our own way free from the constant threat of war and the constant danger of domination by outside influences.

At this time, when we are rejoicing at the victories so hard won by our men in north Africa, when we stand poised upon the brink of even greater enterprises by them in the interest of their own Nation, it is appropriate solemnly to warn our Government and those who are conducting it that to carry on their program of post-war planning at this stage is to breed a terrifying distrust among those associated with us and to endanger the immediate operations which are essential to our ultimate and complete victory.

All of our energies, all of our thinking, all of our diplomacy, all of our ability of reconciliation are essential right now to the prosecution of this war. They are essential right now to cementing the spirit of unity among the nations engaged with us. They are essential to avoid the splitting up of those nations, the stirring up among them of disastrous distrust of each other and each other's motives and objectives.

Those nations now have one and only one aim in common among them all. That aim is the defeat of those enemies who are united in fighting us on the field of battle.

Let us devote our thoughts and energies to attaining that aim, to reaching that goal. What follows will be taken care of when it arises. We cannot attempt to meet an unforeseeable future at the cost of a glorious present. We cannot in good sense imperil a victory while we seek a will-o'-the-wisp and a chimera of a world devoted to policies and principles which are totally inapplicable.

Ours is not the happiest coalition that ever existed. We are far from being United Nations in the full sense of that word. All of us do not have the same enemies in this war.

Russia does not have all of the enemies that the United States has. It has not presently any quarrel with Japan. Japan remains our own particular and personal enemy in this struggle.

Poland can scarcely be described as being united to Russia in the prosecution of the war as Russia sees it. They most assuredly are not seeking the same objectives outside of the immediate objective I spoke of above of beating to their knees the Nazis and Italians.

China is not at war with Germany, and France, stricken to the ground, cannot unite her own nationals who are still free behind one military and one political objective.

Britain, fighting shoulder to shoulder with us in Africa to our greatest glory so far in this war, has made it clear that her foremost enemy is Hitler, and he must be beaten before she will aid us in our fight against Japan. Prime Minister Churchill left no doubt about that in his memorable speech in Congress last week.

Yes, Churchill promised aid in the Pacific after Germany's defeat, but it must be remembered that Great Britain, like the United States, is a democracy, and it is possible that Mr. Churchill's cabinet may not be in power when Hitler is crushed.

After all, even great men die, and political complexions of Government change. Great Britain's government has once "changed horses in the middle of the stream" since Hitler went berserk.

What will the British people think, and how will they feel after being bled white in liquidating Hitler? Will they be as anxious, after Hitler's defeat, to fight the Japs as Mr. Churchill is now?

The Nazis are now only 15 minutes away from England, but the Japs are far, far away. America is the one nation that stands in immediate danger of attack by the Japanese.

I cite these differences not to criticize those alongside whom we are fighting in many countries and on many continents, but to demonstrate the lack of wisdom in placing too much reliance upon that popular misnomer "United Nations."

The inevitable result of trying now to fix a strait jacket of post-war decisions will be to promote further, rather than to curtail, the cleavages which exist among us.

When we proclaim that we can now solve the problems which will arise with the end of the war we are deceiving our own people, we are deceiving our associates, and we are blinding ourselves to the facts of nature and of history. Solve those problems now. Why, Mr. Speaker, we cannot even foresee what those problems will be.

It is a cruel deception and it may be a fatal mistake to pursue the thought that we must be ready to impose upon the world when the last gun is fired in this war a series of global alphabetical agencies which will make all men brothers and each man his brother's keeper.

The very insistence of some in high authority in this country upon such a course has already brought rebuke from some of those countries associated with us, from some of those countries from which we have the right to expect the closest cooperation.

The weak coalition of which we are a member cannot stand many such rebukes.

Further, we are, by our insistence upon forging now the chains by which some of us hope and expect to govern the world after the peace, promoting disunity and strife and bickering among our own people.

We are creating national, just as we are creating international doubt as to the singleness of our purpose to win this war by darting hither and thither into dream worlds which may exist in a more rarified atmosphere, but which have no existence upon the face of this hard and rugged earth.

Let us in these times of great opportunity for victory, in these times of untold suffering upon the part of our own and other nations, bring ourselves back to the hard task of fighting this war as it exists and as it has been thrust upon us.

That is what our principal associates are doing. Britain is fighting for the preservation of the British Empire. Her spokesmen leave no doubt as to that. Russia is fighting for the preservation of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. Her single spokesman makes that abundantly clear by his words and his mighty and useful deeds. China is fighting for the preservation of her mighty and ancient nation, to drive from her territory the invading host and keep him driven.

The overrun nations of Europe, so far as they can be said to be fighting through their governments in exile, are fighting for the restoration of their lands and their peoples and their own governments in their own capitals.

These are things worth fighting for. We honor them all for their valor and their determination and their devotion to their loyal and patriotic aims.

Only in certain circles in the United States are such aims held unworthy. Only in certain circles here is it held to be unworthy that the United States is fighting for the right to live its own life in its own way and to repel those who have attacked us and our right to live that life in that way.

Ask our soldiers, our sailors, our marines what they are fighting for. They do

not travel in the rarified circles to which I have referred. They will tell you, regardless of their rank, that they are fighting to whip our enemies, to avenge the sneaking and disastrous attack on unprepared Pearl Harbor. They will tell you that they are not fighting to establish international bread lines financed by the United States or global boondoggling similarly financed.

They want to beat our enemies as quickly and as thoroughly as possible and get back to their country.

There is nothing shameful about that. There is nothing unpatriotic about that. There is nothing inhumane about that.

Of course they want some kind of a guarantee of peace as long as such a guarantee can be obtained. But they are not cloistered in ivory towers. They know what the world is. They know what the peoples are with whom we must deal at the peace table. They know what their buddies in the other armies with whom they are bivouacked are fighting for. They know what the governments of those buddies stand for.

Mr. Speaker we have need, we have crying need for a concentration of all our best diplomatic thought and international politics on keeping a somewhat shaky coalition creaking along until our victory can be won. Let us use our brains, all of them, in that endeavor now, just as we are using all of our brawn to win the victory.

Let us not now peril the victories of north Africa, the victories of the Pacific and, pray God, the forthcoming victories on the continent of Europe by actions and conferences and pressures which can only be disruptive of the fighting unity which we must preserve if we ourselves are to be preserved.

In Further Defense of Leesville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. LEONARD ALLEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I addressed the House with reference to an article which appeared in the Washington Post recently criticizing the citizenship of the city of Leesville, La., which is in the Eighth Congressional District, which I represent. I included in my remarks statements from the mayor, the State board of health, and various citizens in denial of the allegations contained in the Post.

Soon after the article appeared in the Post, I called upon the War Department to make a thorough investigation of the charges and I requested the Department to advise me of its findings. The findings of the War Department were at considerable variance with the scurrilous article appearing in the Post and seem to me to complete the vindication of the good citizenship of Leesville. I quote the following from the report of the War Department:

Apparently the principal difficulties at Leesville were housing and sanitation, and these were the natural results of the rapid growth of Leesville from a village of less than 3,000 population to something in excess of 15,000, to which must be added a military population of many thousands stationed in the immediate vicinity. The local community apparently was without funds to effect necessary improvement, and even where improvements had been attempted they had been unable to secure the necessary equipment or material.

The following are extracts from an informal report that I have received:

Housing: Steps are under way to provide additional housing through the use of Federal funds. Federal officials are working with Leesville people who will proceed with the project. Lack of understanding of procedure, the main bar, is being removed. Allied with the housing situation is the need for paving, and this also is being solved.

Sanitation: Assistance is being provided the city for garbage collection. The paving project touches on sanitation which includes needed paving within the city, and to the housing settlement known as Lee Hill.

Venereal disease: The situation at Leesville is not as described in the press. Among the whites it is as good as elsewhere in the Eighth Service Command and is considered thoroughly under control. Among colored the situation is also comparable with colored venereal conditions elsewhere with great difficulty in controlling prostitution among colored women.

Workers Speak on Causes of Absenteeism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have clipped from the Lockheed-Vega Star, a paper published on behalf of the employees of the Lockheed and Vega Aircraft Corporation, an article which includes statements of five representative workers in these huge plants wherein they not only discuss some of the causes of absenteeism but also suggest some of the remedies that might be applied constructively.

I think it will be worth the reading of Members of the House.

YOUR JOB

(By R. Randall Irwin)

THIS IS YOU SPEAKING

This week you will write this column. What I say about your job is not important. What you think and say and do about it is all-important. Here is what you have to say:

Harold F. Blackmore, of Lockheed department 7-45, agrees with the recent remarks of C. W. Woodworth, as printed in this column, that uncertainty regarding the draft has contributed to unrest and the lowering of morale in industry. Says Blackmore, "Uncertainty regarding draft classifications is lowering morale. Clear this up and you will stop absenteeism."

Clair Roberts, of Lockheed dispatching department 1-35, agrees that uncertainty is one underlying cause of absenteeism, but he goes a step further to commend "the sincere person who makes every difficulty and problem his own. These are the kind of people who have been the foundation of Lockheed—the kind of people who cheered 'The Spirit of Lockheed-Vega Employees' on its way to England that December day of 1940. We cannot instill that spirit into the new employees unless we oldtimers show them what we mean by putting our personal ambitions second to the cause of freedom."

S. J. Thomas, of Lockheed engineering department 3-25, has no patience with blaming the Government for poor attendance. Says Thomas, "There exists a strong tendency to place the blame for everything unpleasant, including the weather, upon the Government, but I think the blame should be placed upon the individual, where it belongs, when his absence is not justified. A good soldier doesn't stop shooting in the middle of a tough battle because he doesn't know where he may be the next day. It is up to us to stay on the job and keep passing the ammunition to him in spite of the uncertainty existing in our minds as to our draft status."

Helen Lambert, of Vega engineering department 60, points out: "It is still necessary that people who are away from home from 7 a. m. until 6 p. m. eat, take care of their eyes, teeth, and health, and do a certain amount of shopping. If they are women with a family to look after, their problem is all the more serious. If they are not able to take care of these needs between 6 and 9 or 10 p. m., obviously they must take time from their work to do so. The absentee problem cannot improve unless more cooperation is secured from department stores, markets, banks, doctors, dentists, and oculists. An individual is powerless to do anything by himself, but a committee representing the companies interested could really do a lot."

John A. Lasley, of Lockheed tool inspection department 2-51, who has been absent only 1 day in 2½ years (and that absence due to a minor operation), suggests: "In the Army you receive a service stripe for each enlistment. We are soldiers of production, so why not give a service stripe or star to each employee who has not missed a day's work for a year?"

Are these your sentiments? Do Blackmore, Roberts, Thomas, Lambert, and Lasley speak for you?

Philip Allen Bennett

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. MILLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT, late a Representative from the State of Missouri

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, little did I realize when I spent a few enjoyable hours with PHIL BENNETT last December that today I would be paying a simple tribute to the memory of that lovable and admirable man.

I first came to know him when he was a candidate for the nomination for Governor of the State of Missouri. He had previously served his State with distinc-

tion, first as State senator, and later as Lieutenant Governor. Since then I knew him as a business executive in St. Louis and then as a Member of this body.

The positions of eminence in which the people of my State placed him is the most eloquent testimonial of their faith in and their fondness for him. His splendid character, his keen mind, and his kind heart combined to account for his distinguished position among contemporary Missourians.

PHIL BENNETT was a Christian gentleman. He loved decency and practiced it; he despised hypocrisy and condemned it; he held strong opinions and had the intellectual courage to sustai. them.

Sculptors of life are we
With our own lives uncarved before us
Awaiting the hour when at God's command
Our life dream passes o'er us.

When the life dream described by Oliver Wendell Holmes passed over PHIL BENNETT he awoke to find himself standing ready to chisel from the impenetrable to be, a living, breathing monument of integrity and truth. To have dreamed a dream, to have striven for the attainment of that vision and then to have at last come into a small degree of realization of one's ideals is a combination of pleasure and grief that fills the cup of the average individual. This was true of PHIL BENNETT. He had just reached life's high noon, when evening shadows suddenly fell across his pathway. He had brought to this House the rich experience of ripe legislative years. His deep devotion to his country and his constant concern for her welfare in this difficult hour made him a real sentinel in the watchtowers of our Republic. He was truly a public servant—laboring tirelessly and indefatigably for the people and the causes he loved. PHIL BENNETT loved his fellow men; this was the touchstone of his life, the secret of his success and his influence.

The honors that life heaped upon him did not make him haughty, and adversity could not make him despair. He had felt sunshine and sorrow, but this merely blended and balanced his noble nature.

He was incorruptible and honest. He was sincere and dependable. In any contest he was a worthy opponent, in any society he was genial and charming company, and in any life his was a friendship worth forming and keeping.

I shall always cherish with fondest recollection his memory and try to feebly emulate the fine example of his life and the high standard of public service which he has set. His death coming at any time would have been a tragedy. However, coming as it did, in the zenith of his life and as he was approaching the fullness of his capacity to serve, makes the loss to Missouri and the Nation more irreparable and profound. He leaves behind him perhaps the supreme achievement attainable by any man—a legacy of love and respect by all who knew him.

In the faith that I have I utter the sincere prayer that when his dying eyes began to read the mystic meaning of death he heard in the silence of the receding night the great waves breaking upon the farther shore, and upon his wasted brow he has already felt the breath of eternal happiness.

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was a real friend. The older Members of Congress, who have been intimately associated with him in the House can more appropriately and with more accuracy discuss his work as a Member of the House of Representatives. That he was a useful and constructive Member no one can doubt. He was one of the key men in the minority organization. One soon learned that he had the confidence of the members of both parties. He understood the mechanics of government and he had an understanding of public issues which only experience can teach.

The new Members, such as I am, look for guidance and for help in trying to adjust themselves to their new situation and to properly carry out their duties as a Member of the House of Representatives. Because of his position as Republican whip, but more because of his particular personality, we new Members soon came to look upon him as our friend. Perhaps I was more favored by his help than most Members. I had known him before coming; my district bordered his and the problems affecting California were common to our districts. Our association gave me the feeling of complete confidence in his suggestions and his advice. Soon I learned that he was a tolerant, kind, and understanding colleague. He not only was willing to help you, but he was one of those understanding friends who look at your problem from your viewpoint and your situation and from that outlook try to give constructive suggestions. It was a pleasure to sit down and talk to HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. With his wealth of experience he did not dogmatically outline what one should do in a given situation. He helped analyze the situation, he suggested the implications of certain courses of action, and in every way tried to give one rounded advice and suggestions.

It is for this reason that we had complete confidence in HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. His conduct and his discussions made us feel that we could rely on his guidance. It was prompted by that understanding consideration of our situation that made us feel that what he was suggesting was what he would do in a like situation. He was not a blind partisan. He would frequently suggest a course of action that would be contrary to party regularity. He was a great believer in the doctrine that a Member of the House should represent his constituents, especially on matters peculiar to their district or in those matters on which they had expressed themselves.

HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT came from that part of California known as the Mother Lode. He came from sturdy stock. He and his forbears were miners who dug from the bowels of the earth the gold that made the Mother Lode famous. He was steeped in the traditions of the Mother Lode, which has played such an important part in California and American history. He was imbued with the characteristics of the pioneers who developed California and who believed that every man must be honest, dependable, thrifty, and a hard worker. From the Mother Lode came much of the gold of the United States.

As a husband, father, and friend, HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was pure gold. While in the shadow of his death, his family will suffer greatly; yet there must be much consolation and tremendous satisfaction in the knowledge that their loved one contributed much to the happiness of his family and to his friends. The ways of Providence defy understanding, but it is comfortable to know that the loved one that has passed to the Great Beyond lived a kindly, useful, and understanding life. He contributed something of cheer and helpfulness to all who came in contact with him. He contributed to the great numbers who did not know him personally by his statesmanlike work as a Member of the House of Representatives for 17 years. What more can be said of any man than that he was a true friend? I believe I voice the sentiment of every person who ever knew him when I say that HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was a real friend to everyone that he ever met. His presence will be missed, but his kindness, tolerance, and understanding will always be remembered. His friendship stimulated in each of us our belief in the fundamental nobility of human nature.

Philip Allen Bennett

MEMORIAL ADDRESS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT, late a Representative from the State of Missouri

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute today to the memory of my late friend and colleague, Congressman PHIL A. BENNETT, of Missouri. Congressman BENNETT came into the Seventy-seventh Congress when I did. I soon became personally acquainted with him

and he was one of the very first Members I was to personally know and visit with regularly during the entire session of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

Congressman BENNETT stood for everything that is finest and best in American tradition. He understood people. He had a fine, clear understanding of what a democracy should be and at all times he was willing to make the extreme effort to see that his share was contributed in the promotion of a free government.

His outstanding ability and his sterling qualities won him, in the short time he was a Member of Congress, the grand esteem and the complete respect of every Member of the House. It was a privilege to know and to work with Congressman BENNETT. It was a great shock and a real disappointment to his friends to learn of his sudden passing. He had a great future in the Congress. Congressman BENNETT worked constantly in season and out of season for the people of his district. He was a conscientious Congressman and labored for his people as if his very life demanded that he give them this service. He understood men and understood the motives that moved them. He loved his country. He loved our institutions and was willing to give and to serve his people even at the risk of his own health. It was a great loss to the people of the Sixth District of Missouri. I am sure that we are all appreciative of the fact that it was an opportunity for us to have known this good man, and to his wife and children I extend my deepest sympathy and trust a kind Providence will give them the spirit and the heart to continue on in the service of their country.

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and unexpected death of our late colleague, Representative HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, brought not only passing sadness but genuine grief to all of us. HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT had no enemies. All who knew him were his friends. He was a man of truth, master of his own actions, and his behavior was always proof of this fact. He was not dependent and servile either on persons or opinions. Politically he was a Republican, and believed thoroughly in the fundamentals on which the party of his choice was founded. He had faith in our constitutional government, and on all occasions gave expression to that faith.

During the last few years public service in the Congress was especially difficult for HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. The political isms, the economic cross-currents ofttimes made constitutional thinking difficult. During this period it has been tempting to temporize with one's convictions on the ideals of government and the traditional American way of life. In these trying circumstances few Members have been more courageous than HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. While he was always resolute, yet he was ever gentle. Of course, he had a temper and, being human, he must at times have become impatient. Nevertheless any such annoyance was never apparent. Holding the responsible position of Republican Party whip, he was in close contact with all Republicans as well as the majority leadership. It seems anomalous that a political party whip in the Congress should receive both Republican and Democratic nominations in the primary; nevertheless, that is just what happened in HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT's case. In short, he was not offensively partisan and his constituents, regardless of political affiliation, trusted him. The distinguished son of a distinguished father, he acquitted himself well in the halls of Congress. He was especially proud of our great westland and in his passing that section of our country has lost a great advocate, and the entire country loses an able, fair, and just statesman.

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague—our friend in his better days—HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT, has gone. Humbly I arise, today, to express my farewell tribute to this, our friend and co-worker throughout the years; his memory is sacred to us all, and in this memorial we bow our heads and place a chaplet upon his sleeping brow—because he was a fine citizen, an outstanding patriot, a loyal and devoted American, a great statesman, and a loyal friend.

Representative HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT loved his home State of California. He was a part of that great Commonwealth, he loved her people, and her people honored him. His struggles in early life were there. He faced the hardships of life among this great citizenship, and, inspired by them, he forged his way to the front and to fame as a great statesman. He rubbed shoulders with the common people, and he shared their many problems as he carried the burden of their sorrows. He was ever solicitous, with all those about him, over the welfare of his country. Those who knew him judged well his sterling qualities as a great American, and he measured well the highest standard fixed.

Mr. Speaker, one of those I first met when I came here was HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT. He was so kind; his every thought was consideration for others—he appeared to want to help the Members who were new and without advice. In our many conversations I learned of his great distress over the threat of war, and after the war came, he was greatly disturbed as the days passed and our boys were meeting the hardships and the crisis of cruel war. He was sad, he was serious. His own son was at the front fighting for the preservation of our Nation, and his sadness was greatly augmented by this fact. Thus, I knew him, my esteemed friend, while under the stress of great turmoil, and I knew him in the veil of those finer intimacies which are forever reserved by each one of us for but a few, and I knew him when he expressed sound logic and statesmanlike utterances in his constant effort to solve the pending problems of his day. He loved his country. He was as kindly as he was brave.

My loyal friend—my constant friend—whose memory I will long cherish, lived a good life—he struggled onward with the constant weight of livid problems of the people before him. He was at his post serving his people, and the people of this Nation, when the final summons came. He was unafraid. Within the shadow of the Halls of Congress, where, throughout the years his struggle had continued, he calmly wrapped the draperies of his couch about him and laid down as if to peaceful happy dreams.

This was the end of his life work. His brilliant career was ended.

Mr. Speaker, HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT—who has labored among us—who was the whip of the minority in the House—who was the friend of man—has gone. We mourn his passing. Today, as a sad farewell, I pay my humble tribute to him—my friend—in the famous words spoken for an outstanding hero "This was a man!"

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, in this body we are prone to take our friendships as a matter of course. It is not until the Almighty lays his hand upon one we especially love and withdraws him from the ranks of the living that we begin to appreciate the debt we owe for a friendship no longer vouchsafed to us.

HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was one of the first of my California colleagues that I met on coming to Congress nearly 7 years ago.

His personality was such that I was attracted to him instantly. His pleasant disposition made captives of us all. I consider myself most fortunate in being able to work with him on matters of various kinds, all of benefit to the people of our State. So I shall miss him as I know he will be missed by the constituency he served so faithfully.

I have the belief that HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT has gone to a great reward in the Kingdom prepared for him; this will always temper the feeling of loss I share with his many friends in the passing of this kind and noble soul.

Frank Henry Buck

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ED. V. IZAC

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FRANK HENRY BUCK, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, FRANK BUCK, was one of the ablest men to come from the great State of California. He was a champion who guarded zealously the reputation of California and her products. A great producer himself, he was constantly striving to better the lot of those engaged in the agricultural industry of the West. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, he became an authority on taxation, and his fight to safeguard the rights of the community property States will not soon be forgotten.

The people of our State owe much to FRANK BUCK, for as long as his health permitted, he gave unstintingly of his vast store of energy to the solution of problems peculiar to our area. It was not until the last year of his life that, overtaken by illness, he was forced to slacken the pace of his former activities.

I like to remember him as a virile and courageous Member of the House of Representatives always trying to serve the best interests of his State and of the Nation. Divine Providence has seen fit to take him from us. May his soul rest in peace.

Philip Allen Bennett

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. ELMER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT, late a Representative from the State of Missouri

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Speaker, I knew PHIL BENNETT. We lived in the old Sixteenth Congressional District of Missouri and were closely associated together in political and official matters for many years. I served with him in the Missouri General Assembly while he was State Senator, and later Lieutenant Governor. I supported him when he ran for his party nomination for Governor in 1928. During his long years of public service he was devoted to the interest of his people. Not a dishonest act was ever charged against him. Political scandals rocked the State from border to border and involved many, yet not a breath of it ever tarnished his good name. The people trusted him. That is why he was elected to this House in 1940 and reelected by a greater vote in 1942. His untimely death deprived me of the privilege of serving with him in this great body of men and women. I fully intended to rely upon his good judgment and honesty of purpose as a guide in the discharge of my duties here. His faithful and honest record gave a living and forceful power to the candidacy of his son, our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, MARION BENNETT, at the special election in January 1943 that enabled him to carry every county in the Sixth District by an overwhelming majority. It has been my good fortune to know PHIL BENNETT as a friend and the good fortune of Missouri to have him for one of her able sons.

Philip Allen Bennett

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT, late a Representative from the State of Missouri

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, once again we have met to pay tribute to those of our associates who have passed to the great beyond during the last year. Among them is PHILIP A. BENNETT, or PHIL BENNETT as he was known to all of us. PHIL BENNETT'S service in this body was not long as the years go, but during his brief time here his agreeable and lovable personality, his keen intellect, his patriotism and his devotion to the public service made him an outstanding member.

PHIL BENNETT came here after a distinguished record of public service in his own State. He brought to this Body a valuable background of legislative training and a knowledge of public questions which can be acquired only through long experience. Aside from his public service PHIL BENNETT as an editor and citizen wielded wide influence in his State, of which he was a native son and a life-long resident.

I am sorry that I did not have the privilege of knowing PHIL BENNETT for a longer span of years. His passing was to me a distinct personal loss. I shall always remember him as an outstanding American, a Christian gentleman and a sincere friend.

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JAMES M. FITZPATRICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, again death has taken from our midst one of our most beloved colleagues, HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT.

Sixteen years ago when I first came to Washington I had the good fortune of meeting the late Congressman ENGLEBRIGHT and his dear wife, Grace. Through our many years of personal friendship and close association I learned on countless occasions the true warmth of his heart and the kindliness of his spirit. The longer I knew him the more I admired and respected him. Words are mere phrases and meaningless to me in attempting to say that which comes to my heart in the death of him whom I have known most intimately for many years. It was, indeed, an honor and privilege to know him.

We are all familiar with his untiring energy, his fine grasp of legislative procedure, his devotion to his country, and his ever-constant desire to do that which was fair and just. HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT leaves to those who mourn him the record of a distinguished legislator and the memory of a lovable character.

To his good wife, who was his companion and helpmate for so many years, and to his son, a naval ensign, at present serving his country somewhere on the high seas, we offer our loving sympathy. In our prayers let us beseech God to grant them that full measure of strength and fortitude necessary to bear their loss in the spirit in which he would have them bear it.

In the passing of HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT the State of California and the Nation have lost a great statesman; I have lost a very dear and close friend.

Philip Allen Bennett

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT, late a Representative from the State of Missouri

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, as we face a deep sense of personal loss, I rise to express my humble tribute to the life,

character, and achievements of my fine and devoted friend, the late PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT, of Missouri. It is a very high privilege to have extended to me the opportunity of bearing witness to the high esteem and the deep and abiding affection which our colleague of former days was held by the Members of the House of Representatives, and with that treasured memory before me I speak these few words in tribute of him who was a good citizen, a great patriot, a constant humanitarian, an outstanding statesman, and a fine and loyal friend.

Representative PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT loved the State of Missouri; he had the distinct honor of representing one of the districts of that great State; he loved the entire area of that great commonwealth of Missouri, and her people; the people were his friends, and he, likewise, was their friend. It was among them that he met and faced the vicissitudes and the pleasantries of life—he toiled among them—there he wended his way to fame and fortune—there he aided so materially in the molding of public opinion and the prevailing sentiment of the people. He rubbed shoulders with the common people. Their problems were his problems, and their sorrows were his sorrows. Thus, he became deep-rooted in his great and enduring affection for those about him. The people of his great State soon learned that he was a stalwart and loyal friend in whom they could repose their every trust and confidence.

When he first came to the House of Representatives, I soon became acquainted with my friend. We had our frequent conferences; I learned that he was greatly distressed because of the growing threat of war, and he was likewise greatly disturbed because of the threat to our future progress as a nation. He was not visionary. His arguments were couched in sound logic and based upon careful thought. It was in this very close association with my friend in his better days that I came to recognize in him those rare qualities which directly appeal to men. I knew him in the intimacies of those close and confidential contacts which are forever reserved by each one of us for but a few. I knew him in the stress of great turmoil and the depression from worry incident to the deliberation upon weighty problems of state; I knew him, too, when he reveled in the solemn meditations of sadness—when the heart bleeds, and the somber voice pleads for rest and solace; I knew him when he voiced expression and sound logic respecting the future of our Nation—the land he loved and the form of government he professed with unerring devotion. He was as kindly as he was brave. Thus I knew my friend in the days gone by.

My earthly friend, whose memory I will long cherish, lived as he died—and he died as he lived—with the unbending weight of livid problems of the people before him. He was at his post of duty serving his people and his country when the silent summons came. He was unafraid. Within the shadow of the Halls of Congress, where his last efforts in life were so timely and effectively exerted, he calmly wrapped the draperies of his couch about him and laid down as if to peaceful, happy dreams.

Thus the life work of this fine gentleman was ended. The brilliant career of this brilliant man was terminated.

Mr. Speaker, PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT needs no encomium. His life and his living of it stand before us in beauty and in splendor. My humble tribute to him—my friend—I give in the words spoken of a great hero, in the days gone by when it was said, "This was a man."

And of him I pay the added tribute, in the words of the master of verse—

> Behind the dim unknown
> Standeth God, within the shadow
> Keeping watch above His own.

Philip Allen Bennett

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ROBSION

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT, late a Representative from the State of Missouri

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in the greatest war of all time and official duties weigh heavily upon the Members of the House for consideration. Yet we honor ourselves in setting aside this day to pay deserved tribute of respect to our distinguished friends and colleagues, Hon. HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT, of California; Hon. FRANK H. BUCK, of California; and Hon. PHILIP A. BENNETT, of Missouri, who have answered their last roll call since our memorial service day of 1942.

The eloquent, inspiring and soul-searching speeches of our colleagues, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, and Mr. DIRKSEN of Illinois, who were selected to deliver the memorial addresses on this occasion, the prayer and benediction of our Chaplain, Dr. Montgomery, the vocal numbers rendered by Miss Doris Doe, and taps by Sgt. William Lamb, have made this one of the most beautiful memorial services I have ever seen. I feel impelled to submit my personal tribute to these colleagues.

I had been in close association in the House for a great number of years with the Honorable HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT. He was the Republican Whip, and by reason of his position and our close personal friendship in the House and service on various committees, I was brought almost daily in close contact with him, and was able to make an appraisal of his fine character as a man, his patriotic service to our country, his devotion to his friends, and his loyalty to his party. He was one of the finest and noblest men it has been my pleasure to know during all of my service in the House.

Our colleague, Mr. BENNETT of Missouri, was serving his first term but he had been re-elected for his second term. He had served as State Senator and as Lieutenant Governor in his home State of Missouri. Although his district had been represented by an able Democrat for a number of years, Mr. BENNETT was elected to the House in 1940 by a substantial majority and re-elected in 1942 by a greatly increased majority. He had already made his mark in the House as an honest, efficient and able legislator. He, too, had won the respect and esteem of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. We were greatly shocked and deeply grieved over his death, yet there is some consolation in the fact that his fine son, who is still in his twenties, was elected to take his father's seat in the House, and has already demonstrated he will, like his distinguished father, give to his district and to our Nation honest, able, faithful and patriotic service.

The House and the country sustained a distinct loss in the passing of our colleague, Mr. BUCK, of California. He sat on the other side of the aisle and was one of the outstanding leaders in his own party. Through the many years we served together I observed his uniform courtesy and gracious manner toward his colleagues, as well as his great industry and the fidelity with which he served his district, the people of California, and the Nation. The passing of Mr. BUCK, like our colleagues Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT and Mr. BENNETT, is universally mourned by their colleagues.

The splendid services these three distinguished colleagues rendered to their constituents and to our country will be an inspiration and a benediction to all of us.

In the last year the House lost only 3 Members, the Senate lost none. The year before the House lost 6 and the Senate 4, and 2 years ago the House and Senate together lost approximately 20 Members. We thank our Heavenly Father for having spared the lives of 432 Members of the House and the lives of all 96 Members of the Senate during the past year. May it be our good fortune that no one in the House or Senate during the next year will answer the last roll call, and that we may be spared and strengthened to give greater service to our country in this tragic hour.

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, May 13, 1943, God in His wisdom removed from our midst one of the most distinguished and outstanding Members in the Congress of the United States—HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT.

He was one of the most considerate and lovable men in the House of Representatives. For more than 10 years we served together in the whip organization of the Republican Party in the House. I was one of his assistants, which brought me in close contact and association with him. Through those years HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was always the courteous, faithful, gentle friend and public servant. I loved him as a brother. "He who does the gentlest deeds that he can, take him for the greatest gentleman." So wrote one of the world's greatest authors. When those lines were penned, the writer must have had in mind a man like HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT.

To him I went often for information and advice. From him always came uniform courtesy and consideration. To him I went often as a son to an exalted father to drink from his cup of caution and moderation. He was never too busy to extend to others the benefits of his experience and wisdom. He was a national figure. He was a great person and a staunch defender of the fundamental principles of our Government and our American way of life under them. He leaves a vacant place in the councils of the Nation that will not soon be filled. Endowed with great ability, he was faithful in discharging his duty and responsibility to his constituents, his country and his God. I am sure he so lived that he could draw "the drapery of his couch about him and lie down to pleasant dreams."

Among us he was a man of whom no one could say evil. He stood like a giant among men, young and old, as a symbol of goodness and for the higher and nobler things of life. He left behind a good name—no greater legacy can be bequeathed by anyone. He has gone to that realm where there is no middle aisle. All who breathe will share his destiny.

I have lost a faithful friend; his district, a devoted public servant; his State, a stalwart son; his country, a sublime patriot. The world and we who knew him best have been made better because he lived.

Hon. Phil A. Bennett, the Gentleman from Missouri

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT, late a Representative from the State of Missouri

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this day, May 26, 1943, has been set aside on the busy calendar of the House of Representatives of the United States to pay tribute to the Members who have recently been elevated to serve our Master in his Heavenly Kingdom. On December 7, 1942, I sat in the gallery of this House while the friends of PHIL. A. BENNETT, my father, paid eloquent tributes to his soul, which departed from our war-torn world on that fateful day. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, and again on January 7, 1943, carries tributes to PHIL A. BENNETT from those who knew him as a colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, a friend, and a loyal Representative for the Sixth Missouri Congressional District, his State and the Nation. Today I have the privileges of this floor and the honor to fill the office PHIL A. BENNETT occupied with such luster.

What can a son say for the record under these circumstances? There are those among my friends who do me the honor to say that I am fluent of speech. But, Mr. Speaker, my tongue is tied to a bursting heart and eloquence deserts me. There are sons who do not know their fathers. I knew my father. I worked with him and for him. From the time that I was a little boy I shared his hopes, his dreams, his ups and downs, his conception of duty to God and country. I knew his innermost thoughts. It was my privilege to serve as his secretary while he was a Member of Congress. In that capacity I had real opportunity to observe how seriously and with what devotion to duty he carried forward the responsibilities which made him a casualty of this war. Of boundless energy, he did too well and too long, for mortal man, the onerous duties required of his high office.

My father was, above all things, a Christian. He loved his family and his God. He was next an American patriot. In fact, I often think that his devotion to his country was of a religious nature. In this arena of debate and contention, the Congress of the United States, men naturally differ in their views. PHIL A. BENNETT had his views and he stuck to them. With him a principle compromised was a principle lost. He did not compromise where his country's future and safety were involved. All strong men have strong things said about them, and my father was no exception. But the people loved him for the kind of enemies he made. There could be no better testimony that they did so love him than the confidence they showed in him at the polls on election days and in attendance at his funeral. Of high and low estate, white, black, and yellow men, old men and young, rich and poor, paid homage to PHIL A. BENNETT, regarded him as a friend, and his sudden passing as a personal loss. He was humble; he was sensitive; he was honest; he was without prejudice and hate; he was fearless and forthright and clean. He had an unusual and winning personality which radiated his kindly soul and won him the confidence of a legion of friends.

He was always progressive and forward looking. For instance, he brought to his native county its first cylinder press, linotype, motion pictures, and automobile.

He was the kind of man the poet had in mind when he wrote:

God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue,
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty, and in private thinking.

Some men are known for their great estates. Others are known not for what they possess but for what they represent. My heritage is a rich one, not in dollars but in the things which count in the world. If as a Member of this body, as a man, an American, as a Christian, and as head of my family, I can pass to my sons the heritage which is mine from my father, I feel I will have lived a good life and fought a good fight. A day does not pass that I do not feel his firm but gentle presence. He lives.

'Tis not the whole of life to live,
Nor all of death to die.

I will conclude these remarks for there is nothing more I can say.

Well I know he waits not as of old—
I could not find him in the old time place—
I must pursue him, made by sorrow bold,
Through worlds unknown, in strange celestial race
Whose mystic round no traveler has told,
From star to star, until I see his face.

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, when the news reached me of the untimely passing of HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT I was absent from Washington on an official trip for the Naval Affairs Committee. It was a great shock to me, for Harry was one of my closest friends in Congress. I had known him for more than 14 years, and during that period was in almost daily contact with him.

In the spring of 1930 it was my good fortune to travel with him and his dear and devoted wife for more than 2 weeks, and I came to admire and respect him, not only as a loyal, kindly, and generous friend but as a sterling and able gentleman. He tendered great service to his party, his district, and to his country, and those of us who served here with him will miss him greatly. My sincere sympathy is extended to his son and to his dear wife, Grace. You have lost a devoted father and husband, the Nation has lost an able, conscientious legislator, and I have lost a true friend.

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. ROCKWELL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT, of California, we from the mining States of the West have suffered an irreparable loss. His training as a mining engineer with his practical experience in the mining industry of his State fitted him to become what he was, the leader of the metal mining group in Congress.

He was the best posted man in the House of Representatives on this subject and his advice and counsel were sought by Senators as well as Members of this body. It was my privilege to serve with him during this session and the last on the Mines and Mining Committee. His words always carried great weight with all members of the committee, and he was considered an authority on the gold mining industry.

The fact that HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was chosen to serve as Republican whip, a position second only to that of floor leader in importance, shows the confidence and respect that his Republican colleagues had for him. His years of legislative experience and his quiet understanding manner fitted him ideally for the position.

Those of us who represent the mining districts of the West will greatly miss the friendly, intelligent leadership he gave us in our efforts to protect these great industries. Not only his own State of California, but the Nation can ill spare such a man at this critical period in our Nation's history.

Philip Allen Bennett

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT, late a Representative from the State of Missouri

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, it was a distinct privilege to have served in the Seventy-seventh Congress with the late PHILIP A. BENNETT, of Missouri. I had reason to become acquainted with him early upon our entry at the same time in the Seventy-seventh Congress, for he represented the district in which my wife was born and reared, and my father-in-law, O. W. White, of Holden, Mo., was his friend. In the special election which was held to fill the vacancy caused by Mr. BENNETT's death, Mr. White was serving as an election official and was stricken in his final illness on the special election day, at which election his son, Hon. MARION T. BENNETT, was elected to succeed his father.

PHILIP BENNETT brought with him to Congress a measure of ripe experience both in business and political life. He was one of the new Members of the Seventy-seventh Congress who early established himself as an able and conscientious Representative in that Congress. He not only spoke persuasively and eloquently but he had a gift of writing which is given to few men.

It is a historical fact that during the days of the Seventy-seventh Congress preceding and immediately following the entry of this country into World War No. 2, the responsibilities of the Congress and the individual Members were tremendous. Their hours of labor were long and involved and weighed down with responsibilities. I know that PHILIP BENNETT loved this country and his concern for this Government and for the best interests of the people whom he had the honor of representing weighed upon him heavily. Unquestionably the heavy burden which he bore drew heavily upon his strength and we all know how generously he gave of that strength. To the end he carried on like the good soldier that he was. He died in the service of his country and his countrymen.

I personally feel a great sense of loss in the passing of Mr. BENNETT. His death is a loss that is difficult to replace for he was a splendid gentleman, an able and conscientious Congressman. This country is a better country because he lived in it.

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the twenty-sixth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. In this installment the Senator refers to the contention of the leading economist of that day and the generally accepted theory that opening the United States mints to the coinage of silver would engulf our national monetary system with a deluge of silver that would flow in from all over the world to reduce the people of the United States to a Mexican and Chinese economic basis—a fallacy that it remained for the test of the war demands of this late day to disprove.

The twenty-sixth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

Is it not time, after the lapse of over 15 years, that these calamity howls shall be brought to a halt? We hear a great deal in the eastern press about the calamity howlers out West, but if there have ever been any calamity howlers in the West equal to those of Wall Street and the East I should like to have them pointed out. Ever since we took away from them their idol, their god—a single gold standard—they have deluged this country and the press with their calamity howls of the crises and the impending dangers. Talk about a populist in Kansas being a calamity howler. Put him by the side of a New York banker and he would sneak away in shame. [Laughter.]

So much for the assertion that the coinage of silver will drive gold out of the country and bring us to a silver standard. But our opponents say we have only had limited coinage of silver, and that if we give to silver unlimited coinage with full legal tender, then we will certainly be deluged with an overwhelming mass of silver from every nation, kindred, and tongue, and will have piled into our mints all the old silver spoons, forks, teapots, and plate generally, in addition to the great mass of silver coins now in the various nations.

This is a mere guess, assertion, prediction, prophecy. It can only be determined absolutely by the trial. We can only ascertain all the available data, facts, and figures, and then by reasoning—guided by the past and the probabilities of the future—form our conclusions and make up our judgment.

First. Will the silver plate in the world be dumped into our mints? No one denies that a large amount of silver bullion and coin has been consumed annually in industrial uses, in ornaments, in manufactures, and in fine arts.

Is it so consumed in anything near its purity? Certainly not. It is debased, mixed in greater or less proportion with baser metals, and in its present condition could not be received under any ordinary mintage laws for coinage. It would then be absolutely necessary to have the silver extracted from the baser metals, and when purified, then present for coinage.

Now, is not the silver so used in the existing plate, ornaments, etc., more valuable in the plate, etc., than it would be after paying the cost of extraction and losing the entire value of the manufactures in which it exists? There certainly can be no reasonable doubt of this.

The quantity of silver consumed in industrial uses which would ever find its way to our mints would be infinitesimally small and of no consequence whatever. This pretended claim is simply made as a burlesque to bring ridicule and contempt on the silver cause.

Second. Let us now consider how much of the silver coins in existence in other nations would come to our mints. Would we be flooded with the silver from India? According to our Mint Bureau there are $900,000,000 in silver in India, in the rupee silver coins.

The population of India is 280,000,000, and they have only a small fraction over $3.21 per capita, and the silver rupee is their absolute money, with full legal tender at the ratio of 15 of silver to 1 of gold, and at that ratio has full debt-paying and purchasing power, and for ages past has been their only full legal-tender money, used in all the varied and multitudinous transactions and exchanges. The quantity of silver there in the rupee coins—the full equivalent of the dollar—brought here and placed in our mints for our coinage at 16 to 1, would be 6.2 cents less than $1, and that amount would be an actual loss on every dollar's worth besides the cost of transportation, insurance, and interest during time in transit and up to its recoinage here.

Would it pay them to suffer these losses? In view of their financially embarrassed treasury it certainly would not. The Indian Government could not afford it, and private citizens would certainly not. And it is practically all in circulation among the people

and belongs to them and not to the government. It is their coin money.

Besides all these facts the people have not a sufficient quantity to meet the wants and demands of their daily transactions. Yet we are told that we are to be flooded from India. It is a mere chimera. Certainly there could be none from India.

China, with a population of 400,000,000, has, according to our Mint Bureau, $700,000,000 in silver, which is just $1.75 per capita.

Can anyone believe that there is any danger of a flood from that source? The silver there is in the hands of the people, in bullion largely, simply in pieces of silver and used as money in the ordinary business dealings. It is not reasonable to suppose there is any probability of that silver, in whole or even in part, coming to our mints.

In the Straits Settlements, population not given, there is estimated to be $100,000,000 in silver scattered throughout that country in the hands of the people, used as their only money, and so used for ages past. There cannot reasonably be expected any deluge from that source.

In Japan, with a gold coinage of $90,000,000, and $50,000,000 of full legal-tender silver coined at the ratio of 16.18 to 1, and a population of 40,000,000, and $56,000,000 of uncovered paper currency without any gold or silver redemption reserve, the silver is only $1.25 per capita, scattered among the people and in constant use in their business affairs, as standard money equal to gold, and to the use of which they have long been accustomed. If sent here for coinage their silver dollars would only contain 1.01 cents more than our dollar, and this 1.01 cents per dollar would not compensate the expenses of transportation insurance, and loss of interest. No one can reasonably expect any overflow from Japan. Their dollars would be worth no more here recoined into our dollars than they are in Japan.

In South America, with a population of 35,000,000, they have $45,000,000 of gold and $25,000,000 of full legal-tender silver coined at the ratio of 15½ to 1. The amount of silver there is only 71 cents per capita, and besides this they have the enormous sum of $600,000,000 of uncovered irredeemable paper currency, and need and require many times more silver than they have for their daily business transactions. There cannot reasonably be any fear from that source. Their silver dollars at the ratio of 15½ to 1 contain 3.1 cents less than ours, which would be an actual loss on every dollar.

In Mexico, with a population of 11,600,000, they have $5,000,000 of gold and $50,000,000 of full legal-tender silver dollars, coined at the ratio of 16½ silver to 1 gold, and two millions of uncovered paper. Their silver is only $4.31 per capita; is their only circulating coin money in the hands of the people, used time immemorial as money. Their silver dollar contains 1.3-plus cents more silver than ours. Being our near neighbors it is probable that small quantities of their silver coinage might find their way to our mints, but it would be no deluge, and no material amount.

In Egypt, with a population of 7,000,000, they have $100,000,000 of gold and $15,000,000 of limited legal-tender coins at a ratio of 15.68 to 1. Their silver is a subsidiary coin, and amounts to only $2.14 per capita, and is in the hands of the people—used as money in the ordinary business transactions. There would certainly be no deluge from that source, as their dollar contains 1.93 cents less silver than ours. There could be no motive for sending their coin here.

Turkey, with a population of 33,000,000, has $50,000,000 of gold, and $45,000,000 of limited legal-tender silver coins—only $1.36 per capita. Their silver coins are in the hands of the people, widely scattered over a large area, and are in constant use in their daily affairs, and all coined at the ratio of 15.1 to 1. The loss on every dollar would be about 5.6 cents. I cannot see any probability of any deluge, or even light shower, of silver from that country.

Russia, with a population of 113,00,000—doubtless underestimated—has $250,000,000 of gold and $22,000,000 full legal-tender silver coins coined at the ratio of 15½ to 1, and $38,000,000 of limited legal-tender silver coins, coined at the ratio of 15 to 1, with the immense sum of $500,000,000 of uncovered paper currency, practically irredeemable and below par. They have use for much more silver than they have. The actual loss on every dollar of their full legal-tender silver would be 3.1 cents and on their limited legal tender would be 6.2 cents. Their paper currency is redeemable in their silver coins. In this financial condition is it reasonable to suppose that any part of the silver coins of Russia now in the hands of her vast population, widely scattered over her vast domains, would be gathered up and sent here to our mints? It seems to me only reasonable and almost absolutely certain that no part of her silver would flow into our mints.

The Scandinavian Union, with a population of 8,600,000, has $32,000,000 of gold, and $10,000,000 of limited legal-tender silver coins at a ratio of 14.88 to 1, and $27,000,000 uncovered paper currency. This silver is a subsidiary or minor coin amounting to $1.16 per capita. If these silver coins were sent to our mints the loss on each dollar would be 6.3 cents. These silver coins are in constant use in all money transactions in limited sums, and no part of it can be spared or sent to our mints.

The Netherlands, with 4,500,000 population, have $25,000,000 of gold and $61,800,000 of full legal-tender silver at the ratio of 15½ to 1, and $3,200,000 limited legal-tender silver coins at the ratio of 15 to 1, with $40,000,000 uncovered paper. Neither their silver coins nor their paper currency are convertible into gold. All their silver coins are in circulation as money in the hands of the people. If their full legal-tender silver coins were sent to our mints the actual loss on each dollar would be 3.1 cents, and on each dollar of their limited legal-tender silver would be 6.2 cents. There is no possibility with such a small amount of silver that they will ever be able to spare it. In addition to that, it does not belong to the government.

Austria-Hungary, with a population of 40,000,000, has a stock of $40,000,000 in gold, according to our Mint Bureau, which I think is much below the actual amount, as that government has been grabbing for and accumulating gold for some time past, having proposed in 1891 to establish the single gold standard, and having established it in August 1892. They have $90,000,000 of full legal-tender silver coined at the ratio of 13.69 to 1, and $260,000,000 uncovered paper currency, according to our Mint Bureau, but which I think far below the actual amount, as they had at the beginning of 1892 about $345,000,000 of such uncovered paper currency.

Their silver coins are only $2.25 per capita, while their paper currency is from $6.50 to $8.62½. Their paper currency, as well as silver, has been inconvertible. It is doubtless their intention in the end, when their finances will justify, to retire some of their paper and make the remainder redeemable and convertible.

Even with their recently established gold standard, it does not seem reasonable or probable that they can resume coin redemption of their uncovered paper, and dispense with their comparatively small amount of silver coins—only $2.25 per capita—gather their silver into the government treasury and send it to our mints for coinage. It would certainly involve a serious loss, amounting to 14.4 cents on every dollar, which any government in the financial stress of Austria, with a national debt of $70 per capita, would hesitate to suffer and could ill afford to incur this loss and send that silver out of the country. There certainly need be no serious apprehension of any overflow from that country of silver to our mints.

Portugal, with 5,000,000 population, has forty millions gold, ten millions limited legal-tender silver money at the ratio of 14.08 to 1—only $2 per capita, and forty-five millions of uncovered paper money. On every dollar of their silver sent to our mints the actual loss would be 14.35 cents. It is certain there would be none sent to our mints.

Spain, with a population of 18,000,000, has 40,000,000 gold, 120,000,000 full legal-tender silver coined at the ratio of 15½ to 1, and 38,000,000 of limited legal-tender silver coined at the ratio of 14.38 to 1, and 100,000,000 of uncovered paper money. In addition to this uncovered paper, $5.56 per capita, Spain has a national debt of over $70 per capita. The full legal-tender silver is $6.66 per capita and the limited legal tender is $2.11 per capita. On every dollar of the full legal tender the actual loss, if recoined in our mints into our dollars, would be 3.1 cents, and on the limited tender 10.1 cents.

Is Spain in the financial condition to gather into her treasury any considerable portion of her silver coinage from its circulation among a tax-ridden people, dollar for dollar with any and all other money in their hands, and dump it into our mints at the actual loss I have named? There can be no reasonable or well-founded apprehension of any such action.

Switzerland, with 3,000,000 population, has 15,000,000 of gold. Eleven million four hundred thousand full legal-tender silver money coined at the ratio of 15½ to 1, and $3,600,000 limited legal-tender silver coined at the ratio of 14.38 to 1, and 14,000,000 uncovered paper, nearly equal to all her silver.

The actual loss on the full tender coins on every dollar, if sent to our mints, would be 3.1 cents, and on the limited tender 10.1 cents. All her silver is only $5 per capita, and is in the hands of the people, equal to gold and as current money in that country as gold. There can be no reasonable grounds to believe any portion of it will be dumped into our mints.

Italy, with 31,000,000 population, has $93,605,000 of gold, 16,000,000 full tender silver at a ratio of 15½ to 1, and $34,200,000 limited-tender silver at 14.38 to 1, and $163,471,000 uncovered paper, besides a per capita national debt of over $75. Their paper is at a discount. Their full-tender silver is only 51 cents per capita, and their limited tender only $1.10 per capita, combined only $1.61 per capita. No one can reasonably expect any of this silver money to be dumped into our mints, the actual loss being 3.1 on full tender and 10.1 on limited tender.

Belgium, with 6,100,000 population, has, according to our Mint Bureau, sixty-five million gold, a largely overestimated sum according to Indian Currency Commission's report, and $48,400,000 full tender silver at ratio of 15½ to 1, and $6,600,000 limited tender silver at ratio of 14.38 to 1, and fifty-four millions uncovered paper, and in addition a national debt of over $60 per capita.

The actual loss on every dollar of her full-tender silver sent to our mints would be 3.1 cents and on the limited tender 10.1 cents. Certainly Belgium is in no financial condition to gather up from the hands of the people using and passing her silver equally with gold and dump it into our mints at the losses indicated.

Now, I go to Germany. Germany is the greatest scarecrow for deluging us with untold masses of depreciated silver so-called. There is the country that is going to flood the world with its surplus silver. Germany has a population of 49,500,000, and according to our Mint Bureau, has six hundred millions in gold, an overestimate of probably fifty millions, according to Indian Currency Commission reports. She has, notwithstanding her single gold standard, one hundred and

three millions of full legal tender silver thalers or dollars, as estimated by our Mint Bureau, coined at the ratio of 15½ to 1, in circulation upon a perfect equality with her gold, equal to gold in the payment of all debts and in all purchases, and only equal to $2.08 per capita, and one hundred and eight millions of limited legal-tender silver coined at the ratio of 13.957 to 1, and an uncovered paper circulation of $107,000,000. The per capita of the limited tender silver is only a fraction over $2.18.

In 1890, according to Eleventh Census Report, the German Empire proper had a debt of only $85,181,250, but the States of Germany had a combined debt of $1,874,437,972 owing in different amounts by the several States.

If the German full legal-tender silver were dumped into our mints, the actual loss on each dollar would be 3.1 cents, and on the limited tender 12.7 cents. Consider her indebtedness, Empire and States, her one hundred and seven millions of paper money without any gold or silver coin on hand for its redemption, and her $2.08 full legal tender per capita and her $2.18 limited tender per capita, only $4.26 combined, per capita, and the actual and unavoidable loss to be incurred in sending her silver coinage to our mints, while the coin at home is circulating side by side with gold, and it seems to me certain that there can be and would be no deluge of silver from Germany.

There has been so much said about the silver in Germany that I must beg the indulgence of the Senate to not rely simply upon the reports of our Mint Bureau, but to go to the official records, and see whether the Mint is right, and see whether there are $103,000,000 there of full legal tender. I confess we have all been under that impression. I spoke to my friend the Senator from Iowa, Mr. Allison, and asked him if he could give me any estimate of what was stated in the Brussels conference. I had read the report of the Brussels conference, and had found that the German representatives there had submitted a table and that it was not printed with the proceedings, although it was stated that it would be printed. I then went back to the report of the Monetary Conference of 1881, and I will now read from that report the official statement of the German representatives in that conference:

"EXHIBITS OF THE FIRST SESSION—EXHIBIT A

"(Presented by Baron Von Thielmann)

"A STATEMENT OF THE MONETARY SITUATION IN GERMANY"

I will not read this, because we all know she changed from a single silver to a single gold standard and introduced a new coin as her standard, a gold mark. Then she made the silver coins of 5, 3, and 1 mark and 50 and 20 pfennigs, and called in the silver coin, and the world has been scared with what she had ready to dump on it ever since. I will read from pages 17 and 18:

"If the provisions of the present monetary statutes should be completely carried out, and if, by reason thereof, the sales of silver should be resumed, the Imperial Government would need to dispose of only so much of the four hundred and ten or five hundred millions of marks in thalers now in circulation, as well as of the bar silver which it has held since 1879, as might not be required for the augmentation of the circulation of subsidiary silver coins.

"As has been stated in the above title I, the total amount of imperial silver coins must not, under the present law, exceed 10 marks per capita of the population of the Empire.

"The latter, however, having increased between the census of December 1, 1875, and that of December 1, 1880, from 42,727,372 to 45,194,172 souls, making a gain, therefore, of 2,466,800 souls, it becomes possible, at this date, under existing legislation to augment by about 25,000,000 of marks the mass of silver coins struck up to the present time, and which amounts to 427,000,000 of marks. But, besides this, the Imperial Government has recognized, since the year 1880, the propriety of raising the rate of the fractional coinage from 10 marks to 12 marks per capita of the population, in case the monetary reform should be allowed to take its course.

"If this new rate bebased upon the total of the present population of Germany, it would be necessary to coin a further sum of 115,000,000 of marks in silver money, and this would absorb the 31,000,000 of marks in silver ingots."

Referred to here. That is all they had in bullion—31,000,000 of marks in bullion. He says:

"And this would absorb the 31,000,000 of marks in silver ingots which are now on hand, and 73,000,000 of marks in thalers now actually in circulation.

"There would remain to be sold, including seventy-four to eighty-one millions of marks in Austrian thalers, a mass of three hundred and thirty-seven to four hundred and twenty-seven millions of marks; that is to say, of 3,740,000 to 4,740,000 pounds of fine silver.

"If the Austrian thalers be left out of the calculation, there would only remain to be disposed of two hundred and sixty-three to three hundred and forty-six millions of marks, or, in other words, 2,920,000 to 3,840,000 pounds of fine silver."

Winning the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at a win-the-peace radio rally in New York Times Hall, New York, May 23, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Twenty-odd years ago America and all the world thrilled with joy. Victory had come to our armed forces. Right had prevailed over might. The war to end wars was itself ended.

Today some men speak with sarcasm and irony of that triumph. But no sarcastic words come to my lips tonight. The only irony I perceive is that terrible irony of fate which makes a world pay in blood because men failed 20 years ago to make their victory final and complete. War was not ended. The world was not made safe for democracy.

In saying this, I am not attempting to place blame anywhere for the chaos which exists everywhere in the world today. What happened 20 years ago can not be undone now. No speculation as to what might have been can correct present conditions.

But a knowledge of what has transpired since November 11, 1918, may stand us well in hand today, and in the days which lie ahead. Mistakes of the past should at least help to prevent a repetition of those costly and deadly errors.

We live in our own history-making days. Regardless of the past, we have our chapters in the history of men to write. Decisions of tremendous import must be made by this generation. The destiny of all men may rest upon the wisdom with which men of today meet the problems of today and tomorrow. Because some other generation may have failed in its day of opportunity cannot excuse failure on our part.

In fact, the responsibility which lies upon the men of today is even greater than that which rested upon the men of yesterday. We have lived in two world wars during our brief lifetimes. They had lived in but one. We have seen the conquered rise to greater heights of might to strike with unparalleled strength, violence, and ruthlessness. They believed the conquered had been beaten and subdued. They had only foresight to guide them. We look back and see events as they have transpired. What perhaps they should have foreseen, we have actually experienced. Our responsibility is greater than was theirs.

That responsibility must not be avoided if it could be. It must be met fairly, with earnestness, conviction, and courage. It cannot be met in any spirit of partisanship. Every consideration save that of welfare for country and for the world of men must be eliminated. Great as may be this responsibility, its opportunity is even greater. Perhaps no generation of men has ever had a more splendid chance to serve their countries and the world than the one which is presented to the men of today.

On the battlefield, our men carry their responsibility at the risk of life itself. Their victories must not be lost by us. It is our part to make the success of their arms complete by establishing plans and methods which will substitute law among nations instead of force which exists today. War can be conquered. It must be conquered. Either we conquer war, or war conquers us. Permanent peace, established upon foundations of law and justice can come to the world. Through men, war came; by men, war must be driven from the world.

In this search to find some preventive for war, we draw no rosy picture of Utopia. We are not idle dreamers, seeking an easy path to peace. Coldly and realistically we face the world as it is today, convinced beyond any shadow of a doubt that men must find some way to set up a system of law and order among nations. We dare to think and talk of those plans now, even while war rages. We do not subscribe to the thought that the security of the world must await the end of battle.

The picture is not hopeless. As a short step toward finding some method of preventing war and eventually providing a complete cure, several Senators of the United States have sponsored a resolution which at least tends toward the coordination of the great minds and forces of the world in a supreme effort to utilize the same strength and vigor used today in waging war, to prevent wars in the future.

The first declaration of the resolution which Senators BALL, HILL, BURTON, and I introduced on March 16 last, states that the entire military and economic resources of all the member nations must be used to prosecute and win the present war. That declaration was included because every person realizes and agrees that the gangster nations who hope to conquer, subdue, and enslave all men must be defeated on every battlefield and on every front. That defeat must not be a partial defeat; it must be an utter and complete rout of all nations who would use power and might to gain their objectives and oppress weaker nations and peoples.

In our resolution, the Senate of the United States is asked to declare itself as favoring this unalterable purpose. Surely the Senate will not disagree to this pronouncement.

Secondly, we suggest the establishment of temporary governments in Axis-controlled areas of the world until permanent governments can be set up. This is another simple

provision with which all men will surely agree. We only want to establish temporary civil governments until the people of the occupied areas can choose and set up the government of their own kind and choice. To this provision, the Senate must wholeheartedly agree.

In the third clause, we provide for the administering of economic rehabilitation to the occupied and devastated nations of the world. Of course this country of ours is going to do in the future as it has done in the past everything possible to relieve the want and suffering of weak and oppressed peoples wherever they may be, but our resolution declares that this should be the task of the United Nations, not of America alone; that whatever relief and assistance are given should be extended in a businesslike, orderly manner through the regular organization of the United Nations. It should not be given in what may be a too lavish manner, a manner which is and has always been prompted by our natural kindness and generosity. Regardless of these admirable qualities of the American people, kindness and generosity should be extended according to businesslike and regular methods, and should be shared by all of the United Nations and not by the United States alone.

The fourth and fifth clauses provide for the establishment of procedures and machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes among the nations of the world, and to provide military force sufficient to suppress military aggression by any nation. Here lies, of course, the heart of the resolution. Without some method or means of settling disputes among nations according to principles of law and justice rather than by the strength of military might, the world is without any hope of peace.

The history of man is the history of disputes and wars. Probably there are no means whatever by which disagreements can be prevented. Surely there must be some method to settle those differences other than by war. If such peaceable methods are not evolved and provided, war remains in the future as it has been in the past, the only way of settling whatever differences may arise, though those differences be great or small. Argument here seems unnecessary. Will the Senate hesitate to so declare?

In this resolution which we have suggested, we are not attempting to chart an exact course for the world to follow. We do not seek to organize the world according to our own desires or plans. We do propose strongly, vigorously, and earnestly that the Senate of the United States, which has an equal share in the treaty-making power, go on record now favoring a program such as we have outlined. After all, it is only a bare outline, but behind its purposes lie the strength and support of America.

It is said that the Senate should not take the action we propose now; that to attempt such action might lead to bitter and prolonged debate; that the part of wisdom, therefore, is to do nothing.

We live today in a dangerous world. The course we propose may have dangers attending it. But the most dangerous course of all is that of doing nothing. Our own country is in a position to lead the nations of the world We possess every element of strength, all the resources, supplies, industry, power, and men required by our allies to win the war. Shall this vast strength and all of these vast resources be used only to conquer the enemy? Should they not now be used as weapons against war itself? We believe that used now, these weapons will be effective; postponed until after the war is over, until after our men have returned, our guns are silenced, and our industries are idle, our position of advantage is gone. The day of our leadership ends. Let not this opportunity be lost, lest it not return again until some other generation faces and fights even a more deadly war than we face and fight today.

Farm Income and Its Relation to Our National Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the United Farmers of Illinois:

Every good thing we enjoy in life—if we except the air that we breathe and the light from heaven—comes from our soil and streams and is the result of some man's toil. This is the wealth of this or any other nation. Money is not wealth and should only be given to any man as a receipt for the production of wealth or a service to society. It need not have any intrinsic value, but something to use as a medium of exchange, and should be issued only as provided by our Constitution, by the Congress, as Representatives of the sovereign people.

No Congress, legislature, or city council produces any wealth nor can they distribute wealth without first having taken the wealth from the producers of wealth by taxation. Government in itself, as Thomas Jefferson expressed it, "is a necessary evil," and it follows, the more government the greater the evil, as it requires a larger portion of the producers' wealth to maintain it.

Governments were created by men to serve man, to preserve life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which can only be enjoyed by giving ourselves the opportunity to produce wealth and enjoy the fruits of our labor. This is a divine right without any restrictions unless they conflict with the rights of others.

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration farm program must be fundamentally wrong, for how can we have more if we are going to produce less? The first requisite of man is, when and where do we eat. It must be equally wrong to tax the taxpayer to secure the money to pay the farmer a dole to produce less of what the taxpayers want more of—food and clothing, not to mention that portion of the taxpayers' money being given to these Agricultural Adjustment Administration committeemen in salary and expenses.

In the remote past, when some man first planted a seed in the ground and watched it develop, that man laid the foundation of civilization, as that was the beginning of agriculture. Business, industry, transportation, and finance are only a result of that act. Agriculture did, and can, exist before any other industry, but no industry can exist without agriculture.

Today agriculture produces 82 percent of all new raw wealth, comprises 24 percent of the Nation's population and receives less than 10 percent of the Nation's wealth so evidently something is wrong with our economy, when the men who produce our wealth do not receive an equitable share. The reason is simple. The farmers have been willing to produce it, but then they have allowed a few crafty politicians and false farm leaders to do the dividing, so they have only themselves to blame. Jefferson said it is eternal vigilance that is the price of liberty.

"THY WILL BE DONE"

If the object of mankind is to secure the greatest amount of the good things in life, if we are striving to make "Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven," then should we not produce in an abundance of all the good things in life, such as food, clothing, shelter, homes, schools, and churches? How can anyone holding a Christian ideology approve of throwing back into God's face His gifts to mankind, as we did when we killed the 6,000,000 little pigs, plowed under corn, cotton, and wheat? Were these farm products a curse that we refused to accept? Will a just God punish us for our sins?

If we can believe the Bureau of Agricultural Economics at Washington we never did produce enough wheat, hogs, or corn to supply our own needs and the requirements of our export market, for during the years 1930 to 1939 we lacked 72,100,000 bushels of having a sufficient amount of wheat, and it was during this period when we penalized our American producer of wheat, 49 cents a bushel, if he grew more than some little Hitlerite allocated him.

With sugar and rubber, a similar condition existed and as soon as the enemy began to sink our ships, it was necessary to ration the American people, even after we had boasted about our ever normal granary. We are sending our scientists to Latin America to teach them how to produce agricultural products. Secretary Wickard admitted at a hearing held before the Agriculture Appropriations Committees of Congress that the Agricultural Adjustment Administration had not aided the farmers and that it lacked at least $2,000,000,000 a year of bringing farmers parity income.

WHAT MUST WE DO TO BE SAVED?

When the farmer goes into the market place to buy any commodity, the producer of that article sets the selling price, which is based upon all costs plus a reasonable profit. That is our American way of life, which we call our capitalistic system. Even a so-called farm organization here in Illinois that is engaged in commercial enterprises and boasts of having made $25,000,000 profit during the past 12 years, sets the price that the farmer must pay for gas, oil, or chicken feed it sells its members, and this price must be based upon the above formula or it could not possibly have accumulated the $25,000,000 it boasts of doing. Then by that same token, why should not the farmers of this Nation have a voice in determining the sales price of the grain and livestock that they have produced?

The farmers of Illinois were recently shocked to learn that the president of this State organization went on public record stating that he did not approve of the cost of the farmers' labor being considered in determining the ceiling price to be placed upon agriculture products. A Congressman from Illinois whom the farmers of this State elected to represent them added insult to injury, when he wrote that while he was in favor of the farmer getting paid for his labor, he objected when the farmer's wife or children who are doing a man's work on the farm, since their son is fighting with the armed forces, having their labor considered in determining parity prices. To these degrees of contempt have the farmers brought themselves by not taking notice from labor's or business' notebook. Organize, for in unity there is strength. They have contented themselves to pay dues to organizations that were set up for them, by those who are profiting from the result of their lack of an organization of their own. Organizations that, while they have the name of a farm organization, are solely for the purpose of seeing that the farmer does not get paid for their labor, to see that they never get cost of production for their products.

HOW OUR ECONOMY FUNCTIONS

As long as agriculture prices are below parity, the farmer, who is the largest consumer of industrial goods, cannot buy the

products of the factory, hence we have unemployment and business stagnation. Nor can we as a nation meet the obligations of our Government until our income is sufficiently large to pay the necessary taxes to cover all expenses, without selling bonds and going into debt, as this only puts off the day of reckoning to some future date, besides adding the extra burden of interest to service this debt.

The record of the years has proved that as the farm income rises or falls, we get an equal rise and fall in the industrial pay roll, and the farm dollar turns over seven times in the channels of trade, hence the national income is always seven times farm income. This ratio of 1–1–7 is evidenced by the chart below, compiled by the Raw Material Council of Sioux City, Iowa, and is worth the student's study:

Statistical record of the operation of our national economy

[In millions of dollars]

Year	Gross agricultural income	Factory pay roll	Gross national income
1921	8,900	8,300	62,300
1922	9,900	9,100	61,100
1923	11,000	11,000	59,200
1924	11,300	10,500	71,900
1925	12,000	10,800	76,500
1926	11,500	11,400	80,200
1927	11,600	11,200	82,900
1928	11,700	11,300	84,100
1929	11,900	11,700	81,100
1930	9,500	9,600	75,400
1931	7,000	7,000	63,200
1932	5,300	5,200	48,800
1933	6,400	5,500	44,200
1934	7,300	6,800	50,400
1935	8,500	7,600	55,800
1936	9,500	8,800	63,900
1937	9,800	9,300	67,500
1938	7,500	7,800	54,100
Total	170,600	162,900	1,182,600

THE REMEDY

Business does not begin at the factory, but only when some customer with money in his hand enters the store to buy some product. It is then the merchant orders more goods, and the factory wheels start to revolve and the demand for industrial labor increases. So the key to unemployment and business stagnation is to place a price upon the new raw wealth high enough so the producer can buy products needed upon every farm, such as paint, lumber, hardware, plumbing, electrical appliances, and a thousand and one items needed upon every farm. This would give employment to the men in industry and create business and commerce.

We can make the national income any size we desire, by the simple expedient of increasing prices of the new raw wealth produced. Prosperity cannot be created by going into debt or borrowing at interest, nor by spending beyond our income, as these acts can only lead to wildcat inflation, repudiation, or bankruptcy for a nation, as well as for an individual. When the boys come home from overseas, we must have preserved for them an economy that will assure for them an opportunity to enjoy our American way of life or we have betrayed those who are making the supreme sacrifices.

This can be done by placing a floor under farm prices at not less than our average cost of production, plus a reasonable return for our labor, so the gambler and the international trader cannot drive farm prices to a point that means bankruptcy for the farmer, Work Projects Administration for the workers, and business stagnation for our commerce.

Let the American farmer produce for the American market at an American price, and if we have a surplus of any commodity, we can then trade it to the inhabitants of Shangri-La for any of their products that we may desire. That is a good-neighbor policy and like charity, should begin at home. Ninety-six percent of our trade is between ourselves, so why become concerned so much about the four percent that is foreign commerce, so conerned that we should wreck our American system of government for the benefit of a few to the detriment of the masses.

No farmer ever buys an article upon the market, that all costs plus a profit has not been placed in the price tag, by the producer of that article and by the same token, no intelligent farmer will ever again be willing to accept a price for his products that does not include all costs plus a reasonable return for his labor, and to this end our organization is dedicated, and we invite the cooperation of agriculture, labor, and business, to aid in the solution that is the common concern of us all. Why should we allow some false leadership to lead us to believe that we do not have a common interest, when, it is so obvious that the harm of one is and should be the concern of all.

UNITED FARMERS OF ILLINOIS,
CHARLES SHEPPELMAN,
President, Colfax, Ill.
ARTHUR C. HELLEMAN,
Vice President, Tremont, Ill.
ARTHUR H. BOOTH,
Secretary-Treasurer, Mason City, Ill.

Willkie the Leader Who Did Not Lead

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, with his eye on the Republican nomination for the Presidency in 1944, Wendell Willkie will invade my home State of Michigan Sunday.

Under the pretext that he is to be honored as the "titular head of the Republican Party," his stooges have arranged a reception Sunday afternoon. I understand that Mrs. Dudley Hay, national committeewoman, who has heretofore demonstrated her Willkie leanings, is the sparkplug of the enterprise.

It is a clever idea. No question about that. But I take the floor at this time to remind Michigan Republicans that Mr. Willkie is the leader who did not lead in 1942.

Millions of Republicans believed that Republican gains in the November 1942 elections were vital to the preservation of a two-party system, of the American way of life, and our constitutional form of government. Thousands donated lavishly of their time, energy, and money to bring about success at the polls.

Unrelentingly campaigns were conducted for the election of Republican Governors, United States Senators, and Congressmen.

But I ask Mrs. Hay and other Republicans of Michigan, who are proclaiming Mr. Willkie as titular head of the Republican Party, where was this titular head of the party in 1942?

Did he make speeches for Dewey in New York, or Bricker in Ohio, or Martin in Pennsylvania? No.

Did he campaign for Ferguson and Kelly in Michigan, Baldwin in Connecticut, or Brooks in Illinois, or Wilson and Hickenlooper in Iowa, or Moore in Oklahoma, or Vivian and Carr in Colorado? No.

Did he assist Earl Warren in the strategically important fight in California? No.

Did he assist any of the hundreds of Republican candidates for Congress who were waging a life-and-death struggle for the preservation of true Americanism? No.

Did he issue any statements extolling the principles of the Republican Party or urging a general outpouring of voters to assist in Republican elections? No.

Only after he had attempted underhandedly to stop the nomination of Dewey did he, in the last part of the campaign, issue a grudging statement that he would vote for Dewey. That was his sole contribution to the Republican battle for existence.

Where was our leader? Was he perhaps in China on a junket arranged by the New Deal?

He made some attacks on candidates, but the only ones attacked were Republicans.

In the 1942 elections what was he, Republican or New Dealer?

THE COMMUNIST DEFENDER

The titular head of the Republican Party made no campaign for Republican candidates in 1942. He made no effort to assist them.

But late in that year and again in 1943 he appeared in the Supreme Court of the United States to defend William Schneiderman, Russian-born secretary of the Communist Party of California, whose citizenship our Government seeks to revoke.

So ardent was the interest of this supposed leader of the Republican Party in assisting that Communist that, it is reported, his services were supplied to the Communist defendant without fee.

This is more than he did for any Republican candidate anywhere in the United States in 1942.

The reason for his second appearance before the Supreme Court was that the latter had ordered a reargument of the case. In that presentation Willkie praised the Communist Manifesto of 1848, saying, among other things, "Believe it or not, it is one of the great historical documents." He has never said as much for the Republican platform—even the platform upon which he ran in 1940. He has never even spoken in favorable tone of that Republican platform or any other.

What is this Communist Manifesto of 1848 that has compelled the praise of the one who insists that he is the "titular head of the Republican Party"?

The Communist Manifesto of 1848 was prepared by Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx and constitutes the basic document of Russian communism, world-wide revolution, and the destruction of the American and similar systems of life.

It states, "The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence, 'Abolition of private prop-

erty.'" It says, "You are horrified at our intending to do away with private property." And then adds untruthfully, "But in your existing society private property is already done away with for nine-tenths of the population; its existence for the few is solely due to its nonexistence in the hands of those nine-tenths."

As a matter of fact, in the United States under the American system of what the Manifesto calls "bourgeois society" nine-tenths or more of the people are property owners.

The Manifesto says, "In a word, you reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so; that is just what we intend."

It confesses its intention to destroy the family, making this patently false and groundless argument:

On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? On capital, on private gain. In its completely developed form this family exists only among the bourgeois. But this state of things finds its complement in the practical absence of the family among the proletarians, and in public prostitution.

The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital.

Among other revolting doctrines which apparently gained the Wilkie admiration is this:

The bourgeois clap-trap about the family and education, about the hallowed correlation of parent and child, becomes all the more disgusting, the more, by the action of modern industry, all the family ties among the proletarians are torn asunder and their children transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labor.

Further attacking the institution of marriage in this Willkie-praised document, it is said:

Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common, and thus, at the most, what the Communists might possibly be reproached with is that they desire to introduce, in substitution for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalized community of women.

Admitting that Communism aims at the destruction of religion, it says:

The Communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas.

Commenting on this, one of the Communist writers—Max Eastman, June 1932—said:

Marx was an implacable enemy of religion.

The document which Willkie so admired urges the abolition of private property and land, the centralization of credit in the hands of the state, the centralization of the means of communication and transportation in the hands of the state, the extension of control and ownership of manufacture and production in the hands of the state and the "establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture."

In a final ugly thrust at religion, the Communist manifesto of 1848 says:

As the parson has ever gone hand in hand with the landlord, so has clerical socialism with feudal socialism.

Nothing is easier than to give Christian asceticism a Socialist tinge. Has not Christianity declaimed against private property, against marriage, against the state? Has it not preached, in the place of these, charity and poverty, celibacy and mortification of the flesh, monastic life and mother church? Christian socialism is but the holy water with which the priest consecrates the heartburnings of the aristocrat.

To the alien-born Schneiderman, advocate of those antireligious, antimarriage, anticonstitutional doctrines advocating a forcible overthrow of the American way of life, the titular head of the Republican Party gave his legal services in the Supreme Court without fee.

This is the man his Michigan stooges will honor Sunday.

Difficulties in Beef Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the Third Congressional District of Nebraska, which I have the honor to represent in the House of Representatives, is strictly an agricultural district of 24 counties with more than 325,000 population. In this district we raise some of the finest beef produced anywhere in the world. Many of the feeders in the Third District of Nebraska have fed cattle for more than a quarter of a century. However, there is danger that thousands fewer head of cattle will be fed this year because these feeders believe that existing rules and regulations and limitations make the enterprise a loser.

Within the last week, some of these cattle feeders held a round table discussion on this very subject over the pioneer radio station WJAG which is owned and operated by the world's greatest country daily newspaper, the Norfolk Daily News, located at Norfolk, Nebr. This discussion developed the fact that at least one very prominent cattle feeder who has fed cattle for more than 25 years has quit business because he is afraid to buy feeder cattle at the present time without some assurance against loss.

Because of the significance of this discussion, I incorporate into these remarks the following Digest of Facts Brought Out so that it may be read by other Members of the House and by those who are formulating the rules and regulations restricting food production:

CATTLE FEEDERS ROUND TABLE

(Conducted by Art Thomas, manager, over radio station WJAG, May 21, 1943)

Feeders participating: Louis Smithberger, Stanton; Bert Armbruster, Stanton.

Feed manufacturers represented: Don Bridge, Norfolk Cereal & Flour Mills; Howard Murphy, Purina Co., St. Louis; J. H. Williams, Superior Seed & Supply Co., Norfolk; Leo Fisher, Crete Mills, Crete, Nebr.

DIGEST OF FACTS BROUGHT OUT

Smithberger usually feeds a thousand head at this time of year. This year he has no cattle on feed. This is the first time in 25 years or longer that such a condition has existed on the Smithberger farm. He is afraid to buy feeder cattle at the present time without some assurance against loss. He fed 24 head recently on corn and hay for 103 days and made 30 cents a head, not counting anything for labor, taxes or depreciation on buildings or machinery. The margin between cost and selling price was $2.56, the gain was 2½ pounds per day.

Armbruster is feeding 340 head but is selling them off because he does not see anything but a loss and he is afraid to put more feed into them.

He recently held a sale of hogs. After the sale was announced the Government threatened to force hogs down to $14.50. His brood sows previously worth $90 to $100 each, brought $50 to $55.

DIFFICULTIES IN BEEF PRODUCTION

1. Small margin (about $1.50) between cost of feeder cattle and the finished animal.
2. Protein shortage. Both these men had proteins on hand, bought last fall. They can get none now, except in mixed feeds.
3. Price of feed has risen. Corn from about 65 cents to 92 cents in a year.
4. Price of labor has gone up from about $40 a month to $120 a month.
5. Lack of repairs for machinery is serious.
6. Uncertainty as to when present regulations will be changed, or when future regulations may be made and what they may be, causes hesitancy in planning.
7. Misunderstandings in Washington and inexperienced personnel in Government bureaus. For instance, a Pilger, Nebr., farmer attended a committee meeting in Washington and told about difficulties with feeder cattle and the chairman asked him to explain what feeder cattle were.
8. Failure to take cost of farm labor fully into consideration in figuring parity prices.

The Dies Committee

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the enemies of the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities throughout the country are circulating the report to the effect that the Dies committee is to be discontinued.

If I know the temper of this Congress, if I know the temper of the American people, this Dies Committee on Un-American Activities will be perpetuated. The Dies committee is more necessary today, when the Comintern of Russia has been destroyed and when communism is renewing its subversive activities in America in every section of the country, this committee is more needed today than it has ever been before.

While our boys are fighting the battles of this country all over the world,

we should not abolish the Dies committee and permit these subversive elements to undermine and destroy here at home what they are fighting for abroad.

The Dies Committee on Un-American Activities must be perpetuated.

We must save America for Americans.

How Do You Like It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I print herewith an article by Westbrook Pegler, published under date of May 19, 1943:

PEGLER: SPECIFIC CASES

(By Westbrook Pegler)

NEW YORK, May 19.—Here are some specific cases of proof that there is no need of labor conscription or any of the shysteresque variations of compulsion, which totalitarian Washington has tried to date. In considering these typical items it is well to remember that Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt has proposed that we should all join unions and that all able-bodied civilians should be conscribed for labor, in which case this country would find itself in the slavery of a labor front under Government control, like Hitler's. First, we all would join unions and pay financial tribute to these political offshoots, and then the party would tell us all where to work and for how much.

A penciled letter from Superior, Wis., says the writer is a welder with 4 years' experience who has been working for the Globe Shipbuilding Co. for 6 months.

"Due to the fact that I refuse to join the union they will not let me work; also, they will not fire me or lay me off, and I refuse to quit," says this one, signed N. I. Rhead, 2235 South Broadway, Menominee, Wis. "I reported last night and was turned back. I cannot get a job at war work without a release from this company. I pledged my entire wages for 5 weeks through April for war bonds, and the union won't even let me work and fulfill my pledge."

The answer is that this American's Government has sold him out to the racketeer partners of the party in power. Paul McNutt tells him idle hands work for Hitler, but fixes things so that he can't get a clearance to another job, meaning, in the end, that McNutt orders him to accept a bargaining agent not of his own free choice, in violation of the Wagner Act, and to pay tribute to a subsidiary of McNutt's party.

Another letter signed Lewis J. Cullen, 199 Beach Road, Great Kills, N. Y., says he is a veteran of the other war, twice wounded, a member of the New York guard, the father of two sons, one an engineering student at Purdue, the other 17 years old, also a member of the New York guard. His wife is in the air-raid service. They own their own home. Mr. Cullen says he worked 24 years as an electric welder including 9 years in Chile, Mexico, and Persia. There is a "federal" union of the American Federation of Labor in the plant in which he was employed on important work for the Navy and the company had made a contract with the union whereby it undertook to compel every new employee to join the union, under a check-off system. This contract, of course, is a clear violation not only of the Wagner Act but of the human and constitutional rights of such new members. It imposes taxation without representation and violates their right of contract.

Mr. Cullen was not satisfied with the financial affairs of the union and he and two other skilled mechanics ordered the company to cease paying dues for them through the check-off, as a matter of principle. The union ordered them to stand trial and about 30 other mechanics resigned from the union.

Mr. Cullen then got in touch with the War Production Board. The rebellious workers, the union agents and respresentatives of the board met for about 3 hours in the New York office of the War Production Board. Nothing came of this.

At the time of writing his letter Mr. Cullen said he expected to be fired and added that he would be willing to go before any committee in Washington insisting that the company's contract with the union was illegal because it undertakes important commitments for third parties without consulting them.

Finally, L. R. Sandahl, vice president of the F. W. Fitch Co., of Des Moines, says there is a large exchange of goods with their warehouse in Bayonne, N. J., and that their trucks are subject to the notorious highway robbery of the teamsters' union in New Jersey and New York, sanctified last year by the United States Supreme Court. Approaching Bayonne each truck must take on a guest driver or ghost driver at $10.28 for a few miles. Twice, he says, their trucks tried to run the ambuscade. One driver was shot, and the other was beaten up, although they are union men.

One truck had a consignment of butter for New York in addition to regular cargo for Bayonne. Three guest drivers were inflicted on the truck at $10.28 each, one to drive in Bayonne, another to drive into New York, and the third to unload the butter, although Mr. Sandahl says there were two regular drivers aboard who were willing and able to drive and unload.

"This," he writes, "is true in hundreds of cases." Of course, it is under license from the Supreme Court, which holds that Congress so intended to legitimatize highway robbery.

This union belongs to Daniel Tobin, president of the teamsters, a red-hot New Dealer, whom President Roosevelt selected last fall, along with Joe Padway, the American Federation of Labor lawyer, to fly to London as an official emissary to British labor.

The Supreme Court decision upholding this extortion and mock-work system was written by Jimmy Byrnes, then a Supreme Court Justice, but now one of those who are howling against inflation of living costs, including the price of butter, and bawling about a shortage of manpower.

Ten Years of Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include some editorials dealing with the tenth anniversary of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Only a few days ago the Tennessee Valley Authority passed its tenth birthday. That event was heralded far and wide in news articles telling the story of Tennessee Valley Authority's work and appraising its value, particularly its great worth to the war effort.

One very fine appraisal of Tennessee Valley Authority is set forth in the editorial in the Birmingham Age-Herald of May 18, 1943. This represents an objective viewpoint of a community not immediately in the Tennessee Valley Authority area, but near enough to feel the benefits and to see at first hand its work. That editorial follows:

A DECADE OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Born in controversy 10 years ago this Tuesday, the Tennessee Valley Authority is still a controversial matter, both in and out of Congress. That fact in itself is a testimony to the far-reaching implications of the act which created the Tennessee Valley Authority and which was signed by the President on May 18, 1933.

But there is a difference in the controversy between that which accompanied the establishment of the vast social experiment in the Tennessee River Valley and any arguments that now revolve around the Tennessee Valley Authority. Ten years ago there was a dispute as to whether the Government should embark upon any undertaking that in some of its phases constituted competition with private industry. Then there was argument over the Tennessee Valley Authority's constitutionality.

Now, 10 years later, the Tennessee Valley Authority stands firmly entrenched within the sphere of constitutional activities. By virtue of Supreme Court decisions in the Ashwander case and later cases, the Tennessee Valley Authority's constitutional position is no longer in doubt. Consequently today the arguments over the Tennessee Valley Authority concern its methods, its modus operandi, its control. Whatever belief exists throughout the Nation that the Tennessee Valley Authority in effect is an assault upon the system of free enterprise is now quiet. The Tennessee Valley Authority today is a fait accompli. And it has counterparts in other parts of the country.

The Tennessee Valley Authority has made a profound impact upon the life of the Southeast. That impact can be indicated, but not fully depicted, statistically. It shows itself in the construction of 13 large dams, the construction of 385 miles of 9-foot navigation channel for commercial purposes, its production of nearly 30,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy, its $100,000,000 in revenue, the 150,000,000 seedlings it has provided for reforestation, its manufacture of nearly half a million tons of phosphatic fertilizers.

But the Tennessee Valley Authority has accomplishments which cannot be indicated by figures. It has lifted the level of living in a wide area. Through schools, libraries, sanitation, resettlement programs, parks, recreation areas, and in many other social activities, the Tennessee Valley Authority has made for better living in a part of seven southern States. It has taught people how to live more thriftily, how to terrace farms, how to save forests, how to farm more wisely. It has given them places to play. It has carried modern conveniences into farm homes. In many of its activities, the Tennessee Valley Authority has been a missionary of social enlightenment.

On the social, or humanitarian, side of the ledger, there is little criticism of the Tennessee Valley Authority. On the industrial side, all questions are not yet answered. When the war is over, and industry gets back to normal demands, there will doubtless arise again some questions of the boundary lines between the Tennessee Valley Authority and private industry. There is still argument as to whether the systems of accounting in use make the Tennessee Valley Authority a fair yardstick of power production.

Much of the Tennessee Valley Authority argument has been put in abeyance now. With the war demanding maximum production of all agencies of our national life, both public and private, there has been no room or time for questions of division of activity or authority.

However, no matter what the future may bring, the Tennessee Valley Authority, in some form, is here to stay. The first 10 years of its life have amply demonstrated that it has a definite field of usefulness.

The next editorial is not directly connected with the tenth anniversary, but it deals with a very important phase of the T. V. A. program, one that may easily be overlooked. This editorial, from the Raleigh News and Observer of May 24, 1943, is as follows:

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY LESSON

Serious damage done by floods on four large rivers again demonstrates the wisdom of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Tennessee Valley Authority was set up 10 years ago as an experiment. It is now an unqualified success.

So much emphasis has been placed on the electric power activities, which have resulted in enormous savings to private consumers and have furnished power vitally needed for the war effort, that other invaluable phases of the Tennessee Valley Authority have been somewhat obscured.

Before the Tennessee Valley Authority the Tennessee River furnished one of the greatest flood menaces in the world. Floods on the Tennessee are now definitely a thing of the past, thanks to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The fertilizer produced by the Tennessee Valley Authority is now also rendering an invaluable service in this time of food scarcity.

In each of its three functions, the Tennessee Valley Authority has more than justified itself.

Next I offer three editorials from two newspapers in the immediate T. V. A. area. These expressions represent the thinking of people among whom the T. V. A. work has been done. Many of them, 10 years ago, looked with some skepticism on this proposed unified river program. Today almost without a single exception anywhere in that section they believe in it, because they have seen it at work and have seen and felt its benefits.

The first editorial is from the Huntsville (Ala.) Times of May 18, 1943.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY'S ANNIVERSARY

The Tennessee Valley Authority is celebrating today the tenth anniversary of its creation.

This decade has been an eventful one. It has seen what was only a dream, and the brain child of President Roosevelt and Senator George Norris, develop into a magnificent reality.

From its first feeble steps it has grown lustily, and each year has marked vast strides in its expansion and growth.

The early years were fighting ones. There were lawsuits galore; almost every step was fought through the courts. But these happily have now been cleared away and disposed of; they are history.

Sometimes, as one ponders the present war, and the steps that led up to it, it seems almost prophetic that Tennessee Valley Authority's creation came when it did. Perhaps, far back in his head, President Roosevelt, seeing the trend of affairs in Germany—Hitler came into power the same year the Tennessee Valley Authority was established—envisioned the clash that came years later, and speeded its dam construction, so that ample power would be available for aluminum and other materials to fight a modern war.

At any rate, no matter whether he was so farseeing, it is a fact that this Nation could not have fought this war so successfully, and on so great a scale as it has, without the Tennessee Valley Authority's contribution of vital electric power and other services.

The Tennessee Valley Authority now is well established. Its benefits are so evident that there are few, if any, who would be willing to dispense with it. It has set an example of well-managed and well-directed Government enterprise that has become famous the world over.

Great as has been its contribution in this war, the Tennessee Valley Authority has larger possibilities after it has ended, and the Nation is able to revert to a peacetime economy. That is conditional, however, upon its being maintained on a nonpolitical basis, and operated with its past efficiency.

But even in its first 10 years, it has literally revolutionized the social and economic life of the Southeast. It has wrought the greatest change in this section since the Civil War.

In very few words as reported in an editorial from the same paper of May 19, 1943, Dr. J. A. Keller, president of the State Teachers College at Florence, Ala., stated the case as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY AND THE SOUTH

Dr. J. A. Keller, president of the State Teachers College at Florence, in acting as master of ceremonies at the Tennessee Valley Authority celebration yesterday at Sheffield, put the matter of Tennessee Valley Authority's role rather neatly.

"In the Tennessee Valley Authority," he said, "lies the hope of fulfilling Henry Grady's dream of an industrial South."

At first thought, reference would be to its power program. But this is not so. Tennessee Valley Authority is much more than cheaper and larger power. It has brought a new way of life to the South, to its denuded farms, to its one-crop system.

One of the best editorials to be found was that of the Decatur (Ala.) Daily of May 18, 1943. Decatur lies in the very center of T. V. A. It has experienced a great transformation in its economic life since the coming of T. V. A. Its story is told in this editorial by one who knows. I commend to everyone its careful reading.

TEN-YEAR APPRAISAL

Only the people who have fought it through can compare 1933 with 1943.

Looking backward, we can recall a late afternoon in 1933 when a determined foursome of Decatur businessmen met David E. Lilienthal, a Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority, in the office of the Decatur Chamber of Commerce. Those representatives of Decatur were worried. They were not quitting, they were not tired of fighting, they were groping for an avenue of attack upon the central problem worrying all sorts and kinds of men. They were eager to attack against an economic way of life which had proved to be unsatisfactory and unsound.

The Decatur area had ascended a little way, had come down again. Had reascended, and in 1933 must have been at the very bottom of the bottom. Her leadership, appointed by none yet representing a people, laid our way of life before the Tennessee Valley Authority Director, and sought to find what Tennessee Valley Authority was going to do about it, sought a means for the people to raise themselves from a desperate situation.

Seven years passed, the Authority had been engaged all the while in constructing the foundation, the springboard from which the people of this valley could go out on their own and use the tools of progress and economic soundness always to be found in the valley, but not in use.

It was late afternoon again in the hot summer and Mr. Lilienthal paid Decatur a surprise visit. He came to the office of one of these men. He was tired, worn out from a trip of inspection, which had required the greater part of the day. He sat down and this Decatur resident recounted what had been accomplished in this section through the use of tools provided into the hands of the people by the Tennessee Valley Authority. There had been no hesitation this time in seeking an objective. Decatur well knew the objective, knew the weapons necessary to take the objective. This Decatur man told the Tennessee Valley Authority Chairman, "We are building a city here, not necessarily a bigger city, but a better city, a city that will live, that will not blow down in the face of ill economic winds." And the reply was, "I can see you are going to do it."

What had happened in these 7 years? A people had become awake to their possibilities, they had shaken off fear and lack of confidence. Instead of asking the road they might take, here they were challenging, maybe even bragging of what they had done and were preparing to do.

And what has occurred in these 10 years since the Congress, in its wisdom, created the Tennessee Valley Authority an instrument placed in the hands of a people through which they might better their own condition? We can write of great dams, of disease controls, of being in readiness in time of peril to the Nation, of the building of home-grown industry, and of electricity at last coming to the farms of thousands of farm people in the valley. Yet the significant advance has been made in the thinking of a people. They are no longer afraid. They have caught the vision of their own powers.

They can stand now and talk out in meeting and say that if industry doesn't come into the valley from other sections, then we'll build our own industry. This they are doing today. They can say to their farm partners in this great enterprise of constructing a new life in an important part of the United States, "Go ahead and produce on the farm, we will see that a market is provided." They can say to the world, "Come and use our river ports, soon to be ready; you can distribute to the whole growing Southeast territory from these ports." They can say to anybody, anywhere, "You need not be fearful of malaria in the valley. The Army of the United States has approved us as location for Air Forces and other military activities and this is proof against the word of anyone."

And there isn't one among us who will not take off his hat and cheer for the Tennessee Valley Authority, an organization of the finest specialists the Nation has brought together, fighting for the freedom of this world.

Ten years with Tennessee Valley Authority has shown us how to fight for a better standard of living and hence a better people through the opportunity afforded.

The Connally-Smith Bill Should Be Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I insert herewith a statement made by me on the American Forum of the Air program over the Mutual Broadcasting System on May 23, last, at 8 p. m.:

Clear and appealing came their country's call and millions of young Americans, hundreds of thousands of them union men, left all they held near and dear to enter the service of their country.

Some went gladly, cheerfully, enthusiastically. Others reluctantly. Still others hesitated, but in the end they went. The long, strong arm of Uncle Sam took them. They came from valley and from hillside, from the farm, the mine, the factory, from behind the counter, from every walk of life and in every land on every sea under the sun they are working, they are fighting, they are dying—not on a 35- or 48-hour week, not on pay and a half or double pay—but every hour of each of the 365 days of the year. They work and they fight whenever they are called.

They are working, fighting and dying for you and for me, for the preservation of your home and of my home; that your children and my children may have the advantages which you and I inherited and have enjoyed. Instead of $50 a week they get $50 a month.

The least we here at home can do is to keep them supplied with the food, the clothing, the guns, the ammunition, the tanks, the planes, the ships—all those munitions of war which they must have—which they must have on time—if they are to win the battle which they are fighting for us.

Here in America organized labor months ago outlawed strikes for the duration. They were not outlawed by statute.

The no-strike promise was made in good faith; nevertheless, either because of lack of inclination, courage, or ability it has not been kept.

In Michigan in the 11 months following Pearl Harbor there were more than 700 strikes in war industries alone. At the moment in Missouri there is an American Federation of Labor strike which has interfered with the construction of a pipe line across the Mississippi, which is designed to carry, when completed, 300,000 barrels of crude oil per day; 250,000 barrels of high-octane gas.

There are strikes throughout the land. May 20, 45,000 miners closed 9 mines and a coke plant in violation of a truce with the United States Government. Six thousand other miners struck as walk-outs spread throughout 3 States and closed 14 other mines. In the first 5 days a strike at the Gary steel plant cost 1,700 tons of steel, sufficient to make 340,000 rifles.

At the Timken Roller Bearing Co. there were two strikes in March and April which seriously affected that company and many subcontractors.

Just today, May 23, from a factory in the Fourth Congressional District, which has a subcontract over at Timken Roller Bearing Co., came a letter complaining that their production of hubs had been held up because of the Timken strike.

It appears that on June 25, 1941, the Government issued its order No. 8802, declaring that there should be no discrimination in the employment of workers in defense industries because of race, creed, or color, or national origin.

Then on January 19 of this year the National War Labor Board issued its directive order providing that "All employees who 15 days after the date of the directive order of the National War Labor Board in this case are members of the union in good standing in accordance with the constitution and bylaws of the union, and those employees who may thereafter become members, shall, during the life of the agreement as a condition of employment, remain members of the union in good standing."

On March 12, 27 workers under the order were promoted from helpers to machine operators at the Gambrinus plant because they were in line for the promotion. Three days later the promotion was protested and a strike was called.

After a meeting with Government representatives, 95 percent of the men went back and the trouble seemed to be over. Then, on the 31st of March, the Congress of Industrial Organizations asked for the discharge of an air-chuck operator because they said he was no longer in good standing with the union. Under the Government directive, nothing was left for the company to do but to discharge the worker, and he was discharged on the 2d of April.

On the very next day employees protesting his discharge went on strike for the second time in 3 weeks. The matter was finally adjusted, but not until, as a direct result of the strike, according to the best estimate of the company, net production losses totaled 649,000 bearings and 206,000 armor-piercing shot, which, under present 100-percent operation, cannot be made up.

The fact that these strikes were of but short duration in no way affects the principle involved. If men who are drafted are to fight and work for us and do it without any reservation, then we here at home should give the same all-out support to our fighting men.

May 21 strikes in Detroit threatened to close 6 Chrysler plants, and Leo LaMotte, director of the unions, Chrysler division, said:

"There are certain individuals within our own union who are ready to sacrifice the interests of the workers in the shop and endanger the Nation at war to advance their own political aggrandizement."

The strikes he said were pulled by Reuther's boys, and Walter Reuther is vice president of the United Automobile Workers—Congress of Industrial Organizations.

As day follows day, new strikes, work stoppage, and slow-downs occur throughout the country. Organized labor having failed, let us say, because of lack of power to control those who interfere with the aid which should be given to the men who are fighting our battle, it becomes necessary—vitally necessary—that the strong arm of Uncle Sam, which reached out and took millions of men to fight our battle, should reach out and compel those who remain here at home with their loved ones, who have three good meals a day, who sleep in safety in comfortable beds at night, to do their part in supporting those who are fighting for us on and under the sea, on land, and in the air, and many of whom will never return.

The time to hesitate, to coddle those who refuse to obey the union's orders, who refuse to support the men who are doing the fighting, has passed. The time for effective action has come. The Connally-Smith bill is the answer to the prayer of those who wish to win this war.

Results of Administration of the Price Renegotiation Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I recently made summarizing the results of a Nation-wide survey relative to the administration of the price renegotiation law and which was made in cooperation with the Committee of Americans.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

While American industry is glad to forego excessive profits from wartime contracts under the practice of price renegotiations, it wants to be satisfied the alleged savings are real and not imaginary. This was a statement made today by Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, while conducting a Nation-wide survey among 5,000 manufacturers on the subject of the administration of the price renegotiation law by the several boards of the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission.

Senator BRIDGES, in presenting his confidential survey to a bipartisan group from both the Senate and the House, declared: "If the price renegotiation law is to continue, all funds recaptured should go directly back to the Treasury and not remain with the contracting agencies for respending."

In revealing various highlights of the survey, Senator BRIDGES said that even in the case of those advocating repeal of the law there was no disposition on the part of industry to advocate such repeal merely for the reason of gaining undue profits out of an emergency. In all cases where repeal was urged, Bridges said, the manufacturers indicated it would be a simpler process to recapture large profits by the Treasury through excess-profits taxes.

There was a tone of resentment running through the mail survey that the price-adjustment agencies were prosecutor, jury, and judge combined in the matter of renegotiation of contracts and there was no appeal from their rulings.

There follows a general summary of questions and answers as contained in the survey:

Question. Outright repeal of the law? (Yes)—(No). If you answer "yes," what form of profit control would you substitute?

Answer. This question was answered in the affirmative in many reports with the suggestion that the excess-profits tax would take care of "recapturing" undue profits. Further there was a very strong feeling expressed that renegotiation nullified the validity of contracts that the Federal Government should be the last to break the accepted sanctity of a contract. A minority felt that renegotiation was a good thing but should be a prearranged part of the agreement.

Question. Renegotiation restriction to deliveries made after April 28, 1942, instead of, to contracts on which final payments had not been received by April 28, 1942, as provided in the present law.

Answer. Almost unanimously everyone agreed in the affirmative.

Question. Renegotiation restricted to contractors making over 3 percent of total sales

(after taxes) during the taxable year. The purpose being to save the Government and the contractors the burden of renegotiation if their profits after taxes are reasonable.

Answer: This provision—reports indicated—would eliminate the majority of contracts from renegotiation if only profits were considered.

Question. Joint board of all four Government agencies, Army, Navy, Maritime and Treasury?

Answer. "Highly desirable" could be the phrase interpreted from the majority of letters from all manufacturers.

Question. Renegotiation of over-all profits at the year and one renegotiation only?

Answer. Hardly any exceptions—most everyone desires this.

Question. Require the boards to allow all deductions permitted by the Internal Revenue Code?

Answer. Almost unanimously wanted by everyone.

Question. Eliminating from renegotiation those products on which a maximum price has been established specifically by the Office of Price Administration?

Answer. Majority in favor.

Question. Renegotiation to be concluded definitely within 1 year after the ending of the contractor's fiscal year?

Answer. Everyone agrees this is necessary and desirable.

Question. Renegotiating only those contracts undertaken on which the Government and contractor agree the cost cannot be estimated sufficiently accurately in advance, therefore making renegotiating a part of the contract itself, with a provision that subcontracts of similar characteristics may carry clauses providing for renegotiation to be made by and for the benefit of the Government?

Answer. This would smooth out some of the difficulties for a majority.

Five additional questions were posed, which are as follows:

Question. To what extent has additional bookkeeping and accounting burden been imposed upon the contractor in connection with complying with the law? (It is important in answering this question not to confuse the burden imposed by renegotiation with the burden normally imposed in doing business with the Government.)

Answer. Answers run from very little up to 30 percent increase.

Question. If you are a contractor, who has had actual experience with the price adjustment boards, are you satisfied that higher allowances of profit (both in percentage and in dollars) are being given to those contractors who produce efficiently and at low cost than are being given to inefficient and high-cost producers?

Answer: Most say they are not familiar with other than their own cases, but believe by all means that efficiency should be recognized and properly rewarded.

Question. Has there been any material interference with production by reason of the requirement that contractors comply with the renogotiation law? If so, what has been the nature and exent of such interference?

Answer. A great deal of time has been required from executives and office forces that would otherwise have been devoted to planning and increasing productivity. It is now very difficult to get help to say nothing of competent help and for that reason anything that could be done to cut down on the unnecessary work of seemingly almost endless questionnaires from Government agencies and reports to them should be done and this seems to be one of the instances where a very constructive movement could be made to reduce this load.

Question: Have you, as a contractor having actual experience with the price-adjustment boards, felt that you were unfairly treated in relation to the treatment accorded your competitors? If so, what is the basis of such conclusions?

Answer. Some letter writers are reluctant to cite instances, but there is a perceptible feeling of belief that discrimination has been shown although as a whole most believe renegotiation has been handled fairly.

Question. To what extent, if at all, has the necessity for renegotiation interfered with contractors' (a) financing of your businesses, (b) closing your books, (c) dealings with your stockholders, (d) dealings with your creditors, and (e) dealings with subcontractors and suppliers?

Answer. In many cases, annual reports to stockholders and even dividend payments have been radically upset. Bank loans must be negotiated on an uncertain basis. In fact, each and every relationship that corporations have are based on the unknown future attitude of Government Contracting Agency.

CONCLUSION

The majority of firms—especially the machine tool industry—feel that provisions must be made for reserves for the post-war period.

In the case of the machine tool industry, they feel that their future market is gone—as they are producing now more than eight times the normal need—and that if they cannot put aside enough reserves—so that they have enough cash for research after the war in order to make the tools finer than those now on the market—they will be a dead industry.

Some manufacturers—and particularly the textile industry—feel that if their prices are controlled by the Office of Price Administration or have been frozen since the beginning of the war, and if they are now making the same article as before the war, and that article has become well known and its price established, they should not be subject to renegotiation.

Some manufacturers feel that more consideration should be given to those who have put their own capital into converting to a war-time plant and who have not taken the Government's money to do so.

Those contractors engaged in war work prior to Pearl Harbor all felt that goods delivered previous to April 28, 1942, should not be subject to renegotiation.

The conclusion of this survey covering some 5,000 of the Nation's leading industries indicates that many constructive changes must be made before we can possibly have a full capacity of production and an all-out war effort.

Among large, standard-line companies there was strong advocacy for lightening the burden of renegotiation by making a basic distinction between standard articles that a company has manufactured prior to the war and products developed during the emergency in cooperation with the Army and Navy. This would confine renegotiation very sensibly on products which have to be designed and produced on the basis of estimates.

The Abdication of Congressional Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, last night I had the pleasure of making a broadcast on the Blue Network, in the National Radio Forum, which is conducted by the Washington Star. The subject of my talk was the Abdication of Congressional Power. It relates to the surrender of certain congressional responsibilities in the pending joint resolution to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every second year the people of the United States go to the polls to elect every Member of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Members of the Senate in the belief that they are sending legislative representatives to Washington who will act as their spokesmen in passing the laws by which the country is governed and according to which its policy is framed.

It is safe to say that 90 percent of the people cherish the delusion that ours is still a representative democracy and that the people, through the Congress, still control the Government. The fact is, however, that Congress, during a period of almost 50 years, has been gradually giving away its legislative power to boards and commissions which it has itself created and which now constitute an Executive bureaucracy that threatens the very existence of our traditional system of government.

The degree to which the abdication by Congress of its powers has gone is illustrated in the bill now pending in the Senate to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Two separate and distinct questions are raised in this bill. The first involves only the issue as to whether or not reciprocity in international trade is a desirable policy. That is the question to which public attention has been chiefly directed. If it were the only question involved, I would not be talking on this program tonight. If it were the only question involved, I doubt whether there would be any serious debate in Congress at all over the policy.

The vital question which is involved, however, and which makes the proposal to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act one of the most important domestic issues of our time is whether and to what degree the Congress should surrender its legislative power to the Executive.

A TRANSFORMATION OF GOVERNMENT

This law transfers from the elected representatives of the people to the executive bureaus the power to exercise congressional authority over international trade. It transforms our Government from one in which the people, through their elected representatives, determine policy to one under which the Executive, operating through unnamed and unknown individuals does the work which the Constitution said it was the duty and responsibility of Congress to perform.

A trade agreement with a foreign country, because it is an international agreement, takes on some aspects of a treaty. The Constitution of the United States provides that treaties shall be ratified by the Senate. The reciprocal trade agreements act disregards that provision of the Constitution and eliminates that function of the Senate.

A foreign trade agreement, because it deals with tariffs and import duties, takes on some aspects of a revenue bill. The Constitution of the United States says clearly that all revenue bills should originate in the House of Representatives. Under this act, however, neither the House nor the Senate has the slightest knowledge of what the rates in a particular agreement are to be until after the agreement has been made and has

become effective by the action of the Executive. Thus the taxing power of Congress is eliminated by the Trade Agreements Act.

Finally, a foreign trade agreement, because it affects international trade, is a regulation of commerce with foreign nations. The power to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign nations was explicitly given to Congress by the Constitution. In the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act it is transferred to the Executive and no Member of Congress has the faintest notion of what regulation of foreign commerce will be imposed by the Executive until the trade agreement is promulgated and made effective.

THREE GREAT POWERS SURRENDERED

So here, parts of three great powers which, under the American system of government, belong to the people through their representatives, are surrendered by the Congress and transferred to the Executive.

It is no defense to say, as many people do, that reciprocity is a desirable policy. There is no justification of the abdication by Congress of its constitutional powers to say, as some people do, that the executive is better qualified than the legislative to perform these functions. Let him who believes in a dominant executive power defend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act upon that ground if he desires, but when he is making that argument let him acknowledge that he is advocating a departure from the principles of government laid down in our Constitution and is helping to erect in the United States a system of arbitrary executive power at the expense of the legislative power.

It is the blindness of Congress to the nature of the surrender it is making that appalls me. Wherever we look in the world, save only in Great Britain and in the British Commonwealth of Nations, parliamentary power has been vanishing and upon the wreckage of the legislative system has arisen the structure of totalitarian dictatorship. It appalls me, I repeat, to see this thing happening here, to see the elected representatives of the people of the United States meekly write themselves off as futile functionaries.

Within the past 2 weeks the press of the country has been practically unanimous in protesting the exclusion of reporters from the food conference at Hot Springs, Va. Washington correspondents here in the Nation's Capital and editorial writers of most of the newspapers and magazines of the country have resisted to the utmost the withdrawal of what they believed to be their right to know what is transpiring. It may be doubted whether the Constitution grants to every correspondent the right to attend international conferences of this kind, but there can be no doubt that the Constitution of the United States places upon the shoulders of every Member of Congress, both in the Senate and in the House, the responsibility of regulating commerce and fixing tariff rates. But Congress yields its power while the press vigorously defends its privileges.

If the Congress should pattern itself on the virility of the press and defend its power, the steady expansion of bureaucracy would not be the problem that it is today in America.

HOW CONGRESS CREATES EVIL

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed in the House of Representatives on May 13 by a vote of 342 to 65. A few days later the same House of Representatives, by a similar vote, struck from an appropriation bill the salaries of three executive employees who were charged with what the Members of the House were pleased to call subversive views. The removal of these men or a score of others by legislative action of this kind cannot possibly cure the evil which is created by Congress when, by an overwhelming vote, it delegates away its power.

It is the surrender of legislative power to the Executive by wholesale votes in the Senate and the House that threatens the American system of government and not the appointment of radical thinkers to executive office. Men whose policy does not accord with the policy of Congress could not shape the course of government or create any dangers for the people of the United States if the Congress were willing to retain, to cherish, and to exercise the responsibilities placed upon it by the Constitution.

The delegation of legislative power to the Executive is not a manifestation of recent origin. It cannot be charged against any particular party or any particular administration and while it must be acknowledged that in the emergencies of the last 10 years there has been more delegation of legislative power than ever before, nevertheless, the fact is that Congress began to surrender its functions to the Executive as long ago as 1887 when it established the Interstate Commerce Commission.

WHAT SECRETARY HULL SAID IN 1929

In 1934, in 1937, and again in 1940, as a Member of the Senate, I sought to preserve the power of legislative review over the making of reciprocal trade agreements and in doing so I am happy to be able to say that I was following in the footsteps of some of the greatest Democrats who ever sat in Congress. It was in 1929, when the last Republican tariff bill was under consideration and the proposal was made by the authors of that bill to clothe the Tariff Commission with the power to fix tariff rates under the so-called flexible tariff provision, that the Honorable Cordell Hull, now Secretary of State, and the principal sponsor of the present expansion of Executive power, denounced the Smoot-Hawley proposal as "a revolutionary policy" which would deprive the Congress of its authority to fix tariff rates. He declared that he was "unalterably opposed to the provision" and stigmatized it as a transfer to the President of "the supreme taxing power of the Nation, contrary to the plainest and most fundamental provisions of the Constitution—a vast and uncontrolled power, larger than had been surrendered by one great coordinate department of government to another since the British House of Commons wrenched the taxing power from an autocratic king."

I can say nothing as eloquent and nothing more true than these words of Mr. Hull. He was right when he uttered them in 1929 and I am right when I quote them now.

We cannot preserve representative government in the United States if Congress continues to throw its power away to the executive. I care not how respectable and able and good-intentioned the executive may be, it should not be permitted to exercise the legislative power. If we desire to retain representative government in this country, Congress must stop delegating its functions. This is the time to begin. At this hour when we stand upon the threshhold of a new free world to be erected after the United Nations have won their victory, Congress must retain its power to regulate foreign commerce, its power to levy taxes, and the Senate must retain some supervision over international arrangements or else the people themselves will have been excluded from the reorganization that is to come.

If the press can be excluded from food conferences and Congress voluntarily eliminates itself from all participation in making the international arrangements which will govern the future of the world, then the fate of the people of America will be wholly in the hands of anonymous experts of whose purposes and policies they know nothing.

CONGRESS YIELDS TO ANONYMOUS BUREAUCRATS

Let no one imagine that this is an exaggerated statement. It is the plain fact. Under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act there was set up in the executive departments a Committee on Reciprocity Information before which persons interested in the commodities to be affected by pending agreements were permitted to appear. I shall never forget the humiliation which I felt upon one occasion several years ago when I appeared before this committee and there saw a dozen members of the House and Senate, who had voted away their constitutional right to fix tariff rates, appearing before this anonymous committee to make representations on behalf of the manufactures or produce of their States.

This was pure formality and amounted to nothing. In many instances, before these hearings were completed, other experts had already drawn the text of the agreements to be signed.

The degree to which this irresponsibility is carried is illustrated by the structure of the United States Tariff Commission at this moment. This body, to which under the Smoot-Hawley bill of 1930 certain congressional powers were delegated, was intended to be a commission of 5 members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Responsibility to the Congress and to the people was intended to be preserved by this power of confirmation. Of course, that is the purpose of confirmation, but there have been two vacancies on this commission since June, 1941. No nominations have been made and the crippled commission functions, not as was intended, but with a bare majority and a group of anonymous civil service clerks, who are not responsible to the people of the United States or to their elected representatives, but to the vague executive power by which they are provided with a job.

Mr. Lynn R. Edminister, vice chairman of the Tariff Commission, appeared before the House Committee on Ways and Means to praise the system by which these impersonal employees gather the information and reach the decisions which shape our international trade policy. I mean no reflection on these gentlemen. I have no doubt about their patriotism or their ability, but I do challenge the system under which they operate. Whatever it may be called, it is not democracy because they are not the responsible representatives of the people, chosen by the people and accountable to the people. Free government can be carried on only by men and women who are chosen by the people, who are known to the people, and who can be held to account by the people for the official actions which they take.

ACCOUNTABILITY BASIS OF DEMOCRACY

Accountability by the agents of government to the people over whom they exercise the broad powers of Government is the very basis of our institutions. It is the essential mark of a representative democracy. It is the fundamental characteristic of democratic institutions. When we in Congress give it up, when we transfer it from ourselves to these impersonal boards and bureaus which constitute the bureaucracy, we destroy the very basis of our constitutional system.

Last Wednesday, when Prime Minister Churchill appeared before a joint session of the House and Senate in the House Chamber, I could not put out of my mind the shocking contrast between the preservation of parliamentary government in Britain and its surrender here. Mr. Churchill was obviously giving an account to the elected representatives of the people just as he would have done in the House of Commons. He was defending the military policy of the United Nations. Members of Congress wondered why his speech was so effective. The reason was clear; he was talking to equals. He was talking to legislative associates. He was a member of a parliamentary body clothed with

power telling a similar body what had been done and why.

After the great public meeting in the House Chamber he was a guest at a luncheon to which certain leading Members of the House and Senate committees having to do with foreign affairs were invited. After the luncheon, Mr. Churchill invited questions. He took them all on just as they came. Without pretense, without affectation, in a simple and direct manner he was talking to responsible Members of Congress about matters of the highest governmental significance.

BRITAIN PRESERVES LEGISLATIVE POWER

Contrast this with the procedure under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Our Congress, unlike the British Parliament, has surrendered its power to review these agreements, and the Executive gives it no information about what is being done until after the agreement has been signed, sealed, and delivered.

The first reciprocal trade agreement made under this act was with Canada. It was effective in the United States the moment it was signed, though nobody in Congress knew what it contained. It was not finally effective in Canada until the representatives of the Canadian people, in the exercise of their legislative prerogatives, gave it their approval.

Again, in 1938, the Department of State negotiated a reciprocal trade agreement with the United Kingdom. It became effective here in the United States the day it was promulgated by the President and not until that moment did any Member of Congress know what it contained. Not even the members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House or the members of the Finance Committee of the Senate, both of which, by their respective bodies, are charged with the responsibility for revenue levies, had the slightest inkling of the extent and effect of the agreement. In Great Britain, on the other hand, the right of the legislative body to approve or reject the agreement was reserved.

The legislative system of free government is preserved in Great Britain and in Canada. Here it is being transformed into an executive bureaucracy.

Consider the situation in Great Britain as compared with the situation here. Not only is Winston Churchill a duly elected member of the House of Commons from Epping Division of Essex, but Sir Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, is a member of the House from Warwick and Leamington. The Right Honorable Herbert Morrison, Secretary of State for Home Affairs, represents the constituency of Hackney South. Thus it is that the men who in Great Britain discharge the functions performed here by the Secretary of State, the Tariff Commission, the Department of Agriculture, and the other departments concerned in the framing of trade agreements, are the elected representatives of the people and at all times they have complete supervision over the activities of the experts who carry out the details of the work. Here in the United States the Congress exercises no such supervision.

I could go through the whole list of the British Cabinet and demonstrate how legislative control is maintained there while here in America we sacrifice it. The Minister of Production, for example, the Right Honorable Oliver Littleton, is an elected member of the House of Commons. He discharges the functions there comparable to the functions of Mr. Donald Nelson and the War Production Board in the United States. Through him the House of Commons maintains constant contact and constant supervision. Here it is only by the exercise of the investigative function that Congress endeavors to gain some knowledge of what is going on. Churchill painted the picture in his speech to our Congress when he referred to himself as the "majority leader in the House of Commons, in one branch of the legislature." It was, of course, a masterpiece of understatement, but it nevertheless accurately told the story of the preservation of legislative power, or popular sovereignty.

CONGRESS NEED NOT ELIMINATE ITSELF

The American system of the separation of powers has worked successfully in the past. It is an altogether satisfactory system and one of which we may be proud. But when Congress delegates away its authority to the Executive, it destroys not only the principle of the separation of powers, but the independence of the legislature and it erects a new form of government in which the Executive has powers far beyond anything that was ever contemplated by the framers of the Constitution.

As it happens, Congress does not have to eliminate itself as it has been doing. It is made up of men and women of intelligence, ability, and patriotism, men and women of vision who could preserve the American system. I think it can also be accurately stated that the great majority of bureau heads and bureau chiefs are ready to cooperate with Congress, and although some of them seem to resent it occasionally when they are called up to the Hill to answer questions, they all recognize the fundamental power and duty of the Senate and the House.

The complex nature of our economy is such that it has been necessary for Congress to set up numerous boards, bureaus, and commissions. The trouble has been not so much in the creation of these agencies, but in the fact that after creating them Congress tends to forget them and to abandon them to their own devices. We do not exercise constant supervision over them as we ought to do. If Congress were only willing to staff itself the way it staffs the bureaus, legislative power could be retained. The entire cost of the Congress including all salaries of its members and of its clerks in its legislative activities is less than the cost of the information services of the bureaus.

More important, however, than the employment of legislative experts, is the retention by Congress of its Constitutional powers and it is for that reason that now, for the fourth time in 10 years, I am asking the Senate to amend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act by providing that no agreement shall be effective until approved by the Congress. I want the people of America to have the same legislative power of supervision that is retained by the people of Great Britain, by the people of Mexico, by the people of Brazil, indeed, by the people of 22 of the 26 countries with which these agreements have been made.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW WOULD NOT BE MISUNDERSTOOD

It is folly to say that such an amendment would create misunderstanding anywhere in the world. The countries of Latin America whose legislators retain the power I am asking the Congress to retain will not resent it if we put our legislative body on an equal basis with theirs. The British Government, the Canadian Government, both of which retain parliamentary superiority, will not resent it if our Congress says that it will exercise the same function that their legislative bodies exercise.

This is a false argument intended only to preserve exclusive power for the executive. It should not be permitted to induce us in the midst of this great crisis to give up our obligations.

International trade at this hour is wholly a matter of Government action. Government loans, Government credits, Government purchases, all part of the program of total war have changed the whole situation. We are no longer dealing with the exchange of goods and services among individuals, firms, and associations, we are dealing with the activities of governments and of international cartels.

In the past these government arrangements, these cartel arrangements, have been made without regard to their effect upon the people. We in the United States in years past have been made the victims of international government arrangements between the British and the Dutch with respect to rubber and tin. We have been made the victims of international cartel arrangements with respect to copper and chemicals, tungsten, carbide, and numerous other commodities. The international cartels operated without the knowledge of Congress. Shall we say that the Government should also be permitted to operate without the knowledge of Congress?

If we do, we are merely saying that government ought to control the people instead of the people controlling the government.

Everything that has made America great has arisen from the fact that the people have controlled their Government and their business enterprises. When we sacrifice that popular sovereignty we sacrifice the foundations of our liberty. When Congress abdicates, free government dies.

American Progress After the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "American Progress After the War," delivered by me on May 19, 1943, before the Fifty-fourth Annual Congress of the Sons of the American Revolution.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Compatriots, ladies and gentlemen, and fellow citizens of America, we meet tonight shortly after the end of the most successful Allied campaign of the war. The first great step to Allied victory has been taken, and we can now see ahead of us, after greater and more severe campaigns, the goal which we have sought. There is no difference of opinion in Congress or among the people with regard to our goal in the war, and no hesitation about giving to the armed forces the unlimited support and sacrifice which they require. There can be no goal now except the complete and unconditional surrender of Germany, Italy, and Japan. There may be differences as to the best method by which that can be obtained, but in general the decision in military matters must be left to our military and naval leaders.

It is natural, therefore, that the interest of the people has turned to the much more controversial post-war questions which follow an Allied victory. I do not intend to discuss this evening the problems involved in international relations and trade, so closely related to the maintenance of future peace, but to confine myself to the issues which must be faced here in the United States. We are fighting a war to free the world from the domination of brute force and permit all peoples to develop their own freedoms. In the course of accomplishing this

task we are certainly concerned with retaining freedom in this country, and developing our American way of life along the basic traditional principles established in 1776, which have guided our destiny so well for 150 years. It would be ridiculous to abandon liberty in the United States, just at the moment that we are fighting to establish it throughout the world. In the long run the successful working out of our own problems may well have more effect on the happiness and future of the world than any international arrangements that can be made. It is difficult indeed to impose upon other people, by military force or by treaty, philosophies and forms of government to which they have not been trained. The most effective way to spread in this world the American conception of human freedom is to set an example in the United States so striking and convincing that it will be universally followed throughout the world. We did set the style in democratic forms of government which spread rapidly throughout the entire world during the nineteenth century.

I am going to say a good deal this evening against the plans of the National Resources Planning Board, but I should like to make it clear that it is their plans I object to and not the process of planning. The time has undoubtedly come to plan, and I am in favor of working out as completely as possible in advance the steps which the Government should take in the United States after the war. The George Post-War Planning Committee has been established by the Senate, and I am a member of that committee and in favor of a thorough job of planning. The danger does not lie in planning. It lies in bad planning and in the attempt to carry out every detail of a planned economy through compulsory bureaucratic orders directing every step of individual life.

In making our plans for a post-war America we undoubtedly desire to go forward to create a more prosperous people with a higher standard of living. So much emphasis has been put on this material side, however, that we are in danger of losing sight of the greatest purposes of life and the greatest causes of true happiness. Before our system can claim success it must not only create a people with a higher standard of living but a people of character—character that must include religious faith, morality, educated intelligence, and an ingrained demand for justice and unselfishness. In our striving for material things and a higher standard of living we must not change those basic principles of government and of personal conduct which create and protect the character of a people. It is the character of the American people which distinguishes it from a Fascist regime, no matter how successful that regime might be in material things.

All of us are concerned today with economics, for we begin to see how our economic affairs can be managed to reduce poverty and the hardship which results from it. But we cannot hope to achieve salvation by worshipping the god of a standard of living. The working out of economic improvement must be within the framework of American principles. Those principles were embodied by our forefathers in the American Constitution and Bill of Rights. They were formulated to protect and develop the independence and the character of the individual; to banish the idea of arbitrary government and State supremacy, represented in those days of hereditary royalty over the individual citizen.

There were three essential principles in the American form of republican government. First, local self-government, resulting from the independence of the States and the fact that there is delegated to the National Government only matters of direct national interest. If we permit the centralization of all governmental power in Washington, it leads directly to bureaucratic control of the daily life of 135,000,000 people, a control in which they have no effective voice and to which objections are brushed aside as they are today by the Office of Price Administration. If men are to retain independence and self-reliance and character, they must run their own schools and their own cities and their own States.

Second, in order to prevent tyranny the founders divided even the limited powers given the Federal Government between the President, Congress, and the courts, in order that no one might have the domination over the individual which would submerge his life in that of the Government. Today that division is threatened. Administrative boards are established which make their own laws, administer the laws which they make, and then hear the cases which they themselves bring for the violation of their own laws. As a result we have seen, in cases like the National Labor Relations Board and many others, a complete elimination of any sense of justice and fairness. Men are coming to shrug their shoulders with helpless indifference, who should be burning with indignation. If continued, it will undoubtedly destroy that cornerstone of American character, a deeply-ingrained resentment against injustice.

Third and most important is the liberty of the individual insured by the Bill of Rights, the right of the individual to live his own life, to decide the occupation or business or profession he will enter, and to receive a material reward for hard work, for regular work, for training, for ability, for intelligence, and for genius. These were the three great principles which were designed to protect the character and independence of the American people. They have done so, and, besides that, they have made this country the greatest and most powerful Nation in the world today, and the Nation with the highest material standard of living—one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

We have all kinds of attractive plans to increase further the material standard of living. Their advocates have no interest in the principles which our fathers established, however successful they may have been. Those principles are swept aside by the social reformer, sometimes deliberately, sometimes in his zeal to destroy hardship overnight. My own belief is that most of the ends sought can be accomplished perhaps more gradually within the framework of American Government. After the war the economic life of the country will have to be reconstituted. The kind of program we adopt may determine the course of the American people for a hundred years and forever. It is vital that we go forward with our effort for constant progress and improvement, but with those safeguards of character and independence which alone can maintain the real happiness of a people.

THE ISSUE IN THE NEXT ELECTION

I have been reading the reports of the National Resources Planning Board. Those reports contain, I assume, the New Deal platform for post-war reconstruction. I wish that every American could read those reports and analyze them instead of absorbing merely a pleasing picture of Utopia from the headlines in the press. The keynote of those reports is unlimited Government spending. A new philosophy of finance is advanced—that the Government debt can be and should be indefinitely increased. Every problem is to be met by additional Government spending. The difficulty with the deficit policy of the thirties, they say, is that the deficits were not big enough. The reports are ecstatic regarding the effect of the war spending in producing full employment. Referring to this war spending, the 1941 report says, "Given our resources, equipment, techniques, and skills, only that decision—only that courageous implementation of the will-to-do—was required, to release the log-jam of idle plants and idle men." Not a word is said of the fact that the courageous implementation of the will-to-do had the backing of a sixteen-million-dollar deficit in a single year. In the pamphlet After Defense—What? the Board says, "When we organize for maximum production on the basis of full employment, without being stopped by the costs, we discover, as have other nations, that increased production pays the real costs involved. Doing the job pays the bill." Perhaps they did not notice that doing the job in 1942 did not pay the bill, but left behind an increased debt of $60,000,000,000. Mr. Alvin H. Hansen, who directs the Board's thinking on this extraordinary theory, says "An internal debt is in fact so different from what we commonly think of as debt that it should scarcely be called a debt at all." Prof. Seymour E. Harris, of Harvard, now on leave with the Office of Price Administration, suggests a public debt of $4,000,000,000,000 as entirely possible. All this sounds like nonsense, but it is the basis of the plans of the National Resources Planning Board for making over America.

If deficits are a blessing in disguise, of course there are thousands of pleasing ways in which to create those deficits. The Board is preparing a vast program of public works. It proposes to subsidize every State and city and county and school. Tennessee Valley Authorities are to spring up in every valley. Every city is to be torn down and rebuilt from the bottom up. With regard to social-welfare measures and health and education and medical care, and the sky is the limit.

The Board gives lip service to private enterprise, but the measures which they propose would bring it to an untimely end. The Government, according to the report for 1943, is to provide technical engineering assistance in the conversion of war plants. The Government is to provide credit for the same purpose, and of course guide the conversion along the lines which the Brain Trusters think desirable. The Government is to train workers for the converted plants. The Government is to decide where plants should be located in order that there may not be cross hauling of materials and manufactured goods. One locality is to be favored at the expense of another. The railroads are apparently to be taken over by a national transport agency, which shall also control the bus lines, air transport, and pipe lines. The whole effect of the report on transportation is Government ownership. Electric power also is to be operated by the Government, or by corporations with mixed private and public funds. It is suggested also that these mixed corporations be extended to manufacture aluminum, magnesium, synthetic rubber, chemicals, shipbuilding, and aircraft. I think I need hardly point out that once a government enters an industry the day of private enterprise in that industry is drawing to a close.

This program of the National Resources Planning Board is plausibly presented, and it has a global charm; but it leads directly to the abolition of local self-government, to the control of all industry by administrative boards having executive, legislative, and judicial powers, and to a 50-percent Socialist economy. It leaves nothing to the initiative or the ability of the average independent American.

What should be our post-war program? In my opinion, the first essential is sound finance. We will come out of this war with a public debt approaching $300,000,000,000. It is not impossible to pay the interest on that debt if we maintain a reasonable prosperity in this country and do not constantly increase that debt. Any policy of constant debt increase would lead to the ruin of our entire system and the destruction of all the values that constitute the past savings of the people of the United States. Why do we

have inflation today? Simply because we have been forced by the war into a deficit policy. The same policy in peacetime, when we certainly cannot successfully impose the arbitrary controls on prices and wages we are now attempting, would soon depreciate our money as it was depreciated in Germany. All savings would be destroyed. All life insurance values would be destroyed. All incentive to any man to begin again the accumulation of property and capital would vanish. True, we have created full employment today, but we have not raised our standard of living, because more than half the products of our work are necessarily wasted in war.

The Hansen theory is attractive to politicians. They can spend all the money they wish on favorite projects without levying any taxes to pay for them. It is tempting and demoralizing to the people. It looks forward not only to the ruin of the country but to the destruction of the character of the individual. We can't begin to make any plan until we crush the fallacy of unlimited public deficits. In the long run we must work for what we receive. We cannot get something for nothing. We cannot have capital to insure adequate production in the future unless we are economical and save in the present.

The spending theory is advanced as a cure for unemployment and depression. Certainly it did not cure it in the thirties, for never before have we taken so long to recover from a depression, and 10,000,000 were still unemployed when the defense crisis arose. The depressions before were always solved by giving free enterprise the chance to go ahead, and before 1930 it was only a few years before we returned to fuller employment and higher national income than we had ever had before.

And so our program, first of all, must be to create conditions in which free enterprise can go ahead, large and small industries, and particularly small, and new industry encouraged to start. Most of our industries have grown up from little plants, constructed without Government assistance, and enlarged by initiative and ability. As soon as a reasonable supply of any article is available price restrictions should be removed and all the other restraints of war eliminated. I do not mean that war powers should not be continued for a reasonable time after the armistice, but the men in charge should seek every opportunity to surrender them. The danger is that most Government bureaucrats of today will seek every opportunity to continue their own powers and their own jobs.

The Securities and Exchange Commission should be reorganized to permit freer capital markets, particularly in the smaller cities and the securities of smaller companies. Its purpose should be merely to prevent fraud and misrepresentation in the sale of securities, not to direct the flow of capital in the United States as the Government thinks it should flow.

As far as possible, the loaning activities of the Government should be eliminated, except in cases where it is clearly shown that private capital is unable to do the job. I believe we should consider Government assistance or insurance to institutions engaged in the financing of small industry, such assistance to be given perhaps through insurance of credits, or perhaps an insurance against excessive loss by those who invest in such industry.

The only regulation of industry which is desirable is that necessary to prevent monopoly and unfair competition. I am convinced that can be done by the enforcement of specific laws without sending Government controllers into every store and every plant to regulate profits and to direct operations.

A great deal more is known now with regard to inflation, deflation, and depressions. If wise men administer the fiscal affairs of government under present laws, with such additional prohibitions as may become necessary to prevent abuses of our existing system and unsound inflation, I believe the business cycle with its recurrent depressions can be largely eliminated. With impractical men inspired by unsound fiscal panaceas in charge, no kind of legislation can prevent disaster.

In short, I think we can return to a system of private enterprise, let the businessmen run their businesses and the farmers run their farms without the Government attempting to dictate to every individual businessman or farmer. I do not think it is necessary to proceed with a vast system of public works undertaken by States and municipalities through hand-outs from the Federal Government. Undoubtedly necessary and desirable public works should be undertaken when private activity falls off; but as a cure for major unemployment a public works program is bound to be a wash-out. It does not give enough employment for the money expended. I question very much whether after the war any large public works program will be immediately necessary, for I am convinced that the backlog of civilian demand will bring on at least a short period of intense activity by private enterprise.

We cannot escape a heavy post-war taxation, but it should be levied in such a way as to encourage saving and the investment in new projects involving risk. Since high rates must continue, I should be inclined to abolish entirely the capital gains tax. The discrimination against holders of common stock should be removed.

My program for free enterprise is one of progress within the framework of the American Constitution; limited regulation by law and not by fiats of boards and czars; opportunity to individuals to make a success of their own lives without Government interference. The people of the United States realize today what bureaucratic regulation means, and how it may destroy their liberty.

In the field of social welfare we must go forward constantly in our effort to improve the condition of the lower-income groups. There is no reason why in this country extreme poverty should not be largely abolished, except for those shiftless and worthless people who will not work when given the opportunity. I have just read the National Resources Planning Board report on security, work and relief policies, a volume of 640 pages. It is extremely discouraging to anyone who wishes a practical program of social welfare. It defends the work of every single agency which the New Deal ever established. Its program is a bigger and better Public Works Administration, a bigger and better Work Projects Administration, another Civilian Conservation Corps and National Youth Administration, and unlimited Federal funds for relief, housing, education, and medical care. It never even inquires where the money for this vast expenditure is to be found. This is not surprising perhaps when we find that it is written by Dr. Eveline M. Burns, an English socialist, one of the disciples of Mr. Harold Laski.

I believe in the principle of insuring to everyone, unless he refuses to work, a minimum standard of living, but it must be held within a reasonable cost, without setting up a vast Federal bureaucracy, without destroying local self-government, and without removing the incentive to work which is the very keystone to adequate production.

We should go forward with an improved plan of old-age pensions. We can extend the principles of unemployment insurance to a much more extensive group of employees, but it should certainly be under State control and not completely nationalized as the board proposes, for we have now a system well able to meet the emergencies which may arise. The State-Federal Employment Service should be restored.

It is my belief that when unemployment does occur in great volume, beyond the ability of the unemployment compensation system to deal with it, there should be a State-Federal plan for direct relief and work relief. I am absolutely opposed to another Federal Work Projects Administration. I believe that the unemployment problem can be best met by each community dealing with its own peculiar circumstances. But because of the great expense and the inability of the States to finance this additional activity, I believe that both direct and work relief should be largely financed by Federal funds, with some State matching. In the State plan could be included a provision for relief to those poverty-stricken farmers who have been furnished rehabilitation by the Farm Security Administration.

I believe also that there should be some extension of Federal aid to health and medical care and hospital service, without the Federal Government bossing the job or socializing medicine. I have always been in favor of a housing program, and I believe that we should make definite plans today for the tremendous volume of housing which will be necessary after the war. As far as possible, it should be done through private enterprise, but in the case of the lower income groups I am convinced that a program of public housing should be continued. The size of the Government subsidy should be reduced, so that the cost will not prevent the construction within a reasonable time of all the public housing which may be required as part of the general plan.

But every social welfare program must recognize two principles, and the National Resources Planning Board recognizes neither. In a broad sense, only those who are working today can support by their labor those who are not working today. Government assistance of any kind to those who are not working, or working inadequately, must come out of the earnings and the standard of living of the workers of the country. The theory advanced by Mr. Yantis, one of the members of the National Resources Planning Board, that leaf-raking itself creates wealth must be recognized as nonsense. Unless we are going to remove all incentive to work, and endanger the whole principle of reward for ability and hard work and education, the burden of the social welfare program cannot go beyond a reasonable expense. Vast expenditures for relief involve either heavy taxation, affecting every worker, or they involve the danger of inflation, which taxes the worker through increased prices. I am in favor of social welfare measures because they are necessary to prevent hardship and injustice. The theory that in some way they stimulate employment, or prime the pump, or benefit the rest of the population, is a dangerous fallacy. Not only does it offend every principle of common sense, but when we tried it in the thirties it only resulted in the continuation of unemployment. We must approach every social-welfare program with the question—Can the rest of the population afford it?

In the second place, if we are going to put a floor under wages, a floor under housing, and a floor under medical care for those who are unable to earn an adequate sum to pay for them, we must see that the people who do work, who do save, who do provide their own homes and their own doctors, are better off than the Government beneficiaries. Otherwise we will remove every incentive to work and work harder. We cannot exaggerate the importance of that incentive. On it is based all the progress we have made. The average human being simply does not work any harder than he has to work in order to live, and improve his condition in life, and benefit his family. If we are going to give a man who has never worked a pension of $40 a month when he is 65, then we should give practically the same pension to the man who has worked and saved enough money to build himself a home or provide his family with a small income.

If that makes a program of $40 a month too expensive, then perhaps we had better start with a program of $30 a month. If we provide Government housing for a man who is unable to earn $1,000 a year, then we will have to help to some extent the better workman who can earn $1,500 a year and wishes to provide his own home. But we must not destroy the relative position acquired throughout a lifetime of labor by men of greater ability or character or persistence. Otherwise we strike at the foundations of progress and of personal liberty.

In short, a social welfare program must avoid the destruction of local and State responsibility. It must not impose an intolerable and discouraging burden on those who really bring about progress in America. It must continue an adequate reward to the man who without Government assistance fights through his own life, and passes on to his sons and daughters advantages which he himself never enjoyed.

Human progress is bound to be slow. We cannot make this country over in a night. We can only go forward steadily and with determination, trying out new plans, reforming abuses, alleviating hardships, increasing opportunity. But in that progress, if we are not to destroy the character and the independence of our people, we must cleave to that great philosophy of Government, tested in the fires of American experience, which has made all of us proud to be Sons of the American Revolution.

Utilization of Forest and Wood Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio address which I recently delivered, on the subject The Availability and Utilization of Forest and Wood Products in the War Effort.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This war will be won most quickly and with the least loss of life and at the lowest cost, by bringing into use immediately, every possible resource which is of service in waging it. Time of availability of essential supplies, is a factor in our ultimate victory, as much as are manpower, munitions, armies, and navies. It is with respect only to the quickest possible utilization of our natural resources through latest discoveries and inventions that I shall speak tonight.

While my place on those Senate committees which have most to do with the conduct of the war brings me into contact with the commanding generals and admirals, the heads of the War and Navy Departments, and others who determine the over-all strategy and operating programs, as well as with some foreign representatives, it also brings me into conference with those whose duty it is to supply our combat forces with every needful thing. A public discussion now of the sources and means of supply of necessary material things is both advisable and advantageous because it requires the cooperation and use of both civilian capital and labor.

America is blessed by an abundance of wonderful natural resources, an enterprising genius for invention and manufacture, and normally, an industrious population. But we have been extravagant and wasteful of both material things and manpower. Our success in either war or peace does not lie in that direction. We must improve our methods. No longer are battles won or is peace preserved by battle-axes and with bows and arrows, nor do strikes help our combat forces to win the war or to keep our enemies from enslaving and killing us at home.

The materials and methods of yesterday are obsolete today. It is the prompt utilization of the products of the laboratories, by the resourceful industries of Germany, which has made Germany the most powerful nation in Europe; and it is the quick and clever adaptation of every new discovery and invention, by the Japanese, which makes Japan the leading commercial Nation and strongest foe in Asia.

As a Nation we must not be a sleeping giant. This is an all-out war all over the world. Many of the foreign sources of our strategic materials and minerals have been drastically curtailed by submarines. We now must develop quickly domestic supplies of materials and minerals from previously neglected, or wasted, sources of them; and we must bring newly discovered, or invented, materials into production and use with the least possible delay.

It is an old Oregon pioneer custom to make the greatest use of what we have, and not waste time wishing for impossible things. You will recall that our State motto is, "She flies with her own wings." Oregon's greatest natural resources are her forests, falling water and a mild and salubrious climate. While we have great resources of other items and are opening our mines to contribute to the Nation's shortage of critical minerals, and while we should encourage our agriculture and develop our fisheries, to supply foods and fibers for a cold and hungry world, let us not forget the boundless resources in our primeval forests. Therein lies our salvation and our prosperity. Properly utilized and intelligently preserved, our timber products will help us win the war, preserve the peace, and supply employment when returning soldiers and dismissed employees from now overcrowded war industries must have jobs in the ruined economy of an impoverished world.

Years ago I read that Switzerland imported steel from Germany by the ton and converted it into watch springs which it sold to the world by the ounce. By the conversion of bulk steel into watch springs, Switzerland, which does not produce sufficient foodstuffs to feed her own population, was enabled to maintain a profitable industry which gave employment to many of her people and aided her citizens through the generations to be among the most prosperous people in the world.

If we of Oregon are to make the most of our opportunities we must conserve our great natural resources for future generations and utilize them rationally now, in manufacturing and remanufacturing processes. Our logs, slabs and sawdust must be converted in Oregon into furniture, plastics, plywood, fiberboard, paper, airplanes, boxes, crates, chemicals and foods; our grains into flour, breads, breakfast foods, compressed rations, fuel alcohol, and so forth; our fruits and vegetables into preserves, fruit-juices, dehydrated foods, and similar products; our wool and flax-fibers into blankets, clothing, napery, yarns, threads, nets and such things; our livestock, poultry and fish into the numberless finished and preserved food products of which science has created an endless variety and form.

In refined manufacture and by the loyal, industrious, cooperative habits of our people is to be found the greatest contribution which we who are not now in the combat forces of our country, can make in the winning of the war and in preserving peace, plenty, employment and prosperity after the war.

When I first came to the Senate four and a half years ago I advocated the utilization of wood products as a major material in airplane construction. It has been a hard, uphill fight to convince our military authorities of the dependable qualities of our improved wood-products and wood-construction methods. But now the shortage of certain critical light metals forces consideration of wood products for airplane and other strategic construction.

Contemplation of this subject led me to study and observe everything possible about forests and forest products. I have sponsored appropriations for forest management, fire prevention, and for the Federal Forest Laboratories at Madison, Wis., where new wood products are developed and other intensely practical results are achieved.

To better prepare myself to represent intelligently this major Oregon industry, now so vital to the war effort, and in compliance with my obligations as a member of appropriate Senate committees, I visited, by authorization of the Senate, various forest areas last year in company with Chief Federal Forester Lyle F. Watts and several regional foresters. I then learned at first hand in the field of operations, of forest needs and the great possibilities of forest resources in our war effort. The knowledge gained by me then is now of great advantage to the timber industry of our area and of the Nation and to all those employed in it. It also is of advantage, I believe, to the Congress in the present consideration of legislation intended for forest protection and the utilization of forest resources.

It has been the purpose of my efforts to expedite the development of new materials and processes in the Federal forest-products laboratory and then to speed the utilization of these new products in the war effort. War industries, thus initiated, should be continued after the war to aid in the reconstructed economy of our country.

We are told that in the meat-packing industry everything but the squeal is saved in processing the carcass of a hog. Economy demands that we make the greatest possible use of our forests and preserve them for the perpetual harvest of them. We must convert the annual growth and the heretofore waste of our forests into useful plastics, resins, cellulose and lignin compounds, and many new materials, as well as into lumber and shingles. The sawdust, trash, slabs, and wood and forest refuse which now and always have been destroyed or burned must be saved and converted into useful materials.

It is the function of the Federal Forest Laboratory at Madison, Wis., to do this very thing, and it has been remarkably successful in its work. This laboratory has, through chemical and mechanical means, changed the properties of wood, making them harder and stronger, more flexible, or stiffer.

The future will witness the use of many wonderful materials which are unknown today. We still have much to learn. We would like to convert wood waste into fuel gas, cattle feed, baker's yeast, sugar, alcohol, and many other products which already are established forest industries on the continent of Europe. We cannot copy these foreign methods without further adaptation because our woods are all different from European species.

However, there already have been developed in the Federal Forest Laboratory a number of excellent materials which are not yet in production. Some of these materials would be extremely helpful in the war effort. To expedite the commercial production of these useful materials now, I am proposing an initial Federal appropriation of $100,000 for a pilot plant. Its purpose will be to demonstrate methods and determine costs of

factory operations in production of the new materials made from wood wastes and other wood sources, which the laboratory has produced, and to develop the manufacture of useful articles made from these new materials. This pilot plant will enable us to experiment on a small scale with new processes and products, thereby eliminating costly mistakes which might ensue if full scale operation were undertaken. War conditions now make it imperative that we conserve iron and steel. Wood products can be made to serve in place of iron and steel for many uses.

Experience demonstrates that there often is a long delay between the invention of a valuable product produced in the laboratory and the utilization of it by industry. It is expected that the proposed pilot plant will greatly obviate this delay.

In conclusion let me remind you that our evergreen forests are resinous and therefore highly inflammable. To utilize them continuously we must preserve them. The preservation of the forests requires the practice of selective logging operations—harvesting rather than mining our forests. Also it is required that we save what we now waste; we must utilize what we now destroy or burn. To preserve our forests we must also prevent their destruction by fire. War conditions increase this always-present peril. Last year we know that at least two enemy Japanese airplanes which were launched from submarines, flew over Curry County and one of them dropped an incendiary bomb on the forest in that area. Fortunately it failed to accomplish its purpose; but we cannot hope that all such efforts will always fail. We must be prepared to extinguish every little fire before it becomes an uncontrollable conflagration. Therefore I am advocating the approval by the Senate Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, of an item of $7,800,000 for emergency forest fire protection which was not allowed by the House of Representatives. "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

Capitalism on Crutches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an extremely interesting address, Capitalism on Crutches, by a very outstanding gentleman, Samuel Crowther, of Sunapee, N. H., delivered before the Rotary Club of New York, on May 20, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When, a little while back, the very kind invitation to speak before you was tendered to me, I replied that I would be delighted to be with you but that I had made it a fixed policy in these times to call things, to the extent of my ability, by their right names, and I had found that this was not a particularly popular approach, for most people wanted a writer or a speaker—and, as you will discover, I am a writer rather than a speaker—to tell them in some cheery fashion that this is the best of all possible worlds and anything to the contrary just ain't so.

This is in line with the tendency of so many of us to accept slogans and catch-words for thoughts and to divide them into two great classes—the one labeled pessimistic and the other labeled optimistic. The pessimist not only sees nothing but gloom ahead, but also accepts his fate as so inevitable that he can do nothing about it. The optimist sees nothing but joy ahead. He has gurgled himself into a new and perfect world born out of our travail and he is now quarreling about the details of perfection, such as the forms we should use in educating our enemies after we have finished conquering them.

As the risk of being classed as a pessimist, let me say it has not been made wholly plain, at least to me, how the path to freedom of speech will be cleared by its suppression, nor how the path away from want will be cleared by death and destruction, nor how the way from fear will be cleared by more fear, nor how freedom to worship will emerge from the smoking ruins of a world made bare by stimulated hate.

It is all well enough to play at being Alice in Wonderland, and it is fun to go to Never-Never Land by airplane with Eleanor or HENRY or Wendell. They do not ask us to do anything about anything at the moment, and they provide a fluent patter for those of us who wish to be considered intelligent and a good show for the rest of us. But may I remind you that, although one may seem to escape from reality by getting drunk on glory, just as one may seem to escape by getting drunk on a different sort of spirits, there is always a morning after with a more complicated set of realities than we had the day before.

Therefore, instead of asking you lightly to skip with me up to the top of my pet mountain and there unfolding to you a panorama of my pet world, I am going to ask you to sit right where you are and look around, and I am asking you to do this in the hope of bringing an acute realization that, in our mad scramble to escape from thinking, we are permitting an American to be redefined as a supine animal which acts and thinks exactly as it is told. We are already well along on our way toward losing that sturdy, pernickety independence which most of us were reared to believe was our birthright. We are not exchanging it for some supposedly higher form of life in which dependence and interdependence become hallowed. We are not losing it because anyone planned it that way.

We are losing it because, as a people, we have been too cowardly to come to grips with reality, and in trying to escape from reality we have set up a manner and a form of government which has no means of going forward and, therefore, must go backward, and is now mired in the bog of planless socialism, and it does not matter that those who are on the political bandwagon shriek that they are not in the mud at all but on a fine, paved highway.

I hold that it is not only the solemn right but the holy duty of an American citizen to criticize his Government and especially in wartime. And I further hold that it is stark desecration for any Government officer to wrap himself in the flag to hide his errors or his incapacity. In peacetime we can put up with errors and incapacity because usually we can change personalities before too much harm has been done, but today we are at war and the manner and methods of Government are so swiftly destroying our civilian economy that all at once we may find that the props have been knocked from under us and in the hour when most they need us, we may in sheer helplessness let our boys down. That would be to our eternal shame.

We have been taking the Washington bureaucracy as something of a joke. It is no longer a joke and it is no longer just in Washington. It has spawned all over the country and pretty much all over the world. While the factories and farms are acutely short of manpower, the bureaucrats are multiplying until now in every State there are more Federal than State employees and in some States several times as many. I do not know how many are outside the United States, but I am informed that in Brazil alone we have around 10,000 civilian employees. We thought we were rid of the Works Progress Administration, but it is back again in a new hat, and, where the primitive W. P. A.'s had to learn to doze on shovels, the modern W. P. A.'s have desks.

It is a most extraordinary bureaucracy and presents a phenomenon, the like of which the world has never known. Never has any group anywhere at any time had so low a general level of ability. Having said all that, I have said exactly nothing, for this bureaucracy is not a cause but a result. The members of this bureaucracy are not to be blamed for being what they are. We, the people, put them there by insisting that government do what government is incapable of doing. And a change in government which would merely mean the Republican Party displacing the Democratic Party, while it would bring in a lot of new faces, would not change the manner of government or lessen the weight of bureaucracy or enlarge the freedom of the average man.

We, the people, are getting what we asked for, although neither the package nor the contents are what we expected, and, so long as we ask government for that which is not in the power of government to deliver, we are going to get an ever-increasing dose of exactly what we are getting now, regardless of what party is nominally in power.

That needs some explaining. We have been drifting away from the historic American conception of individual independence for a long while, but more especially since the Sixteenth Amendment, which became a part of the Constitution just before the First World War, gave to the Congress the right to levy graduated income taxes and thereby centered in the Federal Government a life and death power over all citizens and all corporations. Almost at the same time, we established the Federal Reserve System as an aid to better banking. We never thought these two laws would ever or could ever be used except in the general welfare, but they did strengthen the power of central government, and one may take for granted that a power given is a power that will sometime be used. It was thus not unnatural that in the great depression people should turn helplessly to the Government to do for them what they thought they could not do for themselves. The cry for help called for the National Recovery Act and you will remember that was a complete departure from the American theory of free private enterprise and an experiment in a kind of guild socialism with business grouped into guilds, with codes of laws supervised by the Government. The act was killed by the Supreme Court. But it lived long enough to establish in Washington the flat principle that the American people have not the mental capacity to think, act, or spend for themselves and therefore must be regulated, supervised, and kidded by government.

The kidding phase—which has now come to be known as morale building—was also new in American life. Never before had a government elected by us become a thing of itself with a vast publicity crew trying to sell policies to the people in exactly the same fashion and with most of the same devices that the Soviet and Nazi governments used to sell themselves to their peoples. The National Recovery Administration may be considered a comic interlude in our national life, and some of you who are here may have walked up Fifth Avenue wearing buttons and carrying flags, in the hope that depression was a kind of Jericho whose walls would fall, if only you marched around them.

The National Recovery Administration was quickly followed by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the Work Projects Administration and no end of other agencies that not only shoveled out the public money but bore prodigious litters of bureaucrats who were nearly all the kind of people who believed that our citizens were incapable of deciding anything of importance for themselves and needed to be cared for. And of course these bureaucrats had to have petty, legalistic, monorail minds, else they could not have found themselves capable of directing the American people.

All this took money. There are only three ways in which a government can raise money. The first is by taxing. The second is by borrowing savings. The third is by printing money. The first notion was that wealth could be redistributed through taxes, and the income taxes, which had been sanctioned by the sixteenth amendment, were raised to such heights that it was no longer worth while for anyone to venture. The Government, while waiting about unemployment, took away the only means which has ever given useful and self-sustaining employment. And, what is more, these taxes took away the power of business to sustain itself. The National Industrial Conference Board several years ago compiled some figures on production per capita of population and compared them with Federal expenditures and gross Federal debt. They are significant. During the years 1923–29, which was the administration of President Coolidge, the production index figure was 405 per capita, the Federal expenditures were $1,314 per capita and the gross Federal debt was $5,017 per capita. During the years 1933–40, which was the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the production per capita fell to 312—which was 4 points lower than during the period 1901–09, which was the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt—the Federal expenditures per capita rose to $3,108, and the gross Federal debt to $11,709. That is, as the Government tried to replace American individual initiative and free private enterprise with a system of doles and regulations administered by welfare workers, production fell by nearly a quarter, Federal expenditures nearly tripled and the gross Federal debt more than doubled. Remember that those figures are per head of population. Any man with ordinary sense knows that the end is not far away if, on a declining volume of business, one increases spending and debt.

That brings us to another highly important point which somehow does not seem generally to be grasped, and that is Government borrowing. I think the reason for the confusion is partly the sort of statistics that have been coming out of Washington and partly the mystery that somehow surrounds banking. A commercial bank as distinguished from a savings bank, which is not a bank at all but an investment trust, does not lend money. It lends credit. That a bank does not lend money but lends a credit which serves as money, sounds as though queer business were going on somewhere, but that is nonsense. Probably no single factor has been so important in the growth of British and American trade as the flexible banking system which can circulate credit as money. But that system will work only in private hands, because it depends on loans being paid off out of new production. In Government hands, the banking system may serve to create the illusion of money, and that is exactly what has happened here and is at the root of our trouble.

Although the New Deal pretended to redistribute wealth, it never collected in taxes more than half the money it spent, and I may say right here that the kind of social reform which has to be supported by borrowing—which, as I shall develop, turns into money printing—is not social reform at all but something in the nature of fake-stock selling. The Government borrowed from the banks. When a bank buys Government securities, it opens a deposit to the credit of the Government to the amount of the securities and puts them among its assets. It follows the same procedure as with an individual borrower. If the Government does not retire its securities, the bank deposits created by their purchase remain, and it may surprise you to know that the increase in our bank deposits since 1916 has been entirely due to Government borrowing; for business, up until the opening of the war period was borrowing less than in 1916.

Our bank deposits are no longer an evidence of wealth or of savings. They simply represent unpaid Government borrowing. Since they may be turned into hand money at any time, they are simply a Government way of printing paper money, and you will remember that our money is no longer exchangeable for gold. If there had been an attempt to spend these bank deposits at any time between, say, 1937 and 1941, we would have had an inflation of prices which would have made a piker out of the 1929 stock market. If such an attempt at individual spending had then occurred, we would have then had all the controls that we have now. But it was just not worth while for the individual to spend for gain, because under the tax laws the Government said: "Heads I win and tails you lose."

Now we are at war, but, financially speaking, we are continuing to do what we did during the social welfare days of the New Deal. The Government then raised, by borrowing, about half of what it spent. Now it is spending sums far beyond human comprehension and raising about three-quarters of the money through the commercial banks—or, to put it bluntly, by printing money. A change in the basic law and character of the Federal Reserve System has made this possible.

Now let us see what all this means. You have heard a lot of fancy talk out of Washington about the "inflationary gap" and about the necessity of controlling inflation through controlling prices, and so on, and so on. It may or may not have struck you that, no matter what happens, turns out to be a reason for more Government control. The "inflationary gap" is supposed to be the difference between the amount of goods available to buy, which in turn is supposed to be exactly the amount of goods on which our civilian population can stay alive and work, and the amount which the Government is spending. The notion is that through taxes, forced savings, price control, and rationing, the Government can create money at will and make it act, smell, and taste like money, and at the same time prevent it from being used as money. This is exactly the manner in which Hitler managed to rearm Germany, although by now, both in Germany and in Russia, money is only a ticket entitling one to use a ration book. We are in a half-socialistic planned economy, but unfortunately our chief planners have astigmatism and are working without their glasses.

We have in this Nation no shortages that are not man made. I include both materials and manpower. You are familiar with the mess in manpower. We have a national shortage of rubber and sectional shortages of petroleum products. Even elementary prevision would have supplied us with a great rubber stock pile and a synthetic rubber industry which would have been in production by the time the pile was used up. Equally elementary prevision would have provided either a petroleum transportation safe from enemy attacks or an adequate defense against these attacks. The recklessness which ignored these vital supplies has cut deeply into the efficiency of our war effort, both directly by crippling a great section of our transport and indirectly by wasting, before various sorts of boards, manpower that could have usefully been employed. It is quite evident that the bureaucrats applied to the motor problem the same grade of reasoning that stopped for a few weeks the selling of sliced bread.

There is not now and never was a shortage of sugar except for a little while after Mrs. Roosevelt and Secretary Wickard reassured us on the radio. There need be no shortage of coffee. Practically all of our shortages have been due to loose talking, planless planning, hopelessly involved and ever-changing procedures and competition between governmental buying agencies. It is a magnificent tribute to American industry that it has been able to produce so gloriously in spite of governmental regulation.

That is over the dam, but a new series of regulations are not over the dam and we can do something about them before they take us into another winter so cold and so hungry that we may become helpless.

I refer to the extraordinary antics of the Office of Price Administration. Our food shortage is not due to the people eating too much or the soldiers eating too much or Lend-Lease sending abroad too much. The shortage is due wholly to the Office of Price Administration. Its ceilings, its regulations, and its horde of busybodies have turned upside down our whole structure of food production and distribution. The official pleas that the people or the black markets or causes outside the Office of Price Administration are to blame are untrue. They are getting pretty tiresome. The flag-waving pleas are contemptible. In the last war Herbert Hoover, without rationing or regulations, sent twice as much food overseas as is being sent in this war, and not only provided the home table with ample food, but also, at the war's end, had more beef cattle on the farms than at the beginning. He relied on the voluntary cooperation of American citizens. The present administration talks about cooperation but relied solely on regimentation and compulsion. The order fixing prices was an order for the winds to cease and the seas to still. The order to roll back prices was an order for the seas to part and open a passage. It set a new high in bumptious ignorance until the order came through to compensate losses and to spur production through subsidies. The intricacy of that undertaking baffles the imagination, and it is wholly evident that its projectors have not the slightest idea of the nature of the bull or the nature of the tail they have grabbed. The Office of Price Administration, having caused an acute food shortage through its policies and regulations, now replies with more regulations, and, if unchecked, will surely bring this Nation into acute hunger. It has withdrawn from our economy the one thing which kept the economy alive—the spark of individual initiative. The rationing which was designed to limit the spending power of the dollar was so clumsily conceived and executed that it is forcing the spending of more dollars. The regulations are not preventing inflation. They are preventing production and making inflation more acute.

Let us put aside the bright-colored blocks with which so many are playing post-war world, and get on with the grim job of winning the war on the home front. For it is on the home as well as the foreign fronts that crisis impends. If we fail here all else will fail. It is time for the real spirit of America to assert itself.

Presentation of Army-Navy E Award to Gilbane Building Co., of Providence, R. I.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting address delivered by Admiral Gaylord Church, of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy Department, at the presentation ceremony of the Army-Navy E award to the Gilbane Building Co., of Providence, held at the Naval Training Station, Newport, R. I., on May 15.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF ADMIRAL GAYLORD CHURCH, BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS, NAVY DEPARTMENT

1. In the present war two types of weapons are being used to an ever-increasing extent—aerial bombs and torpedoes. The wide use of aerial bombs in naval warfare is a new departure in naval combat and it has been so successful that new methods of strategy and tactics have been necessary to meet this new weapon.

2. Aerial bombing is spectacular and seizes the popular imagination. It is the new and outstanding development of the present war and there is hardly a front page of our daily newspapers that does not herald the success of the damage inflicted by these missiles from the air.

3. On the other hand, the other weapon, the torpedo, comes in for little publicity. It is the stealthy weapon of attack, discharged at the unsuspecting ship when least expected in the dead of night, at unpredictable hours of the day, and when stormy weather brings visibility to a minimum. It is the weapon of the submarine, the destroyer, and the PT boat. Its success cannot be blazoned across our front pages. Instead, we read months after the event that the crew of such and such a ship has been landed at an east coast port. Or upon the completion of a cruise of one of our submarines in enemy waters, we are given the tonnage sunk by the marauder with an occasional picture of an enemy ship in the act of sinking.

4. The deadly accuracy and the extensive destruction caused by the torpedo consequently cannot fire the popular imagination, and the very secrecy of its use and the reports of the results prevent widespread appreciation of its tremendous power in determining the issues of the present war. We were familiar with its use in the last war and have accepted it as just another weapon of proven worth in the present war. It is rather surprising, then, to learn that over 50 percent of all vessels sunk, whether by gunfire, aerial bombs, or otherwise, have been sunk by the torpedo.

5. Here at Newport is the home of the American torpedo. Here our energies are being redoubled in research and technique to produce the best torpedoes in the world. The demand for torpedoes has necessitated continued increase of the facilities to produce and test them. The naval torpedo station at Newport, however, still maintains its position at the head of torpedo production, and our fleets depend on the research and experimentation that is the daily task throughout the 24 hours of the workers at Newport.

6. We on the home front like to feel that our efforts are closely connected with the efforts of those on the battle front. You of the Gilbane Building Co. are particularly fortunate in having been engaged in the construction of this splendid annex of the naval torpedo station here at Newport. You have had an intimate hand in construction which is so vitally necessary to our torpedo production. You have constructed it expeditiously and satisfactorily, with excellent planning and management, showing exceptional foresight and executive skill. You have overcome the difficulties inherent in wartime construction and with persistent and untiring efforts you have surmounted these difficulties and produced these excellent results.

7. From an original contract, estimated in the neighborhood of $2,500,000, you are completing this project and the facilities in the adjacent supply depot at a probably total cost in the neighborhood of three times the original figure. You have taken these additions to your contract in your stride. Your patriotism has been involved, and you have nobly responded in your war effort. I hope you all take pride in your work and I am sure you will feel a special interest from now on in the exploits of the American Navy with their torpedoes.

8. In view of your excellent performance, today it is my happy privilege to represent the Government and, on behalf of the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, to present to you the Army and Navy production award, a joint award by both services for the excellent work you have performed on this project so essential to the support of our naval forces.

9. This award is a much-coveted honor and is the highest award the Government has to offer for an achievement in the construction or production field. It is given each month by the Government to the five construction units throughout the entire United States who have been outstanding in their construction performance as to speed in construction, quality of the work, cooperative attitude of the management, cooperation between the management and its employees, ability of the management to overcome construction difficulties, avoidance of work stoppages, minimum absenteeism, and conservation of critical materials.

10. The award is given to you as a construction unit, which means the award is not only for the management, represented by the contractors but for their architects and engineers, associated subcontractors, and for each and every employee on the job.

11. The award consists of a commendatory letter from the Secretary of the Navy to the management, the privilege of flying an "E" pennant at the site so that all may know the excellent work performed by your organization, and the distribution of "E" pins to every employee who has contributed by his good work to this outstanding achievement.

12. The E award for many years has been the coveted award of vessels in our Navy which have excelled in gunnery, engineering, and in general excellence. Since the production and construction industry has been so closely associated with the war effort of our Navy, it is only natural that we should desire you to have the same E award in recognition of your efforts in contributing to the general excellence of our Army and Navy. This award should be particularly gratifying to you since it is only made, as I have said, to five contracting units throughout the entire United States, and particularly when it is realized that the best contractors in the country have been engaged in this competition. An E award under these circumstances means a great deal. Not only to the management but to every one of you who has been associated in the work performed under this contract. It means that you have had the full loyalty of all subcontractors and all employees and that all of you have contributed in an outstanding manner in the war effort of your country.

13. I desire at this time to congratulate the officer in charge of construction, Captain Halloran, and all of his assistants and naval employees for the splendid work they must have done in cooperating with you to achieve and make possible this result. The final success has been due to teamwork of an outstanding character.

14. To the employees of this construction unit, may I say that you have an enviable share in attaining this award, for without your loyalty, your skill, and cooperative effort, the management and their associates would have been powerless to produce this result.

15. You all have been fighting on a home front, which, in many respects, requires as much energy and loyalty as fighting with weapons on the battle front. Your contribution toward the ultimate victory of this country and its allies, though possibly not as spectacular, is just as important and necessary as the effort of the man under arms. Your arms are the tools of the trade, and you have used them well. You could not have done better with rifles.

16. Due to the special character of this war, there are other men of your trades who were in the construction industry and are now on the American battle fronts all over the world. They are the famous, but little-heard-of construction battalions. Their work is not spectacular, but they have been of invaluable service in establishing the advance bases all over the world, so necessary to successfully prosecute this war. They are part of the armed forces of the Navy. They are known as the Seabees, a word which expresses their naval character and the industry with which they accomplish their work. These construction battalions are recruited from your ranks. They are skilled and unskilled men in the building trades and construction industry, who have elected to use their profession on the battle front, rather than on the home front. They are one with you in the work they are doing and in the tools and in the methods which they are using. You are constructing bases at home; they are constructing bases in or near the enemy country. You have a common objective and a common incentive. The efforts of you both are necessary for victory.

17. Let me add that any of you who are physically fit and know your trades can join these splendid construction battalions and contribute with your skill directly in the war effort along the lines of the work you have been trained to do and have done here. Our tremendous construction program is gradually nearing completion. The facilities we have provided are being taken over by the production industry. It may be difficult soon for many of you to find construction work. If so, may I urge you to utilize your professional knowledge in helping with your skill to win our victories on the battle fronts? I can think of no better or more patriotic thing for those of you who can than to join your comrades in these construction battalions.

18. Although I have said that our construction program is drawing gradually to a successful completion, do not misunderstand me to mean by that statement that there can be any slackening of our effort, either in production or construction on the home front. Our fighting men are winning their battles on the military front, but the home front has not yet won its battles. Make no mistake about this war, it is a fight to the finish. When we see in the press encouraging statements as to our progress at the battle fronts

and our enormous strides toward increased production of war equipment and materials, do not let these statements lull you into a false sense of optimism or into a belief that the war is practically won.

Such false optimism tends to slow down production, and it might very well prove fatal. As a matter of fact, after more than 1 full year of war we have just begun to fight. Our advances have been small as compared to those of our enemy. Do not underestimate the tremendous strength of the war machines of Germany and Japan. Their resources have immeasurably increased and you may rest assured that they are consolidating their gains and utilizing these potential resources in a most efficient manner.

19. The tides of battle are subject to unexpected and unpredictable changes and you must be prepared for the worst and strive for the best. This can only be done with untiring effort on the part of everyone. The man on the battle front in his extreme efforts, efforts which may involve the loss of his very life, needs your support at home to win. How can we expect him to protect our interests in this tremendous struggle if we do not give him our full assistance loyally and to the best of our ability. If you are complacent as to the result and outcome of this war you had better revise your optimism. We will win, but only by our united effort.

20. Our effort on the home front can be improved by dedicating ourselves thoroughly to the work we have been given to do. To do that work willingly and loyally is our contribution to the gallant efforts of the men under fire. Let us not be absent from our post of duty, from our job, for any other reason but illness.

21. Our effort can be increased by care in preventing avoidable accidents. Due to the increased employment of many persons in unfamiliar jobs, the accident rate has increased enormously. Accidents last year resulted in the death of 93,000 persons and in the injury of 9,000,000. Such losses far exceed those on the battle fronts, and yet the loss of available manpower and work hours is a distinct and serious threat to our production efforts on the home front. We must be as careful of our resources on the home front as they are on the battle front.

22. You men of this construction unit are being given this award today for your excellent work on this job. It has been based on your good record on these very points: Absenteeism, cooperation, and accident prevention. I congratulate you on your good showing on this particular contract, and I trust you will continue your good work not only on this job but on your next. You will wear E pins which will show that you are capable of excellent work. On your next job you will be expected to live up to the standards which obtained this E award. Be proud of your success and worthy of the confidence the Government has in you in giving you this award. Remember, you are on a battle front, and endeavor every day to be at your post. Make every minute count. Continue your good efforts and victory is bound to be ours.

Changing the Constitution by Statute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THEODORE G. BILBO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and impressive argument by Hon. Arthur Krock, appearing in the May 18 issue of the New York Times, under the title "Changing the Constitution by Statute." The article is in opposition to proposed anti-poll-tax legislation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION BY STATUTE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 17—A long and uninterrupted line of Supreme Court decisions is challenged by the anti-poll-tax bill which has been petitioned out of the House Judiciary Committee and is about to become once more a focus of controversy. If the measure should become law and is upheld on a test of its constitutionality, the present Supreme Court will be obliged to reverse John Marshall and other eminent Justices.

A majority of the Court may find legal language with which to do that, for "the Constitution is what the judges say it is." But if Congress attempts this fundamental change in the American governing system, and the Court approves, then the writers of the Constitution, Jefferson notable among them, and their explanation of the principle of the separation of powers must be overridden at the same time.

This is a celebrant year in the Capital for Jefferson insofar as words and marble memorials are concerned. But perhaps if he could return and be offered his choice he would prefer devotion to his theory of American democratic government and his interpretation of the national charter. Jefferson was abroad when the body of the Constitution was written, but largely on his insistence the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights—were added. So he may be quoted as an authority.

JEFFERSON ON STATE POWERS

The following excerpts from his writings on the powers reserved to the States are pertinent to the forthcoming debate on the anti-poll-tax bill and are not (as in the instances of some other views of Jefferson) modified by anything he wrote before or after:

"It is of immense consequence that the State retain as complete authority as possible over their own citizens. The way to have good and safe government is not to trust it all to one (Washington) but to divide it among the many, distributing to everyone exactly the functions he is competent to perform. Let the National Government be entrusted with the defense of the Nation and its foreign and Federal relations; the State government with the civil rights, laws, police, and administration of what concerns the States generally.

"Every State retained (in the Constitution) its self-government in domestic matters, as better qualified to direct them to the good and satisfaction of its citizens than a general government so distant from its remoter citizens and so little familiar with the local peculiarities of the different parts."

Two principal arguments have been made against the imposition of the poll tax by certain States as a qualification for voting on candidates for national as well as for State offices. One is that if a State can fix a poll tax of $1.50 it can fix a poll tax of $1,500 or more. The other is that, though the constitutionality of the anti-poll-tax bill is doubtful, it is better to legislate the doubt favorably and leave the decision to the courts.

The answer to the first point is that no State government could put a confiscatory tax through the legislature, the processes of democracy themselves prevent such extremes, since only the few are wealthy or prosperous. The answer to the second point is that, when the President in 1935 asked the House to overlook doubts of the constitutionality of the first Guffey bill and pass it regardless, the request was pretty generally attacked as unbefitting one sworn to uphold the laws.

AN UNCHANGING DICTUM

But if the legal records, such testimony as Jefferson's and other documentation are a guide, there is no doubt at all that the anti-poll tax bill is unconstitutional. From 1833 onward the right of States to fix electoral qualifications for all offices, national as well as local, has been sustained. The courts have held repeatedly that admission to suffrage is not a right but a privilege within the powers of the States to bestow on terms not inconsistent with the Constitution. And the Constitution forbids a State to deny suffrage to citizens on the bases of race, color, previous condition of servitude or sex only.

The poll tax has kept many poor southern whites and more Negroes from the ballot box. But the courts have said constantly that where an effect is incidental, and not on its face prescribed, the States are within the rights specifically reserved to them in the Constitution.

In *Barron* v. *Baltimore*, Chief Justice Marshall held that the Bill of Rights "contains no expression indicating an intention to apply it to the State governments," and in 1875 the court said it was "too late" to question the truth of that. In *United States* v. *Cruickshank* (1876), the Supreme Court ruled that the right to vote in the States comes from the States, but that the right of exemption from discrimination for race, color, etc., comes from the Constitution. The Court also found that the fourteenth and nineteenth amendments do not necessarily confer the right of suffrage.

By constitutional amendment the poll tax can be legally abolished, but, on the record's face, not by statute. And, in view of the fourth-term drive and the New Deal's trend to centralization, every new Federal grab of rights reserved to the States is a new peril to the American democratic system.

Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of May 3, 1943, having to do with the Trade Agreements Act and the position taken thereon by Robert H. Patchin. I also ask that the letter addressed by Mr. Patchin to the New York Times dated April 29, 1943, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

We are glad to publish in another column on this page today a letter in which Robert H. Patchin, correcting a headline which inadvertently attached itself to a recent editorial, makes a strong case for continuation of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. Of course, these agreements are not treaties. They are a delegation of congressional power, not a surrender. The conditions under which

this delegated power is exercised by the executive branch are strict. In Secretary Hull's words: "It was specifically provided that no duty could be reduced by more than 50 percent; that no article could be transferred between the dutiable and the free lists; that, while the proclaimed duties whould be applicable to imports from all countries, their application could be suspended in the case of countries which discriminate against American goods." No agreement can run longer than 3 years and a half. No agreement is concluded without public hearings, at which all interested persons can present their arguments.

The act has been in force 9 years. It has been twice renewed. We have agreements with 27 countries, representing about 40 percent of the world's normal trade. Sixteen of these countries are at war with the Axis, 6 have broken with the Axis and are giving us material aid, 4 are neutral, and only 1, Finland, is in league—and as far as the Finnish people are concerned, we believe unwilling league—with our enemies. These agreements look forward toward a peaceful, cooperative, prosperous post-war civilization. They have the endorsement of the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States (renewed this week), the National Foreign Trade Council and, we believe, the great body of public opinion. The American Federation of Labor, opposed to renewal in 1940, is now in favor of it.

Amendments defeated in the House Ways and Means Committee, but certain to come up on the floor, include a proposal to subject the agreements to a 90-day congressional veto. If adopted this amendment would almost surely mean a bitter wrangle, with competing lobbies hard at work behind the scenes, every time an agreement was entered into. It would bring back the days of logrolling, which the act was specifically intended to terminate. We believe the act should be extended as it stands, for the full 3-year period.

TRADE PACTS NOT TREATIES—CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL IS HELD TO BE UNNECESSARY AND HARMFUL

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The heading "Mr. Hull's Trade Treaties" on an otherwise excellent editorial falls into a familiar error. The reciprocal trade agreements are not treaties. They are agreements with foreign countries and made under the authority of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. This is a delegation of Congressional authority to the President, empowering him to make, within strict limits, concessions in our tariff in consideration of concessions accorded us in the tariffs of other countres.

The principle of delegation of Congressional authority is nothing new. Congress has delegated various of its powers, within limits, to innumerable Government departments and agencies. Hundreds of agreements relating to postal affairs, public health, immigration, etc., have been made with foreign countries. Not being treaties, these agreements do not require Senate ratification and this question has been passed upon by the highest courts.

CONGRESSIONAL POWER SOUGHT

It is now apparent that opponents of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will try to change it by requiring that agreements be subject to congressional approval or congressional veto within a specified period after the agreement has been concluded. There would seem to be no more justification for this than for provisions for Congressional approval for rulings of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission or any other governmental entity operating under limited delegated authority of Congress. From a practical standpoint such a requirement would wreck the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program. It would mean that the officials negotiating the agreements would have to constantly bear in mind all sorts of political risks.

It is well known that Congress is loath to legislate any change in the tariff except in the infrequent general revisions. The reason is that legislation on one item or a group of items is certain to precipitate a demand for many other changes until a general revision results. If every trade agreement has to be submitted to Congress for approval or to await possible veto, the tariff issue would be kept constantly boiling.

ONLY THREE TREATIES

It remains to be proved that the trade agreements hitherto negotiated have injured our domestic economy as a whole. On the other hand, the total and specific benefits have been very great.

In our entire history only three reciprocity treaties were ratified, each arising out of special conditions with Canada, Hawaii, and Cuba. The Republican Dingley Act of 1897 authorized the negotiation of "reciprocity treaties" which had to be submitted for Senate approval. Despite the urging of President McKinley these treaties never got out of the Senate committee, where they died.

It ought to be understood that the proposals for Senate ratification, Congressional approval or Congressional veto are just another way of killing the act.

ROBERT H. PATCHIN.

NEW YORK, *April 29, 1943.*

Organization for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in yesterday's Washington Post entitled "Time by the Forelock."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME BY THE FORELOCK

The first anniversary of the Russo-British alliance is a reminder that this country is still lagging behind its war associates in organizing for peace. To be sure, the pact aimed at binding the signatories together to make war more vigorously. But what London and Moscow had chiefly in mind was the need to assume the responsibilities necessary to win the peace. Accordingly the two countries, knowing that peace is more difficult to secure than war is to win, agreed to remain allies for 20 years. They promised to take all the measures in their power to prevent further aggression in Europe by Germany or her allies. And they pledged themselves to collaborate in "the organization of security and economic prosperity in Europe."

That two of the greatest of our Allies should have agreed to perpetuate their association after the conquest of the common enemy is the basic political fact facing our post-war planners. It is a wholly beneficent fact. In wars of coalition the greatest danger is that the victors might be torn apart over the peace settlement. In such a situation the war might easily be lost, especially if, as was the case at the Congress of Vienna, a Talleyrand happens to be the diplomatist for the enemy powers. This is what Moscow and London were determined to avoid. But equally pronounced was their desire to make the new treaty a first step to world security insured in common. The two signatories were explicit on this point. They reaffirmed their desire to unite with the governments of other countries to preserve peace and resist aggression in the period after the war. Our Government, indeed, was kept apprised of the negotiation, and gave the pact its blessing when the signatures were announced.

To this political architecture of the peace, two countries have thus set their seal. Of the remaining allies, the stand of the United States is of main concern. The American enigma, as Demaree Bess calls it, hangs over the world like a huge question mark. It is an enigma because there is never any guaranty that the Senate will ratify the engagements of the President in foreign affairs. At one time it looked as if the Ball resolution would erase the enigma. But where is the Ball resolution? Evidently it is still in the pigeonhole of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—along with other resolutions which would aline the Senate with the President in organizing peace. That seems to be the conclusion of the authors of the Ball resolution. At any rate, Senator Hatch on Sunday warned of the danger of doing nothing. He called do-nothingness "the most dangerous course of all," and pleaded anew that the vast resources we have mobilized against the enemy be kept in use against future aggression.

Yet the Senate is not only doing nothing, it is discussing a project which would be positively damaging to the perpetuation of Allied accord. This is the Danaher amendment to the trade agreements law. Under that amendment Congress would serve notice to the world that 6 months after the end of hostilities Congress might terminate any and all agreements concluded under the act. The amendment is wholly gratuitous, for Congress already has that power under the Constitution. That it is proposed to tie this reminder of the congressional ax to the renewal of the trade act can mean only one thing. And that is that its advocates do not have their hearts in the trade-agreements program and wish to take the first opportunity of any post-war reaction or tiredness to kill it. They dare not challenge the swelling chorus of Americans from every walk of life who have demanded the renewal of the Hull program. But they cannot resist advertising their rod in pickle. Is this the way to build a new world out of the ashes of the old?

Those who are behind the Danaher amendment are looking backward to the pre-war era. And they are looking a long way back. Even as far back as 1932, or 2 years after the fateful Hawley-Smoot tariff law, the Republicans had taken the measure of that folly. In the platform of 1932 they came out flatly against any return to Congress of the power to put into effect the tariff-changing powers of the Tariff Commission. This is what they said:

"We commend the President's veto of the measure, sponsored by Democratic Congressmen, which would have transferred from the President to the Congress the authority to put into effect the findings of the Tariff Commission. Approval of the measure would have returned tariff making to politics and destroyed the progress made during 10 years of effort to lift it out of logrolling methods. We pledge the Republican Party to a policy which will retain the gains made and enlarge the present scope of greater progress."

The Hull system did "retain the gains made and enlarge the present scope of greater

progress." That is the verdict of industrialists and labor leaders both—men who have been persuaded of the wisdom of the law by Mr. Hull's administration of it. Yet the Republicans are leading the fight to attach a club to it. This is not the way to lead the present into the future. It is the way of the destroyer. If such an attitude prevails, the post-war era would become another pre-war era, as Frank H. Simonds called the last post-war era. Congress should join the President in the task of doing our part to build the foundation of the new world. Artificers as well as soldiers are required in order that we may win the peace. To stand still nowadays is to go backward. This is what London and Moscow felt when they took time by the forelock a year ago and signed their alliance.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley at the Fifth Annual Holy Communion and Breakfast of the St. George Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a thoughtful address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at the fifth annual Holy Communion and breakfast of the St. George Association, United States Post Office, New York, May 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To again be the guest of the St. George Association at this annual communion breakfast is an honor I deeply appreciate. Renewing old ties and greeting so many of my former coworkers have added pleasant aspects to the occasion. The passing of time can never dim the memory of the many happy years I spent in the Postal Service.

I am fully cognizant of the stress imposed on you by the war. That you are meeting the extraordinary demands so ably is a tribute to your efficiency, your loyalty, and your patriotism. As one who knows intimately your problems, and being in a position to judge adequately how you are meeting them, for I am still a heavy consumer of stamps, I want to congratulate you, your postmaster, and the department on the superb service being rendered despite the overloads and difficulties resultant from the war.

Two years ago we met and prayed for peace. It was not to be.

Last year we met when the outlook was black. Those months were probably as dark as any in our Nation's history. We prayed again for victory over our enemies. Those prayers are being answered.

The success of the African campaign augurs well for the future. We can be proud of the ascending triumphs of our armed forces and those of our allies. But in the exultation of our successes, we can well pause and in silent reverence utter a prayer from grateful hearts for our honored dead, whose sacrifices have marked the cost of our continued freedom.

The inevitable destruction of those who would destroy our way of life is more than a winning of a war. To us in America it is a vindication of our form of government. The would-be fuehrer of the world staked the fulfillment of his mad ambitions on the premise that our democracy could not wage total war. In his book, to wage total war meant subservience of the people to government by decree.

That ideology was repugnant to everything elemental in American life. The issue was drawn definitely with all the advantages of preparation on the side of the aggressor. These advantages were augmented by initial victories and later by acquisition of the armament and forces of Mussolini and Hirohito. The adversaries seemingly had everything. But one thing was missing. One fundamental element was on our side. That element was individual freedom.

As this war progresses the free nations are outproducing, outmaneuvering, and outfighting the Fascist hordes. Our men and women work and fight as individuals, but the directness of their aims and ideals is toward the one objective of preserving their rights as free peoples. Those common aims have achieved a unity of purpose that will not be denied.

Out of those same aims was born the Declaration of Independence. To perpetuate those aims the Constitution was adopted. To strengthen them Lincoln made the Proclamation of Emancipation. To defend them we joined the First World War. We now put on the altar of liberty everything we have, if need be, to insure that our children will enjoy fruits of freedom to their fullest sweetness.

To have done otherwise would have been unthinkable.

Today we can be thankful for the wisdom of our war leaders; for the bravery of our millions who are risking their all in the service; for the united efforts of our war workers; and, for the favors bestowed on our President and the Government by Divine Providence.

It is not beyond possibility that when the St. George Association meets again a year hence, that the clouds of holocaust will have been dissipated by the sunlight of a victorious cessation of hostilities.

If this should come to pass, the people of the world will be confronted with new problems. But who dares to say that the free citizens of the democracies cannot in their united wisdom find solutions that will promote progress and lessen the frictions which erupt into armed conflicts? Surely the failure of despotism to accomplish conquest will relegate to oblivion all the inane theories that hurled the world into chaos twice in a single generation. Master races have learned from a multitude of miseries that wisdom has its inception in the intelligence of the many and not from a master mind. Public opinion is the most potent force in the world. Free people have always abhorred recourse to arms. Once all the nations acquire each for its people, the intelligence that guides a discerning public opinion, war is bound to follow despotism into permanent odium.

When this hoped-for day comes to pass, the great institution of democratic government will have accomplished what has been the hope of centuries. Then, and only then, will the living be able to say that the sacrifices of the dead have not been in vain. We who are the privileged at home owe it to those who face the foes on far-flung battle lines to do everything in our power to bring about the consummation of those desires for peace that constitute the inspiration that is the driving force propelling the crusade to victory which will presage a peace of permanency.

May God grant that the dawn of attainment of this devoutly-wished-for day be the answer to His humanity's prayer.

The American System of Free Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a prize-winning essay in a national contest held by Forbes, on the subject of whether we should preserve the system under which our country has grown great and strong. This essay is from the pen of a self-made man. He started "from scratch," was born poor on a Texas ranch, taught a rural school, was a bee keeper for 5 years, and now lives in Karnes City, Tex.

Men like Heber E. Coffey are the hope of this Nation, and those who would put America in a totalitarian straitjacket must first destroy Americanism in the minds and hearts of men like Coffey. This essay and the editorial from the Roane County Banner, this day inserted in the RECORD by me, were sent me by my friend, George Gray, a former resident of Roane County, who is a close reader, a clear thinker, and a patriotic American citizen.

The article follows:

WHY I FAVOR PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

(Condensed from Forbes)

(By H. E. Coffey)

When I mention the freedom of opportunity that the American system of free private enterprise offers, critics often try to tell me that our frontiers are gone. "Where is opportunity for the poor man?" they ask. "Look at the great army of the unemployed."

I cannot believe that private enterprise is responsible for this condition. Since the last war I have seen my country drifting away from free private enterprise into the clutches of governmental control and of giant monopolies; I have witnessed the Government's power to stifle and even to destroy private enterprise grow to alarming proportions. I believe these checks on private enterprise are basically responsible for our present social problems.

Our land frontiers are gone; however, this age is not an age of farming but of science. New frontiers are being conquered today by new pioneers—our scientists, engineers, inventors, educators. These pioneers, like those of early days, work best under a system of private enterprise. Some of the most talented men and women of Europe have fled here, because America offers the freedom that private enterprise alone can offer. I favor it because of the encouragement it extends to talent of every kind.

I am an individualist. I would never be happy to be a mere cog in a wheel, to live in a house precisely like every other house in the neighborhood. I would never be happy in a civilian uniform, or if every choice concerning my life were made by someone else. To me the monotony of standardization, of regimentation, would be unbearable. Under private enterprise there is more education, freedom of conscience, liberty to choose one's occupation—in short, more freedom of the will. Give me America, where private enterprise yet holds sway.

Because my philosophy is that of self-reliance, I favor the system which allows me to choose my own path to success, to be my own boss. It rewards honest effort, just as it penalizes laziness and lack of courage. Self-reliance has never failed me, but without our system of private enterprise I would have precious little chance to exercise it.

In America I am part of the Government as well as part of the governed. My ballot and the ballots of my fellow citizens speak louder than the thunder of dictators. I cherish the privilege of voting for whom I please. I can criticize the Government without fear; when someone knocks at my door cold shivers do not run up and down my spine. I want this peace and security preserved.

I believe in economy and thrift. Private enterprise encourages these and stimulates the average person to do his best. A maximum of goods and services is therefore produced, and as a result there is more for all of us. That is one reason this is a land of progress, superior to lands under other systems. Public enterprise, on the contrary, encourages the individual to do the least that he can get by with. Under such a system less is produced, so there is less for all.

I have observed that free private enterprise makes the benefits of discoveries and inventions available to the people of America more quickly than they are to the people in any other country. Therefore, poor as I am, I may have an automobile of which a king would not be ashamed, and my home is equipped with radio, electric refrigeration, and many other conveniences denied to all but the upper classes in other lands. Under the large degree of private enterprise still left in America, I daily enjoy butter, meats, fruit juices, and pastries—foods scarce in many other countries—and never have I been compelled to use soap sparingly.

The principles of private enterprise, like the principles of Christianity, are old. At the same time they are eternally young and true. They have brought America to a high state of civilization and I believe that they must continue to be our guiding principles if we are to maintain that civilization. Other principles—socialism, communism, fascism—claim to be modern and superior. Yet they, too, are old, as history proves; and they, like the forces of hate, militarism, and fear, will never be best for mankind.

Yes; even though I am poor, I favor private enterprise because I love freedom and all the privileges it brings me as an individual.

An All-American Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Howard R. Driggs, president, American Pioneer Trails Association:

AN ALL-AMERICAN CENTENNIAL

(By Howard R. Driggs, president, American Pioneer Trails Association)

In the 1840's our country was in the throes, even as now, of struggle and readjustment. It was not a global conflict that challenged America then, but our people were expanding their vision from sea to shining sea.

When this Nation was born out of a fight for freedom, it was restricted mainly to the eastern slopes of the Alleghenies. The peace treaty that came at the close of the Revolution extended our national horizons to the Mississippi. Land-hungry settlers immediately began to stream westward, settling the woodlands and prairies, adding new stars to the flag.

With this rapid growth of our youthful Nation naturally came vital problems. Wild speculation in western lands brought widespread financial difficulties. The bottom fell out of the fur trade; farm prices went down until bacon was so cheap that it was sometimes used for fuel in steamboats plying our western rivers. Corn would bring scarcely enough to pay for the gunnybags in which it was shipped. Americans were discouraged, restless.

Mountain men, following in the wake of Lewis and Clark, had charted another vast realm beyond the Rockies. Tales they brought back of a land of smiling valleys, leaping streams, abundant game and fish, stirred settlers in our borderlands. Sailors added to the lure. Missionaries, responding to the call of the Indians for the "White Man's Book of Heaven," returned with glowing accounts of Oregon. One school teacher, Hall Kelley of Boston, caught "Oregon fever" and spread it through enthusiastic pamphlets and preaching.

All this helped to fire the hearts of men and women with the desire to go to Oregon. And thousands did go. Braving the dangers of Indian-infested plains and mountains, of desert stretches, these pioneers rolled along in their covered wagons over the old Oregon Trail. From every State east of the Mississippi and from many countries of Europe came those oxteam pioneers. The old West was the transplanted East. It was a product of the blended North and South.

It will be 100 years ago this coming autumn that the first of their covered wagon trains finally achieved the goal, the Whitman Mission. Some travel-worn pioneers even struggled on down the Columbia that same year into the valley of the Willamette. Besides the warm welcome of a scattered few other struggling settlers, there was little of cheer. It was the rainy season. They were well-nigh exhausted, had scant food and clothes, and were haunted by memories of loved ones left in graves along the trail. Yet they began to swing their axes in the woods and build their cabins. The American way of life was ahead of them.

Here was one heartening thought: Oregon had just declared its independence of Britain. A group of Americans—trappers, missionaries, settlers—had on May 2, 1843, created a provisional government under the Stars and Stripes, at Champoeg. Frontier problems had brought these pioneers together. There was need then, as now, for concerted action to protect homes against wolves and savages. Besides, one of their number, who had amassed considerable property, had died without heirs. His estate must be properly administered. In the spirit of those who drew up the "Mayflower compact" and of those who drafted the "Articles of the Watauga Association" in old Tennessee, these Oregon pioneers organized as American freemen to solve their problems.

Here was the first civil government set up in our land beyond the Rockies.

In the face of opposition of the Hudson Bay Co., the settlers were called together. A committee drew up a plan of action. Discussion followed. Then Joe Meek, from Virginia, called for a "divide." The vote was 50 against, 52 for setting up of a provisional government. Two of the Hudson Bay attachés, at outs with the company, voted with the Americans. May 2 has ever since been commemorated by the State of Oregon.

Nineteen hundred and forty-three is an all-American centennial year. We shall do well in these testing days to recall the spirit of the stalwarts who carried civilization across a continent—who gave us a two-ocean country.

Why take time in these strenuous days to commemorate that stirring past? Let this letter, written recently to Walter Meacham of Oregon, give one answer: "I read with great interest your interesting article, on page A4346 in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. When I was in France in 1918 I read a book about the old Oregon Trail, and it made me a better soldier."

During a recent trip across the continent, I spoke to groups of soldiers on the story of America's making. Their interest was keen. One officer commented: "Our boys need to get a more intimate knowledge of what America means." Soldiers are not the only ones who need to get closer to that epic. If we knew better what it cost to put the stars in our flag, we would work harder to back the boys fighting to keep those stars shining there. Winning the war is our first duty, keeping it won is a close second. A vital part of this second responsibility rests on our teachers right now.

America, literally, is a land of all nations. How are we implanting in the hearts of those who have come to help build America the fine ideals which inspired the founders of this land?

Not long ago a lecture dealing with American pioneers on the road to Oregon was given in an eastern high school, most of whose students heard little or no English in their homes. At the close a young man said, "If we could have our history taught like that, we'd feel like saluting the flag. We're required to salute it, but most of us don't know what it is all about."

Evidently these students, like many others, were being fed merely the husks of history. Facts of history are of basic importance, but life-giving lessons are vital to the preservation of our civilization. Our main problem is to make the story of America's making come to life. Stories of America's pioneering are of import here. Let youth help save the fading trails, reclaim the story spots around which pioneer drama was enacted—and history will begin to glow.

In the all-American centennial commemorating the Old Oregon Trail is a golden opportunity. Alert teachers will seize upon this chance to help enrich history and geography, language, and literature, science and nature study, art and music. How? Well, try an "Information, please" with such questions as these:

What two brothers from Virginia played outstanding roles in the exploration of the West? What youth from Kentucky, after a trek to Oregon, discovered the geysers of the Yellowstone? Many of the boys and girls will not know well the stories of William and George Rogers Clark. Many will not be acquainted with John Colter, who told tall tales of spouting springs. Similar questions can be based on Wilson Price Hunt and his Astorians, who opened the Oregon Trail; Joseph Reddeford Walker, discoverer of the Yosemite; the New York heroines, Narcissus Prentiss Whitman and Eliza Hart Spalding, who went with their missionary husbands in 1836 to plant missions among the Indians beyond the Rockies; John Ball, of New Hampshire, who taught the first school in old Oregon; John C. Frémont, who won fame as a pathfinder.

Oregon has its Albany, Portland, Salem, Dallas, Bridgeport. It is recreation for boys and girls to trace the path of the pioneers across our land by finding the names they

placed on it. Such lessons serve to link every part of our country with every other part as one nation indivisible.

Ask pupils to gather from their family lore stories that link the pioneering of America. Give them opportunity to bring to class some old relic and tell its story.

For the centennial there will be Days of Remembrance. May 2—Champoeg Day—is one. There is time to prepare spirited programs, perhaps plays and pagentry depicting the story of Champoeg. Please do not put gray beards on the pioneers. Those who made the conquest of the West were in the vigor of youth.

Another time of remembrance will come in October. That is the month when, 100 years ago, the "cow column," a caravan of ox teams, came down the Blue Mountains to the Whitman Mission. Where shall dependable help be obtained by those who would get that all-American epic in its verities?

1. The Oregon Plan, a pamphlet outlining activities for various grades and listing books, poems, songs. A booklet, issued by the Oregon State Council of the American Pioneer Trails Associations, is also available from Secretary Walter Meacham, 1605 NW., Fourteenth Avenue, Portland.

2. Washington Irving's Astoria (1853, Putnam).

3. Howard R. Driggs' Westward America (1942, Lippincott).

4. Francis Parkman's Oregon Trail (1930, Winston).

5. Donald C. Peattie's Forward the Nation (1942, Putnam)—the Lewis and Clark story.

6. Ezra Meeker's Oxteam Days (1923, World Book)—first-hand experiences of a pioneer of the 1850's who, after more than half a century of helping build our Northwest, led in reclaiming the Oregon Trail.

Thirty-seven years have passed since that picturesque pioneer, Ezra Meeker, trekked in a rebuilt prairie schooner across the Oregon Trail. His purpose was to restore the historic trail for all time. He enlisted boys and girls in schools along the trail, who erected enduring monuments to mark it. Through the years since then Ezra Meeker's work has been carried forward. In 1930 the Old Oregon Trail, with the proclamation of the Covered Wagon Centennial by President Hoover, was lifted into the national limelight. Hundreds of monuments now mark story spots along it.

One aim of this year of observance is to carry to completion the memorialization of the Old Oregon Trail. With the willing help of the boys and girls of our schools and their elders we can do it. In this accomplishment and in learning the great story of old Oregon we all shall "dedicate ourselves to the great task remaining before us." In the renewed spirit of the pioneers who made America we shall keep America.

O. P. A. and Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, so many urgent letters come to me from my district from its most substantial and able businessmen crying out against the price rulings of O. P. A., that I am impelled again to call to the attention of the Congress the seriousness of the situation facing the small retail merchant, threatening the break-down of distribution of food products and the necessities of life which, if allowed to continue to run, in my opinion, will not only strike a very damaging blow to the financial economy of the Nation but will seriously retard the war effort.

This Congress and the great majority of the American people are aware of the necessity of price control which will help to prevent a price rise that will bring about inflation, but the Congress and the people have a right to expect that those agencies selected to administer price control will be made up of citizens who have had practical and successful experience in business and that those in charge of price fixing should be business leaders in the lines upon which prices are fixed and people who believe, without any question, in the tried and proven philosophy of free enterprise.

I would like to call your attention now to some sworn testimony brought out in the hearings before the select committee set up under House Resolution No. 18 to study the problems confronting the small businessmen of the Nation.

In a hearing before this committee last week on May 21, Dr. J. Kenneth Galbraith, Deputy Administrator of the Price Department of the Office of Price Administration, was questioned at length by Congressman PATMAN, chairman of the committee, Congressman CHARLES A. HALLECK, Congressman WALTER C. PLOESER, and others of the committee. I think the background of Dr. Galbraith, under his sworn testimony before this committee, indicates one of the weaknesses of the O. P. A. administration which tends to prove the lack of practical experience. It must be taken into consideration that Dr. Galbraith is the number one top man who is leading in the control of prices affecting the manufacturer, wholesaler, jobber, and the retail merchant. His decisions directly affect billions of dollars in goods and services flowing through the channels of trade to 135,000,000 people.

On being questioned by the committee, Dr. Galbraith gave his age as 34 and that he was born in Canada. Being questioned as to his training for and experience in the important position he now holds, answering the question of Chairman PATMAN:

Did you ever have a business of your own, Doctor?

He replied:

I ran a farm once.

The chairman then questioned:

What size farm?

He answered:

One hundred and seventy-five acres.

The chairman then asked:

How long did you run the farm, Doctor?

His answer was:

I ran the farm from the age of 17 to the age of 19.

Then again the chairman asked:

Did you ever have any experience in distribution?

Dr. Galbraith replied:

No, sir; I never had any business experience in the distribution field.

To further questions Dr. Galbraith said that for the last 2 years he had been in price-control work of the Office of Price Administration, that prior to that time he was with the Agricultural Division of the National Defense Advisory Commission for a brief time and that prior to his employment by the Government he held a position on the staff of Princeton University and later on the staff of Harvard University.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that however earnest and able from an educational standpoint, that his lack of having had any practical business experience, and for the further reason due to his unavoidable lack of experience because of his short life span or age, it follows that for the reason of such lack of experience—the result is that we have this never-ending deluge of complaints coming from the small businessmen of the Nation protesting against rulings and price controls which they claim are inequitable and will drive many of them out of business.

The dangerous part of Dr. Galbraith's testimony given before the committee is that in substance, answering questions directed to him by the committee, he takes the position that the great majority of the complaints are unfounded, that there are very few inequities, that the small businessman is getting along nicely and in effect his plan is not working an undue hardship, only in exceptional cases, and that the businessmen generally are wrong in their conclusions.

It is my opinion—and I believe it is the opinion of most of the men of this Congress—that the businessmen who are complaining are right and that Dr. Galbraith is wrong in his conclusion. There can hardly be any question but that in some manner the Congress must further and urgently attempt to assert itself, to correct administrative abuses and to help bring a practical solution in the direction of the O. P. A. in a manner that will go as far as possible to prevent inflation and at the same time will preserve the business life of the small businessmen of this Nation who are absolutely necessary to distribution, to the civic and business life of our Nation, and to its financial stability and economy.

At this point I want to present a witness in the form of a letter from Mr. G. F. M. Ward, president of the Mammoth Shoe, Clothing & Dry Goods Co., of Mt. Vernon, Ill., in my district. This firm, for over half a century, has been one of the most progressive business institutions in southern Illinois. Here is a man who speaks from over 40 years of practical experience in offering his protest as a businessman and a citizen of our Nation against what he points out is the inequality and inefficiency of price control under the O. P. A.

MAY 20, 1943.

Mr. CHARLES W. VURSELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VURSELL: The maximum price regulation No. 339, covering women's full length rayon hose, that went into effect May 15, is one of the biggest blows to retailing that has happened up to date. This appears to be one of the most unfair regulations that could possibly come from the Office

of Price Administration. First, it classifies stores. It advertises to the public that the large store and the chain store will sell cheaper than the small independent merchant. The Office of Price Administration seems to have forgotten that the majority of the retailers are made up of small independent merchants. The regulation happens to be the first of many that will mean the death of thousands of small retail stores.

We have been receiving various lists of prices from the manufacturers. The general rule is that the manufacturer reduces his price approximately 30 cents per dozen, where the Office of Price Administration reduction to the retailer averages approximately 16 cents per pair. It is not hard to see the unfairness of this regulation.

I wish to call to your attention amendment III to Maximum Price Regulation 208, which affects men's denim overalls, overall jackets, and dungarees. It contains the same basic principles as regulation 339. This order again classifies retailers. This order is fantastic in the fact that when the order is carefully examined it comes to light that the independent retailers could buy to a better advantage if they bought their goods at retail from the chains, rather than from the wholesalers and manufacturers. Also, the schedule of ceiling prices for class I purchasers on the average is about 12½ percent lower than for class II purchasers. Thus, Office of Price Administration officially declares that chain stores shall buy goods 12½ percent lower than the ordinary independents. This is a clear violation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The question that is in every retailer's mind is this, Is Office of Price Administration deliberately trying to put the small independent retailer out of business?

The thing that comes to the writer's mind is, What is it going to cost the Government in taxes by signing the death knell of the thousands upon thousands of small merchants?

I sincerely hope that you will do everything possible to continue to fight the very peculiar orders that the Office of Price Administration is issuing. I wish to thank you for the efforts you have been putting forth in the past in trying to combat these orders.

Yours very truly,

G. F. M. WARD,
President, the Mammoth Shoe, Clothing & Dry Goods Co.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, labor is 25 percent over September 1939 in its purchasing power.

It is estimated that price regulation covers 90 percent of all prices.

One of the most elastic hopes we have is Mr. Jeffers on the future of rubber.

Edsel Ford was a worthy son of a great individualist. He followed through well.

A Congressman crashed a secret food conference where the press men feared to tread.

It is found that the sales on 16 articles in a chain store constitute 90 percent of their total.

Bert Culp, of Beloit, Kans., the shepherd to recruit farm labor, has possibly herded more sheep in his day than any other Jayhawk.

The tax compromise bill will be accepted. There is no leaving of the WAAC in the middle of the ocean—they either go over or else they do not.

"We cannot preserve representative government in the United States if Congress continues to throw its power away to the Executive."—Senator O'MAHONEY.

Fifteen years ago today Lindy flew the ocean alone. The 10-year-old hero worshippers of that day are now carrying the grape to the outside of the enemy's vitals.

The grain loss because of broken levees and otherwise flooded fields will mount to greater losses than all our stored surpluses and the steel bins thrown in. Thousands of farmers are being "rolled back" without the O. P. A. or C. I. O.

As one who has lived by the clock of sunshine and rain, I want to extend to the dirt farmers of the great Central West my sympathy for your predicament at this time. Those with a fixed income just cannot understand.

Poll Tax Issue Imperils Constitution and War Effort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES DOMENGEAUX
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate and most regrettable that the advocates of legislation designed to abolish the poll tax in all the States should see fit to again force this radical and dangerous issue upon Congress at any time. It is all the more inexcusable that they should do so at a time of crisis in our Nation's history.

With the country at war, when all thought and energy of our people should be directed toward the winning of the world conflict and the preservation of the freedom guaranteed by the United States Constitution, this is the most inopportune and most dangerous moment to be debating a matter which strikes at States' rights, a principle of that same Constitution. Surely such action cannot fail to weaken the united strength necessary for our Nation's future welfare and the safety of the world.

Poll-tax legislation is strictly a matter for each State and has no place in the Halls of Congress. The attempt to grant such power to the Federal Government is unconstitutional, since under article I, section 2, of the Constitution, the determination of voters' qualifications rests with the individual State governments.

Shall we attempt, on the one hand, to invade the rights of the States and destroy part of our country's Constitution, while at the same time our soldiers offer their lives to defend the rights granted under this same document? Is there any honesty, any patriotism, any justice, in such action?

I am not arguing for or against the poll tax. My own State of Louisiana abolished this voting requirement some years ago, which it had a perfect right to do. I am only contending that this is for each State to decide. They have the privilege of doing this, under the Constitution, and they deserve Federal protection in seeing that this privilege is safeguarded.

Granting to the Federal Government the right to abolish the poll tax in all the States is a very long step toward the very kind of centralized and dictatorial government that brought the world to war and which our own Nation will oppose at any cost. Furthermore, conceding such power to the Federal Government is another phase of the tendency to place more and more authority in the hands of Washington "bureaucrats."

If we invade States' rights in this particular instance, who can say what will be the next infringement? Who can say how far the Federal Government will go? Representatives of the original Thirteen Colonies proclaimed that the States should have certain rights and the Federal or Central Government would have limited powers. Are we going to trample upon the work and the wisdom of those loyal and devoted men who founded our Nation?

Particularly this legislation marks continuation of the vicious and determined move to interfere with the affairs of the Southern States. Unless this and similar legislation is averted, the social and economic structure and the customs of that great section of our country will gradually be weakened and destroyed. The South does not intend to let this happen without a fight.

I plead with my colleagues to oppose this legislation; to defeat it decisively, once and for all, and thus save further invasion of States' rights which have already been encroached upon too frequently and too far. This present legislation is the most dangerous of all. It must be crushed for the sake of our States and for the sake of our Nation. It must be crushed to assure that we remain a country of freedom and equal rights. It must be crushed to guarantee that American youths on foreign battlefields are not fighting and dying in vain.

Women's Army Auxiliary Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, it is a pleasure for me to support the bill creating a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service in the Army of the United States. I have a daughter now

serving as a member of this splendid organization and I can testify as to the fine job those splendid women are doing in the service of their country.

I am including an article on the life of a WAAC at Fort Sill, Okla., by Corp. E. M. Halliday, Yank field correspondent:

FORT SILL, OKLA.—Fort Sill's first company of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps arrived here one night in March, and for a week latrine conversation reached a new level.

That was about 3 months ago. Since then another company of WAAC's has come to the post, and the novelty has worn off. The MP's no longer make WAAC drivers pull over just for a little chit-chat, and soldier clerks at post headquarters—those that are left—no longer grin at each other when Auxiliary Lois Mitchell, message center mail carrier from South Gate, Calif., comes in with the morning's haul. When the WAAC's go out to drill, the Signal Corps photographers don't stampede for their cameras, and post officers by now are over being surprised, when they phone the motor pool for transportation, to get it from Auxiliary Irene Anderson of Camden, N. J., chief dispatcher.

The WAAC's are glad the novelty is gone. Auxiliary Katherine (Billy) Simpson, a redheaded driver who hails from Irvington, N. J., puts it this way: "We're not here to entertain the soldiers, we're here to work. Sure, we like the dances they throw for us, and we like to go out with soldiers. But we didn't join the WAAC for glamor."

The jobs which the WAAC's have taken at Fort Sill range from a variety of clerical office jobs to running a machine lathe in the ordnance repair shop. They have replaced soldiers who either have been transferred to combat units or OCS, are now taking a 4-week refresher in basic training in preparation for reassignment or, in the case of limited-service men, have been assigned to other work here on the post.

Auxiliary Anne Gruber of Cleveland, Ohio, has a fairly typical WAAC office job. She has replaced Pvt. Samuel Shatz in the internal security office (provost marshal to you) as a registrar for post car tags and cameras and a file clerk. Shatz, whose home is in Portland, Maine, has gone off to Military Police Investigation School at Fort Custer, Mich., and all indications are that despite her size (5 feet 2 inches) Anne is filling his shoes, but full. Like many of her sister WAAC's, she is married to a GI—Pfc. Nick Gruber, who was in Panama with a Coast Artillery outfit when she last heard from him.

Sgt. Jim Long of Chicago, who is Auxiliary Gruber's noncom at the office, thinks she and the other seven WAAC's who work there are doing "a good job"; and Maj. J. L. Woody, post internal security officer, says the same thing.

The largest contingent of the Forty-seventh WAAC Post Headquarters Company, Fort Sill's first female outfit, works for post supply departments. Twenty-eight of them are drivers, having completed special motor corps training either at Daytona Beach, Fla., or here, in addition to their 4 weeks of basic; and they know their jobs. These days, cracks about women drivers are strictly taboo around the motor pool.

"Our WAAC's have had no accidents and no trouble with the Military Police," says S/Sgt. Victor J. Poppe of Nashville, Kans., senior noncom at the pool. "They're doing a nice job, and they turn in accurate defect reports on their vehicles, too."

Capt. F. B. Dougherty, inspector of post supply activities, registers only one complaint against the WAAC's drivers: all of them, he says, want to drive trucks.

"We have one young lady, Thelma McConnell, from Miami, Fla., who said she could drive anything on wheels," the captain relates, "so I thought we'd test her out a little. I told my sergeant, 'Put this girl on a 10-ton truck and take some of the ego out of her.' Well, she took that man killer out on our torture course, as we call the driving range, and shoved it around like a baby carriage."

Recently, making a tour of offices, warehouses, and shops to see how the WAAC's were getting along, Captain Dougherty found Auxiliary Mary McFadden, who comes from Harrisburg, Pa., doing desk work at the commissary.

"How do you like your job?" he asked her.

"It's O. K., but it's not hard enough, sir," Mary told him. "I was unloading box cars for the Pennsylvania Railroad before I joined the WAAC's, and I'd like to get into something tougher."

Now Mary's working in the motor-pool paint shop, where she replaces Sgt. Peter Gunn, of Minneapolis, Minn. Pete himself has just finished a retake of his basic days, firing on the rifle range and giving the obstacle course frequent work-outs in preparation for the transfer, in grade, which he expects any day now.

When the WAAC's are through with their work for the day they go home to barracks which are much like any other general issue residence for soldiers. They are 2-story jobs, sleeping 30 WAAC's on each floor; and the only noticeable difference from the standard temporary barracks is to be found in the laundry rooms, added because most of the girls like to wash their undies themselves; and the latrines, which feature tubs, box-stall showers and swinging doors in the right places.

The WAAC's get up with the rest of the post, at 6 a. m., and do calisthenics in their general issue pajamas from 6:05 to 6:15. At 6:30 they're dressed and lined up outside for reveille, which they stand in the usual fashion, heavy eyelids and all.

Right after that comes chow, eaten in their own mess hall. The WAAC's are on standard field rations, although minor adjustments are made to reduce the calory content of the day's meals somewhat on the theory that women burn up less energy than men. The opinion of soldiers who have had the good fortune to eat a meal there as guests is that their cooks, all regular WAAC's, add a certain something to the culinary art which is missing in most general issue kitchens.

From 7 until 7:45 there is a great shaking and making of beds—regulation Army cots—and sweeping, mopping and dusting, to get ready for the daily inspection of barracks. Latrine orderlies are appointed for a week at a time, and must get things sluiced up before leaving for their regular jobs in various parts of the post.

By 7:50 everyone is in uniform and off to work, and the squad rooms are ready for the scrutiny of Second Officer Lois P. Brown, commanding officer, who can find a layer of dust where the average inspecting officer would see nothing but bare woodwork.

Dinner comes at noon and is just a brief interlude in the working day—the WAAC's leave for their jobs again at 12:40. But at 5 p. m., when they knock off for the evening, they can relax and begin to think about recreation. They don't stand retreat, because many of them can't get back to the WAAC area on time. On Mondays and Fridays, however, they drill for three-quarters of an hour after supper. Most of them say they like drill, and they march as if they mean it.

At Fort Sill the WAAC's have the same privileges as other soldiers belonging to permanent post outfits. They have Class A passes which will take them downtown to Lawton, 5 miles away, any time they're off duty; and they may go anywhere they like on the post, except, of course, male barracks.

Auxiliaries can and do date enlisted men, but commissioned Army officers must deal with them strictly on a business basis. WAAC officers date male officers. The soldiers call for their dates at the WAAC day room, take them to a GI show or into Lawton (on the bus) for a United Service Organizations dance, and get them back by 11 p. m. week nights or midnight on Saturdays. The WAAC's on charge-of-quarters duty make bed check 15 minutes later.

Although the WAAC's theoretically may wear civilian clothes when on furlough, since they're not yet full-fledged members of the Army, few of them want to. "We feel that we're part of the Army," Second Officer Brown explains," "and we want to be as much like other soldiers as possible."

WAAC company officers are officially designated as first, second, and third officers, corresponding to captain, first and second lieutenants; and they rate salutes from all enlisted personnel, WAAC's and otherwise. The accepted practice is to address them as "captain" or "lieutenant" instead of their official titles; and they like that. A WAAC first sergeant is technicallly a "first leader," but all the auxiliaries call her "sergeant," just as they call their third leaders "corporals." They say "ma'am" instead of "sir" when speaking to one of their officers, and that's also the correct word for a male soldier to use.

All in all, the WAAC's have worked into the Army routine without upsetting the GI pattern and without losing stride themselves. Most of them are enthusiastic about the WAAC, and most of them like their new jobs, although they do an average amount of griping just like the rest of the soldiers on this or any other post.

Those who are restless usually are looking for something a little bigger than what they're doing at the moment. Auxiliary Mary Paulon, for instance, who is 22 and does general clerical duties for the post reclamation plant, will tell you she'd like work which would tax her abilities more.

"I was working as an accountant in a chemical factory near my home in Bound Brook, N. J.," she says. "We all worked hard there, and we won the Navy E for excellence. I left that to join the WAAC's because my kid brother is only 13, and I thought someone in the family ought to be in the Army. You see, I came to America from Italy when I was 7 years old, and I can still remember how I hated the Mussolini youth organization. I know what we've got to fight for in this country, and I want to be where I can do the most good."

For Mary, as for many of her barrack mates, overseas duty or officers candidate school at Fort Des Moines, Iowa, look like good targets. They're shooting for them and in the meantime living the Army life and liking it, and doing soldiers' jobs with everything they've got.

Social Service and Social Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 27 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the address delivered by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, D. D., to the grad-

uates of the National Catholic Social Service School on May 23, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two years ago I had the honor and the pleasure of delivering an address at the closing exercises of this school. On that occasion I urged the graduates to cooperate actively with non-Catholic as well as with Catholic groups in efforts and movements for social betterment. I reminded them that a large part of social distress and individual dependency is due mainly to social and economic factors, that prevention is better than cure, and that poverty, distress, and dependency should be attacked in their causes.

Present-day social workers, I said, do not seem to be as actively interested in the economic causes of dependency, or in the removal of bad economic conditions and practices, as were the social workers of 25 or 30 years ago. A little more than 2 weeks ago I asked the assistant director of the school of social work at the University of Minnesota whether this unfavorable judgment upon the social workers of today was correct. She answered affirmatively, but added that in very recent years there had occurred a reaction against neglect of the economic factors and toward greater emphasis upon social and economic reforms.

Whatever may be the present attitude of the average social worker, there can be no question of the position that ought to be taken by Catholic social workers. The comprehensive programs of social reform and social reconstruction laid down by Popes Leo XIII and Pius XI and reaffirmed by our present Holy Father, should make a stronger appeal to the Catholic social worker than to either her fellow social workers who are not of the faith or her fellow Catholics who have not enjoyed her advantages of general education and special training.

In this address I shall bring to your attention an outline of reform measures which are not only in harmony with the papal teaching but calculated to abolish the great majority of the social and economic causes of poverty and dependency in our beloved America. I mean the recently published report of the National Resources Planning Board. This report presents two programs—one for security, the other for employment. The first could be made effective immediately, if Congress saw fit to enact the appropriate legislation; the second could and should be legislatively implemented now as a measure of preparation, but it could not become fully operative until after the war. Unfortunately, the present Congress is not disposed to give serious attention to any part of the report. The congressional comments which made the newspaper headlines were mostly to the effect that the report was socialistic. Legislative action upon it will probably have to await the Seventy-ninth Congress, in January 1945. What will happen to it then is at the present moment completely unpredictable.

I. THE SECURITY PROVISIONS

The principal recommendations of the report with regard to social security may be conveniently summarized under the following heads: "Old age and survivors insurance"; "Unemployment insurance"; "Additional insurance protection"; and "Public assistance."

Under the first of these heads, the report would extend old-age insurance to all employable groups and to their dependents. As we all know, the provisions of our present Social Security Act for old-age insurance do not take in agricultural laborers, domestic workers, or the employees of very small industrial and commercial establishments.

Under unemployment insurance, the most important recommendations are that the benefit payments should cover 26 weeks of unemployment, be uniform in all the States, and cover employees of small firms, and that workers with dependents should receive additional benefits.

The additional insurance protection specified in the report, comprises mainly insurance for wage earners and their dependents against wage loss caused by disability, either permanent or temporary, a Federal system of public health services, medical care and hospitalization. The report also recommends more attention to preventive measures, with regard to unemployment and ill health; but it contains no proposals for a system of health insurance

Public assistance

Under this head is recommended a program adequate to the needs of all persons not now covered by social insurance or by the special public assistances; also assistance for mothers of dependent children and for children dependent from any cause; finally, grants of Federal money to the States for all these purposes, in proportion to the ability of each State to share the costs.

The foregoing description is only the barest summary. It is too condensed to convey an adequate idea of any one of the proposed additions to our present social security legislation, but it does give us some notion of their comprehensiveness, of the vast and varied province of human needs which they are intended to meet. Instead of discussing them further, I shall draw attention briefly to two of their implications. The first of these implications is that society, the State, is obliged not only to protect lives, property and contracts, but also to promote the common good, the general welfare. This function of the State was never more comprehensively defined than by Pope Leo XIII, 52 years ago this month, in his great encyclical, Rerum Novarum or "On the Condition of Labor." Here is the statement:

"Whenever the general interest of any particular class suffers, or is threatened with, evils which can in no other way be met, the public authority must step in to meet them."

This great principle not only repudiates what Thomas Huxley derisively called the policeman theory of the state and the silly slogan, "No class legislation," it also carries an implicit rebuke to all those alleged thinkers who condemn necessary measures of social security on the ground of alleged paternalism. Pope Leo XIII was opposed, as we all are, to real paternalism. Hence he wrote in the same encyclical:

"The first duty, therefore, of the rulers of the state should be to make sure that the laws and institutions, the general character, and administration of the commonwealth shall be such as to produce of themselves public well-being and private prosperity."

The social-security program recommended by the National Resources Planning Board is in full agreement with this principle also, for it recommends not public provision of a livelihood for everybody nor substitution of State care for individual responsibility, but "laws and institutions" to promote "public well-being and private prosperity."

The second important implication of the social-security program is that social workers should become thoroughly acquainted with its provisions and strive to visualize the various ways in which it would affect their own tasks. Every intelligent social worker will be able to see that most of the measures recommended would exemplify the maxim that "prevention is better than relief," and illustrate the method of attacking dependency in its causes. Finally, social workers ought to promote, in whatever way they can, the translation of this program into law. The social worker who is indifferent to social legislation is only half educated.

A few moments ago I discussed from the viewpoint of political philosophy the assertion that the security program is paternalistic. Another aspect of that objection emphasizes the alleged bad effect of so much security upon the average individual. The comprehensive provision which the program makes for human needs and hazards, from the cradle to the grave, would greatly discourage individual thrift, industry, and responsibility. It would mean the death of rugged individualism. I have been under the impression that the poor, pallid thing, called rugged individualism had already passed out, under the accumulated bludgeonings of ridicule. At any rate, the fear expressed in this objection is quite unrealistic for the proportion of Americans who will become shirkers and wastrels because their wants are fully satisfied by the very modest benefits obtainable under any security system that is likely to be adopted by our Congress, is very small, indeed. From the viewpoint of humanity, social welfare, and the common good, it is better that a few thousand malingerers be tolerated than that millions of decent citizens be compelled to live in a manner unworthy of creatures made in the image and likeness of God.

II. FULL EMPLOYMENT.

To organize and maintain an economy in which all who want to work can readily obtain jobs, is more fundamental and more beneficial than to provide complete social security. In proportion as the first of these objectives is attained, the second will become less and less necessary. Full employment is a greater preventive than social security; for the latter prevents, or diminishes, only the necessity for charitable relief, while the former prevents, or lessens, the need for social security itself. In other words full employment is a preventive of a preventive. It removes the primary cause of perhaps the greater part of social distress and dependency.

Of enormous significance, therefore, is the proclamation by the National Resources Planning Board of the right to work, usefully and creatively through the productive years; that our economy must provide work for all who are able to work. This declaration is not only remarkable, but revolutionary. It is also morally right and sound. It deserves the first place in an industrial bill of rights Against whom may this right be asserted? Against whom is it valid? Obviously, against the common guarantor of all rights, the State. This does not mean that the State should itself become the employer of men who cannot find private employment, but it does mean that the State is obliged to create the conditions in which jobs will be available for all. The greatest merit of the report is that it endeavors to outline the public measures that will be adequate to effectuate this right to work, this right to a job.

The sections of the report which deal with employment are of more immediate, as well as of more enduring, importance than those which treat of social security. When the war ends, 10,000,000 or more men will be seeking employment in our various industries and services. Will they get it within a reasonable time? "Yes," is the answer given by the wishful thinkers and the economically illiterate. The realists on the National Resources Planning Board are not so credulous. They believe that private industry should be given full and fair and continuing opportunity and encouragement to do its utmost toward providing employment for all the returning soldiers and sailors, as well as for all others who seek jobs; but they do not believe that either group should place its whole reliance upon an act of faith in the ability of private industry to carry out its good intentions. Hence the report recommends a large and varied program of public works, from housing to T. V. A.'s and Coulee Dams, in order to provide jobs for all whom private concerns will

be unable to employ. Moreover, the report insists that this device should be adopted as a normal and permanent feature of our economy.

Probably the most important of the other economic measures proposed by the report for post-war America is that concerning mixed corporations. These would be partly governmental and partly private. They might operate in the field of housing, in some of the plants into which the Government has poured billions of dollars during the war, and in some of the great monopolistic industries which have grown enormously in concentrated power during the same period. This sort of partnership between industry and government in the operation of Government-owned factories, at least temporarily, would be much more sensible than the sale of these properties to private corporations at bargain prices, as occurred after World War No. 1. In the most dangerous of the monopolistic industries it might well exemplify the declaration of Pope Pius XI, in Quadragesimo Anno:

"For it is rightly contended that certain forms of property must be reserved to the state, since they carry with them an opportunity of domination too great to be left to private individuals without injury to the community at large."

In any case, the mixed corporation, or partnership device, avoids the opposite evils of purely political operation and inadequate private operation.

In the immediately preceding paragraphs, I have discussed only what I regard as the three most important proposals in the economic sections of the report. The others may be summarized as follows: A dismissal wage for soldiers and for factory workers; Government supervision of the process of industrial reconversion to peacetime uses; the continuation of some war plants and war contracts; Government grants for plant rehabilitation; a new Reconstruction Finance Corporation or a Federal Development Corporation for stimulating investment in basic industries; low-interest loans to small business concerns needing capital; Government research for new processes out of which may come new industries; the opening of the channels of investment opportunity, by governmental intervention where necessary; the temporary retention after the war of many of the war economic controls, including the allocation of scarce raw materials, priorities on construction goods, the rationing of consumers' goods, especially durable ones, and the price controls to avoid a post-war inflation; the expansion of peacetime-goods production; the guarding of labor standards and the strict enforcement of protective labor legislation and collective bargaining; the retention in Government hands of the property and patents of enemy aliens; the enforcement of antitrust laws and the encouragement of competition; a set of fiscal policies providing a five-point program which will complement and supplement private enterprise; and the initiation of a large public-works program.

The National Resources Planning Board is confident that our industrial system can be reorganized so as to give us a post-war era of full employment and universal prosperity. One of its ablest members, who is also its chief economist, Dr. Alvin E. Hansen thus describes the requisites and the process:

"We have to make up our minds as a Nation that we will not permit a post-war depression to overwhelm us. We do not have to take economic defeat after the military victory is won. We can, if we will, maintain business prosperity. We can sustain a continuing demand for goods. We can keep industry going at high levels. We can maintain substantially full employment. We can achieve a society in which everyone capable of and willing to work can find an opportunity to earn a living, to make his contribution, to play his part as a citizen of a progressive, democratic country. * * *

"Private business can and will do the job of production. It is the responsibility of government to do its part to insure a sustained demand. We know from past experience that private enterprise has done this for limited periods only. It has not been able to insure a continuous and sustained demand."

Here is our situation: America has the resources—physical, moral, and mental—to produce the necessaries, comforts, and luxuries in sufficient quantity and quality to provide more than a decent living for all her inhabitants, and to lay the material basis for a vastly greater equipment of health, education, and culture than was ever before within the reach of any people. Our national income for 1943 will probably be upward of $125,000,000,000. This amount is three times the national income produced a decade ago, in 1933, the year which saw the nadir of the great depression. In that disastrous year the volume of goods and services produced by our industries and our employed workers was only forty-one and three-fourths billions. Shall we go back to that disgraceful figure after this war is over? In all probability, we shall, if our industrial leaders and our Government adopt the economic and political policies which were dominant between 1929 and 1933. There is grave danger that we shall do that very thing if our post-war policies are determined by some of our most powerful and most vocal business leaders and by a Congress which holds the same views as our present House of Representatives.

Members of the graduating class, your professional life begins in a very troubled and very uncertain world. The most destructive, if not the most cruel, war in human history is not yet finished. When the tens of millions of fighting men have finally stacked their arms, the amount of want, suffering, misery, and despair crying out for relief and assuagement will possibly be greater than the world has ever before witnessed at any one time or period. Because your lot is cast in this fortunate country of ours, you will see at first hand very little of all this wretchedness. But you will see enough and hear enough to challenge not only your Christian sympathy and charity but your Christian faith and intelligence. You will need that faith when you are tempted to question the dispositions of Divine Providence; you will need that intelligence when you are called upon to make some contribution to the post-war social order envisaged and delineated by Pope Pius XII. Your Christian faith will enable you to view the world's misery in its proper proportions, to realize always that the earthly life of the most wretched individual endures but a few years, while his life beyond the grave is eternal. Moved by faith in God and love of God, your trained intelligence can help mightily to make the world a better and happier place for the beneficiaries of your services and ministrations.

The Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I did not have an opportunity to address the House on H. R. 7, "a bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national offices." This bill, in my opinion, is unconstitutional; therefore, pursuant to my duty as a Representative in Congress under a solemn oath of office to preserve and protect the Constitution, I voted against the bill.

My personal opinion relating to a Constitutional question may be of no interest whatever to my colleagues, but in the light of my oath of office it is of importance to me at least that I satisfy my own conscience as to the constitutionality of legislative proposals upon which I am called to cast my vote in the House of Representatives.

I shall not indulge in a long dissertation on the legal aspects of the bill, H. R. 7, but I do wish to show what those who framed the Federal Constitution had in mind when they provided that "the electors, in each State, shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

I shall call as a witness to testify on this point Justice James Wilson who sat as a delegate in the convention which framed the Constitution. I believe he is worthy and well qualified to pass upon the intent and purpose of those who proposed, defined and adopted the provision "that the electors, in each State, shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." Hon. James Wilson of Pennsylvania was chairman of the committee which reported the Federal Constitution. He was later appointed by George Washington as justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, a position which he held until he died. It was in 1790 that this distinguished jurist delivered a series of law lectures in the College of Philadelphia, and in one of these lectures he explained the philosophy and purpose behind the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the National Legislature which were to be those requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures." Here is what Justice Wilson has to say about it:

> This regulation is generous and wise. It is generous; for it entrusts to the constitutions or to the legislatures of the several States, the very important power of ascertaining and directing the qualifications of those who shall be entitled to elect the most numerous branch of the National Legislature. This unsuspicious confidence evinces, in the National Constitution, the most friendly disposition toward the governments of the several States. For how can such a proper disposition be evinced more strongly than by providing that its legislature, so far as respects the most numerous branch of it, should stand upon the same foundation with theirs; and by providing further, that this foundation should be continued or altered by the States themselves?
>
> This regulation is wise as well as generous. An attention to its genuine principle and tendency must have a strong effect in preventing or destroying the seeds of jealousy, which might otherwise spring up, with regard to the genius and views of the National Government. It has embarked itself on the

same bottom with the governments of the different States; can a stronger proof be given of its determination to sink or swim with them? Can proof be given of a stronger desire to live in mutual harmony and affection? This is an object of the last importance; for, to adopt an expression used by my Lord Bacon, "the uniting of the hearts and affections of the people is the life and true end of this work."

The remarks which I have made on this subject place, in a clear and striking point of view, the propriety and, indeed, the political necessity of a regulation made in another part of this Constitution. In the fourth section of the fourth article it is provided that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government." Its own existence, as a Government of this description, depends on theirs.

As the doctrine concerning elections and the qualifications of electors is, in every free country, a doctrine of the first magnitude; and as the National Constitution has, with regard to this doctrine, rested itself on the governments of the several States; it will be highly proper to take a survey of those provisions, which, on a subject so interesting, have been made by the different State constitutions, for every State has justly deemed the subject to be of constitutional importance.

In the constitution of Pennsylvania, the great principle, which animates and governs this subject, is secured by an explicit declaration that "elections shall be free and equal." This is enumerated among the great points, which are "excepted out of the general powers of government, and shall forever remain inviolate." The practical operation of this great and inviolable principle is thus specified and directed:

"In elections by the citizens, every freeman of the age of 21 years, having resided in the State 2 years next before the election, and within that time paid a State or county tax, which shall have been assessed at least 6 months before the election, shall enjoy the rights of an elector."

By the constitution of New Hampshire, "every male inhabitant, with town privileges, of 21 years of age, paying for himself a poll tax, has a right to vote, in the town or parish wherein he dwells, in the election of representatives."

In Massachusetts, this right is, under the constitution enjoyed by "every male person, being 21 years of age, and resident in any particular town in the Commonwealth for the space of 1 year next preceding, having a freehold estate within the same town, of the annual income of £3, or any estate of the value of £60." Everyone so qualified may "vote in the choice of a representative for the said town."

The right to choose representatives in Rhode Island is vested in "the freemen of the respective towns or places." This regulation is specified in the charter of Charles the Second. The State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations has not assumed a form of government different from that which is contained in the above-mentioned charter.

The qualifications requisite, in the State of Connecticut, to entitle a person to vote at elections, are maturity in years, quiet and peaceable behavior, a civil conversation, and 40 shillings freehold, or £40 personal estate; if the selectmen of the town certify a person qualified in those respects, he is admitted a freeman, on his taking an oath of fidelity to the State.

The constitution of New York ordains "that every male inhabitant of full age, who shall have personally resided within one of the counties of the State, for 6 months immediately preceding the day of election, shall, at such election, be entitled to vote for representatives of the said county in assembly; if during the time aforesaid he shall have been a freeholder, possessing a freehold of the value of £20, within the said county, or have rented a tenement therein of the yearly value of 40 shillings; and been rated and actually paid taxes to the State.

"All inhabitants of New Jersey, of full age, who are worth 50 pounds, proclamation money, clear estate within that government, and have resided within the county, in which they shall claim a vote, for 12 months immediately preceding the election shall be entitled to vote for representatives in assembly.

"The right of suffrage is not specified in the constitution of Delaware; but it is provided, that, in the election of members of the legislature, it 'shall remain as exercised by law at present.' "

"In Maryland, 'all freemen above 21 years of age, having a freehold of 50 acres of land in the county, in which they offer to vote, and residing therein; and all freemen having property in the State above the value of 30 pounds current money, and having resided in the county, in which they offer to vote, 1 whole year next preceding the election, shall have a right of suffrage in the election of delegates for such county'."

We find, in the constitution of Virginia, no specification of the right of suffrage; it is declared, however, that this right shall remain as it was exercised at the time when that constitution was made.

It is provided by the constitution of North Carolina, "that all freemen of the age of 21 years, who have been inhabitants of any county within the State 12 months immediately preceding the day of election, and shall have paid public taxes, shall be entitled to vote for members of the house of commons, for the county in which they reside."

According to the Constitution of South Carolina, "every free white man, of the age of 21 years, being a citizen of the State, and having resided in it 2 years previous to the day of election, and who has a freehold of 50 acres of land, or a town lot, of which he hath been legally seized and possessed at least 6 months before such election, or, not having such freehold or lot, has resided within the election district, in which he offers to give his vote, 6 months before election, and has, the preceding year, paid a tax of 3 shillings sterling towards the support of government, shall have a right to vote for members of the house of representatives for the election district in which he holds such property or is so resident."

Mr. Speaker, I have quoted Justice James Wilson at some length because I concur in the opinion of Sir Frederick Pollock that, "We now realize that the laws of every nation are determined by their own historical study, not only as to details, but as to structure, and if we fail to attend to this, we cannot duly appreciate the system as we find it at a given time."

It may surprise some persons who have become so hysterical over the poll tax to find that in the State Constitution of New Hampshire the provision that a poll tax must be paid as a condition precedent to the right to vote existed at the time and prior to the time that this lecture was delivered by Justice Wilson, which was in 1790. Those who framed our Federal Constitution were aware of the then existing stringent State "qualifications for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures," yet this whole subject was left to the States.

I close this argument by quoting the concluding observations of Justice Wilson on this important subject:

From the foregoing enumeration—its length and its minuteness will be justified by its importance—from the foregoing enumeration of the provisions, which have been made, in the several States, concerning the right of suffrage, we are well warranted, I think, in drawing this broad and general inference—that, in the United States, this right is extended to every freeman, who, by his residence, has given evidence of his attachment to the country, who, by having property, or by being in a situation to acquire property, possesses a common interest with his fellow citizens; and who is not in such uncomfortable circumstances, as to render him necessarily dependent, for his subsistence, on the will of others.

By the same enumeration, we are enabled, with conscious pleasure, to view and to display the close approximation, which, on this great subject, the constitutions of the American States have made, to what we have already seen to be the true principles and the correct theory of freedom.

Again; the same enumeration places in the strongest and most striking light, the wisdom and the generous confidence, which rested one of the principal pillars of the National Government upon the foundation prepared for it by the governments of the several States.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief, that if the Congress will steadfastly keep within the powers granted to it under the Constitution and not seek to encroach upon the rights of the States, as it flagrantly attempted in H. R. 7, it will result in that harmony of action between the several States and the Federal Government so essential to national unity, which the fathers in their wisdom sought to attain.

The Anti-Poll-Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM HOBBS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Washington Post:

POLL TAX

The sailor who interrupted the debate in the House on the anti-poll-tax bill explained afterward that he had come to see how a democracy works and found them (the Congressmen) "fighting the Civil War all over again." That is an excellent description of the effect upon legislative tempers of the inopportune resurrection of the poll-tax issue. The Post holds no brief for the poll tax. It is generally conceded that the few Southern States that still make payment of poll taxes a prerequisite to voting do so for ulterior motives. By insisting on payment of the poll tax they succeed, in effect, in disfranchising Negroes, as well as a large proportion of the poorer white population. The result is that Members of Congress from some Southern States are elected under a system of voting that can be called democratic only by courtesy.

The question nevertheless arises as to whether any substantial progress in the direction of a more genuinely democratic system of congressional representation would

result from Federal legislation abolishing poll-tax requirements in elections for Federal office. Opponents of the measure attach great significance to the constitutional issue involved. They argue that the anti-poll-tax bill violates the constitutionally guaranteed right of the States to judge the qualifications of voters. We think such arguments are sound, but we also think that the importance of the constitutional issue has been exaggerated by both friends and foes of anti-poll-tax legislation. The burning issue—the one that causes tempers to rise and leads to the acrimonious debate that fans southern antagonisms and lines up North against South—is the race issue.

To the embattled Southern opposition anti-poll-tax legislation is regarded as a devious device for forcing the South to enfranchise Negroes who have been prevented from voting by inability or unwillingness to pay poll taxes. As a result, some hotheaded Southern opponents of the bill just passed by the House have served notice that the Southern poll-tax States would find means of evading a Federal legislative mandate aimed at reform of their voting methods. This is not an empty threat. There are innumerable ways of preventing a free exercise of the voting privilege if the people are so minded. Educational and literacy tests can be, and have been, perverted to such base ends. And if all else fails, a most effective device for keeping people from exercising the franchise is terrorism. Voters have to be assured protection at the polls and in their homes in order to make the legal right to vote anything more than an empty privilege.

Is the Federal Government prepared to accord protection to disfranchised voters in parts of the country where the State authorities either cannot or do not choose to accord it? Of course, the Federal Government is in no position to undertake such policing tasks. The responsibility rests with the States, and we must depend upon the people of the States, too, to support and enforce demands for reforms in election practices. They have already done so in some Southern States. They will be much more likely to do so in the remaining poll-tax States if they are left to accomplish reforms without being subjected to a kind of Federal compulsion that would be effective only in sowing dissension at a time when national unity needs to be sedulously cultivated.

Point Values of Farm-Produced Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two letters, one concerning the point values of farm-produced butter, and the other concerning transportation for church services by school busses:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1943.

The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This will acknowledge your communication of May 10, 1943, in which you quote a wire from Mr. Ben C. Marable, Chamber of Commerce, Henderson, Tex., relative to the point value of farm-produced butter where slow movement during flush milk production season threatens waste or spoilage.

Amendment 21 to Ration Order No. 16, issued May 11, 1943, provides that the point value of farm-produced butter may be reduced in instances where certain conditions exist. Two copies of the amendment are enclosed for your information.

We appreciate your interest in this matter and trust that the amendment will relieve the situation in the critical areas.

Sincerely yours,

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Administrator.

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
May 20, 1943.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I wish to acknowledge receipt of your memorandum of May 14, and your letter of May 5 to Mr. Prentiss Brown with which you enclosed the card you received from Mr. E. L. Cline, route 2, box 248, Kilgore, Tex., in reference to using a school bus for transporting people to and from church.

The use of school buses has been restricted by our policy statement issued November 16 and General Order 10–A, copies of which are enclosed.

You will notice that item 501.40 (8) of General Order 10–A makes provision for transporting people to and from church for the regular weekly service if no other transportation service is available. Thus, I believe it would be proper for you to indicate to Mr. Cline that the regulations of the Office of Defense Transportation will not prohibit supplying transportation service to church by means of school busses.

Sincerely yours,

C. W. YOUNG,
Deputy Director.

Ban Hits State Revenues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Johnstown Tribune of Monday, May 24, 1943:

BAN HITS STATE REVENUES

State gasoline tax revenues, already greatly reduced by rationing and the ban on pleasure driving, will decline further as a result of the most recent order of the Office of Price Administration cutting by 40 percent the allowances for commercial vehicles.

Gasoline tax collections for January and February driving in 13 Eastern States were 44.7 and 44.2 percent, respectively, below collections for the same months of 1942. The ban on pleasure driving was in effect during those 2 months. It was lifted in March, but has again been slapped on the Eastern Seaboard States, and in addition the gas allowances for trucks, taxicabs, and other types of commercial vehicles have been sharply reduced.

The greatest revenue losses, of course, are in the 16 Eastern States in which rationing has been most severe. For the remainder of the States reporting gas-tax collections, there was a drop of only 38 and 29 percent below the figures for the same months last year.

It will be seen from the above, however, what the result would be from a Nation-wide ban on pleasure driving and a uniform cut in coupon values throughout the country.

Motorists of the 16 Eastern States referred to are naturally resentful of the higher coupon values in the other States of the Union, most of which produce no oil and have to depend upon rail transportation for their supplies. Western Pennsylvania, which produces more gasoline than it can dispose of, is held to 1½ gallons a week on A coupons, while some States in which there are neither oil wells nor refineries continue to get more generous allowances.

In all such States, of course, gas-tax revenues are higher than in those in which the restrictions are more severe.

The motorists of western Pennsylvania are just as patriotic as any other class of citizens. There is comparatively little criticism of rationing edicts, but they are entitled to a better explanation of restrictions than any that has so far been forthcoming from the Office of Price Administration and Oil Administrator Ickes.

Omaha Junior Chamber Opposes Drafting Fathers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD BUFFETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I received the following wire from Omaha:

Omaha Junior Chamber of Commerce today in general meeting overwhelmingly opposed the drafting of fathers.

At railroad crossings there is usually a sign reading "Stop, look, and listen." Indifference to the warning of that message can and frequently does result in disaster. I attach the same degree of importance to the foregoing message of the Omaha Junior Chamber of Commerce.

I know these men. They are loyal patriotic Americans who are meeting their responsibility to their country. When they protest there is a reason. These men must carry the burden created by the present conflict, after those in charge today have stepped out from under. If the American home is wrecked by this war we have lost regardless of any thrilling moments of military glory. That in substance is what this message from the Omaha Junior Chamber of Commerce means.

I plead with those in whose hands the destiny of America is entrusted to listen to the sensible appeal of the folks back home. Use the manpower of the other countries of the United Nations. For example, to the South of us are nations who have declared war on the Axis with a population of almost 86,000,000 of people. So far as I can learn, they have not yet furnished one company of sol-

diers to the fighting fronts. Share with them the glory of defeating tyranny. Prove to them that this is a partnership fight, and not an imperialistic venture by the United States and other large empires. Words alone will not do. Give them a part in the fight.

Six-Month Anniversary of the Coast Guard SPARS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, May 23 marked the 6-month anniversary of the authorization of the Women's Reserve of the United States Coast Guard Reserve, the service known throughout the United States as the SPARS. On the 6-month anniversary date the Director of the SPARS, Lt. Comdr. Dorothy C. Stratton, made it known that at the conclusion of the SPARS' first 6 months of existence the organization was approximately three-fifths of the way toward its 1943 procurement goal of 5,000 women.

The Coast Guard is to be congratulated on this procurement record. It shows that women welcome the opportunity to serve in the United States Coast Guard.

Beginning June 14 all recruit and special training of SPARS will be concentrated at the United States Coast Guard Training Station at Palm Beach, Fla., Vice Admiral Russell R. Waesche, Commandant, announced May 21. The Coast Guard has contracted for use of the Palm Beach Biltmore Hotel there, its Sun and Surf Club and part of a nearby golf course which will be used for drill purposes. At this ideally situated station recruits will be received at the rate of 650 a month, according to present schedules. After recruits have completed their basic training most of them will be kept on at Palm Beach for an additional 12 to 16 weeks' training in specialty schools.

The Coast Guard has also undertaken the entire training of its SPAR officer candidates at the United States Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn. Previously SPAR officer candidates received a preliminary 4 weeks' training at the United States midshipmen's school at Smith College, Northampton, Mass., followed by 3 weeks at the Coast Guard Academy. The new method takes a week off the training period and gives officers of the Women's Reserve a more complete indoctrination in the Coast Guard.

When the Palm Beach station opens on June 14, approximately 800 women will answer muster roll. This number will include 350 recruits fresh from civilian life. The others will be enlisted SPARS who have completed basic training and are assigned to the specialty schools at Palm Beach.

Approximately 800 SPARS have been trained and are assigned to duty stations where eventually they will release men for active sea duty. Many of them have already replaced men who have gone to sea.

This number includes approximately 300 SPARS who are at present on duty at Coast Guard headquarters in Washington, and 75 others who are in units operating under headquarters. This means a large number of Coast Guardsmen released from headquarters duties for active service.

Fifty percent of all SPARS are assigned to duty as yeomen, that is, typists or stenographers. About 30 percent are trained as storekeepers, who are concerned with pay and supply. I understand that the Coast Guard will shortly complete its recruitment and training of women for radio work, although approximately 100 SPARS are still in Navy radio training schools. Radio training will not be given at Palm Beach.

In addition to 800 SPARS who have been trained and are on the job and approximately 800 more who begin recruit or specialty training at Palm Beach on June 14, there is a considerable backlog of SPARS who are awaiting orders to proceed to the Palm Beach station for recruit training. There are also several hundred SPARS who are completing training in Navy schools. These are the last SPARS who will be trained in Navy schools, except for a few communications officers who will continue to attend Navy radio schools. All together there are approximately 2,800 SPARS, either assigned to duty, in training or awaiting call to recruit schools.

It is apparent that in its training of the Women's Reserve, the Coast Guard has moved with its usual dispatch and with a minimum of fanfare. It is a reminder of that motto which many of us have seen behind the desk of Admiral Waesche, "Certainly it can be done."

The new training facilities for SPAR enlisted and officer personnel are adequate for the training of increased quotas of women reservists if the scope of military operations increases. The Coast Guard, according to Admiral Waesche, is preparing to train Women Reservists up to 10 percent of authorized strength. This may ultimately mean 15,000 women in the United States Coast Guard Reserve. When and if this number of SPARS becomes necessary the Coast Guard is prepared to train them.

The Coast Guard, as we all know, has a record of service and courage which glorifies it for all Americans. It is a small sturdy service performing varied peacetime tasks at home as well as in foreign waters. It is made up of volunteers, men proud of their branch of the service, and men who are proud to urge women to don the uniform of the Coast Guard.

We have heard some talk of late about men's unwillingness to advise women to don the uniform. Lieutenant Commander Stratton said recently on this point:

I do not believe that any considerable number of American men are advising women not to serve in uniform. That would hardly be in character with American women's well-known ability to make up their own minds, nor with American men's pride in American women's long tradition of courage and service in wartime. We find that American men in service are proud that American women have been accepted in the fighting forces as coworkers on the basis of equal pay and equal rank and ratings. Women in uniform count on men in uniform for support and they get it right along the line.

As a small organization the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard has been able to keep regimentation and militarization of women in its service to a minimum and to give a maximum of freedom, without relaxing discipline. The Coast Guard arranges housing for groups of SPARS in the largest cities where there are SPAR concentrations. Such quarters have been contracted for in several cities, including Washington, Boston, and St. Louis to date, and contracts are being negotiated in other cities. In Washington, D. C., where approximatetly 300 SPARS are now on duty at headquarters, two houses have already been converted to SPAR residences. The largest and most recent of these is the Randles School where young men formerly prepared for Annapolis. It is the policy to make SPAR residences, wherever they may be located, as homelike and as little like barracks as possible.

These SPAR residences, the relatively small size of the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard, and the close relationship which exists between the Women's Reserve and the Coast Guard proper have, no doubt, been factors in helping the SPARS meet their recruiting goals. Admiral Waesche is confident that the Coast Guard will obtain and train the full complement of 5,000 SPARS in 1943, despite the growing shortage of womanpower in the country.

Commander Stratton has pointed out that recruitment of women for the uniformed services is essentially a problem of the Nation's effective use of womanpower. Several vital phases of our war effort, particularly industry and agriculture, are drawing heavily on the reservoir from which the Women's Reserves of the armed forces are recruiting. It is possible that we overestimated the size of this reservoir. There is necessarily a limited number of women who qualify for military service. They must, first of all, be mobile, able to leave their homes and communities, and move about upon command of their service. They must be between the ages of 20 and 36, in good health, able to pass the military physical examination. Married women with children younger than 18 are not qualified. At present, 2 years of high-school or business-school training are required. In the case of the SPARS women married to Coast Guardsman do not qualify, although after they have completed their recruit training SPARS may marry men in the same service.

It is probable that some of these qualifications will have to be made broader. We might very well be considering the advisability of admitting girls younger than 20 into the uniformed services. Of course, recruitment of women from the age group below 20 presents new problems of supervision in the hours off duty.

These problems are not insurmountable, however.

Boys younger than 20 are in the armed services. Perhaps we should make it possible for girls in the same age group to qualify for the uniformed services. At the present time they are welcomed in industry or agriculture. In fact, both of these branches are making a direct bid for their services.

We might also be thinking of the practicability of admitting women older than 36 to the ranks. Many women of 40 fulfill physical and other qualifications for the Women's Reserve.

I have no doubt that in the second 6 months of their first year the SPARS will improve on their already splendid record of service. They have proved that they were well named from the first letters of the Coast Guard's Latin motto and its English translation. That motto is "Semper paratus—always ready."

On the 6-month anniversary of their admission to the Coast Guard Reserve I should like to congratulate the ever-ready SPARS and wish them continuing success.

Dictatorship by Default

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a splendid editorial from the Roane County Banner, published at Kingston, Tenn., in my district, entitled "Dictatorship by Default":

DICTATORSHIP BY DEFAULT

There is a possibility that this Nation may go totalitarian by default. And if that happens, we will see "the beginning of a cycle of tyranny and impoverishment such as other nations have experienced when the individual was superseded by the state." That is the warning of Eric Johnson, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

The danger of America going totalitarian arises from the illusion that government is blessed with an inexhaustible supply of wisdom and cash, which can be drawn on freely without any strings attached to freedom. It is a dangerous illusion, a warped conception of democracy, the result of which has been a staggering growth of bureaucracy, debt, and political domination of private effort. It must be arased before the future can be approached with confidence.

Our Republic became great because it has always been a land of individual enterprise. Its people grew strong because they were free and self-reliant. A man who had a good idea and was willing to work to put it into effect, received encouragement and reward, providing he could actually give people something they needed and wanted. Thus industry was built. Hard work by individuals keeps it going. Our bountiful natural resources—the oil, coal, and metals so vital to victory—would still be buried in the ground but for the individuals who were not afraid to take risks and back up those risks with a lot of sweat.

The people of many nations are counting on this country. The men and women of America are literally the last hope for a better civilization. It is inconceivable that, with the tradition of greatness which is theirs, they will seek to solve their problems by following the same tawdry path of government idolatry that has destroyed civilization in a large part of the world.

No More Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of May 25, 1943:

NO MORE STRIKES

I am just another American soldier who has just read of one of the walk-outs in an essential war industry over there on the mainland. I can truly say that thousands of American soldiers, like myself, are mutual in our feelings concerning the strikes which are now in progress. We (soldiers on the war fronts) all believe that the news about the strikes will be carried throughout the world, thus giving the Axis an advantage in the war and an opportunity to believe that their war plans are more workable than ours and that they, the Axis, are producing more products necessary to winning the war than we are. We don't want that.

I believe that the strikers have forgotten that our one main job is to win this war in which we are now engaged. You strikers must realize that those strikes are slowing the production of needed materials and ammunition which we soldiers on this Pacific island here, as well as on all other war fronts, are in need of in order to carry on our immediate jobs.

I strongly feel that you people who are walking out of the plants on our continent do not realize that at present you are living under the best conditions of any peoples in the entire world and that asking for more money, and the right to smoke on the job, and any other personal favors is far beyond good judgment, and is, indeed, an unfaithful act for people who are true Americans. Compare your living conditions to that of the people in England. The people in England are enduring endless bombings and suffering. Compare your living conditions with that of the Chinese. The people in China have and are enduring constant battle. The building of the Burma Road by the Chinese with their bare hands in order to defend themselves and advance their war efforts is a good example of conditions which have existed in China. They are not striking for more personal favors.

And so these strikes which you are carrying on in the States, despite your already favorable conditions as compared to those of all other peoples in the world, are slowing down this war. Strikes are an indication of your letting us down. I, and all other servicemen, are doing our parts to help win this war; we aren't letting you down—don't you let us down, for we need your help.

Pvt. ALBERT STEPHENSON,
OVERSEAS, *May 1943.*

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the twenty-seventh installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. In this installment the Senator touches upon another fundamental principle of economic law, the provision that makes for a monetary unit of stable value, the monetary foundation of any stable national economy—so aptly stated by a contemporary Senator of that period in another speech here:

It is in a volume of money keeping even pace with advancing population and commerce and in the resulting steadiness of prices that the wholesome nutriment of a healthy vitality is to be found the highest moral, intellectual, and material development of nations is prompted by the use of money of unchanging value.

The twenty-seventh installment of Senator Cockrell's speech follows:

Let us take the reasonable medium estimate there, 4,500,000 pounds of fine silver, its value $69,795,000. What is the increase of population since 1880? Four million four hundred and five thousand. What is the per capita? Twelve marks per capita, equal to $12,696,400, reducing the stock of silver to $57,108,600 in legal thalers, the most of it in bank as reserve money. Did she coin it? Has she coined any since 1880?

Germany in 1882 and up to 1889, according to our census reports, and in 1891, coined $11,870,460 in subsidiary silver, which shows that she has carried out her monetary policy, and there can be no possible danger from that source. The Imperial Bank of Germany on the 18th of August 1893, had gold coin £36,725,250 and silver £12,241,752; so that from $57,000,000 to $60,000,000 is all there is of standard silver thalers in Germany, and they are a full legal tender and circulating at a par with gold. I say all the pretensions that we are going to be flooded with silver from Germany are without foundation.

Now go to Great Britain. Nobody can claim that her $100,000,000 of silver will ever be brought here. Great Britain, the United Kingdom, has 38,000,000 population, $550,000,000 gold and $100,000,000 subsidiary silver coin money, coined at the ratio of 14.28 to 1, and a full legal tender up to $10, now in circulation as money among the people—used in nearly all the transactions in amounts below $10, and redeemable in gold whenever gold is wanted.

It is worse than ridiculous to pretend even that any portion of that silver money will ever be dumped into our mints, at an actual loss in its value of 10.7 cents on every dollar. There is no danger from that source.

Now for France. France has a population of 39,000,000, eight hundred millions gold, the

largest stock in any nation, and six hundred and fifty millions silver, coined at ratio of 15½ to 1, and a full legal tender in all payments, the equal in all respects of her gold coin, and absolute money, irredeemable in anything, just like gold.

France also has 50,000,000 limited legal-tender coins at ratio of 14.38 to 1. The recoinage into our dollars would entail an actual loss of 3.1 cents on her full legal tender and 10.1 cents on her limited tender on every dollar.

France today maintains the true bimetallic system, so far as her coined gold and silver money is concerned, but not as to silver bullion, for her mints are closed to silver coinage.

France has $81,402,000 of uncovered paper money, without any metallic reserve for redemption, and an enormous national debt of $4,446,000,000, exclusive of annuities whose capitalized value is estimated by good authority to be not less than $2,000,000,000. That is according to the Eleventh Census Report. This vast indebtedness is held almost entirely by her own citizens, who receive the interest on it, and when paid will receive the principal.

In this condition of France, can any rational person believe it either probable or even possible for any considerable portion of this silver coin money to find its way to our mints for recoinage into our silver dollars at the inevitable loss to be incurred? It seems to me that any such belief can only arise in drowsy moments when dreams, not reason nor judgment, hold possession of the mental faculties.

The Bank of France on August 18, 1893, held gold $335,000,000 and silver $250,000,000.

In all these countries the silver coins are money in circulation among the people, and where full legal tenders are money equal to gold—dollar for dollar. Should they come here, it would be as metal, losing every monetary function the moment they crossed their territorial boundaries and at very great loss. If they did come and were coined, what would they do with them? They would put them into our mints and take the standard silver dollars, and what would they do with them? Take them back to their country? Oh, no; it would be only bullion the moment it left the boundaries of the United States. They would buy something that we have to sell. That is what they would do with it. They would have to do that unless these accommodating New York calamity-howling bankers would give them gold coin in exchange for the silver, and I do not believe they would do it. No, no, Mr. President; we have an abundance to spare of the material products of our labor and our factories and would only too gladly exchange them for many, many dollars. There is no danger of a flood from that source. There is no accumulation of silver bullion anywhere in the world.

[At this point the honorable Senator yielded to Mr. SMITH.]

Mr. COCKRELL. Why not then restore that safe system of bimetallism for which, according to professions, whose sincerity I am not questioning, we all hunger and thirst by day and by night?

But, say our friends, the opponents of unlimited coinage, if, as you say, there be no danger of a deluge of silver from the silver coins of foreign countries—the real danger—the deluge from the annual overproduction of silver in the world, coupled with the closing of the mints of all other nations to such coinage, will certainly come, is inevitable.

Here again come predictions, apprehensions of dire calamities, and panicky fears arising from overnervousness, and not from facts and figures.

Let us now calmly and dispassionately reason together and consider the probabilities, based upon the facts and figures of the past.

In 10 years, 1882 to 1891, inclusive, according to our Mint Bureau, the world's product of silver was $1,368,799,078, from which we must deduct the amount of silver consumed annually for industrial purposes, estimated by Dr. Soetbeer at 21 percent, and shown by our Mint Bureau to be in the United States 12.2 percent, and which I will estimate at only 15 percent, to be safe beyond question. This will amount to $204,569,860. Deduct this from the gross product and we have left for coinage $1,159,229,218.

The world's coinage of silver in these 10 years, after deducting therefrom all the coinage in the United States, India, and Austria, amounted to $638,133,496, which, deducted from the balance left for coinage, leaves only $521,095,722 as the surplus to be consumed by the unlimited coinage in the United States in 10 years, being only $52,109,572 for each year. That is no deluge, and we should have no overflow from that.

Take 5 years, 1887–91:

World's product	$787,063,791
Deduct 15 percent consumed in industrial uses	118,059,568
Leaving a balance of	669,004,223
Deduct world's coinage, excluding India, Austria, and United States	322,489,068
Leaving a balance for us to coin of	346,515,155
Being only annually	69,303,031

This would have been no overflow, no inundation of silver.

Suppose our coinage limited to our own product—

In 20 years, 1873–1892, inclusive, we produced	$992,719,000
Deduct 12 percent for industrial uses	119,126,280
We have for our coinage in 20 years	873,592,720
Annually in each of the 20 years	43,679,637

In 5 years, 1888–1892, we produced	343,419,000
Deduct for industrial uses	42,208,178
We have left for our coinage in 5 years	301,210,822
For each year, or annually	60,242,164

There is no deluge in this.

Coinage confined to our own product would, in all reasonable probability, not exceed $1 per capita annually, no more and not as much, in fact, as the increase in population, commerce, and business will absolutely require for monetary uses.

These facts and figures must dispel the trembling fears of a deluge of silver into our mints if opened to the world's product. If limited to our own product there can be no possible danger of a deluge.

The opponents of unlimited silver coinage have proclaimed all over the world time and again, and it has been repeated by the gold monometallists in foreign countries, that the United States have practically had the single gold standard since 1834 and 1837, and silver was practically demonetized in 1853. There never has been any change whatever by our laws touching the coinage of silver dollars as to 371¼ grains pure silver. In 1834–37 the quantity of gold to the dollar was reduced, so as to bring us to the standard of 16 to 1. Our mints from 1792 to 1873 were always open to the unlimited coinage of silver dollars and gold coins on exactly same terms, and both coins had equal legal tender—were absolute irredeemable money, without price, and our silver dollar was maintained as the unit of value.

In addition, the half and quarter dollar, the dime and five-cent pieces, were of standard weight and fineness and full tender equal to gold, until 1853, when they were reduced in weight and limited in tender to $5, simply to keep them as change. Why such misrepresentations? In the Senate, March 8, 1852, Senator Hunter, of Virginia, reported a bill the object of which was to retain our silver currency, which was then leaving the country because of its value being greater than gold; not to demonetize silver. He insisted on bimetallism.

Once monarchs and kings depreciated the coins by reducing the quantity of metal and increasing the paying power. New governments increase the value and purchasing power by demonetizing one-half of the coin money.

True bimetallism, such as will show the Senator has recently advocated, was maintained. Sometimes we had more silver, sometimes more gold, but always open mints to unlimited coinage for both alike.

Again, they say our people did not want silver; that no silver dollars were coined up to 1873. It has been hurled in our faces in almost every international monetary conference, and boldly so proclaimed to foreign nations by our own representatives, and hundreds of times here in the Senate. Why this concealment of facts, and these misrepresentations of the conditions existing under our laws?

Consider the real facts and the true conditions. From April 2, 1792, to July 31, 1834, we produced of silver metal practically nothing—insignificant, as stated in Mint Bureau reports.

From July 31, 1834, to December 31, 1844, we produced $250,000, or $25,000 yearly. In 1845–57—13 years—annually $50,000 amounting only to $650,000 in 18 years. What did we do? We coined of standard silver dollars $2,766,640, and $39,241,110 in half dollars, beside many millions in quarter dollars, dimes, and half dimes, all full legal tender equally with gold for all debts up to 1854. From that year on half dollars and smaller coins were only tenders for $5.

From 1792 to 1853, inclusive, we coined $75,961,554.90 in half dollars and small coins, in addition to standard dollars amounting to $2,550,000, aggregating $78,511,554.90. And yet the world is told we coined no silver.

From 1857 to 1873, we coined 5,261,598 standard dollars; in 1870, $445,462; in 1871, $1,117,136; in 1872, $1,118,000, and in 1 month and 12 days, up to February 12, 1873, $296,600, and if coinage had been kept up at the same ratio for the remainder of that year the total coinage of that year would have been over 2,700,000 silver dollars. Such was our coinage at the very time silver was stricken down by the Coinage Act of February 12, 1873.

There is another reason, Mr. President. Foreign coins of gold and silver were full legal tender in our country up to 1857; and we coined during that time much more silver than we produced in our country; and the only other silver which came here was silver coin. They were full legal tender, and why did anybody want to recoin them into full legal-tender money again?

It has also been circulated in foreign countries, and believed by them, that our people refused to circulate and use as money our standard dollars, under the laws of 1878 and 1890. Foreigners do not understand that in consequence of the era of greenbacks and fractional currency our people prefer legal tenders, gold and silver certificates, to the actual coin, and that the silver dollars in our Treasury are practically in circulation by certificates, which are preferred to gold in circulation.

The RECORD of October 1, 1893, shows that of a total coinage of 419,332,550 silver dollars, only $29,635,504 are in the Treasury as a part

of its reserve; and of the balance, $58,832,668 are in actual circulation, and $330,864,504 in the Treasury, represented by outstanding silver certificates, and are simply held on deposit, to be returned on presentation of the certificates—which simply certify that so many silver dollars have been deposited in the Treasury, payable to the holder on demand. There is no pecuniary obligation whatever to do aught except return the silver dollars specified.

These are the actual, cold facts, and yet the Senator from Ohio—and it is most remarkable—in his speech on the floor of the Senate on May 31 and June 1, 1892, said—and I call the attention of the Senator to the language—

"Shall we sell the silver on hand? We have $400,000,000 in the Treasury. Our people will not readily take it as money. With all the efforts that have been made by Congress there are only 50 or 60 million dollars of silver in circulation. The balance is there in vaults, in cellars, as the security for the payment of the various forms of paper money. Dare you sell that silver? I wanted to provide in the law of 1890 for the disposition of that silver in certain cases, but the conferees would not agree to it, and now to attempt to sell that silver in a falling market would only be adding misery to ruin. I do not like to talk about these things, but it is my duty to state my own opinions. They may be all wrong."

I should not think any Senator having much regard for the integrity of our financial system would want to talk in that style about our silver money.

Mr. DOLPH. Who was that?

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. Sherman] in his speech in 1892, when he referred to all our silver as metal in the Treasury, and the question was whether we should sell it or not. The Senator from Colorado asked this question:

"Mr. TELLER. I wish to ask the Senator a question He says we have $400,000,000 of silver That statement would go out as if the Government owns $400,000,000 of silver Does the Senator mean to make that statement?

"Mr. SHERMAN. Is it in our Treasury, the property of the Government, and our Treasury notes are outstanding against it.

"Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator tell me who owns that silver, whether it is the Treasury of the United States or the people of the United States who hold the certificates?

"Mr. SHERMAN. We hold in the Treasury of the United States $413,000,000 of coined silver. We hold of subsidiary silver $77,000,000. So I was nearly $100,000,000 within the mark I do not want to say anything about this. We have got this vast mass, and we cannot sell it; we dare not sell it."

The Senator from Ohio would not answer the question of the Senator from Colorado, but proclaimed to the world, practically that the United States had four or five hundred million dollars of silver in its Treasury belonging to the United States, which it could sell without a breach of faith, notwithstanding certificates were out calling for nearly every dollar of it. This is our monometallic-bimetallic leader upon the floor of the Senate today, and yet he proclaimed that to the world, and it goes into every nation, kindred, and tongue of the civilized world. But he was pressed still further.

"Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator assert here that the Government has any right to sell the silver dollars; that if there was a law authorizing it the Government would sell the silver dollars, when it is a trustee and holds the money in trust?

"Mr. SHERMAN. There is no doubt the Government will hold that coined money for the payment of these notes outstanding, but it has bullion in its keeping that it dare not sell; and it owes for it. That is affecting the money market.

"Mr. TELLER. Has it a right to sell a dollar?

"Mr. SHERMAN. It has a right to sell the bullion to pay the notes, but there is no law providing for its sale.

"Mr. TELLER. Then it has not any right to sell it.

"Mr. SHERMAN. Suppose, for instance, that these Treasury notes outstanding should come to the Treasury for payment, would you take the gold in the Treasury to pay them?

"Mr. JONES of Nevada. The Government of the United States has no right to sell bullion.

"Mr. SHERMAN. The very moment you attempted to force the silver dollar into the hands of the people you would find at once the gap, the dangerous gap, between silver and gold.

"[At this point the honorable Senator yielded to a motion to adjourn.]"

No, Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio ought to have known and stated distinctly, because he is looked upon as a great financial authority throughout the world, that nearly every dollar of the silver coin in the Treasury was represented by certificates in the hands of the masses of the people, known as silver-coin certificates; that the Government simply held those silver dollars to be returned to the holders of the certificates, and that the only bullion which was in the Treasury was that purchased under the Sherman law. The Treasury had the right to coin it, but no right to sell it. Then the people of the country would have understood it.

No one can tell what was the effect in foreign countries of the publication of that speech to the effect that the United States had $400,000,000 of silver and it was considering the propriety of selling it. That is the way silver has been handicapped ever since we undertook to break down gold monometallism established by the law of 1873. It has been misrepresented and falsified on every hand, and that, too, by distinguished gentlemen whose words have been taken as true.

Mr. President, in the speech of the Senator from Ohio of August 30, 1893, which I shall not consume the time of the Senate in reading, but which I merely refer to, he proposes to coin this same surplus bullion in the Treasury and use it as full legal-tender money.

In 1892, however, it was different. But think of telling the country that this $400,000,000 was stored in vaults and in cellars and not circulating through its representatives. It was a concealment, a suppression of the true facts.

Where is the gold of the United States? Is it in circulation? Scarcely a dollar of it. It, too, is in the bank vaults and in the cellars as a reserve. The certificates are outstanding. Gold no more circulates in this country than silver. There is not $1,000,000 of gold today in actual circulation.

The panic has demonstrated that there is no difference in the estimation of the masses of the people between a coined gold dollar or a coined silver dollar or a greenback or a silver certificate. They have all been taken and hidden away in stockings and in hiding places and in the vaults of safe-deposit companies, and even the despised silver dollar has commanded a premium in the open market in Wall Street during the panic. No, there is not a dollar today in the United States of any kind which is better than the silver dollar in the estimation of the masses of the people among whom it circulates, and there is not a dollar of any kind that has more paying power or purchasing power than the standard silver dollar.

But gold monometallists tell us that gold is the money of civilization, of enlightened nations, of progressive nations, and the doctrinaires are to dictate to us the degree of our civilization by the gold we use or do not use.

Mr. President, it has been thrown up in our monetary conferences why gold should be used, that it is necessary to use gold in large transactions. Mr. Rothschild, in the Brussels monetary conference, insisted upon utilizing silver as money, but at the same time said that for the great commercial transactions of the world we must have gold. "Why," he said "my house sometimes wants to ship millions of dollars, and just think of the load we should have to carry if it was in silver dollars." In other words, the money of the world must be made to suit the convenience of those who handle it by the millions and the tens of millions, and not the great masses of the people who earn it and produce the products for which it must be exchanged. That is the single gold standard.

Russia Versus Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Philip Simms:

RUSSIA VERSUS POLAND

(By William Philip Simms)

In the view of the smaller nations represented here, the case of the Soviet Union versus Poland remains the touchstone of Russia's relations with the rest of Europe and the post-war world.

Poland and Russia are allies. They are fighting on the same side. Both have made enormous sacrifices for the common cause. They have very definite treaty obligations to each other, freely entered into. In common with other members of the United Nations, both are committed to the war aims of the Allies as expressed in the Atlantic Charter.

One of Moscow's first moves after the Red Revolution was to abrogate the agreements between the Czarist government, Germany, and Austria-Hungary concerning Poland. Says article 3 of the Decree of the Council of People's Commissars at Moscow, under date of August 29, 1918:

"All agreements and acts concluded by the government of the former Russian Empire with the governments of the Kingdom of Prussia and the Austro-Hungarian Empire in connection with the partitions of Poland, are annulled forever by the present resolution in view of the fact that they are contrary to the principle of the self-determination of peoples and to the revolutionary, legal conception of the Russian Nation which recognizes the inalienable right of the Polish Nation to decide its own fate and to become united." The decree was signed by Nikolai Lenin.

The present—that is to say, the 1939—boundary between Russia and Poland was fixed by the Treaty of Riga, signed March 18, 1921, and was confirmed by the Conference of Ambassadors on March 15, 1923, at Paris. The United States was one of the participating powers.

Another treaty having to do with their relations was the pact of nonaggression signed by Poland and the Soviet Union at Moscow on July 25, 1932.

"Desirous of maintaining the present state of peace between their countries," this pact declared, "and convinced that the maintenance of peace between them constitutes an

important factor in preserving universal peace, and,

"Considering that the Treaty of Peace of March 18, 1921, constitutes, now as in the past, the basis of their reciprocal relations and undertakings and * * * that the peaceful settlement of international disputes * * * is the surest means of arriving at the goal desired, * * *" the two contracting parties renounce war as an instrument of national policy and agree to "refrain from taking any aggressive action against, or invading the territory of, the other party, either alone or in conjunction with other powers."

As late as November 1938 the Soviet Foreign Minister, Maxim Litvinov, and the Polish Ambassador to Moscow, M. Grzybowski, signed and issued yet another statement on the subject, saying, in part:

"Relations between the Polish Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics are and will continue to be based to the fullest extent on all the existing agreements, including the Polish-Soviet pact of nonaggression dated July 25, 1932. This pact, concluded for 5 years and extended on May 5, 1934, for a further period ending December 31, 1945, has a basis wide enough to guarantee the inviolability of peaceful relations between the two states."

If, within less than a year from the date of this forthright memo, Russia joined with Germany in the invasion and partition of Poland, Poland's hands would appear to remain clean. And while the German-Soviet agreement of September 29, 1939, recognized "as final the frontier between their respective state interests" in dismembered Poland, Poland refused to "recognize this act of violence." Moreover, on July 30, 1941, after Germany attacked Russia, Moscow repudiated her own part in the 1939 partition. "The government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," said the new Soviet-Polish agreement, "recognizes the Soviet-German treaties of 1939 as to territorial changes in Poland as having lost their validity."

If all this, and more, is meaningless, say the little nations, then what is there left for us to cling to?

Sermon at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the sermon by the Most Reverend William T. McCarty, C. SS., R., D. D., military delegate to the Army and Navy diocese, delivered at the fifth annual solemn memorial Mass in the amphitheater at Arlington National Cemetery on May 23:

SERMON AT THE TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER, ARLINGTON, SUNDAY, MAY 23, 1943

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, amen.

In the Old Testament we read that Judah, the military leader of the Machabees, had won a great victory. He then proceeded to bury his slain soldiers. And reflecting that "it is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins," he sent orders to Jerusalem that sacrifices be offered for these dead. Today, under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus and the Catholic Societies of the National Capital, and through the kindness of our own Government, we are here at the tomb of the Unknown Soldier to offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass for the American war dead of all wars.

Monuments are erected to give homage to our heroes, to perpetuate their memories, and to inspire others to follow their example. The greatest monuments in the world are erected to Almighty God, the Creator and Ruler of the universe. Man has always striven to manifest his dependence, his love, and devotion to his God by erecting magnificent shrines and temples. The cathedrals and churches throughout the world today are a testimony of man's belief in the existence of God. Every cathedral is a prayer in stone.

This same innate inclination impels man to build monuments to the memory of other men. Look around the fair city of Washington and you will see it marked with monuments to our great national heroes—Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, and many others. Their names and their deeds are recorded in marble and bronze. But there are countless others who have lived and labored and even died for this Nation, whose names we do not know. Among these unknown heroes there are none greater than those who made the supreme sacrifice for it, who gave their lives fighting for their country and for the principles for which it stands. Their bodies lie in unnamed graves in many lands, with perhaps nothing but a simple cross to mark the spot. But, though unnamed, they are not forgotten.

It was indeed a blessed thought that induced the Government of the United States to bring back the body of one of these unknown, unsung heroes and place it beneath this magnificent monument. This glorious structure proclaims to all men that our beloved country has not forgotten the men who fought and died for her. Beneath this towering marble there lies not only the body of the Unknown Soldier, but symbolically, every American who fought and died for his country.

But this monument, magnificent and imposing as it is, would be a mockery to these heroes if we, the living, did not love and cherish the things for which they died. It would be a mockery if we allowed others to rob us of the precious liberties that they bought for us with their blood. It would be a mockery if we were not willing to fight and even die for the priceless heritage that they won for us. It would be a mockery if we, the living, did not keep faith with these heroic dead. Are we keeping faith with them? Need I answer that question? Go to Africa, go to the Solomons, go to England, go to Alaska, go to all the corners of the globe and you will find American soldiers, sailors, and marines fighting to protect and to preserve the very things this Unknown Soldier died for; you will find them keeping faith with these dead.

I can tell you this in no better way than in the words of the United States Naval Commander, John J. Shea, who wrote this inspiring message to his 5-year-old son: "My Dear Son: When you are a little bigger you will know why your daddy is not home so much any more. You know we have a big country and we have ideals as to how people should live and enjoy the riches of it, and how each is born with equal rights to life, freedom, and the pursuit of happiness. Unfortunately, there are some countries where they don't have these ideals, where a boy cannot grow up to what he wants to be, with no limit on his opportunities to be a great man, such as a great priest, statesman, doctor, soldier, businessman, and the like. Because there are people in other countries who want to change our Nation, its ideals, form of government, and way of life we must leave our homes and families to fight. Fighting for the defense of our country, ideals, home, and honor is an honor and a duty which your daddy has to do before he can come home to settle down with you and mother. In the meantime, take good care of mother. Be a good boy and grow up to be a good young man. Be a good Catholic and you can't help being a good American. If I don't get back, you will have to be mother's protector."

This is just one example of the spirit that is actuating the lives of our soldiers, sailors, and marines. This letter, my dear boys and girls, could well have been written to you by your own father, or by President Roosevelt himself in the past to his own sons, because all true Americans have the same spirit.

Lately a chaplain wrote to me, saying: "The service man of today is a serious thinking young man. He feels that the fundamental cause of the disaster to our Nation and to the world has been the rejection, or at least the ignoring of God and the teachings of His Divine Son. Only through a return to the teachings of Christ can peace through justice and charity be restored to this world. At present he has a deep conviction that he is engaged in a struggle not merely for his country, but for God. He is convinced that he is on God's side; that he is fighting for God as well as for his country and confidently places himself in God's hands." You remember what a soldier in the Philippines said: "There are no atheists in the fox holes of Bataan." And another soldier improved on it by saying: "There are no atheists; period." Surely this generation is keeping faith with the dead.

These, our noble dead, had that same faith in God. The members of the armed forces today are keeping that faith with God. Men are coming to God, they are literally hungry for God. Many men are seeking God for the first time in their lives, asking others to teach them how to pray. Last fall, a chaplain was going across the Atlantic when suddenly his ship was torpedoed. After being in lifeboats for a couple of days, the survivors were picked up by a United States destroyer. When the priest was assisted onto the destroyer, one of his companions said to a sailor on the destroyer, "This is a Catholic priest." And the sailor said, "Are you a real priest? Can you say Mass and hear confessions and give us Holy Communion?" And the priest replied, "Surely, I am a real priest." And that sailor ran around the ship shouting to his Catholic companions, "We have a real priest on board, one who can say Mass and hear our confessions and give us Holy Communion." That is just one example of how the men long to keep in touch with God, and by so doing, are keeping faith with and honoring the dead.

But we are here not only to honor these dead, but to pray for them. While this monument to the Unknown Soldier is a glowing tribute to the heroism of the dead, it is also a public manifestation of our belief in a future life, and hence a reminder that we should offer a prayer, not only for the Unknown Soldier, but for all the dead that we honor here. As Catholics we have the beautiful custom of uttering a little prayer every time we mention their names. How often, for example, do we not hear a person say: "My dear mother, may God be good to her; God rest her." That's a prayer. Every time we visit a cemetery or stand before a grave, we say a prayer because it is just as natural for us to believe in a future life and to pray for the dead as it is to look for the sunrise in the morning and the flowers in the spring. It is a part of our very nature. This consoling belief comes to us from Christ Himself, who said: "I am the resurrection and the life. He who believes in Me, even if he be dead, shall live, and

everyone that lives and believes in Me shall not die forever."

It is in this spirit of praise and of prayer that the various Catholic societies are placing wreaths upon this tomb today, that the Knights of Columbus and the Catholic War Veterans have placed tablets here, and that today the Catholic Central Verein of America and the National Catholic Women's Union are placing a plaque here. In this you are all giving public testimony that you are keeping faith with the dead and praying for their souls.

And as Judah, before the time of Christ, sent to Jerusalem to have sacrifices offered for his fallen soldiers, knowing as he did that "it was a holy and a wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they might be loosed from their sins," so today we gather here to offer the holy sacrifice of the mass for the repose of the souls of our own American heroes, repeating in our hearts the age-old prayer of Mother Church, "Eternal rest grant unto them, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon them. May their souls and the souls of all the faithful departed, through the mercy of God, rest in peace. Amen."

Expert Testimony on Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINDER R. HARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, leaders in the assault on the constitutional rights of the sovereign States, through the anti-poll-tax bill, passed by the House on Tuesday, May 25, 1943, have undertaken, from the inception of this legislation, to justify their thinly-veiled attack on the South on the ground that the poll tax, as a prerequisite to voting, prevents Negroes from exercising the right of franchise.

I call to the stand an expert witness to prove the utter falsity of that charge. There could be no better or more reliable witness than an intelligent and reliable spokesman from the Negroes' own side of this question Here is such a witness:

There is published in the city of Norfolk, Va., a newspaper for Negroes. Its name is the Journal and Guide. It is exceedingly well edited. It courageously champions the rights of its people. It stands out as one of the best colored newspapers in the Nation. In a recent issue, it made this statement editorially:

> The conclusion is inescapable that the poll tax constitutes no effective barrier to his (the Negro's) constitutional right of franchise, regardless of what its sponsors originally intended.

I do not have available at this time the entire editorial from the Journal and Guide, but I have, and append herewith, an editorial from the Norfolk, Va., Ledger-Dispatch, quoting from it and commenting on it. I shall ask permission to insert the entire original editorial in the RECORD at a later date. The editorial from the Ledger-Dispatch follows:

POLL TAX AND NEGRO VOTE

Most of those who persist in the effort to bring about the abolishment of the poll tax as a prerequisite to the vote in Virginia also persist in the contention that the poll-tax laws so operate as to deprive the Negro of his right, his God-given right, to vote in all elections. This is not true of all the anti-poll-tax battlers, but it is true of most of them. The Ledger-Dispatch has set out the fallaciousness of this theory time and again, as have others who have made some investigation into the subject, but this newspaper and those who have taken the same position have been but voices crying in the wilderness. We now welcome another voice, that of the Norfolk Journal and Guide.

Citing as authority the findings of Dr. Luther P. Jackson in the 1942 annual report of the Virginia Voters League, the Journal and Guide, in one of its customarily thoughtful editorials, which we regret not being able to publish in full, says:

"Virginians generally will be surprised to learn that neither the poll-tax levy which their State exacts as a prerequisite to the right of franchise, nor the so-called obstructionist tactics of city and county registrars usually attributed to racial prejudice tendencies, was responsible for their failure to vote during 1942. They will probably be more surprised at the knowledge that this failure to use the ballot was due entirely to their own lethargy."

The editorial then discusses in some detail the Negro vote and the percentage of qualification among those of voting age, and says:

"In the whole State, according to Dr. Jackson's figures, there were perhaps 75,000 Negro Virginians who paid all or a part of the tax for 1942, but only 28,845 of this number paid for each of the years required. These figures are significant, not because the totals are impressive, but rather because they undoubtedly point up the ability of the Negro taxpayer to meet the financial prerequisite to voting."

And then, most impressively:

"Other factors, of course, must be taken into consideration as being partly responsible for the Negro Virginian's poor showing at the ballot box. But the conclusion is inescapable that the poll tax constitutes no effective barrier to his constitutional right of franchise regardless of what its sponsors originally intended."

The Journal and Guide stands fast in its opposition to the poll tax, it emphasizes. But it has made it clear that it places no credence in the theory that it is the poll tax that is responsible for the small Negro vote.

It is not—nor for the comparatively small white vote.

Potato Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. MILLER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of Wednesday, May 26, carried a story on its front page that the O. P. A. had rolled back the retail ceiling price of potatoes and onions by approximately 7 percent, and at the same time increased the price grocers get for their potatoes by 30 cents per 100 pounds.

The white magic was performed without the aid of subsidy, but limited the number of distributor mark-ups to one, and stating there could be 60 cents per 100 pounds of potatoes handled and 80 cents per 100 pounds of onions.

I do not know if the Price Administrator reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I assume somebody in that agency does. On Friday, May 14, I pointed out to the House—and those remarks will be found on page 4490 of the RECORD—that potatoes for which the farmer in Idaho receives $2.30 were selling to the consumer in New York for $7.28. In my remarks I showed the cost of potatoes to the service wholesaler, delivered in New York, was $3.73. In reselling the wholesaler takes a mark-up of 21 percent, which includes delivery within the city. I further pointed out that the 21 percent was not 21 percent of the $2.30 paid the farmer but 21 percent of all charges permitted by O. P. A., plus 21 percent of the freight charge. I then pointed out that the wholesaler could sell the potatoes to a second wholesaler or jobber, who may in turn sell them to a second wholesaler or retailer, also taking an additional mark-up of 21 percent.

It is gratifying to learn that O. P. A. has now been made aware of this situation and that they have taken the necessary action to reduce the price of potatoes to the consumer without resorting to subsidies.

If the Administrator of O. P. A. would take men into the organization who are familiar with the established systems of food distribution, prices could be rolled back on many commodities without resorting to subsidy of any kind.

The O. P. A. is filled up with long-haired professors and assistant professors of economics, many of them from jerk-water colleges, unknown more than 50 miles from their respective campuses.

Members of the House and Senate who know Administrator Prentiss Brown believed that after he had studied the operation of O. P. A. for a reasonable time, he would eliminate a large number of the professors and employ in their place successful businessmen. I hope that this roll-back in the price of potatoes is but the first of many that will follow.

Control of Food Prices by O. P. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RANULF COMPTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the largest groups of food consumers in the country is, of course, organized labor and working people in general. I think therefore it is pertinent, important, and instructive to make available to the members of Congress the point of view of the American Federation of Labor, of which I am a member, on the efficiency, or rather lack of it, in the attempted control of food prices by the O. P. A. This viewpoint coincides with those I expressed on this floor 2 weeks ago.

I think it is important for the membership of the House to have before them the opinion of organized labor in connec-

tion with my resolution (H. Res. 238) which calls for an investigation of the Office of Price Administration. For that reason I include herewith a statement by George Meany, of the American Federation of Labor, which appeared in the American Federalist for May. I have eliminated a part of the text but the most pertinent parts remain:

WAR PRODUCTION AND FOOD PRICES

(By George Meany)

In this titanic world struggle in which our Nation is playing a most vital part, production of war essentials and final victory are inevitably tied to the question of food.

But impressive as our production record is, we are determined to improve upon it, to step up production again and again and again. It is no military secret that our output of the tools of war must be greatly increased to supply the amounts needed for victory.

In the face of these imperative demands upon our war production, American labor today finds itself confronted with a most distressing problem, a problem which can be set forth in one sentence.

The wage-earners of our Nation are at a point where the outrageous price of food staples is destroying their ability to contribute fully and completely to the job that must be done to win the war.

Despite repeated assurances from official representatives of our national government that food prices would be held in check, we find today that the cost of food has risen to a point where it definitely jeopardizes the whole war effort.

As long ago as July of 1941—before we were actually at war—President Roosevelt advised Congress that it was imperative to enact and enforce legislation that would effectively prevent a rise in the cost of living.

Then on April 27, 1942—almost 13 months ago—the President submitted to the Nation a seven-point economic program which he said was designed to place the Nation on a full war basis and hold down the prices of food and other items that enter into the cost of living.

A few months later, on September 7, 1942, we received a Presidential warning that the rising cost of living was a definite threat to our war effort.

This sentiment was echoed last November 17, by the Director of Economic Stabilization, Justice Byrnes, who warned that an uncontrolled rise in prices would sap the morale of the home front and thereby imperil the war effort.

And in the past few months Mr. Prentiss Brown, the head of the Office of Price Administration, whose job it is to carry out the Administration's price-control program, has given the American people a veritable running fire of promises that food prices would be brought under control.

In the face of all these assurances and promises and evidences of good intentions, what do we find today? Have food prices been held down? The answer is a loud, resounding "No." Are food prices too high? Emphatically "Yes." The truth is that they have reached a point so high that our whole war effort is most seriously threatened. The truth is that price control by Government, insofar as it relates to food, has been a miserable failure.

Let us be specific about this. Let us look at retail cash prices from the markets of an industrial city in the Midwest—a typical American community. What do we find?

Potatoes—just plain potatoes—which cost 25 cents a peck in January 1941, now cost 89 cents a peck. The price of hamburger in this same city has gone from 17½ cents a pound to 45 cents a pound in the same period of time. Cabbage has gone from 5 cents to 15 cents per pound. Boiled ham, which so many workers use for sandwiches taken to the shop for lunch, has gone from 85 cents a pound to 75 cents a pound.

Let me also cite some figures secured from another of our American industrial cities by an American Federation of Labor survey, likewise made on the basis of actual prices that prevail today as against prices quoted in newspaper advertisements in January 1941. What do we find in this community?

Bread up 22 percent, butter up 69 percent, milk up 18 percent, oranges up 116 percent, cucumbers up 141 percent, green peppers up 275 percent, and potatoes up 219 percent. In the meat line, in this same town, we find hamburger up 172 percent, pork chops up 113 percent, lamb up 105 percent, boiled ham up 212 percent.

While these figures refer to but two cities, a similar condition prevails in every city in the Nation. American Federation of Labor surveys in New York, Chicago, Seattle, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Atlanta, Charlotte, Cumberland, and a score of other cities—large, medium-sized, and small—all tell the same tale. East, West, North, or South, the prices of food are today vastly higher than they were in January 1941.

The appalling thing about the tremendous increases in the prices of simple, ordinary items in the national diet is that they have occurred under what has been described as a program of price control.

This program is 2 years old, yet only now has the Office of Price Administration for the first time placed dollars-and-cents ceilings on many foods. At this late hour the overwhelming majority of the American people want more of the Office of Price Administration than the mere announcement of dollars-and-cents ceilings.

The common people of this Nation don't want food prices held at their present fantastic levels, nor will we be satisfied with minor reductions. What we want is the rolling back of food prices all along the line. And we want them rolled back to the levels of May 1942—1 year ago.

Why do we specify May 1942? The reason is simple.

Under the President's orders to the War Labor Board, the maximum wage increase which any worker may receive is that established by the Little Steel formula, adopted 1 year ago. This formula is based on the assumption that wages and living costs were in balance on January 1, 1941, and that between January 1, 1941, and May 15, 1942, there was a rise in the cost of living amounting to 15 percent. To compensate for this increase in the cost of living, the War Labor Board ruled that wages should also rise 15 percent, thereby maintaining the theoretical balance.

But since May 1942, a whole year has elapsed, and in that year the cost of living has increased enormously. Wages, however, as they relate to the cost of living are held to the May 1942 level. Therefore, we ask the Office of Price Administration, in simple and obvious justice to the American people, to roll prices back to May 1942.

The Price Administrator announced a few days ago, with manifest pride, that on June 1 the prices of seven articles of food would be rolled back 10 percent. Of course, this will not begin to give the little people of America the relief they need. When basic foods have gone up 20 and 25 cents per pound, it is not enough to snip off a penny here and 2 cents there. A reduction of 10 percent on seven items, when an increase of 100 percent and more has taken place on dozens of items, is not enough.

What, then, do we ask of the Office of Price Administration?

We ask that the retail price of every food staple—not just a handful of items, but every item that ranks as a necessity—be rolled back to whatever the retail price was on May 15, 1942. If in the case of a particular food item this means a roll-back of 25 percent, then that is what we want—a roll-back of 25 percent on that item. If in the case of another item this means a roll-back of 50 percent, then, again, that is what we want—a roll-back of 50 percent.

In this connection it should be noted that we do not want the farmer to suffer, we do not want any squeeze placed on the distributor or the retailer. We are asking for justice for the consumers of the Nation, and we believe equally in justice for everyone else.

To roll food prices back to the levels of May 15, 1942, will require the employment of subsidies.

We have read in the press lately that the sum of $300,000,000 is to be made available for such subsidies to enable the common people of America to buy the food which they must put on their tables. Three hundred million dollars may sound like a lot of money, until we realize that this is little more than what our Government is spending in 1 day every day of the week to carry on this war. Ninety-six billion one hundred and forty-one million dollars per year for war production, and now we find that our administration officials, by straining themselves, can appropriate $300,000,000 to help solve the food problem of America's production army.

We of labor favor economic stabilization. We know that all the people, and especially the working people, would suffer under inflation. We do not want to see a race between wages and prices which could end only in disaster. Economic stabilization is necessary and desirable, but it must be applied with even-handed justice to both sides of the line. This cannot be done until prices are rolled back sufficiently so that they are again within reach of the wage earner's pay envelope.

Labor is critical, in the most constructive spirit, of the break-down in food price control which threatens the war effort. We ask that the condition be corrected without further delay. We ask that this be done, and done quickly, because unless it is done our war workers will lack the strength to produce at top speed and peak efficiency. We call for action—genuine action—now.

Merchant Marine Awards of Distinguished Service Medals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 22, 1943, I addressed the House on the subject of Merchant Marine Awards of Distinguished Service Medals. I explained the law, Public No. 524, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1942. I stated then that figures submitted by the Navy Department of casualties in the merchant marine as of February 23, 1943, showed 509 dead and 3,108 missing or a total of 3,617. Recently, there was released the eighth casualty list which shows a grand total from September 27, 1941, to May 1, 1943, of 4,555, made up of 569 dead and 3,986 missing.

With my remarks on March 22, 1943, I included a list of awards to and including March 15, 1943.

I submit below a continuation of that list for the period between March 15 and May 15, 1943.

Gustav Franke Alm, carpenter, 1910 Belmont Avenue, Bronx, N. Y.: The Distinguished Service Medal was presented to Mr. Alm by Capt. Edward Macauley, member of the Maritime Commission, in the office of Capt. Granville Conway, district manager for the Maritime Commission, New York City, March 20, 1943.

Citation: For extraordinary heroism under unusual hazards.

His ship was traveling in a convoy which, due to extremely heavy seas and winds of gale force, had become scattered. Near midnight a torpedo struck and the ship sank rapidly. Alm, with about 40 of his shipmates, managed to clear the ship in a lifeboat, but the seas were too great for the heavily-laden boat which swamped and capsized. A number of the men who were thrown into the icy waters managed to cling to the overturned hull, but during the night the seas washed the exhausted men off, one by one, until only he and four others remained. The seas continued to build up, and first one and then another of Alm's four companions was washed off, but, by feats of courage and strength, he hauled them back onto the upturned boat. At dawn a rescue corvette appeared and, with great difficulty, was maneuvered alongside. Lines were thrown to the overturned boat and the carpenter secured them around the shoulders of each man in succession until all were hauled to the deck of the rescue ship. Another line was thrown to Alm, but his efforts in rescuing the others seemed to have exhausted his strength and he fell into the sea between the lifeboat and the corvette. Although crushed several times against the side of the corvette by the heaving lifeboat, he managed, by supreme effort, to secure a line around himself, and was hauled unconscious to the ship's deck.

His magnificent courage and disregard of his own safety in saving the lives of his shipmates constitute a degree of heroism which will be an enduring inspiration to seamen of the United States merchant marine everywhere.

James C. Cameron, junior third officer (deceased), 560 West One Hundred and Thirteenth Street, New York, N. Y.: Medal received by his brother, T. T. Cameron, 530 West One Hundred and Thirteenth Street, New York City, from Capt. Edward Macauley, member of the Maritime Commission, in the office of Capt. Granville Conway, District Manager of the Maritime Commission, New York City, March 20, 1943.

Citation: For especially meritorious service under unusual demands and hazards.

When his ship was torpedoed, she listed badly to starboard and began settling rapidly. "Abandon ship" orders were given, and one boatload of the crew had already pulled away when the ship righted herself and ceased settling. Junior Third Officer Cameron was the remaining deck officer on board at this time. He continued to supervise arrangements for abandoning ship and, with the heroic assistance of the remaining crew members, he accomplished the extinguishing of deck fires and directed the chief engineer to start the engines in an effort to save the ship and her valuable cargo. He then brought her through heavy weather and dangerous waters to the nearest safe port. During the two days the ship was under way toward land, Cameron remained continuously on the bridge and on deck directing the ship's course. After a safe anchorage was reached, then, in spite of his exhausted condition, he continued necessary arrangements to make his vessel seaworthy for the voyage to the nearest repair port. His skillful handling of this extremely difficult situation, and his willing assumption of responsibility not ordinarily his, were prime factors in saving both ship and crew.

His personal courage and devotion to duty will be an enduring inspiration to seamen of the United States merchant marine everywhere.

Ragnar F. Eklund, master, 4330 Forty-eighth Street, Sunnyside, Long Island, N. Y.: Medal presented to Captain Eklund by Capt. Edward Macauley, member of the Maritime Commission, in the office of Capt. Granville Conway, district manager for the Maritime Commission, New York City, March 20, 1943.

Citation: For especially meritorious service under unusual demands and hazards.

His was the only American ship in a convoy of seven, all of which were sunk in the Bay of Bengal by heavy shell fire from three enemy cruisers. The first salvo threw him from the bridge into the ship's office, breaking one or two of his ribs and injuring his left ankle. He returned to the bridge and ordered the bridge watch below to the lifeboats and remained alone on the bridge at the helm of his sinking ship, directing the lowering of the boats. He did not leave the bridge until the forward deck was completely under water. Although the loss of life from the other ships was high, Captain Eklund managed to land his entire crew safely on the Indian coast with the survivors of the other ships. There the injured were treated, and the entire company set out on foot through 12 miles of dense jungle to the nearest river village. From this point, the survivors were taken in busses to Cattuck, 50 miles from the coast, and thence returned to Calcutta.

His extraordinary achievement and leadership will be an enduring inspiration to seamen of the United States merchant marine everywhere.

John J. Lapoint, master, 3129 Normount Avenue, Baltimore, Md.: Medal presented to Captain Lapoint by Capt. Edward Macauley, member of the Maritime Commission, in the office of Capt. Granville Conway, district manager for the Maritime Commission, New York City, March 20, 1943.

Citation: For especially meritorious service under unusual stress and hazards.

His ship was struck simultaneously by two torpedoes. Immediately the stern went under water, and the ship sank in 3 minutes. Only one 26-foot lifeboat and 4 life rafts from the rigging were successfully launched. The master, caught in the suction of the sinking ship, was carried under twice by entangling rigging. Although painfully injured, he fought his way to the surface. Taking command of the lifeboat, he proceeded to pick up survivors in the water. The four life rafts were secured in line for towing by the lifeboat and a course calculated to fetch land was set. At the end of the second day strong headwinds and rough seas made it imperative to transfer all men to the lifeboat and cast the dragging rafts adrift. The small boat, now crowded with all 49 survivors, sailed and drifted for 26 days before a landfall was made at night. Although carefully rationed, all food was exhausted by the fifteenth day. From then on the men subsisted almost entirely on berries garnered from passing seaweed and rain water caught during the frequent squalls. A landing was made on what proved to be an uninhabited island, without food, and with only a brackish, sulphurous spring from which a new supply of water was taken. After a second night's rest the disheartened survivors again put to sea. On the morning of the thirty-third day a second landing was made, this time on an inhabited island, where food and water were obtained from the natives. It was from this island that the final rescue was effected. Throughout the many days in the crowded lifeboat, Captain Lapoint's control of the thirst and hunger-maddened men was firm but kind and undoubtedly was the means of saving many lives.

His good example and quiet mastery of a heavy and difficult responsibility will be an enduring inspiration to seamen of the United States merchant marine everywhere.

Walter J. Lee, second mate, 86 West Albany Street, Oswego, N. Y.: Medal presented to Mr. Lee by Capt. Edward Maçauley, members of the Maritime Commission, in his office, April 1, 1943.

Citation: For especially meritorious service under unusual demands and hazards.

The ship in which he was serving encountered heavy weather in dangerous waters near Sable Island, Nova Scotia. Wind and sea increased to gale force and after enduring severe battering for a prolonged period the ship broke in two. The forward half of the vessel in which were all officers senior to Lee drifted away and grounded nearby with the loss of all on board. Lee took charge of the after half of the ship, which he skillfully maneuvered with the engines to lessen the strain and keep the ship stern to the sea as long as engine and firerooms were tenable. A jury antenna was rigged, S O S sent out, and rescue ships advised of the ship's condition. Lee took every conceivable step to keep the wrecked half of the ship afloat and to safeguard personnel until eventually taken off by British naval vessels in a most gallant rescue operation. Throughout this long period Lee was faced with responsibilities far greater than he had previously experienced. He met each crisis with cool and calm efficiency and contributed in large measure to the successful rescue of the 37 survivors.

His extraordinary achievement and exemplary leadership will be an enduring inspiration to seamen of the United States merchant marine everywhere.

Richard Moczkowski, chief mate, deceased, 3710 Fall Avenue, Richmond, Calif. Medal received by his mother, Mrs. Bertha Moczkowski, from Mr. Mark O'Dea, Director of Public Relations, Maritime Commission, at a launching ceremony at the Richmond Shipyard No. 2 of the Permanente Metals Corporation, Richmond, Calif., where Mrs. Moczkowski sponsored the launching of a Liberty ship, April 10, 1943.

Citation: For extraordinary heroism beyond the call of duty.

Two enemy surface raiders suddenly appeared out of the morning mist to attack the small merchantman upon which he was serving. Heavy guns of one raider pounded his ship and machine guns from the other sprayed her decks until she was a complete wreck and afire fore and aft. The merchantman exchanged shot for shot with the enemy raiders until the crew of one raider was forced to abandon their sinking ship, and the other forced to withdraw. The mate, shot in the chest and in the left forearm early in the action, continued at his exposed post abaft the wheelhouse rallying his men and directing orders to the bridge to enable his ship to keep her guns bearing on the enemy ships. Weakened by rapid loss of blood from a severed artery, he collapsed to the deck, but refused to stay down, and ordered a seaman to assist him to his feet and prop him in a doorway that he might better discharge his duties. With her boilers blown up, engines destroyed, masts shot away, and ablaze from stem to stern, orders were finally given to abandon the gallant merchantman. Moczkowski was carried to the boat deck, and propped against the housing while the only usable lifeboat was lowered away. His shipmates carried the mortally wounded man to the side, but seeing the crowded boat already released and clear of the ship, the mate commanded his men to leave him rather than further jeopardize their own safety.

His fearless determination to fight his ship, and his perseverance in engaging the enemy to the utmost until his ship was rendered helpless and sinking, constitute a degree of heroism which will be an enduring inspira-

tion to seamen of the United States merchant marine everywhere.

Alexander S. Henry, master, 25 South Street, New York, N. Y.: Medal presented by Capt. Edward Macauley in New York City, April 16, 1943.

Citation: For distinguished service under unusual stress and hazards.

His vessel had completed delivery of vital war material to one of our allies then hard pressed by a major enemy offensive, and was anchored in port awaiting the formation of a homeward-bound convoy. A flight of six enemy bombers attacked, dropping many bombs. One, a near miss, lifted the ship's stern bodily out of the water. The explosion blew in several plates and frames, and her stern immediately settled to the bottom. The chief engineer rushed below and closed the shaft alley watertight door which prevented the flooding of the engine room and boiler room. The master ordered the flooding of the No. 1 hold which then put the ship down by the head and raised her stern off the bottom. She was beached stern to by her crew on a nearby mud flat, and wired hawsers made fast to huge boulders ashore. The ship was then hove ashore on top of high water by her own deck machinery. For 2 months, a period in which the crew were often called to defend themselves, or assist in the defense of the part against extensive enemy air activity, they effected temporary repairs between tides which enabled the ship to shift to drydock where she was again made seaworthy for active service.

His able leadership of a loyal and courageous crew constitutes an epic of resourcefulness and dogged determination which will be an enduring inspiration to seamen of the United States merchant marine everywhere.

John Anton Mattson, master, 182 Orange Street, Oakland, Calif. Medal presented to Captain Mattson by Commander A. G. Ford, United States Naval Reserve, Superintendent of the United States Maritime Service Officers' School at Alameda, Calif., at the Alameda school, May 8, 1943.

Citation: For distinguished service under unusual stress and hazards.

Arriving in Australia shortly after the Japanese attacks on Manila, he and his crew volunteered to carry vital war matériel to the beleaguered forces on Bataan. Loaded with high explosives and armed only with two light machine guns, they set out into a typhoon upon a voyage which none who saw them sail thought either ship or crew would survive. At a time when huge Japanese convoys were coming south through Molucca Straits, he pushed his ship northward; by day, through channels considered too dangerous for navigation; by night, under forced draft along the edges of open waters often within sight of enemy craft. On two nights enemy ships were passed within hailing distance. On another night floating mines were evaded by sharp lookout and masterful maneuvering. Making its secret port of call, the ship was discharged by night, and set out upon its return voyage with a valuable cargo of tin. But this was not the end of this gallant ship's service to her country at a time of great need. Two more voyages were made to advanced bases where the ship was subjected to savage bombing attacks. Riddled by gunfire, dented and holed by shrapnel beyond temporary repair, it finally became imperative to send her to a drydock in a south Australian port. Within a day and a half of her destination, she was torpedoed and sunk.

With full knowledge of the hazards involved, he and his crew performed special missions of outstanding importance to our fighting forces. His able leadership of a valiant crew, and his masterful exhibition of seamanship will be an enduring inspiration to seamen of the United States merchant marine everywhere.

Texas and Louisiana Sulfur May Win the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is no exaggeration to say that sulfur is one of the absolute essentials in the war effort. It is a necessary element in the manufacture of explosives, in the production of steel, in the manufacture of rubber, and in the refining of oil. In peacetime, it is necessary in practically all branches of industry and can therefore claim its high place in our great industrial structure.

The United States produces more sulfur than any other country in the world and practically all of that production comes from the coastal regions of Louisiana and Texas. Incidentally, the mines are all located either directly on or in close proximity to the Intracoastal Canal.

The Ninth Congressional District of Texas, which I have the honor to represent, produces all of the sulfur which is now mined in Texas and this represents about 80 percent of the total sulfur production of our country. One mine in my district is presently producing approximately 60 percent of all of our sulfur.

The sulfur mines of Louisiana and Texas are doing their full part in the war effort. Called upon to increase their production to meet war demands, they have not only measured up fully to the requirements but I am reliably informed have actually increased their stocks on hand. The total production exceeds 3,000,000 tons annually.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that the major portion of this sulfur production, when coastwise steamship service was available, moved by water to the great consuming centers along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. With the exception of a large movement which traverses the Intracoastal Canal and moves up the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to industries in the interior, all of the sulfur is now moved by rail at rates approximately 3 times greater than the former cost by water.

The island of Sicily is the second largest producer of sulfur. If it falls into Allied hands, as now seems likely, the effect upon the war-making powers of the Axis will be tremendous and may be decisive. On this point and under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the New York Times of May 23:

LOSS OF SULFUR WILL HURT AXIS—BOMBING WILL PREVENT SICILY FROM SENDING THE SUPPLIES NEEDED BY WAR INDUSTRY

Sicily is now under such heavy bombardment that it can no longer supply Italy and Germany with sulfur, and without sulfur the chemical and metallurgical industries of both countries will find it hard to make sulfuric acid, fertilizers, pulp, explosives, insecticides, fungicides, and several thousand other essentials.

In the United States sulfur is melted underground by superheated water and pumped up at low cost. In Sicily sulfur is obtained by melting it tediously out of rocks. Three years ago the Italian production was about 500,000 tons annually. What it has been since nobody knows. The American production is well over 3,000,000 tons a year.

Incidentally a Sicilian sulfur burner is called a "Caruso." The American process of melting sulfur underground by superheated water and pumping it up almost ruined him. Only an arrangement made by the late Hermann Frisch, inventor of the process, with Prime Minister Crispi, saved him from virtual extinction.

Both Germany and Italy will now have to rely on the pyrites for sulfur, for Spain produces only about 25,000 tons of sulfur a year, Turkey not more than 3,000 tons, and Japan at least 200,000 tons a year—enough for her own use only.

Belated Justice for China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker as a Member of Congress, I am ashamed of the treatment we have accorded China over the years. I am especially ashamed of the fact that although friendly to China yet we furnished Japan a large part of the war materials she needed to carry on her aggressive war against China, and to build up her war fleet to make war upon us. If we had placed an embargo upon the sale of war materials to Japan, as some of us advocated several years ago, she would have been unable to take over Manchuria, and certainly she would have been unable to prepare to make war upon us.

The opportunity to bring about a better understanding between the Chinese people and ourselves and to do justice to the Nation that is our most friendly ally in the present war presents itself in the proposal to repeal the Chinese Exclusion Act, which is now being considered by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. Because of transportation difficulties we cannot send the Chinese material aid in the shape of guns, tanks, war planes, food, and so forth, needed so badly by her to carry on her heroic resistance against the Japanese aggressor, and we will be unable to send her this badly needed material aid for months to come. Military experts tell us we must recapture the port of Rangoon, now in Japanese hands, and reopen the Burma Road before we can give China much material aid. Chinese military experts tell us the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act will stiffen up the morale of the Chinese people and help the Chinese military leaders to offset Japanese propaganda which seeks to foment dissatisfaction among the Chinese people against the United States because of our treatment of the Chinese people over the years.

Our State Department very wisely removed one of the long-standing obstacles to good will between China and the United States when it voluntarily gave up our so-called extraterritorial rights in China. Now Congress has the opportunity to remove the other long-standing obstacle to good will and full friendship between the two nations by repealing the Chinese Exclusion Act, thereby placing China and the Chinese people upon the same basis, so far as immigration is concerned, as other nations that have been given a quota.

The following editorial taken from the New York Times presents this matter so clearly and concisely that I submit it for the consideration of my colleagues in the House:

BELATED JUSTICE FOR CHINA

Hearings on legislation to repeal 61-year-old discriminations against the Chinese are announced to open in Washington today before the House Immigration and Naturalization Committee. What is asked by friends of the Chinese is more than reasonable. It is simply the repeal of long-standing laws specifically prohibiting Chinese immigration and singling out the Chinese as ineligible for citizenship. The Chinese would then be under the quota system, which would permit the annual immigration of about 100 persons. These legal immigrants could become citizens. So could perhaps 20,000 other Chinese now resident in the United States but born in the homeland. The anti-Chinese laws were passed, the first of them in 1882, because of the fear that this country would be flooded with cheap labor. Some employers had already brought them in for this purpose—notably the builders of the first transcontinental railroads. Nothing like this can be permitted to happen again. The Chinese themselves do not want it. They now have their own undeveloped Far West, and the end of the present war should furnish new opportunities for them throughout the western Pacific. What the Chinese want, and what their friends here want for them, is a recognition of their dignity as human beings. We can give them thi recognition now without the slightest danger or inconvenience, and we ought to do so. The war has made this easier as well as more desirable, since it has eliminated any possible claims the Japanese might have had to consideration.

Several measures will come before the House committee. The simplest will be the best. Here is an opportunity to pay tribute to a people who have earned their right to be treated with respect.

Small Countries of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, under our Constitution the State Department is charged with dealings on the part of this Government and other foreign countries. In wartime, other agencies enter into the picture, the War Department and the Navy Department, for example. I have always felt that this policy was a sound one. I am still of that opinion.

However, I am prompted to make these remarks today in view of a newspaper item yesterday, stating that 220 prominent United States citizens had petitioned President Roosevelt to wage war on Finland. That newspaper item encountered my resentment and opposition. As one Member of Congress, I do not hesitate to say that I consider this petition distasteful and ill-advised. This country has no quarrel with the little Republic of Finland, nor with their people, nor with people of Finnish nationality in the United States. Following World War No. 1, the Republic of Finland was one of the few countries which paid its war debts. There is much more that I can say and may take occasion to do so at some future date.

Right now, however, I want to talk about the small countries of Europe, and I include them all and I exclude none. I have in mind Poland, and I have in mind Norway, Denmark, Holland, Czechoslovakia, and Greece, and others.

My recollection is fairly clear, in connection with this discussion, as to what Russia did, and I do not here repeat the tragic story.

I want to say to the Members of this House that now is the time, if it has not already been done, for our State Department to make clear to our allies the sympathy of the United States for small countries and the fact that our people in a reconstruction post-war period want to see the boundaries of the small countries across the water restored, and want to see those people permitted to govern themselves in their own way. Certainly, if we qualify this declaration, it can only be qualified by saying that we expect our allies in this World War No. 2 to agree to treat these countries as fairly as the United States expects to do.

In my opinion, the United States is entitled to such an understanding of powerful Allied countries with which it is now fighting and cooperating against the Axis countries.

The Republic of Finland and the other small countries of Europe are entitled to the benefit of the protecting hand of the United States of America, and also of our allies, and I feel that it is the responsibility of our country to see that this protection is accorded these countries.

Repeal of All Poll Taxes Urged by Mrs. Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 24, 1943

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include two press reports appearing in the Washington Star under the current dates of May 24 and May 25, respectively, as follows:

REPEAL OF ALL POLL TAXES URGED BY MRS. ROOSEVELT

NEW YORK, May 24.—Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt favors repeal of all poll taxes as "a good thing," not only "for the colored people, but for all people."

Speaking here last night at the inauguration of the second annual city-wide Harlem week observance attended by whites and Negroes, she said questions of race prejudice would have to be faced by the Nation after the war, and "the patterns we set here will build the foundations for the future."

She also suggested that "there should not be German communities, Scandinavian communities, and other communities of the foreign-born" in this country, but there should "just be American communities."

Mrs. Roosevelt said that whenever she speaks on race prejudice she receives letters calling her enemy No. 1, and declared that persons writing the letters accuse her of stirring up the problem which, if left alone, would be solved by individuals.

GASOLINE SHORTAGE CUTS ACTIVITIES OF MRS. ROOSEVELT

The gasoline shortage is complicating Mrs. Roosevelt's life as much as anybody else's, she said today.

Miss Melvina Thompson, Mrs. Roosevelt's secretary, started to tell a press conference today about a tour planned for the President's wife on Sunday.

"Oh, no," Mrs. Roosevelt interrupted. "I may not be able to drive. I have to see about the gas."

She finds it disconcerting to promise to be some place and then not be able to be there, she added, but imagines that she will soon get used to it.

Mr. Speaker, it has been truly said that "It is an ill wind that blows no one any good."

Post-War Relations Between Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter which I have received from the uncle of a young man who is serving in our armed forces in the Pacific. I am frank to say that after having read this communication carefully several times, I am deeply impressed with its contents. It is definite proof that our boys in the Army and the Navy are deeply concerned over the future status of world relations between nations when the present conflict is terminated. I commend it to my colleagues for their thoughtful consideration.

The letter follows:

APRIL 28, 1943.

DEAR RAE: I have a lot to say today, so I am using ordinary stationery. I'm afraid that when the censor sees the length of this letter he may throw it out, so I am putting in a plea to him here at the beginning. Please, censor, before you start blotting out, or before you throw this into the waste basket, read it through. It is not just a letter from me to Rae, it is a letter from a soldier to all the people at home. You are a soldier. I believe when you have read it you

will agree with me and want to send it on. If you feel as I do, subscribe to it. Thank you.

You see, Rae, I want like hell for you to get this, because it is the first time I have written home about my real feelings. Here it is, almost straight from my diary.

I was trying to put into words my feeling about the Army and this war. To have a clear concept of this whole war and our purpose of fighting in it is a difficult thing to attain. I have the universal fear of death, but my greatest fear is that when we win we might again muff the peace. A realization has come to me that the American soldier is pretty vague about what he is fighting for. I think that fact alone makes two strikes against us. It is hard to fight a war successfully unless it has an all-consuming purpose. Killing another person is against human nature and we can only really fight and kill when we are driven by a conviction that what we are fighting for is worth more than our individual lives.

We know we are fighting for the American way of life, for freedom. But for most that is an empty phrase, because American youth has never known anything but freedom. He has never seen a whole people under bondage or tyranny. He reads about it in books and in the newspapers and, though he believes it to be a fact, it makes almost no impression on him. What happens to other people in other nations in this day and age means no more to him than knowing that millions were tortured in the Middle Ages. It's just a story. We still have the fatal attitude of "It can't happen here."

I wonder how many soldiers in the last war actually felt they were fighting to save democracy and build a new world, and how many were fighting because of a blind patriotism to a country they loved and because the leaders of that country declared war and said it was necessary for our safety. I don't mean to say that I feel our leaders were wrong or that they are wrong this time. But how many of us see clearly what the consequences would be if we didn't fight? If Hitler and the totalitarian states won? And, conversely, how many of us see clearly what is to be done if we do win this war.

And there lies my greatest fear. I don't begrudge giving my life if I feel sure it is being given to some end. I am too much of a realist to be willing to give it happily for my country and my God if my country has no definite program of construction or real direction for what it will do with victory. But this is all negative, and now I come to my point.

There has been one big heartening piece of news from home. In the February issue of the Reader's Digest, I read an article by Ely Culbertson. He had thought out a whole program of action for after the war, and not only that, he had the courage to put it before the American public for criticism. It might have been a program so ridiculous that the whole country would have laughed at him. It wasn't, but he, and Reader's Digest, took that chance. And that is what we need.

Every man equipped with a knowledge of world affairs and human nature should give constructive thought to such a program and, where possible, present it for discussion. Somehow a way must be found for the public to see these ideas, think about them, and give their opinions. I believe this to be a duty incumbent upon every thinking American and Englishman and Russian, in fact, everyone who desires a world at peace. Somewhere in the minds of 130,000,000 Americans must lie the right answer. However, without some agency to make it known, it may die with its possessor. Culbertson has set an example. A layman, an ordinary citizen, puts before the world his plans for peace. Let's have more of it. Our leaders cannot be expected to know all the answers. They need the help of the Nation. That one article is the greatest ray of hope I have seen.

If we soldiers could be sure that those at home were putting forth such effort to make this war an overture to a new world, a world of peace, of growing brotherhood and trust, we'll gladly, even eagerly, give everything to win. Then we would be sure. Every soldier would fight with 10 times his present effectiveness. His main concern will not be "Will I get through this next attack, the next mission, the next raid?" If he's anything like myself he will know that the most important thing in history will be our victory. If he has to face death he will know why. There will be a promise that those left at home will carry on the fight to build a new world. We know and are grateful for the efforts you have put forth. You have sent us guns, you have sent us planes, you have sent us food and supplies. Please send us this last most powerful weapon: the knowledge that you know the end of the war is just the beginning, a clearing of the decks.

I wish I could see Culbertson and tell him how grateful I am for him and others like him who might be doing the same thing. It would be a crime against future generations to let that kind of courage and effort go unrewarded.

And this is not something that can be done later. In time of peace we learn to lie back comfortably and let the world roll on and in the past it has always rolled in the same direction; toward war. But feeling runs high during a war. The horror and suffering and loss stare us constantly in the face. Then when war is over it ceases some to be a reality. After that no one feels it worth the effort to think in terms of world reconstruction. The nations have again fallen into a mold and it is too dangerous then to meddle with the status quo. So now is the time. When we begin to get direction then, and only then, will victory be in sight, and by the time that victory comes, when we have the power, we should have, we must have, the way. A program must be ready.

We had the makings of it after the last war, but somehow it flopped. It flopped because already the American public had withdrawn to its own corner to lick its own wounds. That will always be an ugly smear on the great story of America. We can't afford another one, for in time we will find that there is no story. It will be just a fable. There was a story once that France had the greatest army in the world. But the book in which that story was written had no binding, and the leaves all blew away. After 28 days they were so scattered that the story was lost. But there was a page found in Africa, and one in England, and one in America, and a few in France. The old story is lost forever, but those scattered pages are forming an introduction to a new one. There should be a new story for all nations, a universal story. It can't be done all at once and perhaps the first draft will have to be changed. During the hectic days after our revolution the founders of this Nation, after many tries, drew up the Constitution of the United States. Can there be a world constitution? Such terms as world court and world police force sound unreal to us, almost ridiculous, but it is no bolder a concept for us than the first Constitution of the French Republic was or our own Constitution. Certainly there was no less discord and disagreement among the founders of our Constitution than there is among the people of the world today. Really the only basis of agreement they had, the only common ground, was a desire for freedom. Today most peoples of the earth have that desire and with it a desire for peace.

We must have learned by now that all our future plans must be in terms of world activity. Just as our State governments must operate under a national constitution, a national concept, in order to hold together in a peaceful federation, so in the future must all national governments operate under a world constitution. World courts and world police forces must pass from Utopian haze to realities.

A bridge player has started the ball rolling. Maybe the next will be a banker or a carpenter or a professor or a soldier. Some of our clearest thinkers are men on farms and ranches who see town once a week. Let's hear from them all.

That's it, Rae. I don't dare take up more space. Somehow I wish you could let Culbertson and Reader's Digest know that that article has been read and greatly appreciated by at least one soldier over here. Perhaps you might even think it right to let our Congressmen in on how we think. I feel it is tremendously important, not only because of future world security, but because I feel it would make a great difference with our fighting forces. If these things are going ahead at home, we should be told about it. The lack of such assurances is a great gap in our national defense and in the defense of the United Nations.

I'll just say now that I am well and I hope you and your family are the same. Let me know what you do with this, and please get a copy to mother if you can. She'd be interested.

Fondest regards.

AN AMERICAN SOLDIER IN THE PACIFIC.

Compensation of Goodwin Watson, William Dodd, Jr., and Robert M. Lovett

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted with a small minority of Congress (62 Members) against the so-called Kerr amendment to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, providing that none of the funds appropriated should be available to pay any compensation to three designated individuals: Goodwin Watson and William Dodd, Jr., of the Federal Communications Commission, and Robert M. Lovett, secretary of the Virgin Islands. I agree with the majority of the House that the men should not be on the public pay rolls, but I do not think that the procedure employed to get them off the pay roll was fair; and I think that the precedent established by this legislation, which may well become historic, is an unfortunate one.

It must be understood that back of this legislation lies the complete lack of confidence of Congress in the competence of the executive branch of the Government. This lack of confidence, I regret to say, I share; yesterday's vote shows that it is a well nigh universal sentiment. Messrs. Watson, Dodd and Lovett are men who can be fairly termed intellectuals. They have all written and spoken extensively and the opinions which they have expressed have certainly not been sentiments of approbation about capitalist democracy. To some extent these men are typical of a large number of people who have entered the Federal service with more or less radical or leftist ideas animated by

a Tugwellian ambition to "make America over." No one questions the right of these men to their own opinions about the institutions of capitalist democracy; to exploit those opinions on the pay roll of a capitalist democracy is another matter. No sales agent for the Ford motor car would staff his organization with men constantly asserting the superiority of the Chevrolet, and vice versa. I firmly believe that the employees of a capitalist democracy like the United States should be believers in its basic and traditional institutions, among which I should certainly include the profit system.

It should be said that the Kerr subcommittee which found these men guilty of subversive activities was a capable body of men who approached their unpalatable job with fair minds. The fact remains that the proceeding which found the three individuals guilty of seditious activities was in no way a judicial proceeding. It was simply a series of secret interviews by a legislative subcommittee with the individuals named. No specific charges were presented, no testimony was offered against them, they were not represented by counsel, and they were not given the right to present evidence. They were convicted by the subcommittee on the basis of their writings and the subcommittee, having prosecuted and convicted them, brought the case onto the floor of the House where, of course, the men could not be represented. No transcript of the evidence was made available to us. It hardly requires argument to prove that this is a dangerous procedure and a precedent which can be extremely troublesome.

On the strength of this precedent any party in power can legislate off the pay rolls of the Government thousands of employees of the opposite party, notwithstanding any civil service law or any other statute designed to give permanence of tenure in the Federal service.

The correct procedure in my opinion would be to have Congress legislatively define classes of people unfit for the public pay roll, such as, let us say, aliens, persons advocating the overthrow of the Government by force, persons having criminal records, and the like. The duty of determining whether a given individual fell within the designated class should then be left to the Federal courts or some genuinely judicial tribunal having no connection with the Congress. That is academically the correct solution. The people who voted with the majority yesterday point out, however, that as long as the executive insists on retaining these men in its employ no tribunal appointed by the Executive could be trusted fairly to pass on the question of the men's qualifications. The dilemma is a serious dilemma which must embarrass every conscientious legislator. If at some later time I become convinced that this admittedly crude legislative procedure conserves the public interest, and that no other procedure will, I shall feel at liberty to reverse the stand I took yesterday. This, however, I shall be extremely hesitant to do.

Another obvious objection to legislation of this type is that neither Congress nor any committee thereof has the time to scrutinize the millions of people now on the civilian pay roll for the purpose of determining either their loyalty or their competence. To single out three out of 3,000,000 is a sufficiently invidious and discriminatory business.

A situation of this sort could not arise under a form of government in which the executive branch was responsible directly to the legislative as in Great Britain and her dominions. The segregation of the legislative and executive branches under our Constitution makes possible these frictions which, often in our history and notably after the First World War, have proved so disastrous.

To the present controversy there is no real answer except for the people to select a Chief Executive and a Congress who, regardless of party labels, shall be of the same political philosophy.

It is possible that some of the embarrassments of the situation with respect to these individuals may be relieved by a decision of the United States Supreme Court. It was at first my disposition to believe that the legislation passed yesterday would be deemed to be in the nature of a bill of attainder and hence held unconstitutional. I know, however, of no decision to this effect and the majority of the lawyers in the House, which includes in its membership many competent lawyers, is satisfied that it lies within the legislative prerogative to impose any limitations which it likes in an appropriation bill, even to the point of excluding from the Federal pay rolls Catholics, Protestants, Republicans, Democrats, and so on. An adjudication of this question by the Supreme Court would be helpful to everyone, and I hope that it will be obtained.

It might also be desirable to be a little more logical about communism. At the present time Earl Browder or any other Communist may run for President and solicit votes on the Communist platform; but if Mr. Browder had a job in the Federal Comunications Commission, he would be pretty sure to become a target for legislation such as that passed yesterday, and anyone on the Federal pay roll known to have voted for Browder would be in like danger. It seems a little odd for Congress to say to the Nation's electors, "Here is Mr. X running for President on the Communist ticket. You may vote for him if you like, but if we catch you doing it you never can hold a Federal job."

When Tenures Are Too Long

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an editorial from the Cumberland News of Saturday, May 22, 1943, entitled "When Tenures Are Too Long":

Two former members of President Roosevelt's Cabinet have been discussing Government leadership. The words of Postmaster General James A. Farley, spoken at Mother's Day services at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington have been rather widely commented upon. But those of former Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, now an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, spoken at commencement exercises at Syracuse University, have received scant publicity.

"A government that governs but little and leaves economic life to its own devices can be pretty mediocre and not too high-minded and still be tolerable," said Justice Jackson. "Unpleasant chapters in our own political history and more in those of other countries prove that. But when government pervades all life, holds the economic system in its hands, becomes the greatest employer, the biggest customer, the largest borrower and the largest lender of money, neither incompetence nor low standards of disinterested conduct can be tolerated."

The justice told Syracuse graduates that opportunities for a career are shifting from private hands to Government, whether this be good or evil, and described some of the satisfactions that accrue to those in permanent Government service.

From the context of Mr. Farley's speech one might conclude that the man who was responsible for Mr. Roosevelt's first nomination was—even on Mother's Day—hitting at the New Deal and at agitation for a fourth term for his quondam friend in the White House.

"There seems to be a spirit growing among some in this country that is alien to our institutions," said the former Postmaster General. "I have an uneasy feeling that the belief is spreading that the people are not capable of governing themselves, that the problems of today are so complex that the citizen at large must, of necessity, be detached from his own difficulties. The concept of the political elite is growing."

The United States has never had a governing class, or bureaucratic elite, in the sense in which Great Britain and some other European countries have had. Whether such an elite would be also a political elite would seem to depend upon the degree to which such permanent officials become tied to the philosophic dogmas of a particular administration.

If Mr. Jackson is right in forseeing a huge Government establishment for an indefinite future, and Mr. Farley is right in fearing that a political elite will govern America, a strong argument is presented against leaving one group of elite too long in office.

The practical Mr. Farley has produced a sound philosophic argument against a fourth term.

Service Activities of the Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAYMOND S. SPRINGER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, it was very gratifying recently to be reminded by my good friend, Millard W. Rice, national service director for the Disabled

American Veterans, that the D. A. V., long before Pearl Harbor, decided that its best contribution to the Nation's all-out war efforts would be for it to extend the expert advice and counsel of all of its service officers, national and local, to those members and former members of our armed forces who may have become disabled by reason of their war service.

I know of no veteran organization that has any more extensive or effective Nation-wide service set-up to take care of this essential national defense job than that maintained by the D. A. V.

FORMATION OF D. A. V.

Formed in 1920, and chartered by Congress in 1932, to render service to, for, and by disabled veterans, the Disabled American Veterans has been generally recognized as the official spokesman for America's disabled war veterans.

According to its congressional charter—Public Law No. 186, approved June 17, 1932, as amended by Public Law No. 668, approved July 15, 1942—active membership in the D. A. V. (as the organization is generally referred to) can be secured only by those Americans whose bodies bear the scars of wounds or injuries, or the blight of disease or disability incurred by reason of active war service in the armed forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

Increasing numbers of those who have returned from service in World War No. 2 are becoming active members of the D. A. V.

Having incurred a disability while serving with our armed forces during World War No. 1, I am personally proud to be a life member of this select outfit.

During its more than 23 years of constructive activities, the D. A. V. has many times pressed for liberalizing legislation, on behalf of disabled veterans and their dependents, and for more liberal application of such laws by the Veterans' Administration, too numerous and too technical here to set forth.

D. A. V. NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS

Its national headquarters, located at 2840 Melrose Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio, takes care of all administrative matters and records, and publishes the Disabled American Veterans' semimonthly newspaper, containing accurate, up-to-date information as to all legislation, Presidential Executive orders, court decisions, Attorney General's opinions, Comptroller General's opinions, and Veterans' Administration regulations, service letters, and other instructions, as well as much other information of interest and of value to disabled veterans and their dependents.

The D. A. V.'s present national commander, Laurence R. Melton, captain, Air Corps, now in charge of all of its military police in Miami and Miami Beach, Fla., is the first veteran of both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 to serve as the national commander of a major veteran organization. Its national adjutant, Vivian D. Corbly, has been secretary-manager of the organization and editor of its newspaper since 1925. Capt. Cicero F. Hogan is his able assistant.

The largest bank in Cincinnati—the Fifth Third Union Trust Co.—has, for many years, been the depositary for the funds of both the D. A. V., and of its incorporated trusteeship, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation. Officials handling funds have always been adequately bonded by the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland.

NATIONAL SERVICE SET-UP

The office of the National Service Bureau of the Disabled American Veterans almost since its inception have been located in the Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., where it now has 10 service experts to advise and to assist deserving disabled veterans in the technical preparation, presentation, and prosecution of their equitable claims for compensation, pension, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, civil-service appointments, employment, and so forth.

Heading up the national service bureau is the national service director, Millard W. Rice, who is now the dean among the national legislative representatives of the several recognized veteran organizations, with his energetic assistant, Thomas J. Kehoe—both of them former marines. Mr. Rice also supervises the activities of the organization's large staff of nationally paid officers, as well as over its some eight hundred volunteer State and chapter service officers.

These unselfish, self-sacrificing service officers are all disabled veterans themselves. Each of them has had the experience of pushing his own claim for service connection and compensation. Every one of them personally knows of the difficulties and handicaps by which many disabled veterans are often baffled in their efforts to secure and to hold suitable gainful employment.

These D. A. V. service officers know about the technical complexities that disabled veterans must overcome, factually to prove the service connections of their disabilities to the satisfaction of rating agencies of the United States Veterans' Administration, under the limitations and restrictions of existing law "as legalistically interpreted and administratively applied."

D. A. V. SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Being equitably entitled to service connection and compensation for a disability is not the same as being legally entitled thereto.

Understanding such baffling problems, these D. A. V. service officers are naturally more sympathetic and therefore generally more effective in helping disabled claimants to comply with the requirements for technical proof.

During the past 14 years, for which records are obtainable, the paid national service officers of the D. A. V. have extended service as indicated by the following brief résumé: Claims handled, 794,392; hospitalizations and examinations obtained, 126,021; and total monetary benefits, $57,222,760.

It is, of course, not practicable, in a brief statistical résumé, to indicate the many different types of service extended by service officers. It must also be remembered that many liberalizing precedents have been established by cases handled by D. A. V. service officers, which subsequently have proven of value to hundreds or thousands of disabled veterans having similar claims, the results of which cannot appear in service reports.

These compensation payments thus obtained for more than 125,000 disabled veterans and their dependents, who might not otherwise have been able to secure such needed benefits, have converted such beneficiaries from local liabilities into community assets, by bringing increased purchasing power into such communities, thus helping to increase the volume of business in each locality.

This comparatively small organization of America's disabled war veterans has freely helped thousands of disabled veterans each year technically to secure compensation for service-incurred disabilities, medical treatment, hospitalization, insurance benefits, vocational training, civil-service appointments, private employment, and pensions for dependents.

DIFFICULTIES OF PROVING SERVICE ORIGIN

Most citizens insist that the burden of providing for the Nation's defenders should be borne by the Federal Government, but only when it has been established that the veteran's disabilities were caused by his military service. To prove service connection of a disability is not an easy thing to do, however, unless official records show its inception in service.

An equitable claim cannot necessarily be legally established. A disabled veteran may be conscientiously convinced that his disability was caused by his service without being able legally to prove that fact.

A hundred and one different factors may make it extremely difficult, and in many cases impossible, for a veteran factually to prove that his disabilities were caused by his war service, even though they actually were service incurred or service aggravated.

The fight for justice, however, must still be carried on for such disappointed, disillusioned, disabled veterans, not only for them, but also for the sake of their wives and their growing children. The D. A. V. is striving to see to it that justice is extended to the Nation's disabled war defenders of the past, present, and future.

AN INVESTMENT IN PATRIOTISM

It is definitely in the interest of the Nation—all of us—that the faith be kept with those who have sacrificed their youth and a part of their bodies, or their health, in the Nation's most hazardous occupation—its military and naval services during time of war.

The faith must be kept with those who have made such sacrifices in the past, as well as with those who are now baring their young breasts to the enemy, so that other young men, who in the future may be called upon to make similar sacrifices, will have the assurance, on the basis of past performance, that, if they, too, should also be so unfortunate, they will not be permitted to become mere forgotten heroes.

Truly, seeing to it that America's disabled war veterans are adequately provided for is a big investment in the future patriotism of our youth. Providing adequately for the Nation's defenders

is an investment in patriotism which brings huge dividend returns to every community, to every State, and to our country.

HOW D. A. V. SERVICE IS FINANCED

The D. A. V. has been able to maintain its extensive service program primarily out of funds contributed by disabled veterans themselves, by their payment of membership dues in the D. A. V., through its some 40 departments and 800 chapters.

A national annual per capita tax of $2, plus a national service fee of $1, is paid by each local chapter for each of its members to the national headquarters.

Local D. A. V. chapters finance their own service and relief activities out of their portion of the annual membership dues, and by annual forget-me-not drives, dances, and so forth.

Nationally, the D. A. V. has recently been endeavoring, with considerable success, to raise needed service funds through the sale of Ident-O-Tags—miniature automobile license plates to be attached to one's key ring—and as an incidental service to car owners has, now and for many months, been receiving and returning about 200 sets of lost key rings each week.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS SERVICE FOUNDATION

To assure continuance and to make possible a much-needed expansion of its valuable service in the future, primarily in order to be of help to the many thousands of disabled veterans resulting from World War II, who will so sorely need the sympathetic understanding and technical assistance of those who have gone through it themselves, the D. A. V. is hopeful that understanding fellow Americans will help to build up a needed trust fund of up to $10,000,000 by generous donations to its incorporated trusteeship, the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation, 546 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

This D. A. V. Service Foundation consists of seven trustees, five of whom each serve for 5-year terms, one expiring each year and replaced by another as confirmed by the national convention of the D. A. V., and the other two automatically to consist of the national commander and national adjutant of the D. A. V.—all of whom serve as trustees without any pay therefor. The donations received by D. A. V. Service Foundation are placed into separate State trust fund accounts according to State of origin, for allocation to the D. A. V., when needed, for the expense of maintaining one or more national service officers in each such State.

WHY D. A. V. NEEDS OUTSIDE HELP

Some may wonder why more eligible disabled veterans do not become paid-up members of the D. A. V., and thus to maintain its Nation-wide service set-up on behalf of less fortunate disabled vets. Certainly, there are many eligibles who could afford to make payment of membership dues. Some of them know very little about the D. A. V.; some of them are indifferent; others have continued to neglect it because of other so-called more pressing matters, and many others feel that they cannot afford it.

It is unfortunate, but true, that many disabled veterans, medically diagnosed as only partially disabled, are actually totally disabled from an employment standpoint. Moreover, nearly 60 percent of all compensated disabled veterans receive less than $40 per month compensation, whereas about 80 percent receive less than $60, amounts entirely inadequate with which to maintain a decent existence for themselves and families, particularly in the case of those who are unable to secure gainful employment because of their handicapping disabilities, in the face of increasing living costs.

The American public is, I am confident, desirous of fulfilling its obligation that those who return from hazardous military employment in the armed forces of the United States, handicapped by some physical or mental scars incurred by reason of such active service, shall be adequately provided for by a grateful Nation.

The D. A. V. is anxious to see to it that all deserving disabled veterans of this war, and of other wars, are given such technical assistance as will help them legally to establish their equitable claims for lawful benefits, provided under certain conditions.

The D. A. V. is convinced that it is helping to protect and to advance the best interests of disabled veterans, and of the general public, by maintaining its nation-wide set-up of national service officers, and its National Service Bureau in Washington, D. C., and by endeavoring to extend such service into all the regional facilities of the Veterans' Administration, and feels that such a service program deserves the solid support of its own eligibles, and of Americans generally.

COMMENDATIONS OF D. A. V.

Among many statements commending the D. A. V., and its rehabilitation services, the following are a few examples:

Knowing something about the good work it does I wish the Disabled American Veterans all success. (Franklin D. Roosevelt, President.)

Please express for me to the Disabled American Veterans my continued appreciation of their services to the country. (Herbert Hoover, former President.)

You have always my most sincere sympathy, admiration, best wishes, and assurance of active support. (Gen. John J. Pershing.)

By helping deserving disabled defenders, and their dependents in the proper presentation of just claims, the rehabilitation service of the Disabled American Veterans, both here in Washington, D. C., and throughout the country, is thus of material asistance in increasing the effectiveness of the functions of the Veterans' Administration. (Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.)

In spite of its small number, I feel that the Disabled American Veterans has, in years since I have been in Congress, been the most effective organization for the benefit of the ex-servicemen. (Senator Bronson Cutting, deceased.)

The Disabled American Veterans are a heritage of proven patriotism. Let's serve God by serving humanity. (Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN.)

The Military Order of the World War passed a resolution endorsing the Disabled American Veterans * * * for the purpose of assisting disabled veterans in the preparation and presentation of their claims * * * a most important work. (Col. George E. Ijams, past commander in chief, Military Order of the World War.)

It affords me real pleasure to heartily endorse the Disabled American Veterans * * * to assist individual deserving veterans in their local needs and in the technical prosecution of their equitable claims for compensation resulting from war incurred disabilities. (Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, past commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Americans who help to provide security for America's disabled defenders thereby help to provide security for America. (Senator HOMER T. BONE.)

Helping disabled veterans to help themselves and getting the help of the Nation for those who need help—a big dividend paying investment in real Americanism—is the self-appointed task of the Disabled American Veterans. (Representative ED. V. IZAC of California.)

Be assured of our deep interest in the work and the common objectives of the Disabled American Veterans' organization. We have followed the work of you and your associates representing your organization with very deep interest. We regard what you are doing in behalf of disabled American veterans, and in the furtherance of other civic undertakings and in support of the war effort, as of great value. Be assured that we, of the American Federation of Labor, who have long relied upon the principle that unity develops strength, look with favor upon the valuable service-giving activities of the Disabled American Veterans' organization. (William Green, President, American Federation of Labor.)

This is to express my appreciation of the important work undertaken by the Disabled American Veterans on behalf of those who have given more to their country than can ever be fully repaid. Labor's heart goes out to the disabled veterans, many of whom come from its own ranks, and we are eager to do everything we can to help these handicapped veterans and their dependents to secure the fair and generous treatment to which they are entitled. (Philip Murray, President, Congress of Industrial Organizations.)

Six Sons in the Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at various times Members of this House have called attention to sacrifices being made by their constituents to win the war. But, no case has yet come to my attention where one family has contributed six sons to the armed services. The Sixth Missouri Congressional District has this distinction. I am proud that among my constituents there lives Mr. and Mrs. H. Edwin Patrick. As part of my remarks I include herewith an article about this patriotic couple as it appeared in the Sedalia (Mo.) Democrat and Capital of May 23, 1943:

Mr. and Mrs. H. Edwin Patrick, who live on a farm 6 miles north of LaMonte, have six

sons in the Service. They are Joseph P., Daryl K., Billy M., Robert E., Edwin H., and Warren T. Patrick.

Joseph P. Patrick, 22, the first to enter, is in the Coast Artillery, in training at Camp Hulen, Tex. He is a corporal.

Daryl K. Patrick, 20, is an aviation cadet in the Naval Reserve, completing his secondary flight training at Maryville, Mo., where he expects to be commissioned an ensign and assigned to an aircraft carrier.

Billy M. Patrick, 18, is a private, recently graduated from the aerial gunnery school at Las Vegas, Nev.

Robert Eugene Patrick, 27, is a seaman second class in the Coast Guard, stationed at Southwest Harbor, Maine. He is married and his wife is with him.

Edwin H. Patrick, 26, is a corporal, now taking advanced radio training in Florida. He is married and his wife is making her home with his parents on the farm near LaMonte.

Warren T. Patrick, 24, is a private in the Field Artillery and is serving overseas. He is married and his wife is making her home with her parents in California.

Mr. Speaker, when sacrifices are called to my attention like that of Mr. and Mrs. H. Edwin Patrick and their boys, it gives me added strength to carry on my onerous duties here. It inspires me as a member of the War Veterans' Legislation Committee to do all I can to protect these fine young Americans as soldiers, sailors, and later as veterans. I want to bring them home as quickly and safely as victory will permit. I want their victory to be an enduring one. I commend their example and spirit of loyalty to the Congress and the country.

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join other Members of the House in payment of a sincere tribute to our departed beloved colleague, HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT.

I knew Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT from the time that I became a Member of the House of Representatives in 1935. He was a legislator of rare talent. He was a sturdy patriot, an American gentlemen, and a true friend. I shall ever be grateful for his advice and counsel, particularly in the early days of my service when there was so much to learn about the rules and practices of the House of Representatives.

An outstanding quality of our departed colleague was his loyalty to and affection for all Members of the House. Frequently I had occasion to talk to distinguished members of the majority party and I found that they, too, loved him and respected him. The whips of both parties have heavy responsibilities to discharge. Frequently I have heard the Democratic whips say that HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT, the Republican whip, never betrayed a confidence and never hesitated to serve unselfishly. Whenever the country's interest was at stake, all conceded that HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was first an American.

During my 8 years in Congress, Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to be an intimate friend of HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT and his devoted wife. Such a friendship is rare and will always be cherished. The service that he rendered to all of us and to his country will live in the memories of those of us who have been spared to carry on.

Home Work to the Rescue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. TALBOT

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert the following editorial published in the Bridgeport Post under date of May 24, 1943, in regard to home work and industry:

HOME WORK TO THE RESCUE

The ingenious home-work system devised by Miss Vivian Kellems, nationally known Westport manufacturer, to meet a rush of orders and a dearth of manpower in her factory, may prove to be one of the outstanding contributions to the national war effort. By furnishing materials and jigs with the aid of which small articles may be made by hand, Miss Kellems has added to the production of her factory without competing with any other industry for manpower.

On the contrary, she has brought into productivity scores of men and women in the Westport area who by force of circumstances could not contribute otherwise.

The problem of how to get all of these workers to the factory and back every day, how to find transportation for them, how to take care of invalids and children in the meantime, or to provide housing for workers brought from distant points, are all out of the Kellems picture.

A factory truck delivers the materials and collects the finished products. Mothers of minor children can still supervise the children and do their housework, perhaps preparing meals for adult members of the family working in distant factories. Invalids and shut-ins can do something useful in their spare time.

The weekly check for the work done is a most welcome addition to the budget of every modest household and even if there are some who don't need it—though few will admit being in any such happy condition—the surplus may be put into War bonds.

Miss Kellems does not pretend to have invented anything new in the simple idea of subdividing work and taking it around to homes where people are tied down by household duties or by various kinds of physical incapacity. The idea itself is an old one.

But its application in our times is a revival based upon present circumstances, and it seems amazing that other industries have not tried it before this. When we need every ounce of the productive capacity of our people to meet the demands of the war effort, it has remained for Westport's outstanding businesswoman to demonstrate this gold mine of neglected manpower and womanpower.

As a matter of fact, they have been doing this in both Germany and England ever since the war began. If the war continues much longer in our own country a much wider extension of this plan is inevitable.

Not forgetting that the Nation's No. 1 industry—by far the biggest and most important of all—is homework. That is on the farm.

If Farmers Must Shop To Find Equipment, Mr. Studwell, Hungry Consumers Will Shop To Find Food Next Winter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, "Stop and shop" is the new formula worked out by the War Production Board for the farmers who are having great difficulty getting equipment and supplies so urgently needed to produce the food to meet the demands of a hungry world next fall and winter.

That in brief is the answer I have received to repeated pleas to the War Production Board for action to get some tools, machinery, and fence into the Eighth District of Michigan to meet the needs of farmers.

The farmer has not enough problems taking off the shoes of his horses at night and on rainy days, and scheduling lambing seasons to suit War Production Board convenience and listening to a lot of crackpot answers from sidewalk farm experts but now he is told to shop around the world until he finds the fence or other article he needs. Sure, shop around—it is a lot easier to use your gas, tires, and time to find what you need than to disturb War Production Board experts and cause them to see that equipment you need is routed into your State.

Here, to my mind, is another of the prize classics of the War Production Board planners.

A great many of my farmers have complained for months that they could not get fence. Early in the season I called this situation to the attention of the powers that be at War Produtcion Board.

After repeated efforts and exchange of a lot of correspondence, Mr. E. F. Studwell, of the Steel Division, comes through with this great assurance that he feels that the farmer "will be able to obtain his requirements if he continues to shop around."

A lot could be said about that generous observation, but it has been too well said by my constituent, Mr. F. C. Voss, of Howard City, Mich., to whom I sent Mr.

Studwell's letter. By telegram Mr. Voss fires back this answer:

How long does Studwell expect us to shop? Season late now. Situation desperate. Been shopping around since Christmas. Time to work, not shop.

Desiring to see how much Mr. Studwell knew about the Michigan situation, I wrote a number of the Michigan hardware wholesale houses and warehouses. The replies are just beginning to come back. It looks like my constituent will have to retire from the farm and spend the rest of the summer shopping around.

The Towner Hardware Co., of Muskegon, Mich., advises me:

We have placed with the American Steel & Wire Co. a car of fencing and barb wire for farm consumption and we cannot get a promise of delivery better than the end of July, which means this material will not be available for use until August and what good this material will be to the farm community at that time is more than I can understand.

The Van Dervoort Hardware Co., in Lansing, Mich., writes me:

We have had no fencing whatever in several months.

The Michigan Hardware Co., in Grand Rapids, advises me:

As far as obtaining any increased shipments in recent weeks, we would candidly state the situation is becoming worse instead of better.

One thing, apparently, was left out by the planners in scheduling the super-secret international food conference. They forgot to tell the foreign representatives to bring us some tools and equipment if they want us to produce the world's food. On the other hand, out of all the secrecy may fall a briefcase full of hoes, shovels, and milk pails or a ream or two of fencing for my Michigan farmers.

On April 9, in response to my urgent pleas for such things as milk pails, barn shovels, bull rings, halters, batteries, and other items much needed by the farmers, I received word from Mr. W. P. Barrows, of the Farm Machinery and Equipment Branch of the War Production Board, to the effect the farmers could let up on their worries. About these items, the W. P. B. letter contained such phrases as:

This equipment should be available in very near future; production considerably stepped up; and, so supplies should just now be reaching the field.

It sure sounded good on paper 7 weeks ago.

So good that I passed the reports along to the people in my District. You should see the replies.

Mr. C. F. Schoeneberg of the Saginaw Hardware Co. wrote me yesterday that—

We immediately contacted several manufacturers in order to check upon these reports and find several of them seem to be erroneous and misleading.

Along this same line a West Virginia shovel manufacturer writes:

Frankly, the various reports being brought to our attention alleged to have been issued by the War Production Board concerning our products are astounding. It is extremely difficult to operate under existing abnormal conditions and when the organization of our Government in control of production issues incorrect information, considerable and unnecessary explanations must be made.

An Ohio hay tool manufacturer writes:

We have no additional information of further quantities of steel which have been allotted the manufacturers of hay tools.

I was advised April 7 the production of milk pails had been considerably stepped up. Under date of May 19 one of the very large manufacturers of these writes:

While you might get the impression when reading newspapers and some of the magazines that there has been some relief on the steel situation, that is not a fact, at least in this industry.

Our purchasing agent spent the first week of March in Washington, checking on the material for the very items you mention. While we were promised that sufficient tonnage would be released to us the second quarter to permit us to fabricate the percentages we are privileged to make under the restraining orders, up to now and it is the middle of the quarter, we have not received material.

Under the heading "Chickens come home to roost", the American Fork and Hoe Co. sent a letter May 18 to its distributors which described the situation in a superb manner.

In part it follows:

CHICKENS COME HOME TO ROOST

For two years, we have done our best to impress Washington on the importance of tools for the production of crops. We were told that their surveys disclosed there were plenty of tools for all essential needs and we were in error. Now, we are receiving telegrams from many States, from Government officials, and are being urged by Washington to deliver these essential tools because of irreparable crop damage unless they are supplied.

Arbitrary Government regulations destroyed our production for 9 months. Now, 9 months too late, they appeal to us for help. It was they who were in error though no one has admitted it. Below is an excerpt of a letter written April 9, 1942, to the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture, Washington D. C., by Colonel Withington:

"As you know, Limitation Order L-26 specifies that forks, hoes, rakes, scythes, shovels, etc., shall be limited during the current production period to 75 percent of the 1940 production. This would be equivalent to about 40 percent or 50 percent of the 1941 production. Unless the manufacturers of hand tools have a very generous adjustment made in their production at once, it is my opinion that nothing like the number of gardens or acreage of crops desired by your plan can be cultivated and harvested."

No attention was paid to the letter. It is only an illustration of many appeals made by us forecasting what would happen unless they gave some relief. Now, it's here.

Certainly, we are doing our utmost to make delivery, but we cannot perform miracles.

So, Mr. Studwell, it looks like the Nation is headed for a grand spree of "shopping around." The farmers will shop around all summer for their essential equipment and supplies and the consumers will shop around all winter for something to eat.

America's Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY S. TRUMAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "America's Tomorrow," delivered by Hon. William L. Nelson, a former Representative from the second district of Missouri, at the annual convention of Missouri postmasters, Kansas City, Mo., on May 18, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S TOMORROW

America's tomorrow is in the making. With the war being won, we do well to consider what is to come, to plan for peace.

Mighty, as moves machinery, has been mobilization. Demobilization will be different—demobilization of 10,000,000 men in our armed forces and thirty to forty millions in war factories.

What of America of tomorrow? What is to happen when the boys come home—but the boys will not come back. They will be men, the men of tomorrow. It is for us to see that they and the workers representing half the manpower of the Nation are not lost in a financial fog such as too often follows the order "Cease firing." This calls for patriotism, planning, appropriations—yes, and prayer. If there are no infidels in fox holes or on rubber rafts, there should be none among our representatives who sit at peace council tables.

Demobilization, covering both arms and industry, will mean such moving days as never before known, a thousand firsts of March merged, a hundred Cherokee Strip runs rolled into one. As populations shift, many beehives of industry, born of war, will become ghost towns, this despite every effort to change to peacetime production.

Fortunate is it that thought is being given to demobilization days. Thousands of thinking men and women are saying that if the chaos and confusion which characterized the post-war period of more than a quarter century ago are to be avoided, employment, either by the Federal Government or private capital, or both, must be provided.

Paths for decent living need to be laid out in advance. No "back to normalcy," no returning through the black tunnel of reaction.

Looking to the future, there is now a National Planning Board, a voluntary group of 50 men representing business, labor and agriculture. In a memorandum to President Roosevelt the Board says, "The first goal of post-war planning should be a foundation for better living through a provision for enough jobs and lasting jobs."

As to the farmer, who is never without a job, an everlasting job, I go further. Short of help and machinery, and long on floods, he and his household are diligently working to produce the food, more than ever before, required to feed our fighting forces, our civilian population, sparing great stores for our allies, and ultimately to save other millions from starvation. So all post-war planning must include the producer.

This is a people's war, and there should be written a people's peace. The fruits of victory, paid for in sweat, blood, tears, and precious human lives, must not be lost.

Just because we cannot make an accurate blueprint of tomorrow, we should not fail to consider our country's course. We cannot set up signboards for ourselves. Those who go ahead do this for us.

Woodrow Wilson died a broken-hearted man but he did not live in vain. His plans to promote world peace may not have been perfect. Mistakes may have been made on both sides. It is generally so. But that great wartime President spoke as a patriot and as a prophet. His utterances should serve as signboards now. Speaking to great throngs in St. Louis, here in Kansas City, and elsewhere, Mr. Wilson pled for some effective peace plan. Said he, "The arrangements of the present peace cannot stand a generation unless they are guaranteed by the united nations of the civilized world."

Surely the 28 Allied Nations should, with each giving up some things and each assuming some responsibility, be able to get together on a program to make sure that the sons of each generation shall not be sent to slaughter.

You, noticing that repeatedly I place the soldier first, may ask why I do not speak of the cost of war as measured in money, as well as in men. Ask the anxious mothers and fathers who wait, and often must weep, at home. Of course wars cost billions of dollars, cost more to lose than to win, but no financial burden of the taxpayer at home can compare with the hardships of the soldier in the field.

What of the men of the present war? Is a forgetful country to see the hero of today forced to become the hobo of tomorrow? Must veterans of World War No. 2 sell apples on the streets of Washington as did veterans of World War No. 1? Are these men of America, should they in after years visit the Capital of their country—key city of the world—as did the veterans of 1917–18, to be driven out by armed forces under orders of an after-war President?

But as to the peace for which we pray, first our own house must needs be set in order, but this alone will not insure safety. It is disease, not health, that is contagious. No place on earth is now far from any other place. The world, whether we like it or not, is our near neighbor. So our country's future is closely connected with every clime and continent.

We must play our part in the family of friendly nations, see to it that the germs from festering sores—too deep for sulfa drugs—sores remaining from the present global struggle, do not spread and so start another war.

Safety measures mean United States participation in a world police force to preserve peace; mean punishment for the arch criminals who are responsible for war; mean, from the offending and conquered countries, reparations, but, as applies to the civilian population, without revenge; mean that preparations for another war on the part of the Axis Powers must be made impossible.

In all this we need to be guided by signboards along a road which proved not to be passable. Again failure must follow if we demand of our own people the impossible in forgiving and of the beaten enemy the impossible in giving. High tariff walls, such as were blindly built a few years after the First World War, do more than stop the payment of full reparations. They breed national hatreds.

Let it be remembered that wars are waged not alone with guns, planes, ships, and tanks but with ideas and ideals. Let not the views of the vanquished conquer the conquerors. While determined never again to be found unprepared in a military way, we do well to avoid militarism as the Old World knows it. America must still be America.

Why do I speak of peace while at this hour armies are engaged in stupendous struggles or are poised to strike? My answer is that even now it cannot be said, as when dawned that Easter day, "It is yet early." Unless we hasten, we may do too little and do that too late.

Flames kindled on countless battle fronts have not seared the selfishness out of all souls. There are signs that many are planning to cast the future in the mold of the past. How can this be prevented? First, by an aroused public opinion. The sleeping citizen may imperil national safety as does the sleeping sentry.

Should the unconditional surrender of the Axis forces come soon, no peace terms will be agreed upon until after the 1944 election. Upon that election may depend the future of America. As men and women—and I am glad to have had a part in extending suffrage to mothers, wives, and all women, greatest of war sufferers at home—go to the polls in 1944, or fail to go as did so many in 1942, vital issues will be determined. On that election day, with a President, one-third of the Senate, and the entire House of Representatives to be chosen, our country will proceed along the way that leads to other wars or to peace.

The next Congress, and I include House as well as Senate, for views and voices in the House will bear weight second only to votes in the Senate, will represent us, vote for us. Washington will vote, but first we are privileged to vote. Furthermore, voting is the duty of every man who this week, a week ushered in by a day set apart, proudly says, "I am an American." Surely a country worth fighting for is worth voting for. We owe our ballots to our boys.

Finally, America's tomorrow should be no day of doubt and negation, but a day of hope and promise as we, people of all parties, creeds, and classes, together press toward the goal of lasting peace.

Attention, Mr. Morgenthau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1943

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from a letter from Mr. Paul James, of Des Moines, Iowa:

I note you are having a whee of a time over the new tax bill. Some of the gentlemen in Mr. Morgenthau's department might be interested in this story:

A lady of wealth visited a silver fox farm and, having paid a fancy price for her silver fox fur, was entranced by the idea of the fancy profits, so she negotiated the purchase of a farm, the building of pens, fences, etc., and she acquired a goodly number of silver foxes to start her enterprise.

She then thought it would be prudent to obtain the experienced advice of the fox-farm operator, which she proceeded to do, inquiring:

"Now, would you please tell me how many times a year you can skin these foxes?" And he soberly replied, "Well, madam, after the second or third skinning, they are likely to get pretty sore."

And if Mr. Morgenthau thinks he can "skin" the American people twice in 1 year and collect 2 years' taxes in 1 year, he is just kidding himself. There are exceptions. But most of us can just be "skinned" once, and there is nothing left, either silver or gold.

Memorial Day—The Blue and the Gray

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, day after tomorrow, May 30, will be Memorial Day, an annual event growing out of the War between the States.

Unfortunately, the Confederate and Federal soldiers have now passed away, and it remains for us, their descendants and their relatives, to carry this beautiful service on.

Memorial Day began in Columbus, Miss., on April 25, 1866, when the women of that community, while decorating the graves of their Confederate dead, strewed flowers alike on the graves of the Federal soldiers who were buried there.

The woman who led in placing these flowers on the graves of those fallen Federal soldiers was the widow of a brave Confederate who had been killed in the Civil War.

The Mississippi Index, a paper published at Columbus at that time, in its issue of April 26, 1866, gives this account of the event:

The procession on yesterday in honor of the Confederate dead was large and imposing. First marched, in twos, the young ladies and girls, dressed in immaculate white, each bearing her bouquet or chaplet of flowers. Next came the matrons dressed in mourning; like the others, with flowers in their hands, their black dresses typical of the southern heart in gloom for its beloved dead, the fair flowers emblematic of woman's admiration and affection for all that was gallant and chivalrous in patriots. Lastly came the procession of carriages bearing the elderly ladies.

Arriving at the cemetery, the ladies assembled around the graves of the soldiers in the form of a square. From the center of the ground an elaborate and eloquent address was delivered by Rev. G. T. Stainback, and following it a fervent prayer by Rev. A. S. Andrews. The ladies then performed the beautiful and touching duty of decorating the graves with flowers.

There were over 1,400 graves to be decorated. Through exertions and appeals of the kind ladies superintending the good work all these graves had been neatly cleaned off, so that after the decoration was completed God's Acre of heroes looked as if freshly blooming with a thousand flowers—bearing up to heaven a fragrant and beautiful evidence of woman's love, tenderness, and appreciation.

We were glad to see that no distinction was made between our own dead and about 40 Federal soldiers who slept their last sleep

by them. It proved the exalted, unselfish tone of the female character. Confederate and Federal—once enemies, now friends—receiving this tribute of respect.

A report of this incident was carried throughout the press of the country, and made such a profound impression, that it brought from the pen of the Hon. Francis Miles Finch, a distinguished New York jurist, a little poem called The Blue and the Gray, that will live as long as the English tongue endures.

The entire poem as it appeared in the Atlantic Monthly of September 1867, with the title and preface given it by Judge Finch, reads as follows:

THE BLUE AND THE GRAY

The women of Columbus, Miss., animated by nobler sentiments than are many of their sisters, have shown themselves impartial in their offerings made to the memory of the dead. They strewed flowers alike on the graves of the Confederate and of the National soldiers.—New York Tribune.

By the flow of the inland river,
Whence the fleets of iron have fled,
Where the blades of the grave grass quiver,
Asleep are the ranks of the dead;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the one the blue,
Under the other the gray.

These in the robings of glory,
Those in the gloom of defeat,
All with the battle-blood gory,
In the dusk of eternity meet;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the laurel, the blue;
Under the willow, the gray.

From the silence of sorrowful hours
The desolate mourners go,
Lovingly laden with flowers
Alike for the friend and the foe;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the roses, the blue;
Under the lillies, the gray.

So with an equal splendor
The morning sun rays fall,
With a touch, impartially tender,
On the blossoms blooming for all;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Broidered with gold, the blue;
Mellowed with gold, the gray.

So, when the summer calleth
On forest and field of grain,
With an equal murmur falleth
The cooling drip of the rain;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Wet with the rain, the blue,
Wet with the rain, the gray.

Sadly, but not with upbraiding,
The generous deed was done;
In the storm of the years that are fading,
No braver battle was won;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the blossoms, the blue,
Under the garlands, the gray.

No more shall the war cry sever,
Or the winding rivers be red;
They banish our anger forever
When they laurel the graves of our dead!
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Love and tears for the blue,
Tears and love for the gray.

The inspiration of this beautiful poem, based upon the action of the noble women of Columbus at that time, was responsible for General Logan's order setting aside a day in each year for the purpose of strewing flowers on, and otherwise decorating, the graves of our dead—a custom which I trust will prevail—

Till the sun grows cold
And the stars are old
And the leaves of the Judgment Book unfold.

Amendment of the Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over radio station KMPC, Beverly Hills Calif., on May 22, 1943:

How do you do, ladies and gentlemen; just this week I had the privilege of introducing a bill in the House of Representatives amending the Social Security Act for the purpose of correcting certain inequalities and inequities that exist under the act at the present time, due to the impact of the present war upon our home economy.

I am thankful for this opportunity to discuss this legislation with you. At the outset, I should like to impress upon everyone that this bill does not purport to be a new pension plan or a substitute for any named plan. It has, as I have just said, but one purpose—and that is to correct certain conditions that exist under the present act.

As you all know, the Social Security Act authorizes the Federal Government to pay unto each State an amount of money equal to one-half of the sums expended by the State for old-age assistance to each needy individual—not counting so much of such expenditure made to any individual as exceeds $40 per month. This means, briefly, that for every dollar up to the sum of $40 that the State pays to a needy individual, the Federal Government contributes one-half. In this fashion, the amount of money expended by a State up to $40 for old-age assistance, determines the amount of money the Federal Government will contribute, so that the maximum amount of old age assistance granted to an eligible aged person which the United States Government will recognize for the purpose of reimbursing the State to the extent of one-half of the assistance granted, is $40.

This same act goes on to discourage—or even prevent—needy persons from supplementing their old-age assistance by outside employment in requiring the State agency, in determining need, to take into consideration any other income or resources of the individual claiming assistance. From the many letters I have received from my constituents, as well as formal communications from the legislature of the State of California, I have observed a unanimous consensus of thought and request, insofar as the Social Security Act is concerned, and that is that: First, the amount of old-age assistance be increased, and secondly, that provision be made to allow these needy individuals to perform some outside work for remuneration to supplement this assistance, without the penalty of losing all or part of this public aid.

I am sure that you will agree when I say that $40 per month is inadequate, under present conditions, to provide an aged person with the necessities of life, or to permit him to maintain a proper standard of living. I am sure that each and every one of us has noticed the increase in cost of living that has resulted from the changes in our economy under war conditions. The rise in the cost of living has been officially recognized by our national Government, and has been made the basis for the adjustment of salaries and wages by the National War Labor Board. I cannot help but notice that salaries and wages are being adjusted in nearly all fields to meet this rise in the cost of living, but very little effort is being made by the Federal Government to assist our needy people to meet this ever real burden.

California has seen fit to increase its old-age assistance, but it has done so without the Federal assistance it should have in the form of the Federal contribution of one-half of that increase.

You may have asked yourself, "Why hasn't someone introduced legislation providing for an increase in old-age assistance participation by the Federal Government?" This is a natural question to ask. I asked it of myself, and determined to find out why there was no great interest in the Congress of the United States in increasing the limits of Federal participation in the program of old-age assistance. I think I have found the answer, and it, to a great extent, explains the logical apathy on the part of the Congress to legislation providing for additional participation in the old-age assistance program.

I have found, from statistics presented, that there are but 3 States in the 48 that would be in a fiscal position to take advantage of any increase in old-age assistance by being able to increase the State share of the funds. I also found that the great majority of the States were unable to take full advantage of the Social Security Act as it now stands, and were making old-age assistance payments as low as $10 per month, representing $5 paid by the State and $5 by the Federal Government. We must keep in mind at all times, that the power of the Federal Government under the act is a matching power, that is, the Federal Government matches the State Government dollar for dollar within the specified limit of $40, so that the State must first move before the Federal Government can participate. If a State is fiscally unable to provide sufficient funds for old-age assistance, the participation of the Federal Government is limited thereby, as well. It is this condition in the many States, that makes the matter of an increase in old-age assistance a moot question. It is of no interest to a State that is only able to contribute $5 per month, to have the assistance limits raised from $40 to $50 or $60 per month, as those States do not have the funds to pay out for old-age assistance. Yet the needy person in that State is no different from the needy person in a State with very high old-age assistance payments.

Under the act as it now stands, we have the anomalous situation of two American citizens—both poor—but one resides in a rich State, and one in a poor State. The poor citizen in the rich State get $20 per month from the Federal Government, while the poor citizen in the poor State, gets $5 from the Federal Government. This does not reflect a true equality of treatment of American citizens by their National Government. I ask you "Why should a man's place of residence determine the type of treatment a citizen of the United States should receive from the hands of his Federal Government?"

There can be only one solution to this dilemma—for all States there must be an over-all increase in the limits of old-age assistance eligible for Federal participation, to meet the increased cost of living. For those States fiscally unable to enjoy the benefits of an act intended for the benefit of its

citizens, special Federal aid—in the form of an increase in the ratio of Federal contribution, based upon a comparison of the per capita income of a State to the national per capita income.

It is these features that I have incorporated in my bill. Under the terms of my proposed bill, Federal participation for all State programs, is increased 25 percent so that old-age assistance for each needy individual may be increased from $40 to $50 per month, with half of that sum being contributed by the Federal Government. For California it means that the Federal Government will contribute one-half of the $10 increase that has been granted to its needy folks.

For those States whose per capita income is less than the national per capita income, the United States Government shall contribute not one-half of the sum paid out by the State to its needy, but up to 75 percent of the sum so paid out, depending upon the difference between the per capita income of the State and the national per capita income. The bill will allow a State, whose average old-age assistance payment is $10 per month ($5 being paid by the State and $5 by the Federal Government) to increase its payment to approximately $20 per month. The formula utilized to determine how much special Federal aid shall be given to an eligible State is simple but fundamental. Once the Social Security Board determines the national per capita income, and the per capita income for each State, it is authorized to contribute special Federal aid to States having a lower than national per capita income, of an additional 1 percent over and above the usual 50-percent contribution, for each $10 that the State per capita income is lower than the national per capita income.

Under this arrangement a citizen of the United States, who by circumstance happens to be the citizen of a State that does not have the fiscal ability to provide sufficient old-age assistance, will not be penalized by virtue thereof, and not only be deprived of State assistance but be deprived of that Federal assistance to which he is entitled as a citizen of the United States. Under the present Social Security Act, this inequality and inequity is being perpetuated. It is fundamentally wrong and should be corrected as soon as humanly possible. My bill will correct this unfortunate circumstance.

There is still another phase of the Social Security Act presently in effect that merits attention at this time and that is the section which requires the State agency in determining need to take into consideration any other income and resources of an individual claiming old-age assistance. This section of the act was added in 1939 but did not become effective until July 1, 1941. Prior to that time the Old-Age Security Law of California as well as the other States, therefore, determined the amount of outside earnings the recipient could receive without deduction from the amount of his aid. When in July 1941, this amendment became effective, the State of California amended its law to deny the aged this privilege, which amendment was made solely to enable the State to comply with the Federal Social Security Act as it was construed by the Social Security Board. It is my sincere belief that the withdrawal of the privilege of the aged to supplement their aid with some outside employment was hastily and ill-advised during times of peace, much less during times of war, when the manpower problem has been classified as a critical problem. No law should remain in effect that would discourage any contribution of manpower—no matter how small. This privilege has been restored for the aged in farm labor under recent legislation. It should be restored to all of the aged so that other fields of production may enjoy this assistance to whatever extent it can be made available.

Under the terms of my bill, the State agency shall, in determining need, not take into consideration other income and resources of an individual claiming old-age assistance, to the extent of $25 per month, allowing the needy person to supplement his $20, $30, $40, or $50 assistance payment by $25 per month. In addition to this phase, I have taken one more logical step to encourage our needy to work, and have also provided that, in the event he secures employment paying him a sum sufficient to meet his needs, that his payment of assistance be suspended only for that period of time that he retains his employment, that upon loss of such employment for any reason whatsoever, he or she shall be returned to the assistance rolls automatically and immediately. This latter provision is mandatory in nature and should leave no doubt in the minds of the aged that they shall not be penalized if they accept full-time or part-time employment during these critical times when the services of every man and woman are required to safeguard the democratic form of government that borrows money from its people and does not confiscate it—that pays for its voluntary labor and does not enslave it.

Office of Price Administration Subsidy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1943

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to insert the following telegrams from Johnstown and Punxsutawney, Pa., with regard to the opposition of the meat packing industry to the subsidy program of the Office of Price Administration scheduled to take effect June 1. A terrific hardship has been placed on the meat-packing industry by the regulations of the O. P. A. This matter has been placed before the Administrator of the O. P. A. on numerous occasions with little, if any, success. If the meat-packing industry is to continue in business, it must have immediate relief. The responsibility for their continuing to operate a successful business rests upon the O. P. A., which has had sufficient time to broaden its orders and to give aid to an oppressed industry.

The telegrams follow:

JOHNSTOWN, PA., *May 27, 1943.*

Congressman HARVE TIBBOTT:

Urgently request you do all possible to prevent price roll-back on meat products scheduled June 1 by Office of Price Administration. Will mean loss of 2 to 3 cents per pound on all meats in packers' inventories of May 31. Such action will undoubtedly tremendously increase black-market operations and practically stop all legal production of meats.

THE C. A. YOUNG CO.

JOHNSTOWN, PA., *May 27, 1943.*

Hon. HARVE TIBBOTT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urgently request that you protest vigorously to Office of Price Administration against proposed roll-back on wholesale meat prices which are proposed to go into effect June 1. Same would cause us large financial loss of present inventory. Also would cause big increase black market. Subsidy proposal of Office of Price Administration to cover our losses is not to our liking. Just ask that we be permitted to operate at a fair profit margin.

EDWARD HAHN.

PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA., *May 27, 1943.*

Hon. HARVE TIBBOTT,
House of Representatives Office
Building, Washington, D. C.:

Rumors of price roll-back without adequate safety valve will cost this industry millions of dollars and will reflect an estimated minimum loss to us alone of $15,000 just upon inventory. Operations due to bureaucratic bungling causing loss of a thousand dollars weekly to this very small concern. Our financial structure now wavering under terrific impact of regulation and cannot survive the strain of additional damaging regulation. We are facing the un-American way of either quitting under fire or permitting bureaucratic termites to destroy foundation of 38 years of business building. Ours is an essential industry for military and civilian needs and does not deserve complete obliteration. Remedial action to correct inequities and injustices necessary at once to prevent wholesale stoppage of independent operations. It is high time for leadership to throw spotlight upon these distressed and chaotic conditions. Unless prompt and proper action, this industry will be caused to revert to but a few well financially entrenched operators, thereby forcing a monopoly upon helpless millions. Laxity of complete investigation months ago would have prevented this destruction. Swift strokes of action necessary now to salvage an oppressed business. The defendant rests.

PUNXSUTAWNEY BEEF & PROVISION CO.

How Much Sovereignty Is Left?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD J. McMURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1943

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Saturday Evening Post of May 29, 1943, commented editorially on the speech by Justice Owen J. Roberts in favor of federal union which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] introduced into the RECORD on May 4. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial in part:

HOW MUCH SOVEREIGNTY IS LEFT

Justice Roberts, of the Supreme Court, a few weeks ago made one of too few realistic addresses on the question of international organization after the war. Like Governor Stassen, he favors a higher level of government, but he adds the all-important statement that, if it is true that Americans insist on keeping the last vestige of their sovereignty, "that ends the discussion. We may as well then throw up our hands and let the world roll on to chaos. Unless the United States espouses and promptly and vigorously urges a project of world organization, none such will reach fruition."

To Justice Roberts it seems clear that there must be "a fundamental framework of government to which the people of each constituent nation surrender such portion of their

nation's sovereign prerogative as is essential to an international order." Specifically he suggests an arrangement similar to that of the American Federal Union in which the Federal Government enforces certain laws against the citizens of the States rather than against the States themselves. "Enforcement as against a citizen is a police function; enforcement against a State or nation is war." But it is obvious that no such powers can be exercised over individuals until the nations have defined them, limited their application and assigned them to the supernational organization.

All this demands a broad leap for the thinking of most of us—almost as broad as that demanded of the American Colonist of 1789. Patrick Henry could not make it, because he was so terrified by the coming extinction of Virginia that he could not envisage the rise of the United States. Justice Roberts' plan demands definition and specific analysis. But he has boldly challenged the theory of unrestrained sovereignty, an institution which has been destroyed for little States by the bomber and greatly compromised even for the most powerful states. The extent and the nature of the surrender which Justice Roberts has urged will have to be debated fully and frankly. Much heat can be saved if we begin by asking ourselves, not how much sovereignty we ought to give up, but how much we can legitimately expect to retain. In any event, the question can be dodged only at the risk of the certain destruction of whatever hopes we have of an organization of nations able to keep the peace.

Extension of Trade Agreements Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from a recent issue of the Denver Post:

THAT'S THAT

(If the Congress passes this (Trade Agreements Act extension) bill in its present form, it will voluntarily eliminate itself from all executive participation in post-war reorganization. Already we are told it will be unnecessary to end this war by a treaty of peace. Indeed, it has been suggested that it would be preferable to allow the Executive arm of Government, through its military and diplomatic branches, to conduct post-war reconstruction."—Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming.)

Senator O'MAHONEY has put his finger unerringly on the real issue in this trade-agreements fight. It is as plain as A B C that, if the President's power to make trade agreements without Senate ratification or any kind of congressional ratification is extended, Congress will be barred from post-war treaty making as completely as Congress and the American press now are excluded from the International Food Conference at Hot Springs, Va.

Incidentally, the door of the food conference from which the supposedly free American press already had been barred was shut in the face of Congress Saturday. Two Congressmen, BRADLEY of Michigan and SMITH of Ohio, were given a final "No" to their demand that they be permitted access to all conference sessions. BRADLEY announced he will demand a Congressional investigation.

If Congress extends the reciprocal trade-agreements authority of the President, it will be shutting in its own face the door to every peace conference held after the war. It will have surrendered to the Executive unlimited and unrestricted treaty-making powers. And any peace treaties made will be made by Executive decree.

There isn't any question that there is a theory in Washington that all post-war planning and treaty making should be left entirely to the President, and that Congress should be ignored. In a statement last week to the Senate Finance Committee, Senator O'MAHONEY called attention to this significant passage from a recently published book on International Executive Agreements, by Wallace McClure, of the State Department staff:

"It is believed that the President has, and was intended to have, under the Constitution, all the powers and functions of the head of a fully recognized member of the society of nations; that he has, accordingly, the authority to enter into any manner of international act, on any subject, that is entered into by other states of the world."

Then Senator O'MAHONEY pointed to this statement in McClure's book:

"The President can do by Executive agreement anything that he can do by treaty, providing Congress by law cooperates, and there is a very wide field of action in which the cooperation of Congress is not necessary; indeed, where Congress possesses no constitutional authority to dissent."

If Congress continues to delegate to the President authority to make international trade agreements, without any congressional approval or review, then it will be furnishing the cooperation which one of the State Department experts declares permits him to do by Executive agreement anything he can do by treaty. And as Senator O'MAHONEY declares, if this policy outlined by McClure, of the State Department, is coupled with the policy in the trade-agreements bill, "then obviously the elected representatives of the people of the United States will be without voice in the reorganization of the New World."

Senator O'MAHONEY voices this sound warning:

"If the Congress, at the threshold of this great crisis, voluntarily eliminates itself from an active part in reviewing the international economic arrangements that are to be made, then it and it alone will be to blame if, in the reorganization that is to come, the people of this country will be forced to play the role of Santa Claus to the entire world while other and more realistic nations protect the interests of their populations."

A Bold Guess at a Huge Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1943

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks an editorial by Dr. L. L. Gwaltney, editor of the Alabama Baptist. Dr. Gwaltney is a practical thinker and makes 10 predictions in the editorial. It will be interesting to read this editorial in 1953 and see how many of his observations come true:

A BOLD GUESS AT A HUGE PROBLEM

The decade between December 7, 1941, which was the day of the attack upon Pearl Harbor and December 1951 will go down in history as the most momentous decade in all the annals of the world. The historians, 500 years hence, will be writing about the decade in which we are now living. Certainly there has been nothing else like it, and it is probable that never again will there be any other time like this, the fourth decade of the twentieth century.

In that which is to follow a bold guess is being made at certain things which, it seems to the writer, are inevitably bound to happen. These things for clarity, are numbered, but each point mentioned would require a hundred books to give in detail the facts as the facts will develop.

1. The Allied Nations, which among others embrace the English speaking world, will win the war. The Hill-Ball-Burton-Hatch resolution offered to the Senate, which would place America in the lead in forming a federation of nations for world peace, should be passed by the Congress now. But this should not be permitted to cause any extended debate in our Congress or any of the parliaments in Europe which would in any way militate against every effort being put forth first to win the war. So the war should be won first and then the peace should be taken care of.

2. It may be assumed that hostilities will cease only after an unconditional surrender by the leaders of all the Axis Powers. That means that Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo will personally have to yield up their swords as a token of the surrender of their whole war machines. And if any one, or all, of the three are not in authority at the time of the defeat of the Axis Powers then whoever is in authority will have to personally surrender, not in the name of some puppet government which may be set up but in the name of the Axis armies themselves.

3. It is certain that immediately after the surrender the Allied armies of occupation will go into all of the Axis Nations—Germany, Italy, and Japan. And smaller Allied armies of occupation will have to go into all the European countries which have been conquered by the Axis Powers. This will be necessary to preserve order and necessary also to defend the Germans themselves who are in the subdued countries of Europe for, if they were not protected by the Allied armies of occupation, the people of the various countries which are subdued would immediately kill all the Germans in those countries.

4. The Axis Nations will be disarmed and the people will be reduced to military impotence. Their munition plants will all be dismantled and they will not be allowed the raw material to build other munition plants for making munitions.

5. While the armies of occupation are in control, the Axis high officials will be brought to trial by court-martial and Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo (if they are living) will be disposed of, together with scores of others of their high officials.

6. There will be no peace treaty signed immediately after the armistice is declared, nor will there be any immediate attempt to form a federation of the Allied Nations for permanent peace or for the future prevention of war. Instead of this, all Europe and Asia will be under military control which will last from 5 to 10 years. This control will consist largely in bombing planes which will be so based as to reach in a few hours any part of the world where disorders may begin; and it will be during this time of military control that plans will be made eventually for permanent peace. The powers which will exercise the military control will be those who will win the war and their Allies, namely, the United States, Britain, Russia, and China.

should Russia refuse to have a part in this, the necessity of it will fall upon Britain and the United States.

7. The Axis in Europe, Hitler and Mussolini, will be defeated first and probably 2 years before Japan is defeated. And the military controls mentioned above will have a chance to work in Europe and will become the pattern of the same controls to be worked in Asia after the defeat of Japan. Armies of occupation will have to be placed on the Japanese mainland and smaller armies in Indochina, Thailand, Singapore, and the Philippine Islands. If these armies did not take over, the natives in these countries would kill every Jap immediately, just as the people of conquered Europe would destroy all Germans.

8. The armies of occupation will not return to their native lands from 5 to 10 years after the war comes to an end. All the armies placed by the Federal Government, after the War between the States, in the South were not withdrawn until 1876 or 11 years after the war closed. The same will be true of the armies which occupy the countries both in Europe and Asia at the close of this war. When the soldiers do return they will control every office from the justice of the peace to the president.

9. While the Allied military power is holding the world together and keeping alive some semblance of civilization, there will be terrific changes going on in the economic, social, and religious realms. These will be so stupendous in their nature as not even to be conceived or imagined at the present time.

10. When the military control shall cease to exist, there will be in its place some form of an Allied federation of nations which will then control the world. This federation of nations must be so organized as to administer justice through some kind of international court and the decisions of the court must be enforced by power of some kind. For if, indeed, there were no force there could be no world federation any more than the decisions of our Supreme Court in America would be respected apart from the force which resides in the Army and Navy of the United States.

Some Phases of the Political Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH A. BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 15, the young Republicans of Connecticut were in convention at Hartford, where they were addressed by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER]. In view of the timeliness of his remarks, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in full in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, it seems to me appropriate as I appear before this convention of young Republicans that we talk a little bit about politics, not in a narrowly partisan sense, but that we may consider together some of the problems involved in our Government. For that matter, you need offer no apology were we to discuss only partisan aspects, for you have complete right to your views as Republicans. The administration supporters have a right to their views. Elmer Davis has a perfect right to be a member of the American Labor Party. The chief difference, so far as you are concerned, lies in the fact that the administration supporters control your Government and its policy-making positions, and hence they have the power, which they freely exercise, to exploit their own notions of how our Government should be run. They believe in controls from the top. They believe in control through bureaus. They believe that administrators should have the power to make regulations which will direct the most intimate concerns of all of our people and that administrative rulings should be final. They believe such administrators are more capable of deciding what should be done than the people themselves are. As an outgrowth, you have witnessed an extraordinary extension of domestic government through executive orders for which is claimed the force and effect of law.

Nor has the field of external sovereignty, the international field, been overlooked, for we are becoming increasingly aware of resort to executive agreements, so-called, which would short circuit the treaty-making power, quite in disregard of the fact that national policy, when reduced to treaty form and consented to by the Senate, has far greater chance of finding popular support. Our whole faith and integrity as a nation are pledged to its execution.

I have said enough in this prefatory way to point out that such mechanisms of government, advanced by a certain school of political thought, have given rise to bitter controversy among our intelligent citizenry. Millions of our citizens refuse to embrace the political philosophy espoused by the administration supporters, now, and for more than 10 full years, in control of our Government. You, yourselves, over that period, have witnessed the growth of an unprecedented bureaucracy quite alien to our earlier forms.

Our Constitution is sufficiently flexible to permit of most of these developments if our people really want them. However, in the course of our consideration of matters of government, their objectives and the method of attaining them, we should, in furtherance of our duties as citizens, examine the situation with an honestly impartial and critical eye. Bureaucracy under Executive order is a very different thing from regulation under statutory standards. To illustrate, there are special fields in which our people felt that regulation should be had, but in accordance with statutes adopted by the Congress, and as to railroads, we have the Interstate Commerce Commission; as to utilities, the Federal Power Commission; as to business and business methods, the Federal Trade Commission. In such fields, the individual citizen has a right to be heard, to present witnesses, and to receive consideration of his problem by a regulatory agency, from whose rulings an appeal may be taken to the courts, to test whether or not a particular decision or ruling conforms to the statutory authority of the agency. In such fields, I need not emphasize, a vastly different case prevails from the situation arising out of operations under Executive orders.

Curiously, the American people are ready tools to the erection of the structure of which they themselves are the first to complain when the operations of government have their full impact on the individual. Paradoxically, American citizens, demanding a complete independence of thought and action for themselves, are quite ready to tell the other fellow how he should conduct his affairs. It happens right on your own street. Our people are told by one leader or another that some particular result can be achieved if we only had this or that law. The people are sold by slogans, just as though a statute were an ordinary commodity like pork and beans. So they write their Senators or their Congressman, "Get back of the Mullarkey bill," or "oppose," as the case may be. They don't know what's in the bill; more often than not the measure will be amended; in fact, the bill may permit the desirable objective about which the people have been told, but go far beyond what the public really wants.

I mention such things because in our vast mail we have daily evidence of how easily people can be led astray in their own thinking, and quite naturally, too, because they're all busy at their own daily tasks. They have neither the time nor the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the schemes and the plans of those who would centralize all government power in their own hands in Washington. It behooves us well to inquire most thoroughly into the language used in a bill. Whoever wrote that measure used words for a purpose. He wrote into that bill language which he would cause to speak when it serves his purpose to rely upon such language. Will the bill do what its sponsors say? Yes, perhaps; but what else will it do? What will be the over-all effect of this legislation? What are the facts? Above all, what is the need for this legislation? These are the very fundamental questions we should ask ourselves concerning any measure as we consider our approach to the problems ahead of us.

The function of the Republican Party in the face of this situation is very real. We are a minority party. Every committee in Congress, both in the Senate and in the House, has been organized by and is under control of the Democratic Party majority. The majority membership, in general, reflects the views of the administration and offers legislation to further administration policy. It becomes the plain duty of the minority not only to try to enlighten its own membership but to expose the weaknesses and the fallacies of measures which are open to adverse criticism. Equally, it is our plain duty to support worth-while legislation designed and proposed for the good of the whole country, irrespective of the origin of the bill. Particularly, measures which will work vast changes in the American economy or which would alter our institutions should receive pitilessly the clear white light of analysis. If, thereafter, the people still want such legislation, it will be passed and will receive their support. If, however, such measures are jammed through Congress covertly or in disregard of the legitimate objecjections of the minority, the people will be hostile and dissatisfied and bitterly critical. I regret to say that at least down to January 1, there had been too much action of that sort. Last November 3 the people took a partial step toward recovering a voice in Congress. In the 4 previous years of my service in the Senate not a single measure of national economic impact intrdouced by a Republican was allowed to become law. The administration control was so great that such measures, if introduced by Republicans, couldn't even get out of committee, and even now they don't have much chance.

Of course, you can ignore all of these questions if you choose to do so. You may say that the political philosophy under which we are to be governed will make no difference, but when enough people in this country have reached that state of mind their opportunity for self-government will have vanished. I believe that most people still think of the United States as offering a government by the people for the greatest good of the greatest number. Let's test that principle for a moment. I believe that the working people of the United States should have an opportunity to organize, to form unions through which

they may gather economic strength and bargain for the well being of their membership through representatives of their own choice. But labor, organized by labor, is one thing; labor organized under coercion of government is quite another. The former is American, the latter involves a concept quite foreign to us. Let's carry it to its logical conclusion. The Government, through its procurement officers, will order that contracts be granted only to concerns which are organized the Government's way. Workers in other plants without contracts become unemployed. The unemployed can get work only if they present certificates of availability issued by some Government bureau. This same bureau will tell the worker he may be employed in factory A or in city B, but nowhere else. It is then a simple matter to fix a rate at which the worker will be employed, and he will be told that he may not earn or at least may not receive, more than a sum fixed by a Government bureau. Legitimate businesses which have been built up through generations will be forced to the wall. They will be denied contracts, they will be unable to get materials, they will have no available labor. Huge masses of our laboring population will then, indeed, be creatures of the Government, and having once been brought within its control, what will become of labor's organizations?

Presently you will be told that the Government must furnish employment. The argument will run something like this: "Whose money built that great plant at Kansas City, or that new factory at Omaha? Yours. Where did the Government get the money to build these plants? From you. Who decides what will be manufactured in these plants? The Government. Hasn't your Government shown you that it can employ you in time of war? Yes. Then why shouldn't it employ you in times of peace?"

If the profit system is to be destroyed, it should. If Americans, on the contrary, demand opportunity, and a chance for each succeeding generation to better its lot, it will reject the political philosophy that Government is supreme. It is so easy to say that great Government corporations, Government-owned, Government-controlled, by people you never elected and don't even know, can decide what is best for you. It is so easy to say that these Government corporations will withdraw the people's savings and invest them. It is so easy to point out that all imports are brought in by Government agencies. It is so easy to point out that no exports can be made except by Government license. It is so easy to say that Government big-business control is superior to privately owned big-business control. Against all this I urge that it is better for a free people to make mistakes and to try to correct them, and still be free, than to be creatures of bureaucratic government.

The facts are that the United States Employment Service today certifies to the War Manpower Commission that thus and such cities constitute a critical labor area. Then the War Manpower Commission directs the War Production Board to grant no more contracts within that area. Even a company which is the lowest bidder, in competition throughout the Nation, can get no more contracts, the industry must close and its labor pool must seek other employment elsewhere, as the bureau may decide. The Board of Economic Warfare passes on all export licenses. It tells the reconstruction Finance Corporation, or its subsidiaries, what materials to import. It even decides what foreign country will be aided or denied, and then some other bureau decides how the imported raw materials will be allocated, and where, and how, and on what terms and conditions, they will be fabricated. All of these things are being done under Executive order. Don't you think it makes a difference whether our lives and our economy are to be governed by bureaus not accountable to the citizens, rather than in accordance with standards created by Congress which is responsible to the people? Inherent in that question is a summary of two very opposite political concepts. I have indicated a situation which is either actual or possible under the present trend. You can appreciate how real and how alive the problem is, when I tell you that Mr. Prentiss Brown, less than 2 months ago, asked for a conference with Members of the Senate Committees on Finance and Banking and Currency. A former Senator from Michigan, and now Administrator of O. P. A., he told us that his chief purpose in meeting with us was to give assurance that he would never lend his office to a destruction of the American profit system. He felt that such assurances were necessary.

Another phase of Government activity which affects primarily the working people of the United States, but thereafter all commerce, and hence our whole economy, lies in the international sphere. There are people who believe in free trade. I do not. I do oppose extreme and excluding tariffs. I favor reasonable rates which will take into account differences in costs of production abroad and transportation charges. That much protection is absolutely essential for the well-being of American workers as well as for the industry which gives them employment, for the citizens who invest their money in business, for the farmers who sell their produce to the working people. The American worker after years of effort has succeeded in obtaining statutes which provide for minimum wages and for a maximum workweek. Unemployment compensation and social-security benefits depend upon our work and our contributions based on pay rolls. What will become of these minimum advantages if American workers are thrown into open competition with the whole wide world where no such standards prevail? Nowhere else on this globe do workers enjoy the opportunities which can be provided under reasonable protective tariffs. You have only to look about you to realize the truth of this fact. There are those who would destroy the status of the American worker and who would reduce his standard of living. Such people argue that if goods can be produced more cheaply in other countries, American people should be able to buy those goods at lower prices and that we should engage in the production of noncompetitive articles. Carried to its logical conclusion, this argument would say that if Chile can produce brass more cheaply than Waterbury, Waterbury should stop rolling brass. I believe such an approach to be utterly unrealistic. I believe that reasonable tariffs will provide against unreasonable advantages to Chile, and yet leave a stimulus for honest competition which will result in reasonable prices and guard against monopoly.

As in the case of Executive orders on the domestic front, so in the international field, there are those who claim our Government should bind us, not through treaties, but through Executive agreements. This concept is freighted with possibly disastrous consequences to us, as there would remain no control whatever in the American people over the subject matter or the commitments which may be involved. I mention this invading concept only to differentiate it from treaties or authorized trade agreements, for as to both of the latter a different rule prevails.

Treaties have a firmly fixed place in our law, and when entered into according to constitutional standards, they become the supreme law of the land. To their fulfillment the public faith and integrity of the United States are pledged. Public conscience demands their support, for they have been negotiated and entered into through the people's representatives. We have many successful treaties, and whenever the subject matter will properly admit of their use, we should resort to this method of international contract. Thus established, their sanctity will carry its own commendation.

Yet they need not be exclusive; and, saving the question of constitutionality, Congress has, from time to time, delegated some of its power, as through the mechanism of the reciprocal trade agreements program. Much has been said of this lately, yet because of the war, the question raised is really academic. There is no competitive international commerce to speak of, and all of our imports of materials are being made by the Government duty-free. Because of its ultimate importance, we should surround the program with proper safeguards.

For example, adequate hearings should be provided for all parties affected. In most foreign countries, alterations in tariffs provided in reciprocal trade agreements entered into with us, must be submitted for legislative sanction. In the present state of world affairs, extreme caution should be our own watchword, and it is mandatory for American well-being that emphasis be placed on certain features which I shall outline.

First, however, let me mention that we have outstanding 30 trade agreements with 25 different countries. Such agreements may be entered into for 3 years, although at the expiration of that period they may run on without further renewal, but subject to termination upon 6 months' notice. It would be my view that no outstanding agreements be renewed for the present, but rather be continued under their terms.

Second, as is so often the case, utterance and fact are at wide disparity with reference to our prevailing tariff law. The Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930, some say, must bear all of the iniquity of the world's ills. Such a statement is sheer nonsense. Without defending the act at all, the fact remains, that it has been on the statute books for more than 12 years, and despite the administration's complete control of the Congress throughout most of this period, there has never been even a suggestion that the act be repealed. In short, it is still the American standard, and it is against this yardstick that all of our reciprocal trade agreements have been and are being measured. Under the reciprocal trade-agreements program, decreases in tariffs may be granted up to 50 percent of the Hawley-Smoot level. Such decreases once granted, are applied in favor of all countries. It it well to remember that while decreasing our tariffs will increase imports from trade-agreement countries, these same countries will still buy their goods in the world market wherever they can be most cheaply procured, and there is no guarantee or assurance that any such country will buy more from us. I cite these facts for their bearing on the points I promised to mention.

The first prerequisite to sound international trade will depend upon the stabilization of international currency. One of our trade-agreement countries, for example, today has seven different exchange rates. Until the Lend-Lease Act, Great Britain had for the pound, an official sterling rate of $4.02 and a free rate of $3.26. When we bought from her, we paid the official rate. When we competed with her in the sale of our goods, she sold at $3.26. In the post-war economy, with nations exhausted, with our finances depleted, unless we can achieve a stabilization of international currency, chaos can result in the commercial field. The return to productivity for the channels of commerce will result in scrambles for world markets. Governments in whose policies we have no voice will be led to subsidize their exports. Without the statutory protections granted to American workers, labor abroad can and will be exploited. Production costs, control of shipping lanes, commercial concessions, and similar factors will

have marked bearing on world economy. Thus, stabilization of international exchange becomes of prime importance, for without it, and without reasonable protections to Americans, profound and adverse effects upon the American economy would follow from commitments now made which fail to take into account such factors.

As the trade-agreement program operates, our State Department first explores the feasibility of an agreement with a particular country. Then follow a publication of formal intention to negotiate and hearings, of a sort, on the proposed agreement. Committees of the State Department prepare studies and reports, following which an agreement is ready for negotiation. In most cases, it will then be submitted through diplomatic channels to the country which proposed it, perhaps for legislative approval, but at least for executive confirmation. Thereafter, our President proclaims the agreement.

It is my view that all of this mechanism except the final step should be presently retained, and strengthened where deficiencies have appeared. The President's war powers have been granted for a period to terminate 6 months after the cessation of hostilities, as proclaimed by the President. I think we would reach the very zenith of common sense were we to provide that no renewal of existing trade agreements and no final execution of new ones shall be concluded prior to that same date. There are other ways to accomplish the same result, but Congress at least should retain a voice in the premises.

If we were to follow such a course, in the meantime negogtiations already under way may be concluded with reference to a stabilization of international exchange. Moreover, we would know with what governments we are to deal. The process of inquiry and negotiation for possible new agreements could be continued. An agreement upon all items affected could be prepared, ready to be made operative at the post-war date mentioned. Wartime conditions which have throttled competitive commerce would be removed. The rehabilitation of war-torn nations would be under way. All of the advantages of the program could be secured without our suffering the disadvantages of commitments, which, if entered into now, could not possibly take into account such factors as will prevail 6 months after the termination of hostilities. Indeed, agreements, if any, which shall have been concluded except for proclamation by the President can then, and instantly, become operative by his proclamation. Meanwhile we would be enabled to appear at the peace table without our hands tied.

I submit that in this way American workers and the American economy can achieve reasonable protection. That much we should have, we should be given no less.

Of course, there is no obligation on American citizens so obvious and so necessary as that we win the war. To that end every Republican and every Democrat, both in the Congress and outside, stand irrevocably commited. In what is to follow there occurs profound disagreement. As a firm believer in law and order, as a lawyer by training and profession, I have long believed in the establishment of a strong world court. As one sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States, I have an abiding faith in the sanctity of treaties which after negotiation and ratification become the supreme law of the land. In this way and through that medium our rights among nations may be defined and our duties prescribed. As a citizen, I believe our Nation should propose to other nations treaties which—

1. Should condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies and renounce war as an instrument of national policy in the relations of all nations to one another.

2. Engage that the settlement or solution of all disputes, or conflicts of whatever nature, or of whatever origin they may be, arising among nations, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

3. Should agree with other nations on such terms and conditions as will not burden commerce, but rather will promote mutually advantageous economic relations among them.

4. Should seek to achieve an accord to result in appropriate international and domestic measures relating to production, employment, and the exchange and consumption of goods which are the material foundations of the labor and welfare of all peoples.

As a Senator of the United States I have offered some observations on the current scene and some advice for your future thinking.

As a Republican, I have outlined a basis upon which citizens of every persuasion may agree if our philosophy of government is to prevail.

As an American, I am opposed to merging our national sovereignty into some new entity. I am a citizen of the United States, I do not wish to be a citizen of the world.

New Horizons for the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "New Horizons for the Republican Party," written by me at the request of the Nebraska State Journal, and published therein on May 24, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

G. O. P. FACES TWO MAJOR CHALLENGES—PROMOTE ABUNDANCE, ENCOURAGE COOPERATION

NEW HORIZONS FOR THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

(By JOSEPH H. BALL, United States Senator from Minnesota)

The American people today are searching desperately for political leadership worthy of the critical times through which we are living, leadership that has vision, courage, and that knows where it is going and will present to the people a realistic, constructive program for the United States.

The people will turn to that one of the two great political parties which in their estimation holds the best promise of providing such leadership. With some notable exceptions, neither party is showing much of it today. The Democratic administration is still wedded to a policy of expediency wholly inadequate to solve the basic problems facing the United States and the world. Too many Republicans appear to have no policy except to watch and wait, in the hope that the New Deal will make enough political mistakes to catapult the Grand Old Party back into power without the necessity of its thinking through basic issues and revealing to the people the conclusions reached.

There are two major challenges facing the Republican Party today and both demand that the party leadership abandon some of its old positions and fix its sights on new horizons.

One of these challenges is to develop and support policies which will continue and enlarge the gains in social security of the people made under the New Deal and at the same time preserve our political liberties and free private enterprise and initiative to achieve the full prosperity and production which our democratic system must achieve in order to survive.

The old battle cry, "Scrap the New Deal," will not do. People realize that the New Deal is not the final answer to America's problem, but the basic philosophy of the New Deal, that it is Government's obligation to provide a floor beneath which it will not permit the living standards of the people to fall, is here to stay. It is because they are determined that Government shall assume this obligation that a majority of the people have for 12 years supported the New Deal, despite its wasteful and inefficient administration and its failure even to come to grips with our basic economic problems.

The fundamental weakness of the New Deal is that it combined with its social-security policies, a running attack on the free enterprise system that gradually slowed it down and, in the long run, made it certain that more and more of the people would finally find themselves living on the social-security floor instead of on the standards which our system can and should provide.

Our war production job has renewed confidence in American industry and enterprise. It is up to the Republican Party to formulate and present to the people a program to give our economy the environment in which it can and will produce the abundance which we now know it can produce. The corporate tax structure, for instance, should be changed drastically to give venture enterprises a chance. The Securities and Exchange Commission needs overhauling to make it easier to raise capital for ventures. Labor relations must be stabilized on a fair and sensible basis. Monopolies which prevent production savings and price reductions, whether in the field of labor or management, must be broken up. Government reports of business must be reduced and simplified—the Wages and Hours Act is a prime example.

Some of these policies will be new for the Republican Party. Some will be open to demagogic and political attack. But policies which on the basis of the facts provide the only logical solution will be accepted by the people and in the long run will overcome partisan political attacks.

The second major challenge facing our party is to develop and present to the people a constructive foreign policy which will afford the United States and the world the greatest chance of working out their problems and continuing to progress in a stable and peaceful world.

Again some new horizons for the party are in order. The Grand Old Party has supported a high protective tariff. That was a good policy during the decades when we were building our industry in competition with old, established industries of Europe. This policy no longer makes sense because the facts on which it was based have changed. Our industry can stand on its own feet. It does not need protection and consumers should be relieved of paying this subsidy. Particularly for our Midwest agricultural States, the protective-tariff policy has been disastrous in recent decades. Because our tariff barriers prohibited a reasonable exchange of goods through the world, our farm surpluses piled up here in the twenties and thirties while Europe lacked food, and many nations there were forced to attempt to achieve economic self-sufficiency, a goal which inevitably leads to aggression and war because

no nation possesses all the varied resources necessary for complete self-sufficiency. Both our own interests and the requirements for world peace demand a gradual relaxation of this traditional policy in the direction of freer world trade.

In recent years the Republican Party has been to some extent identified with a foreign policy of isolation. That policy likewise no longer makes sense in the world today. Radio, the airplane, and mechanized war have shrunk the globe.

We can have peace for America only by helping to maintain peace in the world. The people will ask their political leadership to tell how it proposes to achieve that goal, and they will insist on a realistic answer. Twice in one generation they have seen their sons die on foreign battlefields in wars not of our seeking. Old slogans and catchwords, appeals to prejudice instead of to reason, will not be accepted. The Republican Party must lift its eyes to the new horizons of the world and find an answer based on the facts of today, not yesterday.

Farmers Paying Debts to Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address entitled "Farmers Paying Debts to Government," delivered by Hon. Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, on the National Farm and Home Hour on May 26, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Several times in the past I have talked to you about the importance of using the increased returns that crops and livestock are now bringing to pay off farm debt. I have emphasized that the payment of outstanding obligations, along with as large an investment as possible in War bonds, is a sound protection for the future.

Just this week I have brought together the reports of agencies in the Department of Agriculture that make loans to farm people. I am very pleased to say that the farmers, in general, who have borrowed from the Government are now making a splendid record in the repayment of their loans.

The collections of these agencies show that the farmers to whom they have extended financial aid in many cases are paying off their loans in full before they fall due. It is extremely gratifying to note that a great many others are paying loan installments in advance in order to retire the principal as rapidly as possible.

For example, the Farm Credit Administration reports that 20,000 land-bank loans were paid in full before the maturity date during the first quarter of this year. This was double the number of such payments during the same months in 1942. Advance payments on land-bank loans up to April totaled around $21,000,000.

Another indication that farmers are making wise use of their increased income is the fact that repayments—including payments in full—on Federal land-bank loans were about four and one-half times as great as the total of new loans closed by the land bank and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation in the first quarter of 1943. In other words, farmers are paying back four and one-half times as much on land-bank loans as they are borrowing. Repayments at the same time last year were running only about two and one-half times as much as new borrowings. Loan applications in the first quarter this year were the lowest since 1933.

The Farm Security Administration estimates that collections on rehabilitation loans for the year ending June 30 will total about $130,000,000. This is a third more than the total amount of such loans made during the year. From the beginning of the Farm Security Administration to the first of this year 85 percent of the total amount due on all of these so-called "high risk" loans had been repaid on time. And enough advance payments had been made to bring the repayments up to 91 percent of the total amount due. This is a magnificent record. It justifies the Government's faith in low-income farm people.

Former farm tenants who are buying farms with Farm Security Administration funds also are making a fine record. The record shows that 23,000 of these borrowers up to the first of this year had paid back a total of $3,000,000 more than the installments that were due. They are paying for their farms on a 40-year plan. Their repayments were equal to one and one-half installments in 1 year.

Another outstanding record is being made by the 800 cooperative electric systems, with more than 1,000,000 members, now participating in the program of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Up to February of this year a total of $365,000,000 had been advanced to the Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives. And these systems had repaid $36,000,000, of which about $9,000,000 was in excess of the installments due. Delinquencies in the repayment of their loans have been extremely small, amounting to only about $200,000.

In addition, these Rural Electrification Administration co-ops have invested approximately $5,000,000 in War bonds.

All of these highly gratifying reports indicate that most farmers who have had the benefits of Government aid are determined to make wise use of their income while farm prices are higher than in many years. By retiring their debts now, they will be in a better position to meet future obligations and to protect the investment they have in their land and homes.

As all farmers well know, their occupation is always subject to risks and losses that can't be foreseen. While conditions may be excellent over the country generally, individual farmers may in any season suffer unexpected misfortunes and some may even have their crops wiped out entirely.

Floods such as we have been having in some parts of the country recently bring destruction and suffering to a great many rural people. Crops and livestock can be swept away overnight. Drought, crop pests, fire, and other disasters may be visited on individuals or affect entire localities.

When disaster strikes or when the returns of an individual farmer are cut by circumstances beyond his control, the farmer who has had the foresight to get his debts paid in more favorable years will find himself in a much better position to keep going. It might mean the difference between saving his farm and losing it.

Another thing, when debts are paid, there is always more money for investment in War bonds. Savings put into War bonds mean added insurance for the future, a reserve for rebuilding the land, repairing farm buildings, replacing equipment, and educating the children. It is far better, in my judgment, to get debts out of the way now and keep on buying War bonds, than to take a chance on being caught later with a heavily mortgaged farm or in some other serious financial plight.

I commend all farmers who are using their income wisely in these trying times. I hope everybody else will follow their example.

Broaden Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Broaden Social Security," from the May 22 issue of Collier's Weekly.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Out of most of the voluminous National Resources Planning Board report, which hit Congress with a dull thud just as Congress was cutting off the National Resources Planning Board's appropriations, we get little light or leading. The bulk of these blueprints for a post-war American paradise seem to us entirely too vague and sketchy for you to get your teeth into them.

The part of the report having to do with a possible wider and further-reaching Social Security Act, however, seems eminently sound, sensible, and solid. This part was the work of Arthur Altmeyer, chairman of the Social Security Board, and Altmeyer is no fuzz-brain. George Creel, as you probably remember, described Altmeyer's suggestions at some length in a recent Collier's.

Under the existing Social Security Act several large groups of people are "exempt," which in this case is a polite word for frozen out. These groups are farm laborers, domestic servants, employees of Federal, State, and city governments, and self-employers. Nor do the social-security benefits now cover sickness or disability.

Altmeyer says these gaping holes in the act can be plugged, and should be, and that the operation can be performed at small cost as compared with the profit to the Nation as a whole. The present system would simply be extended, enlarged, and improved, with the existing foundations utilized and approved actuarial principles used throughout. Employers, employees, and general taxpayers would foot the bills.

We have now had 6 years of the limited Social Security Act, and it has proved its excellence as far as it goes. None of the economic horrors predicted by its one-time enemies has materialized—not even the bankrupting of any privately operated insurance companies. On the contrary, it appears that many a person, awakened by the Social Security Act to the possibilities of insurance, conceives an ambition to supplement his or her Government insurance with policies of private companies.

We hope that this part of the National Resources Planning Board report will not be choked off and forgotten in the alarums and excursions of the war. Indeed, there would seem to be a good deal in the argument of the plan's hotter supporters that now is the time to broaden Social Security—now, while most of us are employed and money is circulating swiftly, so that we could without too much financial agony take on this added precaution against the consequences of unemployment and penniless old age.

King Cotton Needs a Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "King Cotton Needs a Friend," by the Honorable C. M. Harrison, president of the Bank of Amory, Amory, Miss.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KING COTTON NEEDS A FRIEND

Cotton is second to steel as most vital war material—and even steel needs cotton to function properly.

Eleven thousand different items made of cotton are used by the Army.

The Quartermasters Department of the United States Government is cotton's largest purchaser. In one recent order they bought 351,300,000 yards of cotton cloth and over 40,000,000 yards of mosquito netting.

So says the National Cotton Council.

One thousand four hundred pounds of seed cotton will make one 500 bale of lint, 140 pounds of oil for human consumption, 400 pounds of meal, and 240 pounds of hulls for cattle feed, and 81 pounds of gun cotton for powder.

A good acre of ground will grow 1,400 pounds of seed cotton. Out of this you get 140 plus 400 plus 240, or a total of 780 pounds of food. The farmer can trade his seed for meals and hulls and get 900 pounds of feed out of a bale of cotton. Nine hundred pounds of corn is 17.6 bushels.

How many acres do you have that will grow 17.6 bushels of corn and $100 worth of other produce?

Lint cotton is now selling at better than 20 cents per pound. Seed sold at $50 per ton. One thousand four hundred pounds of seed cotton will bring $100 for the lint and $22.50 for the seed. Two-thirds of that weight was in food products.

The linters and oil are not sold but ordered out by the Government and to be shipped according to their orders and direct to powder or refining plants.

The linters are made into powder.

The oil into food for human consumption.

The hulls and meal into feed for cattle, both beef and dairy type.

Farmers stand in line waiting for meals and hulls for their cattle.

If you think there is a surplus of cotton, try and buy some ginghams, sheeting, or diapers.

This section knows how and is prepared to grow cotton. They have not had the experience and do not have the equipment to grow peanuts and other crops of that kind. This equipment could not be bought at present time, even though it was advisable, and it is not. Peanuts sold at $130 per ton in south Alabama last year. What did you get for yours?

The Government is urging increased food production but still limiting our farmers to a very small cotton acreage. Some to as low as 3 acres. Of course, they did get a 10-percent increase, but what is 10 percent of 3 acres, or even of 10 acres? Just another joke.

If there is a food shortage and cotton is two-thirds food, the second most vital war material, and practically all goes into war consumption; then why in the name of common sense don't they let the little farmer—the one that owns the land and one still on the farm—grow all the cotton he can? The big farmers are not going to increase their acreage because they can't get the labor or fertilizer. The little man can and would increase his acreage, but is still restricted to such a small acreage that he can't make a living unless he is lucky enough to make a big crop every year—that just doesn't happen.

Consistency, where art thou?

C. M. HARRISON.

The Boondoggling Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, May 28, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Thursday, May 27, 1943, entitled "The Boondoggling Champions":

THE BOONDOGGLING CHAMPIONS

The Joint Congressional Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures has recommended that the National Youth Administration be abolished. The public will doubtless be surprised to learn the youth outfit is still in existence. It is not only in existence but is asking for $59,304,000 to keep its pay rollers fat and satisfied for another year.

The findings of the congressional committee not only present cogent arguments for immediate abolishment of the National Youth Administration but give an excellent picture of just what is going on in that discredited agency. National Youth Administration was started to buy the youth vote for the New Deal. Its presiding genius was Mrs. Roosevelt's pet, Aubrey Williams, notorious for his advice, a few years back, to Work Projects Administrationers "to remember their friends" at the polls. When the war came the National Youth Administration foresaw the end of its existing boondoggling projects. The staff immediately undertook to make themselves an essential war agency. They embarked on a program of training young people for jobs in industry.

A few months later the Baltimore Sun locked into their activities. Its reporters found that the boondogglers had rounded up thousands of intricate machine tools that were needed for actual war production and had many of them hoarded away in warehouses, unused. Such courses as the Youth Administration was conducting were tremendously expensive, when compared with similar training given in the public schools of Baltimore.

The National Youth Administration has not mended its ways since. On last October 28, the date on which the congressional committee got its figures, the agency had 43,000 youths in training and 11,806 pay rollers—more than 1 to every 4 students—to train them. Of these pay rollers only 44 percent were engaged in direct shop supervision. The rest were sitting around offices drawing their pay. Furthermore, the committee found that only 50 percent of the trainees ever got into war industry, and they could have got their training just as well somewhere else, as everything the National Youth Administration does is a duplication of activities of other governmental agencies and of the training programs carried on by the war industries themselves.

The National Youth Administration personnel is composed of lame ducks—not political lame ducks, because none of them could get elected to office in the first place—but economic lame ducks. The vast majority of them never had such a soft snap in their lives and they're not going to let go of it, war or no war, as long as Congress is foolish enough to provide funds for them.

The investigating committee recommended that the equipment they have hoarded be transferred either to essential war industries or to industry, which can use it to some advantage, and that the functions be taken over by other governmental agencies that are already doing the same thing. If the committee's recommendation is accepted by Congress, the country will save nearly $60,000,000; thousands of worthless pay rollers will be kicked out of their soft situations, and, it is not too much to hope, may even find jobs where they will do something useful toward winning the war.

Prob'ems of Columbia River Fish Packers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUFUS C. HOLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from the Point Adams Packing Co., which sets forth in some detail the difficulties which the fish packers of the Columbia River area are having in meeting various departmental directives.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POINT ADAMS PACKING CO.,
Hammond, Oreg., May 20, 1943.

Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY,
Senator RUFUS HOLMAN,
Congressman JAMES W. MOTT,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: This letter is being addressed to our Oregon Senators and to Congressman MOTT, who is the Representative of this district, and is done so with full knowledge of the fact that you gentlemen are constantly beset with letters, pleas, etc., from cranks, crackpots, insincere persons, and last but not least, those who are entirely sincere. It is because we find ourselves in a precarious position that we address ourselves to you.

The writer is the president of the Point Adams Packing Co. and is personally known to some of you, and because of that fact believes that you will understand that our complaints are sincere and of vital interest to not only ourselves and citizens generally, but canners of vegetables and fruits, as well as fish.

To begin with, we have, like all other business houses, been flooded and deluged with forms and demands upon our time in filling out these forms by our limited personnel for information that, so far as we can see, is of little or no value in the prosecution of this war. Furthermore, a great many of these forms appear to be duplications of other forms that have been demanded by and submitted to other governmental agencies or bureaus.

We now come to a situation that is decidedly critical. In our own case we have in the neighborhood of 30 of our regular seasonal employees gone from the small town of Hammond and the adjacent town of Warrenton,

who have entered the armed forces and to whose patriotism in so doing we give deep credit. In fact, we are extremely proud of these boys, who have so promptly offered themselves as fighting men in our country's time of need. And we might add that we are doubly proud of the fact that the large majority of these boys have entered their country's armed forces voluntarily, not waiting for any draft call. Many of these boys, in order to do so, had to make sacrifices of the nature of reconstructing the course of their domestic lives inasmuch as some of them were married and some even fathers.

This in itself has depleted severely the available manpower which we have heretofore been able to call during the season for the purpose of processing Columbia River salmon and Oregon tuna. Now we are faced with the fact that the Wage Stabilization Act and the President's Executive Order No. 9301 has prohibited us from meeting the going wages that are being paid in other industries in this vicinity. The result is that the few employees that we have left are naturally dissatisfied and new employees cannot be secured because of the fact, as stated above, that higher wages are permitted the employee in other lines of work. Even our own Government is one of these employers who are paying wages that we are prohibited from paying.

For instance, the United States Army Engineers have been paying common labor 95 cents an hour, which is more in most instances than we are permitted to pay our skilled labor. By skilled labor we mean men who have put in long years in this business and know all the phases of the preparing and processing of salmon and tuna. Contractors who are doing work for the Government, such as the Austin Co., who have long had Government contracts on the expansion of the Tongue Point naval base facilities, are paying women helpers and sweepers a minimum of 95 cents an hour. Contractors who have Government contracts for the building of housing projects are taking any man who can saw a board as a full-fledged carpenter and paying wages which we understand run about ninety-odd dollars per week.

All of our high school boys as soon as they approach 18 years of age have offered themselves to the armed services, which eliminates this source of help during the summer canning season. Under the Wage and Hour Act we are prohibited from employing anyone under 16 years of age. There are many light jobs around the cannery that boys of 15 years of age are perfectly capable of doing. In fact, most of the older men in the Columbia River canning industry, the writer included, started working in the canneries during summer vacations at or around 13 years of age, and the writer can safely say that he has never known a single one of these boys of that age who were in any way harmed, physically, mentally, or otherwise, by being so employed. In fact, it is rather the other way around. When a boy of 14 or 15 could get summer work in the canneries it kept him from becoming a loafer during his summer vacation as well as giving him a little money that he could save to assist himself through school during the school year.

The matter of wages to be paid by the Columbia River canning industry has been certified to the War Labor Board according to a wire received from J. E. Steelman, director, United States Conciliation Service. What the result will be is, of course, problematical, but you can readily understand our inability to secure help when the first thing the prospective employee wants to know is what he is to be paid. When we can't give them a definite answer other than we will pay the same wage we paid last year plus any increase that may be granted by the War Labor Board, the prospective employee is immediately not interested. In August and September we have our two very heavy packing months, both on salmon and on tuna. We employ during those months approximately 250 people in the cannery alone, not including our outside help such as fish receivers, launchmen, and so forth, which brings the total up considerably more. We haven't the slightest hope that under these circumstances sufficient help can be secured under the present conditions as outlined above.

We understand that in the case of the Alaska Fisheries, the War Labor Board five-man panel has recommended to the Board an increase of 7 percent over last year's wages. If the same formula is applied to our local industry, we still doubt that prospective employees would be interested when they can get higher paid work locally by governmental agencies and semigovernmental agencies.

The Food Distribution Administration has sent to us and all other Columbia River canners a specimen of the proposed contract for the 55 percent of our pack of salmon and the 60 percent of our pack of tuna which they insist that canners should sign. These contracts are extremely unfair and one sided and in a telegram dated May 14, 1943, directed to Mr. H. C. Albin, Chief, Special Commodities Branch, Food and Drug Administration, Washington, D. C., the salmon and tuna packers through their committee, T. F. Sandoz, Chairman, have objected to certain provisions of the contract they gave us to sign, the chief objections to which is the matter of prices in section 2 of said contract. In effect, that clause of the contract if signed by ourselves, means that we would have to deliver our salmon and/or tuna at whatever ceiling price might be set on the date of actual delivery by the Office of Price Administration. In other words, we were asked to sign a blanket contract to deliver regardless of our costs, at whatever price the Office of Price Administration may decide to offer at the time or times that delivery or deliveries are made. We would have no idea, when signing, whether we were selling the goods at a loss or not and regardless of loss would be compelled to deliver.

Another very objectionable clause in the Food and Drug Administration contracts is clause 8 which frankly looks to us as having been inserted by the labor unions and why the Government should allow the labor unions and their leaders to inject themselves into a contract between two other parties, namely the Government and the individual canners on the Columbia River, is more than we can fathom. Clause 8 of the proposed contract reads as follows:

"8. Workweek: We are familiar with the requirements of Executive Order No. 9301, February 9, 1943, 8 Federal Register, 1825, establishing a minimum wartime workweek of 48 hours, and such applicable policies, directives, and regulations issued by the War Manpower Commission. We will consult with the regional or area manpower directors concerning any question which may arise as to interpretation or application of the order or regulation."

Under the Wage and Hour Act, processors of fish due to the uncontrolled deliveries of such fish for processing which are dependent entirely upon the runs, are exempt from the hour provisions of that act. We have a 48 hour workweek and by agreement with our union have paid time and a half after 8 hours in any one day. According to clause 8, should we sign the same, we would be required to pay time-and-a-half overtime after 40 hours in any one week. In other words, we would have to pay overtime for the sixth day of the week. It is our understanding that the Wages and Hours Act was passed by Congress with the intent in mind of trying to spread work so as to give more employment to those who were more or less unemployed. Such a condition does not exist throughout the country today. No one, even physically defective persons, are without work if they are willing to work and the inclusion of paragraph 8 in any contracts we would sign would increase very materially the cost of our production. Especially is this so with help so scarce that long hours will undoubtedly be necessary in order to be able to process the fish and preserve food that we are certain is so badly needed by not only our armed forces and our allies, but by our own citizens.

On the one hand the Government tells us that they want to keep down the cost of living, but it is quite apparent that behind the scenes there is no intention of doing this as long as they can fool the public into thinking they are doing it. The writer believes it is high time that politicians and political parties forget their politics and buckle down to work and be willing to make the same sacrifices that the common, ordinary citizen is making and desires to make in order to prosecute this war to a successful conclusion. It is the writer's personal conclusions, and he personally knows that a vast majority of the people with whom he is acquainted also feel the same, that the political party in power and the professional bureaucratic politicians in general, refuse to sacrifice their own selfish interests for the interests of the people as a whole which means sacrificing their interests to the successful and smooth prosecution of this war in which we are now engaged.

The writer has been long winded and rather rambling in calling to your attention the above five complaints. However, they are only a few of the many gripes about which citizens all over the Nation are concerned. My complaint is that our Representatives in Congress are permitting the country to drift into a socialized state that is alarming. In fact, the quasi-fascist inclined people seem to be in control and the very foundation of the greatness of this Nation, namely, free enterprise, is being squashed in the name of being necessary for the war effort to such an extent that we will never recover it. Gentlemen, the people of our State have no one to look to but yourselves to safeguard these precious birthrights of the people of the United States and the writer thoroughly believes that if the Congress is alive to the trust imposed upon them by the people who elected them, they will do their utmost to prevent the infiltration of these socialized theorists who in their zeal to try out their theories would destroy the very thing that has built this Nation to the position of greatness that we now enjoy.

Very truly yours,

C. L. ROGERS.

Feeding the Children of Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 28 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Feed the Children" published in the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch of May 12, 1943, and another editorial entitled "Food for Hungry Children" published in the Ohio State Journal of May 13, 1943. Both editorials relate to the need of feeding the children of Europe through the agency of the Red Cross.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch of May 12, 1943]

FEED THE CHILDREN—A WORTHY HUMANITARIAN APPEAL

A worthy and humanitarian project, meriting every consideration, is the one espoused by Dr. Howard E. Kerschner, who spoke in Columbus Monday evening on behalf of the International Commission for Assistance of Child Refugees. "A whole generation of European children is slowly dying from starvation," he asserts, in pointing out that an ounce of practical life-saving help now is worth a pound of noble post-war plans for rehabilitation of a war-ravaged European youth.

Three years of actual experience in feeding French children as director of the American Friends (Quaker) Service committee entitle Dr. Kerschner to a thoughtful consideration of his appeal, which has the endorsement of Herbert Hoover and numerous other public figures.

Five arguments frequently have been adduced to counter the plea he advances. They are that the Germans would grab the food; that if they didn't, they would take an equivalent amount from the children's families; that it would raise American taxes; that we are too short of food ourselves; that shipping isn't available.

He refutes these by saying that in France the Germans have scrupulously refrained from taking food routed direct to the beneficiaries and have not short-rationed their families; that there are plenty of French, Norwegian, Belgian, and Dutch funds frozen in this country available to purchase food if facilities for getting it to hungry children of these countries are provided; that much of the food could be bought in South America and taken direct to the occupied countries; that neutral shipping is available and that so far the Germans have been willing to give refugee-food ships safe conduct.

He further states that the International Red Cross is ready to assume responsibility for distribution using neutral Swiss and Swedish personnel.

A movement is under way to induce England to lift the blockade which is the reason that food is not now being sent. It ought to have the support of our public. Not only is it common humanity to keep babies and little children from starving to death but, from the standpoint of cold realism, it cannot fail to help in cementing the bonds of sympathy between the United States and the stricken nations whose cooperation will be necessary if, as our leaders tell us, we are destined to take the initiative in rebuilding a shattered world after the war.

[From the Ohio State Journal of May 13, 1943]

FOOD FOR HUNGRY CHILDREN

There is no logical reason why the Allies, led by America, should not see to it that food gets through to the subjugated European countries where literally millions of children are starving. The case for the hungry youth of Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France especially was presented here the other night by Howard E. Kershner, executive vice president and director of the International Commission for the Assistance of Child Refugees. He spoke under auspices of the Central Ohio Committee on Food for the Small Democracies.

Part of our planning for the post-war era is tied up in a program to get food to those nations which have been crushed under the Nazi war machine and which have seen their own supplies taken away to feed the soldiers and leaders of the Reich. But for some reason, best to be explained by Winston Churchill, we permit starvation among our democratic friends in Europe, with the sole exception of Greece, to which we and Canada send about 18,000 tons of food per month.

Fear that the Germans would take this relief food are belittled by Kershner, who from 1939 to 1941 directed food relief on the continent and who says unequivocally that the Axis has not taken such food in the past and would not in future, if only because of the greater antagonism among the conquered peoples such action would inspire.

As for the plea that ships for such humanitarian work are not to be had, it is pointed out that the vessels of neutral Sweden, Portugal, Spain, and Turkey would be more than ample to transport the food.

Herbert Hoover has urged that we permit relief food to get to starving occupied Europe ever since the emergency arose. Others reiterate the plea and work for such an end. But England is adamant in refusing to lift her blockade, and President Roosevelt apparently has bowed to Winston Churchill's wishes in this respect, else he has been antagonistic to the idea because it was not New Deal inspired.

Whatever the motives which permit children to starve in Europe while we try to tell their parents we are out to save the world, they are shortsighted and misguided. The 51,000 tons of food per month that would meet the urgent need is not much; moreover, if a single pound of it were diverted by the Germans to their own use, the whole program, as Mr. Hoover has often pointed out and promised, would immediately be called off. Let us, then, feed these helpless youngsters. If we do, we certainly shall have more friends and more active cooperation when we start the invasion of the Continent.

It Is the Duty of the Government to Make Provision for the Care of Its Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES V. HEIDINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1943

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to submit for the consideration of the Congress the following resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois on the 19th day of May 1943:

House Resolution 59

Whereas during World War No. 1 the returning sick and wounded soldiers and sailors found us totally unprepared to furnish them proper hospitalization and treatment; and

Whereas those sick, helpless and bewildered men were for a considerable length of time left to shift for themselves or were inadequately cared for; and

Whereas the number who will return from World War No. 2, broken in mind, spirit, and body, needing medical service, treatment, and hospitalization will in all probability exceed the number who needed such services during the former World War; and

Whereas we now have an efficient Veterans' Administration which is making efficient use of all the means at its command; and

Whereas it will take time to properly locate, plan, equip, and staff specialized institutions of this nature so as to provide adequate care and treatment for all those in need; and

Whereas we as a nation are duty bound to do everything in our power to relieve and rehabilitate all those injured while in our service: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That in order to be assured that the close of World War No. 2 will not find our Nation unprepared to properly care for our sick and wounded, as was the case in World War No. 1, we hereby memorialize the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that immediate steps be taken to prepare to meet our responsibilities in this matter; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, May 19, 1943.

A Post-War Planning Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. HART

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1943

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, very many thoughtful citizens of our country are now directing their attention to what kind of a world we shall be living in after the conclusion of present hostilities. The ravages of war will be more far-reaching than anybody at the present time can possibly visualize. Our most earnest efforts ought to be directed to preparing now against the day when the world will seek to return to the way of peace and progress. Too much intelligent thought cannot be directed to the end averting chaos and complete economic break-down in the lives of all civilized nations.

It is important too that we should look to our own internal security after our armies have been disbanded and our brave fighting men return to their homes to seek a proper and deserved place in the new world set-up. Not only our Federal governmental officials but also those in our several States and many municipalities ought to be devoting the most intense thoughts of which they are capable toward the solution of anticipated problems which will surely arise to plague us when the war shall have been ended

One of the foremost citizens in my district, Prof. Louis Bader, associate professor of marketing at New York University and the capable chairman of the Civilian Defense Council of the town of West New York, N. J., has devised a post-war planning procedure which is admirable and might well serve as a guide for the officials of all municipalities and States throughout the Nation. The plan referred to is appended herewith:

A POST-WAR PLANNING PROCEDURE

(By Louis Bader, associate professor of marketing, New York University, chairman, Civilian Defense Council, West New York, N. J.)

Two important acts must be performed by us. The first is that of winning the war.

The steps have been taken to accomplish this, and most of us are playing our allotted parts. Soon, we hope, this act will be accomplished. Each day the news becomes more encouraging. The second act is that of post-war planning so that the returning military men and women and the no longer necessary war workers can secure other jobs which will enable them to earn a good living. Most of us have not yet found our allotted parts in this task. Many organizations, both private and public, are thinking in terms of post-war planning. These are highly selective groups, and they are concerned for the most part with over-all planning for the world, and in many areas their concern is with political organization. This type of planning may not become very effective unless it is backed up by individuals doing specific tasks in an area they can visualize.[1] To take up the slack in over-all planning, I propose the following procedure, which we might call the New Jersey plan of post-war planning:

1. Each community, such as West New York, should appoint a post-war planning commission consisting of representatives of the various interests in the community. In any case, they would include some from government, business of various kinds, labor, and the consumer. This commission should then canvass and survey the community to discover:

(a, What industries will need to repair, and to replace of equipment, buildings, inventories, etc., after the war ceases.

(b) The same study for wholesalers and retailers.

(c) The same study for real property owners.

(d) The same study for town property such as:

(1) Streets, sewers, new buildings, extensive repairs to old buildings, new equipment, etc.

(e) Take a sample of the residents as to their plans and provisions for purchase of:

(1) Automobiles.
(2) Household electric equipment.
(3) Furniture and furnishings.
(4) Food and clothing.
(5) Health maintenance.
(6) Vacations and travel.

2. Each county, such as Hudson, or other appropriate geographic area should appoint a post-war planning commission.

(a) This commission should consist of a representative from the post-war planning commissions of each community in the respective county plus county engineer's office and others as necessary.[2]

(b) This commission would compile the reports made by the community commissions resulting from their surveys. To this result would be added what contribution to jobs could be made by the county by way of roads, buildings, new equipment, extensive repairs, etc.

3. The State should form a post-war planning commission.

(a) This commission should consist of representatives from each county commission and such representatives of the State as are necessary to add to the effectiveness of such a commission. It should be established at once and added to as county commissions are formed.

(b) This commission would suggest surveys to the local commissions, compile the reports of the county commissions, and add to these reports the contributions the State could make leading to work for the returning war workers. This commission could also suggest and supervise the educational work that might need to be done, arrange for State appropriations to be shared with communities and counties whose combined appropriations would care for public work under the plans and for the educational effort to secure private action indicated as possible by the surveys.

(c) his commission would also maintain a liaison with public and private national organizations which have contributions to make in both specific and over-all planning such as ideas, appropriations, and so forth.[3]

(d) This commission would also aid counties and communities to form the local commissions.

As a result of these studies, we would have a good picture of probably private and public needs shortly after the war ends. Plans could then be laid to finance the public needs and arrangements concluded to provide the public needs as jobs became necessary. A short report could be drafted of private needs. This could be used for educational purposes. Provision could be made to educate all private interests to put their private plans into effect shortly after the war ends, thus adding to the call for workers. The surveys would suggest many opportunities to entrepreneurs to invest and engage in economic activities, which, combined with expenditures by governments for their part in the scheme, would go a long way to tide us over the demobilization period and back to peacetime activities. In fact if the last post-war period, roughly 1920–28, can be taken as a criterion, it is quite possible as one critic of the plan has suggested, that purchases may need to be scheduled to prevent a chaos in demand which might well cripple what would otherwise be a fairly long period of prosperity. The change-over then would be effected by planning and operational activities by (1) governments, (2) private enterprisers, and (3) by cooperation of these two. The necessary purchasing power would come from the production activities of private enterprise, the savings of both consumers and entrepreneurs, and necessary borrowing by government whenever the tax load became too heavy to be borne by existing production.

A large field of activity that calls for special study and action is our housing. In terms of new housing equipment such as insulation, light, heat, and plumbing, probably 25 percent of the country's residential property could well be replaced. In terms of better protection against blitz war tactics, probably 50 percent of all buildings should either be reinforced or replaced over the next 25 years. The housing needs, indicated above, plus new houses for our increased population, and new furniture and furnishings together would provide nearly all the jobs necessary to demobilized men and women.

This is a tremendous job. By starting with the small unit suggested, it becomes a possible job. A small group of intelligent people can formulate the questionnaires and work out the sampling method which will yield the necessary information. For example, the real-estate member of the Commission could map the town or other area by rent rates. From this, using family budget studies, income classes could be developed and then a sample struck off in the proportion that each class of rent payers or home values are to the total and in the number necessary which when surveyed would yield a result close enough to what is true for the area as a whole. Where possible the Commissions could call on market consultants or research men to draft comprehensive questionnaires and in the wording of which the psychological rules for objective results would be closely followed.[4] These in combination with good sampling would yield a mass of information now more often guessed at, which should have considerable value to businessmen. If it seemed desirable to create prosperity for years by scheduling consumer order, this information would seem to be invaluable for the first schedules to be drafted.

The field work could perhaps be done by members of local civil-defense organizations. These already exist in nearly every town or county. While they are, for the most part, properly concerned with the impact of war, the community war-services division could add this task to their present activities. Since it would be done only once, it would hardly encroach on what are regarded as war activities sufficiently to hurt them. The compilation by counties and States could be done by present employees of these public organizations. They need merely competent directions. Later the educational work could be arranged for through experts from educational commissioner's and advertising offices. The educators could draft the syllabus and the advertising experts could make the application of the material to secure the best results from space used in mass media.

It is a big, manifold job to return to peacetime conditions. Therefore, in my opinion, we must start now so that a year from now we will know what to do and who is to do it and have plans which can be put into effect as the situation requires. In this way, it would seem, return to peace-time conditions might be effected reasonably promptly and successfully.

Many other acts would probably need to be done to preserve prosperity for a long period. Some of this long-time, overall planning will have to do with the prevention of inflation. This will make necessary some control of prices and incomes. Some price ceilings and high taxation will need to be continued by the Federal Government. Control of prices will be especially necessary in the durable-goods industries which will need to go through the slow process of reconversion back to peacetime production. With these activities private enterprisers would necessarily cooperate for complete success.

The Federal Government will also need to turn back military personnel slowly to peacetime activities; it will need to continue some war output; maintain a comparatively large military force; and for several years aid stricken countries through some control of exports and imports and by the offer of technical assistance to enable the people of those countries to become productive again.

Even if the Government adopts a plan of "industry job quotas" the surveys will be desirable, if not necessary, for the proper working of such a plan so that goods are produced, which later will not need to be "plowed under." Similar surveys, adapted to conditions, will also need to be made in those areas which we propose to restore to economic health. It could even be suggested that our neighbors to the south, in the interests of the good-neighbor policy, make such surveys. It would help them to return to peace economies, establish a basis on which to build a good reciprocal trade foundation, lead to increased trade

[1] My concern is with a healthy national state. Without such it would seem we cannot have healthy relations between nations. The two types of effort, however, could proceed in their development at the same time.

[2] This is a tentative proposal. In many countries this might make an unwieldy commission. In that case, such county commissions could consist of appointees indicated by proper county authorities.

[3] Such as National Resources Planning Board and their proposals; Committee for Economic Development, and the organizations proposed in S. Res. 102 and S. 846, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session. One might also note another proposal of planning from the ground up in the report, entitled "What To Do Today," of the Massachusetts Committee on Post-War Readjustment made public March 22, 1943.

[4] As indicated, for example, in Chapters III and IV, "The Technique of Marketing Research," McGraw-Hill Book Co.

between us, and, to that extent, play a significant part in the restoration of healthy world trade.[5]

Post-war planning commissions established as above could be used to some extent in effecting the other long-run acts as these are developed and proved by active trial under social laboratory conditions to be effective.

I suggested that mayors and commissioners establish such a commission for their cities and they should urge their county and State confreres to do likewise. Readers could help this along by prodding officials to take action.

[5] Eric A. Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, has announced the formation of the United States Inter-American Development Commission to start a study of post-war business opportunities in South America. New York World Telegram, seventh sports edition, p. 17, March 22, 1943.

Commission to Represent Sports During the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LA VERN R. DILWEG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1943

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the results of a recent telegraphic poll conducted by Esquire magazine on the proposal that a three-man commission be appointed to represent sports during the war. I heartily agree with the common trend in the telegrams that financial interest in any one sport and politics should disqualify any member of the commission:

RICE, GRIFFITH, AND LANDIS WIN IN VOTE ON BOARD—ESQUIRE POLL OF SPORTSMEN RATES THEM BEST FOR NEW COMMITTEE

As a result of the Nation-wide enthusiasm created by the address of Representative LA VERN R. DILWEG, of Wisconsin, in Congress last Tuesday in which he proposed that a three-man committee be appointed to supervise American sports during the war, Esquire magazine immediately conducted a special telegraphic poll of the leading sportsmen, sports editors, and sportscasters of the Nation to determine their choices for such a national governing body of sports.

Previously in the February issue of Esquire, the results of a poll on whether such a committee should be appointed drew a favorable response from 68.49 percent of the public. Out of the 153 leading sportsmen who were nominated for the proposed new board, the three leaders were Grantland Rice, Maj. John L. Griffith, and Judge Kenesaw M. Landis. The final tally found Rice's name on 26.69 percent of all the ballots, followed by Major Griffith on 18.15 percent of them, and Judge Landis close behind with his name proposed on 17.08 of the telegrams.

Close up in the race were Elmer Layden, Herbert Bayard Swope, the Honorable James A. Farley, Branch Rickey, Senator James Mead, John Kieran, Ford Frick, John B. Kelly, Clark Griffith, Bill Stern, and Bill Corum. Another fairly clear-cut division brought into the picture the names of: Babe Ruth, Jack Dempsey, Larry MacPhail, J. G. Taylor Spink, A. A. Stagg, Connie Mack, Prof. Philip O. Badger, Congressman Dilweg, Frank G. Menke, Arch Ward, Fritz Crisler, Judge W. B. Branham, Bob Zuppke, Representative Samuel Weiss, Jimmy Walker, Ted Husing, Clark Shaughnessy, Asa Bushnell, Dan Ferris, President "Curly" Byrd of the University of Maryland, Jimmy Conzelman, Gene Tunney, and Joe Williams.

Herbert Bayard Swope suggested: "I think Grantland Rice should be one because of his experience, his understanding, and his character." Lawrence Whiting spoke for Major Griffith along with so many others. Commodore Sheldon Clark, himself a choice of many, voted for Judge Landis, Elmer Layden, and Avery Brundage. Merrill C. Meigs suggested Bernard Gimbel, Grant Rice, and Ed Cochran.

Response of the sports leaders to the idea was most enthusiastic and favorable. One common trend in the telegrams, however, was to keep politics out of it. Harry Keck, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, urged: "Keep off all men who have financial interest in any one sport or job in it." Robert M. Feldman, radio station WMAS, Springfield, Mass., demanded: "No politicians, please." J. H. Samuel, Augusta Herald, said: "Keep politics out." Max Kase, New York Journal-American, nominated Curley Byrd, president of the University of Maryland; James Walker, ex-mayor of New York City, and Harold Vanderbilt, yachtsman. "My choices," he said, "are disinterested yet sports-minded parties familiar with college, professional, and amateur sports."

George Sutherland, WFCI, Pawtucket, R. I., said: "No one now in political office should be named." Gordon Gilmore, St. Paul Dispatch, said: "The national sports committee must be comprised of men who put the war effort above the sports-as-usual sports apologists who have shouted about 'morale building value.' As a fair-minded committee which could see through the smoke screens and put national welfare first, how's this: Branch Rickey, to represent professional sports; Doug Mills, of Illinois, to represent college sports, and Damon Runyon, who knows the sports picture thoroughly."

Gene Kessler, Chicago Times, telegraphed: "My choices would be: K. M. Landis to represent baseball. He is unquestionably qualified to advance best interests of national game honestly and efficiently. James Farley, who proved an able and honest boxing commissioner before serving the country as Postmaster General. Herbert Bayard Swope, who did an excellent job in obtaining war-relief funds from horse racing last year."

Robert E. Harlow, Press Association, New York, asked for men who "know that a man of their own breed can be a rascal and have courage enough to act against their own brother if necessary. I consider this important in a field in which the gang's-all-here angle needs reviewing."

Pete Lightner, Wichita Eagle, put in a plug for "Jimmy Conzelman, the Demosthenes of football, who would make a capable member of the sports commission, having wide experience both in the college and professional side." Dick Conners, Albany sportscaster, wished to "record one loud vote for J. G. Taylor Spink, publisher of baseball's bible, the Sporting News. Spink has more energy and ability than any three men in sports." Dale Stafford, Detroit Free Press, put first on his list Prof. Philip O. Badger, president of the N. C. A. A.

Bob Foote, Pasadena Star News, nominated "Capt. Charles W. Paddock of the Marine Corps, Will Cox of the Phillies, and Herbert Bayard Swope. Such a commission needs young blood. Paddock on the basis of his services should be represented; Cox for new showmanship ideas and Swope for conservative balance." Bob Wilson, Knoxville (Tenn.) News-Sentinel, spoke for Senator A. B. (Happy) CHANDLER. "Senator CHANDLER," he said, "is one of the best-informed men on sports in the country." Dick Freeman, Houston Chronicle, like "Branch Rickey, D. X. Bible, and Commander Tom Hamilton, with a sports writer replacing Hamilton if his naval duties prevented him from serving." Roscoe D. Bennett, Grand Rapids Press, favored "Lt. Comdr. Alden W. Thompson, physical training officer, Great Lakes." Daniel F. Mulvey, New Haven Register, entered the name of former Congressman James A. Shanley, of Connecticut, "a lawyer, teacher, and athlete." Budd Sweeney, WHKC, Columbus, Ohio, favored Dr. L. W. St. John, Ohio State athletic director. Floyd Olds, Omaha World-Herald, spoke for Col. Lawrence (Biff) Jones, graduate manager of athletics at West Point. "He certainly knows amateur sports from all angles," he said, "and being a military man also knows which sports fit into the war picture and which do not."

Curley Grieve, San Francisco Examiner, suggested "Al Masters, athletic director at Stanford University; Branch Rickey; and Bill Corum. Masters is a man of courage and wouldn't play politics. The dynamic Rickey would accomplish plenty." John O. Hjelle, Bismarck Tribune, didn't forget Sgt. Barney Ross. Bill Sutherland, KDKA, Pittsburgh, suggested Bing Crosby, Elmer Layden, and Ford Frick.

Jack Wade, Charlotte Observer wrote: "If feasible for men in service to serve on board my nominations would be Wallace Wade, Jack Dempsey, and Larry MacPhail, as they are three superior men with war effort at heart and yet sympathetic with sports and close to the picture."

Statement of Albert S. Goss, Master of the National Grange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1943

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of whether to increase production by raising prices to cover production costs or by paying subsidies to cover such costs is daily becoming more important. Shortly Congress will be called upon to make a series of decisions on this question. One of the best analyses on the antisubsidy side was presented to the Banking and Currency Committee by Albert S. Goss, master, the National Grange on Friday, May 28. It merits the careful study of every Member of the House and of the general public. It is generally agreed that either paying subsidies or raising prices is a choice of evils. So we should learn all we can of both sides of the question before reaching any final decision on something which may have such momentous consequences. I do not oppose all subsidies but I feel it is dangerous to carelessly or without congressional authorization to embark on any general system of subsidies.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF ALBERT S. GOSS, MASTER, THE NATIONAL GRANGE, ON H. R. 2725, BEFORE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, MAY 28, 1943

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2725, relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation, has four main

purposes. The first is to change the basis of taking inventories.

The second is to provide more funds.

The third is to extend the life of the Corporation.

The fourth is to provide for audit by the General Accounting Office.

We have no suggestion to make with reference to the method of taking inventories.

As to the life of the Corporation, we recognize that certain commitments have been provided by law for extending the life of the Steagall amendment to the post-war period as described in section 3 (a) of the bill; nevertheless, we doubt the wisdom of extending the life of the Corporation for more than 2 years. Congress can always extend it further whenever it desires to do so, and we believe it is best for Congress to look over the operations of any such emergency corporation, dealing in sums so vast, at least once in every 2 years to determine whether any changes in procedure are justified, and whether or not the life of the Corporation should be extended. If Congress determined not to extend its life, it is assumed that it would provide other means for meeting commitments made under its instructions.

The method provided for audit by the General Accounting Office is unusual, but we believe it may provide a practical means for meeting the difficulties encountered when an operating corporation is subject to audit by an agency established to audit governmental expenditures. We believe it worth a trial.

As to the increase of $1,000,000,000 in available funds, we have no way of determining the amount of money needed to carry on the buying, selling, or lending operations for which the Corporation was created. We assume that your committee will be guided by the estimates of the officers of the Corporation. We feel, however, that your committee should give very careful consideration to the purposes for which money may be used, and we wish to direct our remarks to this phase of the problem. We strongly suspect that it is the plan to use a substantial portion of these funds for the payment of subsidies or for financing direct loss transactions which are tantamount to subsidies, since they show a definite and certain unrecoverable loss known at the time the transaction is initiated. We believe there is grave danger in embarking on such a policy on a large scale, and that restrictions should be written into the bill preventing certain types of practices which we wish to discuss in greater detail.

There are two major issues at stake, both of which are so far-reaching that they vitally affect our war efforts and the maintenance of a stable economy. We refer to the production of food and the prevention of inflation. These questions are so interrelated that it is impossible to discuss one without the other. If either is more important than the other, we would say that the production of food should claim our first consideration, for first we must eat. However, we will not take the time of your committee to discuss the importance of food, for you know all about it. It is regrettable, however, that the general public does not realize the precarious food situation we face if we fail to pursue policies designed to encourage maximum production.

INFLATION

There are two distinct schools of thought with reference to the control of inflation. One school favors establishing price ceilings, enforced by fines and penalties. The other advocates making use of economic forces by increasing production of goods and controlling purchasing power. The former is based on an economy of scarcity and requires a huge army of enforcement agents. The latter is based on an economy of abundance and is largely self-enforcing. The former is bureaucracy at the height of its glory. The latter is a decentralized approach to a tough problem.

Before we consider methods for the control of inflation it would be well to consider the causes which bring it about. There are two chief causes of inflation. First is the pressure of surplus income upon an inadequate supply of consumer goods. Second is the loss of faith in the Government's ability to meet its obligations.

War Food Administrator Davis has given your committee some interesting figures on income and outgo through expenditures. A national income of $140,000,000,000, less estimated taxes of sixteen billions, leaves one hundred and twenty-four billions in spending power. At present values available consumer goods are estimated at eighty-two billions, leaving a gap of approximately forty-two billions. There are numerous estimates of how much of this will go into savings, running from fifteen to twenty-five billions. This leaves from seventeen to twenty-seven billion dollars of income in excess of consumer goods, all seeking an outlet.

Those following the first school of thought, including the administration, propose to erect a price-ceiling dam against this excess income, and thereby shut off the spending outlet. They reason that our economy was in fairly good balance on some given date, and they would freeze everything at that spot. They would thereby prevent any price rises to prevent inflation. This is fallacious reasoning, as all history has adequately demonstrated, for never have price ceilings prevented inflation over an extended period in the history of the world, although they have been tried hundreds of times.

The chief reason is that price ceilings ignore production costs and shut off the supply of goods. In war time, there are many items of cost which arise from war dislocation that cannot be controlled by any price-ceiling method. On the farm we send our experienced young men to war and replace them with young boys and old men. We can control the wages by wage ceilings, but the substitutes do only half as much work and our labor cost is doubled. There are hundreds of uncontrollable war dislocation costs which force up the costs of consumer goods. When these costs bump into the ceilings, production is strangled, and the inflationary gap is increased. By bungling price control methods we have already created a lot of unnecessary food shortages and driven a lot of items into black markets, where the consumer is trimmed up right. It is now proposed to use subsidies to meet these war dislocation costs, so that production will not be strangled.

We are opposed to the use of subsidies for such purposes because they will not work, for reasons which I shall set forth. We believe your committee should safeguard any money made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation against such dangerous use, and we will suggest how we believe this can be done. We are confident that there are practical ways to control inflation if we have the courage to use them, as we will expain.

First, however, we want to point out two or three more fallacies in the price control system as we have tried to operate it. There are more than 10,000 hamlets and crossroads in America, each with its own individual production and marketing characteristics. We go into the mountains of Montana, where costs are high, and we find miners and stockmen paying more for their food. The law of supply and demand has adjusted prices to costs. We go into the mountains of the Carolinas, where costs are low, and we find the people are paying low prices for their food. The law of supply and demand has again adjusted prices to costs. Both places are equally distant from the railroad. Under the Office of Price Administration they are forced into a common mold. It is an extreme example, but to a greater or less degree it is typical of what is attempted all over America. The production may not be large in an individual high-cost area, but in the aggregate it is enormous, and this production is largely curtailed or destroyed by rigid price ceilings. No system of subsidies can be devised to meet the tens of thousands of conditions which prevail, and the daily changes which are occurring by reason of dislocation costs.

We have pointed out the enormous inflationary gap we now face. These are not static figures. They will get progressively worse. Assuming that we could dam a $15,000,000,000 flood, we must not forget that it is accumulating; that it will be twenty billions by summer, twenty-five billions by fall, and forty or fifty billions a year from now. Holding it back by price ceilings and subsidies is a complete impossibility.

We should also mention that we have adopted a policy of adjusting wages to meet living costs. Actually wages have gone up approximately three and one-half times as fast as living costs. These conditions are mentioned merely to point out the complete unworkability of a price-ceiling system which which you are now asked to bolster up by vast sums taken out of the Federal Treasury.

Now, to enumerate some of the reasons why we oppose subsidies and believe safeguards should be provided against their use:

1. They are inflationary and will defeat the purpose sought to be accomplished.

(a) Subsidies are paid from Federal funds which must be borrowed. About 80 percent is borrowed from banks and directly increase the surplus income to the extent of such borrowing, thus increasing the inflationary gap.

(b) Nothing will cause a greater loss of confidence in the financial soundness of our Government than to follow a policy of unwillingness to pay our bills as we go, as far as we can. In the days of our greatest national income, if America refuses to pay its food bill, but passes it on to future generations, it is clear that we are deliberately pursuing a policy that leads straight to bankruptcy. Every thinking person knows that such a policy long continued must result in a financial crash. The symptoms of loss of public confidence are all too plain in the statistics of bond-selling campaigns among individuals.

2. Subsidies in lieu of fair prices will lead to post-war chaos. The goal of the present policy is to maintain a rigid price ceiling with the use of subsidies to meet the ever-increasing dislocation costs of production. As the war progresses, we will find it necessary to increase the subsidies and our price structure will become more unbalanced day by day. If we are to avoid bankruptcy, when the war is over we must balance our budget. When that day comes, subsidies will be the first thing to be cut off. Then one of two things will happen. Either farmers will have to get higher prices to meet their costs, or quit producing.

If we do not have the moral or political courage to pay the cost of our food bill during these days of billions of dollars of excess income and full employment, what chance would there be to raise food prices when men come back from the Army hunting jobs and income starts down?

The answer is none whatever, and the result will be farm bankruptcy and chaos worse than that following the last war, which was, at least, not complicated by subsidies.

3. Subsidies pass on to future generations costs which this generation should bear. It is almost axiomatic that we cannot fight a world war and raise our standards of living at the same time. But that is exactly what we are trying to do. How many of us are worse off financially than before the war started? For most of us our incomes have gone up far faster than our outgo, and we know very well that somebody has got to pay for the enormous destruction going on.

instead of facing the facts and paying the necessary increased living and operation costs, (and you will note I am omitting actual war costs) we are insisting on passing these costs on to future generations, and are trying to live better today than ever. It is time we faced the facts. Would not the boys who are making the sacrifices and fighting the war be justified in saying: "We have shed our blood and done so almost without pay, while you at home have prospered financially. Out of your earnings you have refused to pay your food bill. We will not pay it for you." If there is anything which would invite repudiation, it is a subsidy program such as is proposed.

4. Subsidies lead to the dangerous doctrine of expecting the State to support its people. There was never a time when it was more necessary for the people to support the State than today; but seldom if ever have more people been willing to dodge the responsibility and let the State support them by straining its credit to the danger point.

5. Subsidies lead to political control, and when once used, they are politicaly almost impossible to get rid of.

There are many reasons why subsidies are dangerous and should be avoided, but we will not encroach further on your time to enumerate them. If there were no better way, one might be excused for advocating subsidies, but there is a way which will work.

The only way inflation has ever been cured is to bring supply and demand into balance. Where countries have been too weak to face the issue, and have tried a lot of expedients, to hold the support of the voters, economic law has eventually stepped in and solved the problem by reducing the purchasing power of money until there was little spending power left, and the supply then caught up with the demand. That is inflation. Inflation means making money so cheap it will not buy anything. It can be prevented by three or four constructive steps.

First, encourage the production of needed goods. There never was inflation where there was an abundant supply. Aside from the weather, three major factors control farm production.

(a) An ample supply of labor.
(b) Adequate machinery and supplies.
(c) A compensatory price.

You are concerned chiefly with price. The price must be sufficient to secure as much production as can be reasonably expected. If it is too low to attain this end, a support price may be necessary. It may be pertinent to point out the difference between a support price and a subsidy.

Years ago we found out that unlimited competition often destroyed supply. We prohibited railroads from cutting rates to destructive levels. We set up control for minimum premiums for insurance companies. In other words, we set floors designed to prevent prices falling below cost in order to protect certain essential services from destruction. This was no subsidy. There was no element of gift in it. It was merely protection against a destructive practice.

When floors are placed under farm prices to prevent them going so low as to destroy production, the same principle is employed. This is a very different practice from paying out cash in order to hold prices down to the consumer. Usually a support price requires little expenditure. Its purpose is to bring prices into a reasonable economic balance or relationship. The very fact that the money is available frequently stabilizes the market at an equitable level. Even when it becomes necessary actually to buy the commodity, the market usually adjusts itself, so that when the commodity is sold, no loss ensues. The purpose of a support price is to aid in bringing about a reasonable price relationship which may have been upset by unusual circumstances or some emergency. A support price does not develop an unbalanced price structure such as would lead to chaotic conditions following a subsidy program. When a support price is used in connection with a ceiling which holds the normal market down, and thereby makes the support price necessary, or when a support price is used to buy a commodity and sell it for less than the cost, such a support becomes a subsidy and takes on all the dangerous characteristics of a cash subsidy. That is a practice which has been employed by the Commodity Credit Corporation and one which should be prohibited by law. If there are some commodities where such a policy is justified by reason of special or unusual circumstances, Congress should be authorized to define or determine those circumstances, and not someone who might want to use the subsidy to bolster up an unsound price-control experiment, or possibly for political purposes.

A support price which is necessary to secure production and which is not used in connection with a ceiling or other device in lieu of a fair price is sound.

If, after all reasonable steps have been taken to encourage production, and the supply will still not meet the demand, then the remedy is to adjust the demand to fit the supply. This can be done in two ways.

1. By syphoning off surplus income. Some of the surplus income would be already syphoned off by paying the cost of producing the food and other commodities people demand. The balance should be reached through taxation and forced savings. The savings should be such that the money stays saved until the war and the inflationary aftermath are over. Leaky savings merely serve to fool ourselves.

2. By rationing, so that all may share equitably in the limited supply. Rationing which fails to cut the demand to fit the supply defeats its purpose. It is possible to ration so as to have a surplus and thereby largely control price. Thus economic law takes the place of an intricate system of price controls, margins, grades, and differentials, and about 90 percent of the regulatory work of a price-control administration could be dispensed with.

Your problem is how to use the Commodity Credit Corporation to bring out the maximum production of food, avoid inflation, and prevent abuse. Before making specific recommendations, we wish to point out that the Price Control Act of October 2 already points the way in large measure, if its mandates were strictly followed:

When the first price-control act was passed, early in 1942, a provision was included permitting the use of subsidies. After it had been in operation some months it became apparent that it was the intent of the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration to use subsidies in lieu of a fair price. Believing this to be a dangerously inflationary practice, the Grange filed a brief with the Banking and Currency Committee of the House when the second price-control act was under consideration and called attention to the danger. We said:

"Subsidies are not mentioned in the President's message. Subsidies are not mentioned in the bill, but all the powers are there for their use if the President so decides. Congress should not pass by such a vital issue without an understanding on it. We believe Congress should set forth the policy of meeting the costs of war dislocations now, by assuring enough flexibility in ceilings to meet these unavoidable costs.

"We recommend that this principle be written into the measure itself by adding the following words after the word 'President' in the second sentence: 'Shall adjust prices where necessary to maintain adequate production goals and.'"

We presented a number of reasons why subsidies should be avoided. Congress adopted the principle we suggested when it included the following limited proviso after setting up the September 15 price level as a base:

"*Provided further*, That modification shall be made in maximum prices established for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, under regulations to be prescribed by the President, in any case where it appears that modification is necessary to increase the production of such commodity for war purposes, etc."

We felt this was a clear mandate to adjust price ceilings where necessary to obtain production, but various kinds of subsidies have been used in spite of this mandate. We therefore believe that the intent and purpose should be so clearly set forth in the pending measure that no confusion should exist and no money would be available if the intent of Congress is ignored.

First, we have an impossible situation where the Office of Price Administration can slap on a price ceiling which will strangle production, or can let buying power run wild with no adequate rationing system to hold it in check, and the Administrator of the War Food Administration has no authority to adjust the price or influence the distribution. The War Food Administrator should have the complete control of all governmental functions connected with the production and distribution of food, including the regulation of price ceilings and rationing. It may not lie within the province of your committee to provide for this necessary reorganization, but you can provide that—

1. The War Food Administrator shall have the right of veto of any maximum price placed on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity.

2. No funds shall be used to make loans on or to purchase any commodity for the purpose of supporting the price thereon if at the time of purchase any maximum price is maintained on such commodity lower than such support price, or if at the time of purchase, it is contemplated to resell the commodity at less than the purchase price, except as shall be specifically authorized by Congress as to each individual commodity for which exception is made; provided that in the case of any commodity which is used for more than one purpose, the prices may be so adjusted with respect to the different uses for which such commodity is sold that the total returns shall be not less than such support price.

3. Except as normal market conditions justify, no maximum price shall be placed on any commodity below the support price so long as the Commodity Credit Corporation shall hold any such commodity either under loan or through purchase, it being the intent and purpose to avoid the use of public funds to prevent agricultural commodity prices from seeking a level necessary to secure adequate production for war purposes.

4. No direct or indirect subsidy shall be paid to any producer, processor, or distributor of any agricultural commodity upon which any maximum price is in effect, except as may be expressly authorized by Congress. It is recognized that commitments may have been made and purchase or marketing plans may now be in operation which cannot be immediately adjusted to such a program without causing costly disruption and loss. It is, therefore, suggested that an exception be granted as follows:

5. Exclusive of losses on commodities in respect to which mandatory loans are applicable, the War Food Administrator may enter into such commitments not in violation of the purpose of subsection 3 as in his judgment are necessary to secure production

of needed commodities for war purposes; provided that the total estimated losses under such commitments shall not exceed $100,000,000. A detailed report on all transactions under this subsection shall be made to the Congress semiannually.

Admittedly the $100,000,000 named above is a random shot. We believe the committee should find out the extent of the need and adjust the amount accordingly.

Believing as we do that any subsidy program will not attain the goal of maximum production, and will lead directly to inflation, we urge your committee to guard carefully against a mistake which may have tremendously serious consequences.

Incentive Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in a speech in the House on December 15, last, I attempted to summarize my own position as to the general path along which the solution of our country's problems was to be found. Here is what I said on that occasion:

This war is being fought first to destroy the greatest threat to human liberty and decency, to the right of people to call their souls their own that the world has ever known. But like all periods of great suffering it has got to issue into a better and more hopeful world for all sorts and conditions of men. To believe that the onerous controls and executive governmental powers which this war has brought upon the people of America are going to be perpetuated is to deny the existence of every strong current of popular feeling in this Nation and to overlook what I judge to be the strongest passion of the overwhelming majority of the Congress. But to propose that as an alternative the people be told that they can no longer look for any sort of wise and constructive action from their Government to protect the weak and restrain the strong, to motivate full production and employment, to use its taxing and its monetary powers to assure producers—especially farmers—of a full market for their products—to say that none of these things will be done, but that we shall simply return after the war to a vacuous nirvana of normalcy, wherein the devil will again have license to take the hindmost in every economic race, that indeed is a gospel of despair.

There is another way—a golden mean, if you will. It is a way whereby both freedom and security can in reasonable degree be achieved in our country. It is to be distinguished from some aspects of the New Deal in that it will emphasize the motivation of full production and employment by dynamic measures, but will avoid the greatest possible extent measures which involve direction or control of the economic life of the people by Government agencies and bureaus. Its principal tasks will be monetary and fiscal ones, though it will never neglect for an hour the basic duty of any democratic government, which is to break the hold of irresponsible monopoly power over any aspect of the people's lives.

And so now I come to what I may call a sort of confession of my political faith. I believe that freedom and decent security for the people are not incompatible. I believe it is possible to find and apply with salutary effect the proper functions of government in the solution of economic problems without extending either governmental power over the people or causing them to become dependent upon paternalistic action by government. I believe the achievement and maintenance of a state of abundant production in peacetime is possible if it is based on a resolute maintenance of a proper balance between that production and a full, free flow of consumer buying power. The one rule that must never be departed from is this: Whenever the potential supply of needed goods and services exceeds the demand for them, then the demand should always be increased, and under no circumstances should the supply be artificially reduced.

Since that speech was delivered, my belief that both freedom and security are possible for the people of this Nation if we but follow the proper course, has been strengthened. I believe that effective measures in the field of monetary and fiscal policy can give us both those great and fundamental desires and needs of mankind.

My views as to certain changes in the method by which the medium of exchange of the Nation comes into being will be quite familiar to the House and are set forth in my book, Out of Debt, Out of Danger. However, as I stated in that book, I fully realize that the proposals I set forth therein regarding the monetary system are not in themselves a complete answer to the problems which we shall face. Something more is required, namely, a method of assuring the dynamic use of funds by all those who hold them in the United States. I believe a significant and profoundly important contribution to bringing this about has been made by Mr. C. William Hazelett, of New York City.

Mr. Hazelett has made several statements before committees of the Congress and has recently written a book entitled, "Dynamic Capitalism," in which he sets forth his proposal for incentive taxation.

In the parable of the talents, it will be remembered that Christ taught that whereas the two men who had put their talents to constructive and productive use received them back twofold, the man who had buried his talent lost even what he had buried. Incentive taxation as developed by Mr. Hazelett is based upon exactly that same principle. Were this tax system in effect, the hoarder and the spendthrift would pay heavily, and the man who put his money to work so as to create employment and bring about production would be taxed correspondingly less. The arch economic crime of a free society consists in holding the medium of exchange out of use. For such action can, if indulged in by most people, deprive millions of our fellow citizens of an opportunity to work. Incentive taxation says in effect that we can achieve full production, decent security, and also economic liberty, by simply requiring all citizens to pay for the privilege of refusing to put their money to constructive work.

I shall not go into further detail myself, but I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks herewith statement by Mr. Hazelett to the Senate Finance Committee on August 5, 1942, which is a brief résumé of the point of view which he more fully develops in his recent book:

STATEMENT OF M. WM. HAZELETT TO SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE AUGUST 5, 1942

I shall not mention your problems. You know them. I shall discuss the answers. You have a 320-page and the most complicated and controversial tax bill in history. It will bring no fraction of the revenue really required. It will penalize and therefore restrict production, which will determine the outcome of the war. Many hardship provisions must be added to further complicate it. I feel sure that you will consider a 1-page tax bill, which can bring all the revenue that can be collected, which will stimulate instead of restrict production and which will be acceptable to your constituents as entirely just.

After a brief study of incentive taxation in 1938 before a subcommittee of this committee, under the chairmanship of Senator Herring, and a resolution of Senator VANDENBERG "reasonable experimentation with incentive taxation" was recommended. The possibilities of this under present conditions are so astounding that I request the committee's study of the 1-page tax proposal which I have submitted, as a solution of practically all of your fiscal problems.

The first proposal is not a revenue device but one which results in the maximum revenue to collect and other Government financing. It is a tax device to compel the prompt use of money in the purchase of Government bonds, the production of munitions, the prompt payment of taxes, etc. The second is an all-out sales tax without the regressive and complicated features of the ordinary sales tax, and a form of tax which can absorb every other form of taxation except of the windfall type.

Referring to the nonrevenue "A" tax on the sheet before you, we determine the promptness of money use by the following mechanism.

A—NONREVENUE INCENTIVE TAX

All individuals and corporations having average cash balances in excess of $300 shall pay 2 percent of said balance for each turnover less than 8. (If turn-over exceeds 8, this tax is 0).

Turn-over calculation

(a) Average cash balance (monthly) during year.
(b) Total real disbursements during year.
(c) Turn-over rate (b) divided by (a).

Definitions

Cash is all United States money under control of the taxpayer on the 1st of each month, wherever located.

Real disbursements are all expenditures for the purchase of original issues of stocks, bonds (including Government), mortgages, the payment of taxes, dividends, debts, insurance premiums or benefits, for charity or the public welfare, for employment, for the purchase of any goods for consumption or any other payments on a direct course to provide employment.

Passing for the moment the purchase of consumer goods and services, which I shall discuss later, we note that this simple device offers a most powerful incentive at all times to everyone to buy bonds immediately with their wages, salaries, dividends, rents, royalties, or any other form of income, or to invest their income promptly in armament producing enterprises, or to pay taxes promptly, more frequently, or even in advance, to escape this tax. It will compel quick distribution of surpluses either in wages or dividends or immediate plant expansion. It would bring out the hoarded billions in currency and the billions of idle or slow-moving bank deposits to finance the

war, instead of the Government being obliged to create billions in new money to replace this idle capital. In this war, private financing for production is only 20 percent of the total. In the last war it was 80 percent. Obviously, if private money of either individuals or corporations is invested to produce armament or to buy bonds, the Government requires less in current taxes.

To sum up: By this, the A phase of incentive taxation, we could sell bonds without effort, compel private money into war production, stop Government borrowing from the banks, impel the payment of taxes frequently and as promptly as desired, plus far more important benefits to be discussed later. This is a conscription of money to back our conscripted men.

Since the idle money tax continually pushes a corporation's gross income, which includes its net income, its capital gains, its surplus, and its excess profits into the pay of the employees, dividends of stockholders, taxes, or Government bonds, all except the latter two items promptly become individual cash income. (For those who fear the corporations financial stability, please note that the employees and stockholders must also promptly and continually use their money to purchase the products of the corporations or buy their securities, thus promptly returning the money to the corporation, something the undistributed-profits tax failed to require.)

With a sound individual tax we can proceed in time to the total absorption of corporate taxes at this point. Since a corporation enjoys no income, time shows that there is no sound corporate income tax, and the endless attempts to make them just and workable attest this fact. Individuals do enjoy real income in their living standards, and there can be no more and no less economic income than the living standards of the individual. Since all corporate income would become individual cash income, we would not lose any revenue whatever if the individual tax is properly levied and our corporation executives could go back to their real task of producing planes, tanks, and ships.

The B phase of Incentive Taxation proposes such an individual tax and was also a subject of study by the subcommittee. It is similar in principle to the spending tax proposed by Ogden Mills. It has been substantially improved by a checking device recently developed by Professor Irving Fisher and the novel part of a book by him, now on the press.

B—REVENUE PHASE OF INCENTIVE TAXATION

Income for individual tax purposes is defined as all money expended by the taxpayer for his living standards and is determined by difference as follows:

1. Add all cash receipts to initial cash balance. (The maximum possible living standard expenditures.)

2. Deduct from 1 all money not used for the comfort or the enjoyment of the taxpayer and his family, which includes all money actually paid out for investments for profit, business expenses, interest, taxes, insurance premiums, contributions, and medical care and taxpayer's final cash balance.

3. The remainder will represent taxpayer's entire living standard expenditures for the period—his spendings income.

4. From 3 subtract personal exemption, credits for dependents, and earned income credit as at present, giving the taxable income.

Calculation of tax. Rate for first $1,000 15 percent increasing at the rate of 1 percent for each additional $1,000.

This simple form of taxation has the following extraordinary advantages:

As before mentioned, since all corporate cash income proceeds to individuals, it can all be subject to tax on the individual.

Having granted the taxpayer an exemption and credit for dependents on a subsistence level, it is possible for government in war to take any fraction of every dollar the individual may have to spend without producing destitution. The maximum possible revenue may be collected.

The widows' mite is protected by the personal exemption; the tax is not regressive.

This tax is an all-inclusive sales tax which includes not only all purchases of commodities but all services as well, such as domestic services, travel, etc.

It would be a universal sales tax collected by the existing income-tax machinery instead of a levy on hundreds of millions of transactions to be recorded and checked.

The taxpayer levies every dollar of his own taxes. No man can fairly complain of paying more than another if he lives better. No goose can conveniently squawk when plucking his own feathers.

By graduating the rates steeply in wartimes, we have, to any desired degree, a luxury tax. The higher the living standard, the higher the degree of luxury, and the higher the tax rate.

By having all rates high, we ration and control spending in wartime and can divert as much of the national income to armament as we like.

We tax the only true excess profits, i. e., excess living standards at as high a rate as desired.

We solve the question of tax-exempt securities by not taxing the income therefrom but only taxing spendings, whatever the source.

All excise taxes, unless considered as fines, are automatically in living standard expenditures and could be eventually absorbed therein.

All social security taxes come out of present living standards to provide future ones and should be absorbed in the same manner.

High consumption taxes would cause self-denial in war and the purchase of Government issues at even nominal interest rather than the payment of an excessive consumption tax.

For the first time in income-tax history, there would be no question about ability to pay either the A or B tax. If a man has $10,000 of idle money, there is no question about his having the money to pay any fraction of that in taxation. If we grant an exemption preventing destitution, anyone who has $1,000 to spend on himself above that amount can pay anything up to $999 in taxes for the privilege of spending the other dollar.

Like all consumer sales taxes, it cannot be passed to others and does not pyramid and result in price inflation.

The living expenditure tax is anti-inflationary in proportion to its rates, since it can siphon off any amount of purchasing power desired.

It only taxes capital gains if used in the taxpayer's living standard, wiping out the at times unjust and highly repressive nature of this tax.

It eliminates the necessity of calculating business income with all the problems of depreciation, etc., merely taxing cash income from business when spent on living standards.

In short, it is a tax which can absorb all other taxes except inheritance taxes and one which meets the basic requirements of any sound tax, namely, ability to pay, simplicity, and justice.

Up to this point and because of the question of constitutionality, I have not mentioned the only incentive tax item required to make the living expenditure tax a complete living standards tax. The latter has far-reaching possibilities, in addition to those above mentioned, and requires a slight modification by adding the real income to the taxpayer resulting from the use of property owned by him and not used for business purposes. Heretofore, this was only subject to local taxation.

If income in the sixteenth amendment were construed to mean the taxpayer's living standard—the only real income possible—we should make the following additions to the B incentive tax and as originally proposed:

To 1 add rental value of taxpayer's property not used for business purposes.

In 2 include as a deduction principal and interest payments on above property. (Payments not constituting living standards.)

Our revenue base would now include for practical purposes all items contributing to living standards, and we would have a single and all-comprehensive real income tax base for city, county, State, and Federal taxation. Each of the taxing jurisdictions could levy its own rate and on this base, and the entire tax could be collected by one authority, such as the State, and disbursed to the local and Federal authorities in proportion to their levy.

With such a system of taxation we require only to change the rate to vary the revenue. Federal taxation of property is justified since defense and many other services protect property, just as local government is justified in taxing living standards which it protects, for example, in food supply and which it now exacts as sales taxes.

With such a simple mechanism, we can solve our revenue problems, eliminate practically all other forms of taxation, resolve the question of federal versus local taxation with such simplicity and justice as to command rather than destroy the loyalty of the taxpayer.

CONTROL OF INFLATION

Since our living-standard base includes all consumer prices, rents, etc., we can regulate the general price level by merely varying the rates. We must first select the most suitable cost of living as our normal price level, then add to "B."

The Federal living-standard tax rate shall be uniformly raised from that required for revenue to absorb all increase in national income due to increase in the normal price level.

In other words, if the price level increases 1 percent in a month and national income has increased 1 percent in the same period, we absorb the entire 1-percent increase in income by raising the rate the required amount. The result is to take all surplus purchasing power out of the system which causes price rises. This money received in taxes should be used to retire bank debt, the principal cause of inflation, and thus get rid of the legal counterfeit which has been "primed" into the system. This will stop present and prevent future inflation.

We merely need to circulate the remaining money as rapidly as we did in prosperous times to provide full production at the selected price level.

We now have the ridiculous spectacle of the Treasury creating billions of new dollars by bank borrowing, which everyone knows is inflationary, and another Government organization, the Office of Price Administration, trying heroically to stop it.

Government war debt is merely the price the people charge the people for protecting the people, and rising prices simply mean that the people are charging the people more money.

It is now worth while to consider how high turn-over rates of money help to solve all sorts of monetary problems, including Government financing by either the sale of bonds or by taxation, the payment of debt and finally and most important, the problem of full employment after the war.

We have at the moment some five billions in idle money in the form of hoarded currency and, in addition, many billions of idle or very slow moving bank deposits. Let us

assume that, to escape the idle-money tax, five billions of this total are used this week to buy War bonds at a very low interest rate. Assume also that Government now pays this money for armament back to the public the following week. The public now has as much money as at first, and it is no hardship whatever for it to promptly buy another five billions in bonds with this same money since it was not being used and because it would be again subject to tax if not used. If we could repeat this cycle say every 18 days, we could sell $100,000,000 worth of bonds in 1 year, pay for one hundred billions in armament and at the end of the year, the public would have just as much money as at the beginning and only five billions in money which had been idle would be used in the entire transaction, and the interest rate could be nominal.

Let us assume that, instead of borrowing from the public, we levy an extra five billion in taxes next week. By compelling the idle money to be used, it would be available to pay taxes immediately. The Government now pays out the five billions pomptly as before, and the public has once again the same amount of money as before taxes. Repeating this cycle every 18 days, we could levy one hundred billions in extra taxes and immediately pay another five billion and only use five billions of now useless money in the entire transaction. We could balance the Budget any time by such a policy, stop bank borrowing, get rid of the interest burden and avoid ultimate repudiation of our debts.

In paying off Government debt already incurred, the same conditions apply. After the war, we can continue to levy the one hundred billions in extra taxes by the repeated use of five billions in surplus money. There is no question whatever of ability to pay, and we could retire the debt at a tremendous rate. The turn-over rates I have suggested are obviously high, but they could be achieved.

Thus the whole problem of Government finance depends upon the rapid turn-over of money.

When paying off Government debt, the living standard tax is vital as a matter of just distribution of the burden. The person who would receive large amounts of cash by the redemption of his bonds must promptly use this money to employ men, bringing up their living standards. If it is used for his personal living standard on a large scale, he is heavily taxed. If he invests it to raise the living standards of others, these latter pay the tax. We thus maintain employment and at the same time distribute the tax burden on those who receive the benefits in their living standards.

The value of defense to anyone is the protection Government gives to a man's life and how well he lives and that such protection is in no way related to his holdings of business property, or securities, which raise the living standards of others.

When Government debt is retired, for reasons I shall not mention now, graduated taxes should be abandoned.

We must not that no one can escape incentive taxation except by living on a subsistence level and putting his money to work to raise the living standards of others. During war he may escape by buying Government bonds or by investing in armament production by private enterprise, which in either case reduces the Government's need for current taxes.

Every use of his money thus results either in revenue or decreases the need for taxes, but no dollar that is idle produces any living standards, any revenue, or any guns.

Having discussed the effect of incentive taxation on war financing, debt payment and inflation control, all of these problems and solutions fade into utter insignificance when compared with the question of How can we promptly put twenty-five or thirty million people into peacetime production, "when the smoke blows away?"

No assumption but victory is tenable. To achieve that, we must have the greatest aggregation of armament in history, and to secure peace we must take most of the war equipment of the vanquished. We shall then have no need for further armament in years to come and with peace on the battlefields we shall have peace in the factories.

Many believe that pent-up demand produces employment. What are the facts? For 10 years we continued to build up more and more pent-up demand during the depression, and it never produced any employment. Poverty does not create prosperity.

We have so far instituted no successful device except war to provide employment. Many propose that Government shall put our people to work. It could not put 25,000,000 people to work without taking over the tools of private enterprise, for they would have nothing to work with. To do so is, of course, to adopt totalitarianism, which is what our people are working, sacrificing, and dying to destroy. I need not tell you that 25,000,000 people, of whom millions know how to shoot, will neither go on bread lines nor will they come to Washington to talk.

What is the answer? We now have and will have far more money in the hands of private enterprise than we had at our period of maximum employment and prosperity. Therefore, unemployment will not be due to lack of money but only to lack of prompt use of it.

Let us see how high money turn-over rates solve unemployment. Assume I have $5. I use it today to employ A. A uses it tomorrow to employ B. B uses it the next day to employ C, etc., for, say 300 turn-overs per annum. We would produce $1,500 worth of employment in a year with $5. Assume again that I employ A tomorrow with it. A holds it an extra day before employing B. B holds it an extra day before employing C, etc. We would then only have 150 turn-overs per annum and only $750 in wages paid, and these men would be out of work half the time. Assume on the other hand that I hold the money idle for the year; there is no employment whatever, and if A, B, or C, hold it, it stops all subsequent employment. We see that for any of us to hold money in idleness longer than we do when we have full employment, we have unemployment in direct proportion to the decreased turn-over rate of cash.

Since we have plenty of money, we only need to apply Incentive Taxation to A, B, and C, and everyone else having any substantial quantity of money to spend or invest it promptly in ways which result in employment, to solve this great problem. The money now turning over rapidly in the production of war material need only continue to turn over rapidly to produce the only thing there will be a market for, namely, peacetime goods. Whoever has the money must, in order to escape the idle money tax, promptly and continuously furnish the capital to produce goods or buy them.

Let us permit the people to plan the future. Let us permit them to select their own servants, those from whom they buy both goods and services, instead of the Government planning what they shall produce, which is what they can buy.

Let us permit the people to select their own masters. If they do not like to work for one man, the latter must find someone else to use his money to employ them. Thus they would select their own servants and their own masters, the foundation of freedom. Let us permit the citizen to levy his own taxes, which in that sense makes "every man a king." Let us stimulate and even compel private enterprise, the essence of democracy, the dynamic system which built the greatest nation on earth to plan and build our future by compelling it to continuously provide full employment by incentive taxation.

It was unemployment that produced Hitler. It was unemployment which weakened and disunited France, Britain, and the United States. Let us prevent the greatest of all disasters; civil war, which will come from great unemployment after this war. Let us show the rest of the world that we are fit to lead by solving our own problems. Let us offer our people a definite future worth fighting for and tell them not what we are going to do, but how we are going to do it. None of them can understand the proposed tax bill. All of them want a simple, a just tax bill. All of them want everyone else to furnish promptly capital to them or buy goods or services.

If we really want revenue with simplicity and justice, if we wish to take the restrictions off of production and place them on consumption, where they belong, I recommend for your consideration a "mercy-killing" of the proposed tax bill and the adoption of incentive taxation.

Address at I Am an American Day Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1943

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of the Honorable Louis Le Baron, associate justice of the Supreme Court of Hawaii, at I Am an American Day Ceremony, May 16, 1943, Honolulu, T. H.:

It is an honor and a privilege to welcome you all as Americans, especially you, who so recently in the presence of Almighty God have taken a solemn oath as a citizen of the United States of Ameria. Whenever the words "I am an American" are spoken, whether spoken by right of birth or adoption, they are fighting words of an exceedingly deep significance.

It is a fearful obligation to be an American—one fraught with grave responsibilities. Never before in the brief history of this Nation has there been a greater challenge in becoming an American than today. The forces of evil have already struck with a premeditated plan of destroying our people as a nation so that this world may be enslaved. Allegiance to the Nation, therefore, has an outstanding significance.

Today America is at open war with the principalities of this world which would destroy the human soul, and your American citizenship alines you on the side of the forces which are fighting to establish forever the divine right of the people to govern themselves in liberty and in justice. For this purpose the Constitution of the United States of America was framed in 1787 at Philadelphia.

The authors of our Constitution were determined to preserve the gains which the

freedom-loving peoples of the world had won by hundreds of years of bitter struggle.

They, therefore, were inspired to form a government where justice would be accorded to all men, and the blessings of liberty would be secured to themselves and their posterity. The Constitution thus established a government which would safeguard the liberties of the people, distributing the powers of government among three distinct and independent departments—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—devising as nearly as could be foreseen, a perfect system of checks and balances. The Constitution also recognized that the tyranny of the many may be just as oppressive as the despotism of the few. Consequently, the Bill of Rights was written into the Constitution as the first 10 amendments for the protection of the people in their inalienable rights as free individuals, fixing the boundaries beyond which the people themselves might not go in transgressing the freedom of others.

The clear purpose of government as expressed throughout the Constitution and its amendments is for the benefit of the people as individuals. It emphatically repudiates the Old World conception which regards people as slaves of the state and lays down a gauntlet which you have so gallantly taken up.

You newly adopted Americans have solemnly sworn to support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic, but every American, whether in uniform or not, has this responsibility in common. It does not mean merely to be law-abiding, which is important, nor to bear arms against the foe, which is very important and deserving of the highest honor, but, in my opinion, it means something a great deal more; in a larger sense it means that Americans must be steeled against evil, wherever it may be found, for evil directly demolishes freedom, and, with it, our way of life, and saps the potency of our fighting faith. Satanic forces, through the instrumentality of certain foreign nations, are determined to plunge the world into another darkened age where greed, murder, and filth will hold sway, and where might will prevail over right. But—America is fighting with the faith and zeal of her fathers to smash those malignant cohorts back into the dust of history where they belong, and, with the guidance and help of God, will triumph.

As an American, you individually have become a vital part of America's destiny to help redeem the people from the pollution by which our enemies hope to rule the world.

Therefore, whether by birthright or adoption, "I am an American," are truly fighting words, of an exceedingly deep significance.

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, when I learned of the sudden passing of our colleague, HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT, I was deeply grieved, for during his entire membership in the House, covering a period of 17 years, it was my pleasure and privilege to serve with him.

While we belonged to different political parties, the center aisle did not separate or divide our friendship. His personality was so charming that he naturally drew men unto him, and I had a deep and affectionate regard for him.

Only a day or so before his death, I walked with him from the Capitol to the House Office Building, and his fine optimistic spirit and genial personality did not reveal any indication of his illness. While I knew that he had not been very well for several years, he never complained and always radiated sunshine wherever he went.

He was an able and faithful legislator, and was on the floor of the House only the day before his passing.

His district and the Nation have sustained a severe loss, and I shall miss him and treasure forever my friendship and happy association with him. God bless his memory.

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the twenty-eighth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. In this installment of the Senator's speech he reviews the long record of financial booms and depressions resulting from the expansion and contraction of credit intensified by a deficiency in the volume of basic money, further demonstrating the principle of economic law that "the money unit to be stable in value must increase in volume evenly with the growth of population and commerce."

The kind of money described more recently in another way by a great President when he said:

The United States seeks the kind of a dollar in the near future that will have the same purchasing power and the same debt-paying power a generation hence. This same monetary objective was placed before the country by a national farm organization in a resolution presented to both the great political parties quoted here. Agriculture demands a monetary system providing an honest dollar—one just to the debtor and creditor alike, with constant purchasing power preventing uncontrolled inflation or the disastrous effects of deflation.

The twenty-eighth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

Our gold monometallists say, "If you give unlimited coinage to silver we shall have too much money in this country." I challenge any man, historian or doctrinaire, to show me any nation on this earth, in any age of the world, that has had more full weighted coins of silver and gold of standard fineness than were necessary for monetary purposes. No, sir; you may search the world over, and no nation, no people have ever had more coined gold and silver of full weight and fineness than they could use for monetary purposes. Such an instance cannot be found.

Talk about flooding the world with money today. Cast your eye over the world and behold it, and what do you find? Today all the money of the world, gold and silver, amounts to $5.82 per capita, with which to do the business of the entire world. In what condition is the world? Look at the national debts of foreign countries according to the census of 1890:

National debts of foreign countries	$26,633,016,811
Local debts of foreign countries	1,689,740,252
Total	28,322,757,063

This estimate includes 83 principal countries, 363 principal and a large number of other foreign cities, and all the departments of France.

Per capita debt of some nations: France, $116.35; Great Britain, $87.79; Russia, $30.79; Austria-Hungary, $72.42; Italy, $70.06; Belgium, $63.10; Netherlands, $95.56; Spain, $71.27; Canada, $47.51; New South Wales, $214.87; New Zealand, $298.01; Queensland, $333.46; South Australia, $321; Portugal, $134.11; while our own is only $14.24.

This vast debt does not include many hundreds of millions, even billions of debts on the part of corporations, minor government divisions, and individuals, on which the interest alone each year is from fifteen hundred to two thousand millions. Then consider the revenues of all the foreign governments collected for government purposes, amounting to billions annually. Then consider the billions needed in the billions of transactions between buyers and sellers of the world's productions, the necessaries and comforts of life, etc.; these aggregate amounts are almost beyond calculation. We have no statistics sufficient to enable any fair computation.

One ascertained amount may give some conception of the magnitude of these transactions. According to Mulhall, the value in the year 1888 of all the manufactures of textiles, hardware, clothing, beer and spirits, and leather in the world, amounted to $22,370,000,000, an immense product to be paid for by the consumers annually. All the full legal-tender gold and silver coins in the world, in every place, would have to be used three times simply for these products, not considering the purchase of the other articles.

Now, look at our own country, according to the census of 1890:

Debt of United States less cash in Treasury	$891,960,104
State debts less sinking fund	228,997,339
County debts less sinking fund	145,048,045
Municipal debts less sinking fund	724,463,060
School-district debts less sinking fund	36,701,948
Total	2,027,170,546

These are the debts upon which interest must be paid each year.

What are the annual receipts and expenditures of all our governmental machinery, National, State, Territorial, county or parish, municipal, and school districts? According to the most reliable data from the Census Office the expenditures are $1,000,000,000, which is rather below than above the amount; this is at least two-thirds of all our available money twice to be used. The annual interest on National, State, Territorial, county,

municipal, and school-district debts is about $1.50 per capita. These revenues or taxes paid at different periods require some hoarding and when paid in are not at once paid out.

Take our railroads in 1893. The funded debts of corporations, railways, street railways, telephone, telegraph, and other quasi-public corporations are over five thousand millions; the annual interest to be paid, which, with dividends on stock, rentals, etc., amounted to 1892 to $417,861,702. Operating expenses in 1892, $846,633,503.

There were paid by travelers and shippers to the railway and street-railway companies $306,972,023 for passenger fare and $898,299,623 for freight, etc.; total $1,205,272,023, nearly equal to all our circulating money.

Our census reports in regard to farm and home mortgages are not completed; when completed, they will show many hundreds of millions, and even billions of indebtedness. I have made no calculations from the census bulletins only in part issued. Mr. Frederick C. Waite, of this city, in a letter to the Senator from Colorado, Mr. Teller, printed as Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 25, says on page 2, $6,500,000,000. If these figures are correct, the annual interest charge cannot well be less than 8 percent, probably much more, amounting to $510,000,000, one-third at least of all our circulating money and nearly $8 per capita of all our people.

I hope the completed and final returns of the Eleventh Census may show these figures too high and above the actual indebtedness. We know this class of indebtedness is very large and by no means includes all the indebtedness of our people; the aggregate amount of which can never be ascertained with certainty.

Take the banking institutions, National, State, and private banks, loan and trust companies, and savings associations. According to the report of the Comptroller of the Currency for 1892, their aggregate loans were $4,346,263,221, and their aggregate deposits were $4,888,533,979. An indebtedness to the banks three times greater than our circulating money; and an indebtedness by the banks to their depositors over three times as much as our available circulating money.

The interest on loans to banks at 6 percent is over $260,000,000 annually. Then consider the amounts of all the sales of imported and domestic products to our people for consumption. Our whole internal commerce, traffic, exchanges, sales, and purchases, aggregate almost an incalculable sum.

It is impossible to ascertain the sum of all such sales and purchases. In the clearing houses in 58 principal cities, the exchanges in 1892 were $61,017,839,067, and only 8 percent in cash or currency used. Drafts drawn by national banks upon bankers at other places in 1892, $12,994,959,590.

These figures show the vastness of the transactions by banks alone and their many transfers of money from one point to another while using only about 10 percent in actual cash.

On September 15, 1892, the receipts by the national banks were $331,205,213, about one-fourth of all the available money in the country, of which 9.39 percent was cash, and 89.61 percent substitutes, checks, drafts, exchanges, etc.

It is argued that very little money is needed; that these substitutes answer all the purposes of money and are so much more convenient. They say, look at London, where only 2.77 percent of actual cash is used in the billions of dollars of transactions. Great exemplar.

Henry Carey Baird, in a letter entitled "Bank of France and French Finance," addressed to the Manufacturer and published in its issue of December 16, 1890, says:

"But we, in this country, have never in practice seen the bank-credit system run mad as it exists in England, and especially in London. For instance the London Economist of November 22 tabulates the statements of 11 joint-stock banks in London, June 30, 1890, so far as regards the 2 items of 'Liabilities to the public' and 'Cash on hand and at the Bank of England.' These liabilities were $848,000,000, while the cash, including that in the Bank of England, was but $87,000,000, or 10.3 cents of so-called cash for each $1 of liabilities, exclusive of those to the stockholders."

I have given some of the items in regard to the needs of money in the world and in this country simply for reflection, for consideration, to show what our pretended financial system is. It is not based on metallic money nor yet on paper. We have a wholly inadequate supply of all combined in the world, and more especially in this country. We base our system on confidence, trust, and faith. How easily shaken. And yet with our country in this condition, with this great demand for money, this absolute need for an increase of the metallic basis of our financial system, we are commanded to vote now for the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law and establish and leave in force the single gold standard of the law of February 12, 1873, striking down from further coinage the entire silver of the world, so far as our mints are concerned. Look back at our history and see what the system has been. One-half of the money of the world was stricken down. Jay Cooke's failure in 1873 destroyed confidence, and the deadly panic of 1873 crashed from one end of this land to the other.

Come up a little later. A New York snipe named Ward began banking cloaked in the name of our great military chieftain, General Grant. He became at once a financial oracle in Wall Street, ran his course, and fell, and our whole financial system was shaken and tottering almost to a panic. Why? Because confidence, faith, trust, were shaken.

In 1885 doctrinaire financiers conjured themselves into the dreamy belief that some ailment existed in our system, and looking around thought it the Bland silver law, began hoarding gold for a premium, etc.; almost a panic. So it has been every few years.

Our Democratic administration just coming in as now was in a panicky condition, and the Secretary of the Treasury went to New York and negotiated with those bankers to exchange $10,000,000 of fractional silver for $10,000,000 of gold, but the scare got over before they had to use it. President Cleveland came here pleading, and urging, and recommending the repeal of the Bland law because of the fearful consequences that would follow.

Coming on down, the Argentine Republic's financial structure, based on faith, hope, and charity, crumbled into ruins in 1890, entailing a loss of hundreds of millions in Great Britain, Germany, and elsewhere in Europe. The Baring Brothers, of model London, were driven to the wall. The world's financial structure moved and swayed to and fro and reeled on the brink of panic.

Seventy million dollars left our country then, and yet Congress was not called in session to repeal the Sherman law, for it was not in existence.

Now, let us go back to 1890 and see what it was. Just see the doctrinaires and financiers, the great business men in New York, how much they know about it and how they are affected by every little evening zephyr that comes along whispering this thing and that thing. New York. Wall Street in agitation. I will read the headlines:

"November 10, 1890: Notable shrinkage in values of all securities.

"November 11, 1890: Confusion and demoralization in stock markets.

"November 12, 1890: Enormous sales of stock on a seesawing market.

"November 14, 1890: Slowing recovering from effects of storm.

"November 15, 1890: Depressed by rumors. Wall Street agitated by reports from London. The Baring Brothers involved in recent troubles.

"November 16, 1890: Thrilling financial events on both sides of the ocean. France stays the tide of panic.

"November 17, 1890: Ten millions to lend. Clearing house to issue ten millions. Clearing-house certificates to support the weaker banks."

How much like the present; but the clearing house had to come to the rescue with $38,000,000 this time, instead of $10,000,000 then.

In May 1893, the banks of Melbourne, Australia, went to the wall with three hundred millions liabilities, to add to the panic over the Argentine collapse, scarcely dead, and to the effects of the Panama Canal collapse, Austria-Hungary in the market for gold, with gold bonds for sale.

Soon another collapse in Australia; five banks driven to the wall, with one hundred and twenty-five millions liabilities. Then our panic.

Why should it not come? It is just as sure as that the day or night shall succeed each other. I will not consume the time of the Senate in reading from a speech I delivered here in 1891 on the free coinage of silver and the increase of the currency. The very identical things were pointed out there and what would bring a panic, just precisely as it has occurred. I will ask to insert that in my remarks from page 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FAULKNER in the chair). If there be no objection the request of the Senator from Missouri will be granted. The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

" 'DISTRUST CAUSES BUSINESS DEPRESSION'

"This circular was issued in the interest of the gold monometallists of the country and is a protest against the recoinage of the standard silver dollar. It says:

" 'The rule has heretofore been almost invariably that money returned to the financial centers in November. Why is this year of 1890 an exception? The answer must be that distrust has caused hoarding, especially hoarding of gold.

" 'The hoarding of gold since the Silver Act of July 14 went into operation is clearly shown by the following figures.'

"Then the circular quotes the figures which it pretends are true and says:

" 'Therefore, the purpose of the silver men is defeated. They want inflation, but in fact produce severe contraction.'

"Now I quote from another circular. I quote from resolutions adopted by the Chicago Board of Trade January 7, 1891:

" 'That we deprecate any further legislation by Congress in regard to silver, believing that further agitation of the subject will be injurious to the business and commercial interests of the country and tend to retard'—

"What?—

" 'to retard the increasing confidence of the business world and the speedy return to a healthy state of affairs so much desired by Congress and the country.'

"You must not do anything to retard the growth of confidence. Confidence is the substratum of the financial system of the United States, and when you shake that the whole fabric totters, and we are told that we must not legislate here in the interest of the great masses of the people and to give a foundation to this financial structure for fear we shall destroy confidence.

"But, Mr. President, I want to quote another circular. This is from the circular of Henry Clews, a banker of New York. He says:

"'The hoarding of gold has largely come from the holders of the 4½-percent bonds, which mature next September. Under the Secretary's liberal offer to redeem the same, both principal and interest, they have obtained payment therefor and locked it up simply because the Government has issued money backed by a corresponding amount of silver, and they profess to be scared about the Government credit in connection therewith and make that as a pretext for hoarding.'

"In regard to the recent panic, I quote also from this same circular of Henry Clews:

"'It is apparent now, I think, that in taking a prospective estimate of the outlook it is necessary to note carefully the conditions of general business which preceded the panic. It is also important to keep in mind, that this panic differed from almost all its predecessors in the characteristic that it was a rich man's panic. It resembled more closely the panic of 1884 than any other historic parallel of this character, but I venture to predict that the recovery will be quicker and the restoration'—

"To what?—

"'to confidence more thorough than in the former instance, if all the signs of the times are not deceptive and misleading. The hardest blows fell this time where the material and the preparation for resistance were actually the strongest and not on the rank and file, as in former perturbations of this character.'"

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. Clews was so accurate in his description of the "rich man's panic" of 1890, that I will quote from his financial circular of September 9, 1893, in regard to the panic of 1893. He says:

"'The winter of our discontent has been made glorious summer' by the death knell of the panic, and now it is over it can be reviewed, and of all the panic that this country has ever had, it has been the silliest, as there was less cause for it than any previous one. It is not unlike the 'Bull Run' panic during the war period. From the day that memorable event occurred up to this date, I have never yet been able to find anybody who could give a reason for its occurrence, whether on the battlefield or off at the time. The same can be said of the recent financial panic. I venture to say that no one can now give a good and justifiable reason for it having occurred; for that reason it has been a 'Bull Run' panic. The whole country, in consequence, has had to go through a general liquidation of credits. In fact, it started as a gold panic; then came a silver panic, which was followed by a credit panic, and the climax was reached by a money panic. Now the corner has been turned, and building up takes the place of tearing down; the recuperation, I venture to say, will be more rapid than this country has ever experienced after any previous financial eruption."

Why, then, Mr. President, shall we not have more metallic money, silver money as well as gold, irredeemable, absolute money against which no reserve has to be kept; good wherever it goes, which is its own redeemer?

"All intelligent writers agree that where money is decreasing in amount, poverty and misery prevail

"But history proves indisputably that every increased influx of the precious metals into human intercourse, by new discoveries or the increased production of the mines, has always been accompanied by a decided amelioration of human necessities by the increase and diffusion of every means for a more humane existence of the masses, which we call the progress of civilization. The great prosperity of Europe which preceded the age of the Reformation followed in the wake of the great increase in the precious metals caused by the discovery of America. The immense development of modern trade by railroads, steamships, and telegraphs followed the tide of gold and silver with which California and Australia supplied the world."

Why withhold from our people these manifold blessings sure to follow an increase of our metallic money?

If we deny it, what follows? Only what the attempt to establish the gold standard has already caused in the past. The paper inflation dogma—greenbackism, populism—all these inflation ideas will prevail as they have in the past. They are the legitimate offspring of gold monometallism. They never existed in the United States when the grand old Democratic party controlled and guided the destinies of this country for over half a century and maintained the true bimetallic system. We never heard of a Greenback party nor of a Populist party nor of an increase of the currency party.

What will follow? Substitutes for metallic money must come in. Your bank checks, your drafts, your clearing-house certificates, your stock gambling, your financial bulls and bears, and panics, and crises, and revulsions and depressions of property and of prices, losses in the value of securities, and the depreciation of the prices of all the products of human labor. We see them almost every year. It is estimated now that the shrinkage in the value of stock on the stock market amounts to hundreds of millions of dollars. I saw one estimate given, I think in the New York World which estimated the depreciation of the selling price of stocks at over $500,000,000—not money enough to sustain it and confidence gone.

But it is said that we cannot maintain any more silver dollars on a parity with gold, that we cannot keep every dollar as good as any other dollar. Once for all I want to say that I am in favor of a dollar just as good as any other dollar. Those who are advocating this bill are not the only men who are in favor of an honest and stable dollar. The President in his message seems to think that there is somebody here who does not want an honest and stable dollar. If that is intended as a reflection upon those who advocate the coinage of the standard silver dollar I repudiate it unhesitatingly. I am just as honestly in favor of an honest and stable dollar as the President and I am not trying to impose upon this country any dishonest or unstable dollar.

Address by Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director, Office of War Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able address delivered by Hon. James F. Byrnes, Director, Office of War Mobilization, at Spartanburg, S. C., on May 31, 1943. Let me add that I feel certain that this distinguished South Carolinian will do everything in his power to lend glory and success to the war effort of the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to be back home even for a day. I am particularly happy to join you in paying tribute to the men and women of the cotton textile industry who, tending their looms and machines, are doing their part in winning the greatest war in the history of mankind.

I wonder if you yourselves realize what you are doing in this struggle. In the last war American troops were outfitted with clothing and equipment for fighting in a relatively small sector in western Europe. In this war troops must be provided with clothing and equipment to fight in all parts of the world under every conceivable climatic condition.

Cotton no less than steel or aluminum is an essential war material. More than 5,000 articles in which cotton is used are purchased for our armed forces.

Rafts like the one which saved the life of Eddie Rickenbacker and his associates, and parachutes which drop fighting weapons out of the sky for our paratroopers are made from King Cotton.

The task of meeting the rapidly growing war demands for cotton textiles has fallen mainly upon American cotton mills. Management and labor have responded magnificently. The bolts of cloth produced by the industry in 1942, if sewed together, would reach around the world 282 times. The remarkable part of this acheivement is that the mills are turning out 66 percent more textile products with 30 percent less spindles than the industry had in the last war. Textiles have really gone to war.

Textile workers are justly proud of their war work. Although firmly determined to preserve their right to strike in time of peace, with few exceptions they have patriotically refused to countenance the right to strike in time of war. We have had some stoppages of work in industries producing weapons of war. They have justly aroused criticism. But when you condemn the few who strike, do not forget that the great mass of our workers and, with rare exceptions, the leaders of organized labor, are doing as much as any of us, and more than many of us, to see that there is no interruption of war production. Do not forget that during 1942 only one-twentieth of 1 percent of the time of workers engaged in war work was lost on strikes. The striker in war industry is almost as rare as the slacker in the Army.

But we have a big job ahead of us. The Nazis and the Japs started to prepare for this war years before we as a Nation woke up to what was going on. While they were plotting our destruction we were passing neutrality laws that helped them out. Not until after France collapsed, and Britain was besieged and Russia attacked, did we begin to realize what was happening in the world.

But in the meanwhile we had lost precious time, and our enemies launched their treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor, mistakenly believing they could beat us down before we could equip ourselves for battle.

It was humiliating for a Nation as great and proud as ours to remain for months on the defensive, to be unable in the winter of 1942 to send the reinforcements necessary to save the Philippines, to be unable in the spring of 1942 to prevent the fall of Burma and the closing of the Burma road to China, to be unable in the summer of 1942 to open a second front in Europe to help Russia.

It was not easy to reply to critics who complained that we were losing the war by default. The President could not tell them what the General Staff was doing to rebuild our Pacific Fleet and to strengthen our supply lines in the Pacific by the capture of Guadalcanal. The President could not tell them how the General Staff was assembling ships, supplies and men to drive the Nazis

from Africa and to expose them to attack in Europe from every direction.

Military operations require more than the brilliant ideas of clever strategists. They require extensive preparations. As important as the coordination of our air, sea, and land forces in actual battle is the preparation which must be made long before the battle begins to bring together at the right place and the right time the necessary men, supplies, and equipment. Hitler won the first battle of Europe not in 1939 or 1940 but in the preceding 5 years of preparation.

We have at length caught up with the Axis in our preparations and are forging rapidly ahead. We are now girding ourselves not for a single attack on a single front, but for many attacks on many fronts both in the European theater of war and in the Pacific. Those attacks will proceed when and where the enemy least expects them. And they will not cease until the last vestige of Japanese treachery and Nazi tyranny are blasted from this earth.

Those attacks will be made possible by our production program which is now really getting into high gear.

This is the harvest year for the Navy's ship construction. It is the year in which the great majority of the vessels for which plans were made a year and 2 years ago will actually join the fleet.

In the first 5 months of this year we have completed 100 fighting ships. That means 1 ship every 36 hours. It means that in 5 months we have finished almost as many warships as were finished in the entire year of 1942, and 3 times as many as we completed in the entire year of 1941. And this is only the beginning for 1943.

During this year, we will double the size of our fleet. That accomplishment is without parallel in history. It is bad news for Tojo.

These are fighting ships—battleships, aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, escort ships, and submarines. These do not include the several thousand landing craft which have been completed during the last 5 months.

This year's warship construction will be marked by two special achievements—aircraft carriers to give air coverage to our convoys and to our attacks, and escort vessels to destroy the enemies' submarines.

The Navy has developed a special convoy vessel, the destroyer escort. It has but one function—to hunt down submarines. More of them will be built this year than there were destroyers in the fleet at the end of 1942. Within a year and a half we will have more of these vessels than any other single class of vessels in the fleet.

Living up to our disarmament agreement, we junked a large part of the fleet following World War No. 1. But the Navy fortunately kept up its research work. We put on paper some of the most effective devices and implements of war in naval history. They had to be built. They have proved to be marvelously effective. With the airplane and the escort vessel, they have contributed to the splendid record in the month of May when we lost fewer ships and destroyed more submarines than we dared to hope for.

The submarine is still a deadly menace, but our attack against the submarine is even more deadly. Recently one of our convoys was set upon by a pack of Nazi submarines. They got one of our merchant ships, but we got four of their submarines.

History will some day record the part radio and the radar have played in giving us fighting superiority over the Axis. But let me give you one instance. On the night of November 14, off Guadalcanal there lay a Japanese battleship. It was a stormy night. Eight miles away was a ship of our fleet. With the use of the radar our ship with its second salvo, sank the Jap battleship in the blackness of the night, 8 miles away. Is there any wonder that the Japanese Admiral Yamamoto who boasted he would dictate the peace to the United States in the White House has quietly passed away?

This war imposes great and grave responsibilities upon our merchant marine. Ships must maintain lines of supply to our far-flung battlefields.

During the 12-month period ending May 31, 1941, we constructed 50 dry-cargo ships and 22 tankers. During the 12-month period ending tonight we have constructed more than a thousand oceangoing dry-cargo ships and almost 100 oceangoing tankers. Remember this record has been achieved on top of the gigantic naval construction program.

We are building merchant ships four times as fast as they are being sunk. The merchant fleet of the United States is growing so rapidly that we are shipping and delivering more cargo than ever before in history. But we still need more ships and still more ships to carry out the unconditional surrender war plans of the United Nations.

Of course, conditions are entirely different now from those existing in World War No. 1, but only by comparison with our achievements then can we grasp the progress of our effort now. In World War No. 1 our forces were equipped in very large part by arms and munitions lend-leased to us by our allies. In this war we have had to assume the burden not only of equipping our own troops but of helping equip our allies.

We have, for example, shipped to lend-lease countries almost twice as many motor vehicles as we produced for ourselves alone in the last war. If all these vehicles were parked bumper to bumper, they would reach twice across North America.

In all World War No. 1 we produced 1 piece of artillery for each 1,100 men in the Army. In World War No. 2 we produced 1 piece of artillery for each 45 soldiers, and remember that we have and need an army almost twice as large. We have made 100,000 pieces of antiaircraft cannon.

In the month of May this year we produced three times as many pieces of artillery for ground troops as we did in all 19 months of the last war.

Our production of high explosive powder has been six times greater than during the last war.

Because we were unprepared we had the tremendous task of providing training camps. By April 1 of this year we had spent $10,000,000,000 in buying land and in building all over the United States airfields and training camps such as you have here at Camp Croft. We provided housing for 5,000,000 men.

In modern war we must have machine guns for airplanes, machine guns for antiaircraft, and for ground troops. Between June 1, 1940, and June 1, 1941, our ordnance plants turned out 25,000 machine guns and submachine guns. The year following we turned out 700,000. Between June 1, 1942, and the present date we turned out 1,500,000, bringing our total to 2,225,000 since America began to rearm.

From these figures the enemy will get very little comfort. From them he can draw his own conclusions as to the number of machine guns we will make in the next year. America means business.

Every day our bombers and the bombers of our allies are flying on their offensive missions over enemy lines—over Germany, over Italy, over the war-won island possessions of the Japanese. Constantly we are stepping up the number of our planes and the poundage of their destructiveness. In the 3-year period we have manufactured 44,830,000 bombs. Included in this figure are our incendiary bombs, but included also are blockbusters weighing from two to four thousand pounds and capable of laying in ruin the enemy's ports, his factories, his fortifications.

Let me give you some idea of what we have in store for our enemies. A week ago last night there occurred the greatest and most devastating raid in history. The Germans know what it did to Dortmund and its war industries. Our bombing strength is being added with increasing intensity to the strength of the British. The tonnage of bombs that we have already produced is sufficient to load our planes for 542 raids the size of the Dortmund raid and we are producing more every day. America means business.

For the 7 years preceding June 1940, while we were building automobiles and refrigerators, Hitler was building airplanes. He relied upon those planes to enslave the world. American skill and energy are producing planes to free the world.

Between June 1, 1940, and June 1, 1941, we made 10,143 airplanes. Between June 1, 1941, and June 1, 1942, we made 30,248 airplanes; and between June 1, 1942 and today we made almost 60,000.

I have some bad news for the man Mr. Churchill calls Corporal Hitler. I have some bad news for the Japanese too. I am permitted to announce that the one-hundred-thousandth airplane manufactured since we began our war production program came off the assembly line today.

Do you remember how the Nazi and Japanese propagandist scoffed when President Roosevelt first announced that we were going to build 100,000 planes? Well, they do not scoff now. They know that America means business.

I cannot tell you how many of these planes are bombers, how many are fighter planes, how many are training planes and cargo planes. That is a military secret. But I can tell you that in the beginning of our program the proportion of trainers was large. Since that time our planes have become heavier and heavier. The proportion of bombers and fighters has become steadily higher, and they are bigger and more devastating.

I will make no prediction about the number of planes we will produce in the next 12 months. You may draw your own conclusions. Our planes today are being piloted not only by our own men, but by Russians and British and Chinese, and, yes, by Frenchmen, and Poles and Czechs, too. We have sent thousands to the air forces of our allies and will send thousands more. But to keep up day and night bombing against the Nazis and the Japs we must continue to step up our production.

Russia and Britain are both producing planes in tremendous numbers in their own factories. Not only America, but all the Allies mean business. Our combined might will drive the Axis from the skies, and hold a protective umbrella over our ground forces as they triumphantly march to the roads that lead to Tokyo, to Berlin, and to victory.

It has not been so very long ago that we were told by some who claimed to have special knowledge that the Germans had a peculiar genius for air power and that neither Britain nor America singly or jointly could beat them in the air.

But the history of this war is proving that the Nazi's genius in the air is no greater than the genius of a gangster with a gun against an unarmed victim.

Before this war is over, Hitler will learn as the psalmist foretold:

"Behold, he travaileth with iniquity; yea, he hath conceived mischief, and brought forth falsehood. He hath made a pit, and digged it, and is fallen into the ditch which he made. His mischief shall return upon his own head, and his violence shall come down upon his own pate."

But this is no time for overconfidence. Remember in June 1941, Hitler was overconfident. It was Hitler's overconfidence which caused him to attack Russia and gave us the time to catch up in our preparations.

Thus far we are only on the outer fringes of this war so far as personal deprivation on the home front and the loss of blood on the battle front are concerned. We have been in this war almost as long as we were in the last war. So far our casualties in this war have been only 86,862. Our casualties in the last war totaled 233,184. This will be a much tougher war.

There is no doubt in my own mind but the American people will steel themselves for the tough weeks and months that lie ahead. Already the mothers who have lost sons have shown the mettle which makes America great.

Let me read you some lines that came to me from a letter by a mother whose home is in Aiken and whose son was killed in Guadalcanal.

"One of the first things I thought of and said, when I heard about George, was that it is not the length of time we live, but how we live and what we do with our lives that counts. It would not have been fair for other boys to have given their lives and not one of ours. Thank God, he had courage enough to give his life for what he knew was right."

There are thousands of mothers just like this one. They are America's answer to the Axis propaganda that we are too soft, too weak, and too indifferent to our liberties to make the sacrifices which must be made before victory is won.

We have a long, hard road ahead. The hardest fighting is yet to come. We have not yet a firm foothold anywhere on the Continent of Europe, excluding Russia. Japan still holds her stolen empire rich in vital war resources. Thousands of our boys are prisoners of war in the Philippines and the flag of the Japanese aggressor flies in place of Old Glory over Corregidor

There can be no cheer in American hearts until the Nazis are crushed in Europe and the Nipponese in the Pacific, until China is free from aggression, and Quezon, MacArthur, and Wainwright march in triumph through the streets of Manila.

In fact, we are just entering the critical period of war. Hitherto our energies have been largely engaged in production in preparation for attack. Now we must not only keep up our production and increase it at critical points, but we must assume a major part in the all-out military operations against the enemy. We must keep up our all-out production at the same time that millions of our men are engaged in all-out attacks. This will put stresses and strains on our military machine, on our civilian economy, on our private lives. We must streamline our governmental operations.

We must act with greater dispatch and greater efficiency than ever. We must learn to work, to fight, to sacrifice together as we have never done before. We must accept willingly and gladly a self-discipline to which we are not by tradition accustomed.

Masses of men and women cannot work together if they are always thinking whether the other fellow is doing his part. Masses of men and women can work effectively together only if they are actuated by a desire to outdo each other in contributing to the common effort. The American people on the farms, in the factories, and in the mines, as well as at the battle front, must work together as one team.

Your Government has no right to call upon you to work as a team if it is not going to demand of Government officials that they work as a team. I admit that officials of the Government have made mistakes. That is to be expected of human beings. But the people have a right to expect Government officials to sacrifice all pride of opinion and cooperate just as officers of the Army and Navy are required to cooperate.

We must be just. There have been controversies in government. But that these controversies and their effect upon the war effort have been greatly exaggerated is clearly demonstrated by the statement I have made of our progress.

The President has taken new and resolute action designed to unify and solidify our war efforts here on the home front. As part of this action, he has designated me as Director of the Office of War Mobilization. Later this week the War Mobilization Committee will meet. Until that meeting I can make no statement as to our plan, but I pledge you that I shall do all in my power to bring about the same coordination of efforts among the civilians in governmental agencies that exists on the military fronts.

Victory in war cannot be achieved cheaply. We must pay dearly for our victory with the lives of our fighting men. We must also pay for our victory by unremitting and, when need be, unrewarded toil on the home front. We must also pay for victory by willing sacrifice of the things we can do without. We must demonstrate that we are worthy of our freedom by our unwillingness to work, to fight, and, if need be, to die for our freedom.

We must so conduct ourselves that future generations will speak of the men and women of 1943 as we speak of the men and women of 1776.

In Time of War We Must Prepare for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "In Time of War We Must Prepare for Peace," delivered by me at the University of Alabama at the alumni banquet, on Saturday, May 29, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN TIME OF WAR WE MUST PREPARE FOR PEACE

I appreciate the honor you have done me in asking me to speak to you. It is also a happy privilege.

My strength is renewed and my spirit refreshed by each contact with our great university. It is like hearing an old melody to walk amid the familiar scenes and tread again the hallowed ground.

In my university days our graduates went forth with high hopes of personal success and advancement in an inviting world. Today, our young men and women go from these peaceful scenes to bloody battlefields in the steaming jungles, the burning deserts, and the frozen Arctic wastes. To save our Nation, they must forget themselves and their personal fortunes, and turn their backs upon all their loved ones and all domestic joys.

We brought this fate upon them by our own mistakes. It is not enough for us to resolve in our hearts that we shall sustain and support them to the limit of our strength. We must resolve, and we must see to it, that never again shall a whole generation go forth to travail and sorrow, to suffering, mutilation and death.

Our immediate duty is to win the war in the shortest possible time and with the least possible loss of life. Our lasting obligation is to make sure that peace, the fruit of victory, is not lost. It cannot be endured that all in vain our finest and our bravest shall moulder in the jungle or lie buried beneath the burning sands.

The victories of war will be barren if we fail to win the peace. Last time, our failure to win the peace brought tragedy to us and to millions. This time, such a failure might well prove the end of our civilization and the death of all our race.

In George Washington's day the Atlantic Ocean on one side and the Pacific Ocean on the other were constant and unremitting guardians of our country. Even in the days of Woodrow Wilson these two wide oceans were effective barriers against our enemies.

Today, the airplane has terribly diminished the effectiveness of those barriers. The development of the planes of tomorrow will make the oceans of no account. Greater and mightier planes, with their death-dealing bombs and lethal weapons, will bring death and destruction to the United States, even as they now burn and destroy Germany by day and by night.

We cannot isolate ourselves. The world is too small. There is no remote place to which we can withdraw. The airplane and the radio, rapid transportation, and instantaneous communication, dealt a death blow to isolationism. As a means of preventing war, isolationism died at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

Isolationism can no longer afford us protection, but the idea of isolationism can and will bring us many dangers. It has already brought them. Because of our isolationism, we had no part in the events that led up to the First World War; we had no part in the events that led up to the present World War. We missed our opportunity to prevent these wars. If we had realized that isolationism is an illusion, we would have taken our part in world affairs and shaped a peaceful world.

Economically, the airplane and the radio, rapid transportation and instantaneous communication have made the world one common neighborhood. Politically, however, the world is not one, but consists of many separate units. Disputes between such units are inevitable. Those disputes must be settled by law rather than by violence, by peaceful procedure rather than by war if our children are to escape World War No. 3.

Professor Keller, of Yale, a distinguished authority on social science, tells us that the growth of civilization consists in the enlargement of the peace group. He reminds us that the earliest peace group was the family. The head of the family laid down the law and enforced it, thus keeping peace within the family group. This form of family government is exemplified in the Patriarchs of the Old Testament. Then came the village community, composed of a number of families, with its government and its court of justice. Afterwards came the State, composed of a number of communities, and then the nation, composed of states.

As Professor Keller says, "These names—family, village, state, nation—are, of course, merely symbols of the various successive increases in the size of the peace group, typical of most historical developments."

When we had no larger peace group than the family, we had family fighting against family. Even in our time, we have seen family feuds in the mountains of Kentucky, because there was not effective government to prevent interfamily fighting. Likewise,

when there has been no larger peace group than the village or municipality, we have had war between cities. There were interurban wars in ancient Greece and the cities of Medieval Italy often were at war. In the same way, when the largest peace group is the state or province, we have wars between these units. Finally, when the largest group is the nation, we have international war.

We have reached the point where we have only international war. And international war can be abolished by precisely the same processes by which the wars between smaller peace groups were abolished. International wars will be abolished through the establishment of machinery that will provide procedure for the settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

All the old methods, such as isolationism, balance-of-power diplomacy, imperialism, peace pacts, and nonaggression agreements, have been tried again and again and always have failed. They have failed because they could not settle disputes or else could not enforce settlements when they had been made.

If there is to be hope of peace, there must be a collective world security system, with an organization of the peace-loving nations with power to adjudicate and enforce its decrees.

To this end, Senator HATCH, of New Mexico, Senator BALL, of Minnesota, Senator BURTON, of Ohio, and I have introduced a resolution in the Senate to advise the President to take the initiative in summoning representatives of the United Nations to meetings, to form an organization and set up machinery for settlement of international disputes without resort to war, to provide for United Nations military force for the immediate suppression of any future attempt at military aggression by any nation, and to require every member nation of the organization to commit itself to seek no territorial aggrandizement.

The resolution was introduced in the Senate because the Senate, under our Constitution, will have the final determination of our foreign policy and of what we shall do about the peace. It was the Senate that defeated the Versailles Treaty, that refused to permit the United States to play its part as a member of the League of Nations, and meet its responsibility in preventing war and maintaining peace in the world.

Today the leaders and peoples of the other United Nations entertain grave doubts as to what part, if any, the United States will play in shaping the peace after the war and in helping to build a decent world. These leaders and peoples are fearful that the election of last November was a repudiation of President Roosevelt's foreign policy of collaboration. Many think that the people of the United States in that election decided that the United States would do this time as it did last time—walk out on any joint action of the nations to set up machinery to insure peace. These leaders and peoples feel that last November's election was analagous to the election of November 1918, which proved to be the first chapter of the tragic story which ended with the dramatic defeat of the Versailles Treaty on the floor of the United States Senate.

Many of the United Nations are now pursuing two courses, one course based on the idea that the United States will collaborate with the other nations in maintaining the peace, and the other course based on the idea that the United States will return to its isolationism. If this situation is permitted to continue, some of the nations will take steps or make commitments which will embarrass, if not make impossible, the formulation of a just and enduring peace.

The only body in the world that can clarify the situation and keep open and unimpeded the pathway to peace is the Senate of the United States. The Senate alone can let the world know that the United States will collaborate in an organization for peace.

In time of war we must prepare for peace. Conditions are now far more favorable for agreement and cooperation among the nations than they will be after the war is finished. Today, kindred forces and identity of interest draw the United Nations together. These forces include our common cause of freedom and our common enemies, and the urgent necessity of effective mobilization of our combined resources to win the war.

Once the war ends some of the forces which make for unity and cooperation will disappear and others will lose much of their potency. If the past be a guide for the future, the forces which make for division rather than for unity will become ascendant. Economic rivalry, nationalistic feeling, and pressing domestic problems will inevitably come to the front, and they will divide the nations.

For some years men saw clearly the forces of war and destruction sweeping the nations closer and closer to the brink of this present war, but they stood powerless to prevent the tragedy because there was no machinery and no organized force to bring to play against these sinister forces.

The League of Nations failed for several reasons. One reason was that the United States was not a member. Another reason was that it imposed political obligations but provided no economic benefits. A third reason was that it could act only by unanimous consent. But the League's most fatal defect was the fact that it could adjudicate and render decisions, but had no organized force with which to enforce its decrees.

We had a similar experience in our early American history. Under the Articles of Confederation, the Continental Congress could make laws but had no power to enforce them. It quickly became evident a nation thus formed could not endure. It was for this reason that the people, through their representatives, gathered at Philadelphia and gave us the Federal Constitution, with power in the Federal Government to enforce its laws.

No organization can be stronger than its power to enforce its decisions. If it has no such power it has no effect upon the conduct of its members, and at best becomes merely a debating society.

There must be power to use force immediately to suppress any aggressor nation. If Japan had been stopped by organized force when she moved into Manchuria, if Italy had been repelled by organized force when she started to invade Ethiopia, if Germany had been turned back in the beginning of her aggression by a well-organized force, the whole world would not now be engulfed in war. Just as a city police force preserves order and prevents wholesale riots and city-wide lawlessness, so an international police force would preserve the order and peace of the world and prevent war.

The resolution which my colleagues and I have introduced in the Senate starts the United States along the only way upon which the light of hope shines—the way of a world organization built upon the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," with recognition of the rights of peoples everywhere, and with each member nation committed to seek no territorial aggrandizement. We would form a world organization strong enough to administer justice and enforce order among the nations.

There are those who say that we should wait and take no steps at this time looking to the establishment of such an organization. Wait for what? For war weariness and disillusionment, economic rivalry, nationalistic feelings, and pressing domestic problems to make impossible the formation of an association of nations to secure an enduring peace? Wait for the return of that isolationism which allowed us to be swept into two terrible wars?

There is a time for all things—for planting and for harvesting, for planning and for execution. Ideas and plans need time to grow and be nurtured, just as crops need time to grow and to ripen. Deliberate and well-considered plans have a far better chance of success than hasty and ill-considered schemes. If we wait until peace has come, to plan for peace, our plans will be found wanting. If we take no forward step until we have a perfect plan we shall make no move at all; the rush of events will overwhelm us.

The men who drafted the Constitution of the United States did not have a perfect constitution in mind on the day of their assembly. If they had waited upon that miracle, our present form of government would never have come into being.

We know now there are many things that can be done to prevent an aggressor nation from making war. Deny such a nation steel, aluminum and oil and you stall its war machine. When it first begins its warlike preparations, subject its citizens to economic pressure from all the associated nations, and those preparations for war will be abandoned.

We must plan and build the machinery and organization for peace, or peace will catch us unprepared.

The United Nations await America's decision. We cannot afford to delay in giving it. The consequences of delay are too dreadful. This horror of war, this fate of death for our youth, of broken bodies and disordered minds, must not face us again.

The voices which quote George Washington's disapproval of entangling alliances have a hollow sound. George Washington recognized the necessity of organization in the small and remote world of his day. The Thirteen Colonies were not as close together then as the whole world is now. Geographical limitations and difficulties of travel made impractical a world grouping then to preserve order. The fires of conflict in Europe could have raged for weeks before the Colonists ever heard of it. But the very same conditions of propinquity and common neighborhood which led Washington to advocate the union of the Thirteen States would lead him now to urge an organization of the nations of the world to preserve the peace of the world.

I have been reading again the speeches of Woodrow Wilson explaining the League of Nations and pleading for our cooperation with the other nations of the world in the building of an orderly world. All those speeches are different, yet the burden and the message of each is this: "If we do not cooperate and play our part in building an enduring peace, our sons will again fight and die in the welter and blood of far-away battlefields."

We see today how prophetic was Woodrow Wilson's vision. And as I think of him there come to me the lines of the poet:

They told me, Heraclitus, they told me you were dead:
They brought me bitter news to hear and bitter tears to shed
I wept as I remembered how often you and I
Had tired the sun with talking and sent him down the sky.
Now that thou art lying, my dear old Carian guest,
A handful of gray ashes, long, long ago at rest,
Still are thy silent voices, thy nightingales awake—
For death he taketh all away, but them he cannot take.

Woodrow Wilson's nightingales are still awake. If we fail to heed their voices we shall go headlong into a Third World War.

The stage is set for the United States to play her part in the establishment of a new world. We have the power and we have the vision. We have proved it in the past by building a mighty land of freedom and of opportunity, not with any one race but with peoples gathered from all the races of the earth. If we could build this Nation from all these peoples, surely we can build upon a larger scale, and lead the peoples of the world out of anarchy and away from death into a world where all people may live in peace, under law and justice.

The responsibility is yours and mine, it is the responsibility of every American to make certain that the youth of America may not again be forced to journey to the far ends of the earth and give up their lives. Let us prepare now. Let us have a peace so ordered and established that our children and generations to come be not compelled to cower in darkness, but may walk upright in a world of freedom and of light.

Why a Committee on Peace Aims Should Be Created

REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, this speech will be made by a man who wants to be a Christian and who above all things else would like to see the Christian forces of the world called into action, so that their powerful potential influence might be used to bring this awful World War to a successful conclusion, and to establish thereafter a permanent peace of justice, based on the everlasting foundation of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

We of the United Nations are waging war with only half of our resources when we fail to state our peace aims to the world. We need to make it very clear to the enslaved subjects of totalitarian oppression that we do not hate them but that we sympathize with them and want to help them, so that they may overthrow their tyrannical rulers and take their rightful places in a free world society as emancipated men and women.

When we get to the people of enemy countries the idea that our quarrel is not with them but with their rulers; that we are friends of theirs—the people—and will help them in every way we can in the difficult problems of reconstruction if they will get rid of their unconscionable masters, we will have taken a long step toward winning the war. We will have unleashed forces that the gates of hell cannot prevail against.

We need to show to the people of the oppressed lands, especially Germany, Italy, and Japan, a vision of Christianity and the tremendous possibilities of bringing relief to them and their loved ones by an application of Christian principles. When the embattled hosts of Christianity get that message across totalitarian governments will begin to crumble.

When God moves into Germany, Italy, and Japan—Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo will move out.

We of the United Nations have two powerful weapons which we can use in winning this war—

First. The weapon of military might.

Second. The weapon of legitimate propaganda.

We are making effective use of the former weapon, the weapon of military might. The products of our war factories are on every front. Our men are giving a splendid accounting of themselves in every theater of war.

Of the latter weapon—the weapon of propaganda—we are making no adequate use, nor hardly any use at all, compared with the possibilities such a weapon really affords. The weapon of military might is limited by manpower, natural resources, and technological equipment. The weapon of propaganda is limited only by the validity of our cause and the range of our ingenuity.

The only flaw in the recent great speech of Winston Churchill before the Congress at Washington was the omission of any reference to peace aims and the blessings that will come to the world if the United Nations win. It is to be hoped that in some future address, not too long deferred, he will devote his magnificent powers of expression to that theme. A speech by him of this kind would be worth many battalions and battleships as a contribution to victory.

It was the Declaration of Independence, more than military might, that won the Revolutionary War. Without the clear-cut, challenging indictment against British oppression drawn by Jefferson, it is very doubtful whether that war could have been won. The Declaration of Independence was the magnetic spark that raised the fighting spirit of the colonists to fever heat and made them believe that right and God were on their side. The Declaration of Independence was the inspiration that prompted every lover of freedom from Boston to Georgia to reach for his flintlock rifle and swear an eternal oath never to lay it down until every redcoat was chased from the American continent.

When the Continental Congress appointed a committee to draft a statement of grievances and peace aims of the American people, it took the first important step toward winning the Revolutionary War; and when a tall, lank, sandy-haired Virginian of 35 sat up at nights in a room in Philadelphia which he had rented for 35 shillings a week and with a quill pen put into writing the immortal declaration of the committee of which he was spokesman, he did more toward victory than any number of battalions could have done, because he created in the hearts of the colonists a spirit that nothing could defeat.

It seems to me that the time is now at hand when history might well repeat itself and when the Congress of the United States, representing the people, might very properly take the lead in creating a committee on peace aims, the function of which would be to draft a statement that would set forth clearly and definitely the reasons that impelled us and the other Allied Nations to enter the present conflict and that will state in language so clear that he who runs may read exactly why we are fighting and what we are fighting for.

One of the purposes of the Office of War Information, as set forth in the justifications presented to the Appropriations Committee, a few days ago, is to advance the cause of the United Nations by publishing our peace aims throughout the world. The Office of War Information showers millions of leaflets of various kinds over enemy countries by airplane and it has the machinery set up whereby it could distribute the United Nations' peace aims everywhere in the world, but when I interrogated the spokesman of the Office of War Information as to what has been done along that line he admitted that practically nothing has been done, because of the lack of a definite authorized statement as to what the United Nations' peace aims are.

How important it is, therefore, that a statement of United Nations' peace aims shall be forthcoming as soon as possible. To pave the way for the drafting of such a statement I introduced on March 8, 1943, a resolution in Congress, known as House Joint Resolution No. 91, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the text of which is as follows:

Joint resolution to create a committee on peace aims

Be it resolved, etc., That a committee on peace aims is hereby created, to be composed as follows: Three Members of the Senate to be chosen by the Vice President; three Members of the House to be chosen by the Speaker, and six members at large to be chosen by the President. Of the six members to be chosen by the President, one shall be a woman, one shall be a representative of labor, one shall be a representative of the Federal Council of Churches in America, one shall be a representative of the Catholic Churches of America, one shall be a representative of the Jewish religion, and the other shall be a representative of the State Department, trained in the field of foreign service.

SEC. 2. This committee shall prepare a clear, definite statement of what the United Nations are fighting for and the peace aims which they will faithfully execute when victory comes to Allied arms.

SEC. 3. When this statement is completed the Secretary of State shall transmit the text thereof to the Governments of Great Britain and British Dominions, Russia, and China. If those Governments consent to become signatories no further negotiations will be required and the statement will be regarded as a finished document expressing the views and purposes of all of the United Nations. The statement shall also be submitted to friendly governments under Axis subjugation, whose adherence may be desired.

SEC. 4. If any one of the United Nations dissents to the statement or any of its provisions, the President shall invite the governments of the United Nations to send delegates to a conference to be held in the city of Washington to compose existing differences and agree on a modified statement which all can sign.

SEC. 5. When the statement is completed and approved it shall be promulgated as an official declaration stating the United Nations' peace aims, and copies of it shall be widely distributed throughout the world.

You will note that this resolution proposes to enlist the religious forces of America for an active part in leading the

world out of its morass of death, destruction, and misery. Under the terms of the resolution three of the members of the committee to draft peace aims would represent the great religious bodies of America.

In this period of the world's extremity, when many nations already have sunk into the black night of paganism, the call for Christian service is loud and clear.

Some years ago, before the world was plunged into war, President Roosevelt made a very striking statement which I think might well be revived now and applied to the existing situation.

No greater thing—

Said he—

could come to our land today than a revival of the spirit of religion—a revival that would sweep through the homes of the Nation and stir the hearts of men and women of all faiths to a realization of their belief in God and their dedication to His will for themselves and for their world. I doubt if there is any problem—social, political, and economic—that would not melt before the fire of such a spiritual awakening.

If ever there was a call for Christian service, that call is now. The world is crying to be saved. It is high time our Christian forces should be mobilized to save it.

True followers of the lowly Nazarene must be keenly disappointed by the conduct of so many of our churches and our church people in this world situation. They appear to have settled down into an attitude of smug complacency and are content with the role of spectators watching the world go by. Christians need to be shaken into a realization that this is a time of supreme emergency, when they should be represented on every front if they are to do their part in ushering in a better post-war world. This is no time to parade dogmatic theories and revel in beautiful platitudes. It is a time for action, and the churches are not doing their part.

Christians ought to be trying to lift the world up out of the miasmas of hate into a realm of mutual understanding and respect. We are all children of the same Father. We will be doing His will and will be helping to save the world if we will act as Christians ought to act in this emergency.

I am pleased to report, notwithstanding, that my resolution for the creation of a committee on peace aims has not fallen entirely on sterile soil. Some of the leading divinities of America have taken note of it and have voiced their approval in letters to me. From a large and growing mail I have culled the following letters which, by unanimous consent, I offer for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE ARCHBISHOP OF NEW ORLEANS

ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW ORLEANS,
New Orleans, La., May 13, 1943.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: Your proposal that a clear-cut statement of our objectives in the present global war and of our peace aims be defined, and that for this purpose religious as well as civic groups be called into counsel seems very commendable. It will be very important that for this purpose the best type of representatives of each group contemplated in your bill be procured.

Very sincerely yours,

JOS. F. RUMMEL,
Archbishop of New Orleans.

BISHOP LEETE

ECUMENICAL METHODIST COUNCIL,
May 11, 1943.

The Honorable LOUIS L. LUDLOW, LL. D.,
Member of Congress for Indiana.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LUDLOW: * * * I hardly need to tell you that I appreciate your effort to keep before the minds of legislators and the public not alone the thought and desirability of peace, but the wisdom of considering carefully in advance the conditions and nature of the peace which the world requires, if it can get it. All this is to the good.

There will be no permanent value in what so many shallow thinkers would fatuously accept—peace on any terms and at any price. Nor will peace be acceptable or long lasting unless it is well and nobly planned.

I wrote recently to some church leaders who are very eager to settle things as to post-war conditions by popular agitation at once that in my opinion a good deal more war is necessary before there will be a great deal of peace. Hasty and general pronouncements may serve the purposes of agitators with personal axes to grind, or vague and impractical ideologies, but we live in an actual world, of atmosphere, rather than vacuum, and what we need is deliberation and prayer for wisdom beyond the thought and cross-currents of the moment.

Wishing you every success in your responsible labors together with somewhat of the impersonal appreciation of American and world affairs which characterizes the best statesmanship.

Very sincerely yours,

FREDERICK D. LEETE.

BISHOP OF WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS

DIOCESE OF WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS,
Springfield, Mass., May 17, 1943.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Thank you so much for writing me about your resolution. Let me say that I am enthusiastically for it.

I quite agree with you, too, about the lack of influence of the church in world affairs, and I am deeply distressed over it.

I am so glad that you wrote me, and although I am doing a little something to try to wake people up to the situation, and to sift some of the propaganda, nevertheless your message will stir me to greater efforts. May God prosper your work for the cause of peace, and hasten the succesful conclusion of the war.

Yours faithfully,

W. APPLETON LAWRENCE.

THE BISHOP OF CORPUS CHRISTI

BISHOP'S HOUSE,
Corpus Christi, Tex., May 14, 1943.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Eleventh District, Indiana,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: I read your splendid address delivered before the House of Representatives of March 8, 1943, anent a resolution to create a Committee on Peace Aims. I think you handled the matter ably and convincingly; and I only hope that your patriotic sentiments and suggestions have met a responsive agreement on the part of your associate Members of the House. As a churchman, I naturally compliment you on the magnanimous and liberal attitude you have taken in suggesting that our President, when appointing a committee of six, include in such committee representatives of the principal religious groups in our country. It shows American fairness; and I do sincerely hope that your address will have been well received in general. As you well state, it is of paramount importance that matter of peace aims be thoroughly canvassed and specifically stated, to avoid any later embarrassing developments which might, in no little measure, discount much of the strenuous efforts put forth to win the victory. One thing that should always stand out prominently, is that our founding fathers based all their ideas of proper government on Christian principles. We must not deviate one iota from that attitude that our founding fathers took when forming and adopting our Constitution and bylaws. In these times when so many elements are trying to "chisel in," we have to be all the more on our guard against the misleading ideologies, which are diametrically in opposition to the Christian principles that our solid-minded founding fathers followed in the framing of the Constitution of our American Government.

I take pleasure in sending you this comment on your speech, and feel proud of the splendid stand you have taken and expressed; and I only add that God bless you for the courage of your convictions, and give you a sturdy determination to stand by your convictions. More power to you!

Yours very truly,

E. B. LEDVINA,
Bishop of Corpus Christi.

BISHOP CASADY, OF OKLAHOMA

DIOCESE OF OKLAHOMA,
Oklahoma City, Okla., May 6, 1943.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your letter under date of May 1, together with a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, containing your speech on May 8, reached me this afternoon. I have read both with interest. It is my conviction that the proper authorities should present the peace aims of the United States. In my opinion there can be no victory in any real and spiritual sense without a world-wide understanding of the peace aims of the United Nations. I am not equipped to pass judgment upon the proper instrumentality for formulating and making known these peace aims. That is a governmental and not an ecclesiastical function. I do think the aims should be stated and I hope you may be instrumental in accomplishing this end.

Please give my sincere regards to your fellow Congressman, MIKE MONRONEY, who is one of my dearest friends and whom I regard as a blameless representative of the people.

Trusting that this expression of my judgment, though limited in scope, may help to accomplish a worthy end, I am,

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS CASADY.

THE BISHOP OF FARGO

THE DIOCESE OF FARGO,
Fargo, N. Dak., May 6, 1943.

Mr. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I am deeply interested in your proposal to have Congress create a Committee on Peace Aims. Serious-minded people are thinking more than ever about the post-war peace problems. Even our soldiers in the field are giving thought to the many questions that will arise after the war.

Here in the State of North Dakota we are using every opportunity possible to bring before our people the peace points of Pope Pius XII through the written and spoken word, in sermons and addresses. In study

circles and discussion clubs we are trying to focus the attention of our people on the gravity of these problems.

You will be interested to learn that we expect a very important book to come off the press this month, containing excerpts from papal documents on the various phases of peace. This book will be published under the auspices of the Bishops' Peace Committee, of which Archbishop Stritch of Chicago is chairman and of which I am a member, together with Bishop Ryan of Omaha. We are primarily concerned with basic fundamentals that need to be regarded if we are to have a good and lasting peace. Problems of finance, trade, commerce, frontiers, etc., we shall have to leave as matters of technique to experts in their various fields.

I shall be pleased if you will keep me in touch with your efforts to plan for a good peace now.

Yours very sincerely,

A. J. MUENCH,
Bishop of Fargo.

THE BISHOP OF ERIE

DIOCESE OF ERIE,
Erie, Pa., May 12, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I am in receipt of your letter of May 1, 1943, proposing the composition of a statement on our aims as a Nation in this present struggle.

I commend you very highly for this clear objective and for your heart and good will in trying to arrange the matter; also, for your Christian ideals which would be weaved into the statement.

I am willing to do anything to help you and admire deeply your sincere and edifying effort. I shall continue to give some thought to the proposal and will be willing to assist you at any time I possibly can.

Wishing you success and the blessings of God,

Very sincerely in Christ,

JOHN MARK GANNON,
Bishop of Erie.

BISHOP MAGEE

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Des Moines, Iowa, May 10, 1943.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of May 1, relative to your bill urging a committee on peace was received along with the enclosure of your address and the bill. I am writing to acknowledge its receipt and to express my commendation of your presentation of this and the sincere hope that it may be passed and that such a committee will be appointed. You are correct that this is the plan for the Christian people to assert themselves and to see to it that we create a mind in America toward world cooperation that shall produce a permanent peace. If there is anything that I can do to help I want to add my bit.

With best wishes to you, I am,

Very cordially yours,

J. RALPH MAGEE.

THE BISHOP OF INDIANAPOLIS

DIOCESE OF INDIANAPOLIS,
Indianapolis, Ind., May 5, 1943.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: This is to acknowledge your letter of May 1, relative to your recent resolution to create a committee on peace aims. I recall reading of your address at that time in the newspapers and thought very well of it. Certainly it is an effort in the right direction, and it is representative of all the various groups in our country.

One thing is sure, that without religion we cannot get very far in setting up a permanent peace. Of course, that means, above all things, that our people must change their ways of thinking, and this includes those who have charge of forming our international policies.

You may be sure that I will give your address and also your letter earnest consideration, and if there are any further observations to make, I will gladly send them to you.

Thanking you for the compliment paid me in asking my views, and with good wishes, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH E. RITTER,
Bishop of Indianapolis.

THE BISHOP OF FORT WAYNE

BISHOP'S HOUSE,
DIOCESE OF FORT WAYNE,
Fort Wayne, Ind., May 8, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

YOUR HONOR: * * * You are right in assuming that the bond of religion alone will be able to unite the people of the many nations of Europe, hitherto divided by long, deep-seated antipathies on a dozen other grounds. No treaties of peace, no Atlantic Charters will be able to change the hearts of people or to force them to love one another. Only religion can do that, which stipulates that we must love even our enemies.

Despite the very potent proof we have had over the past 25 years that people follow leaders and not principles, we still are hoping that they will be easily converted to a different frame of mind.

When Italy was impoverished and disunited after the last World War, its people rallied round a leader, which is the meaning of "duce." When Germany had 23 political parties in the field and representatives of that many parties in parliament, the people found it necessary to abandon political parties and to rally round a leader, which is the meaning of "fuehrer." After the collapse of Russia in 1918, Lenin offered himself as a leader, and the people rallied round him. Here during the depression the Nation rallied round Roosevelt, practically suspending its Constitution, and asked him to lead us out of the trouble. This is the natural instinct of people, and it is very important that we know what kind of a leader the world is to have after this war, especially since we are talking about a world leader, a world government. It seems settled that that leader will not be Mussolini; that it will not be Hitler. Will it be Stalin? Will it be Churchill? Will it be Roosevelt? Should it be any political leader? What the world needs today is a moral leader, and only religion can provide that.

Unfortunately, most people in the world have very vague religious convictions; they do not know its A B C's; they can hardly think in terms of religion. Great Britain and the United States are the best examples of nations utterly illiterate in matters religious and moral. Over here fully 70,000,000 are unattached to any church, and probably never had 15 minutes of real religious instructions during their entire life. In England it is worse. Outside the Catholic body, only 1 out of 8 people is affiliated with any of the churches. It may surprise you to learn that the membership in the Established Church of England has fallen below that of the Catholic. See the 1943 World Almanac.

It is high time for our statesmen to become realistic and whether their own religious convictions are weak or not, they should know that politics tend to divide rather than to unite, while the very word "religion" implies a bond of union.

Churchmen who are familiar with God's teaching and with God's ways are much worried over the future, chiefly because the Nation is not learning the lesson for which the war was sent.

In the light of Holy Scripture and history it is "a scourge of God" on nations for their apostasy and it is intended to bring about a reform in the lives of people.

The chief need for the success of our arms is not prayer but rather the general observance of God's commandments. When conduct does not match prayer, the latter becomes rather an insult to Almighty God.

I sincerely hope that you will find a multitude of people to praise your appeal for the representation of religion on any committee discussing post-war peace.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. NOLL.

BISHOP OXNAM APPROVES

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Boston, Mass., April 5, 1943.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I deeply appreciate your letter of March 29 and the highly significant proposal you make. You are familiar, of course, with the work of the Commission to Study the Basis of a Just and Durable Peace appointed more than 2 years ago by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. I have been serving as a member of its committee of direction from its inception. I take it for granted you have noted its publications and particularly its last statement which contains six simple political propositions. I am enclosing a copy, and would very much appreciate your reaction to these proposals.

However, I have felt for some time a very definite need of a clear-cut simple statement of peace aims. I have hoped that in developing it there would be no conflict between executive branch of government and the legislative. It seems to me that your plan has this in mind, because the appointment is vested in the Vice President, the Speaker, and the President of the United States. I feel, with you, that we have not been doing all we ought to do. Unfortunately, heretofore, the church, instead of being influential at the place decision is made before decision is made, so that its contribution is regarded as constructive, cooperative, and creative, we have waited until decision is made and then have protested. To avoid that procedure in this instance, I proposed to our council of bishops at its December meeting that we spend a week in Washington interviewing the executives of government and other officials charged with administration, to ascertain what the peace aims are. The entire council spent a week in Washington and had the privilege of meeting the President, all members of the Cabinet, Mme. Chiang Kai-shek, President Quezon, and several others, 22 in all. We then appointed a commission of 12. This commission is at the task right now of trying to state peace aims not only as intellectual propositions for the scholar and the professional, but as propositions that reach the heart, in addition to the mind, so that people will feel the something for which we must stand. On April 27, we hope to have a meeting to accomplish this. We are then planning to mobilize the full strength of the Methodist Church in support of these proposals. We do not wish to step over the line that separates church and state, nor do we wish to have some representative of the church sitting up in the balcony of Congress checking off the votes of our Representatives. We feel, however, there is an earnest desire on the part of millions of our

people for an ordered world. We think it our duty to mobilize that desire which is essentially moral, so that our representatives may know that across the Nation there is a supporting opinion that will really stand behind them. I don't know whether we can do it or not, but I hope we may be able to have a million of our people write our Representatives when the measures are actually before them. We do not wish them signing stereotyped resolutions or petitions, but to express their honest views as people in a democracy.

All of this is to say that if there could be a clear-cut statement of peace aims it will be easier to mobilize the opinion. I am very eager to cooperate in any way I can with your very significant proposal.

It seems but yesterday that I had the privilege of meeting you from time to time in Indiana. We are very proud of what you are doing in the Congress.

With kindest regards, believe me,

Ever sincerely yours,

G. BROMLEY OXNAM.

BISHOP DECELL, OF BIRMINGHAM

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Birmingham, Ala., May 7, 1943.

Congressman LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: * * * I thank and congratulate you!

I heartily endorse the principle which you set out in the joint resolution.

The committee constituted as you indicate would include civilians and other statesmen. Their paper would set forth in brief, clear, and convincing language the high aims of the free peoples of the world. These peace aims of the United Nations would prove what they are fighting for. Manna from Heaven was rained down once for a people struggling toward a better land. A statement drawn and approved as you indicate should be showered upon Axis and conquered lands. This would be truth for their minds, strength for their hearts, and hope for their despair. I believe it would hasten the day of peace and carry us on through this wilderness toward a better world.

With appreciation and best wishes, I have the honor to remain,

Cordially and sincerely yours,

J. L. DECELL,
Methodist Bishop.

BISHOP DAVIS, OF NEW YORK

THE DIOCESE OF WESTERN NEW YORK,
Buffalo, N. Y., May 5, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: * * * Personally I should welcome such action as your resolution proposes, first, because it gives to the Congress a part in the post-war planning; second, because it gives organized religion also a part and thus recognizes the fact that any effective planning must rest upon spiritual principles; and third, because I believe the time has come when our idealistic aims in this war should be defined and made known.

It is a fact, of course, that the church, both in England and the United States, has spoken in regard to this subject in the Malvern declarations in England and in the Dulles program of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. I am confident, however, that this is not enough and that it is only through some such means as you suggest that the voice of the church can be made sufficiently emphatic to be heard around the world. I hope that your resolution may obtain favorable action.

Faithfully yours,

CAMERON J. DAVIS.

BISHOP OF MINNESOTA

THE DIOCESE OF MINNESOTA,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 6, 1943.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: * * * I am very much interested in the resolution which you have introduced and I believe that it would be a great help to have it pass. I read your statement and feel that I can support it in every way. Certainly we should be thinking of that side of the war as well as of the military side.

With every good wish for you and for this particular movement.

Faithfully yours,

F. A. MCELWAIN,
Bishop of Minnesota.

CHANCELOR HENRY F. DUGAN

DIOCESE OF INDIANAPOLIS,
Indianapolis, March 11, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS J. LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: * * *

May the undersigned be permitted to tell you that he has taken time to read through the resolution three different times and considers it one of the finest made to the people of this country in these distracted days. He also expresses the hope that the resolution will become a reality by the appointment of a committee on peace aims in order to gratify for yourself and the world the aims and objectives of the present bloody strife.

Wishing you God's blessing and success in this great undertaking, I beg to remain,

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY F. DUGAN,
Chancellor.

BISHOP OF CALIFORNIA

DIOCESE OF CALIFORNIA,
San Francisco, May 11, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I am greatly heartened to learn of the resolution to create a committee on peace aims which you presented in the House of Representatives on March 8, 1943.

The service of such a committee can do much, not only to clarify the position of America in this global conflict, but it will also help to unify our most numerous national groupings, and thus make more effective the impact of public opinion in securing a just and durable peace.

I sincerely hope that prompt and affirmative action will be taken on this matter, confident that it will be conducive to the aims and ends which you envision.

I shall be pleased to hear of your progress and wish you every blessing in this enterprise.

Faithfully yours,

KARL MORGAN BLOCK.

REVEREND FOSDICK, OF THE RIVERSIDE CHURCH

THE RIVERSIDE CHURCH,
New York, N. Y., April 13, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I should have acknowledged before this your gracious letter, together with a copy of the joint resolution that you have introduced into the House of Representatives under date of March 8.

I have from the beginning felt that the sooner the United States and its allies could make a frank and constructive statement of positive peace aims, the sooner we would begin to get light on our total situation. My conviction is that it would be better than the winning of many battles, for example, in the Far East, where, as all competent observers notice, our objectives are very much under suspicion.

Whether the methods you propose in your joint resolution are likely to be effective, I do not feel myself competent to judge, and only those who are closer to Congress would be likely to know. I sincerely hope, however, that at the earliest possible moment we can begin to present to the world so constructive a program of world organization that our objectives can begin to gather around them the support of right minded and forward looking people.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY E. FOSDICK.

BISHOP BOAZ

SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY,
Dallas, Tex., April 10, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your gracious letter of recent date came in due time, bringing a copy of your address before Congress on March 8. I have read and enjoyed immensely your address and approve every word of it.

I have often wondered why President Roosevelt did not give out such a statement as was made by Woodrow Wilson during the other World War. That did more than most anything that had happened up to that time to bring the war to an end. Your plan would make such a document much more effective than anything that any one man could say.

I see from Who's Who in America that you are a Methodist. I thank God for such as you. I wish we had more of your kind who are not afraid to tell the world that you are a disciple of the Great Galilean and want a peace consistent with His doctrines of justice to all men of all races and classes of mankind. If I can do anything to help the cause along, let me know.

With all good wishes, I am,

Yours cordially,

H. A. BOAZ.

THE BISHOP OF TOLEDO

BISHOP'S HOUSE,
Toledo, Ohio, May 10, 1943.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: It is a satisfaction to know that at least some Members of Congress appreciate the force and value of religious teaching and principles in relation to peace aims. Whether or not a committee composed of all religious forces would be the best way of bringing their influence to bear is a matter which would need further consideration. Certainly their influence ought to be solicited and perhaps parallel action in religious groups rather than joint action might be desirable.

I am enclosing herewith a copy of the report which our committee on moral principles and human rights drafted for the peace forum, presently taking place in Toledo. You may be interested to know that Mr. Sumner Welles and other notables are in attendance.

With every good wish,

Sincerely yours,

KARL J. ALTER,
Bishop of Toledo.

BISHOP HAMMAKER OF DENVER

DENVER AREA,
THE METHODIST CHURCH,
Denver, May 11, 1943.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: Your note of May 4 with enclosed address reached me a

few days ago. I have read both with interest and care.

You solicit an answer. By and large, I am pleased and encouraged by what you said. However, I had the question, when I went through your address, as to whether your view is quite all-inclusive. You do state in the middle column of the second page that this new order must be all-inclusive.

But in other sections, there seems to be a willingness to fall into line with the current thought concerning a post-war world presided over and largely directed and controlled by the United Nations. If we proceed along that line, I am very sure that we shall have a continuance of the old "balance of power" procedure. We will have a fancy name just as we gave a fancy name to land-grabbing after the first war. You will recall that we named that thing "mandates" in 1919. I am very fearful that we are in jeopardy now of buying some sort of international governmental set-up at too great a price. We can pay too much for a name and miss the reality entirely

If we are not to go head-on toward another war, we must, in my opinion, have all nations in on the creation of a new order of internationalism. We must forego revenge, whether we call it righteous punishment or not. We must reckon with the fact that the sturdy spirit of independence which we praise if it manifests itself in the souls of people in occupied countries, is not confined to those nations that are friendly to us. This same indomitableness of the human spirit is universal. We cannot go in and "police" and educate those who are now our enemy nations anymore than the Axis Powers have been able to do that sort of thing. What I want is a new world, activated by a different set of principles and procedures. I think that the churches and all idealists must set their faces against agreement with a world ruled by the United Nations only. If we follow such a pattern, then our so-called policing will really be military control.

Another danger which I envision is that of failure to apply the basic principles of the Atlantic Charter and of the "four freedoms" to Asia. Out there the great question is color and racial equality. I found that out full well during my 3 years' residence in China as Methodist bishop. I went out there in the summer of 1936. I soon found out that the white man had deceived himself in believing that the colored peoples conceive themselves to be inferior. They do not believe that they were created to serve the white man. Any failure in the post-war world to reckon with color and racial equality will be the supreme disaster for mankind.

But I must desist. You have led me into the temptation of saying overmuch. I want to assure you before I sign off, that I am profoundly appreciative of the position which you have taken with reference to peace for the last several years. You have served the cause magnificently. I have often thanked God for your courage and your foresight.

With every good wish and kindest personal regard, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR E. HAMMAKER.

BISHOP OF GEORGIA

DIOCESE OF GEORGIA,
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH,
Savannah, Ga., May 7, 1943.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I am heartily in sympathy with the House resolution you enclosed. I hope something can be done about it. If I can help in any way, please let me know.

Yours truly,

M. S. BARNWELL.

BISHOP PEELE, OF RICHMOND

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
SOUTHEASTERN JURISDICTION,
Richmond, Va., May 17, 1943.

Congressman LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: I feel with you that a major task before us is to carry through to a successful conclusion the purpose of our world conflict. The winning of the peace is of as much importance and probably will be more difficult than the winning of the war. We must not make the mistake this time that we made before.

In line with your suggestion, you may not know that the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church has a special committee from its number appointed for the purpose of cooperating with the other agencies in the hope that a lasting and permanent peace will be realized. In order that you may make contact, if you desire, with the chairman of this committee, I am furnishing you his name and address.

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, 581 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Thanks for your communication.

Cordially yours,

W. W. PEELE.

BISHOP COADJUTOR OF TENNESSEE

THE DIOCESE OF TENNESSEE,
Nashville, May 18, 1943.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Long absence from home has delayed my reply to your letter of May 1. I have read both your letter and your speech in the House with keen interest, and I think that the committee and declaration called for in your resolution might serve a very useful purpose. I hope it may prevail.

Sincerely yours,

E. P. DANDRIDGE.

BISHOP OF ST. PAUL

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
St. Paul, Minn., May 6, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I congratulate you on your action in offering a resolution calling for a committee on peace aims.

There is a tremendous amount of work being done in most of the denominations right now along these lines. Christian people are greatly interested in a lasting peace. Just how you are going to get church and state to cooperate together on this matter is not clear to me.

With cordial regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. CUSHMAN,
Resident Bishop, St. Paul Area.

BISHOP BROOMFIELD, OF ST. LOUIS

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
St. Louis, Mo., May 6, 1943.

Congressman LOUIS LUDLOW
Eleventh District, Indiana,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I have read with keen interest your speech of March 8, 1943, introducing a resolution to create committee on peace aims.

The logic of your reasoning is irrefutable, and the sanity of your approach is refreshing.

With your permission, I shall be pleased to use in my public addresses what you say concerning the right type of propaganda.

I trust the committee you suggest will in due time be authorized and appointed. There is great need for it. To me, one of the most hopeful signs of the times, is the growing demand for what you have in mind in your resolution.

Appreciating your letter, and assuring you of my deep interest in your proposal, I am,

Cordially yours,

J. C. BROOMFIELD,
Bishop, St. Louis Area.

BISHOP FREEMAN, OF WASHINGTON

THE BISHOP OF WASHINGTON,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1943.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Bishop Freeman is ill at the present time, but he has asked me to acknowledge your letter of March 23. The bishop rejoices in your idealistic and Christian stand, and wishes you all success with your resolution.

Very sincerely yours,

RAYMOND L. WOLVEN,
Chaplain to the Bishop.

GENERAL SECRETARY OF YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

THE YOUNG MEN'S
CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION,
Indianapolis, Ind., March 22, 1943.

The Honorable LOUIS LUDLOW,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE LUDLOW: Thank you very much for the copy of your resolution to create a committee on peace aims. I have read it with care and interest and believe that your suggestion is wise and timely.

I hope that it is passed and that you are selected as one of the three men from the House to help in drafting the case for the Allied Nations.

With appreciation for the splendid service you are giving our district and our country and with every good wish, I am

Sincerely yours,

PARKER P. JORDAN,
General Secretary.

REV. JOHN A. FARR

FIRST CHRISTIAN CHURCH,
Frankfort, Ind., May 11, 1943.

Congressman LUDLOW,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your joint resolution to create a committee on peace aims has just been called to my attention. Let me commend you for this move and pray that such a committee may speedily be formed and its work carried on. Certainly we at home and the world need such a statement. It should be forthcoming. I have read the resolution. It is what is needed.

We and the world deserve to know exactly what we are fighting for and to what this sacrifice shall do for the world. I say give the people the facts, tell them the truth, and keep confidence high in individuals and governments.

People have and are losing much of their confidence in our Government from the smaller unit to the Central Government. This is an ill omen. I have fears for the future. Without confidence we can do nothing. We are grateful for men like yourself. May your number increase and your efforts for good be prospered.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. FARR.

REV. HAROLD L. LUNGER

AUSTIN BOULEVARD CHRISTIAN CHURCH,
Oak Park, Ill., May 18, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your joint resolution providing for a committee on peace aims

seems to me to be a most timely and vital proposal.

Be assured that you will find a wide and enthusiastic support among not only church folk but thinking citizens across the land. I sincerely hope that your resolution will be acted upon favorably by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. LUNGER,
Minister.

REV. R. MELVIN THOMPSON

MAIN STREET CHRISTIAN CHURCH,
Rushville, Ind., March 9, 1943.

HONORABLE SIR: Thanks for your joint resolution to create a committee on peace aims.

Everything would favor such action; nothing save prejudice or self-interest could be against it.

Surely our country won't again betray a whole generation of youth by refusing to cooperate in a just and lasting peace.

May God speed you in your good work.

Sincerely,

R. MELVYN THOMPSON.

P. S.—Especially I favor the idea of having religion represented on such a committee.

REV. C. H. SCHEICK

LYNHURST BAPTIST CHURCH,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 3, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I received a copy of your speech for a committee on peace aims. I have enjoyed reading it a number of times. If such as your speech contains could be carried out it would be so much of the Kingdom of God under way. It reminds me of Proverbs 11: 23a—"The desire of the righteous is only good." How great good to everybody your proposal would be.

I read most of it at our well-attended prayer meeting this last Wednesday, and it would have done you good to see the interest shown in hearing it. I sincerely believe such a speech should be broadcast and that such a committee should already be doing what you propose.

Thank you,

C. H. SCHEICK, *Pastor.*

MR. W. FOSTER HAYES

Harvey, Ill., March 10, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was very much interested to notice your resolution on a proposed joint committee for a statement of peace aims. I cannot think of a more important action that could be taken by the Congress.

I seem to remember that a similar resolution was introduced some time ago by someone, but do not know what became of it. At any rate I hope you will follow yours up and get action on it. It seems to me that it is urgent to get to work on this while we are jointly engaged with the other nations in prosecuting the war. The probability of agreement apparently would be much better now than it might be after the war.

With best wishes for your success, I am,

Yours respectfully,

W. FOSTER HAYES.

REV. GEORGE CRENSHAW

NORTH FAIRFIELD, OHIO, *May 22, 1943.*

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is written to express my wholehearted approval of your proposed resolution concerning peace aims. I am thankful that amidst the petty, selfish bickerings of our Congress there are a few men who seem to have a sense of direction. We are demanding peace aims and some assurance as to what kind of a peace we can expect. We demand a Christian peace because we know that this is the only lasting peace. In the name of all that we hold dear, let your voice sound clear and insistent in this chaos. What are our aims? If they are Christian now is the time to begin to enforce them here in our own country.

Any support that I can give to the statesmen of our Congress will be thankfully rendered! Keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

GEORGE CRENSHAW,
Pastor, North Fairfield United Church.

HON. JAMES W. NOEL

INDIANAPOLIS, *March, 22, 1943.*

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR LUDLOW: * * * Your resolution seems sound and practical. Of course at this time a lot of fools are talking without anything definite in mind and without being controlled at all by the fundamentals of American institutions. Your speech is statesmanlike and worth while.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES W. NOEL.

SECRETARY OF UNITED CHRISTIAN MISSIONARY SOCIETY

THE UNITED CHRISTIAN
MISSIONARY SOCIETY,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 8, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LUDLOW: I have just read your address delivered in the House of Representatives on March 8 concerning a resolution to create a Committee on Peace Aims.

I want to congratulate you on this striking and timely message. I hope the resolution is adopted and put into effect.

As one resident of Indianapolis I am proud of our Representative in the House of Representatives and believe that he is giving leadership in this crucial time which, if followed, will hasten the end of this terrible war and bring us a better world in which to live.

* * * * *

Cordially yours,

H. B. HOLLOWAY,
Executive Secretary,
Service Department.

BISHOP KEENEY

MIAMI, FLA., *May 7, 1943.*

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I heartily endorse your resolution calling for a committee on peace aims.

Sincerely,

F. T. KEENEY,
Bishop, Methodist Church.

MR. HENRY PHILLIPS

SYRACUSE, N. Y., *May 26, 1943.*

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our representatives whom you refer to as coming from the very grass roots of our population should speak through appropriate resolution and by that process the mind and heart of America will be adequately revealed and it cannot be adequately revealed otherwise. I liked especially that which you have to suggest with reference to the composition of the group making up the committee on peace aims. We are a Christian Nation, and we should make our broadcast appeal on the basis of charity for all.

This is not a time for our leaders to take it upon themselves to bypass Congress in the formulation of theories. There has been too much of that attitude in recent years. Let Congress make its own pronouncement on this all-important subject and without wavering or temporizing.

Very truly yours,

HENRY PHILLIPS.

THE BISHOP OF SACRAMENTO

THE DIOCESE OF SACRAMENTO,
Sacramento, Calif., May 20, 1943.

DEAR CONGESSMAN LUDLOW: Thank you for your letter concerning a committee on peace aims, and I am in hearty agreement that peace aims should not just be left in the hands of statesmen and policitians but that the religious forces of the world should have their place. Otherwise, there will be the danger of a repetition of conditions that make for social unrest and another war, which God forbid.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

NOEL PORTER,
Bishop of Sacramento,
Protestant Episcopal Church.

THE BISHOP OF SOUTHERN OHIO

DIOCESE OF SOUTHERN OHIO,
Cincinnati, Ohio, May 25, 1943.

MY DEAR MR. LUDLOW: Your letter, enclosing the reprint of your speech delivered in the House of Representatives on March 8 reached my office while I was away. Immediately on my return I had to face 2 busy weeks preparing for carrying through our annual diocesan convention. I regret that some of my correspondence has had to wait until I could take care of immediate responsibilities.

Your letter and your address have both been read with deep interest and much appreciation. I entirely agree with your thesis in the matter of the importance of stating our peace aims, and the necessity of having the Christian church take the leadership in this whole matter.

Your suggestion that a committee on peace aims should be set up appeals to me. Of course, the membership of such a committee would have to be most carefully chosen. The work of such a committee would have to be lifted above partisanship in politics, religion, and social and economic interests.

It is all too obvious that there is frequently a tendency for persons serving on joint committees to be particularly concerned with their own interests. Unfortunately this is true of religious representation. I've run into several instances of late where a bloc has been set up within a committee which has sought to favor one particular branch of the Christian church. If any such thing happened within a committee on peace aims it would destroy the opportunity of the committee to do any work of lasting value.

What concerns me most is whether, even if a high-minded committee sets forth a statement of adequate peace aims, we could get our Congress to adopt same, and get the necessary backing on the part of the people of our country. I fear that many are still in the state of selfish isolationism. They are willing to cooperate with other nations to win the war, but they are not showing any willingness to yield 1 inch of their own privileges and comforts in order to indicate a willingness on the part of America to play its part in future world affairs. Opposition to, and attempts to limit the effectiveness of, the reciprocal trade treaties, and the opposition to such a general statement as the Ball-Burton-Hatch-Hill resolution are indications of the difficulties we face in getting Congress or the American people to set forth any definite pronouncement which would indicate our willingness to be a partner in world affairs in the post-war period. I touched on this whole matter in my recent diocesan convention address, and knowing

your interest I am taking the liberty of sending you a copy.

I shall be interested to hear whether your resolution runs any chance of being adopted by Congress. It is important for the churches to urge study of and support for the whole peace-aims program. As individuals we must do our full part by sharing in such efforts as that being developed by the Non-Partisan Council To Win the Peace.

God has a purpose which involves world partnership in support of His moral principles. If America fails to take its part in this purpose, civilization is doomed.

Thanking you for writing me and for the copy of your fine address, I am

Sincerely yours,

HENRY W. HOBSON.

Farm Security Deserves Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 28, 1943

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address by Edward J. Meeman, editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, Memphis, Tenn., which appeared in that paper on May 20. The Memphis Press-Scimitar has conducted an investigation of the various Farm Security enterprises in its section, and the conclusions expressed by Mr. Meeman are substantiated by the findings arrived at through this investigation. I commend the splendid editorial for your consideration.

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION'S AIMS AND OPERATION DESERVE SUPPORT, SAYS PRESS-SCIMITAR EDITOR

(By Edward J. Meeman)

The attacks now being made in Congress on the Farm Security Administration must not be allowed to result in the crippling of this agency.

For the idea back of the Farm Security Administration and, on the whole, the manner in which that idea has been carried out, deserve the warm support of the American people.

Before Farm Security Administration was launched, we had at the bottom of our farming system a vast number of people who were propertyless, homeless, and hopeless. Undernourishment and disease were eating away the strength of the American race, even as erosion was washing away the strength of the American soil. The tenant would frequently move at the year end, hoping for a better place, or the landlord would compel him to move, hoping for a better tenant; both were usually disappointed. The tenant would not care for the land, since he did not expect to remain long; the landlord would not care for the tenant, since he had little hope of keeping him

RESULTS MIRACULOUS

To these hopeless, Farm Security Administration brought hope. To these penniless, Farm Security Administration loaned money. To these landless, Farm Security Administration sold farms. The results were miraculous. The seemingly dull and lazy were brightened with enterprise and fired by ambition. The seemingly unreliable paid off their loans. The seemingly careless took care of their land.

Three reporters who investigated Farm Security Administration for the Memphis Press-Scimitar concluded:

"Farm Security Administration's actual percentage of repayments cannot be stated with certainty, but there is no doubt that at least 85 percent of all who borrowed have paid back on or before the due date, and total collections may be over 90 percent. Farm Security Administration officials state they believe less than 5 percent will be uncollected in the end.

"This fact, so curious in a nation where borrowing by persons of property becomes ever more complicated and bound by rules and regulations; this fact that the average poor farmer's word is as good as his bond, is not attacked by critics of the Farm Security Administration. It is one of the outstanding discoveries of the New Deal; you can take an ever-broke, shiftless, ragged, undernourished American farm man, give him a lot of money on his own signature, show him how to spend it and any other money he may get, and he will pay you back what he borrowed."

Farm Security Administration made this valuable discovery because it brought something new into American life; a new kind of education—education of the entire family in their own home in the things that concern them most; how to be well nourished, how to keep well, how to pay their debts, how to "get ahead."

NEVER COMMUNISTIC

Is there communism in the Farm Security Administration? Probably there is a little, because communism has schemed its way in some measure into nearly every phase of American life; unions, business, churches, schools, government. Therefore, it is to be supposed that some Communists got into Farm Security Administration. But certain collective farming enterprises sponsored by Farm Security Administration attracted far more attention than they deserved; they were small in comparison to the vast program of Farm Security Administration. It is characteristic of communism that it is dogmatic, thinks it has the final answer, and that it is justified in ruthlessly employing any means to force acceptance of its plan on others for their own good. That was not the spirit in which these collectives were designed under the former Tugwell administration; it was rather in a spirit of experimentation: "Let us try several forms, and see which forms of agricultural life work best." It has been proved that American farmers will have nothing of collectivism; and Farm Security Administration, accepting the verdict, began liquidating these collectives.

COLLECTIVISM OUT

Farm Security Administration is now committed entirely to the policy that its clients shall buy not a share in a collective farm but title to their own acres.

But if it does not make Communists of millionaries to live in a well-planned suburb, why should it be thought that farmers will go "red" if they live in a community in which some thought has been given to its design? If in a farm community in which every farmer owns his own acres there should be some cooperative features, why is not such cooperation as American as the logrolling and barn raising of the frontier?

The truth is that Farm Security Administration has vastly increased the strength of the private property system in this country. It has made stable, healthy-minded property-owning citizens of thousands who had been rootless, propertyless proletarians. Formerly they were the potential victims of the agitation of some Fascist Huey Long or Communist Browder; today they are acquiring the independence that property owning and acknowledged rights give to a man, and they will be fit participants in American democracy.

FOES INCONSISTENT

One of the just criticisms of the New Deal is that it has had too many shake-ups and changes of organization. If a difficulty arose, a new organization was created or an agency was shifted to some other head. After considerable early confusion, the Farm Security Administration recently has been gradually and steadily shaking down into an orderly and businesslike administration. What irony that critics of the New Deal are now making the same mistake the New Deal has so often made; they are proposing to place the Farm Security Administration in the hands of the Farm Credit Administration and the Extension Service, which have no experience in the problems of the low-income farmers, in which the Farm Security Administration officials have acquired so much profitable, if somewhat costly, experience. What economy would there be in tearing up a program which is working better and more conservatively all the time?

Mission to Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Mission to Moscow" written by Frank C. Waldrop, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of May 31, 1943.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSION TO MOSCOW

(By Frank C. Waldrop)

Everybody having eyes to see with, ears to hear with, and a brain to think with had better go see the movie Mission to Moscow, advertised as a true record of Joseph E. Davies' career as United States Ambassador to Russia in the critical pre-war years.

This picture is not entertainment. It is politics. It is the first weapon in a battery that is either going to knock out the independent intelligence of this once free Republic, or be knocked out by same.

This picture is not history, either, any more than it is entertainment. By any test of historical fact it is a lie and a fraud. What is more, it has already been publicly exposed in clear detail as a lie and a fraud by many Americans of usually conflicting political feelings.

And so, no more details of evidence will be offered here at this time except a listing of just a few of the patriots who are helping expose the historical lie and fraud. These include:

John Dewey, Princeton University's world-acclaimed philosopher; Anne O'Hare McCormack, editorial columnist of the New York Times; Manny Farber, film critic of the New Republic, a magazine ordinarily found defending anything pro-Russian; William Henry Chamberlain, for many years Moscow correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor and internationally known as an authority on Russian affairs.

Also, Sidney Hook, chairman of the department of philosophy at New York University; Dorothy Thompson, syndicated newspaper columnist and as wild-eyed an advocate of war upon Hitler before December 7, 1941, as there was in the world.

Also, A. Philip Randolph, president of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, American Federation of Labor; and Harry Gideonese, president of Brooklyn University.

These are just a few of the people who have seen Mission to Moscow and denounced it as a historical lie and fraud.

As it shows throughout the country there will be others with equal courage and intelligence to speak up and say publicly what they know to be true.

But how many others?

That is why it is vitally important for you to see Mission to Moscow. For, whether you like it or not, you are now jockeyed into the position of having to defeat this historical lie and fraud or have it defeat you in the struggles dead ahead.

Of course, this is not the first politically slanted movie, but up to now political propaganda in the movies has been sly, left-handed, and tentative. Therefore, hard to prove in detail.

Back in 1941, while the foreign policy debate was rocking America, a brave but unskilled handful of United States Senators tried to show how propaganda was seeping into movie entertainment.

They flopped—not because there wasn't any propaganda in the movies but because they weren't smart enough to demonstrate the real inside facts to a politically unskilled public.

But now the Warner Bros., who made Mission to Moscow, have become so bold as to lay aside the poisonously gilded lily and swing a sledge hammer.

The movies are using a sledge hammer on the country. How about the country using a sledge hammer, too?

In America there never has been—and we must all make sure there never will be—a monopoly of weapons on one side in a political fight.

Free speech, the free press, and the laws forcing radio stations to share free broadcasting time between all candidates for the same job are designed to keep United States politics competitive.

Now that the movies are in politics, they, too, must be opened up for competition.

The Warner Bros. have shoved off on us one version of the 1938–41 foreign-policy debate as it related to Europe. How about this same Warner Bros. making now another movie on the foreign-policy debate as it involved Japan?

Mission to Moscow makes Roosevelt, Stalin, and Ambassador Joe Davies supernatural in their knowledge of what was going to happen in Europe. It also makes a thundering campaign speech for Roosevelt's fourth term.

Well, let's get at the other side. How about a movie beginning with Ambassador Joe Grew's Report from Tokyo and traveling the straight road of public fact on past Pearl Harbor and Bataan to the Japs now entrenched on Kiska and, until yesterday, on Attu?

This other movie could hammer upon some plain home truths concerning the cause of Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941.

Who had the responsibility to stay awake? Who was Commander in Chief then? Who was supernatural and wise ahead of events that time?

This movie could remind us of the prewar warnings by Gen. Douglas MacArthur out in the Philippines, and of the now publicly forgotten testimony before the House Military Affairs Committee in 1941 by Admiral Joseph K. Taussig—remember him?

He declared that Japan was our No. 1 enemy—remember?—and was promptly retired from active duty and sent down to Norfolk, Va., as commander of that city's garbage scows.

This movie could also remind us that the Japs raped Hong Kong, Singapore, and the Dutch East Indies because the United States Fleet was all the while at the bottom of Pearl Harbor—shot dead in its sleep on a Sunday morning. Why? How come?

The administration and Warner Bros. committed this conspiracy to drag the movies into politics. It was a terrible thing to do.

But now that it is done, O. K. Let's have not just this one political movie but also another to be shown free in every hamlet and village and town during the summer of 1944. Let's call it the Truth About Pearl Harbor.

Price Control

REMARKS

OF

A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the people of the Fourth District of Nebraska are wrought up over this latest scheme of price control, proposed by theoretically minded economists in the Office of Price Administration, known as the roll back of prices by means of subsidy payments. Here are some of the expressions found in the mail that is coming into my office:

We believe that production will be further curtailed and black markets increased. Government bureaus must listen to common sense if they are to ward off starvation.

Proposed subsidy program will mean only further Government control, will increase black markets tremendously, will add materially to already much confused conditions, will tend to reduce production and cost of operation will be exorbitant and extravagant.

Stockmen wire:

Subsidies are wrong in principle and roll-back will be incentive to bootleg meat and decreased production. Let's win the war and quit messing things up.

These messages show that practical people understand just what the subsidy scheme implies and how it will fail in practice. In the first place, if it does reduce the price of meat and butter at the retail store, the housewife who buys it will pay in taxes not only the subsidy but the cost of the huge organization that will be set up to administer the program. In this day when everybody is going to pay taxes to the limit there can be no shifting to someone else. Today there is a black market in food because the consumer has the money and is willing to pay a higher price in order to get the food. By reducing the official price of food with a subsidy the O. P. A. is not going to be able to destroy the black market nor is it going to be able to reduce the actual price that people will pay for food, if they get any at all.

These theoretical schemes, hatched in the brains of impractical economists, which disregard our whole established plan of production and distribution, serve only to disturb and upset those who are having a hard enough job of producing our food. These schemes only serve to discourage the producers and inevitably reduce the amount of food produced. What I say about this is borne out in the following statement I received from 145 members of the Dawson County (Nebr.) Feeders Association this morning:

Government meddling has already taken half the cattle out of our feed lots, and we know that the proposed subsidy program will further discourage cattle and hog feeding in this territory.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, what good will it do to reduce prices if the scheme employed reduces the production of food itself?

These people are appealing to their Representative in Congress for aid against these schemes. The bureaus that hatch them will not listen to them. We are the elected representatives of the people. They look to us for help against the "planners" who have taken this land of plenty almost to the point of where it is a land of scarcity. It is high time, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress serve notice in a way that will be understood that it is opposed to these schemes of totalitarian economy. I want to place in the RECORD the following letter that I am this day addressing to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, the new Director of War Mobilization, and to the Honorable Prentiss Brown, Director, Office of Price Administration:

JUNE 1, 1943.

JAMES F. BYRNES,
Director, War Mobilization.
PRENTISS M. BROWN,
Director, Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I address this letter to both of you calling your attention to the proposed subsidy program designed to control food prices. I wish to call your attention particularly to the program as it will affect the production of meat.

My office has received many telegrams from the producers and packers of meat, protesting the subsidy and roll-back program about to be put into operation. It is the considered judgment of the livestock producers and packers that a roll-back program, as it will affect livestock and meat, is very unwise. Such a move will add to the already existing confusion. It means red tape and regimenting the livestock and meat industry, which have heretofore had an unequaled record of patriotic cooperation in our national war effort. It will in the end not only create chaos but encourage black markets and decrease the production of meat.

The expense of the administration of not only the meat program but the entire food-subsidy idea will cost the taxpayers of this country billions of dollars. The original request for funds from the Office of Price Administration was $450,000,000. This, as you must surely know, is but a drop in the bucket. The citizen has more money to spend than ever before and the giving of subsidies to him will add more millions of dollars to an already swollen and unmanaged public purse. The cost will be upon the small individual, who must eventually pay for the subsidies. It is estimated that the saving to the individual on meat would be about $1.50 to $2 a year. On butter, 60 cents a year. On coffee, 24 to 36 cents a year. Do you think the public wants that type of hand-out? Are these subsidies being inaugurated so that the people can save money? Do you think that will control inflation? What do you want the people to do with the extra money they have in their pockets? It seems to me that the people would prefer to pay 17 cents for a can.

of peas and be able to get them than to pay 15 cents for the same can and not be able to get them. What goes for peas goes for every other product, be it butter, coffee, or meat.

The giving of subsidies is an unwise economic experiment designed to fool the people. It is un-American and unnecessary. Such a move will be an additional form of inflation. The subsidy scheme might in theory be workable, but from a practical administrative standpoint it is entirely devoid of any merits. It will be impossible to distribute subsidies with any degree of equity among all the producers and handlers of food.

You will find that subsidies will act as a creeping, grasping narcotic which will in the end lull industry to sleep and eventually paralyze and stifle free American enterprise.

When one buys meat and food at our local stores it has advanced in price but I want to call your attention to the fact that the producers and the farmers are not making an unusual profit. There are middlemen with brief cases making more off the farmer in 30 minutes than the farmer can make on the same crop in a whole season of hard labor. The difficulty has been in the distribution of food. Subsidies are not the answer.

Someone has said that subsidies in England seem to work. Yes; but you must remember that England is a small compact country and that they buy a great deal of food. The government can buy the food and then sell it at a lower cost. I suspect they pay these subsidies with our own lend-lease money. Our country produces a large amount of food. England is having subsidies on a moderate scale. England also has a rigid control of wages and prices.

I would like to ask your Office of War Mobilization where you expect to get the money with which to pay subsidies. Congress to date has frowned upon paying subsidies. If the money is to come from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Commodity Credit Corporation you must remember that they were set up to make recoverable loans. Subsidies are a gift. It is true under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation it is possible to subsidize certain critical materials but that act refers entirely to construction material and not food. I presume the next move of your group, if Congress refuses subsidies, and I am sure they will, will be to pass the roll-back to the farmer.

I wish you would tell me, Mr. Byrnes, why certain individuals and Government bureaus are insisting on these subsidy payments. I am a new Member of Congress, coming from a food-producing section of the country. I have many requests from the stock producers and packers, as well as from the food industries, protesting these subsidies. I cannot find an answer or justify them. I want an answer which my people and the public will understand. An answer that is reasonable, one which is American and based on sound business practices. May I expect a reply.

Very truly yours,

A. L. MILLER,
Member of Congress, Fourth District, Nebraska.

United States Fleet's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. Basil Harris, former United States Commissioner of Customs, printed in the Journal of Commerce of New York, dated May 21, 1943.

I was so impressed with the logic and importance of the article that I am bringing it to the attention of Congress for their consideration:

UNITED STATES FLEET'S FUTURE IS SEEN DEPENDENT ON CAPITAL'S PLANS—OBVIOUS GOVERNMENT STEP HELD PAYMENT FOR SHIPS ALREADY TAKEN BY UNITED STATES

(By Basil Harris, President, United States Lines)

I have been asked for my views on the future of American shipping and its place in the after-the-war period. My answer is that much depends upon the attitude assumed by those in authority at Washington.

Is our Government to pursue a policy which will enable the shipowners to replace vessels lost by enemy action, add to their fleets, reestablish their contacts, reopen their offices all over the world, and permit companies to work back into service many highly trained men now in the armed forces?

POLICY OF NEGATION?

Or is Washington bent on a policy of negation, one which proclaims that during war, earnings shall be so limited that when peace comes the shipping industry will be prostrate—without adequate funds to meet its demand for new ships of modern design and speed sufficient to compete in every trade route?

American shipping got its rebirth under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, so much so that when the present conflict began it was one of the few industries in the United States that was fully prepared and met the impact head on. American shipping, American management, and American personnel, made it possible to land our forces in the south Pacific and on the north African coast at a time of crisis.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was put on the books by a group of wise and farseeing Congressmen and Senators who deserve the unstinted praise of every American citizen for their foresight and judgment and I say that it is an injustice to those very men in Congress that the aim and intent of their deliberations have not been rigidly followed.

Our Nation cannot have a strong merchant marine without strong companies to own and operate American flagships—companies well financed and well organized. These shippings organizations must be in a position when peace comes to meet the intense competition which will inevitably accompany world reconstruction.

OBVIOUS STEP CITED

At the moment the most obvious step for the National Government to take is to pay for the ships long ago seized for the permanent use of the Army, Navy, or any other branch of our war economy. In determining the price to be paid the Government should not, for instance, say that a vessel which is 20 years old or more is virtually valueless to the owner while vitally needed for successful prosecution of the war.

Those individuals who have trained for a lifetime in shipping and direct the destinies of America's great shipping organizations, have given evidence of their supremely patriotic motives, yet feel affronted and abashed when bluntly informed if they are dissatisfied with the valuation placed at Washington on the ships they have surrendered they can sue for what they conceive to be just compensation.

COMPANIES NEED CAPITAL

Take the case of America's three largest and most useful liners—the *Manhattan*, the *Washington*, and the *America*. These vessels, readily and willingly released to the Government for war purposes, have been used to the fullest by the Government for more than 8 months. To date not one penny has been paid either for their possession or use, and the Government has indicated these ships will never be returned to the owners.

Shipping companies must have capital. They risk their own funds in the building of vessels even though they have the aid and cooperation of the Maritime Commission. Yet if the policy persists that it is unpatriotic to make profits—reasonable profits—in wartime, where are private shipping organizations to get money with which to replace fleets destroyed by the enemy and rebuild their worldwide organizations? How bright, I ask, can the post-war prospect of shipping appear when confronted by this condition?

Steamship companies have given without stint to the Government in this war so far. The War Shipping Administration requisitioned all privately owned ships not allocated to the Army and Navy and took control, as well, of all new vessels built by the Maritime Commission. All these vessels are in the hands of private companies which act as the managing agents of the War Shipping Administration to operate them to such destinations and with such cargo as the War Shipping Administration directs.

This means that the American companies which through the years had built or bought American-flag ships and in peace had developed regular and frequent services between the United States and the chief world markets are now devoting all their resources of management, experience, organization ashore and afloat, and their knowledge of technical steamship operation wholly at the command of our Government.

SUPPLYING NEEDED MANAGEMENT

They are supplying the essential management and agency function between the War Shipping Administration and the accomplishment of the task which is to carry supplies to the numerous war fronts, bring to the United States materials essential to the war effort and, last, to supply friendly countries with the absolute minimum of their commercial requirements.

The peacetime commercial operations of every American steamship line have been entirely terminated and all their efforts are for the account of the United States Government. This clearly justifies the statement that the merchant marine has been given over more completely to the war effort than any other great industry.

A thing to emphasize is that even the railroads and manufacturers, while putting every ounce of strength behind their war effort, still have a substantial amount of commercial business for their own account. But the American shipping industry has absolutely none. We have, so to speak, only one customer, the American Government. We ask it to treat us considerately—not generously—so that from earnings we may lay aside a sufficient amount to carry on America's battle to serve world markets and our own precious land when the Axis is defeated and our Nation, in company with her allies, writes the terms of peace.

Restrictions on Refiners of Gasoline and Fuel Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I

am including a copy of a telegram sent to Chester Davis, War Food Administrator in the Department of Agriculture, in regard to the refiners' stocks of gasoline and other motor fuels in Kansas and Oklahoma. The wire is signed by the leaders of the outstanding farm organizations and cooperative movements in Kansas and Oklahoma. Our farmers are working with insufficient help and must not be further handicapped by the lack of petroleum. This territory produces large quantities of crude oil and has the refineries necessary for distilling. It is my hope that immediate action will be taken by the proper Government officials in order to secure the needed supplies for this vast farming territory:

NORTH KANSAS CITY, MO., *May 25, 1943.*
CHESTER DAVIS,
War Food Administrator,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

With refiners stocks of gasoline and other motor fuels in Kansas and Oklahoma 60 percent under a year ago, tractors will be standing idle on hundreds of farms before harvest is over this year unless immediate action is taken to remove present Government restrictions on refiners who normally supply Central and North Central States. The bread basket of the Nation will fail in its job of producing food for freedom if its power-farming equipment must stand idle. Same situation which kept tractors from rolling in Virginia and other eastern seaboard States recently will come to Kansas and Oklahoma inevitably unless all refiners in this area are required to return at once to maximum production of motor fuels. Please use your influence with Petroleum Administrator for War to break the log jam that is threatening operations on the vital food front.

HOWARD A. COWDEN,
President of Consumers Cooperative Association, North Kansas City, Mo.
H. E. WITHAM,
Manager, Farmers Union Jobbing Association, Kansas City, Mo.
C. C. COGSWELL,
Master of Kansas State Grange, Topeka, Kans.
DR. O. O. WOLF,
President of Kansas Farm Bureau, Manhattan, Kans.
ZEB LAWTER,
General Manager, Farmers Union Sales Department, Oklahoma City, Okla.
ROY BENDER,
Secretary, Cooperative Grain Dealers Association of Oklahoma, Enid, Okla.

The Day of Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me on Nation-wide broadcast from station WEAF on May 30, 1943:

This morning the President of our country and you and I and 130 million other Americans solemnly and reverently celebrate our Memorial Day.

The setting aside of this day in the Nation's rosary of remembrance is of comparatively recent origin. Officially, the first Memorial Day was celebrated on the 30th of May 1868, by order of Gen. John A. Logan, of the Grand Army of the Republic. This order was occasioned by a tour of inspection of the battlefields of Virginia, undertaken in March 1868 by a semiofficial party, which included Mrs. Logan. Her comments follow. I quote her own words:

"In the churchyard near Petersburg we saw hundreds of the graves of Confederate soldiers. These graves had upon them small bleached Confederate flags and faded flowers that had been laid upon them by loving hands on the occasion of their Decoration Day.

"Upon our return General Logan was much interested in our account of what we had seen, and I remarked to him that I had never been so touched as I was by seeing those little flags and the withered flowers. At this, General Logan said that it was a beautiful revival of the custom of the ancients in thus preserving the memory of the dead, and that he, as commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, would issue an order for the decoration of the graves of Union soldiers."

May 30 was selected as the time when the most beautiful flowers abound everywhere in the country. Most of the State legislatures, with the approval of the President of the United States and the Governors, set aside this day as a legal holiday.

Arlington Cemetery, the great national point from which our Memorial Day celebrations radiate to every city and town and hamlet in the United States, was formerly the home of Gen. Robert E. Lee and, before him, of John Parke Custis, the son of Martha Washington. Today, Arlington is the priceless sanctuary for the mortal remains of our soldiers of every war, from the Revolution to the present conflict. President Taft lies buried there and only the other day Mrs. Taft, one of the very few women to be accorded such honor, joined him. Abraham Lincoln's son is there, and General Sheridan, Admiral Sims, Admiral Hobson, General Leonard Wood—the roster of famous names is long. But even longer is the roster of names of the little people whose lives loomed terribly large when the defense of their Nation was at stake, and who gave those lives to preserve it, or else who came back from the battlefields to live long and honorably in the country they fought to uphold, and so came at last to the well-deserved peace of Arlington.

On the crown of the green hills of Arlington, studded with crosses, with the historic Potomac below, stands the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. This great block of Colorado marble, weighing 50 tons, is the sarcophagus beneath which lies the body of an American lad slain in battle during the First World War. On the tomb is this simple inscription, "Here lies the body of an American soldier known but to God." At this national shrine a constant military guard is maintained, and will be forever maintained, throughout the 24 hours of the day, "walking the post of the Unknown Soldier." The Congress of the United States approved this burial of the Unknown Soldier by public resolution on March 4, 1921. The actual ceremonial took place on Armistice Day of that same year. To our whole country the Unknown Soldier represents all the men of America who have given their lives in defense of its freedom and its honor. The Unknown Soldier is the soul of America.

Let me say a few words about the selection of the Unknown Soldier. I am sure everyone knows the story, but it cannot be too often repeated, since it is so highly indicative of the essential democracy of our people—a democracy whose symbols are always as sturdy and forthright, and yet as tender and beautiful as this story.

One unidentified body was taken from each of the four great American cemeteries in France. The records of all unidentified men were carefully searched, and of these four chosen, all that could be ascertained was that they were American boys, and that they died of gunshot wounds in battle. The four heroes, with appropriate honors, were placed in a chapel of a small town on the Marne; each casket was identical, and each draped with an American flag. Sgt. Edward F. Younger, who, incidentally, passed away not so long ago, was selected from a group of noncommissioned officers who had distinguished themselves in battle, to choose the Unknown Soldier. Let me tell his story in his own words:

"I was standing outside that little church, with five other soldiers. Our colonel walked over to us. In his hand he held a bunch of roses. He said, 'Men, it is my task to choose one of you to perform a great and sacred duty. He stood there for a long minute. Then he called my name. 'Sergeant Younger,' he said, 'in this church are four caskets. In them lie the bodies of four nameless American soldiers. Go into the church; put a rose on one of the caskets. That is all.'

"I went into the church and walked by the caskets. I passed the first one, the second, then something made me stop. And a voice seemed to say, 'This is a pal of yours.' I don't know how long I stood there. But, finally, I put the rose on the second casket and went back out into the sunlight."

In a very real sense, this day is as old as memory and bereavement and pride and patriotism. There is an Arlington Cemetery for the preciously loved in every heart, a grave ever green with our tears, forever garlanded with the roses of the heart's blood and the lilies of the heart's dedication.

It is indeed in the hushed spirit of dedication that we honor our glorious and gallant dead whose courage and supreme sacrifice stains the altar of freedom. For we must not merely do them lip service. Flowers and bugles and speeches, howsoever lovely and noble and stirring, are not enough. We must deserve our heroes; we must be worthy of our dead. We must so live that their courage and their sacrifice may not die; we must prove, in our deeds, that the vision and the faith which inspired their "last full measure of devotion" was a vision of truth and a faith grounded in fact, a triumphant reality and not a lyrical pretense.

That is the fundamental meaning of Memorial Day. That is the only reason which is valid, which gives the day substance and hope and splendor. That is what Pericles, some 500 years before Christ, meant when, in the course of his noble funeral oration in memory of the heroes of Athens who fell fighting for liberty, he urged his countrymen to greater sacrifices, declaring: "To men who fall as they have fallen, death is no evil." That is what our own beloved Lincoln meant when, speaking at the Battlefield of Gettysburg, he said, "It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they have thus far so nobly advanced." That is what Woodrow Wilson, in his Memorial Day address at Arlington during the last war meant when he said, "I do not see how we can have any thoughts of pity for the men whose memory we honor today. I envy them, because theirs is the great work for liberty accomplished, and we are in the midst of a work unfinished."

There it is. This is the same injunction laid upon our hearts: the passing of the torch from the hands of the dead to the

hands of the living—eager hands, strong, capable, and confident hands. We must not, we cannot, we shall not betray that trust. For if we would enjoy those "four freedoms" which they, our gallant dead, gave their lives to preserve for us; if we would preserve for our posterity those privileges of a free people, then we must equally assume the four responsibilities: for freedom of speech, the responsibility of patriotism; for freedom from fear, the responsibility of service; for freedom from want, the responsibility of charity and sacrifice; and for freedom of worship, the responsibility of tolerance.

Only thus shall we realize the implicit promise we make this Memorial Day to our soldier dead whose glorious blood enriches Pearl Harbor and Wake and Bataan and the Solomons; whose courage has reddened the Coral Sea and the far-flung reaches of the African desert. Only thus can we redeem the sacrifice and in some measure soften the anguish which cherishes with solemn pride the gold star in the window of an American home.

The star of gold knows no race, creed, or color. It is a mark of great honor. To all Americans living in homes adorned with a gold star, and especially to you who are located off the beaten path, keeping a lonely vigil in the service of humanity, I, as a Representative in Congress, am grateful for the sacrifice which has hallowed your homes forever and has kept our country free.

How wonderful it would be if all who happen to be listening would this very minute go to that house next door with the gold star shining in the window—go and knock and enter and offer the hand of friendship and encouragement.

Only thus, unfalteringly and without compromise, by matching their sacrifice with ours, shall we follow where their bravery led, through the darkness into the light.

Post-War Food Plan Revealed at United Nations Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Dixon:

POST-WAR FOOD PLAN REVEALED AT UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE

(By George Dixon)

HOT SPRINGS, VA., May 31.—The United Nations today presented their blueprint for feeding the post-war world. The plan envisions a universe that will begin with tremendous shortages of all principal foods, move through a transition period of steadily increasing production and emerge at last with international machinery that will assure everybody freedom from want.

The blueprint was made public by the food conference's section on the expansion of production and its adaptation to consumption needs. It will be presented formally to the full conference tomorrow.

VARIOUS PROFOSALS

The report advocates both short-term agricultural adjustments in the immediate post-war period and long-range planning in the periods to follow. Among the proposals are crop diversification, soil conservation, industrialization, increased credit between nations, and lowered trade restrictions.

The blueprint-drawing section, which is headed by Alexey D. Krutikov, 35-year-old chairman of the Soviet delegation, said it was attacking the problem from a coldly practical and scientific standpoint. The production program, it was said, must be planned on a basis which puts the elimination of hunger first and the nutritional improvement of diet second.

COLLECTIVE FARMING

One of the proposals, in which the Russian influence appeared detectable, was that there should be a gradual shift to collective farming in countries where technological knowledge and equipment is scarce. The report also speaks of the need for developing producer, consumer, and credit cooperatives. It adds:

"These cooperatives will help the people of rural areas to help themselves, in accordance with democratic methods."

Of the prime importance of eliminating starvation, the report says:

"This will call for increasing the acreage of crops for direct human consumption and actually holding back the rebuilding of reduced livestock herds—essential though this is in the long run—together with limiting the production of other crops, which compete for acreage with essential foods.

LARGEST YIELD SOUGHT

"We shall need a pattern of production that will yield the largest possible amount of needed food for each unit of resource used. We shall need to provide for the production and equitable distribution of the greatest possible amounts of agricultural machinery, fertilizers, and other essential means of production to this end.

"As agriculture is rehabilitated in devastated areas, it will then be possible to devote progressively more acreage in the world as a whole to the production of livestock and livestock products as well as of other protective foods essential to improved diet."

Concerning the transition period, the report states:

"If we are to achieve these aims efficiently and fairly in the short-term period, it will be necessary to avoid an unrestrained competition for scarce supplies of foodstuffs, the means of production and transport.

HARDSHIPS FEARED

"With the recovery of the devastated areas there will be danger of a recurrence of the situation which followed the last war, when overproduction of cereals, sugar, and other products was accompanied by a heavy fall in prices, with attendant losses and hardship to producers. This danger can be avoided, provided that nations act individually and together, with foresight and in time.

"In order to provide better diets for its own people and for all people everywhere, it will be important in this period of transition for each nation progressively to adjust the use of its available agricultural production resources to conform with a long-term coordinated production plan for the best use of these resources on a world scale.

"Such an adjustment toward higher nutrition standards throughout the world would create new demands for food and other farm products and tend automatically to prevent the piling up of excessive surpluses. Each nation will need to produce more of the protective foods—vegetables, fruits, milk, eggs and meat. Livestock production should be encouraged in those areas where foodstuffs are economically obtainable.

LIMITING OF PRODUCTION

"Production of bulky, easily stored energy foods, such as grains and cereals, should be progressively limited in those areas where they cannot be produced efficiently."

Improved farming practices would include the rotation of crops and the planting of soil-restoring crops; the equitable distribution and use of fertilizers and insecticides; and measures to make more farm machinery available.

Agricultural credit at fair rates of interest would also be needed, the report says. "The claims of agriculture should be fully recognized in any international action that may be taken for the control or direction of international investment, or the international use of capital and credits."

SECURITY OF TENURE

Security of land tenure "to insure maintenance and improvement of the land" is suggested by the report. So too is "opportunity for obtaining returns sufficient to provide an adequate standard of nutrition and comfort for the producer and his family, and to provide in addition, a sufficient margin for a further development of the land and its resources."

Under education and the spread of technical knowledge the report points out the need for "joint planning and exchanges of information services, materials, and specialists on an international scale."

OPPOSES MIGRATIONS

The development of new land and the conservation of agricultural resources are also in the post-war blueprint. The problem of agricultural overpopulation brings forth proposals for shifting from extensive to intensive agriculture; long-time public works programs, and, above all, the industrial development of the affected areas.

The report comes out strongly against large-scale migrations from agriculturally overpopulated areas to those needing more people. These migrations "are not feasible," it says. "The principal answer lies, rather, in raising the level of living in what are now the poorer areas."

However, some countries are prevented from developing new land through lack of either manpower or capital.

One of the responsibilities of any international organization that may grow out of this conference should be to assist agricultural settlement in those areas where it is desirable.

Actual methods for carrying out the recommendations of the report, now in the hands of section 4, the planning section, will be placed before the full conference at its closing plenary session.

Office of War Information Publications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by Mr. Raymond B. Howard, of the National Editorial Association, to Elmer Davis, of the Office of War Information:

MAY 29, 1943.

Mr. ELMER DAVIS,
Office of War Information,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVIS: Before I became president of the National Editorial Association in 1941 I advocated some kind of a weekly news letter out of Washington to stop the overlapping of publicity coming from all the

bureaus—something we could use in one piece and not have to wade through the other stuff. This was an earnest effort to aid the war, actually then it was defense, as we were not yet in war officially. "This Week in Defense" was changed later to "A Week of the War." Many of our publishers used it as an effort to aid Uncle Sam.

Last fall you spoke at the National Editorial Association convention in Chicago. Rather, it was our fall conference. You said then you were cutting out overlapping bureau publicity. We all cheered. I don't think you thought much of "A Week in the War" then and actually now I don't since it has been ruined. That's why the National Editorial Association withdrew its sponsorship, since we no longer review it. That is all past history, but, Mr. Davis, the overlapping is, if anything, worse.

Here I am on a Sunday working my ears off wading through franked envelopes, trying to do the work of my editor, who is ill. No wonder he got sick! It makes me ill!

I could stand Office of War Information selling fourth terms—and I never thought you would do that. I can stand having it rubbed in on things I consider political that we must follow the Commander in Chief—in war, yes, but not in politics. But this criminal waste of paper must be stopped.

Here, for instance, is a story from Chicago from the United States Department of Agriculture Food Distribution Administration that says "Only a farmer may kill livestock for own use." It goes on to say "A banker, a lawyer, doctor, or any other kind of a professional man who owns a farm and has been in the habit of having his tenant kill a beef or a hog for him 'no longer has the right to follow this practice,'" says E. O. Pollock. In the same mail from the Columbus office of Office of War Information comes a story saying "if the farm owner lives in the city he must give up points for the meat he consumes off the farm, although he need not necessarily pay for meat in money." There has been more "hossing around" with sugar stories and by the time I get a story in type that comes from Washington the Office of Price Administration in the courthouse calls to tell me that the rules have been amended and not to print anything until they can set me straight.

Obviously all this changing of minds isn't your fault. But you could get your district and State offices, which seem to be as numerous now as there are bureaus and State offices to attach them to, to hold their fire for 24 hours after a ruling is made to see how many changes are going to be made before they are sent to harassed newspaper editors and confused readers. You could stop such foolishness as having conflicting stories on whether a lawyer can eat a pig off his own farm. One says he can. The other says he can't.

Most newspaper men were for the Office of War Information when you took hold and looked like you would tell some of these bureaucrats off but derned if I don't think you have become so involved in Washington red tape and political desire to perpetuate the New Deal that you have lost sight of the goal you started out for.

Yes, Mr. Davis, the newspapers—large and small—want to keep their readers posted. They have run hundreds of columns of stuff each week but you should just sit on this desk for a week and you would be amazed at what some of the bright boys on publicity are sending to us.

For weekly papers one capsule, well edited, like Charley Allen's stuff or A Week of the War if made newsy as well as informative and cleared of propaganda would do the trick. We are all trying to save paper but the reams and reams of mimeograph sent out cannot be used even if it didn't contain conflicting material. Most of the "songs" could be told without so many "refrains"—I just can't figure how these boys can find so many ways of retelling a story in one article.

It's a good thing for the boss, who pays the pay roll, to get on the news desk and see what is clogging his linotypes, his waste basket, and driving his editorial staff nuts.

For God's sake stop this waste of paper and manpower.

Sincerely,

R. B. HOWARD,
Publisher, the Madison Press.

Last Days of a White Elephant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, most of us have our desks covered with letters complaining about this, that or the other price regulation of the O. P. A. It has long been my feeling that the difficulty is not a mere difficulty of administration or of a minor error of judgment here or there. The whole O. P. A. has been founded on a misconception. If we are to have a sound rationing or price-control system, we must start now and proceed on the lines of the Jenkins bill as recently introduced. In this connection, I wish to direct attention to a recent article of Mr. Lippmann's entitled "Last Days of a White Elephant," as follows:

LAST DAYS OF A WHITE ELEPHANT
(By Walter Lippmann)

Now that the Office of Price Administration has broken down, the radical reorganization which is inevitable cannot be successful unless we recognize that no one could possibly have made a success of the Office of Price Administration. It is easy to put the blame on Mr. Henderson and his lawyers, on Mr. Prentiss Brown and his politicians and public relations men. But in fact the Office of Price Administration has failed because it was founded on a popular fallacy—on the fallacy that if you freeze all prices, including wages, by legal decree you can keep them frozen at a time when war requires a radical readjustment of production and consumption.

There is no use blaming the administration because the fallacy is now proved to be unworkable. The truth is that the fallacious doctrine was imposed on Mr. Henderson by public pressure against his better judgment, and the trouble with the administration is that it lacked the conviction and resource to resist the pressure and to lay down a sound doctrine and a workable plan. Thus for 2 years it has administered badly a policy which no one could have administered well.

In no other country in the world have men imagined that all prices could be kept frozen by decree. Hitler did freeze all prices, wages, and profits 3 years before the war. But Hitler backed up the decrees by the complete regimentation of industry and agriculture, by the conscription of labor, by his ruthless police and by the concentration camp. Even at that, with all that power behind the decrees, he has had to use also the devices of subsidies, equalization funds, and requisitioning. How anyone could have supposed that we could make the freeze work by unarmed decrees from the Office of Price Administration is mysterious only if we remember how many Americans have believed that liquor drinking could be abolished by prohibition and war outlawed by signing a treaty to outlaw it.

As a matter of fact the American experiment in universal price-freezing has been from the start an economic absurdity and in practice a most curious deception. In 1942-43 the total net production has been, let us say, $110,000,000,000 of goods, of which say $50,000,000,000 were military. These goods at the various stages of production represent several billion prices and wage rates. Of all these prices, at least half, those paid by the war agencies, have been outside the freeze. The Army, quite rightly, has paid what it had to pay in order to procure its weapons. These military prices have priority over civilian. Why has anyone, who ever took an elementary course in economics, supposed that Mr. Henderson, Mr. Brown, or anyone else could keep a rigid ceiling on the civilian price structure when within the price structure there were rolling around and flying around the Army, the Navy, and all their expensive warships, tanks, airplanes, and what not?

The supposed justification of this universal civilian freeze was that it would prevent inflation. But that was a misunderstanding of the nature of inflation. For if by some miracle all retail prices were held fixed, inflation would still exist. If money cannot buy goods, money loses its value, and that is what inflation is. And since in wartime there is bound to be more money than there are civilian goods for sale, merely to make the goods cheap does not prevent inflation. At best it merely alleviates the effect of excess unusable money until the time comes when there again are enough civilian goods to restore the real value of money.

Therefore the true object of wartime economic policy is (1) to assure at reasonable prices the necessities of life to the mass of the people and (2) to drain off some of the excess money, and then to impound the rest of the excess until peacetime production can be resumed.

The object of the price-fixing of rationed necessities—food, fuel, clothing, housing, transportation—is social, not financial; to maintain the efficiency of the people in their war work. For that reason, rationing, subsidies, and the control of civilian supply, are justified provided they are administered so as to insure the possible and the necessary total production.

The object of financial policy—through taxes and loans, the restriction of credit and investment—is in the last analysis to keep the supply of inflated and therefore depreciated money in cold storage until its value can be restored and it can safely be spent.

Therefore the true line of reorganization is that proposed in the Jenkins bill, and very ably advocated on the floor of the House of Representatives by Congressman HERTER, of Massachusetts. It is to place in the hands of Mr. Chester Davis, who is responsible for the production of food, the rationing and pricing of food as well. Then, if Mr. Davis cannot sell food at reasonable retail prices after he has paid adequate prices to get it produced, the difference should be made up in the form of some kind of subsidy. The same principle ought to be applied elsewhere, for example, to all fuels—whether oil or coal—and the whole business of pricing and rationing placed in the hands of Mr. Ickes.

Then Mr. Davis, Mr. Ickes, and the other controllers of the production and distribution of essentials, should become a price committee, presided over by Mr. Byrnes, to determine general policy.

On the other side—the control of the wartime inflation—let us hope that with the compromise on the Rumi plan behind us, we can move on from this largely sterile debate to the real task of devising taxes and other measures which discourage wartime spending and promote the conservation of a larger and larger part of the war earnings until they can, without the loss of their purchasing power, be spent when peace is fully restored.

Under a False Label

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal-American:

UNDER A FALSE LABEL

The minority report of the House Ways and Means Committee on a three-year renewal of the delegation of power to Secretary Hull to negotiate reciprocal trade treaties, and the statement made by Samuel Crowther, author, economist, and farmer, before the same committee, present to the American people one of the gravest domestic issues confronting them.

That issue is the continued abdication of the treaty and tariff-making powers of Congress and the growing dominance of executive and bureaucratic powers.

The minority members of the Ways and Means Committee, after announcing that they are not necessarily opposed to mutually beneficial tariff schedules with foreign nations, expose the real import of the present manner in making such treaties in these words:

"1. It involves an obviously unconstitutional delegation of the tariff- and treaty-making powers of the Congress.

"2. The trade treaties negotiated are not truly reciprocal, since the concessions which this country made with individual countries have been extended gratuitously to the whole world without endeavoring to secure reciprocal concessions.

"3. The fact that in the administration of the act the principal object of reciprocity—which is to exchange our own surpluses for goods we do not produce—has been ignored.

"4. The fact that tariff duties on competitive foreign products have been reduced drastically and indiscriminately without proper regard for the protection of domestic agriculture, labor and industry from unfair and destructive foreign competition."

In a word, these reciprocal trade treaties besides being extra-constitutional are not reciprocal at all.

It is wide open free trade, an economic fallacy that nearly ruined England and that would do the same to us, for the highest paid labor in the world—American labor—cannot successfully compete with labor paid on much lower levels.

Samuel Crowther in his statement before the committee boldly told its members that the bill before them "has nothing to do with reciprocity and almost nothing to do with trade." The real issue, said Mr. Crowther, is:

"Shall you abdicate as a Congress and deed to the Chief Executive the arbitrary and absolute power to form a present and post-war United States according to his judgment or his fancy, or shall you regain the right, which we have considered inalienable, of the American people to determine their own future through their Congress?"

The fundamental motive—and therefore the basic issue—of this bill, asserts Mr. Crowther, is delegation of power, not tariff schedules. This motive is being dodged because, says Mr. Crowther:

"This administration is engaged in a program of international commitments which to the extent that they can be discerned, form so fantastic a picture that it does not dare to submit the picture to the people for their judgment."

Mr. Crowther riddles the arguments for the Hull fiat trade treaties this wise:

In 1934 they were urged on the ground that they would put 3,000,000 men to work in a few months.

They did not do so.

In fact, unemployment grew.

In 1937 the free traders by ukase urged the "reciprocal" treaties as a means of "achieving world peace." The answer to that is obvious.

In 1940 "reciprocity" was urged as a measure to keep us out of war. Comment on that is unnecessary.

Although we profess to be fighting this war for the continuance of democratic procedure, the whole tendency of this administration has been to usurp constitutional democratic procedure "little by little," establishing a procedure that smacks more of totalitarian procedure, and of which the Hull reciprocal trade treaties are one of the most glaring examples.

Mr. Crowther told the committee in unmistakable terms:

"If our Nation is to maintain a reputation for frankness, it is a plain duty to make clear to all the world that ours is still a constitutional government; that the powers of the President are limited; and that the final decision in foreign policy rests with our people through their Congress. The very reasons which the Secretary of State advances for the adoption of this bill are the compelling reasons why it should be rejected.

"We must not permit our Executive to misrepresent us to the world."

Those "compelling reasons" are delegations of powers that now above any other time should remain in the hands of Congress, where the wisdom of the founding fathers placed them.

Are You Listenin', Eddie?—The Men Wanted To Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. McGRANERY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Philadelphia Record:

ARE YOU LISTENIN', EDDIE?—THE MEN WANTED TO WORK

If the 30,000 workers at New York Shipyard, in Camden, had asked for Memorial Day off—

The screams of enraged reactionaries would be echoing from Maine to California. Eddie Rickenbacker, rushing for the nearest microphone, would make another of his speeches denouncing labor's absenteeism as the greatest boon to our enemies.

Because those 30,000 workers were forced to take a holiday, by a shut-down of the shipyard for Memorial Day—only shut-down of a major war plant in this area—from 15,000 to 20,000 of those workers voiced their protest by showing up for work at the usual time.

That this great demonstration was made not merely against the shipyard but in answer to wartime labor baiters was evident from signs in the workers' parade as they marched to Roosevelt Plaza at Camden City Hall. Signs read:

"How about this, Eddie?"

"Two hundred and fifty thousand man-hours lost."

"This is enforced absenteeism."

Well, how about it, Rick?

This is enforced absenteeism. Shipyard officials say the cause is a shortage of critical materials. Yet no such shortage was evident in other eastern shipyards.

This does mean 250,000 man-hours lost. And Rick has been adept in slinging big figures about lost man-hours in his campaign to discredit labor.

Who's to blame for the work stoppage at the shipyard? We don't know.

The shipyard workers wanted to make clear to the Nation that they were not to blame.

But somewhere along the line somebody was. Maybe it was no fault of the company. Maybe the fault lay in allocations, or in some bureau in the Navy, or in some factory supplying the shipyard.

In fairness, the cause of the major work stoppage should be found, and corrected. Especially since the shipbuilding workers union has done its part in combating absenteeism by reducing it at the Camden plant from 11 percent in January 1943, to 6 percent in May—in spite of the known fact that shipbuilding work, by its very nature, carries with it an illness rate higher than normal in ordinary war plants.

On the shipyard's part, there seems to have been chiefly a lack of foresight in handling the public-relations angle of this "holiday."

The New York Shipyard's record is considered tops in America. Under the guiding hand of John F. Metten, one of the greatest naval architects in the world, it has produced many of the finest warships in Uncle Sam's Navy, and has turned many of them out far ahead of schedule.

The record of both management and men is a source for genuine American pride.

That's why this demonstration by the shipyard workers is important; it expresses the eagerness of the men to maintain that great record. As their statement emphasized, they "feel that the proper way to pay homage to the men who have sacrificed their lives in the service * * * is to produce the arms that will make possible the speedy winning of the war."

We'll be interested in seeing if this protest by the ship workers against enforced absenteeism gets the same space and headlines in our conservative press as the denunciations of absenteeism by Rickenbacker.

And, by the way, Eddie—are you listening?

Why Did Republicans Sponsor the Ruml Tax Cancelation Plan in Its Entirety?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, we have struggled with this income-tax bill for many weeks. I feel that the Ways and Means Committee has twice before early this session offered us a reasonable and sound measure which, if enacted, would have gone a long way toward a pay-as-you-go plan for individuals, without undue hardship on the taxpayer, and with salutary effects upon the Treasury and upon the stability of our national economy. I know today is the

last chance this year to pass a bill modifying the income taxes, and yet I cannot bring myself to vote to accept this conference report. I have certainly favored having most individual taxpayers on a pay-as-you-go basis. I deny that the Ruml-ites are the only people who have that aim or that they have a monopoly upon that idea. While I believe it is desirable, I believe forgiveness of taxes on a year of war profits—or virtually a year—is too great a price to pay to attain that objective. I could see justice in forgiving some individual taxes and favored doing so.

I consider this conference report as about the same as the original Ruml plan, for this will forgive seven or eight thousand million dollars of due and collectible obligation owing the United States Government. Republican leaders favored forgiving all, or $10,000,000,000. I have always been opposed to any such move, for it would force us to borrow just that much more money at interest to pay for what has already been spent for the Nation's protection. It would add just that much more fuel to the fires of inflation. And it would enable some people to make profits out of this war. I believe I see a deliberate attempt on the part of some to make it possible for a new crop of war millionaires to grow up in this country out of this ghastly struggle, and this Ruml plan is one phase of this threefold effort.

By the enactment of this Ruml idea the stage is undoubtedly being set for a Federal sales tax, and the adoption of the forgiveness plan, almost in its entirety, will make the passage of Federal sales tax inevitable, as I see it. This forgiveness will be pleasing to a few taxpayers for the moment, but within a year's time they will understand that it was but a mess of pottage. All the Members of this body who seek political credit for securing so large an amount of tax forgiveness may have all such credit they are entitled to. I want no credit for this kind of a blow at the United States Treasury. I am thinking of the immediate future, yes, but I am thinking beyond 1944.

Address of Hon. Burton K. Wheeler, of Montana, Before University of Michigan Club of Chicago

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] at Chicago, Ill., on the occasion of the annual spring banquet of the University of Michigan Club of Chicago on May 28, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen, I should like, in the first place, to say how much I appreciate the honor you have done me in inviting me to speak before you.

The subject of my address is "The War and the Peace."

This is a broad field, one which we might discuss for hours. To do even partial justice to it would require more time than you can give me. Yet, I hope, by concentrating on those of the problems which may be regarded as fundamental, to present to you my views in general outlines on these matters.

Today we seem to have reached a turning point both in the war and in the development of our domestic affairs. This calls for a reappraisal of the existing situation.

The great majority of our people and most of the active personalities in each of the old parties are united in their will to defeat Japan and the Axis at the earliest moment. We want to accomplish this objective with the least loss of life, and the subordination of every sectional and group interest and activity. But at the same time all of us are determined to preserve our way of life and the principles of liberty and political equality contained in and guaranteed by the Constitution.

There is a widespread desire, also, that some sound program shall be developed, and at the proper time presented, which will make an early recurrence of war impracticable and will contribute to national and international prosperity.

Our differences lie in the means of attaining these objectives and in the rate of speed with which progress toward them can be made soundly and effectively.

Our first objective is, of course, to win the war. The winning of the war entails a coordinated policy with respect to our grand strategy—the diplomacy and the military conduct of the war.

The task of the armed forces is to conquer the enemy. The object of victory, in turn, is to win a peace which accords with the aims of our people and with a sound and practical national policy. The function of grand strategy is so to conduct the war, that we may achieve the desired peace.

Grand strategy is then both a political and a military problem. Since the Constitution clearly provides that peace can be made only with the advice and consent of the Senate, this question of grand strategy would seem to lie coequally with the Senate and the Executive. Nor should we lose sight of the fact that it was precisely because President Wilson did not consult and advise with the Senate in advance and take into his confidence the Members of that body that he failed.

But, however this may be, Senator CHANDLER, of Kentucky a strong advocate of the administration's foreign policy prior to Pearl Harbor, has now challenged the administration's strategy. Underlying his charges are reports from usually reliable sources current in the Capitol that Russia's post-war demands will be a large share of Poland, the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, and a substantial part of the Balkans. Incredible as it may seem, Russia also demands political and economic influence in Norway, Sweden, and Finland, and control of the Bosphorus.

I am disturbed that our ally, Soviet Russia, which has waged such a gallant fight against Hitler, should raise the suspicion that she intends to play an imperialist role after the war. Nor would there seem to be anything to stop Mr. Stalin from attaining these objectives if we persist in the strategy of neglecting the whole Asiatic area. This policy will leave us with a greatly strengthened Japan to deal with following the end of the war in Europe.

In this connection, listen to what Mr. Ernest Lindley, New Deal newspaper columnist and close friend of the President, says: "But if Russia intends to play the imperialist game, why destroy Germany?" asks Mr. Lindley. He continues, and I quote: "Germany may be needed as a check to Russia. This is exactly what Hitler has been trying to make Axis-controlled Europe, Britain, and the United States believe."

One indisputable fact is that the war against Poland was the prelude to, the cause of, and, up to a certain point, the excuse for, the convulsions of which we are all now the victims, and most of us had supposed that one of the chief aims at the peace table would be that Poland's ancient and complete independence might be restored to a people so worthy of the interest of all other peoples.

If Poland is now to be sacrificed on the altar of Soviet imperialism, one cannot help wondering to what ends, if any, the grand strategy of Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt is directed, or where the end will be.

The valor of the Russian people has, of course, given certain rights to the Soviet, but the boundary of those rights is the point beyond which injury would result to Russia's neighbors. What happens to Poland, then, may determine whether the peace conference is to insure the welfare of the world or merely to present a scene of disorder and intrigue—an ignoble contest for power at the expense of principles.

This is one reason that the question of future grand strategy is a matter of such vital importance to the people of this Nation.

To date our war policy has been largely dictated from abroad. The time has now arrived—or will soon arrive with the securing of the Mediterranean communications to the east—for America to decide independently what its future strategy shall be. Remember that America, for all practical purposes, is the only allied nation today engaged in a two-front war. We must decide whether to continue on the defensive with respect to Japan and to pursue the war actively against Germany—or whether the policy of this Nation should be directed primarily to the defeat of Japan and only secondarily to the defeat of the Axis pending the defeat of Japan.

The decision to pursue the present strategy may drastically affect America's relation to the peace, our contribution to the rehabilitation of the world and the reconstruction of Europe, and even our ability to participate effectively in either.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of crushing Hitlerism. But the European situation now appears to have reached the point where the Nazis are on the defensive. There seems to be no shortage of manpower to maintain this situation and improve it, while at the same time we develop an effective offensive against Japan.

On the other hand, the Japanese are becoming increasingly aggressive. While time is working against the Axis, it is working definitely in favor of Japan, particularly if we remain on the defensive against them.

The war against Germany which the administration apparently would conduct first, may not prove easy. Germany may have little strength left to take the offensive, but she may, judging from the past, be strong enough to hold out a long time on the defensive. If we have meanwhile maintained our present military policy, we may find that it is increasingly difficult to continue our defensive successfully against Japan if we have become heavily engaged in an offensive in Europe.

Oddly enough Prussia faced a similar problem in her war with Austria in 1866. The question then was what Prussia should do if France actively intervened in that war.

General Von Moltke held the view that Prussia should adopt a defensive attitude toward Austria and in the meantime prosecute the war actively against France. Bismarck, Prime Minister, held a diametrically opposite opinion. That two such able strategists, in a similar situation, could hold two such divergent views shows that in our situation today there is room for an honest difference of expert opinion. The deciding factor seems to be the future attitude of Russia toward Japan and the Soviet's post-war position and intentions.

Russia has yet to show a clear-cut demonstration that she is on our side in the Pacific war. Russia has yet to renounce her imperialistic designs after the war. Until we have firm assurances on both these points it would appear wise for America to proceed primarily with an offensive against Japan, and only secondarily with the allied invasion of Europe, pending the defeat of Japan.

Were Russia now to grant us bases from which to bomb the heart of Japan and we were to engage in an all-out offensive against her, Japan might be quickly knocked out of the war. Our rear being thus made secure, the whole energies of the United Nations might then be soundly directed to the defeat of Hitler, with complete success inevitable.

Such a policy would not only result in expediting final victory. It would strengthen our hand at the peace table. And it would give America the opportunity to contribute her just share toward the rehabilitation of the world and the restoration of Europe

On the other hand, to quote again from Senator CHANDLER, "I should hate to envision a time after Germany becomes prostrate, as it is my belief that she will be eventually, when we would be left entirely alone except for the loyal support of China" to deal with a greatly strengthened Japanese Empire.

We have no assurances that should the war against Hitler end first, Russia would feel called upon to fight Japan. On the contrary as Senator CHANDLER openly charged on the Senate floor, Russia's recently renewed fishing rights treaty with Japan enables the Japanese to obtain weather information not available to the United States, and this circumstance is—and I quote him—"what has made it so difficult for us in the Aleutians." In fact Senator CHANDLER even described Russia as "a friend" who "is lending aid and comfort to the enemy that is trying to destroy the United States." Those are strong words to which many of us may hesitate to subscribe. But facts cannot be wished away.

We all appreciate the bravery and fortitude of the Russian people. We are all deeply grateful for the benefits that have enured to us by reason of their magnificent defense. And we are all glad to send her, in her great struggle, lend-lease materials until it hurts. But surely a way should occur to Mr. Stalin, the realist, to correct these injustices to America.

Nor is it probable that Mr. Churchill, with the best will in the world, would in the event of Hitler being defeated first, find it within the realms of practical politics in England to come to our aid in the Orient. His recent address in which he discussed partial demobilization of England's Army on the completion of the war in Europe gives concrete reality to this premise. In fact, the British may find themselves so involved in preventing a post-war upheaval in Europe, following the defeat of Hitler, as to make it impracticable for them to grant us substantial aid in the Pacific.

We, in turn, may find ourselves so embroiled in the East as to make it impracticable for us to carry out any commitments, direct or implied, under the provisions of the Atlantic Charter or those made at Casablanca, in Washington, or elsewhere.

President Wilson in the last war proved that the diplomatic front is of almost equal importance with the military in the sound conduct of the war and in expediting victory. On this diplomatic front we also seem to be operating at a disadvantage.

The strongest weapon in Hitler's arsenal is the propaganda from Germany that his defeat would result in a communistic Europe. This propaganda should be met. It is incumbent on ourselves and on our Allies unequivocally to state first that we seek no territorial aggrandizement; and second, that no Allied power will attempt to interfere—once internal peace has been assured—in the free choice of governments by the people themselves in those states of Europe which are reconstituted.

Our military forces have given an excellent account of themselves. Nobody doubts—or has ever doubted—the ultimate result of their efforts. But if we could secure the combination of sound strategy and wise diplomacy with an effective military machine—we would save lives and bring about an earlier termination of the war than might otherwise result.

So far as the peace is concerned—without knowledge of what is in Mr. Stalin's mind—what he will take or what he will settle for—or even with such knowledge—it is impossible now to visualize the conditions which will exist at the final termination of this war.

For one thing—Hitler has destroyed many governments—incorporated into Germany vast territories and many distinct populations. When Germany is forced within the territorial limits to which she must henceforth be kept—many countries without any government will exist throughout Europe. Thus until it becomes more evident what conditions will actually be—it seems unwise to involve this nation in definite commitments far in advance.

Discussion—yes. All we can have of it—but no present commitments.

It goes without saying that we all wish some sound and feasible American program may be developed that will make an early recurrence of war impracticable and will contribute to national and international prosperity. Our differences—as I have said before—lie in the methods of obtaining these objectives and in the rate of speed with which progress toward them may be made.

America is now, and always has been, willing to cooperate toward effecting these aims. But such cooperation should not, it seems to me, involve a surrender of the sovereign right of the American people to dictate the policies of this Nation, or impair its freedom and independence.

On the contrary, a free and independent America, strong and vigorous defenses for our country, the restoration and strengthening of our domestic economy—these seem to be the best bulwarks against future wars—the most helpful starting point for contribution to the peace.

"The trouble with many peace plans is," as the New York Times recently stated, "that they are projected in a vacuum without taking into account the realities of the world we live in. They—the peace plans—assume a uniformity of thinking and of ways of living throughout the world which does not and never will exist. They are a credit to the idealism rather than the wisdom or experience of their authors. They begin with the end instead of with the beginning: they build superstructures without testing the foundations." That is the view of the internationally minded New York Times.

No particular group in this country has a monopoly of idealism. We are all idealists. But if we are to make our idealism effective we must make it practical.

Mr. Stalin is noted for his realism. Mr. Churchill does not propose to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. And the idealism of the United States will go for naught if we plan, by reason of it, to give away America.

Turning to specific measures as a practical proposition, international stabilization of currencies, and its counterpart, reciprocal tariffs, must, in my opinion, for the time being be laid on the shelf until the present upheaval in Europe has subsided and evidence of permanent peace seems assured. Nevertheless, two tentative plans have recently been proposed for an over-all stabilization of exchange rates of member nations. One plan is by the United States Treasury and known as the White plan; the other by British experts and known as the Keynes plan.

Both plans are examples of starting at the end—instead of at the beginning—of building superstructures without testing the foundations. It is axiomatic that external stabilization cannot effectively precede the establishment of internal equilibrium on a firm foundation. In addition, both plans contemplate the establishment of an international institution with strong international controls over the domestic, monetary, and economic policies of the member nations. Implicit in both plans is a large measure of management and a substantial power over the domestic economy of every nation—including our own. The first question therefore has to do with all aspects of the problem of sovereignty.

In this connection it may be well to recall that after the break-down of the old gold standard several great economists abroad were led to suggest that the world monetary standard of the future should not be based on gold, but should be a managed currency. While in theory there may be much to say for the idea, in practice, it seems to me, it would not work.

It is one thing for smaller nations to aline their currencies to those of a great nation due to intimate economic and financial relations between them, and a similarity of outlook in political, economic, and monetary affairs.

It is quite another matter for great nations to link their currencies to a managed standard—the management of which rests in part with the political and monetary authorities of other countries.

So long as the international management tended to stimulate production and trade all might be well. But supposing the international bank, in the true interests of the world's economy, were to apply monetary measures tending to curb unduly rapid or speculative expansion. Such measures would be immediately reflected in all the countries concerned, and might immediately result in a sharp drop in commodity prices.

Abuse would be heaped upon the international management from all directions. It would be only too natural—then for suspicion to be aroused that these measures had been adopted because some nation, or combination of nations, conceived them to be in their interests regardless of their effect on any of the other countries concerned. Think of the political reactions which such a state of things might create. Instead of fostering friendship and cooperation, it might easily lead to serious discontent and antagonism.

I believe that the creation of an international banking institution, such as the one contemplated, while in theory perfectly legitimate, would in practice probably be unacceptable to most of the great nations. And even if acceptable to them would lead to the danger of international discord and the possibility of a breakdown of the system through the later defection of some of the most important countries. Should this happen, the

world might well have to pass through another period like that through which we recently passed with disastrous consequences to all.

As an alternative to both plans—there would seem to be no reason, politics aside, why the dollar, as the dominant currency today, should not occupy in the future the same position that the pound has occupied in the past with equally desirable results for all mankind.

A second specific suggestion of a world confederation is based on the fact that distance has been annihilated by the airplane. While this fact is an interesting extension of a process which has been proceeding rapidly since the discovery of the steam engine—it is not a sound basis for world confederation. The theory that it is "assumes a uniformity of thinking and ways of living throughout the world which" as the New York Times rightly states "does not and never will exist." Germany and France have been neighbors for years, but Germans are still German and Frenchmen—French. Surely the fact that America and Mexico adjoin does not make us Mexicans or vice versa.

The further idea of an international force to police the world fails to take into account the realities of the world in which we live. Like the world bank idea, in theory perhaps perfectly legitimate, it would in practice probably be unacceptable to most of the great nations. Who would direct such a force? Where would it be located? Of what would it be composed? And is it likely we could police the world any more effectively than Germany has policed Europe or with any less disastrous results? Would America stand for any permanent international police force greater than our own military forces and under control of some international body of which we were a small minority? And would not the whole idea likewise be open to the danger of fomenting international discord with the possibility of break-down of the system through defection of some of the most important countries?

For myself, I cannot envisage a peace that America would underwrite, that would depend for its execution on the continuous use of military force. Such a peace would not be peace at all, but rather an indeterminate perpetuation of the present conflict.

What seems to be needed is a different approach rather than a rehash of old conceptions.

It is not enough to annihilate Hitlerism. We must eliminate the economic and political factors which gave rise to Hitler and men like him.

I am in no doubt that the social and political convulsions which shook so many countries, especially on the continent of Europe during the pre-war years, are primarily due to the economic distress of those countries; that is, to the debasement of their standards of living. This, in turn, is almost certainly due to the clogging and distortion of the channels of trade.

A few figures will perhaps bring home this point more strikingly.

At no time in the history of the world has there been so stupendous an increase in the population as since the beginning of the nineteenth century. The population of Europe and America in 1801 numbered about 190,000,000 people. Today it numbers about 660,000,000 people—an increase of 470,000,000 people, or 250 percent.

The increased population owes its very existence to the fact that it had been able to exchange freely the products of its labor. Conversely, it must be obvious, if it is not now allowed freely to exchange these products, it must suffer a progressive debasement of its standard of life. There is a limit below which civilized society will not allow its standard to be debased.

In the 70 years preceding the outbreak of the last war, while the population of the United States and Europe doubled, production increased eightfold. This had the effect of increasing the standard of life of the doubled population fourfold. During the 70 years in which production increased eightfold, international trade increased sixteenfold. Is it not evident then that a fundamental factor in the increase of the standard of life was the great increase in production and in trade? It is equally evident that the disastrous economic war which began almost immediately after the Armistice in 1918 and continued with slight intermissions for two decades—lies at the base of the present conflict.

Certainly there can be no world political peace unless and until we have world economic peace. Because of America's vast importance as a world power, economically and politically, there can be no world economic stability without American cooperation to help bring it about and sustain it. But this need not and should not involve military or other entangling alliances.

It is the scheme of an economic United States of Europe then; an economic union perhaps not inclusive at the start, but designed to embrace western Europe eventually—which holds out the best avenue to world peace. One cannot exaggerate the stabilizing effects upon the world that a great, free-trade area in Europe—the counterpart of the great, free-trade area of our own country—would create.

This would bring about a situation that tended to remove the causes of war at their very roots. Through such an economic union it might further be possible to get rid of traditional jealousy and prejudice and to create political understanding between the several nations of Europe, soundly founded on the broad base of unrestricted free trade within that territory. Such an understanding is demanded not only by the interests of the peoples of the world, but by the cause of civilization itself.

Turning now to domestic matters, I believe the present seems to offer an opportunity for political collaboration between Democrats and Republicans to prove that this Nation is a democracy. We must show that a democracy, even in wartime, can function better than any authoritative administration; that private industry, not needlessly hampered by restrictions, is more competent to solve the economic problems of the post-war world than any bureaucratic regime; that the system of free enterprise, properly regulated, is by far the best economic system so far devised for improving the standard of life of all the people; that prosperity rests not on scarcity, but on abundance; that thrift is essential in public as well as private affairs; and that constitutional government shall be preserved at all costs.

It is an extraordinary fact that in the nineteenth century democracy and self-government were established throughout the larger part of the civilized world—largely through the growth and example of America.

Yet in 1917, when we went to war to make the "world safe for democracy," the result was to send great sections of the earth back to despotism in the short space of 25 years.

The plain, simple truth is democracy cannot triumph by the sword. The only method to extend democracy is by such orderly conduct of the Nation's affairs as to win the respect of all nations.

American productive genius, as represented by agriculture, capital, and labor, has done a magnificent job toward winning the war. There is every likelihood, if cooperation between management and labor can be carried over into the post-war world, that the solution of many of the internal problems that will then arise will be greatly facilitated.

Agriculture, capital, and labor have each shown their willingness to cooperate fully with Government. Nevertheless, there are some individuals in high circles who seem to question the desirability of a continuance of the system of free enterprise—on which our way of life is based.

To me—the trouble seems in combining unhampered individual enterprise with the ideal objective of the good of the community. For the great mass the struggle to obtain daily bread must absorb man's efforts, but there is a constantly increasing class in easier circumstances which is devoting more and more of its services to the public and to the state. We may hope the day will come when service to the community will be the pride and aim of life.

One thing seems certain. Organized labor cannot successfully preserve its rights by building up the power of the executive arm of government—any more in this country than it was able to do in Germany.

In the United States the question of the right of labor to organize, free of all interference from management, for the purpose of achieving better working conditions and higher wages, is no longer an issue. But the example of Germany, where the Nazis used the advancements of labor as a bait for personal power, shows that if labor is to retain its gains, it must free itself from the political domination inherent in one-man government.

The arguments for a labor paradise built on government largess and security for all, are of course very enticing, as long as one does not look at the final result.

The result, when the system is worked to its logical conclusion, has been shown in Germany and other countries. There political dictatorship, the enslavement of labor and all other elements which compose society have resulted; and forced labor to make good the previous impoverishment of the nation has, of necessity, followed.

Finally, domestic economic confusion exists due to the lack of any well-considered plan, rather than to any failure of agriculture, capital or labor. An elaborate and extensive system of Government control has been built up haphazardly; successive measures have been determined by emergencies or the successful pressure of some sectional or group interest, none of which is related or coordinated to any general conception. Such a system is bound to be wasteful and inefficient, and ultimately it becomes injurious to all interests.

In a democracy we certainly do not want a planned economy, but the Nation should plan its policy as a whole. The real alternative to planning in this sense is, as we have seen, not freedom—but chaos followed by improvisation.

America made clear at the last election that we were unanimous as a people on the question of winning the war, but that we are unalterably opposed to the war being used as a shield behind which to change our form of government or our way of life. Hitherto in this country our traditional regard for public order, personal liberty, and freedom of thought and discussion has never been questioned. But recently there have been signs in some quarters of a willingness to apply dictatorial methods in place of reason and persuasion. Though the people have been alienated by these threats, they are waiting to respond to a leadership in which they are asked for intelligent cooperation, and not browbeaten into unintelligent submission.

If democracy is to survive, the people must not be threatened or talked down to. They must be informed, convinced and led. Leadership is no mere affair of political programs. It is an attitude to power, a belief in the people and in our constitutional form of government.

Memorial Day Address of Hon. James J. Davis, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on yesterday, Memorial Day, at the Calvary Cemetery, Pittsburgh, Pa., under the auspices of the Martin-O'Donnell Post No. 274, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, impressive services were held commemorating the memory of the brave sons of America who have valiantly served her cause and her flag. On that occasion I was privileged to make a brief address, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We come together on this Memorial Day to pay homage to those honored dead who lie resting here, and to reaffirm in this hour of crisis our solemn, soul-felt pledge that "these dead shall not have died in vain." No thoughts can measure nor words describe the immortal works of these departed men. We can only say of them that they gave up their lives for an ideal which they cherished, for a hope which they sustained.

These were not conquering legions; these were not a soldier caste. Theirs was not the art of making war. These were people of the land. These were the tillers of the soil, the builders of industry, and the artisans of labor. Theirs was the art of keeping peace.

Yet when the hour of decision struck, they went down into the valley of death. They grappled with adversity. And they did not return. Their lives, their youth, their every dream were spent upon the altar of war.

Yet they who went down before the monster death did not go down in vain, for out of the conflict, the hate and the chaos of that seething hour, these men created a mighty and enduring union. The energies that were spent, the hearts that were stilled, and the hopes that were lost were rebuilt again into a vibrant, living Union of States and men—the United States of America. Welded from the blood, marrow, and tears of a tortured people, this Union has preserved and shall continue to preserve the majesty and dignity of man as long as we remain worthy of these very men whose memory we honor here today. For these honored dead gave to the world an example, they gave to us a destiny, they gave to all men an inspiring hope. So as we look down upon these hallowed graves today, let us not be heavy of heart. Let us not be cynical of purpose or bereft of will. Let our hearts beat with eternal gratitude, that men like these have moved across the stage of time and left in their wake a better, more deserving world.

But the soldiers who bore arms, who fired the volleys, and who fell upon the field of battle were not alone in the fashioning of this enduring Union. For behind these courageous men, supporting their every effort was a united and determined people, whose long, laborious toil produced the implements of war, created the sinews of effort, and stored the myriad supplies which played such a vital and impelling role in the accomplishment of the great task.

Many of them lie buried here—men and women of all races and all lands, who labored long in the cause of that enduring union wherein full right and justice would be assured to all people and all races—where men of all callings and all creeds could dwell together in honor and in peace, welded together in an indissoluble unity by the guaranties and processes of a constitutional government. The cause for which they labored has prevailed. The government which our esteemed forefathers of another era established, and which these honored dead saw fit to preserve, still functions today—the most outstanding medium of self-government that the world has ever known.

The America which was reared upon these ashes of adversity has lived on this continent in uninterrupted peace. It has made and maintained peace with all its continental neighbors. It has reared no costly fortifications. It has maintained no large standing armies. It has lived in cooperative peace and progress with all its immediate neighbors. And within its own borders, it has brought together peoples of diverse races and conflicting cultures. It has absorbed them all into a union where peace, liberty, and personal privilege are undiminished, and where old hatreds, rivalries, and tensions have been dissolved in this structure where the common good prevails.

How different the conditions on the continents of Europe and Asia. Here war after war has swept across the lands, leaving devastation, destruction, and destitution in their wake. No union has arisen there. Hatred, rivalry, and rancor are yet unabated. Nations vie against each other in war and in peace. All is chaos and confusion. These peoples and these nations, with rare exception, have not yet learned to live at peace with themselves or their neighbors. And this condition must be rectified for the good of all men everywhere.

There was a time when it could be said by Americans that the wars and welfare of these distant lands were of no immediate concern to us; but that is no longer true. The growth of scientific knowledge, the coming of the airplane, the radio, and other such improvements have so reduced the size and increased the interdependency of the world that whether it please or pain us, we must be constantly and increasingly concerned with the trend of events in those lands beyond the seas.

Twice in a generation the truths of these considerations have been forcibly and clearly brought home to us. Twice in a generation we have become embroiled in a world-wide clash of arms which came into being because of events and disturbances which occurred among nations many miles removed from our shores.

Today the second of these wars is raging in full fury. Scarcely had the forces of violence been silenced in the previous war when preparations for the present conflict were begun by those nations still motivated by a consuming hatred and contempt for their neighbors, and an all-encompassing ambition for self-aggrandizement and plunder.

These forces of aggression are bent upon the destruction of every fundamental concept of human rights. They have neither faith nor tolerance nor belief in the common man. They have a complete distrust and contempt for all systems of free government, and they would destroy every part and parcel of a people or a nation that refused to become their willing slaves.

It has been the strength of union which was created by these fallen dead that has given to us the will and the power to withstand our enemies.

The brave Americans now under arms, fighting in all the ramparts of the world with unquestioned valor and unequalled skill, will pursue and harry the enemy until he falls in complete and overwhelming defeat—a defeat which shall be heralded by his unconditional surrender, when our forces march into Rome, Berlin, and Tokyo.

And the Americans on the home front—those men and women of the farm, the factory, and the forge—whose records of production have amazed and astounded the world will continue at their tasks with unfailing courage and unflagging will, until the weapons they produce shall bear heavily upon our enemies and crush them down into a final, complete, and unconditional surrender.

With such a cooperative unity as this we cannot fail to achieve the final victory—hard and tortuous though the task may be.

But our efforts will not end with the mere military defeat of our enemies. We will not lose the peace this time. We will strive to make it certain that the forces of aggression never again loose themselves upon a peaceful world, there to bring untold suffering and misery to all men and all nations.

But our approach to the problems of peace will not end with the completely negative purpose of forestalling aggression, however necessary that may be. Indeed we will take positive action—action designed to bring the nations of the world together in common strength and unity. We will devise a pattern for international relations wherein each race, each culture, and each nation shall be free to work out its own destiny in the full equality of a peaceful world.

Indeed, we will hold out to the world the forces and processes which have made our union strong—individual freedom and immunity for all peoples; the necessity for and validity of fundamental constitutional principles. We will strive to convince them that men of all races, all creeds, and all nations can and should live together in peace, unity, and progress.

This represents a task of the utmost urgency—such a task as will require the continued faith, tolerance, and determination of us all. But it is such a task as must be done if we are not to fail ourselves and the world. It is such a task as will be done if we but keep faith with those who lie buried here, and with those who fell and shall fall in the battles now being waged throughout the world.

Our task seems awesome. The road we tread seems long. The sacrifice we make seems costly. The labor we perform seems exhausting. Indeed, the entire prospect seems clouded, obscure, and ill-defined. But let us look upon the graves of these men, and from them "take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion."

Their task was to redeem a union torn and rent asunder by internal strife. Their road was that ghastly internecine road of civil war. Their sacrifice was the sacrifice of death. Their labor was measured in years, not days. Their prospect was that dark foreboding prospect of a nation disunited, of wounds yet unhealed, of passions yet unspent.

Such was the foreboding prospect which loomed before these honored dead. But they were dauntless souls. They stepped into the breach and turned back adversity. We shall be no less dauntless. We, too, shall step into the breach and turn back adversity. And on the remnants of this struggle, we, like they, shall build a stronger, more enduring structure of freedom and justice—a structure which shall prevail as a haven for all men and all races down until the end of time.

The Battle of Gettysburg—furious, bloody battle of civil war that it was—saw the strength of our Union at the lowest ebb it has ever known. Yet out of that battle there emerged among our people a kindred spirit and a united strength which brought

forth a new freedom, an inspiring hope, and an eternal unity of peace and progress to Americans of every race, color, and creed.

Today the strength of the world is again at low ebb. Unity and peace loom as distant and forlorn hopes. Yet, out of these present battles, there may emerge a new unity, a new era of peace and progress among all the nations of the world.

The United States, having first reestablished its own internal strength and internal order, shall extend a friendly and a helping hand to all nations who are sincerely striving to create unity among the nations of the world, and who are willing to proclaim and sustain the majesty of all men, and to extend the principles of human justice and material growth to all peoples and all races on that sound and impartial basis of a common union.

The legacy of right and justice which these honored dead left to the world can lead us into no other paths save the paths of unity and peace.

George Washington's Views on Reciprocal Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington Post of May 30, 1943, entitled "Washington's Words Point a Path Now," written by Carl Sandburg. The article deals with reciprocal trade agreements, and quotes two letters from George Washington.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON'S WORDS POINT A PATH NOW

(By Carl Sandburg)

The blessed and definitely remembered American hero, George Washington, was nobody's fool, neither was he a stuffed shirt nor a Christian gentleman who went to church regularly merely to set a good example. It does not lessen his dignity nor worth to remark that while he was beautifully human, he knew his onions and could tell a hawk from a handsaw. We come to these observations out of reading the original manuscripts of two letters written by General Washington. With a feathered quill pen he traced across the honest and rugged ragpaper words for this hour a little more important than the genera. run of what comes off the hit-and-run typewriters of today.

My friend Oliver R. Barrett, of Chicago, had dug the manuscripts out of his wide ranging and priceless collection. We agreed that Washington is worth reading—now. He saw the earth as a globe with the human family on it. And he saw the global life of man was to be hard and hazardous, though, like many of us today, he had his wishes and prayers for global peace. This he saw possible whenever men should truly try to shape it with will and vision.

"BLESSING OF PEACE"

At Mount Vernon on September 5, 1785, General Washington's goose-quill pen wrote these lines to be sent to his friend in France, Marquis de Chastellux:

"DEAR SIR: My first wish is to see the blessings of peace diffused through all the countries, and among all ranks in every country, and that we should consider ourselves as the children of the common parent, and be disposed to acts of brotherly kindness toward one another. In that case, all restrictions of trade would vanish; we should take your wines, your fruits, and surplusage of other articles, and give you, in return, our oils, our fish, tobacco, naval stores, etc.; in like manner, we should exchange produce with other countries, to our reciprocal advantage.

"The globe is large enough. Why, then, need we wrangle for a small spot of it? If one country cannot contain us, another should open its arms to us. But these halcyon days, if they ever did exist, are now no more. A wise Providence, I presume, has ordered it otherwise, and we must go on in the old way, disputing, and now and then fighting, until the globe itself is dissolved."

MORE OF WASHINGTON

This should go into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, also into the standard school readers immediately following the farewell message which is read aloud in the halls of Congress each anniversary of Washington's birthday.

Alongside the above letter should go one that Washington wrote on the same day to His Excellency Chevalier de la Luzerne. It reads:

"From the last European accounts we have reason to hope that the clouds which seemed to be gathering in your hemisphere will yield to a tranquil sky, and peace, with all its blessings will spread its mantle over the threatened lands. My first wish is to see the sons and daughters of the world mixing as one family, enjoying the sweets of social intercourse and reciprocal advantages. The earth certainly is sufficient to contain us all, and affords everything necessary to our wants, if we would be friendly and endeavor to accommodate one another. Why, then, should we wrangle, and why should we attempt to infringe the rights and properties of our neighbors? But, lest you should suppose that I am about to turn preacher, I will only add that, with the highest esteem and consideration, I have the honor to be, etc."

NOT FORCE ALONE

Thinking in global terms is no new thing for a President of the United States. Abraham Lincoln capitalized his phrase "The Family of Man."

Mei Ling Soong Chiang, in giving the gist of her own philosophy in the two words "cooperation and humility," was also summarizing Washington and Lincoln.

Force only isn't worth so much. Force with control is what counts.

As between speed only and speed with control, who wouldn't take speed with control?

War Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address on the subject of war mobilization delivered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] on May 28 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. The Blue Network brings you a talk by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, on war mobilization. Senator PEPPER is one of the Senators who has been sponsoring a war mobilization bill in the Congress. Senator PEPPER.

Senator PEPPER. My friends, these are great times and great things are being done. The President did a great thing today when he issued an Executive order setting up in the Office for Emergency Management of the Executive Office of the President an Office of War Mobilization, to be under the direction of the Director of War Mobilization, to be appointed by the President. As you perhaps have learned already, the President appointed to this responsible and dominant place Mr. Justice James F. Byrnes, who vacates a position of Director of Economic Stabilization.

This Executive order issued by the President, according to a statement which the President issued in explanation thereof, is based upon these grounds primarily:

"We are entering," said the President, "a phase of the war effort when we must streamline our activities, avoid duplication and overlapping, eliminate interdepartmental friction, make decisions with dispatch, and keep both our military machine and our essential civilian economy running in team and at high speed."

Eleven Senators issued a statement in comment upon this Executive order. They were: Senator KILGORE, of West Virginia, who has done so very much in furtherance of this program and policy; Senator BALL, of Minnesota; Senator TRUMAN, of Missouri; Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island; Senator MURRAY, of Montana; Senator THOMAS of Utah; Senator HOLMAN, of Oregon; Senator CAPPER, of Kansas; Senator JOHNSON of Colorado; and Senator WALLGREN of Washington; and I. In this statement we said, among other things, "We hope that this Presidential action will now gear the entire domestic economy and mobilize all resources to the urgent task set by the Churchill-Roosevelt conference. It is hoped that this Office—that is, this Office of War Mobilization—will at least establish that economic high command which has been repeatedly urged by Members of the Congress."

Continuing, we said: "We welcome the adoption of the principle of advance program planning to unify policy and eliminate conflicts which have hitherto hindered the full mobilization of our country for war. This Office gives us the first opportunity to forestall the developments of program conflicts among the various agencies administering the war effort. 'Ve hope," we said, "that the Director of War Mobilization will proceed at once to establish the machinery necessary to balance and schedule the war program of its constituent officers." We trust that this will strengthen the scheduling activities already begun under Mr. Charles E. Wilson, of the War Production Board. As the interim report of May 13 said, such a move opens the way for the coordination of manpower, production, and economic stabilization policies, which has hitherto been lacking.

The handling of economic stabilization particularly as applied to prices, wages, and food production will be one of the major problems which faces this new office.

I think I should state that the powers conferred upon this new Office of War Mobilization and conferred upon the Director of the Office of War Mobilization are enumerated by the President's order as follows:

"To develop unified programs and to establish policies for the maximum use of the Nation's natural and industrial resources for military and civilian needs, for the effective

use of the national manpower not in the armed services, for the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy, and for the adjustment of such economy to war needs and conditions.

"To unify the activities of Federal agencies and departments engaged in or concerned with production, procurement, distribution, or transportation of military or civilian supplies, materials, and products, and to resolve and determine controversies between such agencies or departments, except those to be resolved by the Director of Economic Stabilization.

"To issue such directives on policy or operations to the Federal agencies and departments as may be necessary to carry out the programs developed, the policies established, and the decisions made under this order. It is the duty of all such agencies and departments to execute these directives and to make to the Office of War Mobilization such progress reports as may be required."

Senator KILGORE, from his home where he is ill today, issued a statement in which he said that he trusted that the Executive order of the President had sufficient teeth in it to straighten out the whole procurement problem facing the country. Moreover, Senator KILGORE said that he hoped that those appointed to the board and that the director would have sufficient temerity to use the teeth that the order contains to get an effective job of mobilizing the resources and the power of this country done toward winning the war.

Most of us know that throughout the whole administrative machinery of Washington there has been clash and conflict in the furtherance of the war effort. We know that agency has collided with agency. We know that on occasion department has been antagonistic to department. We know that there have been disagreements of opinion and action. The greatest difficulty has been to find anyone outside the person of the President who could resolve these conflicts, who could adjust these differences, who could diminish these antagonisms, and could make all the various administrative agencies, the several departments of the Government work and pull and fight together as a single team toward crushing the evil Axis.

Now the President has put upon Mr. Justice Byrnes the great responsibility under him of heading the Nation's economic high command. The way Mr. Justice Byrnes shall perform the functions of this office shall, of course, determine whether the Executive order is sufficient and further legislative action is unnecessary or whether it shall be required that the Congress shall continue to pursue this subject as it has in the past and perhaps establish a legislative agency with legislative power and authority instead of relying upon the Executive responsibility which has thus been conferred upon the able Mr. Justice Byrnes.

You will recall that a little bit ago there was conflict in the three programs so essential to the war effort. The program relative to the production of synthetic rubber, the program concerning the development of octane gasoline, and the program providing for escort vessels. There was one vital requisite, namely, valves which they all must have. We evolved the programs, we determined the number and the quantity that would be necessary in carrying out those programs, but we failed so to coordinate all the production facilities that there would be enough of this essential element, the valves, to make possible those three programs.

Now Mr. Justice Byrnes is the boss. He has the power to call into consultation any of the Federal agencies or departments and they have the duty to execute the directives of Mr Justice Byrnes, so that there may be a single policy on behalf of the National Government and not a number of different policies on behalf of the Federal agencies of the Government.

It's very easy, for example, to see how all the various programs are tied one to another. Take, for example, the matter of food production. That is not solely the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture. That concerns the War Production Board because you cannot produce upon the farm unless you have machinery with which to carry on agricultural operations. Neither can you produce food for the Nation and the armed forces unless you have manpower. You cannot have manpower unless you are able to devise a system of wages which will be conducive to manpower taking up agricultural employment. The workers cannot get to the fields unless they have transportation. You cannot have transportation unless you have tires and gasoline. And so it goes throughout the whole gamut of our production program.

It is to be hoped that this coordination which Mr. Justice Byrnes is expected to bring about will relate not only to Washington but will extend out into the field—that is to say, that in the several regions of the country there shall be coordination among the various agencies and departments of the Government. There shall be, for example, a single procurement program for the whole Nation. It will not be just a matter of the Maritime Commission buying for its ships, the Navy buying for its ships, the War Department buying for its forces, or some other agency indulging in a procurement activity. The United States Government is fighting the war; the United States Government will be engaged in procurement for war; the United States Government will mobilize the whole resources of the Nation for the winning of the war.

And I think it's encouraging also to note that a member of the War Mobilization Committee, which is to consult with and assist Mr. Justice Byrnes, the Director, is Mr. Harry Hopkins, who has been the liaison between this Government and allied governments in the coordination of the supply programs of all the United Nations. That indicates that President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, in their consultations here, have been thinking not only about how the several nations may be more effective but how all of the United Nations may together work and fight more mightily toward the early conclusion of the war.

For a long time we in the Congress have been seeking to achieve the results which the President has initiated today. We hope that the administration of the program is going to be such that we will be able to throw against the enemy the total power of the Nation. We hope that we are going to be able hereafter to work together and not fight with one another. We hope that the Federal agencies shall each find its several place, perform its several part in the whole effort; that the result will be an acceleration of our struggle and the increase of our might so that every blow will be timed and directed with the greatest energy and power.

This is another step assuring that the Axis shall soon begin to feel that democracy is not decadent; that we've not lost the power of self-discipline; that we are capable of bringing order out of confusion and chaos; that it is still within the genius of democracy to govern and to fight; and that all over the earth those forces which they thought sluggish or sleeping are today aroused giants which with their mighty power are beginning to destroy the evil citadels of tyranny which their bloody hands have constructed upon the good earth.

So the prospect for freedom for mankind is encouraging. The home front is strengthening and tightening. Our military activities are growing in greatness and grandeur. We are drawing back our mighty force for the last blow. After a while we will be able to see in the darkening sky the light of hope and victory, and beyond that we shall begin to construct, to build, to erect, the kind of a peace in which democracy shall ever work to promote the health, the happiness, and the security of men everywhere in the world. I thank you.

ANNOUNCER. You have heard a talk by Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, on war mobilization. Senator PEPPER spoke from the studios of WMAL in Washington.

Memorial Day Address of Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by me on May 30, 1943, at the Battle Ground Cemetery, Brightwood, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are met here at the Battleground National Cemetery to mark another Memorial Day. We are met to pay homage here in the silent city of the dead—pay homage to those who have answered the last roll call in the defense of home and country. Homage implies honor, reverence, and gratitude. We honor their memory, reverence their handiwork, and express gratitude for their patriotism and sacrifice.

Above all, we are met to recovenant ourselves and our faith with the timeless dedication Lincoln made to the unfinished work "thus far so nobly advanced."

Tears and tributes are not enough in this great world crisis. This is no time for hollow words—no time when our boys on all the continents and all the seas are giving their lives that we might enjoy and retain the great freedoms. It is a time for fullness of deeds by all of us.

Lincoln, speaking in 1858, said, "Think nothing of me. Take no thought for the political faith of any man whatsoever, but come back to the truths that are in the Declaration of Independence. You may do anything with me you choose if you will but heed those sacred principles." It is appropriate that we quote the words of Lincoln on this spot for it was here when Washington was threatened in 1864 that he came out to visit the troops who were defending Washington. But it is more vital that on this Memorial Day we dedicate "our lives, our fortunes, our sacred honor," to the preservation of the sacred principles and values laid down in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

Those were critical days in the life of the Nation when Lincoln stood here—days that hardly anyone has time to think about now; but at least once in a while it might be well for us to remember that the city of Washington was nearly captured in June 1864 by General Early. There were no airplanes in those days. There were no tanks. But General Early had horsemen and swift-moving

troops, and he arrived practically at this spot where we are now standing. Every able-bodied man in Washington—yes, even those who were not able-bodied—were called to the colors. Grant was before Richmond when he got word of the danger and he sent the Sixth Corps down the historic James and up the historic Potomac. President Lincoln who had been out at this spot in the morning drove to the Seventh Street Wharves to meet and welcome them, and how warmly he greeted them. Then the Sixth Corps marched to reinforce the brave defenders on the firing line. They marched up Seventh Street past the Smithsonian Institute, the Patent Office, and the post office, and Washington was saved by the noble men of that generation. Within a year victory came and Lincoln was martyred.

Now America is being saved by the noble men and women of this generation. The generation of Lincoln banished slavery from our land, but we know that it lives in other lands to menace us with a world engulfing bondage—bondage of men's minds and lives, and we are engaged in this conflict to break those chains. The national ideals men fought for here are being ravaged internationally. The hopes they died for here are being despoiled.

The battle for freedom and free men is not yet won. The camp fires on all the continents of the world are still burning. We are met today in a spirit of grim reality. The torch of freedom that burned here is still aflame, held aloft by America and our allies' cause—human liberty is still at stake. Instead of "We are coming, Father Abraham, 300,000 strong", America is saying to the world, "We are placing 15,000,000 in our armed forces and 125,000,000 of the rest of us are back of them."

From the cold voiceless lips of those who have left their stirring and tragic yesterdays to dwell in other worlds with Him who peoples all abodes of time, there comes a call. From Bunker Hill, from Valley Forge, from Gettysburg, from Antietam, Atlanta, the Wilderness, from Chateau Thierry, the Argonne, from Bataan, Corregidor, the Solomons, from north Africa, and from all the continents and seas of the globe comes a call, a call to us Americans—we who are free born. It is a call to serve with full dignity mankind, answer the challenges of the present and banish slavery from the earth.

All America is the direct heir of the birthright of freedom. Our forefathers fought for that freedom. In deep humility here today we acknowledge that they enshrined their ideals. They won their battle. We must win ours, if we would preserve America.

In this contest in which we are engaged now, we covet no lands. We ask only for the freedom of enslaved humanity—and to win it and to insure its survival America has drawn the sword.

When I say we covet no lands I mean just that. But we are resolved that when this war is over we will do that which is necessary to protect and guard the future of our beloved land. We will keep faith with those who died here and those who are going to die for us in this contest.

Last year I spoke at Gettysburg, on that spot where Lincoln spoke his immortal words. Today I speak where Lincoln came to witness a battle. We cannot even think of Memorial Day without thinking of this great American. "He sounded forth the trumpet that shall never call retreat." His was the vision that kept us a Nation.

In communities throughout the land, the Nation is observing Memorial Day. In these observances, we look not for marble markers, but rather to the people and to the land which are themselves enduring monuments, to the men who have died and to the men who are dying, that the hopes of free men may live.

The men who fight in our armed forces today have cherished since childhood their memories of Memorial Day and the stirring feeling it engendered as crowds gathered in the valleys of the dead throughout our land.

To the aged man it brings pictures of the past that touch innumerable chords of memory. To the young man it brings a challenge for the future. To the child, it is a day of wonder, of awe and hope. In their faces we can read many questions.

We must ever teach them our children—the men and women of the future—the inspiring lessons of the past and the present, of the response and call to arms, of the prayers that were uttered, of the sacrifices that were made, of the tears that were shed, of the lives that were lost, and of the union that was reunited, and the freedom that was won and will be won again. Teach them that eternal vigilance alone will preserve our liberties.

We must teach them of Washington, of Lincoln, of Grant, of Sherman, of Sheridan, of Pershing, of MacArthur, Wainwright, Doolittle, Colin Kelly, Joe Foss, Commander Dempsey, and the sailors and soldiers and airmen in the ranks, and of the sacrifices in every war of the men and women on the home front.

We must teach them that today we are a strong and united people, because the men in blue and gray who fought here at Fort Stevens left us a united people with one flag—the same flag that flew over Washington's troops, the same flag that went with Jackson to New Orleans, the same flag that went with Taylor and Scott to Mexico, the same flag that Grant raised at Appomattox, the same flag that Dewey and Schley and Sampson flew over the Spanish possessions, and the same flag that Pershing carried to the shores of the Rhine—the same flag that flies with MacArthur in Australia, New Guinea, and the isles of the sea; the same flag that went with Eisenhower to north Africa, and flies on all the seas of the earth.

The Nation's heroes are not merely legends. They are very real today. They were no better and no stronger and no more noble than the men of this war. The men who made America great, the men who established and maintained our freedom, are as one with the men who fight to maintain it today.

At Valley Forge Washington looked beyond the bleak hills and the bloody footprints in the snow, past the horizon, into a vision of the future—a great future for a free people.

That vision survived the bleak days of Valley Forge, survived the dark hours of the Civil War, survived the losses in France in the World War, and it has survived the losses in the Far East and in Africa in this war. The vision of Washington was for a great free people. That vision of freedom will never perish, providing we have learned the lesson of Pearl Harbor. Alert America. Constantly alert, down through the centuries. That's the lesson of Pearl Harbor.

Peace will come. It must come without rancor or hatred as peace came to the men who made their last earthly bivouac here. It must come without compromise to the sacred cause of freedom as it came here to these guardians of faith.

A righteous victory will be ours. A just peace will be ours. For them we acknowledge our dependence on Divine Providence. For them we renew to those living and dead who gave "the last full measure of devotion" our pledge that we will hold high the torch. We will keep faith. And we of this generation pledge we will transmit to those who come after us the liberties of America, unimpaired.

And with the peace will come added responsibility—the responsibility to rebuild bleeding, suffering humanity, and make a repetition of this holocaust impossible. We are dedicated to fulfill this task.

May God be with us then, to guide the leaders and the people of this Nation, so that the wisdom of the Most High will be ours and the heritage of America for all time to come.

Proposed National Brown-Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following anticipated effects of proposed limitation order supplementing L–94—popularly known as the National Brown-Out—of the War Production Board:

There exists in draft form in the Office of War Utilities a proposed limitation order, the details of which have not been released. This limitation order is intended to supplement Order L–94 restricting the uses of certain forms of electric lighting throughout the United States and is based on a presumed existing or anticipated shortage of fuel and of the means for transporting fuel. It is rumored that this limitation order is scheduled for issue on or about July 1, 1943.

Order L–94 was based on a presumed shortage of power which has since been shown to exist only in the 25-cycle areas around Niagara Falls and has been put into effect only in those areas. The proposed limitation order is believed to be much more far-reaching in its effect which is, apparently, to be brought about without much opportunity for public scrutiny. This order is presumably directed at signs and display lighting which are in operation during the low period of total electric consumption, in other words, not during the peak period. Sources of power must maintain enough turbines in operation at all times to supply the requirements of peak demand, and for this reason display lighting loads are actually produced at little additional cost to the power producing sources. Also, for the same reason the additional fuel consumed is relatively small. Estimates of the fuel consumed which might be saved by such a limitation order should be subjected to scrutiny on this basis.

EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESS

The smaller manufacturing firms in this country are largely dependent upon income upon sales made locally, which in turn depend on the effectiveness of local retail sales. Smaller retail firms do very little advertising, and depend largely upon their illumination and electric signs to attract the buying public within their doors. Statistics on this subject indicate that in general this means represents by far the most effective advertising for small retail firms. It is impractical to estimate the far-reaching damage to small business if such illumination were terminated by the War Production Board fiat.

This order also empowers War Production Board to classify industries and consumers of electric power into varying degrees of critical needs, and also empowers them to exempt individually or by area those firms arbitrarily established as essential to the war effort. Such powers are subject to all manner of abuse, and the charge may properly be drawn that only the firms having power-

ful representation in Washington will be in position to receive such exemptions.

It is well enough to advocate any step necessary to implement the winning of the war. It is another thing, again, to put thousands of small firms out of business by Executive order without the firm establishment of the facts of need concerning such action.

THE EFFECT ON THE ELECTRIC SIGN INDUSTRY

Previous Limitation Orders L-29 and L-78 have resulted in obliterating well over a third of one industry. This industry comprises 3,500 small manufacturing firms engaged in the neon sign business. The first named limitation order forbids the manufacture of new signs and freezes stocks of material; the second virtually eliminates the possibility of conversion from neon to fluorescent. Mr. Victor H. Todd, 509 Fifth Avenue, New York City, has done a great deal of research on these orders. Senator STEWART, chairman of the subcommittee on complaints of the Senate Small Business Committee, has interested himself to a degree in this problem.

With the advent of these two limitation orders, those of the small sign manufacturers that stayed in business did so by devoting their entire efforts to the maintenance of existing displays. They have been unable to convert into the war effort because of the nature of their factories. If the proposed "brown-out" regulations go into effect, their last avenue of maintaining their organizations will have been eliminated.

THE EFFECT ON CIVILIAN MORALE

Light is by far the cheapest morale builder.

If war workers in America are to face the situation of working long hours for the war effort, only to return home to face a "brown-out" situation, in which wives and daughters will not feel safe on the streets, and in which the streets will not be sufficiently attractive to invite visiting, attendance at movies, etc., there will be an inevitable slackening of morale such as has always been associated with "all work and no play." This is so fundamental as to not require further comment.

Statistics are available on the number of fatal injuries before and after the dim-out regulations were put into effect in New York City. It may be claimed that the "brown-out" will not constitute the same degree of hazard, but this is only a question of degree. The "brown-out" will result in some measure of loss of time due to direct injury traceable to this source, if not loss of life. This consideration is more destructive of morale than any other factor.

Even in Germany and Japan the principle is recognized that gayety and recreation are essential to those who are spending long hours in monotonous work associated with war production. We should be at least as intelligent.

EFFECT ON WAR PRODUCTION

No clear statement has been made to date as to the anticipated fuel and transportation savings on which the current "brown-out" agitation is based. It is rumored that the estimated savings are about a million barrels of oil and 2,000,000 tons of coal. This sounds large, but actually represents the equivalent of one-fifth of 1 percent of the total annual fuel consumption. This is a very small corner in which to start saving fuel and transportation. And the American public is asked a huge price for this small saving.

Is it not likely that there is some hidden reason for the current agitation? Is it possible that large manufacturers of electric lighting equipment are instrumental in eliminating the remaining two-thirds of the smaller manufacturers? Is it possible that personal ambition in high office is being implemented through a proposed sadistic suppression of the American public, with the excuses of bringing the war home to the people and of preventing them from spending their money on so-called trifles in the hope that more money will be made available for tax and War-bond purposes? All the above is conjecture; but certainly none of the reasons produced to date on behalf of this order ring true.

The reason given for L-94 was a presumed power shortage. The Office of War Utilities now admits that a power shortage does not exist. The current reasons involve a saving of relatively small amounts of fuel and transportation as stated above, and represent an equally false basis for such drastic action.

If, then, these reasons are merely excuses, the question inevitably arises who, and for what purposes, is promoting this brown-out limitation order L-94?

Federal Elections Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS E. MILLER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am about to introduce a bill providing for a new Federal elections law. This bill is a product of the carefully considered labors of the Criminal Law Council of the American Bar Association. It is not generally known, nevertheless it is a fact, that the present Federal elections law makes no provision for the prosecution and punishment of frauds committed in the election of the President and Vice President, and the adoption or rejection of proposed amendments to the Federal Constitution.

The bill does not affect or change State laws but merely permits Federal cooperation in the prosecution of vote frauds in the election of President and Vice President, and in balloting on amendments to the Constitution of the United States. I believe devoutly in State rights and I am unalterably opposed to Federal encroachment upon this field. However, local initiative has not always been responsible for cleaning up unsavory local conditions. "Save democracy" is a meaningless cry unless we realize in these times that an honest ballot is the cornerstone of democracy, and its protection and preservation is among the first duties of every public official.

The bill makes it a Federal offense to fraudulently interfere by miscount or tabulation with the result of any vote for the nomination or election of a Member of Congress, President, or Vice President in the primary and general elections. It provides that no person shall by bribery, force, or threats, prevent or obstruct a voter from casting his ballot or qualifying to do so. It makes it an offense to pad election rolls or bribe election officials, and assesses penalties ranging to a $5,000 fine and 10 years in prison.

The act is drawn for the sole purpose of securing to the citizens of the United States the honest and lawful conduct of elections which affect the selection of Federal officers. It is designed to make possible the prosecution of fraud in Federal elections without resort to the circumlocutions of a questionable and antiquated conspiracy statute. The old Civil War conspiracy statute has been used in some types of frauds but is powerless to punish frauds committed in primaries, and it cannot be used against certain types of fraud in a general election.

It is obviously inconsistent to pass laws regulating the source and size of campaign contributions, as well as the political activities of Federal employees, while the door is left open for unbridled frauds in Federal elections.

It is my opinion that this bill adequately remedies a lamentable defect in the present law and provides positive protection against a repetition of the voting practices which have disgusted decent citizens and seriously undermined democracy at home.

Mr. Arthur J. Freund, of St. Louis, Mo., has prepared a helpful and illuminating statement explaining the proposed bill and also the Federal elections law. The bill and the accompanying statement follow:

A bill to enforce the rights of citizens of the United States in the nomination and election of Senators, Representatives, electors, the President and Vice President of the United States, and in any election to amend the Constitution of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Elections Act."

SEC. 2. The term "election" as used in this act shall mean—

(a) Any primary election or nominating election or general election whereby persons are selected, nominated, or elected by and under the authority of the Constitution and the laws of the United States or by and under the authority of the constitution or the laws of any State or Territory for the nomination or election of any United States Senator, Representative to the Congress of the United States, elector of the President or the Vice President of the United States, or the President of the United States, or the Vice President of the United States;

(b) Any election held by and under the authority of the Constitution and laws of the United States, or by and under the authority of the constitution or laws of any State to vote upon any amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The term "voter" as used in this act shall mean any person lawfully entitled by and under the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the United States or by and under the constitution or the laws of any State or Territory to participate in and vote at any election.

The term "officer of election" as used in this act shall mean any judge, clerk, canvasser, commissioner, or other person whose duty it is or shall be to receive, count, canvass, certify, register, supervise, or report, or give effect to the vote of any voter at any election, or the registration or qualification of any voter for any election.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful for any officer of election—

(a) Knowingly, willfully, or fraudulently to refuse or omit to receive, count, certify, register, report, or give effect to the lawful vote of any voter; or

(b) Knowingly, willfully, or fraudulently to give or attempt to give effect to any false or fraudulent vote, or to give or make, or attempt to give or make, any false count, certificate, document, report, or other false evidence in relation to any election.

SEC. 4. It shall be unlawful for any person—

(a) By force, bribery, reward, menace, threat, intimidation, trick, or knowingly, willfully, or fraudulently to hinder, delay, prevent, or obstruct any voter from doing any lawful act required to be done to qualify him to vote or from lawfully voting at any election; or

(b) By any such means or knowingly, willfully, or fraudulently advise, aid or abet, maintain, or procure or attempt to maintain or to procure the placing, registration, or enrollment of any false, fraudulent, unlawful, or fictitious name or names upon the election rolls, poll books, books, or documents of registration, or election, or any other records of registration or election used or intended to be used at any election by any officer of election as a list or designation of lawfully qualified voters; or

(c) By any such means or knowingly, willfully, or fraudulently to compel or induce, or attempt to compel or induce any officer of election, to receive the vote at any election of any person not lawfully entitled to vote at such election; or

(d) By any such means or knowingly, willfully, or fraudulently to counsel, advise, induce, or attempt to induce any officer of election to give or make any false count, certificate, document, report, or other false evidence in relation thereto, or to refuse or neglect to comply with his duties prescribed by law at any election, or to refuse the vote of any person lawfully entitled to vote in such election, or to violate any law regulating such election; or

(e) By any such means or knowingly, willfully, or fraudulently to obstruct, interfere with, delay, or hinder in any manner any officer of election in the lawful discharge of his duties at any election.

SEC. 5. It shall be unlawful for any person, at any election, falsely to impersonate a voter or other person, and vote, or attempt to vote or offer to vote in or upon any name not his own, or to vote, or attempt to vote, or offer to vote in or upon the name of any other person living or dead, or in or upon any assumed or fictitious name; or knowingly, willfully, or fraudulently to vote or attempt to vote or offer to vote more than once at the same election, except as authorized by law, or knowingly, willfully, or fraudulently to vote, or attempt to vote, or offer to vote in an election or at a place where he is not lawfully entitled to vote.

SEC. 6. If two or more persons enter into an agreement, confederation, or conspiracy to violate any of the foreging provisions of this act, and do any overt act toward carrying out such unlawful agreement, confederation, or conspiracy, such person or persons shall be punished in the manner as hereinafter provided by this act.

SEC. 7. The sole purpose of this act is to secure to the citizens of the United States the honest and lawful conduct of elections which affect the selection of United States Senators, Representatives to the Congress of the United States, United States Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, the President and Vice President of the United States, and the adoption or rejection of proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States. None of the provisions of this act shall be deemed or construed to apply to elections other than such elections, or to any acts or conduct of election officials or other persons which do not affect the nomination, selection, or election of any United States Senator, Representative to the Congress of the United States, United States Presidential or Vice Presidential elector, or the President or Vice President of the United States, or the adoption or rejection of any amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 8. Any person committing any offense defined in this act shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

SEC. 9. If any provision of this act, or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

STATEMENT OF MR. ARTHUR J. FREUND, OF ST. LOUIS, MO.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS LAW

In the early part of 1939 a committee on Federal election laws was appointed by the Criminal Law Council of the American Bar Association. The committee consisted of Henry W. Toll, of Denver, Colo.; George R. Jeffrey, of Indianapolis, Ind.; Hon. John B. Sanborn, of St. Paul, Minn., judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit; and Arthur J. Freund, of St. Louis, Mo., chairman. This committee was assisted by Hon. Albert L. Reeves and Hon. Merrill E. Otis, judges of the United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri.

It was noted that under the present state of the Federal law there could be a national conspiracy formed and carried out to fraudulently elect the President and Vice President of the United States without the violation of any Federal law. Furthermore, there is no Federal law to reach fraud and corruption in the nomination or selection of United States Senators and Representatives for Congress. The present Federal law pertaining to the election of these officers is wholly deficient for the reason that there is no direct legislation dealing with fraudulent practices at any election.

The committee was charged with the duty of preparing a proposed bill to insure to United States citizens, as far as possible, that elections in which national officers or national questions were to be voted upon should be honestly conducted.

The committee has prepared a proposed bill styled the "Federal Elections Act" to remedy existing defects in the law pertaining to the nomination and election of Federal officers, by denouncing as Federal offenses dishonest acts which affect the vote upon Federal officers, including the President and Vice President of the United States, and upon national questions upon which there may be a popular election.

This proposed Federal elections law is the result of much thought and careful study. It has received the approval of all of the members of the committee and of Judge Reeves and of Judge Otis, as well as many other members of the bench and bar.

It is not a matter of common knowledge, even among members of the bar, that the only Federal law on the subject of election frauds, except the narrow provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act (2 U. S. C. A., par. 241-254) and the Hatch Act (U. S. C., Current Service, 1939, No. 10, pp. 1242-1244), is section 19 of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C. A., par. 51), a conspiracy section, which, among other things, makes it a Federal offense if two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States. It was under this section that the Kansas City prosecutions for fraudulent practices at the 1936 general election were based (*Walter* v. *United States*, 93 F. (2d) 383, and other opinions in the same volume). It was held in the Walker case that a conspiracy to fraudulently select Presidential electors at an election does not come within the purview of the present Federal statutes. This was a direct holding to the effect that there is no Federal law which denounces as a crime fraudulent practices or criminal conspiracies in the election of a President or Vice President of the United States. Furthermore, there is no Federal law which makes it a Federal offense to commit vote frauds or to carry on fraudulent conspiracies at primary elections wherein nominees for the offices of United States Senators and Members of Congress are nominated at general primary elections.

The conspiracy section in the present Federal law is section 19 of the Criminal Code (sec. 5508, R. S., 18 U. S. C. A., par. 51), which reads as follows:

"If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same, or if two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privileges so secured, they shall be fined not more than $5,000 and imprisoned not more than 10 years, and shall, moreover, be thereafter ineligible to any office or place of honor, profit, or trust created by the Constitution or laws of the United States."

It will be seen from the above section that it does not specifically apply to election offenses; it does not denounce as a crime the impersonation of voters, multiple voting, bribery, or intimidation of voters, or the numerous other devices and practices common to vote stealing. Further, and what is of utmost importance, it does not define as an offense a conspiracy to fraudulently affect the vote for the President or Vice President of the United States. It was held in the *Walker Case*, supra (93 F. (2d) at 388, loc. cit.) that inasmuch as the Federal Constitution does not provide that the selection of electors shall be by popular vote, or that electors shall be voted for upon a general ticket, or that the majority of those who exercise the elective franchise can alone choose the electors, a conspiracy to fraudulently select Presidential electors at an election does not come within the purview of the present Federal statute. It was pointed out in that opinion that the Federal Constitution leaves it to the State legislature to define the methods of effecting the object, and that as an elector is a State officer the Federal act referred to does not pertain to the office of an elector for the President or Vice President of the United States. There seems to be no doubt that the Federal Government has this right, if it chooses to exercise it, but under the present state of the law there could be a national conspiracy formed and successfully carried out to fraudulently elect the President and Vice President of the United States without the violation of any Federal law.

HISTORY OF PRIOR LEGISLATION

On May 31, 1870, Congress passed a law containing a series of sections, the whole act being entitled "An act to enforce the right of citizens of the United States to vote in the several cities of this Union, and for other purposes" (16 Stat. L. 140-146). Section 6 of this act included what, with some alterations, is now section 19 of the Criminal Code. Among the substantive acts which were prohibited and made offenses were those of interfering with any election officer, or inducing any such officer, whose duty it was to ascertain, announce, or declare the result or to make any certificate, document, or evidence relative thereto, to violate his duty (sec. 19). It was made an offense for any such election officer to neglect or to refuse to perform any of his duties, or to do any unauthorized act with intent to "affect such election or the result thereof"; or to "fraudulently make any false certificate of the result of such election"; or to withhold, conceal, or destroy any required certificate pertaining to such election; or to neglect or refuse to make a return of the same as required by law; or to omit to do any required duty; or to counsel, procure, etc., the same to be done (sec. 22). It was also made an offense to impersonate and vote for any person living, dead, or fictitious, to

vote more than once, to vote without lawful right, to bribe a voter, etc. (sec. 19).

There were numerous other provisions dealing with the elective franchise, fraudulent registration, obstructing execution of process, conspiracy to deprive persons of the equal protection of the laws, conspiracy to prevent the support of any candidate, provisions relative to supervisors of elections, etc.

July 14, 1870, and more extensively later, on June 10, 1872, Congress passed laws making provisions for the supervision of elections by supervisors appointed by the Federal courts (16 Stat. at L. 254–255; 17 Stat. at L. 347-349).

Section 6, the present section 19 of the Criminal Code, remained in its original form until the revision of 1874, when the laws of the United States were revised and codified. In the revision, it became section 5508, Revised Statutes.

However, on February 8, 1894, Congress repealed all of the portions of the May 31, 1870 act which made offenses the various substantive acts in connection with the election franchise, and also repealed the laws providing for Federal supervisors of elections (28 Stat. at L. 36).

The history of this legislation and kindred legislation is traced in the opinions in *United States* v. *Gradwell* (243 U. S. 476); *United States* v. *Bathgate* (246 U. S. 220); and *United States* v. *Mosley* (238 U. S. 383).

THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION DOES NOT CHANGE THE LAW OF ANY STATE

It is, of course, well recognized that a great deal of fraud in elections having to do with Federal officers is committed at primary elections and the importance of primary elections in the selection of proper officials needs no emphasis. It is the opinion of the committee that Federal election laws should properly have to do not only with the general election of Federal officers, but with the primary election for such officers.

The proposed legislation changes no present State law; it adds no new duty or additional burden upon election officials. It merely provides that it shall be a Federal offense if such elections are dishonestly conducted where the vote upon a national officer or national question is affected.

SUBSTANCE OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The bill provides in substance that an election shall be defined to mean any primary or general election held under the laws of any State or Territory or under the laws of the United States for the nomination or election of any Representative or Senator, any elector of or direct vote for the President or Vice President.

It is made an offense for any election official to fraudulently miscount or tabulate the result of any such election. It is further made an offense for any person by force, bribery, threat, or any such other means to prevent or obstruct a voter from voting or from qualifying him to vote; to fraudulently pad the election rolls to be used at a Federal election; or to fraudulently induce an election official to receive an illegal vote or to refuse a legal one.

It is also made an offense for any person to willfully or fraudulently impersonate a voter or to vote in any fictitious name or to vote more than once or to vote in an election or at a place where he is not entitled to vote. A conspiracy of two or more persons to violate the act is further denounced as an offense.

The act specifically provides that its sole purpose is to secure to the citizens of the United States the honest and lawful conduct of elections which affect the selection of United States Senators, Representatives to the Congress of the United States, United States Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, the President and Vice President of the United States, and the adoption or rejection of proposed amendments to the Constitution of the United States. It is provided that none of the provisions of the act shall be deemed or construed to apply to elections other than such elections, or to any acts or conduct of election officials or other persons which do not affect the nomination, selection, or election of any United States Senator, Representative to the Congress of the United States, United States Presidential or Vice Presidential elector, or the President or Vice President of the United States, or the adoption or rejection of any amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The punishment provided is a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both.

IMPORTANCE OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

It is of the highest importance to note that the Federal Government in no way changes the election laws of any State or any subdivision thereof. It is the opinion of all right-thinking persons that such laws, however, should be honestly administered. The bill proposes that this be done so far as it is within the powers of the Federal Government to make it so.

Upon the proposed draft of the Federal Elections Act, Judge Reeves writes:

"It is my opinion that your bill quite admirably covers all of the matters desired to be included in a good election law. This bill should be passed by the Congress."

Judge Otis likewise gives his opinion as follows:

"I have carefully considered the proposed bill prepared by your committee * * * to enforce the rights of citizens of the United States in the nomination and election of Senators, Representatives, and Presidential electors. I am decidedly in favor of the adoption of this bill as law. The Federal judges in Kansas City have had, perhaps, more intimate experience with attempts to defeat the rights of citizens in elections than have any other judges in the country. The present laws are certainly inadequate to protect the rights of citizens. Under the present laws great things have been accomplished here in Kansas City, but the difficulties have been apparent and the narrow field in which it is possible for the Department of Justice to operate has been especially apparent. It is difficult to conceive of any reason why there should not be jurisdiction in the Federal courts to protect the rights of all citizens in all elections in which Federal officials are nominated or chosen for public office."

Judge Reeves and Judge Otis are the judges who presided at the Kansas City election fraud conspiracy cases, and they are wholly and acutely aware of the present Federal law on the subject of election frauds and its deficiencies.

Judge John B. Sanborn, of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, wrote the major opinions in the Kansas City cases. He is a member of the committee which drafted the proposed legislation, and he actively assisted in the preparation of the bill.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The committee which prepared this bill is of the opinion that the Congress has the constitutional right to enact legislation having to do with the primary election of Representatives for Congress and United States Senators. It may be thought by some that in view of the decision in *Newberry* v. *United States* (256 U. S. 232), there is no constitutional authority for Federal legislation having to do with primary elections. But, in the Newberry case the dissenting opinions written by Chief Justice White and Mr. Justice Pitney appear to be not only persuasive but conclusive arguments that the election process commences at the time a candidate first begins to seek nomination and continues until the votes in the general election have been cast and counted. The basis of the system of control provided in this proposed bill rests fundamentally upon its relation to elections at which United States Senators and Representatives are chosen. It has repeatedly been held that in order to preserve the integrity of such elections the Congress may assert almost any degree of control which it finds necessary to prevent election frauds and corruption.

It is the opinion of the committee that the United States Supreme Court would sustain the proposed act as constitutional, as it affects primary and general elections and elections affecting the President and Vice President and national questions.

INADEQUACY OF THE PRESENT LAW

A mere reading of the present conspiracy section (section 19) demonstrates its present inadequacy to fulfill the objects sought to be reached by the proposed bill. Indictments based upon the same section have been drawn where homesteaders were interfered with in their rights. *Buchanan* v. *United States* (233 Fed. 257), where there was a conspiracy to deprive a postmaster of his right to enjoy his office, *McDonald* v. *United States* (9 Fed. (2d) 506); where conspirators attacked a rancher on public land, scattering and killing sheep, *Janes* v. *United States* (6 Fed. (2d) 545), and where there was an alleged conspiracy to injure, oppress, and threaten a citizen in the free exercise of his right to speak and publish his views in a newspaper, *Powe* v. *United States* (109 F. (2d) 147). A statute so general in its terms is quite inadequate to cover our present situation regarding fraudulent elections.

It seems quite obvious that if vote stealing at Federal elections is to become widespread, or if such practices are to become national in scope, the last hope of a democracy has failed.

The proposed bill was approved by the Criminal Law Council of the American Bar Association. The matter was then presented, in the general form of a resolution approving the principle for which the bill stands, to the house of delegates of the association. This resolution was debated upon the floor of the house of delegates of the association and, by a vote of 57 to 50, the resolution was sent back to the criminal law section of the association for further study. It cannot be said that the proposed bill has the sanction or approval of the American Bar Association, although it is likely that the matter will be again presented to the house of delegates of the association at its annual meeting in Philadelphia in September of this year.

No more important subject confronts the American people in the conduct of its internal affairs than the sanctity of its elections. It is believed that the proposed bill, when enacted into law, will be a progressive and effective forward step in assuring to the people of the United States that Federal elections will be honestly conducted.

Commencement Address by Hon. Sumner Welles at North Carolina College for Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Sumner

Welles, Under Secretary of State, at the commencement exercises of the North Carolina College for Negroes, at Durham, N. C., on May 31, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am deeply appreciative of the privilege you have granted me of delivering this commencement address to the North Carolina College for Negroes.

No citizen of the United States, who is afforded the opportunity in these days of speaking to a graduating class of one of our universities or colleges, can accept that honor without a very deep sense of gratitude and without a very profound feeling of humility.

You who are graduating today will, in one form or another, now enter the service of our country. You will enter that service at a moment when the United States is engaged in the greatest struggle of its history, the struggle to preserve the liberty and independence of the American people and the battle to make it forever certain that freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples like ourselves can in the world of the future live in happiness and in safety.

We are confronted by the most sinister and the most ruthless forces which our modern world has known. There is no brutality of which they are not capable, no machination, however despicable, to which they will not stoop. The Axis Powers have sought to obliterate from this earth everything which to us makes life worth living and to reduce all of humanity, other than themselves, to the status of the slaves of a master race.

There could be nothing more perilous than to underestimate the strength remaining to our adversaries; nor to believe that we have not still before us many desperately sad and anxious days. But we are entitled to derive great hope and encouragement from the magnificent victories which the United Nations have recently inflicted upon their enemies. The beacon light of our war objective—the unconditional surrender of our foes—burns ever brighter as we advance toward it.

Millions of young Americans like yourselves, with a courage and a devotion which have never been surpassed, have dedicated themselves to the great cause for which our country and the other United Nations stand—the cause of human liberty.

Many of them from every section of this land already have laid down their lives for that cause.

Almost a quarter of a century ago Woodrow Wilson spoke these words: "It is our duty to take and maintain the safeguards which will see to it that the mothers of America and the mothers * * * of all the other suffering nations should never be called upon for this sacrifice again. This can be done. It must be done. And it will be done."

For many years these appeared to me to be very deeply tragic words. The failures, and the selfishness, and the criminal shortsightedness of peoples and of governments throughout the world during the decades that spent themselves after the end of the last World War, seemed to make infinitely remote the possibility of achieving the ideal for which President Wilson so valiantly fought, and for which he died. And yet, now that I myself have grown older, I can see clearly that those words were not tragic. They are filled with indomitable faith and with prophetic truth. What many of us perhaps have not realized sufficiently is that no great achievement in human progress has ever yet been realized until the sacrifices of men and women have paved the way for its realization, and until the conscience of mankind has refused to admit the possibility of any other outcome.

So has it been in our own history. We are wont to speak with devotion of our Constitution as the greatest instrument which the human brain has conceived. It is. But we do not so often remember that in the 150 years of our national life our Constitution has been, not a static, but a living thing—continuously adapted by the wisdom of our people to their changing needs as their material evolution and their spiritual growth have advanced.

Time and again in our history progress toward the great objectives set forth in our Declaration of Independence has been checked. Often we have fallen back. But eventually we have moved on, ahead.

And, in the new world of the future, which you, and those of your generation, will join in building, that same process must take its course. My generation has fallen back. Your generation must press forward. Without that vision, what we term modern civilization cannot survive.

The long-range problem which confronts us all is the achievement, through our victory, of permanent peace.

No one of us can afford to be so blind to his own self-interest as to pay any heed to those cynics whose voices we occasionally hear trying to tell the men and women of this country that just because there have always been wars in the past, there will always be wars in the future; that the surest way for us to save our own skins is for the United States to "mind its own business," and after this war is over once more to pretend that what goes on in the rest of the world does not affect every one of us here within the borders of our own country.

The people of this country have seen that policy tried out, and fail—utterly and miserably. The mothers and the fathers of today realize that if the United States had in reality seen clearly what its "business" was during the past 20 years, and had in fact "minded" it, by taking a hand in putting out the first flames which later lighted this world conflagration, their sons would not today be called upon to make the supreme sacrifice in the defense of the liberty and security of their native land.

The taxpayers of the United States also realize today that this crushing burden of taxation imperatively required of them in order that we may win the war, and this staggering debt which will have to be borne by our country to enable the United States to produce the armaments we require to equip our own armed forces and to strengthen the power of our allies, could have been avoided if their Government had been empowered to assume its fair share of responsibility in the past for keeping peace in the world, and for seeing to it, together with the governments of other civilized and peace-minded nations, that international disputes as they arose were promptly settled by pacific means, and that militaristic dictatorships bent on world domination were quashed before they had the chance to run amok.

The people of the United States realize today, I am convinced, that what we have utterly failed to do in the past was, in the truest and most practical sense, "to mind our own business." They cannot fail to see also that, had we been willing to play our part in keeping the peace of the world since the last World War, the cost to us in life and treasure would have been but an infinitesimal part of the cost required of us today so that we can achieve that victory which we must gain, if the United States is to survive as a free nation.

This long-range problem of post-war policy is fundamentally a question of our own self-interest.

I know that men and women are thinking this problem through in every section of this country. The more opportunity which is given for public discussion of these vital issues, the more light which is thrown upon the specific aspects of the complexities which are involved, the more assurance will there be that the answer to be given by our democracy will be a wise one. It has always seemed to me that if the American people had had more time for study and discussion of the basic policy at stake in 1919, and if the issue itself had not become enmeshed in the web of bitter partisan politics, a more realistic and a more enlightened course would have been followed by this country during the past generation.

It is my individual view that it would be premature at this stage for this Government to attempt to define with precision and in detail an exact plan of international cooperation upon which the American people would be expected to pass.

We all of us must agree that certain conditions are going inevitably to obtain at the conclusion of the war.

For a number of years, particularly in Europe, social and economic conditions will be in a state of flux. In some of the presently Axis-occupied countries there will be political instability. Both in these countries, as well as in the Axis countries, millions will be starving, and other millions must be repatriated to the homes from which they have been driven. Throughout the world there will be a chaotic, and, in some areas, an anarchic, state of affairs.

During this period—and no one can today estimate how long it may be—order will have to be maintained by those of the United Nations which will have to assume these necessary functions.

It is during that transition period, as well as during the remaining period of the war, that the opportunity may presumably be afforded to the United Nations to undertake the more specific elaboration of the form of international organization upon which they may jointly determine.

We, all of us, remember that the agreements, which in their entirety comprise the inter-American understanding upon which Pan Americanism rests, and through which the regional solidarity of the American Republics has had its being, were not brought into existence in a day. They were not achieved by means of an initial blueprint. On the contrary, the objectives sought were only achieved over a period of many years, and it required an actual act of aggression against one of the American Republics, the United States, to bring about the final consummation of the regional understanding of the Western Hemisphere.

It may be well that the surest course for the United Nations to pursue would be the construction of an international organization by the same method of gradual evolution. By permitting sufficient elasticity of operation at the outset of the transition period, the practical experience undergone by the United Nations during the war as well as after the victory is won, will presumably demonstrate clearly the type of organization which will most efficiently guarantee the securing of the basic objectives which they seek.

It seems clear, though, as a result of the tragic lesson which humanity has learned from the events of the past 25 years that any form of international organization, in order to function successfully, must be premised upon the recognition of a few cardinal principles:

There must be, through international agreement, a combination of armed forces made available by the powers which are prepared to do so, which may be used regionally or on a broader scale, and which can,

and will, prevent aggression, render international conflict impossible, and, in general, see to it that the peace of the world is maintained inviolate;

An international tribunal to which international controversies can be referred, and in which international confidence can be safely placed;

An efficient international method for the outlawing of certain kinds of armaments, and for the inspection of all national armaments;

The creation of appropriate and practical technical organizations to deal with economic and financial matters, and to advise the members of the United Nations thereon, so that autarchic commercial and financial policies will not be pursued by individual powers, and so that the post-war period may be an epoch of economic cooperation and of rising living standards, rather than a time of cut-throat competition and of falling living standards for us all;

The recognition—not merely in words, but in practice, as in the Western Hemisphere—of the principle of the equal sovereignty of all States, whether great or small. And together with this, the establishment of the principle that the path must be prepared for the freedom and self-government of all peoples who desire their liberty, as soon as they are able to assume that right;

Finally, in the kind of world for which we fight, there must cease to exist any need for the use of that accursed term "racial or religious minority." If the peoples of the earth are fighting, and dying, to preserve, and to secure, the liberty of the individual under law, is it conceivable that the peoples of the United Nations can consent to the reestablishment of any system where human beings will still be regarded as belonging to such "minorities"? The equality of individuals, like the equality of peoples, cannot in fact be granted by fiat. Equality depends on their own achievements and upon their own intrinsic worth. But to equality of human rights, and to equality of opportunity, every human being is by divine right entitled. That is the essence of our democratic faith. If that cornerstone is laid in the foundation of the new world of the United Nations, the blot of the concept of minorities upon the fabric of our civilization will be erased.

In a cemetery, far from here, there was erected a monument to the memory of a group of American flyers who died in the last World War. On it were written these words of the prophet Samuel:

"And in their death they were not divided; they were swifter than eagles, they were stronger than lions."

To me those words apply to all of the countless defenders of the faith which we uphold. United in sacrifice for the ideals of freedom for which our country and its allies stand, they constitute a brotherhood which knows no divisions of faith or race. They are joined by the indissoluble bonds of their common love of liberty.

It is to you, and to your comrades in arms, that this sorely stricken world looks with confident trust for its redemption. If you of this new generation, in all of the lands where the love of freedom is the supreme value, refuse to permit yourselves to be divided in war or in peace, you can forge that new world of which mankind has so long dreamed—a world which is free from war and in which men and women can live out their lives in security, in happiness, and in peace.

The Greek Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, last evening I made a radio address which was broadcast overseas, on the subject of the sinking of a German supply ship by a Greek submarine. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If Greece has lost the war, the Greek seamen, famed for their courage and skill, and the patriots in the Olympus and Parnassus districts and in the heights of Crete Island, have not heard of it. Neither have the Greek sea patriots who reportedly have seized a fleet of small Axis vessels and are using them to harass enemy coastwise shipping.

The Greek Navy is in the thick of battle. Greek Army units have participated in the African campaign. When General Montgomery sent his flying column around the Mareth line in the maneuver that threw Rommel out of that strongly fortified position, it was the Greek Sacred Company that led the way. The Greeks were among the first to enter Gabes.

Very appropriately, the uniform insignia of this famed Greek commando unit are a spear and a laurel wreath on which is inscribed "with this or on it." It will be recalled that this was an ancient Spartan mother's admonition to her son as she girded him for battle and handed him a shield. She told him to return victorious or dead. Now this famed unit has returned eastward to train other Greek fighters for the coming liberation of their homeland.

On the mainland of Greece, the patriot bands, which have waged relentless war against the Germans, Italians, and Bulgarians since 1941, have divided Greece into military areas vowing to cooperate among themselves.

In the towns and villages of Greece, despite starvation, the people continue to resist, committing every conceivable kind of sabotage. Many a German or Italian ammunition ship has mysteriously blown up in a Greek harbor, and many a railroad bridge has been destroyed.

Thus the gallant Greeks daily prove their unwavering fidelity to the cause of freedom and their confidence in the triumph of the United Nations.

Following the inevitable defeat of the evil forces of tyranny, I should like to go to heroic Greece and shake the hand of many of her heroes. Meanwhile, we have had many an opportunity to get acquainted with and appreciate the patriotism and loyalty of our American citizens of Greek ancestry. They are fine citizens—law abiding and public minded. Their sons are defending the freedom of the country in every theater of war.

Under the leadership of the great Greek-American national organization "Ahepa" which is dedicated to good Americanism, the American citizens of Greek descent have sold nearly $50,000,000 worth of War bonds. Mr. George Vournas, the supreme president of the organization, having completed a tour of the country in connection with the War bond campaign, has now volunteered his services to the armed forces of the country.

These are some of the reasons why the entire American Nation is proud of its Greek-American citizens. The steadfastness of the people of Helles to the cause of liberty has made that classic country synonymous with the idea of freedom. As surely as day follows night Greece will be liberated and completely restored.

New Approaches to Lasting Peace—A Realistic Analysis of What Is To Follow This War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of Collier's magazine there appears the first in a series of four articles on the post-war world by the Honorable Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson. These articles appear under the title of "New Approaches to Lasting Peace" and are based on the many long years of intimate knowledge and experience which both Mr. Hoover and Mr. Gibson have had with foreign affairs both through residence abroad and service at home.

It is hoped that members of the king-can-do-no-wrong contingent of the New Deal flank of the Democratic Party will not permit the candid criticism of their leadership incorporated in paragraph 14 of this article to deter them from giving careful study to the entire discussion, because the experienced counsel of Hoover and Gibson must not be lightly turned aside in days like these. Too, these great and good Americans have criticized some of the sweeping deductions and grandiose generalities made by less experienced Republicans, but men of all parties would do well to give careful study to the basic propositions in this series of articles. Discussion of pre-Pearl Harbor policies can well be left to sometime after the war, but it is not too early now to begin the serious consideration of what America can and should do to play its rightful part in the post-war world.

The article follows:

NEW APPROACHES TO LASTING PEACE

(By Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson)

(This series of four articles by Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson will present specific proposals for the world's peacemakers. They are clear and unequivocal and the most important contribution on this subject yet set before the American people.)

It is imperative that America take its full part in building a lasting peace. Whatever may have been our views before the war as the best course for America to follow in order to maintain our peace, we have now taken up the sword. We shall inevitably suffer dreadful losses in substance and precious lives. Having entered upon this course, there can be only one compensation: That is the

chance to produce a situation in the world in which it is possible to live in safety without the burden of arms and the threats of wars.

Peacemaking is the second greatest task before our people. The first being absolute victory of arms, for any compromise at once destroys all hope for lasting solutions.

We have a better chance than we have ever had to build for lasting peace. But there is only one way to set about it. We must deliberately seek out the difficulties, identify them, and, in the light of experience, consider what can be done to deal with them. If we go about this intelligently, courageously, and realistically, we may hope for lasting peace.

In this first article we will discuss the first necessity to successful peacemaking, that is, the intellectual and spiritual approach to it.

In article II, for next week's issue, we will propose for American thinking a new and definite method of transition for the world from war to peace and to an ultimate "world institution" to preserve it.

In article III we will discuss the settlement of specific problems and issues that must be effected in this transitional period if we are to reduce the causes of war so that a "world institution" to preserve peace can succeed.

In article IV we will discuss the specific plans for a "world institution" to preserve peace, their limitations, and the direction which combined experience, realism, and idealism indicate we should travel if we are to secure lasting peace.

In the intellectual and spiritual approaches to peace, we are dealing with dreams, idealism, and realism.

There are various sorts of minds engaged in the discussion of peacemaking. One group consists of those souls sensitive to the infinite agonies of war who, with disregard to human experience, are in constant search for some magic, some mystic formula, or some patent medicine, to cure humanity's greatest scourge. American life is conditioned with headlines, slogans, and movie captions which give glamour to panaceas and create belief in short cuts. To many people, global planning is a field where imagination can engage in unrestrained play. It is indeed a playground where they may blow gigantic bubbles by dipping their pipes in suds of human kindness. We can solace ourselves that these iridescent globes are a diversion from the miseries of the times and that the bubbles themselves explode before they reach the heavens.

Much of this sort of discussion starts from the assumption that the instant firing ceases, the world will be pervaded with sweetness and light. And that all we have to do is to think up now a great world plan to keep the peace and promote world welfare, and all will be well.

If it were that easy, man would long ago have solved his most dreadful and baffling problem.

Another group are the more purposeful idealists whose dreams are by no means to be sniffed at. Without dreams, mankind never would have emerged from savagery. But even their plans must be soaked in a solution of hard realism if they are to be made into lasting parchment.

Nor can peace come to the world by cynical realism devoid of idealism, any more than it can be summoned by the incantation of emotional slogans. We cannot dismiss the profound reality that idealism plays in our problem.

It is often said that America is today fighting a war of defense because we were attacked. That is overrealistic. It is not the whole truth. It does not do full justice either to our motives or our past conduct. This is the second crusade of America to widen the boundaries of freedom and safety in the world. If we had been prepared to sacrifice China and had not concerned ourselves to save Europe from military aggression we would not have been attacked at Pearl Harbor. With modern weapons, we could no doubt have protected ourselves from any invasion. Sometimes one could wish all this were remembered when we are castigated for not doing enough for this nation or that.

We have a breed of flagellants who simplify world problems by the expedient of blaming everything on our own country. Because American genius has made our country strong and rich out of our own soil and hard work, we seemed to have wronged somebody. No matter what goes wrong in the world, we are to blame. They hang their heads and beat their breasts and apologize to the world for our behaving. If the League of Nations failed to keep the peace, it was because we did not join, which is untrue. If there is war in the Far East, it is because our Government would not cooperate with Britain and France to restrain Japan, which is untrue. Generally, their attitude is that if the present World War has come upon us, it is because we have consistently failed to do our duty. If foreigners complain of the insufficiency of our aid, instead of examining the facts to see if they do not show some justification of our country, these critics at home promptly agree with the foreign complaints and fill the air with self-denunciation. In general the zeal of these people is equaled only by their disregard of facts.

This sort of mind not only presents America as a sorry spectacle in the eyes of the rest of the world, it also weakens American influence in securing the fundamentals of peace.

We are indeed a crusading nation. We won a military victory in the first crusade. But we lost most of President Wilson's "points" at Versailles.

TRUE TO OUR IDEALS

We will again win military victory. But thas it only halfway to a lasting peace. And to win peace this time America must start with a much deeper understanding of the hard realities we will encounter. Many of them are clearer today from the experience of last time.

Not only does realistic approach offer the best hope of achievement; it avoids a real danger. If we hold out to our people hopes that cannot be realized, there will be inevitable disillusionment. And disillusionment means isolationism.

One of these realities is that our first purpose must be freedom from wars and threats of wars.

We all know (that is, all of us except those who are incorrigible bubble blowers) that there are many highly desirable things for perfecting the world morally, socially, and economically, and that we cannot hope to achieve them now. We should concentrate on the thing we can hope for, which is peace, and not dissipate our energies or start quarreling over the unattainable.

There are certain American ideals in relation to international life which we cannot abandon and still be true to our own spiritual foundations. One of them is the right of every politically capable people to self-government. We were born of that conviction. We have stood for this right ever since. Over the years of our national life we have sympathized with every nation struggling for independence. The Monroe Doctrine was an expression of it. We fought the Spanish War that Cuba and the Philippines might be free. It was one of our first purposes in the last World War; it is one of our proclaimed purposes in this war to restore the sovereignty of those who have been deprived of it. Our national conscience, our national ideals, our national policies, our sons who will have died do not permit the abandonment for this purpose.

We have other national ideals, which include representative government, the inalienable rights of the Bill of Rights, the sustained dignity of the individual man. We cannot seek to impose these rights upon other peoples, because the very right of peoples to self-government carries also the inherent right to determine their own way of life. In any event, personal liberty cannot be imposed by machine guns. Wrong ideas cannot even be cured by war or by treaty. Personal liberty does not come like manna from heaven. It must grow in the minds and spirits of men. But by aiding them to self-government we open the door for it to their peoples. Although we do not seek to impose the Bill of Rights on other peoples, we must hold to it within our borders with no less tenacity if we are to maintain the light by which mankind is to be redeemed.

We must focus our minds on lasting peace, not on the spreading of our ideology.

We must make up our minds to deal with governments and their social systems as they are and not as we should like them to be. On the United Nations' side in this war we have a large variety of these systems. It is a dangerous fallacy to assume that more than a minor portion of the people in the world are democracies in our sense, or that they ever will be in our lifetime. While we must hold to ideals of our own, it is entirely possible for us to work with nations which do not share our ideological views. We have to live and get along somehow in the same world. In fact, during the first 50 years of our existence we were about the sole republic in a sea of kings or dictators. For the most part we contrived to keep the peace with them.

It is, of course, easier to collaborate with some countries than with others, and we should make our plans accordingly. Honesty in facing these facts will save us much anguish.

One of the deepest of all spiritual emotions is patriotism. People, proud of their traditions, their countryside, their heroes, their accomplishments, will make any sacrifice in life or death to preserve their altars and their independence. Their symbols, their flags, their songs sustain them in battle, their devotion to their country consoles them in loss and in death. The tensity of nationalism always rises from the fires of war. Already in this war we have seen the Russians discard a creed of internationalism and die in millions for the "soil of Holy Russia."

It is our belief from these inherent mores of their people that both Russia and Britain will be cold to any commitments which affect their sovereignty or independence of action, or control their domestic, economic, or political life. We venture the opinion that the American people will not do so either.

We believe that reality calls for emphasis in peace plans on cooperation or joint or united action of independent peoples, not on supergovernment.

We Americans indulge in too many sonorous phrases to the import that:

"America will make the peace."

"America will police the world."

"America must lead." America will do none of these things alone. The other leading nations in the world will take no back seat. America has a great role to play in generous cooperation. Neither victory nor peace can come without our aid. And cooperation is a two-way street.

EACH NATION FOR ITSELF

Realism requires that we accept the fact that most other nations will struggle for the interests of their own peoples in the peace settlements. On this continent we have enjoyed an ease of living rarely found elsewhere; we have never had to fight to get the

last farthing. In most of the world outside of the United States, even in peacetimes, living for the masses of people is hard at best. These other countries will be further impoverished by the war and, in consequence, their national policies will of necessity strive to secure every economic and other advantage they can obtain for their people. What may appear to us as selfish appears as legitimate self-interest to them. We will also have legitimate self-interests to be defended.

There is another trend in our thinking that calls for correction. It arises from our weakness for simplification. Everybody knows that the world has shrunk in terms of communications. Melbourne and Calcutta are closer to us in flying hours than parts of our own country are to each other by train. Radio has made the spread of ideas general and instantaneous. But it is a long flying jump from that to the assumption that we now have one world in terms of political and social or philosophical and religious outlook.

Many naively assume that, because Asia is now just over the horizon, occidental and oriental thought can be standardized, or that the people of Asia are consumed with a desire to adopt our way of life, to have the new world built on American blueprints.

Such a belief is very interesting but it simply isn't true. We can test all this upon ourselves. Are we prepared to adopt oriental philosophy, religion, economic standards, or ways of life because we can more easily know their views and their way of living?

The fact is that the world remains pretty much as it has always been. We are only fooling ourselves by trying to distort a revolution in transport and communications into a world-wide political and social revolution. Though the skies be darkened with planes and the air filled with radio propaganda and messages of good will, life will go on much the same; Chinese, Italians, Americans, Arabs, and Swedes will remain pretty much what they were. However beguiling the thought may be, the world has not turned into a great melting pot. And we shall not achieve lasting peace by starting with the assumption that we have been transformed into one world by radio and airplanes, for if that were true, we should have no problem in making lasting peace.

In this war we Americans have held out great world hopes and promises to suffering humanity that we will perpetually divide our productivity and resources and thus bring to them complete comfort and security in life. Realism with respect to our resources today and our probable situation after the war demands more caution in our oratory. Many of those hopes will appear to peoples as undertakings and obligations on our part.

There is nothing more realistically dangerous than propaganda-stimulated war hates toward whole enemy peoples. Moral indignation at cruelty and wrong is a proper basis of moral action. But artificially created hate is a form of hysteria. It is neither the sign of power nor the badge of courage. It does not make the vital distinction between the peoples and the leaders to whom punishment should be meted out. Such propagandas of general hate prolong wars by creating desperation in the whole enemy peoples.

Hate adds nothing to the real zeal of our civil population. Ie beclouds judgment and stimulates rash conduct in nations. The soldiers at the front do not have such hysterias. And like them, the civil population will have a more lasting resolution if it keeps cool. War hate is a venomous infection of men's minds that does not spurt solely toward the enemy. Sooner or later it stirs intolerance and violence in their own countrymen. Its international damage, however, is that a durable peace becomes impossible under its emotional mandates. Such stirrings of hysterias perhaps indicate the war zeal of leaders, but, some day, it weakens the making of peace. The hate elections in Britain and France after the last armistice crippled their leaders in making a lasting peace. We have grown 300 years away from the fears, dangers, and age-old hates which are deeply implanted in the racial mores of Europe and Asia. We have lived a century and a half without fear of our neighbors, without aggression directed against us by them, or wrong done to us by them. In the fires of this war these animosities must increase from a thousand diabolical outrages. We can do a great service to the world if we sustain an objectivity that is so essential in long-view statesmanship.

We also need realism as to the causes of war.

The causes of this war, and of war in general, have been obscured by a tendency to oversimplification. That is the assumption that wars are the work of evil men or perverted nations and that they can be ended by a sound spanking. Some years ago the writers set out, as many others have done before, to explore what caused war in the past, why peace has been so precarious, and what has given promise of lasting peace.

No realistic search for the truth can avoid the conclusion that wars result from no simple causes but are the result of the interplay of long-antecedent dynamic forces, of varying pressures. These destructive forces can be grouped as ideologic and economic pressures, extreme nationalism, imperialism, militarism, and the complexes of fear, hate, and revenge. Theer can be no peace unless these forces are courageously met.

THE HIGHWAY TO LASTING PEACE

Immense aid in discovering the method of preserving peace can be found in experience as well as in idealistic realism. The explosion of the modern world into total wars and tumult has occurred on three major occasions in a century and a half. Twice the world has tried to build just peace and to erect institutions to preserve it. The needed solvent of realism can be had from these experiences mixed with realistic extracts from the mores of different branches of the human race with which we have to deal. If this mixture is not compounded and used we shall have no peace.

If we build the great highway to lasting peace, experience must be our guide. That highway must provide us the way through a wilderness of swamps and precipices where our crusade can pass. And our way must be lighted by idealism.

Neither goodness nor evil will be abolished by this war. Ideas may shift but human nature will not be greatly changed. We need to be awake and not dreaming.

Coddling the Japanese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, of late there has been a movement afoot to allow Japanese evacuees to return to the Pacific coast. This movement has been developing in the face of sternest opposition by the people of the Coastal States and against the sound judgment of Gen. John L. DeWitt, commanding officer of the western defense command, who has consistently rejected all proposals for the return of the Japanese to the evacuated areas.

Recently the War Department announced that General DeWitt was to be relieved of his post of western defense command. As to the actual reason for his removal, as distinguished from the official reason, I am at present uninformed. However, the action taken by General DeWitt's successor on this very pertinent issue of returning Japanese to the Pacific coast will more graphically inform everyone on this point than any other explanation. I trust that a change in command does not represent a change in General DeWitt's thought on this subject. I would at this time, Mr. Speaker, include an editorial of the Inglewood Daily News of May 26, 1943, on this matter, entitled "Kicked Upstairs."

The editorial follows:

KICKED UPSTAIRS

It appears to be regrettably true that Gen. John L. DeWitt, able commanding officer of the western defense command, is being kicked upstairs to make way for someone who will reflect the views of a segment of the State Department headed by Francis B. Sayre, who favors coddling the Japanese.

The west coast has been particularly fortunate in having General DeWitt in charge of the military in this area. He has recognized from the beginning the utter absurdity of permitting Japanese to return to this vital military sector, and he has rejected each and every proposal made to him in this connection.

An element in the State Department which has issued directives tending toward a softening up in our attitude toward our mortal and barbaric enemies, the Japs, disagrees with General DeWitt. Now he has been promoted, and it appears quite likely that he will be removed to another command—solely for the purpose of ridding the western defense area of his able direction.

The segment of the State Department cannot escape the fact that it has issued instructions that the Emperor of Japan—a semiepileptic baboon—should not be held to ridicule or scorn, that his palace should be regarded as sacred and be not bombed or attacked by Americans (in spite of the fact that it is one of the most heavily protected spots in Japan, surrounded by a row of German-made Zeiss antiaircraft guns and peopled by crack troops in the service of the Emperor). Yet this same Emperor meets every morning at 11 o'clock, with the heads of his branches of service, to plot the death and destruction of Americans. And there is no person in this country so stupid as to believe that if the sons of Nippon had the opportunity they would not, without a moment's hesitation, drop a bomb on the White House or murder the head of this Government at the slightest provocation.

It was the same segment of the State Department which sent scrap metal to Japan as late as 1939—the same metal which is being sent back to us now in the form of bullets and bombs. And it is the same segment which encouraged the shipment of high-octane gasoline to Japan almost to the moment of Pearl Harbor.

There isn't any use coddling the Japanese. They are deceitful, treacherous, and tough.

It is to be devoutly hoped on the west coast that whoever succeeds General DeWitt, in the event of his being kicked upstairs, will see eye-to-eye with him on the Jap question.

Address by J. Edwin Mattox Before Young Democratic Clubs of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SHERIDAN DOWNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 1 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an able and vigorous address entitled "Youth of America and Civilian Defense," delivered by J. Edwin Mattox, national chairman of civilian defense committee, Young Democratic Clubs of America, before the sectional State executive committee, Young Democratic Clubs of California, at San Francisco, Calif., on May 23, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH OF AMERICA AND CIVILIAN DEFENSE

The justification of youth reaches its zenith in war years, when the young men of a generation defend those things which have been set up by their forefathers.

The youth of all countries, and particularly the youth of America, are the strength of conquering forces. Time and again this fact has been brought sharply to the attention of all peoples. Hitler, with his nefarious scheme for world domination, placed his future in the hands of the youth of Germany. The international grapevine has informed us that he now calls up the youth of the occupied countries.

It will be the youth of America and its allies of the United Nations that will defeat Hitler's projected disaster of our civilization. The middle-aged and the elders of our way of life will borrow on their backgrounds and experience to plan the victory over darkness. The youth of the United Nations will do the job.

This global struggle is unlike any which has beset humanity in its history. The tempo of mechanized war has brought battle to our very doorsteps. The foxholes of Bataan may find their counterpart in the gutters of America if and when the possibilities of modern war reach their ultimate climax. The war we fight is not alone for the trained and uniformed youth of a country. It is a civilian war in which we must be prepared to fight to defend our way of life street by street.

This brings us down to the soldiers of the home front—those who play an active part in civilian defense.

When our country had a peace-time complement of 100,000 servicemen in Army uniforms, there was in existence a movement among the two major political parties to establish interest in the political destiny of the United States. Young Democrats and young Republicans expended their ingenuity in organization work. They gathered together the youth of the various sections of our broad country in political activity. Their interest was the betterment of our way of life through the peaceful force of the ballot. They worked in behalf of leaders who would bring about changes in their parties and in their Government.

Through this combined effort was established organizations that were fundamentally sound in educating young men and women in united action. All those things now necessary in reaching the eyes, ears, and minds of fellow citizens were taught and practiced. What was then used in political defense is now available to use in civilian defense. The machinery that was set up for political purposes is easily convertible to civilian-defense purposes. The combined resources of the two major political parties in one common aim make this machinery even more important.

Congress and the administrative branch of the Government have recognized the need for using every available plant and work organization to speed up production. The presence of union labor clearing houses has made direct contact with workers a far easier task. The cooperation of manufacturers' organizations through production leaders facilitated that job. America boasts proudly, and rightly, of its organizations. Quickly it was able to assemble all its needed physical resources.

Our Nation needs its youth to bolster morale and preserve democracy. Truly American youth, as exemplified by our major junior political parties, has stood firm against nazi-ism, fascism, and communism—united in the common purpose of keeping America strong. American youth is the greatest single force available for action on far-flung battle fronts. The remaining young men and women not in military service must keep our United States safe on the civilian front.

American youth realizes that if freedom is worth having, freedom is worth fighting for. When victory is ours and we have conquered the external threats to our free world, our attention will once more be directed to internal problems.

Tested leadership and individual responsibility will be required to overcome new hurdles as idealistic youth, tempered by the advice of their experienced elders, forges on to the establishment on a world-wide basis of the freedoms as enunciated by the provisions of the Atlantic Charter.

The participation of young Democrats and young Republicans has not been brought to its potential strength or used to its fullest advantage. The organizations are there awaiting the power to act as a unit. Many of the personnel are in the uniforms of the service and in far flung battlefields. But there is yet a nucleus of those who have been young Democrats and young Republicans who are familiar with the organizational operations.

To take advantage of this resource of youth Congress should establish a financed program for bringing these members into civilian defense as a unit. Their organizations and leadership could play a greater part in preparing for civilian defense problems.

An investigation and survey of the civilian defense program might well disclose that the various elements needed at a time of immediate national peril may not be as cohesive or as complete as possible. Critical articles in newspapers throughout the country have disclosed that not all rehearsals for impending disaster have found coordinated action. The welding of medical, surgical, fire-fighting, utility, and morale forces finds much to be desired.

Mobilization of all civilian forces is something that cannot be left to haphazard rule. We were treated recently to a west-coast city (Redwood City, Calif.), a few miles from the Pacific, being the scene of open verbal hostility between the mayor and the chief of the fire department, each charging the other with failure in doing his civilian-defense duty.

On the evening the mayor and the chief of the fire department were hurling personal invective at each other in a council meeting, it was fortunate that no bombs dropped. ward off as much disaster as possible. But the situation is not alone the responsibility of that single community—or many more which may be like it—it is the Federal Government's duty to see that a working organization is effective, that authority is established and that the fullest protection is given to American citizens of any and all communities.

Against an air raid there is no defense but the fact that the military has prepared to ward off as much disaster as possible. But there is among the civilians a responsibility to see that the disaster does not spread to utter confusion.

Especially are the cities of the West Coast vulnerable to air attack. Across the waters of the broad Pacific the vast armies and navies of our most formidable enemy have dealt the United States its worst defeat since the War of 1812. Almost 18 months have passed since Pearl Harbor. Approximately a year has gone by since the fall of Singapore and Java, and Japan grows stronger hour by hour.

What measures, in the face of such growing military, might have been afforded for the civilian protection of our west coast cities? Repeatedly, leading statesmen, even Cabinet members, have told the civilian population of the west coast that they could, at any time, expect nuisance raids or suicide raids from Japanese airplanes.

We believe that we should ask for greater and more carefully planned and supervised civilian defense for the protection of our west coast. Competent civilian defense organization should be provided for every city in the Nation, so that if disaster occurs it could be adequately and efficiently handled.

We believe that the youth, such as compose our two great junior political organizations, are the logical nuclei to act in the forming of a coordinated civilian defense group to augment the civilian group already established.

Recently, the two great leaders of our United Nations, namely, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, met in Washington to discuss plans for defeating our enemies. Neither expressed the opinion that this war would soon be over. Rather, both gave the impression that it still remained a long, hard-drawn fight before final victory could be won. We do not wish to question or doubt the wisdom of their decision. We realize that it is the aim and purpose of both Roosevelt and Churchill to arrive at victory in the shortest possible time.

However, the impression has been given that Germany must be defeated first. Churchill, in his Nation-wide radio talk addressed to the assembled Senate and Congress of the United States, stated that it was the opinion that if Germany was defeated, Japan would not be able to fight alone against the combined weights of America and Great Britain.

We sincerely hope and pray that the Japanese war lords were listening to his broadcast.

In the meantime, while Germany is being crushed, we are told by Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur and Prime Minister Curtin, of Australia, that hour by hour Japan grows mightier in the Pacific. It is therefore prudent, in the face of such advice, to urge that the West be immediately adequately prepared for any catastrophe that might threaten.

The recent revelation of the cold-blooded murder of the captured aviators that bombed Tokyo, of the cruelties practiced upon the military and civilian captives, the recent sinking of a hospital ship off the Australian coast clearly demonstrate the barbaric practices of the inhuman enemy which, according to the advice of our military men, may be visited upon our west coast cities at any moment.

Recently, California's Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY was a visitor to California, holding meetings as chairman of a Senate subcommittee. At that time he stated Japan was the United States' most formidable foe. Senator DOWNEY has continually urged that

adequate defense measures be taken for the protection of not only California but the entire west coast.

Our global war is far from being over. The possibility of civilian disaster is not remote. We must be prepared to bravely face the worst—to hold our heads as high in adversity as the people of London, Chungking, and Stalingrad. And we can do a better job if we are prepared to use every cog, wheel, and belt of our organizational machinery to offset an enemy attack. Our great President Franklin Roosevelt must have the active loyalty of each and every one of us in his unrelenting efforts to guide us to victory.

As Young Democrats we look to the leadership of our national president, Joe Cordell Carr, secretary of state of Tennessee, and Patricia Firestone Coyner, our national vice president, as well as other national officers, and our many State and District leaders. Here, in California, the valued assistance of Democratic leaders such as Senator Sheridan Downey, Edwin Pauley, William M. Malone, Alfred Robertson, Robert W. Kenny, Helen Gahagan, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Mrs. Maurine Simpson, B. J. Christman, and John N. Riggs, cannot be overestimated.

This is our America. Because we believe in this America we respectfully urge that Congress should not overlook the opportunity of making use of the Young Democratic and Young Republican Organizations.

Propaganda Technique From the Goodwin Watson Hearing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have received many protests against the House action denying Federal funds for Dr. Goodwin Watson, chief analyst of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of the Federal Communications Commission. I ask leave to extend in the RECORD the letter I am using to answer such protests. This letter summarizes some of the testimony and exhibits from the Goodwin Watson hearing which the House considered in acting on appropriation for his salary. The suggestions for propaganda technique of New America, the organization he sponsored, show a pattern that is familiar to us but not so well understood by the public. As the Goodwin Watson case is to come up again on the conference report on this appropriation bill, I believe it is well for us to refresh our recollections on this hearing at this time:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1943.

DEAR SIR: I have carefully considered your protest against the amendment denying Federal funds for the salary of Dr. Goodwin Watson. Please excuse this form-letter answer. The protests organized on his behalf are too numerous for me to answer with individual letters.

I voted for this amendment and shall do so again if I have the opportunity.

Practically every protest shows the result of misinformation which must have come from Dr. Watson and his associates, both as to the nature of the action taken by Congress and as to the evidence against Dr. Watson.

This was not a judicial trial for a crime; it was simply a decision as to whether money should be appropriated to pay a Federal employee. No one has a vested right in a Federal job. Congress has the duty of deciding whether to appropriate money for the various departments and offices of Government, and must, therefore, pass on the work of these departments. Congress can only do this by passing on the work of the people in the departments, for that is the way the departments do their work. Congress does not select employees, but sets up standards for their selection and their retention. Congress has the power to decide whether or not to appropriate money to pay an individual employee. This is a cumbersome and difficult way to legislate, but it has become necessary in a number of instances because this administration has made a practice of evading the standards set up by Congress in determining fitness for positions of responsibility in the Government in wartime.

To meet this situation, Congress created a special committee to review such cases, consisting of five well-qualified men, three Democrats and two Republicans, headed by Judge Kerr, who served 7 years on the bench before coming to Congress. A majority of the members of this committee voted against the Dies committee. While a judicial "trial" is not a part of legislative procedure in passing on appropriations for salaries for a whole department or for a single employee, this committee afforded every person in question a fair hearing. To date, the committee has considered six employees, has held three were fit and three were unfit. The committee was unanimous against Dr. Watson. He is now fomenting attacks on the committee and its procedure, but here is what he said April 8, 1943: "I have the highest respect for this committee and welcome an opportunity for a thorough and judicial review of my case." During his hearing, he agreed that in view of his writings, Congress was "justified in calling such a person to account." He was asked whether his writings alone demanded some investigation. His answer was, "I would think so * * * an investigation is well warranted." At the end of the hearing on April 12, he said to the committee, "I think this has been a very real endeavor to have a meeting of minds on a very difficult problem."

I had heard many good things about Dr. Watson from many good people. He had been an ordained Methodist minister! I am a Methodist. He had been a Y. M. C. A. worker; I am a director in the Columbus Y. M. C. A. Because of all this, I personally reviewed his file and his testimony, although I did not have access to his F. B. I. file and certain confidential matters the committee considered. The record clearly shows that Dr. Watson has openly and publicly advocated and sponsored the overthrow of our Government by violent revolution, and has associated through the years with persons and organizations whose aims and purposes have been held "subversive" by the Attorney General under the laws of our country.

Dr. Watson denied joining all of the organizations in question, but admitted under oath he had "contact * * * with every one of them, in that he had joined with them in some enterprise or other," and when asked whether he had ever publicly repudiated any of these organizations, his answer was "No."

He helped organize and sponsor an organization called "New America," and spoke for it all over the country. New America in its official pamphlet advocated the following:

"Agitation and struggle for revolutionary change."

"Eliminate private ownership."

Under the heading "Methods," New America was "to prepare" (because of the inevitable resistance of the capitalists) "to resort to force and violence."

"New America * * * will direct the forces of hate and destruction that remove obstacles in order to build."

Under the heading "Coercion," New America is "Preparing the masses to use sufficient coercive restraint at the proper time."

Under the heading "Other Organizations," New America will "Cooperate in genuine united front movements designed to weaken capitalistic society * * * New America offers and strives to maintain an attitude of friendliness to other revolutionary groups that have the same general objectives."

Dr. Watson objected to the use of isolated phrases and "misrepresentative writing." His voluminous writings in the committee files were in full accord with the aims and purposes of "New America," but it is difficult to find in them isolated phrases which contain the bald shocking words of the official pamphlet. The reason for this is explained in a mimeograph issued by the organization entitled:

"Suggestions in Propaganda Technique"—New America Organization.

This mimeograph explained that there was a good way and bad way to present the purposes and program to the American people, and contains elaborate cautions as to the use of the right words. The mimeograph ends up by giving recommended examples as follows:

EXAMPLE OF SUBSTITUTION

ORIGINAL

"The only chance the worker has is to seize power through a revolutionary movement, destroy capitalism, set up a socialist state."

SUBSTITUTED

"The only chance that the wage earners have is to get the political and economic authority through a party recognizing the need for social change, completely change the economic system, and set up an intelligently planned society."

Do not use: "Seize power," "revolutionary potentiality," "fight for," "revolution."

Substitute: "Get the authority," "Social consciousness," "work for," "basic social change."

After examining these suggestions in propaganda technique, it is easy to understand and interpret the words and writings of Dr. Watson and many others now writing and speaking in America.

Dr. Watson conducted two trips through Europe under the auspices of the Open Road, a travel group approved by the Communists. His own expenses were always paid and on the last trip he received an additional honorarium. He led a similar group to Mexico, under similar auspices when Mexico was on the verge of going Communist. On March 5, 1941, he signed a statement in the Daily Worker, "Defending the Communist Party," and on October 18, 1941, he signed a letter urging the President to free Earl Browder. His magazine articles and speeches contain phrases like these, "Shall we work for an all-or-none change? * * * The apparent attractiveness of gradualism is fallacious, * * * only the sharp break brings promise of success."

"Only Soviet Russia has gone up to the left in an ox cart. * * * Our machines are more powerful but more delicate than ox carts."

"I wish I knew whether it will take longer for the Russians to develop efficiency or for America to develop socialism. Then I'd know where I want to live."

"Our Government and that of France and England may pretend to be democracies, but they are in truth plutocracies."

In the committee hearing, Dr. Watson stated under oath, that he had changed his

mind and abandoned some of these views, but that he never publicly repudiated or disavowed any of these associations and writings. He was asked this question:

"Mr. KEEFE. I find no writing in any place disavowing these previous statements and philosophy. You have admitted that yourself."

"Dr. WATSON. That is right."

Under the circumstances, Dr. Watson's recent disavowals and explanations of his previous writings and associations are not conclusive or convincing. The experience of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other security agencies is that Communists, Bundists, and others who are plotting and advocating the overthrow of our Government, make a practice of maintaining respectable contacts and associations and of denying their real associations and purposes. This makes it extremely difficult to distinguish between them and others who are dupes or who are merely reckless and irresponsible in their statements, writings, and associations. Dr. Goodwin Watson may belong to this last group. He is certainly not a fit person to be chief analyst of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of the Federal Communications Commission. His exoneration by this Commission, in view of his record, does not clear him, but implicates the Commission.

I am keenly aware of the danger of abuse or distortion by Congress of its powers to appropriate or withhold money, and of the danger of injustice through failure to give careful consideration to any employee accused of unfitness. On the other hand, we are in a struggle to maintain our form of government at home as well as abroad, and we dare not have persons in positions of responsibility during a war whose opinions and actions have brought either their patriotism or their good sense into grave question. Dr. Watson is still free as a citizen to do and say what he pleases within the law. We are certainly justified, however, in withholding taxpayers' money to support him as a Federal employee in war time.

Yours very truly,

JOHN M. VORYS.

Your Money—Worthless?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, apparently we are over the hill in our battle of production, and there are evidences that we are now winning the war of transportation. We have not been so successful in our battle against inflation.

No member of this body has more consistently warned against the dangers of inflation than my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include here an article by Mr. GORE published in the magazine This Week.

The article, which merits careful reading, follows:

YOUR MONEY—WORTHLESS?

(By ALBERT GORE, Member of Congress from Tennessee)

(Maybe you get good pay—but what use is it if your money won't buy anything? That's what will happen if we get uncontrolled inflation! You—everyone—can help prevent it. Here are some things you can do.)

We are running the risk—a dangerous chance—of an economic crack-up. Tremendous forces are steadily pushing us nearer the precipice, and our inadequate resistance shows signs of weakening.

I am talking about inflation. Do you shrug your shoulders? Do you think inflation is just something for bankers and politicians to worry about?

The danger—to you and to all of us—is very real. And it is imminent. Inflation could mean misery, disaster, and internal chaos—and the consequent danger of losing the war.

Ask the man in the street if he wants to prevent inflation, and the answer will likely be a vague "yes." But the hue and cry in Congress and over the country against rationing, price control, the bureaucrats, regimentation, and inconveniences reflect either a faulty understanding of the rigid measures necessary to stave off inflation or a reluctance to accept those measures.

"Hold the line," the President has ordered; and the various governmental agencies are trying to hold it with their directives and "freeze" orders and requests for public cooperation. But there must be more than orders. There must be a public demand and a public will. The danger is to your pocketbook and in your pocketbook.

Do you think that your pocketbook is still too thin, compared to that of somebody in some other occupation? The let-us-catch-up plea is the favorite of organized efforts to secure higher prices, wages, and profits. I am a farmer, and I have been a wage earner, and I can understand and sympathize with the convincing and appealing arguments why these two groups of people, for instance, despite recent gains, should still have increases to "catch up." But what is gained if the catching-up process develops into an accelerated spiral, and we all go over the precipice?

Total war is an endurance contest between national economies as well as a conflict between armed forces. Only by a stable, all-out war economy can our full force be cast against the enemy. A break-down at home means unsupported troops at the front. Inflation could bring about that break-down.

The other day, a woman in Nashville, Tenn., wrote me: "There is a group of women here making in the neighborhood of $100 per month in businesses where profits and business itself are dwindling monthly. Many of these women are not physically strong enough to go into better-paying war jobs. And, besides, we are loyal to our struggling employers.

"On account of inflation, a $100 salary is reduced in purchasing power to not more than $60 We now have barely enough for necessities of food and clothing to say nothing of medical care. Won't you please try to stop the rising cost of living?"

This is just a small sample of how people are already being hurt by the inflation we have now. But it is a plain danger signal. Inflation means a drastic rise in the cost of living, bringing with it deprivation, suffering, and insecurity on the one hand, and profiteering on the other. It creates unrest, undermines the Nation's morale, brings to people a loss of confidence in their Government, and a resentment against the existing order—all of which are the seeds of upheaval.

CONTROLS NECESSARY

In peacetime, almost all of us work to supply each other with the goods and services which we need or desire. The law of supply and demand regulates both production and price. But in wartime, with so many of us working directly or indirectly in the war effort, that law doesn't work. The things we want as consumers tend to become scarce at the same time that pay rolls—financed by the Government to get the war jobs done—are getting bigger. So the Nation must largely replace the law of supply and demand with controls. This means regimentation. Regimentation is a nasty word; so is war. Both are unavoidable.

Suppose, for instance, that when the East was shivering last winter for want of fuel oil, the Government had removed rationing and price control. Obviously there would have been a terrible scramble to fill tanks and odd cans, regardless of price, before it was all gone. Many who couldn't pay skyrocketing prices would have had to go without. If meat and butter and other scarce foods had been handled the same way, people would have had to go without those, too. Not only would suffering and want have resulted, but war production would have tumbled because, without a fair and equitable share of fuel and food, war workers cannot be healthy, willing, and efficient. We should have had angry and unreasoning strikes, and just and irresistible demands for higher and still higher wages. But the wage increases wouldn't have meant anything, because prices would have gone up faster. That would have been all-out inflation.

Similarly, if there were no wage control, what with manpower shortages rapidly becoming more acute, wage bidding would not only bring about a dizzy, upward spiral of wages, but it would, in my opinion, disrupt war production and undermine our whole domestic economy. Employers with cost-plus war contracts would immediately boost wages to attract more workers to their plants. Then other plants would have to bid higher to get their employees back or pirate labor from other factories. Down would go production. Up would go wages, prices, war costs. Imagine the havoc.

As to the farmer, the all-important thing is not how high his prices will go temporarily—not by a long shot; rather it is to prevent inflation so that he will not finally be even worse off in comparison with other groups than he is now. The farmer who thinks ahead knows that when this war is over much of his produce must be sold abroad—and that he won't have much chance in world trade if the United States has a price and wage structure so high that it can't be related to that of competing countries. He knows, too, that when wages and salaries go up, they tend to stay up—but that farm prices don't.

HANG-OVER

"It's like drinking liquor," an old farmer friend of mine put it to me. "You get all exhilarated while it's going on, but you get an awful headache after. I went through it in the last war—we were still paying war prices for farm machinery when our own prices hit rock bottom in the depression."

And for the millions of people on minimum and fixed incomes, there isn't even the temporary exhilaration—nothing but increasing hardship, fewer clothes, poorer shelter, less wholesome food. To workers in declining businesses, like my correspondent in Nashville, to clerks, old-age pensioners, wives and mothers of soldiers trying to get by on small allowances, runaway inflation is sheer ruin.

Can we hold the line? I think it must be admitted that we haven't done as well, so far, as Canada has. For one thing, Canada recognized the danger earlier. For another, she has acted more resolutely and adequately. In October 1941, she slapped an over-all ceiling on prices, wages, salaries, services, and rents—practically everything; and tightly tied wages to prices by requiring employers to pay a cost-of-living bonus to workers according to the rise of the official cost-of-living index.

Then her price-control director appealed directly to Canada's 3,000,000 women, who do

most of the retail buying, to help prevent price rises. Seeking their aid through women's organizations and local clubs of consumers, and housewives, he named them "guardians of the law," and asked each woman to make "her own list of ceiling prices" and to be guided by it. The women cooperated, and, despite some confusion, have played a big part in holding down the cost of living.

Too, Canada has wrung a lot of water out of her distribution system—something we need to do. Businesses were advised to reduce the cost of packaging, delivery, and overhead. Whole industries were forced to standardize their products to save materials, factory space, labor. For instance, tomato juice can be commercially canned in only four differentsize containers. And subsidy payments have been made to squeezed businesses rather than permit them to raise prices.

CEILINGS NOT ENOUGH

But ceilings over prices, wages, rents, and the rest are not enough. Ceilings operate as a dike against the flood of a rapidly rising stream of purchasing power. In times like these, this rising tide of purchasing power in excess of available goods is too strong for any price-control dike. A portion of the stream must be diverted to other channels.

In other words, we must get rid of more of our money in other ways than through buying—or trying to buy—the goods we want. This year, according to the best official estimates, we shall have a national income which will give us about $50,000,000,000 more to spend—after we have paid our taxes—than there will be goods to spend it for. And the gap will keep widening. That is the danger in our pocketbooks.

FIGHTING WITH TAXES

Again, Canada is meeting this danger better than we are. Both Canada and Great Britain are paying for approximately half their war expenditures by taxation. That cuts down purchasing power and helps stem inflation. We are paying less than a third of ours that way. Both Canada and Britain are borrowing about two-thirds of the money not raised by taxation from the public—thus still further cutting spending power. We are borrowing more from the banks than from ourselves.

Now, banks do not buy bonds with cash. A bank purchases a bond by placing on its books a newly created deposit to the credit of the Government in the amount of the bond. When the Government spends this money, or credit, not only is no purchasing power taken away, but new money, in the form of credit, is added to that already in existence. This process results in monetary inflation, itself a grave danger.

On the other hand, when you buy a bond—or pay taxes—you are reducing that dangerous, inflationary power of our wartime pocketbooks. The amount of money we have to spend is thereby brought more nearly in line with the goods for sale. And every bond you buy means just that much less of inflationary bank borrowing.

The long and short of it is that the national interest and your self-interest are endangered. You can help decrease the danger by:

1. Buying more War Bonds.
2. Accepting a vigorous program of compulsory savings.
3. Being willing to pay higher taxes.
4. Cooperating in the rationing program and accepting the fact that it must be extended further.
5. Helping in every way possible to "hold the line" against rising prices, wages, profits, and salaries, even though it hurts.

These measures are necessary to protect us against runaway inflation. The question is, Are you ready to accept them, and quickly enough?

Address of William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by President William Green of the American Federation of Labor delivered at the A. F. of L. Labor for Victory rally, Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C.:

We have met here tonight to offer everything we have or hope to gain in the future of our country—for victory.

We want the entire world to know that victory in this war is the supreme goal of the 6,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor—a goal that rises above and beyond all other considerations.

We want the whole world to know that the working men and women who make up the American Federation of Labor constitute a mighty and militant army of production soldiers who are driving forward, united heart and soul in the determination that the enemies of freedom and democracy must be crushed at any cost.

Let the American people hear this and gain new hope and courage for the days of struggle and suffering that lie ahead.

Let Hitler and Mussolini and the Japs hear it and tremble with dread of their inevitable doom.

For make no mistake about it—the workers of our country are resolved that this war must go on until the gates of Berlin and Rome and Tokyo have been beaten down by the armed forces of the United Nations and until the enemies of the American way of life are obliterated from the face of the earth.

Our fighting men have started out to do a job and they won't quit until they've done a thorough job—a job that will never again have to be undertaken in the future at the risk of American lives.

Every one of us is filled with pride for the achievements of our boys in uniform on the battle fronts. You have met some of America's outstanding heroes here this evening. You will have a chance to hear from more of them later on. We of the American Federation of Labor want them to know, and their buddies facing the enemy in every part of the globe, that they can count on us to back them up to the limit.

Who are these boys in uniform? Are they strangers to us? The fact is that they are drawn from every walk of life in our country. The fact is that more than a million young men now serving in the Nation's armed forces are members of the American Federation of Labor and the sons and brothers of our union members.

Is it conceivable that we who serve our country on the home front should ever let them down?

The answer of the American Federation of Labor is 6,000,000 times "no."

The smashing victory of the United Nations in North Africa and the new offensives now being undertaken against the enemy on all fronts constitute spectacular and highly encouraging news, the kind of news that gets the big headlines. Everyone knows about it and is thrilled by it. But what fewer people realize and keep in mind is the fact that these glorious advances by our armed forces were made possible only because the workers of our country have won the basic battle of production.

If we stop to consider a moment, it becomes clear and unmistakable that without the assurance of overwhelming superiority in the weapons of warfare these military drives toward ultimate victory could not have been even started, much less crowned with success.

To those of us who participated in it, the results of the battle of production right here in America are breath-taking.

Seventeen months ago America was practically defenseless. We had no modern guns or tanks, our few fighting planes and bombers were obsolete, our Navy had been crippled by a single, treacherous blow at Pearl Harbor.

But what is the picture today? Today President Roosevelt informs us that America is producing more battle planes than all other nations combined. Today Secretary of the Navy Knox reveals that virtually an entirely new Navy was launched in the first few months of this year. Today merchant ships are sliding down the ways at a rate never before approached in shipbuilding history and are being quickly equipped and loaded with vital supplies for our own soldiers and our allies across the seas. Today a virtual avalanche of guns, tanks, and ammunition, unsurpassed in quality, is pouring forth in an endless stream from American factories. Today America can truly say that we have made good our pledge to become the arsenal of democracy.

How was all this accomplished? Not by waving a magic wand. Not by money or laws or arm-chair criticism. It was accomplished by hard work—the hard, relentless, and back-breaking work of you men and women in this hall and millions of your fellow American workers throughout the country.

It was the building-trades workers of the American Federation of Labor who answered their country's call and flocked by the thousands to remote sections of the country to construct almost overnight the vast chain of Army and Navy camps and airfields where the armed forces of our country were trained for the battle. It was these same highly skilled and efficient building-trades workers who broke all records in rushing to completion new factories and ordance plants so that production could be doubled, tripled, and quadrupled within the first year of the war.

Then it was the metal-trades workers of the American Federation of Labor who rallied to the emergency and brought the long-dormant shipyards and navy yards of America to sudden life and vigor. Working in shifts around the clock, in all weathers and under hazardous conditions, they have shown the stuff that American Federation of Labor workers are made of. With an unconquerable spirit, they tackled seemingly impossible quotas and smashed every record for shipbuilding ever made in this or any other country.

Then it was the aeronautical mechanics of the American Federation of Labor who raced against time in aircraft plants all over the country to get American planes flying and keep them flying. All the most famous types of American planes—the ones that have distinguished themselves exceptionally in battle against the enemy—all of them are made by American Federation of Labor workers. To name a few the Flying Fortresses, the P-38 Lightnings, and the Liberators.

The men who fly these planes thank their stars daily for the skill and the sustained hard work of the men and women who make them and are shattering production records daily.

Other American Federation of Labor workers have made equally excellent records in turning out countless quantities of tanks, heavy guns, anti-aircraft guns, machine guns, rifles, bombs, explosives, shells, and bullets.

Prime Minister Winston Churchill told Congress the other day how effective American weapons proved under the test of actual battle in north Africa. Similar reports come to us from the Solomon Islands, from Alaska, from Russia, and from every other front where American fighting equipment is being used against the enemy.

Therefore it seems to me that our own country and its allies owe an everlasting debt of gratitude to the workers of America for the wonderful progress they have made in so short a time, for the fine job they are doing today and will continue to do until the war is won.

But in paying full and deserved tribute to the members of the American Federation of Labor for their tremendous contributions to victory, we should not overlook the part played by their trade unions in organizing, expediting, and promoting the successful war production drive.

No words of mine can express my heartfelt appreciation for the unstinting cooperation given to the American Federation of Labor by its affiliated unions throughout these trying times.

Immediately after Pearl Harbor I called together the officers of all our affiliated national and international unions and informed them that the emergency called for drastic action to assure maximum and uninterrupted war production. Without a moment's hesitation they agreed unanimously to support the solemn no-strike pledge which the American Federation of Labor gave to the President of the United States.

I am proud to report to you tonight that this pledge has been fulfilled almost 100 percent by the workers and the organizations affiliated with the great American Federation of Labor.

This remarkable record, unmatched during any previous period in the Nation's history, was perhaps the most important factor in bringing about the Nation's phenomenal production gains.

Only a few days ago, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, whose members are sitting here on this platform, issued an official declaration reaffirming the no-strike policy for the duration. No matter how sharply we may disagree with some of the wartime restrictions imposed upon labor, the council said, the no-strike pledge holds good for us. I say to you here and now, without reservations of any kind, that no strike will be authorized, approved, or condoned by the American Federation of Labor and its affiliated unions until the enemies of America have been crushed into final defeat.

I cannot conclude this discussion of labor's role in the war effort without mentioning a few other vital and voluntary contributions our members and unions have made to victory.

First and foremost is the War bond program. Last year the members and organizations of the American Federation of Labor purchased the huge total of more than a billion dollars' worth of War bonds. This year I confidently expect our War-bond purchases will exceed $2,000,000,000.

In addition, we of the American Federation of Labor have donated considerable sums to the Red Cross, to the United Service Organizations, and to the relief of our allies through an organization known as United Nations Relief, directed by my friend, Vice President Woll.

Throughout the country the members of the American Federation of Labor have rallied to the call for civilian defense and have helped organize community programs for protection against enemy attacks.

Unquestionably, the most outstanding record with regard to civilian defense was made by the Washington Central Labor Union, which is sponsoring this rally, when it raised more than $130,000 in contributions from American Federation of Labor workers in this area to protect the Nation's Capital from any enemy raid.

These are some of the highlights of what the American Federation of Labor and its 6,000,000 million members have done and are doing to help America win the war.

I want you to know that our trade-union movement is also going to make certain that America wins the peace. For the first time in history, I predict that organized labor in America will be directly represented at the peace conference at the close of this war. We shall make our voice heard. We will never agree to any peace terms unless they guarantee that war shall be abolished forever as a means of settling disputes between nations. We shall insist that Fascism and Nazi-ism and all their hateful practices be sunk without a trace. We shall press for the adoption of the "four freedoms" as a world-wide code. We shall seek justice for all victims of Nazi and Fascist aggression. And we will never be satisfied until economic and social conditions are established which will free human beings from fear of poverty and from fear of oppression.

We believe these objectives are worth fighting for. That is why the American Federation of Labor will go on working, with might and main, come what may, for victory.

Government Benefits for World War No. 2 Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following summary of Government benefits for World War No. 2 veterans under laws enacted by the Congress of the United States as of May 1, 1943.

As a member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, I have received many requests for this information. As a Member of Congress, I have been in position to help many veterans and their dependents with problems relating to their rights under this legislation. I stand ready to continue this service.

I think we can take just pride in the fact that no nation on earth has provided for the veterans of its various wars as well as we have provided for ours. Before the end of this session of Congress, other benefits will be added to those I set forth here, for there are yet some improvements to be made. I welcome at any time any suggestions which may be made by my constituents. Particularly is this true if these suggestions relate to the subject of war veterans' legislation, which is my special responsibility as a member of the committee of the House of Representatives dealing with that subject.

The summary of benefits as of May 1, 1943, is as follows:

ALLOWANCE AND ALLOTMENT—ARMY

Under the new Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, which the President signed on June 23, 1942, allowances are provided for the wives and children, and certain dependent relatives, of men in the lower grades of the Army. This benefit is limited to relatives and dependents of enlisted men in the seventh, sixth, fifth, and fourth grades. In the Army, these grades are: Private, private first class, technician fifth grade, corporal, technician fourth grade, and sergeant.

The act provides a family allowance for the wife and children of a soldier in one of these grades; and, if the soldier desires, a family allowance for certain other relatives of the soldier if they are dependent upon him for a substantial portion of their support.

Here is how the law works: A soldier, who has relatives or dependents who are eligible, gets an official application form from his commanding officer. He fills out the form, following the simple directions printed thereon. He then returns the form to his commanding officer.

If his application is approved, the allowance to his relatives or dependents will begin to accrue on the first of the next succeeding month following the date of application, and will be payable to the relatives or dependents following the end of that month. The allowance will continue to be payable each month thereafter as long as the soldier and his relatives or dependents remain eligible for it, up until 6 months after the present war ends.

Relatives and dependents should not file an application if they know one has been filed by the soldier. If they apply, however, relatives and dependents must use the official application form, and must accompany their applications with certain documentary evidence. If the soldier files the application, he is allowed 6 months in which to furnish the documentary evidence. This evidence is explained on the application form.

Official application forms (WDAGO Form No. 625) are being distributed to all Army organizations and installations throughout the world. Civilians may obtain forms by writing to the commanding officer of the nearest Army post or camp, or the nearest Army Recruiting Station, or to the commanding general of any of the nine Service Commands (formerly Corps Areas).

After an application is filed, it is usually unnecessary to write further letters to the War Department regarding the allowance. Unnecessary correspondence adds to the War Department's great volume of work, and delays action on all applications. However, all changes in the status of the soldier or his relatives or dependents which might affect the allowance must be reported immediately. Changes in the status of the soldier are normally reported automatically by the soldier's unit Personnel Officer. However, the soldier and the person to whom the family allowances are paid are responsible that such changes as the following are reported immediately to the Allowance and Allotment Branch: Change of address, birth of a child, death of a beneficiary, divorce of a wife, remarriage of a parent or a former wife divorced, the marriage of a brother, sister, child or grandchild, or the fact that any class B dependent of a soldier ceases to be dependent upon him. These changes are to be reported on an official change of status form (WDAGO Form No. 641) which may be obtained from the same sources as the official application form.

Who is eligible

For the purposes of family allowances, the relatives and dependents of a soldier is divided into two classes—class A and class B. In class A are the wife and children of the soldier and a former wife, divorced, to whom alimony is payable. Class A relatives do not have to be dependent upon the soldier in order to be eligible for a family allowance. In class B are the parents, brothers, sisters, and grandchildren of the soldier. Class B dependents must be dependent upon the soldier for a substantial portion of their support in order to be eligible.

Meanings of terms in class A and class B

In determining who is eligible for allowances, the terms used in class A and class B have the following meanings:

Class A

Wife: A lawful wife.

Child: Includes the following:

1. A legitimate child.
2. A child legally adopted.
3. A stepchild, if a member of the man's household; including a stepchild who continues as a member of the man's household after the death of the mother or termination of the marriage; and
4. An illegitimate child, but only if the man has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to such child's support; has been judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child; or, has acknowledged under oath in writing, that he is the father of such child.

Former wife divorced: Former wife divorced who has not remarried and to whom alimony has been decreed and is still payable.

Class B

Parent: Includes father and mother, grandfather and grandfather, stepfather and stepmother, father and mother through adoption, either of the soldier or of his wife, and persons who, for a period of not less than 1 year prior to the man's enlistment or induction, stood in place of parents (in loco parentis) to the soldier. (NOTE.—No more than two parents are eligible for an allowance based on the service of one soldier.)

Brother and sister: Includes brothers and sisters of the half blood, as well as those of the whole blood, stepbrothers and stepsisters, and brothers and sisters through adoption.

Grandchild: A child as above defined of a child as above defined, and is limited to persons to whom the soldier has stood in place of parents (in loco parentis) for a period of not less than 1 year prior to his enlistment or induction.

NOTE.—The terms "child," "grandchild," "brother," and "sister" are limited to unmarried persons either (1) under 18 years of age, or (2) of any age, if incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect.

Amount of contribution by service person

For each month for which an allowance is paid to the relatives or dependents of a soldier, $22 will be deducted from, or charged to, his pay. This deduction or charge is made whether they are in class A or class B. However, if allowances are paid for both class A and class B, $27 will be deducted from his pay. (The above amounts are the normal situation. However, if by legal agreement or court order the soldier is obligated to pay alimony or support, which is a lesser amount than the total allowance, the monthly deductions from his pay and the Government's contribution will be reduced proportionately.)

Here is a typical example. If a soldier obtains an allowance for his wife and children, he will have $22 deducted from, or charged to, his pay each month, if he also obtains an allowance for a dependent parent, brother, sister, or grandchild, he will have an additional $5, or $27 in all, deducted from or charged to, his pay each month.

Total monthly allowance, including Government's contribution and soldier's contribution

Wife but no child	$50
Wife and 1 child	62
Wife and 2 children	72
Wife and 3 children	82
Wife and 4 children	92
Wife and 5 children	102
No wife but 1 child	42
No wife but 2 children	52
No wife but 3 children	62
No wife but 4 children	72
No wife but 5 children	82
Divorced wife	42

(The total allowance payable to a divorced wife depends on the amount of the alimony and the number of other dependents of the soldier, but in no case will the allowance exceed the decreed alimony, nor $42 per month.)

Questions on specific cases should be referred directly to the Allowance and Allotment Branch.

1 parent	$37
1 parent and 1 sister, brother, or grandchild	42
2 parents	47
2 parents and 1 sister, brother, or grandchild	52
No parent but 5 sisters, brothers, or grandchildren	47
Wife but no child and 1 parent	70
Wife but no child and 2 parents	80
Wife, 1 child, and 1 parent	82
Wife, 4 children, and 1 parent	112

Many other combinations of relatives and dependents are possible, and are authorized for allowances when eligible. The above are presented only as typical examples.

How to file an application

Allowances will be paid only on application by the soldier or his dependents or relatives or by persons acting on their behalf. Applications must be submitted on the official application form (WDAGO Form No. 625). In other words, no letters, or other informal applications will be accepted.

When an application is made by, or for, a relative or dependent, the original and the official copy, plus all documentary evidence required are mailed to the Office of Dependency Benefits, 213 Washington Street, Newark, N. J. The applicant's copy is retained by the applicant. Application forms may be obtained from the above address.

In filling out the application, a typewriter should be used, if possible, if not, the applicant should print legibly—in ink.

Every question must be answered. If a certain question is not applicable to the case, "None" should be written after the question.

Documentary proof which must accompany application

If application is made by a person other than the soldier, the following documentary proof must accompany the application. However, if application is made by the soldier, he may have up to 6 months from the date of filing the application in which to furnish such documentary proof to the Allowance and Allotment Branch, War Department.

Date of birth of minors who are under 18 years of age

(a) A certified copy of the public record of birth or church record of baptism.

(b) If (a) cannot be produced, an explanation and an affidavit from physician or midwife in attendance at birth.

(c) If (a) or (b) cannot be produced, the affidavits of two or more disinterested persons stating their ages and the name, date, and place of birth of the person whose date of birth is being established and stating that to the best of their own knowledge such person is the child of such parents, naming the parents.

(d) If (a), (b), or (c) cannot be produced, an explanation why, and other evidence such as family Bible, church, naturalization, immigration or hospital records, abstracts of passports, or insurance policies, and so forth, provided it is properly certified as a true copy of the original by a notary public or similar official and supported by documents such as affidavits from disinterested persons.

Proof of marriage to soldier

(a) A duly certified copy of the public or church record.

(b) If (a) cannot be produced, an explanation and an affidavit of the clergyman or magistrate who officiated.

(c) If (b) cannot be procured, the production of the original marriage certificate or a certified photostatic copy accompanied by proof of its genuineness and the authority of the person to perform the marriage.

(d) If (a), (b), or (c) cannot be procured, then the affidavit of two or more eyewitnesses to the ceremony.

(e) In jurisdiction where common-law marriages are recognized, proof may be established by affidavit of one or both parties to the marriage, if living, supplemented by affidavits of two or more witnesses who know that the parties lived together as husband and wife and were so recognized, and stating how long to their knowledge such relationship continued.

Adoption of a minor under 18 by the soldier or previous adoption of the soldier by a foster parent

A certificate from the clerk of the court which legalized the adoption, or certified copy of order of adoption from a court of competent jurisdiction.

Illegitimate child of a soldier

Certified copy of court decree adjudging soldier to be putative father of child, or of court order requiring him to contribute to child's support, or soldier's written acknowledgment under oath that he is the father of the child.

Change of name of a dependent of the soldier

(a) A certified copy of decree of the court order or other court record effecting such change of name.

(b) Affidavit from two disinterested persons setting forth the facts and the cause for, and circumstances concerning the change of name, in States which do not require a court order or record.

Divorce of former wife of the soldier; Separation or maintenance concerning wife, former wife, or children

(a) Certified copy of the divorce decree from the court in which such decree was awarded.

(b) Separation or maintenance agreement concerning wife, former wife, or children to which must be appended an affidavit that the same is a true copy in all respects and is still in full force and effect.

Guardianship of a dependent of the soldier

Certified copy of court decree and certification by clerk of the court that the guardian so appointed is now performing his duty as such.

Mental or physical defects

Affidavit that unmarried child, grandchild, brother, or sister, if over eighteen (18) years of age, is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defects, corroborated by affidavit of licensed physician or psychiatrist.

Relationship of parent (In loco parentis)

Affidavit of two (2) disinterested persons of facts showing that dependent stood in loco parentis to soldier for 1 year or more immediately prior to his induction or enlistment into service; degree of control exercised over enlisted man should be indicated.

Dependency (class B)

Proof of status by affidavits of at least two reputable, disinterested persons attesting to the relationship and dependency of the relative to the soldier is required. Each person making an affidavit should show his status with respect to the claimant or applicant, and in what manner he learned the facts to which he has sworn and subscribed. The affidavit should also contain the home or business address of the person making the affidavit. Photostatic copies of documentary evidence, like any other true copies, will be accepted if properly certified as to their authenticity.

Allowance and allotment—Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard

While the above specifically refers to soldiers, it is equally applicable to members of

the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, in the same pay grades, except that applications should be addressed to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Field Service Division, Navy Department, Euclid Avenue at Thirteenth, Cleveland, Ohio.

GOVERNMENT LIFE (CONVERTED) INSURANCE

Persons now in our armed forces who served during World War No. 1 between April 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921, and who are in good health may secure insurance under the old War Risk Insurance Act as amended.

Where it is possible the applicant should obtain insurance under the old War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, as this Act provides for the payment of insurance benefits should the insured become permanently and totally disabled; that is, unable to follow continuously a substantially gainful occupation.

Monthly installments will be paid in the amount of $5.75 for each $1,000 insurance. The National Service Life Insurance Act does not carry this provision. It provides only for the waiver of payments of premiums over the period the insured is totally disabled.

Another advantage of Government life (converted) insurance is that the class of beneficiaries is not limited. Too, in the event of maturity by death this form of insurance may be paid in a lump sum, or in 36 or more monthly installments.

The beneficiary may elect to receive payments in a greater but not lesser number of installments than designated by the insured.

Veterans' Administration Forms 579 and 579A are used to claim maturity by reason of permanent and total disability.

In case of death a formal claim should not be executed until receipt of form and instructions from the Director of Insurance, Veterans' Administration.

NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE AND AUTOMATIC INSURANCE

Part I of Public, No. 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, as approved October 8, 1940, and subsequently amended, affords each man entering our armed forces an opportunity to protect his dependents by purchasing national service life insurance.

This insurance may be secured without physical examination if applied for within 120 days after entrance into service. After the person in the armed forces has served for more than 120 days the application must be accompanied by physical examination showing good health.

Due to the fact that less than half of the men in our armed forces had applied for insurance prior to December 7, 1941, Public, No. 360, extended the time for applying for insurance, and also protected those in service on December 20, 1941, who died or became totally disabled after October 8, 1940, with automatic insurance in the amount of $5,000 until April 19, 1942. Those entering service after December 20, 1941, are not protected by automatic insurance.

This automatic insurance is payable only to the following permitted classes:

1. To the widow or widower of the insured, if living and while unmarried.

2. If no widow or widower entitled thereto, to the child or children of the insured, if living, in equal shares.

3. If no widow or widower entitled thereto, or child, to the dependent mother or father, including loco parentis, of the insured, if living, in equal shares.

Following the enactment of Public, No. 360, and the expiration of the 120 days, it became obvious that thousands of men in the services had no insurance protection or were inadequately covered, and due to the fact that many of these were overseas, and it was impossible to furnish them insurance applications and secure the necessary examinations, legislation to provide that applications be accepted for another 120 days without physical examination was approved on April 12, 1943, as Public Law No. 36. All persons now in our armed services may secure this protection without physical examination on or before August 10, 1943. Note: In no case does automatic insurance protection extend beyond April 19, 1942, except in cases where members of our armed forces were taken prisoner or otherwise isolated by the enemy prior to April 19, 1942.

National service life insurance is maturable only by death of the insured, but premiums may be waived for total disability of 6 consecutive months or more occurring while insurance is in effect and before reaching the age of 60 years.

Beneficiaries are limited to: Wife, husband, child (includes adopted child, step-child, illegitimate child), parents (includes parents through adoption and persons who stood in loco parentis to the insured for not less than 1 year prior to entry into active service), brother or sister (including those of the half blood).

The insured may designate his beneficiary or beneficiaries in such order as he desires. If the beneficiary eligible to take payments is under 30 years of age at the time the insurance is matured by reason of death, payment will be made in 240 monthly installments in the amount of $5.51 for each $1,000 insurance. Where the beneficiary is 30 years of age or over when the contract matures, payments are made at the rate of from $3.97 per $1,000 at the age of 30, to $9.61 per $1,000 at age 85. Application for this insurance is made either directly through the service agencies, or on contact with the Veterans' Administration. Payments of premiums may be made directly to the Veterans' Administration or deducted from the service pay roll.

The insurance is issued originally on the 5-year level premium term plan, with the privilege of conversion to or exchange for policies of national service life insurance on the ordinary life, 20-payment life, or 30-payment life plan, at any time after the 5-year level premium term policy has been in force for 1 year and within the 5-year term period.

In no case will insurance be issued in excess of $10,000.

Beneficiaries of national service life insurance do not have a vested right in any installment or installments of such insurance.

Where the insured fails to name a beneficiary or where the named beneficiary dies before completion of payment of the guaranteed installments the remaining installments are paid only to the persons listed below, in order, and in no other way:

1. Widow or widower of the insured.

2. Child or children of the insured (including adopted children) in equal shares.

3. Parent or parents who last bore such relationship to the insured (including parent through adoption and persons who stood in loco parentis to the insured for a period of not less than 1 year prior to entry into active service) in equal shares.

4. Brothers and sisters of the insured (including those of the half blood) in equal shares.

Veterans' Administration Form 537 is used for claiming waiver of premium, form 355 for claiming death benefit. All claims are filed with Central Office, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

Proof of age and relationship is made in the same manner as for World War No. 1 cases.

Where dependency for automatic insurance must be established, Veterans' Administration Form 355A should be used and presented to the Director of Insurance, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C. Claim for automatic insurance must be filed with the Veterans' Administration within 1 year from the date of death of the person in service or from July 11, 1942, whichever is the later date except as to those who are mentally or legally incompetent, who have until 1 year following removal of incompetence.

DECEASED VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Burial

When a soldier dies while on active duty with the United States Army, the expenses incident to preparation of his remains and transportation to the place designated by the legal next of kin are borne by the War Department in accordance with existing regulations.

After the remains arrive at destination an amount not exceeding $50 may be allowed for necessary expenses of interment—such expenses to include undertaker's services, cost of grave site, opening and closing of grave, transportation of remains, and immediate relatives, to the cemetery, and services of a minister. In these cases the following is the correct procedure to be followed:

a. The undertaker rendering services incident to the interment of the remains at destination should submit this itemized bill in quadruplicate to the Quartermaster General, War Department, Washington, D. C., with a certificate on each copy over the signature of the undertaker.

b. If the relatives pay the undertaker for the services rendered, the person paying same should address a letter to the Quartermaster General, War Department, Washington, D. C., requesting reimbursement and accompanying such request with an itemized reecipted bill in quadruplicate.

Upon receipt of the bill in the Quartermaster General's Office executed in either of the two ways described above you may rest assured it will be given every consideration with a view to payment in the amount allowed under existing regulations.

Burial for veterans who die in Veterans' Administration hospitals

The maximum reimbursement for burial and funeral expenses as prescribed by the regulations dealing with this subject is $100, but a special provision in the regulation dealing with hospitalization and domciliary care permits payment of transportation for the body in excess of this amount. This special provision only applies when the veteran dies while receiving hospitalization or domiciliary care. In such instances transportation will be furnished by the Government to the place of residence or nearest national cemetery. The actual allowance for embalming, casket, and clothing cannot exceed $100 when the body is to be shipped from a veterans hospital or home. The remaining $20 is available for secondary service. In the event relatives or friends desire burial at a place more distant than place of residence it will be necessary for them to pay excess cost of transportation in advance. This is applicable to veterans of all wars, including World War No. 2, and those serving in time of peace.

Burial allowance

An allowance for burial under certain conditions is made for all honorably discharged war veterans. A flag to drape the casket of any honorably discharged veteran shall also be furnished upon application. After burial it is given to the next of kin. A flag may be secured from any Veterans' Administration Facility or post office designated by the Veterans' Administration.

The following requirements are necessary to secure burial allowance:

1. Honorable discharge from war service.

2. Service in the World War between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918; except if veterans served in Russia before April 2, 1920.

3. Service for Spanish-American War veterans between April 21, 1898, and July 4, 1902. This has been extended to July 15,

1903, for those who served in the Moro Province.

4. Service after December 6, 1941.

The amount payable is $100 which covers burial, general expenses, and transportation of the body.

No deduction is made from the sum allowed because of contributions toward funeral and burial made by a State or other political subdivision, union, fraternal organization, but aggregate of all sums allowed shall not exceed the actual cost.

Veterans' Administration Form 530 is used to claim this benefit This claim should be executed by the undertaker if the bill is unpaid. If paid, it should be executed by the person who defrayed the funeral expenses. It should be accompanied by form P-121 in duplicate. These claims should be filed through the National Service Bureau.

NOTE.—Burial claims must be filed within 2 years after the veteran's death and if claim is not complete when filed, the Veterans' Administration will advise claimant as to evidence needed for completion. If the required evidence is not filed within 1 year from date of request the claim will be disallowed.

PUBLIC LAW NO. 10, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, GRANTS WARTIME BURIAL BENEFITS TO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Burial flags

These are furnished as indicated in the articles on burial for soldiers who die in service and burial allowance.

Death gratuity

Upon death while on active duty and not the result of own misconduct of a member of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, there may be payable a sum equal to 6 months' pay at the rate allowable at time of death. This is known as the 6 months' death gratuity.

Army: Payable to the widow and if there is no widow to the child or children; if there be no widow or child to any other dependent relative of such officer or enlisted man previously designated by him.

A recent decision of the Comptroller General says: "I conclude that limiting the payment 'to any other dependent relative—previously designated' who has an insurable interest in the life of the deceased will more fully give effect to the intent, as well as the purpose and object, of the status than to require a showing of actual dependency, even to a limited degree, of any relative previously designated."

It is held that the mother, father, brother, or sister have an insurable interest and that more distant relations must prove an insurable interest to be eligible to receive this benefit.

Claims for this benefit are presented to the Gratuity Pay Section, Finance Office, United States Army, Washington, D. C., on forms furnished by that department.

Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard: Payable to the widow, and if there is no widow, to the child or children, and if there be no widow or child, to any other dependent relative previously designated, or if no one in the designated classes, to any grandparent, parent, sister, or brother shown to be actually dependent upon the deceased.

As to those in the "previously designated" classifications the rule set forth by the Comptroller General is the same as for the Army but as to the latter classifications there must be proof of both insurable interest and actual dependency.

Claims for this benefit are presented to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Navy Department, Washington, D. C., upon forms furnished by that office.

MEDICAL CARE WHILE ON LEAVE

Army personnel on leave for 24 hours or less who require medical attention may arrange for the necessary civilian attention at Government expense either through their commanding officer or as individuals. If the original leave was granted for more than 24 hours, it is impossible to secure reimbursement for civilian medical care. However, such individuals may receive medical care from any Army post or station or any Government hospital or dispensary. Such individuals or someone for them should immediately report all facts relating to the injury or illness requiring hospital care to the surgeon's office of the proper service command. The report should contain a complete statement of the case signed by the attending physician.

Naval and Marine Corps personnel on leave are not entitled to civilian medical care at Government expense. Such personnel should report to their commanding officer or the nearest naval or Marine Corps station or naval hospital.

Coast Guard personnel on leave who are beyond reach of regularly established relief facilities are not entitled to medical care at Government expense. Dependents of Coast Guardsmen may be given out-patient care at marine hospitals and some Public Health Service relief stations. Note: Since November 2, 1941, the Coast Guard has operated under the Navy.

ARMY EMERGENCY RELIEF

The Army has made special provisions for soldiers whose families might otherwise suffer hardships before the first family allowances are paid. However, there are a number of private service organizations throughout the country which are giving help to soldiers' families who are suffering hardship because of the soldiers' military service. For example, the American Red Cross has local chapters in over 3,400 cities and towns, and additional branches in many more villages. The Army Emergency Relief has a section officer in almost every Army post and camp, and a branch officer in every service command headquarters.

NAVY RELIEF SOCIETY

Members of the naval services or their families in need of emergency financial assistance may secure help by application to the Navy relief organization at the navy yards or naval training station, and the naval air stations. If they are not conveniently near any such station, they should apply for such aid from the Navy Relief Society through their local Red Cross.

CIVIL RELIEF

This law is for the purpose of protecting life insurance and property rights of those in the active military service.

It does not relieve one of his legal obligations or fulfillment of contracts; however, it is effective when ability to meet obligations is impaired through service in the armed forces.

Generally, protection is afforded against eviction or distress for nonpayment of rent, against taking undue advantage of one in service in court proceedings, in foreclosure of mortgages or deeds of trust, and against assessment of penalties because of inability to pay taxes, et cetera.

It also affords protection through the Veterans' Administration against lapsation of commercial life-insurance contracts. Veterans' Administration Form 380 should be available at all military and naval posts and is used to secure such protection

All matters affecting real or personal property rights should be referred promptly to competent local attorneys for assistance and advice.

MISSING IN ACTION

Public Law No. 490, Seventy-seventh Congress, March 7, 1942, provides that when any person in active service is officially reported as missing, in action, interned in a neutral country, or captured by an enemy shall, while so absent, be entitled to receive or have credited to his account all pay and allowances to which he was entitled at the time of the beginning of such absence. This protects allotments for support of dependents and insurance premiums. It also permits allowances for members of family even though the missing person may not have made provisions for same.

Inquiries as to Army cases should be directed to the Adjutant General, United States Army, Washington, D C., and Navy cases to the Bureau of Navy Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

Many inquiries are received by Congressmen as to individuals whose whereabouts are unknown. We cannot give this information. The service department concerned invariably notifies next of kin when a man is reported killed, wounded, or missing, before the facts are released to anyone else, and gives all information available.

VETERANS AFTER DISCHARGE

Pensions

There is no provision at the present time for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War No. 2 except for service-connected disability.

Service connection is established under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), Part II, which is more restrictive than are the laws and regulations allowing compensation to World War veterans.

However, full wartime rates are payable under Public Law No. 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, effective December 19, 1941.

The injury or disease causing disability or death must have been incurred in line of duty, otherwise, service connection cannot be allowed.

Misconduct or discharge under other than honorable conditions is an absolute bar against the payment of pension.

The decisions of the War and Navy Departments as to line of duty or misconduct are not completely binding upon the Veterans' Administration as these terms are defined for pension purposes by Public Law No. 648, Seventy-fifth Congress, June 16, 1938.

There are no presumptions of service connection, but there is a rebuttable presumption of sound condition at enlistment after 6 months or more of active military service, which may be rebutted either by facts or medical judgment.

Veterans' Administration Form 526 is used to claim disability pension and should be filed with the Veterans' Administration regional office having jurisdiction over place of residence. When a proper claim was filed incident with discharge it is not necessary to file a new claim.

Pensions are payable only under the 1933 rating schedule on evaluations of 10 percent or multiples thereof, plus statutes allowance in certain cases. No additional disability pension is payable for or on account of dependents.

Disability incurred before December 7, 1941, with discharge thereafter, is pensionable at peacetime rates unless there was an aggravation of the disability after December 7, 1941, or unless the disability was "a direct result of armed conflict, or while engaged in extra hazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war" (Public, No. 359, 77th Cong.).

HOSPITALIZATION AND DOMICILIARY CARE

Public Law No. 10, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 17, 1943, extends full hospitalization privileges on the same basis as veterans of other wars, to "any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after December 7, 1941, and before the termination of hostilities or by concurrent resolution of the Congress: *Provided*, That the term 'active military or naval service,' as used herein,

shall include active duty as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard." Approved March 17, 1943.

PAY AND ALLOWANCE DUE AT DEATH

All claims for pay and allowances due to a serviceman at time of death in the active service are settled by the General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C.

These claims must be over the personal signature of the next of kin or legal representative of the deceased.

HEADSTONES

Upon application to the Quartermaster General, United States Army, Washington, D. C., headstones will be furnished for unmarked graves of soldiers, sailors, marines, and Army nurses who served in the Army or Navy of the United States (including the Revolutionary War and service with the military forces of the Confederate States of America), whether regular or volunteer, and whether they died in the service or after muster out or after honorable discharge. The headstones for Civil and Spanish War are of American white marble, 39 inches long, 12 inches wide, and 4 inches thick; for the World War, 42 inches long, 4 inches thick, and 13 inches wide. Headstone will be shipped freight prepaid by the Government, only to the nearest station or steamboat landing.

In addition to the above-described marker there is authorized a flat marker 24 inches long, 12 inches wide, and 4 inches thick. Placed flush with the ground. Inscription will be placed parallel to the greatest dimension on the stone and will consist of the full name of the veteran, the State from which he came, his rank, regiment, and date of death. There will be no religious or other emblems or shield on this marker.

The issuance of bronze markers was also authorized, but because of the scarcity of bronze and the need for same in our war effort their use has been discontinued.

WOMEN VETERANS

Members of the Army and Navy Nurse Corps are entitled to disability pension on the same basis as male members of the armed forces. The Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, the Women's Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard are not yet covered by the pension laws, and disability and death claims for these units are handled by the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, 385 Madison Avenue, New York City. The WAVES, as well as members of the Army and Navy Nurse Corps, are entitled to national service life insurance, while the WAAC's are not. Under Public Law No. 10, Seventy-eighth Congress, members of the WAAC's, WAVES, SPARS, and Marine Corps Auxiliary Reserve are eligible to hospitalization benefits on the same basis as members of the armed forces.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

"Public, No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, amended Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide, among other things, 'that any person who served in the active military or naval service at any time after December 6, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war, who is honorably discharged therefrom and who has a disability incurred in or aggravated by such service for which a pension is payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, or would be but for the receipt of retirement pay, and is in need of vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap of such disability, shall be entitled to such vocational rehabilitation as may be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to fit him for employment consistent with the degree of disablement.' "

It is to be distinctly borne in mind, in applying the above definition, that there is a clear distinction between average impairment in earning capacity for pension purposes and a vocational handicap requiring vocational rehabilitation to overcome the handicap. A person who is totally disabled on the basis of average impairment in earning capacity may nevertheless be fully able to secure and pursue employment in some occupation for which he is well qualified. Conversely, a person who has a very slight pensionable disability may, on account of peculiar relationships existing between specified skills and his occupational experience, have a vocational handicap which would require vocational rehabilitation to overcome. It should also be borne in mind that unemployment is not necessarily an indication that a vocational handicap exists, nor is employment alone sufficient to support a determination that no vocational handicap exists. Mere temporary employment, the tenure of which may be dubious or which is not suitable for the individual, or comparable with his education, occupational training, and skill, is not incompatible with the existence of a vocational handicap. A disabled person may be able to follow occupations not comparable with the occupation pursued prior to service and still have a vocational handicap. By comparable is meant, substantially similar or on a parity with regard to remuneration, permanence of employment opportunities for advancement, and environment. When, however, the disabled person's best interests will be served by seeking and pursuing employment for which he is qualified, that is, when this offers a suitable career, it may not be held that a vocational handicap exists.

Application for vocational training should be made on Veterans' Administration Form 1900, which may be secured from any Veterans' Administration regional office, or from a Member of Congress who can be addressed simply in care of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Too Many Eleventh Hours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of May 28, 1943:

TOO MANY ELEVENTH HOURS

This business of being repeatedly rescued at the eleventh hour and fifty-ninth minute from the disasters of a major strike isn't good enough. The American people are beginning to feel like the heroine in the play who wearied of being carried down the fireman's ladder just before the house collapsed. The public is plainly glad that the Akron rubber workers have heeded President Roosevelt's demand to return to work, but is inclined to ask, "How many times have we got to go through this?"

It is time the United States had a clear-cut policy on wartime strikes. So far the President by leaping from emergency to emergency has staved off any long large-scale stoppage. But aside from the damage done by tension and bitterness, there has been loss of production, not small in the coal mines and estimated at $18,000,000 in the rubber walkout. If Mr. Roosevelt can't find something better than these hair-raising last-minute rescues, Congress should attempt to bring some order into a chaotic and explosive labor situation.

Many people believe strikes should simply be outlawed. Action in that direction is certainly coming closer. Union leaders and members might give it more attention—or at least earlier attention—than a replaying of the President's stock appeal to go back to work.

Something needs to be done to jar workers out of the habit of striking. They may feel they haven't any other way of calling attention to their case or getting action. But when men strike because one of their number hasn't bought enough War bonds or because their union has increased the dues—seemingly incredible, but actual cases—a nation at war has got to call a halt. Public opinion—and certainly the opinion of men whose working hours are set by the bugle—will soon force some sharper restraints on strikes.

But just passing a law will not solve the fundamental trouble—which is a faiure to feel the necessity for sacrificing to win the war. This affects the public and Congress as well as labor and the administration. It is seen in profiteering and gas chiseling, in black markets and in just plain apathy as well as in strikes. The bombs are not falling on American cities, the enemy isn't visible at the border.

This attitude bears very directly on the problem of strikes because it is the attitude which has prevented more effective action against inflation. And the rise in living costs is the fire which puts steam behind workers' demands. Congress particularly has been lax in failing to draw off surplus buying power by higher taxes and has undermined price controls. It could remove much of the pressure for strikes by action to curb inflation.

When a show-down comes workers seem to realize that the war comes ahead of wages. They—and every other section of the community—should look a bit further ahead and without coming to the brink of action that endangers the national effort, recognize that this is war.

Any Wage Boost Is Inflationary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THAD F. WASIELEWSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of May 28, 1943:

ANY WAGE BOOST IS INFLATIONARY

An emergency board of the national railway labor panel has recommended an increase of 8 cents an hour for the million employees outside the railroad brotherhoods. The men had asked for an increase of 20 cents, with a 70-cent minimum. The 8 cents award is beyond the Little Steel formula, but represents, in the words of the board, the "minimum noninflationary adjustment

necessary to correct gross inequities and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war."

In the coal situation, the War Labor Board, turning down the miners' plea for a $2 a day increase, directed resumption of negotiations between miners and operators on a new basis. A program to guide negotiations was set up, looking to a probable increase of about $1 in daily pay. Here again Little Steel was ignored—pay will be raised by plugging loopholes in the 6-day week, by adopting a portal to portal workday, by increasing vacation payments, and by directing the companies to furnish tools and safety equipment now paid for by the workers.

Both settlements are admittedly of an emergency nature. They permit wage advances for men who have already had adjustments under the Little Steel rule, but whose pay is still below prevailing rates at this time. Both are to aid "in the effective prosecution of the war." The combined effect of the two will, nevertheless, be to raise pay rolls and thus increase costs by several hundred million dollars annually. The effect will be definitely, though perhaps mildly, inflationary. This is a thing always to be kept in mind in appraising wage advances.

There was a time, long since past, when the country could have avoided these upswings. If at that time prices, wages, and other forms of goods and labor exchange had been frozen, nobody would have benefited much or lost much because of a war economy. No deep-rooted abuse would have been remedied. No relative position would have been changed. Every adjustment would have awaited the end of the war. Inflation would have been held to a rock-bottom minimum.

The administration, worried by labor on one side and by agriculture on the other, missed the opportunity to accomplish this freezing. Instead, it permitted prices (especially agricultural prices) to rise. It encouraged high overtime pay and approved basic-pay adjustments, to draw men and women from idleness into work and to persuade workers in unessential lines to switch over to war work. The result was the creation of new inequalities, of new inequities, in both the price and wage fields.

Adjustments have been going on ever since—adjustments uniformly upward until price roll-backs with subsidy backing (but without corresponding wage roll-backs) came into the picture. Our present policy, as exemplified in the railroad and mine rulings, is one of controlled. or slowed-down inflation. Apparently this policy will be carried on for the remainder of the war period. It will not stop inflation. It will merely hold inflation in check.

Perhaps there is no suitable alternative to this policy at this time, but that does not excuse its proponents for calling it noninflationary. Every rise in price, every increase in wages, no matter how small in either case, is definitely and positively inflationary. When these increases are held in check by slow motion processes, the upward swings are less frequent and less violent. There is safety, if nothing else, in that.

The kind of inflationary spiral now in effect possibly can go on year after year until the end of the war without danger of ruinous inflation—provided the war does not last too many years, and provided the program itself can be held. If more direct remedies having been eschewed, this controlled inflation aids in the prosecution of the war so effectively that years are cut off the duration of hostilities, then there has been economic gain in addition to the manpower gain which is sure to come from a shortened war.

The point is, having granted some raises, we are in for more. Inflationary processes lead to more inflationary processes. Wages up a little here and there, prices up to match; new inequities to be met, with adjustments to adjust the other adjustments.

Ohio's Big Surplus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Cleveland Press:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press of April 19, 1943]

OTHER STATES WITH SURPLUSES CUT BUDGETS—OHIO'S BOOSTED

(By Richard L. Maher)

Ohio has between $45,000,000 and $60,000,000 in excess tax money lying idle in its treasury.

The amount depends upon the way you figure and what figures you accept.

That's quite a tidy sum, you say.

But—

California has a $90,000,000 surplus.

Illinois has a $62,800,000 cash balance.

New York has $69,000,000 in its treasury.

Indiana, to the west, has $26,390,000 in its till.

Kentucky, to the south, has $7,705,000 surplus.

Pennsylvania, to the east, ended 1942 with its books even—but estimates that its tax collections during the next 2 years will run $80,000,000 above its needs.

Ohio's surplus is one of the most frequently used arguments for the nomination of John W. Bricker, the Buckeye State Governor, for President at the next G. O. P. national convention.

In the light of what other States have done, booms for other Governors perhaps should be expected.

Of course, the Ohio surplus really isn't a surplus. It represents excess taxes—not savings—paid into the Ohio treasury during years of good business—taxes that could not have been spent by the administration because they had never been appropriated by the General Assembly.

Early in January Governor Bricker placed the surplus at $42,000,000. At the same time, his finance director, H. D. Deffenbacker, said there was an unencumbered balance of $56,000,000 in the treasury. He subtracted from this a $6,000,000, payment to be made on an old school foundation debt, a $4,000,000 payment due the schools in February, and placed the surplus at $45,700,000.

In arriving at his figures, Governor Bricker subtracted some legislative appropriations which had lapsed January 1—but which he said he would ask to be renewed.

Since January 1, it is estimated, about $4,000,000 in excess taxes have been poured into the treasury.

Governor Bricker recently has handed the legislature a budget that calls for the expenditure of $372,000,000 during the next two years.

This is $20,000,000 higher than his budget of 1941.

In California Governor Warren, with $90,000,000 in excess taxes in the treasury, has cut State expenditures by $64,000,000 for the biennium.

In Illinois Governor Green has slashed State expenses by $40,000,000. His 1943-44 budget asks that much less than the 1941-42 budget.

In New York Governor Dewey has submitted and has seen adopted a budget $11,000,000 below the 1941 budget.

In Pennsylvania, with no surplus but with an expected $80,000,000 increased income during 1943 and 1944, the only extra expenditures in the budget are to increase salaries of lower paid teachers.

Ohio's $45,000,000, $56,000,000 or $60,000,000, as it probably is now, in excess taxes lies in the State treasury, or is in banks at extremely low interest rates.

Illinois has $33,000,000 invested in 90-day United States Treasury certificates, and another $28,000,000 invested in United States Treasury certificates of indebtedness.

The legislature has enacted a bill to give the State treasurer power to invest any or all of the surplus in War bonds.

California plans to invest $14,000,000 of its surplus in War bonds.

For more than 2 years, excess taxes piling up in the State treasury have lain there idle. Weeks ago State Treasurer Don H. Ebright suggested that the State grant him power to invest State money in Government securities.

The law finally was passed, and only a few days ago Mr. Ebright bought $15,000,000 in United States certificates of indebtedness. These will bring an additional revenue of $117,000 to the State during the coming year.

This marks the first effort by Ohio to put its excess taxes to work, and is the first purchase of Government securities out of the State's general revenue fund.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press of April 20, 1943]

PESSIMISM BUILDS UP OHIO'S BIG SURPLUS

(By Richard L. Maher)

Ohio's income will shrink $140,000,000 in 1943 and 1944, Governor Bricker told the general assembly last February in submitting his budget.

He told the assembly the general revenue fund would lose $64,000,000—a 20-percent drop from the $328,000,000 that came to the fund in 1941 and 1942.

He also told the assembly highway income would be off $19,000,000—25 percent from the $68,000,000 total for the past 2 years.

The Governor told the legislature the $45,500,000 the administration admits is in the State treasury as a surplus from 1941-42 would be wiped out by the end of 1944.

The Governor has a pessimistic outlook for the future. Of course, it was the same kind of pessimism about revenues that enabled him to garner $45,500,000—or more in excess taxes during the past 2 years.

In 1941 the Governor estimated that revenues paid into the general fund would total $139,000,000. Actually collected that year was $158,000,000. For 1942 he estimated income at $142,000,000. Actually it was $169,000,000. There's the $45,500,000 surplus.

In addition millions of dollars appropriated by the 1941 Assembly now rest idle in the treasury. Further, income to date is exceeding estimates in the 1943 Bricker budget.

The Governor offered one piece of legislation reducing taxes in Ohio—the only move he made toward lifting the burden of taxpayers. This was the suggestion that the sales taxes on food served in restaurants and the tax on medicines be repealed.

The legislature shelved the idea, which would have saved taxpayers about $3,500,000 a year.

In California a citizens committee named by Governor Warren has proposed and the legislature is considering:

Reduction of the State sales tax from 3 to 2½ percent, with drugs, medicines, and prescriptions exempted.

Reduction of the personal income maximum tax rate from 15 to 7 percent, with a 25 percent war credit on all personal income-tax returns.

Reduction of 25 percent for 2 years in all bank and corporation taxes.

OTHER STATES CUT TAXES

New York claims a surplus of $69,000,000. However, a year ago Herbert Lehman, then Governor, offered a program reducing taxes by $82,000,000, cutting ordinary expenditures by $5,000,000, and setting aside $5,000,000 for home defense.

In anticipation of increased revenues, Pennsylvania has before its legislature a program for repeal of the mercantile license tax on wholesalers and retailers, repeal of a 4-mill personal-property tax, and a reduction of gross receipts tax on utilities.

In Illinois, Governor Green is pessimistic about the State's income for the coming 2 years—but not as much as Governor Bricker. He thinks Illinois will lose $40,000,000 during the biennium.

But he believes the best financial policy to meet this anticipated reduction is by reducing State expenditures. So he offers a budget that will keep the State surplus intact, and will run the government on $40,000,000 less than was received during the past 2 years.

The huge surplus will be kept intact for post-war emergencies, says Governor Green.

SETS ASIDE SURPLUS

Governor Warren, of California, has recommended that $58,000,000 of that State's surplus be appropriated for future emergencies. The sum of $25,000,000 would be set aside as a war catastrophe fund to be used at the direction of the Governor and the State war council in case of invasion for relief and protection of citizens

Another $33,000,000 would be reserved for post-war construction and reconstruction of State buildings.

Governor Bricker has recommended to the present assembly that $19,000,000 of the surplus be set aside for post-war building. He also asks 10 percent pay raises for employees earning under $2,000 yearly. This will cost $5,635,000.

In addition he proposes a $2,000,000 increase to welfare institutions to meet increased maintenance costs.

He also recommended a $4,400,000 yearly increase in old-age pensions.

Indiana, to the west of Ohio, expects to have its surplus almost intact at the end of its fiscal year. The legislature has provided an appropriation of $6,000,000 to rebuild a hospital for the insane that was destroyed by fire and will keep the rest of its $26,000,000 surplus for emergencies.

Kentucky has appropriated $3,000,000 of its $8,000,000 for the improvement of State institutions, and is holding the remainder as a cushion against falling revenues.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press of April 21, 1943]

GOVERNOR DEWEY SEEN TOPPING BRICKER AS ADMINISTRATOR—NEW YORK EXECUTIVE'S PROGRAM ENACTED WHILE OHIO ASSEMBLY DAWDLES

(By Richard L. Maher)

This might be entitled "The Tale of Two States" or the "Story of Two Governors Who Would Be President."

John W. Bricker is Governor of Ohio. Thomas E. Dewey is Governor of New York.

Both are considered as 1944 Presidential possibilities.

John Bricker is serving his third term as Ohio's Governor. Thomas Dewey is in his first term as New York's chief executive.

Three months after taking his office, Governor Dewey has seen the New York Legislature complete its work and go home. He saw his entire legislative program enacted into law.

That program included reduction of expenditures by $11,000,000; changes in State income-tax laws to permit deductions for medical expenses, support of children in college, and life-insurance payments.

Appropriation of $2,500,000 to be matched by Federal funds to care for children whose mothers are employed in war work.

Reapportionment of the general assembly, the first in 26 years, giving larger communities in New York fairer representation.

Pay raises for employees, 40,000 of them, earning less than $3,975 a year. The raises are scaled from 10 percent down to 7½ percent, and a State minimum of $1,200 yearly is established.

New York's $69,000,000 surplus is intact. New York's law places it entirely under the Governor's control.

LOOKS TO POST-WAR PERIOD

"It will be used," says Governor Dewey, "to strengthen the State for stormier seas ahead."

He is looking forward to the post-war period and the time when the State may be called upon to aid unemployed.

There was no wrangling between Governor Dewey and the New York Assembly. His program went through almost without a hitch.

He had promised during his campaign that he would fight for legislative reapportionment to give the borough of Queens especially adequate representation. The bill was unpopular with many Republican legislators, some of whom may lose their jobs because of it.

There was a threatened revolt.

Mr. Dewey didn't try to push himself into the situation, but he insisted on enactment of the bill. The revolt died, and the reapportionment carried.

Mr. Dewey, an unsuccessful contender for the G. O. P. nomination in 1940, mentioned every day as a 1944 contender—but the New York Governor goes right along keeping his nose to the New York grindstone and announcing that he is interested "only in doing a good job in New York State."

On January 11, Governor Bricker submitted his program to the Ohio Assembly. He made a score of specific recommendations. Few have been enacted into law.

One, the repeal of the sales tax on food served in restaurants and on medicines, has been buried by the house of representatives.

BRICKER IS DEFIED

Republican members, the majority in the House, defied the Governor in sidetracking this proposal. This repealer was regarded as one of the key arguments for the Bricker-for-President campaign. Its enactment would have marked the Governor as a tax reducer and would have provided an argument against what the Republicans call the "tax spenders" in Washington.

The Governor now is pleading for its revival.

The Governor submitted a huge budget—largest in the history of the State. It totaled $375,723,921—$23,000,000 above the 1941 budget, which in itself set a record.

The legislature has clipped $2,763,278 from that budget, $1,000,000 of which was for civilian defense.

The Governor has seen enacted into law these of his recommendations:

Appropriation of $12,000,000 annually out of sales tax funds to municipalities.

Extension of the 65 percent excise tax on utilities.

Appropriation of $7,500,000 for construction of a new school for the deaf and blind.

Reenactment of the liquid fuel tax of 1 cent per gallon.

None of these is controversial.

He has recommended in his budget and the house has approved to date:

A 10-percent raise for employees earning less than $2,000 yearly.

A $4,400,000 yearly increase in old-age pensions.

Appropriation of $19,000,000 for post-war buildings and reconstruction.

Ohio's legislature now is in its fourth month of session. It probably will be in Columbus for another 3 weeks.

Despite large Republican majorities in both the house and senate, the assembly and the Governor are at loggerheads.

The assembly, despite months of wrangling, hasn't adopted a program for relaxing the hours of women and minors in industry—and the administration has shown little leadership upon this controversial issue.

TIME ISSUE CONTROVERSY

The most controversial issue before the legislature was the question of whether the State should remain on eastern war time or switch back to eastern standard time.

The assembly debated it for weeks. The Governor offered no recommendation, but did a lot of surveying. The result was that the first 5 or 6 weeks of the legislature's time was consumed in arguing about time.

Governor Bricker is taking his boom for President seriously, and has leaped at every opportunity to make a speech outside Ohio.

While he campaigns for the nomination—without, of course, as yet declaring himself a candidate—and while he grows more and more conservative about pitching into controversial problems, the strong influence he once exercised over the legislature is fading.

In January, it was predicted that the assembly session would be short.

It could have been short if the Governor had used the influence he wielded in former legislatures, if he had followed the Dewey policy.

Something Better

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post for Wednesday, May 26, 1943:

SOMETHING BETTER

Gen. Jan Smuts, the grand old man of South Africa, and one of the world's finest fighters for freedom, has added a new inspirational note to the battle against the dictators.

A small, seemingly insignificant statement, given at the celebration of his seventy-third birthday, it can be regarded as trivial and quickly forgotten. Or, reading it, people can resolve in their heart that it be fulfilled.

It has to do with those days which lie beyond the war, the days to come when mothers will not wait impatiently for the coming of the mailman in the morning, with the long-delayed letter from Guadalcanal, or the father's heart will not stop beating as he watches a messenger boy pedal down the street.

It has to do also with the years to come after, when the young men who went away to war are settled in life jobs, have homes of their own and families.

It concerns everyone, of all ages and stations, of all nations and creeds, the kings and commoners, the babes and the bearded, the fortunate and the poor, the learned and the learning, all for whom God made the earth.

General Smuts used more than words. He took words and made a banner out of them, something to lift the eyes as well as the heart, something to remember when the cheering, the singing, and the sound of the bells that announce the last victory have died away.

Simply, succinctly, and superbly he said, speaking of the war's end:

"Our boys will be returning from the war fronts to their homes and I hope to a better world. We want to see something better than just victory."

What can be better than victory? What can surpass the Axis leaders in chains, their minions marching by disarmed?

General Smuts lived through the prior victory. After the echoes of the victory bells died in the hills, he was one of the signers of the Versailles Treaty.

At that time, with the vision which has made him a great man, he foresaw in the terms of the treaty, in the attitude of his compatriots, and particularly in the attitude of the signers for Germany, the next world war—the one the world is now fighting.

"Something better than just victory" born of that experience, is a phrase to live and be remembered, now and when the guns cease firing, now and when it comes time to write the permanent peace, now and when the world settles down to live a normal life again.

The cynics will scoff, the disillusioned will shake their heads, the perpetual faultfinders will deride "something better than just victory."

They will be right if the end of this war means only the unconditional surrender of Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo. They will be wrong if it means a world thereafter, free of the fear of enslavement and aggrandizement, of which wars are bred. General Smuts has challenged the hearts of men.

Money—The Most Important Issue Before the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the twenty-ninth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. In this part of the Senator's speech he touches on the very essence of money—the thing that makes money, money—the legal-tender function which is so strikingly exemplified in the record of the financial transaction in silver in London and gold in Calcutta, cited in the Baring testimony presented in this installment of the Senator's speech.

When the prerogative of governments to create and circulate money and to establish by legislation the monetary unit in a monetary system is considered, the power of the legal-tender function becomes apparent, as well as the effect on the value of the monetary metal of granting or withholding the coinage and legal-tender privilege.

The twenty-ninth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

But, Mr. President, from the foundation of the Government until today not one solitary silver coin that the United States has coined, whether full legal tender or subsidiary, has ever been redeemable in gold. I challenge any man to point to one law of the United States that has ever made silver coin full legal tender or a limited legal tender, redeemable in gold. Silver coin of the United States has been irredeemable, whether it was of the full legal tender or the limited legal tender, and I say it is not for this Democratic administration or any Democratic administration to undertake to force upon this country the principle that silver coin shall be redeemed in gold.

Mr. President, this is not democracy. I do not believe the administration is attempting to do it. The resolution that we have passed has not been answered; but if we are to be told that the administration is redeeming our silver dollars in gold I say, "Halt, the people of the United States are not ready for that." That issue has never been presented to them. They will never sanction it—never. If they do that, they trample under their feet the glorious record of the Democratic Party from the foundation of the Government. They trample under their feet every true principle of democracy. If, therefore, it is meant that we must maintain the silver dollar at a parity with gold by making it redeemable in gold I say, "No; gold wants no redeemer, nor does the standard silver dollar."

Such an interpretation destroys the silver dollar as money—coined money. Metallic money is absolute and irredeemable in any other money, is without price. There can be in true coined metallic money no money value. Gold and silver as mere metals may have their market value, but as coined money at the ratio established by law they are equal—each money absolute and irredeemable. That is the law. That is democracy. Value is a relation—a ratio established by law—and cannot be measured. Length and capacity are positive properties of things while value is not a property of anything and arises out of the relations existing between things. We measure the length of a thing by laying alongside it some other thing whose length is known. We measure the capacity of a thing by filling it with something else whose quantity is known.

"Values are not determined by any such bringing of one thing to another."

"Labor once spent has no influence on the future value of the article produced." Value is the purchasing power—power in exchange; while price is the money value of commodities—the power any commodity has to exchange for money.

The demand for money depends upon the amount and character of the trade, commerce, and business of a country, and the number of times such articles are sold and resold, while the supply of money depends upon the quantity in actual circulation and the number of times each piece changes hands in business matters. The amount of money required by the people of different nations to meet their demands and supply will vary according to the conditions of the country and their business.

A country small in area and densely populated requires far less money than a country with a larger area and a more widely dispersed population.

The larger the area and the more sparsely or thinly peopled the greater the amount of money required. Our country and people require a much larger amount of money per capita than any nation of Europe, save probably Russia.

Our silver dollars today are at a parity with gold dollars. Why? Because the law makes them absolute money, irredeemable and the equal of gold, a full legal tender in the payment of debts. The value of money as a medium of exchange depends upon the law of the country wherein circulating.

Silver as a metal, a commodity, may vary in its value in the market, but coined legal-tender silver dollars, in relation to coined gold, do not vary in value, and will not as long as the law maintains their full legal tender and their paying and purchasing power. The law cannot fix a value between different commodities nor between coin money and any given commodity. It cannot, therefore, fix a ratio of value or equivalency between coined gold and silver metal as a commodity.

The sovereign, according to its organic constitution or law, creates money value. The Constitution gives this express power to coin money and to regulate its value, to fix the ratio or value between the coins. Our laws give to coins of silver and gold at the ratios fixed their value, the legal-tender, and debt-paying power.

Now, I will read a little incident here, or refer to it in regard to the value given to gold and silver. It is an incident quoted in the Gold Standard, page 9:

"On the testimony of Thomas Baring we are assured that it was found impossible, during the crisis of 1847 in London, to raise any money whatever on a sum of £60,000 in silver. But during a similar crisis in Calcutta in 1864 it was equally impossible to raise even a rupee of paper money on £20,000 of gold. The silver in London was not a legal tender above 40s., while the gold in Calcutta was not so for any sum whatever.

Mr. President, this is not merely a contest to repeal the Sherman law and stop the purchase of silver bullion.

Whether intended so or not by the present advocates of this unconditional repeal bill—and I gladly say that many of its advocates do not so regard it—this is a renewal of the contest to establish a single gold standard throughout the world, and to make gold the only money and all silver coins and paper currency redeemable in gold. It originated in 1863, when our representatives told the monarchical and regal governments of Europe that we were about to flood the world with from $200,000,000 to $400,000,000 annually of the precious metals, backed by the demand of Senator Sherman in 1867 for the single gold standard and refusal to agree to bimetallism with the Latin Union, the contest has been kept up ever since. One by one the nations of Europe have been scared and driven to the gold standard in imitation of Great Britain, the so-called mistress of the seas.

If we repeal unconditionally, then no one dare say that our laws do not recognize the single gold standard established in 1873. Gold will be the only metal admitted to unlimited coinage. Silver will depreciate in value, refusals to recognize it debase and humiliate it. It will depreciate in value.

Now, Mr. President, I have quoted some from the distinguished Senator from Ohio in his finance report, showing what policy he wanted, but I now have before me his speech of May and June 1892, in which he says:

"Mr. President, when that law of 1873 was passed the only trouble about it was that we were not as wise as the Almighty Ruler of the universe. We could not see ahead. I have no doubt, however, that if it had been known that silver was going to fall as much as it did after that it might have made a change. But I know myself—and I speak for myself only—that while I did not know it, did not dream of the fall in the price of silver following that law, yet I do now say, in the light of all the circumstances that surrounded us, that if I had known it I would have kept the silver dollar there and put it on the same footing as the fractional silver dollar, and no better."

The Senator then quoted approvingly from John Jay Knox, late Comptroller of the Currency, as follows:

"I am happy to agree with the statement that the silver dollar now coined in this country, if held in England, would be worth a gold dollar, less the loss of interest and the cost of transportation across the Atlantic.

This statement is true. I hold in my hand the 5-cent nickel coin. If $100,000 of these 5-cent nickel coins, which are intrinsically worth 1 cent each in the bullion market, were offered for sale in China or in Japan, in England or in France, to a shrewd broker, they would be worth to him exactly $100,000 of gold, less the loss of interest and the cost of transportation from England or France, or China or Japan to this country. What amount that broker would give for such a large amount of nickel coin or silver dollars is quite another question.

"Why is this?

"It is because these coins are redeemable in gold; it is because we are upon the gold and not upon the silver standard. When free coinage of silver comes, the promise of this great country, with its great credit unsurpassed anywhere in the world, is withdrawn and our silver dollar, like the Mexican dollar, becomes worth its intrinsic value only at home and abroad."

The Senator from Ohio said in the same speech:

"All our money is at par with gold. How is that maintained? We have a careful series of guards and laws which practically make now in the United States gold coin the standard of value, not the legal standard in the sense that the Senator speaks of as the ratio, because whenever that ratio diverges from the market value the ratio ought to be changed always."

In referring to the provisions of law for purchasing silver bullion, he said:

"If it had been seigniorage levied upon the people, it would have been the most outrageous seigniorage ever inflicted upon a people by any government in the world; but it was not in the nature of seigniorage, but bought at its market value, and we issued money for it at its coinage value. We have behind it all the silver we bought, and we have that very surplus of silver called the profit fund in our Treasury now, which amounts to $75,000,000. We have treated it as an ordinary income, but that is not the proper way it should be treated. If the time shall come when it will be necessary, the people of the United States can without loss restore this large sum of $75,000,000 for the redemption of the silver coin or for the maintenance of it at the standard of gold.

"The careful measures which I have mentioned, by which we have sustained and maintained the gold standard, are now to be swept away by one fell stroke, the free coinage of silver. All the safeguards which experience has shown, not only to our own country but to other nations, to prevent the depreciation of our coin and our currency, are about to be abandoned, a new standard is about to be proposed, and all our money is to be brought down to that standard.

* * * * *

"If there was but one standard of money, then, as a matter of course, the silver standard might be made the basis of our transactions, but we have gold for our standard; we have an equal amount of gold in the Treasury and in circulation; the precise quantity is shown by the table and is over $600,000,000. This is to be demonetized or left for the use of the rich, who stipulate for gold payments."

The Senator from Ohio, in his speech of August 30, 1893, quotes approvingly from Hon. E. O. Leech, late Director of the Mint:

"The closing of the mints of British India to the coinage of silver coins of full debt-paying power is the most momentous event in the monetary history of the present century. It is the final and disastrous blow to the use of silver as a measure of value and as money of full debt-paying power, and the relegation of it to the position of a subsidiary or token metal. It is the culmination of the evolution from a silver to a gold standard which has been progressing with startling rapidity in recent years.

"For the last quarter of a century civilized countries have combined to dethrone silver as a precious metal and have declared in unmistakable terms that, by reason of its cumbersomeness, the enormous quantity produced, and the violent fluctuations in its value, silver is not fit to serve as a measure of the value of all other things; that hereafter gold alone shall be the standard of value, and that the business of the world is to be done with gold money and an enlarged use of instruments of credit, such as bank notes, checks, drafts, settlements by transfer, by telegraph, and by clearing house, which nineteenth-century civilization has provided as substitutes for actual money.

"This modern preference of gold for silver manifested itself first and most strongly among people of the highest civilization and of the largest commercial pursuits. The reason for it will be found in the immense expansion of modern commerce, requiring very large payments in the settlement of balances and necessitating the use of that metal containing the greatest value in the least bulk, thus making gold the money of commerce, and in the wonderful improvements and developments in modern banking, providing substitutes for money, and avoiding as far as possible the actual handling of cash.

* * * * *

"This policy has already resulted in changing our currency from gold to silver, and has created widespread distrust of our ability to maintain the gold standard. It is not possible, now that barbaric India, our great silver ally, has pulled down her silver idol and taken steps to conform her monetary system to that of the civilized world, that the United States will continue to act in monetary isolation, in defiance of the rest of the world, and still further imperil its magnificent prosperity and credit by paying gold for a discarded, a depreciated, and a depreciating metal.

"It must be remembered that whatever importance there may be in the use of money as a medium of exchange, its greatest value is as a measure of values, and that in this respect the United States has not departed since 1834 from the gold standard. Gold is still the sole standard of value in the United States, both legally and actually, and the determination and ability of the United States to maintain all its money at a parity with gold is still unabated.

"While the road back to safe financial principles may be rough and stony it is still open, and the sooner we enter upon it the surer will be our relief from the present distressing and threatening business difficulties."

I also refer to the President's message, page 6:

"The people of the United States are entitled to a sound and stable currency and to money recognized as such on every exchange and in every market of the world. Their Government has no right to injure them by financial experiments opposed to the policy and practice of other civilized states, nor is it justified in permitting an exaggerated and unreasonable reliance on our national strength and ability to jeopardize the soundness of the people's money.

"That matter rises above the plane of party politics."

I confess I may not understand that exactly.

"The people of the United States are entitled to a sound and stable currency."

If he means, however, the money recognized as such on every exchange and in every market in the world, then I say we have no power nor right to establish any such money. No nation has the power to give to its money legal tender or to anything monetary functions beyond its own territorial domain. When it goes beyond that, whatever it is, it goes as a commodity, as bullion if it is metal, and as a mere promise to pay if it is paper. I say Congress has nothing to do with providing for the people of the United States the money to be used in the markets of Australia or India or any other country. If this means a single gold standard then I disapprove of the message. I am not in favor of a single gold standard. That issue has never been submitted to the American people yet. It was not submitted in the last campaign—not a bit of it.

As I said, if the purpose is to go to a single gold standard, then I am unalterably opposed to it. I had hoped before I closed my speech, which I shall do now in a few minutes, to have had a report from the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain whether silver dollars have been redeemed on demand in gold. As a matter of course, the Treasury Department will, for convenience and accommodation, exchange one kind of money for another; but if these men have come to the Treasury with silver-coin certificates or silver dollars and as their right demanded that gold shall be paid to them, I say it has been in violation of the law and every principle that has guided this Government from its foundation if that demand is yielded to. The Government has no right to do it. I am not in favor of yielding to the imperious demands of foreign bankers and brokers in our country. I refer to what the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Blackburn] said on October 4. He said:

"But I know of another interview, which was held by the representatives of the Rothschilds in New York, not in the city of New York, but in the city of Washington, not at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, but on the seeking of the New York Wall Street bankers, not on the 29th of April, but on the 26th or 27th of April. I knew then that the demand was made for the issue of $150,000,000 of bonds. So far from this administration being a party to that conspiracy, that demand was peremptorily, flatly, and unconditionally refused."

Think of it, the representative of foreign bankers coming here and telling us, "You must issue $150,000,000 of gold bonds that we may as a syndicate have the right to dispose of them and manipulate them." No, Mr. President, it only shows the arrogant, brutal demand of these foreign bankers and syndicates who have determined to force upon the world the single gold standard. Think of it: $30,000,000,000 of national indebtedness, strike down silver and make gold the only money, and add to the purchasing power of that $30,000,000,000 not less than 20 percent—$6,000,000,000 added to the burdens of the masses of the people of the world.

The President in his message says:

"The maxim, 'He gives twice who gives quickly,' is directly applicable."

In other words, hurry, hurry, haste, haste. That is a very old maxim, but I want to quote some others equally as old:

"Too swift arrives as tardy as too slow."

"Of hasty counsel take good heed,
For haste is very rarely speed."

That is pretty well verified right here. Haste has not been speed. "One hates to see men do important things in a hurry."

"The more haste we make in a wrong direction the further we are from our journey's end."

This has been in that direction.

"What is done hastily is not done well."

"Who hastens in the beginning seldom goes far."

But, Mr. President, I want to read some authority on this question of haste. I now quote from John Quincy Adams, who spent several years in studying the question of uniformity in weights, measures, and, incidentally, in coinage; indeed, the latter cannot be separated from the other two. He says:

"If there be one conclusion more clear than another, deductible from all the history of mankind, it is the danger—"

The danger "of hasty and inconsiderate legislation upon weights and measures. From this conviction, the result of all inquiry is that, while all the existing systems of metrology are very imperfect and susceptible of improvements, involving in no small degree the virtue and happiness of future ages; while the impression of this truth is profoundly and almost universally felt by the wise and powerful of the most enlightened nations of the globe; while the spirit of improvement is operating with an ardor, perseverance, and real honorable to the human character, it is yet certain that, for the successful termination of all these labors, and the final accomplishment of the glorious object, permanent and universal uniformity, legislation is not alone competent. All trifling and partial attempts at change in our existing system, it is hoped, will be steadily discountenanced by Congress."

Hasten to do this patchwork, to take a step in the wrong direction, by repealing this act, and do nothing more and nothing else, is the demand.

We have ample time now. Just think of it; there is no election coming on this fall; there is no election coming on until next fall. We are all here; we are all bimetalists; we have laid aisde politics apparently. The Administration is led by the distinguished Senators from Ohio, Mr. Sherman, and from Rhode Island, Mr. Aldrich, on the one side, and from New Jersey, Mr. McPherson, and from Indiana, Mr. Voorhees, on the other. A glorious spectacle. We are just in condition, if we are wise, to devise a financial substitute, a financial policy, a financial measure, not a makeshift.

The panic is over. I had forgotten to talk about that. It has been over so long that everybody has about forgotten about it. I have read just for the edification of the public generally the circular of Henry Clews about the panic, which stated that it was the most senseless panic that had ever occurred in this country A regular Bull Run panic, emphatically a Bull Run panic. Now it is over.

Denmark's Immortal Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I hope that every Member of Congress will read the following address, delivered by Jean Hersholt, celebrated Danish-American stage and screen and radio actor, on May 24, in the Library of Congress, under the auspices of the Library of Congress Writers' Club. This address will serve to remind us that beauty and truth and courage burn bright in the hearts of the oppressed people of the little countries:

HANS CHRISTIAN ANDERSEN, DENMARK'S IMMORTAL SON

The most unforgettable character I ever met was Hans Christian Andersen, and I know him well. Now, you might possibly wonder how I arrived at my acquaintance with this most colorful character, as he lived in a different era, and I can only tell you that he came to me out of the pages of his letters and books without any formal introduction.

To begin with, I spent the greater part of my youth in my native Denmark. To me Andersen personifies Denmark. No other Danish poet has so aptly captured its peaceful beauty and its charm. To a youngster this weaving of fantasy certainly seemed the real thing. So sincerely had Andersen put his words to paper that a child could not help but believe that he, himself, was sincere in the hope, at last, that such beautiful things must actually exist upon this earth.

It has perhaps been the minor events in his life that have led me into fascinating findings about this one of the most colorful of all European authors. Anyone who has honestly and carefully surveyed Andersen's life could not but help to realize that here was a man beset by as many of the common weaknesses of man as any average human. More so than the average did he drink freely of life. Every moment of living was a moment of ambition, of tears, of joy, and fast-paced activity that caused extreme confusion in the world in which he lived. From his letters, from his tales and books, there emerged the spirit and the figure of a man who succeeded in the face of adversity that would have downed a man less confident of his destiny. Consider the circumstances:

Born in 1805 of poor parents in Odense, a little Danish town in Denmark steeped in the traditions of the middle ages, Hans Christian Andersen had to combat the combined forces of ignorance and his own sensitive nature.

He died an intimate friend of European royalty, acclaimed by his native city, beloved by the world for his contribution to everlasting literature.

Between the beginning and the end, stretches an amazing tale of a struggle against odds, overcome by sheer talent.

From his parents, Andersen inherited his sensitive nature, his love of simplicity, a faculty for neatness, and, in contrast, an inferiority complex that would hinder and help his progress.

When he was 8, his father died and his mother remarried. This time she undertook to support a lazy lout by taking in washing. Her plight troubled him greatly and was a source of constant worry throughout his early years. As her work was an overburden and she suffered from varied pains, she began to take nips of alcohol to soothe her weary body. This also worried Hans Christian, according to letters that he wrote his friends, and he presumed that his parentage might some day hold back his career.

It was his mother's superstitious nature that bred in Hans Christian a regard for the supernatural. Whenever the little boy was seized with convulsions, his mother would consult an old woman herb-healer, rather than consult the country doctor.

It was about this time that the theater phase of the future author began to take hold. His keen imagination was the spring from which welled many novel playlets in which the youngster was producer, cast, and stage manager. He re-created in a little puppet theater, willed to him by his father, every play that he had ever seen or that he had read to him. Before he reached his teens, he was already writing plays and stopping anyone who would listen (and I mean anyone), to read his brain child.

I might say here that his imagination was uncurbed. No schoolroom could bound it and as a consequence he was expelled from classes. This was later cause for much regret, and it was not until he went through the College of Copenhagen that he really began to take his place as an author. It all but broke his spirit—but he carried through.

When he was 14, this youngster convinced his mother to let him seek his fortune in Copenhagen. His purse held a total of 1 kroner for every year of his life—14 kroner.

Nourished on the rich Danish folklore, and thriving on the celebrated plays of Shakespeare, read to him by his father, little Hans Christian's fertile mind sprouted buds of great literary ambition. However, these were not cultivated by dull and basic education that was forced upon him. At the age of 14, he was practically illiterate, unpolished, and unwilling to fortify himself with learning. This was because he spent much of his time daydreaming about a career on the stage, though he was never very clear about his ambitions.

He had already won a very small measure of fame as a singer, boy soprano, and so receptive to any kind of praise he would sing for hours until those who were kind enough to listen to him became very bored.

Without realizing the actual nerve that it took for his actions, he made weepy and fervent appeals to all whom he sensed could help him find a place in the Royal Theater of Denmark and eventually drew the interest of the artistic crowd of the capital. After 3 years of struggle he was brought to the attention of a Mr. Collin, who in turn was able to apply to the King for a fund to send the boy to school at Slagelse. Hans Christian was virtually ordered to refrain from writing poetry or compositions at the school until he was certain of his studies in language, grammar, and spelling. Until then, he had written but few insignificant pieces which, out of friendship, were hailed as having some merit but only on the promise of something better to come.

At Slagelse, under the cruel teaching hand of one Simon Meisling, the headmaster, he all but snuffed his spark of genius.

Self-privation and a growing belief that he could never take to school, bothered him greatly. However, slowly, with great mental struggle, he managed to forge ahead at considerable speed.

In letters to friends, he gave forth varied new complaints. He complained of the treatment that he received at the hands of the headmaster and numerous petty annoyances that seemed to lay heavy upon his sensitive soul. His elders regarded his discontentment as the silly prattlings from an over-imaginative mind—yet Hans Christian's rebellion was in a way justified. Presently the truth came to his sponsor, Collin, who placed the boy in the hands of a private tutor and commissioned his own son to help the youngster from Odense. Hans Christian went on rapidly now to complete his final examinations, and thence to the university where he received his degree.

At this turning point it was decided at his own request that Hans Christian end his school days, and the literary calling, which had taken a fierce hold, lured him more and more. Collin's son became his best friend and business manager, although Andersen never did confide completely in anyone. He had an inherent distrust of human beings that made him think many times before he would reveal any of his innermost thought to anyone.

More fabulous than his own talents, Hans Christian Andersen kept much of his world to himself. Disregarding critics, he, like other great men, prepared his work in the

face of adverse conditions and discouraging advice.

Whatever his ambition, he sincerely believed himself so superbly talented that failure would be almost impossible. Such was the case when at the age of 14 he succeeded in inducing a Professor Siboni in helping him to sing in the chorus of the Copenhagen opera. Elated by his new effort, Andersen practiced ardently for his debut. He actually envisioned himself as a great opera star, but, in the midst of his short career his voice changed. The falsetto that developed was far from what the opera required.

Undaunted, he was continually seeking new fields of conquest. "How about the ballet?" he once inquired of himself. The appeal was one of glamor, and his head was immediately turned in this new direction. It was by convincing an influential member of the Royal Theater that he was capable of becoming a ballet dancer. One need only close his eyes and imagine a young Abe Lincoln, large, bony, ugly, doing a ballet, and it is easy to realize that Andersen must have attired himself in a cloak of confidence to fortify such a sales talk. Yet he succeeded in getting sponsorship.

Somehow, he succeeded most of the time. Not always would he deliver what was expected of him, but in most cases he gave his sponsors an exciting time for their money.

Adolescence found Andersen wandering aimlessly through life; however, colossal nerve succeeded in gaining him nearly everything that he wanted.

Herein lies another sequence in the human scheme of things that shows us a clear picture of Hans Christian Andersen's personality. In his autobiography, "My Life's Fairy Tale," Andersen himself describes the episode as follows: "I had a young friend from my home town, Odense, who worked for a small printer's shop called 'E. M. Cohen's Widow.' He promised me that if I could obtain enough subscriptions he would print the book in his spare time. As I loved William Shakespeare and Sir Walter Scott and of course I loved myself too, I had the book published under the pseudonym of William Christian Walter."

No shrewd business woman, Mrs. Cohen let herself be sold on the idea of publishing Andersen's first little book. It was during this time of his life that Andersen evidenced one of his most important faculties—the ability and nerve to ask anyone for anything that he desired at any time. Not satisfied with the general book buyers, he practically confined his soliciting to the Royal Court starting with the Crown Princess and working down the list to bishops, minor clergymen, and educators. His sales campaign was not a startling success, for he sold only 17 copies. Probably his approach was at fault, nevertheless, I should like to read it to you:

"Without funds for continuing my studies, I am forced (at the age of a little over 17 years) to publish my first effort. As subscriptions are necessary to secure me from loss, I beg to ask that you please take a copy. The price per copy is 9 marks. If you will permit it, I will with pleasure read some of my work for you, at any time you wish. The management of the Royal Theater has found so much good in my work (Alfsol) that they have decided to support me for some years at the Soro Academy.

"Respectfully,

"H. C. ANDERSEN."

But E. M. Cohen's widow was not able to sell any of the copies and in turn the remainder of the edition, some 80 copies, ended up at a local grocer's counter and made excellent wrapping paper. And today only three copies of these little books are known to be in existence.

Andersen had a lifelong gift for inspiring people with confidence, friendship, and a desire to help him. He thought nothing of asking people to listen to him read whatever he wrote. Fortified with this personal charm, he was able to accomplish much to promote his success.

Fine example of his superb imagination dates back to his early days when he would sit on the banks of the Odense River and sing in his high, clear voice. Townfolk had declared it to be a definite fact that Danish goblins lived beneath the river's bed. But Andersen, whose imagination went far beyond that, did not sing to the goblins. He had reason all of his own. He was singing to the Emperor of China, as it had also been said that directly beneath the river lay China, and he thought that there might just be a bare possibility that that great personage may hear him and offer him a post of court singer. Say it was a silly thing to do, if you like, but don't say it until you have carefully read and re-read "The Nightingale," one of his greatest stories written many years later. He never did see China, but Andersen could not have written this beautiful work had he not felt himself very close to that Chinese emperor of his.

Andersen loved cosmopolitan life. He saw himself as a citizen of the world, and managed to travel all over Europe. In his youth he traveled to mend the heart that young ladies had broken, and when he was older he traveled to forget the unkind things that critics had said about him.

It was following a great traveling spree and after his mother passed away, that Andersen turned to writing the stories that were to gain him the most fame and to make his name enduring. Previously he had been writing novels; hence, when Fairy Tales for Children was first published no one, including the self-confident Andersen thought they were anything special. But in this first book of his fairy tales were The Tinder Box, and Little Claus and Big Claus, both reflecting his desperate need for money; the Princess and the Pea, which was based on the folklore of Odense, and Little Ida's Flowers.

In speaking of his conception of the ideas for his fairy tales, Andersen related the cause simply, "they were in my thoughts like a seed that needs only a stream, a sunbeam and a drop of wormwood to grow into a flower." He always spoke like a poet and had the skill of a master of words that always brought out the best in him in public conversation.

The history of the tales might be interesting to those who know that comparatively little has been said about the origin of this most important phase of world literature.

In a letter that Andersen wrote to a maternal friend of his, one Henrietta Hanck dated on New Year's Day, 1835, he wrote: "Today I am starting on some fairy tales for children. I want you to know that I intend to conquer coming generations." Simply said but sincere was this forthright statement of his predicting the success that was eventually to come.

After the publication of his first pamphlet of tales, he was not as happy as he might have been, as the critics were far from being kind. While two of the most important literary papers neglected to mention the fairy tales, one of the leading critics had his say: "While this reviewer has nothing against good fairy tales, he hopes that in the future the author will not waste his time writing fairy tales for children."

One would naturally think that such rebuke would completely discourage anyone, but not Andersen. He explained his viewpoint and unconcern to a friend when he wrote him: "I am certain that some day I shall have a name as great as any poet in Denmark, because I want to."

Like this country's Edgar Allan Poe, Andersen first found fame in foreign lands. Poe, if you will remember, trod the trail of unknowns until British literary circles hailed him as a great "discovery." Poe's life in many ways paralleled that of Andersen's in that he, too, overcame problems of ridicule.

As Andersen traveled, he found that he was far more appreciated outside his native land. Germany, Italy, later France, England, and other countries, joined in singing his praises far ahead of the sentimentality-fearing Danes. He wrote from his travels in Italy The Improvisator, a book of travels, which was more heartily received, and his fame was spreading. Immediately he set to work on another massive novel. In order, however, to bridge the financial gap, he dashed off a couple of stories which he was pleased to call fairy tales—something he considered insignificant alongside his allegedly immortal works. Oddly enough, his first pamphlet of tales for children was attracting wide attention. It was some time before he realized their true worth, and, finally, to turn his full attention upon his greatest forte.

The fairy tales introduced a new style of writing which made use of a conversational tone, as if Andersen himself were sitting with an eager child on his knee, to whom he told his stories. Basically they were a mixture of Danish folklore, fanciful, thinly veiled excerpts from his own much-referred-to autobiography, all cemented with an excellent talent for storytelling.

Hans Christian Andersen developed a fondness for America through extensive correspondence with Henry Wadsworth Longfellow and his own American publisher, Horace Scudder.

His formal introduction to America came through Scudder who was editor of the Riverside Magazine, and who was responsible for publishing the author's works in this country.

How many people, I wonder, are aware of the fact that at least 13 of Andersen's famous fairy tales were first published in America, even prior to their publication in his native Denmark?

Some 4 years back I came into possession of the Andersen-Scudder letters, 35 in all, and none previously published. It had been known before that certain of the tales appeared in the Riverside Magazine for Young People, a New York publication of which Scudder was editor; however, no one had yet been able to determine which of these had been published first in the United States, as there is no bibliography of Andersen's works in existence.

Scudder was himself an author, credited with the eight Bodley books, Dream Children, and many more. He was also friend and advisor to many of his contemporary authors, among them Mary Dodge, Thomas Bailey Aldrich, and Helen Hunt Jackson. In the spring of 1868 he wrote to Andersen of his great admiration for the Dane's work. In this first of the letters he expressed hope of securing for the Riverside Magazine new and unpublished Andersen stories, and arranging for a complete American edition of the author's works.

Andersen immediately answered, and an agreement was made whereby he would receive ten English pounds, or approximately fifty dollars, for each of the tales printed in the magazine, with the understanding that until 4 months after their publication in New York none of them could be published elsewhere throughout the world.

It was thus established, through these communications, that this country was the first to be honored with the publication of classics that have stood the test of time and that America shared well in Andersen's eventual claim to immortality.

Correspondence between Andersen and Scudder was the stem that blossomed into

friendship. Having achieved all other ambitions, Andersen's sole regret at the time of his passing was that he had never availed himself of his numerous invitations to visit America—the nation that adopted him as one of its own.

On February 9, 1872, Andersen wrote to Scudder: "Dear and excellent friend: This morning I have received your kind letter of January twenty-third! I am glad that you have seen and talked with Robert Watt. He will now, on his return home, be able to tell me about you and many dear friends in magnificent America."

"Magnificent America," those were the words he used. He meant them too as they were borne out of a longing to see the new world.

From America, he received reports of his success in that country, and the very fact that he was accepted here without question, sold him more on the idea that here must be the true fairyland that he had been writing about.

Andersen's life, like those of any man's, had its love stories too, but these were not to be featured in accounts of his living days.

The first serious affair came when he was 24. Still "innocent" and heartfree, he wanted to fall in love badly, and fell. It was a simple maiden, sister of a schoolmate. This was the first of his disastrous love affairs. For it seems that they were not really "affairs" at all, rather one-sided situations. With the poet's imagination—that was his—Andersen imagined friendly gestures were expressions of love and was thusly disappointed time and time again. Like others of his human failing, he blamed it on the lack of money, lack of position, and a lot of other things. The truth was that the girl was already betrothed and, being an honorable person, she married her fiance.

At about 32, he fell in love with 16-year-old Sophie Orsted, the great scientist's daughter, and again the flame flared brightly. But he met with the same disappointments in this affair as he had in previous attempts. Sensitive and sad, Andersen mirrored his sadness in many of his works.

His physical homeliness was a cause of unending worry to him. Although we do not find any evidence of this in his writings, we do know that he spent hours trying to improve his appearance before he would appear on the street for so much as a shopping trip. It was a daily routine for him to have his hair curled, his clothes pressed into perfect order, and to dress himself regally before he let another human eye see him.

Although Andersen outwardly brushed off critics' comments, he really worried about what other people thought of him. Recording as one of the happier moments of his life, he wrote Horace Scudder the following:

"I have now been in Nice 6 weeks and am feeling quite at home. People from all countries are in this house, and we celebrated Christmas Eve by assembling in the large reception room of the hotel, where a mighty fir tree was set up and decorated with ornaments, candles, and the flags of all nations. In the midst of the festivities one of the company stepped out and said: 'We have with us a man to whom we all, whatever nation he may belong to, owe thanks for many happy hours he has given us through his writings.' And then a little girl handed me a laurel wreath tied with ribbons in Danish colors, and the entire gathering applauded in approval." It gave him the greatest pleasure to record tributes in his correspondence. He was certain that he was a great man, but more important to him was the fact that he wanted everyone else to be just as sure about him.

He never failed, in his trips to and from the Continent, to bring something of the countries he visited back with him. More important, he generally left a part of himself there. He was an ambassador of good will without portfolio, par excellence. The higher social circles, of which he found himself the center, never failed to dazzle him, but the love of his simpler friends he never let himself forget. Royalty entertained him, fawned upon him in their castles and mountain retreats, but the celebration in his honor in his native town of Odense, was the greatest single joy of his lonely life.

Today Hans Christian Andersen is without a doubt one of the most widely read of authors. His works are translated from the original Danish into practically every known civilized language. Years have seasoned his works until they have gained a certain literary mellowness that has earned them a positive place in the list of immortal writing accomplishments. For in reading these fantasy stories, one finds that the Ugly Duckling, the Tin Soldier, the Fir Tree, the Little Match Girl (which have amused generations of children) are not for amusement alone. They direct attention to the author, to his, shall we say, complaints of his treatment at the hands of the world. They do show, however, not a basically morbid nature but rather one which looks with hope at a brighter future, a future in which right rules, justice is done, culprits are brought to the bar. Each in its own way presents a moral in which, in some way, some providential being takes a hand in the final rewards for virtue and honesty.

I can think of no finer philosophy in the days that are at hand.

Possibly few of you know it, but invasion is nothing new to Denmark. The aggressor invaded Denmark in 1848, and invoked the German military code of ethics upon the free people of that country the same as he did in this war.

How sharply this pain of patriotism hit Andersen's heart can be best explained by reading his letter to his closest friend, Edward Collin: "The behavior of the enemy is outrageous. Poor Denmark, our unfortunate little country. But God will not tolerate it. Help must come and it will come from Him."

Then in Andersen's lifetime came a second attack upon the freedom of the Danes. This time from the same source. Remember, in more than 5 centuries, the Danish people have only suffered invasion from one source—Germany.

This was too much for him. He wrote, at this time, to Collin: "We who have never wanted to rule or fight can only leave our fate in the hands of God. Shall our beautiful and rich Danish language be destroyed and forgotten in the next hundred years? A great sorrow overwhelms me, a human fear; I don't believe I can live through it. I went to church today and prayed."

Though his homeland is now overrun by the invader, a sight that might have shocked him to death had he lived to witness it. Hans Christian Andersen is today providing the beauty and warmth, so sorely needed in the free nations of the world, with his immortal word pictures. The solace and comfort derived is enough to say that to him we owe a great debt of gratitude.

O. P. A. Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDGAR CHENOWETH

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, just a week ago today more than 100 retail grocer's of southern Colorado met at Pueblo, Colo., to discuss the problems caused by arbitrary and unwise orders issued by the O. P. A. affecting the distribution and sale of food. The following resolutions were adopted, which indicate the confusion and discrimination that exists.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the time is here when Congress can no longer ignore this situation. It is very apparent that these merchants cannot continue in business if the O. P. A. does not change its attitude. We cannot disclaim responsibility. I think a very careful appraisal should now be made to determine whether or not this agency should be kept alive.

When the original price-control bill was before the House many of us had the suspicion that this was a bill designed not so much to regulate prices, but to control business. Our suspicions have now been confirmed. There seems to be no secret of the fact that many of these orders have as their sole purpose the regimentation of business. They are seriously detracting from our war effort and have brought about a lack of confidence in the whole price-control program.

The following resolutions tell of the desperate situation in which these retail grocers find themselves as a result of O. P. A. regulations. If Mr. Brown, as Administrator of O. P. A., neglects or refuses to correct these conditions, then it is up to Congress to act, and act promptly:

Whereas the retail grocers of southern Colorado have assembled in a special meeting to discuss the problems confronting the grocer in the distribution of food, particularly caused by rules, regulations, orders, and policies of the Office of Price Administration; and

Whereas the retail grocer is confronted with a Herculean task in attempting to distribute food to the Nation's civilians, and this burden has been increased by the clerical work necessitated through rationing, ration stamps, point values, and ceiling prices; and

Whereas in making the arbitrary classifications which have been made, the Office of Price Administration has absolutely overlooked the difference in the type of services rendered by the stores in the different classification numbers and has given an unfair picture to the consuming public, and an unfair advantage to some stores in Nation-wide publicity, Government sponsored, and this is tending to and will tend to destroy the independent store; and

Whereas in truth and in fact many independent cash-carry stores doing an annual volume of business less than $250,000 annually, have an overhead no higher than stores in group 4, and are actually competitive with the l: tter stores; and

Whereas in the press releases given at frequent intervals at the Office of Price Administration, there have been innuendoes and some direct statements to the effect that the retail grocers are dishonest profiteers and chiselers, which statement is not true, nor founded upon fact, and is ruthlessly undermining the confidence and goodwill which the local grocer has created by many years of fair dealing with the consuming public; and

Whereas the Office of Price Administration has made frequent changes in point values, ceiling prices, and other regulations without previous consultation with the members of the industry who are affected thereby; and,

Whereas unless the present attitude of the Office of Price Administration is materially and quickly modified, it will result in the material disintegration of the retail food business: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the following recommendations be made, and adoption thereof on a Nation-wide basis be made effective with dispatch:

(a) That we be given immediate representation of retail-industry members upon all local, State, regional, and national bodies, boards, and panels whose duties are to make regulations and prices for the retail grocer;

(b) That the rules, regulations, and orders issued by the Office of Price Administration be simplified, reduced in verbiage, and put in language that is readily understandable by the layman, and not so involved that it is subject to various interpretations after its issuance;

(c) That the orders and regulations of the Office of Price Administration be so standardized as to avoid unnecessary, frequent, and disturbing changes and revisions;

(d) That the classifications of stores into four groups be reduced to two, namely: Group 1, the service stores; group 2, the cash-carry and super market;

(e) That the Office of Price Administration desist from issuing press releases and indiscriminately, which convey to the consuming public the idea that the grocer is a dishonest profiteer and a chiseler; and, therefore, be it further

Resolved, That all of the foregoing be called to the attention of His Excellency, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, to the end that he may be informed of the hardships imposed upon the retail food industry and of the present impossibility of complying with the multitudinous regulations and manifestos promulgated by the Office of Price Administration, and in the hope that the President, being made aware of the emergency with which the retail food industry is now confronted, will take steps forthwith to remedy the evils hereinbefore set forth.

Local Sponge-Iron Production Advanced by North Carolina's Governor Broughton's Answers to Plight of Small Business

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, modern warfare requires a vast abundance of iron and steel. Any shortage of this master metal means a corresponding shortage of weapons and ships, a shortage of the means by which our armed forces can achieve victory.

Who would have supposed that the United States would be found short in its supplies of iron and steel? That seems almost incredible. It has been generally believed that our stock piles and available reserves of iron ore were vast and inexhaustible. We have believed, also, that our engineering skill was vast and inexhaustible. Why should our Nation be suffering from a steel shortage?

EIGHTEEN PERCENT SHORT OF REQUIREMENTS

Yet the fact is undeniable. It is a fact which the public learned gradually but conclusively, and the War Production Board has finally admitted how serious the shortage is. Our Army, our Navy, our Maritime Commission, and our home front are all suffering a "cut back" or deferral of required items to the extent of approximately 18 percent.

The explanation is given that "there just ain't enough steel to go around." Our armed forces must go short of the supplies needed for the immediate and far-flung military operations upon which a swift and conclusive victory depends. The war must proceed more slowly, and last longer, with the greater ultimate human costs, because of our iron and steel shortage. And in the meantime, the effects of this shortage spread to every corner of our national life. Farmers are obliged to operate with inadequate machine equipment, with the result that our food supply for both military and domestic consumption is endangered. Every home and every kitchen is hit by the effects of our national iron and steel shortage.

FARMER, CONSUMER—EVERYONE HIT BY STEEL SHORTAGE

Consumers are forced to take an active interest in this war-production problem, and they turn naturally to Congress and ask what we are doing to meet this situation.

This is everybody's war, and everybody is thinking about our war needs and problems. Everybody has been shocked by our iron and steel shortage. Everybody has asked: "Is it possible that we have not enough iron in the ground to meet our war needs? Or is it possible that we lack the engineering skill and enterprise required to turn our iron ores into steel"?

These are questions that are easy to answer. There is no actual lack of iron ore. It is scattered in all parts of the country. Twenty-six States have native resources of a quality and in amounts sufficient to support furnaces for reducing them to metal for steel production.

But if you have plenty of iron ore in the ground, why are we not using it? Is the process of reducing iron ore to metal for steel production too difficult or expensive for us to undertake? Again the answer is "No." The reduction of iron ores to metal can be accomplished by the sponge-iron process, which is remarkably inexpensive.

WHY THE SPONGE-IRON PROCESS IS INEXPENSIVE

The sponge-iron process does not require the erection of huge and highly expensive blast furnaces, such as are necessary for pig iron meeting temperatures of 3,000° F. Instead, in the sponge iron process the ore is simply baked at a temperature of only 1,200° F. The sponge iron furnace need be only one-twentieth the size of a typical blast furnace.

The fuel requirements of the sponge-iron process are thus different from those of the great blast furnaces. Lignite coal can be used in baking by the sponge iron process. Large deposits of lignite coal exist in many parts of this country, including my own State of North Dakota. In comparison to anthracite coal, lignite coal gives a weaker flame, but it liberates the hydrogen gas required for the sponge-iron process, and hydrogen, not high temperatures, is the secret of this process.

Furthermore, at the low baking temperature, certain foreign elements known to all pig iron, such as phosphorus, sulfur, and nitrogen, are not absorbed in the making of this metal. The resultant spongy briquettes—whose appearance has given rise to the name sponge iron—is purer than pig iron produced in blasting furnaces. It is thus far better than pig iron for use in the working of quality steels, such as are more and more required in our war-production program.

But if there is plenty of iron ore available, and a comparatively inexpensive process by which it can be made available for use today, why is there an iron and steel shortage?

The sponge-iron process, although inexpensive, requires some aid from the Government in order to get established. Indeed, it cannot be established at all without Government permission and the allocation of certain small quantities of steel for the erection of its furnaces. The Government has been liberal in its aid to our great steel companies, as a part of its effort to increase war production. The question then remains, why has not similar aid and encouragement been given to the erection of small sponge-iron plants at various points in the country?

The answer to this question is all too clear. The Government has, naturally enough, turned first of all to the great steel companies for war production. It has not only relied upon them for production, but for information and advice. The great steel companies have asserted that they could handle the job of essential war production, and they have been reluctant to permit the entrance of small concerns to any extent into war production.

The bad results of this policy of excluding small business from the war effort soon became apparent, and, as a result of popular pressure, some steps have been taken to bring small business into the picture. The steps thus far taken are, however, far from sufficient. Nothing has been done to alter the fundamental situation, which can be described as a high degree of monopoly control of iron and steel production by the great steel companies.

That control, which grew up in peacetime, now gravely hampers our war effort. But the monopoly attitude is apparently an inveterate habit of mind in the persons who have been accustomed to serve the monopoly interests. It is doubtful if we can expect them to see the iron and steel situation from a truly national point of view. They can see it only from the steel combine point of view. And any changes in national policy in this field will have to be accomplished by popular pressure, exerted through Congress, against the stubborn resistance of officials who are committed to a policy of maintaining the power of

the great steel companies in war and in peace.

It is clear that the sponge-iron process is one which, if now encouraged for wartime purposes, would remain in the postwar period as a means whereby independent iron and steel production could flourish in areas heretofore retarded by the cost of a long freight haul. It would free local industry in many States from dependence upon the great steel companies. It would break down monopoly control. And for precisely these reasons the great steel companies are now exerting all their influence to prevent, if possible, or at least delay and discourage, the erection of independent sponge-iron plants.

We know that this policy is hampering our war effort. And we have good reason to believe that this monopoly policy is as dangerous to the Nation in peace as it is in war. We all have a rightful interest in the post-war development of our Nation. North Dakota has a common cause with all the other retarded states of the Nation in restoring free enterprise. All of us know that we have been prevented by monopoly dictated freight rates from putting to work our native resources. Of all our resources the most fundamental one is our iron ore. If we are only permitted to convert our iron ore into metal, we shall not only help the Nation to win the war, but we shall be enabled to establish a lasting prosperity in our regions—a prosperity based upon a balance in our local economy, centering in iron products and small foundries, but extending on one side into agriculture and on the other into urban business.

These hopes for post-war prosperity are of serious concern to us all, and Congress has become the forum for their expression. North Carolina's progressive Governor, the Honorable J. Melville Broughton, recently appeared as a witness before the House Steel Shortage Investigating Committee, where he was examined by our able colleague the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN, chairman in charge of the investigation. The day on which Governor Broughton appeared before the committee was the same day on which Prime Minister Churchill addressed Congress. That, naturally, was the news story of the day. But the message to all the people of the Nation brought by Governor Broughton was so impressive that it was dealt with by Hope Ridings Miller in an article in the Washington Post, which I am glad to quote at length:

PROPOSED REMEDY FOR STEEL SHORTAGE DISCUSSED OVER CAPITOL LUNCHEON TABLE

In a Washington week jammed with Pacific war parleys, stellar appearances on Capitol Hill, and a brace of big-league fetes for noted visitors, a highly significant step toward winning the war got under way with a minimum of fanfare.

I heard about it, as I have frequently heard of many other Washington happenings, across a luncheon table, and it chanced to be the same day that Prime Minister Winston Churchill and the Duke and Duchess of Windsor took over the spotlight on Capitol Hill.

NORTH CAROLINA WOULD ENHANCE STEEL OUTPUT

A couple of hours before the Prime Minister stepped to the House rostrum to make his address, and before the former Wallis Warfield of Baltimore and Washington and the Duke of Windsor came into Capitol camera range, a State Governor stood before a House committee to issue a statement regarding the most significant step in the progress of the iron and steel industry in 30 years. Two hours later, that same man, Gov. J. Melville Broughton of North Carolina, was guest of honor at a large luncheon given by Representative FRANK BOYKIN of Alabama, in the House dining room. There again, the visitor voiced a few opinions about a subject that deserves a lot more attention than it has thus far received.

Specifically, it is a proposed remedy for steel shortages—the erection of sponge-iron plants capable of substantial tonnage output. The project is the outgrowth of the work carried on by the Steel Shortage Investigating Committee, headed by Representative BOYKIN.

The group got down to the business of investigating the steel shortage just after the Higgins shipbuilding contract was canceled last summer. Reason given for the cancelation was that there was not enough steel on hand, or in sight, to fill the contract, without crippling other wartime projects already begun.

BROUGHTON BACKS BOYKIN INVESTIGATION

If that was the case, the next step was to determine which raw-material resources, if any, there were in the United States; the extent to which industry already was utilizing the best methods for putting those resources to use; and the need for developing still other methods.

Governor Broughton is but one of many State heads who have rallied around the committee in an effort to find the answers to these problems. And when, as a result of the investigation, it was determined that the use of sponge iron to supplement steel would make it possible to exploit numerous small ore mines in 26 States, the response from each of those has, according to Chairman BOYKIN, been highly gratifying.

It would seem every American might well read every word of the statement Governor Broughton made before the committee last Wednesday, for it includes an impressive summary of the committee's work to date and touches on the future value of developing the use of sponge iron.

Addressing Chairman BOYKIN and members of the committee, the Governor referred to the action in making possible the first sponge-iron plant in the United States capable of substantial tonnage output—the plant recently established in Warren, Ohio.

LOCAL SMALL INDUSTRIES PROFIT BY SPONGE IRON

"If this plant is permitted to succeed," Governor Broughton continued, "it will demonstrate the value of the sponge-iron process and encourage its general use, which will result in the revival of many industrially retarded communities and areas throughout the country. Decentralized production of melting stock from local ores will give rise in post-war years to foundries and machine-shop operations for the independent manufacture of the countless durable articles of commerce."

Touching on the plight of small business, the Governor went on to point out the necessity to resist monopolistic tendencies should be as rigorously resisted in time of war as in peace; and that as long as the basis of American economy has been what we call, for want of a better term, "small business" the latter must be preserved—if the war is won on the home front at the same time as on foreign fields.

MONOPOLY PERMITTED TO RUIN LOCAL INDUSTRY

"The Nation today needs iron and steel with which to win the war—more iron and steel than can be produced from the resources of big steel companies," the Governor went on. "But we have other resources. Iron ore exists plentifully in at least 26 States, and many a community has had one or more iron-producing furnaces in past decades, before unfair competition of monopolistic type ran them out of business."

PERMIT SMALL BUSINESS TO PARTICIPATE

"Now those communities have eagerly volunteered their resources to increase the production of iron and steel for our war purposes. * * * We need only reasonable encouragement from governmental agencies, fairer freight rates, and freedom from monopolistic domination and intimidation for these substantial resources to be developed."

There's a lot more to Governor Broughton's statement, of course, and what I have touched on in passing regarding the work of the Boykin committee is only a hint of what that group has done, and hopes to do.

Serving with Representative BOYKIN on the work which is, as Governor Broughton sees it, "a first step in the process of returning our principal industry to the service of the people—a step which will lead to the liberation of American iron and steel production from monopoly control," are the following Members of Congress: Representatives RICHARD T. WELCH and CECIL KING, of California; Representative HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington; Representative JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, of Texas; Representative FRANCIS D. CULKIN, of New York, and Representative GORDON CANFIELD, of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, the newspaper article which I have here quoted is an illustration of the public response to hopes and plans for war and peace, based on the sponge-iron process as a key factor in the revival of free enterprise in this basic industry of iron and steel production. Note should be taken of the writer's remark that "every American might well read every word of the statement Governor Broughton made before the committee." Let me say that we intend to bring these views to the attention of every citizen, with full confidence in the support of the people in carrying into effect these plans for success in war and prosperity in peace.

Your Problem, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which recently appeared in the Grafton Sentinel, Grafton, W. Va., entitled "Your Problem, Too":

YOUR PROBLEM, TOO

The problem of rapidly increasing juvenile delinquency is not confined to the larger cities and overcrowded war areas of the Nation, but is also perplexing law-enforcement officials in smaller communities throughout the entire country.

Questionnaires were sent to the chiefs of police in a number of areas and the company has tabulated replies from these officials in 45 areas having a total population of 23,771,000 persons.

Slightly more than 81 percent of the police chiefs in war areas (localities having large war factories or near Military Establishments) report substantial increases in juvenile delinquency, while almost 85 percent of the police chiefs located in communities not near Military Establishments and not having war factories report an alarming surge upward in delinquency.

Several police officials in nonwar areas attributed this break-down in the morals of young people, at least in part, to a type of hysterical "war fever" that is sweeping the youth of the country.

"This area," wrote one law-enforcement official, "has few war or defense industries. There is no overcrowding. Recreational facilities are good. Due to lack of war work here, there are no high wages being earned by immature youths or girls. It could, therefore, be possible that some psychological or mental reaction to the war has affected parental discipline and young boys and girls alike, especially the boys who anticipate entrance into the armed forces of the Nation. In view of these facts, this trend must be general in various degrees throughout the country."

A second official, although he reported from a war area, also mentioned the abnormal psychological effect of the war, in particular relation to sex offenders. Many girls, he said, had abandoned their peacetime moral standards under pressure of the belief that they might never again see the boys they knew, once these boys entered the Army. This psychology, he added, has caused an alarming increase in sex delinquencies.

Statistics on the increase in juvenile delinquency since war was declared varied widely from community to community. The Nation-wide average was 20.5 percent, and more police chiefs reported a 20 to 29 percent increase than any other figure. This figure was chosen by officials in both war and nonwar areas.

Crimes against property were listed by 81.8 percent of those answering the questionnaire as being the most frequent offenses committed by juvenile delinquents. Next in order came sex offenses, then crimes with violence, and lastly acts of carelessness or mischief. This ratio held true in war and in nonwar areas, alike.

Asked what type of juvenile delinquency was increasing most rapidly in their communities, 76.2 percent of the police chiefs named crimes against property. Sex offenses and crimes with violence were listed next in order in both war and nonwar areas.

Although crimes against property received the most mentions in both the "most prevalent" and "increasing most rapidly" categories, its total percentage of mentions in the "increasing most rapidly" class was not quite as great. Statisticians for the Etna pointed out that this might indicate the beginning of a trend and that in the future law enforcement officials might find themselves increasingly occupied in handling the cases of sex offenders.

Asked what factors contributed most directly to juvenile delinquency, all 43 police officials who answered this question mentioned lack of parental control, and 41 reported that it was of utmost importance. Most of these attributed this lack of parental control to the disruption in home life caused by the war, while others indicated that some erring parents would not be watchful of their children's welfare even in peacetime.

A juvenile court judge wrote: "There has been specific evidence here that the disruption of the home due to the war and war work has been an important cause of the increase of juvenile delinquency here. In some instances a decided improvement has been observed in the child's behavior when the mother was advised to stay at home. When father goes to war, and mother goes to work, Johnny and Mary begin to go to the bad."

Lack of the proper recreational facilities was cited as being next to lack of parental control in causing widespread juvenile delinquency. High wages earned by immature youths and girls was ranked as the third most important cause of delinquency. Other causes of juvenile delinquency were listed as poor housing, improper ideas on how to entertain service men held by young girls, lack of religious or moral training, drinking, and the automobile.

Asked if they believed the problem of juvenile delinquency will become more acute during the remainder of the war, 68.2 percent of the officials replied affirmatively. The others, 31.8 percent, thought it would remain about the same. The belief that the problem will become more acute was held more strongly in the war areas than in the nonwar areas. Not one of the officials answering the questionnaire believed that the problem would become less acute.

In answer to the question, "What suggestions have you for the alleviation of the problem of juvenile delinquency?" the majority of those answering the questionnaire declared that more recreational facilities, and good supervision and leadership of boys and girls would accomplish this end.

Next in order came the suggestion that parents of delinquent children be held responsible for their negligence, and prosecuted if necessary. Other suggested remedies for juvenile delinquency problem included: Educational programs directed at parents; conferences and cooperation between the child and schools, churches, police, and social agencies; more juvenile courts and child-guidance workers; stricter supervision and prosecution of places leading to juvenile delinquency; more appreciation of the importance of the church and religion.

Three police officials suggested the establishment of curfew laws and their strict enforcement. Another official reported success in making a map of the "hot" areas in his community, the areas found contributing to juvenile delinquency, and working quietly and without publicity to clean these areas. Other officials reported success in establishing Boy and Girl Scout troops for delinquents. Some officials suggested the teaching of more vocational subjects in the schools which might have the effect of keeping the children in school longer, and another official suggested "more satisfying participation in the war effort by the teen-age group."

Let us realize that juvenile delinquency is not an individual probelem. It is a community problem.

Bond Sale at Stoughton, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY SAUTHOFF

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, on May 20 the Stoughton Courier Hub, a daily newspaper published at Stoughton, Wis., had a front-page story which should be of interest not only to the people of that enterprising city, but also an object lesson for all good Americans all over the country.

This story shows the picture of a pursuit airplane with the inscription "City of Stoughton, Wisconsin," on its fuselage. Accompanying the picture is the following story:

Bearing the notation "No objection to publication, Bureau of Public Relations, War Department, Washington," there was released this week photographs of a pursuit airplane with the Stoughton, Wis., inscription on its fuselage. The complementary Stoughton designation results from the bond drive success by the Stoughton area, which ended in February. It was a 45-day bond sale which aimed to reach a total of $125,000; Stoughton's total on that occasion was $178,000. The cochairmen of the Stoughton area effort, Elver Oscar and N. A. Nyhagen, were destined to furnish the direction and leadership in connection with the still bigger April drive which followed. The second War bond drive which started nationally on April 12, did not really get under way in Stoughton until 3 days later, and had $270,000 as the area's quota; some time elapsed before organization could be perfected, and selling momentum developed, but at the end of 2 weeks the quota had been reached, and the $300,000 mark was being approached when the national drive terminated. As a result, the Stoughton area was credited by the United States Treasury War bond authorities with "having done the outstanding job in Dane County, outside the city of Madison." Because the April drive got away to a moderate start, the War bond committee now is endeavoring to make all area residents understand the importance of being ready for action if another 1943 effort is requested by the United States Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, the residents of the city of Stoughton, the residents of Dane County, in which Stoughton is located, and the residents of the State of Wisconsin, as well as the Second Congressional District, are very proud of this evidence of patriotism on the part of the good people of Stoughton.

A Roosevelt-Willkie Coalition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York News:

A ROOSEVELT-WILLKIE COALITION

We can't see what would be illogical or wrong about a Roosevelt-Willkie coalition Presidential ticket next year.

The publishers of Mr. Willkie's book, One World, announce in big newspaper advertisements that by last Thursday the book had sold 938,316 copies and that 1,100,000 copies had been printed.

That demonstrates widespread public interest in Wendell L. Willkie, in this book about his glamorous trip around the world aboard a United States Army bomber as a virtual guest of the Commander in Chief, and in Mr. Willkie's ideas about the modern world.

Mr. Willkie's ideas are internationalist ideas, by and large, like those of the President.

There is considerable talk about a possible coalition ticket next year to be headed by some Republican and some anti-New Deal Democrat—Governor John W. Bricker (Republican, Ohio) and Senator Harry F. Byrd (Democrat, Virginia), for example, or perhaps Governor Thomas E. Dewey (Republican, New York) and Senator Bennett Champ Clark (Democrat, Missouri).

Such a ticket is pictured as a coalition of what might be called nationalists—Americans who believe the United States would be wise to look out for its own interests first and thoroughly before it tries to save and sanctify the world and become the world's milkman as proposed in an inspired moment by Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE.

Though the Roosevelt-Willkie internationalist thinkers don't like to admit it, the fact remains that many Americans believe in looking out for American interests first.

Americans who think that way are entitled to register their opinion at next year's Presidential election. If it is to be Roosevelt against Willkie again, or any other two internationalist candidates against each other, the voters will be able to register no such choice, any more than in 1940.

The American people are entitled to vote next year on the question whether to mind our own business or mind all the world's business.

Give them a Democratic ticket headed by a couple of internationalists like Roosevelt and Willkie, and a Republican ticket headed by a couple of nationalists and the people can make that choice.

There are so many contradictions and conflicts inside both the old parties that perhaps they are due for a top to bottom shake-up and reorganization, anyway. This issue looks like the logical one on which to base such a redivision of political groups.

As for Mr. Willkie, it should cause him no soul agony to run on a Democratic ticket with Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Willkie was a Democrat, anyway, until shortly before he ran as a Republican in 1940.

The Bivouac of the Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARION T. BENNETT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address delivered by me over the radio on Memorial Day, May 30, 1943, and containing information on the pertinent subject of burial of war veterans in national cemeteries:

Fellow citizens, today is Memorial Day. Sometimes it is called Decoration Day. This day is designated by the laws of the United States as a legal holiday and all over this broad land flags fly at half mast until 12 o'clock noon. This day is set aside in memory of our loved ones who have gone on and who await our coming to that realm of eternal peace presided over by the Master. While this old earth is consumed with raging fires of total war, today we have in mind especially our departed heroes who have laid down their lives for the Star Spangled Banner and what it means everywhere to those who love freedom. Memorial Day was originally conceived as a day of special homage to those who died in the Civil War. But, from the beginning of the glorious history of the United States of America this Nation's valiant sons have, when the call came, never faltered in holding high, even at the cost of dear life itself, the precious principles symbolized in Old Glory's red, white, and blue. The honored dead who wore their country's uniform have a special place in our hearts on this Memorial Day. Everywhere their graves are decorated with flags and a grateful Nation stands in solemn tribute. Is this the only day of the year the Nation shows such gratitude? No, indeed! And, therein lies the story I want to bring to you today. For several weeks over KGBX, Springfield, Mo. (1260 on your dial) at 12:15 p. m. each Sunday and again the same day at 5:30 p. m. on KWTO (560 on your dial) I have been bringing to you a report from your Nation's Capital, a report of developments on the congressional front where the decisions are made and the laws written in that democratic fashion of representative government for which millions of American men today are prepared to make a supreme sacrifice to preserve. With your permission I will digress from our usual form of report today, but I am not going to deliver the customary eulogy which marks Memorial Day. I want, instead, to tell you briefly how your Federal Government shows its gratitude toward its honored soldier dead in the matter of interment or burial.

NATIONAL CEMETERIES

The United States has experienced frequent and bitter wars. In the days of our Nation's infancy the soldiers of the Revolution did not expect and did not receive burial in national cemeteries. However, many of the Revolutionary war soldiers now have found such a resting place. With the passing of time there has developed, with congressional sanction, a fine system of national cemeteries. There is, for example, a splendid national cemetery at Springfield, Mo. In this cemetery soldiers of the Civil War, both those who wore the blue and gray, as well as soldiers of the Mexican, Spanish, and First World Wars, known and unknown, are buried in graves which receive the tender care of a vigilent country's public servants. There are 92 such national cemeteries scattered through the 48 States of the Union. Information about procedure to obtain burial in one of these cemeteries can be obtained either from the quartermaster general, War Department, Washington, D. C., or from the Office of National Parks, Buildings, and Reservations, of the Department of the Interior, in Washington.

With the coming of the First World War we were confronted with a new problem of huge proportions; namely, what would be done with the bodies of thousands of Americans who had died in turning back the wave of German valor on Flanders Fields? The question was settled in this way. All American dead were brought back to the United States and interred in this country in national or private cemeteries if their families wanted it so. On the other hand, if the family gave specific written permission the remans were left in Flanders Fields beneath the poppies of France. There in great cemeteries, in land given by a grateful French government, lie the bodies of 30,907 of these heroes. The American Battle Monuments Commission, of which Missouri's son, Gen. John J. Pershing, head of the first American Expeditionary Force, is chairman, has charge of the supervision and maintenance of these properties. I mention the French cemeteries only by way of example. We have cemeteries in other countries too where there will always be "a little bit of the good old United States of America."

The question naturally arises, what will be done in this global war about permanent burial of our soldier dead? The question is a large one and it has not yet been answered. In my capacity as a member of the War Veterans Committee where we try to keep a watchful eye on the welfare of all our veterans and their dependents, I have had special occasion to inquire into this question. The most that I can say now is that after this war has culminated in the victory which will be ours, I will insist that all our soldier and sailor dead be returned to America's shores in just the same way that was followed in the last war, unless the families of the deceased wish otherwise. In the meantime, burials are being made in temporary cemeteries, often on the field of battle and sometimes far from these fields under the same blue sky which looks down on coral islands in the Pacific, the sands of the desert and the ice-capped wastes of the north country.

ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

There is in Washington, D. C., the first and most famous of all national cemeteries, Arlington. I want to tell you the story of Arlington National Cemetery because this story is, in fact, the story of the sentiment which characterizes all of our national cemeteries.

Just across the Potomac River from the city of Washington are the hills of Arlington, Va. On one of these beautiful hills which commands a view of the world's greatest Capitol, sprawled beneath it, is a handsome southern mansion. This mansion is Arlington House, on the site of the estate of John Parke Custis, son of Martha Washington by her first marriage. When John Parke Custis died his son, George Washington Parke Curtis, adopted son of George Washington, inherited the 1,000-acre estate and built the mansion I have mentioned. This gentleman's only daughter married Robert E. Lee in this home in 1831. Mrs. Lee eventually inherited the estate and was living there at the outbreak of the Civil War. She fled to the South and the Union armies occupied the heights which command the city of Washington. Because Mrs. Lee was behind the Confederate lines and could not pay taxes on the property in person, as the law then required, it was sold for back taxes and bid in by the Federal Government. Eventually, however, the Lee family was paid handsomely for the property by the Government.

In the Civil War there prevailed throughout the North a suspicion, not founded on fact, that Union dead were always carelessly and irreverently buried. Q. M. Gen. M. C. Meigs was greatly disturbed by this problem. One day while with President Lincoln attending a conference in Arlington House, on the impulse of sudden inspiration, General Meigs ordered some of the Confederate prisoners who had died in prison camps, buried on the lawn of General Lee's home. Thus on May 13, 1864, the first interment of soldier dead was made at Arlington. Eventually the property came to be used exclusively for this purpose. The cemetery proper now contains over 408 acres. As it appears to the visitor today it presents a seemingly endless vista of marble headstones, stretching in unbroken lines like the silent army of the dead standing in review before the succeeding generations of the living. Notwithstanding this there are many sweeping lawns and groves of magnificent oaks and wildwood not yet used for burial purposes. These beautiful glades will provide a final resting place for many who die in World War No. 2. It is interesting to note that the dead of the Civil War occupy their own section of the cemetery as do the dead of the Revolution, the Spanish-American War, and other conflicts.

Arlington is a cemetery of many beautiful monuments and there lie many famous Americans. It is difficult to name the most famous men buried there because the measure for fame may vary with the viewpoint of each individual. However, here are a few: The former President and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, William Howard Taft, Gen. Philip H. Sheridan, Lt. Gen. Nelson A. Miles, Rear Admiral William E. Samson, Rear Admiral Robert E. Peary, Brig. Gen. Joseph Wheeler, Col. William Jennings Bryan, Rear Admiral Richard P. Hobson, Capt. Oliver Wendell Holmes, and Capt. Robert Todd Lincoln. You will have noticed that some of these men have fame which is not connected with military ventures. But every man buried in Arlington wore his country's uniform, except members of President Wilson's War Cabinet. This single exception merits attention.

It was the feeling of the people that Cabinet members and Congressmen who served in these official capacities during war had merited from their country much the same consideration as those who served in uniform. Provision had already been made, however, for burial of Congressmen in the Congressional Cemetery in Washington. From the early days of the Republic it had been so and today a visitor to this cemetery can see the queer, square, dome-topped stone memorials which mark the graves of some of our most illustrious statesmen. One Congressman on viewing these memorials, which by present-day standards are very unattractive, is reported to have said that they added to his horror of death. With the coming of more modern means of transportation the bodies of deceased Congressmen have generally been returned to their districts and buried among the friends and neighbors they loved and served as a Representative in Congress. On the day they die Congress adjourns out of respect and later holds a memorial service. Such a service was held in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, May 26, for Congressmen Frank Buck, Harry Englebright, and my father, Phil A. Bennett. It was an impressive ceremony with two wonderful funeral orations, music of the Army Band, and one red rose in a vase on the Speaker's rostrum for each of the departed who died in action on the congressional front where the strains of guiding a nation at war have withered the heart of many a stout man.

Turning again to burials in Arlington, and in other national cemeteries, we find the matter all regulated by public law enacted by the Congress of the United States. All soldiers buried in these cemeteries have received honorable discharges unless this requirement was obviated by death in action. There are women buried there too—Army nurses and wives of officers. Deceased WAVES, WAAC's, SPARS, and women Marines are now accorded this privilege also.

THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER

Before closing I want to make reference to the most imposing and frequently decorated of all the tombs at Arlington National Cemetery. I refer to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. This tomb is marked by a solid block of pure Colorado marble, weighing 50 tons. Beneath it lies an unknown American soldier who died in action in France. He represents the thousands of unknown sholdiers and those who are missing. There are more than 4,000 unknown dead buried in Arlington alone. This tomb is a shrine very dear to the hearts of all patriotic Americans. A constant military guard is maintained at this tomb 24 hours per day and it is a signal honor for a soldier to be chosen as one of the detail to guard this tomb. The Congress approved this particular burial by public resolution on March 4, 1921, and in October of the same year one unidentified body was exhumed from each of the four great American cemeteries in France and taken to a nearby city. Sergt. Edward F. Younger, now buried in Arlington himself, was chosen by authority of the Quartermaster General to select the body for return to the United States for burial as the Unknown Soldier. Following a brief ceremony, Sergeant Younger walked slowly around the caskets and placed a spray of red roses on the one he selected. An American flag was then draped over the selected casket, and the body placed in an appropriately decorated funeral car of the special train furnished by the French Government. October 25,1921, the train reached a port in France where the Unknown Soldier was placed aboard the United States Cruiser *Olympia*. On arrival at the Washington, D. C., Navy Yard the Unknown Soldier was taken to the rotunda of the Capitol, where he rested on the same bier which had borne the bodies of Presidents Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, and other great Americans who laid in state there.

On November 11, amid the greatest pomp and ceremony ever witnessed even in Washington, the Unknown Soldier was laid to rest in his marble tomb overlooking his Nation's Capitol and the monuments to her other great sons—Lincoln, Washington, and Jefferson. In the beautiful marble building just back of this tomb, and forming part of the Memorial Amphitheater, visitors can see the highest military decorations of all the Allied Powers. They are awarded to the Unknown Soldier—yes, through him to all the unknown soldiers who died in that Great War. Inscribed on this marble tomb and in the hearts of his countrymen is the simple identification, "Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God."

My friends, each year, each month, each day, the long white rows of simple headstones and the more imposing monuments of granite and marble increase in number. Humble and famous sons of America, known and unknown, are borne to their last resting place by their comrades in arms and the solemn strains of taps are heard as a flag-draped casket is lowered into a soldier's grave.

"On Fame's eternal camping ground
Their silent tents are spread
And Glory guards, with solemn round,
The bivouac of the dead."

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on May 29, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Endicott, Johnson City, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, you folks back home are well aware, after hearing statement upon statement by me on this subject, just how much concerned I am over the agricultural situation in America today. You have listened to me discuss many angles of this important phase of our war effort. You well know to what extent I have gone to condemn the tragic and ill-advised policies which are even now being carried out by bureaucratic officials, who not only have absolutely no regard for the wishes of the people but who also choose to ignore the natural laws and elements they so boldly upset.

But let me read to you out of a letter I received from one who is better qualified than I am to describe the critical and pending conditions we find ourselves facing on the dairy farms of our section. This gentleman will tell you in a few frank, simple paragraphs exactly what I have pointed out again and again and over which I have lost no little sleep and patience.

I beg leave to quote from Mr. Fred H. Sexauer's letter, president of the dairymen's league:

"MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The food needs of our armed forces, our allies, the city dwellers, and the farmers cause us to place before you the critical dairy situation of the New York milk shed.

"For 2 years our organization has endeavored to call to the attention of those in authority and the public, both directly and through their elected and appointed officials, the very serious food problem which this Nation faces.

"The situation is rapidly becoming acute. This milkshed, comprising almost 80,000 dairy farmers, an area probably second in production of milk in the United States, has a milk production very much lower than last year. During the first 15 days of this month the production per day of each dairy has averaged approximately 28 pounds less than each day during the same period a year ago. This is an 8 percent reduction. This 28 pounds per day per dairy, multiplied by the number of dairies in this milkshed, amounts to 2,267,076 pounds of milk per day, or 70,279,356 pounds of milk per month. If made into whole milk powder, this amounts to 8,785,000 pounds—whole milk powder which will not be available for our soldiers, our allies, or to feed the peoples of the nations freed from the oppressor by our armies.

"This is only part of the picture. Shortage in production in other areas along the eastern seacoast, with increased consumption in those areas, is taking additional quantities of milk out of this milkshed, probably to the extent of 10,000 40-quart cans per day. This diversion of milk from this area to other markets further shortens the supply of milk powder by 3,290,000 pounds per month.

"Consumption requirements in this market have increased more than 5 percent, which is approximately 5,000 40-quart cans of milk per day, or 150,000 cans a month. This further reduces the whole milk powder available 1,645,000 pounds per month.

"Furthermore, about 1,500 dairies have recently entirely ceased production. The cow population of New York State has fallen off 14,280 during the year. This means a further loss per month of milk in terms of milk powder of 875,000 pounds.

"Added together, this lost production, in terms of whole-milk powder, aggregates 14,595,000 pounds per month. Add to this the grave danger which all dairymen of this milkshed recognize that there may not be sufficient feed in the United States to feed all the hogs, cows, and poultry due to the present pricing policy on corn. In addition to the physical discouragement of production of milk, farmers have been faced with the continual ever-changing price policies. They do not know from one month to the next whether prices are going down or remain at a standstill. At this writing there is no assurance that the class I price under the New York marketing order will remain for June milk at the present level. Unless gov-

ernmental action is taken the price will certainly drop 25 cents a hundred on June 1.

"There is a constant barrage of propaganda that farmers' prices are already too high and that they, in asking reasonable prices, are responsible for an inflationary spiral. Threats of subsidies, rollbacks of prices on dairy products, seizure of farm crops, should immediately cease. Assurances should be given at once and cover a sufficient period of time to permit dairymen to plan to maintain and increase milk production.

"The Nation is about to pay dearly for the unsound price and regulatory policy applied against the dairy industry for the past 2 years. The cost will be in terms of inadequate supplies of dairy products.

"Farmers desire to step up production. They know the Nation's needs. To do this they must receive prices that will cover increased and increasing costs of labor, feed, supplies, taxes, etc.

"The solving of this impending shortage of dairy products will need the combined efforts of all the leaders of the groups upon whose shoulders rest the welfare of the people of this country.

"Your cooperation in the consideration and solution of this critical situation is earnestly solicited.

"Very sincerely,

"FRED H. SEXAUER,
"President."

A person elected to the high office of Congress of the United States would be ungrateful to his people indeed, if he did not use every means at his disposal to improve his representation and to make himself a better Congressman. He would be derelict in his duty to the country and the folks back home if he did not consult with them as often as he could regarding the many issues and problems he has to face as their Member of Congress. For today no single mind is capable of propounding the complex questions which come before the greatest deliberative body in the world. It takes the sum total of many individuals and many ideas to make decisions and cast votes in the House.

Therefore, I say to you this evening as I have said a hundred times before that, I welcome your suggestions, your advice, and your views. I am frank to admit that without the guidance of my thousands of friends in our district, I am helpless to conduct my office in an efficient and commendable manner.

With me, this job is not just one which gets hot a few weeks before election. I consider working for you the greatest honor and privilege I could possibly attain. Therefore, if it is an honor and a privilege to work for you, it is worth putting 365 days a year of effort into it. This job of representing you in Congress was best described to me not long ago by an old friend who said, "Being in Congress is like going to a three-ring circus. You just can't see the whole show."

How true those words are. There aren't hours enough in the day to see the whole show here in Washington. Even if there were, you couldn't be in so many different places at once. Sometimes a visitor from back home will say to me upon calling at my office, "Did you see this or did you go there?" and I have to confess I was either working in my office or speaking on the House floor or going to bat for some constituent downtown at one of the many bureaus and agencies Washington is cluttered up with. I have to confess to my friend that I completely missed the incident he speaks of. Yes, being in Congress is like looking at a three-ring circus. You can't possibly take everything in. You have to see all you can and pick out the things which count most in the interests of the people you represent. But this makes it all the more interesting and entertaining. There is something entirely different with each new day.

Many people will be interested in knowing that I cast my vote recently in favor of the anti-poll-tax bill which passed the House by a substantial vote. As one of the original advocates in Congress of universal franchise for Americans regardless of their race, creed, or color, I am glad to say, I voted for this measure. To me it was a symbol of the lofty and noble rights guaranteed in our Constitution.

It is amazing to think that anyone in the United States should be denied the right to vote because of poverty or of circumstance. I can never condone such a shocking condition as long as I am in Congress. I hope America will always remain free and liberty loving and I am proud to be with those who cast their votes for equality and freedom. The anti-poll-tax bill provides that all Americans will be privileged to vote and I commend these principles most highly.

Every once in awhile, I peruse the home papers and pick out something which interests me particularly. The other morning I glanced on the Endicott Johnson workers page and read a poem which I liked so well, I take the liberty at this time to make use of. It is entitled the "Song of the Seabees," and it was written by Lester Hover, stationed somewhere in the Pacific with the Seabees. I quote from Mr. Hover's lines:

"Oh, it's great to be a Seabee, and to serve on foreign shores,
We are allied with the Navy, but we do the Army's chores,
And we get up in the morning ere the sun begins to shine,
For the sun's too hot for Junior, so he works six hours per day.
This is now a rest camp area; he must have some time to play.

"We are patient with the Navy, since they think they're in command,
But the sea's the Navy province and our work is on the land.
And we know it makes small difference if the job goes on the rocks,
If we send those pretty pictures to the Bureau of Yards and Docks;
But we must be very careful when we take construction scenes,
It is really most important that we never show marines.

"We build roads and set up barracks, but for others, if you please,
Since the 'cobbler's kids go barefoot,' we wade in mud up to our knees.
We're the Service's stepchildren, and we know just who to thank,
It's our 'Experts ex Officio,' they think knowledge comes with rank.

"We're the older 'Sons o' Martha,' and we take it on the chin,
'Old experienced billiard drinkers,' so we squawk but still we grin
When they take our best mechanics for a pick and shovel crew,
Leave our tractors standing idle, with a million yards of road to do.
Our unloading details labor—bales and boxes, some of each,
While the infantry maneuvers, playing baseball on the beach.

"We build something out of nothing, that is all we have down here;
Our equipment has been chiseled, to build bases to the rear.
We do it if it's difficult—at once—of that we're proud,
But if it is impossible, some time must be allowed.
We are first-class construction men, whatever be the name;
We'll play the game and win it, we will let you name the game.

"We'll accomplish all our missions, though we're hamstrung every way;
We are our country's workers, and our building wins the day.
When our foes are all defeated, Crooked Cross and Cheating Sun,
We'll let others wait promotion, we'll move on when we are done;
And when the war is over, we'll sail back across the foam,
For there's work there waiting for us, but we'll do it close to home."

The Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I think the present so-called tax bill, a modification of the so-called Ruml plan, is one of the worst pieces of legislation ever to be considered by this Congress. It has a little good mixed up with a lot of bad. I approve of the partial relief extended to our fighting men, but as to the rest of the people the benefits and burdens of this bill are unreasonable and unnecessary. The bill gives a bonus to the rich and a bonus to the poor and a sock on the jaw to the middle class. The rich and the poor of my section do not want bonuses in any form, least of all as tax forgiveness. To collect taxes we will begin by promoting inflation through a return of millions in taxes already collected.

In short, Mr. Speaker, tax forgiveness and tax doubling as a means of tax collection is an absurdity.

War Mobilization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely radio address entitled "War Mobilization" delivered by the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on Friday, May 28, 1943.

There being no objection the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When this talk was originally scheduled, it was my intention to make a plea for the enactment by Congress of the war mobilization bill. The President today, however, by Executive order, has put into effect the most

vital and urgent of the principles inherent in that bill.

Those of us who sponsored the war mobilization bill and who had worked for its passage are gratified that the President has accepted the bill's reasoning. We are pleased that he followed in substance the recommendations outlined by the Senate Military Affairs Subcommittee on War Mobilization in its interim report of May 13. Indeed, the importance of the President's action today cannot be overestimated It is one of the most vital and far-reaching orders issued by him since the beginning of the war.

The subcommittee's studies revealed that there has been an appalling lack of balance between the various civilian war programs and between the civilian and military sides of the war effort. As a result of this, we have had conflict and confusion. The public has seen this in the form of frequent controversies in the Nation's headlines.

A group of Senators, led by the able and distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, HARLEY M. KILGORE, for months has been urging the establishment of an economic high command, a centralized Government structure for pushing the war through to a quick and successful conclusion.

It looks as though we have that structure today. It looks as though we can forge ahead now.

Through the machinery of the new Office of War Mobilization the component parts of the war effort can now be put in balance. But it is necessary that those in charge of this new office hit hard in the administration of the powers delegated by the Executive order. As stated in our subcommittee report of May 13, the establishment of an over-all agency opens the way for integration of manpower, production, and economic stabilization policies. This integration has hitherto been completely lacking. Decisions have been made by each agency without regard to other agencies. Now there can be joint action on joint problems. And every problem is, of necessity, a joint problem.

The new Office of War Mobilization now makes it possible to schedule programs, to take first things first, to eliminate costly competition between programs. Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, has already shown what can be done in scheduling production. This same principle can be applied to the entire war program. It is the duty of the new Office of War Mobilization to see that this is done.

War mobilization is a meaningful phrase. It means total action. It means that every resource in the Nation must be brought into full play in the prosecution of the war. It means that there can be no more "business as usual," "farming as usual," "politics as usual." It means that we now have a system which if properly operated will make it impossible for any group to duck wartime responsibility. There can be no sliding back into peacetime customary practices.

There has been a strong fight against the war mobilization bill and the principles it has advocated. This fight will continue. It will continue because there are those who find it more comfortable or more profitable not to have total war mobilization. These forces will attempt to throw monkey wrenches into the machinery of the new office. They will cry out loudly that it is not democratic to enforce total mobilization. They will employ all the tactics of press agentry, and expensive public-relations advisers will keep the mimeograph machines hot with propaganda against any all-out war program. It will take a strong administration of the new office to succeed.

I say here and now that the Office of War Mobilization as set up in the President's order and as envisioned by the sponsors of Senate war mobilization bill is merely an organization. It cannot succeed in its noble purposes without strong, intelligent management. It must not appease its enemies.

It can now be safely said that the war has entered the final stage. By this I do not mean that victory is around the corner, or that we can dare relax our attention or our offensive action. I mean simply that recent events point toward certain victory; certain if we continue to press for it; certain if we adhere to a strict policy of all-out effort; certain if we cast aside the divisive doctrine propounded by those among us who disparage our allies and divert our energies from war back to customary peacetime practices in business, farming, politics, and other endeavors.

There are certain elementary rules of smart fighting. Every good prize fighter follows them. Every shrewd football coach employs them. Every military leader who wins the battles, likewise, bases his strategy on them.

Primary among these rules is that which calls for maximum use of offensive power in the places where it will do the most good. The good prize fighter moves in for the kill when his opponent shows signs of weakening. He is cautious, but he moves in nevertheless. The shrewd football coach sends his men around left end when he knows that the right side of the opposing line is weaker, or that his opponent's left tackle is a tower of strength.

This is very simple strategy, but it is fundamental. This is the strategy which has been adopted by the United Nations in the present death struggle against the Axis Nations. It is sound strategy, intelligent strategy, despite the loud protests of those who oppose it. This strategy calls for concentrating our force and power against the Germans and Italians, while they are yet reeling from heavy blows of British and American forces in Tunisia and heroic Russian resistance which has lately assumed the proportions of a terrific offensive threat. This strategy has been announced by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, and a second front in Europe is now in the making.

We are about to move in on the enemy for the knockout blow. But we know the dangers that confront us, and we are cautious.

We know that the Pacific is a less vulnerable point of attack. This does not mean any neglect in that area, but we know that we can put more men and arms in the field in Europe in a shorter time, with less risk and more potential gain, than we can in the Pacific. In other words, we know that attacking in Europe will pay bigger dividends now and will assure a stronger eventual attack on the Japanese. We know, too, that time is the one thing that the German military machine needs most in order to recover from recent setbacks. We know that to give him that time, as is strongly advocated by some, might prove disastrous.

The fortunes of war seem to have shifted in our favor. The United Nations are in better position, militarily speaking, than they have been since the first days of Axis aggression. We appear to dominate both the air and the sea. But there are yet dark months ahead. Our enemy is as ruthless and clever as ever. He now adds desperation to his other deadly qualities. No one can forecast the course of a desperate maniac.

These last stages of war will be the most difficult. These final months can possibly stretch into years. This desperate enemy can prolong the war with vicious but effective strategy. We must counter with our strongest efforts. There can be no let-up if we expect to achieve victory without tremendous cost in human lives and property.

It is imperative that this war be brought to a quick and successful conclusion. A war that drags on—even though we know that victory is certain—will claim lives, will further dislocate our national economy, will bring closer the threats of inflation. Our every effort must be bent toward crushing the enemy at the earliest possible moment. We must look upon the current stage of the war as the beginning of a whirlwind mopping up campaign. And any military men will testify that mopping up is a mean job, requiring all the courage and genius at our comand.

By setting up this War Mobilization Board, we can now balance production, solve technical problems, make the correct decisions in advance of crises, use our present resources more wisely as well as develop new resources.

The American people want all-out war mobilization. They do not want their sons, brothers, and husbands at the front to suffer because of cut-backs or renewed production of civilian goods. They consider it downright stupid to have overexpansion in certain industries while some plants equally able to do the job are not being used at all.

Americans know that unless we mobilize all our resources speedily, we shall be confronted with even more bitter conflicts over basic programs. They know our war mobilization is in crisis today. They will not permit it to continue in that crisis. They do not want to proceed haltingly from one emergency to another.

Americans will not accept the doctrine that because we are in the middle of a war we cannot have total mobilization and thus speed victory.

Every day brings new problems which have never confronted mankind before.

In light of all this, it was necessary for our war program to develop on a trial and error basis. But, I submit, the time has passed when we can continue on this basis. We have now adopted a system of balanced program. We have 18 months of war behind us. That constitutes the body of experience and precedents upon which we can now draw. We must study the problems and try to predict the new ones which are inevitable.

This action today by President Roosevelt is a worthy message of assurance to our soldiers in North Africa. It unquestionably lays the basis on the home front for carrying out the great military decisions arrived at during the Churchill-Roosevelt conference.

Address by Senator Mead at "Four Freedoms" Rededication Services and Unveiling of Plaque in Memory of Capt. Jacob Joseph

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at the "four freedoms" rededication services, held by the Jacob Joseph School and Mesifta, and at the unveiling of a plaque in memory of Marine Capt. Jacob Joseph, at the Seward Park High School auditorium in New

York City, on Sunday afternoon, May 23, 1943.

I also request that there be printed in connection with the printing of my address the introductory remarks made by the chairman of the meeting, Mr. Morris W. Haft.

There being no objection, the address and introductory remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION OF SENATOR JAMES M. MEAD BY MR. MORRIS W. HAFT

Ladies and gentlemen, we are honored by the presence of one of our most distinguished citizens. He is no stranger to us, and his outstanding record as a champion of humanity has indelibly inscribed him in our hearts. His life is typical of our democracy. Like most of us here, a son of immigrant parents who also came to this country in search of freedom, he fought his way to top honors by serving his fellow men and country.

Long before the United States was attacked, he had the far-reaching understanding, by supporting a vigorous foreign policy, for checking the Axis in Europe and Asia, which led to the preparation of the defense of our country.

He has a timely message to impart to us. I now have the pleasure, the privilege, and the honor to present our beloved and my personal friend, United States Senator JAMES M. MEAD.

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR JAMES M. MEAD, OF NEW YORK

We have just listened to an eloquent discussion of each of the "four freedoms." I should like to say something about the "four freedoms" as a unity, as a simple but all-embracing declaration of our social purposes; something about the responsibility those purposes impose on all of us as a nation and on each of us as an individual.

It is the most tragic paradox of our society that we can so often gain freedom only by first sacrificing freedom; that we have so frequently to purchase peace at the grim cost of war. Nowhere is that paradox more starkly apparent than in the members of our armed forces. At this very moment, American soldiers, sailors, airmen are fighting to stamp out a plague that has sickened the world. In the festering jungles of the Pacific, on the burning deserts of Africa, in the seas and skies everywhere, they are giving their lives so that decency and humanity shall not perish. We speak of the "four freedoms." To a considerable degree, they are real for us in America today. But for those who are dying to make them real for the world, they are a hope, a vision rather than a fact. Certainly we now know that our men and women in the service know no fear. But the torpedoed sailor afloat for desperate days on the open seas, the marine with malaria in his blood and short rations in his mess tin, the soldier advancing across the open desert in the face of a withering artillery barrage—for these men there is no freedom. Theirs is the stern discipline of obeying without question the orders that are given. Theirs is the grim task of facing constant danger and sudden death.

Theirs also is the profound hope, the gripping faith, that out of their sacrifice of life will come a new life for mankind, that out of their self-denial of freedom there will be born a more vital freedom for humanity, that out of their ever-present insecurity there will emerge a lasting security for a world in which all men are neighbors. That is why, in the deepest sense, they feel themselves freer than they have ever been. That is why they are so truly an army of freemen.

They are basing that hope, that faith, on our resolution that their supreme sacrifice will not be made in vain. When we accept the "four freedoms" as our ideal, when we rededicate ourselves to their fulfillment, we strengthen anew the hope and faith of our men in uniform.

Our sons and brothers on the fighting fronts are making no compromise with the perils of the present. We therefore dare make no compromise with the promise of the future. The man or woman who fails to do anything less than his utmost to make the "four freedoms" real, the individual or group who seeks—from whatever motive—to limit those freedoms—is guilty of the gravest crime that a freeman can today commit. He is breaing faith with sons and neighbors who go willingly to their deaths because they trust in our faith. He is committing treason against the ideals of our people and our Nation.

Last fall a young marine, he was 22, I believe, lost his life fighting for the "four freedoms" on Guadalcanal. He was a captain—prabably the youngest captain in the Marine Corps. I speak of him here because he was a friend of mine. I knew him as Jackie. As a fighting marine, Jackie was one of the millions I have been speaking about—a youth who gave up his freedom so that we might be free; a youth who gave his life so that we might live.

Two days after Pearl Harbor, he wrote a letter to his parents. I want to read to you a bit of that letter. "Your job," he wrote his parents, "and it is an important one, is to carry on, calm, determined; deterred or dismayed by nothing, imbued with the one resolve of achieving final and solid victory, letting nothing you fear or might have feared turn you from this resolve. I, your son, and my shipmates who also have loving parents and families shall do the rest—so help us God.

"Shipmates and brother officers of mine, fine young men whom I know well, have already been killed, wounded, or captured. Those captured will be released in triumph; those who have died for their service and Flag will be avenged 100 times over. So—thumbs up."

So wrote Capt. Jacob Joseph to his parents. He hated war so intensely that he went to help end it. He loved freedom so dearly that he was prepared to purchase it with his life.

Men of narrow vision, of no faith, of deep prejudice still tell us that when the war ends, the fate of the rest of the world will not truly be our business. These people have learned nothing and forgotten nothing. The brave Russians who died in the streets of Stalingrad were defending the streets of New York. The heroic Chinese who have kept the Japanese aggressor at bay have kept him also from the shores of America. When we pledge ourselves to the "four freedoms" we announce that our business is peace, security, plenty, freedom; but we can complete that business successfully only when together with the Chinese, the Russians, the British and all the members of the United Nations we plan and build a world which will know no fear nor want, nor insecurity. That is why Capt. Jacob Joseph fought and died in Guadalcanal.

Today, our enemies are on the defensive. That is why we can expect that in the months to come they will redouble their efforts at an offensive which they have so frequently launched. I refer to the psychological offensive. There will be rumors, there will be false reports, they will attempt by devious and subtle means to shake our faith in the "four freedoms," we will be told that these freedoms represent an ideal which cannot be fulfilled, our enemies will seek to destroy the foundation on which the fighting faith of our Nation rests, they will endeavor to set ally against ally, friend against friend; they will work to divide class from class, religion from religion; they will try to cast doubt on our purposes; to sow suspicion of our ultimate intentions; through this psychological offensive they hope to retrieve the losses they have suffered and will continue to suffer from our military offensive.

Against this offensive, my friends, we have one impregnable defense—the example, among countless others, of Capt. Jacob Joseph.

The example of an American youth whose great-grandfather, Rabbi Jacob Joseph, once chief rabbi of this city, came to the lower east side generations ago. He came to this country seeking freedom from tyranny and oppression. He brought with him in that search the best of the traditions of the Old World. Today, the memory of his great-grandson stands forth as one of the most powerful weapons we have in our own search for freedom from oppression and tyranny. Capt. Jacob Joseph, what an inspiration that name should be to an embattled humanity fighting to regain and to extend its freedom. Capt. Jacob Joseph, a name which by its title represents a position of honor, of leadership and responsibility in an army of free men, a name which in its jewish origin represents the noble spiritual tradition that first taught the world the meaning of freedom and justice; a tradition from which America has drawn so much of its inner strength, a name which in its family history represents the embodiment of our hopes and our ideals, the name of an American youth who symbolizes that unity of peoples and faiths which is America's strength, America's pride and America's future!

Thousands of years ago, when tyranny first rose in Egypt, the children of Israel, the descendants of Jacob and of Joseph were set to work building hollow edifices of stone, today, those pyramids stand alone in the vast desert, they serve no man, they fulfill no useful purpose, they stand as a mocking monument to the memories of dictators who sought to achieve immortality through the enslavement of their fellows.

Today we rededicate another structure, a structure also built by Jacob, Joseph, and the descendants of Jacob Joseph. In appearance it may not be as impressive as the Pyramids the children of Jacob and Joseph were forced to build. But neither is it hollow. It is filled with the inspiration of generations of great and wise and noble men, with the idealism and faith on which alone a decent society can be erected.

To this structure children will come. They will come, not as tourists to view a useless monument to the folly of tyranny but as students to learn the pathway to freedom. Here they will learn those eternal principles of faith and religion out of which the concept of the "four freedoms" was born. These principles, inscribed on human hearts, have been the guide posts to man's age-old struggle for progress and human betterment. They have inspired men in all ages to acts of great nobility, of supreme self-sacrifice. Capt. Jackie Joseph belongs in that immortal company. When he fell in battle the "four freedoms" shrieked. In his honor, and to his memory, and with a solemn promise to redeem his sacrifice, as he would redeem those of others a hundred times over, I hereby dedicate this plaque.

The wording of plaque is as follows:

"Inspired by the lofty ideals of his country, the precious heritage of his people, the saintly life of his illustrious great grandfather, the late Chief Rabbi Jacob Joseph, and the ennobling influence of his family, he valiantly made the supreme sacrifice for the United States and the eternal principles of justice, liberty, and democracy.

"Young, brave, and true, his useful and noble life will ever shine forth in perennial luster, to the honor of our country and our people. To him belongs the divine words: 'Mark the perfect man and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace.'

"Rabbi Jacob Joseph, 1848–1902.

"Capt. Jacob Joseph, 1920–1942."

Soviet Russia After 15 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding authorities in the United States on the subject of Soviet Russia is a distinguished citizen of Florida, Col. Raymond Robins, whose name is familiar to many Senators. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able radio address entitled "Soviet Russia After 15 Years," delivered by Col. Raymond Robins on July 26, 1933.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From November 1917 until May 1918 I was the unofficial contact officer with the Soviet Government of Russia for the Government of the United States. I met frequently with Lenin and Trotsky and other members of the first council of people's commissars and the first generals of the Red Army. Returning to the United States in June 1918, I reported that Lenin was a man of extraordinary ability and command, and that the Soviet Government would hold power for the period of the war and probably longer. Fifteen years have passed, and I have just returned again after a careful, if limited, survey of Soviet Russia. I have been in the Urals, western Siberia, along the Volga, the Dnieper and the Don Rivers, in the northern Caucasus, and in the Ukraine. I have visited the largest factories and mills in Leningrad, Moscow, Sverdlovsk, Cheliabinsk, Magnitogorsk, Samara, Saratov, Stalingrad, Rostov on the Don, Kharkov, and Dnieprostroi-Dnieproges. I have been on the largest state farms and a number of agricultural collectives and communes. Having seen the first Soviet May Day demonstration on the Red Square of Moscow in front of the ancient walls of the Kremlin in 1918, I have just witnessed the fifteenth demonstration on last May Day 1933. I watched Lenin review the first, and I saw Stalin review the fifteenth from the red granite walls of Lenin's tomb. I have talked with old friends whose judgment was tested in the year of the great revolution, and I have talked with Stalin and other leaders of the present Soviet Government and with many of its friends and not a few of its foes. All agree upon one fact—the colossal transformation that these 15 years have wrought in the economic and social life of the Russian people. It is difficult to generalize on so vast a theme.

In 15 years the most illiterate mass among the great nations has largely learned to read and write, and today all the youth and many older folks in Russia are going to school.

In 15 years primitive strip, wooden-plow, peasant farming has been transformed into an industrialized, mechanized agriculture with the largest units under one management in any land. I was on farms of more than 300,000 acres without a cross fence—broken, harrowed, planted, and to be harvested by the latest American tractor machinery, and where the director supervises these vast acres in an airplane. There are over 3,000 tractor and machinery stations in the agricultural centers of the Soviet Union. Each such important center has or is building an agricultural and mechanical school with laboratories for tests and experimentation.

In 15 years the individualist hand industry and manufactures of the old Russia have been transformed into machine mass production in factories as large, as well lighted, and equipped with as good machinery as any in the world. They are educating a skilled and inventive labor, and developing a creative-minded leadership and technical force in mines, mills and farms, and other economic units by methods unique in the history of modern industry. Every industrial and agricultural center has or is building a complete school and library system: day nursery, kindergarten, primary and technical schools, with classes for workers at the bench or machine, in line with their task of daily labor. Every such center has a Bureau of Suggestions and Inventions—for the rationalization of ideas as the Russians term it. Expert draftsmen, mechanics, and engineers are provided to help the most ignorant workman or skilled technician who has an idea of improvement in method or machine. In every such center bad work goes on the black board with an explanation of the defect and the name of the careless or ignorant worker. Superior work goes on the red board with the picture of the udarnik—as the best workers are called—for the consideration and emulation of his fellow workers. All work is being put on the piece payment system—more product more pay. Premiums are paid for workable suggestions for improvements in methods or machines—material gain and public glory wait upon the worker who excels in production. No worker in Russia is afraid of working himself out of a job—there is no unemployment in Soviet Russia. They are always ready to scrap any machine for a superior device or method as there is no profit investment or patent limitations in our sense in the Soviet land.

The driving power in Russia comes through the workers themselves. "Shock brigades" in factories, mines, and mills and "conquerors of the fields" on the farms demonstrate efficiency in a simple language of performance and achievement telling how, "We did it; you can do it—you must do it."

In 15 years a land swept by revolutionary chaos and civil war has developed an iron-disciplined law and order and the first planned economy among the nations of the earth. All the rich, natural resources of nearly a sixth of the earth's surface and all the labor power—hand and brain—of 160,000,000 people is now organized on a national scale. And this planned economy is not handed down from above by a committee of supermen, as has been supposed, but comes up from individual factories, mines, farms, and economic units, through communities, districts, states; and when it reaches Moscow more than a million minds have worked upon the details of this plan. And those who have submitted the plan have to share in carrying it out. With power goes responsibility throughout the Soviet Union.

In 15 years the revolutionary Bolshevik power has become the oldest executive without substantial change among the governments of the world, and I could find nowhere anyone who knew of or said he believed in any organized resistance against the Soviet Government throughout the Russian land.

The effective social control in Soviet Russia is in the Communist Party, with over 2,000,000 members—little folks and great, scattered throughout the Soviet Union, capable of concentration at any point of need, aided by 4,000,000 "Komsomols"—Young Communists. In every city you find them marching on rest and gala days—singing as they march; in every industrial unit they lead the efficiency drive; they are the cutting edge among the workers on the farms; in every barracks they spur the laggard soldiers, demanding effort, suffering, sacrifice for building what they call a new world.

Sport is now an institution throughout the Soviet Union. Gymnasiums and stadiums are in every important center, and there is a physical minimum of exercises and conditions, for which a badge is awarded to men and women on equal terms, announcing the wearer as fit for the work and citizenship of the Soviet State.

The theater has become the great recreational and cultural center of the Russian people. Every Red Army House, Workingman's Club, and House of the People has its theater. There is a children's theater in every important community. The finest artists in either comedy or tragedy go to the remote centers of the Soviet Union.

The penal system of the Soviets has abolished all punitive elements. The whole method of their detention is educational and correctional. No one is treated as a sinner or an outcast. They are dealt with as comrades who have been ill or unfortunate. They assume that the basis of all antisocial conduct is either ignorance, economic need, or physical or mental defect.

There are no distinctions of title among the citizens of the Soviet Union. It is Comrade Ditchdigger and Comrade Stalin, Head of the State—men, women, and children all comrades.

There has been terrible cost in freedom and life to the Russian people during these 15 years. There have been hunger, bitter suffering, starvation, and death to pay for the new order of things that is rising out of the old Russia. Everywhere there is the presence of armed force, and propaganda is around the citizen from the cradle to the grave. Are the gains worth these colossal costs? That is a matter of personal opinion. Certain I am that no western nation could have paid the price the Russians have had to pay. Certain I am that we would not tolerate the Soviet system 24 hours in our America.

Can the Soviet system endure? There is a poster on dead walls throughout the Soviet land showing a worker, a peasant, and a soldier marching side by side into the promised land of the Socialist state. Beneath their marching feet are enumerated what they have overcome. You read the names of Kolchak, Denikin, Yundenich, Wrangel, Semenoff, and Petlura. You read the words "civil war," "allied intervention," "cordon sanitaire," "Volga famine." Through each name and each great menace to the Soviet power for 15 years a deep red line is drawn to show that it has been subdued, mastered, canceled. The final word of this poster is "victory." Can the Soviet Union endure? The answer is in the realm of prophecy.

Should the United States recognize Russia?

For 15 years I have sought relations between my country and the Soviet Union, based on reality rather than propaganda. There is no other one action that will develop so large a market for American products, so truly stabilize international price levels, so widely serve the interests of world peace as will realistic relations between the United States and Soviet Russia. Of course, we should recognize Russia.

The Compromise Pay-As-You-Go Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, until such time as I can place a complete analysis of the compromise pay-as-you-go tax-collection bill in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and others, I am taking this opportunity under leave to extend to insert a helpful article on this subject appearing in the June 4, 1943 issue of The United States News, as follows:

PAYING TAXES AS YOU GO: HOW NEW SYSTEM WORKS—COMPLICATED TASKS AHEAD FOR BOTH INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESSES—HIGHER OPERATING COSTS FACING EMPLOYERS IN VAST BOOKKEEPING JOB

Get ready for a change, sudden and complete, in your income-tax habits.

The pay-as-you-go bill means a lot more than simply withholding money from pay envelopes for tax purposes. When the present bill becomes law it will junk long-established rules for making returns and payments, will put an entirely new plan into effect July 1.

Every income-tax payer in the Nation will be affected.

Main idea of pay-as-you-go is to switch, in the middle of the calendar year, from the old way of paying 1942 taxes in 1943 to the new idea of paying 1943 taxes in 1943, 1944 taxes in 1944, and so on. All the changes in prospect flow from the problems involved in making the switch.

Chief problem was this: How to change over without paying two years' taxes in one year; how to avoid doubling up tax payments. The problem involved abatement of one year's tax. After 5 months, Congress worked out the pending bill. Full abatement was not granted; a large measure of forgiveness was.

The formula finally adopted originated with Senator GEORGE (Democrat), of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. It was modified somewhat to meet suggestions made by Senator BYRD (Democrat), of Virginia, and Senator VANDENBERG (Republican), of Michigan. Defeated in the Senate, the George formula emerged triumphant in House-Senate conference. Its acceptance by conferees was due to Representative DOUGHTON (Democrat), of North Carolina; Mr. DOUGHTON, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, broke a deadlock in conference by supporting it.

Full abatement of 1942 taxes was written into the bill for 7,000,000 persons whose 1942 incomes, derived solely from wages or salaries (with not more than $100 from other sources), showed by returns made last March a tax obligation of $50 or less. Those taxpayers thus marked for abatement were:

Single persons earning up to $788; married persons without dependents earning up to $1,510; married persons with two dependents earning up to $2,233; married persons with more than two dependents, proportionately more.

Seventy-five percent abatement was written into the bill for all other taxpayers. The remaining 25 percent, unabated, is to be paid in two installments: half of it March 15, 1944, the other half March 15, 1945. In those cases, 75-percent abatement in reality would mean an increase in tax payments next year and in 1945, even though present rates for normal tax and surtax remain unchanged.

This arrangement, it is believed in Congress, precludes any rise in those rates during the pay-off period, or until 1945.

Exception to this general rule would cover taxpayers whose 1943 income is less than their 1942 income. In such cases the 75-percent abatement would apply to the lesser year; that is, to 1943 income.

Withholding of 20 percent—above certain exemptions—of pay of all wage earners and salaried persons, starting July 1, is designed to make 30,000,000 taxpayers current. This result is attained only if all the income comes from wages or salary. If part comes from other sources, such as investments, up to $100 a year, a supplemental return covering that part must be filed. For 1943 this return must be filed next September 15. It will be an estimate of income, subject to final adjustment on March 15, 1944. After 1943, however, estimated returns covering such income need be filed only on March 15 of each year.

Exemptions have been changed: The $500 exemption for a single person has been made $624; the $1,200 for a married person, $1,248. The change makes income-tax and Victory-tax exemptions for single persons the same, the income-tax exemption for a married person double the Victory-tax exemption. This facilitates the work of computing deductions. The change is for withholding only, not for final returns.

Single persons whose incomes do not exceed $2,700 a year, and which are derived wholly from wages or salary, will be made current in their tax payments by the amounts withheld from their pay.

Married persons with similar incomes up to $3,500 also would become current.

All those taxpayers would have to do, under pay-as-you-go, is to file a full return of 1943 income on March 15, 1944—just as they filed returns last March—and every March 15 thereafter. They would compute their taxes in future as in the past. They also would compute their Victory tax—5 percent of gross income above $624 a year. The sum of the income tax thus computed and the Victory tax would be the full amount of their 1943 tax bill.

But they would have paid part, if not all, of the bill through the amounts withheld from their pay, and otherwise. For the payments already made, they may make deductions from the bill.

They can deduct, first, the installment paid March 15 last, plus the second installment to be paid June 15, 1943; next, the total of all the amounts withheld from their pay from July 1 to December 31, 1943; third, the total of all amounts withheld from their pay for the Victory tax between January 1 and June 30, 1943; and, finally, all the Victory tax credits allowed them for buying United States bonds, paying debts, and paying life-insurance premiums.

The sum of those four items would be the total deductions from the full tax.

The difference then would be due the Government. In most cases the difference would be small, probably only a few dollars. In many cases, however, these taxpayers would find that the deductions exceed the total tax. Where this is true, a prompt refund of the excess would be made by the Government to the taxpayer.

That would be all there is to it for wage earners and salaried persons whose incomes do not exceed $2,700 if single or $3,500 if married.

If their salaries or wages exceed those amounts, they would be among a group of 14,000,000 taxpayers for whom another formula is provided. Those other taxpayers consist of:

Single persons earning more than $2,700 a year.

Married persons earning more than $3,500 a year.

Single and married persons whose incomes include more than $100 from sources other than wages or salary.

Professional men and women—doctors, lawyers, architects, etc.—in businesses of their own.

Self-employed persons such as tradesmen, storekeepers, contractors.

Men and women whose incomes stem from investments, rents, royalties, fees.

Farm workers and household servants working for hire have been exempted from withholding provisions of the bill.

For 1943 taxes, the persons in those groups must take the following steps:

First, an estimate of 1943 income must be filed with the appropriate collector of internal revenue. That is due September 15, 1943. Forms for the return will be supplied by collectors.

If the estimate of 1943 income is greater than actual 1942 income, the taxpayer will pay on 1943; if less, he will pay on 1942 income. Assuming that 1943 income is the larger, the taxpayer will make his deductions for personal exemption, allowance for dependents, and so on, to determine his net income. When the net income is determined, he will compute his income and Victory taxes.

He would owe, on September 15, three-quarters of the full year's taxes, thus computed. But from the three-quarters owing, he would be permitted to deduct the installments on 1942 income tax which he paid March 15 and June 15, 1943; also any Victory tax withholdings during the first half of 1943, plus any withholdings from his pay between July 1 and September 15, 1943.

Having made the deduction, he would send the collector a check for the balance for the three-quarters of the year.

The final quarter would be paid December 15, 1943.

His next step would be to file a revised return (estimated) of 1943 income on December 15, 1943. He then would make suitable adjustments to meet the revisions in his estimate. Should there be no need to revise his September 15 estimate, no further return would have to be made December 15.

The final step would be, as in the case of all other taxpayers, to file a full return March 15, 1944, covering his 1943 income. He then would pay whatever he might owe. But unless his final estimated return (filed December 15, 1943) were at least 80 percent correct he would have to pay a small penalty in addition.

In addition, taxpayers in those groups would be required to file an estimated return of their 1944 incomes on March 15, 1944. They then would have to pay one-fourth of the tax on the estimated income. They would be permitted to revise the March 15 estimate on the following June 15 and again on September 15 and December 15.

Five tax returns a year—four estimated and one final return—thus are in prospect for hundreds of thousands of those 14,000,000 taxpayers. For them the pay-as-you-go plan means continuous tax returning.

Farmers, whose income is seasonal, are given special treatment. They must file an estimate of their 1943 income not later than December 15, 1943, and pay then the full tax computed at present rates. On March 15, 1944, they must file an accurate return covering their 1943 income and pay the Government the balance of the tax due, if any. To avoid a penalty they must report next December 15 at least two-thirds of the income shown on their final return for the year, to be filed next March.

Each year thereafter they may make their estimate of current income not later than December 15.

Employers face a continuing headache under pay-as-you-go. They must obtain from each worker a statement showing his marital status and number of dependents—that before July 1, on forms to be provided by the Treasury. They must withhold from each worker's pay the amount prescribed in five complicated tables to be furnished by the Treasury.

They must keep a separate record of the amount withheld from each worker each payday, must account to the worker at the year's end. They must account to the Government quarterly—perhaps monthly; such a plan is being considered—and must remit withholdings promptly or deposit them in banks specified by the Treasury.

All of which means a vast amount of increased clerical work. In even modest establishments, it probably means, as well, additions to the clerical staff. And while employers may include the expense among the items deductible from gross income when making out their business tax returns, they will receive no compensation for the work.

Pay-as-you-go would make them United States tax collectors on a grand scale.

Let Us Not Penalize Honest, Patriotic Organized Labor for the Deeds of One Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the conduct of John L. Lewis has been shocking and that it constitutes one of the ugly pages of American history. If there is one thing above all others that the dire extremity of these time calls for, it is willing sacrifice—sacrifice beyond all former experience—on every one of the home fronts and on the part of both employers and laboring men. Everyone of us should say, and mean it, "As nearly as my physical limitations will permit, I will work around the clock. I will forget personal profits and will go hungry, if necessary, to see that that boy on Guadalcanal gets the tools necessary to protect his life."

For human freedom, our homes, our precious institutions, our American way of life are in extreme jeopardy. Make no mistake about that.

In this emergency we see the spectacle of one isolated labor leader daily defying public sentiment and behaving in a way that brings upon him the criticism of all right-thinking people, but when we stand up his conduct against a background of the faithful, loyal, devoted service that is being rendered to our country by organized labor in general in this emergency we get an entirely different picture.

If any legislation were needed to place restraints on John L. Lewis and the pending measure were confined to that purpose, I would think better of it, but in the first place there is ample administrative authority to take care of him, and in the second place this bill, in my opinion, goes far beyond Lewis and attempts to put organized labor in a strait jacket.

I fear that back of this measure are influences that are distinctly and traditionally hostile to union labor and that are using Mr. Lewis as a convenient vehicle to break down organized labor and to open the way for further anti-labor legislation, such as the repeal of the wage-and-hour law, and so forth. The great body of well-behaved, patriotic organized labor should not be held to blame for the misdeeds of John L. Lewis.

In this connection, I cite a telegram which I received from a local labor union in Indiana, as follows:

To vote for the Connally-Smith bill because of the irresponsible leader of 400,000 coal miners and hurt the vast majority of the patriotic laboring people is beyond reason.

I am not going to cast a vote on this measure that would "hurt the vast majority of the patriotic laboring people." Having been brought up in the school of hard knocks without any advantages except such as come from interminable work and intense application, I have great sympathy for those who toil and I am a strong believer in organized labor as an institution of service not only to the toilers of our Nation but also as an institution of general welfare. I believe that employers generally recognize the indispensability of labor organizations and desire to see them perpetuated under sound direction.

I want this country to come through the war with all of its freedoms intact, and its civil liberties unimpaired, and I will never vote for a measure that would shackle and break down organized labor, no matter how it may be disguised.

If the passage of this measure were necessary to promote the war effort, if it were needed to insure peak war production, it might have more standing in court, but all of the agencies that have anything to do with running the war recommend against its enactment. They say that this legislation is not needed and that to enact it would breed unrest and distress and impede the war effort. Whose word are we going to take? The word of those who would like to see organized labor crushed or those whose responsibility it is to provide the implements necessary to win the war?

In time of war I regard it as my duty to support the Commander in Chief and his associate war counselors in all matters related to winning the war. When the Commander in Chief and all of the officials who direct the war effort clear down the line ask me to vote against this bill because of its anticipated harmful effect on the war effort, I cannot and will not deny them my support.

Who, I ask, can speak with more authority on this matter than Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board? For my own guidance and for the enlightenment of others in respect to the measure before us, and similar measures, I asked Mr. Nelson to give me two statements, as follows:

First. The extent of absenteeism in war plants, and whether legislation is needed to curb absenteeism.

Second. The extent to which strikes have impeded, and are impeding, war production, and whether legislation is needed to curb strikes.

Mr. Nelson's reply in respect to absenteeism follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: This is in answer to your letter of March 18 in which you requested my views as to whether legislation was needed to prevent absenteeism in war-production plants.

The strain on the American labor market brought about by unprecedented military requirements and increased production makes it imperative that we give effective attention to the problem of absenteeism, but, in my opinion, the solution of this pressing problem calls for remedial rather than penal measures.

The various legislative proposals which have been introduced seek to penalize the persons who are absent from work, either by inducting them into military service or by subjecting them to criminal penalties. I can see little merit in such proposals. It is highly unrealistic to suppose that any Government agency could police the daily employment records of the some 16,000,000 workers now engaged in war and essential civilian production, to say nothing of those engaged in essential agricultural activities, and pick out and punish the individuals who violated its necessarily vague definitions of absenteeism. Even if we could afford the manpower necessary to undertake such a task I do not believe that it would accomplish its purpose of keeping men at work.

In a recent publication the Ministry of Labor and National Service, charged with the administration of the British absenteeism statute, stated that it was "convinced that a solution of the problem of avoidable absence from work is more likely to be found by those establishments which look for that solution within themselves, than by those which tend to rely more on external powers of discipline or punishment." The reason for such a conclusion is easily understood. Disciplinary measures against absences from work which remove the worker from the job are, after all, plainly self-defeating. The solution of the problem calls for an analysis of the causes of absenteeism and the consequent removal of these discovered causes.

Chronic absenteeism, the state of the individual who is constitutionally unable to remain at work for a continuous period of time, is fortunately extremely rare and is not amenable to punishment. The bulk of the absences, whether avoidable or unavoidable, result from the same underlying causes—accidents, ill-health, personal problems, poor working and living conditions, and low morale. While these causes cannot be absolutely eliminated, they can be minimized by the treatment of the conditions from which they arose. We must study the causes of absenteeism and eliminate them through joint management and labor action under governmental guidance. This solution to the problem calls for intelligent planning and work and not for penal legislation. I am convinced that American labor and management, with the guiding assistance of the

responsible Government agencies can do this job.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised informally that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON.

The correspondence between Mr. Nelson and myself in regard to the advisability of enacting antistrike legislation is as follows:

MAY 7, 1943.

Hon. DONALD NELSON,
Chairman, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NELSON: For the benefit of those of us who need information on the question of strikes as related to war production, I would appreciate very much your answers to the following questions:

1. To what extent has war production been impeded by strikes?

2. To what extent is future war production threatened by strikes?

3. In your opinion is antistrike legislation desirable at this time, or do you think it would be best in the national interest to continue the American system of free enterprise without restrictions, depending upon the patriotism of individuals to do their part?

4. If you believe some form of antistrike legislation is advisable, will you kindly indicate the kind of legislation you think should be enacted?

I value your opinion very highly, and as I am seriously seeking information on these matters I would appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience.

Thanking you in advance,

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1943.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUDLOW: I have given your letter of May 7 the serious attention which its important subject and your request deserve. I answer your questions in order.

1. Past record of strikes: Employing personnel from labor and management, the War Production Board has worked with other governmental agencies to avoid any interruptions of essential production and through the cooperation of labor and management they have been greatly reduced. Enclosed please find a release of the War Labor Board dated February 7, 1943, which shows that during the year 1942 the amount of time lost due to strikes was only six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total man-days worked in war production. Since the first of the year these figures have been collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, with no break-down between war and other industries. Their latest release shows that for the first 3 months of 1943 the percentage of time lost dropped to an average of less than four one-hundredths of 1 percent.

2. Future danger of strikes: Any opinion on this subject must be premised upon the assumption that the factors which have reduced strikes in the past will continue to operate. Those factors include the existence of adequate machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes, the maintenance of a policy which makes possible necessary adjustments, and, most of all, the cooperative will on the part of management and labor in collaboration with the Government to settle industrial disputes without interruption of production.

3. Advisability of antistrike legislation: Speaking generally, the production record of American industry during this war period represents a remarkably successful achievement. In view of this any proposal for broadly coercive legislation would, in my opinion, inject a disturbing influence in the war-production effort, and any such proposal should be given most careful consideration in all of its aspects and implications.

4. Type of legislation, if any: In view of my answer to the foregoing questions an answer to this fourth question is unnecessary. Of course, the responsibility for legislation must, in the final analysis, rest upon the Congress.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I submit an editorial entitled "Curbing Strikes," which appeared in the Washington Post on Thursday, May 13, 1943. The Post, a Republican newspaper of capitalistic leaning, could hardly be described as a newspaper that is partial toward organized labor. The editorial expresses what I regard as convincing reasons why the bill now before the House should not pass. It is as follows:

CURBING STRIKES

The House Military Affairs Committee has warped the Senate's Connally bill into a pair of handcuffs for labor. What was intended originally as legislation to strengthen the President's powers in dealing with strike problems has now become a purely punitive and repressive measure. This is the reaction of angry men to the situation created by John L. Lewis in the coal industry. But ire is scarcely a sound stimulus to lawmaking. When the House comes to consider this proposal it will do well to bear in mind the admonition which Senator BARKLEY delivered to his colleagues during discussion of the Connally bill last week: "Do not legislate in anger because you are mad at somebody."

The provisions of the old Smith antistrike bill which the House Military Affairs Committee grafted onto the Connally measure and which we criticized 12 months ago can serve only as an irritant to the already difficult labor problems with which the country is beset. They will be regarded by organized labor, and rightly, as class legislation, designed to impose upon them special restrictions. Such legislation can be nothing but a provocation to unrest and disunity. Men won't work when they are shackled.

O. P. A. Price Ceilings

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, when manpower and manhours are so precious in the prosecution of this global war, business is loaded down with additional O. P. A. orders to the tune of three conflicting different amendments to Maximum Price Regulations No. 237, placing food products under mandatory mark-up pricing that were formerly under so-called optional pricing. To comply with these three amendments it has taken many manhours and additional expenses as indicated by a letter from Mr. Elmer Hale, president of the Hale-Halsell Co., who operate seven wholesale houses in eastern Oklahoma. I have received permission to insert Mr. Hale's letter, and he has gone into minute detail and fully explains the impracticability of such continual flow of such edicts and the expense and cost of operation.

Mr. Hale sets out in his letter that he read a notice in one of his trade papers that there are employed 2,700 lawyers by the Office of Price Administration and that the same article continued that in England there were only 10 lawyers employed by their rationing set-up.

The businessman—yes, the great consuming public—would make better progress if the O. P. A. could give or set up stable rules to govern these prices. All the mistakes which are admitted by a continual modification or repealing of mandatory mark-up pricing represents many useless hours of labor, much needed manpower and passing the expense on to the buyer.

Mr. Hale's letter is as follows:

HALE-HALSELL CO.,
McAlester, Okla., May 13, 1943.

Hon. PAUL STEWART,
Care House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAUL: I have written you on several occasions in recent months about various asinine situations pertaining to the Office of Price Administration. You have been very patient to acknowledge receipt of that information and make contacts to try to get some correction to those situations, but these blunders and harebrained ideas of the Office of Price Administration are happening more often than ever, to the extent that business cannot stand up under all of the work being unloaded on it by the many blunders and requirements of Office of Price Administration.

I trust that you will just not read this letter and acknowledge the receipt of it, but that you will do something very definitely toward seeing that something is done about the way the Office of Price Administration is being operated.

I would address a letter on this subject to Mr. Prentiss Brown, but it would do no good whatsoever because every letter I have addressed to him has been referred to some pencil-pusher further down in the Department, from whom I receive a most courteous letter with no common-sense answer to anything that I have taken up with them, and I know that other businessmen have had the same experience. So it is exasperating, to say the least of it, and utterly useless to address any communication to Mr. Prentiss Brown.

I want to point out a very definite situation to you that has occurred this week, and when multiplied the Nation over, involving all wholesale and retail food outlets in this entire Nation of ours, you can see what a vast amount of needless work has been carried on in the last 3 days in this country due to somebody's blundering in the Office of Price Administration on this matter.

It seems that on the 10th day of May, Office of Price Administration released an amendment to Maximum Price Regulation No. 237, placing certain food products under mandatory mark-up pricing, that formerly were under so-called optional pricing, and also removing a number of food products

from many other price ceiling regulations and placing them also under mandatory pricing requirements with specified mark-ups under Maximum Price Regulation No. 237. That amendment apparently was released on the 10th, which was Monday of this week, and was effective that day and the wholesalers were given until Monday, the 17th of May, to refigure their prices on these many items. The information with reference to this amendment apparently reached the district offices of Office of Price Administration on Tuesday, the 11th (at least that was the day that our branch house in Tulsa telephoned me that Office of Price Administration district office at Tulsa had just advised the Tulsa jobbers of these several changes). We took all that information down by long distance telephone and then telephoned all that information long distance to our other branch houses in order that they might get busy on all the tedious work of refiguring their wholesale ceiling selling prices to comply with this amendment. When we say refiguring all the prices, we mean prices on several hundred items—that is when you consider the different size cans of each product, each as a separate item, because the prices naturally are different on each size can of canned fruits and canned vegetables, as well as fruit and vegetable juices. As you may know, when a wholesaler changes his prices, he must make up cost book or catalog sheets showing those changes and issue them to his salesmen which we did at our seven houses.

Then, this morning, Thursday, we received a wire from the district Office of Price Administration at Tulsa, advising us that they had just been advised from the regional office at Dallas that the percentage mark-up for wholesalers on all canned vegetables and vegetable juices, all canned fruits and canned fruit juices, had been changed, as compared with the schedule issued on Monday, the 10th. In other words, this amendment, as issued, called for a mark-up on canned fruits, berries, and fruit juices of 1.18, and on vegetables and vegetable juices a mark-up of 1.20, but this wire states that all of these items of canned fruits and canned vegetables have a mark-up of 1.135. We couldn't believe that this wire was correct, so we spent a telephone call to call the district office of Office of Price Administration at Tulsa and have just completed talking to them. They said "Yes, the wire is correct." They received that advice by wire from the regional office at Dallas and could not believe their own eyes and so they called long distance telephone to the regional office at Dallas for verification and Dallas told them "Yes, this change is correct," that all these items have a mark-up of 1.135 and the gentleman we talked to in the Office of Price Administration district office at Tulsa told us that yesterday they had their clerks busy preparing a digest of the Maximum Price Regulation No. 238 for retail grocers and mailed out over 3,000 of those digests last night, as well as having mailed out at the same time a digest to the wholesale grocers in the Tulsa district to the extent of 32, covering the digest of Maximum Price Regulation No. 237 that had just been changed. They had to spend 32 telegrams today to wire the wholesalers this correction, but they said they could not send out the 3,000 necessary wires to retailers.

Now all of our houses have to refigure or recalculate their percentage mark-ups on all canned fruits, canned vegetables, and juices, and issue new cost-book sheets to the salesmen and then carry the story by word of mouth to the retail customers to tell them of the error made by some blunderbuss in Washington Office of Price Administration in this matter.

We might say further that the national associations of wholesale grocers and retail grocers issued special bulletins on Monday, the 10th, from such places as New York, advising the trade of this new regulation, and, of course, those associations must now send special bulletins to all their members advising them of this correction. This isn't the first instance. There have been many of this kind, and while we are on this subject we would like to point out that we noticed in a trade paper yesterday where there are employed in Washington in the Office of Price Administration at this time 2,700 lawyers, and this article pointed out that in England there is a total of 10 attorneys employed by their rationing set-up.

Now, I would further like to point out to you that Office of Price Administration has been telling the wholesale and retail food industry ever since about last September or October that in about 30 days they were going to come out with an over-all pricing order and each 30 days they would say it would be out the next 30 days. They have kept the trade in a turmoil and in the meantime wholesalers have received many items that were at a higher cost than formerly and at too high a cost to be able to sell under their established ceiling prices and all they could do was to store that merchandise awaiting this over-all pricing order, which was supposed to take care of such situations. We have such merchandise stored in our different houses and have had for months. Some of it came in last fall, some of it came in up in the winter, and we have waited patiently for these changes. Then, instead of issuing the over-all pricing order, the President of our United States, at the insistence of the greatest traitor this Nation has ever known—namely, John L. Lewis—held up the over-all pricing order in Office of Price Administration in order to satisfy Mr. Lewis and his cohorts, and as a result this substitute order, issued on the 10th of May, has been brought out.

* * * * *

I would like to point out something else to you as a concrete example of some long-eared professor's or theorist's idea in Office of Price Administration, to show you how utterly silly some of these pricing mark-ups are. You take the item of baby food. I believe any wholesale grocer in the United States in all honesty will tell you that never in their history have they enjoyed a 20-percent mark-up on baby foods. Yet this new pricing order places a mark-up of 20 percent on baby foods. Then on the other hand this same pricing order places a mark-up of 13½ percent on all canned fruits and canned vegetables and to show you the folly, the utter senselessness of such a mark-up, that means that standard or substandard grade Arkansas or Oklahoma tomatoes will bear the jobber the same margin of profit as will his fancy California or Northwest canned fruits. They are all placed in the same category of mark-up. Still, on the other hand, I would like to point out to you that this compulsory mark-up schedule just issued places choice and fancy canned fruits, berries, and juices as well as the highest grade of canned vegetables and juices in a profit percentage mark-up group that is below the average profit the wholesale trade down through the years of its history have always received as a return for handling that merchandise. As a matter of fact, I know you realize that whether it is in the food industry or in dry goods, clothing, shoes, or whatnot, higher grades of merchandise always bear a greater margin of profit to the wholesaler or retailer than low-grade merchandise. Yet these regulations or pricing mark-ups totally disregard that fundamental fact that has been a recognized essential factor in the conduct of all business during many generations.

In other words, Office of Price Administration's ideas on many of these things have not been to so regulate business with the prime thought in mind of doing those things that will aid the successful prosecution of the war effort, but most of their ideas that they have put into effect have been the imposition of radical theories entirely revolutionary and previously unknown to sound business practices in this country and theories that have no bearing whatsoever on things essential to be done to successfully prosecute the war effort.

Office of Price Administration has from the very beginning, from the days of the famous Leon Henderson, and on down to this present date, almost totally ignored advice of those in the industries who are expected to carry on and continue to function. They listen patiently sometimes to these committees, for instance of wholesale grocers or retail grocers, and then they go on and carry out the hare-brained ideas of the professors and "smart" young attorneys in Office of Price Administration and totally disregard advice given them by those in the industry that are going to be affected by their regulations.

In brief I would like to suggest that if you think of no other way, that you can get action to call a halt to some of these things, there certainly is one way that you can and that is to vote against any further appropriations for the maintenance of the Office of Price Administration in any degree of its work.

Yours very truly,

ELMER.

P. S.—Since dictating this letter yesterday, the first thing at the opening of business this morning we receive another wire from the district office of the Office of Price Administration at Tulsa, advising of a further revision in mark-ups pertaining to baby food for the wholesaler and pertaining to baby food, canned fruits, and canned vegetables for the retailer. So after yesterday's many wires, telegrams, making of cost-book sheets, issuing of bulletins all over the United States on the part of the trade associations, wholesalers, and the Office of Price Administration district and regional offices—then today the same procedure has to be gone through with more telephone calls, more wires, more bulletins, more cost-book sheets. So it is a never ending procession of blunders and errors being made by the Office of Price Administration calling for vast reams of paper to be used, vast sums to be expended on telephone calls and wires, all because of inefficiency in Washington.

May I say to you again the time for action has come. Please do not just read this letter and acknowledge receipt of it. Won't you please get active, definitely to do something about this situation?

Now, Paul, I want to really beg your pardon for the length of this letter, but after you have read it, I know you will realize that I could not present these facts to you in fewer words.

ELMER.

Federal Taxes Paid by Hawaii

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON

DELEGATE FROM HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House at this

time to the record of Federal taxes paid by the people of the Territory of Hawaii over the past 10 years.

This record shows that the people of the Territory have consistently paid more taxes into the Federal Treasury each year than 11 to 17 States.

The 17 States which have been exceeded either constantly or in one or more years by Hawaii in annual payments of internal revenue taxes to the Federal Treasury over the past 10 years are Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

This record shows in addition that the Federal tax contribution of Hawaii, on a per capita basis, has exceeded that of from 25 to 32 States.

On a percentage basis that means that Hawaii's payment of per capita taxes is more than the corresponding figure in from 52 to 67 percent of the States in the Union.

These figures are from the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

As an incorporated Territory, Hawaii pays the same taxes as States. It carries and always has carried the financial responsibilities of a State.

These are borne with no complaint and, in fact, with considerable pride even though the people of the islands, now numbering close to a half million people, do not enjoy the right to vote in Congress.

The legislation approved yesterday by the House, placing the payment of Federal taxes on a so-called pay-as-you-go basis, like all Federal legislation to raise funds for the Federal Government, applies automatically to the Territory as it does to the States, as the Territory is an integral part of the States.

In raising taxes the Federal Government never overlooks the Territory even though the Congress not infrequently overlooks Hawaii in the appropriation of funds.

The position of the people of the Territory of Hawaii is sometimes described as that of having consistently paid for first-class accommodations on the Federal ship of state, but continuing to travel in political steerage.

Treasury statistics show that Hawaii paid a total of $116,837,859 to the Federal Treasury in internal-revenue taxes in the 10-year period ending June 30, 1942.

In the fiscal year ending June 30th last, Hawaii's internal-revenue payment totaled $32,416,909, exceeding the total in each of 13 States—Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

In the fiscal year ending June 30 last, Hawaii's internal revenue tax payment totaled $13,991,366, exceeding the payments of 12 States—Arizona, Idaho, Arkansas, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, Hawaii's Federal tax payment was $9,874,713, exceeding 12 States—Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, Hawaii paid $11,893,769 in internal revenue taxes, exceeding 14 States—Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, Hawaii paid $14,394,589 in Federal taxes, exceeding 14 States—Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, Hawaii paid $11,725,876 in internal-revenue taxes, exceeding 17 States—Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Maine, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, Hawaii's Federal tax bill was $8,034,000, exceeding 16 States—Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, Hawaii paid $5,692,097 to the Federal Treasury, exceeding 11 States—Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, Hawaii paid $5,747,291 in Federal taxes, exceeding 13 States—Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, Hawaii paid $3,067,249 in internal-revenue taxes, exceeding 15 States—Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

Roll-Back on Meat Prices

REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, livestock producers of our country are up in arms and 100-percent opposed to the "roll-back" on meat prices by the subterfuge called subsidies. In my district we feed more than one-quarter million head of cattle and 1,000,000 head of sheep annually, and unless immediate action is taken to allay the fears of our feeders and assure them of at least the cost in producing this meat supply, serious decline in the feeding operation is certain.

The great livestock industry of our country has, through the practice of the most efficient methods, produced the world's finest meat at the lowest possible prices without Government subsidization. It has developed into a complex and nicely balanced industry, the regulation of which by the Office of Price Administration has already seriously disrupted its normal production. The industry is divided into three major processes: Range production, stock feeding, meat processing and distribution. The unbalance of any factor of the industry will cause an unrecoverable loss of meat. On July 24, 1942, I called to your attention the harmful results of newly effected price ceilings and predicted that even though we had the greatest cattle population in the Nation's history that meatless days were on the way.

This contemplated roll-back of meat prices, coupled with subsidies, will so disrupt and discourage the stock feeder that we will find ourselves without the necessary supply for our armed forces and little left for home consumption. The livestock industry would produce meat for the Nation at cost, but let us pay this cost as we go rather than postpone, through subsidies, this expense to future generations.

With the livestock feeders faced with an increased cost of labor, feed, and all other factors in the fattening of livestock, it is impossible to understand why any sensible group of men would suggest a cut in the price paid for our marketable livestock, while the average consumer has plenty of income to pay his food cost and is requesting no such action as is contemplated by the O. P. A.

Today I received more than 50 wires from feeders in my district, who feed from 500 to 5,000 head of cattle and from 5,000 to 15,000 head of sheep per year—all protesting the O. P. A. plan to roll-back prices and stating they will discontinue feeding operations immediately if the plan is adopted.

I include as part of my remarks several wires from large feeders of livestock in Colorado, all of them incensed at this un-American and unnecessary attempt to subsidize the entire feeding and livestock industry.

For more than 18 months I have been trying to convince the Department of Agriculture and the O. P. A. of the futility of this program. The Committee on Agriculture has investigated this proposed plan and used its influence to prevent the adoption, so far with little success. I am convinced that this House should take action immediately to end this attempt instigated by a few college economists who seem to be more interested in performing experiments on our

national economy than in saving us from inflation.

The telegrams referred to follow:

AULT, COLO., *May 31, 1943.*

WILLIAM S. HILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As vice president of Weld County Lamb Feeders Association and feeding about 3,500 lambs each year, I would like to make a protest against meat subsidies and price roll back. I think it will be very disastrous to the livestock production.

Respectfully,

A. B. STEWART.

WINDSOR, COLO., *June 1, 1943.*

W. S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Am shipping today 115 unfinished steers account costly feed and price ceilings. Subsidies not satisfactory. Will likely cut feeding on four farms next year.

E. P. HICKMAN.

WINDSOR, COLO., *May 31, 1943.*

W. S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Fed 5,000 lambs and 1,100 steers each year. Lowering price will cut number in half. Cost feed too high for fat price. Subsidies undesirable.

GEORGE F. KERN.

FORT COLLINS, COLO., *June 1, 1943.*

Congressman WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Any ruling by Office of Price Administration to roll back prices of meat and to pay subsidies to reimburse processor will be disastrous to livestock industry.

C. J. FITZSIMONS.

GREELEY, COLO., *June 1, 1943.*

W. S. HILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As a cattle feeder I deplore the subsidy idea. So much is being said and planned toward regulating beef industry that cattle are being shipped at lighter weights than normal and feedlots are being emptied not to be refilled. Millions of pounds of beef are being lost never to be regained. Office of Price Administration's effort to control feed prices are being violated on every hand. Why can't Government stay out of one business and let it function in normal way. I annually fatten for market around 7,000 cattle but am going to quit until this is settled. All these regulations are creating hostility and resentment among producers of food. You may expect near famine conditions in short time if we continue to be regimented.

WARREN H. MONFORT.

GILCREST, COLO., *May 31, 1943.*

WILLIAM HILL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: As a farmer rancher and feeder who has tried to comply with the various Government requests for more food and more weight on livestock such as putting 5 pounds or more on lambs. Last year I fed 2,800 head with the result of being penalized for overweight. Last September 1 May cattle in Denver lost 75 cents per hundred because on that day President Roosevelt's Labor Day speech on the price of meats. Now you come along with the roll-back set-up on cattle after ranchers and feeders have stocked up for the year's operation. I have 1,025 head of cattle on grass. Does our President and you intend to break all the morale of the rancher and farmer as well as breaking them financially? Feeding and ranching is a year-around operation and juggling prices of livestock cannot be tolerated if you want results, or do you?

ROYAL MCLEOD.

Feudal Hawaii: Paradise, Ltd.

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON], when he presumed to read a lecture to the House a while ago to the effect that Hawaii pays more income taxes than many of the States, I want to call attention to the fact that Hawaii is now gobbled up by five big corporations, known as the Big Five; and while they employ Japanese laborers and virtually exclude white men from owning land in Hawaii, these big interests are probably making more profits than Mississippi or Vermont, two of the States, the gentleman mentioned. But if Pearl Harbor had been in Mississippi or Vermont, or any of the other States mentioned, we would not have sat down and let the Japs destroy it, nor would we coddle the Japs to the exclusion of white Americans.

Another thing, Mississippi and Vermont and other States mentioned, not only pay taxes, but they are furnishing men to fight this war, while many Hawaiian-born Japs are fighting for Japan, and thousands of others are being fed by us in concentration camps.

If I had my way, we would put Hawaii back on an American program and establish a military government that would make it impossible for Japanese traitors to wreck our Navy, sabotage our Army, or destroy our public works, in the future.

I would make it exclusively American, now and for all time to come.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I insert at this point an article written by Stanley High, which describes the situation in Hawaii about as well as anything I have ever read.

The article referred to follows:

FEUDAL HAWAII: PARADISE, LTD.

(By Stanley High)

Hawaii is the all-important bastion of the Nation's defenses in the Pacific. In peacetime, it is one of the world's pleasantest and most interesting communities, a vast domain worthy of becoming the forty-ninth of the United States. But Hawaii is likewise the all-too-exclusive preserve for fat profit of a little handful of families whose feudal rule—through their Big Five corporate monopolies—is so tight and complete that even the Army on occasion finds its wishes quietly ignored and its plans stalled.

The situation is an amazing anachronism, a survival of the public-be-damned era of an earlier America. That the feudal families are pleasant, hospitable, cultivated, and philanthropic does not alter the fact that their exploitation of the islands is carried much too far. It is not the islanders alone who pay the bill; the Nation as a whole pays tribute.

Hawaii is run from five massive buildings within shadow reach of each other in downtown Honolulu. Of the men behind desks in those offices, there are probably 15 who matter. They sit separately but they act together. Closely bound by inheritance, intermarriage, and a web of interlocked directorates, they would not act any other way. The Big Five are Castle & Cooke, Ltd.; Alexander & Baldwin, Ltd.; American Factors, Ltd.; C. Brewer & Co., Ltd.; Theo. H. Davies & Co., Ltd.

The history of the Big Five goes well back into the nineteenth century. They grew to their present stature as factoring companies for Hawaii's sugar plantations. In 1876 a reciprocity treaty with the United States opened sugar's boom era. There were then 90 plantations in the islands, most of them independently operated. Many were isolated, some poorly managed; all were beset with problems of financing, shipping, marketing, purchasing, labor supply. For 2½ percent of the planter's gross income, the factoring company took over the administration of these and numerous other matters. By able management, the factors put system and stability into the sugar industry and greatly facilitated its rise to a $55,000,000 yearly business. Pineapples, with some of the same Big Five zeal behind them, were helped to a $50,000,000 status.

Meanwhile, the Big Five bought propitiously into both industries. The 90 sugar plantations were consolidated until today there are 38, of which 35 are controlled by the Big Five. Five of the islands' seven pineapple companies are likewise under the Big Five wing.

The Big Five soon acquired other interests. Controlling the plantations they also controlled the islands' biggest banking accounts. Today Honolulu has only two banks of consequence—both Big Five owned.

Similarly, their control of the plantations gave them the islands' biggest insurance business.

Purchasing for the plantations brought into camp the islands' largest volume of wholesale and retail merchandising. Today Honolulu's one large department store is Big Five and the largest slice of the islands' merchandising business flows into Big Five tills.

From Big Five companies, too, the Honolulu citizen gets his electricity, gas, water, and telephone services. He rides on Big Five streetcars; goes to Big Five motion-picture theaters; listens to the Big Five's radio station.

The Big Five controls the large volume of interisland shipping. Today there are only two means of communication among the islands—one sea, one air—both Big Five.

The interisland passenger steamship fares were investigated in 1937. The report showed that the 194-mile trip from Honolulu on the island of Oahu to Hilo on the island of Hawaii cost more than a 500-mile trip from San Francisco to Los Angeles.

Since the Big Five controlled Hawaii's chief exports—sugar and pineapples—they also readily negotiated absolute control of shipping between Hawaii and continental United States. For Hawaii, 2,000 miles from its markets, shipping is a matter of economic life and death. The Big Five have used it for both.

Until the Maritime Commission and the war somewhat rocked the boat, only one shipping company—the Matson Navigation Co.,

Ltd.—had free access to the Hawaiian trade. It is largely owned and wholly controlled by the Big Five.

Numerous independent efforts to horn in on island shipping proved profitless. By 1929, the only serious fly in the Matson ointment was the Dollar Steamship Co. which, with Hawaii as a port of call on its trans-Pacific schedule, did some island business. The business was less important than the threat.

Consequently, Matson entered two ships in the transpacific trade in competition with Dollar. That gesture cost Matson $164,000. But it was efficacious. In exchange for a Matson agreement to keep out of the Orient, Dollar agreed that henceforth it would charge Matson rates on all traffic—freight and passenger—between Honolulu and the mainland. That took care of the fear that Dollar might one day undercut Big Five rates. Dollar also agreed that out of every dollar of gross income on its mainland-Hawaii business—freight and passenger—it would kick back 50 cents to Matson. That took care of everything else.

After 1930, Dollar had to carry the islands' third-class passengers, because Matson, to increase revenues, cut out such accommodations. No matter. Matson got half the price of every third-class ticket sold by Dollar. Frequently Matson had more freight than its ships could handle. Its agents, therefore, sent prospective shippers to Dollar. For that business, too, Dollar had to come across, 50–50.

By such tactics, said the Maritime Commission in 1940, Matson killed off competition, hindered American commerce, retarded the growth of a war-necessary merchant marine, and helped substantially to bring Dollar to the verge of bankruptcy.

Although Hawaii is entirely agricultural, 85 percent of its food is imported. Sugar and pineapples take 97 percent of the islands' cultivated land. More food production means less area for the Big Five's two-crop bonanza; less revenue from Matson's sugar and pineapple cargoes to the mainland; less on the high-paying food cargoes from the mainland; less likelihood that the Big Five can maintain food prices at an average of 25 percent above mainland levels.

When an experienced agricultural operator came to Honolulu with plans to increase truck farming, he could get no adequate parcels of land. Several years ago farmers on the island of Hawaii went ahead on their own to produce vegetables in some quantity. Interisland freight rates were set so high that their vegetables cost as much in Honolulu as those shipped from Los Angeles.

Actually fewer vegetables were produced in the 12 months following Pearl Harbor than in the preceding year, despite $100,000 spent by the Government to stimulate truck farming.

When the War Department recently proposed measures for the reduction of the price of foodstuffs, Honolulu's men in power looked out of the window and yawned.

And the Army—tough enough elsewhere—seems discreetly hesitant to get tough here. Transporting food from the mainland uses a lot of cargo space in ships at a time when ships are the Nation's greatest need.

With this amazing set-up at the top, the man at the bottom encounters numerous other costly items. To build a home, he runs smack into the Lumber Trust—affiliated with the Big Five. It does 91 percent of the lumber business. A mainland company made some pre-Pearl Harbor inquiries and reported that for lumber purchasable on the mainland for $15 a thousand board feet, the Honolulu Lumber Trust tacked on a stout $13.50 for transportation and sold it in Hawaii for $78—a $40.50 mark-up. Thus, a modest house which in California could have been built for $3,000 cost in Hawaii from $5,000 to $6,000.

Independent lumber dealers, willing to sell within reason, found their good intentions blocked when the Big Five's steamship company failed to ship their cargo or the Big Five's Honolulu Stevedores, Ltd., failed to move it.

The Big Five also collected from the public in less observable areas. One inquiry disclosed that city and county medical supplies were bought from a Big Five affiliate at prices far above those of independent dealers. Until a city auditor spoke out of turn, the Big Five's department store made it a practice to boost prices substantially for sales to the local government.

If many of these items are also costly to the plantations, that, too, the Big Five can face with equanimity. Their 2½ percent for factoring is collected not from the plantations' net profit but from their gross income. To keep up gross income, therefore, is a major Big Five concern. That concern has sometimes been carried so far as to involve plantations in uneconomically large production which substantially reduced the net profit. In such cases, the stockholders' loss was the Big Five's gain.

Some sugar plantations are owned by many stockholders and profits therefore have to be widely split. Thus, in milking the plantations by heavy charges for transportation, fertilizer, merchandise, machinery, and numerous other things, the Big Five merely transfers the profits from the plantations (with many dividend mouths to feed) to these other Big Five companies which have fewer outsiders to be cut in.

If, being stirred by these manifold pressures, the citizen feels the urge to do something about it, he will be well advised to suppress the impulse. Protected by an anti-picketing law and well schooled in the business of strong-arm antiunionism, Hawaii's boss employers have blocked the growth of an organized labor movement. The first contract between an employer and a labor union was not signed until 1936. Today the island unions have perhaps 6,000 members—about 1 for every 25 eligible workers.

The Territorial legislature, which looks to the average citizen for votes, looks higher up for orders. Legislation involving Big Five interests so filled the 1941 season that no time could be found to pass the M-day bill—backed by the Army and Navy as critical for defense.

Even the courts have been something less than a safeguard. In 1939, for example, the Honolulu grand jury, as was its right and duty, gave notice of its intention to nose into numerous smelly situations—bound to involve Big Five interests. The presiding judge quickly took over. Because of "the practical situation obtaining in Hawaii," he told the jury, "the grand jury has not the right to institute or prosecute an inquiry on chance or speculation that some crime may be discovered."

That this amazing realm can be kept intact and its rulers on their thrones in the face of the war's necessities is improbable. Rifts have already appeared.

The Maritime Commission has thrown out the Matson-Dollar agreement. The Civil Aeronautics Authority has canceled a somewhat similar arrangement which Matson made with Pan American Airways. A new governor who can't be bossed—Ingram M. Stainback—is in office.

A sizable slice has already been cut from the Big Five's land holdings on the Island of Oahu for military purposes. Sooner or later the military, fed up at getting nowhere, may order work begun on the food production plans.

Meanwhile, many thousands of workers on war projects have been brought to Hawaii. Thousands of them will stay. No other present prospect causes such general upper-bracket discomfiture. For the newcomers are undisciplined in the islands ways, unawed before their gods, unlikely to jump through the ancient hoops or keep silent when the whips crack. The darkness of this outlook deepened last fall when an avowed anti-Big Fiver was elected to the legislature with the second highest vote of any candidate.

Outwardly the islands remain on the pleasant periphery of the Tropics: Seldom too hot, never too cold, always too beautiful. It is in their inward parts that they are being shaken. The charming overlords of Hawaii's antiquated domain have far too long been unwilling to catch up with the times to relish the present likelihood that the times will catch up with them—or to know what, in such an event, they can do about it.

Barge Rates on Inland Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a complete statement with reference to barge rates on inland waterways, and particularly on the proposed intracoastal canal from Trenton, N. J., to Corpus Christi, Tex. The statement was prepared by Mr. C. E. Holloman, traffic manager of the Houston Chamber of Commerce, a thoroughly qualified rate expert.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of rates by barge line and rail line on various commodities between Pittsburgh, Pa., Trenton, N. J., Cairo, Ill., Charleston, S. C., Norfolk, Va., and Louisville, Ky. and New Orleans La., Houston, Tex., and Corpus Christi, Tex.

The distances shown by barge line from Pittsburgh, Pa., Cairo, Ill., and Louisville, Ky., are actual distances, as shown in Transportation Series No. 2 (1929), Transportation in the Mississippi and Ohio Valleys, issued by Corps of Engineers, United States Army and Southern Water Carriers Distance Circular No. 1, Clarence E. Becker's I. C. C. No. A–2.

The distances shown from Trenton, N. J., Norfolk, Va., and Charleston, S. C., by barge route are approximate distances, determined by existing canals from Trenton to St. Johns River, Fla., short route distance across Florida to St. Marks, Fla., thence via existing canals and channels to Louisiana and Texas.

The distances shown by rail lines are the short line distances determined by mileage scales and by the Rail Lines' Official Guide and by short line rail distances in Rand McNally Commercial Atlas.

There is no barge line service between Louisiana and Texas points and Trenton, N. J., Norfolk, Va., and Charleston, S. C., and the barge line's rates shown herein from and to those points, are constructive rates based on existing barge line rates from and to points on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, as indicated.

The rates named herein do not include the ex parte 148 percentage increases, recently suspended by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Rate per ton of 2,000 pounds

CANNED GOODS, IN TIN, IN SHIPMENTS OF 500 TONS

From—	To—	Distance (miles)		Rate per ton of 2,000 pounds	
		Via barge route	Via short rail route	Via barge route	Via rail route
Pittsburgh, Pa.	New Orleans, La.	1,952	1,146	$5.20	$18.20
Trenton, N. J.	do	1,650	1,286	[1] 4.40	18.40
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Houston, Tex.	2,362	1,256	7.00	18.00
Trenton, N. J.	do	2,060	1,621	[2] 6.10	21.00
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Corpus Christi, Tex.	2,516	1,478	8.00	20.40
Trenton, N. J.	do	2,214	1,843	[3] 7.00	23.00

IRON AND STEEL ARTICLES, EXCEPT PIPE IN SHIPMENT OF 500 TONS

Pittsburgh, Pa.	New Orleans, La.	1,952	1,146	$5.20	$13.60
Trenton, N. J.	do	1,650	1,286	[1] 4.40	16.20
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Houston, Tex.	2,362	1,256	7.00	14.00
Trenton, N. J.	do	2,060	1,621	[2] 6.10	16.40
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Corpus Christi, Tex.	2,516	1,478	8.00	22.60
Trenton, N. J.	do	2,214	1,843	[3] 7.00	25.00
New Orleans, La.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	1,952	1,146	5.20	13.60
Do	Trenton, N. J.	1,650	1,286	[1] 4.40	16.20
Houston, Tex.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,362	1,256	7.00	18.00
Do	Trenton, N. J.	2,060	1,621	[2] 6.10	20.60
Corpus Christi, Tex.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,516	1,478	8.00	23.80
Do	Trenton, N. J.	2,214	1,843	[3] 7.00	26.60

WROUGHT IRON OR STEEL PIPE, TUBES, CONNECTIONS, COUPLINGS, AND FITTINGS, IN SHIPMENTS OF 500 TONS [4]

Pittsburgh, Pa.	New Orleans, La.	1,952	1,146	$5.20	$13.60
Trenton, N. J.	do	1,650	1,286	[1] 4.40	16.20
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Houston, Tex.	2,362	1,256	7.00	15.68
Trenton, N. J.	do	2,060	1,621	[2] 6.10	19.80
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Corpus Christi, Tex.	2,516	1,478	8.00	19.60
Trenton, N. J.	do	2,214	1,843	[3] 7.00	22.60

WOOD PULP IN SHIPMENTS OF 500 TONS

New Orleans, La.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	1,952	1,146	$5.20	$16.40
Do	Trenton, N. J.	1,650	1,286	[1] 4.40	16.60
Houston, Tex.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,362	1,256	6.75	19.40
Do	Trenton, N. J.	2,060	1,621	[2] 5.90	22.40
Corpus Christi, Tex.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,516	1,478	8.00	22.00
Do	Trenton, N. J.	2,214	1,843	[3] 7.00	24.60

PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS IN DRUMS IN SHIPMENTS OF 500 TONS

Houston, Tex.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,362	1,256	$6.50	$14.20
Do	Trenton, N. J.	2,060	1,621	[2] 5.65	16.80
Corpus Christi, Tex.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,516	1,478	8.00	14.60
Do	Trenton, N. J.	2,214	1,843	[3] 7.00	17.20

ON SULFUR, IN BULK, IN SHIPMENTS OF 500 TONS [5]

Freeport, Tex.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,358	1,319	$6.00	$12.86
Do	Trenton, N. J.	2,056	1,684	[2] 5.22	16.35
Port Sulphur, La.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,008	1,192	5.00	[6] 12.86
Do	Trenton, N. J.	1,702	1,332	[1] 4.25	[6] 16.85
Freeport, Tex.	Cairo, Ill.	1,379	766	5.38	6.27
Do	Charleston, S. C.	1,356	1,198	5.38	9.78
Port Sulphur, La.	Cairo, Ill.	1,029	596	3.86	[6] 6.27
Do	Charleston, S. C.	1,006	817	3.86	[6] 9.78

COTTON, IN BALES, IN SHIPMENTS OF 300 TONS

New Orleans, La.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	1,952	1,146	$5.20	$16.60
Do	Trenton, N. J.	1,650	1,286	[1] 4.40	16.60

Rate per ton of 2,000 pounds—Continued

COTTON, IN BALES, IN SHIPMENTS OF 300 TONS—continued

From—	To—	Distance (miles)		Rate per ton of 2,000 pounds	
		Via barge route	Via short rail route	Via barge route	Via rail route
Houston, Tex.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,362	1,256	[8] $8.26	[9] 17.60
Do	Trenton, N. J.	2,060	1,621	[9] 7.46	17.60
Corpus Christi, Tex.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,516	1,478	9.78	19.40
Do	Trenton, N. J.	2,214	1,843	[8] 8.60	19.40

FLOUR AND FEED, IN PACKAGES, IN SHIPMENTS OF 500 TONS

New Orleans, La.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	1,952	1,146	$5.20	$13.00
Do	Trenton, N. J.	1,650	1,286	[1] 4.40	16.60
Houston, Tex.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,362	1,256	7.00	16.80
Do	Trenton, N. J.	2,060	1,621	[2] 6.10	19.00
New Orleans, La.	Cairo, Ill.	573	550	3.00	7.80
Do	Charleston, S. C.	550	771	[10] 3.00	9.20
Houston, Tex.	Cairo, Ill.	1,383	703	4.80	9.20
Do	Charleston, S. C.	1,360	1,135	[10] 4.80	16.00
New Orleans, La.	Louisville, Ky.	1,348	749	4.30	9.20
Do	Norfolk, Va.	1,360	1,133	[10] 4.50	11.40
Houston, Tex.	Louisville, Ky.	1,758	1,057	6.10	14.20
Do	Norfolk, Va.	1,770	1,495	[10] 6.10	15.40

CLEAN RICE, IN PACKAGES, IN SHIPMENTS OF 500 TONS

New Orleans, La.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	1,952	1,146	$5.20	$12.20
Do	Trenton, N. J.	1,650	1,286	[1] 4.40	14.40
Houston, Tex.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,362	1,256	7.00	14.60
Do	Trenton, N. J.	2,060	1,621	[2] 6.10	15.80
New Orleans, La.	Cairo, Ill.	973	550	3.00	6.20
Do	Charleston, S. C.	950	771	[11] 3.00	8.00
Houston, Tex.	Cairo, Ill.	1,383	703	4.80	7.60
Do	Charleston, S. C.	1,360	1,135	[11] 4.80	11.40

TOBACCO, MANUFACTURED (PLUG), IN PACKAGES, IN SHIPMENTS OF 300 TONS

Louisville, Ky.	Houston, Tex.	1,758	1,057	$7.78	$26.60
Norfolk, Va.	do	1,770	1,495	[12] 7.78	25.80
Louisville, Ky.	Corpus Christi, Tex.	1,912	1,279	8.78	32.20
Norfolk, Va.	do	1,924	1,717	[12] 8.78	37.40

WOOL, IN GREASE, IN SACKS, IN SHIPMENTS OF 300 TONS

Houston, Tex.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,362	1,256	$8.78	$29.40
Do	Trenton, N. J.	2,060	1,621	[2] 7.64	33.60
Corpus Christi, Tex.	Pittsburgh, Pa.	2,516	1,478	9.78	34.60
Do	Trenton, N. J.	2,214	1,843	[8] 8.61	38.80

[1] This rate is based on 85 percent of the rate from Pittsburgh, which represents the approximate difference in distance of haul, Trenton versus Pittsburgh.
[2] This rate is based on 87 percent of the rate from Pittsburgh, which represents the approximate difference in distance of haul, Trenton versus Pittsburgh.
[3] This rate is based on 88 percent of the rate from Pittsburgh, which represents the approximate difference in distance of haul, Trenton versus Pittsburgh.
[4] These rates via rail are the rates from Chester, Pa., no through rates being provided from Trenton, N. J.
[5] Rates per ton of 2,240 pounds.
[6] Freeport rate observed as maximum from Port Sulphur.
[7] The rate to Cairo is shown as a reasonable basis to Charleston as the difference in distance, Cairo versus Charleston, does not justify any difference in rate.
[8] This is a combination of rates over New Orleans.
[9] This rate is based on 85 percent of the rate from New Orleans to Pittsburgh, plus the rate from Houston to New Orleans.
[10] The Cairo, Ill., and Louisville, Ky., rates are shown as reasonable rates to Charleston and Norfolk, as the difference in distances, Cairo versus Charleston, and Louisville versus Norfolk, does not justify any difference in rate.
[11] The Cairo, Ill., rate is shown as a reasonable rate to Charleston, S. C., as the difference in distances, Cairo versus Charleston, does not justify any difference in rate.
[12] The Louisville, Ky., rate to each destination is shown as a reasonable basis from Norfolk as the difference in distance, Louisville versus Norfolk does not justify a difference in rate.

The barge-line rates to and from Pittsburgh, Pa., Louisville, Ky., and Cairo, Ill., are published in Union Barge Line Corporation Tariff 100-A, I. C. C. No. 2, and Campbell Transportation Tariff No. 1-B, I. C. C. No. 5, and cover furnishing the barges transportation and marine insurance.

Rates by barge lines between New Orleans, La., and points in Texas are shown in Inland Water Carriers Freight Association Tariff No. 100-A, Agent C. E. Becker's I. C. C. No. A-8.

Under these rates the shipper or receiver loads and unloads the barges.

The rail-line rates to and from Pittsburgh and Trenton are published in tariffs shown below, and under these rates the rail lines furnish the cars and assume liability for loss and damage.

Under these rates the shipper or receiver loads and unloads the cars.

RAIL-LINE TARIFF REFERENCES

Southwestern Lines Tariff 133-F, J. R. Peel's I. C. C. 5457.
Southwestern Lines Tariff 102-U, J. R. Peel's I. C. C. 3332.
Southwestern Lines Tariff 2-Z, J. R. Peel's I. C. C. 3557.
Southwestern Lines Tariff 259, J. R. Peel's I. C. C. 3276.
Southwestern Lines Tariff 251-B, J. R. Peel's I. C. C. 3527.
Southwestern Lines Tariff 173-P, J. R. Peel's I. C. C. 3526.
Southwestern Lines Tariff 185-D, J. R. Peel's I. C. C. 3116.
Southwestern Lines Tariff 130-H, J. R. Peel's I. C. C. 3362.
Southwestern Lines Tariff 252-A, J. R. Peel's I. C. C. 3360.
Consolidated Classification No. 15, I. C. C. O. C. 59.
W. S. Curlett's Tariff 44-H, I. C. C. A-712.
W. S. Curlett's Tariff 128-A, I. C. C. A-640.
Central Freight Association Tariff 490-B, B. T. Jones' I. C. C. 3642.
Central Freight Association Tariff 484, B. T. Jones' I. C. C. 2448.
W. S. Curlett's Tariff 69, I. C. C. A-339.
Exceptions to Southern Classification 21, E. H. Dulaney's I. C. C. 86.
Central Freight Association Tariff 130-B, B. T. Jones' I. C. C. 3684.

The Republican Party and Its Fight on Interest-Free Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, to anyone who receives the daily statement of the United States Treasury and the monthly Treasury Bulletin which comes to every congressional office, and is at all familiar with existing law and has read the last Republican national platform, or knows anything of the principles of the Republican Party, the present stand of the Republican Party as represented in Congress against the creation and use of interest-free money is truly amazing and difficult to understand.

For some 15 weeks now the Republican Members of the House of Representatives, aided and abetted by a few misguided Democrats, have stood adamant in their effort to strike down the United States Treasury program to create and use the only interest-free money the American people have in circulation—silver dollars and silver-certificate currency.

With the exception of a few western Members the Republicans in the House are solidly behind an amendment to the Treasury's appropriation bill that provides—

No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used directly or indirectly during the fiscal year 1944; for the purchase, procurement, storage, guarding, checking, or transportation of silver under the provisions of the Silver Purchase Acts; namely the act of June 19, 1934, and the act of July 6, 1939, or for the carrying out of any of the provisions of said Silver Purchase Acts.

Now, just what are the Republicans trying to strike down? The provisions of the law—act of July 6, 1939—by which the Treasury acquires and uses domestically mined silver for money at no cost to the taxpayers and places interest-free money in circulation is simple. This law provides that—

Each United States coinage mint shall receive for coinage into standard silver dollars any silver which such mint subject to the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury is satisfied has been mined subsequently to July 3 1939, from natural deposits in the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof. The director of such mint with the consent of the owner shall deduct and retain of such silver so received, 45 percent as seigniorage, for the services performed by the Government of the United States, relative to the coinage and delivery of silver dollars. The balance of such silver so received, that is 55 percent, shall be coined into standard silver dollars and the same or any equal number of standard silver dollars shall be delivered to the owner or depositor of such silver The 45 percent of such silver so deducted shall be retained as bullion by the Treasury or coined into standard silver dollars and held or disposed of in the same manner as other bullion or silver dollars, held in or belonging to the Treasury.

Here we have a law and a monetary program that provided for the use of the money metal produced in this country at almost a 50-percent profit to the Government—when we consider the related tax revenue the Government's income will exceed 50 percent—a monetary program that is putting new interest-free money into circulation to support the credit and business structure of our country.

Let us see what some of the leading Republican Members of the House say about this monetary program, leaders on whom the Republicans of the country must rely for leadership.

Mr. DIRKSEN of Illinois, in supporting the amendment to strike down silver money, said:

The time is now for the Congress to go on record and strike once and for all this indispensable policy from the books. * * * Under the rules of the House we may not add anything that is legislative or gives affirmative direction to the Treasury Department. We have got to do the best we can. We should unite in support of this amendment and then direct the Appropriations Committee to take action, looking to the complete repeal of the Silver Purchase Act.

Mr. WOLCOTT, another Republican leader in the House, in offering a substitute amendment for silver, said:

Mr. Chairman, in order to clarify this situation I am offering an amendment to the Celler amendment. If adopted, the Celler amendment will read as follows: "No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used directly or indirectly during the fiscal year 1944 for the purchase or procurement of silver under the provisions of the Silver Purchase Acts, namely the act of June 19, 1934, and the act of July 6, 1939, or for the carrying out of any of the provisions of said Silver Purchase Acts.

Congressman COLE, Republican, of New York, was more vehement in his opposition to the use of interest-free silver money when he said during the debate on the floor:

Mr. Chairman, the silver purchase program of our Government for the past 8 years presents one of the most outrageous frauds upon the taxpayers that has ever occurred. * * * It is unbelievable that the special interests of a few of the Western States of our country should have such complete control over these programs which have operated to the disadvantage of the rest of the country but it is, nevertheless the fact. * * * During the 8 years of its operation the silver purchase program has cost the American taxpayers $1,600,000,000 and no great benefit or advantage has been obtained except for the few private interests in a few Mountain States of the West.

In reviewing the records of the deliberations of Congress, it is doubtful if there could be found a more striking example of misrepresentation than this presentation of the silver issue by the Republican Members of the House.

The best answer to the contention of these Republicans is the silver seigniorage table that appears regularly in the monthly bulletin of the Treasury Department available to every Member of Congress, including the Republicans, which is printed herewith:

Seigniorage on silver

[Cumulative from Jan. 1, 1934—In millions of dollars]

End of calendar year or month	Seigniorage on silver and minor coins	Sources of seigniorage on silver bullion revalued [1]						Potential seigniorage on silver bullion at cost in general fund [2]
		Miscellaneous silver (including silver bullion held June 14, 1934)	Newly mined silver (proclamation Dec. 21, 1933)	Newly mined silver (act July 6, 1939)	Silver Purchase Act of June 19, 1934	Nationalized silver (proclamation of Aug. 9, 1934)	Total seigniorage on silver revalued	
1934	4.5	48.7	0.4	----------	51.1	28.5	128.7	132.6
1935	18.5	48.7	16.8	----------	226.2	34.3	326.2	274.9
1936	46.1	48.7	36.0	----------	302.7	34.7	422.1	397.5
1937	63.7	48.7	58.0	----------	366.7	34.7	508.1	541.6
1938	69.5	48.7	74.9	----------	457.7	34.7	616.0	758.8
1939	91.7	48.7	87.3	4.2	530.7	34.7	705.6	950.6
1940	122.2	48.7	87.6	25.7	562.7	34.7	759.4	1,055.8
1941	182.1	48.7	87.6	48.3	580.4	34.7	799.7	1,086.0
1942	245.7	48.7	87.6	63.6	584.3	34.7	818.9	1,048.2
1942—April	198.0	48.7	87.6	55.3	583.8	34.7	810.1	1,096.5
May	204.0	48.7	87.6	57.5	584.3	34.7	812.8	1,067.5
June	209.2	48.7	87.6	58.9	584.3	34.7	814.2	1,095.5
July	213.0	48.7	87.6	60.6	584.3	34.7	815.9	1,090.0
August	218.5	48.7	87.6	61.6	584.3	34.7	816.9	1,085.5
September	225.8	48.7	87.6	62.4	584.3	34.7	817.7	1,082.5
October	233.4	48.7	87.6	63.1	584.3	34.7	818.4	1,068.5
November	239.5	48.7	87.6	63.4	584.3	34.7	818.7	1,060.0
December	245.7	48.7	87.6	63.6	584.3	34.7	818.9	1,048.2
1943—January	251.0	48.7	87.6	63.6	584.3	34.7	818.9	1,029.7
February	257.5	48.7	87.6	63.6	584.3	34.7	818.9	[3] 1,048.4
March	264.9	48.7	87.6	63.9	584.3	34.7	819.2	1,038.9
April	271.9	48.7	87.6	64.4	584.3	34.7	819.7	1,036.6

[1] These items represent the difference between the cost value and the monetary value of silver bullion revalued and held to secure silver certificates.

[2] The figures in this column are not cumulative; as the amount of bullion held changes, the potential seigniorage thereon changes.

[3] Increase due principally to cumulative adjustment in computing average cost per ounce.

Basis: Daily Treasury Statements.

By consulting the figures appearing in the seigniorage table above and the figures appearing in the daily balance sheet of the Treasury, any Member of Congress can see that instead of the silver-purchase program costing the taxpayers a penny, this program has placed over $1,960,000,000 interest-free money in circulation, and in doing this the Government has made an initial profit of over $800,000,000 in the form of silver seigniorage by buying foreign silver at the world market price and domestic silver at the President's proclamation

price, revaluing the metal, and—this quotation is from the Silver Purchase Act of June 19, 1934—

Issuing silver certificates in such denominations as he (the Secretary of the Treasury) may from time to time prescribe—in a face amount of not less than the cost of all the silver purchased under the authority of section 3, such silver certificates shall be placed in actual circulation.

So we find that all the 35-cent foreign silver and 65-cent domestic silver acquired by the Government was in reality paid for by the people who accepted silver certificates, mostly $1, $5, and $10 bills, in payment for their goods and services—money that proceeded to flow into the channels of trade and business free of an interest charge, a charge that must be paid to get any other kind of money created and loaned into circulation by the banks. To better understand what our silver currency is saving the American people, our Republican leaders should compare the cost in the form of interest of keeping a bank note paper dollar in circulation, with the cost of keeping a silver dollar in circulation, as indicated in the following letter from the Federal Reserve bank:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, February 6, 1942.

Hon. C. I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: This is in reply to your telephone request today. The present value of $1 compounded at 3 percent annually from 1879 to date would amount to $6.44. Compounded at 6 percent it would amount to $39.29.

Yours very truly,
WOODLIEF THOMAS,
Assistant Director, Division of Research and Statistics.

Think of it—this worn old 1879 dollar in passing from hand to hand in the transaction of business has saved the American people more than its weight in gold—$39.29. Is it any wonder that it is abused and shunned by the banks of the country, because it interferes with their profitable privilege of creating and circulating money, and is reviled by the paid propagandists, who have been feeding so long on their opposition to the people's money—silver. But why should the great Republican Party support this profiteering crew with their deceit and deception? Why should the Republicans of today turn their back upon the ideals of the great Lincoln, "sound money, economy, and the protection of American industry."

Abraham Lincoln, who spared the people of his day and their posterity the interest burden on the issuance of money by creating interest-free Treasury notes—greenbacks—to finance another great war, under greater difficulties and uncertainty than the outcome of the war in which we are now engaged.

Does the Republican Party as represented in the Congress fully understand what the plan to strike down silver money will actually do to our national economy and the welfare of the American people.

I know and respect my Republican colleagues, and I cannot bring myself to believe they really understand the side of the issue into which they are being led, particularly, in this great war emergency and on the present financial condition of our Government.

The people of this country, regardless of politics, should cry out to the Congress from the housetops by wire and by letter to Democrats and Republicans alike, not to strike down our only redeemable money, but to unite in giving the American people a sound workable and adequate money system, free from a continuing interest charge, with an honest dollar, one just to the creditor and debtor alike.

Address by Senator Burton at Dedication Ceremonies of Fletcher General Hospital, Cambridge, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. BURTON
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a dedicatory address which I delivered at Fletcher General Hospital, Cambridge, Ohio, on May 31, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a privilege to join in these ceremonies of dedication. We are fighting this war on many fronts—the firing lines in both hemispheres, the production lines on our farms and in our factories, the inflation front calling for cooperation in payment of taxes, restriction of industrial prices, farm prices and wages, the purchase of War bonds, the practice of conservation, the fair administration of rationing, the restriction of extended credit and the practice of economy in Federal, State and local governmental expenditures. The hospitals like this one that we dedicate today are a part of the military front and of the firing line itself extending directly from north Africa and Europe to Cambridge, Ohio.

Back of all these fronts there is the home front—in the hearts of the American people. This is the front where the spirit of America must be at its best and strongest. It sets the standards for which we fight. This is the front that owes the obligation to support and cheer those on the firing lines. Their best support and their best cheer will come when they know that we all are doing our full part here in a manner worthy of their efforts there. We must do our share and more than our share—just as they are daily doing their share—and more than their share.

We must keep their homes ready and waiting for them as they would have those homes. We must keep the home front up to the ideal that they are fighting for. We must preserve here sound and loving home life—freedom of opportunity for the individual to work and to advance himself and his family. We must develop and preserve stability and fairness in our national, regional, and international relations that will produce a just and lasting peace and will win an independence for the individual that is worthy of the effort he makes for it.

On this home front Cambridge will now occupy a special position. It will be given a place far closer to our service men and women than ever before. Cambridge today is assigned the critical responsibility of typifying the best spirit of America to those hospitalized servicemen who have made personal physical sacrifices that America may live and be free. The people of Cambridge today are given a new opportunity for wartime service. I am sure the people of Cambridge are ready and anxious to meet both the opportunity and the responsibility that has come to them. The opening this morning of the downtown Cambridge Service Center is ample evidence of this and I wish to thank W. K. Deselm and his committee for their leadership in this action.

The Fletcher General Hospital brings America's greatest war close to Cambridge. We are in our Nation's greatest war. It may well require 2 to 4 years of our greatest effort to fight our way to victory.

General Douglas MacArthur in response to his welcome to Australia stated the case well when he said, "I have come as a soldier in a great crusade of personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. * * * There can be no compromise. We shall win or we shall die, and to that end, I pledge you the full resources of all the mighty power of my country and all the blood of my countrymen." The people of Cambridge long ago joined in this great effort, as those in other cities have done, to fight our way to complete victory in both hemispheres.

There now has come to Cambridge an opportunity for special service. Due to the natural advantages of its location, including its geographical situation, its accessibility by railroad and highway, its water supply, the general level and grade of its land, and the ready availability of material and labor, it became eligible for consideration as a site for a general hospital. When there was coupled with this eligibility an initiative, cordiality, and general willingness on the part of the people of Cambridge to cooperate in the establishment and operation of such a hospital, the responsible authorities of the United States Army recognized in Cambridge a community well suited to accept the combined responsibility and opportunity which accompanies the location of a general hospital in its midst in time of war.

The American people, through their Government, feel the deepest responsibility for the men and women who are risking their futures, their health, and their lives in our armed forces. The American people, through their Government, have no more sacred trusteeship than that for those men and women and their families. One of the deepest obligations of this trusteeship is owed to those who, in the course of their service, become physically or mentally disabled by wounds, accident, or illness.

The first responsibility in providing for their care is to secure suitable hospital locations, buildings, facilities, and equipment. Equally important is the responsibility for skilled medical and hospital service. Both of these responsibilities have been adequately met here in this well-located, equipped, and manned 1,520-bed general hospital. With these primary responsibilities goes a third. This is the intangible and vitally important requirement of a community filled with the cheerful, kindly, cordial hospitality that makes both the hospital staff and the hospital patients feel that they are wanted and welcome. That need can be met only by the people of the community. I am confident it will be well met by the people of Cambridge. I hope that every patient and employee who comes to this hospital will leave with a good word for Cambridge and with gratitude for the assignment that gave him or her a chance

to see and to know the hospitable and hospital-minded people of Cambridge.

I pay special tribute to the community leaders of Cambridge, who presented its case to the Government in the first instance. I include the city, county, and other officials, the officers and members of the many civic and community organizations as well as all individuals who had any part in presenting the case and assisting in expressing the desire of this community to be of service. From a personal standpoint, I recall especially the early interest and leadership shown by Samuel G. Austin, whose illness I regret prevents him from being present today, and by my friend, former State Senator Willard Campbell, who took part in the early presentation of the case. Another early leader in the movement was Frank B. Amos, president of the Jeffersonian. Mr. Amos as president and Walter G. Springer as manager of the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce are likewise continuing that interest today. The widespread cooperation of those engaged in industry, or representing organized labor or civic activity has been outstanding. I especially appreciate also the high standard of public service demonstrated by Lt. Col. Lawrence G. King, of the United States Corps of Engineers, who at one time was a resident of Cleveland, and who originally came from southeastern Ohio. He took a leading share on the part of the Government in making a thorough investigation of the hospital locations available, not only in Cambridge, but in many other communities of southeastern Ohio. The decision reached on behalf of the Government was reached by the officials of the War Department entirely upon the merits of the situation and solely in an effort to be of the greatest possible service to our armed forces.

I feel sure that in addition to the physical advantages of this location, the united and cordial spirit of the people of Cambridge has been an important factor in securing final approval of this site. The opportunity of the people of Cambridge to be of service in the war will increase with the opening of this hospital. The people of Cambridge recognize the trusteeship which has been placed upon them by their Government. In this new relationship the people of Cambridge will be representing the people of the United States and especially the people of the State of Ohio in making the new contacts that will be opened to them. I compliment Col. T. E. Darby, as commanding officer of the hospital, upon the high character of his service in that capacity and upon the cordial relations that he has established with the community.

This hospital is to serve the broadest obligations of our Nation to those disabled in its service either in combat or otherwise. It is a general hospital seeking to afford relief and care for those suffering from all kinds of disabilities. It will serve all branches of our armed forces. It may serve the armed forces of our allies. It may thus bring to Cambridge a close realization of the dependence which we have placed upon our allies and of the sacrifices they have made for our common cause. This hospital may well bring to the people of Cambridge a deep appreciation of the common bond which reaches across all divisions of race, nationality, and creed to bind the United Nations together in the defense of humanity itself. There certainly will come to Cambridge an extraordinary opportunity to demonstrate the sincere dedication of our people to the principles of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, which principles are the very foundation of our Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution of the United States.

We are facing a critical period of the war. The war already exceeds by more than 10 times the scope and average daily cost of World War No. 1. Our armed forces are twice the size of those we raised in World War No. 1. The materials and supplies sent to our troops and to our allies are many times greater than in World War No. 1. The engagements of our troops thus far have been small in comparison with those to come. We face the most hazardous and costly of all military operations—the invasion of a continent. Our casualties will be large and much of the war news will be hard to take. Service at the front will call for the greatest courage, efficiency, and determination. The least we can do behind the lines is to show full appreciation of what is done on the lines. The service of our soldiers has been and will be superlative. Our service to them must be no less so.

Our Army Medical Corps is the best equipped and is giving the best service in its history. This hospital is a part of that service. Cambridge is privileged to share, through this hospital, in the Army's high endeavor to give superlative service to everyone who enters it—whether from battlefield or training camp and whether wounded or ill. All of these patients are giving their full efforts and their lives, if need be, to the Nation. Their hospitalization here offers us an opportunity to lend them the helping hand they deserve. It is only thus that we can hope to justify the price that these men pay to preserve this Nation and all for which it stands.

With the coming of the Fletcher General Hospital to Cambridge there comes an opportunity for special service which opens to the people of Cambridge a particular course of conduct to which they can dedicate themselves with unlimited devotion and recognize that in doing so they are meeting a special assignment of service to their Nation. No one can substitute for them. This opportunity will be met as well or as poorly as they meet it. The effect of their work upon the Army staff at the hospital and upon the patients in the hospital who will come from all over this Nation and perhaps from all over the world will be just as fine or just as poor as the people of Cambridge make it. The opportunity will be one not only to render direct service but also to inspire new hope, faith, and courage in the hearts of those who are being served.

In naming the hospital for Lt. Col. John P. Fletcher, the Army has recognized the service of one of its devoted officers who contributed much in a practical and quiet manner throughout his career to the improvement of the medical field equipment of our Army. It is through such service as his that thousands of disabilities and immeasurable sufferings have been saved to our soldiers. Many who will come to this hospital will have been aided by his contributions to the adequacy of the medical treatment which they received in the field. His name will ever connect this hospital with the front line. It will identify its service with a life of constructive thinking and devotion to his country. The Fletcher General Hospital will bring into the life of Cambridge a new name that will carry with it a message of competent public service of the kind that sets the standard needed for the success of free government.

While it is not possible to foresee who may come as patients to this hospital yet, it is clear that there will be many ways in which the people of Cambridge and Ohio may serve this hospital. Among these will be the business relations of the community with the hospital and with the individual members of the hospital staff. I am confident that the United States Government will find in Cambridge, as it has already found in many instances, a readiness to deal fairly with the Government and to assist it in an effort to be businesslike and conscientious in the performance of its duties. Similarly, I am confident that the people of Cambridge will extend to the staff of the hospital, from Col. T. E. Darby, its commanding officer, to its most humble employee such a cordial Ohio welcome and continued expression of hospitality that they will be glad they are here. We want them to feel at home and to enjoy themselves. We want them, because of our cordiality and helpfulness, to be able to render increased services in the performance of their duties. I am confident that the religious, civic, social, fraternal, labor, veteran, and other organizations of Cambridge and the surrounding communities will go out of their way to render service both to the staff and the patients of the hospital, and I urge them to do so at every opportunity. In fact, I urge them to seek out opportunities to do so. In such efforts they should always act in full cooperation with the commanding officer and with those who bear the official responsibility for the policies within the hospital.

But, most of all, it is in regard to the patients who will come to this hospital that I wish to address an especial word to the people of Cambridge and its vicinity. These patients will come here at a time when their physical, mental, and spiritual needs will be great. Whether their disabilities arise from wounds or other causes, they will have been incurred in their service of their country and for our cause. These disabilities may change substantially the course of the lives of those who suffer them. The helpful attitude of the people of their country toward them will be expressed in part through the financial provisions made for them and through the hospitalization offered them here. On the other hand, the attitude of the people of America which will touch them most keenly will be the personal and human expression of it that will reach them. Some of these expressions will come to them through personal visitors who will come here from their families or from their home areas. For the most part, however, these expressions of interest will come directly from the people of Cambridge. Some Cambridge people will be serving as employees and officials of the hospital. Others will be volunteers or friends who seek to give such help as they can, either directly or indirectly, to these men and to their families or relatives. It is through the exercise of this trusteeship that the people of Cambridge will have their special opportunity. I count upon their full response as fellow American citizens and as representatives of the best spirit of the State of Ohio.

Some of the war's hardest fighting will be the fighting by the disabled soldier to maintain his own morale. Florence Nightingale typified the helpful encouragement that a nurse can give to the wounded soldier at the front. It is best told in the letter of a soldier who wrote of her as follows:

"What a comfort it was to see her pass even. She would speak to one and nod and smile to as many more; but she could not do it all, you know. We lay there by hundreds, but we could kiss her shadow as it fell, and lay our heads on the pillow again content."

There is work, long, hard, trying work to be done—to serve these men who have served their country and deserve their country's everlasting gratitude and help. America must never overlook what they have done nor what they yet will be glad to do for a grateful and helpful America.

As we now dedicate the buildings of this Fletcher General Hospital to the service of those armed forces to which Colonel Fletcher devoted his life, so let us also dedicate the people of America, of Ohio, and especially of Cambridge to the highest expression of hospitality, service, and human brotherhood in the service of those whose own service to their Nation shall have brought them here.

Let us so serve that every patient shall be ready to say in his heart, "God Bless America—God bless the people of Cambridge."

On the Constitutionality of the Rent Control Act

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. GRANT

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under date of March 30, 1943, at page A1504 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I placed a copy of an opinion by the United States District Court for the northern district of Indiana, declaring the Rent Control Act as administered to be unconstitutional. The Supreme Court of the United States has now declared that it cannot accept jurisdiction of that question because of alleged collusion in the bringing of the suit. The opinion of the Court follows:

[Supreme Court of the United States. No. 840.—October term, 1942. *The United States of America and Edward Roach, Appellants*, v. *Dick Johnson*. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Indiana. May 24, 1943]

Per curiam: One Roach, a tenant of residential property belonging to appellee, brought this suit in the district court alleging that the property was within a "defense rental area" established by the Price Administrator pursuant to sections 2 (b) and 302 (d) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, 56 Stat. 23; that the Administrator had promulgated Maximum Rent Regulation No. 8 for the area; and that the rent paid by Roach and collected by appellee was in excess of the maximum fixed by the regulation. The complaint demanded judgment for treble damages and reasonable attorney's fees, as prescribed by section 205 (e) of the act. The United States, intervening pursuant to 28 United States Code, section 401, filed a brief in support of the constitutionality of the act, which appellee had challenged by motion to dismiss. The district court dismissed the complaint on the ground—as appears from its opinion (48 F. Supp. 833) and judgment—that the act and the promulgation of the regulation under it were unconstitutional because Congress by the act had unconstitutionally delegated legislative power to the Administrator.

Before entry of the order dismissing the complaint, the Government moved to reopen the case on the ground that it was collusive and did not involve a real case or controversy. This motion was denied. The Government brings the case here on appeal under section 2 of the act of August 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 752, 28 U. S. C., sec. 349a), and assigns as error both the ruling of the district court on the constitutionality of the act and its refusal to reopen and dismiss the case as collusive.

The appeal of the plaintiff Roach to this Court was also allowed by the district court and is now pending. But his appeal has not been docketed here because of his neglect to comply with the rules of this Court. As the record is now before us on the Government's appeal, we have directed that the two appeals be consolidated and heard as one case. We accordingly find it unnecessary to consider the question which we requested counsel to discuss (see 318 U. S. —), "whether any case or controversy exists reviewable in this Court, in the absence of an appeal by the party plaintiff in the district court."

The affidavit of the plaintiff, submitted by the Government on its motion to dismiss the suit as collusive, shows without contradiction that he brought the present proceeding in a fictitious name; that it was instituted as a "friendly suit" at appellee's request; that the plaintiff did not employ, pay, or even meet the attorney who appeared of record in his behalf; that he had no knowledge who paid the $15 filing fee in the district court, but was assured by appellee that as plaintiff he would incur no expense in bringing the suit; that he did not read the complaint which was filed in his name as plaintiff; that in his conferences with the appellee and appellee's attorney of record, nothing was said concerning treble damages and he had no knowledge of the amount of the judgment prayed until he read of it in a local newspaper.

Appellee's counter-affidavit did not deny these allegations. It admitted that appellee's attorney had undertaken to procure an attorney to represent the plaintiff and had assured the plaintiff that his presence in court during the trial of the cause would not be necessary. It appears from the district court's opinion that no brief was filed on the plaintiff's behalf in that court.

The Government does not contend that, as a result of this cooperation of the two original parties to the litigation, any false or fictitious state of facts was submitted to the court. But it does insist that the affidavits disclose the absence of a genuine adversary issue between the parties, without which a court may not safely proceed to judgment, especially when it assumes the grave responsibility of passing upon the constitutional validity of legislative action. Even in a litigation where only private rights are involved, the judgment will not be allowed to stand where one of the parties has dominated the conduct of the suit by payment of the fees of both (*Gardner* v. *Goodyear Dental Vulcanite Co.*, 131 U. S. Appendix, ciii).

Here an important public interest is at stake—the validity of an act of Congress having far-reaching effects on the public welfare in one of the most critical periods in the history of the country. That interest has been adjudicated in a proceeding in which the plaintiff has had no active participation, over which he has exercised no control, and the expense of which he has not borne. He has been only nominally represented by counsel who was selected by appellee's counsel and whom he has never seen. Such a suit is collusive because it is not in any real sense adversary. It does not assume the "honest and actual antagonistic assertion of rights" to be adjudicated—a safeguard essential to the integrity of the judicial process, and one which we have held to be indispensable to adjudication of constitutional questions by this Court. *Chicago, etc., Ry. Co.* v. *Wellman* (143 U. S. 339, 345); and see *Lord* v. *Veazie* (8 How. 251); *Cleveland* v. *Chamberlain* (1 Black 419); *Bartemeyer* v. *Iowa* (18 Wall. 129, 134–135); *Atherton Mills* v. *Johnston* (259 U. S. 13, 15). Whenever in the course of litigation such a defect in the proceedings is brought to the court's attention, it may set aside any adjudication thus procured and dismiss the cause without entering judgment on the merits. It is the court's duty to do so where, as here, the public interest has been placed at hazard by the amenities of parties to a suit conducted under the domination of only one of them. The district court should have granted the Government's motion to dismiss the suit as collusive. We accordingly vacate the judgment below with instructions to the district court to dismiss the cause on that ground alone. Under the statute, 28 United States Code, section 401, the Government is liable for costs which may be taxed as in a suit between private litigants; costs in this Court will be taxed against appellee.

So ordered.

Under the law of Indiana we have a Declaratory Judgment Act, designed to bring about the settlement of disputed questions of law in such cases as this. Many other States have similar declaratory judgment acts. In light of that fact and in light of the further fact that Federal courts generally do follow the procedure of the States within which they sit, and in view of the importance of the question at issue, it is regrettable that the Supreme Court of the United States has not found it within its power to accept jurisdiction of this case and to decide the question of constitutionality raised therein.

Wise Leadership or Inflation—and Dictatorship

REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable talk in Washington recently about rationing everyone's spending as a necessary way to enforce the rationing of food and other commodities, to support price ceilings, and fight inflation. Some are in favor of the idea; others are opposed to it, and favor a spendings tax to accomplish the same purposes; still others are opposed to both the rationing of spending and a tax on spending.

Back of the proposal is a recognition that price ceilings are not being maintained, that black markets flourish, and that inflationary tendencies are getting the upper hand of our economy; but whether either rationing of the people's purchasing power or a spending tax is a proper method to correct these situations is open to considerable question.

Several measures have already been tried to counteract the effects of our runaway economy and keep down the costs of living. An increase of purchasing power, combined with a decrease in consumer goods, always results in higher prices. Taxes have been increased, and War bond sales have been promoted to siphon off some of this expanded purchasing power. Price ceilings have been established for thousands of articles. Many necessary commodities have been put under the point-rationing system to achieve more equitable distribution among the consumers. The Little Steel formula was announced as a ceiling on wage increases.

If these measures had been fully operative and efficiently administered and enforced, there would now be no need for additional restrictions upon consumers. The fact that some in the administration are now proposing to ration spending is proof that the measures have not been effective, if proof is needed by the consumer who sees his living costs mount almost daily.

These measures have not been effective for a variety of reasons. Taxes and War

bond sales do not absorb the increased purchasing power coming from the tremendous sums being spent for war production. I doubt if taxes sufficient to do so would be acceptable to the people; and I doubt, too, that any advertising campaign, however forceful, would boost War bond sales sufficiently to make up the difference.

Price ceilings have not served to stem rising costs of living: First, because they were established too late and have been changed too often; second, because the system became so complex neither businessmen nor consumers could understand it or comply with its regulations; third, because black markets have been permitted to operate almost unchecked; fourth, because no one agency has been given the power really to maintain price ceilings; fifth, and most important, because price ceilings too often do not, and cannot under present laws, take account of production and distribution costs.

No price ceiling can be enforced with regard to any commodity when the price fails to cover the costs of production and distribution. Meat prices have soared, and new and higher ceilings have been established from time to time, because of this simple fact. The Office of Price Administration has no authority to establish the price at which cattle growers and hog growers must sell to packing houses. Neither does it have authority to establish the wages of packing-house workers. It has no power over two of the most important elements of the cost of any commodity: Raw materials prices and wages and labor. When either, or both, begin to bring the cost of the steak at the butcher shop higher than the retail price ceiling, one or all of three things must happen, and are happening: The price celing is raised, the price ceiling is ignored by the butcher shop, or the meat is sold at higher prices through someone not averse to maintaining a black market.

What has happened with regard to meats has happened with regard to many other necessary commodities, and it will happen to many more unless more firm and intelligent action is taken against the tide of inflation. Inflation is a powerful force—so powerful it can destroy our economic system, make our money worthless, and even lose the war for us. It cannot be fought with half-way measures, with inefficient administration of price and cost-controlling agencies, nor without the wholehearted support and cooperation of all the people, everywhere in the United States.

The point is that we have to pay the costs of this war; they cannot all be passed to later years or later generations. They must be met now in terms of real wealth—materials and labor. The costs are heavy; they will be heavier, possibly more than half of our national income; in other words, more than half of our labor and more than half of our production will be used in fighting the war. Because money and credit are merely counters for keeping track of expenses and income, the material and labor costs are necessarily reflected in money costs. We must pay these too. The best way to pay them is in the form of taxes and savings—taxes paid to the Government, savings loaned to the Government. The only other way to pay these costs is a dangerous way, the way of inflation. If that becomes the way, instead of paying taxes or buying bonds, your purchasing power will be absorbed for the war in the form of higher prices. But this way lies national bankruptcy, tremendous suffering by those living on fixed incomes, unequal distribution of the financial burdens of war.

What can be done? We can be willing to pay higher and higher taxes. We can increase our purchase of War bonds. The Government can concentrate its cost-controlling and price-controlling powers under one efficient agency. It can stamp out black markets. If the public can find them, the Department of Justice should be able to do so. We should refuse to pay higher than ceiling prices anywhere.

Unless all these things are done, the proposal to ration spending with all its complexity and danger to our money and credit structure, will be but the beginning of more and more restrictions which can lead only to chaos or dictatorship.

America's Aid in Policing the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Must Help to Police World, Maxey Declares," from the Philadelphia Record of a recent date, containing a speech by Hon. George W. Maxey, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. As I have rather severely criticized Judge Maxey in the past for some of his political decisions, it gives me pleasure to have this article inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES MUST HELP TO POLICE WORLD, MAXEY DECLARES—CHIEF JUSTICE CITES NATION'S BLINDNESS IN ADDRESS TO COLLEGE MEN

CHARLESTON, S. C., May 29.—The United States must aid in policing the world to assure a just and lasting peace, Chief Justice George W. Maxey, of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, told the student body of Citadel College here today.

"Civilization is now in its twilight and the darkest hours are just ahead," Justice Maxey declared. "Communism, fascism, and anarchy have thrust themselves into the vacuum of a crumbling civilization.

FORCE HELD NECESSARY

"International peace, like domestic peace, is an order. And there can be no order without compulsion. Organized force is a prerequisite not of war but of peace. Without international law backed by force, international order dissolves into anarchy, just as without a police force our cities would fall prey to criminals."

Replete with allusions to world conquerors, from Alexander to Napoleon, Justice Maxey's address, Marching to the Sound of Guns, was pointed at the graduating class of this famous southern military academy, whose commandant is General Charles P. Summerall, former Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

RIPE FOR SLAVERY

It was premised on the tactical maxim that time always is the essence of any successful maneuver where the maximum force is brought to bear at the opportune moment.

"This principle applies in civil as well as military life," Justice Maxey said. "The great physician is he who has trained himself for the battle against disease and who in times of crises arrives promptly to deliver his maximum skill.

"Nations which are not prepared for war are ripe for slavery. There is always some Genghis Khan who is ready to begin their subjugation. 'Around every Rome hover the Gauls; around every Athens, some Macedon.'

IGNORED REALITIES

"If the United States and Great Britain and France had not refused to face realities, this great war could have been averted. It has been said that he who will not use his eyes for seeing will later have occasion to use them for weeping."

Justice Maxey reviewed the tragic fiasco of the late Prime Minister Chamberlain, who blindly hoped for "peace in our time," and declared:

"We Americans were just as blind as the British in refusing to learn from experience. Woodrow Wilson declared in 1919 that 'Germany had been preparing every resource, perfecting every skill, developing every invention which would enable her to master Europe and dominate the world'.

PENALTY FOR FOOLISHNESS

"And 20 years ago Germany began again to build up another great store of force to enslave the world and we again moved back into the fools' paradise against which Wilson warned. For our foolishness, we are paying the penalty now.

"For the good things of life we always pay in advance; for our sin of omission and commission we pay afterward. A learned historian once said, 'The history of humanity is the history of their sufferings, and the history of their sufferings is the history of their credulity.'"

Justice Maxey recalled all the warnings this country received from far-sighted soldiers and statesmen as to the intentions of both Germany and Japan.

NO REASON FOR SURPRISE

"It is a military maxim that it is permissible for a commander to be defeated, but never to be surprised," he said. "The maxim applies to nations as well as to individuals. It was criminal negligence for this Nation to be surprised by Japan.

"Admiral Taussig predicted it 3 years before it came, and Homer Lea and many others predicted it long before that. It is carrying politeness entirely too far to let your avowed enemy have the first shot. It is rash to assume he is a bad shot.

"The 19 sunken and damaged warships at Pearl Harbor and the 3,600 dead and the thousands wounded prove that our Oriental enemy was a good shot. Bad men are often good shots; good men should be also. And, like 'Wild Bill Hickok,' a 'law-and-order man,' they should be first on the draw. The only time Bill wasn't first he was killed."

HITS THEORY OF DEFENSE

Justice Maxey also declared that the war has demonstrated clearly that the theory of

defense was always suicidal and that the war must be carried to the enemy.

He recalled that Gen. Robert E. Lee, when asked by a woman how she should rear her son, told her, "Teach him to deny himself."

"No nation of self-indulgent people," Justice Maxey said, "is likely to match in battle a nation of self-sacrificing people."

Future Course of the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Alabama Baptist, written by Dr. L. L. Gwaltney, editor of that publication, entitled "A Bold Guess at a Huge Problem."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BOLD GUESS AT A HUGE PROBLEM

The decade between December 7, 1941, which was the day of the attack upon Pearl Harbor and December 1951 will go down in history as the most momentous decade in all the annals of the world. The historians, 500 years hence, will be writing about the decade in which we are now living. Certainly there has been nothing else like it, and it is probable that never again will there be any other time like this, the fourth decade of the twentieth century.

In that which is to follow a bold guess is being made at certain things which, it seems to the writer, are inevitably bound to happen. These things, for clarity, are numbered, but each point mentioned would require a hundred books to give in detail the facts as the facts will develop.

1. The Allied Nations, which among others embrace the English speaking world, will win the war. The Hill-Ball-Burton-Hatch resolution offered to the Senate, which would place America in the lead in forming a federation of nations for world peace, should be passed by the Congress now. But this should not be permitted to cause any extended debate in our Congress or any of the parliaments in Europe which would in any way militate against every effort being put forth first to win the war. So the war should be won first and then the peace should be taken care of.

2. It may be assumed that hostilities will cease only after an unconditional surrender by the leaders of all the Axis Powers. That means that Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo will personally have to yield up their swords as a token of the surrender of their whole war machines. And if any one, or all, of the three are not in authority at the time of the defeat of the Axis Powers then whoever is in authority will have to personally surrender, not in the name of some puppet government which may be set up but in the name of the Axis armies themselves.

3. It is certain that immediately after the surrender the Allied armies of occupation will go into all of the Axis nations—Germany, Italy, and Japan. And smaller Allied armies of occupation will have to go into all the European countries which have been conquered by the Axis Powers. This will be necessary to preserve order and necessary also to defend the Germans themselves who are in the subdued countries of Europe for, if they were not protected by the Allied armies of occupation, the people of the various countries which are subdued would immediately kill all the Germans in those countries.

4. The Axis Nations will be disarmed and the people will be reduced to military impotence. Their munition plants will all be dismantled and they will not be allowed the raw material to build other munition plants for making munitions.

5. While the armies of occupation are in control, the Axis high officials will be brought to trial by court martial and Hitler, Mussolini and Tojo (if they are living) will be disposed of, together with scores of others of their high officials.

6. There will be no peace treaty signed immediately after the armistice is declared, nor will there be any immediate attempt to form a federation of the Allied Nations for permanent peace or for the future prevention of war. Instead of this, all Europe and Asia will be under military control, which will last from 5 to 10 years. This control will consist largely in bombing planes which will be so based as to reach in a few hours any part of the world where disorders may begin; and it will be during this time of military control that plans will be made eventually for permanent peace. The powers which will exercise the military control will be those who will win the war and their allies, namely the United States, Britain, Russia, and China. Should Russia refuse to have a part in this, the necessity of it will fall upon Britain and the United States.

7. The Axis in Europe, Hitler and Mussolini, will be defeated first and probably 2 years before Japan is defeated. And the military controls mentioned above will have a chance to work in Europe and will become the pattern of the same controls to be worked in Asia after the defeat of Japan. Armies of occupation will have to be placed on the Japanese mainland, and smaller armies in Indochina, Thailand, Singapore, and the Philippine Islands. If these armies did not take over, the natives in these countries would kill every Jap immediately, just as the people of conquered Europe would destroy all Germans.

8. The armies of occupation will not return to their native lands from 5 to 10 years after the war comes to an end. All the armies placed by the Federal Government after the War between the States in the South were not withdrawn until 1876, or 11 years after the war closed. The same will be true of the armies which occupy the countries both in Europe and Asia at the close of this war. When the soldiers do return they will control every office from the justice of the peace to the President.

9. While the allied military power is holding the world together and keeping alive some semblance of civilization, there will be terrific changes going on in the economic, social, and religious realms. These will be so stupendous in their nature as not even to be conceived or imagined at the present time.

10. When the military control shall cease to exist, there will be in its place some form of an allied federation of nations which will then control the world. This federation of nations must be so organized as to administer justice through some kind of international court and the decisions of the court must be enforced by power of some kind. For if, indeed, there were no force there could be no world federation any more than the decisions of our Supreme Court in America would be respected apart from the force which resides in the Army and Navy of the United States.

Effect on American Workers of Importations of Swiss Watch Movements and Watches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by the president of the American Watch Assemblers Association in a letter addressed to me as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, relative to the brief presented by the Waltham Watch Workers Union, published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 28, 1943.

There being no objection the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 24, 1943.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The American Watch Assemblers Association is concerned with misleading statements made before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and repeated before the Committee on Finance of the Senate, at hearings held before those two committees on House Joint Resolution 111, a resolution to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act, as amended. These statements refer particularly to the alleged effect upon American workers and American watch producers of importations from Switzerland of watch movements and watches under the existing reciprocal trade agreement between Switzerland and the United States and the alleged benefits resulting to Germany from this business.

The association asks the committee to consider the following information:

American dollars paid to Switzerland are not available to Germany. They are held here in the United States, deposited in the blocked account of the Swiss National Bank. Payments for all imports from Switzerland are made into this account as directed and licensed by our Federal Reserve bank. The Swiss National Bank, which is comparable to our Federal Reserve bank, pays the Swiss exporter with its own Swiss francs against the blocked dollars held in the United States. The Swiss manufacturer spends those francs in Switzerland to pay his labor and other production costs. None of it goes to Germany.

Nor does it go to Germany for materials used in watches. Practically all of the steel used in Swiss-made watches comes from Sweden. The brass used in Swiss-made watches most likely is made from copper imported from the United States in 1940. In that year, with the countries around her at war, Switzerland bought from the United States and stored enough copper to supply her needs for a great many years.

Moreover, extremely strict control is exercised by Switzerland over funds remitted by her citizens into Germany. Even had Germany supplied all the brass going into all the Swiss-made watches imported into the United States during 1940, 1941, and 1942, the actual weight of the brass so used would

have had an import cost into Switzerland of not more than $15,000.

And even had all the raw materials come from Germany—which they did not—surely it is infinitely better to have the material converted into watches for use in the United States instead of fuses, instruments, or other war materials for use by Germany.

The domestic manufacturers often have contended that the wages paid to skilled labor is practically the cost of a watch movement. Cost of the raw material in a watch movement is negligible. The benefits and advantages to us in keeping highly skilled Swiss workers employed in making watches for our use rather than producing needed war materials for Germany are so obvious as to need no comment. While they are working for us they are not working for our enemies. Importations from Switzerland help meet America's present need for watches, which American manufacturers cannot now supply.

There is no stock pile of Swiss-made watches in the United States. We have about 20,000 retail stores dealing in watches, and not one has an adequate supply of watches. American-made watches are in great demand but unobtainable, and this accumulated demand for American-made watches will be stronger than ever; after the war domestic manufacturers will have to use all their facilities to supply that demand.

Competition from Swiss watch importations did not reduce the number of American watch factories. It was more than 20 years ago that we had 60 American watch manufacturers. Every one of them making jeweled watches, and many of them making nonjeweled watches, imported many of their parts and much of their machinery from Switzerland. Few watches were imported from Switzerland during the years when most of the American factories went out of business. Competition amongst themselves, lack of capital, lack of quality, failure to keep abreast of style changes, business failures, and mergers caused the reduction in number of American manufacturers. Those same factors are found in the histories of other industries in the United States, such as the automobile industry for instance. Forty years ago, more than 100 firms were making automobiles. Today there are only 5 major automobile manufacturers. In the watch industry three of the original manufacturers of jeweled watches remain in business today. In addition, at least 10 of the manufacturers of domestic nonjeweled watches still are in business. The three manufacturers of jeweled watches are now under indictment by the Department of Justice for violation of the antitrust laws.

Meantime, new jeweled-watch manufacturers have sprung up in America and today they all still face the same competitive difficulties which in the past forced the concentration in the industry.

The policy of reciprocal trade agreements has been adopted by the United States Government. The production of watch movements and watches is one of the principal industries of Switzerland. Naturally, Switzerland is seeking an outlet for this production. We should take it, not let it go to Germany. The State Department entered into this trade agreement because it is advantageous to the United States. Its work should not be undone.

Respectfully submitted.

AMERICAN WATCH ASSEMBLERS ASSOCIATION,
By ROLAND GSELL, *President*.

Missouri River Floods and Federal Programs for Their Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, under permission previously granted, I place in the RECORD a transcript of the proceedings at the closing meeting of the Eight-State Committee on Missouri River Problems, held in Omaha, Nebr., May 21, embodying the remarks of Col. Lewis A. Pick, division engineer, United States Corps of Engineers. The remarks of Colonel Pick will be of interest to all who are interested in current flood problems and especially those who represent districts in the watersheds of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers:

FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION, MAY 21, 1943

After showing of Mr. Towl's pictures, the meeting was called to order at 1:55 o'clock by the temporary chairman.

Chairman WARDEN. This will be made a part of the record, and we thank Mr. Towl for these most interesting pictures. I am sure you would like the new chairman to take over at this time, Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, of South Dakota.

Chairman-elect SHARPE. The next order of business is item No. 1 under No. 7, which is a discussion by Colonel Pick of Federal plans and programs for the Missouri River watershed. Colonel Pick has done and is doing a large amount of useful and valuable work along the Missouri River, in addition to a lot of other duties which the colonel has. I have had the pleasure of conferring with him, and I am sure you will be glad to hear from Colonel Pick.

FEDERAL PLANS AND PROGRAMS FOR THE MISSOURI RIVER WATERSHED

(Col. Lewis A. Pick, Omaha, Nebr.)

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, and guests, I fear you may be disappointed with what I have to tell you. I regret that, due to various circumstances, I am unable to give you a complete or final outline of pending plans for the Missouri River watershed. I assure you, however, that notwithstanding the war, the Missouri River Basin is not being neglected in our planning. You have seen recent evidences of floods in the Missouri Valley. Most of you are familiar with the needs for flood control in the middle Missouri. If you have read your paper today you will note that there is need for flood control in the lower Missouri.

I should like to read a report which I have just received and which will emphasize this point:

"Railroads: M-K-T overtopped at Cul de Sac 5:00 p. m. yesterday. Four to six feet of water at Mokane. Burlington.—No service between Kansas City and Parsons; flooded just north of Machens below St. Charles; using the Wabash between Mexico and St. Louis. Alton.—No through passenger service between Kansas City and St. Louis; flooded out at Machens; using Wabash between Mexico and St. Louis. Missouri Pacific.—Getting through all right on high line through Sedalia; all trains 2 to 3 hours late. Rock Island.—Under water at Chesterfield; using Missouri Pacific tracks."

In addition, numerous highways are flooded. All the levees which have been provided up to this time below the mouth of the Osage River have been overtopped except in a few isolated places where, through the efforts of thousands of men working day and night, they are still being held.

The crest will not reach St. Charles until Saturday or Sunday. The Civil Air Patrol Airport near St. Charles, Mo., is in danger of going under water. Industrial plants in St. Charles must be guarded against inundation. The Union Electric Co.'s transformer system is likely to go out of service unless adequate protection is provided. The city water supply must be protected until the crest passes. The city and county water supply intakes for St. Louis above St. Charles will be jeopardized unless they receive continuous protection. These and about eight miles of levees are all that have been left unflooded in the flood plain in the lower 140 miles of the Missouri River.

WATER OVER LOCAL LEVEES

Except at the Kansas Citys, and at certain military airfields such as at St. Joseph, Mo., and Fort Leavenworth, Kans., the only flood protection in existence along the Missouri River at this time is a system of agricultural levees, which do not provide protection against floods like we have seen this year. These agricultural levees have all been constructed and financed by the local landowners. At the Kansas Citys some work has been done on a local flood-protection project at Federal expense, but further construction has been halted on account of the war.

The Missouri River is an interesting stream. No flood which has occurred has produced maximum flood heights in all its reaches. The major flood at Omaha this spring did not produce any real flooding at Kansas City and beyond. The big flood which is occurring now in the lower river at this time did not pass Kansas City. Most of it is coming out of the Osage River, which is discharging more water now than the Missouri did at Omaha at the peak during the April flood.

It is, of course, physically possible to provide protection against such floods. However, it will require comprehensive thinking as well as comprehensive planning, not only by this committee but every other group that is interested in this great problem, if proper flood protection is provided for this great river. The problem of floodwater from the Missouri is not ended when it passes out at the mouth; it has in the past and is again taking its toll below St. Louis. Control of the water of the Missouri River will not only solve a serious problem in the Missouri River Valley, but will be a most important contribution toward the elimination of destructive floods on the Mississippi.

FLOODS ONLY ONE PROBLEM

Flood protection is one problem that must be solved in the development of this valley. However, that is only one phase of a comprehensive plan of development, as was so ably explained this morning by Governor Sharpe and Mr. Warden. Governor Sharpe says he advocates multiple-purpose projects. I want to add that we who have been dealing with these problems for many years are also convinced that consideration of multiple-purpose projects is inevitable if the maximum use of the water of so large a stream as the Missouri is to be realized.

We know it is possible to develop this river, and I might say a great deal has already been done in that direction, especially in connection with navigation. Now the river is ready for further improvement.

It was pointed out this morning that during one major flood the river was shortened in one reach about 40 percent by cut-offs.

Throughout the ages, prior to the construction of river improvement works, the Missouri River changed its course at will. However, from Sioux City, Iowa (the upstream limit of the existing 6-foot navigation project) to the mouth no cutoffs occurred during this flood. Why? Because of the improvement works which have been installed in the river to stabilize the channel, which many of you can take pride in as having advocated and worked for.

Stabilizing the channel was the logical first step in a comprehensive plan of development of a river having the characteristics of the Missouri.

It has been definitely proved that the river has been pegged down from Sioux City to the mouth. But why is it necessary to peg the river down? Because you must have more stable banks than the river has been able to build of its own accord, if you expect to deny it the natural flood plain which it has reserved. Only then will it be possible to build barriers along the river which will stand and prevent the river from going back into these natural reservoirs.

The river is here. A long reach has been pegged down. Where it has been pegged, it will be possible to build barriers to prevent it from getting out of a floodway which we should provide. When that is done, we need not worry so much about the flood waters, because we can control them. Flood control will be another step forward in developing agriculture in the Missouri River valley, where the fertility of the lands is among the highest in the world.

FLOODS CAN BE REDUCED AND USED

However, as with navigation, flood control is but another step in full development of the water resources of the basin, so we must consider other water uses in connection with flood control. If we do not allow these flood waters to come down in one big wave, we shall not need to have barriers quite so high nor so expensive. If we could store excess water in the upper reaches and let it out gradually, we would not need as much protection in the lower river, and at the same time when the water is released we could use it for other purposes.

There has already been a beginning in the lower part of this valley toward a plan of ultimate development. Congress has already authorized a project consisting of reservoirs in Nebraska, Missouri, and Kansas, three of which would reduce the major flood crest at Kansas City about 3 feet. These three and the other six, supplemented by a system of levees, would take care of all but a most extraordinary flood on the lower river. In the section of the river from Sioux City to Kansas City, it would not appear economical or practical to build reservoirs.

Major floods above Kansas City are generally caused by spring run-off from snow and ice in the upper river above Sioux City. Therefore, if we are to stop these floods from Sioux City to Kansas City, consideration must be given to provide more storage above Sioux City.

RESULTS FROM FORT PECK

A start has been made in that direction by the building of the Fort Peck Dam, which this year reduced the stage of the flood in Omaha by more than 2 feet. Instead of the flood being 22.45 at Omaha, it would have been 24.45 or greater. If I were to hazard a guess, I would say that with a stage of 24.5 it would have been impossible to have prevented Council Bluffs from being flooded with probably greater damage than that which occurred at East Omaha.

The Fort Peck Dam was built primarily as an aid to navigation. However, it is operated so as to store floodwaters during the spring and summer months for release during the dry low-water season later. It thus serves as a flood-control structure also. We have also a dam partially constructed in Kansas to protect the lower river. We have others ready for construction when funds are made available.

That is why I say there has been a lot of work done on this river, and there is a lot of background left on which we can build. However, up to the present time no one has seen fit to say, "I shall work out a plan which will provide everything that is needed for the maximum or complete development of this valley."

WORKING ON CONGRESSIONAL RESOLUTIONS

I came out here a year ago and found a number of congressional resolutions for studies on the river—one study was in the South Dakota area and one in the North Dakota area. I immediately started to work last June on the resolutions for which I am directly responsible. The preliminary draft of one of these reports would have been ready May 15 had it not been for the big flood this spring. I did not consider it proper to submit the report to Congress without including a consideration of the 1943 flood—a flood which might have been greater than the 1881 flood. Therefore, the report will now necessarily be delayed a while longer.

The resolution covering the area in North Dakota concerns not only this watershed, but the watershed of the streams to the east of the Missouri, some of which drain into the Red River of the North. In view of the fact that this investigation deals with two watersheds, the Chief of Engineers saw fit to create a special board of officers to make the report. Col. Malcolm Elliott, division engineer of the Upper Mississippi Valley division, is chairman of the board, and he is with us today. The other member is a civilian, Mr. W. H McAlpine, chief engineer in the Office of the Chief of Engineers in Washington.

We hope to complete this report by early fall. In this connection you must remember that we are deeply involved with work which is essential and vital to the war effort. We are, therefore, limited as to the personnel which we can assign to work on the preparation of the necessary field data and the preparation of these reports. However, we will have that report ready for the consideration of Congress at the earliest possible date.

It was pointed out during the morning session that it was thought highly desirable and necessary that such reports receive the coordination of other governmental agencies concerned. I want to assure you now that on every report which is prepared by the Army Engineers we obtain the coordination of the Federal Power Commission, the Bureau of Reclamation, and all other interested governmental agencies. That will be done on these two reports.

When the two reports have been completed what will we have? I should like to be able to explain to you in detail what we have done and tell you what we are doing and what results we expect to accomplish. To do so now, however, I fear would be premature.

I will say this: "If it is feasible, from an engineering standpoint, to construct multiple-purpose projects which will provide for the use of all water which comes down the Missouri, our reports will outline such a plan."

VISIONS A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

I have another report which I must prepare immediately. At the hearings before the Flood Control Committee in Washington the other day, it was pointed out that we needed additional authority to study the flood situation from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River. A resolution containing such authority has been adopted. As soon as I am authorized to commence the study I propose to prepare the report just as quickly as possible.

These three reports, tying in all previously authorized projects in the valley, I believe, will present a comprehensive plan of development for the Missouri River Valley that every interested group of people can support wholeheartedly.

It will consider the needs for water for irrigating large blocks of land.

It will consider the development of power—certainly enough to pump water for irrigation.

It will consider our flood-control problem on the Missouri River.

It will consider the needs of navigation.

It will also consider other activities, such as recreation, wildlife refuges, and numerous other activities which should be included in such developments. We propose to take into consideration all factors involved in a comprehensive plan of water utilization.

We are now engaged in repairing the levees from Sioux City to Kansas City that were breached during the recent flood. We hope to have them all repaired before any high water can come in June. As soon as possible we plan to start the work of repairing the levees below Kansas City that are now being breached and overtopped. Whether it will be too late for them to grow crops this year I cannot say. However, we will do everything in our power to put those people back on the land, and to keep further rises later in the season from inundating the crops they have been able to plant and get started.

I am glad to have had the opportunity to appear before this committee today. I assure you we are striving to develop a plan which will merit your wholehearted support. [Applause.]

Chairman SHARPE. Thank you, Colonel Pick. I am sure your informative talk has confirmed what we already knew, and that is practically all of the agencies of the United States Government are giving our project a lot of good support. As I told you this morning, I think the genesis of this committee was in the work of Mr. Elwood in calling the meeting at Bismarck, so we owe something to the National Resources Planning Board.

Question for Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem entitled "Question for Americans" by R. L. Nicholson.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUESTIONS FOR AMERICANS

A WAR WORKER ASKS IT—WHAT CAN YOU ANSWER?

(By R. L. Nicholson)

What did you do for freedom today?
A marine on Guadalcanal,
Through a hail of lead and jungle hell,
Crept out to a wounded pal;
And he dragged him back through the slime and muck,
Then, with never a thought of rest,
Back over that deadly route he went

And smashed a machine-gun nest.
It wasn't much fun—the bullets—the mud—
He may have been scared, but he hid it;
He only knew of a job to do
And he didn't quibble, he did it.
What did you do for freedom today?
"All that you could." Think well—
One-millionth as much as that leatherneck did?
—They buried the boy where he fell.

What did you do for freedom today?
A gob on a rubber raft
Drained the last wet drop from his water flask
Then threw it away and laughed.
For 18 days on an endless sea
In a torment of pain he lay;
Drenched and chilled to the bone at night,
And burned to a crisp by day.
He wanted to live, but he knew in his heart
That the odds were a thousand to one;
But he drifted and hoped, consoled by a prayer,
And the thought of a job well done.
What did you do for freedom today?
"All that you could," you declare.
But when you say it, remember the gob
Who died on the raft out there.

What did you do for freedom today?
Nine lads in a B–17
Ran into a flock of Messerschmitts
And died in their wrecked machine.
Oh, they didn't do bad with what they had,
But they flew through hell to do it;
They had smashed Berlin and a dozen "one-ten's,"
But their number was up and they knew it.
They were full of holes, with no controls,
And their ship was a comet of flame;
But they stuck to their guns and the useless stick
And battled on just the same.
What did you do for freedom today?
"All that you could." O. K.;
But if those nine boys in the B–17
Were to ask you, what would you say?

What did you do for freedom today?
I think they've a right to ask.
You're in this fight just as much as they,
And with just as important a task.
Were you at your desk, or bench, or press,
And at work at the starting bell?
Did every minute of this day count?
And the job—did you do it well?
Did you buy a bond or a stamp today?
Or collect any scrap for the pile?
Did you save your grease or throw it away?
Did you drive just an extra mile?
Have you been down to the Red Cross bank
And given a pint of your blood?
Did you send that V-mail letter today?
Did you hoard any rationed food?
Before you begin to complain and gripe
That life is all work and no fun—
Would you trade your dinner for ration K?
Or your overtime pay for a gun?
Just stop every once in a while today
When your lot seems hard and lean,
And think of a gob, and a leatherneck,
And nine boys in a B–17.

Drift Policy Risks Loss of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH H. BALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Drift Policy Risks Loss of Peace" written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of June 1, 1943, commenting on the dangers to peace in the present drift policy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRIFT POLICY RISKS LOSS OF PEACE—UNITED STATES SURRENDER OF WARTIME LEVERAGE ON ALLIES SEEN

(By David Lawrence)

Judging by the pronouncements of our own spokesmen, America seems to be engaged already in "losing the peace."

Gradually the leverage which can be exercised on Allies only during a war is being surrendered, and the American Government evidently content to let the basic issues of organizing the world for peace drift until after hostilities have ceased.

No commitments and no agreements binding on the Allies—known as the United Nations—are apparently to be entered into but a sort of groping or evolutionary process is to set in after the armistice so that conceivably five to ten years thereafter the question of a world organization to preserve peace is to be finally resolved.

This does not fit in with the lessons of experience in World War No. 1. When hostilities had ended and there was no longer need for the money or the manpower of the United States, there was a different attitude on the part of the victors—Great Britain, France, and Italy.

SECRET TREATIES COME UP

The fourteen points on which the armistice was based began to be regarded as a goal rather than a commitment, and soon President Wilson found himself up against spokesmen for the victorious powers who wanted to divide the spoils in accordance with secret treaties. And what could Mr. Wilson do? The war was over. There was no pressure he could exert against the selfishness of the victors.

It is, therefore, surprising to read that the main issues of the kind of organization that will be committed to keep the peace are to be left unsettled for a long time. Under Secretary Welles of the State Department often has outlined with statesmanlike vision the basis of a permanent peace. His latest speech, however, seems to fit in now with the Churchill-Roosevelt philosophy of regional understandings and a loose framework of nations for the after-the-war era.

"For a number of years," said Mr. Welles in a public speech just delivered, "particularly in Europe, social and economic conditions will be in a state of flux. In some of the presently Axis-occupied countries there will be political instability. Both in these countries, as well as in the Axis countries, millions will be starving, and other millions must be repatriated to the homes from which they have been driven. Throughout the world there will be a chaotic, and in some areas, an anarchic state of affairs.

PERIOD OF TRANSITION

"During this period—and no one can today estimate how long it may be—order will have to be maintained by those of the United Nations which will have to assume these necessary functions. It is during that transition period, as well as during the remaining period of the war, that the opportunity may presumably be afforded to the United Nations to undertake the more specific elaboration of the form of international organization upon which they may jointly determine."

Mr. Welles then drew attention to the pan-American agreements, which, he said, were "not brought into existence in a day." He pointed out that perhaps "the surest course for the United Nations to pursue would be the construction of an international organization by the same method of gradual evolution."

If, therefore, the pan-American "regional understanding" is to be the model, then indeed, it would appear that the idea of an association of nations or some other international body, pledged solemnly to keep the peace, is not to be set up after this war is over but that sometime in the distant future there will be a vague evolution toward that end.

PUZZLING APPROACH

There is something puzzling about this approach. Is it possible that disorder in some of the "presently Axis-occupied countries" has anything to do with the opportunity of Great Britain, Russia, the United States and China to get together and commit themselves, along with the other countries of the world which are not in disorder?

If there is to be, as Mr. Welles hopes, a "combination of armed forces made available by the powers which are prepared to do so, which may be used regionally or on a broader scale," scant opportunity for such an understanding will be affected when the war is over and armies have been demobilized and America has again given her men and resources in a "war to end war."

First Things First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 13, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Post for Sunday, May 9, seems to me contains wise counsel so far as the action of Congress with regard to labor legislation is concerned:

FIRST THINGS FIRST

John L. Lewis' coal strike has made Congress realize more clearly than ever before the need for legislation to curb abuses of the enormous powers now in the hands of organized labor. Many Congressmen believe, moreover, that with the threat of another strike at the end of the present truce hanging over the mines, the administration will be inclined to favor labor legislation for the first time in several years. So there is a clamor in the House for consideration of old labor bills some of which have been gathering dust since the early days of the previous Congress. That is scarcely a hopeful outlook so far as meeting the present emergency is concerned.

We believe that the present Congress may well deliberate upon ways and means of enhancing the responsibility of labor unions. For example, unions owe their members a complete accounting for the expenditure of their funds, just as corporations owe such an accounting to their stockholders. As a means of avoiding corruption and of protecting the political rights of the individual, unions should also be forbidden to spend the dues of members in the form of political contributions. In short, Congress must some day get around to enacting a code of fair conduct for unions, as it has already done for employers. And that day should not be long delayed.

It would be a serious mistake, however, to inject this issue into consideration of the Connally bill. That bill is very limited in scope. It is designed to meet an emergency. More important than any of its provisions touching the relationship between employers and employees are the sections defining the relations between the Government and organized unions when industries essential to the war have been paralyzed by strikes. President Roosevelt has pointed out once more that the coal miners are now working for the Government. Strikes against the Government or against the national safety simply cannot be tolerated. The immediate task before Congress is to back up the administration in dealing with this crisis and every move for labor legislation that detracts from this one objective runs contrary to the national interest at this time. We hope that the House will concentrate its efforts upon improvement and enactment of the Connally bill, without attempting to cure all abuses that have come to light at one fell swoop.

The National Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Hon. HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Member of Congress, fourth district, Oregon, station KEX, recorded Wednesday, May 19, broadcast the evening of May 22:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Before I embark upon a discussion of the national food situation, which is my principal topic this evening, just a few words about what Congress has been doing this week. For the third time, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives were defeated Tuesday in their effort to pass the Rumi plan. The first time we lost by 17 votes, the second time by 4 votes, and this week, on the first roll call on the conference report, we lost by 8 votes.

The highlight of this week, of course, was the appearance of Prime Minister Winston Churchill. When a famous personage addresses the Congress in joint session, the meeting is held in the House of Representatives' Chamber. The Members of the House and Senate, members of the Supreme Court, and the Cabinet gather on the floor of the House. Visitors are permitted in the gallery so far as its capacity will permit. The gallery only seats about 600. Consequently each Member of Congress is given only 1 visitor's ticket, and there is always a mad scramble, beginning a week ahead, for extra tickets. I know from experience that there are no extra tickets, so a great many people are disappointed.

As a matter of fact, getting a seat in the gallery is only half the battle. When the President or Winston Churchill is scheduled to speak in the Capitol, the entire area is surrounded by police and Federal Bureau of Investigation men, in uniform and in plain clothes. Each entrance is guarded by four or five officers, and numerous officers are stationed in all the halls and corridors. Handbags and bulging pockets are investigated, and brief cases are not permitted. Every possible precaution is taken, and your credentials must be just right if you gain admittance to the building at all.

As I said before, however, the main topic of my talk this evening is the food situation. I am a member of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, and am in charge of the subcommittee on compilation of reports. In other words, I am in the fortunate or unfortunate position, depending upon how you wish to look at it, of having all of the data gathered by the 40 members of this committee, and their nine subcommittees, pass through my hands. We have been working only a little more than a month, but the facts that have been uncovered are enough to indicate rather clearly that the food situation in this country is far more serious than most people imagine.

As a matter of fact, it was the lack of consistent and reliable information on the subject of food and food supply that led to the formation of the committee. It was discovered shortly after Congress convened that reports on the subject from various Government agencies were often in sharp conflict. We heard statements by men in positions of authority that the food supply was splendid, and shortly thereafter learned from men of apparently equal authority that a crisis impended. On the Republican side of the aisle in the House of Representatives, the leadership came to the conclusion that figures and facts presented by Government departments and by official information sources could not be relied upon. It was recognized, however, that unless dependable facts could be obtained, the Congress would be helpless in doing anything toward righting the situation. Therefore, the Republican Food Study Committee was appointed and went to work. I should point out that this committee is not a committee operating at Government expense. Its activities are financed by the Republicans, and thus far, rather largely by the members themselves. I think such a committee should be an official congressional committee, but quite obviously the administration Members, being in the majority in the House, would not agree to the establishment of a committee which would "dig up the dirt," so to speak, on the failures of the administration to solve the food problem.

Now let me give you some facts, selected more or less at random, from my notes on the several hearings we have held and on some of the investigations made thus far:

Are our present food control policies preventing inflation: Figures obtained from the Industrial Conference Board, an organization of undoubted integrity, show that, in the first 15 months following the outbreak of World War No. 1, the rise in food prices was 15 percent. At the end of the first 15 months following Pearl Harbor, the rise in food prices has been 18 percent.

Testimony in hearings in New York, and in Boston, indicated that between 75 percent and 90 percent of all poultry sold in the 13 northeastern States is going through black markets, and at prices generally far beyond the 18 percent increase just mentioned.

The head of a large potato marketing concern told us, 3 weeks ago, that he was quitting business—that not a single carload of potatoes for normal markets was available on the entire Atlantic coast.

Small grocery stores and markets are closing at an alarming rate. Large poultry markets, both in New York and in Boston, I mean the streets and sections of the town normally a beehive of activity in the poultry trade, are closed up and vacant.

A man conversant with the livestock and feed situation over the entire Nation, a Mr. McConnell, who is chairman of the Feed Industry Council, and who quite obviously knew what he was talking about, stated that, on the basis of animal population of the country, at the end of this year there will be a 20-percent shortage in the feed requirements for meat animals.

A producer of baby chicks read letters to us in Boston from his customers. They represent large producers of poultry and are canceling their orders for chicks, declaring that ceiling prices will not permit them to produce poultry for market at existing costs of production.

A meat dealer in New York told us, and rather conclusively proved his statement, that steers at $17.60 could not be processed and made ready for the market and be sold at 22 cents per pound. Consequently, he is quitting and liquidating his business and named a number of others doing the same thing.

The egg trade has been completely demoralized according to testimony we heard, due, they said, largely to the fact that regulations, ceilings, and grades were established by people in the Office of Price Administration who do not know the egg business and who apparently would take no counsel from people who do.

I could go on indefinitely citing such examples, but I believe those given are enough to indicate that there is a great deal wrong with our handling of the food problem.

Obviously, it is easy for anyone, or for a study committee, to find fault and criticize. That is not our objective. Our committee of 40 members, and in fact I think a majority of the Members in Congress, are determined to do everything humanly possible to prevent hunger and suffering.

We believe we have not only found the principal reason for the chaos in the food situation, but we have decided on a measure that should, if enacted, help materially to solve the problem.

First, the cause of the trouble: We have found that no less than 10 different agencies of the Government have some control over food, and it is clear that these agencies are not pulling together.

The Office of Price Administration is in charge of price fixing and rationing.

The Commodity Credit Corporation negotiates the purchase and sale of crops and finances certain adjustments.

The Surplus Commodities Corporation has stocks of food from previous purchases.

The Army is making large purchases, frequently offering prices considerably above established ceilings.

The Navy is purchasing food on a basis similar to that of the Army

The Lend-Lease Administration is buying food through the Agricultural Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture.

The War Production Board has definitely appeared in the food picture, both with respect to the limitation and control of farm machinery, and in the acquisition of certain stock piles from time to time.

The Board of Economic Warfare has certain policies with respect to both buying and selling food products.

The War Shipping Administration, through the control of the movement of ships, has a direct bearing upon such commodities as sugar and coffee.

The Food Administration of the Department of Agriculture, under the head of Chester Davis, who is known as the Food Czar, has a great deal to do with production and marketing of food.

Obviously, also, certain activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the State Department, and other Government departments, have some direct or indirect contact with the problem.

It is quite obvious to me, and to the other members of the Food Study Committee, that a coordinated and efficient and sensible handling of a phase of our war effort as vital as food is cannot be had with 10 or more authorities of Government involved in the picture. All of our studies and hearings reveal clearly that the confusion is directly traceable to the fact that there are too many bosses.

Accordingly, the Food Study Committee has developed a bill which was introduced in the House this week by THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ohio, Chairman of the Food Study Committee. This bill, if enacted into law, would consolidate under one head in the Department of Agriculture, the entire control of food from production to consumption, including War, Navy, and lend-lease purchases, as well as control over the import and export of food. This bill, we think, would so consolidate and concentrate the authority over food as to make an orderly administration possible.

We think this can be done if all factors are centralized under one head, but in our opinion nothing can be done of a constructive nature so long as the conflicting forces now in control spend half their time in battling one another and in writing new and conflicting regulations.

Our present system is complicated and confused. More than 90,000 employees are engaged in the administration of the food problem now. In the First World War the food administration under the direction of Mr. Hoover never had more than 3,000 employees, and I might add that the food problems of that war were even more serious than those of today.

As secretary of the Food Study Committee I have been talking about, I can say for the committee that we are anxious to have factual reports from the people concerning food. We would like to know how the consumer is effected, how the small retailer is faring, how the farmer is getting along under the existing situation, and we would like to have suggestions for improving matters or comment and criticism on the bill I have just mentioned. We are anxious above everything else to clear up the food dilemma, for we are well aware that should we fail to do this there may be serious shortages and possibly actual hunger in some of the densely populated areas of our country within the next 12 months.

I hope I have not painted a picture that is too gloomy. I feel that the situation can be improved, and I want to assure you that your Representatives in Congress are devoting serious effort to that end.

Good night.

Capitol Stuff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John O'Donnell from the Washington Times-Herald of June 2, 1943:

CAPITOL STUFF

(By John O'Donnell)

For the first time since the New Deal came to Washington, we are observing the interesting spectacle of private citizens thumbing their noses at a White House plea that they please step up and receive a hand-out of about a half billion cash money from the Treasury—the half billion being only an initial pay-off with promises of more to come, several billions in fact.

The cash that Franklin Delano Roosevelt would like to push out from the Treasury and that nobody wants to touch is the millions that the inner group in the White House thinks should be spent by way of a subsidy to the meat packers and processors of food so that the civilian cost of eating will be whittled down by a gift from the Nation's pocketbook.

So far as we've been able to discover, only the most ardent New Dealers and the inner-palace guard at the White House are behind the present subsidy plan.

The present scheme isn't the Canadian or the English plan to hold down the cost of living.

Labor, so far as John L. Lewis is concerned—and it came into being to meet his demands for higher wages—has cursed it as a White House sophistry.

The farmers don't want it and are fighting it on Capitol Hill.

Cattlemen and meatpackers, and the spokesmen for chain stores and independents, have damned it out of hand, insisting that it will needle up the black market transactions.

Even F. D. R.'s Food Administrator Chester Davis opposes the plan and Federal Loan Administrator Jesse Jones, who will have to put up the cash from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, shrugs his shoulders and points out that the orders come from the White House—and that's that.

Now, the theory of Chester Davis is that this payment of subsidies to hold down the price level of butter and meat, for example, will encourage the consumption of these luxury foods and, in cold fact, decrease, because of the increased demand, the total amount of food in the American and lend-lease breadbasket.

By holding down the consumer cost of butter by Federal subsidies you divert milk to this product—and thereby cut down the amount of milk available for milk products of greater food value.

The same holds true for meat, according to the Davis theory. Seven pounds of cereals are necessary to produce one pound of meat on the hoof. Cereals require little farm labor, but beef cattle and milk cows demand constant care. With the labor supply dwindling by demands of the armed forces, why not feed the cereals directly to the humans instead of making meat available to them at a lower cost?

All this, of course, goes back to the "guns instead of butter" argument that came from Germany before '39, and the ancient doctrine that we eat too much anyway—"digging our graves with our teeth."

A few days ago the spokesmen for the meat dealers, the retail stores, the Office of Price Administration, and Mr. Money Bags Jesse Jones sat down to talk over this payment of subsidies to make meat cheaper for the housewife. They talked with their hair down, much more frankly than they will ever talk in the publicity of a congressional committee hearing.

Here were the important gentlemen sitting around a Washington table. We report their observations.

First comes incisive Tom Connor, spokesman for the meat division of the Great A. & P. chain. Barks Connor grimly:

"This subsidy is not going to alter the black market situation—not one iota. It won't provide more meat for the ration coupons. Furthermore, the people in the business who know the situation have not been consulted about this subsidy plan. You know it's already been worked out and this meeting is so much eye-wash.

"Enforce the laws you now have without creating more laws and more confusion. Office of Price Administration is not enforcing its regulations now and never has.

"Why not do some thinking before you pass regulations, not after?

"Everybody in the Nation is hoping that the morale of the Germans and Italians is crumbling, but we'd better be God-damned sure that our morale doesn't crumble before theirs. And if this continued harassing by Office of Price Administration continues, if people continue to be shut off from meat by senseless regulations of Office of Price Administration, if the armed forces continue to be unable to get their needed supply of meat—and that situation is going to get a lot worse—our own morale will crumble. This subsidy is just prolonging the agony a little longer—it will definitely increase the black market because it adds to the buying power."

Independent Packer G. W. Birrell interjected:

"They tell us to 'hold that price line.' The only line that is being held now is the line of suckers."

An unidentified retailer growled out: "Wish you could have your Administrator, Prentiss Brown, come down and sweep up those red stamps that customers threw on the floors of our stores last week."

Swift & Co.'s Paul Smith then went into action:

"If you're honestly trying to roll back the cost of meat to the consumer, you can roll it back three times as much by curbing the black market and honestly enforcing your own regulations as you can by this subsidy that only creates another and bigger policing job. Where are you going to get the personnel to enforce it? What about the fellows right now doing business on the black market and making enormous profits? Where are we going to get the auditors and bookkeeepers to do this new job when we haven't got enough as it is?"

Office of Price Administration's spokesman, Charles Elkington, then delivered the White House ukase:

"This subsidy is in accordance with the national policy against inflation. Furthermore, it comes to us as a directive. It is the President's order. Our job is to do it."

Then came the final words from Secretary of Commerce Jesse Jones. It was a blunt statement that the subsidy plan was "a directive from the President" and, whether the group present "liked it or not, it was going into effect."

The group then retorted that, this being the case, they wished to go on record as being unanimously and unalterably opposed to the subsidy. Cudahy's Victor Norton added that tart observation that "political pressure here in Washington" was behind the black market in meat and that a housecleaning here in the Capital might do good.

"Pressure from politicians has caused the Department of Agriculture to issue hundreds and hundreds of licenses to slaughter cattle for black market trading—as long as it goes on you will have bigger and bigger black markets."

Memorial Day Address of Hon. Louis E. Miller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER C. PLOESER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the eloquent Memorial Day address delivered over radio station KMOX, St. Louis, May 30, 1943, by my very able and esteemed colleague from the Eleventh District of Missouri, the Honorable LOUIS E. MILLER, as follows:

The rich rays of the morning sun, as they came over the eastern hills in glory, heralded the beginning of a beautiful day of devotion—a day fresh with the fragrance of flowers and carpeted with nature's noblest green.

This day has the dignity and tenderness of funeral rites without the sadness. This is a day not only for the dead whom we commemorate, but for the living whom we would have dedicate themselves anew to the principles and purposes of true democracy—for democracy is America.

Throughout the Nation, loving hands and hearts have united in doing honor to the day, which belongs to the heroic dead. At one time this day belonged only to the soldier dead—now it belongs to all who in superb sacrifice gave their lives for humanity.

Memories' walls are carved with deeds of daring by those who gave their lives for their country. We recall the forefathers who blazed the way and in whose blood a nation was born—and in whose spirit it has been sustained. A sublime faith in the efficacy of our form of government, untouched by foreign philosophies, is the safest assurance of its future.

Service to one's country ultimately recognizes no rank. Death gives the same distinction to all. Whether in battle or life it levels general and private to the same rank. It embalms all with the oil of the same ultimate end. Death is the penance and penalty that all must pay upon earth. But, alas, it is the great purifier. Those who have seen the excitement of battle and drunk of the exultation of victory have returned to dedicate themselves to the preservation of the Republic and the ideals for which it has stood.

World War No. 1 has passed and now World War No. 2 has come. The armies of the first war have been disbanded, but there is another army which no Presidential order could disband, but only the Supreme Commander could reduce the ranks of those who can answer the roll call no more. They have already pitched their tents upon fame's eternal camping ground and their deeds live indelibly in the memory of those who loved them. Time has enriched the recollection of those days, and we live in appreciation of what they did for democracy.

After the first World War, no one ever dreamed that there was the bold vision to conceive, or the insane audacity to attempt to execute a scheme to impoverish and enslave countless peoples, much less a world.

From what clay could there come a madman who would exult in mass murder and make science the silent accomplice in the skilled and speedy destruction of innocent peoples? Yet these organized forces of evil, disaster, and death have been hurled against the structure of our twentieth-century civilization. But to meet and destroy these agencies is the duty of the living and the privilege of the dead, whom we have honored today. We keep communion with our sacred dead through the causes for which they fight and die. Who, but the craven coward, fears the hideous face of war when the cause is just? We may, some of us, touch the tragic depths of grief only to rise to the lofty summits of glory through their sacrifices and noble deeds. We cannot count war a waste and ruin when we are forced to defend our lives and possessions against the stealthy assault of an international assassin.

War is a definite tragedy when it strikes home and touches the heart of someone. When a loss occurs in a household, kindly neighbors come to compensate and console for the grief that has been sustained. Then it is that we begin to learn something about the cost of democracy in terms of blood and affection.

This Nation today has the finest fighting force that ever took the field. It has a just cause to sustain. It has the heritage of a great people to preserve. What an inspiring spectacle to see the brave youth of this Nation, who prefer the risks and the dangers abroad to the relative safety at home. They may not express their sentiments in the slogans of a statesman's creed. They ask for the anxious moments—they seek the hazards without the sighs. They said simply to themselves—"it is better to go in a common cause in the companionship of one's friends than to stay at home and see this Government destroyed by a bloodthirsty dictator or poisoned by an alien philosophy."

A few days ago, one of my colleagues in Congress told me a story of heroism that touched me deeply.

In Worcester, Mass., there stands a simple monument to the memory of John McGarty. He was just a high-school boy before he enlisted in the Navy. While serving on a light cruiser it was torpedoed, causing the ship to get out of control and to run in a circle rendering it impossible for the crew to take to the lifeboats. As the ship began to sink and the danger of disaster hung like a pall, at that moment young McGarty rushed forward and confronting the captain volunteered to go below. The captain reminded him that he was not asking for volunteers. McGarty begged to be permitted to volunteer. As he drew his hood over head and disappeared below in the roaring steam of the engine room, the ship slowly came to a stop. The crew then safely took to the lifeboats and as they watched from a distance that ship with the mortal remains of young McGarty at last sink out of sight—the captain standing with his cap raised toward heaven, slowly said "Today, God, I give you a man."

Do we really appreciate the deeds of our youth? Do we realize that in this great adventure they meet and defeat our foes upon every front? Do we grasp the meaning of the moment and gage fully what is going on every hour of the day and upon every front of the world? That, regardless of time, climate or space, a civilization is being saved and freedom is being reborn, not only for us but for all peoples of the earth?

There is no one anywhere who wants this conflict to continue 1 second longer than is necessary to bring about the full defeat of the foe. Yet it could end years and months earlier if everyone could feel the throbbing heartbeats of those who eagerly await the return of a son and realize that to win we must have the will to produce—the will to stay on the job—the will to avoid stoppage in work—the will to avoid paralyzing production, regardless of provocation until final victory is won.

The Axis do not debate hours, wages, or conditions—they demand servitude or offer the alternative of the firing squad. This is not, and must not, be the American method—because we recognize that there are patriots in the factory, the forest, and on the farm, as well as upon the field of battle.

The legion of the living who will come back to us from freedom's front will forever bind us to the fields of glory which they have ennobled and enshrined in our memories.

How can we ever forget the bravery upon Bataan and the stalwart courage of the defenders of Corregidor, or the wonderful epic of gallantry at Wake, or the inspiring defense of the sultry Southwest Pacific, or the valiant victors in Africa?

The passion of gratitude should grow greater with each passing Memorial Day. As we face the consequences of this vast struggle, we must be prepared to play our part manfully in and following the great triumphs that lie ahead. We must not forget that success upon the field of battle brings responsibilities to the Congress and the council table which shall not be shirked.

The world changes. To have fought and won and then to feebly forsake our posts of duty and responsibility in the desperate days ahead is to forfeit our claim to peace in this and succeeding generations. It is worse—it is to forget the deeds of the dead and to make sacrifice upon the field of honor hollow and empty, and citizenship itself a meaningless mockery.

The world has been saved for democracy—it must now be saved by democracy. The power to plunge the world into a sea of blood and tears and to pull down the pillars of civilization must be taken forever from the hands of despots and madmen, and in its place established positive international peace and order, with the force and determination to see that it is permanently preserved. Democracy will not survive alone upon its hopes and aspirations. It must have the sustaining power of a world police force.

The war for liberty will ultimately triumph. The blood-stained swords will be torn from the dirty hands of dictators and the ghastly conspiracy to conquer and enslave a world will end.

In preparing for peace we must recognize and practice equality, justice, and freedom for all. These are the keystones of the arch of democracy. From such equality and justice, there will be born a real brotherhood of men; a freedom of action and conscience and an exalted understanding of the equality of all men before government and God.

Here in America the shackles of servitude were first broken—her destiny now is to emancipate mankind. We cannot waver in finishing the work which became our duty when we entered this war. And if perpetual freedom and peace is the fruition of this costly conflict, let us all continue with unyielding effort and God's speed to complete victory.

Food Is Our Most Serious Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me on June 1, 1943:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Next to the war the most serious problem confronting Americans now is the food shortage. Steel and lumber are important, but food is vital. Food is almost as vital as air and water. Ninety-nine percent of the editors of the country responding recently to a Nation-wide poll, said that food was the paramount national problem for 1943.

Our food situation is badly bungled, and some radical changes in policies and practices must be made immediately. Our present plight has been coming on for years. It is due largely to the impractical theories of the administration, one of which is that surpluses should be avoided. You will remember that millions of little pigs were killed; thousands of acres were plowed under; and millions were paid out to farmers for not producing. The law of retribution has overtaken us. An old maxim says: "Willful waste makes woeful want." Let me remind you that nobody ever went hungry on a surplus.

The test of management and statesmanship is ability to produce goods and services, rather than the ability to destroy them. While our country is a great producer of food, strange as it may seem, our imports of food have exceeded our exports every year for the past 20 years. It is a mistake for us to believe and say that we can feed the world. Our population has increased 30 percent in the last 25 years, while our food production has increased less than 20 percent.

Our serious plight is also due in part to present unwise regulations and unintelligent price fixing. Those in authority refuse

to admit their mistakes and cling to their theories and to their jobs. Misguided theorists must be removed and men of experience in the various fields of production and distribution must supplant them. Departmental jealousies must be ended. Forthright action and honesty of purpose would be a salutary change. Accurate information and figures are a critical necessity. At present the figures put out by the Government are notoriously inaccurate.

Because of these facts, the Republicans in Congress were moved by patriotic duty to try to bring order out of chaos. A committee was set up to study the food situation and make recommendations. I was made chairman of that committee. We have been actively at work without any expense to the Government. We have held public hearings in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and other great consuming centers. We shall contact the rural and western sections as rapidly and widely as time permits. Interested persons are communicating with our committee in large numbers. You are invited to participate in this study. Write to the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, Room 546 House Office Building, Washington, D. C., or to me, THOMAS A. JENKINS, Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Our studies have already disclosed many alarming situations. We have come to believe with Thomas Jefferson that "Were we to be directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap we should soon want for bread."

We believe the administration must face facts, and deal with fundamentals. Problems of scarcity cannot be solved at swanky watering places where rationing is unknown and special permits are issued for a bountiful supply of fancy liquors. The immediate situation is too critical for generalizations on fanciful post-war plans. Let's find the reason why 40,000 grocery stores have been forced out of business in this country in the past year. Let's find out why 90 percent of the poultry produced in the large eastern poultry sections is being handled through the black markets.

The Office of Price Administration and other food administrations in Washington are breaking down. Radical changes must come soon. Inefficiency is producing chaos and peril. Production is falling off. Black markets are thriving and housewives are spending most of their time in figuring out how to get food. Our people, my friends, are facing hunger. Yet when the President recently set up his super war cabinet, no special consideration was given to food. This causes me to wonder why.

Our Food Study Committee is operating constructively. We have recommended that all food activities of the Government be placed under 1 head. The proof of the dangerous lack of administration understanding of this critical condition lies in the fact that at the present time 10 different agencies have some authority over foods. Recently Chester Davis was brought back to Washington to be placed in full charge of all food activities. This has not been done. The administration has treated him as it has all its key appointees, denying him initiative and effective authority. He, or some other competent man, should be given full charge of, and responsibility for, the whole food situation. He should not be handicapped by this persistent inside influence which palsies with politics every agency created.

By direction of the Republican Congressional Food Study Committee, I introduced a bill to place all food activities under the full control of a food administrator. He would be given full power and responsibility. This bill is getting the hearty approval of the country. Walter Lippmann, for instance, said recently: "Therefore the true line of reorganization is that proposed in the Jenkins bill."

Our bill carefully provides for the best interests of the consumer as well as the producer.

The system proposed under this bill can be administered much more effectively and economically than the present system. During the first World War, the Food Administration employed only 3,000 persons. We now are employing between eighty and ninety thousand.

One of the most serious food problems is that of the vegetable growers and the canners. They have been neglected shamefully. It is almost too late to relieve them. Planting is over in much of the South. Only a few months ago Washington was proclaiming there would be no shortage of vegetables. Yet the truck farmers and canners were warning that shortages would occur. There is danger that there will be a severe shortage. Congressman LANDIS of Indiana, a member of our committee, has introduced a bill to deal with perishable food, which, if passed, will bring some relief.

The poultry business is also in a sorry plight. New England, with Boston as its principal distributing point, is a great poultry-producing section. At a public hearing before our committee in Boston it was developed that the poultry business was at a standstill. From 80 to 95 percent of the poultry production was passing through the black market. The old Faneuil Hall Market which has operated for 115 years and which is a great poultry market did not have a single chicken for sale on the Saturday before our meeting. Chicken hatcheries in the country have drowned many thousands of chicks during the past few weeks. This was due to market uncertainties and to the shortage of feed. This condition obtains in all parts of the country.

Just recently it was found that Ohio truckers were moving chickens from Delaware back to Ohio through the black markets. No price ceilings or sanitary regulations can reach such operations.

Black markets thrive only because of the inability of the consumer to get desired merchandise through legitimate channels.

In Washington one day last week about 1,500 bushels of green beans were dumped as garbage when beans were selling for 20 cents per pound.

Last year millions of dollars worth of crops and vegetables were not gathered due to lack of machinery and manpower help. The situation for this year has not changed materially.

Ladies and gentlemen, our hope is in our American initiative and capacity to meet emergencies. We must face facts. Washington authorities must give up pet schemes. Hunger cannot be relieved by theories. We must produce and distribute before we can expect to consume.

Production and more production must be our watchword.

Good night.

Congressman Morrison of Louisiana Calls Attention to Mistakes of War Rationing and War Production Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. MORRISON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the grave mistakes that have been made in the first year of our war rationing and food production planning. Let us take sugar as one of the glaring examples of how we are mishandling our food program. We may start back in 1941, when we were just getting our defense program under way, when everyone knew we were preparing for an actual war, we fumbled the ball by ordering a reduction in the beet-sugar acreage of nearly 17 percent, resulting in a production below our actual needs, when we should have been preparing a huge stock pile against increased war demands. The Louisiana cane growers have received such a raw deal from the Federal authorities in recent years that many are turning their acreage to other crops. This is especially true of the small cane grower.

The next big mistake was our failure to pass a sugar act in December 1941 that would encourage the construction of new sugar processing plants in the continental United States. Instead, we listened to our planners who insisted on guaranteeing a market for sugar from the Philippines, which we soon lost for the duration of the war through capture of the islands by Japan. We have also lost a large share of our sugar supply from Cuba and Puerto Rico through the sinking of our ships in the Atlantic by submarines, making the transportation of sugar in normal quantities from Cuba and Caribbean points impossible.

To still further confuse the sugar situation, the Office of Price Administration and the Bureau of Economics of the Department of Agriculture in the spring of 1942 issued a leaflet entitled "Victory Begins at Home", in which our so-called food experts, in answering the question of How much sugar do you need, said None. Since this leaflet was issued, scores of newspapers and magazines, relying on the statement mentioned as a Government established fact, have published articles with a view of selling the American public on the idea that sugar was just a sweetening agent, but not really needed as a food. Our good American, John Public, was gullible enough to swallow this propaganda for awhile, but he is waking up to the fact that he was going without the sugar he needed and Lend-Lease was moving large quantities of sugar to Russia, England and our other allies. Certainly we do not begrudge our allies the sugar we have sent them, but why try to tell the American public that they do not really need sugar and then turn around and send large supplies of sugar in our limited number of ships to our allies, if it is not a good and necessary food?

As another illustration of how we have been trying to kid ourselves about the value of sugar, we quote from correspondent Ernie Pyle of the World-Telegram in a dispatch from Tunisia, "When our infantry goes into a big push in northern Tunisia each man gets three bars of V-ration chocolate, enough to last one day. He takes no other food."

Again this year our Government failed to encourage and increase the mainland cane acreage or announce its policy for the growing and processing of 1943 sugar beets until the planting season for many areas was past. Our experts simply sat back and said, "Oh well, if worst comes to worst we can take some ships and go to Cuba and get sugar," but—can we? Right now it appears that our 1943 crop in mainland cane and beet sugar will

be at least 500,000 tons short of the lowest estimate of our sugar experts. We have recently been given a promise that 200,000 tons of additional sugar will be moved from Caribbean areas for canning purposes. This is an inadequate quantity and unless our Government officials take more positive action than announced to date, we are not going to have enough sugar to permit the proper amount of home or commercial canning.

Recently our new War Food Administrator called attention to the fact that while our experts plan to supply the American public with foods totaling 2,800 calories per day, England, a country that always imports three-fourths of its food, bases its minimum requirements on 3,100 to 3,200 calories per day. It is just about time that the American public wakes up and kicks out our great array of planners and experts into the defense work and begin to base our food requirements on just old American horse sense, which can be relied upon to tell us when we are getting the proper amount and variety of food. We will have a lot more men for the Army when we dispense with our food planners, besides cutting down our Federal pay roll.

Bill To Prevent Strikes That Will Protect Labor and Guarantee Individual Right To Quit Any Employment—A Bill That Will Apply to Both Management and Labor

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I expect to support any bill that will stop or have a tendency to stop strikes in war industries. In the early part of November 1941, before Pearl Harbor, I insisted upon the passage of a bill that would stop strikes. Recently I was accorded the courtesy of a hearing on this same bill, which was reintroduced January 6, 1943, and is H. R. 147, before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the Honorable SAM HOBBS is chairman. The testimony before the committee at that time, which was May 6, 1943, was as follows:

Mr. HOBBS. We will take Mr. PATMAN'S bill up next, H. R. 147, because of that being first introduced. We would be glad to hear from you, Mr. PATMAN.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE WRIGHT PATMAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, sir. I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this committee on behalf of H. R. 147, which will, I hope, be inserted in the record at this point.

Mr. HOBBS. It will be inserted in the record at that point, or wherever it logically falls in the reporter's transcript.

"H. R. 147

"A bill prohibiting certain acts interfering with the national-defense program or with normal Government activity, and for other purposes

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That it shall be unlawful for two or more persons to conspire together for the purpose of preventing, stopping, hindering, delaying, or interrupting any work or service necessary to the national defense program, or for the purpose of preventing, stopping, hindering, delaying, or interrupting any work or service essential to the normal operation of the Government of the United States, or of any department, independent establishment, or other agency thereof.

"SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of any agency of the United States dealing with labor, or with the wages, hours of labor, or working conditions of employees, to recommend to the President any changes in such wages, hours of labor, or working conditions which it deems necessary to remedy any condition unfair or inequitable to employees in any employment necessary to the national defense program.

"(b) Upon receiving any such recommendation the President, if he deems such action necessary to remedy such condition, shall issue an order directing the employer of such employees to take such action as is necessary to so remedy such condition. If, within a period of 30 days after the issuance of such order, such employer fails to take action in compliance with such order, he shall be guilty of a crime and punished as prescribed in section 3 hereof.

"SEC. 3. Any violation of section 1 or 2 of this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to prohibit any person or persons from organizing for the purpose of petitioning or making representations to any officer or agency of the United States or of any State, and nothing in this act shall be deemed to prohibit any person from quitting any employment."

Mr. PATMAN. All right. Now, this bill is to prohibit certain acts interfering with the national-defense program. The reason the words "interfering with the national-defense program" were used was to embrace any essential war industry. It was felt by those with whom I conferred that that phrase would be all-embracing, that that would include everything that is essential to national defense and essential to a war, any essential war industry, and it also includes any normal Government activity. In other words, this bill proposes "that it shall be unlawful for two or more persons to conspire together for the purpose of preventing, stopping, hindering, delaying, or interrupting any work or service necessary to the national-defense program," which is construed to mean any essential war industry, "or for the purpose of preventing, stopping, hindering, delaying, or interrupting any work or service essential to the normal operation of the Government of the United States, or of any department, independent establishment, or other agency thereof."

APPLIES TO BOTH MANAGEMENT AND LABOR

It will be noted, Mr. Chairman, that the language applies not just to workers but it applies to management as well. It applies to both management and labor. Labor in this bill is amply protected. It is provided in section 2 that, "it shall be the duty of any agency of the United States dealing with labor, or with the wages, hours of labor, or working conditions of employees, to recommend to the President any changes in such wages, hours of labor, or working conditions which it deems necessary to remedy any condition unfair or inequitable to employees in any employment necessary to the national-defense program."

"Upon receiving this recommendation the President, if he deems such action necessary to remedy such condition, shall issue an order directing the employer of such employees to take such action as is necessary to so remedy such condition." So labor is amply protected in this bill.

RESERVES TO INDIVIDUAL RIGHT TO QUIT WORK

It provides a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both, and it reserves to the people the right of a group of any number to petition or make representations to their Government or any agency thereof, and it also reserves to the individual the right to quit any employment he desires. The essence of the offense is that it shall be unlawful for two or more persons to conspire together to stop or slow up work in an essential war industry during war or in any Government activity.

FEW STRIKES, YES; ALSO FEW DESERTIONS IN ARMY

Strikes have not been stopped. I know that practically all the laboring people in this country are patriotic. Labor has done a wonderful job, and anyone who goes out over these United States, like any of us have gone, and who has witnessed the enormous production of labor, cannot do anything else except tell the truth about labor and say that labor has done a wonderful job. At the same time our armed forces have done a wonderful job, but we have a law that although they are doing a wonderful job if just one deserts or fails to do his part he can be court-martialed or even sentenced to death. So, it is no reflection upon the millions of men in the service that there is a law that will punish the very few who are guilty of desertion or failing to do their duty in time of war. Neither is it a reflection upon the patriotic laboring people of this country that there is a law that will in a like fashion, or in like manner, punish those in labor who are guilty of offenses against our war effort, that are harmful to it, just the same as we punish those in the armed forces who are guilty of such offenses.

STRIKES CONTINUE

Now, strikes have not been stopped. Although the responsible leaders of our labor movement in this country, I believe, have made an honest, conscientious and sincere effort to stop strikes they have been unsuccessful in doing so, and strikes continue, and in presenting this bill it is not an attack upon labor. It is for the purpose of reaching those groups that their recognized labor leaders cannot handle. Now, this bill, I believe, will stop strikes in essential industries.

STRIKES IN WAR PLANTS BORDER ON TREASON

We have some laws upon our statute books which are very close to existing facts. One of them is this article of war, I guess you would call it, "Misbehavior Before the Enemy." It is title 10, article 1547 of the United States Code. I am reading this for the purpose of illustrating that the same principle is involved:

"Misbehavior before the enemy: Any officer or soldier who, before the enemy, misbehaves himself, runs away, or shamefully abandons or delivers up or by any misconduct, disobedience, or neglect endangers the safety of any fort, post, camp, guard, or other command which it is his duty to defend, or speaks words inducing others to do the like or casts away his arms or ammunition, or quits his post or colors to plunder or pillage, or by any means whatsoever occasions false alarms in camp, garrison, or quarters, shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court martial may direct."

Mr. FELLOWS. That is article 1547 of the Articles of War?

Mr. PATMAN. It is title 10, article 1547.

Mr. FELLOWS. Title 10, article 1547?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. There is a case where if one in the service runs away or shamefully abandons his duty he is subject to the penalty of death. It is true those of us on the domestic front are not in uniform, and that does not apply to us, but at the same time I see no reason why if there is any element in our country that is attempting to do that, I see no reason why Congress should not be fair toward the servicemen who have been sent to every continent on earth and on to every sea in the world to fight our battles and to make sure that this lifeline of supplies, munitions, guns, and tanks is not interrupted by anyone abandoning their post or shamefully refusing to do their duty.

Another article is article 1553 of title 10:

"Relieving, corresponding with, or aiding the enemy: Whosoever relieves or attempts to relieve the enemy with arms, ammunition, supplies, money, or other thing, or knowingly harbors or protects or holds correspondence with or gives intelligence to the enemy, either directly or indirectly, shall suffer death or such other punishment as a court martial or military commission may direct."

Mr. SPRINGER. Will you please give me that citation?

Mr. PATMAN. Article 1553, title 10. Now, a strike in war industry does not relieve the enemy with arms, ammunition, or supplies under the terms of this article, so that a worker if he stops work is not guilty of this offense which carries the death penalty, but at the same time whenever he stops that work in an essential war industry he is doing just as much to relieve the enemy, just as much as if he helped the enemy, because he is helping the enemy, and I do not think that is treating our servicemen fair to send them out upon the field of battle to fight our battles and not give them the right protection against such conduct.

Another one is title 18, section 1, the definition of treason:

"Whoever, owing allegiance to the United States, levies war against them or adheres to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort within the United States or elsewhere, is guilty of treason."

Well, now, it is true that people who are striking in these essential war industries are giving aid and comfort to the enemy, and within the terms of this law they are giving that aid and comfort within the United States, and they would be guilty of treason if they adhered to their enemies. Under a strict and legal definition I do not think that they are guilty of treason, because adhering to an enemy, I assume, means embracing the philosophy of that enemy or belief in his cause or leadership. Now, these people, so far as I know in this country who are striking in essential defense industries are not devoted to the cause of our enemies and they are not devoted to the leaders of our enemies. Therefore they are not adhering to our enemies, but it is certainly in spirit and in effect bordering upon treason, and should not be permitted in this country.

Another reference I would like to invite your attention to is seditious conspiracy, section 6 of title 18:

"If two or more persons in any State or Territory, or in any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, conspire to overthrow, put down, or to destroy by force the Government of the United States, or to levy war against them, or to oppose by force the authority thereof, or by force to prevent, hinder, or delay the execution of any law of the United States, or by force to seize, take, or possess any property of the United States contrary to the authority thereof, they shall each be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 years, or both."

Now, there is a case where force is required. Under this law I presume if the Government is operating a plant, if the workers refused to work and the Government attempted to bring in other workers to do that work in place of those who were out on strike, and those who had struck attempted by force to keep them from working they would be guilty of sedition under this law that is already upon our statute books, but since they do not use force, although they are hindering and delaying the execution of a law of the United States, and one upon our statute books which has the force and effect of law is to carry on to a successful conclusion the war upon Japan, Germany, and Italy, but although they are preventing, hindering, and delaying the execution of our laws, unless they use force they are not violating this seditious conspiracy act.

Therefore, I say that it is necessary for some other law to be passed that will deal with this particular situation. Having been a prosecuting attorney myself in Texas where the district, of course, embraces more than one county always, I have had some experience in trying lawsuits, and the easiest statute to prove, to my knowledge, is conspiracy. Conspiracy is easily proven, because whenever it is shown that any certain number of people, two or more, get together and do a certain thing together, that is prima facie evidence of conspiracy, and yqu can prove it by circumstantial evidence. Conspiracy is easily proven.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a reflection upon our lawmaking body for our boys to be serving on all of the battle fronts on all of the seas and continents of the world under the most oppressive and crushing conditions, and yet to permit people here in our own country to conspire together to stop or delay the life lines of materials and supplies that are to go to our servicemen on the fighting fronts. I shall be glad to answer any questions that the committee desires to ask if I can.

Mr. HOBBS. The basic, fundamental question here that addresses itself to my mind is the limitation of the purposes of this conspiracy in your bill. You say that the conspiracy that is punishable by your bill is one of preventing, stopping, hindering, delaying, or interrupting any work or service necessary to the national defense program. Under that requirement would you not have the obligation as a prosecuting attorney of proving that that was the purpose of the conspiracy and not simply the result of the conspiracy?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I think it would be necessary to prove that the operation was in connection with the defense of our country, and after that was proven then to show that there was a conspiracy on the part of two or more to stop work in that industry which was carrying on that operation, and when those two things are shown I think it would be sufficient to constitute an offense.

Mr. HOBBS. The question that I am raising is that under your bill it seems to me that they must conspire together for the purpose of preventing, stopping, hindering, delaying, or interrupting work or service necessary to the national defense program.

Mr. PATMAN. Preventing, stopping, or slowing down.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right. It seems to me that the court would hold this being a criminal statute, it must be construed strictly, and that you have to prove, in order to constitute a defendant guilty under this statute that that was his purpose, rather than to get more money for himself or to get better working conditions, or to get exclusive jurisdiction of a plant as the collective bargaining agency for his union, or anyone of the legitimate objectives of organized labor.

Mr. PATMAN. I see your point, if we quibble over words. It has been my policy throughout life that if there are two ways to do a thing, and one way is certain and the other doubtful, to do it the certain way. You can make this certain by changing the language.

Mr. HOBBS. In your statement explaining the purpose of the bill you substitute other language which I think covers it.

Mr. PATMAN. I have no objection to changing it. That is the reason we have a fine Committee on the Judiciary composed of those who are well versed and trained in matters of that kind and understand these words and their uses, and they are able to dress up these bills to carry out the object and intent of Congress, and I hope the committee will consider that and that any changes which are necessary will be made.

Mr. HOBBS. What do you think about that?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, at least it raises a substantial doubt. There is a certain way to fix it, so there would be no danger then and no doubt.

Mr. HOBBS. If you phrase this bill in the way that you phrased your purposes in argument by saying any conspiracy which has this effect it would be all right.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the chairman will assist in removing any doubt about it.

Mr. HOBBS. Do you think there is any real doubt as it is drawn?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think so, but at the same time as long as the chairman thinks there is, it would be all right with me to change it.

Mr. HOBBS. I am just raising the question.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOBBS. Now, the other question that I would like to have the author of the bill consider is that in the sabotage statutes there has been a clearly drawn differentiation between national defense and war. We have there a definition, as you know, of national-defense materials and war materials, and we have two separate sections of the Sabotage Act, dealing one with national-defense injuries, and the other with war injuries. That is, the war program, or the national-defense program. The point I am raising is that there is a well-defined differentiation between national defense and war, and the question that I would like to have you consider very seriously is whether or not in your bill in the face of our former statutes and definitions this language in your bill is inclusive enough to cover war.

PEOPLE BELIEVE CONGRESS PLAYING HORSE WITH THEM

Mr. PATMAN. In view of what you said, I would make it very plain; I would use language which would make it plain. Remember this, Mr. Chairman, I have no pride of authorship in this bill at all. I am just expecting this committee to consider the subject. If you will pardon a frank statement, I think the people of the country are kind of getting disgusted with Congress on this business. We have drafted their boys and sent them all over the world, and they are reading in the newspapers every day of these strikes in essential war industries. I have just returned from a trip over some parts of this country, and I have never seen the people of the country so wrought up in my life. A lot of the people just think that Congress is playing horse with them. The House passes a bill and sends it over to the Senate, and the Senate then passes a substitute bill and sends it over to the House. For instance, in the early part of 1942 we passed the Smith bill to stop strikes. Well, the Senate ignored the Smith bill and in 1942 sent back a Connally bill to stop strikes. Then this year, 1943, we passed the Hobbs bill to stop certain racketeering and we sent it over to the Senate, and then the Senate ignored the Hobbs bill and sent back to the House another Connally bill. So the people think we are just playing

horse with them and they are liable to deal with Congress on that account when the time comes. The Senate ignored the Hobbs bill, and about all they did since then was to send a bill over here. Let us fix up a bill and send something back to them, and see if we cannot get something done on this, and I hope something will be done soon.

Mr. HOBBS. Then the last question I want to ask you is about your view as to whether there could be a conspiracy to do a lawful act?

Mr. PATMAN. A conspiracy to do a lawful act?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. Here we are making an act unlawful, and we are making it a conspiracy or crime to do this act which we consider unlawful.

Mr. HOBBS. It seems to me if you have a conspiracy there must be a criminal scienter, and it might be better to condemn the act or the effect of the act rather than to denominate it as a conspiracy. I may be wrong about that.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not concerned about that. I feel this committee can take care of it, and I am not one to quibble over words about it. I know the chairman does not expect to; he just wants to get the bill fixed up in good shape.

Mr. HOBBS. So that it cannot be misconstrued.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, so that it cannot be misconstrued, and I think the intent of the people is very evident, and that they would like to have some kind of a law passed to stop strikes in essential war industries, and everybody knows that it is up to us to write the words and phrases and the paragraphs and the language to do that, and that is all I am asking the committee to do, of course.

Mr. FEIGHAN. In view of the high praise that you have bestowed upon labor in general for the excellent work that they have done in the war program, just about what percentage of strikes have occurred?

Mr. PATMAN. A very low percentage I am very proud to say; a very low percent, but at the same time the number of desertions in the Army is very low.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Do you believe we should establish what is tantamount to martial law in every essential war industry?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I do not.

Mr. FEIGHAN. As an argument you make a parallel between the duties of a man in the service and those in essential war industries.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, if they strike, I would be in favor of martial law or anything else to get the industry back to work. The number of desertions in the service is very low, but at the same time I would not be in favor of repealing that law making desertion a less serious crime, would you?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Would you make a distinction, however, between persons in service and those who are not in service?

Mr. PATMAN. Not so far as duty to country is concerned.

Mr. FEIGHAN. You make a distinction, do you not, between duty to country and duty to the employer?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I can see how it is the duty of all persons in time of war to serve their country whether they are in uniform or not. That is the point I am endeavoring to make, that they refuse to do that, and we should deal with the subject.

Mr. FELLOWS. In the last part of that first paragraph the bill provides: "or for the purpose of preventing, stopping, hindering, delaying, or interrupting any work or service essential to the normal operation of the Government of the United States, or any department, independent establishment, or other agency thereof." Just what is that designed to cover?

Mr. PATMAN. That is intended to cover Government employees. Government employees are being organized, and most of them are organized now. They insist that it is never their purpose to strike, that it will never be their object or intentions to strike. It has been demonstrated that the leaders of labor cannot always control the workers, and since it has been demonstrated that they cannot, why not deal with this subject at the same time so as to protect our Government against any possibility of a strike in an essential Government activity?

Mr. FELLOWS. Well, it is pretty broad.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; it is intended to be broad.

Mr. FELLOWS. In view of these recent decisions of the Supreme Court, which I cannot understand, even if I read them or have them read to me, and what the intent is I have lost all conception of, that particular part of the paragraph does not mean very much to me, if two or more persons conspire to hinder the normal operation of the Government. It does not say they have to be employed by the Government. I wonder if you and I should get our heads together, and we are not even working for the Government, if we should do that and perhaps go out and make some talk that is perhaps strong talk, and I make a lot of it sometimes, whether that could be construed to applied to me, assuming the Department of Justice should undertake to operate, and I cannot control that part of it. I am wondering if that might perhaps hit me. I am looking out for our own interests.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, we are expected to look out for our own interests, and I think the gentleman would be safe in assuming that it would not apply to him, especially in view of Section 4, which provides: "Nothing in this act shall be deemed to prohibit any person or persons from organizing for the purpose of petitioning or making representations to any officer or agency of the United States or of any State, and nothing in this act shall be deemed to prohibit any person from quitting any employment."

Mr. FELLOWS. That is what section?

Mr. PATMAN. Section 4.

Mr. FELLOWS. Section 4?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, and this is intended clearly to prevent the interruption of normal operations of the Government of the United States. I think that should apply to people who are not in the Government service as well as people who are in the Government service. If two fellows sit down there at the door of one of the Government buildings and stop people from going into that building to go to work, I think the law should apply to them just the same as though they were employed by the Government.

Mr. FELLOWS. I think probably it is all right, only it is pretty broad. I do not want it to hit me or you.

Mr. PATMAN. I would want it to hit us if we were stopping the normal operations of the Government.

Mr. FELLOWS. If we conspire for the purpose, and the only way they can find that out is by what we say and do. For instance, if I might attack the fuel agency or some other agency in the Government would that apply to me?

Mr. HOBBS. Or the F. S. A. or the C. C. C.?

Mr. FELLOWS. Yes, the F. S. A. If we had a real zealous prosecutor do you suppose he might act on that and institute proceedings against me?

Mr. PATMAN. He might act on it, but you would have a jury of 12 to decide the case.

Mr. FELLOWS. But to indict me is just as effective in ruining me as to convict me.

Mr. PATMAN. Let us see if the gentleman has cause for alarm over it. It has to be done for the purpose of preventing, stopping, delaying, hindering, or interrupting this work or service of the Government. You can go out and discuss the Office of Price Administration, the War Production Board, and all the officials you want to. You are trying to improve the service and not stopping them or hindering the service in doing so.

Mr. FELLOWS. The trouble with that is that is a matter of point of view, and if you have a zealous prosecutor, he might proceed against me.

Mr. PATMAN. The juries pass on that.

Mr. FELLOWS. But I do not want to get as far as the jury with it. That is the point I make.

Mr. PATMAN. I think a prosecutor who would go that far would be a rather unusual prosecutor. In other words, you are dealing with the exception rather than the rule.

Mr. FELLOWS. I do not want any chance for them to operate under that.

Mr. PATMAN. By that same reasoning you could ask for the repeal of every criminal law because it might be abused.

Mr. SPRINGER. I was just wondering about that same point Mr. Fellows has suggested. Suppose there were workmen in a plant and some fellow who was not employed in the plant at all would stop and have a discussion with one of these workmen in that particular defense plant, and say, "Are you going to work today?" Or, "You are certainly not going to work today, are you?" And suppose just through that conversation the fellow who was stopped does not go to work, would that fellow who stopped the workman be guilty under this?

Mr. PATMAN. No; there is no meeting of the minds there that would form a conspiracy to stop work.

Mr. SPRINGER. Suppose they discussed just whether he ought to go to work, and he advises the man and he does not go to work, that would be a stoppage or delay of the operation of the plant to that extent.

Mr. PATMAN. I think in a conspiracy you would have to show a meeting of the minds for the purpose of stopping that work.

Mr. SPRINGER. There would have to be the intent?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FEIGHAN. May I ask another question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly, Mr. Feighan.

Mr. FEIGHAN. In the event that several colleagues conspire together to eliminate an agency of this Government which is performing a normal operation of the Government, and they conspire to pass legislation to eliminate that agency which is performing normal operations of the Government, why would not that come within the purview of section 1 of this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. It would have to be a service essential to the normal operation of the Government. According to your own statement, it would not be an essential operation or we would not want to repeal it. You are getting legislative functions mixed up with criminal law.

Mr. FELLOWS. Who would be the judge of this essential nature of the work? That would be that same tribunal I am talking about.

Mr. PATMAN. If there is any doubt in the minds of you gentlemen about that applying to any advocacy of any class I would put in a qualifying phrase that would protect it, because there is no desire to stop freedom of speech in this country.

Mr. FEIGHAN. But I am referring to a conspiracy which would be followed by action, not merely freedom of speech.

Mr. PATMAN. I say if there is any doubt, any chance of doubt about that, any clarifying phrase that would make it plain would be agreeable to me.

Mr. FELLOWS. Thank you, Mr. Patman.

Mr. HOBBS. We are very much obliged to you for your contribution.

Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee.

(Thereupon, the committee proceeded to the consideration of other business.)

Lend-Lease in Russia and North Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I submit herewith remarks by Raymond Gram Swing, news commentator over the Blue Network of the National Broadcasting Co., on Tuesday, May 25, 1943, relating to the activity of the Lend-Lease Agency of our Government, particularly with reference to Russia and north Africa:

In these days of scanty official information about the war effort the regular lend-lease reports to Congress make refreshing reading. They do not cover the whole war, but they report detailed facts about segments of it, and the facts are highly satisfactory. The President's report sent to Congress today, covering lend-lease operations to April 30, has some passages of particular interest. One is about the work in north Africa. Another is about the supplies being delivered to Russia. As to north Africa, lend-lease can point to two positive achievements beyond the supplies which aided the earlier British victories. One is the equipping of a French army, which will add invaluable manpower to the United Nations. The other is laying the groundwork for utilizing north Africa's resources of food and materials for the war effort. In 1941, this area provided more than 300,000 tons of fruits and vegetables, 200,000 tons of cereals and other large quantities of food for the Nazis and for Vichy France. North Africa was the only large source of phosphates for fertilizers used in Europe. North Africa can supply manganese, cobalt, and phosphate for the war production of the United Nations. The Nazis stripped the area of food and production equipment, so we must start from scratch in restoring its productivity. But everything now going to north Africa will pay for itself many times over. This sets a pattern for the invasions to come, as the report points out. There will be a twofold task, to aid the invading forces and to aid the peoples of the liberated areas. So far we have sent to north Africa more than $30,000,000 worth of food, clothing, medicines, and other essentials for the civilian population, while the British also have sent materials and equipment to aid in restoring the production of strategic and critical raw materials.

As to Russia, the lend-lease shipments up to April 1 came to 3,500,000 gross tons. Russia now stands at the head of the list of countries receiving American munitions. We have furnished thousands of planes, many tens of thousands of trucks, jeeps, and other motor vehicles, hundreds of thousands of miles of field-telephone wire, several million pairs of army boots, and quantities of other military supplies. There have been hundreds of thousands of tons of armor plate, steel, aluminum, copper, zinc, TNT, and chemicals. Also electric furnaces, presses, forging hammers, and machine tools, as well as electric power generating equipment, and rails and other railroad supplies. We have sent more than a million tons of food, and over half of that went in the last 6 months. Forty percent of all shipments to Russia in March consisted of food. Food for Russia now has a shipping priority on a par with planes and trucks. As Russia wrestles with a tremendous problem to restore the agricultural production in areas liberated from the Nazis, we have contributed 10,000 tons of seeds. In our food shipments are wheat, flour, sugar, canned meats, peas and beans, lard and vegetable oils. Most of the food dehydrated in this country now goes to Russia. British shipments have sent huge quantities of other supplies including 50,000 tons of crude rubber. They do the major job of convoying in the Arctic. But an increasing share of the shipments to Russia now go to the Persian Gulf. Here a transport system has become efficient almost as by a miracle.

Thousands of American trucks carry supplies across Iran by road. The trans-Iranian railway, now operated by the United States Army in the south, and using American and British locomotives and freight cars, delivers them to the Russian Army in the north.

One has a glimpse of interlocking war activities in north Africa and Russia, which holds good the world over. Never has a coalition war been fought by such an integrated system of shared supplies. The labors go on tirelessly day by day without making news. Then these periodic accounts bring them to life with their impressive figures. Twelve percent of our vast war expenditures to date has gone to lend-lease, and we have set going a system to which many now contribute, as well as receive. We have actually transferred to our allies more than $9,000,000,000 worth of goods, nearly half of it munitions. And if there is a gap where one can hope more will be done, the supply of China, the report says categorically that opening the Burma Road is one of the strategic objectives of our armed forces.

Tribute to Col. A. Robert Ginsburgh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. WAGNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 2 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a very interesting article appearing in the Louisville Courier-Journal outlining the distinguished career of Col. A. Robert Ginsburgh. Colonel Ginsburgh, who has served in Washington as head of the Industrial Services Division of the War Department, Bureau of Public Relations, is moving on to other service in the armed forces. At this time I wish to pay this small tribute to his splendid work in improving plant morale and production by promoting better cooperation between management and labor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLONEL GINSBURGH'S WAR-PLANT RALLIES KEEP PRODUCTION BOOMING—A "LOUISVILLIAN BY MARRIAGE" WHO IS A REGULAR ARMY OFFICER WITH AN IMPRESSIVE ARRAY OF DEGREES IS THE "'FATHER" OF THE RALLY PLAN AND THE MAN WHO MADE THE "E" A JOINT AWARD

(By Robert L. Riggs)

WASHINGTON, May 22.—Everybody knows that never before has there been a war that has been waged so intensively in the industrial plants of the world.

Tanks and planes and ships—all the equipment that goes into total mechanized warfare—have made this war a series of factory battles; a series of home-front battles which must be won before the armed forces of any of the nations involved can go into the fight against the enemy.

In this country, a symbol of the complete dependency of the front-line soldier upon the factory soldier is the war-plant rally. Every week that passes sees an average of 50 rallies conducted in the factories of the Nation.

FIRST-HAND NEWS

Sometimes these rallies are the occasion for the presentation of the Army and Navy E, given in recognition of the plant's record of production. Often the rallies simply provide an opportunity for the factory workers to learn first-hand from the lips of the men who have used the factory's products on the firing line the urgent importance of production.

Some weeks attendance at these rallies is as high as 300,000, including both the workers and the management personnel. The average weekly attendance runs between 50,000 and 100,000.

Father and mother of the war plant rallies is a Regular Army officer who is a "Louisvillian" by marriage. He is 47-year-old Col. A. Robert Ginsburgh, head of the Industrial Services Division of the War Department Bureau of Public Relations.

Colonel Ginsburgh is one of a relatively small group who have had a hand in the country's production for war from the embryonic stage, when it was a difficult feat to get $10,000,000 from Congress in order to give "educational" orders to factories into the present era of all-out production.

MONEY WASN'T ENOUGH

The plant rally idea came to him because 3 or 4 months before Pearl Harbor the War Department realized that if it was to achieve maximum production it would have to do more than let contracts, more than buy material, more than select sites for new plants; it would have to make the men and women working in the factories conscious of the part they were playing in the victory effort.

The simple theory behind the rallies is that "the people who make the stuff should get better acquainted with the people who use the stuff." The programs for the rallies have been kept up to date with the shifting events of the fighting fronts.

A few months ago the stellar performer was an Army nurse, who stood calmly on a platform in the factory yard and told the workers in simple language how she had seen their sons, their brothers, and their neighbors die on Bataan for lack of more planes, more tanks. More recently men from the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps who have fought on the sea, in the air, and on the land of Guadalcanal and other Pacific islands have told their stories to the men and women who supplied them with weapons.

Veterans of north Africa now are available to those who draw up the programs. The flyers who helped drive the Axis out of Tunisia spoke to the workers by means of recordings.

STRAIGHT FROM BIZERTE

In one instance, a flyer who had just brought his plane back from an attack over Bizerte made a recording of his battle impressions. The recording was rushed to the airplane factory which had made his plane, so that the workers received a fuller realization of the part they had played in the north African campaign. Similar recordings have come from Australia.

Movie films also have played their part. Once a month the Signal Corps turns out a 15-minute film for exclusive showing to war-plant workers. These have borne such titles as "The Arm Behind the Army," "Signal

Attack," and "Fire Power." Two million workers have viewed these films.

Posters have played their part. The favorite of Colonel Ginsburgh's division is an almost life-sized painting of a steel-helmeted soldier lugging a box of ammunition into the battle zone. Above his head is the admonition, "Pass the ammunition," and at the bottom of the poster is the workers' response, "O. K., soldier—that's our job."

The effect of plant rallies on the morale of employees has been indisputable. An unexpected byproduct has been that the fighting men who participate in them have obtained a deeper understanding of the problems facing production workers.

COMPETITION IS KEEN

The popularity of such rallies is attested by the growing competition for the Army and Navy E. Those in charge of the program feared that interest in the E award would die away when the novelty of the thing had worn off.

On the contrary, the demand for the award is greater today than ever before. Already 1,750 awards have been made, and there still remain about 80,000 firms who are eligible to receive one.

It was Colonel Ginsburgh who first suggested that the E awards should be joint, as a symbol of unity between the Army and Navy. The Navy had had such an award for some time, and the Army felt that it also should have one. Colonel Ginsburgh's insistence resulted in the merger.

In its efforts to increase production, the Industrial Services Division has worked closely, both with organizations of employees and with management groups. There scarcely has been a State convention of any labor group—American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, or Railroad Brotherhood—which has not heard an address by some representative of the division. Sometimes the speaker is Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, who is responsible for industrial mobilization. Colonel Ginsburg is military aide to Patterson.

MANAGEMENT'S FOR IT

Likewise, trade association executives, representing management, have come in, eight or ten times at a time, for a Sunday night meal at which they throw their problems at the division. When the plant rallies were started in September 1941 some feared there would be objections from management. But they have been so popular with management that Colonel Ginsburgh's division can't fill all the requests it receives.

The field of labor relations and industrial management may seem a strange one for an officer of the Regular Army, Colonel Ginsburgh's whole military career is equally unusual. No West Pointer, he has one bachelor of arts degree (with Phi Beta Kappa key), two master of arts degrees, one bachelor of laws degree.

He got into the service in 1917, just as he completed his senior year at Harvard, by passing an examination for provisional second lieutenant in the Regular Army. His commission was in the Field Artillery.

His service during the last war was spent in this country. From 1920 to 1922 he was stationed at Camp Knox, Ky. That was before it became Fort Knox, and when it consisted chiefly of many acres of artillery range and a few barracks. While on that tour of duty, Ginsburgh found time to get a master of arts degree in history from the University of Louisville, and to persuade a Louisville girl to marry him. She was Miss Elsie Pinney, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. A. B. Pinney. Mrs. Ginsburgh's mother and sister, Miss Anne Pinney, live at 1220 Bates Court.

THE UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE INFLUENCE

It was at the University of Louisville that Ginsburgh first found himself interested in the field of labor relations. He attributes this interest to a member of the faculty at that time, Norman J. Ware, a British war veteran, who had studied the subject extensively.

As part of his work under Professor Ware, Ginsburgh made a study of the history of the Knights of Labor, ancestor of the American labor union. For his thesis, Ginsburgh wrote a discussion of the use of troops in domestic disturbances.

Ginsburgh took his Louisville bride to the assignments that fall to officers in peacetime—Fort Sill, Okla.; Governor's Island, N. Y.; Fort Robinson, Nebr. He put in several years with troops before arriving on the Washington scene. Before the Camp Knox assignment he had spent 2 years with troops in the Orient—the Philippines, French Indochina, Japan, and Siberia.

At Fort Robinson he was in command of a battery of mountain artillery. It was while there that he drew the assignment which led eventually to his Washington services. This was an assignment to attend the journalism school of the University of Missouri.

A PUZZLED DEAN

That was in 1930. The then chief of staff, Gen. Charles P. Summerall, had decided to train a bureau of public relations for the Army. He sent two men to the Pulitzer School of Journalism at Columbia University, New York, and two to Missouri. Ginsburgh had done some newspaper work, and had edited a recruiting newspaper while at Governor's Island.

The late Frank Martin, then dean of the Missouri School of Journalism, didn't know just what to do with this Army officer who had a liberal arts degree and a Phi Beta Kappa key from Harvard, as well as a master's from the University of Louisville.

But after some head-scratching, Dean Martin told Ginsburgh to select his own work. Ginsburgh did so, wrote a thesis on War Correspondents in the American Expeditionary Forces, which was a study of censorship and Army public relations. So Missouri gave him another master's degree in the spring of 1931.

The colorful Patrick J. Hurley then was Secretary of War in the Hoover administration, and it wasn't long before Captain Ginsburgh was in Washington helping Hurley with his speeches.

ANOTHER HARVARD DEGREE

When Hurley went out with the rest of the Hoover administration in 1933, Ginsburgh's next assignment was to escort a group of World War mothers on a tour of French battlefields and cemeteries. When he got back to this country the Army, which had sent him through 1 year at Missouri, decided to send him through Harvard Law School's 3-year course.

He emerged with his law degree in 1936, joined the staff of the Judge Advocate General in Washington and passed his bar examination. But he soon was sidetracked from the legal field.

Louis A. Johnson became Assistant Secretary of War with the specific assignment to take up the matter of industrial mobilization. The War Department assigned Ginsburgh to help him. In 1938–39 Ginsburgh attended the Army Industrial College, and then worked with Johnson in the long battle to make industrial mobilization more than something on paper.

In the summer of 1940 President Roosevelt made a Republican, Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War. As part of that arrangement, Johnson had to step out so that another Republican, Patterson, could become Assistant Secretary—later Under Secretary.

A BUNDLE OF ENERGY

Major Ginsburgh continued to work with Patterson, becoming public relations officer for the industrial program. From that he moved into the Industrial Services Division.

Colonel Ginsburgh and Mrs. Ginsburgh have a 19-year-old son, Robert, Jr., who has 1 more year at West Point. Their twin daughters, Anne and Martha, are 17.

The people who work with Colonel Ginsburgh say the success of his division is accounted for by his amazing energy and his capacity to pick the right people for the right job. The colonel, in turn, is proud of the people who work with him, and is especially proud of some of his alumni.

Among these "graduates" is Lt. Col. Joseph Phillips, 42-year-old native of Paducah, Ky., who, before he went into the Army, was editor of Newsweek. He now is handling public relations for General Eisenhower.

Others include Lt. Col. Kenneth Clark, public relations officer for Lt. Gen. Mark Clark's fifth army; Lt. Col. Robert S. Pickens, public relations officer for Maj. Gen. J. H. C. Lee, who is in charge of the supply services in the European war theater, and Capt. Freeman S. Bishop, public relations officer on the Alcan Highway.

THE ARTHUR EPISODE

Colonel Ginsburgh hand-picks his staff from advertising agencies, labor groups, corporation executives and reporters of well-known newspapers. The Courier-Journal staff had an illustration 2 years ago of the manner in which he works in picking up men.

One of our own people, William B. Arthur, the assistant State editor, held a lieutenant's commission in the Reserve Corps but his efforts to get into active duty became snarled in red tape. A letter to Colonel Ginsburgh resulted, within 2 weeks, in getting Lieutenant Arthur on duty as a public relations officer with an armored division at Pine Camp, N. Y. But that wasn't the end of the Arthur episode.

A year later, Lieutenant Arthur had occasion to come to Washington to see some officers in the Public Relations Bureau. In the course of his visit, he was introduced casually to Colonel Ginsburgh. Out of the mountain of detail that flows across his desk, Ginsburgh remembered Arthur's name and the circumstances under which he was called to duty. As a result, he had Arthur transferred to the Ginsburgh division. Arthur now is a major in the Public Relations Bureau.

Stories about Ginsburgh abound in the Washington press corps. The favorite story deals with his days as a lieutenant at Governor's Island. In order to work off some of his excess energy (as well as to augment his Army pay) Ginsburgh worked at night as a reporter on the New York World.

A SERMON ON MULES

One night there was an explosion at an Army arsenal, and the Army got word to Ginsburgh, while on his reporter's job to get in uniform and handle public relations on the affair.

Ginsburgh's competitors on the other New York papers had no knowledge of his Army connections. When they arrived to get news about the explosion, whom did they find handing it out but their competitor, dressed in an officer's uniform?

"Get those duds off," one of the reports warned him. "Don't you know you can go to jail for impersonating an officer?"

My favorite Ginsburgh story deals with the period when he commanded a mountain battery at Fort Robinson. He took his mules and his men on an extensive march. When they made camp in an isolated community on Saturday afternoon, the members of the local church asked Captain Ginsburgh if he would conduct services for them.

So on Sunday the captain occupied the pulpit. He delivered a sermon from the text, "Balaam and His Ass." He spoke of the Army mule's loyalty, devotion to duty; he extolled the mule's virtues of determination and perseverance. Reports are that the congregation regarded it as a powerful bit of preaching.

Labor Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter received by me from Frontier Lodge, No. 49, of Kimball, Nebr., my home. The membership of this lodge includes a cross section of the people in my community, and what they say about the labor situation I am convinced is felt generally by the rank and file of the people of the whole country. I would call your attention particularly to the quotation from the soldier son of one of these members:

FRONTIER LODGE, No. 49,
Kimball, Nebr., May 27, 1943.

Hon. A. L. MILLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILLER: The members of this lodge take this opportunity to advise you of their attitude in regard to the strike situation as we find it today. To a group of men interested in the welfare of the community as a whole, and especially interested in the promulgation of this war to a speedy end, that we may again be at peace with our fellow world citizens, this exhibition of complete disregard for the lives of our young men is appalling. Who has better right to the question our management of the situation, when we say that we have five of our members serving with the armed forces of our country?

The question is not which side is in the right and which side is at fault. The issue is now coming up is, why doesn't the powers that be, do something to correct the situation that blots our war efforts? If the unions are entitled to the various things that they ask, why no so order it? If they are not entitled to those things, drop them and advise both men and management that if they do not care to accept the terms, perhaps they would rather take their individual turns at manning Uncle Sam's guns.

Recently one of the members of our organization read a portion of a letter received from his son, a son that is stationed in north Africa, of which I would quote you a few lines. "One of the most disgusting things we have read in the news from home is the coal-strike situation. If some of those phonies at the head of the unions could be over here and see the fellows spilling their insides out, they would change their minds."

Recently you made the statement that your hands were tied in the matter of labor. If then, we find ourselves on the minority, and have allowed such situations to arise, then God forgive the error of our way, that we for a few paltry dollars will allow our youth to experience the agony of death on the battlefields of the world. All this because we continue to allow a few misguided leaders to rule the factions of our country regardless of right or wrong.

To you and the members of our representation, we urge that you demand that action be taken one way or another that no such thing as these walkouts be permitted to nullify the efforts of the majority that strive for excellence in their war effort. We ask you to diligently bend your efforts to the immediate demand that the situation be settled now, once and for all. The balance of power lies in our government, and if necessary individual rights, when wrong, must fall by the wayside.

Now, doctor, you are familiar with our group and with the number of our group, and we ask that you personally do all that you may find in your power to do.

Fraternally yours,
FRONTIER LODGE, No. 49,
T. W. MUNDELL,
Chancelor Commander.
D. H. PETERSON,
Keeper of Records and Seal.

Patriots of the United States Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Comdr. William A. Porteous, Jr., United States Naval Reserve, delivered one of the most inspirational addresses of World War No. 2 to the officers and enlisted personnel of the U. S. S. ——— on the occasion of his taking command on January 5, 1943. It is so excellent I feel that it should be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Under unanimous consent, I include this speech in the RECORD:

Patriots of the United States Navy, when I came aboard this ship on December 3, 1942, I knew none of you. In the course of a few days I had observed many of you, and on the memorable afternoon when we had an encounter with a submarine, at which time I was not in command, I observed every one of you at your battle stations, on the alert, in action, ready to do or die. I observed real men, men who are a credit to the Navy, patriots all, and since that afternoon I have felt that I know you. I know you are made of the sterner, finer things of life, that indefinable something that makes it a pleasure to know you and a privilege to be your commanding officer. In addition to knowing the finer side of your natures, I have observed you at your work, I have read your service records, have censored your mail, and I think I know every man in this crew. We are all salesmen. To succeed as a salesman you must know your product. For the time being we have a job to do—selling enemy submarines to Davy Jones, and with the grace of God, we are going to do it.

We have a fine ship and a splendid crew. We will make her a smart ship, a ship that can with pride stand inspection every Saturday. It will take a lot of work. For the present and possibly for the duration this ship will be our home, and we want to be proud of her, and we will be proud of her, but not only do we want this to be a smart-looking ship of which we can feel proud, but we must keep ourselves smart. We must be proud of the men and the work of the men at the guns.

I propose to give you men as much target practice as the allowance of this ship will permit, and if I can get extra ammunition for target practice I am going to get it. What is the good of having a smart ship unless we have smart gunners aboard? I want every man aboard to know how to fire the guns and be able to creditably take over any gun on this ship if the man or men at the guns is disabled or killed.

We are going to have many drills and inspections. This is going to be a well-trained crew. To be properly trained requires work. There is no place on this ship for a lazy man. A crook, or drunk might reform, but a lazy man—never.

I want every officer and man on this ship to read the Bluejacket's Manual and know it thoroughly. Bearing in mind the safety and security of the ship, I want not less than 10 men a day, while in port, to attend the anti-submarine warfare school, and everyone must practice on the ———; a shore party will leave each morning at 0945 for the anti-submarine warfare school. I want you to read and study the subjects for which you are trying to get rated. Navy training courses will be placed in the ship's service department so that the booklets will be before you. There are many courses open to you. As you know, the courses cost you nothing. I want every man to decide what courses he wants to take. Every nonrated man is urged to be a striker in one of the diversified rates. Aim high and you will hit high; but I don't want any New Year's resolutions about your future. Decide for yourselves, now, whether you want to be engines or boxcars; engines lead, boxcars follow. Which do you want to do, lead or follow, or do you want to be just another snowflake in the drift? Do you want to be a credit to yourselves and to your families? Always remember there is room at the top—

"Never you mind the crowd, men,
Nor fancy your life won't tell;
There is always room at the top, men,
For the man who doeth it well."

Your future is what you make it. I propose to rate the men just as often and as fast as they deserve it. The sooner every man deserves and gets a rating, the better I will like it. I propose to keep the men diligently occupied, and to those who deserve it, will be given not only a rating or ratings, but ample leave. There will be no favorites aboard.

I expect but one thing out of you, namely, that you do your duty properly. In doing your duty you must constantly bear in mind many things. I expect you to manifest loyalty, that you have a courageous fighting spirit, that you exercise self-control, be obedient, at all times truthful and honorable, that you show some energetic initiative; do unto your shipmates and officers as you would have others do unto you.

"This above all to thine own self be true,
It must follow, as the night follows the day,
Thou cans't not then be false to any man."

I previously referred to obedience; not only do I expect you to be obedient to the officers and petty officers, but I expect you to show respect for them. If you do not show proper respect for those whom the Navy Department has put over you, you are likewise disrespectful to the Navy Department, and you cannot expect respect for yourself. Remember, fools criticize and find faults. I want you to show respectful cooperation, and if you have constructive ideas or helpful suggestions, communicate them to your division officers.

On meeting an officer for the first time in the day, you should smartly salute him, likewise on other appropriate occasions. Some men apparently don't like to salute officers, and seem to think it is belittling to their natures. Such should not be the case. A salute is a military courtesy. All of you want to be courteous. If some of you were accused of being discourteous, you would want to fight, and that is exactly what you are when you do not render proper military courtesy. The origin of the military salute began years ago, when one knight in armor met another. He would raise his visor so that his face could be seen and observed as a friend. Always remember to render proper military courtesy.

I wish I could think that I would have such cooperation from you that punishment would be unnecessary. Remember, I said there will be no favorites. You will make

your own punishments by the offenses you may commit. All of you know what punishments are prescribed for various offenses. One thing is certain as long as I have command. Punishment will be swift and certain.

All of you will make mistakes; that is to be expected, that is why we have erasers on pencils, but don't try to bluff through your mistakes and don't make the same mistake twice.

Now another thing I won't tolerate aboard this ship is profanity. Profanity is a poor way to express one's self, it not only indicates a lack of knowledge of the English language in order to express one's self, but it is, or should be, insulting to others. I expect to see some black eyes aboard this ship. If a man is profanely called out of his name and doesn't administer a beating to the man who profanely addressed him, I don't care what his size may be, I am going to have the man who didn't properly resent the language, court martialed, because by his silence or inaction he accepts the slander as true, and there is no place for such people in the finest Navy in the world.

I would like to see everyone aboard this ship save something regularly each month. Get the habit of thrift, and the best way to save money while in the Navy is to buy War bonds. It is the safest investment in the world and I am disappointed to learn that other than myself, no one aboard has subscribed for War bonds. At least 10 percent of the income of everyone aboard this ship should be invested in War bonds and when you eventually have saved something, you will all be better sailors. There is nothing like having some money to windward.

(NOTE.—The ship's company has now made regular allotments for bonds which total 43 percent of the total ship's pay.)

I have censored the letters of many of you. Most of the letters are a credit to you, but there are not enough letters written by you. I would like to see 40 times as many letters leave this ship, and I will make stationery available to you. Writing home is good for the morale aboard this ship and for the morale at home. Believe it or not, I have never failed to write my mother and wife every day I have been out of town, and may God grant me the privilege to write them for many years to come. There are those at home who love you, and whom you love. Your loved ones at home are made happy by hearing frequently from you. Don't you want to make them happy?

Every Sunday in port you will be furnished an opportunity to go to the church of your choice. I bought 12 records of familiar hymns. These will be played at sea over the ship's phonograph each Sunday, providing the weather is such that the phonograph can be played, and heard in the crew's messroom over the loudspeaker 1 hour before dinner. Given a cause and a leader, men will die by the millions. This Republic fortunately has had strong leaders in its hour of threatened peril. We again have been blessed with a strong and fearless leader in our present Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt. One of the causes for which we are at war is the freedom of worship. Let us make the most of the opportunity to worship God. Don't let us sing and shout "God Bless America" without deserving to be blessed. Justify the blessing and pray as did Abraham Lincoln during the blackest days of the Civil War that we are on God's side.

It would be impossible to too strongly impress on every man on this ship that his duties are important. If they weren't, you wouldn't be aboard. We don't take vacation trips or pleasure jaunts aboard fighting ships, and this one is no exception. You must always bear in mind the importance of your job, as long as you feel that the safety and security of this ship and men depends on you, you will do your job well. For instance, if on look-out you fail to observe a ship or airplane at the first possible moment, and communicate that information promptly to the officer of the deck, you may be the sole cause for wives and children being widows and orphans, or causing your mother to wear a gold star, which she would prefer not to wear because she would prefer to have you. Remember, a dive bomber can come down from 10,000 feet at 400 miles an hour in 11 seconds. About as long as it takes you to pull out your handkerchief and blow your nose. Don't be like one sailor whom I heard fail to resent a remark. He was told by one of his buddies that if dynamite was brains, he wouldn't be able to blow his nose. If you are not alert the enemy may supply the dynamite in the right place, which will keep you from blowing your nose forever, and cause your Government insurance to be paid to people who would prefer to have you alive than collect insurance. All of you have loved ones, but if you think you don't have (and you are wrong), then try to think of my wife and two children.

I'm satisfied that the officers aboard this ship are competent, and by nature, are gentlemen. I'm satisfied from observation that every man aboard has potential power for good. I want to see that power developed. The officers will help you. You must first help yourselves. Learn to control yourselves before you can hope to control others. My code has been, and God grant it may forever be,

"Do unto others as you would have others do unto you."

This is a good ship, not small, not large. Already her existence has been justified, and it is up to each and every one of you to contribute in justifying her further existence. Put something on the ball, shoot straight, but hit hard and often.

Chinese Exclusion Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, from America, May 29, 1943. It is an eloquent statement of the need for my bill to grant the Chinese rights of entry to the United States and rights of citizenship. I shall appreciate the attention and the comments of Members of the House on this editorial:

OPEN DOOR TO CHINA

Sculptors in Congress are to be congratulated for the figurative Statue of Liberty they are carving out, to be erected at the Golden Gate on the west coast. For 61 years there has been no welcoming statue there for the Chinese; now one is a building, in the shape of a bill, introduced by the Honorable MARTIN J. KENNEDY, of New York, to grant to the Chinese rights of entry to the United States and rights to citizenship.

Under this bill, the Chinese, who have been specifically excluded ever since 1882, will be admitted under the quota system—their present quota is 100 a year—and those now resident in this country, but born in China, will be eligible for citizenship. That they will make industrious and loyal citizens there is no doubt.

Thus another step is being taken in breaking down the sundering walls of discrimination; the walls of this Jericho must come tumbling down, in our relations at home and abroad, if we are to be a united nation among United Nations.

In our present glow of friendship and admiration for the Chinese, there is small fear that this bill will not pass. But when our 8,000,000 or so troops start home, to be resettled and reemployed, there may well be a panicky return to discrimination, under the endemic fear we seem to have of the cheapening of American labor by Oriental competition.

But certainly, even if the Chinese quota were 10 times as great, there is still room in the land for hard-working citizens, particularly in the rural areas. Moreover, although any State can set up immigration restrictions for the protection of its own interests, its policy in these matters must always conform itself to the higher needs of the common good of humanity. This bill is motivated not only by regard for China, but also by a fine regard for brotherly cooperation.

Faced as we are by the large welcome given to Americans in China, which has been brought to our attention recently by speeches of Madame and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, praising the work of the missionaries, particularly the Catholic ones, it is certainly high time that we begin to exercise a little graciousness in return. Turn about is, after all, even among nations, fair play.

The Mission of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. J. MONKIEWICZ

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein an editorial entitled "The Mission of Poland" from the Hartford Courant, Hartford, Conn., issue of May 25, 1943:

THE MISSION OF POLAND

The celebration on May 24 of the four hundredth anniversary of the death of Nicholas Copernicus calls to mind several pertinent reflections on the cultural mission of the Polish people, the first to suffer from the massacre-mania of one Adolf Hitler, anticultural catalyst of the twentieth century. Through all their long history, the Poles have kept alight in Europe—despite reiterated aggression, persecution, and partition—the flame of liberty. The name of Poland has become one practically synonymous with the love of freedom.

Yes; the Poles are a proud people, and they have reason to be. From the tenth century one of the earliest Christian nations of Europe, they have been traditional defenders of Christianity—another reason why, according to the Antichrist of Braunau, they should be exterminated with blitz, fire, and sword. They had their own Magna Carta, the Compact of Kassa (September 17, 1374).

In 1683, the liberation of Vienna from the besieging Turk, and therewith the turning of the tide of Mohammedanism, which threatened to engulf all Europe, through the instrumentality of King John III. Sobieski at the head of his Polish armies—this alone was the fulfillment of a historical mission. An unprecedented—and purely altruistic—outburst

of heroism on the part of an entire nation, probably the last grandiose reflex of the noble crusading impulse, this act alone made Poland in virtual fact the savior of Christianity in Europe.

In the realm of letters, in the arts and sciences, in music and painting, in astronomy (Nicholas Copernicus, 1473–1543) and humanism, in short as a cultural nation, down to modern times, Poland has performed her magnificent office in the evolution of mankind. In the realm of literature alone, we have only to evoke the names of Henryk Sienkiewicz (Quo Vadis, 1895; Nobel Prize winner, 1905), Wladyslaw Stanislaw Reymont (1868–1925; Nobel Prize winner, 1924), our own Joseph Conrad, born Korzeniowski, 1857–1924); and Ferdinand Ossendowski—and with this evocation, we begin to realize what Poland has meant to each one of us. In the field of science, we need only mention the name of that saintly woman, Mme. Marie (nee Sklodowska) Curie, codiscoverer of radium, martyr to the cause of that work which brought healing to millions.

In music—Chopin (1810–49)—and we have almost said everything. But then we remember, too, Moskowski, Szymanowski, Wieniawski, Godowsky, Rosenthal—and the list is endless. Ignace Paderewski, by the whole world acclaimed the greatest pianist of all time, belongs in a separate niche, a shrine in our hearts. Like his great predecessor, Casimir Pulaski (who fought with us, alongside Washington, and died for our own national independence) Paderewski was another great champion of the human spirit, the flame that keeps men free. And, in 1919, after World War No. 1, he returned to Poland to become his country's first premier.

At this day and hour, notwithstanding, it is Copernicus who stands as the symbol of Polish national unity—of a people who, through their native spirit of self-sacrifice, have engendered many a man of science, thus contributing priceless treasures to the general cause of humanity. Here was a man who, as the crowning fruition of his life's work, revolutionized the whole thinking world in terms of the cosmic structure, and his influence has endured to this day.

It is fitting and well to remember the great protagonists of the race, the heroes and inspired martyrs of the human mind. In paying tribute to Copernicus, Poles all over the world are rendering obeisance to the highest qualities that have been their own cultural contribution to our world. At the same time, we trust and pray that, with all due humility the Polish people will remember the greatness of another great pioneer in the Christianizing of mankind.

It was the Polish Jesuit father, Peter Skarga (1536–1612), whose Lives of the Saints still constitutes a religious classic, revered by theologians of all denominations, who, in his Parliamentary Sermons (1597), the crowning achievement of his lifework, said so much that will be eagerly recalled by those Poles who esteem the soul of their nation above the illusory lures of national grandeur. Candidly exposing many faults of the Polish national character—and we all have faults, however patriotic we may be—in the accents of a Polish Jeremiah, Peter Skarga at that time foretold the downfall of the Polish state.

The Poles, in their hour of trial, have well earned and now enjoy the sympathy of the entire world. Their durable greatness will indisputably enable them to surmount all trials and, in the spirit of a true humility, once more arise to continue and fulfill their historic mission. Assuredly, therefore, it will not be considered impertinent at this time to suggest that Poland's freedom and Poland's future should be fought for on the basis of a reasonable (not fanatic) and conciliatory spirit.

We in this war are most truly fighting for human liberties, the rights of man. And the Poles, whatever their destiny, may rest assured that, in the peace after victory, that sacred flame they have so long and faithfully tended—that torch of liberty which guides America at home and beyond the seas—will be as stanchly and inviolately upheld in any peace settlement with which the United Nations shall have to do. Poland's freedom is likewise theirs, honesty demands it, and theirs is hers.

Labor Should Not Be Punished!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we are faced today with the consideration of the Smith-Connally bill S. 796. The passage of this bill will in my opinion be a mistake at this time. Our complete national effort should be toward winning this war. How can this object be achieved? Obviously the war can be won only through the harmonious efforts of every section of American society. We cannot at this time afford to drive a divisive wedge into our unified effort. Mistakes, either intentional or unintentional, have been made by every section of our people.

The great corporations were slow to realize our danger and refused to convert their peacetime factories to war production, and after the catacylsm of war had engulfed us many of these great financial and industrial entities have, through placing $1-per-year men in key places, maintained their monopolistic advantages or improved their position. In this process of production, thousands of small manufacturers and retailers have been forced out of business. Thousands of good American citizens have lost their life's accumulation of property. How much of this was inevitable in order to win this war I cannot say; but this is a sacrifice this section of American life is making.

Let us consider the 8,000,000-plus of our young men and women who are members of our armed forces. These people have given up their accustomed ways of life, their financial and family status has been disrupted. They come from every level of American life—the rich, the poor, the capitalist, and the laborer, all making their sacrifices to preserve America as it was when they entered the service.

And now let us consider the American people that constitute one of the most important parts of our civilian life as it pertains to war production; I speak of the 12,000,000 members of organized labor. What is their record? Have they contributed their part in the war effort?

I say that their record is the finest of any labor group in the world. They have given of their membership into the armed forces over 2,000,000 members. They are members of the merchant marine whose achievements in sea-borne transportation of the matériel of war has made possible our military successes. The members of organized labor have oversubscribed their War bond allotments and have donated generously to the blood-bank and war-relief chests. But most important of all through their efforts we have achieved the greatest production of war matériel the world has ever known. This production has been voluntary, it has not been achieved through governmental coercion or punitive legislation. Our free labor has outproduced the slave labor of the Axis. Let us consider this important fact as we contemplate our votes on the Smith-Connally bill, S. 796.

Let us not act hastily because of our righteous anger against John L. Lewis. I hold no brief or make no excuse for his selfish, ruthless action in promoting or condoning the coal strike.

The President has the power and the tact to solve this problem. He knows the human factors involved, including the insane hatred of John L. Lewis. After this coal strike is settled we will have the wholehearted cooperation of a million coal miners, the cooperation that is necessary for victory.

Let us act wisely and not allow our natural feeling of resentment to rush us into a legislative act which will punish and penalize over 12,000,000 loyal members of organized labor. Let us refrain from driving a divisive wedge into labor which has made our production of war matériel the criterion and wonder of the whole world. Vote to defeat the Smith-Connally bill—S. 796.

The Connally-May Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 1, 1943.*

Hon. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

It seems inconceivable that Congress would consider and act upon vicious antilabor legislation such as the Connally-May bill, S. 796, without giving labor a chance to be heard in opposition to said measure. My appeal to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to grant labor a hearing in opposition to the bill was denied. I appeal to the Members of the House to defeat the rule providing for consideration of the Connally-May antilabor bill in order that it may be returned to the Committee on Military Affairs for further consideration and to accord the representatives of the American Federation of Labor an opportunity to present facts and arguments in opposition to said antilabor legislation.

WILLIAM GREEN,

President, American Federation of Labor.

Banking and Currency Committee Opposes Subsidies—Proposal To Place All Foods and Food Problems, Including Prices, Under War Food Administration Loses by One Vote but Will Be Renewed in House—Oil Should Be Placed Under Secretary Ickes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives on June 1, 1943, favorably reported H. R. 2725, to extend for 2 years the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Under existing law, the powers of this Corporation would expire June 30, 1943. Under this bill the time is extended until June 30, 1945.

The bill provides for additional capital stock for the Commodity Credit Corporation of $500,000,000.

The bill was amended in two very important respects. The amendments were proposed and offered by me because of information received as chairman of the Committee on Small Business of the House and as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House.

AGAINST SUBSIDIES

Amendment No. 1 which was adopted and will be part of the bill is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1

In order to prevent the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other Government agency from being used for the payment of subsidies to maintain maximum prices for agricultural commodities or for commodities processed in whole or in substantial part from agricultural commodities, no maximum price shall be established or maintained under any law for any such commodity below a price which will reflect to the producers thereof in the market place the support price therefor announced by the Secretary, or below the higher of the maximum prices provided in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, as amended, except that nothing in the foregoing provisions shall be construed to prevent the selling of wheat for feeding purposes if sold at not less than the parity price of corn nor to prevent such adjustments in the price supports and price ceilings on competitive oils and fats as may be required to bring about or to maintain the necessary relationship in the prices of such products that is required to assure adequate production for the war effort.

The amendment is self-explanatory but the effect of it is to prevent subsidies.

RAISE PRICES TO SECURE ADEQUATE PRODUCTION

Amendment No. 2, also adopted and now a part of the bill, is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2

Such modifications shall be made in maximum prices established under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, approved January 30, 1942 (Public Law No. 421, 77th Cong.) and an act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to aid in preventing inflation and for other purposes, approved October 2, 1942 (Public Law No. 729, 77th Cong.), for any agricultural commodity and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, as the War Food Administrator determines are necessary to secure adequate production of such commodity for war purposes.

The purpose of this amendment is also self-explanatory. The Price Control Act has certain provisions regarding agricultural commodities, but it has been held by those administering the law that those provisions do not apply to processed or manufactured agricultural commodities. This amendment, if it becomes a law, will make the Price Control Act clear and plain that all provisions regarding agricultural commodities will apply to the processed or manufactured commodities the same as the raw materials.

In addition, this amendment places additional powers in the War Food Administrator and sufficient powers to enable him to control prices if used for the purpose of securing adequate production of a commodity.

PUT ALL FOOD UNDER CHESTER DAVIS

In addition to these amendments, I made an effort to secure the adoption of an amendment that would have placed all foods under the War Food Administrator. That is, everything connected with the production, manufacture, processing, distribution, or price of foods would have been placed under the War Food Administrator if the amendment had been adopted. The amendment was defeated by 1 vote or by a vote of 10 for and 11 against. This amendment will be proposed by me as an amendment to the bill when the bill is considered on the floor of the House. The proposed amendment is as follows:

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT TO H. R. 2725 PROPOSED BY MR. PATMAN

Page 5, after line 15, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. (a) All functions, duties, powers, authority, and discretion vested in or imposed upon the Price Administrator and the Office of Price Administration by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, in respect of food, are hereby transferred to and shall be performed and exercised by the War Food Administrator and the War Food Administration established by Executive Order No. 9322 of March 26, 1943, entitled, 'Centralizing and Delegating Authority With Respect to the Production and Distribution of Food' (Federal Register, vol. 8, No. 62, p. 3807, Mar. 30, 1943), as amended by Executive Order No. 9334 of April 19, 1943, entitled, 'War Food Administration' (Federal Register, vol. 8, No. 82, p. 5423, Apr. 27, 1943).

"(b) As used in this section the term 'Food' means (1) all commodities and products, simple, mixed, or compound, or complements to such commodities or products that are or may be eaten or drunk by either humans or animals, irrespective of other uses to which such commodities or products may be put, and at all stages of processing from the raw commodity to the product thereof in a vendible form for immediate human or animal consumption and (2) all starches, sugars, and vegetable and animal fats and oils.

"(c) Section 205 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out 'he may make application' and inserting in lieu thereof 'he may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, make application' and (2) by striking out the word 'Administrator' where it appears the second time and inserting in lieu thereof 'Attorney General.'

"(d) Section 205 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out 'Administrator' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Attorney General.'

"(e) Section 205 (f) (2) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out 'Administrator may petition' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Administrator may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, petition,' and (2) by striking out 'Administrator's' and inserting in lieu thereof 'Attorney General's.'"

The bill H. R. 2725 is expected to be considered some time during the week commencing June 6, 1943, in the event a special rule is granted for its consideration in the meantime by the Committee on Rules of the House.

PUT PETROLEUM UNDER SECRETARY ICKES

In the event the amendment to place all foods under the War Food Administrator is adopted, another amendment will be proposed that will place all petroleum and petroleum products under the Petroleum Administration for War. This amendment will be the same as the food amendment except that it will have the following two provisions in the place of the part in the amendment relating to foods:

In the case of petroleum, by the Petroleum Administrator and the Petroleum Administration for War established by Executive Order 9276 of December 2, 1942, entitled "Establishing the Petroleum Administration for War and defining its functions and duties" (Federal Register, vol. 7, No. 237, p. 10091, Dec. 4, 1942).

"Petroleum" means petroleum, petroleum products, and associated hydrocarbons, including but not limited to natural gas.

It will be noticed that in both amendments, food and petroleum, the enforcement will be in the Department of Justice.

There is so much confusion now relating to food and petroleum it is thought that these two very important and essential commodities in wartime should have separate administrations and the adoption of these amendments will permit food to be administered separately and petroleum to be administered separately.

The Kerr Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Judge KERR, of North Carolina, chairman of the Subcommittee on Subversive Activities of Federal Employees, of the Committee on Appropriations, who is absent from the House, on leave, I submit for the RECORD a statement unanimously authorized by the subcommittee, as follows:

The committee generally spoken of as the Kerr committee is a special subcommittee of

the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives appointed in pursuance of House Resolution 105 offered by Congressman CANNON of Missouri, chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, and passed on February 9, 1943.

In connection with a discussion of the functions of this committee something should be said about the background.

In 1938 the House of Representatives of the Seventy-fifth Congress realized that there was an organized un-American propaganda at work within the United States both of foreign and domestic origin, and as a result a special committee on un-American activities was set up under authority of House Resolution No. 282 to investigate (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of Government guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

Appropriations were made for these investigations by this committee through appropriating the amount of $495,000. In 1941 and following the investigations by the Committee on Un-American Activities the Congress allocated to the Department of Justice $100,000, and in 1942 $200,000 to investigate employees of every department, agency, and independent establishment of the Federal Government who are members of subversive organizations or advocate the overthrow of the Federal Government.

Upon the appropriation of these last mentioned funds the Department of Justice, through the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has made exhaustive investigations and examinations of employees and of various organizations and a report thereof made for the use of the Congress. In the meantime there was set up another investigating committee, known as the Interdepartmental Committee, appointed by the President of the United States to investigate subversive activities. So it appears that between 1938 and the present time Congress has appropriated and expended through committees and departments the sum of approximately $800,000 for investigations of employees and organizations who were suspected of subversive activities, and $300,000 of this amount was used for investigations of employees and organizations within the Government.

On February 1 of this year Mr. MARTIN DIES, Congressman from Texas and chairman of the Dies committee, on the floor of the House of Representatives named about 39 persons whom his committee had investigated and pointed out the activities in which the several persons had been engaged or associated. After these allegations were made on the floor of the House and when action was about to be taken in some of the cases by the House of Representatives to so limit the appropriations that these persons could not receive further pay from the Government, it was deemed wise and fair and expedient by leaders in the House of Representatives to appoint a special committee to examine the files of the several departments, including the investigations by the several committees and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and make report to the House of its findings, and it was at this point that Chairman CANNON of the Appropriations Committee offered House Resolution 105 which was passed on February 9, and here are the provisions of House Resolution 105:

"That the Committee on Appropriations, acting through a special subcommittee thereof appointed by the chairman of such committee for the purposes of this resolution, is authorized and directed to examine into any and all allegations or charges that certain persons in the employ of the several executive departments and other executive agencies are unfit to continue in such employment by reason of their present association or membership or past association or membership in or with organizations whose aims or purposes are or have been subversive to the Government of the United States. Such examination shall be pursued with the view of obtaining all available evidence bearing upon each particular case and reporting to the House the conclusions of the committee with respect to each such case in the light of the factual evidence obtained."

No appropriation was made or asked for this committee, and it is significant to note at the outset that this House resolution does not refer to an investigation, but authorizes and directs the committee to examine into any and all charges of allegations that certain persons in the employ of the Government are unfit to continue in such employment by reason of their present or past association or membership in or with organizations whose aims or purposes are or have been subversive to the Government, and to report the conclusions of the committee with respect to each case. It will be noted that up to this point the Committee on Un-American Activities had not given the persons charged any hearing, and it was certainly contemplated that the examinations by the Kerr committee would afford to each accused person an opportunity to appear and be heard.

Acting under the authority of the resolution the Kerr committee organized and adopted rules of procedure, and at this point I think it in order to read to you the minutes of the meeting of the committee held on March 23, 1943, at which the rules of procedure were adopted.

These rules of procedure have been followed and should be a complete refutation of charges made by Secretary Ickes that the right of counsel had been denied and that the transcripts of evidence were not available. In this connection it is stated that no person has been subpenaed to appear before the Kerr committee and no person has appeared and asked the privilege of counsel. On the other hand every person has appeared voluntarily and has been given ample opportunity and time to make full statements and explanations concerning all charges.

Here are the rules of procedure:

1. Unless or until otherwise ordered, all hearings before this committee shall be held in executive session.

2. It is the understanding of this committee that it is acting under a mandate of the Congress of the United States to examine into any and all allegations or charges that certain persons in the employ of the several executive departments and other executive agencies are unfit to continue in such employment by reason of their present association or membership or past association or membership in or with organizations whose aims or purposes have been subversive to the Government of the United States, and to report to the House of Representatives the conclusions of the committee with respect to each case in the light of factual evidence obtained, and that it is not the province of this committee to pass upon any legal or constitutional questions that may be raised, such responsibility being the proper office of the House of Representatives after this committee has made report of its findings and conclusions.

3. The committee will proceed to collect and review all of the reports of the several committees and the reports of investigations made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation together with such transcripts of evidence as may be available from the several investigating committees, and prepare a digest or memorandum of each individual case for the aid of the committee and for use at such time as the person charged shall appear for examination.

4. After all such evidence has been assembled, reviewed, and a digest made, an invitation by letter to the accused shall be mailed suggesting a time and place at which such accused person will be privileged to appear in person before the committee and make such statement or explanation under oath as such person may desire and to answer such questions as may be propounded. The invitation shall either advise the accused of the specific charges and allegations made or shall set forth that if the accused is unacquainted with the charges and allegations a copy will be furnished upon request in person or by telephone.

5. The proceedings before this committee shall be summary.

6. All reports of the several committees and the investigations made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, together with such transcripts of evidence as are made available from the several investigating committees, and all letters, resolutions, and other data bearing upon each individual case will be treated as a part of the evidence and record in each particular case.

7. The following definition of "subversive activity" is adopted by the committee for the purposes of the examinations to be conducted, namely:

"Subversive activity in this country derives from conduct intentionally destructive of or inimical to the Government of the United States—that which seeks to undermine its institutions, or to distort its functions, or to impede its projects, or to lessen its efforts, the ultimate end being to overturn it all. Such activity may be open and direct as by effort to overthrown, or subtle and indirect as by sabotage."

8. After the committee has made its findings and conclusions, a report thereof at convenient intervals will be made to the Committee on Appropriations for such other and further action as it may deem proper.

9. Upon the completion of the hearings before this committee the transcripts of all evidence taken will be delivered to the clerk of the Appropriations Committee to be, in turn, delivered over by him to the file clerk of the House of Representatives.

10. If this committee shall deem it necessary and advisable to require the attendance of witnesses other than the accused person or the production of books or papers or documents by subpena or otherwise, or if the accused person shall fail to appear in response to the invitation issued by the committee and it shall be deemed necessary and advisable to subpena the accused person, then and in such event another or other rules of procedure may be adopted.

This committee makes no apologies for writing a definition of subversive activity. The Attorney General had failed to write one, and the Congress had not seen fit to write one, and there had been no case before the courts in which a definition had been made. It was necessary to have a definition in order to intelligently pass upon matters before the committee.

It will be noted also that this committee has not presumed to pass upon any legal or constitutional questions that may be raised, and by the procedure rule No. 2 it was expressly stated that such responsibility was the proper office of the House of Representatives after this committee had made report of its findings and conclusions.

It has been charged that this committee has denied the accused right of counsel. This charge is without foundation. This committee has never subpenaed any accused person to appear before it. It adopted the rule of issuing an invitation to the accused to appear if he desired to do so, and in each instance the accused has appeared, and in no case has any accused person demanded counsel. That question was left open to be

covered by rule No. 10 where an accused should be brought before the committee under subpoena.

The committee has endeavored to follow the mandate of the House of Representatives in making its findings and conclusions and the House of Representatives has accepted the responsibility of the amendment to the appropriations act providing that no part of the appropriation should be applied in the payment of salaries to a certain person.

The critics of the Kerr committee and of other legislative committees charged that the proposed rider to the appropriation bill is unconstitutional because it invades the Executive powers of the President and they all cite as an authority the opinion of Chief Justice Taft in the case of *Meyers* v. *U. S.* (272 U. S. 52–161), and these critics aver that impeachment procedure is the only method for the removal of these inferior officers. In this much cited case the facts are that Meyers was reappointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as a postmaster of the first class.

The act of July 1876 under which this appointment was made provides that such postmasters shall hold office for 4 years unless sooner removed or suspended according to the law, and provides that they may be removed by the President "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." Meyers was removed before the expiration of his term by an order of the Postmaster General sanctioned by the President, and the removal was not referred to the Senate either directly or through nomination of a successor during the 4-year period. Meyers brought suit before the Court of Claims for salary and thus raised an issue between the executive power and the legislative power, and the court held that the provisions of the act of 1876 by which the unrestricted power of removal of first-class postmasters was denied to the President was in violation of the Constitution.

In the Meyers case there were three dissenting opinions, one by Justice Holmes, one by Justice McReynolds, and one by Justice Brandeis. The dissenting opinion of Justice McReynolds covers 61 pages and the dissenting opinion of Justice Brandeis covers 54 pages. Chief Justice Taft in the Meyers opinion cites with approval *U. S.* v. *Perkins* (116 U. S. 483) and quotes from the opinion in the Perkins case the following language: "We have no doubt that when Congress by law vests the appointment of inferior officers in the heads of departments it may limit and restrict the power of removal as it deems best for the public interest. The constitutional authority in Congress to thus vest the appointment implies authority to limit, to restrict, and regulate the removal by such laws as Congress may enact in relation to the officers so appointed. The head of a department has no constitutional prerogative of appointment to office independently of the legislation of Congress and by such legislation he must be governed not only in making appointments but in all that is incident thereto."

The Constitution does not determine who shall remove officers. It is true that the courts vastly increased the influence of the Executive and conferred powers upon him far beyond the expressed contemplation of the Constitution and contrasts strangely with the teachings of the fathers of the Republic.

But the legislation here proposed does not remove the officer but provides that no part of the public funds shall be paid to him, and I think no one has yet questioned the absolute control of the Congress over moneys that shall be drawn from the Treasury. Those who are criticizing upon the grounds of constitutionality cannot claim that the present situation is analogous to the facts in the Meyers case, but they contend that this proposed action violates the constitutional doctrine of separation of powers. Under clause 7, section 9, article I of the Constitution there is the following provision:

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time."

This power over the purse strings has been recognized unconditionally by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Hart* v. *U. S.*, which case originated in the Court of Claims, in which the following language was used:

"The absolute control of moneys of the United States is in Congress and Congress is responsible for its exercise of this great power only to the people. It is entirely within the power of Congress to indicate a class of persons who shall not be paid out of general appropriations but shall come to Congress for relief."

Another case in point is *U. S.* v. *Perkins*, 116, page 483, in which the court says:

"We have no doubt that when Congress, by law, vests the appointment of inferior officers in the heads of departments it may limit and restrict the power of removal as it deems best for the public interest. The constitutional authority in Congress to thus vest the appointment implies authority to limit, restrict, and regulate the removal by such laws as Congress may enact in relation to the officers so appointed.

"The head of a department has no constitutional prerogative of appointment to offices independently of the legislation of Congress, and by such legislation he must be governed, not only in making appointments but in all that is incident thereto."

We are here dealing with offices that owe their existence to Congress and offices that Congress may abolish tomorrow. Their duration and pay depend on Congress alone. With such power over the creation of these offices it would seem to necessarily follow that Congress has the power to prescribe the absolute power of control of the office and its incumbents.

IMPEACHMENT

The suggestion that these officers should be impeached is beyond the question. The Constitution expressly provides that removal of officers shall be "on impeachment for and conviction of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors." The charges and allegations against these persons do not come within this constitutional provision.

Money—The Most Important Issue in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the thirtieth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. In this part of Senator Cockrell's speech we learn the real reason for the breakdown of the leading nations of Europe except England—a money plan that finally crystalized into a system of standardization and interchangeability of the coinage of the nations subscribing to the Latin Union monetary convention, which was broken down by the avarice of Germany after the defeat of France in the war of 1870 more fully explained here by the Senator.

The thirtieth installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

Mr. GEORGE. What firm was that?

Mr. COCKRELL. It was Henry Clews. Now the panic is over, we are all pacified. I believe there is only one Senator who has ever attributed the present condition to the Sherman law, or claimed that it caused the panic. It is all over now; we have ample time. Remember we were called together expressly for the purpose of considering the financial question. Remember, further, in the campaign it came as if from headquarters that the silver or financial question must be relegated to the rear and the tariff must be placed in front. We did it. It was done in the campaign, and we expected, and I believe the people of the country expected, that the tariff would be pressed to the front. I think they had a right to expect it.

But, Mr. President, the financial question has been brought to the front. It is not the fault of Congress. The President had the right to call Congress together for whatever purpose he desired. He exercised that right, and he called us together upon the financial question, and when he convened us he had gone to the end of his Executive power. The responsibility now rests with us as to what we shall do. The responsibility rests upon him for having Congress here. We did not call ourselves into existence here. He brought us here. He is responsible for that and we are responsible for what we do. Why should we bow to England? If we are going to adopt a financial policy why not adopt that of France, the country that stood by us in the dark days of the Revolution and helped us achieve our independence and today is a sister Republic? Why shall we bow the knee to England? Are we not old enough to establish a financial system? We are 100 years old. That is a great age. Can you find any other nation on earth that has not established its own policy?

Mr. MCPHERSON. May I ask the Senator from Missouri a question?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Is the Senator from Missouri quite ready to adopt the system of France—that is, to close our mints against silver, as France has done, to stop the purchase of silver as France has done, and to hold in our reserves $250,000,000 of gold to redeem $700,000,000 of silver, as France has done?

Mr. COCKRELL. Not at all. Not a dollar of it is redeemed in silver. I deny it in toto.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Gold with which silver may be redeemed.

Mr. COCKRELL. No; it may not be redeemed in gold. It is not redeemable in that way. It cannot be done.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Standing there, then, as an evidence that the French people, the Bank of France, the French Government, have an abundance of gold to maintain all their silver on a parity.

Mr. COCKRELL. No, sir; they have not one dollar of gold to maintain silver.I say today (and I challenge anyone to show to the contrary) that there is no nation, kindred, or tongue on earth that has given full legal tender to silver and redeemed it in anything else. Metallic money is irredeemable. I read today from the Indian currency commission report. They tell you that the silver in France is irredeemable. Every writer tells you that. Look at the law itself. There it is. The silver there is irredeemable. They comment upon the great spectacle of France, Belgium, and those nations maintaining a

large amount of silver coin at the ratio of 15½ to 1 at a perfect parity with gold, while it is irredeemable in gold.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Why did they close their mints?

Mr. COCKRELL. Simply because they were afraid they were going to be deluged, principally with the silver from Germany, and then with the exaggerated, falsely reported sums that were to come from the United States—$200,000,000 or $400,000,000 a year.

Mr. MCPHERSON. If the silver is irredeemable, the silver being irredeemable, not a menace to anything, requiring no gold to maintain its parity and its circulation with gold, why would they be afraid of a deluge of silver? If silver is such a good thing why not take the silver of Germany?

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator knows perfectly well the existing condition between France and Germany. Germany adopted the single silver standard in 1857, and had a great fierce war with France, the two nations with adjoining territory. France had been overrun and prostrated at the foot of Germany. Germany had demanded $1,000,000,000 of indemnity from prostrate France, and France had raised the money and paid it; and as soon as it was done, having largely paid it in gold, then Germany commenced to discard her silver standard and shipped her money across the border in order to get French gold and try to bankrupt France. That is the reason for it, and a good reason, when your neighbor is trying to cut your throat, to take away from him the instrument he uses.

Now, Mr. President, what shall our system be? I want to quote here, for I do not want to consume the time of the Senate much longer, from our distinguished bimetallic gold monometalist, Senator Sherman, in his speech of 1892. I will have his proposal inserted. It is as follows:

"Mr. President, the policy of bimetallism, as understood by me, has always been the policy since the Government was founded. We never had in the true sense of the word, the free coinage of silver, strange to say, because, as I stated early in my remarks, Jefferson and Hamilton made a slight mistake in the ratio. Jefferson within 12 years afterward stopped the coinage of silver, and only a little of it had been used. So we never had in actual practice the free coinage of silver, but we had what is called by scientists the alternative standard, the cheaper standard, that is, whenever one of the two metals fell below the ratio that metal alone became the standard of value, and when the scale changed back again and the other metal became lower, that again became the standard of value, and it so happened that that occurred three or four times in our brief financial history.

"When Mr. Jefferson stopped the coinage of silver dollars because they were exported, American silver coin disappeared entirely and our people depended upon abraded Mexican or Spanish coin for change. In 1831, in the time of General Jackson, the Secretary of the Treasury of that day first proposed a change of the ratio. He said that under the existing ratio silver went abroad, and sometimes all the gold went abroad. Two years after that, after full deliberation, Congress did change the ratio. It became 16 to 1, and the result was that silver was undervalued, because 1 ounce of gold was not equal in value to 16 ounces of silver.

* * * * *

"Mr. SHERMAN. The result was that silver was undervalued, because 16 ounces of silver were worth more than an ounce of gold, and the result was that silver disappeared. Then 10 years afterward, again under Democratic administration, Congress passed a law in order to avoid this difficulty, and my memory goes back a little to that time. There was no change here to be had and in the West we had what were called shinplasters, issued by banks and sometimes by private persons. Senators may have seen some of them. We had no change because silver had gone away. It was demonetized; not legally in the sense of demonetization, but it had gone out of the country; and therefore in order to provide for a currency that would not run away at every change in value, in good Democratic times, in 1854, Congress passed a law reducing the amount of silver in minor coins, 50 cents and quarters and all minor coins, 8 percent, and then made them only a legal tender for $5, so that they would answer the purposes of change but could not be made the instrument of injustice as a depreciated coin.

"Now, that is the law and that has always been the law. The Government of the United States has always adhered to that and maintained its money always at the same standard. Most of this, it so happened, was in Democratic times. That very silver coin provided for by Mr. Hunter and his associates was adopted in the act for the resumption of specie payment. We provided for this minor coinage, this subsidiary coinage, as it is called in the law, to take the place of the fractional currency. It is the policy we are now acting upon, and the policy I advocate is the policy of our fathers from the beginning of the Government to this time."

Why does the Senator conceal apparently the actual facts, that during all the times to which he refers our mints were open to unlimited coinage of standard silver dollars and gold upon exactly equal terms? Knowing these facts, he opposes opening our mints to unlimited coinage of silver, and yet claims to favor our system from 1792 to 1873, the true bimetallic system, when our mints were so open.

And also I quote from the speech of Senator Sherman of 189:

"There is no doubt that the act of 1890 is made the imaginary pretext for many evils it did not produce. It is made to bear the results of wild speculation, of fears well or ill-founded as to future legislation, of failures and disturbances with which it has no connection. It is made the scapegoat for extravagance and folly.

* * * * *

"Let us not deceive our people as to the reasons for this repeal; for when the purchasing clause is repealed you will still have to deal with the real causes of the prevailing stringency and distrust. I do not vote for this repeal with any expectation that it will in any considerable degree relieve us from the industrial stagnation that has fallen upon all kinds of business and production, and that has thrown out of employment hundreds of thousands of laboring men and women. They care little about the kind of money that is paid them, provided that it is equal in purchasing power to any other money, and is backed by the United States. They do not study the question of ratio, or the difference between silver and gold, and, if left to choice, prefer the notes of the United States to either coin.

* * * * *

"Now, I wish to make a few observations in regard to what ought to be done for the future. If the purchasing clause is repealed, what then? I do not want to advise either this Congress or the Administration. I have no right at all to be weighed in their council, but I take it that whether we are Democrats or Republicans we are all Americans, and that every American would desire to do that which is best for all interests and all parties. I think there are certain urgent duties resting upon the Democratic Party at this time, and although I am not their adviser, I have the right as an American citizen to give them my opinion, and I will briefly do it."

The Senator then recommends—

1. Strengthening the reserve in the Treasuary by issuing bonds or Treasury notes bearing interest, to be sold for gold, to maintain the parity of all our money.

2. In event of deficiency in revenues the Treasury Department should have power to meet and provide for it.

3. Coining the seigniorage in the Treasury and using it in the ordinary operations of the Government.

He then says:

"I heartily and truly believe that the best thing we can now do is to suspend for a time, at least, the purchase of silver bullion. We should then turn our attention to measures that are demanded immediately to meet the difficulties of the hour. Let this be done promptly and completely. It involves a trust to your officers and great powers over the public funds. I am willing to trust them. If you are not, it is a strange attitude in political affairs. I would give them power to protect the credit of the Government against all enemies at home and abroad.

"If the fight must be for the possession of gold, we will use our cotton and our corn, our wheat and other productions, against all the production of mankind. We, with our resources, can then enter into a financial competition. We do not want to do it now. We prefer to wait awhile until the skies are clear and see what will be the effect of the Indian policy, and what arrangements may be made for conducting another international conference."

Mr. President, we have tried all these makeshifts which the opponents of the unlimited coinage of silver have forced us to adopt or leave their single gold standard of 1873 still in full force. We have tried them all. Now why not let the true friends of silver once try their policy? We have tried all the expedients that you gentlemen have forced us to take toward the rehabilitation of silver, and now why not let our proposition be tried for awhile? Is there any reason for it? Why not let the friends of silver try their policies awhile? They were tried in the United States for nearly a century, and they proved satisfactory. They have been tested by time and approved, and now why not let them be tried again?

You ask me what would be my policy. I ought to answer that by asking you what your policy is. What do you gentlemen propose to do when you get the act repealed, if you ever do? We would like to know something about it. We have a right to know.

As a great and growing nation increasing in population more rapidly than any nation, and also in wealth and the development of our manifold resources, this Congress and this administration owe it to the sovereign people, the great masses whose servant and representatives we all are, to devise and establish by just and wise laws a safe and permanent financial system.

If I had the power to declare and enforce a monetary system for our great country I would open our mints to the unlimited coinage of gold, with full legal tender, and to the unlimited coinage of silver at the present ratio or 15½ to 1, and receive all the silver bullion offered to the mints at its market value and issue in exchange therefor standard silver dollars with full legal tender, and silver coin certificates payable in silver dollars, until 412½ grains of standard silver metal were equal to a coined dollar and then give free as well as unlimited coinage to the silver dollar, and coin all the silver so offered as rapidly as possible into standard dollars; retire the national-bank circulation as rapidly as practicable, and with the increase of the silver dollars, if the currency of the country increased more rapidly than the increase of population and the demands of commerce, I would extinguish the bonded debt as rapidly as possible and retire the non-interest-bearing legal-tender notes gradually, until we, as a nation, owed no man, woman, or child a dollar of debt.

That is the system I would adopt, and I would enforce it by the imperious demand of Andrew Jackson. I want to wipe out the bonded debt, and now, since this fierce contest has come, I want to wipe out every paper obligation of the Government. I do not want any pretext made that this Government is hereafter to keep a gold reserve. Wipe out your bonds and then your greenbacks and have nothing that the Government is compelled to redeem in gold or in silver for that matter.

We want no reserve held in the Treasury of the United States. We want no redemption fund there. We want the money of the United States to be in circulation in the hands of the people, and we do not want our finances to be in such a condition that a few foreign bankers and syndicates can form a ring upon us and draw out our reserves. That is the only reason on earth why I would retire the greenbacks. That is what our country wants as a great country, a permanent financial system. We do not want to be driven around by a parcel of foreign syndicates and bankers. We want to be above their power, above their influence, above their reach.

Then our money would be gold and silver coins of equal legal tender paying and purchasing power, and our only paper currency, the certificates for the deposited coins held in the Treasury for their redemption on presentation, and I would make these certificates call only for dollars in coin, and would pay such kind of coin, silver or gold, as the stock of each on hand might justify. If the prophecies of the opponents of silver should by any possible means be fulfilled, then when we had a sufficiency of silver dollars, together with the gold, I would suspend such coinage. If this plan be impossible of securing, the next best plan would be opening our mints to the unlimited coinage of gold and the silver produced from our own mines, exchanging for the silver at its market price silver dollars or silver coin certificates, as before stated.

According to the figures I have given, the reasonable probabilities are that we would receive of our own mine product for coinage each year, only about $60,000,000, not $1 per capita. Certainly there could be no danger in this.

Suppose we found there was some danger, is Congress impotent to save the country from danger? Not at all. It is in danger now. What we are trying to save the country from is real danger, but the friends who propose the unconditional repeal are trying to save the country from an imaginary danger, a midnight dream, a nightmare without foundation. It has already disappeared and is dissipated. We are trying to save the country from real danger, from gold monometallism, and the evils that have resulted to the world from it.

No one more strongly favors true bimetallism, the perfect equality of gold and silver as bullion or metal, and as coin, than I do, and no one labors more earnestly and consistently to secure such bimetallism than I do. The discriminating legislation of foreign nations and of our coinage act of February 12, 1873, and the very recent action of Austria-Hungary, and especially of India, have so greatly depreciated the value of silver as a metal in the market that it seems unfair to the great masses of our people to permit owners of silver bullion or metal to have the same coined free in our mints into standard silver dollars—silver money—endowed by our laws with full legal tender, with all monetary functions, when unlimited coinage in our mints of silver bullion at its market value in exchange for coined dollars would just as surely bring us to free coinage if our contentions proved true, and remove every possible ground that we are attempting to enact class legislation for the special benefit of silver-mining States and silver-bullion owners.

Therefore I would prefer unlimited coinage to free coinage as I have indicated; and the hue and cry that we propose legislation for silver simply for the benefit of silver miners is false so far as I am concerned. I have not a dollar of interest, directly or indirectly, and never expect to have, in any silver mine or in anybody interested in a silver mine except citizenship in this country. I am not advocating silver here because my people are interested in silver mining or in its metallic value. I am advocating silver for monetary purposes and because my people, in my judgment, demand its use for monetary purposes.

Mr. President, the first step to be taken, however, before we get any plan, is by way of amendment to the pending bill to require the coinage of all the bullion on hand in the Treasury, and to coin it into a standard silver dollars, and with them, or with silver-coin certificates to retire and cancel every United States Treasury note issued for the purchase of silver bullion just as quickly as possible. That ought to be done in 36 hours. Coin certificates ought to be issued for the full amount of these Treasury notes, based upon the silver in the Treasury; they ought to be put in the subtreasuries and the national depositories, and every United States Treasury note which is outstanding ought to be taken in at once.

That is what the country needs; and it needs it quickly. In my judgment such an amendment ought to be put on the pending bill immediately or passed in a separate bill, which can be passed more quickly than this bill will ever get through in any shape, manner, or form. I would reestablish as quickly as possible the old constitutional Democratic bimetallism as nearly as the changed conditions would permit, with the hope and belief of finally attaining it in full. I would also increase the silver in the half and quarter dollars and dimes to the half, one-quarter, and one-tenth of the standard dollars and have but one currency for the Government and the people, the laborer and the office holder, the pensioner and the soldier, the producer and the bondholder, and wipe out any class distinction by law.

Mr. and Mrs. Hal Marriott, of Newark, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I call to your attention that I have at least one family, and possibly more, in the district which I have the privilege to represent, who has six sons serving in our armed forces. This fine American couple is Mr. and Mrs. Hal Marriott, of Newark, Ohio, in whose home hangs a service flag almost solid with stars. From this home six sons have stepped to serve their country.

A year ago in February the first star was placed on the flag when Karl W., 21, left for camp. Since then the stars have been added at regular intervals.

Hal Thomas, Jr., 25, and Leo Francis, 23, both left last May, and Robert W., 20, enlisted in the United States Navy in October. Finally the last two stars were added in February of this year, when Harold E., 29, and Clyde D., 19, entered the Army.

Life has definitely changed at 163 South Second Street, but Mr. and Mrs. Marriott feel it is only right and patriotic that their sons should get into the scrap.

"It is a little quieter," Mrs. Marriott said, "with the younger boys gone. But they will be back soon. I only wish I had had 12 sons to give."

Karl, who was inducted first, has been serving in England since last August. He is a corporal and is with the Engineer Corps. Hal, a private first class, also serves in England. He has been there with the Field Artillery since September.

Private Leo recently left this country for an unknown destination. He received his basic training at Camp Wallace, Tex. He was inducted May 20, 1942. His wife and son reside with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. R. Harger, of 14 East National Drive.

The fourth star was added to the flag when young Robert joined the United States Navy. He longed to have a share in the present conflict so he enlisted last October. He is a second-class seaman and is now on active duty with the fleet.

A few months ago Harold was inducted and is now stationed at Fort Lewis, Wash. He is a private with the Artillery. Harold's wife resides on Elmwood Avenue.

The last star for their sons was added soon after February 13 when young Clyde left with the draft call. Private Clyde, the youngest son, is training at Camp Croft, S. C., with the Infantry.

Mrs. Marriott has placed seven stars on her service flag. The seventh star is for her son-in-law, Pvt. John F. Wicker, who serves in north Africa. John is the son of Mr. and Mrs. John Wicker of 392 Henderson Avenue. His wife, Mrs. Effie Marriott Wicker, resides with her parents.

I fully realize that each parent, regardless of the number of members of their family in the armed service, are sacrificing and contributing to our war effort, but I feel that special recognition should be given to those parents who have six of their family group serving in the uniform of our country and carrying the banner for victory. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I salute and pay respect to Mr. and Mrs. Hal Marriott of Newark, Ohio.

Abrogation of the Cremieux Decree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letters:

LETTER TO UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE SUMNER WELLES CONCERNING THE ABROGATION OF THE CREMIEUX DECREE

HON. SUMNER WELLES,
Under Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WELLES: It is because of my knowledge of you as a man of courage and

integrity, one who has embraced with clarity of vision the tenets of the Atlantic Charter and the concepts of the "four freedoms," that I turn to you in the hope that you will see along with so many of us the fatal misstep and the eclipse of justice in General Giraud's abrogation of the Cremieux Decree.

When Adolph Cremieux as minister of justice decreed, "The native Jews of the departments of Algeria are declared French citizens," he did so in recognition of the contributions of loyalty and service that the Jews had made as a trustworthy and integral part of the Algerian population. Thus it was in 1870 and thus it is today.

Because General Giraud bases the abrogation of the decree on a special plea of the removal of racial discrimination, it is well to examine the foundation on which this special pleading rests. The Arab can, upon request, be admitted to French citizenship, but in so doing he places himself within the civil and political laws of France. It has been so since 1865 and yet the records show that only on the average of 30 Moslems per year have sought naturalization. It must be remembered that the special status of the Arabs includes polygamy, unilateral repudiation of a wife by a husband, forced marriage, and succession in the male line only. Upon embracing citizenship and thus departing from the mores of his ancestors, the Arab lost caste with his fellow Moslems. The Jews, on the other hand, cherished their right of citizenship, took part in administrative and military functions, and, indeed, welcomed the duties attendant upon citizenship.

Aside from the question of the human equation, it is well to glance at the legal effect of such abrogation upon the structure of French law. The abrogation of the Cremieux decree was likewise a violation and cancelation of the French law of nationality of 1927. That law provides that children of Frenchmen born on French soil and the children of foreigners born on French soil, and not opting at their majority for any other citizenship, are French citizens. The 44,000 descendants of the beneficiaries of the Cremieux decree, the grandchildren and great grandchildren of the native Algerian Jews of 1870 who were collectively naturalized, are today French not because of the effect of this naturalization, but by virtue of all that is signified by "born of French parents in France."

The shameless illegality of the abrogation of the Cremieux decree and the resulting violation of the nationality act is the first instance in the present era in which an antitotalitarian government has acquiesced in the acts of totalitarianism. It is the first time that our government, dedicated to democracy and diametrically opposed to totalitarianism, has approved one of those very totalitarian acts we have so violently abjured by word of mouth.

Ominous indeed is the precedent this carries with it for the future.

Moreover, such abrogation of the Cremieux decree is bound to have an alarming effect upon the underground movement in Axis and Axis-controlled countries. Disappointment and fear that a true victory of liberalism and equality will not follow can act as disintegrating agencies to impede the movement's progress, for it must be admitted that the success of the underground movement and the success of the armed forces move on parallel lines.

It is hoped that you will not hesitate to recognize the vital necessity for the immediate reinstatement of the Cremieux decree.

With assurances of highest esteem, I am

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Representative, Tenth Congressional District, New York.

LXXXIX—App.——174

REPLY OF HON. SUMNER WELLES

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 27, 1943.

The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CELLER: I have received your letter of May 21, 1943, in which you set forth the reasons why you consider it imperative that the Cremieux Decree of 1870 be reestablished in north Africa.

As you are undoubtedly aware, the presence of American troops in French north and west Africa does not mean that those territories have been occupied by our forces. The fact is that matters of local administration have at all times remained in the hands of the French. This, of course, applies to all laws and regulations affecting the local population, and it is therefore incorrect to state that any action taken by General Giraud with respect to the local situation has been approved, or disapproved, by this Government.

It was stated some time ago by General Giraud that immediate study was being given to the early establishment of a procedure whereby those native Algerian Jews who were temporarily deprived of their French citizenship—but not their French nationality—could reacquire citizenship.

Now that the battle for Tunisia has been brought to a successful conclusion there is every reason to hope that the legal problems involved will be solved in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

SUMNER WELLES,
Under Secretary.

LETTER TO GEN. CHARLES DE GAULLE CONCERNING THE ABROGATION OF THE CREMIEUX DECREE

Gen. CHARLES DE GAULLE,
Fighting French Headquarters,
London, S. W., England.

DEAR GENERAL DE GAULLE: We in America appreciate your gallant fighting for the liberation of France. We know how you stood fearlessly alone while others sought to appease and pander to Hitler.

Yours are the inspiring words, "Our allies help us and will continue to help us in defense and attack. But it is up to us to see that our chains be struck off by our own hands through combat and sacrifice common to all."

Thus, in sure knowledge of your dauntless belief in the unity and liberation of France, I cannot help but seek to enlist your aid and understanding in behalf of the Algerian Jews.

The abrogation of the Cremieux decree was neither an act of justice nor an expression of the freedom for which we stand united in battle. When, in 1870, it was decreed that "the native Jews of the departments of Algeria are declared French citizens," the Algerian Jews were reaping the benefits of their undisputed loyalty to, and their willingness to serve, the cause of France. In no way today have they departed from that loyalty and service.

Moreover, because the true nature of the abrogation of the Cremieux decree has been beclouded by noble phraseology, to wit, "the removal of racial discrimination," we must cut through to the core and question whether such abrogation serves the purpose of the "removal of racial discrimination."

The Arab in Algeria, while he can, upon request, be admitted to French citizenship, has shown himself unwilling to place himself within the jurisdiction of French civil and political law. To do so would deprive him of his special status, which includes such practices as polygamy, unilateral repudiation of a wife by a husband, forced marriage and succession in the male line only. The Arab's unwillingness to embrace the rights and privileges of French citizenship is clearly indicated by the fact that only approximately 30 Moslems per year have sought naturalization. To the Jews, this right of citizenship of which they have been stripped was one to cherish and guard zealously. No equality is served in depriving one portion of a precious right another portion has rejected. Wherein, then, does such deprivation act as a removal of racial discrimination?

Still further, it is well to remember, the 44,000 descendants of the beneficiaries of the Cremieux Decree, the grandchildren and great grandchildren of the native Algerian Jews of 1870, who were collectively naturalized are today French not because of the effect of this naturalization but by virtue of the French Law of Nationality of 1927, which confers this right upon them as children born of French parents in France.

There is none unmindful of the manifold problems which you face and will continue to face. Yet, such is the nature of the abrogation of the Cremieux Decree in its illegality, in its implication of Hitlerism that you cannot fail to see its ominous import. You can do much to help sever the chains that still tether the Algerian Jews. Your success in that regard with General Giraud will be electrifying and give heart to liberals and all friends of France everywhere.

Until the Cremieux Decree is reinstated, the true victory of liberalism remains inconclusive.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Representative, Tenth Congressional District, New York.

Excessive War Freight Railroad Costs Would Pay for St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PITTENGER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been called to an article in the May 29 issue of Business Week concerning the United States Maritime Commission's claims for refunds from the railways which Admiral Land believes are due the Government because of the land grant rate concessions allowed by law on Government traffic in return for the public lands we gave the railways in the early days.

The article is of such vital interest to the American public that I take the liberty of inserting it at this point. It reads as follows:

While doing a whale of a war job at a tidy profit, the railroads are involved in a collision with a threat to earnings, and the jolt is not lessened by the fact that they know it is coming. The obstacle is the old question of land-grant rates and the types of Government freight to which they apply.

Government audit delayed: The issue has been raised by the Maritime Commission which claimed that all materials going into construction of merchant ships since Pearl Harbor are entitled to reduced rates since such materials are solely for military purposes. The controversy will come to a head when the General Accounting Office gets around to checking the freight bills in dispute.

The General Accounting Office is swamped with work, hence it may be months before a decision is reached, but there is little doubt as to the outcome if the Maritime Commission sticks by its guns. In the history of the

controversy to date, the General Accounting Office has rather cleverly put the onus of decision upon the Commission itself. In response to inquiry made by the Commission's chairman, Admiral Emory S. Land, back in August 1941, Comptroller General Lindsay Warren advised him that administrative certification by the Maritime Commission that the materials are for military purposes would be accepted by the General Accounting Office, prima facie, as correct.

Thus it would appear that ultimately the railroads will have to refund the difference between regular rates and land-grant rates, a fat figure of a few hundred million dollars. The roads, of course, can sue for recovery in the United States Court of Claims.

Claims piling up: The refund presumably would include returns not only to the Maritime Commission but also to Lend-Lease and other Federal agencies. Meanwhile, the roads continue to charge the Government full rates. It follows that the amount claimed by the Government will increase even while the auditing office is working its way toward the bills.

However, there is a tax angle that will soften the blow considerably—when and if it falls. Since the railroads already have paid a 45-percent normal tax and, in some cases, excess-profit taxes for 1942, it is figured that the net amount returnable should be closer to $75,000,000 than $150,000,000.

All roads liable: Among the roads hardest hit by the refunds would be the Union Pacific, Southern Pacific, Santa Fe, and Great Northern. The Milwaukee and Northern Pacific would be less seriously hurt. Since non-land-grant roads have equalized their rates to compete with land-grant roads for Uncle Sam's business, they also would be affected but to a lesser degree.

The whole argument (BW-September 12, 1942, p. 65) swings on what constitutes military material and what does not. Land-grant rate concessions were allowed on Government traffic in return for public lands ceded to the roads to stimulate construction in the early days. The rates are 40 to 50 percent lower than regular tariffs. The railroads claim that the traffic on which the reductions were allowed meant a $26,000,000 Government saving during 1942.

Pressure was eased: The railroads sought relief from land-grant rates during the thirties. As Government agencies went into public works and emergency projects during the business slump, railways found that a huge percentage of their freight was moving at the low rates. Congress eased the pressure somewhat by the Transportation Act of 1940. It provided that Uncle Sam would have to pay full rates with an important exception—the low tariffs still applied to Army and Navy personnel and freight when traveling for military purposes. In return the roads relinquished to the Government 14,500,000 acres of land then in dispute.

After Japan struck, Government agencies stretched the meaning of the 1940 law to include all types of material in addition to guns, tanks, planes, and ammunition. Last year the roads again tried to wiggle off the hook. A bill seeking to make the Government pay the same rate as any other shipper was introduced in the House. The railroads claimed that reductions over the years had long since paid back the original value of the land ceded.

Two bills derailed: The administration frowned on some of the provisions, and the bill was sent back to committee for revision. Senator HARRY S. TRUMAN later introduced a bill that would apply land-grant reductions only to combat material. Both measures died with the last Congress.

Since the Interstate Commerce Commission suspended until the end of the year the freight rate increases granted a year ago, agitation for a repealer of the land-grant rate differential is reviving. Transportation Director Joseph B. Eastman went on record recently as favoring repeal.

Much of land sold: About 130,000,000 acres originally were granted the roads. They have received almost $500,000,000 in the past 90 years for the acreage sold, not counting taxes and other expenses.

I want to call attention to the fact that this article gives us our first indication as to how much just one Government agency is spending for freight. If the amount the Maritime Commission asks be refunded runs to "a fat figure of a few hundred million dollars," because the land-grant rates are from 40 to 50 percent lower than regular rates, it seems safe to say that the Maritime Commission's total spendings for freight will run $500,000,000 or more to date since the beginning of the war.

And, remember that this is only one Government agency. What the Navy, the Army, and Lend-Lease are spending on military shipments moved by railroad, we are not told. No opponent of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project, however, extravagant, has contended it would cost more than $500,000,000 to construct the St. Lawrence project. The Army engineers testified before the Rivers and Harbors Committee last year that the cost to the United States of the St. Lawrence seaway project was $277,056,515. This includes an item of $93,000,375 to be paid to the United States Government by the New York State power authority.

There certainly can be no question that the Maritime Commission is paying its huge freight bill to the railways to ship steel made in the Great Lakes basin to seaboard shipyards which, had the seaway been built, might better have been located next door to the steel mills. Even a blind man can see that the American taxpayers are paying for a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway but not getting it. In other words, the enormous saving in the freight rates paid the railroads amounts to enough to build the St. Lawrence seaway project several times over. Surely, this situation shows how foolish it is to neglect our domestic economy even in the time of a critical war crisis. With the foregoing figures in mind, I think I am on safe ground when I say that the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway power project is justified as a war measure, and the Under Secretary of War and his collaborators in the War Production Board did America and the American people a tremendous wrong last fall when they insisted that no priorities be made available for the seaway project at that time. Does anyone suppose that the railways now hauling this tremendous, but unnecessary—if we had the seaway—traffic are not consuming huge amounts of critical war materials and manpower? The use of these materials would be unnecessary if the St. Lawrence seaway project were in operation, and their diversion to the seaway now will, in my opinion, result in a net saving of money, men, and materials before the war period can end. The American taxpayer can ponder this question, because it is to his advantage to do so.

Memorial Day at Skagway, Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I offer for insertion in the RECORD a notable address made by Col. K. P. Bush, Chief of Staff, Northwest Service Command, at the beautiful and historic city of Skagway, Alaska, on May 31, 1943.

The course of empire which is now definitely making its way northwestward on the North American Continent gives promise that Skagway will once more be one of the most important ports of that entire region, important not only to Alaska but to Canada.

The address follows:

Colonel Ahrens, Mayor Benedict, friends of Skagway, fellow members of the armed forces: It is a privilege for me to come here today to participate in this ceremony. The raising of our flag to the peak of this great new pole fittingly symbolizes the quick advance which has been made in developing Skagway's facilities in the interest of national defense and continental security.

We are fastening the flag to the halyards on a day set aside in tribute to men who have given their lives for their country. This year, Memorial Day has a special meaning to us all. Within the past 24 hours Americans have probably died in battle. Perhaps even as I speak, some American soldier or sailor is perishing in the cause of freedom. As we raise this flag to the northern breezes and gales, I hope we will think of the valorous men of many generations who have given—and are giving—their lives that the American flag may continue to be a symbol of justice, equality, and liberty.

Although my own station is within the borders of Canada, I feel a warm interest and close kinship for the people of Alaska. In the 8 months that I have served in this northern region, I have come to realize and appreciate the fortitude and patience of the men and women who have hewn a living out of these far-flung solitudes. I have had the privilege of meeting and knowing some of your public officials, such men as Delegate Dimond, Governor Gruening, Secretary Bartlett and Adjutant General Williams. I have met many of the average people of Alaska, too, and their hospitality and kindness shall always be a bright memory.

I realize that to some degree your day-to-day routine and habits may have been upset by the extensive preparations for defense which have taken place here. Yet these discomforts are only trivial and minor when the larger picture is considered. The efforts in Skagway of Colonel Ahrens, of Lieutenant Colonel Wilson, of Lieutenant Colonel Hayes, have been directed toward making this historic port a vital rampart in Alaska's military system. Transportation is essential to defense. These men and their associates have been developing Skagway as a transportation center. That development will help in the great task of strengthening Alaskan defense. Remember that one enemy shell exploding would cause many times the discomfort, hardship, and irregularity that has been occasioned by the present construction period.

I speak for all the men in the armed forces here when I thank the citizens of Skagway for their patience, cooperation, and hospitality. Many of our soldiers have had their

lives brightened by the warm hearts and open doors of Skagway's people.

We of the Northwest Service Command, whose task it is to coordinate activities in this area, are especially mindful of the splendid assistance we have enjoyed from the civilians of Skagway, whether those civilians drove locomotives or practiced surgery. Skagway has had a colorful and vivid past. Through this port, tucked beneath its granite cliffs, struggled the men who sought the riches of the Klondike. Fourteen miles from Skagway, at Chilkoot Barracks, was established our first Army post in Alaska. The ground where we stand is fertile with legends of the North.

Yet I cannot help but believe that this is Skagway's most momentous hour. The community which lies at the head of the Inside Passage is now more than a portal to the grandeur of the Yukon. It is one stone in the arch of defense we are building in the North Pacific area. It is enlisted in a great and everlasting cause—the cause of human dignity and independence. With that thought and spirit, I raise our flag to the peak of this new pole, a pole fresh from Alaska's forests. May it wave here eternally over free men and women.

The Withholding Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARTER MANASCO

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, it is with reluctance that I feel compelled today to vote against the conference report on the pay-as-you-go tax proposal. Frankly, I must admit that when the Ruml tax plan was first presented to the Nation, I, like a large majority of Americans, thought it was a great advance in our complex system of tax payments.

Today our national debt is well over $100,000,000,000 and the most optimistic expert predicts that it will reach $300,000,000,000 before the war is brought to a successful conclusion. We do not and will not object to increasing the national debt to any amount necessary to protect our homes and our American institutions, to rid the world of all forces of aggression. A majority of Americans would not think of canceling our enormous war debt. We want to pay it at the earliest possible date and remove the terrible burden of paying interest and principal. Will passage of the conference report reduce the debt one dollar? I think not. My elementary knowledge of finances and mathematics lead me to believe that passage of the bill will automatically increase our debt by seven and one-half billion dollars. The pay-as-you-go advocates tell us that the Treasury will not lose a dollar under the terms of this new panacea. Let us examine this contention for a moment and see whether or not the Treasury will lose. True, we will not lose any revenue this year or the next, but remember that every taxpayer will die sooner or later and when we forgive 75 percent of last year's taxes under the provisions of the bill, the Treasury will lose seven and one-half billion dollars when all present taxpayers die. That means that within the next 55 years other taxes will have to be levied to reduce the debt by a mere $7,500,000,000.

Passage of this bill will mean an added tax burden on our men in the armed forces when they return. It will be passed on to unborn children. The seven and one-half billion dollar forgiveness will pyramid through interest charges for years until the war debt is paid.

Many advocates of pay-as-you-go argue that unless we adopt a monthly withholding plan, the Treasury will lose a large percentage of taxes due by war workers when the war is over. The best available information is that the total tax that will be due by the war workers after the war is over will be two and one-half billion dollars. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that the Treasury will lose the entire amount of two and one-half billion dollars, would that justify our forgiving seven and one-half billion dollars? We all know that a large percentage of our war workers will pay their income tax after the war and the percentage of delinquencies will be small. Yet, to collect this two and one-half billion dollars now, we must forgive seven and one-half billion dollars of last year's taxes. Some financing, and a new way to reduce the National debt.

It is argued that the Gallup poll shows a preponderant majority of the American people favor pay-as-you-go. This may be true but I wonder if the same percentage would want to cancel the national debt after the war is over. After the boys return from overseas and when unborn children are burdened with payment of the enormous debt we are piling up, do you not think it would be easy to sell them on the idea of canceling the national debt? They could base their argument on just as sound grounds as the argument in favor of this bill. Could not they say that by canceling the debt taxes could be reduced and the Government itself placed on a pay-as-you-go basis? Our generation does not have a monopoly on new ideas. Some of the holders of Government bonds may some day awaken to that fact. The Gallup poll, if it had been in existence, would probably have shown that a large majority of Americans opposed building up our national defenses in the late twenties. We all realize now what a terrible mistake we made.

Payment of taxes in any form is unpleasant; so is fighting a war. When the new program goes into effect in July, it will not meet with the same popular acclaim as the Ruml plan, for then everyone will be face to face with the varied complexities of the act. Every employer will have to have a trained staff of tax collectors. They will have to hire a staff to keep up with all regulations and changes and will have to help the employees prepare endless questionnaires. Every employee will have not only one return to file annually but many, or suffer severe penalties. They will have to file estimates of probable earnings at the start of the new tax year in addition to their usual returns.

How will the proposal affect seasonal workers, such as coal miners, automobile workers, school teachers, and many others? I wonder if the Treasury will be willing to return immediately any overpayment? You think we now have too many regulations. You know that people are groaning under Government control. You will have 44,000,000 taxpayers mad and belligerent when the program gets into full swing. My position might be wrong and I hope it is, but we will know better next year, and better still when the war is over.

Can you consistently vote for this bill and later on vote for a higher income-tax bill and probably a sales tax?

Textiles Go to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend on Monday, May 31, 1943, at Spartanburg, S. C., a celebration entitled "Textiles Go to War."

I have more spindles and looms in my congressional district than any other Congressman. More cotton was consumed in Spartanburg County this year than in any other county in the world.

A program extending through 3 days at which were present outstanding civilian and military officials was interestingly and profitably attended by tens of thousands of people.

The climax of this celebration was the speech delivered by a citizen of Spartanburg, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, Chief of War Mobilization. It was most gratifying to observe the fine patriotic spirit of the people of Spartanburg, especially those who are engaged in the manufacture of textiles, one of the most vital elements of our war equipment. There are no strikes or dissensions among our people.

Chief Byrnes' speech is as follows:

UNITED STATES NAVY TO BE DOUBLED IN SIZE THIS YEAR, BYRNES STATES—BAD NEWS FOR JAPS AND HITLER PACKED INTO TEXTILE TALK—LABOR DEFENDED FOR MAGNIFICENT EFFORT—STRIKES IN WAR INDUSTRY ABOUT AS RARE AS SLACKERS IN ARMY, BYRNES SAYS

(SPARTANBURG, May 31.—The text of an address by James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, follows:)

I am happy to be back home even for a day. I am particularly happy to join you in paying tribute to the men and women of the cotton textile industry who, tending their looms and machines, are doing their part in winning the greatest war in the history of mankind.

I wonder if you yourselves realize what you are doing in this struggle. In the last war American troops were outfitted with clothing and arms to be used only in western Europe. In this war troops must be provided with clothing and equipment to fight in all parts

of the world under every conceivable climatic condition.

Cotton, no less than steel or aluminum, is an essential war material. More than 5,000 articles in which cotton is used are purchased for our armed forces.

Rafts like the one which saved the life of Eddie Rickenbacker and his associates, and parachutes which drop fighting weapons out of the sky for our paratroopers, are made of King Cotton.

The task of meeting the rapidly growing war demands for cotton textiles has fallen mainly upon American cotton mills. Management and labor have responded magnificently. The bolts of cloth produced by the industry in 1942, if sewed together, would reach around the world 282 times. The remarkable part of this achievement is that the mills are turning out 66 percent more textile products with 30 percent less spindles than the industry had in the last war. Textiles have really gone to war.

Textile workers are justly proud of their war work. Although firmly determined to preserve their right to strike in time of peace, with few exceptions they have patriotically refused to countenance the right to strike in time of war. We have had some stoppage of work in industries producing weapons of war. They have justly aroused criticism. But when you condemn the few who strike do not forget that the great mass of our workers and, with rare exceptions, the leaders of organized labor, are doing as much as any of us, and more than many of us, to see that there is no interruption of war production. Do not forget that during 1942 only one-twentieth of 1 percent of the time of workers engaged in war work was lost on strikes. The striker in war industry is almost as rare as the slacker in the Army.

NAZIS AND JAPS STARTED YEARS AGO

But we have a big job ahead of us. The Nazis and the Japs started to prepare for this war years before we as a nation woke up to what was going on. While they were plotting our destruction we were passing neutrality laws that helped them out. Not until after France collapsed and Britain was besieged and Russia attacked did we begin to realize what was happening in the world.

But in the meanwhile we had lost precious time and our enemies launched their treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor, mistakenly believing they could beat us down before we could equip ourselves for battle.

It was humiliating for a Nation as great and proud as ours to remain for months on the defensive, to be unable in the winter of 1942 to send the reinforcements necessary to save the Philippines, to be unable in the summer of 1942 to open a second front in Europe to help Russia.

It was not easy to reply to critics who complained that we were losing the war by default. The President could not tell them what the General Staff was doing to rebuild our Pacific Fleet and to strengthen our supply lines in the Pacific by the capture of Guadalcanal. The President could not tell them how the General Staff was assembling ships, supplies, and men to drive the Nazis from Africa and to expose them to attack in Europe from every direction.

Military operations require more than the brilliant ideas of clever strategists. They require extensive preparations. As important as the coordination of our air, sea, and land forces in actual battle is the preparation which must be made long before the battle begins to bring together at the right place and the right time the necessary men, supplies, and equipment. Hitler won the first battle of Europe not in 1939 or 1940 but in the preceding 5 years of preparation.

UNITED STATES NOW LEAVING NAZIS FAR BEHIND

We have at length caught up with the Axis in our preparations and are forging rapidly ahead. We are now girding ourselves not for a single attack on a single front, but for many attacks on many fronts both in the European theater of war and in the Pacific. Those attacks will proceed when and where the enemy least expects them. And they will not cease until the last vestige of Japanese treachery and Nazi tyranny are blasted from this earth.

This is the harvest year for the Navy's ship construction. It is the year in which the great majority of the vessels for which plans were made a year and 2 years ago will actually join the fleet.

In the first 5 months of this year we have completed 100 fighting ships. It means that in 5 months we have finished almost as many warships as were finished in the entire year of 1942.

During this year we will double the size of our fleet. That accomplishment is without parallel in history. It is bad news for Tojo.

These are fighting ships—battleships, aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, escort ships, and submarines. These do not include the several thousand landing craft which have been completed during the last 5 months.

This year's warship construction will be marked by two special achievements—aircraft carriers to give air coverage to our convoys and to our attacks, and escort vessels to destroy the enemies' submarines.

The Navy has developed a special convoy vessel, the destroyer escort. It has but one function—to hunt down submarines. More of them will be built this year than there were destroyers in the fleet at the end of 1942. Within a year and a half we will have more of these vessels than any other single class of vessels in the fleet.

MUCH OF FLEET JUNKED AFTER WORLD WAR NO. 1

Living up to our disarmament agreement, we junked a large part of the fleet following World War No. 1. But the Navy fortunately kept up its research work. We put on paper some of the most effective devices and implements of war in naval history. They had to be built. They have proved to be marvelously effective. With the airplane and the escort vessels, they have contributed to the splendid record in the month of May when we lost fewer ships and destroyed more submarines than we dared to hope for.

The submarine is even more deadly. Recently one of our convoys was set upon by a pack of Nazi submarines. They got one of our merchant ships, but we got four of their submarines.

History will some day record the part radio and the radar have played in giving us fighting superiority over the Axis. But let me give you one instance. On the night of November 24, off Guadalcanal there lay a Japanese battleship. It was a stormy night. Eight miles away was a ship of our fleet. With the use of the radar our ship with its second salvo, sank the Jap battleship in the blackness of night, 8 miles away. Is there any wonder that the Japanese Admiral Yamamoto who boasted he would dictate the peace to the United States in the White House, has quietly passed away?

This war imposes great and grave responsibilities upon our merchant marine. Ships must maintain lines of supply to our far-flung battlefields.

During the 12 months period ending May 31, 1941, we constructed 50 dry cargo ships and 22 tankers. During the 12-month period ending tonight, we have constructed more than 1,000 ocean going dry cargo ships and almost 100 ocean going tankers. Remember this record has been achieved on top of the gigantic naval construction program.

We are building merchant ships four times as fast as they are being sunk. The merchant fleet of the United States is growing so rapidly that we are shipping and delivering more cargo than ever before in history. But we still need more ships and still more ships to carry out the unconditional surrender war plans of the United Nations.

Only by comparison with our achievements then can we grasp the progress of our effort now. In World War No. 1 our forces were equipped in very large part by arms and munitions lend-leased to us by our allies. In this war we have had to assume the burden not only of equipping our own troops but of helping equip our allies.

LEND-LEASE SHIPMENTS ARE ENORMOUS

We have, for example, shipped to lend-lease countries almost twice as many motor vehicles as we produced for ourselves alone in the last war. If all these vehicles were parked bumper to bumper, they would reach twice across North America.

In all World War No. 1 we produced 1 piece of artillery for each 1,100 men in the Army.

In the month of May of this year we produced three times as many pieces of artillery for ground troops as we did in all 19 months of the last war.

Our production of high explosive powder has been six times greater than during the last war.

Because we were unprepared we had the tremendous task of providing training camps. By April 1 of this year we had spent $10,000,000,000 in buying land and in building all over the United States airfields and training camps such as you have here at Camp Croft. We provided housing for 5,000,000 men.

In modern war we must have guns for airplanes, machine guns for antiaircraft and for ground troops. Between June 1, 1940, and June 1, 1941, our ordnance plants turned out 25,000 machine guns and submachine guns. The year following we turned out 700,000. Between June 1, 1942, and the present date we turned out 1,500,000, bringing our total to 2,225,000 since America began to rearm.

GERMANS HAVE IDEA WHAT TO EXPECT

Let me give you some idea of what we have in store for our enemies. A week ago last night there occurred the greatest and most devastating raid in history. The Germans know what it did to Dortmund and its war industries. Our bombing strength is being added with increasing intensity to the strength of the British. The tonnage of bombs that we have already produced is sufficient to load our planes for 542 raids the size of the Dortmund raid, and we are producing more every day. America means business.

For the 7 years preceding June 1940, while we were building automobiles and refrigerators, Hitler was building airplanes. He relied upon those planes to enslave the world. American skill and energy are producing planes to free the world.

Between June 1, 1941, and June 1, 1942, we made 30,248 airplanes; and between June 1, 1942, and today we made almost 60,000.

I have some bad news for the man Mr. Churchill calls "Corporal Hitler." I have some bad news for the Japanese, too. I am permitted to announce that the one hundred thousandth airplane manufactured since we began our war-production program came off the assembly line today.

Do you remember how the Nazi and Japanese propagandists scoffed when President Roosevelt first announced that we were going to build 100,000 planes? Well, they do not scoff now. They know that America means business.

I cannot tell you how many of these planes are bombers, how many are fighter planes, how many are training planes and cargo planes. That is a military secret. But I can tell you that in the beginning of our program the proportion of trainers was large. Since that time our planes have become heavier and heavier. The proportion of bombers and fighters has become steadily higher, and they are bigger and more devastating.

I will make no prediction about the number of planes we will produce in the next 12 months. You may draw your own conclusions.

OTHER ALLIES ALSO PRODUCING WAR PLANES

Russia and Britain are both producing planes in tremendous numbers in their own factories. Not only America, but all the Allies mean business. Our combined might will drive the Axis from the skies, and hold a protection umbrella over our ground forces as they triumphantly march to victory.

It has not been so very long ago that we were told by some who claimed to have special knowledge that the Germans had a peculiar genius for air power and that neither Britain nor America singly or jointly could win in the air.

But the history of this war is proving that the Nazi's genius in the air is no greater than the genius of a gangster with a gun against an unarmed victim.

Before this war is over, Hitler will learn as the Psalmist foretold:

"Behold, he travaileth with iniquity; yea, he hath conceived mischief, and brought forth falsehood. He hath made a pit, and digged it, and is fallen into the ditch which he made. His mischief shall return upon his own head, and his violence shall come down upon his own pate."

But this is no time for overconfidence. Remember Hitler's attack on Russia. It was Hitler's overconfidence which caused him to attack Russia and give us the time to catch up in our preparations.

Thus far we are only on the outer fringes of this war so far as personal deprivation on the home front and the loss of blood on the battle front are concerned. We have been in this war almost as long as we were in the last war. So far our casualties in this war have been only 86,862. Our casualties in the last war totaled 233,184. This will be a much tougher war.

There is no doubt in my own mind but the American people will steel themselves for the tough weeks and months that lie ahead. Already the mothers who have lost sons have shown the mettle which makes America great.

Let me read you some lines that come to me from a letter by a mother whose home is in Aiken and whose son was killed in Guadalcanal.

AIKEN MOTHER GLAD OF SON'S COURAGE

"One of the first things I thought of and said, when I heard about George, was that it is not the length of time we live, but how we live and what we do with our lives that counts. It would not have been fair for other boys to have given their lives and not one of ours. Thank God, he had courage enough to give his life for what he knew was right."

There are thousands of mothers just like this one. They are America's answer to the Axis propaganda that we are too soft, too weak, and too indifferent to our liberties to make the sacrifices which must be made before victory is won.

We have a long, hard road ahead. The hardest fighting is yet to come. We have not yet a firm foothold anywhere on the continent of Europe, excluding Russia. Japan still holds her stolen empire, rich in vital war resources. Thousands of our boys are prisoners of war in the Philippines, and the flag of the Japanese aggressor flies in place of Old Glory over Corregidor.

There can be no cheer in the American hearts until the Nazis are crushed in Europe and the Nipponese in the Pacific, until China is free from aggression, and Quezon, MacArthur, and Wainwright march in triumph through the streets of Manila.

Hitherto our energies have been largely engaged in production in preparation for attack. Now we must not only keep up our production and increase it at critical points, but we must assume a major part in the all-out military operations against the enemy. We must keep up our all-out production at the same time that millions of our men are engaged in all-out attacks. This will put stresses and strains on our military machine, our civilian economy, on our private lives. We must streamline our governmental operations.

We must act with greater dispatch and greater efficiency than ever. We must learn to work, to fight, to sacrifice together as we have never done before. We must accept willingly and gladly a self-discipline to which we are not by tradition accustomed.

VICTORY CANNOT BE ACHIEVED CHEAPLY

Masses of men and women cannot work together if they are always thinking whether the other fellow is doing his part. Masses of men and women can work effectively together only if they are actuated by a desire to outdo each other in contributing to the common effort. The American people on the farms, in the factories, and in the mines, as well as at the battlefront, must work together as one team.

Your Government has no right to call upon you to work as a team if it is not going to demand of Government officials that they work as a team. I admit that officials of the Government have made mistakes. That is to be expected of human beings. But the people have a right to expect Government officials to sacrifice all pride of opinion and cooperate just as officers of the Army and Navy are required to cooperate.

We must be just. There have been controversies in Government. But that these controveries and their effect upon the war effort have been greatly exaggerated, is clearly demonstrated by the statement I have made of our progress.

The President has taken new and resolute action designed to unify and solidify our war efforts here on the home front. As part of this action he has designated me as director of the Office of War mobilization. Later this week the War Mobilization committee will meet. Until that meeting I can make no statement as to our plan but I pledge you that I shall do all in my power to bring about the same coordination of efforts among the civilians in governmental agencies that exists on the military fronts.

Victory in war cannot be achieved cheaply. We must pay dearly for victory with the lives of our fighting men. We also pay for our victory by unremitting, and when need be, unrewarded toil on the home front. We must also pay for victory by willing sacrifice of the things we can do without. We must demonstrate that we are worthy of our freedom by our willingness to work, to fight, and if need be to die for our freedom.

We must so conduct ourselves that future generations will speak of the men and women of 1943 as we speak of the men and women of 1776.

Our Debt to General Grant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Memorial Day address given at Grant's Tomb, May 31, 1943, by Charles J. Zinn, commander, Lafayette Camp, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War:

It has been for more than a generation the privilege of Lafayette Camp, Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War, to hold these annual memorial exercises at the tomb of one of the Nation's greatest generals, statesmen, and benefactors. This fine tradition which was instituted at the close of the last century by U. S. Grant Post, No. 327, Grand Army of the Republic, has been maintained by us under the auspices, and as successors, of that post. In thus paying tribute to General Grant we are in fact ourselves honored, in that we, as guard of honor for the Grand Army of the Republic, are granted the inestimable privilege of placing this floral wreath at his final resting place, and of expressing vocally our reverence for and gratitude to that great patriot. It is fervently to be hoped that these exercises which were inaugurated shortly after the last remains of that illustrious general were placed here will be continued as long as this tomb remains. We must all realize, however, that these Memorial Day exercises are merely the external manifestation of those sentiments which each one of us, not only in every State of the Union but in every liberty-loving country in the whole world should cherish all the days of the year. Too frequently do we think of General Grant in terms only of his military genius and of what he accomplished for our own Nation rather than of what he did for the entire world.

It is true that his generalship has long been recognized by every European nation—with the exception of Germany whose general staff officers considered the Civil War as a mere squable of amateurs—and that the British Staff College and French War College have both included a history of that struggle in their curricula, but his greater significance has too often been overlooked by Americans and others alike. When we shall have finally won the war in which almost the entire world is now engaged—then perhaps, will the people of all the nations come to a fuller realization of the part General Grant played in preserving the Union not only for itself but as the rescuer of the world. While we are fighting cruel and heartless enemies for the preservation of everything that we hold dear—in fact, for our very existence—and while we sometimes find it easy, without urging, to hate those enemies, we naturally may experience difficulty in coming to a full and true understanding of the character of the man whose memory we are honoring today. We are in the mood to appreciate his generalship and military genius but his generous humaneness and compassion are characteristics which some would now have us forget. Nevertheless, it is the happy combination of these talents and virtues which made General Grant the great man he was and which were responsible in large measure for the firm unity among the States which has enabled our Nation to arrive at its place as the greatest Nation in the world.

Not only is the United States the greatest Nation in the world, but it is the greatest secular possession of the world, and its potency for good is being demonstrated every day in every corner of the globe. This precious possession was preserved for the world by the exercise of the genius of General Grant as a soldier and as a humanitarian. Although he was capable of using whatever stern military measures were necessary in accomplishing his task, it was not as the vanquisher of an enemy, but rather as the shepherd gathering together a divided flock, that Grant must have considered himself. As the soldier he could say, "We will fight it out on this line if it takes all summer," and as a humanitarian he could say to a defeated Lee, "Let the men take their horses; they will need them on their farms." The South remembers that the same Grant who boldly proclaimed, "Immediate and unconditional surrender," also said, "Let us have peace."

Such expressions of the Christian spirit by a magnanimous victorious general are the cornerstone upon which was erected the towering structure of a stronger re-United States upon which the entire world is today placing its hopes for survival.

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in the sudden taking off of the Honorable HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT the House lost an able, intelligent and hard-working Member. The State of California lost a splendid member of its congressional delegation. The Nation lost a great and good legislator and the Second District of California has lost an effective, alert, and courageous representative.

He was the distinguished son of a distinguished father, whose seat in the House he so ably filled following his father's death.

HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT represented a typical western American district. As a mining engineer he was able to foster and promote the interests of mines and prospectors. He knew the problems of the lumberjack, the farmer, the fruit grower, and the small businessman, and he was always keenly interested in their welfare.

Every Member of this body knew and respected HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. He had a kindly smile for all and we shall miss his fellowship.

I had the honor and privilege of numbering him among my friends and his untimely passing leaves me sad.

To his bereaved family I can only offer my sincere and heartfelt sympathy. Their loss is an irreparable one.

HARRY was a loving husband, a kind and companionable father.

The parliamentary term "the gentleman from California" as used when addressing him was no mere prescribed courtesy. He was a gentleman in the best sense of the term. Peace to his soul.

Philip Allen Bennett

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. PHILIP ALLEN BENNETT, late a Representative from the State of Missouri

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, on this day we are commemorating the memory of such distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, I want to pay my respects to the late Congressman PHIL A. BENNETT, of Missouri.

Throughout his term of service in the House, Mr. BENNETT was my sincere friend. I learned to love and respect him with increasing admiration. I never knew him to cast a vote on any great issue without first consulting his conscience. His votes reflected conviction rather than political expediency.

Although his distinguished son, Congressman Marion Bennett now represents his district ably and well, his loss will long be felt in Congress. When the people choose more men like PHIL A. BENNETT, our country will be sure of direct and genuine representation in Washington.

Frank Henry Buck

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. FRANK HENRY BUCK, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is once more called upon to perform the sad duty of holding memorial services for its departed Members.

The Honorable FRANK HENRY BUCK who so ably represented the State of California on the great Ways and Means Committee in passing left a gap that will be hard to fill.

His knowledge of the intricate problems connected with taxation rendered him one of the committee's most valuable members.

He was, in addition to being a good businessman, an able lawyer and his broad and intimate knowledge of the legal, financial, and agricultural problems of California enabled him to render his State invaluable service.

While this service was somewhat impaired by the illness which finally proved fatal, the State of California generally, and the agricultural interests particularly, are forever in his debt.

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT came to Congress in 1925 and from that day to the date of his death I was intimately acquainted and associated with him.

He was one of the finest, most lovable characters I have ever known. Few men have as great loyalty to their country. Few men give as much of themselves as he did to the work here. I have never known the House of Representatives to be as stricken as it was when the announcement was made of his passing.

His family have much in his fine record to comfort them. His memory will always be an inspiration to those of us who are left.

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to remember HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT as a loyal friend, a patriotic American, and as a man who served his country with honor and distinction. His life and career typifies the advancement made possible under our American system of free enterprise and opportunity.

HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was a native son of California. He was also a Sixty-niner—having been elected to the 69th Congress. Those of us who began our service in the 69th Congress have enjoyed many years of happy association with each other and with our friend HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT. We loved and respected him for his fine qualities of friendship, ability, and leadership.

We often speak of treasures gained through life. For myself, the memory of my association with HARRY L. ENGLEBRIGHT and his family will be cherished as a prized possession which will remain mine until I, too, must answer the final roll call.

Jefferson Davis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Jefferson Davis," by Mrs. Charles H. Fred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An epoch in southern history began June 3, 1808. This day Jefferson Davis was born at

Fairfield, Ky. He was destined to be the leader of a liberty-loving people whose courage and fidelity to principle would write upon the pages of American history a story that would for all time be the admiration of the world.

Jefferson Davis came of Revolutionary stock who helped to carve out with their swords this Nation.

His childhood days were spent in Mississippi.

In 1824 he received an appointment to the United States Military Academy; after his graduation in 1828 he was assigned to the First Infantry and won his spurs in the Black Hawk War. About this time he was sent to muster into the United States service such troops as might present themselves. Among the first to arrive for muster was a tall, homely, and slender youth who presented himself to Lieutenant Davis; this young man was Abraham Lincoln; so Jefferson Davis administered to Abraham Lincoln the first oath of allegiance he ever took to the United States Government.

Remembering that Mr. Davis was educated at West Point at the expense of the Government who controlled that institution, and that their text book on the Constitution and civil government endorsed the doctrine of States' rights and States' sovereignty as held and understood by the South, it seems strange that the Government of the United States should condemn her student, who had been taught this doctrine by her direction, when he undertook to put it into practice.

During the war with Mexico he distinguished himself at Monterrey, where he displayed almost superhuman courage by personally leading his regiment in a successful charge through a galling fire from the strongly entrenched city with all the fury of a tempest.

The heroic storming of Teneria caused all the world to ring with the story of the fame of Davis and his Mississippi Rifles.

A new star had appeared in the firmament of military glory.

Jefferson Davis was yet to shed new luster upon the escutcheon of a State that had nurtured him into the fullness of a perfect manhood. The radiance of Monterrey was to fade, as did the starlit glory of Lodi before the noonday splendor of Austerlitz.

His daring genius at Buena Vista presented him to the galaxy of the greatest military chieftains of the earth. Here he won a battle against such overwhelming odds as to make operations around this historic field a marvel to military students. Entering the United States Senate in 1847, he became chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and exerted an influence second to none in the discussion and settlement of the important questions which then agitated the legislative mind.

Upon the election of Pierce as President of the United States, Senator Davis accepted from him the Portfolio of War; and his administration of the affairs of this important bureau was such as to make him the most popular official in the history of that Department.

A splendid stone aqueduct stands but a few miles from Washington City, a monument to his earnest labor. The name of Secretary Davis was carved on the structure, but afterward erased by order of the United States Government. It has since been restored by the efforts of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

When political wrongs were heaped upon the South, she exercised the constitutional right of secession, and, on the 18th of February 1861, the Southern Confederacy was born—born of a people's determination for self-government. Jefferson Davis, the man chosen as the South's leader, was a most uncommon gift to civilization. An uncompromising enemy to the wrong, an eternal foe to deception and hypocrisy; the everlasting companion of candor and sincerity; true in all things he gave to the world a life that emblazoned the coronet of time with the resplendent jewels of honor and patriotism.

Summoning to his aid such heads of departments as appeared most suitable, and proclaiming in his inaugural address that necessity, not choice, had compelled the secession of the Southern States, President Davis bent his every energy to the confirmation of the republic newly born in the sisterhood of nations.

Herculean was the effort, involving as it did the entire organization of the Confederacy.

A venerable historian of Louisiana says: "If Minerva with wisdom, courage, justice, and right was on the side of the southern champion, it was Minerva without the necessary garments to protect her against the inclemencies of the weather; whilst on the other side stood Mars in full panoply, Ceres with her inexhaustible cornucopia, Jupiter with his thunderbolts, Neptune with his trident, Mercury with his winged feet and emblematic rod, Plutus with his hounds, and Vulcan with his forge and hammer.

From the first angry shriek of the cannon at Fort Sumter until taps were sounded at Appomattox the Southern soldier shed glory and luster on the Southland, while the name of their matchless leader will ring down the corridors of time.

"Fame unrecorded still is fame,
Truth, though unknown is truth the same.
And the grand glory known to man is heroism,
Though it win no victor's wreath nor conqueror's crown."

As Atlanta spread flowers along her thoroughfares in 1886 in honor of this uncrowned king of the South who had come to Georgia to pay tribute to Benjamin Hill, and, when he crossed the eternal river, embowered his sleeping body with immortelles as it lay in state on its last journey to Richmond, the mecca of enshrined memories, so let us point to Jefferson Davis the exemplar of noble deeds and inspiring achievements, the South's "priceless jewel."

Democracy on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, several days ago at Salem College, Salem, W. Va., a baccalaureate address full of rare wisdom and inspiring eloquence was delivered by Dr. Fred Taylor Wilson, noted author and lecturer. His subject was Democracy on Trial. The honorary degree of doctor of letters was conferred on Dr. Wilson at Salem College on Thursday, May 27. I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a historic hour for me. Thirty-three years ago on your commencement day, next Thursday, May 27, it was my high privilege to win the founder's medal in oratory at Vanderbilt University, my own alma mater. My subject on that occasion was Democracy on Trial. That is my subject here today. My opening words in that college address were: "Democracy is yet on trial. The verdict of the world has not been rendered." They are my opening words today.

We have seen a bleeding democracy retreat in recent years. At this hour, a world in travail and tears looks anew to the trial of democracy which still goes on here in our own land. The verdict which will be rendered as to the success or failure of our democracy will determine whether civilization is to advance to a larger tomorrow or sink into the shadows of an age darker than any yet known to man.

I am thinking today primarily of the success or failure of our political democracy under which we have, as Lincoln expressed it, government of, by, and for the people. Much could be said about our economic and social democracy or the lack of it. The danger of a financial feudalism named in my college address was averted by later legislation under the far-seeing administration of Woodrow Wilson. May the present danger in our body politic with one great corporation holding more assets than the total wealth of 21 of our 48 States, be in like manner removed by future progressive political leadership.

We must not forget that democracy is only one of the several "ocracies." From Moses forward, for centuries, theocracy, where men ruled under divine guidance, was the ruling force among men. During the Roman Empire, stratocracy, or rule by military might and main, was predominant. Monarchy came to its final climax in the despotism of Russia. Aristocracy, or the rule by the best in wealth, culture, and character has always had a peculiar claim upon the minds of men. A limited democracy prevailed in ancient Greece, where Aristotle was our first political scientist and where Pericles wrote so eloquently. But it was under an Athenian democracy that Socrates was forced to drink the hemlock for his free speech. Servetus, in like manner, surrendered his life under the democracy of Switzerland when he, too, spoke too freely.

The pen of Jefferson, whose two-hundredth birthday we recently celebrated, first proclaimed a universal democracy. It was Jefferson who wrote that all men were created equal, in our immortal Declaration of Independence, and declared that they were divinely endowed with the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Locke, the English philosopher and teacher of Jefferson had already declared for the preservation of the right of man to life, liberty, and property. But happiness as the goal for all men was, under Locke, an impossible dream. Leaders of thought as erudite as Erasmus and wise as Montaigne thought man, born of woman, doomed forever to trouble. Thirteen years after Jefferson, the French in their declaration of the rights of man had as their battle cry liberty, equality, and fraternity. Rousseau, a great Frenchman, for the first time gave to a political battle cry a passion akin to that of a religious crusade.

One of the makers of our own Constitution in the Convention which wrote it dared to express a doubt that the handiwork of that Convention would survive for 150 years.

Today I affirm that if our American democracy is to finally prevail and win a glorious acquittal that three conditions must be met. First, our American electorate must become a more intelligent one. The melting pot in America has lost its magic. Knowledge may not be the wings which will waft us heavenward in a political sense but ignorance is truly the curse of our democracy. No ignorant electorate can be expected to vote wisely. How appalling is the ignorance of the meaning of our American institutions and the freedoms of which we boast on the part of the average man. If our more fortunate elements have as little knowledge as has been shown in recent college polls, how abysmal must be the ignorance of the masses at large? Our political leadership must be

in the hands of more expert leadership. Men trained in the history of our country, its institutions, and the ideals for which it stands, alone should lead us. We demand experts to treat the ills of our human bodies and leave the ills of our body politic for treatment at the hands of quacks and amateurs. Experience has shown that our most valuable statesmen in State and Nation have been those best schooled in the art of statesmanship. We confer high place upon common men and look for the miracle as they suddenly become supermen. My first plea is for a more enlightened electorate led by better trained and more carefully skilled political leadership.

Next, our electorate must become a more industrious one in the exercise of its right of suffrage. Eternal vigilance is the price of a successful democracy. We must have men who work while others sleep, who dare while others fly. The forces of evil are ever awake. This precious right of suffrage has not always been ours. It was 67 years after George Washington became President before universal suffrage was the lot of the American white voter. Woman in America came into her own with the right of suffrage 64 years later. And how few of them have made the most of their high privilege? It is a startling fact that little Rhode Island, which would have to be multipled 212 times to equal Texas in dimension, casts more votes than the combined votes of four southern States—Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina. The lethargy of the legally qualified voter is one of the desperate dangers to our American democracy and the final hope of those who would see it destroyed. Less than 60 percent of the voters who took part in the 1940 election voted in 1942, and in many States less than one-third of all qualified voters exercised the right of suffrage.

My third absolute is that our American electorate must be rooted and grounded in the strictest integrity if our democracy is to survive. Better a benevolent dictatorship than a corrupted electorate. The royal robes of honor must ever be about the shoulders of the American voter, the king in our democracy. Our ballot box must be kept forever free from taint and corruption, and our polling place looked upon as democracy's throne. It must not be polluted. He who would soil its sanctity must be scourged as one who defiled the very ark of the covenant. Too many times "the jingle of the guinea helps the hurt that honor feels."

So I plead for a universal ballot free, clean, intelligent, uncorrupted in the hands of all good Americans regardless of class, creed, or clime. For such is the final panacea for all our political ills. Remember the words of Jefferson: "Give the people light and they will find their own way."

A word must be said for a minority in a democracy. From our earliest days until now our minority has done much to hold our ship of state to an even keel. Our boasted freedoms of speech, press, assembly, and religion, a part of our Federal Constitution were put there through the unceasing efforts of Patrick Henry, George Mason, Richard Henry Lee, and other great Americans who opposed the original Constitution. Lincoln, who brought healing to the Nation, was a minority President when he first took office. We owe much to our present-day minorities

So my plea today is for greater intelligence, more industry and a stricter integrity on the part of our American electorate.

Let me remind you on this baccalaureate Sunday of the close kinship between the ideals of a true democracy and our Christian faith. Each recognizes the supreme value of the individual and the God-given dignity of human personality. Every forward step made by man during the centuries in behalf of liberty and freedom has been under great Christian leadership. That is true from Stephen Langton, the English archbishop who led the fight for the Magna Carta in England 728 years ago, until this good hour. Your Baptist Church has a right to be proud of Roger Williams the great forerunner in the fight for religious freedom in America. If the Augean stables of our national life are ever purified, the stream of purification will flow from our church altars. For he best serves God who serves best his fellow man.

There is much to discourage the youth of today. But let me bid you take heart. Remember this is God's world. That the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof and all they that dwell therein, is as true today as it was in the long ago. We read in holy writ that God created the earth as well as the heavens. He has not forsaken and will not forsake the work of His hands. If America is, as Emerson declared, the last hope of mankind, what an Atlaslike responsibility rests upon the young men and women of the America of tomorrow. Spengler, a great historian, wrote of the decline of the West. But our sun rests on its eastern and not its western horizon. How fortunate we have been thus far in this present world tragedy. "Our alabaster cities gleam undimmed by human tears."

In the midst of all the darkness of the present hour let me assure you that the dreams and visions of our poets and prophets and saints will some day become a reality. Right will win the day. "For right is right since God is God and right the day must win." In the Metropolitan Museum of Arts in New York one may behold a great dream in bronze. There stands Father Time beating the sword into the ploughshare and the spear into the pruning hook. At his feet the lion and the lamb lie sleeping peacefully together. That was the dream of Isaiah in the long ago. How strange the picture as we read of plans to storm the fortress of Europe and invade a nation 10,000 miles away. Then we look again. We catch the dual vision of Tennyson. With one eye he dipped into the future and saw the pilots of the purple twilight with their airy navies dropping bales of destruction upon the world below. With the other eye, the great Tennyson beheld the coming of the hour when the war drum would throb no longer and battle flags would be furled in the parliament of man and the federation of the world. The first vision of Tennyson has become a tragic reality. Shall we not have faith in the greater vision!

So I bid you today go forth in faith and hope and love.

As the stars redeem the night from darkness and red rays of light remind us a new day is near, so may the stars and stripes of our flag become the symbol of assurance to the darkened nations of the earth that their long night of war and slavery will soon be over and that a golden day of peace and freedom will soon dawn for all mankind.

The Poll Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Poll Tax Really Is School Levy," from the Charleston News and Courier of May 31 last.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLL TAX REALLY IS SCHOOL LEVY—PAYMENT NOT OPTIONAL AND IS ENFORCEABLE BY FINE OR IMPRISONMENT

(By J. W. D. Zerbst)

There has been much discussion recently in regard to the poll tax in the various States, with bills pending in Congress and contemplated repeal bills in the South Carolina Legislature. These discussions warrant a review of the poll-tax laws in our State, as many citizens are of the sincere belief that the $1 per year poll tax is an optional tax, predicated upon the desire of the taxpayer to vote or not to vote in the general elections for State, county, or city officials.

To the contrary, a review of the State laws providing for the tax disproves this belief in every phase and clearly shows that it is a school tax of $1 a year to be paid by all males between the ages of 21 and 60 years, inclusive, with certain exemptions.

"There shall be assessed on all taxable polls in the State between the ages of 21 and 60 (exception, Confederate soldiers above the age of 50 years) an annual tax of $1 on each poll, the proceeds of which tax shall be expended for school purposes in the several school districts in which it is collected," according to the constitution of 1895, article 11, section 6.

Section 2565 of the Code of Laws for 1942 has the same provision as the constitution, with an additional exemption which reads as follows: "Except those incapable of earning a support from being maimed or from any other cause shall be deemed taxable polls."

These sections of our laws make it mandatory on the taxpayer to pay the poll tax unless he comes under the exemptions. Further, I believe it can be safely said that it is one of the oldest forms of taxes, if not the oldest, for there have been head taxes or poll taxes referred to for many, many years.

The poll tax is the only tax of its kind which carries with it a provision for a fine and/or imprisonment for nonpayment, for section 2787, volume I of the Code of 1942 requires the treasurer and sheriff to attach the regular fee penalties and costs of all other taxes and in addition provides that when payment is refused the sheriff or tax collector shall certify same to any magistrate, whereupon the magistrate shall issue his warrant as is provided by law in section 1720, which reads:

"Any person failing or refusing to pay his poll tax within the time prescribed by law shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction thereof shall be punished by fine not exceeding $10, together with costs of said suit, or by imprisonment at hard labor on the public works of the county not more than 20 days, provided that the county shall not pay the costs or fees of any constable or sheriff for the execution of any warrant or other process issued in any case by virtue of the provisions of this section unless the defendant in such case shall be arrested and convicted."

Sections 5365, 5366, 1563, 5364, 2708, and 2780 provide for the manner of keeping the records of payments of the poll tax and for certain reports to be made to the superintendent of education by the county treasurer and county auditor.

Every section connects the poll tax with the educational phase of our government and any connections which the poll-tax receipt has with the general election laws or jury service requirement laws of the State is incidental, for you cannot vote just on a poll-tax

receipt. In addition to this, you have to obtain a registration certificate. Again, you do not have to have a poll-tax receipt to vote unless you are under 60 years old. The right of franchise continues regardless of the age of the voter.

For jury duty a man is eligible unless he is 65 years old and the jury list is made up from the registered voters, not from the poll-tax list.

Opinion of Assistant Attorney General of Arkansas

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, out of the regions whence life shone its first light upon me came forth an interpreter of the signs of time and the right of men that are and were the philosophy of freemen. Yet this little epistle comes in the pure form of a parable which has given unto this Union all things that are good.

The great State of Arkansas has bloomed forth many a beckoning invitation to us that have migrated across the line of that State into the fair State of Oklahoma.

The subjects of rugged individualism and free enterprise are ably pictured in an opinion by an assistant attorney general of the State of Arkansas, the Honorable Cleveland Holland. His opinion is as follows:

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL,
May 28, 1943.

Mr. FRANK WARREN,
Huntsville, Ark.

DEAR SIR: You ask if there is a law prohibiting male hogs or boars that are unregistered from running at large in a free stock range.

I am not authorized to give official opinions except to the Governor, the heads of the various State boards and commissions, members of the legislature, and prosecuting attorneys. Therefore, my reply will be unofficial and informal and to the effect that there is no statute prohibiting such animals from running at large in a free stock range.

In this regimented and controlled world, the male hog upon a free range is one of the few creatures, living or dead, upon which the heavy hand of bureaucracy has not descended with restraining force. The gentleman hog as he looks out upon his free range, is still lord of all he surveys. He is, so to speak, like the last of the Mohicans, the sole surviving representative of that vanishing symbol of rugged individualism and free enterprise, which in times past, was thought to be the birthright and heritage of all men. Yes, my friend, the unregistered male of the hog family upon a free range is untouched by rationing cards, travel regulations, administration decrees, and slap-happy country savers, many of whom vainly imagine they can improve upon the plans of the Almighty. As yet, all his roads lead to hog heaven and not to Washington.

The gentleman hog roaming a free range is still free to enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness according to all his inalienable rights and privileges.

He is not required to answer a long questionnaire, giving the details of his profits and pleasures. So may it be with all men when the bluebirds shall sing again over the white cliffs of Dover and free hope shall stir again the spirit of America.

Very truly yours,

CLEVELAND HOLLAND,
Assistant Attorney General.

Memorial Day, 1943

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, today we assemble to pay homage and tribute to the honored dead, and this day may well be considered the diamond anniversary—75 years on the 5th day of this month, now passing into the history of time. Gen. John A. Logan issued his famous General Orders No. 11 as the then commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic.

General Logan designated this day as one for the "strewing of flowers or otherwise decorating the graves of comrades who died in defense of their country" during the Civil War.

He invoked upon all of his comrades, while any one of them yet remained alive to pay respect and honor to the resting place of their dead comrades.

Throughout our land today, and on other days which may be designated to take the place of this day, millions of our people are baring their heads and standing at attention while services such as we are conducting are being held. Too few of our people fully realize the true significance of the glory in this day's memorial services. In lesser numbers, only because of another blood-spilling period in the history of man in his quest for freedom and liberty, too many people accept this day as a time for jollification or self-comfort.

Strange ideologists are rampant over the face of the earth at all times and in recent years some of these in their destructive force have taken possession of the minds of combined national peoples.

Like the recurring scourge of the devastating locust the effect of these destructive forces is upon us again, striving to consume the fruit from the tree of freedom for which these men whom we honor here today have died.

Their offspring are now shedding their blood in deadly combat all over the earth to destroy those, and their followers, who would nullify man's, and especially our Nation's, effort to bring forth freedom and liberty to the peoples of the earth.

In this world-wide war, the principles involved are the same for which they whose remains lie in hallowed places today also fought, bled, and died. The historical episode in which they took part was a pulsating heartbeat in the body of freemen's endowed right, invigorated by the transfusion of their rich liberty-loving blood.

The serious question remains with us—How long in the march of civilization must men, and now even women, beat the martial drums of war, spill their blood in ever greater quantities, decimate our people and homes of our vigorous young in defense of our liberty and freedom?

From the numbered dead on the battlefield of Lexington through all this Nation's wars, our soldiers did not fight because of their love for war. They died performing their duty as freemen contributing their lives to the cause of freedom for others. They believed, and we also believe, there can be no peace while oppression exists; that injustices thwart progress; and that freedom will not remain static. Liberty and freedom will either expand to other peoples of the earth, or the philosophy of life not based on freedom will envelop and submerge them.

All of us are prayerful that the present terrible war will show humanity a way to peace. On this holy day, in the hallowed places throughout our land, let us hope for international understanding. Let us pray for guidance in the post-war days. Let us pray that all nations shall base their dependence upon the divine endowment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Let us learn that oppression among us is no less objectionable than it is apart from us. Let us hope to eliminate class consciousness. There can be no freedom for all people unless we squarely face the question of equality throughout the world. We cannot have equality throughout the world unless we accept it at home. In order to establish the premise for lasting peace we cannot withhold the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness from anyone. Our example, backed by the same determination to gain our liberties, can well be the means whereby these memorial services can be truly held in memory of those who died for the cause of unity and freedom, instead of memorial services for those who died and are yet to die for this same cause.

May the light of our national life give us and all other nations direction, so that humanity can build together, but keep us strong and well armed so that the specter of moronic madness may not ever again raise its ugly head to bleed liberty-loving people white for a cause which should need no defense by an enlightened people of the world.

Evacuated Japanese in California

REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS ROLPH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, citizens of the Pacific coast are definitely opposed

to the return of evacuated Japanese to our area.

On May 5, 1943, a number of Representatives, including myself, stated unequivocally how residents in our section of the country feel. At that time I said the Japanese are now out of our territory and they should remain out.

I submit announcement from the Downtown Association of San Francisco dated May 26, 1943. This statement clearly sets forth the position of the Association. The letter reflects overwhelming sentiment in San Francisco.

Under unanimous consent, I include the communication as part of my remarks:

The Downtown Association of San Francisco, an old-established organization representative of property owners and business interests of San Francisco, has been deeply concerned about the threat to release certain Japanese from detention centers and to permit them to return to the Pacific coast area. Most earnestly we endorse the policy which General DeWitt has adopted and put into effect, excluding all persons of the Japanese race from this critical combat area during the war emergency.

Respectfully, but with all the forcefulness of language that we can command, we protest against any sentimentality or impractical idealism that would permit the Japanese to return to the coast communities. We of the West know the Japs better than do theorists and self-styled humanitarians of the East, whose contacts and impressions of the Japanese have been gained at long distance.

We do not believe it possible that not a single American-born Jap had knowledge of the elaborate preparations made long in advance for participation by Honolulu Japs in the organized sneak attack on Pearl Harbor. Neither have we forgotten that there is no record made known to the public, so far as we are informed, that any American-born Jap came forward to warn our Government of the impending treachery.

It would, in our opinion, be foolhardy and a policy utterly lacking in realism to permit any Japanese to return to the coast areas during the war. Our highest Army and Navy officers continue to warn and even to alarm us into a realization that our coast area—Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles—will be raided and bombed by the Japs, if for no other reason than to lift Japanese home morale and to save face.

We would be the last to countenance violence or reprisals upon Japs within our borders. Any violence shown to Japs would probably have the horrible result of bringing torture and death to our men of Bataan and of the South Seas who are prisoners in Jap hands. The execution of our Tokyo flyers has shown the total savagery of this enemy.

It would be a tragic lack of realism to think that the lives of any Japs loose in our coast area would be safe if there was a Jap air raid over our cities, with death, conflagration, and destruction rained down upon our people from the skies. We are too close to Pearl Harbor and Corregidor and to the awful ordeals our men have endured on Guadalcanal to expect that our people will be complacent and loftily idealistic about pure humanitarianism, if members of this race are at large in our midst while their compatriots are bombing and maiming and killing our people.

Any official or group of officials or citizens responsible for the return of Japanese to the Pacific coast would have upon their heads the tragic consequences that might follow from such an ill-considered policy.

We urge upon you in the best interests of our Nation, not to permit this grievous mistake to be made.

Commencement-Day Address by Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy at Oglethorpe University

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 3 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I request that the speech delivered by Hon. Joseph P. Kennedy, former United States Ambassador to Great Britain, at the Oglethorpe University commencement exercises at Atlanta, Ga., on May 29, 1943, be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"I want to describe for you the shafts of light which I discern in the world's darkness, so that as you go forth to join your friends and brothers in the service you will not despair of America.

"The Americans who now make up our combat units in the Army and the Navy and the air forces are, in the great majority, from 18 to 23 years old. Hence, they were born in the years 1920 to 1925, and therefore, they are the products of a time in our history which has been excoriated more than any other recent era.

"It was the age when, after a campaign of political deception during which pledges were written to read in two ways, the elected administration made a separate peace with Germany and left a fertile field in Europe in which to sow the seeds of a new world war.

"LAUDS PRESENT GENERATION

"Gangsters ruled over great cities because of the avarice and cowardice of politicians, and murder was organized and often unpunished.

"And our fighting men who were infants then grew up in the shadow of another kind of materialism. A brood of young writers—journalists, novelists among them—poured unending scorn on everything that had made the country great, on the pioneers in industry and the heroes of history and especially on the teachings of religion. Communism, even with its godlessness, was hailed as the ideal. The Constitution was referred to by learned men as a national fetish or totem pole. And the technique of smearing or debunking those who had won fame and success reached a high form of development.

"The prophet would have said—and often he did say—that a generation born and bred in such an environment would be soft and mean in spirit. But the genius of our race has triumphed over it. The sons and daughters of the pioneers, brought up the hard way, were no stronger or braver than these children of the decadent twenties have proved to be.

"TRIUMPH OF AMERICAN HOME

"How did this phenomenon occur? How did a brave and gallant generation emerge from a mean and sordid era? The answer cannot long elude us. We had in our midst hidden wellsprings of strength. The great majority of American homes were not engulfed by the tides of cynicism and revolt. Children learned to pray at their mother's knees, as before, and the simple virtues were impressed upon them. In the typical American home, exemplified in the daily routine of life, there was loyalty to the pledged word, there was sacrifice, there was discipline, there was respect for man's dignity and reverence for God's majesty. American family life inculcated in our youth the heroic qualities of mind and spirit which war has demanded. No collectivist cell could have done the work of the American home. It saved the soul of America from the subtle corruption of the age which spelled the doom of at least one proud nation. We who have observed this remarkable work are determined that, despite the stress and strain of war upon the social fabric, the American home must remain as our basic social unit.

"ASSURANCE TO MEN IN SERVICE

"The silent, thoughtful, patient, sacrificing parents of America are doing quiet guard duty on the home front. You may rely on their loyalty and common sense to insure that the Nation stands behind you as you defend us.

"Your parents and elders will see to it that there is no fundamental change in the structure of American democracy while you are gone. No one and no group is going to wipe out the right you have, to create with your own enterprise your own home and to achieve that position among your fellow men to which your industry and talent entitle you.

"There are some Americans—a vocal minority—who appear to take the position that the peaceful structure of the post-war world depends upon the adoption by every nation in the world of the communistic collectivist pattern in its own internal affairs. This is a fantastic condition precedent to international organization for peace among nations. You who defend America are bound to emerge from the fighting lines with valuable ideas on the vital problem of how to preserve your own children from the fate that now befalls you. The least which we, your parents and elders, can give you is the assurance that this Nation shall make no final commitment on post-war policy until after national deliberation in which you have an opportunity to participate and are given the attentive hearing you deserve.

"OUR PRAYERS WILL FOLLOW YOU

"We, your parents and elders, have profound faith in you and complete confidence in your ability to win a decisive victory for our cause. We ask you to trust us to protect your heritage while you do battle. One last assurance we give you—that our prayers will follow you to the ends of the earth. In truth, we shall work as if all things depended upon ourselves, and we shall pray as if all things depended upon God. A minor British economist has recently written:

" 'Russian achievements—military, political, economic—are having a profound influence on western Europe. Faith in Europe today is based on belief in the supremacy of economic man. Scientific advances have given man the power to control his destiny; no longer is he subservient to the divine law or the immutable laws of nature. Social planning by national and international commissariats will free all humanity from the fear of want.'

"STRENGTH WILL COME FROM GOD

"This, I submit, is the boastful cry of man's independence of his Creator that has brought civilization to the present crisis. By coincidence the same edition of the press which carried the economist's remarks also contained a despatch to the effect that Lt. Gen. Sir Kenneth Anderson had announced that

his victorious First Army would hold Thanksgiving services in every unit on a forthcoming Sunday. The general said:

"'When we are afflicted, we often ask God for help, but when we are successful we are too prone to give credit to ourselves, not to God. There are great spiritual forces at work in this war, for truly this nazi-ism we are fighting is an evil, beastly thing, and the strength finally to conquer it will come from God.'

"The great soldier, who has seen the awful reality of death in a thousand forms on the battlefield has expressed our simple faith. It is the faith which, kept alive in thousands of homes, nurtured the gallant generation that now defends us. It is the faith without which our best plans for international organization and collaboration will produce a modern Tower of Babel. It is the faith with which we must restore and repair the shattered structure of our civilization."

Food Is Where You Grow It!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and table:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
May 5, 1943.

Mr. DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman, War Production Board.

DEAR MR. NELSON: It now appears probable that food supplies available for civilians in 1943, after meeting the requirements for United States armed forces and for shipments under the lend-lease program, will have a caloric content of somewhere between 3,100 and 3,200 calories per person per day. This compares with the minimum amount necessary to maintain the health and efficiency of the civilian population recommended by the Food and Nutrition Board of about 2,800 calories and with the British consumption of between 3,000 and 3,100 calories.

Because of the size and complexity of the United States, it is impossible to assure as uniform distribution of our available food supplies as does the United Kingdom. Consequently, it is almost certain that a considerable segment of the domestic population will be unable to obtain the average amounts of food available for civilians or even the minimum amount recommended by the Food and Nutrition Board.

Supplies of food available for civilian consumption in 1943, at least for all the seasonal products, are to a considerable extent the result of production in 1942. Production last year reached an all-time high of about 28 percent above the average production during the 5-year period 1935–39. This all-time high was due in considerable part to unusually favorable weather conditions. If 1943 acreage production goals are reached (for some critical products we know that they will not be reached) and average yields are obtained, food production will be 6 to 7 percent greater than in 1942.

This prospective increase in domestic food production will not be sufficient to meet the increased noncivilian demands on us for food in 1944. Requirements for our own armed forces in 1944 are expected to be 10 to 15 percent larger than in 1943. This does not represent a net increase in food requirements since the number of civilians will be reduced by the same number as the increase, however, since per capita consumption by the military forces is substantially larger than the per capita consumption of those same persons in civilian life.

There will be increased demands for food shipments under the lend-lease program. Such shipments to the United Kingdom have become fairly well stabilized but shipments to Russia and perhaps other countries will be increased. Russia has lost large percentages of its most productive agricultural land to the enemy, and Russian civilians, particularly, are alarmingly undernourished. While no over-all figures are available, reports indicate that in Moscow even workers in the heaviest industries are getting nowhere near 2,800 calories per person per day and that many other groups in the civilian economy are getting as little as two-thirds of the minimum as established by the Food and Nutrition Board.

Certain food products to Russia take precedence for shipping space over everything else, and it seems inevitable that increased food shipments to Russia will have to be made if the civilian population is to be maintained sufficiently to provide the Russian armed forces with the implements of war.

Unless the United Nations suffer unexpected military reverses during the next few months, it is certain that there will be increased demands on us for food for feeding the civilian populations of reoccupied countries. At the present time only relatively small quantities of food are being used for this purpose. As the area reoccupied increases, the drain will become more and more significant and will be promptly reflected in reduced supplies available for domestic civilian consumption, since, with few exceptions, there are no stock piles of food either here or abroad which can be drawn upon.

Even this year domestic civilian consumers are going to be short of two essential elements in their diets—namely, calcium and riboflavin. These elements are also the ones which other United Nations and the reoccupied countries will need most. Since a chain is no stronger than its weakest link, consideration of caloric content of our diet is apt to be misleading. Some shifts in agricultural production to meet deficiencies of calcium and riboflavin are being made, but such shifts cannot be effective in overcoming these specific deficiencies, even by 1944, so nonagricultural sources may have to be drawn upon.

It is apparent that every effort must be made to increase agricultural production this year and for 1944 and 1945, since the need for food is inevitably going to exceed our ability to produce it, and supplies available for civilians will continue to decline.

Finally, it should be noted that food is in a category by itself insofar as the war and post-war situation is concerned. The minute the war has been won, production of direct military items—ships, tanks, guns, airplanes, etc.—can be suspended. No such action can be taken with food. The demand for it will continue at even higher levels for at least 2 years after the war is won. Consequently, in appraising the timing of projects for expanding food production, at least 2 years should be added as compared with projects for the expansion of direct military production. In other words, if projects for expansion of production of direct military items are ruled out if such production will not come into being until after 1945, projects for the expansion of food should not be ruled out unless they will not come into production until after 1947. The importance of the continuing post-war demand for food should not be minimized because our ability to supply food to freed countries and even to the civilian populations of enemy countries in the immediate post-war period will have a vital bearing upon the chances for a lasting peace. Moreover, because of the time lag in agricultural production, we cannot afford to wait until the war is over to develop post-war food-production programs.

It is evident, therefore, that it is essential to press into production every possible acre of land in the Nation. Our present food-production resources in established areas already are operating at capacity and the only other means of increasing output are through development which will permit more intensive cultivation, such as irrigation projects.

The 18 Western States afford many excellent opportunities for expanding production of the foods in greatest need, such as dry beans and peas, potatoes, and dairy products. Through irrigation project development, production of these items can be increased in certain and stable amounts without sacrificing output of other essential crops and livestock products.

The War Food Administration currently is engaged in an analysis of potential irrigation developments. Attached is a tentative list of proposed projects which, in our judgment, merits careful consideration from the standpoint of adding to our production capacity for essential war and post-war foods. The material requirements for the construction of these projects, on a wartime basis, have been furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation.

The War Food Administration will submit data and recommendations on each project listed as rapidly as the information can be analyzed.

CHESTER C. DAVIS,
Administrator.

Tentative list of irrigation projects suggested for development by the War Food Administration, fiscal years 1944 and 1945

Project	Steel		Copper		Lumber	
	1944	1945	1944	1945	1944	1945
	Tons	*Tons*	*Tons*	*Tons*	*M b. m.*	*M b. m.*
1. Friant Dam (San Joaquin), California	160	40	0.7	0.3	0	0
2. Madera Canal, California	400	350	.1	0	375	325
3. Yakima-Roza, Washington	531	14	0	0	700	0
4. Newton, Utah	32	0	------	0	30	0
5. Colorado-Big Thompson, Colorado	405	354	2	0	1,415	1,260
6. Anderson Ranch, Idaho	988	2,863	.8	5	490	590
7. Klamath-Modoc, Oregon and California	57	20	7	0	500	100
8. Mancos, Colorado	128	------	1	0	126	------
9. Riverton, Wyoming	355	150	------	------	336	75
10. Rapid Valley, South Dakota	44	------	.05	------	40	10
Total	2,972	3,791	10.65	5.3	3,886	2,360

Dissolution of the Communist International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is no one who has fought communism more than I have. The Communist Party in the United States withdrew its membership from the Communist International in 1940 because of the bill I introduced, which became law, compelling the registration of foreign agents in our country.

While it will take time and later happenings to show the full effect of this dissolution of the Communist International it is an important event that may have great effect upon post-war as well as upon war conditions.

Most of us in opposing national socialism or communism, recognize the right of the people of other nations to have any kind of a government they want that does not violate the international law of decency.

It was the advocacy by Soviet Russia of world revolution, violating the law of nations, and atheistic communism, repulsive to decent mankind everywhere that properly aroused resentment and opposition.

The recent dissolution step may well be a forerunner to the repudiation by Soviet Russia of atheistic communism and the permitting of religious freedom to exist in Russia. If this is done the chances of a healthy post-war condition, and the establishment of some kind of practical international action for permanent peace will be greatly strengthened.

With the sincere dissolution of the Communist International, and the opportunity for a normal religious life existing in Soviet Russia the basis stands for the representatives of the United Nations, and all other peoples to gather around the peace table and plan for the future without distrust or suspicion.

The dissolution of the Communist International makes that outlook more favorable.

The solution of the religious question in Soviet Russia will make the outlook more complete so far as the removal of these fundamental and intense differences are concerned. The future peace of the world is a challenge to the leaders of church and of government.

We should not underestimate the significance of the action in dissolving the Communist International. We should not underestimate the natural and probable results that might and can flow from this action, the most important of which would be the repudiation or solution by Soviet Russia of atheistic communism. Decent persons, hundreds of millions, of all religious callings, of all faiths throughout the world, would welcome and applaud such an important event.

One of the strong convictions of every decent person is that the opportunity of exercise of a free religious conscience should exist everywhere. That is necessary for every person to possess his or her dignity and personality.

Expressing my pleasure in the dissolution of the Communist International, which means the renunciation of world revolution, I make the friendly suggestion that every constructive effort be made to satisfactorily solve the religious question.

If this is done the chances of world cooperative action for permanent peace will be strengthened and the outlook will be bright.

While our first thoughts and efforts should be the winning of the war, let us also give some thoughts to the winning of the peace in the doing of those things that will save the next generation from the constant fear and threat of war.

The Repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement made by Admiral H. E. Yarnell, United States Navy, retired, before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives this morning.

The statement is as follows:

It is generally appreciated by those who follow the course of the war in the Far East that the main attack on Japan must come from the mainland of Asia. This area is the only one from which air power adequate to inflict serious or decisive damage to Japanese arsenals and munition plants can operate and from which forces for the invasion of the main Japanese islands can be based. Russian bases cannot be relied upon since these would probably be occupied by Japanese troops very soon after war between Japan and Russia began. This is due to the exposed position of the Vladivostok area with reference to the advantageous position of the powerful Japanese army in Manchuria which renders the successful defense of this area a very difficult operation.

This leaves the mainland of China as the only area from which long-range bombers can reach Japan and leads to the conclusion that Allied success against Japan requires the continuance of China in the war.

It is needless to enlarge upon the desperate situation in China today, and the grave possibility that the Nationalist Government may collapse unless effective aid is given at the earliest possible moment.

The military situation is, of course, known to those in authority in this country and Great Britain, and doubtless every effort is being made to give all possible military assistance.

There are other means, however, of strengthening the determination of the Chinese Government and people to fight on until real and adequate assistance can be given.

The most effective method is to consider, by act as well as by word, China as an equal in every respect with the other three Allied Nations in the conduct of the war and in the post-war settlement.

A step in this direction has been made in the announced intention of annulling the treaties regarding extraterritoriality and special privileges.

A greater step will be the repeal of the Chinese exclusion laws. Such a step will compare with that of the dissolution of the Third Internationale in the effect it will have on the Allied cause.

As you know, Japan has utilized American exclusion laws with much effect in her propaganda campaign in China and other areas of the Far East. By the repeal of these laws this means of stirring up hatred of the western nations will be eliminated.

In the consideration of the repeal of these laws, we also should look beyond the war to the peace settlement and the years to follow.

When the time for that settlement comes, the four nations that have contributed the most to the defeat of the Axis Powers will have the main task and responsibility of arriving at terms that will insure a durable peace. Each should have an equal voice and there should be no bar which will interfere.

Furthermore, in order to insure peace in the Far East, there must be a strong, stable, and democratic government in China. We have every reason to expect that if the Nationalist regime remains in power. We need not fear from this nation a policy of world conquest such as has been the curse of Japan. Chinese tradition, history, and philosophy oppose such policy.

The friendship that has existed between the United States and China for many years must continue in the future if we hope to maintain peace in the world. It cannot continue if these laws are retained on the statute books. Modern China is determined to take her rightful place in the congress of nations. It is our duty and it is to our interest to help her attain that end.

In conclusion, it is my conviction that the repeal of these laws will have far-reaching effects as a war and as a post-war measure. It will also be a partial recognition of the bravery and endurance of a great people who for six years have been fighting America's most dangerous enemy.

The CHAIRMAN. Admiral, you naturally base that conclusion upon your actual experience, both from the strategic standpoint of the war as well as from observations which you have made while in charge of that area?

Admiral YARNELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, do you think the removing of that restriction and the fixing of a small quota would really bring home to the Chinese people our sincerity—I am talking of the American sincerity—more than preaching words that we are their friends; and will lift the morale of China until we can get some aid in there?

Admiral YARNELL. I think it would have a very great effect and I think it is necessary in the post-war time especially.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not need to answer some of the questions I may want to ask you if it is a military secret or if you do not want to disclose it. Do you know how many men we have in there now?

Admiral YARNELL. No. I have no idea.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think we will need China after this war is over?

Admiral YARNELL. I beg pardon?

The CHAIRMAN. Will we need men after the war is over?

Admiral YARNELL. In China?

The CHAIRMAN. In China.

Admiral YARNELL. China has a tremendous army available of excellent soldier material and all they need are munitions and leadership, training. If we can keep China in the war, there is no necessity, as far as I can see, of sending a single American soldier to China outside of technicians and advisers and people

who can help them organize and train their army.

The CHAIRMAN. And they would be the bulwark of our safety and our security as a democracy on this side of the ocean, someone to depend upon to maintain peace and order?

Admiral YARNELL. Yes, sir. It is absolutely necessary that China be established as a strong, stable nation if there is to be future peace in the Far East.

The CHAIRMAN. And is there any question that you could establish that firm, stable, sound nation that will always be ready to defend its democracies in the same philosophy that we are trying to defend in our democracy, not only here but wherever it may be?

Admiral YARNELL. If we can keep her in the war, no; but if China does collapse and falls under the domination of the Japanese, it will be many years before the old Chinese tradition of democracy can reestablish itself, and that will be a period of turmoil in the Far East.

The CHAIRMAN. And the American Legion could not dispute that, could it?

Admiral YARNELL. I doubt it.

The CHAIRMAN. Nor the American Federation of Labor or anybody else could dispute those sound principles?

Admiral YARNELL. No.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been with the service, Admiral?

Admiral YARNELL. I entered the Navy in 1893. Fifty years.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

We appreciate your coming here and we thank you for this fine statement you have made.

Contract-Renegotiation Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith a letter I have received from Mr. Frederick P. Austin, Jr., of Barrington, R. I., relative to the contract-renegotiation statute, and my reply thereto:

BARRINGTON, R. I., *May 19, 1943.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have attempted, since its enactment, to follow the progress of the so-called renegotiation law, and consequently read with interest the 30-minute speech which you delivered on Monday last in the House opposing a bill providing for the repeal of said law.

I was particularly interested, and wondered to which section or sections of the act you might have reference when you made the statement: "The law fixes a standard of reasonableness." I was likewise interested in your statement that "furthermore, there is no doubt about the legal ability of the contractor to appeal any findings of a price adjustment board to the courts."

I should appreciate hearing from you as to just what sections of the act give rise to the opinions which you expressed in your speech.

Very truly yours,

FREDERICK P. AUSTIN, JR.

FREDERICK P. AUSTIN, Jr., Esq.,
Barrington, R. I.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter of May 19, 1943, requesting certain information about the renegotiation statute.

First, the explicit purpose of the renegotiation statute is to permit the recapture of excessive war profits—war profits in excess of reasonable profits under all the circumstances. The plain meaning of the word excessive is as follows:

"Excessive—* * * Characterized by, or exhibiting, excess; as: (a) exceeding what is usual or proper; over much. (b) Greater than the usual amount or degree; exceptional; very great. Synonym: Extreme, intemperate, unreasonable * * * Excessive is the general term for what goes beyond just measure or amount * * * Antonym: Temperate, moderate, reasonable; * * *." (Webster's International Dictionary.)

That Congress, in enacting the statute, relied upon the plain meaning of the word "excessive" and legislated to permit the retention of reasonable profits and the recapture of unreasonable or excessive profits, see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD April 21–23, 1943. It is apparent, therefore, that there is a legislative standard and that such standard is one of reasonableness. I should also like to reiterate what I also stated in this connection: "any more precise formula is not feasible."

Second, a right to judicial review of a determination made without the consent of a contractor is clearly authorized. I refer you to pages 3402, 3403, 3651, and 3652, volume 88, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which will recall to your attention that, as introduced in the Senate, the renegotiation bill contained a provision precluding suits by contractors and that such provision was deleted in order to authorize suits. It is inherent in the power of the courts under the Constitution that judicial review be available, even in the absence of a statutory procedure for such review, in respect of all questions of law arising in connection with administrative action, including constitutional questions and questions of statutory interpretation.

I trust that the foregoing answers the questions which you raised.

Very truly yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

Money—The Most Important Issue Before the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 16, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, by the indulgence of the House there is presented herewith the thirty-first installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money. In presenting the closing installment of Senator Cockrell's speech, we find that we are still confronted with the fact that with all the financial expedients and money makeshifts that have been tried from that day to this, the money problem is still unsolved.

We, the people of the United States, are left to decide what kind of a currency will best provide the function of money with which to transact the domestic and international business of the people of one of the most enlightened and progressive nations on earth.

The question remaining to be answered is, Can there be devised and put into operation a money system with a dollar of stable value—the kind of money aptly described in the platform of the National Grange in which this great farm organization demands, "A monetary system providing an honest dollar—one just to the debtor and creditor alike, with constant purchasing power preventing uncontrolled inflation and the disastrous effects of deflation"? The problem is, how can our country best obtain this kind of money; a money system that will work equitably and justly under all conditions? Shall we accept the bankers' plan and have a managed currency based work equitably and justly under all confidence and controlled by the ability of business to borrow money and pay interest—or shall we return to the use of an automatically controlled currency based on the production and use of the precious metals supported by the element—cash—in the form of money of ultimate redemption?

In considering the merits of these alternate plans recognition must be given to the fact that in time of financial stress credit shrinks. Confidence is destroyed and prices recede to the level of a cash basis. Thus, we find that in periods of financial readjustment that cash is the indispensable foundation of the price level and so we come to the fact that with all that has been written and said on the subject; the banks and economists have left us with the money problem unsolved. The most important issue before the world today is money.

The thirty-first installment of Senator Cockrell's speech on money follows:

We hear some criticisms of those who only speak their sentiments in regard to the message of the President. Mr. Cleveland is not the Democratic Party. The Democratic Senators on this floor do not make the Democratic Party. We are well as the Members of the House of Representatives, as Democrats, are the agents, the servants, and the representatives of the savereign people just as Mr. Cleveland is. Mr. Cleveland is at the head of our Democratic administration, and he has his constitutional functions. We as Democratic Senators here have our constitutional functions, and they are as separate and distinct as the midnight darkness and the noonday brightness. They go in separate spheres.

Why should criticism be had of a Democratic Senator now because he does not bow at once to the unconditional repeal of the Sherman law? Did anybody ever make such a criticism in 1885? Mr. Cleveland then demanded—no, not demanded, but recommended—the repeal of the Bland law. He sent his message to us. He did not call us in extra session; but if he had it would not have made a particule of difference. He sent his message to Congress recommending the repeal of the Bland law. Did we repeal it? No, sir; we did not. We never entertained the proposition. Were we read out of the Democratic Party? Not a bit of it.

We come to 1886, when he again recommended the repeal of the Bland law, and we paid no attention to it. It was his duty to recommend it as he honestly believed, and it was our duty as honestly entertained to

pay no attention to it. There was no reading of us out of the Democratic Party. In 1887 the clouds had been dissipated, the fears and apprehensions had subsided, everything was going along peacefully and quitely, the country was on the road to prosperity, and the President did not say anything about the Bland Act in 1887, but in 1888, the farewell message of that session, he referred to it incidentally, and indorsed the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury.

I see no cause for any criticism. We have had struggles before, and we were not ignored or read out of the Democratic Party.

I hold in my hand a letter dated "Executive Mansion, Washington, D. C., September 25, 1893," addressed to Hon. W. J. Northen, and signed "Grover Cleveland."

I have not the time to read all of this letter, but it is about a safe and stable currency and one dollar being as good as another dollar, all of which we have today. The President says:

"In the present state of the public mind this law cannot be built upon nor patched in such a way as to relieve the situation."

We do not want to build on it, we do not want to patch it over, but we want to wipe it out and pass a proper substitute for it. That is what we want, and that is just what the President wants. We stand side by side and shoulder to shoulder. I read, however, in this letter:

"I am astonished by the opposition in the Senate to such prompt action as would relieve the present unfortunate situation."

So I am astonished, profoundly astonished, that the President should expect us, who have fought here for years and years for our honest and sincere convictions in regard to silver, to flee from the battlefield of silver and fall upon a single gold standard. Not quite yet, Mr. President. What right did the President have to expect us to yield because of the panicky apprehensions of Wall Street and a few businessmen? The President continues:

"My daily prayer is that the delay occasioned by such opposition may not be the cause of plunging the country into deeper depression than it has yet known, and that the Democratic Party may not be justly held responsible for such a catastrophe."

Mr. President, would it be sacrilegious in me, would it be improper in me, to recommend to the President, when he offers up his prayers to accompany them with that grand old Presbyterian song:

"God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform;
He plants His footsteps in the sea,
And rides upon the storm.

Ye fearful saints, fresh courage take;
The clouds ye so much dread
Are big with mercy, and shall break
In blessings on your head.

Behind a frowning providence
He hides a smiling face.
The bud may have a bitter taste,
But sweet will be the flower.

Blind unbelief is sure to err,
And scan His work in vain;
God is His own interpreter,
And He will make it plain."

The President has had fears that these lowering clouds were about to swamp this country ever since 1885. There is only one man in public life who has more unfulfilled predictions on record than the President, and that is John Sherman. [Laughter.]

This is no disrespect to him. He is an honest and a brave man, and he has the courage to tell us what he thinks. But, oh, how often he has been mistaken! [Laughter.] There is no danger to the Democratic party. When Mr. Cleveland and every Senator here, and every Member of the other House, and all the members of that grand old party who compose it today shall have passed to that bourn whence no traveler returns, the Democratic Party will only be in its youthful vigor and manhood.

It is the only political organization which has survived the wreck and ravages of time for over a century. It was not organized to die and fade away from this earth. Its principles, crystallized and proclaimed by the immortal Jefferson, became vitalized with immortality, and they will stand as beacon lights and as monumental landmarks; they will be pillars of cloud by day and pillars of fire by night to guide the Democratic hosts to victory when all of us shall have passed away.

No, no, Mr. President, our differences will not destroy the Democratic Party. It will survive us and all our struggles, and continue to bless the country as it has; and the enforcement of its principles will bring it to true democratic bimetallism.

[NOTE.—Since the foregoing speech was delivered, the Secretary of the Treasury, in response to the resolution of the Senate, has reported to the Senate that he has not redeemed silver certificates issued on the deposit of silver dollars in gold or gold obligations. I am very glad to be able to make this statement, which sustains what I stated to be the law and removes from the Secretary any ground of criticism.]

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, today this installment brings us to the close of Senator Cockrell's speech on money; 50 years after this speech was delivered on the floor of the Senate of the United States, our monetary problem remains unsolved. Today—as then—the question is, Can the money function that serves the needs of the people of this Nation best be supplied by a currency system that makes it necessary to pay interest to the banks, for the creation and circulation of all money, with the exception of the subsidiary coinage or can this Government devise and put into operation a money system that will create and provide money that can be issued and remain in circulation without an interest charge as a cost for its creation and circulation?

To illustrate, let us differentiate between the cost in interest of a national-bank-note dollar, created and loaned into circulation by a national bank and reloaned back into circulation as fast as the supporting loan is repaid and a gold or silver dollar made of their respective metals, dug from the mines of our western hills, and minted by the Treasury and returned to the miner who pays the seignorage and spends this new money into circulation. The contrast between the two kinds of money is emphasized in a letter recently received from the Federal Reserve bank, reprinted here:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, February 6, 1942.

Hon. C. I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: This is in reply to your telephone request today. The present value of $1 compounded at 3 percent annually from 1879 to date would amount to $6.44. Compounded at 6 percent it would amount to $39.29.

Yours very truly,
WOODLIEF THOMAS,
Assistant Director, Division of Research and Statistics.

Think of it. This worn old 1879 silver dollar by circulating as money from hand to hand in the transaction of business has saved the American people in interest alone almost twice is weight in gold—$39.29.

Must American business continue to struggle with the handicap of a banker's system of money, or can we have a Government system of interest-free money?

The Labor and Food Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD two editorials by Manchester Boddy, one of the leading editors of the Pacific coast, which cover two of the most important problems facing the people of this country today, namely, the labor and food situation. These editorials are written in a very comprehensive way and offer practical methods of solution.

(Wednesday, May 26, 1943)

VIEWS OF THE NEWS

(By Manchester Boddy)

The War Labor Board has denied the United Mine Workers' demands for a $2 daily wage increase, but has indicated that it might approve portal to portal pay and a six-day workweek.

At the same time, an estimated 49,000 workers in Akron's three major rubber companies are continuing an unauthorized strike in protest of a War Labor Board wage decision granting them a 3 cents per hour increase.

There is a food crisis in the offing.

Dr. Edward Benes, chief of the Czechoslovakian government in exile, says the war against Hitler is in its final stages, and predicts peace in Europe this year.

And that's the important news to date.

Coupled with the growing scarcity of food in the large industrial centers in the East is a widespread breakdown of price control. In spite of everything the Office of Price Administration has been able to do, ceiling violations are being reported from widely scattered areas, and have become numerous enough to indicate an abrupt rise in the official cost of living that is not recorded in official Office of Price Administration reports.

One of two things must happen: Either the cost of living must be rolled back or wages must be increased. General wage increases at this time or a continued rise in the cost of living would result almost immediately in the real thing—explosive inflation. What would happen from then on out is anybody's guess.

Economists have been saying that the harmful effects of inflation can be curbed by stepping up production of wanted things. In other words, inflated dollars will lose their power of destruction if there is a proportionate inflation of things dollars can buy.

That is why the threatened food shortage may become the gravest problem facing government.

This is only one possible solution: The government will contract for the purchase of food exactly as it is contracting for the purchase of war material. In other words, the

government will enter into firm contracts with food producers on a "cost plus" basis; it will supply the producers with capital and it will give them the highest possible priorities on machinery, transportation, fertilizers, and labor.

Under this plan the government will become the exclusive buyer of food, just as it is now the exclusive buyer of war material. It will sell that food to the consumer at a fixed price consistent with a fixed standard of wages. The difference between the cost and the selling price will be a net loss to the government, which must be met in precisely the same manner as the government now meets the cost of war production.

This is not a pleasing picture—and so far, at least, government officials have refused even to look at it.

But water running down hill must eventually reach bottom. The government is well into a program of controlling prices, wages, and distribution. It can't stop halfway; it must either abandon the program it has already established or it must go through to the bitter end.

If the stress and strain of political considerations delay prompt action, we may expect explosive inflation coupled with a severe shortage of food before the end of 1943.

(Thursday, May 27, 1943)

VIEWS OF THE NEWS

(By Manchester Boddy)

The continued strike of some 57,000 war workers—a strike that virtually has paralyzed the Akron, Ohio, rubber industry and halted the manufacture of Army jeeps—is the most serious blow to the welfare of the Nation since Pearl Harbor.

It should be noted, however, that practically every news dispatch with respect to the strike has recounted efforts by officials of the labor unions involved to persuade the workers to resume production.

While the effect of these rapidly spreading strikes is to drastically curtail war production, the cause is not so easily described. Paradoxically, labor strikes in this instance cannot be put under the general category of "labor trouble." They represent, in fact, a protest against the uncontrolled rising cost of living and increased taxation which are taking place concurrently with a strong effort to keep wages on a fixed basis.

Inasmuch as mass production involves mass labor, it has been relatively easy for the Government to establish uniform regulations with respect to wages. Since labor, like major industry, has been thoroughly regimented it is equally easy to enforce the regulations made.

Since, however, food producers and distributors are not similarly regulated, it has not been easy for the Government to fix the price of food, clothing, and services that constitute the essential elements in the cost of living.

Reports from Washington indicate that with the exception of John L. Lewis, all of the responsible heads of labor unions are working with Government officials in an attempt to hold wages at their present levels long enough to permit the application of new methods calculated to roll back the cost of living. It has been impossible, apparently, to hold the labor front in line.

Equally difficult too has been the job of compelling the producers of food—processors and retailers—to cooperate in fixing a price to the consumer compatible with the line of wages now in effect.

The situation will probably get much worse before it gets better.

Everyone who has thought intelligently about the situation at all knows the current crisis could have been avoided if the Government had "gone all the way" at the very beginning of the war program and put the entire civilian economy under complete control of the Government.

But everyone should know as well that such a step was impossible and could only be taken after the country had experienced near chaos. There is nothing new about that. There is no instance in the entire history of the United States or any other nation on earth where solutions are perfected in advance of problems.

First must come experience—and then the application of common sense procedure.

As bad as the picture looks at the moment, there is reason to be optimistic; the remedy cannot be far away.

The Cloakroom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. LAMBERTSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, getting dull here, no visiting rulers for a week.

There is now only one West Pointer to every 50 Army officers.

Butter will soon take its place alongside the potato in the Archives.

It is 95° outside today and 110° in the air-cooled House Chamber during the labor debate.

A beggar asked a Member for a quarter for food. When bought a sandwich instead, he said, "What kind is it?"

The four things we will want freedom from after the war: "DET," O. P. A., C. I. O., and I, I, I.

The country doctor who attended the quints is dead at 60. No other doctor with that record ever lived that long.

Rationing 100 percent was seen from the Empire State Building at 3 p. m., Decoration Day, when only yellow taxis were in sight the length of Fifth Avenue.

We have the semblance of a still democracy, but our Government agents spend $100,000,000 a year traveling. No wonder the I. C. C. warns us to stay at home.

New York City's owned transportation system is valued at $700,000,000 and consists of subway, ferry, elevated, and surface cars. Any ride is only a nickel.

The idea of a superboard, additional and without elimination, to correct an ineffective operation is multiple in precedent during the last 10 years. Here is hoping. Byrnes is good, but BYRD would have been better.

"Oh, what's the use" is the deep undercurrent in the House on the antistrike bill. They all know that regardless of our action the Senate will delay it weeks, and, in the end, if passed, the President will give it a glorified veto.

Bernard W. Rogers, of Fairview, Kans., as first captain at West Point graduation follows such illustrious predecessors as Gen. Robert E. Lee, Gen. John J. Pershing, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and Gen. Jonathan Wainwright.

Strikes in War Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor now during consideration of this bill to express in a most humble way my deep feeling of respect for our American fighting men all over the world, who this Congress has sent to service and to battle, to fight, and die, while others of our citizens are on strike only to satisfy the un-American whims of would-be labor dictators who every loyal American must surely despise.

It was the brave men from my own Seventh District of Iowa who first stepped off the gangplank onto foreign soil, shortly after Pearl Harbor. It was many of these same brave fighting Americans who fought and died in the greater numbers at the Battle of Casserene Pass in north Africa than from any other district in the United States of America. To them I pay the highest tribute, and from this safe distance, we, of this House of Representatives, should in this hour most humbly and reverently bow.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, more than that, we should resolve here and now to go on record, taking all necessary means at our command as the guardians of the portals of our free land, and as representatives of our fighting men stop these destructive strikes now and bring the perpetrators to the bar of justice.

If anyone is in doubt as to how our American fighting men feel about these strikes, I need only read to you this letter from one of them. He expresses his feelings in a few plain, understandable words. I am sure he voices the true feeling of an overwhelming majority of American service men and women. I read:

WE AGREE WITH THESE SENTIMENTS

Roy Pont gives his opinion of strikes in a letter from north Africa:

MAY 1943.

DEAR DAD AND SIS: I am O. K., but a little down in the dumps. The news from back there don't help any. Wish I could be around the coal strikers for a couple of days. There would be a few less strikers or I would be dead. The boys don't like to hear things like that over here when they are facing death all the time at $60 a month and stew and hash, if they can get it. Sorry about the above, but that is how I feel and that is the way all of us feel. Hope you are all O. K. back there. If we keep going like we have been up here, it won't be long. You should see the planes that go over us in a day's time. It looks like geese going back south in the fall. I meant to write you about Harold Fay and the rest of the boys, but want you to get the news at home first. Do you remember Turk? He is gone, too; I don't know if he is dead or captured. The boys should feel good about striking back there when they are dying for them over here. Wish I could write a more cheerful letter, but that is the way I feel. Sorry.

Love,

ROY.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, we now have under consideration a bill in regard to labor. In my opinion this legislation would not be up for attention today if a majority of Congress had not followed a program of being a party to helping the administration jeopardize the "hold the line" inflation order when the act was passed recently to give Federal employees receiving $5,000 to $10,000 salaries an increase in salary of $626 per year. I called the attention of this body to this situation before the Federal pay increase was passed. The result was that in order to give $200 to the people in the low-income brackets, you passed a bill that provided over $600 per year increase in salary to the people on the Federal pay roll that come in the higher income brackets.

In fact, you have given the $10,000 bureaucrats a $600 annual increase in salary, or more than the Members of Congress themselves receive.

When this bill was up for consideration a few weeks ago we did not hear anything about inflation. We did not hear a word about holding the line from any administration spokesmen. Why? This bill was signed by the President.

I also called the attention of this body to the effect that this Federal pay increase to employees in the higher income brackets would have on the hold-the-line attitude of other groups. For example, once more I ask, how are the members of the War Labor Board, the ones that are on the Federal pay roll at $10,000 a year in a position to accept a $626 increase in salary for themselves and make no public protest against it and no public utterances as to its effect on "hold the line" or on inflation?

I read in the press a few days ago that the coal miners were now working for the Government. The immediate thought that came to me was, well now, since they are now on the Federal pay roll they will be able to receive an increase of salary and their worries will be over.

It is apparent that Congress, under the guidance of the present administration, thought it had to give the Federal employees in the higher income brackets a $600 increase in salary to meet the increased cost of living in order to give the employees in the lower income an increase in salary of $200 to meet the same increased cost of living.

Administration leaders were apparently willing to provide for and humbly submit to, the Little Steel formula that provides a $1.50-per-day increase in wages to men in some areas and on some jobs, and a 15-cents-per-day increase in wages to men in other areas and on other jobs.

There are three facts that are more apparent every day. First, we should realize we cannot legislate for the few at the expense of the many. We should not be compelled to give one group $600 in order to give the deserving group $200.

Second. We cannot legislate to give the high-salaried bureaucrats additional salaries, and expect our civilian groups who have had their salaries frozen as low as 30 cents per hour, through Mr. McNutt, to thoroughly believe in the slogan of "equality of sacrifice."

Third. The only time we hear about "inflation" and "hold the line" from the administration spokesmen is when the people receiving low incomes are involved or when the farmers of America are in the picture.

Prohibition of Sale of Alcoholic Liquors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINDER R. HARRIS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I herewith append a petition signed by citizens of Portsmouth, Va., in support of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082. The petition is captioned "Petition for H. R. 2082 to the Congress of the United States." It follows:

To reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization, we, the undersigned citizens of the State of Virginia, petition the Congress of the United States to pass H. R. 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina.

Mrs. Virginia C. McCoy, L. C. Brinson, Mrs. Rosa Lee Noe, W. R. Binkley, Kathleen Phelps, Edna Rowe, Mrs. J. T. Lawrence, Mrs. Charles Carson, Mrs. J. H. Gaskins, Mrs. G. W. Simpson, G. W. Simpson, Mrs. W. E. Lewis, Mrs. E. F. Gray, Mrs. Arnold Shepherd, Mrs. W. I. Harrell, Mrs. J. C. Cowan, Mrs. G. C. De Graw, Mrs. H. Lassiter, Mrs. W. A. Stacious.

C. P. T. Flying Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I would like to call your attention to the neglect on the part of our Government of more than 9,000 boys in the C. P. T. flying course conducted by the C. A. A.

By the time this year is ended we will have appropriated more than $120,000,000,000 to the various departments of our Government. This is more money than all the nations of the world fighting in this war spent in 3 years.

Yet, with this large amount of money appropriated we have more than 9,000 of our boys who are forced to serve our country without pay. They undergo just as strenuous a training program as any in our armed forces and yet they get nothing for it. In fact, when they finish this strenuous program they are told that there is no need for them.

The neglect of more than 9,000 of our boys in the C. P. T. is nothing short of absolute criminal negligence. Several billions of dollars for every purpose, but somehow in our Government structure there does not seem to be anybody in the C. A. A. or in our military set-up who gives a damn about the welfare of these more than 9,000 boys in the C. P. T.

Several bills have been introduced in this Congress to remedy that situation. Many complaints have been sent to the C. A. A. and to our military authorities regarding this condition. Despite these complaints and these bills absolutely nothing has been done, and it appears right now that absolutely nothing will be done. But to call the attention of the Members of this House to the criminal negligence regarding these 9,000 boys, I am entering in the RECORD a summary of the complaints by a man who has spent practically all of his time and all of his money in trying to wake up the "brass hats" around here to take some humane action. I enter in the RECORD a summary of the protests by Bradley R. Taylor, of Rhinelander, Wis. He has a son in the C. P. T. and he knows what actual conditions are:

POLAR BEAR ASSOCIATION,
Rhinelander, Wis., March 6, 1943.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing you a copy of a letter that I have written to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate.

If you are interested in the war effort, you will read this letter and also ask to see the series of letters that I have attached to the original, in the hands of the chairman of the committee, from wives, parents, and the men themselves who are students in the Commercial Pilot Training flying course conducted by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

This group of men, some 9,110 in number, have been trained at Government expense for the past 6 months and without pay. It now appears that no use is going to be made of their expensive training.

Men in this course thought that they were going to be called to active service or to a paid job at the end of 16 weeks or not more than 6 months. They and their families budgeted their funds for this period. Now the courses are being extended to 8 and 9 months and the men and their families are destitute and desperate, as they have had no funds coming in during their training period.

We cannot afford to waste the training that these men have had—we cannot, as a just Nation, compel these men to serve longer without pay or guarantee as to their future use in the war effort.

I ask you to support any bill that will take these 9,110 men out of the pitiful state that they find themselves in and give them dignified positions in the war effort.

Thanking you for looking into this matter—for the men are from every State in the Union—I am,

Sincerely yours,

BRADLEY R. TAYLOR,
Past President, Polar Bear Association.

POLAR BEAR ASSOCIATION,
Rhinelander, Wis., March 4, 1943.

To the CHAIRMAN,
Senate Committee on Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I call your attention to the pitiful and unhappy plight of some 9,110 men in training under the Civilian Pilot Training program, now called War Training Program, and designated as "phase two" by the Department of Commerce under Civil Aeronautics Authority.

These men are enlisted men in the Air Corps Reserve, but called to serve their country under a so-called inactive status. Their plight is unbearable at this time, as they are neither in the Army nor are they civilians. For the past 8 months they have served without proper medical or dental attention—without proper food, lodging or clothing. They have served from 6 in the morning until 10 at night. All these things without any recognition from any Government agency connected with the armed forces. They have even been denied the small right of franking mail to their wives and parents, a right that even the lowest grade of private in the Army has. These men have served with and fly the same ships and take the same courses in the same training centers with Navy men—these Navy men are on active status with full pay, proper medical attention, food, lodging and good clothes, and under proper Navy control. This unjust situation has shattered the morale of the Army Air Corps Reservists. It has shattered the morale of the wives and parents who have had to support their men while the full time of the men is taken up by training in a Government service. Married men with families, men who are past 27 years of age and too old for combat duty, have budgeted their money for a short period of 6 months, at which time the program was supposed to have been completed and the men sent to the Army or to paid jobs, and now find themselves desperate for money with which to support their families, as the courses in the program have run into 8 and 9 months.

These patriotic men and their families are desperate unless you give them relief—they will have to stop training and ask for discharge from their enlistment in order to support themselves and those dependent on them. This costly training program will be wasted, for many of these 9,110 men are, or could be, draft exempt if they leave this service. These men want to serve their country in its hour of need, and they want to serve it with honor, but after 7 or 8 months of training without pay or proper care they can no longer afford to serve. This will be a great waste of public money to have these well-trained men leave the service at this time and no use made of their training.

Most of these men have had from 150 to 200 hours (many of the men had a great number of flying hours paid for at their own expense before they entered this program) at not less than $15 per hour cost to the Government. This, plus the meager subsistence that has been given to them, will run into twenty to thirty millions of dollars of Government money that will have been wasted in training these men. As these men have had a large part of this training at Government expense, I do not believe that we taxpayers can afford to waste not only the funds expended but the experience that these men have had in flying. Nine thousand one hundred and ten is a lot of trained men, and the Government should find some dignified use in this hour of national need, for these men. These men come from every State in the Union.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has advised me that the Army does not contemplate calling these men into active service of the country, but feels that some of these trained men will go to private fields as instructors. Many of these men, at the time they enlisted, anticipated that when trained they would be called into active service with the armed forces in one of its various flying needs. This plan seems to have been changed at present—to the confusion of the men in training. It seems that each time the trainees near the end of their course, the program is changed with additional courses being added. Each week the men are held with no promise of their future use, or prospect of pay or proper care. It lowers the morale of the men, their wives and parents, as well as that of the civilian population who are involved in this matter.

These men are further penalized due to the fact that they are not eligible for any rehabilitation programs, either under the Federal laws or those laws being passed by the various States at the present time. Most of these laws are based on the number of months in active service. The men who are in this training program for the past 8 months have already been penalized 8 months of service, yet they have had their full time taken up just as much as any man on active service. It is unjust to these patriotic men to keep them on a full-time training program, but on an inactive status.

To further the war effort and to utilize all of our manpower, I suggest and pray that you will see that these men are called to active status and given the full rights that any other enlisted man or officer is entitled to. If this is not possible, I suggest that they be given honorable discharges so that they can seek some place in the war effort where they will be of some dignified use to their country, or so that those who are not eligible for the draft may seek employment in some productive industry in the war effort.

The plight of these 9,110 men is deplorable at the present time—and a just government should listen to their plea.

Knowing of my interest in these men and their unhappy situation, and the unhappy predicament of the wives and parents under the uncertainty of this program, I have received many letters telling of their unhappy lot. Copies of some of these letters are attached to this plea. You cannot read these letters without realizing that their cause has justice—you cannot read these letters without showing pity and sympathy for these 9,110 men who have and are trying to do their bit for their country; so far, without proper recognition.

I pray that you will right this condition before it is too late to save what little morale is left in these men and their families, and to remedy the destitute condition of those men who are without funds to continue this training.

Sincerely yours,

POLAR BEAR ASSOCIATION,
BRADLEY R. TAYLOR,
Past President.

LITTLE CHUTE, WIS.,
February 16, 1943.

Hon. ALVIN O'KONSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'KONSKI: I am writing you on behalf of my brother, Francis M. Van Hoof, who is in training under the Army Civilian Aeronautics Authority war-training program, commonly known as the Civilian Pilots Training, and other boys similarly situated. Although this program was set up by the War Department for individuals who are unable to meet the qualifications of the Army for combat pilots, but who would qualify for copilots, liaison pilots, ferrying pilots, and instructors, these boys are given no pay whatsoever for their services and receive only board and lodging during their training period.

I have talked with quite a number of students enrolled in these courses, and they all insist that the conditions under which they must operate are very unsatisfactory. They all are definitely of the opinion that they can be of some service to the country, but that so far they have not been given a fair opportunity.

I believe that the matter of the Civilian Pilots Training should be corrected. I am sure that these boys are all sincere and are in no way to be classed as draft dodgers or anything of that nature. As an example, I cite the case of my own brother:

He enlisted in the Marine Air Corps over 2 years ago, was in training with the Marine Air Corps at Minneapolis, Minn., and Pensacola, Fla. While in training at Pensacola and just shortly before receiving a commission as a second lieutenant and while going through stunt flying, he developed an infection in his eardrum and after a period of hospitalization at Pensacola, was given a medical discharge for that reason. Upon his return home, he attempted to enlist in the Navy Air Corps and subsequently the Army Air Corps, but was rejected in each case because of the eardrum infection. He was, thereafter, induced to enroll in the Civilian Pilots Training program. He is still in that program.

I believe that his situation is duplicated many times by other students in the Civilian Pilots Training and I sincerely believe that the situation with respect to these boys should be cleared up so that they could be encouraged, rather than be discouraged as the program certainly tends to be doing at this time from all information available to the writer.

Anything you can do to assist in the matter of these boys in the Civilian Pilots Training program, will, I am sure, be appreciated by every single boy enrolled in that program.

Respectfully yours,

GERARD H. VAN HOOF.

Thomas J. Lyons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN J. KENNEDY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today we have heard many speeches advocating the passage of legislation which, in my opinion, if passed, would impinge upon the rights of labor and would be a reflection upon the millions of loyal, conscientious and patriotic workingmen and women of this country.

Because much emphasis has been placed upon the activities of certain labor leaders, and because this emphasis might be misconstrued as applying to labor in general, I take this opportunity of giving answer to these statements, statements which I consider grossly unfair, by directing the attention of this Congress to the splendid record of Thomas J. Lyons, a great leader of labor in my State.

These are a few words about a man who gave his life to hasten the day of victory, as surely as though he had died

in active military service. He was a devout man, both in his allegiance to his flag and his unfaltering faith in his church, a good man, and in the annals of the best that organized labor stands for, a great man.

Thomas J. Lyons, president of the New York State Federation of Labor, passed away on May 6 of this year. Mr. Lyons, who had been in ill health for several months, persisted in his strenuous service both for the labor movement in New York and for the war effort, until he was compelled to undergo a minor operation. His return to his duties without proper rest caused his untimely death, at the early age of 49.

One may judge something of the friendship and high esteem accorded Thomas J. Lyons by the fact that his funeral was one of the largest ever held in New York City. More than a thousand sorrowing friends and associates followed in the cortege to St. Patrick's Cathedral, and more than 2,000 entered the cathedral to attend the solemn mass and requiem, and to pay their respects to their brother and coworker. George Meany, Mr. Lyons' predecessor as president of the New York State Federation of Labor, led the procession of trade unionists and public officials in the line of march from the funeral chapel to the cathedral. One hundred and fifty firemen in uniform, headed by Fire Commissioner Walsh, marched in this long line and stood as a guard of honor at the cathedral. After the celebration of mass, Msgr. Joseph F. Flannelly portrayed Mr. Lyons as an outstanding citizen and patriot, a self-sacrificing leader of workingmen, and a devoted Christian servant.

Thomas J. Lyons was one of those who saw from the beginning the heavy burdens which would fall upon the shoulders of labor with the inception of international hostilities. He saw, too, the equally heavy responsibilities which labor must assume in order to justify and to keep the freedom which it has won in so long and hard and obstinate a struggle. When he addressed the seventy-seventh annual convention of the State federation at Niagara Falls in August 1940, he solemnly pledged that the American Federation of Labor in New York State would subordinate every other interest to the tremendous task of preserving democracy, of achieving ultimate victory, and of establishing permanent peace. We all know how that pledge, made by Mr. Lyons, has been kept faithfully and well.

Shortly before Pearl Harbor he declared:

> The Atlantic Charter has sent the blood coursing through the veins of all freedom-loving people, and sent a simultaneous chill of fear through the gangster governments of Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo.

And immediately after December 7, 1941, which he characterized as "the day that shall live in infamy," he addressed a meeting of the Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York with these words:

> Today America stands one, united in the determination to bring victory to the United Nations and to the rest of the civilized world. Labor will cooperate 100 percent * * * in every way that will insure victory.

Every moment of the active life of Thomas J. Lyons gives another and another and yet another reason for the necessity for organized labor to maintain honor, dignity, and courageous assumption of duty. By word and deed, he emphasized the fact that if labor is to enjoy the benefits of power, it must also discharge the responsibilities of power. As president of the State Federation of Labor in New York, Mr. Lyons devoted himself to the destinies and affairs of more than a million and a half people, all directly concerned with the war effort. His men trusted him; he, in turn, trusted them, and, I feel certain, that trust and mutual respect will not be broken by his passing.

When a member of our armed forces exhibits unusual bravery on the field of battle, he is cited for valor above and beyond the call of duty. I can honestly say that Thomas J. Lyons might receive such a citation, were it given in civil life. Of him it might truly be said:

He fought the good fight; he finished the course; he kept the faith.

A Perversion of Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. ELSTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Times-Star of May 29, 1943:

A PERVERSION OF TRUTH

To quote the Times-Star review of the film, the Warner Bros. screen version of Mission to Moscow is "totalitarian propaganda, and crude propaganda, at that."

The picture is supposed to be based on ex-Ambassador Davies' book of the same name. In a prologue to the film Mr. Davies say that he tried to "tell the truth about the Soviet Union." But, contrary to report, he does not say that about the film.

In spite of his effort to give a sympathetic picture of Russia, Davies could not deny the overwhelming atmosphere of terror, in high places and low, during the period of the purges. The film ignores all this, presenting Russians as a happy, well fed, confident people, under the benign guidance of a great white father in the Kremlin. The purge trials are twisted into a semblance of the free and open courtroom procedure of America, a grotesque caricature of the truth. Davies is shown rushing about the continent, trying to avert a world war. (This was in 1937 and early 1938, mind you.) But the only places where he can find a sincere desire for peace are in the Kremlin and Winston Churchill's garden.

Britain and France are condemned for "selling out" Czechoslovakia because they were terrified of German bombs. But Russia is excused for touching off the World War by the Hitler-Stalin pact because she needed more time to arm. The carving up of Poland by Germany and Russia are, of course, omitted. The Soviet invasion of Finland is excused on the ground that Baron Mannerheim was working in Hitler's interest. The fact that Russia and her agents abroad denounced the "imperialist war" before June, 1941, and only embraced the "war of liberation" after she was invaded, is blandly ignored.

The film's distortion of recent American history is in the same vein. Congress is caricatured as a band of isolationist diehards, bent on blocking the President's efforts for peace and his every wish to aid the Allies. By contrast, Mr. Roosevelt is referred to, again and again, and with bated breath, as "our great President." It's hard to tell whether the makers of this film were more interested in glorifying Russia or in helping along the fourth-term campaign.

This is surely not the time to revive old scores with Russia. She is our brave and powerful ally in the war. She is carrying the main burden of land fighting in Europe. But it was Warner Brothers and their staff of propagandists who dug up the old bitter issues, not their critics.

This kind of propaganda, designed for people with short memories and only a passing acquaintance with headlines, is something new in the United States. It is not new in any totalitarian country abroad. But not even the enslaved peoples of Europe have been forced to look at films which glorify an alien government at the expense of their own national institutions. Will Americans stand for this perversion of truth in the guise of entertainment?

G-Men at Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, there is an old Latin admonition, nosce te—know thyself—that should be applied today. With the troubled world about us, destroying all sense of proportion and perspective, it is enlightening to turn our thoughts inward. Introspection makes us both proud and humble—proud of our humanity, humble before our God.

In the solitude of such meditations we can then truly lift our hearts in prayer—in thanksgiving for the blessings of the past and in petition for their continuance in the future. Then, with renewed strength of mind and spirit, we are ready to face the world again with a new determination.

One of the best methods of such introspection is by means of a retreat. A short time spent in silence and prayer and meditation can do much to revitalize and strengthen character.

For 3 days recently, a group of so-called G-men, members of the Federal

Bureau of Investigation, made such a retreat at Manresa-on-Severn, just across from the Naval Accademy at Annapolis. What a splendid example of devotion! Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article from the Manresan of May 1943 in tribute to these men who took time from their busy lives "to gain mastery over themselves":

G-MEN AT PRAYER

One of the greatest and most efficient organizations within the framework of the United States Government, is, without doubt, the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Perhaps, it is the greatest. The final verdict will be given by competent historians, but to this writer the favorable verdict, as the best organization within the Government, is already given, sealed, and delivered. For the Federal Bureau of Investigation is not only at "the top of the dial" but it is at the bottom, in the middle, and everywhere in between. Composed of many men of many nationalities and of many religious faiths, the Bureau has molded these men, as if by magic, into one man, into one family, dedicated to one objective, the quest for truth in all things. And the secret of this unity and uniformity is written in one word: Character.

At home and abroad the achievements of the men of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are recognized and respected. No one can meet them individually or mingle with them in a group without being profoundly impressed by their gentlemanly qualities, their mental alertness, physical prowess, devotion to duty, loyalty to each other and to the cause which they serve with honor and distinction. By their deeds they have merited the everlasting gratitude of the American public and they have enchanted and captured the heart of young America. No righteous person fears the G-men. Only the guilty begin to quake as an investigation gets under way, for the wrongdoer knows that the men of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are trained not only to shoot the questions calling for correct answers but eminently qualified to shoot it out in cold steel should the culprit elect that final stand.

The picture that America has not yet seen is the picture of the G-men at prayer. Catholic, Protestant, and Jew they gathered at Manresa, slept under one roof, supped together at table, relaxed on the porch, and attended exercises in the chapel with real fidelity and deep devotion. They were all good men, trying to make themselves still better men, in the sight of God. It was the special privilege of the fathers attached to Manresa to see the picture of the G-men at prayer unfold hour by hour, and one could have wished that all America might have seen and heard what went on in the little chapel. No one could doubt that in the final analysis the real strength of these men was the spiritual strength that comes from within.

To Director John Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Manresa extends its compliments, congratulations and gratitude for the privilege of receiving these men of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. They are the special fruits, not only of an excellent system of training, but especially of a personal leadership that has fashioned them for country and for God. They are acutely aware of their high responsibility to the Nation, and utterly loyal to the high ideals of their distinguished Director. America is safe in the hands of these men. They detest treachery, trickery, terrorism. They seek and love only peace and truth and justice. In God's Holy Name they will triumph, for He has said: "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice; for they shall have their fill."

The G-men are apostles of justice, God bless them!

Resolution of Cleveland Federation of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Federation of Labor, the local central body of Cleveland's labor organizations, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, has taken a historic, unique, and most constructive step to halt unauthorized or wildcat work stoppage in Cleveland industry.

It has unanimously resolved to denounce and to refuse its support to any strike unless and until the union involved has submitted its grievances to the Cleveland Federation of Labor and has given an appropriate committee the opportunity to mediate the dispute with the employer involved without work stoppage.

This pledge of the Cleveland federation, drafted by John B. Fitzgerald, legislative agent of the American Federation of Labor, central body, and A. I. Davey, Jr., editor of the Cleveland Citizen, and vigorously sponsored by Messrs. William Finnegan, John Rohrich, Thomas Lenehan, Edward Murphy, and Bernard B. McGroarty, has earned for it the unstinted praise of the press of Cleveland, and of the public generally.

Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein the resolution in full, so that it may be submitted to other central labor organizations as an example of constructive labor leadership that may well be followed:

When the United States of America entered the present conflict against the Axis, the labor movement of this Nation met with its employers and joined in a 'no-strike, no-lockout pledge.' This pledge has been kept to such a great extent that those who know the truth marvel at its effectiveness.

REAFFIRM PLEDGE

The Cleveland Federation of Labor, in keeping with that pledge, has done exerything in its power to eliminate work stoppage in all industry. We reaffirm our pledge and go beyond that today in guaranteeing our every effort and our every influence toward the end that no affiliate of this body, regardless of numerical strength or position, will be aided or abetted by us in work stoppage unless we have first been given the opportunity to explore every avenue of settlement through the agencies now provided for such action.

Further than this, and in response to the wishes of our own members, we hereby declare that we will publicly denounce and openly criticize any local union or the membership of such local union that leaves any job with a connection between itself and the successful prosecution of the war efforts, until every measure has been taken through the Cleveland Federation of Labor for the peaceful settlement of any dispute or misunderstanding.

CARRY OUT PART

In keeping with our determination to give Cleveland labor the leadership that it so well deserves, we also serve notice to all Federal, State, and local agencies, officers, and organizations that, as of this date, we will refuse to recognize or deal with any appointee supposed to be a labor representative or any of these agencies, offices, or organizations, until they have first been approved by the Cleveland Federation of Labor and have been so notified by the Cleveland Federation of Labor or approved by the grievance committee.

Still further, we insist that the national office of the American Federation of Labor, our parent body, shall recognize our jurisdictional and autonomous rights and shall keep us informed at all times, as to the assignment of organizers, special representatives, or international employees directly active in this area and working out of the office of the American Federation of Labor here in Cleveland.

Let it be understood that this is not an arbitrary or domineering action taken for the purpose of gathering strength in small groups, but is rather a determination on the part of the signers of this declaration, that they who are held responsible for the actions of labor shall have a definite opportunity to assume that responsibility and carry out labor's part in the war effort.

Gambling With Vital Steel Scrap Threatens War Production—Scrap Shortage in 1943 May Again Shut Down Steel Furnaces—Steel Output Endangered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, in these times of huge war expenditures, our minds are no longer impressed by large figures. But there is one large figure which has made a profound impression upon the minds of everyone in the United States. It is the figure that represents not dollars but men.

We have been told that our armed forces by the end of 1943, will total nearly 11,000,000 men. That is, as I understand, the figure set by our Chiefs of Staff, and concurred in by Congress. We have full confidence in our leaders, and we do not doubt that they have decided upon such vast armed forces for good and sufficient reasons.

But, with no thought of criticizing that decision, I will say that it is a figure which, when we think of it in human terms, almost stuns the imagination.

IMPORTANCE OF RELIABLE INFORMATION

I trust that it will make a full impression on the minds of our enemies, who

have by now had reason to know that this Nation is making war in dead earnest. We are pouring our resources into this great cause with no reservations. Eleven million men in our armed forces represent a striking power of immense magnitude.

But we do not think of this colossal number of men in exclusively military terms. They are the heart and soul of our country. These millions of young men are the bulwark upon which our future as a free Nation depends. And upon the millions who return to their homes after the war, our peacetime future will largely depend.

It is, or should be, axiomatic that along with the plans for raising this colossal Army, our responsible leaders are making plans for the even more colossal supplies of every kind that we must send along with them to the far corners of the world.

But the problem of supply is a large and far-reaching problem, and our military planners are obliged to rely upon the information and advice they are given by those whose duty it is to know all the facts about our resources. If this information is not dependable, the consequences will be a slowing up of our war efforts, a prolongation of the struggle and a tragic wastage of precious American lives.

MISLEADING ASSURANCES

The consequences of making our war plans on the basis of inaccurate information about our resources will be equally tragic, whether this information is supplied by careless ignorance or supplied with a full knowledge of its misleading character. The latter possibility is one that we should not entertain except for the gravest reasons. Yet, as we all know, misleading information about our resources for war purposes has already been given in the course of our defense preparations, by those who stood to profit personally from the delays which ensued before the truth was discovered.

We have been blandly reassured on one point after another. Would there be enough of this, that, and the other essential material from our regular sources of supply—or should we begin at once to open up new sources? We were told, "Oh, yes, there will be plenty of this, plenty of that, plenty of the other—plenty of everything, don't worry!" As it turned out, the only thing we had in plenty was worry. We had plenty of that. We lost precious months in our war preparations. But it was all set down to the over-optimism of those whose minds were geared to the idea of business as usual, and who could not comprehend the immensity of the needs of national defense.

Pearl Harbor was supposed to have changed all that. Now, we are told, these persons on whose information and advice our military leaders rely have waked up to the meaning of war. Let us hope that is true. But if they know the full actuality of our war needs, and still hand out misleading information about our ability to meet those needs from regular sources of supply, then we shall not be able to go on calling it overoptimism.

If the regular sources of supply about which they are overoptimistic are sources controlled by biased interests, and if they are the employed servants of these interests, at the same time that they are supposed to be serving the Nation, then we shall be forced to conclude that interests were served at the expense of the Nation.

SCRAP IRON CRUCIAL TO STEEL PRODUCTION

These painful thoughts have been forced upon me by some figures that have recently come into my possession. They concern the production of steel—which is the very center of the whole great problem of supplying our armed forces with adequate weapons for victory.

The production of steel, as we all know, depends upon a supply of various ingredients, of which the most crucial is scrap iron. The use of scrap varies from about 50 percent, mixed with an equal quantity of pig iron in the open-hearth type of furnace for the manufacture of standard grades of steel, to about 100 percent in the electric furnace for the manufacture of alloy steel, which is needed in increasing quantities for war purposes. Scrap is essential to the manufacture of all the ships, tanks, airplanes, and other implements of war that are essential for victory.

NEWSPAPER EDITORS, CIVIL GROUPS, COOPERATION

Thanks to alert millions of citizens and our newspaper editors, the importance of scrap was impressed upon the whole Nation in the great scrap collecting drives of last year. Every school child knew that scrap had to be found quickly to keep our war plants from being closed down. That was at the time when our program of war production was just getting into its stride.

Our goals or production in tanks, guns, ships, and airplanes then seemed to us immense, and so it was. But we were not then faced with the immediate necessity of providing arms and munitions for a force of 11,000,000 men. Our production must now be immensely increased. And this means necessarily an immense increase in our scrap-iron requirements.

LESS SCRAP NEEDED FOR MORE STEEL IN 1943?

That is plain enough. And we ask anxiously if we can count on enough scrap iron for this immensely increased production program.

They have turned to the iron and steel experts of the W. P. B.

Now here is the situation: In 1942 we produced 86,000,000 tons of steel ingots, and used 26,000,000 tons of scrap iron in the process; in 1943 we must produce 91,000,000 tons of steel ingots, 5,000,000 tons more than last year, and the question is, How much more scrap shall we require this year?

You will be surprised at the answer given to that question by the iron and steel experts of the W. P. B. I have their memorandum here in my hand, and here are the figures they give: This year, they say, in order to produce 91,000,000 tons of steel ingots, we shall require only twenty-three and one-half million tons of scrap iron. That is, to produce 5,000,000 tons more of steel ingots we shall need two and one-half tons less of this melting material.

These are remarkable estimates and no doubt they are intended to be reassuring. I regret to say, gentlemen, that I do not feel reassured. But let us go on to the other figures in the memorandum. Is that amount of scrap available? Yes, says this reassuring memo. We need only 23,500,000 tons of scrap iron, and we can get 25,700,000 tons of it through normal collections, which will give us a surplus of a little more than 2,000,000 tons.

In all of these calculations it must be emphasized that the W. P. B. refers only to normal collections, without the necessity of procuring scrap from public drives, from friendly Allies, or from special projects within the United States, all of which was found necessary in 1942, when we barely were able to meet our scrap requirements as the result of all of these efforts. Nowhere do we see any indication in the W. P. B. calculation for building reserves for a long war; they cannot see beyond barely getting by with scrap during 1943.

NINE AND ONE-HALF MILLION TONS DIFFERENCE IN FIGURES OF TWO AGENCIES

So, you see, if we accept these optimistic figures, there is nothing to worry about. But we do not have to accept these figures. The Board of Economic Warfare has made an independent estimate of the amount of scrap available for collection this year. This estimate is carefully substantiated, and it comes to the realistic figure of 16,240,000 tons of scrap iron available from normal collections in 1943.

The difference between the two estimates of available scrap iron is nearly 9,500,000 tons. One estimate gives us a surplus of more than 2,000,000 tons over our actual needs; the other estimate gives us a deficiency of over 7,000,000 tons—a deficiency of over 31 percent.

I hold the two documents here in my hand, the optimistic memorandum of the iron and steel experts of the W. P. B., and the sober, realistic memorandum of the Board of Economic Warfare. We can choose which authority we shall trust. We can be lulled again into a false sense of security, or we can face a situation which is of the utmost gravity.

I ask you to read these documents and compare these estimates, and choose between them. If you do so, I think you will be obliged to reject the optimistic figures of the iron and steel experts of the W. P. B., and accept the figures of the Board of Economic Warfare, at whatever cost to your peace of mind.

NEW SCRAP CRISIS COMING

It is not pleasant to face the fact that our war-production program faces a new scrap-iron crisis, and one of such huge magnitude as to overshadow the crisis of last year. But the conduct of a great war involves the facing of many painful facts. And we have a legislative duty in this matter that we cannot evade.

If the Nation proceeds on the basis of wrong information on this essential matter of scrap iron, then our entire war-production program is in danger of a serious break-down. I do not wish to ex-

pand upon that possibility. But it is one that we must guard against. It should be within the legitimate scope of legislative inquiry to find out exactly how the iron and steel experts of the W. P. B. arrived at their optimistic estimate.

We have a right to know exactly what interests were represented in the conferences in which those figures were decided upon. Were these conferences dominated by the same steel experts who guessed wrong a year and a half ago on the capacity of the steel plants whose interests they represented in the high councils of war production? And are they guessing again today on scrap iron—and guessing wrong this time, too?

W. P. B. ALONE IS COMFORTABLE ABOUT SCRAP SUPPLY

The experts of the W. P. B. tell us that we are in a comfortable position as regards available scrap iron. "Comfortable" is the word they use. They may be feeling comfortable about the scrap-iron situation, but nobody else is feeling comfortable about it. On February 4 of this year, the Senate National Defense Investigating Committee—the Truman committee—declared in its report that scrap collection presents one of the most serious of the unsolved problems of war production; and it was highly critical of the methods and results of the W. P. B. in handling this important matter.

The scrap-iron situation is not regarded as comfortable by the national organization of the scrap-iron people, which issued a bulletin on the subject on March 2. Let me read to you from that bulletin:

At the start of the year the War Production Board calculated the amount of metallics that would be required in 1943, and came to the conclusion that the need for purchased scrap would be several million tons less than in 1942. It is important that the scrap industry know that these calculations have been rechecked, and now it is apparent that substantially as much purchased scrap will be required this year as last.

Not only do these statistics disclose inadequate stocks of metallics at the height of a war when the objective is an annual output of 100,000,000 net tons of steel ingots and some 15,000,000 net tons of castings, but it is likely that the figures for January 31 not only will show very little addition to inventories but may actually show a decrease, due to the high rate of consumption in January and abnormal adverse weather conditions, especially in the North and Middle West.

Already mills in certain districts are known to be eating into their inventories, and some consumers, who recently were slowing down their intake of scrap iron have been telephoning dealers to expedite shipments. In turn, dealers have been handicapped by the drying up of receipts of unprepared scrap and the increasingly critical shortage of labor, which shows little evidence of being remedied, due to the drain of the armed services upon all industry.

NORMAL SOURCES CLEANED OUT AND DISRUPTED

Let me point out a few of the obvious facts of the scrap iron situation. The homes of the country have been cleaned out of a great deal of the scrap which represents years of casual accumulation in cellars and back yards. Railroads, which must use every bit of their rolling stock as long as it can hold out, can no longer be counted upon for heavy scrap iron; and the same thing is true of our factories.

The consumer goods industries, which have been so largely converted to war production, will not produce greater percentages of scrap per ton of steel processed than in normal years. Our automobile owners can be expected to hold on to their old cars as long as possible. And, finally, there is the fact that the scrap dealers' business has been badly disrupted by war conditions; it has lost so many of its former workers that it is able to work at only a fraction of its normal capacity.

It must be obvious to every one of us that reliance upon so-called normal collection sources, when the normal collection organization and machinery in the United States has been disrupted, is a figment of the imagination. It must be obvious that even the abnormal sources can no longer be depended upon to produce essential melting stock, without a carefully thought out plan by a responsible Government agency to utilize every weapon and means at hand to fill the gap between the demand and supply of scrap.

MONOPOLISTIC CONTROLS OF STEEL INDUSTRY

Do these facts add up to favorable prospects for scrap iron collection this year? I think not. And there is another aspect of the scrap iron situation that we should not neglect while we are looking into this situation. For many years the large companies that control the steel industry have been attempting to secure control of scrap.

Every raw material used in the manufacture of steel, except scrap, has already been brought under the control of the large steel companies. Iron ore, pig iron, coke, limestone, and other ingredients and materials requisite for steel making have been integrated into the steel industry—which is the polite way of saying that the steel monopoly owns or controls all the mines and other facilities by which these raw materials are produced. Scrap, however, since it does not originate in mines, is not so easily brought under monopoly control; and thus far the scrap-iron dealers have resisted every effort made to integrate scrap iron into the steel monopoly. This raises the question of whether the policy-making functions of the W. P. B. are being influenced in this scrap iron situation by representatives of the large steel companies.

W. P. B. PUBLIC ASSURANCE BELIED BY FACTS

The experts of the Salvage Division of the W. P. B. have gone to great lengths in a continuous campaign of reassurance of the public in regard to scrap iron. Last December 15 they issued to the Nation's press a detailed statement concerning the purchase of surplus scrap, which was said to exist in large quantities in dealers' yards in 11 Western States. In this press hand-out there was was a letter from Mr. Donald Nelson requesting Mr. Jesse Jones to purchase, through the Metals Reserve Co., some 35,000 tons of scrap melting materials.

All this was very reassuring to a public anxious about the scrap-iron situation. After the press release had been issued—not before—a joint committee went from the W. P. B. and the Office of Price Administration to the Pacific coast, to find out how much surplus scrap was actually on hand. On January 18, the committee returned to Washington and reported that there was no surplus scrap at all in those areas. Was any press release issued by the W. P. B. to correct the misleading impression made by its earlier optimistic announcement? No. Reassurance is what the experts of the W. P. B. are giving out. Not grimly serious facts, but rainbow-colored prospects.

THE STRANGE CASE OF WAR MATERIALS, INC.

But is it simply overoptimism that affects the judgment of these experts? In August of last year, the W. P. B.'s Donald M. Nelson requested Mr. Jesse Jones, as head of the R. F. C., to form a corporation, called War Materials, Inc., for the purpose of buying heavy scrap iron and steel.

It was expected to purchase not less than 5,000,000 tons of scrap steel to be got from obsolete bridges, plants, abandoned railway and trolley tracks and similar sources.

This was hailed far and wide as a great step toward meeting our scrap-iron crisis. Yet we find that this corporation has collected only 8,522 tons of heavy scrap—less than two-tenths of 1 percent of that much-advertised 5,000,000 tons.

And why has it done so little? On March 1 of this year, the head of the War Materials Corporation, Mr. C. B. Moişe, resigned after charging that the company had been thwarted in all its activities by a series of orders from the head of the W. P. B. One of these orders was that no salvaging projects be undertaken in southern States during the winter months.

Since little salvage work could be done in the Northern States in winter months, because of the cold weather, this practically amounted to stopping all salvage operations for the winter months.

Make what you can of that, gentlemen. Perhaps you will ask yourselves the question: Is it incompetence that explains the failure of the W. P. B. to handle this matter sensibly? Or is there something else behind this apparent incompetence? Who, in the W. P. B., is playing a game with the scrap-iron situation, and what kind of game is it?

We all know that most of the experts serving in the Government bureaus which have control of steel production are drawn from the ranks of Big Steel officialdom.

Strong ties of self-interest continue to bind them to their old associates and employers after they have entered wartime Government service. They are plainly concerned with the future of those private interests.

SMALL BUSINESS IN JEOPARDY

Their concern for these extra-governmental and private interests is illustrated by their allocation of Government funds for providing increased iron and steel production facilities. Ninety percent of the funds, over a billion dollars,

was handed out to their own companies, the four or five top metal producers of the Nation.

This was done in spite of this administration's commitments to protect small business.

This was done in spite of the fact that an immense supply of iron ore could be secured by opening up our local deposits of high grade ore known of in over half the States.

This ore could be reduced to metallic iron in small furnaces by the sponge-iron process and would immediately supply all the needs for high-quality steel-making melting material which we are attempting to meet by the collection of scrap iron.

The allocations were made to the large steel companies in spite of the fact that allocations to small independent companies would have opened up new resources for our war-production program. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that these allocations were so made because the opening up of new resources, which would threaten the monopoly control of steel production, was thereby prevented.

BIG STEEL BLOCKS SPONGE-IRON PROCESS

It appears that something besides the war is on the minds of the steel experts of the W. P. B. The sponge-iron process is one which, once established in wartime with funds from the Government, would continue to flourish in peacetime in the hands of small independent iron producers.

After the war, as well as right now, local resources would be available for industrial use in all parts of the country. Pittsburgh alone would no longer rule the steel market. Areas which are now in a state of colonial dependency upon the few mines and mills of the steel monopoly would have their own mines and mills, around which new industries would develop. To me, this seems a happy prospect, as it does to all the retarded areas of this country in which local iron and other metal resources now exist unused.

But it does not seem a happy prospect to the officials of the steel combine. They do not want to lose their lucrative monopoly control of the steel market, now or after the war. They intend to hang onto that monopoly control, no matter if it does slow down and hamper our war program.

That same psychology is not, it seems, confined to those officials of the steel companies who serve its interests in Pittsburgh. It evidently continues when they come to Washington to help the Nation manage its war-production program. They are still serving their private interests. No doubt, to a great extent these private interests and the interests of the Nation are identical, or can be reasonably harmonized. But at a certain juncture there is an inescapable conflict between private interests and the interests of the Nation.

I think I have said enough to show that the bland reassurances which we have been given on the subject of available scrap iron are not to be relied upon. If the facts of the situation are what they appear to be, then we face a crisis in our whole war-production program. But there is still time to guard ourselves against the disasters that would result from our going on in blind confidence.

INQUIRY IMPERATIVE

If our war-production program should bog down in this critical year because of such mismanagement of the whole steel and iron and scrap situation, then blame may attach to Congress. We are invested with authority which we must exercise on behalf of the Nation and on behalf of those 11,000,000 young men whom we are sending out to battle. We must determine without delay what the facts are, and we must see to it that plans and policies are pursued which will bring victory and peace—and, first of all, plans and policies which will produce enough steel to carry us through to victory.

Telegram of Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram received from Mr. A. F. Whitney, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen:

The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen urges defeat of Connally bill and protests undemocratic procedure in reporting it out of committee with hearing. This bill will have adverse effect on war effort because it subjects workers to regimentation of the Nazi pattern and will compel American labor, in order to retain its domestic liberties, to divert its energies from the war against Fascism to defending itself against native Fascism as typified by the Connally bill.

The Poll-Tax Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mark Sullivan from today's Washington Post:

STATE'S FUNCTION

(By Mark Sullivan)

POLL-TAX ISSUE

As a device to make an obscure thing simple, I print, as the opening of this article, something that did not happen. I print an imagined news dispatch from a State capital. For the illustration, I choose the capital of New York, Albany—but the dispatch might be imagined as coming from Columbus, Ohio, or Des Moines, Iowa, or any one of the 48 State capitals. Herewith the imagined dispatch:

"ALBANY.—The New York State Legislature today adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the State of New York now possesses and exercises the exclusive function of fixing the qualifications for voters; and

"Whereas the Legislature of New York believes that the powers of it and of all other States ought to be reduced; and

"Whereas the State of New York believes that the powers of the Federal Government at Washington ought to be increased: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the State of New York hereby surrenders a part of its function of fixing qualifications for voting; and be it

"*Resolved*, That henceforth the qualifications in this State for voting for Federal officials—President, Vice President, Presidential electors, Senators, and Representatives—shall be fixed by the Federal Congress at Washington, so far as it chooses to do so."

No, that did not happen. It did not happen in New York or in any other State. Every reader knows it did not happen. Every reader knows it could not happen. It would be unthinkable, at any time, and just now it would run counter to the strong and growing sentiment favoring greater local self-government, not less. Any member of any State legislature who would introduce such a resolution would be jeered out of public life.

No, the New York Legislature did not pass the resolution imagined above, and neither did any other State legislature. But exactly the same thing was done in a different way last week. In Congress at Washington the House passed a measure decreeing that the States should no longer possess the exclusive function of fixing qualifications for voters. Specifically, the measure in Congress forbids every State to have a certain qualification, namely the paying of a poll tax.

While this one qualification was the only one taken away from the States by the measure in Congress last week, the principle and precedent thus established applies to any and every qualification for voting set up by any and every State. It applies to such familiar qualifications as citizenship, possession of naturalization papers, literacy, length of residence in the State and voting district.

Now why? It is unthinkable that any member of any State legislature would vote for any reduction of the State's exclusive function of fixing qualifications for voters. But Members of Congress from the same State voted to do exactly that. In several States, practically the whole delegation in the House voted to do that which the State legislature would never do.

In every State there is a legislature, which would never vote to surrender part of the State's function. But from every State there is a delegation in Congress—and this delegation in many cases voted to take away that which the legislature would not dream of surrendering.

There are several reasons. Some are more contentious than there is space here to discuss adequately. But there is one reason which can be stated without adding to the bitterness which attends this issue. This reason is lack of understanding by the people and even by some members of Congress. Lack of understanding of the effect—on all the States and on the structure of American Government—of what the House did last week.

There is still time for understanding to be achieved, by popular discussion and education. The measure which the House passed last week will come later before the Senate. There is time for every Senator to inform himself, whether he as a Senator should vote to take away a function which his State

now exclusively possesses and exercises. And there is time for the people of every State to inform their Senators whether they wish the function of fixing qualifications for voters to be taken away from the States.

What is said here does not deal with the poll-tax as such. It is widely disapproved. The spirit of the time opposes it. It is disappearing by action of the States themselves. At one time it existed in many States, North and South. It existed in Pennsylvania as late as 12 years ago, and was abolished by action of the State. One State, Tennessee, abolished it last year. It continues in only 7 Southern States. In most of these States increasing public opinion favors abolition of it.

The Freedom of the Press, at the Point of a Bayonet and the Muzzle of a Gun

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following quotations:

Men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. (Third chapter of John, nineteenth verse.)

When he was old and full of wisdom, John the Disciple, beloved of the Master, wrote:

And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.

What is going on in the International Food Conference, attended by representatives from this Nation and 44 other nations of the world, down at Hot Springs, Va.? Just what kind of a broth are they brewing and what are they cooking up for the American people? What mischief are they up to that the American people must be kept in darkness? Do they prefer "darkness rather than the light, because their deeds are evil"? Does the secrecy that shrouds the meeting of these representatives of our foreign friends and the muzzled, handpicked representatives of our people threaten the liquidation of the freedom and power of the press and the ushering in of the supremacy of the sword, the rifle, and the bayonet?

And to think that it is taking place on the soil of Virginia. Shades of Thomas Jefferson! Is this a desecration and an abandonment of the first amendment, under the protection of which freedom of speech and of the press have been unrestrained and unshackled since the twilight of the eighteenth century? If, by the Constitution Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, by what authority does the executive branch of the Government or the Department of State abrogate, set aside, and nullify the freedom of the press and the right of our people to know what is going on at Hot Springs, Va.? People are suspicious that they may be bartering away our future. For all we know, they may be committing the American people to a program of eternal rationing in an attempt to feed the whole world.

It was Napoleon Bonaparte who said:

Three hostile newspapers are more to be feared than a thousand bayonets.

Somebody has gone Napoleon one better—at the point of bayonets in the hands of soldiers marshaled, as we all thought, to establish the freedom of the press and freedom of speech throughout the whole world, the representatives of the newspapers of this country are looking down a gun barrel and facing the point of a bayonet while they twiddle their thumbs, cool their heels, and stew in their own juice.

Was Jefferson right when he said:

No government ought to be without censors; and where the press is free none ever will.

Was he speaking the truth when he said:

When the press is free and every man able to read, all is safe.

The liberty of the press is the palladium of all the civil, political, and religious rights of the American people.

Let us take for our motto the words of Joseph Story:

Here shall the press the people's right maintain,
Unawed by influence and unbribed by gain;
Here patriot truth her glorious precepts draw,
Pledged to religion, liberty, and law.

Henry Ward Beecher adds his voice in these words:

Newspapers are the schoolmasters of the common people. That endless book, the newspaper, is our national glory.

Horace Greeley, the great Civil War editor, thus saluted a free press:

Then hail to the press! chosen guardian of freedom! Strong sword-arm of justice! bright sunbeam of truth!

Thomas Jefferson thus summed up the esteem in which he held the freedom of the press:

Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.

I have just received the following telegram from one of my constituents, Dr. S. H. Hodge, of Knoxville, Tenn.:

First time since Columbus landed we have been without cornmeal and corn.

The International Food Conference, by processes known only to themselves, as they meet among the luxurious surroundings at Hot Springs, Va., under the protection of the guns and bayonets of 190 of our trained American soldiers, are engaged, according to press releases, in preparing a bill of fare containing a more nutritious and abundant food supply for the whole world.

The American people are the most generous in the world. They have never turned a deaf ear to cries of distress from any people on the earth. Right now, however, the delegates who comprise this meeting and those who are catering to their physical wants had much better be employed in producing food than in undertaking to distribute victuals which, at this time, we do not happen to possess.

Those sponsoring this secret food meet under the protection of our guns are in a large measure responsible for the lack of food which is now about to put this country on half rations and which brings us face to face with the most dangerous condition with respect to food in all our history.

The forthright statement by Harrison Spangler, chairman of the Republican National Committee, that what we need in this country is abundance and not scarcity, is good, sound, American common sense. It is good Republican doctrine. Never again in this country will growing crops be plowed under, and it will be a long time before HENRY WALLACE can again pronounce the death sentence upon millions of little pigs and thousands of inoffensive mother sows. The maladministration of our agricultural policy is a forceful reminder that—

Willful waste makes woeful want.

It may be that the 2,400 pints of high-priced whisky and the fine wines that our State Department purchased with the funds of the American people and furnished to the delegates of the International Food Conference in session at Hot Springs, Va., has wrought a wonderful change on the spirit of their dreams. These "wet goods" may have put them in a frame of mind that they are able to "achieve the harmonious confluence of incompatible elements"; able to "weld the pewter handle to the wooden spoon"; able to graft "the dead bough to the living tree" and make it "bloom, and burgeon, and bend with golden fruit." These gentlemen from the four corners of the earth may be capable of making "playmates of the lamb and leopard, and boon companions of the spider and the fly." Yet, it may have come to pass that they are able to make "soda and vinegar to dwell placidly in the same bottle" and to teach "oil and water how they might agree." And for all we know, those who have shrouded this meeting in secrecy away from the pestiferous interference of the representatives of the press and are giving to the American people its doings in broken doses have "builded wiser than they knew." No censorship of the press, however, can hide these facts:

The lowly Irish potato has become scarcer than hen's teeth, and is now the stock and trade of a new crop of bootleggers.

There is an existing shortage of meat which will grow worse and not better. Our food stocks dwindle and prices soar.

Adverse crop conditions in many States where neither corn nor spring oats have yet been planted, and devastating floodwaters in the great Mississippi Valley, and a threatened drought in our western bread-producing States, should operate to instill some common sense in the minds of those who are constantly throwing monkey wrenches into the food producing machinery of this country.

It would not be so bad if those who have brought the American people face

to face with a threatened famine were experimenting in the badlands on wooden Indians. They are taking dangerous chances with the health and morale of our people at home, and they constitute a threat to our successful prosecution of the war.

Repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials:

[From the Washington Post of May 23, 1943]

FRIENDLY GESTURE

The House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization has opened hearings on several bills which have a common purpose—to grant entry to the United States and the right of citizenship to Chinese. To those of us unfamiliar with the complexities of American immigration policy, it may come as a shock to learn that our laws discriminate against the Chinese even more rigorously than against the Japanese. The Chinese are barred from entry to this country not only under the Immigration Act of 1924, which denies admission to Asiatics, but also specifically under a series of laws going back to 1882 known as the Chinese exclusion laws.

What is proposed is to put the Chinese on a quota basis comparable to that applied to Europeans. The practical effects of such a change would not be very great. It is estimated that no more than 108 Chinese would be enabled to enter the United States in a single year. But the gesture would have real significance to the Chinese, who understand and appreciate gestures.

The discrimination we have practiced against them on the basis of their race and color has naturally been offensive to a proud people. Our common enemy, Japan, has taken great pains to capitalize on the insult. Japanese radio broadcasts have dinned a knowledge of it into Chinese ears. It has been their strongest weapon in attempting to disrupt the unity of the United Nations. With a simple gesture, we can take this weapon from their hands. To put the matter on the lowest and most practical level of consideration, it behooves us to end this discrimination against China as a shrewd stroke of political and psychological warfare in the Far East.

But beyond this pragmatic argument lies a highly important question of principle. If we have learned anything at all from the bloodshed and suffering of this war, it is that we cannot tell our friends by the color of their skins or the shape of their heads. Our friends are those who share allegiance to our way of life. For a longer time and at a greater cost than any other people, the Chinese have proved their friendship. Here is one respect in which we ourselves have yet to prove it. For the underlying doctrine of our way of life is the equality of man.

[From New York Herald Tribune of May 31, 1943]

IN FAIRNESS TO AN ALLY

There is an immediately practical argument behind the movement for the repeal of the Chinese exclusion acts, those invidiously discriminatory laws which we still apply to our great far eastern allies. They constitute one of the best remaining propaganda weapons in the hands of the Japanese, who ceaselessly use them to convince the Chinese that we look down upon them as inferiors and that they should place no faith in our lofty protestations; it is an effective weapon, and the enemy should be deprived of it. But far more impressive is the less selfish argument of reason, fairness, and common courtesy to the people who have so long sustained our battle.

These laws, which prohibit Chinese from entering the United States and deny the possibility of acquiring citizenship to all those not born here, are as anachronistic as the extraterritorial treaty rights which we recently surrendered with such happy effect. Their history, going back to the early 1880's, carries with it memories of old passions and indignities. They are needlessly humiliating, not only in the basic discrimination which they enforce but in the stringency of their regulations as to visas and points of entry for Chinese who are temporarily admitted, and the Chinese feel them keenly. And there is the more reason for their repeal because the quota system of our general immigration law now provides an adequate method of control without the insulting special treatment which the Chinese resent. The laws can be overhauled without inviting any floods of oriental immigrants; the quota would admit only about 100 Chinese a year, which is virtually nothing, while if these were allowed to become citizens, as are other immigrants, they would scarcely be noticed among the fifty-thousand-odd American-born Chinese.

The exclusion laws are somewhat complex in character, and various proposals for amending them have been introduced into Congress, all of which require study. But the subject is one certainly demanding attention, in the interests of justice and of the sincerity of our own principles.

Jefferson Davis Memorial Day Address of Hon. Jame O. Eastland, of Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEWART
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, yesterday was Jefferson Davis Memorial Day, in connection with which exercises were held in Statuary Hall in the Capitol. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] delivered a very interesting address on that occasion, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United Daughters of the Confederacy, Mrs. Fred, fellow Americans, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor and a privilege to be invited to speak at the memorial exercises of Jefferson Davis, Mississippi's most brilliant and distinguished son.

Born 135 years ago in an humble cabin in Kentucky. Reared deep in Mississippi on the banks of the mighty Father of Waters. Educated at Transylvania College and West Point Military Academy. As an officer in the American Army, his brilliant military genius, the invention of the V formation, snatched victory from defeat and won for a greatly outnumbered American Army the great battle of Buena Vista, the decisive battle of the Mexican War. Congressman from his district, United States Senator from Mississippi, leader of the Democratic Party, one of the greatest Secretaries of War in the history of America. Leader of the South, spokesman for our people, President of "that storm-cradled Nation that fell." A fine executive, a great President, a good man. It was that great leader of the South, of blessed memory, the sainted Robert E. Lee, who said of him as President of the Confederacy: "If my opinion is worth anything, you can say that few people could have done better than Mr. Davis; I know of none that could have done as well."

Imprisoned, humiliated, caused to suffer for his people! Those vengeful little men who thus mistreated Jefferson Davis, and who foisted upon the South that tragic reconstruction era, which was the worst treatment accorded a conquered people in modern history, were inferior to Davis' integrity, were pigmies by the side of Davis' greatness. Loved, revered, and honored by his contemporaries, their children, their children's children, and by each succeeding generation of the South.

These, in short, are the high points in the eventful life of Jefferson Davis. In truth, my friends, Jefferson Davis was one of the world leaders of his age. But what of Davis the man?

From his associates, from his contemporaries, from those intimately in touch with him throughout his life, and from impartial historians who carefully look back over this violent era, there is but one verdict. Throughout his whole life there was never a blemish, there was never a suspicion cast upon the public or private life of this good man. Citizen, husband, father, the life and conduct of Jefferson Davis was in every respect above reproach. Public servant, leader of the South, a man of great ability, whose devotion to his cause and whose deep sincerity impressed all who knew him, Davis was never one to surrender his convictions for monetary gain, to place expediency above right, to play the demagog, or to fawn for public favor upon any issue. He was truly a leader among men.

My friends, the South was indeed fortunate. Its three great leaders, Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, and Stonewall Jackson, were all three deeply religious men. To a remarkable degree all three possessed the same fundamental attributes of character. They were good men. They were square men. They were great men. Truly their lives, their conduct, their character is the yardstick to measure human greatness.

Like Lee and Jackson, Jefferson Davis is one of the mountain peaks of American history. The farther we travel forward and look back into this not so distant past, these mountain peaks loom ever higher. They loom ever greater. The view becomes more beautiful. We of the South are proud of this heritage which has been handed down to us. We are proud of the South. We are proud to be known as southerners. No braver, truer, kinder people ever lived than the sons and daughters of the South. Down in Dixie, there dwells today a citizenry through whose veins flows the purest bloodstream of America. There honor dwells. Secession is gone. We have renewed our fealty to the flag of our reunited country. The flag which Jefferson Davis never ceased to love.

My friends, southern people today, as always, have upheld the ideals of the South. Those sacred principles which have been confided to our keeping from our historic past. The love and reverence of pure womanhood. White supremacy, which is necessary

for the integrity and purity of the white race. The system which deals honestly, fairly, and with justice to all peoples regardless of their race, creed or color, but which maintains the white race must rule supreme to protect its purity, integrity, and creative genius, and which holds that these things are necessary to protect the future of America.

And, further, there is the American system of free enterprise. States rights and local self-government, economic justice and economic equality for every section of the country—North, South, East, and West. It was the contention of the South in 1860, as it is now, that no section should discriminate against, and by legislation impoverish, any other section of the country. That no section should, by having a majority of the votes of Congress, pass tariff acts or laws which would oppress or injure any other section. But that we all lived under the same flag, and that all sections were entitled to equal treatment. This is but simple justice. When southern statesmanship failed, the people of the South took up arms to assure their rights. Their contention of the right to secede was a legal right, widely recognized at the time. There followed the bitterest war in history. There followed what up to 1914 was the bloodiest war in history. The heroic feats of arms of the armies of the South have no equal in the annals of mankind. Ill equipped, ill fed, ill clothed, greatly outnumbered, and with no reserve supplies of resources or manpower, but principally depending on bravery and fidelity, these heroes wrote brilliant pages in the history of mankind. Man for man, battalion for battalion, regiment for regiment, no army ever compared with the armies of the South. They were never beaten. They were starved into submission. I am proud that I descended from one who wore the gray.

Southern people of every rank and class are proud of the conduct of the peoples of the South. We are proud of the Confederacy. We love and revere Jeff Davis, Lee, and Jackson. We love and revere those gallant men, our forefathers who wore the gray. May we, my fellow southerners, ever be true to the ideals of the South. May we ever be true to those sacred principles for which our forefathers fought and heroically died. Those sacred principles, the culture of the South, which has been handed down to us. These things are immortal. They are stained with the blood of heroes. They have been washed by the tears of widows and orphans. Through the anguish and suffering of southern people, they are handed down pure and clean to us. The South is a noble region.

These ideals of the South are under attack today. White supremacy is under attack. There has arisen in this country an alien creed—a doctrine which seeks to tear down the social institutions of the South—a movement which, by granting political equality, would lead to the mongrelization of the white race. This creed—this doctrine—backed by aliens in America, seeks the destruction of the culture of the South. It denies economic equality to the South. It perpetuates discrimination in tariffs and freight rates, which pauperize our section and our people. Against this ever-tightening chain our people fought a bloody, heroic war. The statesmanship of the South must now correct these evils. We must do it without regard to political party. We must protect our social institutions, irrespective of former political affiliations.

A political party is merely a vehicle to accomplish endeavors in the field of government. Its masses are stirring. May its leadership measure to the devotion, ability, and patriotism of Jefferson Davis. May we have this quality of leadership when the post-war world is created. Justice begins at home. A just man must first be just within his own family. Before America can consistently and conscientiously create a post-war world of justice between the nations and peoples of the earth, we must be just within our own country.

The economic discriminations which have impoverished the South must be removed. Freight rates must be equalized. The tariff and other discriminatory legislation must be made fair and just to each section and to all Americans. The South's social structure must be recognized, and her culture protected. This would have been demanded by Jefferson Davis, by Lee, by Jackson, by the heroes who wore the gray. True to our ideals, these will be the demands of the new South in the days that lie ahead.

And so, my friends, we pay tribute today to the memory of a great Mississippian, a great southerner, a great American. Jefferson Davis was at every stage in life true to his trust. We revere and honor his memory. May we all, within the limits of our lesser ability, measure to the standards of his greatness.

The Poll-Tax Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered on June 2, 1943, by the very able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] on the subject of anti-poll-tax legislation now pending in the Senate. The address was delivered on the National Radio Forum arranged by the Washington Evening Star and broadcast on the Blue Network.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, the House of Representatives has passed an act making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers. After passage by the House, the bill was sent to the United States Senate, where it was appropriately referred to the Judiciary Committee. I anticipate that at an early date the Judiciary Committee will report this bill favorably to the full membership of the Senate. I shall vote in favor of the anti-poll-tax bill.

My friends, I doubt that America has passed through a period since the Constitutional Convention when the citizens were so concerned about the right to vote. The elimination of the poll tax is only one phase of this extremely important problem. For example, there are now pending in the Senate and the House of Representatives three bills seeking to amend the Constitution of the United States, which would permit all those who have reached 18 years of age to exercise the right of franchise. I favor that proposal. Certainly, individuals who are physically and mentally strong enough to fly a plane, man a tank, carry a machine gun, and kill the enemy, have the necessary qualifications to exercise intelligently the right of franchise on election day.

Last year the Senate enacted legislation providing soldiers billeted in the camps of this country, as well as the soldiers serving in foreign lands, with the opportunity and machinery for voting. The administration of the bill is lacking in effectiveness. I propose in the near future to introduce legislation which will strengthen that measure and insure to every soldier the opportunity to vote.

Recently I introduced a bill in the Senate providing for uniformity in the opening and closing of the polls in Federal elections throughout the Nation. My bill provides that the polls shall open at 6 a. m. and close at 9 p. m. This is another bill which will give to the defense worker, the farmer, the housewife, and all other soldiers on the home front a greater opportunity to vote. At the hearings held on my bill today before a subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I was happy to listen to the approval of this measure by the Honorable Frank C. Walker, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, as well as the approval in principle by the Honorable Harrison Spangler, chairman of the Republican National Committee.

All these important measures of legislation form the general pattern of the effort to augment the constitutional right of franchise, of which elimination of the poll tax as a prerequisite for voting is a part. Each and every one of these bills seeks to give the voter every possible opportunity to cast his vote in any primary or general election, and this I want to particularly stress during this national crisis.

On the cold and bleak island of Attu, in the jungles of New Guinea, on the plains of Australia, in the swamps and the malaria-infested region of Guadalcanal, yes, throughout the Pacific, men of every race, creed, and color are shedding their blood, nursing their wounds, and fighting on, in order that the cornerstones of free government may continue to stand. What is true in the Pacific is true in the Atlantic. It is true in Europe and Asia. It is also true in north Africa where American boys on the desert sands, in the mountain passes, and on the streets of Tunis and Bizerte, along with the Allied brothers, beat back and finally destroyed and conquered one of Hitler's great armies. In that historic battle American soldiers, regardless of race, creed, or color, gave their all that the Stars and Stripes might continue to wave over a free land. In that battle you could find men whose ancestors were of German, Irish, Polish, Negro, Czechoslovakian, Greek, and Jewish blood, as well as other nationalities, but in north Africa they all fought only as Americans.

Surely, my friends, it is not asking too much that men, whether they be white or black, living in States which require payment of poll tax to vote, should not be denied the right to vote if they are willing to shoulder a gun and die, if necessary, for the flag. I have heard all the arguments of the representatives of the States having poll-tax laws, but it seems to me that the time has come in America when those who fight side by side for the protection of home and country should also be able to vote in the same election precinct for the candidates of their choice, the poll tax to the contrary notwithstanding.

America has always been known as the land of equal opportunity, the land of equal privileges, and the land of equal rights. It would seem that this piece of legislation is only a small step to further guarantee that equality of opportunity, for which America is famed throughout the world.

Much was said in the House, and much will be said on the Senate floor about the constitutionality of this poll-tax bill. It will probably hinge upon whether or not payment of a poll tax is a regulation or a qualification. This recalls to my mind what the dean of our law school used to say when a question was presented that was highly debatable. Not knowing the exact answer, he would pause for a moment and then say,

"Young gentlemen, there is much to be said upon both sides of that question."

Obviously, the question must ultimately be decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, but, my friends, I undertake to say that the Constitution is not a static organism of government. If so, it would have been outmoded in the long ago. For 150 years it has withstood the test of time and change, and that is primarily true because the powers enunciated therein have been broad enough to embrace everyday conditions as we move down the road of progress from one generation to another. The Constitution, because of its inherent, its expressed and implied powers, has fortunately grown along with the times and one of the fundamental principles of constitutional government from the beginning has been that men should have the right to vote freely and without any unreasonable restraint.

I am satisfied that if and when this legislation should reach the Supreme Court of the United States, its constitutionality will be upheld. I do not believe that any unreasonable restrictions and regulations, which I conceive the poll tax to be, can be placed by any State upon one who seeks to vote for a Federal officer.

In conclusion, let me say that I have great respect and affection for my colleagues in the United States Senate, and my hope is that regardless of the States they may represent they yield to this basic principle and permit H. R. 7 to become the law of the land with the least possible friction or debate, thereby promoting national unity which is so vital and necessary in furthering the great war effort.

Analysis of the Connally-Smith Bill as It Passed the House Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in view of the number of amendments accepted and rejected to the bill S. 796, entitled "An act relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants, mines, and other properties in the prosecution of the war, and preventing strikes, lock-outs, and stoppages of production, and for other purposes," I submit the following explanation of the bill as it passed the House today:

Section 1 deals with definitions and is the same as section 1 in the bill reported by the Military Affairs Committee. It should be noted in this connection that in the definitions railroad companies coming under the provisions of the Railway Labor Act are expressly excluded from the operation of the bill.

Section 2 of the bill as reported remains intact. This section makes it unlawful to conduct either a lock-out or a strike until after the expiration of 30 days from the date on which notice is given to the Secretary of Labor of such intent with a statement of the reasons for such strike.

Section 3 of the committee bill remains intact and makes it unlawful to strike until the Secretary of Labor has certified the results of a secret ballot of employees on the question of whether or not they desire to strike. It does not in any sense condone strikes or legalize strikes. On the contrary, it prohibits strikes until the provisions of the law have been complied with.

Section 4 of the committee bill is stricken out. It was the section dealing with violence and intimidation and prohibiting the use of professional or hired pickets.

Section 5 is stricken out. It was the section that prohibited jurisdictional strikes, boycotts, and sympathy strikes.

Section 6 (a) of the committee bill is stricken out. It was the section suspending the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act with respect to violations of this act.

Section 6 (b) remains in the bill and makes persons violating the act subject to suit for civil damages.

Subsections 6 (c) and 6 (d) of the committee bill remain in the act and withdraws from violators of the act for a period of 1 year their rights under the National Labor Relations Act.

Section 7 remains in the bill. This section relates to registration and financial accounting by labor organizations. It requires detailed financial statements periodically and information relative to initiation fees, annual dues and assessments, and sundry other items.

Section 8 of the committee bill remains intact with the exceptions hereafter noted:

Section 8 (a) remains as written in the committee bill and authorizes the War Labor Board to take jurisdiction of any dispute that it terms sufficiently serious to interfere with the war effort.

Section 8 (b) of the committee bill is amended and remains in the bill in the following form:

> The War Labor Board shall have power to decide the dispute and provide by order the wages and hours and all other terms and conditions (customarily included in collective-bargaining agreements) governing the relations between the parties, which shall be in effect until further order of the Board. In making any such decision the Board shall conform to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; the National Labor Relations Act; the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; the act of October 2, 1942, hereinbefore referred to, and the regulations and orders issued under such acts; and where no law is applicable the order of the Board shall provide for terms and conditions to govern relations between the parties which shall be fair and equitable to employer and employee under all the circumstances of the case.

Section 8 (c) is stricken from the bill. It required the attendance of witnesses before the War Labor Board and was stricken because a similar provision is contained in section 9.

Section 8 (d) remains in the bill and authorizes any Federal court to require obedience to the subpenas of the War Labor Board.

Section 9 remains in the bill and gives the War Labor Board the power to issue subpenas requiring attendance of witnesses and production of books, papers, and so forth.

Section 10 (a) remains in the bill and gives to the War Labor Board power in any dispute to order the maintenance of the status quo during the deliberations of the Board. The War Labor Board could forbid a strike by the employees and forbid the employer from changing the situation existing when the dispute arose. But it expressly provides that no individual employee can be compelled to render labor without his consent.

Section 10 (b) provides that such stay period shall not exceed 60 days.

Section 10 (c) is stricken from the bill. It authorized the Attorney General to proceed by injunction for enforcement of any order of the Board notwithstanding the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Section 11 of the committee bill remains intact and gives the Board authority to issue rules and regulations.

Section 12 is stricken from the bill. It gave to the War Labor Board broad powers to change wages and terms and conditions of employment. It was considered as perhaps conflicting with the administration's anti-inflation policies.

Section 13 (a) remains in the bill and provides that when the property is in the possession of the United States it shall be unlawful to induce any person to interfere by strike or other interruption with the operation of the property or to aid any such strike or interruption by giving directions or guidance or by providing funds for the conduct thereof or for payment of strike or other benefits.

Section 13 (b) imposes a penalty for such strikes against the Government of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than a year or both.

Section 14 of the committee bill remains and provides for the termination of the act at the end of 6 months following the war or upon passage of a concurrent resolution.

The bill as passed contained a provision not in the committee bill amending the Corrupt Practices Act to forbid campaign contributions by labor unions.

The bill as passed also contained an amendment not in the committee bill which prohibited any member of the War Labor Board from participating in any decision in which such member has a direct pecuniary interest as an officer, employee, or representative of either party.

Section 13 of the bill, above outlined, would effectively put a stop, in my opinion, to the present coal strike as it would make it a crime to aid in the conduct of such strike or to pay strike benefits to the striking miners.

The provisions that would require a strike ballot by the employees themselves and the 30-day cooling period before a strike and the provisions that would enable the War Labor Board to forbid a strike for a period of 60 days would give sufficient time for settling disputes before a strike occurred and would, I believe, effectively prevent the many brief strikes that are occurring daily in war industries.

South America—Jails To Make United States Army Shoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have received an emphatic protest from my district in reference to the purchase of Army shoes abroad and their manufacture by prison labor.

The Brockton Union, a local paper in Brockton, Mass., under date of May 28, carries a story on the front page under a 2-inch headline reading, "South America—Jails to make United States Army shoes—Report Chile to make over a million—Leavenworth, 200,000."

The article follows:

SOUTH AMERICA—JAILS MAKE UNITED STATES ARMY SHOES—REPORT CHILE TO MAKE OVER A MILLION PAIRS; LEAVENWORTH, 200,000

The Brockton shoe district was stunned this week when reports reaching this city revealed that the armed forces of our country would be supplied with shoes made in the Federal penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans. This news came on the heels of a reported deal between American representatives and Chilean manufacturers whereby the South American country of Chile would furnish our armed forces with more than a million pairs of shoes. Exportation arrangements for the latter orders are believed to be already arranged.

These announcements have not been very well received here, and wires of protest have been sent to our Representatives in Washington by the Brockton Chamber of Commerce and the Brotherhood of Shoe and Allied Craftsmen condemning the placing of Army shoe orders with jails. Apparently these organizations were not aware of the Chilean deal when they found out about the jail order.

The Brockton district in particular and the shoe industry as a whole is well equipped to handle much more shoe business than the orders now being filled for our various armed forces. Plants in this section have not been pushed to capacity up to the present time and there doesn't seem to be any need of placing shoe orders with jails or foreign concerns so long as our concerns are well able to produce the needed footwear. There is no evidence that our own manufacturers cannot easily take care of the shoe situation, and until that time comes it is believed that manufacturers and workers alike will protest very strongly to the proper authorities.

The fact that Brockton is not considered in a critical situation in regard to the manpower situation would indicate that we have sufficient workers to supply far greater shoe production than the present output. Most of our factories are working only one shift in contrast to other trades where the workers are very highly paid for less skilled work. The shoe workers should be furnished with every opportunity to make a decent living during the current era of high living costs. If they were allowed to work overtime at extra rate they would be in a position to make their incomes more adjustable to the present living costs. Such a condition does not seem likely if the Government continues to hand out shoe contracts to foreign workers and prisons while our shoe workers go begging for a decent week's pay.

These workers and their employers have been loyal to the core. They have purchased War bonds and will continue to buy them so that we will have the necessary equipment to successfully combat our enemies. It is therefore quite paradoxical that money which has been loaned to our Government by these shoe workers and shoe manufacturers should be spent for foreign-made shoes to the distinct advantage of foreign workers and foreign manufacturers. That does not seem to be the democratic way as we know it.

At the start of the present conflict when shoes were needed on the double-quick for the Army and Navy it was our resourceful shoemen in the industry who were on the job to deliver the goods and on time. They were ready for any emergency, and they proved their worth as shoe plants were converted almost over night from civilian to service-shoe production. Most of these plants gave up their regular civilian customers in order to fill the needs of the Army and Navy. They are ready to make plenty of shoes of quality by skilled workers under American working conditions, not prison-made, not foreign-made.

All these workers and manufactures want a fair shake. When our shoe industry is unable to supply the armed forces with the necessary shoes, that will be the time to place orders with Chile or Leavenworth and not until that time. Somebody has blundered at the expense of our shoe workers, and we would be derelict in our duty if we did not speak out publicly on a matter which so seriously affects our neighbors and our community. Protests at this time may stop this kind of business which is so detrimental to the best interests of each and every one of us in this district. Write your Massachusetts Representatives at Washington and let them know that you will not stand for shoe contracts being awarded by our Government to any but legitimate American shoe manufacturers.

The reported transaction in Chile appears to be confirmed by a special cable to the New York Times from San Diego, Chile, under date of May 18, which indicates that negotiations began when manufacturers and workers in the shoe industries in Chile made an offer to Vice President WALLACE during his recent visit and that arrangements for exportation have already been closed.

I have just received a telegram in this connection from Mr. John J. Mara, general president of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, representing thousands of shoe workers in this country. The telegram reads as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *June 3, 1943.*

Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House of Representatives:

The Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, representing thousands of shoe workers in the United States, respectfully requests your opposition to the purchase of shoes by the Federal Government from the Republic of Chile or any other foreign country, especially when such shoes are prison made. We are not opposed to the good-neighbor policy but we are primarily interested in the welfare of free American shoe workers many of whom now are employed on short-time schedules.

JOHN J. MARA,
General President, Secretary-Treasurer.

I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, why this country should embark upon a policy of placing orders for millions of pairs of shoes for the United States Army in our jails and in foreign countries at a time when many thousands of our own loyal and patriotic shoeworkers in this country are employed on short-time schedules. The good-neighbor policy would not seem to require or justify any such action. Surely our workers on the home front are entitled to first consideration.

Antistrike Legislation

REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have always made it a point when considering legislation, and other matters where I have not full information, to be a patient listener and receive advice from those who know more about the matter than I do. In this present consideration of antistrike legislation I wanted to find out all about the matter and have listened patiently.

To summarize the parliamentary situation, I find about the following: The Senate passed a bill and sent it to the House. The Senate bill was not severe enough to suit some, and hence the Military Affairs Committee—who had assumed control over a labor bill—struck out all of the Senate bill and put in a new bill under the guise of an amendment to the Senate bill. In that form the bill did not suit others and a substitute bill was offered for the Senate amended bill. This substitute contains some fair and reasonable provisions not to be found either in the old Senate bill or in the House amended bill. When the movers of this present legislation saw that the Harness substitute bill had quite general support, the gentleman from Virginia, who has attempted harsh legislation against organized labor for the past 9 years, offered an entirely new bill under the guise of an amendment to the substitute bill for the committee amended bill of the Senate, and there the matter remains: A bill, an amended bill, a substitute for the amended bill, and an amendment to the substitute bill for the committee amended bill of the Senate.

We are now to have another substitute to the amended substitute for the committee amended bill of the Senate This substitute amendment or amended substitute is offered by the able gentleman from Alabama.

From this historical outline of the bill, and arguments we have heard for and against each and all of these diverse and sundry moves from able gentlemen whom we have heard on both sides in this debate it is perfectly clear in my mind that there is not a single Member on this floor who understands what the enemies of organized labor are trying to do. If any Member should know, it should be the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee that has this bill in charge. Near the close of the debate yesterday

this chairman arose and said, "Mr. Chairman, just what part of this bill or what part of any other bill are we considering?" When the chairman has lost the ball in the sun how do you expect the rest of us who depend upon the information passed out by the learned men to even know what bill, what amendment, what substitute, what amended substitute, and what substituted amendment we are supposed to pass or reject.

There probably was confusion in King Solomon's Temple when in its building the workmen found no designs drawn on the trestle board, but I will wager that history records no greater legislative confusion than that which now prevails on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why there is confusion is because we are trying to do an impossible thing—to make men work under conditions which will not sustain their families and themselves. There is confusion because we are trying to act judicially and justly on a matter in a period of hysteria.

I know a few facts about this situation which I did not get from this debate. If these facts had been brought out in the debate I am sure I would not recognize them now.

Men who labor hard must have enough to eat—they must have substantial food and I know that thousands of miners are not getting enough sustaining food. Here in Congress we can live on celery and sassafras but we are not using our muscles and in this debate nothing else. We can go a long time with limited food, but men who work hard, and coal mining is a calling that no weakling can follow, cannot.

The next fact I know is that the operators of mines and the War Labor Board are more responsible for the cessation of workers in the mines than the laborers or any leader of laborers. Some say, when the flag was hoisted over these mines that the laborers ipso facto became Government employees, and when they refuse to work they refuse to work for their own Government. There is quite a difference between hoisting the American flag over a mine and continuing the operators in control and in trying to force labor to arbitrate their differences with their operators and that of Government ownership. Doesn't this situation show conclusively that the Government has not substituted itself for the operators?

The President made an attempt to put someone in charge of this troublesome situation, and for that post he named Secretary Ickes—the one man who if given authority—who could have adjusted this whole matter. But the War Labor Board objected to Mr. Ickes and threatened to strike if their prerogatives were not recognized. The fight has lately been one between this Board and Mr. Ickes, but in this debate so far, labor has received all of the blame. The mine operators want the Government to fight out their troubles with labor, but during the battle leave them in full control of the situation.

Some in this debate have fixed all the fault on Mr. Lewis, but remember one thing—which you should not have forgotten if your sassafras diet has not dulled your memories—that a leader always gets the blame. A leader may be condemned and even driven out of leadership, but just as soon as he is there will be another leader. You cannot settle a question as big as that of removing all vital protection from labor by starting any campaign against a leader.

Our trouble just now is how to find a way to crush labor without causing such a reaction in the public mind as will bring condemnation on us instead of organized labor.

Let us think straight in this matter at a time when a concerted program of publicity unfavorable to labor has been launched in the press and over the radio. This is a smoke screen prepared by the profit takers and designed to cover their own crimes.

The following concerns in 1941 increased their profits—on practically all war contracts—over their profits of 1936–39, after all taxes had been deducted as follows: General Motors, 20 percent; Curtiss-Wright, 994 percent; Bethlehem Steel, 123 percent; Douglas Aircraft, 930 percent; Consolidated Aircraft, 962 percent; Glenn Martin, 177 percent; United Aircraft, 321 percent; New York Shipbuilding, 2,420 percent; Lockheed Aircraft, 961 percent.

While this process has been going on millions of workers have received wages which have not sustained a minimum living standard. Now, when the coal miners cannot buy enough to eat within their wages, we condemn them and their leaders, but the public has not been advised of the unconscionable profits which corporations are making through the use of subliving standard wages paid to the laborer.

Let us consider this matter fully and carefully and place the blame where it belongs. Send this bill and all of the amendments, substitutes, amended substitutes, substituted amendments, and what have you, to the Committee on Labor where the question belongs.

The Poll-Tax Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, yesterday I asked and received the consent of the Senate to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] on the National Radio Forum, broadcast over the Blue Network, the broadcast originating at station WMAL in Washington, the subject of the address being the poll-tax issue.

The address in full is as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, at the outset, I would like to state that while serving as a member of the Louisiana Legislature in 1932, I voted for and supported the enactment of the law which abolished the poll tax as a qualification for voting in the State of Louisiana. The passage of the bill now before the Congress, which seeks to abolish poll taxes as a prerequisite to voting in Federal primaries and general elections, would therefore not affect my constituency. My objection to the bill is fundamental and is leveled at the method of attaining such a goal for all of the voters of the States of the Union.

Let me remind you that Congress has no authority to legislate on matters which have been specifically reserved to the States. Or, may I put it this way, Congress has no right to pass laws affecting the internal affairs of the States unless our Federal Constitution gives it such a right.

The Constitution of the United States provides in article I, section 2, clause 1:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

Any schoolboy knows that the States have the undisputed right to fix the qualifications for those who vote for the election of the members of their respective legislatures. The provision of our Constitution guaranteeing that right has never been modified, but, on the contrary, it was reaffirmed when our Federal Constitution was amended to permit the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people. The amendment provided: "The electors in each State (for the selection of United States Senators) shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures." That language is identical with the language provided 126 years previously by the founders of our Constitution, and it remains unchanged to this day. So, ladies and gentlemen, we have two similar provisions in our Constitution providing that the qualifications of electors or those who vote for Congressmen and United States Senators shall be fixed by the States. The provisions are specific. They are direct and subject to no other interpretation. In no place in our Federal Constitution is Congress given the power to establish the qualifications of voters.

Such unmistakable language should end all arguments, except possibly for some gullible politicians, who are willing to trample on our sacred Constitution in order to appease certain pressure groups, and who fear reprisals at the polls unless they lend their support to this pernicious legislation.

Let us go a step further and explore the views of our founding fathers who drafted the provisions of our Constitution to which I have referred. It would seem to me that since those who drafted the language understood its meaning, and stated that it was wiser to permit the States to determine the qualifications of voters rather than leave it to the Congress, that should be overwhelmingly convincing and should result in the disastrous defeat of the measure when presented to the Senate. After considering various proposals, the committee on details of the Constitutional Convention reported substantially the language incorporated in the Constitution and quoted by me a few minutes ago. This committee was composed of five eminent lawyers, well versed in the law, three of whom afterward became members of the Supreme Court of the United States, and one served as Attorney General.

When the phrase "Electors to be the same as those of the most numerous branch of the State legislature" was debated, Governeur Morris offered as an alternative, "to add a clause giving to the National Legislature powers to alter the qualifications." He argued further that "to make the qualifications of the National Legislature depend on

the will of the States, would not be proper." Whereupon Ellsworth stated, and I quote: "If the Legislature (i. e. Congress) can alter the qualifications they may disqualify three-fourths, or a greater portion, of the electors. This would go far to create aristocracy—the States have staked their liberties on the qualifications which we have proposed to confirm." He further argued, "The right of suffrage is a tender spot and strongly guarded by most of the State constitutions. The people will not readily subscribe to the National Constitution if it should subject them to be disfranchised." Does such language indicate that Congress, and not the States, was to determine the qualifications of voters?

Madison, Dickinson, and others wished to confine electors to holders of property, saying, "I am in favor of entrusting the right of suffrage to free holders only," but Gorham contended, "The qualifications (being such as the several States prescribed for electors of their most numerous branch of the legislature) stand well * * *. There is no risk in allowing the merchants and mechanics to be electors, they have been so time immemorial in this country * * *. We must not disregard the habits, usages, and prejudices of the people." James Wilson added: "This part of the report was well considered by the committee, and I do not think it could be changed for the better. It was difficult to form any rule of qualifications for all the States. It would be hard and disagreeable for the same persons at the same time, to vote for representatives in the State legislature and to be excluded from a vote for those in the National Legislature."

Can any language be more convincing? Can any reasonable person contend that the members of the Constitutional Convention were not aware of the meaning of the phraseology that was agreed upon? Can anyone honestly argue that the question of qualifications of voters was not to be left in the hands of the State legislatures?

Hamilton, the champion of a strong central government, in discussing the same subject said, and I quote from Hamilton's article in the Federalist: "The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government. It was incumbent on the convention, therefore, to define and establish this right in the Constitution. To have left it open for the occasional regulation of the Congress would have been improper * * *. The provision made by the Convention appears, therefore, to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every State, because it is conformable to the standard already established, or which may be established by the State itself." That was Hamilton speaking.

Again I ask, in the light of the clear language of the Constitution, and the interpretation placed on such language by those who proposed it, can Congress encroach on a right specifically vested in the States? The honest and sincere citizens of our Nation, who revere our Constitution, will answer in a thunderous "No."

May I be permitted to go a step further? Lack of time forces me to center my opposition to the bill on constitutional grounds. The courts are open to all persons whose rights have been jeopardized. If the pending bill passes, the court will be obliged to decide upon the right of the States to provide for the qualifications of its voters. The Court would no doubt reaffirm its previous decisions involving virtually the same issues that would be presented should the pending bill become law. In the case of *U. S.* v. *Cruikshank* (reported in Federal case No. 14, p. 897), speaking of the fifteenth amendment, the Court declared: "It does not confer the right to vote. That is the prerogative of the State laws. It only confers a right not to be excluded from voting by reason of race, color, or previous condition of servitude, and this is all the right that Congress can enforce." The Court further states: "It is not the right to vote which is guaranteed to all citizens. Congress cannot interfere with the regulation of that right by the States except to prevent by appropriate legislation and distinction as to race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The State may establish any other conditions and discriminations it pleases, whether as to age, property, education, or anything else."

In the light of that decision, can it be said that a State does not possess the right to fix the qualifications of its voters? Many more cases could be cited. The question of the State's right to fix the qualifications of voters has never been challenged in any of them. That undoubtedly results from the plain and unmistakable language contained in the Constitution, which I quoted in the beginning of my remarks.

Ladies and gentlemen, although the poll-tax bill has no merit in the light of our Constitution; although it is a direct encroachment on States' rights, many are willing to foster such legislation in order to satisfy a few miserable political groups who are misleading our people. Such an issue should not be provoked at this, the most critical period in our history. It tends to shatter our national unity; it will revitalize sectionalism; and in the wake of the long debates that will certainly occur in the Senate, bitterness, hatred, animosity, and the like will be engendered to an alarming degree. My hope is that State governments will continue to function within the sphere prescribed by the Constitution and that no section of the country will be permitted to force its misguided viewpoint upon another.

Exercises and Addresses at Dedication of Rabbi Jacob Joseph School in New York

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD portions of speeches which were delivered at a remarkable event held in New York City on Sunday, May 23, the occasion typifying the real America, the America of all races and creeds unified for one purpose—the furtherance of our democratic way of life. The occasion was a rededication of the oldest Hebrew parochial school in America, held on the East Side of New York. It was dedicated to the "four freedoms," and it honored a young American soldier who fought gallantly and fell heroically at Guadalcanal.

The school is the Rabbi Jacob Joseph School in New York. It was organized 43 years ago to disseminate religious and secular education to the young generation of Jews, to teach the general culture of America, and to coordinate the modern American spirit and education with the basic essentials of Judaism.

The Rabbi Jacob Joseph School teaches respect of man through love of God. It holds out to every American an ideal of democracy, fellowship, brotherhood, and equality—all that is good and just and worthwhile.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The president of the school, Mr. Harry W. Golding, in his opening remarks, said:

"Forty-three years ago, the Rabbi Jacob Joseph School was started. Its founders were poor, but devoted to the ideals of their religion and beliefs, even as the founding fathers, who, with great hardship but with perseverance and enthusiasm, helped build and develop the America that we cherish and love so much.

"America is now fighting to preserve the teachings and purposes of the founding fathers of this democracy. In the same spirit it is up to us, sons and daughters of Jewish parents, to dedicate ourselves to the preservation of the ideals and Jewish traditions which have so very much in common with the principles of American democracy."

The Right Reverend Monsignor E. J. Flanagan, of Boys Town fame, who spoke about freedom from want, said:

"Our Nation is engaged in a great struggle against the forces of evil rampant throughout the world, forces wholly inspired by greed and an all-consuming lust for power, forces that seek to deprive all but a small privileged class of their sacred, God-given rights to freedom, justice, and equality.

"It is also most fitting and inspiring that on this occasion we are paying tribute in the memory of one of this school's most illustrious graduates, Capt. Jacob Joseph.

"Capt. Jacob Joseph has paid a big price, made the most noble sacrifice to our holy cause. He has set an example of courage and devotion to the service of God and his fellow men that emblazon his name on the honor roll of immortal heroes.

"Freedom from want was the goal of every right-thinking, God-fearing man and woman before this scourge of war was forced upon the world. We must now vanquish these evils warring forces before we can resume our peaceful striving for its fullest achievement. Unless these evil forces are conquered and banished, there is no hope for the greater share of the people of this world to gain freedom from want.

"To secure universal freedom from want we must create and maintain the opportunity for every person to use his God-given talents in useful endeavors and the assurance of compensation adequate to provide his daily requirements of food, shelter, clothing, education, moral and spiritual sustenance—all the prerequisites for a normal, happy, and useful life."

Dr. Thomas Fraser, rector of St. George's Episcopal Church, said in his discussion of freedom from fear:

"The 'four freedoms' are the natural endowments of all men everywhere, of every creed and every race. They are man's inheritance from the loving and creative act of Almighty God who has woven into each person the image of the Divine. They are the foundation stones of the city of God on earth, and the prerequisites for a peaceful world order.

"Freedom from fear is the emancipation of the heart, soul, and mind of man who was created to be free. The chains of fear which shackle the human personality in this age have been imposed by power-wielding minorities who have been seeking privileged position rather than the welfare of the whole community of mankind. As a result, the twentieth-century man finds himself denied the natural right to express the image of God through his heart, soul, and mind, and thus

he is cursed with a lack of faith, a feeling of inadequacy, and a sense of suspicion—all of which are components of fear.

"Freedom of religion was the topic for the eminent rabbi of the Jewish center of New York, Dr. Leo Jung. He said, 'From the dawn of civilization a prayer has sounded rousing the hearts of men and banishing darkness and superstition: "Hear, O Lord, the Lord is our God, the Lord is one."'

"Freedom of religion is as elemental to the happiness of the individual as to the humanization of humanity.

"Freedom of religion implies the right of every citizen to live in accord with his particular faith in God, as long as such life does not interfere with the rights of his fellow citizens and the safety of the Nation. On the same basis freedom of religion implies the right of every citizen to be unhampered because of his own creed in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

"Religion undisturbed in its vision, unthwarted in its effort, is the strongest reservoir of moral strength. Only from men free in their faith comes the deathless determination and courage to fight the battles, face the perils, win victory from evil. Free religion teaches men and women to move from local patriotism to national loyalty, thence to international peace and security. Freedom of religion is basic not only as a moral postulate but as the expression of supreme statesmanship, the strongest foundation of democracy.

In his address on freedom of speech, Mr. Cecil Brown stated:

"It seems to us the most natural thing in the world, to gather together, in sorrow and gratitude, to commemorate the death of a hero.

"We here find neither hesitancy nor difficulty in expressing our tributes to the bravery and sacrifice of Capt. Jacob Joseph.

"For he died, as men are dying on battlefronts every day, so that we who remain behind shall have the right to express ourselves, however we want, and whenever we want. And of all the freedoms Captain Joseph fought for, and died to preserve, the most precious to him was freedom of speech. Because that right is the essence of democracy.

"We Americans have a tradition of freedom of speech. More than a tradition, it is part of our nature, as dear to us as life itself.

"It is inconceivable that an American could endure his existence if he were denied the right to express himself. It is no wonder we react with such energy when American demogogues wish for undemocratic power and at once, try to deny us freedom of speech.

"And now these days we are showing how very precious to us is that freedom. No price is too great to pay to preserve it. Our men, fighting and dying all over the world, understand that the freedom to speak is in the gravest danger.

"That danger cannot be endured, and its menace must not prevail."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, this patriotic manifestation was crowned by the presentation of American flags to every classroom at the Rabbi Jacob Joseph School. Mr. Benjamin Koenigsberg, a veteran in the field of civic work and education, accepting the flags in behalf of the school, said:

They represent the beautiful blending and the wonderful integration of Judaism and Americanism, and will serve as our constant reminder that the religious concepts of brotherhood, justice, tolerance, freedom, and democracy, fundamental ideals in Judaism through the ages, have their spiritual counterpart in American ideals and faith.

The Success of War May Be Jeopardized By Failure to Increase Price of Oil to Encourage New Discoveries of Major Fields

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Petroleum Administrator, Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Harold Ickes, had recommended that the price of crude oil be increased an average of 35 cents per barrel. The Price Administrator, the Honorable Prentiss Brown, has declined this recommendation. It is possible that the success of our war effort will be jeopardized by the failure of Mr. Brown to increase the price of oil at least 35 cents per barrel. It really should be increased more to encourage maximum discoveries and production.

It is probable that the people will soon find themselves with plenty of tires for their cars but no gas to put in their tanks.

We are consuming petroleum five times as fast as we are discovering petroleum. Common sense dictates that this cannot last indefinitely.

The handwriting is on the wall, we must either commence quickly to discover new major fields or our war machine, which depends largely upon the use of petroleum products, will be bogged down.

The Independent Petroleum Association of America, in a meeting at St. Louis recently, passed a resolution on this subject. It is very interesting and states the facts clearly and convincingly. This resolution also refers to the warning of the Honorable William P. Cole, Jr., a former colleague of ours in the House of Representatives and who is now a judge of the United States District Court. The resolution is as follows:

Resolution 6

Crude oil and its prices

Whereas the price index of crude oil 36 gravity Mid-Continent is now only 58.9 in accordance with Bureau of Labor Statistics price index figures, while the price index of the average of all commodities is now approximately 103. The present price for 36 gravity Mid-Continent crude oil is $1.17 per barrel. If this price were increased so as to bring the price index for Mid-Continent crude oil up to the price index of the average of all commodities it would be necessary to increase the prices of 36 gravity Mid-Continent crude oil to approximately $2.02 per barrel. This indicates clearly that the depressed prices for crude oil that were in existence at the time of our entry into the war still exist and certainly an increase in the price of crude oil would not be inflationary until it had been brought up to the point where the price index was equal to the price index of the average of all commodities.

Whereas for a period 4 years prior to our entrance into the war, the discovery rate of petroleum reserves had been on the decline until for the year 1942 it reached its lowest level in many years. This condition was brought about by a price for crude petroleum insufficient to maintain the discovery of new reserves equal to the annual consumption of crude petroleum. Before our entrance into the war, this failure to find new reserves was created by one factor alone. Manpower was plentiful, all materials and steel necessary for the finding of new reserves were available, but the price for crude oil failed to meet the cost of preliminary work and exploration for new reserves and failed to provide the incentive to create sufficient new development. Therefore, upon our entrance into the war, we were faced with a declining productive capacity and the problem of finding new reserves of petroleum to assist in maintaining the productive capacity required by the war program.

Whereas upon the establishment of the Federal war agencies for control over industry the Office of Price Administration placed a ceiling on crude petroleum prices. These prices although already established as subnormal were arbitrarily adopted by the Office of Price Administration. For more than 18 months these prices have remained unchanged. During this time prices of labor and cost of drilling wells have increased from 25 to 50 percent. These increases in cost of producing oil, regulations and restrictions on the use of material, the loss of manpower from the producing branch of the petroleum industry to industries not so restricted by inadequate price ceilings plus a declining productivity of producing wells have all combined virtually to eliminate the margin necessary to maintain the 18,000 to 20,000 independent producers who have been responsible for the discovery of more than one-half of the new oil fields in the United States and at least two-thirds of the new oil reserves. As a result of this condition these independent producers do not now have venture funds to explore, drill, and develop adequate oil reserves. Profits of integrated petroleum companies cannot be used as a basis to reflect the economic condition of the independent oil producer for the reason that operations of integrated companies permit the absorption of production losses by profits derived from transportation, refining, and marketing. The small producer generally in operating at a loss. Certainly he cannot replace the oil he is currently producing at existing prices.

Whereas we are now faced with an acute shortage of petroleum because there is not sufficient margin between the cost and the income to warrant the hazard involved in the search for and the development of new reserves. This condition has been recognized by part of the industry for nearly 2 years. The Independent Petroleum Association of America as early as October 1941, and on numerous occasions since that time, has called this situation to the attention of the Federal agencies responsible for the operation of the petroleum industry. The Petroleum Industry War Council in recent months recommended to the Petroleum Administrator that the price ceiling on crude oil be raised 25 cents per barrel. After a study of all reports including that of the Petroleum Council the Petroleum Administrator recently recommended to the Office of Price Administration that the price ceiling be increased an average of 35 cents per barrel. On May 1, 1943, the Price Administrator refused this increase.

Whereas it has been proved in the past that an adequate price for crude petroleum at the well results in the finding of the necessary reserves to provide a sufficient productive capacity to meet the oil requirements. The producers of crude petroleum recognize that their responsibility is

to maintain adequate supplies of crude oil to meet all necessary demands for war and civilian requirements. Since a price increase is necessary to accomplish this and it becomes the duty and responsibility of the petroleum producers to use every effort to achieve the necessary increase to accomplish this result. The Office of Price Administration derives its duties and powers from Congress. It is essential that the producers of crude should urge the Congress of the United States to take action that will give relief from the recent decision of the Office of Price Administration.

Whereas on October 22, 1942, the Honorable William P. Cole, Jr., addressed a letter to the President of the United States, in which letter certain recommendations were made with relation to the centralization of administrative oil matters in the following language:

"Whoever is responsible for the production of petroleum products, and therefore responsible for our ability to win or lose the war, should have the authority to set the prices. * * *

"Legislation goes into effect too slowly to accomplish these purposes, and as oil is such a desperate and ever-pressing necessity for our war needs, I believe that the entire problem should be placed in the hands of one man, during the war period only, who has the organization available to furnish the information and to dictate the following things: * * *

"(c) To set whatever prices may be necessary over the products to insure their production, processing and delivery in the needed quantities and types."

Whereas on November 10, 1942, the President answered the above letter of the Honorable William P. Cole, Jr., and in commenting on these expressions, stated in part:

"I share your view that further centralization in the administration of oil is desirable": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Independent Petroleum Association of America, and the members thereof, petition the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to take such action as in its judgment will assure relief from the restricted action of the Price Administrator in refusing to grant a general increase in crude oil price ceilings, and will enable the oil producers of this Nation to provide continuously the necessary oil requirements for war and essential industrial and civilian use during this critical war period, and that immediately the concentration of authority over petroleum problems be centralized into one Government agency in accordance with the suggestions of Congressman Cole and the approval of the President above referred to.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that all petroleum, including production, distribution, and prices, should be under one person. I am therefore proposing the following bill which I will endeavor to attach as an amendment to the first bill coming to the floor of the House that will permit it to be offered under the rule of germaneness. It is as follows:

(a) All functions, duties, powers, authority, and discretion vested in or imposed upon the Price Administrator and the Office of Price Administration by the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, in respect of petroleum, are hereby transferred to and shall be performed and exercised by the Petroleum Administrator and the Petroleum Administration for War established by Executive Order 9276 of December 2, 1942, entitled "Establishing the Petroleum Administration for War and defining its functions and duties" (Federal Register, vol. 7, No. 237, p. 10091, Dec. 4, 1942).

(b) As used in this section the term "petroleum" means petroleum, petroleum products, and associated hydrocarbons, including but not limited to natural gas.

(c) Section 205 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out "he may make application" and inserting in lieu thereof "he may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, make application" and (2) by striking out the word "Administrator" where it appears the second time and inserting in lieu thereof "Attorney General."

(d) Section 205 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out "Administrator" and inserting in lieu thereof "Attorney General."

(e) Section 205 (f) (2) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out "Administrator may petition" and inserting in lieu thereof "Administrator may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, petition", and (2) by striking out "Administrator's" and inserting in lieu thereof "Attorney General's."

Strikers in America Anger Fighters on Guadalcanal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following newspaper article by Clay Gowran, war correspondent for the Chicago Tribune. In view of some of the arguments presented in opposition to the Smith-Connally antistrike bill, the article is especially significant at this time:

STRIKERS IN UNITED STATES ANGER FIGHTERS ON GUADALCANAL

(By Clay Gowran)

AN ADVANCED SOUTH PACIFIC BASE, May 30 (delayed).—Striking coal miners, aircraft company employees, rubber workers, and others are building up a grudge score among American soldiers, sailors, and marines on this and other world combat fronts.

Here on the front, the daily naval press sheet, plus a few old newspapers, give us all the news we get. About 50 percent of the news seems to deal with industrial stoppages in the United States caused by workers demanding higher wages and unions demanding recognition.

GRUMBLE AGAINST SLACKERS

The men here have volunteered or have been drafted. They have been separated from their families for months. They have toiled and fought in the sweat and fever of jungle suns and have seen their buddies drop from Japanese fire. They have eaten bad food and drunk muddy water. And when they read of defense industry workers striking—workers who receive five and six times the wages they get here—there is grumbling and much talk of industrial slackers and feather-bed jobs.

I was sitting in a tent on Guadalcanal Island in the Solomons with a group of tired and worn Navy Catalina (patrol bomber) plane pilots the evening they received the news that big rubber companies in Akron were shut down by a walk-out. Their reaction furnishes a good example of the attitude of fighting men toward strikes in wartimes.

HE DID HIS JOB

"When is this going to stop?" demanded a spokesman for the group of pilots who had flown the "groove" to Bougainville may times in the lumbering and vulnerable flying boats. "Why don't those guys get to work? How can they have the guts to sit back there in their comfortable homes with their high salaries and let us down like this?

"Don't they realize everyone has got to pull together and pull hard to win the war? It makes us sick to read this stuff. What would they think if we staged a sit-down when ordered against the Japs? Our hash would be settled quick. Why not theirs?"

That pilot won't be here to express his feelings again. Two nights later he took off at dusk for a patrol over Munda. That was the last we heard of him and the others aboard his plane. The next day a strafed life raft and parachutes were found floating in the water. He had performed his duty—without question.

Chinese Exclusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication which was printed in the Christian Science Monitor of June 1, 1943:

CHINESE EXCLUSION

To the Christian Science Monitor:

The flight from "Shangri-La" to Tokyo cost the United States a number of planes and the lives of a few brave men. From the American standpoint the undertaking may have been successful.

The same flight, however, has cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of Chinese, whose provinces were devastated by the Japanese in revenge. We have been horrified by the murder of American captives; we ought still more to be horrified by the other consequences of the act, which have included the destruction of Chinese cities, and the starvation of the people from whom the Japanese took their harvests, their homes, their seeds, and their agricultural implements. This is the price which China paid directly for our act.

My reason for calling to mind this fresh debt of the United States to China is the fact that Congress is about to have an opportunity of passing upon the matter of the Chinese Exclusion Act. A number of bills have been presented in the House looking to the ending of a discriminatory law which has no longer validity. Granting that it would be unfortunate to have large numbers of eastern peoples in our midst because of their ability and willingness to subsist on a lower standard of living, placing them upon the same quota basis as exists for other peoples would cause the admission of only slightly over 100 in any one year. This certainly cannot endanger the people of the United States.

The Chinese are a proud race. They have suffered much from the western World. In spite of what we have done there is still, as Wendell Willkie said, a reservoir of good will toward us in China. We now have the opportunity to add to this by treating the Chinese no worse than we do the rest of the world. I am sure that the Representatives in Washington and particularly the chairman of the Immigration Committee would be very glad to get an expression of opinion from the readers of this paper.

WARREN A. SEAVEY.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Tax Forgiveness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Morning Sun of today:

TAX "FORGIVENESS" WHICH REALLY MEANS MORE TAXES

Is there a taxpayer with thoughts so out of touch with the times that he believes the new tax bill will leave him more dollars to inflate his pocketbook? Let him correct his error. The so-called forgiveness (the abatement) section of the bill should fool no one aware of the financial realities facing the United States at war. He should know as certainly as he knows his own name that no revenue measure would be enacted now or for some time to come which did not contemplate the present or ultimate appropriation of an even bigger slice of his income.

In terms of the actual cash millions of taxpayers must pay during this and the next few years, nothing is forgiven, nothing abated. On the contrary, the new legislation will, without changing the existing rates at all, add at least $3,000,000,000 to the Treasury's total take during the next 2 years—and that is, admittedly, a conservative estimate.

Individuals earning more this year than last year will be paying more to the Treasury for the next 6 months under the regular rates than they would have had to pay had the bill not been approved. Their payments, that is, will be based on their higher 1943, not on their 1942, incomes. The number in this group cannot be easily calculated, but wage increases granted since January and extensions of overtime schedules indicate that it is not inconsiderable.

Those whose 1943 taxes (figured on 1942 incomes) would have exceeded $66.67 have been handed a 25-percent boost in their immediate tax liability. They will have 2 years in which to pay the added amount—but the fact remains that the bill has increased the total they must pay during that period. The Treasury estimates that some 14,000,000 will be in this group.

Hardest hit of all, perhaps, is the man who happens to belong to both the above groups. Next March 15 he must scrape together, out of funds already depleted by the withholding levy, cash enough to pay half of his hangover 1942 liability, plus the adjustment on his 1943 tax to cover the margin left by his 1943 payments which, during the first half of the year, were based on his lower 1942 income. And again on March 15, 1945, he will have the second half of the 1942 hang-over liability to pay.

And, at the same time, he, together with all other taxpayers, may by then be under the shadow of an even more drastic Federal-tax structure. The present bill is only incidentally a revenue measure; it is designed primarily to revise collection methods and establish the pay-as-you-go principle. The 20-percent withholding levy does not alter existing rates; it is simply an approximation of their combined impact adopted for administrative purposes. Congress has yet to tackle the task of writing a new tax bill in accord with President Roosevelt's insistence that means must be found to siphon billions more into the Treasury to help finance the war and hold the line against inflation.

Memorial Day for Remembrance and Let Remembrance Bring Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARVE TIBBOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Observer, Johnstown, Pa., of Friday, May 28, 1943:

MEMORIAL DAY FOR REMEMBRANCE AND LET REMEMBRANCE BRING ACTION

(By the Editor)

To how many unknown soldiers—to us unknown—do we owe our land, our liberties, our way of life? Since the beginning of time men known only in the annals of the Almighty have fought and died to the end that our generation might be brought to this, its present tragic hour. In ancient days tyrants lusted for power, the peasants longed for pease while brave men stood at the barrier and died in the hope their sons might have peace.

The unknown soldier is coeval with the dawn of human history. His blood has colored the stream of human destiny and from his fortitude and high endeavor have welled the clear springs of courage that have kept cool and sweet those currents of our national life that have had cleansing power. Who except the Father Eternal can number and name the men who died at Bunker Hill, at Lexington, at Yorktown, or at Valley Forge?

And yet those men died to preserve a nation to the end the nation they preserved might live to help preserve the world. The men who marched and fought under Grant's command are now an army of the nameless. Their identity is as vague and misty as that of the heroes who stood at Thermopylae's historic pass. And, in the days to come, few there will be who can call by name the men who are fighting and dying in the jungles, plains, and deserts of the world.

There is an inner voice, a racial call that bids even the American soldier who fights alone against a jungle-hidden foe to make his stand—although there might be no mortal eye to watch and rebuke him if he wavered. There is no call to serve the soldier hears that does not call as insistently to those, who, behind the lines, must needs support the soldier's hands. Soldier and civilian alike have been cast in the role of defenders of the same land.

The man in the trench and the man in the mill are both a part of our Nation's soul. They are blood brothers. Our soldiers must march, fight, and carry on until they fall. Yet the soldier is not one peculiarly fashioned by destiny and ordained to him emprise. The soldier is the boy who lived next door—a lad molded from our common clay. He is not a superman. If he is great it is because he faces a great occasion.

In their way those who serve behind the lines are locked in combat with the very enemy against whom the soldier struggles. The soldier's patriotism has been transformed into action. For the sake of remembrance, as a tribute to all the Nation's soldiers, known and unknown, and as a memorial the soldiers behind the lines must also act. Of our War bond dollars—still needed—let us say: "This, too, by way of remembrance."

America's No. 1 Domestic Problem Is Highway Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CALVIN D. JOHNSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago I introduced a resolution (H. Res. 232) calling upon the House Committee on Agriculture to investigate the effect on the agricultural and food-supply situations of the action of the War Production Board in failing to provide sufficient trucks and trailers to sustain our highway transportation system. It is my urgent plea to the Committee on Rules that they favorably report this resolution at the earliest possible moment.

There are some in the administrative branches of the Government who resent investigations of this sort. But the employees in the Automotive Division of the War Production Board who make recommendations to Mr. Nelson simply do not have all the facts. They may not be careless in the performance of their duties; they just do not know the facts about America. Highway transportation is essential to both our domestic economy and to our war effort. You, the Members of Congress, know that unless more new trucks and trailers are manufactured and placed in operation our present highly efficient system of highway transport will break down.

It took months of hearings by both Senate and House committees before a solution was found for the rubber problem. It may take months of hearings to convince the War Production Board or its superiors that the problem of highway transportation is headed for as big a mess as rubber unless something is done promptly. Though, the War Production Board and the Office of Defense Transportation have apparently ignored this problem, we in Congress who have contact with America, cannot afford to do likewise. Action must come before it is too late; and time is fleeting, and our trucks and trailers are wearing out.

I have had my attention called to a report made by the War Planning Com-

mittee of one of the large trucking associations. So far as I can ascertain this report has not been made public, though it should be. There is one section of this report on "Equipment and Supplies" that is most timely and of interest in connection with the investigation I have requested. This section is as follows:

Accepting as an axiom the premise that motor transportation is a vital part of the war effort and must be continued in full vigor in order to prevent the collapse of all transportation facilities within the Nation, we find no alternative to the fact nor escape from the conclusion that new motor equipment, trailers, and parts must be made available at once to the industry and that future planning must be established promptly to insure the continued flow and availability of supplies, such as fuel, parts, and tires.

At the present time, there is need for promptly starting construction of new vehicles, since any further delay will undoubtedly result in a repetition of "too little, too late."

We have no grounds for anticipating an early cessation of hostilities but already a shortage of motor equipment and trailers exists throughout the Nation. Most carriers find it impossible to handle the tonnage which is now being offered to them. Government agencies charged with the production of war materials, now moving via trucks, inform us that the traffic peaks ahead will be greater than those of the past; yet the industry is faced with a diminishing fleet capacity. Already the volume of Government traffic moving via the highways has increased tenfold since Pearl Harbor.

Too often producers of war materials are forced to use slower and less direct means of transportation because of the nonavailability of motor equipment, thus resulting in loss of many man-hours of production, and too often the distribution of food has been and is now being impeded; urban communities are faced with periods of shortages of perishable foods, due to lack of truck transportation. Too much of farm produce is deprived of markets and the agricultural program is disrupted because sufficient trucks are not available to do the job.

Because of the lack of sufficient equipment and the growing demand for essential motor service, the present plant is not and cannot be properly maintained mechanically. Whenever a carrier is faced with a decision as to whether or not he will provide proper maintenance at the expense of letting an important load of war freight, farm produce, or other essential material go unmoved or whether he will take a chance and move the load, leaving the maintenance until the next trip, the decision inevitably is to move the load, and rightly so. Due to this constant pressure for continuous usage of the equipment, the trucks are being worn out faster than is customary when ample time is available for proper maintenance.

Pressure of like nature and with similar results is also aggravated by the lack of sufficient replacement and repair parts which causes excessive usage of the remaining vehicles in order to compensate for those withheld from service due to this lack.

The only way to correct these situations is to make sufficient equipment available so a carrier can properly maintain its equipment and still have a truck available to move the load. In this manner individual truck life will be immeasurably increased.

Instead of finding that a constructive plan for augmenting and replacing present equipment is in existence or in the making, the facts are about like this:

The equipment which had been manufactured and accumulated into a pool, for essential transportation and civilian usage as replacements, is rapidly being depleted with actually only a very small percentage ever finding its way into the public transportation plant of the Nation.

The armed forces, lend-lease, governmental departments, construction and specialty carriers have received all except a very few out of each month's allotments. Without directing any criticism to the judgment which was used in making these allotments, it is pointed out that the net result has been that as far as this pool of equipment was concerned, it might just as well have been nonexistent for all it contributed to the public transportation picture. Now the pool is gone or practically so and the few replacements which have found their way into public transportation plants are not sufficient to replace those that have been destroyed through usual mortality, so we find the over-all motor transportation plant has shrunk to an alarming degree. There has been no production, particularly of sorely needed heavy duty units, to restock this vital pool.

Even if materials were allocated for a building program, it is pointed out that many of the former equipment manufacturers are now engaged in other war endeavors and they would probably be reluctant to take on the additional production job. Despite the difficulties, equipment must be built to prevent a catastrophe. Immediate planning and action on this matter are imperative. Valuable time will be consumed in getting into production and there is no time to waste.

And what has been quoted above relative to the common-carrier trucking industry can as well be said for the contract or private truck or trailer operator. The farmer faces a shortage of truck and trailer transportation for his cattle, hogs, fruits, vegetables, and grain. Whether your constituents are engaged in logging, mining, agriculture, or manufacture, they all must look forward to an inevitable wearing our and breaking down of highway truck and trailer transportation if the agencies charged with the responsibility continue on the present course. The war front is merely an extension from farm and factory, linked by transportation. Highway transportation must not be allowed to degenerate for lack of supplies.

Where Are We Going?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAN R. McGEHEE

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, as I continually toil here as a representative of the people, not only for my district and State, but Nation, ever conscious of the responsibilities that are daily being pyramided on the membership of this body to preserve and maintain, if possible, for the people of this country those fundamental principles enunciated in the Bill of Rights, I have become so alarmed over the situation that is existing today and to the extent, I am wondering what is going to be the ultimate outcome.

The solution of what the future will bring forth to the American people, if our administration, leadership and the two branches of the elected representatives of the people continue to dilly-dally with the major problems which are confronting us in this the greatest crisis that has ever faced our people, is elementary.

There has been a mismanagement of our national affairs for the past several years. This mismanagement, caused by people being placed in the key positions of our Government to administer and control the manifold activities that are so necessary for the proper functioning of a government, just as there are so many angles for the successful running and advancement of individual business and enterprise. Place men with no practical experience in charge of a private enterprise and it is only a short time until a successful business is wrecked and ruined. That is true in the management of a government.

It is my intention today to call the attention of the Congress to some of the things that have been done by this administration that must be corrected, and if not, the sad story will be, in the near future, it is too late.

Some 10 years ago the gentleman who occupies the next highest office in this land was at that time Secretary of Agriculture. Ten years ago, or to be exact, in the year 1933, there were literally hundreds of thousands of people walking the streets of our cities and villages naked and hungry. There was at that time in the bins and storehouses of our Nation food and raiment aplenty. Yet, that gentleman, and those through whom he administered his office, proceeded to destroy not only the products of agriculture which created clothing, but the products of the farm which satiated a hungry people. That program has been carried on since and is trying to be carried on now, and if continued it will only be a few months until our bins and storehouses will be empty and our people will be hungry.

This situation must be corrected, but it is not being done, because departments and created war agencies are acting individually, without any coordination with each other so as to work out a practical program whereby the farmers of this Nation could produce sufficient food and raiment, not only for the people in the war effort but to have a surplus for our allies in this war. Had there been a proper cooperation between the draft boards, the War Manpower Commission, the labor departments, and Office of Priorities, a program could have been worked out whereby our farmers could produce sufficient food to carry on.

But, to solve this problem at this late date when twelve to fifteen million of our boys and men have been drafted into service, without any thought of the continued successful operation of the many phases of our agricultural life, I think it is entirely too late, because the damage has already been done and the ordinary course of pursuit for the successful carrying on of an agricultural program has been so disrupted and each of the named

departments have gone so far that a successful remedy cannot be properly exercised.

But many things can be done that will alleviate a situation that is bound to exist in the near future; that is, the shortage of practically every necessity that comes as a product of agriculture. Today there is a shortage of corn. The people in my section are clamoring for corn, so they can furnish the dairymen and poultry raisers with feed, but it cannot be had. Many dairymen and poultry raisers advise me they will have to sell their stocks. All this happening because this administration through its appointees and the Congress did not work out a plan 10 years ago for the distribution of the surplus farm products rather than a curtailment of the production of them.

Thomas Jefferson said:

> Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread.

Mr. Speaker, we have been directed from Washington for 10 years and the prophecy of that great statesman has come true even though spoken 139 years ago. As representatives of the people, let us uniformly demand of these different departments more coordination and cooperation with each other and the placing of men on their staffs with some practical experience and see that the farmers of our Nation are given cooperation and the tools to work with.

It is charged that the leadership of this curtailment in production program was a crystal gazer. We know the entire program was nothing but a theoretical one. We know that they who fostered such programs are responsible for the conditions existing today, yet they continue to advocate and preach theoretical visions of a world Utopia when this war is over, not only advocating it in this country but throughout the world and at the expense of the American taxpayer.

I want to say that the membership of the Congress swallowed the bait, hook, and line on these foolish recommendations in 1933, but surely you will beware of the creation of a post-war Utopia, as is being advocated by these would-be statesmen. May I add, I think it behooves the membership of this body to exercise themselves in an all-out effort to win this war and worry about the problems that daily confront us, rather than at this time what is going to happen after the war.

There is a problem that is confronting our people today which is having a serious effect on the morale of our people, and that is the enforced social status of the Negro race on the white race, being done under these abnormal conditions, because were conditions normal there would not be a chance of its success. Every loyal citizen of this country, regardless of their feeling about present existing conditions, are harboring their thoughts and actions and going ahead with a view of doing their all in our effort to eliminate the enemy at our throats.

The passage of what is called the anti-poll-tax bill by the House a few days ago is being fostered by the administration, the Chief Executive's wife, and other radical elements and, if it ever becomes a law, it is going to be one of the most disturbing factors that the people ever faced.

As I stated on the floor when this bill was up for consideration, it is not the question of the payment of the dollar or so tax, it is a question of preserving to the different States of the Union those rights that were granted to them by the Constitution of the United States. The passage of this act by the Congress would be an abridgment of the States' constitutional rights. The verbiage of the Constitution is so plain that a mere child who understood the English language would know it is unconstitutional, but as stated on the floor, we know that if its constitutionality is ever tested before the present Supreme Court, it is going to be declared constitutional, because this Court's majority membership has raped the Constitution at every opportunity since taking their seats on the bench.

Take for instance the decision of Justice Frankfurter and the Federal Communications case a few weeks ago, which was violative of every constitutional right given to the people of this country. But we can expect nothing else from him, because his ideals are un-American and he has done more to destroy American ideals in this country than any other man who came from foreign shores accepting the hospitality of the people of this country and living under its free Government. Living under the freedom and guaranties of that very Constitution that has so protected him for the last 30 years. It is he whom the people charge with using his power influence with the Chief Executive in placing so many radicals and un-American people in key positions in our Government.

Ah, Mr. Speaker, when we have a Supreme Court that will render a decision as this one I have just called your attention to, and one that will render a decision as they did in the New York racketeering case, and I could name you dozens of others, we need not wonder why our people have lost all faith in that branch of our Government which is supposed to be the bulwark of their protection of person, life, liberty, and property. I am sure it is because of the knowledge of the character and expectancy of the kind of decisions that would be handed down in the future that gave unto one Durr of the F. C. C. the audacity and arrogance to petition this Congress to remove one of its most esteemed and beloved Members from the chairmanship of an investigating committee. It is that type of people who are at the head of the F. C. C. and many other departments of our Government who are so un-American in their ideals that they have the effrontery to do such acts, knowing they will be backed up by the highest Court of the land in the event their cause should be placed before it.

Every day as you read your newspaper there is called to the attention of the public by some reporter the name of persons of foreign birth who are occupying positions of great power in our different war set-ups. Only a few days ago we note that one Dr. Julius Hirsch is one of the chief consultants of the Office of Price Administration. We find that Solomon Siegfried Hirsch is principal consultant for the Bureau of Economic Warfare—he entered this country some 4 years ago. We find that one Louis Joseph Emile Rosenstock-Frank, who arrived in this country in 1941, is employed as an economist, with the Board of Economic Warfare. We find that Karl Lachmann, who entered this country 6 years ago, is now assistant solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

A few weeks ago we read in the daily press of the Utopia program from the cradle to the grave, which was submitted to the Congress by the National Resources Planning Board. An employee of that Board, Dr. Eveline M. Burns, so I am informed, wrote this monstrosity. She is employed as director of research at a salary of $7,000. Her husband, Dr. Arthur R. Burns, is employed by the W. P. B. as chief labor adviser at a salary of $8,000; they are both of foreign birth and became citizens of our country in 1936 or 1937. Both are great students of H. Laski and we know his teachings.

Another foreigner is Kenneth Galbraith, who is holding the position as Deputy O. P. A. Administrator in Charge of Prices at a salary of $8,250 a year. He only became a naturalized citizen in 1935. It was Galbraith who said during congressional inquiries into draft deferments in the O. P. A. that the deferment of O. P. A. youths was absolutely essential, because anyone who has not been trained in modern economics within the last 10 years would be incapable of understanding how the country should be run. The morning papers reveal that he is resigning.

We also have on the Federal pay roll one Israel Moses Sieff, a Britisher of radical leanings. Sir Hubert Wilkins, an Australian. It was he who suggested that our country give Alaska to Japan as a means of maintaining peace in the Pacific. Also, there is one, Alexis Leger, a Frenchman, employed at the Library of Congress.

It would take too much of the time of this Congress for me to even enumerate the names that I have in my files, yet I am sure there are literally hundreds of others. Is it that we are going to turn our Government and its administration, especially in our war efforts, over to the foreign-born and those with foreign ideas, which are so contrary to American ideals? In the common course of events in governmental employment, there may be a radical or two who would seure employment, but certainly our war activities would not be infested with so many unless there were unseen hands behind the throne. I think the Congress should take some action, yet, would it avail anything? We in the House only a few days ago voted that no moneys in that bill that was being considered could be used to pay the salaries of three employees whom a governmental agency and an investigating committee of the Congress had said were un-American. But uniformly, when this has been done in the past 2

years their names are reinstated in the Senate, and the House so far has gone serenely along and accepted it.

May I ask of the membership how long, oh, how long, are you going to continue this docile attitude? It may be too late some day. You will look back in bewilderment and say, Why did I not act to save my country long ago? The people of this country are uniformly aware of this situation, and they are fearful of what the future may bring forth to them by this inactivity of their Representatives.

Another foremost problem confronting us, and, in my opinion, the most disturbing to the citizenship and the armed forces, is the situation that has been created by the racketeering leadership of the C. I. O. headed by John L. Lewis. The administration is still nursing them and playing along; in fact, fiddling while Rome burns. Ask every boy in uniform who visits your office what is the most thought- and talked-of internal situation and to a man their answer will be the conduct of the racketeering labor leadership causing strikes.

Many of those who have visited the battle fronts where our boys are stationed throughout the world admonish us that when this war is over "There will be more rugged individualists come back to America from the four corners of the world than we ever had at any one time in our history. They will not accept regimentation of their lives or of planned economy; they will want the same opportunities, and will demand them and will get them, that we had, for they are entitled to them."

Those boys on the 70 battle fronts of the world are today offering and giving their all—their lives—for the preservation of American ideals, of the American way of life, and yet, back here on the home front when every human being should be exerting every effort, making every sacrifice to help them carry on and giving them every weapon and comfort, what would they find if they were to land back on our shores today?

They would find our administration piddling on some kind of a post-war problem, selfishness, greed, and thoughts of political expediency prevailing in the actions of so many. They would find strikes day in and day out, caused by the racketeering labor leadership of certain organizations, which is slowing the furnishing of not only food, clothing, but the very weapons that are so necessary for them to win this battle.

They would find the administration and its leadership coddling along with this racketeering labor leadership, standing by the wayside performing in an Alphonse and Gaston dramatic play.

The American papers reveal to us that one-half million miners, led by John L. Lewis, have struck again. Last week the headlines in every paper revealed strikes in the rubber and other plants. Mr. Speaker, this same situation existed in France just prior to its fall. Have we not learned a lesson? Are we going to follow in the footsteps of those nations who thought more of their social program than they did of their preservation.

Membership, today we have an opportunity to do something that will stop these strikes. The people of this Nation are expecting us to act; the boys on every battle front are demanding that we do. That is, take drastic actions and stop these debacles that are daily occurring.

I understand that this racketeering labor leadership is threatening a political death knell to any man who votes for this legislation. I am wondering if the membership of this House is going to be bluffed and bullied; I am wondering if the membership is going to stand four-square for the preservation of our country rather than the expediency of holding another political job.

Membership, if you are going to meet the mandates of 95 percent of the people of this country, pass this legislation and demand that the representatives on the other side pass it, and demand that our leader sign it. You home is afire; your wives and babies are on the inside; their lives are at stake. Are you going to stand out on the street corner and quibble until they are burned to death.

Freedoms of Meaning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD P. NYE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from the address of June 2 by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on the subject of the "four freedoms," which was broadcast over the Mutual Network.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Last evening, ladies and gentlemen, I told you that I would have something to say tonight that was far off the beaten track of the usual news on this broadcast, a radical departure from the regular policy of reporting news developments; that it was something that must be said in the best interests of the United States of America, I believe; that it has gone much too long unsaid, and that while some of the high figures in Washington unquestionably will criticize me very loudly for saying it and will be greatly displeased, nevertheless it was going to be said tonight on this broadcast, come what may.

For more than 3 months now I have been expressing this thought I am about to present to you from lecture platforms all over the Nation. It has been picked up by political figures in speeches here and there, but with some of the trends in planning in Washington for the post-war period, I feel very, very strongly that the time has come when circumstances and the welfare of the Nation and the preservation of the things that American soldiers and sailors and marines are giving their lives for all over the world, those considerations demand that it have the wider audience of this radio microphone rather than the mere audience of lecture halls, even though it is not news, but rather a matter of personal opinion and editorialization on my part. And I may say that I do not want to shock you with this; I don't want to appear to be trying to be sensational. Just please hear me through with an open mind as good human beings who love this country and everything that it stands for, and then see if you don't agree.

You have heard a great deal about the "four freedoms." They have been advertised and propagandized and ballyhooed to the four corners of the earth, translated into dozens of languages, as the principles for which we are fighting this war, and more particularly they have been advertised to the four corners of the earth as the essence of Americanism and American philosophy. With a very few exceptions, most of us here in this country have swallowed those "four freedoms" hook, line, and sinker. No one has stepped up publicly to analyze them or take them apart or see whether they really do represent American philosophy; no one has challenged them; no one has ever raised so much as a murmur about them. We just let it go on being spread over the world as the spirit of our United States of America, and I frankly don't believe that they are the spirit or the philosophy of America.

Let's take them up one by one. The first two of them, freedom of religion and freedom of speech, certainly, there is no controversy about that. The little clique of master minds who conjure up these ideas behind the scenes and these trick phrases behind the scenes and do it constantly, working for tighter and tighter Government control of everything by Washington, were not the ones who thought of those first two freedoms, freedom of speech and freedom of religion. Those date back hundreds of years to strong, courageous people who came across the ocean and settled this country. Those date back to Thomas Jefferson and the other founding fathers of this American Republic. They are axiomatic now. There is no one of all the millions who are listening to this broadcast who would live in a country that does not have both of them. But what comes, then, after those first two? What are the other two of the "four freedoms," and the only other two, the complete remainder of American philosophy as expressed in this statement?

They are freedom from fear and freedom from want—two very nice luxuries if you are able to afford them. But it wasn't freedom from fear and freedom from want that made this Nation what it is or what made the American people the strongest people on the face of the earth. On the contrary, it actually was fear and want themselves and the struggle of individual men to make themselves free of both things; that is what settled New England, settled Virginia; that is what sent men across the flooded lands of Ohio to settle the Northwest country and then cross the plains and the Rocky Mountains in covered wagons to California, and it was the work that they did trying to achieve that freedom from want and freedom from fear that produced strong arms and clear heads and fine, strong children that carried on after them. It was not given to them by any government. Let me remind you that Joe Louis didn't become the most famous and the most powerful fighter in the world or in world history by lying in bed 24 hours a day and having a government of college economists in Washington serve him his meals on a tray.

If you want to consider these "four freedoms" to be a political vote-getting document, perhaps those last two are all right. If you want to represent them as real American principle, I am afraid not. They smack too much of a government pretending to be all things to all people. Frankly, they smack

too much of the old Work Projects Administration hand-out system: You support my kind of government, and that government will give you this, freedom from want.

That, ladies and gentleman, is a straight case of selling gold bricks. No government can give its people freedom from want, because the very people themselves are the government, and the only place the government can get the materials, the food, and the clothing, and the shoes, and the whatnot with which to provide that freedom from want which they promise is from the very self-same people to whom they are promising to give it. That is a humbug game in the most virulent sense of the word, and if any private citizen were to practice a similar game on his neighbors he would be jailed for obtaining money under false pretenses.

But the real tragedy, the really frightening and tragic part of this expression of Americanism as represented by the "four freedoms," is that that is where the statement of American philosophy stops. The tragedy is that the minds in Washington who conjured that very catchy idea, that very catchy phrase, and sold the idea to the President for promulgation to the entire world, those people were not even sufficiently familiar with the true philosophy of this country to include what is the real American freedom, the only thing that has made this Nation what it is, the one thing that must make it what it is in the future if we are to continue to maintain our leadership and our greatness in the world, the fifth freedom, which is freedom of individual enterprise, freedom of initiative, freedom to work a little harder and longer than your neighbor does, and therefore to have a better home than he has; freedom to cut the lawn a little more often and have the lawn look better; freedom to climb up out of the level of the rest of the world and build a better standard of living; freedom to raise your children with more advantages, give them a better education than you yourself had; in other words, freedom to rise in the world if you are willing to do the work to achieve that rise. And as a corollary, of course, there goes along with that always the obligation of every man to row his own weight in the boat, to do his share in the rebuilding of America, or if he refuses to do so, to drift aimlessly around in the middle of the ocean, washed by the tides.

That is the fifth freedom, ladies and gentlemen, freedom of individual enterprise. That is something that government can give to its people honestly. Without it, there can be no tomorrow for this country as we have known this country in the past. And to me it is shocking and frightening in the extreme that those in Washington who conceived the "four freedoms" didn't have sufficient acquaintanceship with real Americanism to have included in their list the most important and the most vital freedom of all.

We hear a great deal, ladies and gentlemen, recently, about Vice President WALLACE'S idealistic proposal for a quart of milk on every doorstep in Algeria and Morocco and everywhere else after the war is over. That's all very well, but I don't believe in my heart that that is what the 12,000,000 American men who are fighting this war for us are fighting it for. I know very well that that is not what the ones I know are fighting it for. The thing that they are risking their lives for on 10 different fronts throughout every corner of the globe, the thing that they are risking their lives for is the right to have a doorstep of their own right back here in their beloved United States of America after this war is over with a wife and children that they love behind that doorstep and the right to have a quart of pasteurized milk or any other kind of milk on that doorstep every morning if they are willing to earn the money to pay the milkman.

The New Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, June 4 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and enlightening address delivered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] before the Georgia Bar Association at its annual meeting at Atlanta, Ga., on Wednesday, June 2.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I realize that I am invited down here to talk about other subjects than law, but since my talk generally will be about the East, I cannot refrain from starting with a reference or two to the most significant beginnings of what now have evolved into our notion of government by law and the protection of liberty and freedom through law.

Former generations of political scientists attempted to divide the world into political and nonpolitical peoples. They did not succeed because their deductions were not based upon true observation, in fact one of the greatest political peoples of all time was always classified by such writers as being nonpolitical. But there is a definite division and a very significant one which can be made between peoples, between those peoples who discovered a right and maintained it in law, and those peoples who continued a system of personal government wherein caprice or the will of a single person became dominant. Under the latter system, there can be no such thing as a right, and there can be no liberty or freedom.

Our world today happens to be divided in just this way, for the alinement in war is, on the one side, nations dominated by single will and, on the other, democracies which recognize a right in law.

Among ancient peoples there were established two great fundamental codes: one, a canon of Shun which became the fundamental constitution of Chinese political thought through all ages; and the other, Hammurabi's code. While in neither of these codes do we find protection for a free man as we have it in our modern law, still the essence was there, the glimmering germ of a great beginning.

Punishments under each code were drastic, and they were very similar. But the significant thing to us now is that in the code of Hammurabi there was a provision that whenever property was transferred, a receipt must be given—on pain of death. Thus was recognized early the notion of private property, the right of individual ownership, and that freedom which we call the freedom to have, to hold, to buy, and to sell.

Under the Chinese code private property, too, found a place, and throughout Chinese history men have been free to own and to keep. Because of this fact, Chinese peoples, through various devices, set up those mediums which make it possible for us to say that throughout their history taxes, for example, were imposed only to that extent that the people would sanction the imposition. The Chinese have been free to come and go, to have and hold; have been free from taboos. They could marry as they wished, eat what they wanted, go and come as they desired.

The irony of history comes to us very vividly today, because in ancient times these two great codes dominated the thought and governmental habits of middle Asia, but Egypt on one end and later Japan on the other, until very modern times, never had a law which guaranteed any rights. And the second irony is that the fundamental thought behind that which we call today nazi-ism and fascism is a reversion to the old Egyptian and the traditional Japanese Governments of caprice.

We have also in our Eastern studies in early India and in early China the beginnings of what we now call international law. China had a period of 800 years before the second century B. C. which is known as the period of warring states. During that period there was continuous strife among these states, numbering over 50, and during that time there evolved a great many concepts which are fundamental in the international law which has developed since Hugo Grotius' time. But with the coming of the great Chinese conqueror, Tsin Shih Hwangti, these states were united and the development of international law ceased; and from 200 B. C. when the Great Wall was started, until after the Boxer Rebellion, China remained a land whose concepts of international relations were reflected in the isolationism of the Great Wall. The Great Wall of China was in very deed a monument to 2,000 years of a foreign policy.

International ideas of ancient India reflected themselves in practical deductions from the experiences of brute force and conquest, and the outstanding concept was the concept of the big fish—that is, the big fish could eat the little fish—wherein unity is brought about by the powerful swallowing the weak. I think we have had a revival of that concept at the present time in Italy, Germany, and Japan. In contrast is America's stand today, as witness the treaties behind American solidarity. The recent recognition on the part of President Roosevelt of the equality of the small states and large states in the international custom of receiving Ministers is typified by the raising of the rank of the Central American representatives to full Ambassadorships.

Let us turn to the Far East of today. I feel that the question in most of your minds is "How has Japan become what she is and why must we reckon Japan in when considering any phase of the new world?"

First of all, we must grant Japan one unique position in Asia. She has for years, since before 1900 when she got rid of her unequal treaties, been the only true independent state in all Asia. The revolutions and the changes incident to the last World War have brought some exceptions, but as a general rule that statement will stand. Today Japan has within the orbit of her control the greatest source of manpower and the greatest and most varied sources of raw materials and natural resources that the world can show. If we accept as a fact Colonel House's description of the nations of the world as a contest between the "haves" and the "have nots," Japan today represents the greatest of all the "have" nations, while a year or so ago she was always classified with Germany and Italy as one of the "have nots."

If the Axis Powers should be successful—which, of course, we as Americans know they will not be—Japan would find herself moving in three-quarters of a century from the position of the most insignificant of the hermit nations to that of a world power without rival, and future historians would make that nationalistic achievement of Japan a glorious chapter. Personally, I believe that while Japan will always have a contributing influ-

ence on the world, she has lost her chance of being a dominating one because she has sought false gods and followed false philosophies. Therefore, to one who knows Japan's history and to one who knows the Japanese people, the story which I have to tell is, of course, a story of sadness. It is a story of what might have been, a story of leadership gained but lost through overbearing ambition.

The German Nation is now being psychoanalyzed, and some persons are wondering if that nation can be cured of the ills which seem to beset her. If I were to psychoanalyze the Japanese Nation, her alliance with the Axis is merely the reflection of an inferiority complex and longing ambitions. The inferiority complex came because of admitted weakness, the ambitions from a desire to turn weakness into strength. Her walking out of the League of Nations under the leadership of Matsuoka was a most un-Japanese act. In the entire Japanese literature and tradition, Japan's leadership is gained by politeness, subtlety, and well-thought-out plans, not by sword-rattling rudeness.

Japan from the time of Perry to the end of the First World War was a student nation. Her alliance with Great Britain was a helpful thing. She had a guide to advise her. But with the breaking up of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, Japan was left on her own, and when the strutting Mussolini and Hitler became the vogue, her leaders accepted that strutting, imitated it, because it seemed to them to be successful. They had had some experiences with the West to convince them of the principle that the only time the West kept its promises was when it had to. That which Japan had gained, she gained by a show of force. She got rid of her unequal treaties that way. She got her rights in Asia that way. She defeated Russia in that way. The pressure of the world curbed her every time in gaining what she considered were the fruits of victory. At the end of the last war she was stopped by our own President Wilson after she had shown force enough to make herself one of the Big Five at Versailles and to keep the provisions of the Shangtung settlement out of the treaty. A Japanese was made Under Secretary of the League of Nations.

That which has happened to our world did not happen to Japan alone. In the capture of Port Arthur by the Japanese we have the outstanding adherence to the finest principles of international behavior in war that we have in all history. You probably remember the incident when General Nogi sacrificed brigade after brigade of his men to save the lives and property of civilians. The general ordered repeated assaults until he captured a hill from which he could see the Russian ships in the harbor. From this vantage point he signaled the ships' location to Admiral Togo, who was waiting outside the harbor, separated from the Russian Fleet by a densely populated land area. Thus Togo was able to destroy the ships by shooting over the land into the harbor, and won a great victory without injuring civilians or private property.

It was the Japanese who sacrificed thousands of men to keep from breaking an international law in 1904–5. The same Japanese in 1932 fired promiscuously upon the people of Chapei, killing men, women, and children with indifference and paying no attention to the rights of private property or persons. In the course of one generation all that civilization had gained in the 2,000 years' struggle from the time Jesus first taught the worth of the individual to the near present was wiped out by Japan's act at Chapei. But was she the only guilty party? Had not the Italian writers invented the total destruction and horrible war idea? Did not German military books accept the theories of the blitzkrieg? Had not the theory of total war and total destruction come into the whole world? An American captain, who with others had rushed to the roof of his Shanghai hotel with his field glasses to watch the destruction of Chapei, when asked what about the women and children, replied that it was just too bad. Was the whole world shocked, or did we accept it as being just too bad? Total war is the answer to that question.

When Japan adopted a modern constitution and the chief writer of that document, Prince Ito, after study through Europe and America presented it to the Japanese people, he remarked that Japan would not make the mistake of western nations in allowing the military to become controlled by the civil branches of government. "Never," said he, "would we put a general in command of troops out in the field in the position of not being able to be in sole command of his whole situation." Thus the Japanese Government became, whenever tthe military acted, militaristic in its nature; and when Germany and Italy started upon their modern careers, Japan was a natural admirer because in her military clique there were those who accepted the philosophy which underlies fascism and nazi-ism.

Now, what about the future? Through Japanese history we find periods of conquest and cruelty and all that is bad in society. But these things do not dominate her history.

Two cultures have had more to do with the thought and the lives of the Japanese than any others. Those cultures are the Chinese Confucianism and the Indian Buddhism. Both of these influences are peace-loving. Shinto, the mythological religion of Japan, later under western guidance turned into a harsh nationalistic religion, and had never had a great influence upon the thoughtful of Japan until the present time. I say these things to make the point that Japan of today is definitely apostate in its nature, but the leaders of this apostasy must be utterly destroyed or their leadership will persist as the leadership of the steel helmets persisted after the last war in Germany.

No compromise can be made with present-day leadership. From their leaders an unconditional surrender must be gained, and they themselves must acknowledge their defeat. The defeat must be crushing, not in the sense that we are to destroy Japanese men, women, and children, and Japanese property; but those who are responsible for the leading of Japan into her wicked career of the last generation must be humbled, humiliated and put down forever. That is the paramount task for our military and naval forces in this war. We have allowed Japan to extend herself to the limit. We are now fighting on a great circle. Some militarists believe that if we can strike the heart and head of Japan, the circle will collapse. Others believe that we must blast forth and divide present Japanese military government into small pockets of inferior force and destroy them one at a time.

Let me make this simple contrast between what might take place in Europe and what might take place in Japan:

Germany, since Bismarck's time, has been a country dominated by the general staff. When professional soldiers see that the game is up, there are but two alternatives—to fight it out and sacrifice to the utmost and remain strong wherever strength can be maintained, or to face the inevitable and allow collapse. In Germany, judging from her history and from her type of military control, I expect collapse.

I do not expect the collapse of Japan, even if we do that which I think we must do, destroy her head and her heart; but still there will be the old military theory which has never changed, and that is, that a general sent out with a contingent has a task to perform, and he performs it as he sees fit regardless of orders from the homeland. Thus, wherever Japanese concentrations are, the stage is set for a battle which will last just as long as the soldiers in command are willing to fight. This point is extremely essential; it shows us what we may have to sacrifice in bringing peace to Asia. Japan, which seems so united to the outside world, never fights a single war, but she fights as many wars as she has theaters of war and as diverse a war as the varied ideas of her generals and her admirals. Thus, you see that those strategists who feel that our task in Asia is easy fail to recognize the background facts.

The Fight Between President Andrew Jackson and the Money Power

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 1, 1943

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, just a little over a hundred years ago, during the administration of President Andrew Jackson, there was a celebration in Washington. The last dollar of the national debt had been paid. For once—and only once—in the history of our Nation our Government was out of debt.

To the average businessman or farmer who has struggled with a mortgage or the burden of debt the accomplishment of President Jackson, on this occasion, was something to celebrate. In our present financial situation and in light of the history of this struggling new country which had successfully waged two great wars and had triumphed in an internal struggle for the control of our Government finance, we can better appreciate the sterling worth of this great warrior and statesman, President Andrew Jackson.

The account of the fight between President Andrew Jackson and the Bank of the United States, as recounted by one of Abraham Lincoln's Presidential electors, Charles Schreiner, of Pennsylvania, follows:

Everyone should read the history of the great battle between Andrew Jackson and the money power in Benton's Thirty Years in the Senate.

History on the money question is simply repeating itself. In Jackson's time we had but one great corporation in the United States; that was the old United States Bank, with a capital of $35,000,000 and a charter that expired in 20 years. The great money power of that generation was concentrated in that bank and its branch banks in all States of the Union. Thirty-five million do not seem very big when compared with the corporations we have now, but the old United States Bank had one vast advantage over all other corporations. We had no United States Treasury then, separate and apart from the bank, and the laws then required that all the money belonging to the Government should be deposited in that bank. This gave its managers millions of money and vast

power, for money was worth from 1 to 5 percent a month, and no restraint on the amount they could issue, except their good faith. Banks then printed their own paper money, and the law permitted them to circulate $5 in paper money for $1 of capital, with no restraint except their good faith to prevent them from circulating $100 to $1 of their capital, which was often done.

Nicholas Biddle was president of the great bank. He was the money king of that day and generation. He lived in a marble palace on the banks of the Delaware, 15 miles above Philadelphia, and there in that palace of pure white marble, with great Corinthian columns, this money king dispensed hospitality equal to almost any king in Europe. Thousands of people thought him vastly greater than General Jackson.

Some time before Biddle's charter expired he took a trip to Washington to have a talk with his then friend, Jackson, about a new charter for his bank. The old one was to expire in 1836, and as Jackson was a candidate for reelection he thought it would be a good thing to tell him about the vast power of his bank and its many branches. He told Jackson that the merchants and men of affairs through all the States were, as a rule, largely indebted to his banks and that through the influence of his branch banks he could control the election in any State in the Union. Then up rose Andrew Jackson and with suppressed emotion said: "Mr. Biddle, if that is true, and I think it is, I tell you here and now, that if you can control the election in any State in the Union, that is too much power for one man to have in a free country in time of peace. And I will tell you further, here and now, that if you can get a new charter from Congress for that bank, by the eternal, I will veto that charter."

Then the great money king set himself to work to defeat the election of Andrew Jackson. The first thing that Banker Biddle did was to buy up or influence all the great democratic papers that were for sale from Boston to New Orleans. They even bought Jackson's home organ, the old Washington Globe, edited by Jackson's personal friend, General Duff Green. When Jackson saw them using Government money to buy up Democratic papers, editors, etc., he said to his Secretary of the Treasury: "Mr. Duane, I don't want you to put any more Government money in that bank; it will blow up; the money is not safe." But Mr. Duane was himself a banker and a very rich man for that day. Of course he was in sympathy with the money power and he said: "I can't obey that order." Then he was told to take an indefinite furlough for the benefit of his health and Jackson put Roger B. Taney in his place, the man who afterward became Chief Justice of the United States.

Clay, Webster, and Calhoun were then all in the United States Senate and all candidates for President against Jackson. Benton, Jackson's great defender, called them "the great triumvirate." At the proper time these great men made great constitutional arguments to show how Jackson had turned Cromwell and was trampling the Constitution and the liberties of the people under foot.

The next move Biddle's henchmen made was to get up honest democratic meetings—honest primaries to denounce and head off the President.

A great anti-Jackson, an honest Democratic meeting of this kind was held in Philadelphia, where the great bank was located, at which they gave a free dinner to 80,000 men—all paid for by the great bank. They appointed a committee of 300 Democrats to go to Washington and ask Jackson to desist from his course in ruining the country. When this committee got to Washington, one of these pride-swollen bankers so far forgot himself to say to the President that if he persisted in his course the people would rise up en masse and come to Washington with shotguns, pitchforks, and anything that would kill to expel the Goths from Rome. Jackson replied: "Do you come here to threaten me? If you men dare to put any of your big threats into execution, by the great eternal, I will hang you high as Haman."

For a time it did look blue for Old Hickory. It seemed as if he was being forsaken by all his old friends. But after a while it began to be seen that for each great banker that left him four or five honest farmers, mechanics, and laborers came to him.

When the election was over and the vote counted Andrew Jackson, the hero of the people, had swept the whole country by storm. He had more majority than the other candidate had votes. Then the Democrats rejoiced.

Of the millions who (now) inhabit our great Republic how many know that such a man as Nicholas Biddle ever lived? His marble palace is gone and in the wreck of his great bank only $20 was found to redeem a paper circulation of over a hundred million.

Andrew Jackson was indeed a great man. His name will live forever with the Republic. He saved the people of his day from the grinding curse of a monied aristocracy.

Capitalism on Crutches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Samuel Crowther on capitalism on crutches before the Rotary Club of New York, the Commodore, New York:

When, a little while back, the very kind invitation to speak before you was tendered to me, I replied that I would be delighted to be with you bu that I had made it a fixed policy in these times to call things, to the extent of my ability, by their right names, and I had found that this was not a particularly popular approach, for most people wanted a writer or a speaker—and, as you will discover, I am a writer rather than a speaker—to tell them in some cheery fashion that this is the best of all possible worlds and anything to the contrary just ain't so.

This is in lien with the tendency of so many of us to accept slogans and catch-words for thoughts and to divide them into two great classes—the one labelled pessimistic and the other labelled optimistic. The pessimist not only sees nothing but gloom ahead, but also accepts his fate as so inevitable that he can do nothing about it. The optimist sees nothing but joy ahead. He has gurgled himself into a new and perfect world born out of our travail and he is now quarreling about the details of perfection, such as the forms we should use in educating our enemies after we have finished conquering them.

At the risk of being classed as a pessimist, let me say it has not been made wholly plain, at least to me, how the path to freedom of speech will be cleared by its suppression, nor how the path away from want will be cleared by death and destruction, nor how the way from fear will be cleared by more fear, nor how freedom to worship will emerge from the smoking ruins of a world made bare by stimulated hate.

It is all well enough to play at being Alice in Wonderland and it is fun to go to Never-Never Land by airplane with Eleanor or Henry or Wendell. They do not ask us to do anything about anything at the moment and they provide a fluent patter for those of us who wish to be considered intelligent and a good show for the rest of us. But may I remind you that, although one may seem to escape from reality by getting drunk on glory, just as one may seem to escape by getting drunk on a differen sort of spirits, there is always a morning after with a more complicated set of realities than we had the day before.

Therefore, instead of asking you lightly to skip with me up to the top of my pet mountain and there unfolding to you a panorama of my pet world, I am going to ask you to sit right where you are and look around, and I am asking you to do this in the hope of bringing an acute realization that, in our mad scramble to escape from thinking, we are permitting an American to be redefined as a supine animal which acts and thinks exactly as it is told. We are already well along on our way toward losing that sturdy, pernickety independence which most of us were reared to believe was our birthright. We are not exchanging it for some supposedly higher form of life in which dependence and interpendence become hallowed. We are not losing it because anyone planned it that way.

We are losing it because, as a people, we have been too cowardly to come to grips with reality, and in trying to escape from reality we have set up a manner and a form of government which has no means of going forward and therefore must go backward and is now mired in the bog of planless socialism, and it does not matter that those who are on the political bandwagon shriek that they are not in the mud at all but on a fine, paved highway.

I hold that it is not only the solemn right but the holy duty of an American citizen to criticize his Government and especially in wartime. And I further hold that it is stark desecration for any Government officer to wrap himself in the flag to hide his errors or his incapacity. In peacetime we can put up with errors and incapacity because usually we can change personalities before too much harm has been done, but today we are at war and the manner and methods of government are so swiftly destroying our civilian economy that all at once we may find that the props have been knocked from under us, and, in the hour when most they need us, we may in sheer helplessness let our boys down. That would be to our eternal shame.

We have been taking the Washington bureaucracy as something of a joke. It is no longer a joke and it is no longer just in Washington. It has spawned all over the country and pretty much all over the world. While the factories and farms are acutely short of manpower, the bureaucrats are multiplying until now in every State there are more Federal than State employees, and in some States several times as many. I do not know how many are outside the United States, but I am informed that in Brazil alone we have around 10,000 civilian employees. We thought we were rid of the Work Projects Administration, but it is back again in a new hat, and where the primitive Work Projects Administration had to learn to doze on shovels, the modern Work Projects Administration have desks.

It is a most extraordinary bureaucracy and presents a phenomenon, the like of which the world has never known. Never has any group anywhere at any time had so low a general level of ability. Having said all that, I have said exactly nothing, for this bureaucracy is not a cause but a result. The members of this bureaucracy are not to be blamed for

being what they are. We, the people, put them there by insisting that government do what government is incapable of doing. And a change in government which would merely mean the Republican Party displacing the Democratic Party, while it would bring in a lot of new faces, would not change the manner of government or lessen the weight of bureaucracy or enlarge the freedom of the average man.

We, the people, are getting what we asked for, although neither the package nor the contents are what we expected, and, so long as we ask government for that which is not in the power of government to deliver, we are going to get an ever-increasing dose of exactly what we are getting now—regardless of what party is nominally in power.

That needs some explaining. We have been drifting away from the historic American conception of individual independence for a long while, but more especially since the sixteenth amendment, which became a part of the Constitution just before the First World War, gave to the Congress the right to levy graduated income taxes and thereby centered in the Federal Government a life and death power over all citizens and all corporations. Almost at the same time, we established the Federal Reserve System as an aid to better banking. We never thought these two laws would ever or could ever be used except in the general welfare, but they did strengthen the power of central government, and one may take for granted that a power given is a power that will sometime be used. It was thus not unnatural that in the great depression people should turn helplessly to the Government to do for them what they thought they could not do for themselves. The cry for help called forth the National Recovery Administration, and you will remember that was a complete departure from the American theory of free private enterprise and an experiment in a kind of guild socialism with business grouped into guilds, with codes of laws supervised by the Government. That act was killed by the Supreme Court. But it lived long enough to establish in Washington the flat principle that the American people have not the mental capacity to think, act, or spend for themselves and therefore must be regulated, supervised, and kidded by Government.

The kidding phase—which has now come to be known as morale building—was also new in American life. Never before had a government elected by us become a thing of itself with a vast publicity crew trying to sell policies to the people in exactly the same fashion and with most of the same devices that the Soviet and Nazi Governments used to sell themselves to their peoples. The National Recovery Act may be considered a comic interlude in our national life, and some of you who are here may have walked up Fifth Avenue wearing buttons and carrying flags, in the hope that depression was a kind of Jericho whose walls would fall, if only you marched around them.

The National Recovery Act was quickly followed by the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Works Progress Administration and no end of other agencies that not only shoveled out the public money but bore prodigious litters of bureaucrats who were nearly all the kind of people who believed that our citizens were incapable of deciding anything of importance for themselves and needed to be cared for. And, of course these bureaucrats had to have petty, legalistic, monorail minds, else they could not have found themselves capable of directing the American people.

All this took money. There are only three ways in which a government can raise money. The first is by taxing. The second is by borrowing savings. The third is by printing money. The first notion was that wealth could be redistributed through taxes, and the income taxes, which had been sanctioned by the 16th amendment, were raised to such heights that it was no longer worth while for anyone to venture. The Government, while wailing about unemployment, took away the only means which has ever given useful and self-sustaining employment. And what is more, these taxes took away the power of business to sustain itself. The National Industrial Conference Board several years ago compiled some figures on production per capita of population and compared them with Federal expenditures and gross Federal debt. They are significant. During the years 1923-1929, which was the Administration of President Coolidge, the production index figure was 405 per capita, the Federal expenditures were $1,314 per capital and the gross Federal debt was $5,017 per capita. During the years 1933-1940, which was the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, the production per capita fell to 312—which was 4 points lower than during the period 1901-1909, which was the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt—the Federal expenditures per capita rose to $3,108 and the gross Federal debt to $11,709. That is, as the Government tried to replace American individual initiative and free private enterprise with a system of doles and regulations administered by welfare workers, production fell by nearly a quarter, Federal expenditures nearly tripled and the gross Federal debt more than doubled. Remember that those figures are per head of population. Any man with ordinary sense knows that the end is not far away if, on a declining volume of business, one increases spending and debt.

That brings us to another highly important point which somehow does not seem generally to be grasped, and that is Government borrowing. I think the reason for the confusion is partly the sort of statistics that have been coming out of Washington and partly the mystery that somehow surrounds banking. A commercial bank, as distinguished from a savings bank, which is not a bank at all but an investment trust, does not lend money. It lends credit. That a bank does not lend money but lends a credit which serves as money sounds as though queer business were going on somewhere, but that is nonsense. Probably no single factor has been so important in the growth of British and American trade as the flexible banking system which can circulate credit as money. But that system will work only in private hands, because it depends on loans being paid off out of new production. In Government hands, the banking system may serve to create the illusion of money, and that is exactly what has happened here and is at the root of our trouble.

Although the New Deal pretended to redistribute wealth, it never collected in taxes more than half the money it spent, and I may say right here that the kind of social reform which has to be supported by borrowing—which, as I shall develop, turns into money printing—is not social reform at all but something in the nature of fake stock selling. The Government borrowed from the banks. When a bank buys Government securities it opens a deposit to the credit of the Government to the amount of the securities and puts them among its assets. It follows the same procedure as with an individual borrower. If the Government does not retire its securities the bank deposits created by their purchase remain, and it may surprise you to know that the increase in our bank deposits since 1916 has been entirely due to Government borrowing, for business, up until the opening of the war period, was borrowing less than in 1916.

Our bank deposits are no longer an evidence of wealth or of savings. They simply represent unpaid Government borrowing. Since they may be turned into hand money at any time, they are simply a Government way of printing paper money and you will remember that our money is no longer exchangeable for gold. If there had been an attempt to spend these bank deposits at any time between, say 1937 and 1941, we would have had an inflation of prices which would have made a piker out of the 1929 stock market. If such an attempt at individual spending had then occurred, we would have then had all the controls that we have now. But it was just not worth while for the individual to spend for gain, because under the tax laws the Government said: "Heads I win and tails you lose."

Now we are at war but, financially speaking, we are continuing to do what we did during the social welfare days of the New Deal. The Government then raised by borrowing about half of what it spent. Now it is spending sums far beyond human comprehension and raising about three-quarters of the money through the commercial banks—or, to put it bluntly, by printing money. A change in the basic law and character of the Federal Reserve System has made this possible.

Now let us see what all this means. You have heard a lot of fancy talk out of Washington about the inflationary gap and about the necessity of controlling inflation through controlling prices, and so on and so on. It may or may not have struck you that no matter what happens turns out to be a reason for more Government control. The inflationary gap is supposed to be the difference between the amount of goods available to buy, which in turn is supposed to be exactly the amount of goods on which our civilian population can stay alive and work, and the amount which the Government is spending. The notion is that through taxes, forced savings, price control, and rationing, the Government can create money at will and make it act, smell, and taste like money, and at the same time prevent it from being used as money. This is exactly the manner in which Hitler managed to rearm Germany, although by now, both in Germany and in Russia, money is only a ticket entitling one to use a ration book. We are in a half-socialistic planned economy, but unfortunately our chief planners have astigmatism and are working without their glasses.

We have in this Nation no shortages that are not man-made. I include both materials and manpower. You are familiar with the mess in manpower. We have a national shortage of rubber and sectional shortages of petroleum products. Even elementary prevision would have supplied us with a great rubber stock pile and a synthetic-rubber industry which would have been in production by the time the pile was used up. Equally elementary prevision would have provided either a petroleum transportation safe from enemy attacks or an adequate defense against these attacks. The recklessness which ignored these vital supplies has cut deeply into the efficiency of our war effort, both directly by crippling a great section of our transport and indirectly by wasting, before various sorts of boards, manpower that could have usefully been employed. It is quite evident that the bureaucrats applied to the motor problem the same grade of reasoning that stopped for a few weeks the selling of sliced bread.

There is not now and never was a shortage of sugar except for a little while after Mrs. Roosevelt and Secretary Wickard reassured us on the radio. There need be no shortage of coffee. Practically all of our shortages have been due to loose talking, planless planning, hopelessly involved and ever-changing procedures and competition between governmental buying agencies. It is a magnificent tribute to American industry that it has been

able to produce so gloriously in spite of governmental regulation.

That is over the dam, but a new series of regulations are not over the dam, and we can do something about them before they take us into another winter so cold and so hungry that we may become helpless.

I refer to the extraordinary antics of the Office of Price Administration. Our food shortage is not due to the people eating too much or the soldiers eating too much or Lend-Lease sending abroad too much. The shortage is due wholly to the Office of Price Administration. Its ceilings, its regulations, and its horde of busybodies have turned upside down our whole structure of food production and distribution. The official pleas that the people or the black markets or causes outside the Office of Price Administration are to blame are untrue. They are getting pretty tiresome. The flag-waving pleas are contemptible. In the last war, Herbert Hoover, without rationing or regulations, sent twice as much food overseas as is being sent in this war, and not only provided the home table with ample food, but also, at the war's end, had more beef cattle on the farms than at the beginning. He relied on the voluntary cooperation of American citizens.

The present administration talks about cooperation but relied solely on regimentation and compulsion. The order fixing prices was an order for the winds to cease and the seas to still. The order to roll back prices was an order for the seas to part and open a passage. It set a new high in bumptious ignorance until the order came through to compensate losses and to spur production through subsidies. The intricacy of that undertaking baffles the imagination, and it is wholly evident that its projectors have not the slightest idea of the nature of the bull or the nature of the tail they have grabbed. The Office of Price Administration, having caused an acute food shortage through its policies and regulations, now replies with more regulations, and, if unchecked, will surely bring this Nation into acute hunger. It has withdrawn from our economy the one thing which kept the economy alive—the spark of individual initiative. The rationing which was designed to limit the spending power of the dollar was so clumsily conceived and executed that it is forcing the spending of more dollars. The regulations are not preventing inflation. They are preventing production and making inflation more acute.

Let us put aside the brigut-colored blocks with which so many are playing "post-war world," and get on with the grim job of winning the war on the home front. For it is on the home as well as the foreign fronts that crisis impends. If we fail here all else will fail. It is time for the real spirit of America to assert itself.

Szamul Zygielbojm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter written by Szamul Zygielbojm, who was found dead in his London flat on May 12, 1943. Mr. Zygielbojm committed suicide by taking an overdose of sleeping pills. He was a member of the Polish National Council or Jewish Socialist Party and had worked untiringly to alleviate the plight of countless thousands of Jews who were being systematically exterminated by the Nazis. The letter was addressed to President Wladislaw Raczkiewicz and Premier Wladislaw Sikorski. I call particular attention to the following paragraph which appears in the letter:

The responsibility for the crime of murdering all the Jewish population in Poland falls in the first instance on the perpetrators, but indirectly also it weighs on the whole of humanity, the peoples and governments of the Allied states, which so far have made no effort toward a concrete action for the purpose of curtailing this crime. By passive observation of this murder of defenseless millions and the maltreatment of children and women, the men of those countries have become accomplices of criminals.

Mr. Speaker, Szamul Zygielbojm, who did so much good for the oppressed Jews of Poland during his lifetime, may have accomplished almost as much in dying as he did in living.

The letter follows:

I take the liberty of addressing to you my last words, and through you the Polish Government and people, the governments and people of the Allies states, and the conscience of the world.

From the latest information received from Poland, it is evident that without doubt the Germans with ruthless cruelty are now murdering the few remaining Jews in Poland. Behind the walls of the ghettos the last act of a tragedy unprecedented in history is being performed.

The responsibility for the crime of murdering all the Jewish population in Poland falls in the first instance on the perpetrators, but indirectly also it weighs on the whole of humanity, the peoples and governments of the Allied states, which so far have made no effort toward a concrete action for the purpose of curtailing this crime. By passive observation of this murder of defenseless millions and the maltreatment of children and women, the men of those countries have become accomplices of criminals.

I have also to state that although the Polish Government has in a high degree contributed to stirring the opinion of the world, yet it did so insufficiently, for it did nothing extraordinary enough to correspond to the magnitude of the drama now being enacted in Poland.

Out of the nearly 350,000 Polish Jews and about 700,000 Jews deported to Poland from other countries, there still lived in April of this year, according to the official information of the head of the underground bund organization sent to the United States through a delegate of the Government, about 300,000. And the murders are still going on incessantly.

I cannot be silent and I cannot live while the remnants of the Jewish people of Poland, of whom I am a representative, are perishing.

My comrades in the Warsaw ghetto perished with weapons in their hands in their last heroic impulse.

It was not my destiny to perish as they did, together with them, but I belong to them and their mass graves.

By my death I wish to express my strongest protest against the inactivity with which the world is looking on and permitting the extermination of Jewish people. I know how little human life is worth especially today. But as I was unable to do anything during my life, perhaps by my death I shall contribute to destroying the indifference of those who are able and should act in order to save now, maybe at the last moment, this handful of Polish Jews who are still alive from certain annihilation.

My life belongs to the Jewish people in Poland and, therefore, I give it to them. I wish that this handful that remains of the several million Polish Jews could live to see with the Polish masses the day of liberation—that it could breathe in Poland and in a world of freedom and in the justice of socialism in return for all its tortures and inhuman sufferings. And I believe that such a Poland will arise and that such a world will come.

I trust that the President and Prime Minister will direct my words to all of those for whom they are destined and that the Polish Government will immediately begin appropriate action in the diplomatic and propaganda fields in order to save from extermination the Polish Jews who are still alive.

I bid farewell to all and everything dear to me and loved by me.

S. ZYGIELBOJM.

Winning the War and the Connally-Smith Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW C. SCHIFFLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened attentively to many of the arguments for and against the legislation before the House at this time, including the proposals to amend S. 796, as presented to the House by the Military Affairs Committee.

It is with sincere regret that we are met with legislation of this type at this particular time. In looking at the production records, the evidence of patriotic service by American workers, both men and women, I find our production in every industrial commodity far excels the capacity for its use. Frankly, I believe we are in grave danger of suspension in many plants now producing goods for war purposes and the laying off of men and women because we have an overproduction of some of the things essential to the winning of the war. This is a splendid and outstanding tribute to American labor, which has gone to work with vigor and patriotic zeal and is now flooding the world with its products to be used in achieving the objectives of the war and accomplishing an overwhelming and glorious victory. The bottleneck today is not in the production of essentials of war. We are producing tanks, planes, guns, clothing, and everything else, excepting, however, food for the world, at a rate hitherto undreamed of. The problem today is that of transportation; of getting these things and the men that we have trained and are training to the places in the world where they can effectively use the products of our patriotic laborers.

I am afraid the efforts to legislate upon this question, unfortunately precipitated by a stoppage of work in the coal mines, is a serious step backward, and will be fraught with many difficulties if passed

by the Congress and made the law of the land. This legislation is a roll-back—a roll-back in social advancement, without a concurrent roll-back in price ceilings. The latter being the most important and vital step in our fight against inflation and a preventative to future labor controversies.

I have in my hand evidence of price increases in the State of West Virginia showing the average price increase in foods—those foods which are essential to the well being of every individual and occurring since January of 1941. The average increase is 106.3 percent. Wages in most lines have had increases during such period. Those increases range from 5 to 15 percent. The increased cost of living is the primary cause of labor disputes today. A more rigid and inelastic control of living costs will contribute more to the solution of labor controversies than any other single thing, and the sooner we establish an all-over ceiling, just that soon will we begin to win our fight against inflation, labor controversies, and other domestic matters that to a greater or lesser degree, create disunion and discontent.

I am impelled to believe that the legislation before the House is the result of agitating elements using propaganda, unfortunately even among our soldiers and sailors, to create a hysteria, destroy our reasoning, and by emotional conduct bring out laws that are not predicated upon sound reasoning and actual necessity. It is my firm belief that we, as legislators, should immunize ourselves from the effect of such tactics; that we owe to our constituency, to the country, and to the world the highest degree of careful and sober thought, as contradistinguished from jittery, ill-spoken words, and imperfect and clouded thinking.

Many Members of this House have sons or daughters in the armed forces of our country. There are millions of American union men and women who also have sons and daughters in the armed forces. I have a son in the Air Forces. I am cognizant of his necessities and of the necessities of every other boy and girl in the armed services of our Nation, and I regard it my first duty at this time to see that they are fully and completely, to the utmost of my ability, sustained in their efforts to win the war at the earliest possible date, with the least possible loss of life and injury, and I propose to carry out this duty to the utmost of my ability and at whatever cost.

I regret that propaganda has been used among our armed forces. I have information that a speech was made to our troops in north Africa upon the strike situation, portraying it as seriously crippling production in the United States and leading to alarm among such troops that supplies will not be available by reason of such strike. This is lamentable, tragic, and, if this report is accurate, unforgivable.

I voted against the rule to permit this legislation to be considered. Regardless of the merits or demerits of the legislation, I am duty bound to rely upon the representations made to this body, and to me as a Member, of the effect of such legislation upon the war effort. We have been clearly and very emphatically told by the offices of Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, War Production Board, Secretary of Labor, and of the merchant marine, that this legislation would be obstructive of the war effort and create chaos and disunion. These are the agencies directing the entire war effort. Can we ignore their statements, and in the face of such advice given to the Congress, pass this legislation and continue to believe that we are aiding the war? They are the constituted authorities upon whom we must rely in all matters relating to the war and its conduct. I have consistently supported every measure presented, having for its object the strengthening of our forces and of providing them with every essential to the successful prosecution of the war. I will not fail them at this hour. I believe my primary duty to my constituency, to my country, and to the world, is to render every constructive service possible to aid in the conquering of our enemies, and the accomplishment of victory, and this measure will, as we have been advised, cripple and obstruct in such effort and is therefore of such nature as to merit an overwhelming defeat.

Aside from any sympathy that I may have as to the merit or demerit of the legislation before the House, it is imperative that I follow the advice of those legally in charge of our war effort, and oppose this legislation. I shall vote accordingly.

The Smith-Connally Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS F. FORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have expressed my opposition to the Smith-Connally bill in a previous statement. Permit me now to state flatly that I also opposed the Harness substitute, and though I have profound respect for the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] I shall be forced to oppose his substitute, even though his substitute has the unqualified approval of our distinguished majority leader, Mr. MCCORMACK.

Yes, I understand that we are facing a grave crisis. Coal is one of the supercritical war materials. But is there a man on this floor that has the hardihood to stand up and declare that the Commander in Chief is going to permit the production of coal to cease? Certainly not.

Of course, he could come out in a flamboyant statement that would blast John L. Lewis to hell, where he belongs, but that would simply be a display of temper, on a par with the display of temper we have witnessed in this body.

I, personally, have complete confidence in President Roosevelt, the Commander in Chief, to handle this crisis in the same sane, masterly, and statesmanlike manner in which he has met previous crises.

With that feeling of utter confidence in our great President's ability to meet and master this situation, I rest my case on the simple statement: This House cannot in passion stigmatize all labor for the sins of a few. Edmund Burke, that incomparable British statesman and orator, once said, "You cannot indict a whole nation."

That is what any of these bills would do and therefore I am opposed to all of them.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL STEWART

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Times-Herald of yesterday:

"WE'LL ASK STRICT ACCOUNTING," WOUNDED YANK WARNS LEWIS

NEW YORK, June 2.—Warning that "those of us who return will call for a strict accounting," an open letter from a wounded Iowa private lying in a South Pacific hospital today called upon John L. Lewis to end the coal strike. The letter was read by George Moorad, Columbia Broadcasting correspondent, in a broadcast from Australia.

The writer, Byron M. Edgett, of Des Moines, is recuperating from wounds in an Army hospital in New Guinea. Private Edgett sent the letter to Moorad as an "open letter to John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers."

POWER-STRICKEN ATTITUDE

The letter, as read on the broadcast, follows:

"I am a soldier confined to a hospital in New Guinea, divorced from Army functions and ability to assist the war effort as a civilian, and I feel even greater futility, with the news from America of the strike of 500,000 coal miners under your domination.

"Knowing the hard-headed power-stricken, selfish attitude you have assumed toward your Government, it is with small hope of influencing your actions that this is written. In this hospital there are fellows who have spent from a year to 18 months overseas. Some are engineers who went through the Milne Bay carnage, the Philippine and Java campaigns. Some are artillerymen and Air Force. About 50 percent have wives and half this number have families to support. Our average income, including Government benefits, is $100 a month.

SHOULD SOLDIERS STRIKE?

"Should we strike for higher wages? What would your reactions be in our place? Living in mud and dust, fighting vermin and mosquitoes, suffering under a blazing sun, and always waiting for equipment—for planes and food—only to read that Americans at home are too concerned with personal welfare to worry about our precarious foothold, still

slippery with the blood of our comrades—are we, or are we not, entitled to 100-percent support from our country?

"Would you like to think, Mr. Lewis, that by lengthening the war by a day, a week, a month, you have cost lives of thousands of men, unselfish men? These miners have fathers, sons, and brothers in the service. When they realize that following your dictates will mean that more of their loved ones are not coming home, how will you maintain that you have been their champion?

"So, sir, I say to you, and to all of you, guard jealously those things we have given to your keeping, for one day those of us who do return will call for a strict accounting."

Greater Part of War Debt, if $300,000,000,000, Can Be Paid in 40 Years if Unearned Interest Is Not Paid on This Debt—Interrogation of Mr. Eccles, Chairman Federal Reserve Board, on This Subject

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 27, 1943

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith excerpts from the Goldsmith Washington Service, devoted exclusively to United States Government securities, which was issued April 10, 1943, by Theodore R. Goldsmith, director. It is as follows:

PATMAN AGAINST ECCLES

Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, last week again pushed his proposal to finance that portion of the war which must be financed through the commercial banks or the Federal Reserve banks through the issuance of non-interest-bearing Treasury certificates to the Federal Reserve bank. He questioned Chairman Eccles at length on his proposal at the public hearings before the House Banking and Currency Committee on the bill to eliminate reserve requirements and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation assessments on war loan deposit accounts.

Congressman PATMAN has studied and understands the mechanism under which our private banking system finances the Treasury. In view of the large additional amount of Government's which may have to be sold to the commercial banks, his view is even now obtaining increasing attention. If the amount of Government's held by banks increases too rapidly, his case may find considerable favor with the man on the street.

Chairman Eccles last week did an excellent job of replying to PATMAN's questions and opposing his viewpoint.

But PATMAN has a case which may have considerable appeal to the layman. The questions he raises are of paramount importance to the public relations of the entire private banking system. They also have some bearing on the present investment policy of commercial banks.

For that reason we are presenting as much of the discussion between PATMAN and Eccles last week as space permits. The direct quotations have been taken from the uncorrected stenographic transcript and in some cases we have edited the wording ourselves and have changed the order of the discussion. It would seem advisable for all bankers to read the entire testimony as well as Congressman PATMAN's testimony before Ways and Means of the House on February 14, in regard to his proposal.

PATMAN'S PROPOSAL

Congressman PATMAN's proposal is contained in H. R. 1. The bill prohibits the Treasury from issuing any further interest-bearing securities of the Government to the banks receiving demand deposits and would restrict the amount of United States Government securities held by any bank to the amount held by such bank on December 31, 1941. Congressman PATMAN, however, states that this date is an arbitrary one. He says any other fair date or fair adjustment of the amount of United States securities any bank could hold would be satisfactory to him.

Moreover, PATMAN understands that his proposed method of financing (namely the sale of non-interest-bearing Treasury certificates to the Federal Reserve banks) will increase excess reserves of member banks. He believes the Federal Reserve Board should have the power to increase reserve requirements of member banks sufficiently to offset this.

Congressman PATMAN does not propose to eliminate interest on outstanding Government securities or to stop selling interest-bearing Government securities to investors and investment institutions other than commercial banks. He believes that his plan will help avert inflation because the savings on interest will permit the Government to retire a substantial amount of interest-bearing debt now outstanding and that to be issued to bona-fide investors.

In view of the much more conservative attitude in Congress since the last election there does not seem to be any possibility that a plan such as Mr. PATMAN's will be adopted in the near future. But if there should be fear at any time that such a plan might possibly be adopted, this would be just one more reason why individual banks to protect their own interest should invest all their idle funds in Government securities now.

Some of the discussion between Messrs. PATMAN and Eccles last week was as follows:

"Mr. PATMAN. Have you given consideration to any plan that would enable the Government to do any part of its financing without payment of interest?

"Mr. ECCLES. I have given a good deal of thought to the question of Government financing, and I have had occasion to analyze your point of view on this question and have come to the conclusion that any attempt to finance the Government without interest would be very inflationary and entirely contrary to the whole basis of our capitalistic system.

"Mr. PATMAN. And you have not tried to formulate a plan to finance part of the Government deficit without interest?

"Mr. ECCLES. No; I have not undertaken to develop a plan that would, to my mind, destroy our whole creditor-debtor system.

"Mr. PATMAN. Would you give consideration to such a plan if you were convinced that the inflationary element could be removed?

"Mr. ECCLES. I would give consideration to any plan that would save interest if you substitute some other means of sustaining the banks for the interest they now receive."

Mr. PATMAN then asked some questions to prove that the deposits invested in Governments by commercial banks were created by the flick of a pen, and Mr. Eccles replied, "Any credit extended by the banking system whether to the Government or others results in the creation of money; the money that is created in any capitalistic economy is created through credit extended by its banking system."

After some sparring, Mr. Eccles admitted that Federal Reserve banks were now authorized to purchase $5,000,000,000 of Government securities directly from the Treasury and that the purchase of interest-bearing Government securities by the Federal Reserve banks was just as inflationary as would be the purchase on the non-interest-bearing certificates PATMAN is proposing.

Mr. PATMAN then asked: How do you then justify requiring the Treasury to pay interest on that five billion? The only difference is that the taxpayers have to pay the interest.

Mr. ECCLES. It would make little difference whether the Treasury pays the Federal Reserve banks interest on the five billion you refer to or not. The only advantage of having the Federal Reserve banks acquire marketable interest-bearing obligations is that they may sell those bonds in the market.

Now, the interest that is paid on those bonds to the Federal Reserve banks does not go to the stockholders of the Federal Reserve banks. That interest helps pay the operating expenses of the Federal Reserve System. The earnings of the System in excess of the dividends fixed between $8,000,000 and $9,000,000 are added to surplus, and Congress can appropriate the surplus at any time it sees fit. In 1933 Congress appropriated $140,000,000 of the surplus of the Federal Reserve banks to set up the capital of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. If the Federal Reserve banks did not get interest upon the Government bonds which they hold, then it would be up to Congress to appropriate the funds that would be required to operate the Federal Reserve banks and to pay the dividend on the capital stock of these banks so long as they are owned by the member banks.

"Mr. PATMAN. I am familiar with the way the money is paid out and with the law which at one time provided that all surplus earnings of the Federal Reserve System would go into the United States Treasury.

"Mr. ECCLES. Right.

"Mr. PATMAN. The point that I am making is that the Federal Reserve banks do not necessarily need the interest on any particular five billions because they have sufficient earnings from other sources, and I am merely trying to illustrate what can be done to save interest on a large part of the public debt.

"Mr. ECCLES. Why not finance the whole national debt without interest?

"Mr. PATMAN. I am opposed to that. I am in favor of selling all the Government bonds to the people or corporations that have the money to buy them and of collecting as large an amount in taxes as possible to pay off as much of the national debt as possible.

"But after we have sold all the bonds we can to the people and corporations who have the money to buy them and have raised all the money possible through taxes we will have to sell a large additional amount of Government securities, perhaps 40 percent or 50 percent of the total, to the commercial banks which create the money by a flick of the pen and we will then be in a position of having a perpetual debt on our hands. If the public debt gets up to $200,000,000,000 or $300,000,000,000 the interest charge will be $5,000,000,000 or $7,500,000,000. It occurs to me that this Congress will be falling down in its duty if it sits idly by and permits this money to be created in that way and obligates the people and the taxpayers to forever pay the interest. It just does not make sense to me."

Mr. Eccles then pointed out that commercial bank earnings declined by $55,000,000 in 1942, despite an increase in their holdings of $17,000,000,000 in Government securities, because higher yield private loans and investments were decreasing and the expenses of handling the large volume of deposits cre-

ated by Government deficit financing were increasing. He also stressed the large volume of work the banks were doing for the Government free of charge in selling Government securities directly to the public and that the compensation allowed banks for the huge job involved in ration banking only covered out-of-pocket expenses but not the overhead. For these reasons Mr. Eccles stated that Mr. PATMAN'S discussion was purely academic.

Mr. Eccles also pointed out that the Treasury adopted last October a 10-year and 2 percent limit on new Treasury securities that would be offered to commercial banks and that the higher yield, longer term securities that had been issued since that time are not eligible for commercial bank purchase.

Mr. PATMAN stated that among the larger banks there were 140 officials who received compensation of between $75,000 and $100,000 per year and mentioned one who received $175,000. He said, "It is hardly fair to my way of thinking to take money out of the Treasury to pay such huge salaries."

Mr. Eccles, holding to his view that the discussion was academic because commercial bank earnings were declining, nevertheless stated, "You will find me just as ready as anyone to stop profiteering by banks when that time comes."

During the discussion Mr. PATMAN stated, "I recall the Stevens Hotel was taken over by the Government recently because they said the rent charged would amount very soon to enough to pay for it and pay for it in cash, rather than to have to pay such high interest charges."

"So I am apprehensive that one of these days the banks will have so many Government bonds upon which they receive interest that there will be a clamor in this country for the Government to take the banks over. People will say, 'Why pay the banks $3,500,000,000 a year interest when they only have $3,500,000,000 invested?'" (Mr. PATMAN probably will correct the figures in the final proof.) "I am in favor of the private banking system and free enterprise and I think the banks are doing something against themselves when they place themselves in a vulnerable position."

Mr. Speaker, it will be noticed that Mr. Goldsmith says that I will correct my statement about the banks having only $3,500,000,000 invested. I have no correction to make since I was referring to the entire capital stock of all commercial banks, which is $3,500,000,000 and is not intended to include undivided profits and surpluses.

Farmers Paying Debts to Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard, on the National Farm and Home Hour, Wednesday, May 26, 1943:

Several times in the past I have talked to you about the importance of using the increased returns that crops and livestock are now bringing to pay off farm debt. I have emphasized that the payment of outstanding obligations, along with as large an investment as possible in War bonds, is a sound protection for the future.

Just this week I have brought together the reports of agencies in the Department of Agriculture that make loans to farm people. I am very pleased to say that the farmers in general, who have borrowed from the Government are now making a splendid record in the repayment of their loans.

The collections of these agencies show that the farmers to whom they have extended financial aid in many cases are paying off their loans in full before they fall due. It is extremely gratifying to note that a great many others are paying loan installments in advance in order to retire the principal as rapidly as possible.

For example, the Farm Credit Administration reports that 26,000 land-bank loans were paid in full before the maturity date during the first quarter of this year. This was double the number of such payments during the same months in 1942. Advance payments on land-bank loans up to April totaled around $21,000,000.

Another indication that farmers are making wise use of their increased income is the fact that repayments—including payments in full—on Federal land-bank loans were about four and one-half times as great as the total of new loans closed by the land banks and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation in the first quarter of 1943. In other words, farmers are paying back four and one-half times as much on land-bank loans as they are borrowing. Repayments at the same time last year were running only about two and one-half times as much as new borrowings. Loan applications in the first quarter this year were the lowest since 1933.

The Farm Security Administration estimates that collections on rehabilitation loans for the year ending June 30 will total about $130,000,000. This is a third more than the total amount of such loans made during the year. From the beginning of the Farm Security Administration to the first of this year, 85 percent of the total amount due on all of these so-called high risk loans had been repaid on time. And enough advance payments had been made to bring the repayments up to 91 percent of the total amount due. This is a magnificent record. It justifies the Government's faith in low-income farm people.

Former farm tenants who are buying farms with Farm Security Administration funds also are making a fine record. The record shows that 23,000 of these borrowers up to the first of this year had paid back a total of $3,000,000 more than the installments that were due. They are paying for their farms on a 40-year plan. Their repayments were equal to 1½ installments in 1 year.

Another outstanding record is being made by the 800 cooperative electric systems, with more than 1,000,000 members, now participating in the program of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Up to February of this year a total of $365,000,000 had been advanced to the Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives. And these systems had repaid $36,000,000, of which about $9,000,000 was in excess of the installments due. Delinquencies in the repayment of their loans have been extremely small, amounting to only about $200,000.

In addition, these Rural Electrification Administration co-ops have invested approximately $5,000,000 in War bonds.

All of these highly gratifying reports indicate that most farmers who have had the benefits of Government aid are determined to make wise use of their income while farm prices are higher than in many years. By retiring their debts now they will be in a better position to meet future obligations and to protect the investment they have in their land and homes.

As all farmers well know, their occupation is always subject to risks and losses that can't be foreseen. While conditions may be excellent over the country generally, individual farmers may in any season suffer unexpected misfortunes and some may even have their crops wiped out entirely.

Floods—such as we have been having in some parts of the country recently—bring destruction and suffering to a great many rural people. Crops and livestock can be swept away overnight. Drought, crop pests, fire, and other disasters may be visited on individuals or affect entire localities.

When disaster strikes—or when the returns of an individual farmer are cut by circumstances beyond his control—the farmer who has had the foresight to get his debts paid in more favorable years will find himself in a much better position to keep going. It might mean the difference between saving his farm and losing it.

Another thing—when debts are paid there is always more money for investment in War bonds. Savings put into War bonds mean added insurance for the future—a reserve for rebuilding the land, repairing farm buildings, replacing equipment, and educating the children. It is far better, in my judgment, to get debts out of the way now and keep on buying War bonds than to take a chance on being caught later with a heavily mortgaged farm or in some other serious financial plight.

I commend all farmers who are using their income wisely in these trying times. I hope everybody else will follow their example.

A Committee To Straighten Out the Petroleum Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL C. MICHENER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the people of Michigan are much concerned over the present petroleum situation. I am this day in receipt of a telegram from Mr. James Vernor, president of the Automobile Club of Michigan. No man in Michigan is more familiar with the automobile transportation problem in the State than is Mr. Vernor, and pursuant to the permission granted to me, I include in these remarks a copy of his telegram which is self-explanatory, and which is as follows:

Automobile Club of Michigan with a membership of 189,000 in this State estimated 70 percent of which are engaged in essential war production, urges you to use all possible influence to bring about appointment of a committee headed by Bernard Baruch to straighten out the muddled, confusing, and seriously menacing petroleum situation. Presently it appears inevitable that petroleum confusion will prolong mileage rationing long after rubber situation has been solved. Suggest Baruch committee should make immediate and exhaustive survey aimed at two principal objectives—to develop body of facts to be given the public, to promote better understanding, lessen existing resentment, and reestablish public confidence, to place national petroleum policy on a definite track,

assuring ample military supplies and at the same time sufficient fuel for essential civilian needs. Automobile transportation is all important in the present emergency and must not be jeopardized by jurisdictional conflict among governmental agencies. This threatening situation affects every area of the United States, but in no area is it so menacing as here in Michigan, the arsenal of democracy. Earnestly urge that you use your every influence in this emergency.

Japs Should Not Be Returned to California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack, there were in California about 100,000 Japanese. About one-third of them were aliens and two-thirds were born in America. The attack was a stab in the back at the same time that Japan professed friendly relations with us. Our Secretary of State, at the very moment of the attack, was discussing the settlement of differences with the Foreign Minister of Japan.

The Army acted quickly and effectively. Under the able leadership of General DeWitt all Japanese were evacuated and placed in relocation camps, later to be removed to better and more comfortable camps farther from the Pacific coast.

Now a plan is on foot to bring them back to California. The Californians do not want them back. The people know from experience that the return of the evacuees will provoke strife and trouble. Ever since the coming of the Japanese to California they have been a source of friction. Because of color, race, differences in religion, tradition, standards of living, and racial background the Japanese never can and never will become really amalgamated and part of the American citizenry. Therefore, the Californians are most earnestly hoping and praying that neither the W. R. A. nor anyone else will send these evacuees back to California. I ask permission to include as part of this statement two editorials from the Sacramento Bee, of Sacramento, Calif., which represents the unanimous opinion of Californians on this subject:

[From the Sacramento Bee of May 26, 1943]

COAST SENTIMENT STRONGLY SUPPORTS GENERAL DEWITT

One of the strangest bits of writing to appear in print in a long while is an editorial in the newspaper published at the Japanese relocation project in Amache, Colo.

The article, apparently written by the Japanese editor of the paper, bitterly and sarcastically assails Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt, who directed the evacuation of the Japanese from the Pacific coast.

Says the editorial:

"Recently, General DeWitt publicly took a stand against the return of the evacuees to the west coast, declaring 'a Jap's a Jap' whether he is a citizen or not.

"The first reaction to these words was one of anger that a man in his position would make such a statement. But, on second thought, he is a man to be pitied.

"His actions and statements are of a man desperately trying to justify a mistake he made—and which the Nation is beginning to recognize as a mistake—that of mass evacuation.

"He had allowed economic pressure groups looking after their own interests to influence his decision for evacuation, and now, instead of admitting his mistake, his frantic attempts to cover up are making him ridiculous.

"Pity him and don't waste your anger."

This newspaper is published by the War Relocation Authority and is paid for with the taxpayers' money. What is printed in it can be assumed to have been approved by the War Relocation Authority. If not, it is high time that agency took it upon itself to exercise some editorial supervision.

But not the least strange is that one agency of the Government should countenance an attack of this nature upon the highest military authority on the west coast. Just where does the War Relocation Authority consider its first responsibility rests?

The writer of the article could have had only one purpose in mind, namely, to discredit General DeWitt and weaken the confidence of the people in their military commander upon whose shoulders rests the sponsibility for their security. An Axis propagandist could not have done more.

In that purpose, however, the writer fails. His views to the contrary, the public as a whole regards the evacuation as a necessary job, well done, and is overwhelmingly in favor of keeping the Japanese away from the vitally strategic Pacific coast areas so long as this Nation is at war with Japan.

The circumstances which impelled the evacuation still exist as much today as they did on December 7, 1941, and no personal attack upon General DeWitt can alter that fact one iota.

And in conclusion it might be said the general is scarcely in need of the sneering solicitude of the Japanese in the relocation projects.

[From the Sacramento Bee of May 28, 1943]

WEST IS AGAINST RETURN OF ANY JAPANESE TO COAST

Congressman RICHARD J. WELCH, of San Francisco, told reporters in that city on Wednesday that he feared the impending displacement of Lt. Gen. J. L. DeWitt, commanding officer of the Western Defense Command and commander of the Fourth Army, was due to Washington displeasure with his Japanese policy.

DeWitt has taken an outspoken, strong stand against permitting any of the evacuated Nipponese to return to the Pacific coast combat area, whether native-born or aliens.

This attitude is reported to have aroused the displeasure of some high officials in the Capital.

Congressman WELCH, in explaining his own position, said:

"I stand with the other Congressmen of the west coast and with the people of the west coast in demanding that the policies of General DeWitt regarding the Japanese be adhered to.

"Any softening of this policy, or any coddling of the Japanese in this area, will be met by the congressional delegations and by the people of the west coast with all the opposition at their command."

That statement expresses the deep conviction of 99 percent of the men and women of the Pacific coast. They demand that the DeWitt program in regard to the Japanese be respected and enforced, no matter what change is made in the Western Defense Command.

Secretary of War Stimson, in a statement made yesterday, took cognizance of the reports anent DeWitt's departure. He called them "nonsense," adding:

"The War Department feels that General DeWitt has made a fine and successful record in his command of the Fourth Army, particularly in his handling of the difficult problem of the evacuation of the Japanese from the coastal area."

In a way, this is reassuring; in another way, it is not.

The present queston is not the successful removal of the Japanese but whether they are to be kept removed.

And Stimson, either inadvertently or deliberately, failed to make any comment or pledge as to the War Department's future policy on that point.

In any event, the West admits of no compromise on General DeWitt's policy to date.

Farm Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, for many years now the New Deal advocates, with their vast network of researchers and planners, some 50,000 in number, have been acting as conservators and regimenters in what they deem was an attempt to aid the farmer to get on his feet. Whether they have contributed to his gains or retarded them in the past few years, now when the farmer has regained his financial footing they refuse to allow him to walk. They refuse to allow him to go it alone but insist on keeping control of him, to a large extent, through subsidies.

In fact, for the past 2 years, under the pressure of the old and reliable law of supply and demand due to the war, the farmer has had such a ready market for his products that his prices generally have been able to rise even though the paternal conservators have been using most of their efforts to keep his prices down, to keep him from regaining his financial footing and use his own legs and brains. As the Members of the Congress well know, the administration for the past year, in many instances, has resorted to subterfuge and at times refused to carry out the laws enacted by the Congress and have kept the farmers' price below parity.

At one time a high public official in the Department of Agriculture, when being questioned before the Committee on Agriculture, let the "cat out of the bag" in insisting on subsidies when he said, "If we abandon the policy of subsidy we will lose control of the farmer."

Why does the administration want to keep control of the farmer? Does it want to deceive the farmer in setting up Uncle Sam as a Santa Claus for the purpose of enticing or inducing the farmer to support the administration for the fourth term? If it does those who are promoting subsidies must now begin to become awakened to the fact that the

farmer is able to do some very clear thinking for himself.

It is evident that the farmer has been thinking and has very definitely decided that an extreme danger has been builded up about him, a real danger of regimentation and control. Now, he looks with suspicion on such a policy of government. He is alarmed and is ready to fight it.

We arrive at an interesting milestone in the life of the farmers, who have been accused through inspired-from-Washington newspaper stories as constituting a dangerous pressure group out for all they can get. The most emphatic answer proving the falsity of such charges is being given throughout the Nation today, not only by the foremost leaders of the farm organizations but by the farmers, thousands as individuals who have risen up almost as one man against the recent decision of the O. P. A. to roll back prices to the consumer by giving a subsidy to the processor, claiming it indirectly as a subsidy to the farmer. They are literally thumbing their noses at the idea of subsidy, and they are loud in their denunciation of those in high places in Government who want to so subsidize them.

They do not want a hand-out from the Public Treasury, and they have made that plain for several months past. They only want a fair price that will give them less than half in return in wages than is given the average industrial worker for the same number of hours.

Rather than leave the farmers' prices where they are now or increase them to a reasonable extent where necessary for a greater production of food, the administration now is attempting to resort to another new scheme which they term "roll-back prices." This scheme is the brain child of the O. P. A. bright young men just out of college and superintellectuals from the universities, man of whom have never had a day's practical experience, and are trying to work from a blueprint to change and remake our economy. This scheme is as wild and impractical as the many complete failures of New Deal theorists who throughout the years have wasted billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

This scheme is to subsidize the big food processers such as the meat packers, the cheese manufacturers, the creameries, and so forth, at the expense of all the people of the United States. Such a scheme to get to the real facts of cost prices would probably require the employment of 25,000 or more accountant and countless other thousands of men on the Government pay roll. The accountants are not available and neither is the manpower. This scheme is unworkable and would further add to the confusion and chaos, would encourage inflation rather than prevent it by adding billions of dollars to already crushing national debt.

For instance, they propose to roll back the price of butter 5 cents per pound. This one move will cost the Treasury $90,000,000 to save the individual 60 cents per year on butter. On meat they propose to roll back the price 2 cents per pound. We are allowed 2 pounds a week under the rationing system. We would save 4 cents per week or $2.08 per individual per year. To do this the subsidy on the meat would cost the Treasury $300,000,000. On coffee they propose to roll back the price 2 cents per pound. This would save the individual 20 cents per year and would cost the Treasury $100,000,000. This Congress has repeatedly gone on record against further subsidies, and it is my opinion that the Congress should and will refuse to vote the appropriations necessary.

They propose to start this program by bypassing Congress, by taking money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which was never intended for such use. They had better take into consideration the opposition of Congress before they embark further on such a program.

Under Orders Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of June 4, 1943:

UNDER ORDERS NOW

"As President and Commander in Chief, I order and direct the miners who are not now at work in the mines to return to their work on Monday, June 7, 1943."

Those are stronger words than Mr. Roosevelt used on April 29: "Not as President, not as Commander in Chief, but as the friend of the men who work in the mines, I appeal to them to resume work. * * *"

The difference is significant. The miners, with few exceptions, ignored the friendly appeal, and resumed work temporarily only when John L. Lewis said they might. We hope, for their sake and the country's sake, that they will obey the order of the Commander in Chief.

If they do not, the Government now seems committed to an attempt to break the coal strike. Secretary Ickes has been instructed to reopen the mines. He has been given authority to call upon the Army to protect men who are willing to work. "The miners," says the President, "are working for their Government on essential war work, and it is their duty no less than that of their sons and brothers in the armed forces to fulfill their war duties."

Many a miner, between now and Monday morning, will be torn between two loyalties.

Their loyalty to John L. Lewis is misplaced. He is using them as pawns in a selfish game of power politics. His aim is to force the Government to let him have his way, and thus to prove that defiance is more profitable than compliance with the no-strike pledge and cooperation with the methods provided for peaceable settlement for wartime labor controversies. Mr. Roosevelt is insisting only that Lewis and his union proceed under the same rules accepted by other labor leaders and other unions, and those rules, as already applied by the War Labor Board, assure the coal miners of extensive wage increases after they go back to work.

May the miners realize that their first loyalty is to America and that their best interests will be served by obeying the Commander in Chief.

The Antistrike Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN A. DAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, when free unions pass from the American scene we will have economic absolutism as the American contribution to international economic socialism which will supplant the political organization of nations.

I call to the attention of the House that when Stalin dissolved the Comintern—Third International—he issued a statement from which I quote the following:

Guided by the judgment of the founders of Marxism and Leninism, Communists have never been supporters of the conversation of organizational forms that have outlived themselves. They have always subordinated forms of organization of the working-class movement, and methods of working of such organization, to the fundamental political interest of the working-class movement as as whole, to peculiarities of the concrete historical situation and to problems immediately resulting from this situation. They remember the example of the great Marx, who united foremost workers in the ranks of the Workingmen's International Association, and when the first international had fulfilled its historical task of laying the foundations for the development of working-class parties in the countries of Europe and America, and, as a result of the matured situation creating mass national working-class parties, dissolved first the International, inasmuch as this form of organization already no longer corresponded to the demands confronting it.

We must not drive American labor into a Marxian political party founded on the interest of labor as a class. To pass this measure today will have that effect. It will not end the coal strike. But it will end the last remaining element of freedom of contract in labor relations.

The right to strike is the protecting mother of freedom of contract and when you strangle her to death you have destroyed the last guardian upon which to reconstruct free enterprise after this war is over.

Private enterprise cannot survive without free labor. When you enslave labor, you also conscript capital. This measure now pending before us does both with a vengeance.

The President has the power to stop the coal strike. Why does he not exercise it? Can it be possible that he wants this Congress to go on record in favor of slave labor? Abraham Lincoln gave us the thirteenth amendment prohibiting involutary servitude. I stand with Lincoln and the Constitution and against this antistrike bill.

Rotary Address—Unite and Conquer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter which I received from a former distinguished Member of Congress, Louis C. Cramton of Lapeer, Mich., with particular reference to the annual conference of the one hundred and fifty-second district of Rotary, held in my home city of Flint. This conference was addressed by Robert J. S. Stead, past president of the Rotary of Ottawa and an official of the department of mines and resources in the Dominion Government.

I am also enclosing the address given by Robert J. S. Stead, the title of which address is "Unite and Conquer."

The letter follows:

LAPEER, MICH., *May 26, 1943.*

Hon. WILLIAM BLACKNEY,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We have recently held at Flint, your home city, our annual conference of the one hundred and fifty-second district of Rotary. An outstanding address at that meeting which was attended by representatives from nearly all of the 56 clubs in Ontario and Michigan that make up this district was that by Robert J. S. Stead, past president of the Rotary Club of Ottawa and an official of the department of mines and resources in the Dominion Government. In its presentation of the part played by our neighbor in this great struggle, financially, industrially, in transportation, and in military and naval strength it deserves to be read by the people of our country. If you feel that you can consistently do so I would be glad to have same published at an early date in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Hoping this may prove possible and with best regard, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

LOUIS C. CRAMTON,
District Governor.

ADDRESS OF ROBERT J. C. STEAD

The Hitler technique, since the beginning of the war, and before, may be summed up in three words "Divide and conquer." He has followed that technique with the utmost skill and effrontery, and he is still following it.

All the success he has had may be attributed to it. Unprepared as they were, had all the democratic nations spoken with one voice and acted with one purpose when Poland was attacked, the war—if it ever came to war—would probably have been over long before this. But each, understandably but unwisely, tried to save itself from war, and most of them have already demonstrated the truth of the Scripture, "He who would save his life shall lose it."

The technique of divide and conquer is to sow distrust of each other among the United Nations; to persuade each that it is doing more than its share; to convince each that if it would stay out of the war it would have nothing to fear. Thus the French are told that the British let them down; the British are told that the United States is scheming to take over the British Empire; the United States is told that Hitler has no designs upon America, and that its leaders have plunged it into a needless and disastrous war. Right now he has scored one of his biggest successes by stirring up ill feeling between Russia and Poland.

If all these statements were signed by Adolf Hitler of course they would mislead only those who choose to be misled. But the German propaganda machine is much too skillful for that. So they come to you, not directly from Berlin, but indirectly, perhaps with a question mark after them, from your neighbor at lunch, who is as loyal as you are; from someone who drops into your office, expressing his fears rather than his convictions; from sources where implacable hatred of Britain discolors and distorts the whole vision. But whatever the source, or whatever the immediate purpose, it is all designed to carry out that one fundamental technique: Divide and conquer.

This is the danger we face. The United Nations never can be ultimately whipped on land or sea or in the air so long as they resolutely make common cause and measure their sacrifices only by their ability to sacrifice. Hitler knows that as well as we do, and better. Therefore Hitler will spare nothing whatever in his attempt to win the war by bringing about a psychological breakdown as the antecedent of a physical breakdown.

Perhaps this situation justifies me in talking to you for a few minutes about what Canada is doing in the war. Perhaps you have heard too little of what we are doing in this fight—we are sometimes accused of being a modest people—and perhaps much of what you have heard is not true.

Let me first give you a bit of historical background:

Like yourselves, we entered the Great War of 1914–18 in the hope that it would make the world safe for democracy. In proportion to our population we lost more blood and spent more treasure in that struggle than did the United States. And we came out of the war a debtor nation—not a creditor nation. But, just to make the record clear, let me say that all our debts have been honored.

We tried to do our bit to outlaw war in the future. We joined the League of Nations, subscribed to its policies, supported it financially. The League of Nations was the invention of a great American to prevent the nations ever again going to war. Many of us believe that had the league received the support which was anticipated when it was organized, the world would have been spared the desperate position in which it now finds itself.

We were so sure the world was sick of war that we allowed our defense forces to shrink to a mere skeleton. Our mother country set the example by disarming to a point which almost proved to be disaster. It was a terrible mistake, but it was a mistake that will stand forever to her credit. It is the permanent answer to the German claim that Britain wanted this war.

Then we suddenly awoke to the fact that while we had been working for peace the Nazi Party in Germany had been secretly preparing for war. A few voices had been telling us that for years; Churchill's, for example; but we refused to listen, just as you did; we called them warmongers, just as you did; but with the beginning of open aggression in Europe the secret could no longer be hid.

We were humiliated by Munich, but we felt that while there was the most remote chance of peace it was worth while to take that chance. That is how much we hated war.

After Munich, when Hitler proceeded almost immediately to break his solemn pledge of peace, even the most unrealistic of us began to see that these promises were made only to lull us into a sense of security. Then came the point where, as Anthony Eden said, we could not go on forever with a pistol at our heads. So, on September 3, 1939, 3 days after Germany attacked Poland, Britain declared war. On September 7 the Parliament of Canada assembled. On September 9 that Parliament declared for war. On the following day, September 10, a state of war between Canada and Germany was proclaimed.

Canada was not obliged to declare war. No external pressure was brought to bear upon her. She might have remained neutral, as Eire has done. But we believed then, and we believe now, that just as Abraham Lincoln said 80 years ago, "This Nation cannot survive half slave and half free," so today, with the world contracted by rapid and easy transportation, the world itself cannot survive half slave and half free. It must either be all free or freedom will be safe nowhere.

That was more than 3½ years ago. You have a right to ask me what we have accomplished in that time. Our experience may be not only interesting to you, but profitable as well.

In weighing the effort of a nation it is necessary to take its potential power into consideration. You do not expect a hundred-horsepower engine to deliver as much power as one of a thousand horsepower. What you expect of each engine is that it will deliver all the power that is in it.

If you are going to measure the effort of Canada by that of the people of the British Isles, or of Russia, or China, or of some of the smaller nations like Greece, or Norway, we must stand bareheaded and silent in the presence of a consecration we have not yet attained. But by other standards our showing may appear more creditable.

When war broke out we had a permanent army of some 4,500 men, and a nonpermanent militia, which corresponded to the National Guard in the United States, of about 55,000—approximately 60,000 in all. Now we have an active army of more than 445,000 and a reserve army of more than 100,000. This is proportionate, on a population basis, to an enlistment of about 6,000,000 in the United States.

Canada's Navy at the outbreak of war consisted of 13 ships of all kinds and a personnel of 1,700 men. Today we have more than 500 vessels and 55,000 men. I do not suggest that we have been building battleships. That requires great equipment which we did not have. But we have been building smaller ships; corvettes, for example, efficient and effective in dealing with the submarine menace.

So far our Navy has lost 12 vessels. It has assisted in convoying more than 9,000 ships from Canadian shores, flying the flags of 17 different nations. These convoys have borne more than 55,000,000 tons of cargo. In protection of the sea lanes the Navy has encountered and sunk enemy submarines, captured 5 enemy vessels, and caused others to be scuttled.

Canadians are an air-minded people. In the late war Canadian airmen established a reputation excelled by none. Canadian air aces ranked among the foremost in the world. But with peace we returned to peace, and the outbreak of this war found us with an air force of about 4,000 men. Today it exceeds 200,000 proportionate to 2,200,000 in the United States.

Thousands of Canadians are serving as individuals with the Royal Air Force in Britain, Africa, and every war area. Every day our papers carry news dispatches of the effective heroism of Canadians in the air and, unhappily, of the loss of gallant lives.

Every single day men under training in Canada fly more than 2,000,000 miles. If the paved runways of our airports were stretched out into one highway, it would reach more than a thousand miles.

Not only Canadians, but Australians and New Zealanders, are being air trained in

Canada. Up until an event at Pearl Harbor there were also considerable numbers enlisting from the United States.

But this is a war which cannot be won by men alone. I cannot give you quantities, but our industries are turning out equipment on a scale far beyond anything that could have been conceived before the war. At the beginning of the war we had practically no munitions industry; now, besides supplying ourselves, we are turning over 50 percent of our production to Britain and Russia and over 20 percent to United States and Pacific theaters of war.

Our airplane industry at the beginning of the war employed about 1,000 persons; now it employs 93,000.

We manufacture 1,500,000 shells per month and also great quantities of aerial bombs, trench mortar bombs, and antitank mines. We are shipping ammunition to more than 50 different destinations in all parts of the world.

Before the war we had 500 people making small arms ammunition. Now we have 30,000.

Since the beginning of the war we have produced nearly 450,000 motor vehicles. One Canadian plant, the largest of its kind in the world, turns out enough universal carriers in one day to equip a battalion. Less than 10 percent of our automotive production is used by our own forces; the remaining 90 percent is sent to other United Nations. More than half of the mechanized transport used by General Montgomery in his amazing drive across Africa was made in Canada. Canada has already sent more than 2,000 universal carriers to Russia.

Our shipyards are delivering from 8 to 10 cargo ships per month. We have now in various stages of production 157 ships of 10,000 tons each.

I might go on enumerating these details, but perhaps I have said enough to change your minds about Canadians being a modest people. But I am not saying these things in order to boast; I merely wish you to know that we are trying to pull our share of the load. Compared with your production, it is small, but when you remember that the population of all Canada is no more than that of the single State of New York I think you will agree that the showing is not discreditable.

And I have another purpose. Let us all hope that after this war there will be none of the childish talk we heard after the last war as to who won it. We are all going to win it. It may be that the weight of even a small nation like Canada will be just what is needed to tip the balance. We won't talk about that; we are all going to win it, and we won't let any silly arguments as to who did what divide us, neither now nor afterward.

Operations on the scale I have outlined naturally call for huge expenditures and place a heavy strain upon the financial resources of a young country. Particularly, we require foreign exchange to buy war commodities and other necessities from the United States. Imports from the United States, you know, must be bought with United States dollars, not Canadian dollars. Lend-lease legislation does not apply, except with respect to goods which Canada must obtain in the United States to fill British war orders placed in Canada. To accumulate United States dollars for war purposes, we have had to accept some hardships, chief of which is our inability to spend United States dollars on pleasure travel in the United States. We can get Canadian dollars by taxing ourselves or raising internal loans, but all the Canadian taxation in the world will not produce United States dollars. We have to get them by some other means.

Perhaps, first, however, I had better tell you what we are doing to get Canadian dollars.

Our Government has sought, from the first, to put this war on a pay-as-you-go basis, as far as that is humanly possible. In this it has been supported by the good sense of the Canadian people, who have voluntarily accepted taxation on a basis which less than 4 years ago would have been considered incredible.

For example: A single person earning $1,200 in 1943 will pay an income tax of $247. A married man with two dependents earning $10,000 in 1943 will pay a tax of $4,665. It is true that a certain proportion of this, varying, but perhaps about one-quarter, is placed to his credit and will be returned after the war with 2 percent interest, but against that is the fact that in 1943 he has also to pay up certain arrears from 1942, as this year we are going on the pay-as-you-go basis, sometimes referred to as the Ruml plan. We also pay an 8 percent Federal sales tax and various other taxes.

At the beginning of the war the principle was laid down that, so far as Canada is concerned, this war is not going to make anybody rich. That principle is being sternly and impartially applied.

Another phase of our war effort which may be of interest to you is the steps which we have taken to prevent a rise in prices, commonly called inflation. With vast sums being poured out for war purposes, immense purchasing power is being placed in the hands of consumers—which means all of us. There is, however, no corresponding increase in commodities available for purchase, as the commodities are going overseas. If the public, with money in its pocket, were left to compete with itself for such commodities as remain, the price would soon rise, carrying with it the cost of living and bringing in its wake demands for higher wages, higher salaries, larger profits. Those who had plenty would satisfy their wants; those who had less would go without. And the vicious spiral of inflation, once set in motion, would endanger the whole economic structure of the Nation.

As protection against such a possibility wages and salaries were frozen, and it was decided to give to the dollar a fixed value in goods and services. It was decided to select the period from September 15 to October 11, 1941, and use it as the base of all future values. In short, one might continue to sell any commodity or service at the highest price he got for it during that basic period, but no higher. He might reduce his price if he were able to do so and were so disposed, but he must not increase it. There are some exceptions, relating particularly to seasonal farm products and to some other commodities which cannot very well be made subject to the general regulations, but taken by and large prices across the whole range of goods and services must not exceed those which were charged during the basic period.

The plan is devised to insure that the dollar will have permanent purchasing power on the basis of the basic period. There may be shortages in some commodities, such as, for example, at present, gasoline and tires. These situations will be met, not by allowing those who have plenty of money to buy up whatever supplies are available and leave the rest of the public to go without, but by allowing to each his necessary requirements so far as it is possible to do so.

The action which has more recently been taken along somewhat similar lines by the United States Government is not only a considerable compliment to Canada but will greatly lessen the strain of maintaining a price ceiling in the Dominion. It is obvious that a country having such close commercial relationships with the United States as has Canada might find it difficult to keep some prices under control if they were allowed to move without restriction on this side of the boundary. I think the principal differences in our systems is that from the very first we in Canada have taken the view that it is impossible to control the price of goods and services unless wages and salaries are similarly controlled.

One other point I would like to make clear. I believe the impression prevails in some quarters that whereas the United States supplies Britain with goods under the lease-lend provision, Canada demands cash. That statement is not true.

The Canadian Government more than a year ago voted from its own funds the sum of $1,000,000,000 with which to supply goods to that value to Great Britain, not even on a lease-lend basis but absolutely free. We have voluntarily restricted our own use of such concentrated foods as bacon, ham, and cheese in order that these may be sent to Britain. We pay our farmers for these products with our own money raised by our own taxes. Quite recently we have voted another billion-dollar gift and this aid will be extended, not only to Great Britain, but to other United Nations as well. So much for the statement that Canada demands cash for her shipments to Britain.

So much for the past and present. What about the future? I shall not assume the role of a prophet, but there are one or two observations which I think can be made, and which are particularly appropriate before a Rotary audience.

We are hearing a good deal in these times about free enterprise. I suppose we all believe in free enterprise. But we do well to define our terms, so that we know what we are talking about, and make sure we all mean the same thing. For example, someone in the pursuit of free enterprise knocks you down on the street and takes your wallet. The community as a whole bands against that expression of free enterprise; it tracks down the offender, tries him, and, if he is convicted, punishes him, because he applied the principle of free enterprise in a nonsocial way. Society now asserts that the free enterprise of the individual must not conflict with the rights of other individuals, or of the community as a whole.

But this was not always so. What I mean is this: There was a time when he who had the strong right arm and a big club took what he wanted—by force. It was considered all right. What's the sense in having a strong right arm and a big club if you don't use it? But advancing civilization said it was all wrong. So now when a highwayman knocks you down on the road or a footpad gets you in a back alley we put him in jail—if we catch him.

But there is another kind of strength very unequally distributed among we members of the human race. There is the strength of mind, the strength of will, the strength of agile mental ability. And so far we have not said that that strength must not be used for one's personal advantage. We have made some restrictions, but on the whole we have allowed the person who has been richly endowed with mental capacity to use it for his own personal gain, and we have even held it to his credit if he did so use it. In spite of all the preaching of the preachers we have refused to believe in the brotherhood of man, we have refused to love our neighbors as ourselves. We have been out for No. 1, and the more success we have had in promoting the interests of No. 1 the more regard we have received from the community, the higher our citizenship has been reckoned to be.

I am convinced that civilization has got to take another great step forward and that this condition has got to change; that just as we have prevented the man with the big biceps

from using those biceps for his personal advantage, so we must prevent the man with the big brain from using that brain for his personal advantage. It must be for the advantage of the community as a whole. Some, I know, are already so using it. I will not launch into names; that would exhaust too much time; but I think, for example, of men like the late Sir Frederick Banting, who gave a great service to the race and didn't try to patent or protect it for his own personal advantage. There are hundreds of other such examples large and small, and they prove what I am contending, namely, that it is possible to get the man with the big brains and the outstanding ability to work for the community as a whole and for humanity as a whole instead of for his own personal enrichment and the satisfaction of his personal ambitions. Some of them are doing it today.

Is that an impossible ideal? Is it impossible for us to teach ourselves and our children—at any rate our children—that the one great objective of every person living in a democracy must be to serve society, and that the most successful man is not he who has the largest salary or income but he who gives the greatest service? Hitler has succeeded in rebuilding Germany by planting a new ideology in the minds of the young. Cannot we do as much, but with a very different ideology, an ideology which is consistent with Christian belief, which is in fact the very expression of Christian practice? We shall not accomplish it in a day or a year, but surely it is worth trying. If we march under a banner which says "Service Before Self" let us really believe in what that banner stands for. Perhaps some of us are using it as a cloak to give our selfishness a certain appearance of respectability.

So I say, no matter how far we fall short of our ideals, let us still keep them as our clear objective. The mists of the future will recede as we advance. Our first task, in which all the world is now grappling, is to overthrow once and forever the theory that he with the big biceps and the big club shall take what he wants. Our next task will be to establish an ideal that both biceps and brains must be used for the benefit of society rather than for the aggrandizement of the particular person who happens to possess them.

Changes greater than we know are being shaped about us. Things that we would not do as a matter of good sense we shall be compelled to do as a matter of force. Our whole conception of the world present and the world to come is taking on new shapes.

"We wait beneath the furnace blast
The pangs of transformation;
Not painlessly doth God recast
And mould anew the nation."

Not painlessly. Certainly not painlessly. Today upon the anvil of war are being shaped the white-h' destinies of nations. It hurts. It probably will hurt still more. This is one of the world's climacteric moments. We are trying to demonstrate that the big biceps and the big club do not have the right to take what they want. The Axis Powers are trying to prove that they do.

I think we shall win our point. Then what shall we do? Settle back to await the final destruction of civilization in a third and greater war, or go forward to set up new social and economic standards? I think we shall go forward. Premier Churchill and President Roosevelt have already, in the Atlantic Charter, pledged their peoples to do so. Lease-lend aid opens a new conception of international relationships. The gift of $2,000,000,000 worth of goods from Canada to Britain and other United Nations writes a new page in economic history. Old standards are being flung overboard, new standards are being adopted. This is a work in which, it seems to me, Rotary must take an important part. It does not mean any change in our principles; it merely means putting our principles into effect.

And now, but for one word, I have finished. You may have noticed that in my remarks tonight I have not once called you Americans. That is because we are becoming somewhat jealous of that word. For we, you know, are Americans, too. It is a word which has become too big to hold only one people however great. It is a word which binds us together in a sense of brotherhood. Because, like you, we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes obstructive of those ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it. When a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evince a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty to overthrow such government and to provide new guards for their future security. And for the purport of this declaration, with a firm reliance upon the protection of Divine Providence, we pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

In the spirit of this declaration let us unite and conquer.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address delivered by our distinguished colleague from Virginia, the Honorable P. H. DREWRY. The address was delivered at Camp Pickett, Va., on Memorial Day, and is more than an eloquent expression by a great Virginian. It is of historical value in that it gives a detailed account of the origin of Memorial Day:

Today is Memorial Day—the day set apart by this Nation to perpetuate the memory of those who died for their country. It is a beautiful custom to give 1 day out of our busy lives in grateful service as a memorial honoring the remembrance of our patriotic dead. From earliest times other nations honored their heroes with monuments of bronze and stone, but the people of this country have made their remembrance an annual observance, accompanied by strewing with flowers. Each year on a fixed day, with love in our hearts and with unashamed tears in our eyes, we lay on the graves of our patriots the flowers we have gathered, the flowers of their native land. In their quiet resting place there is no bitterness of argument, the strife of conflict is over—only the spirits of brave men hover there. All honor, the honor of loving hearts, has been rendered them—their duty has been done. It is ours to carry on. With the fragrance of the flowers about them, leave them in peace under the trees until awakened by the reveille of the Resurrection.

All of us carry in our minds recollection of other Memorial Days, incidents and events bringing into relief past commemoration of this day. There flashes across the screen of my memory a sequence of pictures that seem to me to be related in my thinking of this day.

I think first of the origin of Memorial Day, not far from here at Petersburg. It was told to me by a dear old gray-haired lady, Miss Nora Davidson, a teacher of a girls' school. On June 9, 1865, she took her school to Blandford Cemetery where were buried about 30,000 soldiers of that government of which the English poet, Henley, so beautifully said:

"No nation ever rose so white,
Nor fell, so pure of crime."

It was the anniversary of the battle the previous year in which a small body of old men and young boys of Petersburg had attempted to repel an invading army, and two-thirds of them were killed or captured. To my vision, still I can see these children, their arms laden with flowers, on a hot June day, going slowly up the dusty road to Cemetery Hill to lay their tributes on the graves of those who had offered their lives that others might live. The sight so affected a visitor, the wife of the Commander in Chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, that she told her husband of it. He issued the order for the observance of a National Memorial Day, that the gratitude of the living might be shown in this beautiful way, to those who in a spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion to duty, wrought well for their country. Memorial Day honors the brave of both those armies who died in that unfortunate fratricidal conflict.

Another picture comes on the screen. It is November 11, 1918, Armistice Day. The breathtaking, emotional relief that swept over us at the news that the war—World War No. 1—was over. Strong men broke down and shed tears of rejoicing that the boys could come home. The greatest conflict of all times—up to that time—had ceased. Two millions of khaki-clad Americans had made the world safe for democracy and had saved their country from the brutal domination of a ruthless and cruel autocracy.

Then the reaction. With the triumphant exaltation of victory came over us a sadness—sadness at the absence of those who laid down their lives in the "supreme sacrifice." We cheered the living, but we wept for those brave boys who lay sleeping their last sleep on foreign fields. On this day we reverently honor them.

The United States did not want that war; we are a peaceful people. Since the beginning of our Government the spirit of the Republic, with folded arms, has looked across the turbulent Atlantic to the east and across the smooth Pacific to the west and has said to the nations of the earth: "We have nothing to do with your dissensions; so long as you do not touch me or mine, I shall take no hand in your quarrels." When the storm broke over Europe, far-seeing men in our country knew that we must go in for our own preservation. Our leaders saw that Germany, led by a power-loving emperor, would attempt to put the nations of the world in subjection. They tried in vain to persuade Germany that we were isolated from European conflicts and had no part in them. The answer they got was the sinking of the *Lusitania*. When the cries of innocent women and children, drowning in the icy waters, came to the ears of horrified Americans, then every man and woman knew that the crime must be avenged or else the Stars and Stripes must be hauled down and thrown on the ash pile. Aloofness was ended; our isolation became a thing of the past.

Afterward come the vision of peace. In Washington, at the western entrance to the Capitol on Pennsylvania Avenue, is a memorial group of statuary called Peace. The top group consists of two weeping women in each other's arms. Below them are two little children vaguely understanding that something was wrong, but unable to comprehend. At first I could not understand the significance of the title "Peace." Then it came to me. Peace was the cessation of war. After war came peace, but peace had to bear the burden of war with its aftermath of weeping women and helpless little children. In peace we honor the memory of the heroes of war. Peace must have its Memorial Days.

It is significant that the United States has at the entrance to the Capitol the Statue of Peace. Forever before the eyes of the statesmen is the reminder of the cessation of war. In peace the United States set to work to reconstruct the devastation of the war. Firmly fixed in the mind and soul of America was the thought that never again should the horrors of war afflict mankind. The United States led the way in calling a peace conference in 1922. Although at the end of World War No. 1 the United States had the greatest Navy afloat and the strongest ability to maintain such power, yet in the interest of peace it agreed to put itself on a ratio of equality with England and on a ratio of 5 to 3 with Japan.

In furtherance with this agreement the United States scrapped and sunk $350,000,000 worth of the finest ships in the world. It further agreed not to build beyond the agreed treaty strength. This country kept its word. Great Britain kept its agreement. But now w know that Japan feverishly went to work to break it as soon as the treaty was signed by her. She began to build in utter disregard of her given pledge. Professing friendship for the United States and a desire for the peace of the world, she was quickly preparing, with diabolical trickery, to attack the United States suddenly and without warning. Japan, with lies on her lips and a dagger up her sleeve, kept up this falsity until with dastardly cunning she assaulted our Pacific outpost at Pearl Harbor.

The last picture comes into view on December 7, 1941. The horrors of that sneaking attack are fresh in our minds. Our very existence was threatened. There was only one thing to do, fight for our lives and our sacred honor. The next day Congress declared war, with only one shameful vote against it. The Nation sprang to arms as it has always done, and I pray God will always do, when it is attacked and insulted. Pearl Harbor has been avenged, and it will be more and more avenged until the lying and treacherous foe begs for mercy.

Germany, led by a despised degenerate, and Italy, headed by a boasting braggart, joined forces with semisavage Japan to control the world. The entire world has been engulfed in the abysmal vortex of this destructive conflict. Every person on any spot of the world is, or will be, affected by the outcome of this war. Probably never before in the world's history has there been such a possibility of the complete destruction of civilization. Before it is over, 50 percent of the world's best youth, energy, initiative, mentality, and spirituality may be gone. The world may be set back 2,000 years. The abstract principles of truth and justice no longer may be human concepts. Christianity, the rule of peace, may be thrown out, and in its place be substituted barbarism, the rule of might. No longer may men "do unto others as they would that men do unto them," but the universal cry of struggling men and women may be, "take what you want as you have the power to take it." The Golden Rule may be discarded for the rule of the sword. International highway robbery may make null and void all good-will treaties for the advancement of mankind.

The people of the United States have responded magnificently to the need to fight for the preservation of their freedom. Starting from scratch, in a state of unpreparedness, all patriotic Americans have dedicated themselves to win the war. The acetylene torch of patriotism in the hands of the Master Welder has fused all the elements of our society into a solid bulwark for our defense. The farmer is using his strength to the limit to feed the Nation and the starving slaves of other countries rendered unproductive by the unspeakable Hitler and the ruthless Jap; the manufacturer converted his factories into war material production; the laboring man threw his skill and labor into the war effort; the citizens gave of their savings to the Government to use for victory; and, above all, the young men stopped whatever they were doing and offered themselves and their strength as fighting men for the preservation of their country. When you think of all the years of preparation by our enemies in comparison with what the United States has accomplished in 1½ years, our present condition seems to be the marvel of the ages.

We are contending for our rights as free men, in a free country, in a free world. Such insistence upon our desire for freedom carries with it the duty to fight for that freedom, if necessary. Every citizen owes that duty to his country under the protection of whose government he lives, and enjoys his freedom. There has been no shirking by any true American of that duty. That is why you are here today at Camp Pickett. The same patriotism impelled you to give your services to your country that impelled others of less vigorous strength to give of their all to the land they love. All America is united in the effort for victory. You recall those words of Lord Wolsey to Cromwell:

"Let all the ends thou aim'st at be thy country's,
Thy God's, and truth's; then if thou fall'st,
O Cromwell,
Thou fall'st a blessed martyr."

If you fall—and those of us who remain at home must also sometime fall—you have the blessed and eternal consciousness of duty done. You will live forever in the hearts of a grateful people. What if in some future Memorial Day you will be honored? It will be a greater reward than can come to most of us. If you don't fall—and your countrymen pray to God that you will not, you still have the cherished memory of your sacrifices for your country, your God, and for Truth and Justice—the memory that is dear to a brave man, but never felt by a coward.

This is what you are fighting for—for God and Country, for Truth and Honesty and Justice among all men—for Freedom to live our own lives in our own way.

Our Great War President in the former World War gave as his reason for entering the war that it was a "war to make the world safe for democracy." Many critics sneered at this phrase, but the men who knew—the thinking men—were glad to have our entry into this war put on a more intellectual and spiritual basis than simply to say that a man shot another without knowing why he was fighting. That war was a war to make the world safe for democracy. So is this war. This war is a war to make the virtues of truth and justice observed by all nations in their relations with each other. As individuals we know that there are such virtues as truth and justice. We know that men should not lie to other men. We know that men should not rob other men of their possessions. We know that there can be no peace between men unless these virtues exist. Nations, as well as individuals, must observe these truths or there will be war. This war was brought on by a crazy leader of a great nation in utter disregard of other's rights. It was brought on by a man whose given word no one believes and in whom no one has any confidence. No people can believe the word of the German, Italian, and Japanese nations when given; no people can trust nations which believe in robbery of others' rights.

This war will be a war to so educate the peoples of the earth, that truth, and justice amongst men will be the guiding principle of nations in their relations to other nations for evermore—to the everlasting peace of the world. This is the underlying reason why the United States is fighting Germany, Italy, and Japan. Our country has observed the principles of international law. It has dealt honestly and fairly with other peoples. It has not robbed other nations of their possessions or their rights. We have notified the world that we want nothing that belongs to anyone else. And we have notified the world that no other nation shall deprive us of our rights and our possessions.

The people of this country have developed their own form of government, and we have further notified the world that we will not permit any nation to interfere with the rights possessed by us under our form of government. We prefer peace with all the world, but we will fight to preserve those rights. You know those rights, but it does no harm to call your attention to them. They are: Freedom of speech; freedom of security; freedom of protection under the law; freedom of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

When Japan, with the support of Germany and Italy, stealthily attacked us at Pearl Harbor, the United States arose as one man to resent and punish the attack. If Japan thought that cowardly submission would be the price we would pay for peace, such an error on their part will turn out to be quite a shock to their system.

Victory is in sight—in northern Africa, in the Aleutians, in the Pacific. Wherever the Americans may be, they are proving their valor. The training camps at home have done their job and done it well and are still doing it. The soldiers they have sent forth have shown by their actions and the results they have obtained that the American soldier is the best fighting man on earth, because, well trained, he fights in the panoply of truth and justice.

But the war is not over—the victory is yet to be fully wo The United States must step up the fight until its enemies are killed or surrender unconditionally. The home front must be as active and heroic as the soldiers on the fighting front.

Those of us here back of the lines should remember the old slogans—"In union there is strength" and "United we stand, divided we fall." This is no time for those who are supplying the soldiers with war material, to preserve their lives and ours, to quibble over a few cents more per hour for their work. The least we can do is to make our sacrifices willingly as our soldiers are doing. Give all that is in us—not to make money for ourselves—but to keep our soldiers supplied with all that is needed for their efforts. No army can win a battle, if its forces are divided when the battle begins. We shall win, but we must unite all our forces, both civilian and military.

We must follow our leaders. They may make mistakes, but a leaderless country cannot win. We will surely lose if we do not unitedly follow the course laid out for us by our leaders. This is no time for criticism. Patriotism requires courage and united action—now.

We must be ready for any sacrifice, however great. The effort may cost us everything we have—even our lives—but whatever the cost may be, it is not comparable to the cost, if we lose. Any sacrifice is better than life under German or Japanese domination. Death itself is preferable to slavery, degradation, and misery under Hitler or the uncivilized Jap.

We are fighting to preserve our freedom—the freedom guaranteed us by the Bill of Rights. And we are fighting for more than that—we are fighting to preserve Christianity. In Germany, Christ has been displaced by Hitler. In Japan, no god is recognized but a heathen one.

The words "The End" have not yet been written on the curtain that rolls back across the screen. Those prophetic words will be written and, in God's will, soon, we hope. When that great day comes, as we fall on our knees to offer heartfelt thanks to God Almighty, for the victory He has granted us over our enemies, we shall give reverent honor on our Memorial Day to the American soldier, who gave his life for his country.

Heroic Work of the Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on April 7, 1943, I spoke of the heroic work of the Coast Guard in peace and in war. I undertook to show that even while it was helping to carry the burden, and stress and strain of war, it performed with equal vigilance and unrelenting vigor the exacting duties of peace. I said that the work of the Coast Guard never ends, and that the officers and men of the Coast Guard are always prepared for all the eventualities of life. The Coast Guard is the great humanitarian service of the Nation.

They must be ready always not only for human offenders and human conspiracies but also for the unpredictable assaults of nature, the violence of storms, and the caprices of calms. Fighting icebergs, rescuing from floods, saving from earthquakes, the transition from guardian to warrior is easy, for the training of every officer, enlisted man and surfman is so complete, his experiences so varied, his duties so vast, and his preparation so complete that he readily turns from missions of mercy to deeds of daring.

The recent floods have confirmed the truth of this statement. The magnificent efforts of the Coast Guard in the past few months show that the Coast Guard is always ready. Service in and with that organization is a badge of honor—a glory no other service can surpass. In a release issued on May 26 by the Navy Department, with which the Coast Guard operates in war, it is shown that the Coast Guard has removed to safety from positions of danger or flooded farm lands of the lower Missouri, Mississippi, and Illinois River valleys more than 5,000 persons with some rescues being effected by cutting holes in the roofs of homes where the residents had taken refuge in the upper stories of their homes and then found that the flood waters continued to rise above window sill levels. More than 2,000 horses and cattle, more than 2,000 hogs, and innumerable chickens, sheep, goats, and other livestock have been removed to safety.

More than 400 Coast Guard men, including 26 officers and 87 Coast Guard vessels, are being used in the relief work. Capt. Stephen S. Yeandle, U. S. C. G., senior naval officer at St. Louis, praised the great help of more than 200 members of the Coast Guard Auxiliary, who, although they hold civilian positions, have taken out their yachts and small power boats to aid in the rescue operations.

While performing the herculean tasks of peace, the Coast Guard pursues with unabated vigor its war against an armed foe. On April 7, 1943, I cited the work of the Coast Guard cutter *Campbell* as possibly the most outstanding achievement of the present war. It will be recalled that the cutter *Campbell*, under the command of Commander James A. Hirshfield, in a series of engagements in the Atlantic lasting for several hours, rammed and sank one submarine and depth-charged four others. The record of the *Campbell* was inserted by me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 7, 1943.

Since my remarks on April 7 on The Coast Guard in War and on the Coast Guard cutter *Campbell*, and my insertion, on April 21, of the article which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star entitled "Following the United States Coast Guard Around the Globe," by Bainbridge Crist, there have been other releases revealing beyond any words of mine the heroic work of the Coast Guard in our struggle for existence.

COAST GUARD CUTTER "ICARUS," LT. COMDR. MAURICE D. JESTER

On May 1, 1943, the Navy released the account of the work of the 165-foot Coast Guard cutter *Icarus*, under the command of then Lt.—now Lt. Comdr.—Maurice D. Jester. The cutter was proceeding alone southward from New York on a routine run. She was sailing through calm seas just off the Carolina coast, when Lieutenant Jester and his executive officer, while calmly reviewing patrol run experiences, detected a submarine dead ahead and about 100 yards distant. General quarters were sounded, the crew assumed battle stations, and the *Icarus* flashed into action. Speeding forward she reached the spot over the submarine and dropped depth charges. As she maneuvered for another attack, a terrific explosion occurred about 200 yards on her port side. The *Icarus* crossed the spot where the submarine was submerged, dropping another pattern of charges, and followed with single charges in quick succession. Air bubbles began rising to the surface, quickly followed by the submarine itself, her bow pointing skyward at a 45° angle. The conning tower burst open, and submarine crew members scrambled to the deck, making for the deck gun. The *Icarus* steamed toward the submarine at full speed and put all guns into action. The withering fire was so accurate that it swept the Germans back toward the conning tower. The submarine started to sink. The Germans abandoned the attempt to man their guns and jumped into the sea. The submarine sank slowly and disappeared from the surface. The engagement was over.

The *Icarus* then picked up the 33 survivors. One of the captured Nazis died of wounds after being rescued from the water. The others were brought into port as prisoners of war. Secretary of Navy Frank Knox, acting for the President, awarded Lieutenant Jester the coveted Navy Cross—

For distinguished service in the line of his profession as commanding officer of the United States Coast Guard cutter *Icarus* during a successful action with an enemy German submarine. His persistence, alertness, determination, and judgment, both during and after the attack, resulted in sinking the enemy submarine and capturing the commanding officer, 1 other officer, and 31 members of the crew.

Lieutenant Commander Jester is 53 years old and makes his home at 19 Prospect Place, New Dorp, Staten Island, N. Y. He entered the Coast Guard as a surfman in 1917. I have seen it stated that when Jester was placed in command of the *Icarus* his superior officer gave him this order: "Bring me the hat band of a captain of a Nazi U boat." That seemed a big order. When the time came to carry the order out, he was ready. The command was obeyed. Jester might have reported, "Saw sub, sank same" or have adopted the famous message "We have met the enemy and they are ours." That is the spirit of the Coast Guard.

Commander Jester was born at Chincoteague Island, Va., and has three sons in the armed services, one of those, Ensign Maurice E. Jester, with 11 years service in the Coast Guard, was on the *Icarus* when the submarine was sunk. Two other sons in the service are Floyd Jester, a warrant pay clerk with 11 years service, and a third son, C. B. (Bill) Jester, a lieutenant in the United States Army.

Speaking of this engagement, Commander Jester said:

During the 30 minutes from the time we first detected the enemy until the last survivor was rescued, I acted automatically as though I were doing a rescue job as I had done many times in the past. I did not feel that I was in a battle, nor did fear enter my mind. It merely seemed that I had a job to do and my sole ambition was to complete it in the shortest possible time.

The crew of the *Icarus* was outstanding in the performance of its duty and displayed excellent morale. Not one man showed the least hesitation in performing any duty assigned to him.

In my 28 years of service with the Coast Guard, starting as a sandpounder (surfman), I have never seen a better crew than that aboard the *Icarus* at this time.

Commander Jester is new assistant Coast Guard operations officer in the Seventh Naval District, with headquarters at Miami. Commander Jester's native county, Accomack, his native State, Virginia, his congressional district, first, which I represent, and the Nation take pride in his splendid work and the splendid work of the crew of the *Icarus*, and in the glorious record that is being written by the United States Coast Guard.

Commander Jester said that he and his crew went about this work as they had gone about their rescue jobs many times in the past. It is that kind of service,

determined, intelligent, vigorous, persistent, and continuous that is spelling the doom of the U-boat, removing its menace, and laying the sure foundation for ultimate victory.

The work of the *Campbell* and the *Icarus* are but conspicuous examples of the work being done by the Coast Guard from commandant down through the ranks to the latest recruits, surfman or SPAR. Each seeks not popular applause but the rich reward of each day's duties well done.

COAST GUARDSMAN PAUL L. CLARK

On May 8, 1943, the Navy released information as to the award of the Navy Cross to Coast Guardsman Paul L. Clark, 22, of 45 Skillman Avenue, Jersey City, N. J., for "consummate skill and courage" in defending his landing boat against strafing enemy planes and for evacuating wounded during the landing of American troops in French North Africa.

Clark was engineer of a landing boat that carried assault troops ashore in the original landing. After the first wave of troops had been placed ashore, the commanding officer of the boat group to which Clark's craft was attached went ashore to find a new spot to carry out subsequent landing operations. Clark, and two other Coast Guardsmen, Richard L. Buckheit, of St. Marys, Pa., and Donald LaRue, Hackettstown, N. J., stood by the landing boat.

As the three men awaited the return of their commanding officer, a flight of eight planes came over, and commenced strafing runs over the craft. The hull of the boat was riddled by bullets from the plane, and its guns put out of operation. LaRue was killed in the attack, and Buckheit was severely wounded.

Alone, Clark struggled to get the badly damaged boat back in the water, and at last succeeded in getting it afloat, in spite of continued strafing from the planes. Just as he completed the task, he was joined by another Coast Guardsman, Leonard D. Goldstein, 6485 Saunders Street, Forest Hills, N. Y.

Goldstein got the disabled guns working, and began firing on the attacking planes while Clark headed the boat for the nearest destroyer. After placing the wounded Buckheit aboard the destroyer, Clark again took the boat in to the beach, picked up his commanding officer, who had returned from his reconnaissance mission, and several wounded men, then transported them back to the safety of the fleet.

COAST GUARD CUTTER "SPENCER", COMMANDER HAROLD S. BERDINE

The United States Coast Guard cutter *Spencer* has chalked up a definite submarine sinking to her credit.

In an engagement in the Atlantic several weeks ago, the *Spencer* skillfully tracked down a U-boat which tried to slip away under the roar of the propellers of a convoy, forced the raider to the surface with depth charges, and destroyed her in the gun battle which followed, taking many survivors prisoner.

Casualties aboard the *Spencer* were light, while the cutter suffered only slight damage.

The clean-cut victory enabled the men aboard the cutter who had sworn not to shave until their ship had a positive submarine sinking to her credit to scrape off their ragged beards.

The *Spencer*, a heavily armed, 327-foot craft under the command of Commander Harold S. Berdine, United States Coast Guard, 41, of 630 Victory Boulevard, Staten Island, N. Y., was part of the escort assigned to a large and important convoy making for an Allied port. She was also serving as the flagship of the Escort Unit commander, Capt. Paul R. Heineman, United States Navy, 45, 107 East Gorgas Lane, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.

She was proceeding ahead of the convoy in clear weather when the submarine was detected, lying in wait, directly in the path of the oncoming ships. She was completely submerged, and her periscope was down. Apparently her commander hoped to slip in past the escort screen, and had he succeeded, a raised periscope would have revealed many heavily laden ships at which to discharge his deadly torpedoes.

But the *Spencer's* veteran crew, well-trained and alert, was not fooled by the ruse.

As the U-boat came in, the sound operator, Harold V. Anderson, soundman 2d class, United States Coast Guard, 24, of 723 Franklin Street, Kewanee, Ill., detected her presence and gave the warning that saved the convoy. General quarters was sounded, and the crew leaped to battle stations. The cutter swept forward and dropped depth charges over the spot where the submarine lay submerged.

Then the *Spencer* circled to come back for a second attack, the great convoy still bearing down upon her. But there remained time for another attack without risk of damage to the merchantmen, if it could be carried out speedily. Instantly the cutter wheeled around in front of the leading ships of the convoy, and dropped a second "basket of eggs" at the last possible moment.

The submarine then tried to escape by running under the convoy, where the noise of the cargo ships' screws would interfere with the operation of the *Spencer's* sound apparatus. But the cutter held determinedly to the trail and followed the fleeing U-boat through the long columns of ships. Then, as the convoy cleared, she delivered a third depth charge attack.

The worst threat was now over. Not a "fish" had been fired, nor had a ship been touched. However, the cutter still continued her pursuit. The United States Coast Guard cutter *Duane* charged in to assist, and the *Spencer* made ready to let go with her fourth attack when a lookout shouted: "Conning tower on the port quarter!"

Gun crews on both the ships trained their guns instantly on the submarine, and opened a withering, effective fire. At the same time, the *Spencer* rang up full speed, and headed for the U-boat, prepared to ram.

As the damaged sub moved slowly ahead through the calm seas, members of her crew took stations on the bridge and returned the fire of the American ships with the light gun mounted there. The *Spencer's* life boats were riddled, a boat davit was nearly cut in two; bridge flag bags, bulkheads, and doors were damaged.

Submarine crewmen who made for the heavy deck gun, however, were driven back by the accurate fire from the escort vessels' guns.

Round after round was pumped into the undersea raider, and the after part of the conning tower was completely torn away. Then, just as the *Spencer* was on the point of ramming, the fire from the submarine suddenly ceased, and many members of her crew were observed abandoning ship through the conning tower.

The cutter turned aside and waited, ready to resume the assault; but the battle was over. The U-boat's propellers stopped, she dropped lower in the water, then rapidly plummeted down.

Circling, the *Spencer* picked up more than 40 submarine-crew members who were floating in the water, supported by rafts and life belts. Locating the U-boat's survivors was not difficult; some were on rafts, the others adrift, but all of them safely supported by their escape lungs which were being used as life belts. Nevertheless, as they awaited rescue they acted in a very hysterical manner, shouting and waving arms so frantically that no doubt was left as to their existence and location. The sea was smooth, there was a moderate breeze and conditions were generally fair. No doubt the depth charging and heavy gunfire had unnerved them; several were still hysterical on coming aboard. All prisoners were impressed by the deadliness of the depth charges. Several threw up their hands and exclaimed, "Wasserbombes; terrible, terrible!"

Then the *Spencer* stood up through the columns of ships to assume her assigned station at the head of the convoy.

As she passed, each ship hoisted a signal of congratulation and cheered the *Spencer* for her triumph.

SIGNALMAN DOUGLAS A. MUNRO

Douglas A. Munro, a signalman first class of the United States Coast Guard, died heroically on Guadalcanal September 27, 1942, after succeeding in his assignment, for which he had volunteered, to evacuate a detachment of marines from a point where enemy opposition developed beyond anticipated dimensions. Munro's final words were "Did they get off?"

In the action, Munro had already played an important part, since he was in charge of the original detachment of 10 boats that had landed the marines at the scene. He had successfully gotten them ashore and then had headed his boats back to a previously assigned position. Almost immediately upon his return, he was advised by the officer in charge that conditions were different from those that had been anticipated and that it was necessary to evacuate the men immediately. Munro volunteered for the job of heading the boats for the evacuation. In charge of the rescue expedition, he brought the boats inshore under heavy enemy fire and proceeded to evacuate the men on the

beach. When most of them were in the boats, complications arose in evacuating the last men, whom Munro realized would be in the greatest danger. He accordingly so placed himself and his boats that they would serve as cover for the last men to leave. It was thus that he was fatally wounded—protecting the men after he had evacuated them. He remained conscious sufficiently long only to say four words: "Did they get off?" He died, therefore, with the realization that his mission had succeeded and his final assignment had been carried out.

Douglas Albert Munro was born in Vancouver, Canada, of American parents, on October 11, 1919, but spent his entire life previous to his enlistment in South Cle Elum, Wash. His parents are Mr. and Mrs. James Munro of South Cle Elum. Douglas Munro was educated at the South Cle Elum grade school and was graduated from the Cle Elum High School in 1937. He attended the Central Washington College of Education for a year and left to enlist in the United States Coast Guard in 1939. He had an outstanding record as an enlisted man and was promoted rapidly through the various ratings to a signalman, first class.

Posthumously awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, his citation reads:

For extraordinary heroism and conspicuous gallantry in action above and beyond the call of duty as officer-in-charge of a group of Higgins boats, engaged in the evacuation of a battalion of marines trapped by enemy Japanese forces at Point Cruz, Guadalcanal, on September 27, 1942. After making preliminary plans for the evacuation of nearly 500 beleaguered marines, Munro, under constant risk of his life, daringly led 5 of his small craft toward the shore. As he closed the beach, he signaled the others to land, and then in order to draw the enemy's fire and protect the heavily loaded boats, he valiantly placed his craft with its 2 small guns as a shield between the beachhead and the Japanese. When the perilous task of evacuation was nearly completed, Munro was killed by enemy fire, but his crew, 2 of whom were wounded, carried on until the last boat had loaded and cleared the beach. By his outstanding leadership, expert planning, and dauntless devotion to duty, he and his courageous comrades undoubtedly saved the lives of many who otherwise would have perished. He gallantly gave up his life in defense of his country.

The story of self-sacrifice in giving his life to save 500 of his fellow countrymen has been told in detail by his commanding officer, Commander D. H. Dexter, United States Coast Guard, who was in charge of operations at the time. His account, told with simple dignity and admiration in a letter to the boy's parents, follows:

GUADALCANAL, B. S. I.,
October 2, 1942.

JAMES MUNRO,
South Cle Elum, Wash.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. MUNRO: Believe me when I say sincerely that this is a very sad letter for me to write, advising you of the death of your son Douglas, but, as commanding officer of the unit to which he was attached at the time of his death, I have pride in telling you that he covered himself with honor and I hope glory, and fulfilled the mission so satisfactorily that almost all of the men he had under his charge returned to their unit, and, without exception, all had praise for your son's execution of his duties.

It was a year ago last June that Douglas and Raymond Evans came to me and asked if they could be transferred to Captain Ashe's staff. I succeeded in getting them and since that day have felt that Douglas was one of my boys, for both Douglas and Ray Evans have been with me and his loss has left a very decided space which I feel will never be filled so far as I am concerned.

On Sunday the 27th of September an expedition was sent into an area where trouble was to be expected. Douglas was in charge of the ten boats which took the men down. In the latter part of the afternoon, the situation had not developed as had been anticipated and in order to save the expedition it became necessary to send the boats back to evacuate the expedition. Volunteers were called for and true to the highest traditions of the Coast Guard and also to traditions with which you had imbued your son he was among the first to volunteer and was put in charge of the detail. The evacuation was as successful as could be hoped for under fire. But as always happens, the last men to leave the beach are the hardest pressed because they have been acting as the covering agents for the withdrawal of the other men, and your son, knowing this, so placed himself and his boats so that he could act as the covering agent for the last men, and by his action and successful maneuvers brought back a far greater number of men than had been even hoped for. He received his wound just as the last men were getting in the boats and clearing the beach. Upon regaining consciousness his only question was "Did they get off?" and so died with a smile on his face and the full knowledge that he had successfully accomplished a dangerous mission.

I am sending this to you direct for I feel that you should have the privilege of knowing the facts, but request that you keep it confidential until such time as the official notification is received. I regret having to make this request but feel that it is for the good of all concerned. I consider this is a personal letter and not an official report.

In the year and a half that I have known Douglas I have grown to admire him and through him, you. He was the true type of American manhood that is going to win this war and I hereby promise that I will make all efforts to personally call on you whenever it is my privilege to be near Cle Elum and to pay homage to you both as the parents of Douglas.

Sincerely and respectfully,
D. H. DEXTER,
Lieutenant Commander, United States Coast Guard.

MOTHER REPLACES SON IN COAST GUARD, MRS. JAMES MUNRO

Mrs. James Munro, an American mother, replaced her hero son in the ranks of the United States Coast Guard when Rear Admiral L. T. Chalker, assistant commandant, swore her in as a lieutenant, junior grade, in the SPARS, Women's Reserve of the United States Coast Guard Reserve. Two hours earlier in a noon ceremony the President presented Lieutenant Munro and her husband, James Munro, chief operator of the Milwaukee Railroad's electrical substation at South Cle Elum, Wash., with the Congressional Medal of Honor bestowed posthumously upon their 24-year-old son Douglas who gave his life to help save a battalion of marines trapped by enemy gunfire at Guadalcanal on September 27, 1942.

Mrs. Munro, slim, blue-eyed, brown-haired and 48, is English-born and an American citizen through marriage. She is the sister of Lt. Col. Francis Thrower-Fairey, Royal Irish Fusiliers of Canada, and the Minister of Technical Education for British Columbia. Four of her brothers fought with the Canadians in the First World War. Two of them were wounded. Mrs. Munro attended schools in England and Canada. The Munros' two children were born in Canada.

Mrs. Munro's reason for joining the SPARS:

We are a Coast Guard family, through Doug. He loved his service. I am very happy to be eligible to serve in it.

Douglas Munro's 25-year-old sister, Patricia, who was present at both ceremonies tried to enlist in the SPARS in Seattle soon after the organization was authorized but was turned down because she was 9 pounds underweight for her height. She is Mrs. John Burton Sheehand, of 3209 Dearborn Street, Seattle, Wash.

VETERAN PHOTOGRAPHER, NOW IN COAST GUARD, TOOK PHOTOGRAPHS

When the Coast Guard cutter *Spencer* sighted the Nazi submarine which it sank in the north Atlantic several weeks ago one of the first men to start the shooting aboard the American vessel was Jack January, of St. Louis, a chief boatswain's mate.

But he was not back of a machine gun or a cannon. He was at the trigger of a camera with which he "shot" the pictures of the sinking.

January, who was a photographer for a St. Louis, Mo., newspaper before enlisting in the Coast Guard in September 1942, was assigned to the *Spencer* early this year.

January said in discussing the pictures he made:

I was standing on the quarter deck talking to Chief Boatswain's Mate Charlie Lockett of Philadelphia. Three of my cameras were lying on the deck, for I had hoped to get some shots if any Nazis stuck their noses out. Frankly, I'd been pretty skeptical about ever seeing a sub. Maybe it's because I'm from Missouri. On many occasions we had seen oil slicks after dropping depth charges, but no submarines or debris were ever seen.

Then it happened. Charlie just finished saying something or other about how war can be pretty dull—when he began tugging at my arm.

"Jack," he blurted, "Jack! Isn't that a submarine coming up out there?"

I jerked around to see Charlie pointing at a spot about a mile off our port quarter. A long, dark object seemed to be squeezing itself out of the water.

While I grabbed for my camera, our skipper, Commander Harold S. Berdine, turned to a gunner's mate on the wing of the bridge and said quietly: "Well, son, here's what you've been waiting for. Give 'em hell."

The gunner's 20-millimeter cannon began throwing shells and I began shooting film from every angle I could think of. Our crew was yelling like a college cheering section. I closed my eyes once and thought I was back at St. Louis, covering a Cardinal-Dodger baseball game.

Suddenly, Nazi heads began to appear at the conning tower of the sub and the first men out swarmed toward the U-boat's three deck guns. By that time our machine guns and cannon were on the beam, and they knocked off Germans like so many clay pigeons.

We didn't know if the Nazis would try to use their torpedoes, so we kept pouring shells and slugs into the long iron fish, while the

Spencer charged in, preparing to ram the huge submarine.

The Huns had enough, however, and began jumping overboard, throwing up their hands and shouting "halp! halp!" As a result, it was decided not to ram the sub.

Seconds after the cease-firing order had been given, we began picking up the survivors. Some came aboard the *Spencer*, and others were dragged in by the Coast Guard cutter *Duane*, which also had been shelling the U-boat.

When asked what they'd like to eat, the crew as well as officers stated, "Just bread and jelly." But one man took a generous helping of corned beef and cabbage, and all soon followed suit. We eventually learned that only four of the entire group could not speak English.

January, who has spent 17 of his 33 years working as a professional photographer, and his wife, Mrs. Vera January, make their home at 4133 Potomac Street, St. Louis.

He recently was at home on leave and received considerable recognition for a series of pictures publicized throughout the Nation, showing mid-Atlantic rescue work of the Coast Guard, which it had been revealed were taken by him.

Now January is back at sea aboard a Coast Guard cutter.

Pictures of the engagement and of January are available in the Photographic Section, Office of Public Relations.

LT. COMDR. NELSON C. M'CORMICK COMMENDED FOR PROBABLY SINKING SUBMARINE

Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox has commended Lt. Comdr. Nelson C. McCormick, former commanding officer of the U. S. Coast Guard cutter *Thetis*, for a successful attack by his vessel on an enemy submarine last year. The commander in chief, United States Fleet, credited the *Thetis* and her crew with having probably sunk the enemy undersea craft.

Lieutenant Commander McCormick, who is 33 years old and whose home address is 8218 Edwin Drive, Norfolk, Va., was presented the letter of commendation at Norfolk on May 5.

Born in Dayton, Tex., on July 12, 1909, Lieutenant Commander McCormick attended the United States Naval Academy and the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn. He was graduated and commissioned an ensign in 1935. He has since completed courses at the Naval War College and on December 8, 1942, was commissioned a lieutenant commander. His wife, the former Doris M. Darrow, of New London, Conn., and their two children, now reside at the Norfolk address.

Mr. Speaker, the work of the Coast Guard never ends. They turn from the tasks of peace to the deeds of war "always ready" for the work at hand. The spirit of officers and enlisted men and women is superb. The Coast Guard Academy has as its motto "Scientiae cedit mare (The sea yields to knowledge)." That motto extends to all in the ranks. The motto of the service is "Semper paratus (Always ready)—and daily exemplification of that motto is the effort of all in the service. The result is that the sea yields its mysteries to their knowledge and the death-dealing submarine succumbs to their ceaseless vigil and their relentless attack. The fine esprit de corps of the Coast Guard is unexcelled by any other service—military, naval, or civilian. All honor to the officers and men of the United States Coast Guard.

Farmers Oppose O. P. A. Roll Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that a governmental agency is doing its utmost to precipitate a crisis among the farmers of our Nation. There is complete unanimity of opinion that the production of food is second only to the war effort. In fact it is the No. 1 problem for our civilian population. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record, I include a letter from a prominent constituent which expresses very clearly the attitude of the farmers in this matter:

MAY 29, 1943.

Congressman L. H. SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At this time I am writing you in regard to Office of Price Administration roll-back on farm products prices.

I think it is one of the worst things that could happen right after the farmer has been asked to produce more so we can feed the world. To freeze prices where they are today would not be as bad as to roll them back. It would not have the discouraging effect.

While talking about subsidizing, I believe every farmer would rather help himself than to have somebody giving him something taken from somebody else. Why there should be any roll-back in farm prices when labor has more money today than they have ever had and getting still more, is something I cannot understand.

I have had many farmers approach me and say, "What is the use of working 14 to 16 hours per day only to get less for producing more?" Now, they have been a loyal group. Food is what we need. Let's not discourage them at this critical time just to please the consumers who are more able to pay today than they have been for a long time.

Hoping you will see fit to do what is right about this, I remain,

Yours truly,

A. L. PETERSON,
Secretary and Treasurer,
Raymond Cooperative Creamery Association.

Resolution of Saratoga County War Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

"Whereas farmers of Saratoga County have pledged themselves to an all-out food production program in relation to our war program; and

"Whereas farmers, through the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, have pledged themselves to goals in excess of any food production ever attained in Saratoga County; and

"Whereas the outcome of a telephonic survey by leaders of agricultural wartime committees has revealed the fact that there is a dire shortage of gasoline on farms; and

"Whereas further telephonic survey to distributors supplying farm business, finds said distributors' storage tanks empty, with no source of supply in sight; and

"Whereas food produced by farmers is a No. 1 vital defense material in our war production program; and

"Whereas farmers today do not have the horse power and are dependent upon gasoline-operated farm machines, tractors, and so forth, for the production of these food supplies for our armed forces, allies, defense workers, and the public: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Saratoga County War Council bring to the attention of the general public the seriousness of the situation and by this action, seek the cooperation of the public to the ultimate end that our armed forces, our defense workers, and the civilian population may be adequately fed; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Saratoga County War Council hereby requests committees dealing with transportation to place emphasis upon the seriousness of the situation, and work toward a solution of the problem with existing cooperating agencies; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the New York State War Council; New York State War Manpower Director, State Office Building, Albany; National Food Administrator Chester Davis, Washington, D. C.; and the Senators and Congressmen representing Saratoga County."

Resolution passed by Saratoga County War Council at a meeting held on the afternoon of May 21, in the Saratoga County Office Building, Saratoga Springs, N. Y.

RICHARD J. SHERMAN,
Clerk.

Memorial Day Address of Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and inspiring Memorial Day address delivered by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commanding general of the Army Service Forces, at Arlington Cemetery, Arlington, Va., Sunday, May 30, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a solemn hour, and this is a solemn place.

We meet today among our soldier dead. Here in the green hills of Arlington our silent regiments are camped. Here rest the legions of hundreds of never-to-be-forgotten battles.

Their last, long march is over; the last, sad echoes of their final taps have drifted into

silence. Their arms are stacked; into our hands they have delivered the task of guarding the frontiers of freedom for which they died.

This we will do. We give our solemn pledge not to retreat a single pace, not to give up a single ideal or a single foot of ground so dearly earned in agony and blood.

To the nameless soldier here before us in this marble tomb and through him to all his comrades, wherever they may lie, we make this promise. With them we enter into an earnest covenant that we will carry on the fight against whatever odds and however long it takes until justice and decency and human liberty are reestablished throughout the earth.

The flowers we strew today will wither in an hour or 2; the words we utter will dissolve and fade into the wind. Only our resolution will remain, and our vigilance, only our devotion and our passion to labor in the common cause. These we must nurture within our own souls until that day when all those insolent and abominable men who challenge us are conquered. Then and then only will there be time for pity.

How shall we go about the unfinished task that lies before us? How shall we carry on the tradition of these mute battalions here camped in Arlington?

First, and last, we must have unity. We must unite and we must remain united in the fierceness of our determination, to carry on to victory, no matter what the cost. We must unite and we must remain united in our willingness to sacrifice everything except our honor, in order that our honor may survive.

We must cast out suspicion of each other and of our allies in this fight for freedom. We must remember, always, that it's the same war on the farm and in the factory, on the assembly line and on the battle line, in the homes of America and in the slit trenches of the Tunisian hills.

We dare not forget that there can be no personal profit for anyone, in money or comfort or in fame. Each of us has his own small job to do. That job must be meshed into the stupendous job of saving the world from chaos and the peoples of the world from slavery.

Only the united effort of every man and every woman, no matter where employed, can give us that victory. We must face this fact squarely—we must never forget it.

We Americans know that we have not fought our wars for aggrandizement, or for supposed wrongs, or for military glory. We have not sought war, and we understand that war is an eventuality to be accepted only when all peaceful trials have failed. But when it is finally clear that our freedoms can be preserved in no other fashion, then we fight for them. We are the sons of warriors; we can fight and outfight any enemy.

We fight to keep alive the essence and the spirit of America; our homes and the freedom to be secure in them; the peaceful conduct of our several lives; the liberty to walk our streets unmolested by the arrogant sentinels of a foreign dictator.

The men who answer from their graves our muster roll today, knew all these things. Like us, they were slow to anger. Like us, they doubted first that men could be so base as to thrust peaceful peoples into war; that men could violate a world so desperately anxious for peace. Like us, their anger grew at each separate swing and thrust of the saber of their foe until at last it had become a flame.

Today, on this quiet Sunday in America, our anger burns hot. It burns against the violence of men who have destroyed cities and laid waste peaceful fields to enslave our friends. It burns against the tyranny, the oppression, and rank brutality which these enemies have loosed upon the earth. This just anger will not be quenched until the men who have wrought these cruelties are made impotent, their armies scattered, and the instruments of destruction they have created lie in ruins at their feet.

This will not be accomplished by men at arms alone. In this world conflict every American has been summoned to play his full part in the gigantic struggle toward victory. Our cause and the stake of our future have been clearly marked. There is no longer reason for any man to doubt either his individual responsibility or the unthinkable alternative of defeat. On this day, every American must search his soul and ask whether he is giving his utmost to bring the final victory.

Already our enemies have begun to feel the might of our armies. The great victory which we have lately won in the mountains and on the plains of Tunisia is but the prelude to the greater operations in which we must triumph in Europe and in Asia.

Here, in the presence of our honored dead, we must pledge that we will not falter in the task. Here, in their last, peaceful bivouac, we must pledge that we will steadfastly follow, through all the ordeals which face us, the example they have furnished of free Americans fighting for their liberties. They rest, we will not rest, we must not rest, we cannot rest, until our freedom is secure.

The Petroleum Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, for some time I have been seriously concerned by the gasoline situation in the East. I believe we have reached the point when there must be clear-cut explanations made to the public, if we are to have the public understanding and public cooperation which are necessary.

Statements are emanating from a variety of Federal agencies. Rationing policies and rationing programs are being changed almost daily. No one will question that petroleum for our armed forces must be our first and foremost concern. What I am wondering is if adequate attention is being given to the serious effects of further crippling transportation at a time when mass facilities are already overtaxed.

Reports reaching me indicate that there is widespread misapprehension over the ultimate results of directions from Washington which tell a man how and when he can use his own property without satisfactory reasons for this regulation. In fact, we have the rare situation of taxing car owners $5 a year through a Federal use tax for the use of their vehicles, while other agencies of Government are telling them that the vehicles cannot be used.

The American Automobile Association, which has been extremely farsighted and constructive in its public appeals and utterances under wartime, has asked the immediate appointment of a national committee to straighten out the muddled petroleum situation in the same way that a blueprint was drafted for rubber under the direction of Bernard M. Baruch. Almost simultaneously the A. A. A. asked that highway tank trucks be fully utilized to meet the gasoline emergency.

Certainly the time is here when there should be a real and understandable appraisal of what is being done to meet the petroleum situation; what is being done to bring about relief; what sacrifices the oil industry is making in the interest of service to their customers; what is the outlook for stabilizing rationing machinery and what further steps are necessary.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement issued by Thomas P. Henry of Detroit, president of the American Automobile Association, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I commend this statement to the careful consideration of Members of Congress, who, like myself, are undoubtedly disturbed by the trends now in evidence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The petroleum situation today has in it many of the elements of confusion, misunderstanding, and apprehension as to the future that characterized the rubber situation when President Roosevelt set up the distinguished committee, headed by Bernard M. Baruch, to do a fact-finding job and plan a rubber program adequate to meet military demands and essential requirements of the civilian economy.

Such a program was developed. Public confidence was restored, and there is now every indication that the so-called rubber crisis is well on its way to liquidation. So much so, indeed, that we could reasonably look forward to the relinquishment of mileage controls on automotive vehicles by the middle of 1944 and thus increase the role that the motor vehicle can play in the over-all transportation requirements of the country.

This prospect, however, is largely offset by the petroleum outlook as of today. This outlook involves much more than the distrait situation along the Atlantic seaboard. There are official intimations that restrictions may have to be extended westward and that actual shortages may develop in oil-producing areas or in areas adjacent to these and which heretofore have had plenty of petroleum transportation facilities.

Confronted with these conditions, it is our confirmed belief that the time has come for the appointment of an independent fact-finding committee. No one is better equipped to head such a committee than is Mr. Baruch. Rubber and petroleum constitute the double arch on which highway transportation moves. One is equally as essential as the other. The rubber study was a transportation study as well. Out of it grew the mileage rationing program which was based on minimum requirements and which is already breaking down insofar as the eastern States are concerned.

The committee we suggest would have two distinct functions: First, to develop a body of facts that could be given to the people in order to promote better understanding and to reestablish public confidence; and second, to put the national petroleum policy on a definite track that will assure ample supply for all military requirements and for essential civilian needs. In addition, there are specific points that call for clarification, to wit:

1. Is everything possible being done by Government and by transportation agencies to increase the petroleum supply for the Atlantic Seaboard States?

2. Is adequate provision being made for minimum civilian requirements, to the end that the Government's mileage rationing program in this area may not break down entirely?

3. What can be done to bring about a closer relationship between supplies made available for civilian use and the outstanding coupons?

4. How widespread are black-market operations and to what extent are such operations draining the available supply? What can be done to bring these operations under control?

5. Can the requirements of the military services be placed on a basis that will permit a greater degree of stabilization and a lesser drain upon the stock resources of the shortage area?

6. To what extent is the conflict over jurisdiction between various agencies of Government over phases of petroleum—supply, transportation, prices, rationing—responsible for existing conditions?

7. Are transportation facilities, particularly tank cars, being employed with maximum efficiency? Are tank cars being employed for long-distance hauling of products such, for example, as asphalt? Have pooling arrangements as between the oil companies been consolidated so as to eliminate unnecessary long hauls and cross-hauling of petroleum products?

8. Are proper steps being taken now to assure an adequate supply of crude oil so as to obviate the imposition elsewhere of the severe restrictions that are now in force on the Atlantic seaboard?

These are just a few of the more obvious aspects of the situation. There are dozens of elements and cross currents that merit the attention of an independent and wholly impartial body.

The situation on the Atlantic seaboard has gradually deteriorated. The present acute shortage was on its way before the break in the "big inch" pipe line and before the flood descended on the Mississippi Valley. These unfortunate and unforeseeable events, of course, aggravated the condition and the outlook for the immediate future—more particularly because the Atlantic seaboard was and is on a day-to-day basis.

We recognize that there has been brought about a revolution in the transportation of petroleum to the east coast. Tank-car transportation has been increased from virtually nothing to close to 1,000,000 barrels a day in the space of little more than a year. The 24-inch pipe line, with a capacity of 300,000 barrels a day, is due for completion early in July. The 20-inch products pipe line, with a capacity of more than 200,000 barrels a day—depending on the number of pumps used—should be completed late in December. Other pipe lines have been completed and extended. Barge movements have been stepped up.

But, in spite of all this, the Petroleum Administration for War has repeatedly warned the people in the Eastern States that there is no relief for civilians in sight. They see "no gas" signs at the service stations and are subjected to a new ban on nonessential driving, which makes for a net gasoline saving of 20,000 barrels a day, as against total petroleum shipments of 1,300,000 barrels in recent weeks and an anticipated 1,600,000 barrels a day by the end of the year.

No one condones so-called pleasure driving today, but officials would do well to realize that the superimposing of a ban on nonessential driving on millions of car owners already reduced to the equivalent of a gallon-and-a-half ration a week simply means the wholesale immobilization of motor vehicles.

The people are told that everything possible is being done to bring petroleum into the East, but they question this. They are told that the Florida barge canal would solve their problem. They see high-sounding and high-placed authority cited for and against the project. They are naturally indifferent to the alleged "politics" in the project and they cannot be expected to understand the extent to which any undertaking today is subject to the impacts of scarce materials, equipment, and manpower.

The people are told that whatever increase in supply comes into the East is more than offset by the increase in the demands of the armed services and that this will continue for the duration. The fact that these demands cannot be revealed merely adds to their puzzlement. They naturally ask why so much of the military requirements are taken from the New York area and so little from points further south where the supply situation is not so stringent. With the reported improvement in the antisubmarine battle many are asking if it is possible to bring some tankers into operation again to the Atlantic Seaboard.

Of course, the armed services may have good and sufficient answers to such questioning—the exigencies pertaining to the make-up of convoys, ocean distances, need for tankers and escort vessels elsewhere, and so forth. No one begrudges anything needed by the armed services of the country. No one wants to divert tankers or escort vessels from the war effort. The people simply do not understand it. They will not understand it or accept explanations, no matter how correct, until they are given the facts in the situation—what is being done, what more can be done, with other things cannot be done and why—by someone in whom they have complete confidence.

There have been reports and charges to the effect that the situation has been aggravated to some extent by the effort of the oil companies to continue their own competitive practices, particularly in the matter of distribution. In fact, this situation was cited for particular comment in the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Gasoline and Fuel-Oil Shortages, headed by Senator Francis Maloney, under date of February 22, 1943.

There are current reports that tank cars which might be used to transport gasoline to the sorely stricken Eastern States are employed for long-distance hauling of asphalt for the surfacing of airfields. One such report has it, indeed, that an airfield in central Pennsylvania was surfaced with asphalt brought all the way from Texas by tank car. The number of such cars employed may not be large in the aggregate, but why any tank cars for such long-distance hauling since asphalt can be secured at nearby points and since alternative means of surfacing airfields are readily available.

The recent action under the pleasure ban, by which four Eastern States were excluded, namely, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, naturally led to questioning in other States as to the why and wherefore of it all. There were all kinds of explanations from Washington—the completion and extension of pipe lines, the difficulty of bringing the backed-up gasoline north because of congestion in the Potomac yards, the 200-mile limitation on tank-car hauls, and so on. All of these explanations possibly had merit. Unquestionably those who made them had convinced themselves. But, by the same token, they did not convince the people of the States on which further restrictions were imposed. Conviction is, in fact, so lacking that there are hundreds of thousands who believe that they are being subjected to a premeditated policy of restriction for the sake of restriction, and out of it comes a widespread demand for equality of treatment for every section of the country irrespective of the conditions existing. This demand for the uniform application of what would amount to sacrifice for the sake of sacrifice is important because it reflects a state of mental desperation.

The extent to which the conflict over jurisdiction and authority as between Government agencies is responsible for conditions was dealt with at length in a letter addressed to Economic Stabilization Director James F. Byrnes, under date of March 25. The conditions we set forth at that time continue and certainly it is an aspect of the situation that deserves the attention of the committee we are suggesting. It is an understatement to say that those responsible for the supply of gasoline to civilians, and the rationing of the supply made available, have not, in the past, seen eye-to-eye or worked hand-in-hand.

When mileage rationing was put into effect every assurance was given that, outside of the eastern petroleum shortage area, it was predicated wholly on the need for conserving rubber. It does not require much imagination to realize the reverberations that will ensue if it should develop that mileage rationing may have to be continued because of petroleum shortages after the rubber crisis is behind us. Now, and not later, is the time to guard against such an unfortunate denouement.

Recently the Petroleum Administration for War recommended an increase of 45 cents a barrel in the price of crude petroleum in order to encourage the bringing in of new wells. The Office of Price Administration turned down the request in order to maintain the "hold the line" edict on prices issued from the White House, and offered a form of subsidy as an alternative. The important thing is to "hold the line" against a national petroleum shortage and the disastrous consequences that would result therefrom. Certainly this is no time to permit a conflict as to the means whereby a job can be done to prevent the doing of the job itself in time.

The Memory of Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

THE MEMORY OF MAN

If some great power should black out
The memory of man,
So that the past would be forgot
As soon as it began,
The past, locked in oblivion's chest,
In vain nonentity, would rest,
And all the future would, at last,
Sleep with the unremembered past.

The spirit would impov'rished be
If we, at eventide,
Could not recall some sweet refrain,
When its last note had died—
We love, in mem'ry, to recall
Our mothers' songs that used to fall,
In sweetness, on our infant ears,
Back in those happy bygone years.

Remembrance is the light that shines
Along the way ahead,
Reflecting from the golden past
The luster of the dead,
Thus widening the present's scope,
And giving to the future hope
For greater greatness, that shall last,
From hist'ry's and tradition's past.

There is a question that's as old
As are the lives of men—
'Tis, "If a man die"—and he must—
Yet, "shall he live again?"
Men, since the dawn of time, have sought
For comfort in the hour that wrought
Out their transition from this life
Into the one where there's no strife.

From Nature's wild, unlettered man
Down in his lonely cave,
And from the wise philosopher
There at the open grave,
And from the voice of Eastertide,
Thru its sweet echoes, far and wide,
There comes sweet memory's refrain,
"Tho men must die, they'll live again."

Departed statesmen, that are gone,
Still shine like stars of gold,
And will, in memory, live on
Till time, itself, grows old.
Baptized in mem'ry's long-dried tears,
They've mellowed with the ripening years,
And have with brighter luster shone
Since they were called to God's unknown.

The great Creator creates all,
But nothing He destroys—
The past He brings back to the small
And great, with all its joys,
Thru memory, again to give
Enjoyment to men while they live,
And teach them lessons, to the last,
From out the dead, yet living past.

Without man's memory, his hope
Would have no precedent,
And toward the future's goal he'd grope,
Beset with discontent,
To be assailed with doubts and fears,
That will the greater grow with years,
Unless he finds, and holds it fast,
A guiding hand, from out the past.

In memory, there is no hope,
It toward the future lifts
Its miscroscopic telescope,
And, peering thru the rifts
Of vague imagination, tries
To see what in the future lies—
But we to memory must turn,
And at her feet, there sit and learn.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

The Antistrike Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to this bill. This measure, given rebirth under a hysteria of patriotism, tramples and violates almost every right which labor has gained after years of struggle. It is wrong in principle and lacking in necessity and constitutes an insult to the millions of loyal American workers who are putting forth their very best efforts toward winning the war on the assembly lines and production fronts of this country. I believe that I know something about the loyal and patriotic service that our American workers are putting into the war effort—it is my privilege to represent the largest industrial district in the world. That area that I call home and the surrounding territory is referred to as the arsenal of democracy and the greatest number of war plants in that arsenal of democracy are in my congressional district, and hundreds of thousands of patriotic men and women are toiling night and day in those shops, factories, and shipyards.

We have here in America over 12,000,000 organized workers, and it would indeed be a bitter reward for their unselfish and untiring efforts and the miracles they have performed in production records to destroy their morale and place shackles on free labor by dictatorial rule of government.

A careful reading of the bill—especially those sections that deal with enforcements and penalties—discloses that its main objective is to weaken and destroy labor unions.

Of the 12,000,000 organized workers in this country, over 1,000,000 of them are in our armed forces and within the family groups—on the basis of an average American family, they constitute a group of approximately 36,000,000 people. We have had no request from the leaders of our war program—both on the military and production fronts and the heads of our governmental agencies and tribunals dealing with labor relations—for this legislation, but to the contrary, they have unanimously condemned the bill as constituting an interference with the war effort and have urged the Congress to vote against its passage. Chairman of the War Production Board Donald M. Nelson; Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox; Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins; Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission; Assistant Secretary of War McCloy; Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board; and the four public members of the War Labor Board in a letter to the Speaker of the House stated that—

> The committee bill proposes drastic and far-reaching changes in the over-all machinery and principles established by statute, Executive order, and mutual agreement, for dealing with labor relations in the war period. According to the committee report, these changes are imperative because of the emergency which may arise from the current dispute in the coal industry. But the bill in its terms is not limited to that industry and, therefore, must be appraised with respect to its impact upon the whole field of industrial production. While recognizing the gravity of the coal-mining situation, and without attempting to suggest here what specific steps should be taken in dealing with that situation, we note that since the Government has taken possession of the coal mines, only a few sections of the bill have any bearing upon that particular dispute. The bill relates to American industry generally and to the whole problem of maintaining industrial peace in time of war. It is accordingly felt that in evaluating the bill our judgment should not be obscured by the exception presented by the coal-mining situation to an otherwise unprecedented record of industrial peace since Pearl Harbor. Although a number of strikes have occurred since the declaration of war, they have, with very few exceptions, been unauthorized stoppages of short duration opposed by the responsible leadership of organized labor, and the total man-days lost have been less than at any other time in our industrial history.
>
> The bill contains numerous coercive provisions, including injunctions and criminal penalties. At the same time it impliedly recognizes the propriety of strikes after a 30-day notice and a secret ballot. In both these respects the bill runs squarely counter to the national policy embodied in the voluntary and unconditional no-strike agreement entered into by industry and labor with the President immediately after Pearl Harbor. This agreement, which represents the cornerstone of our wartime industrial-relations structure, has been supplemented in a number of industries by written agreements outlawing strikes and lock-outs for the period of the war. This nationally accepted arrangement, whereby strikes and lock-outs have been outlawed by voluntary action, has proven by experience so satisfactory that a change in the arrangement should be approached with greatest caution. It would seem unwise in time of war to experiment with an untried substitute for a policy whose worth is already demonstrated.

That expression of itself of responsible leaders should have sounded the death knell to this drastic legislation.

There is another reason that this bill should not be enacted into law—it is a labor bill, yet none of the responsible leaders of the great labor organizations were given an opportunity to testify upon the provisions of this bill. It is true that there were hearings held before the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives on H. R. 2239, H. R. 1742, H. R. 1728, and H. R. 992, bills relating to the full utilization of manpower, but there were no public hearings held by the committee on this proposal, S. 796, an act relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of national defense, which we are told in the committee report is in the nature of an amendment to section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 and that the legislation is extremely urgent and should be speedily enacted into law because of the present difficulty relating to the coal strike. The coal strike involves some 500,000 miners whereas this bill deals with the rights and privileges of more than 12,000,000 organized union workers. It is nothing more than an effort to use the coal strike as a vehicle to weaken and destroy our labor unions—as well as the rights and privileges that have been granted them and which the enemies of labor would like so much to see taken away.

You will note that the letter I have heretofore quoted specifically pointed out that "the bill contains numerous coercive provisions, including injunctions and criminal penalties." The bill also contains a provision that is a direct reflection on the integrity of responsible union leaders who voluntarily pledged at the beginning of the war not to strike until the enemies of America have been crushed into final defeat. Responsible leaders of labor have kept that pledge since the beginning of the war, and in giving up the right to strike the records disclose that only six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the workers have disregarded that agreement prior to the present coal controversy.

It is because they have kept the faith that America has produced war materials in such staggering quantities that the Chairman of the War Production Board, Donald Nelson, has stated that there is no further need of expanding the present war-production facilities of this country.

It, therefore, follows that the 12,000,000 members of organized labor in this country have done a magnificent job. They have done that job like true Americans, free and unhindered. This bill would deny them many of the rights and privileges they now enjoy and a coerced laboring class would not be satisfactory in this all-out war effort. I, therefore, urge that the bill be voted down. American labor is free and unshackled; let us keep it so.

Absenteeism—H. R. 2553

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARY T. NORTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, June 8, 1943, I intend to call up on the Unanimous Consent Calendar H. R. 2553, reported from the House Committee on Labor on May 4.

This bill was reported from the committee unanimously after hearings had been held for 3 weeks. During the hearings the following witnesses were heard: The Secretary of Labor, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, the Director of Industrial Personnel of the War Department, the Labor Production Chief of War Production Board; Mr. S. T. Ingram, of the Reynolds Aluminum Co.; Mr. Randall Irwin, Industrial Relations Director of Lockheed-Vega Aircraft Corporation; Mr. Lawrence B. Morris, vice president of Radio Corporation of America; Mr. Harold J. Gibson, president Aeronautical Industrial District Lodge 751, Seattle, Wash.; Mr. Leslie J. Bull, A. F. of L. representative of Western Cartridge Co., East Alton, Ill.; Mr. William Taylor, legislative representative U. A. W., C. I. O., Detroit; Mr. Henry J. Kaiser; Mr. J. E. Walters, vice president Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., Rome, N. Y.; Mr. Hubert Butts, representative of Aluminum Workers of America, A. F. of L.; Mr. John Green, president, Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America; Mr. C. E. Gill, director of industrial relations of Wanskuck Co., Providence, R. I.; Mr. Van A. Bittner, assistant to the president of United Steel Workers of America; Mr. John L. Farmer, representative of Smith Steel Workers, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mr. Felix Reisdorf, general secretary to the same organization; Mr. Russ Nixon, legislative representative of United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America; Mr. Conrad Cooper, assistant vice president, Wheeling Steel Corporation; Mrs. Eleanor Fowler, Women's Auxiliary, C. I. O.; and Mr. S. M. DeBrul, director of economic service, personnel staff, General Motors Corporation.

The hearings are printed and available in the document room.

There is represented, in this group of witnesses, a good cross section of the entire war-production program, not only from the industrial standpoint, but also from Government's side. The interesting fact resulting from the hearings is that all of the witnesses were absolutely agreed on the necessity for a study to be made of the subjects so that the causes can be determined and cures inaugurated.

Because of the wide labor markets for many years, absenteeism has not been a problem because of the number of replacements available in any given industry. For this reason, neither industry nor the unions kept statistics on the subject. It has now reached a point where there are not replacements available in many areas and absenteeism is an important problem.

The Labor Department has done a splendid job on the limited survey made in the shipbuilding and part of the aircraft industries with almost no funds at their disposal. For this reason, the committee has reported this bill, H. R. 2553, which directs the Department of Labor to make the necessary studies and to use funds which have been requested in a special message on the Budget sent up to the House by the President. We are completely convinced that this job would be done in the most efficient possible manner and that the Department of Labor is the agency to do it.

We sincerely hope that the House will adopt this bill so that the machinery for getting the facts may be set in motion immediately.

They're Going To Demand an Accounting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the News-Palladium, Benton Harbor, Mich., of June 5, comes the following editorial:

That open letter to John L. Lewis from a wounded American soldier in New Guinea, radioed from Australia and published in American newspapers, sounds a warning long ago voiced by civilian observers and all too long ignored by administration highups and the overlords of industry and labor.

"Those of us who do return will demand a strict accounting," states the New Guinea hero after recounting the depressing effect of work stoppages in America upon soldier morale.

And what an accounting those millions of fighting men will demand. They will want to know why America was not squarely and unitedly behind them as they faced formidable foes upon foreign lands, upon the seas and in the air.

They will demand to know why their lives were further jeopardized by greed-inspired interruptions in the production of the things they need to defend themselves and vanquish the enemy. Above all, they will want to know why we who stayed at home failed to preserve intact the America they have known and the America they are fighting for.

If these men who have borne the bloody brunt of this war could return tomorrow they would make short shrift of the matters over which American civilians are fighting each other instead of fighting the enemy. They might betimes halt the economic shambles into which we are drifting.

The sentiment of the lad in New Guinea is the sentiment of every American fighting man. Make no mistake about it, they will demand an accounting, and they will make themselves heard in no unmistakable terms in shaping the policies of America for years to come. They are doing their part; woe betide those factions among American civilians who fail to do theirs when they do return.

Not only will the returning men demand an accounting because there have been interruptions in production; they will also want to know why it is that production costs so much and, when they seek jobs, they will want to know why any organization should dare to ask why they, who have saved the Nation as well as the jobs, should be required to sign on the dotted line and pay the union organizer from $25 to $1,000 for the privilege of working in the land they have saved, under the Government their efforts have preserved.

Creation of an Army Pharmacy Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Cambria County (Pa.) Medical Society:

Whereas the pharmacy corps bills, S. 216 and H. R. 997, are now pending in Congress, providing for the creation of a pharmacy corps in the United States Army, to be organized under graduate pharmacists skilled and learned in the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines; and

Whereas in the treatment of disease and the care of the sick, or injured, the services of skilled, reliable, and experienced graduate pharmacists are essential and such services are second only to the services of skilled physicians and surgeons; and

Whereas it is the well-established public policy of the United States and of every State thereof, to require all persons engaged in the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines to be graduate pharmacists; and

Whereas the health, safety, and preservation of life of every member of the armed forces of the United States is of primary and paramount importance to the safety of the Nation; and

Whereas members of the armed forces of the United States and especially those who are overseas at various fighting fronts, are entitled to receive, and it is the policy and desire of the people of the United States to furnish to them, the best treatment and the most proficient services within the power and capacity of the people and especially the services of proficient and skilled graduate pharmacists to safeguard the health and lives of its fighting men; and

Whereas the compounding and dispensing of drugs and medicines is essentially a professional service requiring great skill and intimate knowledge and experience with drugs and medicines: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Cambria County Medical Society unanimously endorse the pharmacy corps bill (S. 216, H. H. 997) and request the Members of Congress to enact the same into law; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representative from Pennsylvania, and that the Senators and Representatives from Pennsylvania are hereby respectfully urged and requested to support the said pharmacy corps bill.

Adopted March 12, 1943.

PAUL MCCLOSKEY, M. D.,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Rubber and Freedom From Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 8, 1943:

RUBBER AND FREEDOM FROM WANT

Mr. Foust, of the Tribune staff, visited the synthetic rubber plant that has just been placed in operation at Baton Rouge, and was told by A. L. Freelander, president of the operating corporation, that out of present research in synthetic rubber there will come in time a puncture-proof tire that will last for the life of the automobile on which it is placed.

Mr. Freelander explained that synthetics, tailored to meet particular requirements, will serve mankind better than natural rubber, and as a result new uses for which natural rubber is not fitted will be found. This is just what was to be expected when American technology and skill in production were set to work to overcome the loss of the British and Dutch rubber plantations across the Pacific.

We are paying common and semiskilled labor at Baton Rouge from 62 cents to $1.22 an hour, as compared with 14 cents a day on the Hevea plantations. The workers of Baton Rouge are able to supply rubber at prices not greatly in excess of those charged for the production of the half-starved coolies on the plantations because our implements are towering stacks, and tanks, and high-pressure stills, instead of machetes and sap buckets. The advantage in the long run will favor the synthetic plants, as their technology is developed and production methods are improved, though it should be remembered that great advances are to be expected also in increasing the yield of the rubber trees.

As Mr. Foust noted, the complicated masses of machinery in the plant have no look of impermanency. The workmen and officials do not regard themselves as engaged in a temporary wartime job, yet he finds this aspect is being soft-pedaled for "diplomatic reasons." We have heard some of this before.

Mr. WALLACE is supposed to have hampered the synthetic rubber program at its outset by insistence that we avoid permanent competition with the rubber barons of the western Pacific. Just how Mr. WALLACE reconciles this attitude with his famed program of a quart of milk a day for everybody in the world it is hard to see. The rubber workers of the tropics aren't going to buy much milk on 14 cents a day unless it is furnished them gratis by the American dairymen.

It is likewise hard to see how Mr. WALLACE or the rest of the Washington internationalists can reconcile their championship of the rubber barons with the Atlantic Charter, because the whole basis of the natural rubber industry is the poverty of the native population. In those crowded tropical countries the best land has been preempted for the commercial plantations. The native population, as prolific as the jungle itself, has had to import its food and the resultant competition for employment has been so intense as to force wages down to the 14-cents-a-day level.

It is only by the use of half-starved, inefficient native labor that rubber growing can be a profitable enterprise. If freedom from want were ever bestowed on the Malayans and Javanese, in the form of income sufficient to give them even a minimum standard of living, no tariffs would be necessary to protect the American synthetic rubber industry. Malaya and Java would have to erect a tariff to keep American rubber out of their own ports.

The crux of our rubber question is whether we are to have American labor producing a superior article at decent wages or are to go back to enriching the plantation corporations of London and Amsterdam which make their profits out of exploiting half-starved populations. So far the great humanitarians of Washington have cast their influence on the side of the rubber barons.

Gasoline Rationing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Baltimore Evening Sun of June 5, 1943:

EQUALIZED GAS RATIONING URGED—D'ALESANDRO ASKS STANDARDIZED COUPON QUOTA FOR ENTIRE NATION

Congressman THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, of Maryland, today proposed that gasoline rationing be standardized throughout the entire United States to equalize the hardship and make the whole country sacrifice equitably.

The Third District Democrat presented his proposal at a meeting in Washington of the Congressmen from 12 Eastern States to consider the gasoline supply problem on the Atlantic seaboard and discuss possible relief measures.

NOT AT MEETING

Mr. D'ALESANDRO was unable to attend the meeting but made his contribution to the discussion by letter. His letter said:

"Surveys made indicate that the current shortage of gasoline in the Eastern States threatens to disrupt our deliveries of food, transportation of war workers to their places of employment and the delivery of finished war materials to the railroads and steamship piers for transportation to our troops abroad.

EQUAL SACRIFICE

"I believe that one method of relieving this shortage would be to place the Middle West and Western States on the same rationing basis as the Eastern States to equalize the hardship and make the whole country sacrifice equally. Many of the tank cars and trucks now being used to take gasoline to those States could be used to bring it to the Eastern States, relieving the acute shortage here.

"I would also like to go on record as being in favor of the recommendation advanced by the American Automobile Association that a fact-finding committee be appointed to do for gasoline what Bernard M. Baruch's survey committee did for rubber."

MOTOR REPRESENTATIVES

The meeting of the Eastern States legislators, called by Representative FRED HARTLEY (Republican, New Jersey), was held in the Old House Office Building. Those attending, besides the Congressmen, were various representatives of the transportation field.

Invitations to the session stated that "recent changes in the Office of Price Administration gas-rationing regulations for the Eastern Seaboard States have raised considerable doubt that the gasoline-rationing program is being administered efficiently and equitably," and commented that the present regulations are working a hardship on the transportation business.

STAKE EQUAL

Congressman D'ALESANDRO remarked that the gas-ration coupons now are worth 4 gallons in the West and Midwest and only 2½ gallons in the East. He said that, since the object of the rationing program is to win the war, all sections of the country have an equal stake in the issue and must make equal contributions.

"So the only thing for an eastern Congressman to do," he said, "is to advocate a standardization of the rationing program."

The American Automobile Association's recommendation for a fact-finding committee in the petroleum field is being supported by the Automobile Club of Maryland. Mr. Baruch has been proposed by the association to head the committee, which would have a twofold job—to determine the facts of the situation and present them to the public and to formulate a hard and fast conservation program.

National Youth Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Democrat:

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

The National Youth Administration will be abolished after June 30, if the recommendation of the Congressional Committee on Unnecessary Expenditures is accepted. The committee proposes that its personnel be transferred to essential war work. That

would save $59,304,000 sought by National Youth Administration supporters for the coming fiscal year.

There may have been, doubtless was, a time when the National Youth Administration played an important part in the war effort. It has undeniable virtues which should not be forgotten when peace comes.

But the evidence has been piling up that it has outgrown its usefulness, and if not that, is duplicating the work of other agencies which could use the money given to National Youth Administration more economically.

The Byrd committee says the National Youth Administration, in its "industrial training program," duplicates or overlaps programs of six other governmental agencies and emphasizes that these competitors in most cases are serving far more efficiently and economically.

The National Youth Administration has persistently advertised for clients to increase its ranks to a point that would justify its existence. And it has been pointed out that to train the 53,000 youths on its pay rolls, it has had 11,806 paid administrators, only 4,771 engaged in actual shop supervision.

Not only does that make the cost far above the $1,000 per enrollee but most of those being trained are within or on the verge of the draft age.

The Byrd committee's figures are taken from the records so we see no reason why the Aubrey Williams regime shouldn't be classified among those things we can do without while we're fighting a war.

Organization of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL A. HATCH

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] over the National Broadcasting Co. network on Saturday, June 5, 1943, from Washington, D. C. This address constituted the opening address of a series of broadcasts which will be sponsored this summer by the National Broadcasting Co. and given under the auspices of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDERWRITING VICTORY

I am proud to open the program of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. Because of the rapid movement of events, the peoples of the United Nations are giving thought to the world they wish to build after the war before the Axis Nations have surrendered unconditionally, which is the only way we will permit the war to end. The National Broadcasting Co. and the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, in presenting various phases of the problem of building a world of security and justice, are performing a distinct public service, for the people themselves must decide these questions.

The tragic history of the last 25 years taught us that it is no good winning a war unless, as our President has said, "that war stays won." At the end of the first World War we failed to understand this fact, and as a result we are at war again. This is no longer theory. The history of the last 25 years is one long testament to the inadequacy of our victory in the first World War. How shall we avoid a repetition of our mistakes? How shall we underwrite and preserve the greater victory in this greater war which we must and shall win?

Today our brave men are fighting and dying in all parts of the earth. How can we best see to it that others like them shall not be called upon to fight and die in another war in another quarter century? Only if we do our best to plan to prevent that war shall we really keep faith with all those by whose sacrifices we shall win the war. For lasting peace will never come by fiat. It must be planned and made to work.

World wars do not just happen by accident. They grow out of causes; they result from the things men do and from the things men leave undone. In our own time the pages of history provide us with a record of the forces which make for war and of the forces which make for peace—a record which, if studied and understood, can guide our quest for the means and the methods which can make our victory lasting.

Now, as to those means and methods. In the first place, we now know that we cannot live in peace if we live in a world of anarchy, a world in which there is no means to keep the peace. As the first report of our Commission stated:

"Peace under modern conditions cannot be a static condition of life achieved by the renunciation of war, nor a mere pious desire to live at peace. Peace must be a dynamic and continuous process for the achievement of freedom, justice, progress, and security on a world-wide scale."

It was said at the end of the last war that if we joined the League of Nations we should be involved in "foreign wars" and therefore we should not accept any commitments to uphold international order. But we realize now that so long as the war system dominates the affairs of men and nations, those nations which are trained to think in militaristic terms will invoke war as the instrument of their policy against free and peaceful peoples. There is no difference of opinion on this point anywhere in our land. The only difference in opinion is how to meet this danger. It cannot be met, as all of us can see from the unlimited cost and scale of modern armaments, by each nation fighting or preparing to fight in its own defense; nor, on the other hand, can it be met by creating a superstate which would destroy the individuality of nations. The conclusion is inescapable that it can only be met through cooperation of nations for their common defense against aggression, and that by pooling but a fraction of the forces they would need for individual preparedness they can maintain peace. A will to do this is all that is lacking. The United Nations have the force. They are now acting jointly in war. Why should they not act jointly in peace?

The prevention of war, rather than its cure, must be the ultimate solution of this difficult problem. This may seem to some of us like an utterly unreal dream, but I do not think it is. There is at least no reason why we should not plan and strive to make this the last of wars among the civilized peoples of the world. Nothing is lost even if we fail.

Two lines of action lie before us. First, we must reduce the risk of war by disarming the bandit nations and then—but not until then—reduce the armaments of the whole world to the lowest level consistent with the maintenance of domestic tranquillity. Then we must agree that the employment of force in international matters be never permitted to any nation which refuses to accept pacific means of settlement of disputes, in court or arbitration, conference or diplomacy.

But this means that to get rid of war we must enthrone justice in the place of force, and a decent regard for human rights in place of violence. So we must understand that any plan to keep order in our world, and to prevent another war such as we are undergoing, must include a court system which can deal with the disputes of nations. For those disputes are not going to end, but to continue. They will be adjusted by one of two means: The means of peaceful decision, or the means of violence.

Then, too, if our world is to know any lasting peace there must be for its peoples a reasonable hope of a tolerable life. Not all parts of the world may know such fortunate conditions and glorious opportunities as we can hope for, but hopeless despair and unrelieved misery on the part of many of the world's millions will mean a resort to war. It is useless to say that we are not concerned with the condition of the peoples. Our first consideration should be for the condition of our own people. That goes without saying. Justice and peace, like charity, must begin at home. But our welfare can be increased in proportion as other people are able to buy our goods under fair conditions of trade and in proportion as they make the goods they sell to us under decent standards of livelihood. The more they can buy the more we can sell. Poverty anywhere helps no one.

There is a moral as well as an economic reason why we cannot be indifferent to injustice and suffering. It tests the fiber of our conscience and the strength of that precious heritage of kindliness which is the outstanding quality of America. In this we shall not fail. We shall help to fight starvation and disease, whether it be in gallant China or in suffering Europe. Helping China to help herself to a better life when Japan is crushed will be one of our greatest opportunities. Not only will it be an opportunity, it will be one of the best bases for our lasting prosperity. The emergence of China from economic misery will cause growing demands for our agricultural surpluses and growing markets for our industries. Four hundred million customers who are able to buy should be a concern of every businessman.

We must realize that in addition to helping to keep order and to promote opportunity, we must be concerned for liberty all over the world. We should not try to dictate the form of governments under which others should live, but we should know by now that when any powerful nation crushes all freedom and teaches its youth perverted cults of hate and blood and evil, the peace of our world is insecure. There will need to be some means by which the nations can be restrained from doing this and restrained before rather than after such dangerous creeds are acted upon. Liberty is like love—the more you give, the more you receive.

If all this is to be done there must be developed a sense of world community and a growing sense of world citizenship. And to this our own national experience can contribute greatly. In our own federal system there is much that can help us, for an important suggestion as to the place of the individual in a world society can be found in our Constitution. According to that great document, we are citizens both of our Nation and of the State in which we reside. It took us some time to come to that concept. At first it was fought bitterly by those who thought only in terms of their own States. It will take us long to come to a fully recognized concept of citizenship in our own Nation and in the world. But that is the way we must move, that is the direction we must take, if we are to enjoy a lasting peace.

Our own Nation cannot build a world of order and opportunity and freedom, alone.

But it alone of all nations can give leadership to that great endeavor. Not only because of our strength, not only because of our wealth, but because we have in our own heritage the tradition for the organization of a great peaceful, freedom-loving community. The federal idea is capable of great enlargement.

Our world today is a smaller community than were our Thirteen Original States. It can be encompassed in 4 days' travel. It can be instantly informed of the news and views of all peoples. It will know peace and opportunity and freedom as a whole, or no part of it will long be secure or prosperous or assuredly free.

Aristotle taught that no state should be larger than the ability of its people to know on one border that they were being attacked on another. News of attack in one part of the earth can now be told to the whole world sooner than such news could be told throughout the small Greek city state. Thus war and peace are of world-wide concern even under Aristotle's concepts.

Once we realize this the planning of a lasting peace will not be hard, for the way of peace is in the world today even though men are not treading the path of peace.

Feeding the War Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. WARREN BARBOUR

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Eugene Casey, Special Assistant to the Chief Executive, before the Kiwanis Club of New York City on May 4. The subject of this address is Feeding the War Workers.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Food to maintain the war workers' health, energy, and will to work is as important to victory as food for our armed forces and allies. Our food-rationing program recognizes this. It permits the allocation of food to all war plants providing in-plant feeding. All food eaten in the plant cafeteria or the nearby restaurant is, in effect, supplementing the worker's ration allowance. No ration stamps are submitted by the worker for this food. Every possible effort is being made by the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration to assure adequate food supplies and equipment for in-plant food service. Unfortunately, more than 60 percent of our war plants employing 250 or more workers do not now have in-plant feeding facilities.

It is an important responsibility of management today to provide some type of factory feeding service. There are four types that can be used: Cafeterias, lunch counters, mobile or stationary canteen units, or lunch-box services.

Great Britain has found in-plant feeding so important in keeping the worker on the job and maintaining efficiency to meet production goals that all factories with 250 or more employees can be required to have some type of factory feeding. More than 96 percent of the British factories with 250 or more employees and 7,500 smaller factories now have canteen service. Where it has been impossible to provide canteens, units of British restaurants have been developed in suitable places for groups of smaller factories. By this program, workers secure food in addition to their rations.

Even prior to food rationing in this country, war conditions were increasing the dependence of employees upon in-plant feeding. Employment of women, shortage of housing, inadequate restaurant facilities, and transportation problems make in-plant feeding more essential for the maintenance of production, the reduction of absenteeism, and the conservation of manpower and food. With food rationed, in-plant feeding becomes even more desirable.

Your Government recognized this growing need for the extension of in-plant feeding and the need for nutrition education to help workers and their families make the best use of available foods. It established a Nutrition in Industry Division which is now in the War Food Administration. This Division offers, without cost to management, free technical advisory service on food problems. This service is available upon request to plants of all sizes where new feeding facilities are to be installed or existing services are to be extended. Requests for the service may be sent to Dr. Robert S. Goodhart, Chief, Nutrition in Industry Division, War Food Administration, Washington, or to any one of the Food Distribution Administration regional offices. Industrial nutrition regional representatives will make an on-the-ground survey of the factory feeding problems and recommend practical solutions. In this region the industrial nutrition representative is Dr. H. F. Kilander, 150 Broadway, New York. The surveys and recommendations are confidential unless permission for their publication is granted by management.

In plants where workers travel a considerable distance to their work, it has been recommended that the food service in the plant provide breakfast as well as lunch for workers on all shifts. When breakfast is omitted, production begins at a low point the first hour in the morning. There is a sharp decline in efficiency during the forenoon. A much higher level of productivity is attained immediately after lunch, but again a sharp decline occurs during the afternoon. When breakfast is included in the day's meals, the chief improvement in production is during the morning hours.

When midmorning and midafternoon feedings of nutritious food, such as orange or grapefruit juice or tomato juice, or milk and sandwiches is taken in addition to the regular meals, production reaches a higher and more uniform rate throughout the day, according to scientific experiments.

Cafeterias are not always the practical solution. Sometimes the industrial nutrition representative has recommended the installation of simple lunch counters, or mobile units that can be serviced from a central kitchen and taken into all departments.

In all cases the recommendations have called for simplification of menus to speed up service, to provide adequate balanced meals with resulting savings in labor, food, and absenteeism due to illness or fatigue. A lunch should be more than a snack. It should provide at least one-third the daily food requirements of basic foods. A cold lunch may be as nutritious as a hot lunch, if the right choice of foods is made.

If hot lunches are served, a choice of two lunch specials is recommended. A lunch special might include: fish or poultry, meat, eggs, beans, or cheese; a potato, and a yellow or green vegetable, a raw vegetable salad, fruit or milk dessert, and choice of beverage including milk.

The lunch special, called a Victory lunch, in an Evansville, Ind., plant became so popular that it was selected by 85 percent of the employees. It is significant that absenteeism was cut 19 percent in the first 4 months after the Victory-lunch program was adopted.

Ways in which the workers may be encouraged to choose the lunch special, or make better choice of available foods and alternates offered to replace food shortages, are part of the nutrition in industry advisory service to war plants. Suggested menus for hot or cold lunches, articles for plant publications and bulletin boards, posters, and other materials may be secured by writing the Nutrition in Industry Division, Washington. I have here a manual of industrial nutrition which is just off the press which I think you will all be interested in securing.

It may be that an in-plant food service will be some expense to management. Where adequate food service is now provided, management seems to feel any expense is as justified for a good food service as it is for any other safety and health program. The National Association of Manufacturers medical and health consultant, Dr. Victor Heiser, and the United States Public Health Service Industrial Hygiene Division urge the provision of in-plant feeding wherever possible.

Some plants provide a food service under plant management. Others engage a concessionaire. Whichever plan is adopted, it is to the advantage of the employer and the workers to have the plant provide a dietitian. The dietitian can more than save her salary in guiding the food planning, buying, preparation, and service to reduce labor and food waste and improve the health and morale of the workers.

There is an increasing recognition on the part of management that in-plant food service is necessary, but action in installing the service is still lagging behind the need.

Arthur C. Dorrance, president, Campbell Soup Co., Camden, N. J., where food service is provided for workers, says, "Well-fed workers on the production front are as vital to victory as well-fed soldiers on the fighting front. Nutritious meals served in attractive surroundings build morale, promote efficiency, and reduce absenteeism."

C. S. Swayze, assistant general manager, Eastern Aircraft, Linden, N. J., division of General Motors, says, "With the fast tempo and added pressure of war work, the working man and woman in the plant today deserves and must have proper food. Plant cafeterias should pay special attention to supply good, wholesome, nutritious food in the meals they serve their employees."

Through the progress made in nutrition science since the last war, we now know our basic food needs and the foods that provide the best food values. A popular chart of these foods, called the basic seven includes the food groups we should include in our meals every day. The basic seven are Group 1, green and yellow vegetables; group 2, oranges, tomatoes, grapefruit, or raw cabbage or salad greens; group 3, potatoes and other vegetables and fruits; group 4, milk and milk products; group 5, meat, poultry, fish, or eggs, or dried beans, peas, nuts or peanut butter; group 6, bread, flour, and cereals, natural whole grain or enriched or restored; group 7, butter and fortified margarine.

Many of us do not recognize the difference between what the basic food requirements are to maintain health, and what we think is necessary because of the food habits we established in peacetime.

For instance, as workers' earnings increased, their meat eating increased. Reports show that many were eating as much as 7 to 9 pounds of meat a week, when they could get all they wanted. The civilian consumption of meat in 1941 exceeded by 15

pounds per person the average consumed in 1935–39 period. Yet nutrition scientists and medical authorities say that even the biggest man doing the hardest work will not suffer by eating as little as 1½ pounds of meat a week, if he eats sufficient amounts of other strength- and health-building foods in the basic seven each day. No more than one-third of the daily protein requirements need be supplied by animal protein. This can be satisfactorily secured from poultry, fish, milk, and eggs. The balance of the protein needs can be supplied readily from vegetable sources such as whole grain or restored cereals, bread, peas, dried beans, lentils, soybeans, peanuts, and nuts.

Nutrition science has also made it possible for us to know that such unrationed foods as enriched and whole grain bread and whole grain and fortified cereals are useful scources of the "morale" vitmain B_1. Without sufficient amounts of foods providing this vitamin, in a few weeks workers become irritable and tired. Thus, nutrition science has shown that food can play an important part in employer-employee relations and in production, as well as in health protection.

When the President called the nutrition conference just 2 years ago this month, the national nutrition program was launched which has helped to make all Americans more aware of their personal responsibility in eating right to keep fit. The continued loyal cooperation and activities of thousands of volunteers serving on the 48 State committees and their subcommittees on industrial nutrition, and the more than 2,600 county committees and community committees, and the millions of dollars in advertising that has been contributed by industry, press, and radio, are valuable aids to the nutrition program and the conservation of manpower and food.

Never before has our country faced the problem of utilizing so great an amount of its food resources to wage a world war. It means new problems for government, for employers, and for employees. Only by cooperating in meeting these problems can we make the adjustments that are necessary to win the war.

Food is a weapon of war as vital as guns. By sharing our food with our armed forces and peoples in countries where loyalty to the United Nations is necessary to victory, each of us has a part in winning the war. It may mean pulling in our belts. That may mean a longer and healthier life for those who are overweight. It need not mean sacrificing health, strength, or the will to work and win, while workers, employers, and government, cooperate on the home front.

The Roll-Back on Butter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in order to obtain the facts in regard to food prices, I wish to call your attention to the information in the following tables. Table I is from the United States Department of Labor and table II is from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

TABLE I.—*Percent change in food prices*

Commodity group	Mar. 16 to Apr. 20, 1943	Sept. 15, 1942, to Apr. 20, 1943	May 12, 1942, to Apr. 20, 1943	Apr. 14, 1942, to Apr. 20, 1943	Jan. 14, 1941, to Apr. 20, 1943	Aug. 15, 1939, to Apr. 20, 1943
All foods	+2.3	+11.1	+15.6	+17.6	+43.8	+50.4
Cereals and bakery products	+.4	+1.9	+2.1	+2.2	+13.2	+15.0
Meats	+.5	+5.7	+11.0	+13.6	+36.5	+44.2
Beef and veal	+.7	+3.6	+5.2	+8.2	+19.3	+31.0
Pork	−.3	+1.6	+2.3	+4.6	+46.5	+43.2
Lamb	+.9	+3.7	+17.3	+28.4	+40.5	+40.4
Chickens	+1.0	+9.5	+29.1	+30.5	+50.6	+54.8
Fish, fresh and canned	+1.4	+22.9	+37.0	+31.7	+74.1	+107.5
Dairy products	+.1	+7.4	+11.2	+12.1	+30.4	+47.3
Eggs	−.8	−9.0	+22.4	+27.0	+45.1	+55.8
Fruits and vegetables	+8.8	+38.3	+39.4	+42.8	+92.3	+94.2
Fresh	+10.5	+46.7	+47.0	+51.4	+104.5	+105.9
Canned	+.5	+6.9	+7.9	+8.5	+44.9	+44.5
Dried	+.4	+10.0	+20.2	+20.8	+58.3	+74.6
Beverages	0	+.9	+.2	+1.9	+37.4	+31.6
Fats and oils	+.2	+4.9	+3.4	+5.6	+57.7	+49.8
Sugar and sweets	+.4	+1.1	+1.0	+.2	+34.7	+34.3

[1] The number of cities included in the index was changed from 51 to 56 in March 1943, with the necessary adjustments for maintaining comparability. At the same time the number of foods in the index was increased from 54 to 61.
[2] Preliminary.

TABLE II.—*Average prices received by farmers for specified farm products, Aug. 15, 1939, and their percentage of parity price*

Commodity	Unit	Average price, Aug. 15, 1939	Percentage average price is of parity price
Wheat	Bushel	54.5 cents	49
Corn	Bushel	45.7 cents	57
Oats	Bushel	25.4 cents	51
Barley	Bushel	34.5 cents	45
Rye	Bushel	34.2 cents	38
Buckwheat	Bushel	54.8 cents	60
Flaxseed	Bushel	$1.35	64
Rice (rough)	Bushel	57.9 cents	57
Cotton	Pound	8.70 cents	56
Cottonseed	Ton	$16.24	58
Potatoes	Bushel	69.0 cents	[1] 81
Sweetpotatoes	Bushel	90.7 cents	83
Peanuts	Pound	3.39 cents	56
Apples	Bushel	66.0 cents	55
Butterfat	Pound	22.4 cents	[2] 73
Chickens (live)	Pound	13.0 cents	92
Eggs	Dozen	17.5 cents	[2] 75
Hogs	100 pounds	$5.47	61
Beef cattle	100 pounds	$6.50	100
Veal calves	100 pounds	$8.13	96
Lambs	100 pounds	$6.94	95
Hay	Ton	$6.77	46
Wool	Pound	22.0 cents	96

[1] Base prices are averages for the crop years, 1919–28. Taxes and interest not considered in determination of parity prices of commodities when using post-war base.
[2] Adjusted for seasonal variation.

Source: Midmonth price report, Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Aug. 29, 1939.

Mr. Speaker, let us try to analyze the information furnished by these official tables. First, you will note that from August 15, 1939, to April 20, 1943, there has been an increase in the cost of living from 15 percent in cereals and bakery products to 105.9 percent in fresh fruits and vegetables.

There is one most important fact which must be considered in the appraisal of this food situation, and that is, that by August 15, 1939, after 6 years of the more abundant life, the domestic and foreign agricultural policy of the present administration had bogged down. The farm prices on August 15, 1939, as you will note, ranged from 38 percent of parity up to 100 percent for beef cattle, the only food product which was at parity. The 1939 prices were just as disastrous as the 1932 farm prices as far as the producer was concerned except that his agony would be prolonged a little longer if he tried to continue on the 1939 prices.

There is not much fairness in using August 15, 1939, prices as the basis from which to show the increase in the cost of living. More farms were foreclosed on in Wisconsin in 1939 than ever before in the history of the Federal land bank.

The fact that the O. P. A., the Office of War Mobilization, certain metropolitan newspaper editorials, and radio commentators have intentionally, or unintentionally, neglected to mention that 1939 farm prices were more than subnormal when talking about inflation, does not alter the other fact that the prevailing low prices of 1939 must, in fairness, be taken into consideration. Mr. I. Lubin, who is supposed to be the leading economist of the New Deal, in his testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee on the Price Control Act, indicated the same approach. He showed how prices and the cost of living had advanced since 1939 but he did not bother to mention that cotton was only 8.4 cents per pound, or less than half of parity or of the cost of production. He did not mention the fact that thousands of farm families were living on less than a $500 annual income during 1939. He did not mention that farm labor, in many States, was receiving less than $1 per day, without board, in 1939.

I wish to make note at this point that not one of these Federal agencies, the O. P. A., the W. M. C., or the W. L. B., or any of the super economists on the Federal pay roll made any public statement as to the effect the increase in salary to bureaucrats would have on inflation. It appears that we are to believe that $600,000,000 or $700,000,000 to a group of one and one-half million people is not supposed to have any effect on inflation but whenever any additional income is provided for the people receiving 30 cents to 40 cents per hour is suggested—whether on farm or in factory—the "hold the line" and inflationary tendencies immediately project themselves into the picture.

Every person realizes that people with fixed incomes, those obtaining pensions, railroad retirement recipients, and

other low-income groups are caught in the squeeze when food prices advance. Everyone knows that people receiving even up to $50 per week spend a large percentage of their weekly wages or salaries for food but they also know that food costs are a small part of the incomes of the people in the higher income brackets. We can protect our low-income groups as far as food is concerned without paying a part of the grocery bill of people who receive more per hour than the food producer receives per day. The increase in the amounts allocated to these groups would be a much fairer, cheaper, and effective method of approaching the problem.

Now, let us take another look at table I. You will note that the price of dairy products increased 47.3 percent from August 15, 1939, to April 15, 1943. You will also note in table 2 that butterfat on August 15, 1943, was only 73 percent of parity. On May 15, 1943, butterfat was 112 percent of parity but remember farm labor, which in April 1943 was 2.39 times the base period of 1910–14, is not included in figuring this parity. Who is there that will say the butter farmer is profiteering?

The question arises, from looking at the above table, Why select butter for the roll-back? Why not take fresh fruits and vegetables for the backward ride since they show a 105.9-percent advance in price while all dairy products show only a 47.3-percent rise during the same time? Canned vegetables show a 44.5-percent increase but in 1939 many canned vegetables were not bringing over half the cost of production. I shall not mention fish because it is not strictly a farm product. Our distinguished colleague of New Jersey, the Honorable JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, has so clearly called to our attention previously that the shortage of this product is due not only to a shortage of manpower but also to the result of turning these fishing boats over to the Coast Guard to protect our shores.

If there is any Member in favor of rolling back the price of butter at this time, I would like to have him answer the following questions:

First. If the butter price was fixed by Secretary Wickard at 46 cents per pound, Chicago, in order to stimulate milk production to obtain milk solids in the form of powdered skim milk, do you think the roll-back of 10 percent can be put into effect without causing harm to the war-food program?

Second. Did you know that this roll-back will freeze the butter farmer at less than 40 cents per hour for his labor? Is not 40 cents an hour the minimum hourly rate prevailing under Wage and Hour Administration? Did you know that no butter producer can pay anywhere near 40 cents per hour and produce butter for 46 cents per pound at Chicago?

Third. Did you know that cheese production is 24 percent below 1942 production for the same period? Did you know that butter production is below the 1942 production? Did you know that wheat production estimate for 1943 is far below the 1942 production? Do you know that only 50,000 cheese farmers are producing one-half the Nation's cheese that is needed for the armed forces, lease-lend, domestic consumption, and foreign uses? Do you realize that only 13,500,000 cases of peas were produced in 1942 and that present estimates are far below this total?

There are many individuals and many groups who are not familiar with food production. We should not let any of these groups or any individuals interfere with the 1943 war-food program.

The American producer should not be held accountable for the big spread between the producer and the consumer as a result of black markets. The producer, before the war, received less than 40 percent of the consumer's dollar and this percentage has been becoming gradually lower.

If farm crops and food products were handled through the normal channels of trade, the American consumer would receive his food much cheaper than will be provided by any roll-back that is liable to be put into operation. If milk solid production in the form of powdered skim milk is as important as we have been told, someone should be exercising a little more judgment and not advocate a program that will jeopardize the whole dairy war-food program.

According to reliable sources, it appears that Mr. Harry Hopkins is the guiding influence in these domestic programs. His copartners are Judge Rosenman, Ben Cohan, and Justice Frankfurter. With this kind of leadership, where not a one of them have any practical experience or training in food production, it is not now surprising, nor will it be surprising in the future, to see proposals unfolded that may show more of political approach than a practical approach to the war-food program. There can be a food shortage even in the United States under the wrong leadership.

Prentiss Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News:

A BROWN STUDY

In one of his Washington dispatches, Mr. Paul Leach says that Office of Price Administration Boss Prentiss Brown is going to stick it out despite the storm he has to ride. As this newspaper took no part in the yipping and howling that retired Leon Henderson to private life, we are naturally not going to worry whether Former Senator Brown stands pat, ducks it, or is thrown to the wolves. It isn't going to make any great difference who is running the Office of Price Administration, as we said when we ventured the assertion that if anybody could do such a job, Leon Henderson was probably as good a man as could be found. And he was about as good a scapegoat as could be found when the thing just didn't work.

We suspect that the big technical difficulty of the Office of Price Administration is mathematical. Trying to supervise from 20,000,000 to 40,000,000 retail transactions a day, between all kinds of folks in all kinds of communities, presents a problem close to the limits of human brain power, if not beyond it. In World War No. 1, no such difficulties were encountered because price controlling was centered upon points of production or wholesale distribution. That reduced the number of transactions regulated to a fraction of the number that the Office of Price Administration attempts to police.

In World War No. 1 scarcities were themselves scarce. Such shortages as arose were nearly all sporadic, temporary, and localized. Production was promoted, not discouraged. The Office of Price Administration can boast no such results.

It must be admitted that prices rose in World War No. 1. A large part of the price inflation came after the war ended, as was the case abroad. The staggering increases of Government debt and of the volume of money had the classic effect upon prices that economists of that day hardly disputed would be encountered. Has Office of Price Administration shown to date any capacity to hold prices down? Who can answer that with assurance?

Mr. Leach tells us that Brown and his staff "cannot for the life of them see how prices can be fixed at wholesale levels without legalizing black markets at every retail store."

The phrase "black market" was not even heard in World War No. 1. We never even heard much of "bootlegging" until the eighteenth amendment brought control by criminal law to one branch of trade. In World War No. 1, normal competition between retail merchants was allowed to exert its normal influence upon prices below the controlled wholesale levels. That appears to have been enough to dispose of the "black market" peril. The man who sold cheaper was the magnet that attracted customers.

Do the doubts of former Senator Brown and his associates in Office of Price Administration stem from that oblivion into which the very idea of free competition by free enterprisers has been engulfed under the New Deal? Or do these doubts reveal in Freudian fashion that the real "libido" of Office of Price Administration is not so much control of price inflation as control of business and of businessmen, little business as well as big business, little businessmen as well as big businessmen?

Powers of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES L. McNARY

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in recent months Col. Robert R. McCormick has delivered a series of lectures on the Federal Constitution. At the request of the able junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who is absent on official business, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a timely address on the Powers of Congress delivered by Colonel McCormick.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is the second of a series of lectures on the Constitution of the United States. I have come to the article dealing with the powers conferred upon Congress.

Section VIII of article I, follows:

"1. The Congress shall have power:

"To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

"2. To borrow money on the credit of the United States.

"3. To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

This paragraph not only gives Congress the power to pass all tariff laws, but clearly indicates that it is the duty of Congress to fix the policy of the Government as to international trade. It then becomes the duty of the Executive to carry out the desires of Congress in treaties to be negotiated with the advice and consent of the Senate.

It is not the prerogative of the Executive to originate the policies.

"4. To establish a uniform rule of naturalization and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States.

"5. To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.

"6. To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States.

"7. To establish post offices and post roads."

Under this paragraph Congress may lay out a system of world-wide airways and direct the State Department to arrange for them by treaties with foreign powers.

"8. To promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive rights to their respective writings and discoveries.

"9. To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court.

"10. To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations."

I will refer to this momentous paragraph at the close of this lecture.

"11. To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water."

In the British monarchy the power to declare war rested with the crown. The eleventh paragraph puts this responsibility upon Congress.

"12. To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

"13. To provide and maintain a navy.

"14. To make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

"15. To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions.

"16. To provide for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress."

The foregoing paragraph stemmed from the experience in the English as well as the American revolutions.

The experience of the Revolutionary War showed that armies were necessary. That experience and English precedent, as well as the universal experience on the continent of Europe, also showed that they were extremely dangerous. Almost every government in Europe had fallen before them.

All the Stuart kings after James I had used the army to enslave the people.

Cromwell had kept England and Scotland in subjection for 9 years by the use of a regular army. Under it Ireland's Gethsemane lasted for centuries. The Colonies had been insulted, quartered upon, and invaded by the armies of what was then their supergovernment.

To prevent such calamities from recurring, therefore, it was provided that no appropriation of money to support armies should be for a longer term than 2 years. As no such danger was anticipated from the Navy, no limit was placed upon the time for which money could be appropriated for this use.

Under present conditions there could be danger from a naval air force.

Further, to keep the armed forces from getting out of hand, it was provided that Congress should make the rules to govern them.

The Convention wished to place its chief reliance for the defense of the Nation and for the freedom of its citizens upon the militia, meaning all male citizens capable of bearing arms. But Congress has neglected to carry out the provisions for the training of the militia, and in consequence we have no trained militia. All of our armed men are in the Army or Navy.

"18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

Under this paragraph Congress has power to implement its powers in paragraphs 3 and 10, those dealing with Congress' control of foreign affairs.

Today the most interesting and most important of congressional powers is that contained in the tenth paragraph: "Congress shall have the power to define and punish felonies committed on the high seas."

If Congress had declared the sinking of ships without warning to be piracy, Mr. Wilson would not have had to indulge in his lengthy correspondence with Germany before the last war. If Congress should declare the sinking of hospital ships to be piracy, it will facilitate the execution of the perpetrators of such fiendish deeds.

Now consider this:

"Congress shall have power to define and punish * * * offenses against the law of nations."

Take in the meaning of those words. Congress shall have power to define and punish offenses against the law of nations." The people especially interested in controlling events after this war is over can find their implementation in this paragraph, the full significance of which seems to have been completely ignored.

If Congress will catalog what it considers offenses against the law of nations, and a sufficient number of other countries adopt these principles, the framework of a post-war world will have been firmly established, and that within the framework of our Constitution.

If Congress will use this power, it will give us the initiative in establishng what our civilization thinks is just and right and not, as 25 years ago, confront the Senate with a treaty drawn by foreigners in which it would be faced with the choice of rejecting much that it thought good or of accepting just as much that it knew to be evil.

Such acts could provide that no nation shall impose its authority by force on any other nation. No nation shall attack another nation without a declaration of war. No nation shall set minimum prices for articles in which it holds a monopoly. These suggestions are sufficient for illustration.

It has been held that Congress may not delegate these powers to the President. Obviously, therefore, it cannot delegate them to anyone else, certainly to no foreigner or organization of foreigners.

Under the Constitution the Government of the United States cannot be given away.

Aftermath of the Bermuda Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in the June 3, 1943, issue of the Sentinel there is a most interesting article captioned "Whose heads are we hitting?—The Bermuda conference aftermath provokes a query." The article is written by Barnet Hodes, corporation counsel of the city of Chicago, cochairman, Patriotic Foundation of Chicago. This interesting article tells of the work and the splendid accomplishments of the Bermuda conference. We recall that our colleague the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] was a member of the American delegation to that conference. I ask that the article dealing with the splendid work of the conference be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHOSE HEADS ARE WE HITTING?—THE BERMUDA CONFERENCE AFTERMATH PROVOKES A QUERY

(By Barnet Hodes)

It was Lord Byron, I believe, who once suggested the tactical advantage of not stopping, when attacked, to distinguish friend from foe but to whack every head in sight.

This picturesque advice, although possessing the undoubted virtue of producing instant action, is not without its drawbacks. Witness the classic example of the wrestler named Joe, who in the midst of an indistinguishable tangle of arms, legs, and torsoes, found himself at a complete impasse. "Bite 'im, Joe!" yelled his trainer. Whereupon Joe closed his teeth on the nearest piece of flesh, only to discover that it was his own.

Pardon the irreverent allusion, but may I point out with all earnestness that by attacking the Bermuda conference before waiting to find out what the Bermuda conference either accomplished or failed to accomplish the overzealous Committee for a Jewish Army of Palestinian and Stateless Jews, has been whacking the heads of its best friends with a Byronian frenzy and—to mix my metaphor completely—biting its own skin.

To make matters worse, certain more responsible Jewish spokesmen—individually and in groups—are wielding verbal clubs with equal lack of discrimination.

From such apothegms as "hollow mockery" to charges of "betrayal," "conniving with the slaughter of millions," and dealing the Jews a "severer blow than the accumulated force of all the Nazi atrocities," the blows rain down. Personally, I see no purpose whatsoever in leveling and continuing to level these blows at our friends.

So far it appears that military necessity has sealed the lips of the delegates and governments to utterances beyond the communiques and the statement of Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden in the House of Commons. But granted that the conference accomplished less than some of us had been led to hope—largely because we failed to appreciate the wartime shortage of shipping, food, and supply—what warrant has the Committee for a Jewish Army to assume to speak on behalf of the Jewish people or to find fault with the conference for not finding an answer to the problem of liberating

all the Jews of Europe? The Bermuda Conference, let me remind the critics, was called for the single purpose of endeavoring to find a solution to the European refugee problem. Of this problem the plight of the Jewish refugee is one, although an important, fact.

To what purpose, therefore, is it to belabor the conference for not accomplishing what it was never intended to accomplish—the settlement of the Jewish problem? To what purpose is it to continue to lay on, when the objects of attack are the leaders who alone have dedicated themselves to the task of rescuing Jewish refugees today and whose governments alone can be relied upon to offer a permanent solution—if there be such a solution—of the entire Jewish problem tomorrow.

Does anyone doubt that it is only by defeating Hitler and crushing the Axis powers that the rescue of the oppressed peoples of Europe can be affected and thus—among other problems—the Jewish problem solved?

If we were to grant that the rescue of the Jews trapped in Hitler-held Europe presents itself to the Allied governments and the Allied command as not the sole but as only one of the many problems upon the grim, complicated pattern; grant that it is not even the first item upon the long and terrible agenda of the war, why, to what end, attack the efforts or impugn the good faith of those governments and those of their delegates who have placed the question upon the order of the day as one of the most pressing?

The Jewish problem is inextricable from the entire military situation. Unless the United Nations destroy Hitler and his works by military might, there will be no solution of the frightful problems of the Jews or of any other of the oppressed peoples. No solution of the Jewish problem except in the ghastly sense that there will be no Jews left in Europe to present any problem.

Let me tell you why I consider these attacks on the Bermuda Conference as attacks on some of the best friends the Jews have in the world today. And on doing this, please let me explain that my criticism is not meant to impugn the motives of all the attackers—but only their methods.

To begin with the Bermuda Conference, this conference was the result of a constant searching by President Roosevelt over a long period for possible means of rescuing the refugees from Hitler-occupied Europe, including the Jews both inside and outside the doomed continent.

That Roosevelt should be so deeply concerned with the fate of the Jewish refugees—in the midst of the gravest crisis in American history—brought on by the terrible and exhausting war which is affecting the destiny of all mankind—is to me cause for wonder and thanksgiving.

My wonder is derived from my failure to find an historic parallel to President Roosevelt—a figure wielding such power and yet so cognizant of Jewish contributions to world civilization, so sympathetic with the Jewish problem, and so eager to ameliorate it. This deep concern on the part of our President is understandable only in the light of his remarkable background, his profound concern with the dignity of every human being, and his many contacts with men of every shade of thought—with Jews of all classes over many years. He learned to understand the hopes and aspirations of the Jewish people and from their intellectual reservoir he borrowed freely of the life-giving waters which have fed his philosophy and his actions.

In the second place, when President Roosevelt finally succeeded in having the Bermuda Anglo-American Conference called, he plainly indicated his intention of making the conference more than a gesture or a symbol, by appointing as the American delegates three men of unmistakable humanitarian sympathies. To leave no room for doubt in the eyes of the world, he appointed a Jew, Congressman SOL BLOOM of New York, as one of the delegates. The other delegates were SCOTT W. LUCAS, the senior Senator from Illinois, and President Harold W. Dodds of the Princeton University, two noted champions of religious freedom and democracy.

Having served on the Illinois Tax Commision with Senator LUCAS and having been associated with him intimately for many years on various political and civic projects, including the erection of the George Washington-Robert Morris-Haym Salomon monument in Chicago, I know him. Senator LUCAS is a great American, loyally devoted to the cause of democracy and human rights.

In the third place, the American delegates not only resolved to do everything humanly possible to find a solution to the refugee problem but they joined the English delegates in issuing an official communique to the effect that they had "examined the refugee problem in all its aspects, including the position of those potential refugees who are still in the grip of the Axis Powers without any immediate prospect of escape * * * Nothing was excluded from their analysis and everything that held out any possibility, however remote, of solution of the problem, was carefully investigated and thoroughly discussed * * * The delegates were able to agree on a number of concrete recommendations which they are jointly submitting to their governments and which it is felt will pass the tests set forth above (i. e., practicability and noninterference with war operations) and will lead to the relief of a substantial number of refugees of all races and nationalities.[1] * * * The delegates also agreed on recommendations regarding the form of intergovernmental organization which was best fitted in their opinion, to handle the problem in the future."

In the face of this official announcement and the further statement that the recommendations agreed upon constituted a military secret and could not be revealed at this time, the Committee for a Jewish army published its indefensible full-page attack in the New York Times and other newspapers under the headline, "To 5,000,000 Jews in the Nazi death trap, Bermuda was a hollow mockery." The committee did not wait for an official statement from the American delegation. It did not even take time to interview any of the three delegates. It rushed into print within 48 hours of the delegation's return from Bermuda. The bitter, emotional attack was founded solely upon quotations from undocumented opinions published on both sides of the Atlantic.

The full-page attack, among other things, declared that the conference had not even touched upon the problem of the Jews in Europe and had banished the name "Jews" from its vocabulary, that the United Nations were giving Hitler carte blanche in his extermination process, "exactly as in the prewar days they permitted him to deal with Jews in Germany, with Austria and Czechoslovakia, thus paving the way for aggression, invasion, and war" and that "democracy cannot connive with the slaughter of millions of innocent civilian people—the Jews in Europe."

The utter lack of responsibility of the authors of this amazing and hysterical advertisement becomes obvious from the fact that it appeared over the name of United States Senator EDWARD C. JOHNSON, of Colorado, who had graciously consented to have his name used as chairman of the committee, and in a separate box on the left side of the page appeared an endorsement of the Jewish army by 33 other Senators. But Senator JOHNSON and the other Senators denied that they had seen the ad before its publication, had been apprised of its publication, or had given consent to the use of their names upon it in any form.

In extenuation of its advertisement, the Committee for a Jewish Army points out that it quoted criticisms of other persons and publications and based its arguments thereon. But inasmuch as those other persons and publications had even less information than the committee—one criticism appearing during the conference, another before the delegates had returned—this argument is the equivalent of saying that I shall continue to strike my neighbors and bite myself because "Joe is doing it!"

Just as the committee's advertisement was more violent than any of the criticisms which it quoted, so my attention has been called to still more violent attacks appearing in the Jewish Spectator. If these undocumented attacks continue to grow in vehemence in the same geometric progression, I shudder to think what the editorial will be like which may be based on the Jewish Spectator.

I do not wish to place myself in a position of criticizing or censuring any Jewish person or group. It can hardly be expected that all Jews continue to maintain their mental equilibrium under the repeated bludgeonings of fate. But when I read the committee's advertisement in the New York Times and the comment in the Jewish Spectator, I found myself asking exactly what Senator LUCAS asked in his speech on May 6 on the floor of the United States Senate, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "Why do they do this at this particular time? Why does this organization rush into print with a denunciation of the accomplishments of the conference less than 48 hours after the American delegation has returned to the United States? No one, other than the members of the delegation and the two respective governments, knows what is in the report. Yet the authors of the advertisement would assume to know all about it."

Incidentally in the course of his speech, Senator LUCAS expressed one of the finest tributes ever paid to a Jew. Let me quote briefly:

"I yield to no man, regardless of his race, creed, or color, in my humanitarian sympathy for those people who are now locked on the inside of Europe's conquered lands. I believe that I understand the heartbeats of the underdog. I believe that I understand what it means to make one's own way in this life. I believe I understand something about suffering in the early days of life. Some of the best friends I have in this country, Mr. President, are members of the Jewish faith. Henry Horner, the great Governor of Illinois, one of the best, if not the best, our State ever had, was my dear friend. He was responsible, more than any other individual, for sending me to the United States Senate. He was a good man. He was a great man. Henry Horner did more to destroy intolerance and bigotry in the State of Illinois than any other public official who ever held an executive position in that State."

Senator LUCAS went on:

"My friends among the Jewish faith are legion. When it is said that the Senator from Illinois would do anything that would interfere one iota with giving assistance to these poor helpless souls, those who make such statements simply do not know what they are talking about, and I will not permit the charge to go unanswered."

My own extensive discussions with Senator LUCAS following his return from Bermuda were confined to the general matters covered by the communiques, because of the Senator's pledge to military secrecy. Yet I am

[1] An Associated Press dispatch of May 19 reports the transfer to a neutral country of the first contingent of refugees as a follow-up of the Bermuda Conference.

convinced that the delegates went over the entire globe with the proverbial fine-tooth comb, made a thorough study of all the technical problems involved, and recommended to their governments the only practicable program possible today.

It is no military secret that the Bermuda conference had to take into account the tremendous restrictions on all transportation facilities caused by Allied losses on land and sea and the terrific demands imposed by the Allied military campaign. But save for the purpose of issuing an illusory and unattainable "paper program," what could any other group of human beings dealing with the refugee problem have done?

Not only did I find Senator LUCAS bewildered by the fact that his efforts in behalf of the refugees was greeted by this fusillade but a former president of the Zionist Organization of America and the present executive director, whom I met in Washington, expressed similar bewilderment and chagrin. The spectacle of a Jewish group raining verbal brickbats on men of the stature of Senator Lucas, Sol Bloom, and Dr. Todd—not to mention President Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and the United Nations—recalls to the mind, not without some bitterness, the old query concerning the probable program of two members of the Jewish faith who might find themselves marooned on a desert island. The answer, you may remember, is that they would start two factions.

Despite the intellectual temptation of the lover of dialectic to argue and dispute, this is no time for factions in Jewry. To continue to divide our strength by internal bickerings would be playing into the hands of the Nazis, whose game is to divide and conquer.

With all due allowance for the zeal and fighting spirit of the committee for a Jewish army, may I humbly point out that this is decidedly not the time—good intentions or no good intentions—to be striking at the wrong heads.

Short of the millennium, we may never achieve all we desire. But—make no mistake about it—we shall never win our major aspirations—or even any considerable part of them—until Hitler has been defeated unconditionally and victory has been won by the Allied nations.

The Jewish problem—which in its essence is the struggle of a minority people to survive with dignity and self-respect—is at bottom the problem of all oppressed peoples. True, the No. 1 target of the Nazis is the Jew. Yet this target is only one of the many targets and it is fatuous indeed for us to expect the entire Allied world in its present life and death struggle, to single out the Jewish problem as its sole concern, or even its primary concern. It can only consider it as an integral part of that larger problem—the struggle between the democratic way of life and Fascism, the war for survival of the Allied nations. And it is only as an integral part of the Allied nations and the Allied cause—a cause in which our lives and our treasures are being poured forth in a supreme sacrifice—that the Jew will survive.

Foreign Trade Zones—Portals to International Commerce of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Thomas E. Lyons, executive secretary, Foreign Trade Zones Board, before the Norfolk Propeller Club at the Atlantic Hotel, Norfolk, Va., May 17, 1943:

Just now the implements of American foreign trade and shipping are marshaled to help this country and its allies win the world's greatest war. Merchant ships that normally carried peacetime cargoes are transporting men, munitions, food, and materials to all the fighting fronts all over the world. This constantly growing fleet is bringing essential supplies for the war industries of the Nation. Railroads, air-transport facilities, international banking channels, cables, telegraphs, and radio all are among the many instruments of peacetime commerce that are backing up hard-hitting United Nations' fighting forces.

Some day our fighting men will stack arms with victory achieved. When that time comes the channels of trade and the implements of commerce must be reconverted and reestablished to their maximum usefulness in helping businessmen of all nations restore normal trading activities.

Naturally, it will be a much changed world. Entirely new conditions must be met and solved. Living standards will be changed. The economic fabric of nations will be materially altered. Pre-war nonindustrial countries will have become industrialized. The borders of some of the world's nations may follow an entirely new pattern.

In announcing the observance of this National Wartime Foreign Trade Week, the United States Chamber of Commerce said "It is not too early for the citizens of the United States, and particularly the businessmen concerned with international trade, to try to pull aside the veil of the future to glimpse the pattern of things to come.

Discussion of conditions under which foreign trade of the future will be carried on will be left to others. It seems timely, however, in the light of post-war requirements to appraise the provisions which Congress has made for handling that part of our foreign commerce generally referred to as transshipment, reexport, and consignment trade.

The first tariff law, enacted in 1789, contained a provision for the remitting of duties, or the so-called "drawback," on foreign goods subsequently exported. Legislation providing for the customs bonded warehouse system, as it is known today, has been on the statute books for nearly 100 years. Although subsequent tariff acts have extended the privileges of the drawback and bonded-warehouse system, many importers still felt that the rigid restrictions for operating under these provisions presented little or no opportunity for the development of transshipment and reexport trade.

To overcome these disadvantages Congress in 1934 enacted a foreign-trade zone law. The legislation, sponsored by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, had the unanimous support of all foreign traders, port interests, and Government agencies. The purpose of the statute is to provide physical areas in ports of entries, fenced off from the ports themselves, at which ships may unload cargoes or goods may be brought in and processed if necessary, without payment of duty pending reshipment of goods abroad or entry into the United States. It is only when goods are shipped out of the foreign trade zone into domestic territory that they become subject to customs duties.

Although this law was enacted more than 8 years ago, only one locality, New York, has taken advantage of its provisions. Recently, harbor officials at Houston, Tex. and New Orleans, La., filed applications for the establishment of foreign-trade zones in their respective ports.

Since the opening of the New York Foreign-Trade Zone in 1937, hundreds of thousands of cases of South American canned meats, $50,000,000 worth of Sumatra tobacco, thousands of tons of Brazil nuts, entire shiploads of tungsten ore, Brazilian cotton, Mexican garbanzos, and many other commodities have been manipulated there. On many occasions, upward of 500 people have been engaged in the various zone manipulations at the same time. Some operations have been conducted on a 24-hours basis.

Substantially all these activities were performed on piers which had long been known as Hylan's Folly. One can only speculate as to the results if modern warehouse facilities with ample manipulating space and low insurance rates, had been provided.

During 1 year (1940) 70,000 tons of foreign merchandise, valued at $13,000,000, or 50 percent of all the foreign tonnage handled, were transshipped or reexported to 60 foreign countries. For emphasis, let me restate it in slightly different language: During 1940, 1 out of every 2 tons of foreign merchandise brought to the zone for manipulation or storage was reshipped to a foreign destination.

At its annual meeting last month, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States recognized the importance of foreign-trade zones by incorporating the following resolution in its declarations:

"That actual operation of the New York foreign-trade zone has demonstrated the advantages that may be secured by American foreign trade and shipping, through the early establishment of additional, adequately equipped zones on the Atlantic, the Gulf, and the Pacific coasts."

War requirements for existing port facilities and the suspension of commercial construction has, of necessity, postponed the program of establishing foreign-trade zones until the vastly more vital job of beating the Axis has been completed. This, however, should not cause any progressive port community to dismiss the subject as something to be resurrected after victory is won. Your port officials, responsible for post-war improvements, are entitled to your studied advice and aid on the possible value and effectiveness of the foreign-trade zone in meeting future trade conditions.

The ports of Hampton Roads have always supported the principle of foreign-trade zones, and harbor officials here have continued to follow closely the progress which has been made.

Congressman S. O. BLAND, ever alert to any opportunity for advancing our shipping and foreign trade, recently expressed his views on the foreign-trade zone as follows:

"Soon after the termination of World War No. 1, there was considerable interest manifested in the establishment of a foreign-trade zone in the Hampton Roads area, and I still believe it contains untold possibilities for our people."

For some months past, a special committee of the Maritime Exchange of Hampton Roads, has been engaged in a study of the possibilities of a foreign-trade zone for this vicinity. Data which I have supplied this committee clearly indicates that their study is not of a superficial nature. It is my intention to confer with the members of this committee and officials of the Maritime Exchange later today.

Very often we are asked what advantages a foreign-trade zone possesses for handling foreign merchandise which is not ready or intended to be imported into the United States. The following list sets out many of the advantages and economies which the foreign trade zone offers to importers:

1. No expense for bonds or customs inspectors when imports are stored or manipulated, whether dutiable or non-dutiable.

2. Buyers may examine and samples of merchandise may be withdrawn at any time.

3. Imports may remain in storage with no time limit.

4. Sub-standard foreign products are reconditioned before customs appraisal and liquidation. Goods not meeting standards of Government inspection agencies may be destroyed or re-exported.

5. Ships, lighters, railroads, motor trucks or parcel post make direct delivery to or from zone insuring efficient and frequent carrier service.

6. Foreign products may be held on consignment for spot delivery without being subject to customs regulations.

7. Domestic products may be assembled, repacked, or combined with foreign products for export. Draw-back formalities are unnecessary.

8. Imports arriving improperly marked, are remarked to meet customs requirements and heavy penalties avoided.

9. Imports under quota restrictions may be received in any quantity in excess of quota and held without customs liquidation awaiting next quota period, thereby enabling owners to obtain loans on warehouse receipts.

10. Alcoholic beverages and other liquids imported in bulk may be bottled, labeled and packed prior to customs entry and without being subject to State or Federal licensing agencies.

11. Inland importers may arrange to examine foreign merchandise here and save costly transportation expense to interior points on defective merchandise later returned. Examination prior to customs entry precludes the possibility of payment of duties on damaged or unsaleable merchandise.

12. Importers may erect their own structures within the zone to perform manipulating operations adapted to their needs.

Where these zones will be situated, under present law, is a matter for local interests to decide. Naturally, a foreign-trade zone should be located where the goods which pass through or into the commerce of this country, can readily move into a major artery of our internal transportation system. In our opinion, foreign-trade zones are not competitive with each other, if the zones are located at points which represent gateways to natural or existing transportation systems.

In evaluating the benefits to be derived from a foreign-trade zone in the Tidewater area, there are, among other factors, several favorable considerations which should not be overlooked. For instance, as most of the overseas shipping of the Chesapeake Bay area moves through the Virginia Capes, a well located foreign-trade zone would be available for the combined in transit, transshipment, and consignment traffic of both the Maryland and Virginia customs districts. Furthermore, the inland freight rate structure is generally uniform from Baltimore and Hampton Roads ports and is based on a differential below other North Atlantic ports. Another interesting point is that during 1 year (1940), dutiable merchandise entered at Hampton Roads amounted to 69 percent of the total imports, while at New York it was 30 percent; Baltimore 28 percent, and for all United States ports averaged 35 percent.

In 1940, the last pre-war year, 1,408 vessels in foreign trade were entered at the Maryland and Virginia customs districts. One-third of these ships arrived in ballast. Ordinarily shipowners will make every effort to avoid ocean voyages in ballast. If a foreign-trade zone had been available where foreign cargo could have been deposited without expensive restrictions, it is possible that these ships might have entered with cargo. Assuming that each of them would have brought in 500 tons—and it could easily have been more—the annual port traffic would have been increased by more than 225,000 tons.

In an address before the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, last March 25, Rear Admiral Howard L. Vickery, Vice Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission said: "After the war is won shipping undoubtedly will play an indispensable role in making victory permanent. In not many more months the American merchant marine will be the largest in the world and will present us with a post-war responsibility of great magnitude. The end of the last war's building program likewise found us with a vast merchant fleet largely composed of ships of emergency construction. What happened to that fleet is a sad story. When this war is over, therefore, we must not again rest on our oars until our merchant marine threatens to become an economic Achilles' heel. If victory is to outlast the ships we are building, we must resolve to maintain in peace a first-class merchant marine and, as an essential corollary, a healthy shipbuilding industry."

Naturally a merchant marine is essential for the development of any maritime nation, but international trade requires more than ships. Nations must be willing to freely exchange their products for the goods of other countries. Traders must arrange these transactions to the advantage of each country and banking facilities must be provided to finance such trade. Plans for the exchange of commodities will be worked out around international conference tables in accordance with the terms of the Atlantic Charter, which provides in article 4 for access by all states, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

While the matter of international shipping policy will be determined by the Federal Government, there are steps which can be taken by our steamship operators and port authorities to improve the efficiency of our merchant marine for peacetime operations. Facilities must be provided in our ports to handle ships and cargo in the most efficient manner. Obsolete terminals, congestion, delays in unloading and loading ships, customs bonds, and formalities all add to the total landed cost which foreign merchandise must pay.

If we are to employ our merchant marine in normal peacetime trade and in post-war reconstruction, we must plan now to provide our ports with facilities which will develop foreign commerce and furnish two-way cargoes for our surface vessels; yes, and aircraft, too. Amply equipped and efficiently operated foreign-trade zones in our major ports will serve as portals in opening up new fields of international trade and shipping.

Decentralization of the Steel Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD J. WELCH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a joint resolution adopted by the California State Legislature relative to the decentralization of the steel industry.

The tremendous importance of this matter is evidenced by the fact that this resolution was adopted by a practically unanimous vote by both branches of the State legislature, it having received only one dissenting vote.

While the shortage of steel in California seriously affects every branch of our economy, the detrimental effect of such a shortage is felt most keenly in four of our great industries—that is, ship construction, agriculture, housing and industrial construction, and gold and other mineral mining, the last named of which is completely closed down.

The joint resolution follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 50

Joint resolution relative to decentralization of the steel industry

Whereas the concentration of the steel production industry in the hande of a limited few, centralized within a small geographical area, has stifled the development of this all-important industry in other large sections of the Nation, and particularly in California; and

Whereas this situation has resulted in a serious shortage of steel—the backbone of our national economy and the keystone of our war-production and agricultural development—which continues to be an ever-increasing major source of distress in fully mobilizing the war effort of the Nation at this critical period in its history; and

Whereas the critical shortage of steel is further causing a 62-percent reduction in the manufacture of agricultural machinery and implements from the production in 1940–41, at a time when the great agricultural sections of the State of California are being urged to increase the production of food supplies so urgently needed now; and

Whereas large high-grade ore deposits of iron and other essential byproduct minerals are already known to exist throughout the State of California in areas closely adjacent to adequate hydroelectric power, natural gas, and other requirements for the mining and processing of iron ore and its production into steel; and

Whereas huge quantities of steel are particularly required to continue the remarkable record of shipbuilding and war-industry production in general which has been established on the Pacific coast, thus creating a more difficult steel-shortage situation than in other parts of the Nation due to the long distances over which steel now must be transported, increasing the strain upon our transportation facilities to coastal cities, through which must flow almost all of the military equipment and supplies necessary for the use of our Army, Navy, Air Force, and merchant marine in the Pacific; and

Whereas further quantities of steel are required to furnish hardware necessary for the construction of adequate housing facilities to provide proper homes for shipyard and war industry workers in close proximity to their places of employment, thus eliminating the abominable conditions under which thousands of them must now live which create health, fire, and safety hazards and provides a major cause of absenteeism and increases the problems of transportation to and from work for thousands of others; and

Whereas notwithstanding the apparent opposition of sectional private interests which have continuously thwarted the development of these vast natural resources of the State of California, it is necessary that they be immediately developed to the fullest possible extent in the interest of national defense; and

Whereas all California industry is unfavorably affected in successfully competing with other large sections of the Nation in developing its own economic well-being through the operation of the so-called Pittsburgh-plus system of steel costs which has been permitted to dominate the steel industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That it is our firm conviction that the best interests of the Nation in the matter of adequate national defense, demand the immediate development of our natural iron ore resources, the construction of blast furnaces, steel mills, and rolling mills, with sufficient capacity to meet all the needs of the Pacific coast area; and be it further

Resolved, That it is our firm conviction that the immediate projection and completion of such facilities to develop an adequate steel industry, will prove a major asset contributing toward the permanent economic advancement and well-being of our people, throughout the years to come, and be it further

Resolved, That every agency of the Government of the United States concerned with the problem of war production be urged to lend support to and give favorable consideration to the development and construction of an iron and steel industry in the State of California in the interest of national defense, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith by the chief clerk of the assembly to the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States, the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives from the State of California, the Director of the War Production Board, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, and to the Committee for the Investigation of the War Effort of the United States Senate.

The Coal Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Memphis Commercial Appeal:

Staff Sgt. William M. Edrington expresses himself in a letter to his father Justus H. Edrington, of Osceola. Sergeant Edrington is with the air forces somewhere in the South Pacific

"Dad, I heard over the radio about the big strike that John L. Lewis is leading the coal miners on again," the sergeant wrote. "* * * Can't understand why they let that go on during wartime. Coal mining is no picnic, I know, but it's not as much hell as wading through hot lead every day in steaming hot climates.

"I wish they would draft everyone of those scoundrels and send them across and let them see what that production line means to them here. We haven't won this war by a long shot and the more they slacken back there the longer we have to stay over here and the more of us have got to die. I sure wish they would send a bunch of us back and turn us loose on those fifth columnists. * * * But I guess you're pretty well disgusted and mad about the matter, too. The more I think about it the madder I get, and there's nothing we can do about it over here, so I may as well not think any more about it, eh?"

Address by the Vice President at Commencement Exercises at Connecticut College for Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST W. McFARLAND

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 7 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an able address delivered by Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, on the occasion of the commencement exercises at the Connecticut College for Women at New London, Conn., on Sunday, June 6, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENCEMENT

We who are met here together in the midst of life, no matter how much joy and confidence we may have in the future, must, nevertheless, be prepared to face death. Not one of us can be immune.

I am thinking of a boy. He was such a fine boy, that boy who is now dead. He was a close friend of mine for 8 years. Two years ago when he graduated from high school, he came to tell me how much opposed he was to the United States getting into the war. He was a pacifist, almost of the Quaker type, and the dignity of the individual, regardless of race, creed or color, meant everything to him. But he was strong physically, an excellent football player, and a good wrestler, and he had a complete disdain for physical fear. We talked. He said that we Americans were suckers to get into World War No. 1, that it was not our obligation to get involved twice in a European mess.

I told him I disagreed with him, and why. After sketching out for him Germany's five wars of aggression during the past 80 years, I told him that before we could start to work on the kind of world he wanted, it would be necessary to use force to destroy the power of the aggressor nations—to destroy their power so completely as to make it impossible for them to break the peace again.

George remained a pacifist in his heart, but he became a convert to the necessity of using physical force to fight this particular evil. He was in his second year at a Quaker college when the Japanese attacked at Pearl Harbor. He at once determined to put his strong body and alert mind at the disposition of his Government in one of the most dangerous services possible. He wanted to become a dive bomber in the Marines. A month ago he had a day off in Washington. He had just gotten his wings and the Marines had accepted him for dive bombing duty. I talked with him and his fiancée. They desperately wanted to get married. He still hated war with an ardent hatred. He spoke of the technical difficulties of dive bombing, of how difficult it was to get close enough to hit the mark and yet pull out of the dive fast enough to avoid destruction of the plane. He was leaving that night for Florida to take his last six weeks of training preparatory to getting into active fighting.

Two weeks ago there came from Florida the telegram announcing his death. He and another boy were on a routine "oxygen hop," diving from 20,000 feet altitude; just what happened is not clear, but in any event they never pulled out of the dive.

Two weeks ago today I was with George's parents and with the girl he was to have married. She had received a letter from him written on Wednesday of that week, telling about the flight which he was to take on Thursday and how confident he was of a successful result. The father reminded me that 2 years previously I had given the boy my photograph with the inscription, "For George, with hope for the future."

Then, I remembered that when I convinced the boy of the necessity of eliminating Nazi-ism as a preliminary to building a world of peace, he had been pessimistic about the ability and willingness of the older generation in the United States to measure up to its responsibility.

He never doubted that he and his comrades would defeat the Nazis and the Japs. He had no reservations whatsoever about doing first things first. He was utterly resolved to give his all to make sure of the first part of the program. But with regard to winning the peace, he was less optimistic. The last week he was home he said: "It's all baloney to talk about this younger generation winning the peace. We won't come to power for 20 years. The same generation that got us into this mess has got to get us out of it. What really matters is not what new thoughts we kids are thinking but what new thoughts you older guys are thinking. You'll be writing the ticket."

George is one of the millions of fine young men who have been killed as a result of this war. Many of you have your George. He may be a son, a brother, a sweetheart, or husband, or a boy from the neighborhood. He may be living, he may be dead. The chances are he hates war just as my George did. He hates the necessity of hating in order to do his part toward winning for himself and the world the privilege of life and love.

George had supreme confidence in his generation, but less in my generation. He looked on many of the public men of our time as incipient appeasers. He considered them small-minded and short-sighted. He argued that they were easily frightened by pressure groups, that they were lost in the trees of the political forest, and that they were unlikely to rise to the challenge of the fundamental verities when brought face to face with the job of rebuilding a shattered world. In a letter written shortly before he was killed, George said: "It's after the war that the real fights will start. Plenty of people who couldn't change fast enough to prevent this war still sit in the seats of the mighty. Never forget that they'll be a lot stronger when this is over than they are now. That's the time when we who are doing the fighting will need some real leadership. This war is our job and we are going to win it on the battle fronts, come hell or high water. The really tough job is going to begin after the war when the same forces that got us into this one will be pitted against the men who've got the guts to fight for a world in which everybody can have a chance to do useful work. We kids are depending on you older guys not to let this thing happen again. What we're fighting for now must not die in an armistice."

Through George's meteoric life and symbolic death, I was forced into a more complete appreciation of the meaning of the death of Christ to his disciples. Something bright and shining and full of hope had passed from the world. It just couldn't be. Death couldn't end all. Christ must live. He must live in the world forever. Somewhere there must be a perpetual song of resurrection, ringing forth continuously the

message of peace and good will. And now I conclude this vivid personal experience by saying: May it so be that my George, your George, and all those who have sacrificed their lives will so inspire us to effective action that they will not have died in vain. May many Georges live to hold my generation to account in building the peace, and to build upon that peace in such a way that the Georges of 30 years hence will treat, with reverence and love, the sacred values bought for them by death. May your children and my grandchildren be there greeting each new day in joy, confidence and creative endeavor.

George was right when he said that my generation will have the immediate responsibility for building the right kind of peace. But, as the years go on, that responsibility will pass to those who are young people now, to those who are in the armed services, to those who are graduating from college this year. No matter how wise the patterns of the peace set by the older generation, action within this framework will be the increasing responsibility of the younger generation. Day-to-day and month-to-month modifications will be necessary to make the peace a live and dynamic contribution to human welfare.

The individual graduate of this particular college sitting before me on this June morning has perhaps a hundred thousand graduating companions in the United States this spring. It has cost not merely many thousands of dollars, but an infinitude of loving care to bring you to this stage of life. Only 1 out of 12 of our American boys and girls is given the privilege of graduating from college. Much will be expected from those to whom much as been given. In an astonishingly short time many of you will begin to have influence in your respective communities. On you will fall the heavy burden of the day-to-day job of maintaining a just peace, 10 or 20 years from now when the memories of this vile war have faded and new and difficult economic problems have arisen.

Maintaining a peace is like keeping a garden in good order. You have to work at it day in and day out, otherwise the rains wash away the soil, and the weeds get so deeply rooted that it is impossible to pull them out without destroying many good plants as well.

If we are not to break faith with the boys who have died we must invent better machinery for weeding the world garden. First, and above everything else, we must have an intense desire to make this machinery succeed. We can then work out the details of disarming aggressor nations, of preventing the exploitation of small, weak nations, and of seeing to it in the future that no aggressor nation can again start on the path which leads to breaking the peace of the world.

We must appeal to the Axis youth, especially German youth, and if possible get their cooperation. The task of all the peace-loving peoples will be to build into the next generation the knowledge and character required to maintain a just and lasting peace.

The present false attitude of the German people toward war finds its roots in the Prussion school system and especially in the type of militaristic education which became more prevalent as a reaction to defeat by Napoleon. The Danish educator, Grundtvig, writing in 1833, predicted that German education would finally kill the Germans. He pointed out that following the Napoleonic wars the German schools, which he called schools of death, had been teaching the youth to believe that the Germans were better than anyone else, that the rest of the world existed to serve them and be dominated by them, and that their will should be imposed on the rest of the world by force.

When the education of youth goes wrong, socner or later all goes wrong. There had existed in Germany a fine, liberal tradition. There had lived men like Luther with his emphasis on freedom, Kant with his message on peace, Goethe with his belief in international understanding and cooperation, and Bethoven, who early in the Napoleonic wars thought a new day of liberty was being born. Out of the culture fostered by these men, and many others like them, came Carl Schurz and the other German liberals of that era who contributed so vitally to the building of many progressive communities in the Middle West of the United States. Not all the liberal Germans left Germany, but those who remained—they, their children, and their grandchildren—were subject to the increasing tyrannies of Bismarck and Hitler.

I believe that in the prevention of World War No. 3—in keeping faith with the boys who have given their lives—much will depend on just how we handle the German youth immediately following this war. I think of the experience of a man who today is a professor in one of our American universities but who in World War No. 1, as a boy of 17, had spent just a few months in the German Army when peace came. With thousands of other German boys, he immediately set out to finish his education. He described to me a few days ago how most of the German students, in the winter of 1918–19 and the years that followed, felt liberated from the terror of war and from the routine of army life. They were hungry for spiritual food. Living on the poorest quality of black bread, eating in soup kitchens, and studying at night in cold rooms, they were bound together by hardship but buoyed up by the faith that they would rebuild themselves through books toward spiritual understanding and a new order—a democratic order. They knew that Germans had lost in the external world, but they dreamed of creating a rich internal world to replace the loss. They eagerly hoped for a lasting peace. They demonstrated this at Munich in 1921, when they gave a tumultuous welcome to the Indian poet, Rabindranath Tagore.

But, according to my German professor friend, the Allied Powers had no interest in the glorious hopes among the German university youth of that day. The Allies provided no incentive for education in democratic traditions. And so the German youth fell into the hands of retired army generals, monarchist professors, and politicians. Thus the way was prepared for Hitler and Goebbels to return German education to the teaching of racial superiority, war, and death.

We must not repeat the mistakes made by the Allies after World War No. 1. This time we must see that the defeat of Germany is complete. The Germans themselves will probably wreak vengeance on their Nazi overlords. In any event, we must see that the guilty are dealt with as they deserve. And we must not again fail the German young people who, in the depth of their material hunger and misery, will have a great philosophic and spiritual hunger. That these strong and despairing emotions may be guided toward a good end is a matter of supreme importance for the world.

The German post-war youth of World War No. 2 need not be forced to embrace either communism, a new type of totalitarianism, or even the particular type of democracy which we have in the United States. We shall not need to send school teachers from the United States into the German schools, but we can make sure that the liberal element in Germany has an opportunity to replace the Nazi school books and the Nazi methods of teaching.

I am a great believer in the Danish folk high school and the Scandinavian systems of cooperation. I believe they are well adapted to the German situation, once militarism and totalitarianism are stamped out. A considerable segment of the German people has long admired the emphasis placed on peace, cooperation, and fruitful work by the various Scandinavian countries. The German youth must be encouraged to develop a peaceful, worthwhile purpose in life. I believe there are Germans who are steeped in the German liberal tradition and the ideals of Scandinavian cooperation, to whom this job can safely be entrusted.

Not only in Germany, but in our own and other countries the type of education which prevails may well determine whether we succeed in building a world of law and order and productive work. Our own educational system has many splendid achievements to its credit, but it can be even more fully adapted to the needs of modern, highly-integrated society.

Working for peace and the general welfare is the essence of all true education and all true religion. It is the Sermon on the Mount in action.

All the schools in the world will have to be reborn after this great conflict, if the boys who have died are not to have died in vain. In the years to come it will be even more important for the schools to teach character than to teach facts. In the teaching of character, the essential thing will be the ability of the teacher to kindle enthusiasm—enthusiasm for knowledge, but especially enthusiasm for the greater good. There is something about the spoken word of the person who is deeply moved inside which carries great conviction. Neither the book nor the radio can ever take the place of the face-to-face contact with the living teacher. May the emphasis on system never stamp out of our schools the personal equation—the communication, by friendship and the power of the spoken word, of a boundless enthusiasm for all the facts of nature and human life which lead to peace and vital living. May the vision of a new and finer and more orderly world animate the teachers of every country. In their hands is the hope of the future.

Many of the teachers will, of course, continue to be women. In the building of character and the communication of enthusiasm the majority of women throughout history have demonstrated a unique capacity. In the field of original investigation and in administrative positions they have not hitherto been as prominent as men. While I am sure that many women have excellent executive ability, yet I cannot help thinking that their greatest contribution for many years will result from their capacity to stimulate the best in others. The kindling of inspiration is an art rather than a science. The ultimate function of most women's minds is to synthesize rather than to analyze, to build up rather than to tear down. Doubtless the women's colleges will continue the trend of recent years in the direction of enabling their graduates to realize most effectively that which they are by nature—women capable of communicating enthusiasm and building character. And may this all be for the purpose of insuring harmonious living together on every level of existence—in the family, in the Nation, and in the family of nations. If the women of the world really make their influence felt, war will surely be outlawed and stay outlawed.

And in the hands of everyone who is going out into the work of the world, whatever it may be, is the responsibility for keeping faith with those who have died. This is the true commencement, which has come for you here, this June Sabbath day. Commencement time will come to the world when the armies stop marching, when the men return to the factories and fields, and when the statesmen get down to planning in real earnest. Commencement time is a sudden break with the past. It is a new opportu-

nity. There may be disillusionment or fulfillment.

After the first World War many boys came home from overseas, looking for the better conditions that would justify the lives that had been spent. Instead, they found prices skyrocketing and a national fever for making money. There was a sad lack of planning on the part of the statesmen of both parties. Neither domestic nor foreign policies were well thought out. Thousands of these boys were lured into the speculative excitement and were ruined. All of our people have paid a bitter price in the suffering that has followed.

As a Nation we decided we were not ready to take on adult responsibilities after World War No. 1. We weren't ready even to graduate from high school, and some of us wanted to go back to the eighth grade. Now, whether we like it or not, we must get out into the world and work. The easy days of sheltered isolation are over. We have grown up. We must live day after day with the family of nations, furnishing our share of leadership, even though we are reluctant to do it. Our feeling of responsibility must match our economic power, or the mere fact of that economic power will rot us inside and make us a prey either to internal revolutionary forces or external aggression.

Yes, commencement time is here. Responsibility has begun. Life has come upon us. The joys of opportunity and service lie ahead. No generation has ever had such an opportunity. The world has never had such an opportunity. We must make the dead live. We must make them live in the world's commencement of abiding peace based on justice and charity.

Forest and Range Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 3, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, as the Congress well knows, I am extremely interested in the well-being and future welfare of the Forest Service. Coming from western Montana and knowing at first hand what the Service has done, I naturally feel that I am a reasonably good judge of its ability and usefulness to the country as a whole. It is my privilege to number many of the Forest Service personnel among my friends, and I have found them most anxious and willing to do everything in their power for the good of the Service and the benefit of the country. I feel that we are fortunate indeed in having in that organization men and women of the highest type, and I personally know of no group in Government service who should be more highly commended. For the benefit of my colleagues in the House, I am enclosing for your consideration a letter from one of my friends who is an officer in the Service and who knows thoroughly the importance and significance of the problems in forest-fire protection, management, utilization, and forest and range research. The remarks he has to make are well worth our time.

MISSOULA, MONT., *May 19, 1943.*

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD: Having been a regular forest officer in this region since 1920 and being quite familiar with the situation and problems in forest protection, management, and utilization, I know, as you do, just what such a reduction in forest-fire fighting funds would mean for the average dry season in this region. I am hoping that the Senate will restore the cut in funds and that final restoration can be held later in the House.

My particular official responsibility, forest and range research, is also having a tough time in the 1944 appropriation bill. The experiment station here in Missoula, you know, is responsible for all of the Federal forest and range research work in the northern Rocky Mountain region. It is 1 of 11 such stations located in the principal timber producing regions of the United States. A year ago we redirected our program to wartime activities by abandoning for the duration those projects not directly supporting the war effort; placing on a maintenance basis those long-time reasearch investigations in which we had substantial capital investments; and directing our activities through technical advice and extension to those projects which aided directly in increasing the production of forest products, range livestock, fiber, wool, and leather.

We took a 14-percent cut in appropriations this fiscal year (1943) and during the calendar year 1942 reduced our regular personnel 30 percent over and above replacements and additions. I conscientiously believe that close to 90 percent of our effort is in direct support of the war. Mr. Gisborne, who is in charge of fire research, has spent a considerable portion of his time inspecting, analyzing, and preparing forest and grass-fire protection plans for the several airfields, bombing ranges, air and Navy depots, and Army camps within the region. In addition, he has been working on revised fire danger and smoke-chaser meters as an aid in the more more efficient and rapid control of forest fires in the region. Mr. Hurtt and his men in range management studies have concentrated their attack on increased production of range livestock and range forage. The men in forest products and utilization research and in the inventory of forest resources have spent their entire time in making available for agencies, including the War Production Board, current and accurate figures on the location, availability, quantity and quality, amounts produced, and the cost of production and selling value of the forest products within the region. All of these efforts are, I feel, contributing directly to the war effort.

The House cut of $625,100 below the Budget allowances for forest and range research for fiscal year 1944 actually means a reduction below fiscal year 1943 allotments of around 33 percent. Such a cut, if prorated on the basis of 1943 allotments to the various experiment stations, would mean a 50-percent reduction in the personnel at this station. Actually such a cut might, for reasons of organization and efficiency, wipe out entire fields of work at certain stations or even entire stations, as was necessary in the case of the New England station in 1942. The future of the forest and range resources in this region and their place in its economy depends to a large extent upon the determination and application of practical research results.

I have written a much longer letter than I had intended when I set out to thank you personally for your fine help. I expect that there is still much to be done in the Senate and again in the House before there is any assurance that the cuts will be restored.

Very sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Agricultural Credit—A Factual Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Hon. A. H. Stone, editor of the Staple Cotton Review for May 1943, entitled "Agricultural Credit—The Farm Credit Administration, the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations, and the Banks—A Factual Review."

The Staple Cotton Cooperative Association of Greenwood, Miss., is a cotton marketing association. The Staple Cotton Discount Corporation is an affiliated credit agency of the association. They are the oldest and most successful of all the cotton cooperative marketing associations and cotton production credit corporations.

Hon. A. H. Stone is the vice president of the association and is the editor of the official organ of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association, published monthly. Mr. Stone is one of the ablest economists and statesmen in the South. He is chairman of the Mississippi State Tax Commission and for years was a large grower of cotton. He has been vice president of the association and editor of the Review for more than 20 years.

In view of the insistence of certain bankers and others that no agency which rediscounts with the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks shall be permitted to make a loan to a farmer or a farm organization unless such loan has first been offered to and refused by a private loan agency customarily engaged in making loans of similar character and at comparable rates in the regions where such loan is proposed to be made. The editorial of my valued friend, A. H. Stone, than whom I know of no one in the United States better qualified to speak or write on the subject of agricultural credit in the May issue of the Staple Cotton Review is timely, constructive, and illuminating. This editorial is as follows:

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT—THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION, THE REGIONAL AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATIONS, AND THE BANKS—A FACTUAL REVIEW

I

We hold no brief for the regional agricultural credit corporations—either as originally set up in 1932 or as recently disinterred and revived. We are not concerned either with their burial or their rebirth. We are not expert in such matters, but we have lived long enough and know enough to be able to tell a hawk from a handsaw. And by so simple a token we are quite sure that there is some sort of snake in the grass in all this Nation-wide and almost hysterical bank opposition to the revival of these moribund concerns. There is no probability, scarcely a possibility, of their existence beyond the current year. And while it is unlikely that they can accomplish all that seems to be expected of them, there is no conceivable way in which they could possibly do a tenth part of the

harm which the bankers are trying to conjure up against them. This whole propaganda business suggests the thought that somebody is using them as red herrings to drag across the trail of the entire governmental agricultural credit structure, and more particularly as to the intermediate credit banks and the production credit corporations and associations. And this, of course, also involves, apparently by deliberate purpose, every concern which does business with the intermediate credit banks and with the banks for cooperatives. And this in turn includes the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association and the Staple Cotton Discount Corporation. A study of the arguments, letters, pamphlets, congressional committee hearings, circulars, et cetera, marshalled by the American Bankers Association and others, in the so-called battle against socialized agricultural credit, leaves room for no other conclusion as to the ultimate objective of the fight.

II

We are not party to the controversial discussion which has developed over the revival of these regional agricultural credit corporations, and which, purposely and inevitably, has been broadened to include all forms of agricultural credit extended by the so-called governmental agencies which compose the Farm Credit Administration. We thought we were in position to take an impartial view of this controversy, because neither of our organizations is in any sense a governmental institution. The Staple Cotton Cooperative Association was established in 1921, 12 years before the enactment of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, under which the production credit corporations and associations and the banks for cooperatives were set up, as component parts of the present Farm Credit Administration. This was 11 years before the act of 1932, which authorized the regional agricultural credit corporations. The Staple Cotton Discount Corporation was organized in 1923, 10 years before the agencies just referred to began to function. Neither the cooperative association nor the discount corporation has ever enjoyed any special governmental privileges, by way of stock subscriptions or otherwise. Neither one operates, nor has ever operated, under any form of governmental subsidy, supervision, or control. The Staple Cotton Discount Corporation supplies credit to cotton growers in the alluvial areas of Mississippi, Arkansas, and Louisiana for every aspect of their production credit needs. The Staple Cotton Cooperative Association markets the cotton thus produced and finances its handling from compress delivery to final sale to merchants, dealers, and mills. But its services are not confined to these operations. It handles also thousands of bales not thus financed. The corporation has ample credit, supported by 20 years of successful operation, and by fully adequate resources and reserves. The cooperative association's credit is as good as that of any cotton selling organization in America. It is supported by 22 years of successful operation, with accumulated cash reserves of more than $3,000,000. The association has recently participated in the current War-bond program, through the purchase by the discount corporation of a million dollars' worth of these bonds.

Each of these organizations is absolutely farmer owned, farmer operated, and farmer controlled. Their affairs are supervised by boards of directors elected by their members and borrowers, wholly without any form of outside influence, suggestion, or approval. Yet each of these concerns is vitally interested in anything, either by way of Federal legislation, Executive order, or competitive agitation, which in any way whatever, directly or indirectly, affects the operations or interest rates, or limits the services, of the Federal intermediate credit bank or of the bank for cooperatives of this district. We are, of course, also definitely concerned, only in a less personal degree, with whatever affects the production credit corporation of the Federal land bank of this district, as constituent units of the Farm Credit Administration of New Orleans—with which we do business through the two agencies first above referred to. We are by far the largest customers of the New Orleans Bank for Cooperatives, and have been continuously since it began to operate.

We are at some pains thus to refer in detail to the two concerns of which this Review is the official organ, both as a matter of pertinent information and as a supporting basis for our claim of impartiality in the discussion which follows. Also, because the history of these concerns is part of the history of the origin and growth of the credit structure which now serves American agriculture. Certainly, if anybody has a right to object to the revival of the regional agricultural credit corporations, it is ourselves, inasmuch as they come into immediate competition with our Staple Cotton Discount Corporation, if, indeed, as is claimed by the objecting banks they really compete with anybody at all. And to even greater extent is this true of the production credit associations, which necessarily come into much closer contact with them than do we.

We have no prejudice whatever, in the remotest degree, against banks, bankers, or banking institutions. We had three bank presidents on our original board of directors. Some of our directors are directors in banks. One of our directors is a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. His immediate predecessor was also one of our directors. We enjoy the most cordial relations with all the banks of the Delta. No two unrelated business institutions could be on closer terms than the Staple Cotton Association and the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, during an unbroken period of more than 20 years. We do business with banks every business day in the year—and without them we could not continue in business for a day. We enjoy their confidence. We live with them on terms of friendly intimacy. We regard them as absolutely necessary to the maintenance and promotion of the business, industrial, and agricultural structures of this country and of the world. But we do not regard them as entitled, by any process of reasoning, to a monopoly of any part of the world's credit business. And most certainly we are not willing to concede to them any right or lien of priority on the business of agricultural credit. And we say without fear of successful contradiction that any apparent antagonistic competition between banking institutions and governmental agencies, for the credit business of American agriculture, is either the ultimate responsibility of the banking institutions themselves, or of the banking system—or it is the inevitable outgrowth of emergency conditions which were beyond the control of banks and could be met only by the organized strength of governmental credit itself.

Let us illustrate with the history of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association, as a case in point. In the February and March issues of this Review, we discussed at some length the history of the financing of this association during its early struggle to secure a foothold in the cotton-marketing business of the world. We were an organization of cotton growers, originated, promoted, guided, handled, and controlled by cotton growers, just as we have been continuously for 22 years and just as we are today. Nothing was more alien to the thought and purpose of its organizers than to secure for this association any sort of assistance from any sort of agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government. As we have pointed out elsewhere, we asked no help at anybody's hands. Our directors themselves executed and endorsed 20 notes of $2,500 each, and when we needed money for organizing expenses, we simply put up a note at a local bank.

This was easy. We were guileless enough, or dumb enough, or conceited enough—you make take your choice—to believe, because our directors, officers, and members were men of substance, and of outstanding character, conservatism, and ability—with a perfectly sound proposition to offer—that any reputable banking institution, with experience with cotton loans, would be glad to do business with us. But when we had perfected our organization, even to the extent of engaging the services, outlets, office force, et cetera, of the ablest man in the staple-cotton business, the story was entirely and hopelessly different. We had the organization. We had the set-up. We had the managerial ability, background, and experience. We had the outlets. We had more than 200,000 bales of staple cotton pledged, with an ample margin of safety. We had everything—but the necessary financing, and that we could not find. We secured the services of financial experts, who pronounced our set-up not only sound, but perfect. But even these experts at the game could not induce a single bank, banker, or banking institution in New York, Chicago, St. Louis, New Orleans, or Memphis, to give us credit even for a limited experimental operation. They would not even enter into negotiations with us for our financial needs.

Now note the contrast between our experience with the banks and our experience with a governmental credit agency—operated by a banker—one who later became Governor of the Federal Reserve System. We have elsewhere told the story of our transactions with the War Finance Corporation, to which, under the counsels of desperation, we turned as a last resort. Within 48 hours we had a commitment for $5,000,000, based solely upon the faith of the corporation and its managing director, Eugene Meyer, in the soundness of the proposition wrich we laid before them—and in the men behind it—identically the same proposition in which we could not even arouse the interest of a single metropolitan bank or banker. The banks courteously and coldly told us that ours simply was not banking business—and they could not handle it. So sorry. And that was all there was to it. Had we been solely dependent upon banks, as without the War Finance Corporation we would have been, one of the outstanding cooperatives in America, and certainly one of the most useful, would have died before it was born. It is this concern, the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association, which has since handled 4,900,000 bales of Delta cotton for its members, releasing to them $406,000,000 and securing for their product, through all the vicissitudes of 22 years, an average price of 15.97 cents, practically 16 cents, a pound. The over-all value and breadth of its services to this entire area, and the worth of its example, cannot be overestimated. And we may add here, to complete the record, that on another important occasion, some years after its organization, when the association found itself in need of an emergency loan of a million dollars, it was another governmental agency, the Federal Farm Board, which was glad to extend the accommodation.

One of our original directors, and he is still on our board, was Mike Sturdivant—one of the largest individual cotton planters in America. He is not only a first class planter and businessman but he also has a sense of humor. Some years ago Mr. Sturdivant needed a considerable sum of money and went to his Memphis banker—merely as a routine matter of form—so he thought. His banker friend told him that he did not believe there was that much money left in the world, just at that immediate juncture. At the close of the season, the same banker rather took him to task one day, in good natured fashion, for no longer doing business with his old bank, and boasted of the money he had to lend. Mike replied: "Ned, you remind me of an old darkey down on my

place at Glendora. He was picking cotton on a cold November day, and had built a little fire at the end of a row, in order to warm his hands. I was on my horse, and as I rode up behind him, be buttoned his coat and put his right shoulder up against the wind, and I heard him mumble to himself—'Oh, breeze, breeze, whar wuz you las' summer?'" This was just another typical banker-farmer episode. When the farmer most needed the banker's help—it was just too bad. So sorry.

When banks sought our business in after years, when we no longer needed their help—we might well have asked, like Mike Sturdivant's old darkey, "Oh breeze, breeze, whar wuz you las' summer?" And this has been the discouraging experience of American agriculture, in all its branches and in all its generations. In every acute emergency organized banking has failed to meet the legitimate and often desperate needs of unorganized agriculture, and the farmer has lost in each recurring period of distress such gains as he might have made since the one before. American agriculture as a whole might make the same reply to the present insistence of American bankers, many in high places, that they are now the only proper and legitimate sources of agricultural credit. Since when have they become so, and by what grant of authority do they arrogate to themselves the right—whether by Congressional action or by competitive coercion or by any other means—to deprive American agriculture of the governmental credit facilities which were born of pitiless and inexorable necessity, and which have been developed through the heartbreaking experiences of adversity. The farmers of America know, whether the bankers of America know it or not, that if the present agricultural credit structure is stricken down, or even seriously hampered or impaired, they will have to travel the same hard road when the next emergency comes again. Regardless of good intentions, in time of stress, the banks simply cannot carry the load—with the result that another governmental agency will have to be set up as another temporary expedient—with all which that will mean of loss and tragedy while forgotten lessons are being learned anew.

III

We have said that we felt that we could take an impartial view of this controversy. And we still like to think so. But it seems now to have reached a stage at which, at the insistence of certain bankers and others, it is seriously proposed in Congress that no agency which rediscounts with Federal intermediate banks shall be permitted to make a loan to a farmer or a farm organization unless such loan has "first been offered to and refused by a private loan agency customarily engaged in making loans of similar character, and at comparable rates in the regions where such loan is proposed to be made."

This is precisely the meaning and purpose of the amendment offered on April 13, 1943, to the agricultural appropriation bill, then pending int he House. The amendment was defeated, but the circumstances under which it was proposed carry their own significance and warning. The concrete purpose was to put out of business every production credit association in America. The forces back of this movement, which they hope, and are desperately striving, to make Nation-wide, probably never heard of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association nor of the Staple Cotton Discount Corporation. But the result to these concerns would be none the less destructive. (The statement as to our common concern with the production credit corporations and associations, in a foregoing paragraph, was written before this amendment was offered and before we knew that this opposition had gone that far. We say this in fairness to our own position in the whole matter at issue.)

The proposed destructive credit restriction by act of Congress, just referred to, is an illustration of one phase of the fight being waged against existing agricultural credit facilities. Here is an illustration of another line of attack—direct competitor coercion by threat—to accomplish the indirect but no less hampering result of raising interest rates. The country is being flooded with letters to city banks of which the following is an exact copy:

COUNTRY BANK DIVISION OF THE INDEPENDENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION (UNALTERABLY OPPOSED TO THE SOCIALIZATION OF CREDIT)

WAHOO, NEBR., *April 23, 1943.*

To ——— BANK,
Chicago.

GENTLEMEN: Reports of the intermediate credit banks disclose that over 85 percent of the funds obtained from the sale of debentures are used to discount the notes of the production credit associations, who are in direct competition with country banks. Investigation further shows that 95 percent of the debentures are sold to large city banks. How long will city banks be a party to this destructive competition?

May I again ask, What will be your future policy with respect to the purchase of intermediate credit bank debentures? All replies will be tabulated and a report made to the country banks. Failure to reply will be classified as unsatisfactory. An early reply will be appreciated.

Yours truly,

E. E. PLACEK,
President, Country Bank Division.

Other letters before us refer to "the socialistic machinations of the Farm Credit Administration," and speak of its "damnable attitude toward the banks." We could illustrate expressions from similar and related sources. And these criticisms and attacks are not confined to the 12,000 country banks of America, nor to country-bank organizations. We have no means of appraising the ultimate effect of persistent and widespread threats of this kind. But we would be unwise to ignore or minimize them.

IV

In view of the direct fight on the production credit associations and intermediate credit banks, units of the Farm Credit Administration, boldly revealed in the above letter, this seems an opportune time and place to give a few factual figures as to the production credit associations. These figures, of course, speak also for the intermediate credit banks, which serve as rediscounting agencies for the production credit associations and for other organizations of similar purpose. By "socialized agricultural credit," the banks mean credit which is improperly advanced to farmers, on insufficient security, through which heavy losses are sustained, which losses are absorbed by the whole body of American taxpayers, through the capital grants and subventions of Government money to these socialized credit associations.

Since their organization, under the Farm Credit Act of 1933, and down to the approximate date of April 30, 1943, the 529 production credit associations, operating throughout the country, have made a total of 2,116,216 loans. These loans have covered every variety and type of production credit need. They have been made to every class of individuals engaged in American agricultural production. They have been made in every amount from $50 up to $100,000 and over. Some in the aggregate, probably thousands of them, have been loans which for strictly technical banking reasons no bank would handle. But even so, such as these have been required to accomplish the goal of a complete and necessary credit service to American agriculture.

These loans for the over-all Production Credit Association system since organization have reached the total amount of $2,825,500,665. In view of the indictment of these loans, as improperly made and inadequately secured, and as "socialized," through having their losses absorbed by the general taxpayers of the country, we have been to some pains to inquire into this aspect of the matter. We find that in this tremendous volume of business, including in its ramifications every branch of agriculture throughout America, and through a period of 9 years, the losses have amounted to only two-tenths of 1 percent. Reduced to figures, this is a total of $5,651,000 on more than two and three-quarter billions of loans. We believe that this showing, to say the least will compare favorably with any similar volume of bank loans, in the industrial and commercial fields. Keep in mind the fact, as noted elsewhere in this discussion, that in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans and investments of $3,364,713,703 made to banks themselves, and presumably highly secured, there was a charged-off loss of $1,282,697 with $474,725,440 still unpaid and outstanding at December 31, 1942. In addition to this, Reconstruction Finance Corporation losses on loans other than to banks have amounted to $5,391,839. The total of bank and other losses is $6,674,536, which is a million dollars more than the total losses on Production Credit Association loans to agriculture for the same period.

The banks also have a great deal to say about the Government's capital investment in these agricultural loan agencies. That investment, in the entire production credit system, amounts to $120,000,000. The farmer-borrowers themselves have an investment in the system of $23,000,000, with a surplus of $32,000,000. We are reliably advised that the system could today go into liquidation, pay the Government every dollar it owes and have a balance in hand of $55,000,000. There does not seem to be much danger of any banker or other taxpayer being called upon to shoulder any sort of burden on account of the operations of these "socialized" concerns.

And in this connection, it may not be improper to compare the $120,000,000 of credit advanced by the Government to these agencies, with the $3,364,713,703 advanced to banks, just referred to. And it may also be noted that this $120,000,000 is equivalent to almost exactly one-fourth of the $474,725,440.81 of bank loans and investments of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Government money still owed by banks on December 31, 1942. It is less by twenty-odd millions than was still due the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by banks in New York and New Jersey alone on that date.

For a closer view of the picture of socialized agricultural credit in the raw, or as some of our banker friends describe it, "at its worst," suppose we look at the operations of the production credit associations in the New Orleans district—Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi—right here at home. The 26 associations (production credit associations) in this district at the end of 1942 had 32,685 farmer stockholders or members. The production and livestock loans of these associations were 25,613 in number in 1942, and amounted to $28,504,907. These loans served 128,065 families, including some 640,325 people. More than 80 percent of these loans were for amounts under $500. The total cost of these loans to borrowers, including interest and all fees, was $814,147.71. This was equivalent to $2.86 for each hundred dollars loaned. Total losses on 1942 operations were $21,639, or less than one-tenth of 1 percent.

Since organization in 1934 these 26 associations have made 224,606 loans, in the total amount of $173,671,251. The losses on this volume of loans have amounted to $118,483. This is equivalent to 76 cents per thousand dollars loaned.

The operations of each of these associations are under a board of 5 directors elected annually by farmer members. Loans are passed on by a committee of 2 farmer directors and the association manager, the latter elected by the directors. What has been accomplished by these 26 associations has been due largely to the unselfish labor and interest of 130 farmer directors serving entirely without pay. They have been assisted by 340 men and women employees, on modest salaries, covering the office and field work involved in servicing more than 25,000 loans, of endless variety, scattered throughout the States of Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi. The business educational value to the farmers of America of the operations of this production credit system is beyond calculation.

Speaking seriously, we question if there is a banking organization in America which could have taken over the set-up in 1934 and made anything like an equivalent showing for the 9-year period which has followed. This just simply is not banking business.

May we add here that a candid review of the experience of both the banking system and the present agricultural credit system suggests the thought that possibly, perhaps even probably, the latter is the sounder of the two. Between 1921 and 1929, 5,714 banks failed in America—with total deposits of $1,630,000,000. Between January 1930 and March 1933, 5,522 banks failed, with deposits of $3,400,000,000. From 1921 to 1933 there were 14,820 suspensions of banks with aggregate deposits of $8,484,101,000. Banks are subject to the same stress of depression and panic which comes to agriculture. And there is nothing in the record of performance to justify the repeated bank claim, or to convince anybody, that the present banking system is practically adapted to the credit requirements of modern agriculture. We believe the truth to be that a sound agricultural credit structure, stabilized as at present and with years of experience behind it, is really one of the greatest supporting safeguards which the American banking system could possibly have. Any unprejudiced, intelligent individual, who will really study the facts of the situation, must reach the conclusion that the entire agricultural, banking, and business fabric of these three States, Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi, is immeasurably strengthened by the protection guaranteed by the farm credit system to the entire agricultural structure of this area. The same proposition is true of the country at large. Any other conclusion would be just as foolish and indefensible as one which would argue that the entire business structure of the Mississippi Delta, including its banks, is not tremendously fortified by the presence and operations of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association and the Staple Cotton Discount Corporation, which depend for their major financing upon the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank and the Bank for Cooperatives, of New Orleans. Certainly there should be no antagonism between Farm Credit and banking. The two should work together for the common good—not only now but always.

In this general connection we take the liberty of borrowing a thought from Oscar Bledsoe, president of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association, and one of the finest analytical minds in the entire field of agricultural credit and cooperation. Mr. Bledsoe has frequently expressed the idea that banks of deposit had clearly shown their inability to meet the cope with either agricultural or industrial crises, and that in sheer self-defense the Federal Reserve System had been created to take care of industry and business, while the credit structure embraced within the Farm Credit Administration had to be set up to meet the needs of agriculture.

V

But do not misunderstand us. No part of this discussion is meant to be an indictment of banks or bankers. Even if construed as a criticism—it is intended to be both constructive and friendly—a criticism of a system of which in many cases banks have been just as truly the victims as were the farmers whom in emergency they tried to serve. The history of all such emergencies supports this conclusion. Take two periods, for illustration, the crises of 1920 to 1922 and of 1930 to 1933. In each case the crisis was financial as well as agricultural. This is always true. The banker simply could not help the farmer. He could not help himself. And we repeat the statement just made that in many cases the banker's troubles were largely due to his efforts to help the farmer. The banking system has demonstrated time and again that it has not yet adapted itself to the practical needs and vicissitudes of present-day agriculture. This is proven beyond question by the facts of the situation. As we indicated in some detail in our discussion in the March issue of this Review, it was a governmental credit agency, the War Finance Corporation, which, under the Agricultural Credits Act of 1921, advanced to banks and banking institutions the sum of $172,114,000, against commitments of $188,550,000. The advance of $88,000,000 to livestock loan companies, at the same time by this same governmental credit agency, was, of course, of immediate assistance to banking institutions also.

These loans enabled the livestock companies to meet their banking obligations, as well as enabling them to carry on operations which made business for the banks in routine course. The same thing was entirely true of the loans to all sorts of agricultural organizations. Every dollar of these loans helped to lift a load from the banker's shoulders, while also immediately making business for his bank. These War Finance Corportion—governmental credit agency—loans were made to 4,317 banking institutions in 37 States, covering the entire country from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf. During the period of its active operations, 1918 to 1928, the War Finance Corporation made loans aggregating $690,431,099.

In this connection, and to emphasize the intimate and noncompetitive relationship which should exist between banking and business and agricultural credit, we may refer again to the $5,000,000 commitment from the War Finance Corporation to the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association in 1921. The mere announcement of the transaction put new life into every branch of the then stagnant business of the Delta. It made possible the movement into trade channels of millions of dollars' worth of Delta cotton. And every turn of each of these transactions made business for Delta banks and for banks in Memphis and elsewhere. The association used only $2,975,000 of its $5,000,000 commitment for 1921. But it was thereby enabled to handle 156,000 bales of Delta cotton, for which it received and distributed in the Delta the sum of $20,299,394. For the first 2 years of that emergency the association handled for its members a total of 324,047 bales, for which they received $45,242,568. The direct and indirect benefits resulting to the banks of this area are beyond calculation. And, as we have clearly pointed out in previous discussions in this Review, this transaction was broadcast throughout the country, with definitely helpful results to the then existing general situation.

There was no opposition to the creation of these regional agricultural credit corporations when they were set up in 1932—either by banks, bankers, private lending agencies, or anybody else. On the contrary, they were then acclaimed by banks, bankers, and the general public as the tangible and crowning evidence of the business wisdom of a business administration—proof of the beneficent statesmanship of President Hoover and his associates. The depression was 2 years old. Banks were folding up. Their demands upon farmers and livestock borrowers could only lead to foreclosures, and really helped nobody. The first loans by these corporations—regional agricultural credit corporations—were made during the week ending October 14, 1932, being 37 loans for $75,517. By December 31, 1933, 14 months, $245,094,324 had been disbursed on 172,945 loans. There were 333,879 applications for a total of $557,958,699.

In view of the indisputable facts of the situation, in general and particular, it seems to come with poor grace from any group of banks or bankers to criticize as unfair competition the agricultural credit operations of these service agencies. What is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. It is beyond our powers of comprehension and analysis to understand why the extension of billions of dollars of Government credit to banks, trust companies, railroads, insurance companies, general utilities, and so forth, is said to mark the high tide of business statesmanship, while the extension to agriculture, by this same Government, of similar credit, but in far less volume, is characterized as the low-water mark of socialistic, governmental paternalism. And we repeat that this attitude on the part of certain banking interests is all the more inexcusable and unfair in the light of the fact that practically every dollar of credit extended to agriculture, and to all forms of industry and business, immediately begins to make business for the banks. And thus far we have not even mentioned the fact of the benefits enjoyed by banks throughout the country in the form of enormous and continuous deposits of Government funds.

VI

We have glanced at the figures of loans made to banks and banking institutions and related interests as well as to agriculture, by one governmental credit agency—the War Finance Corporation— during the crisis of 1920-22. In view of the present bank and banker led fight on agricultural credit of all kinds—for that is what it really is—the cellophane wrapper fools nobody, it should be interesting to examine into some of the activities of another governmental credit agency—the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This is another hold-over from the Hoover administration.

And, by the way, this is the same agency which somebody discovered still had some money on hand to the credit of the old Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations. True, it was really not much money, as money is measured these days—only some $45,000,000 of capital with $13,000,000 surplus. But it was a nice nest egg, and it seemed a shame to let it stay there and dry up and be forgotten and neglected, like the gold hoard at Fort Knox. So it was decided to put it to work in an important part of the war effort. And thereby hangs the tale of the Regional Agricutural Credit Corporations and the American Bankers Associations and all the hell that the latter have raised about the former. But that will keep till we get back to it. Right now we are more interested in seeing what the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has already done for the big boys of big business, than we are in what it may be called upon to do for the small boys of agriculture.

One of the most suggestive of Will Rogers' daily wisecracking combinations of philosophy and wit was his account of a United States Chamber of Commerce banquet which he had just attended, along with Jesse Jones. Will said that practically all of the speakers were big-shot bankers and big-shot businessmen. As each one spoke he cried out against "government in business," and wrung his hands in horror over the way the Government was spending the taxpayers' money, with a lot to say about "socialized credit," and so forth.

Will said that as each speaker spoke his piece Jesse told him how much money the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had loaned that particular speaker or his own particular organization, and he wrote it down on his place card. Will said that when the dinner was over and he had added up both sides of his card, the total looked like a sectional view of the national debt. He said that he meant to deposit his card in the National Archives, and we hope that he did so. We would like to see it dug up and printed in neat pamphlet form by the American Bankers Association, as a companion piece to their recently published brochure under the attractive and suggestive title, "The Battle Against Socialized Agricultural Credit." As this seems unlikely to happen, we shall fill part of the gap by giving some of the figures ourselves.

Through the kindness of Hon. WILL M. WHITTINGTON, the distinguished Congressman from our Delta district, we have secured exhibits of certain officially correct data which show the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's loans to banks and trust companies, both open and closed; loans on and subscriptions for preferred stock and purchases of capital notes or debentures of banks and trust companies; total amounts disbursed to banks and trust companies and amounts outstanding; charge-offs of unpaid principal of loans and stock purchases to aid banks and trust companies; loans to insurance companies, and loans on, and subscriptions for, preferred stock of insurance companies; loans to and purchases of securities of railroad companies. The period covered is from 1932 to 1942, inclusive. Amounts outstanding are as of December 31, 1942. All of which makes interesting reading, particularly when considered in connection with The Battle Against Socialized Agricultural Credit, just above referred to.

Within our limitations of space we can give only a few of these figures. And it seems almost a shame to give them at all; they make the regional agricultural credit corporations proposed and denounced agricultural loans seem so significant by comparison. The banks of every State in the Union shared in these loans, including the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. The total number of banks receiving such aid was 6,909. The amount disbursed to these banks was $2,194,821,871.51. Loans on and subscriptions for preferred stock and purchases of capital notes or debentures, 6,128 banks, amounted to a total of $1,169,891,831.56.

These two items, loans and stock subscriptions, make a total governmental aid to banks of $3,364,713,703.07. Of this total there remained outstanding at December 31, 1942, the sum of $474,725,440.81. The charge-off of principal, not including interest, of bank loans and stock purchases as of December 31, 1942, was $1,282,697.34. These transactions are far from concluded, and there is no way of estimating right now what the losses to the Government will finally be. In face of these figures and of some to follow—for bankers and businessmen even to criticize governmental assistance to farmers, much less to try to break it down, requires more than a distorted sense of proportion and fair play. It requires monumental gall. And we may add that it is a matter of very real satisfaction to us to know that hundreds of banks and bankers in this general area have declined to take any part in this unfair attempt to destroy the American farmers' present agricultural credit structure, under the thin veneer of a so-called battle against socialized agricultural credit. Of the total amount outstanding, $351,224,011.61 was by banks in the 8 States of California, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Vermont. The largest outstanding items were by banks in New Jersey, $77,452,818.94; New York, $65,069,613.93; Illinois, $46,834,290.08; California, $44,322,678.69.

Louisiana is the only State in the fifth district, New Orleans, whose banks reach up into the class of important money. Their total unpaid and outstanding Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans at December 31, 1942, were $16,611,811.13. The banks in the other two States were simply among the also-rans—Alabama banks still owing $5,838,388.69; those in Mississippi, $5,351,555.18—making a total of $27,801,755 for banks in this district.

We may digress here for a moment, to observe in passing that this balance still due the Government, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, by banks in this district, on December 31, 1942, was within $700,000 of the total amount of 1942 loans by the 26 production credit associations in this district. As we have pointed out above these loans last year amounted to $28,504,907, all but $21,639 of which was collected. They were 25,613 in number and served the farm operations of more than 25,000 families, including more than 600,000 people. You may denounce so-called socialized agricultural credit, if you want to—but if this is it, then we are willing to leave to the candid judgment of fair-minded men the question of which of the 2 types of loans here discussed, those to banks or those to farmers, renders the greater service to the Nation.

Returning to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, we find that total loans disbursed to insurance companies amounted to $137,668,209.81, with $33,958,716.03 outstanding at December 31, 1942. Total Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans disbursed to railroads, including purchases of securities, were $1,035,626,714.70, with a total outstanding at December 31, 1942, of $460,439,037.62. The total Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans actually disbursed to banks, insurance companies, and railroads amounted to $4,538,008,627.58. The total amount unpaid and outstanding at December 31, 1942, was $969,123,194.46. As just above noted, the losses on banks amounted to $1,282,697.34. The losses on loans other than banks, which include railroads, insurance companies, etc., amount to $5,391,839. This is a total charge-off on these items of $6,674,536.34. Looking at these really handsome figures, it is small wonder that the timid little amount left over on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation books for socialized credit for agriculture remained so long in forgotten obscurity. It just wasn't big enough to attract attention.

VII

The problem of the ability of this country to produce under war conditions sufficient food for the war rejuirements of ourselves and our allies has been emphasized and public attention focused upon it by the setting up of the War Food Administration. That the problem was sufficiently serious to cause Mr. Roosevelt to borrow Chester Davis from the presidency of the St. Louis Federal Reserve Bank, and turn over to him the job of war food production, is enough to challenge the interest of every financially unprejudiced man in whose mind and heart the war effort occupies first place. It is no military secret that the problem of feeding the conquered peoples of Europe is rated as of primary importance in every discussion of the matter of a second front in terms of an allied continental invasion. For many years it has fallen to the lot of this country to feed the hungry and clothe the naked of all the world's unfortunates. From time immemorial America has relieved the famine stricken without regard to time, place, or circumstance. We have been the big brother, may we say the Good Samaritan, in years gone by to Ireland, to Russia, to Japan, to India, to China. The work of the Belgian Relief Commission, during the First World War, under Mr. Hoover and his associates, has passed into history as one of the noblest humanitarian achievements ever undertaken by civilized man. And by the way, before we entered the present war, Mr. Hoover made an earnest effort to arouse public opinion to the point of assuming the burden of feeding the women and children—at least the children—of the overrun countries of Europe.

So this war food production problem in America is necessarily tied into the European invasion problem of the military strategists of the Allied Nations. Assuming that a continental invasion might, on a strictly military basis, be undertaken with reasonable safety right now, it is doubtful that those in authority would attempt it unless the food situation should also justify it. An influencing consideration might well be that of our immediate ability or inability to feed the people of any country or countries which we might recapture from Hitler. The very day, the very hour, on which Allied troops took over, America would be called upon to assume and immediately to begin the tremendous responsibility of feeding and clothing the people who had been freed. This is the goal of accomplishment toward which all European eyes are turned. It has been a problem of vexatious proportions on the North African front since the day American soldiers set foot on African soil. It has been accentuated by the recent capture of at least 150,000 prisoners of war. Our ability to feed the people of these conquered countries is, in their sight, right next to their actual deliverance itself, the greatest test of our ability to help them. The issuing of food, and ample food, to the hunger stricken, starving millions of Europe, this, and not the waving of flags, is to them the real measure of the quality and substance of our aid. Our failure to feed the people of a reconquered territory might be worse than a delay in the final effort to drive out their oppressors. It would be giving them a stone in answer to their cry for bread. And the repercussions of our failure would be felt in every conquered country of the world. It is something which we cannot allow to happen.

In the light of these facts, and we assume them to be facts, we can understand why men around war conference tables speak of "bread and bombs." And it requires no stretch of the imagination to realize that the phrase is very much more than a mere alliterative combination of words. We can also understand why soldiers, men high in the military counsels of our Nation and of our allies, make common cause with agriculturists, why they agree that this year, right now, it is just as crucially important, just as vitally essential, to the successful prosecution of the war effort, that we produce bread as it is that we produce bombs. And we may find in all of this an explanation of the almost desperately feverish effort of those responsible for the food production end of the war program to leave no stone unturned, to spare no means, to the end that in this year, above all others, we shall have no failure of food. The difference between a superabundant supply of food at the end of 1943 and a food scarcity might mean the difference between an early and a long-range conclusion of the war.

This is why those in places of responsibility are so disturbed over the manpower problems of our farms. This is why it was determined that the success of the war food production program should not be jeopardized, should not for one moment be in any one instance hampered, for lack of necessary production credit. And we may safely assume that this is fundamentally why the regional agricultural credit corporations were revived, as one additional policy of insurance against the dreaded possibility of failure.

There is nothing overdrawn about the picture. The seriousness of the food problem in war can never be overdrawn. We have only to open our eyes and ears, to read the daily press, to look at an occasional country weekly, to keep in touch with those in positions of agricultural responsibility. Listen to

Chester Davis in a press report of April 27: "In an extraordinary eleventh-hour plea for all-out agricultural effort before the spring planting season ends, he sounded this call to the Nation's farmers: 'This is the most important planting season in American farm history. We ask farmers, on their part, in the days that remain of the spring planting, to take an extra degree of chance this year for their country—to plant in full the acreage they can expect to handle under the most favorable circumstances.'" He gave his personal and official assurance of all possible help in the matter of labor and machinery and added an appeal for a maximum acreage of soybeans, peanuts, and other vegetable oil crops.

Chester Davis' appeal for a maximum acreage of vegetable oil crops, such as soybeans and peanuts, reminds us that this war production program is by no means confined to the production of actual food requirements. The controversial aspects of the financing program now under fire include what are designated "essential war crops." This includes some 18 items, such as soybeans, peanuts, flax, hemp, American-Egyptian cotton, castor beans, etc. The production of these commodities, under the proposed program, may be financed under certain circumstances through conditional nonrecourse loans.

All loans under this Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation program must be passed on by the Department of Agriculture County War Boards—one of which is supposed to have been established some months ago in every county in America. No loan may be made which is competitive with any other lending agency, including banks. The borrower is personally liable for all loans made under the program. But in some cases the local County War Board may approve a partially nonrecourse loan. Where such a loan is made, the nonrecourse feature becomes effective only under certain conditions, as where the County War Board, at the end of the season, certifies that the borrower has used the full amount of the loan in producing the crop or crops agreed upon; that the borrower "in good faith has diligently applied principles of good husbandry to the production of such crop;" that all the proceeds of the crop have been applied to the repayment of the loan, and that such amount has been insufficient to repay the loan in full. If these conditions are met, and are certified to by the local County War Board, that part of the loan remaining unpaid after the application of the crop proceeds will be canceled and the borrower's assets will be released.

The philosophy back of the conditional limitation of liability under this particular type of loan, is that the Government is just as thoroughly justified in taking this action, where necessary to induce the planting of a sufficient acreage in "essential war crops," as it is in advancing practically unlimited funds to manufacturers of military equipment—when it is a matter of common knowledge that such war emergency advances will never be repaid—and are not expected to be repaid. This idea is part of the "bread and bombs" set-up. Entirely regardless of whether or not we agree with the philosophy in question, its meaning and intent are clear and unequivocal, and the philosophy itself is free of any communistic or socialistic taint. In set-up and purpose it is a war measure proposition, straight out, whether we like it or not. It is no more socialized agricultural credit than is a Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan to a distressed bank socialized commercial credit, or a Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan to reorganize a railroad socialized industrial credit. They are all tarred with the same brush, if we want to look at it that way.

Due to the confusion which seems to exist as to the administration of the regional credit corporations and purely as a matter of information, we may say that these concerns were originally set up by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the several land bank districts, beginning in September 1932 under the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of July 21, 1932. Under the creating act, these corporations were managed by officers appointed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and under the supervision of that concern. By the terms of an Executive order of the President, dated March 27, 1933, all administrative functions of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations were transferred to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration, effective May 27, 1933. Their business was logically, but gradually, absorbed by the Production Credit Associations, set up under the Farm Credit Act of 1933. And whatever functions have since been exercised by them, in process of liquidation or otherwise, have remained under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration. There is, therefore, no mystery whatever as to the present relations of these corporations with the Farm Credit Administration—even though such relations may have been interrupted temporarily, for a brief period.

It is too early to secure much over-all data on the revived Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation operations. But here are some authentic figures of Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loans in this district, Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi. Let us see how far these loans have gone in swallowing up all other kinds of credit. The figures should also give us some light on the amount of business which these loans are taking away from country banks, if you want to pursue the matter that far.

From January 1 to April 27, 1943, inclusive, the New Orleans district made a total of 1,703 Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loans, for a total of $985,716.63. Of these, 941, for $285,441.30, were F-2 or conditional nonrecourse loans—more than half in number and less than one-third in volume of the total.

For the same period the number of Production Credit Association loans closed in this district, was 22,162, for a total of $18,627,801.65. Private financing concerns, for the same period, discounting through the Federal Intermediate Credit Bank of New Orleans, closed 829 loans, for a total of $6,062,293.59.

Based on this showing, it does not seem likely that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation loans will set this part of the world on fire, nor justify any part of the hurrah that has been raised about them.

These loans cover wheat, corn, oats, barley, flax, hemp, soybeans, peanuts, American-Egyptian cotton, tobacco, sugarcane, rice, sweetpotatoes, castor beans, and livestock. Down to April 30, the indicated acreage to be financed by such loans was 21,563. Of this, 7,610 acres are to be financed by F-2, or conditional nonrecourse loans.

VIII

Perhaps, after all, there is merit in the banker's position, when presented with a proposition somewhat out of the ordinary—that it is not bank business. Perhaps they were right when the organizers of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association appealed to them for help back in 1921. Maybe it was not bank business. Doubtless it was too much to ask or expect of the banks that they take care of the farmers during the various depressions of the past. The truth is that as a whole the banking system was not able to take care of itself. In emergencies the banks have not hesitated to turn to the Government for assistance. They have, in fact, themselves helped devise new institutions and agencies through which such assistance could be given them, either directly or indirectly, through their customers.

Since their organization in 1923 the Intermediate Credit Banks have been of outstanding assistance to agriculture. This is, of course, true through the ordinary course of their rediscounting functions for production credit and marketing organizations. This also is business which the banks would not, or could not handle. We have particularly in mind the services which the Intermediate Credit Bank of this district has rendered during times of emergency and distress. After the low-grade cotton year of 1925, the Staple Cotton Association secured from the Intermediate Credit Bank of New Orleans a commitment of $10,000,000, to enable it to carry low-grade Delta cotton until outlets could be developed for it. This meant also a service to cotton mills, in carrying this cotton until the mills could find uses and customers for the product into which it could be manufactured. This service by the Intermediate Credit Bank, and through the Staple Cotton Association, was worth more than $3,000,000 to Delta growers, measured by the actual results secured. Again, in 1931, in the early days of the depression period which made it impossible for many banks to carry on normal operations, the Intermediate Credit Bank of New Orleans advanced to the Staple Cotton Discount Corporation a line of $10,000,000 for the relief of that emergency situation.

The bank's services to the cane and rice growers of Louisiana have been outstanding through a period of years. This service has all but revolutionized the warehousing and grading of rice. The service to cane growers was rendered largely in cooperation with the State Agricultural Credit Corporation, and practically saved the sugar industry of Louisiana.

Without going into details, we may add that it is an established fact that the Intermediate Credit Bank of this district was a pioneer in insisting that the proceeds of the loans which it rediscounted for production credit purposes should be disbursed and used by growers on a budget basis. This bank has been a tower of strength to the farmers and farm organizations of the States of Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi. The business it does is principally business which banks formerly refused to take, and probably are not in position to handle now. Yet there is a movement on foot among certain bankers and politicians to boycott any banking institution which will buy Intermediate Credit Bank debentures—on the proceeds of which these banks must depend to finance the farmer organizations which they are called upon to serve.

During 1942 the 12 Intermediate Credit Banks of the Farm Credit Administration system discounted agricultural paper for farmers and farm institutions to the amount of $816,000,000. Sixty million, five hundred thousand dollars of this was advanced in this district—Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi.

We may add in conclusion that we have had little to say here about the Federal land banks and the banks for cooperatives. These highly important units of the Farm Credit Administration are not included in the immediate attacks on so-called socialized agricultural credit. Hence, we have given primary consideration in this discussion to the two units which are actually under fire, and to the agricultural credit system as a whole.

IX

For something more than 50 years the editor of this Review has been a student of agricultural economics, with particular reference to agricultural credit. The conclusion

which he reached many years ago remains basically unchanged—namely that there can be no sound system of agriculture without a fundamentally sound substructure of agricultural credit. And this credit structure must cover every phase of agricultural operations, from production to marketing. Back in the cotton factorage days, when there seemed no hope except for the rich, it never occurred to us that we would live long enough to be able to make the following statement, upon the basis of accomplished fact:

"The farmers of America may assume and discharge their full share of this war's burdens, in the untroubled confidence that at its conclusion they will have at their disposal the vast facilities of the most elaborate credit structure which has ever been devised for the agricultural needs of any country in the history of the world. These modern credit facilities did not just happen. They are not matters of chance. They did not spring up like mushrooms overnight. It should be both interesting and instructive to inquire into the history of their origin and of their growth through the years."

It is a further contribution to that history when we write, as we have written in this fragmentary review, of the effort "to deprive American agriculture of the governmental credit facilities which were born of pitiless and inexorable necessity, and which have been developed through the heartbreaking experiences of adversity."

Agriculture is the basic industry of human life, because it has to do with the vital necessities of human life—food and clothes and shoes and fibers and fats and oils—and with the needs of domestic animal life as well. When this war is over a stabilized agriculture will be the surest foundation, as it will be the greatest need, of whatever processes of readjustment may be found to be necessary to a resumption of the ways of peace. And the surest guaranty of a stabilized agriculture for the future is to be found in the undisturbed continuance of the agricultural credit structure which is today making possible in America the greatest agricultural effort ever undertaken by any people anywhere at any time.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—When this Review was established, our directors took the position that a maximum degree of freedom of expression should be permitted on the editorial side. It was felt that such a policy would enhance the value of the Review, both to our members and to such other interested readers as our modest house organ might reach. This freedom of expression has never been abused, and will not be. We have found it advisable, from time to time, during the past 20 years, to remind our readers of the fact of this independence of editorial thought and utterance, in order to emphasize the corollary fact that there is no responsibility upon the part of the Cotton Association or the Discount Corporation for what appears in our editorial pages. The editor of the Review is a director in both of these concerns. He is also a director in the Farm Credit Administration of New Orleans. But editorially he is a free agent. He has no business transactions with any of them, and is under no obligation to them, other than to serve them by keeping himself fully informed as to their functions and operations and fully advised as to their performance. Hence his statements here are not based on gossip or hearsay, just as they are not influenced by prejudice or self-interest. Nor is any unit or official of the Farm Credit Administration in any way responsible for any statement or expression in the accompanying editorial. It was written solely by the editor, and solely in the interest of fairness to the agricultural credit structure which is today so well serving the farmers, not only of our own district, but of the country at large.

Antistrike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS RIZLEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to no one in this body in genuine sympathy for the men and women who toil in the factories, in the shops, and in the fields or in the mines.

Born of humble parents and reared in humble and simple surroundings, I know as well as anyone what it means to work with my hands in the field and in the factory, long hours and with scant pay.

The men who go into the bowels of the earth to mine the coal are entitled to decent wages, decent hours of work, and better living standards. This, no one with a spark of human understanding will deny.

We are, however, in a serious situation in this country. The country it at war—total war—and the most cruel kind of war in the history of the world. The winning of this war and all-out production of the things necessary to furnish to our fighting men and our allies, transcends the rights of any individual or of any group, whether it be labor, owner, or operator.

No one has a right to strike against the Government of the United States, especially when our country is at war. It is not a question based solely upon the fine job that has been done so far in producing the tools and implements of war. The morale of our Army, the morale of our people must be considered, and it should be apparent to everyone that when a half million men walk out of a production plant, that the morale of the boys in the fighting front and of the Nation generally, is greatly affected.

I am not particularly interested in where the fault lies, whether it be with the owners of the plants, the men who work in the plants, or the Government agents. Their quarrels must be postponed while the Nation is at war.

This bill applies during the emergency. The necessity for the legislation grows out of an emergency. The coal miners' sons are fighting side by side with the sons of the owners of the mines. If we quit mining coal, we cannot supply the furnaces which melt the steel and forge the minerals into implements of war necessary for the boys to defend themselves and to defend our country.

For 3 days we have listened to this debate. Much of it has been on a very low plane. Anyone who supports any legislation is branded as a labor hater and a labor baiter. Powerful leaders representing labor organizations have attempted to intimidate Members of Congress by threatening to use the entire power and force of the particular labor organization he represents to go into the Congressman's district and defeat him for re-election.

It is a sad commentary when legislation cannot be debated on its merits and when intimidation, coercion, and threats are used to take the place of argument. After listening to this debate for 3 days it is impossible to tell whether this administration or any political party in this country has any fixed labor policy except that of political expediency.

The soldiers on the battle fronts are not responsible for the conditions which have made necessary this legislation. The Congress is not responsible for the conditions which have made necessary the consideration of this legislation at this time. Strikes sponsored and brought about by the leaders of labor, created the public demand that Congress do something.

It has been argued—and I think rightly so—that the President under the various war power acts and in his role as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, has full and complete authority to effectively and decisively put down these strikes and prevent their reoccurrence. His failure to do so however, does not entirely relieve the Congress of responsibility.

Let us write a bill containing mandatory directives and let us say to the executive department of this Government, that this coddling of labor leaders must stop while this country is at war. Let us at least discharge our duty to the Nation and to our boys who are fighting everywhere in the world.

Free Private Enterprise in a Post-War World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater problem that will face us following the conclusion of the war than that of restoring free private enterprise in America. Our Nation has prospered throughout its more than 150 years of existence by adhering to the policy of free enterprise and assuring to every citizen the right to conduct his own affairs free from dictation and regimentation. While it is true that during war emergency it is necessary to lodge almost dictatorial powers in the hands of the Commander in Chief and the war agencies under him responsible for the conduct of the war, we must not forget that these powers are temporary and for the duration of the war and must be revoked following cessation of hostilities.

One of the great enterprises in America is home building and home ownership which has always been carried on as a private industry. We have throughout our history encouraged home ownership and we know that that community is most prosperous and dependable which has the greatest number of home owners.

A group of citizens in my district recently held a conference and passed a resolution urging that home building in the United States should be restored to free private enterprise. This is of such great importance to the Nation as a whole that I include the resolution, together with the names and business association of those participating in the conference:

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 13, 1943.*

At a conference held here today to discuss needed legislation to encourage private home building and home ownership and to assure full employment in the building industry, especially in the post-war period, the following resolution was approved.

Those participating in the conference, informally representing the business interests of Portland and vicinity, were:

L. C. Simms, president, Portland Home Builders Association, Inc., and president, Franklin Homes, Inc., 620 Platt Building, Portland.

Larry W. Bome, executive secretary, Portland Real Estate Board, 607 Wilcox Building, Portland.

Fred E. Arnold, president, Portland Real Estate Board, Porter Building, Portland.

Harry M. Hawkins, president, Commonwealth, Inc., 415 Southwest Sixth Avenue, Portland.

P. M. Robinson, assistant director of industrial promotion department, Portland Chamber of Commerce, Portland.

Carl A. Strand, Great Lakes Steel Co., 730 Southwest Salmon Street, Portland.

C. B. Sweet, manager, retail department, Long-Bell Lumber Co., post-office box 1079, Longview, Wash.

Glenn W. Chenny, Dant & Russell, Inc., Porter Building, Portland.

Charles R. Wilson, Timber Structures, Inc., 3400 Northwest Yeon Avenue, Portland.

Paul Neils, J. Neils Lumber Co., American Bank Building, Portland.

Ray W. Simeral, vice president and general manager, Fir-Tex Insulating Board Co., Porter Building, Portland.

Al Discero, manager, Qualser Lumber Co., 2528 Southeast Eleventh Street, Portland.

Harry Mittleman, builder and operator, 710 Southwest Madison, Portland.

Joseph R. Gerber, advertising, 1305 Southwest Twelfth Avenue, Portland.

Ray Andrews, Botsford, Constantine & Gardner, advertising, 115 Southwest Fourth Avenue, Portland.

Ralph Calkins, McCann-Erickson, advertising, 1309 Public Service Building, Portland.

R. G. Barnett, vice president and general manager, Portland Gas & Coke Co., 313 Public Service Building, Portland.

Col. W. B. Greeley, secretary-manager, West Coast Lumbermen's Association, 364 Stuart Building, Seattle, Wash.

Bernard L. Johnson, western editor, American Builder, 1038 Henry Building, Seattle, Wash.

"Be it resolved, That home building in the United States should be restored to free private enterprise.

"The private home-building industry is the best prepared instantly to take up the slack caused by cessation of war activity, and to prevent post-war unemployment and depression.

"The first step in planning a home-building program for the immediate future, as well as for the post-war period, is to obtain a directive from Congress that will establish the policy of the United States as promoting and encouraging private home building. At the earliest possible time a program of private home building should replace the current socialized defense housing activity by Federal agencies (as set forth in the joint statement of policy by the National Housing Agency and the War Production Board) for immediate war emergencies.

"This legislation should establish the permanency of the Federal Housing Administration as a Federal mortgage insurance agency, stimulating private home building and private home ownership in lieu of all forms of federalized housing.

"Such action on the part of Congress is an essential step in recovering the American way of life."

O. P. A. Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that every Member of Congress has received many appeals from the small businessmen from their districts with respect to the crippling and unfair regulations issued by the Office of Price Administration and with an especial reference to the recent M. P. R. 333 and 208.

We all realize that through the years the small businessman in the thousands of the communities throughout the United States have been the mainstay of local community life. I am in receipt of a letter from one of the most representative and long-established firms in my district, which so fairly and convincingly outlines the viewpoint of these concerns which through the years have served our people well that I am taking the liberty of inserting this letter in the RECORD, feeling that it will strike a responsive cord with every Member of this House:

SAVANNA, ILL., *May 22, 1943.*

Hon. LEO E. ALLEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEO: This firm, successors to F. M. Jenks (father), F. M. Jenks & Sons, has been worrying along for nearly 90 years trying faithfully to serve this community fairly and honestly as a comparatively small independent dry-goods store.

In a way we feel some measure of pride in that we have met many kinds of competition and have survived up to the present. However, we are much concerned about our latest competitor—the Office of Price Administration, with MPR 339 and 208 taking the first crack at us. While we can worry through that we trust that you readily appreciate what it would mean if such a program were extended throughout a general stock.

It is needless, of course, to remind you that the small and large independent store pay a lot of taxes; support a great many families; generally help all the churches in the community contribute liberally to distress cases wrought by fires, flood, wind, sickness; keep Main Street looking thrifty; patronize home banks beyond the asking for change; usually in the front rank for all local improvements, paving, sewers, fire protection, recreation, and civic centers; hospitals, even to well-kept cemeteries; indeed it can be well said that the small and independent stores of any community not only are but have been for many years pretty much on the job from the cradle to the grave.

We are afraid that the Office of Price Administration does not appreciate or realize that the average small or big-town merchant does a multitude of worth-while things to help make the people home loving and patriotic citizens.

The best of them make only a modest living and put in long hours to do that; and just why the Office of Price Administration should discriminate against the independent merchant on prices of rayon hose and work clothing and probably set to do so on other things we don't understand.

Thanking you for any attention that you may give this and for any assistance that you may render to make the path of the independent store a little smoother that now seems in prospect.

We are,
Yours truly,

JENKS BROTHERS.

Labor Comes of Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 4, 1943

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from this week's issue of Collier's:

LABOR COMES OF AGE

John L. Lewis' recent head-on collision with the White House aroused a variety of passions all around the United States—all around the United Nations, indeed. We think, though, that this is the sensible way to look at the whole episode, and at any others like it that may occur:

Organized labor has come of age in this country. Time was when it was regarded by liberals as a pathetic but deserving infant that should be coddled and nursed to adolescence, and by conservatives as a sinister little brat that ought to be strangled before it got any bigger. The liberal view won out, and organized labor in the United States is long past adolescence now.

How it got that way doesn't much matter, or who helped it to grow up. You can blame the aggressiveness and ruthlessness of labor leaders like Lewis if you wish, or the New Deal's labor lovers if that makes you feel any better, or evolution if you like to regard yourself as a scientific thinker.

What does matter is that labor is now full-grown in this country, and that it is time for it to take on the responsibilities of adulthood as well as the privileges.

Up to now it has enjoyed mainly the privileges, plus. The National Labor Relations Act has given it a lot of these, and sundry Supreme Court decisions have given it a lot more. Accordingly, various labor leaders of the less scrupulous type have been stepping high, wide, and unhandsome as regards racketeering, intimidation of workers and employers, feather-bedding, freezing new materials and processes off the market, fighting for power to the injury of the consuming public, and pushing up various war costs to unconscionable heights.

As long-time believers in the necessity of labor unions and collective bargaining, we also believe that the time has come for labor

to realize that it is a grown man now, and to take to acting like one.

It can do that by cooperating in the framing of legislation making labor accountable to the law, just as business concerns and private citizens are accountable.

Such legislation would include laws requiring labor organizations to publish honestly compiled financial statements at regular intervals, to hold real elections periodically, to abstain from jurisdictional strikes, to consent to cool-off and talk-it-over periods before starting any strike, sit-down or slowdown, to drop feather-bedding practices, perhaps even to forego the luxury of electing men who are known criminals, Communists, Fascists, or Nazis to union offices.

If labor doesn't help to make these adjustments and any others that may be needed, we must fear that American public opinion will shove a set of far more drastic reforms down labor's throat. American public opinion can—and for better or for worse habitually does—do just that to any bloc or faction that overtaxes its patience.

Address by Hon. Harold H. Burton, of Ohio, at Commencement Exercises of Mount Union College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. BURTON

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 8 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a commencement-day address entitled "Look Up, America, Look Up," delivered by me at Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio, on June 6, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handiwork." Look up, America, look up. This generation has a special invitation to share those heavens with the birds and with God.

For thousands of years man has lived largely in two dimensions. He has shared the surface of the earth with the caterpillar and, with him, has dreamed of a day when he might fly. The caterpillar went into his chrysalis each season and was born again with wings. Not until this century has man been so reborn. Today, however, he can fly as he has longed to fly. He can live in three dimensions instead of two.

As a flyer he can see more and do more. Before man could fly, he walked as a pedestrian, he spoke as a pedestrian, and he saw the world only from the ground. But now that he has earned his wings he can walk as a man and fly as a bird, and can see things from a higher and truer point of view.

Ohio is the birthplace of aviation, for the Wright brothers won their wings in Ohio. Today at Dayton we have the world's greatest experimental flying field and at Cleveland we are building one of the world's best aircraft engine research laboratories. One-fourth of every dollar spent in the United States for airplanes comes to Ohio for her contributions to those planes. Here in Alliance you have the Taylorcraft industry that contributes much to aviation.

Your generation has been given the talent to fly. Do not bury it in the ground. Develop it, be worthy of it, and you will be repaid many times over.

When you fly you see the landscape as a whole more clearly than when you walk. Your perspective increases. Your horizons expand. You see no artificial boundary lines. You see the true relation of city to country, river to ocean, farm to factory, mountain to valley, woods to prairie. You see the historic courses of ancient rivers. You read the story of geology written in bold characters across the earth. You rise from a dark and rainy day on the surface straight through the clouds into the ever-present sunshine. You see the gold and silver lining of the darkest storm. You do in minutes what you used to do in hours. You do in hours what you used to do in days. Your life is larger. Your efforts are more productive.

Because of the habits of your ancestors your first flight may seem a little hard to take. But I ask you to live in the future rather than in the past. Use the new opportunities that are yours. It is only thus that you will grow.

I urge you at every turn to encourage this new industry, the flyers in the armed forces, the Civil Air Patrol, the individual civilian flyers, the commercial air lines, and the air mails. The hardest pioneering has been done. The greatest rewards lie immediately ahead. But wings will not grow unless they are exercised. Aviation is in its infancy. It is ready to grow as fast as you will help it grow.

Sixteen years ago our domestic planes were carrying mail and a few passengers. In that year less than 6,000 people in America rode as air passengers. Two years ago 4,000,000 did so. The airplanes of America carried those 4,000,000 an average of nearly 400 miles each. It is conservatively estimated that within 2 years this passenger mileage will be increased 4 times over.

The danger in making regular commercial flights has been so far reduced that insurance companies no longer make restrictions against such travel, and they ask no special premiums for it. From 1939 to 1942 there were less than 3 lives lost to every 100,000,000 passenger-miles flown in the continental United States.

Aviation serves not only in commercial passenger travel but also in carrying the mail, express, and freight. Its greatest volume in time of peace is, however, in private and personal flying. Before the war all our great domestic commercial flying was done in 350 planes with 700 pilots. At that same time America was flying 25,000 private planes with 100,000 qualified pilots for them. It is the private car rather than the bus that has made the greatest contribution to the automotive industry. So, in aviation, to the surprise of many people, it will be the private plane rather than the commercial plane that in time of peace will account for the greatest volume of our plane production.

In time of war the military use of planes dominates every other use. Aviation advanced by leaps and bounds because of the lessons of the last war. Today, the genius of the rising generation is rushing into the air with an enthusiasm that is driving the aviation industry into a development that promises to lead not only to victory in war but to post-war prosperity.

Three years ago our domestic aviation industry reported $280,000,000 spent in production. Two years ago it was $1,800,000,000. Last year it was $6,400,000,000. This year it will be $20,100,000,000. This is one-fifth of our National Budget and one-seventh of our national income. The automotive industry at its peak spent less than $4,000,000,000 a year. Our aviation expenditures this year will be five times that.

So fly, America, fly! Fly, not only to add to your pleasure and your personal efficiency, but also to help realize a worth-while return upon the tremendous investment of capital, material, time, and skill that war is forcing into aviation. You have a wealth of productive capacity in plants, in skilled labor, and in actual flying experience. Such capacity will not soon be offered to you again.

What are some of the things that aviation can do for you after the war? It can save your time, thereby increasing your productive capacity. It can save costs of transportation, especially in personal travel and in distant shipments of small, light, and valuable articles or of those that have added value if delivered quickly. It will displace some surface travel but it also will develop much new long and short distance travel for which there has been neither time nor demand. If you are to use any thing like the full capacity for production of planes that will be available at the close of the war, you will need to develop not only commercial and military aviation but the widespread personal use of planes for private purposes. Competent authorities do not expect the airplane generally to replace the American family's one general automobile but they do expect an airplane to replace many an American family's second automobile. This is the natural field for helicopters.

Of these William A. M. Burden, Special Aviation Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, recently said in testimony before the Committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate Commerce, "Great strides have already been made in developing a safe and reasonably economical helicopter—a step which in itself may be greater than all which has been accomplished for private flying in the last 20 years. * * * If 200,000 private planes could be sold per year in the United States, they would provide a dollar volume of sales equal to any annual transport aircraft sales volume which we seem likely to achieve for many years to come."

Ten years from now an airport will be as vital to a town as was a railroad connection 40 years ago. Already a nearby airport is necessary in order to attract the location of an industry. Airports large and small are the foundation stones of aviation and the key to its usefulness. Not only commercial passenger ports will be needed but also freight and express ports and almost countless private parking spots and factory airplane "sidings."

Aviation is the key to world-wide military stability. It is the key to the effectiveness of an international police force assigned to the preservation of international law and order against military aggression. It is the key to increased trans-Atlantic and trans-Pacific travel and commerce. From many an ocean passenger's point of view, it not only saves time but also brings welcome freedom from seasickness. When the planes of the future reach successfully into the stratosphere, aviation will have overcome most of the hazards of bad flying weather. Aviation is the key to access to priceless new raw materials. Aviation will deliver countless manufactured products to new markets. This is especially true in Central and South America and in the Far East. The greatest gains through aviation are made on routes where the only other means of travel is by boat at about 20 miles an hour or over mountains and through jungles which, for commercial purposes, are impassable.

Turning to another aspect of the future of aviation, Edward Warner, vice chairman of the United States Civil Aeronautics Board, said in his Wilbur Wright memorial lecture

before. the Royal Aeronautical Society in London last month the following:

"The most modest anticipation cannot doubt that the technical development will be great. It will be for the people of the United Nations and their governments, and in particular and in large part for the nations of the British Commonwealth and for the United States, to determine how technical progress will be used. When the last bomb has been dropped and unconditional surrender has become a fact in Tokyo and in Berlin, that problem will confront us. The success with which it is solved will shape the destinies of children yet unborn. The designers will not fail. The statesmen, and the people whose interests the statesmen serve, must not."

Whether or not we want it so, the airplane has made a neighborhood not only of the Nation, as one of our national air lines has advertised, but also of the entire world. After the war, substantially every nation will be less than 50 hours by air from every other nation. Buenos Aires will be 1½ days from New York by air instead of 20 by water. Singapore will be 29 hours from San Francisco by air instead of 22 days by steamship. A passenger on the *Constellation* will fly from New York to San Francisco in 9 hours, which is the train schedule for a fast trip from New York to Pittsburgh. Washington, D. C., will be 16 hours from Moscow, Rio de Janeiro, and Istanbul. It will be 26 hours from Chungking and the Cape of Good Hope.

It is estimated by Warner that in a few years trips of 1,000 miles or more in the United States will be made 65 percent by air instead of 20 percent as in 1940. Trips of 200 miles will be 25 percent by air instead of 11 percent as in 1940. He anticipates a post-war average of 600 air passengers a day, passing one way or the other, between North America and Europe. Allowing for the difference in time, airplanes will leave London at 6 p. m. to arrive in New York the next morning at 9. Similar trips will leave at 4, 8, 10, and midnight. Return trips, flying against the course of the sun but with the prevailing winds will leave New York at noon to arrive in London the next morning at 9.

William Burden says: "Our primary task in winning this war is training our youth to use air power. The greatest essential in constructing a civilized post-war world will be the conditioning of our entire population to the air point of view."

Alexander P. de Seversky says: "The Roman Empire flourished in the days of land power because every Roman was a soldier. In the period of sea power, every Britisher, even if he never went to sea, was a sailor in his heart, and today, in the epoch of air power, it behooves every American, man and woman alike, to be an airman in his heart."

Today 250,000 of our boys and girls in 14,000 public, parochial, and private high schools are studying preflight courses. They are learning the A B C's of aviation in aerodynamics, airplane structure, meteorology, navigation, airplane engines, and radio communication. Three million of our youngsters are making model planes.

This brings us to the practical consideration that if your generation and mine is to keep up with the technical advances of this age it is essential that the people and the nations of the world adjust the man-made barriers between governmental areas so as to permit the passage of traffic and the development of this tremendous potential air traffic with fairness to humanity and fairness to each of the nations concerned.

It has been said in this connection that an air age will compel either conquest of the world or cooperation throughout it. Hitler is trying conquest. He is doomed to failure at the hands of the very air power by which he sought to dominate the world. Soon it will be the turn of the United Nations to demonstrate the feasibility of cooperation.

It will broaden our horizons to meet the opportunities of aviation. It will call for broadminded constructive cooperation among not only the technical advisers but also among those charged with the governmental responsibilities of the nations of the world. In self-governing nations, like ours, it will call for sound leadership and for widespread popular understanding of the needs and benefits of aviation. Success will rest with the imaginations of the young people of today. If the people of America and the world once understand the opportunity that is theirs, they will not only support international cooperation but will seek it. It can lead them to prosperity and improved standards of living.

At present there are but few principles of public international law of the air established by the International Council for the Regulation of Air Navigation that met in Paris, in 1919. The work of that council has been ratified by 33 nations, but not by the United States. It does not even remotely meet the needs of the situation. It recognizes the initial complete control over the air space above it that vests in every nation. It permits that nation to insist upon its individual permission for every outsider to enter that air. It provides no adequate program for mutually beneficial development of air travel. It leaves such development to the haphazard course of bilateral agreement of each nation with every other.

A few principles were developed by the Habana Conference on Commercial Aviation held in Habana, Cuba, in 1928. This report has been ratified by 11 nations. All 11, including the United States, are in the Western Hemisphere. None of them ratified the Paris convention. These agreements at least provide a right of passage for foreign planes if they use designated routes.

The time is near for further constructive measures. These measures will call for leadership and a clear and well-informed analysis of the problems in the mutual interest of the industry and of the several nations concerned. Just now most of the best informed authorities on aviation are engaged in fighting the great war of the air—but in this process of world-wide military aviation they are blazing the trails of the airways of the everlasting future.

To illustrate the problems of the air, there are many positions which may be taken between the extreme position excluding all foreign planes and that giving them unlimited freedom to fly everywhere. Mention of some of them suggests the need for the thoughtful consideration of them. There is the need for simple or so-called innocent air passage without landing. There is the need, under certain conditions, to use air facilities, such as radio, landing space, refueling service, repair service and a place of refuge in case of storm or accident. There are needs for "commercial outlets" carrying rights to import and export. These in turn suggest the problems of customs, immigration, and designated ports of entry far from the ordinary seaports. There is need for uniformity in safety requirements, flying regulations, certification of pilots and identification of planes. There is a natural need for restricting foreign planes to certain routes, landing fields and "free zones." There are problems raised by commercial, passenger, mail and cargo planes that are different from those raised by private planes. There are special questions at seaports where the clippers come in on the surface like ships from the sea. There are additional questions that will arise when commercial planes shall fly in the stratosphere completely out of sight from the ground. There are the special needs of military planes and the problems of the storage of military supplies. There will come international competition between nationally owned air lines, internationally subsidized air lines and private self-sustaining lines, some operating on a competitive basis and others perhaps as monopolies.

This tremendous transportation industry will have much to do with the development or retardation of commerce in many fields. The commercial growth of nations may depend upon it. There will be difficult questions arising from the convertibility of civilian airplanes and manufacturing facilities to military uses. There will be others affecting strategic airports of vital value for purposes of defense and offense. Without international collaboration, many of these problems will be insoluble and many of them can lead to trouble.

There are other nations besides ourselves interested in this industry. There is England and perhaps France, Russia, the Netherlands, Portugal, and still others in limited regions. There is to be considered the strategic geographical location of Canada that stretches from coast to coast and intervenes between the United States and all air routes to the north. There is our Hawaii, which is the key to the Pacific routes. There is our Alaska, which would be invaluable in connection with stratospheric flights to Asia. There is the Western Hemisphere and its rapidly developing air services in Central and South America and the West Indies. In relation to this our Monroe Doctrine against new European influences take on new significance. There is the world-wide British Empire naturally hopeful of establishing an industry of air transportation comparable to its historic leadership in water-borne transportation. Each of these problems presents important questions. Each calls for early consideration because this industry will move fast and on an heroic scale as soon as opportunity permits. In it there will be need to preserve the opportunity for individual initiative and the impetus of competition that is the leading characteristic of America's progress.

If we have peace, and if we have vision, fairness, and statesmanship, there is a new world full of new wealth and new opportunities open to your generation. These opportunities are not limited to the field of aviation. I have enlarged upon it because of its uniqueness and dramatic appeal. It is but one of the great fields which stands at the hand of man. There is radio, the miracle of communication, fully equalling in its marvels, aviation, the miracle of transportation. Then there is electric power, Diesel power, automotive power, perhaps atomic power, the use of light metals, the development of electric welding, the infinite field of plastics and chemistry, including new uses of glass and wood and rayon. There are many more illustrations, including the development of agricultural products grown for industry, such as the soybean; the improvements in agricultural production; and even such contributions to human life as the better understanding of vitamins and the medical value of the sulfa drugs. The opportunity of tomorrow is infinite. I have infinite faith in the ability of God and man to meet that opportunity together.

Look up, America, look up! Look far up to the heavens above, for the sky and all the world is ours if we prove ourselves worthy and able to accept the opportunity. Look up, not only to the birds but to the firmament and to God beyond. We need Divine guidance. Man will fully meet his great opportunities only if he obeys the commandments of moral conduct, as well as the laws of physical control, which have placed these opportunities in his hands.

If we are to be worthy of the wings we have won, we must recognize that it will take both mechanical skill and strength of character to use them. Let us then look up and recognize the need in these times is equally for an understanding of science and for an understanding of the meaning and value of the brotherhood of man and the Fatherhood of God. Let this be our motto: "In God is our trust."

Address by Hon. Ernest W. McFarland, of Arizona, Before Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. MEAD

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 8 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by our distinguished colleague the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] at the forty-eighth national memorial service of Jewish War Veterans of the United States, in New York City, May 22, 1943.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is indeed an honor and a privilege to be here with you at your forty-eighth memorial services. I am glad to come to the State of my colleagues, your able and industrious Senators WAGNER and MEAD, both of whom I feel honored in being able to call my personal friends. The fact that you have invited me, one not of your faith, to be with you is conclusive evidence that, above all, each and every member of your organization is truly American, and that Americans place their patriotism upon a high plane.

It is fitting and proper that we should, upon this occasion, do honor to those who have gone before and who have made the supreme sacrifice in behalf of our great democracy. And it is particularly fitting in the midst of this, the greatest crisis during the existence of our country, that we should bow our heads in memory of these veterans of all of the wars, from those who first made the supreme sacrifice at Valley Forge—down through Flanders Field—and on down to those who are on this very day giving their lives that this Nation may continue as a democracy and that we may have the many rights and privileges which are so sacred to our citizenship.

A casual examination of the records of these wars reveals that your people have done their part and have, by deeds and acts, placed their names upon the honor roll of patriotism. In the American Revolution men like Col. David Franks, Col. Solomon Bush, Maj. Benjamin Nones, Ensign Mordecai Davis, and Capt. Jacob Cohen won undying fame and renown on the field of battle. In this period, too, we have the man who "again and again staved off mutiny" among the ragged, starving continental troops of General Washington. He was Haym Solomon, of Philadelphia. It was he who found money to pay the soldiers when it seemed that the very bottom of the financial resources available to our cause had been reached. He was also paymaster for the French troops who were serving with our forces. Later, after the war, he served the young Nation well by arranging sorely needed loans from foreign countries, and it is said that he never accepted a cent of commission for these services.

In the War of 1812, when again we faced the British, most of the decisive battles were fought on the sea, and the name of Commodore Uriah P. Levy probably led the list of Jewish heroes who served their country in this struggle. Levy, on one voyage, destroyed 21 English merchantmen and captured many others which were later fitted out as warships for our side. He, himself, was captured later and spent nearly 2 years in the dark, foul prison at Dartmoor. When he died he was the highest ranking officer in the United States Navy.

In the war that Texas waged for independence another Levy, the surgeon, Moses, won renown by the side of Gen. Sam Houston. Abraham Wolf perished with the brave little band that won renown at the Alamo. The names of many fighting Jews were recorded in the Mexican War that followed, and in the mighty conflict that we call the Civil War they were again represented in large numbers. I recall Max Frauenthal, a Confederate soldier, in particular, his name became synonymous with bravery. On the Union side seven Jews won the Congressional Medal of Honor. I need not mention the name of Judah P. Benjamin, who held three Cabinet posts in the Confederate Government and had much to do with directing the southern ship of state through the war. He was also a United States Senator from Louisiana and at one time refused a seat on the United States Supreme Court bench.

The first volunteer accepted by the War Department in the Spanish-American War was Col. Joseph Heller, a surgeon, who was decorated and served later in the World War. Two hundred and fifty thousand Jews saw service in the World War, and I wish to emphasize that a large percentage of these were in combat organizations. To attempt to enumerate the individual heroes in this group would entail more time than I have at my disposal here. I should like to mention that almost legendary hero, Sam Dreban, known as the fighting Jew. Tales of his courage have been published far and wide and are well known to you.

From the historical records of those awarded the Distinguished Service Cross I select the name of Corpl. Hyman Yarnis, of the Fifth Division. He participated in every battle that his outfit was engaged in and his citation reads: "Corporal Yarnis volunteered for an attack on a machine-gun position which was menacing the line of fire from the left flank. In the encounter he was wounded by a grenade. Despite the wound he advanced on the enemy position and killed the gun crew. He then moved on a second machine-gun position and was wounded again, but captured the crew of the second nest sparing all save one who attempted to resist." I cannot overlook the bravery of the men who fought with the famous Seventy-seventh Division. As you all know, the Lost Battalion won undying fame as a part of this group.

And now we come to World War No. 2. Probably no people on the earth today has felt the terrible iron heel of the oppressor so much as the Jewish people. Certainly none other has a better right to make a personal issue of the struggle and take up arms against the bestial monsters who are seeking by every means, fair or foul, to convert the world into a place of their imagination over which they would control every human being remaining alive to labor under the yoke of slavery for generations to come. And the young men and women of the Jewish faith, realizing that they and theirs face only death or worse in a future dominated by tyrants, have answered the call to arms, and tales of their courage and heroism are already written in words of blood that will endure forever. Here again the names of these are in such legions and so well known that I shall mention only a few. You know them all: Meyer Levin, Irving Strobing, Bernard Kessel, Hymie Epstein, Arthur Hoffman, and Barney Ross.

These and others of your faith, together with those of every belief, fighting and dying side by side as true Americans, have made it possible for us to be here today—something which Hitler destroyed over on the other side several years ago. His cruelty and treachery to the Jews and others who came in his path are too well known for me to take time to repeat here today.

A little while before the ruthless attack upon us at Pearl Harbor, one of my Jewish friends in Arizona showed me a letter which he had received from his father in France, in which the latter said: "Yes, France is at peace, but without food and without freedom. It would be better if we were dead." That was the opinion of a man who had felt the yoke of the Nazi tyrants. Our job today is a big one. We have been brought face to face with an enemy cruel and cunning, with a determination to destroy us, with a determination to destroy the freedoms for which our Nation stands.

It has not been an easy task; we were only partially prepared. We have been forced to fight and to prepare at the same time. Today we can well be proud of our accomplishments upon the battle front and upon the home front. While we have a right to celebrate our victories in Africa, on Guadalcanal, and in other places upon the seas and land, and while we can safely say we have reached a turning place in this war, we must recognize that there is yet much to be done; that there is going to be a lot of bloodshed before we have conquered the enemy.

A short time before last Christmas I received a letter from an Arizona boy who was stationed on Guadalcanal. The letter was short but to the point. It stated: "There are several boys here from Arizona dealing out misery to Mr. Tojo and keeping up the reputation of the State. I have been delegated to write and wish you and the State all the best for Christmas and the New Year. You keep up the good work there, and we will look out for things here. Thumbs up." In answer to my reply he stated: "I am sorry to say that your letter came too late for a couple of the boys. To quote Rupert Brooke, 'There are parts of this island that will be forever Arizona.' Your sentiments were appreciated by all hands. We believe that our responsibilities and the responsibilities of the ordinary civilian at this time are great enough, but the weight on the shoulders of you people in Congress overshadows them. You cannot afford to make any mistakes."

These are the sentiments of our boys on the battle fronts, and although we have not as yet reached the peak of the war, we have men fighting upon every front. Wherever they may be, may God bless them; and while they are doing their duty over there, in the words of the Arizona boy, "We cannot afford to make any mistakes." This is a war that calls for the best that is in all of us. It is an all-out, global war that calls for the best that is in labor, the best that is in capital, and the use of every individual and every industry. There is much for us to do on the home front. We must feed ourselves and help feed our allies, we must produce implements of war for ourselves and also help supply those who fight on our side. We must do all this and at the same time furnish men for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, totaling about 11,000,000. This will mean sacrifice. But I am sure the American people are willing to pay whatever price is necessary

to end this war at the earliest possible moment. Whatever the sacrifice may be, it is nothing compared to that of our boys on the firing line. Those who have gone before us have given to us the torch. It is for us to hold that torch of freedom high. It is our job to see to it that these brave men who have given their lives for this great Nation shall not have died in vain.

Each and every one of us shared in the glorious freedom that has been won by those we honor now. This we will always remember and in that remembrance, we come in reverance today. In sorrow, too, and also in gratitude, that America has reared such sons. From their hands has come to us the torch of liberty. We will hold it high.

Enlargement of Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 8 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several statements in support of the social security bill introduced in the Senate by the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and myself, and in the House by Representative DINGELL of Michigan. The statements are by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, appearing in the current American Federation of Labor News Service; by Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; and an editorial in the Washington Daily News, June 7, 1943, entitled "Better Than the Beveridge Plan."

There being no objection, the statements and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

WASHINGTON, D. C.—A bill designed to banish the fear of want in America was introduced in both Houses of Congress by Senator ROBERT F. WAGNER, of New York; Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana; and Representative JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan, under the title "Social Security Amendments of 1943."

The measure, which is the most comprehensive attempt yet made to establish postwar security in this country, is the fruit of a 5-year study by experts on the staff of the American Federation of Labor, which will give the proposed program full sponsorship and support.

It provides for a unified national insurance system with these major new features:

1. It broadens coverage to include millions of agricultural and domestic workers, self-employed persons, lay employees of educational and religious bodies; also, by request, hourly employees of the Tennessee Valley Authorty; also, under voluntary compacts, employees of local and State governments, if they so desire.

2. It grants unemployment-insurance compensation to all members of the armed forces who may be unable to find jobs in private industry after the war is over and disability benefits for those physically injured in the war.

3. It provides health and hospitalization insurance for the first time.

4. Also for the first time, the bill sets up a system of temporary and permanent disability insurance.

5. It offers maternity insurance to working women.

6. It extends health insurance and other benefits to the dependents of beneficiaries.

7. It sets up a uniform national system of unemployment insurance, to replace the present State-Federal system. Benefits are extended to 26 weeks and, if funds are available, up to 52 weeks in emergencies.

8. Increases the maximum old-age, survivors, and permanent disability benefits from $85 under the present law to $120 a month.

9. Provides for a broad system of national employment offices to assist employers in finding workers or jobs and to help workers find jobs.

10. Levies a 12 percent tax on pay rolls to finance the program, to be shared equally, 6 percent by the worker and 6 percent by the employer. The tax on employers merely anticipates the 6 percent rate which would go into effect in 1949 under existing law. The tax on employees, which would be 2 percent next year and 3 percent in 1949, under existing law, is sharply increased to cover the cost of materially greater benefits provided in the new bill.

Another important new feature of the bill is a provision that all social security tax receipts shall be deposited in a Federal Social Insurance Trust Fund managed by a board of trustees.

The new health insurance program extends medical and hospital care to all persons covered under old-age and survivors insurance and for their dependents. The benefits include necessary general and special medical services, hospitalization, nursing, and related medical services, supplies, and commodities. Technical and professional administration is lodged with the United States Public Health Service. Financial administration is assigned to the Social Security Board, with joint action on matters of joint concern.

The bill assures free choice of any regularly licensed general practitioner, arrangements for use of specialists' services and varied methods of remunerating doctors, with emphasis on maintenance and development of the quality of medical care and provision for grants to aid medical education and research. A National Advisory Medical and Hospital Council is established by the bill to advise the Surgeon General, who heads the United States Public Health Service.

Another section of the bill provides for setting up advisory councils of employee, employer, and public representatives to make recommendations on the administration of the social-security program and to consider the adequacy of benefits in the post-war period.

Hailing the introduction of this bill in Congress as a great forward step toward protecting all American citizens against post-war hazards, American Federation of Labor President William Green declared:

"The Wagner-Dingell bill is one of the most important legislative proposals of our times. It fortifies the American way of life against our great internal enemies—poverty, disease, and economic dislocation. Coupled with a program for vast expansion of our peacetime industries, it will constitute a guarantee that the American people will be spared from unnecessary suffering after the war is over.

"The great benefits of this bill are so manifest and so essential as to shame any petty, technical opposition into silence. The American Federation of Labor has put in many years of hard work to get this bill prepared and introduced. It is ready to redouble its efforts to secure its enactment. We appeal to all forward-looking and patriotic American citizens to join with us in urging immediate and favorable action by Congress."

STATEMENT BY CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

The improved program of social security offered by Senator WAGNER, Senator MURRAY, and Congressman DINGELL deserves immediate attention and action by Congress. These constructive proposals if enacted will aid the war effort now, and later help achieve full peacetime employment. I am sure the 5,000,000 Congress of Industrial Organizations members and their families will give the bill their wholehearted support. Many of its principles and provisions have long been recommended by the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The immediate post-war period will involve tremendous changes and much uncertainty and perhaps terrific unemployment. To lay aside reserves now for use then is to practice as a nation the old American custom of saving for a rainy day. Both the individual and the Nation will thus be cushioned against economic collapse.

The program is of further value in assuring the men of our armed forces that the goal of freedom from want will be within reach as they return to their homes.

The burden of post-war readjustments can be shared. It must not be permitted to fall too heavily on any family. The millions of soldiers and war workers must be provided jobs, but if efforts to that end fail, they must be assured an adequate income.

The bill makes important progress toward guaranteeing an income to all Americans no matter what hazards overtake them. It sets up an improved machinery for finding jobs. It provides wide protection for former members of the armed services not now covered under any legislation. It broadens and greatly improves the programs of old age and survivors' insurance and unemployment compensation, which at present have serious weaknesses.

It launches a new program of health insurance which will make the wonders of modern medicine available to all our people. It provides benefits during permanent disability, for shorter periods of illness, and at maternity. Through an improved system of Federal grants it makes possible more adequate public assistance by States and localities.

The program is sound in that it builds on American experience and American needs. It is an extension of the social-security laws enacted in 1935, which have already obtained wide acceptance. It utilizes the best from the experience of other countries which have long had health-insurance programs, for example, but shapes them to American conditions.

The proposals allow for differences in modes of living in our vast expanse of territory while recognizing the economic unity of the Nation. It wisely replaces the piecemeal and wholly inadequate State systems of unemployment compensation with a Federal system wider in coverage and more adequate in protection.

Some persons, more familiar with financial abstraction than with human suffering, will doubtless say the cost of the program is prohibitive. I am more concerned about the cost of not making adequate provision for former soldiers or for the children of those who have given their lives to their country. The price of neglect will be paid at once in lowered efficiency and morale at

home and abroad. That price will continue to be paid for many years in lowered health, in social unrest, perhaps in economic stagnation.

The time will come when permitting any child to grow up without proper food and care will seem as cruel and blind as jailing the insane a century ago now seems to us. Adequate provision for all children, no matter what may befall the breadwinner, is the strongest defense of the American home and the best guaranty of the continued soundness of the Nation.

A broad program of benefits, as is proposed, will, of course, necessitate large expenditures and substantial contributions. Labor is willing to pay its fair share of the increased amounts required for greater benefits. The Congress of Industrial Organizations would prefer, however, that the program be supported in large part by levies on swollen incomes and fortunes. The Congress of Industrial Organizations hails this important result of the efforts of labor to move toward real social security and will continue to fight for this and such additional improvements as are necessary.

[From the Washington Daily News of June 7, 1943]

BETTER THAN THE BEVERIDGE PLAN

The Wagner-Dingell bill to expand our Social Security System deserves the prompt, friendly, and constructive attention of Congress.

There are many obviously good things about this measure—

Its high humanitarian purpose to extend the protection of insurance against the hazards of ill health, unemployment, and old age.

Its proposal, through enlarged pay-roll taxes on both employers and employees, to impound at a time when it is not needed about $5,000,000,000 yearly of what is now mostly excess spending power, for use in years to come when it will be needed.

Its inclusion of millions of farm workers, domestic servants, self-employed persons, and others now unfairly denied a share in our Social Security System.

In studying this bill, of course, Congress may find that some of its features are impractical and require revision. The bill's authors and sponsors, as we understand them, do not contend that this is a perfect measure. It is the fruit of 5 years' study by the social-security staff of the American Federation of Labor, cooperating with Government social-security officials, and it is also endorsed by the Congress of Industrial Organizations. It represents an honest effort to solve very real human problems for which all Americans want to find a solution. In meeting the needs of our people and our way of life, this bill, as something for Congress to start work on, is far superior to the much-publicized Beveridge plan offered as an answer to the requirements of the British people.

In the final analysis, the important test of this, as of any other proposed legislation, is not its benign intent, but its economic soundness. The American people want their Congress to provide by law the very finest and most all-embracing system of social security that the economy and productive enterprise of the country can support. Congress could not do more if it tried. If desire and good intentions alone were enough, we could eliminate Congress and use a wishing well as our legislature. Benefits voted are of no value unless ways and means are provided by which the benefits will be paid.

Some of the features of the Wagner-Dingell bill may not, but we think must of its proposals will, meet that practical test. Congress should move forward along this line.

Uniform Opening of Polls on Election Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 8 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial published in the Springfield, Mass., Republican, entitled "The Lucas Bill." I desire to read one paragraph of the editorial as follows:

The Lucas bill ought not to be made a party issue in Congress. In certain States it might help the Democrats and in certain others it might help the Republicans. * * * issues which may be involved in 1944 are likely to be so grave that the largest possible out turn of the voters will be desirable as never before. The Lucas bill ought to pass.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LUCAS BILL

The bill introduced by Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, providing that the polls in all the States shall be uniformly open on election day from 6 a. m. to 9 p. m. attracts increasing attention. Its passage would represent the exercise by Congress of a power with which Congress is clearly endowed by the Constitution, but which by nonaction Congress has hitherto left to the several States in fixing their own voting hours.

The pressure of war production in industrial plants throughout the country will surround election day in 1944 with conditions which have not existed before. It is for this reason and to make sure that industrial workers have the same chance to go to the polls, no matter which State they live in, that Senator LUCAS has introduced his bill.

At present the voting hours in the States vary widely, especially the hours of closing the polls and to a less degree the hours at which the polls open. In Kentucky the polls close at 4 p. m. In other States they close at 5 p. m., at 6 p. m., at 7 p. m., and at 8 p. m., as here in Massachusetts. Six a. m., which is our Massachusetts hour, is the most usual hour of opening, but in Alabama the polls do not open until 8 a. m., and there are several States in which they open at 7 a. m.

In Illinois, the State of Senator LUCAS, the polls open at 6 a. m. and close at 5 p. m. It is felt that under war conditions this is not long enough for many of the workers to get to the polls on time.

The Lucas bill ought not to be made a party issue in Congress. In certain States it might help the Democrats and in certain others it might help the Republicans. But in all the States for the first time in history it would give the voters the same chance to get to the polls.

In the Presidential election of 1940 approximately 50,000,000 votes were cast. In the congressional and State elections of 1942 only about 28,000,000 votes were cast. The difference was due primarily to the fact that a Presidential election always brings out a larger vote than is cast in other years.

But there clearly were other causes. These included the presence in 1942 of many men with the armed forces and the activity of both men and women in industry, which Vice President Wallace claimed to have hurt the Democrats because more of them were too busy to go to the polls.

Regardless of the accuracy of that once much-derided explanation of the Democratic reverse and near-Republican victory of 1942, the issues which may be involved in 1944 are likely to be so grave that the largest possible outturn of the voters will be desirable as never before. The Lucas bill ought to pass.

Excerpts From Diary of Welsh Soldier at Gettysburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DAVIS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 20, 1943

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I have received from Hon. William S. Bennet, former Member of the House of Representatives, a letter in which he enclosed duplicate photostatic pages of the diary written by a young man of Welsh ancestry, at the Battle of Gettysburg. The notes, written in the Welsh language, were made by him on the battlefield, and were presented to me by Mr. Bennet. They have been translated into English. I have complied with Mr. Bennett's request by writing to the owner of the notes in Welsh, which letter is also translated into English. I ask unanimous consent to have the letters and notes in both Welsh and English printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letters and notes are as follows:

MOUNT VERNON, N. Y., *May 9, 1943.*

To Hon. JAMES J. DAVIS.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I enclose a duplicate of some photostated pages I have just sent to Senator ROBERTSON, who indicated an interest in them.

The writer was a young Welshman in the Fourteenth Vermont who kept a diary throughout his military service. The pages, of course, relate to the Battle of Gettysburg.

Benjamin Williams, a Welshman living in Proctor, Vt., has the diary now and I know he would appreciate it greatly if you would drop him a few words of thanks, in Welsh

Yours very truly,

WM. S. BENNET.

UNITED STATES SENATE, *May 20, 1943.*

Mr. BENJAMIN WILLIAMS,
Proctor, Vt.

ANWYL GYMRO: Trosglwyddwyd i mi gan Mr. William S. Bennet, of Mount Vernon, N. Y., gofnodion o ddyddiadur bachgen ieuanc o Gymro gymerodd ran yn Mrwydr Gettysburg, a darllenais hwynt gyda dyddordeb digymysg.

Pwy bynag ydoedd y milwr dewr hwn, arddangosodd nodweddion yr hen Gymry gynt. Y rhai a frwydrasant dros ryddid a chyflawnder gyda dewrder diildio.

Diolch am y cyfnodion.

Gyda dymuniadau goreu.

Yr eiddoch yn ddiffuant.

[English translation]

DEAR CYMRO: There has been conveyed to me by Mr. William S. Bennet of Mount Vernon, N. Y., excerpts from the diary of a young

Welshman who participated in the Battle of Gettysburg, which I have read with unalloyed pleasure.

Whoever this young soldier may have been, he displayed the traditional characteristic of the Welsh people of old, who fought with unyielding courage for justice and freedom.

Thanks for the diary.

With best wishes,

Very sincerely,

JAMES J. DAVIS.

EXCERPTS IN THE WELSH LANGUAGE FROM DIARY OF BENJAMIN WILLIAMS, OF PROCTOR, VT., AT THE BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG

Llun, Mehefin, 29ain, 1863: Cychwyn drwy Frederick City, lle y gorphwysom dros y nos. March galed a llawer yn syrthio allan.

Mawrth, Mehefin, 30ain, 1863: Cychwyn yn foreu. Diwrnod niwliog a gwlawiog. Daethom drwy Lewistown i McKelleck's Farm, ac yn mlaen i Emmitsburg, pentref hardd o fewn tair milltir i Penn house. Gorphwysom dros y nos.

Mercher, Gorphenaf, 1af, 1863: Symud yn mlaen. Gorfu i mi syrthio allan a myned i'r Ambulance. Daethom i Penn., o fewn 2 filltir i Gettysburg. Yr oedd ein Corps ni, sef y 1st, wedi bod yn ymladd drwy y dydd yn foreu. Yr. ydym yn ymyl cael ymladdfa.

Iau, Gorphenaf, 2il, 1863: Dechreu saethu yn foreu. Yr ydym yn yml cael ymladdfa. Skirmishing gwyllt. Yna dechreuodd y Rebel Batteries agor arnom. Yr oeddym ar y Right a gorweddasom ar lawr, a'r Shells fel cenllysg o'n cwmpas. Troisant i'r Left. Curo caled yno. Yn yr hwyr ar y Centre, symudasom ni yn mlaen drwy ganol y tan i'r front. Gyrwyd y Rebs i bob cyfeiriad a chymerwyd lluaws o garcharorion. Gorweddasom ar y ddaear drwy y nos.

Gwener, Gor., 3ydd, 1863: Agorodd y Rebel Batteries eu tan arnom 5 o'r gloch y boreu. Symudasom yn nes atynt a gorweddasom ar y ddaear. Troisant eu tan i'r Right a'r left, a bu ymladdfa frwd am gwrs o amser yn y prydnawn. Troisant eu tan arnom ni fel Brigade (151 Penn. a 20th N. Y. S. V. M.) Yr oedd eu Shells, Grapes a Canisters yn disgyn yn gawodydd arnom am oriau. O'r diwedd daeth eu Hinfrntry yn mlaen am danom. Rhuthrasom arnynt. Syrthiasom yn ol. Yr ail waith yn mlaen a ni a gwnaethom hwynt i Skiddadlio, eu lladd, a chymeryd eu Colors, chanoedd yn garcharorion. Cafodd Lt. Bosworth ei glwyfo yn dost, Merling ei ladd, Lt. Hamilton, ei glwyfo a'i ladd, a lluaws eraill eu lladd a'u clwyfo. Yr oedd ym ymladdfa galed. Yn yr hwyr cawsom eim rhyddhau o'r front, a daethom i'r rear i gysgu. Yr oedd y fuddugoliaeth o'n tu. Cafodd Longstreet ei gymeryd yn garcharor. O 75 i 100 Batteries yn agor eu tan arnom ni.

Sadwrn, Gorphenaf, 4ydd, 1863: Cawsom ein galw yn nghyd i wrando ar gymeradwyaeth Major General D. Day i ni fel Brigade 151 Penn., 20 N. Y., am ddal mor wrol yn ngwyneb tan y gelyn ddoe, ac am i ni droi y fuddugolaeth o'n tu pan oedd o 75 i 100 Batteries yn agor eu tan arnom, heblaw miloedd o Infantry.

Daeth yn wlaw mawr arnom yn y prydnawn a ninau yn yr awyr agored. Dim o bwys yn y front, ond ychydig o skirmishing, a phob arwydd fod y Rebs yn skiddadlio. Cysgu ar y ddaear damp, yn y gwlaw.

Sul, Gorphenaf, 5ed, 1863: Niwlliog a gwlawiog. Yr Army vn symud yn ol ar ol y Rebs. Yr oedd Co. A a ninau ar y Picket drwy y nos. Battle yn y prydnawn 3 milltir oddiwrthyn.

[English translation]

Monday, June 29, 1863: Started at 7 o'clock in the morning and came through Frederick City, where we rested for the night. It was a hard march, and many fell out.

Tuesday, June 30, 1863: Started early. A foggy and rainy morning. We came through Lewistown, McKelleck's Farm, and onward to Emmitsburg, a beautiful town, within 3 miles of Penn House (or line—not certain of word), where we rested for the night. It was an exceedingly hard march.

Wednesday, July 1, 1863: We move forward. I was compelled to fall out and go into an ambulance. Came to Penn, within 2 miles of Gettysburg. Our corps, the first, had been fighting hard throughout the day, and we slept on our arms in the field.

Thursday, July 2, 1863: Started firing early in the morning, and we are on the brink of a battle. Wild skirmishing. Then the rebel batteries opened on us. We are on the right, and lay down, with shells like hail around us. They turned to the left; hard fighting there. In the evening, on the center, we moved forward and through the fire to the front. The rebels were driven to every direction and we captured a lot of prisoners. We laid down on the ground throughout the night.

Friday, July 3, 1863: The rebel batteries opened their fire on us 5 o'clock in the morning. We moved forward nearer them, and lay on the ground. They turned their fire from the right to the left, and there was fierce fighting for some time. In the afternoon they turned their guns on our brigade (151st Penn. and 20th N. Y. S. U. M.). Their shells, grapes, and canisters fell on us like showers for some hours. At last their infantry came forward to attack us. We rushed forward to meet them, and then fell back. The second time we went forward and made them skedaddle. They were slaughtered and their colors captured and hundreds taken prisoners. Lieutenant Bosworth was badly injured, Merling was killed, Lieutenant Hamilton was injured fatally, and many others were killed and wounded. It was a frightful battle. In the evening we were relieved from the front and moved to the rear to sleep. The victory was ours. Longstreet was taken prisoner, and the batteries were silenced.

Saturday, July 4, 1863: We were called together to listen to the felicitations of Maj. Gen. D. Day extended to us as a brigade, One Hundred and Fifty-first Pennsylvania and Twentieth New York, for our heroic effort in facing the enemy yesterday, and for our courage in turning the victory for us, when from 75 to 100 batteries were firing on us, besides thousands of infantry. Heavy rain fell on us in the afternoon, and we were in the open air. Nothing of importance at the front, except light skirmishing, with every indication the rebels were skedaddling.

Sunday, July 5, 1863: Foggy and raining. The Army moving backward, in pursuit of the rebels. Company A and ours on picket duty during the night. A battle in the afternoon 3 miles distant from us.

Sports in England—Why Not the United States?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest arguments in favor of wartime sports is advanced by one of the country's outstanding sports authorities, the famed Grantland Rice, in his column, The Sportlight, as it appears in this morning's issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, and which I include herein as a part of my remarks:

THE SPORTLIGHT

(By Grantland Rice)

THE BRITISH WAY IN SPORT

In order to get a better line on how Great Britain handles her sporting arrangement, we looked up our young friend, Lt. Jock Buchanan, of Glasgow and the British Navy.

Lieutenant Jock, now over here on official work, is a chunky Scot who knows and loves his sport, no matter what the game is.

He is just in from north Africa, the Mediterranean, and a few other sections of the seven seas.

"I'll tell you how it is," Jock said. "When the first blitz klitzed us, we thought we had to give up sport. We tried it. It didn't work. So we picked up about where we'd left off. Not quite. But not so bad, either. And what a difference it has made to us on the war—winning side.

"In the old days in football we had national leagues with divisions consisting of the best 22 teams in division 1, the 22 next best in division 2, etc. No limits to traveling. Of course, that has been all changed."

THE WARTIME WAY

"The wartime organization is different, although we have crowds up to 150,000 spectators. Now, our regional leagues consist of some 20 teams from each district. All players are either in the armed forces or defense work. We have an arrangement where any player under contract to a team can play for another team in the new district where he now lives.

"Training is arranged so that the player trains at the football park nearest his home or station with traveling cut to the minimum. This keeps them in good football shape.

"Interforce games and international games for the Red Cross and other war funds are extremely popular.

"The heads of the services realize the great value of football as a morale builder to the defense workers, who nearly all average a 72-hour week. I don't mean a 40- or a 48-hour week. I mean 72 hours. These welcome the relaxation that football and racing bring.

"Our games are broadcast and recordings made of the broadcast and played to our forces overseas. It is what our soldiers, sailors, and flyers want. Football games between the Air Force and the Army teams are especially popular.

"The continuance of football and sport in general has been a great contributing factor to the high morale of the British people.

"I only wish America could realize how much it has meant. Four years of wartime football have not reduced the public's love of the game, despite the fact that their teams change constantly and often consist of 75 percent of players from other teams, even bitter rivals.

"By rearranging the competitions as above with mutual and free interchange of players, the standards of play have been lowered very little. Much new talent has also been discovered.

"I have heard rumors here in America that football will be discontinued at many places. I hope this isn't so. I know how much football and other games have helped the war effort in Great Britain. It would be a great pity over here if the authorities should make such an ill-timed decision against football in particular. Body-to-body contact is a leading essential of modern warfare, as you can learn from the veterans who reach from Guadalcanal to north Africa."

ENGLAND—WHY NOT THE UNITED STATES?

If England can carry out her sporting program only a few miles from hostile air fields

and hostile guns, there is certainly no reason why the United States, protected by two oceans, can't work out some plan for both her college and professional football teams.

It would be just a trifle on the silly side to have the United States giving up intercollegiate and all-professional sport with England still playing games before 100,000 or 150,000 for Red Cross and other war-fund collections.

It would be an acknowledgment that under pressure we haven't quite got what it takes, compared to the English and the Scotch. After all, they have been in the war, too.

No Forced Liquidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "No Forced Liquidation," which appeared in the Baltimore Evening Sun, May 28, 1943:

NO FORCED LIQUIDATION

Those who have only a little knowledge of the liquidation process, as it applies to real estate, will understand how impractical it is to order the Home Owners' Loan Corporation dissolved on a fixed date and will be happy to note that the Senate, yesterday, abandoned the idea. The proposal originally was that Home Owners' Loan Corporation be required to wind up its affairs by July 1, 1945. This amended recommendation calls on Home Owners' Loan Corporation only for a plan of final liquidation to be presented 2 years hence.

Home Owners' Loan Corporation is not engaged in a business that it can drop in casual fashion. Several million Americans who were caught in the real estate collapse of the thirties with mortgage obligations that they couldn't meet have reason to know that Home Owners' Loan Corporation bailed them out of their difficulties by buying up their mortgages at prices decidedly out of line with the market value of the security and, in consequence, soon found itself in possession of vast holdings of city, suburban, and rural properties. Had Home Owners' Loan Corporation dumped these holdings on the market then or at any time since, the Government would have taken a beating, the slow recovery of the market would have been stopped, and banks, insurance companies, and other lending agencies would have suffered.

Criticisms of Home Owners' Loan Corporation management of its affairs have been astonishingly few. It has made mistakes and it has had extracurricular jobs for which it was not staffed thrust on it (such as the lease-conversion program); but on the whole it has functioned well. Its insistence on rehabilitation and adequate maintenance of property has operated as an effective check on the spread of blight, for one thing, and a very important thing, at that.

The proposal to abolish it now could have no other effect than to compel a forced sale under conditions which nobody can foresee. Under the best conditions the procedure is costly. The thing to do is to make sure that the organization of Home Owners' Loan Corporation will be kept in proper relation to the size of the job it has to do, and that it will wind up its affairs at the earliest date consistent with the public interest.

Repatriation of American Women Who Married Aliens Prior to September 22, 1922

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS D'ALESANDRO, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein a copy of H. R. 1289 and correspondence from the Attorney General's office and the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization:

H. R. 1289

A bill to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien

Be it enacted, etc., That section 317 (b) (1) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 717 (b) (1)) is amended by inserting after "terminated," the following: "or who has resided continuously in the United States since the date of such marriage."

JULY 9, 1942.

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This will refer to your secretary's memorandum of July 2, 1942, requesting a ruling upon the law relating to the repatriation of American women who married aliens prior to September 22, 1922.

Under the act of June 25, 1936 (49 Stat. 1917; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 9a) any native-born woman who had or believed she had lost United States citizenship solely by marriage prior to September 22, 1922, to an alien, and whose marital relation with such alien had terminated, was regarded as a citizen of the United States. H. R. 4185, which Mr. D'ALESANDRO introduced and which became the act of July 2, 1940, amended the 1936 act by including in its benefits women whose marriages remained intact and who resided continuously in the United States from the dates of their marriages. However, the women embraced within the 1936 act, as amended, could not have or claim any rights as citizens of the United States until they had taken the oath of allegiance under the naturalization laws.

As you know, the act of June 25, 1936, was specifically repealed by the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1137, 1172; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 904). While no specific mention was made of the repeal of the act of July 2, 1940, it is obvious that inasmuch as the act which it amended was repealed, there is no possibility of the operation of the amendment subsequent to the repeal and the amendatory act, therefore, likewise must be regarded as repealed.

The provisions of the Nationality Act corresponding to the act of June 25, 1936, are found in section 317 (b) (54 Stat. 1146; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 717 (b)). It is true that no provision has been made in section 317 (b) for the repatriation of women whose marriages are intact and who have resided continuously in the United States since the dates of their marriages. However, under the administrative view adopted by this service, a woman who met the requirements of the act of June 25, 1936, as amended, is deemed to have reacquired United States citizenship on June 25, 1936, July 2, 1940, or upon the date of the termination of the marriage prior to January 13, 1941, depending upon the circumstances of the case, and may take the oath of allegiance required by the act even after the passage of the Nationality Act in order to claim rights as a citizen of the United States. Under that interpretation every woman embraced within the amendment to the 1936 act was declared to be a citizen of the United States on July 2, 1940, and if she has retained that status is entitled at this time to take the oath of allegiance as provided by the naturalization laws. In other words, on July 2, 1940, every woman being a native-born citizen who had or believed she had lost United States citizenship solely by reason of her marriage prior to September 22, 1922, to an alien, and who had resided continuously in the United States since the date of the marriage, was declared to be a citizen of the United States and was not deprived of that status by the repeal of the law by the Nationality Act. It would seem, therefore, that no necessity existed for the inclusion in the Nationality Act of a provision similar to the one added to the act of June 25, 1936, by the amendment of July 2, 1940.

It would appear, therefore, that the action of the Federal Court referred to in the remarks of Mr. D'ALESANDRO in the House of Representatives on June 22, 1942, in permitting several hundred such women to take the oath of allegiance on the basis of the prior law subsequent to the effective date of the Nationality Act was in accordance with the administrative view and that the same opportunity should be accorded those 40 women whose cases are being held under advisement by the court.

Sincerely yours,

LEMUEL B. SCHOFIELD,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General.

JULY 28, 1942.

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Under date of July 2, 1942, you referred to this office a letter addressed to you by Congressman D'ALESANDRO of Maryland, with which he forwarded copy of his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of July 22, 1942, pointing out that Judge Coleman had denied the right to approximately 40 women, who had lost United States citizenship by virtue of marriages to aliens prior to September 22, 1922, to take the oath of allegiance as provided for in the act of June 25, 1936, as amended by the act of July 2, 1940. They desire to take this oath in order to gain the rights of citizenship in accordance with the provisions of the acts referred to, as heretofore interpreted by this service. I wish to refer again to your reference note and to our letter of July 9, addressed to you on the subject.

In our letter of July 9 (par. 1, p. 2 thereof) we set forth our interpretation of the law as indicating that Congressman D'ALESANDRO's amendment was not necessary, being of the opinion that such women had been restored to citizenship by the act of June 25, 1936, as amended, and had the continuing right to take the oath of allegiance in order to acquire the rights of citizenship, as distinguished from the status of citizenship, even though the act of June

25, 1936, as amended, had been specifically repealed by the Nationality Act of 1940.

After receiving your letter we instructed our district director at Baltimore to interview Judge Coleman and to point out to him our interpretation. We have now received a letter from our Baltimore office to the effect that, regardless of our interpretation, the United States District Court at Baltimore has concluded that the oath of allegiance may not now be taken in these cases. The court has been fully informed of our views that the oath of allegiance may still be taken by these women but both Judge Coleman and Judge Chestnut have made a complete study of the situation and, after considering the question for several months, have decided to follow the doctrine laid down by the *Shelley* case (120 Fed. 734 (D. C.)). Our district director at Baltimore states the same view is held by the United States courts in the District of Columbia and in Virginia.

In a few words, the Shelley case held, contrary to our views, that the status of "citizenship" and the status of the "rights of citizenship" are indivisible. It was indicated in that decision that the language of the act of June 25, 1936, might lead to the conclusion we have reached, but when the act is read together with the committee report and hearings it is clear that the two cannot be divided.

While we have had no decision of courts of higher jurisdiction, it is believed that inasmuch as a number of the lower courts have ruled in the same way, your committee might desire, in order to overcome the conflict of opinion and to insure both citizenship and the rights of citizenship to these women, to amend existing law to cover the matter. It is believed that the bill introduced by Congressman D'ALESANDRO, H. R. 7275, will meet the situation.

This letter should, of course, not be considered as an endorsement of the bill. It is merely an expression of opinion of the law on the subject. The Department will be very happy to submit its formal views on the bill, through the Bureau of the Budget, if and when you request a report.

Sincerely yours,

EARL G. HARRISON,
Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to thank the membership of the House for unanimously passing this meritorious piece of legislation today.

Prelude to Downfall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe of May 26, 1943:

PRELUDE TO DOWNFALL

As the hour draws near when invasion of continental Europe may be expected, deterioration of Germany's diplomatic position is becoming as notable a fact as the growth of the armed might of her opponents.

The opening of a press and radio campaign and its subject territories against the Vatican represents part of this process. It follows, by but a few days, the broadcasting of an earlier order signed by Goering to all Nazi Party officials in Germany, directing them to proceed without gloves against the Catholic bishops and clergy in the Reich who refuse to accept Nazi policy and the thesis of the illimitable power of the state over the body, mind, and spirit of man.

It is not without significance that the radio barrage against the Vatican was delivered first over radio Paris. Does this imply a German decision to substitute the France of Laval for Germany's distraught and doomed partner below the Alps?

The latest move by the Germans in the political realm would seem, also, to be intended to convey a warning to Rome. Russia's dissolution of the Cominterm has been followed by discussion of the possibility of concordat between Moscow and the Vatican. This, were it to come about, would increase the influence of the Vatican at the peace conference.

Given Hitler's record of ruthlessness in this war; his repeated declarations (both in Mein Kampf and in his conversations with Hermann Raushning) that he proposes to reduce the church in Europe to the role of a propaganda instrument, run by his supermen; the presence of many divisions of German troops and almost as many members of the Gestapo in Italy; and the vital importance of the Italian peninsula to defense of his position in the adjacent Balkans—he and his policy directors may feel in a position to threaten dire consequences to any agency in Italy, religious or political, which seems to them to be toying with the idea of a quick retirement from the Axis war partnership. One of the most persistent of Hitler's threats, these past many years, has concerned what he would do to Italy if she tried to run out on Germany in this war as she ran out on her alliance with the Central Powers in 1915.

Nazi preoccupation with Italian prospects represents but a part of the story of the recession of German diplomatic prestige in Europe. The decision taken by Franco yesterday in Spain, to demobilize two military classes, can mean only that the Spanish leader is convinced that Germany will lose the war, and that she will be unable to invade Spain because of her worries about other parts of her fortified domain.

This same view is in evidence among the Balkan satellites of the Reich, where enthusiasm for fighting the United Nations, and particularly Russia, is now at very low ebb. It is visible in the two most important neutral countries on the verges of Hitlerite Europe—Turkey and Sweden.

Neither one of these nations dared, until this spring, to speak or act in any way which might offer the German excuse for attack. Both have been fearful for their security and dubious about the ability of the opponents of the Axis to put down the new barbarism.

Today this is no longer true. Sweden speaks vigorously in her own right, more and more openly against Nazi atrocities, especially in Norway, challenges German activities in the Baltic, and defies the demands of both Wilhelmstrasse and the official German press. Turkey dares mention the possibility of joining the war, if and when her interest would be thus served.

The structure of Germany's diplomatic position in Europe is crumbling. Yet her military might remains formidable and the possibilities of further evil implicit in it need to be kept clearly in mind. Only sharp military defeat within her "fortress" will cleanse the world of the foul blot she has come to be.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Chinese Exclusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED GOSSETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H. R. 2893, a bill designed to repeal our Chinese exclusion laws and to place China on an equal basis with all other nations whose nationals are permitted to migrate to the United States. In her propaganda campaign of Asia for Asiatics, the Japanese have had two potent weapons, both of which we have placed in her hands. The first was extraterritoriality, which our State Department wisely abrogated several months ago. The second is Chinese exclusion, which can only be abrogated by act of Congress. H. R. 2893 is a war measure to make real our professions of friendship for the Chinese. H. R. 2893 is designed to pull the last effective leg from under false Japanese propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2893 is not a bill to lower immigration barriers or to let in more immigrants. I favor a tightening up of immigration restrictions as to all the nations of the earth and shall propose such legislation at a proper time. I think we should admit fewer people to this country. The present bill is simply designed to place our Chinese friends upon a parity with other foreign nations who are friendly to us.

Mr. Speaker, a brief explanation of H. R. 2893, section by section, follows:

SECTION 1

From May 6, 1882, until June 23, 1913, the Congress of the United States passed 13 laws or parts of laws dealing with the exclusion and deportation of persons of the Chinese race. These laws also relate to other matters having to do with the exclusion of Chinese, such as regulating fees of the United States commissioner, providing against persons of the Chinese race from becoming citizens, etc.

It is interesting to note that while orientals generally have been excluded from admission to the United States for many years, the Chinese are the only persons specified by race in the statutes. These acts are replete with the expression "Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent."

SECTION 2

Section 2 abrogates the immigration treaty of 1880 with China. That treaty, in substance, purported to give the United States authority to regulate, limit, or suspend the coming of Chinese persons to the United States. The treaty was never actually necessary because the Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the Congress of the United States has absolute power over the control of aliens, who shall be allowed to enter the United States, and as to those who shall be permitted to remain here. There is ample precedent for the Congress by legislative act to abrogate a treaty, the most noted precedent being the abrogation of the treaty with France of 1795. It has no actual effect on basic policy because the treaty of itself excludes no one. However, it is believed it is desirable as a gesture of good will to abrogate the treaty at the same time as the Chinese exclusion laws are repealed.

SECTION 3

The important part of section 3 is that it allots a quota to China, thereby permitting Chinese persons to enter the United States as immigrants. The quota, arrived at by the same formula as in the case of all other quota countries, is slightly over 100 per annum. Chinese persons desiring to come to the United States under this quota must meet all of the other qualifications of existing law to the same extent as any other alien migrating to the United States. That is to say, they must meet the mental, physical, moral, and financial standards contained in section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, and also meet the qualifications contained in other immigration acts.

The one quota of 107 covers all persons of the Chinese race desiring to migrate to the United States, regardless of where they may have been born. From all the countries of the world no more than 107 Chinese can enter this country in any one year under this bill.

SECTION 4

The nationality laws of the United States provide that, with certain limited exceptions, the only persons who may become naturalized are white persons, persons of African nativity and descent, and descendants of races indigenous to the Western Hemisphere. Section 4 merely provides that Chinese persons or persons of Chinese descent will hereafter be eligible for naturalization.

There are approximately only 40,000 Chinese aliens in continental United States and about 5,000 in Hawaii. There are less than 100 in all of the other United States possessions. However, while these persons under the proposed amendment would be racially eligible for naturalization, it is an actual fact that only comparatively few of this number could actually qualify for citizenship under existing law, because it is a condition precedent to naturalization that the alien applicant for citizenship must have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. As only an almost insignificant number of Chinese, such as ministers and professors, have been admitted to the United States for permanent residence in many years, it follows that but a comparatively small portion of the Chinese alien population in the United States could be in a position to successfully apply for citizenship, even though made racially eligible to do so.

Mr. Speaker, at a later date I shall further discuss the effect and importance of this proposed legislation.

The Livestock Situation in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAX SCHWABE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a letter from the director of livestock marketing of the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation giving the reaction of the farmers of the federation to the livestock situation, the price roll-back and ceilings on live animals. His statement, after a series of livestock meetings in Jefferson City, Mo., is representative of the feeling of the farmers throughout the country, and I am sure it will interest the Members of this House who represent farming districts:

HON. MAX SCHWABE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have just finished a series of livestock marketing meetings at which we discussed the livestock situation and the feed requirements for 1943. In these meetings we made a survey of the pigs farrowed prior to May 1, 1943, as compared to the same period in 1942. We found less than a 5-percent increase in pigs farrowed to date, but we found a prospective increase of over 30 percent in gilts and sows to farrow between May 1 and August 1.

Many of the farmers present indicated that they were going to market these sows and gilts before they farrow and were not going to increase their hog production as originally planned. They gave as their reason the feed situation and the labor problem, but were more disturbed by the threat of price ceilings on live animals and a roll-back in meat prices.

A neighbor on an adjoining farm in Boone County sold all his livestock last Monday. He stated that with new threats every few days causing livestock prices to go down and production prices going up he just couldn't go on trying to produce. Numerous farmers are making this threat and will carry it out unless they are offered some encouragement instead of a constant threat of lower prices.

Farmers in general feel that there was never a time that the consuming public was more able to pay a reasonable price for food. They are opposed to subsidizing the processor or the producer in order that consumers may have a cheaper food.

The weather has already drastically reduced our 1943 food production. Many farmers are now discouraged. Talk of price roll-back and ceiling on live animals only adds to the confusion, and unless it is straightened out immediately, the food situation in the Nation will become critical before the year is over.

I appreciate the work that you have done on this matter, but unless the situation is remedied immediately the damage will be beyond repair.

Yours very truly,
MISSOURI FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
W. W. FUQUA,
Director of Livestock Marketing.

Women at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article published by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce:

WOMEN AT WORK

According to a recent Gallup poll, 56 percent of women war workers want to continue in industry after the war.

Should they be permitted to do so, thus competing for jobs with men released from the armed forces and war industries?

If socialism is to be the order of the postwar era, Government will be the sole employer and every able-bodied citizen will work for the Government—or starve. Women will work in Government mines, on Government farms, and in Government factories, as in Russia—with working conditions and wages set by bureaucratic decree. The choice as to whether they will work, or where, will not be made by the women themselves, but by officials with power to withhold ration books or inflict other penalties in the case of the recalcitrant.

More imminent than socialism is the danger of NRA capitalism. Then millions of women will be told to hang up their slacks and go back to the dresses and jobs of pre-war days Spread the work, which is really spread the unemployment, will be the order of the day.

GOOSE-STEP CAPITALISM RESTRICTS ENTERPRISE

NRA capitalism, toward which this Nation is drifting, is sometimes confused with free competitive enterprise. In fact, however, under that Fascist-type system only the ownership of capital remains in private hands. Enterprise in every form is rigidly controlled by agencies set up or sanctioned by government.

"1. Prices for commodities and wages for labor are fixed by official organizations of employers and employees.

"2. To maintain these prices and wage rates, competition is restricted. The right to engage in any trade or profession is restricted to the fortunate members of the official association, guild, or union.

"3. Enterprise, invention, and improvement are discouraged by (a) heavy taxation of profits, (b) standardization of qualities, and prices of goods, and (c) standardization of salaries and wage rates.

"4. A strong government, through a swollen bureaucracy, regulates the associations, guilds, or unions, and helps enforce their monopolistic decrees."

Under this NRA capitalism, or fascism, women lose out. This is because economic opportunity and success is not determined by personal worth or merit, but by strength of organization. Unattached individuals, newcomers, and weaker organizations find their opportunities for work and advancement restricted by the monopolistic methods of the strong.

And because of this restriction of work and production, such a system becomes truly an "economy of scarcity."

"High prices mean unsold surpluses and combinations for limiting output.

"Rigid costs mean featherbed policies and restricted efficiency.

"Bureaucratic controls mean delay and waste, deficits and taxes.

"Restricted opportunities mean work camps for the young, relief projects for the old, and only domestic employments for women."

The sales talk for the regimented economy holds out promises of security and stability, short hours, and high pay, fair prices, and sure profits. But regimented societies are neither secure nor prosperous, even for the politically strong. For the weak they mean the insecurity of oppression and injustice.

Free competitive enterprise is the one system which offers full and equal opportunity to all, regardless of age, sex, or creed. It alone offers women freedom to decide how best they may employ their time and talents.

FREE ENTERPRISE EXPANDS JOB OPPORTUNITIES

It provides incentives for individual enterprise in discovering where and how each producer may contribute most to the national stream of useful commodities and services. Rising efficiency in output reflects itself in lower prices, thereby bringing goods within the reach of more buyers and raising the purchasing power of their incomes. Real wages rise and the demand for labor grows. Distribution expands with production.

Thus the system works to bring about the most complete and economical employment of the Nation's entire labor force—whether in homes, offices, schools, or factories.

Of course, this free competitive enterprise has never been completely realized. Monopolistic restriction and unsound policies have always limited its scope and eventually brought reaction. But the brief periods in which it has been approximated have been the periods of most rapid progress in abolishing want and raising standards of human welfare. Recessions and depressions have come, not because of free competitive enterprise but because of the lack or perversion of it.

Women who want freedom to choose for themselves whether or not they will remain in industrial work will repudiate the chambers of commerce or trade unions, trade associations or politicians who seek to restrict or limit employment. In short, they will repudiate the "scarcity" theorists.

Full employment for our every resource in the line for which it is best fitted—this must be the goal or policy for the strong and progressive nation we want our country to be.

And freedom of enterprise is a first essential of this progressive policy. This means freedom for every competent citizen to choose what useful occupation he or she will follow.

When the Going Gets Tough, Just Think of Jimmy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AIME J. FORAND

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief article appearing in a recent issue of the Pawtucket Times, containing part of a letter written by Pvt. (1st cl.) Joseph Hargreaves, son of Mr. and Mrs. James Hargreaves, of 22 Chapel Street, Saylesville, R. I., in my district, in which he pays a fine tribute to his commanding officer, Col. James Roosevelt. I commend the reading of this letter to all Members of the House. It follows:

"When the going gets tough, just think of Jimmy."

This phrase has become the slogan of a marine raider battalion somewhere in the southwest Pacific. Jimmy is Col. James Roosevelt, son of the President, who because of a recurrent illness, was forced to give up his command and return to the States. A dramatic picture of his farewell to his men is told in a letter from one of them—Pvt. (1st cl.) Joseph Hargreaves, son of Mr. and Mrs. James Hargreaves of 22 Chapel Street, Saylesville.

"Last week we had a calamity," Hargreaves writes. "We lost our beloved James Roosevelt.

"Maybe you'll remember that about 3 years ago he was operated on for stomach ulcers. Well, he has been bothered by them again because of this climate.

"Whatta man. He used to get us all together and tell us of future plans, etc. He would also discuss world affairs and he sure was interesting.

"Well, one day we were ordered to the get-together place again. Jimmy came on the platform and we all stood at attention as usual.

"He just said: 'Well, fellas,' and then couldn't go on. He broke into tears. After a few seconds he recovered himself and spoke about a half an hour, about the battalion, how he loved it. All the time he was speaking he had tears in his eyes. Some of the officers who were pretty close to him broke down and left the place.

"Well, after his speech the fellows just went crazy with their applause. We just let him know how we felt about him, that's all.

"I think every one of us had a little tear in his eye because Jimmy is one swell guy. And now we have a saying—'When things get tough, think of Jimmy.' And we will."

In Fairness to an Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of May 31, 1943:

IN FAIRNESS TO AN ALLY

There is an immediately practical argument behind the movement for the repeal of the Chinese exclusion acts, those invidiously discriminatory laws which we still apply to our great far eastern allies. They constitute one of the best remaining propaganda weapons in the hands of the Japanese, who ceaselessly use them to convince the Chinese that we look down upon them as inferiors and that they should place no faith in our lofty protestations; it is an effective weapon, and the enemy should be deprived of it. But far more impressive is the less selfish argument of reason—fairness and common courtesy to the people who have so long sustained our battle.

These laws, which prohibit Chinese from entering the United States and deny the possibility of acquiring citizenship to all those not born here are as anachronistic as the extraterritorial treaty rights which we recently surrendered with such happy effect. Their history, going back to the early 1880's, carries with it memories of old passions and indignities. They are needlessly humiliating not only in the basic discrimination which they enforce but in the stringency of their regulations as to visas and points of entry for Chinese who are temporarily admitted, and the Chinese feel them keenly. And there is the more reason for their repeal because the quota system of our general immigration law now provides an adequate method of control without the insulting special treatment which the Chinese resent. The laws can be overhauled without inviting any floods of oriental immigrants; the quota would admit only about 100 Chinese a year, which is virtually nothing, while if these were allowed to become citizens, as are other immigrants, they would scarcely be noticed among the fifty-thousand-odd American-born Chinese.

The exclusion laws are somewhat complex in character, and various proposals for amending them have been introduced into Congress, all of which require study. But the subject is one certainly demanding attention, in the interests of justice and of the sincerity of our own principles.

American Soldier Overseas Writes About Strikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUTHER A. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, concerning strikes in war industries, many letters have been published from our boys in the armed forces overseas, expressing their indignation at those who strike in time of war.

A letter appeared recently in the Dallas News from Lt. James LaRoche to his mother, which I think worthy of reproduction, and under leave granted, I submit same herewith:

DALLAS SOLDIER SAYS HE KNOWS MANY WHO WOULD DIG IN MINES

"Here's a job for you back home. Get hold of Old Man Lewis and tell him that if his boys don't like digging coal for $20 a day, you know where there are men who would love to change places with them."

That's what Lt. James LaRoche and his Army Air Forces buddies who have seen plenty of action off an island in the Southwest Pacific feel about the coal strike. The soldier wrote his mother, Mrs. Francis LaRoche, 4200 Lomo Alta.

"If the miners think it's tough digging coal for that price, maybe they had better come out here, or go to the African desert, and learn what tough conditions really are.

"And you can tell Lewis for us that if he thinks any man out here is fighting for his boys and their jobs, he is completely off his nut. Yes, and tell him that there are several boys here from those same coal mines, and they are with us 100 percent.

"Tell him that he is doing the Japs a very great service, because this strike business has had a very bad effect on the morale of the fighting men. They even begin to question what they are fighting for."

And Lieutenant LaRoche should know. He left his job as public relations director for the University of San Antonio in February 1942 to enlist in the Army Air Forces. From the Southwest Pacific, where he has been since Christmas he has written about the swamps, jungles, mountains, and mosquitoes which beleaguer soldiers there.

Lieutenant LaRoche tells that it takes 3 days to travel 15 miles on the island by car and that men spent 2 days going on foot to a wrecked plane only 4 miles away.

The Aftermath of the War—The Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD F. HARLESS

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Cleon T. Knapp, of

Tucson, Ariz., before the Arizona State Bar Association on April 30, 1943:

The generations and the centuries that follow us, in writing their histories of the world, will dwell at length upon the panorama of great events which have crossed the stage of history during the last 75 years—great events in the fields of science, invention, economics, and warfare. We are privileged to be a part of the present hour, for despite adversity and sorrow, we live in a spectacular age, and a wonderful opportunity for lasting service lies before us. We are now engaged in a world war—a war that reaches to the four corners of the earth and affects every nation and all peoples. It will be won by the United Nations; the dictators will disappear, and eventually the wounds of war will be healed. But the people of the United States are looking beyond the present horizon and are wondering how this war, and the peace to come, will affect our present system of government and its fundamental laws; and to what extent the United States shall bind itself under international agreements. I have time to touch upon such questions merely in general terms.

Economic planners are now asserting that the fundamentals upon which this Government rests must be revamped. We might review the march of events which established those fundamentals. It is the story of the climb of the common man and his undying hope to win freedom. A story which began when the first civilization was cradled along the Nile and in the shadows of the Pyramids. This common man has felt upon his back the whip of oppression; to serve the purposes of rulers he spilled his blood upon every historic battlefield; he suffered the cruelties of religious intolerance; the sweat from his brow built palaces and filled the money coffers for kings; death most often was his only victory. But through all the centuries he dreamed of the hour when the door of opportunity would be opened unto him. That hour struck in 1787. In the little town of Philadelphia, 55 men met to form a nation. They had no chart to guide them—but were inspired as they again saw this common man, over whom had swept the storms of fate, ambition, and revenge, and relived with him his darkest hour of despair. They knew that the crown of thorns upon his brow was placed there by the hand of despotic power; that he was only a regimented thing. So these men resolved to create a government under which all the people should rule, and were careful to arrange checks and balances designed to prevent the exercise of bureaucratic power by any branch of the government. These men were in session 91 days, and, when their work was done, history was given a document of 89 sentences, which is known as the Constitution of the United States, to which later was added the so-called Bill of Rights. The greatest charter of human rights and freedom in the history of the world. The dream of the common man had come true. Freedom of religious belief, of speech, and the press—to assemble peaceably—protection against unlawful searches and seizures—trial by jury—no one to be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law—the establishment of a government of law, and not of men.

Then came the world's greatest experiment. Before this man lay an undeveloped continent, rich in resources. A new frontier that challenged his spirit of adventure, his initiative and ingenuity. The tide of his energy rolled through forests, across plains, over mountains, from the Atlantic to the Pacific Farms, towns, and cities came into existence. Threads of steel marked the trail of the railroads. Prospectors, pecking at mountain ranges, found hidden riches. The age of metal arrived. A hidden world of electricity was discovered. Rivers were harnessed, power developed. Manufacturing plants and great industrial centers came into being. A nation born and grown to greatness. What made it grow? Was it due to governmental planning, direction, and regimentation? No—the United States of America has grown to its present greatness because its charter released the flood of individual initiative and free enterprise which had been dammed up through the centuries by despotic and bureaucratic power. No governmental blueprints inspired the minds of those men who, like Edison, worked in laboratories to bring us light and great discoveries; like Westinghouse with his air brake, McCormick with his reaper, Ford with the gasoline engine, and all those others, whose minds were intellectual oceans in the world of invention, and who brought to our lives those many things which have made life much more worth while living. A few weeks ago two notable Americans died. Frank O. Lowden and James A. Farrell. Mr. Lowden was the son of a blacksmith, he became an outstanding lawyer, Governor of Illinois, and narrowly missed becoming President of the United States. Mr. Farrell was the son of a sailor, he started as a day laborer in the steel mills at the age of 15, and became president of the United States Steel Corporation for 21 years. Both were born of poor families, but were rich because they had equality of opportunity in a land of free competition. This Nation was built by and upon individual initiative and free enterprise.

Our Government as created was not perfect. The founders knew it would not remain unchanged, and through pressure of public opinion legal changes have, from time to time, been made. It is recognized that private enterprise should not operate unchecked and without legal limitations. When corporate railroad wealth became arbitrary and engaged in unfair discriminatory practices, Congress created an Interstate Commerce Commission to protect communities and the people; when persistent frauds were perpetrated by dishonest sales and distributions of stocks and bonds, Congress created a Securities and Exchange Commission to correct the evil; valuable natural resources have been safeguarded from exploitation. Congress has prohibited practices resulting in unreasonable restraint of trade; or combinations to restrict production or fix prices; or to engage in unfair trade practices; but all for the purpose of encouraging a free competitive system. In the exercise of such regulatory power Congress has always recognized that private enterprise is vital to our governmental and economic structure.

The question which will call for an answer when this war is over is whether our system and theory of government shall be changed. The issue will be free enterprise versus government by direction through a planned economy under greater centralization of power in Federal agencies. We are now engaged in the greatest war in history to determine if our type of democracy can survive. In order to meet this emergency Congress has given great power to the executive branch, with the result that our daily lives and business activities are largely regulated and directed by commissions and boards through executive decrees. A patriotic people is willing to waive legal technicalities in such an hour. But powerful forces are planning for post-war economic controls, entirely foreign to past business experience. Such plans contemplate joint private and governmental partnership in the management of industries; indefinite continuation beyond the war period of the rationing of consumers goods, together with wage and some price controls; direction of distribution of industrial equipment and other producers' goods, increased control of all transportation, and complete power to operate industries based on raw materials; and numerous other proposals. Plans, which if carried through would not only make the Government a business competitor with free enterprise, but enlarge the power of government over our lives and activities. A definite march toward a bureaucracy which a quarter of a century ago would have been called socialistic. A program to bring to the millions now on Federal pay rolls, a horde of additional employees, superplanners, and high-geared economists, whose wisdom and theoretical conclusions, in many instances, have come to them by inspiration, untouched by any contact with or knowledge of practical business operation. A cult has grown up with a great yearning to lay out a pattern of life for the American people; a pattern made up of restrictions and limitations.

Such aims will not be accomplished. I am thinking of the silent man. There are many more of him than of any other group in our Nation. He thinks much but says little. He is not represented by lobbyists in Washington, and belongs to no bloc. He lives in a humble home, and his wants are modest. You have seen him after a day's work put on his slippers, fill his pipe, and read his paper. Perhaps one item on the war prompts him to glance at a little flag hanging on the wall, with a gold star in its center. This silent man is liberal and fair. He believes in the right of men to organize and deal collectively with employers, but under responsible and honest leadership. He is in favor of social advances so that under some fair system of collective security, people will be protected against want and be secure in their declining years, guarded against unemployment and economic insecurity. He favors fewer rich and fewer poor, more leisure hours to enjoy life's sunshine. This silent man is a part of every group—the true cross section of America. He is slow to anger, but he is jealous of his rights. He still believes that those freedoms and guaranties, written into our national life a century and a half ago are his richest heritage. He is in accord with Winston Churchill when he said recently in his great address on England's post-war aims that continued social reform depends on free enterprise. When this war is over and peace has come, I think you will see this man put down his paper, lay aside his pipe, and speak. And he will ask for this: A decentralization of power in Washington, removal from governmental pay rolls of an army of so-called economists and planners, a greater return to State rights and control, less government in business and more business in government, a reaffirmation of the fundamental principles of our Government, less bureaucratic direction and the exercise of greater legislative authority, free enterprise and not state socialism. He will assert that the time has not yet come to rewrite our Constitution or the Lord's Prayer.

Peace lies ahead. What part will our Nation play; what will be its commitments? Isolationism has gone. This modern age has narrowed continents and oceans. But our dreamers in high places are preaching an uplifting philosophy to the world, which is a cruel deception, as it encourages people to accept idealistic promises incapable of fulfillment. This is a realistic war, and we will have a realistic peace.

War will come again. Close as it may be to our heart's desire, there will not be an everlasting peace. A long enduring peace is possible, only if Russia, England, and the United States can reach an accord. In my humble opinion the simplest peace will be the longest peace. The following might be a skeleton pattern. When Germany collapses and hostilities are ended, Europe will lie

devastated. Hunger and disorder will occupy the stage. These things must then be done: The Allied troops should establish and preserve order; such military occupation should continue for the shortest possible time and only until the respective peoples can establish responsible governments. I believe this Nation is unalterably opposed to any plan which will make our valiant American boys any part of a permanent world-wide police force. They must be returned to their native shores as soon as possible to again take up the normal course of their lives. Food and clothing must be distributed by all the United Nations, under direction of the Allied armies, to the starving people whose countries have been overrun by the Axis Powers. Axis soldiers to become enforced laborers, and, without pay, set to the task of tearing down every war installation and defense built by Hitler and then to rehabilitate the devastated countries. Axis nations to be totally and completely disarmed and remain so for at least a third of a century, only allowing sufficient domestic police to preserve order. Trial of Axis war leaders, including puppets in France, Norway, etc., by military court martial, with a penalty of hanging upon conviction. Those are the more important and immediate concerns.

Contemporaneously with the doing of those things Russia, England, the United States, and all other United Nations should meet and form a council of nations. The primary objects should be to establish a basis for a long peace, and to encourage trade and friendly intercourse among all nations. An international court should be organized to settle disputes. The orders of such court, if ignored, should be enforced in two ways: First, by imposing economic pressure through an embargo and blockade; second, by a voluntary cooperative military force from all the United Nations, but in no event by a permanently organized international police force. If the council is a living thing, resort to military enforcement should be infrequent. Most wars arise because of ambitions for commercial or territorial expansion. The council should encourage the flow of trade and commerce among nations, to the end that surplus production will be utilized. If this be done by an international clearing house or currency, it must not affect the national currency of any country nor interfere with import duties. And certainly the United States should not finance any such trade operation. The council should impose proper reparations upon the Axis Powers and establish boundaries. The peace with Japan, while presenting different conditions, could follow the general plan. No council or international court can live without the unselfish support of all three great powers. Peace will depend upon them.

But this Nation must be realistic; we must insure our own peace. We must remain the masters of our own destiny, free from domination of any super world organization. We must maintain a powerful Army, Navy, and air force, the control or direction of which we must never turn over to any international council. We shall develop our international trade as we consider best for our people and their prosperity, with reasonable import duties, if necessary to maintain our standards of living. We must continue to restrict immigration to keep out undesirables. We must preserve our institutions and way of life and yet make our contribution to the economic progress of the world. The United States should not alone assume the expense and responsibility of feeding, financing, and rehabilitating the world. Theoretical planners, of course, would prefer an idealistic peace, under a complicated plan of control; they are intrigued with the vision of being turned loose in a world of economic experimentation. Uncle Sam is not yet the world's Santa Claus.

In conclusion, the United States is approaching its great destiny. We are rich in natural resources; we can produce foodstuffs ample for ourselves, with a large margin for export; our great industrial plants have expanded beyond our wildest dreams; our ships now slipping into the oceans and building into the greatest merchant marine in history, will carry our trade to all shores; our airplanes now dotting the skies, and thousands yet to follow, will wing our products to all peoples; science is waiting impatiently for the war's end, to carry us into a fairyland of great achievements; discoveries so revolutionary that our lives will be recreated by new thoughts translated into things from plastics to electronics, and bettered by new medical thought. All when peace comes.

American boys will come home from far-flung battlefields, strong in self-assurance and filled with a pride in knowing they have contributed so much that their freedoms may live. The narrow confines of their lives will have been broadened for they will have seen other frontiers. Frontiers of world-wide opportunity.

Humanity is stirring. The hundreds of millions, from the banks of the Yangtze—the deep recesses of India, darkened Africa—to the Rio Negro, are awakening to a great urge to know and experience a better, broader, and easier life. They too dream of cities, industries, railroads and those many other things that science and invention have given to us. Let us carry to them the products of our civilization, and also the story of freedoms that can only be found under true democracy.

There lies our new frontier, our opportunity for the great tomorrow. A world calling for vision, individual initiative and free enterprise. Down that road lies our rendezvous with destiny.

Bishop James Edward Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following newspaper article on the life of Bishop James E. Freeman:

ONCE RAILWAY CLERK

Bishop Freeman was born in New York City July 24, 1866. He was educated in the public schools, and it was the original intention to devote his talents to business enterprises. Employed by the Long Island and New York Central Railroads for 15 years, he became interested in politics and won public notice in a series of platform speeches during the Presidential campaign of 1888.

The late Chauncey M. Depew, of the New York Central Railroad, said that the road lost a future president when the church took him.

The religious activities of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew also interested him. Both his eloquence and his earnestness so strongly appealed to Bishop Henry C. Potter that he finally was persuaded by that great preacher to accept the invitation of the church.

His preparation for the ministry was supervised personally by Bishop Potter, and Bishop Freeman was ordained a deacon in 1894 and a priest in 1895. The first assignment to which the former railway clerk was sent was that of St. Andrew's Chapel, Yonkers, N. Y. His service there was signalized by establishment of the Hollywood Inn, at the time considered the largest workingmen's club in the world. The building was designed by Bishop Freeman himself. Its cost was paid by the late William F. Cochran.

RECORD OF ACTIVITY

When Bishop Freeman took charge at St. Andrew's there were only 40 members worshiping in a small frame structure. During the next 10 years a large stone edifice was constructed, various religious and educational endeavors were launched, the communicant strength rose to over 1,200. Bishop Freeman gradually took his place as Bishop Potter's principal aide.

He was nominated to be bishop of Colorado in 1901 and was elected bishop coadjutor of western Texas in 1911, but declined both positions. Called to St. Mark's, Minneapolis, in 1910, he soon became a leader in the civic life of that city. He served as a director of the Civic and Commerce Association and was head of Wells Memorial House, the largest social center in the community, and president of St. Barnabas Hospital.

In the national organization of the Episcopal Church Bishop Freeman was chairman of the Nation-wide Preaching Mission and an active member of the executive council and the departments of missions, social service, and so forth. During the World War he visited many camps and naval training stations in the United States at the invitation of Secretary of War Baker and Secretary of the Navy Daniels. Subsequently he estimated that he had preached to 500,000 men in the course of those tours. He likewise spoke to multitudes of workers in munitions plants and shipyards.

While living in Minneapolis he wrote short religious articles for the Minneapolis Tribune. He also was among the first of American clergymen to make use of radio as a preaching medium. His popularity as a spiritual guide for groups of men led to his choice as arbitrator in several important strikes. He was commissioned a chaplain with the rank of major in the Officers' Reserve Corps on July 24, 1922.

SUMMONED HERE IN 1921

Meanwhile Bishop Freeman was summoned to Washington to be rector of the Church of the Epiphany. He was installed on February 5, 1921, the Right Reverend Alfred Harding, second Bishop of Washington, delivering the keys at the close of the service. Under the new minister Epiphany parish developed a new vitality as a leading division of the Washington diocese. Its membership swelled to 1,500 and the church buildings necessarily were enlarged. The work of Bishop Freeman in the whole local community prepared the way for his election as Bishop Harding's successor in the spring of 1923.

He was consecrated in Epiphany Church on September 29 of that year. The first business to which he applied himself included plans for the continuance of construction work at Washington Cathedral, the apse of which then was the only portion structurally complete. This task remained the bishop's principal duty until the end of his career.

Enlisting the interest of Gen. John J. Pershing, Herbert Hoover, Charles Evans Hughes, and other leading national figures, he quickened to new life the whole Cathedral construction project. The Cathedral Guide Book reports that more than $12,000,000 has

been contributed to the Cathedral and its agencies by more than 50,000 persons from every State in the Union.

ENVISIONED AS SHRINE

Bishop Freeman envisioned the church on Mount St. Alban as a national shrine of this country, just as Westminster Abbey is a national shrine of England. In its burial vaults lie President Woodrow Wilson, Admiral George Dewey and Mrs. Dewey, Henry Vaughan, architect; Herman Kohlsaat, publisher, Melville E. Stone, manager of the Associated Press, and many famous churchmen.

Of pure fourteenth century Gothic, the Cathedral edifice, when completed, will rise 202 feet above the Potomac River. Approximately one-third of the magnificent structure was brought to service by Bishop Freeman. He directed the elevation of the great choir, the north transept, the children's chapel, the chapels of St. Mary and St. John, the chapel of St. Joseph of Arimathea, and the chapel of the Resurrection. He also sponsored the building of the Cathedral library, the College of Preachers, several schools, and many supplementary institutions. It was said of him by an authority on the subject that "no other man of his time was so great a cathedral builder."

Bishop Freeman took a prominent part in the general conventions of the Episcopal Church from 1913 onward. He was host to the convention of 1928, which met in Washington.

Academic honors received by Bishop Freeman included the degree of doctor of divinity from Seabury Divinity School, and LL. D. from Kenyon College and Brown University.

BOOKS WIDELY CIRCULATED

Bishop Freeman's books, some of them widely circulated, were Everyday Religion, Man and the Master, Price of the Byways, The Ambassador, and Themes in Verse.

In the diocese of Washington, Bishop Freeman confirmed more than 20,000 communicants, but his services were not limited to the Capital. Several times he was called to England to preach at Canterbury, Liverpool, and elsewhere. He also was in demand as a university preacher throughout the United States.

Many distinguished leaders in the Government, business, and industry sought Bishop Freeman's counsel from time to time. He was on terms of friendship with Thomas A. Edison, Henry Ford, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., J. P. Morgan, former Presidents Coolidge, Hoover, and Taft.

To tell the story of the modern age of cathedral building, Bishop Freeman organized the National Cathedral Association and published the Cathedral Age magazine, which will carry on his work.

In 1937, Bishop Freeman's name was put forward in candidacy for election as presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church in America, and it was thought that the headquarters of the denomination would be established at the Cathedral in the event of his election. It was his choice, however not to accept nomination, yet the movement toward making Washington the center of Episcopal activity always engaged his enthusiasm.

DECORATED FOR EDITORIALS

Bishop Freeman received the decoration of the National Order of Al Merito of Ecuador in 1938. This was in recognition of his editorials printed in the Star each Sunday for many years.

Bishop Freeman is survived also by four grandchildren, two of whom are first lieutenants in the Army—James Freeman Jaffray, now in north Africa, and Clyde P. Jaffray, in Texas—Mrs. Earl Savage, Wayzata, Minn.; and Jane Freeman, of Washington.

Another daughter, Mary, married Clyde Palmer Jaffray, of Minneapolis, and died in 1923.

Effects of Roll-Backs and Subsidies on Food Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 8 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, copy of a radio broadcast delivered by myself over WIBW, Topeka, Kans., and the Kansas network on June 6, 1943, dealing with the disastrous effects of roll-backs and subsidies on food production.

I also ask that following the copy of the radio broadcast, there be printed two letters on the same subject. The first is from M. G. Buskirk, secretary of the United Dairy Committee, Chicago, Ill. The second is from Charles H. Bren, manager of the Chamber of Commerce of Salina, Kans.

I wish to call particular attention to some of the points covered in Mr. Bren's letter.

First, the packing plants at Salina are not allowed to slaughter a sufficient number of animals for the greatly increased population—due to Army installations nearby—of Salina, although there are plenty of cattle available in the community. The result is that cattle have to be shipped to the larger plants in Kansas City, and the meat then shipped back to Salina.

The second point is that, due to O. P. A. policies, 90,000 pounds of lard are packed up in Salina packing plants, and apparently cannot be distributed. At the same time the Government is importuning people to save and turn in fats and oils, because of the serious shortage. That looks like poor headwork somewhere along the line.

There being no objection, the address and the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends in the radio audience, I have just received a telegram from Earl Sutor, farmer and stockman near Zurich, in Rooks County, Kansas, which is typical of many that have come to me in the past few days. I am going to read you this telegram, as follows:

"I am a farmer and stockman and operate arcund 5,400 acres of land. Handle 500 to 600 head of cattle and 100 hogs each year.

"Because of Government regulations I have been sitting on a hot wire and every move made in Washington the heat is a little greater. This does not apply to me alone but also to my neighbors.

"I want you to know that I think roll-backs and subsidies are very dangerous, especially if you depend upon the American farmer to feed the world.

"If Washington doesn't get down to business we will find ourselves in very deep water. They should study the needs of the farmers before going too far. After attending recent community sales I find there are a lot of unfinished hogs going to market, because of uncertainty.

"This fiddling around in Washington will doubtless cause a lot of farm operators to close down. Farmers and stockmen cannot afford to take chances doing otherwise. I hope that Washington can see enough ahead to cut out a lot of useless business so we can all do our part toward winning this war."

That telegram comes from a practical farmer and stockman. He does not, so far as I know, lay any claims to being an economist, a statistician, a statesman, nor even a Planner (with a capital P).

But nevertheless he has hit the nail right on the head. The "roll-back and subsidy" program so popular with the Office of Price Administration—acting under orders from the White House—is dangerous. It threatens to decrease production, when the need is for increased production. It is economically unsound. Its present effect is to add to the uncertainties to an extent that, as Mr. Sutor says, is likely to cause a lot of hog raisers and cattlemen to close out their operations.

The theory of the roll-back and subsidy is that by lowering prices of butter, coffee and meat 10 percent—presumably other commodities later on—the cost of living will be reduced and necessity for higher wage demands will be eliminated. The subsidies will be paid with borrowed money.

Odds are that the plan will result in fewer pounds of food on the market; the borrowed money will increase the amount of money in circulation. More money and less goods just increases the inflationary forces; will mean more business for the black markets, very likely more and more and bigger and bigger black markets.

Chester C. Davis, War Food Administrator, does not believe in the subsidy and roll-back program. He says very frankly it is dangerous, and will not accomplish the results desired.

But Mr. Davis told the Senate Committee on Agriculture he is working under orders and must carry out those orders when they are given. Incidentally, he says the first he knew of the Office of Price Administration program was when he heard an advance announcement over the radio.

You know, my friends, that seems to me a very odd circumstance, because the very law which gives the Office of Price Administration its powers to ration and to fix price ceilings also provides that any price ceilings placed on foodstuffs or other farm commodities must first be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. And in the matter of production and distribution and prices on foodstuffs, Chester Davis now has replaced the Secretary of Agriculture, through another of those Executive directives, which have largely replaced laws and statutes in these times.

Those who attended the hearing at which Jesse Jones, head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, testified are confident from Mr. Jones' attitude that he does not believe in these subsidies for which he is to borrow the money to pay the subsidies. But in effect Jones let the Byrd Senate committee, before which he appeared, understand that he takes his orders from the White House, and that is that.

It is my best information and belief that the great majority of the Members of Congress are opposed to the subsidy program. The House Committee on Banking and Currency last Tuesday recommended for passage a bill extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for 2 more years.

But in that bill, this House committee included a provision prohibiting the Commodity Credit Corporation from using its funds to pay subsidies for the purpose of holding down food prices. Also, lest the Commodity Credit Corporation be tempted by directives to use its borrowing powers for a huge subsidy program, this committee recommended that its borrowing power for the 2 years be only one-half billion dollars, instead of the full $1,000,000,000 the Commodity Credit Corporation had asked.

Incidentally, and this has no direct bearing on the matter under discussion, Jesse Jones told the Byrd committee he estimated that the borrowing through Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other Government corporations under his control, including commitments to borrow, has reached the respectable figure of thirty-four billion—that is thirty-four thousand million—dollars.

Now, when Franklin D. Roosevelt became President of the United States, a little more than 10 years ago, the entire national debt was less than $34,000,000,000. The acknowledged national debt now is more than $135,000,000,000; will be close to $225,000,000,000 by the end of the next fiscal year (June 30, 1944) probably pass the $500,000,000,000 mark before the United States completes its job of defeating Japan after the European war is over.

War expenditures appropriated, authorized, and in process of getting congressional approval for the 3 fiscal years, 1941-43, have already reached a total of $338,500,000,000. The entire cost of running the United States Government from 1789 to 1940—including all our previous wars—was only half that much, $167,000,000,000. Our great and glorious spender already has exceeded all world records for borrowing and spending public funds; is now well on the road toward setting up a record that should never be reached by anyone else.

Just in passing I might note that the $34,000,000,000 of borrowing—indebtedness if you want to call it that—by Jesse Jones' government corporations are not included in the published figures on the national debt. Because technically the bulk of this $34,000,000,000 is not on the books as a Government indebtedness. It is the Government created and operated corporations that have borrowed and are borrowing this $34,000,000,000. But the Government of the United States underwrites this indebtedness; so far as the books go, this $34,000,000,000 of indebtedness is a "hidden indebtedness" that public officials don't mention in politely official circles. But it is there just the same. And it is a debt just the same. And the people of the United States will have to carry it just the same.

Now let's get back, for a few minutes, to this matter of roll-backs and subsidies, claimed to be part of the much-advertised battle against inflation.

First, let's get the A B C's of inflation.

The first cause of inflation, is a shortage of goods.

The second cause of inflation is a surplus of spending power.

The third cause of inflation is a shortage of goods plus a surplus of spending power.

We have with us today all three causes.

Inflation never existed where there was an abundance of goods.

The first remedy therefore is to increase production.

Manifestly, it is impossible to increase the production of foodstuffs sufficiently to feed our own people, our own armed forces, and the armed forces and peoples of so many of our allies to the extent we have promised to do.

To get increased production, the costs of the increased production must be met. Prices should be adjusted to cover these increased costs.

Then if a shortage of goods still exists—as it does—then the actual buying power demand must be reduced to meet the supply of goods.

There are two schools of thought on how to accomplish this result. One school favors establishing price ceilings, enforced by fines and penalties, without paying much if any attention to production of needed goods—that is the line which has been and is being attempted by the Office of Price Administration.

The other school of thought would (1) increase production by every means possible and (2) control purchasing power by trying to reduce demand to meet supply.

The first school of thought really is based on scarcity. The second is based on abundant production.

If we decide to reduce the demand to meet the supply, there are really two sound approaches to this solution.

First, ration the supplies, so that each may get a share. Actually rationing can go to the point where it causes a "market" surplus, which is a most effective way of controlling prices.

Second—and this is the hard way, so there is a general desire to avoid it—siphon off the surplus spending power by heavier taxes and by forced savings.

The subsidy proponents attempt to dodge the hard facts by a subterfuge—let the Government borrow money to cover increased production and distribution costs, thereby holding prices down. Farmers and other producers, thoughtful people generally, do not approve of this. It has a temptation for consumers and politicians, because it apparently gives the consumers something for nothing. Just another version of borrow and spend, spend and elect, then keep up the process.

Food price subsidies have several weaknesses.

Farmers are not sure the Government will go on forever voting the subsidies, so incentive is not to increase production.

It would be very difficult to check up each farmer and prove his losses to decide the size of his subsidy. The Office of Price Administration is trying to sidestep this by paying the subsidy to processors. Past experience causes farmers to doubt the subsidy would be passed on to the farmer.

Even if we assume the improbable—that farmers get the subsidies, in constantly increasing amounts, farmers have a healthy hunch that when the war ends the subsidies will be lopped off.

If the consuming public cannot pay production costs for food when the Nation has some $35,000,000,000 of surplus spending power, is there any reason to suppose it will when that war surplus spending power has vanished?

My friends, the food-subsidy program just won't work, as I wrote to Prentiss Brown the other day, urging him in the name of common sense to abandon the attempt and make a sound start toward meeting the inflation problem.

UNITED DAIRY COMMITTEE,
Chicago, Ill., June 1, 1943.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Your cordial reaction to matters which the dairy industry has called to your attention in the past prompts us to write you at this time on one of the most serious matters confronting the industry. You will recall that some time since we recorded with you our opposition to a subsidy program for agricultural products, with particular emphasis upon dairy products.

Despite our continued opposition, subsidies have been insisted upon and, as you know, have been in effect in the cheese industry and to a limited extent in the fluid milk industry for some months. Now comes the announcement by the Office of Price Administration of the roll-back on many products, including butter, and the establishment, effective June 1, 1943, of a 5-cent subsidy program on butter.

All of the reasons heretofore set forth in opposition to the subsidy program on agricultural products continue to prevail. Chief among them, however, is the widespread dissatisfaction of producers with the program because of the many unfavorable factors and the uncertainty involved therein. The new subsidy on butter will be no less disconcerting to producers and will meet with increasing dissatisfaction.

Were simple dissatisfaction with the program the only element involved, that might be ignored. We have widespread evidence that dissatisfaction will spread to such an extent that it will result in a curtailment of production. Under present conditions and the tremendous demands both domestic and world-wide for dairy products, such an end is to be avoided if at all possible.

The alternative to subsidy is simple. All that is necessary is that Office of Price Administration set such prices as will give farmers a satisfactory return for their products.

Any assistance you can give in combating the spread of the subsidy program and to the recalling of the programs already in effect will be appreciated keenly.

Yours truly,

M. G. VAN BUSKIRK,
Secretary.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.
Salina, Kans., June 2, 1943.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States, Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the food distribution committee held yesterday afternoon there were several matters discussed in regard to the food situation in Salina, especially beef. It was found that the extreme shortage of beef still exists and as far as we know our packers have not been given any favorable consideration in regard to an increased quota, so we are asking that, if possible, this matter be taken up again, particularly in regard to our packers.

Reports come to us that there are sufficient cattle within this area, and with ample facilities on the part of our packers the demand could be easily met. The situation seems to be growing worse due to the continual increase in our population.

We will appreciate very much this matter being given consideration. In the discussion of this question, thought was given to the possibility of the increase in points on beef, feeling that this would be of some help.

Now, in regard to pork the situation seems to be fairly well taken care of, but there is a serious situation arising in regard to lard. It seems that practically all small packers are accumulating an excess amount and in the case of the Banfield Packing Co. at Salina, at the present time they have 93,000 pounds of lard in storage with a daily output of about 3,000 pounds and only about 10 percent distribution. If some change is not made to create a demand for lard a very substantial loss is going to have to be taken by this packing house and we know the same situation will arise in other cases. The recommendation in this connection is to lower the point value on lard, probably two or three points, until such time as lard can be equalized with the supply of vegetable oils. This is evidently a serious situation and should have some attention, as if the condition continues there will be a decrease in the slaughtering of hogs.

Another thing that was brought up at this meeting was the limited variety of processed foods. We understand that the wholesalers stocks are very low and that the varieties are limited; therefore there is a run on certain items due to there not being a general assortment. In checking we find that out of about 31 items of processed foods, the wholesalers are entirely out of 15, so you can readily see the condition that is being created. Accordingly, it is suggested that the

wholesalers be given an opportunity to stock up on a wider variety of items.

We trust that you can give consideration to the recommendations which are offered and we will appreciate very much hearing from you as to what relief might be expected.

Very cordially yours,

CHAS. H. BREN,
Manager.

Repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to present a letter which I have received from Mr. Sam Chan, a successful businessman operating the Chinese Lantern Restaurant and the Sam Chan Farm Co., who is a good American in spirit, and longs for an opportunity to become an American citizen, which would come to him if the Chinese Exclusion Act should be repealed:

Hon. B. CARROLL REECE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REECE: As you can well realize, my people are more than a little interested in what action Congress will take on the bills now pending in committee to rescind the Exclusion Act. When I speak of my people, I naturally mean myself.

I have lived in America for some 30 years, Mr. REECE, coming here as a very young boy. I married here, became a proud and happy parent; slowly and painfully established myself in a business through many trying ordeals. I have prospered to some extent and because of my experience and the trust of others of my people, I have served as an official of Chinese-merchant organizations.

All these years, despite my happiness, there has been a hurt and an ache in my heart—namely, that here in this wonderful land, I have ever been regarded by Americans as an alien; worse than that, an alien of so-called yellow color, forever denied the rights of other races.

For many years, therefore, my one thought had been to save all I could and return with my family to China. But to me China is a foreign land for I was a child when I left there and war and death have killed off my relatives and the Japs have leveled the place where I was born. So a return there means nothing to me except it is a place where I would be respected. However—and it is a big however—my heart would always be here in America where my friends are and where I grew up. My two children naturally feel the same way. It is for this reason that I personally feel so strongly about these pending bills. I have said often this spring how eager I would be to become a citizen and that my greatest desire would be to become the first citizen under this act if it were only to pass.

I understand the American Federation of Labor and certain veteran groups oppose this legislation because they fear an influx of the coolie labor America once imported to build the railroads. This is a foolish fear. There are thousands of other Chinese here in this country who feel as I do—who have their fortunes tied up in active businesses and real-estate investments. At the proposed rate of only 107 per year, it would take 30 or 40 years to take care of us Americanized Chinese alone. Also, there are few Chinese in China today who are able to come to this country as new immigrants. The new China will need all her citizens to rebuild after the war. Our officials will discourage immigration.

Few Americans seem to realize it but the basis of this war in the Pacific has its roots in the Exclusion Act. All the brutality of the Japanese in battle and towards their prisoners, is based on their hatred of the white man's feeling of racial superiority.

Japan's entire propaganda structure is based on the Exclusion Act. Day and night their radios din at us that we should join with them and drive the white man from Asia. Weary of war and the terrible cost, many of my people are weakening to this sort of propaganda.

The passage of such a bill as the Kennedy Act would be a tremendous encouragement to my people. They would feel that at last America was giving more than idle lip service to the promised Four Freedoms. It would also nullify overnight Japan's lies. On the other hand, if this bill fails to pass, Japan will have a terrible new weapon with which to weaken us and destroy American prestige and good will

There has been talk in the committee hearings of this act (the Kennedy) being a "token" or a "gesture." China is too proud to accept that sort of thing. What we ask is a symbol that America, to whom we have always looked for friendship, courage, education, and trade, will accept us as equals. For ours, you know, is an 8,000-year civilization. We gave the world many of the things you today accept as commonplace—the printing press, the compass, medicine, the principle of the vitamin, gunpowder, and what not.

I dislike to boast, but our people in America are loyal, honest, and obedient to your laws. No other race can show such an enviable record. In no shape or manner can lobbyists claim we will menace jobs that returning soldiers will need. Chinese create jobs—do not take them. They go into business and eventually have to hire Americans to help them.

I could fill pages, dear Mr. REECE, but what is the use? In my heart there is just one desire—that here I could finish out my days, respected and equal to others around me, an American citizen. That my son and daughter could grow up and carry on after me in the same fashion.

Greater than my wish, however, is this last thought: Should this bill fail to pass it will be worth many millions of dollars to Japan and cost America thousands and thousands of lives and dollars.

Faithfully yours,

SAM CHAN.

Monthly Payments After Discharge to Members of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMORY H. PRICE
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, I introduced a bill providing for a payment of $50 per month to every member of the armed forces for each month served between the time the first Selective Service Act was passed and until 6 months after this war shall end. This money to be paid by the month on the first of each month after honorable discharge until the ex-member of the armed forces shall have received a number of payments equal to the number of months served.

At the time I introduced this bill I gave what I thought to be good and sufficient reasons for its passage. My purpose in addressing the House today is to renew my plea in the face of the cold reception thus far given my proposal.

It appears to me to be a certainty that this House will, sooner or later, vote to give those who risk their lives in this war an additional payment for their services, call it a bonus or whatever you will. I am sure we will vote to try in some feeble way to compensate them further for the risk, the sacrifice, to say nothing of the wonderful job they are doing for you and me.

That our Government is certainly obligated to all members of the armed forces, I am sure no Member of this House will deny. When I introduced this bill I said that by passing this measure now we would eliminate the necessity of our boys bringing pressure to bear on Congress at a later date. To pass it at this time would be evidence of our good faith as well as a means of helping the morale of our fighting men. As I said before, soonor or later this House will pass such a bill and as the election approaches there will be the odor of demagoguery contributed to all such movements.

In the Appendix of the RECORD, page A2071, Senator GEORGE says:

> We may find it necessary to make temporary provisions for the men and women in the armed forces and services. This should be done now, before the war ends. If postponed political groups and parties will vie with one another in trying to secure the soldiers' support and vote.

I believe the welfare of our men and women in the armed forces is too sacred to be handled in such a manner.

The more we think of the time immediately following the ending of this war, the more convinced we must be that our men and women returning to civilian life will have to have assistance. The transformation from war production to civilian needs cannot be made overnight and thousands upon thousands of the men and women who have never been in our armed forces will be dislocated, to say nothing of the millions coming out of service. Thus, the real necessity of doing something is apparent.

We do not hesitate to make arrangements for waging war and it certainly should be done, and, in my humble opinion, our purpose, our determination, in this struggle, is in order that we may have an America wherein all our citizens may continue to enjoy the wonderful privileges, the protection, and opportunities that we so fondly refer to as our American way of life. However, it is just as important to make preparations now to preserve these principles after the war ends as it is important to win the war. If there are no provisions made now to avoid chaos and confusion when

our boys return, can they not say truly, "We have fought in vain."

I believe every Member of this House agrees with me that this is absolutely necessary and that we are going to have to do something about it. We hear so much about post-war planning. It is all well and good to plan, but we must do more than plan. My idea is to act, wherever action is possible, and plan to do in the future what you cannot actually do now. And we can provide now for those who will come out of the armed forces so there will be no stoppage in their pay checks. Upon being released they will be paid all that is due them to that date, and then the first of the next month they will be paid at the rate of $50 per month.

The Members of this House can do nothing that will show our boys that we really appreciate the sacrifices they are making more than by passing this bill. If you really want to help them and do it when your motives cannot be questioned, please do it now. Ask the Military Affairs Committee to report out H. R. 2193 and then pass it as is, or amend it if necessary, in order that we may keep faith with our boys.

Political Parade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Rothwell Brown from the Washington Times-Herald of June 6, 1943:

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

Attorney General Biddle—setting himself up to be sort of one-man supreme court—has handed down another of his famous on-the-cuff curbstone opinions.

He is quoted as having decided that the action of the House of Representatives in denying salaries to three Government employees, because of their association or sympathies with radical left-wing organizations, is unconstitutional.

In thus deciding a case that has never been submitted to him, Mr. Biddle runs counter to the policy of his own department. Attorneys general heretofore have declined to render opinions except to the President, and not even to the Congress.

He also puts himself in opposition to a perfect galaxy of able lawyers in the House, and impugns the motives or the intelligence or the regard of Members of that body for the Constitution of the United States—or all three.

Mr. HATTON SUMNERS, of Texas, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, is a far more distinguished and able lawyer than the present Attorney General of the United States. Mr. SUMNERS voted to oust Messrs. Goodwin B. Watson, William E. Dodd, and Robert Morss Lovett. It would be an insult to him to imagine he would have thus voted if he had believed he thereby violated the Constitution. Judge SUMNERS is not that kind of a man.

Representative JOHN TABER, of New York, ranking Republican member of the House Appropriations Committee, which reported the ouster amendment as part of the urgent deficiency bill, is an able lawyer, and a conscientious lawmaker. I asked him what he thought of Mr. Biddle's opinion, handed down this week before the Society for the Advancement of Management.

"If Mr. Biddle said that," replied Mr. TABER, "I should be inclined to say he had never read the Constitution. The action of the House in prohibiting the payment of salaries to these three men is clearly a limitation within the power of Congress to impose."

It is also the opinion of Representative CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of appropriations, that the action was perfectly constitutional. Mr. CANNON, incidentally, was for many years the parliamentarian of the House.

Probably 90 percent of the House would disagree with Mr. Biddle, who, it will be remembered, rendered another of his famous curbstone opinions to the effect that the President had a legal right to impose a $25,000 net limitation on all salaries.

It also will be remembered that Congress overruled the Attorney General on that issue. It should do so on this one.

Mr. Biddle takes the extraordinary position that these Government employees may only be removed by the administrative branch of the Government.

If that were so Congress would be helpless to rid the Federal agencies of any of the economic atheists whose crackpot theories have reduced the domestic front in Washington to a state of bedlam.

According to Mr. Biddle only bureaucracy itself can separate a bureaucrat from the public pay roll.

This makes the issue between Congress and bureaucracy definite and inescapable. The Attorney General joins Curmudgeon Ickes in defense of the employees the House has found to be unfit for Government service.

The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee has dodged the issue, and eliminated the provision from the deficiency bill.

If the Senate stands by that, and the bill goes to conference, it will become the duty of the House to stand by its guns, even if by doing so it should prevent the passage of this appropriation bill.

Mr. Biddle certainly has riled the House by this charge of unconstitutionality.

Let it keep its dander up.

If bureaucracy wins this battle, Congress will be relegated to a sort of fourth branch of the Government. Bureaucracy will be entrenched as the real law-making body. It can snap its fingers at Congress—and will it do it!

Alaska's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Janet R. Keith, from the Washington Post of June 8, 1943:

ALASKA'S FUTURE

(By Janet R. Keith)

POTENTIAL WEALTH

Construction of the Alaska Highway has focused a great deal of attention on the northwest corner of the continent. No longer is this great area regarded, as it was when the United States purchased Alaska from Russia in 1867, as "a dreary waste of glaciers and icebergs." Both Canada and the United States are beginning to realize that the great northwest offers tremendous possibilities for post-war development.

A group of officials under the auspices of the permanent Canadian-American Economic Committee are at present making a study of the most desirable post-war use of the northern Pacific area, including north British Columbia, the Yukon, and Alaska. President Roosevelt has authorized a special study of the Alaskan portion of the road by officials of the United States National Park Service, and it is understood that Canadian officials are conducting a similar survey on the scenic possibilities of their part of the road.

SPECIFIC PROGRAM

Already the Foreign Policy Association of the United States has put forward a specific program for the future development of Alaska. It suggests that farming areas must be developed and opened up with the aid of extensive Government experimentation, new industries must be developed, extensive surveys undertaken to determine mineral wealth, the fishing industry strengthened by discovery of new uses for fish and fish products, and the whole area covered with a network of roads which will make remote areas accessible.

In considering plans for the future development of this great northern area, it is advisable to inquire into the reasons for its comparative backwardness up to the present time.

Climate has undoubtedly been a handicap. Returning travelers have always been prone to paint in lurid detail the extreme coldness of the winters. Yet actual weather records extending over a considerable period show that the climate in many parts of the Northwest is only slightly more severe than that of the prairies, and is much milder than that of some places at corresponding latitudes—Siberia, for instance. Wheat, oats, and barley have been grown as far north as Dawson, Yukon, and visitors are often astonished at the quality of nothern vegetables and flowers. While it is improbable that agriculture will ever become a major industry, modern horticultural methods should be able to push the cultivation of hardy cereals and fresh vegetables to far-northern latitudes.

LACK OF POPULATION

Lack of population has hindered the development of natural resources. Great potential wealth is there—timber, fur, fish and game, gold and silver, radium, lead, copper, and oil. There are even great rivers which would supply abundant water power. But there has been no systematic attempt to develop the natural industries of the country.

Transportation, of course, has always been the great bottleneck. There wasn't much point in working a coal mine inland when freight rates were a dollar a pound. Now these transportation obstacles have suddenly been overcome. In 1941 the Canadian Government completed a series of airports which link Fairbanks, Alaska, with Edmonton, Alberta. This airway, now used by military planes of both Canada and the United States, is expected to play an important part in international air transport after the war.

With the building of the Alaska highway, the Northwest has at last been linked by land to the rest of North America. The final barrier to development has been knocked down.

Will there be a great influx of settlers to Alaska, Yukon, and the surrounding territory after the war? It seems hardly likely that the Governments of Canada and the United States will permit a repetition of the old gold rush days. The country is potentially wealthy, but it is still tough. It needs

men, but men specially trained to make a living in a specialized country.

Perhaps many of the engineers and military men now stationed there, having become accustomed to the climate, will want to stay after the war. Or it may be decided to settle colonies of returned veterans. But if there is to be emigration, it should be systematic. The Northwest has suffered far too long from neglect on the one hand and haphazard exploitation on the other.

When future settlement is being planned, one class of inhabitant should not be forgotten. Some 30,000 of Alaska's 80,000 people are native Indians and Eskimos. In the brave new civilization that is to come, there should be a really worth-while place for these original settlers.

Post-War Advisory Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the decision of Hon. Harrison E. Spangler, the able and farsighted chairman of the Republican National Committee, to name a post-war advisory council has met with widespread approval and I wish to present for the RECORD an editorial on this subject by the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News, a most ably edited paper:

UNFAIR TO MR. SPANGLER

Chairman Spangler, of the Republican National Committee, has made another forward step in the appointment of the so-called Committee of Forty-nine. The purpose of this committee, as announced by Mr. Spangler, is to develop "a realistic peacetime program for American progress."

This committee or council will organize itself into subcommittees, and its recommendations will be submitted to the national committee before the national convention. The membership is made up of 5 Senators recommended by the Senate minority leader, 12 Congressmen recommended by the House minority leader, all the Republican Governors, the chairman of the national Republican congressional committee, the chairman of the Republican senatorial committee, and 6 members of the Republican National Committee designated by Chairman Spangler, and incidentally not one of whom was an original supporter when he was elected at St. Louis.

These 49 members represent every section of the country and every shade of Republican thought. It would be difficult to imagine a fairer way to select this committee, and yet it is being sharply criticized by the New York Herald Tribune and its pet Republican, Mr. Wendell Willkie. The Herald Tribune editorial predicts that unless certain recommendations are made "the real party, the men and women who cast votes, will toss that leadership aside and work out its own and America's destiny."

The answer to this vague and ill-timed observation is that the conclusions of the committee will be submitted to the convention of elected delegates, and the convention, not the Herald Tribune, will eventually write the platform. The editorial does not disclose the Herald Tribune's real peeve but its news column does, namely, Mr. Willkie has been slighted, and the reason that Mr. Willkie has been slighted is that he is not acknowledged to be the titular leader of the party, and "Messrs. Spangler, McNary, and Martin do not admit that Mr. Willkie as the 1940 Republican Presidential candidate has any more standing than Mr. Landon or Mr. Hoover."

As we understand the matter, Mr. Spangler was appointing a council to study and submit a tentative platform to the convention. He was not attempting to decide who was the titular leader, if there is any such an animal. To our way of thinking there is no historical basis for so-called titular leadership. The Republican Party, for example, has had three Presidents, Taft, Theodore Roosevelt, and Calvin Coolidge, who continued in this life after their Presidential terms and yet we cannot recall that the party ever yielded to them so-called titular leadership. The same situation is true of President Wilson in the Democratic Party. Assuredly if nomination and election to the Presidency does not merit this distinction, a defeated candidate for President cannot claim it.

At the present time there are two defeated candidates for Presidency in the Democratic party, Governor Al Smith and John W. Davis. No one will claim that the Democratic Party has ever accorded them this role. The Republican Party have three defeated candidates for Presidency, Mr. Hoover, once elected and defeated the second time, Mr. Landon and Mr. Willkie, both defeated candidates. Could anyone fairly claim, if the matter were an issue which it is not, that Mr. Willkie should be looked upon as the Republican leader to the exclusion of President Hoover and Mr. Landon?

Aside from their technical claims there is a sound reason why this should not prevail, namely, that Messrs. Hoover and Landon are Republicans whereas the Republicanism of Mr. Willkie is a very debatable question. Granted for the sake of argument, however, that Mr. Willkie is entitled to that distinction, if so, he forfeited it in the last campaign by his refusal to speak for any Republican candidate particularly the candidate for Governor in his own state, Mr. Dewey. Mr. Dewey had campaigned for Mr. Willkie when he was a candidate, and we can imagine no reason for Mr. Willkie staying out of the campaign other than that he has no "abiding interest in the Republican Party." He has been to Washington a number of times in the last few years, mostly to visit his "kindred spirit" in the White House, and on one occasion to try and prevent the deportation of a Communist. Seldom, if ever, does he visit and counsel with Republican leaders in the Senate and House.

The impression must not be allowed to stand that no one representing his viewpoint on foreign affairs or persons friendly with him are on this committee. Senator AUSTIN, for example, sees eye to eye with Mr. Willkie Mr. HALLECK, of Indiana, placed him in nomination for the Presidency. Senator MCNARY at Mr. Willkie's instance, was his running mate. Congressman MARTIN, of Massachusetts, was named Republican National Chairman by Mr. Willkie, and the instances can be multiplied.

These criticisms are very unfortunate and very unfair to Mr. Spangler, but we believe the overwhelming Republican opinion will applaud and approve the appointment of this committee, and the manner of its selection.

Weekly Report to the People of My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me over station WNBF, Binghamton, N. Y., on June 5, 1943:

Men, women, and young people of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, as I look back over the pleasant experiences of the last week-end spent at home, I feel greatly satisfied with my visit. It makes me want to spend a lot more time in my own district and see a lot more of the friends I have to leave behind when I return to Washington. The most difficult thing about being in Congress is finding it necessary to spend so much time away from the triple cities and surrounding territory where I enjoy being most of all.

While I speak to you, however, I am thinking of the opportunity I am availing myself of Sunday (tomorrow), which as you know, will be the seventh annual Townsend day at Ross Park. I urge all my friends to gather with me to observe this memorable day. Not only will we get together to honor the founder but we will afford ourselves the pleasure of renewing the friendship which means more to me than anything in my public life.

I often reminisce and recollect the early days before I was elected to city council from Binghamton's famous fifth ward. I remember when Club No. 6 met across the street from where they do now. Nearly once a week I used to come to the meetings and involve myself in some heated debates on just about every subject under the sun. The sincerity of the people in Club No. 6, just like all the other clubs of Broome County, was and is wonderful to see. They are dedicated to the cause of reasonable pay-as-you-go pensions, just as I am dedicated as your representative to doing everything in my power to further their interests in old-age pensions in Washington. I pray the time comes when we will all arrive at our goal. I hope it will not be too long ere the struggle for old-age security will be finished with victory for those who have fought so long and so valiantly for what they believe is right. You know where I stand, and I have never hidden my true feelings in regard to the whole pension issue.

So I anticipate the rare pleasure of seeing you all in Ross Park tomorrow. I want to shake your hands and talk over old times and new ones, too. I have a message of considerable interest to you, also, because it comes fresh out of Washington as well as from the heart. I am sure we will have the best meeting we ever had.

Probably the most enlightening hour I ever spent was with the Independent Grocers Association of Binghamton in the Federal building a week ago. These folks gathered in the Federal courtroom last Sunday for the purpose of presenting to me a number of complaints and problems they face in their daily relations with the Government. I am amazed that their integrity and patriotism have been questioned by those who

know them to be fine, upstanding Americans in our community. I do not believe it is conducive to the war effort to push these grocers around. They are doing a splendid job in serving the public in wartime. They are working many more hours than their usually long shift. In spite of all the confusion which rationing is creating for food dealers, they are accepting their added burdens cheerfully, and from what I can see, are doing a wonderful job.

These grocerymen are not making as much money as many of their fellow citizens who work shorter hours. They get all sorts of headaches and very little thanks for their pains. They tell me that the Office of Price Administration does not understand what they are up against. They say, too, price lists are not issued to them on time and therefore cause mistakes and penalties.

In answer to all this, I assured this patriotic group I would take their complaints directly to Prentiss Brown. It's about time the bureaucrats in Washington woke up to the difficulties they are placing in the way of citizens at home who are trying to win the war. It's high time Congress took action so these thousands of bureaucratic agents could not swoop down upon independent Americans and undermine their enterprise.

Probably no one in America is more concerned with the food problem than is the grocer. He realizes how serious all the bungling and hindering from Washington agencies has become. He knows there will be a terrific food shortage next winter, as the result.

The grocers' association assured me they are greatly worried about this food shortage. They want to see the public properly fed and they are willing to cooperate in food distribution. But they feel the Government must give them a chance to cooperate. Otherwise, the people will go without next winter because the grocery stores will have to close.

During my meeting with the grocers, I asked them to tell me how they felt about grade labeling and the display of standard brands on canned and packaged goods. They adopted a motion to go on record in favor of grade labeling. They believe all goods should be graded and marked. But they are opposed to the idea of taking off the brand names from cans which, as you know, has been proposed by Office of Price Administration. I told them I would never vote for such an idea. It smacks too much of a Government-controlled food industry.

The following is an introduction in the booklet, Our Flag, which is the history of our flag by the United States Marine Corps. I have just received a supply of this publication and will be glad to send anyone a copy who will write me and ask for it:

"I AM OLD GLORY

"For more than eight score years I have been the banner of hope and freedom for generation after generation of Americans. Born amid the first flames of America's fight for freedom, I am the symbol of a country that has grown from a little group of Thirteen Colonies to a united Nation of 48 sovereign States. Planted firmly on the high pinnacle of American faith, my gently fluttering folds have proved an inspiration to untold millions. Men have followed me into battle with unwavering courage. They have looked upon me as a symbol of national unity. They have prayed that they and their fellow citizens might continue to enjoy the life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness which have been granted to every American as the heritage of free men. So long as men love liberty more than life itself; so long as they treasure the priceless privileges bought with the blood of our forefathers; so long as the principles of truth, justice, and charity for all remain deeply rooted in human hearts, I shall continue to be the enduring banner of the United States of America—I Am Old Glory."

Much has been said in this world about friendship. My poor power of expression can add but little I fear, to the embellishment of this priceless gem. But I will say I am aware of no one who appreciates the true meaning of the word "friendship" more than myself. Any man who holds public office in these turbulent times values the love and loyalty of his friends more than all the gold and treasure on the earth.

Friendship is close kin to loyalty. Neither can be bought or sold to the highest bidder. They are unique in political and social spheres because they represent the secret of every man's success. Nobody can survive without friends. They are like food to the hungry, shelter to the homeless, clothing to the naked.

When we condemn or criticize our neighbor, we often overlook the fact that he may have friends. These will rise up to his defense if we persist in chastising him. The more we refuse to tolerate him, to exclude him, to ostracize him the more his friends rally to his support. Human nature has strange ways of asserting itself.

Too often I read in our local newspapers of the passing of some dear friend. It is at that moment that I realize how little I appreciated him in life and how great a pang I feel by this sad event.

No; lasting friendship cannot be bought. Fair-weather friends are apt to be numerous, but they run at the first squall and have entirely disappeared when the storm comes. True, sometimes, friends are few and far between. They are worth more, however, than all the jewels in a kingly crown.

Last week the House of Representatives held a memorial service for three distinguished Members who had passed on. I will read briefly from the remarks of one of the speakers:

There is no more honorable mission than to be chosen to represent a constituency in the United States House of Representatives. It is an honor that may well be coveted by our fellow citizens. The Congress is the most distinctly representative legislative body in the world. Here we find literally and actually a cross section of the American people. Every school of thought, every political philosophy has in this hall its representative, as it has the right to have. If we at times seem to be in confusion and wandering in a wilderness of conflicting objectives, then it is largely because the American people are unsettled and undetermined. This Congress is just what the American people wish it to be. Individually and collectively, its membership compares most favorably with any other group of American citizens. Upon the roster of the Congress we find the names of men who have been leaders in the business, professional, and the commercial life of the Nation as well as those who have served their communities and their States and the Nation in places of high honor and great responsibility, both the judicial and the executive branches of government. Every type and every calling is represented here.

Reverting to the subject of friendship, may I read from the lines of a great modern American poet, Edgar Guest?

"We nodded as we passed each day
And smiled and went along our way;
I knew his name, and he knew mine,
But neither of us made a sign
That we possessed a common tie:
We barely spoke as we passed passed by.

"How fine he was I never guessed.
The splendid soul within his breast
I never saw. From me was hid
The manly, kindly deeds he did.
His gentle ways I didn't know
Or I'd have claimed him long ago.

"Then trouble came to me one day
And he was first to come and say
The cheering words I longed to hear;
He offered help, and standing near
I felt our lives in sorrow blend,
My neighbor had become my friend.

"How many smiles from day to day
I've missed along my narrow way;
How many kindly words I've lost,
What joy has my indifference cost!
This glorious friend that now I know,
Would have been friendly years ago.

"The bud but very little shows
To tell the beauty of the rose,
And him we greet in passing by
With scarce a nod, the day we sigh,
May blossom as the storms descend
With all the beauty of a friend."

—*Edgar A. Guest.*

The Old Home Town—Revere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include a feature article by Bob Coyne which appeared in the Boston Sunday Post, May 30, 1943. Revere is a progressive community in my district:

THE OLD HOME TOWN—REVERE

(By Bob Coyne)

The beginning of Revere, which is today very democratic in spirit, had quite an aristocratic tone. Sir Harry Vane, son of a privy councilor of England, became its first landowner when he was granted 200 acres of Rumney Marsh, the original name of Revere.

Vane, regarded as a romantic dreamer had, however, very high ideals. He contended that all creeds should have equal rights in New England. His convictions so aroused the clergy that he was forced to leave Rumney and sail back to England. The marsh then became the property of the few wealthy gentlemen who remained, seven of whom owned the entire section.

Because large areas had to be reclaimed and the stubborn sea grass continually discouraged settlers, progress was very slow. It was not until the beginning of the eighteenth century when the First Church, which historians claim as the oldest church in Suffolk County, was erected that community life began to grow. Even then, advancement was barely noticeable.

Rumney Marsh, first part of Boston, then of Chelsea, then of North Chelsea, came into its own in 1871. In March of that year, when an act of the legislature named it Revere, after the Revolutionary hero, church- and school-bells rang, flags were displayed, and guns fired a salute.

On the following Patriots' Day a formal celebration took place. One of the unique features was a barouche, drawn by four bay horses, carrying the grandfathers who boasted that they had lived in three towns without changing their residence. An old lady explained that they had not taken the grandmothers because the dear old ladies had been so busy they hardly knew where they lived.

At the evening festivities, Longfellow's Paul Revere was read by a lineal descendant of the great patriot, and that reading has become an annual custom, although it has not always been given by a Revere descendant.

BRITISH DEFEATED THERE

In Revolutionary days Revere played its own part. In the spring of 1775 the British, hard pressed for food, prevailed upon the Continentals to supply them with foodstuffs, which was certainly giving comfort to the enemy. The committee of safety ordered the patriots to withdraw their cattle, sheep, and horses from the coast line.

The settlers had hardly completed their task when up the creek came the British schooner *Diana*, which immediately opened fire on the farmers. The little band of farmers were baffled when, out of the nowhere it seemed, came Israel Putnam with reinforcements. Leading his men knee deep into water, he returned the British fire. So effective was the assault by the patriots that the British left their ship and made a quick retreat in small boats.

The *Diana* was stripped of all that was useful and then destroyed by fire. The whole affair was only a skirmish, but it aroused in that little band invincible confidence.

Clam digging was always popular and especially at low tide when the waters receded. This pursuit brought up an unusual case regarding the town's jurisdiction in the matter. The defense claimed that the titles to the land extended only to the beach edge, but the decision proved rather startling. On the ground that "if the ocean rolled to the Azores it would do nothing more than expose undeveloped territory in the town of Revere," the case was settled.

Many descendants of the early settlers still live in Revere. The Bennetts, Slades, Pierces, Shurtleffs, and the Fennos are as much a part of Revere as Revere itself. Stories handed down by the old families recall the characters and events of early Revere.

Though many years have passed since John Pierce died, he is remembered for his personality and his kindness. He was four persons in one—constable, assessor, tax collector, and cobbler. People who dropped in to pay their bills, waited to have their shoes repaired and enjoyed the kindly philosophy of the genial old gentleman.

Tom Nolan, proprietor of the village blacksmith shop, was also popular. In summer his shop was the rendezvous of old-timers, and in winter boys stopped in to have their skates sharpened. The Fenno store, first in Revere, built in 1835, was typical of olden days. Outside was a pump and a watering trough, as well as stalls where one might park one's team and horses. Three entrances led within, one to the house, one to the dining section, and the third to the general store. All roads met at Fenno's, where men seated on pickle or molasses barrels decided matters of state.

The oldest of Revere houses, the Rumney-Bennett-Slade, was distinctly a New England farmstead. Though it aged, grew rather weather-worn, it remained comfortable; its grass-grown yard and lovely old trees made it very attractive.

In 1914 Revere became a city. Its 3 miles of broad, sandy beach, one of the best in New England, have meant much in its development. The beach, a perfect crescent, affords pleasure and amusement to thousands during the summer months. Apparently sheltered from storms of the sea, it is recorded that during the winter of '84 a terrific storm so lashed the beach that a wall of ice 15 feet high resulted. Then the constant washing of the waters fashioned huge tunnels through the wall. Today the beach, the surf, the many resort amusements, and the carnival spirit that prevails—all make Revere a popular summer spot.

The people of Revere are interested in their community. When a new library was needed, Mrs. Sparhawk and her brother, Mr. Whiting, who were traveling in Europe, sought an interview with Andrew Carnegie. The result was a gift of $20,000 to the city from the noted philanthropist. Many well-known folks have come from Revere: Dan Daly, old-time vaudeville star; Hap Ward, of the fun-provoking pair, Ward and Vokes; Jack Sheehan, famous as a referee and Nat Butler, once bicycle champion and owner of the Revere Cycle Track.

Children of Revere are 100 percent for Jack Haley, movie star. The man, whose old home town votes a "Jack Haley Day," and in addition closes school for the celebration, could not fail to be popular. Revere owes much to Benjamin Shurtleff, town historian, who has kept alive its old memories.

Raymond E. Carey, mayor of Revere, has endeared himself to the people by his charities; to every needy case he gives his personal attention. Each serviceman who leaves Revere takes with him the gift of the mayor, a ring inscribed with the seal of the city.

One of the leading citizens is John Di Pesa, who gives to all civic affairs his time and his talents. Veteran of the First World War, he organized the drive for the Legion Building and he has also done much to keep alive World War associations. Revere had many who distinguished themselves in that conflict, among them Max Achenbach, D. S. C., for whom a school was named.

From almost worthless marshland, Revere has struggled through many changing years to find its own particular place in the sun.

Income Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Galveston Daily News of June 4, 1943. This editorial very clearly expresses one of my principal reasons for voting against the pay-as-you-go tax bill on final passage.

INCOME TAX BILL

All those exaggerated cartoons allegedly depicting the agonies of filling out income tax returns will have more basis in fact than ever under the compromise tax bill which finally emerged from Congress and which, it is reported, the President is almost certain to sign for lack of a more satisfactory measure. After a brief study of its provisions, one can easily understand why nobody is very happy about the bill that finally was concocted. The transition to pay-as-you-go will be comparatively simple for all taxpayers whose income is derived almost entirely from wages and salaries and which does not exceed $2,700 for a single person and $3,500 for a married person. But there is a large group of taxpayers, including those who have income of more than $100 from sources other than wages and salaries, who are going to find the business of keeping even with the Government a very complicated affair. Also included in this group are single persons earning more than $2,700 a year and married persons earning more than $3,500, professional men and women and persons whose income is from investments, rents, royalties, and fees. Many of these 14,000,000 taxpayers may have to file five income tax returns a year—four estimated and one final return.

Assuming that his 1943 income is larger than that for 1942, the taxpayer in this class will have to compute his income and victory taxes on the basis of estimated income for this year and file a return on September 15, paying at that time three-fourths of this year's estimated taxes, less payments made on March 15 and June 15, less any victory tax withholdings during the first half of 1943 and less any withholdings from his pay between July 1 and September 15. Then on December 15 of this year, he will pay the remaining one-fourth of 1943 taxes and file a revised estimated return for 1943, if necessary, making suitable adjustments in the September 15 estimate. Then, on March 15, 1944, he will have to file a final return on 1943 income, paying whatever he might owe. But unless his December 15, 1943, estimated return is at least 80 percent correct, he will also have to pay a small penalty.

In addition, on March 15, 1944, the taxpayer will have to file an estimated return on 1944 income and pay one-fourth of the tax on the estimated income. He then will be permitted to revise the March 15 estimate on the following June 15, September 15, and December 15, with the final return on 1944 income to be filed on March 15, 1945.

From this it can be seen that the taxpayer who falls in this group is faced with the prospect of not one headache a year but possibly five. Farmers are subject to still different treatment. But the biggest headache of all probably is going to be experienced by employers who are charged with the responsibility of keeping individual records on the taxes withheld from each employee's pay. They must account to the worker and also to the Government, and it is possible that the Government accounting will be required every month. They will be allowed to deduct the cost of the additional clerical help that will be needed in making their business tax returns, but they will receive no compensation.

A lot of people soon will be wishing for the good old days when it was necessary to bother about income taxes only once a year.

Life in the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 the Honorable Frederick M. Davenport, Member of Congress from the Thirty-third New York District for many years, and now chairman of the Council of Personnel Administration of the United States Government, made the commencement address at Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt.

Under permission heretofore granted, I wish to insert in the RECORD Mr. Davenport's splendid address:

Of course all healthy and sane young men and women desire to make good, desire to use the powers with which they were born, the potentialities which the process of education has revealed in them, in such a way that it will be worth while to have lived. This is

particularly true of those whom the colleges and universities have sought to make ready for influence and leadership in an age full of difficulty for the human race. The country, the world, cannot long afford waste of energy or confusion of purpose, whether in the economic field, or in the realm of learning into which the American people have poured wealth and sacrifice and prayers to such an extraordinary degree.

By life in the public interest I do not, of course, mean primarily life in the public eye, or on the political front, or in a Government post. It is rather a way of living I am thinking of, an attitude of mind, a choice you make at every important fork in the road. Are you regularly for or against the good of all, or do you decide usually for number one? As your influence widens and you become the head of a great corporation, will you conduct your business so that the welfare of employees, of consumers, of investors is close to your conscience? Or, if you become a figure in the party or in Congress, will you use your position of authority for the good causes or for the strongest pressure group? Is the trend so clear that those who know you, silently mark your uniform with the invisible insignia of the common good?

This is something of great consequence to us in America. There is being thrust upon us by the invisible movement of events the greatest obligation that has ever been put upon a people. The round globe is in peril of tryanny and slavery. These are not mouthings. It has come to pass, through causes that are deeply economic and personal—and traceable—that the malignancies of human nature have suddenly become in the ascendant over large areas of the earth's surface. And fate, if you wish to call it fate, or ultimate providence, if you wish to call it providence, and world opinion, if there is a world opinion, have put upon this country the duty and the necessity of taking the leadership and making the fight in all latitudes, on land, on sea, and in the air, to give the world perhaps its final chance to be in order and to be free. The very thought of it is breath-taking. We have grand allies, but their human and material and spiritual resources alone are not equal to it. Ours and theirs together are, if not wasted or otherwise badly directed.

We now know that this country was far from ready to take up the formidable gage of battle. We had just come through a generation of profit-taking and profit-losing—let us eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die—a generation of general carelessness about what kind of government we had in this country. There were some oases in the desert, but on the whole, invisible and selfish powers were in control of much of our political life. Legislation had become a long struggle of compromise with pressure groups, which we shall probably always have with us to a degree, but which are fatal to fair government unless in legislative posts there is a controlling group of high intelligence and patriotic purpose to act as mediators for the whole people.

We have been through an era—we are on the other side of it now, happily—when college professors were widely advising graduates to take up bond selling or a so-called private profession, and to avoid politics or a public career as a pestilence. Government vision was likewise blurred. The high conduct of Government business was neglected in wholesale fashion. Government employees as a body were held in low regard, as they still are, although as a section of the population they are of unusual excellence but widely underesteemed—damagingly underesteemed, in my opinion—chiefly because there has until recently been little attempt in the field of government to select and train able supervisors, administrators, leaders for these employees in the most enormous and important business in the world. For administrative leadership, for management, in the Government's business every man has been thought as good as any other man, if not a little better. Of course this is not so. The administrative quality, the capacity to bring things to pass, to cooperate successfully with others, the ability to inspire workers to their best efforts—these are unusual traits that should be sought for, caught young, trained carefully, as is done in the best private enterprise. Government has paid very little attention to this, and so the administration of the Nation's business has long and unnecessarily been a byword and a derision.

This is a dangerous flaw. It is very important that the administrative side of government, the management side of the everyday business of government, should be intelligent, clean, and effective. It is the only way a free and busy people can deal with the vast range of complicated social and economic problems which affect us all.

Not simply our administrative controls but our political controls have been neglected, and in this general neglect of our public life college men and women have been chief offenders. If you look closer at the grass-roots management of the political parties you will find very little influence there from the mental and moral energy output of the higher schools of learning. Between fifty and a hundred thousand college students every year pour out into the various activities of human society in America, largely avoiding political party life and experience, even as an avocation. I would not urge seeking mere dominance in politics—there may be persons more simply trained who are fit to become your political peers—but we ought to be carrying our share with the rest of the population and making our contribution to the common good through party and political controls.

For, after all, these controls are fundamental to the public interest. Whatever you may think of this or that politician, who never earned before what he now earns and never will again, the wholesale condemnation of our public men has become shallow and meaningless. A useful politician, a politician in the true sense, is a person actually able to bring things to pass within the fabric of government and in a free system. He is the expert in the behavior of his party colleagues and of the electorate. He understands human nature. He manages human prejudices and prepossessions and emotions. He senses whether an idea is practical and can be maneuvered through the channels and past the reefs of public sentiment and into safe harbor in the law and the Constitution. The able politician is the navigator of the ship of state. No one can take his place in a storm. What Lincoln did in the years 1860–65 was to bring into safe harbor the idea of Daniel Webster that the Union must be preserved. Lincoln was the master of his country's fate, the captain of her soul, because he was the master politician of her history.

A great part of the success of the American Revolution and of the Government of 1789 was due to the amazing political sagacity of George Washington. The heavy likenesses of the Father of His Country, to which we are accustomed, do not bring this out. If you wish a picture of the able politician who became our first President, hear this description of him from one of his biographers, as he appeared when he came with his Virginians to the First Continental Congress:

"When Colonel Washington strode through the streets of Philadelphia, his imposing ways, his tall form in his handsome uniform * * * attracted a great deal of notice. He went here and there everywhere in the city, buying provisions, arms, and munitions for his Virginians. He did not talk, but quietly purchased and paid. He made a profound impression. He was seen everywhere. In the morning and afternoon in Congress, in the evening at the tavern with the merchants, or dining in society * * * with the ostentatious banker Morris, or with the well-known lawyer Dickinson, with Mayor Fisher, with the leading Quakers. He was untiring. One Sunday morning he appeared at a Quaker meeting. In the afternoon he attended the service of the Church of England. On the Sunday following he went to hear a morning sermon in the Presbyterian Church and attended benediction at the Catholic Church after lunch. He frequented the taverns where the New England Delegates were lodged, as well as those where the Delegates from Carolina were dined, and going everywhere, wherever he went he gave the same telling impression of force, resolution, and calm."

In the living room at Mount Vernon and in the House of Burgesses, Washington met and learned to influence his own aristocratic class, and after his campaign around Boston and his association with the free and independent Yankees, who went off home whenever it struck their fancy and came back when they were ready, he learned to understand and to manage the peculiarly free and easy traits of that inchoate and loosely organized body of human beings, later to be known as the American people.

That was political sagacity of a high sort. Young men and women, don't be ashamed of political sagacity, if you have any. No matter what your career, you will succeed all the better for genuine political sense. I recommend that at least as an avocation you become politicians in the public interest—all of you—women as well as men. This war, so far as I can see, will end by rendering sex no bar to any human activity. There are levels of helpful public influence into which all of us may fit, and there are levels of political and party leadership, from town and ward committees up the ladder, into which many of you may fit. I stress avocation and not vocation. If this course leads you naturally into public place, well and good. But you don't have to run for office to be a public power. You don't have to be an officeholder, but if you know the party ways, the legislative ways, the public issues of the hour, and if fifty or a hundred thousand of you go out into active American life every year, you can exert an influence upon public intelligence and morality beyond all price.

Another thing we must bear in mind. The public interest has become as wide as the world. Of course we do not think of the phrase "the public interest" in a provincial sense, as applicable only to the America we love so much. Either we are coming into a new and broader day, a new and better age for other nations as well as our own—which we may help to bring into being—or the folly of this vast conflict is multiplied a thousandfold and we are only on the way to more wars and ultimate complete cataclysm.

There are signs that we may avoid it. The subnormalcy which followed the last war, the secret treaties, the boundary greeds, the balances of power, the implacable isolations, the selfish economic stupidities, are now being measured to some degree in advance, as exactly what they are—namely, deadly enemies of the happiness and progress of mankind. The fighting free nations—China, Russia, the British Commonwealth, the United States and her American allies—have had their fill of poverty, sufferings, and hate. If they understand each other, they are on the march to begin to end them.

There is a larger public interest emerging which may turn out to be irresistible in its economic impact. Not that America is about to become a wild, runaway, starry-eyed country of loose economics. Some fear that we may plunge into deep inflation, for ex-

ample, as half of Europe did after the last war and as we ourselves actually have done during and after other wars not so many generations ago; but inflation is one abyss that the world this time seems determined to shun. Any inflationary trend will bear watching and, if at all extreme, must at all costs be mastered by public power. There is happily developing in this country, however, a strong conservative force against economic imbalance, namely, the Government bondholder. An accurate student of the volume of bondholding in this country estimates that there will be 50,000,000 owners of Government securities at the end of the war. There has been nothing like it in the world before. You may add to it the millions more of insurance policyholders and you have altogether a new, modern, conservative force that is likely to favor reasonable economic caution, and desire to take advantage of what the Lord has delivered into our hands in the way of productive increase during this war. These people are all voters, and you would think them likely to follow the trend of the common good, the trend of using these amazing new productive facilities in the interest of lower prices and lower costs, with a rising standard of living for all.

The national post-war economy to my mind presents a far-from-hopeless picture. No one who crosses this country with his eyes open can fail to observe the colossal energy of productive organization, geared to either war or peace, piling up, under Government direction as well as under private direction, vast stocks of basic commodities of all kinds, in addition to munitions of war, pouring out seaships and airships, inventing and creating synthetic substitutes with amazing ingenuity and skill, with potentialities beyond anything in the history of man for supplying goods and services that the world needs. Relieved of the incubus of monopoly practices, cartels, patent pools, business cycles, the ineffectual economies of scarcity, Government and private wastes, and given the right to live and work in a genuine system of free enterprise—not visionary radicals but men of shrewd economic vision foresee an era of steadily lowering prices with a rising level of production and livelihood throughout the world.

Now you cannot have a national or a world economy like the one I have described, if a cult of incompetence is in control of the public life. It will take plenty of brains and character to manage that economy; and the country must look to many of the young men and women coming back to civil life from the terrible but enlightening experience of the war, and to many of those coming out of the economic and public training of institutions of learning after the war, to provide a great part of the management talent of the broader economy. Unless large numbers of those who come back from the war put unworthy, acquisitive interest underfoot and dedicate their training and thinking, and their very lives to these great projects in the public interest, the new economic vision will fail. But what a cause!

This larger life in the public interest has vast and varied challenge. Our international responsibilities are already great and will be greater still. This Government will need thousands of younger men of trained intelligence, skill, and effectiveness, during this war and when it is over, to manage the relief and reconstruction of occupied areas behind our advancing armies. Whence will come the chief reinforcements to the Government in the leadership of this formidable task? Where but from the schools and colleges of the Nation?

The time has come for a broad view of what constitutes the challenge of the public interest. I look for the day when young men and women graduating from the colleges will count it a high honor to live their lives and do their work, for example, in the environment of a progressive, virile, understanding labor movement. The time for "warriors" of labor pitted against "captains" of industry is over. There you have only the more primitive phase of an undesirable class struggle. The way is open for a worthier leadership on both sides. If the regular colleges do not seize the opportunity, labor colleges will train young men and women in economics, psychology, and leadership. It is a pitiful narrowness which appears to have shown itself recently in a great city of this country, when a new director of adult education was needed, and the best qualified applicant out of a list of 100, recommended by the board of superintendents and the board of examiners, graduate of a labor college, 20 years a student of the subject, 8 years educational director of one of the most enlightened unions in the United States, was rejected by the board of education of the municipality, against the protests of outstanding educational leaders, because he had gained much of his experience in connection with a labor organization. The public interest cannot long survive that sort of Maginot Line mentality.

The time is already here when company presidents are being chosen for their psychological skill in labor relations. The growth of collective bargaining and labor-management councils makes this inevitable. Business leadership is driven to reshape itself in terms of the public interest.

Private enterprise, the genius for production, a clean private capital market, are essential to the mastery and management of the vast national economy which may follow this war. At the same time, the days of mere business dominance of workers or politics are past. Business is a great human career in itself. The political control of the country cannot be managed well from banking houses and security exchanges, but business for the benefit of workers, investors, and consumers alike, remains a vital factor in the welfare and security of the American people. A wholesome career in private industry is, therefore, to be regarded as a career in the public interest.

That this attitude of preeminent regard for the common good is the right attitude toward a useful life is borne out by the fact that it coincides with the growing faith, even during the present crisis, in the dynamics of the common man, and that in the practical, observable sense of collective power. Has not the conduct of the British people in this war proved where real power lies? Does not the epic story of the Chinese people reveal it? Does not the faith of the young and virile nation of Russia declare it? How shortsighted is the view that we cannot act with Russia when this war is over. What matters a particular, current form phase of government or a strongly held economic postulate compared with the emphasis of Russia upon the value and dignity of the individual human soul and the purpose of a larger life for the millions of her citizens?

The way of life in the public interest is so vital because it is the way of personal happiness. It is enlightened self-interest and so is anchored in fundamental reality. There is no comparable satisfaction in money or sheer power over others. An exclusive interest is self-destructive. But the feeling that you are making human existence easier and sweeter, that your influence is rich in all the civic vitamins upon your city, your village, your party, your Government, your church, your school—that is living.

And finally, young people, life in the public interest has spiritual values that it does not pay to miss. Can anybody doubt that to be the lesson of the simple splendor of heart and mind exemplified in the mission of Madame Chiang of China to the American people, so that it could be said of her—as it was—that she made manhood humble and womanhood proud, and humanity itself glow with admiration and gratitude.

All of you had an opportunity to feel the pulse of her personality, directly or by way of the radio. In her there seemed an inner spiritual power which all felt, whether she stood before the Senate of the United States, or joined unpretendingly with her fellow Christians in the lowly prayer, "Our Father Who art in Heaven"; or pleaded for her people and the wide world before vast throngs in the cities of the Nation. She has a great cause; she has given herself in glad sacrifice; she has made clear to plain men everywhere the meaning of this present struggle—the necessity of world fellowship and the blessing of human freedom—not security first and freedom afterwards, but freedom and security, now and forever, one and inseparable. Above all, she has made the democratic ideas and the method of power of the Man of Nazareth clearer to the world than it has been made by anybody else in this generation. She has put dictators in their place—Nimrod, Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus the Persian, Genghis Khan, Alexander, Julius Caesar, Napoleon—all are gone; but the way of the Son of Man abides forever.

To take the side of the public interest is to take the side of the eternal values; to take the side of the higher life of man in the age-old struggle between the brute and the Christ. In this supreme hour of the world's history, choose ye this day whom ye will serve.

The Bishop of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem by Horace C. Carlisle:

THE BISHOP OF WASHINGTON

The Bishop of Washington, loved and revered
All over the United States,
With his master mind has successfully steered
The great temple that still awaits
Completion, as on Mount Saint Alban it stands,
In unfinished grandeur sublime,
The pride of our own sunny, peace-loving land,
To grow, in its greatness, with time.

The Bishop of Washington felt in his heart
The pangs of a suffering world—
He wanted his Nation to do its full part
To win, 'neath Old Glory unfurled,
This war 'gainst the Christian religion and God,
Begun by the tyrants of hate,
Whose armies are painting in crimson the sod,
Destroying what others create.

The Bishop of Washington, till his last breath,
Clung close to the Christ of the cross,
And when he passed into the shadows of death,
His gain overbalanced his loss.
He lost this existence of struggle and strife,
And trouble and worry and care,
To gain all the joys of the beautiful life,
Awaiting the just, over there.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

The Bachelorship of Christian Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANTHONY J. DIMOND
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, during the graduation exercises of Trinity College, Washington, D. C., the sermon at the Baccalaureate Mass on Sunday, May 30, 1943, was given by the able Dr. J. N. Supple, O. M. I. That sermon is so exalted in tone and temper, and so deserving not only of reading but of reflection, that I offer it for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

My dear graduates, I would allay your fears by promising that the sermon which you are about to hear is not another lecture in disguise. Your courses are finished. This morning we are assembled in this beautiful chapel for the baccalaureate mass and sermon. And tomorrow will be the happy day of graduation. But what exactly is, or should be, the special purpose of this morning's exercise? It is to gather your 4 years into a sacred memory, to thank God for his many blessings, and to take away a last lesson which will be the kernel of wisdom in all your learning. It is my real and appreciated honor to give that lesson by retrospecting, inspecting, and prospecting, after a fashion, the degree of bachelor.

If you retrospect, you will remember other happy graduation days from grade school, from high school or academy. But no doubt these days of light-hearted childhood fade in importance as you live the present ones so rich in vivid memories of the first impression beautiful Trinity College made on you, of interesting classes, of new friends, of cuts and campuses, of happy holidays. These are the memories which you wish to cast into a sacred mold before the altar of God this morning.

Your memories, moreover, are memories of blessings, and so your heart is filled with gratitude. There is gratitude to your parents who provided for your education, which has cost them real sacrifices, if not always of a material kind, then surely of a spiritual price. For you have been separated from home and from them. There is gratitude to the devoted and scholarly Sisters of Notre Dame, and to your other teachers, who have so generously worked for your training in body, mind, and character.

There are thanks also for your friends who have brightened your days with help and companionship. But, above all, you are thankful to God, the Giver of all good gifts, from Whom all these various blessings of parents, teachers, friends, health, happiness, and success have come. These are the blessings that you surely wish to acknowledge as perfectly as possible to God, and can acknowledge by uniting them with Jesus Christ, the Son of God, in the holy sacrifice of the mass. For the mass is always an infinitely pleasing thanksgiving to God. And, too, by this same sacrifice you will wish to blot out whatever of fault or of failure that has crept into your 4 happy years.

You young women are becoming bachelors—at least, of the arts and sciences. If you inspect the history of your degree, you will find some very interesting facts. The exact derivation of the word "bachelor" is not known. Some philologists derive it from the Latin word "vacca," meaning cow. But no proud graduate need accept such a derivation when so many others are seemingly more complimentary. Probably the word comes from an old French word having the meaning of youth, or apprentice. In this case, bachelor would appropriately signify that you are but youths or apprentices in the arts and sciences. And this derivation is better than the one which comes from baccalaris, meaning "one who wields a stick," for discipline during the lectures at Trinity has not been maintained by any such armed person.

The students who attended the first universities, founded in the medieval ages, came from all parts of Europe. Their first act was to select a master, who would take over the complete direction of their education. The student was, indeed, instructed by other teachers, but he was chiefly under the master, and he was known to the university only through the master. After his long apprenticeship, the student hoped to become a master himself. As such, he would be learned in the sacred as well as in the profane sciences, for all the arts and sciences in those days were but steps to the knowledge of God through the divine wisdom of theology. This union of human and divine knowledge is not strange to those of us who recall that in the medieval ages society was an organic whole, based on the Christian people, who believed it very important to use the things of earth to climb into the lap of God.

Until the student became a professor he was forced to submit humbly to the discipline of being taught. There was no modern false attitude, condemned by the late Pius XI in his Encyclical on Christian Education, that education could be drawn out of the student himself, or that he could evolve his own learning by his unaided or undirected powers. The student was made to keep his eyes on God, the first principle and last end of every creature in the universe. Meanwhile the teacher, like the busy bee collecting from the choicest part of the flower, selected and gave the choicest bits of wisdom to the student. His mind was a hive storing the honey of human and divine wisdom.

The medieval bachelorship also had its examinations. In the preexamination the candidate was examined by three masters of the faculty, who decided the qualifications of the student to present himself for the determination, or solemn academic test. This last test, worse than your comprehensives, was given by the master, and lasted the whole of Lent. It was an ordeal. In the last session the candidate had to sum up, or determine, his solutions to the important questions and objections proposed to him. Success entitled him to the degree of bachelor. He was then ready to start his studies for the licentiate and mastership.

Prescinding from the beautiful buildings, from the improvements due to science, and from our American customs, the bachelorship at Trinity College is not essentially different from that of the medieval ages. There are links connecting the old bachelors with the new ones. You come from all parts of this country. Your master is really the president and dean of studies, who directs your studies. The same humbleness, obedience, and respect before teachers are required. It is characteristic of Catholic schools to unite moral training with intellectual growth. Your examinations are similar to the preexaminations, which led to the medieval determination. Your comprehensives, which are your determination, certainly entail a period of ordeal. The purpose, too, of your education remains exactly the same, namely, to make your knowledge of the arts and sciences a stepping stone to the knowledge of Catholic philosophy. And the wisdom of philosophy is in turn subordinated to the principles of Christian faith and life. Clearly, then, although centuries have come and gone, the purpose is and must always be essentially the same for all true Catholic bachelors. The Catholic bachelorship has its trade-mark like so many fine products—made by appointment for Christ the King.

By its supernatural mark, your education is distinguished nobly from the education given in so many non-Catholic colleges. In these latter, the serious error of pragmatism destroys most of the value of the learning. The many experimental sciences, in spite of their continuously extending control of nature, are allowed to harm, rather than benefit the souls and well-being of the students. For pragmatism, especially of the experimentalist type which loves the experimental sciences to excess, errs as to the very nature of man, and denies the most important virtues of the soul. It turns the outside world back into the ego, which is made the measure of the true and of the good. The true, human good is divorced from the ideal and supernatural, and wedded instead to the immediately useful and pleasant. So that religion is mutilated. And the notion of God is considered useless, if not harmful. So that whereas pragmatism claims to liberate man from the hurtful light of natural and divine wisdom, it actually destroys his intellectual sight and leaves him groping toward a cold and hopeless, if scientifically conducted, burial. How sad it is to see the corrupting influence of this doctrine upon young minds that hunger for the food of pure truth. How tragic to deny young people those perfect ideals which will strengthen the soul for truly noble and happiness-bringing action.

It is in the face of this false materialistic and worldly viewpoint of education, that we will now idealize and spiritualize the very bachelorship, whose history and purpose we have been inspecting. To find the supernatural message in it should not be hard for us. In other words we are going to prospect the bachelorship as to its eternal value.

In the first place, these past 4 years are not a mere experience of passing, self-centered value. Your baccalaureate entailing 4 years at Trinity is not one of the many unfamiliar and blind alleys in your life. It is rather a stretch of the broad, safe highway leading to the kingdom of God. It is but part of your long education under the one and only real master—Christ Himself. You are going to see in your teachers here and wherever else you may study the providential helpers of the Master. Having adopted the attitude of a Christian student, you will remain during life humble and submissive and confident before God. You will not play the part of a fool who thinks that he can decipher the precise meaning of every blessing and every trial, or who thinks that he is too learned and important to be taught by Christ and His Church.

As for your determination, it is the life that stretches before you. In some sense it will be an ordeal, with its sacrifices, worries, and mistakes. The Master, however, will be presiding at the defense. He will be encouraging you on to success even while testing you. You must alone defend the great truths, or theses, by your own thoughts, words, and deeds. You know that the first thesis runs: God is my Creator and Infinite Good. In Him alone can my heart find true and lasting happiness. To those who object that many men find more joy in pleasure, riches, and honors of the world, you will answer that such persons are deluded by the appearance of things, and by their own blind selfishness.

In your second thesis you will defend the principle: A life of virtue after Christ, the model of Christian living, is a life of freedom, power, and happiness with peace. And this is true in spite of the claim that a saintly person is a fool and a failure in the new scientific world. For the sinner alone is the slave and cripple of the world. In the third thesis the Master will expect many of you to determine the nature of marriage. You will hold that it is an unchanging institution made by God Himself. Some may object that new aims

have been discovered for marriage and for women, but clearly this is false. Fidelity to the position of wife and mother will bring untold glory and happiness to a woman. In every kind of life her model after Christ is His own immaculate mother, the Blessed Virgin Mary. Finally, in your determination of life, you must hold fast to the principle that Christ wills to accomplish your eternal salvation through the one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. This church is not something that will pass with the new scientific discoveries. It is the holy spouse of Christ, who has established it in truth, goodness, and power. In it your soul will be enlightened, your salvation assured.

Such are the theses of divine wisdom to guide you through life. They are not many, but they are the most important that can be thought. Knowing them and living according to them you will be truly wise and noble. Ignoring and violating them you will be in intellectual confusion and spiritual slavery. True success lies before you if you choose it.

In conclusion, I bid you to return to the altar. As you have made sacred your memories and heartful gratitude by uniting them to Christ in the mass, likewise sanctify with grace your resolution to succeed in life's determination. In that resolution you will never be lacking the grace of the Divine Master as long as you rest on Him to pull you through the ordeal. It is the way He wishes us to succeed: through His divine goodness. He awaits the day when He can declare your life examination over, and confer upon you the bachelorship of Christian living. You will then be immediately initiated into a new and more glorious life wherein you will no longer be an apprentice learning the first lessons of wisdom. For then you will be as a master knowing the great mysteries of the divine life in the bosom of the Holy Trinity. It is this Trinity that Trinity College wants you to know with your whole mind, love with every fiber of your heart, and serve with every breath of your earthly life. To that highest end, we pray this morning:

May the power of the Father govern and protect you,
May the wisdom of the Son teach and enlighten you,
May the love of the Holy Ghost renew and quicken you,
May the blessing of the all Holy Trinity: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, be with you now and forever more.

Amen.

New Deal Cheap Politics and the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the letter of Russell H. Potter, resigning from the position of acting district director of the O. P. A., is very revealing. It is as follows:

JUNE 3, 1943.

Mr. SYLVAN L. JOSEPH,
Regional Administrator, Region No. 2,
Office of Price Administration,
New York City.

DEAR SYLVAN: Political machinations designed to create a powerful political patronage machine in the Office of Price Administration force me to tender my resignation from that organization, effective immediately.

I am motivated not by rancor but a conscience which cannot reconcile itself to interests which are inimical to the welfare of our Nation. Under such circumstances I cannot accept the position of executive assistant to the regional administrator. I could not fulfill my duties sincerely knowing that the Office of Price Administration is under the thumbs of political bosses Ed Flynn, Frank Kelly, Mike Kennedy, and Senator Mead, and others.

I was shocked when you told me yesterday afternoon that the reason for my removal as acting district director in favor of Russell was a purely political one, namely, that you were ordered by Ed Flynn, Frank Kelly, Mike Kennedy, and Senator Mead to put their suggested candidate, Frank Russell, in the job. You said that if you didn't do that the Office of Price Administration would not have the support of the New York congressional delegation when, in the near future, the $177,000,000 Office of Price Administration appropriations bill comes up for a vote.

I have no ax to grind, politically or otherwise. I want to impress on you indelibly my sincerity in reviewing certain incidents. For the good of the Nation I want these facts brought out into the open. The American people are entitled to know the facts.

Let me refresh your memory about some political manipulations.

1. You will recall an incident early in the fall when you sent me to Rochester, N. Y., to pick out a candidate for the district director's position. After several days, I found a man, acceptable to you and to Civil Service, by the name of Joseph Paterson. However, before this appointment became effective, you called me to your office late one afternoon and told me you had a call from John Hamm, Deputy Administrator, to the effect that Senator Mead was very much upset over this appointment, because, as you quoted him, he felt he was not getting enough jobs in up-State New York. You ordered me to proceed at once to Rochester to interview the chairman of the Monroe County Democratic Committee, Mr. [Roy F.] Bush, who had a candidate equally as good as Paterson.

When I called on Mr. Bush he stated he was not getting enough jobs from the Office of Price Administration and that he had called upon Senator MEAD to see that he did. I told him the appointment of Paterson had been cleared and that it would be difficult to deny him the district director's job; I told him I was not interested in the political affiliations of any candidate; I told him there was another position—that of area rent director—and that if John Curtin, his prospective candidate, had the qualifications he could be appointed to that position. Inasmuch as he had these qualifications and has since proved to be a capable administrator he was appointed. You will recall there was trouble over this appointment because Senator MEAD later learned that this candidate of Democratic Chairman Bush was a Bennett man rather than a MEAD man. As you have often told me, this incident caused you no end of embarrassment in up-State New York, insofar as Senator MEAD was concerned.

2. Buffalo has been another source of constant embarrassment to you since the resignation of Leston P. Fancuf, because none of the candidates suggested by Senator MEAD for the district director's position has been acceptable to the Civil Service Commission.

3. The Pennsylvania situation, as you so often told me, was a source of constant annoyance to you because of Senator JOSEPH F. GUFFEY, who insisted that his people be given jobs.

4. The removal of Jim Luke, Office of Price Administration State Director of Delaware, was a direct order to you by Washington which emanated from the Delaware political machine. These political maneuverings caused a complete demoralization among the various local boards in that area.

5. The appointment of Henry B. Chambers, Chairman of the Bronx County Democratic Committee and a close friend of Ed Flynn, as Regional Hearing Commissioner.

6. Recently your office requested the appointment of three clerks to the Bronx Ration Board. These three names were submitted through the office of Ed Flynn. The clerks were sent to the Bronx board and Adolph Chesley, Bronx County Administrator, said that they were not qualified for the work and he refused to accept them. This caused much turmoil in the regional office and pressure was immediately put upon my office to have these three clerks placed in some positions immediately. I understand they were sent to Brooklyn, but raised such a fuss over being in Brooklyn that they appealed again to the office of Ed Flynn and were ordered sent back to the Bronx. This was given as a "must" both to my office and to Chesley. I personally was not aware of any of this until after it had happened.

7. Although I personally have never had any contact with the political machine, I have become increasingly exasperated by constant reminders, by both yourself and John R. Johnston, Deputy Regional Administrator, as to the necessity of "playing ball" with certain Congressmen and Senators in region 2. It is inconceivable that the Office of Price Administration, which was created ostensibly for the public welfare and the Nation's security, should become a political patronage machine for the aggrandizement of politicians and political parties.

8. As you know, I have been acting district director since the latter part of December, and from that day until several days ago, when Mrs. Philip L. Crowlie came up from Washington, I had not met Mayor LaGuardia. For some reason, you always told me you felt it was your job to handle Mayor LaGuardia because, as you characterized him, he was very unpredictable and close to the administration in Washington. And yet Mayor LaGuardia has made the statement he has always received the finest cooperation from my office. This morning, Mayor LaGuardia personally called me and said he had written to Mr. Prentiss Brown on April 21 not to make any changes whatsoever in the management of this office, and that he was strongly opposed to these political manipulations and he dreaded the chaotic effect of them.

On June 1, I addressed a Civilian Defense Volunteer Organization recruiting rally at the request of Queens Borough President Burke. I attempted to carry the fight against the critics of the Office of Price Administration to the people themselves. Frankly, I am ashamed of myself. My conscience bothers me. By what special privilege vested in me can I go before the people and ask them to cooperate in the fight against inflation, to secure the economic future of the Nation and eight and a half million fighting men on our far-flung battle fronts, when right within the heart of the Office of Price Administration we have a situation more insidious than any black market.

I am loyal to our President. I will continue to be loyal, and I think, Sylvan, he should be apprised of the situation existing within your region.

I think I have made it clear that the people are entitled to the facts. Therefore, with this in mind and for no other purpose, I am releasing copies of this letter of resignation to the press.

I herewith tender my resignation with regret, because it deprives me of doing a job which should be administered with sincerity and complete freedom from outside influence.

Respectfully yours,

RUSSELL H. POTTER.

Armenians in Two World Wars and Their Aspirations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following, entitled "Armenians in Two World Wars and Their Aspirations":

During the course of time that I have been entrusted with the responsibility of serving the people of my constituency as their Representative in Congress, I have had many opportunities of coming into contact with one of the smaller nationality groups of my district, the Armenians. These contacts have been a source of profound pleasure for me, because they have been established upon a basis of mutual friendship and a spirit of good will that had its inception many years ago and which I feel confident will continue for many more years to come. This is not to be surprised at. True loyalty toward a friend is one of the outstanding characteristics of the Armenian people.

From my observations conducted in my district during my election campaigns and at other times, I have found the Armenians to be industrious, thrifty, peaceable, and enterprising. A large number of them live in the Delray district of west Detroit of whom a great majority settled there as newly arrived immigrants and where they now own their own homes. Here they have raised their families. There sons are now serving in the armed forces of the United States all the way from north Africa to far off New Caledonia. Their daughters, after working in defense factories all day where they are engaged in producing armaments of all sorts, busy themselves in the evenings selling War bonds or collecting tin, rubber or other waste materials used in war production.

Collectively, as a group, they have their educational, charitable, religious, and political organizations. The parent body is named after one of their famous educators, Zavarian, and is called the Zavarian Club. To house all their group activities they have constructed and entirely paid for the Zavarian Building a presentable one-story structure. Well-known public figures, among them Price Administrator Prentiss M. Brown, have spoken at political rallies held in the auditorium. As may be readily grasped, these facts are being recounted in order to portray the racial traits of the Armenians and I am sure these traits remain constant no matter where Armenians have established domicile.

One of the organizations supported by this Zavarian Club group is known as the Armenian-American Citizens' Association. It has undertaken the task of acquainting citizens of Armenian extraction with the benefits derived by the use of the universal suffrage as practiced in America and so far its performance has been excellent. At the time of each election it sponsors a mass rally where the relative merits of the issues of the day, as well as the qualifications of the various candidates, are discussed and choices made accordingly.

Some time ago, I received a communication from this Armenian-American Citizens' Association wherein they make mention of the unjust treatment heretofore accorded the Armenian people as it pertains to their rightful aspirations and the expectation that after the conclusion of this war and the establishment of peace this injustice will be rectified. They also express the desire that I, as the Member of Congress representing their district, insert this extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the understanding that it will be looked upon as a preliminary step of a move which eventually will place this question upon the agenda of the peace conference where, it is to be hoped, it may be favored with an equitable disposition.

There can be no question as to the right of the Armenian people to hope for due consideration of a practical nature concerning their legitimate expectations. They fought for this right at the time of the First World War and are still fighting for it now. They fought and they suffered, just like the Poles and the Greeks, and the Czechs, the British, and we ourselves are fighting and suffering because of their undying love for freedom and the principles of democracy. One million of them were tortured and massacred in the year 1915 because the tenacity with which they clung to their concept of liberty and the preservation of human rights was alien to the mental processes of their stronger and tyranically inclined neighbors. Did this mass murder, the forerunner of the inhuman deeds of the Nazis against the Poles, and the Russians in the conquered regions, paralyze the soul of this small nation of three millions? Far from it.

It would have been generally assumed that such a weak race, unarmed and peace-loving, would necessarily lose its fighting spirit if subjected to the devastating loss of one-third of its numbers. This mortal blow, however terrible though it was, only served to spur the Armenians to gather up their remaining strength and upon the field of battle commence to strike back blow for blow. Thousands of them rushed to arms to avenge the wanton butchery of their kin as well as to help crush the aims of the Central Powers and their satellites. For the services they thus rendered the Allies, Clemenceau called the Armenian people "Our little ally."

This distinction was well earned, as it may be readily seen by enumerating some of the achievements accomplished by the Armenians at the time. First of all, through a decision of the dominant political-military organization of the country, the Armenian Revolutionary Federation, they turned down the request of the Turkish authorities to betray the Allies and to incite the Armenians living in the Caucasus to revolt against the Russians. Thereafter, they provided the Russian armies operating against the Turks on the Caucasus front six battalions of vanguards. These troops, commanded by veteran rebels thoroughly familiar with the topography of the country wherein they fought, served not only as actual combatants but also as scouts and as guides and as such rendered an important service to the Russian military intelligence.

Upon another front, that of the Middle East, another fighting unit under the supreme command of General Allenby distinguished itself at the Battle of Arara in Palestine.

After the collapse of Russia in 1917 and the hasty exodus of the Russian Armies from the Caucausus front, the Armenians augmented the ranks of their troops on the front lines as best they could and thwarted the efforts of the Turks to overrun the Caucausus for 8 months. This, together with the heroic defense of the Baku oil fields, influenced the course of the war in no minor degree.

Mr. James D. Mandalian, editor of the Hairenik Weekly, of Boston, in his book, Highlights of Armenian History, devotes an enlightening passage to these events. Quoting from his book we are informed that "their"—that is, the Armenians'—"fierce resistance to the Turks at Baku prevented or delayed the latter from reaching the coveted oil wells of that region, a fact which, according to German General Ludendorf, had a decisive bearing on the outcome of the war and the ultimate defeat of the Central Powers."

For a brief period of 2½ years, the Armenians were able to enjoy the fruits of their bloody sacrifices and heroic struggles by establishing an independent homeland. Then came the era of international intrigue motivated by jealousy and the conflicting interests of the great powers. These culminated in the obliteration of the Armenian Republic. So intense was public reaction in this country against this and the dark machinations by which it was brought about that one of the major political parties of the United States, namely, the Democratic Party, passed resolutions upon two occasions, once in the national convention of 1924 and again in 1928, demanding that justice be done the Armenians. We can rest assured that the Democratic national conventions would not have acted so upon two successive occasions unless they firmly believed that the cause merited such a stand. This episode is unique in the annals of the political life of our republic. It may be explained by the close spiritual affinity welded together by the significant fact that upon distant fields of battle separated from each other by vast stretches of sea and land American blood and Armenian blood have both been shed in the name of a common ideal, that of liberty.

It is not to be wondered at that the same thing is happening today. Today, Armenians everywhere are giving of their all, just like we are doing, that liberty may not perish from the face of the earth. Again they are sacrificing their blood in mortal strife in the name of the noble struggle for freedom. Approximately one-quarter of a million of them are fighting the Nazi horde on the Russian front. Thousands of them have paid the supreme sacrifice. One of these, Colonel Zekian, fell during the operations around Krasnodar. Zekian had established such an outstanding record for himself in the Russian Army that upon his death, Marshal Stalin sent a personal telegram of condolence to the Government of Armenia. Throughout the Soviet Union, the names of such pilots as Asgtourian, Kevorkian, and Haroutunian have become household words for the heroic deeds that they have done. All three have been decorated by the Soviet Government and have won the title of heroes.

The ability of the Armenians to distinguish themselves in war is not limited to their own homeland. Here in America we have, among others, Capt. Ray Melikian of the air force and Sgt. Victor Mahakian of the United States Marine Corps, both of whom have been cited for their deeds of valor.

Before we conclude our remarks on this subject, we feel it would not be amiss to point out that the participation of the Armenians in the present colossal conflict is all inclusive and that it manifests itself in more ways than one. For instance, there is the singularly full-hearted response they gave to the Second War Loan call. This response was particularly generous in the city of Fresno, Calif. According to Mr. Claude H. Ketchum, executive chairman of the Fresno County War Savings Committee, the bond purchases there were described as amazing and probably not equaled by any other group in a district of comparable size in the country. Over $2,000,000 worth of War bonds were sold in a mass rally held by Armenians in the Fresno Memorial Auditorium on Sunday, April 18, 1943.

It is my firm conviction that the Armenians are stanch believers in the principles of liberty and democracy. It is my ardent hope that I have succeeded in imparting this conviction to others as well by having listed facts of a nature that prove this loyalty toward the cause of the United Nations.

Letter From John Morrison Baldwin, of Ravenna, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH CLARK BALDWIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

RAVENNA, OHIO, *April 14, 1943.*

Hon. JOSEPH C. BALDWIN.

DEAR SIR: I read your address in Vital Speeches, and heartily approve of the Atlantic Charter entirely, especially articles 1, 3, and 6. Those aggressive nations should be forced to give up every foot of ground that they have gained in conquest; neither should they be allowed any voice in determining terms of peace. Now here is my own subject. As a firm believer in Scripture, I will take a text upon which to base my subject. You will find it in II Samuel xviii: 18. Absalom said: "I have no son to keep my name in remembrance." Now we are sending our sons and grandsons where their lives are in severe jeopardy without giving them the right to have children to keep their names in remembrance. This is not treating them with any kind of justice. Congress should at once lower the marriage age to 18 years and thus give those soldiers in all branches of military service the right to perpetuate their names among the living in a lawful and honorable manner. This is not a matter for low-minded, vile people to gossip over; it is a matter of righteousness, justice, and honor. I rejoice greatly in knowing that my great-grandfather was a soldier in the War for Independence. He was David Baldwin, then, of Wallingford, Conn. Let us give our sons and grandsons the right to keep their names in remembrance in a more practical and honorable manner than by a grave marker and a news item. I feel keenly this injustice that is being done to our best young men. However, our duty does not end there. When the children of those soldiers are born, the Government should give free services of physician and nursing through recovery of their mothers. This act should terminate 1 year after the soldiers are discharged.

Personally speaking, I am 85 years of age, on February 9, 1943. My first Presidential vote was for James A. Garfield, and I have always been a Republican, but now is no time to split over party lines. Let us rally around our President and give our best united effort in doing away with the tyranny that is seeking to sweep away all liberty from those peacefully inclined nations.

The remains of David Baldwin lie in the cemetery in Atwater, Portage County, Ohio, but a few feet from my father and mother.

The Atlantic Charter reminds me of a song I used to hear in my childhood soon after the Civil War. I will copy it for you—The Happy Time.

Yours in much esteem,

J. M. BALDWIN, *Ravenna, Ohio.*

RECAST THE LIBERTY BELL

Hon. JOSEPH C. BALDWIN:

As soon as safety will permit, let us have the old Liberty Bell at Philadelphia recast and returned to its old position in Independence Hall. Reduce the weight of the tongue (or clapper) and it will not break again. I believe that the reason for its being broken was the superfluous weight of the clapper. I have a set of reeds from an old organ and a little other brass that I am saving to donate to the bell. When this Atlantic Charter is put into effect, then let the renewed Liberty Bell again "Proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

In August 1941 a daughter and I visited those historic scenes that are so dear to every old-line American and tried our knuckles on the old bell, but it gave no more sound than a solid block of iron.

So let the bell be recast and put in its old place and announce publicly when it will ring, which should be at noon (God's time). By use of the radio the bell can be heard all over the earth.

JOHN MORRISON BALDWIN.

P. S.—Perhaps President Roosevelt would be interested in these matters if he can find time to listen to them.—J. M. Baldwin.

Radio Officers in the American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, two bills on the Consent Calendar today relate to radio officers in the merchant marine. These bills are H. R. 2612 and H. R. 2750. Both bills extend the operation of existing laws. The first extends the time during which it shall be unlawful to employ any person or to permit any person to serve as radio operator aboard any vessel—other than a vessel of foreign registry—if the Secretary of the Navy first has disapproved such employment for any specified voyage, route, or area of operation; and second has notified the master of the vessel of such disapproval prior to the departure thereof.

H. R. 2750 extends beyond June 30, 1943, the time during which the requirement of 6 months previous service as a qualified radio operator, on the part of at least one radio operator aboard cargo ships, may be suspended or modified by the Federal Communications Commission.

The problem of supplying properly qualified radio operators for merchant ships of the United States continues to be one of greatest gravity. The War Shipping Administration has expanded its training program for radio operators four different times in order to keep pace with the expansion of the new ship-construction program. As now constituted this program is designed to graduate 2,500 radio operators within the next year. This course for radio operators is a difficult one and cannot be shortened any further. It originally covered a period of 40 weeks, but for the emergency has been reduced to 26 weeks after beginning the actual radio course to which must be added 5 weeks spent at the apprentice training schools from which all applicants for radio training are now selected through aptitude. This method reduces the attrition in the radio school itself.

The ship-construction program calls for the building of approximately 2,000 new vessels during the next 12 months. If only one radio operator is placed on the ships our graduates, plus some maritime radio operators graduated from private schools, would be sufficient and would allow a margin of safety. However, it has become necessary to place two radio operators on some of the vessels sailing in certain areas. This requirement is likely to be increased rather than reduced, and the administration expects to expand facilities, if advisable, to meet the need. However, it is impossible to qualify these men to serve without the continued suspension of the 6 months' ship-service requirement. Radio operators are, of course, absolutely essential to the operation of the ships.

Testifying before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Telfair Knight, Assistant Deputy Administrator for Training, War Shipping Administration, said that during the past 2 years the Administration had graduated and placed on ships of the American merchant marine approximately 1,500 radio operators from the schools the Administration is conducting and that there had not come to his attention one single complaint of the ability of those men to handle the work on the job.

The age limits of the men in the schools are from 18 to 36, and most of them average up in the early twenties. Most of them are young men. Mr. Knight said that there was no question but that the radio operators in our merchant marine are establishing a new record for courage and fortitude and loyalty. They stand by the ship and keep to their post so long as there is a possibility of getting their signals through. They are among the last to leave the ship, and they leave only when there is no longer any possibility of getting a message through.

The heroism of these men has been shown in many instances and repeated time and again. One outstanding example is the case of Kenneth W. Maynard, radio operator, who on May 21, 1943, was awarded the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal. The citation reads:

CITATION FOR HEROISM AND DISTINGUISHED SERVICE UNDER UNUSUAL HAZARDS

The tanker upon which he was serving was carrying fuel to our eastern seaboard. Without warning, two torpedoes in quick succession exploded in the main tanks. The force of the explosion blew the cargo expansion trunks through the main deck hatches and large quantities of the inflammable cargo were thrown high into the air. The oil rained back upon the ship became ignited and the entire open space blown through the after deck became a blazing inferno. Orders to abandon ship were given when it became apparent that the submarine was preparing to shell the stricken ship, but the master and radio operator remained aboard to rig a jury antenna and set up an emergency short wave transmitter to replace the standard equipment, which had been wrecked by the explosions. Heedless of personal risk from flame and shell fire, the two men worked furiously for three-quarters of an hour and finally, by the grace of ingenuity and spare parts, the emergency radio rig was completed and a continuous call distress signal was sent out. As the ship's radio receivers

had also been wrecked by the explosions, the call was sent "blind"; however, shore stations fixed the ship's position by triangulation and rescue of the entire crew was effected 56 hours after the attack.

Radio Operator Maynard's self-sacrificing courage and high devotion to duty contributory to the speedy rescue of his shipmates constitute qualities of service which will be an enduring inspiration to seamen of the United States merchant marine everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, another case was that of Harry Schlesinger, who, in June 1942 issue of American Communications News, gives a graphic description of a U-boat attack on an American merchant vessel.

When he came on watch about 4 a. m. a submarine was sighted off stern. Under orders, a speed of 16 knots was obtained, but the submarine gained and commenced firing. Schlesinger continued one S O S after another, until he was forced to leave, and crawled on the floor to the doorway. When he reached the boat deck he saw shrapnel shell burst a davit holding a lifeboat in which were five seamen who were thrown into the sea but rescued later as they wore life preservers.

In this case the merchant vessel finally sank and the survivors floated in the boats for 18 hours until a schooner rescued them and brought them ashore.

Another illustration is that of Peter Haracz, who learned radio in the United States Army. The characteristic courage of these fearless men is narrated in the first paragraph of the thrilling story he tells. He said:

> Well, the Nazis got us once and the Italians got us twice, but we had delivered the goods first. Of course, I hated to see the old wagon go, but I feel warm inside when I think about all the military stuff we delivered to our allies in the Middle East first.
>
> We were steaming along in the Indian Ocean. I wasn't feeling too good, because I had heard one ship the day before on the air saying she had been torpedoed and shelled. Another one had been sending that she sighted a sub. It was a cold, gloomy day. There was a swell running with high waves. And it was Friday, the 13th!

After the ship was torpedoed Haracz kept trying to get a message through until the ship's power went off, "a watertender dashed in and told me that the boats were leaving, and I'd better get off while I could," the ship was listed far over, the port gunwales were awash, and the lifeboats had left with some of the crew and officers. When the captain left, Haracz jumped and reached a wooden painting stage floating near the ship.

Haracz with others was picked up by a hospital ship a week later, and later placed on a ship bound for the United States. That ship was torpedoed and sunk, and only one lifeboat remained. Fifty-three got into the lifeboat, and the others on rafts. They were subsequently rescued.

The spirit of these men of the Merchant Marine is typified by these words, "I'm going back."

> Well, there isn't much more to tell. I'm going home for a couple of weeks to get some home cooking and rest. Then back to the union for another wagon. It's a pleasure to go out there when you know that every day, every turn of the ship's wheel helps that much to defeat the Fascists.
>
> I've got a personal interest in that. My parents came from Poland and my father says once in a while: "The Germans will get driven out of Poland." I like to think that the goods I'm delivering will help do that.

Among others should be mentioned:

1. Carl S. Dalbey, 21 years of age, a student of War Shipping Administration's Gallups Island School, who was torpedoed in the Caribbean during his first trip, on a ship bound for Suez, spent 32 days in a lifeboat, had no food for 17 days, no water for four, and caught and ate raw fish.

2. Morton C. Grove, 37 years old, who has been sailing as radio officer since 1923, torpedoed once on a run to Russia, and has sailed continuously through the war period.

3. Anthony J. Vitacco, former coal miner and member of coal mining family, Italian descent, has been going to sea since 1933, torpedoed once, and stayed on vessel with master full hour after crew had left, and finally got his message off on emergency transmitter.

4. Herbert S. Weiner, another graduate from the War Shipping Administration's Gallups Island Radio School in 1942, torpedoed on first voyage, spent 21 days in a lifeboat on improvised apparatus.

These are but a few cases selected at random among many equally deserving.

The records show that United States Merchant Marine radio officers reported dead and missing in official Navy casualty lists covering a period from September 27, 1941, to April 30, 1943, shows 127 dead and missing, and 8 as prisoners of war. The men on this list come from almost, if not quite, all of the States in the Union.

This list does not include United States radio officers who may have been lost or missing on Government transport ships, or those serving on ships of foreign nationality, Honduran, Panamanian, and so forth, or those whose nearest relations might reside in countries under Axis control.

At one time fear was expressed that there were subversive influences among radio operators. The record of service rendered by these men facing death, danger, privation, hardships unparalleled and returning for further service is a record for patriotism unsurpassed in the service.

The spirit of these men is that spirit portrayed by Fred Herman in the closing words of his book Dynamite Cargo, the story of a convoy to Russia. When returning to home and friends and safety, Herman said:

> I thought it over at length when I did get back. I thought it over in tears, on the train going up to Fayetteville for a visit, in a hotel room back in the city. A man is a damn fool to crowd his luck, I told myself. I could get a job in a defense plant, make as much money, and probably save more of it.
>
> But in the end I signed on again. It was my callin'.

The spirit of these men reflects the spirit of all. My own estimate is expressed, though feebly and inadequately in an article by me in the May-June 1943 issue of M. S. G. from which I quote:

> The heroic deeds of the men of the merchant marine in this war should furnish themes for song and story through the endless ages to come.
>
> In complete disregard of privation, suffering, starvation, and death, the men of the merchant marine have answered the call of their country. No draft has been needed for them. They have answered not once but many times. They have been true to the traditions of an illustrious past, continuing the immortal records written by the men of the United States merchant marine since the earliest colonial days.
>
> * * * * *
>
> These men have passed through seas of flame. They have passed through the hell of battle with no chance to fight back and with but a single thought—to carry through the precious cargo that liberty might live.
>
> Officers and crew, from the captain on the bridge to the deck and engine men, up in the crow's nest and down in the glory hole, have given their all to the glory of the Nation.
>
> Not the least in this saga of dauntlessness have been the radio operators, who are preserving through the mystic channels of the air that connection which means security for cargo, for ship, for men with whom they serve, and often for the fleet of which they form a part. On their flag of service are innumerable golden stars. When their ships have been torpedoed, they have stayed by their posts until smoke and flame consumed them. They have died that others might live, and when fortune favored and they returned to port, they have turned again to the same task and defied again the same threatening death.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The records show that about three-fourths of the off-shore merchant seamen are always at sea—"in the front line". Those records show that since the start of the war merchant marine casualties (dead and missing only) have totalled more than 3,200, that is 3.8 percent of their total number in 1 year of war, while casualties of the armed services in the same period amounted to less than 1 percent of their total number.
>
> These men, too, are warriors. They fight for freedom; they fight for peace.
>
> All honor to the men of the merchant marine—officer, radio operators, and crew. May they all soon find havens of safety and homes of peace!

China Has Earned It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News for today:

CHINA HAS EARNED IT

The Chinese counteroffensive in the upper Yangtze Valley has checked for the moment the most serious Jap threat of the war—a threat not only to the Chinese capital and communications, but also to her bread basket.

Much of the optimistic reaction to the Chinese successes of the last fortnight mistakenly assumes that the threat is past.

The Yangtze battle proves only that the Chinese Army can lick the Japs if it has planes and weapons. But we have known that all along. Almost without exception when the Chinese have had even a few planes they have won. This is the first battle in which they have had an adequate air cover

of Chinese fighter planes and of American bombers.

The result is eloquent evidence that the American generals, Stilwell and Chennault, have been right from the first.

But unless Stilwell and Chennault get more planes the Jap are going to win the future battles, for large enemy reinforcements are available.

No less dangerous than the military situation is the Chinese feeling that they are neglected by their allies. They have fought longer and with less than any other people, but they are coming to the end of their rope. They must have help quickly.

That involves more planes, for the morale as well as the military effect. But it also involves some demonstration by the Allies to the Chinese people that we are not deserting them or discriminating against them as inferiors—Jap propaganda to that effect is as potent as Jap guns.

Now is the time to show our appreciation of China's long resistance against our common enemy by wiping out the insult of American immigration exclusion legislation. That act of decency and justice would not cost us anything—by giving China equality in principle under our immigration quota law we would let into this country not more than 108 Chinese a year. Anyone who thinks that would imperil this Nation of more than 130,000,000 has no faith in America.

Admiral Yarnell, one of our greatest authorities on the Far East, summed it up in testimony before a congressional committee the other day:

"The repeal of these (exclusion) laws will have far-reaching effects as a war and a post-war measure."

Food Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on September 22, 1942, I took the floor and pointed out that there was no danger of a runaway inflation so far as the price of farm products was concerned, provided farm production was increased instead of curtailed. I also called attention to the fact that there were two factors within the control of Government which should insure the production of farm commodities in sufficient volume to meet civilian, military, and lend-lease requirements. These two factors I then indicated were an adequate supply of farm labor and a fair price for farm products.

The muddle which now endangers the national food supply for humans and the feed supply for cattle, hogs, and poultry is well set forth in the article by Louis Bromfield, published in the June 12, 1943, issue of Colliers, which I am inserting under leave to extend:

(By Louis Bromfield)

This is about farmers and their relation to the war. Farmers are unorganized and inarticulate. They have no National Manufacturers Association or United States Chamber of Commerce to speak for them. They are essentially 13,000,000 individual tenants, renters, and independent proprietors, scattered all over the country, with a wide range of activities and special interests.

The farm lobby represents a comparatively few rich farmers and commodity dealers. The Farmers' Union represents a few tenant farmers, small operators, sharecroppers—the poor ones. But most middle-of-the-road farmers have no representation at all, except through their Congressmen. They have been victims of economic and political exploitation. They are accused of many things of which they are innocent. The average city dweller knows so little about the farming industry that he cannot judge the farmers' situation or the vast contribution they make toward winning the war.

I am a commercial farmer and credited with being articulate. Every morning I am confronted with the same problems as every other farmer in America. I know that politics are inextricably woven into food production.

The food crisis is not finished. We have not even seen the worst of it. That will come in December, January, and February because whatever has been done under pressure of public indignation and fury has been both too little and too late. Food Administrator Chester Davis is able, honest, and experienced, but he will be helpless unless he gets the necessary power and cooperation from the President. Whether he will be given power and cooperation or be blocked by the maneuvering of the coming Presidential election, no one knows.

SITUATION BADLY MUDDLED

Knowing Mr. Davis, I feel he would not allow himself to be drafted to handle one of the most colossal messes in our history unless he had power to do the job. If he does not possess this power to correct the incredibly muddled food situation—if he is blocked by politicians and incompetents—then we are in for a bad time. Not only will we be limited to a diet like that of Germany, but we actually will not have enough to eat.

We will be forced to make the bitterest of choices: To go below a healthful standard of eating and send what we can to our allies and liberated friends, or demand a sound but limited diet and let the rest of the world go without.

Last year was the most favorable crop season in 25 years, and still we did not have enough food for ourselves, our armed forces, and our allies. The 1943 season has begun badly. The vital wheat crop has been badly winter damaged; many Middle Western farmers are plowing up wheat to replace it with some other crop. Spring was late in the bread-basket area; corn may not ripen—and corn is the food for hogs and beef cattle, the backbone of our meat diet.

There is an increase in hog production, in numbers, but if there is a shortage of feed, both hogs and cattle will be dumped on the market in early fall, and for the rest of the year there will be a meat shortage that will make the present situation seem like abundance. If there is a serious drought, which seems likely, not only will western corn burn out, but cattle and hogs will die even before they reach the corn-feeding stage, from want of pasture and water.

Added to these possible disasters, evident but uncontrollable, there are grave shortages of machinery, skilled and unskilled labor, supplementary hog, cattle, and poultry feeds and certain fertilizers. These things are facts and perhaps disastrous ones—and nothing effective can be done about them this year.

Neither Mr. Davis nor the hysterical measures regarding labor and machinery adopted this spring at the last moment can make more than a minute difference to 1943's production. Abandoning restrictions on wheat growing won't give us more wheat. Wheat is planted in the fall and harvested the following summer. Summer wheat, planted and harvested the same season, is a negligible factor.

Let us look at what we may expect:

Farm machinery is seriously lacking. Originally the Administration limited production to 23 percent of normal. Manufacture of new machinery was left to small plants which cannot produce either the machines or parts used by four-fifths of our farmers. Now the steel required for normal production of farm machinery is less than three percent of our total output, and it is manifestly folly to cut production to less than a quarter of normal, considering the vital importance of food in this war.

Under pressure of public indignation and farmers' despair, the machinery quota was raised to fifty percent of normal, still far from enough. But this increase will not be available this year. Add to this the strange policy which "froze" much available machinery and distributed more in almost insane fashion by sending it to areas where it wasn't needed or couldn't be used.

War Production Board, Office of Price Administration, and Department of Agriculture regulations, muddled and overlapping, have made it as hard as possible for farmers to get machinery and repair parts. Farmers spend precious working hours filling out questionnaires and driving around to various bureaus for permits to buy parts. On our farm, a tractor part broke recently. The manager was forced to spend 2 days and drive 185 miles to get a new part—while the tractor stood idle.

So we have a black market in farm machinery. A 4- or 5-year-old tractor, worth $750 when new, brings as much as $1,200. There is an Office of Price Administration ceiling on prices and so, at farm sales, the auctioneer sells a bale of hay or a rooster for $1,200 and throws in the tractor.

The farm-labor situation is even worse. Dispersal of dairy herds, dumping of hogs and cattle and closing of hatcheries and poultry projects is an old story now. There isn't a county in which you cannot see farms and dairies that won't be operated this year simply because of lack of machinery or labor.

Selective Service and the Food Administration have issued statements to show that the farm labor shortage was caused by high industrial wages in cities. These were misleading statistics, made so deliberately.

High wages affected only unskilled farm labor which could be replaced, though at the cost of lowered food production. Not more than a fraction of 1 percent of skilled labor left farms for factories. This labor was drafted recklessly, cutting at the foundations of food production. Without skilled labor to direct and manage farm recruits and volunteers, little or no food can be produced for the cities. The draft of this precious labor continued in the face of an actual national and world-wide food shortage. At last, in a panic, the War Manpower Commission issued a directive to stop the drain. The Governor of Colorado even took over administration of the draft in his State to accomplish this purpose.

RELIEF STEPS COME TOO LATE

When things became desperate, the President showed signs of noticing the catastrophe and became alarmed. Makeshift measures were taken to remedy the situation this year—again, too little and too late. Skilled workers now overseas cannot be brought back overnight, if at all. The procedure for getting them out of the Army in this country and back to the land is so enmeshed in red tape, delay, and divided authority that few of them were available in time for spring planting but perhaps will be available for the harvest.

Washington authorities, through ignorance or a feeble desire to deceive our people and put off the awful day of reckoning, talk always of the harvest, and how the harvest will be solved. They slip over the spring planting and the fact that you cannot harvest what you don't plant.

It has been proposed to bring back skilled labor from the Army, but the Army and Selective Service change their minds from day to day as to how this is to be done; the required letters and forms frequently are useless before they arrive in Washington, and the thing has to be begun all over again. The number of men released for farm work, if any, is small enough to be ludicrous. Meanwhile, our people and the people of the world want to eat.

Manpower Commissioner McNutt and Selective Service Director Hershey have issued floods of contradictory orders and statements, all designed in theory to force labor out of factories and nonessential jobs and back to farms. This hasn't worked. There were plenty of applications—by individuals who want to be safe from the draft on farms at the wages paid by war industries.

One of my dairy-farming neighbors, about to close down for lack of help, advertised for workers. He got 51 replies, and only 1, an unskilled man who may prove more a hindrance than an asset, was possible. All the others wanted from $200 a month up, with board and lodging—for escaping conscription. This is a wage no farm can pay and escape bankruptcy.

The other farm-problem "solution" offered is Secretary of Agriculture Wickard's "dream army" of 3,000,000 volunteer workers. The Secretary simply announced the project and "left it lay." Today there has been no effort at organization, and if one is being considered, it is on the basis of Federal control, centralized in Washington and foredoomed to failure.

The reasons for this are simple, apparent, and undeniable. There is a universal lack of confidence in Washington bureaus. There is immense resentment among citizens, especially farmers, over the meddling, interference, extravagance, and red tape of these bureaus. A remote, frequently disliked Washington bureau with a bad record cannot arouse patriotism to the same degree as a community organization. If Washington persists in trying to organize and dominate this dream army, it will be a total failure. If it is planned on a State basis, county by county, city by city, it can become a brilliant success.

There is a powerful movement among the people, especially farmers and small business people, toward a decentralization of government and a return to States' rights. Last year, Minnesota under Governor Stassen did a brilliant job of solving her own farm problem after Federal agencies had failed completely. This year a dozen States are following Minnesota's lead. The rebellion against centralized, bureaucratic Federal Government, with its errors, extravagance, and inefficiency, is inextricably involved in the whole food-production problem. It will grow rather than diminish in intensity, spreading from class to class as the food crisis increases.

More than four-fifths of the dairy products, meat, vegetables, and fruit we eat is produced by fewer than 30 percent of our farmers. These are the large commercial farm enterprises, big dairies, big poultry projects, cattle ranges, market gardeners. These are the producers that are hardest hit by labor shortages. Their production has decreased seriously and, under existing conditions and lack of confidence in administration measures and policies, cannot well be increased.

The remaining 70 percent of the American farmers includes 20 percent operating family-sized farms depending almost entirely on family labor. They have been hard hit by the draft and in many cases have simply gone out of production.

The remaining half of American farms contribute little to the national food pool. Either they exist in single-crop areas and don't even produce enough food for themselves or they are so-called marginal farmers who merely scrape a living and contribute nothing. It is among these farmers that the Federal Security Administration has done a good job, inducing them to take on one more beef feeder, one more dairy cow or one more brood sow. The total has been impressive.

From this analysis of the farm-labor and machinery problems, it will be seen that the food mess came about because the Administration failed to conceive or put into operation any food-production plan. The President himself neglected the situation, or failed to recognize that food is as important as armed forces. By now the problem has become so complicated and muddled that no good results can be expected this year. Unless something is done quickly, nothing will be accomplished in 1944, either.

To accomplish anything at all a Department of Food Production should be established at once. At present the prices paid by farmers for machinery and commodities and the prices for what they sell are regulated by the Office of Price Administration. Manpower and farm labor are under the vacillating political combination of McNutt and Hershey. Production of farm machinery depends on the War Production Board. A hundred other details are in the hands of the deposed food czar, Claude Wickard, still kept on as Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Davis, the new administrator, even though he may be the most brilliant man in the world, can achieve little or nothing under such a set-up.

The breach between farmers and labor, which is part of this problem of food, is partly natural and partly created artificially by certain New Deal elements. It must be remembered that the farmer—even the family-sized and marginal farmer—was among the first to revolt openly and violently against the regimentation, red tape, and bureaucracy of the New Deal. For this he never has been forgiven by certain New Deal elements and perhaps by the President himself.

These elements, aware that the farm vote is lost beyond recall, have coddled labor for political reasons and every day they seek to discredit the farmer in the eyes of the public. Administration bureaucrats, even in the Department of Agriculture, seek to widen the breach by abusing the farmer and setting labor and the farmer against each other. Such tactics in time of war and crisis approximate a kind of sabotage which Dr. Goebbels scarcely could have hoped for. Of the warring elements, labor is certain in the end to be the victim of these tactics—and for the next few years labor is going to need all the friends it can muster. In the lean years to follow this will be doubly true.

What, then, is the average farmer, and what does he want? The successful American farmer, the one who counts when it comes to feeding you who work in factories and live in cities, is a hard-working, intelligent fellow, as good a citizen as any nation could pray for. He is asked to produce more and more by an administration that has placed every obstacle in his way. He is desperately short of labor and machinery. He needs more fertilizer.

He is harassed by questionnaires, his precious time is taken up by the stupidity and red tape of bureaucrats. He is not worrying about prices, though of late he is being badly squeezed between the prices he pays for what he buys and the prices he gets for what he sells. In all my contacts with the average farmer—and they are many—I have never heard a single complaint about the prices he receives for what he produces. He wants to work and produce food.

He does not want subsidies because he does not believe in government by subsidy and because he knows that the present Government always extracts payment in return, in terms of new regulations and regimentations that bring him more completely under the thumb of Washington bureaucracy. What he wants is machinery and fertilizer and a free hand to get his job done and some faint degree of cooperation or consideration from his Government in getting it done. He wants help rather than abuse.

As I write, it seems that the Office of Price Administration has learned nothing from its mistakes. A ceiling has been placed on the price of chickens, but none on the expensive feed the farmer must buy to produce them. With feed prices out of scale with the ceiling price on poultry and eggs, neither will be produced.

UNIFORM PRICE CEILINGS NEEDED

It all comes back to the obvious economic dictum of Mr. Baruch—that inflation cannot be stopped or the "line be held" by placing ceilings on some things and not on others. It is a very simple economic law, and even politicians cannot alter its workings. But the whole ceiling arrangement and the gyrations of the Office of Price Administration are only one more factor in the set-up which is making farming an economically hazardous occupation and which threatens to reduce rather than to increase already insufficient food production.

Today there is no sign of improvement in the situation. Conditions are growing worse rather than better. Not even the most optimistic can believe that we will produce more food this year than last. Unless some sensible nonpolitical action is taken at once for the good of the Nation as a whole, the food situation will be worse in 1944 than in 1943.

By December this year we shall really feel the gravity of the food famine. Some of those in the know are predicting food riots. I have no opinion, save that the situation will be bad, and in 1944 will be worse unless it is removed from politics, and active, sensible measures are taken.

Consequences of the food shortage are terrifying in their possibilities. They cannot only defeat the Democratic Party; they also can put an end to lend-lease and force such a strong ally as Russia out of the war. They can change the temper of the American people and throw them back to blackest isolationism. They can change the whole course of the human race for generations to come.

As the war continues, it becomes clearer and clearer that the farmer is as important as any front-line soldier. He is doing his best. On the whole, he is putting up a gallant fight, but the odds still are against him. He has not, like the Army, been given everything. On the contrary, he is faced by almost every possible obstacle, and the situation is very little better than it was a year ago.

Without the farmer, we cannot win the war, and certainly, without him, we cannot win the peace.

A Statement From a Labor Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement received from Mr. James F. Lucas, president of Local

653, U. A. W.-C. I. O., of Pontiac, Mich. The statement is as follows:

WHY THE WORKERS ARE OPPOSED TO THE NO-STRIKE POLICY

Management in this country has actually gone on strike against collective bargaining, and is waging a terrific war in an effort to discredit and destroy labor organizations. They have taken every advantage possible, no matter how small, to cause dissention and dissatisfaction among the workers in the plants. Under the guise of patriotism they grab at every opportunity to insult the men and women who are working for them. The worker becomes discouraged when he sees a sign or poster in the plant which says "An Hour Lost May Mean Many Lives Lost"—then later the company penalizes a man 2 days for smoking, or for the violation of some minor shop rule. He is continually told that being absent from work a day or two costs many lives of our soldiers, yet when he reads the papers, he finds that the most important body in the country, namely, the Congress of the United States, has the highest absentee rate of any group in the country.

They see the indifference of management to the war effort. On cost-plus contracts, they are told by supervision to slow down, and when there is just a straight contract, management tries to use the whip and install their so-called "incentive" plans. In plants where they have "suggestion" plans, as in General Motors, the rewards for a suggestion which causes a man to put forth more manual effort (such as running two machines, instead of one) are high—whereas a suggestion which actually increases production (without speeding the operators up) is treated much less favorably. The worker knows that management has stool pigeons working day and night to bring discredit and confusion in their ranks, by carrying stories and tattling on them to their foremen and supervision.

They read in the papers of the lush profits being made by the manufacturers, and wonder why the same Government who is denying them an increase in wages is permitting these enormous profits to be made by corporations. They hear and read about price control and rationing—yet when they go to the store to buy the necessities of life, they find that these things are just so much talk, and that their groceries cost them from 25 percent to 75 percent more than they did a year ago.

The worker willingly loans 10 percent of his earnings to his Government, to help finance the cost of war—yet he is continually being accused of being unpatriotic and impeding the war effort, by people who (if the whole truth were known) may be doing much less than he for the war effort.

They wonder why the Government can give billions of dollars to these corporations in new plants, subsidies, and what have you, yet when a man is called to the colors, the most that his family can get is $50 per month for his wife, after $22 is taken from his meager pay, plus $12 per month for the first child, and $10 per month for the rest. The worker sees his buddy on the next machine called into the Army, and wonders how his mother, father, and wife will get along—while his foreman, or the son of the foreman or superintendent (who is ofttimes single) is deferred, because it looks to him like the corporations control the draft boards. His son and daughter are serving in the armed forces, and he wants to be sure there will be a decent job for them when they return, and that they will not find conditions as he found them after World War No. 1—no money, no job, and no hope. He doesn't want his son to have to make a pilgrimage to Washington, begging for a bonus that is rightfully his, and for which he offered his life—only to be chased out by the Government, who should have grasped his hand in welcome, in place of giving him tear gas and bayonets. He wonders if all the things he reads in the papers about "patriotism" and "giving his all," is not just a lot of balderdash, when it looks like he is the only one expected to make these sacrifices. He is ready and willing to make all the sacrifices necessary to preserve our way of life, but foolishly expects others too will make sacrifices.

His Government, in which he has a right to have some confidence, was to see that adequate machinery was set up for the speedy adjustment of grievances, and provide the necessary price control and rationing program to guarantee against an increase in the cost of living. This has not been carried out, and won't be, unless the worker is able to create enough pressure through the only organization which has demonstrated it has his interests at heart, and that is his labor organization, who (out of a true sense of patriotism, which has since proved to be a mistake, and a rather naive and trusting sense of confidence in its Government officials) has disarmed itself by pledging no strikes for the duration. He wonders why some of his labor leaders, who know only too well that the no-strike pledge is not working, still want to cling to the thing that has made some of them look silly in the past few months. Some of them, it appears, are just as much interested in crushing the legitimate aspirations of the workers as the corporations themselves.

When the workers see gains being taken away that they fought for years to acquire they grow desperate, and cast about for some weapon to defend themselves, and the only weapon they have is mediation, conciliation, and arbitration, and (as a last resort) the strike. When the first three become so notoriously slow that it takes 6 months to settle a grievance, then they are useless, and the only recourse left to the worker is to exert his economic power by resorting to strike action.

No amount of antilabor legislation will settle these grievances. The only effect it can possibly have is to build up resentment in the hearts of the workers, which sooner or later will erupt, causing him to revolt against whomever it may be that is holding him down—whether it be government, management, or the leaders of his labor movement. This has happened in the last few months, and will happen again unless labor rescinds the no-strike pledge, and provides a safety valve by authorizing strikes in extreme cases.

Harry Lane Englebright

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

OF

HON. BRENT SPENCE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1943

On the life, character, and public service of Hon. HARRY LANE ENGLEBRIGHT, late a Representative from the State of California

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure there is no one who knew HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT but felt a profound regret at his sudden passing. He had many splendid qualities of intellect and heart. He was a gentleman in its finest sense. His nature was companionable, his disposition was kind, he loved his fellow man.

It has been the privilege of Mrs. Spence and myself to have lived in the same hotel with him and his splendid wife and fine son for more than 12 years. During all that time I have never heard him say an unkind word of anyone. His district was the great gold mining district of California, the mother-lode country which gained world-wide fame in the gold rush of '49. HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was a mining engineer by profession, and he was exceedingly close to and beloved by his constituents who were largely miners, many of whom were descendants of miners who came to California in 1849. He knew these people as few men knew them. He loved them and they reciprocated that love. He was a splendid raconteur and his stories of his mining constituents were kindly, amusing and delightful. He served these people for 18 years in the Congress of the United States, and however long he might have lived, he could have served them to the end.

His party demonstrated excellent judgment in electing him the party whip. He discharged the duties of that position with tact and diplomacy, and with signal success. HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT was modest and unassuming, yet he was a man of excellent judgment and splendid ability.

He was apparently in good health up to the very day of his death. Why he should be stricken down in the midst of his useful career when life held so much for him, with his splendid qualities unimpaired and usefulness at its peak, surrounded by his loving family, we have no answer. "God moves in a mysterious way, his wonders to perform." We only know—

The moving finger writes; and, having writ
Moves on: Nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

We may truthfully say of HARRY ENGLEBRIGHT:

His life was gentle and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world, "This was a man."

America Must Have an Adequate National Aviation Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 8, 1943

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Herald-American of Saturday, May 29, 1943:

NO STATE LINE BARRIERS TO FLYING

One of the major post-war duties of the Federal Government will be to foster and develop civil aviation, both at home and abroad.

The war has already proved that aviation will be vastly more important to us when peace arrives than it has ever been before.

The national defense hereafter must be based largely on fleets of huge bombers and long-range fighting planes.

Furthermore, our involvement in the war, together with the operations of lend-lease

methods, has resulted in the construction abroad of large airfields in hitherto inaccessible regions and in the pioneering of new air routes over land and sea.

American money paid for these ventures. American personnel has flown the planes and manned the fields. American industry has provided the machines.

Assuredly, when the war is over American trade will have the use of these foreign facilities which America has created; and in the light of this assurance America must have an adequate national aviation policy.

This means a policy instituted and carried out by the Federal Government, as the diplomatic and political responsibilities implied are beyond the powers of State governments on the limitations of private enterprises.

Moreover, the coming of aviation must also affect our domestic trade, and it has already been recognized by Congress and the Supreme Court that domestic aviation, being a form of interstate commerce, requires—and under the Constitution is subject to—Federal control.

The question involved is not one of Federal ownership or operation, but simply one of Federal regulation by law.

Looking forward to this imminent future, legislation has been introduced in Congress (as H. R. bill 1012) and recommended by the House Committee on Interstate Commerce, to give the Civil Aeronautics Board improved powers of regulation.

Most of the bill is noncontroversial.

To one proposal, however, some opposition has appeared—a provision that the Federal Government shall have "exclusive jurisdiction to regulate air commerce and air navigation."

Opponents of this provision affect to believe that it would impair State rights.

In a recent address in Congress, Representative LYLE H. BOREN, of Oklahoma, a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee, effectively refuted this contention.

As Mr. BOREN pointed out, certain activities such as "the national banking system or the issuance of currency were recognized long ago to be matters in which the Nation must be supreme."

Mr. BOREN also noted that the Supreme Court held in 1922 that "commerce is a unit and does not regard State lines," and that substantially the same language was incorporated by Congress in the Air Commerce Act of 1926.

Legally, therefore, the validity of Federal regulation of interstate aviation is indisputable.

From practical considerations, necessary Federal guardianship of international aviation by American interests is almost inseparable from regulation of domestic aviation, while from a domestic point of view alone, the purpose in giving the Federal Government exclusive regulatory power is merely to prevent demoralization of air service by conflicting State regulations.

For obviously, in a nation of 48 States, State regulation of aviation would be utterly destructive.

"Within a single day," Representative BOREN argued in Congress, "it is altogether possible for a given aircraft to be operated through more than 10 States, and for it to be confronted with a new set of requirements as it passes over an invisible and theoretical State boundary in the heavens twenty or more times within a period of 24 hours would lead to utter chaos.

"No such system is practically enforceable.

"No such system suits the needs of the commercial or the private flyer.

"No such system accords with the realities of air navigation."

Opponents of the pending Lea bill have been seeking to delay its enactment.

Delay should not be permitted.

The bill should be passed, in fulfillment of the constitutional powers and duties of the Congress.

Rolling Back Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over the Columbia network on Tuesday, June 8, 1943:

"Unless that most infamous practice of raising prices of the necessaries of life can be stopped, it will be impossible for any funds to subsist the Army." These words have a familiar ring. Were they uttered by President Roosevelt? No. By Leon Henderson, or Prentiss Brown? No. They were a warning sounded by General Washington on inflation. During the Revolutionary War, inflation advanced to the point where Washington wrote to John Jay, "a wagon load of money will scarcely purchase a wagon load of provision."

The Commander in Chief of the Continental Army then, as the Commander in Chief of our Army now, was greatly concerned that the American cause might be lost not in battle but in the high cost of living and the high cost of military supplies.

Inflation is the enemy that strikes at the very heart of our economy; it is the enemy that invades every home, gnawing, and finally breaking the essential, interwoven fibres of our daily living.

The present situation can be likened unto a flooded river. The first thing in the emergency is to hold back the flood with levees and dykes, but in a long-range flood-control program more is needed—water must be controlled at the source through reforestation and impounding. So a comprehensive plan of inflation-control must be evolved. These are some of the weapons of control (immediate and long range) that must be implemented immediately and simultaneously:

1. Rationing.
2. Price and wage ceilings all along the line.
3. Enforcement.
4. Increased production.
5. Enforced savings.
6. Taxes.
7. War bond purchases.
8. Restrained instalment buying.
9. Payment of debts.
10. Subsidies.

Why is the concern so immediately vital? Every housewife knows the answer, every purchaser knows what his dollar buys today as compared with, let us say, 6 months ago.

It must be remembered that the fundamental purpose of price control and rationing is the equitable distribution of essential, though scarce, commodities. With the rise in prices, it naturally follows that those with the greatest incomes will get the available supplies. Let us follow that to its logical conclusion. Higher prices beget higher wages, higher wages beget higher prices, and the whole structure of stabilization collapses into a dust heap of unenforceable regulations with dollar bills everywhere in evidence and in profusion, but with a dismally shrunken purchasing value. Of what avail two green-colored pieces of paper if in return you get less than what one green-colored piece of paper got before? Witness the tragic debacle of inflation in Germany immediately following the First World War. I need not dwell on the economic and political developments that sprang therefrom. The phrase "not worth a continental" remember that?

True, we have sought to profit by the experience of others and by our own experience in World War No. 1, where our cost of living rose 39.9 percent from July 1914 to March 1918. By congressional act of October 2, 1942, the President was authorized and directed to stabilize wages and prices at the level of September 15, 1942. That line has not been held. You and I are daily made aware of this failure. Taking the figures of 6 months, from September 1942 to March 1943 it is a matter of record that the cost of living rose 4.2 percent. In fact, the rise in the single month from February to March was 1.5. Nor has it stopped there; the rise since then, as you yourself can testify to, has been quite substantial, approximately 6 percent going back to September.

These facts we can ill afford to ignore.

Keeping in mind the increasing rise in prices, let us view for a moment the dilemma faced by the wage earner. By governmental decree, wages were practically frozen. The "little steel formula" was invoked by the War Labor Board on the assumption that stabilization could best be effected by maintaining a balance between wages and living costs as of January 1, 1941. Wages were permitted to rise but could not go beyond a 15-percent increase to maintain that balance.

Wages are frozen, but prices mount daily. It is time that some basic and accurately reported figures are given on wage earnings. The average worker in nondurable goods is earning $32 a week. In durable good which include war industries, he receives a pay of $47 per week. The average for all manufacturing is computed at $41 per week. Out of this pay envelope must come rent, clothing, insurance, medicine and taxes, taxes, mind you, that have increased since the establishment of the "little steel formula," and most important of all, food, food that has gone up 50.4 percent since August 1939. The result, inevitably, must be destruction of our American standard of living—unless drastic steps are taken. We can no more allow defeat on the home front than we can on the battle front. This is our war within a war. The Army marches on its stomach; no less does the Nation.

Our national income will be $140,000,000,000 this year. Taxes will syphon off only about fifteen billion. This leaves one hundred and twenty-five billions of spending power to buy a constantly dwindling eighty billion dollars' worth of goods and services. Naturally, this wide disparity between dollars in one's pocket and the values of goods in show windows and stores provides a dreadful temptation to buy what one wants or craves under all and any circumstances. It tempts the consumer to jump the traces as far as ceiling prices and rationing are concerned. Black markets and bootlegging result under such conditions. It is time for Office of Price Administration to get tough; it is time for our judges to get tough. There can no longer be any palliation. We must clap in jail the buyer as well as the seller of black market goods. Black markets increase the price of necessities way beyond the reach of the average mortal. The rich man is not affected, but the poor, restricted in purse, and his children must go without.

Policing the situation is hard, but it must be done. We must curb the unscrupulous buying habts of our citizenry. Fourteen service station operators in New York were found handling counterfeit gasoline coupons. T coupons were sold in a bar in Columbus, Ohio. Potatoes have been handled as a side line at liquor stores and barber shops. A fireman was selling them from a truck at a firehouse in Washington. Unused coupons go to wholesalers for food which may be resold without collecting points. For consideration, consumers give storekeepers unused ration stamps that have expired. Cuffs cannot be made on men's new trousers, but

one tailor is reported to be making a tidy sum in sewing them on. Again, I must use the apt words of General Washington when he said of black markets and war profiteers: "I would to God that one of the most atrocious of each State was hung in Gibbets upon a gallows five times as high as the one prepared by Haman. No punishment in my opinion is too great for the man who can build his greatness upon his country's ruin."

Frankly, the honor system does not work. We have begun to realize that a Damoclean sword of punishment must hang over the heads of the citizenry.

Some of the remedies against inflation, while not simple, are there for the taking. Holding the present price levels, assuming they can be held, is insufficient, since, admittedly, no balance between wages and income and the cost of living has been effected. Rolling back prices to a level where such relationship between wages, income, and the cost of living can reasonably and properly be achieved is one of the weapons that can be yielded to secure an adequate living standard, and, moreover, provide for a strong and vital post-war economy. Such rolling back of prices is inherently just—just to the worker who is in the front line of production, to the housewife that does the purchasing, to the children who must be fed, clothed, and shod.

How can that balance be maintained by and with the rolling back of prices? The answer lies in subsidies.

The carping critics fail to realize that subsidies are not new. Our Government now pays about $700,000,000 a year to keep down canners' prices of vegetables; to pay rail charges on gasoline to the East and coal to New England; to hold the line on imported goods, and to keep high-cost mines operating like silver and copper. Among the items on which subsidies are being paid are machinery, mahogany, sugar, wheat for the alcohol program, vegetable oils and cocoa.

Subsidies have been in use in the United States throughout its history. In fact, subsidies helped build America. Land grants opened up the West, caused the railroads to expand. Mail subsidies aided air and marine transport. The tariff is a "subsidy." The payments to farmers, such as parity payments, soil conservation payments, crop insurance, commodity loans, etc., are all subsidies. It is passing strange that the farm bloc which has all along enjoyed these handout, opposes like benefits to ultimate consumers.

Government subsidies for the roll-back of prices and the maintenance of rigid price control is the method whereby the Government will make payment to the producers, processors or distributors to prevent addition to the retail price. While paid to the processors, it is for the specific benefit of the consumer. We dare not lose sight of that fact. Subsidies paid, I repeat, will benefit everybody, not just one class or segment of the Nation—will benefit the worker, the fireman, the policeman, the teacher, the dependents of those fighting on the front, everyone who is a consumer—and aren't we all?

The Office of Price Administration is under congressional directive to stabilize the cost of living to September 15 levels. Unfortunately, it has constantly been under fire by one pressure group after another. The cattle bloc, the dairy interests, the packers, the canners, the manufacturers, the wholesaler—none is without guilt in pleading special privilege. The Office of Price Administration has been powerless to withstand this pounding. It has given ground. Now, it must and is seizing the opportunity to stabilize the cost of living, actually stabilize it and hold the line against greed and self-aggrandizement feeding upon the tragedy of war. This it will do through the media of rolling back prices and subsidies. It dare not slip. We have ordered the Office of Price Administration to do this for us; we must give it support against the call of pressure groups. We are all in this war together. We must pull together. We must give the boot to the gripers and the "business as usual" bellyachers. Price Administrator Brown faces a thankless job. With proper support he will do a good job. I have great confidence in him. Bending an economy to meet the needs of 135,000,000 heterogeneous peoples is no simple matter, either in the shaping of policy or administration. Indiscriminate barbs of criticism will not help.

The necessity for subsidies to maintain and increase essential production springs from logical thinking and indisputable facts.

Let us suppose that the maximum prices established by the Office of Price Administration do not permit a fair profit to the wholesaler or producer. Please note I said "fair." It must follow that the production levels will lag, depleting the stock piles of essential commodities. The manufacturer or processor just won't make any more goods at a loss. A subsidy will insure that fair profit and thus encourage production of more goods. Otherwise, the producer will turn to other directions to give him the fair profit he seeks.

Then again, let us suppose that the maximum price at the time of establishment accords a fair profit, but that new factors have entered into the picture creating a discrepancy between unit cost and the maximum price, such factors as physical conditions of production and distribution, decreased efficiency because of replaced drafted workers, shifts in the use of different materials, all factors uncontrollable during wartimes. These cost increases cannot be absorbed by the industry affected without a rise in selling price. The increases are passed on all along the line to the consumer. This must not be. Thus, if the production of an essential commodity is to be maintained, the only alternative to raising retail prices is to subsidize industry.

A dust screen of protest is raised against the cost of subsidies to the Government. Yet the cost to the people will be fragmentary as compared with an unleashed rise in prices. An increased cost at one stage of production is passed on to another stage where the margin is widened, and so on throughout the whole process until the pyramided costs have boosted the retail price to unforseeable size. The consumer must pay for that pyramiding of costs and profits. Moreover, the cost of one commodity is woven into the cost of interrelated commodities so that increased costs all along the line are reflected not only in a single industry but upon all dependent industries. Office of Price Administration proposes to subsidize at the point where the cost increases necessarily. That is the one payment made and there can be no increase upon an increase, ending in inflationary prices. Every price increase if not absorbed or subsidized sets the stage for a dozen more. Where the greater burden for the public lies—either increased prices or subsidies—is easy to discern.

I am not speaking of imaginary woes of nebulous theories. I am speaking of hard unassailable figures. In March of this year, the cost of living was 22 percent above the level of January 1, 1941, the basic date of the Little Steel formula. As of mid-May, it is estimated at 24 percent above that level. The wage rate adjustments to 15 percent above the level of January 1, 1941, cannot hold without adequate price roll-back. How can they with bread up 22 percent, butter up to 69 percent, milk up 18 percent, oranges up 116 percent, cucumbers up 141 percent, green peppers up 275 percent and potatoes up 219 percent? How can they hold, I repeat?

Certainly, there are complexities. Rare judgment will have to be exercised as to where and to whom the subsidies will be granted. There is no intention, and rightfully so, to subsidize the production or importation of nonessential or luxury commodities which do not contribute to the war effort, nor to encourage imports where the domestic supply is sufficient. The subsidies must not exceed the specific cost increase for which the subsidy is paid, nor granted to concerns whose profits are sufficient to absorb such increases. Nor can subsidies be paid as a premium on inefficiency and waste, nor on increase of wages made without the approval of the War Labor Board. Neither should they be awarded on a permanent basis; rather a temporary basis should be used with renewals of applications at specified times and repeated reexamination of existing conditions.

I have touched on some of the difficulties to denote that those of us who so strongly urge the adoption of the roll-back of prices and subsidies are not unmindful of ensuing complications. But we know the driving necessity therefor. We know that stabilization of the cost of living is a concomitant of winning the war. We know that most of labor has consented willingly to the Little Steel formula and cannot take the further shrinkage in the purchasing value of the dollar.

Be it remembered that Great Britain and Canada have by means of subsidy succeeded in holding their line, succeeded in maintaining the stability in cost of living. Great Britain for almost 3 years and Canada for over 1 year have held the line without a single change whatever. I am aware of the different economic, financial, and political conditions that exist in England. Nevertheless, we cannot blind ourselves to its highly successful program of rolling back prices and causing them to stay put by way of subsidies. For example, the British Minister of Food stated that in January 1943 the retail prices of important foods, such as bread, potatoes, sugar, tea, and eggs were less than 10 percent above pre-war level. In England and Canada, the use of subsidies has increased the supplies in the legal market. Frankly, increased production under controlled price levels is an end to be sought.

Consider the ultimate savings not only to public consumers but to the Government. Our Government for military purposes alone will purchase 55 percent of the total output of essential commodities at a cost of over $100,000,000,000. Reckoned among consumers, or rather procurement agencies, the savings to the Government alone in controlled prices are staggering. The Government is not bound by ceilings, yet such savings are inevitable.

A 1-percent increase in the prices Government must pay would cost it $1,000,000,000. The subsidies required to forestall such an increase are far less. Thus the cost of subsidies is much less than the cost of rising prices. The Office of Price Administration reports that the presently scheduled program on meats, fats, and coffee alone will save consumers between $2 and $3 and the Government at least $2 for every dollar paid out in subsidies. This program, therefore, will pay off in hard dollars and cents at the rate of four or five to one. On many commodities, the savings will be even higher. The Government, as stated, has been subsidizing high-cost copper production, and their savings there have been $35 for every dollar paid.

The roll-back program on the prices of meats, butter, and coffee by means of subsidies was announced by Price Administrator Prentiss Brown to take place beginning June 1. The reduction will amount to an average

of 10 percent to the consumers. Subsidies together with the price reductions brought about by the new commodity (dollars and cents) ceilings will cut the cost of living about 1 percent from present levels. The 10-percent slash in prices of the three basic food items will reduce total food costs an estimated 3 percent.

Most naturally, the question of subsidies has raised a storm of controversy. We are proud to be the sort of people that will examine and question a procedure that so intimately affects us in our standards of living, our wages and income, our purchasing power. We are ill, but we examine the cure with indigent and healthy skepticism, displaying, it is true, at times, the petulance of the patient. Once, however, having determined the best course to follow, we follow it unswervingly. Just so we are determined to stop inflation. Congress has so directed the President, the findings have all pointed to no more effective and just method of stabilization of the cost of living than the roll-back of prices and subsidies. We need not hesitate in adopting and embracing it; indeed, we dare not.

Reasons for Having Pacific Northwest Regional Offices of the War Manpower Commission and the War Production Board

---

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. COFFEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, a condition prevails in the Pacific Northwest which is unfortunate from the standpoint of the war effort. This area, which is made up of the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana and, with which the Territory of Alaska often is included for administrative reasons, is one of the most important in the Nation from a war production point of view.

War contracts awarded to the Pacific Northwest, including the Territory of Alaska, between June of 1940 and March 1, 1943, amounted to approximately $6,500,000,000. Some of the country's leading and best-known war plants are located in this region. While the major contracts involve the manufacture of aircraft and ships, there is a broad diversification in the Pacific Northwest war manufacturing picture. For example, there are woodworking and furniture manufacturing plants which are producing foot-lockers, crutches, desks, tool boxes, letter trays, and a variety of other wood items for the armed forces. There are textile plants turning out parkas, sleeping bags, comforters, jackets, and similar materials for the Army and Navy. There are countless machine shops and sheet-metal plants working on important prime and subcontracts, to say nothing of foundries and machine manufacturers. There are luggage manufacturers who are producing such essential items as foot-lockers and leather bags for the troops. There are hundreds of other plants and shops making special precision equipment and small articles of all kinds, plus the food manufacturers, who are a vital part of the war program.

It stands to reason that the Pacific Northwest would enter extensively into this Nation's war production program. The area is strategically located from the standpoint of warfare in any part of the Pacific. What's more, at the outset of this war it possessed numerous manufacturing facilities which could be adapted readily to manufacture of needed war items. And, of course, it had suitable sites for the expansion of existing plants and for the building of new ones. An important factor in this regard has been the tremendous amount of low-cost electric power available in the area through long-term development of water resources. Finally, the Pacific Northwest is made up of people who sense any responsibility keenly. When America began an arms program in the summer of 1940, business and labor alike in the Pacific Northwest were anxious to play an important role in the production of various supplies and implements required. For that reason, they went after war business. The fact that their contracts had reached such a large volume is an indication of the aggressive spirit they have displayed.

Despite all of these things, however, the Pacific Northwest has been forced to operate without benefit of regional offices of the War Manpower Commission and the War Production Board. Such offices are in San Francisco, Calif., which is a distance of approximately 1,000 miles from Seattle, the Pacific Northwest's largest city. Business, labor, and farm organizations in the Pacific Northwest feel that their area is entitled to regional offices of these two important Government agencies and for the past several months they have been trying to get such offices. To date, their efforts along this line have been unsuccessful.

The business, labor, and farm leaders who have worked so hard to obtain regional War Manpower Commission and War Production Board offices for the Pacific Northwest have pointed out time and time again that theirs is not a quarrel with San Francisco. On the contrary, their sole interest, so far as these offices are concerned, is to expedite the war effort. They sincerely and genuinely feel that until such time as there are regional offices in the Pacific Northwest with power to act on the spot and to carry important matters directly to headquarters in Washington, D. C., the war program in their area will be handicapped. They cite case after case of important projects being delayed because War Production Board district office officials in their area lack the authority to act, and must carry the problems to the San Francisco regional offices.

And here are some other things to which they point. The total of $6,500,000,000 in war contracts awarded to the Pacific Northwest, including Alaska, from June of 1940 to March 1, 1943, is larger than that of 5 of the 12 areas throughout the United States which now have regional offices of the War Manpower Commission and War Production Board. From a total war business point of view, then, this area warrants regional offices even more than 5 of the others in the Nation which now have such offices. The 5 regional offices with war contracts amounting to less than the $6,500,000,000 held in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska are:

First. Atlanta, Ga., with $5,900,000,000, covering the States of Georgia, Tennessee, South Carolina, North Carolina, Mississippi, Florida, and Alabama.

Second. Kansas City, Mo., with $4,800,000,000, covering the States of Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, and Arkansas.

Third. Dallas, Tex., with $6,000,000,000, covering the States of Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana.

Fourth. Denver, Colo., with $1,063,000,000, covering the States of Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

Fifth. Minneapolis, Minn., with $1,100,000,000, covering the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

As things stand at the present time, the regional offices of the War Manpower Commission and War Production Board, which are located in San Francisco, cover the States of California, Arizona, Nevada, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and the Territory of Alaska. In other words, they exercise jurisdiction over territory from the Mexican border to the northern boundary of Alaska, and the area which is governed by the San Francisco regional offices at the present time covers 1,221,872 square miles. Thus, it is by far the largest area of any covered by regional offices in the United States. The next largest is that covered by the Denver, Colo., offices, and it amounts to 955,881 square miles—including Montana. That covered by the Dallas, Tex., offices is next, with 385,781 square miles.

From June of 1940 through February of 1943, war contracts awarded to the area now covered by the San Francisco offices amounted to approximately $16,300,000,000. Only three other regional offices in the Nation, namely, Detroit, Philadelphia, and New York, have jurisdiction over that much war business.

It is obvious that the area covered by the San Francisco offices is too great for efficient operation. There are indications that the idea in all eastern regions has been to establish offices over compact areas, covering as little territory as possible. It is difficult to understand why this same idea has not been carried out in the West. A more practical arrangement would be for the San Francisco offices to have jurisdiction over the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada. This would involve an area of 385,142 square miles, with war contracts between June of 1940 and February of 1943 amounting to $11,931,116,000. Regional offices in the Pacific Northwest then would cover the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho—and preferably also Montana—as well as the Territory of Alaska. This would involve an area of 985,868 square miles, with total contracts between June of 1940 and February of 1943 amounting to $6,500,000,000.

It must be realized that San Francisco is a distance of 2,911 miles from Washington, D. C. Most regional offices of the War Manpower Commission and the War Production Board, on the other hand, are within 1,000 miles of Washington, D. C. Such offices as Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and Cleveland, are only a few hundred miles distant. The only ones which are a greater distance than 1,000 miles are Kansas City, which is 1,070 miles from Washington, D. C.; Minneapolis, Minn., which is 1,124 miles; Dallas, Tex., which is 1,416 miles; and Denver, Colo., which is 1,655 miles from Washington, D. C. When it is realized further that the city of Seattle, which is the center of a vast amount of war production in the Pacific Northwest, in turn, is 1,000 miles from San Francisco, it means that Seattle in reality is 3,911 miles from Washington, D. C., because all matters of importance pertaining to the War Manpower Commission and the War Production Board in the Pacific Northwest must be routed to Washington, D. C., by way of the San Francisco offices. No other area which is so important to the war production program is that far removed from the Washington, D. C., headquarters.

The Pacific Northwest is a distinct economic entity. It is the greatest wheat growing area in the United States. It produces the bulk of lead and zinc used in this country. This area also is the center of the lumber and forest products industry in the Nation. For eastern markets it produces a large percentage of wool. It also ships countless carloads of livestock to eastern markets. Here, also, is produced half of the world's supply of salmon. In waterpower resources it probably leads the world in comparable territory. The harbors provide seaports that serve Alaska and Russia in wartime, and the world as a whole in peacetime.

The tremendous area involved in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and the Territory of Alaska, has many problems involving priorities, labor supply, contracts, and other matters of great importance in increasing war production. It should have the prestige of regional directors of the War Manpower Commission and the War Production Board who are familiar with these problems and with the area's resources. These executives should be on the ground floor with full authority to expedite the war effort and to act promptly on the basis of existing conditions.

National Farm Program

REMARKS

OF

HON. JERRY VOORHIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill the aim of which is to simplify our national farm program, to bring it much closer to the farmers themselves and through the organization of local and county committees elected by farmers, to centralize all the contacts of all government agencies with farmers into one office in each county or locality in the county.

I have an abiding faith in the practical judgment and wisdom of the American people. I believe American farmers including farm owners, operators, tenants, and share croppers, are capable of administering on a local level the various portions of the agricultural program of this Government.

The Department of Agriculture has a number of programs affecting the farmer, most of which are very worth while. However, these programs are conducted by different agencies of the Department maintaining separate offices and separate personnel at the county level. A farmer who is a Farm Security loan client living in a soil-conservation district and cooperating in the A. A. A. program may have three different sets of farm plans for his farm. To avoid bureaucracy in Washington as well as in the field these programs must be further decentralized with more responsibility on committees of elected farmers for local administration, and these programs and their personnel should be consolidated in one office so that the farmer has one point of contact with the Department of Agriculture.

No program, however worthy its purpose, can be fully successful unless it rests on a sound basis of administration and organization. Such basically worthwhile programs as that of the Farm Security Administration and the Soil Conservation Act will do correspondingly more good and be subject to less criticism if at the local level the practical guidance of local farm people is available to guide the program and adapt it to local conditions.

Under this proposed bill all farmers and their wives who live in a county would be eligible to vote for community committees, and the community committees would select one county committee to be responsible for the local administration of all programs of the Federal Government affecting farmers. All programs could be consolidated in one office where the farmer could get help and assistance in regard to soil conservation, Government payments, crop loans, crop insurance, production or rehabilitation loans, labor, rural electrification, machinery, gasoline, tires, or advice in regard to deferment.

This bill would result in increased efficiency and economy of operation. All necessary employees of the county association would be selected by the county committee of farmers and would not be Federal appointees. A flexible county association would be set up which would not require Federal appointments, Federal travel regulations, Federal regulation of leases and utilities, or the segregation of funds used from separate appropriations. Expert federally employed personnel would, of course, be available in the localities where necessary to make any particular portion of the program effective.

These elected county committees would have the good will and confidence of a majority of the farmers. The success of any farm program depends upon the good will and understanding of conscientious and intelligent farmers. At the local level these farmer committeemen would take responsibility for major policies and see that the administration of farm programs was practicable. These community and county committees could also gather together constructive ideas and suggestions and forward them to people at the State and Washington levels for the improvement of existing programs and the planning of future programs. As I have stated before, I have the utmost confidence in the fairness and in the ability of local farmers to adapt national programs to local conditions and make them work better and better as time goes on. This bill would help farmers to do that.

The text of my bill is as follows:

A bill to establish community and county committees of farmers to administer those phases of all Federal programs involving farm contact.

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Farmer Committee Act of 1943.

SEC. 2. It is hereby recognized that the Department of Agriculture, the War Food Administration, and other departments of the Federal Government contain many agencies, services, administrations, authorities, and corporations engaged in contacting individual farmers and visiting farms throughout the Nation in connection with various programs being administered by such organizations. It is also recognized that much duplication of effort, waste of manpower, and confusion in the minds of farmers results through each such Federal agency or facility maintaining separate local offices and field employees.

SEC. 3. In order that all Federal programs affecting the agricultural and soil conservation work of individual farmers, or requiring visits to farms may be administered locally through one facility having full knowledge and local authority and responsibility for the administration of all such Federal programs, and having an understanding of local people, problems, and conditions, local and county committees of farmers are hereby authorized, which committees shall, as soon as is administratively practicable, supersede and replace all existing Federal facilities of a local nature, which are now a part of various Federal agencies and instrumentalities engaged in administering such programs. The Secretary of Agriculture is directed, within 60 days after enactment of this act, to make a determination as to which existing Federal facilities of a local nature will be so superseded or replaced.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture shall designate local administrative areas as units for the election of local committeemen and the administration of programs. No such local areas shall include more than one county or parts of different counties. Farmers residing within any such local administrative area shall elect annually, or at a more frequent interval upon special request by the Secretary, from among their own number, a local committee of not more than three members for such area. The members of the local committee chosen at such election shall in an annual convention elect the county committee for the county for the succeeding year, which shall consist of three persons who are bona fide farmers residing within the county. In any county in which there is only one local committee the local committee shall also be the county committee.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of this act a "farmer" shall be the owner or the operator of a farm, a ranch, or a tract of timber, or a tenant or share cropper who shares in the proceeds of the production of any such land, or the spouse of any such farmer, if residing on the farm.

SEC. 6. The farmers residing within the county, together with their elected committeemen shall constitute the county agricultural association for the county and shall operate pursuant to regulations approved by the Secretary of Agriculture in the form of articles of association.

SEC. 7. The local committee shall select a secretary and may utilize one of its own members for such purpose. The county committee shall select a secretary, who may be the county agricultural extension agent, and a treasurer; and, in addition, may select an administrative officer and whatever personnel may be required for clerical, administrative, and field work. Employees, including committeemen, of county agricultural associations, shall not be considered as Federal employees, and their rates of pay and hours of work shall be in conformity with local standards and customs. Such employees (not including committeemen) shall be eligible to all the benefits of the Social Security Act. Any funds made available for the payment of expenses incurred by county agricultural associations shall be available for deductions required by law in connection with employer responsibilities under the Social Security Act.

SEC. 8. It is hereby authorized and directed that from any funds made available for programs or work in connection with which county agricultural associations are utilized, payments shall be made to such county agricultural associations to cover the estimated expenses incurred or to be incurred by them in cooperating in carrying out such programs or work. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon the request of the Secretary of Agriculture, to establish an appropriation account into which there shall be transferred from any funds available for the purposes in connection with which personnel or other facilities of such county agricultural associations are utilized, proportionate amounts estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture to be required by such associations for expenses in carrying out or cooperating in carrying out any such work. All or part of such expenses, or estimated expenses, may be deducted from payments or grants as may be made to farmers in connection with the programs administered through the associations, or may be offset in whole or part by means of fees collected from farmers, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture, such fees to represent not more than a reasonable charge for services rendered or to be rendered. Expenses of county agricultural associations shall be evidenced by approval of the chairman or vice chairman or acting chairman, and the secretary or acting secretary of such associations, but the Secretary of Agriculture may require additional evidence in substantiation of such expenses.

SEC. 9. Actions and decisions of county committees or county agricultural associations shall be subject to review, confirmation, or disapproval by State committees to be designated by the Secretary of Agriculture, and any person believing himself adversely affected by unjust or improper actions or decisions of county committees or county agricultural associations and failing to get satisfactory reconsideration by them, shall have the right of appealing to such State committees.

SEC. 10. All laws or parts of laws conflicting with the provisions of this act are, to the extent of such conflict, amended or repealed.

Our Honored Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILL ROGERS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable J. F. T. O'Connor, United States district court judge, delivered on Memorial Day at the Los Angeles Coliseum, Sunday, May 30, 1943:

No one has expressed the spirit of this day in more significant words than William Gladstone when he said:

"Show me the manner in which a nation or community cares for its dead, and I will measure with mathematical exactness the tender sympathies of its people, their respect for the laws of the land, and their loyalty to high ideals."

We have assembled in this vast coliseum under sunny skies to honor the memory of our soldier dead. High and deserved tribute has been paid in the press, over the radio, and this afternoon by Governor Warren, Mayor Bowron, distinguished officers of our armed forces, Archbishop Cantwell, Rev. Dr. Farnham, and Rabbi Magnin, and you, my fellow Americans, many tens of thousands, by your presence speak a far more eloquent tribute than any words of mine. While similar exercises are held today in most of our States and in Alaska, far-away Puerto Rico, and the Hawaiian Islands, no gathering outnumbers this one.

Three-quarters of a century ago the first Memorial Day services were held. They were dedicated, at the direction of the national commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, Gen. John A. Logan, to the fallen Union heroes of the Civil War; but as time healed the wounds and softened the bitterness of the strife, and men read into Appomattox not defeat for the South but a triumph for both armies, the soldiers in grey were honored with their brothers in blue. The men in 1861 who shot out of the skies at Fort Sumter the Stars and Stripes, and lowered it from the southern Capitols, 4 years later with their own hands raised again the emblem of freedom and justice, testifying to the indestructibility of the Union.

Two years after the close of the Civil War the women of Columbus, Miss., impartial in their offerings made to the memory of the soldier dead, strewed flowers on the graves of Confederate and National alike. This act, simple and spontaneous in its origin, quietly done by women whose men followed the light of a fading star, touched the heart of the North as no resolution, no law, no speech could do.

Was it the soldier son of a mother in Maine upon whose grave fell the tribute from the Mississippi mother's hand? Perhaps in the common sorrow shared by each was drowned the erstwhile enmity. The poet Francis Miles Finch wrote the story in imperishable words:

"They banish our anger forever
When they laurel the graves of our dead,
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the Judgment Day.
Love and tears for the Blue,
Tears and love for the Gray."

Of the 3,000,000 men who marched under the leadership of General Grant and General Lee, about 900 live today. In their honor a nation bows its head in prayer and reverence. Thirty-three years of peace followed the Civil War. From Andrew Johnson to William McKinley our Nation pursued the peaceful pathways of a people determined to build a new continent dedicated to liberty, justice, and free enterprise. A new South arose. The battle trenches were filled, the battle-scarred fields grew new life, with cotton, corn, and tobacco finding new and better markets across the Mason and Dixon's line. Houses and barns were rebuilt, while factories flourished in the North, and the pioneer was breaking sod in the ever-widening West, won by the heroes of the Indian wars. Once again from the lips of a united people came the song, born in the throes of an earlier war, "Oh, say, can you see, by the dawn's early light * * *." Again the bugle note, again the call to arms, and the sons of the men who wore the blue and the gray now marched shoulder to shoulder under one flag, one command, one country.

Today we honor alike the heroes of the Spanish-American War. They avenged the sinking of the battleship *Maine*. They carried our flag in triumph to the outposts of the Pacific and to the rich islands of the Philippines—Guam, Wake, and Midway were among the possessions which fell under our protection, while the last vestige of a foreign power relinquished its jurisdiction in the Western Hemisphere.

Today comes the real appreciation of our debt to the soldiers and sailors of 1898. What would have happened had not the Stars and Stripes floated over the islands in the far Pacific during the past 45 years? We builded better than we knew. No—not we, but a higher power nearly half a century ago sent our battleships to fight in distant tropical waters to liberate millions of men and women and to make more secure the safety of our own land. If speculation is pardonable on this solemn occasion, it is my humble opinion that the flag of the Rising Sun would float from every port and fort and public building, from the largest to the smallest island. Under Nippon the vast resources of the Philippines would have been used to build forts, guns, battleships, and battle planes to rule the orient and threaten the peace of the Occident. The Philippine Commonwealth comprises 114,000 square miles with 16,000,000 people under the heel of Japan, but not for long. Soon Japan will feel the full power of American might and courage in the air, on the sea and under the sea, and on the land, and her flag will symbolize not the rising but the setting sun.

Nearly 20 years of peace followed the Spanish-American War, when again the bugle notes sounded the call to arms, and over 4,000,000 Americans responded. It was Europe's war—not ours—until a ruler drunk with power and crazed with ambition denied the right of American ships flying the flag of the United States to sail the high seas. One after another our unarmed ships were sunk—men, women, and children murdered by German torpedoes—from Washington to Berlin went countless notes of protest but the Kaiser, convinced we would not fight, and if we did could not arrive in time to prevent a German victory, and that if our soldiers did arrive they were no match for German military power—gave the order for unrestricted submarine warfare. Our soldiers did arrive, they did fight, and they conquered. Fifty thousand four hundred and ten American soldiers died in battle or from battle wounds, while 182,674 carry the scars of battle. That was the most valuable part of our contribution and our sacrifice in the last war.

To these heroes of World War No. 1 a Nation pays its tribute today. The statesmen, or

shall I say the politicians, lost what they bled and died for under European skies.

Nearly a quarter of a century passed in peace, but slowly the war clouds were gathering over Europe and in the far Pacific—again it was Europe's war, not ours, until December 7, 1941. Japan without a declaration of war, without justification, without warning, in fact at the very moment her emissaries were assuring our Nation at Secretary of State Hull's desk that Japan was our friend, their grinning faces masking the treachery and perfidy of their minds, the sons of Nippon were murdering our soldiers and sailors at Pearl Harbor. They murdered 2,343; they wounded 1,272, and 960 are missing. They destroyed 177 airplanes. In the harbor 86 ships were damaged or destroyed. The despicable blow planned for a score of years or more in great detail by military strategists was intended to bring speedy victory to Japan. Guam, Bataan, Guadalcanal, Wake, the Solomons, and Attu is part of our answer. The completed story will be written in the ashes of Tokyo.

There are new graves in north Africa, Iceland, Alaska, the Aleutians, the islands of the far Pacific, and under the seas—new reasons for this memorial occasion. Our men sleep side by side with the other heroes of the United Nations. Each country honors its own dead—each honors the dead of the other nations fighting in a common cause. Love of liberty and justice binds in links stronger than steel these United Nations. Determination to crush the enemies of democratic institutions is the watchword—liberty for all men the goal. Here in this coliseum blend the colors of the United Nations, one for all and all for one. Each flag speaks the heart of its own people. Here they form a huge cross silently invoking divine assistance without which no cause can triumph. No historian can pen the story for another generation to read. No language has words to express the inhuman and brutal acts of savagery perpetrated by the Axis Powers.

Inspired by these solemn services, we shall go forth with renewed faith in the justice of our cause, sanctified by the blood of our soldier dead and with a deeper appreciation of the meaning of the present conflict. Let no rumble of discord stay the efforts of the leaders charged with the responsibility of bringing victory to the United Nations, peace to the world, and happiness and freedom to all mankind, foe and friend alike. Roosevelt, Churchill, Stalin, De Gaulle, Giraud, and Chiang Kai-shek—this great multitude voices the approval of the war's progress and lifts its heart in prayer to Almighty God to speed the end of destruction of life and property and with the hope that another Memorial Day will witness "peace on earth to men of good will."

Editorials From the Daily Times, Mamaroneck, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the Daily Times, Mamaroneck, N. Y., on Wednesday, June 2, 1943, entitled "Is There a 'Labor Vote'?" and another appearing on the following day in the same newspaper, "Can't It Be Adjusted?"

[From the Mamaroneck (N. Y.) Daily Times of June 2, 1943]

IS THERE A "LABOR VOTE"?

Political observers are practically unanimous that there is only one reason for the New Deal's kidglove handling of John L. Lewis, only one reason for failure to back up words with action against spreading strikes in war industries, only one reason why such defiance of Federal Government orders as the milk unions' refusal to submit to a skip-a-day gasoline-saving delivery plan is countenanced in Washington.

That reason is the New Deal's implicit belief that it cannot win again next year, that it cannot continue to "make America over," that it cannot reelect Roosevelt to a fourth term, unless it has the labor vote in its pocket. Such belief is founded upon the assumption that Roosevelt has been for three terms the overwhelming choice of labor, regardless of occupation, type of work, creed or color.

But Rogers C. Dunn of Greenwich, head of the Dunn Surveys, has some interesting figures which combat the theory that labor has stuck with Roosevelt. The figures, indeed, indicate that the prevalent idea that the labor vote can be delivered solidly to any candidate or any party is a myth. Here are some of the findings in that survey:

Union membership in the 8 years from 1932 to 1940 increased from 3,250,000 to 8,500,000. That is a gain of 260 percent. But comparison of the Roosevelt vote in 1932 and 1940 in the 33 leading industrial areas of the Nation shows that this did not increase. Instead, in those areas wherein organized labor was most rapidly growing, the Roosevelt vote remained at 57 percent.

In 31 of the 33 industrial areas the Roosevelt vote dropped from 3 to 17 percent between 1936 and 1940. And the Democratic vote in 1938, 1940, and 1942 was lower than it was in 1936 in these industrial areas, which represent more than half the manufacturing activities of the country.

Labor's mouthpieces, of course, keep up the pretense that they hold the balance of power. Note, for example, recent boasts by the American Labor Party in New York State that the Democratic failure to accept their choice for Governor led to the election of Republican Thomas E. Dewey. These braggarts hope the public has now forgotten that Dewey's vote was greater than that of the Democratic and Labor Party candidates combined.

Recall, too, that organized labor has stressed its ability to defeat Congressmen who oppose its influence. But in the case of Representative HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia, outstanding in efforts to regulate unions and, therefore, strongly opposed by the New Deal, Congress of Industrial Organizations, and American Federation of Labor, Mr. SMITH won in his last race by a larger majority than ever before. And of the 252 Representatives who voted for the Smith labor bill, only 11 were defeated in 1942 as against 35 of the 136 Representatives who voted against the bill.

This evidence, we believe, should be submitted to the New Deal leaders. For in it they may find that Samuel Gompers knew what he was talking about when he said: "I do not believe labor leaders can deliver a vote." And in such new assurances they may, perhaps, find courage to act as their oaths of office require, instead of truckling in servile fashion to labor leaders who have bluffed them now for 11 years.

Isn't it about time the New Deal realized that there are other Americans than those in organized labor?

[From the Mamaroneck (N. Y.) Daily Times of June 3, 1943]

CAN'T IT BE ADJUSTED?

We all understand that the shortage of gasoline in the Eastern States is due to the fact the pipe lines and tank cars in which our motor fuel is imported from the Southwest must now have a large portion of their carrying capacity diverted to the Nation's armed services.

But what we can't understand is why some of the rail facilities used to carry gasoline and oil to the Midwest, the Far West, and the Northwest can't be shared with us, to reduce the severity of the sacrifice imposed on us. We can't quite see why reasonable restrictions on motoring in other parts of the country would not release tank cars, for example, which could then be used to deliver needed gasoline to New England and the eastern seaboard.

Frankly, the whole present system of gasoline distribution looks to us highly discriminatory against the East. We may be wrong—and we hope we are—but we can't escape an idea that some political narrowback, possibly with an idea that all easterners are either millionaires who deserve no sympathy or immigrants who ought to be too glad they are here to kick about anything that's done to them, is running the gasoline and oil rationing system out of a "To hell with the East" philosophy.

Laughable indeed is the most recent explanation of the current shortage—that the armed services couldn't advise the oil companies of impending needs because to do so might be to "tip off" impending military movements. Apparently there is no information for our enemies in the fact that, for days now, Fuel Czar Ickes and Office of Price Administration Boss Brown have been yelling to high heaven about the vast gasoline needs of the Army and Navy along the Atlantic coast.

Address of Luther Harr, United States Bituminous Coal Commission Counsel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL J. BRADLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made by Luther Harr, United States Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel, at the wartime conference of the Pennsylvania Retail Coal Merchants' Association, May 27, 1943, in Philadelphia, Pa.:

The idea of making statutory provision for the representation and protection of the consumer in Government regulation and price-fixing in such a basic industry as bituminous coal no longer can be viewed as an experiment. I believe the records will show that the plan of having a consumer's counsel is practical. Furthermore, such representation and protection are essential to democratic and fair administration of the Bituminous Coal Act—and other statutes, too.

Unfortunately, the consumer has too little official representation. At the present time, the Bituminous Coal Consumers' Counsel is the only consumer representative in Federal

Government. It is true the consumer movement throughout the country is stronger and more active than ever before. Many committees are working for better representation. Yet, with all this, consumer organization is weak compared to the organization of producers, distributors, and retailers.

The time has come when somebody ought to officially represent the American consumer. Above everything else, the immediate job before you, me, and the American public is the successful prosecution of the war. In the prosecution of the war, however, there are certain internal dangers which directly affect the local merchant, the housewife, and members of every family. These dangers are present every hour of the day and night since they deal with the necessities of life which must be purchased to sustain each and every household. Up to this time, every special interest except that of the consumer is well represented before governmental and legislative units. Obviously, consumer opinion will not permit this inequitable condition to continue much longer.

An independent Federal consumers' agency should not be a cumbersome or heavily staffed office. Responsible only to the President or Congress, it should be charged specifically with the following:

1. Represent the interest of consumers before all regulatory agencies of the Federal Government;

2. Present consumer information to administrators of Government programs relating to the consumer interest.

Assistance to Veterans in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the Seventy-eighth Congress the constructive and helpful activities of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in behalf of the veterans of the present World War and their dependents. Massachusetts is always foremost among the States in providing substantial benefits for her deserving citizens. Its public-school system, its labor laws, its social-security provisions, and its care for its unfortunate citizens are unsurpassed throughout the country. I am proud to include in my statement the following letter from Hon. W. Rea Long, Commissioner of State Aid and Pensions of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF
STATE AID AND PENSIONS,
State House, Boston, May 28, 1943.

Hon. CHARLES R. CLASON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This letter is just a reminder to your office as to what your State is doing for the veteran of World War No. 2 and his dependents.

In 1861 the Legislature of Massachusetts established the department of state aid and pensions, which was in fact a real modern veterans' administration. By law the commissioner in this department is the representative of the Massachusetts veteran within the State and with Washington. He has the right, under power of attorney, to conduct all affairs of the veteran, whether he be disabled or not, in his relation with any part of his service in the Army or Navy.

The work of the department is divided in two principal sections. First, aid is given to the veteran and his dependents in a monetary way. Assistance is now being given to the dependent wives and children, fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, during that period of time between the man's entry into the service and the granting of the allowance and allotment. In addition, if the allowance and allotment is not sufficient to care for their ordinary needs, supplementary cash assistance is provided by the Commonwealth. Extra assistance is also given in the case of illness or injury, and proper hospitalization is provided where veterans' facilities are not available.

The second general phase of our work is that of advice to the dependents of men in the service and to the servicemen themselves, both during their actual time in the armed forces and after they come out. This advice may be legal, financial, or to help them in their dealings with the Government.

This office files claims for compensation, obtains information for anxious and worried dependents, and assists in cleaning up the affairs of the serviceman who has died for his country.

In addition, Massachusetts provides rehabilitation for both service-connected and non-service-connected disabled veterans. Higher education is provided for the children of those who have died as a result of their injuries or were killed in action.

Massachusetts is the only State in the Union that has such legislation on its books and an organization of this type. In every city and town in the Commonwealth there is someone designated as a soldiers' relief commissioner or agent. In the cities and larger towns there is a regular department usually established in the city or town hall. In the smaller towns usually one of the selectmen acts as the soldiers' relief commissioner.

We should indeed feel proud that we represent a State that recognizes its servicemen and does so much for them. We believe that you should use this service, and inquiries from any of your constituents as to their rights under the existing Federal laws, or inquiries as to how they can procure assistance or information, should be referred either to the person's own home town, or if you so choose, referred directly to this office. Any help that we can give you in any of your problems with the veteran or his dependents will be given immediate attention.

Please do not hesitate to call on us.

Very respectfully,
W. REA LONG, *Commissioner.*

Labor Should Be Given Credit for Marvelous Record of War Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the other day Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, came before our subcommittee of 12 on deficiency appropriations and gave us the production picture.

Mr. Nelson is the official who has primary responsibility for producing the implements of war.

The production picture as he unfolded it to us was astounding. It revealed that the laboring men of America have performed a wonderful service during this war. The production of all of the implements of war has been perfectly amazing and far beyond all expectations. The output of planes, tanks, and ships is staggering in its immensity. No American boy on the fighting fronts has been without the implements and equipment he needed because of lack of production. Vast quantities of military equipment and implements of war are piled up in warehouses and at shipping points awaiting transportation facilities.

This production record, which must challenge the admiration of all Americans, could not have been achieved without the devoted, sacrificial efforts of the laboring men of our country, who have rallied to the colors, and in the workshops and on the assembly line have given the best there was in them to America.

Mr. Nelson's presentation of the production record convinced me, if further evidence on that point were needed, what an enormous injustice it would be to slap down all organized labor in order to get at one disturber, John L. Lewis.

I think the conduct of John L. Lewis has been perfectly reprehensible and that it constitutes one of the ugly pages of American history. I share the general indignation over his contemptuous flouting of the Government and his defiance of public opinion.

I can understand the anger of the people against Lewis but in the face of this wonderful record of accomplishment by labor, I regret to see the great body of honest, hard-working, patriotic laboring men suffer on account of the sins of one man, John L. Lewis. In taking their stand against legislation at this time the war advisers undoubtedly had in mind this magnificent production record and a fear that legislation might injure the war effort by affecting the workers' morale.

All of our military advisers have opposed the passage of legislation which would be construed by labor as being aimed at labor in general and I agree with them. There is ample authority under the administration's war powers to put John L. Lewis in his proper place and hold him in check. All that is needed is the exercise of authority already vested in the executive branch. Legislation is not necessary to take care of John L. Lewis.

I do not believe that we should allow a tide of emotionalism to obscure the paramount duty which all Americans owe to stand together back of our leaders in a united war effort.

Ever since the United States was plunged into war by the attack on Pearl Harbor I have felt it to be my duty to support those who are responsible for the conduct of the war. This I have done in every conceivable way and without stint. I want to defeat Hitler and his unconscionable associates as soon as possible, so that people may breathe freely again

and that the earth may be a place where men may live in security without being eternally terrorized. As a member of the Appropriations Committee I have supported our war advisers by voting every dollar of appropriations necessary for war purposes. When all of the officials clear down the line who direct the war asked us not to pass antilabor legislation because they believed it would have a harmful effect on the war effort, I could not part company with them and do something which they believed would be injurious to the prosecution of the war. I cannot escape the conclusion that it is my duty to stand by the Commander in Chief and his War Cabinet, with Donald Nelson, who is in charge of war production, the War Department and the Navy Department, and with all of the other war advisers who are responsible for running the war at a time when every ounce of unity and strength is needed to pull us through this desperate war, in the outcome of which is involved the peace and security of mankind and the perpetuity of our free institutions.

Grade Labeling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of June 8, 1943:

GRADE LABELING

"Grade labeling" is a term which is not altogether clear to us. It is an Office of Price Administration device to eliminate brand names. It was first applied January last to canned grapefruit. Now there is talk of extending it to the entire 1943 pack of canned vegetables and fruits. Later it may be applied to petroleum and other products. In principle it is vicious.

This is the most serious threat to the Pennsylvania oil industry which has come to our attention for years. The life of this industry depends upon the superiority of its lubricants, especially motor oils. Because of this superiority one-third of all the motor oil ordinarily consumed in the country is processed from Pennsylvania crude, although this amounts to but 2 percent of the country's crude production. To destroy the grade distinction of this motor oil would be to destroy its exceptional quality in the public mind.

Advertising Pennsylvania brands is the very essence of their public acceptance. This would be true of any commodity with merit. Desire is created by informing the public of qualities and prices. There are stiff laws to protect the consumer from misrepresentation. Now that the public has been taught to accept advertising at its face value along comes an important Government agency which assails the basis of this advertising, leaving the consuming public at the mercy of those who market inferior products.

Resignation o Dr. J. K. Galbraith from the Office of Price A ministration is supremely significant in this connection. With the moral support of Mrs. Roosevelt, Dr. Galbraith has been waging a battle for this radical change in American business practice. One of the New Deal tenets is that advertising is an economic waste. This is a view generally taken by professors of economics who had no experience in business, who do not realize that advertising creates markets and that the greater the consumption the greater the production necessary to satisfy the desire. One of the characteristics of depressions is the increasing decline in consumption due to curtailment of advertising.

Let us suppose that some government agency would issue a decree that there is no public necessity for advertising various brands of Pennsylvania motor oil; how long would public faith in this lubricant continue? Suppose that this led to public acceptance that there is no essential difference between Pennsylvania motor oil and any other motor oil; what would become of our Pennsylvania refineries, the millions of dollars invested in them and the communities depending for their support on those refineries? What then would become of the more than 80,000 wells producing crude in the Pennsylvania area?

We are now dealing with but one commodity. Apply it to all products and the effect would be devastating. This war is not going to last forever. If in peacetime advertising is not used to stimulate consumption we will have depressions of greater intensity than we ever had before.

The great trouble with shallow-pated economists is that they never think things through. They are addicted to snap judgment. They cannot see beneath the surface. American newspapers and magazines have stood in the way of their disastrous theories for the past decade. Because of this they feel that advertising support must be taken away from the American press.

Congress should watch the grade labeling propensity of the Office of Price Administration. It is an extracurricular activity of a body which was established solely for the purpose of keeping down the cost of living, and grade labeling is utterly foreign to this activity.

Do You Understand?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a letter purported to have been written by a boy under arms on Guadalcanal to his family, reprinted in the Daily Times, Mamaroneck, N. Y., from a bulletin of the North Newark Kiwanis Club:

DO YOU UNDERSTAND?

Any comment on the letter reprinted below would be superfluous verbiage. The letter is a sermon in itself.

This note purportedly written by a boy on Guadalcanal to his parents was forwarded to The Daily Times by Harry F. Flowers, leader in the Larchmont Community Chest and Red Cross War Fund campaigns. Mr. Flowers was impressed by the simplicity of the letter which was contained in a bulletin of the North Newark Kiwanis Club of which he was at one time a member. It follows:

"Dear Family:

"It is pleasant to hear from you after such a long period of time, but it is unpleasant to learn of your changed condition of living which I can more readily understand from the change of my own conditions.

"It is too bad that you are limited in the use of your automobile. I know how it is to walk through miles and miles of swamp and jungle. So I understand.

"It is too bad to have your choice of food limited. I have experienced this too, except there is no choice here. So I understand.

"It is too bad that Willie has to work so many hours a day at the defense plant. I have to work night and day at our defense plant. So I understand.

"It is too bad Willie has such little time for amusement. I am deprived of amusement, too. So I understand.

"It is too bad that you have to wait in the rain for transportation. I have to wait in the rain on post and my transportation and my destination are uncertain, too. So I understand.

"It is too bad you are being paid so little for working so hard. I only get a fraction of your pay. So I understand.

"Winning this war is hard on all of us. You work long hours and so do I. So I understand. But during these hours I get shot at.

"Do you understand?"

Subsidies No Cure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal and Courier, La Fayette, Ind.:

SUBSIDIES NO CURE

Virtually all farm organizations in the land are opposing the Government's plan to pay subsidies to meat producers, processors, and handlers in an effort to control the cost of essential food to the consumer. The administration, however, insists upon putting into practice this scheme which nearly all economists agree will only serve to hasten the day of destructive inflation for which this latest Washington folly purports to be a panacea.

From another angle, Henry Toben, of Rensselaer, president of the Indiana Aberdeen-Angus Breeders' Association, sums up the case for the beef cattle men in the following paragraph:

"This proposed program of reducing the retail price of meat through a subsidy from the Federal Government is detrimental to the meat industry. It may bring about further confusion in marketing, lower live animal prices, and eventually decrease the available supply of meat. The subsidy can only be paid through additional taxation or additional borrowing."

The argument that payment with borrowed money is a means to prevent inflation is basically unsound. To make such payments from borrowed funds would, itself, be inflationary. The new move is an admission that the whole price situation is out of hand;

that the powers that be in the Capital lack the courage to come to grips with the fundamental problem of inflation.

Subsidization would be wholly ineffective as a remedy for the evils that are bringing us nearer and nearer to economic disaster. It would also present the insurmountable problem of distributing the money equitably among the producers, processors and handlers of food. Billions of dollars would be added to the public debt for future generations to pay at a time when we cannot hope for the prosperity we have now. It would be another long step toward totalitarian government.

Because Congress on many occasions has indicated its opposition to such food subsidy payments, the administration is attempting to use a back door to obtain necessary funds from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation and other agencies designed merely as lending agencies. It was never intended that such Government corporations should make outright gifts with no chance of repayment. Even if subsidies should be warranted, there would be no justification for their payment through Reconstruction Finance Corporation or other Government agencies as a means of circumventing Congress and avoiding a request for an appropriation.

Inflation is creeping upon us insidiously. It can only be controlled by fundamentally sound and courageous methods of attack. Firm controls are needed as never before.

A Fine Tribute to a Fine Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS LUDLOW

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, all who know Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, regard him as an outstanding man among men. They are impressed by his genuineness, his sincerity, and his love for humanity.

On February 20 last, a fine 19-year-old boy of my home city, Arthur Baxter Gipe, of Indianapolis, was inducted at Fort Hayes, Ohio. He was sent to Fort McClellan, Ala., early in March, where he was stricken with spinal meningitis in a virulent form, and on March 24 he died.

Arthur Baxter Gipe had a world of friends, and his untimely death caused great mourning in our city and brought to the parents of the dead boy a flood of letters and telegrams of sympathy.

Among these was a letter from General Marshall, the Chief of Staff. Addressed to Mr. and Mrs. James C. Gipe, of 3501 Spring Mill Road, Indianapolis, the letter said:

My deepest personal sympathy goes to you in this time of sadness in your home.

There are few words which would be helpful in your sorrow, but I hope you may find consolation in the knowledge that your son, Arthur B. Gipe, has made the great sacrifice in order that Americans may continue to live as a free people under a government of their own choosing. He died while serving as a soldier of his country. More cannot be said in honor of his memory.

Again, with deepest sympathy, faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

Mr. Gipe replied as follows:

Mrs. Gipe and I were sincerely touched by your letter expressing your personal sympathy to us over the loss of our son, Pvt. Arthur B. Gipe. Your tribute in honor of his memory we shall cherish always.

It is a tremendous sacrifice which we, with thousands of other American parents, are paying, and it is my prayer that this time our purpose shall be so completely accomplished that the horrors of war will not be passed on to the next generation.

May God bless and direct you in the tremendous task that is yours.

Commenting on the letter of the Chief of Staff, Mr. Gipe said:

The thing which impresses me most of all about it is that such a letter would never be written in Germany or Japan.

When Duty Calls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED ROWE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, any attempt to embellish the message hereafter printed, a privilege of a Member of this House, would almost profane its sacredness.

Sgt. Stuart Shannon Hulse, a former resident of Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, entered the service of his country about the time the vicious attack was made upon us by our enemies.

He was a dreamer of and loved God's handiwork. He possessed a poet's soul and a patriot's spirit. While stationed in England, he wrote the following poem in July of 1942. On April 17, 1943, while at his post as an aerial gunner on an American bomber in action over north Africa, he made the supreme sacrifice by giving his life for the cause so well stated in his poem.

I want these remarks, together with Stuart Hulse's poem, to be a part of the RECORD, from this time, when the hearts and patriotism of freemen are severely tried, henceforth so long as records remain of our great Nation and its gallant soldiers.

Fate decreed that this boy would speak to us from beyond the portal in the written words, titled, "When Duty Calls."

WHEN DUTY CALLS

We've laid aside our peaceful tasks,
We've packed our kits and gone to war;
We loved those things we left behind
But loved our country even more.
Those peaceful streets where once we trod
May never know our step again,
But though we lie in foreign ground,
Almost forgotten by all but God,
We rest in peace because we know
Transgressors' heels shall never grind
Our country's flag into the dust.
We know, because we made it so.

The lad whose hands have milked the cow,
Whose hands have guided straight the plow,
He did not shirk when duty called,
But gladly gave his life, his all,
To keep Old Glory in the breeze,
We loved the murmur of the brook
That flows between the mountain slopes,
The golden moon that softly smiled
As if he shared our secret hopes.
We loved the whisper of the rain
Upon the roof tops overhead,
The gentle breeze from off the lake,
And summer's sun when winter fled.
We sacrificed those things we loved,
When country called were glad to go,
That future peoples shall be free,
We know, because we made it so.

The lad whose hands made tools of steel,
Whose hands have held the big truck's wheel,
He did not shirk when duty called,
But gladly gave his life, his all,
To keep Old Glory in the breeze.

And those of us that do return
To resume the tasks we left undone,
We'll not forget our fellow men
Whose souls have joined the setting sun,
But as we toil our thoughts will stray
Back to the buddies we fought beside,
And to their deeds of valor done,
While we murmur a prayer for those that died.
The price we paid was not too dear,
For as the years shall come and go
The flag of freedom will always fly.
We know, because we made it so.

The lad whose hands were strong and sure,
Whose hands were endowed with the power to cure,
He did not shirk when duty called,
But gladly gave his life, his all,
To keep Old Glory in the breeze.
—*Stuart Shannon Hulse.*

Mr. Speaker, his parents wrote, saying, "We pray that his great sacrifice will not have been in vain."

Flag Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL A. WEISS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, Old Glory, the greatest emblem of freedom in the world—a symbol of truth, equality, and justice—is threatened with extinction. But this is only a threat, and we can avert it by working more, loafing less; producing more, consuming less; praying more, talking less.

Monday, June 14, is Flag Day, and although America is busily engaged in producing planes, tanks, guns, bombs and shells for over half the world, let us take time to pay tribute to this grand emblem by displaying Old Glory in the shops, mills and homes everywhere. I feel honored that while a member of the State legislature I was the author of the Flag Day bill in Pennsylvania, the first State in the Union to honor Old Glory legally.

My distinguished colleague from Alabama, Representative SAM HOBBS, a great American and national vice president of the American Flag Day Association, introduced House Joint Resolution 303 to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the Flag of the United States of America which I am sure will be observed.

Another great American who has fought practically a lone battle to have Congress make June 14 a national holiday is William T. Kerr, national president of the American Flag Day Association for over 45 years, and he deserves the praise of all loyal citizens of this country. As part of my remarks, I am happy to include a frank appeal by William T. Kerr to make Flag Day, June 14, 1943, the greatest birthday of Old Glory. Yes, as Mr. Kerr says, let's "make it a great force for victory":

From present outlook probably by June 14, 1943, someone from nearly every United States family will be in some national defense service. With millions of our sons, grandsons, fathers, brothers, husbands in combat ranks offering their lives to their country under Old Glory, with many others including women actively aiding, therefore Flag Day, 1943, will be and should be the greatest anniversary of our flag in our Nation's history. On that day we should blanket the Nation with a display of the Stars and Stripes from every home, public building, school house, and assembly hall. Every American flag, large or small, displayed will be an appeal for national unity and real true Americanism. In World War No. 1, 66 nationalities were represented in our forces for never was an army in history under any other flag made up of such diverse elements as our first American Expeditionary Force that went over to aid the Allies. History is now being repeated and our boys are fighting side by side with other nations to preserve our freedoms, they to preserve their national life, we to keep and hold ours while aiding others, but in all of it we should not forget that our national banner, the Stars and Stripes, adopted by Congress, June 14, 1777, is our very own and as such deserves every honor and tribute, since it represents all our people of every race, color, and creed.

For almost 50 years the American Flag Day Association has promoted the celebration of Flag Day—even before it was generally known as Flag Day—and this year, you are urged to plan now, in your own way, to celebrate Flag Week, June 8 to 14, especially Flag Day, June 14. Up to and including 1916, Flag Day, June 14, was the only day emphasized, but in 1917 during the first World War, we inaugurated Flag Week, June 8 to 14, in Pittsburgh, so the flag's birthday anniversary might be celebrated, if desired, at their own regular meeting places by organizations meeting during that period, daytime or evening, particularly public, private, or parochial schools, women's clubs, fraternal bodies, etc.

Presidents, Governors of States, mayors of cities, and various other community executives have issued proclamations from year to year. President Roosevelt and many Governors have done so this year (1943), too.

While only Pennsylvania made Flag Day a legal holiday—we trust other States will do likewise—we are hopeful that our National Government will soon give it congressional recognition. However, President Woodrow Wilson on May 30, 1916, really made Flag Day, June 14, a continuing unofficial holiday when he said: "I, therefore, suggest and request that throughout the Nation, and if possible in every community, the 14th day of June be observed as Flag Day * * * this year (1916) and in the years to come."

We urge that you help make this year's Flag Day celebration the greatest ever held, every community doing its share to preserve the inheritance bequeathed to us by illustrious forefathers. It offers great opportunities for flagpole raisings, flag presentations, public patriotic meetings, and rallies. It will aid in keeping up a high standard of spiritual and patriotic morale while our boys are at the front.

Religious bodies which meet Saturday, June 12, or Sunday, June 13, should have their leaders preach patriotic-spiritual sermons, and where Sunday schools have Children's Day programs, to combine patriotism with their religious exercises, for we are a God-fearing Republic.

In these trying days, the celebration of Flag Day is an opportunity to show our patriotic, spiritual loyalty to and rededicate ourselves, if necessary, to our Nation and our American institutions. Will you help—for your country?

O. P. A. Is Wrecking Poultry Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 7, 1943

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this House, I deem it my duty to call your attention to the problems confronting the poultry industry of our country, as a result of ill-advised and destructive policies instituted by the Office of Price Administration. Following these remarks, under leave of the House, I am including a statement made by Mr. Robert F. Thurrell, president of the Northeastern Poultry Producers Council, in which the difficulties of the poultry industry are outlined in detail.

We, in Congress, are primarily interested in securing a maximum production of all types of food for the armed forces and for civilian needs. To accomplish this objective, we must secure the adoption of regulations which are reasonable, and at the same time, conducive of encouraging production. Existing directives and regulations of the O. P. A. are discouraging production of poultry and eggs, increasing black market operations, and rapidly forcing many poultry producers and dealers to go out of business. Congress should not tolerate what is going on, and I hope that a large majority of the membership of this House will join with me in dealing with the problem when the O. P. A. appropriation bill comes up for consideration next week. We must act before it is too late.

The statement of Mr. Robert F. Thurrell follows:

POULTRY AND EGG PRICE CEILING REGULATIONS BY THE NATIONAL POULTRY DEFENSE COMMITTEE AND THE NORTHEASTERN POULTRY PRODUCERS COUNCIL

We regret that it is necessary to come here asking for help in straightening out the confusion in our industry just when it appears that your boys and ours are about to start one of the most important battles in world history. At the outset we want to make it clear that this impractical and un-American social reform hooked on to price control can easily make us a hungry nation. And then where will our food be in writing the peace?

The success of farmers in this country to produce the necessary food will depend upon how well we handle the problems of animal feed supplies, farm labor, farm equipment, and finally price control of our products. We shall deal here only with egg and poultry meat prices.

EGG PRICES

During the early part of the defense effort we were asked to increase egg production. All of the goals were reached. Then we were asked to further increase production, and unless we run out of feed the 1943 goals will be accomplished.

The temporary freeze order of October 2, 1942, established a ceiling price of 55½ cents a dozen for the grade of specials on the New York City market. The accompanying table shows that eggs remained at this ceiling level until December 21, 1942, when larger supplies brought the market down. Here was a ceiling level in effect with supply and demand operating normally. The ceiling price was adhered to even though egg prices would have gone up another 6 to 8 cents during the fall.

Now, on March 6 a so-called permanent egg order was issued which provided prices which the retailer could pay. The prices were named for every week in the year.

Immediately egg prices rose from 3 to 4 cents a dozen on the terminal markets. Speculation ran wild because the order stated the price for the eggs coming out of storage.

Previous to this year the Food Distribution Administration managed the dried-egg problem. Office of Price Administration regulations have made it almost impossible for anyone to handle the egg drying demanded of us, which is 400,000,000 pounds for 1943. When Food Distribution Administration was fully responsible for dried eggs, prices were reasonable, there was no interruption in the normal movement of eggs, and the industry was pleased.

Our top egg people in Food Distribution Administration never saw the present Office of Price Administration egg price ceiling until after it was approved and announced to the public. Speculation took eggs away from the drying plants, where they were and still are needed. Therefore, the Department of Agriculture has had to issue an order which allows them to requisition all the eggs in storage, and even then we may not produce our dried egg requirements.

History of egg prices, New York City quotations, October 1942 to March 1943

Date	Price per dozen	Price-control action
1942—Oct. 3	$0.55	Temporary freeze order announced.
Oct. 10	.54¾	
Oct. 17	.54	
Oct. 24	.55	
Oct. 31	.55½	
Nov. 7	.55½	
Nov. 14	.55½	
Nov. 21	.55½	
Nov. 28	.55½	
Dec. 5	.55½	
Dec. 12	.54	Egg prices declined normally.
Dec. 19	.52½	
Dec. 26	.52	
1943—Jan. 2	.52	
Jan. 9	.48	
Jan. 16	.40½	Confusion over egg-price regulations to follow.
Jan. 23	.45	
Jan. 30	.39½	
Feb. 6	.38½	
Feb. 13	.41	
Feb. 20	.40½	
Feb. 27	.40	
Mar. 3	.40	
Mar. 6	.41	New egg regulation announced to public.
Mar. 10	.42	
Mar. 13	.42½	
Mar. 17	.43	
Mar. 20	.44	
Mar. 24	.43	

Briefly we have had the following circumstances take place in the egg industry:

1. The temporary freeze price of 55½ cents New York City was respected.

2. When supplies increased, egg prices went down.

3. As soon as the regular order was issued March 6, prices went up 3 to 4 cents a dozen.

4. Speculation ran wild and egg-drying plants could not get enough eggs to operate at capacity during the period of heavier production.

5. The United States Department of Agriculture found it necessary to requisition all eggs in storage, many of which are there because of speculation.

6. During all of this period, producers throughout the country were pleading for ceiling prices at consumer levels only and to have dried eggs out of the Office of Price Administration price order and in the hands of Food Distribution Administration. We were always told that the industry never made any practical suggestions, but we were actually making a recommendation which had worked last fall and winter.

It is our understanding that an amendment to the egg order has been prepared and is awaiting official signatures. After 2 days of hard work our people finally learned that this amendment is to establish ceiling prices at all levels, from producer to consumer, the very type of regulation which helped to create black markets in poultry meat.

If this amendment becomes effective we will have a black market on eggs more vicious than on any other commodity in the country because the dried egg program will take all storage eggs and because of the unusually heavy consumption due to a scarcity of all foods. Furthermore, Office of Price Administration does not have the personnel and some other things to enforce any order on 6,000,000 farms.

These over-the-ceiling prices, usually called black markets, will cause the collapse of our many cooperative egg-marketing organizations throughout the country. There will not be anything for them to handle, and, frankly, that would create a complete breakdown of price control in this industry.

Regarding subsidies, this industry never came under any of the incentive or reduction programs, and most emphatically does not want to now. We believe that subsidies are not necessary for egg and poultry producers, as the record shows. We are afraid, however, that the confusion, the black marketing, and the theoretical ambitions of Office of Price Administration might offer some people in Government an excuse to try to pay subsidies to our people. We expect that a substantial sum of such money would be returned if it were paid directly to producers. Furthermore, if conditions get so bad that incentive payments are necessary, a large number of producers would go out of business.

Many of us from coast to coast have been conferring with Office of Price Administration representatives, both locally and here in Washington. Plenty of the local officers could not interpret the long, complicated regulations and are not in sympathy with them.

Our experience here in Washington convinces us that there are many economic reforms woven into these orders which would eventually take us all over. These economic dreams are coming from men who have never been in business, and we believe we have a big enough job to win this war without suffering the shock of industry destruction. We know that when the American farmer is convinced that there is no scheme to bind us all into collective farming under rigid and complete Government control then, and only then, will our producers have the sincere desire to do their full part. We have had opportunities to do our share.

We did it well and will do it again without so much theoretical assistance.

Tonight we are asking our American Congress for help which we believe your committees can give, not only to this industry, but to all of agriculture.

1. We ask for immediate action to place the price control agency for our products in the hands of the War Food Administration. When this is done, this industry is prepared to work with that agency in developing a program of price control which will be supported.

2. As soon as this is accomplished we ask that a separate poultry branch be created in the Food Distribution Administration so that our industry shall have the necessary recognition.

3. We do not want subsidies and do not need them if treated fairly.

4. When the responsibility for food price control is placed in the hands of agricultural people and a practical program developed we are prepared to publically ask producers to support the program and to pledge our cooperation to the consuming public.

As egg and poultry producers, we have stated our case; we are asking for the privilege of doing our job the American way—may we have your immediate cooperation?

POULTRY MEAT

A revision to Maximum Price Regulation No. 269, issued December 18, 1942, established ceiling prices on all classes of poultry meat from producer to the consumer.

This regulation, 22 pages in length, was so complicated and confusing that the distributors and processors of poultry could not interpret it, and farmers did not receive copies of the order until some weeks later.

Careful checks throughout the country show that consumers had no idea of ceiling prices for the poultry meat which they purchased; in fact, a high percentage of the housewives did not even know there was a ceiling-price regulation for this commodity.

In spite of these circumstances, the industry showed a patriotic desire to comply with the order. However, when repeated requests for relief from all branches of the industry were ignored many persons lost faith in this work of the Office of Price Administration. At the same time so-called racketeer buyers came into the picture and prices higher than the ceilings became the rule rather than the exception.

Further complications arose. The regulation did not provide for storage charges and the large quantity of dressed poultry placed in storage during the fall months moved out in December and January. Normally this poultry is used throughout the winter and early spring.

The actual operations of this order are as follows:

1. It was too complicated to understand, and most farmers had no means of calculating their individual ceiling prices.

2. Consumers did not know that there was a ceiling price on poultry meat, or at least did not know any actual figure.

3. No storage allowances were granted, and all storage poultry disappeared just when the scarcity of beef and pork products became more serious.

4. By this time producers were so disgusted with the complicated situation that many sold their poultry for the high dollar and have continued to do so.

5. The legitimate processors and distributors had but one of two courses to follow, since he could not get sufficient volume of poultry at ceiling prices to remain in business without a loss. He either closed the business or went into so-called black-market operations. We are proud to say most of the essential people in this trade did not go above ceiling prices. There are about 25 cooperative live poultry auctions in the Northeast, including Ohio. The volume at these sales at present is from 15 to 20 percent of normal. If this does not improve these sales will be discontinued.

Obviously these conditions seriously disrupted the normal movement of poultry meat. At the request of producer groups, the Office of Price Administration selected an all-industry committee to work with them and the United States Department of Agriculture on revisions of both the poultry and egg orders. A committee of 24 persons met here late in March. The poultry regulation was discussed for a full day, revisions suggested, etc. The following day it was announced that an amendment had been written and was awaiting signature.

This amendment finally came out April 22. It reduced the price of some classes of poultry to the growers. This was done by placing broilers, fryers, and light roasters under the same price classification, because previously in the black markets lower priced poultry was being sold in the higher classifications.

Again the practical result of all this is less and less regard for price control and enforcement.

Ever since price control became a part of our economy we have observed a complete breakdown of ceiling price enforcement. No order will be of any value unless it is enforced. In actual practice such regulations do more harm than good.

Poultry meat producers the country over want practical price control to stop inflation. We therefore ask you as agricultural representatives of our Congress for immediate action on the following:

1. That the necessary legislation be enacted as quickly as possible to place full and complete responsibility for price control on our products in the office of the War Food Administration.

2. That such legislation make it possible for the establishment of simplified price ceiling orders which will be workable.

Without such action on your part we believe that confusion will continue to exist in our industry and such confusion does harm to the war effort. We believe further that your committees can render this valuable service to American agriculture.

The Country Depends Upon Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an extract from a speech delivered by Mr. Beardsley Ruml, treasurer of R. H. Macy Co., and chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, before the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Chamber of Commerce on Tuesday evening, June 8, 1943:

During the discussions of recent months about the pay-as-you-go income-tax measure the public has watched the operations of the legislative process with unusually close attention. Inevitably, as a result of the ups and downs and delays, Congress has come in for a lot of criticism. In spite of this criticism, some of which was just and some of which was not, it is a good thing that in this country we have a Congress to work with.

This does not mean that Congress is perfect, or even that as a democratic legislative body it is not susceptible to the improvement

that comes with the passage of time and from the lessons of experience.

Some of this improvement must come on the initiative of Congress itself. Change and modernization of rules, precedents, and procedures should be undertaken, changes that would not weaken the essential integrity of the representative process, but that would make it less clumsy and more effective, more nearly in fact as we picture it as an ideal. The initiative for these changes must come from Congress itself, because in Congress is to be found the wisdom, the intuitive sense of balance, and the authority that can bring helpful reforms into being.

But there are some things that Congress cannot do alone, that require the initiative and support of the people generally, the citizens whom Congress serves.

I think we must recognize that membership in Congress is the top legislative job in our very important country, that it is therefore a very important job both for our country and for the world.

I think we must recognize that membership in Congress has become a full-time job, not a job that can be fitted in between crop seasons, or between law cases or while a partner can handle the business alone. The time required in Washington has grown to be and will continue to be extensive, and the time at home is fully occupied with duties that arise from legislative responsibilities.

I think we must recognize that membership in Congress requires unusual talents of intellectual equipment, energy, courage, and the rare ability to make oneself acceptable to a constituency through the operation of our democratic process.

We should also encourage Congress to provide itself with much more adequate technical and professional services. Congress has not made the provision for its own needs that modern times require. As a result it has been too dependent on outside experts, occasional and fortuitous consultation, and on the permanent establishments of the administrative branch. These good sources of information and suggestion should not be brushed aside, but Congress should have its own technical services fully equipped to handle problems as the recognized servant of Congress. Such services could be built up in a number of ways. For example, the Library of Congress lends itself admirably to important extension and development. In time, it might become the cornerstone of a national university of a special type, a great institution of learning, serving the people generally and at the same time available to the Members of Congress and responsive to every technical need.

We must give due attention to our representative process and the measures and attitudes that may strengthen it. Our economic and social problems are exceedingly important, but we need not for that reason neglect our legislative institutions, on which so much depends, as we move on to extend and enrich our democracy.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following copy of a Memorial Day address delivered May 31, 1943, by Rev. Arnold Brink, Ph. D., associate minister of Bethany Christian Reformed Church, of Muskegon, Mich. I heartily commend to my colleagues the reading of this inspirational message because of the basic soundness which permeates this thoroughly American utterance:

On Memorial Day, as we stand surrounded by the hallowed memories of our valiant dead, our minds inadvertently turn to that greatest memorial address of our history, and to these significant words from that address: "That we here highly resolve, that these dead shall not have died in vain."

I am sure we understand what Lincoln meant. Soldiers go to war to fight for something. They want to be able to return from war's carnage to see something of those ideals accomplished. If they must return and live to see the disillusioning reality that those ideals have not been realized, they know that they have struggled and offered their lives in vain.

There can be very little question in our minds now but that the honored dead of 1917 and 1918 did die in vain. Not because they did not know what their ideals were. Not because they did not win the victory that should have brought those ideals to pass. Neither was it because the American citizens did not know what those ideals were. It was because we did not really believe in them. One of our great national martyrs was the man who had to return from the treaty negotiations to find that his nation had forsaken his ideals; Woodrow Wilson. The trouble was, we did not "highly resolve"!

It has repeatedly been brought to our attention, that unless the private citizenry is thoroughly aware of our war aims and definitely convinced of their necessity and worth, we are going to miss attaining them, even though we are successful in gaining a military victory.

It seems clear that the most widely accepted statement of those aims is contained in the Atlantic Charter, and especially as focused in the "four freedoms." I can think of two ways in which we can lose these freedoms and are losing them even while we struggle to secure them.

We can lose them [illegible] them to be gradually pared away until they can be extracted painlessly from our way of life. Or we can lose them by so grotesquely misinterpreting them that we find that instead of the real thing we are defending a hideous caricature.

One of these freedoms is freedom from fear. Democracy means by that freedom from fear of our fellow man and of the secret illicit power he can seize and exert. Are we gradually losing that freedom? Everyone knows that so long as we are fighting against a nation that is armed to the teeth and with all its power centralized in one man, we can only hope to fight effectively by granting extensive wartime powers to our President. We are not afraid of losing democracy during wartime. But who will deny that we are becoming increasingly afraid of not getting it back when victory morning dawns? Who will deny that there is widespread impotent fear of the increasing dictator way of thinking? Who will deny that we are growing suspicious of our fellow man and his intentions. Who knows but what the national emergency will simply be prolonged indefinitely after it is really past?

Walter Lippmann has phrased it well when he said that it is not so much that we fear that President Roosevelt intends to abuse the powers given to him, but we fear because the unfolding of this same program in other nations has invariably led to the same "dead-end street," where they woke up one morning to find that a military dictator had taken over the government. We fear because there are pressure groups driving wedges precisely in that direction.

In his first press conference following the November elections, the President had a little joke with the newsmen to the effect that he was surprised to find the polls open. Now, no one assumes that the President meant that he expected to halt the election. But could he have done it? Would we simply have acquiesced? Would it really have made any difference to us? Were we interested enough to use the polls when they were open?

Today fourth-term balloons are going up, and no one is blushing about it. I beg to be excused from expressing any political loyalties, but isn't it time that we realized that no person except God Himself can be trusted to hold office that long?

But if we are to gain and hold freedom from fear, we must be sure what we mean by it.

To many, freedom from fear means freedom from fear of anything. Not only of men but even of God. Freedom means to them freedom to do as we like, absence of restraint, freedom from all tradition, all authority. To such people freedom is measured by the pile of discarded inhibitions. Anyone who would die for such a disemboweled ghost of freedom is a fool.

To others this freedom means freedom from fear of sin and from the old notions of sinful human nature. The current idealism about the holiness of man has gone to such ridiculous heights that we assume as a matter of course that all he needs is to be educated to do right and he will be so inclined. The hue and cry from such impractical idealists is to reeducate our enemies after the war. The very war we are in should have taught us differently. We taught the Japs in droves in our universities, only to see them twist that education into deceitful weapons that they stabbed into our back. Such lack of realism on the part of a supposedly Christian nation is utterly inexcusable. Long ago a person who knew more about us than we will ever know said clearly that even God can't do anything by repairing human nature as it is. "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

We want to secure for all men freedom from want. We cannot help being a little suspicious of mere men who sit down in a luxurious hotel to guarantee freedom from want. We will be pardoned if we express the thought that perhaps these floods and this unseasonable weather are the Almighty's way of reminding us that there are a few things reserved for His control.

Since the Garden of Eden there has been a world in which there could be relative freedom from want sought and won in the sweat of our brow and tinctured with a good deal of sincere consideration for our fellowmen. Democracy has met that principle by another; equality of opportunity. But the new approach is to substitute for equality of opportunity with hard work, equality of possession with strict regimentation of the forces of supply and demand.

Every step of our Government in that direction, as a settled policy, is a step away from democracy and toward communism. When we say that we are not calling names. Our guards against communism are dropped of late because American Communists have a smooth way of suggesting that any criticism of communism is sabotage against the war effort, because it might involve a great ally of ours. All of which is, of course, arrant nonsense. Even Joseph Stalin distinguishes between nazi-ism and Germany. We must distinguish between communism and Russia. Of course, we want Russia to win. We would want that in any case. She deserves to win. She is the victim of deceitful aggression. We want her to win so much we will pray for her, which is more than the Communists will

do; Russia will win, but not because of communism, but because of Russian patriotism.

We do not want communism any more than we want nazi-ism or fascism. Let us be fearfully wary of this gradual painless whittling down of age-old democratic principles. We can never have anything but want if freedom from want must be determined by dictatorial control. Even Russia has learned that much.

But once more we are likely to lose this freedom, too, by misinterpreting it.

Centuries ago, the Bible tells us, people used to send their children through the fire to an ugly oriental idol called Moloch. Today too many of us are doing the same thing—sending our boys through the fire—on all the world's battle fronts. What do we promise them on the other side of the fire? Things, things, and more things. Plastic automobiles, television sets, an airplane in every family hangar. Sending our children through the fire to Moloch, but now he's made of gleaming plastic.

Will we never learn that satisfying physical wants is not enough? Unless we go back to God and have Him do something for the soul hungers, mere things can only be a fearful curse. Why else do strong men cower from machines that roar through the air and mothers dig like moles to escape searing chemicals that fall from the clouds? Unless man is put right, material things can only continue to veer crazily out of control.

We are fighting to preserve freedom of religion. When the Atlantic Charter was drawn up it was assumed that American democracy was guaranteeing that. Is it? Read that section of the National Selective Service Act that deals with the conscientious objector. Now the fact that we recognize such a one goes back to the Constitutional principle that no man may be imprisoned for his religious belief. Lest I be misunderstood, let me make clear that I am not defending the logic of our conscientious objectors. I have been convinced of the need of this war and I am frankly suspicious of those who plead religious scruples in order to avoid the physical hazards of battle. But that's my opinion. No one may be jailed for contradicting it. The Selective Service Act provides that objectors may be escorted to an objectors' camp provided they are accompanied by prison guards.

There are other things that lead us to say we must keep a weather eye on Washington and its methods of supporting the Bill of Rights.

No one can estimate the spiritual strength that has been given to our Republic by its hosts of small church-supported colleges. Most of our national leaders come from them. But if the present policy continues, to centralize all collegiate reserves in the large, least-religious institutions, those small colleges face a direct blow against their freedom to exist. Too long already have the large State-controlled institutions been dictating policy and even textbooks to their smaller contemporaries.

When a minister graduates from his church school, immediately his study is flooded with pseudo-religious propaganda originating in Washington.

Can any Government be neutral on religion? Of course not, no more than an individual can. Is our Government neutral. Certainly not. The result is that public education is dominated by a certain religious philosophy. That State religion accepts evolution as scientific fact, and treats the Bible as a mixture of truth and folklore, and accepts as representative of American Christendom the voice of a Federal council that is not representative and which plays traitor to the convinced faith of the vast mass of ecumenical Christianity. Religious liberty? Not so long as a government has to guarantee it.

Nor do we want to lose freedom of expression. Talk founded our democracy and talk preserves it. Only dictators thrive on public silence. Just as soon as talk is choked off in schools, political rallies, union meetings, on the radio, the street corner, in the barber shop, and the church, totalitarianism has thrust its mailed boot over the threshold.

We are quite willing to accept during wartime the predigested "news" from the Office of War Information. But there was a "national emergency" long before the war. Let us beware of a prolongation of it, far, far into the era of peace?

But the danger against free speech is more insidious. It is again a warped, caricatured form of true freedom. This is the widespread belief that truth and falsehood, wrong and right, are not absolute, but relative Anyone may be right and no one is entirely wrong. Truth is not determined by correspondence with reality but by utility. Whatever works is true. Thousands of Japs sat in our university classrooms and heard that philosophy expounded. They took notes on it and took their notebooks home to Japan and read them over and over until they had learned the lesson well and then proceeded to put it into practice—on December 7, 1941.

Pearl Harbor was just a case of our American agnosticism coming home to roost!

Were the Japs right? Were they? Their plan worked. It had utility. How can Hitler be wrong and we right? How can the Axis outrage the conscience of the world when that conscience may have two billion variations, all equally true?

Our real enemies are not out there or out there. They are the intelligentia that we have nursed like serpent eggs on our bosom.

Fortunately for them and us, our boys in the battlefields don't believe their sly propaganda. Colin Kelly, the Doolittle flyers, the precious expendables all over the world were narrow-minded enough to believe that they were right. They said, "Before God, we are right, and in the name of God we will die for the right!"

"That we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain."

"Though the cause of Evil prosper,
Yet 'tis Truth alone that's strong;
Though her portion be the scaffold
And upon the throne be Wrong,
Yet that scaffold sways the future,
And behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadows,
Keeping watch above His own!"

Thank you.

Making the Laws Understandable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address which I delivered over station WHN, New York, on Tuesday evening, June 8, 1943:

I am grateful to Mr. Paulin and to the management of station WHN for giving me this opportunity to speak to you this evening and to give you a brief explanation of the work of the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives, of which I am chairman. It is through the operation of this committee that the public laws enacted by the Congress each session are rendered available to the public and to the bench and bar of the country. We have adopted as the slogan of the committee in this work that "making the laws understandable is as important as making the laws," and we like to consider ourselves as a sort of liaison office between the lawmaking body and the citizens so that the vast number of laws necessarily enacted each year will be made available to you in such form that you can more readily understand their meaning and effect.

The tremendous task of governing over 130,000,000 people in the complexities of our modern system of business, professional, and personal life naturally requires numerous new laws and amendments to or repeal of existing laws each year. Without intending to burden you with figures, I should like to mention in passing so that you may form a mental picture of the volume of such laws, that for the last 10 years there have been enacted an average of 400 public laws each year.

It is one of the functions of the Committee on Revision of the Laws to codify the general and permanent laws of the United States and of the District of Columbia, and to incorporate such laws into two complete bodies of existing law known as the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code, respectively. Each of these codes contains all the general and permanent laws presently in force—no matter how long ago enacted—arranged according to subject matter, with the effect of amendments to such laws indicated, so that you and I need not have recourse to over 50 chronological volumes of the statutes but may find all the law on a particular subject in its appropriate place in the Code. The 1940 edition of the United tSates Code, together with the supplement containing the laws of the 77th Congress, contains all existing general and public law classified under 50 different subject titles and consists of almost 25,000 sections. Similarly, the 1940 edition of the District of Columbia Code, together with the current supplement contains the general and permanent laws applicable only to the District of Columbia arranged under 49 subject titles.

I think you may be interested in hearing some of the examples of ancient laws which we unearthed in preparing the 1940 edition of the District of Columbia Code and which were deemed to be still in effect because of the wording of a statute prescribing precisely what colonial and early legislation should remain in force in the District of Columbia.

First, there was a law which had been enacted in 1731, during the fourth year of the reign of King George II providing that "all proceedings * * * shall be in the English tongue and language only and not in Latin or French" and imposing a forfeit of $133.33 to any person who shall sue for the same, in case of an offense against such law.

Another statute enacted more than 7 centuries ago during the ninth year of the reign of Henry III provides that a widow may remain for 40 days after the death of her husband "in the chief house of her husband unless that house be a castle; and if she depart from the castle then a competent house shall be forthwith provided for her."

There was also a law which was deemed to be still in force permitting an appeal, in certain cases, directed to the King of England. By one of those coincidences which sometimes enlivens the ordinarily dry routine of law making the present King of England and his charming Queen arrived in Washington the very day after I had introduced a bill to repeal such provision. Because of my Irish ancestry I was subjected to some intense though good-natured jibes by the press. To carry the coincidence to its fitting

conclusion the bill was adopted unanimously by the House of Representatives on March 17—St. Patrick's Day.

Some time ago a candidate for election as a Member of the House of Representatives more or less seriously included in his platform a program of repealing one Federal law a day. There are, of course, many laws still in force today which should be repealed because they have become obsolete, superseded, repealed by implication or otherwise of doubtful force. With this situation in mind I have personally introduced several bills in the House of Representatives intended to repeal several hundred sections of law so that we may have a simplified body of existing law free from duplications and redundancies, and obsolete or superseded sections. I have also instituted a program of rewriting the code of laws of the United States, title by title, repealing prior laws and creating a framework of existing law within which future legislation may be drafted with the assurance that all the statutory law on the particular subject matter is contained within that title of the code.

Such a task is of course a monumental one and no single Member of group of Members of Congress having the multiplicity of duties which our modern system imposes can devote all the time which such a project requires. I believe that there should be created, as provided for in a bill now pending before the House Committee on Accounts, an office of law revision counsel whose function would be the revision of each of the 50 titles of the present United States Code and the preparation of bills to enact such revised titles into positive law at the same time repealing prior laws on the same subject.

In revising the laws it should be the goal of the revisers to achieve a simplicity of style and a method of expression with a minimum of words in order to present the laws in such fashion that you and I, as average citizens, may read and understand them without the benefit of any specialized training or education. Of course, since the laws frequently deal with technical and complicated matters and since it is essential that there be no ambiguity in the language of the statute, it is necessary frequently to use technical phrases and expressions which are not part of our every day conversational language, but there is sometimes a tendency among lawmakers to overdo this. A very simple illustration of the wa in which unnecessary wording can be el inated is the case of a law authorizing a public officer to do a certain act. This is sometimes worded as follows: "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is authorized and directed to * * *," whereas the same result could be achieved merely by providing that "The Secretary of the Treasury shall" thereby expressing as accurately in 6 words what often has required 15 words.

The question of incorrect punctuation is also a source of real difficulty in the drafting of statutes which has, on more than one occasion in the past, proven extremely costly. Many years ago in the preparation of a tariff bill which was to provide for exemption from the payment of tariff on fruit trees imported from South America, through an inadvertance the clerk who prepared the bill for the printer inserted a comma instead of a hyphen between the words "fruit" and "trees," with the result that for some time before the error was discovered, all trees and all fruits imported from South America were admitted duty free, whereas it was intended to exempt only a limited type of trees.

The Committee on Revision of the Laws has been one of the standing committees of the House of Representatives since 1868, when it was established to report bills revising and codifying the laws. Shortly thereafter, all the then existing permanent and general laws of the United States were classified according to subject matter, and embodied in what was called the Revised Statutes of the United States. At that time there had been only 17 chronological volumes containing the text of the laws enacted since the First Congress, whereas today there are 56 such volumes, many of which consist of double volumes. There was no office or committee in Congress charged with the duty of keeping the Revised Statutes up-to-date, with the result that after 50 years we were without an accurate, official body of laws.

To correct this situation, the Committee on Revision of the Laws, in 1925, prepared the first Code of Laws of the United States, containing the general and permanent laws in force at that time and has since kept the code up to date by means of cumulative supplements or new editions.

For most practical purposes, this code is the only usable source of the law as it exists today, since each of the subject titles of the code contains the text of the law regardless of the number of amendments or changes which may have been passed since the basic law was enacted—and in some cases there have been dozens of such changes. However, for use in courts of law, under our present system, the only method of proving the text of the law is by referring to the chronological Statutes at Large, and, of course, where the basic law has been amended a number of times, it becomes a difficult physical task to produce in court each of the volumes of the Statutes at Large containing such amendments and piece them together to show the present status of a particular law.

In order to remedy this condition, the Committee on Revision of the Laws has reported favorably four bills which I prepared and introduced, each designed to revise and enact into positive law a separate title of the present code, which is termed, in legal phraseology, as merely prima facie evidence of the law. I have also prepared three additional bills relating to other titles of the code, and it is my fervent hope that these three bills, together with the four which were adopted unanimously by the House of Representatives last year, will soon be enacted into law, so that these seven titles of the code will no longer be merely prima facie evidence of the law but actually the positive law itself. Then all future legislation could be drafted with the assurance that all existing law on these particular subjects was contained in a particular title of the code and could be appropriately numbered according to title and section so that upon enactment it would have its proper place in relation to other laws on the subject.

You will agree with me, I hope, that making the laws understandable is as important as making the laws.

America's Aviation Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 2, 1943

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the problems and potentialities of our country's aviation future have been presented recently in an admirable manner through an address by Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, president, Air Transport Association of America, before the Foreign Commerce Club of New York City, May 19, 1943.

In Congress, and throughout the country among thinking people, there is a wholesome desire for information on the absorbing subject of what tomorrow will bring to America and the world from the standpoint of the advancement of air power, translated in terms of peace rather than the impact of war.

Believing the address of Colonel Gorrell to be an important contribution to the subject matter, I include excerpts, as follows:

In 1784, George Washington wrote to one of his friends in France commenting upon the balloon ascensions which were then the rage in Paris. He said that the tales of these ascensions "lead us to expect that our friends at Paris, in a little time, will come flying through the air instead of plowing the ocean to get to America." In the same year Thomas Jefferson listed the probable uses which the invention of balloons might have in the future, and, first among these uses, he placed "transportation of commodities under some circumstances." Likewise, in the same year Benjamin Franklin wrote: "Five thousand balloons, capable of raising 2 men each, could not cost more than 5 ships of the line; and where is the prince who can afford so to cover his country with troops for its defense as that 10,000 men descending from the clouds might not in many places do an infinite deal of mischief before a force could be brought together to repel them?"

These early observations bear witness to the fact that the development of aviation has been eagerly anticipated in America throughout our national life. Indeed, the first letter carried by air anywhere in the world was directed to Benjamin Franklin, transported in a balloon which crossed the English Channel in 1783 with an American as one of its occupants. And mail was carried by air in this country for the first time over a hundred years ago, in 1835. As a matter of fact, in the 1860's a company was actually organized to conduct a regular air transportation business between Philadelphia and New York.

Now, after many years of alternate discouragement and revival of hope, those who have dreamed so ardently of realizing the ultimate destiny of aviation as an established and commonly accepted means of transportation are about to see their dreams come true. Experience during the quarter century since the inauguration of air-mail service by our Post Office Department on May 15, 1918, has offered convincing evidence that air transportation is here to stay and must be vigorously developed. Yet, both in government and in private life, those who have had a clear appreciation of the compelling need to develop America's aviation swiftly and extensively have been relatively few in number until the very recent past. But today that appreciation is shared by everyone—by millions of boys in our armed forces who witness daily demonstrations of the miracles which aviation can perform, and by millions more of their families who are anxiously awaiting their safe return. And with this generally shared appreciation, the only question is one of ways and means.

Our first assumption must be, of course, that the United Nations will gain the victory and gain it in an effort united to the end which will promise real hope for comradely cooperation among those nations in the years to come. But in making that assumption we would be foolish to believe that we can safely divert our attention and our energies for one moment from the task which must remain first and foremost—the task of winning the victory. We would be equally foolish were

we to believe that cooperation among nations is to be had for the asking; it can come only if we are willing to cooperate, ready to give as well as to receive.

There is no reason for not giving consideration to all possible means for aviation's best development, including Government ownership, management, or operation in the field not only of foreign commerce but also of domestic commerce. Aviation is too important to the future welfare of America to foreclose from serious consideration any possible means for its best development, and unquestionably there is a certain apparent simplicity about governmental ownership, or management, or operation, which must have a strong appeal, especially to those who have only recently become acquainted with many serious and difficult problems which the development of aviation presents.

But let us hope that responsible persons both in and out of Government will not fall victim to the human tendency to which I have referred, and will not too readily assume that because the problems of aviation may seem to them new and in many respects unique, it is necessary to seize upon some entirely new and untried instrument for aviation's best development. And, by all means, let us hope that those who will be responsible for many of the fundamental decisions which may irrevocably affect aviation's future will not overlook the experience gained in the 25 years since the Post Office Department first speeded the mail aloft from Washington's Polo Field, and will not forget that a great fund of knowledge is stored in the minds of men and of companies, long active in every field of aviation, who have met and surmounted difficulties in the past far more severe than problems yet to be encountered.

Direct governmental intervention in the ownership, management, and operation of air transport enterprise has been familiar in European countries, yet, as we all know, the progress of America's aviation in both domestic and foreign commerce has led the world. It has been estimated that in 1938, the last pre-war year, the total number of aircraft of all the European companies, aside from Russia, was less than 900. In the same year scheduled American-flag air lines, exclusive of the lines in Alaska, had approximately 350 aircraft, and the carriers in Alaska during that year operated an additional 155 airplanes. And many of the aircraft of the European air lines were of American manufacture. Thus the showing of our Nation, compared with the showing of all of the European air lines all over the world, was favorable, to say the least. And other indexes of development, such as numbers of passengers or passenger-miles transported, or volume of operations per fatality, would disclose a record even more favorable to American-flag air transportation in the world picture. For instance, the very significant index of passenger-miles per route mile operated showed a record for United States air carriers, domestic and foreign, in 1938 four or more times better than that of the European companies. And to take our domestic carriers alone, the showing was so much better that there can hardly be any comparison.

I suggest such a comparison not in a spirit of boastfulness or jingoism, or to detract from the admittedly great accomplishments of our brother aviation enterprises in Europe, but rather to remind that the means which our Nation has adopted in the development of aviation did not prove wanting during those years when aviation enjoyed none of the advantages of widespread popular support and interest which now appear to have come to it. Those years, moreover, represented a period of sheer difficulty in the development of aviation which, relatively, will make the future seem halcyon days, indeed.

This is not to say, however, that aviation has reached a stage of stability no longer requiring the sparkle and ingenuity of private initiative. Quite the contrary is true. What has been accomplished in the past is the solution only of certain basic technical problems and the development of certain basic techniques of operation. There lies ahead not only further technological improvement but also the great task of commercial development, the task in which American private initiative is peculiarly fitted to excel. Ahead of us lie such problems as that of devising new methods of packaging cargo, which promise to provide huge savings in time and in cost, and to effect profound changes in the habits of shippers. Ahead of us lie such problems as that of modifying the needs of businessmen with respect to the maintenance of inventory, which will be greatly affected by the speed of air transportation. Ahead of us lie such problems as that of creating new distribution centers in the domestic and international flow of cargo traffic. Ahead of us lie such problems as that of formulating improved cargo rate structures, tailor-made to the needs of shippers and avoiding some of the past mistakes in other fields. Ahead of us lie such problems as that of working out new methods of solicitation for, and servicing of, cargo traffic, applying the many lessons we have learned in the solicitation of passenger traffic and combining the best features of experience in other modes of transportation. For tasks such as these there is hardly any question but that private initiative is best fitted.

Our private air transport organizations, built up through so many years of hard experience, are functioning today even more effectively than ever before. The impression apparently went abroad about a year ago that the airlines were being virtually taken over by the Government. This was not the case then, it is not true now, nor is there any prospect that the demands of the war will require any such move in the future. On the contrary it has been the deliberate effort of the Government—and that includes the Army—to avoid any such step.

The fact is that the private air-line organizations today are larger than ever before. Despite necessary curtailment of airplanes in regular common carrier operations, a great variety of additional transport and related services have been undertaken by the air lines at the Government's request and are being discharged by them, here and abroad, with the dispatch and efficiency which the Nation has come to accept as a matter of course from the airlines. Those same airline organizations will be ready on the instant to carry out with equal dispatch and efficiency the responsibilities of peace-time commerce when this bitter war has been won.

I turn now to another question, bearing on the means for aviation's best development, which is presently before the Congress. In the Lea-Bailey bill, pending in both House and Senate, it is proposed that Federal regulation be extended to all air commerce whether between points within a single State or between points in different States. Few steps to assure the sound development of aviation are essential as this. The reason is to be found in the special characteristics of air commerce. The speed of an airplane, even were it to move no faster than surface vehicles, would be much greater than the speed of surface transportation because it is able to move directly to its destination unimpeded by surface barriers. And bear in mind that even the pre-war airplane moved at a rate often five or six times faster than ordinary surface transportation.

The speed of the post-war airplane will be vastly accelerated. Aircraft in actual use today, developed in notable instances as a result of planning done by the air lines and by the air lines and the War Department jointly prior to the war, make many of the pre-war airplanes seem primitive. Indeed, we are in the midst of a tremendous technological development the full impact of which will not be felt upon commercial plane design until the aircraft factories are retooled. Every type of airplane, small as well as large will be vitally affected, and the whole aviation industry will have to adjust to speeds far in excess of the pre-war rates.

Constitutional lawyers have long speculated concerning the possibility that the air space has never been subject to the jurisdiction of the several individual States. It is suggested that, since new domain can be acquired only through actual use and possession, the domain of the air overlying the individual States was not subject to their sovereignty when they entered the Union. Consequently, when the air space became utilized through aviation, full jurisdiction was vested in the Federal Government, just as would be true were we to discover new territory.

However the constitutional theorists may speculate, there is no question but that the practical necessities of aviation's best development require regulation by a single jurisdiction exclusively—and in our system that can be accomplished only through complete Federal regulation. It is inconceivable that the air space of our Nation should be divided into 48 parts for the purpose of regulation, with the regulations of a 49th jurisdiction added on top of the 48 others. In the case of surface transportation there are doubtless good and sufficient reasons, both of history and of economics, for a system of this nature; but in the case of air transportation, such a system would amount to a Balkanization which could redound to the benefit only of those whose interest is best served by impeding aviation's development.

But it would be impossible so to conduct air commerce were there to be multifarious regulations by the individual States dealing with such matters as rates, securities issues, accounting practices, scheduling, and the technical requirements and qualifications applicable to pilots and planes. Not only would such a system of multi-regulation gravely impair the efficiency and resources of the industry, but it would make virtually impossible the rapid mobilization of the industry for any purpose, at any point, at any time, in the national defense such as it is now capable of accomplishing. It is the sober fact that under such multi-regulation, many things done for our country's defense in the field of transportation by air since Pearl Harbor either would have been impossible or would have been possible only at the dangerous cost of time-consuming arrangements with many State and local government bureaus coupled with deliberately winking at legal requirements. We are able to appraise the likely barriers to the use of air commerce in the national defense which would arise from individual State regulation because of the experiences during the past year and a half in other fields, especially in the motor-carrier field. In such fields there is undoubtedly real need for State regulation which justifies such cost as there may be in loss of efficiency in certain instances. But no such need exists in the case of air commerce.

There is another problem in connection with aviation's development for the future, in the interest both of commerce and of the national defense, which is basic. That is the assuring of a strong aircraft manufacturing industry. If we leaf back through the pages of history to the post-war years of the early twenties, we will be struck by the fact that our country, for a time, lagged dangerously behind other nations of the world. Our aircraft manufacturing industry during the First World War had a record which, relatively speaking, was fully as brilliant as its record during the present conflict. In November 1918, the rate of aircraft production in our factories exceeded 23,000 a year. In fact, our

industry during its 19 months of war produced aircraft which exceeded by more than 50 percent England's production during its first 31 months of war.

Yet, in the immediate post-war years, our aircraft manufacturing industry was virtually forgotten. To an alarming extent, the experience and the resources which it had acquired during the war were dissipated almost at once. Had it not been for the courage, the will, and the fighting hearts of a few brave men among our aircraft manufacturers, some of whom, happily, are still with us, reaping the honors which are their due, it may be doubted whether America today would be bringing to bear upon the most dangerous enemy in history the most effective air bombardment which man has yet conceived.

One among other reasons that the manufacturing industry suffered so seriously after the last war was the failure to assure a reasonably immediate demand for those products. It was many years before the second-hand and converted military airplane had ceased to occupy a dominant place in America's peacetime skies.

So far as our air lines in domestic and foreign commerce are concerned, it is to be earnestly hoped that they will come out of this war with sufficient financial resources readily available so that they can immediately—literally without a day's delay—begin giving the manufacturers necessary large-scale orders which will be so important to a proper transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy for the manufacturing industry. There has been some question from time to time in the past whether the policies adopted by the Civil Aeronautics Board would make it possible for the air lines to provide such orders to the manufacturers promptly and on sufficient scale. I do not have the time to discuss here the role of the Board in this matter, or to appraise the adequacy of its past policies. However, as I am sure the Board itself fully appreciates, its role in this respect is of critcial importance and, in connection with the determination of matters such as depreciation policies, it is in the Board's power either greatly to facilitate or seriously to cripple the important contributions which the air lines can make to the maintenance of a proper aircraft manufacturing industry.

No man today can tell very much about the kind of world, politically or economically, we will be living in 10 or 20 years hence, and my slight reading of history leads me to suspect that many of the most important changes in world politics and economics have occurred while people were talking about something else.

After this war is over the manufacturing industry will face the same danger which nearly destroyed it after the last war. It is imperative that steps be taken to assure that history will not repeat itself.

It is probable that many types of military aircraft could be converted to inefficient commercial usage. It is even probable that in certain regions of the world such converted craft might be operated for certain purposes reasonably well. But, despite the appearance of immediate saving in initial cost, the attempt to utilize converted military aircraft on any appreciable scale in this country or on our principal world trade routes would be a gross mistake—a mistake not only from the standpoint of the essential interest of the Nation in a sound aircraft manufacturing industry, but also from the standpoint of efficiency of transport operations and long-run economy.

The industry has not been able as yet even to hazard a guess as to its likely equipment requirements during the immediate post-war years. It is certain, however, that the figure of 500 new aircraft which we were discussing in the latter part of 1940 will seem insignificant against the numbers of new aircraft which should be absorbed in our commercial systems after the war is over. A recent study made for the National Resources Planning Board estimates an increase in the traffic of the domestic air lines during the post-war years exceeding by more than 1,200 percent the traffic of those lines in 1940. This estimate undoubtedly errs on the conservative side. Even, however, with this conservative estimate, coupled with the great development in American-flag air transportation in foreign and territorial commerce, and the substantial demand for aircraft which can be encouraged in the field of private and miscellaneous flying, it is evident that a potential demand is available among American sources alone which, with proper planning, can assure the maintenance of a sturdy manufacturing industry.

Moreover, no man can predict today with any particular accuracy what kind of traffic, or in what volume, will be flowing to given points on the earth's surface 10 or 20 years from now. And I venture to say that no man today, however wise he may be, can devise a set of abstract principles to be categorically followed in the development of our international aviation or in the negotiations which our Government will have to undertake with other countries. Our international problems will, I feel sure, be intensely practical. Moreover, their shape will change from day to day. If anyone believes that he can prepare a suit of clothes for our international aviation at this time and expect it to fit tomorrow or the day after, he has much more confidence in his judgment than I have in mine. I suspect that a great many of the issues now being agitated in public discussion, and to which it is felt answers must be demanded, and demanded overnight, simply cannot be answered in the abstract, and apart from the specific circumstances which will arise from time to time in the future. And I, for one, suspect that we may very well find in the terms of the present Civil Aeronautics Act, for our country at least, all the answer that can or should be made at this time to some of these issues. However much it may comfort the mind to be certain and precise, I suspect that many of the problems about which we are quite properly concerned are not susceptible of certain and precise answers.

It is extremely important that our Nation be prepared to treat with other nations, respecting aviation's future. Certainly we ought never again to approach an international negotiation of aviation matters as ill prepared as we were at the end of the last war.

Production of Crude Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK A. BARRETT

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the critical situation with reference to the production of crude oil is apparent to everyone. The price of oil has not increased materially in the last 5 years. On the other hand, the cost of production has steadily increased through wartime conditions. The crude oil is now selling at about 60 percent of parity. By reason of this condition, and in view of the fact that oil is of such strategic importance in the prosecution of the war, the position of the O. P. A. in denying a reasonable increase in the price of crude oil is beyond comprehension. The proposal of the O. P. A. to subsidize new production is a mighty poor remedy, and is wholly unwarranted and unfair both to that great industry and to the taxpayers, as well.

Warwick M. Downing of Denver, Colo., is a recognized authority on oil and gas law in the United States. He has been the Colorado representative on the Inter-State Oil Compact for many years, and is also a member of the committee of the Petroleum Regulatory Authorities, appointed by the Secretary of the Interior. I am especially interested in the following statement issued by him, and particularly in the recommendation that the Petroleum Conservation Division of the United States Geological Survey be increased during the coming year, and also his statement as to the utilization of oil shales. It seems to me that the greatest contribution that the home front can make to the war effort is the assurance of an adequate supply of oil products to our armed forces. However, I fear that an intelligent solution of this important problem is not indicated by the actions of the Office of Price Administration.

UTILIZE OIL SHALES—APPROPRIATE NECESSARY FUNDS FOR THE UNITED STATES BUREAU OF MINES TO DO RESEARCH WORK AND BUILD TEST PLANTS TO DEVELOP OUR OIL SHALES AND COAL AND FOR THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY TO HELP IN THE WORK OF DISCOVERY OF NEW OIL RESERVES

(Statement of Warwick M. Downing at meeting of National Conference of Petroleum Regulatory Authorities in session in the conference room of the Honorable Secretary of the Interior on April 21, 1943)

It is the patriotic duty of all of us to take strong measures to prevent the imminent shortage of our national petroleum supply.

President Roosevelt, in his letter to Hon. William P. Cole, Jr., chairman of the Cole committee, of November 10, 1942, said:

"The immediate discovery of additional scurces of oil is imperative."

Petroleum Coordinator for War Ickes, in Collier's, of August 15, 1942, said, in referring to our oil reserves: *

"The truth is that our oil reserves are low and getting lower. Even if we could be complacent about them, we would have no right to be * * *. During the 3-year period of 1938–40, the United States took 4,250,000,000 barrels of oil out of the ground, and during the same period only 2,500,000,000 barrels of new underground reserves were discovered.

"In 1941 it was even worse. That year we produced 1,400,000,000 barrels and discovered a mere 500,000,000 barrels treasured underground."

According to Petroleum Administrator for War release, in 1942 we discovered 421,000,000 barrels of new reserves. Our consumption was 1,385,479,000 barrels.

Thus, during the last 5-year period (1938–42), we consumed 7,035,479,000 barrels, and discovered new reserves of 3,421,000,000 barrels. The 5-year deficiency is 3,614,479,000 barrels, greater than our production.

Senator ED C. JOHNSON, member of the Senate Committees on the Public Lands and on Military Affairs, said more than a year ago:

"I am told by military experts that if the present war continues 5 years—and it is likely to do so—that there will be an extreme shortage of motor fuel in this country, and that it will be necessary to extract the motor fuel from coal as Hitler is now compelled to do. We cannot afford to lose any battles

and a lot of lives through any preventable shortage of natural resources."

Chairman COLE of the Cole committee, on his retirement after 8 years of service in study of the oil situation, in a letter to the President, dated October 22, 1942, said:

"We are certainly headed toward disaster, Mr. President, if we cannot make provision at this time, for an increased supply of nearby petroleum.

"The time lapse between the search for petroleum and its use where needed, is at least 2 years.

"If we knew that one-fourth of our iron furnaces or steel mills would be out of commission within 2 years, and it took 2 years to build others, we would certainly do something about it, and do it now.

"We do not know that 3,800,000 barrels per day will be the limit for our war needs. Our needs may reach 5,000,000 barrels a day, in which case there is no present prospect of meeting them, and all the tanks and trucks and planes grounded in this country for lack of fuel will be of no account.

"The combination of these facts makes it imperative that many, many years before we have a collapse of our oil productivity, we have a substitute to take the place of natural petroleum.

"We have two stupendous possible sources of petroleum:

"First, the oil shales which are widely disbursed over our country and exist in almost limitless quantities in the intermountain country.

"Second, coal of which we have sufficient quantity for several thousand years, and which can be made a huge source of synthetic petroleum."

The worst of it is that new discoveries are dwindling, and becoming less and less each year. Of course, we are helped out somewhat by extensions to existing fields.

But the truth is that our oil fields today are overproducing, and are not producing enough. William B. Heroy, Petroleum Administration for War Director of Reserves, in a statement to the Interstate Oil Compact Commission on April 3 of this month, said: "There is a normal decline in production from one year to the next of about 400,000 barrels per day in productive capacity"; and also that the initial daily production of wells completed in 1942 was only 259 barrels, as against 1,077 barrels in 1937. He shows that what counts is productive capacity rather than estimated reserves.

Yet we are in the midst of a life and death struggle—how long the war may last, how much greater will be the petroleum needs of our fighting men, no one knows.

Mr. Ickes, at our meeting on April 15, 1942, said:

"That is why it is the solemn responsibility of each of us to see that this oil is available—adequate, ever-continuing supplies of it—this year, next year, and for as many years as this war may continue."

Mr. Ickes, in his Milwaukee speech of January 21, 1943, after saying that the complete fulfillment of the requirements of the military is the main responsibility of the Petroleum Administrator for War, and the task was his, said: "In the doing of it, there cannot be—there must not be—any failure."

We must not take a chance of "too little and too late." If we fail in our duty to our country at this critical hour, if any of us fail, if Mr. Ickes fails, if oil is not available, "adequate, ever-continuing supplies of it—this year, next year, and for as many years as this war may continue," if our war effort is stymied, or even impeded by lack of gasoline, or if civilian morale or war work at home is delayed by a like cause, those of us responsible therefor should be, and forever will be, disgraced, in the eyes of our fellow countrymen.

We have been summoned here by the Petroleum Administrator for War to advise him, to make suggestions that would prevent the awful calamity that begins to loom in the future.

We must remember it takes months and years to discover new reserves, and longer to put them in production.

We have heretofore urged a reasonable price for crude to make possible the necessary exploratory work. Petroleum Administrator Ickes has recently recommended a price increase of 35 cents per barrel. Petroleum is selling at only 60 percent of parity, and is the only commodity selling at less than parity. The average price for 15 years prior to the abnormal conditions caused by the flood of oil from East Texas and Oklahoma, was $1.85 per barrel. Inasmuch as wages have gone up, materials have gone up in price, skilled labor is almost impossible to obtain, and inasmuch as oil is more costly to find and wells must be drilled much deeper than heretofore, it is absolutely impossible for the average independent (who must be relied upon to do the successful discovery work) to hope to engage in any exploratory work whatever, unless the price of crude be raised.

We have asked the Honorable Secretary of the Interior to reduce royalties on the public domain—to the one-eighth royalty, a royalty that is universal in the industry, and have asked him to do everything freely, fully, and without stint, necessary to give every possible encouragement to the development of our public lands.

At our last meeting, we urged the speedy adoption of regulations under the O'Mahoney bill, a splendid law if liberally interpreted by the Interior Department.

We have tried to do our duty fully in our home States.

We are not discouraged, even if our recommendations have not been followed.

Though our recommendations heretofore have accomplished little, we are not here to criticize, nor are we here to discuss the past. We much prefer to praise the great amount of good that has been accomplished. We look solely to the future. All of us should present our ideas for betterment of conditions, and as a body we should recommend measures we think would be beneficial. I am sure Mr. Ickes would not have invited us here, and would not have declared that as a body or as a national conference, we run parallel with the war council, unless he expected us to speak out fully and fearlessly, whatever we may think will be good for our country's welfare.

Therefore, I will present briefly two recommendations:

First recommendation: That the United States Geological Survey, a body of very able scientific men under the direct control of Mr. Ickes, be given the funds to help existing oil fields on the public domain to produce more oil, and to help discover new oil fields.

The personnel of the Survey is splendid. Its job is to conserve every barrel of oil possible on the public domain and on the Indian lands, and by secondary recovery methods and otherwise, to cause all wells thereon to produce the maximum without waste. Its principal job, however, during wartime at least, is to aid the search for new oil reserves. Indeed, nothing can be more important than for the Survey to map and geologize probable oil areas. In years past, it has done such work, and such work has been extremely valuable. The American Association of Petroleum Geologists has recently published a book, Possible Future Oil Provinces of the United States and Canada This book contains an index map showing possible petroliferous areas, which comprise about one-third of Montana, nearly one-half of Wyoming, nearly one-half of Colorado, about one-fourth of Utah, nearly one-third of New Mexico, and about one-sixth of Arizona. In the January 1939 report of the National Resources Committee (predecessor of the present National Resources Planning Board), of which at the time Mr. Ickes was chairman, at page 293 thereof, also appears a map showing possible areas for the discovery of oil and gas. This map shows as possible oil-producing areas, one-half of Montana, two-thirds of Wyoming, more than one-half of Colorado, nearly one-half of Utah, and four-fifths of New Mexico. In both maps the "possible" is the most favorable classification for oil-producing purposes.

No effort in connection with winning the war is more important than that the United States Geological Survey geologize promising sections of this vast area, as well as promising sections in other parts of the United States. Certainly Mr. Ickes ought not to have it said that in his own Interior Department, upon lands under his exclusive jurisdiction, the public lands, waste of oil and gas in considerable amounts should occur. Yet notwithstanding the importance of this work, the Budget of the Petroleum Conservation Division of the United States Geological Survey for the current year is only slightly over $500,000, substantially the same as it has been for some years.

I have examined the Budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and have been unable to find any recommendation for any increase for next year.

Plainly speaking, the United States Geological Survey will not have the necessary money to adequately police the public lands for the prevention of waste; it will have nothing whatever for the expense of mapping and geologizing new oil and gas areas. Yet we see immediately in front of us the growth of an organizations created to aid in the war effort. I refer to Petroleum Administrator for War. This organization was not created until December 2, 1942, an outgrowth of the Petroleum Coordinator's office. Yet by December 31, 1942, it had on its pay roll 1,118 employees in Washington and in district offices. It was given a budget for the present fiscal year of $3,365,000 and an additional $685,000 has recently been requested for immediate expansion activities. I mention this solely for the purpose of showing that when there is need, the men and the money are forthcoming. Certainly there is no greater need than that the United States Geological Survey should be supplied with adequate funds for the purposes I have just set forth. I am advised that an additional $500,000 to the United States Geological Survey would be sufficient.

Second recommendation: That the Bureau of Mines, under the jurisdiction of Mr. Ickes, be immediately given the authority and the money to do whatever is necessary and proper, preparatory to building plants to utilize our oil shale and coal for the extraction of synthetic petroleum.

On April 15, 1942, a little over a year ago today, we passed a resolution which it will be well to quote in full:

"We must not repeat the mistake of rubber. Is it not better to be alert, to plan ahead, to realize that we may have unforeseen events and disasters before final victory? Therefore, among other things, we should begin to get ready to make available for petroleum needs our proven deposits of coal and oil shale, which have all the oil we can possibly need during the war and for a thousand years in the future. We should not wait until the necessary is upon us, until it is too late. We should at least be in the blueprint stage. The Secretary of the Interior should be given the money to enable his scientific men to perfect the necessary processes, already fairly well worked out, and to build test plants."

What has been done about this extremely important matter?

Concerning oil shales, absolutely nothing; not a penny has been spent in research work for about 15 years. The Budget for this fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, above referred to, does not ask for a dime for any such work.

Concerning coal, for the fiscal year 1942-43, $85,000 was provided for land, structure, and equipment for an experimental plant for synthesis of motor fuel at Pittsburgh, Pa., and $80,000 was provided for expenses. The plant has not yet been completed. The Budget before-mentioned, as I read it, purposes to appropriate $85,000 for the next fiscal year.

Dr. Arno C. Fieldner, Chief of the Fuel Service of the Bureau of Mines, in his statement before the O'Mahoney committee on October 12, 1942, concerning the availability and cost of coal hydrogenation for the production of gasoline and liquid fuels, says:

"The small laboratory plant at the Central Experiment Station in Pittsburgh, Pa., should be enlarged to pilot-plant scale so that the necessary data for designing commercial plants may be obtained. Also, there should be intensive research on the chemistry of the processes with a view to producing a product of higher octane value and also at lower cost. * * * The Nation should protect itself from disaster in this field such as has overtaken us in the field of synthetic rubber. Such protection involves the erection and operation of full-scale, industrial-size units so as to solve the engineering problems involved in these processes. * * * The cost of such a pilot plant is estimated at $2,000,000."

Very little is known in this country concerning processes to utilize coal or shale as a source for petroleum products. However, it is believed that Germany obtains at least half of her gasoline and motive fuel from coal. Without such utilization of coal, Germany could probably not have carried on the war, and Russia would have been greatly hampered.

Though in the midst of plenty, we are faced with the probability, or the possibility, of a shortage of oil, the most important material, the most strategic of all materials, absolutely necessary to win the war. We know that our petroleum supplies are dwindling. After the experience concerning rubber, is it possible that our national administration, with its eyes open, and after having been forewarned, will make the same mistake concerning oil? Long before we begin to run short of petroleum we should have completed and thoroughly understood the mechanics of extracting oil from our shales and from coal. When in the midst of a long war, where the issue may depend entirely upon the Nation having the greatest petroleum supply, it is suicidal, and indeed treasonable, for public officials to fail to complete detailed plans, so that when and if the need therefor arises, plants may be started immediately for the extraction of liquid fuel from our coal and oil shales.

This statement will not be complete until I give you briefly the facts and figures which show the immensity and value of our shale and coal deposits, a treasure beyond compare, the greatest of all our national resources.

We have in the United States in our oil shales, 92,144,985,000 barrels of recoverable shale oil. At or close to the common corner of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, shale beds contain 75,131,988,000 barrels of shale oil. These figures were taken from the statement of A. J. Kraemer of the Bureau of Mines to the O'Mahoney committee, on October 12, 1942, concerning the "Availability and cost of production of shale oil in the United States."

Our national coal reserves aggregate 3,180,765,230,000 tons, of which 939,457,443,000 tons are lignite coals, leaving 2,241,307,787,000 tons of higher-grade coal more suitable for extraction of hydrocarbons.

Of the coals other than lignite, Wyoming, Colorado, Montana, and Utah have a total of 1,095,656,254,000 tons, or practically one-half of the total reserves of like coal in the United States. These figures were obtained from the report of the Federal National Resources Committee of January, 1939, of which Mr. Ickes was then chairman.

At the present rate of consumption of petroleum products, our Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado shales would supply our needs for 50 years at the present rate, even if a barrel of petroleum be not produced. A ton of coal on the average will produce more than a barrel of oil. Our coal reserves are sufficient to supply our coal and petroleum requirements for a thousand years.

Dr. Fieldner, in his statement before the O'Mahoney committee, says the estimated cost of producing gasoline from coal varies from 12 cents to 25 cents per gallon. Kraemer, in his statement before the O'Mahoney committee, estimates that crude shale oil may be produced at $2 per barrel. This doesn't include refining.

However, it must be strongly emphasized that very little is known in this country concerning the best methods of obtaining oil from coal or shale. The above costs are based on figures of the past. Concerning shale, open-pit mining, recently developed in our country, may be found practicable and greatly reduce the cost; after intensive research it may be found possible to extract the oil from the shale rock and refine it in one operation and with one heating, thereby reducing cost very materially.

If American ingenuity and American technical ability is put to work on the job, we may be assured that a substitute product will be made available at less, perhaps much less, than the above figures. Scientific men tell me that such cost would be greatly reduced if proper allowance be made for by-products, which, by the way, are of the greatest importance. However, it is not a matter of a few pennies' difference in cost; it's a matter of national safety.

A comparison between the method of obtaining oil by wells from oil sands, and of obtaining oil from oil shales, will be illuminating. Each method takes time. After the first well, it may be 2 or 3 years before the field is drilled up and in production. It should not take any longer to build large plants to treat the oil shales. Both methods are expensive. The cost of the average oil well is more than $50,000. Such wells on the average will not produce 50 barrels a day for 20 years, their average life; but if so, the cost of wells or plant would be $1,000 per barrel per day for a limited time. An oil shale plant, producing 10,000 barrels a day, might cost $10,000,000, though probably less. This is at the same figure, $1,000 per barrel per day. The average oil well requires 161 tons of steel. This is on the basis of approximately 3 tons for each barrel of daily production. Kraemer says that a 10,000-ton shale oil plant would require only 15,000,000 pounds of steel, or at the rate of 1.3 tons of steel for each barrel of oil per day. No estimate is given for steel required in mining, but this would be small. The oil shale method, however, has this difference—a plant once constructed will last for the life of the shale deposit, and there will be no dry holes.

Unquestionably, it is entirely practicable to obtain liquid fuels or synthetic petroleum from oil shales and coal. The cost thereof, according to present knowledge, should not greatly exceed the cost of petroleum if petroleum was priced at parity. The amount of steel required is less. As between coal and shale, it is principally a question of what research will show. But an immense amount of work and intensive research is required to determine the best and most economical methods concerning both coal and oil shale. This work should be immediately started.

In respect to every other industry, the brains of our people have found ways to do the job better and cheaper. If this rule follows with respect to coal and shale, we have the right to expect as good or better products that will sell as cheaply or more cheaply than present petroleum products. The great advantage of obtaining these products from coal and shale is, that the risk of drilling (which, by the way, is becoming a very great risk, with few plums) will be entirely eliminated.

I am told that the necessary appropriation for shale is $800,000, and for coal from $2,000,000 to $5,000,000.

I am not urging that we start now to produce oil from shale or coal. It will never be possible to supplant crude oil or its products by extracting liquid fuels from either coal or shale. But nothing is more certain than that the day will come when our petroleum supply will be insufficient. God grant that day may not come during this war. But whenever it comes, especially if it should come during the war, we should be ready.

WARWICK M. DOWNING.

Later: I have been asked to state the relative advantages as between using coal or oil shale as a source for liquid fuel. My information, briefly, is as follows:

There is really no basis of comparison as the products are entirely different. From coal, through hydrogenation, is manufactured a synthetic substance which may be used as a substitute for gasoline, and perhaps other petroleum products. This, however, is a complicated and expensive process.

From oil shale there is obtained by a fairly simple retort process, what I understand to be a low-grade petroleum or the equivalent thereof. This product may be refined, or may be used without refining for fuel oil. Shale oil is in a sense, petroleum in nature's process of making.

The cost of a plant for shale is much cheaper. The cost of mining is much less. The cost of retorting the shale is much less than the cost of the complicated synthetic process relating to coal. On the other hand, a ton of coal will yield a larger quantity of the product. A serious problem concerning shale is the disposal of the dump rock.

As to the time element, a shale plant, being much less complicated, can be built much more quickly. The quantity of steel required is very much less—1.3 tons for the oil shale plant per barrel of product per day, as against 6.5 tons to 14.1 tons for the coal plant per barrel of product per day. Shale rock has only the one use, whereas coal has other uses. The question of by-products can be determined only by further research. The principal question is one of locality in relation to markets. Obviously, it would be better to build a plant in Pennsylvania for the eastern market, and in Colorado or Wyoming for the Rocky Mountain market. Shale fits in better with a declining petroleum supply. Our petroleum supply will be sufficient for gasoline and lubricating purposes for many years if oil shales supply, wholly or in large part, the liquid fuel demand, and coal is used in its natural state wherever possible. The Bureau of Mines believes that the work concerning both coal and oil shale should be vigorously carried on simultaneously.

Farm Plan for War Production in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES R. CLASON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, as I have listened to the speeches of colleagues about agricultural problems and activities in their various States, which are connected with our great war effort, I have been greatly interested.

Since all of you are vitally concerned with the food program now being carried on throughout the Nation I am sure you will be equally interested in some of the activities of the Federal Department of Agriculture in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Federal agents have been in contact with owners or tenants of 13,140 farms during 1943. These farms contain more than 1,000,000 acres of land. It is particularly interesting to note the increase in acreage devoted to potatoes and the decrease in that used for tobacco, one of our most important crops in peacetime. It is equally important to note the increase in livestock since the war started.

I am including tables and statements which are self-explanatory. Some of them are devoted to the two counties of Hampden and Hampshire, parts of which I have the honor to represent. As these counties also are contributing heavily to the industrial efforts of the national war program, they have additional significance for all of us.

The tables and statements are as follows:

Massachusetts, May 10, 1943, summary of the 1943 farm-plan worksheets for maximum war production

Number of schedules	13,140
Number of acres:	
Cropland	390,691
Open pasture	282,356
Commercial orchard	30,045
Other land	480,755

USE OF CROPLAND	Acres		Percent	
	1942	1943	Plus	Minus
Corn, grain, silage	30,747	31,906	3.6	
Sweet corn	8,904	9,318	3.6	
Small grains	3,822	3,969	3.8	
Alfalfa hay	12,519	14,234	13.7	
Other hay	220,877	227,033		1.2
Potatoes	12,725	16,521	29.8	
Commercial orchard	24,753	24,741		.05
Commercial vegetables	20,564	20,931	1.8	
Essential				
Non-essential				
Commercial small fruits	2,439	2,494	.2	
Commercial bulbs and flowers, nursery	1,011	972		3.9
Home garden	5,850	6,351	8.6	
Tobacco	4,497	3,911		13.0
Green manure crops	18,052	18,888	4.6	
Lumber cut (1,000 feet)	22,952	18,217		20.6
Cordwood cut (cords)	103,670	113,969	9.9	

KINDS OF LIVESTOCK	Number			
	1943	1944		
All cattle and calves	156,893	167,339	6.7	
Cows	104,926	113,437	8.1	
Heifers, 1 to 2 years old	20,484	22,206	8.4	
Dairy calves under 1 year	17,599	17,650	.3	
Other cattle and calves	7,172	6,975		2.7
All sheep	4,689	4,804	17.5	
Horses and mules	11,643	11,388		2.2
Hens and pullets kept for laying	2,610,492	3,340,382	28.0	
Sows to farrow	11,296	12,720	12.6	
Spring (litter)	14,261	17,852	25.2	
Fall (litter)	12,819	16,059	25.3	
Hogs raised	76,645	92,465	20.6	
Chickens raised	5,669,963	6,410,140	26.4	
Turkeys raised	157,675	255,406	62.6	
Broilers raised	2,170,144	3,209,343	47.9	
Ducks raised	370,854	434,538	17.2	
Baby chicks sold	16,412,274	18,824,533	14.7	

Summary of farm production data, 1942 and 1943

	Hampden County				Hampshire County			
	1942	1943	1944	Percent increase or decrease	1942	1943	1944	Percent increase or decrease
Number of farms	1,167				1,693			
Cropland	28,391				51,563			
Total farm land	97,624				151,864			
Corn	2,814	2,534		−10	5,083	5,361		5.5
Alfalfa	918	954		3.9	1,221	1,482		21.4
Other hay	15,523	15,614		.6	24,349	24,071		−1.2
Potatoes	1,113	1,440		29.4	3,761	4,869		29.5
Commercial vegetables	2,076	1,937		−6.7	2,609	2,596		−.5
Tobacco	532	486		−8.7	2,514	2,168		−13.9
Dairy cows (Jan. 1)		7,100	7,762	9.3		10,946	12,063	10.2
All cattle and calves (Jan. 1)		11,325	12,124	7.1		17,448	18,935	8.5
Hens and pullets (Jan. 1)		171,463	228,756	33.4		160,539	231,532	36.8
Sows to farrow:								
Spring (litter)	1,452	1,585		9.2	522	626		19.9
Fall (litter)	813	939		15.5	477	541		13.4
Chickens raised	323,000	376,932		16.7	307,568	436,963		42.1
Turkeys raised	34,169	50,104		46.6	8,364	13,294		58.9
Broilers raised	185,729	210,760		13.5	247,723	537,448		17.0

Massachusetts—Principal soil-building practices carried out on participating farms under agricultural-conservation programs, 1936–42

Year	Tons of limestone	Tons of 16 percent superphosphate	Acres of seedings	Acres of green-manure crops	Number of participating farms
1936	7,677	2,085	4,634	6,268	2,908
1937	32,190	6,015	12,778	14,841	7,318
1938	25,795	6,772	15,445	29,208	7,549
1939	32,277	11,496	14,909	32,148	10,719
1940	42,993	12,496	11,232	34,295	12,222
1941	43,697	16,069	17,257	36,000	12,983
1942 [1]	46,573	17,907	21,936	35,520	18,043

[1] Preliminary.

POTATO AND TRUCK CROP PRODUCTION PROGRAMS

POTATOES

Support prices

In order to encourage growers to increase Irish potato production to meet the great wartime need, the War Food Administration is supporting potato prices in 1943 at a level equivalent to 92 percent of parity. To growers in Massachusetts this means a floor price of $2.25 per hundredweight sacked and loaded U. S. No. 1 for September, October, and November, $2.40 November and December, and $2.55 for January through April 1944.

Production payments

As an added stimulus to potato production a payment of 50 cents a bushel will be made on the normal yield of the acreage planted to potatoes in excess of 90 percent of the individual farm goal, up to 110 percent of the goal.

TRUCK CROPS

A payment of $50 an acre will be made for each acre of approved truck crops (carrots, snap beans, lima beans, beets, tomatoes, cabbage, onions, and green peas) for fresh market in excess of 90 percent of the truck crop goal, up to 110 percent of the goal.

Superphosphate—Northeast division

	Purchased commercially	Total used [1]
1930	137,374	
1931	118,182	
1932	100,104	
1933	100,008	
1934	111,419	
1935	112,199	
1936	123,352	
1937	153,649	
1938	221,596	249,206
1939	220,276	263,276
1940	246,988	339,688
1941	234,347	386,347

[1] Including tonnage furnished by Agricultural Adjustment Agency.

Construction of Liberty Ships

REMARKS

OF

HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1943

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to keep the House advised as to the progress of shipbuilding. The demand has been for ships, ships, and still more ships. I am gratified to re-

port that in the 5 months last past, January, February, March, April, and May, 1943, there have been delivered—and I do not mean launched, but delivered into the service, almost as many ships as were delivered in the entire year 1942. We lack only 35 to equal the record of 1942, and by this time I presume that record has been equaled. The dead-weight tonnage for 1943, for these 5 months, is only 947,610 less than in the 12 months of 1942, and it is believed that very shortly at least the deliveries will be six ships per day instead of five per day as at the present time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with that, I think we ought to pay a tribute to the bravery of the men who man these ships, and I hope that some day, and there is no Member of the House more conversant with that than the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], he will pay proper tribute to those men.

Mr. BLAND. If the gentleman will examine the RECORD for the last several months, he will find that there are several extensions that I have made on that very subject.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the splendid record in ship construction continues. The month of May reached a new height of 175 deliveries. Deliveries from December 1941 to the present are: January 1942, 16; February, 26; March, 26, April, 36; May, 57; June, 67; July, 71; August, 63; September, 93; October, 81; November, 84; December, 121; January 1943, 103; February, 130; March, 146; April, 157; May, 175.

In the 12 months, January to December 1942, deliveries of ships were 746 vessels of 8,089,732 deadweight tonnage, while in 5 months of 1943 deliveries have been 711 ships of 7,142,122. In 5 months of 1943 we have delivered almost as many ships as we did in the entire year of 1942. We only lack 35 to equal 1942. The deadweight tonnage delivered for 1943 has been only 947,610 less than in the 12 months of 1942.

The average number of days for Liberty ships from keel-laying to delivery has fallen from 235.0 in December 1941, for 2 ships delivered, to 56.7 in May 1943, for 120 ships.

By regions, deliveries in May were: West coast, 83 vessels, of 812,500 deadweight tons; east coast, 54 vessels, 631,400; Gulf coast, 24 vessels, 257,300; Great Lakes, 14 vessels, 80,800; and the grand total of deliveries was 120 Liberty ships; 12 C type cargo; 12 coastal cargo; 12 Commission tankers; 3 private tankers; 1 costal tanker; 6 special type; 4 seagoing tugs; 1 concrete barge; and 4 ore carriers, making the total of 175 vessels of 1,782,000 deadweight tons.

The complete list of yards and their deliveries follows:

Shipyard	Number of vessels	Type of vessel
Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala.	2	Tankers.
American Shipbuilding Co., Cleveland, Ohio.	2	Ore carriers.
Barnes-Duluth Shipbuilding Co., Duluth, Minn.	1	Coastal tanker.
Bethlehem-Fairfield Shipyard, Inc., Fairfield, Baltimore, Md.	18	EC2 cargo.
Bethlehem-Sparrows Point Shipyard, Inc., Sparrows Point, Md.	2	Tankers.
California Shipbuilding Corporation, Wilmington, Calif.	18	EC2 cargo.
Concrete Ship Constructors, National City, Calif.	1	Concrete barge.
Consolidated Steel Corporation, Ltd., Wilmington, Calif.	5	C-1 cargo.
Delta Shipbuilding Co., Inc. New Orleans, La.	8	EC2 cargo.
Froemming Brothers, Inc., Milwaukee, Wis.	2	Seagoing tugs.
Great Lakes Engineering Works, River Rouge, Mich.	2	Ore carriers.
Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, Mobile, Ala.	1	C-2 cargo.
Globe Shipbuilding Co., Superior, Wis.	1	Seagoing tug.
Houston Shipbuilding Corporation Houston, Tex.	7	EC2 cargo.
Ingalls Shipbuilding Corporation, Pascagoula, Miss.	1	C-3 cargo.
J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc. Brunswick, Ga.	2	EC2 cargo.
J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc., Panama City, Fla.	2	Do.
Kaiser Co., Inc., Swan Island, Portland, Oreg.	4	Tankers.
Leathem D. Smith Shipbuilding Co., Sturgeon Bay, Wis.	1	Constal cargo.
Moore Dry Dock Co., Oakland, Calif.	1	C-2 cargo.
New England Shipbuilding Corporation, South Portland, Maine.	8	EC2 cargo.
North Carolina Shipbuilding Co., Wilmington, N. C.	11	Do.
Oregon Shipbuilding Corporation, Portland, Oreg.	17	Do.
Pacific Bridge Co., San Francisco, Calif.	6	Coastal cargo
Pendleton Shipyards Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.	1	Seagoing tug.
Pennsylvania Shipyards, Inc., Beaumont, Tex.	1	C-1 cargo.
Permanente Metals Corporation (Richmond Shipyard No. 1), Richmond, Calif.	7	EC2 cargo.
Permanente Metals Corporation (Richmond Shipyard No. 2), Richmond, Calif.	15	Do.
Kaiser Co., Inc. (Richmond Shipyard No. 3A), Richmond, Calif.	6	Special type.
St. Johns River Shipbuilding Co., Jacksonville, Fla.	1	EC2 cargo.
Southeastern Shipbuilding Corporation, Savannah, Ga.	4	Do.
Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa.	7	Tankers.
Walsh-Kaiser Co. Inc., Providence, R. I.	2	EC2 cargo.
Walter Butler Shipbuilders, Inc., Superior, Wis.	5	Coastal cargo.
Western Pipe & Steel Co., San Francisco, Calif.	3	C-3 cargo.
Total vessels	175	

Mr. Speaker, when we recall that the *Patrick Henry*, first Liberty ship, was delivered in Baltimore in December 1941, and that the one thousandth Liberty ship was delivered in May of this year—less than 18 months later—we can appreciate the achievement as stupendous.

The British radio said recently, according to Stockholm reports, that six German submarines which recently left a Norwegian port were sunk by "new means of allied antisubmarine combat," and it is reported that a German admiralty commentator said that the present low in the sinkings of Allied ships by the U-boats was due to an "increase in the operational area," and the growing pressure of the enemy's defenses. Report from the Air Ministry, London, May 30, was to the effect that R. A. F. coastal command planes, operating over Iceland waters, the Bay of Biscay, and waters north of Britain, destroyed five enemy submarine charges and damaged others in a 10-day period recently. Flying Fortresses attacked port installations at the U-boat base of St. Nazaire and military targets at Rennes, while Liberators bombed the U-boat base of La Pallice. All of these reports urge us to increase our efforts.

Rear Admiral Howard L. Vickery, United States Navy, Vice Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, recently declared that the shipyards of the United States have passed the five-ships-a-day mark, and soon will be delivering 6 ships every day for the prosecution of the war. The figures justify his hopes. Admiral Vickery also announced that during the last 5 months the building of tankers had exceeded the tanker sinkings by the enemy. He declared that 15 of the large 16,000-ton tankers were delivered in May and that the shipyards of the country will reach the tanker-construction peak of 20 within a few months. He has pointed out that the combined production of dry-cargo ships have exceeded losses every month since August, and that the dry-cargo fleet now was greater than when the United States entered the war in December 1941; also that the production of tankers has exceeded losses for the last 4 months.

Questioned about reports that the Maritime Commission had steel inventories of 4 to 6 months in shipbuilding yards, Admiral Vickery denounced the report as false and said that the average inventory of all steel was about 2.1 months and usable steel in inventory was enough to last only about 6 weeks. The merchant ship program requires about 530,000 tons of plate per month, he said.

The report disclosed that the first of the oil-carrying concrete barges to be delivered had reached a South Pacific port. The concrete barge program totals 91, and it is predicted that they will be in service in the Atlantic within 3 months.

The Delta Shipbuilding Co., at New Orleans, La., delivered on May 25 the *Robert Lowry* as the one-thousandth Liberty ship in America's bridge of ships over which troops and materials are being moved to carry the great offensive of the Allied Nations.

The spirit of the American Creed will sail the seas when the new Liberty ship, *William Tyler Page*, takes her place in the great Liberty fleet. On May 31 that ship, named after the former Clerk of the House of Representatives and author of the American Creed, was launched at the Bethlehem-Fairfield shipyard and christened by Miss Joanne Cronin, grand-

daughter of Mr. Page. Mr. Page served as executive secretary of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of George Washington.

There has been criticism of the Liberty ship. Admiral Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, knew that there would be, and on February 28, 1941, at an executive session of the committee, Admiral Land answered several questions about the Liberty ships. He said:

I make no protest that the design is not obsolescent, considering the present state of shipbuilding, but there are two reasons for the adoption of this type: (a) Materially shortening the time required for delivery, and (b) noninterference with the Navy program and the merchant-marine program. In other words, when I tell you that you have reciprocating engines, water-tube boilers, or steam auxiliaries, and that they are coal burning, and that they have practically no electrical things in the ship, you can see from the modern point of view that it is obsolescent, but you can also see that it does not interfere with the present program of shipbuilding. It is our intention, and it is being done, to distribute the manufacturing of all the auxiliaries, among plants that have no orders, or little orders on national defense now. In other words, over a half dozen reciprocating engine plants that I know of do not build reciprocating engines for ships any more.

It has been charged that the Commission's technicians erred in taking the position that there were not enough propulsion units of the turbine and gear type to equip the merchant vessels our Nation would require to meet the emergency. That decision was even characterized this year in the House as "the present alibi, but not a substantial one," for continuing to build Liberty ships. A careful study of our shipbuilding program does not bear out that contention.

How sound the Liberty-ship policy of the Commission is fully revealed by the facts. Despite expansion of turbine and gear-building facilities to the extent of $100,000,000 in the United States within the past 2 years, there were, in February, of this year, at least a score of C-type merchant ships—practically completed—lying at fitting-out piers awaiting this type of propulsion machinery. Some waited for weeks. Those ships could not be operated until the turbines and gears are available. Our naval shipbuilders were confronted also by the same bottleneck.

Reciprocating steam engines have been and are continuously available because any first-class machine shop and foundry can build them. There are many such shops throughout the Nation and they are being kept busy. There are few turbine and gear builders and I am informed that they have expanded to their limit, with regard both to equipment and specially skilled manpower. Turbines and gears are a precision job. When the Liberty-ship program was adopted it was a case of Liberty ships or no ships. The Maritime Commission was forced to adopt the Liberty ship program. There was no alternative.

There is ample justification for the Liberty-ship program found in the performance of the Liberty ship to date. Up to this time 1,000 of those vessels have been delivered by our shipyards into wartime service. They are traversing every ocean to every battle front of the United Nations with munitions, tanks, planes, food, supplies—and sometimes men. They are bringing back great cargoes of materials vital to our war production and, in some degree, essential to our civilian use.

While the Liberty ships may not be the best ships in the world, they are far superior to the average ship in the United Nations convoys and can travel faster than the normal convoy speed. They are helping to win this war; minimizing the tragedy in the phrase, "too little and too late." They reach their destinations and deliver the goods. In that they remind one of Abraham Lincoln's reply when asked how long a man's legs should be—"Long enough to reach the ground." In other words, they are doing all they were intended to do—and more.

Records show that Liberty ships already have carried more than 5,000,000 tons of cargo from United States ports to all parts of the world.

In addition, several Liberty ships are serving as training vessels for the Maritime Service and many others have been turned over to the armed forces.

Critics of the Liberty-ship program would not have left 5,000,000 tons of cargo on our wharves until higher-type vessels were available. A gun or a tank on time on the battle front is just as effective, no matter what ship carried it.

American bombers in the battle of the Coral Sea sank Japanese warships with bombs that had been carried to them by a Liberty ship whose keel was laid after Pearl Harbor was attacked. That ship got through to the battle front in time.

Patrick Henry, our first Liberty ship in service, has entered her third year with two long war-zone cruises behind her. On her maiden voyage she traveled 30,000 miles and lost only 3 hours for repair. On one voyage carrying a useful load of more than 11,000 tons she averaged 11.6 knots for about 8,000 miles. Excellent records have been made by other Liberty ships and the American people should be proud of their performances and their contributions to the freedom of the world.

In recognition of the work these Liberty ships are doing, Admiral Land sent recently a telegram of congratulations to the shipyard workers in the plant of the North Carolina Shipbuilding Co., at Wilmington, N. C., on the splendid career of the first Liberty ship, built in that yard, the *Zebulon B. Vance*, and pointed out that the ship has established an outstanding record of service in this war. He said she has eluded submarines, withstood aerial attacks at sea and in port, and resistance ashore to deliver her vital cargoes to United Nation's ports extending from Murmansk, in Russia, to the coast of North Africa; she has traveled approximately 30,000 miles and today, her decks scarred with shrapnel, she is continuing good service in another theater of war. Admiral Land said: "We like to think this ship's sturdy performance is not a matter of luck, but the result of fine workmanship in your yard."

Average-value records of Liberty ships deserving especial recognition are the following:

Vessel	Distance traveled	Average knots per hour	Percent estimated efficiency	Voyage made
F. A. C. Muhlenberg	6,373	12	95	San Pedro to Wellington.
Robert F. Stockton	6,051	11.99	111	San Diego to Noumea.
Philip Schuyler	6,596	11.72	106	San Pedro to Wellington.
James Fenimore Cooper	6,270	11.2	102	Los Angeles to Wellington.
Benjamin Goodhue	6,180	11.9	102	San Francisco to Wellington.
James Otis	6,770	11.93	107	Do.
Samuel Huntington	5,279	11.9	110	San Pedro to Suva.
Theodoric Bland	8,672	11.41	95	New Orleans to Trinidad to Capetown.
George B. Seldon	6,165	11.4	104	San Francisco to Wellington.
Clara Barton	4,214	11.7	117	Los Angeles to Pago Pago.

A Check-up of the Food Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 9 (legislative day of Monday, May 24), 1943

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the able and statesmanlike address delivered by the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, June 8, 1943, before the American Farm Bureau Federation meeting at the Hotel New Yorker, New York City.

Mr. President, I wish particularly to call attention to his nine-point program. The first point is to consolidate all authority over food production under one single responsible administrator. We now seem to have too many cooks and too little food—control is divided nine ways.

Second. He would decentralize the work outside Washington under State, municipal, and county administrators.

Third. He would increase the manpower for the farms, and bring into use forty to fifty million more acres than are in use this year.

Fourth. He would supply adequate machinery and parts for the war-food industry.

Fifth. He would abolish the system of retail and wholesale price ceilings. As he says, "The present price system is stifling farm production. It is not stopping inflation."

Sixth. He would ask the farmers to appoint their own war committees on prices—to be fixed as close to production

as possible—and do a little collective bargaining with them in fixing prices.

Seventh. He would ration foodstuffs so as to balance consumption to production. It only adds to the confusion to ration more food than there is available.

Eighth. He would recognize that processing and distributing food are righteous and necessary callings. We should stop using the O. P. A. to put business out of business in the name of winning the war.

Ninth. He would drop the subsidy program as a solution for either food production or heading off inflation.

Such a system—

Says Mr. Hoover—

will avoid subsidies either to farmers or the trades or consumers. Subsidies will not stop inflation. Subsidies are a delayed aggravation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I propose tonight to make a check-up on where we have got to on the food front.

I propose to explore what happened during the 1942 food year.

I shall then examine the prospects before us for the 1943 food year.

I shall from this experience and the world need state our problem.

And I will make some recommendations for the future.

The strategy of the food front is second only to the military front in winning total war. It is of more importance than the military front in establishing peace. Total wars can be lost on the food front. Failure to recognize the importance of the food front has lost wars before now.

Through the glorious courage and ability of our Army and Navy we are making progress against a most cruel and mighty enemy. We grow stronger on the military front. We must now build up the food front. It should be reorganized again. Our job is not destructive criticism. It is to contribute constructive suggestions. The only thing that counts now is to win victory and secure the peace.

To those who are not familiar with food problems, let me say that our food year is approximately from July when the harvest starts to the next July when it begins again.

THE FOOD YEAR 1942-43

We are still eating mostly on the 1942 production.

Newspaper headlines of official statements from Washington as to our present food year read:

"The most abundant harvest in 41 years."

"Harvest per acre 12 percent above all records."

"There are abundant food supplies."

"The ever-normal granary assures no shortages of food."

"Greatest food production in our history."

"We have more beef cattle, dairy cows, and hogs than ever before."

"Food Administrator says food outlook is good."

This happiness and exultation in Washington did not seem to be reflected in the realistic land of housewives. A few quotations from many thousands of city press headlines over the past 4 months carry less enthusiasm.

New York City: "City facing first famine in our history." "Less than 20 percent of normal meat supplies for 8 weeks." "Shops cannot supply the Government ration." "Prices above ceilings." "One thousand and fifty-five black-market convictions."

"Mayor comes to the rescue and imports 600,000 pounds of potatoes.'

Thus the mayor was lighting up the dark scene with 1 potato for every third person among the 7,000,000 people in New York. The headlines blazed for days over the mayor's having secured 1,000,000 pounds of meat. That nourished each person with a gorge of meat equal to the weight of 2 silver dollars for just 1 meal. The mayor, however, was doing his best to keep up good cheer.

Boston: "A desperate food shortage." "Meat and vegetables nonexistent to thousands of families." "Arrivals lowest in history." "Hundred indicted for black markets."

San Francisco: "Shortage meat and vegetables critical all along the coast." And even in the Food Belt we hear:

Chicago: "Shortage meat, vegetables; black markets all about." "Housewives cannot find meat promised on ration cards."

In Philadelphia, Baltimore, Cleveland, Seattle, Omaha, St. Louis, and a dozen other cities, are headlines of the same import. "Scarcity," "Famine," "Black markets," "Shops closing—cannot get the ration in meats, fats, vegetables."

Somehow all this leads me to the notion that the situation is bewildering.

The statistics are also perplexing. The Department of Agriculture states that the extraordinarily favorable weather at last harvest gave us a 12-percent greater yield per acre than ever before in our history. It shows a greater production of meats and fats than ever before in our history. Lend-lease says we are shipping under 10 percent of our total meats and fats abroad. Office of Price Administration says it has rationed down meat consumption by 30 percent. Seaboard city marketing officials say not half of the meat and fat ration is available in the markets. Perhaps some statisticians can tie these figures together. They might also try to tie up the potato figures. I am aware of all the explanations. But one thing is certain. If the statistics are correct, and I do not challenge them, then some bureaucracy is strangling the flow of food from the farmer to the housewife.

But underlying all this turmoil, there is a fundamental disorder. It may surprise some people to know that in the 7 years between the harvests of 1932 and 1939, through Government restrictions, the acreage in 17 leading crops harvested was reduced by 47,000,000 acres. These 17 crops are about 95 percent of our whole harvested area.

When lend-lease was passed in March 1941, we undertook thereby a vast increased burden of food production. Yet payments to farmers to restrict production were not all removed for the two plantings of 1941 and 1942. By 1942 we had recovered only 9,000,000 of these 47,000,000 lost acres in the 17 leading crops.

During the past year we were saved, and our allies were saved from disaster by the superbumper crop. It is not likely to be repeated soon.

1943 PROSPECTS

However, we have eaten our way to the end of that superbumper crop. We may, therefore, explore the prospects for the next food year that is now just coming on the horizon.

Two years ago, 1 year ago, 6 months ago you and I warned that failure to place food production on an equality with munitions would bring disaster. Last winter the Congress, your organization, all of us, demanded drastic reforms in food control, increased manpower for the farms, and more farm machinery. We wanted to recover more of the 47,000,000 lost acres.

Following this the Department of Agriculture issued a report on "farmers' intentions to plant," indicating an increase of 4 percent in the acreage the coming year over that of last summer. The implication of that figure to the public was a probable increase of 4 percent of food over the super-bumper harvest of last year. We vitally needed an increased production over last year. But to assure this with normal yields, we should have had not a 4-percent increase but a 15-percent increase in planting. However, the use of this comforting 4-percent figure led the country into a statistical paradise. And such is the power of statistics that the demands for reform were flattened out. We were told we were alarmists and something worse.

We did secure part reforms. They were not accepted with the speed of light. But finally the War Department, after unkind remarks, gave concessions by deferring some farm boys from draft. The War Production Board authorized a modest increase in farm machinery. One more agency was added to the eight separate and conflicting agencies dealing with food. It was all too little and too late.

Now let us examine what has become of this statistical paradise of increasing food supply. To present to you an independent view, I have canvassed the agricultural authorities in several leading farm States. These reports indicate that the 4-percent increase is likely to vanish. And the indication is that we shall have a normal, not an extraordinary, yield like that of last year. If so, we will have a decrease in the national grain crops of anything from 10 to 15 percent from that of last year. The outlook for wheat and rye is certainly a decrease of 260,000,000 bushels less than 1942, or at least 26 percent.

We have increased our flocks and herds beyond our ability to feed them without the lost 47,000,000 acres. The agricultural experts are estimating a shortage of 10 percent to 15 percent in full supply of feed for our animals during the next year. We can get some feed from Canada. But it appears that we will have about exhausted the surplus of feed of the whole North American Continent during the next 12 months. Already we are feeding large amounts of wheat to our livestock and we are using it for industrial alcohol. By this time next year we will have little surplus of bread grains beyond our own needs.

Thus our supply of food is declining while at the same time the demand is dangerously rising. And these decreases cannot be blamed upon floods which have destroyed less than one-half of 1 percent, nor upon the weather, for that promises about normal crops. Nor can they be laid upon the farmer.

The American farm folks are the most skilled farmers in the world. They produce more per person than any agricultural people on earth. They have done a heroic job in planting this crop with but little help. In January last they were promised an agricultural army of 3,500,000 city folks. But it has not arrived at the food front yet. They must be there before the harvest.

The blunt conclusion from all this is: (a) Our cities will have less food supply during the next winter and spring even than they had in the last few months; (b) we will not starve; (c) we can, by better organization and by tightening our belts, continue to feed our allies; (d) if the war in Europe should come to an end within the next 12 months, we should have no consequential food supplies with which to meet three or four hundred millions of starving people.

PREPAREDNESS FOR THE HARVEST OF 1944

Remedy for the 1943 harvest year is now too late, as the planting is mostly done. We must begin to build up the harvest of a year from now. That is in 1944.

We still have time to redeem the situation. If it is to be redeemed, we must have far wider vision. We must have drastic changes in national policies.

We simply must take seriously certain elemental facts. We must realize that the major burden of the world's food front falls on the North American farmer and the American consumer. We must realize that in peacetimes on balance, we are a food-importing country and today we are blockaded against many imports. We must furnish extra food to our military forces. We

must ship large amounts of food to our allies to support them in the war. We must realize that there is a minimum level in food for our 130,000,000 civilians without impairing their physical and moral resistance.

And we have also pledged ourselves to hundreds of millions of people in the world that they will be rescued from the terrible famine, which has been brought upon them by a monstrous enemy. Without this action, there will be no peace.

We must realize that this food shortage will last for a minimum of 4, and possibly 6 years. These are stupendous burdens.

THE ANSWER TO HITLER

But we have an answer to Hitler.

We can ration down our own consumption further with good management. And we can make sure that we do not lose the war on the food front if we stop the degeneration in agriculture and bring in a far greater production in 1944. We must do it. Otherwise we are headed for a world trouble. We have the resources to do it.

As a foundation for 1944 we must get all that lost 47,000,000 acres back into cultivation. To do that, our authorities must decide whether they will spare the manpower and farm-machinery manufacture from other activities. And we must begin now or again it will be too late and too little.

REFORM IN FOOD CONTROL

Organizing the food front means far more than just increasing acreage, manpower, and farm machinery. It also requires wise coordination, of prices, of processors, of distributors, and rationing.

A month ago the press reported a spokesman of the Office of Price Administration as saying "food prices and food distribution are out of control." It was denied by another spokesman next day. But the second spokesman had not discussed it with the housewives nor with the farmers. However, when we are fighting a war grief over spilled milk does not make more milk. Our question must be, Where do we go from here?

There is only one course which will clear up this muddle of uncontrolled food prices, local famines, profiteering, black markets, and stifled farm production. That is to abandon the obsolete methods now in use which were proved a failure in other nations in the last war, or are copied from the British whose situation is wholly different from ours. We should start with the system which proved a success under the Americans in the last war and improve it.

And let me say this about food control while we were in the last war:

We steadily increased our food production. We shipped more food to our Allies monthly than is being shipped today. We had no local famines in the United States as we are having now. We had no black markets. We had a people zealous in a moral crusade to help win the war with food, instead of lots of people trying to beat the game. Including the Department of Agriculture, we had only 23,000 paid Federal employees connected with food. Today we have over 120,000. Moreover, food prices rose only 17.9 percent in the 17 months after we declared war in 1917. Washington statisticians admit a rise of 24.3 percent in the 17 months since Pearl Harbor. The housewives will admit a rise of at least 35 percent.

I do not pretend that our methods were perfect in that war. We had to pioneer an unknown field. Results ought to be better in this war and not worse.

A PROGRAM

But what should we do now?

1. The first necessity is to consolidate all authority over food production and distribution under one single responsible administrator. There are too many cooks for too little food. Control of food is now divided nine ways over the Department of Agriculture, the Office of Price Administration, the Lend-Lease, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Army, the Navy, the Manpower Commission and the War Production Board.

The recent addition of the ninth wheel even through so able a man as Mr. Chester Davis as Food Administrator does not make a food administration. The food functions of all these agencies must be moved into his office. He must have the right to hire and fire. The food administrator must today be Secretary of Agriculture. And the importance of food in the outcome of the war and peace should be recognized by his appointment to the new Office of Manpower Mobilization.

2. Decentralize the work under State, municipal, and county administrators. In no other way can farmers' and consumers' needs be adjusted to our varied local conditions.

3. Increase the manpower on the farms to a higher level than before the war and plant forty or fifty million acres more in 1944 than in this year. On this question of manpower I offer a suggestion because we must have more skilled labor on the farms.

Public pressure upon our farm boys to join the forces is very great. They are not slackers and do not want to be called slackers. They do not want their gates painted yellow. They are doing a great and indispensable service. If we are to save this situation, I believe farm boys should be called to the Army from the farms immediately after this harvest; that the farm boys should be called up from industry; that they should be given some military training. Then as many of them as are necessary should from time to time be ordered back to the farms with their uniforms. They should receive their pay from the farms, and not the Army. They should be subject to call in national danger. That would give dignity to their service. They could constitute a great national reserve both for production of food and the direct military effort.

4. Agricultural machinery on an average lasts about 12 years. Theoretically, about 1 year's supply or one-twelfth of our machinery has been used up through suppression of manufacture. It will also require great additions to handle this extra forty or fifty million acres in 1944.

5. Abolish the system of retail and wholesale price ceilings. It begins at the wrong end. Price fixing in a great food-producing country must begin as near as possible to the farmers, and controls proceed from there on by regulation of the trades against profiteering. Prices rose less when this system was applied in the last war than they have under the present retail ceilings. We must regulate the flow of water at the nozzle instead of chasing the drops from the shower.

This present price system is stifling farm production. It is not stopping inflation.

6. Ask the farmers to appoint their own war committee on prices and do a little collective bargaining with them in fixing prices. The so-called parties should be abandoned for the war. Prices to the farmer must include floors as well as ceilings. Prices should be fixed that will take into account labor and other costs, and, above all, that will stimulate production.

Such a revolution in the price system would save a few tens of thousands of policemen. It is difficult to catch an economic force with a policemen any way.

7. Rations should be set to balance consumption to production. It only adds muddle to put the ration higher than the available supplies. And it brings great injustice, for some people get the ration and some don't. We should simplify the whole rationing business by over 50 or 60 percent. It can be done by decreasing the number and variety of articles rationed and by excluding all absolutely nonessential food from rationing.

It would certainly give a mighty lift of spirit to the housewife and to the grocer. Also it would save some of their time for other war duties. Also a good way to check inflation is to let food luxuries go to the highest bidder. That would spigot off spare money and get it into channels where the 90-percent profit taxes can bite into it.

8. We should recognize that processing and distributing foods are righteous and necessary callings. Thousands of small firms are being driven out of business. It would help win the war if left-wing reforms in our food economy were suspended for the duration. We should establish war committees in all the processing and distributing trades. They should be given major responsibilities in keeping the flow of food moving to the right spots. They could greatly assist State and local officials in policing the trades. They too have sons in the war. They are just as patriotic men as lawyers and economists. They are the only people who know how. Their interest is to stamp out black markets. And their profits can be absolutely controlled.

Enforce the condition of dealers' licenses so that they may deal only with another licensed dealer and then direct the railways and trucks to transport only for licensed dealers. This would stop most of the black markets.

9. Such a system will avoid subsidies either to farmers or the trades or the consumers. Subsidies will not stop inflation. Subsidies are a delayed aggravation.

The New York Times properly says they "do not in the least deal with primary causes. They are like cleaning a room by sweeping the dirt under the bed."

And who is supposed to benefit by subsidies? It is supposed to be the worker, but the worker is also the taxpayer. So is the farmer. And taxes are, sooner or later, increased by just the same amount as the subsidy. Subsidies consist of taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another with an illusion attached that the cost of living has been reduced. It is both more painful and more costly to take money out of the tax pocket than it is to get it out of the price pocket. A wage based on subsidy foundations will break down sooner or later. Moreover, subsidy money increases Government borrowing and debt to the banks and that adds to inflation pressure. Far more serious, however, is the result to the farmer and the consumer. Price fixing based on any such concept will strangle production. Its operation in the distribution trades will clog the flow of commodities and will in the end increase prices and black markets. Likewise, subsidies can become a weapon of favoritism or of punishment in the hands of the huge bureaucracy. They will sooner or later lead to scandal.

CONCLUSION

If these broad lines, policies, and organization be adopted, then food will flow naturally from farm to processor to wholesaler to retailer and to the consumer. Prices will be better restrained. They will be lower, for the black markets can be blacked out. The housewives will have less trouble and worry. And, above all, farm production will be stimulated, not stifled.

But, over and beyond better methods of food control, we must absolutely assure the maximum production of America.

Let me say again that that is the only road that leads to the defeat of inflation, to decreased hardship in our homes, to assured support of our allies, and to peace for mankind.

If those in power and those not in power shall have wisdom, implacable resolve, a spirit of sacrifice, the fields of America will blossom with an abundant life that will save vast human life in a world given to human destruction.